



DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS

EDITED BY
JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF
JOHN A. SELBIE, D.D.

AND (IN THE READING OF THE PROOFS) OF
JOHN C. LAMBERT, D.D.

VOLUME I-II

AARON-ZION

EDINBURGH: T.&T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET

New York: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, 153-157 Fifth Avenue

1906

VOLUME 1: PREFACE

The Purpose of this Dictionary is to give an account of everything that relates to CHRIST--His Person, Life, Work, and Teaching.

It is in a sense complementary to the *Dictionary of the Bible*, in which, of course, Christ has a great place. But a Dictionary of the Bible, being occupied mainly with things biographical, historical, geographical, or antiquarian, does not give attention to the things of Christ sufficient for the needs of the preacher, to whom Christ is everything. This is, first of all, a

preacher's Dictionary. The Authors of the articles have been carefully chosen from among those Scholars who are, or have been, themselves preachers. And even when the articles have the same titles as articles in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, they are written by new men, and from a new standpoint. It is thus a work which is quite distinct from, and altogether independent of, the *Dictionary of the Bible*.

It is called a Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, because it includes everything that the Gospels contain, whether directly related to Christ or not. Its range, however, is far greater than that of the Gospels. It seeks to cover all that relates to Christ throughout the Bible and in the life and literature of the world. There will be articles on the Patristic estimate of Jesus, the Mediaeval estimate, the Reformation and Modern estimates. There will be articles on Christ in the Jewish writings and in the Muslim literature. Much attention has been given to modern thought, whether Christian or anti-Christian. Every aspect of modern life, in so far as it touches or is touched by Christ, is described under its proper title.

Still, the Gospels are the main source of our knowledge of Christ, and it will be found that the contents of the Gospels, especially their spiritual contents, have never before been so thoroughly investigated and set forth.

It will be observed at once that a large number of the titles of the articles are new. Thus--to take the first letter of the alphabet --there are no articles in the *Dictionary of the Bible* (unless the word happens to be used in some obsolete sense) on Abgar, Abiding, Above and below, Absolution, Accommodation, Activity, Affliction, Agony, Amazement, Ambassage, Ambition, Announcements of Death, Annunciation, Arbitration, Aristeas, Aristion, Arrest, Asceticism, Attraction of Christ, Attributes of Christ, Authority of Christ, Authority in Religion, Awe. These articles are enough to give the present work distinction.

Again, there are certain topics which are treated more fully here than in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, because they have specially to do with Christ. In the letter A may be named Acceptance, Access, Alpha and Omega, Anger, Anointing, Ascension, Assurance, Atonement.

All these articles, moreover, have a range which is greater than the corresponding articles in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, if they occur there. They describe some aspect of Christ's Person or Work, not only as it is presented in the Bible, but also as it has been brought out in the history of the Church, and in Christian experience.

And even when the articles are confined to the Gospels they have a character of their own. The ground that has to be covered being less, the treatment can be fuller. It has also been found possible to make it more expository. Take the following examples --Abba, Amen, Angels, Apostles, Archelaus, Art, Augustus.

Thus, in a word, there are three classes of topics, each of which contributes something towards the distinction of this work. There are topics, like Authority of Christ, which are wholly new. There are topics which may or may not be wholly new, like Attraction (which is new) and Atonement (which is not), but which have a wider range than any topics in the

Dictionary of the Bible. And there are topics, like Angels, which have a narrower range, having no occasion to go beyond the limits of the Gospels, but within that range are fuller, and of more practical value for the preacher.

The subject is inexhaustible. It has not been exhausted in this work. Perhaps the most that has been done is to show how great Christ is.

Many scholars have rendered valuable assistance. In addition to the services of Dr. Selbie and Dr. Lambert, the Editor desires especially to acknowledge those of Professor Howard Osgood of Rochester Theological Seminary, New York, who examined the Gospels minutely to see that no topic had been omitted, and added some useful titles to the list.

The Dictionary will be completed in two volumes, of which this is the first.

VOLUME 2: PREFACE

In issuing the second volume of the Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, the Editor desires, first of all, to thank his colleagues and contributors for the interest that they have taken in the work. He desires, further, to express his gratitude for the reception which the first volume has met with. All concerned in it are ready to confess that the task of producing a Dictionary which could be spoken of as really worthy of its subject has been beyond them. And they have felt this only the more as the work has proceeded. But reviewers have generously recognized the fact that no trouble has been spared to make the Dictionary as worthy as possible; and the public everywhere, but especially preachers of the Gospel, have responded. It is hoped that the second volume will be found to be not inferior to the first.

The Appendix belongs to the original idea. It was felt from the beginning that the articles which it contains should be placed in a group, apart from the general alphabetical order.

#define version=3

#define strong=0

 List of Abbreviations

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

I. General

Alex. Alexandrian.

Apoc. Apocalypse, Apocalyptic.

Apocr. Apocrypha, Apocryphal.

Aq. Aquila.

Arab. Arabic.

Aram. Aramaic.

Assyr. Assyrian.

Bab. Babylonian.

c. *circa*, about.

Can. Canaanite.

cf. compare.

ct. contrast.

D Deuteronomist.

E Elohist.

edd. editions or editors.

Egyp. Egyptian.

Eng. English.

Eth. Ethiopic.

f. and following verse or page: as Act_10:34 f.

ff. and following verses or pages: as Mat_11:28 ff.

Gr. Greek.

H Law of Holiness.

Heb. Hebrew.

Hel. Hellenistic.

Hex. Hexateuch.

Isr. Israelite.
J Jahwist.
J" Jehovah.
Jerus. Jerusalem.
Jos. Josephus.
LXX Septuagint.
MSS Manuscripts.
MT Massoretic Text.
n. note.
NT New Testament.
Onk. Onkelos.
OT Old Testament.
P Priestly Narrative.
Pal. Palestine, Palestinian.
Pent. Pentateuch.
Pers. Persian.
Phil. Philistine.
Phœn. Phœnician.
Pr. Bk. Prayer Book.
R Redactor.
Rom. Roman.

Sam. Samaritan.

Sem. Semitic.

Sept. Septuagint.

Sin. Sinaitic.

Symm. Symmachus.

Syr. Syriac.

Talm. Talmud.

Targ. Targum.

Theod. Theodotion.

TR Textus Receptus.

tr. translate or translation

VSS Versions.

Vulg. Vulgate.

WH Westcott and Hort's text.

II. Books of the Bible

Old Testament

Gn Genesis.

Ex Exodus.

Lv Leviticus.

Nu Numbers.

Dt Deuteronomy

Jos Joshua.

Jg Judges.

Ru Ruth.

1 S, 2 S 1 and 2 Samuel.

1 K, 2 K 1 and 2 Kings.

1 Ch, 2 Ch 1 and 2 Chronicles

Ezr Ezra.

Neh Nehemiah.

Est Esther.

Job.

Ps Psalms.

Pr Proverbs.

Ec Ecclesiastes.

Ca Canticles.

Is Isaiah.

Jer Jeremiah.

La Lamentations

Ezk Ezekiel.

Dn Daniel.

Hos Hosea.

Jl Joel.

Am Amos.
Ob Obadiah.
Jon Jonah.
Mic Micah.
Nah Nahum.
Hab Habakkuk.
Zeph Zephaniah.
Hag Haggai.
Zec Zechariah.
Mal Malachi.

Apocrypha

1 Es, 2 Es 1 and 2 Esdras.

Ad. Est Additions to Esther.

Wis Wisdom.
Sir Sirach or Ecclesiasticus.
Bar Baruch.
Three Song of the Three Children.
To Tobit.
Jth Judith.
Sus Susanna.
Bel Bel and the Dragon.

Pr. Man Prayer of Manasses.

1 Mac, 2 Mac 1 and 2 Maccabees.

New Testament

Mt Matthew.

Mk Mark.

Lk Luke.

Jn John.

Ac Acts.

Ro Romans.

1 Co, 2 Co 1 and 2 Corinthians.

Gal Galatians.

Eph Ephesians.

Ph Philippians.

Col Colossians.

1 Th, 2 Th 1 and 2 Thessalonians.

1 Ti, 2 Ti 1 and 2 Timothy.

Tit Titus.

Philem Philemon.

He Hebrews.

Ja James.

1 P, 2 P 1 and 2 Peter.

1 Jn, 2 Jn, 3 Jn 1, 2, and 3 John.

Jude.

Rev Revelation.

III. English Versions

Wyc. Wyclif's Bible (NT *circa (about)* 1380, OT *circa (about)* 1382, Purvey's Revision *circa (about)* 1388).

Tind. Tindale's NT 1526 and 1534, Pent. [Note: Pentateuch.] 1530.

Cov. Coverdale's Bible 1535.

Matt. or Rog. Matthew's (*i.e.* prob. Rogers') Bible 1537.

Cran. or Great Cranmer's 'Great' Bible 1539.

Tav. Taverner's Bible 1539.

Gen. Geneva NT 1557, Bible 1560.

Bish. Bishops' Bible 1568.

Tom. Tomson's NT 1576.

Rhem. Rhemish NT 1582.

Dou. Douay OT 1609.

AV Authorized Version 1611.

AVm Authorized Version margin.

RV Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885.

RVm Revised Version margin.

EV Auth. and Rev. Versions.

IV. For the Literature

AHT Ancient Hebrew Tradition.

AJSL American Journal of Sem. [Note: Semitic.] Lang. and Literature.

AJTh American Journal of Theology.

AT Altes Testament.

BL Bampton Lecture.

BM British Museum.

BRP Biblical Researches in Palestine.

CIG Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum.

CIL Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.

CIS Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum.

COT Cuneiform Inscriptions and the OT.

DB Dictionary of the Bible.

DCA Dictionary of Christian Antiquities.

DRE Dictionary of Religion and Ethics.

Ebi Encyclopaedia Bible.

EBr Encyclopaedia Britannica.

EGT Expositor's Greek Testament.

EHH Early History of the Hebrews.

ERE Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.

ExpT Expository Times.

GAP Geographie des alten Palästina.

GGA Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen.

GGN Nachrichten der königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen.

GJV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.

GVI Geschichte des Volkes Israel.

HCM Higher Criticism and the Monuments.

HE Historia Ecclesiastica.

HGHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.

HI History of Israel.

HJP History of the Jewish People.

HPM History, Prophecy, and the Monuments.

HPN Hebrew Proper Names.

HWB Handwörterbuch.

ICC International Critical Commentary.

IJG Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte.

JBL Journal of Biblical Literature.

JDTh Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie.

JQR Jewish Quarterly Review.

JRAS Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.

JSL Journal of Sacred Literature.

JThSt Journal of Theological Studies.

KAT Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Test.

KGF Keilinschriften u. Geschichtsforschung.

KIB Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek.

LB The Land and the Book.

LCBl Literarisches Centralblatt.

LOT Introd. to the Literature of the Old Test.

MNDPV Mittheilungen n. Nachrichten d. deutschen Pal. [Note: Palestine, Palestinian.] Vereins.

NHWB Nenebräisches Wörterbuch.

NKZ Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift.

NTZG Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte.

ON Otium Norvicense.

OP Origin of the Psalter.

OTJC The Old Test. in the Jewish Church

PB Polychrome Bible.

PEF Palestine Exploration Fund.

PEFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.

PSBA Proceedings of Soc. of Bibl. Archaeology.

PRE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.

QPB Queen's Printers' Bible.

RB Revue Biblique.

RE Realencyklopädie.

REJ Revue des Etudes Juives.

RP Records of the Past.

RS Religion of the Semites.

RWB Realwörterbuch.

SBE Sacred Books of the East.

SBOT Sacred Books of Old Test.

SK or *TSK* Theol. Studien und Kritiken.

SP Sinai and Palestine.

SWP Memoirs of the Survey of W. Palestine.

ThL or *ThLZ* Theol. Literaturzeitung.

ThT Theol. Tijdschrift.

TS Texts and Studies.

TSBA Transactions of Soc. of Bibl. Archaeology.

TU Texte und Untersuchungen.

WAI Western Asiatic Inscriptions.

WZKM Wiener Zeitschrift für Kunde des Morgenlandes.

ZA Zeitschrift für Assyriologie.

ZAW Zeitschrift für die Alttest. Wissenschaft.

ZATW Zeitschrift für die Alttest. Wissenschaft.

ZDMG Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.

ZDPV Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.

ZKSF Zeitschrift für Keilschriftforschung.

ZKW or *ZKWL* Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft.

ZNTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissenschaft.

ZThK Zeitschrift f. Theologie u. Kirche.

A small superior number designates the particular edition of the work referred to: as *KA*T [Note: AT Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Test.] 2, *LO*T [Note: OT Introd. to the Literature of the Old Test.] 6.

 Authors of Articles

AUTHORS OF ARTICLES

Rev. Robert M. Adamson, M.A., Ardrossan.

Rev. Walter F. Adeney, D.D., Professor of Theology and Principal of the Lancashire College, Manchester.

Rev. P. Henderson Aitken, B.Sc., B.D., Glasgow.

Rev. Gross Alexander, S.T.D., late Professor of New Testament Greek and Exegesis in Vanderbilt University, Nashville.

Rev. Willoughby C. Allen, M.A., Chaplain, Fellow, and Lecturer in Theology and Hebrew, Exeter College, Oxford.

Rev. Frederick Lincoln Anderson, M.A., D.D., Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Newton Theological Institution, Mass.

Rev. William P. Armstrong, D.D., Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in Princeton Theological Seminary, N.J.

Rev. Benjamin Wisner Bacon, D.D., Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation in Yale University, New Haven.

Rev. P. Mordaunt Barnard, B.D., late Rector of Headley, Epsom.

Rev. J. Vernon Bartlet, M.A., D.D., Professor of Church History in Mansfield College, Oxford.

Rev. Francis R. Beattie, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., Professor of Apologetics and Systematic Theology in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of Kentucky.

Very Rev. John Henry Bernard, D.D., Dean of St. Patrick's, Fellow of Trinity College, and Archbishop King's Lecturer in Divinity in the University of Dublin.

Rev. Harry Bisseker, M.A., The Leysian Mission, London.

Rev. Archibald Bisset, Ratho.

Rev. Andrew N. Bogle, M.A., Leith.

Rev. Albert Bonus, M.A., Alphington, Exeter.

Rev. George H. Box, M.A., late Hebrew Master, Merchant Taylors' School, London, Rector of Linton, Ross.

Rev. E. P. Boys-Smith, M.A., Vicar of Hordle, Brockenhurst.

Rev. J. B. Bristow, B.D., Rector of Clondalkin, Co. Dublin.

Rev. Morison Bryce, Baldernock, Milngavie.

Rev. A. E. Burn, D.D., Rector of Handsworth, Birmingham, and Prebendary of Lichfield.

Rev. Adam G. Campbell, M.A., Afton, New Cumnock.

Rev. R. J. Campbell, M.A., City Temple, London.

Rev. William M. Christie, Aleppo.

Rev. Dugald Clark, B.D., Glassary, Lochgilphead.

Rev. John S. Clemens, M.A., Principal of Ranmoor College, Sheffield.

Rev. Camden M. Cobern, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of the English Bible and the Philosophy of Religion in Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.

Rev. Arthur W. Cooke, M.A., Newcastle-on-Tyne.

Rev. James Cooper, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Glasgow.

Rev. Henry Cowan, D.D., Professor of Church History in the University of Aberdeen.

Rev. Hugh H. Currie, B.D., Keig, Aberdeenshire.

Rev. Edgar Daplyn, London.

Right Rev. Charles Frederick D'Arcy, D.D., Bishop of Clogher.

Rev. Edwin Charles Dargan, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Homiletics and Ecclesiology in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.

Rev. W. Theophilus Davison, D.D., Professor of Theology in Richmond Theological College, Surrey.

Rev. Percy Dearmer, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's the Virgin, Primrose Hill, London.

Rev. Francis Brigham Denio, D.D., Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature in Bangor Theological Seminary, Maine.

Rev. James Denney, D.D., Professor of New Testament Language, Literature, and Theology in the United Free Church College, Glasgow.

Rev. Marcus Dods, D.D., Principal and Professor of Exegetical Theology in the New College, Edinburgh.

Rev. James Donald, D.D., Keithhall, Inverurie.

Rev. C. T. Dimont, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Halifax.

Rev. Marcus Dods, D.D., Professor of Exegetical Theology in the New College, Edinburgh.

Rev. Henry E. Dosker, D.D., Professor of Church History in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of Kentucky.

Rev. F. Homes Dudden, B.D., Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford.

Rev. Alexander A. Duncan, B.D., Auchterless, Aberdeenshire.

Rev. Hugh Duncan, B.D., Garturk, Coatbridge.

Rev. W. H. Dundas, B.D., Curate Assistant of St. Thomas's, Belfast.

Rev. W. H. Dundas, B.D., Rector of Magheragall, Lisburn.

Rev. William Henry Dyson, Edgerton, Huddersfield.

Rev. William Ewing, M.A., Edinburgh, formerly of Tiberias, Palestine.

Rev. J. W. Falconer, B.D., Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Rev. R. A. Falconer, D.Litt., D.D., Principal of the Presbyterian Theological College, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Rev. George Farmer, formerly Vicar of Hartlip, Kent.

Rev. George Boardman Eager, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Biblical Introduction and Pastoral Theology in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.

Right Rev. Rowland Ellis, D.D., Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney.

Rev. Cyril W. Emmet, M.A., Vicar of West Hendred, Berks.

Rev. W. Ewing, M.A., Edinburgh.

Rev. R. A. Falconer, D.Litt., D.D., President of the University of Toronto, Canada.

Rev. J. H. Farmer, Professor in M Master University, Toronto.

Rev. C. L. Feltoe, D.D., Rector of Duxford, Cambridge.

Rev. Adam Fyfe Findlay, M.A., Arbroath.

Rev. J. Dick Fleming, B.D., Tranent.

Rev. Frank Hugh Foster, Ph.D., D.D., lately Professor of Systematic Theology in the Pacific Seminary, Berkeley, Cal.

Rev. William Barrett Frankland, M.A., late Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge, and Assistant-Chaplain at Giggleswick School.

Rev. Robert Sleightouse Franks, M.A., B.Litt., Birmingham.

Rev. Norman Fraser, B.D., Edinburgh.

Rev. Henry William Fulford, M.A., Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge.

Rev. C. E. Garrad, M.A., Fellow of Clare College, and Vice-Principal of the Clergy Training School, Cambridge.

Rev. Alfred Ernest Garvie, D.D., Professor of Ethics, Theism, and Comparative Religion in New and Hackney Colleges, London.

Rev. Owen H. Gates, Ph.D., Professor in Andover Theological Seminary, Mass.

Rev. Lucien Gautier, Ph.D., Honorary Professor of Old Testament Exegesis and History, Geneva.

Rev. Alfred S. Geden, M.A., Professor of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in Richmond College, Surrey.

Rev. George Holley Gilbert, Ph.D., D.D., late Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation in Chicago Theological Seminary.

Rev. Richard Glaister, B.D., Kirkcudbright.

Terrot Reaveley Glover, M.A., Fellow and Classical Lecturer, St. John's College, Cambridge.

Rev. Calvin Goodspeed, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Baylor University, Waco, Texas.

Rev. George Pearce Gould, M.A., Principal of Regent's Park College, London.

Rev. James Gordon Gray, D.D., Rome.

Rev. Thomas Gregory, M.A., Kilmalcolm.

Rev. Canon Charles T. P. Grierson, B.D., Rector of Seapatrick, Banbridge, Co. Down.

Rev. James O. Hannay, M.A., Rector of Aughaval, Westport, Co. Mayo.

Rev. Charles Harris, D.D., Vicar of Claverley, Wolverhampton, late Lecturer in Theology in St. David's College, Lampeter.

Rev. D. A. Hayes, Ph.D., S.T.D., LL.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.

Rev. W. J. Henderson, B.A., Principal of the Baptist College, Bristol.

Rev. R. Travers Herford, B.A., Stand, Whitefield, Manchester.

Rev. John Herkless, D.D., Professor of Church History in the University of St. Andrews.

Rev. W. W. Holdsworth, M.A., Professor of New Testament Language and Literature in Handsworth College, Birmingham.

Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, B.D., Rector of Kinnitty, King's Co.

Rev. Caspar Wistar Hodge, D.D., Lecturer in Systematic Theology in Princeton Theological Seminary, N.J.

Rev. A. Mitchell Hunter, M.A., Cardross, Dumbartonshire.

Rev. H. L. Jackson, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Huntingdon.

Rev. Arthur Jenkinson, Innellan, Greenock.

Rev. William Ralph Inge, D.D., Vicar of All Saints', Ennismore Gardens, London, late Fellow and Tutor of Hertford College, Oxford.

Rev. James Iverach, D.D., Professor of Apologetics and Dogmatics, Principal of the United Free Church College, Aberdeen.

Rev. H. L. Jackson, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Huntingdon.

Rev. Arthur Jenkinson, Innellan, Greenock.

A. J. Jenkinson, M.A., Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford.

Rev. M. P. Johnstone, B.D., Fraserburgh.

Rev. E. Griffith-Jones, B.A., Principal and Professor of Theology in the Yorkshire United College, Bradford.

Friedrich Wilhelm Ferdinand Kattenbusch, D.D., Ph.D., Ord. Professor of Dogmatics in the University of Halle.

Rev. John Kelman, D.D., Edinburgh.

Rev. W. S. Kerr, B.D., Vicar of Ballywalter, Co. Down.

Rev. Thomas B. Kilpatrick, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Knox College, Toronto.

Rev. Richard John Knowling, D.D., Canon of Durham, and Professor of Divinity in the University of Durham.

Rev. David M. W. Laird, M.A., Edinburgh.

Rev. John C. Lambert, D.D., Fenwick, Kilmarnock.

Rev. Robert Leggat, Berwick-on-Tweed.

Rev. John Robert Legge, M. A., Buckhurst Hill, Essex.

Rev. William F. Lofthouse, M.A., Professor in the Theological College, Handsworth, Birmingham.

Rev. Charles Scott Macalpine, B.D., Manchester.

Rev. A. B. Macaulay, M.A., Dundee.

Rev. C. A. M'Donald, B.D., Arrochar, Dumbartonshire.

Rev. John Edgar M'Fadyen, M.A. (Glas.), B.A. (Oxon.), Professor of Old Testament Literature and Exegesis in Knox College, Toronto.

Rev. George M'Hardy, D.D., Kirkcaldy.

Rev. George M. Mackie, D.D., Chaplain to the Church of Scotland at Beyront, Syria.

Rev. Duncan A. Mackinnon, M.A., Marykirk, Kincardineshire.

Rev. Robert Mackintosh, D.D., Professor of Christian Ethics, Apologetics, and Sociology in the Lancashire Independent College, Manchester.

Right Rev. Arthur John Maclean, D.D., Bishop of Moray.

Rev. A. H. M'Neile, B.D., Fellow and Dean of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.

Rev. James Edmond M'Ouat, B.D., Logiealmond, Perthshire.

Rev. William M. M'Pheeters, D.D., Professor of Old Testament Literature and Exegesis, Columbia Theological Seminary, S.C.

Rev. Robert Macpherson, D.D., Elgin.

Rev. Joseph T. L. Maggs, D.D., Leeds.

Rev. John Turner Marshall, D.D., Principal of the Baptist College, Manchester.

Rev. A. Stuart Martin, B.D., Scone, Perth.

Rev. G. Currie Martin, D.D., Professor of New Testament Theology and Patristics in the United College, Bradford.

E. W. Gurney Masterman, M.D., F.R.C.S., F.R.G.S., D.P.H., Jerusalem, Syria.

Rev. Shailer Mathews, D.D., Professor of New Testament History and Interpretation in the University of Chicago.

Rev. J. H. Maude, M.A., Rector of Hilgay, Downham Market.

Late Rev. Prebendary F. Meyrick, M.A., Rector of Blickling, Aylesham.

Rev. Andrew Miller, M.A., Glasgow.

Rev. W. J. S. Miller, B.D., Houndwood, Reston.

Rev. George Milligan, D.D., Caputh, Perthshire.

Rev. Joseph Mitchell, B.D., Mauchline.

Rev. James Moffatt, D.D., Dundonald, Ayrshire.

Rev. W. S. Montgomery, B.D., Abbeyleix, Queen's County.

Rev. R. W. Moss, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the Didsbury College, Manchester.

Rev. Warren Joseph Moulton, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Associate Professor of New Testament Language and Literature in Bangor Theological Seminary.

Rev. T. Allen Moxon, MA., Vicar of Alfreton, Derbyshire.

Rev. W. W. Moore, D.D., President of Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.

Rev. W. Morgan, M.A., Tarbolton, Ayrshire.

Rev. R. Waddy Moss, D.D., Professor of Classics in the Didsbury College, Manchester.

Rev. John Muir, B.D., Kirkcowan, Wigtownshire.

Rev. Joseph Muir, B.D., Edinburgh.

Rev. Lewis A. Muirhead, D.D., Broughty Ferry.

Rev. George Murray, B.D., Sauchie, Alloa.

Rev. James Ross Murray, M.A., Manchester.

Eberhard Nestle, Ph.D., D.D., Professor at Maulbronn.

Rev. M. R. Newbolt, B.A., Vicar of Iffley, Oxford.

Rev. Albert Henry Newman, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Church History in Baylor University, Texas.

Rev. Thomas Nicol, D.D., Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University of Aberdeen.

Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, B.D., Organizing Secretary of the Parochial Missions to the Jews.

Rev. James Orr, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology and Apologetics in the United Free Church College, Glasgow.

Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, B.D., Organizing Secretary of the Parochial Missions to the Jews at Home and Abroad.

Rev. J. W. Oman, D.Phil., Alnwick.

Rev. James Patrick, B.D., B.Sc., Burntisland.

Rev. William Patrick, D.D., Principal of Manitoba College, Winnipeg.

Arthur S. Peake, B.D., Professor of Biblical Exegesis and Dean of the Faculty of Theology, Victoria University, Manchester.

Rev. John Robert van Pelt, Ph.D., Lewisburg, Pa.

Rev. Samuel Plantz, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., President of Lawrence University, Appleton, Wis.

Rev. Alfred Plummer, D.D., late Master of University College, Durham.

Rev. Edward B. Pollard, D.D., Professor in Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa.

Rev. William Louis Poteat, M.A., LL.D., President of Wake Forest College, N.C.

Rev. E. B. Pollard, Georgetown, Ky.

Rev. Cyril Henry Prichard, M.A., Rector of Wiston, Steyning, Sussex.

Rev. Leighton Pullan, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of St. John Baptist College, Oxford.

Rev. Frederick J. Rae, M.A., Aberdeen.

Rev. F. S. Ranken, M.A., Rector of South Walsham, Norwich.

Rev. W. M. Rankin, B.D., Glasgow.

Rev. John Reid, M.A., Inverness.

Frank Richards, M.A., Kingswood School, Bath.

Rev. Charles Wesley Rishell, Ph.D., Professor of Historical Theology and Assistant Dean in Boston University, Mass.

Rev. J. S. Riggs, D.D., Professor of Biblical Criticism in the Theological Seminary of Auburn, N.Y.

Rev. C. W. Rishell, D.D., Professor of Historical Theology in Boston University, Mass.

Rev. John Edward Roberts, B.D., Manchester.

Rev. Frank Edward Robinson, B.A., Professor of Hebrew and Church History in the Baptist College, Bristol.

Rev. Archibald Thomas Robertson, D.D., Professor of Interpretation of the New Testament in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.

Rev. James Robertson, D.D., Whittingehame.

Rev. F. E. Robinson, B.D., Professor of Hebrew in the Baptist College, Bristol.

Rev. George Livingston Robinson, Ph.D., Professor of Old Testament Literature and Exegesis in the M'Cormick Theological Seminary, Chicago.

Rev. Arthur E. Ross, B.D., Rector of Portrush, Co. Antrim.

Rev. Andrew E. Ross, B.D., Rector of Portrush, Co. Antrim.

Rev. Alfred Norman Rowland, M.A., London.

Rev. John Richard Sampey, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Interpretation of the Old Testament in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.

Rev. William Sanday, D.D., LL.D., D.Sc., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, Chaplain in Ordinary to H.M. the King.

Rev. Charles Anderson Scott, M.A., London.

Rev. Ernest F. Scott, B.A., Prestwick.

Rev. Robert Scott, M.A., Professor in Wilson College, Bombay.

Rev. Henry Clay Sheldon, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Boston University.

Rev. Edward Shillito, M.A., London.

Rev. Henry Clay Sheldon, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Boston University.

Rev. Edward Shillito, M.A., Brighton.

Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, M.A., Chaplain, St. Mary's Hospital, Ilford.

Rev. John W. Slater, B.D., Scone, Perth.

Rev. S. J. Ramsay Sibbald, B.D., Crathie, Ballater.

Rev. J. G. Simpson, M.A., Principal of the Clergy School, Leeds.

Rev. David Smith, M.A., Tulliallan.

Rev. Harold Smith, M.A., Rector of Grimley, Worcester.

Rev. J. Cromarty Smith, B.D., Coatdyke, Coatbridge.

W. Taylor Smith, M.A., Sevenoaks, Kent.

Rev. Harry Herbert Snell, B.A., Reading.

Late Rev. J. Soutar, M.A., Tiberias, Palestine.

Alexander Souter, M.A., Litt.D., Yates Professor of New Testament Exegesis in Mansfield College, Oxford.

Rev. James Stalker, D.D., Professor of Church History and Christian Ethics in the United Free Church College, Aberdeen.

Rev. Wilbur Fletcher Steele, M.A., S.T.D., Professor in the Department of Biblical Science of Denver University, Colorado.

Rev. Robert Stevenson, B.D., Gargunnoch.

Rev. G. Wauchope Stewart, B.D., Fyvie, Aberdeenshire.

Rev. W. B. Stevenson, B.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Introduction in the Theological College, Bala.

Rev. George Wauchope Stewart, B.D., Aberdeen.

Rev. Robert Laird Stewart, D.D., Professor in Lincoln University, Chester Co., Penn.

Rev. Darwell Stone, M.A., Pusey Librarian, Oxford.

Rev. G. Gordon Stott, B.D., London.

Rev. R. H. Strachan, M.A., Elie.

Rev. A. Pollok Sym, B.D., Lilliesleaf.

Rev. John G. Tasker, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in Handsworth College, Birmingham.

Rev. R. Bruce Taylor, M.A., Aberdeen.

Rev. Milton Spencer Terry, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Christian Doctrine in the Garrett Biblical Institute, Northwestern University.

Rev. G. W. Thatcher, B.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament History in Mansfield College, Oxford.

Rev. R. Bruce Taylor, M.A., London.

Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford.

Rev. William D. Thomson, M.A., Edinburgh.

Rev. Edward Harper Titchmarsh, M.A., Sheffield.

Rev. Geerhardus Vos, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Biblical Theology in Princeton Theological Seminary, N.J.

Rev. G. H. S. Walpole, D.D., Rector of Lambeth.

Rev. Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Theology in Princeton Theological Seminary, N.J.

Rev. E. Wheeler, M.A., Canning Town, London.

Rev. B. Whitefoord, D.D., Prebendary of Salisbury Cathedral and Principal of the Theological College, Salisbury.

Rev. Owen C. Whitehouse, D.D., Senior Tutor in Cheshunt College, Cambridge.

Rev. George C. Watt, B.D., Edinkillie.

Rev. Thomas H. Weir, B.D., M.R.A.S., Lecturer in Hebrew and Arabic in the University of Glasgow.

Professor Dr. Johannes Weiss of the University of Marburg.

Rev. Newport J. D. White, D.D., Lecturer in Hebrew and Divinity in the University of Dublin, and Canon of St. Patrick's Cathedral.

Rev. B. Whitefoord, D.D., Prebendary of Salisbury Cathedral and Principal of the Theological College, Salisbury.

Rev. A. R. Whitham, M.A., Principal of the Culham Training College, Abingdon.

Rev. J. R. Willis, B.D., Rector of Preban and Moyne, Rathdrum, Co. Wicklow.

Herbert G. Wood, M.A., Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge.

Rev. H. J. Wotherspoon, M.A., Edinburgh.

Rev. Arthur Wright, D.D., Fellow, Tutor, and Vice-President of Queens' College, Cambridge.

Rev. T. H. Wright, Edinburgh.

Rev. D. G. Young, B.D., Moneydie, Perth.

Rev. J. Young, B.D., Paisley.

Rev. Nathan E. Wood, President of the Theological Seminary, and Professor of Christian Theology, Newton Centre, Mass.

Rev. Arthur W. Wotherspoon, M.A., Glasgow.

Rev. T. H. Wright, Edinburgh.

Rev. Andrew C. Zenos, D.D., Professor of Biblical Theology in the M'Cormick Theological Seminary, Chicago.

⚡ Aaron

AARON.—The name occurs only 5 times in the NT. Three of the passages contain historical references only: Luk_1:5 where Elisabeth is described as ‘of the daughters of Aaron’; Act_7:40 which refers to the request of the Israelites that Aaron would ‘make them gods’; and Heb_9:4 ‘Aaron’s rod that budded.’ The other two passages refer to Aaron’s office as high priest, and are directly concerned with the Christian doctrine of the priesthood of Christ. In Heb_5:4 we read, ‘And no man taketh the honour unto himself, but when he is called of God, even as was Aaron’; and Heb_7:11 speaks of another priest after the order of Melchizedek, who should ‘not be reckoned after the order of Aaron.’ It is as the representative high priest that Aaron has been regarded as a type of Christ.

The two points on which the writer of Hebrews insists are, one of comparison, and one of contrast. On the one hand, Christ, like Aaron, did not take His priestly office on Himself, but was directly appointed by God (Heb_5:5); on the other, the Aaronic type of priesthood is sharply distinguished from that of our Lord in certain fundamental respects. Christ was indeed divinely appointed: He was prepared for service, in being made like His brethren (Heb_2:17), and fitted by His sympathy (Heb_4:15) and fidelity to undertake priestly work on their behalf; through His death on the cross He offered Himself as a sacrifice, apparently on earth and certainly in heaven as a temple not made with hands (Heb_9:24); He is able to save to the uttermost those who come to God through Him as priest, seeing He ever lives to make priestly intercession for them (Heb_7:25). Thus far He was Aaron’s antitype. But the analogy fails most seriously in certain important features, as the writer of Hebrews shows. Christ’s priesthood was not according to the Law. If He were on earth, He would not be a priest at all, springing as He did from Judah, not from Levi (Heb_7:14). He did not hold His office in virtue of earthly descent, nor was He limited to an earthly sanctuary, nor did He present to God a sin-offering which could be, or needed to be, frequently repeated (Heb_9:24 f.). None of the sacrifices of the Law could ‘make perfect as pertaining to the conscience’ (Heb_9:9). At best they procured only a limited access to God. Into the holiest place the high priest was permitted to enter only once a year, and then in virtue of sacrifices offered for his own sins, as well as the people’s (Heb_9:7). Christ’s priesthood was ‘after the order of Melchizedek’ (Heb_6:20), eternal: His sacrifice was a spiritual one, offered once for all; it is impossible to think of the repetition on earth of that offering which ‘through (the) eternal Spirit’ (Heb_9:14) our glorified High Priest presents continually in ‘a more perfect tabernacle’ (Heb_9:11) in heaven itself, for us. He was made a priest, not according to any legal enactment belonging to earth and finding its expression in

the flesh; but dynamically, according to the enduring power of an indissoluble life (Heb 7:16).

Thus Christ may well be spoken of as the second Adam, but not as a second Aaron. The lines of Bishop Wordsworth's hymn, 'Now our heavenly Aaron enters, Through His blood within the veil,' can be defended only in so far as the name Aaron is synonymous with high priest. The personal name suggests just those limitations which the generic name avoids, and which the writer of Hebrews expressly warns us must on no account be attributed to our great High Priest who has passed into the heavens. So far as the doctrine of Christ is concerned, it is well to follow Scripture usage and to speak of Him as our Eternal High Priest, rather than to press an analogical or typical relation to Aaron, which fails at many cardinal points.

Literature.—For the further discussion of the subject see Westcott and A. B. Davidson on *Hebrews*, especially the detached note of the latter on the Priesthood of Christ; also Milligan's Baird Lectures on *The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord*, and the art. of Dr. Denney on 'Priesthood in NT' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, vol. iv.

W. T. Davison.

Abba

ABBA.—An Aramaic word preserved by St. Mark in our Lord's prayer in Gethsemane (Mar 14:36 Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ, πάντα δυνατά σοι), and given twice in the same association with ὁ πατήρ by St. Paul (Rom 8:15 ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υιοθεσίας ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν, Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ; and Gal 4:6 ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν κράζον, Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ). A difficulty arises both as to the spelling and the pronunciation of the word Abba, and also as to its being found in all the above passages joined to ὁ πατήρ.

1. Abba (ἄββᾶ) corresponds to the Aramaic אַבְבָּא abbâ, which is the definite state of אַבְבָּא âbh (construct state אַבְבָּא abh), and means 'Father,' unless it is used for 'my Father' (אֲבָא for אַבְבָּא) as in Gen 19:34 a (Targ. [Note: Targum.] of Onkelos and pseudo-Jonathan; see Dalman, *Aramaisch-Neuhebräisches Wörterbuch*, s.v., *Gramm.* p. 162, and *Words of Jesus*, p. 192 [Dalman says that the suffix of 1 pers. sing. is

‘deliberately avoided with אב and is supplied by the determinative form’]). It is not, however, quite certain that the word was pronounced *abbâ* in Palestine in our Lord’s time. As the points were not invented till many centuries after, we cannot be sure that *abbâ* was then the definite state rather than *abhâ* as in Syriac; and we have no indication except the Greek transliteration that the *b* was then doubled. But the fact that, when points were first used (a.d. 700?), the *daghesh* was employed for the definite state of this word in the Targumic literature, coupled with the doubling of the *B* in the Greek, affords a presumption that the *b* was hard and doubled in this word at the beginning of our era [Dalman gives for the definite state אבא Gen 44:19, or אבא Num 25:14, or in Palestinian Targum also אבא; with other pronominal suffixes we have אבא etc., and the pl. definite state is אבא]. The Syriac, on the other hand, has *b* aspirated throughout, אב^h *abh*, אב^h אב^h *abhâ* (pron. *av*, *avâ*, or *aw*, *awâ*), etc., and the distinction between *abâ*, a spiritual father, and אב^h *avâ*, a natural father, which the grammarians make, appears not to be founded on any certain basis, nor to agree with the manuscripts (Payne-Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, s.v.). The proper name אב^h אב^h also in Syriac has always aspirated *b*, while Dalman (*Wörterbuch*) gives for Targumic אבא, and says it is an abbreviation of אבא. In Mar 14:36 (Peshitta) Pusey and Gwilliam give אב^h אב^h as in Massora 1 in the British Museum (Codex Additionalis 12138, Nestorianus, a.d. 899); the American edition prints אב^h (i.e. with א) in all three NT places; but this is rather a following of the grammarians than of good manuscripts. It is very noteworthy, however, that the Harkleian version in the Markan passage spells the word אב^h אב^h, transliterating the Greek directly back into Syriac, rather than using the Syriac word itself.

John Lightfoot (*Horae Hebraicae* on Mar 14:36) remarks that the Targum, in translating the OT, never renders a ‘civil’ father, i.e. a master, prince, lord, etc., by אבא, but only a natural father, or a father who adopts; in the former sense they use some other word. But this throws no light on the pronunciation of Abba.

It is to be noticed that it is not certain how the Greeks of the 1st cent. themselves pronounced ἀββᾶ, whether *abbâ* or, as the modern Greeks pronounce it, *avvâ*. The word is not found in the LXX Septuagint. It passed into ecclesiastical Latin with a doubled *b*, and gave us such words as ‘abbot,’ ‘abbacy,’ etc.

But does it mean 'Father' or 'my Father'? If it be a Jewish formula or fixed manner of beginning prayer, it may well be the latter. We must, however, note that whatever be the way of accounting for Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ (see below), the originators or originator of that phrase in Greek, whether the Jews, or our Lord, or St. Paul, or the Second Evangelist, seem to have taken Ἀββᾶ to mean merely 'Father.' And the same is probably true of the translators of the Peshitta. The Sinaitic Syriac, however, appears to read ܐܒܝܐܘܝܐ my Father (see below). The Curetonian Syriac is wanting here.

2. We have next to account for the association of Ἀββᾶ in its Greek dress with ὁ πατήρ in all the three places where it occurs in NT. In Mar_14:36 the Peshitta reads ܐܒܝܐܘܝܐ ܐܒܝܐܘܝܐ 'Father, my Father,' and the Sinaitic Syriac has simply ܐܒܝܐܘܝܐ 'my Father.' In Rom_8:15 and Gal_4:6 the Peshitta reads ܐܒܝܐܘܝܐ ܐܒܝܐܘܝܐ. All these appear to be mere expedients adopted to avoid the awkwardness of repeating ܐܒܝܐܘܝܐ, and they do not really throw light on the origin of the Greek phrase.

We may first take as a supposition that our Lord, praying in Gethsemane, used the Aramaic language, and therefore said 'Abba' only, and that ὁ πατήρ is the Evangelist's explanation, for Greek readers, of the Aramaic word. St. Mark undoubtedly reports several Aramaic words, and except in the case of the well-known 'Rabbi,' 'Rabboni' (Mar_9:5; Mar_10:51 etc.), explains them. But then he always uses a formula, ὁ ἐστίν (Mar_3:17, Mar_7:11; Mar_7:34) or ὁ ἐστὶ μεθερμηνευόμενον (Mar_5:41, Mar_15:34). It is suggested that in the case of Abba the familiarity of the word would make the connecting formula unnecessary; but the same consideration would make it unnecessary to explain it at all. Another suggestion is that the solemnity of the context would make the formula incongruous. The strongest argument for ὁ πατήρ being an addition of the Evangelist is that, whatever view we take of our Lord's having made use of Greek in ordinary speech, it is extremely unlikely that His prayers were in that language; and if He prayed in Aramaic, He would only say 'Abba.' It is the common experience of bilingual countries that though the acquired language may be in constant use for commerce or the ordinary purposes of life, the native tongue is tenaciously retained for devotion and prayer. Sanday-Headlam's supposition (*Romans, in loc.*), that our Lord used both words spontaneously, with deep emotion, might be quite probable if He prayed in the foreign tongue, Greek; but scarcely so if He prayed in the native Aramaic (see, however, below).

If ὁ πατήρ be due to St. Mark, it is probably not a mere explanation for the benefit of Greek readers. The suggestion that Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ had become a quasi-liturgical formula, possibly even among the Jews, or more probably among the Christians, would account for its introduction in a prayer, where interpretations would be singularly out of place. And this suggestion would account for St. Paul's using the phrase twice, in two Epistles written about the same time, indeed, but to two widely distant Churches. St. Paul is not in the habit of introducing Aramaic words ('Maranatha' in 1Co_16:22 is an exception), and if he were not quoting a well-known form, it is unlikely that he would have introduced one in writing to the Romans and Galatians. It is not probable, however, that he is quoting or thinking of our Lord's words in Gethsemane, for there is nothing in the context to suggest this.

If the phrase be a liturgical formula, we may account for it in various ways. J. B. Lightfoot (*Galatians, in loc.*) suggests that it may have originated among Hellenistic Jews; or else among Palestinian Jews, after they had learned Greek, as 'an expression of importunate entreaty.' He prefers the latter view, thinking that perhaps our Lord Himself used both words. He apparently means that Jesus took the Greek word into His Aramaic prayer; and he quotes from Schöttgen a similar case where a woman entreats a judge and addresses him as כִּירִי מִרִי 'My lord, lord,' the second word being equivalent to the first, except for the possessive suffix, and being a transliteration of κύριε. Chase ('The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church,' in the *Cambridge and Studies*, vol. i. p. 23) has suggested another origin for the phrase, which would place its home, not among the Jews (for which there is no evidence), but among the Christians. He suggests that it is due to the shorter or Lukan form of the Lord's Prayer (Luk_11:2 ff.). The Aramaic shorter form would begin with Abba, for the Greek begins with Πάτερ; and the hypothesis is that the early Christians in the intensity of their devotion repeated the first word of the prayer in either language. A somewhat similar phenomenon is seen in the repetitions for emphasis in Rev_9:11; Rev_12:9; Rev_20:2, where the names are given in both languages. Such a repetition is possible only in a bilingual country. That it is the shorter form of the Lord's Prayer that is used (if Dr. Chase's hypothesis be true), is seen from the Aramaic אבבא Abba. If the longer form had been in question, Πάτερ ἡμῶν, the initial word of the Aramaic would have had the possessive pronominal suffix of 1 pers. pl., and would be אבביןא äbhûnâ.

It is a confirmation of this theory that the words which follow, 'Not what I will but what thou wilt,' recall 'Thy will be done' of the Lord's Prayer; compare especially Mat_26:42 γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου, the exact words of the longer form of the Lord's

Prayer. This shows that both Evangelists had that prayer in their minds when relating the agony. The only consideration which militates against the theory is that ὁ πατήρ is used for Πάτερ. The nominative with the article is, however, often used in NT, by a Hebrew analogy, for an emphatic vocative, and the desire for emphasis may account for its use here.

A. J. Maclean.

⚡Abel

ABEL (אַבֶּל, Ἄβελ).— The name occurs in the Gospels only in Mat 23:35 || Luk 11:51, where Jesus declares that the blood of the prophets will be required of this generation. The passage is one of a series of invectives against Pharisaism, collected in Matthew 23, parts of which are preserved in Luke 11, 13, 14, 20, 21. Abel is named as the first of the long line of martyrs whose blood had been shed during the period covered by the OT, the last being Zachariah (which see). ‘In both cases the ἐκζήτησις is indicated: “the voice of thy brother’s blood crieth unto me from the ground” (Gen 4:10); “the Lord look upon it, and require it” (2Ch 24:22).’ In St. Matthew the words are addressed to the Pharisees in the 2nd person: ‘that upon you may come every righteous blood [.e. the blood of each righteous person] shed upon the earth, from the blood of Abel the righteous, until the blood of Zachariah ... etc.’ In St. Luke the passage is thrown into the 3rd person: ‘that the blood of all the prophets which hath been shed from the foundation of the world may be required of this generation, from the blood of Abel until the blood of Zachariah ... etc.’

The description of Abel in St. Matthew as ‘the righteous’ is noteworthy, and should be compared with Heb 11:4. In the story of Abel nothing whatever is said as to his moral character; the contrast between him and his brother lay in the fact that ‘Jehovah had respect unto Abel and to his offering; but unto Cain and to his offering he had not respect.’ The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews says that it was faith which led Abel to offer the more excellent sacrifice; but wherein the excellence consisted the narrative of Genesis does not explain. But the expression τοῦ δικαίου seems to reflect the Pharisaic conception of righteousness as that which ‘consisted primarily in the observance of all the rites and ceremonies prescribed in the law’ (cf. Luk 1:6). Abel’s offering must have been preferred presumably because it was in some way more to God’s liking—more correct. This, however, was not consonant with Christ’s idea of righteousness—‘except your righteousness shall abound beyond that of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven’ (Mat 5:20). It may be

concluded, therefore, that St. Luke has preserved the more original form of Christ's words, and that 'the righteous' is an addition in Mat 23:35 due to current Jewish conceptions.

2. It is possible that Christ had the story of Abel in mind when He spoke of the devil as being 'a murderer (ἀνθρωποκτόνος) from the beginning,' *i.e.* the instigator of murder as he is of lies (Joh 8:44). But the passage may be a reference to the introduction of death into the world by the fall of Adam.

3. In Heb 12:24 the 'blood of Abel' is contrasted with the 'blood of sprinkling' under the new dispensation. In Gen 4:10 God says: 'Hark! (קח) thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground,' *i.e.* it pleads for vengeance. But the blood of sprinkling 'speaketh something better' (κρείττον λαλοῦντι): it is the blood shed in ratification of a New Covenant, whose mediator is Jesus.

Literature.—The most recent commentaries on Matthew and Luke (*ad locc.*); Wright, *Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek*, p. 232; Sanday-Headlam, *Romans*, pp. 28-31, on δίκαιος and its cognates; Driver, *Genesis* (in Westminster commentaries); Dillmann, 'Genesis,' in *Kurzgef. exeget. Handb. z. AT* [English translation by Stevenson, Edinburgh, 1897]; Marcus Dods, 'Genesis' in *Expositor's Bible*.

A. H. M'Neile.

⚡Abgar

ABGAR.—Between the years b.c. 99 and a.d. 217 eight (or ten) kings or toparchs of Edessa in Osrhoëne bore this name. It is with the toparch that ruled in the time of our Saviour, Abgar Ukkâmâ ('the Black,' *e. b.c.* 13 to a.d. 50 [Gutschmid], b.c. 9 to a.d. 46 [Dionysius of Telnahr]), that we are here concerned, owing to the legendary accounts of his correspondence with Jesus, accepted as historical fact by Eusebius, and by him given wide currency. Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* i. 13) relates, without any suggestion of scepticism, that 'king Abgar, who ruled with great glory the nations beyond the Euphrates, being afflicted with a terrible disease which it was beyond the power of human skill to cure, when he heard of the name of Jesus and His miracles, ... sent a message to Him by a courier and begged Him to heal the disease.' Eusebius proceeds to impart the letter of Abgar and the answer of Jesus, which he claims to have derived directly from the archives of Edessa, and to have translated

(or caused to be translated) literally from Syriac into Greek. The letter of Abgar reads as follows:—

‘Abgar, ruler of Edessa, to Jesus the excellent Saviour who has appeared in the country of Jerusalem, greeting. I have heard the reports of thee and of thy cures as performed by thee without medicines or herbs. For it is said that with a word only thou makest the blind to see and the lame to walk, that thou cleansest lepers and castest out impure spirits and demons, and that thou healest those afflicted with lingering diseases, and also that thou raisest the dead. And having heard all these things concerning thee, I have concluded that one of two things must be true: either thou art God and hast come down from heaven to do these things, or else thou who doest these things art the Son of God. Wherefore I have written to thee to ask thee that thou wouldest take the trouble to come even to me and heal the disease which I have. For I have been informed that the Jews are murmuring against thee and are plotting to injure thee. But I have a city, small indeed yet honourable, which may suffice for us both.’

The answer of Jesus runs—

‘Blessed art thou who hast believed in me when thou thyself hast not seen me. For it stands written concerning me, that they who have seen me will not believe in me, and that they who have not seen me will believe and be saved. But in regard to what thou hast written me, that I should come to thee, it is necessary for me to fulfil all things here for which I have been sent, and after I have fulfilled them thus to be taken up again to Him that sent me. But after I have been taken up I will send to thee one of my disciples, that he may heal thy disease I and give life to thee and those who are with thee.’

From an accompanying narrative in the Syriac language, giving an account of the fulfilment of Christ’s promise, Eusebius quotes at considerable length. A brief summary of the contents of this document must here suffice. Judas, also called Thomas, is said to have sent Thaddaeus, one of the Seventy, to Edessa, soon after the ascension of Jesus. Arriving in Edessa he took lodgings, and without reporting himself at the court engaged extensively in works of healing. When the king heard thereof he suspected that he was the disciple promised by Jesus, and had him brought to court. On the appearance of Thaddaeus ‘a great vision appeared to Abgar in the countenance of Thaddaeus,’ which led the former to prostrate himself before the latter, to the astonishment of the courtiers, who did not see the vision. Having become assured that his guest is the promised disciple of Jesus, and that he has come fully empowered to heal and to save on condition of his exercise of faith, Abgar assures Thaddaeus that his faith is so strong that, had it not been for the presence of the Romans, he would have sent an army to destroy the Jews that crucified Jesus.

Thaddaeus assures him that in fulfilment of the Divine plan of redemption Jesus has been taken up to His Father, and, on a further profession of faith in Father and Son, Thaddaeus lays his hands upon the king and heals him. Many other healings follow, accompanied by the preaching of the gospel. At Thaddaeus' suggestion the king summons the citizens as a body to hear the preaching of the word, and afterwards offers him a rich reward, which is magnanimously refused. According to the Syriac document from which Eusebius quotes, the visit of Thaddaeus occurred in the year 340 of the era of the Seleucidae (corresponding, according to K. Schmidt in *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , *sub voc.*, to a.d. 29; according to others, a.d. 30, 31, or 32).

From the same Edessene materials Moses of Chorene, the Armenian historian of the middle of the 5th cent., prepared independently of Eusebius an account of the intercourse between Abgar and Christ and His disciples, which attests the general correctness of Eusebius' work. The fact that Moses was for several years a student in Edessa enhances the value of his account. He represents the reply of Jesus as having been written on His behalf by Thomas the Apostle. In Moses' account occurs the statement that after his conversion Abgarus wrote letters to the emperor Tiberius, to Narses, king of Assyria, to Ardaches, king of Persia, and others, recommending Christianity (*Hist. Arm.* ii. 30-33). Here also appears the legend that Christ sent by Ananias, the courier of Abgar, a picture of Himself impressed upon a handkerchief. This part of the story was still further elaborated by Cedrenus (*Hist. Comp.* p. 176), who represents Ananias, the courier of Abgar, as himself an artist, and as so overcome by the splendour of the countenance of Jesus when attempting to depict it that he was obliged to desist; whereupon Christ, having washed His face, wiped it with a towel which retained His likeness. This picture was taken by Ananias to his master, and it became for the city a sort of talisman. This miraculously produced portrait, or what purported to be such, is said to have been transferred to the church of St. Sophia at Constantinople in the 10th cent., and later to have passed thence to the church of St. Sylvester in Rome, where it is still exhibited for the edification of the faithful. A church in Genoa makes a rival claim to the possession of the original handkerchief portrait.

Any suspicion that Eusebius fabricated the documents that he professes to translate was set aside by the discovery and publication of what have been accepted as the original Syriac documents (*The Doct. of Addai the Apostle, with an English Translation and Notes*, by G. Phillips, London, 1876). The Syriac document contains the story of the portrait, which was probably already current in the time of Eusebius. The Syriac version of the story given by Cureton in his *Ancient Syriac Documents* seems to be an

elaborate expansion of that of Eusebius, and to have been composed considerably later.

The letter of Christ to Abgar was declared by a Roman Council in 494 or 495 to be spurious. Tillemont sought to prove the genuineness of the correspondence (*Memoirs*, i. pp. 362, 615), and similar attempts have been made by Welte (*Tübingen Quartalschr.* 1842, p. 335 ff.), Rinck (*Zeitschr. f. Hist. Theol.* 1843, ii. pp. 3-26), Phillips (preface to *The Doct. of Addai*), and Cureton (*Anc. Syriac Doc.*).

It may be assumed that the documents were forged some time before Eusebius used them. Christianity seems to have been introduced into Osrhoëne during the 2nd cent. a.d. The first king known to have favoured Christianity was Abgar viii. (bar-Manu), who reigned 176-213, and is said to have been on very intimate terms with Bardesanes, the scholarly Gnostic. A Christian church building modelled after the temple in Jerusalem existed in Edessa some time before 202, until, according to the Edessene Chronicle, it was destroyed (middle of the 6th cent.) by flood. As Edessa grew in importance as a Christian centre, with its theological school, its ambition for distinction may have led some not over-scrupulous ecclesiastic to fabricate these documents and to palm them off on the too credulous authorities. The forgery may have occurred early in the 3rd cent. (Zahn), but more probably early in the 4th. The only piece of real information that has come down to us regarding the Abgar of the time of Christ is a very uncomplimentary reference in Tacitus (*Ann.* xii. 12. 14).

Literature.—In addition to the works already mentioned, special reference should be made to Lipsius, *Die edessenische Abgarsage*, 1880, where the available materials are brought under review and critically tested; cf. also Matthes, *Die edessenische Abgarsage auf ihre Fortbildung untersucht*, 1882; Tixeront, *Les origines de l'église d'Edesse et la légende d'Abgar*, 1888; Farrar, *Christ in Art*, p. 79 f.

Albert Henry Newman.

⚡ Abia

ABIA (Authorized Version of Mat 1:7, Luk 1:5).—See Abijah.

⚡ Abiathar

ABIATHAR.—The son of Ahimelech, the son of Ahitub, the son of Phinehas, the son of Eli. He is mentioned in Mar 2:25-26 ‘Have ye never read what David did, when he had need, and was an hungred, he, and they that were with him? How he went into the house of God in the days of Abiathar the high priest, and did eat the shewbread?’ The Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, however, translates, ‘when Abiathar was high priest.’ The reference is evidently to 1 Samuel 21, where, according to the Hebrew text, *Ahimelech* gives David the sacred bread. There is thus a discrepancy between the two passages. The facts are these:—The Authorized Version, cited above, follows the reading of A and C (ἐπὶ Ἀβιαθὰρ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως), Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 follows that of B and x̄ (which omit the article) and the Vulgate (‘sub Abiathar principe sacerdotum’). The clause is omitted altogether by D [Note: Deuteronomist.] . In the Massoretic Text of 1 Samuel 21, 22 and in Psa 52:2 (title) the high priest is Ahimelech the son of Ahitub and the father of David’s friend Abiathar. In the Greek text of all these passages, however, the name is Abimelech. In 2Sa 8:17 and 1Ch 24:6 Ahimelech (in 1Ch 18:16 Abimelech) the son of Abiathar is priest along with Zadok, but it is generally supposed that Abiathar the son of Ahimelech is meant. Ahimelech is usually held to be identical also with Ahijah the son of Ahitub of 1Sa 14:3; 1Sa 14:18.

The discrepancy between Mar 2:26 and 1 Samuel 21 f. has been sought to be accounted for in several ways. It may readily be due to a mere *lapsus memoriae* or *calami*, Abiathar, David’s high priest, being a much more familiar figure than his father, just as in Jer 27:1 ‘Jehoiakim’ is a slip for Zedekiah. It is not impossible that father and son may each have borne both names, according to Arab usage, Abiathar corresponding to the Arab. [Note: Arabic.] *kunyah*, and Ahimelech being the *ism* or *lakab*, or name proper. It has been suggested that the reference in St. Mark is not to 1 Samuel 21 at all, but to some later unrecorded incident, such as might have occurred during the flight from Absalom. But this is very improbable.* [Note: Swete (St. Mark, ad loc.) suggests that the clause ἐπὶ Ἀβιαθὰρ ἀρχιερέως, which is peculiar to Mark, may be an editorial note.]

T. H. Weir.

☞ Abiding

ABIDING.—Of the three possible renderings of the Greek *μονή* and *μένω*, ‘remaining, to remain,’ ‘dwelling, to dwell,’ ‘abiding, to abide,’ the last is the most satisfactory. The first has the advantage of being akin to the Greek in derivation, but it is too passive in its sense, and in so far as it includes the conception of expectation it is

misleading; the second is too local, and is rather the fitting rendering of κατοικία, κατοικέω; the last is an adequate though not a perfect rendering. ‘Mansions’ ((Revised Version margin) ‘abiding-places’) is the stately rendering (Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), through the Vulgate *mansiones*, of the noun in Joh 14:2; but it becomes impossible in Joh 14:23 of the same chapter when the translators fall back on ‘abode.’ Further, in the English of to-day ‘mansion’ suggests merely a building, and that of an ostentatious type. The Scottish ‘manse,’ self-contained, modest, and secure, would be a nearly exact equivalent if it carried with it more than the idea of a dwelling-house; yet neither it nor ‘mansion’ has any correspondent verb.

Students who desire to get at the full meaning of verb or noun will find all that is needful in the etymological paragraph *sub voc.* μένω in the larger edition of Liddell and Scott’s *Greek Lexicon*. They will discover how rich in language product is the root of this word. The inquiry cannot be pursued further here. It is enough to say that locality enters very slightly into its conception, and that what is dominant is ethical. The leading idea is that of steadfast continuance. This is apparent the moment one turns to the derivative ὑπομονή (cf. Rom 2:7), the term of Stoic virtue boldly incorporated and transmuted in Christian usage and experience. The primitive noun, however (μονή), reminds Christians more clearly of the sphere in which it is contained, of a life in which it survives, of a power not its own on which it depends, and which in turn it exercises. If, as will be shown, the ethical import of μένω and μονή is dominant in the Gospels, the instances where the verb has a purely local sense, the sense of stopping or staying, may be dismissed. As a matter of fact, the instances are almost entirely confined to the Synoptists, and occur but in twelve passages; the use of the noun is purely Johannine. Only twice in the Synoptists does the verb occur in relation to persons, viz. Luk 24:29 in the pathetic appeal of Cleopas and his anonymous comrade, and the gracious response of the risen Christ; and even here there is no ethical significance, for the prepositions which link the verb and the personal pronouns imply only association (μεῖνον μεθ’ ἡμῶν), or joint action (εἰσῆλθεν τοῦ μεῖναι σὺν αὐτοῖς).

As soon as the student turns from the Synoptists to the Johannine literature, the idea of ‘mansion’ (one could wish it were a theological term) becomes full, luminous, and suggestive. St. John uses the verb μένω only thrice in its literal sense in the Gospel (Joh 2:12; Joh 4:40; Joh 10:40); he seems almost jealously to reserve it for metaphorical, *i.e.* ethical, application. We are not here concerned with St. John’s

letters, but it is pertinent to observe that μένω occurs 23 times therein, while it is used in the Gospel some 35 times. Moreover, as if the Evangelist and letter-writer would not suffer the spiritual point to be lost, he perpetually reminds his readers and children of the sphere of ‘mansion,’ and the source of its power. With a singular and marked uniformity, he employs the preposition ἐν in connexion with the verb. The Evangelist presses the idea not only of intimate relationship, but also of resultant power and blessing.

It is to be observed that, until we reach the great discourses in the chamber and on the way (chs. 14 and 15), we have only passing hints of the nature of the Abiding. The former chapter unfolds its meaning. The difficulties besetting the interpretation of these discourses are familiar to all students of the Fourth Gospel, and need not be dealt with here. They are not adequately met by references to the subjectivity or mysticism of the Evangelist. Our modes of thought, as Bishop Westcott reminds us, * [Note: to the Gospel of St. John, Joh 2:7.] follow a logical sequence; Hebrew modes of thought follow a moral sequence. The sermon to the Apostles in the chamber, especially, bears this moral impress throughout, and is rightly interpreted as the complement to the Sermon on the Mount. But while the connexion is thus somewhat precarious to the reader, certain great ideas or conceptions of the Abiding stand luminously forth for the devout mind. Here is set forth—(1) the Abiding of Christ in the Father; (2) the Abiding of Christ in the Church, as in the individual believer; (3) the issues of the Abiding.

1. *The Abiding of Christ in the Father.*—Here the student is, indeed, on ground most holy. He may not add to the Lord’s words, he trembles as he ventures to interpret them. He feels with the patriarch that this place in the Scriptures is dreadful—full of a holy awe. Thus much, however, may be said, that the abiding of Christ in the Father belongs wholly to the operation and energy of the Holy Spirit. The keynote of this truth is struck by the testimony of the Baptist in the preamble of the Gospel (Joh 1:32 f.). It is important to notice that that which was the object of sight to the Baptist was not merely the descent of the Holy Spirit, but the Abiding. And here the careful student will observe that, though the preposition used in these verses is not ἐν but ἐπι, yet the employment of the latter is necessary as linking the descent and the continuous indwelling of the Spirit in the Son. But if any hesitation remains as to the view that the character and sphere of Christ’s abiding in the Father lies in and through the indwelling Spirit, it must disappear on consideration of our Lord’s words (Joh 14:20), ‘At that day [the day of *realized life*] ye shall come to know [by the Spirit what is at present a matter of faith only] that I am in my Father.’ The thought is inevitably linked with the Spirit’s work both in Him and for them. When, therefore, the Lord invites His own to abide in His love (Joh 15:10), He does not merely imply

that His love is the atmosphere of their discipleship, but, as St. Augustine[†] [Note: in Joan. xiv. No. lxxiv, ad fin.] suggests, He invites them to abide in that Holy Spirit whose love as fully permeates Him as it is imperfectly exhibited in His disciples.

2. *The Abiding of Christ in the Church, as in the individual believer.*—Our Lord's teaching as to the Abiding in Him refers even more closely to the Church than to the individual. John 14, 15 are penetrated through and through by Pentecostal costal thought and Pentecostal expectations. Christ looked eagerly forward to the birthday of the Spirit-bearing body. He could and does, indeed, fully abide in the heart of each individual believer; but that believer is not a mere unit standing solitary and unsupported. The individual disciple will be a terrible loser unless he realize his incorporation, his oneness with the universal body, the body of Christ. But as if to make sure that this great truth should never escape His own down the ages, Christ introduces the great figure of the Vine and the branches (Joh 15:1-6). The vine was already the symbol of the ancient Church;* [Note: Hos 10:1, Isa 5:1 ff., Jer 2:21.] Christ speaks of Himself as the true, the ideal Vine. But it is as a formula incomplete without the complement of Joh 15:5 'I am the Vine, ye are the branches.' As a vine is inconceivable without branches,[†] [Note: Westcott's Commentary, in loco.] so in all devoutness it may be said He is inconceivable without His disciples. Again, they draw their life from abiding in Him. The life may be imperfectly realized, the fruitage may be disappointing, it may be nothing but leaves (Mat 21:19); the task of discipline, or of cleansing (καθαίρειν Joh 15:2 f.) is in the hands of the Great Husbandman. Thus as in ancient Israel union with the Church nation was the condition of life, so in the new dispensation the condition of life was to be the abiding in Christ. As apart from the vine the branches are useless since the living sap is therein no longer, so separated from Christ there can be no productiveness in Christian lives. St. John bears record of one more thought of the highest consolation to Christian hearts. There is a true analogy and correspondence between the abiding of Christ in the Father and the abiding of believers in Him (Joh 15:10). Our abidings in Christ, often so sadly brief, uncertain, precarious, through the consequences of sin, have still their sublime counterpart in the abiding of Christ in the Father.

3. *The issues of the Abiding.*—We have seen that the Abiding finally depends upon the Spirit's work, whether in the Church or in the individual heart. The first fruit of that Spirit is love. The Spirit moves in this sphere, He manifests and expresses Himself in love. Thus love furnishes the test of the indwelling, as truly as it contains the pledge of a fruitful issue. According, moreover, to Johannine teaching, this love spread abroad in the hearts of believers is not a stagnant or sentimental affection. Of the basal or abiding virtues (1Co 13:13) it is the greatest because of its fruitful action. St. John presents another aspect of this truth when he shows that obedience and love are strictly correlated (Joh 15:10). This love is seen in action. It doeth the will, and the

reward of such loving obedience is final and complete. Those who in this dutiful and affectionate temper keep the commandments are raised by Christ from the base of bond service to the height of friendship. It is enough—the fiat has gone forth—‘such ones I have called friends.’ † [Note: Joh 15:15.]

Literature.—A. Maclaren, *Holy of Holies*. 190; A. Murray, *Abide in Christ*; T. D. Bernard, *Central Teaching of Jesus Christ*, 219; J. H. Jowett, *Apostolic Optimism*, 225; B. F. Westcott, *Peterborough Sermons*, 49, 61; Sir A. Blackwood, *Christian Service*, 46; G. B. Stevens, *Johannine Theology*, 258.

B. Whitefoord.

Abijah

ABIJAH (אֲבִיָּהּ, Ἀβιά, ‘Jah is my father’: or more probably without the particularizing pronoun, ‘Jah is father’).—Son of Rehoboam (Mat 1:7) by Maacah (2Ch 11:20—see art. ‘Maacah’ No. 3 in Hastings’ B [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] iii. 180). Abijah reigned over Judah from about b.c. 920, and the impressions made by him are given with some variety in 1Ki 15:3 and by a later tradition in 2Ch 13:4-22. His name is introduced by St. Matthew simply as a link in the pedigree, in which it is shown that Jesus was both of Jewish and of royal stock.

2. A descendant of Eleazar, son of Aaron. The name was attached to the eighth of the twenty-four courses into which the priests were alleged to have been divided by David (1Ch 24:10). Members of only four courses seem to have returned from the Captivity (Neh 7:39-42, Ezr 2:36-39; Ezr 10:18-22). According to Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] Talm. [Note: Talmud.] *Taanith*, iv. 68, these men were divided into twenty-four courses with a view to restore the ancient arrangement. The authority for this statement is not of the best kind; but the statement itself is substantially confirmed by Neh 12:1-7, where twenty-two groups are referred to (in Neh 12:12-21 the number has fallen to twenty-one, and two of the courses are grouped under a single representative), and by Ezr 8:2, where two other priestly families are mentioned. Slight changes were probably made in the classification during the process of the resettlement of the country; but by the time of the Chronicler the arrangement seems to have become fixed. The course of Abijah is not mentioned amongst those that returned from the Exile; but in one of the later rearrangements the name was attached to a course that afterwards included Zacharias (Luk 1:5). Each course was on duty for a week at a time, but all were expected to officiate as needed at the three great annual festivals. It is not possible with our present materials to determine

exactly how the various services were divided amongst the members of a course, or at what times in the year Zacharias would be on duty. Nor does his inclusion in the course of Abijah carry with it lineal descent through that line from Aaron.

R. W. Moss.

Abilene

ABILENE.—Mentioned in Luk_3:1 as the district of which Lysanias was tetrarch in the 15th year of Tiberius. It was called after its capital Abila, situated on the Barada, about 18 miles from Damascus, and represented by the modern village of *Suk*. The identity of *Suk* with Abila is confirmed by a Roman rock-inscription to the west of the town. According to popular tradition, the name Abila is derived from Abel, who was buried by Cain in a tomb which is still pointed out in the neighbourhood. Little is known of the history of Abilene at the time referred to by St. Luke; but when Tiberius died in a.d. 37, some ten years later, the tetrarchy of Lysanias was bestowed by Caligula on Herod Agrippa I. (Josephus *Ant.* xviii. vi. 10), and this grant was confirmed in a.d. 41 by Claudius (xix. v. 1; *BJ* ii. xi. 5). On the death of Agrippa I. (a.d. 44) his dominions passed into the charge of Roman procurators (*Ant.* xix. ix. 2; *BJ* ii. xi. 6), but in a.d. 53 some parts of them, including Abilene, were granted by Claudius to Agrippa II. (*Ant.* xx. vii. 1; *BJ* ii. xii. 8), and remained in his possession till his death in a.d. 100. See Lysanias.

Literature.—Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] i. ii. 335 ff.; Robinson, *Later BRP* [Note: RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.] 479 ff.; Porter, *Giant Cities of Bashan*, 352 l.; Conder, *Tent Work in Pal.* 127; *SWP* [Note: WP Memoirs of the Survey of W. Palestine.] , Special Papers.

James Patrick.

Abiud

ABIUD (Ἀβιούδ).—A son of Zerubbabel, Mat_1:13. The name appears in the OT in the form *Abihud* (אֲבִיחֻד 'Father is glory'), 1Ch_8:3.

⚠️ Abomination Of Desolation

ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION (τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως).—This phrase is found in the NT only in Mat 24:15 and Mar 13:14, in both cases forming part of the passage in which Christ predicts the woes to come on the Jews, culminating in the destruction of Jerusalem. St. Mark's words, which are probably more exact than those of St.

Matthew, are: ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἐστηκότα ὅπου οὐ δεῖ (ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω), τότε οἶ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη, κ.τ.λ. Three points in this account are to be noticed: (1) the change of gender* [Note: Dr. A. Wright (Synopsis2, 131) says that the masculine indicates that St. Mark interprets τὸ βδέλυγμα to signify a man. But this does not seem necessary. The masc. appears to denote a personification rather than a person. Such personifications are not uncommon in prophetic and apocalyptic literature (Ezekiel 38, Rev 2:1 [ἄγγελος] 2:20 [Ἰεζαβελ] 12:3 [δράκων]. In 2Th 2:3 ἁ ἀγθρωτος τῆς ἀνομίας (שׂוֹן הַיָּהוּדָה = Βελίαρ) may denote not a person, but a sin (ἀποστασία); see Nestle in . Times, July 1905, p. 472 f.] τὸ βδέλυγμα—ἐστηκότα (cf. 2Th 2:6-7, Rev 21:14); (2) the 'editorial note' ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω, calling special attention to the prophecy (cf. Dan 9:25, Rev 2:7; Rev 13:18); (3) the command to flee to the mountains, which seems to have been obeyed by the Christians who escaped to Pella (Euseb. *Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 5; Epiphanius. *Haeres.* xxix. 7). St. Matthew characteristically adds the words (absent from the best MS^S [Note: SS Manuscripts.] [ⲭ βL [Note: L Bampton Lecture.]] of St. Mark) τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δαυὶδ τοῦ προφήτου; substitutes the neuter ἐστηκότα for the masc. ἐστηκότα; and instead of the quite general phrase ὅπου οὐ δεῖ has the more definite ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ,—an expression which may refer to the Temple (cf. Act 6:13; Act 21:28), but (without the article) may mean nothing more than 'on holy ground.' To the Jews all Jerusalem (and, indeed, all Palestine) was holy (2Ma 1:7; 2Ma 3:1). St. Luke, writing most probably after the destruction of Jerusalem, omits the 'editorial note'; and for ὅταν ἴδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως substitutes ὅταν ἴδητε κυκλουμένην ὑπὸ στρατοπέδων Ἱερουσαλήμ (Luk 21:20).

The phrase we are considering occurs three times in the LXX Septuagint of Daniel:† [Note: The Hebrew text and its meaning are doubtful (see A. A. Bevan, Daniel, p. 192). Our Lord adopted the current view with which the LXX had made the Jews

familiar.] Dan 9:27 (βδ. τῶν ἐρημώσεων), Dan 11:31 (βδ. τῶν ἐρημώσεων) and Dan 12:11 (cf. Dan 8:13), and is quoted in 1Ma 1:54. The original reference is clearly to the desecration of the Temple by the soldiers of Antiochus Epiphanes, the ceasing of the daily burnt-offering, and the election of an idol-altar upon the great Altar of Sacrifice in b.c. 168 (1Ma 1:33-59; Josephus *Ant.* xii. v. 4, *BJ* i. i. 1). Thus it is plain that Christ, in quoting the words of Daniel, intends to foretell a desecration of the Temple (or perhaps of the Holy City) resembling that of Antiochus, and resulting in the destruction of the national life and religion. Josephus (*Ant.* x. xi. 7) draws a similar parallel between the Jewish misfortunes under Antiochus and the desolation caused by the Romans (ὁ Δανιήλος καὶ περὶ τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίας ἀνέγραψε, καὶ ὅτι ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐρημωθήσεται). But the precise reference is not so clear.

(1) Bleck, Alford, Mansel, and others explain it of the desecration of the Temple by the Zealots just before the investment of Jerusalem by Titus (Josephus *BJ* iv. iii. 6-8, vi. 3). Having seized the Temple, they made it a stronghold, and 'entered the sanctuary with polluted feet' (μεμιασμένοις τοῖς ποσὶ παρήεσαν εἰς τὸ ἅγιον). In opposition to Ananus, they set up as high priest one Phannias, 'a man not only unworthy of the high priesthood, but ignorant of what the high priesthood was' (ἀνὴρ οὐ μόνον ἀνάξιος ἀρχιερεὺς ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἐπιστάμενος σαφῶς τί ποτ' ἦν ἀρχιερωσύνη). The Temple precincts were defiled with blood, and Ananus was murdered. His murder, says Josephus, was the beginning of the capture of the city (οὐκ ἂν ἀμάρτοισι δ' εἰπὼν ἀλώσεως ἄρξαι τῆ πόλει τὸν Ἀνάνου θάνατον). In support of this view it is urged (a) that the 'little Apocalypse' (2Th 2:1-12, a passage closely resembling this) clearly contemplates a *Jewish* apostasy; (b) that the word used in Daniel (יָרַשׁ = βδέλυγμα) is properly used not of idolatry in the abstract, but of idolatry or false worship adopted by Jews (1Ki 11:5, 2Ki 23:13, Eze 5:11); (c) that there was among the Jews a tradition to the effect that Jerusalem would be destroyed if their own hands should pollute the Temple of God (ἐὰν χεῖρες οἰκεῖται προμιάνωσι τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τέμενος, Josephus *BJ* iv vi. 3).

(2) Others (Bengel, Swete, Weiss) explain it by reference to the investment of Jerusalem by the Roman armies. A modification of this view is that of H. A. W. Meyer, who explains it of the 'doings of the heathen conquerors during and after the capture of the Temple.' When the city was taken, sacrifices were offered in the Temple to the standards (*BJ* vi. vi. 1, cf. Tertullian, *Apol.* 16). Between the first appearance of the Roman armies before Jerusalem (a.d. 66) and the final investment by Titus (just before Passover a.d. 70), there would be ample time for flight 'to the mountains.'

Even after the final investment there would be opportunities for 'those in Judaea' to escape. St. Luke's words (Luk 21:20) are quoted in support of this view.

(3) Theodoret and other early Commentators refer the prophecy to the attempt of Pilate to set up effigies of the emperor in Jerusalem (*BJ* ii. ix. 2).

(4) Spitta (*Offenb. des Joh.* 493) thinks it has to do with the order of Caligula to erect in the Temple a statue of himself, to which Divine honours were to be paid (*Ant.* xviii. viii. 8). This order, though never executed, caused widespread apprehension among the Jews.

(5) Jerome (Commentary on Matthew 24) suggests that the words may be understood of the equestrian statue of Hadrian, which in his time stood on the site of the Holy of Holies. Similarly, Chrysostom and others refer them to the statue of Titus erected on the site of the Temple.

(6) Bousset treats the passage as strictly eschatological, and as referring to an Antichrist who should appear in the 'last days.'^{*} [Note: Some (Keim, Holtzmann, Cheyne) hold the passage to be part of an independent Jewish (or Jewish-Christian) Apocalypse inserted subsequently in the Gospels. But it occurs in all the Synoptists, and 'it is difficult to think that even these words ... are without a substantial basis in the words of Christ' (Driver).]

Of these views (1) and (2) are the most probable. Considerations of chronology make (3), (4), and (5) more than doubtful, while the warnings that the events predicted should come to pass soon (Mat 24:33-34, Mar 13:28-30, Luk 21:29-33) and the command to flee 'to the mountains' seem fatal to (6). Between (1) and (2) the choice is not easy, though the balance of evidence is on the whole in favour of (1). St. Luke's language (ὅταν ἴδητε κυκλουμένην ὑπὸ στρατοπέδων Ἱερουσαλήμ) is not decisive. He may not have intended his words to be an exact reproduction of Christ's words so much as an accommodation of them which would be readily understood by his Gentile readers.

Literature.—R. W. Newton on Matthew 24 (1879); Bousset, *Der Antichrist* (1885), English translation by A. H. Keane, 1896; J. H. Russell, *The Parousia* (1887); articles in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible (by S. R. Driver), *Encyc. Bibl.* (by T. K. Cheyne), Smith's *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (by W. L. Bevan) the Commentaries of Bengel, Cornelius a Lapide, H. A. W. Meyer, Alford, Wordsworth, Mansel (in *Speaker's Commentary on NT*, i. 139), H. B. Swete, *St. Mark*, *ad loc.*; A. A. Bevan, *The Book of Daniel*, *ad loc.*

⚡ Above And Below

ABOVE AND BELOW.—1. *As cosmological terms.* Like all similar expressions (ascent, descent, etc.), they presented to early ages a clear-cut image, which has disappeared with the rise of modern astronomy. But this is rather a gain than a loss. Here, as in so many other cases, the later knowledge is an aid to faith. At the beginning of the Christian era the earth was still regarded as a fixed body placed at the centre of the Universe, with the heavens surrounding it as vast spheres. But we know now that it is only a small planet revolving round the sun, which also has a ‘solar way,’ so immense and obscure that it is not yet determined: while the whole sidereal system—of which our constellation forms a ‘mere speck’—is ‘alive with movements’ too complex to be understood. While, therefore, ‘above and below’ (like ‘east,’ ‘west,’ ‘north,’ ‘south’) would have for the ancients an absolute and cosmic, they can have for us only a relative and phenomenal, significance. We still use the old terms, just as we still speak of the rising sun, but we do so with a new interpretation. They have no meaning in a boundless Universe save in relation to our observation, and appearances are misleading. But these wider views of the Universe should help us to realize that all language involving conceptions of time and space is utterly inadequate to express spiritual realities.

2. For the *spiritual* significance of these and kindred terms we turn first of all to Joh 8:23; Joh 8:42; Joh 8:44. Manifestly, ‘I am from above’ (ἐκ τῶν ἄνω) = ‘I came forth and am come from God’; and clearly also, ‘Ye are from beneath’ (ἐκ τῶν κάτω) = ‘Ye are of this world,’ ‘Ye are of your father, the devil.’ ‘The source of My life is above, *i.e.* in My Father; ye draw your inspiration from below, *i.e.* from a malign spirit of darkness.’ This is the spiritual significance of ‘above and below.’ To be ‘born again,’ or ‘born from above’ (ἄνωθεν) (Joh 3:3), is to be ‘born of God’ (Joh 1:13). To receive power ‘from above’ (ἄνωθεν), as in the case of Pilate (Joh 19:11), is to receive it from God (Rom 13:1). The wisdom which is from *beneath* is ‘earthly, sensual, devilish’ (Jam 3:15); while the wisdom which is ‘from above’ ‘is of God’ (cf. Jam 1:5, Jam 3:17). The following passages may also be consulted: Joh 3:13; Joh 3:31; Joh 6:38; Joh 16:28; Joh 20:17, Rom 10:6-8, Col 3:1, Col 3:2.

3. But, as has been already suggested, in using these and all similar terms, it is important to bear in mind their inadequacy and limitations. Not merely has theology suffered to an extent that is little realized, but the spiritual life of thousands has

been impoverished through a tenacious clinging to an order of ideas in a region where they no longer apply. The difficulty, of course, is that we must employ such categories of thought even though we are compelled to recognize their inadequacy. 'A danger besets us in the gravest shape when we endeavour to give distinctness to the unseen world. We transfer, and we must transfer, the language of earth, the imagery of succession in time and space, to an order of being to which, as far as we know, it is wholly inapplicable. We cannot properly employ such terms as "before" and "after," "here" and "there," of God or of Spirit. All *is*, is at once, is present, to Him; and the revelations of the Risen Lord seem to be designed in part to teach us that, though He resumed all that belongs to the perfection of man's nature, He was not bound by the conditions which we are forced to connect with it' (Westcott, *The Historic Faith*, p. 74). We invoke 'our Father in heaven,' not as One who is divided from us by immeasurable tracts of space, but as far beyond our ignorance and sin—infinately above us, yet unspeakably near.

'Speak to Him thou for He hears, and Spirit with Spirit, can meet,—

Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet.'

So, when the Apostle bids us 'seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God' (Col 3:1), we must shake off the incumbent thought of immeasurable distances to be crossed. And when we think of Christ's Ascension into heaven, we must not conceive of it as a flight into some far-off region, but as His passing into a state of existence (of which we gain hints during the great forty days) which we can describe only by employing words which, in the very act of using them, we see to be utterly inadequate. He has gone into a state which we cannot even imaginatively picture to ourselves without robbing it of much of its truth.

Literature.—Westcott, *Gospel of St. John*; F. D. Maurice, *The Gospel of St. John* [especially valuable]. If the reader wishes to pursue the subject of the inadequacy of the categories of the understanding, and of the concepts of time and space in relation to spiritual realities, he will find an ample field of investigation by beginning with Kant's *Critique of the Pure Reason*, and then, if he cares to, following the discussion into more recent works of Philosophy. He will find two valuable chapters (vi. and vii.) in Caird's *Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion*, dealing with the subject.

Arthur Jenkinson.

ABRAHAM.—It is noteworthy that while in the Synoptic Gospels references to the patriarch Abraham are comparatively frequent, and his personality and relation to Israel form part of the historical background which they presuppose, and of the thoughts and conceptions which are their national inheritance, in the Gospel of St. John his name does not appear except in ch. 8. In the Synoptists he is the great historical ancestor of the Jews, holding a unique place in their reverence and affections; he is their father, as they are each of them his children (Mat 3:9 || Luk 3:8, Luk 13:16; Luk 16:24; Luk 16:30; Luk 19:9). To this the introductory title of St. Matthew's Gospel testifies; it is 'the book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, *the son of Abraham*.' And in the genealogical record that follows, his name stands at the head (Mat 1:2), and through equally graduated stages,—epochs marked by the name of Israel's most famous king, and by the nation's most bitter humiliation (Mat 1:17),—the ascent of the Christ is traced to the great fountain and source of all Jewish privilege and life. It is otherwise in the genealogy of St. Luke; and the difference indicates the different standpoints of Jewish and Gentile thought. Here the historian records no halting-places in his genealogy, but carries it back in an uninterrupted chain, of which the patriarch Abraham forms but one link (Luk 3:34), to its ultimate source in God. See art. Genealogies.

Other references in the Synoptists are on the same plane of thought, and presuppose a prevalent and accepted faith, which not only knew Abraham as the forefather and founder of their national life in the far-off ages of the past, but realized that in some sort or other he was still alive; and it was believed that to be with him, to be received into his bosom (Luk 16:22) was the highest felicity that awaited the righteous man after death. Both St. Matthew and St. Mark bear emphatic testimony to this belief, in their narrative of the incident of our Lord's solution of the dilemma presented by the Sadducees with their tale of the seven brothers. Jesus quotes Exo 3:6 in proof of the fact of the patriarchs' resurrection and continued existence (Mat 22:32 || Mar 12:26, Luk 20:37), inasmuch as the Divine sovereignty here asserted over Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob necessarily implies the conscious life of those who are its subjects. In the Songs of Mary and Zacharias, again (Luk 1:46-55; Luk 1:68-79), Abraham is the forefather of the race, the recipient of the Divine promises (confirmed by an oath, Luk 1:73) of mercy and goodwill to himself and his descendants (cf. Gal 3:16; Gal 3:18, Heb 6:13, Act 7:17, Rom 4:13); and his name is a pledge that the same mercy will not overlook or cease to care for his children (Luk 1:55). And, finally, to be with Abraham and his great sons, to 'sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven' (Mat 8:11), is the desire and reward of the faithful Israelite. This reward, however, Christ teaches, is not confined to the Jews, the sons of Abraham according to the flesh, still less is it one to which they have any right by virtue of the mere fact of physical descent from him; it is one that will be enjoyed by 'many' faithful ones from other lands, even to the exclusion

of the 'sons of the kingdom,' if they prove themselves, like His present opponents, faithless and unworthy (Luk_13:28).

The expression 'Abraham's bosom' (Luk_16:22) or 'bosoms' (Luk_16:23)* [Note: The plural form is frequently used by the Greek Fathers, e.g. Chrys. Hom. XL in Gen.: πάντες οἱ δίκαιοι ... εὐχῆς ἔργον ποιοῦνται εἰς τοὺς κόλπους τοῦ πατριάρχου κατανῆσαι.] is hardly to be understood as conveying the idea of an eminent or unusual degree of happiness. It is practically equivalent to 'Paradise.' And the new condition of blessedness in which Lazarus finds himself is pre-eminent only in the sense that it is so striking a reversal of the relations previously existing between Dives and himself. The parable says nothing of any superior piety or faith exhibited by Lazarus, which might win for him a more exalted position than others. As far as his present and past are concerned, it but sets forth retributive justice redressing for him and Dives alike the unequal balance of earth. 'Abraham's bosom,' like the Hades in which the rich man lifts up his eyes, is part of the figurative or pictorial setting of the parable, and indicates no more than a haven of repose and felicity, the home and resting-place of the righteous with Abraham, who is the typical example of righteousness. The parable is on the plane of popular belief, and of set purpose employs the imagery which would be most familiar and intelligible to the hearers.† [Note: On the phrase 'Abraham's bosom,' see Trench, Parables 13, p. 461 ff., and the references there given; Lightfoot, Horae Heb. et Talm. iii. p. 167 ff.; Stevens, Theology of the New Testament, p. 82; Meyer, and the commentators, in loc. Cf. also Salmond in Hastings' DB i. 17b f.]

In conformity with the general character of St. John's Gospel, the references to Abraham there would seem to imply a more mystical, less matter of fact and as it were prosaic manner of regarding the great patriarch. He is spoken of in the 8th chapter alone, in the course of a discussion with Jews who are said to be believers in Jesus (Joh_8:31). Here also Abraham is the father of the Jews, and they are his children, his seed (Joh_8:37; Joh_8:39; Joh_8:56); and this position they claim with pride (Joh_8:33; Joh_8:39; Joh_8:53). It is a name and position, however, which Christ declares is belied by their conduct, in that, though nominally Abraham's seed, they do not Abraham's works, in particular when they conceive and plot the death of an innocent man (Joh_8:39-40). To the charge itself they have no answer, except to reassert their sonship, in this instance of God Himself (Joh_8:41 f.), and to repeat the offensive imputation of demoniacal possession (Joh_8:42). But with almost startling abruptness, taking advantage of a phrase quietly introduced, which they interpret to imply freedom from physical death for those who accept Christ's teaching, they interrupt with the assertion that Abraham died 'and the prophets' (Joh_8:52), in apparent contradiction to the tenor and assumption of the language which a moment before they had employed. Probably they meant no more than that he and they, like all other men, had passed through the gate of death which terminates life on earth;

and were more intent on gaining a dialectic advantage than on weighing the implications of their own words. But, in spite of them, for the few moments that are left the discourse preserves the high level of other-worldliness, to which Christ's last words have raised it; and gives occasion for one of the most striking and emphatic assertions in which He is recorded to have passed beyond the boundaries and limitations of mere earthly experience. Abraham has seen His day (Joh 8:56). And by silence He concedes and affirms the half-indignant, half-contemptuous and protesting question of the Jews; He has seen Abraham, and is greater even than their father (Joh 8:53; Joh 8:57). The climax is reached in Joh 8:58,—in a brief sentence, which, if it did not bear so evidently the stamp of simplicity and truth, would be said to have been constructed with the most consummate skill and the finest touch of artistic feeling and insight. 'Before Abraham came into being,'—the speaker gathers up and utilizes Jewish belief in its past and reverence for its head,—'I am.' Abraham ἐγένετο; Christ *is*. Thus was conveyed the answer to their question, 'Art thou greater?' (Joh 8:53); and thus was reasserted with emphasis the measureless distance between Himself and the greatest of the Jews, and *a fortiori*, as it would appear to the company around, of the whole human race.

It is remarkable and suggestive that in the only notice of the patriarch Jacob that is contained in the Fourth Gospel, ch. Joh 4:5 f., Joh 4:12, the same question is addressed by the woman of Samaria to Christ: 'Art thou greater than our father Jacob,'—the Dispenser of the new water with its marvellous properties than the actual giver of the well? It was natural and inevitable that one of the questions that more particularly forced itself upon the attention of His contemporaries should be the relation of the Teacher, who had arisen in their midst and who claimed so great things, not only to the earlier prophets, but to the patriarchs and ancestors of the Jewish nation. See further art. Jacob.

The figure of Abraham, therefore, in the Gospels is idealized, and invested with a simple grandeur as the head and founder of the race in the indistinct ages of the past, to whom are owing its present privileges, and around whom gather its future hopes. There is, however, no indication of hero-worship, as in the case of the more or less mythical ancestors of other peoples. This conception, moreover, apart from St. John's Gospel, is purely patriarchal. The characteristic Pauline presentation of Abraham as the father of the faithful in a moral and spiritual sense, as the type and pattern of all righteousness and obedience, as it is developed in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, is absent (cf. also Heb 11:8 ff., Jam 2:21; Jam 2:23). References to the details of his history are not indeed wanting in the remaining books of the New Testament, but they are all, as it were, with a moral and didactic purpose: Gal 4:22, the two covenants; Heb 7:1 ff., Abraham and Melchizedek; Rom 4:18 f. and Heb 11:8; Heb 11:17, faith exhibited in the abandonment of his fatherland, in the

birth and offering up of Isaac; Act_7:2; Act_7:16, the same abandonment of his country and the purchase of a tomb from the sons of Emmor in Sychem; cf. 1Pe_3:6, with a possible reference to Gen_18:12.

Later Hebrew literature discussed especially this aspect of his character, and the historical view was superseded by the ethical or theological. Cf., for example, *Pirke Aboth* v. 4, of the ten testings or trials (נסיונות) of Abraham, and Taylor, loc.; 'Testament of Abraham,' ed. M. R. James, and Studies, ii. 2.

Literature.—The authorities cited above, with articles on 'Abraham' in Bible Dictionaries, and the Commentaries.

A. S. Geden.

⚡ Absolution

ABSOLUTION

1. *Our Lord's words on Absolution.*—We find these in the following passages: Mat_16:16-19, especially this word spoken to Peter, 'I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven'; Mat_18:18 (spoken to all the Apostles), 'Verily I say unto you, What things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and what things soever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven'; Joh_20:21 ff. 'Jesus therefore said to them again, Peace be unto you: as the Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this he breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them: whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.'

The first of the sayings—that about the keys and the binding and loosing—we might have been under some compulsion to take as for Peter alone, if it had not been that the like saying is repeated to all the Apostles afterwards. The words were special to Peter, as the early history of the Acts shows; but they were not limited to him. And following as they do on his great confession—being a prize and reward of that confession—they belong to him as a man who had attained by the revelation of the Father to a true faith that Jesus was the Christ the Son of God: they belonged to all the Apostles as men of like faith: and they belong to the whole Church of which these twelve were the nucleus, in proportion as that faith is alive in it. In regard to the saying (in Joh_20:23) about the forgiveness and retaining of sins, it was spoken in 'a

general gathering of the believers in Jerusalem' (see [Luk_24:33](#)), and 'there is nothing in the context to show that the gift was confined to any particular group (as the Apostles) among the whole company present. The commission, therefore, must be regarded properly as the commission of the Christian society and not as that of the Christian ministry' (Westcott, *in loco*).

The 'keys' may be understood as the keys of the porter at the outer door of the house, and as symbolic of authority to admit into the kingdom of heaven or to exclude from it. Or they may be taken as the keys of the steward for use inside the house, and as symbolic of authority to open the stores or treasuries of the household of God and to give forth from these treasuries according to the requirements of the household. It is rather in this second sense that authority is given to bind and to loose, which in Rabbinical usage meant to forbid and allow in matters of conduct; that is to say, to interpret the will of God and to enjoin rules of life in harmony with that will. This is the work of the steward of the mysteries of God, and has to do directly with things, not persons. But the first sense, that of admitting and excluding, which has to do with persons, is what is chiefly meant by the power of the keys, and it is as an exercise of this power and of the power given in the words, 'Whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them,' that absolution must be considered.

Our Lord's words seem at first reading to invest the Church with absolute authority, and to promise that Heaven will follow and ratify the action of the Church on earth, whatever that action may be, in forgiving or judging, in admitting into the kingdom of heaven or excluding from it. But we recoil from this as impossible. There is no Church, how great soever its claims in regard to absolution, which does not admit that God alone forgives sin. We feel, however, that we must find a great sense in which to understand so great words as those of our Lord in these commissions. And we observe that before the words in [Joh_20:23](#) our Lord breathed upon His disciples and said, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost.' He imparted to them His own very Spirit, so enabling them to be His representatives and equipping them to continue His work. (The faith which Peter had by revelation of the Father, that is to say, by the same Spirit, was an equivalent endowment before he received the promise of the keys). It was evidently the purpose of the Lord Jesus that His Church should continue the exercise on earth of the power which He constantly exercised and set in the forefront of His ministry, the power of saying to the penitent, 'Thy sins are forgiven thee'; and of saying this with such assured knowledge of the truth of God and such sympathetic discernment of the spirits of men, that what was done by the Church on earth should be valid in heaven, and the word of Christ by the Church powerful to give comfort to truly penitent souls.

The Lord is concerned not only that men be forgiven, but that His disciples should know that they are forgiven. The grace of forgiveness has not its proper power in

transforming their lives unless they know that they have it. As long as men are under fear and doubt they are not Christ's freemen: their religion is still only regulative. It is when they have an assured sense of forgiveness and reconciliation to God that a great impulse of gratitude, with a new life in their souls, makes them free indeed, and strong in their freedom to serve God. Christ accordingly equips His Church to convey this assurance of forgiveness, and if a Church does not succeed in doing this, especially if, as often, the current idea in the Church is that to be assured of forgiveness is abnormal and unusual, the Church is greatly failing in its mission. If the form of our Lord's promise in Joh 20:23 'Whose soever sins ye forgive,' etc., seem too absolute, we must remember that the gift of the Holy Spirit, which He then gave the sign of imparting, is a gift of exceeding power, and that no limit can be set to the degree in which God through Christ is willing to give the Spirit. 'He giveth not the Spirit by measure' (Joh 3:34). And our Lord is speaking, according to His wont, to the ideal Church, to the Church which receives in the fulness with which He is willing to bestow. Just as, speaking at the high level of the ideal, He says to His servants in another place (Luk 10:16), 'He that heareth you heareth me: and he that despiseth you despiseth me'; so He says here, 'Whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven,' etc. But all these and such like promises depend for their fulfilment on the Spirit of Christ working, nay, reigning, in the Church. This power and reign of the Spirit ebbs and flows according to the faith and receptivity of the Church; and while it is the duty of the Church to believe in God being with it, and while the Church ought to clothe itself with the mighty assurance of heaven assenting to its judgments, it can dare to do so, and will be able to do so, only in proportion as it has sought and obtained the indwelling of the Spirit.

The words of our Lord before us certainly do not mean that forgiveness by the mouth and at the will of man is always to be followed by a ratification of God in heaven, even though that man be an apostle. But they do imply that when Christ's servants do their work in the enlightenment and guidance of the Spirit, they will be able to convey messages of grace which will be according to the truth of things, and therefore valid in heaven: they will be able also to convey assurances of forgiveness, which will be owned of God as true, and will be made effective by His Spirit in penitent souls. So then the great and chief means by which the Church has in all ages fulfilled the work which is sustained by these startling promises, is the preaching of the gospel of reconciliation by Jesus Christ. By preaching in the power of the Spirit, thousands of souls have been in all ages receiving remission of sins and an assurance of forgiveness. Although the preaching is public, and the preacher has little or no separate knowledge of individual hearts, there is a 'privacy of publicity' in which whatever message he has from God is made an absolution Divine in power and assurance to one and another of the hearers. So effectual is preaching in the Spirit, that it may perhaps be found that in the Churches in which there is no ordinance with the title of 'private absolution,' the sense of forgiveness of sins is truer, deeper, and

more widely spread than in those which have such an ordinance, and count it necessary. Obviously another means by which the Church carries out the Lord's purpose of conveying absolution to the penitent is by the sacraments. But there is great occasion also for the Church to afford full opportunity for individual help to souls in spiritual trouble, and such individual dealing as may in its issue amount to private absolution. In every revival of religion the need for this is felt. There are souls in doubt whether their repentance and faith are true, and whether they are themselves accepted of God. Such souls seek the help of the Church, and often greatly profit by it. 'Inquiry-rooms' have been of notable service in modern 'missions,' and it is a common thing for people in trouble of conscience about some special sin to long to unbosom themselves about it to one whom they feel to have spiritual authority. Evangelical religious newspapers have found that they supply a demand by setting apart a column, often largely used, for the answers of some minister of reputation to men who open their minds to him, confess their chief sins, doubts, or temptations, and seek comfort through him. All the Churches, to a greater or less extent, supplement the preaching of the word by 'discipline,' and their admission to communion and exclusion from it tell powerfully on the individual conscience. The effectiveness of all such dealing has a natural basis in the fact of experience that a man's judgment of himself is greatly influenced by the judgment of his fellow-men. It belongs to human nature that the judgment of the community in which a man lives so tells upon his spirit that it is hard for him to bear up against it. This is carried to a higher power in the Church, in the sphere wherein the Spirit of Christ works. The testimony of men who are spiritually minded and in communion with God is felt to have an authority such that great relief is given to souls by the Church's absolution, and great burden imposed by its refusal. And justly, for the discernment of spirits is one of the gifts of the Spirit of Christ to His servants. They all have it in some measure, some in a wonderful measure (1Co 2:15, 1Jn 2:20; 1Jn 4:1), and it may be recalled that after our Lord promised to Peter that on him He would build His Church, He did not say, as we should have expected, 'I will give thee the keys of the Church,' but 'the keys of the kingdom of heaven': from which we infer that, while the Church and the kingdom are not conterminous, the Church is meant to be a true realization of the kingdom, and its judgments valid for that kingdom. In an ideal Church this would be fulfilled. In any actual Church the power spoken of, at once gracious and awful, varies in its effectiveness according to the fulness of the Spirit in its office-bearers and members.

2. History of Absolution in the Church.—In the NT age there is no trace of the practice of private confession to ministers of the Church for private absolution (Jam 5:16 cannot be so interpreted). But very early in the history of the Church it became customary for those who, after baptism, had fallen into gross sins, especially the sins of idolatry, adultery, or murder, to be cut off from fellowship, and to be readmitted after repentance manifested by public confession in the church. This

readmission was an absolution, which came to be spoken of as the Church's power to forgive sins,—a power, however, declared by Tertullian (*de Pudic.* xxi.) to belong to the Church only in so far as she is composed of spiritual men. This power in the 2nd cent. was claimed as vested in the whole episcopate, and, by and by, in every single bishop; still later, in every priest. And from the time of Leo the Great (Bishop of Rome a.d. 440), the custom grew of private confession and private absolution.

In the Middle Ages there were many discussions as to whether the priest had power simply to declare the forgiveness of sins, God alone having power to forgive, or whether the priest truly himself exercises a power to forgive as representative of God.

The final doctrine of the Church of Rome, as fixed by the Council of Trent, combines both these views. God alone forgives sins, and He does this solely on account of the sinner's repentance. But the priest is the necessary instrument of God. God has been pleased to make the priest's absolution the means by which the grace is conveyed, and the word of the priest is a judicial act in which he passes sentence on the penitent. The priest is entitled to use the words of the ritual, 'I absolve thee from thy sins in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.' It is admitted that 'perfect sorrow for sin without addition of external rite blots out the stains, and restores the peace of God in the soul'; yet this perfect sorrow involves in a well-instructed Catholic the intention of confessing and receiving the priest's absolution when opportunity offers. Protestants truly penitent may indeed receive the peace of God, because this desire of confession may be regarded as implicit in them. But confession to the priest is a necessary duty, and priestly absolution may not be omitted without loss of salvation.

The Lutheran Church did not entirely abolish confession and absolution; but Luther made changes which very greatly altered its character. Confession was not made compulsory: it was a free opportunity that might be used in ease of sins about which the penitent could not otherwise attain to peace. Luther made it unnecessary in confession to enumerate every individual sin; and so little was absolution sacerdotal that it might be given by a Christian layman. In course of time, private confession to the pastor mostly died out in the Lutheran Church. But it has often been spontaneously resumed in times of religious revival, of which interesting examples may be found in Dr. Buchsel's *Erinnerungen*. He testifies strongly to the benefit both to pastor and people of the *Privatbeichte*, as he calls the Lutheran method, in contradistinction to the Roman Catholic *Ohrbeichte* vol. ii. p. 113 ff.). And he justifies the word of absolution spoken by the minister, 'I absolve thee,' etc., defending it from the objection that it is falsified and of no effect if the absolved lag not truth and faith, by saying that in that case it is still effectual for judgment, as in the case of the misuse of the Lord's Supper, or, indeed, of the preached gospel.

In regard to the Anglican Church, in its ordinary service ‘the absolution or remission of sins to be pronounced by the priest alone, the people still kneeling,’ is no more than a gospel proclamation of God’s pardon to the penitent, ending in a prayer for true repentance. The exhortation before the Communion contains this invitation, to be pronounced by the curate: ‘If there be any of you who ... cannot quiet his own conscience, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned minister of God’s word, and open his grief, that by the ministry of God’s holy word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness.’ From this, the teaching of the Church of England appears to be similar to that of the Lutheran, making confession exceptional not compulsory, and absolution not sacerdotal, but a part of the ministry of the Word.

In the service for the visitation of the sick, the minister is enjoined ‘to move the sick person to make a special confession of his sins if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession the priest shall absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire it) after this sort: “Our Lore Jesus Christ, who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great merey forgive thee thine offences: and by His authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” ’

In the Presbyterian Churches the words ‘absolve’ and ‘absolution’ are used only of the restoration to Communion by the minister and elders—*i.e.* the Kirk-Session—of those members of the Church who have fallen into any scandalous sin by which Christ is publicly dishonoured. These are usually dealt with first by the minister in private: then they appear before the Session, or before a delegation of it, to make acknowledgment, and profess repentance. Thereupon they may be addressed and ‘absolved,’ by which is meant restored to Communion. This dealing has been undoubtedly, when used with spiritual tact and tenderness, a great means of deepening both the sense of sin and the trust of God’s forgiveness, and it has the effect of giving many who had lost character a new spiritual start. The value, however, of this discipline depends wholly on the measure in which those who administer it are Christian, not legal, in their spirit, and on the support which the discipline receives from the spiritual level of the general body of the Church.

3. Conclusion.—Absolution, in the full meaning of bringing men into the sense of God’s forgiveness and keeping them in that sense, may be said to be the primary work of the Church and its ministry. This work is carried out mainly by preaching, sacraments, and individual dealing with souls. The short history given above indicates the more or less fitting and successful methods by which the Christian Church has endeavoured to fulfil especially the duty of individual dealing. In order that a Church

may be truly successful in this work of grace, it must be largely and widely pervaded by the Spirit of Christ in its whole membership. The gift of power in this work is not confined to the ministry; it is found wherever there is a deeply spiritual mind and Christian experience. Men in spiritual trouble do not betake themselves to a priest or minister unless they feel him to have the spiritual authority that belongs to Christ-like character. A merely official spiritual authority is not seriously believed in. What comforts and assures in time of soul-trouble is the word or sign of acknowledgment from the Christian company speaking by those who truly represent it—those who are truly called of God to the ministry, or who are shown by their goodness to be in the fellowship of God. On the trainingship *Shaftesbury* a had boy met with an accident; he was taken to the little hospital. When he was awake at night he talked to the nurse. One night he said, ‘Sister, I think I am dying, and it is so hard; but I think if you kissed me as if I was a good boy, I could bear it.’ This boy, conscious of an evil past and struggling to escape from it, felt as if the kiss of that good woman would give him cheer, and hope of acceptance with God—would be, in fact, an absolution. A Christian minister, in converse with a dying man in whom he discerns a true repentance, may be able to say with great power, ‘Brother, be assured thy sins are forgiven thee,’ and great blessing of comfort to the man may follow, may indeed be looked for. Only in a high moment of spiritual impulse and assurance could the minister venture to say, ‘In the name of the Lord Jesus I absolve thee from thy sins.’

Literature.—The Commentaries on the Gospels, especially Westcott on St. John, Bruce on St. Matthew, Dods on St. John; Bishop Harold Browne’s *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*; *A Catholic Dictionary* by Addis and Arnold, art. ‘Penance’; Canon Carter’s *The Doctrine of Confession in the Church of England*; Dean Wace’s *Confession, and Absolution*; Dr. Drury’s *Confession and Absolution*; Dr. Büchsel’s *Erinnerungen aus dem Leben eines Landgeistlichen*; F. W. Robertson, of Brighton, *Sermons*, 3rd series, v.; Selby, *The Imperfect Angel*, etc., xii.

J. Robertson.

⚡ Abyss

ABYSS (ἡ ἄβυσσος).—The word ‘abyss,’ which we find in several places in the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 of the NT, is not found in the Authorized Version. There we find instead, in St. Luke ([Luk_8:31](#)) and in Romans ([Rom_10:7](#)) ‘the deep,’ and in the Apocalypse ‘the bottomless pit.’ In [Rev_9:1-2](#) we find (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) ‘the pit of the abyss’ (τὸ φρέατο τῆς ἀβύσσου), a somewhat peculiar

expression, but not having, it would seem, a different signification from the simple word ‘abyss.’

It is not easy to see that the word ‘abyss’ has the same signification in Romans as it has in St. Luke and the Apocalypse. In a general way, of course, the word may be taken as meaning the underworld, the world of departed spirits and of things dim and mysterious,—a world conceived of as deeply hidden away from that of things seen and known, even as the interior of the earth and the depths of the ocean are hidden. The abyss is certainly the realm of the departed in Rom 10:7, where St. Paul himself interprets the word for us: ‘Who shall descend into the abyss (that is, to bring up Christ from the dead)?’ But a more specific meaning than that of simply the underworld must be given to the word in Luk 8:31 and in the various passages in the Apocalypse where it occurs. The abyss is not even in Luk 8:31, perhaps, the ultimate place of punishment, but it is there assuredly a place of restraint and of terror, as it is also so far in the Apocalypse. The abyss in the latter is the Satanic underworld, the dark and mysterious region out of which evil comes, but also the prison in which during the millennial period Satan is confined. Of course much that is given in the Apocalypse is given under poetic imagery. The abyss is rather a condition of spiritual beings than a region of space. But under the imagery there is fact, the fact that there are spiritual beings setting themselves in opposition to the Kingdom of God, and yet in their very opposition conscious of His restraining power. Satan is bound for a season in the abyss. He has no absolute power, but must submit to such restraint as is put upon him. Evil comes from the abyss, but the very Spirit of evil has to submit to being bound there.

Literature.—The Commentaries on the passages above cited; the art. ‘Abyss’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible and in the *Encyc. Biblica*.

George C. Watt.

☞ Acceptance

ACCEPTANCE.—The state or relation of being in favour, especially with God. It is a common OT conception that has been carried over into the NT. In the former it has both a ceremonial significance, involving the presence of an approved offering or a state of ceremonial purity, and also an ethical significance, involving divinely approved conduct. The Hebrew expression פָּנִים נִשָּׂא ‘to lift up face or person of one,’ becomes in NT πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν, ‘to accept the person presence,’ which, however, with its derivatives, προσωπολημπτεῖν and προσωπολήμπτῃ

ς, always implies the acceptance of the outward presence, without regard to the inward or moral qualities; hence, in a bad sense, partiality, as in [Luk 20:21](#) (cf. [Mat 22:16](#) and [Mar 12:14](#)). In a good sense the idea is expressed by εὐάρεστος, 'well-pleasing' ([Mat 3:17](#) 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased'; cf. [Mat 17:5](#)); cf. also δεκτός, 'acceptable' ([Luk 4:24](#), [Php 4:18](#)), used with ἐνιαυτός, 'acceptable year' ([Luk 4:19](#)) and with καιρός, 'acceptable time' ([2Co 6:2](#)), of a period or time when God's favour is specially manifest. In numerous passages in the Gospels and Epistles acceptance with God comes only through and in Jesus Christ ([Joh 14:6](#), [Eph 1:6](#) 'accepted in the Beloved,' [Rom 14:18](#), [Heb 13:21](#)). So also the disciple's conduct and service are to be such as will find acceptance with Christ ([Eph 5:10](#), [2Co 5:9](#); cf. [Heb 12:28](#)). See, further, art. Access.

As applied to our Lord Himself, the idea of His acceptance both with God and man is of frequent occurrence in the Gospels. Of Jesus as a growing boy this twofold acceptance on earth and in heaven is expressly affirmed ([Luk 2:52](#)). His perfect acceptance with the Father is testified to, not only by a voice from heaven both at the beginning of His ministry ([Mat 3:17](#) ||) and towards its close ([Mat 17:6](#) ||), but by the constant affirmations of His own self-consciousness ([Mat 11:27](#) ||, [Mar 12:6](#) ||, [Joh 5:20](#); [Joh 8:29](#); [Joh 10:17](#); [Joh 15:9](#) etc.). The favour with which He was regarded by the people when He first came declaring 'the acceptable year of the Lord,' is proved not only by such notices as, 'The common people heard him gladly' ([Mar 12:37](#)), but by the crowds which followed Him constantly all through the period of public favour. So far as acceptance with men is concerned, there is, of course, another side to the picture. 'No prophet,' He said, 'is acceptable in his own country' ([Luk 4:24](#)). His own brethren did not believe on Him ([Joh 7:3-5](#)), His own townsmen thrust Him out of their city ([Luk 4:28-29](#)), His own people were guilty at last of that great act of rejection which found utterance in the shouts, 'Not this man, but Barabbas' ([Joh 18:40](#)), and 'Crucify him, crucify him' ([Luk 23:21](#)), and was visibly set forth to all coming time when He was nailed to a cross in full sight of Jerusalem (see Rejection). He who had been accepted for a time was now 'a root out of a dry ground,' the 'despised and rejected of men' ([Isa 53:2-3](#)). And yet it was from this same root of rejection and sorrow that the acceptance of Christ was to grow into universal forms. Being lifted up from the earth, He drew all men unto Him ([Joh 12:32](#)). And though as the well-beloved Son He had never for a moment lost favour in His Father's sight, it was through enduring the cross and despising the shame that He sat down at the right hand of the throne of God ([Heb 12:2](#); cf. [Php 2:8-11](#)).

E. B. Pollard.

Access

ACCESS (προσαγωγή).—No word in the English language expresses the double meaning of προσαγωγή. While the Authorized Version translates it invariably ‘access,’ the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 more accurately renders ‘our access’ in Rom 5:2 and Eph 2:18.

The προσαγωγεὺς at Eastern courts acted as official introducer in conducting strangers to a king’s presence. * [Note: Tholuck, Rom. l.c., and Ustcri, Lchr. ii. i. 1, p. 101.] Whether there were any allusion to this or not in the minds of our New Testament writers, the custom *illustrates* appropriately one use of the word ‘access.’ Christ as our Introducer obtains admission for us into the favour and presence of God. προσαγωγή is ‘*aditus ad rem vel personam*’ (Grotius). It means (1) ‘introduction,’ ‘admission’ (see references to classical Greek authors, and to Chrysostom in Ellicott on Eph 2:18); (2) ‘liberty of approach.’

‘Access’ (προσαγωγή) occurs in three passages in the New Testament, Rom 5:2, Eph 2:18; Eph 3:12. An examination of these passages will best explain what ‘access’ meant in the thought of St. Paul. Then it will be necessary to consider 1Pe 3:18 ‘For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us (προσαγάγη) to God’; and afterwards, the idea of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews regarding ‘access’ as the act of drawing near to God through the great High Priest must be stated.

1. Rom 5:2 ‘Through whom we have also [καί, ‘copulat et auget’ (Toletus), ‘answering almost to our “as might be expected” ’ (Alf.)] got [ἐσχήκαμεν] our [τήν] access (introduction) by our [τή] faith, into this grace wherein we stand.’ The Perfect tense is used in connexion with that justifying act referred to in Rom 5:1. Access is not here a second privilege of the justified, but introduction to the very grace of justification itself. We owe to Christ not only peace as the primary blessing of justification, but admission to that state which is the atmosphere of peace.

This paragraph, beginning with Rom 5:1 and descriptive of the life of the justified, is founded on the doctrinal basis just laid down. The Apostle has examined the world of men, as it appeared in the prevalent antithesis of Jew and Gentile. His spiritual diagnosis revealed the fact of universal sin and universal condemnation. A guilty race, a holy God, and a broken law, with its death penalty, were factors in the problem for

solution. This problem, insoluble by man, is taken in hand by Christ. Christ provided a solution as effectual as the need for it is clamant. The summary of that solution as contained in Rom_4:24 f. is the Divine certificate of its efficacy. It was written not for the sake of Abraham alone (a typical case of its application), but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on Him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification. Based on this, ch. 5 begins: 'Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.' Before getting further, the Apostle 'harks back' in Rom_5:2 to the thought of justifying grace, access to which is by Christ.

Into the state of justifying grace we have access through Christ's Passion. His introduction includes, nay, is the starting-point of, liberty of approach. The need of an introduction implies that we were outside the state into which we are introduced. St. Paul himself had experienced transition from the condition of a condemned, to that of a justified, sinner. 'Barnabas introduced him to the apostles (Act_9:27), and there were others "that led him by the hand to Damascus" (Act_9:8); but it was Christ that introduced and led him by the hand into this grace' (M. Henry). Christ *introduces*, 'Contigit nobis ut perduceremur' (Erasmus). He does not drag unwilling followers. Faith is the following foot. If He draws us, we run after Him.

2. Eph_2:18 'For through him we both have our access in one Spirit unto the Father.' Eph_3:12 'In whom we have our boldness and our access with confidence by the faith of him.' The old controversy as to whether access means in these verses introduction or liberty of approach, still survives. Among moderns, Alford and Ellicott take opposite sides. Alford contends for the latter as 'better representing the *repetition*, the *present* liberty of approach which ἐχομεν implies, but which "*introduction*" does not give.' While pressing the point that as 'boldness' (παρρησία) is subjective in Eph_3:12, 'access' there coupled with it must also be subjective, he gives away his case by admitting that the second term (προσαγωγή) is 'less purely so than the first' (παρρησία). Ellicott argues for 'introduction' on grounds of lexical and classical usage, but also makes the significant admission that the *transitive* meaning of προσαγωγή is a little less certain in Eph_3:12 than it is in Eph_2:18, on account of its union with the intransitive παρρησία.

Where equally competent critical authorities thus differ, the context of the passages may be allowed to decide between them. In the paragraph Eph_2:11-22, where 'access' (Eph_2:18) appears, the Apostle writes of a change in the Ephesians' relations corresponding to the change already described as having taken place in their moral and spiritual condition. At one time they were afar off, aliens, strangers, hopeless,

godless. A change was effected by the blood of Christ. Those for whom His death procured peace are now declared to be fellow-citizens of the saints, members of the household of God, stones in that living temple in which God dwells through the Spirit. There is surely something more implied by ‘access’ in such a setting than mere liberty of approach to God. The Church is Christ’s body, sharing the privileges of its Head. The reconciliation effected by His blood is not a mere potential one. Very definite language is used to express change of relationship: Eph 2:13 ‘were brought nigh’ (historic). To become citizens of a kingdom, members of a household, stones in a building, implies a definite act performed on behalf of the persons or things thus brought into these new relations. *Access* in the sense of *introduction* seems to express most fitly the alteration thus contextually described.

The argument for ‘introduction’ is not quite so strong in Eph 3:12. In the context preceding, St. Paul has been speaking of his own office as Apostle of the Gentiles. He was made a minister of the gospel in order by its means to bring the Gentiles into the fellowship of the saints, and instruct men as to the eternal purpose of God in Redemption. That purpose, executed in Christ, manifested to principalities and powers in heaven the wisdom of God. Had the ‘access’ been used by itself in Eph 3:12 after the above line of thought, that would not point to *introduction* rather than to *liberty of approach*. But standing as it does between ‘boldness’ (παρρησίαν) and ‘with confidence’ (ἐν πεποιθήσει), ‘liberty of approach’ scarcely expresses all the author’s thought. The multiplication of terms indicates an attempt to give utterance to something besides this. And so, according to the analogy of Rom 5:2 and Eph 2:18, we are warranted here also in translating προσαγωγή, by ‘introduction.’ ‘While the former of the parallel terms (boldness) describes the liberty with which the newborn Church of the redeemed address themselves to God the Father and the unchecked freedom of their petitions, the latter (admittance) takes us back to the act of Christ by which He introduced us to the Father’s presence and gave us the place of sons in the house’ (Findlay in *Expos. Biblc*, ‘Ephesians’).

Confusion has been created by expositors insisting that ‘access’ must, in the three passages where the word occurs, always mean either *introduction*, or *liberty of approach* exclusively. But the larger concept, ‘introduction,’ includes the lesser, ‘liberty of approach.’ To put it in another way—the latter term follows from the former. Presentation at the Court of Heaven gives one the right to return there. It secures habitual access to God at all times.

3. 1Pe 3:18 ‘Because Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us (προσαγωγή) to God.’ The Apostle does not set himself in this Epistle to expound the theology of the Passion. His general purpose is

to comfort and sustain Christians who are suffering persecutions. Some of them were slaves, enduring wrongs from cruel masters because of their faith in Christ. These were directed to the exemplary character of Christ's sufferings. In 1Pe 3:13 St. Peter assures them that it is better to suffer for well-doing than for evil-doing. Then in 1Pe 3:18 he links them in thought with the suffering Saviour. But it is not on the exemplary significance of Christ's sufferings that he enlarges. That is left behind. The writer is spellbound by the very mention of the Cross, and for a moment he forgets his purpose of directing some wronged slaves to Christ as the supreme example of suffering innocence, that he may state again the wider and deeper meaning of his Lord's Passion. Christ suffered in connexion with sin once for all (ἅπαξ). The unique significance of His death consisted in its being the death of a righteous person for the unrighteous (δικαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων); and His action had this end in view, that He might conduct us (προσαγωγή) to God: 'ut nos, qui abalienati fuimus, ipse abiens ad Patrem, secum una, justificatos adduceret in cœlum, 1Pe 3:22, per eosdem gradus quos ipse emensus est, exinanitionis et exaltationis' (Bengel). 'And if the soul bear back still through distrust, He takes it by the hand and draws it forward; leads it unto His Father; presents it to Him, and leaves not the matter till it [the reconciliation between a sinner and God] be made a full and sure agreement' (Leighton).

4. The word προσαγωγή is not found in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Access is expressed there in different language from that in the passages considered, because it is associated with somewhat different ideas. The author of Hebrews, writing as a pastor, not as an evangelist, aims at conserving rather than initiating faith. Instead of the Pauline and Petrine idea of the Saviour leading in a sinner, we have the sinner coming to the Saviour. *Introduction* (προσαγωγή) becomes *access, liberty of approach, approximation*. Sinners are represented in the very act of approaching—are exhorted to approach. The worshippers under the law were τοὺς προσερχομένους, 'the comers' (Heb 10:1); 'not those that come to the worship, but those who by the worship come to God' (Owen). Under the gospel (Judaism evolved) their attitude and character remained the same: Heb 7:25, Heb 11:6 (singular) or Heb 4:16, Heb 10:22, where believers are exhorted to draw near (προσερχώμεθα).

As a Hebrew Christian addressing Hebrew Christians, the writer of Hebrews makes large use of Old Testament conceptions and Old Testament rites familiar to himself and his correspondents. Urging upon them the truth 'that the faith of Christ is the true and final religion' (Davidson), he presents a series of contrasts between what was elementary in Judaism and the finished product of Christianity. Modern readers are apt to lose themselves amid unfamiliar details here. But it is possible to set these details in the background, and yet grasp the permanent truths, which are as

important for us as for the readers to whom such details became the most effective illustrations. We shall keep this in view when attempting now to summarize the great facts associated with the idea of access in the four Epistles already referred to.

(1) The need of *access to* implies *separation from* God—want of fellowship like that enjoyed by those who walk in the light. We are by nature afar off (Eph 2:13), aliens (v. 12). There is an enmity which must be slain before peace is effected. The wrath of God is revealed against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men (Rom 1:18). The Ephesians were by nature children of wrath (Eph 2:3). That exhortation used in Hebrews to draw near (Heb 4:16; Heb 10:22) could be addressed only to those who are at a distance from God. ‘Whereas it is emphatically affirmed that He is able to save unto the uttermost, it is supposed that great oppositions and difficulties do lie in the way of its accomplishment’ (Owen).

(2) The great separating barrier is *sin*. All have sinned (Rom 3:25): and the correlative of universal sin is universal condemnation. Sin and death are so associated as to be completely one (Rom 5:12; Rom 5:14-15; Rom 5:17; Rom 5:21). The Ephesians are represented as dead in trespasses and sins (2:1).

(3) All three Persons of the Godhead conspired to deal with the problem of sin, in a way corresponding to its magnitude. Access is (a) *to* (πρός) the Father (Eph 2:18)—representing the God to whom we are to be reconciled and introduced, and into whose family we are to be adopted; (b) *through* (διὰ) the Son (Rom 5:2, Eph 2:18); (c) *by* (ἐν) the Spirit (Eph 2:18).

(4) This is the special work of Christ. He bridges the gulf which sin has created between God and man. We have access into the grace of justification through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood (Rom 3:24-25). The double alienation from God and His Church discussed in Ephesians is removed through Christ—by His blood (Eph 2:13), by His flesh (Eph 2:15), by His Cross (Eph 2:16).

The steps whereby access was effected by Christ are clearly laid down in 1Pe 3:18. His death has a connexion with sin. He suffered once for all (ἅπαξ), ‘so that to them who lay hold on Him this holds sure, that sin is never to be suffered for in the way of strict justice again, as not by Him, so not by them who are in Him’ (Leighton). The unique significance of Christ’s suffering in connexion with sins is expressed in the words ‘the just for the unjust’ (δικαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων). In dying, the righteous One took on Himself the liability of the unrighteous. Access to God was, in St. Peter’s estimation, thus purchased at an unspeakable price. ‘A righteous One has once for all

faced, and in death taken up and exhausted, the responsibilities of the unrighteous, so that they no more stand between them and God' (Denney, *The Death of Christ*, p. 102).

The author of Hebrews explains and illustrates by a method *sui generis*, how Christ obtains access for us. Christ is the great High Priest interceding for men in the heavenly sanctuary, and the function which He discharges in heaven is based on the death which He died on earth. A priest's duty is to establish and represent fellowship between God and man. Christ found that sin barred the way to this fellowship, and accordingly dealt with sin. He was appointed with a view to this end—to make propitiation for the sins of the people (Heb_2:17). In contrast with the Levitical priests and their duties, Christ's Person and work are perfect (τέλειος). He deals with sin by way of sacrifice. This He did *once* when He offered up Himself (Heb_7:27). 'Once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, (Heb_9:26). 'Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many' (Heb_9:28). 'For by one offering he hath perfected for ever ['to perfect,' τελειοῦν, 'is to bring into the true condition of those in covenant'] them that are sanctified' ['to sanctify,' ἁγιάζειν, 'is to make to belong to God,' Davidson].

Associated with the same conception of sacrifice are the references in the Epistle to the blood of Christ. He entered into the Holy Place by (διὰ) His blood (Heb_9:12). The blood of Christ, who offered Himself to God, purges the conscience from dead works (Heb_9:14). We have boldness to enter into the Holiest by the blood of Christ (Heb_10:19). Access is therefore dependent on Christ's Person and work. In reliance on His sacrifice (Heb_10:19), along a way consecrated by His death (Heb_10:20), mindful of their High Priest (Heb_10:21) in heaven, believers are exhorted to *draw near* to God. The exhortation in Heb_4:16 to come boldly unto the throne of grace is also founded on Jesus having passed into the heavens as our great High Priest: and it adds the thought of Christ's sympathy, as having experienced infirmities and temptations Himself, in order to encourage suppliants for mercy and grace. The truth put hortatively in these passages is also taught directly in Heb_7:25, where access is linked with intercession. This intercession, of which an example is preserved in John 17, is continued in heaven, and derives its power from the sacrifice which Christ offered on earth.

(5) Faith is the subjective condition of those who have access (Rom_3:25; Rom_5:2, Eph_3:12). 'He who comes to God must believe that he is' (Heb_11:6). The eleventh chapter of Hebrews is a record of faith in action, faith as illustrated in the lives of saints, who first came to God, and then acted and endured, because sustained by the strength of God.

Literature.—The Commentaries on the passages discussed, especially Sanday-Headlam on *Romans*; Ellicott, Meyer, H. G. Miller, and Armitage Robinson on *Ephesians*; Delitzsch, Davidson, Westcott, and Bruce on *Hebrews*; also Calvin's *Institutes*, iii. xiii. 5, xx. 12; Cremer's *Biblico-Theol. Lex.*; Denney, *The Death of Christ; Expositor*, 4th series [1890], ii. 131; 2nd series [1882], iv. 321.

D. A. Mackinnon.

☒ Accommodation

☒ Accusations

ACCUSATIONS.—See Trial (of Jesus).

☒ Achim

ACHIM (Ἀχίμ).—An ancestor of Joseph, according to the genealogy of our Lord in St. Matthew's Gospel (Mat_1:14). The name may be a shortened form of *Jehoiachim*, or it may be for *Ahiam* (cf. 1Ch_11:35) or *Jachin* (cf. Gen_46:10).

☒ Activity

ACTIVITY.—1. The period of our Lord's activity is, in other words, that of His ministry, in the fulfilment of which His activity was exhibited. Its duration is a matter of dispute, relevant only so far as it compresses into one year the recorded details, or extends them to the traditional three. In any case the records are in no sense exhaustive. Manifold ministries are expressed in few words (Mat_4:23-24; Mat_15:30, Luk_4:43; Luk_8:1, Joh_4:1 etc.); a complete account is beyond an Evangelist's scope (Joh_20:30-31), and would be voluminous (Joh_21:25). This is said of things done 'in the presence of the disciples' (Joh_20:30), and we cannot suppose they saw or knew all that Jesus did. See art. Ministry.

In fact, we possess no more than specimens of Christ's labours; but these, no doubt, are so selected as to give us a general idea of the whole. In this connexion the first Sabbath at Capernaum (of which a detailed account is given in Mar_1:21-34, Luk_4:31-43) has well been pointed to as a specimen day. Some details of the Son of

Man's toilsome life—wearing journeys (Joh 4:6), rising 'a great while before day' (Mar 1:35)—may be in themselves not much more than features of Oriental life: others—'nowhere to lay his head' (Mat 8:20)—cannot be so explained. Day to Him meant work. The Father's work was both a daily necessity (Joh 9:4) and His very 'meat' (4:34). Its substance was twofold: (1) the *general* work of evangelizing and healing; (2) the *special* work of training others, the Twelve (Mar 3:14; Mar 6:7 etc.) and the Seventy (Luk 10:1), and superintending their efforts. Similarly we may regard as twofold the conditions under which it was carried on: (1) the *normal* conditions, ever varying, of the day (Sabbath or week-day), the place (synagogue, Temple or open-air) and the hearers (multitudes or individuals); (2) the *abnormal* conditions, created by the presence of opponents (Mat 12:10-14; Mat 12:24-42 etc.), or of crowds who clung to Him sometimes for days together (Mat 15:32, Mar 8:2). Under such pressure there was often no leisure to eat (Mar 3:20; Mar 6:31). Night did not mean sleep, but was given largely to prayer (Mat 14:23, Luk 6:12; Luk 9:28; Luk 22:39-41), till His exhausted nature, finding opportunity for repose, could sleep undisturbed even by a storm (Mar 4:38, Luk 8:23). More than once His disciples (accustomed by their trade to night-watches, Luk 5:5) proved unequal to the strain of wakefulness (Luk 9:32, Mar 14:37; Mar 14:40). His friends, fearing a mental breakdown, came to restrain Him by force (Mar 3:21). It would be hazardous to estimate degrees of spiritual activity by the precarious test of numerical results (Joh 12:37-40), but it is noticeable that at one time He made more disciples than John the Baptist (Joh 4:1).

Certain limitations of Christ's activity are clear and significant. (1) In scope it was confined to 'the house of Israel,' more especially its 'lost sheep' (Joh 1:31, Mat 15:24). A few outsiders (Gentiles and proselytes) came within its range; but these were exceptional (Mat 8:5-13; Mat 15:22, Luk 17:16, Joh 4:9; Joh 12:20-21). (2) In development it was regulated by the unfolding of a Divine plan, frequently referred to by such expressions as 'my hour' (Joh 2:4; Joh 7:30; Joh 8:20; Joh 13:1 etc.), 'my time' (Mat 26:18, Joh 7:6). (3) In operation it was morally conditioned by the existence (or otherwise) of a certain measure of receptiveness (Mar 6:5).

In reference to the source of His activity, it must be noted: (1) that it was always and essentially associated with times of retirement and prayer (Mar 1:35; Mar 3:13; Mar 6:46; Mar 9:2 etc.); (2) that its manifestation is directly ascribed to the power of the Spirit (Mat 12:28, Luk 4:14 etc.); and (3) that, in its miraculous exercise, there is indicated (at least once) a perception that 'power had gone out' (Mar 5:30, Luk 8:46).

2. In the Christian course, energy is constantly commanded (Mat 11:12, Mar 13:33, Luk 13:24). Yet it is worthy of remark that in Christ's estimate of human character the active qualities seem sometimes to be depreciated in comparison with the

passive, contemplative, and devotional. The latter attain to 'the good part' (Luk 10:38-42), and find their place in the Beatitudes (Mat 5:3-12). See, further, Character (Christian).

3. Finally, the believer's view of Christ is not, in the Gospels, primarily directed to His active labours. Such things are the record of an Apostle (2Co 6:4-5 etc.) rather than a Saviour: accordingly, if with the account of our Lord's active labours we measure that of His Passion, both as to general proportion and minutiae of detail, there can be no doubt that in the Gospel picture the Passion, and not the activity, occupies the foreground.

F. S. Ranken.

Acts Of The Apostles

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.—The aim of this article is to answer the question, What does the Acts of the Apostles say of Christ?; otherwise expressed, How is the Book of Acts related to 'the gospel?' or, What is 'the gospel' of the Acts? We do not know the name of the author of the book—for St. Luke or some other disciple of St. Paul did not compose it, but merely supplied valuable materials for its composition—but his religious individuality may be ascertained from his work with sufficient clearness to enable us to answer the questions just stated. The problem is all the more interesting because the author can hardly have written before the end of the 1st cent., and thus cannot reckon himself among the first eye-witnesses and ministers of the word (Luk 1:2). What then is the picture of Christ that stamps itself on the heart of a man of the second generation? Has this man anything new, anything unique, to tell us of Him?

Before we go on to answer this question, we must make it clear to ourselves that our author, in what he writes, does not always speak *in his own person*. From the Gospel of St. Luke we know to what an extent he is dependent on sources. This may be observed and proved in particular instances by a close comparison with St. Mark and (in the case of the discourses) with St. Matthew. In the Gospel he is almost entirely a mere retailer of older tradition, and the lineaments of his own personality scarcely come into view. There can be no doubt that likewise in the Acts he largely reproduces early tradition, that he makes use of sources, sometimes copying them in full, at other times abbreviating or expanding them, grouping them and editing both their language and their contents. Modern criticism, however, has reached the conviction that in this second work more of the author's idiosyncrasy is to be detected than in his Gospel. Hence it will be necessary to make the attempt to distinguish the notions

which reveal to us the educated writer of the last decade of the 1st cent. from those passages in which the rôle is played by early popular tradition.

The author's personality undoubtedly shows itself more strongly in the second than in the first part of the book, but most clearly in the way in which the work is arranged in these two parts, so that the first is dominated by the person of Peter and the second by that of Paul. To him the Church rests upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets (cf. Eph 2:20; Eph 3:5)—not upon *one* Apostle, as in Mat 16:18, but upon the two great leaders, the head of the primitive Church who by a Divine dispensation was led to engage in a mission to the Gentiles, and the great Apostle of the heathen world who by Divine guidance had to turn his back on his own people and betake himself to the Gentiles. 'Peter and Paul' is the watchword, the shibboleth of the Roman Church, as we find again in the First Epistle of Clement.

It is especially in the *speeches* contained in the second part of the book that the author reveals his conception of Christianity. When St. Paul discourses (Act 24:24) of 'the faith in Christ Jesus,' the subjects of his address are given in Act 24:25 as 'righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come.' This future and not distant judgment is also the point that forms the climax of St. Paul's address at Athens (Act 17:31): 'He hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness,' and immediately thereafter, 'by a man whom he hath (thereto) ordained, having given him his credentials before all men by having raised him from the dead.' This last is the essentially new point in contradistinction from the Jewish preaching in the Diaspora. That there is to be a judgment of the world had, indeed, been already declared, but that the Judge 'appointed by God over living and dead' (Act 10:42) is already present in heaven (Act 3:21), has already been manifested on earth (Act 1:3, Act 10:40 f.), and accredited by God through an unprecedented miracle—this is the cardinal and significant message of the Apostles. Now, it is noteworthy how the author of the Acts gives point and practical application to this generally accepted idea. The resurrection of *Jesus* is the main content of the Apostolic preaching, so much so that in Act 1:22 the Apostles are roundly designated 'witnesses of the resurrection.' In the eyes of our author it comes to this, that in the gospel of the resurrection of *Jesus* is implied the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead *in general*. What St. Paul (1Co 15:12-19) seeks to prove to his readers, is to our author self-evident: the one special case implies the general. This is plainly declared in Act 4:2 'they proclaimed *in Jesus* the resurrection from the dead.' So also in Act 17:18 'he preached *Jesus and the resurrection*,' and in Act 17:32 'the resurrection of the dead' is the point in St. Paul's address on which the Athenians fix. Before the Sanhedrin St. Paul declares: 'Touching the hope and *resurrection of the dead* I am called in question' (Act 23:6); to Felix he says: 'I have the hope that there shall be a resurrection both of the just and of the unjust' (Act 24:15). The latter passage is specially important because in it the relation of Christianity to Judaism is

defined to the effect that there is really no essential difference between them. St. Paul, like his accusers, serves, although after the new 'Way,' the God of the fathers (Act 24:13); 'for the hope of Israel' he bears his chain (Act 28:20). All Jews who believe in the resurrection ought really to be Christians. 'Why is it judged incredible with you if God doth raise the dead?' (Act 26:8). Hence also the Pharisees, who believe in the resurrection of the dead, appear as the party favourable to Christianity; whereas the Sadducees, who say that 'there is no resurrection,' are its enemies (Act 23:8). Resurrection, then, is the main theme of the new message, hence the preaching of the Apostles bears the designation 'words of this Life' (Act 5:20). The Risen One is 'the Prince of Life' (Act 3:15). By His resurrection and exaltation He is proved to be the Saviour ($\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho$, the term best answering our author's purpose, and most intelligible to the Greeks of the time, Act 5:30 f, Act 13:23); the 'word' is the 'word of salvation' (Act 13:26); and the whole of the Acts of the Apostles might have this motto prefixed: 'In none other is there salvation, and neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved' (Act 4:12). This religion is proved to be the superior of all earlier ones, superior alike to the darkness of heathendom (Act 26:18) and to Judaism, in this, that it tells of a *Saviour* who saves *alive*. The method is described in Act 10:43, Act 13:38 f, Act 26:18 as the forgiveness of sins, or, to use the designation adopted in one of St. Paul's addresses, 'justification' (Act 13:39).

But who now is the Judge and Saviour accredited by the resurrection? It is very characteristic of our author that in those passages where for the most part it is himself that speaks, *e.g.* in the speeches put into the mouth of St. Paul before Agrippa or Felix or Festus (chs. 22, 23), we scarcely hear of the earthly Jesus but of the heavenly Lord. The appearance of the Exalted One near Damascus is the great matter which St. Paul has to communicate to his countrymen and to the Jewish king. It is the heavenly Lord that permeates the life of His Church and His apostles, the Κύριος on whom Christians believe. This Divine name is very often applied in the Acts to God, but not infrequently also to Christ. Thus the Exalted Christ, working miracles from heaven by His name (Act 9:34), accredited by the miracle of the resurrection, and destined to come again with judgment and salvation, occupies the central point of the faith of our author.

But it would be a mistake to suppose that our author had no interest in the earthly Jesus of Nazareth. As the heavenly Christ says to Saul, 'I am Jesus of Nazareth whom thou persecutest' (Act 22:8), so to the writer of the Acts 'the Christ' and 'Jesus' constitute an inseparable unity. He interchanges freely such expressions as 'proclaimed unto them the Christ' (Act 8:5) and 'preached unto him Jesus' (Act 8:35); cf. Act 5:42 'to preach Christ Jesus' (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'Jesus [as] the Christ'), Act 9:20 'proclaimed Jesus that he is the Son of God,'

Act 18:5 'testifying to the Jews that Jesus was the Christ.' And as our author in his Gospel narrative already calls Jesus 'Lord,' it is always of the Exalted One that he thinks even when communicating what he knows of the earthly life of Jesus. More than once he defines the contents of the Apostolic preaching as 'the things concerning Jesus' (Act 18:25) or 'the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ' (Act 28:31), and this concise formula embraces far more than one might infer from the meagre sketches of St. Paul's address in Act 13:24-30 or St. Peter's in Act 10:37-43. We must keep in mind that the first readers of the Acts, Theophilus in particular, when this work came into their hands, were already acquainted with the Third Gospel, and would thus, by means of the full details supplied in it, unconsciously clothe with meaning the brief formulae in question. Still more varied was the knowledge which *our author* possessed of the life of Jesus, for he was acquainted not only with St. Mark's Gospel, but with other writings which he utilized merely for extracts; and how manifold may have been the oral tradition current at the same time, which he made use of in an eclectic fashion! The whole of this copious tradition we must think of as forming the background of the Acts if we are to appreciate rightly its picture of Christ.

A special charm of the Lukan writings arises from the fact that the author, with all his culture and Greek sympathies, has had the good taste to retain in large measure the peculiar, un-Greek, popular Palestinian character of his sources, and that both in language and contents. Some scholars, indeed, are of opinion that he himself deliberately produced the colouring appropriate to place and time, as in the case of an artificial *patina*. But this view is untenable. The more thoroughly the Third Gospel and the Acts are examined, the deeper becomes the conviction that the author worked upon a very ancient tradition which he has preserved in his own style. As in the early narratives of his Gospel he preserves almost unimpaired the colouring and tone of Jewish-Christian piety without any admixture of Graeco-Gentile-Christian elements, so also in the Acts, especially in the first part of the book, he has succeeded in presenting the original picture of the religious conceptions and the piety of the earliest Christian community in Jerusalem. We are far from believing that everything here related is 'historical' in the strict sense. For instance, it is in the highest degree improbable that the actual speeches of St. Peter have been preserved *verbatim*; all we assert is that these chapters are a true representation of the spirit of early Jewish Christianity. Very specially is this the case with the Christology. For such a doctrine of Christ as is represented by the Petrine discourses was scarcely to be found in the Church after the time of St. Paul and at the time when the Fourth Gospel was written. After the *kenosis* doctrine of St. Paul had been propounded, and then, as its counterpart, the Johannine picture of Christ, in which also the earthly Jesus wears the 'form of God,' had taken hold of men's minds, a Christology such as the first part of the Acts exhibits could not have been devised. But we are grateful to the author

for having preserved to us a picture of that earliest mode of thought. Let us examine its main features.

We may use as a collateral witness the words of the disciples on the way to Emmaus (Luk_24:19), for it is a mere accident, so to speak, that this story is found in the Gospel and not in the Acts: 'Jesus of Nazareth, which was a prophet (ἀνὴρ προφήτης), mighty in deed and word before God and all the people.' So also He is described by St. Peter: 'Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God unto you by mighty works and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you' (Act_2:22). The peculiarity of this last statement is that the wonders and signs are not attributed to Jesus Himself: *God* wrought them through Him; He was simply God's organ or instrument. The same thing is expressed in another passage (Act_10:38), where it is declared that in His going about and in His deeds God was *with Him*. In both instances the conception comes out clearly that Jesus was a man chosen and specially favoured of God. There is not a word in all these discourses of a Divine birth, no word of a coming down from heaven or of a 'Son of God' in a physical or supernatural sense. On the contrary, Jesus is called more than once 'the Servant of God' (Act_3:13; Act_3:26, Act_4:27). This designation suggests a prophet, and as a matter of fact Jesus is directly characterized as a prophet when in Act_4:22 the words of Deu_18:15; Deu_18:18 f. are applied to Him. At the same time He is no ordinary prophet, but *the* prophet like unto Moses; He is the second Moses predicted by Moses himself.

But it may be asked, Was Jesus then nothing more than this to the earliest disciples, was He not to them *the Messiah*? In a certain sense—yes, and in another sense—no. Certainly He had received the kingly anointing (Act_10:38); but, as David was anointed long before he received the kingdom, so Jesus was from the time of His baptism a king, indeed, but a secret one with an invisible crown. The primitive Jewish-Christian Church was far from saying: Jesus of Nazareth, as He journeyed through the land teaching and healing, *was* the Messiah; no, He was then merely the One destined for lordship. It was only at a later period that He received the crown, namely at His resurrection and exaltation. Here comes into view the saying of St. Peter in Act_2:36, which is a gem to the historian of primitive Christianity: 'This Jesus hath God made *both Lord and Christ*,' namely by exalting Him to His right hand (Act_2:33) and thereby fulfilling the words of Psa_110:1 'Sit thou at my right hand.' The exaltation of Jesus marks His ascension of the throne; now He has become in reality what since His baptism He was in claim and anticipation—'the Anointed.' Now for the first time the name 'Lord' is fully appropriate to Him. This is the principal extant proof passage for the *earliest Christology*. It reveals to us the conceptions of the primitive Church, which, as a matter of fact, still underlie the teaching even of St. Paul. For, in spite of his advanced speculations on the subject of Christ, in spite of his doctrine of pre-existence and his cosmological Christology, the Apostle holds fast

in Rom 1:4 and Php 2:9 to the notion that Jesus became 'Son of God in power' through His resurrection from the dead, and was invested with the title 'Lord' at His exaltation. To the same effect St. Paul in Act 13:33 applies the words of Psa 2:7 ('Thou art my Son, *this day* have I begotten thee') not to the birth nor to the baptism of Jesus, but to the day of His resurrection and exaltation. With this fundamental passage corresponds another. When in Act 3:19 f., speaking of the future, it is said 'that there may come the times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord, and that he may send the Christ who hath been appointed for you, even Jesus,' this assumes that Jesus has not yet made His appearance as *Messiah*; in that capacity He belongs to the future; there is not a word of coming *again* or of a *second* sending. Such is the earliest primitive Christian conception, and it is this alone which is in harmony with the preaching and the self-estimate of Jesus when these are rightly understood.

But what now are the contents and the significance of the life-work of Jesus? Thoroughly in harmony with important words of Jesus, Act 10:36 replies: 'He went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed *of the devil*.' Just as the Third Gospel delights to represent the work of Jesus as a conflict with the devil, the brief formula we have quoted reproduces accurately the contents of His life work. Along with this, indeed, should be taken also Act 3:26 'God sent him to bless you in turning away every one of you from your iniquities.' He was 'the Holy and Righteous One' (Act 3:14), or, absolutely, 'the Righteous One' (Act 7:52). The latter expression is chosen no doubt in order to emphasize His innocence in His sufferings and death, but it is certainly not contrary to the spirit of the Acts to find in it the testimony that it was He that was called to break the sway of sin in the world. Less clear is Act 10:36, according to which God caused 'peace to be preached by Jesus to the children Israel,' a form of expression which recalls Eph 2:17, and in its abrupt conciseness no doubt reflects the conceptions of the author more than those of the early Church.

This brings us to the question, What view, judging from the evidence of the Acts, did the early Church take of the death of Christ? Repeatedly in the addresses of St. Peter it is urged upon opponents that *this* Jesus, the Holy and Righteous One, was put to death by the Jews (Act 2:23, Act 3:13, Act 4:10; Act 4:25 ff., Act 5:28 ff., Act 7:52, Act 10:39, Act 13:28), by the hands of wicked men (Act 2:23), although Pilate was prepared to acquit Him (Act 3:13). In all these instances, as was fitting in addresses meant to lead the hearers to conviction and repentance, the innocence of Jesus is emphasised as a point to awaken conscience, not as an element in a doctrine of the atoning death of Christ. Such an element is entirely lacking in these chapters, for in the passage from Isaiah 53 about the Suffering Servant, which Philip expounded to the Ethiopian eunuch, it is precisely the expressions about bearing our sins that are wanting. The early theology of the death of Christ confines itself entirely to the point that this event was in no way contrary to God's saving purpose; on the contrary, it had long been foreseen (Act 2:23, Act 3:18, Act 4:28, Act 13:29). Hence the copious

Scripture proofs, which, however, deal more with the resurrection than with the sufferings and death (Act 2:25 ff., Act 2:34 f, Act 4:11; Act 4:25 f, Act 8:32 f, Act 13:33 ff.).

The resurrection is not in these passages, as with St. Paul, regarded as a clothing of the Risen One with a glorified body, but as the revivification, or, to put it better, the conservation of the very same body of flesh which was laid in the grave. The principle that governs the conception is found in Psa 16:10 (quoted in Act 2:27), 'Thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption.' For, if Christ did descend to Hades, He was not given over to its power (Act 2:31), God 'having loosed "the pangs of death," because it was not possible that he should be holden of it' (Act 2:24), 'nor did his flesh see corruption' (Act 2:31). This is the essential point, that the same body which was laid in the grave was that which rose again. For this reason, as in St. Luke's Gospel (Luk 24:39-43), such emphasis is laid upon the eating and drinking of the Risen One (Luk 10:41); hence also the forty days' intercourse with the disciples (Luk 1:3). Jesus, in short, actually returned again to earth in complete corporeality; hence the necessity, at the end of the forty days, of yet another special miracle, that of the Ascension (Luk 1:8). Like Moses or Elijah, He is carried up by a cloud, as He still walks on earth and still belongs to earth. This tradition says nothing about the necessary change whereby this fleshly body that rose from the grave was transformed into the glorified heavenly body that appeared to Saul of Tarsus in kingly splendour. We have here before us the popular view of the Resurrection in its crudest form. That an author whose ideas otherwise are cast in such a Greek mould should reproduce it, shows that the popular conceptions cannot have been so strange to him as we should have supposed. Conceptions which *our* intelligence thinks it necessary to separate, and which a St. Paul did separate, appear to have found a place in the same mind side by side.

We owe a special debt of gratitude to the author of the Acts for having drawn for us several pictures illustrating the prominent part played in the early Church by the Spirit and the Name of the exalted Christ. The Spirit sent by the latter is the proof of His exaltation and Messiahship (Act 2:33-36). This is the culminating point of St. Peter's Pentecostal address (Act 2:14-36), whose *order* of thought forms a very interesting study for the historian of primitive Christianity. This proof is addressed primarily to the house of Israel (Act 2:36). The Jews have not, indeed, seen the Risen One (Act 10:41), but for that very reason His exaltation is designed as a final means of leading Israel to repentance (Act 5:31), for the coming of the era of salvation is bound up with this repentance (Act 3:19 f.). Through this Spirit the exalted Lord is ever present with His own; He imparts power and success to the words of the Apostles (Act 2:37, Act 5:33, Act 6:5); and miracles are wrought by the power of God (Act 6:8). It is noteworthy, however, that it is only rarely that the Spirit of God is introduced in this connexion; far more frequently it is the Name of Christ that, like a

present representative of the Lord, works miracles (Act 3:16, Act 4:30). Specially instructive are Act 9:34 where the *pronouncing* of the Name effects healing, and Act 19:13 where the use of the Name is resorted to even by unbelievers.

Literature.—Johannes Weiss, *Absicht u. literar. Charakter der Apostelgeschichte*; Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*; Pfeleiderer, *Urchristentum*; McGiffert, *Hist. of Christianity in the Apostol. Age*; Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*; Chase, *Credibility of Acts*; *Expositor*, iv. iv. [1891] 178ff.

J. Weiss.

Adam

ADAM.—1. In Luk 3:38 the ancestry of Jesus is traced up to Adam. From what source the Evangelist drew his genealogy it is impossible to say. But when compared with that in the First Gospel, it clearly shows the purpose with which St. Luke wrote. As a Gentile, writing for a Gentile, he took every opportunity of insisting upon the universal power of the gospel. The effects of the life and Person of Jesus are not confined to the Jews; for Jesus is not, as in St. Matthew's Gospel, a descendant of Abraham only, but of the man to whom all mankind trace their origin. See art. Genealogy of Jesus Christ. But further, St. Luke closes his genealogy with the significant words 'the son of Adam, the son of God' (τοῦ Ἀδάμ, τοῦ Θεοῦ). Adam, and therefore all mankind, had a Divine origin. The same Evangelist who relates the fact of the virgin birth, and records that Christ was, in His own proper Person, υἱὸς Θεοῦ (Luk 1:35), claims that the first man, and hence every human being, is υἱὸς Θεοῦ. Thus the genealogy, which might at first sight appear to be a useless addition to the Gospel narrative, possesses a lasting spiritual value.

The truth placed by St. Luke in the forefront of his Gospel is treated in its redemptive aspect by his master St. Paul, who in four passages brings Adam and Christ into juxtaposition:

(a) 1Co 15:22. The solidarity of mankind in their physical union with Adam involves universal death as a consequence of Adam's sin. Similarly the solidarity of mankind in their spiritual union with Christ involves universal life as a consequence of Christ's perfect work.

(b) In Rom 5:12-21. this solidarity and its results are treated in fuller detail. (i.) Rom 5:12-14. *There is a parallelism between Adam and Christ*. Adam 'is a type of

him who was to come' (Rom_5:14), in the sense that his act affected all men. Adam committed a *παράπτωμα*, a lapse, a false step—commonly termed the Fall. By this lapse, sin was as 'a malignant force let loose among mankind'; and through sin came physical death. (St. Paul sees no occasion for proof of the connexion between sin and physical death; he unhesitatingly bases his position on the narrative in Genesis; see Rom_2:17, Rom_3:3; Rom_3:19; Rom_3:21). Were this all, the passage would implicitly annul human responsibility. But St. Paul, without attempting fully to reconcile them, places side by side the two aspects of the truth—the hereditary transmission of guilt, and moral responsibility: 'and thus death made its way (*διήλθεν*) to every individual man, *because all sinned* (*ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον*)'. Controversy has raged hotly round this phrase, Augustine and many other writers having understood the relative *ω* as masculine, and as referring to Adam; so Vulgate *in quo*. But there can be no doubt that *ἐφ' ᾧ* must be taken in its usual meaning 'because.' Adam's fall involved all men in sin, and therefore in death; but this was because all men (in full exercise of their free will) sinned. It would be out of place here to discuss the attempts that have been made to combine these two factors in the moral history of man (see Literature): strictly speaking, they cannot fully and logically be combined; but many of the most fundamental truths of the Christian religion can be arrived at only by the balancing of complementary statements. In Rom_3:13-14 a qualification is entered, which causes St. Paul to ruin his construction, and omit the apodosis of which Rom_3:12 forms the protasis. He feels obliged to explain that, sin being an offence against law, those who lived between Adam and Moses had no law, and thus did not transgress an explicit command as Adam had done. But the fact that death reigned throughout that period only shows that—not the guilt of individuals, but—the transmitted effects of Adam's sin were at work. And it is this that makes him a type of the Messiah. (ii.) Rom_3:15-17. *The contrast is far greater than the similarity*. The contrast between Adam and Christ is great:—In *quality* (Rom_3:15). The one representative man, Adam, committed a *παράπτωμα*; but over-against that must be placed the undeserved kindness (*χαρις*) of God, and the gift of righteousness arising from the kindness of the other representative Man, Jesus Christ. In *quantity* (Rom_3:16). 'One act tainting the whole race with sin, and a multitude of sins collected together in one only to be forgiven.' In *character* and *consequences* (Rom_3:17). Adam's fall ushered in a reign of death; Christ's work ensures that all who have received His kindness and His gift of righteousness shall themselves reign in life. (iii.) Rom_3:18-21. *Summary* of the argument, in which it is further shown that Law 'came in as an afterthought' (*παρεισηλήθεν*), multiplying sin, but thereby only increasing the abundance of God's kindness.

(c) 1Co 15:44-47. The two foregoing passages from St. Paul's writings deal with the practical moral results of union with Adam and Christ respectively. These verses (i.) go back behind that, and show that there is a complete and radical difference between the *nature* of each; (ii.) look forward, and show that this difference has a vital bearing on the truth of man's resurrection.

(i.) St. Paul maintains (1Co 15:36-44 a), by a series of illustrations from the natural world, the reasonableness of a resurrection from death. In Nature 'every seed has its own particular body'—'all flesh is not the same flesh'—the terrestrial differs from the celestial—there is a different glory of the sun, the moon, and the stars. So also it may be rightly held that it is possible for *man* to exist in two different states, one far higher than the other. Not only so, but (1Co 15:44 b, 45) there actually exists such an analogous distinction between man and man, as Scripture shows. The thought in

1Co 15:45 is arrived at by an adaptation of Gen 2:7 : Θ καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν. These words relate only that after being lifeless clay, man was by God's breath transformed into a living being. But St. Paul reads into the statement the doctrinal significance that the body of the first representative man became the vehicle of a 'psychical' nature, while the body of the Second is the organ of a 'pneumatical' nature. St. Paul's trichotomy of man may be represented thus:



Everything in man that is not *πνεῦμα* may be called 'psychical' is so far as it is considered as 'intellect,' and 'carnal' in so far as it is thought of as the seat of the animal passions; both the adjectives *ψυχικός* and *σαρκικός* thus mean 'non-spiritual.' The second half of St. Paul's statement—'the last Adam became a life-giving spirit'—finds no exact parallel in the OT, but seems to be based on a reminiscence of Messianic passages which speak of the work of the Divine Spirit, e.g. Isa 11:1-2, Joe 2:28-32.

(ii.) But as the *ψυχή ζῶσα* came first and the *πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν* last, so it is with the development of mankind; the spiritual must follow the psychical (1Co 15:46). As the first man was formed from the clay, and had a nature in conformity with his origin, while the second Man has His origin 'from heaven' (1Co 15:47), so among mankind there are those whose nature remains low and mean, tied to the clods of earth, and there are those whose nature has become heavenly (1Co 15:48). But this implies more (1Co 15:49). In his present state man is an exact counterpart, he visibly reproduces the lineaments and character, of the first man, because of his corporate

union with him (ἐφορέσαμεν τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ χοϊκοῦ). But the time is coming when we shall become the exact counterpart or image of the second Man (cf. Gen 1:26 f.), because of our spiritual union with Him (φορέσομεν καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἐπουρανίου). The above follows the text of B a c g 17 aeth. arm. [Syriac ܡܫܝܚܐ is indeterminate]; and Theodoret distinctly is says to τὸ γὰρ φορέσομεν προορητικῶς οὐ παραινετικῶς εἶρομεν The mass of authorities read φορέσομεν, ‘from a desire to turn what is really a physical assertion into an ethical exhortation’ (Alf.); so Chrys., τοῦτ’ ἐστίν, ἀριστα πράξομεν ... συμβουλευτικῶς εἰσάγει τὸν λόγον. But it is difficult to conceive how St. Paul, who has from 1Co 15:35 been leading up to the thought of the resurrection, could at the critical moment throw his argument to the winds, and content himself with saying, ‘according as we have been earthly in our thoughts, let us strive to be heavenly.’

It has been suggested that St. Paul adopted the designation of Christ as ‘the last Adam’ and ‘the second Adam’ from Rabbinic theology. But such a comparison between Adam and the Messiah was unknown to the earlier Jewish teachers. Passages adduced to support it belong to the Middle Ages, and are influenced by the Kabbala. See G. F. Moore, *JBL* [Note: *BL Journal of Biblical Literature.*] xvi. (1897), 158-161; Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, English translation 248 f., 251 f.

(d) Php 2:6. St. Paul speaks of ‘Christ Jesus, who being [in His eternal and inherent nature, ὑτάρχων] in the form of God, deemed it not a thing to be snatched at (ἀρταγμοῦ) to be on an equality with God.’ There is here an implied contrast with Adam, who took fruit from the tree of knowledge of good and evil, which God said had made him ‘as one of us’ (Gen 3:22).

2. In Mat 19:4-6 || Mar 10:6-8 reference is made by Jesus to the account of Adam and Eve in Gen 1:27 ‘male and female created he them’ (ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς). Pharisees came and asked Him whether divorce was allowable [‘for any cause,’ Mt.]. Our Lord’s answer is intended to show that the provision made for divorce in the Mosaic law (Deu 24:1) was only a concession to the hardness of men’s hearts. The truer and deeper view of marriage which Christians should adopt must be based on a nobler morality,—on a morality which takes its stand on the primeval nature of man and woman as God made them. ‘To suit (πρός) your hardness of heart he wrote for you this commandment. But from the beginning of the creation “he made them male and female.” ’ And with this quotation is coupled one from Gen 2:24 (see also

Eph_5:31), ‘For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother [and shall cleave to his wife (Mt.)], and they twain shall become one flesh.’ The same result is reached in Mt., but with a transposition of the two parts of the argument. See Wright’s *Synopsis, in loc.* Thus Jesus bases the absolute indissolubility of the marriage tie on the union of man and woman from the first. In Mat_19:9; Mat_5:32 this pronouncement is practically annulled by the admission of the words ‘except for fornication’ (μη ἐπὶ πορνεία, and παρεκτός λόγου πορνείας). See Wright, *in loc.*, who contends that ‘the Church (of Alexandria?) introduced these two clauses into the Gospel in accordance with the permission to legislate which our Lord gave to all Churches (Mat_18:18).’ See art. Marriage.

3. In Joh_8:44 ἀνθρωποκτόνος may refer to the introduction of death into the world by the fall of Adam. But see art. Abel.

4. The parallel drawn by St. Paul between Adam and Christ may have been the origin of the tradition that Adam was buried under Golgotha. Jer. (*Com. in Mat.* § iv. 27) rejects it, saying that it arose from the discovery of an ancient human skull at that spot. He also declines to see any reference to it in Eph_5:14. But in Ep. 46 he says, ‘The place where our Lord was crucified is called Calvary, because the skull of the primitive man was buried there. So it came to pass that the second Adam, that is the blood of Christ (a play on אדם and הדם), as it dropped from the Cross, washed away the sins of the buried protoplast, * [Note: Wis_7:1.] the first Adam, and thus the words of the apostle were fulfilled,’—quoting Eph_5:14. Epiphanius (*contra Haer.* xlvi. 5) goes farther, stating that Christ’s blood dropped upon Adam’s skull, and restored him to life. The tradition is mentioned also by Basil, Ambrose, and others.

Literature.—Besides the works cited in the article, the following may be consulted on the relation between Adam and Christ: Sanday-Headlam, *Com. on Epistle to Romans* (pp. 130-153); Bethune-Baker, *An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine*, ch. xvii.; Tennant, *The Sources of the Doctrine of the Fall and Original Sin*; Sadler, *The Second Adam and the New Birth*; Thackeray, *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, ch. ii.

A. H. M’Neile.

 Addi

ADDI.—An ancestor of Jesus Christ, Luk_3:28.

Adultery

ADULTERY (μοιχεία).—This word is used to denote the sexual intercourse of a married man or woman with any other than the person to whom he or she is bound by the marriage tie. It has sometimes been maintained that μοιχεία is confined in its use to the misdemeanours, in this respect, of the woman. That it has, however, a wider sense is evidenced by the reference which Jesus makes to the inward lust of *any* man after *any* woman (ὅτι πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς ἤδη ἐμοίχευσε ν αὐτήν, κ.τ.λ., Mat 5:28). The word πορνεία is also employed to describe this sin, though it has been contended that it refers solely to pre-nuptial immorality; and again we have a reference made by Jesus in His teaching to this sin, which disposes of that contention, and which establishes the fact that the *married* woman who commits herself in this way was said to be guilty of πορνεία (cf. παρεκτός λόγου πορνείας, Mat 5:32, and (εἰ) μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ Mat 19:9). In both passages just quoted Jesus makes the woman's guilt the ground of His teaching on divorce. With these examples we may compare the words of Amo 7:17 (LXX Septuagint) ... ἡ γυνὴ σου ἐν τῇ πόλει πορνεύσει, κ.τ.λ, where the form of the expression incidentally but conclusively carries out our argument.

A very favourite figure of speech, by which the intimate relations of Jehovah and Israel were denoted by OT writers, was that of marriage (see, e.g., Isa 54:5; Isa 62:5, Jer 3:14, Hos 2:7; Hos 2:19-20); and accordingly in the prophetic books the defection of the Jewish people from the altars of Jehovah, and their repeated reversions to the worship and practices of their heathen neighbours, were stigmatized as 'adultery' (*ni'ûph* or *ni'ûphîm*, Jer 13:27, Eze 23:43; cf. Isa 57:3, Jer 3:8 f., Eze 23:37). This transference of an idea from the daily social life to the life spiritual finds its place in the teaching of Jesus, whose example in this respect is followed by writers of a subsequent period (cf. Jam 4:4). The generation in which He lived was denounced by Him, for its continued rejection of His claims, as 'wicked and adulterous' (γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς, Mat 12:39; Mat 16:4; cf. also Mar 8:38). It is, of course, possible that Jesus by these words had in view the social evils of His day, as well as the general lack of spiritual religion. 'That nation and generation might be called *adulterous* literally; for what else, I beseech you, was their irreligious polygamy than continual adultery? And what else was their ordinary practice of divorcing their wives, no less irreligious, according to every man's foolish or naughty will?' (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. et Talmud. ad Mat 12:39*). It is not necessary, however, in

the interpretation of His teaching in this and similar places to insist on such a view of His words. The entire body of the recorded teaching of Jesus betrays the most intimate acquaintance with the literature and ethical tendencies of the OT.

That exceedingly lax and immoral views of this sin were held generally by the generation in which Jesus lived, becomes evident not only from His casual references to the subject, but also from His positive teaching in answer to hostile questions addressed to Him about adultery and the kindred subject of divorce. We are also confronted with the same phenomenon in the writings, e.g., of Josephus (cf. *Ant.* iv. viii. 23; *Vita*, § 76), Sir_7:26; Sir_25:26; Sir_42:9, and in the Talmud. The result of the teaching of Hillel was of the worst description, reducing as it did the crime of adultery to the level of an ordinary or minor fault. This Rabbi actually went the length, in his interpretation of the Deuteronomic law of divorce as stated in Deu_24:1, of laying down the rule that a man might put away his wife 'if she cook her husband's food badly by salting or roasting it too much' (see Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. et Talmud ad Mat_5:31*), and R. 'Akiba, improving on this instruction, interpreted the words 'if she find no favour in his eyes' as giving permission to a man to divorce his wife 'if he sees a woman fairer than her.'

On the other hand, R. Shammai refused to take a view so loose and immoral, and in his exposition of the Deuteronomic permission confined the legality of divorce to cases of proved unchastity on the part of the wife. Other celebrated Rabbins took a similarly rigid view of this question, while all, of every school, were agreed that the crime of adultery demanded divorce as its punishment. The form of the question addressed to Jesus by the Pharisees (*κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν*) in Mat_19:3 shows the nature of the controversy between the rival Rabbinical schools, and also lets us see how far the pernicious teaching of the school of Hillel had permeated the social fabric. Men's ideas about this sin were also debased by the polygamous habits then prevalent. Of Herod the Great we read that he had ten wives; which, according to Josephus, was not only permissible, but had actually become a common occurrence amongst the Jews, 'it being of old permitted to the Jews to marry many wives' (*BJ* i. xxiv. 2). In another place the same historian remarks, in connexion with the story of the Herodian family, that 'it is the ancient practice among us to have many wives at the same time' (*Ant.* xvii. i. 2). There seems to have been no hard and fast rule limiting the number of wives permissible to each man, but their teachers advised them to restrict themselves to four or five (cf. Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] i. i. 455, note 125).

From these observations we see what an important bearing the teaching of Jesus had on the current conceptions of sexual morality obtaining amongst His countrymen. It is quite in harmony with His method of instruction to reduce the overt commission of a

sin to the element out of which it originates and takes its shape. 'A corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit' (Mat 7:17 f., cf. Mat 12:33 and Luk 6:43 f.), and the heart corrupted by evil desire fructifies, just as surely, by an inexorable law of nature. There exists within the man whose inner life is thus tainted not merely latent or germinal sin, such as may or may not yet issue in deeds of wrong. The lustful eye gazing with sinful longing is the consummation,—the fruit of the corrupt tree,—and so far as the man's will is concerned, the sinful act is completed (Mat 5:28). The note of sternness which characterizes this teaching is not altogether original, as will be seen if we refer to such commands as are found, e.g., in Exo 20:17, Pro 6:25, Sir 9:8 etc., and to such interpretative sayings in the Talmud as forbade the gazing upon 'a woman's heel' or even upon her 'little finger' (cf. Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. et Talmud. ad Mat 5:28*). The ethical foundation, however, upon which Jesus based His doctrine strikes the reader as being the deepest and the firmest of any that had as yet been revealed on the subject; and this must have seemed to His hearers to be not the least remarkable of those luminous addresses by which He contradicted the laboriously minute guidance of their moral and religious guides. We are not concerned here to inquire whether Jesus put no difference between the guilt of the man who, though he has lustful desires, abstains from carrying them into practice, and that of the man who completes them by the sinful act. Common sense forbids us to suppose that Jesus put out of sight the social aspects of the question when He discussed it. What is of importance is to note the lofty tone assumed by Him when engaged in inculcating the absolute necessity of sexual purity. Nor is it possible to infer that Jesus confined His remarks to the case of those who were married. The general terms into which He casts His instruction (*πᾶς ὁ βλέπων*) forbids us to assume that *γυναῖκα* and *ἐμοίχευσεν* are to be limited to the post-nuptial sin with a married woman. It gives a much more fitting as well as a truer meaning to Jesus' words if we think of Him as giving directions for the guidance of the entire social and ethical life to all members of society whether married or otherwise.

According to the laws of the ancients, those guilty of adultery were to be put to death, whether by burning (Gen 38:24) or by stoning (Joh 8:5, cf. Deu 22:23 ff., Lev 20:10, Eze 18:11 ff.). This punishment was not, however, universally prescribed; for where the woman was a slave, and consequently not the owner of her own person, the man was exonerated by presenting a guilt-offering (Lev 19:20 ff.). It is doubtful, indeed, if ever capital punishment was insisted on. Lightfoot, for example, says: 'I do not remember that I have anywhere in the Jewish pandect read any example of a wife punished with death for adultery' (*Horae Heb. et Talmud. ad Mat 19:8*). This statement is borne out by such incidental references as we have in Mat 1:19, where Joseph receives the praise of his contemporaries (*δικαιὸς ὢν*) for his merciful intention; and if the story of Hosea's wife is to be taken literally, we have an OT example of mercy towards the guilty being recommended, and even of divorce not

being suggested as a punishment. Jesus Himself also leaned to the side of mercy; and nowhere does the tenderness of His solicitude for the guilty sinner appear so deep as in the traditional, yet doubtless genuine, narrative incorporated in the Fourth Gospel (Joh 7:53 to Joh 8:11). For a discussion of the 'pericope adulterae' see Blass, *Ev. sec. Lucam*, Pref. p. xlvii, and his *Philology of the Gospels*, pp. 155-163.

A closer examination than we have as yet attempted in this place, of the words and teaching of Jesus Christ will reveal some startling results, and furnish obvious reasons to explain the difficulties which have been always felt on the relations of adultery, divorce, and remarriage, by Christian thinkers and legislators. A comparative examination of the passages in the Synoptic writers (Mat 5:32; Mat 19:9, Mar 10:11 f., Luk 16:18) discloses a peculiar addition to the words and teaching in the first of these places. According to Mat 5:32, Jesus asserts that the wife who is wrongfully divorced is involved compulsorily in the guilt of her husband. He is not only an adulterer himself (Luk 16:18), but 'he causes her to be an adulteress,' or rather 'he makes her to commit adultery' (ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι). The interpretation which would explain these words as if they meant that the divorced wife is placed in such a position that she probably will commit adultery by marrying another man, is manifestly unsatisfactory. The statement is unqualified even if we are absolutely convinced of the genuineness of the succeeding words, 'καὶ ὅς ... μοιχᾶται.' [They are omitted by DH, see WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] , *New Test. in Greek*]. It is as if Jesus said: 'The wife who is divorced is, in virtue of her false position, an adulteress though she be innocent, and the man who marries her while she occupies that position becomes a willing partner in her guilt.' It is not too much to say that, in this place, we have a glimpse of the profound depth which Jesus was accustomed to sound in His ethical teaching. Marriage is a Divine institution, and has its roots in the eternal order of things (cf. Mat 19:4-6). It results in a mystical union so close that the married pair are no longer two; they have become 'one flesh.' With this we may compare the teaching which St. Paul embodies in a few luminous words based on his Christological doctrine (Eph 5:22-33 especially Eph 5:28-29), and of which he says 'this mystery is great.'

We have thus a clue to the meaning of the difficult expression ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι. Any mode of conduct or action which tends to mar or set at nought the mysterious relationship of marriage is of the essence of adultery. Perhaps we shall not be considered to be importing more meaning into words than they were originally intended to convey, if we press the Markan addition ἐπὶ αὐτὴν into our service here. Jesus, according to St. Mark, seems to teach His hearers that the husband in wrongfully divorcing his wife is guilty of the aggravated sin of dragging her into the

slough where he is himself already wallowing. On him falls the woe pronounced in another connexion by Jesus (Mat 18:6-7); for he compels his wife to occupy a position which is a living contradiction of the Divine law. A course of action tending to the dissolution of that which in the Divine intention is indissoluble, Jesus places in the category of adulterous acts. He mentions nothing as to His view of the case of the remarriage of a woman justifiably divorced, but to the present writer He appears plainly to assert that the man who marries an innocent divorced woman is guilty of adultery.

In our critical examination of these passages we are confronted with a still greater and no less remarkable variety. St. Matthew differs from the other two Synoptists by giving a place in Jesus' teaching to an implied ground for legitimate divorce. He alone includes the exceptive clauses *παρεκτός λόγου πορνείας* (Mat 5:32) and *μη ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ* (Mat 19:9). It is this variety in the records of Jesus' words which has introduced so much difficulty, doctrinal and legislative, into the questions of divorce and the remarriage of divorced persons. We are not, of course, without that form of conjectural criticism which would delete these clauses as mere glosses or unsuitable interpolations (see Bacon, *The Sermon on the Mount, ad loc.*). In the absence, however, of external or textual evidence we are not entitled to invent textual emendations in the interests of a preconceived theory (cf. Wright, *Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek*, p. 98 f.). It is but fair to add that the Codex Vaticanus (B) and some less important authorities manifest a strong desire to make Mat 19:9 conform literally to Mat 5:32, and thereby create some uncertainty as to the textual purity of these passages. The evidential value, however, for these variations is too slight to be of any avail against the unanimity of all our other witnesses; they are transparent and later attempts at assimilation or harmony. The *argumentum e silentio* is in this case too strong to admit the validity of conjecture. A forcible statement of the other side of the case may be found in the art. 'Sermon on the Mount' (Votaw) in the Extra Vol of Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible p. 27.

At all periods of the history of Christian teaching, differences of opinion have existed within the Church as to the practical application of Jesus' words concerning adultery, divorce, and remarriage. These differences have been stereotyped in the Eastern and Western branches of the Catholic Church. The former takes the more lenient view, and permits the remarriage of the innocent *divorcé* (*e*), while the latter has always maintained the more stringent and (shall we say?) the more strictly literal conclusion from Jesus' words, that inequality of treatment is not to be tolerated, interpreting the conclusion by refusing the right of remarriage to either during the life of the other.

On the other hand, the general consensus of theological opinion amongst English-speaking divines since the Reformation has leaned towards the view held by the Eastern Church, and the resolutions of the bishops in the Pan-Anglican Conference of 1888 on this subject were but the formal expressions of a traditional mode of interpretation. When we turn from the words of Jesus to see what were the ideas of those who taught in His name during the ages immediately subsequent, we have St. Paul's teaching on, and references to, the question of divorce. In one place he treats marriage as indissoluble, and he has no hesitation in saying that the woman who marries another man during the lifetime of her husband is guilty of adultery (Rom_7:1-3). On the other hand, we must not forget that the Apostle in this place is dealing with the Jewish law and with Jews who did not admit the absolute indissolubility of the marriage tie. The fact that he has made no reference to this Jewish law of divorce forbids us drawing any certain conclusion as to the length St. Paul was willing to go in stating a universal principle which would guide the legislative activity of the Christian Church. In another place he speaks of separation as the possible outcome of an unhappy or unequal marriage, and gives permission, if not encouragement, to that contingent result (χωρίζεσθω). In this he goes farther than Jesus, so far as we have His teaching recorded for us, went. According to Jesus, adultery is the only crime of sufficient enormity to warrant divorce; according to St. Paul, the law of marriage does not govern the deserted wife or husband (οὐ δεδούλωται ὁ ἀδελφὸς ἢ ἡ ἀδελφὴ ἐν τοῖς τοιοῦτοις, 1Co_7:15 [cf. Newman Smyth, *Christian Ethics*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 412f. and note]).

The *Shepherd of Hermas* (*Mand. iv. 1. 6*) lays down the rule that adultery demands separation or divorce (ἀπολύσάτω αὐτήν), because by continuing to live with his wife after she has been convicted of guilt, the husband becomes 'an accomplice in her adultery.' On the other hand, he is equally insistent that the man thus wronged must not marry another, lest he cut his guilty partner off from the hope of repentance, and lest he involve himself likewise in the sin of adultery (ἐὰν δὲ ἀπολύσας τὴν γυναῖκα ἐτῆραν γαμήσῃ, καὶ αὐτὸς μοιχᾶται).

Amongst the number of those who are debarred from inheriting the kingdom of God, St. Paul mentions fornicators and adulterers (πόρνοι καὶ μοιχοὶ 1Co_6:9; cf. Eph_5:5, 1Ti_1:10, Heb_13:4, Rev_21:8; Rev_22:15).

The universal conclusion is that this sin creates a breach of the marriage relation so grave and far-reaching that it makes divorce the only legitimate sequel—divorce a

mensâ et thoro. The question, however, remains whether the Christian Church has the right to go farther and say that, as the result of an adulterous act, the aggrieved party has a just claim to divorce *a vinculo*; has a right, that is to say, to be placed in a position as if the marriage had never taken place. This will, no doubt, be answered differently by different minds, and the difficulty is not decreased by merely appealing to the authority of Jesus. Different answers are given to the more fundamental questions, Did Jesus intend to occupy the position of legislator when He spoke of adultery and divorce? or was He simply enunciating a general principle, leaving future generations to deal with social conditions as they arose? The present writer has no hesitation in saying that his own opinion leans strongly to the side of those who believe that Jesus affirmed solemnly the indissolubility of the marriage tie, and that He meant His followers to understand that the remarriage of either party during the life of the other constitutes adultery. At the same time he is not unaware of the fact that there is a strong body of sober modern thought which tends towards a relaxation of this view in favour of the innocent (see Gore, *The Sermon on the Mount*, p. 73).

If Jesus in Mat 5:27-32 is making a categorical statement of universal application, then the opinion, given by the present writer as his own, can scarcely be disputed; but if He is interpreted as dealing with the foundations rather than making structural alterations in the ethical beliefs of His countrymen, we must conclude that He leaves His followers to deal with the question as it arises. In the latter case it is, of course, competent for the Church in each age to treat the question *de novo*. The conditions of society alter, and what constitutes danger to the social welfare at one time, may have comparatively little peril for the people of another period. At the same time it must not be forgotten that the tendency of human legislation has been and is likely to be, for some time to come at least, towards the loosening of the marriage bond, and the minimizing of the seriousness of that guilt by which men uproot the foundations of their social and domestic life.

Literature.—Newman Smyth's *Christian Ethics*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] contains a very fair and cautious discussion of this whole question, and along with that work it will be found useful to study the more abstract volume of Bampton Lectures on the same subject (1895) by T. B. Strong; cf. G. B. Stevens' *The Theology of the NT*. Gore's *The Sermon on the Mount* may be read along with Bacon's volume of the same title, and Votaw's article 'Sermon on the Mount' in the Extra Volume of Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible. In the latter work (vols. i. and iii.) are also to be found useful references under artt. 'Crimes,' 'Marriage.' A very suggestive art., 'The Teaching of Christ about Divorce,' by the Rev. the Hon. E. Lyttelton, will be found in the *Journal of Theol. Studies* for July 1904. Cf. also H. M. Luckock's *History of Marriage* (1894), and O. D. Watkins' *Holy Matrimony* (1895).

Advent

ADVENT.—In its primary application the term is used to denote the first visible coming of Jesus into the world. His coming again at an after period is distinguished as the Second, or the Final, Coming (see Coming Again and Parousia).

The term is also employed to designate one of the ecclesiastical seasons,—that immediately preceding the Festival of the Nativity,—during which, in certain sections of the Church, the thoughts of believers are turned to the first appearance of their Lord in the flesh. This season includes four Sundays, commencing on the one nearest St. Andrew's Day (Nov. 30) and lasting till Christmas Eve. With Advent the appointed order of Church services is renewed, and the ecclesiastical year begins.

Dealing here specially with the primary historical application, the first coming of Jesus possesses a unique significance as marking the entrance into the world of a moral force altogether unparalleled, a momentous turning-point in the religious progress of mankind. As the Son of God (Mat 10:32, Joh 3:16-17), revealing and representing God in His own person (Joh 5:30; Joh 14:9-10), whose mission it was to redeem men from sin (Mat 18:11, Luk 4:43; Luk 17:21), Jesus was to prove Himself in the truest sense the Messiah whom the Jewish people had long been expecting,—‘a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord’ (Luk 2:11).

1. *The foreshadowing Promise.*—The expectation entertained by the Jews had its roots in a promise enshrined in their earliest literature and dating from the dawn of history, that a signal deliverance from sin should be brought to the human race,—the promise contained in the sentence pronounced on the tempter, that the seed of the woman should bruise his head (Gen 3:15). This blighted outlook for fallen humanity was confirmed by the assurance given to Abraham that in the line of his descendants the original promise was destined to be fulfilled (Gen 12:2-3),—an assurance which was further strengthened when, under Moses, Israel was formed into a nation and entered at Sinai into covenant with Jehovah as His chosen people (Exodus 20-24). It was not, however, till David's prosperous reign, with its recognition of ruling power held in the name of Jehovah, had passed, and when the idea of the theocratic kingship had been deeply implanted in the national consciousness, that the conception of the blessing to be looked for took definite shape. Then, as successive rulers failed and the nation's fortunes became embarrassed, the splendours of David's time, glorified by the halo which memory and distance cast around them, were

projected into the future, forming a picture full of allurements and charm. It fired the imagination of the prophets amid the troubles of the later monarchy.

The promise, as thus transformed, was that of a king, or line of kings, sprung from David's house who, endowed with transcendent gifts, and acting by special authority as the Anointed of the Lord, should reign in righteousness, introduce an era of Divine salvation for Israel, and draw all other nations round them in loyalty to Jehovah's law (Isa 2:2; Isa 11:5-9; Isa 27:1, Mic 4:1-4). This was the blossoming out of the Messianic idea.

During the period of the Exile, with the fall of the monarchy and the collapse of the expectations based upon it, the figure of the victorious and righteous king was thrown into the background; yet the prospect of a future glorious manifestation of Divine mercy, rescuing the people from their iniquities and miseries, kept its hold on susceptible minds (Isa 55:5; Isa 60:1-8). It was in this period that the distinctively spiritual character of the coming deliverance emerged into prominence. As delineated in Ezekiel and the Second Isaiah, it was to consist in an inward regeneration, wrought by penitence and the impartation of a new spirit and a new heart (Isa 65:6-7, Eze 11:18; Eze 11:20; Eze 36:25-30). In those prophecies of the Exile, Jehovah Himself is set forth as the true and ever-living King of Israel; and collective Israel, the nation regarded poetic ally as an individual, is conceived as the Anointed Servant of Jehovah, who, amid manifold afflictions, is to bear witness for Jehovah, and be the medium of accomplishing His saving purpose for mankind. On the return from the Exile the hope of salvation through a Davidic kingship revived, as is evident from the prophetic utterances of Haggai (Hag 2:22-23) and Zechariah (Zec 3:8; Zec 6:12); but in Malachi's day it had again disappeared.

With the Maccabean struggle against Antiochus Epiphanes (b.c. 167-135) the Messianic idea entered on a fresh course of development. In the Book of Daniel, which dates presumably from that time, we find supernatural elements more freely introduced. The writer in vision beholds an ancient of days, seated on his throne to judge the great world-kings and their rulers. Before him appears, coming with the clouds of heaven, more like unto a son of man,' and to him is given ever-lasting dominion and a kingdom which shall not be destroyed (Dan 7:13-14). This dominion is passed over to 'the saints of the Most High,' to be theirs for ever and ever (Dan 7:18; Dan 7:27). There is thus a picture of the Messianic future in which the triumph and rule of the godly over the nations are the distinguishing features.

We look in vain in the books of the Apocrypha for any expansion of these ideas. Their allusions to the Messianic hope are somewhat meagre, and do not expressly refer to the appearance of a personal Messiah. It is in the Apocalyptic literature, which sprang up in imitation of the Book of Daniel, that we find the conceptions which gave

peculiar shape and colour to the Messianic expectations entertained in later times. We see there, amid the stress of national misfortunes, the prediction of the prophets interpreted and expanded in such a way as to furnish elaborately drawn out schemes of future glory. The coming of the God-sent king is depicted (*Sib. Orac.* iii. 652 ff.) the supernatural Son of Man, who was hidden with God before the world was created, and who, clothed with Divine attributes, will suddenly appear along with the Head of Days to execute judgment on men and angels (*Similitudes* of Enoch 46:1, 2, 48:2, 3). The dispersed of Israel will be restored, and the Gentiles drawn into submission (Enoch 90:30); sin and wrong will be banished (*Simil.* 49:2); the faithful dead will be raised to life again, and the righteous will dwell in everlasting joy (Enoch 51:1, 90:37). In the Psalter of Solomon, written under the pressure of the Roman domination (b.c. 70-40), the idea of a king of the Davidic line is once more revived. The Messiah is regarded as 'the Son of David,' 'the Anointed of the Lord,' free from sin and endowed with miraculous powers, who will conquer, not by force of arms, but will smite the earth by the rod of His mouth (17:28f.), and bring to an end all unrighteousness (17:36).

In those Apocalyptic writings peculiar prominence is given to the spiritual content of the Messianic hope. Notwithstanding the supernatural elements they so largely introduce, they throw into strong relief the higher religious conceptions which the best of the prophets had insisted on as essentially bound up with the great period of blessing expected; while the scope of the ancient promise is widened out beyond national and temporal limitations to embrace the world and the life to come.

Meanwhile the scribes were at work, hardening the Messianic idea into scholastic form, and reducing the poetic language and bold imagery of the prophets to dogmatic statements and literal details, with the result, on the whole, of a restoration of the theocratic idea that God was to vindicate His authority as the true Sovereign of the nation, and to send His vicegerent in the line of David to establish His law and introduce the rule of righteousness under His anointed King.

Such was the form which the long-cherished hope had assumed when Jesus appeared. It was largely mixed up with expectations of political deliverance, yet the thoughts of many earnest spirits were centred mainly on the prospect of a spiritual emancipation for Israel. He came to meet the great hope by fulfilling in their ideal and spiritual significance the prophecies that had kindled and kept it alive. Leaving aside the merely earthly, time-coloured features that bulked so largely in the popular imagination, He entered the world to offer Himself as the true representative of God, in and through whom all that was eternal and most precious in the Messianic idea was destined to be realized. See art. Messiah.

2. *The state of Religion at the date of Christ's Advent.*—In many respects the way had been prepared for the appearance of Jesus and the spread of His influence as Messiah and Saviour. There were national, political, social, and other conditions existing in the world at the time, which rendered His coming and work singularly opportune (see Fulness of Time); but here we are specially concerned with the prevailing aspects of religious life in the immediate scene in which He appeared. Undoubtedly, among the Jewish people at that period religion was a dominating interest, and was based on principles far higher than any that obtained in other nations. Yet its quality was vitiated by certain serious defects. There was—

(1) Its *partisanship*. Scribes and Pharisees on the one hand, and Sadducees on the other, stood in mutual antagonism, striving for ascendancy as leaders of national religious feeling,—the scribes and Pharisees combining to enforce the mass of stringent precepts which the former had elaborated to supplement the original written word; the Sadducees entirely rejecting those precepts, and contending that the Law as written was sufficient, and that the observance of the temple ordinances, its worship and sacrifices, was the central element in religion. The controversies that arose over those points of difference, and over the doctrine of the resurrection, created a fierce party spirit, bitter and bigoted on the one side, haughty and contemptuous on the other, while the smaller sect of the Essenes, with their extremist views and rigid austerity, maintained an inflexible protest against both these classes of religionists.

(2) Then there was its *legalism*. By their insistence on conformity to the regulations they had added to the Law as a condition of Divine favour, the scribes and Pharisees, who were the most numerous and aggressive party, converted religion itself into a matter of slavish obedience, in which the instigating motives were the hope of reward and the fear of punishment. The calculating temper thus engendered rendered the religious life a task-work of anxious scrupulosity and constraint, wanting in spontaneous action from the higher impulses of the soul; while in the case of those less sincere it introduced an element of prudential self-regard concerned only with the prospect of future benefit and safety.

(3) Closely allied to this was the *externalization* of piety. The Rabbinical regulations were held to be so binding, and their multiplicity was so great, that the effort to observe them inevitably involved a machine-like routine and formality. The Jew in his fulfilment of the Law found himself at every turn brought under the pressure of hard and fast exacting rules,—in his food, his clothes, his daily occupations, his devotions, and the smallest acts of his life. The endeavour to yield obedience under such circumstances necessarily led to a laborious outward punctiliousness; a tendency to ostentation and spiritual pride was fostered; and many were ensnared into hypocrisy by finding they could obtain a reputation for exceptional piety by an obtrusive parade

of their ceremonial performances. The most precise minuteness was observed in trifles, the tithing of mint and cummin, but in matters of greater import the principles of morality were surrendered.

These are the darker shades of the picture. Nevertheless, it is clear that a very considerable measure of religious earnestness was preserved in the nation. It was fed by the ancient Scriptures, which were regularly read in the synagogues and committed to memory in the synagogue schools. Thus in the body of the people there was kept alive a sense of the holy character and mighty doings of Jehovah; and although, owing to the decayed influence of the priesthood, the Temple itself was not a centre of spiritual life, yet the hallowed memories it recalled in the breasts of the multitudes assembled at the religious festivals were calculated to inspire the higher emotions. At all events, there is evidence enough to show that many hearts throughout the nation were imbued with a deep-seated reverence for God and a true spiritual longing for the hope of Israel. The soul of religion might be sadly crushed by legality and formalism, but it was not utterly dead. Devout men and women in varied ranks of society were holding a pure faith and leading lives of simple sincerity, vaguely dissatisfied with the bondage of legal observances and Rabbinical rules, and yearning to rise into a more spiritual atmosphere, a closer communion with the Divine mind and will. Of these Zacharias and Elisabeth ([Luk 1:5-6](#)), Anna ([Luk 2:36-37](#)), and the aged Simeon ([Luk 2:25](#)) may be taken as examples; while the numbers who responded to the living preaching of John the Baptist and became his followers are an index of the extent to which genuine piety survived in the land. It was amongst such that the spiritual preparation was found for the recognition and welcome of the promised Saviour when He appeared. The coming of Jesus brought the birth of a new spirit in religion, a spirit of fresh vitality and power; and the life of absolute devotion to righteousness which He began to live, and which He was ultimately to close in a death of sacrificing love, infused into religion an inspiring energy destined on a scale of vast magnitude to regenerate and redeem.

3. *The national unrest of the period.*—The Jewish people, fretting under political depression, had flung themselves with impassioned eagerness on the hope that the long-desired Messiah and His kingdom must be drawing nigh. It was even thought by many that He was hidden somewhere in obscurity, only waiting for a more penitent disposition in the national mind; and so inflamed was the common imagination with these ideas, that popular excitement was easily aroused, and any bold spirit, rising in revolt against the existing state of things, could find a group of followers ready to believe in him as the one who should deliver Israel. In the broader world outside, too, the expectation of a powerful king, issuing from Judaea, who was to conquer the world, appears to have been widely spread; and the references to this given by Tacitus (*Hist.* v. 13) and by Suetonius (*Vesp.* 4) may be taken at least as an echo of views disseminated throughout the Roman Empire by the Jews of the Dispersion.

When Jesus was born into the world, however, an event had transpired vastly grander than Jewish expectation at the time conceived. The day at last had dawned to which the original promise to fallen humanity pointed forward, and for which the best minds of the nation had for ages yearned; the divinely-pledged Deliverer from sin and its curse had arrived, to set up the kingdom of righteousness, love, and peace.

Literature.—For a lengthened treatment of the Messianic hope and its transformations, see Riehm, *Messianic Prophecy*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (English translation 1900); Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah* (1877); Stanton, *The Jewish and Christian Messiah* (1886); Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy* (1886); Orelli, *OT Prophecy of the Consummation of God's Kingdom* (English translation); and for a more condensed survey, Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii. ii., and Schultz, *OT Theol.* (English translation 1898) vol. ii. For the Apocalyptic writings, see Charles' editions the *Book of Enoch*, etc. On the religious condition of the Jewish nation at the date of the Advent, see Stapfer, *Palestine in the Time of Christ* (English translation 1886); Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. v. (1883); Keim, *Jesus of Nazara* (English translation), vol. i.; Wellhausen, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer* (1874); Ewald, *Hist. of Israel* (English translation), vol. vi.; and Cheyne, *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile*.

G. M'Hardy.

⚠ Adversary

ADVERSARY.—In the Gospels the word 'adversary' stands twice (Luk 13:17; Luk 21:15) for ἀντικείμενος, and thrice (Mat 5:25, Luk 12:58; Luk 18:3) for ἀντίδικος. The first two passages require no comment, as they describe the opponents of the gospel in the simplest terms, as adversaries. Thus we read that when Jesus triumphantly vindicated His actions, His adversaries were ashamed and could not answer Him. Similarly Jesus assured His disciples that none of their adversaries in the approaching time of persecution should be able to gainsay or resist the words of wisdom which the Holy Spirit would put into their mouths.

In Mat 5:25 (|| Luk 12:58), and again in the parable of the Unjust Judge (Luk 18:3), the question suggests itself, 'Who is the adversary referred to?' The passage from the Sermon on the Mount occurs as one of a series of maxims of Christian prudence, and the key to its interpretation is suggested by that which immediately precedes it (Mat 5:23 f.), where Christ says that reconciliation with an offended brother must go before the offering of a gift at God's altar.

Alienation from the brother offended must operate as a hindrance to true worship. Therefore he who would be accepted of God must do justly by his brother and have all cause of difference with him removed, for if he regards iniquity in his heart, has upon his conscience the guilt of wrongdoing or ill-will, or a grudge, the Lord will not hear him (Psa_66:16). Thus a certain order must be observed in connexion with this matter of worship. Still more, Jesus appears to suggest, does this principle of order hold in respect of the controversy between God and sinners. Reconciliation with God must be for every man the first business to be attended to. That antagonism must be removed, and he must satisfy the claim which the law of God has against him in the first place, else if he fails to avail himself of the present opportunity of ending the controversy, the law must take its course. The adversary referred to is thus the broken law, or God Himself as the Author of the law, whom the unreconciled sinner treats as an adversary (cf. Luk_14:31 f.).

In the parable of the Unjust Judge the widow's petition against her opponent at law, and her importunity in pressing it upon the attention of the judge, are used to illustrate the prayers of God's elect. The reference seems to be to the opposition which, in her efforts to promote the cause and kingdom of God, the Church is obliged to encounter, some adverse influence to which she has long been exposed, and against which she fears she is left to struggle alone. Here there is no special reason for identifying this adversary with Satan (cf. Alford, *in loc.*; Trench, *Parables*, 488, etc.) or with the Jewish persecutors of the Early Church (Weizsäcker, who regards the passage as a late addition; cf. Weiss in Meyer's Commentary, *in loc.*). We must not forget that the word occurs in a parable which was spoken with a special didactic purpose, that being, as St. Luke is careful to explain, the encouragement not of the Church only, but especially of individual believers, to persevere in their efforts by faith and prayer to withstand the power of evil in the world, in whatever form it may assail them or thwart their endeavours. Christ's object was to assure them that their importunity must prevail with God, who shall soon respond to their prayers and grant them the victory over all that would frustrate their efforts for the advancement of His cause. See also art. Satan.

Literature.—Cremer, *Bib.-Theol. Lex. s.vv. ἀντίδικος, ἀντικειμενος*; Trench, *Notes on the Parables*; Bruce, *The Parabolic Teaching of Christ*: comm. of Meyer, Alford, Bengel, etc.; Schmid, *Biblical Theology of the NT*, p. 175 ff.; Beyschlag, *NT Theology* (2nd English ed.), i. 90; H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der neutest. Theologie*, i. 179 ff.; Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, ii. 61; Wernle, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, i. 76 ff.

H. H. Currie.

Advocate

ADVOCATE (παράκλητος).—A term applied to Christ in 1Jn_2:1 (Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ; (Revised Version margin) ‘Or *Comforter* or *Helper*, Gr. *Paraclete*’), and to the Holy Spirit in (Revised Version margin) of Joh_14:16; Joh_14:26; Joh_15:26; Joh_16:7, where both Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 have ‘Comforter’ in the text. For an examination of the Greek word and its cognates, see art. ‘Paraclete’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible iii. 665-668. The verb παρακαλέω occurs in the papyri in the contrasted senses of ‘encourage’ (*Oxyr. Pap.* 663. 42) and of ‘entreat’ (*ib.* 744. 6); but the passive verbal form has not been found. The term in its Latinized form came originally from the Itala or one of the Old Latin versions through the Vulgate. And Wyclif introduced it into the English versions, translating 1Jn_2:1 ‘we ban avoket’ in 1382; so Purvey ‘au advocat’ in 1388.

Etymologically the word means ‘called to one’s side,’ especially for the purposes of help, and, in its technical usage, for advice in the case of judicial procedure, with the further suggestion of endeavouring to enlist the sympathy of the judge in favour of the accused. In 1Jn_2:1 the last is generally taken to be the only sense; and the meaning evidently is that, if any believer sin Jesus Christ in person intercedes in his behalf with the Father, and, representing the believer, carries on his cause in the courts of heaven. Similarly, according to the passage in the Fourth Gospel, the Holy Spirit may be regarded as God’s Advocate both with and in man, promoting the Divine interests in the human sphere, from repentance (Joh_16:7-11, cf. Job_33:23-30) to perfecting. But here the technical legal sense of the word disappears, and the Spirit becomes, according to another marginal rendering, the God-sent ‘Helper’ of a man who is struggling against everything within or around him that makes godly living difficult. Whilst, therefore, the provisions of grace include the twofold advocacy,—Christ as the Advocate of a believer with God, and the Spirit as the Advocate of God with man, whether believing or unregenerate,—the two functions differ both in range and in relation; and the term ‘Advocate’ is too specialized to characterize or to cover the operations attributed to the Spirit. The Spirit, as an Advocate sent from God, entreats and helps a man (see art. *Comforter*), but does not represent him before God as Judge or as Father, and does not appeal to anything in man of final and supreme authority.

R. W. Moss.

⚡ Aenon

AENON (Αἰνών, probably from Aramaic עֵינָן ‘springs’).—Mentioned only in [Joh 3:23](#) ‘And John also was baptizing in aenon near to Salim, because there were many waters there’ ((Revised Version margin)). The place cannot be identified with certainty. Four sites have been proposed, two in Samaria and two in Judaea.

1. Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 229. 91, 99, 25) place aenon in the Jordan Valley, 8 miles south of Scythopolis (*Beisân*), ‘juxta Salem et Jordanem.’ About 7 miles south of Beisân and 2 miles west of the Jordan there are seven springs, all lying within a radius of a quarter of a mile, and numerous rivulets. Three-quarters of a mile to the north of these springs van de Velde found a tomb bearing the name of *Sheikh Salim*. But the fact that a modern sheikh bore the name *Salim* is far from satisfactory proof that the *Salim* of our narrative was at this place. If we are to find Salim in Samaria at all, does not the mention of it as a well-known place suggest the well-known *Salim* 4 miles east of Shechem? And would it not be gratuitous for the Evangelist to say of a place so near the Jordan that there was much water there? But, in spite of these objections, Sanday (*Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, p. 36) and others still think this site has the best claim.

2. Tristram (*Bible Places*, p. 234) and Conder (*Tent Work in Palestine*, i. pp. 91-93) place aenon at ‘*Ainun* on a hill near the head of the great Fâr‘ah valley, the open highway from the Damieh ford of the Jordan to Shechem. Four miles southwest of the village of ‘*Ainun*, in the Wady Fâr‘ah, is a succession of springs, yielding a copious perennial stream, with flat meadows on either side, where great crowds might gather. Three miles south of the valley (7 miles from ‘*Ainun*) stands Salim. Conder says: ‘The site of Wady Fâr‘ah is the only one where all the requisites are met—the two names, the fine water supply, the proximity of the desert, and the open character of the ground.’ The situation is a central one also, accessible by roads from all quarters, and it agrees well with the new identification of Bethabara. But (a) ‘*Ainun* is not ‘near to Salim,’ the two places being 7 miles apart, and separated by the great Wady Fâr‘ah. (b) There is not a drop of water at ‘*Ainun* (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* iii. 305). (c) It is not likely that John the Baptist was labouring among the Samaritans, with whom the Jews had no dealings (cf. [Mat 3:5](#); [Mat 10:5](#)). (d) It appears that both Jesus and John were baptizing in Judaea ([Joh 3:22-23](#)), and their proximity gave occasion to the remarks referred to in [Joh 3:25](#), and that Jesus left Judaea for Galilee with the intention of getting out of the neighbourhood of John and removing the appearance of rivalry ([Joh 4:1](#)). But if aenon was in Samaria, Jesus was nearer John than before.

3. Ewald and Hengstenberg prefer *Shilhim* (LXX Septuagint Σελειμ) in the extreme south of Judaea, mentioned (Jos 15:32) in connexion with Ain. Godet says the reason given for John's baptizing in aenon would have greater force as applied to a generally waterless region like the southern extremity of Judah than if the reference were to a well-watered district like Samaria. But elsewhere (Jos 19:7, 1Ch 4:32, Neh 11:29) Ain is connected with Rimmon and not with Shilhim.

4. More probable as a Judaeian site for aenon is *Wady Fâr'ah*, a secluded valley with copious springs about 6 miles north-east of Jerusalem (quite different, of course, from the great *Wady Fâr'ah* of Samaria). This is the view adopted by Professor Konrad Furrer in his article on the geographical allusions in the Gospel of St. John in the *ZNTW* [Note: *NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissen. schaft.*], 1902, Heft 4, p. 258. The suggestion is not new. It was put forward nearly fifty years ago by Barclay (*City of the Great King*, pp. 558-570), but has never received the attention it deserves. Barclay says that 'of all the fountains in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, the most copious and interesting by far are those that burst forth within a short distance of each other in Wady Fâr'ah.' He quotes the following description from *The History of the Jerusalem Mission*:—

'From the brow at Wady Fâr'ah we descended with some difficulty into that "Valley of Delight,"—for such is the literal signification of its name,—and truly I have seen nothing so delightful in the way of natural scenery, nor inviting in point of resources, etc., in all Palestine. Ascending its bold stream from this point, we passed some half-dozen expansions of the stream, constituting the most beautiful natural *natatoria* i have ever seen; the water, rivaling the atmosphere itself in transparency, of depth varying from a few inches to a fathom or more, shaded on one or both sides by umbrageous Fig-trees, and sometimes contained in naturally excavated basins of red mottled marble—an occasional variegation of the common limestone of the country. These pools are supplied by some half-dozen springs of the purest and coldest water, bursting from rocky crevices at various intervals. Verily, thought i, we have stumbled upon Enon!... Portions of aqueducts, both of pottery and stone, and in a tolerable state of preservation, too, in many places, are still found remaining on each side of the valley, indicating the extent to which the valley was at one time irrigated; and richer land i have never seen than is much of this charming valley.... Several herds of cattle were voraciously feeding on the rich herbage near the stream; and thousands of sheep and goats were seen approaching the stream, or "resting at noonday" in the shadow of the great rock composing the overhanging cliff here and there.... Rank grasses, luxuriant reeds, tall weeds, and shrubbery and trees of various kinds, entirely conceal the stream from view in many places.... Higher up, the valley becomes very narrow, and the rocky precipices tower to a sublime height.'

The name aenon does not seem to have survived in connexion with these springs, but within 2 miles of them there is another valley called by the Arabs *Wady Saleim*. It is at least possible that this name was once borne by one of the towns whose ruins still crown the neighbouring heights. A town thus placed would have been a conspicuous object from many parts of Judaea, and would have been naturally referred to by the Evangelist when describing the location of aenon.

Literature.—In addition to writers cited above, see artt. ‘aenon’ in Smith’s *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , and ‘Salim’ in *Encyc. Biblica*.

W. W. Moore.

☞ Affliction

AFFLICTION.—In AV of the Gospels ‘affliction’ occurs only twice (Mar 4:17; Mar 13:19), corresponding both times to *θλιψις* in the original. RV gives ‘tribulation’—its invariable rendering of *θλιψις* except in Joh 16:21, where, like AV, it has ‘anguish.’ In Mat 24:9 AV translates *εἰς θλίψιν* ‘to be afflicted’ (RV ‘unto tribulation’). In all remaining cases it renders *θλιψις* by ‘tribulation’ (Mat 13:21; Mat 24:21; Mat 24:29, Mar 13:24, Joh 16:33). The Greek *θλιψις* (WH *θλιψις*) signifies literally ‘pressing together,’ ‘pressure’ (cf. *ὁδὸς τεθλιμμένη* in Mat 7:14 of the ‘straitened way’; *ἵνα μὴ θλιβῶσιν αὐτόν*, ‘lest they should throng him,’ in Mar 3:9). In classical Greek it is found infrequently, and with its literal meaning only. In Biblical Greek, where the metaphorical significance prevails, it is of much commoner occurrence, always possessing a passive sense, and usually suggesting ‘sufferings inflicted from without’ (Lightfoot).

In the sayings of Christ the word bears three references. It denotes the persecution to which His followers will be subjected, and by which their loyalty will be tested (Mar 4:17 = Mat 13:21; Mat 24:9, Joh 16:33). It describes the privations and sufferings (not, as above, necessarily induced by His service) attendant upon a great national or universal crisis (Mar 13:19; Mar 13:24 = Mat 24:21; Mat 24:29). And, finally, it is employed in one of His illustrations to indicate a woman’s pangs in childbirth (Joh 16:21, Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘anguish’). See, further, artt. Persecution, Suffering, Tribulation.

Age

AGE.—The word ‘age’ is a vague term, as may be seen by its doing duty as a possible translation for αἰών (Lat. *aevum*, an unmeasured period of existence), for γενεά (Lat. *generatio*), and even for the more precise and exact terms χρόνος (Lat. *tempus*), and καιρός (Lat. *occasio*). Its strictest Greek equivalent, however, is ἡλικία (Lat. *aetas*). An examination into the significance of the term shows a remarkable parallel between its employment in classical literature and in the Greek of the New Testament. Ἡλικία marks a normal development of life; such development may be registered in the individual by years, or by physique. In classical Greek, the former is the usual reference of the term, and hence the most ordinary meaning of the word is, like the poetical ἥβη, the flower or prime of life. The significance, however, of ἡλικία as *stature* or *height*, that feature of physical development which mostly attracts the eye, is quite classical; and this sense occurs in Herodotus (iii. 16),* [Note: ἔχων τὴν αὐτὴν ἡλικίην Ἀμάσι .] Plato, and Demosthenes. Turning to the New Testament, we find the same oscillation of meaning in ἡλικία. In the Fourth Gospel the parents of the blind man for fear of excommunication evade the question of the Jews, and shift the responsibility of answering upon their son: ‘Therefore said his parents, He is of age,† [Note: ἡλικίαν ἔχει (Joh_9:21; Joh_9:23).] ask him.’ In the Sermon on the Mount ‘age’‡ [Note: Mat_6:27, Luk_12:25.] appears to be the true rendering of ἡλικία. A cubit would be a prodigious addition to a man’s height, while a span was already a proverbial expression§ [Note: Psa_39:5.] to signify the brevity of life. ‘Stature’ is, of course, the only possible rendering in the interesting note about Zacchaeus;|| [Note: | Luk_19:3, cf. Eph_4:13.] and this is the only place in the Gospel where, as will be seen, ἡλικία bears this meaning with an absolute certainty.

The idea of periodicity, which is largely foreign to the meaning of ἡλικία in classical Greek, appears only once, and that doubtfully, in the New Testament.¶ [Note: Heb_11:11.] The different ‘ages of man’** [Note: * Mar_5:42, Luk_8:42.] and so of our Lord,†† [Note: † Luk_3:23.] are indicated by the classical formula of time, ‘years’ being in the genitive case. Hence the word yields no suggestion as to those

characteristic periods, or epochs in the earthly life of our Lord—the infancy, childhood, manhood of Christ. Nor would the word deserve a place in this Dictionary were it not for two passages in which it occurs or is referred to when its interest is a real one, as is evident by the attention paid to them by all commentators on St. Luke's Gospel. †† [Note: † Luk_2:40; Luk_2:52.] Both passages appear as a postscript to the narrative of the Holy Child with the doctors in the temple. It is an incident in the regular equable development of His life upon earth. This development is shown in two aspects. The Evangelist declares that Jesus increased (or advanced) in wisdom and stature, and in favour (or grace) with God and man. St. Luke's phraseology was no doubt influenced by his recollection of a similar encomium passed upon the youthful Samuel, §§ [Note: § 1Sa_2:26.] and already he had found it not unsuitable to be quoted in reference to the Baptist. || || [Note: || Luk_1:80.]

The key to the meaning of ἡλικία in Luk_2:52 may be discovered by a comparison of these four passages—

1Sa_2:26 Καὶ τὸ παιδάριον Σαμουὴλ ἐπορεύετο [+ μεγαλυνόμενον], καὶ ἀγαθὸν καὶ μετὰ Κυρίου καὶ μετὰ ἀνθρώπων (LXX Septuagint, B, said of Samuel).

Luk_1:80 τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἠΰξανε καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο πνεύματι (said of the Baptist).

Luk_2:40 τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἠΰξανεν καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο πληρούμενον σοφία, καὶ χάρις θεοῦ ἦν ἐπ' αὐτό (said of Christ).

Luk_2:52 καὶ Ἰησοῦς προέκοπτεν ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ καὶ ἡλικίᾳ καὶ χάριτι παρὰ θεῶ καὶ ἀνθρώπων (said of Christ).

A careful comparison of these passages appears determinative of the sense of ἡλικία in the last as 'stature,' not 'age.' What was noticeable in a measure in Samuel and in the Baptist, was supremely characteristic of the Holy Child, namely, an equal development both on the physical and spiritual side. Translate it as (Revised Version margin), and it is little more than a truism. 'Stature' is not only not superfluous, but an interesting and unexpected contribution to that group of references which lay stress on our Lord's humanity. It helps to explain His 'favour with men' with which it stands in parallel. It suggests that our Lord's personality, even His appearance, may have had a fascination about it. Even more, it may make the student of Messianic

prophecy cautions in attaching a too physical meaning to the description of the countenance of Jehovah's Servant ([Isa 52:14](#); [Isa 53:2](#)).

B. Whitefoord.

☩ Agony

AGONY.—This word is used in [Luk 22:44](#) to describe the sorrow, suffering, and struggle of Jesus in Gethsemane. The Greek word *agônia* (ἀγωνία) is derived from *agôn* (ἀγών), meaning: (1) an assembly of the people (cf. ἀγορά); (2) a place of assembly, especially the place in which the Greeks assembled to celebrate solemn games; (3) a contest of athletes, runners or charioteers. Ἀγών is used in a figurative sense in [Heb 12:1](#) 'let us run with patience the *race* that is set before us.' The word has the general sense of *struggle* in [1Th 2:2](#) 'in much conflict'; [Php 1:30](#) 'having the same conflict'; [1Ti 6:2](#) 'the good fight of faith'; [2Ti 4:7](#) 'I have fought the good fight.' It means *solicitude* or *anxiety* in [Col 2:1](#) 'how greatly I strive for you' (literally, 'how great an *agôn* I have for you').

The state of Jesus in Gethsemane is described in the following phrases: [Mat 26:37](#) 'he began to be sorrowful and sore troubled'; [Mar 14:33](#) 'he began to be greatly amazed and sore troubled'; [Luk 22:44](#) 'And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat became as it were great drops of blood falling down upon the ground.'^{*} [Note: On the genuineness of this passage see the 'Notes on Select Readings' in Westcott and Hort's NT in Greek.] Jesus confesses His own feelings in the words, 'My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death' ([Mat 26:38](#), [Mar 14:34](#)). That He regarded the experience as a temptation is suggested by His warning words to His disciples: 'Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak' ([Mat 26:41](#), [Mar 14:38](#); cf. [Luk 22:40](#); [Luk 22:46](#)). That He was conscious of human weakness, and desired Divine strength for the struggle, is evident from the prayers, in reporting the words of which the Evangelists do not verbally agree, as the following comparison shows:—

[Mat 26:39](#).

'O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou

[Mar 14:36](#).

'Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; remove this cup from me: howbeit not what I will, but what thou

[Luk 22:42](#).

'Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless, not my will, but thine, be done.'

wilt.’

wilt.’

St. Mark and St. Luke give the words of one prayer only, although the former evidently intends to report three distinct acts of prayer (Luk 22:35; Luk 22:39; Luk 22:41), and the latter apparently only two (Luk 22:41; Luk 22:44). But St. Matthew gives the words of the second prayer, which he reports as repeated the third time (Luk 22:42; Luk 22:44): ‘O my Father, if this cannot pass away, except I drink it, thy will be done.’ It is not at all improbable that there was such progress in Jesus’ thoughts. At first He prayed for the entire removal of the cup, if possible (Mt.), because possible to God (Mk.), if God were willing (Lk.); and then, having been taught that it could not be taken away, He prayed for strength to take the cup. It is not necessary for us to decide which of the reports is most nearly verbally correct, as the substance of the first prayer is the same in all reports. Although St. John gives no report of the scene in Gethsemane, yet in his account of the interview of Jesus with the Greeks there is introduced what seems to be a faint reminiscence: ‘Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify thy name’ (Joh 12:27-28). It is substantially the same request, expressed in the characteristically Johannine language. But even if this conjecture be unwarranted, and this be an utterance on the occasion to which the Fourth Evangelist assigns it, the words serve to illustrate Jesus’ struggle in view of His death. Much more confident can we be that Gethsemane is referred to in Heb 5:7-8 ‘Who in the days of his flesh, having offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and having been heard for his godly fear; though he was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered.’ Having passed in review the material which is offered us in dealing with the question of the nature of the agony in Gethsemane, we may now concentrate our attention upon it, excluding all reference to other matters which are dealt with in their own place.

Many answers have been given to the question, What was the cup which Jesus desired to be taken away?

(1) The most obvious, but not on that account the most intelligent and reverent, answer is that in Gethsemane Jesus was overcome by the fear of death, from which He longed to escape. But this is to place Christ on a lower plane of manhood than many men, even among the lowest races. If the love of Christ has constrained many martyrs for His name to face rack and block, water and flame, and many other painful modes of death without shrinking, and even with the song of praise upon the lips, is it at all likely that He Himself shrank back?

(2) A more ingenious view, which has an apparent verbal justification in Mat 26:38, Mar 14:34 (‘even unto death’), and Heb 5:7 (‘to save him from death’), is that Jesus

felt Himself dying, and that He feared He would die before He could offer the great sacrifice for the sin of the world. But to this suggestion there are three objections. Firstly, there is no evidence of such physical exhaustion on the part of Jesus as would justify such a fear; although the stress of His work and suffering had undoubtedly put a severe strain upon His bodily strength, yet we have no proof that His health had given way so far as to make death appear at all probable. Secondly, only a very superficial and external view of His work as Saviour warrants the supposition that His sacrifice could be accomplished only on the Cross; that its efficacy depended in any way on its outward mode; that His death, if it had come to Him in Gethsemane, would have had less value for God and man than His crucifixion has. Thirdly, even if this supposition be admitted, we may be sure of this, that Jesus was so confident of His Father's goodness and guardianship in every step of His path, that it was impossible for Him to fear that the great purpose of His life would be left unfulfilled on account of His premature death. His rebuke of the 'little faith' ([Mat 8:26](#)) of His disciples during the storm at sea would have been applicable to Himself had He cherished any such fear.

(3) A much more profound view is offered to our consideration, when not the death itself, but the circumstances of the death, are represented as the cause of Jesus' agony. He regarded His death not only as a sacrifice which He was willing to offer, not only as a tragedy which He was ready to endure, but as a crime of man against God from which He shrank with horror. That the truth and grace of God in Him should meet with this insult and injury from the race which He had come to save and bless—this it was that caused His agony. He could not endure to gaze into 'this abysmal depths' of human iniquity and impiety, which the murder of the Holy One and the Just opened to view. Surely this apocalypse of sin was not necessary as a condition of the apocalypse of grace. If we look more closely at the conduct of the actors in this drama, we shall better understand how appalling a revelation of sin it must have appeared to Jesus. The fickleness of the multitude, the hypocrisy and bigotry of the Pharisees, the worldliness and selfishness of the priesthood, the treachery of Judas, the denial by Peter, the antagonism of the disciples generally to the Master's saving purpose, the falsehood of His accusers, the hate and the craft of His persecutors,—all these were present to the consciousness of Jesus as an intolerable offence to His conscience, and an unspeakable grief to His heart. To His moral insight and spiritual discernment these were not single misdeeds, but signs and proofs of a wickedness and godlessness spreading far and wide in the life of mankind, reaching deep into the soul of man. Must this antagonism of sin to God be forced to its ultimate issue? Could He not save mankind by some mode of sacrifice that would involve the men concerned in it in less heinous guilt? Must He by persevering in His present course drive His enemies to do their worst against Him, and thus by His fidelity to His vocation must He involve all who opposed Him in this greater iniquity? That such questions cannot have been present to the mind of Jesus, who can

confidently affirm? He foresaw the doom of the guilty nation, and He also saw that it was the crime about to be committed against Him that would seal its doom. That He shrank from being thus the occasion of its judgment cannot be doubted. But if in Gethsemane Jesus anticipated distinctly and accepted deliberately what He so intensely experienced on the Cross, then this solicitude for all who were involved in the crime of His death does not at all exhaust His agony. The words of darkness and desolation on the Cross, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' (Mat_27:46), must be our clue to the mystery of this experience.

(4) The only view that seems to the present writer at all adequate is that what Jesus dreaded and prayed to be delivered from in the experience of death was the sense of God's distance and abandonment. His sorrow unto death was not the fear of death as physical dissolution, nor of dying before He could finish His work on the Cross, but the shrinking of His filial soul from the sting of death, due to sin, the veiling in darkness of His Father's face from Him. His prayer was answered, for He was saved from death, inasmuch as the experience of darkness and desolation was momentary, and ere He gave up the ghost He was able to commit Himself with childlike trust unto His Father. 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit' (Luk_23:46). His agony in Gethsemane was worthy of Him as the Son of God, for it was the recoil of His filial spirit from the interruption of His filial communion with His Father, which appeared to Him to be necessarily involved in the sacrifice which He was about to offer for the sins of the world.

It is not the function of this article to offer a theological interpretation of Jesus' experience in Gethsemane; but a justification of the above answer to the question of the nature of Jesus' agony may be briefly offered in a psychological analysis of His experience. First of all, then, we note Jesus' sense of solitude. He must leave behind Him the disciples except three, and even from these three He must withdraw Himself (Mat_26:36; Mat_26:39). He sought this outward isolation because He felt this inner solitude. Since His announcement of His Passion (Mat_16:21) the disciples had been becoming less and less His companions, as they were being more and more estranged from His purpose. At last He knew that they would abandon Him altogether, their outer distance but the sign and proof of their inward alienation. Yet the comfort of the Father's presence would remain with Him: 'Behold, the hour cometh, yea, is come, that ye shall be scattered every man to his own, and shall leave me alone: and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me' (Joh_16:32). But now in Gethsemane He began to realize that it might be necessary for the accomplishment of His sacrifice that even the Father's presence should be withdrawn from Him. That dread drives Him to the Father's presence, but the assurance that there is no ground for this fear does not come to Him. Again He turns to His disciples. Secondly, therefore, we note His need of sympathy. When He withdrew from the three, He asked them to watch with Him; when, returning, He found them sleeping, His words

are a pathetic reproach: 'What, could ye not watch with me one hour?' (Mat 26:40). He craved sympathy, not only because He felt solitary, but because this solitude was due to His love for man. The sacrifice He was about to offer, in which the sense of His Father's abandonment was the sting of death, was on behalf of, and instead of man; and yet not even the men He had chosen would sorrow with Him, although He was suffering for all mankind. Thus man's denial of sympathy must have made Him feel more keenly the dread that even God's comfort and help might be withheld from Him. Thirdly, we note that this dread was not groundless, but was rooted deep in His experience and vocation. We must then go beyond any of the words uttered in Gethsemane itself to discover all that was involved in His agony there. As the incarnate love, mercy, and grace of God, His experience was necessarily vicarious. He suffered with and for man. He so identified Himself with sinful mankind, that He shared its struggle, bore its burden, felt its shame. Himself sinless, knowing no sin, He was made sin for mankind in feeling its sin as it were His very own. The beloved of God, He became a curse in experiencing in His own agony and desolation the consequences of sin, although as innocent He could neither feel the guilt nor bear the penalty of sin. So completely had He become one with mankind in being made sin and a curse for man, that even His consciousness of filial union and communion with God as His Father was obscured and interrupted, if even for only a moment, by His consciousness of the sin of man. God did not withdraw Himself from, or abandon His only-begotten and well-beloved Son, but was with Him to sustain Him in His sacrifice; but the Son of God was so overshadowed and overwhelmed by His consciousness of the sin and the consequent curse of the race which He so loved as to make Himself one with it, that He dreaded in Gethsemane to lose, and did on Calvary lose for a moment, the comfort and help of His Father's love. In this experience He exhibited the antagonism of God and sin, the necessary connexion between the expulsion of God and the invasion of sin in any consciousness, since His self-identification with sinful man involved His self-isolation from the Holy Father. This, then, was the agony in Gethsemane, such a sense of the sorrow, shame, and curse of mankind's sin as His very own as became a dread of the loss of God's fatherly presence. Although He at first prayed to be delivered from this, to Him, most terrible and grievous experience, yet He afterward submitted to God's will, as God's purpose in the salvation of mankind was dearer to Him than even the joy of His filial communion with God His Father. In this surrender He was endowed with such strength from above that He finished the work His Father had given Him to do, and in His obedience even unto death offered the sacrifice of His life, which is a ransom for many, and the seal of the new covenant of forgiveness, renewal, and fellowship with God for all mankind. See also art. Dereliction.

Literature.—The standard Commentaries and Lives of Christ; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. 712 f.; Jonathan Edwards, *Works*, ii. 866 ff.; *Expos. Times*, vi. [1894-1895], 433 f., 522; *Expositor*, 3rd ser. v. 180 ff.; Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life*

of Christ, 'Gethsemane,' where the explanation numbered (3) above is fully elaborated.

Alfred E. Garvie.

⚠️ Agrapha

AGRAPHA.—See Sayings.

⚠️ Agriculture

AGRICULTURE.—The influence of the physical and climatic characteristics of a land upon the character of its people has been a favourite theme with many writers. But we are more concerned here with another marked feature—the profound influence exerted by the occupations of a people on their manner of thought and their modes of expressing it. Nowhere was this subtle influence more manifest than in the case of the Hebrews. Their occupations were largely determined by the characteristics of the land they inhabited, but their thought and the language that was its vehicle were equally moulded by their occupations.

1. *The place of Agriculture in the life and thought of the Hebrews.*—From the first the Hebrews were a pastoral, and from very early times an agricultural people; and these twin employments have lent their colour and tone to their literature, and shaped their profoundest thoughts and utterances regarding God and man. God is the Shepherd of Israel (Psa_80:1); Israel is 'the people of his pasture, and the sheep of his hand' (Psa_95:7, cf. Psa_74:1, Psa_79:13, Psa_100:3). God is the Husbandman; Israel is His vineyard (Isa_5:1 ff.). God is the Ploughman; Israel is the land of His tillage (Isa_28:25 ff.; cf. 1Co_3:9).

When we turn to the Gospels we find the same stream of thought in full flow. The highest Christian virtue is enforced by appeal to Him who 'maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust' (Mat_5:45). The kingdom of God is set forth under such emblems as the sower going forth to sow (Mat_13:3 ff.), the wheat and the tares growing together until the harvest (Mat_13:24 ff.), the lord of the vineyard going out early in the morning to hire labourers (Mat_20:1 ff.), or sending to demand its fruits (Mat_21:33 ff.). Christ compares Himself to the shepherd who seeks his lost sheep until he finds it (Luk_15:4), or lays down his life for the sheep (Joh_10:11). The multitude are, to His compassionate eye,

as 'sheep I not having a shepherd' (Mat 9:36, Mar 6:34). The world appears to Him as a great field 'white unto harvest' (Joh 4:35), and awaiting the labour of the reapers (Mat 9:37 f.). His relation to His disciples is expressed under the figure of the vine and its branches (Joh 15:1 ff.) See also art. Husbandman.

Noteworthy also is the place assigned by Biblical writers to the cultivation of the soil. It is represented as the duty of the first man. Adam, placed in the Garden of Eden, is 'to dress it and to keep it' (Gen 2:15); driven from it, he is sent 'to till the ground from whence he was taken' (Gen 3:23). To Noah the promise is given that 'while the earth remaineth, seedtime and harvest ... shall not cease' (Gen 8:22). The land of promise is 'a land of wheat and barley' (Deu 8:8). The Golden Age will be a time when men 'shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks,' and 'they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig-tree' (Isa 2:4, Mic 4:3-4). The gladness of the Messianic age is 'joy according to the joy in harvest' (Isa 9:3).

Nor was it only in their conception of the past and their anticipation of the future that the influence of agriculture made itself felt: it was the very foundation of their national and religious life. A pastoral age, it is true, preceded the agricultural, and the patriarchs are represented, for the most part, as herdsmen rather than cultivators (Gen 37:12; Gen 47:3); and even as late as the beginning of the settlement in Canaan, the trans-Jordanic tribes are said to have had a great multitude of cattle (Num 32:1). But, on the other hand, we learn that Isaac, who had gone to Gerar, 'sowed in that land, and found in the same year an hundredfold' (Gen 26:12); while the first dream of Joseph shows that if he did not actually follow, he was at least familiar with, agricultural pursuits (Gen 37:5-7). But it was not till after their conquest of the Land of Promise that the Hebrews became an agricultural people on any large scale. Prior to that time, however, agriculture was highly developed among the Canaanites (Deu 8:8); and it may have been from the conquered race that they acquired it. Once learned, it became the staple industry of the country.

The Mosaic legislation presupposes a people given to agricultural pursuits. That is sufficiently attested by the laws anent the three annual festivals (Exo 23:14-16), the septennial fallow (Exo 23:11), the gleanings of the harvest field (Lev 19:9), Lev 19:10 the year of Jubilee (Lev 25:10 ff., Lev 27:17 ff.), and many others. Further attestation of the same fact is found in the blessings that were to attend the faithful observance of the Law, and the curses that would follow disobedience (Lev 26:3-5; Lev 26:14-20, Deu 28:1-5; Deu 28:15-18).

2. The soil of Palestine.—The fertility of the soil of Palestine was remarkable, as is testified by Josephus (c. *Apion*. i. 22; *BJ* ii. 3) and others (Diod. xl. 3, 7; Tac. *Hist.* v. 6). The soil varies in character. In the Jordan Valley and the maritime plains it

consists of a very rich alluvial deposit; in the regions lying at a higher elevation it has been formed from decomposing basaltic rock and cretaceous limestone. This, however, was greatly enriched by the system of 'terracing,' low walls of 'shoulder-stones' being built along the mountain slopes, and the ledges behind them filled with the alluvial soil of the valleys. These walls gave protection against the heavy rains, and prevented the soil from being washed away. It was to this system that districts such as Lebanon, Carmel, and Gilboa owed the wonderful fertility that formerly characterized them.

All parts were not, of course, equally productive. Thus we find the *Mishna* (*Gittin*, v. 1) enumerating several classes of soil according to their quality or the degree of moisture. Such a classification is quite distinct from that of the parable of the Sower, where the wayside, the rocky places, etc., are all within the limits of a single field (Mat 13:5, Mar 4:3, Luk 8:5). It may be noted here that ground which yielded thorns was considered specially good for wheat-growing, while that which was overrun with weeds was assigned to barley. The most productive fields were often marked by the presence of large stones, some of which were beyond a man's own strength to remove. Their presence was regarded as a token that the soil was fertile. Smaller stones, which were also plentiful, were often used for making rude walls along the side of the fields. In some districts they were so numerous that they had to be removed every year after ploughing had taken place.

3. Agricultural operations, etc.—The work of preparing the land for cultivation was the first concern of the farmer. Where virgin soil had to be reclaimed, a beginning was made by clearing it of timber, brushwood, or stones (Jos 17:18, Isa 5:2). It was then ready to receive the plough (which see).

(a) *Ploughing* began immediately after the 'early rain' had softened the ground, *i.e.* towards the end of September or beginning of October, and went on right through the winter, provided the soil had not become too wet and, therefore, too heavy. Usually a single ploughing sufficed, but if the soil was very rough it was ploughed twice.

In some cases the *hoe* or *mattock* took the place of the plough. That is the common practice in modern times where there is a rocky bottom and only a sparse covering of earth. In ancient times the same course was followed where hillsides were brought under cultivation (Isa 7:25). The same implement was employed for breaking up large clods of earth (Isa 28:24, Hos 10:11), but whether the reference includes the clods upturned by the plough, or merely those occurring in 'stony ground,' is not quite certain.

(b) **Dung** was employed for increasing the productiveness of fruit trees (Luk 13:8), but not, as a rule, for grain fields. The most common forms were house and farmyard

refuse mixed with straw ([Isa_25:10](#)), withered leaves, oil-scum, and wood-ashes. The blood of slaughtered animals was also used for this purpose.

(c) The *principal crops* were wheat, barley, spelt, millet, beans, and lentils (see articles on the first two of these). Oats were little cultivated. From [Jos_2:6](#) we learn that flax was grown. It was sometimes sown as an experiment for testing the quality of the soil, for a field which had yielded good flax was regarded as specially suitable for wheat-growing.

(d) The *sowing* season began in the early days of October. A beginning was made with pulse varieties, barley came next, and wheat followed. Millet was sown in summer, the land being prepared for it by irrigation. When the winter set in cold and wet, barley was not sown till the beginning of February.

The sower carries the seed in a basket or bag, from which he scatters it broadcast. Where a single ploughing suffices, the seed is sown first and then ploughed in. When it is sown on ploughed ground, the usual course is also to plough it in, but sometimes a light harrow (not infrequently a thorn-bush) is used to cover it. Seed that falls on the footpath or 'wayside' cannot be covered owing to the hardness of the ground, and is picked up by the birds ([Mat_13:4](#) and parallels).

(e) The crops thus sown were exposed, as they grew, to various *dangers*, such as the inroads of roaming cattle, the depredations of birds, or the visitation of locusts; and also to such adverse natural and climatic influences as drought, east wind, and mildew. Some of these will be separately treated, and need not be dwelt upon now. But it may be convenient to say a few words at this stage regarding—

(f) *The water supply of the country.*—Unlike Egypt, which owed its fertility exclusively to the Nile, Palestine had its time of rain ([Deu_11:10-11](#); [Deu_11:14](#), [Jer_5:24](#) etc.). The 'early rain' (מִיָּדָה) of the Bible is that of October, which precedes ploughing and sowing: the 'latter rain' (מִלְקוֹשׁ) denotes the refreshing showers that fall in March and April, and give much-needed moisture to the growing crops. The intervening period is marked by the heavy rains of winter (בַּשָּׁמַיִם), the wettest month being January. The rainfall is not uniform over the country. In the Jordan Valley it is very slight; at Jerusalem it averages about 20 inches annually; in some other upland regions it is almost twice as much. In the highest lying parts, as Lebanon, there is a considerable fall of . There are also many brooks and springs ([Deu_8:7](#)), and irrigation is employed, especially in gardening, though naturally on a much smaller scale than in Egypt. The summer months are hot and rainless.

(g) *Harvest*.—Barley harvest (2Sa_21:9) began in April or May, according as the district was early or late; wheat and spelt were ripe a few weeks after (Exo_9:31-32). The grain was cut with a sickle (Joe_3:13, Deu_16:9, Mar_4:29; see art. Sickle), or pulled up by the roots (Mishna, *Peah* iv. 10). The latter method was followed both in Palestine and in Egypt, and is so still; but the use of the sickle goes back to very early times, as the excavations at Tell el-Hesi have shown. Ordinarily the stalks were cut about a foot beneath the ear, but in some instances even higher (Job_24:24). The reaper grasped them in handfuls (Rth_2:16), reaped them with his arm (Isa_17:5), and laid them behind him; while the binder, following him, gathered them in his bosom (Psa_129:7), tied them with straw into sheaves (Gen_37:7), and set them in heaps (עֲבָרִים)* [Note: See Vogelstein, *Landwirtschaft in Pal.* 61.] Rth_2:7).

(h) *Threshing*.—The sheaves thus prepared were carried to the *threshing-floor* on the backs of men or of beasts of burden, such as donkeys, horses, or camels. Amo_2:13 has been taken by some as implying that they were sometimes removed in carts, but this is very doubtful. The reference is more probably to the threshing-sledge (Isa_28:28).

The **threshing-floor** is simply a circle of level ground which has been carefully cleaned and beaten hard, and is enclosed with a row of big stones to prevent the straw from being too widely scattered. The spot selected always stood higher than the surrounding ground, so that it should be open to the air currents, and that rain, if it occurred, though it was rare in harvest time (1Sa_12:17), might run off without doing injury. The sheaves were unbound and scattered over the floor, till a heap was formed about a foot high. Cattle (Hos_10:11) were then driven over it repeatedly, or a threshing wain drawn by cattle. The Pentateuchal law provided that the cattle engaged in this operation should not be muzzled (Deu_25:4). It was also the custom to blindfold them, as otherwise, moving continually in a circle, they became dizzy (Talmud, *Kelim* xvi. 7). Certain crops, however, were threshed by being beaten with a stick (Isa_28:27).

Two kinds of threshing machines were employed, the drag and the waggon. The drag (מֹרְרָה, מֹרְרָה) was a heavy wooden board,† [Note: See illustration in Driver's *Joel and Amos* (Camb. Bible), p. 227.] the under-surface of which was studded with nails or sharp fragments of stone (Isa_41:15). It was further weighted with large stones, and by the driver himself, who stood, sat, or even lay upon it. The waggon (עֲגִלָּה Isa_28:28) was provided with sharp metal discs. These were affixed to revolving rollers set in a rude waggon-frame.

(i) *Winnowing*.—The operation of threshing yielded a confused mass of grain, chaff, and broken straw, which required to be winnowed. Two implements were used for this process—the shovel and the fan (Isa 30:24). With these the mixed mass was tossed into the air, against the wind. The chaff was blown away (Psa 1:4), the straw fell a little distance off, and the grain at the feet of the winnower. Where, as at large public threshing-floors, there was an accumulation of chaff, it was burned (Mat 3:12). The chopped straw (חֵבֶן Isa 11:7) was used as fodder for cattle.

(j) *Sifting*.—The winnowed grain still contained an admixture of small stones and particles of clay, stubble, and unbruised ears, and also of smaller poisonous seeds such as tares, and so stood in need of yet further cleansing. This was effected by means of sifting. In modern Palestine the sieve in common use is a wooden hoop with a mesh made of camel-hide. This implement probably corresponds to the כְּבִרָה (ĕbhârâh) of ancient times (Amo 9:9). The mesh was wide enough to allow the separated grains to pass through, but retained the unthreshed ears, which were cast again on the threshing-floor.* [Note: In this case the meaning of ‘the least grain’ in Amo 9:9 must be ‘the least pebble’ (so Preuschen, ZATW, 1895, p. 24). Others (e.g. Driver, Joel and Amos, p. 221; Nowack and Marti in their Comm. ad loc.) רֶצֶד (ĕrôr, lit. ‘pebble’) to stand here for a grain of wheat, while admitting that the word is not elsewhere so used. On this supposition the action of the ĕbhârâh would be similar to that of the modern described above.] In Isa 30:28 another implement is mentioned, נֶפֶת (nâphâh), which both Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 render ‘sieve.’ It is not quite certain, however, that the nâphâh was really a sieve. If it was, it may have resembled the modern *ghirbal*, which is of smaller mesh than the kĕbhârâh (Arab. [Note: Arabic.] *kirbal*), and permits only broken grains and dust to pass through, while retaining the unbruised kernels.

The sifted grain was collected in large heaps, and, pending its removal to the granary, the owner, to guard against thieving, slept by the threshing-floor (Rth 3:7). In the Gospels there is one reference to sifting (Luk 22:31).

(k) *Storage*.—In the NT a granary is called ἀποθήκη (Mat 6:26; Mat 13:30, Luk 12:18; Luk 12:24). In the OT quite a variety of names occurs (מִסְבֵּנוֹת Exo 1:11; אֶסְמִים Deu 28:8; יִסְמֵמָה Jer 50:26; מוֹרִים Psa 144:13; אֶצְרוֹת and רֹתְמֵן Joe 1:17). But though the nomenclature is so ‘rich,’ of the construction and character of those granaries we know nothing. Some of them were probably sheds, and may have resembled the flat-roofed buildings used in Egypt for storing grain. Others may have

been dry wells, or cisterns, or caves hewn out of the rock, such as are common in modern times. The grain stored in these magazines will remain good for years.

Literature.—Ugolinus. *Thesaurus*, vol. xxix.; Benzinger, *Heb. Arch.* 207 ff.; Nowack, *Lehrbuch der Heb. Archäologie*, i. 228 ff.; Vogelstein, *Die Landwirtschaft in Palästina zur Zeit der Mischna*; Stade, *Geschichte d. Volkes Israel*, i. vii.; Wilkinson, *Ancient Egyptians, passim*; Thomson, *The Land and the Book*; van Lennep, *Bible Lands and Customs*; ZDPV [Note: DPV Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.] ix.; PEFSt [Note: EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.] , *passim*; Ungewitter, *Die landwirthschaftlichen Bilder und Metaphern i. d. poet. Buch. d. Alt. Test.*; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , and *Encyc. Bibl. s.v. 'Agriculture.'*

Hugh Duncan.

⚠️ Ahaz

AHAZ.—One of the kings of Judah (*circa (about)* 735-720 b.c.), named in St. Matthew's genealogy of our Lord (Mat 1:9).

⚠️ Ahimelech

AHIMELECH.—See Abiathar.

⚠️ Akeldama

AKELDAMA.—The name given in Act 1:19 to the field purchased with the price of Judas' treachery. The true reading seems to be ἀκελδαμάχ (B; cf. ἀχελδαμάχ, ⚠️A 61, etc.: ἀκελδαιμάχ, D [Note: Deuteronomist.] ; ἀκελδαιμάχ, E [Note: Elohist.]) rather than the TR [Note: R Textus Receptus.] ἀκελδαιμάχ; and the final aspirate is here of importance, as will be seen.

The two accounts of the death of Judas (Mat 27:3 f. and Act 1:18 f.) are hard to reconcile (see Judas, and art. in *Expositor* for June 1904, by the present writer); but it is sufficient to note here that they are clearly independent of each other. The salient features of the Matthaean tradition are—(a) Judas stricken with remorse

returned the money paid to him as the price of his treachery; (b) he hanged himself in despair, nothing being said as to the scene of his suicide; (c) the priests bought with the money a field known as ‘the Potter’s Field,’ which (d) thenceforth was called ἄγροδς αἱματος, the allusion being to the blood of Christ, shed through the treachery of Judas; (e) the field was devoted to the purpose of a cemetery for foreigners. In Acts, on the other hand, (a) nothing is said of a refunding of the money by Judas; (b) his death was not self-inflicted, nor was it caused by hanging; it is described as due to a fall and a consequent rupture of the abdomen; (c) the field was bought by Judas himself, and not by the priests; (d) nothing is said of its former use as a ‘potter’s field,’ nor (e) of the purpose for which it was used after the death of Judas; (f) the blood which gave its name to the field was that of Judas, by which it was defiled, for (g) the field Akeldama is identified with the place of his death, a fact of which there is no mention in Matthew.

The only point common to the two accounts is that the name by which the field was known in the next generation after Judas’ death was an Aramaic word which was variously rendered ἄγροδς αἱματος and χωρίον αἱματος by Mt. and Luke. Lk. gives a transliteration of this Aramaic name; he says it was ἀκελδαμάχ, that is, he understands it as equivalent to לְקַח אֶמְנָה, ‘Field of Blood.’ And ἀκελδαμάχ is, no doubt, a possible transliteration of these Hebrew words, for we have other instances of final א being represented by the Greek χ, as, .g., in the equation Σιρόαχ = שִׁירָא. But we should not see a final χ, although it might be defended, if the last part of the Aramaic title were אֶמְנָה; the presence of χ suggests rather that the Aramaic title ended with the letters מְנָה. Now it is remarkable that מְנָה = κοιμᾶσθαι, so that κοιμητήριον ‘cemetery’ would be the exact equivalent of לְקַח מְנָה. And Klostermann (Probleme im Aposteltexte, p. 6 ff.) has suggested that this was really the name by which the field was known to the native Jews, and that we have here a corroboration of St. Matthew’s tradition ‘to bury strangers in’ (Mat 27:7). This conjecture is confirmed by the fact, which has been pointed out above, that the significance of the name ‘Field of Blood’ was differently understood by Mt. and Luke. When we have two rival explanations offered of a place-name, it is probable that the name itself is a corruption of some other, akin in sound, but not in sense.

The evidence, then, points to the following conclusions. The field which was purchased with the wages of Judas was originally a ‘potter’s field,’ or pit, in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. It may have been (as Christian tradition had it afterwards) the place in the Valley of Hinnom where the potter of Jeremiah’s day

pursued his craft (Jer_18:2; Jer_19:2); but of this there is no hint in the NT, for the reference to Jeremiah in the text of Mat_27:9 is an inadvertence, the passage quoted by the Evangelist being Zec_11:13. This ‘potter’s field’ was used as a burial-ground for strangers, and so was called תְּהִלַּת הַיָּדָד = *oemeterium*. Within half a century the name became corrupted to תְּהִלַּת הַדָּם ‘the Field of Blood,’ the allusion being variously interpreted of the blood of Christ and the blood of Judas.

There is no good reason to doubt the identity of the modern *Hakk ed-Dumm*, on the south bank of the Valley of Hinnom, with the ‘Akeldamach’ of Lk. and the ἀγρός αἵματος of Matthew. The early pilgrims, e.g. Antoninus (570) and Areulf (685), describe its site with sufficient accuracy, and so do the later mediaeval travellers.

Tradition has distinguished Akeldama, the field purchased with Judas’ thirty pieces of silver, from the scene of his death—a distinction of sites which though inconsistent with Acts 1, is compatible with Mt., as has been pointed out above. Thus Antoninus places ‘Akeldamac. hoc est, ager sanguinis, in quo omnes peregrine sepeliuntur’ (§ 26), near Siloam; but the fig-tree ‘on which Judas banged himself’ was shown him on the N. E. of the city (§ 17). Arculf seems to place the latter upon the Hill of Evil Counsel (§ 18), where it is shown at the present day; but the tradition has not been constant, the ‘elder-tree’ of Judas having been pointed out to Sir J. Maundeville (in 16th cent.) near Absalom’s pillar.

The best description of *Hakk ed-Dumm*, and of the buildings which remain of the old charnel house, will be found in an article by Sehick (*PEFSt* [Note: *EFSt* Quarterly Statement of the same.] , 1892, p. 283 ff.). It is quite possible, as he says, that this was once the site of a potter’s cave; and clay used to be taken, up to quite recent times, from a place a little higher up the Hill of Evil Counsel. This burial-place was much used in Crusading times; indeed, it came to be regarded as an honour to be buried in Akeldama, so completely were the old associations of horror forgotten or ignored.

J. H. Bernard.

☞ Alabaster

ALABASTER (ἀλάβαστρος or ἀλάβαστρον; in secular writers always ἀλάβαστρος [more correctly ἀλάβαστος], though with a heterog. plur. ἀλάβαστρα; in NT only in aecus,

and only once with art., which is found in different MS^S [Note: SS Manuscripts.] in all the genders—*TῆN, ΤάΝ, Τά* [Tisch., Treg., WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.], Meyer, Alford prefer *TῆM*].—The word occurs four times in the Gospels: Mat 26:7, Mar 14:3 *bis*, Luk 7:37. The Oriental alabaster, so called from the locality in Egypt (the town of Alabastron, near Tell el-Amarna)* [Note: The reverse supposition is possible, that the town derived its name from the material (see Encyc. Bibl. i. 108).] where it is found in greatest abundance, is a species of marble softer and more easily worked than the ordinary marble. It was so frequently used for holding precious ointment that ἀλάβαστρος came to be a synonym for an unguent box (Theoer. xv. 114; Herod. iii. 20), Horace (*Od.* iv. 12. 17) uses *onyx* in the same ways.

In all three of the Gospel narratives emphasis is laid on the costliness of the offering made to our Lord. The ointment was that with which monarchs were anointed. Judas valued it at three hundred pence. If we bear in mind that a *denarius* was a day's wage for ordinary labour, it would represent about four shillings of our money. And unguent and box would have a value of something like £60. Mary 'brake the box.' This is generally interpreted as merely meaning 'unfastened the seal'; but is it not in accordance alike with a profound instinct of human nature and with Oriental ideas to interpret the words literally? The box which had been rendered sacred by holding the ointment with which Jesus was anointed would never be put to a lower use.

This incident is the gospel protest against philanthropic utilitarianism. 'Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.' We have here the warrant for the expenditure of money on everything that makes for the higher life of man. Whatever tends to uplift the imagination, to ennoble and purify the emotions, to refine the taste, and thus to add to the spiritual value of life, is good, and is to be encouraged. Jesus claims our best. He inspires us to be and do our best, and the first-fruits of all the higher faculties of the soul are to be devoted to Him. See, further, art. Anointing i. 2.

A. Miller.

✠ Alexander And Rufus

ALEXANDER AND RUFUS.—The Synoptists all record that the Saviour's cross was borne by one Simon of Cyrene. St. Mark (Mar 15:21) alone adds that he was 'the father of Alexander and Rufus.' From this we gather that, when the Second Gospel was written, the sons of him who bore the cross were followers of the Crucified, and men of

prominence and note in the Church. This information as to the two sons of Simon being Alexander and Rufus, is also found in the Gospel of Nicodemus (Mark 4). The name Alexander appears in Act 4:6; Act 19:33, 1Ti 1:20, 2Ti 4:14, but there is not the slightest ground for identifying any one of these with the Alexander of Mar 15:21.

In the case of Rufus, however, it has generally been considered that he is probably the same as the Rufus who, with his mother, is saluted by St. Paul in Rom 16:13 (Ῥοῦφον τὸν ἐκλεκτὸν ἐν Κυρίῳ). And if this is so, it tells us that not only the sons of Simon of Cyrene, but his wife also, were members of the Church. Lightfoot supports this view, and Swete considers that it has ‘some probability.’ In St. Paul’s Epistle to the Philippians, written from Rome, occurs a salutation sent to the Church at Philippi from Caesar’s household (Php 4:22). Lightfoot has compared the list of names of those to whom St. Paul sends greeting in his letter to the Romans (ch. Romans 16) with the names in the lists of the household which occur in the inscriptions, and on the name Rufus he writes (*Philippians*⁷ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 176)–

‘Rufus is a very ordinary name, and would not have claimed notice here but for its occurrence in one of the Gospels. There seems no reason to doubt the tradition that St. Mark wrote especially for the Romana; and if so, it is worth remarking that he alone of the Evangelists describes Simon of Cyrene as the “father of Alexander and Rufus” (15:21). A person of this name, therefore, seems to have held a prominent place among the Roman Christians: and thus there is at least fair ground for identifying the Rufus of St. Paul with the Rufus of St. Mark. The inscriptions exhibit several members of the household bearing the names Rufus and Alexander, but this fact is of no value where both names are so common.’

In connexion with Bishop Lightfoot’s note, it is worthy of notice that in Polycarp’s Epistle to the Philippians (Philippians 9) we find Ignatius, Zozimus, and Rufus adduced as examples, with St. Paul and the rest of the Apostles, of men who had obeyed the word of righteousness and exercised all patience, ‘and are gone to the place that was due to them from the Lord with whom also they suffered; for they loved not this present world, but Him who died and was raised again by God for us.’

In the *Acts of Andrew* and *of Peter*, Rufus and Alexander appear as the companions of Peter, Andrew, and Matthias, but no further information is given.

J. B. Bristow.

☒ Allegory

ALLEGORY.—See Parable.

☒ Almsgiving

ALMSGIVING (ἐλεημοσύνη).—[For the history of the word, and Jewish teaching, see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible i. 67]. Only on three occasions does our Lord in the NT employ the word (Mat 6:1-4, Luk 11:41; Luk 12:33). But these texts by no means exhaust His teaching on the subject. All the Gospels witness to His interest in it. Mk. contains the incidents of the Rich Young Man whom He told, 'Yet one thing thou lackest: go, sell all that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven' (Mar 10:21); the Widow's Mite (Mar 12:43); and the emphatic praise of Mary of Bethany (Mar 14:7). Jn. again exhibits all Christ's miracles as so many charities (e.g. Mar 2:1-11), 'good works' which Christ 'showed you from the Father' (Mar 10:32); tells the Lord's defence of Mary's act (Mar 12:8); and drops a hint twice over (Mar 12:6 and Mar 13:29) of Christ's own practice of giving something to the poor out of His scanty wallet. But it is St. Matthew the converted tax-gatherer who left all and followed Him, and St. Luke the beloved physician, with his abounding sympathy for wretchedness of every sort, who have preserved to us the most numerous and striking of His sayings on the subject.

The general character of our Lord's teaching concerning Almsgiving has been described as in close accordance with the Jewish thought of the time, even in points where we should have least expected it. Certainly He endorses and very much enhances the praise of Almsgiving which we find in the OT (e.g. Psa 41:1, Pro 19:17, Du 4:27). But in dealing with the teachings of the Apocrypha, which probably reflect more closely the views He found prevailing, He discriminates. If, on the one hand, He combines (Mat 6:2; Mat 6:5; Mat 6:16) Almsgiving, Prayer, and Fasting, as in Tob 12:8, and describes Almsgiving as providing a treasure in the heavens which faileth not (Luk 12:33), as in Sir 40:17; yet, on the other hand, He explicitly condemns (Mat 6:2) the notion countenanced in Sir 31:11 [LXX Septuagint, Sir 34:11] that alms may be done to gain a reputation for piety; while in Mat 5:45 He directly contradicts both the precept and the doctrine of Sir 12:5-7 'Give *not* to the ungodly ... for the Most High hateth sinners, and will repay vengeance.'

Almsgiving is, according to Christ, a duty even towards our enemies, and those with whom we have little to do (Mat 5:42-45, Luk 6:33-36; Luk 10:37); it is a means whereby we may conform ourselves to the example of our Father which is in heaven (Mat 5:45, Luk 6:35); it is the first exercise of righteousness (Mat 6:1-4). As

eliminating from our enjoyment of material things the elements of unthankfulness and selfishness, it is the true way to purify them for our use (Luk_11:41). To obtain the means of almsgiving, we may profitably part with earthly goods, because we shall thereby provide ourselves with ‘purses which wax not old,’ and raise our hearts, with our treasures, to heaven (Luk_12:33-34). In certain cases, like that of the Rich Young Ruler, it may be needful for a man to sell all and distribute to the poor (Mat_19:21, Mar_10:21, Luk_18:22); while the poor whom we may make our friends by using ‘the mammon of unrighteousness,’ for their benefit, are able, by their grateful prayers for us, to ‘receive us, when *it* (our wealth) has failed us, into the eternal tabernacles’ (Luk_16:1-13 parable of the Unjust Steward). Even trifling alms, given in the name of a disciple, are sure to be rewarded (Mat_10:42). And surely in those words of the Good Samaritan to the innkeeper, ‘Whatsoever thou spendest more, *when* (not, if) I come again I will repay thee’ (Luk_10:35), we must discern the voice of our Lord Himself: since no one but He can be certain either of returning (Jam_4:13), or of ability to reward the ministrations of love. His rewards, when He does come, will surprise some, who did not realize that in ministering to ‘his brethren’ they ministered to Him (Mat_25:37 ff.). On the other hand, for the rich to indulge themselves, and neglect their poor neighbour, is the way for them to Gehenna (Luk_16:19-31 parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus); and the omission of the duty will be a ground of condemnation at the Last Day (Mat_25:45).

Other notices, though less direct, are worth considering, *e.g.* our Lord’s injunction to the Twelve, ‘Freely ye have received, freely give’ (Mat_10:8); His own compassionate feeding of the hungry multitudes (Mat_14:18; Mat_15:32, Mar_6:37; Mar_8:3, Luk_9:13); His rebuke of the Rabbis’ rule, that when sons had rashly or selfishly taken the vow of Corban, they must no longer be suffered to do aught for their father or their mother (Mat_15:5, Mar_7:11); His acceptance of the Jews’ intercession for the Gentile who had built them a synagogue (Luk_7:5); the praise of the women who ministered unto Him of their substance (Luk_8:3); His advice, when we make a feast, to invite the poor (Luk_14:13); and the vow of the penitent Zacchaeus, ‘The half of my goods I give to the poor’ (Luk_19:8). Nor may we omit ‘the words of the Lord Jesus,’ quoted by St. Paul, but preserved by St. Luke (Act_20:35), ‘It is more blessed to give than to receive.’

We do not find in the teaching of our Lord Himself any of those cautions, which are so dear to the present day, against excessive almsgiving; though doubtless St. Paul ‘had the mind of Christ’ (1Co_2:16) when he laid down his rule, ‘If any man *will* not work, neither let him eat’ (2Th_3:10). Not far, at any rate, from this is His parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard (Mat_20:1-16), where Jesus describes God under the figure of a rich and generous householder who gives work and wages (not mere alms) to those who are able to work, asks with surprise of such, ‘Why stand ye here all the day

idle?’ and, on learning it was their misfortune and not their fault, makes them work for the last hour, yet pays them a whole day’s wages.

We have seen how Christ condemns the doing of alms to have glory of men. He exposes also the ugliness of boasting of our giving before God (Luk_18:11 parable of the Pharisee and the Publican); insists that justice, mercy, and truth are of infinitely greater importance than minute scrupulousness in tithing, and lays down the comprehensive principle that, however there may be opportunities for us to do more than we have been explicitly *commanded*, yet we never can do more than we owe to God: ‘When ye have done all, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which it was our duty to do’ (Luk_17:10). Again, by His own example, in the case of the woman of Canaan (Mat_15:21-28), He cuts off another unworthy motive, too often active in our so-called almsgiving, the wish to get rid of a beggar’s importunity; while, both in the case of this woman and of her with the issue of blood (Mat_9:20, Mar_5:25, Luk_8:43), He shows by His own example that true kindness is not indiscriminate, but takes the most careful account, not so much of the immediate and material, as of the ultimate and spiritual benefit which may be done, by its assistance, to the afflicted or the needy. The soul’s wellbeing is higher than the body’s. And, of course, our almsgiving, like all our works, is to be done in subjection to the two commandments which are the standing law of His kingdom, that we love the Lord our God with all our heart and all our mind, and that we love our neighbour as ourself (Mat_22:37 ff. ||).

Literature.—Besides the Commentaries on passages referred to, consult O. Cone, *Rich and Poor in the New Testament*, 112ff.; B. F. Westcott, *Incarnation and Common Life*, 195-208; A. T. Lyttelton, *College and University Sermons*, 256; W. C. E. Newbolt, *Counsels of Faith and Practice*, 227; F. Temple, *Rugby Sermons*, 2nd ser. 7; Pusey, *Sermons*.

James Cooper.

☞ Aloes

ALOES.—We have in the NT only one reference to aloes, Joh_19:39, where Nicodemus brings myrrh and aloes with him, when he joins Joseph of Arimathea in taking away the body of Jesus for burial. In English, ‘aloe’ is used to designate (1) *Aloe vulgaris*, *A. spicata*, etc., of the natural order Liliaceae, from which the medicine known as ‘bitter aloes’ is obtained; (2) *Agave Americana*, or American aloe, of the order Amaryllidaceae, a plant which is noted for its long delay in flowering, and for the rapidity with which it at length puts forth its flowering stalk; and (3) *Aquilæria*

Agallocha, *Aq.* [Note: *Aquila.*] *Seeundaria*, etc., of the order *Aquilariaceae*, from which is obtained the aloes-wood or eagle-wood of commerce. The substance so named is the result of disease occurring in the wood of the tree. To obtain it, the tree has to be split, as it is found in the centre. With this eagle-wood are probably to be identified the aloes of the Bible.

The grounds on which this identification rests are chiefly these:—(1) Under the name ἀγάλλοχον Dioscorides (i. 21) describes an aromatic wood which was imported from India and Arabia, and was not only used for medicinal purposes, but also burned instead of frankincense. Similarly Celsius (*Hierobot.* i. 135 ff.) discusses references of Arab writers to many varieties of *aghâlûji* found in India and Ceylon which gave off, when burned, a sweet fragrance, and which were used as a perfume for the very same purposes as those which ‘aloes’ served among the Jews (Psa 45:8, Pro 7:17, Son 4:14). Quite analogous is the employment of aloes for perfuming the coverings of the dead (Joh 19:39; cf. 2Ch 16:14).

(2) It is practically certain that ἀγάλλοχον and *aghâlûji*, and also the Hebrew אֶלִילִים (*ăhâlim*) and אֶלִילֹת (*ăhâlôth*), are derivatives of the Sanskrit word , of which the term ‘eagle-wood’ is itself a corruption. If this etymology is correct, it indicates that both the name and the commodity were brought from the Far East (cf. אֶלִיל, Sanskrit). The Greek ἀλόη and our own ‘aloe’ may be from the same root.

(3) There was an active trade in spices carried on in ancient times, not only through Phœnicia but also through the Syrian and Arabian deserts, so that there is no great difficulty in supposing that ‘aloes’ were brought from India. These considerations seem to afford sufficient justification for the belief that eagle-wood was the aloes of the Biblical writers.

Hugh Duncan.

⚡Alpha And Omega

ALPHA AND OMEGA.—A solemn designation of divinity, of Jewish origin, peculiar to the Book of Revelation. In Rev 1:8 it is applied to Himself by ‘the Almighty,’ with obvious relation to Exo 3:14 (cf. Exo 3:4) and Isa 41:4; Isa 44:6 (for the LXX Septuagint rendering of אֶלֶף וֶאֱוֶמֶת by παντο by παντοκράτωρ, cf. Amo 3:13; Amo 4:13). In Rev 21:6 also the epithet is applied not to the Son but to the Father,

as shown by the context (cf. Rev 21:3 ‘a voice out of the throne,’ Rev 21:5 ‘He spake that is seated on the throne,’ Rev 21:7 ‘I will be his God and he shall be my son’). In Rev 22:13 it is placed in a derived sense (*i.e.* ‘I, the primary object and ultimate fulfilment of God’s promise’) in the mouth of the glorified Jesus. This transfer of a Divine title to the Son furnishes a problem of great interest for the early development of Christology; for, as R. H. Charles points out (Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible i. p. 70), ‘although in Rev 1:8 [add Rev 21:6] this title is used of God the Father, it seems to be confined to the Son in Patristic and subsequent literature.’

1. *Origin and Significance.*—(a) The simplest and most primary use of this figure, derived as it is from the first and last terms of the alphabet, which with Greeks and Hebrews were also those of numerical notation, is common to several languages. Thus in English we have the expression ‘from A to Z.’ Schoettgen (*Hor. Heb.* i. 1086) adduced from *Jalkut Rubein*, fol. 17. 4, ‘Adam transgressed the whole law from א to ת’; and 48. 4, ‘Abraham kept the law from א to ת.’ As Cremer shows (*Theol. Worterbuch*, p. 1), this has no bearing on the case except linguistically. In *Rub.* 128. 3, God is said to bless Israel from א to ת (because Lev 16:3; Lev 16:16 begins with א and ends with ת), but to curse only from א to ת (because Lev 16:14-34 begins with א and ends with ת). R. H. Charles (.c.) adds examples of this (general) use from Martial (v. 26 and ii. 57) and Theodoret (E [Note: E *Historia Ecclesiastica.*] iv. 8).

(b) In the later, more philosophical, period of Hebrew literature similar expressions are applied to God, as indicative of His omnipresence and eternal existence. God, as the Being *from* whom all things proceed and *to* whom they tend, is thus contrasted in Deutero-Isaiah with heathen divinities (Isa 41:4; Isa 43:10 [cf. Exo 3:14] Isa 44:6; Isa 48:12). Here the best example is the Kabbalistic designation of the Shekinah as אה, according to Buxtorf = ‘principium et finis’ (. Chald. Talm. [Note: Talmud.] *et Rabb.*).

But a threefold designation of God as the Eternal is also employed. The *Jerusalem Targum* on Exo 3:14 so interprets the Divine name (‘qui fuit, est, et erit, dixit mundo’), and the *Targ.* [Note: Targum.] *Jonathan* on Deu 3:29 (‘ego ille est, qui est, et qui fuit, et qui erit’). So also, according to Bousset (*ad Rev 1:4*), *Shemoth R.* iii. f. 105. 2, *Midrash Tillim* 117. 2, *Bereshith R.* on Dan 10:21 (the ‘writing of אה—truth = the seal of God.’ See below). Thus in Heb 2:10 God is both end and *means* of all things (δι’ ὧν, δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα); in Rom 11:36 ‘Of him, *through* him, and unto him are all things’; cf. Rev 1:4.

Instances of expressions of like implication applied to the Deity (ὁ θεός), or to individual divinities, are naturally still more common in Greek philosophical literature, so that, as Justin says (*ad Graecos*, xxv.), ‘Plato, when mystically expressing the attributes of God’s eternity, said, “God is, as the old tradition runs, the end and the middle of all things”; plainly alluding to the Law of Moses.’ The tradition was indeed ‘old’ in Plato’s day, but there are many more probable sources than Exo 3:14 for Plato. We need refer only to the song of the Peleidae at Dodona: Ζεὺς ἦν, Ζεὺς ἔστιν, Ζεὺς ἔσεται (*Paus.* x. 12. 5); and the Orphic saying, Ζεὺς πρῶτος γένετο, Ζεὺς ὕστατος ἀρχικέραυνος, Ζεὺς κεφαλή, Ζεὺς μέσσα, κ.τ.λ. (Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, 521, 523, 530 f.). Similar attributes are applied to Athene and Asclepius in examples quoted by Wetstein. Notoriously the Jewish apologists had been beforehand with Justin Martyr in ascribing to Moses the larger and more philosophical conceptions of Deity enunciated by the philosophers; and from these writings of the period of Revelation and earlier it is possible to demonstrate the existence of a Jewish *kerygma* (formula of missionary propaganda) defining the true nature of the Deity and of right worship, wherein Isa 44:6 ff. with the expression borrowed in Rev 1:8; Rev 21:6, or its equivalent, is the central feature. Josephus (*circa (about) Apion*. ii. 190-198 [ed. Niese]), contrasting the law of Moses on this subject with heathenism, calls it ‘our doctrine (λόγος) concerning God and His worship.’ What he designated ‘the first commandment’ is easily recognizable as part of such a *kerygma*, and seems to be derived from the same Jewish apologist pseudo-Hecataeus (*circa (about) 60* b.c.) whom he quotes in *circa (about) Apion*. i. § 183-204, and ii. 43. It is traceable already in the diatribes against idolatry in the *Ep. of Aristeeas* (132-141) and the *Wisdom of Solomon* (chapters 13-14). The Proœmium of the oldest Jewish Sibyl (*Sib. Or.* v. 7-8, 15) has: ‘There is one God Omnipotent, immeasurable, eternal, almighty, invisible, alone all-seeing, Himself unseen.... Worship Him, the alone existent, the Ruler of the world, who alone is from eternity to eternity.’ It appears again in Christian adaptation in Act 17:24-31 (cf. 14:15-17, 1Th 1:9-10, Rom 1:18-32, Wis 11:23; Wis 13:6; Wis 13:10; Wis 14:12; Wis 14:22-27); in the fragment of the *Kerygma Petri*, quoted in Clem. *Strom.* vi. 5. 39-43 (Frag. 2 and 3 *ap.* Preuschen, *Antileg.* p. 52: εἰς θεός ἐστιν, ὃς ἀρχὴν πάντων ἐποίησεν καὶ τέλους ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, κ.τ.λ.): in the *Apology of Aristides*; Tatian’s *Oration* iv.; Athenagoras, *Leg.* xiii., and the *Ep. to Diogn.* iii. It begins in Josephus: ὅτι θεὸς ἔχει τὰ σύμπαντα παντελῆς καὶ μ ἀκάριος, αὐτὸς αὐτῷ καὶ πᾶσιν ἀτάρακτος, ἀρχὴ καὶ μέσσα καὶ τέλος οὗτος τῶν πάντων—‘He is the beginning and middle and end of all things’ (*circa (about) Apion*. ii. 190).

On the other hand, the apologetic and eschatological literature, which Rabbinic Judaism after the rise of Christian speculation more and more excluded from canonical use, shows a marked tendency to offset these heathen demiurgic ascriptions by similar ones applied not directly to God but to a hypostatized creative Wisdom (Pro 8:22-36, Wis 7:21; Wis 8:1; Wis 9:4; Wis 9:9, Sir 24:9; Sir 24:28, Bar 3:9-37), or to an angelic Being endowed with the same demiurgic attributes (2Es 5:56 to 2Es 6:6).

The statement of Rabbi Kohler (*Jewish Encycl.* i. p. 438) is therefore correct regarding the phrase in Rev 1:8; Rev 21:6 if not in 22:13: ‘This is not simply a paraphrase of Isa 44:6 “I am the first and the last”, but the Hellenized form of a well-known Rabbinical dictum, “The seal of God is *Emet*, which means Truth, and is derived from the letters א מ ת, the first, the middle, and the last letters of the Hebrew alphabet, the beginning, the middle, and the end of all things.” ’ In other words, we must realize the metaphysical development of Jewish theology which had taken place between Deutero-Isaiah and Revelation. The passages adduced by Kohler from Jerus. 69 and . 64, and in particular Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] *Jeb. 12:13a*, Gen. [Note: Geneva NT 1557, Bible 1560.] R [Note: Redactor.] . lxxxi., show the early prevalence of this interpretation of Dan 10:21 ‘I shall show thee what is marked upon the writing of truth (אמת בכחב), as the *signum* of God; for, says Simon hen Lakish, “א is the first, מ the middle, and ת the last letter of the alphabet.” ’ This being the name of God according to Isa 44:6, explained Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] *Sanh. i. 18a*, ‘I am the first [having had none from whom to receive the kingdom]; I am the middle, there being none who shares the kingdom with me; [and I am the last], there being none to whom I shall hand the kingdom of the world.’ It would seem probable, however, considering the connexion with Isa 44:6 (‘first and last,’ the passage is a commonplace of early Christian-Jewish polemic), that the Kabbalistic form אמת is the earlier, the middle term having perhaps been inserted in opposition to Jewish angelological and Christian cosmological speculation. Cf. Rev 11:17; Rev 16:5 with Rev 1:4; Rev 4:8; and 2Es 6:1-6 (where Uriel, speaking in the name of the Creator, says, ‘In the beginning, when the earth was made ... then did I design these things, and they all were through me alone, and through none other: as by me also they shall be ended, and by none other’) with Heb 2:10.

In 1Co 8:6 we have a significant addition to the two-term ascription, ‘One God, the Father, *of* (ἐξ) whom are all things, and we *unto* (εἰς) him.’ St. Paul (or his Corinthian converts) adds, ‘And one Lord Jesus Christ, *through* whom are all things, and we *through* him.’ This addition marks the parting of the ways for Jewish and Christian theology, implying a mediating hypostasis identified with Christ, that is, a

Wisdom-Logos doctrine. That in Rev 1:6; Rev 21:6 the phrase is still applied in the purely Jewish sense to God the Father alone, is placed beyond all doubt by the connected ascriptions, especially ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος (not = ἐσόμενος) connecting Rev 1:8 with Rev 1:4.

Why, and in what sense, the term Α-Ω is applied in Rev 22:12 by the glorified Christ to Himself, is the problem remaining; and this independently of the question of composite authorship; for to the final redactor, whose date can scarcely be later than a.d. 95, there was no incompatibility.

(c) Besides the metaphysical or *cosmological* development, which we have traced in connexion with the Divine title Α-Ω from Deutero-Isaiah through Wisdom and pseudo-Aristeas to its bifurcation in Jewish and Christian theology contemporary with the Book of Revelation, we have a parallel development of *eschatological* character. Jehovah is contrasted with the gods of the heathen in Isa 41:26-27; Isa 42:9; Isa 43:9-10; Isa 44:6-7; Isa 44:26; Isa 45:21; Isa 46:9-10; Isa 48:3; Isa 48:5; Isa 48:12, also, and indeed primarily, as ‘first and last’ in the sense of director of all things to the fulfilment of His predeclared purpose, *i.c. confirmer and fulfiller of His promise of redemption (Isa 44:7)*. And I manifestly the development of this idea of Jehovah as ‘first and last’ in the redemptive or soteriological sense, would be more congenial to Hebrew thought than the metaphysical, although cosmology plays a great and increasing part in apocalyptic literature. In the substitution of ὁ ἐρχόμενος for the anticipated ὁ ἐσόμενος in Rev 1:4; Rev 4:8 (cf. Rev 11:17, Rev 16:5) recalling Mat 11:3 and Heb 10:37, we have evidence of the apocalyptic tendency to conceive of God by preference soteriologically.

But the final redemptive intervention of Jehovah is necessarily conceived as through some personal, human, or at least angelic (Mal 3:1, 2Es 5:56) agency, even when creative and cosmological functions are still attributed to Jehovah directly, without any, or with no more than an impersonal, intermediate agency. Hence, while in Rev 1:8 as in Rev 1:4 and Rev 21:6 Jehovah Himself, ‘the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end,’ is also ὁ ἐρχόμενος, there is no escape for any believer in Jesus from transferring the title in this soteriological sense to Him as Messiah. This will be the case whether his cosmology requires a Logos-doctrine for demiurgic functions, as with St. Paul, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Fourth Evangelist, or not. (The only trace of a true Logos-doctrine is the very superficial touch Rev 19:13 b). Thus in Rev 1:17; Rev 2:8 the Isaian title ‘the first and the last’ is applied to Christ, and in Rev 3:14 He is called ‘the Amen ... the beginning of the creation of God.’ The titles are combined in Rev 22:13, where we should perhaps render

(Benson, *Apocalypse*, 1900, p. 26), 'I, the Alpha and the Omega (am coming), the first and the last, the beginning and the end.' As Hengstenberg maintained (on Rev 1:8), 'In this declaration the Omega is to be regarded as emphatic. It is equivalent to saying, As I am the Alpha, so am I also the Omega. The beginning is surety for the end' (cf. Php 1:6). For this reason it is perhaps also better to connect the words Ναι , Αμην of Rev 1:7 with Rev 1:8 'Verily, verily, I am the Alpha and the Omega' (Terry, *Bibl. Apocalyptics*, 1898, p. 281).

The true sense, and at the same time the origin and explanation of this application of the Divine title, is to be found, as before, in the Epistles of St. Paul. In 2Co 1:20 the promises of God, howsoever many they be, are said all to have their Yea in Christ. And, because this is so, it is further declared, 'the Amen is also through him.' The conception that Christ is the Amen or fulfilment of all the promises of God, as 'heir of all things' and we 'joint heirs with him' (Rom 4:13; Rom 8:17, 1Co 3:22, Heb 1:2, Rev 21:7), is comparatively familiar to us. It represents the significance of the term Ω in the eschatological application. We are much less familiar with the idea expressed in the Α , though it is equally well attested in primitive Christian and contemporary Jewish thought. In Pauline language it represents that the people of Messiah were 'blessed with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places in Christ, inasmuch as God chose them in his person before the foundation of the world ... and foreordained them to be an adoption of sons,' Eph 1:4-5; cf. Isa 44:1-2; Isa 44:7, Wis 18:13, Heb 2:5-10, Rev 21:7, and the doctrine of the apocalyptic writers, Jewish and Christian, that 'the world was created for the sake of man'—resp. 'Israel,' 'the righteous,' 'the Church' (*Assump. Mos.* 1:12-14; 2Es 6:55-59; 2Es 7:10-11; 2Es 9:13; *Hermas, Vis.* ii. 4:1 etc. The doctrine rests on Gen 1:26 f., Psa 8:4-8, Exo 4:22 etc.). Harnack has shown (*History of Dogma*, vol. i. Appendix 1, 'The Conception of Pre-existence') how pre-existence is for the Jewish mind in some sense involved in that of ultimate persistence. The heir 'for whom' all things were created was in a more or less real sense (according to the disposition of the thinker) conceived as present to the mind of the Creator before all things. Thus in Rabbinic phrase Messiah is one of the 'seven pre-existent things,' or His 'soul is laid up in Paradise before the foundation of the world.' Apocalyptic eschatology demanded a representative 'Son,' the 'Beloved,' chosen 'in the beginning' to be head of the 'Beloved' people of 'sons' in the end, with at least as much logical urgency as speculative cosmology demanded an agent of the creation itself. It is this which is meant when St. Paul says that 'however many be the promises of God, they are in Christ Yea.' This is 'the mystery which from all ages hath been hid in God who created all things ... according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus.' In Pauline language, Christ 'the Beloved,' the 'Son of his love,' is the Yea and the Amen of the promises of God. Cosmologically, He is the precreative Wisdom, 'the firstborn of all creation, in whom

all things were created' (cf. Rev 3:14, Pro 8:22). But it is not only that 'he is before all things, and in him all things consist' (cf. Sir 24:9, Wis 1:7), not only that 'all things have been created *through* him,' but also eschatologically '*unto* him' (Col 1:15-17; cf. Heb 1:2-3 and Wis 7:22-27), logically subsequent to Him because made for His sake. In Revelation we have only the latter. The cosmological 'through' Him practically disappears. It is only in the eschatological sense that Christ becomes the original object and the ultimate fulfilment of the Divine purpose and promises, 'the Yea, the Amen,' 'the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end.'

2. *The Later History.*—It is doubtless from Revelation that the use of the term in Patristic literature and Christian epigraphy is mainly derived, though its popularity may well have been partly due to oral currency in Jewish-Christian circles before the publication of Revelation. The eschatological interest is still apparent in the hymn of Prudentius (*Cathem.* ix. 10-12), wherein the first line contains a reference to Psa 45:1 Vulgate ('Eructavit cor meum Verbum bonum'), treated as Messianic by the Fathers—

'Corde natus ex Parentis

Ante mundi exordium

Alpha et Ω cognominatus

Ipsa fons et clausula

Omnium quae sunt, fuerunt

Quaeque post futura sunt.'

But in Clem. Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] (*Strom.* iv. 25 and vi. 16) and Tertullian (*de Monog.* 5) the cosmological predominates. Ambrose (*Expositio in VII visiones*, i. 8) presents a different interpretation. In Gnostic circles speculative and cosmological interpretations are unbridled. Thus Marcus (*ap.* Irenaeus, *Haer.* i. xiv. 6, xv. 1) maintained that Christ designated Himself Α Ω to set forth His own descent as the Holy Ghost on Jesus at His baptism, because by Gematria Α Ω (= 800 +1) and περὶ οὗ (= 80+5+100+10+200+300+5+100+1) are equivalent.

Literature.—For the great mass of later epigraphic material the reader is referred to N. Muller in Herzog-Hauck's *Realencykl.* i. pp. 1-12, and the article 'Monogram' in

Smith and Cheetham's *Dict. of Christian Antiquities*. Besides the works already cited, articles on Λ and Ω may be found in the various Bible Dictionaries and Encyclopaedias. Its use in Rev_1:8; Rev_21:8; Rev_22:13 should be studied in the critical commentaries. On Divine epithets and the doctrine of hypostases see Bousset, *Religion des Judenthums*, iv. chs. 2 and 5 (1903). Older monographs in J. C. Wolfe, *Curae Philolog. et Crit. on Rev_1:8*.

B. W. Bacon.

⚡Alphaeus

ALPHAeus ($\text{\AA}\lambda\phi\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$).—In the NT this name is borne by (1) the father of the Levi who is commonly identified with Matthew the Apostle (Mar_2:14); (2) the father of the second James in the lists of the Apostles (Mat_10:3, Mar_3:18, Luk_6:15, Act_1:13). The desire to connect as many of the Twelve as possible by ties of natural relationship has led some (e.g. Weiss) to identify the two. But in the lists Matthew and James are separated by Thomas in St. Mark and St. Luke; and even in St. Matthew, where one follows the other, there is no note that they were brothers, similar to that attached to the names of the sons of Zebedee.

The identification of (2) with the Clopas of Joh_19:25 rests on two hypotheses: (α) The assumption that as a Mary is given as the mother of James, and consequently as the wife of Alphaeus, she must be the same as Mary the wife of Clopas who stood by the Cross. Jerome (*de Perpet. Virg.* v. 16) adopted this argument. But Mary is a name of far too common occurrence in the NT to make this theory of any value. (β) The alleged derivation of the names Alphaeus and Clopas from a common Aramaic original. But this has not been satisfactorily established: there is even a lack of agreement as to the form of the original. WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] hold that its initial letter would be π , and print $\text{\AA}\lambda\phi\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$ accordingly; but Edersheim quotes the Babylonian Talmud to show that the letter would be κ . Jerome, although predisposed by his view of the Brethren of the Lord in favour of finding the same man under both names, rejects the linguistic identification; and the Syriac versions also represent them by different words. Delitzsch held Alphaeus to be a Grecized form of an Aramaic word, but Clopas and Cleopas to be abbreviations of a Greek name Cleopatros (against this see Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, English translation p. 315 n. [Note: note.]).

Nothing is known of either Alphaeus beyond the name; for such details as that (2) was the brother of Joseph, the reputed father of the Lord, stand or fall with his identification with Clopas to whom they really belong. See art. Clopas, below.

Literature.—Lightfoot, Essay on ‘The Brethren of the Lord’ in his Commentary on *Galatians*, also in *Dissertations on the Apost. Age*, p. 1; Mayor, *The Epistle of St. James*, Introd. p. xxi; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, bk. v. ch. 15; Andrews, *Life of our Lord upon Earth*, 114, 115; Weiss, *Life of Christ*, bk. iv. ch. 7 [English translation].

C. T. Dimont.

Altar

ALTAR (θυσιαστήριον, a word of Hellenistic usage, applied to Jewish altars as distinguished from βωμός, the ordinary word for heathen altars [cf. Exo 34:13, Num 23:1, Deu 7:5, Act 17:23]).—The raised structure on which sacrifices and oblations were presented. As used in the Jewish ritual, the word was applied not only to the great altar of burnt-offering before the temple, but also to the altar of incense within the holy place, and on one or two occasions even to the table of shewbread (cf. Mal 1:7; Mal 1:12, Eze 41:22). When no further specification was added, it denoted the altar of burnt-offering, the altar κατ' ἐξοχήν.

The Jewish altar of Christ's day was the last term of a long development, the history of which remains still in many points obscure. In the primitive Semitic worship it seems that no altar, properly speaking, was in use; unless we choose to give that name to the sacred stone or pillar beside which the victim was slain, and on which the blood or fat of the sacrifice was smeared (cf. 1Sa 14:33; 1Sa 6:14-15, 1Ki 1:9). In such cases the victims were slain (or slain and burnt), not on the sacred stone, but beside it. No doubt the significant part of the offering lay in the smearing of the stone, which was more or less identified with the Deity (Gen 28:18-22), and might thus be considered as both altar and temple. Later the burning of the victim came to be an integral part of the ceremony, and the hearth of burning acquired more importance. The hearth was originally the bare ground, or a rock (Jdg 6:20; Jdg 13:19-20), but later it was artificially formed. In the earliest law (Exo 20:24-26) it was prescribed that the altar should be of earth, or of unhewn stone, and be made without steps, evidently a reversion to a simpler custom than prevailed in many of the Canaanite altars, or in the altars of the high places. That the stone was not to be hewn may also be connected with the primitive idea that the deity which inhabited

the stone might be offended or injured by the dressing. These regulations were respected in a modified degree in the building of the altars of the temple at Jerusalem. The altar built by Ahaz, on an Assyrian model, was probably designed in total disregard of the early prescriptions; but the later altars endeavoured to conform somewhat to the original ideal. Thus the altars of the second temple—both that of Zerubbabel and that built by Judas Maccabaeus—were built of unhewn stone. In all probability there were steps up to the altar of the first temple* [Note: i.e. the altar of Ahaz. For the 'hrazen altar' of Solomon see the daring hypothesis of W. R. Smith (RS, note L), and A. R. S. Kennedy's note in Hastings' DB. i. 76b.] (cf. the altar of Ezekiel's vision [Eze 43:17], which had steps on the eastern side); but the altars of the second temple were ascended by means of a gradual acclivity.

The altar of Herod's temple, though larger than all former altars, preserved their main characteristics. It stood in front of the temple, in the innermost court. It was built of unhewn stone; no iron tool was used in its construction. In this the letter of the law in Exodus was adhered to, while its evident intention was evaded. A new interpretation of the law against the use of hewn stone was given by Jewish tradition in the words of Johanan ben Zakkai: 'The altar is a means of establishing peace between the people of Israel and their Father in heaven; therefore iron, which is used as an instrument of murder, should not be swung over it.' The altar was of huge dimensions. According to Josephus (*BJ* v. 6) it was 15 cubits high and 50 cubits square at the base; according to the more reliable tradition of the Mishna, which enters into precise details, it was 32 cubits square at the base and correspondingly less in height.† [Note: The dimensions given by pseudo-Hecataeus (*Jos. c. Apion. i. 22*)—20 cubits square and 10 cubits high—are not adducible here; they refer to an altar of the second temple. The altar of Ezekiel's vision was 18 cubits square at the base and 11 cubits high. The altar of Solomon, according to 2Ch 4:1, was 20 cubits square at the base and 10 high; dimensions perhaps taken, by the author who inserted them, from the altar of the second temple, with which he was acquainted.] Like the earlier altars, it rose up in a series of terraces or stages, contracting at irregular intervals. (The first landing was a cubit from the ground, and a cubit in breadth; while 5 cubits higher came a second landing). The hearth on the top still measured 24 cubits in length and breadth. The altar-hearth was made accessible to the ministering priests by a structure on the south side, built in the form of a very gradual acclivity, and making a pathway 32 cubits long by 16 broad. Beside this main ascent were small stairs to the several stages of the altar. Round the middle of the entire altar ran a red line as an indication to the priest when he sprinkled with blood the upper and lower parts of the altar. At the southwest corners of the hearth and of the altar's base were openings to carry off the wine of the drink-offerings or the blood sprinkled on the side of the altar. These openings led into a subterranean canal which connected with the Kidron. At the corners of the altar-hearth were projections, called horns. The

supposition that these were a survival of the time when the victims were slain as well as burnt on the altar, and required to be bound upon the hearth, has at least the recommendation of simplicity; but it scarcely explains the peculiar sacredness attached to the altar-horns, or the important part they had in the ritual (1Ki 1:51; 1Ki 2:28, Lev 8:15; Lev 9:9; Lev 16:18; in certain cases they were sprinkled with blood, Exo 29:12, Lev 4:7). The explanation given by Stade and others connects them with the worship of Jahweh as symbolized by a young bull. Northward from the altar was the place of slaughtering, with rings fastened in the ground, to which the animals were tied; it was provided also with pillars and tables for purposes of hanging flaying, and washing. The temple, together with the altar and the place of slaughter, were separated from the rest of the inner court by a wall of partition, a cubit high, to mark off the part reserved for the priests from that free to Israelites generally.

On this great altar the fire was kept burning night and day; it was the centre of the Jewish ritual. On it, morning and evening, was offered the daily burnt-offering in the name of the people, accompanied with meal-offerings and drink-offerings. On the Sabbaths and during the festival days, the public offerings were greatly augmented. Still more vast was the number of private sacrifices which were offered day by day; and on the festival days, when Jerusalem was crowded with worshippers, thousands of priests officiated, and the great altar was scarcely sufficient to burn the masses of flesh that were heaped continuously upon it.

The altar of incense, or the golden altar, stood within the Holy Place. It was of very modest dimensions, and was used chiefly for the offering of incense, which took place twice daily, in the morning before the burnt-offering, and in the evening after it.

Besides an incidental mention of the altar (Mat 23:35, Luk 11:51), there are two pregnant sayings of Christ in the Gospels where the altar is concerned. In the first (Mat 5:23-24) He opposes to the mere externalism of the altar-worship the higher claims of brotherhood, teaching that what God requires is mercy and not sacrifice. In the other (Mat 23:18-20) He exposes the puerility of the distinction made, in swearing, between the altar and the gift upon it. It was by such miserable casuistry that the scribes and Pharisees evaded the most solemnly assumed obligations.

Literature.—Benzinger's and Nowack's *Heb. Arch.* (Index, s.v. 'Altar'); Josephus, *BJ* v. 6, and *c. Apion.* i. 22; *Mishna, Middoth* iii. 1-4; Schenkel, *Bibellexicon*, 'Brandopferaltar'; Lightfoot, *The Temple Service*; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii. i. 24; Wellhausen. *Prolegomena* ('Die Opfer'), and *Reste des Arab.* [Note: Arabic.] *Heidenthums*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 101 f.; W. R. Smith, *RS* [Note: S Religion of the Semites.] (Index, s.v. 'Altar'); Perrot and Chipiez, *Histoire de l'Art* (English translation , sections on

Phoenicia and Judaea). See also Lightfoot (J. B.), 'Essay on the Chr. Ministry' in *Phil.* [Note: Philistine.] pp. 251, 261, 265, and in *Dissertations*, pp. 217, 229, 234; Westcott (B. F.), *Hebrews*, pp. 453-461.

J. Dick Fleming.

Am ha'arez

AM HA'AREZ (אִמְ הָאָרֶז) means literally 'the people of the land.'

Sometimes—particularly in later books of OT—it is found in the plural 'ë hâ'ârez or 'ë hâ'ârâzôth. Its use in the time of Christ indicates the following development:—From being (1) applied to the ordinary inhabitants of the land (Gen 23:7; Gen 23:12-13) or to the people at large as a body (2Ki 11:14; 2Ki 11:18-20; 2Ki 15:5; 2Ki 16:15; 2Ki 21:24 etc.), the term came (2) to be used to designate the common people as distinguished from the king, princes, priests, etc. (Jer 44:21, Hag 2:4, Zec 7:5), and (3) like 'pagan' from , was applied to those remote from or untouched by the culture (particularly religious culture) of the time, till it became (4) finally, an expression of contempt meaning 'uncultured,' 'rude,' 'barbarous,' 'irreligious,' applied to a certain class or even to a member of that class. To the 'hâ'ârez the Pharisees directly refer in Joh 7:49 'This multitude which knoweth not the Law are accursed.'

The origin of this cleavage is found in the OT. At the Exile we are told 'none were left save the very poor of the people of the land' (2Ki 24:14 אִמְ הָאָרֶז עִם רַלְחָ). These mingled with the neighbouring non-Israelites and perhaps also with the settlers from Assyria, intermarrying with them, and probably adopting their customs. Hence at the Return both Ezra and Nehemiah demanded a complete separation (Ezr 9:1; Ezr 9:12, Neh 10:28-31) between the returned exiles who observed the Law strictly, and those settlers who constituted 'the people of the land.'

This idea developed and led to the formation of a party called 'Separatists,' *Hăsidim* or *Pěrûshim* (Aram. [Note: Aramaic.] *Pěrishayyâ*); see art. 'Pharisees' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. p. 826b), who regarded all contact with the vulgar crowd ('*am hâ'ârez*) as defiling, observed a strict *régime* of ceremonial purity, and called each other *hâbçr* (i.e. 'brother'). The '*am hâ'ârez* was the antithesis of the *hâbçr*, outside the pale of this higher Judaism, poor, ignorant of the Law, despised. In Rabbinical literature, where he is always regarded as a Jew, many definitions of the '*am hâ'ârez* are given. Thus in the Talmud (*Berakhôth 47b*) he is described as one 'who does not give his tithes regularly,' or 'who does not read the Shema morning and evening,' or 'who does not wear *těphillim*,' or 'who has no *mězûzâh* on his

doorposts,' or 'who fails to teach his children the Law,' or 'who has not associated with the learned.' Montefiore in his *Hibbert Lectures* denies that such sharp cleavage between the *Hāsīdim* and the 'am hâ'ârez ever existed save in the minds of later Rabbis who had difficulty in defining 'am hâ'ârez, and consequently he questions the authenticity of Joh 7:49, but on insufficient grounds. A great gulf and much bitterness existed between the two. A Pharisee would not accept the evidence of an 'am hâ'ârez as a witness, nor give him his daughter in marriage. Even the touch of the garment of an 'am hâ'ârez was defiling; and Lazarus (*Ethics of Judaism*) quotes a saying, 'An 'am hâ'ârez may be killed on the Sabbath of Sabbaths, or torn like a fish.' This can hardly be taken literally; yet it illustrates the feeling which doubtless prevailed in the time of Christ towards the 'am hâ'ârez. The mind of Jesus triumphed over this narrow spirit. In these poor despised outcasts He saw infinite possibilities for goodness. They were the objects of His special care. To them had the Father sent Him, for at the very worst they were only 'the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Mat 10:6).

Literature.—*Jewish Encyclopedia* (art. 'Am-haaretz'); Schürer, *GJV* [Note: *JV* Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ii. 40 [English *HJP* [Note: *JP* History of the Jewish People.] ii. ii. 22]; Weher, *Jud. Theol.*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (Index, s. 'Am haarez'); Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i. 85; Wunsche, *Der Bab.* [Note: Babylonian.] *Talm.* [Note: Talmud.] ii. i. 295; Lazarus, *Ethics of Judaism*, English translation i. Appendix, note 48^a, 258; C. G. Montefiore, *Hibbert Lectures*, 1892, 'Origin and Growth of Hebrew Religion,' pp. 497-502; Rosenthal, *Vier Apokryphische Bücher*, pp. 25-29; Hamburger, *RE* [Note: *E* Realencyklopädie.] ii. 54-56.

G. Gordon Stott.

Amazement

AMAZEMENT.—The interest of this word to students of the Gospels is twofold, and arises out of its employment, on the one hand, as one of the terms used to express the effect upon the people of our Lord's supernatural manifestation, and on the other, in one unique instance, to describe an emotion which tore the heart of the God-man Himself.

The nominal form, ‘amazement,’ is of rare occurrence in EV (only Act 3:10, 1Pe 3:6 [for πτόησις] in AV; Mar 5:42, Luk 4:36; Luk 5:26, Act 3:10 in RV); the passive verb, ‘to be amazed,’ occurs not infrequently in the narrative books of NT (rarely in OT. e.g. Exo 15:15). They are especially characteristic of the Synoptic Gospels, and are currently employed in their narratives, along with several kindred terms, to describe the impression made by our Lord’s wonderful teaching and His miraculous works. In the AV they translate in these narratives a number of Gr. words: θάμβος, θαμβέομαι, ἐκθαμβέομαι; ἔκστασις, ἐξίσταμαι; ἐκπλήσσομαι. But the RV, studying greater uniformity of rendering, omits ἐκπλήσσομαι from this list, and makes ‘amazement,’ ‘to be amazed,’ the stated representatives of the other two groups [exceptions are: Mar 16:8 where ἔκστασις is rendered ‘astonishment’; Act 3:10 f. where θάμβος, ἐκθαμβέομαι are represented by ‘wonder’: passages like Mar 3:21, 2Co 5:13, and again Act 10:10; Act 11:15; Act 22:17 are, of course, not in question]. To ἐκπλήσσομαι it uniformly assigns ‘astonish,’ ‘astonishment’; and to the accompanying terms of kindred implications similarly appropriate renderings: ‘to θαυμάξω (ἐκθαυμάζω, Mar 12:17) generally ‘to marvel’ (but ‘to wonder,’ Mat 15:31, Luk 2:18; Luk 4:22; Luk 24:12; Luk 24:41, also Act 7:31), and to φοβέομαι (φόβος Mat 14:26, Mar 4:41, Luk 5:26; Luk 7:16; Luk 8:37; cf. ταράσσω Mat 14:26, Mar 6:50, τρόμος Mar 16:8, τρεφίω Mar 5:33, Luk 8:47) ‘to be afraid,’ varied to ‘to fear.’ The constant recurrence in the Synoptic narrative of one or another of these terms as a comment upon the effect of our Lord’s teaching or works, imparts to the reader a vivid sense of the supernaturalness of His manifestation and of the deep impression which it made as such on the people.

Sometimes it appears to have been the demeanour or bearing of our Lord which awoke wonder or struck with awe (Mat 27:14 || Mar 15:5, Mar 9:15; Mar 10:32; cf. Luk 2:48). Sometimes the emotion was aroused rather by the tone of His teaching, as, with His great ‘I say unto you’ He ‘taught them as having authority, and not as the scribes’ (Mar 1:22 || Luk 4:32, Mat 7:28; cf. Mar 11:18, Mat 22:33). At other times it was more distinctly what He said, the matter of His discourse, that excited the emotions in question—its unanticipated literalness, or its unanticipatable judiciousness, wisdom, graciousness, or the radical paradox of its announcements (Luk 2:47-48; Luk 4:22; Mat 13:54 || Mar 6:2; Joh 7:15; Mat 19:25 || Mar 10:28; Mat 22:22 || Mar 12:17, Luk 20:26). Most commonly, however, it was one of His wonderful works which brought to the spectators the dread sense of the presence of the supernatural (Luk 5:9; Mar 1:27 || Luk 4:38; Mar 2:12 || Luk 5:26, Mat 9:8; Luk 7:18; Luk 11:14 || Mat 12:23; Mat 8:27 || Mar 4:41, Luk 8:25; Mar 5:15 ||

Luk 8:32; Luk 8:37; Mar 5:30; Mar 5:33; Mar 5:42 || Luk 8:35; Mat 9:33; Mar 6:51; Joh 6:19, || Mat 14:26; Mar 7:37; Luk 9:43; Mat 21:20), and filled the country with wonder (Mat 15:31).

The circle affected, naturally, varies from a single individual (Mar 5:33), or the few who happened to be concerned (Luk 2:48; Luk 5:9), or the body of His immediate followers (Mat 17:8; Mar 10:24; Mar 10:26; Mat 19:25; Mat 21:20), up to a smaller or larger assemblage of spectators (Luk 2:17; Luk 4:22; Mar 1:22 || Luk 4:32; Mar 1:27 || Luk 4:36; Mar 2:12; Luk 7:16; Luk 8:25; Luk 8:37; Mar 5:42; Mat 13:54; Mar 6:51; Joh 6:19 || Mat 14:26; Mar 6:50; Mar 7:27; Luk 9:43; Mar 16:8; Mat 22:22 || Mar 12:17; Luk 20:26). These spectators are often expressly declared to have been numerous: they are described as ‘the multitudes’ or ‘all the multitudes,’ ‘all the people of the country,’ or quite generally, when not a single occasion but a summary of many is in question, ‘great multitudes’ (Mat 9:8 || Luk 5:26; Mat 7:28; Mat 12:23; Luk 11:14; Luk 8:35 || Mar 5:15; Mar 8:20; Mat 9:33; Mat 15:31; Mar 9:15; Joh 7:15; Mar 11:18; Mat 22:33).

The several terms employed by the Evangelists to describe the impression on the people of these supernatural manifestations, express the feelings natural to man in the presence of the supernatural. In their sum they leave on the reader’s mind a very complete sense of the reality and depth of the impression made. Their detailed synonymy is not always, however, perfectly clear, the student will find discriminating discussions of the two groups of terms which centre respectively around the notions of ‘wonder’ and ‘fear’ in J. H. Heinrich Schmidt’s well-known *Synonymik der griechischen Sprache*, at Nos. 168 and 139. It will probably suffice here to indicate very briefly the fundamental implication of each term in its present application.

Θαυμάζω is a broad term, primarily expressing the complete engagement of the mind with an object which seizes so powerfully upon the attention as to compel exclusive occupation with it. It is ordinarily used in a good sense, and readily takes on the implication of ‘admiration’; but it often occurs also when the object contemplated arouses internal opposition and displeasure. What it always implies is that its object is remarkable, extraordinary, beyond not so much expectation as ready comprehension, and therefore irresistibly engages attention and awakens ‘wonder.’ It does not import ‘surprise,’ but rather, if you will, ‘curiosity,’ or better, ‘interestedness.’ In this it separates itself from θαμβέομαι, in which the notion of ‘unexpectedness’ is, at least originally, inherent.

This latter term gives expression to the sense of mental helplessness which oppresses us on the occurrence of an unanticipated and astonishing phenomenon. The affection of the mind it suggests is one of mingled admiration and fear; and in the usage of the

word this passes both downward into ‘consternation,’ strengthened to ‘fright’ and ‘terror,’ and upward into ‘awe’ and ‘veneration.’ In the LXX Septuagint the lower senses are predominant (e.g. Sir 12:5, Son 3:8; Son 6:3 [Son 6:4] Son 8:10, Eze 7:18; 1Ki 14:15, 2Sa 7:15, Wis 17:3, Dan 8:17-18; 1Ma 6:8, Dan 7:7, Sir 30:9). In the Evangelical passages now before us, on the other hand, the higher senses come forward, and the idea expressed lies near to ‘awe,’ and the term comes thus into close synonymy with φοβέομαι.

The notion of ‘surprise’ which underlies θαμβεομαι seems to be much more prominent in ἐξίσταμαι. This term, broad enough to be applied to any ‘derangement,’ bodily or mental, was particularly employed, with or without a defining adjunct, to describe that aberration of the mind, the subjects of which in English too we speak of simply as ‘demented’ (2Co 5:13). In its more ordinary usage the implication is no more than that the subject is thrown out of his normal state into a condition of ‘ecstasy,’ or extreme emotion,—the emotion in question being of varied kind, but more commonly an ‘amazement’ which carries with it at least a suggestion of perplexity, if not of bewilderment.

When this ‘surprise’ rises to its height, however, especially if it is informed with alarm, the appropriate term to express it would seem to be ἐκλήσσομαι, although this term is used so frequently for purely intellectual effects arising from intellectual causes, that it falls readily into the sense of pure ‘astonishment.’ Nevertheless, the element of ‘alarm’ inherent in it places it among the synonyms of φοβέομαι, from which it differs as a sudden access of fright differs from an abiding state of fear, or as, in connexions like those at present engaging our attention, to be ‘awestruck’ differs from the continuous sense of ‘awful reverence’ which prompts to withdrawal from the dread presence.

The same fundamental emotion of fear which finds its most natural expression in φοβέομαι is more rarely given expression also in such terms as ταρασσω, the basal implication of which is ‘agitation,’ ‘perturbation,’ passing on into the ‘disquietude,’ on the one side, of that ‘troubled worry’ the extreme of which is expressed by ἀδημονέω, and on the other into that terrified ‘consternation’ which finds its extreme expression in πτοέομαι (Luk 24:37): or as τρέυω, which in its application to the trembling of the mind—to mental ‘shivering’—draws near to the notions of ‘anxiety’ and ‘horror.’

The emotions signalized as called out by the manifestation of Jesus in His word and work, it will be seen, run through the whole gamut of the appropriate responses of the human spirit in the presence of the supernatural. Men, seeing and hearing Him, wondered, were awestruck, amazed, astonished, made afraid, with a fear which disquieted their minds and exhibited itself in bodily trembling. The confusion by RV under the common rendering ‘amaze,’ ‘amazement’ of two of these groups of terms (θάμβος, θαμβέομαι, ἔκθαμβος, ἐκθαμβέομαι, and ἔκστασις, ἐξίσταμαι), seems scarcely to do justice to the distinctive implications of either, and especially fails to mark the clear note of the higher implication of ‘awe’ that sounds in the former. The interest of noting how completely the notion of ‘surprise,’ originally present in θάμβος, has in usage retired into the background in favour of deeper conceptions, is greatly increased by the employment of the strengthened form of the verb ἐκθαμβέομαι by St. Mark (14:33) to describe an element in our Lord’s agony in Gethsemane.

When St. Matthew (Mat 26:37) tells us that Jesus ‘began to be sorrowful (λυπεῖσθαι) and sore troubled’ (ἀδημονεῖν), St. Mark, varying the phraseology, says (in the RV) that He ‘began to be greatly amazed (ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι) and sore troubled (Mar 14:33).’ Surely the rendering ‘amazed,’ however, misses the mark here: the note of the word, as a parallel to ἀδημονεῖν and λυπεῖσθαι, is certainly that of anguish not of unexpectedness, and the commentators appear, therefore, to err when they lay stress on the latter idea. The usage in the LXX, both of the word itself (Sir 30:9, where also, oddly enough, it is paralleled with λυπέω) and of its cognates, seems decisively to suggest a sense for it which will emphasize not the unexpectedness of our Lord’s experience, but its dreadfulness, and will attribute to our Saviour on this awful occasion, therefore, not ‘surprise,’ but ‘anguish and dread,’ ‘depression and alarm’ (J. A. Alexander), or even ‘inconceivable awe’ (Swete).

The difficulty of the passage, let it be remarked, is not a dogmatic, but an exegetical one. There is no reason why we should not attribute to the human soul of the Lord all the emotions which are capable of working in the depths of a sinless human spirit (cf. J. A. Alexander’s excellent note on Mar 8:10 and Swete’s on Mar 6:6). But certainly the employment of the verb ἐκθαμβέομαι here by St. Mark affords no warrant for thinking of the agony of Gethsemane as if it exceeded the expectation of our Lord, and as if it consisted in large part of the surprise and perplexity incident upon discovering it to be worse than He had anticipated (cf. the otherwise admirable note of Dr. Swete, *in loc.*—‘long as He had foreseen the Passion, when it came clearly into view its terrors exceeded His anticipations’; A. J. Mason, *The Conditions of our Lord’s Life on Earth*, pp. 135-138—‘when the hour came, it exceeded all His expectations’). On the contrary, the usage of the word combines with the context here to suggest that its whole force is absorbed in indicating the depths of soul-agony through which

our Lord was called upon to pass in this mysterious experience. On the terms employed, the note of Pearson, *On the Creed*, ed. 1835, p. 281; ed. New York, 1847, pp. 288-289, is still worth consulting.

In studying the emotional life of our Lord's human spirit during His life on earth, as it is exhibited to us in the Gospel narratives, nothing in point of fact is more striking than the richness of the vocabulary by means of which He is pictured to us as the 'man of sorrows and acquainted with grief,' and the slenderness of the suggestion that He may have been subject to the surprises which constitute so large an element in the lives of mere men. So far as the explicit assertions of the Evangelic narratives go, it would seem that the unexpected never happened to Jesus. Neither surprise, nor astonishment, nor amazement, nor suspense, nor embarrassment, nor perplexity, nor distraction, is ever, in so many words, attributed to Him. Those who would discover in the narratives, nevertheless, some ground for supposing that He may have experienced these emotions (e.g. A. J. Mason, *The Conditions of our Lord's Life on Earth*, pp. 135-138; T. Adamson, *Studies of the Mind in Christ*, pp. 11, 12, 167: and in its extremity, E. A. Ahbott, *Philomythus*, on which see *Southern Presbyterian Review*, Oct. 1884, 'Some Recent Apocryphal Gospels,' p. 733 ff.), must needs depend on an inferential method, the inconclusiveness of which has been repeatedly pointed out of old, as, for example, by Augustine (e.g. *circa (about) Faust, Manich.* xxii. 13), who remarks upon its equal applicability to the anthropomorphisms of the OT.

'Wonder' (Authorized Version ; Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'marvelling'), to be sure, is attributed to Jesus on two occasions (Mat 8:10, Luk 7:9, Mar 6:6). But the term used ($\theta\alpha\upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$) is on both occasions precisely that one which least of all implies 'surprise,' which declares its object rather extraordinary than unexpected. ' $\theta\alpha\upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$,' remarks Schmidt (*op. cit.* p. 184), 'is perfectly generally "to wonder" or "to admire," and is distinguished from $\theta\alpha\mu\beta\epsilon\iota\nu$ precisely as the German *sich wundern* or *bewundern* is from *staunen*; that is, what has specially seized on us is in the case of $\theta\alpha\upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$ the extraordinary nature of the thing, while in the case of $\theta\alpha\mu\beta\epsilon\iota\nu$ it is the unexpectedness and suddenness of the occurrence.' All that needs be imported by these passages is that the circumstances adverted to were in themselves remarkable; and that Jesus recognized, felt, and remarked upon their remarkableness,—in the one instance with the implication of admiration, in the other with that of reprobation. That the circumstances which called out His sense of the incongruity in the situations He remarks upon were unanticipated by our Lord, and therefore when observed struck Him with a shock of surprise, we are not told.

Benjamin B. Warfield.

⚠️ Ambassage

AMBASSAGE.—This term is used in Luk_14:32 (Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) and in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 of Luk_19:14 (more accurately instead of Authorized Version ‘message’). The Greek is *πρεσβεία*. Both in the original and the translation the abstract is used for the concrete; a term meaning the office or message of an ambassador or body of ambassadors for the ambassadors themselves.

The formation of the word is not fully explained. The earlier form both in English and French was *ambassade*. The French suffix *-age* (= Lat. *-aticum*) is usually found in words transferred from France, but sometimes it was added to English words. *Ambassage* seems to be an exception to both. It may be either a formation from a French root or a softening of *ambassade* by the influence of analogy. The word was accented by some on the first syllable, by others on the second. An alternative spelling was *embassage*. Both forms are obsolete, being supplanted by *embassy*, the direct equivalent of *ambassade*.

In Luk_14:26-35 Jesus is speaking of discipleship and the necessary condition of entire surrender to spiritual authority. And He gives in illustration the parable which teaches the folly of entering on an enterprise without counting the cost. A prince who has provoked to war a superior power will do well to send an ambassage to sue for peace—peace without honour. The man whose force of character is not able to withstand and overcome the worldly obstacles, must in some form or other make compromise with the worldly powers. He is not lit for the kingdom of God. (For other interpretations see Trench and the Commentators).

The second occurrence (Luk_19:14) is in the parable of the Pounds; not in the main part, which bears resemblance to the parable of the Talents, but in one of two verses (Luk_19:14; Luk_19:27) directed to a subsidiary aspect of the situation. While the servants of the distant dignitary are, in his absence, carrying out instructions and using opportunities, a section of his subjects resolve to cast off his authority. To this effect they send an embassy. When he returns he rewards the faithful and executes punishment on the disloyal. The application is to the Second Coming of the Lord.

The term *πρεσβεία* (from *πρέσβυς*, ‘old’) belongs to classical Greek, and it contains an expression of the rule that responsible duties of statecraft are naturally entrusted to approved elders and heads of families. St. Paul uses the corresponding verb in 2Co_5:20, where he describes the Christian preachers as ‘ambassadors for Christ,’ and

in Eph 6:20 the idea is repeated. Perhaps we may connect the occurrence of *προεσβεία* in the Thud Gospel with St. Luke's apparent preference of 'presbyter' to 'bishop' (Act 20:17), and his repeated use of *presbyterion* for the body of Jewish elders (Luk 22:60, Act 4:5; Act 22:5). For the terms are expressive of dignity, and in St. Luke's literary style a sense of dignity is clearly shown.

It is further notable that commentators are able to refer the suggestion of both these parables to contemporary history. The former corresponds with the struggle between Antipas and his father-in-law, Hareth, king of Arabia; the latter is illustrated by Herod, by Archelaus, and by Antipas, each of whom went to Rome to obtain an enhancement of power. But details apply to the case of Archelaus, who put his friends in command of cities, and against whom the Jews sent to the emperor an embassy of fifty men (Josephus *Ant.* xvii. xi. 1).

R. Scott.

☞ Ambition

AMBITION.—The word 'ambition' is not found in the Authorized Version or Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, but the propensity signified is, of course, represented in the New Testament. Its derivation is Latin [*ambi*, 'about,' and *ire, itum*, 'to go'], meaning *a going about in all directions*, especially with a view to collecting votes. It thus means to have *such a desire as to make one go out of one's way to satisfy it*, and, in a secondary sense, denotes the object which arouses such desire and effort. As a psychological fact, Ambition may be defined as a natural spring of action which makes for the increment of life. Ethically speaking, it takes its colour from the object towards which it is directed. In ordinary use it implies blame; but in true Christianity, where the utmost is given for the highest, it is otherwise.

In the Epistles the verbs *διώκω*, *σπουδάζω*, *ζητέω* are used figuratively for this propensity (Php 3:12, 2Pe 3:14, Rom 10:3); but perhaps a nearer synonym is *ζηλόω* with its corresponding substantive *ζήλος* (as in 1Co 14:1; 1Co 14:12; 1Co 14:39, cf. Weymouth's *NT in Modern Speech*), though *ζήλος* in a good sense is generally translated 'zeal,' and in a bad sense 'jealousy,' both words being of rather broader significance than 'ambition.'

It is in accordance with the literary characteristics of the Gospel narratives that such an abstract idea as *ambition* can be found only under some picturesque phrase, e.g.

‘lamp of the body’ (Mat 6:22-23), ‘food’ (Joh 4:34). ‘To cut off the right hand’ or ‘to pluck out the right eye’ is the expression used by our Lord for destroying one’s dearest ambition, whether it is controlling one’s energies or directing one’s imagination (Mar 9:43 f., cf., as Trench points out, the use of ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρὸς [Mat 6:23, Mar 7:22] for ‘envy’).

But although there is no explicit reference to Ambition in the NT, it is so characteristic a fact of human nature that a large part of the teaching of Christ might be exhibited in relation to it. And because it is capable of being bent towards lofty as well as sinister, or at least selfish ends, Christian ethics seems from one point of view to be the exaltation of Ambition, from another its deposition.

1. *For Ambition.*—Christ’s method was to use the fact of Ambition and purify it by exercising it on the highest objective. The call to the first disciples was an appeal to their ambition for a higher life: ‘Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men’ (Mat 4:19). He gave primacy to an ambition for the ends of the Kingdom over all worldly ambitions in the words: ‘Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness’ (Mat 6:33). He compared the earnestness of true followers with the ambition of a pearl-merchant (Mat 13:45), and encouraged the religious ambition of the young ruler by trying to turn it into a new and deeper channel (Mat 19:21): ‘If thou wouldest be perfect, sell ... give ... and thou shalt have treasure in heaven.’ It was part of His teaching to set before His disciples a prize to aim at (Luk 22:29-30, Mat 5:13-14, Joh 12:26); and He expected them to go out of their way in devotion, and to all lengths in fidelity (Luk 9:62; Luk 14:26 f., Luk 19:15-19, Mat 25:14-23), in order to win the truest praise and most lasting success. ‘The Christian moral reformation may indeed be summed up in this—humanity changed from a restraint to a motive’ (*Ecce Homo*).

2. *Against Ambition.*—But it may with equal truth be said that the aim of the life and teaching of Christ was to depose Ambition from its ruling place. He was always rebuking (1) inordinate desires for any kind of selfish satisfaction, whether they were associated with *greed* (Joh 6:27 ‘food that perisheth’; Luk 6:24, and esp. Luk 12:15-21) or with *pride* (Mat 6:1-4 ‘glory of men,’ Mat 20:25-28 ‘lord it,’ Mat 23:5-12 ‘seen of men and called Rabbi’); or (2) even a high-placed desire if it was held thoughtlessly and without counting the cost (Luk 14:28-33 the builder and the king who failed in their ambition; Mar 10:35-40 the sons of Zebedee who ‘knew not what they asked’). Moreover, Christ cut away the very tap-root of Ambition by turning self out of its place at the seat of the motives of life, in favour of a living trust in the Father and an undivided allegiance to Himself. The virtues which are most prominent in the Christian ideal leave no room at all for Ambition in the generally accepted use of the word. For Christianity demands *humility* (Mat 5:3 etc.,

Luk 14:7-11 etc., Joh 13:12-15), *generosity* (Mar 12:43-44, Luk 6:30-31; Luk 12:33 etc.), and *self-renouncement* (Mat 10:38-39, Mar 10:29-30, Joh 12:24-26).

On the whole, the influence of Christ's teaching and inspiration on Ambition has been not to extirpate it, but to control and chasten it by the discovery and establishment of other standpoints, such as the outlook of other-worldliness, the sense of brotherhood, and personal allegiance to Himself.

Literature.—Lightfoot (J. B.), *Cambridge Sermons*, 217; Moore (A. L.), *Advent to Advent*, 239; Shedd (W. G. T.), *Sermons to the Spiritual Man*, 371; Mozley (W. B.), *University Sermons*, 262.

A. Norman Rowland.

☩ Amen

AMEN.—Like the Greek ἀμήν, this is practically a transliteration of the Heb. אָמֵן, which itself is a verbal adjective connected with a root signifying make firm, establish. In the last instance, and as we are concerned with it, it is an indeclinable particle. Barth treats it as originally a substantive (= 'firmness,' 'certainty'). For the derivation, cf. our English 'yes,' 'yea,' which is also connected with an old verbal root of similar significance.

As a formula of solemn confirmation, asseveration and assent, it was established in old and familiar usage amongst the Jews in the time of our Lord. Its function is specially associated with worship, prayer, the expression of will and desire, the enunciation of weighty judgments and truths. For modes in which Amen is used may be distinguished—(1) *Initial*, when it lends weight to the utterance following. (2) *Final*, when used by the speaker himself in solemn confirmation of what precedes. (3) *Responsive*, when used to express assent to the utterance of another, as in prayers, benedictions, oaths, etc. (4) *Subscriptional*, when used to mark the close of a writing, but hardly amounting to much more than a peculiar variant of 'Finis.'

The subscriptional Amen requires but a brief notice. No instance of it is found in the OT; and as regards the closing Amen in the several Scriptures of the NT there is for the most part a lack of textual authority. The Authorized Version, following the TR [Note: R Textus Receptus.], in most instances has it; the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 in most instances omits it. Where it is found, in the Epistles and the Apocalypse, it is rather due to the fact that these writings close with a doxology,

prayer, or benediction. The variations of authority in such cases seem to a large extent capricious: else why. e.g., Amen at the end of 1 Corinthians and not at the end of 2 Corinthians? The closing Amen in each of the Gospels, though without authority, is a genuine instance of the subscriptional use of later times. This use has a further curious illustration in the practice of copyists of MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] who wrote 99 at the end of their work, this being the total numerical value of the characters in ἀμήν. For the purposes of the present article it will be necessary to examine the whole Biblical usage of 'Amen.'

1. *Amen in the OT.*—The formula is found in (a) the Pentateuch (Num 5:22, Deuteronomy 27 *passim*) as a ritual injunction (LXX Septuagint γένοιτο throughout). (b) In 1Ki 1:36, 1Ch 16:36, Neh 5:13, Jer 11:5; Jer 28:6 it is mentioned as being actually used (LXX Septuagint in 1Ki 1:36 γένοιτο οὕτως, Jer 28:6 ἀληθῶς, elsewhere ἀμήν). (c) In the Psalms (Psa 41:13; Psa 72:19; Psa 89:52; Psa 106:48) we meet with its liturgical use (LXX Septuagint γένοιτο). The most common equivalent for Amen in the LXX Septuagint is γένοιτο; and with this may be compared St. Paul's familiar μὴ γένοιτο, the negative formula of dissent and deprecation.

No clear instance of the use of an *initial* Amen occurs. Hogg thinks we have such in 1Ki 1:36, Jer 11:5; Jer 28:6; but in each of these cases it will be found that the Amen is a *responsive* assent to something that precedes. It is true that the LXX Septuagint rendering in Jer 28:6 (ἀληθῶς) shows that the translators were inclined to regard this as an instance of an initial Amen; but even here the term is really an ironical response to the false prophecy of Hananiah in Jer 28:2-4. Almost all the instances, indeed, in which Amen is met with in the OT are examples of the responsive use; the only considerable instances of the *final* use being found at the end of each of the first three divisions of the Psalter. In the Apocrypha we have further instances of the responsive Amen in Tob 8:8 and in Jdt 13:20; Jdt 15:10 (Authorized and Revised Versions in the latter book renders 'So be it'). The doubled formula ('Amen, Amen,' cf. Jdt 13:20) thus used is naturally explained as an expression of earnestness. It may here be added that among the Jews at a much later period Amen has a responsive and desiderative use in connexion with every kind of expression of desire and felicitation; e.g. 'May he live to see good days: Amen!'

2. *Amen in the Gospels.*—We must set aside the instances of *subscriptional* Amen (see above) as without authority. In Mat 6:13 some ancient authorities support the conclusion of the Lord's Prayer with doxology and Amen; but it can hardly be doubted that Amen here, along with the doxology which it closes, is not original, but due to

liturgical use (see ‘Notes on Select Readings’ in Westcott-Hort’s *NT in Greek, ad loc.*). In all the other instances in the Gospels it is the *initial* Amen that is found, given always and only as a *usus loquendi* of Christ in the formula, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν (σοι), according to the Synoptists, and ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν (σοι), according to St. John.

Now, whilst final Amen as a formula of conclusion or response remains unaltered throughout in NT in the various versions, it is of interest to notice the different ways in which this initial Amen is treated. The Vulgate, e.g., invariably keeps the untranslated form, and reads *Amen* (or *Amen, Amen*) *dico vobis*. The modern Greek equivalent is ἀληθῶς (ἀληθῶς ἀληθῶς); and with this accords our Authorized and Revised Versions ‘Verily,’ and also Luther’s *Wahrlich*. And, indeed, among the Synoptists themselves there are indications that an initial Amen has sometimes been replaced by another term. This is specially so in the case of St. Luke, who has only 6 instances of ἀμὴν as against 30 in St. Matthew, , 13 in St. Mark. We have, e.g., ναὶ in [Luk_11:51](#) for ἀμὴν in the parallel [Mat_23:36](#); ἀληθῶς in [Luk_9:27](#) (cf. [Mat_16:28](#), [Mar_9:1](#)). All this goes to show that this use of Amen on the part of Jesus was quite a peculiarity.

The very λέγω ὑμῖν alone would have been noticeable as a mode of assertion: the addition of ἀμὴν does but intensify this characteristic, as an enforcement and corroboration of the utterances that are thus prefaced. The Heb. אָמֵן, which in our Lord’s time was usual only in responses, thus appears to have been taken by Him as an expedient for confirming His own statement ‘in the same way as if it were an oath or a blessing.’ Formulae of protestation and affirmation involving an oath were in use among Rabbinical teachers to enforce teachings and sayings, and with these the mode of Jesus invites comparison and contrast.

The attempt of Delitzsch to explain this Amen (particularly in the double form) through the Aramaic אָמֵן ‘I say,’ cannot be sustained. Jannaris, again (. Times, Sept. [Note: Septuagint.] 1902, p. 564), has ventured the suggestion that ἀμὴν thus used is a corruption of ἡ μὴν (εἶ μὴν); but interesting and ingenious as this may be, it lacks confirmation, and amongst the instances of the use of ἡ μὴν which he adduces from the LXX Septuagint, the papyri, etc., not one suits the case here by showing any such construction as ἡ μὴν λέγω ὑμῖν in use.

A parallel between Amen and our 'Yes' has been already suggested: and in the NT we similarly find ἀμήν and ναι closely associated (2Co 1:20, Rev 1:7), whilst we have before noticed how in St. Luke ναι is found as a substitute for ἀμήν. It may not therefore be out of place here to suggest that we have an illustration and analogy as regards the use of an initial Amen in the use of an introductory 'Yes' sometimes found in English (see, e.g., Shakspeare, *2 Hen. IV.* i. iii. 36; Pope, *Moral Essays*, i. 1).

The double Amen, which occurs 25 times in St. John, and is peculiar to that Gospel, has provoked much curiosity as to how it is to be explained. If Jesus used as a formula in teaching now ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν and again ἀμήν ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν, it is very strange that the Synoptics should invariably represent Him as using the former, and the Fourth Gospel invariably as using the latter. Why not instances of both promiscuously through all the Gospels if the two were thus alike used?

The statement that the Johannine form 'introduces a truth of special solemnity and importance' (as Plummer in *Camb. Gr. Test. for Schools*, etc., 'St. John,' note on ch. Joh 1:51) is quite gratuitous, as a comparison of the sayings and discourses of our Lord will show. It is too obviously a *dictum* for the purpose of explanation. The truth is, if we have regard to the exclamatory character of ἀμήν as a particle in this special use, there is nothing surprising in its being thus repeated; and we have the analogy of the repeated Amen in responses, as noticed above. Why St. John alone should give the formula in this particular way is a further question. If a consideration of the phenomena connected with the composition of the Fourth Gospel leads to the conclusion that in the *form* in which the utterances of Jesus are there presented we have not His *ipsissima verba*, we may most naturally regard the repetition of ἀμήν as a peculiarity due to the Evangelist, and (taking the evidence of the Synoptists into account) not necessarily a form actually used by Jesus.

3. Amen in the rest of the NT.—In the numerous instances in which Amen occurs in the NT outside the Gospels, it is almost entirely found in connexion with prayers, doxologies, or benedictions, as a solemn corroborative conclusion (*final* use). In addition, we have the *responsive* use of Amen illustrated in 1Co 14:16 (see below, s. 'Liturgical use') and Rev 5:14 : and ἀμήν in Rev 22:20 is responsive to the ἔρχομαι τα χὺ preceding. Extra-canonical writings furnish plentiful examples of the same use. Two instances, again, of an *introductory* Amen in the Apocalypse (Rev 7:12; Rev 19:4), as a form of exultant acclamation, are interesting, but are quite distinct from the initial Amen in the utterances of Jesus in the Gospels.

Amen as a substantive appears in two forms: (1) τὸ ἀμήν, (2) ὁ ἀμήν. We meet with the former in 1Co_14:16 and 2Co_1:20. In both cases there appears to be a reference to a liturgical Amen. In the latter passage, indeed, it might be contended that ἀμήν is merely in correspondence with *ναί*, both simply conveying the idea of confirmation and assurance; but if we follow the better supported reading (as in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) the presence of such a reference can hardly be denied.

The use of ὁ ἀμήν as a name for our Lord in Rev_3:14 is striking and peculiar. The attempt, however, to explain it by reference to 2Co_1:20 is not satisfactory. The curious expression ‘the God of Amen’ (Authorized and Revised Versions ‘the God of truth’) in Isa_65:16 is not sufficiently a parallel to afford an explanation, for the Amen in this case is not a personal name, but the Authorized and Revised Versions furnishes a satisfactory equivalent in the rendering ‘truth.’ Surely, however, there need be little difficulty about the use of such a term as a designation of Jesus. Considering the wealth of descriptive epithets applied to Him in the NT and other early Christian writings, and also the terminology favoured by the author of the Apocalypse, we must feel that this use of Amen, if bold, is not unnatural or unapt, so suggestive as the term is of truth and firmness. Another but very different use of Amen as a proper name may be mentioned. Among certain of the Gnostics *Ἀμήν* figured as the name of an angel (Hippolytus, *Philosophumena*, ccxviii. 79, ccciv. 45).

4. Amen in liturgical use

(a) *Jewish*.—In the Persian period Amen was in use as ‘the responsory of the people to the doxology of the Priests and the Levites’ (see Neh_8:6, 1Ch_16:36, Psa_106:48). In the time of Christ it had become an established and familiar formula of the synagogue worship in particular, the response used in the Temple being a longer form: ‘Blessed be the Name of the glory of His kingdom for ever and ever!’ In still later times a formula of response was used which was apparently a combination of the synagogue Amen with the Temple responsory: ‘Amen: praised be the great Name for ever and ever!’ In the synagogue service the Amen was said by the people in response to the reader’s doxology. (In the great synagogue of Alexandria the attendant used to signal the congregation with a flag when to give the response). Amen was also the responsory to the priestly blessing.

Responsive Amen at the end of prayers was evidently an old custom among the Jews. In later times they are said to have discouraged this, because Amen at the end of every prayer had become the habit of Christians. The use of Amen in this connexion was thus considerably restricted; but certain synagogue prayers were still specified as to be followed by the Amen.

The Rabbis in their liturgical exactness rigorously determined the sense of Amen, and, among other things, enjoined that every doxology, on whatever occasion, must be followed by this response. Curious sayings were current among them, emphasizing the significance and value of Amen. Should, *e.g.*, the inhabitants of hell exclaim ‘Amen!’ when the holy Name of God is praised, it will secure their release (*Yalk.* ii. 296 to [Isa 26:2](#)).

(b) *Christian.*—This use of Amen was undoubtedly borrowed by the Christians from the Jewish synagogue, as, indeed, other liturgical features were. St. Paul’s words in [1Co 14:16](#) are of special interest here. The reader is so to recite his prayers that the ignorant should have the boon of answering the Amen to the doxology. The *ιδιώτης* (הַדְּיוֹתִי) for whom he pleads is similarly considered by the Rabbis, and they give the same instruction. It cannot be maintained that the term *εὐχαριστία* used here by St. Paul has that special and, so to speak, technical sense which it afterwards acquires as applied to the Lord’s Supper, and that so ‘the Amen’ (τὸ ἀμήν) intended is specifically the response connected with the observance of that institution. At the same time, the whole reference clearly indicates that Amen as a responsory in Christian worship was already a regular and familiar usage.

It is, however, in connexion with the Eucharist, in the special sense of the term, that the Fathers particularly mention the responsive Amen, and refer to it as said after the doxology with which the long Prayer of Consecration closed. Justin Martyr (*Apol.* 2), Tertullian (*de Spectaeul.* 25), Dionysius of Alexandria (*ap.* Euseb. *Historia Ecclesiastica*), and Chrysostom (*Hom. 35 in 1 Cor.*) make such reference. This prayer, of course, was at first said aloud, so as to be heard by all; but in the course of time (after the 8th cent.) the custom grew for the officiating minister to say it *sotto voce*. Even then, such importance was attached to the response of the people that the priest was required to say the closing words (‘world without end’) aloud, so that then the ‘Amen’ might be said. This in the West: in the Greek Church it was similarly required that the words of the institution should be said aloud, though the first part of the prayer was said inaudibly, so that the people might hear them and make their response. A writer of the 9th cent. (Florus Magister), referring to this usage, says: ‘Amen, which is responded by the whole church, means *It is true*. This, therefore, the faithful respond at the consecration of so great a mystery, as also in every prayer duly said, and by responding declare assent.’ A similar use of Amen at the end of the Exhortation (which is not a prayer), commencing the second part of the eucharistic service (see Book of Common Prayer), and at the end of the corresponding ‘Preface’ in the old Gallican Liturgy, may also be pointed out.

Jerome has an interesting reference to the loud congregational Amen, which he describes as resounding like thunder ('ad similitudinem cœlestis tonitruī'—*Com. ad Galat.*). This corresponds to a synagogue custom of uttering the 'Amen with the full power' of the voice (*Shab.* 119*b*).

The modern practice of singing Amen at the close of hymns in public worship is partly due to a musical demand for a suitable cadence to conclude the tune: but it is also in harmony with the most ancient practice of closing hymns with doxologies, which naturally carried an Amen with them. The discrimination observable in some hymnals, whereby hymns containing a prayer or a doxology are closed with Amen and others not, arises from misapprehension. Amen not only means 'So be it,' but equally 'So it is,' and should thus be suitable as a conclusion to all hymns that are appropriate for Christian worship.

(*c*) *Mohammedan.*—Among the Mohammedans Amen is used liturgically, but only to a slight extent. It is universally used by them after every recital of the first *Sura* of the Koran—the so-called *Surat al-Fâtihat* (= Preface or Introduction). This brief, prayer-like form is held in great veneration, and has among them a place corresponding to that of the Paternoster amongst Christians.

Literature.—The Bible Dictionaries, *s.v.*; *Jewish Encyclopedia*, *s.v.*; *Berakhoth* i. 11-19; H. W. Hogg, *Jewish Quart. Review*, Oct. 1896; articles in *Expository Times*, by Nestle (Jan. 1897), and Jannaris (Sept. [Note: Septuagint.] 1902); Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu* (English translation 1902, p. 226ff.); Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*.

J. S. Clemens.

⚠ Amminadab

AMMINADAB.—An ancestor of our Lord, Mat 1:4.

⚠ Amon

AMON.—A king of Judah (*circa (about)* 640 b.c.) mentioned in our Lord's genealogy, Mat 1:10 (Gr. Ἀμὼς, (Revised Version margin) Amos).

Andrew

ANDREW (Ἀνδρέας, ‘manly’).—In the Synoptic Gospels, Andrew is little more than a name; but the references to him in the Fourth Gospel are of such a character as to leave upon our minds a wonderfully clear impression of the manner of man he was, and of the service which he rendered to the Church of Christ. Andrew was a native of Bethsaida (Joh 1:44), but afterwards shared the same house (Mar 1:29) at Capernaum (Mar 1:21) with his better known brother Simon Peter. By trade he was a fisherman (Mat 4:18), but, attracted by all that he had heard or seen of John the Baptist, for a time at least he left his old work, and, following the Baptist into the wilderness, came to be recognized as one of his disciples (Joh 1:35; Joh 1:40). A better teacher Andrew could not have had; for if from John he first learned the exceeding sinfulness of sin, by him also he was pointed to the promised Deliverer, the Lamb of God, who was to take away the sin of the world. And when, accordingly, the Christ did come, it was to find Andrew with a heart ready and eager to welcome Him. Of that first interview between the Lord and His new disciple the Fourth Evangelist, who was himself present, has preserved the record (Joh 1:35-40), and he it is also who tells us that no sooner had Andrew realized for himself the truth regarding Jesus, than he at once went in search of his brother Peter (Joh 1:41-42). And thus to the first-called of Christ’s disciples (πρωτόκλητος, according to a common designation of Andrew in early ecclesiastical writers) was given the joy of bringing next his own brother to the Lord. The call of James and of John, if they had not been previously summoned, would seem to have followed; but in none of these instances did this imply as yet more than a personal relationship to the Saviour. The actual summons to work came later, when, by the Sea of Galilee, Jesus bade Andrew, along with the same three companions, leave his nets and come after Him (Mat 4:18 ff.). And this in turn was followed shortly afterwards by Andrew’s appointment to a place in the Apostolic Band (Mat 10:2 ff.). His place, moreover, was a place of honour, for his name always occurs in the first group of four, and it is with Peter and James and John that he is again associated in the ‘private’ inquiries to Jesus regarding the time of the Last Things (Mar 13:3).

Still more interesting, however, as illustrating Andrew’s character, are the two occasions on which he is specially associated with Philip, the only other Apostle who bore a Greek name. The first incident occurred at the Feeding of the Five Thousand, when, in contrast to the anxious, calculating Philip, the downright, practical Andrew thought it worth while to draw the Saviour’s attention to the lad’s little store, even though he too was at a loss as to what it could effect (Joh 6:5 ff.). And the second occurred when to Philip, again perplexed by the desire of certain Greeks (Gentiles, therefore) to see Jesus, Andrew suggested that the true course was at least to lay the

request before Jesus Himself, and leave Him to decide whether or not it could be granted (Joh 12:20 ff.).

After this, with the exception of the incident already referred to (Mar 13:3), Andrew is not again mentioned in the Gospels, and the only subsequent reference to him in Scripture is the mere mention of his name in Act 1:13. Tradition, however, has been busy with his after-history; and he is represented as labouring, according to one account, in Scythia (Eus. *Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 1), whence he has been adopted as the patron-saint of Russia; or, according to another, in Achaia. In any case, there is general agreement that he was martyred at Patrae in Achaia, being bound, not nailed, to the cross, in order to prolong his sufferings. There is, however, no warrant for the belief that the cross was of the decussate shape (X), as this cross, usually associated with his name, is of a much later date.

A striking tradition preserved in the *Muratorian Fragment* brings Andrew and John together in their old age as they had been in their youth: ‘The fourth Gospel [was written by] John, one of the disciples (*i.e.* Apostles). When his fellow-disciples and bishops urgently pressed him, he said, “Fast with me [from] to-day, for three days, and let us tell one another any revelation which may be made to us, either for or against [the plan of writing].” On the same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the Apostles, that John should relate all in his own name, and that all should review [his writing]’ (see Westcott, *Gospel of St. John*, p. xxxv; *History of NT Canon*, p. 523).

It is also deserving of mention that about 740 Andrew became the patron-saint of Scotland, owing to the belief that his arm had been brought by St. Regulus to the town on the East Coast that now bears his name.

The character of Andrew, as it appears in the few scattered notices that we have of him, is that of a simple, kindly man who had the courage of his opinions, as proved by his being the first of the Baptist’s disciples openly to follow Jesus; who was eager to share with others the privileges he himself enjoyed (witness his search for Peter, and his treatment of the Greeks); and who, his work done, was always ready to efface himself (see especially Lightfoot, *Sermons on Special Occasions*, p. 160 ff.). Again, when we think of the Apostle in his more official aspect, it is sufficient to recall that he was not only the first home-missionary (Joh 1:41), but also the first foreign-missionary (Joh 12:22)—evidence, if evidence be wanted, of the close connexion between the two spheres of work.

Literature.—In addition to what has been noted above, and the references to Andrew in the different Lives of Christ, see H. Latham, *Pastor Pastorum*, p. 156 ff.; the present writer’s *The Twelve Apostles* (J. M. Dent), p. 24 ff.; *Expositor*, 1st ser. vii.

[1882], 424 ff.; Ker, *Sermons*, 2nd ser. 100 ff. The principal authority on Andrew's traditional history is Lipsius. *Die Apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden*, i. p. 543 ff.; cf. M. R. James in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, vol. i. p. 93. His place in Art is discussed by Mrs. Jameson, *Sacred and Legendary Art*, i. p. 226 ff. We may refer also to Keble's poem on 'St. Andrew's Day' in *The Christian Year*, and to the poem on 'St. Andrew and his Cross' in the *Lyra Innocentium*.

George Milligan.

☞ Angels

ANGELS.—The statements as to angels which meet us in the Gospels are in most respects the same as are found in the Jewish literature of the period, both Biblical and extra-Biblical. In the main, Christ and His Apostles appropriated the Angelology of current Judaism—but not without critical selection. It would be difficult to point to a time when the Jews, as a people, did not believe in angels; yet there were exceptions. Possibly it was the exuberance of the belief that produced in some minds a reaction. At all events, it is a fact that the portion of the OT known to criticism as the Priests' Code is silent on the subject of angels; and it is also noteworthy that the Sadducees, who were the descendants of the high-priestly families, protested in the time of our Lord against some, if not all, of the popular notions respecting angels (Act 23:8).

It is probable that belief in angels is originally a corollary from the conception of God as King. A lone king—a king without a court—is almost a contradiction in terms. And inasmuch as the recognition of God *as King* is the earliest and most prevalent of Israel's conceptions of God, we naturally expect the belief in angels, as God's court, serving Him in His palace and discharging the function of messengers, to be ancient and pervasive. We have then, doubtless, a very primitive conception of angels in the words of Micaiah to Ahab, in 1Ki 22:19 'I saw Jahweh sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him, on his right hand and on his left.' A second and quite distinct feature of the Angelology of the OT is found in the appearances of one who is called '*the Angel of Jahweh*'—who is described as undistinguishable from man in appearance, and yet claims to speak and act in the name of Jahweh Himself (Gen 18:2; Gen 18:16-17; Gen 32:24; Gen 32:30, Jdg 13:3; Jdg 13:6; Jdg 13:22). It is noteworthy as a feature of OT criticism, that, as P [Note: Priestly Narrative.] is *silent* as to angels, so the appearances of an angel as a manlike manifestation of God and not a mere messenger, are confined to those portions of the OT which, on quite other grounds, are assigned to JE [Note: E Jewish Encyclopedia.] . Thirdly, when the Jews came to have more exalted views of God, and of the incompatibility between

Divinity and humanity, spirit and matter, good and evil, and, in consequence, conceived of God as aloof from the world and incapable of immediate contact and intercourse with sinful mortals, the doctrine of angels received more attention than ever before. The same influences which led the Persians to frame such an elaborate system of Angelology, led the Jews, during and after the Exile, to frame a similar system, or in some respects to borrow from the Persian system; to believe in gradations among the angelic hosts; to give names to those who were of high rank, and to assign to each of these some definite kind of work to do among men, or some province on the earth to administer as satrap under 'the King of Heaven' (see art. 'Zoroastrianism' in vol. iv. of Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible).

In the Gospels there are clear indications of the first and third of these phases of belief. The second is of interest to the NT student as a preparatory discipline in the direction of Christology: and as such has no further importance for us at present. Ewald has said (*OT and NT Theology*, p. 79) that in Christianity there is 'no denial of the existence of angels, but a return to the simpler colouring of the early narratives.' So far as simplicity of narrative is concerned, there is certainly a close resemblance between the angel-incidents of St. Luke and Acts on the one hand, and of Genesis on the other; but in the NT the angel never identifies himself with Jahweh as is done in Genesis; and there are in the NT some phases of Angelology which belong, not to 'the early narratives,' but to post-exilic conceptions.

We wish now, with the help of Jewish literature, more or less contemporary, to make a systematic presentation of those beliefs as to angels which are found in the discourses and narratives of the four Gospels. It might be supposed that we should find it helpful to keep apart the utterances of our Lord from the descriptions of the Evangelists; but, in fact, there is such complete unity of conception underlying both discourses and narratives, that no useful purpose can be served by treating them separately.

i. Angels in Heaven.—1. They form an *army* or *host*. Luk 2:13 'There was with the angel (who appeared to the shepherds) a multitude of the heavenly host' (στρατιά). Our Lord carries the military metaphor even further when He speaks of 'more than 12 legions of angels' (Mat 26:53). Oriental hyperbole was fully employed in expressing the magnitude of the heavenly army. Rev 5:11 speaks of 'myriads of myriads and thousands of thousands'; and Heb 12:22 speaks of 'the myriads of angels'—both in probable allusion to Dan 7:10. In Job 25:3 also the question is asked: 'Is there any number of his armies?' Similarly the Pal. [Note: Palestine, Palestinian.] Targ. [Note: Targum.] to Exo 12:12 tells of 90,000 myriads of destroying angels; and in Deu 34:5 the same Targum speaks of the glory of the Shekinah being revealed to the dying

Moses, with 2000 myriads of angels and 42,000 chariots; as 2Ki 6:17 tells of a 'mountain full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha.'

2. They form a *court*. Heaven is 'God's throne' (Mat 5:34; Mat 23:22), and there also 'the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory' (Mat 19:28). The angels, as courtiers, stand in vast multitudes before the throne (Rev 5:11; Rev 7:11). As in earthly courts there are gradations of rank and dignity, so in heaven. It is St. Paul who speaks most explicitly of 'the principalities and powers in the heavenly places' (Eph 3:10), and of Christ's being 'exalted far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion' (Eph 1:21); and 'evidently Paul regarded them as actually existent and intelligent forces' (Robinson, *in loco*); but the same conception presents itself in the Gospels in the reference to archangels, who were four, or in some authors seven, in number: Gabriel, Raphael, Michael, and Uriel being those most frequently mentioned. In Luk 1:19 the angel who appears to Zacharias says: 'I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God'; as in Tob 12:15 the angel says to Tobit: 'I am Raphael, one of the seven holy angels, which present the prayers of the saints and go in before the glory of the Holy One.' Even in the OT the angels are spoken of as forming 'a council': e.g. in Psa 89:7, where God is said to be 'very terrible in the council of the holy ones,' and in Psa 82:1 where He is said to 'judge amidst the Elohîm.' This idea was a great favourite with later Jews, who maintained that 'God does nothing without consulting the family above' (*Sanhedrin*, 38b). To the same circle of ideas belong the words of the Lord Jesus: 'Every one that shall confess me before men, him will the Son of Man confess before the angels of God; but he that denieth me in the presence of men shall be denied in the presence of the angels of God' (Luk 12:8-9). Evidently the angels are interested spectators of men's behaviour, responsive to their victories and defeats, their sins and struggles; and we are here taught that to be denied before such a vast responsive assembly intensifies the remorse of the apostate, as to be confessed before them intensifies the joy of those who are 'faithful unto death.' Again, in many courts, and particularly in that of the Persians, there were secretaries or scribes, whose business it was to keep a 'book of records' (Est 6:1), in which the names and deeds of those who had deserved well of the king were honourably recorded. The metaphor of heaven as a palace and court is so far kept up, that the Jews often spoke of *books* in heaven in which men's deeds are recorded. Not only do we read in Slavonic Enoch 19:5 of 'angels who are over the souls of men, and who write down all their works and their lives before the face of the Lord'; and in the Apocalypse of John, where symbolism abounds, of 'books' being 'opened,' and of the 'dead' being 'judged according to what was written in the books': but even in an Epistle of St. Paul we read of those 'whose names are in the book of life' (Php 4:3), and in Heb 12:23, of 'the church of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven'; and precisely in accord with the above our Lord bade His disciples rejoice, because their names 'are written in heaven,' *i.e.* enrolled for honour (Luk 10:20).

3. They form a *choir* in the heavenly temple. The description of heaven in the Apocalypse is quite as much that of a temple as a palace. Heaven contains its altar (Rev 8:5; Rev 9:13), its censers (Rev 5:8, Rev 8:3), its musicians (Rev 5:8, Rev 15:2), and its singers (Rev 5:9, Rev 14:3, Rev 15:3). In extra-Biblical literature the veil is often mentioned, concealing the abode of God in the Most Holy Place, within which the archangels are permitted to enter (Tob 12:12; Tob 12:15, Enoch 40:2). The only reference in the Gospels under this head is the song of the angels, described in Luk 2:13 f. It is possible, in spite of the reading of some very ancient Greek MS^S [Note: SS Manuscripts.] (κ* ABD), that this song, like that of the seraphim in Isa 6:2, is a triple antiphonal one—

‘Glory to God in the highest [heaven],

Peace on earth,

Among men [Divine] good pleasure.’

4. They are ‘*sons of God*.’ In this respect the saints who are raised again are ‘equal to the angels’ (Luk 20:36). They are sons of God by creation and by obedience (Job 1:6; Job 2:1; Job 38:7). They ‘do not owe their existence to the ordinary process of filiation, but to an immediate act of creation’ (Godet, *OT Studies*, 7); thus resembling in their origin the bodily nature of those who are ‘sons of the resurrection.’ Hence we find that they are frequently described as ‘holy’ (Mat 25:31, Mar 8:38, Luk 9:26, Job 5:1; Job 15:15, Dan 8:13), and by implication we learn that angels obey God’s will in heaven, since we are taught by our Lord to pray that God’s holy will may be done on earth as it is in heaven (Mat 6:10, cf. Psa 103:20).

5. They are *free from sensuous feelings*. This is taught in Mat 22:30 ‘In the resurrection they neither marry [as men] nor are given in marriage [as women], but are as the angels of God in heaven.’ These words were spoken by our Lord in response to the doubts of the Sadducees on the subject of the resurrection. Christ’s reply is in effect this: The source of your error is that you do not fully recognize the power of God. You seem to think that God can make only one kind of body, with one sort of functions, and dependent on one means of life. In that way you limit unduly the power of God. ‘In that age’ (Luk 20:35), ‘when they rise from the dead’ (Mar 12:25), men do not eat and drink (Rom 14:17). Not being mortal, they are not dependent on food for nourishment, nor have they, by nature, sensuous appetites, but are *ισάγγελοι* (‘equal to the angels’). Thus skilfully did Jesus give a double-edged reply to the teachings of the Sadducees (Act 23:8). While answering their objection against the resurrection, He affirms that ‘those who are accounted worthy to attain to that *αἰών*, and the resurrection from the dead ... are equal to the angels’—thus plainly disclosing

His belief in angels and setting it over against their disbelief. As to the spiritual nature of angels, Philo speaks of them as ἀσώματα καὶ εὐδαιμονες ψυχαί ('incorporeal and happy souls'); and again, as 'bodiless souls, not mixtures of rational and irrational natures as ours are, but having the irrational nature cut out, wholly intelligent throughout, pure-thoughts (λογισμοί, elsewhere λόγοι) like a monad (Drummond's *Philo*, 145-147; cf. Philo's *Confusion of Tongues*, p. 8, *Allegory*, iii. 62). The Rabbis interpreted Dan 7:10 to teach that the nature of the angels is fire. 'They are nourished by the radiance which streams from the presence of God. They need no material nourishment, and their nature is not responsive to bodily pleasures' (Weber, *Jud. Theol.*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 167; *Pesikta*, 57a; *Exodus R.* 32). They are also said to be 'spiritual beings' (*Lev. R.* 24), 'without sensuous requirements' (*Yoma*, 74b), 'without hatred, envy, or jealousy' (*Chag.* 14). The Jewish legends which interpret Gen 6:4 as teaching a commingling of angels with women, so as to produce 'mighty men, men of renown,' seem at variance with the above belief as to the immunity of celestial intelligences from all passion. It is true that Jud 1:6 and Enoch 15:3-7 both speak of the angels as having first 'left their habitation' in heaven; but the fact that they were deemed *capable* of sexual intercourse implies a much coarser conception of the angelic nature than is taught in the words of our Lord, of Philo, and of the Talmud.

6. They have *extensive, and yet limited, knowledge*. This is clearly taught in one utterance of Christ's, recorded in Mat 24:36 || Mar 13:32 'Of that day and hour knoweth no man, *not even* the angels of heaven.' The implications clearly are (1) that angels know most things, far better than men; but (2) that there are some things, including the day of the Second Advent, which they do *not* know. Both these propositions admit of copious illustration from Jewish literature. First, as to their extensive knowledge. There are numerous intimations of the scientific skill of the angels, their acquaintance with the events of human lives, and their prescience of future events. The Book of Jubilees, a pre-Christian work extensively read, affirms (Jubilees 1:27) that Moses was taught by Gabriel concerning Creation and the things narrated in Genesis; that angels taught Noah herbal remedies (Jubilees 10:12), and brought to Jacob seven tablets recording the history of his posterity (Jubilees 32:21). In Enoch 8:1 Azazel is said to have taught men metallurgy and other sciences; as Prometheus was said to have taught the Greeks. In Tob 12:12 the angel assures Tobit that he was familiar with all the events of his troublous days: as in 2Sa 14:17; 2Sa 14:20 the woman of Tekoa flatters Joah that he was 'as wise as an angel of God to know all things that are in the earth.' But this knowledge has its *limits*. Angels were supposed to understand no language but Hebrew (*Chagigah*, 16a). In 2Es 4:52, in revealing eschatological events, the angel gives the tokens of the coming end, but confesses his ignorance as to whether Esdras will be alive at the time. The Midrash on Psa 25:14 affirms that 'nothing is hidden from the angels'; but according to

Sanhedrin, 99a, and other Talmudic passages, ‘they know not the time of Israel’s redemption.’ In 1Pe 1:12 we are told that ‘the angels desire’ (but in vain) ‘to look into’ some of the NT mysteries; and in Slav. Enoch 24:3, 40:2, Enoch tells his children that not even the angels know the secrets which he discloses to them.

7. They take a deep interest in the salvation of men. We gather this from the evident joy with which angels announced the advent of the Messiah to the shepherds at Bethlehem. The angel who brought the ‘tidings of great joy’ (Luk 2:10) clearly felt the joy himself; and the song which the heavenly host sang in praise to God was the outcome of joyous hearts. Even more explicitly is this taught in Luk 15:10 ‘There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.’ The word ἐν ὀπιον seems here to mean ‘in the midst of,’ ‘among.’ ‘Joy is manifest on every countenance.’ Even if the joy intended be ‘the joy of God, which breaks forth in presence of the angels’ (Godet, *in loco*), still the implication would be that the heart of the angelic throng is *en rapport* with the heart of ‘the happy God.’ On this point the words of the angel are instructive which are recorded in Rev 22:10 ‘I am a fellow-servant with thee and with thy brethren the prophets, and with them that keep the words of this book.’ The interpreting angel confesses to unity of service with the Church, and in so doing implies a oneness of sympathy and love with the saints. So also when, in 1Pe 1:12, we read that ‘the angels desire to look into’ the marvels of redemption, there is, as Dr. Hort says, ‘a glimpse of the fellowship of angels with prophets and evangelists, and implicitly with the suffering Christians to whom St. Peter wrote.’ The same deep interest in the progress of the Church appears in Eph 3:10, where we are taught that one great purpose which moved God to enter on the work of human salvation was, that ‘through the Church the manifold wisdom of God might be made known to the principalities and powers in heavenly places.’ The Church on earth is the arena on which the attributes of God are displayed for the admiration and adoration of ‘the family in heaven’ (Eph 3:15).

ii. Angels as Visitants to Earth.—1. To convey messages from God to man.—(a) In dreams. It is a peculiarity of the Gospel of the Infancy, as recorded by St. Matthew, that the appearances of the angels are in dreams to Joseph, bidding him acknowledge Mary as his wife (Mat 1:20), take the young child and His mother to Egypt (Mat 2:13), and return to Palestine on the death of Herod (Mat 2:19). The only OT parallel to this is Gen 31:11, where Jacob tells his wives that ‘the angel of God spake’ to him ‘in a dream.’

(b) In other instances the message of the angel is brought in full, wakeful consciousness. It was while Zacharias was ministering at the altar of incense in the Holy Place that an angel who called himself Gabriel appeared, foretelling the birth of John (Luk 1:11). It was while the shepherds were keeping watch over their flock that

the angel stood near them and directed them to the babe in Bethlehem (Luk 2:9; Luk 2:11); and it is narrated by the three Synoptists that it was through angelic agency that the disciples were informed of the Resurrection. St. Matthew narrates that it was an angel who had 'descended from heaven' (Mat 28:2), that spoke to the women at the tomb (Mat 28:5; Mat 28:7). St. Mark speaks of a young man 'arrayed in a white robe' (Mar 16:5), and St. Luke of 'two men in dazzling apparel' (Luk 24:4), who assured the women that Christ was risen. The author of the Fourth Gospel is silent as to angelic appearances at the Resurrection, but he bears testimony to the popular belief in angelic voices (Joh 12:29). When a voice came from heaven, saying, 'I have glorified and will again glorify (my name),' the Evangelist records: 'Some of the people said, An angel spake to him.'

We reserve for special consideration the sacredly mysterious interview of the angel Gabriel with the Virgin Mary (Luk 1:26-38). The salutation of the angel was: 'Hail, thou favoured one! The Lord is with thee.' When she was perplexed at the saying, the angel announced: 'Thou shalt conceive in thy womb and bear a son, and shalt call his name Jesus.' This Son is further described as 'Son of the Most High' and He to whom 'the Lord God will give the throne of his father David.' Then, in reply to the Virgin's further doubts and perplexities, the angel vouchsafes the dread explanation, 'The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power ($\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$) of the Most High shall overshadow thee.... No word from God shall be devoid of power.' The full consideration of these words will be fittingly considered under Annunciation (which see). On us it seems to devolve to speak of the view which arose very early in Jewish Christian circles, and which regarded the angel as not merely the messenger, but the *cause* of the conception. It was a general belief among the Jews that a spoken word has causal efficacy. This lay at the root of the belief in the potency of spells and charms. And if every spoken word is mighty, the words of God are almighty. The expression 'No word from ($\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}$) God shall be devoid of power' (Luk 1:37) was accordingly interpreted to mean that the message brought from God through the angel had causal efficacy: the Divine word spoken by the angel caused the conception. In the *Protevangelium of James* (11:2) the angel is recorded to have said: 'Thou shalt conceive from His word' ($\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$), and the same expression occurs in the Arabic *Gospel of the Infancy*. This is the origin of the curious doctrine of the ancient Church, that the Virgin conceived *through the ear*. The word of the angel, which was a Divine message, reached the Virgin through the ear. The ear was thus believed to be the channel through which the Divine potency was operative. Even Augustine says: 'Virgo per aurem impregnabatur.' As bearing on this subject, we may note that in the *Ascension of Isaiah* the angel Gabriel is called 'the angel of the Holy Spirit' (3:18, 7:23, 9:36). In *pseudo-Matthew* (c. 10), Joseph says: 'Why do ye mislead me to believe that an angel of the Lord hath made her pregnant?' and in the

Protevangelium of James the Virgin explains her condition to Joseph in these words: 'The case is the same as it was with Adam whom God created. He said, "Let him be"; and he was.'

2. Angels as *performing physical actions*. This is an ancient representation of which the OT furnishes many instances: Psa 91:11 f. (cited Mat 4:8, Luk 4:10 f.), 'angels ... shall bear thee up on their hands'; in Dan 6:22 angels shut the lions' mouths; in Psa 34:7 angels encamp round about them that fear God; so in Apocrypha (Bel 36, Three 26). It is therefore precisely in accord with Jewish modes of thought that we read in Mat 28:2 'There was a great earthquake: for an angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and *rolled away the stone*'; and in Mar 1:13 'He was with the wild beasts; and the angels *ministered* unto him' (cf. Mat 4:11).

3. As *performing psychical actions*. When Jesus was in the garden, and 'being in an agony prayed more earnestly,' we are told that 'there appeared to him an angel from heaven *strengthening* him' (Luk 22:43).* [Note: On the question of the genuineness of this passage see the 'Notes on Select Readings' in Westcott and Hort's NT in Greek.] So in Dan 10:17 f. Daniel records that there was 'no strength in him, and no breath left in him,' and an angel 'touched him and strengthened him.' The Hebrews drew no distinction between the physical and the psychical. It was in their regard just as easy for these spiritual existences to roll away a stone as to infuse vigour into the system, and give power to the enfeebled nerves and will.

4. Angels are deputed to *guard the righteous from danger*. In Gen 24:7 Abraham prays for his servant: 'May God send his angel before thee'; and Jacob saw angels 'ascending and descending' over him in his sleep (Gen 28:12). In the time of Christ it was a Jewish belief not merely that angels are sent to guide and guard men, but also that every man has his *own* guardian spirit, or, as others teach, two guardians. In the Talmudic treatise *Berakhoth* (60b), when a man goes into an unclean place, he prays his guardian angels to wait outside till he returns. In Pal. [Note: Palestine, Palestinian.] Targum to Gen 33:10 Jacob says to Esau, 'I have seen thy face as if I saw the face of *thy* angel'; on Gen 48:16 the same Targum reads: 'May the angel whom thou hast assigned to me bless the lads.' Similarly the *Sohar* to Exodus (p. 190) says: 'From the 13th year of a man and onwards, God assigns to every man two angels, one on the right hand and one on the left; and the *Testament of Joseph* (*circa* (*about*) 6) names the angel of Abraham as the guardian of Joseph. It is here more than elsewhere that we seem to recognize the influence of Persia on Jewish beliefs.

The question now occurs, What connexion is there between the above and Mat 18:10 'See that ye despise not one of these little ones, for I say unto you, that their angels in heaven continually behold the face of my Father who is in heaven'? It is evident

that 'their angels' means angels that watch over them. But did our Lord refer to the 'angels of the presence' or to individual guardian angels? The former is more probable for two reasons—(1) It was not part of the Jewish creed that any angels behold the face of God except the archangels; (2) the guardian spirits accompanying men on earth could hardly at the same time be said to be *in heaven* continually beholding the face of the Father who is in heaven. The allusion probably is, then, to the 'angels of the presence,' and especially to Michael the guardian of the pious and the helpless. It must be admitted that in Act 12:15 we seem to have the popular Jewish notion in all its later development. When many brethren were met in the house of Mary, mother of John Mark, and were unable to believe that Peter had really been delivered, they said to Rhoda, first, 'Thou art mad,' and then, 'It is his angel.' This, if pushed to its apparent implications, seems to contain an allusion to a notion which occurs in some Jewish writings, that heaven is a counterpart of earth, and every man has his double in the celestial sphere; or at all events the guardian angel is *like* him whom he guards. It is quite likely, however, that on the lips of the disciples these words might be merely an allusion to a popular conception, without carrying with them any literal belief.

5. *Angels visit wrath on the adversaries of the righteous.* This is implied in Christ's words: 'See that ye despise not one of these little ones' (Mat 18:10). The word ὀφθαλμοῦ implies 'beware!' and the teaching clearly is that angels are capable of punishing any who injure those whom it is their business to guard. The OT contains instances of their punitive abilities. It was an angel of the Lord who smote 185,000 in the camp of the Assyrians (2Ki 19:35), and who destroyed the children of Israel till, when he came to Jerusalem, the Lord said to him, 'It is enough' (2Sa 24:16); and Psa 35:5 f. presents a picture calculated to inspire terror in every breast: 'Let them be as chaff before the wind, the angel of the Lord driving them on. Let their way be dark and slippery, the angel of the Lord pursuing them.' It is very noteworthy that the Lord Jesus, even in His hour of intensest agony, drew comfort from the thought of angelic help. It was a real comfort to Him that the angels were at His control, if He needed them. The military band led by Judas could not arrest or injure Him unless He voluntarily submitted Himself to them. He had 'authority to lay down' His 'life'; and when the struggle was over, and the resolve retaken that the path of the cross was the path of duty, he conveyed to the Eleven the fact of His self-surrender by saying of Peter, who had impetuously used the sword in his Lord's defence, 'Thinkest thou that I cannot now beseech the Father, and he would even now send me more than twelve legions of angels?' (Mat 26:53). We note here that the prayer is not to be addressed to angels. There are very few instances of Jews praying to angels. The Rabbis discouraged it. Every pious Jew would, as Jesus did, pray to God that He would *send* angelic ministry; as in 2Ma 15:23, where Judas is said to have prayed: 'O sovereign Lord, send a good angel before us to bring terror and trembling.'

6. Angels *render aid at death*. Luk 16:22 'Lazarus was carried away by the angels into Abraham's bosom.' We come here upon a widespread belief among Jews and Jewish Christians—that angels convey the souls of the righteous to Paradise. Michael is usually the one entrusted with this duty. If he has a companion, it is Gabriel. The *Gospel of Nicodemus* records that when Jesus descended into Hades and released the righteous dead from captivity, He delivered Adam and all the righteous to the archangel Michael, and all the saints followed Michael; and he led them all into the glorious gate of Paradise: among them being the penitent thief. The *History of Joseph the Carpenter* records that Michael and Gabriel drew out the soul of Joseph and wrapped it in a silken napkin, and amid the songs of angels took him to his good Father, even to the dwelling-place of the just. In the *Testament of Abraham* we have a similar account of the death of Abraham. The *Ascension of Isaiah* (7:25) affirms that 'those who love the Most High and His Beloved will ascend to heaven by the Angel of the Holy Spirit.'

7. Angels are to be *the ministrants of Christ at His Second Advent*. 'The reapers' in the great Harvest 'are angels'; and they separate the tares from the wheat (Mat 13:39). 'The Son of Man will send forth his angels to gather out all that offend' (Mat 13:41). 'He shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him' (Mat 25:31). 'He shall send forth his angels with the great sound of a trumpet to gather the elect' (Mat 24:31; cf. 1Th 4:17, 2Th 1:7).

8. To complete our survey, we must add one word as to *the appearance of angels* when men were conscious of their presence. It is taken for granted that there needs to be a preparation of vision before man can recognize their presence. As Balaam was unaware that the angel confronted him until the Lord opened his eyes (Num 22:31), and as Elisha prayed that God would open the eyes of his servant (2Ki 6:17), so when the risen Jesus appeared to Saul of Tarsus, those who travelled with him 'saw no man' (Act 9:7). (a) Angels had a manlike appearance. As Abraham and Manoah's wife mistook them for men (Gen 18:16, Jdg 13:6), so, in describing the Resurrection, St. Mark says that the women 'saw a young man' (Mar 16:5), and St. Luke that 'two men stood by them' (Luk 24:4).—(b) Their appearance was usually with brilliant light or 'glory.' When the angel appeared to the shepherds, 'the glory of the Lord shone round about them' (Luk 2:9), and when the Son of Man cometh, He will come 'in the glory of the holy angels' (Luk 9:26). So in Tob 3:16, Cod. B reads: 'The prayer of both was heard before the glory of the great Raphael'; in 2Ma 3:26 two young men appeared, 'notable in their strength and beautiful in their glory'; and the *Protevangelium of James* narrates that 'an angel of the Lord appeared in the great light to Joachim.'—(c) They wear raiment of great luminousness. Mat 28:3 'His appearance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow'; cf. Dan 10:6, Eze 1:13, Rev 1:14; Rev 19:12. So *Apocalypse, Apocalyptic of Peter* says of the angels, 'their body was whiter than any snow.'

iii. Differences between NT and Rabbinism as to Angels.—We undertook to show that ‘in the main Christ and His Apostles appropriated the Angelology of Judaism’; and the above systematic treatment has surely rendered this evident. It has often been observed that ‘Jesus says very little about angels’; and, so far as the bulk, of His sayings is concerned, this is quite true; but when we *classify* His utterances, we find that they constitute almost a complete Angelology; and so far as it goes, it is in harmony with the Jewish beliefs of the period. The Jews believed all that the NT says of angels, but they also believed much more.

1. It is very significant that the Gospels are silent as to *the mediation of angels*. In Judaism this was very prominent. In Tobit, *e.g.*, one great function of angels is said to be to carry the prayers of saints within the veil, before the glory of the Holy One (Tob 12:12; Tob 12:15). In Enoch 40:6 the seer says: ‘And the third voice heard I pray and intercede for those who dwell on the earth, and supplicate in the name of the Lord of spirits.’ In the Greek *Apocalypse*, *Apocalyptic of Baruch* (c. 11), Michael is said to have a great receptacle in which the prayers of men are placed to be carried through the gates into the presence of the Divine glory (*Texts and Studies*, v. i. 100). In the Midrash *Exodus Rabba* 21 an angel set over the prayers of men is said to weave them into crowns for the Most High.—But not only are the Gospels *silent* as to the need of angels to be mediators in carrying the prayers and necessities of saints into the unapproachable chamber of the Most High, the teaching of Jesus was designed to counteract such a view of God. When our Lord said: ‘Your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things’ (Mat 6:32); ‘Your heavenly Father feedeth the fowls’ (Mat 6:26); ‘Thy Father seeth in secret’ (Mat 6:18); ‘Pray to thy Father who is in secret’ (Mat 6:6),—He certainly wished to break down the barriers which the Jewish mind had placed between itself and God, and encourage men to come direct to the Father in childlike confidence.

2. In other respects the only difference is, that the Gospels are free from the extravagant embellishment in which the Rabbis indulged, when speaking of angels: (a) as to their *size*. The Talmudic treatise *Chagigah* (13b) says that Sandalfon is taller than his fellows by the length of a journey of 500 years; and the *Gospel of Peter* (c. 9) tells how the Roman soldiers saw two men descend from heaven, and the head of the two reached unto heaven, but that of Him whom they released from the tomb overpassed the heavens.—(b) As to a fondness for the marvellous in describing their appearance and actions. For instance, *Yoma* 21a narrates how a high priest was killed by an angel in the Holy of Holies, and the impress of a calf’s foot was found between his shoulders. Joshua ben Hananiah is reported to have told the Emperor Hadrian that God hears the song of new angels every day. When asked whence they come, he replied, ‘From the fiery stream which issues from the throne of God’ (Dan 7:10); see Bacher, *Agada der Tannaiten*, i. 178.—(c) The Jews also speculated much as to the origin of the angels, their connexion with the four elements, etc.; and they had

ingenious methods of computing their number by Kabbalistic *Gematria*—the whole thing being the extravaganza of Oriental phantasy.

iv. The objective value of the NT doctrine of Angels.—The most difficult part of our task now awaits us, to give some account of modern views as to the *reality* of angels, and to discuss whether there are valid reasons why we, as Christians, are bound to accept the *prima facie* NT teaching as to the angelic ministry. Every Christian must feel that it is of very great importance to decide whether the Lord Jesus really believed in the objective existence and ministrations of angels. To this question the present writer feels obliged to give an affirmative reply [but see art. Accommodation, above, p. 20], and that for the following reasons: (1) Though Jesus did not speak much concerning angels, yet His recorded sayings cover, with some intentional exceptions, almost the complete Angelology of the Jews—which is evidence that He was, in the main, in agreement with it. (2) If the disciples had been radically mistaken on this subject, surely this is a matter as to which Christ's words were applicable: 'If it were not so, I would have told you,' Joh_14:2. (3) In controversy with the Sadducees, who were sceptical as to angels, He adroitly gave them such a reply to their objection against the resurrection as to show that the existence and nature of angels was to Him a settled matter, and might be used to elucidate the nature of the resurrection body. There is a wealth of conviction in the words of Jesus: 'Those who rise again are like the angels.' (4) Christ made mention of angels not merely in the parables, where we expect symbolism and pictorial illustration, but also in the interpretation (Mat_13:39; Mat_13:41; Mat_13:49). (5) He used the punitive ability of angels to warn men against despising the little ones in His kingdom (Mat_18:10). Apart from a literal belief in angels, such words are an empty threat. (6) In the time of His most intense agony He evidently derived comfort from the loving sympathy of the 'cloud of witnesses'; for when He emerges from the trial and its bitterness is past, He assures Peter that, had He permitted it, more than twelve legions of angels would readily have intervened to deliver Him (Mat_26:53).—Stevens (*Theology of NT*, p. 80) is impressed by other passages. 'In several places,' he says, 'Christ seems to refer to angels in such a way as to show that He believed in their *real existence*. He will "come in the glory of his Father with his holy angels" (Mar_8:38). "Angels in heaven" neither marry nor are given in marriage (Mar_12:25). Of the hour of his Advent "not even the angels in heaven" know (Mar_13:32).'

In recent times the views of scholars are much divided on this subject. 1. There are large sections of the universal Church to whom the existence of angels is very real, not only as a matter of theoretical belief, but as a matter of religious experience. They set great value on the services of angels as mediators between themselves, in their sins and needs and miseries, and the holy, infinite God; and they delight to think that the spiritual strength and light and succour which come to them in answer to prayer, reach their low estate through the mediation of angels. We might readily

quote from saints of the Greek and Roman Churches on this head, but we prefer to give the ‘disclosures’ of Swedenborg. ‘According to him, we are every moment in the most vital association with the spirits both of heaven and hell. They are the perpetual prompters of our thoughts: they incessantly work by insinuating influences on our loves; and they give force on the one hand to the power of temptation, and on the other fortify the soul, by hidden influx, to resist temptation’ (Rev. G. Bush, *Disclosures of Swedenborg*, 79).

2. There are many who believe in angels theoretically. They take the teaching of the NT in a thoroughly literal sense. They are prepared to maintain and contend that Jesus Christ believed in the real existence of angels; and, in consequence, a belief in angels forms part of their ‘creed’; but angels have no part in their inner religious life. Some admit, not without regret and self-reproach, that angels do not seem so real to them as they did to Jesus; while others are reluctant to admit that it can be a fault to yearn as they do for heart-to-heart fellowship with God Himself, without the intervention of an angel ministry—to seek for direct interaction with God, without even the holiest angel intervening in the sacredness of the communion. As a specimen of this attitude, we quote from an article in the First Series of the *Expositor* (viii. 409 ff.) by R. Winterbotham: ‘I do not mean to imply that we *disbelieve* either the existence or the ministry of angelic beings: we cannot do so without rejecting and denying point blank the unquestioned and unquestionable dicta of our Lord and of His apostles. But I do say that our belief in angels is formal only, or at the best merely poetic. It does not strike its roots down into our religious consciousness, into that inner and unseen, but most real and often passionate, life of the soul towards God and the powers of the world to come.’

3. There are others yet again who set such a high value on the immediacy of the interaction of fellowship with God, believing, as they do, that it was the chief feature of Christ’s teaching to reveal the possibility of fellowship with God as our Father—or led perhaps by scientific predilections to feel that there is now no room for angels in our modern world—that they sweep away the intervention of angels, and are reluctant to admit that the Lord Jesus really believed in their existence. They would believe rather that He accommodated Himself in this matter to current popular notions. For instance, Beyschlag maintains that ‘the immediate relation to the world in which Jesus viewed His heavenly Father left no room for such personal intermediate beings’ [as the Jews of that time believed in]. In passages like [Luk_12:8](#); [Luk_15:10](#) angels are ‘a poetic paraphrase for God Himself.’ ‘The holy angels of the Son of Man, with whom He will come again in His glory, are the rays of Divine majesty which is then to surround Him with splendour: they are the Divine powers with which He is to waken the dead.’ And again, ‘The most remarkable passage is [Mat_18:10](#), and it is the very passage which we can least of all take in prosaic literalness. According to it, even the least of the children of men has his guardian angel who at all times has access to the

Heavenly Father, viz. to complain to Him of the offences done to his protégé on earth. But as God, according to Jesus, knows what happens to each of His children without needing to be told, in what other way can we conceive this entirely poetical passage, than that in every child of man a peculiar thought of God has to be realized, which stands over his history, like a genius, or guardian spirit, and which God always remembers, so that everything which opposes its realization on earth comes before Him as a complaint?' (*New Test. Theology*, i. 86 f.). Dr. Bruce is even more pronounced. In his *Epistle to the Hebrews* (p. 45) he says: 'For modern men, the angels are very much a dead theological category. Everywhere in the old Jewish world, they are next to nowhere in our world. They have practically disappeared from the universe in thought and in fact.' Then, with a strange lapse of the historic sense, he adds: 'This subject was probably a weariness to the writer of our Epistle. A Jew, and well acquainted with Jewish opinion, and obliged to adjust his argument to it, he was tired, I imagine, of the angelic regime. Too much had been made of it in Rabbinical teaching and in popular opinion. It must not be supposed that he was in sympathy with either.'

A belief in angels among men of to-day depends entirely on one's religious outlook, one's general view of God and the world. The man who has *scientific* proclivities, who has toiled through much doubt and uncertainty before he can sincerely affirm the first article of the Christian creed, 'I believe in God the Father Almighty,' will probably be reluctant to take more cargo aboard than his faith can carry. In other words, he will employ the Law of Parsimony, 'Entia praeter necessitatem non multiplicanda sunt,' and, finding the full satisfaction of his religious needs in direct intercourse with God the Father, will reject, or ignore as superfluous, the ministry of angels. So also the man of *mystical* tendencies, whose eager desire is to have communion with the Divine—who claims to be endowed with a faculty by which he can cognize God, and receive immediate communications from Him, is also likely to regard the intervention of angels between his spirit and the Divine Spirit as an intrusion. And not less so is this the case with one who has leanings to *Pantheism*—whether he regards God as altogether immanent in the world, or as both immanent and transcendent. In proportion as one's thoughts centre on Divine immanence, and as one regards God as more or less identical with Force, variant but transmutable, present everywhere, and everywhere causative, in that proportion are one's thoughts drawn away from every theological conception but that of the One Great Cause of motion, life, and mind. There is no room for angels.

The only scientific conception which to some minds seems to foster the belief in angels is the Law of Evolution, or, to speak more accurately, the anticipation of gradation of being, encouraged by that law. T. G. Selby, in his volume of sermons headed by one on 'The Imperfect Angel,' contends that a true science welcomes the belief in angels as intervening between man and God. 'It is surely not unscientific,' he

says, 'to assume the existence of the pure and mighty beings spoken of by seers and prophets of the olden time.' 'The spirit of inspiration, in seeking to convey to us some faint hint of the strict and awful and absolute holiness of God, depicts ranks of angels indefinitely higher and better than the choicest saints on earth: and then tells us that these angels, which seem so lofty and stainless and resplendent, are creatures of unwisdom and shortcoming in comparison with the ineffable wisdom and surpassing holiness of God' (p. 7). Godet in his *Biblical Studies on the OT* has elaborated a scientific *apologia* on behalf of angels. He contends that science recognizes three forms of being: species without individuality, in the vegetable world; individuality under bondage to species, in the animal world; individuality overpowering species, in the human race. He holds, therefore, that it is antecedently probable that there is a *fourth* form of being—individuality without species—each individual owing his existence no longer to parents like himself, but immediately to the Creative Will. This fourth form would exactly be the angel (p. 2 ff.).

It remains now to show that a belief in angels is in precise accord with the fundamental views of God and the world which present themselves in the recorded life and teaching of the Lord Jesus. Were the belief in angels at variance with Christ's personal religious outlook, we might readily regard it as an excrescence which modern thought might lop off without much detriment; but if it is closely allied to our Lord's fundamental doctrines, then this will surely confirm the impression arrived at from other evidence, that Jesus sincerely believed in the reality of angels, and would have us derive from the belief the same comfort and support which He did. Where shall we look with more assurance for the first principles of the doctrine of Jesus than to the Lord's Prayer? There our Saviour taught His disciples to say, 'Our Father which art in heaven. Hallowed be Thy name.... Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.' Beyond all contradiction, then, it is an axiom of the creed of Jesus that there are beings in heaven who do God's will. It is generally recognized that Jesus presented to men a conception of God which meets the needs of man's religious nature, rather than of his reason and intellect. Men of culture and philosophical training may aspire to know God as 'the One in all,' 'the Absolute,' 'the First Cause'; and may appeal for support to isolated sayings of the Apostles, but *not* to sayings of the Master. His sayings owe their eternal permanence to the fact that they appeal to that which is common to all men—the innermost in all men—the heart—the religious nature. To conceive of God as the Absolute, or the First Cause, may satisfy the reason; but before the heart can be satisfied, it must know God as Father, the 'Father in heaven.' But the very phrase 'Father in heaven' seems to imply that He has *sons* in heaven. And that this implication is warranted, is irrefragably substantiated by the words which follow: 'Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.' Surely no one can deny that Christ firmly believed that there are beings in heaven who do God's will, to say the least, far more perfectly than we do, since their obedience is the model to which we are constantly taught to pray that we may attain. Again, it was the outstanding

feature of Judaism to push God aloof from men and the world, whereas Jesus brought God nearer to men, as a Father who takes a minute interest in all that concerns us. But if Jesus thus brought heaven nearer to man, He must, in the very act, have brought the occupants of heaven nearer, and must wish us to believe that they also are deeply interested in our welfare. There is no need that angels should *tell* God anything that concerns us. He knows already far more than they can tell. Those who object to the doctrine of angels because it interposes a barrier between our prayers and our Father's love, misunderstand Christ's teaching. His disclosure of the Fatherliness of God was meant to correct Judaism, in so far as it made angels the bearers of our prayers and the informants to God of our requirements. Those Christians also who approach God through angels contravene in this way Christ's teaching: and also His *example*, for in the garden He said to Peter (Mat 26:53): 'I could pray the *Father*, and he would *send* ... angels.' Christ's teaching and example both show that it is our duty and privilege to have direct intercourse with God in prayer and fellowship. But this is not to say that there is no room for the *ministry* of angels. We may still believe that angels are *sent* on errands of mercy. Indeed, we may well say to those who on this subject are of doubtful mind, as the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews said: 'Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to do service on behalf of those who shall inherit salvation?' (Mat 1:14). There is nothing at all in the Gospel doctrine of angels which is at variance with the religious needs of the most cultured among us. It may present difficulties to reason, as everything which is supernatural does; but the heart of man which loves God must surely rejoice to think that the heavenly Father has also a 'family in heaven' as on earth (Eph 3:15). It must always find a responsive chord in the nature of men who allow the heart a place in their creed, to be told that there are beings who 'continually behold the face of our Father,' who are deeply interested in us (Mat 18:10); that our penitence gives the angels joy (Luk 15:10); that in our times of depression and anguish it may be our privilege to have 'an angel sent from heaven, strengthening' us (Luk 22:43), as in our times of gladness it is our privilege to 'give thanks to the Father from whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named' (Eph 3:14 f.).

Literature.—Articles on 'Angels' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible (by Davidson; cf. also Extra Vol. p. 285 ff.), Schenkel's *Bibellexicon* (by Schenkel), Riehm's *HWB* [Note: WB Handwörterbunch.] (by Delitzsch). *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (by Robertson Smith). For Jewish beliefs see *Jewish Encyclopedia*, vol. i. p. 583 ff.; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus*, vol. ii. Appendix xiii.; Bousset, *Religion des Judenthums*, 313-325; Gfrörer, *Urchristenthum*, i. 352-378; Weber, *Judische Theologie*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (see Index 8. 'Engel'); Donehoo, *Apocryphal and Legendary Life of Christ*; Schiefer, *Die religiösen and ethischen Anschauungen des IV Ezrahus*; Kohut, *Die Judische Angelologie*. On the general subject see Everling, *Die Paulinische Angelologie*; Latham, *The Service of*

Angels; Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics*, 127 ff.; *Expositor*, First Series, viii. 409 ff.; *Expository Times*, iii. 437, vi. 145, 193; Davidson, *Theology of OT*, 289-306; Beyschlag, *NT Theology*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , i. 86 ff.

J. T. Marshall.

⚡ Anger

ANGER.—Anger is the instinctive resentment or reaction of the soul against anything which it regards as wrong or injurious. It is part of its equipment for self-preservation, and the promptitude and energy with which it comes into play are a fair measure of the soul's power to protect itself from the evil which is in the world. If there is not an instant and indignant repulsion of evil, it creeps into the apathetic soul, and soon makes it not only its victim but its instrument. The child's anger with the fire which burns him is in a sense irrational; but one true meaning and purpose of anger in the moral world is illustrated by it. It is the vehement repulsion of that which hurts, and there is no spiritual, as there is no natural, life without it.

An instinct, however, when we come into the world of freedom and responsibility, always needs education; and the radical character of the education required by the instinct of anger is apparent from the fact that the first thought of almost all men is that anger is a vice. Taking human nature as it is, and looking at the actual manifestations of anger, this is only too true. There is, as a rule, something vicious in them. They are self-regarding in a selfish way. Men are angry, as Aristotle puts it (*Ethics*, iv. 5, 7), on wrong grounds, or with the wrong people, or in a wrong way, or for too long a time. Their anger is natural, not spiritual; selfish, not guided by consideration of principle; the indulgence of a temper, not the staking of one's being for a cause. In the NT itself there are far more warnings against anger than indications of its true place and function. Yet when we read the Gospels with the idea of anger in our minds, we can easily see that justice is done to it both as a virtue and a vice. There is a certain arbitrariness in trying to systematize the teaching of Jesus on this or on any other subject, but most of the matter can be introduced if we examine (1) the occasions on which Jesus Himself is represented as being angry; (2) those in which He expresses His judgment on moral questions with a vehemence which is undoubtedly inspired by indignation; and (3) those in which He gives express teaching about anger.

1. *Occasions on which Jesus Himself is represented as being angry.*—(a) The most explicit is Mar_3:5 ‘He looked round on them with anger (μετ’ ὀργῆς), being grieved (συνλυπούμενος) over the hardening of their heart.’ The objects of Christ’s anger here are the people in the synagogue, who maintained an obstinate and prejudiced silence when He asked them, ‘Is it lawful on the Sabbath day to do good or to do evil, to save life or to kill?’ What roused His anger was partly their inhumanity, which cared nothing for the disablement of the man with the withered hand, but even more, perhaps, the misrepresentation of God of which they were guilty, when in His honour (as they would have it) they justified inhumanity on the Sabbath day. To be inhuman themselves was bad enough, but to impute the same inhumanity to the Heavenly Father was far worse, and the indignation of Jesus was visible as He looked round on them. He passionately resented their temper, and repelled it from Him with vehemence, as injurious at once to God and to man. Yet His indignation was expressed in one indignant glance (περιβλεψάμενος, aorist), while it was accompanied by a deep pain, which did not pass away (συνλυπούμενος, present), over the hardening of their heart. This combination, in which resentment of wrong is accompanied with a grief which makes the offender’s case one’s own, and seeks to win him by reaching the inner witness to God in his soul before insensibility has gone too far, is characteristic of Jesus, and is the test whether anger is Christian.

(b) The next occasion on which we see our Lord display an emotion akin to anger is found in Mar_10:13 ff. He was ‘moved with indignation’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ἠγανάκτησεν) when the disciples forbade the children to be brought to Him. The other instances in which the same word is used (Mar_10:41; Mar_14:4, Mat_21:15, Luk_13:14) show that a natural feeling of being hurt or annoyed is what the word specifically means. The disciples should have known Him better than to do what they did: they wronged Him in forbidding the approach of the children. Hence doctrines and practices which refuse to children, and to the intellectually and morally immature in general, their place and interest in the kingdom of God, are proper subjects of resentment. In one aspect of it, the kingdom of God is a protest against nature, and to enter into it we must be born again; but in another, there is a real analogy between them; the order of nature is constituted with a view to the order of grace; man is made in God’s image and for God, and it is his true nature to welcome God; if the children are ‘suffered,’ and not forbidden, they will go to Jesus. They wrong God who deny this, and therefore the denial is to be resented.

(c) There is a striking passage in Luke (Luk_14:25 ff.), where, although anger is not mentioned, it is impossible not to feel that Jesus is speaking with a profound and even passionate resentment. ‘Great multitudes followed with him, and he turned, and said to them, If any man cometh to me, and hateth not his father, and mother, and

wife, and children, and brothers, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple.’ Jesus was on His way to die; and it moved Him as an indignity, which He was entitled to resent, that on the very path to the cross He should be attended by a shallow throng who did not have it in them to do the slightest violence to themselves for the sake of the kingdom of God. The whole passage, in which the moral demands of discipleship are set at the highest, vibrates with indignation. To follow Christ is a great enterprise, like building a tower, or going to war; it requires the painful sacrifice of the tenderest natural affections, the renunciation of the most valued possessions; and when it is affected by people who have no moral salt in them—who could not win it from themselves to give up anything for God and His cause—the resentment of Jesus rises into scorn (Luk_14:34 f.). With all His love for men, there was a kind of man whom He did not shrink from describing as ‘good for nothing.’

(d) The last passage is that in which Jesus cleanses the Temple: Mar_11:15 and parallels. What stirred His indignation here was in part the profanity to which sacred places and their proper associations had lost all sacredness; in part, the covetousness which on the pretext of accommodating the pilgrims had turned the house of prayer into a den of thieves; in part, again, the inhumanity which, by instituting a market so noisy in the Court of the Gentiles, must have made worship for these less privileged seekers after God difficult, if not impossible. The text quoted in Joh_2:17 (Psa_69:9), as remembered by the disciples in connexion with this event—‘the zeal of thy house shall eat me up’—sums up as well as anything could do the one characteristic which is never wanting in the anger of Jesus, and which alone renders anger just. It is jealousy for God—the identification of oneself with His cause and interest on earth, especially as it is represented in human beings, and resentment of everything which does it wrong.* [Note: In Mat_21:31 Wellhausen adopts the reading ὁ ὑστερος instead of ὁ τῶ ὠτος. This makes the Jews deride Jesus, instead of seriously answering Him; and Wellhausen, taking it so, finds in the words which follow—‘The publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you’—not an explanation of the parable, but a Zornesausbruch, an outburst of wrath, which could hardly be cleared of petulance (Das Evangelium Matthaei, 106 f.). O. Holtzmann’s idea that Jesus cursed the fig-tree in a momentary fit of temper is only worth mentioning as a warning (see his *Leben Jesu*, p. 324).]

2. The occasions on which Jesus expresses His judgment on moral questions with a vehemence which is undoubtedly inspired by indignation.—Every moral judgment, of course, contains feeling it is not merely the expression of assent or dissent but of consent or resentment. We are all within the moral world, not outside of it; we cannot be spectators merely, but in every thought we are actors as well; to deny this is to deny that there is a moral world at all. Hence all dissent is condemnation, and all condemnation, if real, is resentment; but there are circumstances in which tin

condemnation is so emphatic that the resentment becomes vivid and contagious, and it is illustrations of this that we wish to find in the life of Jesus.

(a) The most conspicuous is perhaps that which we find in the passage on *σκάνδαλα* (Mat 18:6 f.). Jesus has taken a little child to rebuke the ambitious strife of the Twelve; but ‘these little ones who believe in me’ are not children, but the disciples generally (cf. Mat 10:42). ‘To make one of them stumble’ (*σκανδαλίξειν*) is to perplex him, to put him out about Christ, to create misunderstanding and estrangement, such as we hear of for a time in the case of the Baptist (Mat 11:2 ff.) and the Nazarenes (Mat 13:57), and so to make his discipleship void. In a more general sense it means to mislead, or to be the cause that another falls into sin which his better conscience condemns. If we are to judge from His language, nothing ever moved Jesus to such passionate indignation as this. The sin of sins was that of leading others into sin, especially ‘the little ones’—the weak, the untaught, the easily perplexed and easily misled—whose hearts were otherwise naturally right with Him. Every word in Jesus’ sentence is laden with indignation: ‘Better for him that a great millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.’ This anger of Jesus is exactly what is meant in the OT by ‘the jealousy of God,’ *i.e.* His love pledged to His own, and resenting with all the intensity of the Divine nature any wrong inflicted on them (cf. Zec 8:2 f.). Though anger is often sinful, the absence of anger may be due to the absence of love: and the man who can see the ‘little ones’ being made to stumble and who takes it quite coolly is very far from the kingdom of God.

(b) It is possibly an instance of this same indignation that we find in Mat 16:23. Peter tempts Jesus to decline the cross—in other words, tries to make Him stumble at the will of the Father; and the indignant vehemence with which he is repelled—‘Get thee behind me, Satan’—shows how real the temptation was, and how a prompt and decisive resentment is the natural security in such trials. We have a right and a duty to be angry with the tempter.

(c) In the answer of Jesus to the Sadducees in Mar 12:24 ff. we have another light on what moved Him to indignation. In the scornful *πολὺ πλανᾶσθε* with which the discussion closes, resuming the *πλανᾶσθε* of Mar 12:24, Jesus’ resentment shines out. The question at issue, that of man’s immortality was a great and solemn question. It involved the whole character of God—what He was, and what in His power, His goodness, and His faithfulness He could and would do for the souls He had made in His own image. The Sadducees had tried to degrade it and make it ridiculous, and the indignation of Jesus is unmistakable. It is an example which justifies indignation with

those who by unworthy controversial methods profane or render ridiculous subjects in which the dearest concerns of humanity are involved.

(d) To these passages may be added Jesus' denunciation of the Pharisees in Mat 23:13 ff. The long series of woes is not merely a revelation of things which in the mind of Jesus are illegitimate, it is a revelation of the passionate resentment which these things evoke in Him. They are the things with which God is angry every day, and it is a sin in men if they can look at them without indignation. To keep people ignorant of religious truth, neither living by it ourselves, nor letting them do so (Mat 23:13); to make piety or the pretence of it a cloak for avarice (Mat 23:14, only introduced here from || Mark); to raise recruits for our own faction on the pretext of enlisting men for the kingdom of God (Mat 23:15); to debauch the simple conscience by casuistical sophistries (Mat 23:16-22); to destroy the sense of proportion in morals by making morality a matter of law in which all things stand on the same level (Mat 23:23 f.); to put appearance above reality, and reduce life to a play, at once tragedy and farce (Mat 23:25-28); to revive the spirit and renew the sins of the past, while we affect a pious horror of them, crucifying the living prophets while we build monuments to the martyred (Mat 23:29 ff.): these are the things which made a storm of anger sweep over the soul of Jesus, and burst in this tremendous denunciation of His enemies. Yet it is entirely in keeping with the combination of ideas in Mar 3:5 (μετ' ὀργῆς ... συνλυσσόμενος) when the Evangelist attaches to this our Lord's lament over Jerusalem (Mat 23:37 ff., cf. Luk 13:34 f.). His anger does not extinguish His compassion, and if the city could be moved to repentance He would still gather her children together as a hen gathers her chickens under her wings.

Putting the whole of the passages together, and generalizing from them, we may infer that the two things in human conduct which moved Jesus most quickly and deeply to anger, were (1) inhumanity, wrong done to the needs or rights of men; and (2) misrepresentation of God by professedly religious people, and especially by religious teachers. He stood in the world for the rights and interests, or, we may say, for the truth of God and of human nature; and His whole being reacted immediately and vehemently against all that did wrong to either.

3. Something may further be learned from *the passages in which Jesus gives express teaching about anger.*—(a) The chief of these is Mat 5:21-27. Here our Lord interprets the sixth commandment for the citizens of the kingdom of God. It is not only the act of murder which is condemned, but the first movement of the passions which leads in that direction. 'He who murders shall be liable to the judgment? I tell you, every one who is angry with his brother shall be liable to the judgment.' The reading εἰκῆ ('without cause,' *temere*) is no doubt erroneous here; but the introduction of it is rather a rhetorical than an exegetical blunder. As Tholuck observed, to bring in the

idea that there is such a thing as lawful anger would only weaken the condemnation passed here upon such anger as men are familiar with in themselves and others; but after what has been said under (1) and (2), it does not need to be proved that there is a place for anger in the Christian in the world in which we live. What Jesus condemns here is not any kind of anger, but anger with a brother, which forgets that he is a brother, and that we have a brother's duty to him; the anger which leads straight to contemptuous and insulting words (the ὀρακά and μωροῖ of Mat_5:22), and ends in irreconcilable bitterness (Mat_5:25 f.). Anger like this on the part of one Christian toward another is sin, and sin so deadly that no words could exaggerate the urgency of escape from it. No religion's duty, not even the most sacred, can take precedence of the duty of reconciliation. If a man should be offering his gift at the altar—if he should actually be seated at the communion table with the communion cup in his hand, let him put it down, and go first, and get out of these angry relations with his brother, and then come and have fellowship with God (Mat_5:23 f.). How can an angry man, with the temper of a quarrel in him, have communion with the God of peace? It is possible to raise casuistical questions in all such situations as are here supposed, but as these questions present themselves only to the spectators, not to the responsible actors, it is not worth while to raise them. The one duty insisted on here, as in the partly parallel passage in Mat_18:15-18, is the duty of placability. The person who has suffered the wrong—that is, who is in the right, who is entitled to be angry—is for that very reason to take the initiative in reconciliation, and to bear the expense of it. That is how God deals with us, who have offended Him, and that is how we are to deal with those who offend us. There is to be no anger in the sense of a selfish resentment into which the bad passions of unregenerate human nature can pour themselves; and the lawful anger of the soul, whose wrong is a wrong done to the kingdom of God, will pass away at once when he who has done the wrong is brought to repentance. The penitence and the resentment are the guilty and the innocent index of the reality of the wrong; and each is as inevitable as the other if the Christian life is to be morally sincere.

(b) It is natural to take account here of the passage on retaliation and non-resistance in Mat_5:38 ff. Anger seems to be unconditionally precluded by such a saying as, 'Whosoever smiteth thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also.' It is difficult to believe that any one was ever struck on the face unjustly (as is assumed in the connexion) without resenting it, and just as difficult to believe that it would be for the good of humanity or of the kingdom of God that it should be so. But Jesus, who came to abolish one literalism, did not come to institute another. His words are never to be read as statutes, but as appeals to conscience. What He teaches in this place is that there is no limit to be laid down beforehand beyond which love is no longer to regulate the conduct of His disciples. No provocation can be so insulting, no demand can be so unjust, so irrational, so exasperating, as that His disciples shall be entitled

to cast love overboard, and meet the world with weapons like its own. Love must to all extremities be the supreme and determining principle in their conduct, the same love, with the same interests in view, as that of their Father in heaven (Mat_5:45); but no more in them than in Him does it exclude all manifestation of anger. What it does exclude is the selfish anger which is an alternative to love, not the Divine resentment which is a mode of love, and expresses its sense of the reality of wrong. If this died out of the world, society would swiftly rot to extinction; but the gospel, in the sense of the words, the example, and the spirit of Jesus, is so far from proscribing this that it is the greatest of all powers for keeping it alive. For those who have learned that where the spirit of the Lord is there is liberty, the literal interpretation of words like Mat_5:39-42 is a combination of pedantry and fanaticism which no genius will ever make anything else than absurd.

Echoes of the teaching of Jesus on anger are probably to be traced at various points in the teaching of the Apostles. e.g. in Romans 12, a chapter which often recalls the Sermon on the Mount, Rom_12:18-21 are entirely in the key of Mat_5:38 ff. 'The wrath' of Rom_12:19, to which Christians are to leave room, is the wrath of God which will be revealed at the last day. God has reserved for Himself (ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω) the vindication of the wronged, and they are not to forestall Him or take His work out of His hands; in the day of wrath, when His righteous judgment is revealed, all wrongs will be rectified; meanwhile, as Christ teaches, love is to rule all our conduct, and we must overcome evil with good. It is perhaps with a vague recollection of Mat_5:23 f. that men are directed in 1Ti_2:8 to pray χωρὶς ὀργῆς: an angry man cannot pray. Accordingly a bishop must not be ὀργίλος, given to anger, or of an uncontrollable temper (Tit_1:7). Exhortations like those in Eph_4:31, Col_3:8, Jam_1:19, show that anger was known to the Church mainly in forms which the Christian conscience condemned. Jam_1:19 is particularly interesting, because it reminds us of the danger (in anger) of enlisting self in the service of God, calling on the old man to do what can be done only by the new: 'The wrath of *man* worketh not the righteousness of *God*.' But though it is difficult, it need not be impossible that the wrath which a man feels, and under the impulse of which he expresses himself, should be, not 'the wrath of man,' but a Divine resentment of evil. The words of Mat_18:6 or Mat_23:13 ff. fell from human lips, but they are the expression and the instrument of the jealousy of God. To be angry without sin is difficult for men, but it is a difficult duty (Eph_4:26).

Apart from anything yet alluded to is the use of the verb ἐμβριμᾶσθαι to describe some kind of emotion in Jesus (Mar_1:43, Mat_9:30, Joh_11:33; Joh_11:38). Ordinarily the word conveys the idea of indignation which cannot be repressed; but this, though found elsewhere in the Gospels (e.g. Mar_14:5), is not obviously appropriate in the

passages quoted. In the first two it may be due to our Lord's consciousness of the fact that the persons on whom He had conferred a great blessing were immediately going to disregard His command to keep silent about it; the sense of this put something severe and peremptory into His tones. In the last two it has been explained as expressing Jesus' sense of the indignity of death; He resented, as something not properly belonging to the Divine idea of the world, such experiences as He was confronted with on the way to the grave of Lazarus. But this is precarious, and on the whole there is little stress to be laid on any inference we can draw from the use of ἐμβριμάσθαι in the Gospels.

Literature.—Butler, *Sermons*, viii., ix.; Law, *Serious Call*, ch. xxi.; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*, chs. xxi.-xxiii.; Dale, *Atonement*⁷ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 338 ff.; *Expos. Times*, iv. [1893], pp. 256 ff., 492 ff.; *Expositor*, 1st ser. i. [1875], 133 ff.

James Denney.

☒ Animals

ANIMALS.—It cannot be said that animals play a very important part in the life and teaching of our Lord; yet the Gospel references cover a wider range than is usually imagined. The Evangelists use no fewer than 40 different Greek words denoting animals, and, apart from such general terms as 'birds of the air,' 'wild beasts,' and 'serpents,' they mention at least 20 particular kinds. The references may best be classified under the headings 'Domestic' and 'Wild.'

i. Domestic Animals.—1. The *beasts of burden* in Palestine in the time of our Lord were the ass and the camel. The horse is not mentioned in the Gospels, its use in the East being restricted to purposes of war. Thus the horse becomes prominent in the military imagery of the Apocalypse.

A general term for 'beast of burden' occurs in the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luk_10:34 κτήνος). In Rev_18:13 'beasts of burden' are distinguished from horses. Josephus (*Ant.* iv. vi. 3) uses the word of asses in particular. In Act_23:24 a 'beast' is provided to carry St. Paul to Caesarea; in the NT therefore κτήνος is clearly some 'beast of burden' which is not a horse. Probably the Good Samaritan rode on an ass, or possibly on a mule.

The **ass** is denoted by four other words in the Gospels, viz. πῶλος, ὄναριον, ὄνος, and ὑποζύγιον. The animal on which our Lord made His triumphal entry into Jerusalem is described by all four Evangelists as a colt (πῶλος, [Mat_21:2](#); [Mat_21:5](#); [Mat_21:7](#), [Mar_11:2](#); [Mar_11:4-5](#); [Mar_11:7](#), [Luk_19:30](#); [Luk_19:33](#); [Luk_19:35](#), [Joh_12:15](#)). The word is not used elsewhere in the Gospels, and in John it occurs only in the quotation from Zechariah. St. John describes the colt as ὄναριον, a young ass. St. Matthew introduces the she-ass, the mother of the colt, into the story. In the Matthaean form of the quotation from Zechariah ([Mat_21:5](#)) the mother ass is further described as a draught beast (ὑποζύγιον).

The meaning of this fulfilment of prophecy is well brought out by Chrysostom. Jesus entered Jerusalem riding on an ass, ‘not driving chariots like the rest of the kings, not demanding tributes, not thrusting men off, and leading about guards, but displaying His great meekness even hereby’ (*Hom. 66 in Mt.*).

The triumphal entry into Jerusalem is the only incident in the life of our Lord in which an ass is concerned; but in His teaching, as reported by St. Luke, there are two other references. The synagogue-ruler, who forbade people to come to be healed on the Sabbath, received the rebuke, ‘Hypocrites, does not each one of you loose his ox or his ass (τὸν ὄνον) from the stall on the Sabbath and lead him away to watering?’ ([Luk_13:15](#)). On another occasion, with reference to the same question of Sabbath healing, our Lord asked, ‘Which of you shall have an ass or an ox fallen into a well, and will not straightway draw him up on a Sabbath day’ ([Luk_14:5](#)).

The text of the latter passage is uncertain, the evidence of Ⲙ and B being divided. B reads υἱὸς, adopted by Westcott and Hort; while Ⲙ reads ὄνος, retained by the Revisers. Possibly neither is the correct text; but if we follow the Revisers, we may notice that on the only two occasions when the ass is mentioned in our Lord’s teaching, it is coupled with the ox, as if to imply that the Jewish farmer took equal care of each. ‘The ox, the ass, and the sheep are the (chief) domestic animals with which an Israelite household is provided’ (O. Holtzmann).

The ass occupies a much more important place in the farm life of the East than his neglected descendant occupies in England to-day. The finer breeds are regularly used for riding, while the commoner breeds draw the plough and carry burdens. ‘The ass is still the most universal of all beasts of burden in Bible lands’ (Post, in *Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible*).

The **camel** (κάμηλος) figures in two sayings of our Lord which have a proverbial ring. (Thomson notes that the camel is still the subject of many Arabian proverbs). The three Synoptics record the saying, 'It is easier for a camel to pass through a needle's eye than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God' (Mat 19:24, Mar 10:25, Luk 18:25). There is no need to stumble at the hyperbole involved in 'a needle's eye,' nor is it necessary to explain the phrase as a reference to a particularly small gate (see art. 'Camel' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible). The second reference is found in the denunciation of the Pharisees, who strain out a gnat while they gulp down a camel (Mat 23:24). A camel-caravan would be one of the sights of our Lord's boyhood, and the awkwardness of meeting a camel in the narrow street, which modern travellers experience, was not unknown nineteen hundred years ago. The camel must have been the largest animal with which our Lord was familiar, and in both sayings it is mentioned for its size.

The only other reference to the camel occurs in the description of the dress of John the Baptist, whose garment, like that of Elijah, was of camel's hair (Mat 3:4, Mar 1:6).

On this Sir Thomas Browne notes: 'a coarse garment, a cilicious or sackcloth garment, suitable to the austerity of his life—the severity of his doctrine, repentance—and the place thereof, the wilderness—his food and diet, locusts and wild honey.'

2. Of larger cattle,* [Note: The word 'cattle' is used to tr. θρόμματα in Joh 4:12. The word is also found in the AV of Luk 17:7.] oxen, bulls, and calves find a place in the Gospels.

The **ox** (βοῦς) is mentioned three times in Luke, twice in connexion with the ass in the passages previously cited (Luk 13:15; Luk 14:5), and again in the parable of the Great Supper, when one of the invited guests excuses himself on the ground that he has bought five yoke of oxen which need to be tested (Luk 14:19). The ox was employed in the East for ploughing and threshing; it was also used for sacrifice, as appears from the only other passage in the Gospels where oxen are mentioned, viz. St. John's account of the cleansing of the Temple court. Sheep and oxen (Joh 2:14 f.) were driven out along with their vendors.

Bulls (ταῦροι) and **fat beasts** (σιτιστά)† [Note: Wyclif, following the Vulg. altilia, translates 'my volatilis (fowls)'; but fatted cattle are probably meant.] are mentioned only in Mat 22:4. They form samples of the rich dainties prepared for the marriage feast of the king's son, and illustrate the magnificent scale of the entertainment which those summoned to partake so insolently spurned. Similarly the

fatted calf (ὁ μώσχος ὁ σιτευτός), which appears only in the parable of the Prodigal Son (Luk 15:23; Luk 15:27; Luk 15:30), indicates an unusual feast, made to celebrate an unusual joy. The fatted calf is contrasted with the kid, the customary repast, which Oriental hospitality provides to this day. The elder brother complains that he has never been allowed to offer his friends the entertainment which his father is wont to provide for any chance visitor; while for the graceless prodigal is killed the fatted calf, which is destined only for high festivals. The bulls and fatlings in the parable of the Marriage Feast, and the fatted calf in the parable of the Returning Prodigal, alike stand for the lavish generosity of God's love, which the Scribes and Pharisees could not appreciate, even when offered to themselves, the king's invited guests, much less when those prodigals, the publicans and sinners, were likewise embraced therein.

3. Of *smaller cattle*, goats and sheep are mentioned.

Goats (ἔριφος, ἐρίφιον, lit. 'kid,' a meaning retained in Luk 15:29; in LXX Septuagint the word = 'goat' as well as 'kid') appear only in the picture of the Last Judgment (Mat 25:32 f.), where they are contrasted with sheep. The point of the contrast lies in the colour rather than the character of the animals, the sheep being pure white, while the goats are covered with long jet-black hair. So in the Song of Solomon (Son 4:1) the locks of the beloved are compared to 'a flock of goats that appear from Mt. Gilead.' The Son of Man shall separate all the nations 'as a shepherd separateth the sheep from the goats,' and the simile is quite true to pastoral life. Tristram (*Nat. Hist.* p. 89) says that sheep and goats pasture together, but never trespass on each other's domains; they are folded together, but they do not mix; they may be seen to enter the fold in company, but once inside they are kept separate.

The Syrian goat, *Capra mambrica*, is the most common breed in Palestine. It is distinguished by long pendant ears, stout recurved horns, and long black silky hair. Flocks of goats are most frequent in hilly districts from Hebron to Lebanon, where their habit of browsing on young trees tends to deforest the country.

A **kid** (ἔριφος, some MS^S [Note: SS Manuscripts.] ἐρίφιον) is mentioned in the parable of the Prodigal Son (Luk 15:29). The kid formed the ordinary dish at an Eastern feast, as lambs were preserved for the sake of wool, and were, as a rule, slain only in sacrifice. For the contrast between the kid and the fatted calf see above, s. 'fatted calf.' There is no other direct mention of the goat in the Gospels, though the wine-bottles (ἄσχοι) referred to in Mat 9:17 (| Mar 2:22, Luk 5:37 f.) were doubtless made of goat-skin. These bottles were made by cutting off the head and legs, and drawing the carcass out by the neck, and then tying the neck, legs, and vent, and

tanning the skin, with the hairy side out (Post, in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. 195).

The word for sheep (πρόβατον) is to be found in the Gospels no fewer than 36 times, while words connected with sheep, e.g. ποιμνη, ποιμνιον, 'a flock,' are not infrequent. Sheep were so often in the thoughts of Jesus that we have postponed fuller consideration of these passages to § iv.

Of the two words for lamb, one, ἀμνός, is applied only to our Lord, whom John the Baptist twice describes as 'the Lamb of God,' adding in one case 'which taketh away the sin of the world' (Joh_1:29; Joh_1:36). The title implies sacrifice.

Whether the Baptist was thinking of the Paschal lamb or of the lamb daily offered in the temple matters little. In Jesus he saw 'the reality of which all animal sacrifice was the symbol' (Marcus Dods). No doubt the patience of the lamb is implied in the title, as unfolded in Isa_53:7 'as a lamb before its shearer is dumb, so he opened not his mouth.' The purity of the lamb, without spot and without fault, on which St. Peter dwells (1Pe_1:19), is also involved. But the idea of redemption through sacrifice is fundamental in the Baptist's words.

The second word for 'lamb' occurs in two forms, ἄρνας (acc. pl.) and ἄρνιον. The diminutive form is found only in Joh_21:15, where our Lord bids Peter feed His lambs. 'Lambs' is used instead of 'sheep,' to bring out more strongly the appeal to care, and the consequent complete confidence in Peter (M. Dods). In the Apocalypse our Lord is called 'the Lamb' (τὸ ἄρνιον) no fewer than 27 times. The form ἄρνας is confined to Luk_10:3 'Behold, I send you forth as lambs into the midst of wolves.'

The parallel Mat_10:16 reads 'sheep,' but the Lukan form is supported by Clement of Rome, *Ep.* ii. 5, 'Ye shall be as lambs (ἄρνια) in the midst of wolves. But Peter answered him, saying, If then the wolves tear the lambs in pieces? Jesus said to Peter, Let not the lambs fear the wolves, after they (the lambs) are dead.' Further support for the reading 'lambs' may perhaps be derived from Justin's casual description of Marcionites as lambs torn by wolves (ἄρνες σνηητασμενοι, *Apol.* circa (about) 58).

4. *Poultry* were kept in Palestine in the time of our Lord, as is clear from the references to the **cock** (ἀλέκτωρ) and the **hen** (ἄρνις). If we except the mention of cock-crow (see sep. art.) in Mar_13:35, the cock appears only in the story of Peter's denial, and our Lord's prediction of it (Mat_26:34; Mat_26:74 f., Mar_14:30

(Mar 14:68), Mar 14:72, Luk 22:34; Luk 22:60 f., Joh 13:38; Joh 18:27). The hen (ὄρνις) affords a simile in the lament over Jerusalem. 'How often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen gathereth her chickens (Lk. 'her brood') under her wings!' (Mat 23:37, Luk 13:34). The action by which the hen gives rest and protection to the chickens under the shelter of her wings is too well known to need comment. The tenderness of the simile witnesses to the love of Jesus for His own countrymen, and His longing to avert national disaster. The words used for 'chickens' and 'brood' (νοσσίον and νοσσιὰ) are found here only, though a word from the same root is employed in the phrase 'two young pigeons' (νοσσοῦς περιστερῶν, Luk 2:24).

5. To the list of domestic animals we may add dogs and swine, which were classed together as unclean.

Dogs (κύνες) are mentioned twice. In the Sermon on the Mount the disciples are warned not to give that which is holy to dogs (Mat 7:6). The pariah dogs that infest Eastern towns, and have to be cleared off periodically with poison, are 'a lean, mangy, and sinister brood,' acting as scavengers and living on offal. Naturally these animals do not possess a fastidious palate, and their manner of life is disgusting enough to justify the Jews' contempt for them. To call a man a dog is throughout the Bible a customary form of abuse. These wild dogs, says Tristram (*Nat. Hist.* p. 80), were the only dogs known in Palestine, with the exception of the Persian greyhound; and though they could be trained enough to act as watch-dogs for the sheep-folds, * [Note: It would be truer to say that the pariah dogs have degenerated from the sheep-dogs than that the latter have developed from the former.] they hardly became companions to man [the dog of Tob 5:16; Tob 11:4 is altogether an exceptional case]. To the Jew the dog was a very fitting symbol of the man who had depraved his moral and spiritual taste by evil living. In the *Didache*, 'Give not that which is holy to dogs' is interpreted to mean, Do not administer the Eucharist to the unbaptized; but the principle involved in the text is capable of wider application. A Christian is not required to wear his heart on his sleeve! In the parable of Dives and Lazarus it is said that these street-dogs came and licked the beggar's sores (Luk 16:21). This is an aggravation rather than an alleviation of Lazarus' suffering. It shows his destitute and defenceless condition, that he could not even keep the dogs away! A diminutive form of κύων, viz. κυνάριον, occurs in the story of the Syro-Phœnician woman. 'It is not right,' said the Master, 'to take the children's bread and cast it to dogs.' 'Yea, Lord,' replied the woman, 'yet the dogs eat of the crumbs that fall from their masters' table' (Mat 15:27 f., Mar 7:27 f.). Bochart treats the diminutive κυνάριον as doubling the contempt inherent in the word. But it is clear

from the woman's reply that the dogs in question are kept within the house; they are household pets. Tristram says that he found no difficulty in making a pet of a puppy taken from among the pariah dogs (*Nat. Hist.* p. 80). Probably the κυνάρια were puppies which had been taken into Jewish households as pets in a similar way. The word is not intended to add to the harshness of our Lord's saying; the woman saw in it her ground for appeal.

Swine (χοῖρος, not ὄς) appear in the story of the Gadarene demoniac (Mat 8:30 ff., Mar 5:11 ff., Luk 8:32 f.). 'The fact that swine were kept in Palestine at all is evidence of the presence of the foreigner' (O. Holtzmann). Cf. Lev 11:7, Deu 14:8, Isa 65:4. The country on the east side of the Lake was much under Gentile influence. The Prodigal Son is put to tend swine. The nature of the task is evidence at once of the difference between his home and the far country, and of the want and degradation into which he has fallen (Luk 15:15 f.) The only further reference to swine is the saying, 'Cast not your pearls before swine' (Mat 7:6), in which our Lord emphasizes the necessity of tact in religious work.

ii. Wild Animals.—1. θηρίον, the general word for *wild beast*, is found in the Gospels only once. Mar 1:13 tells us that during the Temptation our Lord was with the wild beasts. Thomson says that 'though there are now no lions (in Palestine), wolves, leopards, and panthers still prowl about the wild wadys' (*Land and Book*, 'Central Palestine,' p. 594). 'In the age of Jesus, the chief beast of prey in Palestine was, as to-day, the jackal. Mark's addition indicates Jesus' complete severance from human society' (O. Holtzmann, *Life of Jesus*, p. 143 f.).

The word θηρίον is now to be found in the second of the five new Gospels recently recovered by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt: 'The birds of the air and whatever of the beasts are on the earth or under it are they who draw us into the kingdom.' Here the word is not confined to 'beasts of prey'; it stands for the whole kingdom of wild animals. There is a similar use of the word in a saying of our Lord as given by Justin Martyr: 'Be not anxious as to what ye shall eat or what ye shall put on: are ye not much better than the birds and the beasts?' (1 *Apol.* 15). These considerations support the conclusion that St. Mark's addition does not imply physical danger, but is rather intended to suggest that our Lord was alone with Nature.

Two beasts of prey mentioned by name in the Gospels are the fox (άλώπηξ) and the wolf (λύκος). The fox, which has at least a hole to live in, is contrasted with the homeless Son of Man (Mat 8:20, Luk 9:58). In Luk 13:32 our Lord speaks of Herod as 'that fox.' The cunning and perhaps the cowardice of the animal are the basis of the

comparison. 'The name,' says O. Holtzmann, 'must have been given to Herod because he was inimical, yet, not daring to make any open attack, timidly prowled about until he found an opportunity to murder in secret' (*Life of Jesus*, p. 364).

The **wolf** is mentioned only in connexion with or in contrast to sheep. The wolf is the chief enemy against which the shepherd has to guard his flock. 'A single wolf,' says Tristram, 'is far more destructive than a whole pack of jackals' (*Nat. Hist.* p. 153). Eastern shepherds employ dogs (if they employ them at all) not to help in herding the sheep, but to ward off wolves. In contrast to the hireling, the Good Shepherd faces the wolf even at the risk of his life (Joh 10:12). False prophets are wolves in sheep's clothing (Mat 7:15). The contrast between outward profession and inward character could not be more vividly expressed. The same antithesis is used by our Lord to portray the contrast between the Church and the world, between the patient non-resistance of the one and the brutal violence of the other. The disciples are sent forth as sheep (Lk. as lambs) into the midst of wolves (Mat 10:16, Luk 10:3).

2. The general term for *wild birds* is τὰ πετεινά, 'the birds,' often τὰ πετεινά τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, 'the birds of heaven.' They are mentioned in the Sermon on the Mount: 'Consider the birds: they do not sow, nor reap, nor gather into barns' (Mat 6:26; in the parallel passage, Luk 12:24, the reading is κόρακας, 'ravens,' which, however, are themselves called πετεινά at the end of the verse). Dean Stanley says that the birds most in evidence round the Sea of Galilee are partridges and pigeons. Finches and bulbuls are also abundant, according to Thomson. For the doctrine of providence involved in this and similar sayings of our Lord, we must refer our readers to § iv. Like the foxes, the birds are contrasted with the Son of Man; they have nests, while He hath not where to lay His head (Mat 8:20, Luk 9:58). The birds appear in the parable of the Sower, where they pick up the seed that falls by the wayside (Mat 13:4, Mar 4:4, Luk 8:5). No doubt the fields round the lake, with the birds busy upon them, could be seen from the place where Jesus stood to teach the people. Probably the parable was spoken early in the year. The parable of the Mustard Seed also introduces the birds, which come and lodge in the branches of the full-grown tree (Mat 13:32, Mar 4:32, Luk 13:19). Here the imagery seems to be drawn from Dan 4:12; Dan 4:21, where the kingdom of Nebuchadrezzar is likened to a tree 'upon whose branches the birds of the heavens had their habitations.' Daniel interprets the tree to represent the greatness of Nebuchadrezzar's dominion, which is to reach to the end of the earth. The description in the parable carries with it the same implication with regard to the kingdom of heaven. There is one other reference to 'the birds' in Luk 12:24 'How much better are ye than the birds!'

The following particular wild birds are mentioned in the Gospels:—dove (pigeon), eagle, raven, sparrow, turtle-dove.

In all four Gospels the dove appears as the symbol of the Holy Ghost at our Lord's Baptism. In Mat 3:16 the vision of the Holy Ghost descending in the form of a dove (ὡσεὶ περιστέρων) seems to have been granted to all present at the Baptism. In Mar 1:10 and Luk 3:22 the vision is apparently addressed more especially to Jesus Himself. In Joh 1:32 it is a sign given to John the Baptist. In the story of the Creation, a metaphor from bird-life is employed to describe the Spirit of God fluttering ((Revised Version margin) 'brooding') over the waters (Gen 1:2). The same Spirit rests on the Saviour with whom begins God's new creation. But the mention of the dove naturally carries us back to the story of the Flood (Gen 8:11). For Jesus the dove with olive-leaf after the Flood is the emblem of the Spirit (A. B. Bruce in *Expositor's Greek Testament*, on Mat 3:16). The Holy Ghost in the form of a dove typifies the hope of the gospel, peace between man and God. In cleansing the Temple-court our Lord came upon them that sold doves for sacrifice. It is to these dove-sellers that the words in Joh 2:16 are addressed, 'Take these things hence.' The cattle can be driven out: the doves must be carried out. This detail, which is perfectly natural, is recorded only in John, who consequently mentions 'doves' twice (Joh 2:14; Joh 2:16), while Matthew and Mark have only one reference each (Mat 21:12, Mar 11:15).

The word περιστέρα is used in the LXX Septuagint where the Authorized and Revised Versions reads 'pigeon' as well as where it reads 'dove.' The same bird is probably meant by the two English words. But in the directions for sacrifice in Leviticus, the word 'pigeon' is regularly used, and in Luk 2:24 περιστέρα is translated 'pigeon,' though elsewhere in the Gospels it is rendered 'dove.' In Lev 12:6 a poor woman, 'if she be not able to bring a lamb, shall bring two turtles or two young pigeons.' The mother of Jesus brings the poor woman's sacrifice.

To the ancients the dove symbolized purity (Aristotle mentions the chastity of the dove), and this fact perhaps made birds of this class suitable for sacrifice. The only other reference to the dove in the Gospels is found in Mat 10:16, where the disciples are bidden to be as pure (ἀκέραιοι) as doves, a command which St. Paul echoes in Rom 16:19 and Php 2:15.

The **turtle-dove** (τρουγών) is mentioned only in the quotation from Lev 12:8 in Luk 2:24. There are three species of turtle-doves in Palestine. The collared turtle (*T. risorius*) is the largest, and frequents the shores of the Dead Sea. The palm turtle (*T. Senegalensis*) 'resorts much to the gardens and enclosures of Jerusalem.' 'It is very

familiar and confiding in man, and is never molested.’ The common turtle (*T. auritus*) is the most abundant of the three species.

The eagle (ἄετός) is the subject of a proverbial saying recorded in Mat_24:28 || Luk_17:37 ‘where the carcass is, there shall the eagles be gathered together.’ According to Post, there are four kinds of vultures and eight kinds of eagles to be found in the Holy Land. Here the term ‘eagle’ is generic. Thomson describes the eagles’ flight as majestic, and their eyesight and, apparently, sense of smell, are both extremely keen.

The exact force of the above saying is hard to determine. Some old commentators, following the Fathers, take it to refer to ‘the conflux of the godly to the light and liberty of the Gospel’ (Master Trapp). More modern exegesis regards the passage as hinting at the gathering of the Roman eagles round the moribund Jewish nation. But Bengel rightly observes that in Matthew 24 the reference of Mat_24:28 goes back to the false prophets and false Christs of Mat_24:23. In the decay of Judaism as a religious faith, such men will find their opportunity, and will turn popular fanaticism to their own profit. In Matthew the proverb is perfectly general in form, and is capable of wider application. National ruin and feverish religiosity go hand in hand. False Messianism marked the final overthrow of the Jews in a.d. 135; and when the barbarians laid siege to Rome in 408, even a Pope consented to resort to Etruscan magic rites! (Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i. 126). In Luk_17:37 the ‘wheresoever’ becomes ‘where,’ and the saying is in answer to a definite question regarding the signs that are to mark the sudden return of the Son of Man. Here it is difficult not to interpret the eagles of the Roman standards. For St. Luke evidently does not take the saying as a statement of a general law. The Matthaean form and position give the more attractive interpretation.

The raven (κόραξ) is mentioned only in Luk_12:24, ‘Consider the ravens how they neither sow nor reap.’ The parallel Mat_6:26 reads, ‘birds.’ The whole passage and the force of Luke’s change will be considered in § iv. The term ‘raven’ includes the numerous tribes of crows. Tristram mentions eight different species as common in Palestine. God’s care for the ravens is twice mentioned in OT (Job_38:41, Psa_147:9). These passages may have influenced Luke, if he changed ‘birds’ into ‘ravens.’ Again, they may have been in the mind of our Lord, if Luke gives the original form of the saying.

The sparrow (στρουθιον) is twice mentioned in sayings recorded both in Matthew and Luke. In Mat_10:29 we read, ‘Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing?’ and in Luk_12:6 ‘Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings?’ In Tatian’s *Diatessaron* the words *in taberna*, ‘in the cookshop,’ are added. Doubtless we have here the prices

current in popular eating-houses in the time of our Lord. ‘Sparrows, two a farthing; five a halfpenny.’ In [Mat 10:21](#) and [Luk 12:7](#) our Lord adds, ‘Ye are much more worth than many sparrows.’ For a discussion of these references to sparrows and of their bearing on our Lord’s teaching, we must again refer our readers to § iv.

3. For *fish*, three words are used, *ἰχθύς*, *ἰχθύδιον*, and *ὀψάριον*. The latter term is confined to John. In the feeding of the five thousand, the Synoptics speak of ‘two fishes’ (*δύο ἰχθύας*, [Mat 14:17](#); [Mat 14:19](#), [Mar 6:38](#); [Mar 6:41](#); [Mar 6:43](#), [Luk 9:13](#); [Luk 9:16](#)). The parallel narrative in John reads *δύο ὀψάρια*, which is also translated ‘two fishes’ ([Joh 6:9](#); [Joh 6:11](#)). But while the Syn. *ἰχθύς* is a general term, *ὀψάριον*, says Edersheim, ‘refers, no doubt, to those small fishes (probably a kind of sardine) of which millions were caught in the lake, and which, dried and salted, would form the most, common savoury, with bread, for the fisher-population along the shore’ (*Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i. 682). The parable of the Drag net ([Mat 13:47-50](#)) is taken from the life of the Galilaean fisher-folk. But this definite meaning of *ὀψάριον* cannot always be maintained: for in John’s narrative of the miraculous draught of fishes, *ὀψάριον* and *ἰχθύς* are interchanged as equivalents (*ὀψάριον*, [Joh 21:9-10](#); [Joh 21:13](#); *ἰχθύς* [Joh 21:6](#); [Joh 21:8](#); [Joh 21:11](#)). Jesus says to the disciples, ‘Bring of the fish (*ὀψαρίων*) which ye have now caught. Simon Peter went up, and dragged the net to shore full of great fishes’ (*ἰχθύων*). Both in the narratives of the miraculous multiplication of loaves and fishes and in His post-resurrection appearance by the lake, our Lord makes use of the disciples’ own resources, while adding to them something of His own. In the similar miracle recorded in Luke 5, *ἰχθύς* is the word used ([Luk 5:6](#); [Luk 5:9](#)). When narrating the feeding of the four thousand, both Matthew and Mark speak of a few small fishes (*ὀλίγα ἰχθύδια*, [Mat 15:34](#), [Mar 8:7](#)). These are probably the same as the *ὀψάρια* of John 6. In [Mat 15:36](#) *ἰχθύς* reappears. The remaining references to fish do not require much comment. [Mat 17:27](#) is concerned with the stater in the fish’s mouth. This passage contains the only reference to line-fishing in the Gospels: ‘Cast a hook and take the first fish (*ἰχθύν*) that cometh up.’ In [Luk 24:42](#) we read that our Lord convinced the disciples of the reality of His resurrection by eating before them a piece of cooked fish (*ἰχθύος ὀπτουῦ μέρος*). In [Mat 7:10](#) || [Luk 11:11](#) the word *ἰχθύς*, ‘fish,’ is found in the teaching of Jesus. In Matthew the passage runs thus; ‘What man is there among you who, if his son ask for bread, will give him a stone? or if he ask for fish, will give him a serpent?’ Here fish and bread are the subject of joint reference, as in the narratives of the

feeding of the five and four thousands. Bread and fish are clearly the customary diet of the common people of Galilee, and in the form of these questions, as in so many other details, the teaching of Jesus closely reflects the daily life of His countrymen.

In the Catacombs the figure of a fish was often used as a symbol of Christ. The letters which make up *ιχθύς* form the initial letters of *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός Θεοῦ Υἱός Σωτήρ*, so that the word served as a summary of the faith. See art. Christ in Art.

4. The general word for *serpent* (*ὄφεις*) occurs 7 times in the Gospels. No human father will give his son a serpent as a substitute for fish (Mat_7:10, Luk_11:11). Some small reptile as common as the scorpion must be meant, as Luke twice (Luk_10:19; Luk_11:12) couples scorpions and serpents (*ὄφεις*). The disciples are to be as wise as serpents [or ‘as the serpent,’ reading *ὁ ὄφις* for *οἱ ὄφεις*: the sense is the same in either case] (Mat_10:16). The ideal of discipleship is a combination of the prudence of the serpent with the guilelessness of doves. As in the saying about not casting one’s pearls before swine, our Lord here condemns recklessness and tactlessness in religious work. ‘Religion without policy is too simple to be safe: Policy without religion is too subtle to be good’ (Trapp). In Mat_23:33 the word ‘serpents’ is applied to the Pharisees.

In the later appendix to Mark’s Gospel, power to take up serpents is numbered among the signs that are to follow faith in Christ (Mar_16:18). The passage is paralleled in Luk_10:19 ‘Behold, I have given you power to tread upon serpents and scorpions, and upon all the might of the evil one.’ WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort’s text.] here note a reference to Psa_91:13 ‘Thou shalt tread upon the lion and the adder.’ Possibly the passage is to be interpreted metaphorically, and the ‘serpents’ are to be explained by the might of the Evil One. The words, however, find a more literal fulfilment in St. Paul’s experience at Melita (Act_28:3; Act_28:6).

The viper (*ἐχιδνα*) is referred to only in the phrase *γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν*, ‘offspring of vipers,’ and the phrase is applied only to scribes and Pharisees. John the Baptist thus addressed the Pharisees that came to his baptism, ‘O offspring of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?’ (Mat_3:7, Luk_3:7). According to Mt., our Lord on two occasions adopted the same mode of address (Mat_12:34; Mat_23:33). Sand-vipers about 1 foot long are common in Palestine. The young are said to feed upon the mother. But the force of the phrase, Bochart observes, is not to be derived from any such special characteristic; the sense implied is simply ‘bad sons of bad fathers.’ This comment satisfactorily interprets Mat_23:33 : but perhaps we may read a little more into the phrase. The words of John the Baptist suggest the

familiar picture of vipers roused from torpor into activity by the approach of heat (cf. Act 28:3). In Mat 12:34 the phrase receives added point from the fact that the Pharisees have just been attempting to poison the popular mind against Christ by suggesting that the miracles were the work of Beelzebub; there is something spiteful and venomous about their attacks on our Lord.

5. Scorpions (σκορπιός), which we are told may be found under every third stone in Palestine, are twice mentioned in Luke. The disciples are to tread on scorpions with impunity (Luk 10:19). However we interpret the passage, the addition of ‘scorpion’ seems to imply that the disciples are to be protected against some small, frequent, and at the same time serious danger. The other reference is in Luk 11:12. If a son asks for an egg, the father will not give him a scorpion. In both passages the scorpion and the serpent are mentioned together, being common objects of the country in Palestine. The scorpion at rest is said closely to resemble an egg in appearance.

6. The worm (σκόληξ) is mentioned only in Mar 9:48 in the phrase ‘where their worm dieth not,’ a description of Gehenna based on the last verse of Isaiah (Isa 66:24).

In the TR [Note: R Textus Receptus.] the verse appears 3 times, Mar 9:44; Mar 9:46; Mar 9:48, and there is something impressive in the repetition: WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort’s text.] , however, retain only Mar 9:48. Whether literally or metaphorically understood, the phrase must not be taken as the basis of a Christian doctrine of future retribution. The worm does not stand for remorse: it is simply part of a picture of complete physical corruption. A man has sometimes to choose between losing a limb and losing his life: the part has to be sacrificed to save the whole. The same law of sacrifice, says Christ, holds good in the spiritual world.

7. Of insects the bee is indirectly referred to, while the gnat, the locust, and the moth are all mentioned. In Luk 24:42, the Western Text says the disciples gave our Lord part of a bees’ honeycomb (ἀπὸ μελισσίου κηρίου), *i.e.* the product of hived bees. John the Baptist, on the other hand, lived on wild rock honey, *i.e.* honey deposited in clefts of the rock by wild bees; this honey was often very difficult to get.

Bees, wild and hived, are very common in Palestine. Tristram (*Nat. Hist.* p. 325) says: ‘Many of the Bedonin obtain their subsistence by bee-hunting, bringing into Jerusalem skins and jars of the wild honey on which John the Baptist fed.’ Bee-keeping is much practised, especially in Galilee. The hives are very simple in construction; being ‘large tubes of sun-dried mud, about 8 inches in diameter and 4 feet long, closed with mud at each end, having only a small aperture in the centre.’

The gnat (κρόνωψ) is mentioned in Mat 23:24. As one of the smallest animals, it is contrasted with the camel, one of the largest. The Pharisees strain out a gnat with scrupulous care, while they will swallow a camel. They are careful to tithe mint, but they fail to do justice. The Pharisees may have adopted a practice which is still in use among the Brahmans, viz. of drinking through muslin in order to avoid swallowing any fly or insect present in the water.

Locusts (ἀκρίδες) formed part of the food of John the Baptist (Mat 3:4, Mar 1:6). The LXX Septuagint uses ἀκρίδες for the third of the four kinds of edible locusts mentioned in Lev 11:22. They formed a common article of diet in Palestine, and there is no need to alter the text, as one or two MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] have done, reading ἐγκριδες, 'cakes.'

The moth (σῆς) is mentioned as disfiguring earthly treasures (Mat 6:19-20, Luk 12:33). The common clothes-moth is meant, of which there are many species in Palestine. 'In this warm climate it is almost impossible to guard against their ravages' (Post). There is an indirect reference to the saying of Jesus in Jam 5:2.

8. A sponge (σπόγγος) full of vinegar was offered to our Lord on the cross (Mat 27:48). Of sponges, the finest in texture and the most valued is the Turkish or Levant sponge. The sponge-fisheries of the Mediterranean have always been and still are very considerable. For the method of diving for sponges see Post in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iv. 612^b.

iii. The place of animals in the life of our Lord.—In this connexion it may be worth while to point out that the part played by animals in many of the incidents in which their presence is recorded, serves to emphasize the humility of Jesus. The two young pigeons which Mary brings as an offering when she presents Jesus in the Temple (Luk 2:24), are a mark of her poverty. Jesus belonged to a poor family. The peaceful character of Christ's teaching, which is marked at the outset by the descent of the dove at His baptism, is confirmed at the close by the fact that He rode into Jerusalem (Mat 21:3-7 ||) not on the warrior's horse, but on the ass, which, as prophecy foretold, was to be a sign of the lowliness of the coming Messiah.

iv. The place of animals in the teaching of our Lord.—We have reserved for discussion under this head the imagery drawn from pastoral life in which Jesus described His own mission, and the doctrine of providence unfolded more especially in His sayings about the birds of the air.

1. *Our Lord's mission illustrated.*—(a) Jesus confined His earthly ministry to ‘the lost sheep of the house of Israel’ (Mat 15:24). When He sent forth the Twelve on a preaching tour, He bade them observe the same limits (Mat 10:6). We need not suppose from this phrase that the work of Jesus embraced only the outcasts of Israel. ‘The lost sheep of the house of Israel’ describes the nation as a whole [grammatically the words ‘of the house of Israel’ (οἴκου Ἰ.) are best taken as a defining genitive, *i.e.* ‘the lost sheep who are the house of Israel’]. The very sight of a Galilaeen crowd touched the heart of Jesus, for they were like worried and scattered sheep that have no shepherd [Mat 9:36, Mar 6:34]. In the eyes of Jesus, the spiritual condition of His countrymen agreed with the description of the shepherdless people given in Ezekiel 34. More particularly the Jews needed guidance in their national and religious aspirations. They had mistaken alike the character of the coming Messiah and the nature of the coming kingdom. The hope to re-establish by force the throne of David made the people the helpless victims of political agitators like Judas the Gaulonite (Act 5:37), and led at length to the chastisement inflicted on the nation by the Roman power.

The exact interpretation of John 10 is exceedingly difficult, but it may in part be understood, in relation to this view given in Matthew and Mark, of the nation as a shepherdless flock. Jesus speaks of Himself as the door of the sheep, through which if a man enters, he shall be saved (Joh 10:7; Joh 10:9). The only hope of salvation for the Jews lay in their realizing, through the teaching of Jesus, that God's kingdom was not of this world. Those who offered themselves as leaders before Christ, and who proposed to subdue Rome by arms, were thieves and robbers who came only to steal and destroy (Joh 10:8; Joh 10:10). The best comment on these thieves and robbers, and their treatment of those helpless sheep, the house of Israel, is perhaps Josephus' account of the Judas above mentioned—

‘There was one Judas a Gaulonite, ... who, taking with him Sadduc, a Pharisee, became zealous to draw (the people) to a revolt; who both said that this taxation (under Cyrenius) was no better than an introduction of slavery, and exhorted the nation to assert their liberty; as if they could procure them happiness and security for what they possessed, and an assured enjoyment of a still greater good, which was that of the honour and glory they would thereby acquire for magnanimity.... All sorts of misfortunes also sprang from these men, and the nation was infected with this doctrine to an incredible degree: one violent war came upon us after another, and we lost our friends, who used to alleviate our pains; *there were also very great robberies and murders of our principal men. This was done in pretence of the public welfare, but in reality from the hopes of gain to themselves*’ (Josephus *Ant.* xviii. i. 1).

If Barabbas was one of these robbers (cf. [Joh_18:40](#) with [Joh_10:8](#)), the fact that the Jews chose Barabbas in preference to the Good Shepherd shows the bewilderment of the popular mind, which led Jesus to compare the house of Israel to lost sheep. Jesus further describes Himself as the Good Shepherd in contrast to the hirelings, who care nothing for the sheep ([Joh_10:11](#); [Joh_10:15](#)). If the thieves and robbers betoken political agitators like Barabbas and Judas, 'the hirelings' are probably the Pharisees and Sadducees, the shepherds who, in the words of Ezekiel, 'fed themselves and did not feed the sheep.'

The interpretation here suggested is not usually adopted. Godet, for example, understands the thieves and robbers to be the Pharisees. The wolf ([Joh_10:12](#)) he takes as a further symbol of the same party, the hirelings being the scribes and priests, whom cowardice kept from opposing Pharisaic domination. This latter interpretation fits in well with the context, *i.e.* with ch. 9 (see Godet, *St. John*, vol. ii. pp. 375-397).

But without attempting to decide questions of exposition, it is sufficient for us to point out that the imagery of the parable is true to life.

'A sheep-fold in the East is not a covered building like our stables, but a mere enclosure surrounded by a wall or palisade. The sheep are brought into it in the evening, several flocks being generally assembled within it. The shepherds, after committing them to the care of a common keeper, a porter, who is charged with their safe keeping during the night, retire to their homes. In the morning they return, and knock at the closely barred door of the enclosure, which the porter opens. They then separate each his own sheep, by calling them: and after having thus collected their flocks, lead them to the pastures. As to robbers, it is by scaling the wall that they penetrate into the fold' (Godet, *l.c.* p. 378).

The details are confirmed by all Eastern travellers. Thus, speaking of the power of the sheep in distinguishing between the voice of the shepherd and that of a stranger, Thomson tells us that, if a stranger calls, they stop, lift up their heads in alarm; and if the call is repeated, they turn and flee from him. 'This is not the fanciful costume of a parable, but a simple fact. I have made the experiment often' ('Central Palestine,' p. 594).

Godet cites 'the well-known anecdote of a Scotch traveller, who, meeting under the walls of Jerusalem a shepherd bringing home his flock, changed garments with him, and thus disguised proceeded to call the sheep. They, however, remained motionless. The true shepherd then raised his voice, when they all hastened towards him, in spite of his strange garments' (*l.c.* p. 382).

All the sheep distinguish the voice of a shepherd from that of a stranger: a shepherd's own sheep distinguish his voice from that of any other shepherd (Joh 10:3). The practice of naming sheep (φωνεῖ κατ' ὄνομα, Joh 10:3) is common in the East. The picture of the shepherd thrusting his sheep out of the enclosure (ἐκβάλλη, Joh 10:4, implies the use of a certain amount of force) and then placing himself at the head of the flock, is likewise a simple fact, and not fanciful imagery.

Though the historical application of the parable in John 10 is not easy to determine, yet it is clear that the chapter deals with the relation of Christ to the Church and to the individual Christian, and it is unnecessary to draw out in detail the lessons that follow from the fact that Christ is for us the door of the sheep and the Good Shepherd. It is, however, important to notice that in John 10 our Lord speaks of the Jewish nation as a whole and of His disciples alike as sheep ('his own sheep,' *i.e.* the disciples, are distinguished from the other flocks in the fold, *i.e.* the Jewish people), and that He compares His mission towards both to the work of a shepherd. These ideas are common to St. John and the Synoptists, and the pastoral imagery we are considering links the Fourth Gospel to the other three.

(b) We have seen that in the Synoptics our Lord spoke of the people as lost sheep. But though the Matthaean phrase 'the lost sheep of the house of Israel' applies to the nation as a whole, the parable of the Lost Sheep in Mat 18:12 f. is a defence of Christ's view of children, and in Luk 15:3-6 (where alone in Luke the word πρόβατον is used) a similar parable forms an answer to the criticism of the Pharisees, who could not understand our Lord's eating with publicans and sinners. In a sense all the Jews were like lost sheep; in a very special sense the comparison applied to these social outcasts. 'No animals are more helpless than sheep that have strayed from the flock: they become utterly bewildered, for sheep are singularly destitute of the bump of locality. They have to be brought back' (Thomson). The figure of the lost sheep illustrates to some extent the character of the publicans and sinners. In the East, says Thomson, the sheep have to be taught to follow the shepherd: they would otherwise leave the pasture lands and stray into the corn-fields. Naturally some sheep follow the shepherd closely, while others straggle and have to be recalled to the path by means of the crook. So a lost and wandering sheep is an ill-trained and troublesome one. But the main point of the parable is the action of the shepherd, who would regard it as part of his ordinary duty to seek the lost. Though Jesus does not call Himself the Good Shepherd in the Synoptics, yet the parable recorded in Mt. and Lk. shows us how naturally He came to compare His ministry to the work of a shepherd, and how He used the comparison to justify His friendly attitude to publicans and sinners. According to Mat 12:11 f., our Lord also adduced an owner's care for a single sheep as a defence of His healing a man with a withered hand on the Sabbath-day.

(c) If the weakness and the helplessness of sheep supplied Jesus with similes whereby to describe the Jewish people as a whole, the purity symbolized by their white wool, their harmlessness and patience, led Him to speak of His own disciples in similar terms. The disciples are sent forth as sheep (or as lambs) into the midst of wolves (Mat 10:16, Luk 10:3; Clem. Rom. [Note: Roman.] *Ep.* ii. 5). Christians are to be ready even to suffer death without resistance, so at least the epistle attributed to Clement interprets the saying (see above under 'lamb').

(d) In the Synoptics the few other passages where the disciples are described as sheep throw little light on the subject. In Matthew 25 the righteous and the wicked are contrasted as sheep and goats; but, as has already been pointed out, the character of the animals concerned has little to do with the comparison. The words 'I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered' (quoted from Zec 13:7 in Mat 26:31, Mar 14:27), serve only to show that the death of Christ would place the disciples in the same leaderless bewilderment which, in the eyes of our Lord, marked the nation as a whole. But in a somewhat different connexion (Luk 12:32) our Lord spoke of His disciples as a little flock. After bidding them forego anxiety about earthly goods and seek the kingdom, our Lord adds, 'Fear not, little flock: for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.' The reassuring words were needed, no doubt, because the disciples were but a little feeble band. But surely the little flock implies something as to character as well as number. It is the duty of the shepherd at all times to find suitable pasture, and in the autumn and winter he has to provide fodder. Sheep cannot fend for themselves. Similarly the disciples, intrusting to God the care of their earthly interests, will appear to the world at once foolish and ineffectual; yet this little flock is to inherit the kingdom. God chooses the weak things of this world (1Co 1:27).

Further references to sheep in the Gospels are less important. Mat 7:15 speaks of the false prophets who are sheep in appearance and wolves in reality, a saying which also appears in Justin, *Dial.* 35. In Joh 21:16 f. Peter is bidden to tend (ποιμαίνειν) Christ's sheep (προβάτια, 'lambs,' is given as a variant in WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.]). Here we have in germ the pastoral view of the ministerial office. See art. Shepherd.

Jesus' description of Himself as the Good Shepherd laid hold from the first of the Christian imagination. In the NT Jesus is twice spoken of as the Shepherd (Heb 13:20; 1Pe 2:25). In the Catacombs no symbol of Christ is more frequent than the picture of the Good Shepherd. See Christ in Art.

2. Our Lord illustrates His teaching concerning *God's providence* by one or two sayings about the birds. He bids His disciples 'consider the birds of the air: for they neither

sow nor reap nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they?' (Mat 6:26). In conjunction with this passage, we must examine the reference to sparrows in Mat 10:29; Mat 10:31, Luk 12:6 f. 'Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? yet not one of them shall fall to the earth without your Father.... Fear not then: ye are of more value than many sparrows.' Bochart well brings out the force of Luke's mention of 'ravens' instead of 'birds of the air,' and he rightly discerns the bearing of the reference to the sparrows, when he says, 'Express mention is made of ravens and sparrows among the other birds, to make it clear that God's providence is not only concerned with birds in general, but even extends to the most worthless and the most despised among birds: so that men, especially those that believe, may the more certainly draw from this fact the conclusion that God cares for them, since He will not deny to those who worship Him and call upon Him, the care which He so graciously bestows on animals of the lowest order.' Bochart further dwells on the harsh grating voice, the ugly black colour, and the awkward movements of the raven, which make him a despicable bird. Concerning the sparrows, Thomson says they are 'a tame, troublesome, vivacious and impertinent generation: they nestle just where they are not wanted. Their nests stop up stove-pipes and water-gutters. They are destroyed eagerly as a worthless nuisance' ('Lebanon,' etc., p. 59). Jesus then insists that the birds which men hold cheap are not unthought of by God: 'our Lord has taught us that God providently caters for the sparrow, and Himself conducts its obsequies.'

By taking the references to sparrows and ravens closely together, we may save ourselves from a onesided interpretation of Mat 6:26 which has found favour with many. Thus O. Holtzmann (*Life of Jesus*, p. 102) says: 'With the drudgery and toil of human labour, Jesus contrasts the toilless life of nature, in which God feeds the raven and clothes the lilies.' A parallel saying from the Talmud is cited in Delitzsch's *Jewish Artisan Life*, which suggests the same view of our Lord's teaching. 'Didst thou ever see in all thy life,' says Rabbi Simeon, son of Eleazar, 'a bird or an animal working at a craft? And yet these creatures, made simply for the purpose of serving me, gain their living without difficulty. But I am created to serve my Creator: and if those who are created to serve can gain their livelihood without difficulty, shall not I, who am made to serve my Creator, earn my living without trouble?' If this saying is modelled on Mat 6:26, then Rabbi Simeon and O. Holtzmann seem to agree in interpreting our Lord's teaching to the effect that 'the birds are fed, without working: surely we may expect God to feed us too, without our toil.' Such an interpretation makes Mat 6:26 the magna charta of idleness. But the superiority of the birds does not lie in their not working, but in their not worrying. If we may paraphrase the passage, 'the birds do not engage in any methodical toil: yet they trust God for daily food, and praise Him for His care: men are better than birds, a superiority shown in the fact that men work in an orderly manner: now, if God feeds the birds, which live a haphazard kind of life, how much more will He reward men's patient labour without their needing to be

anxious?’ This section of the Sermon on the Mount is best interpreted by St. Peter’s words, ‘casting all your care (*i.e.* your worries and anxieties) on him; for he careth for you’ (1Pe 5:7), or by St. Paul’s lesson of contentment under all circumstances (Php 4:11-13). Our daily wants are the care of God. The saying about the sparrows forbids us to assume that daily needs will be met exactly in the way we expect. We are not to assume that food and raiment will be provided amply and at all times. Privation and suffering may fall to men’s lot; but suffering even unto death is not to be feared, because the very death of a sparrow is not forgotten before God.

Our Lord’s teaching as to the trust in God’s providence, which may be learnt from the animals, appears to be summed up in the second of the five new Sayings recently discovered by Grenfell and Hunt. They restore this logion as follows: ‘Jesus saith (ye ask? who are those) that draw us (to the kingdom, if) the kingdom is in Heaven?... The fowls of the air, and all beasts that are under the earth or upon the earth, and the fishes of the sea (these are they which draw) you, and the kingdom of Heaven is within you; and whoever shall know himself shall find it. (Strive therefore?) to know yourselves and ye shall be aware that ye are the sons of the (almighty?) Father; (and?) ye shall know that ye are in (the city of God?) and ye are (the city?).’ The restoration of the saying is highly conjectural, but it seems to be based in part on Job 12:7-8. ‘Ask now the beasts and they shall teach thee; and the fowls of the air and they shall tell thee. Or speak to the earth and it shall teach thee; and the fishes of the sea shall declare unto thee.’ And the conclusion which the saying is intended apparently to enforce may be stated in the following verses taken from the same passage in Job. ‘Who knoweth not in all these that the hand of the Lord hath wrought this? In whose hand is the soul of every living thing and the breath of all mankind’ (Job 12:9 f.). In effect we are taught that converse with nature should produce a calm trust in God.

It does not fall within the scope of this article to discuss the wider aspects of our Lord’s attitude towards Nature. But the place taken by animals in His teaching bears out the truth of the following words of a recent writer. ‘Jesus loved Nature as Nature: here as everywhere He was in touch with the actual. Plenty of people—from aesop to Mrs. Gatty—have made or drawn parables from Nature, but not like His. His lost sheep have no proverbs: His lilies may be dressed more charmingly than Solomon, but they have not Solomon’s wisdom: and His sparrows are neither moralists nor theologians, but sparrows,—two for a farthing, sparrows chirping and flying about and building their nests,—just sparrows! But the least motion which they made seemed a thrill of pleasure.... Sparrows, lilies, lost sheep, hens and chickens, midnight stars and mountain winds,—they all entered into His mind and heart, and spoke to Him of the character of God, of His delight in beauty, and His love’ (T. R. Glover).

Literature.—Without attempting to provide a complete bibliography, it may be worth while to give a list of books that the present writer has found helpful. Bochart’s

Hierozoicon (ed. Rosenmüller) is encyclopaedic. Tristram's *Natural History of the Bible* is a most handy manual of compact and accessible information. References to animals are frequent in books of Oriental travel: e.g. Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*; Robinson's *BRP* [Note: RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.] ; and Thomson's *Land and the Book* [the latest edition of Thomson's work in 3 vols, is especially valuable, though the information is widely scattered and is not always easy to find]. The articles on natural history and on particular animals in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible* and the *Encyc. Bibl.* may be consulted with advantage. The standard 'Lives of Jesus' deal with the references to animals incidentally; Edersheim is perhaps the fullest and most reliable. There are some fresh, though not always accurate, observations on the subject in the *Life of Jesus* by O. Holtzmann. Of the many commentaries that expound the passages in the Gospels which concern our subject, the present writer has found vol. i. of the *Expositor's Greek Testament* ('Synoptics' by A. B. Bruce, 'St. John' by M. Dods) most useful.

H. G. Wood.

☞ Anise

ANISE.—'Anise' is the translation given in Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 of ἀνιθον (Mat 23:23): the marginal rendering 'dill' is the correct one. The true anise is the plant *Pimpinella anisum*, which is quite distinct from *Anethum graveolens*, the anise of the Bible.

By the Jews dill was cultivated as a garden plant, but in Egypt and Southern Europe, to which it was indigenous, it is often found growing wild in the cornfields. It possesses valuable carminative properties, and in the East the seeds are eaten with great relish as a condiment. It is a hardy annual or biennial umbellifer, and grows to a height of one, two, or even three feet. The stem is round, jointed, and striated; the leaves are finely divided; the flowers, which are small, are yellow; the fruits are brown, oval, and flat.

In Mat 23:23 dill is represented as subject to tithe. That is in strict accord with the provision of the Law (Lev 27:30, Deu 14:22), and is corroborated by the express statement of the Mishna (*Ma'ascroth* iv. 5). See, further, art. Rue; and cf. note by Nestle in *Expos. Times*, Aug. 1904, p. 528^b.

Hugh Duncan.

☩ Anna

ANNA (Ἄννα, Heb. אַנָּה).—When His parents brought the infant Jesus to the temple to present Him to the Lord, two aged representatives of the OT Church received Him with songs of praise, Simeon and Anna (Luk 2:25 ff.). Anna was the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Asher (v. 36), which, though one of the Ten Tribes of the Dispersion, was still represented in Palestine. From it some beautiful women are said to have been chosen as wives for the priests (Edersheim, and Times of Jesus the Messiah, i. p. 200). Anna was a widow 84 years of age (Authorized Version), or more probably (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) about 105, as 7 years of married life followed by 84 years of widowhood would make her to be. She was a devout and saintly woman, worshipping constantly in the temple, with fastings and supplications, night and day; and, like Deborah Huldah of the OT, she had prophetic gifts. Her desire, like the Psalmist's (Psa 27:4), was to dwell always in the house of God, though it is hardly likely that a woman would be allowed literally to dwell within the sacred precincts. Having entered the temple at the same time as Jesus was brought in, she followed up the song of Simeon in similar strains, and spake of the Holy Child 'to all them that were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem' (Luk 2:38). Anna would seem to later times an ideal saint of the cloister, as such stress is laid on her virginity, her long life of widowhood, and her ceaseless devotions. Possibly her name may have had to do with the name Anna, given to the mother of the Virgin Mary, in the *Protevangeliium of James*.

David M. W. Laird.

☩ Annas

ANNAS (Ἄννας, Heb. אַנָּס, Hanan, Josephus Ἄνανος, *Ananos*).—High priest of the Jews from a.d. 6 to 15, and thereafter exercising commanding influence through his high priestly rank and his family connexions. The son of one named Sethi, who is otherwise unknown, he was appointed high priest by Quirinius, probably in a.d. 6, and exercised that office, which involved political as well as religious headship of the nation, until he was deposed by the procurator Valerius Gratus in a.d. 15 (Josephus *Ant.* xviii. ii. 2). The duration of his rule, and the fact that of his sons no fewer than five succeeded him at intervals in the high priesthood ('which has never happened to any other of our high priests'), caused him to be regarded by his contemporaries as a specially successful man (*Ant.* xx. ix. 1). On the other hand, he incurred in an unusual degree

the unpopularity for which the high priests were proverbial. In addition to their common faults of arrogance and injustice, Annas was notorious for his avarice, which found opportunity in the necessities of the Temple worshippers. It was he, probably, who established the 'bazaars of the sons of Annas' (*hănnûyôth bĕnê Hânân*), a Temple market for the sale of materials requisite for sacrifices, either within the Temple precinct (Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, v. 116) or on the Mount of Olives (Derenbourg), the profits of which enriched the high priestly family. Beyond this, the house of Annas is charged with the special sin of 'whispering' or hissing like vipers, 'which seems to refer to private influence on the judges, whereby "morals were corrupted, judgment perverted, and the Shekinah withdrawn from Israel" ' (Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i. 263).

Annas is referred to by St. Luke and by St. John. In Luk_3:2 ('in the high priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas') he is linked with Caiaphas, who alone was actually high priest at the time (a.d. 26). The explanation of this is found partly in the fact that the office having become to some extent the prerogative of a few families, it had acquired some degree of hereditary and indelible quality, and partly in the unusual personal authority exercised by Annas. The result was that even after his deposition he continued to enjoy much of the influence, and even to receive the title, of his former office (Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii. i. 195 ff.; against this Keim, *l.c.* vi. 36 ff.; H. Holtzmann, *Hdeom. ad Luk_3:2*). In like manner in Act_4:6 Annas appears at the head of the chiefs of the Sanhedrin in its action against the Apostles, though the actual president was the high priest. See Chief Priests.

The only other passage in which Annas is referred to is in the narrative of the trial of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel (Joh_18:13-24). The Evangelist, speaking with technical accuracy, refrains from calling him high priest, and assigns as a reason for Jesus being led before Annas the relationship between Annas and Caiaphas. The ex-highpriest had probably been the chief instigator of the plot against Jesus, and before him He was brought not for trial, but only for an informal and private examination (so Schürer, *l.c.* p. 182). 'The Lord Himself is questioned, but there is no mention of witnesses, no adjuration, no sentence, no sign of any legal process' (Westcott, *ad loc.*).

C. A. Scott.

☞ Announcements Of Death

ANNOUNCEMENTS OF DEATH.—It is certain that we have words from Jesus concerning His death; for such ruthless criticism as that of Schmiedel (*Encyc. Bibl.* 'Gospels'), who admits only nine genuine sayings of the Master, is uncritical and unscientific.

These words appear in the Synoptics as well as in the Fourth Gospel. The genuineness of the latter is here assumed, though there is a wide difference in character between it and the Synoptics.

The main point in the announcements of His death by Jesus rests on the time of their utterance. Hence the chronological grouping of these sayings of Jesus must be followed. If He spoke of His death only as a disappointed man after He saw the manifest hate of the rulers, there would be little ground for claiming Messianic consciousness concerning His death as an atonement for sin. And the heart of the whole problem turns on the Messianic consciousness. *When did He become conscious of His death? Why did He expect a violent death? What did He think was to be accomplished by His death? Was His death a voluntary sacrifice, or merely a martyr's crown?* These and similar questions can be answered only by a careful and comprehensive survey of Christ's own words upon the subject. It is noteworthy that Jesus put the emphasis in His career on His death rather than on His incarnation. That is so out of the ordinary as at once to challenge attention. Here is One who came to give life by dying. That is in deepest harmony with nature, but not in harmony with man's view of his own life.

1. The first foreshadowings.—(a) Jesus first exhibits knowledge of His death at the time of the Temptation, immediately after the Baptism and the formal entrance upon the Messianic ministry. The word 'death' or 'cross' is not mentioned between Jesus and Satan, but the point at issue was the easy or the hard road to conquest of the world. It is the unexpressed idea in this struggle for the mastery of men. Hence, before Jesus began to teach men, He had already wrestled with His Messianic destiny and chosen the path that led to the cross. This tone of high moral conflict is never absent from Jesus till the end. The Synoptic Gospels thus give the first account of Christ's consciousness of His struggle to the death for the spiritual mastery of men.

(b) Another* [Note: [Joh 2:2-9](#) and [Mat 12:39](#) are passed over because of doubts (not shared by the present writer) as to their interpretation or genuineness. The case is strong enough without these disputed passages.] occasion for the mention of His death by our Lord grew out of the failure of Nicodemus to understand the new birth and the spiritual nature of the kingdom of God ([Joh 3:9](#)). If the teacher of Israel could not apprehend these aspects of what took place in the kingdom on earth, now could he lay hold of the purposes of God in heaven ([Joh 3:12](#)) about the work of the kingdom? One of the chief of these 'heavenly things' is the necessity of the death of Christ for the sin of the world. The brazen serpent of the older history serves as an illustration ([Joh 3:14](#)), but 'das göttliche "δεῖ" Todesschicksals' (Schwartzkopff, *Die Weissagungen Jesu Christi*, p. 20) is grounded in the eternal love of God for the world ([Joh 3:16](#)). The Son of Man ([Joh 3:14](#)) who 'must' be lifted up is the Son of God

(Joh 3:16). It is not perfectly certain that Joh 3:16 is a word of Jesus and not of the Evangelist, but at any rate it is a correct interpretation of the preceding argument. The high religious necessity for His death, of which Jesus is here conscious, could come to Him by revelation from the Father (Schwartzkopff; *l.c.* p. 22). The consciousness of Jesus is clear, but He finds in Nicodemus an inability to grasp this great truth. The word 'lifted up' (*ὑψωθῆναι*) refers to the cross, as is made plain afterwards (Joh 8:28; Joh 12:32 f.). Even when the multitudes heard Jesus use the word just before His death, they did not understand it (Joh 12:34), though the Evangelist gives the correct interpretation in the light of the after history (Joh 12:33). In itself the word could refer to spiritual glory (Paulus) or heavenly glory (Bleek), but not in view of the later developments. So then the cross is consciously before Jesus from the very beginning of His ministry.

(c) It is possibly nearly a year before we have the next allusion by the Master to His death. Again in parabolic phrase Jesus calls Himself the bridegroom who will be taken away from the disciples (Mar 2:20, Mat 9:15, Luk 5:35). The Pharisees from Jerusalem (Luk 5:17) are now in Galilee watching the movements of Jesus, so as to gain a case against Him. On this occasion they are finding fault because the disciples of Jesus do not observe stated seasons of fasting. The answer of Jesus is luminous in marking off the wide difference in spirit between a ceremonial system like Judaism and a vital personal spiritual religion like Christianity. There is a time to fast, but it is a time of real, not perfunctory, sorrow. Such a time will come to the disciples of Jesus when He is taken away. By itself this reference might allude merely to the death that would come to Christ as to other men, but the numerous other clear passages of a different nature preclude that idea here. Gould is right (*Internat. Crit. Com.* on Mar 2:20) in saying that 'even as a premonition it is not premature,' though there is more in it than this, for Jesus understood the significance of His death. Soon the historical developments confirm the prejudgment of Jesus, for the enmity of the historical conspiracy grows apace. At the next feast at which Jesus appears in Jerusalem (Joh 5:1) the rulers make a definite attempt to kill Him as a Sabbath-breaker and blasphemer, also for claiming equality with God the Father (Joh 5:18). This decision to kill Jesus soon reappears in Galilee (Mar 3:6), and often in Jerusalem during the closing six months of the ministry.

(d) The use of the cross as a metaphor, as in Mat 10:38 (see also Mar 8:24, Mat 16:24, Luk 14:27), would not of itself constitute an allusion to the death of Jesus, since death on the cross was so common at this time. But in the light of the many allusions by Jesus Himself to His death, the background of the metaphor would seem to be personal, and so to imply His own actual cross. He is Himself the supreme example of saving life by losing it. Meyer, *in loco*, considers that this verse was transferred from the later period; but this is unnecessary; for it is eminently pertinent

that in the directions to the Twelve, who are now sent out on their first mission, they should be urged to self-sacrifice by the figure of His own death on the cross. In this same address occurs an apocalyptic saying that presupposes the death of Christ (Mat_10:23). It is not an anachronism (J. Weiss) to find self-sacrifice and self-realization in the words of Jesus about losing life and finding it (Mat_10:39), for Jesus Himself gives the historical background of this image in the sublime justification of His own death in His resurrection (Joh_12:24).

(e) It is just a year (Joh_6:4) before the death of Jesus that He is addressing the Galilaeen populace in the synagogue at Capernaum. He explains that He is the bread of heaven, the true manna, the spiritual Messiah. It is the climax of the Galilaeen ministry, for but yesterday they had tried to make Him king (Joh_6:15). To-day Jesus tests their enthusiasm by the supreme revelation of His gift of Himself 'for the life of the world' (Joh_6:51), a clear allusion to His atoning death on the cross. Thus will it be possible for men to make spiritual appropriation of Christ as the living bread. The people and many of the so-called disciples fall back at this saying (Joh_6:66), and thus justify the wisdom of Jesus in having said no more as yet concerning His death, and life by His death. For at the first dim apprehension of this basal truth the people left Him. But it was time for the truth to be told to the flippant multitudes. Here Jesus reveals His consciousness of the character and work of Judas as the betrayer, a very devil (Joh_6:70 f.). The bald truth of the betrayal is not at this point told to the Twelve, for John's comment is made afterwards; but Jesus expressly says that one of them is a devil. Jesus clearly knows more than He tells. There is this bitterness in His cup at the very time that the people desert Him. The shadow of the cross is growing closer and darker, but Christ will go on to meet His hour.

2. The definite announcements.—(a) The new departure at Caesarea Philippi. Just after the renewed confession by Peter that Jesus is the Messiah, St. Matthew says that 'from that time began Jesus to show unto his disciples how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and the third day be raised up' (Mat_16:21). St. Mark (Mar_8:31) also says that 'he began to teach them.' Clearly, then, this was an epoch in the teaching of Jesus concerning His death. When He withdrew from Galilee this last summer, he devoted Himself chiefly to the disciples, and especially to preparing them for His departure. The specific teaching concerning His death follows, therefore, the searching test of their fidelity to Him as the Messiah. This is not a new idea to Jesus, as we have already seen. It has been the keynote of His mission all the time, but He had to speak of it in veiled and restrained language till now, when 'he spake the saying openly' (Mar_8:32). Now Jesus told the details of His death, the place and the persecutors. He repeats the necessity ($\delta\epsilon\iota$) of His death as He had proclaimed it in Joh_3:14. The disciples are still unprepared for this plain truth, and Peter even dares to rebuke

Jesus for such despondency (Mat 16:22). The sharp rebuke of Peter by Jesus (Mat 16:23) shows how strong a hold the purpose to die had on His very nature. Peter had renewed the attack of Satan in the Temptation. The Gospels record the dulness of the disciples, thus disproving the late invention of these sayings attributed to Jesus. The principle of self-giving is a basal one for Jesus and for all His followers (Luk 9:23-25). The disciples could not yet, any more than Nicodemus, grasp the moral necessity of the death of Jesus. They recoiled at the bare fact.

(b) On the Mount of Transfiguration a week later, somewhere on the spurs of Hermon, Peter, James, and John get a fresh word from Jesus about His death (Mar 9:9). It is not necessary to suppose that they understood or even heard the conversation of Jesus with Moses and Elijah about 'his decease which he was about to accomplish at Jerusalem' (Luk 9:31). Most likely they did not, if Peter's remarks are a criterion (Luk 9:32 f.). There is a fitness both from the manner of the deaths of Moses and Elijah, and from their respective positions in law and prophecy, that these two should talk with Jesus about His atoning and predicted sacrificial death. This exalted scene lifts the curtain a little for us, so that we catch some glimpse of the consciousness of Jesus concerning His death, as He held high converse with Moses and Elijah. But the remark of Jesus (Mat 17:9) was a caution to the three disciples to keep to themselves what they had seen till His resurrection, when they would need it. But the lesson of strength was lost on them for the present. Even the chosen three questioned helplessly with each other about the rising from the dead (Mar 9:10). They could not understand a dying Messiah now or later till the risen Christ had made it clear.

(c) In Galilee Jesus renewed His earnest words about the certainty of His death (Mar 9:31, Mat 17:22 f., Luk 9:44). He concealed His presence in Galilee as far as possible (Mar 9:30), but He was very insistent in urging, 'Let these words sink into your ears: for the Son of Man shall be delivered up into the hands of men' (Luk 9:44). But it was to no purpose, for they understood it not (Mar 9:32). St. Luke (Luk 9:45), in fact, says that it was concealed from them, thus raising a problem of God's purpose and their responsibility. They were sorry (Mat 17:23), but afraid to ask Jesus (Luk 9:45). Hence Jesus has not yet succeeded in making the disciples understand His purpose to die for men. So then He will have no human sympathy, and will have to tread the path to Calvary alone.

(d) At the feast of Tabernacles, or a few days afterwards, just six months before the end, in the midst of the hostile atmosphere of Jerusalem, Jesus emphasizes the voluntary character of His death for His sheep (Joh 10:15). He does this to distinguish between Himself and the Pharisees, who have been vehemently attacking Him. They are robbers, wolves, and hirelings, while Jesus is the Good Shepherd. He is not merely caught in the maelstrom of historic forces, nor is He the victim of time and circumstance, for He has voluntarily put Himself into the vortex of sin (Joh 10:17 f.).

The Father has given the Son the power or right (ἐξουσία) to lay down and to take up His life again. It was a 'commandment' from the Father, but not to the exclusion of the voluntary nature of His death; just as the necessity of His death was an inward necessity of love, not an outward compulsion of law. It is in the realm of spirit that we find the true value of the death of Jesus for our sins (Heb 9:14), and the moral grandeur of it is seen in the fact that He made a voluntary offering of His life for those who hated Him (Rom 5:8).

(e) As the time draws nearer, Jesus even manifests eagerness to meet His death (Luk 12:49 f.). It is only some three months till the end. However we take τι, whether as interrogative or exclamation, we see clearly the mingled eagerness and dread with which Jesus contemplated His death. It is a fire that will burn, but also attracts. He had come just for this purpose, to make this fire. It will be a relief when it is kindled. It is a baptism of death that presses as a Divine compulsion upon Him, like the 'must' of the earlier time (Joh 3:14, Mar 8:31). Here we feel the inward glow of the heart of Christ as it bursts out for a moment like a flame from the crater, unable to be longer restrained. So Jesus had a double point of view about His death, one of joy and one of shrinking, but He did not go now one way and now the other. He will pursue His way steadily, and as the time draws nigh, His view of His death will amount to rapture (Joh 17:1; Joh 17:24). But Jesus was never more conscious and sane than when He spoke thus about His death. It was, in fact, His inner self speaking out. He thus gave us not only a new view of His own death, but a new view of death itself.

(f) Jesus even tells His enemies that He expects to be put to death in Jerusalem (Luk 13:33). They were posing as His friends, but were either representatives of Herod Antipas or of the Jerusalem Pharisees. Jesus asserted His independence of 'that fox' and of them, but announced the inward necessity ('I must') that He should ultimately at the right time meet the fate of other prophets in Jerusalem. His lament over Jerusalem reveals the depth of His love for that city, and demands a Judaeian ministry such as that described by John.

(g) It is not till the death of Lazarus that the disciples realize that Jesus may be put to death (Joh 11:8); and then as a dread growing out of the last attempt of the Jews to kill Him at the feast of Dedication (Joh 10:39). Thomas has the courage of despair (Joh 11:16) in the gloomy situation, but Jesus speaks of His own glorification (Joh 11:4; Joh 11:40). One item in this glorification was the formal decision of the Sanhedrin to put Jesus to death (Joh 11:53). With this formal decision resting over Him, Jesus withdrew to the hills of Ephraim, near where in the beginning He had refused Satan's offer of a compromise, and had chosen His own way and the Father's. Had He made a mistake?

3. *Facing the end.*—(a) The relation between the death of Christ and the consummation of the kingdom. It is in the last journey to Jerusalem that the Pharisees ask when the kingdom of God comes (Luk_17:20). They are thinking of the apocalyptic conception current in their literature. There are two difficulties thus raised. One is their utter failure to understand the nature of the kingdom, for it is inner and spiritual, not external (the Papyri show that ἐντός means ‘within,’ not ‘among’).*

[Note: Cf., however, Expos. Times, xv. [1904], 387.] But, though the kingdom had already come in this sense, there would be in the end a fuller and completer realization of the work of the kingdom. It is in this sense that Jesus addresses the disciples in Luk_17:25. The day when the Son of Man shall be revealed (Luk_17:30) will be the end. ‘But first must be suffer many things, and be rejected of this generation.’ Thus Jesus separates His own death from the final stage of the Messianic work on earth. The other difficulty is raised by the disciples, and concerns the place where the Son will manifest Himself (Luk_17:37). He will come when there are people for Him to come for.

(b) Jesus uses the word ‘crucify’ before He reaches Jericho on this last journey to Jerusalem (Mat_20:19). Stapfer scouts this item as put in *post eventum* (*Jesus Christ during His Ministry*, p. 202), because it is expressly used by Christ only twice before His death (see also Mat_26:2); but the Master particularizes beforehand other details, such as the mocking, scourging, spitting, delivering to the Gentiles (these all now mentioned for the first time, Mar_10:33 f., Mat_20:19, Luk_18:32 f.). Besides, now for the first time also Jesus claims that His death will be in fulfilment of the prophetic writings concerning the Son of Man (Luk_18:31). See later Mat_21:42, Joh_13:18, Mar_14:27, Luk_22:37; Luk_24:27. Jesus is not, however, playing a part just to fulfil the Scripture, but He sees this objective confirmation of the inner witness of His spirit to the Father’s will concerning His death. Besides, on this occasion Jesus had made a special point of talking about His coming death, taking the Twelve apart (Mat_20:17 f.), and explaining that He does so now because they are near Jerusalem. There was an unusual look on the Master’s face, so much so that the disciples were amazed and afraid (Mar_10:32). But with all this pain, they were hopelessly dull on this subject (Luk_18:34).

(c) There is strange pathos in the next occasion Jesus had for speaking concerning His death. James and John and their mother (Mat_20:20, Mar_10:35) seem hardly able to wait for the Master to cease telling about His death before they come and ask for the chief positions in the temporal kingdom for which they are still looking. It was a shock to Jesus. Waiving their ignorance, He asked if they could drink His cup of death and take His baptism of blood (Mat_20:22, Mar_10:38). They actually said that they were able. And James was the first of the Twelve to die a martyr’s death, and John the last; for Jesus had said that they would have His cup and baptism (Mar_10:39).

(d) It was on the same occasion, as Jesus proceeded to give the disciples a needed lesson in true greatness and taught the dignity of service, that He set forth in plain speech the purpose of His death (Mat_20:28, Mar_10:45). Certainly Jesus had the right to tell the purpose of His voluntary death. *Λύτρον* is obviously 'ransom,' but it need not be said that this word exhausts all the content in the death of Christ. Jesus Himself elsewhere spoke of the vital connexion between Himself and the believer (Joh_15:1 ff.). This view of the redemptive death of Christ is further emphasized by the symbol of Baptism and also of the Supper, in both of which the vital aspect of mystic union is expressed. *Ἀντι* is here used to express the idea of substitution, though *ὑπέρ* is more common in this sense in the NT (Joh_11:50) and in the earlier Greek (*Alcestis*, for instance). It is a ransom instead of many.

A distinction needs to be made between the atoning death of Christ as a basis for reconciliation and the consummation of reconciliation in the individual case by the Holy Spirit's work in the heart. The doctrine of the substitutionary atoning death of Jesus, with vital and mystic union of the believer with Him, is not a rabbinic and legal refinement of St. Paul. He simply echoes the words of the Master more at length, while true to the heart of the matter.

(e) The request of the Greeks during the last week brought forth one of the deepest words of Jesus concerning the necessity of His death (Joh_12:23-25). He gives, in fact, the philosophy of grace about His death, which is, in truth, the same as the law of nature. It is the law of self-giving. Thus the wheat grows, and thus will Jesus establish the kingdom. By His death the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile, and between both and God, will be broken down (Eph_2:14-18). The agitation of Jesus on this occasion is surpassed only by that in the Garden of Gethsemane, and the cause is the same. In facing His death He shrinks from it, but instantly submits to the Father (Joh_12:26 f.), and is comforted by the Father's voice. To the multitude Jesus boldly announces that His lifting up (on the cross) will be the means of drawing all men (Gentile as well as Jew) to Him (Joh_12:32). And it has been so. Jesus gloried in His own cross as the means of saving the lost world.

(f) In the famous controversy with the Jewish rulers in the temple on the last Tuesday, Jesus identified Himself as the rejected Stone in the Messianic prophecy in Psa_118:22, and pronounced condemnation on those who collided with the rejected Stone (Mat_21:44). At every turn during these last days the death of Jesus is in the back ground of His words and deeds; especially is this true of the great eschatological discourse (Matthew 24 f.), as well as of the third lament over Jerusalem (Mat_23:37-39), and the previous defiance of His enemies (Mat_23:32).

(g) It is on Tuesday night (beginning of Jewish Wednesday) that Jesus definitely foretells the time of His death (Mat 26:2). It will be at the feast of the Passover, which begins after two days. Strangely enough, on this very night the rulers were in conference, and had decided, owing to the popularity of Jesus with the multitude at the feast, as shown by the triumphal entry and the temple teaching, to postpone the effort to kill Him till after the feast (Mat 26:3-5). And so it would have been but for the treachery of one of Christ's own disciples, who this very night, after the doleful announcement by Jesus of His near death, and after a stern rebuke for his covetous stinginess (Joh 12:6 f.), went in disgust and showed the Sanhedrin how to seize Him during the feast (Luk 22:6). But Jesus saw in the beautiful act of Mary a prophecy of His burial (Joh 12:7).

(h) Jesus is fully conscious that the Paschal meal which He is celebrating is His last, is, in fact, taking place on the very day of His death (Joh 13:31-33; Joh 13:38). The material is now so rich and full, as the great tragedy draws near, that it can only be alluded to briefly. He is eager to eat this meal before He suffers (Luk 22:15 f.). He knows that now at last His hour has come (Joh 13:1), and that He will conquer death (Joh 13:3). The contentious spirit of the Twelve at such a time occasions the object-lesson in humility. Jesus points out the betrayer, who leaves the room; comforts the disciples, and warns them of their peril, though all fail to grasp the solemn fact or the moral greatness of the tragedy that is coming swiftly on them, actually producing two swords for a fight under the new policy of resistance now announced by Jesus (Luk 22:36-38).

Pfleiderer (*Evolution and Theology*, p. 179) seeks to reconstruct the whole story of Jesus' attitude towards His death by the answer of Jesus, 'It is enough.' He forgets that this answer may be neither irony nor sober earnest, but rather an inability to make the disciples understand more about the matter before the time. It is chimerical for Pfleiderer to set up his view of this one passage against all the clear words of Jesus, and say that Jesus did not expect to die.

(i) When Jesus introduces the Supper just after the Passover meal, He speaks a strong word about His death. He calls the cup of this new ordinance 'my blood of the covenant' (Mar 14:24, Mat 26:28); and it is the 'new' covenant, *i.e.* of grace (1Co 11:25, Luk 22:20). Not only so, but the blood of Jesus is shed for many (Mar 14:24, Mat 26:28), as He had previously said (Mat 20:28, Luk 18:31); and St. Matthew has the further clause 'unto remission of sins' (Mat 26:28).

H. Holtzmann (*Hand-Com.*, *in loco*) would expunge this phrase, while Spitta (*Urchristentum*, p. 266 ff.) demes that Jesus made any reference to His death on this occasion. Hollmaun admits that He spoke of His death, but rejects the liturgical

observance commanded in 1Co_11:25 f. Bruce (*Kingdom of God*, p. 247) bluntly calls all this ‘criticism carried to an extreme in the interest of a theory.’

There is just doubt as to the true text of Luk_22:19 f., but this in no way affects any of the points above mentioned. Certainly expiation of sin by the shedding of His blood is the idea of Jesus here. The world had long been familiar with blood sacrifice, but the new thing in His vicarious sacrifice is that it has real efficacy and is not mere type and shadow. The blood is the life, and Jesus gave Himself, a sinless and free self, the representative Man and God’s own Son. The moral value of this voluntary and vicarious blood-offering comes from the worth of the spiritual self of Jesus. Jesus could see that this atoning sacrifice was in Isa_53:10, but it was also inwrought in His very consciousness.

(j) The very heart of Jesus is laid bare in John 14-17. The Master tries once more to prepare the Eleven for the tremendous fact of His death. Nothing in life or literature approaches the touch of Christ as He makes plain the awful truth of His separation, silences the doubt of Thomas, Philip, Judas, cheers them with the promise of another Paraclete, reminds them of their high dignity as His friends, exhorts them to courage against the world, and promises victory in spite of tribulation. In the prayer that follows, a halo is around the cross in the mind of Christ, for He asks for His glorification in death (Joh_17:1; Joh_17:5). He had already sanctified Himself to this mission (Joh_17:17; Joh_17:19), and now the hour is at hand.

(k) And yet in Gethsemane Jesus Himself is ‘greatly amazed’ at His own agitation of spirit (Mar_14:33). He needs the Father’s help, and for the moment has difficulty in finding Him fully, for Satan has renewed his temptation with fresh energy. For a moment Satan seemed indeed to triumph, but Jesus quickly surrendered to the Father’s will and won supreme mastery over Himself (Mar_14:35 f.). But Ritschl is in error in saying that Jesus ‘is first of all a priest in His own behalf’ (*Justification and Reconciliation*, p. 474). What broke the heart of Christ in Gethsemane was no thought of His own sin, but the sin of the world. Here in Gethsemane the heart of Jesus was touched to the quick by the essence of the redemptive sacrifice. The disciples gave Him no human sympathy, and Satan even sought to poison His heart toward the Father. The picture in Hebrews (Heb_5:7-9) of the strong Son of God, having learned obedience through suffering, crying out to the Father for help, is the acme of soul agony. Jesus won the power to drink the cup, and in the dregs of the cup was the kiss of Judas. His hour has come at last, and His enemies take Him now only because He allows them. It is the hour and the power of darkness (Luk_22:53). The hour and the power of light will come later. Once again He speaks of the necessity of His death that the Scriptures may be fulfilled (Mat_26:52-54).

(l) In the trial it is a foregone conclusion that Jesus will be condemned, and on the cross He 'sees what He foresaw.' He knows that His public confession of His Messiahship means His death, but He asserts His ultimate triumph over His enemies (Mat 26:63 f.). He claims superiority over the world, and that He is now fulfilling His destiny (Joh 18:36 f.). On the cross itself He practises the forgiveness of enemies which He had preached (Luk 23:34), exercises saving power though dying (Luk 23:43), is in some sense forsaken by the Father (Mar 15:34), is conscious to the last of what He is performing (Joh 19:28), and proclaims the completion of His Messianic work (Joh 19:30) as He dies with submission to the Father (Luk 23:46).

After the resurrection Jesus had a new standpoint from which to teach the disciples the significance of His death (Luk 24:25-27; Luk 24:32; Luk 24:45). But it is not till they receive the new light from the Holy Spirit at Pentecost that the disciples fully appreciate the moral greatness of the death of Christ, and see the glory of the cross, with something of the dignity with which Jesus Himself went into the shadow.

Literature.—Schwartzkopff, *Die Weissagungen Jesu Christi von seinem Tode, seiner Auferstehung und Wiederkunft* (1895); Babut, *La Pensée de Jesu sur la Mort* (1897); Smeaton, *Our Lord's Doctrine of the Atonement* (1871); Fairbairn, 'Christ's Attitude to His Own Death,' *Expositor* (Oct. Dec. 1896; Jan. Feb. 1897); Denney, *The Death of Christ* (1902); Hollmaun, *Die Bedeutung des Todes Jesu*; Dale, *The Atonement* (1881); Ritschl, *Justification and Reconciliation*, (1900); Belser, *Die Geschichte des Leidens und Sterbens, der Auferstehung und Himmelfahrt des Herrn* (1903); Barth, *Die Hauptprobleme des Lebens Jesu* (1903); Baldensperger, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu* (1892); Schurer, *Das Messianische Selbstbewusstsein* (1903); Hoffmann, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu nach den drei ersten Evangelien* (1904); Appel, *Die Selbstbezeichnung Jesu* (1896); Bruce, *Training of the Twelve*, pp. 167 ff., 273 ff., 289 ff., 346 ff.

A. T. Robertson.

☩ Annunciation, The

ANNUNCIATION, THE (*Annuntiatio*, Εὐαγγελισμός, Χαριτισμός).—The announcement of the fact that the Son of God was to be born of the Virgin Mary, who at the time was espoused to Joseph, the descendant and heir of David. St. Luke (Luk 1:26-38) tells us that this announcement was made to Mary by the angel Gabriel at Nazareth six months after the same angel had told Zacharias in the Temple at Jerusalem that his wife Elisabeth should bear him a son, who was to be called John. St. Luke is our sole authority for this announcement by the angel to Mary. St. Mark and St. John are

silent; and the narrative of St. Matthew, who is our other authority for the fact that Jesus was born of a virgin, is very different, being written as entirely from Joseph's point of view as St. Luke's is written from Mary's point of view (see below). Nevertheless there is no contradiction between the accounts, and in some important particulars they confirm one another. They are wholly independent narratives, as their wide differences show. Yet they agree, not only as to the central fact of the virgin birth, but also as to the manner of it, viz. that it took place through the operation of the Holy Spirit. This agreement is all the more remarkable when we remember that there is nothing like this effect of the Spirit of God upon a virgin in the Old Testament, and that, prior to the New Testament, the very expression 'Holy Spirit' is rare (see the art. in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. p. 402ff.); also that the fact of the Incarnation is elsewhere indicated in quite other terms, as by St. John (Joh 1:14). Moreover, the two narratives agree as to four other points, which are of some importance. Both state that at the time of the announcement Mary was espoused to Joseph, that the child was to be named 'Jesus,' that He was born at Bethlehem in Judaea, and that the parents brought Him up at Nazareth.

It is well to remember that there are stories, more or less analogous to what is told by the two Evangelists, in heathen mythologies. The historical probability of the Gospel narratives is not weakened but strengthened by such comparisons. St. Luke's Gentile readers must have felt the unspeakable difference between the coarse impurity of imagined intercourse between mortals and divinities, in the religious legends of paganism, and the dignity and delicacy of the spiritual narrative which St. Luke laid before them. And St. Matthew's Jewish readers, if they compared his story with their own national ideas, as illustrated in the Book of Enoch (6, 15, 69, 86, 106), would find a similar contrast. Nor should the legendary additions to the Gospel story, which are found in the Apocryphal Gospels, be forgotten. These show us what pitiful stuff the imagination of early Christians could produce, even when the Canonical Gospels were there as models. All these three classes of fiction, heathen, Jewish, and Christian, warn us that we must seek some source for the Gospel narrative other than the fertile imagination of some Gentile or Jewish Christian whose curiosity led him to speculate upon a mysterious subject. We should have had something very different, both in details and in tone, if there had been no better source than this. And this applies even more strongly to St. Luke's narrative than to that of St. Matthew. It required more delicacy to tell the story of the virgin birth from Mary's side than from Joseph's; and this greater delicacy is forthcoming. And it is all the more conspicuous because St. Luke's narrative is the richer in details. We conclude, therefore, that St. Luke had good authority for what he has told us, viz. an authority well acquainted with the facts. For if he was incapable of imagining what he has related, equally incapable was his informant. The narrative which he has handed on to us is what it is because in the main it sets forth what is true.

Then who was St. Luke's authority? Assuming the truth of the narrative, it is obvious that, in the last resort, the authority for it must have been Mary herself. No one else could know what St. Luke records. It does not follow from this that he got the information from her directly, although there is nothing incredible in the supposition that he and she had met. And the form of the narrative leads one to think that there cannot have been many persons between her and him. By frequent transmission from mouth to mouth details about the angel's outward appearance, his beauty and brightness, and about Mary's attitude and employment, would have crept in, and the conversation would have been expanded; all of which corruptions are found in the Apocryphal Gospels. Moreover, such touches as Luk 2:19; Luk 2:51 would be likely to drop out; and they have dropped from the Apocryphal Gospels.

We may go a step farther, and say that if St. Luke did not get his information direct from Mary herself, the person who passed on the mysterious story from her to the Evangelist was almost certainly a woman. Mary would be much more likely to tell it to a woman than to a man; and, in spite of her habitual reticence, she would, after Joseph's death, be likely to confide it to some one. She would feel that such an astounding fact, so much in harmony with the life and death and resurrection of her Son, must not be allowed to die with her; and she would therefore communicate it to some intimate friend, who may have communicated it to St. Luke.

It is quite possible that this communication was at its first stage, or had not even started, when St. Mark composed his Gospel, so that when he wrote he was ignorant of the virgin birth. But as the plan of his Gospel excludes all that preceded the preaching of the Baptist, St. Mark's silence would be natural even if he already knew it. Probably most of the first generation of Christians were ignorant of this mystery, for the Book of Acts and the Epistles show us that what was preached by the Apostles was not the miraculous birth, but the death and resurrection of Christ (Act 1:22; Act 2:23-24; Act 2:32; Act 3:15; Act 4:10; Act 10:39-40; Act 13:28-30; Act 17:31 etc.).

That the Fourth Evangelist knew the Synoptic Gospels, and sometimes silently corrects them, is certain; but he does not correct the story of the virgin birth. On the contrary, what he says about the Incarnation and about the pre-existence of the Son of Man and His oneness with the Father, is in harmony with it. Such passages as Joh 1:14; Joh 3:13; Joh 6:38; Joh 6:44; Joh 6:51; Joh 6:62; Joh 8:38; Joh 8:46; Joh 8:58; Joh 10:30; Joh 11:25; Joh 20:28; Joh 20:31 are more intelligible if written by one who believed the virgin birth, than if written by one who knew the doctrine and rejected it. It is indeed urged that this Evangelist's beliefs about the Christ are such, that he must have stated the virgin birth, if he believed it. But, as the story had already been twice told, there was no need to repeat it. And the whole of his Gospel shows that he is reserved about the Virgin Mother, whose name he alone among the

Evangelists never mentions. She had become his mother (Joh_19:27), and he is reticent about all things connected with himself. He nowhere names his own brother.

Nevertheless, when the mystery became known through the diffusion of the First and Third Gospels, its importance as a completion and confirmation of the faith was recognized. Ignatius (*circa (about)* a.d. 110), in a passage (*Eph.* 19) which is frequently quoted by later Fathers (Origen, Eusebius, Basil, Jerome, etc.), places the virgin birth in the front rank among Gospel truths; and we find it as an article of faith in the Old Roman Creed, which can be traced almost to the beginning of the second century, τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου: *qui natus est de S.S. ex M. V.*

The antecedent probability that St. Luke derived the information respecting Mary either from herself, or from a woman to whom she had confided it, is confirmed by the characteristics of these first two chapters of his Gospel. The notes of time (Luk_1:26; Luk_1:36; Luk_1:56) are specially feminine; and competent critics find a feminine touch throughout (Luk_1:24-25; Luk_1:41-43; Luk_1:57, Luk_2:5-7; Luk_2:19; Luk_2:35; Luk_2:48; Luk_2:51). Lange (*Life of Christ* [ed. 1872], i. p. 258) says: 'The colouring of a woman's memory and a woman's view is unmistakable in the separate features of this history. When it is once ascribed to a female narrator ... we comprehend the indescribable grace, the quiet loveliness and sacredness of this narrative.' Ramsay (*Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* p. 88) says: 'There is a womanly spirit in the whole narrative which seems inconsistent with the transition from man to man.' Sanday (*Expository Times*, April 1903, p. 297) agrees that the narrative came not only *from* a woman, but *through* a woman, and he thinks that Joanna, the wife of Chuza, steward to Herod Antipas (Luk_8:2-3; Luk_24:10; cf. Luk_23:49, Act_1:14), may have been the person through whom the information passed from Mary to St. Luke. Both Lange (confidently) and Sanday (less confidently) believe that St. Luke received the information *in writing*, and that he wrote the first two chapters with a document before him. On the whole, this is probable. It is quite true that the peculiarities and characteristics of St. Luke's very marked style are specially frequent in these two chapters (Plummer, *St. Luke*, p. lxx); but they are also very frequent in other places where he was working from a document. St. Luke seems never to have simply copied his authority. In using written material he freely altered the wording to expressions which were more natural to himself: so that mere frequency of marks of his style is no proof that he was not using what was already in writing. And, of course, when he was translating from an Aramaic document his own favourite words and constructions would come spontaneously.

But, while this is admitted because it admits of something like proof, we are not compelled to admit the unproved assertion that the hymns of praise with which these

chapters are enriched have been composed by St. Luke himself, and have no more basis in fact than the speeches in Livy. Each of these canticles suits the time at which it is supposed to have been uttered better than the time at which St. Luke wrote, and it may be doubted whether he could in imagination have thrown himself back to the surroundings and anticipations of Zacharias and Mary and Simeon. There may have been on his part 'a free literary remodelling of material' (B. Weiss). Before anything was written down there may have been some modification in the wording as the result of reflexion upon what had been uttered and done. There may even have been conscious elaboration. But it is reasonable to believe that these exquisite and appropriate songs represent fairly accurately what was said and felt on each occasion. What was said and felt would be remembered, and perhaps was committed to writing long before St. Luke obtained the precious record, although not till many years after the events. And there is nothing extravagant in the belief that Mary herself may at last have thought it best to commit her recollections and meditations to writing. The feeling, *meum secretum mihi*, would prevail for a long time: 'she pondered these things in her heart.' Then, as the end of her life drew nearer, she might put on record what ought not to be lost. Finally, she committed the sacred mystery to another woman, or to a small group of women; and from them it passed to St. Luke. But we must be content to remain in ignorance as to whether Mary, or some confidante, or St. Luke himself, was the first to put the story in writing.

That St. Luke should be the Evangelist to receive this womanly story of women is not surprising. The rest of his Gospel shows a marked sympathy with the sex which was so commonly looked down upon by both Jews and Gentiles. To this day, in the public service of the synagogue, the men thank God that they have not been made women. No other Evangelist gives us so many types of women. Besides those in the first two chapters, we have the widow at Nain, the sinner in Simon's house, Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Susanna, the woman with the issue, Martha and Mary, the woman bowed down for eighteen years, the widow with her two mites, the daughters of Jerusalem, and the women at the tomb. And he alone gives us the parable of the Woman and the Lost Coin. We may believe that he was one in whom a woman might naturally confide.

While in St. Luke everything is grouped round Mary and her kinswoman Elisabeth, in St. Matthew everything is grouped round Joseph. Joseph's genealogy is given by way of preface. The Annunciation is made to him; and all revelations about the name of the Child, and the provisions to be taken for His safety, are made also to him. Obviously, if the story is true, Joseph must have been the ultimate source of a great deal of it; but it may have passed through many mouths before it took the form in which it appears in the First Gospel.

Doubt has been thrown upon the two narratives, because in the First Gospel the revelations are made by the angel of the Lord *in dreams*, whereas in the Third they

are made by angels to persons *in their waking moments*. It is argued that in each case the miraculous agency is due to the imagination of the writer. This is possible. But it is also reasonable to believe that the special method of communication was in each case adapted to the character of the recipients. It cannot be said that St. Matthew always gives us dreams, or that St. Luke objects to such things. St. Matthew mentions the ministry of angels (Mat 4:11), and communications made by means of them (Mat 28:5-7); and St. Luke mentions communications made by means of visions in the night (Luk 16:9; Luk 18:9-10). And if the writers had imagined the substance of the heavenly message, would not St. Matthew have given the promise of the Kingdom, and St. Luke the promise of Salvation? But it is St. Matthew who has the latter (Mat 1:21), while St. Luke has the former (Luk 1:32-33). It is worth noting that in the New Testament we do not read of dreams or visions in the night anywhere but in St. Matthew and in Acts; cf. 2Co 12:1.

Again, doubts have been raised about the two narratives, because in the one the revelation of the miraculous conception is made to Mary, in the other to Joseph; and either revelation, it is urged, would render the other unnecessary. On the contrary, both are necessary. If the virgin birth was to take place, God in His mercy would not leave Mary in ignorance of the mysterious manner in which He was about to deal with her. We may reverently say that the Annunciation to Mary was a necessity in order to save her from dreadful perplexity and suffering. And this rendered a revelation to Joseph also necessary. On the mere testimony of Mary he could not have accepted so extraordinary a story. The fact that, in spite of his inevitable suspicions, he took her in marriage, requires us to believe that to him also had been revealed God's purposes respecting his betrothed.

It is evident that St. Matthew and St. Luke give the narratives as historical. Each believed his own story, and expected that others would believe it also (Luk 1:4). Indeed, the isolation in which these two very different intimations of the virgin birth stand in the New Testament makes the explanation of them very difficult unless there is an historical basis. They are not needed to explain anything else. They are intensely Jewish in tone; but we may be sure that Judaism, with its enthusiastic estimate of the blessings of marriage, would not have invented them. Moreover, at the time when these Gospels were written, Judaism was antagonistic to the new faith, and would not have tolerated such a glorifying of its Founder.

In the Annunciation to Mary we are not told that she saw anything, for the *ἰδοῦσα* read by A C in Luk 1:29 is almost certainly not genuine. Gabriel was sent, and entered some building in which she was living at Nazareth, and there delivered his message. The *εἰσελθὼν* is against the later tradition that she was at the fountain drawing water (*Protevangelium of James*, 11; *Gospel of pseudo-Matthew*, 9). The

angelic message is given ‘in three little pieces of trimeter poetry, which have become somewhat obscured by the Greek translation’ (Briggs, *The Messiah of the Gospels*, p. 45 ff.), the first of which is the Ave Maria ‘in the form of a distich’—

‘Hail, thou that art endued with grace,

The Lord is with thee.’

The much discussed *κεχαριτωμένη* must mean ‘endued with grace’ (Sir 18:17): *πίστιν καὶ χάριν λαβοῦσα Μαρία* (Justin Martyr, *Try.* 100); and both here and in Luk 1:30 the usual translation ‘grace’ should be retained for *χάρις*. ‘The Lord is with thee’ is frequent in the Old Testament (Jos 1:9; Jos 6:27, Jdg 6:12, Isa 43:5). The Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 is probably right in omitting ‘Blessed (art) thou among women,’ which may have come from Luk 1:42 : ✠ BL, with the Egyptian and Armenian Versions, omit.

By the first words of the angel, Mary was greatly disturbed (*διεταράχθη*) both in mind and heart: then her perplexity and emotion gave place to thought (*διελογίζετο*). But, although *ποταπύς* originally meant ‘from what country or nation,’ she was not deliberating, like Hamlet about the ghost, whether the message came from heaven or hell, *i.e.* whether it was Divine or diabolical. The Latin Versions rightly have *quails*, not *cujas*, as an equivalent. Nowhere in the New Testament has *ποταπός* a local signification, but means simply ‘of what kind or quality’ (*ποῖος*), and implies astonishment (Luk 7:39, Mat 8:27, Mar 13:1 -2Pe 3:11, 1Jn 3:1).

In his second address Gabriel calms the Virgin’s fears and explains the purpose of his mission. ‘Thou hast found grace with God’ is another Old Testament expression (Gen 6:8; Gen 18:3; Gen 19:19; Gen 39:4, Exo 33:12-13; Exo 33:16-17). This ‘grace’ is manifested in making her the mother of the longed-for Messiah, an unspeakable joy to a Jewish mother. In the promise which follows there are allusions to two prophecies. ‘Son of the Most High’ recalls Psa 2:7, and ‘the throne of his father David’ recalls the great Messianic prediction in Isa 9:6-7.

By the second utterance of Gabriel, which contains the substance of the Annunciation, Mary is astounded. Yet she does not, like Zacharias, ask for proof (Luk 1:18). Nor is her ‘How?’ a request for an explanation. Rather it is an exclamation of amazement. She is not married: how can she have a son? And how can a humble maiden like herself have such a son? This seems to be the natural import of her words.

It is unlikely that 'I know not a man' means that she has already taken, or there and then takes, or intends to take, a vow of perpetual virginity. And can Mat 1:25, with its Imperfect tense (not Aorist, as in Gen 19:8), be reconciled with any such vow? Mary's ἀνδρα οὐ γινώσκω is a confession of conscious purity, drawn from her by the surprising promise that she is to have a son before she is married (see Sadler, *ad loc.*).

Although Mary does not ask for an explanation or a sign, Gabriel gives both in a third utterance. As to the explanation, it is an influence that is spiritual and not carnal, that is holy and not sinful, that is to come upon her and enable her to become a mother, and the mother of the Messiah.

'Wherefore also the holy thing which shall be born
Shall be called the Son of God.'

'Son of God' was a recognized title of the Messiah. Both in the Book of Enoch and frequently in 4 Ezra the Almighty speaks of the Messiah as His Son. Jesus rarely uses this title of Himself (Mat 27:43, Joh 10:36). But we have it in the voices from heaven (Luk 3:22; Luk 9:35) and in the devil's challenge (Luk 4:3; Luk 4:9), in St. Peter's confession (Mat 16:16), in the cries of the demoniacs (Mar 3:11; Mar 5:7), and in the centurion's exclamation (Mar 15:39). The primitive Church adopted it as a concise statement of the Divinity of Jesus Christ (Swete, *Apostles' Creed*, p. 24). It is worth noting, in connexion with the part assigned to the Holy Spirit in the virgin birth, that in a fragment of the Gospel according to the Hebrews quoted by Origen (*Com. in Johan.* iii. § 63) the words, 'My mother, the Holy Spirit, took Me,' are put into the mouth of Christ.

As to the sign, which was granted unasked, Mary receives one which is as convincing as the one given to Zacharias, but much more gracious. Another wonderful birth is about to take place, and by the mention of 'the sixth month' the angel assures Mary that all is known to him. Mary can verify his words respecting Elisabeth, and thereby know that this message to herself is true. He intimates that there is to be close relationship between Elisabeth's son and her own, and directs her to her kinswoman for confirmation and sympathy.

Mary's final response to the angel is not a prayer that what he has promised may be fulfilled, but an expression of absolute submission. She foresees the difficulty with Joseph and with all who know her. But she accepts, without reserve, God's decree respecting her, as made known to her by His messenger, and leaves the issue in His hands. She is the Lord's bondmaid, and His will must be done.

There is perhaps more irreverence than wisdom in speculating whether God could have redeemed mankind by one who was produced without human parent; or, again, by one who had a human father as well as a human mother. But suggestions of this kind have been made, and perhaps call for comment. It may be pointed out that a new act of creation would have left no nexus between the Redeemer and those to be redeemed. He would not have belonged to the same race as those whom He came to save. He would not have taken their flesh, and His life would have had little relation to theirs. It is difficult to see how the death and resurrection of such a being would have aided the human race. But the virgin birth avoided all violent breach with humanity. Just as the prophet (John the Baptist) who was to renovate Israel was taken from the old priesthood, so the Christ who was to redeem the whole of mankind was not created out of nothing, but 'born of a woman.'

Again, if the Christ had had two human parents, it is difficult to see how the hereditary contamination of the race could have been excluded. It may be said that such contamination remains even with only one human parent, and that the choice lies between admitting the contamination and severing the nexus with the human race altogether. But, in truth, there is no such dilemma. The choice is not between creation on the one hand and human parentage (whether with one or two parents) on the other. There is also the possibility of the substitution of Divine agency for the human father. It is conceivable that the presence of this Divine element would entirely exclude the possibility of contamination from the human mother. Indeed it is difficult to conceive that the Divine element could in any way receive contamination. But it is wiser to accept with reverent thankfulness what has been revealed to us respecting this mystery than to speculate needlessly, and perhaps fruitlessly, about what has not been revealed.

It has been pointed out already that the beauty, dignity, and delicacy of the story of the Annunciation are tokens of historic reality; for the fictions about similar subjects in pagan, Jewish, and Christian literature are, in these respects, so very different. There is yet another mark of historic truth to be noted, viz. the extreme simplicity of the Christology. New Testament doctrine about the Christ is here found at a very early stage, earlier even than that in the Epistles to the Corinthians; for there we have Christ's pre-existence implied as 'the second man from heaven' (1Co 15:47), who 'became poor' when He became man for us (2Co 8:9; cf. 2Co 4:4-6); and therefore much earlier than the more developed Christology of Colossians (Col 1:15) and Ephesians (Eph 1:5-7; Eph 4:13), and than that of the writer to the Hebrews (Heb 1:3), or that of the Fourth Gospel (Joh 1:14; Joh 3:13; Joh 17:5). 'The power of the Most High shall overshadow thee' reminds us rather of the manifestations of the Divine presence in the Old Testament, especially the 'pillar of cloud' (Exo 13:21; Exo 40:34-38, 1Ki 8:10-11). If St. Luke had invented the story of the Annunciation, would he not have given us more of Pauline Christology, and that in its fullest form?

That he has given us what is so rudimentary is evidence that he gives a record of what was revealed to Mary at the time, rather than what he himself knew and believed.

The couplet with which the narrative ends ([Luk_1:38](#)) balances that with which it opens ([Luk_1:28](#)), and it is one of deep spiritual significance to every believer. By her absolute submission to the will of God, in spite of the agony of shame and distress which this involved, Mary entered into an intimacy of relationship with Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, such as even angels cannot know. And yet it is precisely here that the humblest Christian may, by similar obedience, follow her. 'Blessed is the womb that bare thee,' said one to the Lord, 'and the breasts which thou didst suck. But he said, Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it' ([Luk_11:27-28](#)).

It was natural that a special day should be set apart to commemorate this mystery, but we do not know when this was first done. The earliest mention of such a festival is in the Acts of the Tenth Synod of Toledo (a.d. 656); and the next is in those of the Second Synod in Trullo (a.d. 692). But, just as the Purification was originally a feast in honour of our Lord rather than of the Virgin Mary, viz. of His presentation in the Temple and meeting with Simeon and Anna, so also this festival originally commemorated His miraculous conception rather than the announcement made to her. In the Ethiopian Calendar it is not called 'the Annunciation of the blessed Virgin Mary,' but 'the Conception of Christ': elsewhere the later name of the feast has driven out the original title, not only in the West, but also in the Eastern Churches.

Literature.—Briggs, *The Messiah of the Gospels*, p. 41 ff., *New Light on the Life of Jesus*, 1904, p. 160 ff.; Ramsay, *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?*; Sanday, art. 'Jesus Christ' in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible* ii. p. 643 ff., also *Expository Times*, April 1903; Pearson, *On the Creed*, art. iii.; Swete, *The Apostles' Creed*, p. 41 ff., also *Expos. Times*, 1893; Westcott, *The Historic Faith*, p. 59 ff.; B. Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, ii. § 2 [English translation i. p. 222 ff.]; Loofs, *Leitfaden z. Studium d. Dogmengeschichte*; Soltau, *Geburtsgeschichte Jesu Christi*, 1902; J. A. Robinson, *Some Thoughts on the Incarnation*, 1903; Knowling, *Our Lord's Virgin Birth*; *Ch. Quart. Rev.*, July and Oct. 1904; Gore, *The Incarnation*, 77 ff., 251 f.; Garvie, *Expositor*, Feb. 1902. On the sceptical side: Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, ii. p. 38 ff.; Hase, *Geschichte Jesu*, § 22 ff.; O. Holtzmann, *Leben Jesu*, cap. iv. [English translation p. 81 ff.]; P. Lohstein, *The Virgin-Birth of Christ*, 1903; Cheyne, *Bible Problems*, 1904.

A. Plummer.

ANOINTING.—I. In the ancient world, Jewish and pagan alike, it was customary to refresh guests at banquets by pouring cool and fragrant ointment on their heads. Cf. Mart. iii. 12; Psa_23:5, where Cheyne gives an Egyptian illustration: ‘Every rich man had in his household an anointer, who had to place a cone of ointment on the head of his master, where it remained during the feast.’ There are two instances of the usage in the Gospel history:

1. *The anointing in the house of Simon the Pharisee* (Luk_7:36-50).—Impressed by the fame of Jesus and desirous of closer acquaintance with one who was certainly a prophet, perhaps more,* [Note: According to the v.l. ὁ τροφήτης in v. 39, Simon thought Jesus might be the prophet who should arise and herald the Messiah. Cf. Joh_1:21; Joh_1:25; Joh_6:14; Joh_7:40.] Simon bade Him to his table, inviting also a party of his friends. He was a Pharisee of the better sort, yet he shared the pride of his order and put a difference betwixt Jesus and the other guests, withholding from Him the customary courtesies: the kiss of welcome, the ablution of the feet, the anointing of the head. In the course of the meal a woman appeared in the room, wearing her hair loose, which in Jewish society was the token of a harlot.† [Note: See Lightfoot on Joh_12:3.] What did she in a Pharisee’s house? She had come, a sorrowful penitent, in quest of Jesus; and she brought an offering, an alabaster vase of ointment. As He reclined at table, she stole to His couch and, stooping over His feet, rained hot tears upon them, wiped them with her flowing tresses, kissed them, and anointed them with the ointment. She should have poured it on His head, but she durst not.‡ [Note: Orig. in Matth. Comm. Ser. § 77: ‘Non fuit ausa ad caput Christi venire sed lacrymis pedes ejus lavit, quasi vix etiam ipsis pedibus ejus digna.’]

2. *The anointing in the house of Simon the Leper* (Joh_12:1-11 = Mar_14:3-9 = Mat_26:6-13).—On His way up to the last Passover, Jesus stopped at the village of Bethany, where, a few weeks before, He had raised Lazarus; and, in defiance of the Sanhedrin’s edict (Joh_11:57), He was received with grateful reverence. One of the principal men of the village, named Simon, made a banquet in His honour. He had been a leper, and, if he had been healed by Jesus, it was fitting that his house should be the scene of the banquet.* [Note: Lazarus was not the host, but one of the guests (Joh_12:2). The notion that his house was the scene of the banquet has occasioned speculations about Simon. Theophylact mentions the opinion that he was Lazarus’ father, lately deceased (Ewald).] But it was a public tribute, and others bore a part in it. Lazarus was present, and the good housewife Martha managed the entertainment. And what part did Mary take? She entered the room with her hair loose and an alabaster vase of precious ointment in her hand, and, approaching the Lord’s couch, poured the ointment over His feet and wiped them with her hair. See Mary.

There are several points of difference between John's and Matthew-Mark's accounts of the anointing: (1) Matthew and Mark say that it happened in the house of Simon the Leper, and make no mention of Lazarus and his sisters. They simply say that the 'beautiful work' was wrought by 'a woman.' (2) They seem to put the incident two days (Mat 26:2 = Mar 14:1), whereas John puts it six days before the Passover (Joh 12:1). (3) They represent the nameless woman as pouring the ointment not on the Lord's feet but on His head, and say nothing of her wiping His feet with her hair. On the ground of these discrepancies it was generally maintained by the Fathers that there were two anointings at Bethany, the incidents recorded by Matthew-Mark and John being distinct. So Chrysostom (*in Matth.* lxxxi.), who apparently identified the anointing in the house of Simon the Leper (Mt.-Mk.) with that in the house of Simon the Pharisee (Lk.). Origen (*in Matth. Comm. Ser.* § 77) held that there were in all three anointings: (a) in the house of Simon the Leper (Mt.—Mk.); (b) in the house of Simon the Pharisee (Lk.); (c) at Bethany by Mary (Jn.); mentioning also the opinion that there were four, Matthew and Mark recording distinct incidents.

Nowadays the tendency is rather to ignore the differences and identify all the narratives, reducing them to one. The Matthew-Mark narrative is regarded as authentic, the Lukan and Johannine narratives being adaptations thereof (Strauss, Ewald, Keim). Even in Origen's day a similar view prevailed: 'multi quidem existimant de una eademque muliere quatuor Evangelistas exposuisse.'

It hardly admits of reasonable doubt that there were two anointings, one in the house of Simon the Pharisee, and the other by Mary in the house of Simon the Leper at Bethany.† [Note: So Aug. *de Cons. Ev.* ii. § 154.] The discrepancies in the triple account of the latter are not inexplicable. (1) Matthew-Mark's omission of the names of Lazarus and his sisters belongs to the larger question of the Synoptic silence regarding the family at Bethany. (2) The position of the incident in Matthew-Mark is merely an example of the freedom wherewith the Synoptic editors were wont to handle the material of the Evangelic tradition, arranging it topically rather than chronologically. They have brought the story into juxtaposition with the betrayal (Mat 26:14-16 = Mar 14:10-11), (evidently by way of casting light on the traitor's action. The Lord's rebuke at the feast angered him, and, burning for revenge, he went and made his bargain with the high priests. Cf. Aug. *de Cons. Ev.* ii. § 153. (3) The difference regarding the manner of the anointing is an instance of John's habit of tacitly correcting his predecessors. His account is historical, and it would stand so in the Apostolic tradition; but the Synoptic editors or, more probably, the catechisers in their oral repetition of the tradition, wondering, since they did not know who the woman was, at the strangeness of her action, substituted 'head' for 'feet,' and then omitted the unintelligible circumstance of her wiping His feet with her hair. See Mary.

Literature.—Andrews, *Life of our Lord*, pp. 281-283; Ramsay, *Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?* pp. 91-92; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , articles 'Anointing' and 'Mary'; *Expositor*, 1st ser. vi. [1877] pp. 214-229; *Ecce Homo*¹⁵ [Note: 5 designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 232 ff.; Bruce, *Training of the Twelve*⁵ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , pp. 289-308; Ker, *Sermons*, 1st ser. p. 16 ff.; Vinet, *Vital Christianity*, p. 294 ff. Reference may also be made to Bunyan, *Jerus.* [Note: Jerusalem.] *Sinner Saved* (ed. 1765), pp. 58-62; Herbert, *Marie Magdalene*; Hartley Coleridge's fine sonnet on Luk 7:47.

David Smith.

II. Besides the two special incidents already described, some other references to 'anointing' may be briefly dealt with.

1. In Mat 6:17 Jesus tells His disciples that when they fast they are to anoint (ἀλείφω) the head as usual. The allusion is to that daily use of oil, as an application soothing and refreshing to the skin, which is common in hot countries, and was regularly practised by the Jews. The meaning of Jesus is that His disciples, when they feel it right to fast, should undertake the observance as in the sight of God, and not ostentatiously parade their performance of it before the eyes of men. They should wash and anoint themselves as usual, and not draw attention by any peculiarities of outward appearance to a matter lying between themselves and their heavenly Father.

2. In Mar 6:13 we read of the Twelve on their evangelistic mission, that they 'anointed (ἀλείφω) with oil many that were sick, and healed them.' The employment of oil as a medicinal agent was familiar in the time of Christ (cf. Luk 10:34, Jam 5:14), and is doubtless referred to here; though the natural virtues of the oil were accompanied in this case by miraculous powers of healing. In Joh 9:6; Joh 9:11 Jesus, before working the miracle upon the blind man, anoints (ἐπιχρίω) his eyes with clay which He had made by spitting on the ground. Here, also, the anointing may have had a medicinal aspect (see Meyer and *Expositor's Gr. Test. in loc.* on the ancient belief that both spittle and clay were beneficial to the eyes); though, of course, it is the miraculous agency of Jesus that is paramount in the narrative. In Rev 3:18 Jesus says to the Church of the Laodiceans, '... and anoint thine eyes with eyesalve, that thou mayest see,' where the effect of the application of collyrium is used as a figure of the healing and enlightenment which are found in the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ.

3. In Mar_14:8 Jesus says of the gracious act of Mary of Bethany in anointing Him at the feast, ‘She hath anointed (μυρρίζω fr. μύρον = ‘ointment’; probably akin to μύρρα = ‘myrrh’) my body afore-hand for the burying’ (cf. Joh_12:7). And in Mar_16:1 we read how Mary Magdalene and the other women went to the sepulchre to anoint (ἀλείφω) the dead body of the Saviour (cf. Luk_23:56, Joh_19:39-40). This application of ointments and spices (cf. Luk_24:1) was an expression of reverence and affection for the departed, and may be compared with the modern custom of surrounding the beloved dead with fragrant and beautiful flowers. These unguents were not used for the purpose of embalming the dead, as among the Egyptians, but were only outwardly applied, and did not prevent decomposition (cf. Joh_11:39).

4. When Jesus in the synagogue at Nazareth read from Isaiah 61 the prophetic words, ‘The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he anointed (χρίω me to preach good tidings to the poor ...’ (Luk_4:18), and went on to say, after closing the book, ‘To-day hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears’ (Luk_4:21), He definitely claimed to be set apart to the Messianic calling. In the OT anointing was the symbol of consecration alike in the case of prophet (1Ki_19:16), priest (Lev_8:12), and king (1Sa_10:1). And in the case of Jesus, who to His people is at once prophet, priest, and king, a spiritual anointing is distinctly affirmed by His Evangelists and Apostles as well as claimed by Himself (cf. Act_4:27; Act_10:38, Heb_1:9). The Hebrew word ‘Messiah’ (משיח from מָשַׁח ‘to anoint’) means ‘the anointed one’; and of this word ‘Christ’ is the Greek equivalent (χριστός, from χρίω, ‘to anoint,’ being employed in LXX Septuagint to render מָשַׁח).

5. In 1Jn_2:20 the Apostle writes, ‘And ye have an anointing (χρίσμα) from the Holy One, and ye know all things’ (so Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ; Authorized Version renders ‘unction’). Again, in 1Jn_2:27 he says, ‘And as for you, the anointing (χρίσμα) which ye received of him abideth in you....’ (here Authorized Version as well as Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 gives ‘anointing’). That the ‘Holy One’ of this passage is Christ Himself, and that the ‘anointing’ He dispenses is the bestowal of the Holy Spirit, is held by nearly all commentators. Being Himself anointed with the Holy Ghost (Act_10:38), the Christ has power to impart the same gift to His disciples. Indeed, the bestowal of this gift is constantly represented as His peculiar function (cf. Joh_15:26; Joh_16:7; Joh_16:13-15, Act_2:33).

Literature.—H. B. Swete, E. P. Gould, A. F. Hort, and esp. E. H. Plumptre on Mar_6:13; also A. Plummer, and C. Watson on 1Jn_2:20.

⚡Answers

ANSWERS.—See Questions and Answers.

⚡Antipas

ANTIPAS.—See Herod, No. 2.

⚡Antonia

ANTONIA (Tower of).—See Temple.

⚡Anxiety

ANXIETY.—See Care.

⚡Apocalyptic Literature

APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE

- i. Name and Nature.
- ii. Origin and History.
- iii. The Apocalypses.
 1. The Ethiopic Enoch.
 2. The Slavonic Enoch.
 3. The Sibylline Oracles.

4. The Assumption of Moses.
5. Fourth Esdras.
6. The Syriac Baruch.
7. The Greek Baruch.
8. The Psalter of Solomon.
9. The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs.
10. The Book of Jubilees.
11. The Ascension of Isaiah.
12. The Histories of Adam and Eve.
13. The Apocalypse of Abraham.
14. The Apocalypse of Elias.
15. The Apocalypse of Zephaniah.
16. Anonymous Apocalypse.
17. The Prayer of Joseph.
18. The Book of Eldad and Modad.

iv. General Characteristics.

1. The Vision Form.
2. Dualism.
3. Symbolism.
4. Angelology.
5. The Unknown as subject-matter.

6. Pseudonymity.
7. Optimism.
- v. Theological Ideas.
 1. The Doctrine of the two aeons.
 2. The Impending Crisis.
 3. The Conception of God.
 4. Complex Cosmology.
 5. Arch-enemy of God.
 6. Doctrine of Man.
 7. Doctrine of Sin.
 8. The coming Messiah.
 9. The Resurrection.
 10. The Judgment.
 11. Punishment of the Wicked.
 12. The Reward of the Righteous.
 13. The Renovation of the World.
 14. Predestination.
- vi. Contact with the New Testament.
 1. Apocalyptic Forms in the New Testament.
 2. Current Phraseology: Son of Man, etc.
 3. Quotations.

4. Influence of Ideas.
5. Treatment of Common Questions.

Literature.

i. Name and Nature.—The term ‘apocalypse’ (ἀποκάλυψις from ἀποκαλύπτω, *to uncover*) signifies in the first place the act of uncovering, and thus bringing into sight that which was before unseen, hence ‘revelation.’ It is predominantly a NT word. It occurs rather rarely in extra-biblical Greek, is used only once in the canonical portion of the LXX Septuagint (1Sa 20:30), and thrice in Sirach (Sir 11:27; Sir 22:22; Sir 42:1 [Sir 41:23]). In the NT it is used to designate the disclosing or communicating of knowledge by direct Divine act. The gospel is an apocalypse to the nations (Luk 2:32, Rom 16:25-26). St. Paul received it as an apocalypse (Gal 1:12). The manifestation of Jesus Christ in glory is an apocalypse (Gal 2:2, 2Co 12:1-7, 2Th 1:7; 1Pe 1:7; 1Pe 1:13; 1Pe 4:13).

An apocalypse is thus primarily the act of revelation; in the second place it is the subject-matter revealed; and in the third place a book or literary production which gives an account of revelation, whether real or alleged (e.g. ‘The Apocalypse of St. John the Divine’). As a matter of history, the form in which the revelation purports to come is of the utmost importance in determining the question whether a writing should be called an apocalypse or not. In general, the form is like the drawing of the veil from before a picture, the result of which action presents to the eye a definite image. All imparting of Divine truth is revelation; but it is not all given in the apocalyptic form, *i.e.* it does not all come in grand imagery, as if portrayed on canvas or enacted in scenic representation. Some revelations come in sub-conscious convictions. Those who receive them do not feel called upon to give an account of the way in which they have received them. In fact they seem ignorant of the method of communication; they only know that they have received knowledge not previously possessed. Apocalypse and revelation thus, though primarily the same thing, come to be distinguished from each other.

The term ‘apocalypse’ is also sometimes used, with an effort at greater precision, to designate the pictorial portraiture of the future as foreshadowed by the seer. When so employed it becomes appropriate only as the title of certain passages in books otherwise not to be called apocalypses (so Bousset in Herzog-Hauek, *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] , s.v., who enumerates the following passages: Dan 2:7-12; Ethiopic En 85-91, 37-71; Ps-Sol 2, 17, 18; the Assumption of Moses; Slav. En.; 4 Ezra; Syriac Bar.; Sibyl. Orac. iii. 286 to the end,

iii. 36-92, iv., the Jewish source of i. and ii.; also certain sections of the Apocalypse, Apocalyptic John and 2Th 2:3-12; Matthew 24 with parallels).

To constitute a writing an apocalypse, it is not necessary that the author should have actually seen or experienced what he portrays. It is enough that he write as one who has had a vision and is describing it. Thus apocalypse becomes a form of literature precisely in the same manner as an epistle. Strictly an epistle is simply a letter from one person, or many persons, to another, or others. But, as a matter of usage, it has often been adopted as a form into which men have chosen to cast their thoughts for the public. The same is true of the dialogue, of fiction, and many other species of literature. Such forms become favourites in certain ages, usually after some outstanding character has made successful use of them. The dialogue became fashionable when Plato made it such a telling medium for the teaching of his philosophical system. The epistle was used by Horace, and later by Seneca. The apocalypse form appears as a favourite about the beginning of the 2nd cent. b.c. The most illustrious specimen, and perhaps the prototype of later apocalyptic literature, is the Book of Daniel.

ii. Origin and History.—The question has been mooted as to the earlier antecedents of the apocalyptic form. Its ultimate source has been traced variously to Egypt, Greece, Babylonia, and Persia. In view of the fact, however, that the Hebrew prophets frequently incorporate visions into their writings (Isaiah 6, Jer 24:1-3, Eze 1:27, Isaiah 24-27), it is scarcely necessary to go outside of Israel to search for its origins. Nevertheless, the Persians, the Babylonians, the Egyptians, and the Greeks had their apocalypics. And it would be a mistake to ignore the influence especially of Persian forms during the period of the formation of Jewish apocalypics. This was the very period when Jewish forms came most directly into touch with Persian. In any case, much of the material of the Jewish apocalypse has been adopted and naturalized from Persia (cf. Bousset, *Die Jud. Apokalyptik*, 1903; Gunkel, *Schopfung u. Chaos*, 1895). Apocalyptic literature in general begins before Christ. Soon after the Christian era it develops into the two naturally distinct forms of Christian and neo-Hebraic. Hence we may distinguish three classes of apocalypses:—(1) The earlier Jewish ones, or those which were published from b.c. 200 to a.d. 100. Within this class, however, may be included also such writings as proceed from Jewish sources purely, though not written until half a century, more or less, later than the last limit of the period. (2) Christian apocalypses, including the canonical book known as *the Apocalypse* (Revelation of St. John), and a series of apocryphal imitations. These are mostly pseudonymous, but include an occasional work in which the author does not conceal his name behind that of an apostle or older prophet (*The Shepherd of Hermas*). Apocalypses of this class pass into Patristics and culminate in Dante's immortal *Commedia*. (3) The neo-Hebraic apocalypses, beginning with the predominance of the Talmud (especially the Babylonian) and including a series of revelations to the great

Rabbis (*The Revelation of R. Joshua b. Levi, The Alphabets of R. Akiba, The Hebrew Elijah Apocalypse, The Apocalypse of Zerubbabel, The Wars of King Messiah, The Revelations of R. Simon b. Yohai, The Prayer of R. Simon b. Yohai, and the Persian Apocalypse of Daniel*).

It would be somewhat beside the purpose of this article to do more than sketch the first of these three classes of apocalypses. On the other hand, as Christ emerged in history at a definite period and in a definite environment, and as in this environment nothing is more conspicuous and potent than the early Jewish apocalyptic literature, the importance of this literature cannot be overestimated. A flood of light is shed by the form and content of these writings upon His life, teaching, and work. Happily, considerable attention has been given in recent years to this as a field of investigation, and some definite results may be registered.

iii. The Apocalypses.—Of the earlier Jewish apocalypse, the canonical Daniel forms the prototype. The proper place, however, for a particular treatment of Daniel is conventionally the sphere of Old Testament Introduction (see art. 'Daniel' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible vol. i.). Our list will begin with the Books of Enoch.

1. The Ethiopic Enoch.—The adjective 'Ethiopic' has been attached to the title of this work because of another Book of Enoch discovered in a Slavonic version. Outside the canonical Daniel, this is the best known of the apocalypses, because of the quotation from it in Jud_1:14 f. Tertullian knows it, believes in its genuineness, and attempts to account for its transmission through and survival under the vicissitudes of the Flood. It appears to have been neglected, however, through the Middle Ages, and lost until 1773, when two MS copies of an Ethiopic version of it were brought from Abyssinia by J. Bruce. A translation of one of these was made by Lawrence, and published in 1821. But its full importance and significance came to be realized only with Dillmann's critical edition of the Ethiopic text in 1851, which was followed in 1853 by a thorough German translation and commentary. A portion of the Greek text was discovered in 1886-7, and edited by H. B. Swete.

Contents.—As it stands to-day, the Book of Enoch can be subdivided into five main parts with an introduction and a conclusion, as follows: *Introductory Discourse*, in which the author announces his parable, and formally asks attention to the important matters which he is about to divulge (1-5).

(a) The first section is concerned with *Angelology* (6-36), beginning with the report of the fall of two hundred angels who were enticed by the beauty of the daughters of men, and left heaven in order to take them for wives. Out of these unions sprang giants 3000 cubits in height. The fallen angels, moreover, taught men all manner of secrets whereby they were led into sin. When the giants had consumed all the

possessions of men, they turned against the men themselves and smote them until their cry went up to heaven. Ringleaders of the angels are Azazel and Semjâzâ (6-9). Through the intercession of the four archangels, Michael, Uriel, Raphael, and Gabriel, God is moved to arrest bloodshed upon earth. He sends Uriel to Noah to tell him that He has determined to destroy the world. He commands Raphael to bind Azazel and throw him into a pit in the wilderness, where he shall remain until the day of the great judgment, and then be cast into the fire. He commands Gabriel to rouse the giants against each other; and, finally, he commands Michael to announce to Semjâzâ the sentence of punishment, which is, that the fallen angels shall be kept enchained and imprisoned under the hills of the earth, waiting the last judgment, when they shall be cast into the fire (10). After the destruction of all impiety upon earth, the righteous shall flourish and live long, the earth shall yield abundantly, all people shall pray to God, and all evil shall be banished from the earth (11). The sentence upon the fallen angels is communicated to Enoch (12), and he reveals it to them; but, at their urgent request, he composes a petition on their behalf, that they might obtain forgiveness; while rehearsing this, preparatory to presenting it, he falls asleep and is informed in a dream that their request for forgiveness will not be granted, and once more makes known to the angels their impending doom (13-16). Enoch tells of a journey in which he learned of the places where thunders and lightnings originate, and saw the stream of Hades, the corner-stone and the pillars of the world, the seven mountains of precious stones, and the places of punishment of the disobedient angels, *i.e.* the stars (17-19). He gives the names and functions of the six (seven) archangels (20). He once more visits the place of punishment of the condemned angels, and the nether world (21), consisting of four parts (22). He travels to the West (23-25). From there he returns to the city of Jerusalem, which is the centre of the earth (26, 27); then he travels to the East (28-33), to the North (34, 35), and, lastly, to the South (36).

(b) The second section is *Christological*, and consists of chs. 37-71, subdivided into three *Similitudes*. A short introductory discourse (37) is followed by the first *Similitude*, including chs. 38-44. The appearance of the Messiah, the righteous One, brings an end of sinners upon earth (38). Enoch is carried by storm-clouds to the end of heaven, and there beholds the pre-existing Kingdom of God, the dwellings of the righteous and the elect, and of angels and archangels (39, 40). He then sees the weighing of men's actions in the balance, the rejection of sinners, the places prepared for the righteous, and certain physical mysteries (lightnings, thunders, winds, hail, mist, clouds, sun and moon, 41), also the place of Wisdom in heaven (42), and, finally, some more physical mysteries (43, 44). The second *Similitude* includes chs. 45-57. It begins with the Messianic Judgment (45). Enoch sees the Son of Man beside the Head of Days (46). An angel explains the vision (47, the Son of Man will overthrow and judge the kings and mighty ones of the ungodly). The task of the pre-existing Son of Man is outlined (48, 49), and the happy consequences of the

judgment for the pious, together with the punishments of the wicked, and the resurrection of those who have died in righteousness (50, 51). In a vision of six mountains of metal which pass away, the destruction of the heathen world by the Messiah is portrayed. The heathen world endeavours through offerings to propitiate God, but fails. The angels of punishment go forth to do their work. The synagogue service may now be carried on unhindered (52-54:6). An account of the coming flood and its occasion is inserted (54:7-55:2), and is followed by the final assault of the heathen world-power (55:3-56) and the return of the dispersed Jews (57). The third *Similitude* comprises chs. 58-69, to which chs. 70 and 71 are added by way of an appendix. It begins with the picture of the blessedness of the righteous in heaven (58); an account of the mystery of lightning and thunder follows (59). A vision of Noah, an account of Leviathan and Behemoth, and various nature-elements which take part in the Flood are then given (60). The judgment of the Son of Man over the angels in heaven, and the sentence of kings by Him, followed by vain pleas on their part for mercy, are given next (61-64). Then comes the revelation to Noah of the fall of the angels, the Flood, his own preservation, the punishment of the angels, and the judgment of men by the Son of Man (65-69). Enoch's translation to Paradise, his ascension to heaven, and his acceptance by the Son of Man, are then given in the appendix (70, 71).

(c) The third section is *Cosmological*, and consists of chs. 72-82. It has been called the 'Book of the Luminaries of Heaven.' It contains a revelation given by the angel Uriel on all sorts of astronomical and geographical matters, among others on the convulsions that will occur during the period of the wicked upon earth. The course of the sun is first described (72), next the course of the moon (73, 74); untoward days (75); the winds (76); the four quarters of heaven (77); further details regarding the rising and setting of the sun (78, 79), changes in the order of things to come in the last days (80), and the return of Enoch to the earth; and the committal of these matters to Methusaleh (81, 82).

(d) The fourth section is a *Historical forecast*. Enoch narrates to his son Methusaleh two visions which he saw before he had taken a wife to himself. The first of these (83, 84) came to him as he was learning to write. It placed before his eyes the picture of the Deluge. The second vision (85-90) unfolded before him the whole history of Israel from the creation of man to the end of time. The children of Israel appeared in this vision in the forms of the clean animals (bulls, sheep, lambs, and goats). Their enemies were in the form of dogs, foxes, swine, and all manner of birds of prey. In the conflict between the clean and unclean, the struggle of Israel against her enemies was portrayed. The chosen people were delivered into the hands of lions, tigers, wolves, and jackals (the Assyrians and Babylonians); then they were put under the care of seventy shepherds (angels). (From this fact this section of the book takes the title of 'Vision of the Seventy Shepherds'). The shepherds allowed more of the

faithful to perish than was the will of God, but at the critical moment there appeared a white lamb in their midst and entered into a fierce combat with the birds of prey, while a heavenly being gave him assistance. Then the Lord Himself burst forth from heaven, the enemies of Israel were overthrown and exterminated, the judgment ensued, and the universal restoration; and the Messiah was born as a white bull.

(e) The fifth section (91-105) is a *Book of Exhortations*. Enoch commands his son Methusaleh to summon to his side all his other sons, and when they have come he delivers to them an address on righteousness, which is especially designed to instruct the righteous of all ages (91:1-11). In this first discourse is inserted the prediction of the *Ten Weeks* (91:12-17, 93). The remainder of the book (92, 94, 105) is taken up with final encouragements and messages of hope.

The conclusion of the whole Book of Enoch (106-108) contains an account of the marvels destined to accompany the birth of Noah (106, 107), and a new description of the fiery tribulations reserved for the wicked and of the blessings that await those who 'loved eternal heaven better than their own lives' (108).

Literary features.—Thus far the Book of Enoch has been treated as it is extant. A closer inspection reveals the fact that it is composite. Criticism is still in a considerable state of flux as to the correct analysis of it. Charles believes it to consist of five primary documents. Clemen finds in it seven separate Enoch traditions or legends worked together by a redactor. The weight of probability, however, is rather in favour of three primitive documents: (1) A Book of Enoch, consisting of chs. 1-36 and 72-105; (2) A Book of Similitudes, including chs. 36-71; and (3) a Noachic document, broken up and inserted in various parts within the preceding two. The work of redaction appears to have been done after the two primary documents had undergone some modification, possibly accidental. The redactor used the lost Apocalypse of Noah, alluded to in Jubilees (10:13, 21:10), supplementing what he deemed to be lacunae. The passages inserted from the Book of Noah are the following: 54:7-55:2, 60, 65:1-69:25, and 106, 107. To these some would add several other passages.

The date of the first of these documents is the first quarter of the 2nd cent. b.c. (200 to 175); that of the Book of Similitudes offers an as yet unsolved problem whose difficulty is somewhat enhanced by the importance of the issue involved, *i.e.* the relation the book sustains to the NT. The fact that this relation is undoubted and intimate has quickened interest and led to the perception of slight considerations otherwise easily left out of view. The weight of these considerations is, moreover, so well balanced that criticism seems unable to reach a general consensus on the subject. The views that divide the field are (1) that the book was composed in the Maccabean period (Ewald, b.c. 144); (2) that it was produced between b.c. 95 and

64 (Dillmann, Sieffert, Charles); (3) that it was written during the days of Herod (Lücke, Hausrath, Lipsius, Schodde, Schurer, Baldensperger, Beer); (4) that it is a product of the 2nd cent, and written by a Christian who has used an older Jewish apocalypse as a basis (Hoffmann, Weisse, Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, Tideman); (5) that though a Jewish apocalypse and possibly written before the beginning of the Christian era, it was interpolated by a Christian through the insertion of the 'Son of Man' passages (Drummond, Stalker). That the book should have been composed as a Jewish apocalypse and as such adopted the Messianic title 'Son of Man' from the Christian Gospels, is not to be thought of. That it should have been originally a Jewish apocalypse and modified by a Christian, either with a free hand or by the mechanical interpolation of the 'Son of Man' passages, is credible. But a more natural hypothesis is that it was a pre-Christian work, inclusive of the 'Son of Man' passages.

It has been demonstrated by Baldensperger and Dalman that the title 'Son of Wan' occurs in Jewish rabbinical writings as the name of the Messiah (*Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 90; *Words of Jesus*, p. 234 f.); and there is therefore nothing in the occurrence of this phrase to lead to its being considered due to a Christian author. Upon the whole it is probable that the book was produced in the 1st cent. s.c. The redaction is difficult to locate with precision and may be post-Christian.

The originals of the book were undoubtedly Semitic (Hebrew or Aramaic). The fragment of the Greek version recently discovered shows clear evidences of being the translation of a Semitic original (the case is argued conclusively by Charles, *Book of Enoch*, pp. 21, 22, 325, and Halévy, *Journal Asiat.* 1887, pp. 352-395).

Editions.—(1) Ethiopic Text: Lawrence (1838), Dillmann (1851), Flemming (*Texte u. Untersuch.*, Neue Folge, vii. 1, 1902). (2) Greek Fragments: Bouriant (1892), Lods (1892). Charles (1893), Swete (1897).

(3) *Translations.*—English: Lawrence (partial, 1821), Schodde (1882), Charles (1893).—German: Hoffmann (1833-1838), Dillmann (1853), Flemming and Radermacher (1901).—French: Lods (the Greek Fragments only, 1892).

Literature.—(See Charles, *Book of Enoch*, pp. 9-21); Lücke, *Einl. in d. Offenb. Johan.* (1852); Ewald, *Abhandl. ub. d. Ethiopic B. Henoch* (1855); Hoffmann, 'Ub. d. Entstehungszeit d. B. Henoch' in *ZDMG* [Note: DMG Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.] , 1852, pp. 87-91; Kostlin, 'Ub. d. Entstehung d. B. Henoch' in *Theol. Jahrb.* 1856, pp. 240-279, 370-386; Gebhardt, 'Die 70 Hirten d. B. Henoch' in *Merx' Archiv*, vol. ii. 1872, pp. 163-246; Wieseler, 'Zur Abfassungszeit d. B. Henoch' in *ZDMG* [Note: DMG Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen

Gesellschaft.] , 1882, pp. 185-195; Lawlor in *Journ. of Philol.* 1897, pp. 164-225; Clemen, 'Die Zusammensetzung d. B. Henoch, etc.' in *SK* [Note: K Studien und Kritiken.] , 1898, pp. 210-227; Stalker, *The Christology of Jesus*, 1899, App. B, pp. 269-294.

2. The Slavonic Enoch.—This is one of the most recent additions to our group of apocalypses. Its existence was not indeed suspected before its discovery. But this was due to the fact that a number of books were attributed to Enoch. In this very work Enoch is said to have written 366; cf. 23:6, 68:1. And because some of those were extant in the Ethiopic book no one thought of seeking for more. Nevertheless, it was no source of surprise when it was announced that a new Enoch had been found. This came first as an intimation that a copy of a Slavonic version of the Ethiopic Enoch was in existence (Kozak in *Jahrb. f. Prot. Theol.* 1892). Prof. Charles started to investigate the matter, and with the assistance of Mr. Morfill procured and examined printed copies of the Slavonic text in question. The result was the publication of the altogether independent and hitherto unknown pseudepigraph (1896). Prof. Charles' title for the book is *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, but it is likely to be known in the future by the more convenient title, *The Slavonic Enoch*,* [Note: Bousset quotes these two works as I and II Enoch respectively (*Die Religion des Judenthums*, 1903).] which distinguishes it from the better known and older Ethiopic work.

Contents.—The book may be divided into three parts, viz. (1) The Ascension of Enoch and his travels in the Seven Heavens (1-38). (2) The Return and Instructions to his children (39-56). (3) Second Series of Instructions, including in his audience an assemblage of 2000 people, and final assumption (57-68).

(a) Chs. 1-38. The book opens with a short prologue, introducing the personality of Enoch, and giving the time and place of a dream he saw (1). Enoch then warns his children of his impending absence from them for a time (2); he is taken by two angels up to the first heaven (3), where he sees 200 angels who guard the treasures of the snow, the dew, and the oil (4-6). He is next taken up into the second heaven, and beholds and converses with the fallen angels (7). In the third heaven, the paradise prepared for the righteous (8, 9), he is led to the northern region, where he sees the places of torture (10). From thence he is taken up into the fourth heaven, the habitation of the sun and moon, and there sees the phœnixes and *chalkadris* (*chalkydries*), mysterious composite beings with heads of crocodiles and bodies of serpents (11, 12). In the eastern portion of the fourth heaven he comes to the gates of the sun (13); thence he is led to the western regions, and hears a song by the phœnixes and chalkydries (14, 15). He is then taken to the eastern course, and hears indescribable music by angels (16, 17). Here his visit to the fourth heaven ends; he is carried to the fifth heaven, where he sees the *Grigori* or Watchers (18). In the sixth

heaven he delays only a short time, and thence passes to the seventh 19, 20), where the Lord is seated on a high throne. Here the ministering angels who have brought him take their departure; Enoch falls down and worships the Lord; he is stripped of his earthly clothing, anointed, and robed in suitable apparel; he is given over to Vretil, the archangel (patron of literature), to be instructed (21, 22). Under the guidance of this archangel he writes 366 books (23) He returns into the presence of the Lord, and holds direct converse with Him, learning the secrets of creation (24-29:2), and of the formation of 10,000 angels and the fall of Satanail (29:3-5); also of the creation of man, *i.e.* Adam and Eve (30), his being placed in paradise, his fall and judgment (31, 32). God then declares His purposes for the future (33, 34), and sends him back to the earth to stay thirty days longer and teach his children the true knowledge of God (35-38).

(b) Chs. 39-56. Enoch now begins his admonitions and instructions to his children (39); he tells of the manner in which he was given his visions, and of how he wrote them down (40); of how he wept for the sins of Adam (41); of his visit to the gates of hell, and the impression produced upon him (42); of the judgment of the Lord (43); of the duty of charity (44); of the superiority of a contrite and broken heart to sacrifice as a means of pleasing God (45); of God's love of purity in heart and His rejection of the sacrifices of the impure (46); and commends his writing to them as a permanent means of knowing God's will (47, 48). He further instructs them not to swear by heaven or the earth, and deprecates vengeance (49, 50); he urges them to be generous to the poor, not to hoard up treasures on earth (51), to praise God, and to be at peace with men (52). He enjoins them not to trust in his own intercession with God, but to give heed to his writings and be wise (53); and closes his address with an exhortation to circulate his writings, announcing at the same time that the hour for his ascension to heaven has come (54, 55).

(c) Chs. 56-67. The second series of Exhortations opens with a request by Methosalem for a blessing over the houses and children of Enoch (56); Enoch asks Methosalem to call his brothers together (57), and gives them his instructions (58), especially that they should not eat the flesh of cattle (59), nor kill any man through 'net,' 'weapon,' or 'tongue' (60); but practise righteousness, and trust in repentance for the future (61, 62), and not despise the humble and thus incur God's curse (63). At this point God calls Enoch with a loud voice, and 2000 persons come together to give him their greetings (64); he delivers his final exhortations to them, which are to the effect that they should fear and serve the Lord (65, 66). A thick darkness covers the earth, and while it lasts Enoch is taken up, but no one knows how (67). The book concludes with a summary of Enoch's life and work, and an account of Methosalem's building an altar upon the spot where his father was last seen before his ascension.

Literary questions.—The author of the work was an Alexandrian Jew. This is made clear by the affinities of his style and thought with those of Philo, his use of the LXX Septuagint, his portraiture of phœnixes and chalkadris (chalkydries), and his syncretistic cosmogony. The date of composition cannot be later than a.d. 70. The temple was evidently still standing, and sacrifice was offered (59:2). But the Ethiopic Enoch was also in existence (40:5-9, cf. also 43:2, 3, 52:8, 61:2, 4).

The original language was undoubtedly Greek. This is proved by the explanation of the name Adam, which is made upon the basis of the Greek form ΑΔΑΜ, each letter representing one of the cardinal points of the compass (ΑΝΑΤΟΛΗ, ΔΥΣΙΣ, ΑΡΚΤΟΣ, ΜΕΣΗΜΒΡΙΑ). The book was known and used by Barnabas, by the author of the *Ascension of Isaiah*, by the author of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, by some of the many Sibyls, and by Irenaeus.

Editions.—The Slavonic text has been published from different manuscripts, varying more or less from one another, and not as yet fully collated (Popoff, 1880).

Translations.—English: Charles and Morfill, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, 1896.—German: Bonwetsch, ‘Das Slavische Henochhuch’ in *Abhandl. d. Gott. Ges. d. Wiss.* (Phil. [Note: Philistine.] -hist. Klasse, Neue Folg. 1-3, 1896).

Literature.—Harnack, *Gesch. d. Altchrist. Lift.* ii. 1, 1897, p. 564; Charles in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible*, 1898; Volz, *Jud. Eschatologie*, 1903, pp. 29, 30.

3. The Sibylline Oracles.—The name ‘sibyl’ is of uncertain derivation. Even the spelling of the word varies in the earliest period. It is, however, a very ancient one, and occurs as early as in the works of Heraclitus. By the Romans a number (ten) of sibyls were distinguished. The one of Erythrae in Ionia is reckoned the oldest. The sibyl of Cumae (Kyme) became the most famous. Large collections of verses were circulated under her name during the latter years of the commonwealth and the early empire. Sibylline verses became common in Egypt, and there arose a so-called Jewish sibyl simultaneously with the appearance of the spirit of proselytism among the Jews. Finally, a Christian sibyl came into existence in succession to and imitation of the Jewish one. The productions of the Jewish and Christian sibyls are for the most part blended into one body. They constitute a compilation of hexameters in twelve Books, besides some fragments. Each of these is evidently independent of the others, and may have circulated separately.

Contents.—Book I. opens with an account of the Creation, based upon Genesis. This is followed by the story of the Fall, the multiplication of mankind, the appearance of

four successive races down to the days of the giants, the story of Noah and the Flood, a sixth race and the Titans, from whom the transition is made to Christ, and the dispersion of the Jews.—Book II. predicts a time of plagues and wickedness, which is succeeded by the tenth race (the Romans), and a period of peace. After an interpolation of a group of proverbs, the woes of the last generations are portrayed, and the events of the last day of judgment and resurrection are foretold. Then follows a picture of the punishment of the wicked and the blessedness of the righteous.—Book III. extols the unity and power of God, denounces idolatry, proclaims the coming of the Great King, and of his opponent Beliar, foreshadows the reign of a woman (Cleopatra), and the subjection of the world to Christ. At this point the sibyl returns to the origin of man, and beginning with the Tower of Babel recounts the story as given in the OT down to Roman days. She foretells the doom of Rome, and of many Asiatic cities, as well as of the islands of the aegean. A general judgment and millennium (Messianic Day) closes the book.—Book IV. declares the blessedness of the righteous, sketches successively the Assyrian and Medo-Persian dominations, announcing the Greek conquest, which will bring woes on Phrygia, Asia, and Egypt; one great king, especially will cause calamities to fall on Sicily and Greece. After the Macedonian will come a Roman conquest. The impious will suffer many evils, and a general resurrection, judgment and retribution will follow.—Book V. opens with a prophecy of the reign of the Roman emperors; it then passes in review the calamities impending on Egypt and Asia Minor; it breaks out into a felicitation of the Jews and Judaea, and of the heavenly Joshua, and once more returns to further details of judgment, such as the destruction of Serapis, Isis, and the Ethiopians.—Book VI. describes the pre-existence, incarnation, and baptism of the Son of God, His teaching and miracles, the miseries in store for the guilty land, and the glories of the Cross.—Book VII. is an account of the woes impending upon various lands and cities of Greece, Asia Minor, and Egypt, in which just one prediction of the signs of the Messiah is incorporated.—Book VIII. is a history of the world under five monarchies. The fifth of these furnishes the subject for a prophecy of misery, judgment, and destruction. From this the sibyl passes to the denunciation of woes upon Egypt, the islands of the Mediterranean, and Persia, and closes with a picture of the Messiah.—Books IX. and X. are in fragments.—Book XI. is an orderly story of the world-powers from the time of the Tower of Babel to the subjection of Egypt under Cleopatra.—Book XII. pictures the fortunes of the Caesars, beginning with Augustus and closing with Alexander Severus.—Book XIII. concerns the times of the emperors of the 1st cent., beginning with Maximin. It touches more especially upon their relations with the Persians and Syrians, closing with an allegory of a bull, a stag, a lion, and a goat.—Book XIV. is the most obscure of the Sibylline productions. The writer evidently intends to unfold the fortunes of a long succession of emperors and conquerors. He gives the initial letter of the name of each, and suggests other ways of identification. But his descriptions are so wide of the historical figures that they cannot be safely identified. The period portrayed is generally the late Roman and possibly the early Byzantine.

Literary questions.—The above division into books was made in the 6th cent. of the Christian era (during the reign of Justinian). Whoever made it is also responsible for the collection of the oracles from various sources, and the insertion of certain verses of his own among them. It has been conjectured that he was a literary monastic and expert transcriber of manuscripts. Before his time the verses were circulated in a rude, undigested mass. The task of unravelling the confusion, which does not seem to have disturbed him, and of rearranging the material according to authorship and date of origin, is a very complex one, and not as yet fully accomplished. This much is evident, however, that there are four classes of utterances in the oracles: (1) those which issue from a Jewish source; (2) those which come from a Christian; (3) those which are of heathen origin; and (4) neutral elements. The last of these adds very much to the difficulty of the critical problem. The heathen elements are not very extensive, and attach themselves in general to the Jewish. For the rest, the analysis which results from the labours of Ewald and Alexandre may be safely adopted as workable, and is as follows:—

The Sibylline Oracles may be grouped into eight parts, each by a different author and from a different age, as follows—(1) The Prologue of Book I. and Book III., 97-828, belong to the age of Ptolemy Physcon (b.c. 140). They were therefore written by an Alexandrian Jew. They constitute the pith and kernel of the whole collection in point of value for the study of inter-Testamental conditions and modes of thought, and for the times of Jesus. (2) Book IV. was written about a.d. 80. Its author may have been either a Christian or a Jew, with the probability largely in favour of the former alternative. (3) Book V., with the possible exception of the first part, issued from the 1st cent. a.d., and is a mixture of Jewish and Christian fragments impossible to disentangle from each other. (4) Books VI. and VII. (to which Ewald adds the first part of Book V.) date from the early part of the 3rd century. The author was a heretical Christian. (5) Book VIII., 1-360, is also by a Christian, but not a heretic, probably of the middle of the 3rd century. (6) Book VIII. 361-501, is also by an orthodox Christian of the 3rd century. (7) Book I. (without the Prologue), Book II., and Book III. 1-35, come from the middle of the 3rd cent., and are of Christian origin. (8) Books XI., XII., XIII., and XIV. were written by a Jew resident in Egypt, who, however, “lived in Christian times, and is acquainted with some Christian practices. According to this analysis, these oracles cover a period of more than 400 years in their production, and represent a wide variety of types of thought.

Editions.—The first eight books in the original Greek text were published in 1545 at Basel, and subsequently by others up to Angelo Mai (1819 and 1828, Milan). The first complete edition is that of Alexandre (1841, and again 1869). Recent critical editions by Rzach (1891), Geffcken (1902), and Heitz (1903).

Translations.—Latin: Sebastian Castalio (1546), Angelo Mai (1817).—English: Floyer (prose, 1731), M. S. Terry (metrical, 1899).—French: Bouché Leclercq in *Revue, de l'Histoire des Religions*, vols. vii. 1883, pp. 236-248; viii. 1883, pp. 619-635; ix. 1884, pp. 220-233 (left incomplete).—German: Friedlieb (1852), Blass (of III. IV. and V. in Kautzsch's *Pseudepigr.* 1900)

Literature.—(See Englemann, *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Classicorum*, 1880, i. p. 528); Bleek, 'Ub. d. Entstehung u. Zusammensetz. d. Sibyl. Or.' in *Theol. Zeitschr.*, herausg. v. Schleiermacher, de Wette, u. Lücke, i. 1819, pp. 120-246; ii. 1820, pp. 172-239; Hilgenfeld, 'Die Judische Sibyllen-Weissagung' in *ZWTh*, 1860, pp. 313-319; also 1871, pp. 30-50; Ewald, *Abhandlung üb. Entstehung, Inhalt u. Wert. d. Sibyll. Bucher*, 1858; Laroque, 'Sur la date du troisieme Livre Sib.' in *Revue Archéolog.*, 1869, pp. 269-270; Bernhardt, *Grundriss der Griech. Litt.*, iii. (ii. 1, pp. 441-453, 1867); Buresch, 'Die Pseudosih. Or.' in *Jahrbb. f. Class. Phil.* [Note: Philistine.] 1891, pp. 529-555; 1892, pp. 273-308; Friedlander, 'La Sibylle Juive' in *REJ* [Note: EJ Revue des Etudes Juives.] , 1894, pp. 183-196; Harnack, *Gesch. d. Altchrist. Litt.* i. 762, 861-863; ii. 581-589; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii. iii. 271-292.

4. The Assumption of Moses.—There is some vagueness in the early Patristic references to the *Assumption of Moses*. Syncellus (ed. Dind. i. 48) mentions an *Apocalypse of Moses*. Clement of Alexandria (*Adumb. in Epist. Jud.* [ap. Zahn, *Supplementum Clementinum*, 84]) and Didymus (*Epist. Judae Enarratio* [in Gallandi, *Bib. Patr.* vi. 307]), allude to an *Assumptio Moysi*. Origen (*de Princ.* iii. ii. 1) refers to an *Adscensio Mosis*. In the Acts of the Nicene Synod (Mansi, *Sacror. Concil., Nova Collectio*, ii. 18, 20) there is mention again of an *Assumption of Moses*. In other lists of apocrypha, a *Testament (Διαθήκη) of Moses* is mentioned (*Stichometry of Nicephorus and Synopsis of pseudo-Athanasius*). It has been argued (by Schürer, followed by Charles) that these two titles represent two separate divisions of one and the same book, or two books fused together in one. The work was lost during the Middle Ages, and recovered by Ceriani in an old Latin version in the Ambrosian Library at Milan in 1861.

Contents.—Moses calls to himself Joshua, the son of Nun, and directs him to preserve his writings (1). He then forecasts the apostasy and distress of the twelve tribes of Israel and their divisions into the ten and two (2), their awakening to consciousness of their sin, their repentance (3), the restoration of the two tribes and the preservation of the ten among the Gentiles (4), their repeated backslidings (5), the tyranny of Herod (6), the prevalence of wicked leaders over them (7), the oppression by the Romans (8), the advent of the Levite Taxo,* [Note: After unsuccessful attempts by

many others, a satisfactory explanation of this name has been given by Burkitt (see Hastings' DB iii. 449b). Taxo is a copyist's mistake for Taxok—Ταξῶκ. And this is to be read by Gematria as Eleazar. חבסוק אלעזר. Eleazar the father of seven sons is the great Levite (2Ma_6:19).] who was destined to restore a better state of things among them (9). At this point the author inserts a Psalm of Hope and adds a few concluding words closing the discourse of Moses (10). Joshua then laments over the course of events revealed to him, and refuses to be comforted (11); but Moses urges him to take up his work, and conquer and destroy the Gentiles (12). At this point the book breaks off rather abruptly.

Literary questions.—The Patristic quotations from the *Assumption of Moses* identify the words of Jud 1:9 as from this book; but as the extant text does not contain the words, it can only be that it is either (1) wrongly entitled, or (2) that the quotation is made from the second part of it which is lost (Schürer), or (3) that two separate works entitled respectively *The Testament of Moses* and the *Assumption (Ascension) of Moses* were fused into one (Charles). The last position is most convincingly supported by its advocate, and seems the most probable. The present so-called *Assumption of Moses* is then the *Testament of Moses*, bearing within it traces of the addition to it of the original *Assumption of Moses*.

The text of the book exists in a single Latin manuscript of the 5th (6th) cent. a.d. This is undoubtedly a translation from a Greek text. It has been further conjectured that the Greek itself was a translation of a Hebrew or Aramaic original; but though the advocates of each of these languages, as also of the Greek, strenuously defend each his position, in the absence of definite data nothing can be dogmatically asserted on the point. Hilgenfeld and Drummond favour a Greek original; Ewald argues for a Semitic (either Hebrew or Aramaic); Wieseler and Laogen, for a Hebrew; Hausrath, Schmidt-Merx, Dillmann, Thompson, for an Aramaic.

The author of the work was probably a devout Jew, a Pharisee, and a mystic who does not share but rather aims to defeat the purposes of the Zealots (so Charles, but it has been strenuously maintained that he was a Zealot). The date of the composition is fixed by the allusion to Herod the Great. At the earliest, it must be 44, but various dates down to 138 have been advocated. The design of the author seems to be to teach the lesson that God has foreseen and foreshadowed all things; hence Israel should entertain no fear. A deliverer is to come.

Editions.—Ceriani (*Monumenta Sacra et Profana*, vol. i. Fasc. 1, pp. 55-64), Hilgenfeld (*NT extra Canonem Receptum*, 1876, pp. 107-135), Schmidt-Merx (*Archiv*, i. ii. 1868, p. 111 ff.), Fritzsche (*Lib. Apocalypse, Apocalyptic Vet. Test.* 1871, pp. 700 to 730), Charles (*Assumption of Moses*, 1897, pp. 54-101).

Translations.—Greek: Hilgenfeld (attempted restoration from the Latin, *Messias Judaeorum*, 1869, pp. 435-468).—English: Charles, *Assumption of Moses* (1897).—German: Volkmar, *Mose Prophetie und Himmelfahrt* (1867), Clemen in Kautzsch's *Pseudepigr.* (1900).

Literature.—Colani, 'L'Assomption de Moïse' in *Revue de Theol.* 1868, pp. 65-94; Wieseler, 'Die jungst aufgefundenene Aufnahme Moses,' etc., in *Jahrbb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1868, pp. 622-648; Heidenheim, 'Beitrage z. besser. Verstaodniss d. Ascensio Mosis' in *Vierteljahrschrift f. deutsche u. englische Theologie*, 1874, pp. 216-218; Hilgenfeld, *ZWTh*, 1886, pp. 132-139; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii. iii. 73-83.

5. Fourth Ezra (Second Esdras).—This pseudepigraph has been known from the earliest Christian days, and widely circulated under the name of Ezra as his second, third, fourth, or fifth book, according to the various ways of grouping and entitling the books that issue from the Restoration generation. (See explanation of these names by Thackeray in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Esdras, First Book of'). Fourth Ezra, however, has come to be generally accepted as the name for it.

Contents.—This is given in seven visions. The First Vision (2Es 3:1 to 2Es 5:19) is granted to Ezra in answer to disturbing doubts arising in his mind. These concern the origin of sin and suffering in the world (2Es 3:1-36). An angel gives him the answer: God's ways are inscrutable. The human spirit can comprehend but little (2Es 4:1-21). But as he pleads that it is painful to be left in ignorance on such vital matters, he is assured of a change of aeon to take place soon. Definite signs will mark the change. He must fast for seven days, and receive another revelation at the end of that time (2Es 4:22 to 2Es 5:19).

The Second Vision (2Es 5:20 to 2Es 6:34) is granted in answer to the question, Why has God given over His only chosen people into the hands of the heathen? (2Es 5:20-30). He receives the answer that God loves His people, and the problem must be regarded as not solvable for man: nevertheless deliverance is drawing near; the generations of men are passing; the world has become old; the signs of the end are visible (2Es 5:31 to 2Es 6:34).

The Third Vision (2Es 6:35 to 2Es 9:25), like the second, is given after a period of seven days' fasting, and is in answer to the question, Why does not Israel possess the land which belongs to it? (2Es 6:35-59). The answer is not direct. An evil age must necessarily precede the good that shall be in the future (2Es 7:1-16). The doom of sinners is grievous but well-deserved. The Son of God, the Christ, shall appear in judgment (2Es 7:17-44). Few are chosen, but all the greater is the honour conferred on them (2Es 7:45-70). A sevenfold suffering and a sevenfold joy await men in the

intermediate state (7:75-101). Intercession for the condemned will be of no avail at the last judgment (7:102-115), they have deserved their doom (7:118-131). God's mercy is consistent with the sufferings of the condemned (7:132-8:19). At this point Ezra interposes a prayer and receives an answer (2Es 8:20-45). The saved shall rejoice at their own lot, and forget the sufferings of sinners (2Es 8:46-61). It is certain that the end of the world is nigh. The signs are not to be mistaken (2Es 8:62 to 2Es 9:13). There are more of the lost than of the saved (2Es 9:14-25).

The Fourth Vision (2Es 9:26 to 2Es 10:58) is given upon the Plain of Ardat. It consists of a symbolic picture of Zion's sorrow, followed by glory. The vision (2Es 9:26 to 2Es 10:28) presents a woman in tattered garments, weeping and wailing because of her lost son. The explanation by the angel (2Es 10:29-58) identifies the woman with Zion, and points out the lesson to the seer.

The Fifth Vision (2Es 10:59 to 2Es 12:51) presents the fourth world-empire under the figure of an eagle coming out of the sea, and like the fourth vision falls into two parts, *i.e.* the Vision (2Es 10:59 to 2Es 12:3) and the interpretation of it by the angel (2Es 12:4-40). This is followed by a Conclusion in story form. The people come out to seek for Ezra, they find him in the plain, and he sends them back into the city (2Es 12:40-51).

The Sixth Vision (2Es 13:1-58) portrays a man emerging out of a stormy sea and floating on a cloudless heaven (2Es 13:1-4). A countless multitude comes to wage war against him; but by a stream of fire proceeding from his mouth he overcomes his enemies (2Es 13:5-11). Then another host of friendly men flock around him (2Es 13:12-13). The question is raised, Is it better to survive to the end of the world or to die beforehand? It is answered in favour of the former alternative (2Es 13:14-24). The explanation of the vision follows. The man in the cloud is the Son of God, the events are those of the Messianic age (2Es 13:25-58).

The Seventh Vision (2Es 14:1-48) is given three days after the sixth, under an oak. This is the familiar legend of Ezra's restoring the lost Scriptures. But it begins with a command to keep his present vision secret (2Es 14:1-17). A prayer of Ezra follows, in which he beseeches the Lord for the privilege of rewriting the lost Scriptures (2Es 14:17-26). The prayer is answered, and Ezra reproduces the lost books together with seventy others (2Es 14:27-48). The book concludes with an account of Ezra's decease.

The above does not include chs. 1, 2 and 15, 16, found in the Latin Version, which is the basis of the chapter divisions of the book. The Latin Version has also served as the basis of some current translations into English (*The Variorum Apocrypha*, by C. J. Ball, and in Wace's *Holy Bible*, 'Apocrypha,' by Lupton). These four chapters are

universally regarded as later additions by a strongly anti-Jewish Christian author, appended respectively to the beginning and end of the Latin Version. The other versions do not contain them. They have been detached and published together as 5th Esdras by Fritzsche (*Lib. Apocr.* [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] *Vet. Test.* 'Liber Esdrae Quintus,' pp. 640-653).

Literary questions.—The book is a unity, and comparatively free from interpolations and editorial tampering. The author was a devout man for whom problems of theodicy especially had a considerable fascination, but he is also interested in the broader and more constant questions which recur in the religious sphere with every generation. He naturally looks into his own age, and finds no sign of a restoration to righteousness and recognition of God in the forces that work there. He accordingly plants his hopes in the world to come.

Kabisch has indeed analyzed the work into four different productions fused together into unity by clumsy redactors (*Das Vierte Buch Esra*, 1889), and his theory has been substantially accepted by de Faye, but his observations would lead rather to the composition of the book from pre-existing sources than to the bringing together of independent books of documents by a redactor. The impression of unity is too strong to be destroyed by such considerations as Kabisch alleges.

The date of the book cannot be earlier than the fall of Jerusalem, as that event is distinctly alluded to (3:2, 10:48, 12:48). The Temple is destroyed and the service in abeyance (10:21). A still later chronological starting-point is given in an allusion to the death of Titus (11:35); the author even expects the death of Domitian (12:2, 28). It is safe, therefore, to set down the year 90 as approximately the time of composition.

Editions.—The book exists in Latin, Syriac, Ethiopic, Arabic (2), and Armenian versions. The original was in Greek. This is made evident by the characteristic differences of the versions. They are all easily accounted for by an original Greek. The Latin text was first edited critically by Volkmar (1863); also by Fritzsche (*Lib. Apocr.* [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] *Vet. Test.* 1871). The Syriac was published in Ceriani's *Monumenta Sacra*, i. Fasc. 2 (1866); also in photolithographic reproduction, under the title *Translatio Syro-Peseitto Veteris Testamenti*, etc. (1876-1883); again by R. Bensly, with an introd. by M. R. James (*Texts and Studies*, Camb. iii. 2, 1895). The Ethiopic was published by Lawrence (1820), the Arabic by Gildemeister (1877), the Armenian by the Mechitharists in Venice (1806).

Translations.—English: Bissell (Lange's *Commentary*, 1880), Lupton (Wace's 'Apocrypha,' 1888).—German: Volkmar (1863), Ewald (*Abhandl. d. Gott. Gesellseh. d.*

Wiss. xi. 1862-1863), Zockler (*Kgf. Kom.* 1891). A translation into Greek was made and published by Hilgenfeld (*Messias Judaerum*, 1869).

Literature.—Corrodi, *Krit. Gesch. d. Chiliasmus*, 1781, vol. i. pp. 179-230; Gudschmid, 'Die Apocalypse, Apocalyptic des Esra,' etc., in *ZWTh*, 1860; Volkmar, *Handbuch d. Einleit. in die. Apokr.* 1893; Wieseler, 'Das Vierte b. Ezra' in *SK* [Note: K Studien und Kritiken.] , 1870, pp. 263-304; Kabisch, *Das Vierte B Ezra*, 1889; Schieffer, *Die religiösen und ethischen Ansehungen des IV Ezra Buches*, 1901; Clemen in *SK* [Note: K Studien und Kritiken.] , 1898, pp. 237-246; Schürer, *GJV* [Note: JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] iii. 232 ff. [*HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii. iii. 93 ff.].

6. The Syriac Baruch.—Baruch is mentioned as Jeremiah's companion and helper during the trying days which ended in the destruction of Jerusalem and the deportations under Jehoiakim and Zedekiah (Jer 32:12-13; Jer 32:36). The fact that he wrote under Jeremiah's direction seems to have stimulated the tendency to publish alleged prophecies and revelations in his name. The first of these was the book that passed into the group of OT Apocrypha. One of Ceriani's many contributions to apocalyptics was the discovery, translation into Latin (1866), and later publication of a Syriac text of a Book of Baruch (*Monumenta Sacra*, v. 1871, pp. 11-18).

Contents.—The book is divided into two main parts, *i.e.* the Apocalypse proper (chs. 1-77) and the Letter to the Nine Tribes and a Half (chs. 78-87).

Part I. may again be subdivided into seven sections. (1) The first section (1-12) begins with the announcement of the impending fall of Jerusalem, and the captivity of Judah; next comes the portraiture of the advancing Chaldaeans, the hiding of the treasures of the Temple, and the destruction of the walls by angels, so that the Chaldaeans might not claim the glory of the capture of the city. The next day the city is occupied by the enemy (6-8). Baruch stays amid the ruins of the city, while Jeremiah, by Divine command, accompanies the exiles to Babylon (9-12).—(2) The second section (13-20) contains a vision given to Baruch while standing on Mount Zion. He is assured that the calamity just fallen on the chosen people has been inflicted in mercy (13); he complains that good men are no better than others, but is answered that sin in one who possesses the Law is worthy of being punished (14, 15). He expresses other misgivings which are answered. He is then promised a new revelation (16-20).—(3) The third section (21-34) opens with Baruch's appearance at the end of seven days in the place appointed. Here he expresses his thoughts in the form of a prayer (21); he is shown that his knowledge is imperfect, that the time is coming when God's judgment will mature (22-25); he wishes to know of the distresses of the last days (26), and is given a revelation concerning the order of the times. The

tribulation will come in twelve stages (27); the whole earth will be affected, but those in the chosen land will escape; the Messiah will appear, first to bring blessings to the righteous on the earth (28, 29), and then, as He returns to His glory, to raise from the dead both the righteous and the unrighteous, and consign them respectively to happiness and perdition (30). Baruch then summons the elders of the people, and announces to them that the ruined Zion shall be rebuilt and destroyed again, and finally restored in glory to last for ever (31-34).—(4) The fourth section (35-46) gives a vision which Baruch saw as he slept amid the ruins of the Holy Place. On one side there appeared a great forest in a valley surrounded with mountains; on the other side a vine with a gentle spring streaming from beneath its roots. But the spring grew into a mighty river, and overwhelmed the forest, together with the mountains round about. A solitary cedar was left. The stream first addressed words of denunciation against the cedar, and then annihilated it. In the place of forest and mountains the vine grew, and the valley was filled with blossoms (35-37). The interpretation of the vision is given as requested by Baruch. The kingdoms which have oppressed Zion shall be overwhelmed by the Messiah. The cedar is the last king of the last kingdom; he shall be slain by the Messiah, who shall then begin His eternal reign (38-40). Baruch is commanded to warn the people and prepare himself for further visions (41-43), which he accordingly does (44-46).—(5) The fifth section (47-52) also opens with a prayer of Baruch's offered seven days later (47-48:24). In answer Baruch receives a new revelation regarding the distress of the last days (48:25-50), and of the resurrection both of the evil and the good, together with their punishment and reward (49-52).—(6) The sixth section (53-76) is again in the form of a vision. A cloud ascends from the sea, and pours forth upon the earth black and white (dark and bright) waters. Lightning illumines it, and twelve streams are put in subjection under it (53). Baruch prays that it may be explained to him (54), and the angel Ramael is sent to him to interpret the vision (55). The cloud pouring forth the waters represents mankind in its historical unfolding; the dark waters stand for evil ages, the bright for good. The course of the world from Adam to the Exile is thus symbolized. The twelve periods are identified with the bright and dark streams (56-68). The twelfth is the age of the rebuilding of Jerusalem and of the restoration of the Temple service. These twelve are followed by a last black stream, which stands for the tribulation of the Messianic age. Then shall the Messiah take charge of the few saved ones (69-71). The lightning is the Messiah, and His eternal beneficent reign (72-74). Baruch thanks God, and is informed that he will shortly be taken from the earth, though not by death (75, 76).—(7) The seventh section tells how Baruch called the people together, told them of his impending departure, wrote two letters, one to the exiles in Babylon and the other to the nine and a half tribes in the regions beyond, and how he sent the first by messengers and entrusted the second to an eagle (77).

Part II. This part of the book is taken up with the letter to the nine tribes and a half (78-87). In it Baruch recalls to the minds of the tribes God's mercy, and assures them

that their sufferings are intended for their good (78-81). God has shown Baruch in visions the meaning of their experiences and the doom of their enemies (82-84); they should therefore be undismayed, and expect speedy deliverance, for the end is near (85). The letter then ends with formal instructions (86, 87).

Literary questions.—The extant text in Syriac is from an original Greek. This is shown by the use of such forms as Godolias, Sedekias, etc., which could only have been made from the Greek. The word for ‘splendour’ in 3:7 is manifestly a translation of *κ*οσμος. But if the Syriac was made from a Greek text, was this Greek the original language of the book? The answer demanded by the facts seems to be negative. There are traces of a Hebrew original behind the Greek. The most distinct of these is the occurrence of Hebrew idioms surviving through the two translations. Moreover, the quotations agree in all cases with the Hebrew text as distinguished from the LXX Septuagint, which must have been used had the original been in Greek. Certain obscurities, too, can be cleared up by retranslation into Hebrew. (For the full argument see Charles, *The Apocalypse, Apocalyptic of Baruch*, pp. xliii-liii).

The relation of this apocalypse to 4 Ezra is very striking. Both books seem to be the products of the same environment. They deal with the same questions and in similar fashion. Their resemblances are indeed so marked that they have been denominated ‘the twin apocalypses.’

The author of Baruch was evidently a Jew. The date when he wrote is determined partly from his relation to the author of 4 Ezra. There are other data in the case. Papias quotes one sentence from it, though attributing the expression to Jesus. This fixes the *terminus ad quem* as a.d. 130. The *terminus a quo* is an allusion to Ethiopic Enoch 56:12, 13, hence b.c. 160. Charles, however, following Kabisch, believes that it was put together out of five or six independent writings, composed between a.d. 50 and 90, some time about the year 100.

Editions.—The Syriac Text: Ceriani (*Monumenta Sacra*, v. fasc. 11, 1871; also in photolithographic reproduction of the entire MS of the Syriac OT, 1876).

Translations.—Latin: Ceriani (1866); Fritzsche, *Lib Apocr.* [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] 1861.—English: Charles, *The Apocalypse of Baruch*, 1896.—German: Rothstein in Kautzsch’s *Pseudepigr.* 1900.

Literature.—Laugen, *de Apocalypsi Baruch*, 1867; Renan, ‘L’Apocalypse de Baruch’ in *Journal des Savants*, 1877, pp. 222-231; Kneucker, *Das Buch Bar.* 1879; Hilgenfeld,

ZWTh, 1888, pp. 257-278; Kabisch, 'Die Quellen Baruchs' in *Jahrb. f. Prot. Theol.* 1892, pp. 66-107; Clemen, *SK* [Note: K Studien und Kritiken.] , 1898, pp. 227-237.

7. The Greek Baruch.—A hint as to the existence of another book bearing the name Baruch was long known to exist in a passage of Origen (*de Princ.* ii. iii. 6), in which he alludes to Baruch's account of the Seven Heavens. No such account is to be found either in the OT apocryphon or in the Syriac apocalypse bearing the name of Baruch. But it was not until 1896 that the book alluded to by Origen was discovered and published in *Texts and Studies* (Camb. vol. v. 1, pp. 84-94).

Contents.—The book opens with Baruch's lamentation and prayer over the fallen kingdom of Judah. Forthwith an angel visits him and promises to show him wonderful secrets (1). The promise is fulfilled. He is taken up into the first heaven, where he sees creatures with the face of bulls, the horns of stags, the feet of goats, and the haunches of lambs; he then inquires as to the dimensions of this heaven, and is given some astounding figures (2). In the second heaven he sees men with the look of dogs and the feet of deer. They are those who have counselled the building of the tower [of Babel] (3). In the third heaven he sees a dragon which lives on the bodies of the wicked; it is Hades. He further learns that the tree which caused Adam's fall was the vine, and therefore the abuse of the fruit of the vine has ever since been the source of fearful evils to men (4). He is told the nature of Hades (5), and is shown the Phoenix, which protects the earth from the burning rays of the sun (6). The approach of this monster terrifies him (7). He learns that the renewing of the crown of the sun is necessary, because the view of the sins of men daily dims and weakens this luminary; it must be cleansed and refreshed at the end of each day (8). The chariot of the moon and the explanation of its stages, together with the reason for its shining only at night, are then made known to Baruch (9). In the fourth heaven he comes into view of a vast plain and body of water which is the source of the 'dew of heaven' (10). The gates of the fifth heaven are closed as he and his guide come to them; but upon being opened they admit the archangel Michael, who receives the prayers and good works of the righteous and presents them before God (11, 12). The guardian angels of the unrighteous petition to be released from their hated work, but are told to wait (13). Michael departs, but returns again bringing oil, which he gives to the angels that had brought to him the virtues of men (14, 15). He addresses the angels who had brought no good works (16). The gate closes, and the prophet and angel return to the earth.

Literary questions—Thus far there are two recensions of this apocalypse known, the Greek and the Slavonic. But neither of them is believed to be the original. Their relations to one another are those of a more and a less condensed version of the same story. That the original must have been fuller and larger is clear from Origen's

intimation that it gave an account of seven heavens, whereas the Greek text before us stops with the fifth heaven, and the Slavonic knows of only two.

The relation of the book to the Syriac Baruch is probably explained by referring to 76:3, 4 of that work. Here God promises to give Baruch, after the lapse of forty days, a further revelation regarding the world of material elements (the cycle of the earth, the summits of the mountains, the depths of the valleys and of the seas, and the number of the rivers). The fulfilment of this promise is not recorded in what follows, and the Greek apocalypse was composed to show not only that it was fulfilled, but also in what way.

This dependence on the Syriac Baruch on the one side and the allusion of Origen to the work on the other, fix the date of its composition as between 100 and 175 a.d. It was written as a Jewish apocalypse, but shows traces of interpolation by Christians (cf. ch. 4, 'The Vine').

Editions.—Greek Text: James (*Texts and Studies*, Camb. 1897, v. 1, pp. 84-94).

Translations.—English: James (as above); the Slavonic text, pub. by Novakovitch, is given in English translation by Morfill in the same volume with the edition of the Greek text by James.—German: Bonwetsch (*Nachrichten von d. Konig. Gesell. d. Wiss. zu Gött.*, Phil. [Note: Philistine.] Klasse, 1896, pp. 94-101); Ryssel in Kautzsch's *Pseudepigr.* 1900.

Literature.—This is limited almost altogether to the introductions accompanying the editions and translations. Of these, however, that by Prof. James is quite ample and thorough.

8. The Psalter of Solomon.—The Psalter of Solomon is placed in the *Stichometry* of Nicephorus among the Antilegomena of the OT, and not among the Apocrypha; so also in pseudo-Athanasius' *Synopsis S. Scripturae*. It is a collection of lyrics, each one independent of every other. Only the last two of these (the 17th and 18th), strictly speaking, fall into the group of apocalyptic writings. They were known and referred to as the 'Odes of Solomon' as early as the *Pistis Sophia* (200 to 250 a.d.), and frequently later than that date.

Contents.—Psalms 17 is in general a prophecy of the restoration of the glory to the desolated throne of David. It opens with an expression of trust in the Lord, the Eternal King of Israel, addressed directly to Him (1-4). The Lord (still addressed in the second person) has chosen David to be king over Israel, and promised him and his seed perpetual dominion; but sinners have risen up against Israel and have desolated the throne of David (5-8); yet the Lord will cast these down and visit them according to

their sins (9-12). They have done wickedly and acted proudly (13-17); the righteous fled before them and wandered in desert places (18-20); the sins of the wicked have abounded (21, 22); the Lord is to raise the son of David, His Servant, purge Jerusalem, cast down the unrighteous and lawless nation, gather together His people, and judge all the tribes of men (23-36). He will not put confidence in human weapons of warfare, but in the Lord; and the Lord will bless him, will strengthen and give him dominion (37-44). He shall rule righteously and wisely (45-49). Blessed are they who shall live in his day (50, 51).

Psalms 18 is on the Messianic Age. It begins with an ascription of praise to the Lord for His favour to Israel and His love to the seed of Abraham (1-5). It foreshadows a blessed day in which God shall purge Israel and raise His Messiah (6); it declares the blessedness of those who shall live in the days of the Anointed (7-10), and closes with a doxology for the constancy and perpetuity of the heavenly luminary (11-14).

Literary questions.—Though the Psalter of Solomon is a collection of independent compositions, these apparently issue from the same historical conditions and are pervaded by the same spirit and tone. They nowhere claim to be Solomon's composition. This claim was made for them by later copyists. In general, the conditions under which they were written are those of the period of thirty years between 70 and 40 b.c. Pompey is alluded to as 'the mighty striker' who comes 'from the ends of the earth' (8:16). Certain princes of the land go forth to meet him and welcome him (8:18). These are Aristobulns ii. and Hyrcanus ii. The Gentiles tread Jerusalem under foot (2:20, 8:23, 24); but he who has conquered it and inflicted severe sufferings on it is finally overtaken and suffers a shameful death in Egypt (2:29, 30). All this points directly to the Roman conquest under Pompey.

Some older critics read the allusions above indicated as having reference to Herod and his days (Movers, Keim); Ewald saw in them Antiochus Epiphanes and his times; but these identifications are manifestly far-fetched. The consensus of critics is now against them. But there are exceptions, such as Frankenberg, who advocates the age of Antiochus.

The original language of the Psalter was Hebrew. The radical difference between the type of Messianism held up in 17 and 18 and the eschatology of the rest of the collection points to a separate authorship of these two psalms. But apart from this, and the antecedent probability that lyrics of this class are apt to be independent contributions, there are no clear grounds for ascribing particular psalms to different authors. The author (or authors) belonged to the Pharisaic sect.

Editions.—Hilgenfeld, *ZWTh*, 1868; Geiger, *Der Psalter Salomos*, 1871; Fritzsche, *Libri Apocr.* [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] *Gr.* 1871, pp. 569, 589; Pick, 'The Psalter of

Solomon' in *Presb. Rev.*, 1883, pp. 775-812; Ryle and James, *The Psalms of the Pharisees*, 1891; O. von Gebhardt, *Die Psalmen Salomos*, 1895; Swete, *The Psalms of Solomon, with the Greek Fragments of the Book of Enoch*, 1899.

Translations.—English: Bissell in Lange's *Com. 'Apocrypha,'* 1880; Pick (above cited), Ryle and James (above cited).—German: Kittel in Kautzsch's *Pseudepigr.* 1900.

Literature.—Ewald, *GVl* [Note: VI Geschichte des Volkes Israel.] iv., p. 392 f.; Movers in Wetzer n. [Note: note.] Welte's *Kirchenlex.*¹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] i. p. 340; Keim, *Gesch. von Jesu v. Nazara*, i. p. 243; Carriere, *de Psalterio Salomonis*, 1870; Kanlen in Wetzer u. Welte² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , i. p. 1060 f.; O. Holtzmann in Stade's *GVl* [Note: VI Geschichte des Volkes Israel.] ; Jacquier, 'Les Psaumes de Salomon' in *L'université Catholique*, Nouv. Série, xii. 1893, pp. 94-131, 251-275; Frankenberg, *Die Datirung d. Ps. Salomonis*, 1890.

9. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.—This production was well known to the ancient Patristic writers. It is quoted by Irenaeus (*Fragm.* 17, ed. Harvey, ii. 487), Origen (*Hom. in Josephus* 15:6), and Tertullian (*adv. Marc.* v. 1). It is named in the *Synopsis* of pseudo-Athanasius and in the *Stichometry* of Nicephorus. In the 13th cent. Bishop Grosseteste made a translation of it into Latin. It has been very frequently translated both in ancient and in modern times.

Contents.—The book extends the idea of Genesis 49 to the sons of Jacob. Just as the father had called his sons together before his death and told them his last thoughts, so each of the sons is made to summon his own children to his deathbed and to give them a retrospective and a prospective view. Each, however, centres his discourse in a dominant idea or topic. (1) Reuben, *on Thoughts*. This Testament begins with the confession by Reuben of his sin and the penance he performed therefor (1). Man has seven spirits given him to perform his work in the world, *i.e.* life, sight, hearing, smell, taste, speech, reproduction (2); an eighth is added to these; but Beliar has intermingled with these seven misleading spirits, *i.e.* fornication, gluttony, strife, vanity, arrogance, lying, and injustice; sleep is a counterfeit eighth (3). Beware of fornication (4). Women have always been seducers. They misled the *Grigori*, 'watchers' (5). Give heed to Levi, for he shall know the Law (6 and 7).—(2) Simeon, *on Envy*. This also opens with a confession, but the sin confessed is envy (1, 2). The patriarch warns his children against this sin (3), commends Joseph, and urges them to imitate him (4-8).—(3) Levi, *on the Priesthood and Arrogance*. This is the distinctively apocalyptic Testament. After introducing himself, the patriarch recounts the revelation given him of the seven heavens (1-4); then tells of being ushered into the presence of the Lord, who gave him the command to destroy the Shechemites (5).

Contrary to the desire of his father, he executed the command (6, 7). He saw a second vision, in which he was invested with the priesthood and received instructions from his grandfather Isaac (8, 9). He foreshadows the corruption of the priesthood by his family (11, 12), instructs them in their duties and again warns against corruption (13, 14); foretells the destruction of the Temple, and indicates from the Book of Enoch that the Captivity will last seventy years (15-17); he announces the Messiah, His rejection and the dispersion of Israel, and closes with an exhortation to choose well (18, 19).—(4) Judah, *on Fortitude, Avarice, and Fornication*. After introducing himself, Judah gives a glowing account of his physical strength and agility, with many illustrative incidents (1-9). He tells of how he chose Tamar as the wife of his son Er, of the wickedness of his sons and their death, and of his own relations with Tamar (10-12). Ascribing his fall to drunkenness and covetousness, he warns his children against these vices, as well as against fornication (13-17); he foresees from the Books of Enoch the wickedness into which they shall fall in the last days, and warns them (18-21); he urges them to love Levi, and predicts with sorrow their apostasies from the Lord and the wars and commotions until the time of Messiah (22-24). This shall be followed by the resurrection of the patriarchs (25).—(5) Issachar, *on Simplicity*. Beginning with the circumstances of his birth, this patriarch gives an account of his early life and marriage (1-3), and points out his simplicity and singleness of mind as virtues to be imitated (4-7).—(6) Zebulun, *on Compassion and Mercy*. After naming himself and the prosperous circumstances in which he was born, he claims not to have sinned except in thought. Only in the affair of Joseph, which he describes at length, he had conspired with his brothers, but with sorrow and compassion for Joseph (1-5). He was the first to construct a boat and go fishing. He used the fish he caught in feeding the needy (6, 7). He urges his children to be compassionate (8) and united in action (9, 10).—(7) Dan, *on Anger and Lying*. This patriarch also begins with a confession. He had planned to slay Joseph out of envy, but the Lord had withheld the opportunity (1). He warns his children against the spirit of lying and anger (2-4); he predicts evil days in the future, of which he had learned from the Books of Enoch (5), and exhorts them to stand firm in righteousness (6, 7).—(8) Naphtali, *on Natural Goodness*. This Testament opens with an account of the mother of the patriarch, Bilhah (1). It proceeds with a description of his fleetness of foot, which gives occasion for a speech on the fitness of the body to the character of the soul (2). He exhorts his children not to force the order of nature (3, 4), and tells of a vision he saw when forty years of age. It was on the Mount of Olives, to the east of Jerusalem. The sun and moon stood still; Jacob called his sons to go and seize them. Levi took hold of the sun, Judah of the moon; they were lifted up. A bull with two horns on its head and two wings on its back made its appearance. They tried to capture it, and Joseph succeeded. Finally, a holy writing appeared telling of the captivity of Israel (5). Seven months later he saw another vision. Jacob and his sons were standing by the Sea of Jamnia. A vessel full of dried fish appeared; but it had no rudder or sails. They embarked, and a storm arose. They were threatened with destruction; Levi prayed,

and, though the vessel was wrecked, they were saved upon pieces of the wreckage (6). Naphtali told his visions to his father, who saw in them a token that Joseph was living (7). With the prediction of the Messiah (8, 9) the Testament closes.—(9) Gad, *on Hatred*. After the customary account of himself, Gad (1) confesses that he hated Joseph and brought about his sale to the Ishmaelites (2, 3). He warns his children against hatred, points out its evil, and urges them to cherish and exercise love (4-8).—(10) Asher, *on the Two Aspects of Vice and Virtue*. This patriarch begins with a portraiture of the two ways open before men, describing each carefully (1, 2). He commends simplicity of heart and devotion to virtue (3), gives reasons (4), and again commends the path of virtue (5, 6), closing with warnings and predictions (7, 8).—(11) Joseph, *on Chastity*. Joseph begins with the contrasts between his many-sided suffering and God's many-sided help and deliverance (1). He then proceeds to narrate the circumstances of his servitude in Egypt (2), his temptation (3-7), his imprisonment (8, 9), and exhorts to brotherly love (10) and the fear of God (11). He further goes back to tell the story once more of the circumstances of the temptation (12-15), and concludes with an exhortation to honour Levi and Judah, predicting that from them should arise the Lamb of God (17-20).—(12) Benjamin, *on a Pure Mind*. Benjamin begins by telling of his birth (1); then of the meeting with Joseph in Egypt (2). This leads to the exaltation of Joseph as the perfect man, who should be imitated (3, 4). A pure mind will be recognized by the wicked (5). Beliar himself cannot mislead the pure-minded (6). There is a sevenfold evil in wickedness, and a sevenfold punishment is to be measured out to those who practise it (7). Flee wickedness, he urges, and concludes with the prediction of corruption among his descendants (8, 9), and of the resurrection and the judgment which will follow.

Literary questions.—The book is extant in a Greek text, also in a complete Armenian and fragmentary Syriac and Aramaic versions. The Latin version, frequently reprinted from the 16th century onwards, is Grosseteste's. An ancient Latin translation is not known to exist. A Slavonic version of uncertain origin is also published by Tichonravoff (*Denkm. d. altruss. Apocr.* [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] *Litt.*, St. Petersburg. 1863).

The original of the work was either Greek or Hebrew. Grabe (*Spicileg. Patr.* 2, 1714, 129-144) argued for the Hebrew. All other critics have favoured Greek until Prof. Charles' revival of Grabe's contention. Charles reasons mainly from the language (cf. also Gaster, 'The Heb. Text of One of the Twelve Testaments of the Patriarchs' in *PSBA* [Note: SBA Proceedings of Soc. of Bibl. Archaeology.] , Dec. 1893).

As it stands, the book presents the anomaly of a work intensely Jewish upon the whole, but containing passages of quite as intensely Christian colour. To explain the anomaly, it must be assumed either that a Christian of late date adopted the mask of a Jew of an earlier period, or that the work was originally that of a Jew, and the Christian passages are later interpolations. The former of these alternatives is

practically excluded by the type of Judaism running through the work as a whole. This is not such as one would assume for the sake of literary effect. Accordingly the tendency of all later writers has been towards the view that the main part of the Testaments was composed in the 1st cent. b.c. It is found, however, that the author incorporated into this work parts of an apocalyptic composition of the century preceding (b.c. 200-100). The whole was later interpolated by a Christian, or rather a number of Christians, at least one of whom held Docetic views. These interpolations were made during the first three centuries of the Christian era.

Editions.—Grabe (*Spicileg. Patr.* 1714), Fabricius (*Cod. Pseudepigr.* 1713), Gallandi (*Bib. Vet. Pat.* i. 1788), Migne (*Patrol. Graec.*), Sinker (*Test. XII. Patr.* 1869; Sinker also published an Appendix containing collating of readings and bibliographical notes, 1879).

Literature.—Translations exist in English, French, German, Dutch, Bohemian, and Icelandic.—English: Sinker (*Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, vol. xxii. 1871).—French: Migne, *Dictionnaire des Apocryphes*, i. 1856.—German: Anonymous, *Acch, e Apokryphische Bucher* (Tubing. 1875); Schnapp and Kautzsch in Kautzsch's *Pseudepigr.* 1900; Nitzsch, *Comm. Crit. de Test. XII Patr.* 1810; Reuss, *Gesch. d. Heil. Schrift. NT*, 25; Kayser, 'Die Test, der XII Patr.' in *Beitr. z. d. Theol. Wissenschaften*, herausg. v. Reuss und Cunitz, 1851; Vorstmann, *Disquisitio de Test. Patr.* 1857; Hilgenfeld, *ZWTh*, 1859, p. 395 ff., 1871, p. 302 ff.; van Hengel, 'De Testamenten der twaalf Patriarchen op nieuw ter sprake gebracht' in *Godgeleerde Bijdragen*, 1860; Geiger, *Jüd. Zeit. f. Wiss. u. Leben*, 1860, pp. 116-135, 1871, 123-125; *Presb. Rev.* 1889; Schnapp, *Test. der Zwölf Patr.* 1884.

10. The Book of Jubilees.—This book was known and often alluded to by the ancient and mediaeval ecclesiastical writers up to the days of Theodorus Metochita (a.d. 1332). It was called 'Jubilees' ('The Book of Jubilees'), or 'Little Genesis' (*Parva Genesis*, Λεπτογένεσις). Some time after the middle of the 14th cent. it disappeared, and was known only through the references to it of the earlier writers. Its recovery in modern times was accomplished by the African missionary Krapf in 1844. Krapf found an Ethiopic version of it in Abyssinia, which he sent to Europe. Here it came into the hands of Dillmann, and was by him translated and published first in German and afterwards in Ethiopic.

Contents.—The general plan of this book follows so closely that of the canonical Genesis that it will suffice to designate some of its distinctive features only. The book gives a haggadistic version of the history contained in Genesis, including also Exodus as far as ch. 14. The main events are identical in all essential points, but very many additions and embellishments are introduced. First of all, the whole of time is

represented as subdivided into jubilee periods, these into sabbatical periods, and these into years. This, it is said, was the original plan of God, and the knowledge of it was communicated to Moses by revelation. The account of the manner and time of the revelation is given in ch. 1, in which, further, the *angelus interpres* (who is in this case the Angel of the Presence) furnishes an outlook into the future and foretells the apostasy of Israel and her restoration to God. In the rest of the book the feasts and observances of the Mosaic ritual are transferred to the days of Noah and Abraham, and in general the events of this earlier period are treated with much freedom and illustrated by amplification and tradition. In the account of the Creation, an addition is made with reference to the creation of the angels. The luminaries created on the fourth day are said to be for Sabbaths and festivals. Eve was created during the second week. Therefore the command 'that their defilement is to be seven days for a male child and fourteen days for a female.' Adam is said to have been set to keep the garden from the incursions of the beasts of the field. Before the Fall animals could speak. It was between the 63rd and 70th year of Adam's life that Cain was born; between the 70th and 77th that Abel was born; between the 77th and 84th that Awan his only daughter was born. Adam and Eve had nine other sons (making twelve children altogether). The names of the wives of antediluvians are generally given. Enoch's wife was Edna, the daughter of Daniel. The corruption of mankind which led to the Flood is said to have spread through the whole creation, so that even animals were made subject to it, for which reason they perished in the waters. The *Nephilim*, who sprang from the union of the sons of God with the daughters of men, were set at enmity with one another, and 'slew each man his neighbour.' After the Flood, Noah offered a sacrifice which is described as in every particular conforming to the Levitical law. The feast of the first-fruits was observed by Noah. The feast of the New Moon also had its origin at this time. The year consists of 13 months, each of 28 days, or altogether 364 days. After the Flood, Mastema (Satan) led men to sin through the building of the Tower of Babel and the worship of graven images. Abraham did not fall into this sin. He tried to convert his father from idolatry, and failing to do so he burned the house of idols, in which his brother Haran perished, and then was called to leave his native land. When Abraham had established himself in the Land of Canaan, and Ishmael and Isaac were born, after Hagar and Ishmael had been sent away, Mastema appeared before God to move him to try Abraham by demanding the offering of his son Isaac. Nine other events in Abraham's life were trials, thus making the complete number ten. Before his death, Abraham addressed his son Isaac, advising and warning him against idolatry. When he was about to die, he called Jacob his grandson and, taking his fingers, closed his own eyes with them and stretched himself on his bed. Jacob fell asleep with his fingers on his grandfather's eyes. When he awoke, he found that Abraham was cold and dead. The affair of Jacob's obtaining Esau's blessing from his father is narrated so as to eliminate direct falsehood. When Isaac asks, 'Who art thou?' Jacob answers simply, 'I am thy son.' The story of the massacre of the Shechemites by Simeon and Levi is also softened, so as to justify the

deed. The relations of Jacob and Esau are presented in a light entirely unfavourable to Esau, who is made to act the part of a cowardly and cunning traitor. In the story of Joseph, the elements of envy and cruelty on the part of his brethren are left out. The account of Jacob's death is given without his final addresses to his sons. It is simply said that he blessed his sons. The death of Joseph gives occasion for the mention of a new king who ruled over Egypt after Memkeron, thus intimating the end of the Shepherd dynasty. In the account of Moses' early life, Hebrew maidens are represented as serving Pharaoh's daughter. The last chapter is occupied altogether with the Sabbath law, which is given with great precision and rigidity.

Literary questions.—The book is preserved as a whole in an Ethiopic version. A fragment, containing about one-third of it, is also found in Latin, probably made from a Greek copy. In addition to these, some smaller Syriac and Greek fragments are known to exist. The original was evidently in a Semitic language, but whether Hebrew or Aramaic is not absolutely certain. Hebrew was more usually the language of such apocalyptic books. Jerome, moreover, alludes to the 'Little Genesis' as a book in Hebrew. But neither of these considerations is quite decisive. In using the term 'Hebrew,' Jerome did not always keep in mind the distinction between that language and Aramaic. He followed the NT habit of calling Aramaic Hebrew (Joh 19:13). In favour of an Aramaic original, the use of the form Mastema as the name of Satan may be adduced. *Mastema* is the Aphel form from אָשָׁם 'to accuse,' and אָשָׁם is Aramaic for אָשָׁם. Further, it is said that when Abraham left Mesopotamia he took with him the books of his father (12:28), 'and they were written in Hebrew,' which would be uncalled for if the account itself was in Hebrew.

The date of the book is approximately fixed by its relation to Ethiopic Enoch on one side, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs on the other. The Ethiopic Enoch is undoubtedly known and used by the author of Jubilees (cf. Jub 21 = Enoch 3; Jub 7 = Enoch 7; Jub 10 = Enoch 10:4, 6; Jub 2 = Enoch 60:16, 21). On the other hand, in all probability, the author of the Testaments had used Jubilees (Jub 30, 33 = Test. Reub. 1, 3; Jub 32 = Test. Leviticus 8; Jub 32 = Test. Leviticus 5; Jub 34 = Test. Jud 1:3-4; Jub 23 = Test. Zeb. 9). Its chronological place is therefore after the end of the 2nd cent. b.c. and before the end of the 1st cent. a.d.

The author has been held to be an Essene (Jellinek), a Hellenist (Frankel), or a Sadducee; but there are strong reasons against any of these views. He was more probably a Pharisee (Dillmann, Ronsch, Drummond).

Editions.—Dillmann, *Kufale, sive Liber Jubilaerum*, 1859; Ceriani, *Monumenta Sacra*, i. fasc. 1, 1861; Charles, *Anecdota Oxon.* viii., 1895.

Translations.—English: Schodde in *Biblioth. Sacra*, 1885-1887; Charles in *JQR* [Note: *QR Jewish Quarterly Review.*] , 1893, pp. 703-708, 1894, pp. 184-217 and 710-745, 1895, pp. 297-328.—German: Dillmann (as above); Ronsch, *Das Buck der Jubiläen*, 1874; Littmann in Kautzsch's *Pseudepigr.* 1900. A translation into Hebrew was made and published with notes by Rubin (Vieuna, 1870).

Literature.—Jellinek, *Üb. d. Buck. d. Jub. u. das Nooh-Buch.* 1885; Beer, *d. Buck. d. Jub. u. sein Verhältniss z. d. Midraschim*, 1856; Frankel in *Monatsschrift f. Gesch. u. Wiss. d. Jud.* 1856; Hilgenfeld, *ZWTh*, 1874, pp. 435-441.

11. The Ascension of Isaiah.—The ancients allude to non-canonical literature associated with the name of Isaiah under four different titles. Origen speaks of the *Martyrdom of Isaiah*; Epiphanius names an *Anabatikon*, and Jerome an *Ascension*; in the list of canonical and kindred books published by Montfaucon (given by Westcott, *Canon of the New Testament*, App. D [Note: Deuteronomist.] , xvii), a *Vision* (ὄρασις) of *Isaiah* is included. Of these, the *Vision* is again named by Euthymius Zigabenus in the 11th cent., and a *Testament of Hezekiah* is spoken of by Georgius Cedrenus in the 12th century. Whatever the facts may have been as to the identity of these writings or their relations to one another, nothing was definitely known of them until 1819, when Archbishop Lawrence accidentally found an *Ascension of Isaiah* in a second-hand bookstore in London. It was an Ethiopic text, and Lawrence published it with a translation and notes. Upon this, together with two other MS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] , later brought to light, Dillmann based his edition of the Ethiopic *Ascension of Isaiah* in 1877.

Contents.—The work consists of two parts.

Part I. (1-5). In the 26th year of Hezekiah, Isaiah predicts that Manasseh would be led by Satan to apostatize. Hezekiah wishes to slay his son, but is prevented by the prophet (1). After the death of Hezekiah, Manasseh does give himself up to the service of Satan and practises all manner of wickedness. Isaiah takes refuge in the desert (2). Balkira, a Samaritan, accuses the prophet of uttering threats against Jerusalem and raising himself above Moses in authority, whereupon Manasseh, possessed by Satan, causes the capture of Isaiah (3:1-12). The reason for this is the wrath of Satan, roused by Isaiah's disclosures regarding the coming of Christ from the seventh heaven, regarding His death, His resurrection, His ascension, His second coming, the sending of the twelve disciples, the persecutions of the Church, the advent of Antichrist, and his destruction (3:13-4:22). Manasseh causes Isaiah to be sawn asunder, and the prophet endures the martyrdom with steadfast calmness in spite of the derision of Balkira and Satan (5).

Part II. (6-11). In the twentieth year of Hezekiah, Isaiah saw a vision which he narrated to the king and council of prominent men (6): an angel took him through the firmament and through the six lower heavens into the seventh. Here he saw the departed patriarchs—Adam, Abel, and Enoch—and God Himself. He learned that Christ should come into the earth; and having received this information, he was led by the same angel back into the firmament (7-10). In the firmament he saw the future birth, life, suffering, death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus into the seventh heaven. The angel left him, and Isaiah's soul returned into his earthly body. It was because of this vision, which he had related to Hezekiah, that Manasseh caused Isaiah to be put to death (11).

Literary questions.—The signs of the compositeness of the book are too plain to require critical demonstration. The question is simply whether it consists of two, three, or four independent writings. The most obvious partition is into two. The Vision of Isaiah is complete in itself and distinct from the Martyrdom. Even its being put after the Martyrdom, which it would precede in historical sequence, is an evidence of independence. But these two main sections have been enlarged by the addition of a preface and two minor passages in the second part. Thus the analysis is: (1) the Martyrdom of Isaiah (1-5, exc. 1 and 3:13-5:1). (2) The Vision of Isaiah (6-11, exc. 11:2, 22). (3) An introduction by a later hand (1). (4) Additions by a later Christian writer (3:13-5:1, and 11:2-22). This is Dillmann's analysis, and has been generally accepted.

The dates of these two sections are also widely apart. The *Vision* belongs to the class and period of Christian apocalypses which culminate in Dante's *Divina Commedia*. It was probably produced in the 2nd cent. a.d. The *Martyrdom* is the embodiment of an ancient tradition regarding the death of the prophet, and was probably composed just before the Christian era.

Editions.—Ethiopic Text: Lawrence (1819), Dillmann (1877).

Translations.—Latin (with both the above). A Greek translation of a late Patristic origin has been published by von Gebhardt (*ZWTh*, 1878, pp. 330-353).—English: *Luth. Quar. Rev.* 1878, p. 513 ff.—French: Migne in *Dictionnaire des Apocryphes*, i., 1838; Basset, *Les Apocryphes Ethiopiens*, iii., 1894.—German: Jolowicz (based on Lawrence's text, 1854); Clemen in Kantszch's *Pseudepigr.* 1900.

Literature.—Gesenius, *Com. ub. Jesaja*, 1821; Stokes in Smith and Wace's *Dict. of Christ. Biogr.*; Harnack, *Gesch. d. altchr. Litt.* i. p. 854 f., ii. pp. 573-579, 714 ff.; Armitage Robinson in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible* ii. 499; Charles, *Ascension of Isaiah*.

12. The Histories of Adam and Eve.—This work appears under two main forms, almost as distinct as two works: one in Greek and one in Latin. The Greek is entitled *Narrative and Citizenship of Adam and Eve* (Ἀνάγνησις). It was published by Tischendorf in 1866 (*Apocal. Apocr.* [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] pp. 1-23) under the misleading title of ‘The Apocalypse of Moses.’ The Latin version is entitled *Vita Adae et Evae*, and was published by W. Meyer (*Abhandl. d. München. Akad. Phil.* [Note: Philistine.] -*Hist. Klasse* xiv. 3, 1878, pp. 185-250). A third slightly varying form exists in Slavonic, and a fourth in Armenian. Both of these are from the Greek narrative.

Contents.—The story opens with an account of the deeds of Adam and Eve immediately following the expulsion from the Garden of Eden. Adam and Eve seek for food, experience difficulties in obtaining it, and perform penance in order to secure God’s mercy (1-8). Satan once more tempts Eve (9-11), and narrates at the request of Adam the circumstances of his own fall (12-17). Then follows an account of the birth of Cain and Abel, and Adam is taught how to cultivate the soil (18-22). Eve dreams of Abel’s death, which presently occurs; but Seth and other children are born to Adam and Eve (23, 24). Adam informs Seth of a vision given him through the archangel Michael, after he and Eve had been cast out of Eden. It was a chariot similar to the wind, but with wheels of fire. The Lord sat upon it, and many thousand angels stood on His right hand and on His left. Adam addressed a prayer to the Lord, and the Lord assured him that those who should know and serve Himself would not fail from the seed of Adam. Adam enjoins Seth to receive this knowledge and keep it (25-29). At the age of 930, Adam falls sick, and, calling his sons together, once more tells them of the circumstances of the Fall (30-34). He then sends Eve and Seth to the vicinity of Paradise in order that, putting dust upon their heads, they might plead for him and receive some of the oil of life to anoint him (35, 36). On the way they are met by the Serpent, which bites Seth, but is persuaded by Eve to let him go (37-39). They reach the gates of Paradise, present their petition, but, instead of the oil for which they had asked, they receive the promise of a blessing in the distant future (40-42). They return to Adam, and report their experiences (43, 44). Adam then dies and is buried (45-51).

The *Diegesis* gives a parallel account of the Fall by Eve (15-30), of Adam’s last will and death (30, 31), of the intercession of the entire angel host in behalf of forgiveness for Adam (33-36), of the acceptance of the prayer (37), of the burial of Adam by the angel (38-42), and of Eve’s death and burial (42, 43).

Literary questions.—This book (or couplet of books) is found in three recensions, Greek, Latin, and Slavonic. It is based on a Jewish original (Tischendorf, Conybeare, Spitta, Harnack, Fuchs). Others, however, do not believe in the Jewish original (Schurer, Gelzer).

The date of the composition is uncertain. The author was a Jew. [Hort, however, finds traces of Christian influence, and relegates the Adam story to post-Christian times.]

Editions.—Greek Text: Tischendorf, *Apocalypses Apocryphae*, 1866; Wilh. Meyer, *Vita Adae et Evae.*—English translations: in Schaff and Wace's *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, vol. xxii.; Conybeare in *JQR* [Note: *QR* Jewish Quarterly Review.] vii. 1895, pp. 216-235.—German: *Litteraturblatt. d. Orients*, 1850, pp. 705 ff., 732 ff.; Fuchs in Kautzsch's *Pseudepigr.* 1900.

Literature.—Hort, art. 'Adam Books' in Smith and Wace's *Dict. of Christ. Biog.*; Gelzer, *Julius Africanus*, ii. 1, 1885.

13. The Apocalypse of Abraham.—This is a work preserved only in a Slavonic translation. It was published in that language (1863), but only made known more widely through a German translation by Bonwetsch (1897). It tells of how Abraham took offence at the idolatry of his father, how he despised both the wooden image Barisat and the stone statue Marumath, and was on that ground made the subject of a special visit on the part of the angel Jaoel, who taught him to offer sacrifice, and then took him into heaven on the wings of a dove. Here Abraham received many revelations. This work should not be mistaken for the *Testament of Abraham*, edited by James in the *Cambridge Texts and Studies* (ii. 2, 1892).

14. The Apocalypse of Elias.—Mention of this work occurs in Origen's *Com. on Mat 27:9* (ed. de la Rue, iii. 916; ed. Lommatszsch, v. 29). Here it is said to be the source from which St. Paul quotes *1Co 2:9* 'Eye hath not seen,' etc. Cf. also Epiphanius, *Haer.* 42 [Dindorf, ii. 398]; and Jerome, *Epist. 57 ad Pammachium*. Fragments of this writing have been recovered in a Coptic manuscript brought from Akhmim. Some of these fragments were taken to Paris and some to Berlin. Those in the former place have been edited and published by Bouriand; those in Berlin by Steindorff (*Texte u. Unters.*, Neue Folge, ii. 3a). This editor thinks that the original was a Jewish apocalypse interpolated by a later Christian writer.

15. The Apocalypse of Zephaniah.—This was a larger work than the preceding, and was known to Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* v. 11. 77). Among the Akhmim fragments published by Bouriand and Steindorff there are portions of this apocalypse also, but they are not extensive enough to serve as a basis of any trustworthy judgment as to its origin and nature. The extracts recovered do not, however, contain Christian interpolations.

16. An Anonymous Apocalypse.—The Akhmim fragments contain, in addition to the above, portions of a purely Jewish apocalypse, which cannot be identified or

associated with any special name. The author, speaking in the first person, names Elias among other saints whom he has seen in heaven (14). The fragments are published along with Steindorff's above-named edition of the Akhmim manuscripts.

17. The Prayer of Joseph.—Origen (ed. de la Rue, iv. 84; Lommatzsch, i. 147) calls this 'a writing not to be despised, current among the Hebrews.' Nothing, however, besides Origen's quotations from it, is known of the contents of the work.

18. The Book of Eldad and Modad.—These names [Authorized and Revised Versions *Medad*] occur in Num 11:26-29. A book bearing this name is mentioned in Hermas' *Shepherd* (*Vis.* ii. 3), but nothing more is known of it with certainty.

iv. General Characteristics.—The general characteristics of apocalyptic literature may not all be found in ideal vividness in any single production of the class. Nevertheless, in so-called apocalypses, most of the following traits are predominant, and, with the majority of them, all appear in some degree of clearness.

1. *The Vision Form.*—This is what gives the name to the class, and, although not an indispensable feature, is quite determinative. The authors put themselves in the place of seers, and throw upon the canvas large, vivid, lifelike portraiture. The imagery is in many cases fantastic and unreal as compared with the actual world, but it is striking and clearly drawn. Conflicts and struggles, judicial assizes, conversations and debates, as well as cosmographical delineations, are placed before the eyes of the seer, and by him described more or less in detail.

2. *Dualism.*—The distinction between the world of sense and the world of Divine or spiritual realities is always prominently in the mind. The other world is, however, conceived as only imperceptible to the bodily senses, not as different in kind. A dualism as between matter and spirit underlies the philosophy of the apocalypse, but is necessarily ignored in the presentation of the realities of the spiritual. These are put before the bodily senses as if a simple heightening of the powers of the senses would bring them into view.

3. *Symbolism.*—The visions portrayed abound in conventional symbolical figures. Mixed organisms, partaking of the parts and characteristics of different creatures (beasts), frequently recur. Generally the different parts that enter into these mixed figures represent different abstract principles, and the mixed figure as a whole stands for combinations of powers. Mystic and symbolic numbers, too, constantly appear (seven heavens, seven archangels, ten shepherds). Sometimes this symbolism is explained in minute terms, but sometimes it is left for the seer to unravel. Sometimes the purpose of the use of such symbolism seems to be simply to harmonize the form of presentation to the mysterious nature of the subject-matter; but at other times it

is evidently designed to conceal the exact import of the revelation from the uninitiated, and to keep it a secret within an esoteric circle. The method of interpretation known as Gematria is to this end frequently resorted to.

4. *Angelology*.—A system of mediators between the two worlds is pictured as establishing their connexion. In comparison with the angelology of the OT (with the exception of Daniel), this mediatorial hierarchy is complex and definite. It is, moreover, subdivided into two branches, the good and the evil, which are at enmity with one another. In some apocalypses one particular angel is commissioned to the task of acting as the companion and friendly interpreter of the seer (*angelus interpret*). To him the seer appeals in his ignorance of the meaning of the mystic visions, and from him he receives needed explanations. Here, too, a difference must be noted between the apocalypses and the earlier prophets (cf. Amos 7-9), who see visions, but speak directly with the Almighty in person.

5. *The Unknown as subject-matter*.—The subject-matter revealed concerns one of two spheres, viz., either the inscrutable mechanism of the other world, or the purposes of God regarding the present world: (a) Under the first head are portrayed the characteristics, deeds, and destinies of angels, both good and evil, the secret forces and courses of the great nature-powers and elements, and the mode of the Creation. (b) Under the second head naturally two divisions are distinguishable, the historical and the eschatological. Such great landmarks in the history of the world as the entrance of sin, the fortunes of the first human pair, the Flood, the destinies of Israel, are given as known and decreed of God. The whole eschatology, including the final judgment, the Messianic Age, the fate of mankind, the resurrection of the dead, and the destruction of the world, are of the utmost interest to the apocalypticist. In fact, so prominent is this part of the world of mystery in the apocalypses, that some authorities have yielded to the temptation of making it the sole test of an apocalypse. Apocalyptic is, according to this view, synonymous with eschatological. (So Lücke, and, among more recent scholars, Bousset).

6. *Pseudonymity*.—The author of an apocalypse generally assumes the name of a very ancient person, preferably of some one who is represented in the canonical books as having enjoyed direct communication with the spiritual world. Enoch, Moses, and Elijah stand out as those who passed from this world to the other in a preternatural manner, and therefore were favoured even while here with apocalyptic glimpses of the other. Others, because of their exceptional holiness and nearness to God, are easily put into the same place of favour. Such are Isaiah, Ezra, Baruch, and Daniel. The name of Ezekiel, however, quite singularly does not seem to have drawn any of these writings to itself. Jeremiah's began to be used, but did not become very popular. That of Solomon was attached to a body of psalms for quite obvious reasons. The Sibyl was probably drafted into the service in order to gain the confidence of

heathen readers through the use of the voice of a trusted prophetic of their own. It was intended to propagate Jewish doctrines among the Gentiles (Schürer). This pseudonymity is accompanied by a not altogether accidental tendency to tamper with the apocalypses. More than any other class of writings they show signs of having been edited and modified. Many of them are manifestly collections or compilations of smaller productions. Others abound in interpolations and additions designed to embellish, clarify, and expand their portraiture.

7. *Optimism.*—The design of the whole class is predominantly that of encouraging and comforting the chosen people under persecution. Some, of course, are more or less sectarian in their tendency, *i.e.* they address their words of encouragement and hope to a particular section of the people, who are regarded as faithful or righteous *par excellence*. The majority are meant to teach and comfort the whole nation.

v. Theological Ideas.—The root of the apocalyptic theology is the sense of need. Though it may not be strictly accurate to call the apocalypses ‘tracts for hard times,’ it is quite true that they issue from a faith which looks to God for deliverance from evil days. The eye is turned into the future for the good which the God of the Covenant has promised to Israel. The darker the outlook, the brighter the hope which breaks through it and sees ultimate victory. The rallying point of thought is here furnished by the conception of the ‘Day of Jahweh’ in the prophets of the earlier period. But this hope for the future is impatient. It cannot await the working of the slow moral forces gradually evolving the consummation. It rather sees the Golden Age bursting forth in a sudden and supernatural manifestation of God’s power and favour to His chosen people. Accordingly, the cardinal doctrines of the apocalyptic theology must begin with the contrast of the ages.

1. *The doctrine of the two aeons* (4 Ezr 7:50).—This is developed from the older idea of the ‘latter days’ (הַיָּמִים אֲחֵרִית) which the earlier prophets always held up as a source of comfort and encouragement whenever they were moved to denounce the existing evils of their day. A great day of Jehovah would bring about the righting of all that was wrong with the world. In the apocalypses, all that precedes the critical day is summed up under the conception of the present age (αἰὼν οὗτος, הַיָּמִים הַזֵּה): the future, with its ideally good conditions, is the coming age (αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων, הַיָּמִים הַבָּרִיִּים). The noteworthy feature about the conception of the aeons is that each is a coherent unity, and has a character of its own. The present age is unpropitious, evil (4 Ezr 7:12); the future will be good. The past is the age of the world-kingdom, portrayed under the symbolic figure of beasts; the future, the age of the Divine reign; it has a human aspect. All this is put forth as a source of comfort and encouragement to the faithful. The duration of the evil age is variously computed. Enoch makes it

10,000 years (Ethiopic Enoch 16:1, 18:16, 21:6); in the Assumption of Moses it is 5000; at any rate, it is definite and near its end. It is soon to pass away. The question is even pertinent whether those living shall continue to the end of it. This question, however, is not answered (4 Ezr 4:37, 5:50f., 6:20, Syriac Bar 44:9).

2. *The impending Crisis.*—The passing of the old will be accompanied by great changes in nature. The order of things will be reversed. The moon will alter her course, and not appear at her appointed times; the stars shall wander from their orbits and be concealed (Ethiopic Enoch 80:3-7). Trees will flow with blood, and stones will cry out (Syriac Bar 27). In the heavens, dread signs of portentous significance will appear (Sib. Or 3:796-806). Fountains will dry up, the earth will refuse to yield; the heavens will be turned into brass; the rains will fail, and springs of waters will be dried up. Among men, wars and rumours of wars will prevail (Ethiopic Enoch 99:4, 4 Ezr 9:3), and private feuds and recklessness of the life of men will be the rule (Ethiopic Enoch 100:2, Sib. Or 3:633-647, Syriac Bar 48:32, 70:3). Women will cease to be fruitful, and miscarriages will occur (4 Ezr 5:8; Ezr 6:21). These are the ἀρχὴ ὧδ ἰσων of Mat 24:8, Mar 13:8.

3. The *Conception of God* is more definitely anthropomorphic than in the earlier period. He is pictured by the apocalyptists as seated on the highest heaven, and surrounded by a host of attendants. In the Slavonic Enoch, in the Ascension of Isaiah, in the Greek Baruch, and in general in all the apocalypses, God is regarded as a monarch with an army to fight His battles, and a retinue of servants to execute His orders. Much of this is naturally a part of the drapery of the vision, but it all tends to accentuate the gulf which separates God from man. Especially where the anthropomorphism is conscious of its own inadequacy, and is combined with descriptions of the fearfulness of God's person, the idea of transcendency is accentuated, and begins to dominate the apocalyptists' thought of God.

4. The *cosmology* is a corollary of the transcendence of God. The distance between heaven, His dwelling-place, and earth, the abode of man, is enlarged and filled with six stages, making altogether seven heavens. These are minutely described in the Slavonic Enoch, the Ascension of Isaiah, the Greek Baruch (cf. also Test. Leviticus 2, 3). The substance of which these heavens are made is light, or rather luminous matter (Ethiopic En 14:8-25). The language is not metaphorical. This light becomes fuller and more intense as one approaches the throne of God Himself. With God are to be found in this sphere the forces and persons that wage His warfare and serve to carry out His plans. Besides the hierarchy of angels (already spoken of), there are here the abodes of the sun, moon, stars, and nature-powers; also the Messiah, ready to be manifested at the proper time.

5. An *arch-enemy* called Beliar, Mastema, Azazel (Satan), at every point undertakes to thwart the purposes of God. It was he who tempted and misled Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden (*Life of Adam and Eve*). As he takes on himself a body and appears on earth in order to defeat the Messiah, he is Antichrist. In this capacity he is sometimes represented as taking the form of a king (Antiochus Epiphanes, Nero, Caligula) and sometimes that of a false prophet (Sib. Or 3:63ff.)

6. *Man*.—There is a definite realization of the unity of the human race. Sin, need, and death are looked upon as affecting all men. They have one cause for all. The world was created for the sake of man (4 Ezr 8:44, Syriac Bar 14:18). Similarly, the plans of God have in view the welfare of men as such. The blessings of the Messianic age come to men in general, although with varying degrees of fulness (Sib. Or 3.367ff., 767ff.). But the distinction between those who please God by obeying His law and those who do not is never lost sight of. Israel is His chosen people, and He has given it the Law; but the Israelite who transgresses the Law is punished, whereas the Gentile who observes the Sabbath shall be holy and blessed like ‘us,’ says the author of Jubilees.

7. *Sin*.—All misery among men is the result of sin, and the fall of the first pair in the Garden of Eden is the cause of it. This is predominantly the lesson of the *Life of Adam and Eve*; but it is also clearly put in 4 Ezra and in the Syriac Baruch (Tennant, *The Sources of the Doctrine of the Fall and Original Sin*, 1905).

8. *The coming Messiah*.—The central development of apocalyptic literature is the figure of the Messiah; but it is nowhere outlined so clearly as in the Ethiopic Enoch. He is here designated as the Son of Man; He is also called the Righteous One, the Elect One, the Elect of Righteousness and the Faithful One, and the Anointed One. He is not a mere human being; He has His home in heaven with the Ancient of Days (39:7, 46:1). Enoch sees Him as pre-existing. This pre-existence is also implied in the declaration that His name was named by the Creator of spirits before the creation of the sun and stars (48:3), that He was chosen and concealed before the foundation of the world (48:6, 62:6). He will become manifest in the day of consummation, taking His seat beside the Lord of the Spirits, and all creatures shall fall down before Him (51:3, 4, 61:1, 63:3). Other portraiture is to be found in 4 Ezr 13:3 (‘One in the form of a man’), and in the Psalms of Solomon (17 and 18).

9. *The Resurrection*.—The doctrine of Dan 12:2 is that ‘many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.’ In the Ethiopic Enoch (51:1) this is broadened into a universal resurrection, the object of which is defined as judgment for the deeds done in the body (Ethiopic Enoch 22). This idea is also taught elsewhere (4 Ezr 7:32, 5:45, 14:35,

Syriac Bar 42:7, 50:2, Test. Benj. 10, almost in the words of Dan 12:2, *Life of Adam*, 41, 10, 13, 28, 51).

10. *The Judgment*.—This undoubtedly developed from the prophetic conception of the Day of Jahweh. It is to be distinguished from the judgment which takes place during the course of the present age. It is called the Great Judgment (μεγάλη κρίσις, Ethiopic Enoch 10:6, 12, 23:4, 45:3, 6, 48:9, 50:4, 58:6, 60:5, 65:5, 10, 67:10, Jub 5:10, 32:11, Ethiopic En 91:7, Test. of Levi 3, Assump. Mos 1:18); Eternal Judgment (Slav. Enoch 7:1, 40:12, 4 Ezz 7:70-73, Syriac Bar 20:4, 57:2, 59:8, 83:7, 85:12 ff., *Life of Adam*, 39). It consists in a spectacular revelation of the wickedness of God's opponents, and their condemnation and punishment for their enmity to Him. The subjects of the judgment are both heavenly and earthly powers. Satan and Antichrist (if these two be looked at as different), the fallen angels, the world-powers, and wicked men are all included. The judgment will be upon the ground of books in which either the names or the deeds of men have been inscribed according to their good or evil. Sometimes the deeds are represented as being weighed in the scales. Each person judged must stand upon his own merits. Intercession in his behalf by another is of no avail. The judge is God Himself. He appears as the Ancient of Days (one having a Head of Days), with white hair and beard. He is seated on a glorious throne, and surrounded with myriads of angels (Ethiopic En 1:4, 9, Sib. Or 3:91, 92, Slav. En 20:1, Test. Levi 4, Assump. Mos 12:9). In some representations it is the Messiah who acts as the judge (uniformly in the Book of Similitudes, Ethiopic Enoch 37-71, with the exception of 47:3). His sphere of judgment, however, includes the fallen angels and demons, not men. For the most part, the Messiah appears either before or after the judgment (4 Ezz 7:33, before; Ethiopic Enoch 90, after). Again, Messiah is associated with God and acts as the judge while God executes sentence (Ethiopic En 62).

11. *The Punishment of the Wicked*.—The most manifest effect of the judgment is the overthrow of God's enemies and the infliction of fit penalties upon them. Of these enemies, three classes may be distinguished: (a) Spirits, including Satan and fallen angels (Test. Benj. 3, Sib. Or 3:73, Test. Sim. 6, Zeb. 9). (b) Heathen world-powers, looked at either in the abstract or as special individual kings 4 Ezz 11, 12:3, Sib. Or 3:250-380, Ps-Sol 17:22, Ethiopic En 51:4, 52:6, 53:7). (c) Sinners in general. But special mention is made of Israelites who transgressed the law (Syriac Bar 85:15, 54:22). Satan (Belial) is cast into the fire (Test. Jud 1:25), though he rules in hell with his angels (Ethiopic En 53:3, 56:1). The fallen angels pass at the judgment into a permanent condition of damnation. The giants who sprang from the union of the angels with the daughters of men are also confined in eternal torment. The heathen who have opposed God and oppressed Israel are destroyed. Destruction (ἀπώλεια), however, is not conceived as equivalent to annihilation, but as involving existence in a wretched state.

12. *The Reward of the Righteous.*—The works of the pious are preserved as in a treasury in heaven (4 Ezr 7:77, 8:33, Syriac Bar 14:12, 24:1). When they are raised from the dead, it is in order that they may come into eternal life (Ps-Sol 3:16). This they are said to inherit (Ethiopic En 37:4, 40:9, Ps-Sol 9:9, 14:1, 3). Eternal life is sometimes looked at as simply a prolonged bodily life (Ethiopic En 5:9, 10:10, 17, 62:14, Jub 23:27-29); but sometimes it appears as a superior kind of life in another world (4 Ezr 8:53, Syriac Bar 21:22, Test. Leviticus 18).

13. *The Renovation of the World.*—This is the natural corollary of the idea that the world as at present constituted has been corrupted by rebellion against God and sin, and therefore cannot stand. Deutero-Isaiah (65:17, 66:22) foreshadows the advent of ‘a new heaven and a new earth.’ The same world-reconstruction is held in prospect by the apocalyptists. The Ethiopic Enoch (91:16f.) announces that ‘the first heaven will vanish and pass away, and a new heaven will appear.’ The present order of the material heavens will last only until the new eternal creation is brought into existence (Ethiopic En 72:1). Time distinctions will cease when the new creation is accomplished (Jub 50:5).

14. *Predestination.*—In the sense of the determination of the destiny of individuals beforehand, as elect or non-elect, the idea of predestination does not clearly appear in the apocalyptic literature. In the sense, however, that all the experiences of God’s people are known and have always been known by Him, and do not come to pass without His consent, the doctrine is constant as the undertone of thought. All the events unfolded in the eschatological pictures are certain to come to pass because God wills that they should. Certainty of blessedness for the righteous is not dependent upon their own piety, but upon God’s having foreordained it (Assump. Mos 12:8). The age is as a whole fixed and measured (Book of Jubilees). When its course has run, it comes to an end (4 Ezr 4:29, 7:74). A certain number of righteous must be gathered in. Only when this takes place can the consummation occur. It was this doctrine that made the whole apocalyptic theory a practical effective scheme, because it enabled it to impart the assurance of the realization of that good in the future which was missed in the present.

vi. *Contact with the New Testament.*—The significance of apocalyptic literature for the NT is very large. In general apocalyptic furnishes the atmosphere of the NT. Its form, its language, and its material are extensively used.* [Note: This does not mean, however, that there are not in the fundamental matters sharp contrasts between the NT and the apocalypses. The New Testament is the New Testament. Its originality is beyond question.] In particular, this is true of the following main lines:—

1. The apocalyptic *form* is used as such in the literary composition of the NT. In the Apocalypse of John this becomes the form of the whole book. In other places it is

introduced as a part of productions of a different literary type (cf. Matthew 24 and parallels). Whether these passages were originally separate works and the Gospel writers incorporated them, or whether they make up integral parts of the plans of the Gospels, is a question for historical criticism to deal with. In their interpretation no satisfactory results will be reached if their formal affinity to the apocalypses be ignored. In 2Th 2:2-12 the case is clear. The Apostle evidently weaves an apocalyptic passage of his own construction into his Epistle. A firm base of operations is thus furnished for the interpretation of the apocalyptic portions of the NT. These must be read as the apocalypses in general are read.

2. Some outstanding *phrases* in the NT terminology deserve special mention. The expression 'Son of Man' occurs first in Daniel (7:13). From here, if the now predominant pre-Christian dating of the Book of Similitudes (Ethiopic En 37-71) be correct, it is adopted into that work, and this usage serves as the bridge of connexion between Daniel and Jesus, who treats this term constantly as His own title. Closely associated with this title is the phrase 'Head of Days' (Ethiopic En 47:3, 48:2-6), as applied to God. Other phrases of this class are the 'Day of Judgment,' the 'Great Day of Judgment' (Ethiopic En 19:1, 22:4-11).

3. *Quotations* from apocalyptic books are not very common in the NT. The most familiar is that in Jud 1:14 f. from Ethiopic En 1:9, Jud 1:9 is also a quotation from the Assumption of Moses (Charles, *Testament of Moses*). The book is not named here, and the quotation is identified by ancient writers to whom this apocalypse was familiar. But coincidences of phraseology, suggesting quotations either of one from the other or of both from a common source, are quite frequent (cf. Charles, *Book of Enoch*, pp. 42-49; *Apocalypse of Baruch*, pp. lxxvi-lxxix; *Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, pp. xxii, xxiii; *Assumption of Moses*, pp. 113; also Sinker, *Testamenta XII Patriarcharum*, pp. 209-210). Some of these parallelisms must be ascribed to the nature of the thought expressed, which perhaps would not admit, or at least would not easily lend itself to very different phraseology; but in a large number the coincidence can occur only where literary affiliation of some kind exists.

4. The most important point of contact, however, is that in *subject-matter*. And here it is no mere point of contact that we have to note, but a large and free adoption of the forms worked out by the apocalyptists. To undertake a list would be to repeat the summary given above of the apocalyptic theology. The simplest way to describe the relation is to say that Jesus and the writers of the NT found the forms of thought made use of in apocalyptic literature convenient vehicles, and have cast the gospel of God's redemptive love into these as into moulds. The Messianism of the apocalyptists has thus become unfolded into the Christology of the NT. The theocratic judgment has passed into the universal ethical discrimination between individuals according to

the deeds done in the body. Other doctrines, such as angelology and demonology, have likewise been used as the vehicles of great eternal verities.

5. Solutions of some *questions* which St. Paul faced are proposed in some of the apocalypses (notably 4 Ezr and Syriac Bar). These are often as different as they can possibly be. Whether they are meant to be a secret form of attack on Christianity or simply independent ways of approaching the same subjects, they are of the utmost importance. In the first case, they throw light on the growth of Christian belief and the manner of the polemic waged against it. In the latter, they illustrate the nature of the setting in which the gospel found itself as soon as preached.

Literature.—Besides the special works (referred to above) on the individual apocalypses, the following comprehensive works may be consulted:—Gtrorer, *Das Jahrhundert d. Heils*, 1838; Hilgenfeld, *Jüd. Apokal.* 1857, and *Messias Judaeorum*, 1869; Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, 1877; Smend, 'Jud. Apok.' in ZATW [Note: ATW Zeitschrift für die Alttest. Wissenschaft.] , 1885, pp. 222-250; Deane, *Pseudepigrapha*, 1891; Thomson, *Books which Influenced Our Lord and His Apostles*, 1891; de Faye, *Les Apocalypses Juives*, 1892; Bousset, *Der Antichrist* [English translation by Keane, 1896], and the same author's *Offenbarung Johannis*, 1896, *Die Bel. d. Judentums*, 1903, and *Jud. Apokal.* 1903; Charles, *Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian*, 1899; Schürer, *GJV* [Note: JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1898, iii.; M. S. Terry, *Biblical Apocalyptic*, 1898; Wellhausen, *Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten*, 1899; Volz, *Jud. Eschatologie*, 1903; Baldensperger, *Die Messianisch Apokalyptischen Hoffnungen des Judentums*, 1903 [this is the 3rd ed. of his *Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*¹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1888]; H. A. A. Kennedy, *The Eschatology of Paul*, 1904; Muirhead, *The Eschatology of Jesus*, 1904; articles by Charles in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible and in *Encyc. Biblica*; Porter, *Messages of the Apocalyptic Writers*, 1905.

A. C. Zenos.

☞ Apocrypha

APOCRYPHA.—This term is here used for those Jewish writings included in the Gr., Lat., and English Bibles to which the title is commonly applied, *i.e.* the Biblical Apocrypha. For the literary history and characteristics of the Apocrypha see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , vol. i. s.v. 'Apocrypha.' The relation of the Apocrypha to Christ and Christianity, which is the subject of this article, comes especially under

four heads—the Messianic idea, the doctrine of Wisdom, the anticipation of Christian doctrines other than that of the Person or mission of Christ, the use of the Apocrypha in the Christian Church.

i. The Messianic Idea.—While this idea is luxuriantly developed in Apocalyptic literature, it is singularly neglected in most of the Apocrypha. The stream of prophecy which ran clear and strong in the OT became turbid and obscure in those degenerate successors of the prophets, the Apocalyptic visionaries. But it was in the line of the prophetic schools of teaching that the Messianic idea was cherished. Accordingly the treatment of the later stage of that teaching as erratic and unauthoritative, not fit for inclusion in the Canon, involved the result that the remaining more sober literature, which was recognized as nearer to the standard of Scripture, and in Egypt included in the later canon (at all events as in one collection of sacred books), was for the most part associated with those schools in which the Messianic hope was not cultivated. Therefore it is not just to say that this hope had faded away or suffered temporary obscurity during the period when the Apocrypha was written, the truth being that it was then more vigorous than ever in certain circles. But these circles were not those of our Old Testament Apocrypha. Thus the question is literary rather than historical. It concerns the editing of certain books, not the actual life and thought of Israel.

This will be evident if we compare the *Book of Daniel* with *1 Maccabees*. These two books deal with the same period. Yet the former, although it does not know a personal Messiah, is the very fount and spring of the Messianic conception of the golden age in subsequent Apocalypses. On the other hand, *1 Maccabees* ignores the Messianic hope, at all events in its usually accepted form.

Only two passages in this book can be pointed to as suggesting the Messianic idea, and they will not bear the strain that is sometimes put upon them. The first is 1Ma 2:57 'David for being merciful inherited the throne of a kingdom for ever and ever.' We have here that very elementary form of the Messianic idea, if we may so call it, the permanence of David's throne. But it is evident that David as the founder of the royal line, not the Messiah, is here referred to, and that the permanence of the throne is for the succession of his descendants, not for any one person. Not only is this the most reasonable interpretation of the passage, but it rests on OT promises to that effect, where the family of David and not the personal Messiah is intended (e.g. 2Sa 7:13; 2Sa 7:16, cf. Psa 132:12). Of this passage, however, as of the earlier Scriptures on which it rests, we may say that the idea contained in it is realized by the permanent reign of David's great Son, and in a much larger and higher way than had been anticipated. The other passage is 1Ma 4:45-46 'And there came into their mind a good counsel, that they should pull it [*i.e.* the sanctuary] down, lest it should be a reproach to them, because the Gentiles had defiled it: and they pulled down the

altar, and laid up the stones in the mountain of the house in a convenient place, until there should come a prophet to give an answer concerning them.’ This is not even a reference to ‘*the prophet*’ of whom we read in [Joh_1:25](#). It is merely a case of waiting for some prophet to come and say when the temple was to be rebuilt, with no definite assurance that one specifically anticipated prophet was thus destined to arise.

Nevertheless, though we cannot point to any Messianic prophecy in 1 Mac., some of the Psalms attributed to this period indicate a prevalence of ideas that belong to the same circle of thought. Passionate patriotism fired by martyrdom and crowned with temporary success naturally painted great hopes for the nation. The reason why these were not connected with a coming Messiah may be twofold. (1) For a time it seemed likely that the Maccabees themselves were realizing those hopes, that this remarkable family of patriots was really restoring the glory of Israel. (2) Since these men were of the priestly line, the splendour of their achievements eclipsed for the time being the national dreams of the house of David.

The reaction of the later *Hasidim*, out of whom the Pharisaic party emerged, against the worldly methods of the Hasmonaeon family and their identification of the mission of Israel with military prowess, released the more spiritual religious hopes, and so prepared for a revival of Messianic ideas. This new movement, which saw the true good of the nation to lie in her religion and looked for her help from God, did not altogether coincide with the hope of a personal Christ, for God Himself was the Supreme King whose coming was to be expected by His people.

The book of *Judith* is a romance issuing from the Pharisaic reactionary party; but it is devoid of all specific Messianic ideas. In this case the human saviour of Israel is a woman.

Of the three other popular tales, two, *The History of Susanna* and *Bel and the Dragon*, contain nothing bearing on the Messianic idea; but the latter part of *Tobit* may be accounted Messianic in the general sense as giving a picture of the Golden Age of the future. Jerusalem is to be scourged for her children’s works, but she is to give praise to the everlasting King that ‘afterwards his tabernacle may be builded’ in her ‘again with joy.’ Many nations are to come from far to the name of the Lord God with gifts in their hands. All generations shall praise her with great joy. The city is to be built and paved with precious stones. ‘And all her streets shall say Hallelujah; and they shall praise him, saying, Blessed be God, which hath exalted it for ever’ (To 13:9-18). In all this there is no mention of the son of David or any human king and deliverer. (In the Hebrew variation of the text of this chapter as rendered by Neubauer, we read of ‘the coming of the Redeemer and the building of Ariel,’ *i.e.* Jerusalem; but evidently this Redeemer is Jahweh). We must go outside our

Apocrypha to the *Psalms of Solomon* for the Pharisaic revival of the Messiah of the line of David.

Apocalyptic literature lends itself more readily to Messianic ideas, and these find full expression in the *Book of Enoch*, where—in the ‘Similitudes’—the descriptions of the Messiah who appears in clouds as the Son of Man are assigned by Dr. Charles to the pre-Christian Jewish composition.

2 Esdras, also a Jewish Apocalyptic work, calls for closer examination, since it is contained in our Apocrypha, although its late date diminishes its value in the history of the development of thought. The Christian additions (chapters (a) 1, 2; (b) 15, 16) do not call for attention here; they could only come into the study of the development of Christian thought if they were in any way contributions to that subject; but the warnings of the supplanting of Israel by the Gentiles in (a), and the judgment of the nations in (b), cannot be regarded in that light. The original work (chapters 3-14) affords significant evidence of the melancholy condition into which Jewish Messianic hopes had sunk during the gloomy interval between the destruction of Jerusalem and the rise of Bar-Cochba, the reign of Domitian (a.d. 81-96) being its generally accepted date (see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, vol. i. p. 765). Unlike the other Apocryphal writings, since it does not illustrate the transition from the OT to the NT, it is serviceable only in the study of post-Christian Judaism. Its Christian interpolations do not materially hinder us from discovering the original text. The Messianic passages are in chapters 7, 12, and 13. The insertion of the name ‘Jesus’ in 7:28 (not found in the Oriental versions) by a Christian hand is not sufficient reason for discrediting the Jewish character of the composition. The picture of the Messiah is quite un-Christian. It is startling to read that he is to die (7:29); but (1) this is after reigning 400 years, and (2) without a subsequent resurrection. The first point indicates the visionary ideas of the Apocalyptic writer, not the known fact of our Lord's brief life on earth, and the second is in conflict with the great prominence which the early Christians gave to our Lord's resurrection. A Messiah who lived for 400 years and then died, and so ended his Messiahship, could not be Jesus Christ. Accordingly the Syriac reads ‘30’ instead of ‘400,’ evidently a Christian emendation. Undoubtedly this is a Jewish conception, and its mournful character, so unlike the triumphant tone of Enoch, is in keeping with the gloomy character of the book, and a reflection of the deep melancholy that took possession of the minds of earnest, patriotic Jews after the fearful scenes of the siege of Jerusalem and the overwhelming of their hopes in a deluge of blood. The reference to the death of the Messiah is not found in the Arabic or the Armenian versions; but it is easy to see how it came to be omitted, while there is no likelihood that it would be inserted later, either by a Jew, to whom the idea would be unwelcome, or by a Christian, since the resurrection is not also mentioned. A noteworthy fact is that the Messiah is addressed by God as ‘My son.’ The Ethiopic of 7:28, instead of ‘My son Jesus’ reads ‘My

Messiah,' and the Armenian, 'the anointed of God.' But the reference to sonship occurs elsewhere frequently, e.g. 'My son Christ,' or 'My anointed son' (7:29; see also 13:32, 37, 52, 14:9, in most versions, but not in Arm.: see Dr. Sanday, art. 'Son of God' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, vol. iv. p. 571). Since, as Dr. Sanday remarks in the article just referred to, the strongly Messianic passage in Ps-Sol 17:23-51 has not the title 'Son,' but clearly borrows from Psalms 2 in v. 26, it is a likely inference that 2 Esdras is here based on that Psalm. Compare the words of the high priest in Mat 26:63.

In chs. 12 and 13 the writer names Daniel, and manifestly bases his elaboration of the Messianic picture on the Book of Daniel. The Messiah appears as a lion rising up out of a wood and roaring. A certain pre-existence is implied in the assertion that the Most High had *kept* him (2Es 12:32); the Latin has only 'for the end,' but the Syriac reads 'for the end of days, who shall spring up out of the seed of David.' He will come to upbraid and destroy the guilty people, but he will have mercy on a remnant and deliver them. Similar ideas are repeated in ch. 13, but in a different form. A man comes from the midst of the sea. This is unlike Daniel (Dan 7:3; Dan 7:13), where the four beasts come up from the sea, but the 'one like unto a son of man' from the clouds. The Most High has kept him for a great season (Dan 7:26), another reference to pre-existence. Similarly later on we read, 'Like as one can neither seek out nor know what is in the depths of the sea, even so can no man upon earth see my Son, or those that be with him, but in the time of his day' (2Es 13:52). He exists, but hidden till the time when God will reveal him. When he comes and is revealed, 'it will be as a man ascending.' 'When all the nations hear his voice' they will draw together to fight against him. But he will stand on the top of Mount Zion, and there he will taunt the nations to their face and destroy them without any effort on his part, the instrument of destruction being the Law, which is compared to fire. Then in addition to the saved remnant of the Jews already referred to, the lost ten tribes will be brought back from their exile beyond the Euphrates, whither they had gone by a miraculous passage through the river, and whence they will return by a similar miraculous staying of 'the springs of the river' again. Thus we have the idea of a restoration of all Israel under the Messiah, but with no further extension of the happy future so as to include other nations, as in the Christian Apocalyptic conceptions; on the contrary, those nations will be humiliated and chagrined at the spectacle of the glorification of the former victims of their oppression. On the whole we must conclude with Paul Volz (*Jüdische Eschatologic*, p. 202) that 2 Ezra adopts the traditional hope of the Messiah, but does not see in it the chief ground of assurance for the future. He is hailed as God's son, but he appears to have only a temporary existence. He does not bring deliverance from sin; nor is he to come for judgment. His death is the end of his mission.

ii. The Doctrine of Wisdom.—Unlike the Prophetic and Apocalyptic literature which confessedly anticipated a great future, and so furnished a hope which Christianity subsequently claimed to fulfil, the Hebrew Wisdom writings profess to give absolute truth, and betray no consciousness of further developments. Nevertheless the Church was quick to seize on them as teaching the essential Divinity of Christ. The historical method of more recent times sees in them the germs of ideas on this subject which were subsequently developed by Christian theologians of the Alexandrian school. For the doctrine of Wisdom in the OT see *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] , art. ‘Wisdom.’ That doctrine in the Apocrypha is in direct succession from the *Hokhmah* teaching of Proverbs.

1. Sirach.—In the Palestinian school represented by Sirach it is difficult to see much, if any, advance on Proverbs. The idea of Wisdom itself is essentially the same, and the gnomic form of writing continues an identity of method.

(a) *Literary Form.*—There is no attempt at metaphysical analysis or philosophical argumentation. This Jewish philosophy is not elucidated by reasoning, or based on logical grounds. It is regarded as intuitive in origin and the treatment of it is didactic. Thus we have nothing like a philosophical or ethical treatise. Much of the writing is directly hortatory, and where the third person is used we have descriptions and reflections, accounts of the nature and function of wisdom, and illustrations of its operations in life and history.

(b) *Unity of Wisdom.*—In Sirach, as in Pr., Wisdom is described from two points of view: as found in God and His administration of the world, and as attainable by man in his own character and life. But it is not that God’s wisdom is merely the model or the source of our wisdom. Wisdom throughout, though seen in such different relations, is taken as essentially one entity. It is wisdom, absolute wisdom, that God uses in the administration of the universe, and that man also is exhorted to pursue. This realism in dealing with an abstract notion is the first step towards personification.

(c) *Personification.*—As in Proverbs, wisdom is here personified. Wisdom is supposed to act. e.g. ‘How exceeding harsh is she to the unlearned’ (Sir 6:20). In a fine passage she celebrates her own praises, glorying in the midst of her people, saying—

‘I came forth from the mouth of the Most High,

And covered the earth as a mist.

I dwelt in high places,

And my throne is in the pillar of the cloud' (Sir_24:3-4);

and, further, after a rich description of the scenes of nature that she influences—

‘In three things I was beautified,

And stood up beautiful before the Lord and men,’ etc. (Sir_25:1).

But there is nothing in this personification beyond a free use of the Oriental imagination. No doubt to this vivid imagination such writing presents wisdom as in some way a concrete entity, and more, as a gracious, queenly presence. But all along there are expressions which admit the imaginary character of the whole picture. For instance, the opening passage, describing how Wisdom stood up in the congregation of the Most High to celebrate her own praises, would lose all its force of appeal if it were taken in prosaic literalness. It is just because this is no actual person posing for admiration, but a truth set forth before us, that the whole picture appears to be sublime, and serves its purpose in leading to a high appreciation of wisdom. Then wisdom is identified with understanding: ‘Whoso is wise, cleave thou unto him’ (Sir_6:34) ... ‘If thou seest a man of understanding, get thee betimes unto him’ (Sir_6:36). Thus cultivation of friendship with a man of wisdom or understanding is part of the pursuit of wisdom itself. Even Philo’s much more explicit personification of the Logos does not mean that he held the Logos to be an actual person in our sense of the term. Here all we can say of the subject is that the allegorizing is very vivid, so vivid as to be on the verge of the mythopœic, but still in the original intention of the writer not meant to be more than the glorification of a great quality found primarily in God, impressed on nature, and commended to mankind as a highly desirable attainment.

The difficulty of the question lies in the fact that the Oriental mind would not clearly face this question of personality. The imagination would so vividly realize the allegorical picture that the idea would seem to assume form and body, condensing to an apparently concrete and even personal presence, so that it would be regarded for the time being as a person, and yet in the course of the meditation this would melt again into an abstraction, and in the less imaginative passages be regarded in its original character purely as a mode of thought or action. To apply to the product of such a process the logic of the West, or to attempt to bring it into harmony, say, with Locke’s theory of ideas, is unreasonable. The atmosphere does not allow of so hard a definition of personality as that which may be either affirmed or denied.

(d) *Source*.—Wisdom originates in God. She came forth from the mouth of the Most High’ (Sir_24:3). ‘Wisdom was created together with the faithful in the womb’ (Sir_1:14). She exclaims, ‘He created me from the beginning, before the world’

(Sir 24:9). As with Pro 8:22, the Arian controversy has given a factitious importance to this sentence. Wisdom is identified with Christ; and thus the Arian doctrine that Christ is a creature, that He was created, not begotten by God and not eternal, appears to have clear support. It is probable that Sirach is dependent on Proverbs, and the rendering of LXX Septuagint (ἐκτισε) is doubtful.* [Note: The Hebrew of Proverbs (קנה) is rendered in RV as well as AV 'possessed.' Still RVm has 'formed,' in agreement with Bertheau, Zockler, Hitzig, and Ewald, and Delitzsch has the similar word 'produced'; moreover, Syr. and Targ. agree with the LXX. In Pro 4:7 קנה is rendered 'get,' and certainly there it can only have that meaning.] But the much debated point is of little real importance; indeed, it is of no value till we grant that Wisdom in Proverbs and Sirach is (1) personal, and (2) identical with Christ. The denial of (1) in the previous paragraph carries with it the exclusion of (2). Nevertheless, apart from the Arian conception, we still have the idea of the creation of wisdom to account for. This, however, is but a consequence of the allegorical personification in conjunction with the thought that wisdom proceeds from God. That has a twofold signification, corresponding to the two aspects of wisdom. First, God is the source of His own wisdom. He has not to learn; all His plans and purposes spring from His own mind. Secondly, mankind learns wisdom from God; it is His gift to His children. Wisdom is with all flesh according to God's 'gift' (Sir 1:10).

(e) *Characteristics.*—There is an intellectual element in wisdom, which is the highest exercise of the mind. The opposite of wisdom is folly, a stupid and brutish thing. The Divine side of wisdom most clearly exhibits this character. Wisdom created by God is with God, and therefore is seen in His presence and works. Nevertheless, Sirach makes very little reference to the manifestation of wisdom in Nature or Providence. The whole stress is on this Divine gift as an object of aspiration for mankind. Wisdom is seen as the best of all human possessions. The sublimity of wisdom is set forth in order to fire the enthusiasm of men to have their lives enriched with the Divine grace. This is just the same as in Proverbs. So also are two further characteristics of Hebrew wisdom. First, it is moral. It is concerned with the practical reason, not the speculative. Its realm is ethics, not metaphysics. It is not a philosophy for solving the riddle of the universe; it is a guide to conduct. The ethics is not discussed theoretically; there is no theory of ethics. The aim of the book is practical, and the treatment of wisdom is didactic and hortatory. Sirach even discourages speculation, in directing the attention solely to conduct—

‘Seek not things that are too hard for thee,

And search not out things that are above thy strength.

The things that have been commanded thee, think thereupon;

For thou hast no need of the things that are secret' (Sir_3:21-22).

Second, it is religious. Wisdom here, as in Proverbs, is identified with the fear of the Lord. The way to attain wisdom is to keep the Law—

'If thou desire wisdom, keep the commandments,

And the Lord shall give her unto thee freely' (Sir_1:26).

Like Proverbs, Sirach contains a quantity of shrewd worldly wisdom, and it is eminently prudential in aim; but it is the better self that is considered, and the higher interests, rather than wealth and pleasure, that are studied. In this way the whole book is concerned with the exposition of the nature and merits of wisdom.

2. Baruch.—The eloquent celebration of the praises of wisdom in this book, which probably dates from the 1st cent. a.d. (see *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] , art. 'Baruch'), is on similar lines to Sirach. Wisdom is like choice treasure, to be sought out from far. But since she is above the clouds or beyond the sea, no man can be expected to reach so far. There is only One who can do this. 'He that knoweth all things knoweth her' (Bar_3:32). Here the idea is different from that of Sirach. Wisdom is not created by God, but is found by Him, as though an independent pre-existence—'He found her out with His understanding' (*ib.*). But the personification is thinner and more pallid than in Sirach. There is no real dualism. The language is little more than a metaphorical expression of the idea that God has the wisdom which is above human reach. Still it goes on into a sort of myth, for Wisdom thus discovered by God hidden in some remote region afterwards appears on earth and becomes conversant with men (Bar_3:37). Here we have a curious parallel to the Johannine conception of the Word originally with God and then becoming incarnate and dwelling with men. But Baruch has no conception of incarnation, and the idea has no place in the Hebrew personification of wisdom.

3. Wisdom.

(a) *The nature of Wisdom.*—Although, as an Alexandrian work in touch with Greek philosophy, the Bk. of Wisdom carries the doctrine of *Hokhmah* a stage forward in the direction of Philo, it is essentially Jewish, and its idea of wisdom is fundamentally the same as that of Proverbs and Sirach, but with additions, some of which may be attributed to Hellenic influences. The essential Hebrew elements, however, remain. While a movement of intellect, wisdom is practical, moral, and religious. We are no

more in the regions of metaphysics or even abstract ethical speculation than in the Palestinian literature. Thus we read—

‘For her true beginning is desire of discipline;

And the care for discipline is love of her’ (Wis 6:17).

(b) *Personification*.—The personification of Wisdom, though still very shadowy, is a little more accentuated than in Sirach. Wisdom is described as ‘a spirit’ (Wis 1:6), and as such seems to be identified with ‘the spirit of God’ (Wis 1:7). In answer to Solomon’s prayer God gave him ‘a spirit of wisdom’ (Wis 7:7). ‘She is a breath of the power of God’ (Wis 7:25). She sits as God’s ‘assessor’ (Drummond) by His side on His throne (Wis 9:4). When, however, various functions, such as Creation and Providence, seem to be ascribed to her, this cannot be as to a personal agent, because they are also ascribed to God (e.g. Wis 9:1-2). It must be, therefore, that God is thought of as doing these things by means of His wisdom.

(c) *Attributes*.—A string of 21 attributes, in thoroughly Greek style, is ascribed to the spirit of Wisdom (Wis 7:22 ff.). Among other things, she is said to be ‘only begotten’ (μονογενής, the very word used of Christ in Joh 1:14; Joh 1:18; Joh 3:16; Joh 3:18 and 1Jn 4:9, though Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 of Wisdom renders it here ‘alone in kind,’ having ‘sole born’ in the margin). Further, wisdom is described as ‘a clear effluence of the glory of the Almighty’ and an ‘effulgence (ἀπαύγασμα, whence Heb 1:3) from everlasting light’ (Wis 7:25-26). She is free from all defilement, beneficent, beautiful.

(d) *Functions*.—Divine functions are ascribed to Wisdom, since it is by His wisdom that God performs them. (1) Creation. She is ‘the artificer of all things’ (Wis 7:22), ‘an artificer of the things that are’ (Wis 8:6). (2) Providence. The function of wisdom in providence is much dwelt on. Wisdom is regarded as a sort of guardian angel watching over men and directing the course of history. Patriarchal history from Adam downward is described as thus under the charge of wisdom. (3) Revelation. The picture of Wisdom as the effulgence from everlasting light points to this. She is also described as ‘an unspotted mirror of the working of God, and an image (εἰκὼν, cf. 2Co 4:4, Col 1:15) of His goodness’ (Wis 7:26); in attaining to wisdom we come to know the ways of God.

(e) *Wisdom as a human acquisition*.—While wisdom is described in its relation to God as coextensive with the infinite range of the Divine activities, it is also represented from another point of view as a treasure which mankind is invited to seek. The

difficulty of acquiring wisdom suggested in Baruch is not found here. On the contrary, we read that—

‘Easily is she beheld of them that love her,

And found of them that seek her’ (Wis_6:12).

Moreover, there is no limitation of Jewish exclusiveness in the privilege of enjoying this greatest of God’s gifts, ‘for wisdom is a spirit that loveth man’ (Wis_1:6). When a little later we read that ‘the spirit of the Lord hath filled the world’ (τὴν οἰκουμένην, ‘the inhabited earth,’ (Revised Version margin)), the breadth of Hellenism seen throughout the Alexandrian movement, first Jewish, later Christian, is here apparent. While Wisdom is identified with the Law in the Palestinian work Sirach, here all true enlightenment, pagan as well as Jewish, must be included in this far-reaching wisdom. At the same time, this widespread wisdom is very different from Greek philosophy. The practical, ethical element which is essential to the Hebrew *Hokhmah* is always its chief constituent. Moreover, the homelier conception of wisdom as an exalted prudence serviceable in worldly affairs, which is often apparent in Proverbs and Sirach, is also to be found in the Bk. of Wisdom.

(f) *Anticipations of Christology*.—With this conception of wisdom we cannot claim the identity of terms (ἀπαύγασμα, εἰκὼν, λόγος) which are here applied to wisdom and in the NT to Jesus Christ as an indication of any clear anticipation of Christian truth. It is rather the other way. St. Paul and the author of Hebrews knew Wisdom, and made use of expressions in the book for their own purposes, giving to them a richer Christian meaning. Nor can it be allowed that the use of the word λόγος as closely associated with wisdom is any real anticipation of the λόγος doctrine of Philo. In Wis_9:1 we read—

‘O God of the fathers, and Lord who keepest thy mercy,

Who madest all things *by thy word*’ (ὁ τοιήσας τὰ πάντα ἐν λόγῳ σου).

This is evidently an allusion to the Creation story in Genesis 1, so that we must understand λόγος in the sense of ‘word’ (דְבַר, in the familiar OT expression ‘the word of the Lord’). But Philo uses λόγος in the Stoic sense of ‘reason.’ It may be conjectured that the transition to this meaning has begun in Wis., because the line immediately following that just quoted is, ‘and by thy wisdom thou formedst man’

(Wis 9:2). Thus *λόγος* is treated as parallel to wisdom. In any case *λόγος* is a rational word, not a mere utterance of the voice, but a word with thought, reason in it. Still, the author elsewhere uses the term in the sense of ‘word’ as the implied reference to Genesis 1 indicates that he does here.* [Note: *λόγος* occurs 15 times in Wisdom (viz. 1:9, 16, 2:2, 17, 20, 6:9, 11, 7:16, 8:8, 16, 9:1, 12:9, 16:12, 18:15, 22). In 13 of these instances there is no question that it means ‘word.’ Of the 2 remaining cases one is that now under consideration; the other is 2:2—‘And while our heart beateth, reason is a spark.’ Here it is human reason that is referred to. In every case where *λογος* is predicated of God the sense is ‘word.’ See especially 12:9, 18:22.] It would be nearer the mark to say that Joh 1:1 is an echo of Wis 9:1. Still there is much more in the prologue to the Fourth Gospel than can be derived in any way from this simple statement, and a great deal of that reminds us more of Philo than of Wisdom. The conclusion would seem to be that in John as in Wisdom *λόγος* is used in the common Biblical sense of ‘word’; but that there are also associations with Philo, the author of the Fourth Gospel ascribing to the *λόγος* as ‘word’ some of the attributes which Philo had ascribed to his *λόγος* as ‘reason.’ Accordingly the prologue to the Fourth Gospel may be said to combine reminiscences both of Wisdom and of Philo, together with its own original Christian ideas.

iii. Anticipation of Christian Doctrines.—Anticipations of the Christ idea, either as Messiah or as Wisdom, have been dealt with in the previous sections. It remains to be seen for what other Christian doctrines preparation is made in the Apocrypha.

1. *The Doctrine of God*.—This subject is treated very fully in *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.], Extra Vol. art. ‘Development of Doctrine,’ pp. 276-281. All that is called for here is to indicate those phases of the doctrine that approach the Christian idea. 1 Maccabees is remarkable for its omission of any direct reference to God. But although (according to the best text) the name of God does not appear, He is thought of under the euphemism ‘heaven’ (e.g. 1Ma 3:18). Therefore we must take the omission of the sacred name as an indication of the reverence that feared to mention it, which was characteristic of a later Judaism. This went with the growing conception of the Divine transcendence which was not an anticipation of Christianity, but the reverse, and against which Christianity was a reaction. Still it prepared for Christianity by emphasizing the need of some intermediary power to bring man into contact with God, a mediating Christ. While no hint of anything of the kind is dropped in the historical part of the Apocrypha, the soil is here prepared for it by the very barrenness of religion in lack of it. The popular tales in the Apocrypha contribute nothing material to the conception of God. The fierce patriotism of Judith falls back

on the ancient appropriation of Jehovah for Israel; but this can scarcely be reckoned a theological narrowing, since the thought is not turned to any question concerning the nature of God. In the Wisdom literature, however, we may look for some development of the doctrine. Negatively we see this in the avoidance of the anthropomorphism that fearlessly asserted itself in the OT. Not only is there no approach to a theophany in human form, but the human features often poetically ascribed to God in the older literature do not appear. This, again, goes with the growing feeling of Divine transcendence, which is alien to Christianity. But it is also an indication of a spiritual conception that may be taken as anticipatory of the spiritual idea of God in the NT. In Sirach, God is not so much too remote, but rather too great for men to understand His nature—

‘When ye glorify the Lord, exalt him as much as ye can;

For even yet will he exceed’ (Sir 43:30).

God is addressed as ‘Father and Master of my life’ (Sir 23:1), and ‘Father and God of my life’ (Sir 23:4), which implies the Divine fatherhood of the individual, a doctrine only just reached in the latest OT teaching. Moreover, the goodness of God extends to all mankind (Sir 18:13). In Wisdom, under the influence of Hellenic thought, the idealizing process is pushed further. God is the ‘eternal light’ (Wis 7:26), so that wisdom which irradiates the world is the effluence from this central fountain of light. On the other hand, there is a narrowing of the idea of creation under the influence of the Greek notion of pre-existent matter. God creates the world out of ‘formless matter’ (Wis 11:17), and creation is described as being ‘impressed,’ like wax by the seal (Wis 19:6). The motive of creation was love, and God hates nothing that He has made, loving all things that are (Wis 11:24). Nevertheless, it is said in another place that God only loves him who dwells with wisdom (Wis 7:28). The seeming inconsistency may be reconciled if we understand that here we have the more special personal affection of Divine friendship.

2. *The Fall and Original Sin.*—While Genesis 3 contains the narrative of the fall of Adam, (1) it does not attribute this to the devil, not identifying the serpent with Satan, but treating it simply as the most subtle of beasts; and (2) it does not affirm that either sin or death visits the whole race in consequence of this primary offence and its doom. But both of these ideas appear in Christianity; and the latter is contained in the writings of St. Paul, who does not give it as part of the new teaching, but assumes that it is already an accepted belief. St. Paul simply appeals to it as a basis for his analogous teaching concerning Christ. Thus he writes, ‘as through the one man’s disobedience the many were made sinners’ (Rom 5:19), and similarly with the second part of the doctrine, ‘as in Adam all die’ (1Co 15:22). Therefore these ideas must have grown up apart from the OT. Now we find them in the Apocr. [Note:

Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] Wisdom literature, both Palestinian and Alexandrian, e.g. the Palestinian teaching—

‘From a woman was the beginning of sin;

And because of her we all die’ (Sir 25:24)—

an easy inference from Genesis 3, but never made in the OT. Then there is the Alexandrian teaching, ‘By the envy of the devil, death entered into the world’ (Wis 2:24).

Grätz regards this as a Christian interpolation; but Dr. Drummond shows that his three reasons for this view do not appear to have much force. (1) Grätz objects that the clause disturbs the connexion of the passage, but it balances the previous statement—

‘God created man for incorruption,

And made him an image of his own proper being’ (Wis 2:23);

for thus we have the antithesis which is one of the common forms of Hebrew poetry. (2) For Grätz to assert that it has for him ‘absolutely no sense,’ is a criticism that would apply to it equally whoever wrote it. (3) The fact that it is without parallel in other Jewish writings must not be taken as condemning it. The idea is familiar in Christian literature; yet there is nothing specifically Christian about it, since it simply results from an application of the doctrine of a devil to the Genesis narrative, with the exercise of some imagination as to the Evil Spirit’s motive. Moreover, Milton’s adoption of the idea of envy as that motive in *Paradise Lost*, shows that, to a great poet at all events, the expression is not without a reasonable meaning. The author of Wisdom is a sufficiently brilliant writer to have struck out these ideas and made the inferences without any antecedent example. Dähne considers the passage to be allegorical, because the notion of ‘an evil principle in opposition to the Divine is foreign to pure Alexandrianism.’ Accordingly he applies Philo’s interpretation of Genesis 3 to it, and understands the word *διάβολος* to stand for the serpent as an image of carnal pleasure. But why should not the writer mention the serpent if he meant it? Since *ὁ διάβολος* appears in the LXX Septuagint for ‘the Satan,’ it is impossible that a Jew who was familiar with that version would use the word in an entirely original way for a reptile. The story of fallen angels was not unfamiliar to Jewish Apocalyptic literature (see Drummond, *Phila Judaeus*, p. 195 f.). That, however, Wisdom does not teach the total depravity of the race, we may infer from its singling out the inhabitants of Canaan as deserving to be extirpated because of their innate vice. ‘Their nature by birth was evil’ (Wis 12:10); ‘they were a seed

accursed from the beginning' (Wis 12:11). Here a doctrine of heredity is implied; but it is applied only to the Canaanites, who are regarded as of an inveterately and hopelessly evil stock. It is to be inferred that other peoples are not so bad.

The late date of 2 Esdras removes it out of the category of anticipations of Christianity. Still, as a Jewish work it witnesses to Jewish thoughts which have their roots in an earlier period. Now this book distinctly teaches the doctrine of original sin. The angel Uriel undertakes to teach Esdras 'wherefore the heart is wicked' (2Es 4:4). In an earlier passage the sin of the race was traced to Adam (2Es 3:21). The pessimism of the book is especially gloomy in regard to this subject. Esdras declares that 'it had been better that the earth had not given thee Adam, or else, when it had given him, to have restrained him from sinning' (2Es 7:46). Though it was Adam who sinned, the evil did not fall on him alone, but on all of us who come from him (2Es 7:48).

3. Redemption.—There is nothing approaching the Christian doctrine of redemption in the Apocrypha. The NT teachers had to go back beyond all this literature to Isaiah 53 for the seed thoughts of their specific teaching on this subject. In the Messianic ideas, as far as these appear in the Apocrypha, which we have seen is but meagrely, there are the two thoughts of God redeeming His people, and the Christ coming as a personal redemption. There is no anticipation of the doctrine of the cross. The sombre prediction of the death of the Christ in 2 Es. (later than the Christian gospel, as it is) contains no hint that this is either sacrificial or redemptive. The goodness and mercy of God in delivering His people are frequently celebrated; but with no specific doctrine of salvation. The *Hokhmah* teaching would suggest that escape from sin is to be had through the acquisition of wisdom, which is rooted in the fear of the Lord. It was wisdom that brought the first man out of his fall (Wis 10:1). Tobit has the great OT teaching of God's forgiveness for His penitent people whom He scourges for their iniquity, but to whom He will show mercy. If they turn to Him with all their heart and soul to do truth before Him, He will turn to them (Tob 13:5-6). Sinners must turn and do righteousness if they would receive His restoring grace. The Patristic idea that the 'blessed ... wood ... through which cometh righteousness' (Wis 14:7, cf. Act 5:30; 1Pe 2:24) is the cross, ignores the context, which plainly shows that the reference is to Noah's Ark (see Wis 14:6).

4. Liberalizing of religion.—In several respects the Apocrypha shows advance beyond the narrower exclusiveness of Judaism. The historical situation in 1 Mac. did not encourage this movement. When the Jews were struggling for freedom of life and worship against the forcible intrusion of paganism, they were not in a condition for missionary enthusiasm. Judith breathes a spirit of fiercest Jewish patriotism. But Tobit in his prayer of rejoicing declares that many nations shall come from far to the name of the Lord God with gifts in their hands (Tob 13:11). That this is not the

reluctant homage of subject peoples is shown by the sequel, where we read about 'generations of generations' praising God with songs of rejoicing. Still all this is ministering to the glory of Jerusalem. Israel is exalted in the honour shown to her God. The Palestinian *Hokhmah* literature is not free from Jewish narrowness. In Sirach, God is prayed to send His fear on all nations. But this is to be by lifting up His hand *against* them, so that they may see His mighty power. Still some gracious end even in this stern treatment of the heathen may be desired, since the prayer proceeds, 'And let them know thee, as we also have known thee' (Sir_36:5). God is asked to hear the prayer of His suppliants [Israel], in order that all on the earth may know that He is the Lord, the eternal God (Sir_36:17). This may not mean more than the acknowledgment of God for His glory and for the reflexion of that on His privileged people. On the other hand, the importance attached to wisdom has a widening tendency; for this is an internal grace, not an external privilege. But the identification of wisdom in Sirach with interest in the Law (Sir_39:1) tends to limit this grace itself and confine it to Israel.

When we turn to the Alexandrian teaching of the Book of Wisdom we expect a wider outlook. Here also the national privileges of Israel are accentuated. God gave oaths and covenants of good promises to the nation's ancestors (Sir_18:6). Moreover, 'the righteous' are to judge the nations and have rule over the people (Sir_3:8). But since the domain of wisdom is world-wide and 'the spirit of God filleth the world' (Sir_1:7), it might be supposed that the world at large would benefit by that gracious presence. Princes of peoples are invited to honour wisdom that they may reign for ever (Sir_6:21), an invitation necessarily applying to the Gentile world. It is stated in a general way that 'the ways of *them which are on the earth*' [more than Israel] were corrected by wisdom (Sir_9:18). There is a magnificent universalism in the great saying that God loves all things that are, and abhors none of the things that He has made (Sir_11:24). God's incorruptible spirit is in all things (Sir_12:1); there is no other God that careth for all (Sir_12:13); His sovereignty over all leads Him to forbear all (Sir_12:16). But further than this the book does not go. It contains no explicit promise of redemption or of the blessings of the future for the world outside Israel, though it would be no illegitimate inference from these large ideas concerning the presence and activity and graciousness of God the whole world over to conclude that such good things were not to be confined to Israel. On the other hand, not only were the Canaanites a helplessly evil race, but the more recent oppressors of Israel, whose gross idolatry is scornfully portrayed at large, after the manner of Deutero-Isaiah, are described as 'prisoners of darkness ... exiled from the eternal providence' (Sir_17:2). For other heathen people allowance is made on account of their ignorance. 'For these men there is but small blame: for they too, peradventure, do but go astray' (Sir_13:6).

5. *Resurrection and Immortality.*—With regard to no other subject is advance from the OT standpoint towards that of the NT more apparent in the Apocrypha. The distinction between Palestinian and Alexandrian conceptions is here very marked, the Palestinian writings promising resurrection, the Alexandrian making no reference to a resurrection, but adopting the Greek idea of the immortality of the soul. The more conservative books of the former school, Tobit, Sirach, and 1 Mac., contain no reference to the resurrection or the future life in any form, retaining only the old gloomy Hebrew notion of Sheol, which, on the other hand, in these writings is not Gehenna, not a place of punishment. ‘There are no chastisements in Sheol’ (Sir 41:4, Heb. mar., and LXX Septuagint).* [Note: Dr. Charles points out that the reference to Gehenna in Sir 7:17 is undoubtedly corrupt, since it is contrary to the whole outlook of the writer as to the future, and is not supported by the Heb., Syr., and best MSS of the Ethiopic (Eschatology, p. 164).] According to Tobit, Sheol is an ‘eternal place’ (Tob 3:6) where life is extinct. ‘All the rewards of faithfulness enumerated by the dying Mattathias (1Ma 2:52-61) are limited to this life’ (Charles, *Eschat.* p. 219). In Judith eternal punishment is threatened to the enemies of Israel (Jdt 16:17); but nothing is said about a future life for God’s people. 2 Mac., an epitome of the five books of Jason of Cyrene (2Ma 2:23), contains a clear doctrine of resurrection to eternal life (2Ma 7:9), which is denied to the non-Israelite (2Ma 7:14); this is a bodily resurrection (2Ma 7:11; 2Ma 7:22-23), and it will be enjoyed in the fellowship of brethren similarly privileged (2Ma 7:29). In 2 Esdras we have ‘the day of judgment’ (2Es 12:34). A first resurrection may be suggested by the reference to ‘those that will be with him’ in the day of God’s Son (2Es 13:52). The end will come when the number of those like Ezra is complete (2Es 4:36). Till then the spirits of the wicked shall wander about in torment while God’s servants will be at rest (2Es 7:75). These spirits of the wicked will be tormented in seven ways (2Es 7:81-87), and after the final judgment even more grievously (2Es 7:84). On the other hand, those who have kept the ways of the Most High shall have joy in seven ways, according to their seven orders, during the intermediate period, and after the judgment receive glory (2Es 7:95), when ‘their face shall shine as the sun,’ and ‘they shall be made like unto the light of the stars, being henceforth incorruptible’ (2Es 7:97).

In Wisdom there is no idea of resurrection. The body is the temporary earthly burden (Wis 9:15) of a pre-existent soul (Wis 8:20). Immortality is for the soul, but not by nature or necessity. It is attained through wisdom (Wis 8:13; Wis 8:17). Still it was God’s design that man should enjoy it, for He ‘created man for incorruption’ (Wis 2:23). ‘The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God’ (Wis 3:1), at peace, with a hope full of immortality. ‘The righteous live for ever’ (Wis 3:15). The wicked have no hope in their death. They will be dashed speechless to the ground; and yet their fate does not seem to be annihilation, for ‘they shall lie utterly waste, and they

shall be in anguish' (Wis_4:19). But there is no definite statement of eternal punishment.

iv. Use of the Apocrypha in the Gospels and the Church.—Our Apocr. [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] , which consists of Jewish writings contained in the Vulgate but not found in the Hebrew OT, rests primarily on the LXX Septuagint , and that was the version of the OT commonly used by the Greek-speaking Jews in the times of the Apostles, and subsequently by the Christians. Being thus the Scriptures in the hands of the NT writers, the LXX Septuagint introduced the Apocr. [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] to them together with the books of our OT. But most of the NT writers knew the Hebrew Bible. This is evident in the case of St. Paul, St. John, and St. Matthew. The only certain exception is the author of Hebrews, to whom probably we should add St. Luke; and it is reasonable to suppose that these two men, being the most scholarly NT writers, were not unacquainted with the limits of the Palestinian Canon. No NT writer names any book of the Apocr. [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] , nor is there any direct quotation from one of these books in the NT. Phrases from some of them indicate, however, that these books were used by the writers in whom they occur, although there is no evidence that they regarded them as authoritative. On the other hand, 2 Esdras borrows from the NT, especially from the Apocalypse. 2Es_8:3 is an echo of Mat_20:16. The only books of our Apocr. [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] to which reference can be manifestly traced in the NT are the works of Wisdom literature, *Wisdom* and *Sirach*, especially the former; and the NT writers who most evidently make allusion to phrases in those books are St. Paul, St. James, and the author of Hebrews. Since these writers are beyond the scope of this Dictionary, the inquirer is referred to *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] articles, 'Wisdom,' 'Sirach,' 'Apocrypha,' and those on the various NT books.

Coming to the special subject of the present volume, we note that Jesus Christ never names or distinctly cites any of the books of the Apocr. [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] , nor are any of them mentioned or directly quoted by any of the Evangelists. Nevertheless there seem to be several reminiscences of *Wisdom* and *Sirach*, if not direct allusions to those books in the Gospels.

Wis_3:7 has been connected with Mat_13:43; but the Gospel phrase can be better derived from Dan_12:3, for in both cases the same verb is used—ἐκλάμπουσι[v], while in *Wis.* the verb is ἀταλάμπουσιν. Wis_3:8 'They shall judge (κρίτουσιν) the nations' may be alluded to in Mat_19:28 'judging (κρίτοντες) the twelve tribes of Israel'; and, if so, the change is in accordance with our Lord's modifications of Jewish Messianic expectations, showing that the judgment which the Jews reserved for Gentiles was to

come upon Israel. Possibly Wis 4:4 is alluded to in Mat 7:19. But Wis 9:1 (ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα ἐν λόγῳ σου) may be more than anticipation of Joh 1:3; it may have suggested the idea in the Gospel, though the entirely different language (πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο) with reference to the function of the Logos in creation excludes the notion of actual quotation. Wis 15:8 'when he is required (ἀταιτηθείς) to render back the soul (τῆς ψυχῆς) which was lent him' is suggested by Luk 12:20 'this night is thy soul (τὴν ψυχὴν σου) required (ἀταιτοῦσιν) of thee.' Perhaps 'the darkness that should afterwards receive them' (Wis 17:21) suggested our Lord's image of 'outer darkness' (Mat 8:12) as the fate of the lost; but the idea is too general to make any connexion evident. On the other hand, Mat 12:41-42 should not be cited as a reference to Wis 4:16; nor Luk 12:47-48 for Wis 6:6; nor Joh 7:17 for Wis 6:12; nor Mat 25:34 for Wis 9:8; nor Mat 4:4 for Wis 16:26. The last instance is a declared quotation from the OT, and the other cases are too vague to allow of any identification.

Sir 2:15 'They that love (ἀγατῶντες) him will keep (τηρήσουσιν) his ways' may well have suggested the language in Joh 14:23 'If a man love (ἀγατᾶ) me he will keep (τηρήσει) my word.' Sir 4:4 'Turn not away (μὴ ἀποστρέψῃς) thy face from a poor man' suggests to us Mat 5:42 'From him that would borrow of thee, turn not thou away (μὴ ἀποστραφῆς).' Sir 7:14 'Repeat not thy words in thy prayer' suggests Mat 6:7, but here the Greek is very different; Sir 10:14 'The Lord cast down the thrones of rulers, and set the meek in their stead,' is probably the source of Luk 1:52, which is nearer to it than to Job 5:11 or Psa 147:6, especially in the use of the word 'thrones.' Possibly Sir 11:19 suggested Luk 12:19; Sir 12:1 has been associated with Mat 7:6, it is more likely to have suggested *Didache* 1; Sir 19:21 is too general and obvious to have suggested Mat 21:29, which is more definite and specific; Sir 21:11 'He that keepeth the law becometh master of the interest thereof' is a fine anticipation of Joh 7:17; Sir 23:9 anticipates our Lord's rebuke of swearing (Mat 5:33-34), but is less specific; the metaphor of the vine in Joh 15:1 ff. is not to be referred to Sir 24:17, it is more likely to have been suggested by Isa 5:1 ff., if by any passage; Mat 6:14 seems to be a reference to Sir 28:2 'Forgive thy neighbour the hurt that he hath done thee; and then thy sins shall he pardoned when thou prayest.' The association of Mat 6:19 with Sir 29:12, proposed by Daubney, is very doubtful; equally vague is that of Mat 16:27 with Sir 32:24 'He that trusteth in the Lord shall suffer no loss.' In both of these cases the slight resemblances are probably purely accidental Luk 1:17 β ἐπιστρεψαι καρδιας πατερων ἐτὶ τέκνα evidently comes from Sir 48:10 ἐπιστρεψαι καρδιαν

πατρος τῶς υἱόν. The peculiarity of thought and phrase is too striking for an accidental coincidence. But that it is a reminiscence and not a direct quotation is clear from the three changes of words for which no reason can be assigned since the sense remains the same, viz. singular for plural; τῶς for ἐπί; υἱόν for τέκνα. The following clause in the parallelism is entirely different in the two texts, so that either the conclusion was quite forgotten or a new conclusion was deliberately formed. In Luke we have 'and the disobedient to walk in the wisdom of the just,' while the clause in Sir. is 'and to restore the tribes of Jacob.' The expression 'the wisdom of the just' in Luke seems to be a reference to the title of Sirach, which was probably originally simply 'Wisdom.' in codex B this is called ΣΟΦΙΑ ΣΕΙΡΑΧ; and in the Syriac, סִירָא דְבַר חַבְמָהָא. Similarly at the end of the Hebrew text it is described as 'the wisdom of Simeon ben Jeshua ben Eleazar ben Sirâ.' On the other hand, St. Luke has not the LXX Septuagint word for wisdom (σοφία), his phrase being ἐν φρονήσει δικαίων. The conclusion to be drawn from these data seems to be that both Wisdom and Sirach were known to Mat., Luke, John, or to collectors of *Logia* of Jesus earlier than those Gospels, that Sirach especially was used by the author of the *Magnificat*, and that our Lord seems to have made use of both books, Sirach more probably than Wisdom.

While the special subjects of this Dictionary do not call for a study of the Apocr· [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] in later times, a topic exhaustively treated in *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] , vol. i. pp. 120-123, a brief *résumé* of its history in the Church may be here added. The presence of the books which we designate Apocryphal in the LXX Septuagint mixed up with the OT Scriptures of the narrower Heb. Canon would naturally tend to float them among the Greek-speaking Churches. Several of them are cited as Scripture by Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria in the Greek Church, and by Tertullian and Cyprian in the Latin Church. While Melito of Sardis held to the Hebrew Canon, Origen championed the more comprehensive Greek Canon. A century later, Cyril of Jerusalem condemned this wider Canon, holding to the Heb. 22 books; and his position was confirmed by the Synod of Laodicea (*circa* (*about*) 360 a.d.). Epiphanius and especially Athanasius introduced the intermediate course, a recognition of several of the Apocr· [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] , not, however, as in the Canon, but as good and useful. Since then, while from time to time scholars have declared the Apocryphal books to be non-canonical, the Eastern Church has used them, and they are in the Bible of the Greek Church. In the West, the Apocr· [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] obtained acceptance as part of the Old Latin Version, which was based on the LXX Septuagint , and as such formed part of Jerome's revision. But when Jerome translated the OT afresh from the Hebrew,

seeing that the Apocr. [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] was not there, he advised its rejection from the Canon. Still, he allowed it an intermediate position; and, in spite of its translator's opinion to the contrary, the books of the Apocr. [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] took their place in the Vulgate as integral parts of Scripture. At the Council of Trent the Vulgate being pronounced infallibly inspired, the Apocr. [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] was canonized with the rest of that version, and therefore it is now regarded as Scripture in the Roman Catholic Church. Among Protestants it has either taken an intermediate position, or has been rejected as not being Scripture. Luther placed it between the OT and the NT with the title 'Apocrypha,' and a statement that it was 'not equal to the Sacred Scriptures,' but nevertheless 'useful and good to read.' The Reformed Church is more severe; in the Zürich Bible the Apocryphal books come after the NT as 'not numbered among the canonical books,' and without a word of commendation. Coverdale translated the Apocr. [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] and placed it between the OT and the NT with a statement that the books were in the Vulgate but not in the Hebrew. It has a similar position in subsequent revisions, including Authorized Version (1611), where it is marked 'Apocrypha.' But from 1629 onwards editions of the Authorized Version began to appear without it.

Literature.—Swete, *OT in Greek*; Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 of Apocrypha; Commentaries by Wace (*Holy Bible with Com.*, Murray), Fritzsche, and Grimm (*Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apoer.* etc.); Bissell (Lange-Schaff); *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] articles, 'Apocrypha,' 'Development of Doctrine,' also articles on the several books of Apocr. [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] ; Drummond, *Jewish Messiah and Philo Judaeus*; Stanton, *The Jewish and the Christian Messiah*; Deane, *The Book of Wisdom*; Charles, *Eschatology*; Paul Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie*; Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums*; Schürer, *GJV* [Note: JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] . The *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] articles referred to contain lists of books, which therefore need not be repeated here.

W. F. Adeney.

☞ Apocryphal Gospels

APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.—See Gospels (Apocryphal).

⚡ Apostles

APOSTLES

Introduction.

1. The first disciples.
2. Beginning of our Lord's Galilaeen ministry
3. Choice of the Twelve.
4. Training of the Apostles.

Literature.

Introduction.—It is proposed to treat in this article the chief facts relating to that group of our Lord's personal disciples known to us by the name of 'apostles.' The sole authorities on the subject are the four Gospels and the first chapter of the Acts. The remaining books of the NT furnish no information as to the relations between Jesus and His Apostles during His ministry on earth; and nothing that is found in the Apocryphal Gospels can be regarded as historical.

The assumption so often made that the Synoptics possess a greater trustworthiness than the Fourth Gospel is baseless, and its baselessness cannot be better seen than in the case of the Apostles. The Apostles of the Fourth Gospel are the Apostles of the first three. Their character, prejudices, limitations, ambitions, views, sympathies are the same in the four Gospels. How can this harmony be explained unless all our authorities draw from the life? But more than this. The Fourth Gospel contains information regarding the Twelve peculiar to itself which, properly weighed, enables us to understand much that is otherwise perplexing in the first three. How can this familiarity with the Apostles be accounted for if the writer was not himself one of them? What is the alternative hypothesis? That the writer of the Fourth Gospel, with the first three before him, was able to form as true and complete an apprehension of the intelligence, moral condition, modes of thought, and language of the Twelve as to be able to create situations where he represents them as speaking and acting with perfect verisimilitude, while all the time he was simply drawing on his imagination. The author of the Fourth Gospel was a man of genius, but his genius was religious, not intellectual or imaginative. The achievement attributed to him was wholly beyond his powers or the powers of any man who has ever lived. The disciples of the Fourth

Gospel are the disciples of the first three; their portraits are firm, exact, striking, because the writer knew them personally.

When the attention of a reader is called to the numerous occasions on which the Apostles figure in the Gospels, he might feel disposed to contend that the Apostles are so prominent in the Gospels because they are their ultimate authors. But this supposition, however ingenious, is unsubstantial. Great as is the place filled by the Apostles in the Gospels, they are never magnified; it is Jesus alone who is magnified. The many references made to the Apostles correspond exactly to the position they held; the Gospels are so much occupied with them only because Jesus Himself was constantly occupied with them, not the least of the tasks of His life being to teach and train them to understand His mind and heart, and to transmit to others a correct representation of what He was and said and did.

The Gospel of St. Mark has been characterized as pre-eminently the Gospel of the disciples. But this language does injustice to the rest of the Gospels, which are equally Gospels of the disciples. A judicious reader sees at once that the Apostles hold substantially the same place in all the Gospels. There is nothing to prove that one of the Evangelists took a deeper interest in the Twelve than any of the rest.

1. *The first disciples.*—It is clear from the Gospels that several of the Apostles had been on the most intimate terms with our Lord before He selected them to become Apostles. In fact the most prominent among them passed through two stages of relationship to our Lord before they were chosen as Apostles. They were first called to become disciples in the most general sense of the term, and thereafter they were summoned to leave their usual occupations and to become the personal companions of Jesus. It is therefore desirable to learn the connexion in which the most distinguished of them stood to Jesus before their formal appointment to the apostolate.

After the Temptation our Lord returned to Bethany in Peraea. Whether this happened by arrangement between Himself and His forerunner we cannot tell, but nothing was more natural than for Him to go thither. The Baptist could best fulfil his duty if He were by his side. On two occasions John, fixing a steadfast gaze on our Lord, said in the hearing of some of his disciples, 'Behold the Lamb of God' (Joh 1:29; Joh 1:36). The remarkable expression doubtless suggested to his hearers that this was the Messiah. Two of them sought an interview with our Lord, and ere they quitted the house were convinced that they had found the Messiah. Not a word is related of the considerations which brought them to this conclusion, but the explanation is to be found partly in the testimony of the Baptist, partly and pre-eminently in the impression produced on them by the personality of Jesus. There was that in His character, aims, and language which distinguished Him from all other men. Hence

Andrew and John, the two disciples in question, had no doubt that the Messiah stood before them (Joh 1:41). It is not quite clear whether each started to find his brother; but Andrew, at anyrate, brought his brother Simon to Jesus. Reading his character and discerning its possibilities, Jesus bestowed on him the name by which he is now known to the world: the name Peter (Joh 1:42). Our Lord, for reasons unknown to us, had determined to set out for Galilee, accompanied by His new disciples. On starting, He called Philip to follow Him, and the instant obedience rendered suggests that Philip had already believed that Jesus was the Messiah, probably through his friends and fellow-citizens Andrew and Peter. On the way Philip encountered his friend Nathanael, who lived in the village of Cana, at no great distance from his own home at Bethsaida, and informed him of the discovery of the Messiah, in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. Nathanael hesitated, but he came and saw and heard, and the knowledge which Jesus displayed of his character and of his inmost life convinced him that He was indeed what Philip had declared Him to be (Joh 1:43 ff.). How many of these disciples accompanied Jesus to Cana and witnessed His first miracle (Joh 2:1 ff.) is not certain; possibly the majority, if not all. The same uncertainty arises in connexion with the journey to Jerusalem at the Passover. We do not know who witnessed the expulsion of the traffickers from the temple, heard the mysterious words spoken regarding the destruction of the temple, or saw the many miracles which He performed in the capital (Joh 2:13 ff.), baptized at His command when He laboured in Judaea in the vicinity of the Baptist, and accompanied Him through Samaria on His return to Galilee (Joh 4:1 ff.). It would seem as if thereafter the disciples returned to their usual occupations, and our Lord retired for a little from public life.

2. *Beginning of our Lord's Galilaean ministry.*—After a short interval our Lord resumed His labours, and continued them without interruption until His death. The Baptist had just been imprisoned (Mar 1:14 and ||), and He seemed to regard his imprisonment as a call to attempt more than He had yet done. So long as the Baptist laboured, the work done by Jesus does not seem to have differed much from his. Now that he was in prison, our Lord proceeded to develop a ministry of His own. This new type of ministry was marked by a change of residence from Nazareth to Capernaum (Mat 4:13). He wished to influence as many of the inhabitants of Galilee as He could, and there was no better centre from which to approach them than Capernaum. The town was large, and was near many others of the same character. It lay on several great roads, and was therefore easily reached from all quarters. The people were genuinely Jewish, and not given to Gentile tastes or customs. No more suitable position from which to command Galilee could have been chosen. It was soon after He settled in Capernaum that He renewed His summons to four of the men whom He had already chosen as His disciples. Walking along the shore of the Sea of Galilee, He saw the brothers Simon and Andrew, who were fishermen, engaged in casting their net. In words the significance of which they could not fail to discern, He commanded them to

follow Him and become fishers of men. Proceeding a little farther, He found James with his brother John repairing their nets, and addressed to them the same command. They, like Peter and Andrew, instantly obeyed (Mar_1:16-20). It is clear that our Lord had a definite aim in calling these four disciples. The duty to which He now invited them was an advance on their former relationship. They were to be no longer fishermen. They must exchange their former calling for a new one. And the nature of that new calling was not wholly obscure. The allusion to the occupation which they were bidden to leave illustrated the character of the labours to which they were invited. They were to capture men instead of fish. Not one of the four could fail to perceive that they were to be employed continuously in the service of Jesus. The call would fill them with the less surprise because they had already served an apprenticeship to Jesus, when they baptized in obedience to His commands. It need not be inferred that Jesus intended to send the four immediately on a special mission. No particular time is specified in His command; and though St. Luke (Luk_5:10) marks the capture of men as beginning with the moment of the call, this can only mean that their new career began as soon as they obeyed the call addressed to them. Only one other call of the same kind is related in the Gospels, that of Levi or Matthew (Mar_2:16, Mat_9:9). It, too, occurred in Capernaum. To the four fishermen a tax-gatherer was added. Capernaum was the seat of a custom-house, and the collector of customs, Levi by name, was called precisely as the two pairs of brothers had been. What previous acquaintance existed between Matthew and our Lord, what special qualities commended him we cannot tell; but the instant obedience he rendered to so extraordinary a command, and the feast which he gave in our Lord's honour as he bade farewell to his fellow-officials, suggest that they had known one another for some time. The interval which separated the call of Matthew from the call of the four cannot be ascertained, but as it is unlikely that he was a disciple of the Baptist, and as it is probable that he was not brought into contact with our Lord till He settled in Capernaum, some little time must have elapsed between his first knowledge of our Lord and his call. He could hardly have been with Jesus from the outset of His career in Galilee.

3. Choice of the Twelve.—It might have been supposed that our Lord would continue as He had begun, and summon disciple after disciple to His side until He had obtained the number He required for His purpose. But this was not to be. He had determined to make a formal selection of a definite number from the body of His disciples (Mar_3:13, Luk_6:13). The importance of the step He was about to take is shown by the fact that He spent the preceding night in prayer (Luk_6:12), doubtless seeking to learn His Father's will regarding the intention He had formed and the mode in which it was to be accomplished. One of the critical hours of His life was before Him. The nature of the selection He was about to make was of supreme consequence. A serious mistake would be followed by calamitous results. No wonder then that He sought

specific guidance. He may even have gone over the names of all whom He judged competent, and have made His final choice.

The Gospels have not preserved any statement by our Lord Himself as to His aim in selecting a special group of disciples. That aim can be judged of only by the issue, for it is certain that what the Apostles proved to be, was what Jesus designed they should become. An account, indeed, is found in St. Mark's Gospel ([Mar_3:14](#)), according to which the purpose of our Lord in choosing them was that they might be with Him and that He might send them forth to announce the approach of the Kingdom of God, endowed with the power to heal and to exorcize. That this is a correct description so far as it goes cannot be doubted, but it cannot be said to embrace the full scope of our Lord's purpose. It defines His immediate rather than His ultimate end. Its horizon is that of the first journey on which the Apostles were sent, not that world-wide commission afterwards committed to them. Hence when we speak of the reasons which induced our Lord to select the Twelve, we must look to the work actually entrusted to them. That work cannot be better described than by the words used by our Lord Himself to the Twelve on the eve of His death. He had been the envoy of the Father to earth. They were to be His envoys on earth. As He had interpreted the Father to men, so were they to interpret Him to men. Their chief, their supreme duty, was to bear witness to Him: to teach the world how He lived, what He said, what He wrought ([Joh_17:18](#), [Act_1:8](#)).

A comparison has often been drawn between the disciples of Plato or of the Pharisees and the disciples of Jesus. And such comparisons are not without suggestiveness. But a sagacious mind discerns that the apostolate of Jesus Christ is a unique institution. The Apostles differ from, far more than they agree with, the disciples of any thinker or teacher. They stand by themselves, devoted to the performance of an unexampled task. No one but Jesus could have conceived such a task; the Apostles were the fit instruments for its accomplishment.

It is a noteworthy circumstance that few writers have spent any time in describing the actual selection of the Twelve. The silence of the Gospels on this point is only what was to be expected, but it is surprising that those writers of our Lord's life who have given the freest rein to their imagination in endeavouring to reproduce the scenes of His career, have passed this event over as if it afforded no opportunity for their skill. Yet what materials lay ready to their hand! What were the sentiments with which our Lord addressed Himself to the task? What was His appearance as He stood on the mountain side and called His followers to Him? How did these followers feel as they perceived that He was about to make a choice among them? Was there excitement among the crowd? Was there strong desire on the part of many to be chosen? Was there any discussion as to the principles He followed in the choice, or did reverence prevent all debate? Was there much disappointment when the number was

completed? Was there surprise at the persons named? Not less instructive would be some knowledge of the sentiments of the Apostles when they stood together for the first time in the presence of our Lord. What were their thoughts? Were they filled with exultation? Did they infer that the Kingdom of God would immediately appear? Did they anticipate a brilliant future for themselves? Or were there those among them who reflected with humility on their unfitness to be the generals and statesmen of the new Kingdom? Did it occur to even one of them that the choice just made was a fresh disclosure of the view taken by Jesus of the Kingdom of God and of the means by which it was to be extended?

Who now were the objects of our Lord's choice? With some of them we are already acquainted. Simon, Andrew, James, John, Philip, and Levi or Matthew are already known to us. So too possibly is Bartholomew (wh. see). *Bartholomew* is not a proper name, but means simply 'son of Tolmai,' and there is much probability in the opinion that he is to be identified with Nathanael. These seven disciples our Lord must have known for some time. The remaining five names—Thomas, James the son of Alphaeus, Simon the Zealot, Judas or Lebbeaus or Thaddaeus, and Judas Iscariot are new. How long they had been known to Jesus is not told us; perhaps some of them had been in His company for several months. On the other hand, it is possible that He may have chosen some of the Twelve without much if any personal knowledge, relying on that power to read the heart which He undoubtedly possessed.

Who the **Alphaeus** was of whom James was a son (Mar_3:18) we cannot tell. There is no reason except the similarity of name for connecting him with the father of Levi; and the assumption that he is the same person as Clopas is gratuitous. The force of the epithet **Cananaean** is not free from doubt; the most likely meaning is that of *zealot*. But the sense of 'zealot' in turn is not perfectly clear. It may denote the political party known by that name; it may, again, simply designate unusual devotion to a cause. Reflexion shows that this latter view has but scanty recommendation, and that the former has nearly everything in its favour. The Apostle who bears a triple name is commonly known as **Jude**. That there were two Judes among the Apostles is plain from the language of Joh_14:22, where 'Judas not Iscariot' is mentioned. In two of the lists of the Apostles, those in Luke (Luk_6:16) and Acts (Act_1:13), he is described as 'Judas of James'; that is almost certainly Judas the *son* not the *brother* of James. But who this James was is quite uncertain. In Mat_10:3 and Mar_3:18 this Judas is called **Thaddaeus**, or, according to the Western text, **Lebbeaus**; and he was probably known indifferently as Judas or as Thaddaeus. The exact significance of the term **Iscariot** is still under discussion. Most commonly it is regarded as a geographical term signifying 'man of Kerioth,' but where Kerioth was situated is keenly canvassed, some placing it to the east of the Dead Sea and others in the south of Judah (see Judas Iscariot).

Attempts have often been made to prove that several of the Apostles were *related to our Lord*. Many of those who have sought for traces of this relationship have been governed by motives very different from those influencing our Lord, who would have been the last person to allow His selection of an Apostle to be determined by the ties of blood. Still there is no reason why relatives of our Lord should not have been among the Apostles. But what evidence is there to this effect? It has been conjectured that James and John were cousins of our Lord, Mary and Salome being sisters. This is one possible interpretation and by no means the least satisfactory of the well-known verse in St. John (Joh 19:25) which mentions the women at the cross. Whether the silence of Scripture regarding the relationship can outweigh the fitness of this interpretation will be answered variously, yet a reader will allow for the possibility that James and John were our Lord's cousins. But if he tolerate this view he will reject without hesitation the opinion once so common, that several of our Lord's brothers were among the Apostles. Practically nothing can be brought forward in support of this hypothesis; for who can attach any value to the fact that three of the Apostles bore the same names as three of our Lord's brothers, when it is known that these names were among the most common in the land? The statement made in Joh 7:5 that six months before the Crucifixion none of our Lord's brothers believed on Him is wholly inconsistent with the view that two or even three of them were Apostles. Scarcely less decisive is the distinction traced in the Acts between the brothers of Jesus and the Apostles (Joh 1:14). Much ingenuity and labour have been expended in the endeavour to prove that James the son of Alphaeus was a cousin of our Lord, his father being a brother of Joseph. But the steps by which this identification is made are numerous and all open to challenge, so that no gain can arise from an examination of the question. See art. Brethren of the Lord.

Four lists of the Apostles are contained in the NT, one in each of the Synoptics and one in the Acts (Mat 10:2-4, Mar 3:16-19, Luk 6:14-16, Act 1:13). A careful examination of these lists shows that each of them consists of three groups of quaternions, and that in each group the same person is mentioned first. The first group contains the names of Peter, James, John, and Andrew. The second is made up of Philip, Nathanael, Thomas, and Matthew. The third is formed of James the son of Alphaeus, Simon the Zealot, Judas or Thaddaeus, and Judas Iscariot. Is this arrangement due to accident, or does it rest on a perception of the historical importance of the disciples at the time at which it was drawn up? The places given to Peter and Judas and the contents of the different groups suggest that there is here an indication of the view taken of the Apostles in the early Church. By whom the catalogues were framed is unknown, but their value as historical witnesses is great. They form, as it were, a table of precedence dating from the earliest times, and embodying the verdict it may be of the Apostles themselves, or at least of those of them who survived when they were prepared. In all the lists the name of Peter occupies the first place. St. Matthew (Mat 10:2) writes: 'Now the names of the

twelve apostles are these; the first, Simon.' In what sense is this 'first' to be understood? It might refer to the fact that Peter was the first of the Apostles to be chosen. This is perfectly credible, but the fact that the order of the names is not uniform in the lists may be regarded as showing that the memory of the order in which the Twelve were called was not preserved in the Church. But why was Peter the first called? Must not an explanation of this fact be sought? And is it not to be found in the circumstance that he was the foremost of the Apostles, their leader, their spokesman? Primacy in the sense of jurisdiction or authority over his fellow Apostles Peter never received and never exercised. His position is that of the foremost among equals; a position due not to any formal or official appointment, but to the ardour and force of his nature.

What kind of men were the Apostles? What was their character, education, social rank, ability, age? The Apostles were in an eminent sense religious men. The tie which bound them to Jesus was a religious tie. It was impossible for any person to become a follower of Jesus who did not believe in obedience to the will of God as the first of all duties. The Apostles were men who desired to fulfil the demands of the law of God. Their aims were high; their morals were pure; whatever their ignorance, misconceptions, defects, they were men of integrity, justice, and mercy; diligent, candid, honest, pious, God-fearing. None of the Apostles had received more than a common education. The range of their knowledge was that of most of their fellow-countrymen. But they were in no sense illiterate. It is probable that all of them could read and write. Most if not all of them spoke Aramaic and Greek. Their minds had been quickened and nourished by the services in the Synagogue. The education that springs from the truest knowledge of God and of man was theirs. And the discipline of their daily lives had rendered them alert, considerate, patient, energetic.

The Apostles without exception belonged to the working classes as they would be called to-day. There was no man of rank or distinction or of social consideration among them. Four of them, we know, were fishermen. One of them was a collector of taxes. The rest belonged to the same rank in life, and followed similar occupations. All of them knew what it was to labour to maintain themselves; they were familiar with life as it presents itself to the great body of mankind. There is no evidence that any of the Apostles was specially distinguished by intellectual force. There was no man of genius among them: no original thinker; no man dowered with the imaginative faculty; no man of great powers of organization. It does not appear that any of them had an unusually impressive or attractive personality. As far as can be ascertained, they were all young men, about the same age as, or younger than, our Lord Himself. No man of middle life, no grey head was included in the circle. Variety of taste, temper, mode of life found full expression among the Apostles. No one was the same as another. Their experience of life had differed. Their anticipations of the future

differed. Their habits of thought and action differed. Perhaps the only common elements were their piety and their devotion to Jesus. Such then were the Apostles. They were pious men belonging to the people, full of the plain sense and judgment which mark the common man: slow to learn, but teachable; free from social prejudices; untrammelled by any fixed systems of thought; with keen eyes for character; anxious to win the favour of Jesus.

The most discordant criticisms have been passed on the choice of the Apostles, many of these betraying a complete failure to grasp the circumstances and facts of the case. The vindication of the wisdom shown in the selection is the future career and achievements of the Twelve. In judging it is necessary to bear in mind the materials at our Lord's command and the purposes which He had in view. The man who realizes these has no difficulty in appreciating and admiring the sagacity exhibited by Jesus. Here, too, he will perceive that originality which marks His entire career. The Twelve would never have chosen one another. Had the selection been left to them individually or to any two or three among them, the persons included would have been very different. Nobody but Jesus Himself would have acted in disregard, as it would appear, of the motives by which men are constantly swayed. No one will suppose that our Lord had any aversion to intellect, wealth, rank, genius, experience, in themselves, or that He preferred fishermen to lawyers, and tax-collectors to priests. But He was equally free from the bias which leads so many to believe that the success of any movement depends on its being supported by the higher classes, whether of intellect or rank. His one test of men was fitness or capacity for the special objects He had in view. The number of adherents at His command as Apostles was limited. His primary aim was to discover men who could be taught and trained to comprehend His character, aims, and labours, who could describe His life to their fellows, who could inform them as to what He said and as to the deeds of mercy and power which He wrought. The defects and the limitations of the Apostles were far better known to our Lord than they are to us or to His critics. Yet He called them despite of these, for after all they were the best instruments within His reach. Their faults of intellect, taste, manner, speech, their stupidity, folly, their prejudices and prepossessions, their unbalanced judgment and intemperate zeal were all before His eyes; nevertheless He summoned them to be His Apostles in the confidence that He could make them become the very men best fitted to discharge the duties connected with the establishment of the Kingdom of God. He had no false anticipations as to the kind of men the Twelve would prove; He chose them knowing what they were and what they would become.

The Apostles were *twelve in number*. The number was intended to be significant. Its import could not have been lost on the Twelve themselves when they were first called, or on the multitude who witnessed their election. Our Lord was evidently thinking of the twelve tribes of Israel. Though ten of the tribes had largely

disappeared, Israel still consisted ideally of twelve tribes, and the mission of the Messiah was to be to all the tribes of the nation. Hence the fitness of the number chosen by our Lord. There was one Apostle for each tribe. Nor should it be overlooked that the employment of this number was a fresh claim on the part of Jesus to be the Messiah. His disciples would argue thus: Who but the Messiah could venture to create a body or group of twelve disciples only? Nobody had done so before, no prophet, not even the Baptist. Jesus then must be the Messiah.

It has been suggested that the number twelve was, so to speak, accidental; that our Lord did not choose a definite number of disciples, but that He allowed all who desired to do so to remain beside Himself. The alleged choice of the Twelve is pronounced not historical. They chose our Lord, not He them. The Twelve is but a name for His closest and most devoted adherents. The only arguments advanced for this view are the silence of the Gospel of St. Matthew as to the selection of the Twelve, and the omission of the list of the Twelve from the Gospel of St. John. But St. Matthew furnishes a list of the Twelve, and therefore presupposes their selection. He assumes as self-evident that they had been appointed by our Lord. St. John not less than St. Matthew takes the selection of the Twelve ([Joh_6:67](#); [Joh_6:70](#)) as known, and even makes our Lord refer to His appointment of them ([Joh_15:16](#)). To assert that the Twelve attached themselves to our Lord gradually and spontaneously is to misread the tenor of the statements regarding them.

The title 'Apostle' and its equivalents.—It is expressly stated that the Twelve received from our Lord the title 'apostles'; but it is doubtful whether the title was bestowed when they were chosen, and its exact sense has always been a subject of debate. It will be expedient at this point to examine the designations borne by the Apostles, because they are not called uniformly by one name.

The most common of all the appellations bestowed on them in the Gospels is that of **disciples**. This usage is as characteristic of the Fourth Gospel as of the Synoptics. And it is noteworthy that in none of the Gospels are the twelve disciples sharply discriminated from the other disciples of our Lord. They are called 'the disciples of Jesus,' 'his disciples,' 'the disciples,' but the context alone reveals whether the writer is speaking of a limited group or of the disciples of our Lord in general.

A peculiar usage appears in the Gospel of St. John. There the title is applied to those who first attached themselves to our Lord. 'The disciples' form a body or class by themselves long before the Apostles are chosen. From the narrative it looks as if no person belonged to this group who was not at a later stage included among the Apostles, but the point is not by any means certain.

The adoption of the term ‘disciples’ to denote the followers of our Lord requires no explanation. The primary sense of the word indicates the relation of a pupil to his teacher, and the designation was therefore the most natural and appropriate which could be employed.

The **Twelve**. This phrase explains itself. As soon as our Lord had selected a specific number of persons for a definite end, it was to be expected that they should be called by the number which they formed. They were twelve, and were accordingly known as ‘the Twelve.’ It is doubtful whether it is proper to supply such a substantive as ‘disciples’ or ‘apostles.’ There is authority in the NT for the use of both of these phrases, but it does not follow that the name first given to this inmost circle of our Lord’s adherents was ‘the twelve disciples’ or ‘the twelve apostles’ rather than ‘the Twelve.’ A time came when all three designations were current. St. Matthew mentions ‘the Twelve’ four times (Mat 10:5; Mat 26:14; Mat 26:20; Mat 26:47), St. Mark nine times (Mar 4:10; Mar 6:7; Mar 9:35; Mar 10:32; Mar 11:11; Mar 14:10; Mar 14:17; Mar 14:20; Mar 14:43), St. Luke six times (Luk 8:1; Luk 9:1; Luk 9:12; Luk 18:31; Luk 22:3; Luk 22:47), and St. John four times (Joh 6:67; Joh 6:70-71; Joh 20:24). St. Matthew speaks four times (Mat 10:1; Mat 11:1; Mat 20:17; Mat 26:20) of ‘the twelve disciples,’ but he stands alone in his use of this description. It is worth while to observe that after the death of Judas the phrase ‘the Eleven’ was employed precisely as ‘the Twelve’ had been. It is found absolutely in Luk 24:9; it is found with the substantive ‘disciples’ in Mat 28:16, and with the substantive ‘apostles’ in Act 1:26.

The word ἀπόστολος occurs ten times in the Gospels. In the Gospel of St. John it is used only in its etymological sense of *a person sent forth* (Joh 13:16); in the other three Gospels it refers to the twelve disciples of our Lord. But there is some doubt as to the meaning it bears in each of these Gospels. St. Matthew employs it once only—in the passage already quoted: ‘The names of the twelve apostles are these’ (Mat 10:2). This language is used to introduce the list of the Apostles, together with the charge addressed to them. The term may be understood here in either of two senses: it may designate the Twelve as sent out on one special mission of evangelization, or it may bear the meaning which it has in Christendom to-day. A decision between these senses is hardly possible in the case of St. Matthew’s Gospel. It is otherwise with the Gospel of St. Mark. Here the term is employed twice (Mar 3:14, Mar 6:30), and apparently in both instances only with regard to the particular missionary tour or journey on which they were about to enter. The use of the term in St. Luke is noteworthy. It occurs six times. Once (Luk 11:49) it is possibly used in its etymological meaning of *messenger*; in two other places (Luk 6:13, Luk 9:10) it may be used to designate the special mission on which the Twelve were first sent; but in the remaining three (Luk 17:5, Luk 22:14, Luk 24:10) it is employed to designate the

Twelve in their capacity as the representatives of Jesus, the sense which it commonly bears in the Acts.

It is unnecessary for our present purpose to enter on the history of the word 'apostle' in Greek. That the word was in use in NT times in its etymological sense of *messenger* is generally allowed. This fact is confirmed by the NT itself. Our Lord, in speaking to His disciples on the night of the betrayal, declared that the person sent (apostle) is not greater than he that sent him (Joh_13:16). Again when our Lord is designated in Heb_3:1 as 'the apostle and high priest of our confession,' the reference is probably to His own description of Himself as 'the sent of God' (Joh_17:18). There is then clear evidence that the word was current in our Lord's time in its sense of *messenger*, *delegate*, *envoy*. Was it also in use in a technical sense to designate those who were despatched from the mother city by the rulers of the race on any foreign mission, especially such as were charged with collecting the tribute paid to the temple service? (Lightfoot, *Gal.* 93). And was it this usage which suggested to our Lord His own employment of the term? There is no evidence to show that the term was current in this technical sense before the Gospels were written. Besides, even though it had been in existence, it is doubtful whether our Lord would have employed a term which had already in the minds of His hearers distinct associations of its own. The absence of such associations would recommend a term to Him. It was the very simplicity and directness of the expression 'apostle' which won for it the favour of our Lord. The Twelve were simply to be His messengers or envoys. The analogy between His own case and that of the men. He had selected was always present to His mind. He had been sent by the Father: they were to be sent by Himself. A technical term could only have served to bewilder the Twelve and lead them to misconceive the object of their mission. What was necessary for our Lord's purpose was a word which set forth simply and aptly the relations of the Twelve to Himself, and for this there was no more suitable term than 'messenger,' 'envoy.' The term 'apostle' then was not suggested to our Lord by its currency as a technical expression. He chose a common word and adapted it to His own purpose. He wished to give the most expressive title to the men whom He had chosen, and none seemed to Him so suitable as the word 'sent.' It reminded them perpetually that they were men with a mission.

It is generally held that the name 'apostles' was given to the Twelve on the occasion of their call. The language of St. Luke (Luk_6:13) does not compel us to adopt this conclusion, nor is that of St. Mark (Mar_3:14) decisive on the point.* [Note: It should be noted that the words οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν do not occur in TR. See, however, RVm.] The statements in both Gospels are consistent alike with the view that the Apostles were so named when they were first called, and with the view that this title was bestowed on them at a later date. The other considerations to which appeal may be made tell in opposite directions. It may be urged that the impression

left on the mind of an ordinary reader is that the Apostles received their name at the time of their call, but it does not follow that this impression is correct. For it is said in the same context that our Lord gave to Simon the name *Peter*, and we know that this name was given to him long before he became an Apostle. This proves that the statements made in connexion with the appointment of the Twelve must not be pressed as if they referred to that event exclusively. Again, it may be contended with much propriety that there was a special fitness in our Lord assigning a new name to the men whom He had set apart for a new task. The new relation might well be designated by a new name. But it may be pointed out in reply that an interval elapsed between the choice of the Twelve and their being sent forth. Is it not probable that the new designation was given only when the new vocation was actually begun? Would the new title be understood apart from the experience by which it was illuminated? This argument is strengthened by the circumstance that St. Mark appears to employ the term 'apostle' only in connexion with the missionary journey of the Twelve. With him it is not so much a title belonging to them, as a term descriptive of the functions assigned to them on a special occasion. To decide between these conflicting opinions is not easy, but on the whole the suggestion that the disciples were not called 'apostles' till they were first sent out appears the more probable.

The Sermon on the Mount is regarded by many as an address delivered by our Lord when He chose the Twelve. The note of time in the Gospel of St. Luke ascribes it to this occasion, and there is no reason to reject this testimony. Besides, it has the greatest internal probability in its favour. The appointment of the Apostles formed an epoch in the ministry of our Lord; what more natural or suitable than that He should avail Himself of the occasion to explain and enforce His convictions as to the true life of man? The time was most opportune for such a deliverance. The hearts of the disciples were deeply moved; their whole natures were quickened and alert; why not sow seed which might afterwards bear abundant fruit? The character of the Sermon itself is another argument confirming this conclusion. It is didactic rather than hortatory. It expounds truth rather than proclaims the mercy of God. Finally, there is nothing in the Sermon which conflicts with this opinion. It may then be assumed with some confidence that the Sermon on the Mount was spoken in connexion with the call of the Twelve. Many writers go further and contend that it was spoken to them principally or exclusively. But this opinion is at variance with the statements of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, and is not required by the contents of the Sermon. The truths it announces were not intended for the Twelve alone; why then should they not have been heard by all the disciples? This result is in no way inconsistent with the opinion that the Sermon on the Mount formed, as it were, a special charge to the Twelve in view of the new position which they were henceforward to occupy. It is not necessary for our purpose to discuss the limits of the Sermon or do more than furnish a brief account of its teaching. Our Lord wished His followers to understand the meaning of righteousness; to know what the will of

God really was; the true nature of the demands He made on them; how to frame their conduct if they were to obtain His approval. The subject of the address then is the true life of man. The characteristic features of that life are set forth in a series of blessings pronounced on those who possess the qualities spoken of; the mission of Christians as the light of the world and the salt of the earth is touched on; and then our Lord proceeds to contrast the perfect requirements of the Law of God as understood by Himself with the requirements of that Law as contained in the OT or as sanctioned by tradition; after which He illustrates the true nature of almsgiving, fasting, and prayer, and of devotion to the will of God. See Sermon on the Mount below, and in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , Ext. Vol. 1 ff.

It would have been most instructive had any record of the effect produced on the Apostles by this Sermon been preserved. Their surprise must have equalled their admiration. The severe requirements, the strictures on the Law, the novelty of the interpretations, the apparent paradoxes, must have astonished and perplexed them. It is doing them no injustice to say that much it contained was beyond their comprehension. They may have seen that the qualities required of them were embodied in our Lord's own life, and that the temper of the Beatitudes was exactly His temper. They may have felt that the sphere of the inner life was not less properly the sphere of law than that of speech and conduct. They may have discerned that the true greatness of man is to live not merely as God enjoins, but as God Himself lives. But they could hardly grasp what our Lord meant by the fulfilment of the Law. A fulfilment which was at the same time an abolition was a mystery to them. Nor would they perceive that He had transformed morality by reducing it to the principle of life according to God; the one supreme rule of duty being to love God and man. The paradoxical expressions, too, would be as puzzling to them as they have proved to thousands since. In their discussions there would be champions of literalism, but these would soon be brought to acknowledge that a perfectly literal obedience to the commands given was impracticable.

4. *Training of the Apostles.*—From the call of the Apostles the mission of our Lord was more a mission to them than to His fellow-countrymen at large. He had waited until the time that a proper selection from His disciples could be made: now that the choice had taken place He devoted Himself to their instruction and training. The Apostles were to accompany Jesus from place to place; they were to be with Him continually. This implied the relinquishment of their means of living. It was not possible for them to continue at their occupations and be Apostles of Jesus. The sacrifice made by each Apostle in obeying the summons to apostleship has seldom been adequately appreciated. In some instances the property left or sold, the income abandoned, might not be great intrinsically, but a man's all is great to him, hence the moral courage needed of every Apostle was not slight. How then were their wants supplied? Whence did they obtain money to meet their daily expenses? The

arrangement followed was probably devised by our Lord, and formed one of the earliest lessons He intended them to master. In a sense this first lesson is the supreme and even the sole lesson which He sought to teach, that of absolute reliance on Himself for everything. Trust in the Father, trust in Himself, was the lesson which Jesus sought to inculcate at all times. The Twelve and our Lord formed, as it were, a single household, of which He was the head. He presided at the common meals, He gave directions as to their movements. The cost of their maintenance was borne by a common purse. One of the Twelve was the treasurer of the company (Joh 13:28). The food needed was either carried with them, or purchased, or provided by the hospitality which is so characteristic of the East. The company could not only supply their own wants, but could minister to those of the poor (Joh 13:29). The sources from which their supplies were drawn were doubtless various. Some among them had had or still had property, and the proceeds, contributed to the common stock, helped to defray the charges of each day. It is almost certain that presents were made to our Lord and the company from time to time by grateful friends and neighbours. But the principal source seems to have been the generosity of several women who accompanied them on some of their journeys, and placed their means and services at the command of our Lord. The names of some of these women have been preserved in a most instructive passage in St. Luke's Gospel (Luk 8:2-3), which is the chief authority on the subject under consideration. Among these are mentioned Mary of Magdala, Joanna (possibly a widow whose husband had been a steward of Herod Antipas), and Susanna. It is evident from St. Luke's statement that the number of such women was large, and it was probably owing to their generosity that our Lord and the Twelve were able to devote themselves untroubled and untrammelled to their task. It should be noticed that the kind of life lived by the Twelve was itself a practical illustration of some of the cardinal lessons which Jesus desired to teach. The subordinate value of earthly possessions could not have been more effectively taught than by the life of dependence on the liberality of others. Their journeys, too, from place to place had also their value. They were stimulated by new scenes and new persons; new conditions had to be faced, new duties performed. They had leisure to ponder on what was said to them; they were not distracted from the great work of their life, the knowledge of their Master. This was their duty, and it became their glory. For in understanding Him they came to resemble Him. The education of the Twelve, the transformation of them from the men they were into the men they became, is one of the greatest of our Lord's achievements. The Apostles were to be our Lord's witnesses, but the witnessing of which He thought demanded insight, sympathy, courage, self-command, tolerance, patience, charity. It was inseparable from the highest moral endowments. It involved great receptive and assimilative power, issuing in vigorous and unceasing obedience and service.

In order that the Apostles might become His witnesses, our Lord made use of three principal agencies: (a) His personality, (b) His miracles, and (c) His teaching.

(a) *To be with Jesus* was in itself the best of all education and training. It was on this account that the Apostles were chosen to be with Him habitually. A complete knowledge of Him could be attained only in this way. For knowledge is acquired insensibly not less than sensibly, and the Apostles learned much regarding Jesus when it never struck them that they were doing so. Gradually His influence told on them. His ideals, motives, ends became clear to them. His manners, looks, tones, words, ways became their inspiration and guide. They felt what goodness, truth, duty were. Above all, they came to know God as the Father. It would, however, be a serious error to hold that the Twelve from the first moment of their selection appreciated the true grandeur of the life of Jesus. On the contrary, that life must often have presented to them a problem of no little difficulty. It was not the type of life which they had been accustomed to regard as specifically religious, still less as embodying religion in its perfection and integrity. It is probable that those of the Apostles who had been disciples of the Baptist were at first more impressed by his austere and solitary life than by the life of Jesus, which was substantially that of ordinary men. He ate and drank as they did. He dressed like them. He moved freely among them. He never sought to protect Himself from the approach of men, but on the contrary invited them to draw near. Nothing in His bearing or speech betrayed that He regarded Himself as standing on a different plane from other men, or that He expected them to treat Him as belonging to a different order of existence. He was simple, genial, affable, accessible. His mode of life, too, viewed as religious, must have filled them with surprise. He had no fixed hours or forms of prayer. His approach to the Father was the expression of His habitual reverence, adoration, and trust, but it was not determined, much less fettered, by rule. He prayed as He was moved to pray. Again, He departed from a usage which was one of the chief features of the piety of the time. He declined to fast. Not only had He no regular fast days, He neither fasted Himself nor did He inculcate the observance on them. Another respect in which He deviated widely from the religious practices of His time was His disregard of ceremonial ablutions. He paid no attention to the rules affecting ritual purity. There is no evidence that He violated the usages of His nation as to foods, but His attitude towards these showed that He attached no value to them. Even that rite which was fundamental and distinctive, the pledge of salvation because the assurance of being a member of the covenant, the rite of *circumcision*, was unnoticed in His teaching. In yet another and hardly less important respect our Lord's life was largely different from the accepted type of sanctity. The *Sabbath*, like *circumcision*, was one of the peculiar glories of Judaism, and the teachers of our Lord's age and of preceding generations had framed a code of rules to protect it from desecration. These He trampled under foot. The endless regulations intended to stop the performance of any work whatever on that day He brushed aside as at variance with the true end of the Sabbath institution. He rejoiced in the Sabbath, esteeming it to be one of God's best gifts to man, but He was everywhere denounced as a Sabbath-breaker by those who regarded themselves as the interpreters of the law

(Joh_5:18). Even in the matter of almsgiving He was not as the men who professed to be specially religious. He was beneficent in the highest degree, but He followed no systematic rules.

Hence it is plain that the tenor of our Lord's life must have formed a problem of no little complexity to the Twelve during the first stages of their apprenticeship. Was this life—so simple, so natural—a truly religious life? Was the religious life bright, sunny, cheerful, full of hope and joy? Was this life of simple trust in the Father and of obedience to His will in the fulfilment of the common duties of life—was this religion? Nor was the perplexity of the Apostles lessened by the classes with which our Lord preferred to associate. He addressed Himself to the sick, the poor, and the outcast. The solicitude of Jesus for the least necessitous of these classes was a difficulty to some of them, but their surprise rose to the height when they saw Him mix freely with those under a social ban.

Doubtless the eyes of the Apostles were opened gradually. They came to perceive, as we do to-day, that the life spent by their Master was the typical life of man. Its likeness to the common life of men is its glory. For by it the common life which all must live is transfigured and made the ideal life of men. Its freedom from rule is discerned to be the reason why it is capable of becoming the model of all lives without exception. For that freedom teaches men that true religion creates its own forms, while its essence of trust in God and devotion to His will remains unalterable. The sympathy which He exhibited for all classes was a revelation of the truth that He was the Saviour of the world.

(*b*) Perhaps nothing impressed our Lord's disciples more when they first became acquainted with Him than His *miracles*. The expectation that the Messiah would work miracles seems to have been general. The Gospels leave the impression that the common people anticipated that works of a most marvellous description would be performed by the Messiah. The nature of these works was undefined, but they transcended the ordinary endowments of man. The Twelve then may have felt little surprise when they saw their Lord perform miracles, but every new miracle would serve to strengthen their conviction of His title to be the Messiah. It is not likely, however, that they were prepared for the kind of miracles which He worked. None of them could have foretold that the Messiah would confine Himself in great measure to the accomplishment of miraculous cures of body and mind; that He would spend many hours on many days in healing sickness and in expelling demons. The miracles of Jesus were as unexpected as His mode of life. The Apostles were dreaming of miracles of judgment at the very hour when he was performing miracles of mercy. Even the miracles over nature were not those of which they naturally thought.

The Apostles could not fail to perceive the range of the power wielded by their Master and be filled with amazement. No disease could withstand His word or touch. The very demons yielded to His sway. Death itself was powerless before Him. It is important to notice that some of the miracles were performed before the Apostles only. The miracles in which the Apostles as a whole or some of them were specially concerned are these: the Miraculous Draught of Fishes recorded by St. Luke ([Luk_5:1-7](#)), the Stilling of the Storm ([Mar_4:39](#)), the Walking on the Sea ([Mar_6:48](#), [Joh_6:16](#)), the Stater in the Fish's Mouth ([Mat_17:27](#)), the Cursing of the Fig-tree ([Mar_11:20](#)), and the Second Miraculous Draught of Fishes ([Joh_21:11](#)). These signs had a peculiar value for the Twelve. They were proofs of knowledge and of power fitted to promote faith and to enforce truth. There is a fitness in the circumstance that most of the miracles on nature were wrought before or on behalf of the Apostles. For they more than others were prepared to embrace the truth that Jesus was the Lord of nature. It was indispensable that they should be taught this fact, and how could it have been better illustrated than by the miracles wrought on the Sea of Galilee? What a revelation of the knowledge or power of Jesus; what a prophecy of the success of the new vocation to which they were summoned, was the first draught of fishes! What a lesson concerning the might of Jesus was contained in the instant obedience of the raging waves and winds to His command! What a fresh disclosure of His power was His walking towards them on the sea as they toiled to make the western shore of the lake! What instruction to Peter and to the rest when Peter first succeeded in imitating his Master's walking on the water and then began to sink! How fraught with suggestions to Peter the coin found in the mouth of the first fish which came to his book as he lowered it into the lake! What confirmation of all that they had learned was found in the second draught of fishes, that after the Resurrection! The cursing of the fig-tree occupies a place by itself among our Lord's miracles, but the lesson it teaches is most weighty. A miracle of judgment is as suitable as a parable of judgment. The lesson of the need of correspondence between profession and practice could not have been more impressively taught than by the fate of the fig-tree.

No one can doubt that the number and variety of the miracles witnessed by the Apostles enhanced their conception of our Lord's person and powers. Perhaps, too, they discerned, even if imperfectly, what is so clear to us to-day, that the miracles were indeed what He called them, *signs*: manifestations of the character and qualities of the kingdom which He had come to set up. The boundless sympathy and compassion of their Master must have struck them; His life not less than His teaching was mercy and service. His works of mercy were the living embodiment of the principles of mercy He inculcated. He healed all who sought His aid, making no inquiry into their past, their station, their gifts, but caring only for their needs. It was impossible for the Apostles not to discover that the miracles they beheld with such

frequency were signs of the grace and love of the Father speaking to men through Jesus.

As the Apostles saw the miracles and heard what Jesus said respecting them, did they form a just conception of their nature and function? Were they able to compare them with the portents for which they had at one time longed? Did they perceive the relation of the signs to the person of Jesus? Did they discern that the signs could be fully understood only through His character? Did they recognize that the character and words of Jesus were greater than His signs, but that these were nevertheless such as to convince every impartial judge that His mission was of God? They knew that Jesus never regarded His miracles as the chief evidence for the validity of His claims; they were neither His sole nor His principal credentials; they were rather a part and element of His message and His work. Did they see clearly that the evidential value of the miracles did not consist in their departure from the established order of nature, in their capacity as marvels, but in their congruity with the character and aims of Jesus, and as illustrations of His spirit and ways? We would gladly learn whether the Apostles ever reflected on the use made by our Lord of His miraculous endowments. Believing in Him as the Lord of nature and of life, aware that He had unnumbered forces at His command, were they surprised that He never employed His powers to promote His advantage or to defend His disciples or Himself from injustice and violence? Whence this self-repression? Why was the sphere of the miraculous so strictly limited? Why were none of the miracles of a character to dazzle, compel, overwhelm? Why did Jesus refuse so often the request for a sign, and especially for a sign from heaven? Why was the thaumaturgic element wholly absent from His works? The fact that our Lord observed a peculiar temperance in the employment of His miraculous gifts must have imprinted itself on the minds of the Apostles, and it is probable that the significance of the fact became more and more obvious as their experience widened. Even before the Crucifixion they may have discerned that this self-restraint was in full harmony with His attitude towards the world, and only the corollary of His conception of the Kingdom. See, further, art. Miracles.

(c) From the first, the disciples had regarded Jesus as a *teacher*, and whatever more He became to them as their intercourse with Him deepened, a teacher He remained to the end. Or, to speak more correctly, from being *a* teacher He became *the* Teacher; and the greatest of teachers, measured by any proper standard, He certainly was and abides. The substance of His teaching is the truest, wisest, and best on the loftiest and weightiest of all topics—topics as to which all teachers before Him were as men groping in the dark. He and He alone speaks with the confidence of personal knowledge regarding the nature of God and His relations to man. It is sufficient for our present purpose to refer to the naturalness, the ease, the familiarity with which Jesus spoke concerning the Kingdom of God; the character and intentions of the Father; the righteousness He requires; the conditions on which entrance into the

Kingdom depends; its history and its final issues; the testimony borne by Jesus to Himself; the place He assigns to His person and work. Never man so spake (Joh 7:46). Yet He speaks what He knows, and testifies of what He has seen (Joh 3:11). Here, if anywhere, the entire religious experience of mankind affirms the truth of the witness He bore. His message authenticates itself; it bears the seal of its Divine origin upon it. Such views never sprang up within the mind of man; they descended out of heaven from God.

And this teaching was conveyed to the disciples and to the people according to definite methods and in language which forms an epoch in human speech. It is unlikely that our Lord ever reflected on the problems which form the science and art of teaching, or that He ever laid down rules for His own guidance; but the essence of all that is best in the writings of the great educators is embodied in His practice. Let a reader come to the Gospels full of what he has learned regarding education from Plato and Aristotle and their successors, and he can perceive without difficulty, in the relations between our Lord and the Apostles; in His attitude towards them; in His modes of stimulating, enlarging, and enriching their minds; in His tact, patience, and wisdom,—the signs of skill which is incomparable because so spontaneous, so flexible, and so fertile of resource. Never for a moment did He lose sight of His object, to qualify the Apostles to be His witnesses and representatives; but He did not dwell on that purpose. He was aware that the power of personality is the strongest and most penetrating of all forces, and accordingly He separated the Apostles more and more, as the days went by, from their familiar scenes and labours, in order that they might, because of their complete intimacy with Him, breathe His spirit and share in His aims. They were ennobled, as it were, despite themselves. New ideals and motives took possession of them. He was so constantly before their eyes, so continually the subject of their speech, so much the centre of their interests and the goal of their hopes, that they grew into His image. Not less evident was His desire that the Apostles should not be mere echoes of Himself, but men of originality, courage, and resource. It was on this account that He delivered no systematic instruction; that He caused nothing to be committed to memory; that He did not store the minds of the Apostles with rules, lists of duties, tables of the forbidden and the permissible. Hence He gave no dogmas in fixed shape even on the greatest of all subjects. Hence, too, He furnished no directory for the duties of the day, and made no attempt to prescribe the hours to be employed in devotion or the words to be used, or to determine the provision to be made for the sick and the poor. Again, He taught only as His disciples were able to receive. Not that He never went beyond their capacity. This He frequently did, and of set purpose. But He observed an order in what He said. The most obvious illustration of this fact is His teaching regarding His person. He did not begin to tell at once who He was, nor did He open His lips as to His death until He had evoked from Peter's lips as the spokesman of the Twelve the confession that He was the Messiah (Mar 8:29, Mat 16:16, Luk 9:20). It is expressly stated that He kept back much from His

disciples, leaving them to the enlightenment of the Spirit, because they were unprepared to receive what He had to communicate (Joh_16:12). If He spoke of what they did not comprehend at once, it was either that their intellects might be quickened or that they might treasure in their memories the truth mentioned, in view of their future experience. His references to His death had as their chief aim to render the Apostles certain of the fact and, above all, that it was foreknown by Him. Nor was He impatient for results. He never forced growth. He knew that to build durably is to build slowly; and so He bore with ignorance, with misapprehension, with imperfect views, with partial and hasty inferences, knowing that these would be corrected by the discipline of experience. He sought especially to preserve the individuality of His disciples, and to unfold the characteristic endowments of each. None of them was to be other than himself. No one was to be a model for the rest. He knew each so well that He could play on him as on an instrument, but this knowledge He used only to promote the welfare of the disciple. The manifestation of personal character, the personal discernment of truth, the exhibition of personal sympathy, appreciation, reverence, devotion, love, filled Him with delight.

The Gospels show on every page that our Lord encouraged the disciples to ask Him questions. Whatever difficulties presented themselves to their minds they were free to place before Him. This they did so constantly that the habit must have been created by our Lord. How large a portion of the Gospels is occupied with the questions and remarks of the Apostles! It is to these questions that we are indebted for the explanation of the parable of the Sower (Mar_4:10). The same is true of His teaching regarding defilement (Mat_15:15). How much we owe to Peter's questions—'How often shall my brother sin against me and I forgive him?' (Mat_18:21); 'What shall we have therefore?' (Mat_19:27). But perhaps the finest illustration of the relations of our Lord and the Apostles in this connexion is the intercourse on the night of the betrayal. No passage in the Gospels is so instructive as to the readiness of the disciples to break in by questions on what our Lord was saying, and the skill with which He availed Himself of these questions to open to them His deepest thoughts and purposes (Joh_13:36 ff.).

The resources of human speech have been strained to the utmost to describe the grace and power of the language of Jesus, and yet the result is felt to be inadequate. Did the Apostles recognize the originality, the strength, the flexibility, the charm, the aptness, the simplicity, the depth of the words of Jesus? We cannot tell; it may have been that their apprehension of the beauty and majesty of His language was much less than ours, but even they must have felt a strange thrill as they heard the most sublime of all truths clothed in terms which they were in the habit of using every day of their lives. It was a new experience to have religion speak the tongue of the home, the workshop, and the street. Then, too, the illustrations which He used! The whole life of the ordinary man was laid under tribute to illustrate the Kingdom of God. The

furniture of his home, his food, his clothing, his work, his intercourse with his fellows were made the symbol and the vesture of heavenly truths. Earth shone in the light of heaven. One form of speech is specially identified with the teaching of Jesus—the **parable**. The parable may be regarded as the creation of Jesus. The parables of the OT, and those found in Jewish writings, hardly deserve mention in this respect. Nor did Jesus teach in parables because the language of parable is the language of the East. He devised the parable to meet the requirements of His hearers. The parable is His own workmanship, the product of His mind and heart. The parables of Jesus are unique alike in literature and religion, and are as distinctive of Him as the miracles.

An ordinary reader of the Gospels is apt to suppose that the ministry of Jesus, from its beginning to its close, was distinguished by the use of parables. But this opinion is erroneous. No parables marked the opening of the ministry. The first use of the parable is noticed at length. To the question why Jesus finally adopted the parable most men would reply—to attract, to interest, to stimulate, to find the readiest and most direct access to the mind for truth and duty. But when the Gospels are consulted they give an answer altogether different. They tell that our Lord, when questioned on the subject, affirmed that He taught in parables, not to reveal but to conceal the truth; not to instruct but to condemn men (Mar_4:12). These words have always been a stumbling-block to interpreters. Perhaps their true significance may never be ascertained; but the view which rejects them as the correct description of the parables as a whole is justified, because they are at variance with the Gospels themselves. The most cursory examination of the parables shows that many of them are messages of grace. Who can fail to discern that the heart of God is represented in the parable of the Prodigal Son as the heart of a Father? Is this truth meant to extinguish hope? Again, an examination reveals that many of the parables were spoken to the disciples themselves. Was this the penalty of their blindness and hardness of heart? Accordingly, the common view of the parable is the true view, and our Lord spoke in parables to render his teaching as simple, vivid, stimulating, and effective as possible. See Parables, and Illustrations.

The extent to which the parables were addressed to the Twelve has scarcely received adequate recognition. Indeed the parables are seldom spoken of in connexion with the education of the Twelve. Yet one-third of them were, to all appearance, directed to the Apostles exclusively. These cover the period from the time when our Lord first began to speak in parables till His death. The ten parables belonging to this class, following the order first of St. Matthew and then of St. Luke, are: the Hidden Treasure, the Pearl, the Drag-net, the Unmerciful Servant, the Labourers in the Vineyard, the Ten Virgins, the Talents, the Friend at Midnight, the Unprofitable Servant, the Unjust Judge. A slight acquaintance with these parables shows that the lessons they teach were those our Lord was most anxious that His disciples should learn. The measureless value of the kingdom of God, the certainty of a final

severance between the evil and the good, the necessity of a forgiving disposition, the nature and conditions of the future recompense, the obligation of watchfulness, the reward of perseverance in prayer, the truth that no men have claims of merit on God, are the subjects with which these parables deal, and these subjects were constantly in the heart and on the lips of our Lord. A flood of light was thrown on all these topics by the parables. The truth was now clearer, more comprehensible, more affecting, more subduing.

Is it possible to discover the sentiments with which the Twelve listened to the parables? Perhaps they were too plain men to perceive their exquisite naturalness and beauty. In all their discussions concerning them not a word may have been spoken in praise of that perfect felicity which secures for them an unequalled place in the literature of the world. But they would at least perceive their appropriateness. How they must have lived in their memories and illuminated truth and duty! Did the Twelve find any difficulty in understanding the import of the parables? Presumably their condition was just that of the diligent and devout reader of to-day. Some parables bear their meanings, as it were, on their forehead. Nobody doubts what is the meaning of the parable of the Good Samaritan or of the Ten Virgins. It is true that there are questions connected with their interpretation which are still under discussion, but the lessons which they inculcate are obvious. But what of the parables which perplex expositors to-day? What of the Unjust Steward? What of the Labourers in the Vineyard? The same difficulties which occur to us must have occurred to the disciples. But they had this immense advantage over us that they could ask their Master questions as to His meaning, and we know that these questions were freely put. The interpretations of the parables of the Sower and of the Tares are said to have been replies made to the request of the disciples for an explanation. What strikes one in these answers is the point, depth, freshness of the meaning. These explanations have sometimes been assigned to the Apostles themselves, but the supposition is without probability. Were it sound, it would form the most striking proof of the effect on them of their intercourse with Jesus, for it is impossible to suggest juster or more suitable interpretations of the parables concerned. One peculiarly instructive sentence was spoken by our Lord in this connexion (Mat 13:52). He had been expounding some of the parables to His disciples, and asked if He had been understood. When they replied affirmatively, He remarked that every teacher of the Law instructed regarding the kingdom of heaven was like a householder who produced from his stores things new and old. The Apostles were the scribes of Jesus, taught to understand the nature, characteristics, and history of the Kingdom of God, and hence capable of furnishing most profitable instruction to their hearers. The old and the new alike were at their command in their mutual relations and connexions. They did not despise the one nor vaunt themselves concerning the other. The Law and the Gospel, prophecy and its accomplishment, the Law and its fulfilment, furnished them with the subjects which they could treat with knowledge and power.

After the Twelve had been some time with our Lord, they were sent forth on a missionary journey (mission of the Apostles, Mar 6:7, Mat 10:5, Luk 9:1). The time at which the mission took place, the town from which they started, the duration of the mission, are uncertain. Two reasons probably influenced our Lord in despatching the Twelve on this enterprise. The first and most prominent was His profound sympathy for the condition of the people of Galilee. It was impossible for Him to evangelize all Galilee, to say nothing of the entire land; others must share His labours. This was one of the ends for which the Twelve had been chosen, and accordingly He sent them to announce everywhere that the Kingdom of God was nigh. A second reason was that He might in this way train them for their future career. The message which they were to proclaim corresponded with their own comparative immaturity on the one hand, and with the spiritual state of their audiences on the other. To have declared the Messiahship of Jesus would have led to misunderstanding, and have hindered rather than furthered the expansion of the kingdom; hence they were confined to the assertion, so full of promise and hope, that the Kingdom was at hand. To assist them in discharging their mission as the envoys of Jesus they were endowed with miraculous powers. They were enabled to cure disease and to expel demons. These powers they were to exercise gratuitously. This liberality was intended by Jesus to be an evidence of the nature of the kingdom, of which they announced the near approach. It was to be a kingdom of compassion, sympathy, tenderness. These endowments, besides serving to show the nature of the kingdom, were also a demonstration of the truth of their message. The Apostles were enjoined to make no special provision for the mission on which they were about to enter. They were to start on it just as they were. They were to take neither money, nor food, nor clothing for their journey. They were to rely for their maintenance on the providence of God, and on the hospitality which they were to seek. Because of the urgency of the case their attention was to be concentrated on the lost sheep of the house of Israel. It is, indeed, not probable that our Lord meant their mission to extend beyond Galilee, or even to the whole of the province, the Greek-speaking cities being excluded. The efforts of the Twelve were probably intended to be restricted to the homes of the people. No reference is made in the instructions given them to any appearance in the synagogue or in the market-place. Their inexperience did not permit them to deliver addresses in public. The Twelve were sent on their mission by twos; that is, six different enterprises were carried on by them at once. The wisdom of this arrangement is obvious. It was desirable that they should overtake as many of the population as possible, but it was not less important that they should be encouraged and strengthened by one another's presence. Had each of the Twelve entered on the work alone, he would have felt isolated and discouraged, and often have been at a loss how to act. No agreement exists among scholars as to the length of time occupied by the mission. Some consider that it lasted only a single day, others two days, others several weeks, and others again, several months. It may be pronounced with confidence that it took up some weeks at least.

The Twelve strictly followed the commands they received, passing through the villages, preaching repentance and the gospel, and casting out demons and healing everywhere. How their message was received does not appear. It is simply known that on their return they told our Lord what they had done and taught. No reference is made to the experience they had acquired or to the conclusions they had been led to form. It would have been most profitable had any information on these points reached us. Not less advantageous would it have been for us to know how they felt when they wrought their first miracles. Were they startled? Did they exult? Or were they grateful and humble? We can but speculate on these points, but we may feel assured that the Apostles profited not a little by this their first mission. Besides those lessons of confidence in the wisdom and power of their Master which they were always receiving, they were taught how to apply the truths they had learned, and how to use the powers with which they were clothed. They were forced to act for themselves, to reflect and decide in a way which elicited their latent capabilities.

From this point the education and training of the Apostles may be regarded as merged in the life of our Lord, and the further treatment of the subject must be sought under the relevant articles. The intercourse between our Lord and the Apostles should be regarded from their side if the work He accomplished in their case is to be fully appreciated and understood. To study the life and teaching of Jesus through the eyes and minds of the Apostles is advantageous in no common degree, because of the many new questions which are thus raised, and which cannot be determined without a clearer and fuller insight being obtained into the wisdom of the methods He followed in preparing them to expound His thoughts and to extend His kingdom. A list of some of the more important topics to be considered may be serviceable. They are such as these: the question put to the Twelve at the crisis in Galilee, 'Will ye also go away?' the confession of Peter, and its significance for the Apostles; the predictions of the death and resurrection made, it would appear, to the Apostles only; the strife for the first places in the Kingdom, and the action taken by our Lord regarding it; the words spoken to the Apostles on the night of the betrayal, some of which form a parting charge to them; the appearances to the Eleven; the final commands addressed to them. Two subjects besides are deserving of particular notice: the inner circle of the Apostles—Peter, James, and John, the Three within the Twelve; and the many questions connected with the name of Judas Iscariot.

The Christian Church rests on the Apostles, for the Christian Church is their creation. But they, in turn, were the creation of Jesus. That He transformed them in so brief, a space of time from the men they were when called, as to be able to convince the world that He was the Messiah of Israel, the Son of God, the Saviour of mankind, is not the least of His titles to the admiration and the gratitude of men; for His success proves what can be made of ordinary men when they surrender themselves to the guidance of His spirit.

Literature.—The chief books to be consulted are the Commentaries on the Gospels and the Lives of Christ, together with art. ‘Apostle’ in the different *Bible Dictionaries* and *Encyclopaedias*, though the best of these are meagre and inadequate for the purposes of the student of the Gospels. For a general treatment two valuable works in English should be named—Bruce’s *Training of the Twelve* and Latham’s *Pastor Pastorum*. On the name and office of an Apostle see Lightfoot, *Galatians 5* [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 92-101; Hort, *Christian Ecclesia*, 22-41; and on the Apostolic group, *Expositor*, i. i. [1875] 29-43, iii. ix. [1889] 100 ff., 187 ff., 434 ff.

W. Patrick.

☩ Apparition

APPARITION

In Authorized Version this word occurs thrice, in the Apocr. [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] only: Wis 17:3 (Gr. ἴνδαλμα, Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘spectral form’), 2Ma 3:24 (Gr. ἐπιφάνεια, Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘apparition,’ (Revised Version margin) ‘manifestation’), and 2Ma 5:4 (Gr. ἐπιφάνεια, Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘vision,’ (Revised Version margin) ‘manifestation’). In Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 it occurs thrice only: Mat 14:26 || Mar 6:49 (φάντασμα Authorized Version ‘spirit’), and 2Ma 3:24 (as above).

The Revisers have used this word in its ordinary current sense of ‘an immaterial appearance, as of a real being, a spectre, phantom, or ghost.’ There is always connected with this term the idea of a *startling* or *unexpected* appearance, which seems also associated with the original φάντασμα. The immaterial appearance of a person supposed to be seen before (*double*) or soon after death (*ghost*), is a *wraith*; but these three synonyms are often interchanged.

The Jews of Christ’s time, like all unscientific minds (ancient and modern), believed in ghosts naturally, instinctively, uncritically. Dr. Swete (*The Gospel according to St. Mark*, London, 1898, p. 131) refers to Job 4:15 ff; Job 20:8, and especially to Wis 17:3 (4) and Wis 17:14 (Wis 17:15) for earlier evidence of a popular belief in apparitions among the Hebrew people. The disciples’ sudden shriek of terror (ἀνέκραξ

αυ, Mar 6:49) shows that they thought the phantom was real; but if we try to realize their attitude and outlook, we shall understand the futility of attributing to such naïve intelligences the discrimination of modern psychological research. The suggestions of excitable imaginations were indistinguishable from the actual presentations of objective reality. The best illustrations of their habits of thought must be sought in ancient and modern records of Oriental beliefs.

A. Erman (*Life in Ancient Egypt*, London, 1894, pp. 307, 308) says that ‘the Egyptians did not consider man as a simple individuality; he consisted of at least three parts, the body, the soul, and the ghost, the image, the double, or the genius, according as we translate the Egyptian word *Kα*.... After the death of a man, just as during his lifetime, the *Kα* was still considered to be the representative of his human personality, and so the body had to be preserved that the *Kα* might take possession of it when he pleased.... It is to their faith in the *Kα* that we owe all our knowledge of the home life of the people of ancient Egypt.’

E. J. W. Gibb (*History of Ottoman Poetry*, London, 1900, pp. 56-59) says that ‘according to the Sufi theory of the human soul it is a spirit, and therefore, by virtue of its own nature, in reality a citizen of the Spirit World. Its true home is there, and hence, for a certain season, it descends into this Physical Plane, where, to enable it to act upon its surroundings, it is clothed in a physical body.... The power of passing from the Physical World into the Spiritual is potential in every soul, but is actualized only in a few.’

For the mediaeval conception of the nature of ghosts see the *locus classicus*—Dante, *Purg.* xxv. 88-108—in which Dante explains his conception of the disembodied soul as having the power of operating on matter and impressing upon the surrounding air the shape which it animated in life (Aquinas), thus forming for itself an aerial vesture (Origen and St. Augustine). See also Dante, *Conv.* translation ii. c. 9, and Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theol.* pt. iii. suppl. qu. lxix, art. 1.

Keim (*Jesus of Nazara*, London, 1879, iv. 184-191) critically reviews the various explanations offered of the miracle of Jesus walking over the billows, but says nothing of the word φάντασμα, merely remarking (p. 190): ‘If we adhere to the actual narrative, the going on the water was far from being an act of an ordinary character—it was something divine or ghostly.’ For the latest criticism of the popular belief of NT times in the manifestations of the spirit world, see P. Wernle, *Beginnings of Christianity*, London, 1903, pp. 1-11.

☒ Appearance

APPEARANCE. See Christ in Art, and Portraits.

☒ Appearances

APPEARANCES.—See Resurrection.

☒ Appreciation (of Christ)

APPRECIATION (of Christ).—The whole NT is one long appreciation of Christ. It is no blind-fold acceptance of Him, no mere echo of a tradition, but a series of utterances of men personally convinced of the supreme value of Christ to the world. St. Paul speaks of Christ only as he himself has been influenced by the Lord, not as the disciples had described Jesus to him. His phrases—high, beautiful, and so often mystical—are the direct expressions of his own personal consciousness of Jesus Christ. No one has accused him of extravagance or of exaggeration. It is because he has felt that to be clothed with the Lord must be the perfection of power and joy, that he says, ‘Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ’ (Rom_13:14). It is because he has seen the love eternal that nothing imaginable can utterly root out again from the awakened heart, that he says, ‘Neither death, nor life, ... nor any other creation, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord’ (Rom_8:38 f.). And St. John opens his first Epistle with the strongest personal declaration of the whole of the Epistles, ‘that which we have heard, ... seen with our eyes, ... and our hands have handled of the word of life ... declare we unto you’ (1Jn_1:1).

But the simplest appreciation of all—as natural as a bird’s song or a child’s praise—is that which threads its way through every page of the Gospels. In spite of all the enmity written there; remembering that there were those who saw in Him an ally of Beelzebub (Mat_12:24), working with the devil’s aid; that some called Him ‘a gluttonous man, a wine-bibber, friend of publicans and sinners’ (Mat_11:19); that lawyers, and Pharisees, and Sadducees were ever watching to trip Him (Mat_22:15), and plotting with Herodians (Mat_22:16) to destroy Him; that the Galilaean cities, which should have known Him best,—Chorazin, Bethsaida, Capernaum (Mat_11:21; Mat_11:23), and even Nazareth,—rejected Him (Luk_4:28 f.); and remembering the

awful and lonely agonies of the last hours, we can yet point to the Gospels as abounding with witness to the wide contemporary appreciation of Christ.

It was most natural that it should be so, even when He is thought of entirely apart from any doctrine of His Divine personality. His own sympathy for others, and indeed for all things, was sure to attract others to Him. His quick perception of the good in all, His tender response to the least wave of the world's infinite music, show Him as destined to be the desired of men. He came upon the most diverse types, the most opposite of characters, and instantly knew their possibilities and their worth. He sees through the pure-minded hesitancy of Nathanael (Joh 1:47), He recognizes the true value of the widow's mite (Luk 21:1-4), He draws Nicodemus the timid to Him (Joh 3:1), He knows what will satisfy Thomas (Joh 20:27), and what will please and win Zacchaeus (Luk 19:5); and His immediate followers include a Mary Magdalene as well as a Mary of Bethany, a Judas as well as a John. Even the failures are appreciated by a standard of faith unknown to the world. He acknowledges the longing of the heart though a weak will robs it of fruition; He reads the zealous affection of Peter between the lines of a moment's Satanic pride (Mat 16:22), or a terror-stricken denial (Mat 26:70); He penetrates to the secret yearnings behind the materialistic questions of the woman at the well, and imparts to her His highest thought of God (Joh 4:24). He cannot even look upon the earth or sky but He must read into it the indwelling of the Eternal, find in all its pages picture and parable of spiritual realities. To His all-sensitive being the universe of things seen is but a symbol. The sower with his seed, the harvest-fields, the birds of the air, the fox in his hole, the sheep in the fold or lost on the hills, the wind that foretells heat or rain (Luk 12:54-55), the prophecies of the sunset (Mat 16:2), or the springtide promise of the sprouting fig-tree (Mar 13:28),—all passing through His appreciative spirit is treasured as the visible manuscript of God.

We might expect that such a receptive, comprehensive, and understanding nature would compel confidence. Men could not help trusting such deep and ready sympathy. And, as we read the Evangelists, one of their most notable traits is this—that they succeed in bringing together, almost without form, and apparently without intention, a wonderful accumulation of witness to the appreciation Jesus inspired from the first. The record is so varied. It is from no one school, or type, or rank. Almost every grade of life in the community is there—from the outcast and the leper to the Sanhedrist and the Roman centurion. From the first His gifts of healing attract the sufferers, and none are more definite in their acknowledgment of Him. The villagers bring their sick on beds to the market-places (Mar 6:55-56), or lower the palsied through the roof at Capernaum (Mar 2:4). The centurion in that town is satisfied that a word from Jesus will be enough to heal his sick servant (Mat 8:8). Martha says, with such simple trust, 'Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died' (Joh 11:21). The ruler of the synagogue feels that the touch of the Lord's hand would be enough to heal his dying

daughter (Mat 9:18). The woman with the issue of blood would but touch the hem of His garment to be cured (Mar 5:28). The Syro-Phœnician woman persisted in her prayer for her sick daughter, eagerly claiming the rights, while bearing the reproach of being a Gentile 'dog' (Mar 7:28). With one cry is He greeted alike by blind Bartimaeus (Mar 10:47), the two blind men (Mat 9:27), and the ten lepers (Luk 17:13)—'Jesus, thou Son of David, have mercy on us'; a cry the meaning of which is uttered by the leper (Mar 1:40)—'Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean.' When sight is given to the man born blind, the parents testify to the Divine origin of the power that has been exercised (Joh 9:33). And the multitude at Nain, when they saw the dead raised, had no hesitation in crying—'A great prophet is risen among us' (Luk 7:16). It was a glad welcome from the sufferers and their friends that greeted Jesus as the manifestation of God in all these things. But not less earnest is the witness of the crowds to the popular estimate of the teacher. 'There went great multitudes with him' is the frequent note that leads up to some great doctrine of life (Mat 19:2, Luk 14:25, Mark 6). The house filled at Capernaum (Mar 2:2) is but the parallel of the occasion when His own mother 'could not come at him for the press' (Luk 8:19), or of the thousands by the seashore (Mar 4:1), or of the multitude that 'trod one upon another' (Luk 12:1). Lives that He changes from darkness to light bear willing evidence to His power and charm: Mary Magdalene will not be held back by false shame from entering the Pharisee's house to acknowledge her Saviour (Luk 7:36-50), nor be repulsed by the charge of wastefulness through sentiment (Mar 14:4); and Zacchaeus will boldly profess a practical conversion before those who know him intimately (Luk 19:8).

We look for appreciation from His nearest disciples, a quick obedience, a joy that has no place for fasting (Mar 2:18), the mother's confidence at the marriage-feast at Cana (Joh 2:5), the great utterances of His forerunner the Baptist (Joh 1:30; Joh 3:30), the exalted vision of the Transfiguration (Mar 9:5), and that Petrine outburst, repeated by all, as they neared Gethsemane—'If I should die with thee, I will not deny thee.' From these His intimates we anticipate such trust. We look for it, too, from the band of holy women—Joanna, Susanna, Salome, the Marys, and those 'who ministered unto him of their substance' (Luk 8:3). But beyond these we have the scribes (Mat 8:19, Mar 12:34) earnestly approaching Him, Pharisees inviting Him to their houses (Luk 11:37; Luk 14:1); we have the confession of the council of priests and Pharisees—'If we let him alone, all will believe on him' (Joh 11:48); we have the acknowledgment of Samaritans, convinced not by hearsay but by personal knowledge (Joh 4:42), of centurions (Mat 8:5-13, Mar 15:39), and of the rich young man 'running and kneeling' and saying, 'Good Master' (Mar 10:17). Strangers seek Him out—'Sir, we would see Jesus' (Joh 12:20); and the common people of His own race 'heard him gladly' (Mar 12:37), and acclaimed His entry into Jerusalem (Mar 11:8-10). In the beginning, shepherds and magi, angels and stars bear witness to the newborn King; so that to the last it is a strange mixed company, that seems to

include (by his long faltering before judgment) Pilate himself, the lone, mysterious figure of Joseph of Arimathaea, and Nicodemus 'bringing myrrh and aloes' (Joh_19:29).

This many-sided appreciation of our Lord in His own day, in addition to its obvious gain to the Christian preacher, is suggestive of the many differing points of view from which men may reverently regard Christ, each one expressive of a truth, though not the entirety of the truth. And it may also indicate the many successive ways of wonder, repentance, sympathy, and vision in which Christ speaks to each individual soul.

Edgar Daplyn.

⚠️Aramaic

ARAMAIC.—See Language.

⚠️Arbitration

ARBITRATION.—The settlement of disputes by the acceptance of the judgment of a third party supposed to be impartial. The arrangement may be purely private, or in accordance with special statute; the application is multifarious. Some method of settlement by umpires is as old as civil government. In Job_9:33 the 'daysman' is perfectly described. The Greek term (μεσιτης) translated 'mediator' (or middleman) has the same meaning; though as applied, in the NT, to Moses and to Christ (Gal_3:19-20, 1Ti_2:5, Heb_8:6; Heb_9:15; Heb_12:24). as standing between man and God (cf. Deu_5:5), it belongs to an essentially different order of ideas, inasmuch as God is not man. The complexity of modern life has multiplied the occasions; but the most important recent advance has been the application to international differences. Thereby questions such as have often led to wars become capable of amicable settlement. The first notable instance was the Geneva arbitration under the Washington Treaty (1871) in the Alabama Question. The principle, then disputed, has now found universal acceptance. Treaties of arbitration already exist or are being negotiated between most nations that have mutual relations. And in the future, except where ambitions and strong passions are involved, this means of agreement will be largely resorted to.

The idea is based on the acknowledgment of the identity of moral law in the two spheres of individual and national life. Duty for persons or communities or nations is one. There is no valid distinction of private and public right; the code of ethics that is binding for the private individual is equally obligatory on kings and the representatives of peoples. This doctrine is opposed to the long history of statecraft, to the maxims of diplomatists, and to the passions of despotism. But few now openly deny its truth; and the acknowledgments already made in treaties of arbitration may be reckoned one of the greatest triumphs of Christian civilization.

The principle may be said to be based on the Golden Rule (Mat 7:12, Luk 6:31), which teaches reciprocal obligation, or on the kindred command to love our neighbours as ourselves (Mat 22:39, Mar 12:31). These fundamental laws are given as the sum of practical duty. They condemn the egoistic attitude. They teach us to regard the position of others with full sympathy, to seek an impartial standpoint, and to make the individual will harmonize with the general mind. The principle of arbitration is also an illustration of the grace of peaceableness. 'Blessed are the peacemakers' (Mat 5:9). This truth finds full expression in the Epistles, where peace, the fruit of the Spirit (Gal 5:22), and the concomitant of righteousness, is contrasted with the strife and envy of sin, and is noted as a mark of the kingdom of God, who is the God of peace. Once more, the principle may be based on prudence; for a willing settlement may prevent a legal defeat, or even a worse disaster (Mat 5:25-26, Luk 12:58-59, cf. Pro 25:8-9).

Christ declined on one occasion to be an arbiter (Luk 12:13 f.). He was addressing the multitude, when one of them said, 'Master, bid my brother divide the inheritance with me.' Jesus replied, 'Man, who made me a judge (κριτήν, so BDL and the crit. edd. [Note: editions or editors.] ; Υ R [Note: R Textus Receptus.] has δικαστήν) or a divider (μεριστήν, only here in NT) over you?' The words which follow (Luk 12:15 ff.) show that Jesus knew that this man was moved by covetousness; but apart from His censure of a wrong motive, He here affirms that it was no business of His to arbitrate between men. He would not interfere in civil disputes which fell properly to be decided by the regular law (cf. Deu 21:17). But His saying goes far beyond the sphere of jurisprudence. Christ lays down universal laws of justice and love, but does not apply them. Moral casuistry was no part of His mission, and decisions of the kind this man wanted could only have weakened the sense of personal responsibility, and hindered the growth of those spiritual dispositions it was His chief aim to create.

R. Scott.

Archelaus

ARCHELAUS (Ἀρχέλαος) is named once in the NT (Mat 2:22), and probably is referred to in the parable of the Pounds (Luk 19:12 ff.). He was the elder of the two sons of Herod the Great by Malthace, a Samaritan woman (Josephus *BJ* i. xxviii. 4, xxxiii. 7). Judaea, with the title of 'king,' was bequeathed to him by his father's will; but he would not assume the royal dignity till he had obtained confirmation of that will from the emperor Augustus (*Ant.* xvii. viii. 2-4). Before his departure to Rome a rebellion broke out in Jerusalem; and in quelling it his soldiers put three thousand men to death, among whom were pilgrims visiting the Holy City for the passover (*ib.* xvii. ix. 3). Thus at the beginning of his reign an evil reputation was gained by Archelaus, and the alarm of Joseph may be understood ('*But when he heard that Archelaus did reign in Judaea in the room of his father Herod, he was afraid to go thither*').

After the rebellion, Archelaus proceeded to Rome (*Ant.* xvii. ix. 3-7, cf. Luk 19:12). Augustus, dealing with Herod's will, received a deputation from the people of Judaea, who begged that neither Archelaus nor any of his brothers should be appointed king (cf. Luk 19:14). The emperor finally decided that Archelaus should receive Judaea, Samaria, and Idumaea, with the title not of 'king,' but of 'ethnarch' (*Ant.* xvii. xi. 1-4; *BJ* ii. vi. 3). On his return from Rome the ethnarch sought vengeance against his enemies (cf. Luk 19:27) in Judaea and Samaria. In the ninth or tenth year of his reign, after many acts of tyranny and violence, he was banished by the emperor to Vienne in Gaul (*Ant.* xvii. xiii. 2). According to Jerome, the tomb of Archelaus was pointed out near Bethlehem (*de Situ et Nomin. Loc. Hebraic.* 101. 11).

Literature.—Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews, Wars of the Jews* [*BJ*], as cited above; references s. 'Archelaus' in Index to Schürer's *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 1898-1901 [English translation of 2nd ed. 1885-90]; and Hausrath's *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, 1873-77 [English translation in 2 vols. 1878-80]. Of the last named work, vol. i. [German] was published in a 3rd ed. in 1879.

J. Herkless.

Arimathaea

ARIMATHAEA (Ἀριμαθαία) is mentioned in Mat 27:57, Mar 15:43, Luk 23:51, and Joh 19:38 as the place from which Joseph, who buried the body of Jesus, came up to Jerusalem. In the *Onomasticon* (225. 12) it is identified with Ἀριμαθῆμ Σειφά

(Ramathaimzophim* [Note: On this name (which is almost certainly based on a textual corruption), see Hastings' DB, vol. iv. p. 198a note.]), the city of Elkanah and Samuel (1Sa_1:1), near Diospolis (Lydda) and in the district of Timnah (Tibneh). In 1Ma_11:34, Ramathem is referred to along with Aphaerema and Lydda as a Samaritan toparchy transferred, in 145 b.c., to Judaea. These notices of Ramathaim point to *Beit-Rima*, 13 miles E.N.E. of Lydda, and 2 miles N. of Timnah,—an identification adopted by G. A. Smith (*HGHL* [Note: *GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*] 254 n. [Note: note.] 7) and Buhl (*GAP* [Note: *AP Geographic des alten Palästina.*] 170). Another possible site is *Râm-Allah*, 3 miles S.W. of Bethel, suggested by Ewald (*Hist.* ii. 421). The proposed sites S. of Jerusalem are not 'in the hill-country of Ephraim' (1Sa_1:1). If Arimathaea, then, be identified with the Ramathaim of Elkanah, it may well be at the modern hill-village of *Beit-Rima*. The LXX Septuagint form of Ramathaim is Ἀρμαθαίμ (1Sa_1:1 and elsewhere), thus providing a link between Ramathaim and Arimathaea.

A. W. Cooke.

☞Aristeas

ARISTEAS (Letter of).—This interesting piece of fiction may find a place in this Dictionary, because it gives the first account of that work which more than any other paved the way of the gospel in early times, namely, the Greek translation of the OT, the so-called Septuagint. There is no agreement as yet about either the age or the aim of this composition. That it is a fiction is now generally admitted. The author pretends to have been one of the two ambassadors—Andreas, ἀρχισωματοφύλαξ of the king, being the other—sent by king Ptolemaeus Philadelphus to the high priest Eleazar of Jerusalem in order to get for him a copy of the Law, and men to translate it for the Royal Library at Alexandria. The letter gives a long description of the gifts sent by Philadelphus to Jerusalem, of the city, its temple and the religious customs of the Jews, and of the table-talk between the king and each of the 72 interpreters. When the work was finished, a solemn curse was denounced on any one who should change anything in it (cf. Deu_4:2, Rev_22:18-19). Schürer, I. Abrahams, and others fix the date about b.c. 200; Herriot (on Philo) dates it 170-150; Wellhausen (*Isr.* [Note: Israelite.] *und Jud. Gesch.*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred]) 1897, p. 232) in the 1st cent. b.c. (but in 4th ed. 1901, p. 236, he assigns it to the 2nd cent.); Wendland, between 96 and 63,† [Note: In Hastings' DB iv. 438b, line 7 from bottom of text, read 63 for 93.] nearer to 96; L. Cohn doubts whether it

was known to Philo; Graetz placed it in the reign of Tiberius, and Willrich (*Judaica*, 1900, pp. 111-130) brings its composition down to 'later than a.d. 33.' Lombroso was the first to show that the 'author was well acquainted with the details of court life in the times of the Ptolemies'; and recent researches have confirmed this; on the other hand, there are interesting connexions with the Greek of the NT; compare καταβολή used absolutely for 'creation' (Mat 13:35 and Aristeas, § 129 [a usage apparently unknown to Hort *ad 1Pe 1:20*, and Swete, *Introd.* p. 397]); ἀνατάττεσθαι (Luk 1:1 and Aristeas, § 144; Mat 6:31-32 and Aristeas, § 140, etc.).

While Jerome had already called attention to the fact that Aristeas speaks only of the Law as having been translated by the 72 interpreters, in later times it became customary to consider the whole Greek OT as the work of the 'Septuagint.' Philo seems to follow a somewhat different tradition, and mentions that in his days the Jews of Alexandria kept an annual festival in honour of the spot where the light of this translation first shone forth, thanking God for an old but ever new benefit. He is sure that God heard the prayer of the translators 'that the greater part of mankind, or even the whole of it, may profit by their work, when men shall use philosophical and excellent ordinances for regulating their lives.'

On the use made of the Greek OT in the NT see Swete, pp. 381-405, 'Quotations from the LXX Septuagint in the NT.' That Jesus Himself was acquainted with it would seem to follow from the quotation in Mat 15:9 = Mar 7:7. For the words δὲ σέβονται μὲ ye are the Septuagint rendering of the Hebrew יְהוָה יִרְאֶה, which rendering rests on a confusing of the first word with יְהוָה (noticed already by Grotius). But it is doubtful whether we are entitled to expect in our Greek Gospels such a *verbatim* report of the words of Jesus.

On the influence of the Septuagint on the spread of the Gospel, cf. (in addition to older works like Grinfield, Oikonomos, etc.) Alfred Deissmann, 'Die Hellenisierung des semitischen Monotheismus,' Leipzig, 1903 (reprinted from *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum* 1903).

Literature.—The Letter of Aristeas was first published in Latin (Rome, 1471 fol.) in the famous Latin Bible of Sueynheim and Pannartz; first edition of the Greek text by Simon Schard, Basle, 1561; all subsequent editions superseded by that of (Mendelssohn-) Wendland (Lipsiae, Teubner, 1900), and that of H. St. J. Thackeray in H. B. Swete's *Introduction to the OT in Greek* (Cambridge, 1900, 2nd ed. 1902). English translations by J. Done, 1633 and 1685; Lewis, 1715; Whiston (*Authentic Records*, i. 423-584), 1727; recently by Thackeray (*JQR* [Note: QR Jewish Quarterly

Review.] xv., April 1903). Compare, further, Abrahams, 'Recent Criticism on the Letter of Aristeas' (*ib.* xiv. 321-342); the works on the Septuagint (Swete, *l.c.*; Nestle in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iv.); Friedlander, *Geschichte der jüdischen Apologetik* (Zurich, 1903).

Eb. Nestle.

⚠ Aristion (Aristo)

ARISTION (ARISTO).—One of the principal authorities from whom Papias derived (written?) 'narratives of the sayings of the Lord' (τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου λόγων διηγήσεις; cf. Luk_1:1), and (indirectly) oral traditions.

1. Importance and Difficulty of Identification.—According to Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 39), Papias of Hierapolis in his five books of *Interpretations* (*var. l.* Interpretation) of the Lord's Oracles 'referred frequently by name' to 'Aristion and the Elder John' as his authorities. From the Preface (προοίμιον) Eusebius cited the following sentence to prove that Irenaeus had misunderstood Papias in taking him to refer to the *Apostle* John as his authority, whereas the 'John' in question was not the 'disciple of the Lord,' but a comparatively obscure 'Elder.' We abridge the sentence, but give the relevant variants: εἰ δὲ που καὶ παρηκολουθηκῶς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι, τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους· τί Ἀνδρέας ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν ... ἢ τις ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῶν, ἅτε Ἀριστίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης οἱ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταὶ λέγουσιν.

For Ἀριστίων Syriac and Arm. read Ἀριστων, and omit the clause οἱ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταὶ λεγουσιν, Arm. by compensation rendering 'Aristo and John the Elders.'

Nicephorus (*Historia Ecclesiastica* ii. 46, but not iii. 20) makes the same omission. Rufinus renders *ceterique discipuli dicebant*. Jerome changes the tense (*loqucbantur*). Four Greek MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] and Niceph. (iii. 20) omit οἱ

Deferring the question of the significance of the valiant readings, it is apparent that 'Aristion and the Elder John' are in several ways placed in contrast with the group of 'disciples of the Lord' mentioned immediately before, by whom Papias certainly means the twelve Apostles, enumerating seven (including James the Lord's brother; cf. Gal_1:19; Gal_2:9), from Andrew to 'John (author of the Revelation) and Matthew'

(author of the *Logia*). The designation μαθηταί instead of ἀπόστολοι is employed because the function in consideration is that of transmitting μαθήματα—the precepts (ἐντολαί) learned from the Lord. The disciples (including James) of the Lord Himself are the first generation of *traditores*. The group next mentioned, ‘Aristion and the Elder John,’ are distinguished expressly and implicitly as belonging to a subsequent generation.

(1) As Eusebius points out, the John spoken of in connexion with Aristion is (a) ‘mentioned after an interval,’ (b) ‘classed with others outside the number of the Apostles,’ (c) has ‘Aristion mentioned before him,’ (d) is ‘distinctly called an Elder’ (in contrast with the John mentioned just before, who is called a ‘disciple of the Lord’). Nowhere in the context should the term ‘Elder’ be taken as = ‘Apostle.’

(2) A distinction not referred to by Eusebius, but at least equally important, is the contrast of tense (disregarded by Rufinus and Jerome), whereby Papias makes it apparent that at the time of his inquiries the Apostles, including John, were dead; whereas Aristion and the *Elder* John were living. He ‘used to inquire of those who came his way what *had* been said (τί εἶπεν) by Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John or Matthew, or any other of the Lord’s disciples; as well as what was *being* said (ἄτε λέγουσιν) by Aristion and the Elder John.’ Hence, as an authority of note, and a transmitter of Gospel traditions earlier than the time of Papias’ writing (a.d. 145-160), Aristion is a witness of the first importance for the history of Gospel tradition. On the other hand, great difficulty and dispute are caused by the descriptive clause attached in most texts to his name and that of John the Elder, because it is identical with that by which the Apostles are appropriately designated as *traditores* of the first generation; whereas the distinctions already noted, especially the contrast of tense τί εἶπεν—ἄτε λέγουσιν, make it certain that Papias did not regard Aristion and the Elder John as belonging to this group. For Lightfoot’s proposal (*Essays on Sup. Rel.* p. 150, n. [Note: note.] 3) to regard λέγουσιν as ‘a historical present introduced for the sake of variety,’ is confessedly advanced only to escape the ‘chronological difficulty’ of supposing two ‘disciples of the Lord’ still living at the time of Papias’ inquiries. It is certainly inadmissible.

The Armenian version makes a natural inference when it forms the second group by reading ‘Aristo and John *the Elders*.’ But the change is clearly arbitrary. Papias applies the title ‘the Elder’ only to ‘John’ to distinguish him from the Apostle. It was doubtless applicable to Aristion as well (Conybeare, *Expositor*, 1893, p. 248, against Hilgenfeld, *Ztschr. f. wissenschaft. Theol.* xxxvii. 1894, p. 626), but was superfluous. The exegesis suggested above (Weiffenbach, Corsen, *et al.*) removes all difficulty by

rendering τοὺς τῶν πρ. ἀνέκρινον λόγους as an ellipsis: ‘I would inquire the utterances of the Elders (reporting) what Andrew or Peter ... had said,’ because ‘Elder’ is then used consistently throughout the paragraph for *traditor* of the *post-Apostolic* generation (cf. Act 15:2; Act 15:4; Act 15:6; Act 21:18 and the Heb. תּוֹרָה), though it is not relied on (as in Arm.) to make the distinction of the Apostolic from the post-Apostolic generation, but only of the two homonymous individuals, John the Apostle and John the Elder.

On this interpretation, Aristion and John were members of the group which perpetuated the traditions of the Apostles (in Palestine?) until Papias’ day (cf. Hegesippus *ap. Eus. Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. xxxii. 6-8, and Luk 1:1-2, Act 11:30; Act 15:2; Act 15:4; Act 15:6; Act 15:22-23; Act 21:18). But even if this exegesis be rejected, there is no escape from the following alternative: Either the descriptive phrase οἱ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταί, appended after ‘Aristion and the Elder John’ precisely as after the list of Apostles, is textually corrupt (assimilated to the preceding clause); or the designation is used in a different and very loose significance. On this view the only certainty is that Aristion was living at the time of Papias’ inquiries (a.d. 120-140?) after ‘Apostolic narratives’ (ἀποστολικὰς διηγήσεις), and in a legion whence Papias could obtain them only from ‘travellers who came his way.’ For Eusebius’ statement that ‘Papias was himself a hearer, not of the Apostles, but of Aristion and the Elder John,’ is made in the interest of his desire to find ‘some other John in Asia’ besides the Apostle (Zahn, *Forsch.* vi. 117 f.), and is corrected by himself in the next clause: ‘At all events he mentions them frequently by name, and sets down their traditions in his writings.’

(3) A second difficulty of more importance for the true reading of Papias and the identification of ‘Aristion’ than is generally recognized, is the spelling of the name, which Syriac and Arm. give as ‘Aristo.’ For this spelling, in combination with the omission of the designation ‘the disciples of the Lord,’ is not only traceable to about a.d. 400 (Syriac is extant in a MS of a.d. 462), but these two main variations are accompanied by minor ones in Syriac, Armenian, and Latin authorities, which form a group in that they manifest a belief in common regarding the personality of Aristo-Aristion which differs from that of the received text of Eusebius.

2. *Text of Eusebius.*—Mommsen (*ZNTW* [Note: *NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissen. schaft.*] iii. 1902, p. 156 ff.) regarded this textual evidence as conclusive in conjunction with the admitted ‘chronological difficulty.’ He would therefore omit the epitheton *from the text of Eusebius*. Corssen (*ib.* iii. p. 242 ff.) rightly criticised Mommsen’s proposal to omit, because some designation of this second link in the chain of *traditores* is indispensable to the sense. He thought Papias capable of the

colossal anachronism of regarding his own contemporaries as ‘disciples of the Lord.’ The present writer had argued (*Journ. of Bibl. Lit.* xvii., 1898) for the reading οἱ τοῦτων μαθηταί (*se. τῶν ἀποστόλων*) as the true text of Papias, on the internal evidence, and because ‘the Elders’ of Papias are twice referred to by Irenaeus (*Haer.* v. v. 1 and v. xxxvi. 1) as ‘the disciples of the Apostles.’ The corruption followed by Eusebius (and probably even by Irenaeus in this passage, though he transcribed others where ‘the Elders’ were correctly described as ‘disciples of the Apostles’), involves only the change (by assimilation) of three letters, ΟΙΤΟΥ(ΤΩΝ)ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ becoming ΟΙΤΟΥ(KY)ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ. In the form wherein Edwin Abbott (*Enc. Bibl.* s.v. ‘Gospels,’ ii. col. 1815, n. [Note: note.] 3) adopts the emendation, the change involves but two letters, ΟΙΤΟΥ(ΤΩ)ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ becoming ΟΙΤΟΥ(KY)ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ, as in Jdg 4:24 (LXX Septuagint) ΤΩΝ ΥΙΩΝ Β becomes KY ΥΙΩΝ in A. This would largely explain the strange error of Irenaeus in taking Papias to belong to a generation even earlier than Polycarp (‘some of them saw not only John but other Apostles also, and heard these same things from them and testify [present] these things’). The difficulty experienced by Eusebius in refuting it could hardly have been so great if his text of Papias had not the same corruption.

On this view the variants are of no help to improve the text of *Eusebius*, which is correct in the received form (Bacon, art. ‘False Witness,’ etc., in *ZNTW* [Note: *NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissen. schaft.*] vi. 1905). They have some importance, even if arbitrary, as indicating that in antiquity also the ‘chronological difficulty’ was felt as well as (in Arm.) the incompleteness of sense produced by simple omission of the descriptive clause and (in Rufinus) the incongruity of applying to ‘Aristion and John the Elder’ the same designation by which the Apostles had just been distinguished. They would have great importance if it could be made probable that they rest, directly or indirectly, upon a knowledge of *Papias* (or, much less probably, of Aristion-Aristo) independently of Eusebius.

3. Origin of Variants.—‘Aristo’ is not simply ‘the Greek name Aristion badly spelt’ (Conybeare, *l.c.* p. 243), nor even should it in strictness be called ‘an equivalent (*gleichbedeutende*) form of the same proper name’ (Hilgenfeld, *Ztschr. f. wissenschaft. Theol.* 1875 ii. p. 256, 1883 i. p. 13, 1894 p. 626). It is at least the more usual, if not more correct form, and ‘occurs very frequently in ancient writers. It has been calculated that about thirty persons of this name may be distinguished.’ But Smith’s *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biogr.*, the authority for the statement just made (i. p. 310), knows of but two occurrences of the form ‘Aristion,’ once as the nickname of the adventurer Athenion (b.c. 87), once as designating a surgeon of small repute *circa* (about) 150 b.c. In Jewish literature only the form ‘Aristo’ occurs (Josephus

Ant. xix. 353 [ed. Niese]). Pape (s.v. Ἀριστίων) adds four others from Antiph. vi. 12, aeseh. Πλαταικός 3. 162, Plut. *Numbers* 9, and Pausanias. Patristic literature knows only the form 'Aristo' in Christian legend (*Acta Barn.* xiv. ed. Tisch. p. 69, knows a Christian host Aristo in Cyprus; *Acta Petri*, ed. Lipsius, p. 51, 14-53. 13, one in Pnteoli; *Constit. Apost.* vii. 46, ed. Lagarde, p. 228, 21, gives to the first and third bishops of Smyrna the name Aristo). The form 'Aristion' is unknown. Eusebius himself (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iv. 6) draws his account of the devastation of Judaea in the insurrection against Hadrian (132-135) from a certain Aristo of Pella. This writer, accordingly, would be a contemporary of Papias in position to be referred to as a *traditor* of Apostolic teaching. To speak of him and 'the Elder John,' if by the latter were meant John the elder of the Jerusalem Church (Eus. *Historia Ecclesiastica* iv. 5; cf. Schlatter, *Kirche Jerusalems*, 1898, p. 40), whose death is dated by Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxvi. 20) in the 19th year of Trajan, as 'disciples of the Apostles,' would involve no greater looseness or exaggeration than we should expect in Asia *circa (about)* 150 a.d. But as Eusebius gives no account of Aristo's writings, although making it a principal object of his work to describe early Christian authorities, it is probable that Aristo of Pella was not a Christian, but a Jewish or (more probably) pagan writer. To this supposition there is but one serious objection, for the references of Nicephorus (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 24) and the *Paschal Chronicle* may admittedly be disregarded as merely reproducing Eusebius. Maximus Confessor, however, in his scholion on the *Theol. Mystira* of Areopagitieus (c. i. p. 17, ed. Corder), undoubtedly refers to the same 'Aristo of Pella' (Ἀρίστωνι τῷ Πελλαίῳ) as author of the Christian *Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus*, basing his statement on 'the sixth book of the *Hypotyposcis* of Clement of Alexandria,' who seems to have referred to this 'Jason' as 'mentioned by (*l. δὲ ἀναγράφαι*) Luke' (Act. 17:5-9). Only, while the *Dialogue* is known to Celsus (*circa (about)* 167), Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Jerome, if not to pseudo-Barnabas and Justin Martyr, and even probably survives in more or less altered form in the *Altercatio Simonis et Theophili* (TU [Note: U Texte und Untersuehungen.] i. iii. p. 115 ff.; P. Corssen, *Altercatio S. et Th.* 1890), it is known to none of these as the work of Aristo, nor do any of the later quotations, references, or other evidences indicate that the work in question contained διηγήσεις τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου λόγων (Eus. *l.c.*). If the name 'Aristo' was ever properly connected with the *Dialogue*, it circulated only anonymously after a.d. 200, and without the introductory narrative portion which it may have once possessed. The late and unsupported statement of Maximus is therefore much more likely to be due to some misunderstanding of the *Hypotyposeis*, especially as we have the explicit quotation of the same Aristo of Pella by Moses of Chorene (400-450?) extending to considerable length beyond the portion quoted by Eusebius, accompanied by the statement that Aristo was secretary of Ardasches, king of Armenia, when the latter was sent by

Hadrian into Persia (Langlois, *Coll. des. Hist. de l'Armenie*, i. p. 391 ff., cf. ii. 110, n. [Note: note.] 3, and Le Vaillant de Florival, *Hist. Arm.* ii. 57). Harnack (*TU* [Note: U Texte und Untersuehungen.] i. 2, p. 125) and Zahn, it is true, reject Moses' quotation as a fabrication; but it contains nothing 'fabulous,' and is defended with reason by Hilgenfeld (*Zts. f. w. Th.* 1883, p. 8 ff.). Besides this, Stephen of Byzantium, who knows of no Aristo of Pella, mentions an Aristo of Gerasa (less than 25 miles distant) simply as an ἀστυεῖος ῥήτωρ.

Our conclusion must be that, while direct acquaintance with Papias is quite conceivable, the variant form 'Aristo' in Syriac and Armenian sources is best accounted for by a mistaken identification of this Aristo of *Historia Ecclesiastica* iv. 6 with the 'Elder Aristion' of *Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 39 and Moses of Chorene.

4. *The Appendix of Mark.*—The most important addition to our data regarding Aristo was made by Conybeare's discovery at Eçmiadzin in 1893 of an Armenian MS. of the Gospels dated a.d. 989, in which the longer ending of Mark (Mar 16:9-20) has the separate title in red ink, corresponding to the other Gospel titles: 'From the Elder Aristo' (*Expositor*, Oct. 1893, pp. 241-254). This representation, though late, Conybeare takes to be based on very early authority (*Expositor*, Dec. 1895, pp. 401-421), appealing to the internal evidence of the versos in question. Undeniably the reference in Mar 16:18 to drinking of poison with impunity must have literary connexion with Papias' anecdote regarding Justus Barsabbas (*Eus. Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 39), whatever the source. Conybeare's citation of a gloss 'against the name Aristion' in a Bodleian 12th cent, codex of Rufinus' translation of this passage, which referred to this story of the poison cup, was even (to the discoverer's eye) a designation by the unknown glossator of Aristion as author of this story. But, besides the precariousness of this inference, it would scarcely be possible to write a gloss 'against the name Aristion' which would not be equally 'against the name of the Elder John' immediately adjoining; and as mediaeval legend reported the story of the poison cup of *John* (*i.e.* the Apostle, identified with the Elder in the glossator's period) this would seem to be the more natural reference and meaning of the gloss.

The evidence connecting the Appendix of Mark with the name 'Aristo' is thus reduced to the statement 'inserted by an afterthought' by the Armenian scribe John, a.d. 989, over Mar 16:9-20, which he had attached, contrary to Syriac and Armenian tradition, to his text of the Gospel. This, however, is unquestionably important, especially if, as Conybeare maintains, 'it must have stood in the older copy transcribed.' The statement has been generally received at its face value, but with different identifications of 'the Elder Aristo.' Resch ('Ausserkanonische Paralleltexzte,' *TU* [Note: U Texte und Untersuehungen.] x. 3, 1894, p. 449; English translation by

Conybeare in *Expos.* 4th ser. x. [1894], pp. 226-232) regards Aristo of Pella as the only personality open to consideration as author of the Appendix. Hilgenfeld (*Ztschr. f. wissenschaft. Theol.* xxxvii. 1894, p. 627) stands apparently alone in identifying the 'Aristion' of Papias with Aristo of Pella, 'a notable contemporary of Papias,' and refusing to the Aristo of the Eçmiadzin codex any significance beyond that of 'some Elder Aristo or other before *circa (about)* 500 a.d., from whom a Syriac MS will have borrowed Mar_16:9-20' (regarded by Hilg. as the original ending). Other critics regard it as 'practically certain' that the Mark-Appendix is really taken from the authority referred to by Papias. Harnack sets the example of peremptorily refusing the suggestion of Resch (TU [Note: U Texte und Untersuchungen.] x. 2, p. 453 ff.), that this 'Elder Aristo' may be no other than Aristo of Pella, but gives no other reason than the date (*circa (about)* 140); which, as he rightly says, is irreconcilable with the (disputed) phrase οἱ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταὶ (*Chron.* i. p. 269; on the textual question, see above, § 2). Zahn (*Theol. Literaturbl.* 22nd Dec. 1893 [English translation by Conybeare in *Expos. l.c.*] regards it as a conclusive objection to Resch's identification that 'Aristo of Pella, who wrote his (?) *Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus* after 135, and perhaps a good deal later, cannot be the author of a section (Mar_16:9-20) which Tatian already read in his Mark at the latest in 170, and which Justin had already known so early as 150, though perhaps not (N.B.) as an integral part of Mark.' We may inquire later what authority the scribe John may have had for his insertion of the title.

5. Internal evidence of the Appendix.—The impression of Westcott and Hort (*Gr. NT*, ii. p. 51), corroborated by Conybeare (*Expositor*, 1893, p. 241 ff.), that the Appendix to Mark is not the original full narrative, but an excerpt, constitutes the next step in the solution of our problem. In particular, a real contribution is made by Zahn (*Gesch. Kan.* ii. App. xiv. 1a, and *Forsch.* vi. § 3, p. 219) in the demonstration that Jerome (*circa (about)* *Pelag.* ii. 15, ed. Vall. ii. 758) had access to it in a fuller, more original form; for he adds after v. 14 'Et illi satisfaciebant dicentes: Saeculum istud iniquitatis et incredulitatis substantia (cod. Vat. 1, 'sub Satana') est, quae (*l. qui*) non sinit per immundos spiritus veram Dei apprehendi virtutem; ideirco jam nunc revela justitiam tuam' (cf. Act_1:6). Jerome's source for this material, whose Hebraistic expressions and point of view confirm its authenticity, becomes a question of importance.

This source can scarcely have been the *Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus*, whoever its author; for while Jerome was acquainted with this work (*Com. on Gal_3:13*, and *Quaest. Heb. in lib. Gen.* [Note: Geneva NT 1557, Bible 1560.] , beginning), and while Celsus, who also used it, twice quotes the substance of Mar_16:9 (*circa (about)* *Cels.* ii. 55 and 70), the nature of the work, so far as ascertainable, was not such as to admit material of this kind. Besides, we have seen that by all early authorities it is

treated as anonymous. Zahn's supposition (*Forsch.* vi. p. 219) has stronger evidence in its favour, and still leaves room to account for the points of contact between the Appendix, the *Dialogue*, Celsus, and Jerome. According to Zahn, 'The ancient book in which Mar 16:14-18 was extant independently of the Second Gospel, and whence it was drawn by transcribers of Mark, can only have been the work of Papias, in which it was contained as a διήγησις of Aristion (*sic*).' But Jerome, he holds, obtained his version indirectly, through his teacher Apollinaris of Laodicea. This explanation has in its favour certain evidences adduced by Conybeare (*Expositor*, Dec. 1895), to connect the cancellation of Mar 16:9-20 in Armenian MS^S [Note: SS Manuscripts.] with knowledge *derived from Papias* of its true origin. In particular, the same Eçmiadzin codex which attributes the Appendix to 'the Elder Aristo' has a version of the Pericope Adulterae (Joh 7:53 to Joh 8:11 T^R [Note: R Textus Receptus.]) independent of the received form, briefer, but with the explanatory comment after Joh 8:6 'To declare their sins; and they were seeing their several sins on the stones.' Echoes of this addition are traceable in Jerome (*Pelag.* ii. 17), in uncial U, and perhaps elsewhere. Moreover, Conybeare's contention that this 'represents the form in which Papias ... gave the episode,' is strongly supported by Eusebius' statement of what he found *in Papias* ('a story about a woman *accused of many sins* before the Lord, which the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* contains'). This applies to the Eçmiadzin text only ('A certain woman was *taken in sins*, against whom all bore witness,' etc. Cf. Eus. *Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 39). It has some further support in the express statement of Vartan (14th cent.) that this pericope was derived from Papias, though this may be merely dependent on Eusebius. Conybeare's suggestion that the story will have been one of the 'traditions of the Elder John,' and for this reason have become attached in most texts to the Fourth Gospel, is more probable than Zahn's attributing it to 'Aristion'; but see Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 156, who thinks it was simply appended at the end of the Gospel canon.

The Eçmiadzin Codex, accordingly, in the two most important questions of Gospel text makes deliberate departure from the received Armenian tradition, in both cases relying on authority which might conceivably go back indirectly to Papias himself. (1) Until about this date (a.d. 989) Armenian tradition followed the Sinaitic, or older Syriac, in omitting the Mark-Appendix. In the 10th cent. it begins to be inserted as in the Curetonian and Tatian, but with various scribal notes of its secondary character. Our codex is simply more exact and specific than others of its time in adding a datum which could never have gone with the Appendix, but must have been derived, like the comment of Vartan on the Pericope Adulterae, from comparison of Eusebius, which in the Arm. spells the name 'Aristo' and expressly designates him as 'Elder.' (2) It also goes beyond current Armenian tradition regarding Joh 8:1-11. Instead of attaching the story after Luk 21:36, as the *Gosp. acc. to the Hebrews* probably suggested, it adopts the position usually assigned it after Joh 7:52, with the marginal scholion in

red ink τῆς μοιχαλίδος, and an expurgated and embellished text, which Eusebius enables us to identify as that of Papias. To infer from this, however, that the scribe John had actual access to Papias would be rash in the extreme. On the contrary, the evidence is only too convincing that his title is based simply on a comparison of the two Eusebian passages regarding 'Aristo,' with the further statements of his own chief national historian, Moses of Chorene (400-450), regarding the Aristo of Pella quoted by Eusebius in *Historia Ecclesiastica* iv. 6.

6. Aristo of Pella.—Moses of Chorene (cf. Langlois, *l.c.*), in writing of the death and obsequies of Ardasches, king and national hero of Armenia, transcribes first the quotation of Eusebius from Aristo of Pella regarding Hadrian's devastation of Jerusalem, to explain how Aristo came to be attached to his (Ardasches') person as secretary; for Ardasches had been sent by Hadrian into Persia. He then continues, quoting professedly from 'the same historian,' an elaborate account of Ardasches' death and obsequies. The connexion of this supplementary quotation, however, is so awkwardly managed as to leave it quite ambiguous to whose person Aristo was attached as secretary. In the text it follows the statement that Hadrian 'established in Jerusalem a community of pagans and Christians whose bishop was Mark. Langlois accordingly makes him secretary of Mark (cf. Eus. *Historia Ecclesiastica* iv. 6). Zahn understands of Hadrian himself (!). The Eçmiadzin scribe seems to have been of Langlois' opinion, and to have drawn the inference that this Aristo, secretary of Mark the bishop of Jerusalem under Hadrian, could be no other than 'the Elder Aristo' of Eus. *Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 39, as well as the natural completer of 'Mark's' Gospel.

If the attribution of Mar_16:9-20 to 'the Elder Aristo' be dismissed as untrustworthy, our knowledge of the 'Aristion' from whom Papias derived (indirectly) his 'accounts of the Lord's sayings' is reduced to a minimum. Eusebius clearly did not identify him with Aristo of Pella, and from his silence would seem to have known nothing more about him than the statement of Papias that he was an elder, one of the 'disciples of the Apostles'; or, as his text of Papias would seem already to have read (by assimilation to the preceding), 'of the Lord.' Aristo of Pella, Eusebius certainly did not include in his chain of Christian writers, and save for the late and improbable statement of Maximus Confessor, all that we know of Aristo indicates that he does not belong there. He may, or may not, be the same as 'the cultured rhetorician Aristo of Gerasa.'

7. Conclusions.—The following may be taken as more or less probable conclusions from the foregoing data. (1) In the famous extract of Eusebius from Papias and the adjoining context (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 39), there is no warrant for substituting the reading Ἀριστων, the common form of the name, for the rarer form Ἀριστιων. The

Syriac, followed by Arm., assimilates it to Ἀρίστων (ὁ Πελλαιος)), quoted a few paragraphs farther on by Eusebius himself (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iv. 6), or perhaps merely falls into the ordinary spelling. The reverse process is inconceivable. Of this Aristion, Eusebius seems unable to relate anything beyond what he found in Papias. He certainly did not regard him as identical with Aristo of Pella, whose narrative of the revolt of Bar Cochba was in his hands. Papias, however, knew of Aristion as a *traditor* (orally; cf. οὐ γὰρ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων, κ.τ.λ.) of the teachings of the Apostles, himself ‘one of the disciples of these,’ probably in Palestine, since Papias obtained his traditions (Eusebius to the contrary notwithstanding) only from ‘those who came his way.’ Aristion was still living at the period of Papias’ (youthful? καλῶς ἐμνημόνευσεν) inquiries.

(2) From this otherwise unknown ‘Aristion’ of Papias we must sharply distinguish ‘Aristo of Pella,’ the historian of the revolt of Bar Cochba, quoted by Eusebius. Had this been a Christian writer, it is inexplicable that Eusebius, in spite of the avowed purpose of his book, elsewhere so consistently followed, should have omitted all mention whatsoever of his works. The *Viri Illust.* of Jerome is equally silent.

(3) The process of confusion of Papias’ Aristion with Eusebius’ Aristo of Pella begins with the Syriac translator (*circa (about)* 400), followed by the Armenian; or, if Maximus Confessor be right in attributing to Clement’s *Hypotyposes* the (conjectural?) assignment of the anonymous *Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus* to this author, perhaps with Clement. The late and unsupported statement of Maximus (*circa (about)* 600), quite in conflict with all that is known either of the *Dialogue* or the writer, is really valueless.

(4) The Armenian historian Moses of Chorene (5th cent.?) appears really to have known, as he claims, Aristo of Pella. His quotation, where it goes beyond that of Eusebius, shows more and more manifestly the secular, non-Christian writer. His statement that Aristo was secretary of Ardasches, which was so unfortunately ambiguous as to seem to make him secretary of Mark, bishop of Jerusalem, seems to be the starting-point for the last stage of the process.

(5) The scribe ‘John’ who wrote the Armenian Codex of the Gospels in a.d. 989 (found by Conybeare at Eçmiadzin), departed from previous Armenian tradition by appending, after the row of discs by which he had marked the end of the Gospel of Mark, at Mar 16:8, the spurious ending Mar 16:9-20, literally translated from the ordinary Greek text. To justify this unusual insertion, he crowded in ‘by an afterthought’ between the first line and the row of discs, in small, cramped, red letters, the title ‘Of the Elder Aristo.’ That he knew the Eusebian passage about

Papias' informant is indicated by his use of the title 'Elder' and the form 'Aristo'; for only the *Armenian* Eusebius has these peculiarities. That he should have identified the writer of the Markan appendix with 'the Elder Aristo' is most probably explained by his finding in Moses of Chorene what he took to be the statement that Aristo (of Pella) was secretary of Mark, the bishop of Jerusalem, in the time of Hadrian. Who indeed should venture to complete Mark's unfinished Gospel, if not his secretary?

B. W. Bacon.

☩ Armour

ARMOUR.—Luk 11:22 speaks of the πανοπλία (ἅπ. λεγ. in Gospels; also Eph 6:11; Eph 6:13, with which cf. 1Th 5:8) of 'the strong man' = the Wicked One—the def. art. ὁ (v. 21) indicating a single and definite person. The 'armour' is the potent influences at his disposal, called by St. Paul (Eph 6:11) 'wiles' and (Eph 6:16) 'fiery darts,' by which he deludes and overcomes. Trusting to these, he with his possessions is 'at peace' until 'the stronger than he' (ισχυρότερος αὐτοῦ [cf. Luk 3:16]) comes on the scene, when the armour is taken away and he is spoiled of his possessions.

The passage has a soteriological and an eschatological bearing. (1) It points to the power of Christ as able to dislodge evil passions and habits from the heart (cf. Mat 10:28 et pass.). He is 'stronger' than 'the strong man,' and has 'power to heal' (Luk 5:17). He thus fulfils the prophecy of Isa 49:24-25; Isa 53:12, delivering the prey and dividing the spoil. (2) Eschatologically it points to the final victory of good over evil. Cf. Col 2:15, where we have the word ἀπεκδυσάμενος (cf. Lighfoot's note, *in loc.*). The 'stronger' had already come into the 'strong one's' house and had delivered many; the conflict was continued by Him and against Him till His death, when He overcame him that had the power of death; the same conflict of evil against good is still continued, His 'spoiling' is going on, He is still taking from His adversary one and another of his possessions, till in the end He shall bind him in the abyss and utterly destroy him (cf. esp. 1Co 15:25-27 and Rev 19:6; Rev 19:11 ff.).

For passages descriptive of Roman armour of the time, in Polybius and Josephus, see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, s.v.; cf. also Martial, *Epigr.* ix. 57. With these St. Paul's description of the Christian's armour is in close harmony; but to find a 'diabolic' significance in the several details is rather fanciful than helpful.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , s.v.; *Ecce Homo*, ch. xiii.; *Expos. Times*, iii. (1892) p. 349 ff.; Bunyan, *Holy War*, ch. ii.

R. Macpherson.

⚠Army

ARMY.—‘Armies’ (στρατεύματα) are mentioned by Jesus as the natural instruments of discipline at the command of an Eastern king (Mat_22:7). He also foretells (Luk_21:20) the day when ‘Jerusalem shall be compassed with armies’ (στρατόπεδα). Otherwise there is little allusion to armies in the Gospels, and comparatively small use is made of lessons or figures drawn from military life. The Roman soldier, the legionary, did not loom very large in Palestine. When the Church spreads into the Province Asia, to Rome and Corinth, the impression of the army of Rome is much stronger both in the incidents of the Acts and in the figurative allusions of the Epistles.

John the Baptist found soldiers (see art. Soldier) among the crowds who came to him to be baptized (Luk_3:14); and the most remarkable bond of union between the military character and the character conformed to God, that of discipline and orderly subordination, was suggested to our Lord by the conduct of a centurion (Luk_7:8).

M. R. Newbolt.

⚠Arni

ARNI.—An ancestor of Jesus, according to the genealogy given by St. Luke (Luk_3:33, Authorized Version *Aram*). In Mat_1:3 f. he is called *Ram* (Authorized Version *Aram*).

⚠Arphaxad

ARPHAXAD.—The spelling (in both Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 of Luk_3:36) of the OT name which appears more correctly in the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 of OT as *Arpachshad*.

Arrest

ARREST (Joh_18:2-11 = Mat_26:47-56 = Mar_14:43-52 = Luk_22:47-53).—When Judas, withdrawing from the Supper, betook himself to the high priests and informed them that he was ready to implement his agreement (see Betrayal), their simplest way would have been to accompany him back to the upper room and there arrest Jesus. It was, however, impossible for them to proceed thus summarily. They had indeed, the officers of the temple at their command (cf. Joh_7:32); but these were insufficient, since the Law forbade them to go armed on the Passover day, * [Note: Mishna, Shabb. vi. 4: ‘No one shall go out with sword or bow, with shield or sling or lance. But if he go out, he shall be guilty of sin.’] and, though Jesus and the Eleven were defenceless, He was the popular hero, and, should an alarm be raised, the multitude would be aroused and would come to the rescue. Moreover, had they taken such a step on their own authority, they would have offended the procurator, Pontius Pilate, who was ever jealous for the maintenance of order, especially at the festal seasons; and it was of the utmost moment that they should secure his sympathy and co-operation. Accordingly, though doubtless impatient of the delay, they first of all appealed to him and obtained from him a detachment of soldiers from Fort Antonia, under the command of a tribune.

The Roman garrison at Jerusalem consisted of a single cohort (σπεῖρα), *i.e.* 500 men (cf. Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] i. ii. p. 55). λαβὼν τὴν σπεῖραν, (Joh_18:3) does not, of course, imply that the entire cohort was despatched on the errand. Cf. such phrases as ‘call out the military,’ ‘summon the police.’

Ere all was arranged several hours had elapsed. Jesus had quitted the upper room and the city, but the traitor knew whither He had gone, and led the way to the garden on Mount Olivet, where each night during the Passion-week the Master had bivouacked with the Twelve in the open (Luk_22:39). It was a motley band that followed Judas. The soldiers would march in order, but the temple-servants, armed with cudgels and carrying lamps and torches, gave it the appearance of a mere rabble (cf. Mat_26:47 = Mar_14:43 = Luk_22:47). And with the rest, forgetting their dignity in their eagerness to witness the success of their machinations, went some of the high priests, the temple-captains,† [Note: Luk_22:4; Luk_22:52 στρατηγοὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, the אַגָּסָּה, officials next in dignity to the priests, charged with the preservation of order in the temple. Cf. Schürer, ii. i. p. 257 ff.] and the elders.

When he had guided the band to the garden, Judas doubtless would fain have kept in the background, but he was doomed to drink his cup of degradation to the dregs. It

was the business of the soldiers to make the arrest, but they did not know Jesus, and, seeing not one man but twelve, they were at a loss which was He. It was necessary that Judas should come forward and resolve their perplexity. Casting shame to the winds, he gave them a sign: 'The one whom I shall kiss is he. Take him.' Then he advanced and, greeting Jesus with feigned reverence: 'Hail, Rabbi!' kissed Him effusively.* [Note: Mat_26:48-49 = Mar_14:44-45 φιλήσω, κατεφίλησεν. Cf. Luk_7:38; Luk_7:45.] It was the climax of his villainy, and Jesus repulsed him with a stinging sentence. 'Comrade!' He cried, in that one word summing up the traitor's baseness; 'to thine errand.'† [Note: Euth. Zig. το δὲ ἐφ', (Tisch., WH ἐφ' ὁ) τάρει οὐκ ἐρωτηματικῶς ἀναγνωστέον· ἐγίνωσκε γὰρ ἐφ' ᾧ ταρεγένετο· ἀλλ' ἀποφαντικῶς.] Brushing the traitor aside, He stepped forward and demanded of the soldiers: 'Whom are ye seeking?' 'Jesus the Nazarene,' they faltered. 'I am he,' He answered, making perhaps to advance towards them and surrender Himself; and, overawed by His tone and bearing, they retreated and fell on the ground.

'Unless,' says St. Jerome,‡ [Note: Ad Principiam Explan. Psalm. xliv.] 'He had had even in His countenance something sidereal, the Apostles would never have followed Him at once, nor would those who had come to arrest Him have fallen to the ground.' It is, however, unnecessary to assume a miracle. Cf. the consternation of the mercenary soldier who came, sword in hand, to kill C. Marius at Minturnae. 'The chamber in which he happened to be lying having no very bright light but being gloomy, it is said that the eyes of Marius appeared to dart a great flame on the soldier, and a loud voice came from the old man: "Darest thou, fellow, to slay C. Marius?" So the barbarian immediately rushed out, crying: "I cannot kill C. Marius!" '§ [Note: Plut. C. Mar. § 39.] It is related of John Bunyan that once, as he was preaching, a justice came with several constables to arrest him. 'The justice commanded him to come down from his stand, but he mildly told he was about his Master's business, and must rather obey His voice than that of man. Then a constable was ordered to fetch him down; who coming up, and taking hold of his coat, no sooner did Mr. Bunyan fix his eyes stedfastly upon him, having his Bible then open in his hand, but the man let go, looked pale and retired; upon which said he to his auditors, "See how this man trembleth at the word of God!" ' And John Wesley was once assailed by a gang of ruffians. 'Which is he? which is he?' they cried, not recognizing him in the press. 'I am he,' said Wesley, confronting them fearlessly; and they fell back and let him go unmolested.

Jesus reiterated His question: 'Whom are ye seeking?' and, when they answered again: 'Jesus the Nazarene,' He once more gave Himself up to arrest, adding an intercession for the Eleven: 'If ye are seeking *me*, let these men go their way.' Recovering themselves, the soldiers seized Him, and, as they were proceeding to bind

Him, the more roughly perhaps that they were ashamed of their weakness, the indignation of the disciples mastered their alarm, and Peter, with the courage of despair, drew a sword which he carried under his cloak | | [Note: | Cf. [Luk_22:38](#). Chrysostom thinks that these μάχαιρα were the knives (μάχαιρα may mean either sword or knife) which Peter and John (cf. [Luk_22:8](#)) had used in slaying and dressing the Paschal lamb. It evinces their sense of impending peril that they carried the μάχαιρα despite the legal prohibition.] and, assailing a slave of the high priest named Malchus, cut off his right ear. An uproar ensued, and the disciples must have paid the penalty of the rash act had not Jesus intervened. Working His hands free from the cords and craving a brief release: ‘Let me go—just thus far,’ He touched the wounded ear and healed it. ¶ [Note: This miracle is recorded by Luke alone, but the immunity of Peter from instant vengeance is inexplicable without it.] The miracle occasioned a diversion; and, while his mates were crowding about Malchus, Jesus reasoned with His excited followers. ‘Put the sword into its sheath,’ He commanded Peter. ‘The cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it? Dost thou suppose that I cannot appeal to my Father, and he will even now send to my support more than twelve legions of angels (*i.e.* one for Himself and one for each of the Eleven)? How then are the scriptures to be fulfilled that even thus it must come to pass?’ St. Chrysostom* [Note: In Matth. lxxxv.] finds here an allusion to the destruction of Sennacherib’s army ([2Ki_19:35](#)): If a single angel smote that host of 185,000 armed men, what could this rabble do against 72,000 angels?

Anxious to avert attention still further from the Eleven, Jesus addressed Himself to the Jewish rulers who with their officers had accompanied the soldiers. ‘As though against a brigand,’ He said scornfully, ‘have ye come forth with swords and cudgels? Daily in the temple I was wont to sit teaching, and ye did not arrest me.’ What had kept them from arresting Him in the temple-court? It was fear of the multitude (cf. [Mat_26:3-5](#) = [Mar_14:1-2](#) = [Luk_22:1-2](#)). And they were cowards still, coming forth with an armed band against a defenceless man. It was a stroke of biting sarcasm, and they felt the sting of it. Apparently it provoked them to violence. At all events the Eleven were at that moment stricken with sudden panic, and ‘all forsook him and fled.’

They made good their escape, but the infuriated rulers† [Note: [Mar_14:51](#) οἱ νεανίσκοι om. Tisch., WH.] laid hands on one who, though not a follower of Jesus, was evidently a friend and sympathizer. St. Mark alone has recorded the incident. A solitary figure (εἷς τις) strangely attired had been hovering near during the *rencontre*—‘a young man arrayed in a linen sheet‡ [Note: The σινδών was a

bed-sheet. Cf. Eus. HE vi. 40: μενων ἐπὶ τῆς εὐνῆς, ἧς ἤμην γυμνός, ἐν τῷ λινῷ ἐσθήματι, where Heinichen, comparing our passage, comments: ‘ἐν τῷ λινῷ ἐσθήματι idem est quod alias vocatur σινδών.’] over his undress.’ When the Eleven took to flight the rulers laid hold on him; and, dropping his garment, he left it in their grasp and escaped undressed. § [Note: γυμνος, not absolutely naked. Cf. Joh_21:7.]

Who was he? and why should the Evangelist have recorded an incident which seems merely to introduce an incongruous element of comedy into the tragic narrative? Of all the conjectures which have been offered, ¶ [Note: ¶ John, who recovered from his panic and followed Jesus to the high priest’s palace (Gregory, Moral. xiv. 23). James, the Lord’s brother, who, according to Eus. HE ii. 23, always after his conversion wore linen garments (Epiphan., Theophyl.). See Petavel in Expositor, March 1891.] the most reasonable seems to be that he was St. Mark himself (Olshans., Godet). The conjecture is of recent date, but long ago it was alleged that he was from the house where Jesus had eaten the Passover (Euth. Zig., Theophyl.); and it may well have been, as Ewald suggests, the house of Mary, that widow lady who resided in Jerusalem with her son John Mark, and showed hospitality to the Apostles in after days (Act_12:12). Probably Mark had gone to rest that evening after the celebration of the Passover by his household, and, with a foreboding of trouble, had lain awake. He had heard Jesus and the Eleven descend after midnight from the upper room and quit the house, and, hastily rising and wrapping his sheet about him, had anxiously followed after them and witnessed all that passed in Gethsemane. And it may be that the incident was less trivial than it appears. In early days St. Mark bore a singular epithet. He was styled ‘the stump-fingered,’ ¶ [Note: Hippol. Philosoph. vii. 30: οὐτε Παῦλος ὁ ἀτίστολο; οὐτε Μάρκος ὁ κολοβοδακτυλος.] and in the absence of any reasonable explanation of the epithet it may, perhaps, be conjectured that during the scuffle in Gethsemane his finger had been mutilated by the slash of a sword (see *Expos.* 1st ser. i. [1875] pp. 436-446).

David Smith.

Art

ART.—There has been in Christian history no antagonism between religion and art as such; though there have been abuses of particular forms of art, and consequent reactions against those abuses. The NT affords little guidance, for it is not concerned with the subject. It is the revelation of a Person, not of a code of rules. It deals with

fundamental spiritual facts, and it was not within the scope of the writers of its books to supply disquisitions on art or philosophy or science. Such problems were left to be settled from age to age by the spiritual instinct of a Church, to which Christ promised the abiding presence of the Spirit: the NT has no more to say about art than it has to say about economics or natural science, and therefore it neither praises any of these things nor condemns them; it is concerned with that which underlies them all.

The NT is neutral also in regard to the use of art in the worship of the Temple. The Jews were not an inartistic nation, though they had not the genius for art of some other races: they had music, poetry, sculpture, architecture, and the usual minor arts of their time; and, though in sculpture they were under strict regulations for the prevention of idolatry, this did not prevent them from using graven images within the sanctuary itself, while in the ornaments of their worship they had been guided by elaborate regulations as to form and colour and symbolism. Christianity grew up in these surroundings, and did not find any fault with them. Our Lord condemned the ethical formalism of current religion, but not its art: He condemned the trafficking in the Temple, but not its beauty. Nor did His disciples have anything to say against the art of the pagan cities where they went, though they had much to say about the wickedness: they are silent on the subject, except for a few illustrations from engraving and painting in [Heb 1:3](#); [Heb 8:5](#); [Heb 10:1](#). It is in the Apocalypse alone that we have any setting forth of visible beauty; and here there is a clearer recognition of the principle of art, because nothing else could express what the writer had to show forth. It is not enough to say that the imagery of the Apocalypse is merely symbolic: all religious art is symbolic. St. John envelops his conception of the highest form of being in an atmosphere of glowing beauty; and a Church which accepted his teaching could hardly mistrust material beauty as a handmaid of religion. It is not therefore to be wondered at that Christian worship, as we know of it after the Peace of the Church, was much influenced by the descriptions of the heavenly worship in the Apocalypse (see, e.g., the recently discovered *Testament of our Lord*, a.d. 350).

But, if we would find in the NT the final argument in favour of art, we must turn, as Westcott says in his great essay on the subject, to the central message of Christianity—*the Word became flesh*. Here is the justification and the sanctification of all that is truly human: Christianity embraces all life, and ‘the inspiration of the new birth extends to every human interest and faculty.’ The old conflict between the spiritual and the material is reconciled by the Incarnation; for by it the visible became the sacrament, or outward sign, of that which is inward and spiritual. Thus, like the Incarnation itself, ‘Christian art embodies the twofold conception of the spiritual destiny of the visible, and of a spiritual revelation through the visible. The central fact of the Christian faith gives a solid unity to both truths.’ The office of art, Westcott continues, is ‘to present the truth of things under the aspect of beauty’: the

effect of Christianity upon art is that of 'a new birth, a transfiguration of all human powers by the revelation of their divine connexions and destiny'; and thus 'Christian art is the interpretation of beauty in life under the light of the Incarnation.' Thus the Christian artist is a teacher, his art is ministerial, and when it appears to be an end in itself idolatry has begun; his true function is both to interpret the world as God has made it in its beauty, in the light of a deeper understanding of its meaning, and also to embody to men his own visions of the truth—'he is not a mirror but a prophet,' and love is his guide. Thus he is led 'through the most patient and reverent regard of phenomena to the contemplation of the eternal'; for 'the beauty which is the aim of Christian art is referred to a Divine ideal. It is not "of the world," as finding its source or its final measure there, but "of the Father," as corresponding to an unseen truth. The visible to the Christian eye is in every part a revelation of the invisible.'

Westcott, however, assumes an 'antagonism of early Christians to contemporary art,' and points to the central message of Christianity as establishing a reconciliation between supposed 'elements of contrast.' Was there, we must ask any such antagonism as a matter of history? When Westcott wrote, Christian archaeology was still in its infancy; much that we now have was still undiscovered, and that which was known was uncertain in date and inaccurately reproduced; notions still held the field which have since been disproved, as, for instance, that which credits the early Church with the wanton destruction of pagan monuments, when, as a matter of fact, the ancient Roman temples were, after the triumph of Christianity, long kept in repair at the expense of the Christian State, as the chief glory of the city.

The question is of great importance, for modern writers frequently condemn Christianity because of its supposed depreciation of humanity. Thus the natural scientist Metchnikoff—writing, as people do, about matters which are outside his province—declares in *The Nature of Man* that Christianity lowered our conception of human nature, and gives as evidence this statement:—'Sculpture, which played so great a part in the ancient world, and which was intimately associated with Greek ideals, began to decline in the Christian era,'—the real truth being, as we shall see, that sculpture had been declining for several generations in pagan hands, and that Christian artists did what they could with the decadent craft.

Now Westcott himself states that 'the literary evidence is extremely scanty' as regards the relation of Christianity to art; and, writing twenty-two years later, we may add that archaeological evidence all points in the opposite direction to that which he supposed. The literary evidence, indeed, proves little as to the first two centuries, though recent discoveries have increased our knowledge of the 3rd century.

The usual quotations from the Fathers—such as Westcott gives—are, indeed, ‘extremely scanty’; but the one extract which does deal directly and definitely with the subject has been curiously overlooked. It is from Clement of Alexandria in the chapter headed ‘Human arts as well as Divine knowledge proceed from God’ (*Strom.* i. 4), and is quite final as to Clement’s opinion. After pertinently referring to the craftsman Bezalel the son of Uri (Exo_31:2-6), whose ‘understanding’ was from God, he proceeds—

‘For those who practise the common arts are in what pertains to the senses highly gifted: in hearing, he who is commonly called a musician; in touch, he who moulds clay; in voice, the singer; in smell, the perfumer; in sight, the engraver of devices on seals.... With reason, therefore, the Apostle has called the wisdom of God “manifold,” which has manifested its power “in many departments and in many modes” [Eph_3:10, Heb_1:1]—by art, by knowledge, by faith, by prophecy—for our benefit. “For all wisdom is from the Lord and is with him for ever” [Sir_1:1], as says the Wisdom of Jesus.’

Though less comprehensive than this admirable statement, the passage to which Westcott himself alludes is also extremely interesting. Clement describes a number of subjects commonly engraved upon seals to which Christians could give a Christian meaning (see *Christ in Art*), whilst he forbids the use of seals which bear idols, swords, bows, and drinking cups—condemning thus, not art, but idolatry, war, and drunkenness (*Paed.* iii. 3). Origen’s answer to Celsus (*circa (about) Cels.* viii. 17-20) is often quoted as denying the use of art. He meets Celsus’ charge that ‘we shrink from raising altars, statues, and temples,’ by saying that Celsus ‘does not perceive that we regard the spirit of every good man as an altar,’ and that Christ is ‘the most excellent image in all creation,’ and ‘that we do refuse to build lifeless temples to the Giver of all life, let anyone who chooses learn how we are taught that our bodies are the temple of God.’ This rhetorical answer cannot be taken as denying the use of art by the African Christians: it is a vindication of the spiritual nature of Christian worship, and the ‘lifeless temples’ must be referred to paganism, since there was nowhere any shrinking from the erection of church buildings. Origen is not concerned with the question of art: he merely denies ‘altars, statues, and temples’ in the heathen sense.

Even Tertullian, Montanist though he was, is clear in not condemning artists for practising their art, though he has a good deal to say about their making idols; the artist who makes idols works ‘illicitly’ like Hermogenes, who ‘despises God’s law in his painting’ (*adv. Hermog.* 1). An artist’s profession was full of temptation from heathen patrons: so Tertullian warns them that ‘every artificer of an idol is guilty of one and the same crime’ as he who worships it (*de Idol.* 3), since to make an idol is to worship it (*ib.* 6); and he advises them to practise their art in other directions—‘gild

slippers instead of statues’—‘We urge men generally to such kinds of handicrafts as do not come in contact with an idol’ (*ib.* 8). Elsewhere he gives useful testimony by his incidental mention of Christian art work in the painting of the Good Shepherd and other subjects upon chalices (*de Pudic.* 7 and 10).

This is, in fact, the conclusion to which the literary evidence leads us: the early Christians were told to keep clear of paganism, with which their daily work was often so closely involved, but they were not told to forswear art.

If we wish to find a condemnation of art as such, we must turn not to Christianity, but to pre-Christian philosophy, and—in spite of all that has been said about the opposition between Hebraism and Hellenism—not to a Jewish but to a Greek writer. **Plato** knew what art was; he belonged to a race with whom art was not a mere incident but a most important part of life; in describing his ideal city he had to deal with the problem of art, and he settled it by excluding the artist altogether. Beginning with dramatic art, he proceeds, towards the end of the *Republic*, with a consistent adherence to principle that is as rare now as it was then, to include every form of art in his condemnation. His reasons are three—The artist creates without knowing or caring what is good or bad, and thus separates himself from morality; he is an imitator of appearances, and therefore a long way off the truth; and art, whether poetry or painting or the drama, excites passions which ought to be curbed. Plato fully recognized that if painting is wrong, poetry must be wrong too; and he decided that poetry also must be excluded from the perfect city. He was right at least in this, that all art must stand or fall together; and in the light of his clear thought it is easy to see that the three movements which have appeared in Christendom—Asceticism, Iconoclasm, and Puritanism—were not really movements against art. The Christian Church never adopted Plato’s position: the ascetic precursors of Monasticism came nearest it, but they formulated no principle beyond that of complete renunciation of the world for the benefit of their own souls, and they did little or nothing to check the lavish decoration of churches which characterized their age. The Iconoclasts of the Byzantine Empire were often great patrons of architecture, poetry, and the minor arts; and, though they carried their special principle down to the forbidding of pictures of sacred subjects even in books, they did not carry it beyond the question of images. The Puritans, being Englishmen, were naturally less logical than the Greek iconoclasts; thus, they accepted Judaism when it forbade images, and ignored it when it commanded ceremonial: in fact, they disliked art in so far as it embodied ideas which were distasteful to them, and no further. Puritanism was a mingling of the two earlier reactions, asceticism and iconoclasm: it can hardly be taken as embodying a principle of opposition to art.

The question is not, then, one between Puritanism and Catholicism, or between Hebraism and Hellenism, but between Platonism and Aristotelianism. For it was

Aristotle who answered Plato; and he did so by pointing out that a true philosophy must make the whole of human nature rationally intelligible; for, the Universe being rationally organized, the existence of art proves that it must have a proper function in life. This is surely the philosophy also of the Incarnation: the Word became flesh, and in that the whole of human nature becomes intelligible; it is good in itself, and in its unstained perfection can become a fit manifestation of the Divine.

Sin, indeed, mars this perfection; and while sin remains, asceticism continues to have its function in the world. The love of the beautiful may degenerate into the lust of the eye, because the inward and spiritual is forgotten, and the sacramentalism of art is lost. It may then become necessary to pluck out the eye that sees, or to cut off the fashioning hand, in order to enter into life; but it is a choice of evils,—the man escapes Gehenna, but he enters into life ‘maimed.’

So, though it is better to be maimed than to be lost, better to hate art than to make it a god, hiding the eternal which it should reveal, better, indeed, to break images than to worship them; yet the fulness of truth lies not in the severance, but in the union of the good and the beautiful. They have often appeared as rival tendencies in history. Religious men have often been narrow and inhuman, artists have often been weak in will and the creatures of their emotions, as Aristotle found them; but the one-sidedness of men serves only to illustrate the manysidedness of truth. Christendom through all her struggles has loved righteousness, and has not forgotten to love art also. She has her fasts, but she has also her feasts.

It is certain as a historic fact that the early Church had no suspicion of art, but accepted without scruple the decorative motives and forms of the classical civilization to which, apart from religion and ethics, she belonged, eliminating only such themes as bore an idolatrous or immoral meaning. Limited at first in her resources, she did not for a while attain to magnificence; but all the evidence of archaeology, which is yearly accumulating, shows that she made use of art so far as she had opportunity. Nor did she try to create an art of her own; she used the art as she used the languages of the empire. The art of the early Church is not Christian in its form, but in its inspiration.

Most of the earliest Christian art that has been discovered is in the Catacombs of Rome. This does not mean, as Westcott supposes, that the Church of Italy was artistic while the rest of the Church was not; still less does it show, as is popularly imagined, that the Roman Christians used the Catacombs as their churches and permanent hiding-places. The art of the Catacombs has survived because it has been preserved underground; but it was not the only art, and the early Christians worshipped above ground like everybody else, except in the case of occasional services for the departed. But hardly anything has survived of the art above ground: in literature we

have only hints that stir but do not satisfy the imagination,—as when Eusebius tells us (*Historia Ecclesiastica* viii. 12) that in times of persecution the churches were pulled down (as by Diocletian in 302), and mentions that the church at Nicomedia, destroyed in 303, was of great size and importance (*de Mort. Pers.* [Note: Persian.] 12, ‘fanum illud editissimum’). At a time when not the buildings only, but the very books of the Christians were destroyed, it was in the burial-places—immune by Roman law from molestation, and hidden away from the ravages of sun and air, and of barbarians ancient and modern—that works of art survived; and to the Catacombs we must turn for our evidence. There is every reason to suppose that the art which we find there is typical of that of the whole Church; for (1) the Christian Churches were bound together by remarkably close ties in the first three centuries; (2) the symbolism of the Catacombs is shown by the early literature to have been that of the rest of the Church also; and (3) there was a uniformity of art throughout the empire, of which Rome was the cosmopolitan centre,—an Italian city indeed in which most of the art was executed by Greeks.

Enough description for our present purpose of the paintings in the Catacombs will be found in the article on Christ in Art. To that article, which deals with Christian art on its most important side (the Christological), reference may also be made for illustrations from the other arts which are here more briefly mentioned. It will suffice here to make a few general statements. (1) Pictorial art is found in the earliest catacombs, belonging to a period before the end of the 1st cent., as well as in those of later date; (2) the first Christians must have been fond of art to use it so freely in the dark: the *cubicula* of the Catacombs, which were only visited occasionally, and where nothing could be painted or seen except by lamp-light, must represent art at its minimum. Yet that art is both good and abundant. (3) Among the very earliest examples, figures are included as well as merely decorative subjects of animals, flowers, etc. (4) The art is the highly developed art of the Roman Empire, which was at its height in the 1st, 2nd centuries, and declined after the reign of Hadrian. (5) The art of the Catacombs is therefore Christian only in that it generally represents Christian subjects, and that it acquires almost at once a certain marked character of mystic symbolism which is peculiar to the ages of persecution. Certainly there is something about this early painting which at once distinguishes it as Christian. Its authors were intent on expressing ideas,—not the technical theology of an ecclesiastical system, but the faith and hope of ordinary Christian people,—therefore they use suggestion and symbol, and are fond of a conventional treatment even of Scripture subjects, and thus their work is marked by a quiet reserve that excludes all reference to the sufferings and death of the martyrs, and dwells upon the life and power of Christ, not upon His death and passion. This art is marked by simplicity, happiness, and peace; it deals only with such OT and NT and other subjects as could bear a mystical interpretation in connexion with the deliverance and happiness of the departed through the power of Christ and the grace of the sacraments. It is

sometimes of a high technical order and of great beauty, though the difficulties of its execution led to its being often sketchy in character. Born full-grown in the 1st cent., it passed in the 2nd into this second mystical period, declining after the 2nd cent. gradually in technique, as the pagan art was declining. After the Peace of the Church in the 4th cent. it passes into its third period, when its symbolism is more obvious, more didactic and dogmatic.

Sculpture naturally does not appear so early as painting. The dark catacombs were no place for its display, though in them it has its beginnings in the *graffiti* or incised designs which are common on the tombs. These were easily to be seen, and could be wrought on the spot, which was an important consideration in days when it was difficult to order Christian sculpture from pagan shops. It would be an easier matter to have executed in the public studios a subject that could bear a pagan interpretation; and thus it is that we do find a statue of the Good Shepherd which probably belongs to the 3rd cent., though one would naturally expect Christians who lived in pagan times to be shy of the use of statuary. In the 4th cent. the growing custom of burial above ground, coupled with the prosperity of the Church, encouraged the use of sculptured sarcophagi (cf. Christ in Art). Excellent carved ivories are also found at this period, but art had been steadily declining since Hadrian's time, and after the 6th cent. no good sculpture of any sort is found. There was no opposition to it in the West, but in the East the Iconoclastic controversy (716-867) led to the wholesale destruction of 'images,' whether painted or carved; and though it ended in the restoration of pictures, there was a tacit compromise by which statues were not restored, in spite of the decision in favour of 'images' by the Second Council of Nicaea (787). This renunciation of statuary in the Eastern Church grew into a passionate aversion to its use inside a place of worship,—an aversion which continues still.

Among the **minor arts** may be mentioned that of *gold-glass*, which commenced early in the 3rd cent., and has preserved for us many Christian pictures and symbols. Miniature illustration came into general use in the 4th cent. in MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] of books of the Bible; it was not decorative like that of the Middle Ages; the miniatures were separated from the text, and were devoted to giving pictures of the Scripture events described, much as in present-day book illustration. The handicrafts of pottery, metal, and jewel work, etc., gradually adopted Christian symbolism,—thus it first appears on lamps in the 3rd century. The magnificence of church plate after the Peace of the Church almost passes belief. An early instance is given in the *Pilgrimage of Sylvia* (a.d. 385), which was discovered in 1888.

'It is needless,' she says, describing her experiences in Syria, 'to write what was the ornamenting on that day of the Church of the Anastasis, or of the cross in Jerusalem or in Bethlehem; for there you would see nothing but gold and gems or silk; for if you

see the veils, they are all of silk, with stripes of gold; if you see the curtains, they are the same. Every kind of gold and gemmed vessel is used on that day. It is impossible to relate the number and weight of the lights, tapers, and lamps and other utensils. And what shall I say of the adornment of the fabric, which Constantine, with all the power of his kingdom, in the presence of his mother, honoured with gold, mosaic, and precious stones?’

With this may be compared the gifts, recorded in the *Liber Pontificalis*, which Constantine made to certain churches: among them he gave to St. Peter’s ‘3 golden chalices with emeralds and jacinths, each having 45 gems and weighing 12 pounds’; and ‘a golden paten with a tower of purest gold, with a dove adorned with emeralds and jacinths, and 215 pearls, weighing 30 pounds’; while to St. John Lateran he gave no fewer than 174 candlesticks and chandeliers of various sorts, as to which Flenry reckons that altogether they furnished 8730 separate lights. These figures suggest a magnificence of the surroundings of worship that is far removed from the simple two-handled cup of the 2nd cent. fresco of the *Fractio Panis*. None the less, the fact that Constantine’s gift was made shows that there was no tradition of dislike to such magnificence. Such descriptions bear out the general impression that the early Church made free use of whatever richness of art her opportunities could provide, though when necessity required she was content, as Jerome says, ‘to carry the body of Christ in a basket of osiers and His blood in a cup of glass.’

Mosaic art, of which there are extant such splendid examples in the churches of the Imperial cities, Rome and Ravenna and Constantinople, followed upon architecture, and flourished between the 4th and 7th centuries. Its magnificence and durability make it to us the most characteristic feature of the Christian art of that period. The principal subjects represented are the great figures of Christ enthroned, figures of the Apostles and other saints, apocalyptic and other symbolic subjects, scenes from the Old and New Testaments, and pictures of imperial personages and bishops.

In architecture there have been many theories as to the origin of the basilica. It is now very generally agreed that the Christian church is a development of the classical *atrium*, the central colonnaded court of dwelling-houses in the Imperial age. The earliest gatherings for worship took place in the *atrium* of some wealthy convert, and were thus surrounded with all the greater and lesser arts of the period. Now, the Greek and Roman temples were constructed for a worship in which both the altar and the worshippers stood outside. The Christian worship began in the home (Rom 16:5 and perhaps Act 2:46), and the purpose of the earliest churches was to hold a large number of worshippers before the Lord’s Table; thus, though the style was that of the age, the manner of its use was different from the first. The basilica is a distinctively Christian building, marked out by its oblong shape, clerestory, colonnaded aisles, and apse. It was probably in process of development in the centuries before the Peace of

the Church,—we read, *e.g.*, of church buildings in the newly found *Canons of Hippolytus*, c. 220-250 a.d.,—though no extant edifice is known (unless the startling theory just put forth by Dr. Richter and Mr. C. Taylor in their books on S. Maria Maggiore in Rome comes to be accepted—the theory being that this church and its mosaics belong to the 2nd century). The churches destroyed by Diocletian were rebuilt under Constantine, and it is to the Constantinian period that the earliest surviving basilicas belong, whether in Italy, Syria, or Africa. In the East there was later one marked development, the use of the dome, which culminated under Justinian in St. Sofia, and has continued to be characteristic of the Greek and Russian churches down to our own day. In the West the basilica continued unchanged till the 8th, and in some parts till the 10th cent., when it was modified by the growth of what is called Romanesque architecture, of which Gothic is but a development; but the main features of the basilica—nave, clerestory, aisles, projecting sanctuary, and often transepts—remain unchanged to-day.

The decline of Western art in what are called the Dark Ages is often attributed to Christianity and its supposed hatred of human nature. The truth is, that while Byzantium maintained a high culture far better and longer than used to be supposed, the whole Roman civilization well-nigh disappeared under the invasions of the northern races; these peoples were converted and gradually civilized by Christianity, and, as their civilization grew up, their art developed from the barbaric stage till it culminated in the perfection of Gothic. That art in its development had the limitations of the young races; it developed more rapidly in architecture and architectural carving than in painting or statuary; but all this has nothing to do with Christianity, as writers like Taine suppose—‘If one considers the stained glass windows, or the windows in the cathedrals, or the rude paintings, it appears as if the human race had become degenerate, and its blood had been impoverished: pale saints, distorted martyrs, hermits withered and unsubstantial,’ etc. (*Phil, de l’Art*, 88, 352, 4th ed.). Passages like this are beside the mark; the art of the Middle Ages was full-blooded enough, and was admirable even in its rude beginnings, when it had not learnt the most difficult of lessons—the representation of the human form. In architecture and the kindred arts the Middle Ages brought a new revelation of beauty into the world,—an art that stands alone, not only for its lofty spirituality and technical excellence, but also for its homely democratic humanity.

Beyond this it is not necessary to go, since we are not dealing with the history of art in general, but only with the relation between it and Christianity. It has been necessary to sketch the beginnings because of the widespread idea that Christianity started with an aversion to the fine arts, and was reconciled to them only as worldliness increased upon her. Modern archaeology has proved this idea to be mistaken; and, having pointed out what is now known as to the early use of art by the Church, we need not follow the subsequent history of painting and sculpture, of

architecture and the handicrafts, in their developments and decadences, except to say that, though art in the Christian era has been sometimes rude and sometimes pagan, it has at its best—when most perfect in technique and most imbued with spiritual purpose—excelled all else that the world has been able to produce: even the perfect statuary of Greece was outrivalled by such an artist as Michael Angelo, who reveals not only the body but the soul within the body also. The best Christian art is better than anything that has gone before, because it has more to express.

Christendom, then, began its career in natural association with art; and art is Christian, not by reason of any peculiarity of style, but when it is informed by the Christian ideal. Art is not an end in itself, but a language; the greatest artificers, like the greatest writers, are those who have the greatest things to say, and the fineness of any art is, as Ruskin says, ‘an index of the moral purity and majesty of the emotion it expresses.’ Pagan reaction has, indeed, more than once taken refuge in art, as it has also taken refuge in science; but the fault does not lie in either. There must always be reaction when the Church refuses to recognize the truth of science or the seriousness of art. And art is serious, for it is one of man’s primal gifts, and, like nature, one of his most constant educators. Art is necessary because, in Ruskin’s words, ‘life without industry is guilt, and industry without art is brutality’; and though, as he found, religious men in his time despised art, they despised it at the peril of religion. He was himself the greatest exponent of the religious mission of art and of its moral value. And his conclusion was that the root of all good art lies in ‘the two essential instincts of humanity, the love of order and the love of kindness,’ the one associated with righteousness, the other with charity. The ‘love of beauty,’ he proceeds, ‘is an essential part of all healthy human nature, and though it can long coexist with states of life in many other respects unvirtuous, it is itself wholly good,—the direct adversary of envy, avarice, mean worldly care, and especially of cruelty. It entirely perishes when these are wilfully indulged.’ If this be so, it is indeed of the gospel, and excellent in so far as it is close to the spirit of Christ. If this be so,—and no man had a better right to make bold generalizations on the subject than Ruskin,—artists and preachers can agree in his conclusion that the great arts ‘have had, and can have, but three principal directions of purpose: first, that of enforcing the religion of men; secondly, that of perfecting their ethical state; thirdly, that of doing them material service.’

Literature.—The same authorities mainly as for the article on Christ in Art. Special use has been made in the present article of: W. Lowrie’s *Christian Art and Archaeology* (1901); Westcott’s essay on ‘The Relation of Christianity to Art’ in his *Commentary on the Epistles of St. John* (1883); A. J. Maclean’s *Recent Discoveries Illustrating Early Christian Life and Worship* (1904); an article on ‘Art and Puritanism’ by J. W. Mackail in *Saint George*, vol. vii. (1904); while out of the multitude of Ruskin’s works the concluding extract is taken from his *Lectures on Art* (1887).

Asa

ASA.—A king of Judah (*circa (about)* 918-878 b.c.), named in our Lord's genealogy, Mat_1:7 f.

Ascension

ASCENSION.—The Ascension is the name applied to that event in which the Risen Christ finally parted from His disciples and passed into the heavens. The traditional view is based on the passage Act_1:1-12, supported by Mar_16:19, Luk_24:49-51 (which narrate the event), Joh_6:62; Joh_20:17 (which look forward to it), Eph_4:8-10, 1Ti_3:16; 1Pe_3:22, Heb_4:14 (which imply it). To the foregoing list many would add references of Christ to His departure (from the context not identifiable with His death), Mat_9:15; Mat_26:11; Mat_26:29; Mat_26:64, Joh_7:33; Joh_7:14-16; and allusions in Acts, Epistles, Revelation, to Christ being 'seated at the right hand of God' (Act_2:33; Act_3:21; Act_5:31; Act_7:56; Act_13:36-37, Php_2:9, Heb_1:3; Heb_2:9; Heb_12:2, Rev_1:13; Rev_5:6 etc.). The details are drawn from Acts 1 : the scene, the Mt. of Olives; the time, forty days after the Resurrection; the occasion, a conversation concerning the Kingdom; the act of parting in being taken up; the vanishing in a cloud; the vision of two men in white apparel and their announcement of His coming again: all indicating a bodily disappearance by an upward movement into the sky.

The bodily Ascension is vindicated as possible, as necessary, and as adequately evidenced.

1. Possibility.—The wonderfulness of the event is not denied, but its acceptance is urged by a varied appeal. Sometimes the reference is to the Divine power operating in the fulfilment of the Divine purpose of salvation. The Ascension is then regarded as part and parcel of the redemptive scheme, and not more wonderful than the other redemptive facts, e.g. Incarnation, Resurrection, etc. Or the reference is to our ignorance of the physical universe and its constitution. 'Miraculous Christianity' does not 'imply an anti-scientific view of the world' (cf. Goldwin Smith, *Guesses at the Riddle of Existence*, p. 165). There is a vast uncomprehended region in nature not yet within the sweep of human faculties, which Science has not fathomed and to whose existence she has become recently profoundly sensitive. The world, as science

interprets its phenomena, is not the complete world which may hold potentialities permissive of such an event as the Ascension. Or, again, the reference may be to our ignorance of the nature of the ascending body. Grant the cogency of the scientific objection to a body having gravity and normal dimensions rising in upward flight to a distance, is it certain that such was the body of Christ? There are hints which furnish the opposite suggestion. The only sure statement that may be affirmed with regard to it is that it was the same, yet not the same, as the pre-Resurrection body: it was a body which issued from the sepulchre with identity complete, yet physically changed, existing under new conditions of which we have only the faintest apprehension. Physically, the Ascension meant a complete change of conditions, the passing into a mode of existence having no longer direct physical relations with our ordinary experience, whither we cannot follow by the exercise of our sensitive intelligence, and which in our lack of material for comparison we cannot even imaginatively picture. The conjecture, further, is hazarded that if the process of spiritualizing the body was at the time of the Ascension so complete as to render it invisible to ordinary sense, the process of preparing the spiritual perception of the disciples was by that time also complete, so that what was hidden from others was manifested to them. Recent research also into psychical activities, both conscious and sub-conscious, has brought the question into renewed prominence especially among scientific men, and that in no spirit of hostility to the traditional view.

2. Necessity.—The necessity of the Ascension is obvious. It was at once the natural consequence of all that preceded and the only sufficient cause of the marvellous experiences that followed. The *risen state* and the forty days demanded its occurrence. Apart from any explicit teaching on the subject during those days, the situation of itself must have provoked reflection and pointed to an exit from earthly scenes not by way of mortal dissolution but rather of glorification. The interval is clearly transitory. The relationship between Jesus and the disciples evinces a certain reserve on His side, a certain surprise and perplexity on theirs. It partakes in all the mystery that hangs over the world of spirits in general, as well as in that pertaining specially to the borderland of that world, the region where thought and matter meet. His appearances are only occasional. His movements are mysterious. His life is not of the bodily order. Whether the theory of progressive spiritualizing be tenable or not,—the conception is very obscure,—the facts of physical transformation and spiritual enhancement are indubitable. The disciples are convinced by the empty tomb and the apparitional body that He had not seen corruption in the grave, yet do not always recognize Him as He appears. He is no longer of them. Their mind must have been challenged again and again to inquire, What next? It was neither fitting that He should die again, nor that He should remain on the earth in His then state: death He had already sounded and survived, while for His departure He had aforetime prepared them. Further, His *Person* claimed it. His self-consciousness during the earthly ministry, and the teaching it prompted; the definite impression of these on

the minds of the disciples leading to the expectation of further developments of His Being; as well as the most distinct intimations of the preparatory character of His present activity, the specialty of His saving mission, the uniqueness of His relation to the Father and heaven,—all combined in an impressive witness to the assurance that not this world but the heavenly life was His proper and rightful sphere, and that until He had attained to it He was not in possession of His own, the glory He had with the Father before the world was, which was as yet for the most part hid, revealing itself only in hints, and which He was bound to reassume, accentuated, so to speak, with all that virtue He had won in His human nature for bestowal on men. In His human life He had been the subject of development in time,—a development, it is true, not from evil or imperfection to the good and perfect, but from strength to strength, involving living growth, a process presumably capable of reaching its end. Underlying that process lay His Divine Being, in its inherent power incapable of growth, no attainment but original endowment. The return to the Father in the Ascension-act marked the perfection of the human process in harmonious realization within the Divine powers of His Person.

Still further, the *work* of Christ remained incomplete without the Ascension. It has been objected against His teaching that it is incomplete as a system and incoherent in its details. There is ground for the complaint. His ministry bears traces throughout of its preparatory character. His teaching is at times parabolic, His acts often typical, His method as much an effort to create a new power of insight as to offer a new sum of truths. He holds out hopes of a more immediate personal, if spiritual, direction, under the force of which a richer fulness of His truth shall be gained. He anticipates future acts of His work which are not simply symbolic of His utterances, but necessary to their interpretation. A future is always with Him: separate from the present in its conditions and gifts and in the nature of His agency, so separate as justly to be entitled to the name of a new 'dispensation.' The Ascension marks the transition. It has no substantial independence. It closes the public ministry; it opens the continuation of that ministry in the new age of the Spirit. It announces that the great human facts necessary to redemption are finished, and that the results are henceforth to be increasingly realized. His saving energies are consummated in His incarnate and glorified Personality: the departure is necessitated that they may not remain a legacy of dead and inoperative information. For this reason the Ascension, as the passing into exaltation, stands at the beginning of the *fresh spiritual experiences* of the Apostolic age. It explains the extraordinary change in the mind of the Apostles. They felt an intense conviction. Because there had been no loss, their conception of Christ has been cleared, His exaltation seen, His perpetual action promised. Under the new light they proceed to organize the momentous work of the Church. On precisely the same basis they instruct their hearers and develop their doctrine. The centre of the missionary discourses is the Exalted Christ; intimate communion with Him exalted is normative to their thought. That truth fills up their entire consciousness and crushes

out every other thought. It forms the firm foundation on which their whole life and mind are built up. They are witnesses to one great fact. The NT documents set forth much in the way of new truths and new ethics, but their distinctive testimony is to a new intense experience, which has altered the entire character of those who share it. That experience is everywhere traced in direct derivation from Christ glorified.

But the Christ glorified is the Jesus of history. The new experience is related to the acts of His life in a vital way. A distinction may be drawn between them, but only as two aspects of one reality, not as two terms, the one of which may be regarded as the mythic symbol of the other. Both terms must be safeguarded. Hence, if the Lord now glorified was once within the conditions of human experience, cognoscible to human faculties, and has passed from them, the question cannot be silenced, *How* did He pass? The essential point is His passage out of those earthly conditions of life within which He had hitherto been known. Must not such passing have been visible? The bodily Ascension is the answer.

3. Historicity.—The evidence for the Ascension is direct and indirect. (a) The *direct* witness is meagre. There is but one description that may serve as a basis of fact, viz. the narrative in Act 1:1-12. The other passages (Mar 16:19, Luk 24:51) are under the highest critical suspicion as being not original to their texts. They suffer, moreover, under two further disadvantages: their vagueness, their summary character. They appear to give results, being less accounts of detail than confessions of faith. Their value is similar in character to that of the Epistles; they testify to the existence of a widespread crystallized tradition in the first century. Does the record in Act 1:1-12 give more? It belongs to the less authentic of the sources of the author. If the author be St. Luke, he cannot be reckoned an eye-witness; but he may furnish the information of an eye-witness. The narrative bears every trace of careful statement and of non-reflective features. Even if indications of idealization of the past occur in this first part of the book elsewhere, there are none here; the phrasing is simple and matter of fact; there is no sentiment, nor sorrow: only a glad vision evoking worship, challenging thought, inspiring courage. The discrepancies between this account and that in Lk. are probably superficial. Bethany lay on the further or eastern slope of the Mt. of Olives, about a mile down from the summit. The road from Jerusalem passed along over the lower wooded ridges, on one of which in all likelihood, just above the village (ἔως πρὸς) over against it, the Ascension took place. There was another route leading nearer the summit, on which later tradition sought the site and erected a church. Neither Acts nor Lk. means to give an exact spot. The fragmentariness of the narrative has created difficulty. Several considerations are adduced in reply. For one thing, the Ascension is plainly regarded as belonging to the Resurrection appearances, viz. as the appearance in which Christ's final vanishing took place, and notable simply on that ground. For another, it is pointed out that the NT writers take a view of

history which does not correspond to modern requirements. They write not to prove truths denied, but to illustrate truths accepted. They do not seek to prove the occurrence of events or to escape 'discrepancies'; they seek rather to emphasize the significance of events. And to the significance of the Ascension there is abundant reference. A suggestion, again, of great interest as justifying the sparse particulars given in the Gospels, is that a sort of convention forbade the introduction of the theme into a narrative of Christ's life, the Resurrection being regarded as the culminating point of His earthly existence.

(b) The *indirect* evidence is remarkably strong. Both in the two Gospels which do not record the event and in the Epistles and discourses of Acts as well as in the visions of the Apocalypse it is implied. We thus have reference to the belief in sources for the greater part earlier than the Gospels. St. Matthew represents Christ as foretelling it (Mat 26:64); St. John puts similar foreshadowings into His mouth (Joh 6:62; Joh 13:3; Joh 13:33; Joh 14:28; Joh 16:5; Joh 16:10; Joh 16:17; Joh 16:28); St. Paul and St. Peter habitually assume it as a fact (Act 2:33; Act 3:21; Act 5:31; Act 13:30-37, Eph 4:8-10, Php 1:23; Php 2:9; Php 3:20, Col 3:1, 1Th 1:10; 1Th 4:14-16, 1Ti 3:16; 1Pe 3:22); St. Stephen declares the same (Act 7:55-56). The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews is equally explicit (Heb 2:9; Heb 4:14; Heb 6:19-20; Heb 7:26; Heb 9:24; Heb 10:12-13; Heb 12:2). In the Apocalypse many passages corroborate (Rev 1:13; Rev 5:6; Rev 14:14; Rev 19:11-16; Rev 22:1). The conviction of His Ascension fills the mind of the Apostolic age. It is nowhere insisted upon or proved, it is assumed as a fact among the other facts of Christ's life, as consistent with them, and as real. There is no suggestion that it is an idea less historical than the other features described.

4. *Modern departures from the traditional view.*—Within recent years the traditional view of the Ascension has been vigorously contested in various interests. From the side of naturalistic theory the *idea* of corporeal ascension has been assailed as absurd. Different rationalistic tendencies have scouted the *event* as delusion (classical representatives are Renan in France; Strauss in Germany; Baur, Schenkel), or myth, whose growth was natural from the presence of contributory elements in the intellectual and religious atmosphere of the age which were not only not inharmonious with such an idea and event, but even rendered it necessary (cf. Keim, M. Arnold, 'Supernatural Religion,' etc.). Even *the necessities of a true spiritual experience* have been urged against it by at least one considerable school (viz. that of Ritschl), which has vastly enriched present-day theological movements by a singularly impressive attempt to interpret the Christian facts through analysis of the ethical experience of the Christian personality, since such experience, it is maintained, best grows and is best explained by communion with the Exalted Christ, conceived not as 'reaching down within the realm of our earthly experience,' but as 'otherwise than we see Him in the mirror of history' (Herrmann, *Communion of the Christian with*

God, Bks. ii., iii.),—a conception to which the Evangelical record as it stands is not adequate. In association with those attempts the relevant textual evidence has been painstakingly sifted and found insufficient (as, e.g., latest by Schmiedel in his *Encyc. Bibl.* article on ‘Resurrection and Ascension Narratives’). The departures from the traditional view here referred to are better dealt with under Resurrection. Here we may point merely to two considerations. First, the whole controversy between orthodox and liberal thought as to the miraculous features in the history of Christ’s life has entered on a new phase. A separation is being made between the ‘Jesus of history’ and the ‘Christ of faith’ identified by ecclesiastical dogma. It is admitted that what we have in the Gospel narratives was written after the identification was practically complete. The ‘Jesus of history,’ therefore, can be resuscitated only by going behind even the oldest historical sources; where, the presumption is, it will be found that the miraculous incidents disappear. The various sources whence the ‘myth of Christ’ is derivable are inquired into; the ignorance of the times, the manifest prejudices of His biographers, and the natural tendency in Oriental minds to expand fact into fable.* [Note: Cf. Browning, *Christmas Eve*, xv.]

The hypotheses of fraud, or delusion, or vision, previously entertained, are discarded and ‘the intellectual atmosphere of the age’ substituted. In particular, in the matter of the Ascension emphasis is laid on (a) current Jewish ideas concerning the departure of great men of God; (b) alleged similar ideas in ethnic religions; (c) contemporary apotheosis of the Roman emperors; (d) the natural working of the human mind, venerating a great name, to idealize the life and invest its close with marvel—as all contributory to the belief. Such analogies are pressed with ingenuity. It may be rejoined, however, that in reality they are not in point. Prevailing mental conceptions do not seem even to have favoured the acceptance of the doctrine, not to speak of having originated it. The narratives give the consistent impression of its novelty. It appears as not native, but alien to the disciples’ thought. Comparison with the assumption of Enoch and of Moses or the translation of Elijah, or with the deification of the Imperial representative, or with the Buddha-legend, only serves to demonstrate its striking originality. It has a character, place, and use that cannot be assigned to these. It is not in the same plane or in the same department of thought. It possesses an inevitableness, a conscious connexion with previous conditions, a naturalness as another and new aspect of Jesus’ life yet continuous with and necessarily complementary to it, which they all alike lack. It lacks their formality, spectacular effect, incoherence with real life. The motives, moreover, which prompted the Senate to give each successive emperor a place among the gods, or the Hindu devotee to regard his hero as divine, are easy to trace: in the former instance political; in the latter, religious indeed, but too naïve for the Jew, who had no natural tendency to deify—such a tendency has not been proved, it is incompatible with the exclusive and stubborn monotheism of the race. The belief enshrines in

simple and reticent phrase the reception by the disciples of a new fact of His Person, which brings new light and adds new mystery, yet for which they had been prepared.

Secondly, the attempt to separate the Christian facts from Christian experience is not well based. We may rejoice to witness that the life of faith now is the being in Christ in a richer sense than the being with Him before He ascended. The acknowledgment, however, neither disproves the necessity for His life before the Ascension, nor proves the necessity to visualize it after the Ascension. The increase of faith may not, indeed, come by a mere 'return to Jesus' as He was known before His death; but how can He as ascended be fruitfully contemplated by ignoring His earthly existence? Then, again, wherein lay the need for the disciples to give outward form to their emotions more than for us now? The narratives they have given us, it is averred, are due to their spiritual imagination embodying in mythic form their spiritual experience. The disciple lives by faith and not by sight, it is argued, hence Christian experience must dispense with outward events.* [Note: The references in the foregoing section are to the school of Ritschl on the one hand (cf. Herrmann, Communion with God, etc.), and to such theistic theologians as Martineau and Estlin Carpenter (cf. the former's Seat of Authority, also sermon on 'Ascension' in vol. entitled National Duties; and the latter's The First Three Gospels.)]

There is in both statements a gross exaggeration. The full glory of Christ's Person is, of course, immeasurable: no vision or bodily appearance can possibly exhibit it except in faint traces. Is the vision therefore useless? The contrary is the very principle of the Incarnation; God revealing Himself in personal, eventful form. 'The Christian facts underlie Christian faith, and make it progressively effective' (Westcott, 'Work,' 2). And this because they manifest the Person of Christ, by them His Person is brought within the range of our experience; they are the channel of His communicating His power to us. The facts and the faith are vitally related. They form one reality. They are distinguishable as aspects of that reality, but not to be separated. In explaining the reality it is not legitimate to make the distinction and then proceed to reject one of its terms, resolving, as may happen, on the one hand, the experience into an aftermath of the event; or, on the other, the event into a vivid picture of the experience. In both cases the witness is invalidated by imagination. The second of those tendencies is aggressively in vogue. If carried to its logical issue, it must eviscerate the Ascension-experience of Christ of all objective substance, and expunge the narrative from the gospel. But to do this is to create a lacuna in the facts which will prove intolerable.

On the whole, the new method of psychological analysis of the primitive Church consciousness has brought no new danger. In at least three respects it is beneficial: it has given the *coup de grace* to earlier negations (cf. Schmiedel in above cited article); it has withdrawn attention from the details to the belief itself as the heart of

the question, as the better mind of the Church insists; it has broadened the range of points to be considered, opening the door for a class familiar to traditionalists but hitherto excluded by advanced critical investigation.

5. General consequences for Christian faith.—Belief in Christ's Ascension involves several general consequences of an interesting kind. From the earliest time it was seen, *e.g.*, to be a type of the ascension of all believers. If Heaven is His true abode, it is also theirs; and this as the natural goal of human nature, the end continuous with the beginnings of human life on earth. For Christ, His Ascension was the assumption of His own proper life, the orderly passing into its full exercise and enjoyment; for the Christian, it is the orderly completion of his life recreated in Christ. It is not simply the ideal to be set before his natural life here, and to be realized by modification or development hereafter. The earthly life is renewed by being incorporated into Christ, through whose Spirit a new power enters into it; he is a 'new creature.' But the new creation is his own proper life, to live below it is to degrade his nature. The renewed earthly nature is already begun to be taken into God; like Christ, believers are ascending even here. To this process the ascension is but the natural close. As such it is at once the entering into the heavenly inheritance of blessing and the entering upon the triumph of them that endure.

Again, the Ascension of Christ assures and develops the desire for immortality. It has greatly quickened interest in the hope of life after death, and encouraged the conviction that it will be justified by the event. There are 'natural intimations of immortality.' There is a practically universal remonstrance of the human heart against the grave. The highest knowledge of this world has always been optimistic of reaching a world of solved problems and of realized ideals. The latest gift of science to mankind is the gospel of hope which is contained in the doctrine of evolution, 'man is not man as yet, but in completed man begins anew, a tendency to God' (*Ascent through Christ*, iii. 3). But of all this there never has been real certainty. The hope is but a longing and an inference at the best. Did Christ actually ascend? The conviction that He did has for centuries been rooted in Christian minds, and has reacted on the general hope. It has assured them that the spirit in man is more powerful than death; it has furnished the proof, as it is the illustration, of man's final destiny. That conviction, be it observed, is not an inference from the general hope. It is a fruit of fellowship with Christ. It is a religious experience: the experience, *viz.*, of men who, united to Christ, share in the power of His Spirit, and by that power enter upon endless life. Further, Christ's Ascension offers a suggestion of important possibilities for the bodily nature. There is to be 'a redemption of our body' (Rom_8:23); there is 'an image of the heavenly' (1Co_15:49) we must bear; a 'spiritual body' (1Co_15:44), the 'body of glory' (Php_3:21), that will be raised; 'our mortal bodies' are to be 'quickened' (Rom_8:11). The future life is not to be one of pure spirit: it is to be 'clothed upon' (2Co_5:2). In no respect did Christ assume fundamental divergence

between His nature and human nature. The Apostolic thought dwells on His oneness with His brethren. Later theology became audacious, and affirmed explicitly, 'Man is to be made God.' Manhood is to be taken up into the Godhead. That the body in some mysterious manner is to participate in this glorification would appear to be necessary, however difficult the conception. The one precedent for the thought is Christ's, whose body was not dissolved but transfigured. See Body.

Literature.—Milligan's *The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of Our Lord* still remains the most exhaustive book in English on the theological aspects of the subject. Every 'Life of Christ' deals, with more or less fulness, with the event in its historical details: see specially the studies of Fairbairn, Gilbert, Farrar, Edersheim. Of brochures, the following are important:—Knowling, *Witness of the Epistles*, 397-414; Bernard in *Expository Times*, 1900-1901, pp. 152-155. There may be consulted also: Bruce in *Expos. Gr. Test.* vol. i.; Swete, *Apostles' Creed*; Westcott, *Historic Faith*, ch. vi., *Revelation of the Risen Lord*, chs. x., xi.; art. 'Ascension' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible; Paget, *Studies in the Christian Character*, Sermons xxi., xxii.; Findlay, *Things Above*, 119-133.

A. S. Martin.

⚡ Asceticism

ASCETICISM.—Asceticism may be defined as a form of self-discipline which consists in the habitual renunciation of the things of the flesh, with a view to the cultivation of the life of the spirit. It is a deliberate attempt to eliminate and uproot the sensuous, to banish it altogether from the sphere of consciousness. It is not content with a doctrine of mere subordination. It does not stop short with teaching men to govern their wants, to subject them to the service of a higher end and purpose. It bids men stifle and suppress them, or at least resist them to the utmost of their ability. The body is represented as the enemy of the soul, and the way of perfection is identified with the progressive extirpation of the natural instincts and inclinations by means of fasting, celibacy, voluntary poverty, and similar exercises of devotion. Hence asceticism may be described as the gospel of negation,—negation of the world and negation of the flesh, each of which is apt to be confounded with negation of the devil.

It is the purpose of the present article to inquire what traces, if any, of such asceticism are to be found in the practice and preaching of Jesus. As a preliminary, however, it will be necessary to notice briefly the main forms of asceticism which were prevalent in Palestine in the time of Christ.

The Jewish ascetics of the 1st cent. may be divided roughly into three classes. (1) First, there were the Essenes, who lived together in monastic colonies, shared all things in common, and practised voluntary poverty. Philo says that they were indifferent to money, pleasure, and worldly position. Their food was limited in quantity and carefully regulated in respect of quality. They ate no animal flesh, drank no wine, and abstained from the use of oil for purposes of anointing. The stricter members of the brotherhood eschewed marriage. The idea of this rigorous asceticism seems to have been that the objects of sense, as such, were unholy, and that man's natural cravings could not be gratified without sin. Hence the Essenes may be said to have prepared the way for the Gnostic doctrine of dualism and of matter as the seat and abode of evil. In this place, however, the principles of the Essenes need not further be discussed. They are not referred to in the Gospels, and the suggestion that John the Baptist or Jesus Himself came under their influence cannot for a moment be entertained. (2) Secondly, there was a class of hermit ascetics who fled away from the allurements and temptations of society, and gave themselves up to a life of rigid self-discipline in the solitude of the wilderness. We meet with an example of this class in the Banus, mentioned by Josephus, who lived in the desert, clothed himself with the leaves of trees, ate nothing save the natural produce of the soil, and bathed day and night in cold water for purity's sake (Josephus *Vit.* 2). A hermit of a somewhat different type was John the Baptist. He, too, dwelt in the desert, wore for dress a rough garment of camel's hair with a leathern girdle, and subsisted on carob-beans (?) and wild honey. We learn from a saying of Jesus that his rigorous mode of life astonished the people, who gave out that he was possessed by a demon (Mat 11:18, Luk 7:33). But the asceticism of John seems to have been an incident of his environment and vocation, and was not regarded as an end in itself. He made no attempt to convert his hearers into ascetics. While it is true that his immediate disciples were addicted to fasting, presumably with his sanction (Mat 9:14, Mar 2:18, Luk 5:33), yet in the fragments of his popular sermons which have been preserved there is no trace of any exhortation to ascetic exercises. The moral preparation for the Kingdom, by repentance and works of righteousness, was the substance of his teaching (Mat 3:7-12, Luk 3:1-14). (3) Lastly, there were many pious Jews who cultivated asceticism of a milder and less striking kind, who, like Anna, 'served God with fasting and prayers night and day' (Luk 2:37). The more strict among the Pharisees paid particular attention to abstinence from food, and, in addition to ordinary fasts, were accustomed to observe all Mondays and Thursdays in the year as days of fasting (Luk 18:12). The asceticism of the Pharisees, however, was a formal performance which resulted naturally from their legal and ceremonial conception of religion. It expressed itself chiefly in fasting, and did not include either voluntary poverty or abstinence from marriage.

Such being the principal types of contemporary asceticism, it remains to inquire, What attitude did Jesus Himself take up in relation to this asceticism? How far did He

identify the life of righteousness with that 'vita religiosa' which has found its fullest expression in Monasticism? To answer this question we must consider (1) the practice of Jesus, and (2) the teaching of Jesus so far as it bears upon the subject.

1. *The practice of Jesus.*—Now it cannot be denied that from very early times there were circles of Christian ascetics who pointed to Jesus as the Founder and Example of the ascetic life (Clem. Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] *Strom.* iii. 6). They emphasized His forty days' fast, His abstinence from marriage, His voluntary poverty, and leaped to the conclusion that the highest life, as exemplified by Jesus, was the life of asceticism or world-denial. Complete renunciation of the things of the present was 'the way of perfection according to the Saviour.' Even now large numbers of people are of this way of thinking; but a closer and more detailed examination of Jesus' mode of life seems scarcely to bear out such a conclusion. Offering, as He did, a most wonderful example of self-forgetfulness and self-denial in the service of others, Jesus exhibited nothing of that asceticism which characterized the Essenes, or John the Baptist, or Christian saints like St. Bernard, St. John of the Cross, and even St. Francis, who of all ascetics approached most nearly to the spirit of his Master. He showed no disposition to flee from the world, or hold aloof from it; He did not eschew the amenities of social life. He accepted the hospitality of rich men and poor, He was present at meals, He contributed to the gaiety of a marriage-feast, He permitted very precious ointment to be poured upon His feet, He had a love for children, welcomed the society of women, and clearly enjoyed the domestic life of the home in Bethany. There is no trace in the records that Jesus frowned on innocent pleasures. His life, entirely devoted to His mission, was undoubtedly hard and laborious in the highest degree; but the motive of His renunciation—e.g. of marriage or property—seems to have been, not the desire to avoid these things as in themselves incompatible with spiritual perfection, but the desire to leave Himself perfect freedom in the prosecution of His work. He did not, so far as we know, impose upon Himself unnecessary austerities, or go out of His way to seek suffering. He accepted pleasures and pains as they came, neither avoiding the one nor courting the other, but, with a sublime serenity, subordinating both to His main end and purpose. The so-called 'forty days' fast' need not cause us to modify our view. This fast is not mentioned in the oldest authority (Mar_1:13); and at any rate it can scarcely have been a ceremonial observance of fasting, but was rather a necessity imposed on Jesus by His situation in the wilderness. The key to its meaning may perhaps be found in St. Luke's expression, 'in those days he did eat nothing' (Luk_4:2), with which we may compare Christ's own description of the life of John the Baptist, 'John came neither eating nor drinking' (Mat_11:18). The phrase as applied to Jesus may, as in the case of John, mean merely that He ate no ordinary food, but supported life on such means of subsistence as the wilderness afforded. But even if St. Matthew's *νηστεύσας* (Mat_4:2) be taken literally, yet, in the face of Christ's teaching on the subject (to be

mentioned below), we cannot believe that He attributed any great importance to this abstinence from food. He was supremely indifferent to the traditional practices of asceticism; in the sphere of self-renunciation in which He moved, no one-sided principle of world-negation could find a place. Hence, while Jesus is presented to us by the Evangelists as the living type and embodiment of absolute self-denial,—self-sacrifice, as it were, incarnate,—yet the marks of the ascetic are not found in Him. And it is interesting to note that His unascetic deportment and manner of life attracted the observation of His contemporaries. ‘John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, He hath a devil. The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a man gluttonous and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners’ (Mat 11:18-19, Luk 7:33-34). There can be no question that the Jews were right when they pointed out the absence of asceticism from the practice of Jesus. We have but to contrast the life of the Son of Man, who ‘came eating and drinking,’ with that of such an one as St. John of the Cross, and the fact will immediately become apparent.

2. *The teaching of Jesus.*—Passing now to the consideration of the teaching of Jesus, we remark at the outset that, from first to last, it is instinct with the spirit of self-denial. ‘If any man will come after me, let him deny himself,’ is the refrain which continually recurs. The principle laid down by Jesus is that the doing of the will of God and the promotion of His kingdom is the absolute duty of man, to which all private and particular aims must necessarily give place. ‘Seek ye first the kingdom of God’ (Mat 6:33, Luk 12:31) is the categorical imperative. The Kingdom of God is the highest good, and as such establishes a claim on man’s exclusive devotion. Hence all desires and strivings which have not righteousness as their ultimate goal must be ruthlessly suppressed; all lesser goods and blessings which hinder and obstruct a man in the pursuit of the *summum bonum* must unhesitatingly be sacrificed. Thus a man must sell all that he has in order to purchase the field with the treasure, or the pearl of great price (Mat 13:44-46). If necessity arise, he must surrender all his possessions to come and follow Jesus (Mat 19:21, Mar 10:21); he must even renounce the closest ties of earthly relationship,—father and mother, children and wife (Mat 10:37, Luk 14:26), the last imperative duties of affection (Luk 9:59-60), the courtesies of farewell (Luk 9:61-62); nay, the most indispensable goods, the hand, the foot, the eye, must be abandoned if they cause offence (Mat 5:29-30, Mar 9:43-47); and, at the call of God, the very life itself must be laid down (Mat 16:24 f., Mar 8:34 f., Luk 9:23 f.). ‘Whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple’ (Luk 14:33). No teaching could be clearer or more forcible than this. With the greatest possible plainness Jesus declares that every earthly blessing must be made subordinate to the service of God and contributory thereto. All lesser goods which come to be sought for their own sake, whether in preference to, or even independently of, the highest good, must be instantly sacrificed. In other words, when the individual realizes that the gratification of any desire will impede or

distract him in the performance of his duties as a member of the Kingdom, he is bound to forego such gratification if he would still be in truth a disciple of Christ.

It is important to notice that, in all Jesus' precepts about the sacrifice of earthly goods, there is a condition, explicit or implied. The condition in any given case is, that the particular good to be sacrificed shall have been ascertained to be an obstacle to the attainment of righteousness on the part of its possessor—'if it cause thee to stumble.' Thus the necessity of every sacrifice is determined by the special circumstances of the particular case. The rich young man is bidden to part with all his possessions and follow Jesus; Zacchaeus gives half, and is told 'this day is salvation come to this house' ([Luk 19:9](#)); Martha and Mary are not asked to leave their home. To one man Jesus denies permission to bid farewell to his relatives ([Luk 9:62](#)); to another He says, 'Return to thine own house' ([Luk 8:39](#)). A sacrifice which is imperative for one man need not necessarily be the duty of another, but the general rule is laid down that all must be prepared, if occasion arise, to surrender their dearest and most cherished blessings for the sake of the Kingdom of God.

Now the note of this doctrine is self-denial, not asceticism. Jesus nowhere teaches that earthly goods are of the devil, or that the gratification of the natural cravings is fraught with sin. He does not recommend men to treat their bodies with contempt. He does not suggest that flight from the world and disengagement from physical conditions is sanctification. He does not say that those who, for duty's sake, renounce the world, are on a higher spiritual level than those who do their duty in the world. He does not hint that the only way of avoiding sin lies in an austere renunciation of all those things from which an occasion of sin might arise. He nowhere implies that the lower goods are of no value in themselves, or that they ought under all circumstances to be foregone. The doctrine of Jesus is a doctrine not of annihilation, but of subordination. He admits, indeed, that special circumstances may make it incumbent on an individual to abstain from certain things which others, otherwise situated, may lawfully enjoy; but He does not say that earthly goods, as such, are irreconcilable with righteousness. His teaching on the subject may be summarized in the word *subordination*. The main point is that earthly goods are not to be retained or enjoyed for their own sake, but must be made subordinate and subservient to a higher end, and must ultimately be directed towards the promotion of the righteousness of the Kingdom of God.

Further to illustrate this point of view, we may briefly allude to Jesus' teaching on three prominent characteristics of the ascetic life—voluntary poverty, celibacy, and bodily discipline as exercised in the practice of fasting.

(1) No one could have been more alive than Jesus was to the dangers of *wealth*, and to the peculiar psychological difficulties which hinder the rich from entering the

Kingdom. His warnings on the subject are more than usually vigorous. Wealth is represented as an idol; care about material things as a kind of heathenism. He even goes so far as to say that, humanly speaking, it is impossible for a rich man to be saved (Mat 19:26, Mar 10:27, Luk 18:27). ‘Woe unto you that are rich!’ He cries again, ‘for ye have received your consolation’ (Luk 6:24). He bids men not lay up treasures upon earth (Mat 6:19), but rather sell what they have and give alms (Luk 12:33). He says, ‘Ye cannot serve God and mammon’ (Mat 6:24). Jesus knew that men tend to become absorbed in their property, to give their heart to it, to become its slaves instead of its masters; and the idea of such bondage filled Him with horror. Hence to those who were in danger of falling beneath the tyranny of money and material things He had but one word to say: ‘Go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor ... and come, follow me’ (Mat 19:21, Mar 10:21, Luk 18:22). This, however, is not a precept of universal validity; it is not, as some of the Fathers have wrongly conceived (e.g. Hieron. *circa (about) Vigilant.* 14; Baeda, *Exp. in Marci Ev.* iii. 10), a *consilium evangelicum* of poverty. It was addressed primarily to a particular person, and it can properly be applied only to those who are in danger of forgetting that ‘a man’s life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth’ (Luk 12:15). The parables of the Unjust Steward (Luk 16:1-12), of the Talents (Mat 25:14-30), or the Pounds (Luk 19:12-27), prove that Jesus was far from regarding wealth as evil in itself, or requiring that people in general should renounce its use. On the contrary, He insisted that riches are a deposit from God, which can and ought to be employed in His service; and He even declared that fidelity in such employment would be the standard for testing a man’s capacity for higher tasks. ‘If ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches?’ (Luk 16:11). There is nothing ascetic in such teaching. What Jesus reprobates is not wealth, but the abuse of it; what He recommends is not alienation of wealth, but subordination of it. He recognizes, indeed, that there may be special cases where the retention of wealth is incompatible with the service of God, but in general He bids men keep and use it in accordance with the purposes of Him who has bestowed it on them. Neither wealth nor poverty is in itself meritorious: only the disposition which makes either minister to the coming of the Kingdom.

(2) So, too, in respect of *marriage*. Jesus certainly teaches that a spiritual vocation is sometimes inconsistent with the married state. ‘There be eunuchs which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven’s sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it’ (Mat 19:12). ‘This,’ says Jerome, ‘is the voice of the Lord exhorting and urging on His soldiers to the reward of chastity.’ But to write thus is an exaggeration, if not a perversion of the truth. Nothing is more noticeable than the extremely guarded form of Christ’s utterance here, in striking contrast with His very explicit injunctions concerning renunciation in other matters. Jesus weighs His words with the greatest care. He makes no general exhortation to celibacy. He merely points out that some people, in the enthusiasm of their heavenly calling, have

suppressed the very instincts of nature, so that they have, as it were, undergone an operation of ethical self-emasculatation, being dead to sexual desire; and He recommends those who have received the gift of abstinence, in this sense, not to neglect it. Just as elsewhere, in His pregnant, paradoxical way, Jesus bids men 'hate' father, and mother, and wife, and children (Luk_14:26), if their claims tend to supersede the claims of God (Mat_10:37); so here He bids those who are convinced that God's claims demand the whole of their time and energy, to refrain altogether from entering the marriage state. But this is no ascetic doctrine of celibacy. The Master who taught that matrimony was a divinely ordered condition, and emphasized in the strongest terms the sanctity of the conjugal relation (Mat_5:32; Mat_19:3-9, Mar_10:2-12, Luk_16:16), who practised (Luk_2:51) and inculcated the duty of filial obedience and love towards parents (Mat_15:4-6, Mar_7:10-13), who habitually used the symbolism of the family to express the profoundest and holiest truths of religion, certainly did not mean to teach that family life, as such, was irreconcilable with righteousness. He uttered no word in disparagement of it; He never implied that the married attain a lower grade of perfection than the continent. On the contrary, it is clear that Jesus regarded marriage as the right and natural course for the majority of people, and He even chose a married man as the chief of His apostles. In short, while recognizing that through special circumstances the individual might be called upon to renounce the gratifications of marriage, Jesus appears to indicate that such renunciation is an exceptional duty imposed on the few, not a general rule for the many. Marriage in itself is not to be avoided as a thing debasing; it debases only when men refuse to subordinate it to the claims of the Kingdom.

(3) So, once more, towards the traditional *discipline* of asceticism Jesus took up an attitude of indifference. In His view, the value of such exercises depends solely upon the spirit in which they are undertaken. As forms through which devotion seeks to find expression, He does not condemn them; but, on the other hand, He does not suggest that they are the necessary or inevitable concomitants of the holy life. This will appear from His teaching on fasting—one of the most distinguishing characteristics of the Jewish piety of His time. Jesus points out that true fasting is not a parade of piety before the eyes of men, but an outward expression of a personal relation of the individual soul to the 'Father which seeth in secret' (Mat_6:16-18). Hence fasting is not a matter of compulsion or prescription or external ordinance; it has value solely as the appropriate manifestation of a state of mind. Thus Jesus refuses to impose fasts on His disciples in their days of gladness, but He foresees that 'the days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken from them,' and then the sorrow of their heart will seek an outlet through the forms of sorrow (Mat_9:15, Mar_2:19-20, Luk_5:34-35). In justification of His refusal to lay down fixed rules upon the subject, Jesus goes on to say that, just as no wise man would sew a new patch on to an old garment, or pour new wine into old bottles, so it would be foolish to graft the new-found liberty of the gospel on to the mass of old observances, and still more

foolish to attempt to force the new system as a whole within the forms of the old. The new piety must develop new forms of its own (Mat 9:16-17, Mar 2:21; Mar 2:23, Luk 5:36-38). From all this we gather that Jesus refuses to bind religion to external acts of asceticism, or to declare such acts to be of obligation. Such performances as fasting, flagellation, or restriction of sleep may certainly have a conditional worth as the sincere expression of a sad and contrite spirit, but they are not of the essence of devotion. Jesus emphasizes the state of the heart, the self-denying disposition, the bent of the soul towards God; with anything besides this He is not concerned.

Hence in answer to the question, Was Jesus an ascetic? we are bound to reply in the negative. Neither in His practice nor in His teaching did He adopt the tone of asceticism. He called indeed for self-denial, self-sacrifice, self-forgetfulness. He demanded that all lower goods should be subordinated to the highest good, that all human strivings should be directed ultimately towards righteousness. But He does not condemn the lower goods or attempt to tear out the human instincts and cravings. Nor does He make fellowship with God depend on any kind of outward ascetical observances. Indeed, as Harnack writes, 'Asceticism has no place in the gospel at all; what it asks is that we should struggle against mammon, against care, against selfishness; what it demands and disengages is love; the love that serves and is self-sacrificing. This struggle and this love are the kind of asceticism which the gospel means, and whoever encumbers Jesus' message with any other kind fails to understand it. He fails to understand its grandeur and importance; for there is something still more important than "giving one's body to be burned, and bestowing all one's goods to feed the poor," namely, self-denial and love' (Harnack, *What is Christianity?* p. 88). See also art. Self-denial and the Literature cited at end of that article.

F. Homes Dudden.

⚡ Asher

ASHER (LXX Septuagint and NT Ἀσηρ, Josephus Ἀσηρος) is the transliteration of the Heb. אֲשֵׁר = 'fortunate.' In Gen 30:13 the origin of the name Asher is connected by J [Note: Jahwist.] with this adjective, but perhaps its source should be found rather in the name of some Semitic divinity (cf. the goddess Ashera and perhaps also the Assyrian god Ashur). In Rev 7:6 Asher appears in the list of the twelve tribes of Israel (cf. Num 1:13; Num 1:40 f., Num 2:27 f., Num 7:72-77; Num 10:26; Num 13:13 [P [Note: Priestly Narrative.]], Deu 27:13 [D [Note: Deuteronomist.]]). The patronymic

ancestor of the tribe is presented in Gen 30:13 (J [Note: Jahwist.]) and Gen 35:26 (P [Note: Priestly Narrative.]) as the eighth son of Jacob: born (like Gad) of Zilpah, Leah's slave-girl. Asher is mentioned in the 'Blessings' of Jacob (Gen 49:20) and of Moses (Deu 33:24). It is put in possession of a territory in the land of Canaan (Jos 19:24-31 [P [Note: Priestly Narrative.]], cf. Jos 21:6; Jos 21:30 f. [P [Note: Priestly Narrative.]]), but does not succeed in making itself thoroughly master of it (Jdg 1:31 f.); the result of which is that its territory is sometimes confused with that of Manasseh (Jos 17:11 [J [Note: Jahwist.]]), and that it holds a precarious situation in the midst of the Canaanites (contrast Jdg 1:32 f. with Jdg 1:29 f.). The district assigned to Asher corresponds to what was afterwards western Galilee, a very fertile country, but apparently never subdued completely by Israel; it is by a fiction that the possession of cities like Acco, Achzib, Tyre, and Sidon is attributed to it. Asher is named in the Song of Deborah (Jdg 5:17) as devoted to navigation; it figures also in the story of Gideon (Jdg 6:35; Jdg 7:23). But it quickly disappears from the page of history, where after all it had played a very small part. It is still mentioned incidentally in 1Ki 4:16 under Solomon, and in 2Ch 30:11 under Hezekiah, but there is no trace of it in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. The genealogical tables will be found in Gen 46:17 (P [Note: Priestly Narrative.]), Num 26:44-47 (P [Note: Priestly Narrative.]), and 1Ch 7:30-40.

According to Luk 2:36 the prophetess Anna, the daughter of Phanuel, was of the tribe of Asher. The source of this genealogical statement is unknown. Its correctness has been suspected in view of similar claims made for some Jews elsewhere to illustrious origin (descent from Aaron, David, etc.). It may, however, be remarked, that there is a cardinal difference between these and the present instance: there was nothing particularly glorious in descent from Asher.

Lucien Gautier.

☞ Ashes

ASHES.—Used twice in the Gospels, referring to an ancient and widespread Eastern mourning custom. The mourner, or the penitent, would throw dust, or dust mixed with ashes (σποδοῦς), into the air, as an expression of intense humiliation, due to penitence for sin, or grief because of affliction (Mat 11:21; for this idea in the OT cf. Mic 1:10, Job 42:6). Such symbolic use of dust and ashes was not unnatural, since grief seems to call for a prostration of the body. These, being beneath the feet, suggest humiliation, and when thrown into the air they were allowed to fall upon the

person of the mourner, that he might carry the evidences of his grief with him. Sometimes ashes is associated with *σάκκος*, sackcloth; the penitent or mourner sitting upon the ash-heap, his face begrimed with the dust. To this custom Christ referred when He said of Tyre and Sidon, 'They would have repented long ago, sitting in sackcloth and ashes' (Luk_10:13; cf. use of *אֲפֵאֶ* in Job_2:8, Jon_3:6).

E. B. Pollard.

☞ Ass

ASS.—See Animals, p. 63^a.

☞ Assurance

ASSURANCE.—This term stands for the fact and the doctrine of personal fellowship with God in Jesus Christ, made certain to the consciousness of the believer by the direct witness of the Holy Spirit. The prophetic ideal appears in the promise of a peaceful work of righteousness, the effect of which is quietness and confidence for ever (Isa_32:17). In Mat_11:27 Jesus declares that 'no one knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him.' Such a personal revelation of God to the believer in Christ would seem to be necessarily obvious and assuring to him who receives it. The immediate context also gives assurance of rest and comfort to the souls of all who labour and are heavy laden, and who come to Christ for help. This teaching is confirmed and enhanced by the doctrine of the Gospel of St. John concerning the Comforter. This heavenly Comforter, the Holy Spirit of truth, bears witness of Christ, and makes known the things of Christ, unto those who receive and love Him (Joh_15:26; Joh_16:14). The world cannot receive this Spirit of truth, for He is an invisible presence, known only to the believer with whom and in whom He abides (Joh_14:17). Those disciples in whom the Spirit thus dwells are loved by the Father and realize the manifestation of Christ, so that Father, Son, and Spirit come unto them and make their abode with them (Joh_14:21; Joh_14:23). The doctrine also finds noteworthy confirmation in the First Epistle of St. John (1Jn_3:19-24; 1Jn_4:13), where it is said that the Spirit of God and of Christ abides in the believer, and assures (*persuades*) his heart with the Divine conviction of His immediate presence, so that he has great 'boldness toward God' (*παρρησίαν πρὸς τὸν θεόν*).

That the Holy Spirit bears immediate and direct witness within the human spirit to the fact of one's being a child of God, is the explicit teaching of St. Paul (Rom 8:16). In Col 2:2 we note the remarkable expression about Christian hearts being comforted and 'knit together in love unto all riches of the full assurance (πληροφορία, 'fulness') of understanding' in knowing the mystery of God. The same truth appears in the phrases 'full assurance of hope' and 'full assurance of faith' (Heb 6:11; Heb 10:22). The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews declares faith itself to be 'assurance of things hoped for, conviction of things not seen' (Heb 11:1).

This Biblical doctrine of Assurance presents one of the most precious truths of the gospel of Christ. It presupposes, as a matter of course, the believer's personal acquaintance with the saving truths of Christianity and the facts of Divine revelation; but it has been needlessly complicated with the dogmas of Election and the final Perseverance of the Saints. It should not be construed to involve a present assurance of final salvation, but it should be defined and guarded against the various delusions of mere subjective feeling. A spiritual conviction, however deep and assuring, needs the constant test of verification in a pure and upright life. It must have the 'testimony of our conscience, that in holiness and sincerity of God, not in fleshly wisdom but in the grace of God, we behaved ourselves in the world' (2Co 1:12). The fruit of the Spirit (Gal 5:22-25) must supplement and continuously establish the personal witness of the Spirit. Therefore Jesus Himself gave the important admonition that the real character of a tree is known by its fruit (Mat 7:15-20).

Literature.—Calvin, *Institutes*, bk. iii. ch. ii. §§ 15-17; Westminster Confession, ch. xviii.; W. Cunningham, "The Reformers and the Doctrine of Assurance," the third essay in his *Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation*; John Wesley, *Sermons* on 'The Witness of the Spirit,' and 'The Witness of our own Spirit'; Richard Watson, *Theol. Institutes*, vol. ii. pp. 269-284; Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, vol. iii. pp. 106, 107; Miley, *Systematic Theology*, vol. ii. pp. 339-353; Bishop Sherlock, *Works*, vol. i. Discourse 8; R. N. Young, *The Witness of the Spirit*, Fernley Lecture of 1882; Jonathan Edwards, *Religious Affections*, Part iii., Introd.; Dorner, *System of Christian Doctrine*, vol. iv. p. 184; J. Agar Beet, *Romans*, 231 ff.; J. H. Newman, *Parochial Sermons*, v. 239; J. Martineau, *National Duties*, 146 ff.

M. S. Terry.

☞ Astonishment, Astonished

ASTONISHMENT, ASTONISHED.—These terms occur with some frequency in Authorized and Revised Versions of OT, but in NT only in the historical books (except

John), and in the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 only in the Synoptic Gospels (except Act 3:12). They are always used in NT as an expression of one of the emotions aroused by supernatural manifestations. The noun occurs once only in either version (but in different passages: Authorized Version Mar 5:42; Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 Mar 16:8): the verb more frequently. In Authorized Version the term translates sometimes ἐκπλήσσομαι (Mat 7:28; Mat 13:54; Mat 22:33, Mar 6:2; Mar 7:37; Mar 10:26; Mar 11:18, Luk 4:32, Act 13:12); sometimes ἐξίσταμαι or ἐκστασις (Mar 5:42, Luk 2:47; Luk 8:56; Luk 24:22, Act 10:45; Act 12:16); and sometimes θαμβέομαι or θάμβος (Mar 10:24, Luk 5:9, Act 9:6). In Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 it is reserved for ἐκπλήσσομαι (except Mar 16:8, where ‘astonishment’ represents ἐκστασις), of which it is the uniform rendering. In its etymological implication it very fairly represents ἐκπλήσσομαι, which is literally ‘to be struck out (of the senses) by a blow,’ and hence, to be ‘stunned,’ ‘shocked,’ ‘astonished.’ For its relation to words implying ‘fear,’ see Schmidt, *Synonymik d. gr. Sprache*, No. 139. For its place among the terms descriptive of the effect of our Lord’s ministry on its witnesses, see art. Amazement.

Benjamin B. Warfield.

☞ Astrology

ASTROLOGY was an important element of all ancient astronomy. The scientific observation of the positions and movements of the heavenly bodies was closely associated with the belief in their Divine character, and their influence upon the destinies of men, and formed the basis of calculations and predictions of future events. Babylonia was the earliest home of this study, which continued to be prosecuted in that part of the world with special diligence, so that in later times the word ‘Chaldaean’ was equivalent to ‘Eastern astrologer.’ It is to this class that we must refer the Magi or Wise Men from the East, who are mentioned in Mat 2:1 ff. They had seen in their own home the rising (for so perhaps we should understand the words ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ, rendered ‘in the east,’ in Mat 2:2) of a star or constellation, which they connected with the expectation, already diffused in the East, of the birth of a great ruler among the Jews. Travelling to Palestine, they ascertained at Jerusalem that the Messiah was expected to be born in Bethlehem, and directing their steps thither they saw the ‘star’ in front of them all the way, till they came to the

house where the infant Jesus was found. (This appears to be the only sense in which the popular and picturesque language of Mat_2:9 can be understood).

The first two chapters of the First Gospel are recognized as being taken from another source than the rest of the book, and different views have been held as to their historic value. But so far as the astrological references in ch. 2 are concerned, no difficulty need be felt about the narrative. The Evangelist, it is true, does not raise any question as to the reality of the connexion between the 'star' and the birth of Jesus. On the possibility of such a connexion, no doubt he shared the common beliefs of his time. But we may accept his statement of the facts without being compelled to admit that there is any truth in astrological theories. The famous calculation of Kepler shows that an unusual conjunction of Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn took place about b.c. 7, and it is quite conceivable that this or some similar phenomenon may in God's providence have led the Wise Men, even through the mistaken principles of their science, actually to visit Palestine about the time when Jesus was born. See further, artt. Magi and Star.

James Patrick.

☩ Atonement

ATONEMENT.—The Atonement is the reconciling work of Jesus Christ the Son of God, in gracious fulfilment of the loving purpose of His Father; whereby, through the sacrifice of Himself upon the Cross once for all, on behalf and instead of sinful men, satisfaction was made for the sins of the world and communion between God and man restored.

The starting-point of Christian experience is the Resurrection of Jesus (1Co_15:17, Rom_4:25). It may now be taken as accepted that the belief of the primitive community and the Apostolic preaching were based on this conviction (see Harnack, *What is Christianity?* English translation Lect. ix.; Schmiedel, *Encyc. Bibl.* art. 'Resurrection'). This fact, reinforced by successive appearances of the risen Christ whether to individuals or the assembled disciples, led to the further conviction, the ultimate root of the doctrine of the Atonement, that Jesus of Nazareth, crucified, risen, ascended, was present in the midst of the Christian congregation. He who in the days of His ministry had claimed authority on earth to forgive sins (Mat_9:2-6), confirming the word with signs following, who had awakened an implicit trust as alone having the words of eternal life (Joh_6:68; Joh_16:30), and who had manifested Himself as the one way by which men might come to the Father (Joh_14:6), had fulfilled His own promise to return to His elect and abide with them to the end of the

days (Mat 28:20). The first corporate act of the disciples was to claim the promise to be present in the midst of two or three gathered in His name (Mat 18:20), by calling upon their Master to choose into the Apostolate one of two set before Him conceived as invisibly present (Act 1:15-26). Moreover, He was present in power as exalted to God's right hand, not therefore limited by time and space, but acting under Divine, eternal conditions, arising to succour His martyr Stephen (Act 7:55; Act 7:59), manifesting Himself as the Righteous One to St. Paul (Act 22:14), giving specific revelations of His will to Ananias and to St. Paul himself (Act 9:4-6; Act 9:10-16, Act 18:9-10, Act 23:11), and performing those greater works of which He had spoken (Joh 14:12) through those who wrought in His name (Act 3:6; Act 9:34). This conviction, peculiarly vivid in the earlier ages, is clearly traced in the hymns addressed to Christ 'as to a god' (Pliny's *Letter to Trajan*), and in the records of early martyrdoms. And the realism with which it was held even as late as the 4th cent. is attested by apologetic like that of Athanasius (see *de Incarnatione*, 46 ff.), or traditions like that of the consecration of St. John Lateran.

But proclamation of forgiveness of sins through faith in the name of Jesus, though arising out of the conviction that the Absolver was Himself in the power of His deity still present on earth, was not made until the realization of the promise of the Spirit in the Pentecostal gift. To this fact, the external results of which were present in the experience of his hearers, St. Peter appealed as witnessing to the reality of Jesus' exaltation and His power to remit sins, (Act 2:33, cf. Gal 3:14). This significant element in the first preaching of the Gospel answers by anticipation objections urged against the Atonement as involving immoral consequences and unworthy views of God. Not only in this passage but throughout the Acts the possession of the Spirit is emphasized as the essential mark of discipleship (Act 2:38; Act 4:31; Act 5:32; Act 8:14-19; Act 9:17; Act 10:47; Act 11:16; Act 13:52; Act 19:1-6). The call to repentance, intimately associated with the gift of the Holy Spirit (Act 2:38, cf. Mat 3:11), necessarily involved a life conformed to the image of the Son of God. The Gospel, though a message of God's free favour with no condition of antecedent righteousness, referred to moral results, the manifestation of an imparted spirit, as evidence of the truth of the promise (Rom 8:13-14, Gal 5:22-24). And when the doctrine of justification by faith was challenged by imperfectly instructed Christians, St. Paul met the charge by an abrupt appeal not only to elementary moral convictions, but to the implications of baptism as a new and spiritual birth (Rom 6:1-4). Nor, again, was it possible for those to whom the possession of the Spirit was a fact of experience to regard God otherwise than as the Father. For He who dwelt within them was the Spirit of Christ Jesus (Act 16:7, Rom 8:9, Php 1:19, 1Pe 1:11), the promise of the Father (Act 1:4), whereby they had themselves attained the adoption, and were enabled to cry, 'Abba, Father' (Rom 8:15-17, Gal 4:6).

The fact of Pentecost was immediately explained as that outpouring of the Spirit upon all flesh which was to mark the establishment of the Messianic kingdom (Act 2:16-21; Act 5:31-32). It stood directly related to the event of which the Apostles were the chosen witnesses, the Resurrection of Jesus, whereby He was exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour unto the remission of sins (Act 2:33; Act 2:38), of which, according to Hebrew expectation, the kingdom was to be the home (e.g. Jeremiah 31, Eze 36:16-36). The assurance that Christ was the ever present source of forgiveness gave its supreme significance to the Cross by which He entered into His glory (Joh 12:32). Later theologians have been charged with 'placing the emphasis too exclusively upon the death of Jesus as the means of redemption' (H. L. Wild, *Contentio Veritatis*, Essay iii.). But the evidence of the NT is irresistible. It is true that the earliest sermons lay stress rather upon the fact of the Resurrection, but always as closely following upon the Death, which, though inflicted by His enemies, resulted from the determinate counsel of God (Act 2:23), who glorified 'his Servant' Jesus. The frequent repetition of this OT expression ($\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$ θεοῦ) in the early chapters of Acts (Act 3:13; Act 3:26; Act 4:27; Act 4:30), taken in connexion with explicit references to the things which God foreshadowed by the prophets that His Messiah should suffer (Act 2:23; Act 3:18; Act 4:11; Act 4:25-28; Act 13:27; cf. 1Co 15:3; 1Pe 1:11), leaves no room for doubt that Philip the Evangelist was not alone in beginning from the picture of Jehovah's Suffering Servant to preach Jesus (Act 8:35), but that the Apostles gave their witness to the Resurrection by preaching what St. Paul called 'Christ crucified' (1Co 1:23, cf. Gal 3:1). The Crucifixion was regarded neither as a bare fact nor as the symbol of a theological system, but as a 'gospel,' an event whose reality lay in its significance, a message of Divine favour and forgiveness. The central fact of Christ's life and work was complex, consisting of both the Cross and the Resurrection. The NT considers neither apart. The redeeming efficacy is attached to each in turn. While, according to the compressed formula in which St. Paul expresses the content of his gospel, 'Christ died for our sins and rose again the third day' (1Co 15:3-4), the common form of the Petrine preaching represents God as raising up Jesus 'for to give repentance and remission of sins' (Act 5:30-31; cf. Act 2:32-36; Act 3:15; Act 3:26, 1Pe 1:21; 1Pe 3:21, also Rom 4:25 and 1Co 15:17). But it was the Cross that tended to fix itself as the central fact, and therefore the characteristic symbol of Christendom. It is the figure of Him 'who bare our sins in his body on the tree' which dominates the First Epistle of Peter (1Pe 2:24). And the 2nd cent. *Gospel according to Peter* has contrived with singular fidelity to the Apostle's mind to give an imaginative picture of the Resurrection, wherein the Cross is curiously blended with the rending tomb (*Gospel acc. to Peter*, § 10, ed. Robinson and James). With St. Paul the gospel of Christ, which is the fixed point in his teaching (Gal 1:11, 1Co 15:1, 1Ti 1:11, 2Ti 2:8), the touchstone of all preaching (Gal 1:8-9, 1Ti 1:3; 1Ti 6:3), proclaimed alike to Jew and Gentile (1Co 1:24), delivered whether to St. Peter or to himself as the deposit of Christian truth (1Co 3:11, 2Ti 1:13-14), is 'the

word of the cross' (1Co 1:18; 1Co 1:23). So remarkable is the unanimity of the two great primary preachers of Christianity that it leaves no room to question the statement of Harnack (*What is Christianity?* English translation Lect. ix.) that 'the primitive community called Jesus its Lord because He sacrificed His life for it, and because its members were convinced that He had been raised from the dead and was then sitting at the right hand of God.'

To this must be added the general symmetry of the NT and the evidence of Christian institutions and Church History. The story of the Passion is out of all proportion to the rest of the Synoptic narrative, as given in each of the three Gospels, unless the foreground is rightly occupied by the Cross. And here the Fourth Gospel, though it emphasizes the function of revelation in the incarnate life of the Son of God, is found in close and almost unexpected agreement with its predecessors. The Apocalypse rings with the praises of 'the Lamb' (Rev 5:4-6; Rev 5:12-13; Rev 7:10; Rev 7:14-17; Rev 12:7-12; Rev 14:1-5; Rev 19:6-9; cf. Rev 1:5; Rev 13:8). The Epistle to the Hebrews, though it opens with one of the classical Christological passages, yet makes the Death of Jesus the pivot of its teaching (Heb 2:9). And the Epistle to the Romans, which elaborates the great argument of Justification through a crucified and risen Saviour, is central to the theology of St. Paul.

Midway between the NT and Church History, as related in point of evidential value to either, come the Creed and Sacraments. The former represents the inviolable basis of the word concentrated in catechetical teaching. That its emphasis rested upon the Cross is apparent not only from such primitive formulae as the Apostles' Creed, but from the NT itself (1Co 15:3-4, 1Ti 1:15). Baptism is the initiatory Christian rite, and whether it conveys or only represents the forgiveness of sins, stood from the first in close relation to the Death and Resurrection of Christ (Mat 28:19, Mar 16:15-16, Act 2:38; Act 8:13; Act 8:16; Act 8:36; Act 9:18; Act 10:47-48; Act 16:33; Act 19:5; Act 22:16, Rom 6:3-4, Gal 3:26-27, Eph 4:4-6, Col 2:12, Tit 3:4-6; 1Pe 3:21; cf. Joh 3:5, Act 11:16, 1Co 10:2, Heb 6:1-6; Heb 10:22, 1Jn 5:6-8). The Eucharist is the Christian counterpart of the sacrifice of the Passover, which commemorated the deliverance of God's people from Egypt; it is associated by the terms of its celebration with the Lord's Passion, and employs language of sacrificial import (Mat 26:26-28, Mar 14:22-24, Luk 22:19-20, 1Co 11:18-34; 1Co 10:16-22 [for τράπεζα Κυρίου = θυσιαστήριον, ct. [Note: contrast.] Mal 1:7], cf. Joh 6:52-68 [see Westcott, *ad loc.*], Exo 12:27, Heb 13:10).

Following upon the Sacraments is the witness of Church History—the worship, the dogma, the art, the experience of the Christian centuries—which have all consistently gathered round the Cross. We are therefore entitled to hold that any interpretation of the Christian facts which shifts the focus from Calvary to Bethlehem or Galilee

represents a departure from the historic faith, and tends to distort the Christian revelation.

Theories of the Atonement, of which the view that identifies it with the Incarnation may be taken as the norm, have inevitably been popular in an age dominated by two great influences, physical science and Hegelian philosophy. But it may be doubted whether they have taken their rise in a study of the facts of Scripture and not rather in a determinist conception of the Universe, to which the Incarnation seemed to give a religious and Christian form. A consequence of this method of thought has been the revival, in this country by Bishop Westcott and others, of speculations like those of Rupert of Deutz and the Scotists, which postulate an Incarnation independent of those conditions of human life which demand the forgiveness of sins. * [Note: These speculations must be distinguished from the teaching of the Calvinistic Supralapsarians of the 17th cent., which, relying upon such passages as Eph 3:11; 1Pe 1:20, Rev 13:8 (?), maintained that the Atonement was itself the fulfilment of an eternal purpose.] It is perhaps enough to say of this line of thought, with Dr. A. B. Davidson (*OT Prophecy*, ch. x.), that it involves 'a kind of principle, according to which God develops Himself by an inward necessity,' and which 'is certainly not a Biblical principle.' Such thinking invariably regards the Atonement merely as a mode of the Incarnation required by the conditions under which it took place. And whether this theory be specifically held or not, it has been a tendency of recent theology to fix the mind rather upon the ethical principle of the Atonement, *i.e.* the obedience or penitence or assent to God's abhorrence of sin, of which death is the 'sacrament' or visible sign, than upon the Crucifixion as a work intrinsically efficacious apart from the moral qualities expressed in its accomplishment. Such views are defective, not because they fail to give expression to aspects of Christ's redeeming work, but because they stop short at the point where explanation is necessary, why these qualities of the spirit of Jesus should have been directed towards the particular end of the death of the Cross. The climax of the account which St. Paul gives in the Epistle to the Philippians of the exaltation of Jesus, is neither the assumption of human flesh nor the suffering of death, but the obedience which accepted the humiliation of the Cross as the act whereby He fulfilled, not the general, but the particular will of God (Php 2:5-11, cf. 1Pe 1:11).

The Apostles, as we have seen, saw the purpose, and therefore the explanation, of this concrete historical event through the medium of the OT. Whatever view it may be expedient to take of the relation between Hebrew prophecy and Jesus of Nazareth, this fact is of primary importance, because it exhibits what in the view of the first messengers of the Cross was the essential character of the good news it was their mission to proclaim; nor would the case be materially altered if the language of Law and Prophets had merely been chosen to illustrate the central idea of the Gospel.

What we find is the remarkable manner in which the idea of the King and the Kingdom, consonant with contemporary Jewish expectation, is combined with that of the suffering Messiah, so alien to the current interpretation of the Scriptures as to present 'to the Jews a stumbling-block.' The antithesis between the Cross and the Resurrection was, indeed, such as to suggest that the death of Jesus was united to its marvellous sequel by a chain of causation removing it from the ordinary category of dissolution, and making it the interpretative fact of a career otherwise the most unintelligible in history. But the main point to observe is that the Resurrection, being in the first instance the crucial fact of experience which marked off for the disciples their Master Jesus as the Son of God (Rom 1:4 ὁρισθέντος, cf. Act 10:36-43; Act 13:23; Act 13:32-33), ratified, in the minds of those who had continued with Him in His temptations, that view of His work which had been before the eye of the Divine Sufferer throughout His ministry, and which He had progressively disclosed to hearts slow of belief, until a hitherto invincible prejudice had succumbed to the decisive evidence of accomplishment.

The persistence with which early heresies connected themselves with the Baptism of Jesus reveals the prominence which the event assumed in the story of the ministry, and goes far to authenticate the details of the Synoptic narrative (Mat 3:13-17, Mar 1:9-11, Luk 3:21-22, cf. Joh 1:32-34), the correspondence of which with the Apostolic view of the Saviour's mission is too subtle to warrant the theory that they are the glosses of a later tradition. In this narrative Jesus is represented as doing something more than declaring the obligation which rested upon Him to fulfil that righteousness characteristic of the Hebrew covenant. 'Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness,' *i.e.* by submitting to the baptism which John would have withheld because it involved repentance and provided for the remission of sins. The Voice from Heaven, and the Temptation endured in the power of the baptismal Spirit (Mat 4:1, Mar 1:12, Luk 4:1), even if they be regarded merely as the interpretation of the subjective consciousness of Jesus, witness to the identity between the scheme of the ministerial life accepted from the first by the Son of Man and the gospel of the redeeming work preached by the Apostles. For the Voice blends the prophecy of the royal Son (Psa 2:7) with that of the beloved Servant (Isa 42:1), and the Temptation is essentially the refusal of Messianic royalty on any condition but that of suffering service. It is no accident that the same Voice is heard again on the Mount of Transfiguration (Mat 17:5 and Mar 9:7 ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, Luk 9:35 ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος [*v.l* ἀγαπητός], cf. Isa 42:1), when the manner in which righteousness is to be fulfilled is made explicit in the subject of Jesus' converse with Moses and Elijah, 'the decease which he was about to fulfil' (Luk 9:31 πληροῦν), cf. Mat 3:15 πληρῶσαι; and that again, from the moment when He begins to make plain to the unwilling ears of His disciples that His throne can be reached only through resurrection after

suffering and death, He has to cry, 'Get thee behind me, Satan' (Mat 16:23). And the taunt of the rulers on Calvary, when the crucified Jesus is bidden to prove Himself the Christ of God, the chosen (Luk 23:35 ὁ ἐκλεκτός), makes it clear that the claim to be at once the Messiah and the Servant, if doubted by the disciples and derided by the Jews, was at least in the hour of its accomplishment sufficiently understood.

It is the Divine necessity of dying which is prominent in the later teaching of the Lord, beginning from that crisis of the ministry which is emphatically presented in all the Synoptics (Mat 16:21-28, Mar 8:31 to Mar 9:1, Luk 9:22-27). He sets His face towards it as the end (Luk 22:37 [cf. Isa 53:12] τελεσθῆναι and τέλος ἔχει, cf. Joh 19:28; Joh 19:30), the goal to which His whole life moves. And in the hour when the things concerning Him had fulfilment, He singled out the leading feature in the portrait of the Servant as that which above all others fastened its application upon Himself. 'I say unto you that this which is written must be fulfilled in me, And he was reckoned with transgressors.' The Prophet, who at the outset of His ministry read in the synagogue of Nazareth the words foreshadowing the deliverance which was to issue in the Kingdom of God (Luk 4:18-19 = Isa 61:1-2), knew that for Himself it meant the Man of Sorrows, led like the lamb of the Hebrew ritual to the slaughter, and in the power of His healing wounds making intercession for the transgressors of His people (Isaiah 53; for the connexion with the Ceremonial Law see Davidson, *OT Prophecy*, ch. xxii) There is thus no inconsistency between the language of Jesus as recorded in the Synoptics and those utterances of the Fourth Gospel which seem to remove the Passion and Death from the immediate historical conditions, and to represent them as the decision of eternal issues by the voluntary activity of the Divine Sufferer, who lays down His life of Himself and judges the prince of this world on the uplifted throne of the Cross (Joh 3:14; Joh 10:17-18; Joh 12:31-33; Joh 14:30; Joh 16:11; Joh 16:33).

These considerations give peculiar point to the declaration which, according to both St. Matthew and St. Mark, stands in close relation to the request of the sons of Zebedee for eminent places in the Messianic kingdom. Messiah's kingship is based on service which takes specific form in the death He goes to accomplish—'The Son of Man came to give his life a ransom for many'—a substitution which made His soul an offering for sin, fulfilling all that was foreshadowed not only in the redemption of the people from Egypt, but also in the redemptions of the Ceremonial Law (Mar 10:45, Mat 20:28 λύτρον ἀντί, not ὑπέρ, cf. ἀντίλυτρον 1Ti 2:6, λυτρώσεται Tit 2:14, ἐλυτρώθητε 1Pe 1:18, where also the τιμιον αἷμα of Christ is the price; Isa 53:10, 2Sa 7:23, Exo 13:13, Num 18:15, cf. Psa 49:8).

That Jesus should thus have recognized the true significance of His death as a fact possessing not an accidental but an inherent worth, is not inconsistent with a due

acknowledgment of the historical circumstances which became its efficient cause. With regard to the prophecy of Jehovah's Servant, it must be remembered that the Sufferer, though offering a sacrifice for sin of which the liturgical oblation is the type, yet incurs pain and death only through setting his face as a flint (Isa 50:4-9) in maintaining truth and righteousness under conditions which inevitably made this witness a martyrdom. And it would be misreading the phenomena of the Gospel narrative to represent the propitiatory death of Christ as wantonly sought by our Lord in a manner inconsistent with the dictates of common morality. The Cross could not have been mediatorial if Jesus had been an official and conventional Messiah reaching Calvary by any other road than that which in the first instance made Him one with His brethren (Heb 2:10-18) in the pursuit of His own moral end. His death, which affects the conscience (Heb 9:14; Heb 10:22), is not represented as self-immolation. He 'witnessed before Pontius Pilate a good confession' (1Ti 6:13, cf. 'the faithful witness,' Rev 1:5; Rev 3:14). His mission being to establish the kingdom upon a basis of surrender (Mat 20:28, Joh 13:4; Joh 13:13-15), upon a gospel preached to the poor (Luk 4:18) by one who is Himself lowly in heart (Mat 11:29), He must not shrink till He send forth judgment unto victory (Mat 12:20). When there is no more risk of quenching the smoking flax by appearing openly as the uncompromising foe of the hierarchy, He recognizes that His hour is come (Joh 12:23; Joh 17:1 al., Mar 14:41, cf. Joh 2:4, Luk 22:53), changing the method of His discourse so that they who reject Him may perceive that He speaks of them (Mat 21:45), and without further parley join the inevitable issue. There is, however, no warrant for Mr. F. W. Newman's theory, that Jesus' denunciation of scribes and Pharisees was a deliberate provocation of judicial murder; though it must be remarked that, assuming the knowledge of power to rise again the third day, we could not judge even such an action entirely by the ordinary standard. Still, if the one necessity of the case was a sacrificial death upon the stage of history, the event might have been accomplished amid accessories more suggestive of ritual than the Crucifixion. But this would have been something less than a moral act, whereas the NT shows the propitiation wrought by Jesus Christ 'the righteous' (1Jn 2:1, Act 3:14; Act 7:52; Act 22:14) to have been something more. The Agony in the Garden, followed by the Seven Words from the Cross, attests the naturalness of the Passion as suffering, though voluntarily endured, yet inflicted from without. It is only after the Resurrection that the human actors in the tragedy fall out of sight, and the Cross can be presented absolutely as that which it behoved the Christ to suffer, so entering into His glory (Luk 24:26).

From what has been already said, it follows that an adequate soteriology, or theology of the Atonement which is genuinely evangelical, must be the expression of a spiritual experience resting upon Christ's death as the expiation of sin. With a few notable exceptions, foremost among them Dr. R. W. Dale, the trend of modern theology, since the publication of M'Leod Campbell's treatise on *The Nature of the Atonement*, has been on the whole to develop the doctrine on its ethical side, and to find its spiritual

principle either in the sinless penitence or the perfect obedience of Jesus (e.g. Westcott, Wilson, Moberly, Scott Lidgett). The tendency of these writings has been, while dissipating theories of a non-moral 'transaction,' to obscure to a greater or less extent 'the offering of the body of Christ,' and to give an insufficient value to the Biblical account of His death as an objective act of propitiation addressed to the Father by the incarnate Son. No doubt English writers for the most part maintain that the 'penitence' and obedience of Christ are imparted by grace to the believer. But between the obedience and the grace, as that which gives meaning to both, NT theology places the substitutionary sacrifice.

St. Peter connects obedience with the 'sprinkling of the blood of Christ' (1Pe 1:2; 1Pe 1:14; 1Pe 1:18-19) and the sin-bearing of the tree (1Pe 2:24). Involving as these expressions do 'the blood of the covenant' (Exo 24:6-8, Lev 16:14-19; Lev 17:11-12, Zec 9:11; cf. Heb 10:29; Heb 13:20, and, for the 'new covenant,' Jer 31:31-34; Jer 33:8, Eze 36:26), and the laying of hands upon the head of the sin-offering (Lev 16:21, cf. Isa 53:6; the whole passage [Isa 53:4-7] should be carefully compared with 1Pe 2:21-25, and the influence of the Levitical code in moulding language and ideas noted), both familiar conceptions of the Hebrew ritual, they point undoubtedly to a real transfer of guilt, a genuine substitution, as the true meaning of the 'glad tidings' (1Pe 1:12), of which the Apostle was the witness (1Pe 5:1). The Christian society is the 'people of God's own possession' (1Pe 2:9-10), ransomed and brought into covenant by the precious blood. The obedience and sufferings of Christians are not, therefore, redemptive, for such are already dead to sin (1Pe 2:24).

With this the Johannine writings agree. Fellowship with God is the eternal life which Christians enjoy, but this mystical union* [Note: The unio mystica must not be confounded with atonement by pressing the etymology of the latter word (at-one-ment), the Pauline equivalent of which (καταλλαγή) St. John never uses. According to its proper meaning, the verb 'atone' is not transitive, but is followed by the preposition 'for.' Mr. Inge in *Contentio Veritatis* constantly ignores this.] is effected by the purifying blood of Jesus His Son (1Jn 1:7), in whom is forgiveness (1Jn 1:9-10 1Jn 2:1, 1Jn 3:5), who is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world (1Jn 2:2, 1Jn 4:19, cf. 1Jn 5:6 [Joh 19:34], Joh 4:42; Joh 11:51, Rom 3:25 ἰλαστήριον). The antecedent power of Christ's death is thus explained by the sacrificial term ἰλασμός to be an effectual means for turning away the wrath of God, which the impressive imagery of the Apocalypse represents as resting upon the wicked (Rev 6:16-17; Rev 14:19 and *passim*). Nowhere is the significant figure of the Lamb more emphatically applied to Christ than in the Johannine books (Joh 1:29; Joh 1:36; Joh 19:36 [Exo 12:46], the Apocalypse, *passim*).

With the Apostle Paul we reach the fullest statement of the doctrine of the Atonement. And here it must be noted that the Epistles of the first imprisonment, which develop the teaching concerning the Person of Christ in His eternal relation to the Universe and the Church, follow those which give detailed expression to the reconciliation of believers to God through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus. It would seem, therefore, that theologians like Westcott, who subordinate redemption to the Incarnation, are less true to Christian experience than those who reach the Incarnation through the Atonement. For St. Paul the Cross in its twofold aspect of Death and Resurrection is the central fact which forms the subject of his gospel (1Co 1:18; 1Co 1:23; 1Co 2:2, Gal 5:11, 1Ti 2:5-7), the basis of Baptism (see above) and of the Eucharist (see above), the source of the forgiveness of sins (Col 2:13-14; cf. Col 3:12, Eph 4:32), the motive of Christian morality (Rom 6:4), the spring of faith (1Co 12:3, cf. Rom 10:9) and of spiritual life (2Co 4:10-11, Gal 2:20), and the assurance of immortality (2Ti 1:10). To this fact there is a corresponding personal experience, so that baptism may be represented as involving an identification of the believer with his Lord so intimate that not only is the figure of putting on Christ as a garment felt to be appropriate to the initiatory Christian rite (see above), but His death, burial, and resurrection are regarded as reproduced in the believer (see above). From the Cross the Christian life takes its specific complexion, so that ‘the new man created in righteousness’ (Eph 4:24) becomes ‘crucified unto the world’ (Gal 6:14), branded in the body with the marks of the Lord Jesus (Gal 6:17); glories in the Cross (Gal 6:14); and fills up that which is lacking in the sufferings of Christ (Col 1:24). Obviously, therefore, the interpretation of this fact and its consequent experience is from the point of view of St. Paul the primary task of the Christian theologian.

The interpretative word used in St. Paul’s soteriology is *καταλλαγή*, ‘reconciliation’ (Rom 5:11 Authorized Version ‘atonement’), the root idea of which is restoration of personal relations between parties hitherto estranged. This involves the explanation of the ‘catastrophe in human life,’ sufficiently evident in common experience but inexplicable apart from the Hebrew realization of the personal God, which is set forth in Rom 1:18-28 as the rebellion of the unthankful human will against the claim of the Divine Creator (Rom 1:21). The need is universal (Rom 3:9; Rom 3:23);* [Note: Notice that St. Paul more Hebraico states sin as a universal fact—‘all have sinned’—without developing a theory by physical analogy. No amount of ‘originality’ in sin detracts from full moral responsibility towards God in the individual. Mr. Tennant in his Hulsean Lectures speaks as though the traditional doctrine of sin neutralized personal disobedience; but this is not the case, as a right understanding of St. Paul’s doctrine of reconciliation in Christ will show.] but the later Augustinian terminology, which, in spite of Luther’s return to a fuller Paulinism, still dominates the language even of Protestant divinity, tends by the use of such figures as ‘vice’

(*vitium*), ‘flaw,’ ‘disease,’ to palliate the exceeding sinfulness of sin and to obscure the personal significance of the Cross, which is always uppermost in St. Paul. Three points must be noted.

1. *Christ died ‘to reconcile the Father to us.’*—This phrase, if not strictly Biblical, conveys the essential idea of Scripture, which is quite obscured by the statement that His death reconciles men to God. Modern teachers, concerned to vindicate the love of God, have inclined to represent the Cross as intended to produce merely a change in the moral life of the sinner. Not only is this inconsistent with the idea of reconciliation, but St. Paul, while, with the NT generally, always representing the work of Christ as arising in the gracious will of the Father (2Co 5:18-19, Rom 5:8; Rom 8:32, Col 1:19-20, Eph 1:9-10, 1Th 5:9, Tit 3:4; cf. 1Pe 1:3, Joh 3:16 and *passim*, 1Jn 3:1), yet invariably regards it as the loving act (2Co 5:14; 2Co 8:9, Gal 1:4; Gal 2:20, Rom 8:37, Eph 5:2, cf. Joh 10:11, Rev 1:5) of a mediator (1Ti 2:5-6, cf. Heb 9:15), producing in the first instance a change in God’s attitude towards the sinner (2Th 1:8-9, Rom 8:1; cf. Rom 8:7-8), turning away wrath (1Th 1:10, Rom 5:9), removing trespasses (2Co 5:19), and providing a channel through which God might forgive sins as an act not only of mercy but of justice (Rom 3:26).

It is perhaps unnecessary to argue with the formality which sets up an abstract Law* [Note: Such theories, like the attempt of Anselm in *Cur Deus Homo* to express the Atonement in terms of the feudal idea of society dominant in the Middle Age, to which they are akin, no doubt perform useful service in freeing the teaching of Scripture from unwarrantable and misleading accretions, but they are a method of expressing rather than of explaining the problem.] to which even God must do homage. At this point even Dale becomes somewhat cumbrous. But it is obvious that even the parable of the Prodigal Son would not ring true in human ears unless it was for ever interpreted by a transaction which gives due weight to the enormity of a sin that entailed the sacrifice of the Father’s only Son. Nor would St. Paul have succeeded in commending the death of Christ to the Christian conscience save by insisting that only thus could God reconcile a world unto Himself and be alike just and the justifier of the believer.

2. *The death of Christ is the act of God* (Tit 2:13 [cf. 2Pe 1:1], Rom 1:4, 2Co 4:4, Col 1:15, Php 2:6, Rom 9:5 (?), Act 20:28).—‘It is at this point in the last resort that we become convinced of the deity of Christ’ (Denney). ‘God was in Christ,’ who was ‘marked off as the Son of God by the resurrection.’ Grace is always in St. Paul the free act of God’s favour (Rom 3:24; Rom 4:4-5 *al.*), and it is ‘the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ’ (Rom 5:15; Rom 16:20, 2Co 8:9; 2Co 13:14), whereby we have been enriched. The love of Christ which constrains us, because He died for all, is Divine

(2Co 5:14; 2Co 5:19-20 ‘on behalf of Christ’ = ‘as though God were entreating by us’). The position of the justified sinner is that of a restored sonship, because his redemption from first to last is the action towards him of the eternal God Himself. His right relation to the Father is witnessed by, or rather is, the presence of the Spirit of the Son ‘sent forth’ into his heart by that same God who had ‘sent forth’ the Son Himself to work out a redemption under the conditions which imposed this necessity of love upon the paternal heart of God (Gal 4:4-6). When this is once apprehended, the objections to a doctrine of substitution (‘ego sum peccatum tuum, tu es justitia mea’—2Co 5:21) are seen to have no application in fact. They are valid only if the activity of the Mediator is separated sharply from that of the Father. Such a distinction is neither Pauline nor Christian. The threefoldness of God is a revelation incidental to ‘the unfolding of the work of Divine Atonement’ (see Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*, ch. viii). With St. Paul, as with St. John, it is the Father who is revealed in the Son (see above), whose work is manifest in the work of Christ. Redemption is parallel to Creation (Gal 6:15, Col 1:18, Eph 1:10, 1Co 15:20-28; 1Co 15:45; cf. Joh 1:1-18, Rev 21:1; Rev 21:5). If the morality of the latter lies in the fact that ‘God saw that it was good,’ the justice of the former is witnessed not only by the ‘new creation’ but by the infinite worth of the Son (1Co 6:20), whom God gave up for us all and who endured the Cross.

3. Reconciliation is antecedent to the renewal of the individual.—This is almost wholly ignored in modern German theology, which thereby goes far to forfeit its claim to be a true development of Lutheran teaching, losing touch with the NT generally and especially with St. Paul. Ritschl, for example, for whom the statement that ‘Christ expiated sin by His passion’ has ‘very little warrant in the Biblical circle of thought,’ regards the death of Jesus merely as ‘the summary expression of the fact that Christ maintained His religious unity with God,’ and places the forgiveness of sins in the ‘effective union’ of believers with God in that Divine kingdom which it was the vocation of Jesus to found (*Justification and Reconciliation*, English translation ch. viii). Now, while Ritschl thus recovers a truly Apostolic conception in the Kingdom of God as the primary object of reconciliation (see below), he does so only at the expense of the ‘finished work,’ which is the glory of all true evangelicalism. St. Paul in particular leaves no doubt as to the objective character of the ‘reconciliation’ wrought by Christ, which stands complete before the preaching whereby comes hearing and faith. ‘While we were enemies we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son’ (Rom 5:10; cf. Rom 5:6; cf. Rom 5:8-9, Col 1:21-22). He has previously shown (Rom 3:24-26) that the vindication of God’s righteousness (ἐνδειξις τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ), which conscience requires as a condition of the acquittal of sinners, has already been given in the redemption wrought by Christ, involving as it did the bloodshedding of the Son of God, which constituted the Redeemer a propitiation for sin. The equivalence adumbrated by the symbolic transfer of guilt to

the head of the victim was consummated in Christ (Rom 8:3, 2Co 5:21, Gal 3:13 cf. Lev 16:5 also Hebrews, *passim*, see below). The spectacle of such a substitution—not one man redeeming his brother, but God putting Himself in the sinner’s place—was the manifestation of a Divine righteousness to which Law and Prophets, the Hebrew dispensation, had witnessed (Rom 3:21). In Christ crucified that righteousness is complete, needing no human condition (ἔργον) to perfect it, but offered freely to him that believeth on the justifier of the ungodly, so that his faith can be reckoned instead of righteousness,* [Note: Much harm has resulted from insisting on the ‘forensic’ character of this justification. No doubt δικαιόω has associations of the law court; but it is as absurd to suppose that legal fictions were present to the mind of St. Paul as to ascribe these ideas to the compiler of Genesis (Gen 15:6) or the author of the thirty-second Psalm (Psa 32:2). The word expresses only the free forgiveness of the Father’s love.] because through it the sinner appropriates Christ’s finished work and becomes ‘the righteousness of God in him’ (2Co 5:21). Here the Atonement, as St. Paul interprets it, leads to the development of the doctrine of the Incarnation (Rom 5:12-21, cf. 1Co 15:21-22). Christ is the second Adam; He ‘recapitulates’ (Eph 1:10, cf. *Protcv. Jac.* 13, and Irenaeus, bk. iii. ch. xxx ‘recapitulans in se Adam’) the human race, so that His redemptive, recreative act has more than a representative value. In Him ‘all died’ (2Co 5:14). This characteristic principle of Pauline theology—‘in Christ’—expands on the other side into the doctrine of the new life through membership (Rom 12:4-5, Eph 4:25) in the body of Christ and fellowship of the one Spirit (1Co 12:13, 2Co 13:14). The second Adam is a quickening spirit, endowed with the grace of unction (Hooker. *Eccl. Pol.*, bk. v. ch. lv.), imparting through the Resurrection a Spirit which dwells in the believer and finally quickens even his mortal body (Rom 8:11).

That the communion of the elect people with God meant the indwelling of His Spirit, is a familiar idea of the OT (Isa 63:9-14, Eze 36:27). So the body of Christ, which is the Church (Col 1:24), being the primary object of redemption (Act 20:28, Eph 1:14; Eph 1:22; Eph 2:11-16; Eph 4:4-6, Tit 2:14; Titus cf. 1Pe 2:9-10), reconciled through death (Eph 2:13), becomes a habitation of the Spirit (Eph 2:21-22), distributed according to the measure of faith to the several members (Eph 4:7-16, Rom 12:1), which through the Presence (‘Christ in you,’ ‘the Spirit of the Son shed abroad in your hearts,’ ‘the fulness of God,’ Eph 3:19) have a common access to the Father (Eph 2:18; cf. Eph 3:12), manifest the gifts of the Spirit (1Co 12:4-11, Rom 12:6-8), and in mutual dependence grow together to ‘the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ’ (Eph 4:13; Eph 4:15-16, Col 2:19, Rom 12:4-6). That this teaching, though given in St. Paul’s individual manner, was no personal speculation of his own, may be gathered from its close relation to the great social sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist, which would be startling if, in view of their generally

accepted significance in the primitive community, it were not obvious (Eph 4:4-5, 1Co 10:17).

To claim for the death of Christ that it is a completed act of reconciliation, the ground of the believing sinner's justification, and thus alike the subject of adoring gratitude and the source of renewed moral effort, is to establish a doctrine satisfactory to reason rather because it sets the several parts of Scripture and Christian teaching in an intelligible proportion to one another, than because it is itself rationally explained. The Cross establishes the Law (Rom 3:31), and, as thus interpreted, manifests and supplies the need of the human spirit, and thus finds its justification in experience. But propitiatory sacrifice remains to be apprehended rather than understood. This is because it is a fact of religion rather than of ethics. Men have felt the need of something to set them right with God, even when they have been far from knowing that He is love. If this distinction be not perceived, we shall fail to see the true bearing of the evidence from Comparative Religion for the universality of the idea of atonement as manifested in myth, ritual, and custom. Thus Sir Oliver Lodge (see art. 'Suggestions towards the Reinterpretation of Christian Doctrine,' *Hibbert Journal*, vol. ii., No. 3), while admitting the cogency of the universal belief in immortality, sees in the crudities of the widespread practice of sacrifice only a reason for discounting this element in traditional Christianity. There can be no doubt that atonement is fundamental to the idea of sacrifice (see Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, Lect. vi. p. 219; Lect. xi. pp. 377-384), and that this idea of 'covering' is prominent in the ritual of the OT (see Schultz, *OT Theol.*, English translation vol. i. pp. 384-400).

Far from deprecating, or even ignoring the ancient sacrifices, the NT, as we have seen, presents Christ as the 'Lamb of God.' And in the Epistle to the Hebrews the Son is explicitly set forth as 'Himself the victim and Himself the priest,' manifested once at the consummation of the ages to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself (Heb 9:26). Though, unlike St. Paul, who sees the analogy between heathen sacrifices and the Christian Eucharist (1Co 10:21), the author of this Epistle confines his attention to the worship of the Hebrews, the argument may be legitimately extended to embrace the 'blood of bulls and goats' offered under any system for what in view of the Cross is seen to be a typical, conventional purification and approach to God. There is, however, one important point in which the Mosaic sacrifices differ from all others. They fulfilled the primary condition of Divine appointment, and therefore availed within the limits of the institution. They were inadequate, not because, like the oblations of the heathen, they were material, but because, unlike like the offering of Christ, they were transitory (Heb 10:1; Heb 10:11), and alien to those who brought them (Heb 9:12; Heb 9:25). Christ, who elsewhere in the NT appears as the Mediator, Saviour, Word made flesh, here becomes specifically the Priest

(Heb 2:11 [ὁ ἀγιάζων = 'priest'; the act of consecration is identified with the Cross in Heb 13:12, cf. Heb 2:9-10] Heb 3:1 and *passim*), the appropriate scientific term, as we may call it, for whoever establishes the proper end of religion, communion with God. His is a 'finished work,' because by Divine appointment (Heb 3:2, Heb 5:1; Heb 5:4-5) He is 'a priest for ever' (Heb 5:10, Heb 7:24; Heb 7:28), who 'through the eternal Spirit' (Heb 9:14) obediently (Heb 5:8, Heb 10:9) fulfilled the priestly function (Heb 8:3) in offering the body prepared for Him by the will of God (Heb 10:5-10) as an eternal sacrifice (Heb 10:12, cf. Heb 5:9). This is no metaphorical self-sacrifice, the essence of which is undeviating conformity to the general law which conditions human life. It is 'through his own blood' (Heb 9:12) that He enters once for all into heaven. This lays the emphasis on His death as the means through which He makes that purification of sins (Heb 1:3, Heb 9:14) whereby access is gained to the throne of grace (Heb 10:19, Heb 4:14; Heb 4:16). The open way witnesses to a sacrifice already offered and accepted (Heb 10:10 ἡγιασμένοι not ἀγιάζόμενοι, Heb 10:14 τετελείωκεν [cf. Joh 19:30] τοὺς ἀγιάζομένους, which Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 rightly translates 'them that are [not 'are being'] sanctified'). The new covenant is thus dedicated with blood (Heb 9:18-22), not because life is liberated through death (for why should death effect this result except according to Oriental mysticism?), but because a death must have taken place for the redemption of transgressions (Heb 9:15, Heb 10:29, cf. Mar 14:24 and parallels), which is, in the phraseology of sacrifice, what St. Peter says when he declares that 'Christ bore our sins in his body on the tree' (1Pe 2:24).

Minds to which sacerdotal ideas are repugnant will always resent such language as sophisticated and superstitious, and, if they do not reject, will endeavour to explain away what is certainly the meaning of the Epistle to the Hebrews. No doubt this particular mould of thought is not necessary to the gospel, which is content to assert that Christ died for our sins. Yet the consequence of rejecting it is likely to be a denial of the atoning character of Christ's death. To describe the central fact of the gospel in ethical terms as a revelation of love, an exhibition of obedience, or a manifestation of the Divine character, expresses a side of truth, apart from which a doctrine of substitution may become, if not immoral, at least superstitious. But such descriptions cease to be true, if they are taken for definitions. The Cross is no longer a revelation, if it be not a redemption. If it be large enough to deal with a situation of which the factors are God, man, and sin; if it be a fact of religion through which men approach that Personality in whom they have their being, its significance cannot be understood unless it be recognized as a mystery, illuminating and illuminated by life and experience, but itself not reducible to simpler terms. It is at this point that 'mysteries,' in the Greek sense of the word, have their place. No organized religious system can entirely dispense with them. And Christianity with its sacraments of

initiation and membership bears witness to the 'mystery of godliness' (1Ti 3:16) preached by it among the nations. Whatever may be the case with individuals, the race has found no language in which to express its need towards God but that of propitiatory sacrifice. To the method of its satisfaction many analogies point, but all taken together cannot sum up the Cross. For it is essentially an eternal fact, embracing but not embraced by experience; and its theory, though to the spiritual man increasingly rational, must ever be less than that which it seeks to explain. It is not distrust of reason, but the confidence of intelligent faith which, the more surely it realizes the reasonableness of the evangelical doctrine of the Atonement, will the more readily make the words of Bp. Butler its own: 'Some have endeavoured to explain the efficacy of what Christ has done and suffered for us, beyond what the Scripture has authorized; others, probably because they could not explain it, have been for taking it away, and confining His office as Redeemer of the world to His instruction, example, and government of the Church. Whereas the doctrine of the Gospel appears to be ... not only that He revealed to sinners that they were in a capacity of salvation ... but ... that He put them into this capacity of salvation by what He did and suffered for them.... And it is our wisdom thankfully to accept the benefit, by performing the conditions upon which it is offered, on our part, without disputing how it was procured on His' (*Analogy*, pt. ii. ch. v).

Literature.—Among English works, J. M'Leod Campbell, *The Nature of the Atonement*; H. N. Oxenham, *Catholic Doctrine of the A.*; R. W. Dale, *The Atonement*; J. M. Wilson, *Hulsean Lectures*; J. Denney, *The Death of Christ*, and *The A. and the Modern Mind*; J. Scott Lidgett, *The Spiritual Principle of the A.* (Appendix on 'The Doctrine of the A. in Church History'); R. C. Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*; B. F. Westcott, *The Victory of the Cross*; W. Alexander, *Verbum Crucis*; W. O. Burrows, *The Mystery of the Atonement*. The student should also consult A. M. Fairbairn, *Christ in Modern Theol.*, Div. ii. ch. ii.; W. Sanday, *Priesthood and Sacrifice*; B. F. Westcott, *Com. on Ep. to the Heb.*, *passim*, also dissertation on 'The Gospel of Creation' in *The Epistles of St. John*; A. B. Davidson, *Theol. of the OT*, 350 ff.; S. R. Driver, art. 'Propitiation' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ; W. P. Paterson, art. 'Sacrifice,' *ib.* Among foreign writers may be mentioned A. Ritschl, *Die christl. Lehre von d. Rechtfertigung u. d. Versöhnung* (English translation *Justification and Reconciliation*); A. Seeberg, *Der Tod Christi*; W. Herrmann, *Der Verkehr d. Christen mit Gott* (English translation *Communion with God*); B. Weiss, *Lehrbuch d. biblisch. Theol. d. Neuen Test.* (English translation i. 419 ff. and ii. 220 ff.); A. Sabatier, *The Doctrine of the A. and its historical Evolution* (English translation). As landmarks in the development of doctrine Athanasius' *de Incarnatione* and Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo* are amongst the most important.

J. G. Simpson.

☩ Atonement, Day Of

ATONEMENT, DAY OF.—See Day of Atonement.

☩ Attraction

ATTRACTION.—Under this head we shall consider the attraction possessed and exerted by the character and the teaching of Christ as portrayed and expressed in the four Gospels. That character and that teaching are, of course, inseparable; for the work and the message of Christ are vitally and absolutely a personal work and a personal message. Thus the supreme appeal of the gracious invitation is: ‘Come unto Me’ (Mat 11:28). Christ’s character and teaching have an attraction, both extensive and intensive, which goes far beyond the merely aesthetic: it is a dynamical and spiritual attraction including and permeating man’s personality. On the one hand, there is the uniqueness of the message (Joh 7:46); on the other, the beauty of the character (Joh 1:14); and yet the attraction of Christ for all men is something deeper than expression or analysis, the attraction of *One lifted up from the earth, drawing all men to Himself* (Joh 12:32). This attraction is the continual directed pressure of His Holy Spirit in the hearts of men, and its reality is suggested by Ignatius’ comparison of the Cross to a crane of which the Holy Spirit is the rope to draw mankind upwards to the Father in heaven (*Eph. 9*). The universality of this attraction is exemplified in the Gospel records. Jesus was the centre of attraction for multitudes, men and women and children (Mar 1:27; Mar 2:2, Luk 19:48 etc.); and Zacchaeus (Luk 19:4), Nicodemus (Joh 3:2), the ‘Greeks’ (Joh 12:21) are only instances of this attractive power which had its culmination in the response of the Apostles to their Master’s call. In these cases the attraction was visibly, audibly, and sensibly personal; the objects of it saw, heard, and often felt *the Man that is called JESUS* (Joh 9:11, 1Jn 1:1).

To-day, the attraction of the teaching must be held to be personal still, through that action of the Holy Spirit which is implied in the inspiration of the Gospels. This attraction may also be said to have its seat in the fact of the revelation of God-in-man vouchsafed to the race of men fashioned in the likeness of God. Thus no limits can be set to the efficacy of the attraction of Christ which starts from such a source: witness the unfailing attractiveness of the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5-7) and the last discourses (John 13-17). The attraction, too, increases many-fold as it takes effect in drawing us nearer to the Master. One feature of this will be the more easy and quick

perception of fresh beauties and glories in the fourfold Gospel of Christ, the acquisition of grace upon grace (Matthew 11, Mark 10, Luke 15, John 9).

More difficult of expression, and intertwined with this attraction of the teaching, is the attraction of the *character*. Christ appealed to it. 'Ye have not always' is the pathetic appeal He made as man (Mat 26:11); 'I am with you all the days' is the glorious promise He makes as God (Mat 28:20). Above all, however, it is the work of Christ in the sacrifice of self for love of others that draws the heart of man with cords stronger and surer than any variable and uncertain attractions. 'Having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end' (to the uttermost, εἰς τέλος, Joh 13:1). It is the Cross of Christ which is the supreme instrument of the attraction, the Cross on which He was lifted up in glory and in shame.

Literature.—Seeley, *Ecce Homo*¹⁵ [Note: 5 designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 156 f.; Bruce, *Galilean Gospel*, p. 30 ff. and *passim*; Dale, *Living Christ*, p. 42 ff., *Atonement*⁷ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 438 f.

W. B. Frankland.

Attributes Of Christ

ATTRIBUTES OF CHRIST.—In the Divine Person of Jesus Christ two perfect Natures were united. We shall therefore find attributes belonging to (1) His Divine Nature, (2) the union of the two Natures, (3) His true Human Nature. As in dealing with certain passages the extent of the Kenosis will weigh greatly, the present arrangement must be taken as largely provisional.

i. Attributes belonging to Christ's Divine Nature.—Jesus Christ is the manifestation of the Divine attributes. He is 'the image (εἰκών) of the invisible God' (Col 1:15); 'the effulgence (ἀπαύγασμα) of his glory, and the very image (χαρακτήρ) of his substance' (Heb 1:3); 'the power of God and the wisdom of God' (1Co 1:24)—synonyms for Λόγος, in the phraseology of Jewish speculators. He applied to Himself words spoken of God, making the significant change of 'Me' to 'Thee' (Luk 7:27, cf. Mal 3:1 and Luk 1:17; Luk 3:4); He asserted that He came forth from God (ἐκ Joh 8:42, cf. παρά Joh 17:8, ἀπό Joh 13:3), words which 'can only be interpreted of the true divinity of

the Son of which the Father is the source and fountain' (Westcott); He claimed the power of interpreting and revising the Mosaic law (Mat 5:27 f, Mar 10:4 f); He acted in the temple as its master (Joh 2:14 f, Mat 21:12); He accepted from Thomas the supreme title (Joh 20:28), and joined His name permanently with that of the Father (Mat 28:19).

St John identified the Divine Person of Isaiah's vision with Christ (Joh 12:41). St Paul charged the Ephesian elders to 'feed the Church of God which he purchased with his own blood' (Act 20:28) and applied to Christ the words of Joel, 'Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved' (Rom 10:13). Thus He is One to whom prayer is offered (Act 7:59; Act 1:24 probably), cf. one of the earliest names for His disciples (Act 9:14; Act 9:21, 1Co 1:2). In the Epistles His Divinity is everywhere assumed and is 'present in solution in whole pages from which not a single text could be quoted that explicitly declares it.'* [Note: Dale, Christian Doctrine, p. 87.] His name is joined with that of the Father, and a singular verb follows (1Th 3:11, 2Th 2:16-17); the title 'Lord' in the highest sense is given (Rom 10:9, 1Co 12:3, etc.); He is 'God blessed for ever'† [Note: See Sanday-Headlam, Romans, pp. 233-238.] (Rom 9:5), and 'in him dwelleth all the fulness (πλήρωμα) of the Godhead bodily' (Col 2:9; cf. Col 1:19, Joh 1:16).

1. Eternal Existence.—Christ claimed that He came down from heaven without ceasing to be what He was before (Joh 3:13). Existence without beginning is implied in Joh 8:58 'before Abraham was born (γενέσθαι) I am' (εἰμι), cf. Rev 21:6; and He spoke of the glory which He had with the Father before the world was (Joh 17:5). The Λόγος was in the beginning, He was the 'mediate Agent of Creation' (Joh 1:1; Joh 1:3, Col 1:16, Heb 1:2; Heb 1:10); He is the upholder of all things (Col 1:17, Heb 1:3), the 'first-born of all creation' and 'before all things' (Col 1:15; Col 1:17), cf. the use of 'manifested' (φανεροῦσθαι) in 1Ti 3:16; 1Pe 1:20, etc.

2. Unique Relation to God.—In a few passages only does Jesus call Himself the Son of God (Luk 22:70, Joh 5:25; Joh 9:35; Joh 11:4, cf. Mat 27:43, Joh 10:36); yet He was early conscious of His Sonship (Luk 2:49). He frequently accepted the title (cf. Mat 16:16), and this led to the charge of blasphemy (Joh 19:7; cf. Joh 5:18). From the earliest time it was adopted as expressing the uniqueness of His Person (Act 9:29, Rom 1:4, etc.). He is described as the 'Only-begotten' (μονογενής, Joh 1:14; Joh 1:18; Joh 3:16; Joh 3:18, 1Jn 4:9). He spoke of 'My Father,' 'Your Father,' but not of 'Our Father' (except as a form of address to be used by His disciples in prayer, Mat 6:9, Luk 11:2 Authorized Version), 'thus drawing a sharp line of distinction between Himself and His disciples, from which,' says Dalman,‡ [Note: The Words of

Jesus , p. 190 (Eng. tr.)] ‘it may be perceived that it was not the veneration of those that came after that first assigned to Him an exceptional relation to God incapable of being transferred to others.’ In this respect Mat 11:27, which forms the link between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel, is quite explicit (cf. Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. 623); cf. also Mar 13:32 and the clear distinction made in Joh 20:17.

3. Union and Equality.—The Jews interpreted His words ‘My Father worketh even until now and I work’ as making Himself equal with God, and He did not correct them (Joh 5:17-18). ‘I and the Father are one’ (ἐν ἑσμεν) implies one essence not one Person (Joh 10:30), cf. Joh 5:23, Joh 10:33, Joh 14:7 f., Joh 17:11; Joh 17:21 f., It is difficult to describe the manner in which St. Paul associates Him with the Father as the ground of the Church’s being and the source of spiritual grace and peace, in any other terms than as ascribing to Him a coequal Godhead (1Th 1:1; 1Th 3:11 f., 2Th 1:1, 2Co 13:14), cf. Php 2:6 (οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ).

4. Subordination and Dependence.—such as belong to the filial relation—are also clearly implied in Joh 5:19 (‘The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father doing: for what things soever he doeth, these the Son also doeth in like manner’), and in Joh 14:28 (‘The Father is greater than I’), cf. also Joh 5:22; Joh 5:26; Joh 6:37. So in Epp. ‘All things are yours; and ye are Christ’s; and Christ is God’s’ (1Co 3:21; 1Co 3:23), cf. 1Co 11:3; 1Co 15:28.

5. Universal Power is frequently claimed by Christ as His even on earth, although it could not be fully exercised until after the Ascension (Luk 10:22 || Joh 16:15). He is given authority (ἐξουσία) over all flesh (Joh 17:2); ‘All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth’ (Mat 28:18), cf. Joh 3:35; Joh 13:3. Accordingly St. Peter describes Him as ‘Lord of all’ (Act 10:36); He is ‘over all’ (Rom 9:5); and the ‘head of all principality and power’ (Col 2:10). He is present still with His Church though invisible (Mat 18:20; Mat 28:20, cf. 1Co 5:4), ruling and guiding (Act 9:10; Act 22:18; Act 23:11, and cf. the letters to the Churches, Revelation 2, 3).

6. Divine Consciousness and Knowledge.—Jesus claimed a unique knowledge of the Father and the exclusive power of revealing Him (Mat 11:27). He spoke of heavenly things which could only be known by Divine consciousness (Mat 18:10; Mat 18:19, Luk 15:10, Joh 3:12; Joh 14:1). He was the great Prophet which was to come (Joh 6:14, Act 3:22), the fullest revealer of God’s will (Heb 1:2), but He differed essentially from even the highest prophets, in that He spoke with authority as from Himself, and never introduced His message by such words as ‘Thus saith the Lord.’ ‘In him are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden’ (Col 2:3). He knew

(Joh 18:4) and made known the details of His Passion and Resurrection (Mar 8:31; Mar 9:31; Mar 10:33 etc., cf. Mar 14:8-9). He foretold the sufferings of His disciples (Mat 10:18 f.), the destruction of Jerusalem (Luk 19:43-44; Luk 21:21), events preceding the end of the world (Matthew 24 ||) and the judgment of mankind (see below). Here too may be mentioned His power of knowing the thoughts of men. Such knowledge is described both as relative, acquired (γινώσκειν, cf. Mar 2:6), and absolute, possessed (εἰδέναι, cf. Joh 6:61, Luk 11:17), cf. Luk 7:39-40; Luk 9:47. He seems to be addressed as καρδιογνώστης in Act 1:24, which agrees with what is told as to His supernatural knowledge of the thoughts and lives of persons, cf. Joh 2:24-25 ('He knew all men... he himself knew what was in man'), also Luk 19:5, Joh 1:48; Joh 4:18; Joh 4:29; Joh 6:64; Joh 11:11; Joh 11:14. It appears also with regard to things (Mat 17:27; Mat 21:2; Mat 26:18, Luk 5:4-6, cf. Joh 21:6). Whether such passages imply absolute omniscience, or omniscience conditioned by human nature, depends upon the view taken of the Kenosis (see Westcott, Add. Note on Joh 2:24; Gore, *Bamp. Lect.* p. 147).

7. Self-assertion and Exclusive Claims.—His works were such as no other man did (Joh 15:24), His words shall outlast heaven and earth (Mat 24:35), men will be judged by their relation to Him (Mat 7:23; Mat 10:32), and by their belief or unbelief on Him (Mar 16:18, Joh 6:40; Joh 12:48). He requires the forsaking of everything which may prove a hindrance to following Him (Mat 8:21; Mat 10:37, Mar 10:21, Luk 14:26). Suffering and loss incurred for His Name's sake will be rewarded in the Regeneration (Mat 19:29 ||), even now those who suffer for His sake are blessed (Mat 5:10 f.). He claims to be the Light of the world (Joh 8:12; Joh 9:5; Joh 12:46), the Way, the Truth, and the Life (Joh 14:6). Eternal life, spiritual strength, and growth can come only from union with Him and feeding on Him (Joh 5:40; Joh 6:51 f., Joh 10:28; Joh 15:4-5; Joh 17:2). He is the Giver of rest and peace (Mat 11:28, Joh 14:27). And such claims are endorsed by St. John (Joh 1:9, 1Jn 5:12) and St. Paul (Rom 8:1, Php 4:13, 1Ti 1:12).

ii. Attributes belonging to the Union of the two Natures.

1. Mediation.—There is a twofold Mediatorial activity ascribed to the Son of God which must be distinguished; that presented in the revelation of the Logos proceeding from God all-creating and all-sustaining; and that exhibited in the work of the Christ, leading back to God and transforming the relation of contrast into one of union, that God may be all in all.* [Note: See Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics*, § 180.] The former has been already mentioned, the latter appears in passages which speak of Christ as delivering us from sin and Satan (Joh 12:31-32, Heb 2:14-15, 1Jn 3:5; 1Jn 3:8), as obtaining for us eternal life (Joh 3:14 f., Joh 6:51, Rom 6:23, etc.), as

procuring the gracious influence of the Holy Spirit (Joh 14:16; Joh 14:28, Act 2:33, Tit 3:5-6 etc.), conferring Christian graces (1Co 1:4 f., Eph 1:3-4 etc.), and acting as our representative High Priest (Heb 4:14; Heb 7:25 f. etc.).† [Note: Dale, *Atonement*, p. 451.] The title ‘Mediator’ (μεσίτης) occurs in 1Ti 2:5, Heb 8:6; Heb 9:15; Heb 12:24.

2. Sovereignty.—One object of Christ’s coming was to found a world-wide imperishable society, called the Kingdom of Heaven or the Kingdom of God. He was foretold in prophecy as King (Zec 9:9, cf. Mat 21:5). He Himself spoke of His Kingdom (Mat 13:41; Mat 16:28, Luk 22:30) and accepted the title from Pilate, but explained that it was ‘not of this world’ (Joh 18:36-37). Satan tempted Him to antedate it by a short but sinful method (Mat 4:8-9). He is ‘King of Kings and Lord of Lords’ (Rev 19:16; cf. Rev 11:15).

Dalman (*Words of Jesus*, p. 133 f.) thinks, assuming an Aramaic original, that ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου or αὐτοῦ would have to be rendered ‘when I am King,’ etc., and Luk 23:42 ‘as King’; cf. Dan 6:28 דָרִיּוֹשׁ בְּמַלְכוּתוֹ ‘in the reign of Darius.’ On the ‘originality’ and ‘audacity’ of Christ’s design to form a world-wide kingdom see Liddon, . Lect. iii.; *Homo*, ch. v.

3. Consciousness of His Mission was ever present to His mind. Frequently He uses such expressions as ‘the Father that sent me’ (Joh 6:44; Joh 8:16; cf. Joh 20:21), ‘Him that sent me’ (Joh 7:33; Joh 12:44; Joh 16:5), ‘I am sent’ (Mat 15:24, Luk 4:43). There was the sense of purpose in His life, ‘To this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth’ (Joh 18:37); it is implied in the repeated use of ‘must’ (δεῖ), implying ‘moral obligation, especially that constraint which arises from Divine appointment’ (Grimm-Thayer, see Mar 8:31, Luk 24:46 TR [Note: R Textus Receptus.] , Joh 3:14 etc.); and cf. Luk 9:51 ‘He steadfastly set (ἔστη ὡς ἔξω) his face to go to Jerusalem.’

4. Sinlessness.—While He had the most perfect appreciation of sin and holiness, while He prescribed repentance and conversion, rebuking all self-righteousness and pride, He was absolutely without any consciousness of sin or need of repentance in Himself. He claimed to be free from it (Joh 14:30); He challenged examination and conviction (Joh 8:46); He could say at the end: ‘I glorified thee on the earth, having accomplished the work which thou hast given me to do’ (Joh 17:4, cf. Joh 8:29; Joh 19:30, Mat 3:17; Mat 17:5; and as to His best disciples, Luk 17:10). The truth of His claim was testified by His forerunner (Mat 3:14), most intimate friends

(Joh 1:14), enemies (Mar 14:55 f.), judges (Joh 18:38, Mat 27:24 etc., Luk 23:15), and betrayer (Mat 27:4)—on Mar 10:18 see the Commentaries. Christ's moral perfection is recognized everywhere in the Epistles: 'who knew no sin' (2Co 5:21); 'who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth' (1Pe 2:22). He is holy (ἅγιος, Act 3:14, Rev 3:7; ὁσιος, Heb 7:26), righteous (δικαιος, 1Pe 3:16, 1Jn 2:1), pure (ἄγνός, 1Jn 3:3), guileless and undefiled (ἄκακος, ἀμίαντος, Heb 7:26); cf. Heb 4:15, 1Jn 3:5; 1Pe 1:19.

5. Glory.—St. John, summing up his experience, writes: 'We beheld his glory, glory as of the only-begotten from the Father' (Joh 1:14); here many find a reference to the Shekinah (note ἐσκήνωσεν) and interpret δόξα as the 'totality of the Divine attributes' (cf. Liddon, βL [Note: L Bampton Lecture.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 232); others, as 'a glory which corresponded with His filial relation to the Father even when He had laid aside His divine glory' (Westcott). Isaiah in his vision saw His glory (Joh 12:41), it was manifested in His 'signs' (Joh 2:11), and at the Transfiguration (2Pe 1:17). In some sense it was laid aside or veiled at the Incarnation (Joh 17:5), but Christ constantly spoke of it as regained by means of His death and resurrection (Joh 12:23; Joh 13:31; Joh 17:1; Joh 17:5), cf. Joh 12:18, Php 3:21, and Rev 5:12 ('Worthy is the Lamb that hath been slain to receive the power and riches ... and glory and blessing'). He will come hereafter in His glory as Judge (Mat 25:31), cf. Mat 19:28; 1Pe 4:13; and in Epp. He is styled 'the Lord of glory' (1Co 2:8, Jam 2:1).

6. Salvation.—His mission on earth was 'to seek and to save that which was lost' (Luk 19:10; cf. Luk 9:56, Joh 3:17, 1Ti 1:15), it was implied in His very name (Mat 1:21). He is the author (ἀρχηγός, Heb 2:10; αἴτιος, Heb 5:9) of salvation. Twice only is the full title 'Saviour of the world' given (Joh 4:42, 1Jn 4:14, cf. 1Ti 4:10), but 'Saviour' is found frequently (Luk 2:11; cf. Luk 2:30, Act 5:31; Act 13:23, Php 3:20, 2Pe 3:18 etc.). In this connexion may be noted the power of forgiving sins which He claimed on earth as Son of Man; see His words to the man sick of the palsy, with the comment of the bystanders (Mat 9:2 f.), and to the woman who was a sinner (Luk 7:46), cf. Act 5:31; Act 10:43.

7. Judgment.—One of the most momentous attributes is the power of judging mankind, involving complete and entire knowledge of the thoughts, actions, and circumstances of all men (cf. 1Co 4:5). That such should be His work was foretold by John the Baptist (Mat 3:12) and asserted by Himself (Mat 16:27; Mat 25:31 etc., cf. Rev 22:12). It is committed to Him by the Father (Joh 5:22), because He is a son of man (Joh 5:27 (Revised Version margin)), and His disciples should watch, making

supplication that they may prevail ... to stand before Him (Luk 21:36). He is 'ordained by God to be the judge of quick and dead' (Act 10:42; cf. Act 17:31, 2Ti 4:1), and before His judgment-seat we all must be made manifest (2Co 5:10, cf. Rom 14:10).

8. Supreme Power.—He exercised power over *nature* (Joh 2:9, Mat 8:26; Mat 14:25; Mat 21:19, Mar 6:35 f., Luk 5:4 f.). His various miracles of healing showed His power over *disease*. Sometimes the cure was accompanied by His touch (Mat 8:3; Mat 8:15; Mat 20:34, Luk 22:51); sometimes the sufferer touched Him (Mar 5:18, Luk 6:19); it was wrought by a word (Mat 12:13); or by visible and tangible means (Joh 9:6-7); and even at a distance (Mat 8:13, Mar 7:30, Joh 4:50). Three instances of power over *death* are recorded (Mar 5:41, Luk 7:14, Joh 11:43); cf. Mat 11:5. His power also over *evil spirits* was shown in many cases and acknowledged by them (Mar 1:24; Mar 5:7, Luk 4:33 etc., cf. Act 10:38). He was the One stronger than the strong man, Luk 11:22, cf. Mat 4:10-11. He *excited astonishment* in the people (noted chiefly in Mk. and Lk.). It was caused by His teaching (Mat 7:28, Mar 1:22), His words of grace (Luk 4:22, cf. Joh 7:15; Joh 7:46), and the authority with which He spoke (Luk 4:32); in these instances θαυμάζειν and ἐκπλήσσεσθαι are used. The effects produced by His miracles are expressed by similar words of amazement—θαυμάζειν (Mat 15:31, Mar 5:20, Luk 11:14, Joh 7:21); ἐκπλήσσεσθαι (Mar 7:37, Luk 9:43); θάμβος and ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι (Mar 9:15, Luk 4:36); ἔκστασις and ἐξίστασθαι (Mar 2:12, Luk 5:28; Luk 8:56); φόβος (Luk 5:26; Luk 7:16). Among the disciples the same feelings were caused: 'they were sore amazed in themselves' (λίαν ἐξίσταντο, Mar 6:51); 'being afraid they marvelled' (φοβηθέντες ἐθαύμασαν, Luk 8:25); 'they were amazed (ἐθαμβοῦντο) and astonished exceedingly' (ἐξεπλήσσοντο, Mar 10:24; Mar 10:26); 'they were amazed (ἐθαμβοῦντο) and afraid' (ἐφοβοῦντο) on the last journey to Jerusalem (Mar 10:32).

9. Dignity.—An attribute commanding respect and reverence is closely connected with the above. The Baptist declared Christ to be immeasurably above himself (Joh 1:27), while Christ described him as the greatest of the prophets because His forerunner (Mat 11:9-10); the disciples 'were afraid to ask him' (Mar 9:32, cf. Joh 4:27); those who came to arrest Him fell to the ground (Joh 18:6; cf. Joh 10:38 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), and Pilate was the more afraid hearing His claim to be the Son of God (Joh 19:8); note His silence (Mat 26:62 f., Mar 15:3 f., Luk 23:9). Other feelings, however, than reverence for His dignity were also excited, e.g. *repulsion* in the demoniacs (Luk 4:33) and in the Gerasenes (Mar 5:17); *wrath* (Luk 4:28); *shame* in His adversaries, *joy* in the multitude (Luk 13:17); *consciousness of unworthiness* in the centurion (Mat 8:8), and of *sinfulness* in Peter (Luk 5:8).

10. Restraint in the use of Power.—This attribute is strongly marked. Christ never used His Divine power for His own benefit (Mat 4:2 f.) nor for destroying life (on apparent exceptions, Mar 5:13, Mat 21:19, see Comm.). He restrained it that the Scriptures might be fulfilled (Mat 26:54), and His exercise of it was often limited by want of faith on the part of those present (Mat 13:58).

iii. Attributes belonging to Christ's true Human Nature.—Becoming truly man, He took upon Him our nature as the Fall had left it, with its limitations, its weaknesses, and its ordinary feelings so far as they are not tainted by sin. He partook of flesh and blood, and in all things was made like unto His brethren (Heb 2:14; Heb 2:17, cf. Rom 8:3). He possessed a true *human will*, but ever subject to the guidance of the Divine will (Joh 6:38, Mat 26:39); a *human soul* (ψυχή, Mat 26:38, Joh 12:27) and a *human spirit* (πνεῦμα, Mar 2:6, Luk 23:46, Joh 11:33; 1Pe 3:16); He was representative Man (1Co 15:22); all which is implied in 'the Word became flesh' (ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, Joh 1:14). The *Permanence of His Manhood* is evident since He was recognized after the Resurrection (cf. Joh 20:27) and ascended with His glorified body into Heaven; there He intercedes as our High Priest (Heb 4:14 etc.), and will one day come again in like manner as He was seen to go into heaven (Act 1:11).

1. Limitation of Power seems to be implied in the Incarnation; it is noted especially by St Mark, who has several passages expressing inability (οὐ δύνασθαι, Mar 1:45; Mar 7:24; Mar 6:5, which compare with Mat 13:58).

2. Limitation of Knowledge is distinctly asserted by Jesus Himself on one point (Mat 24:36 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, Mar 13:32, cf. Act 1:7, Heb 10:13). In His childhood He grew, 'becoming full of wisdom' (πληρούμενον); He advanced (προέκοπτε) in wisdom (Luk 2:40; Luk 2:52); the story of the fig-tree implies that He expected to find fruit (ἤλθεν εἰ ἄρα εὐρήσει τι ἐν αὐτῇ, Mar 11:13). He prayed as if the future were not clear (Mat 26:39); He asked questions for information (Mat 9:26, Mar 6:38; Mar 8:23; Mar 8:27; Mar 9:21, Luk 8:30, Joh 11:34), cf. Mar 11:11.

3. Astonishment and Surprise.—In two cases only is Jesus said to have marvelled (θαυμάζειν, Mar 6:6, Luk 7:9), but surprise is implied at His parents (Luk 2:49); at the disciples' slowness of faith and understanding (Mar 4:40; Mar 7:18); at the sleep of Simon (Mar 14:37); cf. Mar 14:33 where a very strong word is used of the Agony (ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι, to be 'struck with amazement').

4. Need of Prayer and Communion with the Father is apparent from many passages. Sometimes He continued all night in prayer (Luk 6:12). It was associated with great events in His life (Luk 3:21; Luk 6:12-13; Luk 9:18; Luk 9:28, Joh 12:27; Mat 26:36 f. ||, cf. Heb 5:7); it is mentioned after days of busy labour (Mat 14:23, Mar 1:35, Luk 5:16). He offered thanks also (Mat 11:25, Joh 11:41). Jesus prayed for His disciples (Luk 22:32, John 17), and taught them to pray (Mat 6:9, Luk 11:2), but He never gathered them to pray with Him. Compare also Mat 14:19; Mat 19:13, Luk 11:1; Luk 24:30 etc.

5. Temptation was a reality to Jesus (Mat 4:1-11 ||), Satan left Him only for a season (Luk 4:13; cf. Luk 22:53, Joh 14:30). It came also from Peter (Mat 16:23) and His enemies (Luk 11:53); cf. Luk 22:28 (ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου); He was ‘in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin’ (χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας, Heb 4:15).

6. Suffering came from such temptation (Heb 2:18); but the word πάσχειν is specially used of the last days of His earthly life. Thus the prophecy of the Suffering Servant in Isaiah was fulfilled (Mar 9:12, Luk 24:26; Luk 24:46; cf. εἰ παθητὸς ὁ Χριστός, Act 26:23). Peter’s confession at Caesarea Philippi marked the time when Jesus began to emphasize this side of the Messianic prophecies (Mat 16:21, cf. Mat 4:17). The only absolute use of the word in the Gospels occurs in Luk 22:15. (See ‘Sorrow’ below.) By suffering He learned the moral discipline of human experience, He was ‘made perfect’ and ‘learned obedience’ (Heb 2:10; Heb 5:8-9), so that He can be a *pattern* and *example* for Christians (1Pe 2:21, 1Jn 2:6; 1Jn 3:3). He exhibited *faith* (Heb 3:2; Heb 3:6) and trust (Joh 11:41 f., Heb 2:13) in the highest forms. He is the ‘author and perfecter (ἀρχηγὸς καὶ τελειωτῆς) of our faith’ (Heb 12:2), ‘the perfect example—perfect in realization and effect—of that faith which we are to imitate trusting in Him’ (Westcott). *Submission* and *Obedience* He showed to Mary and Joseph also (Luk 2:51), and to His Heavenly Father (Mat 26:42); cf. Rom 5:19. The purpose of His life was summed up in the words ‘to do thy will, O God’ (Heb 10:7).

7. Liability to Human Infirmities.—Jesus experienced *hunger* (Mat 4:2; Mat 21:18, cf. Joh 4:31); *thirst* (Joh 4:7; Joh 19:28, cf. Mat 27:34); *weariness* and *pain*: ‘being wearied (κεκοπιακῶς) with His journey He sat thus (οὕτως) by the well’ (Joh 4:6); in the boat He ‘fell asleep’ (ἀφύπνωσε, Luk 8:23); in the Garden there appeared an angel strengthening Him (ἐνισχύων, Luk 22:43); He was unable to carry His cross (Mar 15:21), and it would seem that He Himself required support (cf. φέρουσι Mar 15:22 with ἐξάγουσι Mar 15:20); cf. 2Co 13:4, Heb 4:15. No sickness is

mentioned (the quot. in Mat 8:17 can hardly bear this meaning); He truly died, but it was a voluntary death (Joh 10:17-18; and note that in no Gospel is the word ‘died’ used of His passing from life); cf. Rom 6:9 ‘death hath no more dominion over him’ (οὐκέτι κυριεύει), and Act 2:24.

8. Sorrow.—The prophecy was amply fulfilled that the Messiah should be ‘a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief.’ Sorrow was inevitable for one who had such insight into human nature, and so sympathized with its woes (cf. Joh 11:33-38). It came also from ‘the gainsaying’ (ἀντιλογία) of sinners (Heb 12:3; cf. 1Pe 2:21 f.). One of the greatest causes of grief is misunderstanding of motive and action, which He experienced in abundance. On one occasion His relatives spoke of Him as ‘mad’ (ἐξέστη, Mar 3:21); His enemies said He had a demon and was mad (Joh 10:20), and ascribed His works to Beelzebub (Luk 11:15). There was disappointment also (Luk 13:34, Joh 5:40). The knowledge of what was coming cast a shadow on His life (Luk 12:50, Joh 12:27), it is implied in the description of the last journey to Jerusalem (Mar 10:32); at the Last Supper He was troubled in spirit (ἐταράχθη, Joh 13:21); it is clearly expressed in the accounts of the Agony—Mat 26:37 ἤρξατο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν, the latter expressing ‘utter loneliness, desertion, and desolateness’ (Edersheim); Mar 14:33 ἤρξατο ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν; Luk 22:44 γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ, and the Bloody Sweat; His soul was περίλυπος ἕως θανάτου (Mat 26:38); the strong word ἀπεσπάσθη ‘was parted’ is used in Luk 22:41 as if the separation itself caused grief; and the sorrow culminated in the heartbroken cry on the cross (Mat 27:46). Cf. Heb 5:7 μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς καὶ δακρῶν.

9. Joy.—It would be a great mistake, however, to regard His whole life as one of continuous overwhelming sorrow.* [Note: See Brooks, *New Starts in Life*, Sermon on ‘Joy and Sorrow.’] Our accounts deal almost entirely with the last three years, and surely there must have been much real happiness in the previous thirty years spent in honest work amid the beautiful surroundings of Nazareth, especially as He was conscious of no stain of guilt or failure in duty, and felt no remorse. Even in the Gospels we see His pure appreciation of nature and of children’s games. It is once recorded that He rejoiced in spirit (ἠγαλλιάσατο, Luk 10:21), and several times He used ‘joy’ (χαρά and χαίρω) of Himself (Joh 11:15; Joh 15:11; Joh 17:13, cf. Luk 15:5; Luk 15:10). He must have felt joy in communion with His Father (Mat 11:25, Joh 11:41), and in the consciousness of success (Luk 10:18, Joh 16:33).

Complaisance appears in His praise of the centurion (Mat 8:10) and His words to Simon (Mat 16:17); cf. Mat 21:16, Luk 19:40, Joh 4:32. So Heb 12:2 ('for the joy that was set before him he endured the cross'). See 'Sociability' (22).

10. Humility and Meekness.—These were shown in the circumstances of His childhood (Luk 2:24; Luk 2:51); during His ministry He was homeless (Mat 8:20), and sometimes without money (Mat 17:27, cf. Luk 8:3). He describes Himself as 'meek and lowly of heart' (πρῶτος καὶ ταπεινός, Mat 11:29); cf. Joh 1:29, 2Co 10:1 (διὰ τῆς προαότητος καὶ ἐπιεικειᾶς τοῦ Χριστοῦ). 'Though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor' (ἐπτώχευσε, 2Co 8:9); He 'emptied himself' (ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, Php 2:7, see whole passage). His life was one of unselfish ministry to others (Mat 20:28, Joh 13:4 f., Luk 22:27; Luk 22:51; cf. Luk 23:28 and the first three 'Words on the Cross'). He 'pleased not himself' (Rom 15:3), and 'He gave himself up for us' (Eph 5:2).

11. Patience and Longsuffering are seen in Luk 9:55; Luk 23:34, Joh 18:11; Joh 18:23; He left us the example of His patience (1Pe 2:20-21, Heb 12:1-2); cf. 2Th 3:5 (Lightfoot's *Notes on Epp. of St. Paul, in loc.*) and 1Ti 1:16.

12. Compassion.—His compassion (σπλαγχνίζεσθαι) is often noticed: it led Him to send out the Twelve (Mat 9:36), to heal the sick (Mat 14:14), to feed the 4000 (Mat 15:32), to give sight to the blind (Mat 20:34), to touch the leper (Mar 1:41), to teach (Mar 6:34), and to restore the widow's son (Luk 7:13). Cf. also Luk 1:78, Mar 9:32, Php 1:8. In Authorized Version 'compassion' stands also for ἐλεεῖν (Mar 5:19) and μετριοπαθεῖν (Heb 5:2). His mercy is appealed to (ἐλεεῖν) by the Canaanite woman (Mat 15:22), Bartimaeus (Mar 10:47), and the ten lepers (Luk 17:13). He is a High Priest who can be 'touched with the feeling (συμπαθεῖσαι) of our infirmities' (Heb 4:15); cf. Mat 8:17.

13. Tender Thoughtfulness appears in Mat 17:7; Mat 28:10, Mar 6:31; Mar 6:48, Joh 6:10 (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) 18:8, 20:15. Cf. the story of Jairus' daughter, Mar 5:36; Mar 5:40-41; Mar 5:43 (on Mar 7:25 f., see Comm.).

14. Pity.—In the story of the man with the withered hand mingled pity and anger appear (συλλυπούμενος, Mar 3:5). Twice He is recorded to have *sighed* (ἔστέναξε, Mar 7:34; ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι, Mar 8:12). Twice He wept for others (ἔκλαυσεν, Luk 19:41; ἐδάκρυσεν, Joh 11:35; cf. Heb 5:7, under 'Sorrow' above). He was

accustomed to give alms to the poor (Joh 12:5; Joh 13:29). Cf. Luk 13:34; Luk 22:61.

15. Love.—He showed His affection for little children, taking them up in His arms (Mar 9:36; Mar 10:16, cf. Mat 21:16); beholding the rich young ruler, He loved him (ἠγάπησεν, Mar 10:21); He called the disciples His friends (φίλοι, Luk 12:4, Joh 15:14-15), whom He loved (ἠγάπησεν) unto the end (Joh 13:1, cf. Joh 13:34; Joh 15:9; Joh 15:12). Even in this select circle there was one of whom it was specially said ‘Jesus loved him’ (ἠγάπα, Joh 19:26; Joh 2:17; Joh 2:20; ἐφίλει, Joh 20:2). He also loved (ἐφίλει) Lazarus (Joh 11:3; Joh 11:36), and, with a significant change of word (ἠγάπα, Joh 11:5), Martha and Mary. There are many reff. in Epp. to His love for His people and the Church; cf. Eph 5:2; Eph 5:25, Rom 8:35, 2Co 5:14, it ‘passeth knowledge’ (Eph 3:19), from it true love may be learned (1Jn 3:16 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885).

16. Courage and Firmness appear under various circumstances in Mat 8:26, Mar 4:38-40; Mar 10:32, Luk 4:30, Joh 11:7 f., Joh 18:4 f., Joh 19:11. His *independence* was well expressed by His questioners (Mat 22:16).

17. Fear in any unworthy sense (φόβος) is not attributed to Him. In Heb 5:7 it is said that He was ‘heard for His godly fear’ (εὐλάβεια). Westcott takes the word in ‘its noblest sense,’ so Alford ‘reverent submission’ (see note); but Grimm-Thayer prefers to render as ‘fear, anxiety, dread’; ‘by using this more select word, the writer, skilled as he was in the Greek tongue, speaks more reverently of the Son of God than if he had used φόβας.’ *Caution*, however, is often noted; cf. His withdrawals before opposition (Mar 3:7; Mar 7:24, Joh 7:1; Joh 11:54), also Joh 6:15 and the directions about the place of the Last Supper (Luk 22:10).

18. Desire (ἐπιθυμία, see art. Desire) is once used of Himself (Luk 22:15), and a *longing for sympathy* is apparent in His bringing of the three into the Garden and His returning to them between His prayers (Mat 26:37 f.): ‘in magnis tentationibus juvat solitudo, sed tamen ut in propinquo sint amici’ (Bengel).

19. That he felt **shame** at hearing a foul story seems a fair inference from Joh 8:6 f. (see *Ecce Homo*, ch. ix. end). He Himself says, ‘Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of Man be ashamed’ (ἐπαισχυνθήσεται, Luk 9:26); cf. Heb 12:2.

20. Anger and Indignation He often showed, though ὀργή is attributed to Him in only one passage in the Gospels (Mar_3:5; cf. ὀργή τοῦ Ἄρονιου, Rev_6:16). He was ‘moved with indignation’ at the action of the disciples (ἠγανάκησατε, Mar_10:14); possibly this should also be the translation of ἐμβριμάσθαι in Joh_11:33; Joh_11:38 ((Revised Version margin)), on which see notes of Westcott and Godet. The same word is rendered ‘strictly charge’ (‘threateningly to enjoin,’ Grimm-Thayer) in Mat_9:30, Mar_1:43. His rebukes (ἐπιτιμᾶν) are noted (Mat_8:26, Mat_1:25, Luk_4:39). Cf. also Mar_5:40; Mar_11:21, Joh_2:15, Mat_21:12. Sometimes he used *Irony* and *Sarcasm*: Luk_5:31, Mar_7:9 (καλῶς ἄθετεῖτε); Luk_13:32 (‘that fox’); Luk_16:22 (‘and was buried’ [‘a sublime irony,’ Trench]). Hypocrisy excited His deepest abhorrence. Cf. the Woes on the Scribes and Pharisees, Mat_23:13 f. || ending ‘ye serpents, ye offspring of vipers’; also Mat_12:34

21. Attractiveness appears in the readiness of many whom He called to forsake all and follow Him. The common people ‘heard him gladly’ (Mar_12:37, cf. Luk_19:48, Joh_12:19); publicans and outcasts were drawn to the ‘friend of publicans and sinners’ (Mar_2:15, Luk_7:37; Luk_19:3); two members at least of the Sanhedrin became His disciples (Joh_19:38-39); and He foretold how by His Crucifixion and Resurrection this attractiveness would attain universal sway (Joh_12:32). See art. Attraction.

22. Sociability.—In this respect Jesus presented a marked contrast to the Baptist, which was commented upon (Luk_7:33-34). He accepted invitations from Pharisees (Luk_7:36; Luk_11:37; Luk_14:1) and from Publicans (Mat_9:10, cf. Luk_19:5-10). In the home at Bethany He was a welcome guest (Luk_10:38). His first ‘sign’ was wrought at a marriage feast (Joh_2:1), and much of His parabolic teaching was suggested by feasts and the incidents of ordinary life; cf. Mat_22:2; Mat_25:1; Mat_25:14, Luk_14:18; Luk_19:12.

23. His Catholicity is to be noted finally. Though a Jew on the human side, yet He rose entirely above all merely national limits. ‘He can be equally claimed by both sexes, by all classes, by all men of all nations.’* [Note: See Gore, Bampton Lect. 168 f.] Even in His earthly ministry, though necessarily confined to His own nation (Mat_15:24), His sympathy went beyond these bounds; cf. Mat_8:5 f., Mat_15:22 f., Luk_10:33 f., Luk_17:18, Joh_4:23; Joh_4:35; Joh_10:16; Joh_12:20 f., Joh_12:47. He looked forward to the time when ‘they shall come from the east and west, and from the north and south’ (Luk_13:29); cf. Mar_13:10 and His last command, Mat_28:19. So each race of men as it is gathered into the Church finds in Him its true ideal.

We have thus presented to us a Person in whom Divine power, wisdom, and goodness are joined with the highest and holiest type of manhood. The portrait is 'such as no human being could have invented.... We could not portray such an image without some features which would betray their origin, being introduced by our limited, erring, sinful minds.... And least of all could Jews have done so; for this was not by any means the ideal of their minds' (Luthardt, *Fundamental Truths of Christianity*, 295 f., and notes). See also artt. on Divinity and Humanity of Christ, and on Names and Titles.

Literature.—Sanday's 'Jesus Christ,' Ottley's 'Incarnation,' and other articles in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ; Gore, *Bampton Lectures and Dissertations*; Liddon, *Bampton Lectures*; Stalker, *Imago Christi*; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*; Dale, *Christian Doctrine and The Atonement*; Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*; Robinson (J. A.), *The Study of the Gospels*; Robinson (C. H.), *Studies in the Character of Christ*; D'Arcy, *Ruling Ideas of Our Lord*; Beet, *Through Christ to God*; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*; Commentaries of Westcott, etc.

W. H. Dundas.

Augustus

AUGUSTUS.—The designation usually applied to Cains Octavius, son of Caius Octavius and Atia, grandson of Julia the sister of C. Julius Caesar, grand-nephew of the Dictator and ultimately his adopted son and heir. He was born 23rd Sept. [Note: Septuagint.] b.c. 63, not far from the 'House' on the Palatine afterwards built for him; declared Emperor b.c. 29; honoured with the title of 'Augustus' b.c. 27; died 19th Aug. a.d. 14 at Nola, when he had almost reached the age of 77.

If we take b.c. 6 as the corrected date for the birth of Jesus, we find that Augustus was then in his 58th year, had already been Emperor 23 years, and had before him 20 more. Though his reign thus runs parallel with the Christian era for 20 years, there is but a single allusion to him in the Gospel history (Luk 2:1). In the NT writings there are but three other instances of the use of the name Augustus. Of these one only (Act 27:1) can be held as possibly pointing to him, the other two (Act 25:21; Act 25:25) mean the reigning Caesar (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'Emperor'), in both cases Nero. Even that solitary allusion to Caesar Augustus might have had no place in the Gospel record, had it not been St. Luke's aim to 'trace the course of all things accurately from the first.' In 'drawing up his narrative' he makes it evident that Nazareth, not Bethlehem, was the home of Joseph and Mary, and that the 'enrolment,' originating in a decree of Caesar Augustus, was the occasion of the

journey from Nazareth within a little time of the expected birth. The Syrian governor is named with the view of fixing the date, as was the custom in those days. Theophilus, as a Roman official, would have access to the list of provincial governors, and must have at once understood the exact period meant. Thus Augustus' contact with Jesus, so far as Scripture deals with it, begins and ends with Luk 2:1.

It need not surprise us that there is no further reference in the 20 years of contemporaneous history that followed. The birth of Jesus took place in a remote part of the Empire and in an insignificant town of Judah. The first 30 years of His life, with the exception of the brief sojourn in Egypt, were spent in the obscure, even despised, Nazareth. Among His townsmen He was known only as the carpenter (Mar 6:3), or the carpenter's son (Mat 13:55). Though the arrival of the wise men from the East, with the inquiry as to the birth of 'the King of the Jews,' 'troubled Herod' and 'all Jerusalem with him' (Mat 2:3), the commotion caused by their advent soon passed with the tyrant's death in b.c. 4. Even the Massacre of the Innocents 'from two years old and under' in Bethlehem may never have been heard of in the palace of Augustus, or, if heard of, would have made very little impression, owing to the many acts of cruelty that had marked Herod's reign. It was about this very time that Augustus is reported to have said that it was 'better to be Herod's sow than his son' (Macrob. *Saturn*, ii. 4).

For St. Luke, with his wider outlook as a cultured Greek writing to a Roman official, it was quite natural to give a distinct place in his record to the decree about the census as leading up to the birth in Bethlehem. The object of the decree is given in the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 correctly as 'an enrolment' (ἀπογραφή), not necessarily involving 'a taxing' as well. As on this occasion it did not lead to any serious uprising of the Jews, as in a.d. 6, it must have been only a census in accordance with Jewish customs: 'all went to enrol themselves, every one to his own city.' The historian is careful to point out that it was part only of a world-wide enrolment ('all the world'). In the light of later research, we can add that this decree seems to have introduced a periodic census in the Roman Empire. The carefully chosen language of St. Luke distinguishes between the going up from Galilee as an act once for all completed (ἀνέβη), and an enrolment begun and having a continuance (ἐπὶ οὐρεῖντο πάντες ἀπογράφεσθαι).* [Note: It is true, indeed, that the imperf. may point, not to a repetition of the census, but simply to the fact of its going on for some time (cf. Winer, *Gram. of NT Greek* [Eng. tr.]9, p. 335).] The further description of the census as 'the first' accords with this, not the first under Quirinius, but the first of a series. For those to whom St. Luke wrote the decree was memorable as 'the first' that affected the Jews. Other enrolments may have taken place before it under Augustus, as the review by the Emperor himself in the celebrated Monumentum

Ancyranum bears, but there is no contradiction between that and the Evangelist's testimony. Three distinct censuses are there named (in b.c. 28, b.c. 8, and in a.d. 14). Only the number of Roman citizens is given in each case, as all others might not have been considered worthy of being mentioned in the Emperor's Memorials. Important light has recently been thrown on the system of enrolments in the Roman Empire through the labours of various scholars referred to by Prof. W. M. Ramsay in his volume *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* The tombs and even the dust-heaps of Egypt are proving that enrolments of households there were quite common, and even that a cycle of 14 years was observed. Applying this cycle to the period immediately before and after the Christian era, we bring out well-known dates, b.c. 8 and a.d. 6, the former marking a Roman-citizen census taken by Augustus, and the other that of the 'great census,' when the disturbances took place in Palestine which were quelled by Quirinius. There is thus a strong presumption, amounting almost to proof, that b.c. 8 is the most likely date for the issue of the decree referred to in Luk 2:1. The delay between b.c. 8 and b.c. 6, so as to have it coincide with the corrected date for the birth of Jesus, may be accounted for by the strained relations existing about the time between Augustus and Herod, and also between Herod and his subjects. As it seems to have been the first enrolment of Jews under the Empire, it is easy to conceive that time was needed to overcome Jewish scruples.

The real difficulty, however, as to this alleged census under Quirinius lies in reconciling St. Luke's testimony with the facts of secular history. The Syrian governors in the period of b.c. 9-4 are given by Schürer as C. Sentius Saturninus (b.c. 9-6) and P. Quintilius Varus (a.c. 6-4). As a.c. 4 is the generally accepted year of Herod's death, the possibility of a governorship of Quirinius at the time of the execution of the decree of Caesar Augustus is thereby excluded. Many therefore have been ready to say, with Mommsen, that St. Luke has 'erred.' Even Tertullian is quoted against the Evangelist, when he affirms that an 'enrolment' was made by Sentius Saturninus. And yet his testimony, while it differs from that of St. Luke as to the name of the governor of Syria, supports none the less the fact that there was a census earlier than the famous one of a.d. 6. The evidence in favour of an earlier as well as later governorship of Quirinius is now admitted to be so strong, that Mommsen and others have fully accepted it. The only question that remains is as to where we are to place it. Important help towards the solution of it has been found in the inscription discovered at Tivoli in 1764, now preserved in the Lateran Museum of Christian Antiquities. On it are recorded the exploits of a Roman official, with the honours awarded to him in the time of Augustus. While no name has been preserved, we are told that he was proconsul in Asia, and that he twice governed Syria and Phœnicia. The only one, known to us, who satisfies these conditions is Quirinius. Where then, in the interval immediately before the birth of Jesus in b.c. 6 or at latest b.c. 5, are we to find room for his earlier Syrian governorship? It must be between Saturninus and Varus, or as a contemporary of the one or the other. If we can find proofs in history of

a double 'hegemony' in provincial government, we may consider that only *there* can the solution lie. In the history of Josephus we have a singular confirmation of this twofold governorship. A Volumnius is named in relation to Sentius Saturninus as 'the hegemon of Caesar' (Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] i. i. p. 350). Why might not Quirinius have been the military governor, while Saturninus was the civil administrator? In view of the progress of discovery in recent years, may we not hope that some additional fragment of the Tiburtine inscription will be found, and definitely settle the much debated question as to the historical accuracy of St. Luke? See art. Census.

Though secular history from b.c. 6 to a.d. 14 furnishes us with no trace of any influence having been exerted by Augustus on Jesus or by Jesus on Augustus, we are able to trace, in the remarkable career of Augustus, a singular preparation for the Christian era. In nothing is this more manifest than in his unification of the Empire. When Augustus finally defeated Antony at Alexandria in b.c. 31, he was the one ruler left in the whole Roman world. The only adverse influence with which he had thereafter to contend was found among the heads of the old families in the Roman Senate. In the course of the next 10 or 12 years he so skilfully guided the affairs of the State, that he was clothed with every attribute of supremacy which it seemed possible for the State to bestow. The title of 'Princeps Senatus' was revived in b.c. 29, and had new significance given to it. In b.c. 27 the Senate conferred upon him the proconsular *imperium* for 10 years. This put into his hands an all but absolute military power throughout the empire. At this same time he received the title of 'Augustus,' a name having to do with the science of augury [or from *augeo*, as *an*-gustus from *ango*], and suggesting something akin to religious veneration. Though even then he wished himself to be considered as having a primacy only among equals, yet, as wielding the power both of purse and sword, he had become really the master of the Roman world. Nor was he content with this. The *tribunicia potestas* was granted to him in a sense more extended than ever before. While he appeared to assume it year by year, it really became his for life, and was the symbol of his sovereign authority, being used to mark the years of his reign. In b.c. 23 the whole machinery of the State had definitely and permanently passed into his hands. When the Christian era dawned, Augustus had for 17 years exercised a dominion unrivalled in its nature and extent, entitling it to be spoken of as over 'the whole world.' And yet there was no one in his day that felt so much the need of limiting the extension of the Empire. Among his last instructions there was one enjoining his successors not to seek enlargement, as it only made the work of guarding the frontiers more difficult. One of his greatest anxieties during his later years, owing to the deaths of Marcellus, Agrippa, Lucius, and Gaius, had to do with the succession to the Imperial throne. While the Christian era had not yet reached its first decade, he had only Tiberius, his step-son, to look to as his successor. At an early period of his reign Augustus had given himself to the development of a complete system of road-supervision for Italy and the

provinces. The celebrated pillar of gilded bronze, the 'Milliarium Aureum,' of which but a fragment of the marble base can be seen to-day near the ascent of the Capitol, was set up by Augustus on 'his completion of the great survey and census of the Roman world' (Lanciani). On it were marked the distances of all the principal places along the main roads from the city gates. Where these roads led, civil government was found established, with a representative of the Emperor or the Senate, and with tribunals for the administration of justice. Anyone claiming to be a Roman citizen had the privilege of appeal to Caesar, and could be assured of a safe conduct to Rome. Safe and comparatively speedy modes of travel were assured.

Our knowledge of the government of the provinces under Augustus is too limited to admit of any clear and full description of it. Suetonius (*August.* 47) has given us the principles on which he acted in dividing the provinces between himself and the Senate, in these words: 'The provinces which could neither be easily nor safely governed by annual magistrates he undertook himself.' In other words, those that required a strong force to hold them in subjection, or whose frontiers were exposed to attack on the part of restless and powerful enemies, he retained in his own hands. The others, which could be easily governed and had nothing to fear from surrounding peoples, he handed over to the Senate. This arrangement placed in his hands almost the whole military forces of the Empire. The Emperor's legates, commanding the provincial troops, were not only appointed by him, but could be suspended or dismissed at his pleasure. The provinces were divided into groups according as they were administered by consuls, praetors, or simply knights. Even those that appeared to be entirely under the control of the Senate were restricted in their appointments by the Emperor, as the list of those eligible had to be submitted to him, and all on the list must have served, with an interval of five years, as consuls or praetors. In the case of Syria we find an imperial province exposed to inroads from warlike peoples on its Northern and Eastern borders, and therefore in need of a military more than a civil commander over it to act as its *hegemon*. The term answers best to our Viceroy. This was the position which Quirinius probably held, and he would have power from Augustus to allow in Herod's dominions a census that would as little as possible offend Jewish prejudices.

Each set of provinces had its own separate treasury. The revenues from the Imperial provinces flowed into the Emperor's *fiscus*, and out of it were taken the enormous sums spent on the great military roads, which became the highways for Christianity. To the Senate, Augustus granted the right of minting copper only, reserving gold and silver for the Imperial treasury. As the result of these and other measures the Empire enjoyed unusual prosperity. Augustus also bestowed great care on the selection of his legates, closely watched over their administration, and made it all but impossible for a corrupt governor to escape swift punishment. To this in great measure the Empire owed its popularity in Augustus' time.

There was another remarkable preparation for the world-census in the ordnance survey initiated by Julius Caesar, and completed only after 25 years of labour on the part of four of the greatest surveyors of the age. The main object of it, no doubt, was the taxation of land, the most profitable source of revenue under the Empire. Thus a completely organized and a world-wide Empire, in absolute dependence upon its supreme ruler in Rome, had become an accomplished fact ere the Christian era had dawned.

As this new era approached, signs were multiplying of a desire for peace on the part of ruler and ruled, though it is scarcely true that the actual year of the birth at Bethlehem was distinguished by the prevalence of universal peace. To the immediately preceding period, b.c. 13-9, belongs the famous 'Altar of Peace,' whose actual site has been laid bare within very recent years (1903-1904) under the Via in Lucina, a little way off from the Corso, the old Flaminian Way. The very same year in which Augustus became Pontifex Maximus owing to the death of his former co-triumvir Lepidus, the Senate decreed the erection of an 'Altar of Peace,' which at first was to have been set up in the Senate-house, but was afterwards placed on the edge of the Campus Martius. One of the chief features of the period to which it belongs was the closing of the temple of Janus. Horace, writing in b.c. 13 (*Epp.* ii. i. 255 and *Odes* iv. xv. 9), speaks of the closing as a recent occurrence. Twice before in the reign of Augustus, in b.c. 29 and b.c. 25, this temple had been closed (*Mon. Anc.* 13), 'when peace throughout the whole dominions of the Roman people by land and sea had been obtained by victories,' and 'only twice before his birth since the foundation of the city,' in all five times up to the Christian era. The Gades (Cadiz) inscription is a remarkable confirmation of b.c. 13 as the date of the third closing of the temple of Janus in Augustus' time.

The monument entitled the 'Ara Pacis Augusti' is of unusual proportions and of exquisite workmanship. Within the walls of a massive marble screen there was placed the altar on an elevated base, pyramidal, and having marble steps leading up to it. The screen was splendidly decorated both within and without with sculptures in high relief. The outer side of the screen had two distinct bands of ornamentation: the lower floral, the upper a procession with figures, many of which might have been actual portraits. The best known of these processional reliefs are to be found in the Gallery of the Uffizi at Florence, one is in the Cortile Belvedere of the Vatican, and one in the Louvre, Paris.

The altar was a splendid tribute to Peace, but it was a peace after many and bloody victories, reminding us of the saying, 'where they make a desert they call it peace' (*Tac. Agricola*, 30), and it was also a peace that was not to last. Yet there the altar stood on the field of Mars, as the reign of the 'Prince of Peace' was ushered in, and became for ages thereafter a witness to the Pax Romana of the Augustan age. Far

more of it remains to the present time than of the triple arch of Augustus set up in celebration of his victories, of which only the bare foundations can be seen between the temple of Julius and that of Castor and Pollux.

The energies of Augustus found scope for themselves in other lines, and all with the object of building up his world-wide Empire that he meant to last in the ages to come. At the beginning of his reign he put his hand to the restoration of the State religion. In b.c. 28 he claims to have 'repaired 82 temples of the gods' (*Mon. Anc.* 20), earning for himself the title given him by Livy (*Hist.* iv. xx. 7), 'the builder or restorer of all the temples.' The sacred images, we are told, had become actually 'foul with smoke' or were 'mouldering with mildew.' The ancestral religion was dead, belief in the gods had all but disappeared. Nor was it only the repair of edifices for religious worship that he took in hand; from him the sacred colleges and brotherhoods received a new impulse by his becoming a member himself of one and all of them. Through him their endowments were greatly increased. With great ceremony was observed the centenary of the city, for which Horace prepared his well-known ode, as the inscription found in the Tiber in 1871 so strikingly confirms ('carmen composuit Q. Horatius Flaccus'). The worship of the Lares was restored. At crossways and street corners three hundred small shrines were set up, whose altars were adorned twice a year with flowers. One of the latest discoveries is that of a shrine of the Lares Publici in front of the Arch of Titus, on the branch of the Via Sacra leading up to the Palatine by the old Mugonian Gate. New temples were erected, the most notable being that of Apollo behind his own 'Domus.' A new spirit also was infused into the rites and ceremonies of the old worship, to which the writings of Virgil contributed in a special degree.

The hardest task yet remained in the social and moral reformation of his people. As early as b.c. 25 we find Horace (*Od.* iii. vi.), in this reflecting probably the opinion of his master, affirming the necessity of 'a reformation of morals as well as a restoration of temples and a revival of religion.' In a later ode (xxiv.) he promises immortality to the statesman who shall bring back the morality of the olden time. The action taken by Augustus about that time was effective, temporarily at least, for his praises were celebrated as 'one Who by his presence had cleansed the family from its foul stains, had curbed the licence of the age, and recalled the old morality.' The text of his laws enacted for this purpose has not come down to us, but their date may be taken as from b.c. 18 to 17, or about 12 years before the Christian era. His own example, unfortunately, did not enable him to take up a very high position on the subject of marriage. He had put away Scribonia in order to marry Livia, whom he took from her husband Tiberius Nero. Again and again he interposed to dissolve existing marriages, when his policy as to the succession required it. High motives, therefore, we do not expect to find in his legislation on marriage. Nothing could have brought out more, clearly the impotence of such legislation than the openly scandalous character of his

daughter Julia. In b.c. 2, the very year when he was hailed by the Senate as the father of his country, he became aware of what had long been in everyone's knowledge. So keenly did he feel the scandal that he shunned society for a time, and even absented himself from the city. His only remedy was her banishment to Pandataria. Never afterwards was she allowed to set foot in Rome. Nor did she see again the face of her father, whom she outlived only by a few short weeks. There were not wanting schools of philosophy that vied with each other in leading men to virtue. Greek philosophers of note were welcomed to the halls of the 'Domus Augusti.' But no system of morals or philosophy had yet appeared that could show the way of attaining to the Divine likeness by the bestowal of a new nature, until Christianity came upon the scene.

The same moulding hand that built up the Empire can be traced in the modification through which Caesar-worship passed under Augustus. The deification of Julius by the Senate in b.c. 42 was only what was to be expected. The decree ran: 'To the Genius of the divine Julius, father of his country, whom the Senate and Roman people placed among the number of the gods.' In the very heart of the Roman Forum, from b.c. 29, there was to be seen, on an elevated platform, a most beautiful marble temple proclaiming the deification of the great Julius. Augustus never allowed such worship of himself during his lifetime as had been the case with Julius. From the earliest period of his reign there is evidence that he allowed it in the provinces, but only in conjunction with 'Rome,' and the formula enjoined for all that were not Roman citizens was 'Rome and Augustus.' In the case of citizens the one name allowed, along with Rome, was that of 'the divine Julius.' For his Roman subjects he would be neither 'rex' nor 'divus,' but outside the favoured circle of Roman citizenship he had less scruple in receiving for himself a share of divine honour, believing that it formed the binding link that was needed to knit all the parts of his wide Empire into one great unity.

As to the permanence of this 'cult' in the provinces, under the joint title of 'Rome and Augustus,' there is still a measure of uncertainty. Dr. Lindsay believes the balance of evidence is in favour of 'Rome' having been left out even in Augustus' lifetime. In that case 'Augustus' signified 'not the person of the Emperor, but the symbol of the deification of the Roman State, personified in its ruler.' Certainly that might have admirably served to establish his State policy, and make him believe that he had accomplished all that human ingenuity could to make his Empire as enduring as it was world-wide.

On his death in a.d. 14 a modification necessarily came, when the Senate decreed that thereafter he should be known as 'Divus Augustus.'

The priesthood of this Imperial 'cult' was divided into two classes, the one representing the State religion in a province, and the other having charge of religious ceremonies in the cities. The provincial priests were responsible only to the Emperor as Pontifex Maximus, and had, in the West at least, jurisdiction over the municipal priests. The way was thus prepared for the development of a full hierarchical system, which became afterwards the model for the Roman Church, with its Pontifex Maximus in Rome, its Metropolitans in each province, and the municipal priests in the cities. The 'cult' itself spread with great rapidity, was binding on every Roman subject with the 'exception of the Jews only, and prepared the way for the application of the prime test for the Christians of the early ages: 'Sacrifice to the Emperor or death.' The man of all others, who created the conditions in which Christianity was to find that supreme test, was Augustus. The Universal Empire, with its ruler as an object of worship, had not long become an accomplished fact when the God-man, in contrast with the man-god, appeared,—'the Word became flesh and dwelt among us.' No contrast could well be greater than that which distinguished (in b.c. 6-a.d. 14) this world-ruler from the Founder of Christianity:—Augustus, a perfect master in State-craft, merciful to his foes only when he had made his position absolutely sure, only somewhat more advanced in his morality than the men of his age, full of self-esteem, as the last scene of his life reveals, yet entitled to be considered by the world in which he lived as its 'chief benefactor' (Luk 22:25); Jesus, though in His twelfth year able to claim a relationship with the Father in heaven such as distinguishes Him from every other son of man, yet remaining for those 20 years of His life at Nazareth as the carpenter's son, all unknown to the great world without, subject to His reputed father and His 'highly favoured' mother, 'advancing in wisdom' as in stature, and above all 'in favour with God and man.' Of the whole of Augustus' work there now remains little but crumbling or half-buried ruins, but the name of Jesus 'endures,' and gives evidence of the truth of the prophecy which points to the world's kingdom as becoming His, and His reign as being 'for ever and ever' (Rev 11:15).

Literature.—Mommsen, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, also *The Roman Provinces*, and *History of Rome*; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] Index, s.v. 'Octavianus Augustus'; W. M. Ramsay, *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?*, *The Church in the Roman Empire*; Shuckburgh, *The Life and Times of the Founder of the Roman Empire*; John B. Firth, *Augustus Caesar and the Organization of the Empire of Rome*; Baring Gould, *The Tragedy of the Caesars*; T. M. Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*; Merivale, *History of the Romans under the Empire*.

J. Gordon Gray.

AUTHORITY IN RELIGION

1. *Various connotations of the word 'authority.'*—The familiar distinction between legislative, judicial, and executive authority is one that is not only convenient, but rational and necessary. These several kinds of authority differ in their respective sources and appropriate modes of expression, and may differ also in their respective repositories. Again, authority may be original or delegated. The latter, moreover, while on a different plane, is not one whit less real than the former. And, passing by other uses of the word, it will be found that the idea lying at the heart of them all is that of *a right* on the part of somebody to submission of some sort and in some degree on the part of somebody else. In other words, the use of the term 'authority' implies the existence of an ethical standard. We shall not, therefore, have reached the ultimate authority along any line until we have arrived at this ultimate standard of right, by which the reality of all other authorities is tested. To avoid confusion, then, in considering Christ's teachings regarding authority in religion, we shall have at every step to take account of the particular kind of authority then being dealt with.

2. *Christ's conception of religion.*—That Christ's conception of religion must have conditioned and shaped His teachings upon authority in religion is too obvious to be questioned. Hence we must at least glance at His conception of religion; but as this subject is itself a large one, we can at most merely glance at it. Our Lord, of course, has nowhere given us a formal definition of religion, nor has He anywhere formally discussed its nature. At the same time, few, we presume, will affirm that Christ has left us wholly at sea upon such a point. By common consent, religion is a term of relation. For present purposes we may, without unwarrantable assumption, say that the terms of this relation are God and man. Further, without undue assumption, we may add that true religion and right relation between God and man are equivalent expressions. Our present question, then, resolves itself into this, What, according to Christ, are the essentials of right relation between God and man?

Now, for answering this question, three statements of our Lord seem to the writer to be of fundamental importance. (1) The first of these occurs in His high priestly prayer. 'This,' says He, 'is eternal life, that they should know thee the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ' ([Joh_17:3](#)). Here the last clause may be an expegetical addition of the Evangelist himself. With this statement naturally associate themselves, among others, those in [Joh_10:10](#); [Joh_3:5](#), [Mat_11:27](#). Now, certainly no one will even for a moment suppose that our Lord here lends any countenance to anything that can properly be called intellectualism. And yet it would be violent exegesis indeed that eradicated from His words the idea that right relations to God invariably imply, and ground themselves on, right conceptions

of God. On any other view, what would be the propriety of the pronoun 'thee,' which certainly singles out from all other possible individuals or entities Him in the knowledge of whom Christ declares that 'eternal life' consists? If right conceptions of God are not essential to right relation between God and man, where, again, would be the propriety of the words 'the only true,' and the emphasis evidently centred upon them? (cf. also Mat 11:27).

(2) A second passage of fundamental significance for Christ's conception of religion is Mat 22:37 ff. || Mar 12:28 ff. 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, etc. Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, etc. On these two commandments hangeth the whole law and the prophets.' But that, according to the teaching of Christ, there is an emotional element in religion, is so generally recognized that it would be superfluous to multiply references, especially in such an incidental treatment of the subject as the present.

(3) The third passage that may be regarded as fundamental for our Lord's conception of religion is Mat 7:21 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.' This, like the last passage cited, is typical. It represents a group of statements that need not be reproduced here.

While, therefore, the first of these three great passages implicates man's understanding in religion, and the second his emotions, this last implicates his will, as controlling his conduct and finding its legitimate expression through it.

What may be called, then, a qualitative analysis of Christ's conception of religion reveals the fact, that it contains this trinity of elements bound together in the indissoluble unity of the rational soul. Were any of them totally lacking, there would be no real religion. On the other hand, the necessary interrelation and interaction between them are recognized by Christ in such declarations as, 'If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching whether it be of God, or whether I speak from myself' (Joh 7:17); 'How can ye believe which receive glory one of another, and the glory that cometh from the only God ye seek not' (Joh 5:44); 'While ye have the light, believe on the light, that ye may become sons of light' (Joh 12:36). Such is the essential unity of the soul, that it cannot experience depravation in one of its functions without all of the others being more or less affected thereby.

While, however, we can with a measure both of ease and of certainty make what we have ventured to call a qualitative analysis of Christ's conception of religion, it would not be so easy to arrive at a quantitative analysis of it, and say just how much knowledge, how much emotion, and how much volitional activity must be present in order to the existence in the soul of any real religion. Indeed, it is hard to conceive of Christ as elaborating any views upon such a subject. We may refrain, then, from

pressing our investigation into what would only be a region of arid and empty speculation. It is enough, if it has been shown that Christ's conception of religion recognizes the essential unity of the soul, and involves its right relation to God in all its several powers or functions. To this conception His teachings regarding authority in religion will be found to conform. See, further, art. Religion.

i. Christ's teaching as to the ultimate standard of right, and the ultimate source of rights.—Obviously we need not expect to find Christ dealing with the ultimate standard of right under the forms of Western dialectics, or in the abstract terms of philosophy. At the same time, we need not despair of obtaining some insight into His mind even upon this question. For one thing, His mode of addressing His Father is significant. Especially is it so when we take into account the circumstances under which it was employed. 'Holy Father,' He says in His intercessory prayer; and again, 'O righteous Father.' Now, under the circumstances, this language is more, far more, than the ascription to His Father of the possession of the qualities expressed by the words 'holy' and 'righteous.' For we must not forget that Christ's intercessory prayer was offered at the very crisis of His career. We cannot pretend to fathom the experiences of His soul in that hour. The prayer itself, however, as recorded in John 17, is tense with the emotions that wrought in our Lord's soul as He poured it forth. He was, so to speak, getting His footing as the floods of great waters gathered around Him in their mysterious energy. And the bed-rock upon which He plants Himself is one lying out of sight so far as the visible providence of God is concerned. He assures Himself of its existence as a reality by turning away from what is taking place under the providence of God, and fixing His mind upon the nature of God. God's nature is His voucher for the righteousness of the course of God's providence towards Himself. In the time of stress that was upon Him, He fixes His eye upon God's holiness and righteousness as His sole but sufficient guarantee for the existence of the qualities for which these words stand.

But, further, that Christ found the ultimate standard of right in God's nature as expressed through God's will, is clear also from such statements as these: 'Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour? but for this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify thy name' (Joh 12:27 f.). Here, it will be seen, our Lord places Himself absolutely at the disposal of the Divine will. But this would have been sheer moral insanity, unless God's nature contained the final norm of righteousness. And this language is by no means exceptional; for, as all know, the Gospel of John abounds with expressions of Christ making the will of God the standard to which everything is to be referred (e.g. Joh 4:34, Joh 5:30, Joh 6:38 f.). Nor is the case different when we turn to the Synoptics (cf. Mat 5:48; Mat 6:10; Mat 11:25 f., Luk 22:42). All these passages and others leave no room to doubt that Christ taught that the nature of God, as finding expression through His will, is the ultimate standard of right.

And as, for Christ, God's nature is the ultimate norm of right, so for Him God's will is the fountain and source of all particular *rights*. Wherever there exists a right upon the part of anybody to submission of any kind or degree from anybody else, such right exists in virtue of God's ordering, and is delimited by God's will. These statements, it seems to us, are involved in the passages already cited. All authority, in other words, is simply *author-ity* writ short and differently pronounced. A free creature, like man, may be, in a limited sense, an original source of power, but never of *rights*. His rights are all derived from, and bear the stamp of, the author of his being. Not only the primary and all-comprehending dependence, but all subordinate dependences and interdependences ground themselves ultimately on the relation that subsists between the Creator, as Creator, and the creature, as creature.

ii. Legislative authority in religion.—1. *Term defined.*—What we have called legislative authority is concerned primarily with *duty*. Its prescriptions, while mediated, at least so far as the knowledge of them goes, through the understanding, terminate upon the conscience and the will. It is the right to require or to forbid. It is the right to establish relations and define the duties or the privileges attaching to them. It is the first and most fundamental form of authority, cleaving closest to the etymological and logical sense of the word, which as already noted is simply *author-ity*. Legislative authority is really or approximately a creative function. In the case of God, of course, it is really creative. Behind it lies only the Divine nature, which alone conditions and regulates its exercise. From it arise all the relations of the creature to the Creator, and to his fellow-creatures, with the duties and the privileges that inhere in them, or that, in the wisdom of God, are, from time to time and under the particular circumstances, attached to them.

Now, according to our Lord's teaching, all legislative authority in religion vests exclusively in God. He represents God as in the most absolute sense 'Lord of the conscience.' To Him it belongs to say, 'Thou shalt,' and to Him also to say, 'Thou shalt not.' As He has determined the relations between Himself and His creatures ('Father, Lord of heaven and earth,' Mat_11:25; cf. also Mat_19:4), it is for Him to define the duties emerging from those relations.

2. If, now, we pass to Christ's teaching as to how this legislative authority belonging exclusively to God comes to expression, we find—(1) That our Lord is wholly silent as to the manifestation of God's legislative authority in what we call 'the laws of nature,' using this phrase so as to include not only the laws of matter, but of mind as well, and also so as to include what St. Paul calls 'the law written in the heart.' For instance, nowhere does He directly advert to 'the ordinance of heaven' (Jer_31:35 f., Job_38:33) as an expression of the Divine will; nowhere does He refer His hearers to the constitution of their own nature, physical, mental, or moral, as embodying an expression of the Divine will regarding this or that. There is, it may be, the glimmer

of such a reference in passages like Joh_10:17 ff., Mat_10:29 f., but it is at most a glimmer, and need not detain us.

(2) But that the legislative authority of God is exercised mediately as well as immediately is also taught by Christ. (a) Thus *the preceptive portions of the OT*, though mediated by ‘Moses and the prophets,’ are really ‘the commandments of God.’ Moses and the prophets, *quoad* this matter, are, so to speak, merely the heralds of the ‘Great King,’ or, to borrow an OT account of the relation between the prophet and God, the former is the ‘mouth’ of the latter (Exo_4:16; cf. Exo_7:1). And so, while ‘Moses said, Honour thy father and thy mother’ (Mar_7:10), this is still for Christ ‘the commandment of God.’ Further, that ‘the law of Moses’ was for Him the law of God appears from the fact that, when He was Himself tempted, and had to choose between two courses, what was written in Deuteronomy prescribed for Him the path of duty (Mat_4:4; Mat_4:7; Mat_4:10-11). In the parable of Dives and Lazarus, our Lord puts these very significant words into the mouth of Abraham, ‘They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them’ (Luk_16:29). The law in Num_28:9-10 (or perhaps in 1Ch_9:32), according to which ‘the priests in the temple profane’ (ironical thrust at His adversaries) ‘the Sabbath and are guiltless’ (Mat_12:5), was for Christ determinative of duty and of privilege. Indeed, He virtually puts it upon the same plane for authority as the primary intuition and verdict of conscience, namely, that ‘it is lawful to do good—on the Sabbath day’ (Mat_12:12). Further, Christ’s summaries of ‘the law and the prophets’ (Mat_7:12; Mat_22:37 ff.) bear impressive testimony to the fact that He regarded the whole preceptive portion of the OT as an expression of the will of God. ‘Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, even so do ye also unto them,’ is, according to our Lord, but a just summary of ‘the law and the prophets’ in terms that may be appreciated by the moral sense of all men. He teaches that the whole OT, so far as it has to do with duty towards man, is but an unfolding, in relation to this or that set of circumstances, of the ‘Golden Rule,’ whose Divine origin and authority are self-evidencing (cf. Mar_12:28 ff.).

(b) Whether Christ represents the *Apostles* also as organs through whom God exercises His legislative authority is, perhaps, not quite so clear. Doubtless they were. But even passages such as Mat_10:20; Mat_16:18, Joh_20:23; Joh_16:13 may refer to a grant of judicial rather than of strictly legislative authority. The authority conferred in these passages is, indeed, large and significant, but none of them necessarily implies that the Apostles were to be organs through whom God would make substantive additions to the commands laid upon the human conscience. Nor has the writer been able to satisfy himself that Christ anywhere uses of them language either demanding, or even susceptible of such an interpretation. In other words, while he thinks it unquestionable that the Apostles were media through whom God exercised His

legislative authority, he is of opinion that we have to go outside of the Gospels for the evidence of this fact.

(c) With *Christ Himself*, however, the case is different. No doubt much of the authority we find Him using in the Gospels is judicial and not legislative. At the same time, intermingled with His judicial expositions of the law of God, we hear Him lay His own commands upon the conscience. Not only does He declare what is the Law, and what its meaning (see above), but He enunciates many specific precepts that stand related to His comprehensive summaries very much as the statutes of the land stand related to its constitution.

‘Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth,’ etc. (Mat 6:19 ff.); ‘Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast your pearls before the swine,’ etc. (Mat 7:6); ‘Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you,’ etc. (Luk 6:27); ‘Repent ye, and believe in the gospel’ (Mar 1:15)—will serve as samples. Very significant for Christ’s claims to be a special organ of the legislative authority of the Godhead is such a statement as, ‘The Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath’ (Mat 12:8), and equally so this other, ‘Ye call me Teacher and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am’ (Joh 13:13). In both these instances it is clear that Christ asserts for Himself an authority going beyond any that can with propriety be considered as merely judicial. The ‘Lord’ is a giver of law, not simply its interpreter. The same conclusion follows even more stringently, perhaps, when our Lord says, ‘I and the Father are one,’ thereby, as the Jews affirmed, and He Himself did not deny, ‘making himself (thyself) equal with God’ (Joh 10:30; cf. Joh 10:33, Mat 11:27; Mat 11:29 note the word ‘yoke’). And, finally, here we must not overlook Mat 28:18 b ‘All authority is given to me in heaven and on earth,’ which certainly constitutes a claim comprehensive enough to include the authority to prescribe laws to the conscience. See preceding article.

(3) But to say that Christ teaches that all legislative authority in religion vests exclusively in God, is hardly to put the case either as fully or as strongly as it needs to be put. For not only does our Lord represent *God as ‘Lord of the conscience,’* but with equal emphasis and great explicitness He teaches that ‘God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in anything contrary to His word, or beside it in matters of’ religious truth and duty. (For the purposes of this article ‘His word’ here may be taken quite broadly for any form in which God has made His will known).

This explains His word at the baptism, when the Baptist ‘would have hindered him,’ and He said, ‘Suffer it now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness’ (Mat 3:15). So saying, He denies to the human reason the prerogative, by annulling or setting them aside, to pass judgment upon the propriety or the expediency of Divine

prescriptions. Recognizing what is praiseworthy in the spirit of the Baptist, He at the same time sets the seal of His disapprobation upon all man-devised substitutions for, or modifications of, Divine ordinances. These are all either acts of open rebellion, or well meant but real usurpations of legislative functions pertaining exclusively to God. The same view finds yet more palpable and pungent expression in His rebuke to the Pharisees (Mar 7:6 ff.). And, as is well known, it was His resistance in word and deed to the traditions of the elders regarding the Sabbath—these being ‘beside’ God’s word—that earned for Him, with the Pharisees, the odium of being Himself a Sabbath-breaker (John 5, Matthew 12, Mark 3).

Indeed, at the beginning of His Galilaeen ministry, our Lord is careful to disclaim, even for Himself, either purpose or authority to disannul any of God’s commandments. ‘Think not,’ said He, ‘that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfil’ (Mat 5:17). See, further, article Commandment, below. Thus He, as it were, anticipated and forestalled the malice of His own, and the mistaken zeal of a later day. The former made it a charge against Him that He taught contrary to Moses and the prophets; and the latter, strangely enough, has supposed that it honours Him by affirming the same. And, lofty as were the claims that He made for Himself, Christ still impressed it upon His hearers that He not only did not assume to lay upon them anything contrary to God’s revealed will but that He taught, and could teach nothing that was ‘beside’ that will (Joh 5:30, cf. Joh 5:19; Joh 8:28 f.). And that nothing ‘contrary to or beside’ the Scriptures correctly interpreted was to be tolerated, is abundantly evident from the finality attached to them in all Christ’s appeals to the OT. For Him its declarations were an end of controversy (Mat 22:29; Mat 19:4; Mat 12:3 ff., Joh 10:35).

iii. Judicial authority in religion.

1. *Term defined.*—As legislative authority has particularly to do with *duty*, so judicial authority has particularly to do with *truth*: the former prescribes what one is *to do* or *to be*; the latter, what he is *to believe*: the former *creates* and *defines* relation and obligations; the latter *declares* and *interprets* them: the former is mainly concerned with the *conscience*; the latter, with the *understanding*. It is worth noting further that legislative differs from judicial authority in that the former is original and the latter derivative. Legislative authority, along with other things, prescribes who is to interpret the laws it makes, and how much of finality shall attach to their interpretation by different persons. At the same time, we should not overlook the fact that the most limited judicial authority, so far as it goes, is no less real than the most absolute. Further, judicial authority, though derived, is just as real authority as is legislative authority. And, finally, when the judicial function vests in the same person as the legislative, then the maxim, ‘The interpretation of the law is the law,’ receives its highest exemplification; for then the law and the interpretation of the

law are but different modal manifestations of one and the same personal will or *author-ity*. For, in this case, the same character that guarantees to the conscience the righteousness of the relation or obligation created by the will of the lawgiver, guarantees also to the understanding the truth of the finding of the judge. And this, be it observed, is precisely the function of judicial authority, namely, not to create a right, not to make an idea correspond with reality, but to certify to the understanding the existence or non-existence of a right, the truth or the falsity of an idea or a statement. The vital importance of this distinction will appear more and more as the discussion proceeds.

2. Repositories.—As to judicial authority, our Lord teaches that it is distributed among a number of repositories, somewhat as the same kind of authority in a modern State is distributed among a number of courts from the lowest to the highest.

In the case of such courts, no one thinks of denying to the least and lowest of them the character of a true court. Its jurisdiction may be limited, its decisions liable to reversal, but so long as it keeps within its jurisdiction, so long as the appeal from its decisions is pending, its authority is not only as real but as absolute as that of the highest court. Further, even the lowest court possesses a genuine independence: its functions cannot be discharged for it, nor can they be wrested from it by any other court. Further still, it is for each court, at least in the first instance, to interpret and declare the law by which it was created, and its duties and prerogatives under the law. Nor does the fact that it may err in the exercise of this right either nullify or invalidate the right itself. We elaborate this analogy thus in detail, because we believe that it will prove helpful in enabling us to understand our Lord's teachings concerning judicial authority in the sphere of religion.

Proceeding now to note His distribution itself, we find that He accords the fullest recognition (1) to what is commonly known as *the right of private judgment*. For Him each individual is clothed with a large, though not an absolute or final, judicial authority. Indeed, it is safe to say that no one has surpassed Christ in the honour, and even—if such words may be used of Him—in the deference with which in practice He treated the judicial rights of the darkest and humblest human souls. Despite the supreme claims that He made for Himself, He habitually permitted both Himself and His claims to be put upon proof at the bar of such souls. Not only did He consent, like any other man of His day, to plead at the bar of the ecclesiastical and civil authorities, but, while He always spake as one having authority, He never failed to submit His credentials along with His claims at the bar of the individual reason and conscience. But here we must particularize.

Christ taught, then, (a) That it is the inalienable prerogative of every man to verify for himself the truth of a proposition before assenting to it as true; and to verify for

himself the rectitude of a command before yielding obedience to it as right (cf. Joh 15:24, Mat 16:4; Mat 11:4 ff; Mat 9:6; Mat 11:20).

(b) Further, as is involved in what has been already said, Christ teaches that the conclusions reached in the exercise of this prerogative are not to be, if, indeed, we should not say *cannot* be, dictated by any form of external compulsion. In many ways He emphasizes the position that the individual is to be left wholly untrammelled in the exercise of his judicial rights. What else, after all, is the meaning of His words to Pilate, 'My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence' (Joh 18:36)? If men were to be left free to deal with His own claims, including, of course, His teachings, without constraint or compulsion of any kind, and to do this even when the decision reached affected not only His liberty but His very life, certainly He would have them no less untrammelled in dealing with every other question of truth or of duty with which they might find themselves confronted. Nor was it only the compulsion of physical force that Christ declined to countenance. He set the seal of His disapproval upon the more subtle and spiritual, but no less real compulsion of a tyrannical public or ecclesiastical opinion, whether formulated into a tradition or into a usage.

His 'Do not your alms before men, to be seen of them' (Mat 6:1), was designed hardly more to eradicate pride from the souls of His disciples, than it was to hearten them to throw off the incubus of a perverted public and ecclesiastical sentiment which threatened to stifle Christian humility and Godwardness in their very birth. It was to disenthral the souls of His disciples from all fear tending to paralyze the free action of the spirit in its quest for truth and in its witness to the truth, that He said, 'Be not afraid of them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him,' etc. (Mat 10:28); cf. Mar 10:29 f., Mar 7:9 ff., Mat 12:1 ff., Joh 5:9.

(c) If what has been said be true, we are not surprised to find Christ teaching that every mind is equipped for the exercise of this high prerogative, that in a certain very true sense the mind has 'the supreme norm of its ideas and acts, not outside of itself, but within itself, in its very constitution' (Sabatier, *Religions of Authority*, p. xvi).

This also is involved in the passages already quoted. And what else can we make of such statements as these: 'Ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, to be loosed from this bond on the day of the Sabbath' (Luk 13:16)? Where would have been the use of submitting such a case to 'the stupid country *archisynagogos*' (Edersheim), unless, stupid as he was, even he was so equipped as to be able to subject it to some sort of process of 'inner verification'? Or, take the question put to the disciples, 'Who do the multitudes say that I am?' and what propriety would there be in it, unless it carried with it the

implication that men generally—‘the multitudes’—were equipped for the forming of a rational judgment upon the truth and righteousness of His claims, and had some touchstone each within himself by which he could determine the truth or falsity of those claims, and the moral quality of the character and of the teachings that lay behind them? The possession of such a norm is involved in every argument framed, in every appeal made, and in every rebuke administered by Christ.

Not only does Christ recognize in every man the existence of such a norm, but He goes farther, and shows that He regards this norm as ‘supreme,’ in the sense, at least, that for the individual man there is no standard of truth or of right more ultimate than that embedded in his very constitution. Nothing can be substituted for it. Nothing can be used to supplement or to correct it. No appeal lies from it. Man has nought that he can do but to abide by the decisions reached in the use of it. ‘If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins’ (Joh_8:24) is no arbitrary sentence; but simply the announcement of the momentous truth, that the beliefs or unbeliefs of those whom He addressed would involve certain consequences *for them*, precisely because those beliefs or unbeliefs were *theirs*. Christ does not teach, of course, that men can make or unmake truth or right for themselves any more than for others. But He does teach that the conclusions that men reach in the use of the norm that is embedded in the very constitution of the mind are for them severally and individually final. It is this fact that constitutes the very heart of the solemnity of His words, when He says, ‘If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness’ (Mat_6:23). The light that is in a man is the only light that is available for him. It is the light in which he sees light. It cannot itself be tested, so far, at least, as the user of it is concerned, by any other light (cf. also Mat_13:9 and the principle laid down in Rom_15:30).

(d) Christ, moreover, is equally clear in teaching that in the proper use of the equipment given them, men may and always will arrive at correct judgments in regard both to truth and to duty—that is, in all cases and as regards all matters in reference to which they are called upon, or indeed are entitled, to form judgments. He recognizes, to be sure, the sad fact that men not only may, but as a matter of fact often do, give hospitable entertainment both to error and to evil. He is very emphatic, however, in asserting that this is their fault, and in no sense their misfortune. Whatever the difficulties of the teaching, they need not leave the soul in error or even in doubt. ‘If any man willeth to do his will,’ says our Lord, ‘he shall know of the teaching, whether it be of God, or whether I speak from myself’ (Joh_7:17).

Any account of Christ’s teachings as to the judicial authority vested in the individual would be fatally defective if it overlooked a saving like Mat_11:27 (cf. Joh_14:9 b, Joh_8:19 b, Joh_17:26). ‘No one knoweth the Son,’ says Christ, ‘save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son

willeth to reveal him.’ This is not the place for a detailed exposition of these remarkable words. So much, however, is clear upon their very face, namely, that there is a knowledge of God for which men are *wholly dependent upon Christ*. Again, it is evident from Joh 14:9 b. that whatever other elements this knowledge of God contains, it is a knowledge that is mediated through the understanding. ‘He that *hath seen* me,’ says our Lord, ‘hath seen the Father.’ The same conclusion follows inevitably from the great emphasis which Christ laid upon His teaching function. But how is a man to test the correctness of propositions for the very knowledge of the contents of which, and much more for their accuracy, he is *ex hypothesi* wholly dependent upon Christ? We have said that Christ teaches that it is the prerogative of every man to bring every proposition, to the truth of which he is expected to assent, to some sort of process of ‘inner verification’; but here are matters which, *ex hypothesi*, men must accept upon testimony, albeit it is the testimony of no less a witness than Christ Himself. Have we here, then, an inconsistency in Christ’s teaching? We think not. We test our telescope; we satisfy ourselves that the laws of its structure are the same as those that obtain in the structure of the eye itself. It is just as truly an organ of vision as is the eye itself, though, of course, an organ of vastly greater range. What it discloses to us we could not apprehend without it. Much that it discloses to us, we either only gradually come to comprehend, or find to be at present incomprehensible to us. But whether we comprehend what we apprehend through the telescope or not, we accept its disclosures, and at least refer them to the large and vague category of what we call facts of existence, and wait expecting to be able to make a closer classification with our advancing knowledge, or the further development of our powers. And, while we never reach the point where we are able with our own eyes to verify the facts given us through the telescope, yet, when we have used the norm in our eye upon the norm in the telescope, and have thus proved a complete correspondence between the two, we have an unshakable conviction that they are not two but one, and that what has been disclosed by the norm in the telescope is assented to by the norm in our eye, as much so as if we had been in a position to bring the norm in our eye to bear directly upon the phenomena revealed to us through the telescope. Just so it is in the case of the individual and Christ. For the knowledge of certain facts regarding God and Christ, and concerning God in Christ, we are absolutely dependent upon the testimony of Christ. We cannot verify the correspondence between that testimony and reality by ourselves comparing it with the reality. The reality here is as inaccessible to our immediate inspection as the phenomena of stellar space would be, apart from the telescope. What then? Does Christ call upon us to surrender the very badge of our individuality, when we are dealing with His statements? Does He claim that His statements must be accepted without our being able to subject them to any process of ‘inner verification,’ the latter being, of course, the only possible real verification? Not at all. What He does claim, however, is that when we have assented to His trustworthiness, we have assented to the trustworthiness of His statements. Obviously, if He is as He claims to

be, 'the Truth,' and we have satisfied ourselves of this by the same rational and moral processes by which we satisfy ourselves of any other propositions whatever, then in verifying Him, so to speak, we have verified His statements, as truly and as certainly as if we were capable of comparing those statements with the great realities to which they relate. Otherwise, where would be the sense in examining witnesses in our courts? And how else do we verify the ultimate facts given us, in the frame of nature and in the constitution of our own being—which, be it observed, are after all but the testimony of God,—except by verifying God? That we can do, of which proposition the simple proof is that we do it. For nothing is more certain than that 'it is impossible for God to lie.' This is the ultimate axiom upon which not only all certainty, but the possibility of any certainty depends.

Christ's teaching in reference to an external revelation, and our absolute dependence upon His veracity for the truth and the righteousness of its contents, do not impinge in the least either upon His teaching as to the judicial authority with which each individual is invested, or upon the true and proper autonomy of the soul. For He constantly teaches both by implication and by direct assertion that it is possible for men to verify Him, so to speak, and that it is at once their privilege and their duty to do so. And how exquisitely tender is His subtle appeal to His disciples to apply to His moral being that norm embedded in the constitution of their minds, when He says, 'In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you' (Joh 14:2).

(2) While Christ accords a large judicial authority to the individual, it is, as already stated, neither an unlimited, nor an absolutely final authority. In His famous words to St. Peter, He speaks of 'my church' (Mat 16:18), and in His equally celebrated words to Pilate, of 'my kingdom' (Joh 18:36). Now it is no doubt true, as Dr. Vos has shown (*The Kingdom of God and the Church*, ch. ix.), that these expressions are not absolutely coterminous in their respective connotations, the 'church' being but one phase of the 'kingdom.' Still, even this being true, it follows that the Church is an organized body, with officers, laws, and members. Now it is clear, from what Christ says of the Church, that the authority vested in her, and exercised through her officers, is a purely judicial authority. The Lord is her lawgiver. From Him alone she receives all the laws by which she binds the consciences of men. Her sole functions are to declare and to apply the law of Christ. To make any laws for her own members or for others is beyond her prerogative.

That such is her authority as set forth in the teachings of Christ appears from such statements as, 'If thy brother sin against thee, go show him his fault between thee and him alone: ... But if he hear thee not, take with thee one or two more, etc. And if he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the church: and if he refuse to hear the church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican' (Mat 18:15 ff.); 'Go ye,

therefore, and make disciples of all nations, etc.: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you,' etc. (Mat 28:19 f.).

The criticism of the former passage by B. Weiss can hardly be regarded as invalidating it as a proper source of information as to our Lord's teaching concerning the Church (see his *NT Theol.* i. p. 141). It is fair, we think, to assume that the charge contained in the latter passage was addressed to the Apostles, not as such, but as representatives of the Church in all ages.

As will be observed, the judicial authority ascribed to the Church in these sayings of our Lord has a twofold aspect. In Matthew 28 she is authorized to declare the law of Christ to those without her fold with a view to bringing them into subjection to Him. And in both sayings she is empowered to unfold that law to those within her pale. The necessity for both aspects of her judicial authority is as obvious as is the grant of it. If it be her function to extend the Kingdom, then it must also be her prerogative authoritatively to declare the nature and laws of the Kingdom. And again, if the term 'kingdom' as applied to the Church is not a hopeless misnomer, then she must have authority to determine what the law of Christ demands of the citizens of the Kingdom, and when this or that citizen is conforming to the law. See, further, art. Church.

(3) The supreme and final judicial authority belongs to the *Holy Spirit*, whose findings are mediated proximately through the Scriptures, and ultimately through the Prophets, Apostles, and Christ Himself. We have seen that, while both the individual and the Church may, in the proper use of their respective equipments, arrive at a knowledge of truth and right in reference to all matters of truth and duty upon which they are respectively entitled to formulate a judgment; yet, as a matter of fact, neither the Church nor the individual does always arrive at such knowledge. Now the very statement of this position implies the existence of some standard by the use of which faulty judgments, when reached, may be detected as such, and corrected. This standard, according to Christ, is, in the last resort, to be found nowhere else than in the teachings of the Prophets, Apostles, and Himself. The finality and the infallibility of these teachings are, so our Lord teaches, guaranteed by the fact that they proceed directly from the Godhead, through the immediate agency of its great executive, the Holy Spirit, whose instruments or organs the Prophets, Apostles, and He Himself were. If we may use the term 'Scriptures' as a somewhat loose synonym for the teachings of the Prophets, Apostles, and Christ, then the Scriptures are, or, as with admirable accuracy the Westminster Confession puts it, 'the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture' is, 'the Supreme Judge by which all controversies of religion are to be determined ... and in whose sentence we are to rest' (ch. i. sec. x.).

(a) That Christ conceived of the teachings of the *Prophets*, or the OT, as constituting, as far as it went, a court of last appeal in matters of religion, is strikingly evinced in His two summaries of those teachings already referred to: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, etc.... Thou shalt love thy neighbour, etc.... On these two commandments hangeth the whole law and the prophets' (Mat 22:34 ff., Mar 12:28 ff., Mat 7:12). But God being love, it is just in love that religion finds its highest and fullest expression. That standard, therefore, which being adhered to leads to love, is the final standard.

The same point of view as regards the OT finds expression in the words, 'They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them.... If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, if one rise from the dead' (Luk 16:29; Luk 16:31). The implication in Dives' plea was that it was his misfortune that he had come to that place of torment. These words distinctly disallow that implication. They affirm both the sufficiency and the finality of the OT in all matters connected with the salvation of those to whom that revelation was given. And so the Sadducees are told (Mat 22:29), 'Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures,' etc., which means, of course, that they need not have erred had they only gone to the Scriptures in the right spirit. Upon all questions raised by His adversaries, it was to the teachings of the OT that Christ Himself continually appealed as the final authority. Quoting Hosea, He said to the Pharisees, 'If ye had known what this meaneth, I desire mercy and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless' (Mat 12:7). Thus the standard to which He brings their judgment of Himself and by which He exposes its falsity and wickedness, is the teaching of the OT. His 'Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye tithe mint and anise and cummin, and have left undone the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: but these ye ought to have done, and not to have left the other undone' (Mat 23:23), is but an application of the standard of the OT for the testing of Pharisaic teachings and practice. Further, He recognizes the *oughtness* of these teachings, when they concern the tithing of mint, anise, and cummin, as truly as in the weightier matters of judgment, mercy, and faith. Especially significant are words like those in Mar 12:35 ff. (cf. Mat 22:41 ff., Luk 20:41 ff.): 'How say the scribes that the Christ is the son of David? David himself said in the Holy Spirit, The Lord said unto my Lord, etc. David himself calleth him Lord, and whence is he his son?'

(b) Besides the passages already cited, the following show that Christ represents His *Apostles* as being the organs of the Holy Spirit in such sense that their teachings, *qua* Apostles, are ultimate and infallible in all matters of faith and duty: 'And I also say unto thee, That thou art Peter, etc.... I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth shall be loosed in heaven' (Mat 16:18 f.). The same promise is made to the Apostles, no doubt to all of them, in Mat 18:18. In

Joh 20:22 f. we read, ‘And when he had said this he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit: whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven; whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.’

B. Weiss (*NT Theol.* i. 142, footnote) regards Mat 18:18 as addressed to ‘the disciples in the wider sense,’ and avoids bringing the statement into collision with the facts of history only by finding in them ‘nothing else than the authorization of the Apostles to proclaim the message by means of which men are called into the Kingdom’ (*ib.* p. 139, where he is commenting more particularly upon Mat 16:19. On the other side see art. ‘Power of the Keys’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible, vol. iv.). To most persons, however, such a view of this passage will appear inadequate. Dr. Chas. Hodge, believing that the grant of power made in these words was not designed to be limited to the Apostles, seeks to avoid collision with the facts of history by representing it as made to the invisible Church (*Church Polity*, p. 35 ff.). This, however, will seem to many as little satisfactory as is Weiss’ view. That the words were addressed to the Apostles, and to no others, appears probable, not only from Mat 16:18 f. and Joh 20:22 f., but even more so from a comparison of Mat 18:1 ff. with Mar 9:33 ff. That the Church also, according to Christ, was invested with a limited judicial authority, has already been shown.

The full character and extent of the power with which Christ represents His Apostles as being clothed appear conspicuously in the words, ‘And whosoever shall not receive you nor hear your words, as ye go forth out of that house, or that city, shake off the dust of your feet. Verily, I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for that city’ (Mat 10:14 f. With this should be compared Mat 11:24). The sufficient ground for such a statement is furnished by the words also spoken of the Apostles (and subsequently of ‘the seventy,’ who received a similar, but more temporary commission, Luk 10:16)—‘He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me’ (Mat 10:40, cf. Joh 13:29).

(c) That Christ claimed for *Himself* a judicial authority that was absolute and final, needs hardly to be illustrated. It appears from such facts as that He taught as one having authority (Mar 1:22; Mar 1:27, Luk 4:36); He always commanded and never merely counselled (Mat 28:20, Luk 8:55, Mat 10:5); while unfailingly tender, He did not tolerate even well-meant correction (Mat 16:22 f.); He invited, expected, and demanded of His disciples the most complete and unreserved surrender to His teachings and to His will.

His ‘hypocoristic expressions’ or ‘endearing diminutives’ (see art. by Professor B. B. Warfield in *Bible Student and Teacher*, Sept. [Note: Septuagint.] 1904, p. 515 ff.) indicate not only His attitude towards His disciples, but, indirectly, that He expected

their attitude towards Him to be one of unquestioning docility, dependence, and submission (Luk 12:32; Luk 10:3, Joh 10:7; Joh 10:16; Joh 13:15, Mat 18:19 et passim). Both His authority and the nature of it are less veiled behind the very common designation of ‘disciples.’ ‘A disciple,’ says our Lord, using the figure of *meiosis*, ‘is not above his teacher’ (Mat 10:24). The very terms of discipleship demand the same absolute self-abnegation upon the disciple’s part that Christ Himself had manifested towards His Father. ‘If any man,’ says He, ‘will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me’ (Mar 8:34, Luk 9:23). In the saying, ‘Ye call me Teacher and Lord: and ye say well: for so I am’ (Joh 13:13), ‘teacher’ is suggestively united with ‘Lord.’ And not less suited to arrest the attention is the statement, ‘But be ye not called Rabbi: for one is your teacher, and all ye are brethren’ (Mat 23:8).

Once more, Christ declared Himself to be ‘The Way, and the Truth, and the Life’ (Joh 14:6); He invited men to believe in Himself just as they believed in God (Joh 14:1); He conditioned His blessings upon the acceptance of His ‘yoke’ and His teachings (Mat 11:29). Nay, He conditioned men’s everlasting salvation upon their unquestioning acceptance of His statements about Himself (Joh 8:24; for the repetition of this thought in a slightly different form see Mat 23:37 f., Luk 13:34 f., Luk 19:41 f.). The word that He spake was to judge them at the last day (Joh 12:48). His words are God’s words: ‘The words that I say unto you, I speak not from myself: but the Father abiding in me he doeth the works’ (Joh 14:10). In a word, He and the Father are one (Joh 10:30); seeing Him, one sees the Father (Joh 14:9); the ‘Spirit of truth’ in guiding into all truth was to glorify Him, ‘for,’ said our Lord, ‘he shall take of mine, and shall declare it unto you. All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine: therefore said I that he shall take of mine and shall declare it unto you’ (Joh 16:14 f.).

Thus when we reach Christ in the matter of religion, we have reached the fountainhead. It were idle to look for a court in which to review and put to the test His findings in regard either to truth or to duty. Such, certainly, is His own teaching upon the subject. See preceding article.

iv. Executive authority in religion.

1. *Term defined.*—The function of executive authority, as needs scarcely be said, is simply and solely to give effect to the legislative will and to judicial findings. Of itself it originates nothing, interprets and declares nothing. It simply *does*. More need not be said, because executive authority is so obviously and so markedly distinct from both legislative and judicial, that there is no danger of its being confused with either the one or the other.

2. *Repositories.*—(1) Our Lord obviously teaches that as every *individual* is a repository of judicial authority, so every individual was designed to be, and every individual Christian is, an executive agent of the Godhead. It is His constant contention that it is for *doing* the will of God that men exist, whether as creatures or as Christians. The end of His whole teaching function was to set men doing, and to guide them in doing, the will of God. It was the gravamen of His complaint against those, like the Pharisees, who ought to have been His disciples, but were not, that instead of doing the will of God, they did the lusts of their father, the devil (Joh 8:44). The end that He set before those professing to be His disciples was, ‘So let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven’ (Mat 5:16). The first three petitions that He puts on their lips are, ‘Hallowed be thy name, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth.’ The badge of discipleship (Mat 12:39), the only accepted evidence of love and of loyalty (Joh 14:15), a condition *sine qua non* to salvation (Mat 7:22 ff.), was that His followers should *do* the will of God. It was His ceaseless theme, elaborated now in this form and now in that, that the end of life is not getting, or having, or being ministered unto, or thinking, but *being and doing the will of God*. To go into details here would require the incorporation in this article of a very considerable part of all four Gospels, and would be superfluous.

(2) The passages already cited show that Christ represents *the Church* in her corporate capacity as the great executive agency of God for the preaching of the gospel of the Kingdom as a witness among all nations, making disciples of all nations, and teaching them to observe all things whatsoever He has commanded. Executive and judicial authority here complement each other.

(3) That Christ ascribes executive authority to the *Prophets* is perhaps a fair inference from such a passage as Mar 7:6, in which our Lord refers to Isaiah not merely as an interpreter of God’s law, but as a teacher of God’s people. But the inference is not to be strained. And for evidence of the executive authority unquestionably exercised by the Prophets, we have to turn elsewhere than to the Gospels. The case is different with the *Apostles*. The mission of ‘the Twelve’ (Matthew 10) points clearly to the fact that they were invested with authority to diffuse the knowledge of the gospel, and to use a variety of agencies to gain men’s attention and win their allegiance to it. The same follows from Luk 24:44 ff. and Act 1:8. But as to the details of their executive functions we learn but little from the Gospels. It is different, however, in the case of *Christ*. He applies to Himself (Luk 4:17 ff.) the famous passage from Isaiah 61, ‘The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,’ etc. This is not the place to unfold in detail the several features of the wondrous programme outlined in the words of the prophet: it is hardly necessary, for they are as plain as they are precious. The title of ‘The Good Shepherd,’ which our Lord appropriated to Himself (perhaps from Ezekiel 34), is evidence both of the fact and of the nature of His executive functions (John 10). The

same fact underlies such statements as 'I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened until it be accomplished' (Luk 12:50). This last passage also brings before us the central feature of the work committed to Christ. Here, again, we must forbear from going into details, which belong properly to another field of discussion. It must suffice merely to recall to the reader's mind such sayings of our Lord as 'Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have authority to lay it down, and I have authority to take it again. This commandment received I from my Father' (Joh 10:17 f.); 'This is my body ... for this is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many unto the remission of sins' (Mat 26:26; Mat 26:28); and the word from the cross, 'It is accomplished' (Joh 19:30). Surely the prophet went not amiss when he spoke of Him as the great '*Ebhedh Jahweh* (יהוה עבד).

(4) According to our Lord, the great executive of the Godhead is the *Holy Spirit*. It belongs to another article (see Holy Spirit) to unfold His doctrine of the Holy Spirit. But we may, without intruding into that discussion, call attention to passages like Joh 3:1 ff; Joh 14:16; Joh 16:7 f, Joh 16:13 ff., Joh 20:22 f., Act 1:4 f., Act 1:8.

Literature.—The literature bearing formally upon the teaching, of Christ concerning authority in religion is very much scattered and somewhat meagre. We must content ourselves, therefore, with mentioning some works and articles that deal with the question of authority in religion without treating specifically of the teachings of our Lord upon this point. Dr. James Martineau's *The Seat of Authority in Religion* is still the first in its class. (Dr. Martineau denies, of course, the existence of any external authority in religion; and supports his contention with an acuteness and vigour that still remain not only unsurpassed, but wholly unequalled by any who have given in their adhesion to his general position). More recent works, representing substantially Dr. Martineau's view, but adding little to what may be called his historical, and nothing whatever to his psychological and philosophical defence of it, are: *Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit*, by the late Prof. Auguste Sabatier; *Liberal Christianity*, by his pupil and after colleague, Prof. Jean Réville; *The Religion of a Mature Mind*, by Prof. George A. Coe. Prof. Sabatier and Dr. Coe both claim the support of Christ for their position. But Prof. Sabatier's presentation of the teachings of Christ is lacking not only in completeness, but in cogency, and Prof. Coe's comes perilously near being mere caricature. For an (in some vital particulars) opposite view of the general subject, the reader may be referred to Stanton, *The Place of Authority in Matters of Religious Belief*; Dale, *Protestantism* (ch. ii.); Ellicott, *Christus Comprobator*; Oman, *Vision and Authority*; Strong, *Authority in the Church*; and also to the following articles: 'The Philosophy of Authority in Religion,' by Wilfrid Ward in *The Hibbert Journal*, vol. i. pp. 677-692; 'The Right of Systematic Theology,' by Prof. B. B. Warfield in *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, July 1896; 'Authority in

Religion,' by Dr. Henry Collin Minton, *ib.* April 1900. Dr. Warfield's article, besides the always valuable matter from his own pen, contains a number of useful references and extracts.

W. M. M'Pheeters.

Authority Of Christ

AUTHORITY OF CHRIST.—The first recorded comment on the teaching of Jesus is that of Mat_7:28 f. (Mar_1:22, Luk_4:32): 'They were astonished at his teaching, for he taught them as one having authority, and not as their scribes.' The scribes said nothing of themselves: they appealed in every utterance to tradition (*παράδοσις*); the message they delivered was not self-authenticating; it had not the moral weight of the speaker's personality behind it; it was a deduction or application of some legal maxim connected with a respectable name. They claimed authority, of course, but men had no immediate and irresistible consciousness that the claim was just. With Jesus it was the opposite. He appealed to no tradition, sheltered Himself behind no venerable name, claimed no official status; but those who heard Him could not escape the consciousness that His word was with authority (Luk_4:32). He spoke a final truth, laid down an ultimate law.

In one respect, He continued, in so doing, the work and power of the prophets. There was a succession of prophets in Israel, but not a prophetic tradition. It was a mark of degeneration and of insincerity when self-styled prophets repeated each other, stealing God's words every one from his neighbour (Jer_23:30). The true prophet may have his mind nourished on earlier inspired utterances, but his own message must spring from an immediate prompting of God. It is only when his message is of this kind that his word is with power. No mind was ever more full than the mind of Jesus of all that God had spoken in the past, but no one was ever so spontaneous as He, so free from mere reminiscence, so completely determined in His utterance by the conditions to which it was addressed. It is necessary to keep both things in view in considering His authority as a teacher. Abstract formulae about the seat of authority in religion are not of much service in this connexion. It is, of course, always true to say that truth and the mind are made for each other, and that the mind recognizes the authority of truth because in truth it meets its counterpart, that which enables it to realize its proper being. It is always correct, also, to apply this in the region of morals and religion, and to say that the words of Jesus and the prophets are authoritative because our moral personality instinctively responds to them. We have no choice, as beings made for morality and religion, to do anything but bow before them. The difficulty is that the 'mind,' or 'conscience,' or 'moral personality,' on which our

recognition of the truth and authority of Jesus' teaching is here made dependent, is not a fixed quantity, and still less a ready-made faculty; it is rather a possibility or potentiality in our nature, which needs to be evoked into actual existence; and among the powers which are to evoke it and make it actual and valuable, by far the most important is that teaching of Jesus which it is in some sense allowed to judge. We may say in Coleridge's phrase that we believe the teaching of Jesus, or acknowledge its (or His) authority, because it 'finds' us more deeply than anything else; but any Christian will admit that 'find' is an inadequate expression. The teaching of Jesus does not simply find, it evokes or creates the personality by which it is acknowledged. We are born again by the words of eternal life which come from His lips, and it is the new man so born to whom His word is known in all its power. There is a real analogy between this truth and the familiar phenomenon that a new poet or artist has to create the taste which is necessary for the appreciation of his work. Dismissing, therefore, the abstract and general consideration of the idea of authority in religion (see next art.), our course must be (1) to examine the actual exercise of authority by Jesus in the Gospels, referring especially to occasions on which His authority was challenged, or on which He gave hints as to the conditions on which alone it could be recognized; (2) by way of supplement we can consider the authority of the exalted Christ as it is asserted in the Epistles and exercised in the Church through the NT as a whole.

1. *The exercise of authority by Jesus on earth.*—(a) The simplest but most far-reaching form in which Jesus exercised authority was the *practical* one. He claimed other men, other moral personalities, for Himself and His work, and required their unconditional renunciation of all other ties and interests that they might become His disciples. He said, 'Follow me,' and they rose, and left all and followed Him (Mat 4:18-22; Mat 9:9). He made this kind of claim because He identified Himself with the gospel (Mar 8:35; Mar 10:29) or with the cause of God and His Kingdom in the world, and for this cause no sacrifice could be too great, no devotion too profound. 'He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me. He that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. Whosoever he be of you that renounceth not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple' (Mat 10:37, Luk 14:33). Nothing is less like Jesus than to do violence to anyone's liberty, or to invade the sacredness of conscience and of personal responsibility; but the broad fact is unquestionable, that without coercing others Jesus dominated them, without breaking their wills He imposed His own will upon them, and became for them a supreme moral authority to which they submitted absolutely, and by which they were inspired. His authority was unconditionally acknowledged because men in His presence were conscious of His moral ascendancy, of His own devotion to and identification with what they could not but feel to be the supreme good. We cannot explain this kind of moral or practical authority further than by saying that it is one with the authority which the right and the good exercise over all moral beings.

Not that Jesus was able in every case to carry His own will through in the wills of other men. Moral ascendancy has to be exercised under moral conditions, and it is always possible, even for one who acknowledges its right, to fail to give it practical recognition by obedience. When Jesus said to the rich ruler, 'Sell all that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, follow me, (Mar 10:21), He failed to win the will of one who nevertheless was conscious that in refusing obedience he chose the worse part. 'He went away sorrowful'—his sorrow implying that it was within the right on the part of Jesus to put him to this tremendous test. He acknowledges by his sorrow that he would have been a better man—in the sense of the gospel a perfect man—if he had allowed the authority of Jesus to have its perfect work in him. These are the facts of the case, and they are ignored by those who argue that it is no man's business to part with all he has for the sake of the poor; that property is a trust which we have to administer, not to renounce; that the commandment to sell all cannot be generalized, and is therefore not moral; and that it is, in short, an instance of fanaticism in Jesus, due to His belief in the nearness of the Kingdom, and the literal worthlessness of everything in comparison with entering into it at His side. There is nothing here to generalize about. There is a single case of conscience which Jesus diagnoses, and for which He prescribes heroic treatment; but it is not in the patient to rise to such treatment. The high calling of God in Christ Jesus is too high for him; he counts himself unworthy of the eternal life (Act 13:46). The authority of Jesus is in a sense acknowledged in this man; it is felt and owned though it is declined. Where the authority lay is clear enough. It lay in the Good Master Himself, in His own identification with the good cause, in His own renunciation of all things for the Kingdom of God's sake; it lay in His power to reveal to this man the weak spot in his moral constitution, and in the inward witness of the man's conscience (attested by his sorrow as he turned away) that the voice of Jesus was the voice of God, and that through obedience to it he would have entered into life. It lay in the whole relation of these two concrete personalities to each other, and it cannot be reduced to an abstract formula.

This holds true whenever we think of the moral or practical authority of Jesus. It is never legal: that is, we can never take the letter in which it is expressed and regard it as a statute, incapable of interpretation or modification, and binding in its literal meaning for all persons, all times, all social conditions. This is plain in regard to such a command of Jesus as the one given to the rich ruler: no one will say that this is to be obeyed to the letter by all who would enter into the Kingdom of God. But it is equally true of precepts which are addressed to a far wider circle, and which are sometimes supposed (like this one) to rest in a peculiar sense on the authority of Jesus. Take, e.g., the case of the Sermon on the Mount in Mat 5:21-48. From beginning to end this may be read as an assertion of the moral authority of Jesus, an authority which is conscious of transcending the highest yet known in Israel. 'It was said to them of old time ... but I say unto you.' On what do the words of Jesus

throughout this passage depend for their actual weight with men? They depend on the consciousness of men that through these words the principle of morality, for which our nature has an abiding affinity, is finding expression. But just because we are conscious of this principle and of the affinity of our nature for it, we are free with regard to any particular expression of it; the particular words in which it is embodied even by Jesus do not possess the authority of a statute to which we can only conform, but about which we must not think. When Jesus says, 'Whoso shall smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him also the other; to him that would go to law with thee and take thy coat, leave also thy cloak': it is not to keep us from thinking about moral problems by giving us a rule to be blindly obeyed, it is rather to stimulate thought and deliver us from rules. His precepts are legal in form, but He came to abolish legalism, and therefore they were never meant to be literally read. When they are literally read, conscience simply refuses to take them in. They are casuistic in form, but anti-casuistic in intention, and their authority lies in the intention, not in the form. What the precepts of non-resistance and non-retaliation mean is that under no circumstances, under no provocation, must the disciple of Jesus allow his conduct to be determined by any other motive than that of love. He must be prepared to go all lengths with love, and no matter how love is tried, he must never renounce it for an inferior principle, still less for an instinctive natural passion, such as the desire for revenge. Put thus, the moral authority of Jesus is unquestionable, and it asserts itself over us the more, the more we feel that He embodied in His own life and conduct the principle which He proclaims. But there is nothing in this which binds us to take in the letter what Jesus says about oaths, or non-resistance, or revenge; and still less is there anything to support the idea that His words on these subjects are part of a fanatical renunciation of the world in the region of honour as well as of property,—a literal surrender, in view of the imminence of the Kingdom, of all that makes life on earth worth having. It is not uncommon now for those who regard the Kingdom of God as purely transcendent and eschatological to match this paradoxical doctrine with an ethical system equally paradoxical, a system made up purely of renunciation and negation, and to fasten it also upon Jesus; but it is hardly necessary to refute either the one paradox or the other. What commands conscience in the most startling words of Jesus is the truth and love which dictate them, but to recognize the truth and love is to recognize that no form of words is binding of itself. It is the supreme task of the moral being to discover what in his own situation truth and love require; and there is no short cut to the discovery of this, even in the Sermon on the Mount. Jesus is our authority, but His words are not our statutes: we are not under law, even the law of His words, but under grace—that is, under the inspiration of His personality; and though His words are one of the ways in which His moral ascendancy is established over us, they are only one. There is an authority in Him to which no words, not even His own, can ever be equal.

The final form which this practical or moral authority of Jesus assumes in the NT is the recognition of Him as Judge of all. Probably in the generation before that in which He lived the Jews had come to regard the Messiah as God's vicegerent in the great judgment which ushered in the world to come; but what we find in the NT in this connexion is not the formal transference of a piece of Messianic dogmatic to Jesus; it is the moral recognition of the moral supremacy of Jesus, and of His right to pronounce finally on the moral worth of men and things. Experiences like that which inspired Luk 5:8 ('Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord'), Joh 4:29 ('Come see a man which told me all things that ever I did'), Joh 21:17 ('Thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee'), are the basis on which the soul recognizes Christ as Judge. The claim to be Judge appears also in His own teaching (Mat 7:22 f., Luk 13:25 ff., Mat 25:31 ff.); and if the form of the words in the first of these passages has been modified in tradition in order to bring out their bearing for those for whom the Evangelist wrote, no one doubts that their substance goes back to Jesus. It is He who contemplates the vain pleas which men will address to Him 'in that day'—men who with religious profession and service to the Church have nevertheless been morally unsound. The standard of judgment is variously represented: it is 'the will of my Father which is in heaven' (Mat 7:21) or 'these sayings of mine' (Mat 7:24) or it is what we might call in a word 'humanity' (Mat 25:35; Mat 25:42): and in its way each of these is a synonym for the moral authority of Jesus. As far as we are sensitive to their demands we are sensitive to His moral claim. Into the representations of Jesus as Judge outside of the Gospels it is not necessary to enter.

(b) The authority of Jesus comes before us in another aspect when we think of Him not as commanding but as *teaching*, not as Legislator or Judge, but as *Revealer*. In the first case, authority means His title to obedience; in this case, it may be said to mean His title to belief.

Perhaps of all theological questions the nature and limits of this last authority are those which have excited the keenest discussion in recent times. On the one hand, there are those who, fixing their minds on the Divinity of Jesus, regard it as essentially un-Christian to question His utterances at any point. Whatever Jesus believed, or seemed to believe, on any subject is by that very fact raised above question. The mind has simply to receive it on His authority. Thus when He refers to Jonah (Mat 12:38 ff., Luk 11:29 ff.), the literal historicity of the Book of Jonah is guaranteed; when He ascribes the 110th Psalm to David (Mat 22:41 ff. and ||), critical discussion of the authorship is foreclosed; when He recognizes possession by unclean spirits (Mar 1:23 ff. and often), possession is no longer a theory to explain certain facts, and therefore open to revision; it is itself a fact: it gives us a glimpse into the constitution of the spiritual universe which we are not at liberty to question. On the other hand, there are those who, while they declare their faith in the

Incarnation, argue that it belongs to the very truth of the Incarnation that Jesus should not merely be man, but man of a particular time and environment; not man in the abstract, but man defined (and therefore in some sense limited) by the conditions which constitute reality. He had not simply intelligence, but intelligence which had been moulded by a certain education, and could only reveal itself through a certain language; and both of these are conditions which (while essential to historical reality) nevertheless involve limitation. Hence with regard to the class of subjects just referred to, those who are here in question feel quite at liberty to form their own opinions on relevant grounds. They do not, as they think, set aside the authority of Jesus in doing so: their idea rather is that in these regions Jesus never claimed to have or to exercise any authority. Thus in the first two instances adduced above, He simply takes the OT as it stands, and He appeals to it to confirm a spiritual truth which He is teaching on its own merits. In Mat 12:38 ff. He is reproaching an impenitent people, and He refers to the Book of Jonah for a great example of repentance, and that on the part of a heathen race; the men of Nineveh who repented will condemn His unrepentant contemporaries in the day of judgment. In Mat 22:41 ff. He is teaching that the essential thing in Messiahship is not a relation to David, but a relation to God; and He refers to the 110th Psalm, and to David as its author, as unintelligible except on this hypothesis. In both cases (it is argued) the truths which rest on the authority of Jesus are independent of the OT appeal which is associated with them. That repentance is an essential condition of entering into the Kingdom of God, and that there is no responsibility so heavy as that of those who will not repent even when Jesus calls, are truths which are not affected though the Book of Jonah is read as an allegory or a poem; that the fundamental thing in the person of Jesus is not His relation to David (which He shared with others) but His relation to God (which belonged to Him alone), is a truth which is not affected though the 110th Psalm is ascribed to the Maccabaeian period. In other words, the authority of Jesus as a revealer of God and of the laws of His Kingdom is not touched, though we suppose Him to share on such matters as are here in question the views which were current among His contemporaries. It is not denying His Divinity to say this; it is rather denying His humanity if we say the opposite. Parallel considerations apply to the belief in possession which Jesus undoubtedly shared with His fellow-countrymen, and in fact with His contemporaries generally. Possession was the current theory of certain morbid conditions of human nature, physical, mental, and probably in some cases also moral; but the one thing of consequence in the Gospel is not that Jesus held this or any other theory about these morbid conditions, but that in Him the power of God was present to heal them. Our theory of them may be different, but that only means that we belong to a different age; it does not touch the truth that from these terrible and mysterious woes Jesus was mighty to save. It does not matter that His notions of medicine and psychology were different from ours; He did not come to reveal medicine or psychology—to ‘reveal’ such things is a contradiction in terms; He came to reveal the Father, and His authority has its centre there.

There is, no doubt, great, possibility of error in arguing from such abstract ideas as 'Divinity' and 'humanity,' especially when they are in some way opposed to one another in our minds: however we may define them, we must remember that they were in no sense opposed or inconsistent in Christ. He was at once and consistently all that we mean by Divine and all that we mean by human, but we cannot learn what that was by looking up 'divine' and 'human' in the dictionary, or in a book of dogmatic theology. We must look at Jesus Himself as He is presented to us in the Gospels. And further, we must consider that there is a vast region of things in which there neither is nor can be any such thing as authority—the region, namely, which is covered by science. Now questions of the kind to which reference has just been made all belong to the domain of science. The nature of the Book of Jonah, the date and authorship of the 110th Psalm, the explanation of the morbid phenomena which the ancients ascribed to evil spirits inhabiting the bodies of men: these are questions for literary, for historical, for medical science. It is a misleading way of speaking about them, and needlessly hurts some Christian feelings, to say that the authority of Jesus was limited, and did not extend to such matters. The truth rather is that such matters belong to a region where there is no such thing as authority, or where the only authority is that of facts, which those in quest of knowledge must apprehend and interpret for themselves. It is a negation of the very idea of science to suppose that any constituent of it could be revealed, or could rest upon authority, even the authority of Jesus. Hence in regard to all such subjects the question of Jesus' authority ought never to be raised: it is not only misleading, but unreal. On the other hand, when we come to the authority which Jesus actually claims as a revealer of God, and of the things of His Kingdom, we find that it is not only real but absolute—an authority to which the soul renders unreserved acknowledgment.

This is brought out most clearly in Mat_11:27. Here Jesus speaks in explicit terms of His function as Revealer, and we see at once the absoluteness of His authority, and its sphere. 'All things have been delivered unto me by my Father, and no one knoweth the Son save the Father, neither doth any know the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him.' Whatever else these words express, they express Jesus' sense of absolute competence in His vocation: He had everything given to Him which belonged to the work He had to do, and He was conscious of being equal to His task. If we try to interpret 'all things' by reference to the context, then whether we look before or after we must say that the 'all things' in view are those involved in the revelation of God: in the work of revelation, and especially in the revelation of Himself as Father, God has no organ but Christ, and in Christ He has an adequate organ. The passage anticipates Joh_14:6 'I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father but by me.' It is in a word like this—*I am the truth*—that we find the key to the problems which have been raised about the authority of Jesus as a Teacher or Revealer. The truth which we accept on His authority is the truth which we recognize in Him. It is not announced by Him from a

world into which we cannot enter: it is present here, in Him, in the world in which we live. It is not declared on authority to which we blindly surrender; it is exhibited in a Person and a Life which pass before us and win our hearts. To put it otherwise, the truth which we owe to Jesus, and for which He is our authority, is not information; it is not a contribution to science, physical or historical—for this we are cast by God on our own resources; it is the truth which is identical with His own being and life in the world, which is embodied or incarnate in Him. It is the truth which is involved in His own relation to God and man, and in His perfect consciousness of that relation: it is the truth of His own personality, not any casual scientific fact. He does not claim to know everything, and it would be difficult to reconcile such a claim with true manhood; but He does claim full knowledge of the Father, and not His words only, but His whole being and life are the justification of His claim.* [Note: Loisy (L'Évangile et L'Église, 45 f., Autour d'un petit Livre, 130 f.) has attacked Mat 11:27 on the ground that the unique Divine Sonship which it ascribes to Jesus is of a sort which it was not historically possible for Him to conceive or assert. Jesus, he holds, could only have used 'Son of God' in the Messianic official sense of Psa 2:7; here, therefore, where the meaning is clearly more than official, it cannot be the voice of a Jewish Messiah which is heard, but the voice of the Christian consciousness in a Gentile environment: the larger Church has universalized the Jewish conception, elevated the official Son—the Messianic King—into a Son by nature, and put its own faith and its own experience of Jesus into Jesus' own lips. Perhaps it is enough to say in refutation of this, that the words here in question, as found both in Mt. and Lk., in all probability belong to Weiss's 'apostolic source,' the oldest record of words of Jesus; and that the same unique relation of 'the Father' and 'the Son' is implied in Mar 13:32, the genuineness of which no one doubts. Schmiedel (Encyc. Bibl. ii. 2527), without disputing the words in Mat 11:27, tries by recurring to the Western text to reduce them to the 'official' Messianic meaning which Loisy could recognize as possibly historical. Harnack, on the other hand, treats them as authentic, and indeed as the most important and characteristic words of Jesus on record for determining His thought regarding Himself (Das Wesen des Christentums, p. 81).]

The authority of Christ as a Teacher and Revealer has been called in question mainly in connexion with His words about the future. There is no doubt that these present great difficulty to those who believe in Him. They seem to say quite unmistakably that certain things will happen, and happen within a comparatively short time, which (if we are to read literally) have not happened yet. 'Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel till the Son of man be come' (Mat 10:23); 'Verily I say unto you, there be some of them that stand here which shall in no wise taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom' (Mat 16:28; cf. Mat 24:29-35, Mar 13:30 f., Luk 21:27 f.). The coming of the Son of man in His kingdom was conceived quite definitely by the Apostolic Church as a supernatural visible coming on the clouds of

heaven, and it is a strong measure to assume that in cherishing this hope, by which the NT is inspired from beginning to end, the early Church was completely misapprehending the Master. He must have said something—when we consider the intensity of the Apostolic hope, surely we may say He must have said much—to create and sustain an expectation so keen. But there are considerations we must keep in mind if we would do justice to all the facts. (1) The final triumph of His cause, which was the cause of God and His kingdom, was not for Jesus an item in a list of dogmas, but a living personal faith and hope; in this sense it has the authority of His personality behind it. It was as sure to Him as His own being that the cause for which He stood in the world would triumph; and it is as sure for everyone who believes in Him. (2) He Himself, with all this assurance of faith, explicitly declares His ignorance of the day and hour at which the final triumph comes. He longed for it intensely; He felt that it was urgent that it should come; and urgency, when expressed in terms of time, means imminence; but the disclaimer of knowledge remains. The one thing certain is that He spoke of the time as uncertain, as sometimes sooner than men would expect, and sometimes later: the moral attitude required being always that of watching (Bruce, *Kingdom of God*, p. 278 ff.; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, i. p. 127). (3) When Jesus bodied forth this hope of the future triumph of His cause, and of His own glorious coming, He did it in language borrowed mainly from the OT apocalypse, the Book of Daniel. It would be hard to say that the Apostles completely misunderstood Him when He did so, but it is hard for anyone in using such language to say what is literal in it and what has to be spiritualized. No one in reading Daniel 7 takes the four great beasts, and the sea out of which they rise, literally; why, then, must we be compelled to take the human form and the clouds of heaven, literally? The Book of Acts ([Act 2:16-21](#)) sees in the experience of the Church at Pentecost the fulfilment of a prophecy in Joel ([Joe 2:30](#)) which speaks of ‘blood and fire and vapour of smoke, of the sun turning into darkness and the moon into blood,’ though no such phenomena actually accompanied the gift of the Spirit. May not modern Christians, and even the early believers, have taken poetic expressions of the living hope of Jesus more prosaically than He meant them? (4) We must allow for the possibility that in the reports of Jesus’ words which we possess, the reporters may sometimes have allowed the hopes kindled in their own hearts by Jesus to give a turn or a colour, quite involuntarily, to what they tell us. They might not be able to distinguish precisely between the hopes they owed to Him and the very words in which He had declared His own assurance of victory. And finally (5), we must remember that in a spiritual sense the prophecies of Jesus have been fulfilled. He came again in power. He came in the resurrection, and He came at Pentecost. He filled Jerusalem with His presence in the early days of the Church as He had never done while He lived on earth; from the very hour when they condemned Him ([Mat 26:64](#)) it was possible for His judges to be conscious of His exaltation and of His coming in power. It may be that in all prophecy, even in the prophecy of Jesus, there is the element which we can call illusive, without having to call it delusive. To be intelligible, it must speak the

language of the age, but it is going to be fulfilled in another age, the realities and experiences of which transcend the conceptions and the speech of the present. Even if this be so, it does not shake our faith in Jesus and His authority. The truth which is incarnate in His person is the truth of the final—and who will not sometimes say the speedy?—triumph of His cause. We may misconceive the mode of it, even when we try to guide ourselves by His words; but the important thing is not the mode but the fact, and of that we are as sure as we are sure of Him.

(c) Besides the authority which He exercised in establishing His ascendancy over men, and that which we recognize in Him as the Truth, we may distinguish (though it is but part of His revelation of the Father) the gracious authority exercised by Christ in *forgiving sins*. That He did forgive sins is not to be doubted. The narrative in Mar 2:1-12 makes this clear. Jesus no more *declared* that the paralytic's sins were forgiven than He declared that he was not lame: the meaning of the whole incident is that His word *conferred* with equal power the gift of pardon and the gift of bodily strength. The one miracle of redemption—'who forgiveth all thine iniquities, who healeth all thy diseases'—reaches through the whole of human nature, and Jesus has authority to perform it all. It is in this sense that we must interpret passages like Luk 7:47 ff; Luk 23:43 as well as Mar 2:17, Luke 15, and ultimately Mat 18:18 and Joh 20:23. There is not anything to be said of this authority but that it must vindicate itself. No one can believe that Jesus has authority to forgive sins except the man who through Jesus has had the experience of forgiveness. The Divine love that dwelt in Jesus, that received sinners and ate with them, that spent itself to seek and save the lost, that saw what was of God in men and touched it: that Divine love made forgiveness not only credible to sinners, but real. It entered into their hearts with God's own authority, and in penitent faith and love the burden passed from their consciences and they were born again. When He was challenged by the scribes, Jesus appealed to the physical miracle, which was indisputable, in support of the spiritual one, which lay beyond the reach of sense; but it was only the scribes, not the forgiven man, who needed this seal of His authority to pardon. Those whom He forgave had the witness in themselves, and ultimately there can be no other. The authority which Jesus exercised in this gracious sense He extended to His disciples alike during their brief mission while He was on earth (Mar 3:15; Mar 6:7-13), and in view of their wider calling when He was exalted (Mat 18:18, Joh 20:23).

Some light is thrown upon the authority of Jesus if we consider the occasions on which it was challenged, and the way in which Jesus met them.

(α) It was tacitly challenged wherever men were 'offended' in Him. To be offended (*σκανδαλιζεσθαι*) is to stumble at His claims, to find something in Him which one cannot get over and which is incompatible with absolute surrender to Him; it is to deny His

right to impose upon men the consequences (persecution, poverty, even death) which may be involved in accepting His authority (see Mat 11:6; Mat 13:21; Mat 13:28 ff., Mat 15:12; Mat 24:10; Mat 26:31; the other Gospels here add nothing to Mt.). Sometimes Jesus met this tacit challenge by pointing to the general character of His work as vindicating His claims. This is what He does in the case of John the Baptist (Mat 11:2-6). Whether we read this passage—‘the blind receive their sight, the lame walk,’ etc.—in the physical or the spiritual sense, the works in question are the signs that God’s Anointed has come, and it can only mean loss and ruin to men if they fail to see and to acknowledge Him as what He is. Sometimes, again, Jesus encountered those who were ‘offended’ in Him with a severity amounting to scorn. When the Pharisees ‘stumbled’ because His word about things that do and do not defile cut straight across their traditional prejudices, He did nothing to conciliate them. ‘Every plant that my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up. Let them alone. They are blind guides of blind men. And if the blind man leads the blind, both shall fall into the ditch’ (Mat 15:13 f.). In reality the ‘offence’ in this case meant that sham holiness would not acknowledge true; and in this situation it can only be war *à l’outrance*. As a rule, however, Jesus only speaks of men being offended, or offended in Him, by way of warning; and He assumes that to the solemn tones of His warning conscience will respond. His authority is inherent in Himself and His actions, and cannot with a good conscience be repudiated by any one who sees what He is. This is the tone of Mat 13:21; Mat 24:10; Mat 26:31.

(β) It is a more explicit challenge of His authority when Jesus is asked to show a sign, or a sign from heaven (Mat 12:38 f., Mat 16:1 f., Luk 23:8, Joh 6:30). This was the recurrence of the temptation of the pinnacle, and Jesus consistently rejected it. He never consented (not even in the case of the paralytic of Mar 2:1-9, see above) to present the physical as evidence for the spiritual. The proof of the authority with which He spoke did not lie outside of His word, in something which could be attached to it, but in the word itself; if it was not self-attesting, nothing else could attest it. This is put with peculiar force in the Fourth Gospel. It is true that an evidential value is recognized in the miracles, but it is only by an afterthought, or as a second best: ‘though ye believe not me, believe the works’ (Joh 10:38); ‘believe that I am in the Father and the Father in me; or else, believe for the very works’ sake’ (Joh 14:11). The main line of thought is that which deprecates faith based on signs and wonders (Joh 4:48). When the multitudes ask, ‘What sign doest thou then? our fathers did eat the manna in the wilderness,’ the answer of Jesus virtually is, ‘I am the bread of life.... He that eateth *me* shall live by me ... the words that I speak unto you are spirit and are life’ (Joh 6:30 ff.). In other words, the authority of Jesus does not depend upon any external credentials; it is involved in what He is, and must be immediately apprehended and responded to by the soul. What enables men to recognize Jesus as what He is, and so to acknowledge His authority, is, according to the representation

of the central chapters in John (chs. 6-10), a need in their nature or state which He can supply. If we wish to be sure that He is the Christ, the King in the Kingdom of God, the way to certainty is not to prove that He was born at Bethlehem of the seed of David (Joh_7:42), nor that He came into the world mysteriously (Joh_7:27), nor that He has done many miracles (Joh_7:31): it is to see in Him the living bread (ch. 6), the living water (ch. 4 and Joh_7:37), the light of the world (chs. 8 and 9), the Good Shepherd (ch. 10), the Giver of Life (chs. 5 and 11). These are ideas or experiences which are relative to universal human needs, and therefore they are universally intelligible; every one who knows what it is to be hungry, thirsty, forlorn, in the dark, dead, knows how to appreciate Jesus; and apart from these experiences no cleverness in applying prophetic or other theological signs to Him is of any value. All this is strictly relevant, for it is through experiences in which we become debtors to Jesus for meat and drink, for light and life, that we become conscious of what His authority means.

(γ) Once, at least, the authority of Jesus was challenged in a quasi-legal fashion. When He drove the traders from the Temple, the chief priests and the elders of the people came to Him, saying, 'By what authority doest thou these things, and who gave thee this authority?' (Mat_21:23 ff., Mar_11:27 ff., Luk_20:1 ff.). Formally, by His counter question about the Baptist, Jesus only silences His adversaries; but more than this is meant. If, He suggests, they had been true to the earlier messenger of God, they would have had no difficulty about His claims. If they had repented at John's summons, and been right with God, then to their simple and humble hearts Jesus' action would have vindicated itself; as it is, to their insincere souls He has no advance to make. The ambassador of an earthly king has credentials external to his person and his message, but not the ambassador in whom God Himself visits His people. His actions like His words speak for themselves. Throughout the Fourth Gospel it is an affinity of spirit with Jesus on which the recognition of His authority depends. It is those who are of God (Joh_8:47), of the truth (Joh_18:37), those who are His sheep (Joh_10:4 f., 26), who hear His voice: those who are not of God, especially the insincere, who seek honour from one another (Joh_5:44), are inevitably offended in Him.

2. Thus far we have considered the authority of Christ as it was exercised, acknowledged, or declined during His life on earth. But the NT exhibits much more than this. It is not merely as historical, but as *exalted*, that Christ exercises authority—in the Church. In all its aspects the authority which we have studied in the Gospels reappears in the Epistles. It is perpetuated in the Christian society in an effective, if somewhat undefinable way.

What strikes one first in the NT literature, apart from the Gospels, is the almost complete absence of *literal* appeal to Jesus. The Apostles, whatever be the explanation, do not, except on rare occasions, *quote* the Lord. It is true that when they do so, His word is regarded as decisive in a sense in which even the word of an apostle is not (cf. 1Co 7:10 with 1Co 7:12; 1Co 7:25; 1Co 7:40). It is true also that passages like Romans 12, 13, and much in the Epistle of James, could only have been written (in all probability) by men who not only had the Spirit of Christ, but whose minds were full of echoes of His words. Nevertheless the fact remains that Jesus is hardly appealed to formally as an authority in the NT writings. There could be no more striking proof of the fact that Christianity was apprehended from the first as a free and spiritual religion to which everything statutory was alien. Not even the word of Jesus had legal character for it. What Jesus sought and found in His disciples was a spiritual remembrance of Himself. His words were preserved not in a phonograph, or in a stenographic report, but in the impression they made, in the insight they gave, in the thoughts and experiences they produced in the lives of living men. They were perpetuated not merely by being put on record, but still more by being preached. Now to preach is not only to report, but to apply; and the application of the word of Christ to new circumstances inevitably and unconsciously brings with it a certain or rather an uncertain amount of interpretation, of bringing out the point, of emphasis on this or that which at the moment demands it. What we wish to know is whether the men whose ministry perpetuated the word of Christ, and perpetuated it in this free and spiritual fashion, had the qualifications demanded by their task. Could Christ so fit them for their ministry that they should be under no legal constraint, and yet should never be unfaithful to His meaning, or misrepresent Him or His work? In other words, could He in any sense transmit His authority to His witnesses, so that it should be felt in them as in Him?

The answer of the NT is in the affirmative, and it is not too much to say that the NT as a whole is the proof that this answer is right. 'We have the mind of Christ,' says St. Paul (1Co 2:16), and again (in 2Co 13:3), 'Ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in me'—a proof which he is quite ready to give. He was conscious that in the discharge of his Apostolic ministry he was not alone: Christ was in him pleading His own cause. Of course the authority of Christ in this case cannot be other than we have already seen it to be in the earthly life of Christ. Its range is the same, and its recognition is conditioned in the same way. The Apostle is no more bound literally to reproduce Jesus than Jesus is bound literally to reproduce Himself. He is no more bound than Jesus is to prove the truth of his message by credentials external to it. He no more hesitates than Jesus does to trace the rejection of his message, the refusal to call Jesus Lord, to a want of moral affinity with Jesus which is the final definition of sin. 'If our gospel is veiled, it is veiled in them that are perishing, in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving' (2Co 4:3 f.). It is not possible to say beforehand, on the basis of any doctrine of inspiration, whether there are elements in

the Apostolic writings, and if so what, which have no authority for us. Nothing in them has legal or statutory authority, and spiritual authority must be trusted to win for itself the recognition which is its due. There is something to be said for the distinction that while the testimony of the Apostles to Jesus—a testimony resting on their experience of what He was and of what He had done for them—is perennially authoritative, the theology of the Apostles—a theology conditioned by the intellectual environment in which they lived and to which they had to vindicate their message—has only a transient importance. The difficulty is just to draw the distinction between testimony and theology; as a matter of fact, the two things interpenetrate in the NT, and there is a point at which the distinction disappears. To insist upon it as if it were absolute is really to introduce again into Christianity (under the form of the Apostolic testimony) that legal or statutory or dogmatic element from which Jesus set all religion free. It is better to read the Apostles as men through whose minds Christ pleads His own cause in the Spirit. The minds may be more or less adequate instruments for His service; they may be more adequate in some relations, and less so in others; but they are indivisible, and it is not helpful in the long run to introduce into them the schism of testimony and theology. We must let them tell upon us in their integrity, and acknowledge their authority whenever it proves irresistible. (More detailed consideration of this point will be found in the article on Preaching Christ).

The part of the NT which raises in the acutest form the question of the authority of Christ—or perhaps we should say here of His Apostle—is the Fourth Gospel. It is practically agreed among scholars that the style of the discourses in that Gospel is due to the author, not to the speakers. Every one speaks in the same style—John the Baptist, Jesus, the Evangelist himself. The words of an actor in the history (Jesus, for example, in the first part of ch. 3, and the Baptist in the latter part) pass over insensibly into words of the historian. The first person plural is used by Jesus (*e.g.* [Joh 3:11](#); [Joh 9:4](#)) where it is tempting to say that it is the Christian consciousness which is expressed, the common mind of the Church which owes its being to Him. Further, Jesus says things about Himself in the Fourth Gospel to which there is no parallel in the other three. He speaks plainly of His pre-existence, of the glory which He had with the Father before the world was, of an eternal being which was His before Abraham was born; He makes Himself the content and the subject of His teaching—‘I am the bread of life, the light of the world, the resurrection and the life’; He identifies Himself in a mysterious way with the redeeming purpose and power of God—‘I and the Father are one,’ ‘He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.’ It may be difficult for the historian, on purely historical grounds, to prove that Jesus uttered all the words thus ascribed to Him, and if the difficulty presses, the authority of the words may seem to disappear. But is this really so? May not the Fourth Gospel itself be the fulfilment of one of the words in question—‘I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. But when he is come, the Spirit

of truth, he shall guide you into all the truth: for he shall not speak from himself, but whatsoever things he shall hear, these shall he speak ... He shall take of mine, and shall announce it to you' (Joh_16:12 f.). These words would not be satisfied by a merely literal reproduction of what Jesus had uttered: they imply that with the gift of the Spirit will come a profounder insight into all that He had meant, and ability to render a more adequate testimony to the truth embodied in Him. Twice in the Gospel (Joh_2:22, Joh_12:16) the writer tells us expressly that after Jesus was glorified the disciples remembered incidents in His career and saw a meaning in them unnoticed at the time; and this principle may well reach further. When Jesus fed the multitudes, He did not, so far as the Synoptics record, say anything to explain His act; all they were conscious of was that He had compassion on their hunger. But the Spirit-taught Apostle, long afterwards, saw what He meant, and felt that if they had only had ears to hear as the bread passed from hand to hand, they would have caught the voice of Jesus—'I am the bread of life.' So when He opened the eyes of the blind, what He meant was, 'I am the light of the world'; and when He raised the dead, 'I am the resurrection and the life.' If John did not hear Him say so at the moment, he heard Him afterwards, and the authority of the words need not be less though we have to think of them as spoken, not by the historical Christ in Galilee or Judaea, but by the exalted Christ through His Spirit in the soul of the beloved disciple. They would be in this case a sublime illustration of what St. Paul calls 'Christ speaking in me.' The peculiarity that they are put into the lips of Jesus Himself, in connexion with definite scenes and incidents in His earthly life, was possibly quite intelligible to those who first read the Gospel; they knew that it was a spiritual Gospel, and that it was never intended to be taken as a literal record of Jesus' discourses, but as an inspired interpretation of all that He was and did. Read in this light, it has its authority in itself, as the other NT books have, and as Jesus Himself had when He spoke with men face to face; and it is an authority, as experience proves, not less potent than that which is claimed and wielded by Christ in any other of His witnesses. If we compare it with the other Gospels, which have in a higher degree the character of literal transcripts of word and deed, we may even say that it is a fulfilment of the words found in the lips of Jesus in Joh_14:12 'He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he also do: and greater works than these shall he do; because I go to the Father.' Faith in Jesus has never achieved anything surpassing the witness—the true witness—of this Gospel to the Son of God. The final and supremely authoritative testimony to Jesus is no doubt that which is given in His being and in His work in the world; but so dull of eye and slow of heart were the disciples, that had He put all the import of this into words they could not have taken it in. What He could not say on earth, however, He was able to say by His Spirit from heaven; and when that one of the disciples who was able to hear puts what he has heard into the Master's lips, he is only giving Him His own. The authority of the word of Jesus here, as everywhere in the NT, lies in itself, and in the fact which it interprets. It is an authority which has

never failed to win recognition, and it may be said of it with emphasis, 'Every one that is of the truth heareth this voice.'

Literature.—H. P. Liddon, *Bampton Lectures*, 166 ff.; C. Gore, *Bampton Lectures*, ch. vii.; A. B. Bruce, *Training of the Twelve*, 536 ff., *Apologetics*, 492 ff.; J. Denney, *Studies in Theology*, ii., iii.; A. Sabatier, *Religions of Authority and Religion of the Spirit*, 292 ff.; H. H. Henson, *Value of the Bible*, 250 ff.; M. Fuller, *In Terra Pax*, 124 ff.

James Denney.

☩ Avarice

AVARICE.—See Covetousness.

☩ Ave Maria

AVE MARIA.—This well-known devotion of the Latin Church is based upon the salutations addressed to the Virgin Mary by the angel Gabriel and by Elisabeth the mother of John the Baptist (Luk 1:28; Luk 1:42). Its earlier and shorter form follows closely the words of Scripture, with the addition only of the names 'Mary' and 'Jesus'; 'Hail (Mary), full of grace; blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb (Jesus).' As thus recited, it cannot be called a prayer, but may be considered either as a memorial of thanksgiving for the Incarnation; or as one of those devotional apostrophes of departed saints which are found even in the writings of the Christian Fathers and in early Christian inscriptions.

The use of the *Ave Maria* in the fixed liturgical services of the Latin Church is of comparatively late origin. Its devotional use is, however, much older: it is even said to be traceable as far back as the 7th century. In the 14th cent. it is found in the popular handbooks of devotion. *The Mirror of our Lady* (first half of the 15th cent.) alludes to it as forming part of the preliminary prayers said privately by the worshipper before the office began. An interesting example of its use is given by Maskell (*Monumenta Ritualia*, ii. 71). The foundation statutes of the Abbey of Maxstoke in the reign of Edward iii. order its recital daily.

But the *Ave* was not definitely placed in the offices of the Breviary until the 16th cent.; and curiously enough by the liturgical reformer, Cardinal Quignonez. In the

present Roman Breviary, dating from Pope Pius v. (1568), it is directed to be said with the Lord's Prayer at the beginning of each office, and after Compline.

The pre-Reformation Ave was usually the shorter and Scriptural form as given above. But as it stands now in the Breviary, it ends with a direct prayer addressed to the Virgin, said to date from the middle of the 15th cent.: 'Holy Mary, mother of God, pray for us sinners, now and in the hour of our death.'

It is fair to remember that, whatever lines the devotions to Mary ultimately followed, they were, in their original intention, undoubtedly devotions to Christ. Like the title *Theotokos*, sanctioned by the Third Œcumenical Council (Ephesus 431), they were intended to safeguard and emphasize the true humanity of Christ. Not only was Christ perfect God, but He was truly conceived and born of a human mother, so that the Son of Mary is indissolubly God and man in one person. The devotions addressed to His mother were therefore a commemoration of the intimate union between the Godhead and human nature, of which union Mary was both the willing instrument and the sign.

Literature.—Addis and Arnold, *A Catholic Dictionary*, 1897; Wright and Neil, *A Protestant Dictionary*, 1904; Bodington, *Books of Devotion*, 1903; Procter, *A History of the Book of Common Prayer*, 1884; Maskell, *Monumenta Ritualia*, 1846; the *Breviarium Romanum*; *The Hours of the Blessed Virgin Mary* (Preface), Percival & Co. 1892; Bengel, Meyer, and Alford on [Luk_1:28](#).

A. R. Whitham.

AWE.—The adoration of what is mysterious and sublime is an essential element in religion. When expressed towards unworthy objects the result is superstition, but the motive itself is the soul of worship. As the feeling is thus fundamental to the relationship between the human and the Divine, increase of knowledge, while testing and purifying this relationship, should protect and strengthen it.

In the service of the missionary gospel, the complaint is made to-day by Eastern heathen religions that our Western Christianity, which comes to them as the aggressive herald of a higher life, is gravely deficient in religious veneration. It becomes, therefore, of practical interest to inquire how Christ's first disciples were influenced in this direction by His presence among them, and to what extent the same feeling towards the person of the living Christ pervades the Church of modern times.

When Christ took upon Him our nature, it was under such circumstances of poverty and humble birth as could not inspire the conventional regard which the world bestows upon rank and title. Further, His life was lived in such daily intimacy with those around Him, and was so thoroughly affected by the local customs of Israel and

the social conditions of the time, that His disciples could speak of their fellowship with Him in terms of exact knowledge and distinct impression. They could afterwards refer to His life as something that they had seen with their eyes and their hands had handled (1Jn_1:1).

Nevertheless, there is nothing more evident in the story of the Evangelists than the fact that a permanent and increasing mystery, passing into reverence and awe, accompanied that familiar acquaintance. The feeling was usually called forth by some manifestation of knowledge or power, and deeper even than the impression thus produced by His wonderful teaching and miraculous works was the trustful consciousness of their being in contact with a personality that was altogether holy and separate from sin. Finally, the reverent submission thus instilled into the minds of the disciples was exemplified in Christ Himself towards the will of God, as in the temptation in the wilderness and in the Garden of Gethsemane.

As their power of spiritual perception increased, the disciples learnt to apprehend and accept the startling renovation, the sudden depth, and the delightful expansion that the Master gave to old religious truths, but there were always meanings about which they had to seek an interpretation in private, and to the end of their fellowship they had often to confess that they knew not what He said. The difficulty thus created by His personality and actions was so far recognized by the Lord Jesus, that on one occasion He encouraged His disciples to make known their own thoughts and the thoughts of others about Himself (Mat_16:13). Thus Nathanael was overawed by the knowledge that He had been watching him in his place of seclusion (Joh_1:49); and this feeling soon became a general persuasion that He knew all men and what was in man (Joh_2:24-25). Peter felt himself so immediately in the presence of Divine power that he confessed his own sinfulness, and he and James and John decided to leave all and follow Him (Luk_5:1-11). The bereaved sisters at Bethany repeat the conviction that if He had been there, their brother would not have died (Joh_11:21; Joh_11:32). And among those who came into more incidental contact with Him by simple inquiry or importunate need, Nicodemus was attracted by the persuasion that He was a teacher come from God (Joh_3:2); an admission to the same effect was made on one occasion by the Pharisees and Herodians (Mar_12:14); the chief priests and scribes were driven to assign a Satanic origin to His unquestionable power (Mat_12:24); while the Pharisees reached a stage in their controversy with Him after which no man durst ask Him any question (Mat_22:46, Mar_12:34). The privileged traffickers in the temple quailed under His exposure and rebuke (Mat_21:12), and to the end the challenge to convict Him of sin remained unanswered (Joh_8:46). All the miracles of Christ, while expressing His pity and love, accentuated this Divine power, and His teaching bore the distinguishing mark of authority (Mat_7:29).

To His first Jewish disciples the name Messiah was the unveiling of a historical mystery, the justification of the calling, preservation, and discipline of Israel. They found in Him the fulfilment of the prophecy 'and his name shall be called Wonderful' (Isa 9:6). With so much that attracted them to His person and depended upon His presence, it is doubtful if they could have ventured upon our depersonalized formulae about 'the plan of salvation.' And so, while the Fourth Gospel, like the ancient epics, begins with the introduction of its principal theme, namely, 'The Word became flesh, and dwelt among us' (Joh 1:14), the Evangelist could add that even through that obscuring medium Christ's disciples were enabled to behold His glory (*ib.*).

After the Resurrection this veil was so completely removed, and the awe of Christ's presence became so unclouded and continuous, that one of the Apostles could write, 'Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him so no more' (2Co 5:16).

Thereafter it became the commission of the Church to proclaim and teach and exemplify how the flesh may in turn become the Word, and every believer be a dwelling-place for the Spirit of Christ. The reverence that once gathered around His own visible person could still influence men through every witness in whom His Spirit dwelt. The condition of life and service was fixed, namely, 'As he is, so are we in this world' (1Jn 4:17). And so in the Apostolic preaching of the gospel the living personality of Christ was never lost in the analysis of His mind and nature. Instead of the parched abstractions that with us so often take the place of the mystical indwelling, they preached 'Jesus and the resurrection' (Act 17:18), 'Jesus Christ and him crucified' (1Co 2:2).

Can it be said to-day of Christian sainthood and the service of the missionary gospel, that the person of Christ is thus central, His presence an indispensable necessity, likeness to Him the recognition mark of His Church, and the conquest of the world the consummation of its appointed labours? If it be otherwise, certain signs may be expected to manifest themselves. Christ will be little more than a beautiful name in His Church, an idea developed and resident in our minds. The work of the Holy Spirit in bringing and revealing the things of Christ will be shadowy and almost superfluous to those who have already reached a complete conception of Christ by philosophical method applied to the study of doctrine. The question, 'Is Christ divided?' (1Co 1:13) will cease to startle and distress, and the loyalty due to the Head of the Church and to the universal kingdom will be pledged to sectarian trusts and the watchwords of exhausted controversy. When the one standard of elevation, the stature of Christ, is withdrawn, Church distinctions will be restricted to the superficial dimensions of mere historical length and doctrinal width. In the ideal picture of the future fold, the one flock still needs the presence of the one Shepherd (Joh 10:16). Through this

visible union in Him, Christ will be glorified (Joh_17:10), and solely to its manifestation is promised the conquest of the world (Joh_17:21).

Literature.—Fowler and Wilson's *Principles of Morals*, Oxf. 1894, p. 101; Kidd, *Morality and Religion*, Edin. 1895, p. 187; Davidson, *Theism and Human Nature*, p. 279; and on Christ's awe, Swete's *St. Mark 2* [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1902, p. 342 (on Mar_14:33).

G. M. Mackie.

⚔Axe

AXE.—This word occurs twice in the Gospels (Mat_3:10, Luk_3:9), each time in the report of the preaching of the Baptist. The old familiar tool of peace and weapon of war (1Ki_6:7, Psa_74:5, Jer_51:20) has become a metaphor for the ministry of men with a mission of reform. This suits the spirit of one who, like John the Baptist, is filled with the teaching of the OT. For the axe gleams in its histories and flashes in its songs, while in prophetic mood the tool is changed to the person—the wielder is himself the weapon (Isa_10:33 f., Dan_4:14, Jer_51:20). All this is the forerunner's inherited world of ideas on this implement of industry and weapon of attack. He is a part of all that his race has been. He sees the men of old times 'as men that lifted up axes upon a thicket of trees' (Psa_74:5). The Messiah, the Coming One, is the last of the line. Nor are all in that line of the lineage of the house of David. 'As the Assyrian axe in the days of old, so now the Roman axe was laid at the root of Israel' (*Philochristus*, ch. 4). Thoroughly as these powers had done their part, yet more drastic was to be the work of the future ('every tree,' Mat_3:10). Under this image of the axe, the road-maker (Mat_3:3) has his vision of the wood-cutter and his effectual working (Mat_3:10).

But 'God fulfils Himself in many ways.' And when the Carpenter laid aside the axe of the workshop in Nazareth, the wood-cutter, 'thoroughly furnished unto every good work, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed,' was already prepared for going up against the trees. Jesus had been *tempered* by waiting, in solitude and temptation. And the stroke of His axe, when it fell, was deliberate, radical, universal (cf. Heb_4:12 f.). Men and institutions, the priests, the temple felt it. He would save the tree of humanity, even 'as a tree whose stock remaineth when they are felled' (Isa_6:13). Therefore He struck at the root of the evil in man and nature—sin. And because the strokes were meant to be regenerating and reforming, they were clean, swift, sharp, and stout (Joh_2:17; Joh_8:1 ff., Luk_13:1 ff.).

Finally, the axe is not only the sign-manual of the mission of the forerunner and the Fulfiller, it is that of reformers in general. As the axe of the backwoodsman has been tempered in fire and water past the useless state of brittleness and beyond the extremity of hardness, so the tempering of the reformer is done, on the one hand, in a series of Divine and delicate processes in the personality of him who is being touched to fine issues by the Spirit, for the service of God and man, and, on the other hand, in a parallel series of providential dispensations in the mind and environment of the people, the race, or the institution with which he has to deal.

Literature.—*Ecce Homo*, ch. 1; Reynolds, *John the Baptist*, Lecture 4; Tennyson, *Idylls of the King*, 'The Coming of Arthur,' *ap. fin.*; Morley, *Life of Gladstone*, ii. 252.

John R. Legge.

⚠Azor

AZOR.—An ancestor of Jesus, according to the genealogy in the First Gospel (Mat 1:13 f.).

⚠Babe

BABE.—1. βρέφος, lit. 'nourished'—by the mother, is used of an unborn infant (Luk 1:41-44), of an infant still in swaddling-bands (Luk 2:12; Luk 2:16), and also of young children brought by their mothers to Jesus that He might touch them (Luk 18:15). 2. νήπιος, literally, 'one that cannot yet speak' (νη = 'not,' and ἔπος, 'word'); cf. Lat. *in-fans*, 'infant,' which is a better rendering of νήπιος, though neither Authorized Version nor Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 is consistent in the translation of the two Greek words, νήπιος is a child as contrasted with an older person, e.g. with 'the wise and prudent' in Luk 10:21 and Mat 11:25 (cf. Gal 4:3, Eph 4:14). It is used also with θηλάζοντες, 'sucklings,' in Mat 21:16, in which passage the root meaning of νήπιος is specially suggestive, 'Out of the mouth of speechless (babes) thou hast perfected praise.'

Jesus' fondness for these little ones was shown, both by His rebuke of the disciples who would have sent them and their mothers away when they came to Him for a blessing (Luk_18:15 f., cf. Mat_19:14), and by His frequent use of children to illustrate the Christian disposition (cf. Mat_18:2-5, Mar_10:15, Luk_18:16-17). See, further, artt. Infancy, Children.

The word 'babe' (βρέφος) is twice used of the infant Jesus Himself (Luk_2:12; Luk_2:16). And it is worth noting that in Luk_2:12 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 brings out a significance of meaning which is lost in Authorized Version . In the Gr. there is no art. prefixed to βρέφος in this verse; the sign given to the shepherds was 'the sign of a babe.' Moreover, according to the reading which is most strongly supported, σμῆλον should have the art., so that what the shepherds were told was 'The sign is a babe.' The meaning therefore is, not as Authorized Version suggests, 'you shall find the babe you are looking for in such and such a condition,' but rather this 'most extraordinary and suggestive one, You shall find the Saviour you are looking for, Christ the Lord, in the form of a babe, wrapped in swaddling-clothes, and lying in a manger.' See Dr. Monro Gibson in *Sunday Mag.*, Dec. 1891; and cf. Dr. Hastings in *Expos. Times*, iii. [1892] 196, and [1894] 147.

E. B. Pollard.

⚡ Back To Christ

BACK TO CHRIST.—The movement or tendency described in the phrase 'back to Christ' belongs mainly to the past half century, and both its wide extent and its far-reaching consequences for religious thought justify us in regarding it as the most important theological event of the period.

The phrase can be received as a correct description of the movement, only under the explanation that the return has not been to the Christ of dogma, but to the Christ of history. This distinction must be kept clearly in view. The Christ of dogma is Christ as exhibited in the creeds—the eternally begotten Son of God, the second Person in the Trinity, who, for our redemption, assumed our human nature and submitted to death as an atonement for our sins. He is the God-man, a Divine Person with two natures and two wills. It is evident that these determinations move in a different region from that of empirical reality. They cannot be established on merely historical evidence; they have their ground in a judgment of faith. What we have in dogma is not a portrait of the historical Jesus in the religious and ethical traits of His character, but a speculative construction of His Person; not an account of His historical ministry, but

a doctrinal interpretation of it. The Christ of history is the concrete Person whose image meets us in the Gospels; the Christ of dogma is the complex of metaphysical or doctrinal characters which the Church, on the ground of its faith, attributed to this Person. So far the distinction is clear enough, and meets with general acceptance. The difficulty begins when we raise the question whether such facts as the Virgin-birth, the Miracles (in the strict sense of the word), and the Resurrection are to be included in our conception of the historical Christ as resting upon historical evidence, or whether they are not rather to be transferred from the domain of history to that of faith. The question will come up again; in the meantime it may be sufficient to call attention to the ambiguity which must attach to the term 'historical Christ' so long as it remains undecided.

When we speak of a return to the Christ of history, we imply that His image has been lost sight of, or at least obscured. It was not doubtless the intention of the Church that its doctrinal determinations should supplant the concrete reality in the thought and faith of the community. But this was what actually happened. More and more the historical Person was overshadowed by the speculative construction, the historical ministry by the formulas in which its significance was summed up. The figure of Jesus disappeared behind the pre-existent Logos, the earthly ministry behind the idea of the Incarnation, the cross behind the doctrine of the Atonement. This result is not to be explained by the fact that dogma, from its controversial character, attracted to itself an undue share of attention and interest as compared with matters that had never been in dispute. The cause lay deeper. It is to be found in the conception of Revelation and of Faith that has dominated the Catholic and also, to a large extent, the Protestant Church. Revelation has been understood as the supernatural communication of a system of doctrine; Faith, as the submission of the mind to doctrine on the ground of its authority. The emphasis has thus been thrown, not on the historical life, but on the dogmatic construction. The historical life has occupied only a secondary place, its significance being found mainly in the basis it supplies for this construction or interpretation.

1. *Causes of the movement.*—What are the causes that have contributed to restore the figure of Jesus to its place in the centre of religious thought? We shall mention three as the chief.

(a) The first is the application of historical criticism to the Gospel narrative. In 1835, D. F. Strauss published his *Leben Jesu*, and this book proved the starting-point of a critical movement the end of which is not yet in sight. The results of Strauss' criticism were almost purely negative: the Gospel story was resolved into a tissue of myths. There are still writers who find in that story only the most meagre basis of fact; but their conclusions are far from representing the general results of the movement, which are much more positive than negative in their character, much more

constructive than destructive. If doubt has been cast on some of the facts related about Jesus, and if the influence of subsequent ideas has been detected here and there in the presentation of His life and teaching, the substantial truth of the Gospel narrative has been amply vindicated. Moreover, the critical study of the NT has done for Christ what that of the OT has done for the prophets. It has reconstructed the contemporary background, given us a better understanding of His teaching, and enabled us to see the Man and His work in their human environment. To this enlarged historical knowledge and new feeling for the historical, we owe the recognition of the fact that the Christ of history is one thing and the conception of His Person that sprang up on the soil of the Church's faith another. As early as the Fourth Gospel the two images had been blended into one. Still further, criticism has contributed to the return to Christ by the mere fact that it has brought the problem of His historical reality and significance into the centre of attention and interest. Up to the appearance of the *Leben Jesu* the problems that occupied the theological field were almost purely speculative: when Christ was considered, it was as the vehicle or symbol of certain speculative ideas. The retirement of the speculative behind the historical is one of the signs of the times.

(b) A second and even more important factor in the movement 'back to Christ' is the widespread dissatisfaction with the traditional statements of Christianity. Since the rationalistic movement of the 18th cent. the history of dogma has been in the main a history of disintegration. Those who seek to go behind the creeds, back to the source of our religion, proceed on the ground that the creeds do not represent, with any sufficient correctness or adequacy, either the conceptions that Jesus taught or the significance that His Person has for faith. All we can do here is to indicate the main lines which the criticism of dogma has followed.

When we examine the formulas of Nicaea and Chalcedon, in which the Being of God and the Person of Christ are determined, we find one basal conception underlying them all. It is the conception of Substance. God is conceived primarily as the Absolute Substance; that is to say, as the indeterminate, unchanging and permanent ground of the knowable world of variety, change, and transience. Christ is true God because He shares in the Divine Substance; and because He has taken up human nature or substance into union with His Divine substance, He is also true man. The inner relations of the Godhead—Fatherhood, Sonship, the Procession of the Holy Spirit—are all expressed in terms of this category. It is true that the Church had other things to say about God and Christ than those of its formulas; still the formulas were regarded as conveying the deepest and most vital truths, and their acceptance was made the criterion of orthodoxy and the condition of salvation. If the ethical was recognized, it occupied only a subordinate position in comparison with the metaphysical. Now, what is this idea of Substance which plays so great a rôle in the creeds? It was not derived from Christ or the New Testament. It was borrowed from Hellenistic philosophy; and

what it originally answered was not any religious need, but the purely intellectual demand that all the manifoldness of this time-world shall be reducible to the unity of a single principle. Even from a philosophical point of view the idea of Substance is open to fatal objections as a principle by which to explain personal or, indeed, any relations. To modern thought Substance is not a concrete reality; it is nothing more than the most abstract of all ideas. To hypostatize abstractions, equip them with causal power, and employ them as principles of explanation, was a peculiarity of Greek thought, and one that it is hopeless to revive. The use which the creeds make of this idea is even more objectionable when considered from the standpoint of religion. Absolute Substance has nothing in common with the holy, personal Will of the prophets, or with the gracious Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. One cannot, on such a foundation, build up a Christian conception of God. And to say that Christ is Divine in virtue of His participation in the Divine Substance, is not to present Him in any character that makes Him the object of our trust. What gives Christ His significance for faith is the fact that in His Person and ministry faith recognizes the revelation of God's gracious will towards sinful men. To substitute a divinity of Substance for a divinity of Revelation is to remove Christ from the realm of faith into that of speculation; and, further, since the category of substance is at bottom a physical category, it is to rank the physical above the personal and ethical.

In formulating these metaphysical doctrines, the Church no doubt believed that it was safeguarding vital religious interests. What seemed at stake was nothing less than the reality of the salvation mediated by Christ. But, it is contended, the conception of salvation that the Nicene and Chalcedon formulas were designed to safeguard is not an ethical, but a metaphysical, or, more correctly, physical, conception. The evil from which deliverance is sought is not primarily sin; it is the mortality that belongs to our fallen nature; and the good salvation brings is not ethical communion with God, but participation in eternal life, which is thought of as a natural quality of the Divine substance. Human substance is deified, invested with the quality of immortality, by being taken up into and penetrated by Divine substance. It is this metaphysical conception of salvation that requires a metaphysical Christ. Christ must be God and man in the substantial sense, since it was in His Person that the penetration (ἐπιχώρησις) of human substance by Divine took place. It is obvious that such a conception of Christ's Person can have little or no significance for those who regard religious relationships as being at their deepest and highest personal and ethical. An ethical conception of Redemption, as a change in our relation to God effected within our consciousness, requires us to seek the significance of Christ not in the metaphysical background of His nature, but in the ethical and religious traits of His character, which disclose to us the heart of God, and have the power to awaken within us the response of love and faith.

In the theology of the Greek Church the work of Christ was summed up in His Incarnation. In that act salvation was already achieved. A more practical and ethical conception entered the Church with the great figure of Augustine. The metaphysical antithesis of mortal, creaturely life and eternal, Divine life retired before the ethical antithesis of sin and grace. There was a transference of emphasis from the metaphysical Incarnation to the ethical Atonement. The change marked an important advance. Yet in the doctrine of the Atonement as formulated by Anselm, and even as subsequently modified, the ethical does not appear in its purity, but only under the form of the juristic. The work of Christ is interpreted by means of categories borrowed from the legal discipline of the Roman Church. But ethical relationships and ethical ends cannot be adequately expressed in terms of criminal law. The juristic no less than the metaphysical conceptions of the old theology have lost their hold on the modern mind. We interpret religious relations now in terms of ethics and psychology.

(c) The third cause that has operated in bringing the historical Person and work of Christ into the foreground, has been the new sense—reflected in the writings of men like Goethe, Emerson, and Carlyle—of the importance of great personalities as factors of historical change and progress. Neither Catholicism nor traditional Protestantism can be said to have shown much appreciation of the religious and ethical forces that radiate from Jesus as a historical personality. The saving activity of God in Christ has been conceived either in a mystical, semi-mechanical way, as affecting us through an operation in the substance or background of our being; or, again, rationalistically, as mediated through ideas or doctrines. The Rationalism of the 18th century and the speculative philosophy of the 19th, while rejecting the former of these views, only accentuated the latter. History was resolved into a dialectic of ideas: not personalities but ideas were regarded as the creative forces. In the speculative theology of the Hegelian period, the religious importance of Jesus was found almost solely in the fact that He was the introducer or the symbol of the supreme religious idea. This idea—the essential oneness of God and man, man as the eternal Son of God—is the active and creative thing. There is still a large and important school, represented by writers like Green, Edward Caird, Pfleiderer, A. Dorner, which continues the Hegelian tradition. But the past half century has witnessed a reaction from this exaggerated intellectualism. It is being more and more widely recognized that the elevation and enrichment of man's spiritual life have been effected far less by the movements and instincts of the mass, or by the introduction and development of ideas, than by the appearance on the stage of history of great creative personalities. Such personalities are fountains of life for many succeeding generations. In no province is their importance so marked as in that of religion. And Christ is the supreme personality. It was the impression produced by His Person, even more than the new ideas He taught, that created the Christian Church. 'The life was the light of men.' And in whatever way we account for it, it is certain that Christian ideas cannot be separated from Christ without being stripped of much of their power

to maintain themselves in men's minds and hearts. The recognition of such facts has had no small share in bringing the Person of Christ into the centre of religious thought.

2. *Theological reconstruction.*—We pass from the causes that have brought about a return to the historical Christ, to consider some of the attempts at theological reconstruction or revision to which the movement has led. What is its dogmatic significance? The movement is not a uniform one; it has taken various directions; and while most of the thought of the day confesses its influence, this influence is much more marked in some cases than in others. We need not take into account a writer like Gore, who, though insisting on the importance of a knowledge of the historical Christ, yet derives his theology not from Christ, but from the Œcumenical Councils; or like Loisy, who, indeed, distinguishes between the Christ of history and the Christ of faith, but yet allows the former little significance except as the starting-point of the movement known as Christianity. Our attention must be limited to the theologies in which the new feeling for the historical Christ has exerted some marked influence.

(1) We begin with that form of the movement which departs least from traditional orthodoxy, and to which the term 'Christo-centric' is usually applied. In this case the return to Christ has not led to anything like a reconstruction of doctrine; the most that has been undertaken is a revision. The traditional doctrines receive a reinterpretation and a fresh grounding in the light of the fuller knowledge of, and keener feeling for, the Christ of history. In the words of the most distinguished representative of the Christo-centric movement in this country, 'We cannot conceive and describe the supreme historical Person without coming face to face with the profoundest of all the problems in theology; but then we may come to them from an entirely changed point of view, through the Person that has to be interpreted rather than through the interpretations of His Person. When this change has been effected, theology ceases to be scholastic and becomes historical.'* [Note: Fairbairn, *Christ in Modern Theology*, p. 8.]

This claim to break with the scholastic method is partially, but only partially, justified. The doctrines of the Church are no longer treated as sacrosanct, and as the first principles of theological construction. Still further, it is recognized that even Scripture cannot be received as the ultimate source and norm of doctrine. The Apostolic conception of Christianity is not formally authoritative. We must not look at Christ merely through St. Paul's eyes; it is possible for us to see the Christ whom St. Paul saw, and to estimate St. Paul's thoughts from the vantage ground of this immediate knowledge. The idea of an external authority is not, however, surrendered; it is only carried back to the last possible resort, the consciousness of Christ. Whatever can be derived from the consciousness of Christ has an authoritative claim on our acceptance. And since His history is of a piece with His consciousness,

the two must be taken together. The theological task is therefore to interpret God through the history and the consciousness of the historical Christ.

But here the question postponed at the beginning presses for an answer. The term 'historical Christ' is not unambiguous. What are the contents of His consciousness, what are the facts in His history, which give to Him His meaning for faith, and which must be regarded as constituting His historical personality? We know Jesus from the Synoptic Gospels as the teacher of an ethical ideal supreme in its depth and height, and of a religion of pure inwardness and spirituality. We obtain glimpses into an inner life of intimate and unbroken fellowship with God. He was conscious of a unique vocation, to bring men to the knowledge and service of the Father in heaven, and to introduce the Reign of God on earth. In His consciousness of this vocation and of His equipment for it, He accepted the title of Messiah. He carried out His vocation with an obedience to God that never wavered, with a trust in God that no storm could shake, with a love that shrank from no sacrifice, and that never grew cold. He accepted the cross in the confidence that God's purpose would not be overthrown by His death, but established. This at least criticism leaves untouched; and for some this human Jesus is the Jesus of history, and, at the same time, the Divine Christ, the Saviour of the world. The constitutive facts in His Person and history are the religious and ethical facts. But such is not the view of those whose position we are now describing. Accepting these facts, they do not regard them as supplying an adequate conception of the Christ of history, or as disclosing the deepest meaning of His life. For Christo-centric as for traditional theology, the elements of cardinal importance in Christ's consciousness and history are the miraculous elements. The facts that give to His inner life its character are His moral perfection and consciousness of sinlessness, His assertion of a unique knowledge of God, and of a Sonship different in kind from that possible to His disciples, His assertion of His Messiahship and pre-existence, His demand for absolute devotion to His Person, His claim to a superhuman authority in forgiving sins and in dealing with OT institutions and laws, His claim to be the Saviour of the world, the arbiter of human destiny, the final Judge. Similarly His outer life receives its character from the Virgin-birth, the Miracles (interpreted in the strict sense), and, above all, from the bodily Resurrection. The historical Christ is the transcendent and miraculous Christ, the Christ who was conscious of a superhuman dignity, and who was declared by the resurrection from the dead to be the Son of God with power (Rom_1:4).

This conception of Christ, with its subordination of the moral and religious in His consciousness and history to the miraculous, carries with it two momentous consequences. In the first place, it involves the view, is indeed founded upon it, that the Revelation of God is to be found not primarily in Christ's Person and ministry, but in the doctrines in which these are interpreted. Christ is brought before us as primarily a *problem* that demands solution. What constitute Him a problem are the

above-mentioned facts in His consciousness and history, which cannot be accounted for except on the hypothesis that He was a superhuman, supernatural Being—a Being that stood in a relation to God beyond any that can be described in ethical terms. These facts are singled out as the essential ones, just because they set the problem and provide the basis for the transcendental hypothesis. The solution of the problem is given in the NT doctrines of Christ's Person and work. The Person and work constitute the facts; the doctrines supply their explanation or interpretation. Apart from the doctrinal interpretation the facts might still retain a certain ethico-religious significance, but they would lose their highest, their essential, meaning. It is the interpretation or construction that is the essential thing in Christianity. The gospel is not given with the character, teaching, and ministry of Christ, in their direct appeal to the heart and conscience; only the doctrinal interpretation of these facts—that the pre-existent Son of God assumed human nature, lived among men, and atoned by His death for their sin—has a right to the name. Christianity is given only when Christ is speculatively construed.* [Note: Fairbairn, *Philosophy of the Christian Religion*, p. 306.]

Though the need for such a construction can be demonstrated, the construction itself is not to be regarded as a work of human freedom. We receive it as authoritatively given. To traditional theology the authority is inspired Scripture, the witness of the Apostolic writers no less than Christ's self-witness. It is characteristic of the Christo-centric school that, with a freer view of inspiration, it admits only the self-witness as the ultimate authority. Only Christ Himself could know and reveal the secret of His unique personality. The doctrine of the Apostolic writers is not to be regarded as the product of a religions experience created by Christ, but as the reproduction or development of ideas received from Christ's lips. These writers are only the channel by which the interpretation has reached us, not its source.

A doctrinal conception of Revelation requires as its correlate a conception of Faith as primarily an intellectual act. Faith must be defined as the assent of the mind to a proposition on the ground of authority. This assent, however, though the primary element in faith, is not treated as the whole of it; it becomes effective only when reinforced by the practical elements of feeling and will.

More fruitful, perhaps, than its attempt at a fresh grounding of doctrine has been the contribution of the Christo-centric school to the revision of doctrine. It has sought to free the formulas that describe the Triune Being of God and the Person and work of Christ from their over-reinement, to translate them into the categories of modern thought, and to make them more ethical and less metaphysical.

(2) We pass to a second, and much more radical phase of the movement. To many, 'back to Christ' means back from historical Christianity, the religion founded upon

Christ, to the religion which Christ taught, and which we see embodied in His life. More than a century ago the position was summed up by Leasing in his famous saying, 'The Christian religion has been tried for eighteen centuries; the religion of Christ remains to be tried.'

That the stream of religion flows purer at its fountainhead than at its lower reaches is a fact which the study of every historical religion confirms. As a religion advances through history, it loses something of its idealism and becomes more secular, takes up foreign elements, accumulates dogmas and ceremonies, parts with its simplicity and spontaneity, and becomes more and more a human construction. And every religious reform has signified a throwing off of foreign accretions, and a return to the simplicity and purity of the source. Did not Christ Himself represent a reaction from the elaborate legal and ceremonial system of Judaism to the simpler and more ethical faith of the prophets? The Reformation was a return to primitive Christianity, but less to Christ than to St. Paul. But we must, it is maintained, go behind even St. Paul and the early disciples. It is true, indeed, that, in the NT, Christianity is not the complex tiling it afterwards became; still, the process of intellectual and ceremonial elaboration has begun. If we have not the fully-developed system of dogma and sacrament, we have at least the germs out of which it arose; and while much must be regarded as the legitimate development of principles implicit in Christ's gospel, there is also the introduction of a foreign element.

Let us contrast at one or two points the gospel as proclaimed by Jesus with the Church's rendering of it. Jesus' gospel contains no Christology. It is the glad tidings of a Father in heaven, whose love and care embrace all His creatures, in whose eyes every human soul is precious, and who is at once the righteous Judge and the pitiful, forgiving Saviour. Jesus was conscious of His unique position as the Mediator of salvation, but He never (according to the Synoptic tradition) required faith in Himself in the same sense as He required faith in God. God was the one object of faith; and if Jesus called men to Himself, it was only that He might lead them to God, and teach them to love, trust, and obey God. Turning to the gospel of the Church, we find a doctrine of Christ's Person at the heart of it. To believe the gospel is no longer, in the first place at least, to receive God's message of love and forgiveness, and to obey His summons to repentance, trust, and service; it is to believe that Jesus is Messiah, a pre-existent, heavenly Being, the second Person in the Trinity. A doctrine of Jesus' Person is substituted for the Heavenly Father as the immediate object of faith.

Again, Jesus' gospel contains nothing like a developed doctrine of Redemption. The question as to the rationale of forgiveness is never raised, and there is no hint of the inability of God to forgive without a propitiation. Forgiveness is presented as flowing directly from God's fatherly love (Luke 15). And as little do we find the other propositions included in the Church's doctrine of Redemption. Jesus, indeed, teaches

that none is good (Mat 19:17), that even at the best we are unprofitable servants, who have done no more than our duty (Luk 17:10); but He knows nothing of inherited guilt, radical corruption of human nature, human inability to do any good work. In the gospel of Jesus we are in the region of direct moral intuition; nothing is there merely because apologetic or system required it. We are also in the region of moral sanity. There is nothing of asceticism, and no attempt to cultivate a feeling of sinfulness. Men are bidden strive to be perfect as their Father in heaven is perfect (Mat 5:48). Comparing the gospel of the Church with that of Christ, we find complication instead of simplicity, theological construction instead of intuition, and sometimes morbidity and exaggeration in place of sanity.

Finally, while the teaching of Jesus places the centre of gravity in the will, the Church transfers it to the intellect. 'This do and thou shalt live' (Luk 10:28) is the command of Jesus: what the Church requires is belief rather than conduct.

The gospel of Jesus represents the crown of religion; it is the highest and, in its innermost nature, the final stage of religious development. No other historical religion can endure a moment's comparison with it. And the religions manufactured out of a few philosophical principles have still less claim to serious consideration, since they are wholly lacking in everything that gives a religion vitality. It can be said with literal truth that, for any civilized community, the choice is not between Christianity and some other religion, but between Christianity and no religion at all.

While the religion of Jesus is regarded as the one faith capable of meeting the need of this and of every age, it is not meant that it can be reproduced in every detail. We must distinguish between central and peripheral elements, and between the enduring spirit and the passing form of manifestation. We cannot, for example, revive the primitive expectation of the world's speedy end, or the ideas about angels, Satan, unclean spirits as the agents in disease, which Jesus shared with His contemporaries. The gospel must be translated into the language of to-day, and its spirit applied to the relations of our modern life.

How is Jesus Himself regarded by those who represent this type of thought? All speculative Christology, whether Biblical or ecclesiastical, is rejected, and it is asserted that such Christology has no basis in the language which Jesus used about Himself. Further, it is held that not Jesus, but the God whom Jesus revealed, is the immediate object of our faith. At the same time, the unique significance of Jesus, not only in the history of religion but also for the individual, is earnestly recognized. We quote the confession of Bousset: 'Thou art our leader, to whom there is none like, the leader in the highest things, the leader of our soul to God, the Way, the Truth, and the Life.'^{*} [Note: Bousset, *Das Wesen der Religion*, p. 267.] The figure of Jesus is the grandest and most perfect that God has bestowed on humanity throughout the

long course of its upward journey. Bousset can even adopt the confession of St. Paul, 'God was in Christ' (2Co_5:19). Harnack goes a step further. 'Jesus,' he says, 'is the way to the Father, and He is also the judge ordained by the Father. Not as a constituent does He belong to the Gospel, but He has been its personal *realization* and *power*, and will always be felt as such.'* [Note: Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums*, p. 91.] But in thus insisting on the dependence of the gospel on the Person behind it for its power in awakening faith, Harnack is to be regarded as representing the type of thought to be described in the next section rather than that described here.

(3) The last type of theological thought which has to be considered, as bearing upon it the impress of the modern feeling for the historical Christ, is the most important of all. It is that represented by the great name of Ritschl. For Ritschlianism, even more than for traditional orthodoxy, Christ is the sum and substance of Christianity. In Him the living God reveals Himself to men; He is the fact in history in which God meets us, to awaken our faith and lead us into the blessedness of His fellowship. What is it in Christ that gives Him His so momentous significance? The answer which Ritschlianism gives to this question involves a new interpretation of the great Christian ideas,—Revelation, Gospel, Doctrine, Faith,—only it is claimed that this interpretation is nothing more than a carrying out of the fundamental principles of the Reformation.

In Catholic, and not less in traditional Protestant, theology the significance of Christ is concentrated in the doctrines in which His Person and work have received their interpretation. Christianity is summed up in the great speculative ideas of the eternal Sonship, the Incarnation, and the atoning Death. These ideas are regarded as constituting the content of Revelation and the object of faith; into them the meaning and power of Jesus' life are gathered, and to believe them is to believe the gospel. Doctrine, Gospel, Revelation are treated as one and the same thing. For Ritschlianism, on the other hand, it is not the doctrinal interpretation that is the vital thing, but the Person and work interpreted. Doctrine has its own importance, but it must not be identified with Revelation or with the Gospel; and consequently it is not the object of faith. The importance of doctrine lies in this, that it brings to expression what faith has found in Christ. The appropriation of the Revelation of God in Christ results in a new knowledge of God and of human life, and it is the task of dogmatics to exhibit this knowledge in its purity, free from any admixture of philosophical speculation, and in its connexion with the inner life. Doctrine is the explicitly formulated knowledge of faith. But the doctrines in which another's faith has expressed itself cannot be received by us as the ground of our faith. It is not by appropriating St. Paul's thoughts about Christ—that He was a propitiatory offering, a pre-existent heavenly Being, etc.—that we become Christians, but only by trusting Christ as St. Paul trusted Him. When there is this direct contact with Christ, St. Paul's thoughts will be reproduced as the fruit of our own experience, and only then will

they have real meaning for us. To substitute for Christ as the object of faith a doctrine of His Person and work is to remove faith from its genetic ground. For the creative thing in Christianity is not the doctrines which, with more or less truth and fulness, describe Christ's significance; it is the personal life in its inexhaustible wealth of meaning and power, and as it manifests itself to us in word and deed. Doctrine is a product of faith, not its causal ground. Moreover, the substitution of doctrine for Christ has this further result, that it carries with it a false view of faith. Faith is then necessarily conceived in the Catholic manner as the submission of the mind to a proposition on the ground of its authority. But if the Reformation has taught us anything, it is that faith is not assent to a doctrine, but trust in the living God. Faith is no product of our own activity; it is God-created—the result of the contact of the soul with Divine reality. In the Person of Christ, God so reveals Himself to us as to command our reverence, trust, and devotion.

Not a doctrine, therefore, but a life is for Ritschlian theology the medium of Revelation and the object of faith. But the further question arises, What are the facts in the life that clothe it with Divine meaning and power? In traditional theology the main emphasis falls upon the element of the miraculous. This follows necessarily from the position assigned to doctrine. Doctrine is the object of faith, and it is the miraculous facts—Virgin-birth, Miracles, Sinlessness, unique Knowledge of God, bodily Resurrection—that supply the basis for the dogmatic structure. But in the Ritschlian system no importance is attached to the miraculous as such. The attempt to demonstrate the Divine significance of Jesus in a theoretical (or causal) way is abandoned as at once impossible and mistaken. It is not possible, it is maintained, by means of the facts to which traditional theology appeals, to prove scientifically that Jesus cannot be explained by the causes operative in history, and that the hypothesis of a transcendental origin and nature must be brought into the field. Only for faith is a miracle a proof of God's working; for science it is either an unexplained fact or a deceptive appearance. Moreover, it is not through breaches in the continuity of nature or of history that God makes His presence and activity certain to us. The religious view of nature or history is no product of causal explanation. To faith alone does God reveal Himself, and the judgment that God is in Christ is a judgment of faith. To consider Jesus in the light of a problem that has to be explained is to abandon the religious attitude for the scientific.

The vital facts in Christ's life are, for Ritschlianism, those that exhibit the living Person, and His activity in His vocation. The Christ who knew God as Father, who never turned aside from doing the Father's will, who never in the darkest vicissitudes of His life lost His confidence in the Father's wisdom, power, and love, and who by His faith overcame the world and conquered death; the Christ who, understanding and feeling the evil of sin as none else, in holy love and pity sought out the sinful, making them His companions and opening for them the door into the Kingdom of God,

and who for their sakes surrendered His life as an offering, enduring the cross and despising the shame—this is at once the Christ of history and the Christ of faith. His unique consciousness of God and His sinlessness—or, as it is better described, His moral perfection—do not owe their religious importance to their serviceableness as proofs of a transcendental ‘nature’; their importance lies in their inherent worth and power as elements in His personality. That there is something inscrutable in Jesus’ consciousness of God is strongly maintained; only it is not our inability to account for Him that gives Him His religious significance. Similarly the miracles are not to be viewed as proofs, but as exhibiting His gracious activity in His vocation. What of the Resurrection? Within the Ritschlian school there are some who include this as part of the historically given ground of faith. The view of the majority, however, and the one that seems most consistent with the general position, is that belief in Jesus’ eternal existence is rather the final outcome of faith than its preliminary condition. Apart from the difficulties which the Resurrection narratives present, our belief that Jesus lives is not one that rests on human testimony. It depends on the impression produced on us by His Person,—He could not be holden of death (Act 2:24),—and on our acceptance of His revelation of the Father-God.

The question has been raised whether it is the historical or the exalted Christ that is the object of faith. These alternatives are not, however, so opposed as they seem. Most would admit that our conception of the exalted Christ, if it is not to pass into the region of pure phantasy, must derive its content from the historical life; and also, that the historical Christ must be thought of, not merely as a figure of the past, but as alive for evermore. The exalted Christ is the Christ of history, with the superadded thought that He is not dead but risen, and at the right hand of God.

The gospel, the glad message of God’s Fatherly love and forgiveness, is, according to Ritschlian thought, already given in the simple proclamation of Jesus. To complicate this simple proclamation with doctrine is to pervert it. But this is not to say that Christ has no place in His gospel. In the first place, it is from Christ’s Personality, and from His activity in His vocation, that the gospel derives its meaning. Apart from His ministry of love, our conception of the Fatherly love of God can have but little living content. That historical ministry in its inexhaustible richness stands as the enduring exhibition of what Divine love means. The dogmatic conception of the Father surrendering His eternal Son to death is much poorer as an exhibition of love than the historical reality. So also one can rise to the height of the gospel conception of God’s righteousness and mercy only as one keeps in view the mind and character of Christ, and His treatment of sinners. The reconciliation of these two attributes is not a matter of jurisprudence, as the Atonement doctrine makes it; it is the secret of a personal life. We see them reconciled in the mind and ministry of Jesus, who, undefiled and separate from sinners, yet received them into His fellowship.

But this is not all. In analyzing Christ's significance, Ritschlian theology attaches even greater importance to the idea of Power. Christ is that fact through which God enters as a force into history, to awaken and sustain faith. It is not natural for us to believe the gospel of God's forgiveness and Fatherly love and care. Rather does faith arise as a victory over nature. When we contemplate the iron system of mechanical forces and laws that beset us behind and before, and beyond which no theoretical knowledge can conduct us, it is a hard matter to persuade ourselves that these forces and laws are but the angels and ministers of a gracious personal will. It is supremely through Christ that we reach this assurance. He is the Divine fact that so masters us as to convince us that not mechanism, but the Good is the ultimate reality. The spiritual might of God becomes real to us as we contemplate the power of the Good in Jesus' life. Forgiveness becomes real and guilt becomes real when we feel behind them the throb of Jesus' holy love. The great redemptive forces—faith, love, self-sacrifice, moral fidelity—have their supreme seat and centre in the Person and life and cross of the man Christ Jesus. We may sum up the position by saying that in Him the will of God for man's salvation becomes effective.

Such are the three theological types in which the influence of the movement 'back to Christ' is most apparent. It would be premature to forecast the ultimate issue of the movement. But one thing is certain. So momentous an event as the recovery of the historical figure of Christ cannot leave theology exactly as it found it.

Literature:—I. (1) Distinction between the historical and dogmatic Christ: Kahler, *Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche biblische Christus*; Fairbairn, *Christ in Modern Theology*, p. 186; Loisy, *Autour d'un petit livre*, pp. 111, 90, 134; Sabatier, *Outlines of a Philosophy of Religion*, p. 141 f. (2) Criticism of dogma: *Histories of Dogma*, by Harnack [English translation], Loots, and A. Dorner; Kattenbusch, *Confessions-Kunde*; Kaftan, *The Truth of the Christian Religion*, vol. i.; Fairbairn, *op. cit.* (3) Religion and history: Harnack, *Das Christentum und die Geschichte*; O. Kirn, *Glaube und Geschichte*.

II. (1) Christo-centric theology: Fairbairn, *Christ in Modern Theology*, and *The Philosophy of the Christian Religion*; Denney, *Studies in Theology*; Forrest, *The Christ of History and of Experience*.—(2) Religion of Jesus theology: Channing, *Sermons on Love to Christ and on Preaching Christ*; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*; A. B. Bruce, *With Open Face*; *The Thinker*, 1893, p. 38; Hatch, *Hibbert Lectures*, 1888, pp. 333, 349, 351; Watson, *The Mind of the Master*; Tolstoj, *My Religion*; Harnack, *What is Christianity?*; J. Weiss, *Die Nachfolge Christi und die Predigt der Gegenwart*; Bousset, *Wesender Religion*, p. 192 ff.

III. Ritschlianism: Ritschl, *Justification and Reconciliation*; Garvie, *Ritschlian Theology*; Swing, *The Theology of Albrecht Ritschl*; Herrmann, *The Communion, of*

the Christian with God, also *Ethik*, and *der Begriff der Offenbarung*; Kaftan, *Dogmatik*.

W. Morgan.

⚡Bag

BAG (Joh_12:6; Joh_13:29 γλωσσόκομον; in Luk_12:33 βαλάντια is translation ‘bags’ in Authorized Version , but Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘purses’; see Purse).

Γλωσσόκομον (in NT peculiar to St. John) meant originally a case for keeping the mouth-pieces of wind instruments (γλᾶσσα, κομew); so Phrynicus, who gives γλωσσοκομειον as the proper form, rejecting that of NT, which, however, is found in an old Doric inscription, in later Comic writers and in LXX Septuagint (see Liddell and Scott). The (Revised Version margin) ‘box’ seems the better rendering. Field (^{ON} [Note: N Otium Norvicense.]) has a very full note, in which he concludes that γλ., both in its general and in its special sense, means not a bag, but a box or chest, always of wood or other hard material. Thus Hesychius defines it as a wooden receptacle of remnants (σορὸς ξυλίνη τῶν λειψανων); Arrian mentions γλωσσόκομα made of tortoise-shell; in the Anthology γλ. is apparently a coffin (‘when I look at Nicanor the coffin-maker [σοροπηγόν], and consider for what purpose he makes these wooden boxes [γλωσσοκομα]’); and in an inscription quoted by Hatch (*Essays in Biblical Greek*) γλ. means the strong box or muniment chest of an association. The LXX Septuagint translates תָּבָא in 2Ch_24:8 f. by ΤΑ. (the chest for the offerings, but κιβωτός in 2Ki_12:9 f. as usually), which Cod. A also gives in 2Sa_6:11 (the Ark). Aquila uses γλ. for תָּבָא in all its significations, e.g. coffin (Gen_50:26), the Ark (Exo_37:1, 1Sa_5:1, 2Sa_6:11). Ancient Versions of Jn. agree with this view; Vulgate gives loculos, the plural, says Field, ‘indicating several partitions,’ a small portable cash-box; D [Note: Deuteronomist.] lat. *loculum*; Nonnus δουρατην χηλόν, *ligneam arculam*. In favour of Authorized and Revised Versions it may be urged that something small and easily carried is required by the context, whereas the above instances are chiefly larger boxes (but note use of γλ. by Hesychius and Arrian above).

Again, in 1Sa_6:8 f. תִּבְרָח (Authorized and Revised Versions ‘coffer’) is translation γλωσσόκομον by Josephus, and is from a root ‘to tremble, wag, move to and fro,’ whence in Arabic there is a similar word meaning a bag filled with stones hung at the sides of camels to preserve equilibrium (see Gesenius, *Lex.*). In modern Greek also γλ. means purse or bag (Hatch).

The γλ. was the receptacle for the money of Jesus and the disciples; it contained, no doubt, the proceeds of the sale of their goods, and gave the idea later of the common fund (Act_4:32 f.); it was replenished by the gifts of friends (Luk_8:3); and from it the poor were helped (Joh_13:29). Judas may have been entrusted with it as being the best fitted for such work; but what might have proved a blessing, as giving useful employment for his talents, became the means of his ruin. Other suggested explanations are: that Christ thought fit to call forth a manifestation of his sin as the only means of cure (Hengstenberg); or that it was simply a private arrangement between the disciples (Godet). The ‘bag’ could not have been taken from him, as Edersheim (*Life and Times*, ii. 472) remarks, without exposing him to the others, and precipitating his moral destruction. See Judas Iscariot.

W. H. Dundas.

Band

BAND.—A Roman legion, the full strength of which was about 6000 men, was divided into ten cohorts (600), and each cohort into three maniples (200). Greek writers use the word σπεῖρα, rendered ‘band’ in our versions, sometimes for *maniple* but usually for *cohort*; hence (Revised Version margin) has regularly ‘cohort.’ The troops in Judaea, however, as in other provinces governed by a procurator, consisted simply of auxiliaries, not Roman citizens, but provincials; these were not formed into legions, but merely into cohorts, of strength varying from 500 to 1000, sometimes consisting purely of infantry, sometimes including cavalry also. The forces in Palestine seem to have been originally Herod’s troops, taken over by the Romans; they were recruited in the Greek cities in or around the country, such as Caesarea, Ascalon, Sebaste. One such cohort formed the garrison of Jerusalem, stationed in the fortress of Antonia, adjoining the Temple, under a chiliarch or tribune (‘the chief captain of the band,’ Act_21:31). From the account of the force at the disposal of Lysias (Act_23:23), his cohort must have been a *cohors miliaria equestris*, consisting of 760 infantry and 240 cavalry; but this may not have been the case in our Lord’s time, some 30 years earlier. This Roman force was probably granted by Pilate to effect our Lord’s arrest

(Joh_18:3; Joh_18:12, where ‘the band’ under its ‘chief captain’ [Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885] seems distinguished from ‘the officers of the Jews,’ *i.e.* the Temple police; see Westcott, *ad loc.*). Of course, only a portion of the whole cohort would be needed. In Mat_27:27 || Mar_15:16, the soldiers gather together ‘the whole band’ to mock our Lord; obviously all who were at hand and not on duty.

Literature.—Grimm-Thayer, *s.v.* στεῖρα; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] i. ii. 49-56; Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung* (1884), ii. 468 ff., 534 ff.

Harold Smith.

Bank

BANK.—1. In the parable of the Pounds, Christ upbraids the slothful servant because he had not given his pound to the bank (ἐπὶ τράπεζαν), *i.e.* the office of the money-changers (Luk_19:23), who would have kept it safe, and also paid interest for it. ‘Bankers’ (τραπεζίται) is used in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 of Mat_25:27 for ‘money-changers’ of the Authorized Version. In Greek cities the bankers sat at their tables (τράπεζα) in the market-place. They changed coins, but also took money on deposit, giving what would now seem very high interest (see articles ‘Money-Changers’ and ‘Usury’ in vols. iii. and iv. of Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible).

In this parable some suppose that Christ meant by ‘the bank’ to indicate the Synagogue, or the Christian Church as an organized body, which might use the gifts or powers of a disciple, when he could not, through timidity or lack of energy, exercise them himself. Others have supposed that He pointed to prayer as a substitute for good works, when the disciple was unable to do such. But all this is very precarious. (Cf. Bruce, *Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, p. 209 f.).

There is an apocryphal saying of Christ which may be connected with this parable. Origen (*in Joann.* xix. etc.) gives it thus: γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δόκιμοι, ‘Be ye tried money-changers.’ This is explained in the Clementine *Homilies* (iii. 61) to mean that Christians should prove the words of Christ, as the bankers lest and approve the gold and silver on their tables. But it may perhaps be looked at rather as connected with the stewardship of gifts and talents by the Lord’s disciples, finding its parallel in such sayings as Luk_16:12 ‘If ye have not been faithful in that which is another man’s, who shall give you that which is your own?’ The duty of a timid servant may be to use his

gifts under the guidance and authority of others, but growing experience might advance him to be a *τρατεξίτης* himself, who is able to trade boldly with that which has been entrusted to him.

2. In Luk 19:43 ‘bank,’ Authorized Version ‘trench’ (Gr. *χάραξι*). probably stands for a palisade (so (Revised Version margin)) of stakes, strengthened with brandies and earth, with a ditch behind, used by besiegers as a protection against arrows or attacking parties (Lat. *vallum*). Such a palisade was actually employed by the soldiers of Titus in the siege of Jerusalem, a.d. 70 (Josephus *BJ* v. vi. 2).

David M. W. Laird.

☞ Banquet

BANQUET.—The people of Palestine in Christ’s day—as, indeed, throughout the East generally—were fond of social feasting. The word *δοχή*, rendered ‘feast,’ from *δέχομαι*, ‘to receive’ (cf. English ‘reception’), is used with *ποιέω*, ‘to make’ (cf. Heb. *קָבַץ* *קָבַץ* Job 1:4). This is the social feast or banquet, as distinguished from the religious feast (*έορτή*). Levi made a great feast in his house (Luk 5:29); and Christ advised His followers, when they gave a banquet, to invite the poor and afflicted rather than the rich and influential (Luk 14:13). Such banquets were usually given in the house of the host to invited guests (Luk 14:13, Joh 2:2), but there was more freedom accorded the uninvited than is common in Western social life (Luk 7:36-38). Guests reclined on couches, leaning upon the left arm, and eating with the aid of the right hand, as in ordinary meals. Eating, and especially drinking of wine (cf. Heb.; *הַמְשָׁה* ‘drink,’ and *יַיִן* ‘wine,’ used for ‘banquet,’ and Gr. *συμπόσιον*, ‘drinking together’), music, dancing, joyous conversation, merriment, usually characterized such a festivity. Such a banquet was a part of wedding occasions. Jesus accepted an invitation to one of these at Cana in Galilee (Joh 2:2 ff.). Levi gave a banquet in His honour (Luk 5:29). There were often large numbers present (Luk 5:29), and gradations in the places (Mat 23:6, Luk 14:7; Luk 20:46, Mar 12:39). One of the guests was usually appointed ‘ruler of the feast,’ or *ἀρχιτροίχλινος* (Joh 2:8-9), who superintended the drinking, etc. (cf. Luk 22:26).

E. B. Pollard.

✚ Baptism

BAPTISM (βάπτισμα = ‘the rite of Baptism,’ always in NT distinguished from βαπτισμός, ‘a washing,’ Mar 7:4, Heb 6:2; Heb 9:10 [but see Lightfoot, Com. on *Colossians*, p. 184]; but this distinction is not maintained in Josephus [cf. *Ant.* xviii. v. 2]; and in the Latin versions and Fathers *baptisma* and *baptismus* and even *baptismum* are used indiscriminately, see Plummer’s art. ‘Baptism’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible).—A rite wherein by immersion in water the participant symbolizes and signalizes his transition from an impure to a pure life, his death to a past he abandons, and his new birth to a future he desires.

The points for consideration are (1) the Origin of Baptism, (2) its Mode, (3) John’s Baptism of the people, (4) John’s Baptism of Jesus, (5) Baptism by the disciples of Jesus.

1. *The Origin of Baptism.*—Baptism, as we find it in the Gospels, may be traced to a threefold source, natural symbolism, the lustrations of the Mosaic Law, and the baptism of proselytes. In many of the appointments of non-Christian religions the cleansing of the soul from sin is symbolized by the washing of the body (see the *Vendidad Fargard*, ix.; Williams, *Religious Thought in India*, 347; Vergil, *aeneid*, ii. 720; Ovid, *Fasti*, v. 680; and esp. MacCulloch, *Compar. Theol.*). As in other religions, so in Israel washings were the means appointed for restoring the person who had incurred ceremonial defilement to his place among the worshipping congregation. The Mosaic Law prescribed certain regulations for the removal of uncleanness by washing with water; Lev 15:5; Lev 15:8; Lev 15:13; Lev 15:16 (λούσεται ὕδατι πᾶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ) Lev 16:26; Lev 16:28. etc. But if the Jew himself needed almost daily washing (‘Judaeus quotidie lavat, quia quotidie inquinatur,’ Tertull. *de Baptismo*, xv.), much more was the bath of purification necessary for the Gentile who desired to pass into Judaism. For the proselyte this baptism (מבילה) seemed the appropriate initiation. ‘Whosoever any heathen will betake himself and be joined to the covenant of Israel, and place himself under the wings of the Divine Majesty, and take the yoke of the Law upon him, voluntary circumcision, baptism, and oblation are required.’ (See this and other passages in Lightfoot, *ae Heb.* on Mat 3:6; Schürer, P [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] § 31; and Edersheim’s *Life and Times of Jesus*, Appendix xii. on ‘Baptism of Proselytes.’ The question whether the baptism of proselytes was in vogue as early as the time of the Baptist has been laid to rest by Edersheim and Schürer). It may almost be said, then, that when John baptized the people, he meant to impress them with the idea that they must be re-born before they could enter the kingdom.

He, as it were, excommunicated them, and by requiring them to submit to Baptism, declared that their natural birth as Jews was insufficient for participation in the Messianic blessings. No doubt also he believed himself to be fulfilling the predictions of Zec 13:1, Eze 36:25, as well as the craving expressed in Psa 51:7.

2. *The Mode of Baptism.*—That the normal mode was by immersion of the whole body may be inferred (a) from the meaning of βαπτίζω, which is the intensive or frequentative form of βάπτω, ‘I dip,’ and denotes to *immerse* or *submerge*. In Polybius, iii. 72, it is used of soldiers wading through a flooded river, ‘immersed’ to their breast (ἕως τῶν μαστῶν οἱ πεζοὶ βαπτίζόμενοι). It is used also of sinking ships (in i. 51, the Carthaginians sank many of the Roman ships, πολλά τῶν σκαφῶν ἐβάπτισον). [Many examples are given in Stephanus, and esp. in *Classic Baptism: An enquiry into the meaning of the word βαπτίζω*, by James W. Dale, 4th ed. Philadelphia, 1872]. The point is that ‘dip’ or ‘immerse’ is the primary, ‘wash’ the secondary meaning of βάπτω and βαπτίζω. (b) The same inference may be drawn from the law laid down regarding the baptism of proselytes: ‘As soon as he grows whole of the wound of circumcision, they bring him to Baptism, and being placed in the water, they again instruct him in some weightier and in some lighter commands of the Law. Which being heard, he plunges himself and comes up, and behold, he is an Israelite in all things.’ (See Lightfoot, *l.c.*). To use Pauline language, his old man is dead and buried in the water, and he rises from this cleansing grave a new man. The full significance of the rite would have been lost had immersion not been practised. Again, it was required in proselyte baptism that ‘every person baptized must dip his whole body, now stripped and made naked, at one dipping. And wheresoever in the Law washing of the body or garments is mentioned, it means nothing else than the washing of the whole body.’ (c) That immersion was the mode of Baptism adopted by John is the natural conclusion from his choosing the neighbourhood of the Jordan as the scene of his labours; and from the statement of Joh 3:23 that he was baptizing in aenon ‘because there was much water there.’ (d) That this form was continued into the Christian Church appears from the expression λουτρὸν παλινγενεσίας (Tit 3:5), and from the use made by St. Paul in Romans 6 of the symbolism. This is well put by Bingham (*Antiq.* xi. 11): ‘The ancients thought that immersion, or burying under water, did more likely represent the death and burial and resurrection of Christ as well as our own death unto sin and rising again unto righteousness: and the divesting or unclathing the person to be baptized did also represent the putting off the body of sin in order to put on the new man, which is created in righteousness and true holiness. For which reason they observed the way of baptizing all persons naked and divested, by a total immersion under water, except in some particular cases of great exigence,

wherein they allow of sprinkling, as in the case of clinic Baptism, or where there is a scarcity of water.’ This statement exactly reflects the ideas of the Pauline Epistles and the *Didache*. This early document enjoins that Baptism be performed in running water; but if that is not to be had, then in other water: ‘And if thou canst not in cold, then in warm; but if thou hast neither, pour water thrice upon the head.’ Here it is obvious that affusion is to be practised only where immersion is inconvenient or impossible. The Eastern Church has in the main adhered to the primitive form. But in the Western Church the exigencies of climate and the alteration of manners have favoured affusion and sprinkling. Judging from the representations of the performance of the rite collected by Mr. C. F. Rogers (*Studia Bibl. et Eccles.* vol. v. pt. iv.),—whose collection is more valuable than his inferences,—it would seem that at an early period a common form of administration required that the baptized person should stand in some kind of bath or tub, naked or nearly so, while the baptizer poured water three times over him. This restricted form gradually gave place to the still more meagre sprinkling of the head. But theoretically the form of Baptism by immersion was retained alike in the Roman, the Anglican, and the Presbyterian Churches. Thus Aquinas (*Summa*, iii. lxvi. 7) determines: ‘si totum corpus aqua non possit perfundi propter aquae paucitatem, vel propter aliquam aliam causam, oportet caput perfundere, in quo manifestatur principium animalis vitae.’ The Anglican Church in her rubric for Baptism directs the ministrant to *dip* the child discreetly and warily, if the sponsors certify him that the child may well endure it; if not, ‘it shall suffice to pour water upon it.’ And the *Westminster Confession* guardedly says: ‘Dipping of the person into water is *not necessary*; but Baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person’ (cf. Calvin, *Inst.* iv. 15, 19). This form of Baptism by sprinkling gives prominence to the ‘pouring out’ of the Spirit (cf. Tit 3:6), but fails to indicate the dying to sin and rising to righteousness.

3. John’s Baptism of the people.—The message of the Baptist as herald of the Messiah was, ‘The kingdom of heaven is at hand.’ The imminence of the kingdom produced in the people a sense of their unpreparedness for its enjoyment. A new sense of sin was created within them, answering to the forerunner’s cry, ‘Repent ye: *for* the kingdom of heaven is at hand’ (Mat 3:2). The hunger for cleanness of conscience thus awakened within them was responded to by John’s Baptism of repentance ‘for (εἰς) remission of sins’ (Mar 1:4). True repentance cleanses the soul, and Baptism represented and sealed this inward cleansing. The reality of the repentance, as John insisted, would be determined by its fruits. Many writers (cf. Reynolds, *John the Baptist*, pp. 288-289; and Lambert, *The Sacraments*, p. 60) hold that the preposition εἰς denotes that the remission of sins was not actually bestowed, but only guaranteed in John’s Baptism. ‘John proclaimed, with the voice of thunder, the need of repentance as a condition of the remission of sins; his Baptism was the external

symbol of the frame of mind with which the penitent approached the great forerunner.' This seems, both exegetically and psychologically, untenable. The whole expression, 'Baptism of repentance for forgiveness of sins,' denotes a Baptism which the penitent submitted to that he might therein receive the pledge and assurance that he was forgiven. The Baptism meant the cleansing of the people from past sin that they might be fitted for entrance on the kingdom.

But John's Baptism had a forward look also. It was the formal incorporation of the individual into the new community, his initiation into the kingdom. It was therefore in a very true sense Christian Baptism. That is, it pledged the recipient to the acceptance of Christ,—a feature of it which perhaps accounts for the Baptist continuing to baptize after Jesus had been proclaimed the Christ. In the same act, then, John excommunicated the whole people, putting them in the position of Gentiles who required to be re-born in Baptism, and gave them entrance to the coming kingdom.

The propriety of Baptism as the symbol of such initiation is obvious, and finds illustration in the forms of initiation commonly used in various races. The ceremonies which mark, among rude tribes, the transition from boyhood to manhood, frequently take the form of a pretended death and resurrection (Frazer, *The Golden Bough*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , iii. 422 ff.). Among ourselves we have titles which preserve a memory of the old customs, though the customs themselves have died out. We still have 'Knights of the Bath.' Originally, the bath to purify from the past was first taken, and the novice then passed the night in a church with his armour beside him, as if he were dead, until in the morning he was raised to life by the touch of his sovereign, 'Rise, Sir M. or N.'

4. *John's Baptism of Jesus.*—When John began to baptize, Jesus was still an unknown artisan in Nazareth. But in this new movement He hears a call He cannot resist. He is conscious that He must attach Himself to it; possibly already conscious that He can guide, utilize, and prosper it. He appears, therefore, as a candidate for Baptism. But to the Baptist this presented a difficulty he had not foreseen: 'I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?' (Mat 3:14). Evidently what was in John's mind was not the initiatory, but the cleansing aspect of the rite. To this, therefore, the answer of Jesus must apply when He said, 'Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.' It would seem, therefore, that Jesus felt so keen a sympathy with His fellow-men that, as one with an unclean race, He judged Baptism to be appropriate. It is idle to tell the wife that she need not be ashamed though her husband is committed for fraud; idle to tell Jesus that He need not be baptized because He has no personal guilt. And it is to be noted that it is precisely at this point of truest union with men and of deepest humiliation that Jesus is recognized as King. It seems to

have Mashed upon John, 'Why, this is the very spirit of the Messiah. Here is the fulness of the Divine Spirit.'

The account given in the Fourth Gospel is different. The Baptist is there (Joh 1:33) represented as saying, 'I knew him not (which, as the context shows, means, 'I did not know that he was the Messiah'), but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and abiding on him, the same is he that baptizeth with the Holy Spirit.' In this Gospel there is no mention of an actual dove being seen. John merely affirms that he saw the Spirit descending 'like a dove' (ὡς περὶ στερῶν). He wishes to emphasize two things, that he saw the Spirit so clearly that it almost seemed a sensible presence, and that it was a Spirit of gentleness. Naturally, the Messianic Spirit might have been more appropriately symbolized by an eagle, but at the moment it was the overcoming humility and meekness of Jesus that convinced John that He was the Messiah.

The Baptism of Jesus thus became His anointing as King. Jesus becomes the Christ, the Anointed of God, not only nominated to the Messianic throne, but actually equipped with the fulness of the Divine Spirit. Here two points are to be noted: (1) Although Son of God, Jesus yet lived in human form and under human conditions, and therefore needed the indwelling of the Spirit. As His body was sustained by bread, as all human bodies are, so did His soul require the aids of the Divine Spirit, as all human souls do. ('Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is, God,' Mar 10:18). His human nature, by which He manifested God to men, was now endowed with the fulness of God's Spirit. (2) It was not a new thing that was conferred upon Jesus at His Baptism. From the first the Divine Spirit was His. But now, having reached the flower of manhood and being called to the greatest work, His human nature expands and girds itself to the most strenuous endeavour, and so gives scope to the fullest energy of the indwelling God.

5. *Baptism by the disciples of Jesus.*—Of Christian Baptism very little mention is made in the Gospels. That it was in use during the life of Jesus is apparent from the references to it in John 3, 4. These references are interesting as showing that Baptism by the disciples of Jesus existed alongside of Baptism by John. The Baptist himself apparently never renounced his position as forerunner nor merged himself in the kingdom. The re-baptism of those mentioned in Act 19:1-6, who had been baptized with John's Baptism, suggests the question whether all who had originally been baptized as disciples of John were re-baptized when they professed allegiance to Jesus. And although this can scarcely be considered likely, this case has been used as sanctioning re-baptism in certain circumstances. Calvin's answer is rather an evasion. He denies that the persons spoken of in Acts 19 were re-baptized. They only had the Apostle's hands laid upon them. The text no doubt says, 'They were baptized into the

name of the Lord Jesus; and when Paul had laid his hands upon them,' etc. But 'hac posteriori locutione describitur, qualis ille fuerit Baptismus.' That is possible, but barely. It is more likely that those concerned, troubled by no questions as to the legitimacy of the renewal of Baptism, and accustomed to the many lustrations then in use, were re-baptized and were conscious of no inconsistency. Apparently they had only seen one half, and that the less important half, of the significance of John's Baptism, its relation to repentance, and not its efficacy as the ordinance of initiation into the kingdom of Jesus. This defect was now supplied.

Baptism could scarcely have gained so universal a currency as the initiatory rite of the Christian Church had it not been instituted by Christ Himself. No other initial ordinance seems ever to have been suggested. Yet it is expressly said (Joh 4:2) that He Himself did not baptize; and it is doubted whether the explicit injunction of Mat 28:19 can be accepted as uttered by Jesus. Thus Harnack (*Hist. of Dogma*, i. 79 note) says: 'It cannot be directly proved that Jesus instituted Baptism, for Mat 28:19 is not a saying of the Lord. The reasons for this assertion are: (1) It is only a later stage of the tradition that represents the risen Christ as delivering speeches and giving commandments. Paul knows nothing of it. (2) The Trinitarian formula is foreign to the mouth of Jesus, and has not the authority in the Apostolic age which it must have had if it had descended from Jesus Himself.' (See the literature in Holtzmann's *NT Theol.* i. 379). That our Lord appeared to His disciples after the Resurrection and said nothing is inconceivable. Better deny the Resurrection altogether than think of a dumb, unsociable ghost floating before the eyes of the disciples. But the Trinitarian formula in the mouth of Jesus is certainly unexpected. For what may be said in its favour Lambert (*The Sacraments*, pp. 49-51) may be consulted. In any case the essential feature of Baptism was its marking the union of the soul to Christ, and therefore it sufficed to call it 'Baptism into the name of the Lord Jesus.' Further discussion of the genuineness of the ascription of these words to our Lord belongs rather to the Trinitarian than to the Baptismal problems.

Literature.—MacCulloch, *Comparative Theology*, 235; Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen*; Lightfoot, *Harae Hebraicæ*; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] § 31; Suicer, *Lexicon*, s.v.; Calvin, *Institutio*, iv. 15, 'de Baptismo'; Reynolds, *John the Baptist*; Feather, *John the Baptist*; Lambert, *The Sacraments in the New Testament*; Holtzmann's *NT Theol.* and the literature mentioned there, as above; Edersheim's *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*; C. F. Rogers, *Studia Bibl. et Eccles.* vol. v. pt. iv. 'Baptism and Christian Archaeology'; *Didaskaliae fragmenta Veronensia Latina* (Lips. 1900); A. C. McGiffert, *The Apostles' Creed*, 1902, p. 175; J. F. Bethune-Baker, *Early Hist. of Christian Doctrine*, 1905, p. 376.

Marcus Dods.

☒ Bar-Jona(H)

BAR-JONA(H).—See Peter.

☒ Barabbas

BARABBAS (Aramaic *Bar-Abba*, ‘son of Abba’ or ‘son of father.’ There is very slight documentary authority for the reading *Bar-Rabban*, ‘son of a Rabbi,’ which is adopted by Ewald and Renan. On the other hand, if *Bar-Abba* = ‘son of father,’ it would hardly differ in meaning from *Bar-Rabban*; for in the time of Jesus ‘Abba’ was a common appellation of honour given to a Rabbi. But after all ‘Abba’ may have been a proper name; for though it is sometimes affirmed [e.g. by Schmiedel in his article ‘Barabbas’ in *Encyc. Bibl.*] that it was not till after the time of our Lord that the word began to be used in this way, the authors of the corresponding article in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* assure us that ‘Abba is found as a *prænomen* as early as Tannaitic times’).

Only one Barabbas meets us in the Gospels, the criminal whom Pilate released instead of Jesus at the demand of the people. All the four Evangelists relate the incident (Mat 27:15-26, Mar 15:6-15, Luk 23:17-25, Joh 18:39-40), which is again referred to in Acts in the account of St. Peter’s sermon in the Temple portico (Act 3:14). From these narratives we gather that Barabbas was ‘a notable prisoner,’ ‘a robber,’ one who had taken part in ‘a certain insurrection made in the city,’ and who in this disturbance had ‘committed murder.’ It had probably been an old Jewish custom to release a prisoner at the Passover feast (Joh 18:39). According to the Roman habit in such matters, the procurators of Judaea had accommodated themselves to the Jewish practice. In his desire to save Jesus, Pilate bethought himself of this custom as offering a loophole of escape from the dilemma in which he found himself between his own sense of justice and his unwillingness to give offence to the multitude. So he offered them the choice between the life of Jesus and the life of Barabbas, probably never doubting that to Jesus the preference would be given. The fact that he seems to have expected this precludes the view which some have held that Barabbas was a pseudo-Messiah, and even the notion that he was no vulgar bandit, but the leader of a party of Zealots, since popular sympathy might have been anticipated on behalf of a bold Zealot or insurrectionary Messiah. The probability accordingly is that Barabbas was simply a criminal of the lowest type, a hater of the Romans it may be, but at the same time a pest to society at large. And unless we are to suppose, on the ground of the possible etymology, ‘son of father’ = ‘son of teacher,’ and the ‘*filius magistri*

eorum' which Jerome quotes from the account of the incident in the *Gospel of the Hebrews*, that he was popular among the people because he was the son of a Rabbi, we have no reason to think that either the Jewish leaders or the multitude had any ground for preferring him to Jesus except their passionate hatred of the latter.

According to an old reading of Mat 27:16-17, the name 'Jesus' in both verses is prefixed to Barabbas, so that Pilate's question runs, 'Whom will ye that I release unto you? Jesus Barabbas, or Jesus which is called Christ?' If this reading were accepted, *Barabbas* would not have the force of a proper name (like *Bartimaeus*), but would be only a patronymic added for the sake of distinction (cf. 'Simon *Bar-jona*'). In his exposition of the passage, Origen refers to this reading, which is favoured by some cursive MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] and by the Armenian and Jerusalem Syriac Versions, and has been defended by Ewald, Lange, Meyer, and others, who have supposed that the accidental similarity of the name may have helped to suggest to Pilate the alternative which he presented to the Jews. Olshausen not only adopts this view, but finds a mournful significance in both of the (supposed) names of the condemned criminal—'Jesus' and 'son of the father,' and in the fact that the nation preferred this caricature of Jesus to the heavenly reality. Both dramatically and homiletically, no doubt, these ideas are tempting—the meeting of the two Jesuses, the irony of the popular choice, the sense of a Divine 'lusus' in human affairs. But the truth remains that the grounds on which this construction rests are very inadequate. There is ingenuity certainly in the suggestion, first made by Origen (who, however, prefers the ordinary reading), that 'Jesus' may have been dropped out of the early MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] of Matthew after the name had become a sacred one, because it appeared unseemly that it should be borne by a murderer; but it is of too hypothetical a kind to counterbalance the immense weight of the documentary evidence against the presence of the name 'Jesus' at all. The fact that, even in the scanty MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] and vSS [Note: SS Versions.] in which 'Jesus Barabbas' is found in Mat 27:16-17, 'Barabbas' and 'Jesus' are set in direct antithesis in Mat 27:20 tells strongly against the reading, as well as the circumstance that no trace of it is found in any MS of the other three Gospels. There is much to be said for the suggestion of Tregelles, by way of explaining the appearance of the 'Jesus' in some copies of Matthew, that at a very early date a careless transcriber repeated the last two letters of ἰησοῦν (Mat 27:17), and that the in was afterwards taken to be the familiar abbreviation of Ἰησοῦν.

Literature.—The Commentaries of Meyer, Alford, and Olshausen; Ewald, *History of Israel*, vol. vi.; Lange's and Renan's *Life of Christ*; art. 'Barabbas' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, *Encyc. Bibl.*, and *Jewish Encycl.*; Merkel, 'Die Begnadigung

am Passahfeste' in *ZNTW* [Note: *NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissen. schaft.*] , 1905, p. 293 ff.

J. C. Lambert.

⚠️ Barachiah

BARACHIAH.—Mat 23:35 (om. ⋈* and; 4 cursives), Luk 11:51 (ins. DSC and 2 cursives).

The name occurs in Mt. in a passage, recorded in substantial agreement by Mt. and Lk., in which the Lord declares that the blood of all the prophets (Lk.) or all the righteous blood (Mt.) will be sought from or come upon that generation, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zachariah. In 2Ch 24:20 ff. is an account of the stoning of Zechariah the son of Jehoiada (LXX Septuagint B has 'Azariah' for 'Zechariah,' but Lagarde prints 'Zechariah') in the court of the house of the Lord. This incident is repeatedly referred to in the later Jewish literature. In the Babylonian Talmud (*Sanh. 96b; Gittin, 57b*), in the Jerusalem Talmud (*Taanith, 69a*), and in the Midrashim (e.g. *Echa Rabbati*, Introd. טו ii. 2; *Koheleth* iii. 16; *Pesikta Rab. Kahana* xv.) it is recorded that Nebuzaradan slew many Jews in order to quiet 'the blood of Zechariah, who is called a prophet' (*Sanh. 96b; Midr. Echa R., Koheleth*) with reference to 2Ch 24:19. It seems natural, therefore, to suppose that the Zachariah of the Gospels is the Zechariah of 2 Chronicles. Abel's was the first murder of a righteous man recorded in the OT, Zechariah's the last (2 Chron. is the last book of the Hebrew Canon). Abel's blood cried from the ground (Gen 4:10). Zechariah when dying said, 'The Lord look upon it and require it' (2Ch 24:22).

But how are we to account for Mt.'s 'son of Barachiah,' when we should expect 'son of Jehoiada'? In Isa 8:2 we read of Zechariah 'son of Jeberechiah' (the LXX Septuagint has υἱὸν βαραχίου), in Zec 1:1 of Zechariah the son of Berechiah the son of Iddo (LXX Septuagint , τὸν τοῦ Βαραχίου υἱὸν Ἰδδώ). The later Jewish tradition identified the two. So the Babylonian Talmud (*Makkoth, 24b*; cf. *Pesikta Rab. Kahana* xv., Targum of Lam 3:20, Rashi on Isa 8:2). Further, there seems to have been a tendency to identify Zechariah son of Berechiah son of Iddo with Zechariah son of Jehoiada, for the Targum of Lam 3:20 calls the Zechariah of Chronicles 'son of Iddo.' We might therefore suppose that Christ spoke of Zachariah, who was really son of Jehoiada, as son of Barachiah, because the Jewish tradition of His age identified or confused the priest and the prophet; cf. the 'priest and prophet' applied to Zechariah son of Jehoiada in *Sanh. 97b*. In this case the omission of υἱοῦ Βαραχίου from Mat 23:35 in

⚡* would be due to someone who wondered at the 'Barachiah' instead of 'Jehoiada.' Or the 'son of Barachiah' might be an insertion on the part of the editor of the Gospel, either on the ground of Jewish tradition, or in remembrance of the two LXX Septuagint passages, Isa 8:2, Zec 1:1. The fact that this editor elsewhere employs LXX Septuagint forms of proper names, as in Ἀσάφ, Ἀμώς (zec 1:8, 10), is in favour of the latter. Or 'son of Barachiah' may be a later insertion in the Gospel (so Merx). The insertion of the clause in Western texts in Lk. is due to assimilation to the text of Matthew.

The difficulty of the appearance of 'Barachiah' in Mt. has led to other and less probable identifications. Origen (de la Rue, iv. 845) supposed that Zacharias the father of John the Baptist was referred to, and quotes a tradition that this Zacharias was murdered in the temple. Cf. the *Protev. Jacobi*, 23, 24, which has a different account of the cause of the murder. Others refer to Josephus *BJ* iv. v. 4, where it is recorded that shortly before the last siege of Jerusalem one Zacharias the son of Baruch or Bariscaeus was murdered in the temple by the Zealots. It is therefore argued that the Evangelist has either blundered by writing 'of Barachiah' in reminiscence of this event, when he should have written 'of Jehoiada,' or that he is responsible for the whole of the clause in which this phrase occurs, and has put into Christ's mouth an anachronistic statement. But, apart from the difference between the βαραχίου of the Gospels and the Βαρούχου or Βάρεις- or Βαρισχαίου of Josephus, the reference to 2 Chron. seems to satisfy the data better. The reckoning from Abel to Zechariah is Jewish in character, the 'of Barachiah' may be due to Jewish tradition, and the 'between the temple and the altar' is perhaps also due to current Jewish speculation or tradition. In the Jerusalem Talmud (*Taanith* 69a) the question is raised where Zechariah was killed, with the answer that it was in the court of the priests (cf. also the same tradition in *Midr. Koheleth* iii. 16, *Pesikta R. Kahana* xv., *Echa, Rabbati*, Introd. ט).

Literature.—Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ*; Merx. *Die vier Evangelien*; Wellhausen and Zahn in their commentaries on Matthew.

W. C. Allen.

☞ Barley

BARLEY.—In the Gospels, barley is mentioned only in the account given by St. John (Joh 6:5-14) of the miraculous feeding of the five thousand with five barley loaves

and two fishes. The word occurs twice (Joh 6:9; Joh 6:13), and in both cases represents the adjectival form *κριθινος* in the original. The noun *κριθή* (in ordinary Gr. usage almost invariably in the plur. *κριθαι*), which is employed in the LXX Septuagint to render the Heb. שֶׁבֶרֶת, occurs only once in NT (Rev 6:6). Barley was one of the most important of Biblical food-products. According to the elder Pliny (*HN* xviii. 72), it was the most ancient nutriment of mankind. It certainly dates back to a very remote antiquity. It was cultivated by the Canaanites prior to the time of the Hebrew conquest (Deu 8:8), and by the ancient Egyptians, as appears from Exo 9:31 and from the representations on the oldest Egyptian monuments. Among the Jews it was used for making bread (Eze 4:9), and it seems to have been the principal food of the poorer classes (Rth 2:17; Rth 3:15, 1Ki 4:22, Joh 6:9). This is confirmed by Jdg 7:13, where a cake of barley-bread is the symbol of an army of peasants, and is also in accordance with modern usage. Thus Dr. Thomson says: ‘*Barley bread is only eaten by the poor and the unfortunate. Nothing is more common than for these people, at this day, to complain that their oppressors have left them nothing but barley bread to eat*’ (*Land and Book* [1878 ed.], p. 449). He also mentions that the Bedawin often ridicule their enemies by calling them ‘eaters of barley bread’ (*l.c.*). Barley was also grown as a forage crop. Its employment as provender for horses is mentioned in 1Ki 4:28, and the chopped straw from the threshing-floor was likewise used as fodder. This practice continues to the present day, oats and hay being unknown.

In Palestine the normal time for sowing barley is about the beginning of October: when the winter is exceptionally cold and wet, sowing takes place early in February. In the Jordan Valley, the harvest begins in April, but it varies according to the elevation of the different regions. At the highest altitudes the crop is not ripe till July or even August.

Hugh Duncan.

Barn

BARN.—The same word (*ἀποθήκη*) is rendered ‘barn’ in Mat 6:26; Mat 13:30, Luk 12:18; Luk 12:24, and ‘garner’ in Mat 3:12, Luk 3:17. In Graeco-Roman times, buildings above ground were probably in use. *καθαίρειω*, ‘to pull down’ (Luk 12:18) could apply only to such. But from ancient times until now Palestinian farmers have stored their grain in cistern-like pits. These are dug in dry places, often out of the solid rock, carefully cemented to keep out damp, with a circular opening at the top,

through which a man may pass. When the mouth is plastered over and made air-tight, the corn will keep sound for several years. For security in a lawless country, the 'barn' is sometimes under the floor of the inmost part of the house, that of the women (cf. 2Sa 4:6). To escape the tax-gatherer, again, it is frequently made in a secluded spot, and so skilfully turfed over that discovery is almost impossible (cf. Jer 41:8). Pits found near ruined sites, in districts that have lain desolate for ages, prove the antiquity of this method. Natural caves in the limestone rock, improved by art, with heavy stone doors blocking the entrance, have also served as 'barns,' and may be seen in use at Gadara to-day.

W. Ewing.

⚡ Bartholomew

BARTHOLOMEW (Βαρθολομαῖος) appears as an apostle in all four lists of the Twelve (Mat 10:3, Mar 3:18, Luk 6:14, Act 1:13), always in the second of the three groups of four. In the Gospels he comes next after Philip (who in all four lists heads the second quaternion), and is followed by Matthew and Thomas: in Acts the order is 'Philip and Thomas, Bartholomew and Matthew.' The name, as the first syllable indicates, is a patronymic, and it is commonly interpreted 'son of Talmai.' In the LXX Septuagint Talmai has many variants (Θολμί, Θολμει, Θαλαμει, Θολομει, Θολμαιλημ): and in Josephus (*Ant.* XX. i. 1) we have a bandit chief named Θολομαῖος. It is often assumed that 'Talmai' represents 'Ptolemy,' and that Bartholomew means 'son of Ptolemy'; but the Θ is against this. Edersheim (*Messiah*, i. p. 521) makes it mean 'son of Telamyon.' Bartholomew may be either a genuine patronymic used in addition to a proper name, like Simon Bar-jona; or it may have become an independent proper name, like Barnabas. If the apostle Bartholomew had no other name, we know nothing about him from Scripture, and the later traditions about him are very untrustworthy (Lipsius, *Apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden*, iii. pp. 54-108). These traditions begin with Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* v. x. 3), and ascribe to him widely different fields of missionary labour, with different apostles as his companions, and different forms of martyrdom. He is often made to be one of the Seventy.* [Note: On the possibility that there was another Bartholomew, identical with the apostle Matthias, among the Seventy, see note by Dr. Nestle in *Expos. Times*, ix. [1898] p. 566 f.]

But both by the early Church and by most modern writers Bartholomew is commonly identified with Nathanael. To treat this as almost certain (Schaff-Herzog) is to go

beyond the evidence; to call it ‘the merest conjecture’ (*Encyc. Bibl.*) is to err in the opposite direction.

In favour of the identification are the following points. (1) Bartholomew being a patronymic, the bearer may easily have had another name; (2) the Synoptists never mention Nathanael, St. John never mentions Bartholomew; (3) the Synoptists in their lists place Bartholomew next to Philip, as James next to his probable caller John, and Peter (in Mt. and Lk.) next to his caller Andrew; (4) all the other disciples mentioned in Joh 1:38-51 became apostles, and none of them is so commended as Nathanael; (5) all the companions of Nathanael who are named in Joh 21:2 are apostles. But all these reasons do not make the identification more than probable. St. John nowhere calls Nathanael an apostle, and we are not obliged to find room for him among the Twelve. The conjecture that he is Matthew or Matthias (Hilgenfeld) is supported by no reasonable evidence; and that he is John himself under a symbolical name (Späth) is contradicted by Joh 21:2, where the sons of Zebedee are mentioned in addition to Nathanael.

On the other hand, there is nothing against the identification: it creates no difficulty. To say that a Galilaeen would have remembered Isa 9:1, and therefore would not have asked whether any good could come out of Nazareth, is unsound criticism. A person with Isa 9:1 in his mind, and convinced that rich blessings would come from Galilee, might nevertheless think that Nazareth was not a likely place to be the dwelling-place of the Messiah. And who can tell whether a particular Galilaeen would or would not remember a particular text?

Literature.—In addition to the works cited above, reference may be made to artt. ‘Bartholomew’ and ‘Nathanael’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible ; and to Garrett Horder, *The Poet’s Bible*, NT, p. 102 ff.

A. Plummer.

☩ Bartimaeus

BARTIMAEUS (Βαρτιμαίος).—Named only in Mar 10:46-52, where he is described as a blind beggar who was cured by Jesus as He left Jericho on His last journey to Jerusalem. But there can be little doubt that we have also accounts of the same miracle in the closely parallel narratives Mat 20:29-34, Luk 18:35-43. There are, however, various divergences between the three narratives which have caused difficulty. Thus St. Matthew, while agreeing with St. Mark that the miracle took place on the Lord’s *departure from Jericho*, speaks of *two* blind men as having been

healed; but St. Luke, reverting to the mention of a *single* sufferer, says his cure took place as the Lord *drew nigh* to the city. And again, while St. Mark is content to describe the healing as the result of a word of comfort, 'Go thy way, thy faith hath made thee whole,' St. Matthew tells us that it was effected by a touch, 'Jesus ... touched their eyes'; and St. Luke assigns it to a direct command, 'Receive thy sight.' The divergences, no doubt, are very considerable, and have taxed the ingenuity of the harmonists both in ancient and modern times. Thus it has been supposed that St. Matthew combines the cure of one blind man at the entrance into Jericho (so St. Luke) with the cure of another at the departure from Jericho (so St. Mark), or that Bartimaeus, begging at the gate, became aware of Jesus' entrance into the city, and, seeking out a blind companion, along with him intercepted the Saviour the next day as He was leaving Jericho, and was then healed. But it cannot be said that any such explanations are very satisfactory. And it is better simply to content ourselves with noting the divergences between the three accounts as an additional proof of the independence of the Evangelists in matters of detail, without, however, abandoning our belief in the general trustworthiness of their narratives. There are few miracles, indeed, in the Gospel story better vouched for than the one before us, authenticated as it is by the triple Synoptic tradition and by the preciseness of the details, while the very mention of the name of the healed man has been regarded as a proof that he must still have been known in the time of the Apostles ('valde notus Apostolorum tempore Bartimaeus,' Bengel).

It has been conjectured, indeed, that *Bartimaeus* is not really a proper name, but a designation derived from an Aramaic root *samyā*, 'blind,' so that 'Bartimaeus the son of Timaeus' might mean no more than 'the blind son of a blind father' (see Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* on Mar 10:46; and for the various derivations that have been proposed, Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, English translation v. p. 61 f.). But the word, as St. Mark interprets it for us, is clearly a patronymic (cf. Βαρθολομαῖος), and the defining clause ὁ υἱὸς Τιμαίου is quite in the style of the Second Evangelist, though it is placed before the patronymic and not after it as usually (cf., however, v. 48; and see Swete, *St. Mark*, p. 228).

It is unnecessary to recall further the details of the Gospel narrative; but, from whatever point of view we regard it, it is full of instruction. Thus, in the case of Bartimaeus himself, we have a notable instance of a *determination* that resolved to let no opportunity of being healed escape it; of a *perseverance* that continued its efforts notwithstanding the difficulties placed in its path; of an *eagerness* that cast off all that hindered its free approach; of a *faith* that recognized in Jesus the Divinely-appointed Messiah ('Thou Son of David') before and not after the cure; and of a *thankfulness* that showed itself in ready obedience and triumphant praise when the cure was complete ('followed him, glorifying God'). And if thus the narrative has

much to tell us regarding Bartimaeus, no less does it throw a vivid light on the character of our Lord Himself, when we remember the *sympathy* with which, notwithstanding His own approaching sufferings, He regarded the beggar's cry; the *readiness* with which He placed Himself at his disposal ('What wilt thou ...?'); and the saving *power* with which He bestowed on the sufferer even more than he asked.

Literature.—In addition to the relative sections in the well-known works on our Lord's *Miracles* by Trench, Laidlaw, and W. M. Taylor, see, for the above and other homiletic details, S. Cox, *Biblical Expositions*, pp. 155-167, and *The Miracles of Jesus* by Various Authors (J. Robinson, Manchester). We may refer also to Longfellow's poem 'Blind Bartimaeus.'

George Milligan.

☞ Basket

BASKET.—All four Evangelists, in narrating the miracle of the feeding of the *five* thousand, describe the baskets in which the fragments were placed as κόφινοι (Mat 14:20 = Mar 6:43 = Luk 9:17 = Joh 6:13); while the two who report the other miracle of feeding the *four* thousand, state that the fragments were placed in σπυριδεςς (Mat 15:37 = Mar 8:8). It is clear from Mat 16:9 f. (= Mar 8:19 f.) that the variation is intentional. The baskets used on the one occasion differed either in size, shape, or material from those used on the other (cf. (Revised Version margin) in Mat 16:9 f. and Mar 8:19 f.). Our Lord preserved the distinction, and our present Gospels have also done so.

'Basket' occurs in the Authorized and Revised Versions Gospels in the above passages only. The older English versions use the confusing rendering of 'baskets' for both words, except that Wyclif has 'coffyns' and 'leepis.' By 'coffyn' he evidently meant a small basket. Rheims renders σπυριδων, 'maundes,' *i.e.* hand-baskets. Davidson (*NT*, 1875) at Mar 8:19-20 has 'basketfuls' for κοφίνους and 'walletsful' for σπυριδων, as if he had found τηρῶν.

The authors of such renderings as the above forgot that St. Paul (Act 9:25) made his escape in a σπυρις. This fact at once excludes wallets or hand-baskets. If the distinction was one of size at all, which is not certain, we should perhaps have to

assume that the σπυρίς was the larger. Bevan (Smith's *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] 1 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] i. 172) says that the κόφινος was the larger, quoting *Etym. Mag.*, βαθὺ καὶ κοῖλον χώρημα, and the use of *cophinus* in Latin, e.g. Colum. xi. 3, p. 460, as containing manure enough to make a hotbed. Greswell (*Diss.* viii. pt. 4, vol. ii.) thought that the *cophinus* was big enough to sleep in. He probably misunderstood the passage in Juvenal quoted below; for though the hay may have been used as a bed, it is *not* said that it was *in* the *cophinus*. Nor is it clear that the Latin *cophinus* and the Greek κόφινος were at all times identical in meaning (so the French *balle* is not a cannon-ball but a musket *bullet*, while our cannon-ball is a *boulet*). Let us examine the two words more closely.

(1) κόφινος is said to be derived from κόττω; but this appears to be more than doubtful, and the grammarians considered it less Attic than ἄρριχτο, which was clearly a wicker or flag basket. In the Gr. OT it is used by LXX Septuagint and Symm. [Note: Symmachus.] for Heb. *dud* in Psalms 80 [81]:6, and by Symm. [Note: Symmachus.] only in Jer 24:1-2 (where LXX Septuagint has κάλαθος), and for *sal* by Aq. [Note: Aquila.] in Gen 40:16 (where LXX Septuagint has κανᾶ). Certainly in the two latter passages a *small* basket, carried in the hand, or on the head, would suit the contexts. Suidas defines κ. as ἀγγεῖον τελεκτόν. In *CI/G* [Note: IG Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum.] 1625, lines 44-46, it is clearly a corn-basket of a recognized size; cf. also *CI/G* [Note: IG Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum.] 2347 κ. In Xen. *Anab.* iii. 8. 6 it occurs as a dung-basket (see the Latin *cophinus* in Columella, as cited above). It is said that the Jews at Rome carried *cophini* about with them to avoid the chance of food contracting any Levitical pollution in heathen places. The reason given appears fanciful, and anyhow would hardly apply to the journeys of our Lord and His apostles. But the fact is vouched for by Juvenal (*Sat.* iii. 14: 'Judaeis, quorum *cophinus* foenumque supellex'; vi. 542: '*Cophino* foenoque relicto | Arcanam Judaea tremens mendicat in aurem') and Martial (*Epig.* v. 7).

(2) σπυρίς (or σφυρίς, as WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] prefer) is not found in the LXX Septuagint. It is generally connected with στειῖρα = *anything twisted* (Vulgate *sporta*, of which the diminutives *sportella* and *sportula* occur, as small fruit or provision-baskets). Hesychius explains σπυρίς as τὸ τῶν τυρῶν ἄγγος, as though from πυρός; cf. δεῖτνον ἀπὸ σπυρίδος (Athenaeus, viii. 17). Hence Greswell thought

that before Pentecost, the season of wheat harvest, when the *second* miracle took place, the disciples were able to use corn-baskets, while the first miracle happening before Passover time, they used another kind of basket! Besides the improbability of this, we may note that there is no proof that in either case the baskets belonged to or were carried about by the disciples, for they may have been borrowed when needed. Yet Trench (*Miracles*, p. 380 note 2) inquires why the apostles should have been provided with either kind, and mentions (a) that perhaps they carried their provisions with them while travelling through a polluted land, such as Samaria (yet cf. Joh 4:8; Joh 4:31; Joh 4:40, Luk 9:52); and (b) he also mentions Greswell's theory, that the disciples carried these baskets in order to sleep in them *sub dio*. This all comes from applying to the Twelve in the Holy Land what Roman satirists said about Jewish beggars at Rome.

As στυρίς in Act 9:25 = σαργάνη in 2Co 11:33, and as the Vulgate has *sporta* in both places (and also in the Gospels for στυρίς but not for κόφινος;), we are led to inquire as to the force of σαργάνη. It is used of anything twisted like a rope, or woven of rope (aesch. *Suppl.* 791—πλέγμα τι ἐκ σχοινίων Suid.). Fish-baskets were specially so made (ἀπὸ σχοιναίων πλεγμάτων εἰς ὑποδοχὴν ἰχθύων, *Etym. Mag.*), as rush-baskets are used in London.

Meyer considered the difference between στυρίς and κόφινος to lie not in size, but in κόφινος being a general term, and στυρίς specially a food-basket. Perhaps the true force of the words we have discussed is to be discovered in the use made of them by Greek-speaking working people at the present day. The writer of this article has therefore consulted a Greek priest, the Rev. H. A. Teknopoulos. In his reply he says: 'In Asia Minor and in Constantinople our porters call κόφινος that big and deep basket in which they carry different things. Στυρίς is a smaller and round and shallow basket. Σαργάνη is a long bag, knitted by (*i.e.* of) rope, which is in one way very like the δίπτυον of fish, but is different from it in other way(s).'

One might ask whether the στυρίς of Act 9:25 is not an error of memory on the part of St. Luke. St. Paul in his own account of his escape would surely use the right word. If so, the supposed need for a στυρίς being big enough to hold a person disappears, and we may accept the decision of those who consider it the smaller of the two kinds mentioned in the Gospels.

⚠️Bason

BASON* [Note: In the appendix to Revised OT of ‘Readings and Renderings preferred by the American Revisers,’ § viii., we read: ‘The modern spelling is preferred for the following words: “basin” for “bason,” ’ etc., but no such note appears in the appendix to Revised NT.] (νιπτῆρ only in Joh 13:5 εἶτα βάλλει ὕδωρ εἰς τὸν νιπτῆρα: Vulgate *deinde mittit aquam in pelvim*: Authorized Version ‘after that he poureth water into a bason’: Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘then he poureth water into the bason’).

The Gr. νιπτῆρ is not found elsewhere in NT, nor in LXX Septuagint, nor in Gr. profane literature (except in Eccl. writers dealing with this passage). Hence Liddell and Scott, s.v., refer only to this instance. The Vulgate *pelvis*, though found in Juvenal, etc., occurs in the Bible only in Jer 52:19.

The general sense of νιπτῆρ is, of course, plain, both from the context and from the cognate verbs νίπτειν and νίξειν both in the Bible and in profane Greek. (The former is the Biblical form, 17 times in NT, including our passage (8 times), and 25 times in LXX Septuagint). It is usually ‘to wash a part of the body’—e.g. the *face*, Mat 6:17; the *hands*, Mat 15:2 = Mar 7:5; the *feet*, 1Ti 5:10,—so Exo 30:18-19 etc. Joh 9:7; Joh 9:11; Joh 9:15 seem to be exceptions, because the washing was in the Pool of Siloam; but here it is only the *eyes* that are concerned, and therefore we need not assume that the man ‘bathed.’ A real exception is Lev 15:12, where the wooden vessel νιφῆσεται; but note contrasted use of νίπτειν, πλύνειν, and λουεσθαι in Lev 15:11.

The noun νιπτῆρ therefore denotes an article (not necessarily a vessel) specially suitable or intended for use in washing *part* of the body. We note the article τὸν νιπτῆρα, neglected by Authorized Version (*a* bason) but noticed by Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 (*the* bason). Was it the ordinary νιπτῆρ of the house? In that case the use of the article is like that in τὸν μόδιον, τὴν λυχνίαν in Mat 5:15 etc. Or was it a vessel set apart for ceremonial ablution, such as would be required by the religious feast in which they were engaged?

But, in spite of the Vulgate and modern versions, it is doubtful if the word 'bason' conveys to us a good idea of the article and of the scene.

The Eastern mode of washing either hands or feet, when performed by an attendant, seems to have been always by the attendant pouring water on the member, *not* by dipping the member in the water. Cf. 2Ki 3:11 'Elisha the son of Shaphat, which poured water on the hands of Elijah.' Kitto's note in *Pictorial Bible*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , ii. 330, with two illustrations, is convincing on this point.

'The Hebrews were accustomed to wash their hands in the manner which is now universal in the East, and which, whatever may be thought of its convenience, is unquestionably more refreshing and cleanly than washing in the water as it stands in a basin—which is a process regarded by Orientals with great disgust. The hands are therefore held over a basin, the use of which is only to receive the water which has been poured upon the hands from the jug or ewer which is held above them. This cannot very conveniently be managed without the aid of a servant or some other person.'

Of course, this extract refers only to the washing of hands.

(1) The incident of the sinful woman who wept over our Lord's feet, and wiped them with the hairs of her head (Luk 7:37-38), is much better explained by comparing her action with that of the host or his servant *pouring* water on a guest's feet, than by supposing that the guest immersed his feet in a footbath (Luk 7:44). (2) It is true that *ποδαμπτήρ* is found in Pollux, *Onom.* x. 78, but here a definition of the *μπτήρ* is contained in the word. 'Basins' are such common articles, that if St. John had meant to name one he need not have used an unique word. (3) The position of the Apostles and of the guests at the feast of Luke 7 was a reclining one. This would not be compatible with the use of a basin or footbath in the ordinary sense of even partially immersing the foot. (4) Dr. A. R. S. Kennedy (art. 'Bath, Bathing' in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible* i. 257^b) shows that 'affusion, pouring on' of water, was probably meant in many cases where we read 'bathe' or 'wash.'

We therefore think that the *μπτήρ* was a jug or ewer, with a dish, sancer or basin, under it to catch the drippings, but that the stress of the word is *not* on this under-basin. We also think that it was kept chiefly in the house, and used for the many 'hand-washings' which the Jews practised (Mat 15:2, Mar 7:3 etc.), but also for any ceremonial ablution. Hence it was ready in the upper room, as part of the

preparation made by the 'goodman of the house' (Mar_14:15, Luk_22:12), and therefore is distinguished by the article.

It may be asked whether the feet-washing in John 13 was ceremonial. As we understand the matter, the Galilaeen disciples, either because they had never adopted the Pharisaic strictness about 'washings' or (less probably) because our Lord had condemned them, were not in the habit of observing them (Mat_15:2, Mar_7:1-4). Our Lord defended His followers (Mar_7:5-23, Mat_15:3-20), in the upper room they found all things ready for the observance. Whether they did observe it before a meal which was not an ordinary one, we do not know. But there was another observance, not of ceremony but of courtesy and comfort (Luk_7:44), in which each might have acted as host or as servant to the other if the spirit of love had ruled in their hearts. Christ would teach them this lesson (Joh_13:12; Joh_13:16). Incidentally He taught them other lessons, which they could not fully understand at the time, about the cleansing of the soul, daily defilement, and the duty of preparation before receiving the Eucharist. In this Christian sense the feet-washing *was* ceremonial, or rather typical, but it was *not* a recognition of any validity in the 'traditions of the elders.' The main lessons for the time were those of humility, self-abasement, and love. Our Lord used the $\nu\lambda\pi\tau\eta\theta$ standing by to teach these.

Kitto (*Pictorial Bible*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , ii. 331) says: 'In the East, the basin, which, as well as the ewer, is usually of tinned copper, has commonly a sort of cover, rising in the middle, and sunk into the basin at the margin, which, being pierced with holes, allows the water to pass through, thus concealing it after being defiled by use. The ewer has a long spout, and a long narrow neck, with a cover, and is altogether not unlike our coffee-pots in general appearance: it is *the same which the Orientals use in all their ablutions.*'

We notice that the assistance of a servant or of a friend is necessary. This is sometimes mentioned, e.g. 1Ti_5:10, 1Sa_25:41, and is probably implied in Gen_18:4; Gen_19:2; Gen_24:32 etc. But in the cases where the English versions suggest nothing of the kind, the Heb. is the Kal of קַיִן as in 1Sa_25:41 (cf. Dr. Kennedy's article cited above).

Lane's account (*Modern Egyptians*, ch. 5) is similar: 'A servant brings him a basin and ewer (called *tisht* and *ibreek*) of tinned copper or brass. The former of these has a cover pierced with holes, with a raised receptacle for the soap in the middle; and the water being poured upon the hands, passes through this cover into the space below, so that when the basin is brought to a second person the water with which the former one has washed is not seen.'

Our conclusion therefore is that the *νιπτήρ* was most probably not a ‘large basin,’ but the set of ewer and basin combined, kept in every Jewish house for the purpose of cleansing either the hands or the feet by means of affusion.

Dr. Anton Tien,* [Note: Oriental Secretary to Lord Reglan during the Crimean War, translator of the Turkish Prayer-Book, and reviser of the Arabic Prayer-Book, author of Turkish, Arabic, and Modern Greek Grammars.] in a full communication to the writer of this article, which we abridge, says *tesht* is the most correct rendering of *νιπτήρ*. The Bible Society’s Arabic NT has *maghsal*, a noun of time and place = ‘washing’ and ‘a place for washing,’ not a correct rendering. The SPCK version has *mathar* (cf. Heb. *טהר*) = ‘purification,’ ‘place *or* time of purification,’ also an incorrect rendering. The word *tesht* is the exact rendering of the Gr. word *νιπτήρ*. It comes from a root = ‘to pour *or* rain slightly.’

The *tesht* and *ibreeq* are made of either metal or earthenware, with a strainer of the same material placed inside the *tesht* (or basin), never outside or under, and in the middle of the strainer there is a small raised place for the soap. The *ibreeq* (Syrian and Egyptian Arabic) is a water-jug, with a spout for the water to come through like a coffee-pot, from which the water is poured on the hands or feet, which are held over the basin. They are to be found in every Eastern house, especially in Mohammedan houses; they are used continually in the mornings. There are no washstands in the houses. The servant holds the *tesht* on the palm of his left hand and the *ibreeq* in his right hand, and a clean towel placed on his left shoulder for each person (Joh_13:4), who washes his face and hands, taking the towel from off the servant’s shoulder. The towel is thrown down, and the servant puts a fresh one for the next person to use.

George Farmer.

☞ Bath Kol

BATH KOL.—See Voice.

☞ Bath, Bathing

BATH, BATHING.—The immersing or washing of the whole person may be a matter of cleanliness, or of luxury, or of religious observance, or of health.

(1) Cleanliness *per se* may be set aside. It is possible to be cleanly with less elaborate apparatus; and the majority in OT (or even NT) times would have ‘neither privacy nor inclination’ for bathing. (2) Luxury in the classical world (diffused even among the people, under Roman influence, at least subsequently to NT times) included plunge-baths and much besides. When Greek culture tried to invade Judaea under Antiochus Epiphanes (*circa (about)* 168 b.c.), it doubtless brought Greek bathing establishments with it. And when Western culture came in resistlessly under Herod (b.c. 40-4), it must have introduced the practice in many places; cf. an anecdote of Gamaliel ii. in Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii. i. 18, 53. (3) Religious observance, under OT law, according to Professor Kennedy (art. ‘Bath, Bathing’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible i. 257^b), required a partial washing, or a washing *with* water rather than bathing. ‘The Heb. of the OT does not distinguish’ between bathing and a partial washing. ‘Both are expressed by בָּטַח.’ However, Schürer insists that Talmudic usage codifies the custom which had long been in vogue; and Kennedy grants that ‘the bath became,’ even ‘for the laity ... an all-important factor in the religious life.’ Nay, proselyte baptism must be earlier than the NT, and it requires a bath, *těbîlâh* (*tâbal* is used in one unambiguous OT passage, the miracle of Naaman’s cleansing, 2Ki 5:14). We hear also of daily bathing among the Essenes (Josephus *BJ* ii. viii. 5). And, finally, John’s baptism was by immersion (as was that also of the early Christian Church, Act 8:38, Rom 6:3-4). (4) The use of mineral baths for health’s sake is always popular. There are remains of such baths near Tiberias; those at Gadara and at Callirrhoë were very celebrated in ancient times. Joh 5:2-7 gives us an example of such bathing, though Christ’s miracle dispensed with the waters of Bethesda. In another passage (Joh 9:7) we have a partial washing (at the Pool of Siloam) as a stage towards completion of a miracle.

Thus bathing was well enough known in NT times. Our Lord’s language in Joh 13:10 turns on the distinction between *bathing* (the whole person) and *washing* (the feet). Quite conceivably a Christian sacrament might have grown out of this incident. Nothing is more impressive at Oberammergan than the threefold journey of the Christus round the company—so it is represented—ministering to the disciples (1) the feet-washing, (2) the bread, (3) the cup. See, further, artt. Bason, Purification.

Robert Mackintosh.

Beach

BEACH.—The Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 translation of *αιγιαλός*,, which the Authorized Version renders ‘shore.’ In the Gospels the word occurs only in Mat 13:2;

Mat 13:48 and Joh 21:4. In classical Greek *αἰγιαλός* usually, though not always, means that part of the seashore on which the tide ebbs and flows, and in the above passages in the Gospels it stands for the sandy or pebbly part of the shore of the Lake of Galilee washed by the waves. The derivation is doubtful, but is probably from ἄγνυμι and ἄλς, *i.e.* the place where the sea breaks. The greater part of the western margin of the Lake of Galilee is girdled with a belt of ‘silver strand’ composed of pebbles and sand mingled with delicate white shells. On such a beach, if the traditional scene be correct, the multitude was gathered listening as Jesus spoke from the boat; and on such a ‘beach’ He stood waiting for the disciples to come ashore in the morning, when for ‘the third time he was manifested to them after that he was risen from the dead’ (Joh 21:14).

J. Cromarty Smith.

☩ Beam And Mote

BEAM AND MOTE.—The proverb of the ‘beam’ and the ‘mote’ occurs in Mat 7:3-5 and in the parallel passage Luk 6:41-42. It condemns the man who looks at the ‘mote’ in another’s eye while a ‘beam’ unconsidered is in his own; and it points out the futility and hypocrisy of the attempt to cast out the mote from the eye of a brother while the beam remains in one’s own eye. The proverb appears to have been current in various forms among Jews and Arabs. Tholuck, in his Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, gives several illustrations; *e.g.* from the *Baba Bathra*: ‘In the days when the judges were judged themselves, said the judge to one of them, Take the splinter out of thine eye; whereat he made reply, Take thou the beam out of thine eye’; and from Meidani (*ap.* Freytag): ‘How seest thou the splinter in thy brother’s eye and seest not the cross-beam in thine eye?’

There is no obscurity in the terms used. The word *δοκός* is common in classical writers for a beam of wood, and is used in the LXX Septuagint (Gen 19:8, 1Ki 6:2, Son 1:17) to translate *דֹּקָה*, a beam used in the roof of a house. Grimm-Thayer derives from *δέχομαι* Ion. for *δέχομαι* with the idea of *bearing*, so that *δοκός* is that which supports a building. So Plummer (‘St. Luke’ in *Internat. Crit. Com.*) says: ‘The *δοκός* is the bearing beam, the main beam, that which receives the other beams in a roof or floor.’ A. B. Bruce (‘St. Matthew’ in *Expositor’s Greek Test.*) says: ‘*δοκός*, a wooden beam (‘let in,’ from *δέχομαι*) or joist.’ Clearly a large piece of timber is suggested,

such as could not literally be in the eye. The symbol has the touch of exaggeration familiar in Oriental proverbs, as, e.g., in the camel and the needle's eye.

The 'mote' (τὸ κάρφος, from κάρφω, 'to contract,' 'dry up,' 'wither') may be a dry stalk or twig, or any small dry body. The word is used in the LXX Septuagint (Gen 8:11) to render חָבֵט, the adj. applied to the olive-leaf brought by the dove. Weymouth (*NT in Modern Speech*) renders 'speck.'

It is clear, therefore, that the point of the proverb lies in the contrast between a smaller fault in the person criticised and a greater one in the critic. The figures chosen express the contrast in a very emphatic way, pushing it, indeed, to the verge of absurdity, to suggest the essential folly of the unbrotherly and insincere faultfinder.

Various illustrations are given by commentators of the possibly greater defect of the man who is finding fault with his neighbour. Morison, e.g., quotes Augustine as comparing 'settled hatred' (the beam) with a passing burst of anger (the mote). A. B. Bruce (*l.c.*) says: 'The faults may be of the same kind: κάρφος a petty theft, δοκός commercial dishonesty on a large scale ...; or a different sort: moral laxity in the publican, pride and inhumanity in the Pharisee who despised him.'

All such illustrations are to the point, for the proverb is capable of many applications; and it is very often true that men eager to correct others have great and obvious faults of their own which disqualify them for the office. It seems clear, however, that 'the beam' is very definitely the censorious spirit. Our passage, as it stands in St. Matthew, follows immediately upon the general exhortation 'judge not,' and the warning, 'with what measure ye mete it shall be measured unto you.' There is a spirit which sees and notes faults in others where true goodness would be blind. The 'beholding' is in the judgment of Jesus often a much greater evil than the fault it beholds. Such a spirit leads a man on to the officious attempt to correct others, and makes him doubly unfit for the task. To cast out the mote from another's eye is always difficult. It needs clear sight and wonderful delicacy of touch. To the censorious man, blind in his fancied superiority, it is of all tasks the most impossible. Moreover, the censorious spirit is closely akin to hypocrisy. It pretends to zeal for righteousness, but really cares only for personal superiority. A sincere man begins with that humble self-judgment which is fatal to uncharitable judgments of others. A zeal for righteousness which *begins* with correction of others stands convicted of dishonesty at the outset. If a man has once taken the true ground of lowly penitence, if he has cast out the proud, self-sufficient, censorious spirit, he will leave no other beam unnoticed in his own eye. He will be too much occupied with the task of self-discipline to be the quick and eager censor of others. Yet he will not be blind to

moral distinctions. On the contrary, the single eye will be full of light; and while he will have no wish to 'behold' the mote in his brother's, he will see clearly to cast it out. Love and pride are both quick to observe; but with what different results!

In St. Luke's Gospel our passage stands in a slightly different connexion. There the command 'judge not' is separated from the proverb of the Mote and the Beam by the verses which speak of the reward of generous giving, of blind leaders of the blind, of the disciple not above his master. A. B. Bruce suggests that the parable comes in at this point, because censoriousness is a natural fault of young disciples. In any case the essential meaning of the passage remains unchanged.

Literature.—Dykes, *Manifesto of the King*, 536 ff.; Dale, *Laws of Christ for Common Life*, 93 ff.

E. H. Titchmarsh.

⚡ Beatitude

BEATITUDE

- i. Derivation and Meaning.
- ii. Significance of μακάριος.
- iii. The NT Beatitudes.
 1. Single Sayings.
 2. The Group of Sayings.
- iv. The 'Beatitudes' in Matthew and Luke.
 1. Their number in Matthew.
 2. The relation of the two versions.
 3. Order and connexion of thought.

i. Derivation and Meaning.—The Latin word *beatitudo* is derived from *beatus*, the past participle of *beare*, ‘to make happy,’ ‘to bless’ (cf. *bene* and *bonus*). Trench says that *beatitas* and *beatitudo* are both words of: Cicero’s coining; yet, ‘as he owns himself, with something strange and unattractive about them.’* [Note: The only passage in which Cicero appears to use the two words is de Natura Deorum, i. 34: ‘Ista sive beatitas, sive beatitudo dicenda sunt (utrumque omnino durum, sed usu mollienda nobis verba sunt).’] On this account they ‘found almost no acceptance at all in the classical literature of Rome. *Beatitudo*, indeed, found a home, as it deserved to do, in the Christian Church, but *beatitas* none’ (*Study of Words*¹⁸ [Note: 8 designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 210).

The primary meaning of ‘beatitude’ is *blessedness*. In the earliest example of its use quoted in Murray’s *Dictionary* (1491, Caxton), it signifies supreme blessedness; hence it was frequently used to describe the bliss of heaven. Cf. Milton, *Par. Lost*, iii. 62-

‘About Him all the Sanctities of Heaven

Stood thick as stars, and from His sight received

Beatitude past utterance.’

Trapp applies the word to ‘such as are set out of the reach of evil in the most joyous condition, having just cause to be everlastingly merry as being *beati re et spe*, “blessed in hand and in hope.” ’ But there is nothing in the connotation of the word itself to suggest whether the blessedness is enjoyed on earth or in heaven; the context must show whether it refers to an experience in the present or to a hope for the future.

The secondary meaning of ‘beatitude’ is a *declaration of blessedness*. This declaration may be made of glorified saints in heaven, as in the Beatitudes of the Apocalypse; or of disciples on earth, as in nearly all the Beatitudes of the Gospels. But the word is unduly restricted in its significance when it is used as a synonym for *beatification*,—a Roman Catholic ceremony wherein an inferior degree of canonization is conferred on a deceased person. The Pope considers his claims to beatitude; and if these are approved, proclaims his admission to the Beatific Vision, and sanctions the ascription to him by the faithful of the title ‘Blessed.’

ii. Significance of μακάριος.—In our Lord’s declarations of blessedness He used a word (μακάριος) which has an instructive history, and passed by the pagan word for ‘happiness’ or ‘well-being’ (εὐδαιμονία) which is not found in the New Testament. In

Homer the gods are the blessed (μάκαρες) ones, because they excel mortal men in power or in knowledge rather than in virtue. 'As compared with men, in conduct they are generally characterized by superior force and intellect, but by inferior morality' (Gladstone, *Homer and the Homeric Age*). The Greek despair of attaining blessedness on earth led to the frequent use of 'blessed' as synonymous with *dead*; Aristotle also distinguishes between μακαρισμός or Divine blessedness, and εὐδαιμονία or human blessedness (*Ethic. Nicom.* x. 8). It is therefore suggestive that the Christian conception of beatitude should find expression in a word closely associated with descriptions of the blessedness of the gods and 'originally stronger and more ideal than εὐδαιμων.... This is manifest in Aristotle, with whom the μακάριος as opposed to ἐνδεής is he who lacks no good' (Cremer, *Biblico-Theol. Lex. of NT Greek*, p. 776).

But the word which describes the blessedness of those who lack no good is ennobled by our Lord's use of it. He turns the thoughts of His disciples from outward to inward good; He teaches that blessedness is determined not by fortune, but by goodness, and that it is attainable on earth by all who put themselves into right relation to God. In His Beatitudes, therefore, it is desirable to translate μακάριοι 'blessed' rather than 'happy.' (Cf. the saying of Carlyle that those who 'find blessedness' can 'do without happiness'). Since the word 'blessed' fell from the lips of Christ, His Beatitudes have worthily set forth an ideal of character loftier than the aristocratic virtue of the Platonists, a joy unknown to the most noble-minded of the pleasure-seeking Epicureans, a satisfaction of soul beyond the reach of the self-sufficient Stoic. Like the chiming of sweet bells, the Beatitudes call men to enter the kingdom in which to be righteous is to be blessed; they appeal to a universal longing of the human heart, and they promise a satisfaction of soul which can be found only in obedience to the law which the Son of Man proclaims in order that His brethren may be blessed. Beatitude is the final purpose of the most perfect law; beatitude is the experience of the humble in whose heart there reigns the grace which came by Jesus Christ. The Beatitudes of our Lord bring the word 'blessed' down to earth and there set up the kingdom of heaven; they portray no remote bliss, nor even a pleasure near at hand, but a fulness of joy within the soul. Henceforth blessedness is seen to be the privilege not only of those who are exalted above all earthly care and suffering, but also of those who still share the limitations of this mortal life; it depends not on outward conditions such as wealth or education (cf. Plato, *Republic*, 354 A, 335 E [Note: Elohist.]), but on inward conditions such as meekness of spirit and purity of heart; it is not the prerogative of the few who have been initiated into the secrets of a Divine philosophy, but the privilege of all who become loyal disciples of Him in whose life the perfect Law was perfectly fulfilled.

iii. The NT Beatitudes.—‘Beatitude’ is not a Biblical word, but it is properly applied to all the sayings of our Lord which contain a declaration of the conditions of human blessedness.

1. *Single Sayings*.—Isolated Beatitudes are recorded in Matthew, Luke, and John. They describe a blissful state which is the accompaniment of certain conditions of soul, or the reward of virtuous acts; but the blissful state is almost always represented as attainable in this life. (The exceptions are Luk 14:14-15). The following is a list (omitting Luke 14, 15) of the single sayings of Jesus in which He declares the blessedness of those who possess spiritual graces, or who exemplify some quality of virtue in their actions:—

‘Blessed is he, whosoever shall find none occasion of stumbling in me.’ (Mat 11:6, cf. Luk 7:23).

‘Blessed are your eyes, for they see; and your ears, for they hear.’ (Mat 13:18, cf. Luk 10:23).

‘Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.’ (Mat 16:17).

‘Blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it.’ (Luk 11:28).

‘Blessed are those servants, whom the Lord when he cometh shall find watching.’ (Luk 12:37; cf. Luk 12:38; cf. Luk 12:43, Mat 24:46).

‘If ye know these things, blessed are ye if ye do them.’ (Joh 13:17).

‘Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.’ (Joh 20:29).

[In Mat 25:34 a different word (εὐλογημένοι) is used]. These scattered sayings suffice to indicate how often our Lord’s teaching was expressed in words of blessing. With these Beatitudes in the canonical Gospels should be compared one preserved by St. Paul, and one found in the Codex Bezae—

‘It is more blessed to give than to receive.’ (Act 20:35).

‘If thou knowest what thou doest, thou art blessed; but if thou knowest not, thou art under a curse, and a transgressor of the law.’ (Luk 6:4 ^D [Note: Deuteronomist.]).

The latter saying is addressed to a man who was working on the Sabbath; probably it embodies a genuine tradition, but certainly it bears witness to the early recognition of the Beatitude as one of our Lord's favourite methods of imparting truth. In the fifth of the *New Sayings of Jesus* (see Grenfell and Hunt's ed. 1904) the word μακάριος can be restored, although the subject of the Beatitude has been lost. Prof. Adeney directs attention to the presence in the *Acts of Paul and Thekla* of a number of fresh Beatitudes. St. Paul is represented as giving utterance not only to some of the Beatitudes of Jesus, but also to such sayings as these—

‘Blessed are they that keep themselves chaste, because they shall be called the temple of God.’

‘Blessed be they who keep the baptism, for they shall rest in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.’

The writer of this apocryphal book imitates our Lord's Beatitudes, and expresses in this form both Pauline teaching and his own ascetic doctrine (*Expositor*, 5th series [1895], vol. ii. p. 375).

2. *The Group of Sayings.*—When the word ‘Beatitude’ is used in the plural, it refers as a rule to those sayings of Jesus, grouped at the beginning of the Sermon on the Mount, in which He solemnly announces who are the blessed in the Kingdom of heaven. Early examples of its use in this significance are—‘The eight beatitudes that ... spryngeth of grace’ (1531, *Pilgr. Perf.*); ‘This qnhilk S. Ambrose callis our Lord's beatitudes’ (1588, H. Kiug Canisius' *Cateeh.*). In his *de Offie.* (i. 6) Ambrose says: ‘*Hae oeto Christi Beatitudines sunt quasi Christi Paradoxa.*’

iv. The Beatitudes in Matthew and Luke.

1. *Their number in Matthew.*—The ‘Beatitudes’ are recorded in Mat 5:3-11 and Luk 6:20-22. In regard to the number of Beatitudes in Matthew there have been diverse opinions; the decision depends upon the view taken of Luk 6:10-12—

Luk 6:10. ‘Blessed are they that have been persecuted for righteousness’ sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.’

Luk 6:11. ‘Blessed are ye when men shall reproach you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake.’

Luk 6:12. ‘Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.’

The seven Beatitudes in [Luk 6:3-9](#) describe the graces of the Christian character; these are followed in [Luk 6:10](#) by another Beatitude which assumes that those who possess these graces, and are, therefore, not of the world, will, so long as they are in the world, be exposed to its hatred. This general truth is first expressed; it is immediately afterwards brought home to the disciples as our Lord, using 'ye' instead of 'they,' reaffirms ([Luk 6:11](#)) the blessedness of His hearers, should they endure reproach for His sake. If this interpretation be correct, there are eight Beatitudes in Matthew. In the first seven we behold the several rainbow hues of the light which reflects in human conduct the glory of the heavenly Father ([Luk 6:16](#)); in the eighth that light is seen in conflict with the darkness it is destined to overcome.

If [Mat 5:10-12](#) is not counted as a Beatitude, the number of perfection—seven—is obtained. This course is followed by some because the eighth Beatitude is not a declaration of the blessedness of character, and by others because its promise of the Kingdom of heaven merely repeats what has already been said. Augustine speaks of a 'heptad of Beatitudes,' and regards the eighth as returning upon the first ('*octava tanquam ad caput redit*'). Bruce refers to the 'seven golden sentences' which sum up the felicity of the Kingdom, though he afterwards enumerates eight classes of the blessed (*The Training of the Twelve*, p. 42). Wordsworth (*in loc.*) prefers the mystical significance of eight to similar interpretations of seven; for if seven is the number of rest after labour, 'eight is the number of blessedness and glory after rest'; he also dwells on the annexing of the promise of the Kingdom of heaven to the eighth Beatitude as well as to the first: 'This is the consummation of blessedness; the recurring note of the beatific octave; also in the eighth Beatitude the word "blessed" is repeated for the sake of greater certainty and emphasis.'

This repetition of the word 'blessed' in what is here called the eighth Beatitude is the ground assigned by some for dividing it into two Beatitudes. Wright (*Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek*, p. 161) speaks of nine Beatitudes. In his judgment, however, the ninth, which is longer and in the second person, is an 'explanatory enlargement'; he is also disposed to regard the eighth short Beatitude as 'an editorial compilation, for the second half of it is repeated from the first Beatitude, and the commencement is an abbreviation of the ninth.' The so-called ninth Beatitude is best regarded as an enlargement of the eighth, but no sufficient reason is given for rejecting the eighth.

Delitzsch is alone in holding that there are ten Beatitudes in Matthew to correspond with the Decalogue. To obtain the number ten he not only counts [Mat 5:10-11](#) as the eighth and ninth Beatitudes respectively, but also treats [Mat 5:12](#) as the tenth Beatitude. The words 'rejoice and be exceeding glad' ([Mat 5:12](#)) are regarded as equivalent to 'blessed.'

2. *The relation of the two versions.*—Only four Beatitudes are given in Luk 6:20-22; the relation of these to the eight Beatitudes in Matthew is one of the unsolved problems in NT criticism. The difference between Matthew and Luke is shown in the following table, the variations in Luke being printed in *italics*:—

‘Blessed are

1. ‘the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.’
 - (1.) ‘*ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of God.*’
2. ‘they that mourn: for they shall be comforted.’
 - (3.) ‘*ye that weep now: for ye shall laugh.*’
3. ‘the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.’
4. ‘they that hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.’
 - (2.) ‘*ye that hunger now: for ye shall be filled.*’
5. ‘the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy.’
6. ‘the pure in heart: for they shall see God.’
7. ‘the peacemakers: for they shall be called sons of God.’
8. ‘they that have been persecuted for righteousness’ sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

ye when men shall reproach you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake.

Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.’

(4.) ‘*ye when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of Man’s sake.*

Rejoice *in that day, and leap for joy: for behold, your reward is great in heaven: for in the same manner did their fathers unto the prophets.*’

The chief elements in the problem to be solved are: the presence in Matthew alone of Beatitudes 3, 5, 6, 7; Luke's variations from Matthew's wording of Beatitudes 1, 2, 4, 8, especially (a) the absence from 1 and 4 of words which make blessedness depend upon spiritual conditions, and (b) the use of the second person throughout. This problem is part of a larger problem, viz., Do Matthew and Luke report the same discourse? and if they do, which account is the more primitive? (See art. Sermon on the Mount).

The view that Matthew and Luke narrate two different discourses is now generally abandoned. This theory accounts for all the variations, but it leaves unexplained the remarkable resemblances in the general purport of the teaching, the frequent identity of phraseology, and the close agreement of the introductory narratives and of the closing parables. Therefore, the question to be asked in regard to the two versions of the Beatitudes is part of the larger question: How is it that in two reports of the same discourse there are so many variations?

Some modern critics distinguish between *primary* and *secondary* Beatitudes, though different reasons are assigned in support of this distinction. (1) Wright (*op. cit.*) regards Beatitudes 1, 2, 4 as primary; they belong to 'the proto-Matthaeus,' because they are also found in Luke. The other Beatitudes have been 'added at different dates as recollections occurred.' But the non-occurrence of a saying in Luke is no proof that it is 'secondary,' unless it is certain that Luke is more primitive, and not a selection from the more original tradition in Matthew. (2) Weiss (in Meyer's *Com.*) describes the same three Beatitudes as authentic, because they point to the righteousness of the Kingdom as the *summum bonum*; the first to righteousness as not yet possessed, the second to the want of righteousness as a cause of sorrow, and the fourth to righteousness as an object of desire. The reasoning is entirely subjective. Weiss tests the authenticity of a Beatitude by its accord with his theory that the theme of the discourse is the nature of true and false righteousness; on his own principles other Beatitudes might be proved authentic. The seventh might be said to point to the righteousness whose work is peace.

When the narratives in Matthew and Luke are taken as they stand, the question remains: Which version of the Beatitudes more correctly represents the actual words of Christ?

That the shorter form in Luke is more genuine is the opinion of many scholars. Dr. E. A. Abbott thinks 'it is more probable that Luke represents the letter of the original words of Jesus more closely than Matthew, however much the latter may better represent the spirit of them' (*Enc. Brit*⁹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] x. 798a). But the words which better represent the spirit of the teaching may also rest on the authority of Jesus. Though the two versions represent

the same discourse, the one discourse may not have been delivered with such formality as many theories imply. It is more than probable that the longer form in Matthew omits some of our Lord's comments on these sayings. The different versions of the eighth Beatitude in Matthew point to this conclusion. The declaration of blessedness having been made in its most general form, it is then reaffirmed and expounded in its special bearing upon the men to whom our Lord was speaking. The Apostles will have the privilege of bearing 'the reproach of Christ,' and as sharers in the experience of the prophets they shall receive the prophets' reward (cf. Heb_11:26). Other Beatitudes may in like manner have been restated in a more specific form. For example, all who would enter the Kingdom of heaven need to be told that its blessings are bestowed on the poor in spirit; but it is to His true disciples and not to the multitude that Jesus says, 'Ye, in your poverty, are blessed.' The argument for the primitive character of Luke is stated (*Expositor*, 5th series [1895], vol. ii.) succinctly and forcefully by Professor Adeney. The sayings of which Matthew gives a longer version than Luke are described as expositions of 'the hidden truth contained in the shorter utterances.' The Beatitudes peculiar to Matthew are not relegated to an editor, but are held to be the true teaching of our Lord, though probably not in their original context. The literary problem is complicated by the absence from Matthew of the four Woes, which in Luke (Luk_6:24-26) correspond to the four Beatitudes. The theory that Luke gives the more primitive form involves the assumption that Matthew omitted the Woes and inserted an equal number of Blessings. Yet Wright's conclusion, after a thorough study of the Synoptic problem, is that the Woes in Luke are either 'conflated from another source' or 'editorial inversions of the Blessings.'

The theory that Matthew gives the Beatitudes in their more primitive form has the support of Tholuck and Meyer among older writers, and more recently of H. Holtzmann and Beyschlag. On the authority of one who probably heard these words of Blessing, the Beatitudes peculiar to Matthew are regarded not only as authentic sayings of Jesus, but also as parts of the original discourse. Holtzmann also holds that Luke modified the language of Matthew in accordance with his own ascetic views (*Hand-Comm.*, 'Die Synop.', p. 100); but this supposition is not essential to the theory. The shorter form of some Beatitudes in Luke may faithfully represent the words of Christ, perhaps His own special application of a general truth to His disciples. Dr. Bruce, who has no bias in favour of 'antiquated Harmonistic,' suggests that, as a critical description of Matthew 5-7, 'The Teaching on the Hill' is probably more correct than 'The Sermon on the Mount'; 'teaching' (διδασχῆ) as distinguished from 'preaching' (κηρυγμα) implies both the announcement of a theme and its expansion. It follows that two forms of a Beatitude may be authentic, 'the one as theme, the other as comment.' According to this view, the theme of the first Beatitude is given in Luke, but in Matthew 'one of the expansions, not necessarily the

only one.' It is of little moment whether the shorter form is primary, *i.e.* the enunciation of a theme afterwards expounded by our Lord; or secondary, *i.e.* His own narrowing of a general assertion previously made. On either supposition, Luke, 'while faithfully reproducing at least a part of our Lord's teaching on the hill,' may state that teaching 'not in its original setting, but readapted so as to serve the practical purpose of Christian instruction' (*The Expositor's Greek Test.*, vol. i. pp. 94 ff., 509).

3. Order and connexion of thought.—The order of the second and third Beatitudes is reversed in Codex Bezae and the Vulgate; so also Clem. Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] , Aug., Orig., Eus., Greg, of Nyssa. Tholuck thinks that this change from the best authenticated order was made on mystical grounds; either because the promise of the lower good should immediately follow that of heaven (Orig.), or because $\gamma\eta$ represents mystically a higher stage of blessedness (Greg. of Nyssa).

In the generally accepted order of the Beatitudes a sequence of thought may be traced, though the 'scale of grace and glory' is perhaps not so carefully 'graduated' as some have supposed (cf. Amb. on Luke 6). The first grace—poverty of spirit—is the germ of all the rest; the first and last Beatitude is the all-comprising word—'theirs is the kingdom of heaven.' The six Beatitudes that intervene unfold different aspects of Christian virtue and set forth its peculiar blessedness, for each blessing promised is the fitting reward of the inward grace, and each is included in the promise of the Kingdom. Dr. Fairbairn (*Studies in the Life of Christ*) divides the Beatitudes into two classes—'those of resignation and those of hope'; the first four Beatitudes are placed in the former class, the last four in the latter class. This division is simple, and serves to emphasize the distinction between the passive and active graces of the Christian character. Yet it seems better to distinguish the eighth Beatitude from the other seven; it differs from them essentially, for it attaches blessedness to endurance of opposition and not to inward qualities, to conduct and not to character, to something a man does and not to what he is. In the seven Beatitudes on character, there are two triads. The first three, as Dr. Dykes points out (*The Manifesto of the King*, p. 101), are closely connected and refer to negative graces; in the last three, positive graces are intimately combined as elements of righteousness; the fourth or central Beatitude is the link between these first groups. 'As the first three, the trilogy of spiritual humiliation, lead up to and produce that blessed hunger after Divine righteousness; so the second three, a trilogy of characteristic Christian graces, are the fulfilment of the soul's hunger.'

With a 'proposal of the end—blessedness,' says Jeremy Taylor, 'our excellent and gracious Lawgiver begins His sermon' (*The Great Exemplar*, pt. 2, sec. xi.). Beatitude is the essence of Christianity, its beginning and end. The 'Beatitudes' reveal the nature of true blessedness and the conditions of its attainment; they reflect the light

which shines from the Hebrew Scriptures that declare the blessedness of the righteous; but they are illumined not only by the Prophets and Psalmists who went before, but also by the Apostles and Teachers who come after. Wernle says with true insight: 'Jesus Himself made of Christianity a religion of hope.... If Paul in a later age preaches the religion of longing in words of enthralling eloquence, he is merely continuing in his own language the Beatitudes of Jesus' (*The Beginnings of Christianity*, i. 68).

Literature.—In addition to the works already quoted, see art. Sermon on the Mount, below; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , Extra Vol. p. 14 ff.; Gore, *Sermon on the Mount*; Bruce, *Galilean Gospel*, 39-72; Leckie, *Life and Religion*, 209-270; Stanley, *Serm. to Children*, 95-131; Matheson, *Landmarks of NT Morality*, 143 ff.

J. G. Tasker.

Beauty

BEAUTY.—This term is applied alike to the physical grace of men and animals, to external nature and works of art, and to moral character and action. In every relationship it is a quality capable of imparting exquisite pleasure, and a power that commands and captivates. The appreciation of beauty for its own intrinsic charm was a special characteristic of the Greeks, to whom the world was a wonder of order and adaptation, and who found an element of worship in the beauty that was a prerogative of the gods. With the Israelites, and in the East generally, beauty was esteemed rather as a sign of dignity and noble birth (Jdg 8:18), and beautiful things were valued as the accessories of official decoration. Much in the Gospels that we feel to be beautiful and describe by that name, is there specialized by such terms as 'grace,' 'glory,' 'excellency,' as indicating in each particular case the arresting feature of charm, sublimity, or pre-eminence that makes it beautiful. Thus in the appeal, 'If God so clothe the grass of the field' (Luk 12:28), and in the declaration concerning the lilies of the field, that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of them (Luk 12:27), the beauty was due to external investiture rather than to any inherent fact of symmetry and proportion. So when the merchantman is described as seeking goodly pearls (Mat 13:45), and the righteousness of Christ's disciples is expected to exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees (Mat 5:20), the quality of beauty arises from the surprising rarity and recognized pre-eminence of the things referred to.

1. *Personal appearance of Christ.*—Much has been written about the face of Christ. Tradition, gathering its data from the apocryphal 'Letter of Lentulus,' the portrait

which Jesus is said to have sent to king Abgar of Edessa, the story of Veronica's veil, the pictures and eikons of the early and mediaeval Church, and accumulated literary traditions, has given to Art its typical presentation of Christ's countenance. The subject, however, is one about which there is no certain information. On the mount of Transfiguration the three disciples had a brief glimpse of the heavenly beauty that then shone out from the face of Christ. But those who were then eye-witnesses of His majesty (2Pe_1:16) tell us that the glorious vision surpassed all description. It remained with them as a restful and inspiring memory, like the 'unspeakable words' of St. Paul's ecstatic experience (2Co_12:4).

2. Beauty in external nature.—It is profoundly suggestive of the reality of the Incarnation that He by whom the worlds were made spoke so little about them. When He called Himself and His disciples 'the light of the world' (Joh_8:12, Mat_5:14), the allusion to light was not in the spirit of Milton's sublime apostrophe (*Par. Lost*, iii. 1 ff.), but with reference to its conflict with darkness. When He pointed to the redness of the evening sky (Mat_16:2), it was not to speak of a Presence immanent in the light of setting suns, but to express the feeling of wonder that those who could draw a practical lesson from something so remote could not hear the footsteps of moral destiny so close behind themselves. And so in the instances of the frail, beautiful grass and the lilies of the field (Mat_6:28 ff.), the allusion served as an argument for God's still greater care of things more precious.

3. Ethical beauty.—The life of Christ witnessed in every detail to His inspiring and impressive personality. It is surely a torso presentation of that life that would make 'sweet reasonableness' its prevailing characteristic. Rather it is marked by the absence of that philosophic detachment that would live and let live. In His mind truth took precedence even of the heavenly hope, and He assured His disciples that if that hope were a sweet but baseless imagination, He would have told them (Joh_14:2). He had come as light into the world, and questionings not only of the defiant darkness (Joh_1:5), but of the bewildering twilight (Joh_16:17 ff.), sprang up around His path. In His presence men were greater and less than they had been before. Even in the days of His flesh those who were Christ's were impelled to put on Christ, and were afterwards recognized as having been with Him (Act_4:13). He exemplified in His own life the principle by which His disciples were to live and extend His kingdom. His outward power was the measure of His inward submission. He came not to do His own will (Joh_6:38). It was when He was lifted up that He would draw all men unto Himself (Joh_12:32). Even so the life of the Christian has its condition of complete and continuous surrender, and in the service of the gospel it is found that men do not yield to the messenger, but to what they see that he yields to.

In the course of Christ's life on earth, along with the general impression of His teaching and ministry there were various incidents that showed in a special manner

with what tender sympathy He took upon Him our nature and bore our infirmities. Among these may be mentioned the conversation with the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well (John 4), the blessing of the little children that were almost sent away (Mat 19:13 ff.), the touching of the leper in the act of healing (Mat 8:3), and the words of hope concerning Nineveh (Mat 12:41) and Tyre (Luk 10:13 f.), and those who should come into the Kingdom from the distant East and West (Mat 8:11). On the cross we have the prayer for His persecutors (Luk 23:34), His comradeship with the penitent thief (Luk 23:42 f.), and the commending of His mother to the care of the disciple John (Joh 19:26 f.).

Also in the lives of others, chiefly of women, He met with intuitions and actions which through His affinity of soul were noticed and commended by Him as bearing the stamp of moral and spiritual beauty. Such were the return of the Samaritan leper to give glory to God (Luk 17:16 ff.); the humble insistency of the Syro-Phœnician woman (Mar 7:26 ff.); the courage and consecration of the widow who gave her mites to the Lord (Mar 12:42 ff.); the act of the sinful woman who bathed His feet with her tears (Luk 7:44), and of her also who unsealed, as for His burial, the alabaster vase of precious ointment (Joh 12:7).

With regard to things physically and morally loathsome, on the other hand, the disease of leprosy (Mat 8:2, Luk 7:22; Luk 17:12) and the affliction of demoniac possession (Mat 9:32, Mar 7:26, Luk 8:39 etc.) could always claim His healing power; there was discriminating pity towards those who had sinned in ignorance (Luk 23:34), or who had been overcome by some swift and overmastering temptation (Mat 26:41, Luk 7:47, Joh 4:16; Joh 21:15), or by the difficulties of outward circumstance (Mar 10:21 f., Luk 13:8); while in sharp contrast with the above, there was His denunciation by descriptive parable and stern rebuke of the hopeless offensiveness of the Pharisaic type (Mat 21:19; Mat 21:23, Luk 20:19 etc.).

Literature.—Under (1) Hauck-Herzog, *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] , art. 'Christusbilder'; Schaff-Herzog, *Encyc. of Relig. Knowledge*, art. 'Christ, Pictures of'; Farrar, *Christ in Art*, pp. 67-95. Under (2) Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, i. 151 ff.; *Expositor*, 3rd ser. ii. [1885] 224 ff. Under (3) Liddon, *Bampton Lectures*⁸ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 192ff.; Channing, *Complete Works* [1884], pp. 237-243.

G. M. Mackie.

BED.—The word ‘bed’ (κλίνη, κράββατος, κοιτη) is found in the Gospels only in Mat 9:2; Mat 9:6, Mar 2:4-12; Mar 4:21; Mar 7:30, Luk 5:18; Luk 8:16; Luk 11:7; Luk 17:34, Joh 5:8-12. There is little here to indicate the kind of bed, or beds, that were in use among the Hebrews in the time of Christ. Among the ancient Hebrews, however, as among other Oriental peoples of that day, the bed usually consisted of a wadded quilt, or thin mattress, to be used, according to the season, or the condition of the owner, with or without covering (cf. Exo 22:27 ‘For that [the outer garment worn in the daytime] is his only covering: it is his garment for his skin: wherein shall he sleep?’). The very poor often made their bed of the skins of animals, old cloaks or rugs, or slept in their ordinary clothing on the bare ground floor, as they do to-day in the East.

The bedding ordinarily in use among Orientals now is, doubtless, much the same as it was in Christ’s day: a mat made of rushes or straw to be laid down first; sheep or goat skins, or a quilt stuffed with hair or vegetable fibre, or both, to lie upon; and a covering consisting often only of the ‘cloak,’ or outer garment, of the poor man, but sometimes in summer of some light stuff in addition, or in winter of skins, or some heavier quilted stuff.

Various allusions are made in the Gospels to beds that could be carried: ‘Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house’ (Mat 9:6); ‘Rise, take up thy bed, and walk’; ‘And immediately the man ... took up his bed, and walked’ (Joh 5:8-9); ‘Behold men bringing on a bed a man that was palsied’ (Luk 5:18 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). St. Luke and St. Mark tell us that on this occasion, when, because of the crowd in the house, the four men could not reach Jesus with the paralytic, they took him up on the house-top, broke through the roof, and ‘let him down through the tiling with *the couch* (κλινιδιον; in Luk 5:18, however, the word κλίνη, ‘bed,’ is used) into the midst before Jesus’ (Luk 5:19), or, as St. Mark puts it, ‘let down *the bed* (κράββατος) wherein the sick of the palsy lay’ (Luk 2:4).

For ordinary use at night the bed was laid on the floor, generally on the mat, which served to keep it off the ground, frequently on a light portable frame of wood which served a like purpose; but sometimes on a more elevated bedstead (‘under the bed,’ Mar 4:21 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). In the morning the bedding was all rolled up, and, after being aired and sunned, was put aside on the raised platform, or packed away for the day in a chest or closet. A bedstead of any pretensions was rare among the Hebrews, and was looked upon as a luxury; the nearest approach to it being in general the raised platform on the side of the room. The richness of beds and of bedsteads among some of the Asiatic peoples, however, was at least equal to that of the Greeks and Romans (cf. Pro 7:18; Pro 7:17, 1Sa 28:23). The degree of richness

would depend, of course, upon the wealth of the family and the style of the house or tent, as it does to-day among the Bedawîn.

Usually a room was set apart as a bedroom, where the whole family slept. 'My children are with me in bed, I cannot rise and give thee' (Luk_11:5-8). Among the poorest a portion of the single room occupied by the family was set apart for sleeping, and, generally, this was raised above the level of the floor. When the house was of two storeys, the beds were laid in one of the rooms of the upper storey, or, during the summer, preferably, on the flat roof. See, further, art. Couch.

Geo. B. Eager.

☩ Beelzebub or Beelzebul

BEELZEBUB or BEELZEBUL.—It is strange that this name has never yet been satisfactorily explained; stranger still that no trace of it has been found as yet among the scores of Jewish names for angels and spirits. The first part of the name is clear enough; it is the Aramaic form of the Hebrew 'Baal'; nor is there anything strange in the dropping of λ before ζ the MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] followed by modern editors like Westcott-Hort and Weiss [Cheyne in his art. 'Beelzebul' in the *Encyc. Bibl.* finds 'this scepticism as to λ in βεελ paradoxical,' 'the word βεεζεβουλ inexplicable and hardly pronounceable,' and urges against it 'the famous passage Mat_10:25, where the οἰκοδεσπότης implies the speaker's consciousness that בְּעַל is one element in the title,' but his objection completely misses the mark. The dropping of the λ is merely phonetical; cf. in Josephus βεζέδελ in codd. MVRC for βελζέδεκ (*BJ* iii. 25), Βάζωρος for Βαλέζωρος (*circa (about) Apion*. i. 124), Βαζαφράνης for Βαρζαφρ. (*Ant.* xiv. 330); Ἀμεσάδ in Cod. Q of Dan_1:11 [Theod. [Note: Theodotion.]] for Ἀμελσάδ; 'Philadelphia' in the Syriac Version of Euseb.'s *Historia Ecclesiastica*, etc.* [Note: The best analogy is the Syr. Name ברבעשמין, 'son of the Bel of heaven,' explained by Barheb. as 'he with four names.')] More difficult is the change of β into λ at the end of the word, supposing the common explanation to be correct, that the name comes from 2Ki_1:2. It has been explained as an intentional cacophonous corruption (= 'god of the dung') or a dialectical or phonetic variation (cf. Beliar for Belial or Bab el-Mandel for Mandeb). The spelling with *b* was retained in the NT by Luther, though his Greek text had λ, and by Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 in text; it was introduced by

Jerome in the Vulgate, see the Index of Wordsworth-White, where 15 Latin spellings of the name are given, and cf. Jerome's remark in *OS* 66, 11: 'in fine ergo nominis b litera legenda est, non 1; musca enim *zebug* vocatur.' λ is even found in Cod. 243 of the text of Symmachus in 2Ki 1:2; but see the Syriac Hexapla in v. 6, and note, what has generally been overlooked, that the Septuagint took זְבוּב not בְּעַלְזָבּוּב for the name of the god of Ekron: ἐπιζητήσαι ἐν τῇ Βάαλ (*dative*) Μυϊαν (*accusative*) θεὸν Ἀκκαρῶν v; likewise Josephus.: πρὸς τὴν Ἀκκαρῶν θεὸν Μυϊαν, τοῦτο γὰρ ἦν ὄνομα τῷ θεῷ.

On the *fly* in worship and legend see Plin. *HN* x. 28. 75; Pausan. *Deser. Gr.* v. xiv. 1; aelian, *Nat. Anim.* v. 17, xi. 8; Usener, *Götternamen*, p. 260. There were Jewish legends about flies, such as that there were none in the temple (*Aboth* v. 8); Elisha was recognized as a prophet by the woman of Shunem, because no fly crept over his place at the table (*Berakh.* 10*b*); on the *yezer ha-ra'* as a fly see *Berakh.* 61*a*, Targ. [Note: Targum.] Jer. on Ecc 10:1). The supposition that the name corresponds to Aramaic בְּעַלְזָבּוּב = 'enemy' is not very likely, nor the other that it is the Baal of the heavenly mansion who became the Baal of the nether world (*JAS*, 1878, pp. 220-221). Later Jews identified Baal-zebug with Baal-berith, and told that some would carry an image of him (in the shape of a fly) in their pockets, producing it and kissing it from time to time (*Shab.* 83*b*. 63*b*). Procopius states (*ad 2 Kings 1*); πλὴν ἔστι μαθεῖν ἐξ ὧν Εὐσέβιος ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς Εὐαγγελικῆς Προπαρασκευῆς ἐκ τῶν Φίλωνος παρατίθεται, ὡς δαιμόνων ἦν, οὕτω λεγόμενος· μᾶλλον δὲ γυνὴ παλαιὰ τις, ἣν ἐθεοποίησαν. Zahn (on Mat 12:34) lays stress on the fact that the article is missing before ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμόνων ('a prince of the devils, not *the* prince'); but the definite article is found in Mark and Luke, and in Mat 9:34 (if this verse be not a later addition) where several Latin documents have the name.

How scanty is our knowledge of NT times, when such a name, which appears quite popular in the NT, defies as yet all explanation, and is not found anywhere else!

Origen on John 19 (p. 315, ed. Preuschen) remarks: πάντως γὰρ περὶ δαιμόνων τι μεμαθήκεισαν καὶ τοῦ ἄρχοντος αὐτῶν, ᾧ ὄνομα Βεελζεβούλ· ταῦτα δὲ οὐ πάνυ τι ἐν τοῖς φερομένοις κεῖται βιβλίοις.

Literature.—In addition to works cited above, see A. Loisy, 'Beelzeboul' (*Rev. d'hist. et de lit. rel.* 1904, v. 434-466).

Begetting

BEGETTING. The idea of begetting, as applied in the natural or in a metaphorical or spiritual sense, is expressed in the Gospels by the common words γεννάω ‘to beget’ (which occurs in the LXX Septuagint as the equivalent of the Heb. יָרָא, meaning either ‘to beget’ or ‘to bear,’ and is similarly used in the NT); γεννητός, properly ‘begotten,’ but which, like the verb, is also found in the sense of ‘born’; μονογενής, ‘only-begotten.’ The common word γεννάω. with its derivatives, is, as might be expected, used to express natural begetting and natural birth. So μονογενής, used in the Fourth Gospel only of the relation of Christ to God the Father, occurs in Luk 7:12 of the son of the widow of Nain, meaning simply ‘only son’ (cf. Luk 8:42 Jairus’ daughter, and Luk 9:38 the demoniac boy); and γεννητός in the sense of ‘born’ in Mat 11:11, Luk 7:28 (‘among those that are horn of women’). In Matthew and Luke again, τὸ γεννηθῆναι and τὸ γεννώμενον are used to describe the miraculous conception of our Lord in the womb of the Virgin Mary; Mat 1:20 has ‘that which is conceived in her (AVM [Note: Vm Authorized Version margin.] ‘begotten’) is of the Holy Ghost,’ and Luk 1:35 ‘that which shall be born of thee ((Revised Version margin) ‘is begotten’) shall be called the Son of God.’ In both cases obviously the expression will bear the rendering ‘which is begotten’ or ‘which is conceived,’ according to the ordinary sense in which the verb is known to occur.

The Messianic and the spiritual uses of the words for begetting are those which alone call for remark in connexion with the Gospels and the NT generally. In the Gospels, and there particularly in the Gospel of John, we find them applied to Christ and His relation to God the Father, and, in connexion with that reference, to the case of believers who, receiving Christ by faith, are, in virtue of the new principle of life thus imparted to them, born again, become children of God. This latter thought is suggested in the Gospels, and dwelt upon at length in the Epistles.

We may regard as the *locus classicus* of the theological or spiritual application of the idea of begetting, as we find it in the Gospels, the well-known passage in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel: ‘No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son (ὁ μονογενής υἱός),* [Note: WH read μονογενής θεός, following \aleph^*BC^*L .] who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him’ (Joh 1:18). Here the use of the

term *μονογενής* in this connexion at once raises the question as to the precise sense in which it is applied to Christ, whether it refers to His being by Divine nature and essence Son of God, or merely to His manifestation in time as Messiah, as one specially chosen to reveal to mankind the will of the invisible God. A little study of the history of the term 'only-begotten' shows that it is by no means peculiar to the Gospels, but is rather a familiar Messianic term, which depends, for a clear understanding of the thoughts denoted and connoted by it, upon what, we may gather from other sources, was the national belief as to God's self-revelation in the history of grace. We are reminded, for instance, that Israel (Exo 4:22, Hos 1:10), the kings of Israel (1Ch 28:6), and the Messiah (Psa 2:7), of whom the latter were types, were successively called sons of God, or God's firstborn. Again, St. Paul (in Act 13:33) and the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb 1:5; Heb 5:5) quote Psa 2:7 as a Messianic prophecy which had been fulfilled in the mission of Jesus: 'Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee' (*σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε*).

In view of this Messianic, spiritual application of the idea referred to, the words of Psa 2:7 have been supposed to allude to some typical king like David or Solomon, and the expression, 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee,' to denote an act performed by God on the person addressed, as by constituting him king, He had moulded his life afresh and set him in a special relation to Himself. Applied to Christ, this might be taken as referring to such an event as the Resurrection, with reference to which St. Paul says in Rom 1:4 that by it God 'declared him to be the Son of God with power.' This might be accepted as a fairly adequate account of the Messianic ideas held by the early disciples, and of the interpretation which they were likely to put upon the passage in the Second Psalm, when they studied it, as St. Paul did, by the light of the Resurrection of Jesus. They must have been largely influenced by traditional opinions on the subject of the Messiah, and would therefore interpret the words, 'This day have I begotten thee,' as referring not to any event in a past eternity or to any period prior to the Incarnation of the Son of God, but to some definite point in the history of His manifestation to the world, as, for example, to the period of the birth of Jesus, or of the Baptism, when the voice from heaven declared Him to be God's Beloved Son, or, as St. Paul appears to teach in his discourse in Acts (Act 13:33) and in his Epistle to the Romans, to the period of the Resurrection.

Such an interpretation, however, of the passage referred to as we find in the teachings of St. Paul and of the Epistle to the Hebrews, does not adequately explain the language of the Fourth Gospel or the author's allusions to the pre-existence of Christ as Logos, and to His relation to the Father as the Only-begotten Son. The Evangelist speaks in such a way of the nature and mission of the Logos or the Son of God as plainly to assume the eternal pre-existence of that Logos or Son. When John, speaking for himself, says in the Prologue (Joh 1:14), 'The Word was made flesh, and

dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father,' the subject of the sentence is He of whom he has just spoken as having been in the beginning with God, and as having been God's agent in the work of Creation. Again, in Joh 1:18 'No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him,' the expression 'which is in the bosom of the Father' is apparently meant for a further explanation or definition of the expression 'only-begotten Son,' the present participle ὁ ὢν signifying, as Alford puts it, '*essential truth* without any particular regard to time,' while the peculiar construction εἰς τὸν κόλπον, literally 'into' not 'in' 'the bosom' (as might have been expected—ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ), is, as that commentator again points out, 'a pregnant construction, involving the begetting of the Son and His being the λόγος of the Father,—His proceeding forth from God.' 'It is a similar expression on the side of His Unity with the Father to εἰμὶ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ on the side of His manifestation to men.' The meaning of the passage is that Christ, who is by nature the Son of God, begotten before all worlds, is He who alone could and did declare the nature and the will of that God whom no man hath seen or could have known apart from such a revelation. Here it is evident that the begetting referred to by the use of the word 'only-begotten' (μονογενής) is different from that which is spoken of in the Second Psalm.

Again, in His discourse to Nicodemus, Jesus Himself alludes clearly to His pre-existence and essential Sonship when He says that God 'gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life'; and in the next sentence it is added, 'For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world' (Joh 3:16-17). There the words 'gave' and 'sent' imply pre-existence on the part of the Son. Similar references occur elsewhere in the discourses of Jesus as recorded in the Fourth Gospel, for example, that of Joh 6:46 'Not that any man hath seen the Father, save he which is of God (lit. 'from God,' παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ), he hath seen the Father,' with which cf. Joh 6:38 'I came down from heaven,' and Joh 6:62 'What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?' passages which, as H. Holtzmann points out, 'connect the historic with the preter-historic being of the pre-existent Logos—the Son of God, that is, in the theological, not the Messianic sense.'

A comparison of these passages in the Fourth Gospel with Psa 2:7 shows that the thought of 'begetting,' as it affects the relations between the Father and the Son, has more than one meaning. Dörner notes even in the Synoptic Gospels three senses in which it is applied—the physical, the ethical, and the official. If we extend our view so as to include the Fourth Gospel, a similar division suggests itself: the theological,

or, as it is sometimes called, the metaphysical; the official or Messianic; and the ethical or spiritual. Jesus as Logos is Son of God by nature. Essential Sonship, eternal generation, is predicated of Him. Then, in a special official sense, His setting apart to the Messianic office is, according to a familiar Scripture figure (cf. Psa_2:7), regarded as ‘a begetting,’ that is, the inauguration of a new vocation or a new order of things. This notion of begetting is practically the idea conveyed by the word ‘Messiah’ or ‘Christ’ itself, and by what Jesus Himself says, according to Joh_10:36, ‘Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?’ Lastly, the thought of begetting is applied in the sense of a Divine communication of life, as when the Spirit of God descended and abode upon Christ. Thus when the Baptist saw the sign, the dove from heaven alighting upon Jesus, he tells us, ‘And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God’ (Joh_1:34). This third aspect is important as illustrating the point of connexion between the Sonship of Christ and that of believers, the Divine Sonship based on a generation, that is, a Divine communication of life. Each of these aspects has its own significance.

1. The *theological* is associated with the apologetic aim of the Fourth Gospel. It was an important part of the object of the Evangelist to enable the Church to rid herself of the influence of the mischievous speculations of the time, of a humanitarian Ebionism on the one side, and of Gnosticism on the other. That Jesus is God from the beginning,—eternally God,—was his answer to those who would detract from the Divine dignity of Jesus. Again, by his doctrine of Sonship, the application of the thought of generation to the relation of God the Father to Christ the Son, St. John gave a new meaning to the expression ‘Logos,’ which represented a well-known philosophical conception long current in the East and among the later Platonists and Stoics, while the speculations of Philo and the Alexandrian School had brought it into still greater prominence. According to the Fourth Gospel, Christ as Logos is the Revealer of the Father, not as Philo and others imagined, as being an ‘emanation,’ an outflow from the Inaccessible Deity, a shadowy existence to be described only by analogies and metaphors, or by mere negations, but as being the Son of God, who shared the Divine nature and glory, One who came at the Father’s bidding to do the Father’s will. What that mysterious ‘begetting’ meant, in virtue of which the Son of God was Son of God, John did not attempt to explain. To him it was a Divine mystery which none could penetrate. It was enough for him that God so loved the world as to send forth His Son, sharer of His Divine nature, for that world’s salvation. Thus, according to the testimony of St. John, Jesus ‘*is μονογενής*, the Only-begotten, as Logos; He *appears* as *μονογενής* through the Incarnation’ (Beyschlag).

2. Again, in all four Gospels the idea of begetting is applied in an *official* or *Messianic* sense in connexion with Christ’s actual appearing among men and with His redemptive

mission. The three Synoptists record the Divine proclamation with which, at the Baptism, the first stage of Christ's ministry was solemnly inaugurated: 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased' (Mat 3:17 ||). The same Evangelists testify to the events of the Transfiguration, when again the voice from heaven addressed the disciples in similar language, as if to inaugurate the final stage of Christ's ministry (Mat 17:5 ||). In the latter case the addition of the words 'hear ye him' to the original form of the Divine testimony would naturally suggest to persons familiar, as the disciples probably were, with the current Messianic interpretation of Psa 2:7, the thought of the Divine decree there spoken of, which constituted the subject of the prophecy King of God's people, having a Divine right to their loyalty and obedience. In the Fourth Gospel this official aspect of the idea of begetting in connexion with Christ is expressed in those passages in which Jesus speaks of Himself as One sent of God, and by that mission brought into a new relation to God and to mankind. That 'sanctification' and that 'sending' of which He speaks (Joh 10:36) correspond to the begetting referred to by the Psalmist, though in this case they point to the Incarnation, and not, as in Rom 1:4, to the Resurrection. In illustration of this we may compare with the passages already quoted in another connexion (Joh 3:17; Joh 6:38; Joh 6:46; Joh 6:62) such utterances as these: 'I proceeded and came forth from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me' (Joh 8:42); 'Ye have believed that I came out from God ... I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world' (Joh 16:27-28). 'Sending forth' and 'coming forth' appear, according to the Fourth Gospel, to have been favourite expressions in the mouth of Jesus with which to describe His Messianic commission, and that act of Divine grace which was, as it were, the genesis of the New Dispensation—the reign of 'grace and truth' inaugurated by Christ as Messiah; as St. John himself laid special stress upon the Incarnation of the Logos as an event which meant the manifestation of that 'life' (Joh 1:4) which 'was the light of men.' The thought is the same. The idea—coming from heaven, being sent of God—is practically identical with that of 'became flesh.' In this Messianic sense, then, the thought of 'begetting' may fitly apply to the beginning of Christ's manifestation in history.

3. The third aspect is the *spiritual or ethical*. In Christ, as the Only-begotten, the proofs of the Divine Sonship are found in His absolute sinlessness (Joh 8:46), in that He did always those things which pleased God (Joh 8:29); that there was perfect harmony between Christ and the Father in all things, in willing and in working, and in the fact that Jesus was habitually conscious of the Father's presence, so that during the season of His sorest trial, when He was deserted by His disciples, He was 'not alone, for the Father was with him' (Joh 16:32). This aspect of the doctrine of the Divine Sonship of Jesus is of great interest and importance in connexion with the idea of 'begetting,' being the point at which the doctrine of the sonship of believers is linked on to that of the Sonship of Christ Himself. It is in this connexion that St. John introduces at once the conception of Christ as the Word made flesh, and that of the

regeneration of believers. The two thoughts are indeed, in the Prologue and elsewhere, so closely related that the one almost imperceptibly shades off into the other. Thus (Joh 1:12) we read, ‘As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God’; (Joh 1:13) ‘which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.’ At this point the Evangelist proceeds at once to state the doctrine of the Incarnation of the Divine Logos. As has been remarked, ‘the subject of the *μονογενῆς* is introduced only after we have learned what is involved in the thought of believers becoming children of God.’ The same idea of the relation between the Divine descent of Christ, the Only-begotten of the Father, and the sonship of believers, is noted and emphasized in the First Epistle of John (in which the teaching of John’s Gospel on this subject is worked out in greater detail), as when we read, ‘If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that every one that doeth righteousness is born of him’ (1Jn 2:29); and again, ‘Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God’ (1Jn 3:9). The relation of the Son to the Father, His Divine setting apart for the accomplishment of the Father’s will, the absolute oneness of Father and Son in respect of will and of work, and the mystery of Christ’s miraculous entrance into the world, being conceived by the power of the Divine Spirit, are, throughout the Gospel of John, treated as analogues of the regeneration which must be wrought out in the heart and life of all who would enter the Kingdom of God. Thus those expressions which, in the case of Christ as the Incarnate Word, or in the case of believers who share the life and the grace of Christ, speak of a Divine begetting, of a birth from above, of regeneration by the Spirit, ‘denote a new commencement of the personal life, traceable back to a (creative) operation of God.’

Literature.—Cremer, *Bib.-Theol. Lexicon*, s.vv.; H. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der Neutest. Theologie*, i. p. 436; commentaries of Alford, Meyer, etc.; Beyschlag, *NT Theol.* i. pp. 68 ff., 242, ii. p. 46; Dorner, *Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, Div. i. vol. i. p. 53 ff.; Reuss, *Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age*, i. p. 162, ii. p. 416 ff.; Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Psalms*, *ad loc.*

H. H. Currie.

Beggar

BEGGAR.—Though beggars are seldom spoken of in the Gospel narratives (Mat 20:30-34; cf. Mar 10:46-52, Luk 18:35-43, Joh 9:1-41, and Luk 16:19-31 parable of Rich Man and Lazarus), they undoubtedly formed a considerable class in the Gospel age.* [Note: As equivalents for ‘beg,’ ‘beggar’ of EV, we find two

radically different words in the text of the Gospels—on the one hand, the verbs *τροοσαι* *τέω* (Mar 10:46, Luk 18:35), *ἐταίτεω* (Luk 16:3), and the noun *προσαίτης* (Joh 9:8 Revised Text); on the other, the adj. *πτωχός* (Luk 16:20; Luk 16:22). In the former case the root idea is that of asking (*αἰτέω*), while *πτωχός* suggests the cringing or crouching (*πτώσσω*) of a beggar. But *πτωχός* is the ordinary NT word for ‘poor,’ whether in the sense of needy (Mat 19:21) or humble (Mat 5:3).] This is evident both from the references to almsgiving in the Sermon on the Mount and from the mention of beggars in connexion with places of a public character: the entrance to Jericho (Mat 20:30 and parallels), a city through which so many pilgrims went at festival seasons, the neighbourhood of rich men’s houses (Luk 16:20), and the gates of the temple (Act 3:2).

The prevalence of the beggar class was due to various causes besides indolence—to the want of any system of poor relief, to the ignorance of proper medical remedies for common diseases like ophthalmia, and to the impoverishment of Palestine under the Romans owing to cruel and excessive taxation. (For the last, see Hausrath, *History of NT Times*, vol. i. 188 [English translation, Williams & Norgate]). Edersheim thinks that the beggar’s appeal for alms may have been enforced by some such cry as ‘Gain merit by me,’ ‘O tender-hearted, by me gain merit, to thine own benefit’ (*Life and Times of Jesus*, vol. ii. 178). It is worthy of notice, however, that no beggar is recorded to have enforced his appeal to Christ by any reference to the merit to be gained by a favourable response to his appeal (though it must be remembered, on the other hand, that the appeal of a blind beggar to one who had power to restore his sight would naturally differ from his attitude to those from whom he merely sought an alms). It is also observable that the begging ‘saint’ of Mohammedan countries is not found in the Gospels.

The remark of the unjust steward in the parable (Luk 16:3)—‘To beg I am ashamed’—favours the conclusion that begging, under any circumstances, was regarded as an unfortunate mode of existence, and, in the case of the indolent, was condemned as strongly by public opinion as it was in the days of Jesus the son of Sirach (Sir 40:28-30).

Literature.—The standard Lives of Christ; G. M. Mackie’s *Bible Manners and Customs*; *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, s.v.; cf. Day’s *Social Life of the Hebrews*.

Morison Bryce.

Belief

BELIEF.—Belief is the mental action, condition, or habit of trusting in or confiding in a person or a thing. Trust, confidence, reliance, dependence, faith are from this point of view aspects of belief. More narrowly considered, belief is the mental acceptance of a proposition, statement, or fact on the testimony of another, or on the ground of authority. The fact may be beyond our observation, or the statement beyond our powers of verification, yet we may believe that Britain is an island though we may never have sailed round it, and we may believe in the law of gravitation though we may not be able to follow the reasoning which proves it.

This is not the place to deal with all the phases or aspects of belief, or to trace the history of opinion on the question. It is an interesting chapter in the history of human thought, and it is of the highest importance in its practical reference. But we may only indicate the main outline of it in both respects. The contributions towards the right understanding of the province and character of belief in more recent years have been of great value. Recent psychology has become aware of the magnitude and complexity of the problem, and in the hands of such writers as Bain, James, Stout, Baldwin, and others it has received a treatment which may be described as adequate. Nor should we omit the name of Dr. James Ward, whose work in this relation is of the highest merit. These have endeavoured to mark off the field of belief, and to distinguish it from other mental states. Is it active or passive? Is it a state of mind which belongs to the sphere of feeling? or is it a state of mind which belongs to intelligence? or is it something which belongs to the sphere of action? and is it a result of the 'will to believe'? Weighty names may be adduced in favour of each of these views. But before the question is asked to what sphere of human nature belief is to be assigned, there is a previous question to be settled. Are we to give the name of belief to every mental state which relates to an object? Is every state of consciousness which arises in response to a stimulus and in relation to an object to be described as a state of belief? Can we say we believe in our sensations as we say we believe in our reasoned conclusions? The state of the question may be set forth most vividly in two characteristic descriptions of the nature of belief. Hume says: 'A belief may be most accurately described as a lively idea related to or associated with a present impression.' Professor Stout says: All belief involves objective control of subjective activity' (*Manual of Psychology*, ii. 544).

According to Hume, 'an opinion or belief is nothing but an idea that is different from a fiction, not in the nature or in the order of its parts, but in the manner of its being conceived. But when I would explain this manner, I scarce find any word that fully answers the case, but am obliged to have recourse to every one's feeling, in order to give him a perfect notion of this operation of the mind. An idea assented to feels

different from a fictitious idea that the fancy presents to us; and this feeling I endeavour to explain by calling it a superior force, or vivacity, or solidity or firmness, or steadiness' (Hume's *Works*, i. 397 f., Green's ed.). The description of belief given by Hume is distinguished by the absence of that 'objective control of subjective activity' which, according to Professor Stout, is the mark of all belief. A closer examination of Hume's statement enables us to see that the superior force or vivacity of a belief is due not merely to the manner of conceiving it, but to a certain coerciveness which fact has and which a fancy has not. The feeling of belief is not a gratuitous addition made by the mind to the experience, it is dictated by the fact itself.

Without entering into the discussion in any detail, it is sufficient for the present purpose to say that all belief in the first place is teleological, that it is the tendency of the mind to make itself at home in the world in which it has to live. This general description includes the naïve uncritical belief of the child, and the reasoned critical belief of the mature man. In its simplicity it is a postulate. It may be almost called an instinct, an expectation that the world will afford to man a place in which to live and grow and work. Be the origin and character of instinct what they may, be they due to original endowment or to the accumulated and transmitted inheritance of the race, yet the instincts are there, and are of a kind to enable life to act before individual experience has had time to work. Our organic nature is related to its environment, and it postulates an environment with which it can interact. Thus all our organic instincts which find expression in appropriate acts, such as sucking, eating, moving our limbs in response to a stimulus, and so on, are called into action on the presentation of their appropriate objects. Action begets belief, and belief is again the mental situation which leads to further action. At the outset belief is dominated by our practical needs. In truth, the new school of Humanism holds that all activities whatsoever are in the interest of the practical needs of man, and by the emphasis it has laid on this aspect it has called attention to a factor of human experience which has been too much neglected. For there is no doubt that the character of belief is to be explained, in the first place at all events, from its function in relation to the practical needs of man. And all through the experience of man, belief is an expression of human need, and is the demand which a living creature makes on the Universe for a place to live in, to grow in, and to furnish itself with what shall satisfy its need. Thus the initial postulate of belief is that it is in a world in which it may make itself at home, and the final demand of belief in developed humanity is that it shall find itself in a rational, intelligible world, in which its ideals of unity, intelligibility, beauty, and worth may and will find their realization.

Our beliefs, then, in their generality are our postulates. They set forth our expectations, our desires, our wishes. They proceed on the assumption that our needs are related to reality, and that reality has a way of satisfying our needs. In all belief

there is, of course, a certain risk. We may mistake our real needs, and we may make mistakes as to the nature of reality. But the postulate is there notwithstanding. In fact, to believe that a thing exists is to act as if it existed. To believe that the properties of a thing are so and so, is to act on that supposition. Thus, apart from any theory, we all postulate a kind of uniformity of nature.

From this point of view all axioms are postulates. They are unavoidable assumptions. Students of science are familiar with these. We do not at present raise the question whether the universal formulae of science are more than postulates. They are postulates, and are demands which our nature makes on the Universe.

Our postulates, however, *may* mislead; they may be unwarrantable, and not unavoidable. Along, therefore, with the predisposition to believe in the reality and modes of being of the objects of experience, there goes the necessity of verification, criticism, and investigation. For postulates may be too readily made. Passing needs may be taken for permanent, and beliefs may be based on wrong impressions. Subjective hopes or fears may objectify their objects, and attribute reality to objects which have none. Thus we have beliefs which are irresistible and unavoidable. They are absolutely based in the constitution of the mind itself, and are the assumptions without which experience is impossible. Students of Kant will readily recognize them. They lie at the basis of our life and activity, they are acted on before we are conscious of them, and when they arise into clear consciousness we recognize that they are unavoidable and inevitable. In like manner there are other principles arising out of our intercourse with the external world which strike us as inevitable and unavoidable. To enumerate these would lead us too far afield.

Between the necessary and universal beliefs on the one hand, and the practical necessity which coerces our beliefs on the other hand, there lies a wide field of beliefs, the validity of which depends on our ability to sift, examine, and criticise them. The process of sifting and criticism is coextensive with experience. Man is ever sifting his beliefs, is ever criticising them, and is, more or less, successfully active in the endeavour to make them correspond with reality as he is able to apprehend and conceive reality. He ventures in the belief that there is a correspondence between his inward nature and the world in which he lives; he believes that there is a constancy in things, that the qualities of things will remain constant. He makes the venture, and the venture is justified, and his faith increases as his expectation is verified. Beginning with the need to live and to make himself at home in the world, going on to satisfy his dominant and controlling need to obtain some mastery of the world, he reaches the time when he pursues knowledge for its own sake, and, in a disinterested manner, seeks to obtain a consistent and complete view of the scheme of things. So the sciences, the philosophies, the poesies of the world arise, and all the manifold works of the human spirit.

The beliefs of man can, as we see, be looked at as movements of the human spirit arising out of his intercourse with the world in which he lives. Our account of the matter would be most imperfect were we to confine our attention to man considered only as an individual. Belief is largely a social product. The working beliefs of the civilized man are largely due to inheritance. Without entering on the mysterious question of heredity, and without inquiry into the amount or quality of our organic inheritance, there is no doubt that a large proportion of our working beliefs arise out of our social environment, and out of the intellectual, moral, and spiritual atmosphere of the society around us. The language we learn to speak is the registration of the beliefs of those who made and used it; it tells the meaning which men found in the world and in their own life. It throbs with the life of all the past, is directive of the life of the present and the future. We learn the meanings as we learn to speak, and the meanings of those who speak to us become our meanings. Our beliefs and our meanings belong together. And ere we know it, we are furnished with a working body of beliefs which mainly represent the experience of our ancestors. As we speak with the accent of the family and the district, as our voices repeat the swing and cadence of the sentence, so we take over also the beliefs which sway the minds of those with whom we live. It is a mixed inheritance which we receive and actively appropriate. Beliefs unsifted, uncriticized, results of prejudice often, often of superstition, form part of the inheritance we receive. And the mind assents readily enough to the strange amalgam. For behind the beliefs are the trust which the young have in the old, and the natural homage which they yield to experience.

The persistence of beliefs from age to age is itself a proof that they have a certain correspondence with reality. As all belief is a venture and a risk, failure to realize an expectation is a questioning of its validity, and gives occasion for inquiry. Thus belief is always under the criticism of reality, and the stress of circumstance and the strain of living compel us to revise our beliefs and strive to make them correspond with the facts. It is a process that never ends; and as experience widens and knowledge grows, the circle of our beliefs may contract in one direction and expand in another. Beliefs may take the rank of universal and necessary convictions, or they may be classed as merely probable, or may sink to the level of bare possibility. Our postulates may pass into the region of certainty, or may have to be abandoned as mere possibilities.

Looking at the matter from a historical point of view, perhaps the most striking factor in the genesis and growth of belief is that of *trust in a person*. Into this state of mind many elements enter. The earliest manifestation of belief among human beings is that which we call Animism, or the belief that all things have an inward life, and have their own nature and activity. A spirit dwells in all objects, whether it is in them originally, or has been put into them by some process or act. Crude as this belief is, it yet has in it the germs of growth, and by refinement of its terms and by the removal of its grosser elements it has become the spirit and the meaning of the higher

philosophy of to-day. What is the Hegelian conception of the final correspondence of thought and reality, but a higher form of the original belief of man that the world around him, and the objects with which he came into contact, had a thought and meaning in them akin to those which he found in himself? It were an easy task to extend this observation to other philosophies, but space forbids.

Animism itself was a form of belief which came to higher issues in the social intercourse of man with man. The belief which man came to hold as to the animistic character of all objects whatsoever attained to vividness and certainty when applied to his fellow-men. In this sphere there was certainty, for was there not the interchange of influence, of feeling and thought, between himself and his fellows? Mutual help, power of working together, concerted action with friends and against enemies, the need of increased adaptation to the conditions of life, all conspired to raise belief in one's fellow-men to a dominant height. Out of this social co-operation have arisen the sciences, the arts, the philosophies, and especially the institutions of civilized life. But in considering the rise and growth of these achievements of human life, we must always remember that they are the outcome of the striving of conscious beings. This has been so well put by Professor Villa that we quote his statement.

'The mainspring of the mental development of the individual and the species thus consists in two contrary forces, on whose equilibrium both individual and social progress depend. One—namely, "imitation"—is a conservative, the other—"invention"—is a progressive force. The former corresponds to biological heredity, and is responsible for social and individual habits and instincts; the latter corresponds to the biological law of variations, and finds its highest expression in "genius." The naturalistic and positive schools of the nineteenth century were too much inclined to consider social development as a purely natural and unconscious evolution, and omitted accordingly to take these two forces into consideration. Instead of considering social institutions, ideas, and phenomena as spontaneous products of the nameless multitude, modern Psychology rightly considers them the outcome of individual genius, subsequently consolidated, diffused, and preserved for the whole species by imitation. This idea, admirably developed by Tarde, on which Baldwin founds his studies of social Psychology, has transformed the theories which were current with regard to the evolution of the collective mind, which is thus presented in the light of a conscious, and not of an unconscious evolution like that of geological phenomena. Genius, therefore, is not to be understood as a degeneration, a violation of the natural and conservative law of heredity, but as the integrating factor of the latter, expressive of variation, impulse, and motion, as a dynamic force, without which evolution itself would be impossible' (*Contemporary Psychology*, by Guido Villa, English translation p. 256).

Thus the whirligig of time brings about its revenges, and the uniform tradition of history as to the influence of great personalities on the race is being justified by modern Psychology. In this tradition every movement of advance was ascribed to great men. Advances in the practical control of nature, the making of tools, the use of fire, the sowing of grain, and so on, are in the tradition of the race ascribed to individual men. More particularly is this the case with regard to the founders of cities, the makers of laws, the founders or the reformers of religions, and the framers of institutions. The 19th cent. was celebrated for its endeavours to disintegrate great men, to minimize their influence, and to trace great historic movements to a process and not to a person. How much influence this predilection has had on historic criticism we shall not here inquire. But in the light of modern Psychology, perhaps, Romulus, Numa Pompilius, Solon, Lycurgus, and many others may be looked at as real persons, benefactors of the race, whose names represent real forces in the development of humanity. Perhaps modern Psychology may help men to have some real apprehension of Moses, as ancient Psychology had so much to do with his disintegration.

In the sphere of religions belief we have clear and overwhelming evidence of the weight and influence of personality in the shaping of belief, and in the advance of men to clearer thought and purer embodiment of the religious ideals. It has been through the striving, the toil, the agony of great men that the ideals of religion have attained to form and reality. To them it was given to toil for the race, and the vision they saw and the moral and spiritual truth they won became the inheritance of other men, and through them were conserved for the good of the race. Nor is it the fact that the work and influence of great personalities on other persons have been of a narrow and cramping kind. On the contrary, all the religious truth we possess may be traced back to the moral, spiritual, and intellectual insight of great men, just as every great discovery of science is associated with some great historic name. This personal element in our belief is of universal validity. As a matter of fact, only those religions which have had a personal founder have become universal, or at least international. For, after all, personality is our highest category of thought and life.

Belief in great personalities may be historically and scientifically vindicated. They were needed to make the new departure, they were the first to see the vision, they made the discovery, or thought out the truth; but those unfitted to be pioneers may be quite able to think over again what is made plain to them by him who was the first to think out that truth. The insight of a great man may be verified by the experience of other men. In fact, we have daily illustrations of this in our own experience. We use telephones, we drive by means of steam or electricity, we command nature by using the means which others have placed at our disposal, though we may not have the power of making these discoveries. Plato, Aristotle, Kant opened out paths on which the feet of others may safely tread, and we may rise to the height of the vision

of Dante, and rejoice in the universality of Shakespeare, though these would have remained undiscovered countries had not those great personalities opened the gates of entrance to us.

Yet the man in the street has something in common with the greatest and the highest. If he cannot initiate he may imitate, and if he cannot make the discovery he may appreciate and act on it when it has been made. For in the long-run the achievements of great men in any sphere, just in proportion to their truth and value, turn out to have elements of permanent value. Though the discoveries of a person, they have no mere personal value. They are objective, and because objective they may become the possession of every man. We have spoken up to this point of the work of great personalities only so far as that work was a help towards the discovery of truth and a help to life. Belief in them, trust in them, is thus far justified. But no great personality answers to the ideal of greatness in all the aspects of greatness. Great men have had their limitations, and greatness from one point of view has been accompanied with littleness in other respects. The leaders of men have had their limitations. Some have been great in action, some in thought, some in invention, some in power of poetic or prophetic vision, and some in other ways. Others have been great in gathering into a system the results of the work of former generations, and have thus marked out the stage to which humanity has come. But the limitations of great men have had their effect, and their achievements may come to hinder and not to help progress. In all spheres of human thought and action this has been true, and the imitative mind of man has striven to live in formulae which have become outworn and effete. There has been also imitation of great men in those aspects of their activity in which they were not good or great. Illustrations of these facts abound, and need not be dwelt on at length.

But trust in personality as one of the greatest forces of human progress and one of the strongest elements in belief is justified notwithstanding. It alone can give the enthusiasm which confronts difficulties, the personal devotion and love which make men willing to live and die for a great cause. The great epochs of human life, the times which stand out in history as full of heroic endeavour, of far-reaching aspiration, and of substantial gain for other ages, have been pre-eminently periods of abounding trust in great ideals; and these ideals appear in all their grandeur as embodied in some great personality. The imitative mind found its ideal embodied in the great man of its time; and was touched as with a flame, and followed on and became greater than it knew. The great personality became for the lesser men the embodiment of the highest ideal they had ever known; and they, so far as they saw it, embodied it in their own action and character, and wrought it so far into the very constitution of humanity. So the vision grew; and as one personality after another revealed to men the possible synthesis of the ideal greatness of a perfect personality,

men were educated to perceive what they ought to demand in the ideal of a perfect personality in whom they might completely and absolutely trust.

In the perfect personality in whom man may absolutely trust all kinds of ideals must meet, and be harmonized in a perfect unity. That is the postulate of the nature of man. And each part of man's complex nature makes its own demand and contributes its own share towards the realization of the ideal. Our intelligent nature demands unity and intelligibility in the Universe, and in Him in whom the Universe lives and moves and has its being. Our moral nature demands its ideal of perfect goodness, righteousness, and holiness in order to meet the needs of our moral nature, and to give us scope for the exercise of reverence towards that which is above us, love towards all that helps and sustains us, and benevolence towards all that needs our help. The aesthetic nature furnishes its ideal of perfect beauty and harmony, and demands that reality shall meet this as it meets every other demand. The heart demands goodness and love, and furnishes in its own action the type of what it demands. The Christian belief is that all these ideals meet and are realized in God. It is the business of Theism to show how these ideals are realized in God, and it is the business of the metaphysician, the ethicist, the aestheticist, and the poet to show how the various ideals converge to the one great ideal whom we reverently call God. Our intellectual, ethical, spiritual, artistic, and emotional ideals agree, must agree, if we are to attain to harmony of life and fulness of being. We repeat again that these are our needs, and our needs have their roots in reality, and reality does not disappoint us.

Is there a Personality who can be to all men what some personalities have been to some men and to some nations? Is there one who can be to all nations what the national heroes have been to particular peoples, one who can embody their highest ideals, and who can so react on them as to make them work out these ideals in themselves? That is the claim which history makes for Christ, which Christians make for Him, and which they believe has been verified in human experience by all who have trusted and followed Him. He Himself makes the claim: 'I am the way, the truth, and the life' ([Joh_14:6](#)). St. Paul makes it for Him: 'in whom are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden' ([Col_2:2](#)). This is not the place to unfold the meaning of the claim of Christ to the reverence and trust of all men, nor to set forth His ability to meet all the needs of our nature and to satisfy all our ideals. It would take many treatises to do that work, instead of one brief article. But the scope of the proof may be indicated. First, as to the demands which our needs make on Christ; and, second, as to His ability to meet them. The main demands of our nature may be summed up in the ideals we have noted above: the demand for unity, the demand for purity, the longing for beauty and harmony, the thirst for love and goodness and fulness of life. The demand for unity, and the belief that unity is there, have led men on towards the conquest of the world,—which conquest has embodied itself, so far as it has gone, in

the sciences and their practical applications and in the philosophies of the world. The demand for beauty and harmony, and its result in the poetries, arts, and beautiful human constructions, and in increasing appreciations of the beauty of the Universe; the demand for goodness, righteousness, love, which has embodied itself in the ethical and spiritual life of the world, are illustrations of the faith of man in the unity, beauty, goodness, and worth of reality, and his own achievements are tributes to the validity of his faith.

But the needs of man make this claim on the perfect human personality. We need One who can reveal to us what human life ought to be and what it may become. We need One who gathers into Himself all the types of greatness that have ever entered into the thoughts of men; and One who has realized them in His own life and action. But we need to be educated and trained to appreciate the ideal, for it may be, nay, it is, the reversal of many human ideals. Man has often mistaken his real needs, and has also mistaken the ideals which alone can satisfy them. The first must become last and the last first. The intellectual, moral, aesthetic, and religious needs of man have sought satisfaction in the pursuit of false ideals, and have not found it. Yet the needs are real and the search was good, and the satisfaction is attainable. The perfect human Personality reveals to man how to show reverence to what is above man, love to all his equals, and benevolence to all that is subject to him. He has shown it in His own action, and inspires it in those who trust Him.

Belief in Christ is thus the outcome of the deepest needs of man's manifold nature, and the prophecy of their complete satisfaction. It means also that there is a revelation to man of what his real needs are. It means instruction, education, training into a true and adequate apprehension of his own nature and calling. He learns from Christ his own value and worth, and the sphere in which these may be realized. He learns how this supreme Personality has thought about him, cared for him, suffered for him, lives for him, and is ever working and striving in him and for him. Then, too, he learns, as he trusts Christ, what life and conduct ought to be, and he learns that it is possible through union with Christ to live that life and imitate that conduct. For the further development of this part of our theme we have to refer to Christian dogmatics, and specially to the NT documents. We may also refer to the practical experience of the Christian through the Christian centuries, and to what it has felt and accomplished.

As to the ability of Christ to satisfy our needs and meet our ideals, we have just to make the same reference. We are beginning to understand the cosmical significance of Christ. As our knowledge of the primary revelation of God is widened by the patient and triumphant labours of scientific workers through the ages, we find increased validity in the process when we reflect that we are following in the footsteps of Him by whom every thing was made that was made. 'In Him all things

consist,' and our faith in the Eternal Logos is confirmed as we trace out the logos of things. Then in the sphere of history we desire a meaning and a unity, we need the belief that a purpose runs through the ages, and we find that of Him, and through Him, and to Him are all things; that 'God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself,' and that there is a ministry of reconciliation in history. Then comes the personal knowledge of Him, in His perfect grace, love, wisdom, power; and the union with Him, till He becomes the atmosphere we breathe, our outlook on life and its possibilities, the source of all our strivings, the goal of all our efforts; and the only true description of it all is that we are 'in Christ Jesus.'

The correspondence is perfect between our needs and their satisfaction in Jesus Christ. Here the subjective is controlled by the objective, and the coercive power of Christ over the belief of those who trust Him is perfect. Much might be said on the educative power of Christ on man as to the true needs of man, and much might be said on the reasonableness of trust in this perfect Personality; but enough has been said to indicate the congruity of this belief with the whole nature of belief in general, and to show that it is the outcome of all the factors which enter into and justify that attitude of the human mind which we call belief. See, further, art. Faith.

Literature.—The articles 'Belief' and 'Psychology' in the *Encyc. Brit.*⁹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; James, *Principles of Psychology*; Turner, *Knowledge, Belief, and Certitude*; Flint, *Agnosticism*; Royce, *The Religious Aspect of Modern Philosophy*; Newman, *Grammar of Assent*; Bain, *Emotions and the Will*, and *Mental and Moral Science*; Villa, *Contemporary Psychology*. It may be well to refer to Kant in his three great Critiques, and specially to his treatment of 'Glaube' in the *Critique of the Practical Reason*. In the works of Sir William Hamilton, Mansel, and Herbert Spencer the reader will find discussions of some value. In truth, the literature which in one form or other deals with the nature and validity of belief is so enormous, that an exhaustive reference is out of the question. But reference ought to be made to Balfour's *Foundations of Belief* and to Kidd's *Social Evolution*, as these books present a somewhat peculiar view of the nature and validity of belief, specially in its relation to knowledge.

As to belief in Christ we need not give any reference, for all the literature of Christianity would be relevant here.

J. Iverach.

BELOVED.—Wherever the word rendered ‘beloved’ (ἀγαπητός—in 9 places Authorized Version has ‘dearly beloved’ and in 3 places ‘well-beloved’; in every case Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 has ‘beloved’ only) is used in the NT, it seems to imply a love deeper and more intimate than the common affections, and is therefore but sparingly employed. In the Epistles it is the indication of the inner brotherhood, and its very form ‘beloved brethren’ has passed into every liturgy. St. Paul uses it to distinguish, as with peculiar honour, those whom he has personally enlightened with the new faith, as Epaenetus (Rom 16:5), Timothy (1Co 4:17), or a whole community (1Co 10:14, Php 2:12). But in the Gospels the word is used solely concerning Christ, and marks out the Son’s especial relationship to the Father. There is abundance of love throughout the Gospels: whether of Jesus for John and the rest, or of the disciples and others for Him: and there is no weakness or timidity in the expression of the love. But to none other save Himself is the word ‘beloved’ applied. He Himself uses it but once, and then in the parable of the Lord of the Vineyard, wherein the ‘beloved son’ is the evident picture of the Son of Man (Mar 12:6 [Authorized Version ‘well-beloved’], Luk 20:13). Elsewhere the Evangelists (Synoptists only), who give the word, report it as the utterance of God, the Divine recognition and approval of the Son. The influence of the OT is plainly visible in the words heard at the Baptism. Jesus hears the voice of God pronouncing a benediction in clearest remembrance of Psa 2:7, ‘Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee,’ and of Isa 42:1 ‘My chosen, in whom my soul delighteth’ (quoted in Mat 12:18; cf. Bruce, *Expos. Gr. Test.*, in *loc.*); for the Synoptists agree in the phrase ‘My beloved son in (thee whom) I am well pleased’ (Mat 3:17, Mar 1:11, Luk 3:22). And there is something beautifully fitting in this consecration of the opening of His ministry by a blended echo of psalm and prophecy. The other occasion of the word is that record of another great revealing moment of His life—the Transfiguration, when two of the three tell of ‘a voice out of the cloud (saying), This is my beloved son, hear ye him’ (Mat 17:5, Mar 9:7; in the || Luk 9:36 the true reading is ἐκλελεγμένος).

Literature.—The *Lexicons* of Cremer and Grimm-Thayer, s.v. ἀγαπητός; R. H. Charles, *Ascension of Isaiah* (1900), p. 3 and *passim*; J. A. Robinson, *Epistle to Ephesians* (1904), 229; art. ‘Beloved’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible .

E. Daplyn.

☩ Benediction

BENEDICTION.—Benedictions on the assembled people pronounced by an officiating priest or minister were a regular part of the liturgies of the temple and the

synagogue, but no direct mention is made of these in the Gospel narratives. Quite similar in character, however, are the benedictions on persons, which are not a part of the ceremonial of Divine worship. Of these there are several examples in the Gospels (Luk 2:34; Luk 6:28; Luk 24:50 and Mar 10:16). All such words of blessing are liable to have magical power attributed to them, but in form and origin they are simply a prayer addressed to God for the wellbeing of some person or persons in whose presence they are uttered. They may be exemplified from the benediction of the Jewish liturgy: 'The Lord bless thee, and keep thee; the Lord make his face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee; the Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace' (Num 6:24-27). In the NT the verbs εὐλογεῖν (Luk 2:34; Luk 6:28; Luk 24:50) and κατευλογεῖν (Mar 10:16) denote 'to utter a benediction' in this sense.

εὐλογεῖν properly means to ascribe (to God) praise and honour (*benedicere*). In accordance with the usage of the OT and NT and of the Christian Church, this act also is termed 'benediction.' It is of the nature of thanksgiving and praise to God for His goodness, and differs essentially from that kind of benediction which is a prayer that Divine favour may be shown to those whom the speaker 'blesses.' In the NT this second kind of benediction is expressed by εὐχαριστεῖν, 'give thanks,' as well as by εὐλογεῖν. The Jewish custom of blessing God on every possible occasion (see below) supplies a probable explanation of the designation of God in Mar 14:61 ὁ εὐλογητός, 'the Blessed.' It does not, however, appear that this title was current in Jewish literature (Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 200).* [Note: Enoch 77:1 seems to supply a parallel. In Berakhoth vii. 3 (ed. Surenhusius) בְּרַכְיָהּ is an epithet qualifying אֱלֹהֵינוּ.] Elsewhere in the NT εὐλογητός is used as an *epithet* of God (e.g. Luk 1:68). This is the Jewish usage of בְּרַכְיָהּ.

The double sense of εὐλογεῖν, just explained, is due to the meaning of בָּרַךְ and the LXX Septuagint use of εὐλογεῖν. It has a third signification when God is the subject, namely 'bless,' *i.e.* prosper. This also is a meaning of בָּרַךְ (see Blessing). In the Gospels the only instances of the third usage are cases where the participle εὐογημένος, 'blessed,' is employed, εὐλογεῖν meaning to *pronounce a benediction* never occurs in John, but εὐλογημένος appears in Joh 12:13.

1. *Benedictions on men.*—In Jewish life the occasions of pronouncing benedictions on men were numerous. Besides those of the temple and the synagogue, and perhaps even older than these, were the salutations customary at meeting and parting, entering a house and leaving it, which were all benedictions. The blessings of the aged and of parents were specially valued, and were often a part of the solemn farewell of the dying. In the temple a benediction was regularly pronounced at the conclusion of the morning and evening sacrifices. The statement in Luk 1:21 that the people waited for Zacharias may be an indirect reference to this custom. But the intercessory benedictions recorded in the Gospels are chiefly of the nature of greetings or salutations (Luk 1:28 f., Luk 1:42, Luk 13:35 = Mat 23:39 = Psa 118:26). Our Lord commends to His disciples the practice of saluting a house when they enter it, *i.e.*, of pronouncing a benediction on those resident in it (Mat 10:12 = Luk 10:5). The actual words of such a benediction are given in Luk 10:5 ‘May peace rest on this house’ (cf. Luk 1:40). Christ’s farewell to His disciples before His ascension was expressed in words of blessing (Luk 24:50 f.). It is to be understood in the light of what has already been said regarding Jewish customs. Simeon’s benediction (Luk 2:34) was that of an old man and a priest. But in any circumstances benedictions were appropriate as expressions of goodwill (cf. Luk 6:28 and Mar 11:9 f.).

εὐλογημένος (= בָּרֵךְ) in formulas of blessing may, be understood to express a wish, ‘Blessed be thou.’ This is clearly the meaning in Psa 118:26 (LXX Septuagint), and consequently in Mar 11:9 = Mat 21:9 = Luk 19:38 = Joh 12:13 and Mat 23:39 = Luk 13:35, where the Psalm is quoted. In the Gospels Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 makes the phrase a statement, and so does Authorized Version except in Luk 19:38 (cf. Mar 11:10). There are similar phrases in Mar 11:10 and Luk 1:42. μακάριος, although translated in the Authorized and Revised Versions ‘blessed,’ is not used in benedictions, and has a different meaning (see Blessing).

There is at least one clear reference to the *attitude* adopted in the act of benediction (Luk 24:50). The uplifting of the hands there spoken of (cf. Lev 9:22) is not peculiar to benedictions; according to ancient custom, Babylonian and Egyptian as well as Hebrew, when prayer was offered in a standing posture the hands were uplifted or spread out (Psa 28:2, Isa 1:15 etc.). It is not equally certain that the laying of hands upon the children who were blessed by Christ (Mar 10:16) is directly connected with the act of benediction as such, although Gen 48:14 may be quoted in support of that view. The request made to Christ is that He should *touch* the children (Mar 10:13 = Luk 18:15; but cf. || Mat 19:13), and that is something different from a request that He should bless them (see Mar 5:28, and cf. possibly Luk 2:28). Mat 19:13 may be regarded as an interpretation of Mar 10:16; benedictions of persons are intercessory prayers on their behalf.

2. *Benedictions of God.*—The practice of uttering benedictions on God is a highly characteristic expression of Jewish religious life. It is broadly formulated as a duty in the Talmud in the words, ‘Whoever benefits from this world without (reciting) a benediction, acts as if he robbed God’ (*Berakhoth*, 35a). Any circumstance or event which recalls or exhibits God’s goodness or power is an appropriate occasion for ‘blessing’ God. At circumcisions, redemptions of the first-born, marriages, etc., benedictions of this class were employed along with others invoking blessings on men. Sometimes unusual experiences and special circumstances called them forth. But the ordinary routine of life, and particularly the daily meals of the family and the individual, equally fulfil the conditions which prompt their use. The Jewish ‘grace’ pronounced at meal-times was an act of thanksgiving to God, that and nothing more. The procedure is described in the Mishna (*Berakhoth*) and in other Jewish sources. When several sat down to a meal together, one usually gave thanks for all, although each in certain circumstances was expected to do so for himself. A company is said to be constituted by the presence of three persons. The meal commenced with a benediction and with the breaking of bread. Whoever broke the bread also spoke the benediction. This was the part of the master of the house, the giver of the feast, or the most important person in the company. There were differences in the words of blessing, according to the formality of the occasion and the character of the dishes that were served. During one meal several benedictions might be pronounced, referring to the various articles of food separately (for the ordinary formulas used in blessing bread and wine, see Blessing). During the Passover meal benedictions were pronounced at several fixed points. Every meal was concluded with a benediction. In the Passover meal the last benediction was spoken before the actual conclusion; a hymn was sung at the very end.

It is not easy to draw a line in principle between the thanksgiving of God which is benediction and that which is denoted by the word ‘praise’ (αἰνεῖν). But there is a practical distinction. The use of special formulas, and especially of the word בָּרַךְ ‘blessed’ (εὐλογημένος), is characteristic of benedictions.

There are only three references in the Gospels to benedictions of God other than those pronounced at meal-times. In each case they are prompted by unusual manifestations of Divine favour to the speakers (Luk 1:64 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, Luk 2:28; Luk 24:53). The actual words of benediction are not recorded in any case. Luk 2:29-32 is a prayer supplementing the benediction proper.

Four narratives in the Gospels allude to blessings pronounced at meal-times. The occasions are the miracles of the feeding of the 5000 and of the 4000, the institution of the Lord’s Supper, and the evening meal at Emmaus. The reference in every case to the breaking of bread is noteworthy. It emphasizes the character of the act as one

in accordance with Jewish custom. The Jewish formulas of blessing at meal-times make it perfectly certain that no blessing on the food is asked, but that God is thanked for the food. Illustrations of this meaning of the word 'bless' are found in the parallel narratives of the Gospels themselves. Luk 22:19 has 'give thanks' (εὐχαριστήσας) in place of the 'bless' (εὐλογήσας) of Mar 14:22 and Mat 26:26; Joh 6:11 has 'give thanks' where the Synoptists have 'bless' (cf. also the parallel expressions in 1Co 14:16). When the grammatical object of the verb is an article of food, 'bless' then signifies 'pronounce a benediction over,' *i.e.* 'give thanks to God for' the food in question (so Mar 8:7 and Luk 9:16). The same construction occurs in the OT (1Sa 9:13), (in the Mishna בּרַךְ לֵב is generally used). Christ's blessing of the elements in the institution of the Lord's Supper should no doubt be understood in the light of these facts.

The only other passage in the NT where a material object is said to be blessed is 1Co 10:16, and it really belongs to the category just explained. The expression 'cup ... which we bless' means simply 'cup for which we give thanks,' over which we pronounce our benediction. In Jewish phraseology material objects may be consecrated or hallowed, but they cannot be said in the same sense to be blessed.

Mar 6:41 (and so the parallels) speaks of Christ looking up to the sky, and implies, no doubt, in accordance with the circumstances, that He stood while He offered His prayer of thanksgiving. But the ordinary Jewish practice seems to have been to sit while grace was being said. In Joh 6:23 it is not obvious at first sight why the words 'when the Lord gave thanks' have been added. Perhaps they were intended to mean 'when the Lord was giver of the feast.' The statement in Luk 24:30 that the risen Christ was recognized in the breaking of bread seems to imply that the disciples were familiar with the manner in which He acted on such occasions, and that there was something peculiar or characteristic in the procedure which He followed. Doubtless the act as He performed it was always deliberate and impressive.

The application of the word εὐλογεῖν to meals is common to the Synoptists, but St. Matthew (Mat 15:36) and St. Luke (Luk 22:19) both substitute on one occasion εὐχαριστεῖν for St. Mark's εὐλογεῖν (Mar 8:7; Mar 14:22). εὐλογεῖν with God as explicit object occurs in St. Luke only (Luk 1:64; Luk 2:28; Luk 24:53). St. John does not use the word at all in this sense (see Joh 6:11 and cf. also Joh 11:41).

Literature.—See the authorities cited at end of art. Blessing.

W. B. Stevenson.

Benedictus

BENEDICTUS.—The Song of Zacharias (wh. see), preserved in Luk_1:68-79, is usually spoken of under the name familiar to us in the offices of the Church—a name derived from its opening word in the Latin version. St. Luke introduces it immediately after his narrative of the circumcision and naming of the future Baptist, with the copulative *and*, in these terms: ‘And his father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied, saying’ (Luk_1:67). But while he thus asserts the author’s inspiration, and claims the Song as an outcome thereof, it does not follow either that the Holy Ghost came on Zacharias then and there,—He may have rested on him during the whole period of his miraculous dumbness, teaching him in that penitential silence, and bringing to his remembrance the dealings and promises of God,—or that the Song was extempore (it was while the old psalmist was musing, that the fire burned, Psa_39:3). Zacharias may have had it ready for the long anticipated moment; may have recited it then, and written it afterwards.

Nor, again, does the fullest acceptance of its inspiration as a fact forbid that it should bear the marks of the time at which it was composed, and of the feelings of devout Israelites under the trials of their age. The Holy Spirit speaks through men, not through pipes. Their character, proved and purified by calamities,—public as well as private,—is of no small importance to Him. They were ‘holy men of God,’ who ‘spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost’ (2Pe_1:21). Zacharias was an old man (Luk_1:18); he might easily remember the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey (b.c. 63), and his pushing forward, like Antiochus Epiphanes, into the Holy of Holies. There were chief priests who ‘opened the gates’ to the heathen conqueror as ‘sons to receive a father’ (Ps-Sol 8:18-20); but among the ministering priesthood there then lived (as there still survived in Zacharias himself) a piety so genuine and fearless that, when the victorious Romans burst into the Temple courts, the officiating priests went on with the service as if nothing unusual were happening, and suffered themselves to be cut down at their posts. That awful day was the end of Jewish independence. Zacharias had lived through all the shame that followed, and the further Roman outrages of Crassus, who robbed the Temple (b.c. 54), and of Cassius, who sold 30,000 Jews into captivity (b.c. 51). The usurpations, the feuds, the subserviences to Herod and the Romans, the Sadducean unbelief of the high-priestly families, the immoralities which disgraced them,—must all have been fresh in his recollection, and may well have led him, as these things led the more quiet and religious Pharisees around him, to turn back for comfort to the Divine promise to David and his seed for evermore.

That such a terrible state of things should have deeply affected Zacharias was as right as it was natural. That it wrought within him affections altogether good and holy is just a sign that it was the Spirit of Christ who taught him by them. The book already referred to, the Psalter (or Psalms) of Solomon, is the nearest Jewish work in point of time to the *Benedictus* and its fellows in the first two chapters of St. Luke: it is also the likeliest to them in style and character. Like these Songs, the Psalms of Solomon are a proof that sacred poetry, so far from being extinct among the Jews at this period, was living, and was being made the vehicle of intensest religious feeling. Nor are these Psalms deficient in merit. They are forceful, vivid, full of noble indignation against Roman oppression and Jewish secularity alike, of shame for 'the dragged purples' of the Hasmonaean princes, of acknowledgments that God is justified in His chastening of Israel. They look, like the *Benedictus*, for a Messiah of the House of David. They assign to Him the double work of 'thrusting' sinners out of the holy place, 'purging Jerusalem and making it holy as in the days of old,' and of avenging her upon the Romans. But with all this, they lack the characteristic elements of evangelical prophecy. They have little insight and less foresight. They emanated from the better sort of Pharisees, and they betray all the elements of Pharisaism as we see it in the Gospels. The Messiah they expect is purely human (cf. our Lord's contention on this point with the *Pharisees*, Mat 22:41-46, Mar 12:35-37, Luk 20:39-44). Their idea of God's salvation is political mainly: vengeance on their enemies rather than undisturbed devotion is the thing they long for. The whole tone of the book is fierce, narrow, separatist, self-righteous. The *Benedictus*, on the other hand, is in its closing notes very strikingly predictive: the father foretells, with proud exactness, the future ministry of his infant son. Even had this element been wanting, the Song is in the truest sense a prophecy, for it discerns the spiritual nature of Christ's kingdom with a clearness unknown even to the Apostles after Christ had been some time with them. It tells of 'salvation in the remission of sins' (Luk 1:77 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) through the mercy of God (Luk 1:79, cf. Tit 3:5) in Christ (Luk 1:69), of human need and darkness, of reconciliation to life and peace, and of the worship of God without fear (cf. 1Jn 4:18) as its climax (Luk 1:74). There is deliverance from every enemy, not from the Romans only, but no hint of revenge upon them. The tone of the Song is eminently gentle. The salvation is from God, according to His promise by the mouth of all His holy prophets from the beginning of the world; it embraces in its range our fathers (Luk 1:72) who are gone, as well as the living (cf. 1Pe 2:19, and Rev 6:9); and is all given us through and in the Horn of Salvation, whom God has *raised* up 'in the house of his servant David' (Luk 1:69), indeed, but who Himself is 'the Most High,' and 'the Lord' (Luk 1:76), and 'the Day-spring from on High'—not rising gradually as does Nature's dawn, but bursting, as it were, upon our wondering eyes, full-orbed from the zenith (Luk 1:78). It is very remarkable how subordinate to Him who is the subject of his Song is the position assigned by Zacharias to his own miraculously-born child. Even while he predicts John's office, it is in contrast with the greater dignity of the Redeemer. Alford justly remarks that the *Benedictus* 'shows the

exact religions view under which John was educated by his father.’ The fruit may be seen in all that is recorded of the Baptist (cf. Mat 3:3; Mat 3:11-12; Mat 11:10, Mar 1:1-8, Luk 3:4-17, Joh 1:7-8; Joh 1:15; Joh 1:19-34; Joh 3:10). It is abundantly clear that the Song was composed in the light both of the Annunciation made to the Virgin Mary (Luk 1:35-38) and of the inspired salutation wherewith she was greeted by Elisabeth (Luk 1:43). The *Benedictus* is thus emphatically a ‘Hymn of the Incarnation’—‘Canticum de Evangelio,’ as the Antiphonary of Bangor styles it.

It differs from the other hymns in these two chapters of St. Luke mainly in this, that whereas the *Magnificat* (St. Mary’s Song) is of Christ’s kingship, whereby He casts down the proud and exalts the humble, and the *Nunc dimittis* (Simeon’s) is of His prophetic or enlightening office, the *Benedictus*, as beseems the song of the blameless priest, is of Christ’s priesthood. It is priestly throughout; it begins with blessing and ends with peace. The work of the Deliverer is remission of sins and reconciliation with God, and its culmination is seen in a people of priests ‘serving God (*i.e.* worshipping Him—λατρεῦειν, same word as in Rev 2:28) in holiness and righteousness before him all the days of their life.’ It is evident that Zacharias has in his mind the history of Melchizedek (Genesis 14) and the oracle, even then ascribed to the pen of David, which forms so important a commentary on that history (Psalms 110).

The ‘sources’ of the Song, as of the two chapters of which it forms an integral part, will be discussed in art. Luke (Gospel of). It may be mentioned here that the text of the *Benedictus* varies little either in MS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] or Versions. The one reading which exhibits an important difference from that of the *Textus Receptus* is in v. 76, where a future tense takes the place of a past. This has been adopted in the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, but with a marginal note, ‘Many ancient authorities read *hath visited us.*’

The structure of the *Benedictus* is simple. It consists of three stanzas—the first (Luk 1:68-70) setting forth the fact of God’s interposition in the approaching birth of the long-looked-for Saviour; the second (Luk 1:71-75) telling the purpose of His incarnation; and the third (Luk 1:76-79) an apostrophe to Zacharias’ babe, declaring his office as the forerunner of Christ.

The references in the hymn are marvellous alike in their number, range, and depth. The opening words remind us of the opening of Melchizedek’s address to Abram (Genesis 14); ‘visited and redeemed,’ of Israel’s deliverance from Egypt (Exo 4:31; Exo 6:6); the ‘Horn of Salvation,’ of Hannah’s Song at the beginning of the story of the kings (1Sa 2:10); ‘in the house of David’ is from 1Ch 17:4; in ‘from the beginning of the world,’ ἀπ’ αἰῶνος, we have possibly an allusion to the *Protevangelium*

(Gen 3:15); in ‘in holiness’ we may see reference to Psa 110:3; while the Baptist’s mission is described by quotation from Isa 40:3. Nor is the opinion of Bishop Wordsworth, accepted somewhat grudgingly by Alford, to be dismissed as fanciful, that in Luk 1:72-73 there is a paronomasia on the three names of the parties chiefly concerned with the Baptist’s birth. The name of *John* had been fixed by the Angel (Isa 40:13); Zacharias knew that *it* must be significant, and it means ‘the grace or mercy of God,’ ἔλεος. He could hardly help reflecting that his own name *Zacharias* (from יָכַר recordatus fuit, and יָהוָה; (Jehovah), means θεὸς ἐμνήσθη; while (from לָאָה , and שָׁבַע shâba‘ juravit) is just ὄρκος θεοῦ. He puts all these together. ‘... The tender of our God ... in e of his holy covenant ... the which he sware.’ If the paronomasia as a literary figure is out of fashion for the moment, we may remember that neither Dante nor Shakespeare thought it beneath their genius; and Zacharias had sacred precedents for employing it in the histories of the births and blessings of the twelve patriarchs (Genesis 30, 49), and still more strikingly in Isaiah 7, 8, where, as Matthew Arnold has observed, the significant names are the keynote of the whole prophecy,

Literature.—Plummer, ‘St. Luke’ (*Internal. Crit. Com.*), 38 ff.; Godet, *Com. on St. Luke*, i. 110 ff.; Wilkinson, *Johan. Document in Lk i.*, p. 17.

James Cooper.

☞ Benefactor

BENEFACTOR (εὐεργέτης).—A title conferred by a grateful sovereign or country for useful service rendered, often in time of difficulty or danger (Est 2:23; Est 6:2). The names of royal benefactors were enrolled in a register (Herod. viii. 85, where see Rawlinson’s note; Thuc. 1:129). In the Persian tongue the king’s benefactors enjoyed a special title, possibly implying that their names were recorded. Besides the special appellation given to all who had done public service, the title ‘benefactor’ is occasionally mentioned as a perpetual epithet of kings, merely enhancing their dignity. So Antiochus vii. of Syria, Ptolemy iii. of Egypt, and at a later period Ptolemy vii. (b.c. 145-117), were called benefactors. It is evidently this latter, complimentary or official, title to which our Lord chiefly alludes in Luk 22:55, and so Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 rightly spells with a capital, ‘Benefactors.’ In worldly societies men reign in virtue of superior power, and εὐεργέτης, ‘Benefactor,’ is a title of flattery which may be applied to the most cruel despot—as in the case of Ptolemy vii., otherwise known as Physcon (‘Big-Belly’), and also called Κοκαεργέτης by a play

upon his official designation. But in this new society which Jesus is instituting, the greatest is to be as the least, and he that is chief as he that doth serve. And this after the example of the Lord Himself, who, being the true Εὐεργέτης, ‘came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many’ (see the parallel passage [Mat_20:25-28](#), and cf. the ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν δίδόμενον, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον which Jesus had just spoken at the Last Supper [[Luk_22:19-20](#)]).

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , art. ‘Benefactor’; *Comm.* of Alford and Godet, *in loc.*; Smith, *Classical Dict.*, art. ‘Ptolemaeus.’

C. H. Prichard.

☩ Benevolence

BENEVOLENCE.—The disposition which sets itself to desire steadfastly the welfare and happiness of others. Christian benevolence is this disposition of heart informed by the example and precept of Christ, this informing of the heart being the work of His Holy Spirit. Continual active benevolence is perhaps the most striking feature in the whole of the Gospel records. It is the keynote of the Sermon on the Mount, and merges into the harmony of love in the final discourses recorded in the Fourth Gospel. The *sons of the Most High* are to do good to their enemies as well as to their friends ([Luk_6:35](#)). The *sons of the Father which is in heaven* are to be kindly disposed and actively beneficent both to the just and to the unjust ([Mat_5:45](#)). And this benevolence, which is to reign in the hearts of His disciples, must have been included in that great last prayer ([Joh_17:26](#)) that ‘the love wherewith thou lovedst me may be in them.’ A simple rule is given to the follower of Christ for securing and testing this attitude of benevolence: ‘All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them’ ([Mat_7:12](#)). The Divine image is not so marred in any man as to destroy the intention and desire to do good to relations and friends ([Mat_5:46](#); [Mat_7:11](#), [Luk_6:33](#); [Luk_11:13](#)), but the benevolence of the Christian heart is to be a kindly feeling towards all without exception ([Mat_5:44](#), [Luk_6:27](#); [Luk_6:35](#)). There is to be no single blot on the escutcheon; Christians are to be *perfect, as their Heavenly Father is perfect* ([Mat_5:48](#)). Natural benevolence expresses itself in the exclamation of those who heard of the fate of the wicked husbandmen in the parable, ‘God forbid’ ([Luk_20:16](#)). Christian benevolence meets us in the story of the arrest in Gethsemane, when the Lord addressed His betrayer as ‘comrade’ (ἐταῖρε, [Mat_26:50](#)).

Such being the intensive character, the extensive character of benevolence may be observed in Christ's compassion on the multitudes (Mar 8:2, Mat 14:14), namely, on each individual; and, again, in His healing *every one* of those around Him on a well-known occasion at Capernaum (Luk 4:40). By precept as well as by example benevolence is enjoined upon the ministry in the first commission to the Twelve: 'Freely ye have received, freely give' (Mat 10:8). Not least beautiful and consoling is the assurance that it prevails in the angelic spheres, even towards poor sinners (Luk 15:7; Luk 15:10).

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Love'; Butler, *Sermons* xi. xii.; Newman, *Oxford Univ. Sermons*, p. 104 ff.; Schulhof, *Law of Forgiveness* (1901), 121 ff.

W. B. Frankland.

☩ Bethabara

BETHABARA (עֲבָרָה בֵּיתָה 'house of the ford crossing').—The name is found in the New Testament only in Joh 1:28 (Authorized Version): 'These things were done in Bethabara beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing.' The place was, therefore, one suitable for the purposes of the Baptist in preaching and baptizing; and it has been usually identified, though this is not precisely stated in the text, with the scene of the baptism of our Lord.

With the great majority of Gr. MS^S [Note: SS Manuscripts.] (including א* ABC*) the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 has retained here the reading 'Bethany,' with marginal alternatives 'Bethabarah' and 'Betharabah.' The latter (עֲבָרָה בֵּיתָה 'house of the prairie,' cf. Isa 40:3 *et al.*; or 'house of the Arabah or Jordan Valley,' cf. Deu 1:7; or perhaps 'house of the poplar,' cf. Isa 15:7 הָעֲרָבִים נָחַל) is possibly a reminiscence of the Beth-arabah of Jos 15:6; Jos 15:61 in the plain of Jericho, or it may be due merely to an accidental transposition of letters. The form 'Bethabara,' on the other hand, is found in a few extant manuscripts of the Greek text, both uncial and cursive, and in the Curetonian and Sinaitic Syriac. Origen adopted this reading, and it seems to have gained general currency mainly on his authority. He writes (*in Evang. Joannis*, vi. 24) that Bethany is found in almost all copies and in Heracleon, but after personal investigation of the district (γενόμενοι ἐν τοῖν τόποις ἐπὶ ἱστορίαν τῶν ἰχνῶν Ἰησοῦ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ) he prefers 'Bethabara' on the twofold

ground of the distance of Bethany, the country of Lazarus and Martha and Mary, from the Jordan, and of the non-existence of any place bearing the latter name within the Jordan Valley. He further reports (λέγουσι) a place Βηθαρά where he had been told (ιστοροῦσι) that John baptized, and says that the word means οἶκος κατασκευῆς (possibly a confusion with בֵּיתָא, cf. LXX Septuagint in Exo_35:24), Bethany being οἶκος ὑπακοῆς, adding a play upon the name as befitting the spot where the messenger sent to prepare (κατασκευάζειν, Mat_11:10) the way of the Lord should baptize.

Origen's view, therefore, was mainly *a priori*, and it has seemed worth while to set it out at length, because later writers, as Epiphanius, Chrysostom, *et al.*, apparently adopt and repeat it with more or less amplification; nor is it easy to decide how much weight is due to additional details they may give. According to Chrysostom, for instance, the more accurate copies read 'Bethabara,' a result that might readily be conceived to follow from Origen's criticism; and he adds that Bethany was neither across the Jordan nor in the wilderness, but near Jerusalem.* [Note: Suidas, s.v. Βηθανια, says expressly that the right reading is Βηθαβαρά; and he also inserts ιτι in the text before τοῦ Ἰορδάνου.] The ancient writers do not seem to take into account the possibility of the names occurring more than once in Palestine. It is clear, however, that either 'Bethany' or 'Bethabara' would lend itself readily to duplication.

The only indication of position which the narrative itself gives is in the phrase πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, 'across (*i.e.* east of) the Jordan.' And if Bethabara or Bethany is the scene of the Baptism, then it would seem that the site must be looked for in the northern part of the Jordan Valley, since Christ comes hither apparently direct from Galilee (Mat_3:13, Mar_1:9). Conder finds all the necessary conditions satisfied by a ford 'Abârah on the Jordan E.N.E. of Beisân, and at a distance of four or five miles from the latter place: and he explains the name 'Bethany' as equivalent to Batanea, Basanitis, or Bashan, the district immediately east of the Jordan, south and south-east of the Sea of Galilee (see C. R. Conder in *Pal.* [Note: Palestine, Palestinian.] *Expl. Fund Mem.* ii. p. 89 f., *Quart. Statement*, 1875, p. 72, *Handbook to the Bible*, p. 319 f.; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Bethabara').

Bethabara has also been supposed to be the same as the Beth-barah (בֵּית בָּרָח, LXX Septuagint Βαιθηρά, of Jdg_7:24) which lay on or near the Jordan. This is on the assumption that a guttural has been accidentally lost from the Hebrew text, and that

we ought to read עֲבָרָה בֵּיהָ. Dr. Sanday (*Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, p. 23) accepts the identification with 'Abârah. But beyond the coincidence of the name, on which much stress cannot be laid, there is no direct evidence in its favour; and the indirect evidence is slight. The inference, moreover, which has been drawn from Joh 2:1, that Bethabara or Bethany lay not more than a day's journey from Cana of Galilee, is precarious. The marriage festivities at Cana would in all probability extend over several days, towards the close of which the supply of wine failed: and the language used is perhaps intended to convey that Christ and His disciples were not present at the beginning. (See on the prolongation of the ceremonies attendant on an Eastern wedding, P. Baldensperger, 'Woman in the East' in *PEFSt* [Note: EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.] , 1900 p. 181 ff., 1901 p. 173 ff.; H. B. Tristram, *Eastern Customs in Bible Lands*, ch. v.).

The traditional site of the baptism of Christ at *Makhâdet Hajlah* in the Jordan Valley near Jericho, though defended by Sir Charles Wilson and others, seems to be too far south. Others would read, by conjecture, in the text of St. John's Gospel, Βηθαναβρόα, *i.e.* Beth-nimrah, on the *Wâdy Shaib*, five miles east of the Jordan, E.N.E. from Jericho (see T. K. Cheyne in *Encyc. Bibl.* s.vv.).

Literature.—See above, and add Smith's *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] s.v.; G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [Note: *GHL* Historical Geog. of Holy Land.] (1894), p. 496; Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 310; Farrar, *Life of Christ*, i. p. 140 n. [Note: note.] ; Weiss, *Life of Christ*, i. p. 361 f. and note; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i. pp. 264, 278; Geikie, *Life and Words of Christ*, i. 388, and *Holy Land and the Bible*, ii. p. 257; Sanday, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, 11, 23, 35, 94; *PEFSt* [Note: EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.] , 1903, p. 161; and the Commentaries on Joh 1:28.

A. S. Geden.

☩ Bethany

BETHANY.—2. See Bethabara.

☩ Bethany

BETHANY (Βηθανιά).—1. A village whose interest arises mainly from its having been the residence of Lazarus, Martha and Mary. As to this it is well to note the following points. (1) None of the three Synoptists mentions Lazarus. (2) St. Matthew and St. Mark maintain the same silence as to Martha and Mary. (3) St. Luke (Luk 10:38-42) records a sojourn of Jesus in ‘a village’ (κώμη τις), which he leaves unnamed. (4) St. John alone (Joh 11:1; Joh 11:8; Joh 12:1 ff.) names Bethany as the place where the brother and the two sisters lived. (5) St. Matthew and St. Mark state that Bethany afforded hospitality to Jesus during the days that preceded His death (Mat 21:17 ff., Mar 11:11 ff.); but in connexion with His stay there they make mention only of the house of ‘Simon the leper’ (Mat 26:6 ff., Mar 14:3 ff.), and give no name to the woman who anoints the feet of the Lord. (6) St. Luke does not speak of this sojourn at Bethany, but simply says in a more general way that Jesus passed the night ‘at the mount called the Mt. of Olives’ (Luk 21:37). (7) The data usually accepted regarding Bethany and the family that lived there and entertained Jesus in their house, are thus derived essentially from the Fourth Gospel.

Bethany is mentioned neither in the Canonical books nor in the Apocrypha of the OT; it makes its appearance for the first time in the NT, and is not named in Josephus. Its situation is relatively easy to determine. We know (Mar 10:46; Mar 11:1, Luk 19:1; Luk 19:29) that it was on the road from Jericho to Jerusalem, at a distance of 15 furlongs from the latter (Joh 11:18), lying thus on the E [Note: Elohst.] . or rather S.E. side of the Mt. of Olives. Origen asserts that in his time the position of Bethany was known. In the 4th cent. the Bordeaux Pilgrim (333) mentions a place where the ‘crypta’ of Lazarus was to be seen. Eusebius records that ‘the place of Lazarus’ was shown, and Jerome adds that it was 2 miles from Jerusalem (*OS*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 108. 3, 239. 10). According to Niceph. Callist. (*Historia Ecclesiastica* viii. 30 [*Patr. Gr.* cxlvi. 113]), a church containing the tomb of Lazarus was built by the empress Helena. Another sanctuary marked the spot where Jesus met Mary (Joh 11:29 ff.). A number of ecclesiastical buildings have risen at Bethany; as many as three churches have been counted there. In its present condition it is a village without importance or interest, with a population of about 200. It bears the name *el-‘Azariyeh*, derived from ‘Lazarus’ or from ‘Lazarium’ (Λαζαριον), a form found as early as the Pilgrimage of Silvia (383); the initial L has been taken for the Arab. [Note: Arabic.] article.

According to the Talmud, *Bethany* is = Aram. [Note: Aramaic.] *Beth-Aineh* or *Beth-Hini*, ‘place of dates’ (?); but this etymology is uncertain. The same may be said of that which traces it to the root ענה, and would yield the sense of ‘place of

affliction' or 'place of the afflicted one,' which may be simply a popular etymology (cf. Nestle, *Philologica Sacra*, 1896, p. 20).

The buildings which are shown at the present day as possessing a historical interest are—1. The 'castle' of Lazarus, a tower which dates from the time of the Crusades, and was probably built in 1147 by Queen Melissenda for the Benedictine nuns; according to others, its construction is still earlier. The name 'castle' is explained by the fact that the Vulgate renders the NT *κώμη* by *castellum*. 2. The tomb of Lazarus is shown to modern pilgrims, but its genuineness is so doubtful that it is questioned even by Roman Catholic writers, e.g. Mgr. Le Camus, bishop of La Rochelle (*Notre Voyage aux pays bibliques*, i. 245). 3. There are still shown—or there used to be shown—at *el-Azariych* the house of Martha, that of Mary, and that of Simon the leper.

In Luk 24:50 the scene of the Ascension is placed, if not at Bethany, at least in its immediate vicinity: 'He led them ἕως πρὸς Βηθανίαν' (Authorized Version 'as far as to Bethany,' Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 less satisfactorily, 'until they were over against Bethany'). On the other hand, Act 1:12 relates that after the Ascension the Apostles 'returned unto Jerusalem from the mount called Olivet, which is nigh unto Jerusalem, a Sabbath day's journey off.' The statement in Luke's Gospel deserves the preference; it fixes the place of the Ascension itself near Bethany, while the text of Acts simply connects the return of the Apostles with the Mt. of Olives, on the slope of which Bethany lies, and does not speak necessarily of the summit of the mountain, as ecclesiastical tradition supposed (cf. Tobler, *Die Siloahquelle und der Oclberg*, p. 83).

Literature.—Robinson, *BRP* [Note: RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] i. 431-433; Guérin, *Palestine*, 'Samarie,' i. 163-181; Buhl, *GAP* [Note: AP Geographic des alten Palästina.] 155; Tobler, *Topogr.* ii. 422-464; *PEF* [Note: EF Palestine Exploration Fund.] *Mem.* iii. 27 f.; Sanday, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, 24, 49.

Lucien Gautier.

Bethesda

BETHESDA.—Joh 5:2 'Now there is in Jerusalem by the sheep-gate (ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ) a pool, which is called in Hebrew Bethesda, having live porches' (RV). Instead of Βηθε

σδά (TR), the most ancient authorities have other spellings, as ⲛ Βηθζαθά, L and Eus. Βηζαθά (? for Βηθζαιθά = בית אֵילָן ‘house of the olive’), B Βηθσαιδά, D Βελζεθά. As to the derivation, Delitzsch suggests בית אֶסְטָן ‘house of pillars,’ and Calvin בית אֶשְׂרָא ‘house of outpouring’; but the most natural etymology is בית אֶרְחָם ‘house of mercy,’ possibly in allusion to the munificence of some charitable person who had these porches built to shelter the sick, or to the goodness of God in providing this healing spring.

As the adjective προβατική, ‘*pertaining to sheep*,’ requires some substantive to be introduced, the Authorized Version supplies ‘market,’ the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘gate.’ Since there is no reference to any sheep-market in the OT, while the sheep-gate is repeatedly referred to (Neh_3:1; Neh_3:32; Neh_12:39), the latter method of supplying the sense is the more probable one. Now the sheep-gate is known to have been north of the Temple, and, as Bovet says, ‘the small cattle which entered Jerusalem came there certainly by the east; for it is on this side that the immense pastures of the wilderness of Judaea lie.’ The modern St. Stephen’s Gate answers to these data. It is at the north-east angle of the Temple area, and is the gate through which the Bedawîn still lead their flocks to Jerusalem for sale. We must therefore look for the Pool of Bethesda in this vicinity, and may at once eliminate several proposed identifications elsewhere, such as the *Hammâm csh-Shifâ*, near the ‘Gate of the Cotton Merchants,’ about the middle of the west side of the Temple area, where there is a pool with pillars and masonry, some sixty feet below the present surface, the waters of which are still supposed to possess healing properties (Furrer); and the Pool of Siloam, where the remains of four columns in the east wall, with four others in the centre, ‘show that a structure with five openings or porches might easily have been erected’ (Alford); and the Fountain of the Virgin, the intermittent spring at the bottom of a deep cavern at the foot of the Ophel slope south-east of the Temple (Robinson). These are all too far from the sheep-gate as probably identified above.

Conder, who adopts the suggestion of Robinson that Bethesda was at the present Fountain of the Virgin, says, ‘This answers the requirements that it still presents the phenomenon of intermittent “troubling of the water,” which overflows from a natural syphon under the cave, and that it is still the custom of the Jews to bathe in the waters of the cave, when this overflow occurs, for the cure of rheumatism and of other disorders.’ Against this view Grove (Smith’s *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] art. ‘Bethesda’) and Barclay (*City of the Great King*, 325) urge the inaccessibility of the deep subterranean water to invalids, the confined size of the pool, and the difficulty of finding room for

the five porches capable of accommodating 'a multitude'; and to the present writer, examining the cave in person, these objections seemed conclusive, apart from the difficulty of the locality.

Turning now to the neighbourhood of the sheep-gate, we find three proposed identifications. (1) Modern tradition identifies Bethesda with the *Birket Israil*, an empty reservoir, 360 feet long, 120 feet wide, and 80 feet deep, half filled with rubbish, which lies close to St. Stephen's Gate and under the north-east wall of the Haram area. (2) Warren and others would place Bethesda at the so-called Twin Pools, in the ditch at the northwest angle of Antonia, under the convent of the Sisters of Zion. Neither of these can be the true site, as both the *Birket Israil* and the Twin Pools were constructed after the events narrated in John 5. (3) In 1872 it was pointed out by M. Clermont-Ganneau that 'the Pool of Bethesda should be sought near the Church of St. Anne, where an old tradition has placed the house of the mother of Mary, calling it *Bcit Hanna*, "House of Anne." This expression is exactly identical with *Bethesda*, both expressions signifying "house of mercy, or compassion." ' Sixteen years later this anticipation was verified by the discovery of what is now very generally conceded to be the ancient Pool of Bethesda, a short distance north-west of the present Church of St. Anne. In the autumn of 1888, 'certain works carried on by the Algerian monks laid bare a large tank or cistern cut in the rock to a depth of 30 feet, and Herr Schick recognized this as the Pool of Bethesda. It is 55 feet long from east to west, and measures 12½ feet in breadth. A flight of twenty-four steps leads down into the pool from the eastern scarp of rock. Herr Schick, who at once saw the great interest of this discovery, soon found a sister-pool, lying end to end, 60 feet long, and of the same breadth as the first. The first pool was arched in by five arches, while five corresponding porches ran along the side of the pool. At a later period a church was built over the pool by the Crusaders, and they seem to have been so far impressed by the fact of five arches below that they shaped their crypt into five arches in imitation. They left an opening for getting down to the water; and further, as the crowning proof that they regarded the pool as Bethesda, they painted on the wall of the crypt a fresco representing the angel troubling the water of the pool.' (Geo. St. Clair, *Buried Cities and Bible Countries*, 327-328. See also *PEFSt* [Note: Quarterly Statement of the same.] , July 1888 and Jan. 1891).

This site is thus supported not only by the mediaeval tradition, but by the early tradition as well. The Bordeaux pilgrim, who visited Jerusalem in a.d. 333, after mentioning two large fish-pools by the side of the temple, one at the right hand, the other at the left, says in another place (*Itin. Hierosol.* 589): 'But farther in the city are twin fish-pools having five porches which are called Bethsaida. There the sick of many years were wont to be healed. But these pools have water which, when agitated, is of a kind of red colour.' This is evidently the same place described by Eusebius (*Onomasticon*, 240. 15) in the same century and called by him Bezatha,

though he gives no other clue to the situation—‘a pool at Jerusalem, which is the *Piscina Probatica*, and had formerly five porches, and now is pointed out at the twin pools there, of which one is filled by the rains of the year, but the other exhibits its water tinged in an extraordinary manner with red, retaining a trace, they say, of the victims that were formerly cleansed in it.’ Clearly, too, it is of the same place that Eucherius speaks in the 5th cent.: ‘Bethsaida, peculiar for being a double lake, of which one pool is for the most part filled by winter rains, the other is discoloured by reddish waters.’ It has been commonly assumed of late that the two tunnels under the convent of the Sisters of Zion are the twin pools mentioned by these writers; but the traditions of the 6th, 7th, and 8th centuries, to be presently quoted, place the pool with the five porches and the church called *Probatiea* (cf. *προβατικῆ*, Joh_5:2) at or near the traditional birthplace of Mary, which is undoubtedly under the present Church of St. Anne. Thus Antoninus Martyr (a.d. 570) says: ‘Returning into the city we come to the *Piscina Natatoria*, which has five porches; and in one of these is the basilica of St. Mary, in which many miraculous cures are wrought.’ Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem (a.d. 632), says: ‘I will enter the holy *Probaticea*, where the illustrious Anna brought forth Mary.’ John of Damascus (about a.d. 750) says: ‘May all things be propitious to thee, O *Probaticea*, the most holy temple of the Mother of God! May all things be propitious to thee, O *Probaticea*, ancestral domicile of a queen! May all things be propitious to thee, O *Probaticea*, formerly the fold of Joachim’s flocks, but now a church, heaven-resembling, of the rational flock of Christ!’ Brocardus also speaks (a.d. 1283) of a large reservoir near St. Anne’s Church, called *Piscina Interior*, just opposite *Birket Israil*.

Early tradition, therefore, as well as mediaeval, seems to favour the site discovered in 1888. This is the site now generally accepted, though some recent writers are still unconvinced, such as Sanday (*Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, 55), who rejects Schick’s identification but reaches no positive conclusion of his own, and Conder (*Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible*, article ‘Bethesda’), who argues for the Virgin’s Pool. The intermittent troubling of the water at the Fountain of the Virgin is, indeed, a point in its favour; but this phenomenon is not uncommon in the springs of Palestine (Thomson, *Land and Book*, iii. 288; Barclay, *City of Great King*, 560), and, while nothing of the kind is now seen at the pool under the Crusaders’ church, it is not, perhaps, a too violent supposition that the same intermittence now observed in the Virgin’s Fountain may have characterized this pool also in that early time of more copious ‘rains of the year,’ as Eusebius calls them, especially if, as some think, they both lie upon the same concealed watercourse.

The last clause of Joh_5:3 and the whole of Joh_5:4, containing the account of the troubling of the water by an angel and the miraculous healing that followed, are relegated to the margin in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, on the ground of their

omission by the ancient manuscripts & BD, and the exceptional number of variants in the other MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] . Popular superstition seems to have attributed the periodic bubbling of the water to the action of an invisible angel. These passages were probably at first written on the margin as an expression of that opinion, and later were introduced into the body of the text.

W. W. Moore.

☛Bethlehem

BETHLEHEM.—Two towns of this name are mentioned in the Old Testament. 1. Bethlehem (בֵּית לֶחֶם ‘house of bread’) of Zebulun, Jos 19:15. The site is now occupied by a miserable village, 6 miles south-west of Sepphoris and about the same distance north-west of Nazareth, in a well-wooded district of country, planted with oaks (Robinson, Researches, iii. 113). That this Bethlehem cannot have been the scene of the Nativity, near as it is to Nazareth, is clear from the fact that both St. Matthew and St. Luke expressly place the birth of Christ at Bethlehem of Judaea. These narratives being independent of each other and derived from different sources, we have for the southern Bethlehem the convergence of two distinct traditions. These two Evangelists are joined in their testimony by the author of the Fourth Gospel, who assumes acquaintance on the part of his readers with the story of the birth of Christ at Bethlehem, the Bethlehem associated with David and his royal line. ‘Some said, Shall Christ come out of Galilee? Hath not the Scripture said that Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem where David was?’ (Joh 7:41-42). It is noteworthy that Bethlehem is never mentioned as having been visited by our Lord or in any way associated with His ministry. But all Christian history and tradition maintain that the southern Bethlehem was the scene of the Nativity.

2. Bethlehem of Judah (בֵּית לֶחֶם יְהוּדָה Jdg 17:7; Jdg 17:9, Rth 1:1-2 etc.) or Judaea (Mat 2:1, Luk 2:4). This town (the modern Lahm) is situated about 6 miles S.S.W. of Jerusalem, lying high up on a grey limestone ridge running from east to west, and occupying the projecting summits at each end, with a sort of saddle between. The ridge rises to a height of 2550 ft. above sea-level, and falls away in terraced slopes on all sides, the descent to the north and east being specially steep. The terraces, as they sweep in graceful curves round the ridge from top to bottom, give to the little town the appearance of an amphitheatre, and serve to make to the approaching traveller a picture which closer acquaintance does not wholly disappoint. The names by which it has been known for millenniums, and is still known, are expressive of the fertility of the place—lehc, ‘house of bread,’ and -Lahm, ‘house of flesh.’ The

hillsides around, merging into the hill country of Judaea, though they look bare to the eye at a distance, afford pastures for flocks of sheep and goats. The valleys below and the fields lying to the east produce crops of wheat and barley, as in the days when Ruth gleaned in the fields of Boaz; and the terraced slopes, under diligent cultivation, bear olives, almonds, pomegranates, figs, and vines. Wine and honey are named among the most notable of its natural products, and the wine of Bethlehem is said to be preferable to that of Jerusalem.

The modern town is highly picturesque. There is just one main street or thoroughfare, extending about half a mile, and largely occupied by workshops, which are little better than arches open to the street. The population is differently given as from 4000 to 8000 souls. Palmer ('Das jetzige Bethlehem' in *ZDPV* [Note: *DPV Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.*] xvii. 90), writing in 1893, and founding upon personally ascertained figures, gives 8035 as the population, which he classifies in respect of religion as follows: Latins, 3827; Greeks, 3662; Moslems, 260; Armenians, 185; Protestants, 54; Copts and Syrians, 47. The small number of Moslems is said to be due to the severity of Ibrahim Pasha, who drove out the Moslem inhabitants and demolished their houses in the insurrection of 1834. It will be observed from the above enumeration that Bethlehem does not contain a single Jew. As in Nazareth so in Bethlehem, the associations with Jesus make residence repugnant to the Jews, and they have accordingly no desire to settle in the Christian Holy Places. They are, in fact, tolerated only as temporary visitors, but not as residents. 'In the cradle of his royal race,' says Canon Tristram (*Bible Places*, p. 72), 'the Jew is even more a stranger than in any other spot of his own land; and during the Middle Ages neither Crusader nor Saracen suffered him to settle there.' The inhabitants of Bethlehem are of superior physique and comeliness. The men have a character for energy and even turbulence; the women are noticeable for their graceful carriage and becoming attire. In the crowds which throng the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem at the Easter services, the women of Bethlehem, wearing a light veil descending on each side of the face, and closed across the bosom, with a low but handsome headdress composed of strings of silver coins plaited in among the hair and hanging down below the chin as a sort of necklace,—are easily recognizable, and make a favourable impression. The industries of Bethlehem, apart from the cultivation of the soil, are intimately associated with the Nativity, consisting of memorial relics and souvenirs manufactured for sale to the thousands of pilgrims and tourists who visit Jerusalem and Bethlehem every year. Models of the cave of the Nativity, figures of Christ and the Virgin, apostles and saints, are in great demand. Olive wood, and mother-of-pearl obtained from the Red Sea, with basaltic stone from the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea, are carved and wrought into useful and ornamental articles with no small degree of skill and taste. Palmer mentions (*l.c.* p. 91) that an increasing number of the

inhabitants go abroad with their products,—their mother-of-pearl carvings and other wares,—and, especially in America, find a good return for their enterprise.

Bethlehem, notwithstanding its royal associations and its renown as the birthplace of the world's Redeemer, has never been, and is never likely to be, more in the eye of the world than 'little among the thousands of Judah' (Mic 5:2). 'In spite,' says Palmer, 'of the numerous visits of strangers and pilgrims, which are year by year on the increase, and in spite of the market-place which Bethlehem affords for the whole neighbourhood, and especially for the Bedawîn, who come from long distances from the southern end of the Dead Sea to make their purchases of clothing, tools, and weapons, and to leave the produce of their harvest and their pastures, Bethlehem appears likely to remain, unencumbered by trade and progress, what it has been for many years bygone—a shrunken, untidy village.' Even so, it can never be deprived of its associations with the Messianic King of Israel, 'whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting' (Mic 5:2), associations which exalt it to the loftiest eminence, and surround it with a glory that cannot fade. These associations in their salient features are now to be set forth.

It is in the early patriarchal history that we meet first with Bethlehem, under its ancient name of Ephrath.* [Note: But see Driver, Genesis (in 'Westminster Commentaries'), p. 311, and in Hastings' DB iv. 193a.] 'When I came from Padan,' said Jacob on his deathbed, recounting to Joseph in Egypt his chequered history, 'Rachel died by me in the land of Canaan in the way, when yet there was but a little way to come unto Ephrath: and I buried her there in the way of Ephrath; the same is Bethlehem' (Gen 48:7; cf. Gen 35:9 ff.). The sacred historian records that Jacob set a pillar upon her grave: 'that is the pillar of Rachel's grave unto this day' (Gen 35:20). Rachel's grave is marked now by a Mohammedan wely, or monumental mosque, at the point where the Bethlehem road breaks off the road leading from Jerusalem to Hebron; and though the monument has been repaired and renewed from generation to generation, it serves still to recall a real event, and to distinguish the spot where Rachel's 'strength failed her, and she sank, as did all the ancient saints, on the way to the birthplace of hope' (Dr. John Ker, *Sermons*, 8th ed. p. 153). Bethlehem becomes more definitely associated with the Messianic hope when it becomes the home of Ruth the Moabitess, the ancestress of David and of David's greater Son. From the heights near Bethlehem a glimpse is obtained of the Dead Sea—the sea of Lot—shimmering at the foot of the long blue wall of the mountains of Moab; and the land of Moab seems to have had close relations with Bethlehem and its people in patriarchal as well as later times. With Ruth the Moabitess, through her marriage with Boaz, the 'mighty man of wealth' of Bethlehem-judah (Rth 2:1), there entered a strain of Gentile blood,—although we remember that Lot, the ancestor of Moab, was the nephew of the great ancestor of Israel—into the pedigree of Christ according to the flesh (Mat 1:5), as if in token that, in a day still far off, Jew and

Gentile should be one in Him. With David, the great-grandson of Ruth, there entered the royal element into the genealogy of Jesus; and Bethlehem has no associations more sacred and tender than its associations with the shepherd king of Israel, unless it be those that link it for ever with God manifest in the flesh. The stream of Messianic hope, as it flows onwards and broadens from age to age, is not unlike that river of Spain which for a considerable part of its course flows underground, and only at intervals miles apart throws up pools to the surface, which the inhabitants call 'the eyes' of the Guadiana. The pools trace the onward progress of the river, till at length it bursts forth in a broad stream seeking the distant sea. So the hope of a great Deliverer from spiritual misery and death flows onward in the story of God's ancient people, throwing up its pools in the days of Abraham, Moses, David, Isaiah and the prophets; and Micah indicates the direction of its flow with more explicitness than any who went before when he says: 'But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be Ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting' (Mic 5:2). When the fulness of the time had come, the Messianic hope became the place of broad rivers and streams which we so happily know and enjoy, and the glad tidings was heard on the plains of Bethlehem, addressed to the watchful shepherds: 'Fear not: for, behold, I bring you glad tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord' (Luk 2:10-11).

The story of the Nativity is told by St. Matthew and St. Luke with a simplicity and delicacy and beauty which are of themselves an evidence of its historical truth. Both narratives, as has been indicated, assign to Bethlehem the high honour of being the place of the Nativity and the scene of the stupendous fact of the Incarnation. The details are too familiar to require rehearsal here.

There is one particular handed down by early Christian tradition which may be regarded not as a variation from, but an addition to, the Evangelic narrative,—the statement made by Justin Martyr (a.d. 140-150), and repeated in the Apocryphal Gospels, that the birth of Jesus took place in a cave. Justin (*Dialogue with Trypho*, ch. 78) relates that, since Joseph had in that village no place where to lodge, he lodged in a cave near by. Justin relates other particulars which may have come to him—he was a native of Nablûs, not 40 miles from Bethlehem—by oral tradition or from apocryphal narratives: such as that the Magi came *from Arabia*, and that Herod slew *all* the children of Bethlehem. That the stable where the Infant Saviour was born may have been a cava is quite in keeping with the practice of utilizing the limestone caves of the hill country of Judaea as places of shelter for cattle and other beasts. Those Apocryphal Gospels which deal with the infancy, notably the *Protevangelium Jacobi* and the *pseudo-Matthaeus*, make mention of the cave. Pseudo-Matthaeus (ch. 13) says, 'The angel commanded the beast to stop, for her time to bear had come;

and he directed the Blessed Mary to come down from the animal and to enter a cave below a cavern in which there was never any light, but always darkness, because it could not receive the light of day. And when the Blessed Mary had entered it, it began to become light with all lightness, as if it had been the sixth hour of the day.... And then she brought forth a male child, whom angels instantly surrounded at His birth, and whom, when born and standing at once upon His feet, they adored, saying, Glory to God on high, and on earth peace to men of good will.’ The *Protevangelium* relates the story with curious imagery (ch. 18). ‘And he [Joseph] found a cave there and took her in, and set his sons by her, and he went out and sought a midwife in the country of Bethlehem. And I Joseph walked and I walked not; and I looked up into the sky and saw the sky violently agitated; and I looked up at the pole of heaven, and I saw it standing still and the birds of the air still; and I directed my gaze on the earth, and I saw a vessel lying and workmen reclining by it and their hands in the vessel, and those who handled did not handle it, and those who presented it to the mouth did not present it, but the faces of all were looking up; and I saw the sheep scattered and the sheep stood, and the shepherd lifted up his hand to strike them and his hand remained up; and I looked at the stream of the river, and I saw that the mouths of the kids were down and not drinking; and everything which was being impelled forward was intercepted in its course.’

The *Protevangelium Jacobi* is generally recognized as belonging to the 2nd cent., and its testimony is a valuable confirmation of the early Christian tradition. Few scholars, if any, will agree in assigning it the place of importance attributed to it recently by the fantastic theory of Conrady (*Die Quelle der kanonischen Kindheitsgeschichten Jesu*, Göttingen, 1900), who regards the *Protevangelium* as the source of the Gospel narrative of the Infancy. The author of it, according to him, is an Egyptian, most likely of Alexandria, who introduces Bethlehem into the narrative not because of its place in Hebrew prophecy, but because it was formerly a seat of the worship of Isis, and he wishes to incorporate this worship with Christianity. In concert with the priests of Isis and Serapis, he aided with his inventive pen the appropriation of this sacred site by the Church, and it was from the *Protevangelium* that the writers of the First and Third Gospels drew their separate narratives of the Infancy. Conrady returns to the subject with an article full of equally curious and perverted learning in *SK* [Note: *K Studien und Kritiken.*] , 1904, Heft 2, ‘Die Flucht nach aegypten.’

It is in the 4th century that Bethlehem begins to receive that veneration as a Christian Holy Place in which it is now equalled only by Jerusalem and Nazareth. As early as Justin Martyr attention is specially directed to Bethlehem as the birthplace of the world’s Redeemer. In addition to the reference, already mentioned, to the cave, we find Justin quoting the well-known prophecy of Isaiah (33:16ff.), ‘He shall dwell in a lofty cave of a strong rock,’ in the same connexion (*Dialogue with Trypho*, ch. 70). Even earlier than Justin’s day it would appear that this particular cave was venerated

by the followers of Christ; for, as Jerome tells in one of his letters to Paulinus, the emperor Hadrian (a.d. 117-138), in his zeal to extirpate the very remembrance of Christ, caused a grove sacred to Adonis to be planted over the grotto of the Nativity, as he caused a temple to Venus to be erected over the site of the sepulchre of our Lord. Origen (*circa (about) Celsum*, i. 51) says: 'If any one desires certainty as to the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem apart from the Gospels and Micah's prophecy, let him know that in conformity with the narrative in the Gospel regarding His birth there is shown at Bethlehem the cave where He was born and the manger in the cave where He was wrapped in swaddling clothes. And this sign is greatly talked of in surrounding places, even among the enemies of the faith, it being said that in this cave was born that Jesus who is worshipped and revered by the Christians.' The site is now marked by the oldest church in Christendom, the Church of St. Mary of the Nativity, built by order of the Emperor Constantine. It is a massive pile of buildings extending along the ridge from west to east, and comprising the church proper with the three convents, Latin, Greek, and Armenian, abutting respectively upon its north-eastern, south-eastern, and south-western extremities. The proportions of the church and its related structures are more commanding from its elevation and from the shabbiness of the town in comparison. The nave of the church is common to all the sects, and is shared by them together—Latins, Greeks, Armenians. From the double line of Corinthian pillars sustaining the basilica sixteen centuries look down upon the visitor, and the footsteps of nearly fifty generations of Christians have trodden the ground upon which he treads. Says Dean Stanley: 'The long double lines of Corinthian pillars, the faded mosaics, the rough ceiling of beams of cedar from Lebanon still preserve the outlines of the church, once blazing with gold and marble, in which Baldwin was crowned, and which received its latest repairs from our own English Edward iv.' (*Sinai and Palestine*, p. 433). It is the subterranean vault that continues to be of perennial interest. Descending the steps from the raised floor of the eastern end of the nave, and turning sharply to the left, the visitor finds a half-sunk arched doorway which leads down by thirteen steps to the Chapel of the Nativity—the rude cave now paved: and walled with marble and lighted up by numerous lamps. This chamber is about 40 feet from east to west, 16 feet wide, and 10 feet high. The roof is covered with what had once been striped cloth of gold. At the east end there is a shrine where fifteen silver lamps burn night and day, and in the floor, let into the pavement, a silver star of Greek pattern marks the very spot of the Nativity with the inscription: '*Hic de Virgine Mariâ Jesus Christus natus est.*' To the Christian the associations of the place make it full of impressiveness, and the visitor has no more sacred or tender recollections of holy ground than those which cluster round the Church and the Grotto of the Nativity. Not far off is a cave, cut out of the same limestone ridge, which was the abode of St. Jerome for over thirty years. Here, with the noble ladies whom he had won to the religious life, Paula and her daughter Eustochium, he laboured *totus in lectione, totus in libris*, preparing the Vulgate translation of the Holy Scriptures, which for more than a thousand years was the Bible of Western Christendom, and is a

powerful tribute to his piety and learning. 'It is the touch of Christ that has made Bethlehem' (Kelman and Fnleylove, *The Holy Land*, p. 234). And the touch of Christ is making itself felt still in the works of Christian philanthropy and missionary zeal that are being performed there. There are schools and other missionary agencies maintained by Protestants and Roman Catholics to instruct in His truth and to enrich with His grace the community who occupy the place of His birth. Bethlehem appears among the stations of the Church Missionary Society, and the work done there among women and girls has borne good fruit. The Germans have built an Evangelical Church, which was dedicated in 1893. There is much superstition and error among the nominally Christian inhabitants of the place, but the efforts of the Protestant and Roman Catholic missionaries have stirred up the Greek Orthodox and Armenian Christians to activity for the moral and spiritual welfare of their people.

Literature.—Andrews, *Life of our Lord*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 82; Cunningham Geikie, *The Holy Land and the Bible*; Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*; Kelman, *The Holy Land*; Sanday, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels*; G. A. Smith, *Histor. Geog. of Holy Land; The Survey of Western Palestine*, vol. iii.; Ramsay, *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?*; Palmer, 'Das jetzige Bethlehem' in *ZDP*^V [Note: DPV Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.] xvii.; articles in Kitto's *Cyclop.*, *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , Vigonroux's *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, Smith's *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] , Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , and *Encyclopaedia Biblica*.

T. Nicol.

☞ Bethphage

BETHPHAGE (βηθφαγή).—A place unknown to the OT, the Apocrypha, or Josephus, and mentioned in the NT only once—on the occasion of our Lord's triumphal entry into Jerusalem five days before His death. It was certainly situated upon the slope of the Mt. of Olives, on or near the road from Jericho to Jerusalem ([Mar_10:46](#); [Mar_11:1](#), [Luk_19:1](#); [Luk_19:29](#)), and in the immediate neighbourhood of Bethany. The site of the latter being accurately determined as the modern *el-'Azariyeh* (see art. Bethany, 1), it might be expected that there would be little difficulty in locating Bethphage. Unfortunately, however, the texts of the three Synoptists [St. John does not mention Bethphage] are obscure on two points—

(1) As to the relation between Bethphage and Bethany, St. Luke (Luk_19:29) alone mentions both places ('as he drew near to Bethphage and Bethany'). His language seems to imply that a traveller coming from Jericho would come first to Bethphage, then to Bethany, and finally to Jerusalem. St. Matthew (Mat_21:1) mentions only Bethphage. As for St. Mark, his original text (Mar_11:1) probably contained no reference to Bethphage, but this name has been inserted, and in the majority of MS^S [Note: SS Manuscripts.] stands between Jerusalem and Bethany in such a way that, if this reading were accepted as the original one, we should have to place Bethphage in a different position in relation to Bethany from what is implied in the text of St. Luke.

To reconcile these divergent statements, a hypothesis has been started to the effect that Bethany may have lain a little off the direct route from Jericho to Jerusalem, upon a side road, and Bethphage at the point where this joined the main road. It would thus have been necessary to pass Bethphage both in going to Bethany and in returning from it. Support for this conjecture has been sought in the use of the word ἄμφοδον in Mar_11:4.

(2) In all three Synoptics, Jesus sends two of His disciples to a village (κώμη) to bring the ass on which He was to ride. Is this village, which is 'over against' (κατέναντι), to be identified with Bethphage, or with Bethany, or with some third locality? Each of these views is capable of defence; the traditional identification of the village of the ass's colt with Bethphage is at least questionable, especially in view of Mat_21:1 'When they had reached Bethphage ... then Jesus sent two disciples to the village over against.' A site for the village of the colt might be suggested at *Siloë*, or rather at *Kefr et-Tur*, on the top of the Mt. of Olives. [It is known that in the time of Jesus Christ there were houses on its summit]. In the circumstances of the case it would be hazardous to offer any opinion as to the probable situation of Bethphage.

Etymologically the name *Bethphage* appears to mean 'house (or place) of unripe fruits,' more especially 'of unripe figs' (cf. Ca 2:13, and see Dalman, *Grammatik des jud. pal.-Aramäisch*, 1894, p. 152, and Arnold Meyer, *Jesu Muttersprache*, 1896, p. 166). Recently a connexion has been suggested by Nestle ('Etymologische Legenden?' in *ZWTh* xl. [1897], p. 148) between this etymology of the name Bethphage and the story of the barren fig-tree. But it may be noted that the latter is associated in the Gospels (Mat_21:17-22, Mar_11:11-14; Mar_11:20-26) with Bethany, not Bethphage. Formerly Nestle (SK [Note: K Studien und Kritiken.], 1896, p. 323 ff., and in his *Philologia Saera*, 1896, p. 16 f.) had pointed to the possibility of connecting, from the point of view of popular etymology, *Bethphage* (= פְּגֵאָה בֵּית = 'place of meeting') and the ἄμφοδον of Mar_11:4. Finally, another explanation of *Bethphage*, viewed as a

dwelling-place of priests (?), is furnished by Origen, and rests upon a curious combination of the Aramaic word 𐤁𐤍𐤁 ‘jaw,’ with Deu 18:3, which assigns to the priests the jaws of sacrificial victims as part of their portion.

In the Middle Ages, Bethphage was shown to the north of Bethany, higher up the slope of the Mt. of Olives. The site of this medieval Bethphage (which proves nothing for the Bethphage of Scripture) was recovered nearly thirty years ago, thanks to the discovery made by the Franciscan Fathers, control led and described by Guillemot and Clermont-Gannean, of a stone (the fragment of an altar?) bearing inscriptions and pictures relating to Christ’s entry into Jerusalem.

Literature.—*PEFst* [Note: EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.] , 1874, p. 173; 1878, pp. 51-61, 146-149; *PEF* [Note: EF Palestine Exploration Fund.] , ‘Jerusalem,’ pp. 331-340; *Revue Archéologique*, Dec. 1877, p. 366 ff.; *Revue Biblique*, 1892, p. 105 f. See also the discussion in Andrews, *Life of our Lord*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 429-432.

Lucien Gautier.

ⲛBethsaida

BETHSAIDA (‘house of fishing’).—The supposition that there were two places on the shore of the Sea of Galilee to which this name appropriately applies has been disputed or rejected by many writers (Buhl, G. A. Smith, Sanday, *et al.*); but the evidence in its favour, direct and indirect, has the support of a long list of authorities on Palestinian geography from the days of Reland to the present time. There are differences of opinion with respect to the precise location of both places, but there is a general agreement that one was on the east and the other on the west side; of the Jordan or its expanse into the Galilaeen Lake. Prominent on the list of those who advocate two Bethsaidas are the names of Ritter, Robinson, Caspari, Stanley, Edersheim, Wieseler, Weiss, Tristram, Thomson, van de Velde, Porter, Merrill, Maegregor, and Ewing. The facts and suggestions which bear upon the supposition itself may be summed up as follows:—

1. Bethsaida of Gaulanitis.—The historic evidence for the existence and general location of this city is not disputed. Josephus describes it as a village ‘situate’ at the Lake of Gennesaret which Philip the tetrarch advanced unto the dignity of a city, both by the number of inhabitants it contained, and its other grandeur, and called it by the name “Julias,” the same name with Caesar’s daughter’ (*Ant.* xviii. ii. 1). In other

passages he indicates its position as in 'Lower Gaulanitis' (Jaulân), 'in Peraea,' and as near the Jordan, which 'first passes by the city and then passes through the middle of the Lake' (*BJ* ii. ix. 1, xiii. 2, also *BJ* iii. x. 7, and *Life*, 72). In every instance, except the one above quoted, which gives a reason for the change of designation, Josephus drops the old name and calls it 'Julias.' Pliny and Jerome give it the same appellation, and locate it on the eastern side of the Jordan (*Plin. HN* v. 16; *Jer. Com.* on Mt 16:31). The modern designation, 'Bethsaida-Julias,' is not to be found in ancient history, sacred or secular. The site of the city which thus became the successor, under another name, of Bethsaida of Gaulanitis, has not been identified with certainty. After careful research, Dr. Robinson came to the conclusion that a mound of ruins, known as *et-Tell*, was the most probable location of the long-lost city.

'The *tell* extends from the foot of the northern mountains southwards, near the point where the Jordan issues from them. The ruins cover a large portion of it, and are quite extensive; but so far as could be observed, consist entirely of unhewn stones, without any distinct trace of ancient architecture' (*BRJP*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ii. p. 413).

The site is over against one of the fording-places of the Jordan, and about 2 miles above its mouth. This tentative identification has been accepted by many recent explorers, but mainly for the reason that the location seems to be the most favourable, because of its commanding position, for such a city as Josephus describes. The objections to it are its distance from the Lake, and the absence of anything which would suggest its original name—'the house (or place) of fishing.'

Another site, to which these objections do not apply, has been suggested by Dr. Thomson at *el-Mas'adiyah*, not far from the eastern bank of the river, and near the Lake, 'distinguished by a few palm trees, foundations of old walls, and fragments of basaltic columns' (*Land and Book*, ii. 422). This writer advocates the existence of a double city, lying on both sides of the Jordan, as the true solution of the Bethsaida problem, and indicates a site over against *el-Mas'adiyah*, where a few ruins have been found, as the probable location of the Galilaean portion of the city. The apparent objections to this site are the boggy and treacherous ground in the vicinity, and the absence of anything that would suggest the existence in former times of a fording-place or a connexion by means of bridges. Wilson accepts Thomson's views; and Schumacher, the noted explorer of the Jaulân region, agrees with him in locating the eastern city at *el-Mas'adiyah*. He suggests also that the royal residence of Philip may have been on the hill at *et-Tell*, and the fishing village at *el-'Araj*, near the mouth of the Jordan, where are ruins, and that both were connected by a good road still visible (see *Jaulan Quarterly Statement*, April 1888). Conder, who favours

et-Tell, makes the plea on its behalf that local changes in the river delta may have increased the distance materially between this site and the head of the Lake.

Assuming this as a possibility, the place must always have been a considerable distance from the mouth of the Jordan. It is not unlikely, however, as Merrill suggests, that the landing-place of Julias was the original site of the town, and that among the local fishermen it retained the old name for some time after the building of the city of Philip, which would naturally be laid out on higher ground. In the only NT references which can with certainty be attributed to this place, the Evangelists make use of the older name (Luk 9:10, Mar 8:22). In the first, the scene of the miracle of the five loaves, it is described as 'a desert,' or vacant place, 'belonging to the city called Bethsaida.' All the Evangelists concur in the statement that it was a place apart from the town, but evidently near it, where the native grass thickly covered the fallow ground and made a comfortable resting-place for the weary multitude. The location which fulfils all the conditions of the narrative is on the eastern ridge of the Batiha plain, in the immediate vicinity of the Lake.

In the second reference it appears that Jesus, after crossing to the other side from Dalmanutha on the west coast, came to Bethsaida *en route* to the towns of Caesarea Philippi. While in the city a blind man was brought to Him. It is a significant fact, in keeping with His uniform attitude towards the Gentile cities of this region, that He took the blind man by the hand and led him out of the town, before He restored his sight. In this, says Farrar, 'all that we can dimly see is Christ's dislike and avoidance of these heathenish Herodian towns, with their borrowed Hellenic architecture, their careless customs, and even their very names commemorating, as was the case with Bethsaida-Julias, some of the most contemptible of the human race' (*Life of Christ*, ch. xxxv.).

2. Bethsaida of Galilee.—It has been alleged by some writers that the existence of a western Bethsaida was invented to meet a supposed difficulty in the narrative of the Evangelists. This is not a fair statement of the case. A Bethsaida belonging to the province of Galilee is designated by name as well as implied by incidental reference. Its claims are advocated mainly, if not solely, on the ground that it is in the Gospel record. The objection sometimes urged, that the existence of two towns of the same name in such close proximity is improbable, has little weight in view of the fact that these towns were in different provinces, under different rulers, and in many respects had little in common. The name itself suggests a place favourably situated for fishermen, and might be appropriately applied to more places than one by the Lake side. But see art. Capernaum.

The main points of the argument in favour of a western Bethsaida are as follows:—

(1) *The direct testimony given in John's Gospel.*—In one passage it is affirmed that Philip, one of the Apostolic band, was of Bethsaida, the city of Andrew and Peter (Joh_1:44); in another (Joh_12:21), that Philip was of Bethsaida of Galilee. This is the testimony of one who is noted for his accuracy in geographical details, who knew every foot of this lake-side region, and who, in common with the other Evangelists, speaks of this trio of disciples as partners in a common industry, and as 'men of Galilee.' 'Cana of Galilee' is a similar expression in the same Gospel, and the fact that the writer mentions the province at all, in this connexion, is a strong presumptive proof that he wished to distinguish it from the other Bethsaida on the eastern side. The mention of Galilee in John's Gospel determines this place on the west of the Jordan as decidedly as that of Gaulanitis does the other Bethsaida on the east. The assertion of G. A. Smith, that the province of Galilee included most of the level coastland east of the Lake,—if it applies to Galilee in the time of Christ,—is apparently in conflict with all the evidence which the history of that time has given us. It conflicts also with the positive testimony of Josephus, who places Julias—the city which Dr. Smith associates with Bethsaida—in Gaulanitis, and under the jurisdiction of Herod Philip.

(2) The well-attested fact that *all of the Apostles, except Judas Iscariot, were men of Galilee* (Act_1:11), furnishes another corroborative proof that the place of residence of the three above mentioned could not have been in the city of Philip (see also Mar_14:70). They were typical Jews, and their place of employment and all their associations were with their brethren of the same faith on or near the plain of Gennesaret.

(3) In the narrative of the return journey from the place of 'the feeding of the multitude, it is distinctly mentioned that the disciples embarked in a ship *to go before to the 'other side' unto Bethsaida* (Mar_6:45). If the word 'unto' stood alone, there might be some ground for the supposition that the disciples aimed at sailing along the shore towards Julias, but in the description which follows, the Evangelist makes it plain that the 'other side,' as he uses the expression, meant the west shore of the Lake. 'And when they had passed over, they came into the land of Gennesaret.' The parallel accounts convey the same impression and are equally decisive on this point (Mat_14:22; Mat_14:34, Joh_6:16). It is true that John adds that 'they went over the sea towards Capernaum,' but there is no discrepancy between the several statements if Robinson is right in identifying Bethsaida with '*Ain et-Tâbigha*. The general direction would be the same, and the distance between the two points does not exceed three-quarters of a mile. In keeping with these statements is the mention of the fact that the multitude on the east side, noting the direction taken by the vessel in which the disciples sailed, took shipping the next day and came to Capernaum, seeking for Jesus (Joh_6:22; Joh_6:24). These passages, interpreted in their natural and ordinary sense, show that the disciples aimed at going

to the western side of the Lake in obedience to the command of Jesus. The contrary wind retarded their progress, but it did not take them far out of their course. The mention of Bethsaida, in this connexion, with Capernaum makes it highly probable also that its site was somewhere in the same neighbourhood.

(4) There is a manifest verification and corroboration of this testimony in the close *association of Bethsaida with Capernaum and Chorazin* in the judgment pronounced upon them by our Lord because of their peculiar privileges (Mat. 11:21-23). There is no uncertainty with respect to the import of this denunciation. It could not apply to a Gentile city like Julias, for it is here contrasted with the Gentile cities of Tyre and Sidon. It is evident, also, that its significance inheres in the peculiar privileges of Bethsaida through oft-repeated manifestations of supernatural power in connexion with the ministry of Jesus. In other words, it was in the very centre of that field of wonders in Galilee, honoured above all other places in the land as the residence of Jesus, to which multitudes flocked from every quarter. We have the record of three brief visits of Jesus to the semi-heathen population on the eastern side of the Lake, mainly for rest and retirement, but there is no record of 'many mighty works' in any of the towns or cities of this region. This of itself seems to be an unanswerable argument against the proposed identification of the city to which Jesus refers in this connexion with the Herodian city of Julias in the province of Gaulaotitis.

The generally accepted site of Bethsaida of Galilee is '*Ain et-Tâbigha*. It is situated at the head of a charming little bay on the northern side of the spur which runs out into the Lake at *Khân Minyeh*. Here, by the ruins of some old mills, is a copious stream of warm, brackish water, fed by several fountains, one of which is the largest spring-head in Galilee. Its course, which now winds and descends amid a tangled mass of rank vegetation to the Lake, was formerly diverted to the plain of Gennesaret by a strongly built reservoir, still standing, which raised the water to an elevation of twenty feet or more. Thence it was carried by an aqueduct and a rock-hewn trench to the northern end of the plain. There is little to indicate the site of the city, except an occasional pier of the aqueduct and the substructures of a few ancient buildings long since overthrown and forgotten.

The natural features of '*Ain et-Tâbigha* are a safe harbour, a good anchorage, a lovely outlook over the entire lake, a shelving, shelly beach, admirably adapted to the landing of fishing boats, a coast free from débris and driftwood; and a warm bath of water, where shoals of fish oftentimes crowd together by myriads, 'their backs gleaming above the surface as they bask and tumble in the water' (Macgregor, *Rob Roy on the Jordan*, p. 337). Although surrounded by desolate wastes, this is still the chief 'Fishertown' on the Lake, where nets are dried and mended, and where fish are taken and sorted for the market, as in the days of Andrew, Simon, and Philip.

Literature.—Andrews, *Life of our Lord*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , pp. 230-236; Robinson, *BRP* [Note: RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ii. 413, and iii. 358, 359; Tristram, *Land of Israel*, p. 418, also *Topog. of the Holy Land*, pp. 259-261; G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [Note: GH L Historical Geog. of Holy Land.] 457 f.; Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii. 423; Stewart, *Mem. Places among the Holy Hills*, pp. 128-138; Reland, p. 653; Macgregor, *op. cit.* pp. 334-343 and 360-372; Merrill *Piet. Pal.* i. 322; Ewieg in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible i. p. 282; Baedeker-Socin, *Pal.* 255 f.; Buhl, *GA^P* [Note: AP Geographic des alten Palästina.] 241 ff.; Sanday, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, 41 f., 45, 48, 91, 95.

R. L. Stewart.

☩ Betrayal

BETRAYAL

The Gr. verb for betray' is παραδίδόναι. παράδοσις never occurs in the sense of 'betrayal' in the NT; in the Gospels it is used of 'the *tradition* of the elders' (Mat 15:2-3; Mat 15:6 = Mar 7:3; Mar 7:5; Mar 7:8-9; Mar 7:13), by St. Paul also of the Christian tradition (1Co 11:2, 2Th 2:15; 2Th 3:6). προδοτης, 'traitor,' occurs in Luk 6:16; cf. Act 7:52, 2Ti 3:4.

Had Jesus not been betrayed into the hands of His enemies, His death would hardly have been averted, but it would have been delayed. They would fain have seized Him and made short work of Him, but they dared not. He was the popular hero, and they perceived that His arrest would excite a dangerous tumult. The goodwill of the multitude was as a bulwark about Him and kept His enemies at bay, malignant but impotent. The crisis came on 13th Nisan, two days before the Passover (Mat 26:1-5 = Mar 14:1-2 = Luk 22:1-2). He had met the rulers in a succession of dialectical encounters in the court of the Temple, and had completed their discomfiture by hurling at them in presence of the multitude a crushing indictment. Enraged beyond endurance, they met and debated what they should do. They were resolved upon His death, and they would fain have seized Him and slain Him out of hand; but they dared not, and they agreed to wait until the Feast was over and the throng of worshippers had quitted Jerusalem. 'They took counsel together to arrest Jesus by stealth and kill him; but they said: Not during the Feast, lest there arise a tumult among the people.'

Such was the situation when, all unexpectedly, an opportunity for immediate action presented itself. Judas, 'the man of Kerioth,' one of the Twelve, waited on the high priests, probably while Jesus was engaged with the Greeks (Joh_12:20-50), and offered, for sufficient remuneration, to betray Him into their hands. Judas was a disappointed man. He had attached himself to Jesus, believing Him to be the Messiah, and expecting, in accordance with the current conception of the Messianic Kingdom, a rich recompense when the Master should ascend the throne of His father David, and confer offices and honours upon His faithful followers. The period of his discipleship had been a process of disillusionment, and latterly, when he perceived the inevitable issue, he had determined to abandon what he deemed a sinking cause, and save what he might from the wreck. It may be also that he desired to be avenged on the Master who, as he deemed, had fooled him with a false hope.* [Note: It seems hardly necessary to refer to the theory popularized by De Quincey (Works, vi. 21 ff.), which has since his time found favour with not a few. This ingenious theory seeks to explain the conduct of Judas by attributing the betrayal not to covetousness or spite, but to an honest, if mistaken, determination to 'force the hand' of Jesus and compel Him to assert His Messianic dignity and hasten the establishment of His Kingdom. It may suffice here to remark that this explanation, while psychologically possible, finds no support in the Gospel narratives, and appears to De quite irreconcilable with the stern words of condemnation spoken by our Lord with reference to the action of Judas (cf. e.g. Mat_26:24 'Woe unto that man through whom the Son of man is betrayed! good were it for that man if the had not been born'). For a full discussion of the motives of the traitor see art Judas Iscariot.] He therefore went to the high priests and asked what they would give him to betray Jesus into their hands. They leaped at the proposal, and offered him thirty shekels. It was the price of a slave.† [Note: Cf. Exo_21:32; Arakh. xiv. 2: 'If anyone kills a slave, good or bad, he has to pay 30 shekels.'] and they named it in contempt not of Jesus but of Judas. Even while they trafficked with him, they despised the wretch. Impervious to contempt, he accepted their offer; and, as though in haste to be rid of him, they paid him the money on the spot.

Such, at least, is St. Matthew's report. St. Mark and St. Luke represent them as merely promising money, the amount unspecified. It might be supposed that St. Matthew's account is assimilated to Zec_11:12-13 (cf. Mat_27:9-10); but (1) Mat_27:3-5 proves that the money had been paid, at all events before the trial of Jesus by the Sanhedrin. (2) ἐστησαν, even if it be taken in its literal sense, 'weighed,' need not be an unhistorical embellishment borrowed from the prophecy. Cf. *PEFS*^t [Note: EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.] , Apr. 1896, p. 152: 'To this day it is usual in Jerusalem to examine and test carefully all coins received. Thus a Medjidie (silver) is examined not only by the eye, but also by noticing its ring on the stone

pavement, and English sterling gold is carefully weighed, and returned when defaced.’

It remained that Judas should perform his part of the bargain, but he encountered a difficulty which he had hardly anticipated. Jesus was aware of his design, and, anxious to eat the Passover with His disciples ere He suffered (Luk 22:15), He took pains to checkmate it. The next day was the Preparation, and, when His disciples asked where He would eat the Supper, He gave them a mysterious direction. ‘Away into the city,’ He said to Peter and John, ‘and there shall meet you a man carrying a pitcher of water: follow him.’ Some friend in Jerusalem had engaged to provide a room in his house, and Jesus had arranged this stratagem with him, in order that Judas might not know the place and bring in the rulers in the course of the Supper* [Note: Euth. Zig. on Mat 26:18; ὅτως μὴ μαθῶν τὴν οἰκίαν Ἰούδα; ἐκδράμη τῶς τοῦ ς ἐπιβούλους καὶ ἐταγάγη τούτους αὐτῷ πρὸ τοῦ ταραδοῦναι τὸ μυστικὸν δεῖτεον τοῖς μαθηταῖς.] (Mat 26:17-19 = Mar 14:12-16 = Luk 22:7-13).

That evening, as they reclined at table, Jesus, desirous of being alone with His faithful followers, made the startling announcement: ‘One of you shall betray me,’ and, amid the consternation which ensued, secretly gave Judas his dismissal. The traitor left the room, and, hastening to the high priests, summoned them to action. See Arrest.

Literature.—Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible , art. ‘Judas Iscariot’; Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, p. 258 ff.; Stalker, *Trial and Death of Jesus Christ*, p. 110 ff.; Hanna, *Our Lord’s Life on Earth* [ed. 1882], pp. 458-467; Bruce, *Training of the Twelve*⁵ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 362 ff.; *Expositor*, 3rd ser. [1889], p. 166 ff.; D. Smith, *The Days of His Flesh*, p. 436 ff.

David Smith.

⚡Betrothal

BETROTHAL.—Betrothal among the Jews in the time of Jesus, like so many other social institutions, was in process of transition. Jewish marriage customs were in origin the same as those of other Semitic peoples, but Jewish civilization was far removed from its primitive stages. Unfortunately there is little positive information concerning the ceremony of betrothal in NT times proper. The Talmudic *seder* on marriage includes two tractates, *Kethuboth* and *Kiddushin*, dealing largely with the

preliminaries of marriage, the latter especially with betrothal, but it is considerably later than the NT period. Accordingly, one cannot be sure that the elaborate laws therein set forth obtained in the time of Jesus. Yet it is possible by the study of betrothal customs in Hebrew and in Talmudic times to form a highly probable hypothesis as to such customs in the time of Jesus.

1. The OT betrothal ceremony perpetuated in a conventional fashion the recollection of the time when a woman was purchased from her family. This appears in the Heb. word קָדָשׁ (Deu_20:7, Hos_2:20). Yet it would be a mistake to regard the use of this word as anything more than a conventional survival. In the days of the codes and the prophets the time was long past when a man's wife was strictly his property. At the same time it is clear that when a woman was designated (קָדָשׁ Exo_21:8-9) by the head of her family as the future wife of another man, there was paid over by the prospective bridegroom a certain sum of money (or service, as in the case of Jacob), and a contract which was inviolable was then entered into (Gen_34:12, Exo_22:17). Until the time of the marriage proper the bride-to-be remained in her own family. It was not permissible to betroth her to any other man except by action amounting to divorce, and any violation of the rights established by the betrothal was as serious as if the two persons had been actually married (Deu_22:23-24). In the OT period it is not possible to say with precision just how soon the betrothal was followed by the wedding. In later times, in the case of a virgin it was after the lapse of a year, and at least thirty days in the case of a widow; but it is impossible to establish more than a possibility of these periods in OT times. So, too, it is impossible to describe with any great precision the betrothal ceremony, but it certainly included the payment of some sum (ôhar; in addition to above references, see 1Sa_18:25), and the making of a betrothal contract (either voce, Eze_16:8, or in writing) by the prospective bridegroom. We know nothing of any formal ceremony or of the use of a ring (unless [unlikely] it may be in Gen_24:58). The money payment belonged originally to the family of the woman, but gradually came to belong in part or wholly to the woman herself. The woman might bring wealth to her husband, as in the case of Rachel and Leah, but this was not obligatory in the Hebrew period, and cannot be said to belong to betrothal as such. The first advances might come from the family of either party. There is no clear evidence that the young woman had any right of appeal from the choice of her family. The bridegroom himself very probably did not conduct the negotiations, but the matter was in the hands of a third party, as his parents, or some trusted servant or friend.

After the Exile the custom of the earlier period seems to have continued, although with certain modifications. The payment to the bride's father on the part of the prospective groom had been increasingly regarded as the property, at least in part, of the bride. Such a payment during this period was often supplemented by a dowry in

the true sense (To 8:21, Sir_25:22). No consent of the girl was demanded, nor do we know of the recognition of any legal age of consent, unless, as in somewhat later times, it was not expected that boys would marry before the age of eighteen or girls before twelve (*Aboth* v. 21). Although families undoubtedly reached some sort of early arrangement, there is no clear reference to the betrothal of children.

2. In Talmudic times proper there was a distinct tendency to combine betrothal with the wedding. At present the wedding ceremony among orthodox Jews combines the two elements of the two older ceremonies. Possibly because of Western influences the Rabbis became more insistent upon the right of the girl (at least if she had reached her majority, whenever that may have been, *Kiddushin*, 41a) to give consent, Rab especially urging it. As the two ceremonies were united, in addition to the former betrothal there grew up a much less permanent form of engagement similar to that which obtains among Western peoples to-day. In Jerusalem, at least, there seem to have been certain opportunities (15 of Ab and *Kippurim*) for young people to become acquainted before the union was determined upon. All men were supposed to marry before the age of 20, and the age of women was a few years less. Other tendencies in Talmudic times were the fixing of the amount of the dowry at not less than 50 *zuz*, that of the *môhar* at 200 *zuz*, and the use of a peculiarly shaped ring. It is interesting to note that the conventionalizing of the *môhar* is evidenced in the words which are now used for the ceremony of betrothal: קדושין 'consecration,' אירושין 'betrothal,' שדבין 'compact,' הנאים 'conditions.'

3. Thus the ceremony of betrothal in NT times probably involved the following acts: (1) A contract drawn up by the parents or by the 'friend of the bridegroom.' (2) The meeting of the two families concerned, with other witnesses, at which time the groom gave the bride a ring and declared his intention to observe the terms of the contract already arranged. (3) The payment of the *môhar*. The act of betrothal gained in importance, and the two parties seem to have been seated under a canopy during the procedure, and the company to have joined in an increasingly jovial celebration. Strictly speaking, there was no religious ceremony connected with the act, but if a priest were present he doubtless pronounced some benediction which was subsequently elaborated into that used by later orthodox Judaism. The status of the man and woman was now, as in Hebrew times, practically the same as that of married persons, although it was now generally customary for the wedding ceremony proper to be celebrated at the expiration of a year in the case of a virgin, and in thirty days in the case of a widow. As in the older times, separation of betrothed persons demanded a divorce, and there seems to have been no reason why they should not live together as man and wife without a subsequent wedding ceremony. The children of such a union would be regarded as legitimate.

So far as the relations of Mary and Joseph are concerned, it would appear from the narrative in both Matthew and Luke that in their case the custom of the Jews was followed. The description of the betrothal in the *Gospel of Mary* is clearly unhistorical and born of pious imagination; but we are justified in believing that Joseph drew up the customary contract, paid a *môhar* of approximately 200 zuz, and gave Mary a ring. After the formal betrothal (μνηστεύειν, Mat_1:18, Luk_1:27; Luk_2:5) they are reported to have lived together without a second, or wedding, ceremony. As has already appeared, there would be no question as to the legitimacy of children born of such a union.

Literature.—Complete details as to the Talmudic requirements regarding betrothal are given in *Kiddushin*; see also the article ‘Betrothal, in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, and Mielziner, *Jewish Law of Marriage and Divorce*. For the ancient Hebrew betrothal, see Benzinger, *Heb. Arch.* p. 133 ff.; and Nowack, *Heb. Arch.* i. 155 ff. Brief accounts are also to be found in Edersheim, *Sketches of Jewish Social Life*, and good articles in Hamburger, Herzog, Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , and in the *Encyc. Biblica*.

Shailer Mathews.

☛ Bier

BIER.—The Gr. word σορός (Heb. קֶמֶט, 2Sa_3:31), ‘bier,’ more strictly means ‘a coffin.’ Luk_7:14 is the only place where the word appears in the NT. The bier was an open coffin, or simply a flat wooden frame on which the body of the dead was carried to the grave. Closed coffins were not used in the time of our Lord. According to the Levitical Law, contact with a dead body was forbidden as a source of defilement (Num_19:11-14). In raising to life the widow’s son at Nain, Jesus, by touching the bier only, avoided any infringement of the letter of the Law. But the miracle, prompted by that same intense sympathy with human sorrow which He so strikingly manifested on another occasion (Joh_11:35), pointed to a higher and more authoritative law—that Divine eternal law of compassion which received its freest and fullest expression for the first time in His own life, and which forms one of the most distinctive features of His Gospel.

Dugald Clark.

☛ Bill

BILL.—1. Bill of divorcement: Mar_10:4, Mat_19:7 (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885): Gr. βιβλίον (a scroll or letter) ἀποστασίου; shorter equivalent, ἀποστάσιον Mat_5:31.

In all three passages the expression is used of the כְּרִיתוֹת סֵפֶר demanded in Deu_24:1-4 of the husband who divorces his wife. In contrast with the older usage—still prevalent in the East—of divorce by a merely verbal process, the need of preparing a written document was calculated to be a bar against hasty or frivolous action, while the bill itself served the divorced wife as a certificate of her right to marry again. The Rabbis, who dwelt with special gusto ('non sine complacentia quadam'—Lightfoot) on the subject of divorce, had drawn up regulations as to the proper wording of the bill of divorcement, its sealing and witnessing, and the number of lines—neither less nor more than twelve—the writing must occupy. In the eyes of Jesus, no document, however formal, could prevent divorce from being a violation of God's purpose in instituting marriage. See Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. in Mat_5:31*.

2. A bond (so Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) or written acknowledgment of debt, Luk_16:5; Luk_16:7 : Gr. (Ti., Tr., WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.]) τὸ γράμματα, (TR [Note: R Textus Receptus.]) γράμμα. The word itself is indefinite (literally = 'the letters'), and throws no light upon a question much discussed by commentators on the parable of the Unjust Steward, viz. Was the bond merely an acknowledgment of a debt, or was it an undertaking to pay a fixed annual rental from the produce of a farm? Edersheim decides, though without giving his reasons, for the former alternative; Lightfoot inclines to the latter. Against the theory of a simple debt is the fact that the amount of the obligation is stated in kind—wheat and oil—and not in money; and the probability of the story is heightened if we are to understand that the remissions authorized by the steward—amounting in money value, according to Edersheim, to the not very considerable sums of £5 and £25 respectively—affected not a single but an annual payment. But, on the other hand, as van Koetsfeld, who argues strongly for the view that the document was of the nature of a lease, admits, there is no precedent for the word (χρεοφιλέται) rendered 'debtors' being used for tenants. Jülicher dismisses the whole controversy as irrelevant. Another point in dispute is whether the old bond was altered, or a new one substituted for it. Lightfoot and Edersheim again take different sides. The alteration of the old bond is suggested, though not absolutely demanded, by the language of the passage, and would be, according to Edersheim, in accordance with the probabilities of the case. Acknowledgments of debt were usually written on wax-covered tablets, and could easily be altered, the stylus in use being provided, not only with a sharp-pointed *kôthçbh* or writer, but with a flat thick *môhçk* or eraser. In any case it is clear that the 'bill' was written by the person undertaking the obligation; that it was the only formal evidence of the obligation; and that its supervision belonged to the functions

of the steward. Hence, should the steward conspire with the debtors against his master's interests, the latter had no check upon the fraud.

Literature.—Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 268-273; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*, *in loc.*; see also the various commentators on the Parables.

Norman Fraser.

☩ Binding And Loosing

BINDING AND LOOSING.—See Caesarea Philippi, Keys.

☩ Bird

BIRD.—See Animals, p. 65a.

☩ Birth Of Christ

BIRTH OF CHRIST

- i. St. Luke's account.
 1. Jewish element and colouring.
 2. Objections taken to the contents of Luke 1, 2.
 3. Probable sources of St. Luke's information.
 4. Bethlehem as our Lord's birthplace.
 5. The census of Quirinius.
- ii. St. Matthew's account.
 1. Use of OT prophecy.
 2. Relation to Jewish legal requirements.

3. Sobriety and delicacy of the narrative
 4. Objections taken to the contents of Matthew 1, 2.
- iii. Apocryphal accounts.
 - iv. Convergent traditions and the main facts.

Literature.

i. St. Luke's account.

1. *Jewish element and colouring.*—The two accounts of our Lord's birth in the Gospels carry us at once into the very heart of Jewish home life. In the fuller account of the two, that of St. Luke, the evidence of this Jewish element has been materially strengthened by recent literature and discussion. No one, e.g., can read the early Canticles in St. Luke's Gospel without noticing their intensely Jewish character. This was amply shown by Ryle and James in their edition of the *Psalms of Solomon* (see esp. pp. xci, xcii), a work which may fairly be placed some half century or so before our Lord's Advent. In the same manner Chase has illustrated many points of contact between these Canticles and the language of the Eighteen Prayers of the synagogue.* [Note: 'The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church' (TS i. 3, p. 147 ff.).] More recently Sanday has emphasized the same argument, more especially in relation to the *Benedictus*, in which he finds quite a piling up of expressions characteristic of the old popular Messianic expectation; the first five or six verses are quite sufficient to mark this essentially pre-Christian character (*Critical Questions*, p. 133; see also Nebe, *Die Kindheitsgeschichte unseres Herrn Jesu Christi nach Matthäus und Lukas ausgelegt*, 1893, p. 166 ff.; and even Gunkel, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verstandniss des NT*, 1903, p. 67).† [Note: Harnack, in his *Reden und Aufsätze*, i. p. 307 ff. (1904), maintains that while St. Luke has undoubtedly used a Jewish-Christian document in chs. 1 and 2, he has also introduced touches acceptable to a Greek, and that one word, in common use to-day, was wanting in the original Christian phraseology, the word 'Saviour.' According to Harnack, we owe this word to St. Luke, a word so often used by the Greeks to designate their gods, and thus it found its way into Luk 2:11. St. Paul scarcely knew it; but shortly after his time, when we come to St. Luke, it is otherwise. It is further argued that we look for the word in vain in St. Mark or St. Matthew. But, to say nothing of its use by St. John, ct. Joh 4:42 and 1Jn 4:14, St. Matthew (Mat 1:21) emphasizes the meaning of the word Jesus, 'for it is he that shall save (σώσει) his people from their sins'; and St. Paul in his first recorded missionary address speaks of 'a Saviour Jesus' (σωτήρ Ἰησοῦς), and connects His coming with the

remission of sins (Act 13:24; Act 13:38). Cf. Php 3:20 and Act 5:31, an admittedly early source); also Ps-Sol 10:9, 16:5.]

This question of the composition of the Canticles in St. Luke is a very important one, because it is constantly assumed that they were the invention of the author of the Third Gospel. But in this case we have to assume that the Greek Luke, or some unknown writer, was able to transfer himself in thought to a time when Jewish national hopes, which were shattered by the fate of the capital, were still vividly cherished in Jewish circles, and that he was able to express those hopes in the popular language current at the date of our Lord's birth with a marked absence of any later Christian conceptions.‡ [Note: Zahn well remarks: 'Passages like Luke 1-2, which in their narrative portions and the psalms introduced can be compared for poetical grace and genuinely Israelitish spirit only with the most beautiful portions of the Books of Samuel, could not have been composed by a Greek like St. Luke' (Einleitung, ii. p. 404). The whole passage should he consulted. On the minute account of the ritual in the Temple (Luk 2:22 ff.), and its significance as pointing to an early date for the narrative, see Sanday (l.c. p. 135), and the Church Quarterly Review, Oct. 1904, p. 194. The whole point of St. Luke's full acquaintance with the legal ritual is well brought out by B. Weiss (Leben Jesu, i. p. 237).]

And yet with all this Jewish colouring there is in these Canticles a depth and a charm which have appealed to men everywhere throughout the Christian centuries. No one recognized the Jewish element in these early chapters of St. Luke more frankly than M. Renan; but he could also write of the *Magnificat*, *Gloria in Excelsis*, *Benedictus*, *Nunc Dimittis*: 'Never were sweeter songs invented to put to sleep the sorrows of poor humanity, (*Les Évangiles*, p. 278).

2. Objections taken to the contents of Luke 1, 2.—The extravagant assertion must, of course, not be forgotten, that we owe these opening chapters of St. Luke, or at least some of their details, to the influence of other great Eastern religions. A discussion of this assertion may more properly be referred to the art. Virgin Birth.§ [Note: See, however, amongst the most recent writers, A. Jeremias, *Babylonisches im NT*, pp. 48, 49, and his able criticism.] But a word may here be said upon the most recent attempt to trace this alleged influence, in *Indische Einflüsse auf evangelische Erzählungen*, by G. A. van den Burgh van Eysinga 1904. On p. 22 ff. a whole series of alleged parallels is quoted between the coming of the aged Simeon into the Temple and the coming of the sage Asita into the Palace to do homage to the infant Buddha. While the writer is constrained (p. 23) to admit that the whole of the story of Simeon is told in a strongly Hebraistic style, he maintains that it is not said that the original motive of the incident is also of Hebrew origin. But in this connexion it is very significant that, while a supposed parallel is alleged between every verse which tells

of Simeon (Luk 2:25-32) and the story of Asita, there is one verse (v. 26) for which no parallel is adduced; and it is difficult to see that any other than a motive of Hebrew origin could inspire such words as these: 'and it had been revealed unto him by the Holy Spirit that he should not see death before he had seen the Lord's Christ.' The contrast is rightly marked between the pious resignation of Simeon and the wail of Asita over his departure amid the ruins of old age and death. But what could be more absurd than to find a parallel (p. 22) between Asita taking his path across the sky by the way of *the wind*, and the statement of St. Luke that Simeon came ἐν τῷ πνεύματι into the Temple?

From a somewhat different point of view these Jewish conceptions are noteworthy. In Luk 1:32 we read: 'He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Most High: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.' Here again we have language closely resembling that of the *Psalms of Solomon*, e.g. Luk 17:4; Luk 17:8; Luk 17:23, full of Jewish thought and expectation, expressing the hopes of the times at which it purports to be written, but scarcely such as would have been invented by a Christian composer.* [Note: 'The phraseology of the suspected Luk 1:34-35 is unmistakably Hebraistic' (G. H. Box in ZNTW, 1905, Heft 1, p. 92).] But we are asked to believe that into the midst of this Jewish language some Christian writer wished to introduce a statement of our Lord's virgin birth, and that he did so by the interpolation of the next two verses, Luk 1:34-35. As a matter of fact, there is no valid ground for regarding these two verses as interpolated. They are retained by the most distinguished editors of the NT both in England and Germany, e.g. WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.], Blass, Nestle; even Gunkel can see no reason for their excision (*Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständniss des NT*, 1903, p. 66).

There are one or two points connected with this alleged interpolation which we may notice without encroaching upon the art. Virgin Birth.

(a) We are struck with the extraordinary reserve and brevity of the statement, a reserve which characterizes the whole story in Luke 1, Luke 2. These two verses (1:34. 35) contain, we are told, the only reference to the virgin birth. Let us suppose for a moment that this is so; and if so we cannot but contrast the language with that of the *Protevangelium Jacobi*, with its fantastic and prurient details, or even with that portion of the *Ascension of Isaiah*, viz. the Vision of Isaiah, which carries us back, according to Charles, within the lines of the first Christian century (*Ascen. Is.* p. xxii ff.).

(b) Let us suppose that these two verses are no longer to find a place in the story, what then? It has been urged with truth that *the whole of St. Luke's narrative* is impregnated with the underlying idea that when Christ was born His mother was a virgin, and that it is impossible to omit this element without destroying the whole (*Church Quarterly Review*, July 1904, p. 383).

'The Christian belief,' writes Professor V. Rose of Fribourg, 'is manifest from the whole trend of the Gospel of the Infancy. Mary it is who, contrary to all Hebrew use, appears alone upon the scene. While Zacharias receives the celestial promise of the birth of a son, while he himself hymns the opening of the Messianic era and the destiny of John, Joseph plays not the smallest part in the mystery of Jesus. Mary is entirely in the foreground: to her the angel addresses himself; the prophecy of Zechariah has to do with her; she speaks to the child found in the Temple; Joseph says nothing; he keeps in the background. His position in the family is that of guardian, the supporter of Mary, the protector of Jesus' (*Studies in the Gospels*, 1903, p. 72).

(c) If the interpolator of these two verses in question had done his work so 'clearly and effectively' as Schmiedel maintains, it is surely surprising that he should have allowed any of those passages in the original document to stand which could refer in any way to Joseph's parentage. These references, e.g. Luk 2:27-33; Luk 2:41; Luk 2:43; Luk 2:48, would have seriously impaired both the clearness and effectiveness of his work. But suppose, on the other hand, that the whole story comes to us from one who was well acquainted with all the facts of the case, we can then understand why he could allow the passages about Joseph to stand; in common estimation our Lord passed for the son of Joseph; probably in the register of births He was thus described; and from a social point of view it was necessary, as we shall see, that this should be so.

3. Probable sources of St. Luke's information.—St. Luke's account gives us not only a picture of Jewish home life, but it also reveals the workings of a Jewish mother's heart; it gives us with unmistakable clearness, and yet with the utmost delicacy and reserve, information which could scarcely have come from any one in the first instance but a woman (this is admirably shown by Ramsay in the second chapter of *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?*). Whether this information reached St. Luke through a written document or whether it came to him orally, we cannot say, and from the present point of view it does not matter. For the impression which is derived from his account is twofold,—not only that it is of Palestinian origin, but also that it is derived from Mary the mother of the Lord, or from those who were closely acquainted with her.* [Note: See the remarks of Wright, *Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek*2, p. 292; Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, i. 31. Recent attempts have been made to ascribe the Magnificat to Elisabeth, and the arguments for and against this view will be found in

PRE3 vol. xii. [1903], p. 72 f. But in spite of all that has been urged by Harnack (Sitzungsb. d. König. Preuss. Akad. der Wissensch. zu. Berlin, xxvii. 1900), it is difficult to believe that the words ‘the lowliness of his handmaiden,’ are not most naturally connected with the words of Mary to the angel, ‘Behold, the handmaid of the Lord’ (Luk 1:48), and that the words ‘shall call me blessed’ are not best referred to the words spoken by Elisabeth to Mary (Luk 2:42; Luk 2:45). On the proposal to find in the words of Mary, ‘all generations shall call me blessed,’ an imitation of the words of Leah in Gen 30:13, see Nebe, *Die Kindheitsgeschichte*, p. 136, Plummer, *St. Luke*, ad loc., also Jacquier, *Histoire de NT*, ii. 504 (1905). The contrast far exceeds any comparison, as these writers show. The combination in Mary of the deepest humility with a firm consciousness of her own high calling and future renown is very striking. See, further, Burn, *Niceta of Remesiana*, 1205, p. cliii ff.]

It has been lately suggested, with much force and learning, that the information derived in the first place from the Virgin herself may have reached St. Luke through Joanna (Sanday, *Critical Questions*, p. 157). Evidently St. Luke had some special source of information connected with the court of the Herods, and Joanna the wife of Chuza, Herod’s steward, appears no fewer than four times upon the stage of the Gospel history. She accompanies our Lord amongst the other women in Galilee; she was one of the group of women who had witnessed the Crucifixion, and who afterwards went to the grave on the morning of the first Easter Day; and it may be safely inferred that she was one of the women in the upper room after the Ascension. We can scarcely doubt that she and the Virgin Mother were often in each other’s company. It may, of course, be alleged that St. Luke’s news about the Herods may have reached him through other channels, and that there is no proof that he was personally acquainted with Joanna.

If credit be allowed to the Acts of the Apostles, it would seem that St. Luke himself, as also St. Paul, may well have come into personal contact with one or more members of the Holy Family. We read, for instance, in Act 21:18, in one of the ‘We’ sections of that book: ‘And the day following Paul went in with us unto James; and all the elders were present.’ How much St. Luke may have learnt from St. James the Lord’s brother, it is, of course, presumptuous to say; but he may at least have learnt something during his stay in Jerusalem as to the place and the circumstances connected with our Lord’s birth. We cannot forget the Evangelist’s claim to have traced the course of all things accurately from the first (Luk 1:2), and he would scarcely have neglected the opportunities of information which were open to him in Jerusalem and afterwards in Caesarea.

4. Bethlehem as our Lord’s birthplace.—The intercourse just referred to would at least have saved St. Luke from the gross geographical blunder which he has been accused of making at the outset of his history, the blunder of confusing

Bethlehem-Judah with another Bethlehem in Galilee (see, in relation to this alleged blunder, Knowling, *Our Lord's Virgin Birth and the Criticism of To-day*, pp. 6-13). But the recently published remarks of Sanday may well be remembered in this connexion (*Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, p. 25):—

‘There are two Bethlehems, the second in Galilee, about seven miles west of Nazareth, and it has recently been suggested in the *Encyc. Biblica* that the Galilean Bethlehem was the true scene of the Nativity. There would be real advantages if Bethlehem could be thought of as near to Nazareth. But to obtain this result we have to go entirely behind our Gospels. Both St. Matthew and St. Luke are express in placing the birth of Christ at Bethlehem of *Judaea*. And as their narratives are wholly independent of each other, and differ in most other respects, it is clear that we have on this point a convergence of two distinct traditions.’

Professor Usener, indeed, fastens upon the passage Joh 7:41 f., and sees in it the hidden path by which Bethlehem found its way into the Gospel tradition (*Encyc. Bibl.* iii. 3347). But there is no reason for supposing that the writer of the Fourth Gospel was himself unaware of our Lord's birth at Bethlehem, because he expresses the popular expectation of the ignorant multitude. If the Gospel was written at the late date demanded by advanced critics, his ignorance of such a belief would be altogether unaccountable. Quite apart from our Gospels, Charles would refer the remarkable passage in the *Ascension of Isa 11:2-16* to a very early date, deriving it from the archetype which he carries back to the close of the 1st cent. (*Introd.* pp. xxii-xlv); and from a comparison of Isa 11:2 and Isa 11:12 it can scarcely be doubted that Bethlehem-Judah was meant throughout the narrative as the scene of our Lord's birth. But if the writer of the Fourth Gospel was St. John, it is a most arbitrary procedure to see in this passage (Joh 7:41 f.) any proof that the place of the Nativity was unknown to him. Are we to suppose that St. John was also ignorant of our Lord's descent from David?* [Note: On the descent of Jesus from David see especially Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, i. 263; also Charles, *Ascension of Isaiah*, p. 95. For the meaning of Joh 7:41 f. see, further, Salmon, *Introduction to the NT5*, p. 277.] an inference which might equally seem to follow from the passage before us, unless we remember that the Evangelist is presupposing that his readers would be well aware of the true descent of Jesus and the actual place of His birth (see this point admirably put by Ramsay, *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* p. 96).

Nor does the fact that our Lord was popularly known as Jesus of Nazareth in any way interfere with the truth that He was born at Bethlehem. It has, indeed, not unfrequently happened that a man has been associated with, or even named after, a town where his youth and early manhood have been passed, rather than after the actual place of his birth, in which his parents may have sojourned for a while (B.

Weiss, *Leben Jesu*⁴ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , i. 227). It will, of course, be said that prophecy pointed to our Lord's birth at Bethlehem, and that St. Matthew (Mat 2:6) distinctly quotes Micah's words in this connexion. But was the prophecy fulfilled? On the one hand, we are asked to believe that St. Luke starts his narrative not only with a geographical, but also with a grave historical blunder, and that he confuses an enrolment of Herod with the subsequent enrolment, some ten years later, of Act 5:37. On the other hand, it is urged that St. Luke's accuracy, so well attested in other respects, would have saved him from making an initial and needless error, and that the least consideration would have prevented him from connecting such an event as an enrolment of the people with the birth of the Messiah at Bethlehem, unless it was true. Undoubtedly both OT prediction and Rabbinic teaching pointed to Bethlehem, yet the prophecy was fulfilled according to the Gospel story by the introduction of a set of circumstances which were strangely alien to Jewish national thought and prestige: 'a counting of the people, or census, and that census taken at the bidding of a heathen emperor, and executed by one so universally hated as Herod, would represent the *ne plus ultra* of all that was most repugnant to Jewish feeling' (Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, i. 181). At any rate, we know quite enough of Jewish susceptibilities and of Jewish fanaticism in the 1st cent. of our era to be sure that a ruler like Herod, and in his position, would naturally guard against any undue exasperation of Jewish national and religious feeling. If it is urged that the story of the Nativity was bound in any case to bring Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem, the city of David, it would have been easier and more significant to have adopted the theory of Strauss, to the effect that the parents were led to go to Bethlehem by the appearance of an angel, especially when we remember that the frequent introduction of angelic visitors is described as one of the special characteristics of the writings of St. Luke.

5. *The census of Quirinius*.—It is one of the great merits of Professor Ramsay's theory, that it not only claims credibility for the enrolment of Luk 2:2 as an historical event, but that it also combines with that claim a due recognition of Jewish national prejudices. The word for 'enrolment' (ἀπογραφή), or its plural, was the word for the periodic enrolments which beyond all doubt were made in Egypt, probably initiated by Augustus. These enrolments were numberings of the people according to households, and had nothing to do with the valuation for purposes of taxation. But H. Holtzmann urges in objection that Egypt is not Syria (*Hand-Commentar zum NT*, 1901, p. 316). On the other hand, however, it does not seem unreasonable to suppose that such enrolments would take place in other parts of the empire,* [Note: Percy Gardner (art. 'Quirinius' in *Encyc. Bibl.* iv. 3 ff.) admits that 'one or two definite, though not conclusive pieces of evidence seem to indicate that this periodical census was not confined to Egypt, but was, in some cases at all events, extended to Syria.'] especially under a ruler so systematic as Augustus; and this probability Ramsay has

not forgotten to illustrate. Moreover, as the same writer urges, we have to take into account the delicate and difficult position of Herod, who was obliged, on the one hand, to carry out the Imperial policy, whilst, on the other hand, he was called upon to rule over a fanatical people full of stubborn pride and inherent suspicious. What under such circumstances would be more likely than that Herod would endeavour to give a tribal and family character to the enrolment, in fact, to conduct it on national lines which would harmonize as far as was possible with Jewish sentiment.* [Note: On this practical method of thus avoiding any outrage upon Jewish national feeling, see, further, B. Weiss, *Leben, Jesu*, i. 231. Turner (art. 'Chronology' in *Hastings' DB* i. 404) also points out that Herod may well have been mindful of the susceptibilities of the Jews, and so, in avoiding the scandal caused by the later census (Act 5:37), avoided also the notice of history.] Here probably lies the true distinction between the first enrolment, which was one of a series, and *the* enrolment (Act 5:37) which was conducted after the Roman fashion, and became the cause not only of indignation, but of rebellion. Here, too, we have the probable explanation as to why Joseph and the Virgin Mother left their home at Nazareth for Bethlehem. If the enrolment had been taken on Roman lines, there would have been no motive for the journey, since in that case only a recognition of existing political and social facts would have been involved; but in the present instance the Roman method was judiciously modified by the introduction of a numbering not only by households, but by tribes. There is, then, no confusion between this enrolment of Herod's and the subsequent enrolment of 6-7 a.d.,—a confusion that would involve a blunder of some ten years,—as Schmiedel and Pfeleiderer maintain; but, on the contrary, a careful distinction is drawn between them.

Moreover, since the publication of his first book on the subject, Ramsay has collected fresh details to support his thesis.† [Note: Zockler (art. 'Jesus Christus' in *PRE3*) speaks of Ramsay's theory in terms of approval; Chase speaks of the same theory as having advanced many stages the probability that St. Luke's reference to the enrolment under Quirinius is historical (*Supernatural Element in our Lord's earthly Life*, p. 21); while Kenyon (art. 'Papyri' in *Hastings' DB*, Ext. Vol. 356) speaks of the light which the discovery of the census-records in Egypt has thrown upon the chronology of the NT, although, as he adds, Professor Ramsay's is the only attempt to work out the problem in detail.] The year, for instance, which he claims for the first periodic census seems to demand an interval of some two years between it and the earliest date for the Birth of our Lord. This somewhat lengthy interval, which has been urged against the theory, may perhaps be accounted for by the situation of affairs in Palestine, which presented at the time considerable difficulty and anxiety. But a fair and contemporary analogy, so far as length of time is concerned, may be found in another part of the Roman Empire, and in a much simpler operation than that of a census. The kingdom of Paphlagonia was incorporated in the Roman province

Galatia; but although the taking of the oath of allegiance was, as compared with a census, a matter which required little preparation and instruction of officials, yet nearly, or perhaps more than, two years elapsed before the oath was actually administered (*Expositor*, Nov. 1901, p. 321 ff.).

One of the most acute and prominent opponents of St. Luke's accuracy in regard to the question before us is Professor Schürer, who in *GJV* [Note: *JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.*] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (vol. i. [1901] pp. 508-543) deals *seriatim* with the difficulties which, in his opinion, St. Luke's statement involves.

(1) Schürer, first of all, points out that history knows nothing of a general census of the empire in the time of Augustus But, as Ramsay rightly says, the contrary assertion stands on a very different level of probability from that which it occupied before the Egyptian discovery. And if there is evidence that the periods of the Egyptian enrolments were frequently coincident with the holding of a census in other parts of the empire, we come very near to St. Luke's statement, that Augustus laid down a general principle of taking a census of the whole Roman world.

(2) It is maintained by Schürer that if St. Luke describes Joseph as travelling to Bethlehem because he was of the house and lineage of David, this presupposes that the lists for the census were prepared according to descent and families, which was by no means the Roman method. But Ramsay's whole contention is that the 'enrolment' in question was conducted not according to Roman, but according to Jewish, methods.

'It is urged,' says Schürer, 'that in this census an accommodation was made to Jewish customs and prejudice.' But he argues that although this was often the case under the Empire, yet in this instance such a method would have been too burdensome and inconvenient; and, further, that it is very questionable whether such an 'enrolment' according to tribes and families was practicable, since in many cases it was no longer possible to trace the link of connexion with some particular tribe or family. But with regard to the former of these points, it is quite consistent with Ramsay's theory that the 'enrolment' should have taken a considerable time, and with regard to the second point we are fortunately able to quote Dalman as to the accuracy with which family registers were kept among the Jews. He points out that the title 'Son of David' would not have been ascribed to Jesus if it had been believed that He did not satisfy the genealogical conditions implied by the name. The Book of Chronicles, which gives (1 Chronicles 17) the promise of 2 Samuel 7, revived afresh the idea of the royal destiny of the family of David, and thereby contributed to the preservation of the household traditions of descendants of David. Dalman adds, 'Where, in addition to proud recollections, national hopes of the greatest moment were bound up with a particular

lineage, those belonging to it would be as unlikely to forget their origin as, in our own day, for instance, the numerous descendants of Mohammad, or the peasant families of Norway who are descended from ancient kings.' And he adds, 'Hence it results that no serious doubts need be offered to the idea of a trustworthy tradition of Davidic descent in the family of Joseph' (*Die Worte Jesu*, i. p. 266).

(3) But Schürer has by no means come to the end of his arguments. The decisive proof against a census in the time of Herod is this, that Josephus characterizes the census of Act 5:37 as something entirely new and unheard of, and that it became on that account the cause of indignation and rebellion.* [Note: BJ ii. viii. 1, vii. viii. 1.] But admitting these statements of Josephus, what then? Simply this, that his language is amply justified with reference to the passage mentioned, viz. Act 5:37. The year a.d. 7, as Josephus has it, did mark a new departure; the taxing then made was made after the Roman fashion; it was wholly removed in its method and in its consequences from the earlier enrolment under Herod. It is therefore evident that whilst Josephus might well refer to the revolt under Judas of Galilee as the result of this taxation, there was no reason why he should refer to the enrolment of some ten to fourteen years earlier with which no rebellious excitement was connected.

(4) In his latest edition Schürer is very severe with regard to Ramsay's theory that Quirinius was associated with Quintilius Varus, the latter being the regular governor of Syria for its internal administration, while the former administered the military resources of the province. This, according to Ramsay, would bring Quirinius to Syria b.c. 7-6, and the 'enrolment' of Palestine took place at the same time. St. Luke does not say that Quirinius was *governor*; he uses a vague word with regard to him, a word which might mean that the 'enrolment' was made while Quirinius was acting as leader (*ἡγεμόν*) in Syria; and it seems quite possible that St. Luke should speak of Quirinius in this way, since he was holding the delegated *ἡγεμονία* of the Emperor in his command of the armies of Syria. But Schürer presages his point, and makes much of the unlikelihood that St. Luke would date his census not from the ordinary governor, but from one who had nothing to do with the taking of the census. Yet it must be remembered that there are undoubtedly examples of frequent temporary associations of duties in Roman administration, and it is quite possible that Quirinius may have been concerned in the census, as Plummer suggests (art. 'Quirinius' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iv. 183).† [Note: In this connexion Plummer points out that Justin Martyr refers to Quirinius at the time of the Nativity by a word equivalent to one holding the office of procurator, and not by a word signifying legatus, as Quirinius afterwards became in a.d. 6. The only other place in which St. Luke uses the word employed in the phrase 'when Quirinius was governor of Syria' refers to a procurator (Luk 3:1), and this fact adds weight to the supposition that, while at the time of the

enrolment Varus was actually legatus, Quirinius may have held some such command as that indicated above. H. Holtzmann (Hdcom., 1901, i. p. 317) dismisses Ramsay's proposed explanation somewhat contemptuously; but he has nothing to say with regard to the analogous cases of a temporary division of duties in Roman administration, or to those quoted by R. S. Bour, who is essentially in agreement with Ramsay in the proposed solution.] Moreover, it may be fairly urged, as it is in fact by Ramsay, that Quirinius ruled for a shorter time than Varus, and that as he controlled the foreign relations of the province he furnished the best means of dating (*Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* p. 246; see also p. 105). But if we once admit that St. Luke's words do not involve the belief that Quirinius was the actual governor of Syria, the view that Quirinius may have been sent as an extraordinary legate to Syria, and as such had undertaken the administration of the census, is well worthy of consideration. This view is mentioned by Schürer (*l.c.* p. 540), although only to be rejected. But Ramsay (p. 248) points out that if this supposition is accepted, it may be observed that Quirinius as the commissioner for Syria and Palestine would be a delegate exercising the emperor's authority, and might rightly be said ἡγεμονεύειν τῆς Συρίας. At all events this view offends against no method of Roman procedure (as Schürer apparently allows), and it may fairly be said to be quite compatible with the language which St. Luke employs.

When we consider the many difficulties which surround this *vexata quaestio*, it is somewhat surprising that Professor Schürer should affirm that all possible means of escape from the conclusion are closed, the conclusion being that St. Luke's statement conflicts with the facts of history (*l.c.* p. 542). Having arrived at this very dogmatic result, he points out that anyone who cannot attribute such an error to Luke should bear in mind that the Evangelist is not free from the perpetration of other blunders. He confuses, e.g., the Theudas in Act 5:36, the Theudas who rises up before Judas of Galilee, with the Theudas who lived some forty years later. But Schürer must be well aware that many able critics do not accept this further summary assertion on his part of St. Luke's ignorance, and that his own learned countryman Dr. F. Blass passes the sensible judgment in his Commentary on Act 5:37, that St. Luke's accuracy in other respects should prevent us from attributing to him here such a grave error as is sometimes alleged. Moreover, it should be remembered that it is precisely in points connected with the administration of the Roman provinces that St. Luke's accuracy has been so repeatedly proved. Consider as a single instance the manner in which in the Acts he is able not merely to distinguish between Imperial and Senatorial provinces, but also to note accurately the particular period during which a certain province was under one or the other kind of rule. Or if we turn to the Gospel, we recall how a keen controversy has raged around the statement in Luk 3:1 with regard to Lysanias the tetrarch of Abilene. Here, too, St. Luke has been accused of manifest inaccuracy. But, to say nothing of the recent discovery of two inscriptions which have

been fairly cited in support of St. Luke's correctness, it may be observed that Schmiedel reluctantly allows (art. 'Lysanias' in *Encyc. Bibl.* iii. 2842) that it cannot possibly be shown, or even assumed, that St. Luke is here mistaken, while Schürer entertains no such hesitation, and frankly states that 'the Evangelist Luke is thoroughly correct when he assumes that in the fifteenth year of Tiberius there was a Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene' (*l.c.* p. 719). And yet within a few lines of this evidence of correctness we are asked to believe that the same Evangelist was guilty of a gratuitous and stupid blunder in relation to the enrolment under Quirinius.

ii. St. Matthew's account.

1. *Use of OT prophecy.*—While St. Luke narrates the events which lead to the Birth at Bethlehem without making any definite reference to OT prophecy, it is noticeable that St. Matthew (Mat 2:6) quotes definitely the prophecy of Micah (Mic 5:2) with reference to the home of David: 'And thou Bethlehem, land of Judah, art in nowise least among the princes of Judah: for out of thee shall come forth a governor, which shall be shepherd of my people Israel.' The prophecy was undoubtedly regarded as Messianic (Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus*, 1903, p. 94; Schürer, *l.c.* ii. 527-530).

The difference in the wording of Mat 2:6 and Mic 5:2 is easily accounted for, if we bear in mind that the Evangelist reproduces the prophecy in the manner popular at the time, *i.e.* he quotes some Targum on the passage, or, as Edersheim puts it, Mic 5:2 is rendered *targumically*, and this would fairly cover the variations in the two renderings (*Jesus the Messiah*, i. p. 206; cf. also Delitzsch, *Messianische Weissagungen* 2, p. 129). But if Schürer is correct in seeing in the prophecy of Micah words which might easily be understood to mean that the Messiah's goings forth had been from of old, from everlasting, *i.e.* to signify the Messiah's pre-existence, yet it cannot be said that Jewish theology pointed to a birth such as that recorded by St. Matthew.

It is no wonder that Zahn (*l.c.* p. 83) should characterize as altogether fantastic the attempt to derive the stories of St. Matthew and St. Luke from the Rabbinic exegesis of Isa 7:14, when there is no reason to assume that the prophet's words were taken at the time of our Lord's birth to refer to the Messiah at all (see also Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , pp. 354, 357; and von Orelli, art. 'Messias' in *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1902, and esp. Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, i. 226). But this is a subject for which reference may be made to art. Virgin Birth.

2. *Relation to Jewish legal requirements.*—St. Matthew's account, which with every due concession may fairly be regarded as dating in its present form within the limits

of the 1st cent., demands our attention for further reasons. It is remarkable, for example, how strictly it adheres to Jewish legality, and yet at the same time how delicately the feelings and thoughts of Joseph are portrayed (cf. G. H. Box, *l.c.* p. 82).

With regard to the first point, it may be noted that 'after the betrothal the bride was under the same restrictions as a wife. If unfaithful, she ranked and was punished as an adulteress (Deu 22:23 f.); and, on the other hand, the bridegroom, if he wished to break the contract, had the same privileges, and had also to observe the same formalities, as in the case of divorce. The situation is illustrated in the history of Joseph and Mary, who were on the footing of betrothal' (art. 'Marriage' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii.; cf. also Nebe, *Kindheitsgeschichte*, pp. 199, 200, and Zahn, *l.c.* p. 71). In this connexion one may also refer to another passage in Dalman with reference to the descent of Jesus: 'A case such as that of Jesus,' he writes, 'was, of course, not anticipated by the Law; but if no other human fatherhood was alleged, then the child must have been regarded as bestowed by God upon the house of Joseph; for a betrothed woman, according to Jewish law, already occupied the same status as a wife' (*Die Worte Jesu*, i. p. 263). See Betrothal.

If we bear this in mind, we can see how easy it is to interpret the reading of the Sinaitic-Syriac palimpsest, of which so much has been made, in Luk 2:5 'he and Mary his wife, that they might be enrolled.' All that the words show, if we allow that they are the correct reading, is that Mary was under the full legal protection of Joseph: 'unless, indeed, our Lord had passed in common estimation as the son of Joseph,' it has been well pointed out that it is difficult to see how Joseph, according to Mat 1:19, could have gratified his wish 'not to expose' Mary. And so again 'Joseph was without doubt the foster-father of our Lord; and if any register of births was kept in the Temple or elsewhere, he would probably be there described as the actual father. Such he was from a social point of view, and it was therefore no wilful suppression of the truth when the most blessed amongst women said to her Son, "Thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing" (Mrs. Lewis in the *Expos. Times*, 1900, 1901, where illustrations from Eastern social customs may be also found). Cf. W. C. Allen, *Interpreter*, Feb. 1905, p. 113.

3. Sobriety and delicacy of the narrative.—If we turn again to what we may call the inwardness of St. Matthew's story, we can scarcely fail to be struck with its singular sobriety and reserve. We hear nothing of any anger or reproach on the part of Joseph against his betrothed, although as 'a righteous man' he feels that only one course is open to him. But with this decision other considerations were evidently still contending,—considerations the very existence of which bore testimony to the purity and fidelity of Mary. The words of the angel (Mat 1:20) say nothing of the appeasement of indignation, they speak rather of the befitting conquest of hesitation

and doubt: 'fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife,' *i.e.* to take unto thee one who had and still has a claim to that honoured and cherished name. No wonder that Dean Plumptre could write that the glimpse given us into the character of Joseph is one of singular tenderness and beauty (see Ellicott's *Commentary, in loco*). If any one will read this delicate and beautiful description and place it side by side with that given us in the *Protevangelium Jacobi*, where, *e.g.*, both Joseph and the priest bitterly reproach Mary, and a whole series of prurient details is given, he will again become painfully aware of the gulf which separates the Canonical from the Apocryphal Gospels.

4. *Objections taken to the contents of Matthew 1, 2.*—St. Matthew's record, no less than that of St. Luke, has been the object of vehement and relentless attack. It is asserted, for instance, by Usener that in the whole Birth and Childhood story of St. Matthew a pagan substratum can be traced (art. 'Nativity' in *Encyc. Bibl.* iii. 3352, and also to the same effect *ZNTW* [Note: *NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissenschaft.*], 1903, p. 21). Thus we are asked to find the origin of the story of the Magi worshipping at the cradle of the infant Jesus in the visit paid by the Parthian king Tiridates with magi in his train to do homage in Rome to the emperor Nero. But the magi of the Parthian king were evidently, like many other magi of the East, claimants to the possession of secret and magical arts, and there is nothing strange in the fact that they are found among the retinue of a Parthian king. But what actual points of resemblance exist between this visit to Nero and the visit of the Magi to Bethlehem it is difficult to see. One crucial contrast, at any rate, has been rightly emphasized. Tiridates came to Nero, not of his own accord, but because his only choice was to do homage to Nero or to lose his crown. Here there is no comparison with, but rather an obvious and essential contrast to, the Wise Men of St. Matthew, who came with joy and gladness to worship the Babe of Bethlehem.

Soltau, who also supports the same origin for St. Matthew's story, adduces the parallels which in his opinion may be fitly drawn between the visit of the Parthian king to Rome and the visit of the Magi to Bethlehem (*Die Geburtsgeschichte Jesu Christi*, 1902, p. 37). As might be expected, he makes much of the fact that Tiridates is said to have knelt and worshipped Nero just as the Wise Men fell down to worship Jesus. But the only other verbal parallel which he is able to adduce is this: Tiridates, according to Dio Cassius (lxiii. 2 ff.), did not return by the way which he came; beneath the quotation of this statement Soltau writes as a parallel the words of St. Matthew: 'and they departed into their own country another way' (Mat 2:12). A strong case scarcely stands in need of such parallels as these.* [Note: See also the recent criticisms of A. Jeremias, *Babylonisches im NT*, 1905, p. 55.]

But an attempt is often made to trace St. Matthew's story to Jewish sources, and reference is made to the words and expectations of the prophets. And no doubt it is easy to affirm that such a passage as Isa 61:1 ff. might have contributed to the formation of the legend of the adoration of the Magi. But the Evangelist, who loves to quote prophecies apposite in any degree to the events connected with our Lord's birth, makes no reference to this passage of Isaiah which Christian thought has so often associated with the Epiphany. As a matter of fact, it would seem that the prophecy referred primarily, not to the Messiah, but to the city of Jerusalem and to the day of its latter glory.

No doubt the Evangelist does definitely connect at least two Old Testament prophecies with the visit of the Magi and the events immediately subsequent to it. But the question may be fairly asked, Which is more probable, that the flight into Egypt actually took place, or that the Jewish Evangelist, or some later hand, introduced the incident as the fulfilment of an OT prophecy which had primarily no definite or obvious connexion, to say the least of it, with the Messiah?† [Note: On the exact words of Hos 11:1, quoted by St. Matthew from the Hebrew, see Zahn, *Evangelium des Matthaus*, p. 103; and also Delitzsch, *Messianische Weissagungen*², 1899, p. 105.] Or, again, if some such event as the Massacre of the Innocents at Bethlehem actually occurred, we can understand that a Jewish Evangelist could find in that event, and in the mourning of the mothers of Israel, a further fulfilment of Jeremiah's words (Jer 31:15). But there is no obvious reason why he should have hit upon and introduced such words unless some event had happened at Bethlehem which recalled to his mind the picture which the prophet had drawn, and the scene once enacted within a few miles of the city of David.

Other explanations are, of course, forthcoming. 'Why,' asks Usener, 'is Egypt selected as the place of refuge?' and one answer is that mythological ideas may have had their unconscious influence; it is to Egypt that the Olympian gods take their flight when attacked by the giant Typhon! (art 'Nativity' in *Ency. Bibl.* iii. 3351; and *ZNTW* [Note: *NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissen. schaft.*] p. 217).‡ [Note: Indications are not wanting that this constant and somewhat reckless appeal to supposed pagan soologies is being overdone; see, e.g., Farnell's remarks in the *Hibbert Journal*, July 1904, p. 827.] In any consideration of such statements it is well to remember first of all that, whatever date we assign to St. Matthew,§ [Note: In art. 'Gospels' in *Encyc. Bibl.* ii. 1893, mention is made of the Syriac writing attributed to Eusebius, and it is maintained that, according to this document, the story of the Magi, committed to writing in the interior of Persia, was, in a.d. 119, in the episcopate of Xystus of Rome, made search for, discovered, and written in Greek. But Zahn (*Einleitung*, ii. p. 266) points out that this statement at least shows that by the date named the year of the coming of the Magi was discussed not only in Rome, but in various places. He further

argues, with good reason, from the same statement of the pseudo-Eusebius, that the narrative of Matthew 2 had already been incorporated in the Gospel before a.d. 119. See, further, Ch. Quart. Rev. July 1904, p. 389. In this connexion it may be noted that it is difficult to see why the statement of St. Ignatius, exaggerated as it is, should not be taken to refer to the star of the Magi (Ephes. 19:2, 3). On the significance of this early reference to the Gospel narrative in St. Ignatius, see Headism, Criticism of the NT, p. 166 (St. Margaret's Lectures). In his recent Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel, Wellhausen begins with 3:1, which is certainly a short and easy method of dealing with the two earlier chapters.] we are dealing with an historic period of the world's history, and that the writer at least claims to place his events in relation to historical data. Nothing was more natural than that Egypt should be chosen as the place of refuge; it was nigh at hand, the communication by caravan was very frequent; in earlier days Jeroboam had fled thither from Solomon (1Ki 11:40), and it was to Tabpanhes that Johanan, the son of Kareah, and his companions had gone to save themselves out of the hands of the Chaldeans (Jer 43:7).

Nothing was more in accordance with the character of Herod than the deed of bloodshed ascribed to him, and modern days supply many proofs of the unscrupulous manner in which a jealous and suspicious potentate has not hesitated to rid himself of anyone likely to render his tenure of sovereignty insecure (see, e.g., amongst recent writers Kreyher, *Die jungfräuliche Geburt des Herrn*, 1904, p. 83).* [Note: See, further, art. Magi. It may, however, be here noted that Ramsay remarks on Macrobius, Sat. ii. 4, that it is not probable that Macrobius (a pagan, about a.d. 400) was indebted to a Christian writer for his information, and that therefore the story of the Massacre of the Infants was recorded in some pagan source (Was Christ born at Bethlehem? pp. 219, 220). Zockler also refers to Macrobius as affording a testimony from a non-biblical source to the truth of the Massacre at Bethlehem (art. 'Jesus Christus' in PRE3). On the silence of Josephus see, further, Zahn, *Evangelium des Matthäus*, p. 109; and Edersheim, *The Temple at the Time of Jesus Christ*, p. 35 f.]

On the other hand, it is very improbable that the Evangelist would have invented a story in which the birth of the Messiah was made to bring bitter sorrow into so many Jewish homes.† [Note: Zahn, *Evangelium des Matthäus*, p. 109. See, too, the same reference for the improbability of supposing that the story in St. Matthew was derived from the rescue of Moses (Exo 1:15; Exo 2:10; Jos. Ant. ii. ix. 2); and cf. art. Magi.]

Nothing, again, was more likely than that Joseph should withdraw into Galilee after the return from Egypt, since we have evidence that Archelaus very soon after his accession gave proof of the same cruel and crafty behaviour as had characterized his father (Josephus *BJ* ii. vi. 2).‡ [Note: 'There is a noticeable difference between St. Matthew's references to the political situation in Palestine and St. Luke's. St. Luke

speaks with the air of painstaking investigation; St. Matthew, with that of easy familiarity, all the more noteworthy that the frequent and somewhat complicated succession of rulers would have made error easy.' This important point is noted by Burton in his Introduction to the Gospels (Chicago), 1904, p. 4.]

In the next place, it is well to remember that there is at all events one instance of a prophecy cited in this part of the Gospel of St. Matthew the fulfilment of which is beyond doubt, if we can be said to know anything at all of the historical Jesus (Mat 2:23). And yet no one with any discernment could possibly maintain that our Lord's residence and bringing up in Nazareth were introduced for the sake of finding a fulfilment for a prophecy which it is so difficult to trace to any one source in OT literature. But if in this case it is certain that the prophecy could not have created the fact, why in the case of the other prophecies cited should their alleged fulfilment be credited to the extravagant imagination of the Evangelist, and to that alone?^S [Note: See some excellent remarks of Bruce in the Expositor's Greek Testament, i. p. 78.]

iii. Apocryphal accounts.—It is of the greatest significance that just in that portion of our Lord's life concerning which the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke are most silent, the Apocryphal Gospels are most effusive.* [Note: For a useful classification of the most important of the Apocryphal Gospels, and a list of those which claim to fill up the gaps in our knowledge of the Infancy and Childhood of Jesus, see art. 'Apocryphal Gospels' in Hastings' DB, Ext. Vol. p. 422.]

In the same volume (art. 'Papyri,' p. 352) it is of interest to note that Kenyon in commenting upon the later Egyptian papyri remarks that one document written about the end of the 1st cent. has been held to show certain resemblances to the narrative of the Nativity of our Lord, but that the resemblance is, in truth, very slight and unessential.]

Here was an opportunity for them to occupy a vacant space, and they lost no endeavour in trying to fill it. Both in the details of the Nativity and in the events just referred to as subsequent to it, we find ample proofs of this. Thus Elisabeth is fearful that in accordance with the commands of Herod her son John may be slain. And when she can find no place of concealment, she begs a mountain to receive mother and child, and instantly the mountain is cleft to receive her; and a light shines round about, for an angel of the Lord is watching for her preservation. And upon this there follows a tragic scene of the murder of Zacharias, who is slain for his refusal to betray his son. As the Holy Family pass through Egypt, the marvellous accompanies them at every step. In these apocryphal stories, lions, dragons, and panthers adore the infant Jesus; a palm tree bends at His word that His Mother may eat the fruit; in one day the

travellers accomplish a journey of thirty days; the idols prostrate themselves in the temples before the Mother and her Child. And we know how the long silence of our Lord's life in our Gospels, which is broken only by one incident in St. Luke, and by the brief summary of St. Matthew, 'He shall be called a Nazarene,' affords further opportunity for the introduction of the same insipid and fantastic tales.† [Note: It cannot be said that Conrady's attempt to derive our Gospel accounts of the Nativity from the Apocryphal Gospels, especially from the Protevangelium Jacobi, is likely to gain acceptance (*Die Quelle der kanonischen Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu*; see, further, his article in *SK*, 1904, Heft 2). Such a derivation might well be called a literary miracle. For a criticism of Conrady's attempt, see *Theot. Literaturblatt*, 1901, p. 283.]

Even in modern days there have not been wanting writers who have boldly essayed to occupy the same ground with an equal lack of historical data.‡ [Note: See, e.g., C. A. Witz, *Keine Lücke im Leben Jesu*, 1895, described as 'Antwort auf die Schrift von Nikolaus Notowitsch, *Die Lücke im Leben Jesu*.'] In all this and much else we mark again and again the reserve so characteristic of St. Matthew and St. Luke alike, a reserve and restraint often emphasized by earlier commentators, and again recently referred to by German writers so far apart in point of view as Gunkel and Hermann Cremer.§ [Note: Cf. Gunkel, l.c. p. 66, and H. Cremer, *Repty to Harnack*, p. 163, Eng. tr. 1903.]

iv. Convergent traditions and the main facts.—It is often said that the narratives in our two canonical Gospels contradict one another. But although, no doubt, it is difficult to harmonize them in their particulars and sequences, their independence is evident proof that there was no attempt on the part of one Evangelist to make his work the complement or corrector of the other. || [Note: | See especially Swete, *The Apostles' Creed*, p. 50, for the distinctness of the two accounts and the almost entirely different ground covered. For a probable order of the events see Plummer, *St. Luke*, p. 64; Andrews, *Life of our Lord upon the Earth*, 1892, p. 92; Rose, *Studies in the Gospels*, p. 64 ff., also *Évangile selon S. Matthieu*, p. 17.] Antecedently we might have expected that St. Luke, the Gentile Evangelist, would have told us of the adoration of the Magi, and that the Hebrew Evangelist would have given us the picture of obedience on the part of Mother and Child to the details of the Law and the worship of the Temple. And it is justly urged as no small proof of the truth of the narratives that each Evangelist could thus transcend his own special standpoint and purpose (Fairbairn, *Stud. in Life of Christ*, p. 36).* [Note: A careful study of Resch's attempt (1897) to reconstruct a *Kindheitsevangelium* from the first two chapters of St. Luke and St. Matthew with the help of some extra-canonical parallels, and to restore the Hebrew original of the narrative, can scarcely be said to carry conviction with it.]

It is indeed urged that this same contradiction may be found in those parts of the canonical narratives which relate most closely to our Lord's birth (Lohstein, *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, p. 42, Eog. translation). But the details vouchsafed to us, it may be fairly said, present no essential incompatibility, and two convergent traditions coming from distinct sources may be rightly affirmed to corroborate and sustain each other as to the main facts which they describe (*Church Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1904, pp. 200, 201; W. C. Allen, *l.c.* p. 115).

The belief that St. Matthew gives us an account which comes primarily from Joseph, while St. Luke gives us an account that comes primarily from Mary, has long been maintained by many able critics, and it is a belief which still commends itself as the most satisfactory explanation of the two stories. It is the simplest thing to see how in the one case the frequent repetition of the name 'Joseph' points to him as the primary source of information, and how in the other case the twice repeated reference to Mary points to her as occupying the same position: 'Mary kept all these sayings, pondering them in her heart' (Luk 2:19); 'and his mother kept all these sayings in her heart' (v. 51). One thing may be safely asserted, that if these two accounts had come to us agreeing in every particular, we should have been asked to discredit them on account of this very agreement.

Literature.—A considerable amount of the literature has been indicated above, and for further information art. Virgin Birth should be consulted. The following works may be added here: W. H. Mill, *Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels*, 1861; C. F. Schmid, *Biblical Theology of the NT*, 1870 [English translation p. 25 ff.]; F. L. Steinmeyer, *Die Gesch. der Geburt des Herrn*, 1873; Wace, *The Gospel and its Witnesses*, 1883; F. Godet, *Commentaire sur l'évangile de Luc*, 1888; Nosgen, *Geschichte Jesu*, 1891, p. 113 ff.; *Geboren von der Jungfrau*, Anonymous, Leipzig, 1896; Bishop Gore, *Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; Grenfell and Hunt, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, i. 1899; *AJTh* [Note: JTh American Journal of Theology.] , July 1902; J. Grill, *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangelium*, 1902, p. 330 ff.; Briggs, *New Light on the Life of Jesus*, 1903; Dean of Westminster, *Some Thoughts on the Incarnation*, 1903; Randolph, *The Virgin Birth of our Lord*, 1903; J. E. Carpenter, *Bible in the Nineteenth Century*, 1903, p. 491 ff.; Bishop Wordsworth, *The Baptismal Confession and the Creed*, 1904; Th. H. Wandel, *Die Wunderbare Zeugung*, 1903; E. Burton, *Introduction to the Gospels* (Chicago): Appended notes on 'Quirinius,' and 'The Old Testament Law in Luk 2:22-24,' 1904; Lepin, *Jésus Messie et Fils de Dieu*, 1904, pp. 55-75; P. W. Schmidt, *Geschichte Jesu*, 1904, ii. 13, 14; Cheyne, *Bible Problems*, 1905; W. C. Allen, *Interpreter*, Feb. and Oct. 1905; G. H. Box, *ZNTW* [Note: NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissen. schaft.] , 1905, Heft 1.

☩ Birthday

BIRTHDAY.—In Mat 14:6 and Mar 6:21 this word represents the Gr. τὰ γενέσια in the account of the king's (Herod Antipas) feast to his nobles, at which John the Baptist was condemned to death. It has been suggested, however, though without much acceptance, that the anniversary referred to was that of Herod's accession, not strictly that of his birth. Γενέσια, which in Attic Greek means 'the commemoration of the dead,' is in the later language interchangeable with γενέθλια (birthday celebrations), and there seems no reason why the translation of Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 and Authorized Version should not be right (see Swete on Mar 6:21, and Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, s.v.). The custom of observing the birthday of a king was widely spread in ancient times (cf. Gen 40:20, 2Ma 6:7; Herod. ix. 110).

For the question of the date of our Lord's birth, and the authority for the traditional 25th December, see art. Calendar.

C. L. Feltoe.

☩ Blasphemy

BLASPHEMY (βλασφημία; for derivation of word see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, vol. i. p. 305a).—This word is used in the Gospels, as in other parts of the NT, for abusive speech generally, as well as for language that is insulting to God. Thus we read of 'an evil eye, blasphemy (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 railing), pride,' etc. (Mar 7:22), where the position of the word indicates human relations. The evil eye is followed by the evil tongue, the one by look and the other by speech expressing malignity towards a fellow-man. Two questions concerning blasphemy come up in the Gospels, viz. the teaching of Jesus Christ on the subject, and the charge of blasphemy brought against our Lord.

1. The teaching of Jesus Christ concerning blasphemy.—Using the term in the general sense, our Lord does not always formally distinguish between insulting speech with regard to God and abusive language towards men. βλασφημία in any application of it is sin. As railing against our fellow-men, it comes in a catalogue of sins together

with the most heinous—‘murders, adulteries,’ etc. (Mar_7:22). In this connexion it is treated as one of the ‘evil things’ that ‘proceed from within, and defile the man.’ Thus it is taken to be the expression of a corrupt heart, and as such a defilement of the person who gives vent to it. Nevertheless it is not beyond the reach of pardon. With one exception all revilings may be forgiven (Mar_3:28-29, Mat_12:31). The comprehensive sentence must include blasphemy against God, although that is not expressly mentioned. In Mat_12:32 there is a reference to blasphemy against the Son of Man, and in both cases the unpardonable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is mentioned; but in neither case is there any reference to blasphemy against the Father. Perhaps the safest thing is to say that this was not in mind at the time, so that no direct pronouncement was made concerning it; and, further, it is to be observed that Trinitarian distinctions do not appear in these teachings of Jesus. Jesus is here the ‘Son of Man,’ not ‘the Son,’ *i.e.* of God, and the Holy Spirit is God in His manifested activity. Still, it must be implicitly contained in St. Mark’s emphatic sentence, ‘*All their sins ... and their blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme* (ὅσα ἂν βλασφημήσωσιν).’

To ‘speak a word against the Son of Man’ is taken as one form of the blasphemy or reviling. Here, therefore, the word is not used in its relation to God. It does not stand for what we now understand by ‘blasphemy’ in our narrower sense of the word. Jesus is not here standing on the ground of His divinity, to insult which would be blasphemy in this modern sense. He is speaking of Himself as seen among men, and referring to personal insults. But, since the term ‘the Son of Man’ appears to be a veiled reference to His Messiahship, for Himself and for the enlightened among His followers He must have meant that those who insulted Him, even though He was the Christ, were not beyond pardon; cf. ‘Father, forgive them,’ etc. (Luk_23:34, om. BD*, etc.). Some doubt, however, is thrown on this reference to ‘the Son of Man’ because (1) it does not occur in the Mk. parallel passage; (2) in Mk. but not in Mt. the phrase ‘the sons of men’ occurs in an earlier part of the saying (Mar_3:28).

The nature of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost (Mat_12:22-32, Mar_3:29, Luk_12:10) must be learnt from the context. This excludes such notions as rejection of the gospel (Iren.), denial of the divinity of Christ (Athan.), mortal sin after baptism (Origen), persistence in sin till death (August.). The form of the blasphemy is given in the words ‘because they said, He hath an unclean spirit,’ and the occasion of it was Jesus’ casting out of demons. Jesus declares that this is done ‘by the Spirit of God’ (Mat_12:28), or ‘by the finger of God’ (Luk_11:20). To ascribe this action to Beelzebub is to be guilty of, or to approach the guilt of, blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, because it is treating the Holy Spirit as Beelzebub. Jesus did not expressly say that the scribes who put forward this Beelzebub theory of His work had actually committed this sin. He judged by thought and intention, not by outward utterance. A

prejudiced, ignorant, hasty, superficial utterance of the calumny would not contain the essence of the sin. This must be a conscious, intentional insult. If one mistakes a saint for a knave, and addresses him accordingly, he is not really guilty of insulting him, for it is not actually the saint but the knave whom he has in mind. If the presence of the Holy Spirit was not recognized, there could be no blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. But when it was perceived and yet deliberately treated as evil, the action would indicate a wilful reversal of the dictates of conscience. Our Lord warns His hearers that such a sin cannot be forgiven either in the present age—the pre-Messianic, or in the age to come—the Messianic, that is, as we should say, the Christian age. The condition of such a person will be that he is guilty (ἔνοχος) of an eternal (αιωνίου) sin (so Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 of Mar_3:29, following \aleph BL, etc., ἁμαρτήματος; not ‘damnation,’ as in Authorized Version, after the Syrian reading ἁμαρτήματος; A, etc.). This cannot well mean ‘a sin that persists, a fixed disposition,’ as Dr. Salmond understands it, because (1) the Greek word ἁμαρτήματος; stands for an act, not a state; (2) there is nothing in the context to indicate persistency in the blasphemy; (3) the Jewish current conception was that a sin once committed remained on the sinner till it was atoned for or forgiven. He had to bear his sin. Therefore one who was never forgiven would have to bear his sin eternally, and so would be said to have an eternal sin. Wellhausen understands it to be equivalent to eternal punishment (‘schuldig ewiger Sünde, d. i. ewiger Strafe,’ *Evang. Marci*, 28).

At the same time, while this must be understood as the correct exegesis of the words, the saying should be interpreted in harmony with the spirit of Christ. Now it is characteristic of legalism and the letter to make a solitary exception, depending on one external act. The Spirit of Christ is concerned with character rather than with specific deeds, and it is contrary to His spirit that one specific deed should be singled out for exclusion from mercy. Then, elsewhere, the breadth of His gospel indicates that no genuine seeker would be rejected. Therefore we must understand Him to mean either (1) that to be guilty of such a sin a man must be so hardened that he never would repent, or (2) that such a sin cannot be overlooked, forgotten, and swallowed up in the general flood of mercy. It must come up for judgment. Against (1) and for (2) is the fact that our Lord says nothing of the offender’s disposition, but only refers to the sin, its heinous character, and consequent never-to-be-denied or forgotten ill-desert. See, further, art. Unpardonable Sin.

2. The charge of blasphemy brought against Jesus Christ.—This charge was brought against our Lord on three occasions—two recorded in the Synoptics and one in the Fourth Gospel. In all of these cases the alleged blasphemy is against God, actual blasphemy in our sense of the word. The first instance is at the cure of the paralytic

who had been let down through the roof (Mat 9:3, Mar 2:7, Luk 5:21). Jesus had just said to the sufferer, 'Thy sins are forgiven thee.' Upon this the scribes and Pharisees who were present complained that He was speaking blasphemies because only God could forgive sins, that is to say, that He was arrogating to Himself a Divine prerogative. In His answer He distinctly claimed this right on the ground of His enigmatic title of 'the Son of Man,' and held it to be confirmed by His cure of the paralytic. The second occasion is that recorded by St. John, where the Jews declare that their attempt to stone Jesus was 'for blasphemy,' adding 'because that thou, being a man makest thyself God' (Joh 10:33). This was just after He had said, 'I and the Father are one (ἐν).' The third occasion is at the trial of Jesus. According to Mat 26:65 and Mar 14:63-64 when Jesus, after being adjured by the high priest to declare if He were the Christ, declared that they would 'see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power and coming with the clouds of heaven,' the high priest treated this as blasphemy, rending his garments as a token of honor at the words. Yet the claim was not for more than the Book of Enoch assigned to the Messiah. But the Messiah in that Apocalyptic book is a heavenly being. Such a being Caiaphas would understand Jesus to claim to be, and he reckoned the profession of such a claim blasphemous. This was the formal ground of the condemnation of Jesus to death by the Sanhedrin. The first charge, that of threatening to destroy the Temple and rebuild it in three days, had broken down because of the inconsistency of the witnesses. The second charge is suddenly sprung upon, Jesus by the high priest on the ground of His words at the council; and, on this account, as guilty of blasphemy, He was condemned to death, although it was useless to cite the words before Pilate, who would have dismissed the case as Gallio at Corinth dismissed what he regarded as 'a question about words and names' (Act 18:15). Therefore a third charge, never mentioned in the Jewish trial,—*laesae majestatis*, treason against Caesar,—was concocted for use at the Roman trial.

It is to be observed that there is one common character in all these accusations of blasphemy brought against Jesus. He is never accused of direct blasphemy, speaking insulting words about God. The alleged blasphemy is indirect, in each case claiming more or less Divine rights and powers for Himself.

Lastly, it may be noted that Luk 22:65 Authorized Version has the word 'blasphemously' for the way in which the mockers spoke of Jesus; but Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 has 'reviling,' which is the evident meaning. There is no reference to our narrower sense of blasphemy as insulting the Divine; the word (ἀμαρτήματος;) is used in the common wider sense.

Literature.—S. J. Andrews, *Life of Our Lord*, 505-514; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Blasphemy'; Cremer, *Bibl.-Theol. Lex. s.vv.* βλασφημία, βλασφημῆω; and in particular on blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, Martensen, *Christian Ethics*, ii. p. 123ff.; Gloag, *Exegetical Studies*, p. 1 ff.; *Expositor*, 2nd ser. iii. [1882] p. 321 ff.; A. Maclaren, *Christ's Musts*, 44-54.

W. F. Adeney.

☩ Blessedness

BLESSEDNESS.—Though the word 'blessedness' itself is never found in the recorded utterances of our Lord nor in the pages of the Gospels, the idea conveyed by it is very frequent. The adjective 'blessed' occurs in many contexts, and may, indeed, be termed a characteristic epithet on Christ's lips. The thought expressed by it was inherited, like so many others, from the Old Testament. It is one of the dominant notes of the Psalter (Heb. **אֲשֶׁר** 'O the happiness of'), and constitutes one of the clearest and most common terms whereby to denote the ideal of Israel's highest hopes. It was natural, therefore, that Jesus should take the word to set forth the great spiritual realities of His kingdom. It is in this sense that it meets us on the earliest pages of St. Matthew's Gospel. The famous form of the sayings there collected (see art. Beatitudes) is one of the best-known sections of the narrative. So throughout the pages of the Gospels and elsewhere in the NT we find sayings cast in the same mould. All of them are expressive of the spiritual graces to be looked for in disciples of the kingdom (.g. Mat 11:6, Luk 7:23, Mat 24:46, Act 20:35), or are indicative of high privileges open to believers in its message (.g. Mat 13:16, Luk 11:28, Joh 20:29). Spiritual gladness is not only a note of service in the kingdom, but is to accompany all its true and inalienable rewards.

When we set ourselves to discover the significance of these sayings we are struck (1) by their *spiritual character*. Twice (Luk 11:27; Luk 14:15) beatitudes of a material character are uttered by our Lord's hearers, and He at once rebukes them, and shows the necessity of fixing the desires of the heart on the inward and unseen. The main qualities designated and praised are meekness, purity, tenderness of heart, peaceableness, faith, patience, contrition, qualities which have no sooner been named than we are reminded of such lists of the fruits of the Spirit as we find in Gal 5:22-23 or Eph 4:30-32. Blessedness, as Christ presented it, was therefore a condition of the mind and heart that expressed an attitude of faith and love towards God and men, and obtained the reward with certainty even if the sowing were 'in tears' and the 'interest far off.'

(2) Several of these sayings are marked by the sense of the *futurity of their fulfilment*. It is noteworthy that in the list of Beatitudes in Matthew 5, while the majority speak of futurity, 'shall be comforted,' 'shall inherit,' etc., one or two are written in the present tense, e.g. 'theirs is the kingdom of heaven.' In Mat 5:10 we have the unique form of expression, 'have been persecuted ... theirs is.' In St. Luke also we find the same commingling of present and future. This reflects a state of opinion that prevails throughout the Gospels, and gives rise to some of the greatest problems of interpretation, viz. in what sense the kingdom of God is to be understood—as a present or as a future condition. The Beatitudes are not only closely related to this question—they constitute a special aspect of it. As Titius puts it, 'Over every saying of Jesus may be written the inscription, "Concerning the kingdom of God" ' These sayings, then, reveal the nature of the kingdom in its twofold aspect as an inward, spiritual, present reality which exists, progresses, suffers, is in perpetual conflict; and, as a great future fulfilment, when conflict shall turn to peace, failure to victory, suffering to reward, and the inward desire and the outward attainment be one in the presence of perfected power.

Blessedness may therefore be regarded as one of the forms under which our Lord presented the character of His kingdom, and so it becomes an illuminative idea whereby to read the whole Gospel narratives. They all illustrate it. They all serve to make up its content. The word and thought derived from the Old Testament receive richer significance, and may be taken as equivalent to those other great terms, such as 'eternal life' and 'the kingdom of heaven,' under which, in the pages of St. John and St. Matthew, the great purposes of God in Christ are set forth.

Literature.—The articles 'Blessedness' and, in particular, 'Sermon on the Mount' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ; the articles in this Dictionary on Beatitudes, Kingdom of God, Eternal Life, Parables, etc.; the Commentaries on Matthew 5 and Luke 6, and on the other verses quoted, especially, for practical purposes, Morison, Bruce [in *Expos. Gr. Test.*]; Trench, *The Sermon on the Mount*. The most recent full commentary on Matthew is that of Zahn (in German). Books on the Kingdom of God should also be consulted, and, in particular, A. Titius, *Die NT Lehre von der Seligkeit*, etc., erster Teil, 1895; and Bousset, *Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judentum*. See also N. Smyth, *Christian Ethics*, 118ff.; J. B. Lightfoot, *Sermons in St. Paul's*, 178; T. G. Selby, *The Imperfect Angel*, 25.

G. Currie Martin.

BLESSING

1. Introductory.
2. Terms.
3. Jewish usage.
4. Usage in the Gospels.

Literature.

1. *Introductory.*—The main underlying idea of the characteristic New Testament word for ‘blessing’ (εὐλογεῖν) seems to be that of goodwill, which, on the part of man towards God, has its appropriate expression in praise and thanksgiving. The close connexion of these two last ideas is clearly seen in the New Testament in the interchange of the expressions for ‘to bless’ (εὐλογεῖν) and ‘to give thanks,’ namely to God (εὐχαριστεῖν, cf. e.g. Mar_6:41 || and with Joh_6:11; and see, further, below, § 4), and is explained by the Jewish development of the term for ‘blessing’ (*běrhâkhâh*; cf. further, § 4 b). In Jewish religious terminology, under the influence of the high ethical views of God’s character and uniqueness, and His relation to Israel and mankind, that had been developed, ‘blessing’ acquires a lofty spiritual connotation. God ‘blesses’ man and his world by His ever active, beneficent Providence; man ‘blesses’ God by thankful recognition of this, and by pure acts of praise; man ‘blesses’ man by invoking the Divine favour for his fellows’ benefit (cf. e.g. Psa_129:8); and even when material things are the objects of blessing, this finds its proper expression in an act of thanksgiving to the Divine Giver.

The original sense of the Heb. verb *bçrakh* (Piel, denominative from *berekh*, ‘knee’) is more probably ‘to cause to make progress’ (so Cheyne) than any notion of adoration (‘to bend the knee’). The primitive conception of blessing and cursing, according to which they were regarded as possessing an objective existence, more or less independent or the speaker after utterance (cf. Gen_27:35), naturally became moralized with the progress of monotheistic religion (cf. Pro_26:2 for a denunciation of ‘the causeless curse’).

2. *Terms.*—The terms for ‘blessing’ used in the Gospels are—

(a) εὐλογεῖν, ‘to bless,’ and εὐλογητός, εὐλογημένος, ‘blessed.’ All these forms are common in the LXX Septuagint, where, in the vast majority of instances, they correspond to some form of the Heb. word בָּרַךְ or its derivatives.

εὐλογεῖν is used—

(A) *of men*: (1) as in Greek writings, in the sense of ‘to praise,’ ‘celebrate with praises,’ viz. God. So several times in the Gospels: e.g. Luk_1:64; Luk_2:28; Luk_24:53 [syn. αἰνεῖν, ‘to praise,’ and δοξάζειν, ‘to glorify’; see under αἰνεῖν, below]. (2) ‘To invoke blessings upon’ (a sense peculiar to Biblical Greek): e.g. Luk_6:28. (3) ‘To bless’ material objects (*i.e.* to bless God for their bestowal): e.g. Luk_9:16.

(B) *of God*: (4) ‘To bestow blessings, favour, upon men’: e.g. Luk_1:42 (εὐλογημένος). [The compound κατευλογεῖν, ‘to call down blessings upon’ occurs, according to the best attested reading, in Mar_10:16].

(b) εὐχαριστεῖν,* [Note: The derivatives εὐχάρισται (‘giving of thanks’) and εὐχάριστοι (‘thankful’) do not occur in the Gospels.] ‘to give thanks,’ viz. to God, esp. for food: e.g. Mat_15:36; Mat_26:27. With this compare also—

(c) ἑξομολογεῖν, ‘to celebrate,’ ‘give praise or thanks to’ (τινί): Mat_11:25 and, || and—

(d) αἰνεῖν, ‘to praise, extol’ God: Luk_2:13; Luk_2:20; Luk_19:37; Luk_24:53 (reading doubtful). [Cf. the use of the synonymous expression δοξάζειν, Luk_17:15, and διδόναι δόξαν τῷ θεῷ,† [Note: See, further, on this expression Grimm-Thayer, Lex. s.v. δόξα, ii.] ‘to give glory to God,’ Luk_17:18—both of thanksgiving].

(e) μακαρίζειν, ‘to pronounce blessed’: once only in Gospels, Luk_1:48; and μακάριος, ‘blessed,’ ‘happy’ (esp. in a congratulatory sense): e.g. in the Beatitudes (Mat_5:3-11, Luk_6:20-22; cf. Joh_20:29). Both words are common in the LXX Septuagint.

It is remarkable that the term εὐχαριστεῖν occurs very rarely (and only in the Apocryphal books) in the LXX Septuagint . The common LXX Septuagint equivalent for ‘to give thanks’ (Heb. *hōdâh*) is ἐξομολογεῖν. αἰνεῖν is also of frequent occurrence there. The Bishop of Salisbury (*The Holy Communion*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 135 n. [Note: note.] 34) suggests that εὐλογεῖν in the NT was ‘often purposely exchanged ... for the more classical and intelligible εὐχαριστεῖν.’

3. *Jewish usage.*—The elements that entered into the Hebrew idea of ‘blessing’[‡] [Note: The wide variety of meaning attached to בָּרַךְ in the OT (cf. Hebrew Lexicon, s.v.) well illustrates this.] sketched above (§ 1) were elaborately developed in later Jewish usage. Here the most important points for the illustration of the Gospels may be briefly summarized.

(A) *Blessing of persons.*—According to Jewish ideas, God is the sole source of all blessing, both material and spiritual; and to Him alone, therefore, praise and thanksgiving are due (cf. Eph 1:3 for a beautiful Christian application of the idea). Thus, even in the great Priestly Blessing (Num 6:22-27), which filled so large a place in Jewish liturgical worship both in the temple and (in a less degree) in the synagogue, it was not the priest *per se* who blessed, but God (*Sifre, ad loc.*)* [Note: The special sanctity with which the Aaronic blessing was invested in the later period lay in the pronunciation of ‘the ineffable name,’ which was permitted to the priests only. Originally, however, this restriction was not in force. Thus the Mishna (Ber. x. 4) cites Rth 2:4 as proving that ‘the name’ was used in ordinary greetings; cf. also Psa 129:8.] The blessing of man by man finds one of its most prominent expressions in greeting and farewell, a custom of great antiquity, and not, of course, in itself specifically Jewish.[†] [Note: See the article ‘Salutation’ (with reff.) in Kitto’s Biblical Cyclopaedia³, iii. p. 739 f.] But the formulas connected with it naturally reflect Jewish religious sentiment in a marked degree. The fundamental idea of goodwill is worked out into an invocation of the Divine favour and providence, and consequent prosperity, on the recipient. These ideas find beautiful expression in the Priestly Blessing, and in the poetical amplification of it embodied in Psalms 67.[‡] [Note: The whole Psalm gives a fine analysis of the contents of the Hebrew idea of blessing. Other echoes of the Priestly Blessing occur in the Psalter (Psa 4:6; Psa 31:16; Psa 80:3; Psa 80:7; Psa 80:19).] The characteristic word employed in greeting and farewell is ‘peace’ (Heb. *shâlôm*, Greek εἰρήνη), which has a wide connotation, embracing the notions of security, safety, prosperity, and felicity.[§] [Note: Note that

this word forms the climax of the Priestly Blessing (Num_6:26).] Thus the regular formula of greeting is 'Peace be to thee' (Jdg_6:23, Dan_10:19), and, for farewell, 'Go in peace' (cf. 1Sa_1:17 etc.). 'To greet' is expressed in Hebrew by the phrase 'to ask of a person concerning peace (welfare)' (cf. Gen_43:27, Exo_18:7 etc.), and similar formulas. || [Note: | For further details see the Hebrew Lexicons, s.v. שָׁלוֹם.] The use of the word 'blessed' (Heb. *bârûkh*), both in solemn greeting (1Sa_15:13 'Blessed be thou of J' [Note: " Jehovah.],', cf. Psa_118:26 'Blessed is he that cometh') and parting (1Ki_10:9), should also be noted in this connexion.

The custom of imparting a solemn blessing at final departure (from life ¶ [Note: 2Ki_2:9.]) is attested in the Talmud (e.g. *Ber. 28b*—death of Johanan ben Zakkai, circa (about) 75-80 a.d.).

Besides the salutation, other forms of blessing prevailed, notably the *blessing of children* by parents (and sometimes by others). This custom is well attested in the OT (cf. e.g. Gen_9:26; Gen_27:7 f., Gen_48:9). Jacob's blessing of Ephraim and Manasseh is esp. notable, because it fixed the formula which has been used among the Jews in later times. ** [Note: * For boys the formula runs: 'May God make thee like Ephraim and Manasseh'; for girls: 'May God make thee like Sarah, Rebekah, Rachel, and Leah' (cf. Rth_4:11). Any other blessing suggested by the occasion or special circumstances might be added. See, further, Jewish Encyc. (as cited below, § 4, end).] The earliest literary evidence for the existence of this particular custom is quite late (17th cent.); but that some form of parental blessing was well known by the NT period may be inferred from Sir_3:9 (cf. Mar_10:13-16 and || [Note: | For further details see the Hebrew Lexicons, s.v. שָׁלוֹם.]).

According to the minor Talmudical tractate *Sopherim* (xviii. 5), which contains valuable old traditional material: 'In Jerusalem there was the godly custom to initiate the children at the beginning of the thirteenth year by fasting the whole Day of Atonement. During this year they took the boy to the priests and learned men that they might bless him, and pray for him that God might think him worthy of a life devoted to the study of the Torah and pious works.'* [Note: Quoted by Schechter, *Studies in Judaism*, p. 380.]

(B) *Blessing of things*.—The feeling of praise and thanksgiving, which is so striking and prominent a feature of Jewish devotional life and worship, has crystallized itself into a regular form of benediction known as *Bĕrâkhâh* (lit. 'Blessing'). In its technical sense the term denotes a set form of prayer, which opens with the words, 'Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who,' etc., and, in its fully developed

form, closes with a repetition of the same words. This class† [Note: The most important example is the well-known group of the 'Eighteen Blessings' (Shěrnónç 'Esrç), the nucleus of which is undoubtedly pre-Christian. It is notable that here the element of petition accompanies that of praise and thanksgiving (for text of these in English see Singer's Heb.-Eng. Prayer-Book, pp. 44-54).] plays an important part in the Jewish Liturgy.

In its simplest and shortest form the *Běrákhâh* opens as described, but has no closing refrain. It contains a brief expression of thanks to God for some benefit conferred or privilege enjoyed.‡ [Note: A very large number of these short Benedictions, expressive of thankful recognition of God's goodness and providence as shown in various ways, has been developed. For a full enumeration see Jewish Encyc. s.v. 'Benedictions,' or the Prayer-Books.]

Undoubtedly the most ancient kind of benediction is that recited at the meal. The Book of Samuel attests the antiquity of the custom, for in one passage (1Sa 9:13) we are told that the people refused to eat the sacrificial meal until it had been blessed.

The Biblical command on which the obligation of grace at meals (Heb. *birkath ha-mâzôn*)—*i.e.* according to the Rabbis (*Ber. 21a, 48b*; *Tos. Ber. vii. 1*), grace both before and after eating—is founded, occurs in Deu 8:10 ('When thou hast eaten and art full, thou shalt bless the Lord thy God for the good land which he hath given thee').

The Benediction over bread, which is recited before the meal begins, and which may have been known to our Lord, runs: 'Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who bringeth forth bread from the earth.' The corresponding one said before drinking wine is: 'Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who createst the fruit of the vine' (cf. Luk 22:18).

Note.—The Benediction (thanksgiving) over wine was especially associated with the hallowing of the Sabbath and festival days embodied in the ceremonies of *Kiddûsh* ('Sanctification') and *Habdâlâh* ('Separation' or 'Distinction'). For a full description of these observances see the *Jewish Encyc. s.vv.* 'Kiddush' and 'Habdalah'; and for a possible connexion with the Gospels reference may be made to an article by the present writer in the *Journ. of Theol. Studies* (iii. [1902] p. 357 ff.) on 'The Jewish Antecedents of the Eucharist.' Though thanksgiving is an essential, and indeed the most prominent, element in consecration or sanctification, the ideas must be kept distinct. Cf. Bp. of Salisbury, *op. cit.* p. 135 f.

The more important Benedictions in this connexion are reserved for the recitation that follows the meal. Of these there are now four (see Singer's *Prayer-Book*, p. 286). The first ('Blessed art Thou, O Lord ... who givest food unto all') is ascribed by the Talmud (*Ber. 48b*) to Moses; the second ('for the land and for the food') to Joshua, who led Israel into the land; the third ('Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who in Thy compassion rebuildest Jerusalem') to king Solomon; the fourth ('Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God ... who art kind and dealest kindly with all') to the Rabbis of Jamnia in the 2nd cent. a.d. § [Note: Cf. Jewish Encyc. iii. 9.]

The act of thanksgiving *after* the meal is not explicitly alluded to in the Gospels. That the custom is an ancient one, however, appears from the fact that, by the time of the compilation of the Mishna, rules as to its ordering had been fully developed (cf. *Ber. vii.*). It constitutes a sort of service, with responses (which vary according to the number, etc., of those present). Details and text of prayers can be read in Singer, pp. 278-285.

Another ancient form of Benediction (with responses), which, however, is not alluded to in the Gospels, is that offered before and after the reading of Scripture (for the modern forms cf. Singer, p. 147 ff.). This has a Biblical basis in the practice of Ezra mentioned in Neh 8:6, and was doubtless well known in the time of Jesus.

Enough has been said above to make it clear that the set form of Benediction, based as it is upon Biblical precedents, had been developed by the NT period. The first tractate of the Mishna (compiled in its present form, probably from earlier collections, at end of 2nd cent. a.d.) deals with the various forms of the *Bĕrâkhâh* (hence its name *Bĕrâkhôth* = 'Blessings'), and embodies the earliest Rabbinical tradition on the subject. According to the Talmud (*Ber. 33a*), the recognized Benedictions were formulated by the 'men of the Great Synagogue.' Later the rule was deduced that a Benediction, to be regular, must contain the name of God and the attribute of God's kingship (*Ber. 40b*).

4. Usage in the Gospels.—The Jewish conception of 'blessing' (cf. §§ 1 and 3) is reflected in the Gospel narratives in its purest and most elevated form. The central thought of God as the sole object of praise, of God's favour as the highest form of felicity (cf. Luk 1:28), the duty of rendering thanks to Him as the Great Giver and Father, are strikingly enforced, especially in some of the sayings of Jesus. The Gospel usage may best be illustrated by an analysis of the passages in which the terms enumerated above (§ 2) respectively occur. These may be grouped as follows:—

(a) *Passages involving the use of εὐλογεῖν, 'to bless,' and its derivatives:*

(1) With a personal object expressed, viz.:—

(A) *God*: Luk_1:64; Luk_2:28; Luk_24:53.

With this division should be considered the use of εὐλογητός, ‘Blessed,’ which is always explicitly applied to God in the NT. The term occurs twice in the Gospels, once as a periphrasis for God, Mar_14:61 (Cf. the regular Jewish periphrasis, ‘The Holy One,’ ‘Blessed be He’), and once in a liturgical ascription of praise, Luk_1:68 (opening line of the *Benedictus*).

(B) *Man*: in the sense of ‘to invoke blessings on,’ Luk_6:28; esp. at solemn parting or farewell, Luk_2:34; Luk_24:50 f. (cf. the Rabbinical parallel quoted above); of solemn blessing of children, Mar_10:16 (better reading κατευλόγει), cf. Mat_19:14, and the Jewish illustration already cited.

Note.—Here it may be remarked that the blessing was imparted either by the imposition of hands, in the case of one or a small number (cf. Gen_48:17-18, Mat_19:15, Mar_10:15); or, in other cases, with uplifted hands (Lev_9:22, Luk_24:50; cf. Sir_50:20).

Here naturally comes to be considered the use of εὐλογημένος = ‘blessed’ (viz. by God): it occurs six times in the acclamation, borrowed from Psa_118:26 [Psa_117:26], of ‘him that cometh’; Mat_21:8; Mat_23:35 and the || passages, Mar_11:9, Luk_13:35; Luk_19:38, Joh_12:13 (where D [Note: Deuteronomist.] reads εὐλογητός); once of the mother of the Lord and her Son, Luk_1:42 (εὐλογημένη, κ.τ.λ., in Luk_1:28 is not well attested); also of ‘the nations on the King’s right hand’ (Mat_25:34), and of ‘the kingdom of David’ (Mar_11:10).

(2) With a material object: Mar_8:7, Luk_9:16 (both of food). ‘In these cases blessing the bread must be understood as “blessing God the giver of the bread” ’ (Westcott), in accordance with the Jewish usage illustrated above (§ 3).

(3) Absolutely, without any object expressed (always of food and sustenance): Mar_6:41 || Mat_14:18 (feeding of the five thousand), Mar_14:22 || Mat_26:26 (in ref. to bread at Last Supper), and Luk_24:30.

In close connexion with the above we have to consider here—

(b) *The use of* εὐχαριστεῖν, ‘to give thanks,’ *in the Gospels*.

(1) Of food and wine. The word occurs eleven times, and in eight of these has reference either to food or wine, viz.: Mar_8:8 || Mat_15:36 (of the feeding of the four thousand), Luk_22:18 (in ref. to the bread at the Last Supper), Joh_6:11; Joh_6:23 (of feeding of the five thousand), of thanksgiving over the cup at the Last Supper, Mar_14:23 || Mat_26:27 and Luk_22:17.

It is clear from a comparison of the parallel passages noted above that εὐλογεῖν and εὐχαριστεῖν are freely interchanged (cf. Cremer, *Bib.-Theol. Lex. s.vv.*; Swete, *JThSt*^t [Note: *ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.*] iii. [1902] 163). It thus appears that the predominant idea in the Gospel usage of such expressions as ‘blessing the bread’ is not so much that of sanctification or consecration as of thanksgiving to God for the gift.* [Note: Cf. the valuable remarks of the Bp. of Salisbury on this point (op. cit. p. 135 f.). He notes the occurrence of the expressions εὐχαριστηθεῖσα τροφή, εὐχαριστηθ εἰς ἄρτος, etc., ‘thanksgiven food,’ ‘thanksgiven bread,’ where we should say ‘consecrated food or bread’ (ib.). Cf. also Didache x. and xv.]

(2) Of thanksgiving to God in other connexions: Luk_18:11, Joh_11:41.

(3) Of thanksgiving to Christ: Luk_17:16.

(Note here that the act of thanksgiving was accompanied by ‘glorifying God’ (Luk_17:15) and that it is on this feature that Jesus lays stress (Luk_17:18), ‘Were there none found that returned to give glory [here = ‘to render thanks’] to God save this stranger?’)

(c) and (d) *The use of the terms* ἐξομολογεῖν, ‘thank,’ and αἰνεῖν, ‘praise’ (cf. δοξάζειν, ‘glorify’), in a more or less synonymous sense (the sense of thanksgiving), has been sufficiently explained above (§ 2), and does not call for further remark here.

Note, however, that αἰνεῖν is never used of or by Jesus.

(e) *The use of* μακάριος, ‘blessed,’ is frequent in the sayings of Jesus (its employment in the ‘Beatitudes’ has already been noted above). It is used especially in a congratulatory sense, corresponding in the LXX Septuagint to the Hebrew term ‘*ashrê*’ = ‘happy’ (lit. ‘O the happiness of’). In this way it is employed, especially in personal address (a good instance occurs in Mat_16:17 ‘Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona,’ etc.). Especially notable are such sayings as that recorded in Luk_11:27-28 (‘Blessed is the womb that bare thee’ ... ‘Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the

word of God and keep it'), in which Jesus pointedly insists on the idea that true blessing and true blessedness are to be found in thought and action that are immediately related and directed to God and the Divine requirements. The Jewish conception of blessing and blessedness is thus set forth in its purest and most elevated phase.

Literature.—The most important original authorities for the Jewish *data* are the recensions of the tractate *Bĕrâkhôth* extant in the Mishna (various ed. of Heb. text; English translation in Barclay's *Talmud*, 1877, and De Sola and Raphall's *Mishnah*, 1845), and the Tosephta (Heb. text, ed. Zuckerman). For a full account of these see *Jewish Encyclopedia*, s.v. 'Berakot.' For an account of the various Jewish forms of blessing see the articles 'Benedictions,' 'Blessing of Children,' and 'Blessing (Priestly),' with the literature cited, in the same work. Cf. also the art. 'Abschied' in Hamburger's *RE* [Note: E Realencyklopädie.] *für Bibel und Talmud*, vol. ii. Some relevant data are also to be found in the article 'Benedictions' (by R. Sinker) in Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*. There is a valuable 'Additional Note' in Westcott's *Hebrews* on 'The Biblical Idea of Blessing' (p. 209 ff.); and a careful synopsis of references in Harper (W. R.), *Priestly Element in OT²* [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , (1905) 136 ff. Reference may also be made to the works of Edersheim (esp. *The Temple: its Ministry*, etc., where the Jewish material is set forth fully) and those of the elder Lightfoot. Other references have been given in the body of the article.

G. H. BOX.

Blindness

BLINDNESS.—Blindness is a very common disease in the East. It is mainly due to ophthalmia caused partly by the sun-glare and partly by lack of cleanliness. The word 'blindness' or 'blind' is used in the Bible, however, very frequently of a spiritual condition; and the references in the Gospels are specially interesting as the physical and the spiritual states are sometimes intertwined, the former being used as emblematic of the latter.

In [Mat 11:5](#) the first evidence of His Messiahship, adduced by Jesus to the disciples of John the Baptist, is that the blind receive their sight. The first miracle of this nature in the life of Jesus is recorded by St. Matthew ([Mat 9:27](#) ff.) as occurring at Capernaum.

Two blind men followed Him, crying, 'Thou Son of David, have mercy on us.' Jesus seems unwilling at first to grant their request, as we are told that it was not till they had entered the house with Him that He turned a favourable ear to their entreaty. Satisfied of their faith, and of the spirit in which they approached Him, He pronounced the word of healing.

In St. Mark (Mar_8:22 ff.) another miracle of restoring sight to the blind is recorded which has features of its own.

Jesus leads the blind man out of the village (Bethsaida), and, having spit upon his eyes, touches them. Sight is only gradually restored, as at first he sees men like trees walking. This is one of the many instances of the realism of St. Mark. Probably it is a reminiscence of the well-known difficulty experienced by the blind-born, to whom sight has been given through a surgical operation, of adjusting the knowledge acquired by the new faculty with that derived through the other avenues of sense-perception.

The story of the blind man or men at Jericho is recorded in all three Synoptics (Mat_20:29 ff., Mar_10:46 ff., Luk_18:35 ff.). It has also features in common with the incident narrated in Mat_9:27.

St. Mark and St. Luke speak of only one blind man, St. Matthew has two. All three give the words of healing differently. There have been many attempts made to harmonize the various accounts, * [Note: For a summary of these see Plummer, Internat. Crit. Com., 'St. Luke,' in loco.] but the necessity for making such attempts arises out of a mechanical theory of inspiration which is difficult to maintain. Is it not enough for all practical purposes to hold the substantial accuracy of the Evangelic narrative without troubling ourselves about those minute divergences which occur in different versions of the same event narrated by the most trustworthy witnesses?

The miracles recorded in Mat_12:22 and John 9 stand by themselves as having a very close relation to the teaching of Jesus which follows. St. Matthew tells us that there was brought to Jesus one possessed with a devil, blind and dumb; and He healed him, insomuch that the blind and dumb both saw and spake. This gave rise to the charge of the Pharisees, that the miraculous power of Jesus was not a God-given, but a devil-given power. 'This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils.' To the clear moral vision of Jesus the attitude implied in this objection showed a radical depravity of nature, an inability to discriminate between fundamental ethical distinctions. 'A house divided against itself cannot stand.' If Satan, inspires to deeds of beneficence, then he ceases to be Satan. He who does good is inspired of God, and the measure of the good he does is the measure of his

conquest over Satan. It is in this connexion that Jesus utters the remarkable reference to blasphemy against the Holy Ghost as the unforgivable sin. See art. Blasphemy.

The other instance where the miraculous cure of blindness is made a text for the most characteristic teaching of Jesus is that recorded in John 9. Here it is a man blind from his birth that Jesus cures. And when the Pharisees seek to persuade him of their peculiar theological tenet that the power of Jesus is derived from Satan, the man has strength of mind enough to fall back on that primary moral instinct to which Jesus always appeals. 'Whereas I was blind, now I see. This man has done good to me, and for me, therefore, he is good. It is not the function of the prince of darkness to give sight to the blind.' He cannot, therefore, accept their theory of the source whence Jesus derives His power.

This leads us to a predominant feature of the teaching of Jesus—His presentation of the gospel as *vision*. Jesus claims to be the Light of the world. Light to those who see is its own evidence, and Jesus, therefore, in making this claim can desire no recognition other than that spontaneously made by the soul when purged from the sinful passions that obscure or deflect its vision. To secure effective vision there must be not only light, but also a healthy visual organ. Blindness may arise from the absence of light, from mere functional derangement of the organ of vision, or from some fatal organic defect in the organ. It is to those whose blindness comes from either of the first two causes that Jesus appeals. He comes as Light, strengthening the visual faculty, dispelling the darkness that envelops the soul, and revealing to it the spiritual realm. 'I am come into this world that they which see not might see' (Joh_9:39). This presentation of Jesus as Light appealing to the organ of spiritual vision and vindicating empirically His unique Divinity dominates the whole of the Fourth Gospel. But the principle is as clearly enunciated in the Synoptics. It is the pure in heart who see God (Mat_5:8), because the pure heart is the organ of the God-consciousness. In the great confession of St. Peter the real point of our Lord's commendation lies not in the clear enunciation of the Messiahship and the Divine Sonship of Jesus, but in the manner in which the profoundest of all spiritual truths has been reached. 'Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven' (Mat_16:17).

Jesus, the Light of the world, can appeal only to those who have the faculty of sight. Where the faculty of sight is impaired, or destroyed, however clearly the light may shine, there is no vision. This obscuration of the spiritual orb is what is called 'judicial blindness.' The phrase implies that there never can be such radical defect of vision without personal guilt in the person so affected. It is a penalty of sin, the judgment that comes through neglecting the light (cf. Joh_9:41). Inasmuch as Jesus is the true Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world, there is in human nature, as such, the capacity of spiritual vision; but this capacity, either by disuse or

perversity, may be so radically corrupted as to be impervious to the light. And when this is so, the sinner rushes to his doom heedless of the plainest warnings. This is a truth always recognized in the Gospels. St. John in his Prologue says that the Light shineth in darkness, but the darkness comprehended it not (cf. Mat_6:22 f.). It is the meaning of the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, a sin unforgivable, inasmuch as it does not recognize itself as sin, and thus renders impossible that repentance which is the condition of forgiveness (but see art. Blasphemy.).

A. Miller.

Blood

BLOOD (דָּם, Aram. [Note: Aramaic.] דַּמָּ, Gr. αἷμα).—Underlying the use of the term ‘blood’ in the Gospels is its root conception, as contained in the OT. This root conception is clearly seen, e.g., in Lev_17:11; Lev_17:14 ‘*The life* (‘soul’ נַפְשׁ) *of the flesh is in the blood ... it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life.... For as to the life of all flesh, the blood thereof is all one with the life thereof ... for the life of all flesh is the blood thereof.*’ The close connexion between ‘life’ and ‘blood’—amounting even to identification—was doubtless realized by man from very early times; for constant experience taught him that loss of blood entailed weakness, while great loss resulted in death, *i.e.* the departure of life. This would have been noticed again and again in everyday life, whether in hunting, or in slaughtering (both for food and sacrifice), or in battle.* [Note: Cf. H. L. Strack, *Der Blutaberglaube in der Menschheit*⁴, p. 1 ff.] This belief was by no means confined to the Hebrews, but was universal in ancient times, just as it is now among primitive races.* [Note: Rob. Smith, *Rel. of the Semites*², p. 337 ff.; Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heid.*² p. 226 ff.; Strack, *op. cit.* p. 9 ff.; J. G. Frazer, *Golden Bough*², i. 353, where other authorities are cited; Bahr, *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus*², i. 44 ff.; Trumbull, *Studies in Oriental Social Life*, p. 157 ff.]

The reiterated prohibition with regard to the eating of blood contained in the Hebrew Code was due, firstly, to the fact that God had made use of it as a means of atonement, and that therefore it ought not to be used for any other purpose; and, secondly, because it was believed to contain the soul or life. In the one case, the prohibition is due to the holy character of blood;† [Note: See, further, with regard to this point, the many interesting details in Trumbull’s *The Threshold Covenant*, and Doughty’s *Arabia Deserta* (2 vols.); the references are too numerous to quote, but both works will well repay careful study.] in the other, to its essential nature.‡

[Note: Cf. Strack, op. cit. p. 75 ff.; Franz Delitzsch, System der biblischen Psychologie, pp. 196, 202.] it being the centre from which animal life in all its various forms emanated. Blood was therefore holy from the Divine point of view, because God had sanctified it to holy uses; and it was holy from man's point of view, both because it had been ordained as a means of atonement in the sight of God, and because human life, of which blood was the essence, was sacred to Him.

In the Gospels one or other of these conceptions underlies the use of the word 'blood.' Its use may be briefly summarized thus:

1. *Blood in its material sense, e.g.,* the woman with the issue of blood (Mar_5:25, Luk_8:43). The power which went out from Christ stayed the flow of the woman's blood; it is implied (Mar_5:26 ἀλλὰ μάλλον εἰς τὸ χεῖρον ἐλθοῦσα) that this outflow was the ebbing-out of her life. The ancient conception is, therefore, plainly present here.

2. *Blood used in the sense of life (i.e. poured out in death).* It is interesting to observe that in all the Gospel passages in which blood is used as synonymous with life, the reference is either to an OT occurrence, or else to Christ as fulfilling OT types. The passages are the following: Mat_23:30 'We should not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets'; Mat_23:35 'That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed on the earth, from the blood of Abel the righteous unto the blood of Zachariah son of Barachiah, whom ye slew between the sanctuary and the altar,' cf. Luk_11:51; Mat_27:4 'I have betrayed innocent blood'; Mat_27:8 'the price of blood'; Mat_27:25 'the field of blood'; Mat_27:24 'I am innocent of the blood of this righteous man'; Mat_27:25 'His blood be upon us.' In each of these passages the meaning of blood as implying life is sufficiently clear.

3. In Luk_13:1 occurs a reference to 'the Galilaeans whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices.' There is no reference to this event either in Josephus (although there is mention of a similar occurrence in *Ant.* xvii. ix. 3) or elsewhere; but the meaning appears to be that they were offering up their usual sacrifice in the ordinary course, when they were fallen upon and butchered by the Roman soldiery, probably as a punishment for some act of revolt [the restlessness of the Galilaeans was notorious, cf. Act_5:37].

4. A further use of the word is seen in Mat_16:17, where the expression 'flesh and blood' occurs. § [Note: The expression σαρξ καὶ αἷμα (also in the order αἷμα καὶ ἐὰ ρξ) is frequent in Rabbinical writing (וְדָם בְּשָׂרָה); 'the Jewish writers use this form of speech infinite times, and by it oppose to ' (Lightfoot, ae Heb. et Talm. [Gandell's

ed.] ii. 234); see also Sir 14:18, where ‘flesh and blood’ are compared to the leaves on a tree.] In this passage the use of ‘blood’ is somewhat modified from what has been found hitherto; the phrase *σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα* denotes what is human, abstractly considered; ‘the antithesis is between knowledge resulting from natural human development, or on the basis of natural birth, and knowledge proceeding from the revelation of the Father in heaven, or on the basis of regeneration’ (Lange). * [Note: Commentary on Matt. in loc. Cf. the words of Tholuck: ‘It designates humanity with reference to its character as endowed with the senses and passions’ (Com. on Matt.); see also Olshausen, Com. on the Gospels, vol. ii. (T. & T. Clark).] The expression therefore emphasizes the contrast between human and Divine knowledge (cr. Gal 1:18 ‘immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood’; cf. also Heb 2:14, 1Co 15:50, Eph 6:12). The special meaning attaching to ‘blood’ here is that it belongs to human nature; and significant in this connexion is the passage Luk 24:39 a ‘spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye behold me having,’ where ‘flesh’ is clearly intended to include blood;† [Note: See, further, art. Body.] the primary difference in bodily structure between a natural and a spiritual body being the absence of blood in the latter. If in the ordinary human body blood is conceived of as being the source of life, the body without blood receives its life in a manner utterly different,—it is the life which comes from Christ: ‘I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly’ (Joh 10:10). Closely connected with this are the words in Joh 1:13 ‘... which were born, not of blood‡ [Note: The use of the plur. here *ἐξ αἱμάτων* (Vulg. *ex sanguinibus*) appears, according to Westcott, ‘to emphasize the idea of the elements out of which in various measures the body is framed’ (Com. on St. John, in loc.; cf. also Godet’s Com. on St. John, vol. i. p. 357 ff. (T. & T. Clark).] ... but of God’; here, too, the contrast is between that which is born ‘of blood,’ *i.e.* according to a natural birth, and that which is born ‘of God,’ *i.e.* according to a spiritual birth.

5. A very mysterious use of ‘blood’ is that contained in the words ‘bloody sweat’ (Luk 22:44).§ [Note: Regarding the text here, see Westcott-Hort, and Godet, in loc.] ‘It is probable that this strange disorder arises from a violent commotion of the nervous system, and forcing of the red particles into the cutaneous excretories.’|| [Note: | Stroud, *Physical Cause of the Death of Christ*, pp. 74, 380, quoted in Trumbull’s *The Blood Covenant*, p. 279 note; cf. also the letters of Dr. Begbie and Sir James Y. Simpson, given in App. i. of Hanna’s *Last Day of Our Lord’s Passion*.] ‘The intensity of the struggle,’ says Godet, ‘becomes so great, that it issues in a sort of beginning of physical dissolution. The words, *as it were drops*, express more than a simple comparison between the density of the sweat and that of blood. The words denote that the sweat itself resembled blood. Phenomena of frequent occurrence

demonstrate how immediately the blood, the seat of life, is under the empire of moral impressions. Does not a feeling of shame cause the blood to rise to the face? Cases are known in which the blood, violently agitated by grief, ends by penetrating through the vessels which enclose it, and, driven outwards, escapes with the sweat through the transpiratory glands (see Langen, pp. 212-214).[¶] [Note: on Luke , ii. 306 (T. & T. Clark). There is certainly one other instance on record of a like mysterious flow of blood, that, namely, of Charles ix. of France. It is said of him that on his deathbed his bitterness of sorrow and qualms of conscience, on account of the massacre on St. Bartholomew's Eve, were so intense that in the anguish of his soul he literally sweated blood.] See Sweat.

6. One other passage must be referred to before coming to the spiritual use of 'blood,' namely, Joh 19:34 'and straightway there came out blood and water.' On the phenomenon of the effusion of water together with the blood, see Godet's *Gospel of St. John*, iii. 274 f. With regard to the flowing of the blood, there seems to be a striking significance in the fact; it was a visible instance of the fulfilment of Christ's own words: 'Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets; I came not to destroy, but to fulfil ...'^{**} [Note: * Cf. the frequent occurrence of such phrases as 'that the Scripture might be fulfilled.'] (Mat 5:17-18); for it was of the essence of sacrifice under the Old Dispensation that blood should *flow*,^{*} [Note: This was originally based on the conception of blood being the drink of gods (cf. Psa 50:13); see Rob. Smith, op. cit. p. 233 ff.; Curtiss, *Primitive Sem. Rel. To-day*, p. 223: 'The consummation of the sacrifice is in the outflow of blood.'] and that it should flow from a vital part, usually from the throat, though the spirit of the Law would obviously be fulfilled when the blood flowed from such a vital part as the region of the heart, the central part of man;[†] [Note: Cf. the words of Philo, de Concupisc. x.: 'Some men prepare sacrifices which ought never to be offered, strangling the victim and stifling the essence of life, which they ought to let depart free and unrestrained' (quoted by Kalisch, *Leviticus*, i. 184).] the sacrifice was consummated when the life, *i.e.* the blood, had flowed out.[‡] [Note: ' Under the symbolic sacrifices of the Old Covenant it was the blood which made atonement for the soul. It was not the death of the victim, nor yet its broken body; but it was the blood, the life, the soul, that was made the means of a soul's ransom, of its rescue, of its redemption' (Trumbull, *The Blood Covenant*, p. 286). 'Blood atones by virtue of the life that is in it' (Bahr, op. cit. ii. 207).] Kalisch points out that, guided by similar views, the Teutons pierced the heart of the sacrificial victims, whether animals or men, because the heart is the fountain of the blood, and the blood of the heart was pre-eminently regarded as the blood of sacrifice.[§] [Note: Kalisch, op. cit. i. 189.] See also the following article.

7. The passages which speak of the blood of Christ (Mat 26:28, Mar 14:24, Luk 22:20, Joh 6:53-56), *i.e.* of blood in its *spiritual* meaning, can be here only briefly referred to [see Atonement, Last Supper]. They must be taken in conjunction with such expressions elsewhere as ‘the blood of Christ’ (1Co 10:16, Eph 2:13), ‘the blood of the Lord’ (1Co 11:27), ‘the blood of his cross’ (Col 1:20), ‘the blood of Jesus’ (Heb 10:19, 1Jn 1:7), ‘the blood of Jesus Christ’ (1Pe 1:2), ‘the blood of the Lamb’ (Rev 12:11).

From the earliest times among the ancient Hebrews the various rites and ceremonies, indeed the whole sacrificial system, showed the yearning desire for a closer union with God; this union was to be effected only through life-containing and life-giving blood. The very existence of these sacrifices proved (and the offering up of their first born sons only emphasized the fact) that men deemed the relationship between God and themselves to be unsatisfactory. Useless as these sacrifices were in themselves, they were at any rate (when not unauthorized) *shadows of good things to come* (Heb 10:1-4); and they served their purpose of witnessing to profound truths which God intended to reveal more fully as soon as man’s capacity for apprehension should have become sufficiently developed. The shedding of Christ’s blood effected a new relationship between God and man; it sealed a *New Covenant*, || [Note: | A covenant was always ratified by the shedding of blood.] and became the means of the *salvation of many* (Mat 26:28, Mar 14:24, cf. Luk 22:20). But the ancient conception, the God-revealed truth only dimly apprehended, was right: *the life was in the blood*, inasmuch as the shedding of blood brought life—‘I lay down my life, that I may take it again’ (Joh 10:17)—only it was a life which it was impossible to conceive of before the Author of it brought it to man. ‘Having in His own blood the life of God and the life of man, Jesus Christ could make men sharers of the Divine by making them sharers of His own nature; and this was the truth of truths which He declared to those whom He instructed.’¶ [Note: Trumbull, *op. cit.* p. 274.]

Literature.—There are many books which give information on this subject, but as regards the special relationship between ‘blood’ and Christ it is difficult to point to any particular work; many details are to be had, but they must be gathered from numerous sources; some of the more important of these are: Franz Delitzsch, *System der biblischen Psychologie*, Leipzig, 1855; P. Cassel, *Die Symbolik des Blutes*, Berlin, 1882; C. Bahr, *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1874; F. Godet, *Biblical Studies in the OT and NT* (English translation by Lyttelton), London, 1876; L. J. Rückert, *Das Abendmahl ...*, Leipzig, 1856; H. L. Strack, *Der Blutbergglaube in der Menschheit*⁴ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , München, 1892 (a work of extreme interest). A great fund of information is to be found scattered in the three books of H. C. Trumbull, *The Blood Covenant*, London, 1887, *The Threshold Covenant*,

Philadelphia, 1896, *Studies in Oriental Social Life*, London, 1895; and in C. M. Doughty's *Travels in Arabia Deserta*, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1888. Other works that should be consulted are: J. Lightfoot, *Horae Heb. et Talm.* [Note: Talmud.] , 4 vols. (ed. Gandell), Oxford, 1859; Rob. Smith, *Rel. of the Semites*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , London, 1894, *Kinship and Marriage* (ed. S. A. Cook), London, 1903; S. I. Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*, London, 1902. Various notices will also be found in the Commentaries of Lange, Tholuck, Olshausen, Godet, and Westcott. See also the art. on 'Blood' and kindred subjects in the Bible Dictionaries, such as Hamburger, Riehm, Hastings, Cheyne, and the *Jewish Encyclopedia*.

W. O. E. Oesterley.

☩ Blood And Water

BLOOD AND WATER (Joh 19:31-37).—When the soldier, whom tradition names Longinus,* [Note: Nicod. x. [(Lat.) (xvi. (Gr.))]. Cf. 'Aug.' Manual. xxiii: 'Longinus aperuit mihi latus Christi lancea, et ego intravi et ibi requiesco securus.' The name is probably derived from λόγχη, 'spear.'] to make sure that He was really dead, drove his spear into the side of Jesus on the cross (see Crucifixion), a strange thing happened. On being withdrawn the spear was followed by a gush of blood and water. It was a singular phenomenon. The Fathers regarded it as a miracle,† [Note: Orig. c. Cels. ii. 36: 'Blood does not flow from dead bodies, τοῦ δὲ κατὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν νεκροῦ σῦματος τὸ παραδόξον.' Cf. Euth. Zigahenus.] but St. John does not venture on an opinion. He neither attempts to account for it nor pronounces it a miracle, but contents himself with solemnly asseverating that he had witnessed it, and could vouch for its actual occurrence. He felt the wonder of it to the last (cf. 1Jn 5:6-8).

Medical science has confirmed his testimony, and furnished an explanation which at once defines the phenomenon as a perfectly natural occurrence, and reveals somewhat of the awfulness of our Lord's Passion. During His dread and mysterious dereliction on the cross (see Dereliction) His heart swelled until it burst, and the blood was 'effused into the distended sac of the pericardium, and afterwards separated, as is usual with *extravasated* blood, into these two parts, viz. (1) crassamentum or red clot, and (2) watery serum.' When the distended sac was pierced from beneath, it discharged 'its sanguineous contents in the form of red clots of blood and a stream of watery serum, exactly corresponding to the description given by the sacred narrative, "and forthwith came there out blood and water." '‡ [Note:

Stroud's Treatise on the Physical Cause of the Death of Christ; J. V. Simpson in Append. to Hanna's Last Day of Our Lord's Passion. Cf. Calvin.] Jesus died literally of *a broken heart*—of 'agony of mind, producing rupture of the heart.'

It was a favourite idea with the Fathers that the Water and the Blood were symbolic of the Sacraments. St. Augustine, following the *v.l.* ἤνοιξε for ἔνυξε in v. 34, comments (*in Joan Ev.* Tract. cxx. § 2): 'Vigilanti verbo Evangelista usus est, ut non diceret, Latus ejus percussit, aut vulneravit, aut quid aliud; sed, *aperuit*: ut illis quodammodo vitae ostium panderetur, unde Sacramenta Ecclesiae manaverunt, sine quibus ad vitam quae vera vita est, non intratur.' Cf. Chrysost. *in Joan.* lxxxiv: οὐχ ἄπλῶς οὐδὲ ὡς ἔτυχεν αὐται ἐξῆλθον αἱ πηγαί, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων ἡ ἐκκλησία συνέστηκε. καὶ ἴσασι οἱ μυσταγωγούμενοι, δι' ὕδατος μὲν ἀναγεννώμενοι δι' αἵματος δὲ καὶ ἰσαρκῶς τρεφόμενοι. ἀρχὴν λαμβάνει τὰ μυστήρια, ἴν' ὅταν προσίης τῷ φρικτῷ ποτηρίῳ, ὡς ἄπ' αὐτῆς πίνων τῆς πλευρᾶς οὕτω προσίης.

Literature.—Besides the Comm. consult S. J. Andrews, *Life of Our Lord upon the Earth*, 566-569.

David Smith.

⚡Boanerges

BOANERGES.—In Mar_3:17 we read that Christ 'gave to James and John name(s) Boanerges, that is, sons of thunder' (καὶ ἐπέθηκεν αὐτοῖς ὄνομα [*v.l.* ὀνόματα] Βοανηργές, ὃ ἐστὶν υἱοὶ βροντῆς).* [Note: The MSS give: βοανηργές & AB, etc., βοανεργής D, βοανεργές EF, etc.] The equation *Boanerges* = 'sons of thunder' presents two difficulties: (a) the Hebrew רַגְשׁ does not naturally give rise to the two vowels *oa*; (b) no known Hebrew or Aram. [Note: Aramaic.] root *rgs* or *rgsh* has the meaning 'thunder.' A third difficulty might be added, that the title *Boanerges*, whatever its meaning, does not accurately correspond to ὄνομα(τα), 'name(s).† [Note: ὀνοματα is read by & AC, etc., ὄνομα is the reading of BD.] If the Evangelist be right in saying that the original title meant 'sons of thunder,' we must suppose that Βοανη or Βοανε is due to inaccurate transliteration of רַגְשׁ, or to a conflation of two readings with a

single vowel (see Dalm. *Gram.*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 144). But the difficulty as to $\rho\gamma\epsilon\varsigma = \beta\rho\omicron\nu\tau\eta$ remains. Jerome (on Dan 1:7) thought that *Boanerges* should be emended into *Benereem* = בְּנֵי רַעַם . In that case the *s* is a mistake on the part of the Evangelist or his copyists for *m*. Others prefer to think that the original title was בְּנֵי רַגַּז = ‘sons of wrath,’ or בְּנֵי רַגַּשׁ = ‘sons of tumult,’ and that $\nu\iota\omicron\iota \beta\rho\omicron\nu\tau\eta\varsigma$ is an inaccurate translation on the part of the Evangelist. The Syriac Version (Sinaiticus) unfortunately gives us no assistance. It transliterates *Bēnai Ragsh* or *Ragshi*, and omits the explanation $\delta\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \nu\iota\omicron\iota\ \beta\rho\omicron\nu\tau\eta\varsigma$ (see Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, i. 181, ii. 280). It is possible, however, that the corruption lies deeper than this. Just as *Dalmanutha* (Mar 8:10) is probably a corruption of an Aramaic proper name (see Burkitt, ii. 249), so *Boanerges* may be a fusion of two names answering to the $\acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$. In that case the Evangelist, misreading or mishearing his Aramaic original, has fused two names into one, and has tried to give a rough translation of the word thus formed. The first name might be בַּנִּי (*Banni*), בַּנַּי (*Bannai*), or בַּנַּי (*Bunnai*). Curiously enough, the Babylonian Talmud gives *Bani* as the name of one of the disciples of Jesus (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Sanh.* 43a). For the second name we offer no conjecture. See, further, John, James.

Literature.—*Encyc. Bibl.* art. ‘Boanerges’; *Expositor*, iii. x. [1889] 332 ff.

W. C. Allen.

⚡ Boat

BOAT

$\pi\lambda\omicron\iota\omicron\nu$: Authorized Version ‘ship,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘boat.’ $\pi\lambda\omicron\iota\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$: Mar 3:9 Authorized Version ‘a small ship,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘a little boat’; Joh 6:22 Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘boat,’ (Revised Version margin) ‘little boat’; v. 24 $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\beta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\alpha\ \tau\lambda\omicron\iota\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\alpha$ Authorized Version ‘took shipping,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘got into the boats,’ marg. ‘little boats’; 21:8 $\tau\tilde{\omega}\ \tau\lambda\omicron\iota\alpha\rho\iota\omega$ Authorized Version ‘in a little ship,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘in the little boat.’ [Luk 5:2 Tisch., WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort’s text.] marg. $\tau\lambda\omicron\iota\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\alpha$: WH [Note: H Westcott and

Hort's text.] , ὤR [Note: R Textus Receptus.] πλοῖα. Joh 6:23 Tisch., ὤR [Note: R Textus Receptus.] , Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 πλοιαρια: WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] πλοῖα].

The word 'ship' is rightly expelled from the Gospels by the Revisers. It corresponds to ναῦς, which occurs nowhere in the Gospels, and in the NT only in Act 27:41. Being a small lake, the Sea of Galilee had no 'ships'; but it had numerous 'boats' mostly employed in fishing (termed πλοῖα in the Gospels, also [τὰ] σκάφη in Josephus). Some of these were bigish craft, and usually swung at anchor on the Lake (cf. Josephus *Vit.* 33), being attended by πλοίαρχα, 'punts' (cf. Joh 21:3; Joh 21:8). In Act 27:16; Act 27:30; Act 27:32 the small-boat of St. Paul's ship is called ἡ σκάφη). To quell the revolt in Tiberias, Josephus mustered all the boats on the Lake, and they numbered as many as 230 (Josephus *BJ* ii. xxi. 8). A boat which could accommodate Jesus and the Twelve must have been of considerable dimensions; and in the battle on the Lake, under Vespasian, the Romans fought on rafts and the pirates on boats. Though small and weak in comparison with the rafts, the boats must have been of considerable size (Josephus *BJ* iii. x. 9).

Jesus had much to do with boats during His Galilaeen ministry, and one use that He made of them is peculiarly noteworthy. In two recorded instances He employed a boat as His pulpit (Luk 5:1-3, Mat 13:1-2 = Mar 4:1). Getting into it to escape the pressure of the multitude, He pushed out a little way from the land and addressed the people ranged along the sloping beach, as St. Chrysostom puts it, 'fishing and netting those on the land (ἀλιεύων καὶ σαγηνεύων τοὺς ἐν τῇ γῆ).' Only two instances of His resorting to this device are recorded, but it seems to have been His practice. Early in His ministry, St. Mark says (Mar 3:9), 'He spake to his disciples that a little boat should wait on him because of the crowd, lest they should throng him'; and it is interesting to observe how the Evangelist subsequently alludes to 'the boat' (Mar 4:36; Mar 6:32. Cf. Mat 8:23 τὸ πλοῖον ὤR [Note: R Textus Receptus.] , Tisch.; πλοῖον WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.]), meaning the boat which had been put at His disposal.

David Smith.

BOAZ.—The husband of Ruth, named in the genealogies of our Lord (Mat 1:5, Luk 3:32).

Body

BODY

i. The Human Body generally.—‘Body’ in the Gospels invariably represents $\sigma\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha$ in the original. Always in Homer and frequently in Attic Greek $\sigma\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha$ = a dead body; and in this sense the word is occasionally used in the Gospels (Mat 27:52; Mat 27:58-59 || Luk 17:37). The usual meaning, however, here as in the rest of the NT and in ordinary Greek usage, is the living body, and in particular the body of a living man (Mat 6:22; Mat 26:12, Mar 5:29). In the records of our Lord’s life, teaching, and whole revelation, we find the dignity and claims of the body as an integral part of human nature constantly recognized. This meets us in the very fact of the Incarnation (Joh 1:14), in the most solemn utterances of Jesus (Mat 25:35; Mat 25:42), in His tender regard for the bodily needs and pains of those around Him—His feeding of the hungry and healing of the sick; but above all in the narratives of His Resurrection and Ascension, which show that the Incarnation was not a temporary expedient of His earthly mission, but a permanent enfolding of our human nature, body as well as soul, within the essential life of the Godhead.

The Gospels give no support to the philosophic tendency, so often reflected in certain types of religious teaching, to treat the body with disparagement. Jesus accords full rights to the corporeal side of our being. He was neither an ascetic nor a preacher of asceticism—‘the Son of Man came eating and drinking’ (Mat 11:18-19). At the same time, we find in His teaching a clear recognition of a duality in human nature—a distinction drawn between body and soul, flesh and spirit (Mat 6:25; Mat 26:41). Moreover, He lays strong emphasis on the antithesis between the body as the lower part of a man, and the soul as the higher. Though the body is a true part of our humanity, its value is not to be compared for a moment with that of the spiritual part (Mat 10:28). Those who follow Jesus must be prepared, if need be, to surrender their bodies to the sword and the cross (Mat 23:34); but ‘What shall a man give in exchange for his soul?’ (Mat 16:26).

In the teaching of Jesus the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, which had gradually taken root in the Jewish mind, is everywhere presupposed (as in His references to the Future Judgment), and at times is expressly proclaimed (Luk 14:14; Luk 20:35, Joh 5:28-29). And by the grave of His friend Lazarus our Lord gave

utterance to that profound saying, 'I am the resurrection and the life' (Joh 11:25), which reveals the ultimate ground of Christian faith in the resurrection of the body, and at the same time invites us to find in the nature of the risen Christ Himself the type, as well as the pledge, of that new and higher corporeal life to which He is able to raise His people.

ii. The Body of Christ.

(1) *Christ's natural body.*—As 'the man Christ Jesus,' our Lord was possessed of 'a true body' as well as of 'a reasonable soul.' When the time was come in the counsels of God for the redemption of mankind, the Second Person of the Holy Trinity took upon Him human flesh by the operation of the Holy Spirit in the womb of the Virgin Mary (Mat 1:18, cf. Gal 4:4). In due time, according to the laws of human life, He was born at Bethlehem (Luk 2:5; Luk 2:7). The child thus born was seen in His infancy by the shepherds and the wise men, and, when He was eight days old, by Simeon and Anna (Luk 2:25; Luk 2:36). From His conception and birth His body developed in the manner usual to human beings. 'The child grew,' we are told (Luk 2:40); arrived at 'twelve years old'; and still 'increased in stature' (Luk 2:42; Luk 2:52).

After He had arrived at man's estate, we find Him living under the conditions to which the bodies of men in ordinary life are subject. We learn that He suffered hunger (Mat 4:2); that He was wearied with journeying (Joh 4:6); that He experienced pain (Mat 27:26); and that He underwent death (Mat 27:50). In healing sickness He frequently used common bodily action, and His power of motion, with one miraculous exception (Mat 14:25 ||), was limited to that which men in general possess. After death, His body, nowise different from that of an ordinary man, was delivered by Pilate to Joseph of Arimathaea, who wrapped it in a clean linen cloth and laid it in his own new tomb (Mat 27:58 f.), where it rested till the moment of the Resurrection. Down to that moment, then, the Lord's body had been a human body with the powers, qualities, and capacities of the body of an ordinary man.

(2) *Christ's body after the Resurrection.*—It was the same body as before His death. The grave was left empty, because the very body which Joseph of Arimathaea laid there had risen and departed. Moreover, it had in most respects the same appearance. His disciples might doubt and hesitate at first (Luk 24:16; Luk 24:37, Joh 20:14), but they did not fail to recognize Him (Luk 24:31; Luk 24:52, Joh 20:16; Joh 20:20; Joh 20:28; Joh 21:7; Joh 21:12, Act 1:3; Act 2:32). We find Him eating and drinking as a man (Luk 24:42), making use of the natural process of breathing (Joh 20:22), declaring to His disciples that He had flesh and bones (Luk 24:39), showing them His hands and His feet (Luk 24:40), and giving them the assurance that His body was the identical body which they had seen stretched upon the cross, by

inviting the disciple who doubted, to put his finger into the print of the nails and thrust his hand into the wound in His side (Joh 20:27).

On the other hand, our Lord's resurrection body was freed from previous material conditions and possessed of altogether new capacities. It seems to be implied that it could pass at will through material objects (Joh 20:26); and it does not appear to have been subject as before to the laws of movement (Luk 24:36), or visibility (Luk 24:31), or gravitation (Mar 16:19, Luk 24:51). These new powers constituted the difference between His pre-resurrection and His glorified body. It was in His glorified body, thus differentiated, that He ascended into heaven; and in that same glorified body He is to be expected at His final coming (Act 1:9; Act 1:11).

There is little ground for the idea of Olshausen (*Gospels and Acts*, iv. 259-260) and others, revived by Dr. Newman Smyth (*Old Faiths in New Light*, ch. viii.), that the transformation of Christ's body from the natural to the glorified condition was a process which went on gradually during the Forty Days, and was not completed till the Ascension. Rather, it must be said that on the very day of His Resurrection the spirituality of His risen body was as clearly shown as in the case of that much later manifestation by the Sea of Tiberias (cf. Luk 24:31; Luk 24:36, Joh 21:4 ff.). We are not to think of the body of Jesus during this period as in a transition state with regard to its substance—partly of earth and partly of heaven. It was with a spiritual body that He rose, that glorified body of which His Transfiguration had been both a prophecy and a foretaste; and if we see Him moving for a time along the borders of two worlds, that was because, for the sake of His disciples and the future Church, He made use of the natural in order to the revelation of the spiritual. It is in this way that we must explain His asking and receiving food (Luk 24:41 ff., Act 10:41). He cannot have depended upon this food for His bodily support. His purpose in taking it was to convince His disciples that He was still a living man, in body as well as in spirit,—that same Jesus who had so often in past days partaken with them of their simple meals.

In respect of His body the risen Jesus now belonged to the mysterious regions of the invisible world, and it was only when He chose to reveal Himself that His disciples were aware of His presence. It is to be noticed that St. John describes His appearances as 'manifestations': He 'manifested Himself,' 'was manifested,' to the disciples (Joh 21:1; Joh 21:14). His resurrection body was a spiritual body, but it had the power of materializing itself to the natural senses, and Jesus made use of this power from time to time in order to convince His disciples, by the actual evidence of sight and sound and touch, that the victory of His whole human personality over death and the grave was real and complete. And when this work was accomplished, He parted from them for the last time, and went up to the right hand of the Father in a kind of royal state which not only proclaimed His own lordship over both worlds, but became a prophecy of the truth regarding the divinely appointed destiny of those

whom He is not ashamed to call His brethren. In the body of Christ's glory both St. Paul and St. John find the type after which the believer's body of humiliation is to be fashioned at last (Php_3:21, 1Jn_3:2). We are to be like our Lord in the possession of a human nature in which the corporeal has been so fully interpenetrated by the spiritual that the natural body has been transformed into a spiritual body (1Co_15:42-49).

There is no ground to suppose that our Lord's entrance upon the state of exaltation implies any further change in His bodily nature. Certainly no new quality could be developed which would be inconsistent with the essential characteristics of a body. One of these characteristics is the impossibility of being in two places at the same moment. As long as He was on earth His body could not be in heaven, though He was there by His Spirit; and as long as He is in heaven His body cannot be on earth, although He is present by His Spirit, according to His promise to be with His followers where they are gathered together in His name (Mat_18:20; cf. Mat_28:20). St. Peter preached that the heavens must receive Him until the times of restoration of all things (Act_3:21); and Christ Himself taught the Apostles that it was expedient for them that in bodily form He should leave them, so that the Comforter might take His place in the midst of the Church (Joh_16:7).

(3) *Christ's mystical body.*—In 1Co_12:12 ff. (cf. Rom_12:5) St. Paul uses the figure of a body and its members to describe the relations of Christian people to Christ and to one another, and then in 1Co_12:27 he definitely applies the expression 'a body of Christ' (σῶμα Χριστοῦ) to the Corinthian Church. With reference to the body politic the figure was a familiar one in both Greek and Latin literature, and the Apostle transfers it to the Church for the purpose of emphasizing his exhortations to Church unity and a sense of mutual dependence among the people of Christ. As yet, however, the figure is quite plastic, while the anarthrous σῶμα suggests that it is the local Church which is immediately in view. Here, accordingly, we have in their first draft the Apostle's grand conceptions on the subject of the Lord's mystical body. When we come to Ephesians (Eph_1:22-23; Eph_4:12) and Colossians (Col_1:18; Col_1:24) we find that his ideas have been elaborated, and that 'the body of Christ' (τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ) has become a fixed title of the Church not as local merely, but as universal, nor simply as empiric, but as an ideal magnitude. We notice this further distinction, that in the earlier Epistles Christ is conceived of as the whole body, of which individual Christians are the particular members; while in Ephesians and Colossians He becomes the head of the Church which is His body (Eph_5:23-24, Col_2:19)—the vital and organic centre of the whole. The idea of this striking figure is similar to that presented by our Lord Himself in the allegory of the Vine and the Branches (Joh_15:1-8). The lesson of the figure, as of the allegory, is not only that in Christ all

believers are bound together into the unity of the Church, but that the spiritual vitality, indeed the very existence, of individual Christians and Christian communities depends upon the closeness of their relations with Jesus Christ who is their head.

(4) *Christ's symbolic body*.—On the night in which He was betrayed, Jesus, in instituting the sacrament of the Supper, said of the bread which He took and broke and gave to His disciples, 'This is my body' (ταῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου: [Mat 26:26](#), [Mar 14:22](#), [Luk 22:19](#), [1Co 11:24](#)). Similarly St. Paul, writing to the Corinthians, says of the bread which is broken at the Supper, 'Is it not the communion of the body of Christ?' ([1Co 10:16](#)); while in the same Epistle he describes the person who eats the sacramental bread unworthily as 'guilty of the body of the Lord' ([1Co 11:27](#)), and says that a man eats and drinks judgment unto himself 'if he discern not the body' ([1Co 11:29](#)). Opinions have differed greatly in the Church as to the full significance of this language, whether on the lips of Jesus or of St. Paul. But whatever its further meanings may be, there can be little doubt that primarily the broken bread of the Supper is a symbol of the crucified body of Christ. With this symbolic use of the word 'body' many have sought to identify the words of the Lord in the Fourth Gospel about 'eating the flesh' of the Son of Man ([Joh 6:53-63](#)). But as the word σῶμα denotes the body as an organism, while 'flesh' (σάρξ) applies only to the substance of the body, and as σάρξ is never employed elsewhere in the NT to describe the sacramental bread, it is unlikely either that Jesus would use σάρξ with this intention, or that the author of the Gospel would have failed to use σῶμα, the ordinary sacramental term, if it had been his intention to represent our Lord as furnishing in the Capernaum discourse a prophetic announcement of the institution of the Supper. See art. Lord's Supper.

Literature.—Grimm-Thayer, *Lexicon*, s.v.; Cremer, *Biblico-Theological Lexicon*, s.v.; Laidlaw, *Bible Doctrine of Man*, s.v.; Salmond, *Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, s.v. 'Resurrection'; Lange, *Life of Christ*, vol. v. p. 126 ff.; Forrest, *Christ of History*, PP. 150 ff., 411 ff.; *Expositor's Greek Testament*, *passim*; arts. 'Resurrection' and 'Ascension' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible .

F. Meyrick and J. C. Lambert.

BOOK.—The word ‘book,’ representing two Greek words, βιβλος and βιβλιον (with dim. βιβλαριδιαν, Rev 10:2; Rev 10:9 f.), is of fairly frequent occurrence in the NT, although it is found only nine times in the Gospels. Very probably a book in the form familiar to us did not exist in NT times. The book of Scripture was a roll, as we may gather from such a text as Rev 5:1, ‘A book written within and on the back, sealed with seven seals.’ The Scriptures used in the synagogues up to the fall of Jerusalem were probably leather rolls, or at least rolls of skins tanned in some way; but papyrus rolls were in very general use. Parchment was in use also, as we see from 2Ti 4:13, but probably also in the roll and not the codex form. The distinction between the books (τὰ βιβλία) and the parchments (τὰς μεμβράνας) in the passage just referred to was, in all probability, simply one relating to the material used and not to the form of the manuscript, although it is not absolutely certain at what date parchments began to be folded instead of rolled.

The word ‘book’ is not always used in a strictly technical sense. In Mat 1:1 ‘The book of the generation of Jesus Christ’ means simply the record of, or writing about, the genealogy of Jesus. There is no reason to think that St. Matthew meant it to be understood that the genealogy formed a little roll by itself. Again in such expressions as ‘the book of life’ (although that expression does not occur in the Gospels), it is evident that the writer is speaking figuratively. Our Lord said to His Apostles (Luk 10:20), ‘Rejoice because your names are written in heaven’; and in the OT (Exo 32:32) there is express mention of a book which God had written: ‘If not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written.’ The connexion of the expression ‘book of life’ with the words of our Lord to His Apostles, and with the daring yet splendid utterance of Moses, is obvious enough. To say that names are in ‘the book of life’ and ‘the Lamb’s book of life,’ is to say that those bearing these names are accepted and accounted as members of the heavenly kingdom here and hereafter.

The word ‘book’ is used in its technical sense of an actual roll or volume in Mar 12:26, Luk 3:4; Luk 4:17; Luk 4:20; Luk 20:42, and Joh 20:30. It is noteworthy that in Mar 12:26 the writings of Moses are called not ‘the books,’ but simply ‘the book.’

The books mentioned in Act 19:19 as having been brought by their possessors and burned, were probably, many of them at least, simply amulets, spells, *grammata Ephesia*, little strips of parchment with words professedly of magical value written on them.

Literature.—Comm. on the NT; art. ‘Writing’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible and in the *Encyc. Biblica*; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.], Index, s.vv. ‘Books,’ ‘Scriptures’; Sanday, *Inspiration*, 157, 297; Kenyon, *Handbook to Textual Criticism of NT*, ch. ii.

Geo. C. Watt.

🚧 Border

BORDER (Gr. κράσπεδον for Heb. צִיָּצִית).—This word plays a significant part in the Gospels (Mat 9:20; Mat 14:36; Mat 23:5, Mar 6:56, Luk 8:44). When Jesus was on His way to heal Jairus’ little daughter, a certain woman who had an issue of blood twelve years came behind Him and touched the ‘border’ (‘hem’) of His garment (τοῦ κράσπεδου τοῦ ἱματίου) and was healed (Mat 9:20-22, Luk 8:44, Mar 6:56). In Mat 14:36 we read of many sick ones who sought healing in the same way. Again, in that remarkable denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees which constitutes the climax of one of our Lord’s most striking discourses, He makes this charge among others: ‘All their works they do to be seen of men: they make broad their phylacteries, and they enlarge borders of their garments’ (Mat 23:5).

What is this ‘border of the garment’ that plays such a rôle? Clearly in our Lord’s time the Jews had come to attach great importance to it. To them it was the chief of three ‘sensible signs,’ or material reminders, of their obligations under the Law, the other two being the Phylacteries (*těphillîn*) and *mězûzôth*, oblong boxes fixed above the door-posts, on which Deu 6:4-9; Deu 11:12-21 were written, according to the directions there given. The Law first required (Deu 22:12) that ‘twisted cords’ (Heb. *gědhîlîm*, incorrectly rendered ‘fringes’ by Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) be formed upon the four corners (‘four borders,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) of the mantle or ‘outer garment.’ This thing termed *gědhîlîm* acquired later the special name *zîzîth*,—it is so rendered by the Targum in Deu 22:12. The same law is found in the Priestly Code in expanded form: ‘And the Lord spake unto Moses saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and bid them that they make them fringes (*zîzîth*, κράσπεδα) in the borders’ (more correctly ‘tassels in the corners,’ (Revised Version margin)) ‘of their garments throughout their generations, and that they put upon the fringe of each border (*i.e.* ‘the tassel of each corner’) a cord of blue’ (Num 15:37-38).

The ‘twisted cords’ of Deu 22:12 were clearly intended to be fastened to the four corners of the outer garment (usually called *simlâh*). The Priestly Code, however, further called for a ‘tassel’ to be attached to each corner by a cord of blue. Now, it is to these ‘tassels’ that the Gr. translators give the name *κράσπεδα*—the term exclusively used in the NT. The *simlâh* was worn like the Gr. *ιμάτιον* (the NT equivalent), the loose end being thrown over the left shoulder. The ‘tassel’ attached to this corner, then, could be reached with ease from behind, as in the case of the woman with the issue of blood (Mat 9:20).

Some think that behind this law was an ancient Semitic custom with superstitious and magical associations, which, however, was impressed with a new significance by the Hebrew legislation. At any rate, we see here, as elsewhere, that in NT times a special virtue was still thought to be attached to the ‘tassels on the four corners’ (cf. Mat 14:36, Mar 6:56 with Luk 4:7 and 1Ki 1:50).

In the Mosaic Law they were evidently intended to be, as to the more spiritually minded doubtless they were, simply reminders of the obligations resting upon Jehovah’s people to walk in this law and to keep all His commandments (Num 15:39-40). The ostentatious Pharisees, however, went beyond others in their use of these signs, by making them large and conspicuous.

Jewish hearers and readers would at once understand what Jesus meant by this charge against the scribes and Pharisees, ‘who sit in Moses’ seat.’ Making their phylacteries unusually broad and enlarging the borders (‘tassels’) of their garments would both be understood as their way of calling every casual observer to witness that they were remarkably pious. It was this ostentatious display of an empty, outward piety which Jesus here and elsewhere denounces, and which has given such a sinister and forbidding significance to ‘Pharisaism’ the world over.

Literature.—Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. ii. 111 ff.; Edersheim, *Life and Times*, i. 624 ff.; Hasting’s *Dictionary of the Bible* and Kitto’s *Biblical Cyclopaedia*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , art. ‘Fringes.’

Geo. B. Eager.

 Borrowing

BORROWING.—See Loans.

☞ Bosom

BOSOM occurs 5 times in Authorized and Revised Versions of the Gospels (Luk 6:38; Luk 16:22-23, Joh 1:18; Joh 13:23), representing in each case the Gr. κόλπος, the word which in LXX Septuagint regularly corresponds to כֶּתֶף of the Heb. text and ‘bosom’ of the Authorized and Revised Versions. κόλπος is found only once more in NT, viz., in Act 27:39, where it has the secondary sense of a bay or bight (a bosom-like hollow); cf. English ‘gulf,’ which comes from this root.

In classical Greek, in the LXX Septuagint, and in the NT κόλπος, like Lat. *sinus* (which Vulgate gives in all the above passages), is used in the two principal senses of (a) the human bosom, the front of the body between the arms; (b) the bosom of the garment, *i.e.* the hollow formed in front when the upper garment was bound round the waist with the girdle. In Authorized and Revised Versions of the OT ‘bosom’ is to be understood, according to the context, in one or other of these two senses. *e.g.* in expressions like ‘the wife of thy bosom’ (Deu 13:6), ‘Naomi took the child and laid it in her bosom’ (Rth 4:16), the first sense is evidently the proper one. On the other hand, when we read of putting one’s hand into one’s bosom (Exo 4:6-7), taking fire into the bosom (Pro 6:27), receiving a gift in the bosom (Pro 21:14), it is the bosom of the garment of which we are to think. See art. Dress.

1. In Luk 6:38, where our Lord says to willing givers, ‘Good measure, pressed down, shaken together, running over ... shall they give into your bosom,’ it is clear that the word has the sense of (b). The overhanging front of the upper garment when confined by the girdle was used as a convenient receptacle, serving the purposes of the modern pocket. An adequate paraphrase would thus be, ‘Your pockets shall be filled to overflowing.’ In the remaining passages two distinct questions emerge. First, the more important one as to the general meaning in each case of the expression ‘in the bosom’ or ‘on the bosom.’ Next, in those cases in which the phrase is taken to refer to the position at table of one guest in relation to another, as to whether the ‘bosom’ is the bosom proper or the bosom of the garment.

2. To begin with the simplest passage, the general meaning of Joh 13:23, in the light of the table customs of the period, is perfectly plain. In the time of Christ it was customary at a set feast to recline on a divan or couch, with the feet stretched out behind, the left arm supported on a cushion, and the right hand free for eating. Moreover, the usual plan was that the guests reclined not at right angles to the table, but obliquely, this being manifestly much the more convenient way of reaching the

viands (cf. Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. et Talm.* [Note: Talmud.] , *ad loc.*). By this arrangement a second guest to the right hand lay with his head towards the bosom of the first, and so on. But what precisely is meant by 'bosom' in this connexion? Whether is the word used in the sense of (a) or of (b) as described above? Probably in the latter, the meaning being that the head of the second reached 'to the *sinus* of the girdle' of the first (see Meyer, *Com. in loc.*). It could not well have reached to the other's bosom in the strict sense of the word, for this would have interfered with his freedom and comfort in eating and drinking. This view is confirmed by the fact that when the Evangelist describes St. John as leaning back (*ἀναπεσών*) on Jesus' breast to ask Him a question, a different word (*σῆθος*) is employed (Joh_13:21, cf. Joh_21:20, and see Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 in both cases). See art. Guest-chamber.

3. The expression 'Abraham's bosom' (Luk_16:22-23) has already been dealt with in its general eschatological signification (see art. Abraham). A question remains, however, as to the precise form of the figure which the words are meant to suggest (note that the plur. in Luk_16:23 has no separate connotation from the sing. in Luk_16:22. Cf. Homer, *Il.* ix. 570, and see Winer-Moulton, *Gram. of NT Gr.* 219 f.). Is Abraham to be thought of, fatherlike, as enfolding Lazarus in his arms (cf. 'Father Abraham,' Luk_16:24; Luk_16:27; Luk_16:30), or rather as receiving him into the place of the honoured guest, the place nearest to himself at a heavenly banquet? 'Into Abraham's bosom' (*εἰς τὸν κόλπον Ἀ.*, Luk_16:22) might suggest the former, but 'in his bosom' (*ἐν τοῖς κόλποις αὐτοῦ*, Luk_16:23) may very well be used with reference to the idea of a feast, after the analogy of Joh_13:23 (*κόλπος* is used in the plural form both of the human bosom and of the folds of the upper garment. See Liddell and Scott and Grimm-Thayer, *s.v.*). And this seems to be confirmed by that other passage (Mat_8:11, cf. Luk_13:28-29) in which Jesus says, 'Many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down ((Revised Version margin) 'recline,' Gr. *ἀνακλιθήσονται*; cf. *ἀνεκλιθη* in TR [Note: Textus Receptus.] reading of Luk_7:36, which Authorized Version renders 'sat down to meat') with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven.' Alike for the social outcast (Lazarus) and for the religious outcasts (the Gentiles), Jesus holds out as a joyful prospect the thought of sitting down with Abraham at a heavenly banqueting-table. The conception of Paradise, moreover, under the figure of a feast, is specially appropriate, because of the contrast it presents to the earthly condition of Lazarus as a starving beggar (Luk_7:21), just as it is in keeping with the great reversal in the positions of the two men that Dives, who on earth had 'fared sumptuously every day' (Luk_7:19), should now lack even a drop of water to cool his burning tongue (Luk_7:24).

4. The only passage that remains is Joh_1:18, where Jesus Christ is described as ‘the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father.’ In this case the image of neighbours at a feast seems quite inappropriate, though some have suggested it; and it is in every way more suitable, in view of the whole purpose of the Prologue no less than the language of the immediate context, to take ‘in the bosom of the Father’ in that closer and more tender meaning in which in the OT the expression is used to describe, whether literally or figuratively, the relation of a wife to her husband (Deu_13:6), or of a child to his father (Num_11:12) or mother (1Ki_17:19). This beautiful term of human affection is employed here to denote the intimate fellowship of perfect love which exists between God and His Son. Some difficulty is occasioned by the fact that the phrase in the original is εἰς τὸν κόλπον, literally, ‘into the bosom.’ Meyer insists on giving to εἰς its ordinary meaning of ‘direction towards,’ and so recognizes as the prominent element in the expression the idea of *having arrived at*. He admits that ‘so far as the *thing* itself is concerned,’ the εἰς τὸν κόλπον of Joh_1:18 does not differ from the πρὸς τὸν θεόν of Joh_1:1, but maintains that in Joh_1:18, at all events, the Evangelist desires to express the fullest fellowship with God, not before the Incarnation, but after the Ascension into glory. In this case, however, the description of Jesus Christ as εἰς τὸν κόλπον of the Father would be inappropriate, for the Evangelist is in the act of explaining how it is that the Only-Begotten Son was made to ‘declare’ the Father while on earth (note the aorist ἐξηγήσατο). It seems proper, therefore, to take ὢν as a timeless present, and to understand the author to mean that Jesus had declared God on earth because His inherent relation to the Father, before the Incarnation as after the Exaltation, was one of being ‘in his bosom’ (cf. Joh_16:28 ‘I came out from the Father, and am come into the world’; Joh_17:5-6 ‘the glory which I had with thee before the world was ... I manifested [ἐφανερώσα, aor.] thy name’). The εἰς in this case may either simply be used for ἐν, after the fashion of the *constructio praeagnans* (cf. Mar_13:9; Mar_13:16, Act_7:4; Act_8:40), or, as Godet and Westcott think (*Comm. in loc.*), may point to a relationship not of simple contiguity merely, but of perfect communion realized through active intercourse. The Father’s bosom is not a place but a life. ‘The Son is there, only because He plunges into it by His unceasing action; it is so with every state which consists in a moral relation’ (Godet, *ib.*).

Literature.—Grimm-Thayer, *Lex.*, s.v. κόλπος; the Comm. on the various passages; Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible, artt. ‘Dress,’ ‘Abraham’s Bosom.’

J. C. Lambert.

Bottle

BOTTLE.—This is the Authorized Version rendering (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘wine-skin’) of *Ἀσκά*, which denotes the tanned skins of sheep and goats that are used in the East for holding water, oil, wine, and cheese (see art. ‘Bottle’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible i. 311). In the Gospels the allusion to ‘bottles’ occurs in connexion with a question that had been addressed to Christ with regard to an observed difference between His disciples and those of John the Baptist and the Pharisees (Mat_9:14-17, Mar_2:18-22, Luk_5:33-38). A certain outward conformity was expected in religious teaching and example, and the absence of fasting among His disciples seemed to create a perplexing and objectionable departure. The interview takes place immediately after the incident of Levi’s feast, when Christ’s eating with publicans and sinners was objected to as lowering the standard of the religious life.

The simile reminds us that the life of institutions as of individuals has a limit. It is sufficient for the wine-skin to have once held and matured and preserved its new wine. The attempt to repeat the act of filling and distension involves the loss of both the wine and the vessel which holds it. The most venerated form was once an innovation on what preceded it, and by the operation of the same law a fresh expansive force will again alter external conditions and create new conformities. Christ claims the entire devotion of His disciples, and while the fasting that was largely a commemoration of the past was suspended during His presence, it would receive in days to come a fresh impulse from His absence.

The important truth taught by the simile of the wine-skin and its contents is emphasized by the twofold fact that religious forces are the most expansive of all, and that their receptive forms often attain to a degree of rigidity which preserves the outward shape after the contents have been withdrawn. With regard to the principle of fasting, the affinity of mind and body that connects sorrow with sighing (Isa_35:10) abundantly authorizes the observance under naturally suitable circumstances, but fasting by statute has usually been found to be linked, both as cause and effect, with ecclesiastical segregation and asceticism.

Literature.—Bruce, *Parabolic Teaching*, p. 295 ff., *Galilean Gospel*, p. 180 ff.; F. W. Robertson, *The Human Race*, p. 190 ff.

G. M. Mackie.

Boy

BOY (the word).—In the Authorized Version this word does not occur in the Gospels, nor indeed in NT, and only three times in OT (Gen 25:27, Joe 3:3, Zec 8:5). We usually have ‘male child’ for a very young boy, and ‘lad’ for an older one, where ‘boy’ would be used in modern English. And Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 has retained the older use in most cases.

But there is in modern English an ambiguous use of ‘boy.’ It sometimes approximates to the sense of ‘servant’ (cf. ‘doctor’s boy’), and in some of our colonies is used of a native male servant irrespective of age. A ‘boy’ in this sense may be grey-headed. This force of the word made it suitable as a rendering of *παῖς* in certain cases. In Mat 8:5-13 = Luk 7:2-10, the centurion’s servant is sometimes described as a *δοῦλος* ((Revised Version margin), ‘bond-servant’) and sometimes as a *παῖς* ((Revised Version margin), ‘boy’). Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 text keeps the Authorized Version ‘servant’ throughout for both words. A comparison of Mat 8:13 with Luk 7:10 shows that the two words apply to the same person. It is in the centurion’s own speech (Mat 8:6-8 = Luk 7:7) that he refers to the slave who was ‘precious unto him’ (Luk 7:2 (Revised Version margin)) by the milder word. The narrative (except Mat 8:13) uses *δοῦλος*, as the centurion himself does in Mat 8:9, Luk 7:8. The variation is either a natural simple touch, proving the veracity of the narrative, or it is an instance of the highest art. See art. Servant.

As in the above instance *παῖς* = *δοῦλος*, so in the narrative of the healing of the epileptic child (Mat 17:14-18, Mar 9:14-27, Luk 9:37-43) we find in St. Matthew and St. Luke (not St. Mark) that *παῖς* can = *υἱός*. Here Mat 17:18, Luk 9:42 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 have ‘boy’ in the text, for the Authorized Version ‘child.’ Similar is the use in Luk 8:51-54, where ἡ *παῖς* is ‘maiden’ and ‘maid’ in Authorized and Revised Versions .

Except where the context requires a different rendering, *παῖς* is usually translated ‘servant’ in both versions, and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 often points out occurrences of *δοῦλος* by putting ‘or bond-servant’ in the margin.

In Joh 4:51 both versions have ‘son’ (= *παῖς*) where Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 had far better have put ‘boy’ as in the above instance, keeping ‘son’ strictly for *υἱός*.

☞ Boyhood

BOYHOOD (Jewish).—So little is recorded on this subject in the Gospels, or in the NT generally, that we are dependent on other sources for our facts. These sources are chiefly the OT, the OT Apocrypha, Josephus, the Talmud, and modern Eastern life. The first of these authorities is too early, and the last two too late, to justify us in basing on them any very positive statements as to Jewish boyhood in the time of Christ. With this caution they are used in the present article. And it will be remembered (1) that the Jewish life of our period was the result of the previous life of the nation; (2) that Israel is a nation of great conservatism in matters of religion and the home, although receptive of new ideas; (3) that some of the Apocryphal books were late enough to be products of an age in which Pharisaism, Hellenism, and other Jewish views met each other, much as they did in the early part of the 1st cent. a.d.

i. The Home.—Boys, until their fifth year, were under the charge of the women, afterwards they passed under the father's control. We therefore treat the period of boyhood as commencing at the age of five. Although no doubt many mothers retained their influence after the boy's childhood, it is surely a mistake to quote Pro 31:1 in this connexion, as Phillott does (Smith's *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] 1 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] i. 305b).

The special influence implied here is surely that of the queen-mother over an adult reigning king, which, according to Eastern custom, exceeds that of a wife. For there may be many wives, but only one mother of the sovereign. The queen-mother (*gēbîrāh*) is mentioned 1Ki 15:13, 2Ki 10:13, Jer 13:18, and the name of the king's mother is given with emphasis in the account of his accession (1Ki 14:21; 1Ki 15:2 etc.). So, in David's lifetime, Bathsheba shows him great outward respect (1Ki 2:19), but is seated at Solomon's right hand (1Ki 2:19) when the latter is king. Phillott also refers to Herod. i. 136; Strabo, xv. 733; Niebuhr, *Descript.* p. 24.

More to the point is St. Paul's reference (2Ti 1:5; 2Ti 3:14-15) to the example and teaching of Lois and Eunice, which no doubt was only one instance out of many of good maternal influence. And the Mosaic law placed the mother on an equality with the father in her claim on the obedience and love of her son (Exo 21:17, Lev 20:9 etc.). The house-mother of such a family as our Lord's was neither so ignorant, so secluded, nor so debased as the woman sometimes described by travellers in the East. Judaism was not in this respect the same as Mohammedanism. Even now we are told

that the home of the Syrian Christian is superior to that of his Mohammedan neighbours. And even among the latter the seclusion of the harem belongs chiefly to the life of the rich. In working and middle-class homes the wife and mother takes her part, as in the West, in the training of the children, and in necessary outdoor business. The OT and the Gospels show this. For instance, 'women's apartments' are never referred to in the latter. And Christ apparently met the wife of Jairus, the wife of Chuza, Susanna, Martha and Mary, Peter's wife's mother, and others, without the obstructive conditions of zenana life. We lay stress on this, because we believe that views of one side of Eastern life are often applied too widely, and because from this freer, higher status of woman in Israel there followed her greater fitness for wifedom and motherhood. We believe that in Galilee, at least, an almost Western freedom of intercourse between the sexes must be considered in estimating the influences affecting Jewish boyhood.

The period of boyhood, as we understand it for the purpose of this article, was from the 5th to the 13th year. The legal 'coming of age' was at 13 for boys, but 12 or even earlier for girls. But Schürer (*HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. ii. 51 f.) thinks that the definite age was fixed in post-Talmudic times, and that nothing but 'the signs of approaching puberty' settled in earlier times whether a child was bound or not bound to the observance of the Law. We shall consider the ceremonies of this 'coming of age' later on. One thing connected with this date was the power of giving evidence. Schürer quotes the Mishna (*Nidda* v. 6): 'When a child is twelve years and one day old, his oaths are tested; when he is thirteen years and a day, they are valid without further ceremony.' Here, for our period, we may compare the commentators on Joh 9:21 'He is of age, ask him; he shall speak for himself.'

ii. Play.—The few allusions in the Bible to children's games do not allude specially to those of boys. Zec 8:5 'The streets of the city shall be full of boys and girls playing in the streets thereof,' is quite general, and is 500 years too early. The use of *yeled* ('boy') and *yaldâh* ('girl') even leaves a vagueness as to the ages of the children. But the prophet no doubt based his words on the customs and sights of his day, and thus a fairly early period of life is meant. It is *not* said that the sexes were playing together, they might be in different groups. Nature, even in England, soon leads to this, and the early ripening of the East must be remembered. Therefore, soon after the period of infantile games, comes that of sports practised by each sex alone, and in the case of boys 'manly' exercises soon follow, if practised at all. In many parts of the East the climate is often quite unsuited for the 'school-boy' games of Northern lands. The absence of these is noticed by the teachers of many Mission schools. But in this respect there must be great differences. That lassitude which is true of children in Bomhay, for instance, cannot at all seasons apply to those of Nazareth, which is about 1500 feet above sea-level. A caution is necessary when such excellent books as Lane's

Modern Egyptians, dealing chiefly with Cairo, or even works on Persia or India, are used not merely to illustrate the Bible, but to add to the descriptions in it.

There were, of course, in the 1st cent. a.d. athletic sports and physical exercises in some of the large towns of the Holy Land. But these were so connected with Hellenic immorality that they were offensive to every pious Jew. They were chiefly confined to the cities which had a large heathen population, and we cannot imagine a gymnasium at Nazareth or Hebron. At Jerusalem, during the high priesthood of Jason (b.c. 173), a gymnasium was set up, and 'the very priests forsook their service at the altar and took part in the games of the palaestra' (Schürer, i. i. 203; 2Ma 4:12-14). Tiberias, Jericho, Tarichaea had each a hippodrome or a stadium (Schürer, ii. i. 33). Had the exercises for which these buildings were erected commended themselves to the Jews, the older boys would soon have emulated their adult countrymen as far as possible, just as English boys are cricketers and footballers because Englishmen are so. But Judaism completely condemned the exercises in which Greeks and Romans delighted. By their history as well as by their surroundings and details these exercises were connected with heathenism and apostate Judaism (Josephus *Ant.* xv. viii. 1). No son of pious Jewish parents could copy even the innocent side of these exercises (Brough, 76, 77). See art. Games.

An older boy in districts like Upper Galilee or the hill country of Judaea would find much physical exertion called for by the contour of the country. Almost every journey implied hill-climbing. Moreover, there were (and are) in many parts of Palestine many minor field-sports practised, such as the snaring of small birds, which would form a pastime for older lads. Skill in *slinging* (Jdg 20:16, 1Sa 17:40, 2Ki 3:25, 1Ch 12:2, Job 41:28 (20), Pro 26:8 [Authorized Version] (Revised Version margin)], 1Ma 6:51) could be obtained only by early training and practice. The same remark applies to the *archery* so often mentioned in the OT. That both these accomplishments were maintained in NT times may be believed from the many references to bowmen and slingers in Josephus (*BJ*, *passim*). But specific references to these arts as boyish exercises are apparently wanting.

Young English children play at 'horses,' 'school,' 'work,' 'mothers,' etc., which we may call *games of imitation*. The Talmud alludes to these; and our Lord noticed the little children playing at marriages and funerals (Mat 11:16-17, Luk 7:32). These would be played by *young* children of both sexes.

It is curious that the Apocryphal Gospels have a legend about our Lord modelling birds out of moist clay (*Syriac Boyhood of the Lord Jesus* 1, pseudo-Matthew 27, Thomas 11, *Arabio Gospel of the Infancy* 36 etc., in B. H. Cowper's *Apocryphal Gospel*). Some of these accounts describe our Lord's playmates as also modelling objects. While we reject the miraculous statements that our Lord endued these figures with life, we

may accept the narratives as based on actual childish games. It is indeed said that Judaism would have shrunk from any representation of animate beings (Schürer, ii. i. p. 36), but there is no proof that all (good Jews took a puritanical, Pharisaic view of the prohibitions of the Law; and even if the Judaea-Christian Apocryphal Gospels are absolutely wrong in describing this modelling as a specimen of our Lord's play in childhood, they may be right in using it as an element in a picture of Palestinian infancy. Are the children of orthodox Jews now forbidden the use of dolls or wooden horses?

In *PEFSt* [Note: *EFSt* Quarterly Statement of the same.] , April 1899, p. 99, is an account, with illustrations, of three soft limestone slabs, resembling draught-boards, found in the excavations at Tell Zakariya. One is complete, measuring 23 cm. × 20 cm. (about 4½ in. × 4 in.) and 7 cm. thick. It is ruled (incised) so as to form 144 squares of irregular size. The other two are fragments only. They belong to the Greek period. Such draught-boards have also been found at Gezer and at Tell-es-Sáfi. Some have fewer squares, and clearly there were various arrangements of the squares (*PEFSt* [Note: *EFSt* Quarterly Statement of the same.] , Oct. 1900, p. 321; Oct. 1903, p. 300). A collection of small waterworn pebbles, each about the size of an ordinary ivory card counter and three times as thick, was found in the lower Jewish stratum at Gezer. These were either draught-men, or counters for calculation (*PEFSt* [Note: *EFSt* Quarterly Statement of the same.] , Oct. 1903, p. 300).

Two small draughtsmen of green enamelled paste (possibly Egyptian), found at Gezer, are described *PEFSt* [Note: *EFSt* Quarterly Statement of the same.] , Oct. 1903, p. 213, and pl. ii., figs. 25, 26). Others of pottery of local manufacture have also been discovered.

iii. School.—The majority of Jewish boys were as unable to study in the *bêth ha-Midrâsh* as the majority of our population are to procure a University training (Act 4:13, Joh 7:15; Joh 7:49, and, on the other hand, Act 22:3 etc.). In any case this higher education belonged to an age beyond boyhood. Elementary schools, however, existed at least wherever there was a synagogue. In them reading was certainly taught; and even if Scripture was the only text-book, the knowledge thus acquired would avail in other directions. Writing also was taught, probably as a help to the reading more than for its own sake (Joh 8:6; Joh 8:8 compared with Joh 7:15 show that it was an 'elementary subject'). Arithmetic, etc., is not mentioned in our authorities, but some acquaintance with it is, of course, a probable part of the course. It would be of more interest to know if Greek was ever taught in the synagogue schools of Palestine. It must have been so necessary in the many bilingual districts. It was the means of communication between the natives and the Roman authorities.

A training in a foreign or in a dead language is always a mental advantage. Even if Greek were not taught to most Jewish boys, Hebrew was; and the Hebrew of the OT which we know they studied was not the Hebrew (Aramaic) which they spoke in their homes (e.g. Mar 5:41). If only the mother-tongue was used, then the Scriptures were read (or verbally taught) in a Targum.

According to the Jewish authorities, the elementary or synagogue school was called the *bêth ha-Sçpher*, 'house of the book' (i.e. the Scriptures), to distinguish it from the *bêth ha-Midrâsh* or *bêth ha-Talmûd*, theological colleges where the Rabbinical explanations and additions were taught. The teacher of the school was usually the *hazzân* or servant of the congregation (Luk 4:20; *Shabbath* i. 3).

An elementary native Mohammedan school at the present day, where the instruction is reading and writing Arabic, and the study of the Koran, will give us an idea of the probable methods. The scholars sit cross-legged at their teacher's feet, he being slightly above them (Luk 2:46, Act 22:3, cf. Mat 5:1). The letters are first taught by tracing with a stick in sand. All reading is aloud, and in a kind of rhythmical chant or drone. Even in after life the sacred Book is always read aloud, and so Philip (Act 8:30) *heard* the eunuch reading his roll of Isaiah. The discipline is of the sternest kind, corporal punishment being freely used. Does a foundation of fact, or at least *vraisemblance*, lie beneath the legends of our Lord's treatment by His schoolmaster? (Gospel of pseudo-Matthew 31; Gospel of Thomas 14, 15; *ib.* (Latin) 12, 13 etc.) It is noticeable how the Lord and His Apostles silently ignore all such advice about the training of children as we find in Pro 13:24; Pro 19:18; Pro 23:13, Sir 30:1-13. We believe that Judaism, like some sections of Christendom, had read such OT passages too literally, or applied them too severely, and Eph 6:4 is much more in the spirit of the Gospel.

How far was elementary education universal and compulsory? The Jewish tradition asserts that it was both (cf. Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] *Kethuboth* viii. 11, quoted in Schürer, ii. ii. 49). Schürer concludes that schools were general in the time of Christ; and thinks that the tradition is by no means incredible that Joshua, the son of Gamaliel (1st cent.), enacted 'that teachers of boys should be appointed in every town, and that children of the age of six or seven should be brought to them.' At least it is possible that education was fairly universal in our Lord's day, within the limits indicated above. See, further, art. Education.

iv. Religious instruction and practice.—Although the school education was on a religious basis, it does not appear to have clashed with or superseded the religious teaching of the home. The responsibility remained with the parents. This was in accordance with the OT and especially the Pentateuch, which gives no commands for formal religious instruction (schools, tutors, etc.) as in later Judaism. But it is clearly

laid down in the Law and OT generally that children are to be taught (cf. Gen 18:19 (J [Note: Jahwist.]), Psa 44:1; Psa 78:3-6, Deu 4:9; Deu 6:7; Deu 11:19; Deu 32:46). The Wisdom books imply parental teaching only (Pro 1:8; Pro 2:1; Pro 3:1; Pro 4:1; Pro 7:1; Pro 10:1; Pro 13:1; Pro 15:20; Pro 22:6; Pro 23:22-26; Pro 29:17, Sir 3:1-31; Sir 7:23; Sir 30:3 etc., also Tobit 4, 14, *passim*). We notice in Exo 12:26 ff; Exo 13:8 the direction that the people were to join the instruction of the children in the history and meaning of the Passover with the feast itself In Exo 13:14-16 the presentation of the firstborn is made another opportunity for such instruction. It is the fathers who have the religious instruction of young Israel in their hands, for other rites, ceremonies, festivals would naturally be explained to the children in like manner. Not by catechisms, reading lessons, tasks learned, or dry instruction in a school, but by sharing in the ritual worship, with interest aroused for the coming explanations offered, which were based on the history, were the children taught.

Many occasions presented themselves for such teaching as arises from the child's own inquiries and interest. There were the suggestive little rolls of parchment hung up in the doorway (the *mězûzôth*) and the phylacteries (*těphillîn*) worn on the forehead and wrist (Deu 6:9; Deu 11:20 and Exo 13:9; Exo 13:16, Deu 6:8; Deu 11:18; Deu 11:20). See art. Phylacteries. Another opportunity for religious instruction without set lessons was given by the wearing of the fringes (*zîzîth*), Num 15:37-41. See art. Border. The feasts observed at home and in the synagogue, and the pilgrimages to Jerusalem also afforded opportunities for oral and interesting instruction on the part of the parents. Though Judaism is a ritualistic and ceremonial religion, teaching through the eye in a way well adapted to the capacities of children, the ritual and ceremonies are largely for the home. The master of the house, the boy's father, did and does much more than 'conduct family prayer.' Although the Passover was held at Jerusalem, the greater part of the service and all the sacred meal were celebrated in private houses and family circles. The outward forms of religion at least met the boy in his home more than they do with us. There were more opportunities for a pious parent to do the duty which we have seen was cast upon him by the Law and by the customs of Israel.

Moreover, the Biblical history occupied the place of national history, of ballad poetry, of folk-lore tales, and of all that, in ages before the invention of printing, took the place of our 'children's literature.'

In many cases, no doubt, perhaps in most, Haggadistic embellishments were made to the OT narratives, some of which have perhaps crept into one or both of our present Biblical recensions, that of Palestine and that of the Dispersion. Ruth as a scarcely altered love-tale; Judith and Jonah, allegorical fictions; Esther, especially in its Greek form, a greatly amplified history, are instances of books which we now have in

written forms, but which were once the ‘fireside stories’ (to use a Western phrase) of many Jewish homes. Here, rather than in a purposeful foolishness of the Rabbis, was probably the source of much that is strange and *bizarre* in Jewish literature.

Who would listen so attentively to the father or old grandfather telling his evening story when work was done as the young boys and girls in the outer part of the family circle? The story-telling taste of the East is a well-known fact (witness the *Arabian Nights*); true history and the truth of God were probably taught orally in a somewhat analogous manner.

Religious instruction was aided in two other ways. No one can doubt that the historical Psalms (78, 81, 105, 106, 114) as well as the alphabetical ones (9-10, 25, 34, 37, 111, 112, 119, 145) were well adapted for use by young people, even if they were not composed expressly for the purpose of assisting those who were to learn them by heart. The ‘Hymn of the Fathers’ (Sirach 44-50) has apparently a similar object. It is far too long for liturgical use, of which besides there is no record.

And, lastly, the synagogue services, with the lections from the Law (Act 15:21) and the Prophets (Luk 4:17-20, Act 13:16), filled their place in the training of a Jewish boy. It is in the highest degree unlikely that every household, even every pious household, possessed rolls of all the OT books. There was not perhaps a definite ‘Canon’ in our modern sense. More families would possess the ‘Law,’ but expense would prevent even this being universal. The oral teaching at home, the reading in school, and the hearing in the synagogue,—all had a share in producing that knowledge of the Jewish Bible which, as we see in the Gospels, was possessed even by working men like the fishers of Bethsaida (Luk 9:54 etc.). But the oral teaching, however and wherever it had been given, is clearly referred to in Mat 5:21; Mat 5:27; Mat 5:33; Mat 5:38 (*heard not read*) Mat 17:10 (hearsay of Mal 4:5-6). Our Lord constantly referred to OT incidents (Mat 6:29; Mat 8:4; Mat 12:40-42 etc.) as to facts well known by the multitudes. (Do all Mohammedan families possess a Koran? Yet they know their faith). But then He also referred to *haggâdôth* (Mat 8:11) and to the OT Apocrypha (Luk 6:9, cf. 1Ma 2:32-41) in much the same way. The contrasted phrase, ‘Have ye never *read*?’ (Mat 21:18; Mat 21:42; Mat 22:31 etc.), was said to the religious leaders, who would have more advantages and opportunities than the bulk of the population, and who were supposed to study the *written* Revelation.

Up to the age of 12 or 13 a Jewish boy was called *kâtân* (‘little’) or *tînôk* (cf. both words used of school children in passages quoted by Schürer, ii. ii. 49 ff.).

The second word is a form of יֹנֵק *yônçk*, suckling (יָקַח to suck), which however is used of schoolboys in the Talmud; and this meaning has clearly been reached by a

language-change similar to that by which *bar-mizvâh* has come in English law to mean, in spite of its etymology, a person who may be twenty years old.

At the age mentioned above, the Jewish boy became bound to fulfil the Law. He was therefore called a 'son of the Law' (*bar-mizvâh*), or a 'son of the Precept,' and the ceremony in which he was recognized as such by the community was naturally regarded as important and interesting.* [Note: The expression *bar-mizvâh* has been found in the Talmud, but does not seem to have become used generally for an adult till the Middle Ages (cf. Schürer, ii. ii. 51, 52 note 38, and his authorities).]

Opinions differ as to how much of the Law and the Precepts a boy was bound to observe before this ceremony. Probably there was no uniformity. The practice for sons of Pharisees is naturally the one recorded for us, rather than the popular one. And probably also the exact period when the fullest obligations fell on the boy was not fixed at first, but was settled individually (as Schürer suggests) by the appearance of signs of approaching manhood. We must remember that Orientals attain physical maturity at an earlier age than we do.

Later on, when the age of 13 was fixed, the Rabbis found support for it, or rather for that of 12. At that age Moses was said to have left the house of Pharaoh's daughter (but cf. Exo 2:11 with Act 7:23). They taught that Samuel was 12 when he began to prophesy (1Sa 1:24 is followed by 1Sa 2:19; 1Sa 2:21, implying an interval of some years before 1Sa 3:4, at which time Samuel was old enough to open the doors of the house of the Lord, 1Sa 3:15. The age is also stated by Josephus *Ant.* v. x. 4). Solomon was (absurdly enough) said to have been 12 years old when he gave his judgment (1Ki 3:16-27). The only instance which was not entirely founded on conjecture or tradition is that of Josiah's age when he carried out his reform, 2Ch 34:3 (not in 2Ki 22:3). These instances all look like attempts to date the origin of the Rabbinical rule further back into OT times.

According to modern rule, the boy must be 13 years old and a day. He is then presented in the synagogue on a Sabbath, called 'the Sabbath of Phylacteries' (*těphillin*) because the boy is then invested with them, and wears them in prayer, and is bound to observe the feasts and fasts. In olden days the obligation to attend the feasts at Jerusalem perhaps became binding after this ceremony. Women and children were exempt by the Law ('all thy males,' Deu 16:16). But Schürer (ii. ii. 51) quotes a decision of the school of Shammai as to the meaning of 'child' (*kâtân*): 'Every one who cannot yet ride on his father's shoulders from Jerusalem to the temple mount'; while the school of Hillel said: 'Every one who cannot yet go up from Jerusalem to the temple mount led by his father's hand.' We think that Luk 2:42 neither affirms nor denies any previous visits of Christ to the temple, either annually or three times a year. The fact that His life had been in danger in Judaea (Mat 2:13; Mat 2:18;

Mat 2:22) might lead Joseph and Mary to observe the rule less strictly than they otherwise would have done. Perhaps boys who lived at or near Jerusalem did more than the provincials. If Joseph went up alone annually he probably did as much as most of his Galilaean neighbours. The Jews of the Dispersion certainly only went up annually (usually at Pentecost), if they went more than once or twice in a lifetime. St. Paul had omitted many years (Act 24:17), although a strict observer himself of the Law.

In modern times the Jewish boy reads (or rather *sings*) the lesson, and gives the blessing for the first time at the *bar-mizvâh* ceremony in the presence of his relatives and the congregation. It is to his parents a time of joy and honour, and as he intones the holy words, the prayers of his pious friends are offered. Was this reading by the boy a custom in the 1st century? If the ceremony existed at all, it probably was a part of it, and Luk 4:16-17 implies that the Carpenter had officiated many times before. The first occasion may well have been at the close of boyhood.

Nowadays also the presiding Rabbi usually gives an address garnished with personal allusions. Presents to the boy from his friends, and a feast at the parents house follow the ceremony. Much in the whole service may well be ancient, and date from before the time of Christ; but the absolute silence of the NT, Philo, and Josephus on the subject prevents our being positive about it.

To those boys who lived far from the capital and temple the periodical visits must have been of great importance, apart from their religious purpose, and if their homes were in quiet villages, the crowds at the feasts would arouse their keenest interest. They would also see the luxury of the rich, the noisy bargaining of traders, and signs of that imperial power which, however it was hated, was the great *fact* of the time.

v. Work.—Every well brought-up Jewish boy was taught an occupation. This may have arisen from the many warnings against idleness in the Wisdom books of the OT (Pro 6:6; Pro 6:11; Pro 10:4; Pro 10:26; Pro 12:24). ‘Abundance of idleness’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘prosperous ease’) is noted in Eze 16:49 as a cause and concomitant of sin, and the Rabbis appear to have realized the truth about the usefulness of manual labour to much the same extent as did the founders and leaders of Western monasticism. Rabban Gamaliel iii., son of R. Judah ha-Nasi, said: ‘For exertion in both (the study of the Law and labour) keeps from sin. The study of the Law without employment in business must at last be interrupted, and brings transgression after it’ (*Aboth* ii. 2; Schürer, ii i. 318, § 25). Another said: ‘He who teaches not his son a trade teaches him to be a thief.’

St. Paul’s father was wealthy enough to give him a good Greek education at Tarsus (probably) and a Rabbinical one at Jerusalem. His wealth is also implied in Php 3:7-8,

if that passage refers, as some commentators think, to St. Paul's being disinherited for his Christianity. His private means somehow disappeared, so that he had to depend either on the contributions of others or on his labour. But he had a trade to fall back upon (Act 18:3, 1Th 2:9, 2Th 3:8). And the warnings about idleness in the NT were addressed by him to Gentile Churches, rather than by him or other Apostles to Jewish converts (Eph 4:28, 2Th 3:10-12). Our Lord was not only the carpenter's son, but the carpenter (Mar 6:3); and Justin Martyr speaks of ploughs and yokes having been made by Him (*Trypho*, 88). But His earthly condition was not wealthy: and this may have been the case with Aquila (Act 18:3), as it probably was with the fisher-Apostles of Galilee. See, further, artt. Trades, Work.

Literature.—J. Brough, *The Early Life of Our Lord*, London, Murray, 1897 (a full, well-arranged and useful compilation, but needing careful testing, as authorities divided by many centuries are used in the same paragraph without a word of caution); F. Delitzsch, *Artizan Life in Zazareth*; Schürer, *GJV* [Note: JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] [English translation *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]] *passim*; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. et Talmud.*; Schwab, *Le Talmud de Jérusalem*; Joseph Simon, *L'Éducation, etc., chez les anciens Juifs*; the 'Lives of Christ' by Edersheim, Didon, Farrar, Keim, Geikie, etc. (the remark on Brough's work applies to some of these also); the relevant articles in the Bible Dictionaries and Encyclopaedias; Keil, *Biblical Archaeology*, ii. 175 ff. § 111; the *Heb. Archaeol.* of Nowack and of Benzinger, s.v. 'Familie.'

Much 'local colour' is to be gained from the works of travellers in Palestine—Kitto, Tristram, Robinson, etc., and from the issues of the *PEFSt* [Note: EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.] .

George Farmer.

☞ Boyhood Of Jesus

BOYHOOD OF JESUS

1. *The Biblical data.*—The preceding article expresses the present writer's ideas as to religious training, education, and recreation in the time of Christ. The Gospels tell us nothing except by inference. The complete absence of *haggâdôth*, i.e. such religious fiction as we find in the Talmud, from our Lord's teaching, implies either want of training in it, or positive rejection of it. But Christ acquired such a knowledge of the

Old Testament, and perhaps of some books outside the Palestinian canon, that the teachers in the temple ‘were astonished at his understanding and answers’ (Luk_2:47). We do not doubt that Scribism and Rabbinism had begun, and had a considerable following. But we doubt if it had made such progress that a good Israelite in the provinces, living in private life, was bound to live and to order his household according to the rules laid down and enforced by the leaders of the nation in the next and following centuries after the great upheaval of the Jewish war with Rome. Then, by political necessity, the ‘traditions’ of a sect became the life of a nation. Perhaps, also, Christianity took out of Judaism those pious souls who were ‘zealous of the law,’ but not necessarily so of the ‘traditions,’ and there were left only those leaders and followers whose sayings supply us with the picture of 2nd century Judaism (cf. Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii. i. § 25, ‘Scribism’—especially pp. 365-379). Yet it must be admitted, in favour of a contrary view, that Peter at least was guided by some rules which went beyond those of the OT, and which came from the scribes, Pharisees, and Rabbis (Act_10:28; Gal_2:12—eating with non-Jews). But if any pious persons and households were as yet free from the Rabbinical ‘yoke of bondage’ (Gal_5:1), surely that freedom was to be found in the household of Nazareth. A protest is needed, because some writers illustrate (?) Christ’s early life entirely by Rabbinical rules. The many illustrations from Jewish books which are brought forward to prove that all Jewish boys learnt a trade are hardly needed to prove that Christ did so. Apart from Mar_6:3 (the only passage in which He is called ὁ τέκτων, and not merely ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός), common sense would teach us that He who deigned to live in a carpenter’s household, under real human conditions, in His youth, would help Joseph, and learn the art he practised. This is implied in His subjection to Joseph (Luk_2:51). Perhaps the parable of the Mote (chip or splinter) and Beam (Mat_7:3-5) derives its outward form from the work of His youth (cf. Justin Martyr, *e. Tryphon*. 88).

During the stay at Nazareth, where Joseph and Mary settled after their return from Egypt (Mat_2:23), the Babe (τὸ βρέφος, Luk_2:16) passed into the stage of young boyhood. He grew in bodily height (ἠϋξανε, Luk_2:40) and in bodily strength (ἐκραταιοῦτο, Luk_2:40). The omission of πνεύματι in this verse by ⌘ BDL Vulgate and most crit. edd. [Note: editions or editors.] takes away any ground for discussing its meaning. The next words πληρούμενον σοφίας (or σοφία) imply a gradual, progressive filling.* [Note: The reading is doubtful. Treg. and WH prefer σοφία, and Lachmann gave it in his margin, supported by ⌘c BL pl; and this, as the more unusual construction, may be right.] What does ‘wisdom’ mean? Just as any manifestation of ‘supernatural’ power was out of place in this stage of our Lord’s life, so would have

been any such manifestation of knowledge, of adult acquirements, of power to instruct others, or of any other form of 'wisdom' which was clearly unsuitable to His age. He was the perfect child, with the perfection suited for each successive stage of childhood. And others recognized and valued this, no doubt (cf. 'in favour ... with men,' Luk 2:52). But nothing occurred in His childhood (or later, up to the time of His beginning His ministry) to prevent His neighbours being astonished when His work began, and wondering at His words and works, which clearly were new to them and unexpected by them (Mar 1:27; Mar 2:12; Mar 6:2-6 etc.).

Had it been found that He knew all human knowledge (e.g. reading, writing, arithmetic) without any instruction, there would have been a contradiction to the above facts. The σοφία then was (as we should expect in this Hebraistic passage) the opposite to 'folly' in the OT sense. As each fresh experience of life, each external difficulty (perhaps temptation) from His environment came on, *pari passu*, with His growth, there was heavenly wisdom to meet it. Tact, gentleness, veracity, the 'soft answer,' were the sort of things which distinguished Him from other lads, and not miraculous knowledge, or miraculous power such as is described in the Apocryphal Gospels.

'*And the grace of God was upon him.*' God's favour was clearly upon Him, as had been foretold in Isa 11:2-3. Men noticed (Joh 1:14) that He was full of grace and truth. But we must remember that it was a gift to His human nature, and therefore words are used which are used of His brethren (e.g. Act 6:8 Στέφανος δὲ πλήρης χάριτος). At the end of the next section St. Luke (Luk 2:52) tells how He progressed in favour (χάρις) also with men.

'*And his parents went every year to Jerusalem at the feast of the Passover*' (Luk 2:41). From our Lord's own presence at other feasts, both of Divine and human appointment, and from the large crowds at them, we are led to reject the idea that pious Jews at this time went to Jerusalem only for the Passover. No doubt the greatest attendance was at that feast, and those who could attend only one probably chose it. Jews resident outside the Holy Land seem, probably on account of the more favourable season for travelling, to have preferred Pentecost (Act 2:1-11; Act 18:21; Act 20:16; Act 21:27; Act 24:18, 1Co 16:8). We think it probable, therefore, that the emphatic words of the sentence are οἱ γονεῖς. Joseph *may* have gone at other seasons; at this season Mary usually (ἐπορεύοντο, imperfect of 'habit') accompanied him. Women were not *bound* to attend any feast (Deu 16:16 'all thy males'). Joh 7:2; Joh 7:8-10 show that the 'brethren of the Lord' attended the feast of Tabernacles, which may be an indication of what Joseph's custom was. But if women went to any

one feast, it would be, if possible, to the Passover, partly because it was the most esteemed, partly because the Supper (both sacrificial and social) was an essential element in it, and partly because of the examples of Peninnah and Hannah (1Sa 1:3; 1Sa 1:7; 1Sa 1:21).

In Luk 2:42 we are told of Christ going with them, being twelve years old. Does this imply that He had never been with them before? We doubt it. The mention of His age may be made only in order to mark at what period of His life the incident which follows occurred. The commentators, etc., lay great stress on His having become a 'son of the Law' or a 'son of the Precept,' and represent this Passover visit to Jerusalem as a sort of 'First Communion' after a sort of 'Confirmation.' The whole of the legislation about the *bar-mizvah* dates *after* the destruction of the Jewish polity in a.d. 70 (cf. Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii. ii. 51 f.). There may have been earlier traces of it in Pharisaic. Judaeen circles. Besides, when a definite age for 'full membership' of the Jewish community was fixed, it was at thirteen, and not at twelve years of age. The current views would never have been brought forward, but for the assumption by the elder Lightfoot and others that in this Talmudic rule we find the explanation of the mention of our Lord's age.

Moreover, are there any Biblical grounds for supposing that a child of five, or ten, or any other age, might not be present at the Passover, and eat of the Paschal lamb? Exo 12:3-4 rather implies the contrary, for if all children under thirteen were excluded, few households would be large enough to consume a yearling lamb. If the custom of the present Samaritans is any guide, it is stated that even little girls eat of the lamb (cf. J. E. H. Thomson in *PEFSt* [Note: EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.] , 1902, p. 91).

But if it was our Lord's *first* Passover (which St. Luke does *not* say), we can find another reason than the age He had reached for the previous omission. Herod the Great had tried to kill the Child, Archelaus was considered by Joseph to be as dangerous, and therefore Jesus was kept out of his dominions. Now Archelaus was in exile; in 759 a. u. c. a Roman governor had been appointed over Judaea, and Roman law and justice, however defective at times, at least ensured safety for the Boy who had been sought for ten or eleven years before as an Infant. Of course, it is possible that the later Jewish rule prevailed in Christ's day, but it does not appear to us to be *proved*, either from St. Luke's words, or from any contemporary or earlier source.

What did our Lord do at Jerusalem? The Biblical accounts of the Passover ritual are mainly confined to the first or Egyptian Passover. This differed naturally from later ones in some respects, and in others a difference had been made by liturgical regulations. For instance, the eating of the lamb in a recumbent instead of a standing

posture was a change (Exo 12:11, 1Sa 1:9 'rose up,' Luk 22:14-15 etc.). So were the psalms, the prayers, the blessings, the four cups of wine, and other well-known customs. One of the best popular accounts of the Jewish ritual is in Bickell's *Messe und Pascha*, of which an English version by Dr. Skene has appeared. He rightly states that our *oldest* source is as late as the end of the 2nd cent. a.d., with large additions from the 11th to the 16th centuries (p. 112 f. English translation). Bickell also points out that 'the Paschal Lamb was an actual offering. It was slain in the Temple, its blood was sprinkled by the priest on the altar, its flesh was consumed as a sacrificial meal. Therefore, after the destruction of Jerusalem, when the Temple service ... came to an end, it could no longer be eaten.

'The same thing is true of the Chagiga, the meat of a slain thank-offering, which was wont to be previously brought with the Passover Supper.' And we must remember that the ritual was probably not written down while it was a 'living rite.'* [Note: Compare the usual view of the earliest liturgies. We will not therefore dwell on the Jewish accounts of the ecclesiastical amplifications of the Scriptural order, and still less on modern Jewish use. But the present Samaritan customs (mode of dressing the lamb, the spit in form of a cross, the mode of roasting, etc.) are very probably similar to the Jewish rites before the destruction of the Temple. Cf. J. E. H. Thomson in *PEFSt*, 1902, Jan. pp. 82-92, and *Expos. Times*, xi. [1900] 375 (very interesting), and other accounts by Dean Stanley, Mills, Petermann, Vartan, in Baedeker's *Palestine and Syria*, etc.] The earliest written sources are based on an oral tradition of what had been done a century before.

We may reverently conjecture our Lord's meditations as He saw the lamb sacrificed, and sat down to the Feast. The death of the lamb was a figure of His own death. The feast shadowed forth His feeding His people. Did He as yet know of His destiny? Perhaps it was beginning to unfold itself to His human consciousness (1) by His growing knowledge of His nation's religion, history, and sacred books; (2) by His mother's telling Him some of the incidents of His birth and infancy; (3) by the inner unveiling of His Divine nature to His human nature. We can only conjecture. But His answer to Joseph and Mary (Luk 2:49) implies some self-knowledge, and perhaps a step in the acquirement of that self-knowledge and consciousness.

On another point we are on surer ground. At the Paschal feast it was customary for the youngest present to ask, 'Why is this night different from all other nights?' adding a mention of some of the ritual acts. 'What mean ye by this service?' (Exo 12:26; Exo 13:7-8, Deu 6:20). And the head of the household or company replied by a recapitulation of the history of the Exodus, which in later times was called the Eastern *Haggâdâ*. No doubt our Lord followed this custom, and no doubt also Joseph gave the explanation, either in the traditional words as handed down to the modern

Jews, or in a freer, perhaps a fuller manner (cf. Exo 12:27; Exo 13:8, Deu 6:21-25; Deu 26:5-9; cf. Bickell, English translation pp. 118-120). Other details of the Passover ritual in the time of Christ, such as the sop, the cups of wine, and the singing of the Great (or third or final) Hallel, are vouched for by the accounts of the Last Supper given by the Evangelists and by St. Paul.† [Note: Many writers who mention the Great Hallel ignore the various accounts as to the Psalms which composed it; cf. Bickell, pp. 126, 127. They are not justified in saying which Psalm or Psalms our Lord used. Psalm 136 has the general support. The Babylonian Gemara mentions Psalm 23. The 114th Psalm, which Christian tradition (cf. the name of its tune, 'Peregrinus') connects with the Passover, cannot have been the one mentioned (Mat 26:30), as its use occurred before the actual supper (Bickell, p. 120). See art. Hallel.] See art. Passover.

'When they had fulfilled the days' (τελειωσάντων τὰς ἡμέρας). Our first impression is undoubtedly that the whole seven days of the Feast (Exo 23:15 etc.) are meant. We should expect pious Jews, like Joseph and Mary, to remain the whole time, not because it was a precept, but out of devotion. 'It was more laudable to remain the whole seven days, especially on account of the last day, which was a Feast Day' (Lightfoot; cf. Exo 12:16). Edersheim (*Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i. 247) argues that Joseph and Mary set out for home *before* the close of the Feast, because the Talmud says that 'during Feasts' (not *after* them) 'the members of the Temple Sanhedrin came out on to the terrace and taught the people, contrary to the usual custom of sitting as a court of appeal,' and he thinks that Christ was there. In dealing with this suggestion we have to notice the expression τελειωσάντων τὰς ἡμέρας instead of the ὡς (ὅτε) ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι of Luk 1:23; Luk 2:6; Luk 2:21-22, and ἐπλήσθη ὁ χρόνος of Luk 1:57. The two words are sometimes synonymous in effect, but the distinction between them has been defined as follows: 'τελειοῦν is to complete so that nothing remains to be done, but the thing or work is τέλειον; it implies an end or object (τέλος) to be looked forward to and fully attained. πληροῦν looks at the *quantity* to be done, not at the *end* to be reached, and so is to fill a thing full, so that it lacks nothing.' St. Luke's words are therefore *perhaps* compatible with Joseph and Mary having left on the third day, the so-called *half-holiday*, when it was lawful to return home, but we prefer (in spite of Edersheim's Talmudical argument) to think that they 'stayed to the end' of the Feast. It might be said, however, by those who believe in the earlier return, that our Lord's staying behind was a tacit rebuke, especially if ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου (Luk 2:49) be taken in a *local* sense. St. Luke's use of the simple μένειν in the Gospel and Acts should be noted: the compound

occurs only here and in [Act 17:14](#) in his writings: and in the latter case it is also used *in contrast* to Paul's departure. St. Luke, however, does *not* say that Jesus remained for any such reason, nor that Joseph and Mary lost sight of Him through any failure of duty. Popular books add much to the narrative.

All the pilgrims used to go to the Temple on the day of their departure, by a rule possibly based on [1Sa 1:19](#). There would be a great crowd, and the temporary separation of a family in the colonnades and on the steps would be (as in great public gatherings now) a natural occurrence, causing little alarm. Possibly Joseph and Mary joined their fellow-travellers from Galilee, in the belief that the Child, who would know the time and point of departure, was among the younger pilgrims. The little fear they felt on the first day ([Luk 2:44](#)) rather supports the view mentioned above, that it was not Jesus' first Passover.

Our Lord's 'parents' (γονεῖς, [Luk 2:43](#)—'Joseph and his mother' is a correction in the interests of orthodox dogma), being ignorant of His having stayed behind, went therefore a day's journey towards home. As we do not know the route they travelled by, it is impossible to say that they went as far as Beeroth (Farrar, *Life of Christ*, and others). Jericho is quite as probable a resting-place.

The search among the kinsfolk and acquaintances being in vain, they returned to Jerusalem, and found Him 'after three days' (probably from the time of separation). We need not inquire whether this expression means 'on the third day' (μετὰ ἡμέρας τρεῖς, cf. [Mar 8:31](#) μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας).* [Note: The mystical school of interpreters have pointed out several parallels to this period: (a) Bengel says: 'For the same number of days, when He lay in the grave, He was considered as lost by His disciples ([Luk 24:21](#)).']

(b) Another writer says beautifully: 'Seeing Mary sigh for three days for her Divine Son, I see again humanity during the 3000 years of paganism, wandering in search of God.'] The search on the road back to and in Jerusalem was a thorough one (ἀναζητησύντες). There must have been many persons who could be inquired of with safety, persons in sympathy with the pious hopes of Simeon and Anna ([Luk 2:25-38](#)), though these had probably passed away. It is St. Luke who tells us ([Luk 2:38](#)) that there was a group of pious persons, who looked for *the redemption of Jerusalem*.† [Note: So RV with ⌘B, etc., but cf. AV and AVm. The Vulgate has the more easy Israel; Amiatinus: , and so Peshitta.] As this refers to a period only twelve years previous, Joseph and Mary could easily find some of these residents of Jerusalem, even if the connexion had not been kept up in the yearly Passover visits ([Luk 2:41](#)). We think that the

reason for Joseph and Mary spending at least a day in Jerusalem before going up to the Temple, was that they *and our Lord* were well known to this group of persons, and that they thought of Him as possibly among friends at Jerusalem, just as they had thought it possible on the first day of the separation that He was among the pilgrims.

Christ in the Temple.—‘And it came to pass, after three days they found him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors ((Revised Version margin) ‘or *teachers*’), both hearing them, and asking them questions’ ([Luk_2:48](#)). By being present at the meeting of the Rabbis, Christ was obeying the counsel of Ben Sira ([Sir_6:34-36](#)), which was possibly a commonplace piece of instruction in pious Israelite families.

‘Stand thou in the multitude of the elders;

And whoso is wise, cleave thou unto him,

Be willing to listen to every godly discourse;

And let not the proverbs of understanding escape thee.

If thou seest a man of understanding, get thee betimes unto him,

And let thy foot wear out the steps of his doors.’

A discussion has been raised as to the meaning of ‘in the midst’ (ἐν μέσῳ). It is usually thought that Christ sat, as scholars did, on the floor, with the Rabbis on a raised bench or divan, arranged perhaps in a semicircle, ἐν τῷ μέσῳ occurs in [Act_4:7](#), where it cannot mean more than ‘present in a central position where others could see and hear,’ yet apart from the members of the court. Kuinoel watered down the expression here to ‘in the same room with the teachers.’ It has, however, been suggested that the Rabbis, being struck by the searching power of the questions put by Christ, and the depth of knowledge of the Law which they displayed, invited Him to take a seat among themselves, as a mark of admiration, as well as for more convenience in the conversation. If this was so, their action would be somewhat similar to that in a British court of justice where a distinguished visitor, or even witness, is sometimes complimented by an invitation to ‘take a seat on the Bench.’ It is said that members of the Sanhedrin did sometimes, on extraordinary occasions, admit an inquirer to the same seat as themselves. It would be a probable thing to do, where the youth of the person made him, as in this case, liable to partial concealment among older and taller bystanders.

There is no ground for supposing that Christ *disputed* with the Rabbis. It is clear that He in nowise offended their prejudices on this occasion. All that He said, although remarkable for His age, was suitable to it. The mode of higher religious teaching among the Jews seems to have been neither didactic nor catechetical, but by mutual interrogation between the teacher and the scholar. Hence the freedom used by the disciples and others in questioning *their* Teacher. Christ answered some questions and put others, no doubt with all marks of respect to those who 'sat in Moses' seat' (Mat 23:2).

What led to Christ's desire to interview the Rabbis at all, and what was the subject of His questions? We can understand His intense interest in the recently celebrated Feast, its history and its meaning. Or, building on His previous knowledge of the Law and the Prophets, and on the current Messianic hopes, He might desire to learn from the Rabbis about the Messiah and the Messianic kingdom. Questions such as those discussed in Mat 2:4; Mat 2:6, Mar 9:11, Joh 7:42 would be raised and would interest Him. Luk 20:22; Luk 20:28-33, Mar 10:2 give us other authentic instances of the points discussed by the Jewish teachers of that age. It has, moreover, been suggested that on the journey up to Jerusalem, Mary for the first time told Him the story of His birth, of the messages of the angels, of the Magi, of Simeon, of Anna, of the flight into Egypt, and of the dreams of Joseph. It would be an overpowering revelation, for which, however, as an exceptional, though true child, He would be ready.

We are in the realm of pure conjecture, but certainly it might be God's way of revealing to the Divine Child a part of the truth about that Child's nature and mission. That to Him, as to the Church, to the world, and to each of us, the truth should come 'by divers portions and in divers manners' (Heb 1:1) is a conceivable, and perhaps the most probable theory. And such a revelation, falling on an unusually gifted soul (Luk 2:40), on a soul infinitely more receptive, because of its sinlessness (Wis 7:22-23 etc.), than any other soul could be, would quicken into energy His whole life. If this were so, we have an adequate exposition of our Lord's desires, an adequate explanation of His action.

'All that heard him were amazed (Authorized Version astonished) at his understanding and his answers' (Luk 2:47). As, later on, 'never man so spake' (Joh 7:46), so now, never child so spake. Yet as in the later case there was nothing contrary to true manhood, so now we ought not to think of anything contrary to true boyhood. It is worth noting that while Authorized Version has 'astonished' for the feeling of the bystanders (Luk 2:47 ἐξίσταντο) and 'amazed' for that of Joseph and Mary (Luk 2:48 ἐξεπλάγησαν), Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 simply reverses the terms. The former word is often rendered 'beside himself,' 'beside themselves,' but

it is difficult to express in English the difference between the two verbs.* [Note: For ἐξιστάσθαι, cf. Mat 12:23, Mar 2:12; Mar 3:21; Mar 5:42; Mar 6:51, Luk 8:56; Luk 24:22, Act 2:7; Act 2:12; Act 8:9; Act 8:11; Act 8:13; Act 9:21; Act 10:45; Act 12:16, 2Co 5:13; and for ἐκπλήσσειν, Mat 7:28; Mat 13:54; Mat 19:25; Mat 22:23, Mar 1:22; Mar 6:2; Mar 7:37; Mar 10:26; Mar 11:18, Luk 4:32; Luk 9:43, Act 13:12. The context sometimes offers no reason for the choice of one word rather than the other. The latter one may be the weaker of the two; in Mat 19:25, Mar 10:26; Mar 7:37 it needs an adverb to strengthen it. Etymological arguments cannot be pressed with regard to the popular Greek of the 1st century.] See artt. Amazement, Astonishment.

In spite of the assembly of ‘grave and reverend signiors,’ Mary’s feelings were at once vented in audible address (εἶπε) to her Son: ‘Child! why hast thou thus dealt with us? Behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing!’ Her trouble overpowered her amazement. No doubt they were proud of Him in their hearts, but Mary thought it necessary mildly to chide Him for having caused them so much anxiety. We say ‘chide’ as the nearest expression of our thought, but few parents in the East or anywhere else would speak of what they deemed to be a child’s error so courteously and with such an absence of ‘temper.’ We notice that it was Mary who spoke, and this may possibly be urged as a point in favour of the orthodox view of the ‘Virgin Birth.’ If Joseph had been the natural father of Christ, he would have spoken to a son of that age at least in addition to the mother. His silence seems to us to balance such expressions as ‘thy father and I,’ or ‘his parents.’* [Note: Where did Alford And ground for saying, ‘Up to this time Joseph had been so called (‘father’) by the holy Child Himself, but from this time never’? It may be so, but it is not recorded.]

Mary joined Joseph with herself not only in her account of the continuous careful seeking (ἐζητοῦμεν), but also in her sorrow.† [Note: ὀδυνᾶσθαι occurs four times in Luke (here, 16:24, 25, Act 20:38) and nowhere else in NT. ‘Sorrowing’ (AV and RV) does not seem strong enough. ‘With intense anguish’ is rather the meaning. Farrar (St. Luke) suggests ‘with aching hearts.’ In Luk 16:24-25 AV has ‘to be tormented,’ but RV ‘to be in anguish,’ of the sufferings of the rich man in Hades. In Act 20:38 it expresses the grief of the Ephesian elders at parting with St. Paul. The word used in the Peshitta here, is used for στενοχωρία in Rom 2:9. As ὀδυνᾶσθαι is frequent in Galen, Aretaeus, and Hippocrates, it may be one of St. Luke’s medical words. We are reminded by it of that later poignant sorrow, commemorated in the ‘Stabat Mater.’ She felt already the ‘sharp and piercing sword.’]

We now come to our Lord's reply, which is a veritable *crux interpretum*. There is no variant in the Greek (Τί ὅτι ἐζητεῖτέ με; οὐκ ἤδευτε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου δεῖ εἶναι με;). Nor is there any doubt that the words were a reminder (with a slight touch of rebuke) that Joseph was not His father (cf. ὁ πατήρ σου κάγω, Luk 2:48), and that in any case the claims of His Divine Father were paramount. The principal interpretations of ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου are: (a) 'in my Father's house'; (b) 'about my Father's business'; (c) 'among my Father's servants and friends'; (d) combinations of (a) or (b) implying an intended vagueness. The Vulgate is *in his quae patris mei sunt*; the Pesh. supports (a) 'in my Father's house,' having **בבית אביו** [But does not *both* support (c) as much?; cf. 1Sa 2:30 etc., *i.e.* by Semitic idiom 'house' (as in English) *may* mean family, connexions].

In favour of (a) is the circumstance that τὰ τινος, which strictly means 'that which is a person's property,' came to be used specially of his house, the word 'house' being omitted. Field and Humphrey compare the colloquialism 'I am going to my father's.' In profane Greek cf. Herod, i. 111, ἐν Ἀρπάγου: Philostratus, *Vita Apollon.* ii. 28, ἐν τοῦ βασιλέως: Lucian, *Philop.* ἐν Γλαυκίου: and many other cases where οἶκος or rather οἰκήματα is to be understood. L. Bos, who collected many of these instances in his work on *Greek Ellipses*, held strongly that πράγμασιν ('business') was not the word to be supplied here. He gave (p. 193) the same explanation of Joh 1:11 (Joh 16:32; Joh 19:27) and Act 21:6, but in these we find τὰ ἴδια. In the LXX Septuagint, cf. Est 7:9 καὶ ὄρθωται ἐν τοῖς Ἀμὸν ξύλον, κ.τ.λ.: Gen 41:51 where πάντων τῶν τοῦ πατρὸς μου represents the Massoretic Text 'all my father's house,' and Job 18:19. On the other hand, the supporters of (a) say that no example has been produced in Biblical or profane Greek for 'to be about a person's business' as a rendering of εἶναι ἐν τοῖς τινος, though it is admitted that ἐν τούτοις ἴσθι (1Ti 4:15) approaches it closely. Origen, Epiphanius, Theodoret, Theophylact, and Euthymius show a chain of commentators, explaining a passage *in their own language*, who take it in the sense of 'house.' Sir 42:10 ἐν τοῖς πατρικοῖς αὐτῆς (Vulgate *in paternis suis*) also seems to support it.

Against this, and in favour of (b), it has been said that Christ did not mean to say 'I could not return, I was in the Temple of God,' but 'My Father's business is the most important thing for Me.' It is also said that 'the necessity of our Lord's being in His

Father's house could hardly be intended by Him as absolutely regulating all His movements, and determining where He should be found, seeing that He had scarcely uttered the words in question before He withdrew with Joseph and Mary from that house, and spent the next eighteen years substantially away from it. On the other hand, the claim to be engaged in His Father's concerns had doubtless both frequently been alleged explicitly in respect of the occupation of His previous home life, and continued to be so during the subsequent periods of His eighteen years' subjection to the parental rule; His acknowledgment of that claim being in nowise intermitted by His withdrawal with His parents from His Father's house. Intimations of a more general kind seem 'easily capable of being read between the lines of the inspired narrative, which increase the probability that the Authorized Version, rather than the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, expresses the meaning of the Evangelist' (Dr. R. E. Wallis). It should also be noted that the expression 'my Father's house' occurs in Joh 2:16 in plain terms.

In favour of (c) we may quote the words of Jul. Döderlein (*Neucs Jahrbuch für deutsche Theologie*, 1892, i. 204): ' "In My Father's house" is not correct: Christ soon leaves the Temple. "Business" is little better.... Joseph and Mary could hardly have been expected to understand that their child had special work to do for God's kingdom' (*i.e.* at that age).... 'Had they sought Him among the good, they would not have needed to seek long. Instead of this, they sought Him ἐν τοῖς συγγενέσιν καὶ τοῖς γνωστοῖς, who afterwards tried to cast Him down from the hill (Joh 4:28-29), and therefore even then would converse little about God's word: on the other hand, He was to be found ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου, who held the office of the Word (Mat 23:2), and as such gladly listened to His eager questions ... the masculine, so to speak, has the first claim on the τοῖς, which is formed from οἱ, not from τὰ. There is no mention of *things* in the context.... In Rom 12:16 Luther, Authorized Version and (Revised Version margin) give the masculine, "them of low estate." 1Co 12:6; 1Co 15:28, Col 3:11 πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν = "all things in all men," not "all things in all things." In Luk 2:44 no one would render ἐν τοῖς γνωστοῖς, "in the known places." Again the με at the end of the phrase seems to be antithetical and emphatic. "Among those of My Father must I not be?" ... Not in what *place*, but in what *company* He must be, the anxious ones are able to learn once for all ... "where men speak of God, I shall surely be found" ' (cf. a review in *The Thinker*, 1893, iii. 171 ff.). We think this explanation deserves more consideration than it has received.

The syncretic combination of (a) and (b), as, e.g., by Alford and others, does not commend itself to the present writer. Finally, we should not forget that this conversation is one of the most likely ones in the Gospels to have been held in

Aramaic and not in Greek. It will therefore be wise not to lay too much stress on the analogies quoted above on various sides of the question. Even the Greek of these two chapters, as we have it, is noted as Semitic in style, not in St. Luke's classical manner (except, of course, 1:1-3). The Pesh., as we noticed above, supports (a). The Sinaitic palimpsest has 'Wist ye not that I must be with my Father?' (*Expos. Times*, xii. [1901] p. 206).* [Note: Besides the works quoted above, the reader should consult Field's *Otium Norvicense, Pars Tertia; Expository Times*, x. 484; Farrar, *St. Luke in Cambridge Bible for Schools*, 368, 369 (in which he abandons the view taken in *Life of Christ*, i. 78); and most reviews and criticisms on the Revised NT generally.]

Joseph and Mary '*understood not the saying which he spake unto them*' (Luk 2:50). Therefore He had not learned this from them, nor from other teachers, nor had He previously spoken much, if at all, of the Father. Their difficulty, of course, was not the literal question of grammar which troubles us. It was that they did not so realize the spiritual force of His saying (οὐ συνῆκαν τὸ ῥῆμα).

Although Joseph and Mary understood neither His words, nor His actions, nor Himself, and although His words and actions show that He now knew more than He had done of His Father, of Himself and of His mission, yet 'He went down with them, and came to Nazareth and was subject unto them.' As W. R. Nicoll says: 'He went their messages, did their work, humbled Himself, as if this episode at Jerusalem had never been' (*The Incarnate Saviour*, p. 41). The twelve years of hidden life were followed by another eighteen years of retirement. Even Nathanael, living at Cana, a few miles off, had not heard of Him (Joh 1:46-47). We may be sure that He who would 'fulfil all righteousness' (Mat 3:15) did not omit the yearly attendance at the Passover, and other feasts. He had at least to lead the life of example to His family and to His fellow-townsmen. Although we do not think that He or His were bound by all the rules of Pharisaic or of later Rabbinic Judaism, we may be sure that He did what was usual among pious Jews, partly because He would obey those who sat 'in Moses' seat' (Mat 23:2-3), and partly because, like His future Apostle (Rom 14:16, 1Co 8:13 etc.), He would put no stumbling-block in anyone's way (Mat 17:27).

We know that after Christ's ministry began, He spent much time in prayer, usually secret and for secrecy's sake, on the mountain (Mat 14:23, Mar 1:35; Mar 6:46, Luk 3:21; Luk 5:16; Luk 9:18; Luk 9:28-29; Luk 11:1). We cannot believe that this communion with His Father began with His ministry. Yet it seems unlikely that Christ in His early childhood would have followed this custom. May we date it from His return to Nazareth in His twelfth year? Then, His claim for liberty to be ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς (αὐτοῦ) would not seem to be a claim which either lay dormant for eighteen years ('my Father's business') or which was at once relinquished (by His return) and

only taken up at intervals ('my Father's house'), in which case no claim for liberty was needed. Moreover, 'His Father's business' for the next eighteen years was, as the event proved, *preparation*. And this is just what Christ did, and the secret prayer and meditation were part of it. If this custom began, or at least took a larger part in His life then, we can reconcile His words in the Temple with His life in the following years. And if 'house' instead of 'business' be the word to be supplied, we can also believe that He knew that the whole Universe is the Father's house (Joh_14:2), and not only the Temple 'made with hands.'

It must also be noted that His growth 'in wisdom' implies not only learning by prayer and meditation, and learning from the written word, but also learning from observation of human life. We learn by these three sources, and He was made like unto His brethren. But for this last source of learning, time and the attainment of greater age are required. Did He know when His active work was to begin? Moses sinned by beginning too soon, but ignorance, and the thought that the right time might be sooner than it was, would be no sin. Yet He who 'was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin' (Heb_4:15), might conceivably be tempted as Moses was. We tread here on difficult ground, and our ignorance, our desire not to err from the Faith, and our reverence for our Lord, bid us say no more. Meanwhile He did His duty in retirement, passing from boyhood into manhood, and waiting for the call which came later. Was the non-appearance of the forerunner (Mal_3:1) the sign that the time had not come, and his appearance the sign that the time was fulfilled (Mar_1:15)?

'And his mother kept all these sayings in her heart' (διετήρει occurs in NT only here and Act_15:29; cf. Gen_37:11 of Jacob concerning Joseph. ὁ δὲ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ διετήρησεν τὰ ῥήματα, where E [Note: Elohist.] has the same tense as here διετήρει, perhaps by assimilation). But Jacob lost hope (Gen_37:35), while Mary kept these sayings in her heart. It was a close, persistent, faithful keeping, but a keeping in silence, even when it might have changed the attitude of His kinsmen towards Him, or indeed have saved His life. She spoke, no doubt, when the right time came. Stress is laid on her faithfulness and meditation also in Luk_2:19. We may ask whether τὰ ῥήματα included other sayings than the ῥήματα of Luk_2:50. The πάντα of some MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] in the place of the ταῦτα of others leads us to think either of other sayings of Christ, or of the remarks of the Rabbis and others about Him (as in Luk_2:19). And though He 'was subject unto them,' the goodness of Joseph and Mary, His own wisdom and advancing years, and now the deepened thoughts Mary had about Him, would surely prevent their making His subjection an obstacle or a hindrance to His development.

Again we read of His progress (Luk 2:52), though this refers to a time beyond the Boyhood. The statement about *wisdom* is a continuation of that in Luk 2:40. The next word ἡλικία is ambiguous. If we take the meaning ‘stature’ (Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 text), it applies only to a part of the time between twelve years of age and thirty. But the margin of Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘age’ would seem to be preferable. Though increase in age is as inevitable as increase in stature, yet St. Luke, having spoken of Christ’s twelfth year, goes on to speak of His thirtieth, and characterizes by his transitional passage the whole of those eighteen years as a period of development. He cannot mean our thoughts to stop at the period when adult height was reached. The advance in ἡλικία must grammatically have the same duration as the advance in wisdom, and in favour with God and man.* [Note: Mere comparisons with other passages, even in this Gospel, cannot outweigh the above considerations. In 19:3 no doubt the stature of Zacchaeus is referred to; 12:25 and Mat 6:27 are doubtful. In Eph 4:13 ‘stature’ is probably right. Joh 9:21; Joh 9:23 and certainly Heb 11:11 mean ‘age.’ In the LXX, Eze 13:18, 2Ma 4:40, Job 29:18 seem to bear the same meaning. But Symmachus in Ca 7:7 must have meant ‘stature.’]

2. Dogmatic conclusions.—The doctrines of the Incarnation, of the Union of the two Natures in one Person, and of the Kenosis are beyond the limits of this article, though it is impossible to avoid bearing them in mind in dealing with our subject. But an exegetical study of Luk 2:40-52 shows a genuine human development of Christ in His boyhood. Body, soul and spirit made regular progress. With other children it is often the irregularity which troubles their older friends. Childishness (in the bad sense), where we expect some measure of intelligence; stupidity, which is sometimes the result of imperfect mental growth, and sometimes the result of the childish sins of laziness and self-will, are the common faults of children. Later on, the desire *not to be subject* to parental, or other restraint, and the premature longing for freedom (not necessarily for evil) are marks of sinful imperfection which we all recognize. Christ was free from them. When He was a child He *lived, spoke*, and no doubt *thought* as a child, but as a sinless one. The awakening of the human consciousness was gradual. As Oostcrzee (on Luke 2) says: ‘His recognition of Himself (we add ‘and of His mission’) formed part of His filling with wisdom. His public ministry did not begin with a sudden impulse, but was prepared for by His whole life. It was the forgetting or overlooking this which led some early heretics to date the Incarnation from the Baptism. But we see that at the age when childhood passes into youth, Christ was already aware (in part perhaps) of His mission.’ ‘The consciousness of His Divine Nature and power grew, and ripened, and strengthened, until the time of His showing unto Israel.’

Those who in times of controversy have most firmly held the Divinity of Christ have sometimes found a difficulty in admitting the ideas of growth and development in our

Lord. This was specially so in the time before the careful statements of the Great Councils and the Fathers of that period. So Epiphanius (*Haer.* li. 20) states that ‘some Catholics were inclined to admit the miracles of the Infancy (as in the Apocr. [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] Gospels) as affording an argument against the Cerinthians, and a proof that it was not at His Baptism that Christ was first united to the man Jesus.’ Jeremy Taylor (*Life of Christ*, pt. i. § 7) has a passage which is worth quoting: ‘They that love to serve God in hard questions use to dispute whether Christ did truly, or in appearance only, increase in wisdom. For, being personally united to the Word, and being the Eternal Wisdom of the Father, it seemed to them that a plenitude of Wisdom was as natural to the whole Person as to the Divine Nature. But others, fixing their belief upon the words of the story, which equally affirm Christ as properly to have “increased in favour with God as with man, in favour as in stature,” they apprehend no inconvenience in affirming it to belong to the verity of human nature, to have degrees of understanding as well as of other perfections; and although the humanity of Christ made up the same Person with the Divinity, yet they think the Divinity still to be free, even in those communications which were imparted to the inferior Nature, and the Godhead might as well suspend the emanation of all the treasures of wisdom upon the humanity for a term, as He did the heatifical vision, which certainly was not imparted in the interval of His sad and dolorous passion.’* [Note: The reference in the last sentence is, of course, to [Mat_27:46](#), [Mar_15:34](#).] See art. Childhood.

Literature.—The works named in the preceding article and those quoted above. On the *dogmatic* problem see Hooker, *Eccles. Polity*, v. lvi. 10, liv. 6; Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, Pars Tertia, Quaestiones 7-12; Dorner, *History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, on the true growth of the Humanity, Division ii. vol. i. 45, 343; vol. ii. 89, 125, 139, 204, 213, 214, 281, 285, 287, 365, 368, 432; vol. iii. 18, 20, 30, 127, 140, 147, 256. On the Apocryphal stories of the Boyhood see Trench, *Miracles*, Introd. iv. 2; Nicolas, *Etude sur les Evangiles Apocryphes*, Paris, 1865; also the ‘Lives of Christ’ and the Commentaries on St. Luke.

The fact that the passage [Luk_2:41](#) ff. is the liturgical Gospel for the first Sunday after the Epiphany in the Anglican and Roman liturgies, has produced a mass of homiletical and devotional literature, which naturally deals more with the spiritual lessons of the Boyhood of Christ, but which often has other useful matter. We can name only a small portion of this literature: Gonlburn, *Gospel of the Childhood, Thoughts upon the Liturgical Gospels*, i. 132, ch. viii.; Bourdaloue, Sermon for 1st Sunday after the Epiphany; Duquesne, *L'évangile médité*, i., *Méditations* 18, 19, 20; Bossuet, *Elévations sur les Mystères*, 20th week, i. to xii.; Rothe, *Sermons for the Christian Year*, p. 100; Gordon Calthrop, in *Quiver*, Dec. 1889 (on [Luk_2:49](#)); Vallings, *Jesus Christ the Divine Man*, ch. vi.; Samuel Cox, *Bird's Nest*, etc. p. 16; W. R. Nicoll,

The Incarnate Saviour, chs. ii. and iii.; Godet, 'Life of Jesus prior to His Public Ministry' in *Thinker*, vii. 390-404; F. W. Robertson, *Sermons*, 2nd ser. p. 175 ff.; *Expositor*, 2nd ser. viii. [1884] p. 17 ff., 4th ser. iv. [1891] p. 1 ff.; 5th ser. ii. [1895] P [Note: Priestly Narrative.] . 69 ff., Liddon, *Bampton Lect.*⁸ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 456 ff.; Farrar, *Christ in Art*, pp. 271-291.

George Farmer.

Brass

BRASS.—Wherever we find the word 'brass' in the Authorized and Revised Versions , we may be reasonably certain that copper or bronze is intended. Copper was universally used by the ancients, on account of its extreme ductility. In Bible lands it was mined in the region of Lebanon, in Edom, in the Sinaitic peninsula, where the great Egyptian mines were located, and in the isle of Cyprus. *Brass* is a fictitious metal, an alloy of copper and zinc; *bronze* is a mixture of copper and tin. But while in ancient vessels a combination of tin with copper is frequently found, analysis hardly ever reveals the presence of zinc.

1. The word *χαλκία* in Mar_7:4 (found here only in the NT), Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'brassen vessels,' may be translation 'copper vessels,' and is actually so rendered in the German and Dutch versions.
2. The noun *χαλκός*, translation 'brass,' is used by Christ in Mat_10:9 'Get you no gold nor silver nor brass in your purses,' by metonymy for copper coin. *χαλκός* occurs also in Mar_6:8; Mar_12:41, where it is translation 'money,' marg. 'brass.'
3. The word *χαλκολίβανον*, white copper, translation 'fine brass' (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'burnished brass') in Rev_1:15; Rev_2:18 (cf. Dan_10:6), is descriptively applied to the feet of Christ as He appeared in the vision of St. John in Patmos. There is quite a diversity of opinion as to its correct meaning. Some have supposed it to be that rare metal, more precious than gold, *Orichalcum*, whilst others have thought of frankincense and even of amber. In this connexion it evidently refers to the strength and stable majesty of the glorified Christ, in the same way as the Heb. *nēhōsheth* is used in the OT (Psa_107:16, Mic_4:13, Zec_6:1).

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , art. 'Brass'; Smith, *Dict. of Antiq.* s.v. 'Aes'; Grimm-Thayer, *Lex.* s.v. *χαλκολίβανον*.

Bread

BREAD.—In Syria and Palestine there are certain shrines and groves that have been preserved undisturbed through times of political change, and are to-day venerated by all the religions of the country. Such also has been the unchanged history of bread in Bible lands. It is to-day practically what it has always been with regard to (1) the materials of which it is made, (2) the way in which it is prepared, (3) its importance and use as an article of food, and (4) the symbolism and sanctity suggested by its value.

1. *Materials.*—Bread is usually made of wheat flour, the wheat of the Syrian plains being remarkable for its nutritious quality. An inferior and cheaper kind of bread is also made from barley flour, and less frequently the meal of Indian corn is used.

2. *Modes of preparation.*—The most primitive way is that of making a hollow in the ground, burning twigs, thorn-bushes, thistles and dry grass upon it, and then laying the flat cakes of dough upon the hot ashes. These loaves are about seven inches in diameter and from half an inch to an inch in thickness. The upper surface is frequently studded with seeds of Indian corn, and they are generally turned in the process of baking (Hos_7:8). They are ‘cakes upon the hearth’ (Gen_18:6), ‘baken upon the coals’ (1Ki_17:12-13). Such probably were the barley loaves brought to Christ at the feeding of the five thousand (Joh_6:9; Joh_6:13). Out of this custom, prevailing among the pastoral tribes and the poorest of the peasantry, were developed several improved methods made possible by more civilized conditions of life. (a) Large smooth pebbles were laid over the hollow in the ground, and when the fire had been kept up for a sufficient time, the ashes were removed and the loaves were laid upon the hot stones.—(b) Thinner cakes of both leavened and unleavened bread were made upon a flat pan or convex griddle. These are now made especially at times of religious festival, and are coated on the upper surface with olive oil and sprinkled with aromatic seeds. They recall the ‘oiled bread’ of Lev_8:26, and the ‘wafers anointed with oil’ of Exo_29:2 and Lev_2:4.—(c) The cavity for the fire is deepened, and a cylindrical hole about the size of half a flour barrel is made of stone and lime with a facing of plaster. The pebbles are still left at the bottom for the better preservation of the heat, and the same fuel is applied till the oven has been sufficiently heated. The dough is then rolled out into broad thin cakes, and each disc, after being still further distended by being passed with a quick rotatory motion between the hands of the female baker, is laid on a convex cushion or pad, and is thus transferred evenly to the hot wall of the cavity. In a moment it is fired, and as it

begins to peel off it is lifted and laid above the others at her side.—(d) The most developed form is that of the public oven in the village or town. Here features of the more primitive types still survive, but the cavity now becomes a low vaulted recess about twelve feet in length, and the pebbles are changed into a pavement of smoothed and squared stones. On it wood and lighter fuel of thorns are burnt, and the glowing ashes are finally brushed to each side of the vault. When the oven has been thus prepared the discs of dough are laid in rows upon long thin boards like canoe paddles, and are inserted by these into the oven, and by a quick jerk of the arm slipped off and placed upon the hot pavement to be fired. These loaves, when fired, are about an inch in thickness and about eight inches in diameter, and when newly baked are soft and flexible.

3. Use and importance of bread.—In the West bread is eaten more or less along with the other articles of food that chiefly constitute the meal; but in the East those other articles are rather eaten along with bread, and are regarded as merely accessory to it. When the farmer, carpenter, blacksmith or mason leaves the house for the day's labour, or the messenger or muleteer sets out on his journey, he wraps his other articles of food in the thin loaves of home-made bread. In the case of loaves fired in the public oven, these, owing to the glutinous adhesiveness and elasticity of the dough, and the sudden formation within them of vapour on the hot pavement, pull out into air-tight balls. They can then be opened a little at one side, and the loaf thus forms a natural pouch enclosing the meat, cheese, raisins or olives to be eaten with it by the labourer. As the loaf thus literally includes everything, so bread represents generally the food of man. A great exclusion was expressed in 'Man shall not live by bread alone' ([Luk_4:4](#)). In the miraculous feeding of the multitude ([Mat_14:15](#) ff. ||) it was enough to provide them with bread. It was three loaves of bread that the man asked from his neighbour to put before his guest ([Luk_11:5](#)). Two would have been sufficient for his actual needs; but even in such an emergency a third loaf was required to represent that superabundant something which as a touch of grace, often passing into tyrannical imposition, so deeply affects Oriental social life.

In the act of eating, Oriental bread is broken or torn apart by the hand. This is easily done with the bread of the public oven, as it can be separated into two thin layers. The thin home-made bread is named both in Hebrew and Arabic from its thinness, and is translated 'wafer' in [Exo_29:23](#), [Lev_8:26](#), [Num_6:19](#), [1Ch_23:29](#) (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). Such bread is called רַקִּיק (*râkîk*; Arab. [Note: Arabic.] *markûk*, from *warak*, 'foliage,' 'paper'). At a meal a small piece of such bread is torn off, and with the ease and skill of long habit is folded over at the end held in the hand. It thus makes a spoon, which is eaten along with whatever is lifted by it out of the common dish. This is the dipping in the dish ([Mat_26:23](#)), and is accomplished without allowing

the contents of the dish to be touched by the fingers or by anything that has previously been in contact with the lips of those who sit at meat.

4. *Symbolism and sanctity of bread.*—In a land where communication with other sources of supply was difficult, everything depended upon the local wheat and barley harvest. As this in turn depended upon the rain in its season, which was beyond the control of the sower, a special sanctity attached itself to what was peculiarly a gift of God, and a reminder of His continual and often undeserved care (Mat_5:45). To the disciples of Jesus, ‘Give us this day our daily bread’ would seem a very natural petition. An Oriental seeing a scrap of bread on the road will usually lift it up and throw it to a street dog, or place it in a crevice of the wall or on a tree branch where the birds may find it. It should not be trodden under foot in the common dust. Thus the most familiar article of food, so constantly in the hands of all, both rich and poor, and used alike by the evil and the good, had in it an element of mystery and nobility as having been touched by the unseen Giver of all good. How deeply this feeling of reverence possessed the mind of the Lord Jesus is evidenced by the fact that He was recognized in the breaking of bread (Luk_24:35).

In the social customs of the East, the giving and receiving of bread has always been the principal factor in establishing a bond of peace between the host and the guest at his table. It was a gravely unnatural offence to violate that law of hospitality. Of this offence Judas Iscariot was guilty at the Last Supper.

In travelling through Palestine and partaking of the hospitality of the peasantry, one may notice in the bread the indentations of the pebbles, and small patches of grey ash, with here and there an inlaid attachment of singed grass or charred thorn, the result of the simple baking process. It is bread, however, the best that the poor can give, and it is given with gladness and the dignity of a high duty towards the guest. When Christ sent forth His disciples to tell of His approach, He charged them to take no bread with them (Mar_6:8). It would have been a serious discourtesy to have set aside as unlit for their use that which was offered to them willingly by their own people, and would have hindered the reception of the good tidings of the Kingdom.

To the crowd that selfishly followed Christ the giving of bread as by Moses was the sordid summary of Messianic hope (Joh_6:31). God’s gift of natural food to His people enters into the praises of the Magnificat (Luk_1:53). When Christ called Himself ‘the bread of life’ (Joh_6:35), He could confidently appeal to all the endeared and sacred associations connected in the East with the meaning and use of bread. In the initiation of the Passover, and in its commemoration afterwards, bread was regarded by the Israelites as the most general and effective symbol of their life in Egypt. In the initiation of the new covenant also the same humble article of food was adopted at the Lord’s Supper, to be, with wine, the token of fellowship between Himself and His

Church, and the symbol among His disciples of the Communion of Saints. The use of a symbol so familiar and accessible to all, and so representative of common life, seems to suggest that to the mind of Christ some realized and visible communion among the members of His Church was possible and to be expected.

G. M. Mackie.

☩ Breakfast

BREAKFAST.—Luk 11:38 ((Revised Version margin)). See Dinner and Meals.

☩ Breast

BREAST.—See Bosom.

☩ Breathing

BREATHING.—On the evening of the Resurrection, the Lord appeared to the disciples, gave them the commission ‘As my Father, etc.,’ ‘and when he had said this, he breathed on them (ἐνεφύσησε), and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost (Λάβετε Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον). Whose soever sins ... retained,’ Joh 20:21 f. The word ἐμφυσάω is that employed by LXX Septuagint to translate נָפַח in Gen 2:7, Eze 37:9. As Westcott observes, ‘the same image which was used to describe the communication of the natural life [at the Creation] is here used to express the communication of the new, spiritual life of recreated humanity.’ The figure of human life depending on the breath of God is frequent in the Bible; besides above passages, see Job 12:10; Job 33:4, Psa 33:6, Isa 42:5, Dan 5:23, Act 17:25. In the following the breath of God is synonymous with the manifestation of His power: 2Sa 22:16, Job 37:10; Job 41:21, Isa 11:4. Both ideas seem to underlie our Lord’s action. The Church was now receiving its commission, and the efficacy and reality of the commission must depend upon the indwelling in the Church of the same Spirit as was in Christ Himself. ‘Alike the mission of the Church and its authority to forgive or retain sins are connected with a personal qualification, “Take ye the Holy Ghost” ’ (Edersheim, ii. 644). The work was not new, but was that already received from the Father by the Son and now handed on to that Church which was to be Christ’s body on earth. He had compared

the action of the Spirit to breath (Joh 3:8). ‘By breathing on them He signified that the Holy Ghost was the Spirit not of the Father alone but likewise His own’ (Aug. *St. John*, translation 121).

Considerable difference of opinion exists as to whether the act of breathing, with the authority to retain or forgive sin, was bestowed upon the Apostles only or on others besides. Those who limit it to the Apostles urge that ‘disciples’ is always in the later chapters of St. John used to signify Apostles; and that, even if others were present, the analogy of Mat 28:16 and Mar 16:14-18 implies that the breathing and commission were limited to the Apostles. They would then see in the act a formal ministerial ordination.* [Note: Stanley (*Christ. Inst.* p. 192) states that ‘in the Abyssinian and Alexandrian Church ordination was, and still is, by breathing.’] On the other hand, Westcott and many others, comparing Luk 24:23, see no reason whatever for limiting the act and commission to Apostles. Even of the Eleven we know that Thomas at least was absent (Joh 20:24). The commission was one given to the Christian society as a body: in it in its corporate capacity would dwell the Holy Ghost, and the authority of retaining or forgiving sins.

Literature.—The Commentaries on *St. John*; Westcott, *Revelation of Risen Lord*, p. 81; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 644; Gore, *Christian Ministry*, p. 229; Stanley, *Christian Institutions*, p. 192.

J. B. Bristow.

☩ Brethren Of The Lord

BRETHREN OF THE LORD.—The only three theories about ‘the brethren of the Lord’ which are worthy of serious consideration are those which are called by Lightfoot (1) *the Hieronymian* (from its advocacy by Jerome [Hieronymus]), (2) *the Epiphonian* (from its advocacy by Epiphanius), and (3) *the Helvidian* (from its advocacy by Jerome’s opponent, Helvidius).

According to the Hieronymian view, the ‘brethren’ of Jesus were His first cousins, being sons of the Virgin’s sister, Mary the wife of Clopas. According to the Epiphonian view, they were sons of Joseph by a former wife. According to the Helvidian view, they were sons of Joseph and Mary born after Jesus. All these views claim to be Scriptural, and the Epiphonian claims in addition to be in accordance with the most ancient tradition.

i. Points that are certain.—In discussing a question of such intricacy as the present, it is well to begin by distinguishing what is reasonably certain from what is uncertain. A careful comparison of the relevant Scripture passages renders it certain—

(1) *That the brethren of the Lord, whatever their true relationship to Him was, lived under the same roof with Jesus and His mother, and were regarded as members of the Virgin's family.* The common household is implied in [Joh_7:3](#), and more distinctly still in [Joh_2:12](#), where we read that 'he went down to Capernaum, he, and his mother, and his brethren, and his disciples: and there they abode not many days.' That the brethren were members of the same family as Jesus, and stood in some definite filial relation to Joseph and Mary, is distinctly stated in [Mat_13:55](#) ||, 'Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren, James, and Joseph,* [Note: In Mt. the correct reading seems to be Ἰωσήφ (so WH and RV, with BC., etc.). In [Mar_6:3](#) Ἰωσήτος (BDL, etc.) is certainly right.] and Simon, and Judas? And his sisters, are they not all† [Note: Epiphanius says that there were only two sisters, Mary and Salome, but the τᾶσαι shows that there were three at least. The present passage seems to indicate that they were married, and resided at Nazareth.] with us?' (cf. also [Mat_12:47](#) 'Behold *thy mother and thy brethren* stand without, seeking to speak to thee'). In harmony with this the Gospels represent the brethren of Jesus as habitually going about in company with the Virgin ([Mat_12:46](#) ||).

(2) *That the brethren of Jesus were jealous of Him, and up to the time of the Resurrection disbelieved His claims.* Thus the Gospels represent Jesus as lamenting the unbelief and want of sympathy of His near relatives: 'A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country, and *among his own kin, and in his own house*' ([Mar_6:4](#)); and again, 'My time is not yet come, but your time is always ready. The world cannot hate you, but me it hateth' ([Joh_7:6](#) f.). There are, moreover, the still more definite statements, 'For even his brethren did not believe on him' ([Joh_7:5](#)); and, 'his friends (οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ) went out to lay hold on him, for they said, He is beside himself ([Mar_3:21](#)).

Some attempts have been made to attenuate the force of these passages. Cornelius a Lapide, for instance, commenting on [Joh_7:5](#), says: 'Licet enim viderent eum tot signa et miracula facere, illaque vera esse non dubitarent, tamen dubitabant an ipse esset Messias et Dei Filius: *licet enim hoc verum esse optarent, et ex parte ob tot ejus miracula crederent*—tamen alia ex parte videntes ejus paupertatem et neglectum, dubitabant. Ut ergo certi hac de re fiant, hortantur Christum ire secum in Jerusalem, etc.' But St. John asserts *disbelief* (οὐδὲ ἐτίστειον), not doubt, and implies *jealousy* and *hostility*. Other critics have maintained that *some only* of the brethren

disbelieved. But St. John's language at the very least asserts that *the majority* (that is, three out of the four brethren) disbelieved, and almost certainly implies the disbelief of all.

From this there follows the necessary inference—

(3) *That none of the brethren were numbered among the Twelve Apostles.* This conclusion is confirmed by the manner in which they are distinguished from the Twelve in Act 1:14, '[The eleven] all with one accord continued steadfastly in prayer with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and *with his brethren.*' With this may be compared 1Co 9:5 ('Have we no right to lead about a wife that is a believer, even as the rest of the apostles, *and the brethren of the Lord*, and Cephas?'), which, though less decisive than Act 1:14, because Cephas is first classed among the Twelve and then separately, points in the same direction. It is no sufficient reply to this to say that in Gal 1:19 James is called an Apostle ('But other of the apostles saw I none, save [ἐὶ μὴ] James the Lord's brother'). Granting that this is the case, though it has been denied (e.g. by Grotius, Winer, Bleek; cf. (Revised Version margin)), it may be fairly maintained that St. James is called an Apostle in that wider sense in which the term is applied to St. Paul himself, to St. Barnabas (Act 14:4; Act 14:14, 1Co 9:6), to Andronicus and Junias (Rom 16:7), and perhaps also to Silvanus (1Th 2:6; cf. 1Th 1:1). That James the Lord's brother was one of the Twelve is implied already in the Gospel according to the Hebrews (*circa (about)* a.d. 100),* [Note: This Gospel represents him as present at the Last Supper, and therefore clearly as one of the Twelve.] but the evidence of this dubious source cannot outweigh the strong negative presumption afforded by the canonical writings.† [Note: It is perhaps worth adding that St. James in his Epistle does not claim to be of the Twelve, and that his brother St. Jude seems even to exclude himself from the number of the Apostles (Jud 1:17).]

ii. The Hieronymian View.—With these three points established, we proceed to consider the Hieronymian view that the brethren of Jesus were really His first cousins. Jerome's theory, as stated by himself in his acrimonious but able treatise *adversus Helvidium*, involves the following positions:—

(a) That James the Lord's brother was an Apostle, being identical with James the Less, the son of Alphaeus.

(b) That the mother of James and of the other 'brethren' was 'Mary of Clopas' (Joh 19:25).

(c) That this Mary was the Virgin's sister.

As developed by subsequent writers, the Hieronymian theory affirms in addition—

(d) That Simon the Zealot and Judas ‘not Iscariot’ were also brethren of the Lord.

(e) That Clopas is identical with Alphaeus, and that consequently ‘Mary of Clopas’ is not to be regarded as the daughter of Clopas, but as his wife.‡ [Note: Jerome himself says: ‘Mariam Cleophae Joannes Evangelista cognominat, sive a patre, sive a gentilitate familiae, aut quaquumque alia causa ei nomen imponens’ (xiii.).]

As these two additional points are maintained by all modern followers of Jerome, we shall regard them as integral parts of the Hieronymian theory. Jerome’s theory has already been virtually disproved by the proof (i. 2, 3) that the Lord’s brethren were not Apostles, but its great ingenuity and wide acceptance§ [Note: Jerome’s treatise converted Augustine, who originally held the Epiphonian view, and the united influence of these two great doctors caused the Hieronymian view to prevail exclusively in the West. It is this view which is implied in the Liturgy, which, both in its Roman and in its Anglican form, regards James the Less, Simon Zelotes, and Judas not Iscariot as brethren of Jesus.] render full discussion of it necessary.

A. Arguments for the Hieronymian view.—

(1) James the Lord’s brother must have been of the Twelve, because he is called an Apostle, Gal 1:19. (For a reply to this see i. 2, 3).

(2) James the Lord’s brother must have been of the Twelve, because he exercised great authority among, and even over Apostles. Thus at the Council of Jerusalem he presided and pronounced the decision, although St. Peter himself was present (Act 15:13). St. Paul names him before St. Peter as one of the chief pillars of the Church (Gal 2:9). The Galatian heretics appealed to his authority as superior to that of St. Paul (Gal 2:12), and his importance is further shewn by such passages as Act 12:17; Act 21:18.

Reply.—St. James’ prominent position is admitted, but it can be accounted for without supposing him to have been of the Twelve. For—

(a) His close relationship to Jesus (whatever the relationship was) would have sufficed of itself to gain him great consideration among the first Christians. He probably owed in part at least to this his election to the see of Jerusalem. Relationship to Jesus was clearly the main motive in the appointment of his successor, Symeon the son of Clopas, || [Note: | This Clopas was Joseph’s brother, and is perhaps identical with the Clopas of Joh 19:25. If so, and if (as is supposed by many) ‘Mary of Clopas’ was the

wife of Clopas, and the sister of the Virgin, two brothers (Joseph and Clopas) must have married two sisters (the Virgin Mary and Mary of Clopas). For reasons to be presently given, we regard this combination as improbable.] who was a cousin of Jesus (Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 11). Hegesippus speaks of the relations of Jesus as 'ruling the churches' as such. Even as late as the reign of Domitian they were sufficiently important to incur the jealousy of the tyrant (*l.c.* iii. 20).

(b) James the Lord's brother possessed personal qualities which fully account for his elevation. Even the Jews, according to Hegesippus, revered him for his piety, his unceasing prayers, his life-long Nazirite vow, and above all for his justice (*l.c.* ii. 23). Josephus mentions the indignation which his execution excited among the Jews (*Ant.* xx. ix. 1), and in a passage not now extant ascribes the sufferings endured by the Jews during the siege of Jerusalem to Divine vengeance for his murder (Origen, *circa* (*about*) *Celsum*, i. 47).

(3) James the Lord's brother must have been of the Twelve, because there were only two prominent Jameses in the Church, as the expression 'James the Less' (Mar 15:40) indicates. He was therefore either James the Great, son of Zebedee, or James the Less, son of Alphaeus. But he was not the former, who was martyred as early as a.d. 44 (Act 12:2). Therefore he was the latter, the son of Alphaeus.

Reply.—Jerome and his followers have been misled by the Latin translation *Jacobus minor*, 'James the Less.' The Greek is, Ἰάκωβος ὁ μικρός, 'James the Little,' the allusion being to his short stature.

(4) The names of James, Simon, and Jude occur together, and in the same division, in all the Apostolic lists. This suggests—(a) that they were brothers, and (b) that they are identical with our Lord's brethren of the same name (see Mat 10:2 ff., Mar 3:16 ff., Luk 6:14 ff., Act 1:13).

Reply.—It has already been conclusively proved that our Lord's brethren were not Apostles (see i. 2, 3); but, waiving this point, we answer: (1) The occurrence of the three names together in the list of Apostles is no proof of fraternal relationship. (2) There is definite proof that the three were *not* brothers. For had they been so, it would naturally have been mentioned in some at least of the Gospels, as it is in the cases of the brothers Peter and Andrew, James and John. Moreover, the father of James is *Alphaeus*, but the father of Jude is a certain *James*, of whom nothing definite is known. It is true that some propose to translate Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου (Luk 6:16, Act 1:13) 'Jude the *brother* of James,' but so unusual, and probably unexampled, a meaning would require at least to be indicated by the context. We conclude, therefore, that James was certainly not the brother of Jude, and there is

no evidence that he was the brother of Simon. If he was the brother of any Apostle, it was of Matthew (Levi), whose father was also called Alphaeus (Mar 2:14). But even this, in the absence of any evidence of the identity of the two Alphaeuses, must be pronounced doubtful.

Equally evident is it that these three Apostles were not brethren of Jesus. The coincidence of three such common names as James, Simon, and Jude in the list of brethren and in the list of Apostles proves nothing. So common are the names that they are duplicated in the Apostolic list itself. If it could be shown that James, Simon, and Jude, Apostles, were also *brothers*, the coincidence would be worth considering; but since they were not, the coincidence is without significance. The very way in which these three Apostles are designated shows that they were not brethren of Jesus. It was necessary to distinguish them from three other Apostles of the same name, and yet they are not once called, for distinction, 'the Lord's brethren.' James is called 'of Alphaeus,' perhaps also 'the Little'; Simon is called the Cananaean,' and 'the Zealot'; Jude receives no less than four distinguishing titles, 'not Iscariot,' 'of James,' 'Thaddaeus,' and 'Lebbaeus' (Mat 10:3, Western Text). How strange, if he really was the Lord's brother, that he is not once so described!

(5) The last argument consists of three distinct steps. (a) James, the son of Alphaeus, the Apostle, is identical with 'James the Little' of Mar 15:40 = Mat 27:56. But this James the Little had a brother Joses, clearly a well-known character, and therefore (since no other Joses is mentioned in the Gospels) the same as *Joses the brother of Jesus* (Mar 6:3; and Mat 13:53, where the authorities are divided between the forms Joses and Joseph). (b) The mother of this James is called by the Synoptists Mary, and she is further described in Joh 19:25 as 'Mary of Clopas' (Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ). This might mean 'Mary daughter of Clopas,' but since Clopas and Alphaeus are the same word, both being transliterations of the Aramaic (ܟܠܦܝܬ) (ܟܠܦܝܬ), the correct translation is 'Mary wife of Clopas.' (c) This Mary, wife of Clopas, is said by St. John to have been the Virgin's sister. Accordingly James and Joses (and consequently also Simon and Jude), the Lord's 'brethren,' were really His cousins on His mother's side.

Reply.—This argument is ingenious rather than strong. For (a) the identification of James the Little (Mar 15:40) with the son of Alphaeus, though generally accepted and not improbable, is only a guess. Indeed it may be argued that since St. Mark in his Gospel gives no hint that the son of Alphaeus was called 'the Little,' he must mean by 'James the Little' another person. But conceding the identity (which, however, whether true or not, is too precarious to bear the weight of an important argument), we still cannot concede the identity of Joses, the brother of this James, with Joses the brother of Jesus. The identity of James of Alphaeus with James the Little may be conceded, because, though it is weakly attested, nothing of weight can be urged

against it. But if this Joses, the brother of James, was also the brother of Jesus, then three of our Lord's brethren were Apostles, a conclusion which is negated by an overwhelming weight of evidence (see i. 2, 3). In such a case the mere coincidence of a name (and Joses or Joseph is, as Lightfoot shews, a particularly common name) is of no weight at all. (b) Jerome's assumption that 'Mary the mother of James and Joses' (Mt., Mk.) is identical with 'Mary of Clopas' is probably, though not certainly, correct. But there is no ground for supposing, as Jerome's supporters do, that this Mary was the *wife* of Clopas. There being no indication in the context to the contrary, the natural translation of *Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ* is 'Mary the *daughter* of Clopas.'* [Note: So Jerome himself understood it. The Vulg. *Maria Cleophae* preserves the ambiguity of the Greek.] It is maintained, indeed, that since she was the mother of James the Little (who was an Apostle), her husband must have been Alphaeus, *i.e.* *Clopas*. But it is doubtful if James the Little really was an Apostle, and it is still more doubtful if Alphaeus is the same person as Clopas. *Κλωπᾶς*, or, as it should probably be accented, *Κλώπας*, is a purely Greek name, being contracted from *Κλεόπατρος* (cf. *Ἀντίπας*, from *Ἀντίπατρος*). *Ἀλφαῖος* (*Ἀλφαῖος*, WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.]), on the other hand, is the Aramaic *ܚܠܦܝ* (*Halpai*), the initial guttural being, as is frequently the case, omitted. The names are therefore linguistically distinct. It is true that if there were strong independent reasons for identifying Alphaeus and Clopas, the linguistic difficulties might possibly be surmounted, but there are no such reasons, or at least none are alleged.

Against the identification of *Κλώπας* and Alphaeus it may be urged: (1) That inasmuch as initial sh'va is almost invariably represented by a full vowel in Greek (*ܫܠܘܡ* = *Σαλομῶν*; *ܫܒܘܬ* = *σαβῶθ*; etc.), there is a presumption against a word like Clopas, which begins with two consonants, representing a Semitic name. (2) Although π is occasionally transliterated κ in the middle or at the end of a word, this never, or hardly ever, happens at the beginning. (3) *ܚܠܦܝ* (*ܚܠܦܝ*) is transliterated quite regularly *Χαλφι*; in 1Ma_11:70. (4) The ω of *Κλώπας* cannot be derived from *ܚܠܦܝ*. The nearest Semitic equivalent of *Κλώπας* would be some such form as *ܚܠܦܝܩܐ*. (5) The Semitic versions uniformly regard *Ἀλφαῖος* as a Semitic word, but *Κλώπας* as Greek, transliterating the κ by ρ.

(c) There is more plausibility about Jerome's contention that Mary of Clopas is described in Joh_19:25 as the Virgin's sister. The words are ἰσθήκεισαν δὲ παρὰ τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἡ μητὴρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ ἀδελφὴ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ, Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, καὶ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ. It must be candidly admitted that the *prima facie* impression which this passage makes upon the mind is that only three women are mentioned, and that the Virgin's sister is Mary of Clopas. There are, however, important considerations on the other side. (1) When persons or things are enumerated in pairs (cf. the list of Apostles, Mat_10:2-4), the copula is not inserted between the pairs. If, therefore, St. John in this passage designs to speak of *two pairs of women*, καὶ is correctly omitted before Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ. (2) The Synoptic parallels show that *Salome, the mother of James and John*, was present at the Crucifixion, and since it is unlikely that St. John would omit to mention the presence of his own mother, ἡ ἀδελφὴ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ is probably not Mary of Clopas, but Salome. The suppression of her name is quite in the style of the Evangelist, who is very reticent in personal matters, and never even names himself. (3) If Mary of Clopas was sister to the Virgin, then two sisters had the same name, a circumstance most improbable, unless they were only step-sisters. The point is undoubtedly a difficult one, and different opinions will continue to be held about it, but fortunately its decision does not affect the main point of our inquiry, because, whether Mary of Clopas was the Virgin's sister or not, *there is no reason for supposing that she was the mother of the brethren of Jesus*.

B. *Objections to the Hieronymian view.*—

The Hieronymian view is to be rejected, partly because the arguments in its favour, though ingenious, are inconclusive and often far-fetched; partly because no trace of it is to be found before the time of Jerome, who apparently invented it;* [Note: Papias of Hierapolis (a.d. 120) used to be quoted on Jerome's side, but Lightfoot has shown that the Papias in question lived in the 11th century, Hegesippus (a.d. 160) and Clement of Alexandria (a.d. 200) have been wrongly claimed on the same side. In reality they support the Epiphonian view.] partly because it 'is obviously an attempt of an ardent champion of celibacy to maintain the perpetual virginity not only of Mary, but of *Joseph*;[†] [Note: Jerome indeed admits this: 'Tu dicis (he is addressing Helvidius) Mariam virginem non permansisse: ego mihi plus vendico, etiam ipsum Joseph virginem fuisse per Mariam, ut ex virginali conjugio virgo filius nasceretur' (adv. Helv. xix.).] partly because it involves an unnatural use of the term 'brethren';[‡] [Note: It is true, as Jerome warmly urges (adv. Helvidium, xiv., xv.), that the OT usage of 'brother' is somewhat wide. In 1Ch_23:21-22 first cousins are

called brethren (ܩܚܝܢܐ = ἀδελφοὶ αὐτῶν, LXX): in Lev 10:4, first cousins once removed (ܩܚܝܢܐ : = τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ὑμῶν, LXX). So also in Gen 14:14; Gen 14:16 Abraham's nephew is called his brother (ܩܚܝܢܐ); and in Gen 29:15 Jacob is called Laban's brother. It cannot therefore be pronounced that our Lord's cousins might occasionally be alluded to as His brethren, especially if it be true, as is generally alleged, that there is no word in Aramaic for cousin. At the same time it should be remembered that all Jerome's examples of an extended use of 'brother' are taken from the OT; that the usage of ἀδελφός is much less elastic than that of ܩܚܝܢܐ ; that no instances of ἀδελφός = ἀνεψιός are cited from profane writers; and that even the OT does not sanction the use of ܩܚܝܢܐ to describe any other relationship than that of brother. The term ἀνεψιός is not avoided in the NT (see Col 4:10), and Hegesippus (a.d. 160), in discussing the subject of our Lord's human relationships, keeps the two terms distinct, calling Symeon, the second bishop of Jerusalem, and our Lord's , ἀνεψιός; but James, the first bishop of Jerusalem, always ἀδελφός. Clearly, therefore, Hegesippus did not regard ἀδελφός τοῦ Κυρίου as equivalent to ἀνεψιός, and he is our oldest and best authority.] but chiefly because it is inconsistent with the three certainties, which, as we have shown, a true theory must necessarily presuppose, namely, the common household, the unbelief of the brethren, and their non-inclusion among the Twelve. Jerome's theory is inconsistent not only with the last two of these certainties, but even with the first, for though his supporters allege that the two sisters were both widows and kept house together, this does not explain the fact that the brethren of Jesus are regarded in Scripture as belonging to the *Virgin's* family, and are continually represented as being in her company, and never in the company of their alleged mother, Mary of Clopas.* [Note: In every passage of Scripture where the brethren are mentioned, except Joh 7:3, it is expressly said that they were in the Virgin's company.]

iii. The Helvidian and Epiphonian Views.—The rejection of the Hieronymian view leaves the choice open between the Helvidian and the Epiphonian views, both of which have the immense advantage over the Hieronymian of not being inconsistent with the three certainties laid down in i. 1, 2, 3.

A. *Arguments for the Helvidian view.*† [Note: The whole of these arguments were advanced by Helvidius himself, and the substance of most of the replies is to be found in Jerome.] —

(1) The Helvidian view, which maintains that the brethren of Jesus were sons of Joseph *and* Mary, gives a fuller and more natural meaning to the term ἀδελφοί than the Epiphonian, which denies that they were blood-relations of Jesus at all.

Reply.—The advantage of the Helvidian view in this respect is but slight. Joseph was not a blood-relation of Jesus, and yet he is called, not only by friends and acquaintances (Mat 13:55 = Mar 6:3, cf. also Joh 1:46; Joh 6:42), but also by the Virgin herself (Luk 2:48), and by an Evangelist who lays great stress upon the supernatural birth (Luk 2:41), the *father* of Jesus. Since, therefore, even in the Holy Family Joseph was called the father of Jesus, it is certain that if he had had sons, they would have been called the brethren of Jesus.

(2) In Luk 2:7 Jesus is called Mary's *first-born son* (πρωτότοκον). This implies that she had other children.

Reply.—πρωτότοκος among the Jews was a technical term, meaning 'that which openeth the womb' (Exo 34:19 ff.), and does not imply the birth of other offspring. Indeed, the redemption-price of a first-born son, required by the Mosaic law, was due at the end of a month (Num 8:15 ff.), before it could be known whether there was any likelihood of further offspring. Dr. Mayor objects that in a purely historical passage, like Luk 2:7, this technical meaning is not to be thought of; but the subsequent statement 'they brought him up to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord, as it is written in the law of the Lord, *Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord*' (Luk 2:22-23), renders it certain that it was precisely this which was in the Evangelist's mind when he called Jesus πρωτότοκον (so already Jerome, *l.c.* x.).

(3) Mat 1:18, 'before they came together' (πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν), implies that the connubial relations of Joseph and Mary were of the ordinary kind.

Reply.—συνελθεῖν need not mean more than living together in the same house.

(4) Mat 1:25, 'and knew her not till she had brought forth a son' (καὶ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκεν αὐτήν ἕως οὗ ἔτεκεν υἱόν), † [Note: The πρωτότοκον of the TR here is certainly an interpolation from Luk 2:7.] implies that he knew her afterwards, especially as the Evangelist mentions brothers and sisters of Jesus, without any warning that they were not Mary's children.

Reply.—This is an argument of real weight, and is not adequately answered by Jerome, Cornelius a Lapide, Pearson, etc., who allege such passages as Mat 28:20, ‘Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world,’ and 2Sa 6:23, ‘Michal the daughter of Saul had no child until the day of her death,’ as a proof that ‘until’ does not fix a limit or suggest a subsequent change. It is quite true that in such passages as those quoted, *where the circumstances of the case preclude the idea of change*, ‘until’ does not imply change. But ‘until’ does imply change when it introduces a state of things in which change is naturally to be expected. Thus, as Dr. Mayor justly remarks, if 2Sa 6:23 be made to read ‘Michal the daughter of Saul had no child, *until she left David and became the wife of Phaltiel*,’ then ‘until’ *does* imply that she had a child afterwards, because child-bearing is a natural and usual sequel of marriage. So in the present case it may be fairly argued that inasmuch as connubial intercourse is the natural accompaniment of marriage, the Evangelist in asserting that it did not take place *until* a certain date, affirms that it took place afterwards. Still the argument, as applied to this particular case, is not convincing. The Evangelist is not (even by implication) comparing together the connubial relations of Joseph and Mary before and after the birth of Jesus (as, in the case supposed by Dr. Mayor, Michal’s connubial relations with David and Phaltiel are compared), but simply affirming in the strongest possible way that Joseph had no share in the procreation of Jesus. Bengel’s laconic comment is therefore, upon the whole, justified—‘*donee*] Non sequitur, ergo *post*.’ The subsequent mention of the brethren of Jesus (Mat 13:55) does not affect the question, because it was well known, when the Evangelist wrote, who the brethren were, and there was no need to guard against misconception.

(5) The fact that the brethren not only lived in the same house with the Virgin, but continually accompanied her wherever she went, is an indication that they were her children as well as Joseph’s.

Reply.—The tie which unites a step-mother and her step-sons is often extremely close, and considering that Joseph was almost certainly dead before our Lord’s ministry began, and that Jesus was fully occupied with public affairs, it cannot be regarded as surprising that her step-sons (if such they were) constituted themselves her guardians and protectors.

B. *Arguments for the Epiphonian view.*—

We shall now state the arguments for the theory of Epiphanius, and subject them to criticism from the Helvidian point of view.

(1) *The Perpetual Virginity* of Mary is implied in the narrative of the Annunciation (Luk 1:26-38). The angel Gabriel appeared to Mary, and after saluting her as ‘highly-favoured’ announced the manner of Christ’s birth as follows: ‘Behold, thou

shalt conceive in the womb, and shalt bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus.’ The reply of Mary was, ‘How shall this be, seeing that I know not a man?’ (Πῶς ἔσται τοῦτο, ἐπεὶ ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω;). It is plain from this reply (1) that she understood the angel to mean that the child would be born in the natural way; and (2) that there was some obstacle which prevented her from having a child in the natural way (‘I know not a man,’ ‘ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω’). These words cannot mean, ‘I do not yet know a man.’ That would have been no obstacle to the fulfilment of the promise. The angel’s words related to *the future* (Luk_1:31), and inasmuch as Mary was already betrothed (Luk_1:27), and might shortly expect to be taken into her husband’s house, there was every prospect, so far as Mary’s *status* went, that the angel’s words would shortly be fulfilled. The only meaning, therefore, which in such a context Mary’s words can bear, is that she had devoted herself (with her betrothed’s consent) to a life of virginity, and that she expected to preserve, even in marriage, her virginal integrity (so nearly all the older expositors, including Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory of Nyssa, Theophylact, Bernard, Bede, Anselm, Aquinas, Cornelius a Lapide, Maldonatus, Grotius; and in more recent times Bisping, Schegg, Schanz).* [Note: This important passage is not alluded to by Mayor and Lightfoot, and is very inadequately dealt with by most recent commentators. B. Weiss (Com. in loc.) says that it is ‘a bewildered question how she, the unstained maiden, can possibly come into this position.’ Considering that she was already betrothed, no such bewilderment was possible. If the angel had said that she would have a son before marriage, such bewilderment would have been natural enough, for the concubitus of betrothed persons, though not exactly forbidden, was not approved. But the angel had not hinted at this. Dr. Plummer reproduces Weiss. Godet simply says: ‘Her question is the legitimate expression of the astonishment of a pure conscience.’ Schmiedel (Encyc. Bibl. iii. 2956) regards the words as an interpolation. Only Schanz (Com. in loc.) gives anything like an adequate discussion of the passage. Of the older expositors Cornelius a Lapide and Maldonatus are full, but uncritical.]

Reply.—Such a vow or resolution is improbable in Mary’s case, because the Jews regarded virginity as less honourable than marriage, and childlessness as a calamity. Moreover, it is improbable that, if she had formed such a resolution, Joseph would have consented to be betrothed to her.

These objections are undeniably weighty, but they do not fully meet the strong exegetical argument for the traditional view. Moreover, it must be remembered (1) that the case in question is a unique and peculiar one, and that it is doubtful how far the canons of ordinary probability ought to be applied to it; (2) that esteem for virginity among contemporary Jews is vouched for (though only to a limited extent) by the writings of Philo, and the existence of the sect of the Essenes; (3) that a high

esteem for virginity characterized the Christian movement from the first (Act 21:9, 1 Corinthians 7), and formed part of the teaching of Christ (Mat 19:12); and consequently it is not incredible that Joseph and Mary, by whom Jesus was brought up, shared the sentiment, and communicated it to Him.

(2) Virginity is regarded, not only by Christians, but by nearly all men, as, *ideally* at any rate, superior to marriage. It is therefore probable that the most privileged and holiest of women remained ever a virgin, as has been believed by most Christians from the first.† [Note: The early Christians, however, while believing the Perpetual Virginity as a fact, did not regard it as an article of faith. As late as c. a.d. 370, St. Basil could write: ‘The words, He knew her not till she brought forth her first-born son, do indeed afford a certain ground for thinking that Mary, after acting in all sanctity as the instrument of the Lord’s birth, which was brought about by the Holy Ghost, did not refuse to her husband the customary privileges of marriage. But as for ourselves, even though this view does no violence to rational piety (εἰ καὶ μηδὲν τῷ τῆς εὐσεβείας παραλυμαίνεται λόγῳ), for her virginity was necessary until she had fulfilled her function in connexion with the economy, whereas what happened afterwards concerns us little as not being connected with the mystery, yet since lovers of Christ cannot bear to hear that the Mother of God ever ceased to be a virgin, we regard the testimonies (to her perpetual virginity) which we have produced as sufficient’ (Hom. in. Sanct. Christ. Gen. ii.).]

Reply.—This argument has weight, but is not conclusive. For (1) though *ideally* virginity is superior to marriage, being the condition of the holy angels and of the saints in heaven (Mat 22:30), yet *practically* marriage is in most cases to be preferred to celibacy, as a more useful means of serving God. And since the estate of marriage is altogether holy, and is a religious mystery or sacrament, symbolizing the union between Christ and His Church (Eph 5:32), it is consistent with the *highest reverence* towards our Lord’s mother to believe that after the birth of Jesus she bore children to her husband.* [Note: Quite unjust, therefore, is the customary Hieronymian abuse of Helvidius as ‘spurcus haeresiarcha,’ and the characterization of his theory as ‘blasphemia.’ Those who use such language virtually deny the sanctity of marriage. Helvidius’ theory is perfectly reverent. Whether it is true or not is another question.]

(3) Reverence for Mary as ‘Mother of God’ would have prevented Joseph from cohabiting with her as her husband.

Reply.—If we could be sure that Joseph and Mary regarded the infant Jesus as *God*, this argument would have great weight; but it is just this point which is doubtful. The angel described the infant as *the Messiah*, and *the Son of God*, but neither of these

terms involved necessarily to Jewish ears the idea of *Divinity*. The term *Son of God* is used in the OT even of the Davidic king.

(4) The brethren of Jesus behave to Him as if they were elder brothers. Thus they are jealous of His popularity (Mar_6:4), criticize and advise Him in no friendly spirit (Joh_7:1 ff.), attempt to control His actions, and even to place Him under restraint (Mar_3:20 f., cf. Mar_3:31 | |). But if they were older than Jesus, they were not Mary's children.

Reply.—It cannot be denied that their actions seem like those of elder brethren, but it is possible that they were only *slightly younger* than Jesus, and if so their conduct is perhaps intelligible.

(5) Jesus upon the Cross commended His mother not to His 'brethren,' but to St. John (Joh_19:26-27). He would have been very unlikely to do this, if His 'brethren' had really been the Virgin's sons.

Reply.—(a) The cause of this arrangement may have been the great poverty of the brethren of Jesus, and the comparative affluence of St. John, who, after all, was a near relation of Jesus (a first cousin). This is, of course, possible; but there is nothing to indicate that the brethren of Jesus were specially poor. They were living with St. Mary, and their united earnings would, under ordinary circumstances, have sufficed to maintain a single household in comfort. (b) Some allege as a cause the unbelief of the brethren. But this is unlikely, because Jesus must have known that within a few days their unbelief would pass into faith.

(6) The most ancient ecclesiastical tradition, especially that of Palestine, favours the Epiphanian view. The testimony of Hegesippus, a native of Palestine, and a man of learning, who wrote about a.d. 160, is definitely against the Hieronymian, and (as is almost certain) in favour of the Epiphanian view. His works are lost, but in the fragments which remain, he consistently speaks of the first Bishop of Jerusalem (James) as the Lord's brother; but of the second (Symeon) as His cousin (ἀνεψιός, which he more exactly defines as ὁ ἐκ θείου τοῦ Κυρίου, the θεῖος being Κλώπας, the brother of Joseph).† [Note: It is possible, but not capable of proof, that this Clopas, the brother of Joseph, and the father of Symeon (not Symeon the Lord's brother), is identical with the Κλώπας of Joh_19:25, or the Κλεότα; of Luk_24:18. Κλωτάς (Κλώτας) and Κλεότα; are etymologically the same word, both being contractions of Κλεόπατρος.] Clearly, therefore, Hegesippus did not regard the brethren of Jesus as His cousins. That he did not regard them as sons of Mary, is shown by his description of

Jude, the Lord's brother, as τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα λεγομένου αὐτοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, and by the fact that Eusebius and Epiphanius, who draw their information mainly from him, regard the brethren as children of Joseph by a former wife.‡ [Note: The statements of Hegesippus about our Lord's brethren are noted by Eusebius, HE ii. 23, iii. 20, iii. 32, iv. 22.] This view is taken by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose, Ambrosiaster, Gregory of Nyssa; in fact, so far as we know, by all the Fathers before Jerome, with the exception of Tertullian, who probably, though his statements are not explicit, held the view of Helvidius. Since Jerome the Western Church has adopted the Hieronymian theory, but the Eastern Church still maintains that of Epiphanius. The traditional evidence, therefore, is almost entirely on the side of the Epiphanian view.

Reply.—It is possible that the Apocryphal Gospels, especially the Gospel of Peter and the Protevangelium of James, and not any authentic tradition, are the source of the Epiphanian theory. This is Jerome's view, who taunts Epiphanius with following 'deliramenta apocryphorum.' This, however, is not likely. The statements of the best informed Fathers seem based on Hegesippus, who made an independent investigation, under specially favourable conditions. The Apocryphal Gospels probably adopted, rather than originated, the current view.

C. The main objection to the Epiphanian view.—There is one objection to the Epiphanian view so important that it deserves special notice. It is well known that a high—an even extravagant—estimate of virginity prevailed extensively in the early Church; and therefore there is some reason to suspect that, just as, at the close of the 4th cent., zeal for the virginity of Joseph produced the Hieronymian theory, so, three centuries earlier, zeal for the virginity of Mary produced the Epiphanian. That this may have been so, no cautious critic will deny; but it does not, upon the evidence, appear to be probable. For (1) if Mary bore to Joseph, as the Helvidian theory assumes, seven children, of whom one was Bishop of Jerusalem, and three others prominent members of the Church, the non-virginity of Mary after the birth of Jesus must have been so notorious a fact in the Apostolic Church, that the (practically) unanimous tradition of her perpetual virginity could never have arisen. (2) The tradition of the Perpetual Virginity was already prevalent early in the 2nd cent., that is, long before ascetic views were dominant or even aggressive in the Church. It prevailed, moreover, in Palestine, where, there is reason to believe, ascetic views had less influence than elsewhere. For these reasons we are inclined to think that the Epiphanian tradition has a real historical basis.

iv. Probable Conclusions.—The scantiness and ambiguity of the only really trustworthy evidence, the Scriptural, obliges us to be content with merely probable conclusions. The only conclusion that seems to be certain is that Jerome's theory is false. The

claims of the two other theories are nearly evenly balanced; nevertheless, it appears to us, after weighing the opposing arguments to the best of our power, that there is a slight but perceptible preponderance of Scriptural, and a much more decided preponderance of historical, evidence in favour of the Epiphonian theory.

Literature.—Jerome, *adversus Helvidium*; Epiphanius, *adversus Antidicomarianitas* (*adversus Haereses*, iii. 2) (both important); Pearson, *On the Creed*; Mill, *Accounts of our Lord's Brethren vindicated*; Schegg, *Jakobus, der Bruder des Herrn*; Schanz, *Comment, über Mt., Mc., Lc.*; Meyrick, art. 'James' in Smith's *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] ; Sieffert, art. 'Jakobus,' and Zockler, art. 'Maria' in *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyclopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, pp. 252-291; Mayor, *Epistle of St. James* (v. ff.) and art. 'Brethren of the Lord' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ; art. 'Clopas' in *Encyc. Bibl.*; Farrar, *Early Days of Christianity*, ch. xix.; Patrick, *James the Lord's Brother*, 1906, p. 4 ff.

C. Harris.

☞Bride, Bride-Chamber, Bridegroom, Bridegroom's Friend

BRIDE, BRIDE-CHAMBER, BRIDEGROOM, BRIDEGROOM'S FRIEND.—See Marriage.

☞Brimstone

BRIMSTONE (burning stone or sulphur [θεῖον, commonly derived from θεῖος, 'divine,' either because sulphur was used for religious purification, or because lightning—the bolt of the gods—emits a sulphurous odour: others connect it with θύω, 'agitate,' cf. *fumus*, 'smoke']).—Its use in Scripture in the imagery of Divine judgment is founded on the story of the destruction of Sodom and the cities of the Plain (Gen 19:24-28), a catastrophe to which the Gospels frequently refer (Luk 17:29; Luk 10:12, Mar 6:11, Mat 10:15; Mat 11:23-24). The story of this tragedy of Divine judgment casts its lurid light all down Scripture history, and has coloured Christian belief in its presentation of the Divine wrath. The imagery of 'fire and brimstone' appears in the prophets and the Psalms as an impressive metaphor of heaven's most pitiless judgment, while the story itself is often recalled both in the OT and in the NT. In the Book of Revelation it is a notable feature in the description of the Apocalyptic riders (Rev 9:17-18), that their breastplates are of fire and brimstone, and from the mouths of their horses

proceed the same dread emblems of wrath; while no more impressive figure can be found to describe the final doom of the wicked in the end of the ages than that they shall be cast into the ‘lake of fire and brimstone,’ there to be ‘tormented day and night for ever and ever’ (Rev 19:20; Rev 20:10; Rev 21:8).

J. Dick Fleming.

☞ Brook

BROOK (Joh 18:1; (Revised Version margin) ‘*ravine, Gr. winter torrent,*’ χειμαρρος) is the usual LXX Septuagint equivalent of נַחַל, and seems to correspond in meaning with the Arab. [Note: Arabic.] *wâdy* = ‘valley,’ but, more particularly, the watercourse in the bottom of the valley. The winter rains, rushing down from the mountain range, have hollowed out great channels westward, towards the Mediterranean. Much deeper are the gullies eastward, where the descent is steeper, towards the Jordan. Most of these are quite dry during the greater part of the year. Although some are called ‘rivers,’ e.g. *Nahr el-‘Aujeh*, in the Plain of Sharon, and the Kishon, while others, such as *el-‘Amûd*, which crosses the Plain of Gennesaret, and *el-Yarmuk*, which comes down from the eastern uplands, draw abundant supplies from perennial springs, yet ‘brook’ more accurately describes them.

The **Kidron** contains water only after heavy rains. It is the one ‘brook’ mentioned in the Gospels. Over it Jesus passed from the upper room to Gethsemane on the night of His betrayal.

The name קִדְרוֹן, from קָדַר, is usually referred to the dark colour of the stream or ravine. The various forms of the name in Gr. are τοῦ κέδρου, τοῦ κεδρών, and τῶν κεδρών. WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort’s text.] in ‘Notes on Select Readings,’ after reviewing the evidence, conclude in favour of τῶν κέδρων. ‘It probably preserves the true etymology of קִדְרוֹן, which seems to be an archaic (? Canaanite) plural of קָדַר “the Dark [trees]”’; for, though no name from this root is applied to any tree in Bib. Heb., some tree resembling a cedar was called by a similar name in at least the later language (see exx. in Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* 1976); and the Gr. *ΚΕΔΡΟ* is probably of Phœnician origin.’ They suggest that isolated patches of cedar forests may have survived from prehistoric times. Lightfoot quotes (Chorag. Cent. 40) a Talmudic reference to two gigantic cedars standing on the Mt. of Olives even in the latest days

of the Temple (Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] *Taanith*, fol. 69. i), which may be taken as supporting this view.

The valley begins in the wide hollow between the city and Mt. Scopus on the north. Turning southward, and passing under the eastern battlements, by a deep ravine it cuts off Jerusalem from Olivet. It is joined by the Valley of Hinnom, and thence, as *Wady en-Nâr*, 'Valley of Fire,' it winds down an ever deepening gorge, through the Wilderness of Judaea, to the edge of the Dead Sea. The name *Wady er-Râhib*, 'Valley of the Monks,' attaching to part of it, comes from the convent of Mar Saba, built on the right-hand face of the gorge, a sort of reformatory for refractory monks, in the midst of the wilderness.

The modern name of the brook Kidron is *Wady Sitti Maryam*, 'Valley of the Lady Mary.' As early as Eusebius and Jerome it was known as the Valley of Jehoshaphat, Joe 3:2 [Heb 4:2]. According to a tradition, common to Jews, Moslems, and Christians, this is to be the scene of the final Judgment. As against the Temple, which overlooked it, the valley ranked as an unclean district, and it seems to have afforded burying-ground for people of the humbler orders (2Ki 23:6). To this day the Jews greatly covet a grave in the Kidron valley.

W. Ewing.

☩ Brotherhood

BROTHERHOOD.—The word (ἀδελφότης) does not occur at all in the Gospels, and is found only twice in the NT (1Pe 2:17; 1Pe 5:9). The idea, however, is common and of very great importance.

1. *The natural brotherhood of man* is assumed rather than asserted. It probably underlies Christ's argument about the Sabbath (Mar 2:27 and parallels), and also such language as is found in Luk 15:11-32; Luk 16:25. This is the more likely in view of such OT passages as Gen 1:26-28; Gen 9:5-7, Job 31:13-15, and Mal 2:10 (which regard it as a corollary of our creation by the one God and Father), and Lev 19:18; Lev 19:34 (which not only commands love of neighbour, but also explicitly enjoins like love for the stranger). Hillel and other Rabbis gave this law the broadest interpretation, and Philo declares that man must love the whole world as well as God (see Kohler, *Jewish Encyc.* art. 'Brotherly Love,' and Montefiore in the *JQR* [Note: *QR Jewish Quarterly Review.*] , April 1895). This, however, does not represent the dominant feeling among the Jews in our Lord's time. They narrowed the term

'neighbour,' as His language in Mat 5:44 plainly implies. It was the scribe's suggestion of this narrow view that drew from Jesus the parable of the Good Samaritan, in which the term 'neighbour' is made the equivalent of brother-man (Luk 10:22 ff.).

Into this brotherhood Christ entered when He 'became flesh.' That at least is implied in the title 'Son of Man' which He so frequently applies to Himself. He was 'the seed of the woman.' The Son of Mary, of David, of Abraham, was also Son of Adam (Luk 3:38) and one of the race.

Yet of natural brotherhood the NT has surprisingly little to say. Very little importance is attached to it. No hopes are built on it. The reason, doubtless, is that it had been destroyed by sin—a melancholy fact visible in the threshold tragedy of Cain and Abel. Such is St. Paul's summary of OT teaching (Rom 3:9-18). So Jesus found it when He was in the world. Men were dead to brotherhood as to all else that was wholly good (Joh 6:53, cf. Eph 2:1). For thirty years He moved among men with a true Brother's heart, but met no equal response, even among those peculiarly His own (Joh 1:10-11). 'Of the peoples there was no man with him' (Isa 63:3). He was sorrowfully alone (Isa 53:3), standing among sinful men like one unharmed temple amid a city's ruins.

2. *The new brotherhood.*—Under these circumstances nothing short of a new beginning would serve. Anything less radical must fail. A new creation is necessary (Gal 6:15). This Jesus states explicitly. Men must be born again (Joh 3:5; cf. Eph 2:5). They must be redeemed from sin and given a new life. This was His appointed mission (Mat 1:22, Joh 10:10). To that work He formally dedicated Himself in His baptism, which also symbolized the means by which the redemption should be effected, namely, His own death (with Mat 3:15, cf. Mat 20:28; Mat 26:28 and Rom 3:24-26, 1Co 15:3, Eph 1:7; 1Pe 1:18-19, Rev 1:5). Tempted to swerve from it, He held to that stern, slow path. Meantime He begins to gather about Him a band of brothers on the new basis. They are such as believe or receive Him. In faith they follow Him and forsake all else (Mar 1:18; Mar 1:20; Mar 10:28, Luk 14:33). That it is no mere external following is manifest. A vital union is established between them and Him, the significance of which is indicated by the figure of the vine and the branches (Joh 15:1-8). The new birth is effected (Joh 1:12; Joh 1:15), the new life received (Joh 6:57; Joh 10:27-28), and their sins graciously forgiven (Mar 2:5-11, Luk 7:47-48; cf. Col 1:14). Thus they become partakers of the Divine nature (2Pe 1:4), children or sons of God τέκνα, υἱοί, 1Jn 3:16, Rom 8:14; Rom 8:16; Rom 8:21, Gal 3:26; Gal 4:7), endowed with a deathless life (Gal 3:26, Joh 10:28), and Christ becomes the firstborn among many brethren (Rom 8:29). Elsewhere the change is called a new creation (2Co 5:17, Gal 6:15, Eph 2:10), of which Christ is the beginning (Rev 3:14, Col 1:18).

It is this profound experience which underlies and accounts for the remarkable statements of Joh 1:35-51. St. Peter's new name is a sign of it (Joh 1:42); the 'Israelite indeed in whom is no guile' is a condensed description of the new man (Joh 1:47; cf. Psa 32:2, the first half of which is the germ of Rom 3:21 to Rom 5:21, and the second of Rom 6:1 to Rom 8:39). These men are nearer to Jesus now than any other persons. Hence the appropriateness of the strong language of this early record in the most spiritual of the four Gospels. St. John had learned meantime the potency of the faith that began so simply, and in the light of that recalls those wonderful early utterances and the steady progress of their faith from strength to strength.

Equally appropriate is the Cana incident which immediately follows (Joh 2:1-11). There Jesus breaks with the old order in the words, 'Woman, what have I to do with thee?' Addressed as they were to her who represented it in its fondest tie, they show the break to be of the most absolute sort. That is the negative side, the turning from the old; the positive, the turning to the new, is indicated by the place assigned to the disciples in the record. They are identified with Him as others are not, and especially in a growing faith, to which others—even His mother and His brethren—are as yet strangers. What was there taught in the veiled language of sign is taught plainly and explicitly in Mat 12:46-50 and Mar 3:31-35. How far Mary and His brothers were from understanding Him, how wide the gulf was that separated Him from them, is shown by the fact recorded in Mar 3:21 that they regarded Him as out of His mind. The disciples, on the other hand, are seated about Him drinking in His sayings. Then He declares to be His mother and His brethren (Mat 12:49). And looking upon the multitude also sitting around and listening to His words, He generalizes the teaching and declares that 'Whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother' (Mar 3:32; Mar 3:35). Such constitute the new brotherhood.

(1) So the first characteristic of the new brethren is that they do the will of God. They are in right relation to Him. When men are not so, they cannot be rightly related to one another. To be bound together by the tie of brotherhood, they must first be bound by the filial tie to God, their Heavenly Father. Loving obedience is the test and evidence of that (1Jn 5:3, Joh 14:15-21).

It is worth noting that this is the first great law of the Kingdom of heaven (Matthew 6, and summarized in Mat 6:33). Really the brotherhood and the Kingdom (in one sense of the term) are different aspects of the same thing. As to membership the two are coextensive. God is at once Father and King; the brethren are both subjects and children, 'fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God' (Eph 2:19). Both ideas run through the Sermon on the Mount, which is Christ's proclamation of the nature and principles of the Kingdom.

Doubtless the new brotherhood and the Church may be similarly equated. Their membership too should coincide. This is indicated not only by Christ's solemn recall of Peter's new name, and His assertion that His church should be built of such confessors as he (Mat 16:18), but also by the uniform practice in the Acts and Epistles of referring to the members of the churches as 'brethren.'

(2) The second characteristic is that they love one another. Loving God as their Father they instinctively love also His other children, their brothers (1Th 4:9, 1Jn 4:20; 1Jn 5:1). This is Christ's new commandment and the badge of discipleship (Joh 13:34 f.). Though an old command, it has been made new in experience by Christ's death for them. And they in turn make it new afresh when they lay down their life for one another (1Jn 3:16; 1Jn 2:7-11). The love that makes the greatest sacrifice will make the lesser. In the OT the law of Israel's brotherhood enjoined kindness, and definitely forbade such sins as contempt, extortion, oppression, etc. (Deu 22:1-4; Deu 23:7; Deu 23:19 f., Deu 24:7; Deu 24:14; Deu 25:3, and elsewhere). So in the NT special mention is made of charity (1Jn 3:17, Jam 2:15-16); hospitality (Heb 13:1, Rom 12:13); forgiveness (Col 3:13); truthfulness (Eph 4:25); mutual admonition (2Th 3:15); a humility that prefers others and renders even lowly service (Mat 18:1-18, Joh 13:12-17, Rom 12:10, Php 2:1-11, 1Pe 5:5 f.); practical sympathy with the persecuted (Heb 12:3), etc. Brotherly love insists on the essential equality of those who are of the same family. Natural affection exists among them (Rom 12:10 φιλόστοργοι). There can be no caste among them (Col 3:11); all selfish ambition and striving after pre-eminence must be eschewed, and the way of service chosen (Mat 20:20-28). Differences of gifts are recognized. But those who are one in Christ must regard them not as signs of inferiority and superiority, or grounds of pride and servility, but as means of mutual helpfulness, and as all necessary to the general well-being. Different gifts are different functions for the common good. For Christ and His brethren form a body, and each member is necessary to the perfect well-being of the rest. This is developed in Romans 12, 1 Corinthians 12, and Ephesians 4.

The love the brethren bear each other is special. It is distinguished from that they feel toward those that are without (1Pe 2:17 and 2Pe 1:7). It is closer, more affectionate, complacent, satisfying. But they must love others—even their bitterest enemies. So do they become like their Father in heaven (Mat 5:43-48; cf. St. Paul in Rom 9:1-5).

Christ calls them His brethren, and is not ashamed to do so (Heb 2:11). Still His position in the brotherhood is unique. He is one of them, yet He transcends them. He is Master and Lord (Joh 13:13 f.) as they are not nor should seek to be (Mat 23:8-10). For He is Son of God in a unique sense (μονογενής, Joh 3:16; Joh 1:18, in which the

reading θεός is probably correct and explains the uniqueness). That truth He ever guards in the expressions He employs. Examples are seen in Mat_11:27 and frequently in the Fourth Gospel; in Mat_6:9, where the emphatic 'ye' and the character of the prayer exclude Him from the 'our,' and in Joh_20:17, where distinction, not identity, of relation is intended.

When the law of brotherhood is lived out in sincerity and truth, in justice and righteousness, in courage and faith, in all wisdom and spiritual understanding, the solution of social problems will be hastened. These problems are not new. But they are seen to-day as never before. Conditions that once were accepted are accepted no longer as just or right or tolerable. And it is precisely because Christ's ideas of brotherhood have grown clearer to men's minds that they feel the inequalities and injustices of the present order. That is the cause of the present discontent. Christ foresaw that such conflicts would be occasioned by His gospel (Mat_10:34-39). And nothing but the gospel that has caused the conflict can bring the proper issue. The cause must be the cure. Loyalty to the way of the Cross is the way of salvation. The age waits for Christians to embark in the honest, whole-hearted application of the great principle of brotherly love. It will not do to say with Wernle that Christ's demands are impractical for any society. They are impractical for any society that lacks the martyr spirit. They are not impractical for the society that is charged with it. Christ's way was the way of the Cross. That is the only way that leads to victory. Only in the spirit of Jesus can the world's need be met, and its problems finally solved. For that the new brotherhood has been created. Only the fresh vision of the Father's love, the surrender to the Saviour's Cross, and the appropriation of the Spirit's power will inspire, fit, and equip it for the holy task to which God summons.

Literature.—Material will be found in most Commentaries, Lives of Christ, and books on Biblical Theology and the Teaching of Jesus. But in addition to the references already made, special attention may be called to Seeley's *Ecce Homo*; Renan's *Life of Jesus*; Denney's art. 'Brotherly Love' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ; Westcott's *Social Aspects of Christianity*; and especially Peabody's *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*; Mathews' *The Social Teaching of Jesus*; and Tolstoi, *passim*.

J. H. Farmer.

 Brotherly Love

BROTHERLY LOVE.—See Brotherhood and Love.

⚡ Buffeting

BUFFETING.—In Mat 26:67 and Mar 14:65 this word (Gr. *κολαφίζω*) is used to describe the ill-treatment received by Christ in the house of the high priest after His condemnation was pronounced. The crowd present seems to have participated in inflicting this personal indignity. St. Mark, with his usual attention to details, notices that the officers received Him with blows of their hands. *κολαφίζω* carries the significance of a blow with the clenched fist (*κόλαφος*, ‘a fist’). It vividly represents the brutal manual violence to which our Lord was subjected. The word also came to imply a meaning of general ill-usage or persecution, and, as such, occurs in 1Co 4:11, 2Co 12:7 (‘a thorn in the flesh, a messenger of Satan to buffet me’), 1Pe 2:20; cf.—

‘A man that fortune’s buffets and rewards

Hath ta’en with equal thanks.’

—*Hamlet, Act iii. Sc. ii.*

W. S. Kerr.

⚡ Building

BUILDING (*οικοδομή*, 3 times; *οικοδομεῖν*, 23 times in the Gospels).

1. Literal.—The lifetime of Jesus nearly coincides with the period which was undoubtedly the golden age of building in Palestine. The Herods, with their ‘Napoleonic passion for architecture,’ eclipsed in this respect even the fame of Solomon, and left their mark in all parts of the country in the shape of palaces, fortresses, theatres, and a variety of splendid structures, some serving a useful purpose (as the great harbour at Caesarea), but many arising merely out of a love of pomp and display. Herod the Great had begun his extensive work of rebuilding the Temple at Jerusalem nineteen years before the Christian era, and the work was still in progress at the time of Christ’s final visit to the city (Mat 24:1-2, Mar 13:1-2, Luk 21:5-6). Herod Antipas began the foundations of his ambitious new city of Tiberias shortly before Jesus emerged from the obscurity of Nazareth; and Pilate was engaged, during the public ministry of Jesus, in constructing an elaborate aqueduct for Jerusalem. It is certain that, wherever Jesus went, He would hear the sound of hammer and chisel; He would observe the frequent construction of a class of building

hitherto little favoured in His country, such as hippodromes, baths and gymnasia (Josephus *Ant.* xv. viii. 1); and would notice the adoption of a style of architecture foreign to Jewish tradition.

It was not only Herodian princes, Roman magnates, and well-to-do proselytes (see Luk 7:5) who lavished large sums on buildings. Wealthy Jews seem to have spent fortunes in erecting luxurious mansions in the Graeco-Roman style. Jesus mentions this eagerness for building as one of the passions which preoccupied His generation, and led Him to compare it with the materialist and pleasure-seeking age in which Lot lived (Luk 17:28). He gives a vivid description of a prosperous farmer designing ampler store-houses on his estate (Luk 12:18). In another passage He probably alludes to some actual instance of the building-mania over-reaching itself, when He describes the tower left half finished for lack of funds (Luk 14:28). In His denunciation of the Pharisees who 'build the sepulchres of the prophets, and garnish the tombs (μνημεῖα) of the righteous' (Mat 23:29), He refers perhaps to the growing practice, unknown in the pre-Grecian period, begun, it seems, in Maccabaeian times, and now become a dilettante cult, of erecting monumental tombs 'reared aloft to the sight'

(1Ma 13:27), as distinguished from the simple rock-hewn tombs of former days.*

[Note: Furrer (*Wanderungen*, p. 77) and Fergusson (*The Temples of the Jews*, p. 142 f.) think that the Tomb of Zecharias in the Valley of Jehoshaphat, 'a lovely little temple, with ... pillars of the Ionic order,' belongs to the first years of the 1st cent. of our era.] See Tomb.

O. Holtzmann (*Life of Jesus*, p. 100 f.) suggests a special reason for the frequent references which Jesus makes to building operations. He calls attention to the fact that the handicraft in which He had been brought up was one of the building trades. It is usual, indeed, to describe Him as 'the carpenter' (Mar 6:3), and the passage is often cited in which Justin Martyr (*Trypho*, 88) represents Him as 'making ploughs and yokes.' But Justin Martyr is quoting nothing more than a popular tradition, and there is no reason for limiting the term τέκτων to a worker in wood. There was hardly the division of labour at Nazareth that exists among our own mechanics. The epithet τέκτων has probably not less significance than the term 'carpenter' as used in *Hamlet*, v. i. 46—'What is he that builds stronger than either the mason, the shipwright, or the carpenter?', where it indicates one who has to do with the construction of buildings. We may say that there is good reason to conclude that Jesus was Himself a builder, and that He understood at least the art of ordinary house-construction, though it can hardly be admitted that the passages which Holtzmann quotes in support of this are sufficient to prove his point. By a similar method it is easy to prove that Shakspeare was a lawyer or a doctor, a Romanist or a Puritan.

On the other hand, it is not to be inferred, from the somewhat disparaging terms in which Jesus appears to have alluded to the building operations of His time, that He was insensible to the beauties of architecture, or that there was an iconoclastic strain in His nature. It would be easy to marshal passages from the Gospels with the object of showing that He was indifferent to, and even evinced contempt for, sacred places and edifices. But such a conclusion would be contrary to all that we know of His many-sided sympathy and genial tolerance. Rather was the case this—that, like St. Paul amid the temples of Athens, or like St. Francis of Assisi, careless of cathedrals in an age of cathedral-builders, He found His contemporaries so smitten with the love of outward magnificence, so absorbed in the thought of the material edifice, that He bent His whole effort to the task of emphasizing the inward and spiritual structure. It is therefore in this direction that all the great sayings of Christ about building look. On each occasion when He is led to speak of a temple, whether at Jerusalem or in Samaria, He takes the opportunity of insisting that the only true Temple is one not made with hands.

It may be suggested that some of His sayings of this kind are lost, but that the reminiscence or influence of them is to be traced in the remarkably frequent use by the NT writers of the term 'building' in a spiritual sense, whether applied to the individual believer or to the company of the faithful (see, e.g., [Act 20:32](#), [1Co 3:9](#), [Col 2:7](#); [1Pe 2:5](#) etc.). And just as Jesus said, 'Ye are a city set on a hill,' He may well have said, 'Ye are the temple of God.'

2. Figurative.—The actual passages in which Jesus spiritualizes the term 'building' may be grouped under three heads.

(1) In two remarkable passages Christ speaks of Himself as a *Builder*. (a) The first of these ([Mat 26:61](#), [Mar 14:58](#), [Joh 2:19](#)), while it is certainly a genuine saying of Christ's, has come down to us in a form which leaves us doubtful as to the exact connexion in which it was first uttered. The general sense, however, is clear enough. The buildings of the Temple might be razed to the ground, but Christ, by His presence among His people, would perpetuate the true sanctuary (cf. [Mat 18:20](#), [Joh 4:24](#)). Had the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews this saying in his mind when he referred to Christ ([Heb 3:3](#)) as the 'builder of the house'? (b) The second passage is that in which Christ contemplates Himself as the Builder of His *Church* ([Mat 16:18](#)). That with which He is concerned is not the material edifice reared on the rocky summit of Mount Moriah, but the spiritual building—the body of believers—founded on a common faith in Himself.

(2) In one passage, cited from the OT, Jesus varies the metaphor. In the 'germ-parable' of the Rejected Stone ([Mat 21:42](#), [Mar 12:10](#), [Luk 20:17](#)) He is no longer the Builder, but the Foundation. In the original passage ([Psa 118:22](#)) the

Rejected Stone is Israel, but Christ appropriates the image to Himself, and once more draws attention to the fact that the work of God proceeds on lines not to be anticipated by a type of mind which is governed by worldly considerations.

(3) In two minor parables Jesus uses the art of building to illustrate the principles which must animate His followers. (a) In Mat 7:24, Luk 6:48 He shows that, as the stability of a house depends on the nature of its foundation, so stability of character can be attained only when a man uniformly makes the word of truth which he has received the basis of his behaviour. *Doing* is the condition of progress. Christian attainment is broad-based upon obedience (cf. Joh 7:17). (b) In Luk 14:28 He checks a shallow enthusiasm, apt quickly to evaporate, by reminding impulsive disciples that for great works great pains are required. The parable is the Gospel equivalent of our saying, 'Rome was not built in a day,' with special reference, however, to the necessity of the individual giving himself up, in absolute devotion, to his task (cf. Shakspeare, *2 Henry IV*. i. iii. 41).

The foregoing passages exhaust the sayings, as reported in the Evangelic tradition, in which our Lord employed the image of building. But, we may ask, whence did St. Paul derive his favourite expression, applied both to the Church and to the individual, of *edifying*? (see Rom 15:2, 1Co 14:5, Eph 4:12 etc.). It does not appear that οἰκοδομεῖν was ever used by classical writers in this sense. Fritzsche (*Ep. ad Rom.* iii. p. 205) thinks that St. Paul derived it from the OT usage, בָּנָה being sometimes used, with the accusative of the person, in the signification of blessing (see Psa 28:5, Jer 24:6). But is it not at least as likely that St. Paul derived the metaphorical use from the custom of Christ, who so often and with such emphasis applied building terms to the spiritual condition alike of the individual and of the company of believers? If Christ did not Himself use the expression 'edify,' all His teaching pointed that way.

Literature.—Hausrath, *Hist. of NT Times*, §§ 5, 10, 11; articles 'Baukunst' in *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] and 'Architecture' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible; Josephus, *Ant.* xv. viii. 1, ix. 4-6, x. 3, xvi. v. 2, *BJ* i. xiii. 8, xxi. 1-11, vii. viii. 3; Schürer, *GJV* [Note: JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ii. 176, 430, 446, etc.; O. Holtzmann, *Life of Jesus*, p. 100 f. etc.

J. Ross Murray.

☩ Burden

BURDEN.—Both in Christ’s discourse against the Pharisees (Mat 23:4, Luk 11:46) and in His saying, ‘Come unto me,’ etc. (Mat 11:28; Mat 11:30), the ‘burden’ (φορτίον) is that of the legal and Pharisaic ordinances of such a minute and exacting kind that they became intolerable and crushed out real heart-religion. ‘My burden,’ Christ says, ‘is light’ in comparison with these; for I put men under the law of love, which is a law of liberty. With loving, gracious hearts, My disciples become a law unto themselves. The new law is written on the fleshy I tables of the heart. St. Peter, in Act 15:10, speaks of the traditional legal observances as a yoke which ‘neither ye nor your fathers were able to bear,’ while faith in Christ can purify the heart and make strict rules for outward conduct unnecessary. In Mat 11:30 Jesus gives utterance to the germ at least of the Pauline idea of a new spirit of life in Christ Jesus, setting free from condemnation. While, in the first instance, Christ meant by ‘burden’ the Pharisaic ordinances, the truth would become ever deeper to His disciples, till they understood the full contrast between the fulfilment of legal precepts through painful effort, and the joyous service of a living God and Father, growing into pervading holiness of character.

The ‘burden (βάρος)* [Note: In Gal 6:2; Gal 6:5 Lightfoot contends that βάρος; and φορτίον mean, respectively, a burden that may and ought to be got rid of, and one that must be borne.] of the day and the heat,’ in the parable of the Labourers (Mat 20:12) is a description of toil which strains and wearies. In the interpretation of the parable, if any stress were laid on this detail, it might be the long and conscientious fulfilment of duty in the Christian life, which, though it must receive recognition in the end, gives no claim on God as one who rewards of debt, nor allows the worker to glory over another who has been less richly furnished with opportunity.

Literature.—On the ‘burden’ of Mat 11:28-30 ref. may be made to *Expos. Times*, iii. [1892] 512 ff.; *Expositor*, 1st ser. vii. [1878] p. 348 ff., xi. [1880]. p. 101 ff.

David M. W. Laird.

☩ Burial

BURIAL.—In contrast to the Greek and the later Roman custom of cremation, the rites of burial were observed amongst the Jews with great reverence, and an account of their ordinary practice will help to illustrate several passages in the NT. Immediately

after death the body was washed (Act 9:37), and wrapped in linen cloths in the folds of which spices and ointments were laid (Joh 19:39-40). The face was bound about with a napkin, and the hands and feet with grave-bands (Joh 11:44; Joh 20:7). Meanwhile the house had been given over to the hired mourners (Mat 9:23 ||; cf. 2Ch 35:25, Jer 9:17), who lamented for the dead in some such strains as are preserved in Jer 22:18, and skilfully improvised verses in praise of his virtues. The actual interment took place as quickly as possible, mainly on sanitary grounds; very frequently, indeed, on the same day as the death (Act 5:6; Act 5:10; Act 8:2), though it might be delayed for special reasons (Act 9:37 f.). In its passage to the grave the body was generally laid on a bier, or open bed of wicker work (Luk 7:14; cf. 2Sa 3:31, 2Ki 13:21)—hence at Jesus' command the widow of Nain's son was able to sit up at once (Luk 7:15). The bier was, as a rule, borne to the tomb by the immediate friends of the deceased, though we have also traces of a company of public 'buriers' (Act 5:6; Act 5:10; cf. Eze 39:12-16). In front of the bier came the women, and in Judaea the hired mourners, and immediately after it the relatives and friends, and 'much people of the city.' Attendance at funerals was, indeed, regarded as a pious act, and was consequently not always wholly disinterested. Among modern Orientals it is called 'attending the merit,' an act that will secure a reward from God (G. M. Mackie, *Bible Manners and Customs*, p. 127).

The place of burial in NT times was always outside the city (Luk 7:12, Joh 11:30, Mat 27:52-53), and frequently consisted of a natural cave, or an opening made in imitation of one. These rock-sepulchres were often of considerable size, and sometimes permitted of the interment of as many as thirteen bodies. Eight, however, was the usual number, three on each side of the entrance and two opposite. The doorway to the tomb was an aperture about 2 ft. broad and 4 ft. high, and was closed either by a door, or by a great stone—the *golel*—that was rolled against it (Mat 27:66, Mar 15:46, Joh 11:38-39). It is sometimes thought that it was in some such rock-tomb that the demoniac of Gadara had taken up his abode; but more probably it was in one of the tombs 'built above ground,' which were 'much more common in Galilee than has been supposed' (Wilson, *Recovery of Jerusalem*, p. 369, *ap. Swete, St. Mark*, p. 88).

As a rule, sepulchres were whitened once a year, after the rains and before the Passover, that passers-by might be warned of their presence, and thus escape defilement (Mat 23:27; cf. Num 19:16). And though it was not customary to erect anything in the nature of our gravestones, in NT times it was regarded as a religious duty to restore or rebuild the tombs of the prophets (Mat 23:29). In addition to family sepulchres of which we hear in the earliest Hebrew records (Gen 23:20, Jdg 8:32, 2Sa 2:32), and such private tombs as the tomb of Joseph of Arimathaea (Mat 27:60), special provision was made for the interment of strangers (Mat 27:7-8; cf. Jer 26:23, 2Ma 9:4). See art. Tomb.

It will have been observed how many of the foregoing particulars are illustrated in the Gospel narrative of the burial of Jesus; but it may be well to summarize briefly what then took place. No sooner had it been placed beyond doubt that Jesus was really dead, than Joseph of Arimathaea obtained permission to take possession of His body (Mat 27:57 ff.; cf. the merciful provision of the Jewish law, Deu 21:23). Haste was required, as the Jews' Preparation was close at hand, and the body, after being, perhaps, bathed (so *Gospel of Peter*, 6), was at once wrapped 'in a clean linen cloth' (Mat 27:59), the 'roll of myrrh and aloes,' of which Nicodemus had brought about a hundred pound weight (Joh 19:39), being apparently crumbled between the folds of the linen (ὀθόνια). It was then borne to the 'new tomb wherein was never man yet laid,' and reverently laid on the rocky ledge prepared for the purpose, while the whole was secured by a 'great stone' placed across the entrance, which was afterwards at the desire of the Jews sealed and guarded (Mat 27:62 ff.; cf. *Gospel of Peter*, 8). There the body remained undisturbed over the Jewish Sabbath; but when on the morning of the first day of the week the women visited the tomb, bringing with them an additional supply of 'spices and ointments' to complete the anointing which want of time had previously prevented, it was only to find the tomb empty, and to receive the first assurance of their Lord's resurrection (Luk 24:1 ff.). In connexion with this visit, Edersheim has drawn attention to the interesting fact that the Law expressly allowed the opening of the grave on the third day to look after the dead (*Bible Educator*, iv. p. 332). In entire harmony, too, with what has already been said of the general structure of Jewish tombs, is the account which St. John has preserved for us of his own and St. Peter's visit to the tomb of Jesus (Joh 20:1 ff.). He himself, when he reached the doorway, was at first content with stooping down (παρὰκλίψας) and looking in, and thus got only a general view (βλέπει) of the linen cloths lying in their place. But St. Peter on his arrival entered into the tomb, and beheld—the word used (θεωρεῖ) points to a careful searching gaze, the eye passing from point to point—not only the linen cloths, but the napkin that was about Christ's head 'rolled up in a place by itself.' These particulars have sometimes been used as evidence of the care and order with which the Risen Lord folded up and deposited in two separate places His grave-clothes before He left the tomb. But it has recently been shown with great cogency that what probably is meant is that the grave-clothes were found undisturbed on the very spot where Jesus had lain, the linen cloths on the lower ledge which had upheld the body, the napkin 'by itself on the slightly raised part of the ledge which formed a kind of pillow for the head. The empty grave-clothes, out of which the Risen Lord had passed, became thus a sign not only that no violence had been offered to His body by human hands, but also a parable of the true meaning of His Resurrection: 'all that was of Jesus of Nazareth has suffered its change and is gone. We—grave-clothes, and spices, and napkin—belong to the earth and remain' (H.

Latham, *The Risen Master*, p. 11: see the whole interesting discussion in chapters i.-iii.).

Apart from these more special considerations, it is sufficient to notice that the very particularity of the description of the burial of Jesus is in itself of importance as emphasizing His true humanity and the reality of His death. From nothing in our lot, even the sad accompaniments of the grave, did He shrink. On the other hand, the empty grave on the morning of the third day has always been regarded as one of the most convincing proofs that ‘the Lord is risen indeed.’ Had it not been so, then His body must have been stolen either by friends or by foes. But if by the latter, why in the days that followed did they not produce it, and so silence the disciples’ claims? If by the former, then we have no escape from the conclusion that the Church of Christ was founded ‘not so much upon delusion as upon fraud—upon fraud springing from motives perfectly inexplicable, and leading to results totally different from any that could have been either intended or looked for’ (W. Milligan, *The Resurrection of our Lord*⁴ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 73).

Literature.—See artt. ‘Burial’ and ‘Tombs’ in Kitto’s *Cycl.*, Smith’s *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] , Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible , *Encyc. Bibl.*; ‘Beerdigung’ in Hamburger’s *RE*; ‘Begrabnis bei den Hebräern’ *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyclopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; Edersheim, *Sketches of Jewish Social Life*, p. 161 ff.; Thomson, *Land and Book*; Bender, ‘Beliefs, Rites, and Customs of the Jews connected with Death, Burial, and Mourning,’ in *JQR* [Note: QR Jewish Quarterly Review.] , 1894 and 1895.

George milligan.

☩ Burnt-Offering

BURNT-OFFERING is a word of rare occurrence in NT (Mar 12:33, Heb 10:6; Heb 10:8). This is probably due to the fact that the more generic word for sacrifice (θυσία) is commonly used, since the distinctions of the Old Covenant, which was vanishing away, did not require to be perpetuated in the NT Canon. It is probable, however, from the train of thought, that in some instances the sacrifice which was prominently before the mind of the writer was the burnt-offering (Rom 12:1). And though not named, it is latent in certain passages (see below). It is known in the OT as the קָדַח ‘ôlâh: more rarely and partly in poetical passages as the בָּלִיל; in Psa 51:19

both terms are used. The most common LXX Septuagint rendering is ὀλακαύτωμα, and in this form it appears in the NT. The *ôlâh* is connected with a root meaning ‘to ascend,’ the idea being, probably, that the essence of the sacrifice ascended to heaven in the smoke; *kâlîl*, with a root meaning ‘to be complete,’ an idea reproduced in the LXX Septuagint translation. Details of the rite may be found in Lev 6:8-13; Lev 8:18-21. Unlike most sacrifices, it was to be wholly burnt (Lev 1:8), the skin only falling to the priest as his perquisite.

The burnt-offering was the principal sacrifice of the Mosaic dispensation, and continued as such till the destruction of the Temple by Titus. It was offered, the victim being a male yearling sheep, every morning and evening (Exo 29:38-42); hence its Mishnic name *tâmîd*, the perpetual offering. In addition, on Sabbaths, new moons, the first day of the seventh month, the three great feasts, and the Day of Atonement, other victims were offered (Numbers 28 f.). Burnt-offering was associated with other sacrifices (Lev 9:3-4; Lev 15:15), could be offered for individuals, even Gentiles, and even for the Roman emperor (Josephus *Wars*, ii. xvii. 2). The altar stood in the court of the priests in front of (eastward of) the Temple building. The offering was made publicly, in the presence not merely of the large group of ministering priests, but also of ‘the men of station,’ representatives of what may be called the Jewish laity.

Although the word is nowhere recorded as being spoken by Christ, and only once as spoken to Him, it must be remembered that His connexion with burnt-offering was, of necessity, more intimate than the mere occurrence of the word suggests. As a Jew, acquainted with the OT, He could not have been unacquainted with the Pentateuchal legislation on this point; nor is it conceivable that as a visitor to the Temple He failed to be a witness of this rite. The altar on which burnt-offering was offered, from its great size, its frequent use, and its standing visibly in the court of the priests, was emphatically ‘*the altar*,’ and it was before this that He directed the offending brother to leave his gift (Mat 5:23). At the Presentation in the Temple (Luk 2:24, cf. Lev 12:6-8) the second of the turtle doves was intended for a burnt-offering (the other bird forming the usual sin-offering at such a time); it was the offering of the poor, and the ritual is described in Lev 1:15-17. The Temple tax to which He contributed was in part used for the provision of burnt-offerings (Mat 17:24).

The two occasions on which, in NT, the burnt-offering is referred to, emphasize the imperfect and transitory character of the OT sacrificial system, and the spiritual, perfect, and abiding character of that which superseded it. In Mar 12:33 the scribe inferred from our Lord’s teaching as to the first commandment, that to love God with all the heart and one’s neighbour as oneself was ‘much more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices,’ and was for this commended as ‘not far from the kingdom of God.’ In Heb 10:6; Heb 10:8, where only besides the word occurs, while

the writer dwells on many points of the Temple, its furniture, and its service, he fails to apply the burnt-offering very closely to the redeeming work of Christ. But he quotes Psa_40:6 as declaring that the Divine pleasure lies not in ‘victim and Minhah’ (Delitzsch, *in loc.*), and infers the superiority of Christ’s obedience to any expiatory sacrifice (sin-offering) or dedicatory sacrifice (burnt-offering) presented by means of an animal victim. His obedience is the burnt-offering that has enduring value and needs no repetition.

Literature.—Articles on ‘Burnt-offering’ and ‘Sacrifice’ in *Bible Dictionaries* of Hastings, Smith, and *Encyc. Bibl.*; *Bible Archæology* of Keil, Nowack; Kurtz, *Sacrificial System of OT*; *OT Theology* of Schultz, Oehler; Cave, *Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice*; Edersheim, *The Temple: its Ministry*, etc.; Girdle-stone, *Synonyms of OT*; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. i. 278 ff.

J. T. L. Maggs.

Bush

BUSH (βῆτος).—Mar_12:26 || Luk_20:37* [Note: The parallel passage in Matthew (22:31) omits the reference to ‘the Bush.’] refers to the ‘Burning Bush’ (Exo_3:2-4, Deu_33:16 where LXX Septuagint uses βῆτος to translation בִּשְׁמֵרָה of the original). Before the [probably mediaeval] division into chapters and verses it was not easy to cite Scripture with precision. ‘In or at the Bush’ (Authorized Version in Mark and Luke respectively) means not ‘beside that memorable bush,’ but ‘in the passage in Scripture describing the theophany in the bush’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 , ‘*in the place concerning the Bush*’).

The derivation of בִּשְׁמֵרָה is not known, and all attempts to identify it have failed.’ There is no justification for the suggestion of Gesenius (, s.v.) that it is connected with the plant, nor for Stanley’s assumption (. of the Jewish Church [ed. 1883], i. 97) that it was the wild acacia. The fact that in the LXX Septuagint it is translated by βῆτος shows that it was believed to be a thorn bush. βῆτος is specially used of the bramble (*Rubus*), but according to Post (Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible , s.v. ‘Bush’), ‘*Rubus* has not been found wild in Sinai, which is south of its range, and climatically unsuited to it.’

βάτος occurs once again in the Gospels: Luk 6:44; Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘bramble bush’ [Matthew’s parallel (Mat 7:16) has ‘thorns’]. It was thought necessary to alter the translation; the word which in the other passage had such lofty associations is here used by Christ almost with contempt. Moreover, a vine might well enough be described as a ‘bush’ in the abstract; it does not grow high, and has no strength of wood (Ezekiel 15). ‘Bramble’ in older English means ‘thorn bush’ not necessarily ‘blackberry bush.’ Yet the translation seems apt enough, even according to modern usage. Liddell and Scott give βάτος as = ‘blackberry bush’ or ‘wild raspberry,’ but the adjective βατόεις = ‘thorned.’

Robert Mackintosh.

Bushel

BUSHEL (ὁ μῶδιος, Mat 5:15, Mar 4:21, Luk 11:33—a Lat. word with a Gr. form).—The Roman *modius*, equal to 16 *sextarii*, or approximately one English peck, was not a measure in common use in Jewish households. Although the definite article is probably generic (‘*the bushel*,’ so Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), the measure which would lend itself naturally to our Lord’s illustration, and that to which He actually referred, was the Hebrew *seah* measure used by the housewife in preparing the daily bread. While the *seah* measure varied in size according to locality, it is generally regarded as being equal to one *modius* and a quarter, though Josephus (*Ant.* ix. iv. 5) states: ‘A *seah* is equal to an Italian *modius* and a half.’

To the influence of Roman customs was no doubt due the substitution of *modius* for *seah* in the report of the saying (Mat 5:15 etc.); and in like manner, since no importance was attached by our Lord to exactness of measure, the familiar ‘bushel’ of earlier English versions has been retained by the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, although ‘peck’ would be a more accurate rendering.

The saying of our Lord is as picturesque as it is forcible. It gives us a glimpse into a Galilaean home, where the commonest articles of furniture would be the lamp, the lampstand, the *seah* measure, and the couch. And who could fail to apprehend the force of the metaphor? ‘When the word has been proclaimed, its purpose is defeated if it be concealed by the hearers; when the lamp comes in, who would put it under the *modius* or the couch of the *triclinium*?’ (Swete on Mar 4:21).

Literature.—Art. ‘Weights and Measures’ in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iv. 911^a, 913^b, and the *Encyc. Bibl.* iv. col. 5294 f.

Alex. A. Duncan.

Business

BUSINESS.—1. The first recorded words of Jesus stand in the Authorized Version , ‘Wist ye not that I must be about my Father’s business?’ (Luk 2:49). This is the only passage in the Gospels where the word ‘business occurs, and it is not without some sort of regret that we are obliged to acknowledge the greater accuracy of the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 , ‘Wist ye not that I must be in my Father’s house?’ The familiar rendering, however, finds a place in the margin; and indeed in this case, as in so many others, the Authorized Version well represents the inner meaning of the original words. Translated quite literally, the phrase (ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου) means ‘in the things of my Father’: it denotes a person’s property or estate, and is equivalent to our colloquialism ‘at my father’s,’—the whole stress falling on the idea of ownership,—and in this way it is fairly frequently used in Greek authors. The closest parallel in Biblical Greek occurs in the Septuagint translation of Est 7:9, where ‘in the house of Haman’ of the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 is represented by the phrase ἐν τοῖς Ἀμάν, and it is clear that the gallows, fifty cubits high, must have stood in the precincts of the house, or on the estate, of Haman. (For other instances, see Excursus I. in Farrar’s *St. Luke* in the Cambridge Bible for Schools, where a summary is given of the essential points from an important monograph on the passage by Dr. Field of Norwich: this monograph has been reprinted in *Notes on the Translation of the NT*, by the late Frederick Field, Cambridge, 1899).

The Latin Versions render the Greek phrase as literally as the language allows, and throw no light on the interpretation. The Sinaitic Syriac has the suggestive paraphrase, ‘Wist ye not that I must be with my Father?’ The idea of a sympathetic relation with God is indeed of the essence of the passage; perhaps we can best render it by borrowing from the symbolical language of the parables, ‘Wist ye not that I must work in my Father’s vineyard?’

A passage of Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iv. xxiii. 148) affords an interesting parallel to the translation of the Sinaitic Syriac just quoted: ‘For the dispensation of creation indeed is good, and all things are well arranged, nothing happens without a reason; *in the things that are Thine* must I be (ἐν τοῖς σοῖς εἶναι με δεῖ), O

Almighty, and if I am there I am with Thee.’ In another passage (*Strom.* vi. vi. 45) the phrase is used with an even wider application; of the souls in Hades, Clement says that they are *in the things* (*i.e.* within the domain) of God. With this compare the teaching of the ‘Elders’ referred to by Irenaeus (v. xxxvi. 1): ‘For this cause they say that the Lord said that in the things of My Father are many mansions. For all things are God’s, who gives to all men the habitation that befits them.’ Thus what in Joh 14:2 is called ‘the house of my Father,’ is by the substitution of the phrase τὰ τοῦ πατρὸς μου extended to mean the whole Universe, including, as the context shows, heaven, paradise, and the ‘city’ of the re-created earth. In *Protrepticus*, ix. 82, Clement seems to have the incident of Luk 2:49 in his mind as implying the complete consecration of life: ‘But I suppose that when a man is enrolled and lives as a citizen and receives the Father, then he will be *in the things of the Father.*’

Godet (in his Commentary on St. Luke, *ad loc.*) points out that the phrase ‘I must be’ (δεῖ εἶναι με) conveys the idea of an absolute and morally irresistible consecration to the service of God on earth. To the awakening consciousness of the child Jesus the Temple at Jerusalem was the symbol of the Father’s dominion over all things; He said in effect to His parents, ‘Ye ought to have sought me in the place where men are occupied with the things of God.’

These first recorded words of Jesus then set a standard by which must be tested every manner of life. How far is it possible for a life spent in business, with which a linguistic accident connects these words for English readers of the Bible, to be lived *in the things of the Father*, according to the teaching of His Son? As an aid towards reaching an answer to this vital question, let us see what we can learn, from our Lord’s acts and words, of the attitude He adopted towards the business life of the time of His Incarnation.

2. At the next recorded visit of Jesus to the Temple, we find Him in conflict with men who conducted business improperly: those who bore rule there did not understand that they were ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς. It is well known that St. John (Joh 2:13 ff.) narrates a ‘Cleansing of the Temple’ as taking place quite early in the Lord’s public ministry, while the Synoptists (Mat 21:12 f., Mar 11:15 ff., Luk 19:45 f.) describe a similar event as occurring in Holy Week. It is at least possible that the holy zeal of Jesus was twice displayed in this manner; but if a choice had to be made, there would be strong reasons for preferring the chronological arrangement of St. John. Without entering into this question, however, we can simply study the attitude of Jesus towards those who conducted the Temple market. The traffic was of two sorts, the sale of sacrificial animals, and the exchange of money: in both cases it may well have been legitimate in itself, and even necessary: the sin was connected with its being

carried on within the sacred precincts. It seems obvious that the Sadducean rulers of the Temple, whose cupidity was notorious, must have made money out of the business carried on there; no doubt the sites for stalls within the Temple precincts would command a good rent; and, further, if the animals sold there were certified officially as being unblemished and fit for sacrifice, while those bought outside were liable to a scrutiny on being brought into the Temple, it is easy to see how the privileged tradesmen may have gained an almost complete monopoly, for which they would willingly pay a high price. If the conjecture (see Edersheim, *Life and Times*⁴ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1887, p. 367 ff.) that this Temple market was identical with the unpopular 'Bazaars of the Sons of Annas' is right, then the notorious Annas and his son-in-law Caiaphas had probably a direct interest in the trade carried on. It seems probable that the 'changers of money' (κερματισται, Joh 2:14; κολλυβισται, Joh 2:15, Mat 21:12, Mar 11:15) were the official *Shulhanim* (Lightfoot, *Horae Heb.* on Mat 21:12; Edersheim, *The Temple*, p. 70 ff.) who sat to collect the half-shekel for a fortnight before the Passover: they were allowed to make a charge on each half-shekel whether change was given or not, and Edersheim places their probable annual gain from this source at £9000. Very likely the ordinary business of exchange of money was carried on, as obviously no coins bearing images or idolatrous symbols could be offered in the Temple. Moreover, the mention by Josephus (*BJ* vi. v. 2) of treasure-chambers in 'the Temple belonging to private individuals suggests that ordinary banking business, including the receipt of money on deposit, may have been made a source of profit, which would be enhanced by the security afforded by the sanctity of the place. These considerations have been put forward to show that it is likely that the ruling priestly faction turned to financial account the consecrated character of the buildings committed to their charge. Probably it was this making money out of holy things, rather than the ceremonial violation of the sanctity of the Temple, that caused the severity of our Lord's condemnation of the whole system which made His Father's house into 'a house of merchandise,' according to St. John's account, or in the stronger words of the Synoptists, into 'a den of robbers.' It is clear that Jesus would not suffer business to be carried on in a manner that interfered with the honour due to God: doubtless He would have applied this principle to the Day, no less than to the House, of His Father. The same lesson is taught in the parable of the Royal Marriage Feast (Mat 22:1 ff.; cf. Luk 14:16 ff.).

3. But the Son of Man, to whom nothing human was void of interest, in no way stood aloof from business. Himself a carpenter by trade (Mar 6:3), He did not hesitate to tell the 'fishermen' Apostles that there was a likeness between their former worldly and their future spiritual vocation (Mat 4:19, Mar 1:17); the would-be disciple, who wished first to bid farewell to those at his house, was told that he might have learned behind the plough the need of concentrating his whole interest and attention on the

task he had in hand (Luk 9:62). Both before and after the resurrection (Luk 5:4 ff., Joh 21:1 ff.) Jesus granted special revelations of Himself to the disciples while engaged in their usual occupations. In the command to render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's (Mat 22:21, and parallels), we are struck by the business-like recognition of actually existing circumstances. Several of the parables prove how fully Jesus understood and entered into the business spirit, and show that, when consecrated by devotion to God, it is necessary to those who seek the kingdom of heaven. The merchantman who sold all that he had in order to buy one pearl of great price, gave proof of that confidence in his own judgment, joined with willingness to stake all upon it, which is indispensable to success in great mercantile ventures, and is said to be even now characteristic of the Jewish nation (Mat 13:45 f., cf. Mat 13:44 'the hidden treasure'). In the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard the fulfilment of a contract is sharply opposed to the voluntary gift of money to those who had presumably been willing but unable to earn it (Mat 20:1 ff.). A proper return is rightly expected from the ownership of land (Mar 12:7 ff., and parallels) and of money (Mat 25:27, Luk 19:23). It is worthy of notice that the case just referred to of the 'unprofitable servant' follows in St. Matthew's Gospel directly after that parable which shows how unbusiness-like neglect to buy oil on the part of the foolish virgins led to their exclusion from the marriage-feast. The man who failed to make correct calculations as to the cost of building a tower is regarded as a fit object for mockery (Luk 14:28 ff.). On the other hand, the unjust steward, who took advantage of his position of authority to make friends of his master's debtors, showed a business-like shrewdness which would have been of value if employed honestly in a good cause (Luk 16:9 ff.).

4. A terrible warning of the danger of misusing business capacity is afforded, not in the imaginary story of a parable, but in the actual life of Judas Iscariot. St. Matthew (Mat 26:14 f.) and St. Mark (Mar 14:10 f.) connect the determination of Judas to betray Christ with the anointing of His feet at the feast in the house at Bethany. St. John, in narrating the same incident (Joh 12:4 ff.), tells us that it was Judas who gave expression to the false idea that the giving of money to the poor was of greater value than personal devotion: 'Now this he said, not because he cared for the poor; but because he was a thief, and having the bag used to take away (*ἐβάσταξεν*, see Westcott in *Speaker's Commentary*, *ad loc.*) what was put therein.' Judas, no doubt on account of natural aptitude, had been made treasurer to Jesus and His disciples; he was vexed that so large a sum of money as three hundred pence had been wasted in the pouring out of the ointment instead of passing through his hands for the supposed benefit of the poor. Comparing together these different passages, it seems clear that St. John traced the fall of Judas, culminating in the betrayal, to the misuse through covetousness of his business faculties.

5. It can be, and often is, argued that the morality taught by Christ cannot be strictly and literally applied in the conduct of business. Probably the impossibility is no greater in the life of the business man than it is in the life of any one who tries to live as a consistent Christian. The main difference seems to be that in business practical morality is daily, and often many times a day, put to a test the extent of which can be estimated in money, and failure to conform to a high standard is easily detected. The business man is obliged to have a definite standard of practical morality, high or low according to his own character and the exigencies of his trade, and according to that standard he must act. Self-deception in his case is practically limited to one particular form,—which, however, is extremely prevalent,—that of attempting to separate personal from business morality. The ordinary non-business man, on the contrary, generally has a curiously vague and more or less ideal standard, and it is a very difficult thing even for a man of honest thought to settle how nearly he lives up to it. Business morality in a measure analyses itself, while the morality of ordinary life almost defies analysis: a comparison between the two is thus extremely dangerous, as they are practically incommensurable quantities.

Jesus Christ evidently believed that the moral and religious truths which He taught were capable of being applied in business. We have seen above that He severely condemned the Sadducean hierarchy, who may be taken to represent the capitalist class of those days at Jerusalem, because their business was conducted on wrong principles: they maintained merely ceremonial purity, and would not put the ‘price of blood’ in the treasury (Mat 27:6), but they did not shrink from making gain of holy things. This shows the uncompromising attitude of Christ towards what was morally bad. But there was a great difference in His manner of dealing with another typical class of business men, the Publicans. He did not follow popular opinion in regarding their occupation as absolutely unjustifiable; He looked on their calling as a legitimate one, while demanding honesty in carrying it out. The Baptist had taken the same line, ‘Exact no more than that which is appointed you’ (Luk 3:13). Zacchaeus, for his charity and earnest desire to avoid extortion, is declared to be truly a son of Abraham (Luk 19:9).

It is worthy of note that St. Luke places the parable of the Pounds in close connexion with the Zacchaeus incident, as if to teach us that lessons of eternal value can be learned in business. The slaves are rewarded with ten or five cities, according to the capacity which each had shown in trading with his pound.

This brings us to the centre of the whole matter: the life of business is a legitimate one for followers of Christ so far as it can be lived ‘in the things of the Father’; then it is a means of imparting training and of teaching lessons which can be used now and hereafter in the service of God. ‘God has set you,’ writes the Rev. Wilfrid Richmond (*Christian Economics*, 1888, p. 159), ‘in the world with other men to learn, by mutual

interchange of the means of life, the laws of love. Your wealth, whatever it may be, little or great,—the wealth you make, the wealth you spend,—is treasure, corruptible or incorruptible, treasure on earth or treasure in heaven, according as it is or is not, in the making and in the spending, the instrument of love.’

Literature.—Besides the works referred to in the art., reference may be made to E. S. Talbot, *Some Aspects of Christian Truth*, 208; A. Whyte, *Walk, Conversation, and Character of Jesus Christ our Lord*, 59; C. R. D. Biggs, *The Diaconate of Jesus*, 19; S. Gregory, *Among the Roses*, 191; H. Bushnell, *Sermons on Living Subjects*, 243; *Expos.* 2nd ser. viii. [1884] p. 17. P. M. Barnard.

☛ Buying

BUYING.—See Trade and Commerce.

☛ Caesar

CaeSAR (Καῖσαρ).—In the Gospel record this name occurs 18 times, in 16 of which it answers to ‘reigning emperor,’ who in each case was Tiberius Caesar; in the remaining two the more individual name is found,—in the one case Augustus (Luk_2:1), and in the other Tiberius (3:1).

The name ‘Caesar’ was assumed by Augustus in 44 b.c., immediately after the tragic death of his grand-uncle, Julius Caesar, being considered by him part of the inheritance left to him. We have Cicero’s authority (*ad Att.* xiv. 5, 10, 11, 12) for saying that the friends of Octavius began to address him as ‘Caesar’ within a week or two of the Dictator’s assassination. Augustus himself soon gave evidence that he meant to gather up and concentrate on himself all the fame that was associated with ‘Caesar.’ Not many years passed till he came to exercise a world-wide sway, such as the great Julius had never known. He handed on the title to his successors very much as we find it used by the writers of the NT, in the sense of the great ruler or Kaiser. His own name (Gr. Σεβαστός, Lat. *Augustus*) was quite familiar to them as applied to the reigning emperor (Act_25:21; Act_25:25, Nero). The fame of the first Caesar had come to be overshadowed by the remarkable career of the founder of the Empire. The way was thus prepared for the still later development, when the title of ‘Caesar’

was given to the junior partner of the two joint-emperors, and 'Augustus' remained the distinguishing name of the supreme ruler. In the Gospel record there is clear confirmation of the first part of this historical development, and there is at the same time no contradiction of the second.

In the majority of the cases of the use of the title 'Caesar' in the Gospel writings, the question of paying the tribute has come up. This reveals the great change that had taken place from the time of the 'census' under Augustus, when 'everyone went to enrol himself in his own city' (Luk 2:3), to that of the trial before Pilate, when the chief charge against Jesus was said to be 'the forbidding to give tribute to Caesar' (Luk 23:2). In those thirty-three years of interval the relation between the Roman power, as represented by 'Caesar,' and the Jewish people, had undergone a radical change. Judaea had become a Roman province, and was under obligation to 'pay tribute as well as submit to an enrolment of its heads of households. In perfect accord with this historical fact, St. Luke wrote (Luk 3:1): 'Pontius Pilate being governor of Judaea,' with the tetrarchs for Galilee, Ituraea, and Abilene, desiring to mark the period in the reign of Tiberius Caesar when 'the word of God came to John in the wilderness.' The change came with the death of Herod the Great in 4 b.c. While Varus, the governor of Syria, was engaged in quelling serious outbreaks of rebellion in Jerusalem, the sons of Herod were in Rome waiting the decision of Augustus as to their conflicting claims. At length all parties were heard by the emperor in an assembly that met in the celebrated temple of Apollo, behind his own house on the Palatine. The imperial verdict, announced after a few days, upheld substantially the will of Herod. To Archelaus were assigned Judaea, Samaria, and Idumaea—not as king, but as ethnarch; to Antipas, Galilee and Peraea as tetrarch; Batanaea, Trachonitis, Auranitis, Gaulanitis, and Paneas to Philip, also as tetrarch (Josephus *Ant.* xvii. viii. 1, xi. 4). The kingdom of Herod was thus divided into three separate territories after his death. As it was in Jerusalem that the question as to the tribute money was raised, our subject in this article has to do only with Archelaus. After some nine years of rule over Judaea, Archelaus was summoned to Rome to answer charges brought against him by a deputation of leading men from Judaea and Samaria. He was deposed and banished by Augustus to Vienne in Gaul in a.d. 6. His territory was put under direct Roman rule, becoming a part of the province of Syria, with a Roman of equestrian rank for its governor. An end was thus put to the uniform consideration for Jewish traditions and national prejudices shown by Herod and his sons. The first notable instance of this in history is met with in the rebellion of a.d. 6, on the occasion of the great census, while Quirinius was governor of Syria, which is referred to in Act 5:37. The tumult, with its accompanying bloodshed, must have been of no slight moment, when a quarter of a century thereafter Gamaliel could effectually use it in restraining the Council from slaying the Apostles. Between a.d. 6 and a.d. 30, whichever length of cycle for the imperial census be taken, there must have been at least another 'enrolment' for purposes of taxation. We do not read of a serious revolt

having taken place then as in 6 a.d. The Roman authorities, no doubt, were better prepared for what might happen, and the Jewish people also had learned the fruitlessness of rebellion. As the time of Christ's public ministry approached, their spirit nevertheless became more and more embittered. It was inevitable that at some point or other in that ministry the question should be pressed upon Him, 'Is it lawful to give tribute to Caesar or not?' (Mat 22:17 ||). It was one of the burning questions of His time. A distinction must here be drawn between the 'customs' or duties upon goods and the land tax with poll tax. The latter only passed into the 'Fiscus' or imperial treasury. With perfect accuracy, therefore, it could be described as 'tribute to Caesar.' This tax was exacted annually, and as the Jews were not yet subject to military conscription, it formed the chief sign of their subjection to the Roman yoke. Officers of state collected it, the procurator for the tax in the case of Judaea being also the governor, Pilate. It was different with the 'customs,' which were farmed out to the highest bidder, thus creating that intense antipathy which is revealed in the phrase 'publicans and sinners.'

The tribute payment after all was based on the fact of the kingship of Caesar. The combination of 'Caesar' with 'king' sounds entirely unhistorical to one familiar with the rise and growth of the Roman Empire. 'King' was a term which Augustus was most careful to avoid from the time that it may be said to have cost the first 'Caesar' his life. Among Eastern peoples, however, it was the most usual title for their ruler. During the long reign of Herod no name was more familiar to the Jews than 'king.' It was most natural for them to transfer it to 'Caesar.' Any one claiming to be a 'king' within the wide dominion of Caesar was seeking to establish a rival authority. This was the charge which they found it so easy to frame against Jesus when He and they were in the presence of Pilate: 'forbidding to give tribute to Caesar, and saying that he himself is Christ, a king' (Luk 23:2). No more powerful appeal could they have made to Pilate's fears, as they thought, than when they cried out, 'If thou let this man go, thou art not Caesar's friend: whosoever maketh himself a king, speaketh against Caesar' (Joh 19:12). The title on the cross, 'Jesus of Nazareth, the king of the Jews' (Joh 19:19), as Pilate actually wrote it, served him better than their proposed modification, 'He said, I am king of the Jews' (Joh 19:31). Should he ever be called in question by Caesar for giving Jesus up to death, that title, written out by his own hand, would form an ample justification. The greater probability lies in the supposition that Pilate so named Him to spite the Jews, in accordance with those other words, 'Shall I crucify your king?' (Joh 19:15). The whole attitude of Jesus towards Caesar, not only in the question of the tribute, but throughout the trial before Pilate, must have entirely disarmed the Roman governor of any fear that He was, or ever had been, a rival of Caesar's.

J. Gordon Gray.

☛ Caesarea Philippi

Caesarea Philippi.—The town called Caesarea Philippi in the Synoptic Gospels (Mat 16:13, Mar 8:27, cf. Josephus *Ant.* xx. ix. 4, *BJ* iii. ix. 7, vii. ii. 1) bore at one time, certainly as early as b.c. 198 (Polybius, *Hist.* xvi. 18, xxviii. 1), the name *Panias* (Πανιάς or ΠΑΝΕΰ), which is still preserved in the modern *Banias*. Situated to the north of the Sea of Galilee on a plateau at the southern foothills of Mount Hermon, it lay in the territory that Philip received from his father, Herod the Great. The place, as well as the surrounding country, received its original name from a cave or grotto in a hill near by, which was called τὸ Πάνειον, because sacred to Pan and the Nymphs. In the face of the cliff there are still several niches with inscriptions in which Pan is mentioned. From the cave (*Mugharet Ras en-Neba'*), now partly filled with fallen stone, issues a strong stream of water which has long been reckoned one of the chief sources of the Jordan (Josephus *Ant.* xv. x. 3). On the hill above, Herod built a white marble temple in honour of Augustus (Josephus *Ant.* xv. x. 3, *BJ* i. xxi. 3), and here the Crusaders built a castle, the ruins of which still stand some fifteen hundred feet above the town, and about a mile and a quarter to the east (*Kula't Subeibeh*). Philip enlarged and beautified Panias, and called it Caesarea (Καισάρεια) in honour of Augustus. The statement of Eusebius (*Chron.* ed. Schoene, pp. 146-147) that Philip built Panias, and called it Caesarea, in the reign of Tiberius, is rendered improbable by coins which show that Caesarea had an era dating from b.c. 3 or 2. To distinguish it from Caesarea on the seacoast (Καισάρεια Στρατώνος or Καισάρεια τῆς Παλαιστίνης), it was commonly called Caesarea Philippi (Καισάρεια ἡ Φιλίππου). Under Agrippa ii. it received and bore for a short time the name Neronias (Νερωνιάς, Josephus *Ant.* xx. ix. 4). The place has probably no part in OT history, since its identification with Dan (Smith, *HGHL* [Note: *GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*] pp. 473, 480) is not certain (Buhl, *GAP* [Note: *AP Geographic des alten Palästina.*] p. 238).

Into this region Jesus came with His disciples during one of His tours of retirement from the common scenes of His Galilaean activity; but He does not seem to have entered Caesarea itself. St. Matthew (Mat 16:13; cf. Mat 15:21) tells us that Jesus came into the region (εἰς τὰ μέρη); St. Mark (Mar 8:27) mentions more specifically and vividly the villages of Caesarea (εἰς τὰς κώμας). In the territory of which Caesarea was the chief city there were smaller towns, and it was through these that Jesus moved with His disciples and others who followed Him. St. Luke alone (Luk 9:18 ff.) of the Synoptists seems to have lost the touch of local colour fixed so indelibly

upon the narratives of Mt. and Mk.—an authenticating element whose force even those who question the Synoptic tradition at this point find it difficult to escape (cf. Wrede, *Messiasgeheimnis*, p. 239). The narrative in Lk. lends itself, however, to the setting of Mt. and Mk., both by the way in which it is introduced without definite localization (καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν προσευχόμενον), and by the fact that in Lk.'s order it follows the feeding of the five thousand in the neighbourhood of Bethsaida. According to Mar 8:22; Mar 8:27, it was from Bethsaida that Jesus went into the villages of Caesarea, and in Joh 6:68 ff. we read of a confession of Peter immediately after the discourse of Jesus in Capernaum, occasioned by the feeding of the five thousand. St. Luke's material may have come to him in the form of a group centring around a saying of Jesus, but without definite localization. By inserting it after the feeding of the five thousand he has preserved the historical order without, however, giving us the exact local setting. For this we must look to St. Matthew and St. Mark.

By our First and Second Evangelists the same group of events is not only connected with a place which lends peculiar significance to them, but set in a larger context which extends to the feeding of the five thousand. Mt. and Mk. alike represent Jesus' arrival in the region of Caesarea Philippi as part of a course decided upon shortly after that event. The decision which led to the retirement into the region of Tyre and Sidon must have been confirmed by His experience on returning to Galilee. For Jesus withdrew again, this time going north into the region of Caesarea Philippi. Located at Caesarea and standing in the period of retirement, this group of events points back to the beginning of the period for the explanation of its characteristic features. The Gospels do not enumerate the causes which led to such a change in the scene of Jesus' activity, but their narratives do indicate a situation which will in a measure account for it.

But, besides change of scene, this group of events reveals, as do the earlier events of the period of retirement, a change in the method of Jesus' work. His retirement from Galilee is from the people and their religious leaders into more intimate companionship with His disciples, from His popular instruction of the multitudes and beneficent activity in their midst to teach His faithful followers in more secluded intercourse the significance of His own person for the Kingdom He had been proclaiming, and to prepare them for His Passion. The period has fittingly been called, from its chief characteristic, the Training of the Twelve, and in no incident does this characteristic more clearly appear than in the events of Caesarea Philippi.

The immediate occasion of Jesus' retirement from Galilee and the change in His method of work are indicated in Mt. and Mk. by their account of His attitude towards the traditions of the elders (Mat 15:1-20, Mar 7:1-23). The fundamental opposition

between Jesus and the legalism of the Pharisees which had appeared in His attitude towards the Sabbath customs, and in the Sermon on the Mount, came now to sharp expression in His attack on the whole system of external formalism in religion. The people, moreover, had shown themselves unprepared to receive and unable to appreciate His teaching, even after the work of John the Baptist and His own labours in their behalf. And so the form of His teaching had changed from the gnostic to the parabolic, causing a separation between the mass and those who had ears to hear. How utterly the people had failed to comprehend Him is revealed by their attempt after the feeding of the five thousand to take Him and make Him king (Joh 6:15). After His discourse in Capernaum (Joh 6:26 ff.), St. John tells us that many of His disciples walked no more with Him (Joh 6:66). Finally, the mission of the Twelve had widely extended His work, and shortly thereafter we are told that Herod (Antipas) heard of Jesus (Mar 6:14, Mat 14:1, Luk 9:7 ff.). Bitter hostility from the religious leaders, failure on the part of the people to understand the character of His work, interested attention from the murderer of John the Baptist,—in the midst of such conditions Jesus withdrew from Galilee, and from His popular preaching activity, to devote Himself to His disciples.

Jesus' first retirement is into the region of Tyre and Sidon, part of the Roman province of Syria. Returning to Galilee, He feeds the four thousand, refuses the request of the Pharisees and Sadducees for a sign from heaven, with its evident Messianic implication, warns His disciples against the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees (so Mat 16:6; Mar 8:15 has 'Pharisees and Herod'), heals a blind man near Bethsaida (Mar 8:22 ff.), and retires from Galilee for the second time, coming with His disciples into the region of Caesarea Philippi.

The key to the situation at Caesarea, its controlling idea, is to be sought neither in the confession of Peter nor in the promise to Peter, but in Jesus' announcement of His approaching Passion. To this Peter's confession leads up; around it Jesus' instruction of the disciples regarding Himself and the conditions of discipleship centres. The theme, moreover, becomes characteristic of His subsequent teaching (Mar 9:12; Mar 9:31; Mar 10:33 f., Mar 12:7; Mar 14:8 etc.).

St. Luke tells us that Jesus had been praying alone (Luk 9:18; cf. Luk 3:21), and that His disciples were with Him. St. Mark vividly locates the question that Jesus put to His disciples, as 'in the way' (Mar 8:27). St. Mark and St. Luke agree in the form of the question, 'Who do men (Mk. οἱ ἄνθρωποι, Lk. οἱ ὄχλοι) say that I am?' St. Matthew, however, gives it in the third person, and introduces the title 'Son of Man'—'Who do men say that the Son of man is?*' [Note: In Mat 16:13 με before λέγουσιν in the TR is to be omitted with x B c vg cop syrhr (cf. also Mat 10:32, Luk 12:8 f., Mar 8:38,

Luk 9:26, Mat 5:11, Luk 6:22, Mat 16:21, Mar 8:31, Luk 9:22.)] In either form the question is a striking one, by reason of the prominence it gives to Jesus' person. Emphasis until now had been placed by Him on His message and on His works of mercy, though both had stood in intimate relation to His person. He desires to know now what men think of the messenger.

The form given to Jesus' question in Mt. has been regarded as secondary, on the ground that by calling Himself the Son of Man, Jesus suggested the answer to His question in asking it. As a matter of fact, however, the answer is not given in terms of this title. In the Synoptic Gospels the title 'Son of Man' is always a self-designation of Jesus. Even where it appears in the Fourth Gospel in the mouth of others, this is in evident dependence on its use by Jesus (Joh 12:34). St. Stephen's use of it also looks back to Jesus' words (Act 7:56, cf. Luk 22:69), and the usage of the Apocalypse is probably to be explained by the influence of Dan 7:13 (cf. Rev 1:13; Rev 14:14). There can, moreover, be no doubt that Jesus so designated Himself during the conversation with the disciples at Caesarea Philippi. The phrase occurs in Mar 8:31 and Luk 9:22, but it is neither more adequately motivated than in Mt., nor is it explained. The disciples must have been familiar with it as a self-designation of Jesus, even if they did not understand its full significance. The way in which it is introduced both in Mt. and Mk.-Lk. makes it difficult for us to think that it was now used for the first time; and the Synoptic Gospels do indeed give earlier instances of its use (Mar 2:10; Mar 2:28, Mat 8:20; Mat 9:6; Mat 10:23; Mat 11:19; Mat 12:8; Mat 12:32; Mat 12:40; Mat 13:37; Mat 13:41, Luk 5:24; Luk 6:5; Luk 6:22; Luk 7:34). Dalman questions this order, regarding it as improbable that Jesus called Himself Son of Man at an earlier time (*Worte Jesu*, p. 216), and Holtzmann holds that if Jesus did so it was in a different sense (*NT Theol.* i. pp. 257, 263). The Synoptic representation is self-consistent, however, in presupposing its earlier use, and this we must accept even while admitting that the meaning of the term cannot be fully determined apart from its usage here and subsequently, where it is associated with Jesus' suffering, resurrection, exaltation, and coming again in judgment. See, further, art. Son of Man.

In answer to Jesus' question, the disciples report the opinions current among the people concerning Him. The report must have been discouraging. Not only was there variety of opinion, some thinking that He was John the Baptist (cf. Mar 6:14), others Elijah, and still others Jeremiah (Mat 16:14) or one of the prophets; but in the midst of this variety there was general agreement that Jesus, whoever else He might be, was not the Messiah. A forerunner of the Messianic Kingdom He might be, but not the Messianic King. His activity in proclaiming the Kingdom, whatever Messianic expectations it may have aroused, had resulted only in the popular recognition of His prophetic character, and in His association with the Messianic Kingdom in some preparatory sense. Manifestly Jesus was not the popular Messiah. His work, directed

as it was towards spiritual ends, did not accord with the popular conception of the Messianic Kingdom. Moreover, Jesus had not spoken plainly in Galilee of His Messiahship. He had not assumed a popular Messianic title, and when individuals had recognized in Him the Messiah, He had commanded silence. His work, however, like that of John the Baptist, had excited interest, and called forth opinions which associated Him with the coming Messianic Kingdom. The report of the disciples so accurately describes the situation and so faithfully represents the tenor of popular opinion, that it cannot be regarded merely as the background sketched by the Evangelists for the purpose of bringing into sharp relief the confession of Peter.

In the Synoptic narratives the question of Jesus about the opinion of the people leads up to a similar question addressed to the disciples about their own, and the answer in the one case stands in sharp contrast to the report given in the other,—a contrast which is vivid and real because true to the historical situation. To the question addressed to the disciples, ‘But who say ye that I am?’ Peter answers, ‘Thou art the Christ’ (so Mk.; Lk. gives simply ‘the Christ of God,’ and Mt. ‘Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God’). Unlike the people, the disciples had recognized in Jesus the Messiah, and to this conviction Peter gave brief expression. However inadequate may have been the content which Peter and his companions gave to this formal statement of their faith, it was a matter of great importance that they were able to affirm clearly, and in opposition to the opinion of the people, their belief that in Jesus the Messianic King had come. The readiness and decision with which Peter formulated the faith of the disciples are an indication that their faith, though now expressed in this form for the first time, did not originate here (cf. J. Weiss, *Das alteste Evang.* p. 51). Their very presence with Jesus at this time gave evidence of such a conviction (cf. Joh 6:68 ff.). In this faith they had answered His call to discipleship; in it they had associated with Him, heard His teaching, and seen His wonderful works; their appointment as Apostles implied it, as did their subsequent mission to Israel. They had seen opposition arise and develop into bitter hostility; but when Jesus withdrew into the region of Tyre and Sidon, and again into the region of Caesarea Philippi, they still accompanied Him. They knew the popular opinion, but they still adhered to their own conviction.

The significance of Peter’s confession, however, lies not simply in the fact that it gave expression to a deep and long-cherished conviction, thus evidencing the permanent, unchanged character of his faith; it had reference also to the future. It was made in answer to a question of Jesus which had as its occasion His intention to reveal to the disciples the necessity of His suffering. The faith of the disciples had stood all the tests to which it had been subjected in the past. Jesus, however, clearly foresaw a still greater test in the near future. In order to prepare them for it, there was need that definite expression be given to their faith. The revelation which was to be made to them would thus serve the purpose of clarifying the content of their faith.

In Mk. and Lk. the confession of Peter is accordingly brought into close connexion with the announcement of the Passion. Mt. alone gives the words of Jesus to Peter (Mat 16:17-19), not only confirming what we may infer from Jesus' reception of the confession (Mk.-Lk.), its essential correspondence with His own consciousness, but going further and giving us positive knowledge of Jesus' estimate and appreciation of Peter's faith.

Addressing Peter as Simon Bar-Jona, * [Note: Bar-Jona , or 'son of Jonas,' probably means 'son of John' (cf. Joh 1:42; Joh 21:15-17). In Hebrew the words יונה and יוחנן differ, but the Greek rendering of יוחנן is sometimes the same as that of יונה (cf. 1Ch 26:3, 1Es 9:23, 2Ki 25:23). Zahn attributes the difference between Mt. and Jn. to a confusion by the Greek translator of Mt. of the two Hebrew words (Kommentar, p. 537). Wellhausen gives his verdict briefly: 'Jona ist Jona und keine Ahnung von Johanan, und Mt wird nicht bloss gegen das Hebraerevangelium, ein spates Machwerk, recht haben, sondern auch gegen das vierte Evangelium' (Evang. Matt. p. 83 f.).] Jesus declares him to be blessed in the possession of a faith which, transcending the human sphere of flesh and blood, has its origin in the heavenly sphere and from His Father. In thus describing the revelation-character of Peter's faith, Jesus does not define more nearly the process or time of origin, the psychological moment, but treats his faith simply as a definite fact of the past. Continuing with the emphatic 'But I,' Jesus makes Peter's confession the occasion of revealing His plan for the future, and the part that Peter is to fulfil in it. With the words 'Thou art Peter,' Jesus recalls the name He had given to His disciple and apostle (cf. Joh 1:42, Mar 3:16, Mat 10:2, Luk 6:14). The Greek Πέτρος, like the Aramaic *Kçphâ*, means a rock, and suggests the idea of firmness or strength. In giving such a name to Simon, Jesus had looked beneath the surface and read the character of Peter in terms of motive and underlying disposition. A man of decision, he was full of energy and strength, a man of action rather than of contemplation, a natural leader; and if at times impulsive, rebuking his Master and even denying Him, he was in the one case loyal to his faith, however unwisely so, and in the other was following Jesus to be near Him when he fell. In maintaining and confessing his faith in Jesus, Peter had shown himself true to the character which Jesus recognized when He named him Peter. Upon this rock Jesus now affirms His intention of founding His Church: not upon any rock, and therefore not simply upon a strong and firm foundation, but upon *this* rock indicated by the name Peter. In the Greek the word for Peter (Πέτρος) and the word for rock (πέτρα) differ in form, but in Aramaic the same form was probably used. The Pesh. has *kiphâ* in both instances (cf. also Mat 27:60; in Mat 7:24 f. *šû'â* is used). The rock intended by Jesus to be the future foundation of His Church is Peter, realizing the character indicated in his name. The function thus assigned to Peter is indeed not apart from his confession, nor is the fact that he evidently spoke in a representative capacity to be

overlooked. The address of Jesus, however, is distinctly to Peter, and it is his name that is interpreted. The confession which precedes is indeed closely related to the words of Jesus, but it cannot be understood as the rock-foundation intended by Jesus. In itself it furnishes the occasion rather than the ground of Jesus' promise. It cannot therefore be treated abstractedly as something separate from Peter, but must be regarded as a manifestation and, in its measure, a realization of the character which Jesus saw in Peter when He gave him his name. The content of Peter's faith, moreover, was entirely inadequate when measured by Jesus' conception of what His Messiahship involved. Much had still to be learned in the school of experience (Mar 8:31 ff; Mar 14:66 ff., Luk 22:31, Joh 21:15 ff., 1Co 15:5), but the character was fixed in principle. Jesus saw its strength, and chose the man for the work He had for him to do. The opening chapters of the Acts of the Apostles give some account of the way in which he accomplished his charge.

The figure of a rock-foundation, used to describe Peter's future function in the Church, suggests naturally a single rock underlying a whole structure, and not one stone among a number built together into a foundation (cf. Mat 7:24 ff.). Neither the figure nor the function thus assigned to Peter excludes the work of the other Apostles (Eph 2:20), much less the work of Jesus (1Co 3:10 f.), which is clearly indicated in οἰκοδομήσω. The figure describes simply what Peter, by reason of his strong, energetic character, and in view of Jesus' intention, is to be for the Church which Jesus will build. The idea of building a community or Church was familiar from the OT (cf. Psa 28:5, Jer 18:9; Jer 31:4; Jer 33:7), and recurs in the NT (cf. Mat 21:42, Act 4:11; 1Pe 2:4 ff., Rom 15:20, 1Co 3:9 ff., 2Ti 2:18 ff., Heb 3:1 ff.). By the use of the future tense and the choice of the word meaning to build rather than to rebuild (ἀνοικοδομέω, cf. Act 15:16), Jesus not only points to the future for the origin of His Church, but declares that it will be His own creation. It was expected that the Messiah would have a people and would rule over them in an organized community. The idea of such a community cannot have been strange to the disciples who had just confessed their faith in Him. It would have been strange had Jesus made no reference to His Church. By speaking of it He made plain to them that the idea was included in His purpose, and thus formed an element in His Messianic consciousness. The future founding of the Church is set by Him in evident contrast to present conditions, but the fact that this is included in Jesus' present purpose and thus made part of His Messianic work brings it into vital and organic relation with the present. His work had, indeed, not yet taken on its Church-form, but this was not due to the fact that the idea of such a Messianic community was foreign to His purpose. He thus encourages His disciples in the midst of popular disaffection and unbelief, by giving them assurance with regard to His intention.

The disciples had confessed their faith in Him, and He now tells them that however little promise present conditions may give of such a future, He will found His Church. And He will do this in the face of conditions which may seem to them to make such a future impossible. Instead of improving, the conditions will become worse. With His conception of the spiritual nature of His work and the consequent character of His Church, Jesus saw the necessity of His completed work and final exaltation in order to the full realization of His Messianic functions in such a Messianic community, and hence speaks of its building as a future event (Act 2:36, Rom 1:4). It is not strange, therefore, that He speaks but seldom of His Church, and dwells on the ideas of the Kingdom, faith and discipleship, in which its spiritual character and principles are set forth.

The word ἐκκλησία, regularly used in the LXX Septuagint to translate כְּהֵל (kâhâl), occurs frequently in the writings of St. Paul, but only here and in Mat 18:18 in the words of Jesus. Its authenticity has been questioned (cf. Holtzmann, *Hdcom.*; but, on the other hand, Kostlin in *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] x. 318), but its use has an adequate basis in the teaching of Jesus, and is naturally motivated here not simply by the confession of Peter, but also by Jesus' thought of the future, controlled as it is by the revelation of His Passion which He is about to make to His disciples.

So permanent and strong will be the structure built by Jesus on Peter, the rock-foundation, that the gates of Hades—a figurative expression used to suggest the idea of the very greatest strength, since they withstand all effort to force them open (Isa 38:10, Wis 16:13, 3Ma 5:51)—shall not surpass (κατισχύσουσιν) it in strength.*

[Note: Others understand κατισχύσουσιν in the sense that the attack going forth from the gates of Hades shall not overcome the Church (Zahn), or again that the gates of Hades shall not prove strong enough to withstand the attack made on them by the Church, Hades in the former interpretation being conceived as the kingdom of evil, in the latter as the kingdom of death (Meyer).] Changing the figure and having the superstructure in mind, Jesus declares that He will give to Peter the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. What he binds upon earth shall be bound in Heaven; what he looses upon earth shall be loosed in Heaven. The phrase 'Kingdom of Heaven' frequently takes the place in Mt. of the corresponding phrase 'Kingdom of God' in Mk. and Lk. Here it is to be understood not of the Kingdom which is in Heaven, but of that Kingdom which has its origin and centre in the Heavenly sphere, whence it receives its character as the rule of God and its determinative principles as moral and spiritual. This is the Kingdom which Jesus preached, whose coming He declared to be at hand, whose character and principles He expounded, and whose blessings He mediated. But

while having its centre in Heaven, this Kingdom was to be realized upon earth, and, in its future manifestation at least, is associated closely with the Church. The authority which Peter is to exercise has reference to the Church, but the reciprocal relation between the Kingdom and its Heavenly centre is to continue in its future manifestation as Jesus had known it in His own experience and had declared it in His teaching. What Peter does as His representative in the Church which Jesus will build shall be ratified in Heaven. The keys of the Kingdom of Heaven symbolize administrative authority (cf. Isa 22:22, Rev 3:7 f.), and the phrase 'bind and loose' is another figurative expression in which the idea of regulating seems to be fundamental: in Aramaic the words 'asar and shērâ mean to allow and to disallow (cf. also Mat 18:18, Joh 20:23). Both figures seem to have reference to the internal affairs of the Church, and are therefore not to be understood as descriptive of Peter's proclamation of the gospel, as if by means of it those who accepted the gospel message were to be received into the Church (keys) and loosed from their sins, and those who rejected it were to be excluded and so bound in their sins. The description of Peter's work in the proclamation of the gospel is given in the figure which represents him as the foundation-rock of the Church. The power of the keys and that of binding and loosing, however, are not only closely associated together, but they are separated from the figure of the rock, and together describe Peter's function in the Church and his relation to its internal management as that of an οἰκονόμος. See also art. Keys below, and 'Power of the Keys' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , vol. iv.

In the command of Jesus to His disciples that they should tell no one that He is the Christ, Mt. not only joins again the narrative of Mk.-Lk., but rightly interprets the briefer form, in which they gave the command, by the words ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς. The authenticity of this and similar commands, especially in the Gospel of Mk., has, indeed, been called in question (Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis*); but the command is quite natural here, and cannot be regarded as having its origin solely in the general apologetic purpose of St. Mark. It has reference to the form in which Peter's confession was made, and to deny its authenticity would necessitate a complete reconstruction of the account which the Gospels give us of Jesus' life and work.

The climax of the scene at Caesarea is reached in Jesus' announcement of His Passion. Both Mt. and Mk. signalize His words as the beginning of instruction on this subject (Mk. καὶ ἤρξατο, Mt. more specifically ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο, Lk. connecting the announcement directly with the command to silence, εἰπὼν ὅτι δεῖ τ. ὑ. τ. ἀ. πολλὰ παθεῖν). *When* Jesus became aware of the necessity of which He here for the first

time speaks explicitly to His disciples does not appear clearly from the Synoptic Gospels. The Fourth Gospel indicates that He was not unaware of it from the beginning of His public ministry (Joh_2:19; cf. Joh_2:21, Mat_26:61). The Synoptic Gospels, however, give evidence that Jesus looked forward at an early period in the Galilaeen ministry to the time when He would be removed from His disciples (Mar_2:20). Certainly the narrative here does not justify the inference that He now for the first time became conscious of the necessity of His suffering, any more than the question to Peter and Peter's confession justify the inference that Jesus or His disciples now for the first time became conscious of His Messiah ship. The conditions of His ministry may well have influenced Jesus to speak of the subject to His disciples at this particular time. Foreseeing not merely the necessity of His suffering, but its near realization, He spoke to the disciples of it for the purpose of preparing them for the issue of His work and of clarifying the content of their faith. The necessity of which Jesus speaks is to be understood as moral rather than physical, since it sprang out of the nature of His Messianic work by which He was brought into conflict with existing conditions. But if faithfulness to His work involved suffering, the necessity of which He speaks becomes voluntarily conditioned by a willingness to suffer, and this finds its ultimate explanation only in the Messianic consciousness of Jesus. A necessity springing out of faithfulness to His work, and thus to Himself, is, however, not only moral, but falls within the Divine purpose; and Jesus evidently so conceived it, since in rebuking Peter He speaks of it as τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ. The idea of a suffering Messiah, if current at all at the time of Jesus, was certainly not a prominent feature of the popular Messianic hope. The traces of it which are found, moreover, do not explain the form in which it appears in the Synoptic Gospels. For here we find it closely associated with a resurrection and a glorious coming of the Son of Man in His kingdom.

However clearly Jesus may have foreseen His suffering, and however calmly He may have announced its necessity, the care with which He prepared for, as well as the actual result of, His statement, reveal plainly the fact that the idea was foreign and repugnant to the thought of the disciples. A Messiah, though in retirement, opposed by the leaders and unrecognized by the people, they could believe Him; but that He should suffer, and that in Jerusalem where as Messiah He should rather establish His kingdom, seemed to them incredible. Peter's action in rebuking Jesus sprang naturally and spontaneously from the limitation of his outlook into the Messianic future. The view which would exclude suffering from His future, Jesus, however, rejects not only as human in character and origin, but as opposed to the Divine purpose; so that Peter in urging it, however conscientiously, became for Jesus a tempter, a hindrance in His way.

In the words which follow Peter's rebuke, Jesus sets forth the conditions of discipleship, and points out that the way of the disciple in following Him, like His way

in going to Jerusalem to suffer, involved not only suffering, but willingness to suffer for His sake—the voluntary taking up of the cross and following Him in the pathway of self-sacrifice. Emphasis is placed by Jesus on personal relationship to Him, revealing a consciousness on His part of His own supreme significance for the world of spiritual realities made accessible through Him and His message (cf. also Mat_10:32 ff.). The fate of the soul, with its possibilities of spiritual life, is made dependent not on a denial of the will to live, but on a denial of the will to live for self and earthly gain. He who would be Jesus' disciple must seek his true and highest life-principle in self-sacrifice for Jesus' sake (cf. Gal_2:20). Self-surrender to Jesus is made the principle of spiritual life, and as such it must be absolute, superseding even the desire for life itself. In stating such conditions of discipleship, Jesus reveals a consciousness of His own significance for men which transcends the present and partakes of the character of the truth which He proclaimed. Discipleship is thus drawn into and made part of that future in which He Himself was conscious of holding a place of highest authority. His words set the present in closest relation with the future, since its true worth will then be revealed. The relation which men sustain to Him now will then have its intrinsic value made manifest by His attitude towards them. 'For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, and with his angels; and then shall he render to every man according to his deeds.' This prophetic description of the future closes with these words: 'Verily I say unto you, There be some here of them that stand by, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power' (so Mk.; Lk. has simply 'till they see the kingdom of God'; Mt. more fully, 'till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom'). The words are prophetic, and describe an experience in which some of those then in Jesus' company shall share. The object of this experience is in Lk.-Mk. the Kingdom, or the Kingdom (having) come (Mk. uses the perf. part. ἐληλυθυῖαν) in power. It seems thus to be conceived as a future but actually existing state or fact rather than event. In Mt. the same experience is described, but the fact of the Kingdom's presence is associated with or described in terms of the Son of Man's coming (ἐρχόμενον) in His kingdom. In their context the words seem to refer to the Messianic kingdom, and to describe it in one of its eschatological aspects. The disciples had just confessed Jesus, who called Himself the Son of Man, to be the Messiah, and He had declared that the Son of Man would come in glory. He now declares that some of those present will live to witness the coming of the Son of Man, the Messiah, in His kingdom; by which we may understand the establishment of His kingdom in power. This, however, was to be realized in the Church; for Jesus, in speaking of His intention with reference to the future founding of His Church, had not only indicated the close relation of the Church to the Kingdom of Heaven, the one being the future manifestation-form of the other, but also stated that He Himself would build the Church, thus directly revealing His power in it. It is therefore not unnatural to understand the 'coming of the Son of Man in his kingdom' or 'the kingdom (having) come in power' as referring to the establishment of His

Church, its equipment with power through the gift of the Spirit at Pentecost, and its activity in realizing the Kingdom under His direction. Others seek the fulfilment of Jesus' prophecy in the Transfiguration, His appearances to the disciples after the resurrection, or specifically in the gift of the Spirit at Pentecost, or in the fall of Jerusalem, or still more generally 'in some convincing proof that the Messiah's kingdom had been actually set up, as predicted by prophets and by Christ Himself' (Alexander, *Matthew*, p. 446).

Literature.—Reland, *Palaestina*, ii. 918-922; Guérin, *Description de la Palestine*, 'Galilée,' ii. 308-323; *SWP* [Note: WP Memoirs of the Survey of W. Palestine.] i. 95, 109-113; G. A. Smith, *HGH*^L [Note: GH Historical Geog. of Holy Land.] , 473-480; Buhl, *GAP* [Note: AP Geographic des alten Palästina.] 238 ff.; Baedeker, *Palestine* 5, 291 f.; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] (Index); artt. 'Caesarea' (Ewing) and 'Peter' (Chase) in Hastings *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] ; 'Caesarea' (G. A. Smith), 'Ministry,' 'Simon Peter' (Schmiedel) in *Encyc. Bibl.*; 'Gaulanitis' and 'Palastina' (Guthe), 'Kirche' (Köstlin), 'Petrus, der Apostel' (Sieffert) in Herzog's *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; Holtzmann, *Handkommentar*, i., *Neutest. Theologie*, i. p. 211 f.; Zahn, *Evangelium des Matthäus*; Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 254 ff.; Vos, *The Teaching of Jesus concerning the Kingdom of God, and the Church*, 140-168; Lowrie, *The Church and its Organization*, 102-123; Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*; A. B. Bruce, *The Training of the Twelve*, ch. xi.

William P. Armstrong.

☩ Caiaphas

CAIAPHAS (Καϊάφας; according to Josephus, 'Joseph Caiaphas') was appointed high priest of the Jews in or soon after a.d. 18, and held office until he was deposed by Vitellius about a.d. 36 (Josephus *Ant.* xviii. ii. 2, iv. 3). He is referred to as the high priest in [Luk 3:2](#) (with Annas), [Mat 26:3](#); [Mat 26:57](#), and is mentioned along with Annas, John, and Alexander among the heads of the Sanhedrin in [Act 4:6](#). The length of his rule, compared with the short periods allowed to his immediate predecessors, suggests that he proved a satisfactory and submissive agent of the Roman policy. By two of the Evangelists, St. Matthew and St. John, Caiaphas is specially connected by name with the procedure which led to the condemnation and death of Jesus. When, after the raising of Lazarus, the 'high priests and Pharisees' held a meeting of the Sanhedrin (informal, as Caiaphas does not appear to have presided), it was Caiaphas

who gave the ironically prophetic advice that it was expedient that one man should die for the people (Joh 11:50). ‘St. John, contemplating that sentence years after, could not but feel that there was something in those words deeper than met the ear, a truth almost inspired, which he did not hesitate to call prophetic’ (F. W. Robertson, *Sermons*, i. 134). In saying that ‘being high priest that same year he prophesied,’ the Evangelist does no more than claim for the theocratic head of the nation the function which might be supposed to be latent in his office (cf. the remark of Philo quoted by Westcott: ‘the true priest is a prophet’; see also the remarks of Dale, *The Atonement*, p. 169 ff.), and had, as a matter of fact, been exercised by some of his predecessors in the office (Num 27:21). The threefold repetition by St. John of the statement that Caiaphas was high priest ‘that same year’ (Authorized Version ; Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘that year’) has been made the ground of charging the Fourth Evangelist with ignorance of the fact that the high priest might hold office for more than one year. But this criticism rests on a misapprehension of the phrase (το ὄ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου), which emphasizes not the date, but the character of the year = ‘that fateful year’ (cf. Joh 20:19, Mar 4:35).

The resolution thus prompted took effect in the arrest of Jesus; but, as son-in-law to Annas, Caiaphas permitted the prisoner to be taken first before him (Joh 18:13) for a private examination. Whether this took place in the ‘palace’ of Caiaphas, where Annas was living, or elsewhere, is not clear. It is also uncertain whether the Fourth Gospel contains any record of an examination of Jesus by Caiaphas. According to the reading and interpretation of Joh 18:24 in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 , it does not; but it is held by some (e.g. Meyer and Edersheim, against Westcott) that Authorized Version may be correct, and that the high priest referred to in Joh 18:15; Joh 18:19; Joh 18:22 was Caiaphas. According to the narrative of the Synoptists, it was to Caiaphas the ‘high priest,’ or the ‘house of Caiaphas,’ that Jesus was led, and there, at the (irregular) meeting of the Sanhedrin at daybreak (Mat 26:59, Mar 14:55, Luk 22:66), Caiaphas presided; and it was he who brought the trial to a conclusion by declaring Jesus guilty of blasphemy, and demanding sentence upon Him.

Caiaphas appears again in Act 4:6 in company with Annas and others, as initiating the persecution of the Apostles, and in the later proceedings is probably the ‘high priest’ referred to in Act 5:17; Act 5:21; Act 5:27; Act 7:1; Act 9:1.

Literature.—On the name, Nestle in *Expos. Times*, x. [1899] p. 185. On the historical circumstances, Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii. i. 182 f., 199; Andrews, *Life of our Lord*, 137, 505. On the ethical significance of Caiaphas’ attitude to Christ, F. W. Robertson, *Sermons*, i. 132; J. B. Lightfoot, *Sermons in St. Paul’s*, 75; A. Maclaren, *Christ in the Heart*, 255; E. H. Gifford, *Voices of the*

Prophets, 73; W. H. Simcox, *Cessation of Prophecy*, 278; H. H. Henson, *Value of the Bible*, 294; *Expos. Times*, iv. [1892] p. 49.

C. A. Scott.

☩ Cainan

CAINAN.—The name occurs twice in St. Luke's genealogy of our Lord: (1) of the son of Arphaxad ([Luk_3:36](#)); (2) of the son of Enos ([Luk_3:38](#)).

☩ Calendar, The Christian

CALENDAR, THE CHRISTIAN

I. The Christian Week.

1. The Lord's Day.
2. Wednesday and Friday.
3. Saturday.

II. The Christian Year.

1. Easter.
 - (a) The name.
 - (b) Early observance of Easter.
 - (c) The Quartodeciman Controversy.
 - (d) Determination of Easter. Paschal cycles.
 - (e) The fast before Easter.
 - (f) Palm Sunday.
 - (g) Maundy Thursday.

- (h) Easter Week.
 - 2. Pentecost and Ascension.
 - (a) The name 'Pentecost.'
 - (b) Connexion of Pentecost and Ascension.
 - 3. Christmas and Epiphany.
 - (a) Their origin.
 - (b) Advent.
 - 4. Presentation of Christ in the Temple.
 - 5. Commemoration of Saints, etc.
- Recapitulation of festal cycles.

Literature.

The Christian Calendar in its origin appears to have been based mainly on the desire to commemorate, by festival or by fast, the events of our Lord's life upon earth. These commemorations were either weekly or annual. But while the weekly observances were developed early—almost, or in part quite, from Apostolic times—the annual celebrations were of very slow growth, and for some three hundred years were confined to the two seasons when the Jews and Christians in common observed a commemoration, Easter and Pentecost. It is noteworthy, as showing that the main desire was to commemorate the events in the life of Jesus, that one of the very earliest books which exhibit any considerable development of the festal cycle is the so-called *Pilgrimage of Silvia*, otherwise of *Etheria* (about a.d. 385), in which the customs at Jerusalem are described. It was natural that those who lived in the land where the events narrated by the sacred history took place, should wish to commemorate them on the spot by annual observances. But this development took place only in the 4th century.

I. The Christian Week.

1. The Lord's Day.—It is significant that the first meeting of the disciples after the evening when they saw their newly-risen Master was, as far as the Gospel tells us, on the immediately succeeding 'first day of the week' (Joh_20:26 μεθ' ἡμέρας ὀκτώ: note how emphatically the Evangelist says of the preceding week, τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, Joh_20:1, and τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ τῇ μιᾷ σαββάτων, Joh_20:19). It was more than an accidental coincidence if, as is very generally assumed, the birthday of the Church (Act_2:1) was also on the first day of the week. At Troas the Christians met together, or held a *synaxis* (συνηγμένων ἡμῶν), on the first day of the week for worship and the Eucharist (Act_20:7, where ἐν τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων appears to be more than a mere chronological reference, and to indicate a custom), and also probably for the Agape (cf. Act_20:7 with Act_20:11). In this and other passages it is necessary to remember that the 'first day of the week' began, from the point of view of a Jew, with what we should call Saturday night; and this consideration is against Prof. Ramsay's view that the service at Troas began on what we should call Sunday night (*St. Paul the Traveller*, ch. xiii. § 3). That it was the custom for Christians to meet together for worship on the first day of the week appears also from 1Co_16:2 (κατὰ μίαν σαββάτου), where the Corinthians are hidden each to 'lay by him in store,' that there might be no collection when the Apostle came. This would point probably to a weekly assembly at which alms were collected. Otherwise there is no reason why any one day of the week should be specially mentioned.

The first mention of the 'Lord's Day' by name is Rev_1:10, if indeed this is the right interpretation (ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ). This phrase has been variously interpreted of the first day of the week, or of the Day of Judgment, or of the Sabbath, or of Easter Day. The last two interpretations may be dismissed as having no support from the earliest ecclesiastical writings. The identification of ἡ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ with the Last Day has more probability; it would then be equivalent to ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ Κυρίου (2Th_2:2; cf. 1Th_5:2 ἡμέρα Κυρίου, Act_2:20 from Joe_2:31; 2Pe_3:10, 1Co_1:8 ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, and 1Co_5:5, 2Co_1:14, Php_1:6), and would mean that the Apocalypticist is carried forward in vision to the day of the end of the world. It is a valid objection to this view that it would practically make the Apocalypse deal only with the future, and that almost the earliest ecclesiastical authors after the canonical writers use κυριακῇ in the sense of the first day of the week (see below). The more probable interpretation of the phrase in question is therefore the first mentioned above.

The NT evidence does not compel the belief that the Lord's Day was of universal observance in the earliest ages of the Church, but it at least makes it probable (especially when we find it so generally established in the next age) that it was of Apostolic precept. And there is nothing to forbid the supposition that it was a following of the spirit of the teaching of the great Forty Days (Act_1:3). But we may gather, with the historian Socrates (*Historia Ecclesiastica* v. 22), that the 'Saviour and His Apostles' did not make fixed rules as to the observance of days, and 'enjoined us by no law to keep this feast [he is speaking of Easter, but his argument applies equally to Sunday], nor do the Gospels and Apostles threaten us with any penalty, punishment, or curse for the neglect of it, as the Mosaic Law does the Jews.... The aim of the Apostles was not to appoint festival days, but to teach a righteous life and piety.'

To pass to the post-Apostolic age, Barnabas (xv. 9) says: 'We keep the eighth day for rejoicing, in the which also Jesus rose from the dead, and, having been manifested, ascended into the heavens,' a passage which throws some light on the occasional observance in later times of Ascension Day and Pentecost together. Barnabas purposely names the 'eighth day' rather than the first, as he has just spoken of it as following the Jewish Sabbath, the seventh day. 'I will make the beginning of the eighth day, which is the beginning of another world.' The *Didache* speaks of the *synaxis* on the Lord's Day, and uses the pleonastic phrase *κατὰ κυριακὴν Κυρίου συναχθέντες*; the purpose of the *synaxis* was that the Christians might break bread and celebrate the Eucharist, having confessed their sins that their sacrifice might be pure (§ 14).—Ignatius (*Magn.* § 9) speaks of Christians no longer observing Sabbaths, but fashioning their lives after the Lord's Day (*μηκέτι σαββατίζοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ κυριακὴν ζῶντες*), which at least involves a general observance of the first day of the week.—Pliny (*Ep.* 96) says only that the Christians met on a fixed day, and does not say which ('soliti stato die ante lucem convenire carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere secum invicem ...'). He apparently, as Lightfoot observes (*Ignatius*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , i. p. 52), confuses Baptism and the Eucharist; but we may probably gather from his account that the Christians of Bithynia met before dawn on a fixed day to celebrate the Eucharist, and later in the day met for the Agape. This inference is disputed by some.—Justin Martyr describes the assembling 'on the day called Sunday' (*τῆ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένη ἡμέρᾳ*) for the Eucharist by 'all who live in cities or in the country' (*Apol.* i. § 67). He also explicitly mentions the Sunday collection of alms, as in 1Co_16:2. In the *Dialogue* also Justin extols the 'eighth day' (cf. Barnabas, *l.c.*) as possessing a 'mysterious import,' which the seventh day had not; he is referring to the Jewish circumcision as a type of 'the

true circumcision by which we are circumcised from deceit and iniquity, through Him who rose from the dead on the first day after the Sabbath' (*Dial.* 24, 41).

That κυριακή became a common name in the 2nd cent. for the first day of the week is further clear from the fact, which Eusebius tells us (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iv. 26), that Melito, bishop of Sardis about a.d. 170, wrote a book περὶ κυριακῆς (ὁ π. κ. λόγος). Dionysius of Corinth (a.d. 171) in his Epistle to Soter calls Sunday 'the Lords Day' (Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* iv. 23: τὴν σήμερον κυριακὴν ἁγίαν ἡμέραν διηγᾶγομεν). After this the name becomes very common, and we find it both in Greek (e.g. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* vii. 12) and in Latin, *dies dominica* (e.g. Tertullian, *de Cor.* 3).

There is little evidence as to the way in which the Lord's Day was observed in the earliest ages. The Eucharist and probably the Agape were celebrated; but perhaps to a great extent other occupations went on much as usual. It would not be easy for Christian working men to absent themselves from their avocations on a day when everyone around them was working; and this may have been the reason why the *synaxis* took place at night or before dawn, as in the examples in Acts and in Pliny. St. Paul apparently began his journey from Troas (Acts 20) on Sunday. There is no evidence in the earliest ages of any attempt to transfer the obligations of Sabbath observance to the Lord's Day. The Jewish Christians already had their day of rest on the Saturday. But, as Zahn observes (*Skizzen aus dem Leben der Alten Kirche*, p. 214), the Gentile Christians must have very quickly learnt all over the world to keep the Lord's Day; they were never compelled to keep the Sabbath, which was not one of the four observances enjoined in Act 15:29.

Tertullian, however, is the first to mention a Sunday rest (*Apologet.* 16, *de Orat.* 23), saying that the Christians postponed ordinary duties and business only on that day, the day of the Lord's resurrection, and that they gave up 'the day of the sun' to joy. He contrasts the Christian with the Jewish rest by implication. He says that the Christians did not kneel on the Lord's Day (*de Orat.* 23, *de Cor.* 3). This custom we already find in Irenaeus (*Fragm.* 7), who traces it to Apostolic times; and it was afterwards laid down in the 20th canon of Nicaea.

For the 3rd and 4th cents., the *Church Orders*, some of which have only lately come to light, and the early *Didascalia* (i.e. the work as it was before it was incorporated in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, and as we have it, for example, in the *Verona Latin Fragments*, edited by Dr. Hauler) throw some light on the question of the Lord's Day. The Christians are hidden 'on the Lord's Day (*die dominica*), putting aside everything,' to assemble at church (Hauler, p. 44). The fragment breaks off in the

middle of a sentence explaining the object of Sunday churchgoing ('audire salutare uerbum et nutriri ab ...'); but we can fill the gap from other forms of the *Didascalia*, such as the Syriac edited by Mrs. Gibson, from which we see that the Eucharist is being spoken of ('be nourished with the divine food which endureth for ever,' Gibson, ch. xiii.). This appears to come from the original *Didascalia*, and it is emphatically said that the Lord's Day is the great time for the Christian assembly, for prayer, Eucharist, and instruction; and this emphasis is all the greater as it was not yet customary to have public daily prayers for all men. But about a.d. 375 the writer of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, in adapting the *Didascalia*, alters this direction for Sunday worship to a command to assemble twice daily, morning and evening (ii. 59). In the *Testament of our Lord* (circa (about) 350?), the way is being felt towards public daily service by providing daily forms for the clergy and the presbyteresses, with whom the devout might be invited to join [see, further, on daily service, Wordsworth's *Ministry of Grace*, ch. vi.; and Cooper and Maclean's *Testament of our Lord*, p. 189]. We may then say that until the latter part of the 4th cent. Sunday was the only regular and universal day for Christian assemblies. There is a possible local and temporary exception in the *Hippolytcan Canons* (§ 217, ed. Achelis), which command daily service; but some have concluded that this is an interpolation, as it is thought to be in contradiction to § 226. These *Canons* allow a bishop to celebrate the Eucharist when he pleases. And again, a daily celebration of the Eucharist is perhaps found in Cyprian (*de Orat. Dom.* 18). But no further trace of this is found till the latter part of the 4th century. The result arrived at does not mean, however, that the Christians were not bidden to pray daily; from a very early period, certainly from about a.d. 200 onwards, regular daily hours of prayer were prescribed (e.g. *Can.* [Note: Canaanite.] *Hippol.* § 223 ff.). But private prayers are here meant, even though sometimes they were said in church. For other *synaxes* in the week, see below (§§ 2, 3).

The Lord's Day was the usual day for the ordination or consecration of a bishop; so the older *Didasealia* in Mrs. Gibson's form, § iii. [but this is an interpolation from one of the following books], the *Egyptian Church Order* (ed. Tattam, § 31), the *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii. 4), and the *Testament of our Lord* (i. 21); also in the *Ethiopic Church Order* (§ 21), according to Achelis, though Ludolf (*ad suam Hist. aethiop. Comment*, p. 323) has 'in die sabbati.' The *Canons of Hippolytus* perhaps mention Saturday, though Achelis gives 'in ea ... hebdomade'; but the Arabic for 'Saturday' and 'week' are pronounced alike (see Rahmani, *Test. D. N. Jesu Christi*, p. xxxvi).

The rest on the Lord's day appears (especially until the time of Constantine) to have been mainly to allow of church-going. But in the edict of Constantine in 321, the magistrates and people in cities are bidden to rest, and all workshops are directed to be closed 'on the venerable day of the sun'; while no such obligation is laid on those engaged in agricultural pursuits. Whatever the motive of the emperor in making this

decree may have been (and this is disputed), it doubtless did much to bring about a weekly holiday on the Lord's Day.

2. Wednesday and Friday fasts.—Almost from the beginning we can trace an observance of these two days for the purpose of fasting. In this way the early Christians interpreted our Lord's words in Mat_9:15, that they should fast when the bridegroom should be taken away from them; though, as we shall see, some found a more particular fulfilment of these words in the fast before Easter. The reason why Wednesday and Friday were chosen is not entirely obvious. The stricter Jews had made a practice of fasting 'twice in the week' (Luk_18:12), and, as we learn from the *Didache* (§ 8), the Christians took over the practice, but changed the days. Probably ever since the Return from the Captivity, Monday and Thursday had been the Jewish fasts, though we read of Judith fasting daily save on Sabbaths and New Moons and the eves of both and 'the feasts and solemn days of the house of Israel' (Jdt_8:6). Monday and Thursday were chosen, or were afterwards accounted for, because there was a tradition that Moses went up into the Mount on the latter day and came down on the former. But these were not matters of law, for the Mosaic Code prescribes only the Day of Atonement as a fast; and though occasional fasts were ordered in times of trouble, these were never permanent nor of universal obligation. Thus the Pharisee's boast in Luk_18:12 was that he did more than he was obliged by law to do (see, further, in Plummer's *St. Luke, in loc.*). In the sub-Apostolic age the Christians went a step further and seem to have tried to make the Wednesday and Friday fasts universal. The *Didache* (§ 8) says: 'Let not your fastings be with the hypocrites [the Jews], for they fast on the second and the fifth day of the week; but do ye keep your fast on the fourth day and on the preparation' (there is a change of construction: νηστ εύουσι ... δευτέρῳ σαββάτων ... ὑμεῖς δὲ νηστεύσατε τετράδα καὶ παρασκευήν. For the latter, νηστεύω with direct accusative, see the parallel *Apost. Const.* vii. 23 and v. 15; and *Oxyrhynchus Logia*, 2: ἐὰν μὴ νηστεύσητε τὸν κόσμον, and *Testament of our Lord*, ii. 6 and 12 [apparently]). A reason was found for the choice of Wednesday and Friday in the fact that on the former day the Jews made a conspiracy against our Lord, and that He was crucified on the latter. But this first appears in Peter of Alexandria († 311), who gives this explanation in his *Canonical Epistle* (canon xv.). It reappears elsewhere, e.g. in *Apost. Const.* v. 15. Another explanation is given by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.*, vii. 12). He says that the fourth and sixth days are named from Hermes and Aphrodite respectively. The true Christian or 'Gnostic' fasts in his life in respect of covetousness and voluptuousness, from which all the vices grow. Considering, then, that the symbolical explanations differ, and that they are not found until a somewhat later date than the first mention of these days, it is reasonable to suppose that they are afterthoughts. Yet it is probable that, when the Jewish fast days had to be changed, Friday was not accidentally fixed upon, but that

our Lord's death on that day would make it appropriate as a fast; and when once Friday was chosen, Wednesday would follow from mere considerations of convenience.

Other early authorities for week-day fasts are Hennas, Tertullian, Hippolytus, the *Hippolytcan Canons*, and Origen. Hennas (*Sim.* v. 1) does not mention the days on which it was usual to fast; but he says that he was fasting and seated on a certain mountain, giving thanks to the Lord, when he met the Shepherd, who asked him why he was there. He replies that he is keeping a 'station' (στατίωνα ἔχω), which he explains as being a fast. Tertullian expressly mentions Wednesday and Friday (*de Jejun.* 2 and 14: 'stationibus quartam et sextam sabbati dieamus, et jeiuniis parasceuen'—a difficult phrase, since the sixth day and 'parasceue' are one; perhaps the meaning is that Wednesday was a 'half-fast' [*de Jejun.* 13] in Tertullian's time, and Friday a whole one, or perhaps Tertullian means Good Friday here by 'parasceue'). He says that the Eucharist was celebrated on those days (*de Orat.* 19). For Hippolytus, see below (§ 3) on the Saturday fast. The *Hippolytcan Canons*, which, whether they represent Roman usage or Alexandrian, probably date from the first half of the 3rd cent., prescribe fasts 'feria quarta et sexta [et quadraginta],' though it approves of individuals adding other fasts to these (§ 154; the bracketed words seem to be an interpolation). Origen speaks of Wednesday and Friday as days 'quibus solemniter jejunamus' (*in Lev. Hom.* x., but see II. 1 c, below).

But hereafter there is a break, except that Peter of Alexandria gives evidence for Egypt, and that in the Edessene Canons of the first half of the 4th cent. there are directions for the Eucharist on Sundays, for service 'on the fourth day,' and for service 'on the eve' [of the Sabbath] at the ninth hour (canons 2, 3). Apparently the observance of these two days was not universal, at any rate in the East, till towards the end of the 4th century. There is no mention of them in the *Testament of our Lord* (*circa* (about) 350 a.d.?), which alludes to the possibility of a fast day falling in the week (i. 22), but does not prescribe one. There is in this curious Church Order a regulation for bishops and presbyters to fast three days a week, perhaps only for one year from their ordination, but they are not tied down to any fixed days, and the rule is expressly said to be 'for the priests only.' The *Arabic Didascalia* (§ 38, *circa* (about) 380 a.d.?), which is probably based on the *Testament*, mentions explicitly Wednesday and Friday as the two fast days of the week, and says that when a festival falls on these days they shall pray and not receive the holy mysteries, and shall not interrupt the fasting till the ninth hour [see a German translation of these later chapters in Funk's *Apostol. Konstitutionen*; the rest is not published]. There is abundant evidence towards the end of the 4th cent. for these days: *Apost. Const.* v. 15, vii. 23; *Apost. Can.* [Note: Canaanite.] 69 (68); pseudo-Ignat. *ad Phil.* [Note: Philistine.] 13; Epiphanius, *Haer.* lxxv. 6 (ed. Dionysius Petavius, lib. iii. 6, p. 910), and *Expos. Fid.* 21.

The *Apostolic Constitutions* are here (vii. 23) based on the *Didache*, and repeat its language about the change of day from those of the ‘hypocrites.’ The *Apostolic Canon* makes it incumbent on all, under penalty, to keep these days, unless in sickness. Pseudo-Ignatius, who is probably the same as the author of the *Apost. Constitutions* [so Harnack, Brightman; but Lightfoot (*Ignatius*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , i. 265 f.) thinks otherwise] re-echoes their language. Epiphanius says that these two days were observed everywhere (ἐν πᾶσι κλίμασι τῆς οἰκουμένης); he calls them τετράς and προσάββατον. Bp. J. Wordsworth conjectures that the restoration of these days in the East was largely due to Epiphanius (*Min. of Grace*, ch. vi. ii.). Probably in Egypt and in many parts of the West their observance was continuous.

Usually the Eucharist was celebrated on Wednesdays and Fridays; perhaps often (as the *Arabic Didascalia* may suggest) at a late hour, so that the fast might be preserved, though Tertullian speaks (*de Orat.* 19) of the service being during the hours of fasting on these days, and of scrupulous communicants reserving the elements in private so as not to break the fast. In ‘Silvia’ (iv. 3, in Duchesne’s *Origines*, Appendix) the observance of Wednesdays and Fridays *in Lent* is spoken of: ‘Diebus vero quadragesimarum ... quarta feria ad nona in Syon [the traditional scene of the descent of the Holy Spirit, possibly the site of St. Mark’s house, called by Epiphanius and St. Cyril of Jerusalem the Church of the Apostles] proceditur juxta consuetudinem totius anni, et omnia aguntur quae consuetudo est ad nonam agi praeter oblatio.... Sexta feria autem similiter omnia aguntur sicut quarta feria,’ which must mean that the Eucharist was usually celebrated on Mount Zion after none at 3 p.m. except in Lent, though Duchesne seems to invert this conclusion (p. 130 n. [Note: note.] 4, English ed.). ‘Silvia’ says that on these days, unless a festival of the martyrs fell on one of them, even the catechumens fasted. In the 5th cent. an exception to the Wednesday and Friday Eucharist is mentioned by Socrates (*Historia Ecclesiastica* v. 22) in the case of the Wednesday and Friday before Easter.

These days were called ‘half-fasts,’ *semi-jejunia* (Tertull. *de Jejun.* 13), because on them Christians broke their fast at 3 p.m. or even at noon; or more frequently ‘station days’ as in Hermas (*l.c.*, though he does not specify the days) and in Tertullian (*de Jejun.* 14). This is a military metaphor. Tertullian (*de Orat.* 19) says: ‘If the Station has received its name from the example of military life—for we are God’s military [cf. 2Co_10:4, 1Ti_1:18]—certainly no gladness or sadness chancing to the camp abolishes the Stations of the soldiers; for gladness will carry out discipline more willingly, sadness more carefully.’ And St. Ambrose says: ‘Our fasts are our encampments which protect us from the devil’s attack; in short, they are called

Stations, because standing and staying in them we repel our plotting foes' (*Serm.* 25, ed. of 1549, p. 716c).

3. Saturday.—There was a considerable divergence of custom with regard to the observance of Saturday. In the East it was commonly regarded as a feast, while in many parts of the West it was a fast, that of Friday being continued to the Saturday, and the added fast being called a 'superposition' (*superpositio*, ὑπέροθεσις). Tertullian (*de Jejun.* 14) mentions and condemns the custom of fasting on Saturday: 'You ['psychic' Christians] sometimes continue your station even over the Sabbath, a day never to be kept as a fast except at the Passover season.' St. Jerome writing to Lucinius in a.d. 398 (*Ep.* 71) discusses the question, and says that it had been 'treated by the eloquent Hippolytus' and others; but he does not tell us what their opinions were. The Council of Elvira in Spain (*circa (about)* 305 a.d.) ordered superpositions each month except in July and August (canon 23); and in canon 26 says that the error is to be corrected 'ut omni sabbati die superpositiones celebremus,' which may mean that superpositions were to be held every Saturday (Hefele), or that this weekly fast was henceforward forbidden (Bp. J. Wordsworth). The latter meaning would suit canon 23 better, but Hefele's construction suits canon 43. St. Augustine says that in his time they did not fast at Milan on Saturday (*Ep.* liv. *ad Januar.* § 3). Writing in the 5th cent., Socrates (*Historia Ecclesiastica* v. 22) says that in his day almost all Churches celebrated the sacred mysteries on the Sabbath of every week [Saturday], yet the Christians of Alexandria and Rome, on account of some ancient tradition, had ceased to do this. This 'ancient tradition' may probably go back before the 4th century. Socrates goes on to say that the Egyptians near Alexandria and those of the Thebaid held *synaxes* on the Sabbath, but, unlike other Christians, "after having eaten and satisfied themselves with food of all kinds [the Agape?], in the evening make the Offering (περὶ ἐσπέρας προσφέροντες) and partake of the mysteries.'

Sozomen (*Historia Ecclesiastica* vii. 19) repeats Socrates' statements.* [Note: Dom Leclercq (*Dict. d'Archcél. Chrét.* s.v. 'Agape', col. 822) thinks that in Socrates and Sozomen there is no trace of an Agape, but only of a Eucharist. But it appears clear to the present writer that the words 'eating and satisfying themselves' point to the Agape, and that the whole purpose of the custom described is to keep up the example of the Last Supper. For a full discussion of the origin and date of introduction of the Agape, see Hastings' (forthcoming) *Dict. of Religion*, s.v.]

The *Testament of our Lord* (i. 23), according to our present Syriac text, prescribes Eucharists on Saturday or Sunday; but we must probably correct 'or' into 'and,' by the omission of Syriac letter (ⲁⲛ into ⲁ), and the rule will then agree with the Arabic Didascalia, § 38. In the Constitutions (ii. 59) Saturday and Sunday are specially appointed for Divine service; and we note that in this passage Saturday is the author's

interpolation into his source, the old Didascalia mentioning only Sunday (Hauler, Fragments, p. 44). Pseudo-Ignatius forbids a Christian to fast on Sunday, save on Easter Even [the reading of the last words is doubtful, but the sense is clear], lest he be a 'Christ-slayer' (χριστοκτόνος). And so the same author in . Const. vii. 23 bids his hearers feast on the Sabbath and the Lord's Day, except on Easter Even; and in v. 13, 15, he bids them leave off fasting on the seventh day, save on that Sabbath when the Creator was under the ground. The Canons strongly make the same prohibition as to fasting on ordinary Saturdays (Canon 66 [65]).

As we saw above, Alexandria did not celebrate the Eucharist on Saturday for some time before Socrates. St. Athanasius (*Apol. con. Avian.* 11) implies that it was celebrated on Sunday only. He replies to a charge against Macarius of breaking a chalice, and shows that the place alleged was not a church, that there was no one there to perform the 'sacred office,' and that the day was not the Lord's Day, and did not require the use of it [the sacred office]. This at least shows that there was no fixed day except Sunday for the Eucharist. And Brightman (*Journ. of Theol. Stud.* i. 92) thinks that the same is implied in the Sacramentary of Serapion (*circa (about)* 350 a.d.), which gives 'The first prayer of the Lord's day' (κυριακῆς), without arranging for any other day. But this is hardly conclusive, especially as Thmuis was not Alexandria, and Socrates says that the 'neighbours of Alexandria' *did* have a Saturday Eucharist. By a.d. 380 the latter was already established in Alexandria (Timothy of Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] *Respons. Canon.* 13, see Brightman, *l.c.*). Cassian says that in his time there were no public services in the day among the Egyptians except on Saturday and Sunday, when they met at the third hour for Holy Communion (*Inst.* iii. 2). St. Augustine sums up the matter by saying that in some places no day passed without the sacrifice being offered; in others it was only on Saturday and the Lord's Day, or, it may be, only on the Lord's Day (*Ep.* liv. *ad Januar.* § 2).

For Phrygia and Cappadocia we have no satisfactory evidence with regard to the observance of Saturday in the 4th century. The 49th canon of Laodicea in Phrygia (*circa (about)* 380?) says that during Lent the bread shall not be offered except on Saturday and Sunday, from which it may perhaps be inferred that these two days were 'liturgical' all through the year. St. Basil in his 93rd Epistle, *ad Caesariam* (v.l. Caesarium; in the Paris ed. of 1618, *Ep.* 289), says that he communicated four times a week, on the Lord's Day, Wednesday, Friday, and the Sabbath, and on other days if there were a commemoration of any saint (v.l. martyr); he refers to and defends the practice of private reservation, and says that in Egypt each layman kept the Eucharistic elements in his own house and partook when he liked. Thus the fact that Basil communicated on the days mentioned does not necessarily imply a Eucharist on those days.

It is noteworthy that Saturday and Sunday have remained in the Greek Church as the only 'liturgical' days in Lent, as provided in the Laodicean canon; whereas the Nestorians provide Eucharistic lections for every day in certain selected weeks in Lent (called the 'weeks of the mysteries') with the one exception of Saturday.

II. The Christian Year.—In addition to the weekly observances, there were annual commemorations of events in our Lord's life, although their development was slow. Two of these, Easter and Pentecost, passed to the Church from the Jews; while others, such as Good Friday, Lent, Ascension, Christmas, Epiphany, Advent, are of purely Christian origin.

1. Easter

(a) *The name.*—'Pascha' (πάσχα) was the common name for Easter at least from the 2nd cent. onwards in Greek and Latin Christianity; and it is of some importance to gather from the earlier writers the reasons for its use, as they will show us the exact meaning of the commemoration. πάσχα is taken from the Aramaic ܦܫܚܐ (hâ), the equivalent of Heb. פסח (h) 'the passover.' Syrian Christians, however, have usually written the word in the form ܫܗܐ (shâ) as if from ܫܗܘܐ 'to rejoice' (see Payne-Smith, Syriacus, in loc.); though, in translating into Syriac from Greek, James of Edessa and others use the form ܦܫܚܐ (as in the of our Lord, passim); and the Lexicons give a verb ܫܗܘܐ 'to celebrate Easter.' The meaning in Syriac literature is usually 'Easter,' though the Nestorian writers, like their descendants to this day, use it in the sense of 'Maundy Thursday.' The older Greek and Latin writers commonly derive it from πάσχειν, 'to suffer,' and draw analogies from etymology between the paschal lamb and the suffering Christ. Thus, perhaps, Justin Martyr (. 40; he is showing how the lamb sacrificed as the passover is a type of the Passion); and most probably Irenaeus (aer. iv. x. 1: 'Moses foretold Him after a figurative manner by the given to the passover, and at that very did our Lord suffer, thus fulfilling the passover'). (. Jud 1:19, Migne, vol. ii. col. 670): 'It is the Lord's passover, that is, the Passion of Christ.' Lactantius expressly adopts this etymology (. Inst. iv. 26, Migne, vol. i. col. 531): 'Pascha nominatur ἀπὸ τοῦ πάσχειν, quia passionis figura est.' Augustine, on the other hand (. Leviticus 1, Januar., a.d. 400) denies this interpretation, while he proposes a scarcely better one: 'The word Pascha itself is not, as is commonly thought, a Greek word; those who are acquainted with both languages affirm it to be a Hebrew word. It is not derived, therefore, from the Passion because of the Greek word πάσχειν, signifying suffer, but it takes its name from the transition of which I have spoken, from death to life; the meaning of the

Hebrew word Pascha being, as those who are acquainted with it assure us, a over or . To this the Lord Himself designed to allude when He said: “He that believeth in me is passed from death to life....” ’

The question then arises, What did these earlier writers mean by Pascha? Was it the commemoration of the Passion, or of the Resurrection? Irenaeus wrote a work, *περὶ τῶν πάσχα* (quoted by pseudo-Justin, *Quaest. et resp. ad Orthodoxos*), which is probably the letter to Victor from which Eusebius gives extracts (*Historia Ecclesiastica* v. 24). In this he speaks of a festival preceded by a fast of varying duration (see below, e); and he may use the word *πάσχα* of the festival or of the festival and fast combined. Bp. J. Wordsworth (*Ministry of Grace*, iii. § 1) says that the Christian *πάσχα* always in the first three centuries and often in the fourth means the celebration of the fast of Good Friday, extended no doubt by *ὑπέρθεις* or superposition in most cases over Easter; and he adduces Tertullian, *adv. Jud. 1:10*, as above (but this hardly shows it), and *de Bapt. 19* (‘Pascha affords a more solemn day for baptism, when all the passion of the Lord, in which we are baptized [tinguimur], was completed’). We may add *de Orat. 18*, where he says that they did not give the kiss of peace ‘die paschae’ when there was a general fast. But in *de Cor. 3* he seems to use the word of Easter Day; he says that the Christians did not kneel ‘a die Paschae in Pentecosten usque’; and in *de Jejun. 14* he speaks of celebrating Pascha, and of the fifty ensuing (*exinde*) days being spent in exultation, which is suitable language if Pascha means Easter Day, but hardly if it means Good Friday. It may, however, in these passages, mean Easter *and* the preceding fast, and this would suit the remark which follows in *de Jejun. 14*, that Saturday was never a fast ‘nisi in Pascha.’ Origen (*circa (about) Cels. viii. 22*) distinguishes *παρασκευή* from *πάσχα*, and doubtless means Easter by the latter. He mentions the observance of the Lord’s Day, of the Preparation, of Pascha, and of Pentecost; and cannot here mean *every* Friday by the ‘Preparation,’ for then he would also have mentioned Wednesday, as in *Hom. in Lev. x.* (see above, 1. §2).

One may conjecture that there was some divergence in the first three centuries both as to the name and as to the actual observance of this commemoration. It seems likely that in many cases the Resurrection and the Passion were observed on the same day. This must usually have been the case with the Quartodecimans, who observed the fourteenth day of the lunar month; but it was also apparently often the case with those who kept the Sunday, for, as we shall see below, the fast observed before the Sunday was often only of one day’s duration, and did not always include the Friday. Even well on in the 4th cent. we find a relic of this in the *Testament of our Lord*, where the Friday before Easter is not mentioned as the day of commemorating the Passion but as a preparation for the festival, and the Passion and Resurrection are

apparently commemorated together, just as the Ascension and Pentecost were often joined (see below, § 2 *b*). There is nothing *a priori* incongruous in commemorating and giving thanks for the Redemption of mankind on a day of rejoicing, especially when a severe fast of a day or two had just preceded. The probable conclusion, then, is that Pascha usually meant, before the 4th cent., the commemoration both of the Death and of the Resurrection of Christ, the festival with its preceding fast, and that the erroneous derivation from πάσχω favoured a certain indefiniteness in the use of the word. This derivation, it may be observed, as well as the equally false Syrian one, probably explains why a name with such a very Jewish association became so popular. When, somewhat later, a distinction had to be made between Good Friday and Easter Day, the names πάσχα σταυρώσιμον and πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον were invented (Ducange, s.v. 'Pascha').

Another use of the name Pascha is to be noted. In the *Testament of our Lord* (i. 28, 42; ii. 8, 11, 12, 18) it means the forty days before Easter, though of these forty days only the last two were fasts. Holy Week is called 'the last week of Pascha.' The end of Pascha is to be after the Saturday at midnight. The 'forty days of Pascha' are specially mentioned. Similarly in *Apost. Can.* [Note: Canaanite.] 69 (68) we find τὴν ἁγίαν τεσσαρακοστήν τοῦ πάσχα. But in the *Testament*, Pascha is used absolutely in this sense. In this work, however, we also read of 'the feast of Pascha' (i. 42), when widows (presbyteresses) are to give alms and bathe. The bathing was on the Thursday before Easter.

'Pascha' was sometimes used for Holy Week. Thus in *Apost. Const.* v. 18 we read: 'Fast in the days of Pascha beginning from the second till the Preparation and the Sabbath, for they are days of sorrow, not of feasting.' And so perhaps *Can.* [Note: Canaanite.] *Hipp.* § 195 ff. (below, *d*).

Other names for Easter were: among the Latins, 'Dominica gaudii' (Bingham, *Ant.* xx. v. 5); among the Greeks, μεγάλη κυριακή; while the common Syrian name was and is ܦܳܫܳܚܳܐ ܕܳܥܳܠܳܡܳܝܳܬܳܐ 'the feast of the Resurrection.'

(*b*) *Early observance of Easter.*—The Apostles, no doubt, continued to keep the Jewish Passover (Act 20:6); but it is uncertain if the first Gentile Christians observed it in any way, or whether they were content with the weekly commemoration. It is not even certain if the Jewish Christians kept it in any way as a *Christian* festival. Yet the phrases τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ... Χριστός and ἐορτάζωμεν (1Co 5:7 f.) would be specially appropriate if the Christians at Corinth were at the time when St. Paul wrote from

Ephesus, namely, before Pentecost (1Co 16:8), observing an Easter festival. But it is significant that there is no mention of Easter in the Apostolic Fathers or in Justin Martyr; and its absence in the *Didache* is specially noteworthy, since that Church Order mentions the Lord's Day, the fast before baptism, and the Wednesday and Friday fasts. We can, however, trace the observance of Easter at Rome back to the time of Pope Xystus, *circa (about)* 120 a.d., for Irenaeus tells us (*ap.* Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* v. 24) that Xystus and his immediate successors, while not observing the Quartodeciman practice themselves, yet were at peace with those who did; and from what follows it is clear that Irenaeus means that Xystus observed the Sunday as Easter Day. In Asia Minor the observance can be traced back still further; for Polycarp, as Irenaeus says (*ib.*), traced his custom of keeping Easter to St. John. The conclusion may probably be, either that Easter was not universally observed as an annual commemoration early in the 2nd cent. or, more probably, that it had not then the great importance which it acquired later in the century, from the disputes as to the day when it should be kept.

(c) *The Quartodeciman Controversy.*—A brief summary only of this question is necessary for the purposes of this Dictionary; for more detailed accounts of it, reference may be made to the works mentioned at the end of this article. The controversy arose in the 2nd cent, and came to a head in the last decade of it; it was concerned with the question whether the Paschal commemoration should follow the day of the week or the day of the lunar month on which the events commemorated originally occurred. Those who upheld the former practice no doubt laid chief stress on the Resurrection of our Lord, since they fixed on Sunday for their commemoration; while the latter, who were called Quartodecimans or τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτται (Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica* v. 22, Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica* vii. 19), probably at first emphasized our Lord's death, as they adhered to 14th Nisan, the day on which He died, or was thought by them to have died; whereas, on no calculation did He rise on that day. The theory has, indeed, been advanced by the Tübingen school that the Quartodecimans commemorated the Last Supper rather than the Passion or Resurrection. According to the Synoptists, the Last Supper appears to have taken place on the evening of 14th Nisan, and the Crucifixion to have been on the 15th; while, according to the Fourth Gospel, the Death of our Lord would appear to have been at the time of the killing of the Paschal lambs, and the Last Supper therefore to have taken place at the end of 13th Nisan. We are not here concerned with the seeming contradiction between the Gospels except in so far as the Tübingen school deduced from the known facts that the Quartodecimans could not have accepted the Fourth Gospel, because their practice rather agreed with the Synoptists. Western readers need, however, to be reminded that in the ordinary Eastern reckoning, at any rate the ecclesiastical reckoning, then as now, the Last Supper and the Crucifixion fell on the same day; for the day began at sunset. Thus, if the Quartodecimans observed

14th Nisan, it must have been because they thought that our Lord both celebrated the Last Supper and also died on that day. It is a pure assumption that their Paschal commemoration began at the moment when the lambs were killed. In that case they would have been rather Quintodecimans. It is generally agreed that the lambs were killed, at any rate in ancient Jewish times, in the afternoon of 14th Nisan, *i.e.* when that day was drawing to a close. The inference, then, is that the Quartodecimans made their Paschal commemoration coincide with the day which began at the Last Supper and ended soon after our Lord's death, and that they thought that that occurred at the time of the killing of the lambs. The deduction is the exact opposite of that drawn by the Tübingen school, and is that the Quartodecimans followed the Fourth Gospel (as they, perhaps rightly, interpreted it) rather than the Synoptists. The supposition that they commemorated the Last Supper in particular has, moreover, no basis of fact. And the view given above is further supported by the fact that in the time of Melito (a.d. 170) the Quartodecimans clearly accepted the Fourth Gospel. Melito, in one of his fragments, speaks of our Lord's three years' ministry, which he could never have gathered from the Synoptists ('de Incarn. Christi,' in Routh's *Reliquiae sacrae*, vol. i.).

It has been thought by some (as by Hefele) that the Quartodecimans kept their commemoration of the Resurrection on the third day after 14th Nisan, *i.e.* on 16th Nisan, or even on the Sunday after. But this is very improbable. If it were so, why should they have broken off their fast on 14th Nisan? It is much more likely that they commemorated the Passion and the Resurrection together.

The history of the controversy is given by Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* v. 23, 24), who takes up the question at its third and most acute stage, namely, at the dispute between Victor and Polycrates at the very end of the 2nd century. He tells us that synods held in that century unanimously decided that 'the mystery of the resurrection of the Lord should be celebrated on no other but the Lord's day, and that we should observe the close of the paschal fast on this day only.' These synods were held in Palestine, Rome (under Victor), Pontus, Gaul (under Irenaeus), and Osrhoëne in N.-W. Mesopotamia. Perhaps the last-named synod was held at the famous Edessa or Ur-hai, which is in that district. There were also personal (*i.e.* not synodical) letters of Bacchylus, bishop of Corinth, and many others, all of whom concurred in the decision mentioned above. On the other side 'Asia' (*i.e.* probably the Roman province, though the Quartodeciman practice extended to other provinces also—even to Antioch), led by Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, maintained that the paschal commemoration should take place on 14th Nisan, on whatever day of the week it should fall. Polycrates, who is very highly praised by St. Jerome (*de Viris Illustr.* 45) and by implication by Eusebius, who preserves his letter (*l.c.*), privileges the example of 'Philip, one of the twelve Apostles, who fell asleep in Hierapolis, and his two aged virgin daughters, and another daughter who lived in the Holy Spirit and now rests at Ephesus'; also of John

‘who was both a witness and a teacher, who reclined upon the bosom of the Lord, and being a priest wore the [sacerdotal] plate (τὸ πέταλον). He fell asleep at Ephesus.’ He also adduces Polycarp, Melito, the martyr Sagaris, and others, who all agreed with his practice.

Victor *attempted* to excommunicate all ‘Asia’; ἀποτέμνειν ὡς ἑτεροδοξούσας ... πειροῦσθαι are Eusebius’ exact words. But Socrates (*Historia Ecclesiastica* v. 22) declares that he did actually excommunicate them. He probably issued a letter of excommunication, but it was not effective. For Eusebius goes on to say that Irenaeus, bishop of ‘Gaul,’ intervened in the dispute in the interests of peace, and he who ‘was truly well named became a peacemaker in the matter.’ Part of Irenaeus’ letter is preserved by Eusebius, and it is specially interesting as mentioning that ‘the presbyters before Soter who presided over the Church which thou [Victor] now rulest, Anicetus and Pius and Hyginus and Telesphorus and Xystus, neither themselves observed [the fourteenth day] nor permitted those after them to do so; and yet’ they were at peace with those who did observe it; and also that when Polycarp went to Rome in the time of Anicetus (bishop of Rome), the two bishops ‘disagreed a little about certain other things,’ but immediately made peace, ‘not caring to quarrel over this matter’; nor did it interfere with their remaining in communion with one another, or with Anicetus allowing Polycarp to celebrate the Eucharist in his church at Rome, ‘manifestly as a mark of respect’ (ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παρεχώρησεν ὁ Ἀνίκητος τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τῷ Πολυκάρπῳ κατ’ ἐντροπήν δηλονότι). It has been suggested that these words mean only that the two bishops communicated together; but in that case they are mere repetitions of what had just been said, and there would be no special mark of respect.

Eusebius here does not mention the intervening dispute in which Melito, bishop of Sardis, figures. But in iv. 26 he speaks of him, and from the account we gather that he was a prolific writer; a list of his books is given. In the quotation from Polycrates in v. 24 we find the name of Melito appearing as a Quartodeciman, but it is not said that he was a writer. From the earlier passage we learn that he wrote a book περὶ τοῦ πάσχα, from which a quotation is given: ‘While Servilius [Rufinus gives ‘Sergius’] Paulus was proconsul of Asia, at the time when Sagaris suffered martyrdom, there arose in Laodicea [in Phrygia] a great strife concerning Pascha, which fell according to rule in those days (ἐμπεσόντος κατὰ καιρὸν ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις), and these things were written [sc. because of the dispute].’ So McGiffert [‘Eusebius’ in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*] renders these words, though it is not obvious what they mean; for when did not Pascha fall according to rule? For other explanations see Salmon in

Smith-Wace, *Dict. of Chr. Biog.* s.v. 'Melito.' Eusebius goes on to say that Clement of Alexandria refers to Melito's work, and himself wrote one with the same title, 'on occasion' (ἐξ αἰτίας) of Melito's treatise, *i.e.*, probably, in opposition to it, though Hefele thinks that Clement's book was meant to *supplement* Melito's.

The *Paschal Chronicle* mentions that Apolinarius, bishop of Hierapolis, of whom Serapion, bishop of Antioch (*circa (about)* 200 a.d.), is the first to speak—but he was then dead—wrote a book περὶ τοῦ πάσχα, and preserves two fragments of it. It is disputed whether Apolinarius was a Quartodeciman. If so, he was not an extreme partisan; he certainly wrote before the discussion became acute, as in the time of Polycrates. He held (the *Paschal Chronicle* states) that our Lord, being the true Paschal Lamb, was slain on the day of the Passover feast. Some have asserted that there were two parties of Quartodecimans, the one Judaizing and the other not. But it is perhaps unnecessary to divide them, with Hefele, into 'Ebionites' and 'Johanneans.' Eusebius (iv. 27) mentions Apolinarius' writings, but not the work in question.

There were thus three stages in the controversy: (1) the discussion between Polycarp and Anicetus, *circa (about)* 150 a.d., when they agreed to differ, and parted amicably; (2) the dispute at Laodicea about a.d. 170; (3) the bitter contest between Victor and Polycrates about a.d. 190.

The other Churches, as a rule,—those outside 'Asia,'—agreed with Victor in his practice, but disapproved of his excommunicating the Quartodecimans. The Roman Pascha gradually prevailed, and was affirmed by the Council of Nicaea in 325, in whose decision the bishop of 'Asia' acquiesced. Thenceforward the Quartodeciman practice was confined to a few communities which were considered heretical. It lasted till the 5th cent., and Sozomen (*Historia Ecclesiastica* vii. 19) speaks of it as still going on in his day, *circa (about)* 443 a.d.

(d) *Determination of Easter: Paschal cycles.*—The defeat of the Quartodecimans did not ensure that all should keep Easter on the same day, for different calculations were in use for determining the paschal full moon. This had long been the case. For a time the Christians were dependent on the Jews for the date of their festival. The *Hippolytcan Canons* (§ 195, ed. Achelis) say that the week when the Jews celebrate Pascha is to be observed by all with the utmost zeal as a fast. And the older *Didascalia*, according to Codex Sangermanensis (Gibson's *Didasc.* 1903, p. 97), bids the Christians 'keep your fast with all care, but commence when your brethren of the Nation keep Pascha'; the Verona Fragments are wanting here. And in the 4th cent. pseudo-Pionius, in his *Life of Polycarp* (§ 2; for the date see Lightfoot's *Ignatius*, iii. 429), says that 'the Apostle [Paul] plainly teaches that we ought neither to keep it

outside the season of unleavened bread, as the heretics do, especially the Phrygians, nor yet, on the other hand, of necessity on the fourteenth day; for he said nothing about the fourteenth day, but named the days of unleavened bread, the Passover, and the Pentecost, thus ratifying the Gospel.'

On the other hand, the *Apostolic Constitutions* (v. 17) expressly say: 'Be no longer careful to keep the feast with the Jews, for we have now no communion with them'; and the Jews are said to have erred in their calculations. [The passage inserted before this in Dr. Donaldson's translation in the *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, taken from Epiphanius, belongs to the older *Didascalia*, and is not part of the *Apostolic Constitutions* at all].

And long before this Hippolytus had made an elaborate calculation, so that it might be no longer necessary for the Christians to follow the Jews, who had gone wrong in their computation through lax calculations of the lunar year. Hippolytus follows the system adopted by the Greek astronomers to harmonize the lunar and solar years. He makes the lunar year to be 354 days of twelve months, which alternately have 30 and 29 days. To supply the difference of $11\frac{1}{4}$ days between the lunar and solar years, he interpolates three months of 30 days each in every eight years ($8 \times 11\frac{1}{4} = 90$). He also puts two eight-year periods together, for convenience of determining the day of the week as well as the day of the year, and he thus makes a cycle of 16 years. But, as a matter of fact, the lunar year is longer by nearly nine hours than Hippolytus reckoned it, and this error made the cycle very soon to be obviously wrong. Calculating backwards on this cycle, he fixed on Friday 25th March a.d. 29 as the day of the Crucifixion, and this computation, though quite erroneous, has ever since been the basis of a large part of the Church Calendar (see on Christmas below, § 3). The same date, March 25, is also found in the *Acts of Pilate*, which probably was written after Hippolytus, and was indebted to him. Epiphanius (*Haer.* l. 1, *contra Quartodecimanos*, lib. ii. tom. 1) says that some, following the *Acts of Pilate*, always kept Pascha on March 25. These Christians, who thus anticipated a reform much desired in modern times, were not strictly Quartodecimans, for they abandoned 14th Nisan, although they observed Pascha on any day of the week, and so were separated from the Catholics. A slight modification on Hippolytus' system was made (*circa (about) 243*) by pseudo-Cyprian in his *de Pascha Computus* (see Dr. Salmon's article, 'Chronicon Cyprianicum,' in Smith-Wace, *Dict. of Chr. Biography*).

The Alexandrian Church is thought by Dr. Salmon to have used the Metonic cycle of nineteen years, which, somewhat modified, is still in use. Anyhow, the Alexandrians and Romans frequently kept Easter on different days. Another source of error was the determining of the vernal equinox, which at Rome in the 3rd cent. was thought to fall on 18th March, at Alexandria from *circa (about) 277* a.d. onwards on 19th March (the

calculation was made by Anatolius of Laodicea). The date was changed to 21st March (as it is now) in the reign of Diocletian.

The later disputes in Britain between the Columban and Augustinian missionaries were due to the former using a cycle which had been employed at Rome itself about a.d. 300, but had long been given up. The Columban missionaries were in no real sense Quartodecimans, though they professed to follow St. John.

(e) *The fast before Easter*—In the ancient literature we find two aspects of this fast. In the first it is a preparation, whether for the paschal commemoration itself or for baptism, whether (moreover) the former emphasized the Death or the Resurrection of our Lord. In the second it is designed to mark the sadness of Christians in the days when ‘the Bridegroom is taken away’ namely, the days when our Lord’s body was in the tomb. In this case it must be looked upon as a Good Friday fast, extended by ‘superposition’ to the Saturday. As the normal time for baptism was Easter, usually early on Easter morning,—a fact which the discovery of so many *Church Orders* has lately made abundantly clear,—it follows that the resultant fast would be the same, whichever account of its origin is the more primitive.

For the first aspect we have the *Didache*. This *Church Order*, as has been said, does not mention Easter. But it gives what seems to be an exhaustive list of the fasts known to the writer at the beginning of the 2nd cent., and says (§ 7): ‘Before the baptism let him that baptizeth and him that is baptized fast, and any others also who are able; and thou shalt order him that is baptized to fast *a day or two before*.’ It then prescribes the Wednesday and Friday fasts. We thus have the curious result that a fast of one or two days is mentioned earlier than the festival which at that time, or at any rate soon after, followed it; and the fast is connected not with the death of our Lord, but with baptism. It is significant that in the *Didache* not only the baptized and the baptizer fast, but also ‘any others who are able.’ And the silence of the Apostolic Fathers and Justin Martyr about Easter makes it not impossible that early in the 2nd cent. the pre-baptismal fast was emphasized more than the paschal festival. Irenaeus also speaks of the fast before Easter Sunday in a way which seems to exclude the idea of a Good Friday fast extended to Saturday. His words are thus given by Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* v. 24): ‘Some think that they ought to fast for one day, others for two days, others even for several, while others reckon forty hours both of day and night to their day. And this variety in its observance has not originated in our time but long before, in that of our ancestors’ (... οἱ δὲ καὶ πλείονας· οἱ δὲ τεσσαράκοντα ὥρας ἡμερινὰς τε καὶ νυκτερινὰς συμμετροῦσι τὴν ἡμέραν αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ.).

Some have put a stop after τεσσαράκοντα (among others Rufinus, who translated Irenaeus into Latin), making the writer say that some fasted forty days. But a forty days’ fast, as we shall see, was an invention of the 4th cent., and Rufinus is

interpreting Irenaeus by the practice of his own day. Moreover, this punctuation makes no sense of the words that follow, for no one can suppose that there was an absolute fast, night and day, for forty days, and, if not, the reference to 'night and day' has no point. Irenaeus seems clearly to mean that the fast lasted, variously, for one day, for two days, for several days, while some made a continuous fast of forty hours. The words, especially 'several days,' seem definitely to determine his point of view, that the fast was a preparation for the festival rather than an extension of Good Friday. The *Church Orders* definitely speak in the same sense. Baptism is described as taking place before the Easter Eucharist, and the directions for the paschal fast and solemnities generally follow immediately after the directions for baptism. The arrangement suggests that in the mind of the author of the lost ancestor of so many of these manuals,—for most of them are of one family and follow the same outline,—the preparation for baptism was the original object of the Lenten fast. The *Canons of Hippolytus* (§§ 150-152; but these are bracketed by Achelis as probable interpolations) speak of a baptismal fast of the newly baptized, and those who fast with them. In § 106 a fast of the candidates on the Fridays is mentioned; on the Saturday they are exorcized (§ 108) and keep vigil all night, and are baptized at cock-crow (§ 112). The *Egyptian Church Order* (Sahidic Eccles. Canons, § 45) prescribes a Good Friday fast. The Verona Latin Fragments are wanting in the parallel passage, but make the fast a two days' one in a later chapter (Hauler, p. 116). The *Testament of our Lord* (ii. 6) says definitely: 'Let them fast both on the Friday and on the Saturday'; and this is not improbably also the meaning of both the *Hippolytean Canons* and the *Egyptian Church Order*. The latter, at least, in a later section (§ 55) speaks of the fast as a two days' one. Now the *Egyptian Church Order* and the Verona Fragments say that if a sick person cannot fast on the two days, he is to fast on the Saturday. The *Testament of our Lord* (ii. 20) implies the same thing. But this puts the idea of a Good Friday fast extended over the Saturday out of the question. Even the *Apostolic Constitutions*, which exhibit a later stage and a longer fast, speak of the two days' absolute fast, and say that if any one cannot fast on the two days he is at least to observe the Saturday (v. 18). It is a characteristic of this last named *Church Order* to retain ancient features even when somewhat inconsistent with its own later point of view.

The other aspect, namely, of a Good Friday fast extended, is found in Tertullian. He speaks of the 'Psychics,'—*i.e.* the Church at large, from which he had now separated,—thinking that those days were definitely appointed for fasts in which the Bridegroom was taken away. The same language is found in the chapter of *Apost. Const.* just quoted, which thus combines the two ideas. It may not improbably be gathered from the evidence that the former point of view is the original one, and that the Lenten fast originated in the preparation for baptism, and that the second point of view was an afterthought.

The length of the fast was originally, as we have seen, one day, or two days, or forty hours. But it was an absolute fast. Another custom grew up in some countries in the 3rd cent. of observing the whole week before Easter, not as an absolute fast, but as a time of severe abstinence from food. It was called 'the week of *xerophagy*' (for the name cf. Tertullian, *de Jejun.* 2, 9). This is mentioned in the *Hippolytean Canons* (§ 197), which allow bread and salt and water only, and by Dionysius of Alexandria in his *Epistle to Basilides* (Song of Solomon 1). He says that 'all do not carry out the six days of fasting either equally or alike; but some pass even all the days as a fast, remaining without food through the whole; while others take but two, and others three, and others four, and others not even one.' It is possible, as many think, that Dionysius is the author of the *Hippolytean Canons*, and that they represent Alexandrian usage, not Roman. The Montanists observed a two weeks' fast, a custom which they kept up till the 5th cent., when, as Sozomen tells us (*Historia Ecclesiastica* vii. 19), they were distinguished by fasting *less* than their neighbours; formerly they had fasted *longer*, when Holy Week had been the maximum (cf. Tertullian, *de Jejun.* 15, when he says that the Montanists offered to God two weeks of *xerophagies* in the year, Saturday and Sunday being excepted). Epiphanius says that the Catholic Church observed a whole week, as opposed to the Quartodecimans, who observed only one day (*Haer.* l. 3, lib. ii. tom. 1).

Fasting for forty days was unknown till the 4th century. To maintain this proposition we must, with Achelis, eliminate 'et quadraginta' from *Can.* [Note: Canaanite.] *Hippol.* 154 (the canons having obviously suffered interpolations), unless these words could refer to the 'forty hours' absolute fast mentioned by Irenaeus; and similarly we must, with almost all scholars, reject the words in Origen's tenth *Homily on Leviticus*: 'Habemus enim quadragesimae dies jejuniis consecratos,' which come just before he speaks of the Wednesday and Friday fasts. We have the homily in Rufinus' translation only, and Rufinus was notoriously lax in interpolating and altering Origen's words. These eliminations will be generally agreed to, for we can see the forty days' fast growing before our eyes in the 4th century. We find τεσσαρακοστή mentioned in the fifth canon of Nicaea, a.d. 325, but as a season only (the holding of synods is the subject), doubtless as a solemn time, but without any reference to fasting. Duchesne seems to have overlooked this point, which adds to his argument (*Origines*, viii. § 4). In the *Testament of our Lord* (ii. 8) the 'forty days of Pascha' are spoken of as a time of vigil and prayer, specially used for the preparation of catechumens for baptism, but it is not a fast. On the other hand, in the *Apostolic Canons* (69 or 68), *circa* (*about*) 400 a.d., we read of τὴν ἁγίαν τεσσαρακοστὴν τοῦ πάσχα as a compulsory fast. This is one of the indications of a comparatively early date for the *Testament*. Duchesne (*l.c.*) has traced in Athanasius' 'Festal Letters' the growth of the fast. At first we read of the *time* of Lent and of the *week* of the fast, but later on of the *fast* of Lent and the Holy Week of Pascha.

In the Edessene Canons (Song of Solomon 7; see 'Syriac Documents' in the *Ante-Nicene Christ. Libr.* p. 39) a forty days' fast is prescribed; 'and then celebrate the day of the Passion and the day of the Resurrection: because our Lord ... fasted forty days, and likewise Moses and Elijah.' ... Can this be a relic of the observance of the Passion and the Resurrection on the same day?

In *Apost. Const.* v. 13 the forty days are exclusive of Holy Week, and so in pseudo-Ignatius (*Philipp.* 13), and in St. Chrysostom (*Hom. 30 in Gen.* § 1). In the *Testament of our Lord* they include Holy Week.

Socrates (*Historia Ecclesiastica* v. 22) says that the fasts before Easter differed in his day. At Rome they fasted for three continuous (συνημίνας) weeks, save on Saturday and Sunday; in Illyricum and Greece and Alexandria for six weeks, which they called τεσσαρακοστή; others, beginning their fast seven weeks before Easter, fasted three periods of five days only, but still called it τεσσαρακοστή. A difficulty is seen in this passage because Socrates had just said that every Saturday was a fast at Rome. Duchesne proposes to emend Socrates as far as the word 'continuous' is concerned, and supposes that the three weeks were the first, fourth, and sixth weeks of Lent. He justly remarks that the divergence of fasting, while the same name τεσσαρακοστή was kept, points to the fact that the 'forty days' were introduced for another purpose than that of fasting. In fact, the prevalence of forty days is due largely to the fact that catechumens were under instruction for that time. The catechumenate was indeed often longer, though St. Jerome (*Ep.* 61) says that in his time forty days was the usual period. We find two years at Elvira, three years in the *Egyptian Church Order* and the *Testament of our Lord*, though a good deal of discretion was allowed. But in any case, at the beginning of the forty days the selected candidates for baptism (*competentes*) were put apart and went through special instruction, with prayers, benedictions, and exorcisms, as is described at length in the *Church Orders*.

(f) *Palm Sunday* appears for the first time in the *Pilgrimage of 'Silvia.'* Formerly we had only known of it as being kept at the end of the 5th cent., a hundred years later; it is mentioned in the life of Euthymius († 472). The appearance of the festival at Jerusalem is significant. It was doubtless due to the desire to commemorate our Lord's entry into Jerusalem on the spot where it happened. 'Silvia' says: 'On this day, at the seventh hour (1 p.m.) all go to the church on the Mount of Olives, where service is held; and at 5 p.m. they read the Gospel story of the events of the day, and all proceed on foot to Jerusalem, the people crying, Blessed is he who cometh in the name of the Lord; some bearing palm branches, some olives; and so the bishop, after the type of our Lord, is conducted to the Holy City very slowly.' The palms and olives are an instructive comment on the Gospel account.

(g) *Maundy Thursday* is not in early times mentioned as being observed in commemoration of the Last Supper. Duchesne (*Orig.* viii. § 3) seems to think that it was so observed at Rome at least, in the primitive ages, but there is no evidence for it. The earliest authority for an Eucharist on this day is the *Testament of our Lord* (*circa* (about) 350?), which in a very difficult and apparently corrupt passage prescribes it (ii. 11); probably, as a comparison of the Copto-Arabic translation of the work with James of Edessa's Syriac shows, in the evening (see Cooper-Maclean's note, p. 226). On this day also the deacon offered 'a lamp in the temple' (*ib.*). 'Silvia,' at the end of the same century, describes the Eucharist in the church called 'The Martyrium' or Golgotha, in the afternoon; it was over by 4 p.m., and then there was—on this occasion alone in all the year—a celebration of the Eucharist in the little chapel of the Cross, to the east of Golgotha. The bishop celebrated, and all communicated. In Africa at the same time there was an evening Eucharist on this day, and the people were exempted from the customary fast before Holy Communion on this occasion by the Third Council of Carthage, a.d. 397 (can. 29: 'excepto uno die anniversario quo coena domini celebratur,' Mansi-Labbé, iii. col. 885). It will be seen that, strictly speaking, these Eucharists, if celebrated after sunset, were at the beginning of Good Friday rather than on the Thursday. St. Augustine (*Ep.* liv., see below) says that there were in his time two Eucharists on the Thursday, one for the sake of those who could not fast till evening, and would not receive the Eucharist otherwise.

In the preparation for baptism this Thursday played an important part. The candidates were bidden to bathe on this day, apparently as a ceremonial washing (*Hippol. Can.* 106; *Egyptian Church Order*, 45 [so Lagarde rightly]; *Test of our Lord*, ii. 6; Augustine, *Epp.* liv. 10, lv. 33 *ad Januarium*). Bathing at Pascha was not confined to the *competentes*; in the *Testament* the widows (presbyteresses) are bidden to bathe on that day (i. 42). There appears also to have been on that day the custom in some places of washing the feet of the *competentes* in memory of the *pedilavium* of Joh 13:4 ff.—a custom which afterwards gave the name to Maundy Thursday (from the 'new commandment,' *mandatum*, Joh 13:34). Elsewhere the *pedilavium* took place after baptism. The council of Elvira (can. 48) forbade priests or clergy to wash the feet of the newly baptized. Pseudo-Ambrose (*de Sacramentis*, iii. l) says that this was the custom at the place where he wrote (not Milan?), but that it did not obtain at Rome. In the Gallican Church also it was common (Hefele, *Councils*, i. 158, English translation).

(h) *Easter Week*.—The observance of the days after Easter is mentioned in the *Apostolic Constitutions* ('the great week [Holy Week] and that which follows it,' viii. 32). This fortnight was to be a time of rest for slaves, that they might be instructed. St. Chrysostom (*Hom.* 34 *de Res. Chr.*) also mentions Easter Week. In 'Silvia,' Easter, as well as Epiphany [Christmas] and the Dedication, has an octave during which

'stations' are held at the various churches in and near Jerusalem. But, with this exception, octaves outside Easter Week are Western and not Eastern.

2. Pentecost and Ascension

(a) *The name 'Pentecost'* had in the first four centuries two meanings, the fiftieth day after Easter, and the whole season of fifty days after that festival.

(α) It is used as a day in NT: Act 2:1 ('the day of Pentecost'), Act 20:15 (*id.*), 1Co 16:8 ('until Pentecost'); the Jewish nomenclature was continued in the Apostolic age. We find the same sense in succeeding ages, though perhaps not so frequently as the other. A fragment of Irenaeus, quoted by pseudo-Justin (*Quaest. et Respons. ad Orthodoxos*, 115) seems to speak of the *day*: 'Irenaeus ... in his treatise περὶ τοῦ πάσχα ... makes mention of Pentecost also, on which (ἐν ἧ) we do not bend the knee because it is of equal significance with the Lord's Day.' Pseudo-Justin in the corresponding question has ἀπὸ τοῦ πάσχα ἕως τῆς πεντηκοστῆς. The 43rd canon of Elvira (*circa (about)* 305 a.d.) has: 'ut cuncti diem Pentecostes celebremus.' 'Silvia' (vi. § 1) has 'a Pascha usque ad Quinquagesima, id est Pentecosten,' and (§ 3) 'Quinquagesimarum die, id est dominica.'

(β) On the other hand, the use of the name for *the whole season* is also common. Tertullian (*de Bapt.* 19) says that 'after Pascha, Pentecost is a very extensive (*latissimum; v.l. laetissimum*) space for conferring baptisms, wherein, too, the Resurrection of the Lord was repeatedly proved among the disciples, and the hope of the Advent of the Lord indirectly pointed to, in that at that time, when He had been received back into the heavens, the angels told the Apostles that He would so come as He had withal ascended into the heavens, of course at Pentecost.' But he goes on to say that Jeremiah signified 'the day of the Passover and of Pentecost, which is properly a feast day.' In *de Cor.* 3 he has 'from Pascha to Pentecost.' In *de Idol.* 14 he says that the Jews would not have shared with Christians the Lord's Day, nor yet Pentecost. Thus he uses the word in both senses. Origen talks of 'living in the season of Pentecost' in the same passage (*circa (about)* *Ccls.* viii. 22) in which he talks of observing certain days, as, for example, the Lord's Day, the Preparation, the Passover, or Pentecost. He refers to the Descent of the Spirit. The 20th canon of Nicaea forbids kneeling in the 'days of Pentecost,' as on the Lord's day. This is unlike St. Paul's usage; he knelt at this season (Act 20:36; Act 21:5). The *Testament of our Lord* speaks of 'the days of Pentecost' (i. 28, 42, ii. 12); it forbids any one to fast or kneel then, for these are 'the days of rest and joy.' St. Basil speaks of the 'seven weeks of the holy Pentecost' (*On the Spirit*, ch. 27, *aliter* § 66).

The quotations given above show that Pentecost as a *Christian* festival goes back at least to Irenaeus. It is rather curious that there is no reference to it between the NT and that Father; and with this fact we may compare the silence of the earlier writers about Easter; but, as Duchesne remarks (*Orig.* viii. § 4), Pentecost is implied rather than explicitly mentioned in early Christian writings.

(b) *The Ascension.*—The fortieth day after Easter was not, so far as we know, observed as a commemoration of our Lord's going up to heaven until at least the middle of the 4th century. In the *Edessene Canons* (can. 9) the Ascension is observed with Pentecost: 'At the completion of fifty (v.l. 'forty,' but this is clearly a later correction) days after His Resurrection, make ye a commemoration of His Ascension.' And so in 'Silvia' on the day of Pentecost there is a 'station' at the Mount of Olives, at the church called Imbomon, 'that is in that place whence the Lord ascended into heaven,' where the lection of the Ascension is read. This 'station' is held after another 'in Syon,' where the lection of the Descent of the Holy Ghost is read. Thus in this account both events are commemorated on the same day. The curious thing is that in 'Silvia' there is also an observance of the fortieth day after Easter; but then the 'station' is at Bethlehem, and there is no mention of the Ascension. The coupling together of the two events, which has its parallel in the joining together of Good Friday and Easter, as mentioned already, is illustrated by the passage from the Epistle of Barnabas cited above (l. § 1); the writer thought that the Ascension fell on a Sunday. Compare also Tertullian, *de Bap.* 19 (see above, § 2 a).

Ascension Day is not found in the *Testament of our Lord* (circa (about) 350 a.d.?) or in any of the earlier *Church Orders*, but it is found in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the author of which made it his aim to increase the festal cycle (v. 19, viii. 32). Sermons preached on this occasion are found in the 4th cent., by Eusebius of Emesa (?) circa (about) 350 a.d., Epiphanius, Gregory of Nyssa, and Chrysostom. The title of Gregory's sermon calls the festival ἐπισωζομενη, which apparently means 'an extra festival.' It does not appear certain, however, that these Fathers kept it on the fortieth day after Easter. St. Augustine (*Ep.* liv. § 1, *ad Januar.*) treats it as universal in a.d. 400: 'They are held as approved and instituted either by the Apostles themselves or by plenary councils ... for example, the annual commemoration by special solemnities of the Lord's Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension, and of the Descent of the Holy Spirit from heaven.'

3. Christmas and Epiphany.

(a) *Their origin.*—These festivals are of much later date than Easter and Pentecost, and were probably unknown till nearly a.d. 300. They were both, in their origin, one festival, and both were meant to commemorate the Nativity of our Lord; but the East

fixed on one day and the West on another as the date of the birth of Christ, and so in course of time two separate festivals emerged.

Before we consider the evidence for the observance of 25th December and 6th January as festivals, it will be desirable to investigate the reason why these two days were chosen. The most probable solution of the matter, in the light of our present knowledge, is that of Duchesne (*Origines*, ch. viii. § 5), whose theory is followed here. The date 25th December was first arrived at apparently by Hippolytus. Other calculations had fixed on 18th or 19th April or 29th May (Clement of Alexandria, *Strom*, i. 147, ed. Potter, Oxford, 1715, p. 407: 'on the 25th day of the month Pachon'; see the whole passage); and about a.d. 243 the treatise *de Pascha Computus* of pseudo-Cyprian (see above, II. § 1 d) named 28th March. The calculations of Hippolytus, which were his mature results (for he had formerly fixed on 2nd January), prevailed all over the West. They are found in his Commentary on Daniel (iv. 23, p. 244, ed. Bonwetsch; *aliter* iv. 9). They depend on the assumption that the earthly life of our Lord, from His conception to His death, lasted an exact number of years. The upholders of symbolical systems of numbers treated all fractions as imperfections. Acting on this idea, Hippolytus fixed on 25th March for the Annunciation, because he had, as he thought, discovered that the Crucifixion took place on that day (see above, § 1 d); he reckoned the Saviour's life as thirty-two years, from b.c. 3 to a.d. 29. Adding nine months, he arrived at 25th December as the day of the Nativity.* [Note: Other Patristic assumptions were that the ministry of our Lord lasted one year only, the 'acceptable year of the Lord (Luk 4:19; see, e.g., Clem. Alex. l.c., 'It was right for Him to preach for one year only'), and that Jesus was baptized on His thirtieth birthday (Luk 3:23 ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα). This last idea accounts for the baptism of Christ being commemorated on 6th January.]

The other date, 6th January, is not so easily accounted for. But Duchesne mentions a coincidence which increases the probability of his theory as to 25th December being correct. Sozomen (*Historia Ecclesiastica* vii. 18) says that 'the Montanists who are called Pepuzites and Phrygians' celebrated the Passover on 6th April. They reckoned that the world had been created on 'the ninth day before the kalends of April,' the vernal equinox, and that the sun was created 'on the fourteenth day of the moon occurring after the ninth day before the kalends of April'; and they always celebrated the Passover 'on this day, when it falls on the day of the Resurrection,' otherwise they celebrated it on the following Lord's day. They probably, then, thought that our Lord died on 6th April; and, as Duchesne remarks, that 'the Passover of Christ, being the true Passover, must fall clue at typical maturity reckoned from the origin of all things.' But reckoning nine months from 6th April, on the same reasoning as that of Hippolytus, we arrive at 6th January.

We do not read of either of these days being observed *as festivals* in the 3rd century. The first mention of such a commemoration on 25th December is in the Philocalian Calendar (see below, § 5), which was copied in 354 a.d., but represents the official observances at Rome in a.d. 336. We find the entry: 'vii kal. Jan. Natus Christus in Bethlehem Judae.' It is not indeed absolutely certain that 25th December was at that date observed as a feast; but it is highly probable that this was so, as the other days, commemorations of bishops of Rome and martyrs, seem to be noted in order that they might be observed. This was more than a century after Hippolytus.

It will be observed that the theory given above of the choice of 25th December takes no account of the heathen festival of the sun held on the same day. But it is quite possible that when, in the 4th cent., the Christians began to observe the Nativity as a festival, they seized on the coincidence between the day as calculated by Hippolytus and the heathen feast-day, and Christianizing the latter as the Birth of the true Sun of Righteousness, showed a good example to the pagan world by making the day a true holy day.

The Eastern festival of 6th January may be traced to about a.d. 300 among the orthodox. Clement of Alexandria, indeed (*Strom. l.c.*), says that the followers of Basilides celebrated the day of Jesus' baptism, 'spending the whole preceding night in lections.' But the earliest orthodox mention of the day is in the *Passion of Philip of Heraelea*, in the Diocletian persecution, a.d. 304. Philip says: 'Epiphaniae; dies sanctus ineumbit' (Ruinart, *Act. Mart. Sine.* p. 410). That it was of recent introduction when the *Testament of our Lord* was written (*circa (about) 350?*), appears from there being no regulations for it as there are for Pascha and Pentecost. It is only just mentioned in that work ('Epiphany,' Syriac ܩܝܡܝܘܢܐ). And during the greater part of the 4th cent., and in some countries even later, 6th January was the only day observed in the East. The sixth Edessene canon prescribes 'the Epiphany of our Saviour, which is the chief of the festivals of the Church [this is significant], on the sixth day of the latter Kanun,' *i.e.* 6th January. Epiphanius knew of no other day. In *Haer.* li. ('the Alogi,' lib. ii. tom. 1) he speaks of 'a.d. vi Id. Nov.' as being 60 days before the feast 'of the Epiphanies,' when Christ was born according to the flesh (§ 16), and of 'the day in which He was born, that is, of the Epiphanies, which is the sixth of January.' Cassian, at the end of the 4th cent., speaks of 'Epiphany, which the priests of that province [Egypt] regard as the time both of our Lord's baptism and also of his birth in the flesh, and so celebrate the commemoration of either mystery not separately as in the Western provinces, but in the single festival of this day' (*Conferences*, x. 2). Even later, Gennadius (*de Vir. Illustr.* 59) says that 'Timothy the bishop wrote on the Nativity,' and that this work was thought to have been composed at Epiphany. Only 6th January was observed at Jerusalem in the time of 'Silvia,' when there was a 'station' at Bethlehem at night. As the manuscript is defective, we do not

know whether there was a celebration of the Eucharist there, but it is probable that there was one, and this nocturnal 'station' may have been the origin of the Christmas midnight Eucharist of later days. The name of the Eastern festival was the 'Epiphanies' or 'Theophanies.' Traces of the older custom in the East of observing 6th January only are found in the 6th cent. at Jerusalem, where Cosmas Indicopleustes mentions it. He says that the Nativity and the Baptism were observed on the same day (Migne, *Patr. Gr.* vol. lxxxviii. 197). The Armenians still observe only that day.

The Easterns, however, even at the end of the 4th cent., began to adopt the Western day in addition to their own; and probably soon afterwards the Westerns adopted the Eastern day as a separate festival. And thereafter on 25th December the Church commemorated the Nativity, and on 6th January other manifestations of our Lord's Divinity and glory. In the East the Baptism, I with its manifestations, was and is alone emphasized on 6th January. In the West, as St. Augustine says early in the 5th cent. (see below), the coming of the Wise Men was the great commemoration. The Calendar of Polemius Silvius (a.d. 448) combines it with our Lord's baptism and the miracle at Cana (Wordsworth, *Min. of Grace*, viii. § 1; Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xiii. 676). In the present day all three events are commemorated.

St. Chrysostom in a.d. 386 tells us that Christmas, as distinct from Epiphany, had been only lately introduced at Antioch, less than ten years before (*in Diem Natalem*, ed. Montfaucon, Paris, 1718, ii. 355 A). In *de Bcato Philogonio* (i. 497 C) he speaks of Epiphany, Easter, and the other festivals taking their origin from Christmas; for, if Christ had not been born, He would in no wise have been baptized, for that is the feast of the Theophanies. In the *Apostolic Constitutions* both Christmas and Epiphany are mentioned (v. 13), and this is one of the chief factors in determining the date of that Syrian document. At Alexandria both festivals were observed before the year 432; for Paul, bishop of Emesa, preached there on his mission of peace after the Council of Ephesus on the Sunday before Christmas, on Christmas Day, and on the following Sunday, New Year's Day 433 (Smith-Wace, *Dict. Chr. Biog.* iv. 261, s.v. 'Paulus 30'),

In the West, St. Augustine tells us that both days were observed in his time; he says that the Epiphany was kept 'per universum mundum,' but that the Donatists would not accept it. He implies that it had been introduced from the East, and says that the Donatists did not love unity, and did not communicate with the Eastern Church where that star [of the Magi] appeared (Sermon 202 in *Epiphania Domini*, iv.; see also Sermons 199-204. The six Sermons are almost entirely taken up with the coming of the Wise Men).

(b) *Advent*.—The first trace of this season is in the canons of Saragossa in Spain (*Concilium Caesaraugustanum*), circa (about) 380 a.d. (Mansi-Labbé, iii. 633), which

provide that from xvi kal. Jan. to the 'day of Epiphany, which is viij Id. Jan. 'all are sedulously to attend church (Song of Solomon 4). We notice here that 25th December is apparently unknown to this council, and that the preparatory season before 6th January is a solemn season of prayer and churchgoing, but not of fasting; much as the 'forty days of Pascha' are in the *Testament of our Lord*. The latter work speaks of the 'days of Epiphany,' which may mean the days after Epiphany, or possibly the days before it, just as the 'days of Pascha' mean in this work the forty days before Easter, and the 'days of Pentecost' mean the fifty days before Whitsunday. But the reference to Advent is too uncertain to be built on.

4. The Presentation of Christ in the Temple.—For this commemoration 'Silvia' is our earliest authority. On this day, she says, all the presbyters preached, and last the bishop himself, 'on the events of the day, when Joseph and Mary bore the Lord into the temple, and Simeon saw Him, and Anna the prophetess, the daughter of Samuel' (*sic*). Then the Eucharist was celebrated. 'Silvia' calls this day 'Quadragesima de Epiphania,' *i.e.* 14th February. The assembly was at the Church of the Anastasis. Here we have a clear indication of the way in which festivals at Jerusalem increased out of a desire to commemorate Gospel events in the holy places. From Jerusalem this festival spread elsewhere; but we do not hear of it, except in Silvia,' till the 6th century. Its name then was ὑπαπαντή or the Meeting [of our Lord and Simeon]—a name still retained by the Greeks.

Although Hippolytus had fixed 25th March as the date of the Annunciation, no trace of any observance of the day as a festival is found in the first four centuries, nor indeed for long after. Possibly its frequent concurrence with the Paschal solemnities or the Lenten fast prevented this. The Nestorians keep neither the Presentation nor the Annunciation.

5. Commemorations of Saints, etc.—These can be glanced at only briefly in a Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. They were originally of local origin, and did not at once become popular except in the places where they began. The earliest known collection of local saints' days is the *Philocalian Calendar* of a.d. 354, which may be conveniently seen in Ruinart's *Acta Martyrum Sincera et selecta*, p. 617, and in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, vol. xiii.; reference may also be made to Bishop Lightfoot's essay in his *Clement* (i. 246, on 'The Liberian Catalogue'). It is the only extant calendar which is certainly older than a.d. 400, though portions of a Gothic calendar remain which may be dated shortly before that year. The so-called *Hieronymian Martyrology* is much later than St. Jerome. The Christian section of the Philocalian Calendar (for it has also a heathen section) is a Roman list. It has two parts: the *Depositio* (burial) *episcoporum*, and the *Depositio martyrum*. Under the first head it contains twelve names: Dionysius, Felix, Sylvester, Miltiades, Marcellinus, Lucius,

Caius, Stephen, Eusebius, Marcus, Eutichianus, Julius. Julius and Marcus come out of their calendrical order (not Marcus in Ruinart), and are probably later additions (Lightfoot). The second part begins with Christmas (as above, § 3), and contains no other festival of Christ. It is, no doubt, the official list of martyrs commemorated at Rome at the time. Its names are all local, except Cyprian and Perpetua and Felicitas, which are African. In all there are 37 entries, as given by Ruinart; but some have more than one name. The first part begins at vi kal. Jan., and its latest date is vi Id. Dec. Of the second part viii kal. Jan. is the beginning and Id. Dec. is the end. The beginning of the year must therefore have been reckoned as Christmas Day (25th December), or at least some day between 13th and 25th December. It is interesting to note in this early calendar 'iii kal. Jul. [*i.e.* June 29] Petri in Catacumbas et Pauli Ostiense Tusco et Basso Coss.,' that is the translation of the bodies of these Apostles.

A Syriac Martyrology published in 1866 by Professor Wright must also be mentioned, as, though the copy in the British Museum dates from 411, it gives (if careful examination be applied to it) earlier lists still. It is an Eastern Martyrology translated into Syriac and abridged at Edessa about 400 a.d. from a collection made in Greek out of local calendars. It has two Roman entries, one African, and the rest are Eastern; it must have been originally Arian, as it does not contain the name of Athanasius, but has that of Arius ('at Alexandria, Arius the presbyter'). Analysis shows it to have been made up of the local lists of Nicomedia, Antioch, and Alexandria. The two latter appear to have contained, at about a.d. 350, 24 and 26 entries respectively. This shows the limited numbers of commemorations in the 4th century. The lists, however, speedily grew to large dimensions. For other early calendars reference may be made to the works mentioned below.

The observance of the death-days (*natales*) or burial days (*depositiones*) of martyrs may be traced back to the 2nd cent., *circa* (*about*) 155 a.d.; the letter of the Smyrneans on the martyrdom of St. Polycarp speaks (§ 18) of his burial-place 'where the Lord will permit us to gather ourselves together ... to celebrate the birthday of his martyrdom for the commemoration of those that have already fought in the contest, and for the training and preparation of those that shall do so hereafter.' This letter was written soon after the martyrdom (see Lightfoot's *Ignatius and Polycarp*, iii. 353 ff.). St. Cyprian says that the death-days of the martyrs were to be carefully noted, that they might observe such commemorations with Eucharist (*Ep.* 12, to his presbyters and deacons). The 18th Edessene Canon orders commemorations of the martyrs. And such commemorations are mentioned by St. Basil (*Ep.* 93, as above, I. § 3).

For the purposes of this Dictionary, the observances of the days following 25th December are of interest, as being closely connected with the Nativity of our Lord. These observances date from the 4th century. St. Gregory of Nyssa, preaching the

funeral oration of his brother St. Basil (who died 1st January 379), says that they were then celebrating these saints' days, which were convenient (he remarks) because Apostles and Prophets were first constituted and ordained, and after that pastors and teachers. He first mentions the commemoration of the Apostles and Prophets after Christmas, namely, Stephen, Peter, James, John, Paul; and then Basil (*in Laudcm Fratris Basilii, ad init.*, ed. Paris of 1638, p. 479). It does not necessarily follow that the saints mentioned were commemorated on different days. The *Apostolic Constitutions* mention a commemoration of the martyrs and 'blessed James the bishop' [the Lord's brother], and 'the holy Stephen our fellow-servant' (v. 8; so viii. 32). The Syriac Martyrology mentioned above gives St. Stephen on 26th December, St. James and St. John on 27th December, St. Peter and St. Paul on 28th December. With this we may compare two later usages, the Armenian and the Nestorian (East Syrian), as these separated Christians have retained many early customs which others have dropped. The Armenians, who do not observe 25th December as Christians, commemorate St. David and St. James the Lord's brother on that date, but follow the Syriac Martyrology for the other days, save that they transpose 27th and 28th December (Duchesne, *Orig.* viii. § 5. 2). The Nestorian usage is somewhat different. That Church keeps its saints' days according to the movable Christian, year rather than according to the month, and most of them fall on Fridays. The Fridays after Christmas (25th December), if there are sufficient before Lent, are (1) St. James the Lord's brother, (2) St. Mary, (3) St. John Baptist, (4) St. Peter and St. Paul, (5) Four Evangelists, (6) St. Stephen; and other festivals of later origin follow (Maclean, *East Syrian Daily Offices*, p. 264ff.). Duchesne conjectures that the 'Four Evangelists' is a transformation of St. James and St. John, the latter having attracted to him the three other Evangelists, and the former being omitted. The Orthodox Easterns now commemorate St. James the Lord's brother on the Sunday after Christmas.

'Silvia' has not, like the *Apostolic Constitutions*, a general martyrs' festival; nor yet have the other *Church Orders*. But considering the great development of festivals in 'Silvia,' it is not improbable that she did describe such a general commemoration; only the manuscript breaks off suddenly in the middle of the account of the Dedication festival, and we cannot be sure of what was in the *lacuna*.

Speaking generally, we note a difference between these commemorations and the festivals of our Lord. The former were at first local only, and of inferior importance. The Nestorians to this day keep up a sharp distinction between the two, calling the former ܘܢܝܢܝܘܬܝܢ commemorations, the latter ܘܢܝܢܝܘܬܝܢ festivals, or ܘܢܝܢܝܘܬܝܢ⁹ festivals of our Lord; and the distinction is ancient.

Dedication festivals were common in the 4th cent., though they are not mentioned in the *Church Orders*, even in those, like the *Testament of our Lord*, which describe the

church buildings minutely. These festivals concern us here only as contributing to the calendar Holy Cross Day, which was the commemoration of the dedication in 335 of the churches built by Constantine on the site of the Holy Sepulchre and Calvary, and of the alleged discovery of the true cross by St. Helena, Constantine's mother. 'Silvia' says that the anniversary was observed with great ceremony in her time, many pilgrims from distant lands attending, and the churches being adorned as at Easter and Christmas. This day (14th September, but among the Nestorians 13th September) passed from Jerusalem to Constantinople; at Rome it was not introduced till the 7th century.

Of the other days of Apostles, Martyrs, or Confessors, most of which are of later introduction than the 4th cent., it may be observed that the majority, at least, are due to the local dedication of a church named after the saint at Rome, Constantinople, or elsewhere. See Duchesne, *Orig.* ch. viii. *passim*.

Recapitulation of festal cycles

Fathers of the first three centuries: Pascha and Pentecost.

Testament of our Lord: Pascha, Pentecost, and Epiphany.

Apostolic Constitutions: Ascension, Pentecost, Pascha, Christmas, Epiphany, Apostles' days (plural), St. Stephen and All Martyrs' day (singular)—viii. 32 Lagarde (*aliter* 33). Add St. James the Lord's brother, v. 8. [The sections of the *Apost. Const.* mentioned in this article are all Lagarde's].

Pilgrimage of 'Silvia': Epiphany with octave, Presentation, Palm Sunday, Easter with octave, Fortieth day after Easter, Pentecost (including Ascension), Dedication (Holy Cross Day).

Cappadocian Fathers and Syriac Martyrology: Add St. Stephen, St. Peter and St. Paul, St. James and St. John.

The account of the Christian calendar is thus brought down to about a.d. 400. For festivals introduced after that date reference may be made to the various works on Christian history and antiquities.

Literature.—(1) General: Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien* (English translation from third ed. entitled *Christian Worship, its Origin and Evolution*); Bp. J. Wordsworth, *Ministry of Grace*.—(2) Calendars: Achelis, *Die Martyrologien*, 1900; Dom Butler, notice of Achelis' book in *Journ. of Theol. Studies*, ii. 147; and Duchesne and Wordsworth as above.—(3) On the Lord's day: Zahn, *Skizzen aus dem Leben der Alten*

Kirche, 1894, ch. vi.; Hessey, *Bampton Lectures*, 1860; Trevelyan, *Sunday*, 1902.—(4) Christmas: Salmon, paper on Hippolytus' Commentary on Daniel in *Hermathena*, vol. iii. Dublin, 1893; and Duchesne and Wordsworth as above.—(5) The Quartodeciman Controversy: Salmon, *Introduction to NT*, Lect. xv.; McGiffert's note on Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* v. 22, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*; Schaff, *Church History*, ii. 209 f.; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, i. 298 ff. (2nd English ed.); Schürer, 'Die Paschastreitigkeiten' in *Zeitschrift für hist. Theol.* 1870, p. 182 ff.—(6) Paschal Cycles: Hefele, *Concilieng.* i. 317 ff.; Salmon, article in Smith-Wace, *Dict. Chr. Biog.* on 'Hippolytus.'

A. J. Maclean.

☞ Calf

CALF.—See Animals, p. 63^b.

☞ Call, Calling

CALL, CALLING

1. Terms.

(a) OT.

(b) Gospels.

(c) Epistles.

2. Secular calling.

3. Spiritual calling.

(a) Our Lord's Messianic vocation.

(b) The Apostolic calling.

(c) Other calls to service.

(d) The Gospel call in Christ's own teaching.

Literature.

1. The Terms.

(a) *The OT.*—The substantive 'call' is not found in the English Bible. If used of an animal's call, it tends to imply a *significant* note—e.g. a mother's call to her brood (Bunyan, *PP* ii. 62)—not a mere emotional cry. The English verb 'call' has for its primary meaning 'to speak *loudly*.' In Hebrew we note the same implication in קרא, .g. Pro 8:1; but in Hebrew the word still more strongly suggests articulate speech, even perhaps in Psa 147:9 (although the partridge probably derives its name קרא from its). It is indeed the technical word for reading (.g. Isa 29:12): the Hebrews read and prayed aloud. Eli suspected Hannah (1Sa 1:13) not because her lips moved in private prayer—rather because in the intensity and modesty of her desire she prayed without sound. Loudness may express authority; or it may be a simple effort to attract notice. Anyway, a 'call,' Hebrew or English, is a loud and definite communication from one person to another. Either language may use the verb intransitively, but always with a sort of latent transitivity. In Greek, *καλέω* is transitive. What is implied in the other languages is explicit in this one. Definiteness (and perhaps authority) receives reinforcement when the calling is name. We are probably not to confuse this with the mere of a name; though, according to the ideas of the ancient world, so much power is wrapped up in names that there may be a certain infiltration of that thought in the Biblical usage of calling name. But, more simply, one's name arrests one's attention, and assures one that the call is addressed to him. In Deutero-Isaiah it is said that Jehovah has a name for every star (Isa 40:26 [we need not discuss whether the stars are here conceived as alive], imitated in Psa 147:4). That signifies His power; it is rather His condescension that is shown when He calls the prophetic servant, Israel, by name (Isa 43:1). Again, He calls Cyrus 'by name' to his historic functions (Isa 45:3-4, cf. also Exo 31:2 [P]). If our text is to be trusted, Jehovah even 'surnames' Cyrus (Isa 45:4). It is a mark of kindness when a servant is not simply 'waiter' or 'guard' to his rich employer, but has a name and a recognized personality of his own. (Here cf. Exo 33:12; Exo 33:17). To 'surname,' at least in the strict sense, is a still stronger proof of friendly interest; surnames are a token of some new destiny, or else imply knowledge of idiosyncrasies. (Acc. to P, Jehovah renames 'Abram' and 'Sarai,' Gen 17:5; Gen 17:15, while Moses renames 'Hoshea,' Num 13:16; cf. also the surnames given by our Lord to the three leading Apostles, Mar 3:16-17). It is also in Deutero-Isaiah that we find the emergence of 'call' in a sort of theological sense; the 'call' of Abraham (Isa 51:2 'I called him').

Another important section of the OT for our terminology is the ‘Praise of Wisdom,’ Proverbs 1-9. Several things are noticeable here; the loud call—Divine Wisdom as a street preacher (Pro 8:1; cf. Pro 1:20); the solemn religious conception of the call rejected (Pro 1:24); the call as an invitation to a feast (ch. 9). This last usage (‘call’ = ‘invite’), while obsolete in modern English, is found in its literal sense both in OT and NT of our version; e.g. 1Ki 1:9, Joh 2:2 Authorized Version .

Still another group of OT passages may seem to require notice—those describing the ‘call’ of various prophets. The term is *not so used* in OT (unless Isa 51:2?—see above—Abraham is a ‘prophet’ in Gen 20:7 [E]). But there is a passage which would lend itself excellently to this interpretation—the tale of the call of the young Samuel, where we have three interesting parallel usages: Jehovah ‘called to Samuel’ (1Sa 3:4 literally), ‘called Samuel’ (1Sa 3:8), ‘called ... Samuel, Samuel’ (1Sa 3:10).

There are therefore several usages of the word ‘to call’ in OT which we ought to keep in mind as we approach the Gospels. It means command, or it means invitation. It means a summons to special function, or it means (along with that) a peculiar mark of gracious condescension.

(b) In the *Gospels*, the verb may occur in the literal sense (Mat 20:8). But in general a compound form is preferred for such sense; e.g. when Jesus calls (προσκαλεσάμενος) His disciples near Him for a short talk (Mar 10:42). We have the simple form in one important passage when James and John are ‘called’ (Mar 1:20 || Mat 4:21 ἐκάλεσεν), though the compound (προσκαλεῖται) is found in Mark’s record of the selection of the Twelve (Mar 3:13), while in the parallel in Luke (Luk 6:13) προσεφώνησεν is employed. It might be argued that, even here, the mere *word* ‘called’ means no more than ‘called to Himself.’ Still, in view of OT antecedents, that is questionable. Anyway, as a matter of fact, those ‘calls’ were commands and invitations, to ‘leave all’ (Mar 10:28) and follow Jesus—to take up solemn functions in His service. When compounds of καλέω are used, or when φωνέω is used, we need not suspect deep religious or theological significance in the *word*. Yet here again the fact has to be dealt with. Jesus may simply ‘call to’ (φωνεῖν) Bartimaeus (Mar 10:49); but the result of the conversation (and miracle) is that he who had been blind ‘follows Jesus in the way’ (Mar 10:52). In two other passages the group of meanings associated with Proverbs 1-9—privilege rather than authority; invitation, rather than command—come to the front: ‘I came not to call (καλέσαι) the righteous, but sinners’ (Mar 2:17, Mat 9:13; Luk 5:32 adds ‘to repentance’), and ‘many are called (κλητοί), but few

chosen' (Mat 22:14; in Mat 20:16 these words are rightly dropped by Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 as not belonging to the original text).

(c) Though our concern is with the Gospels, we cannot refuse to consult the *Epistles* for the light they may throw on Gospel usage. They give us a cognate substantive; not 'call' but 'calling.' 'Call' as a substantive occurs in English much earlier than our Authorized Version, but presumably the purely physical idea—the audible call—was too strongly marked in it to allow of its standing for God's address to the conscience. 'Calling,' which was preferred, reproduces the form of the Greek substantive κλήσις. This term is mainly Pauline (e.g. 1Co 1:26), though it extends into Hebrews (Heb 3:1) and (at least so far as the verb is concerned) into 1 Peter (1Pe 1:15; 1Pe 2:21). As moulded by St. Paul, there is no doubt that the 'call' is primarily one to salvation (Rom 8:28-30), though it may also signify special (Apostolic) function (Rom 1:1). The Epistle to the Hebrews preserves the same twofold reference. All believers 'partake of a heavenly calling' (Heb 3:1), but none may take high honour or office upon himself except when 'called' by God thereto (Heb 5:4). Later in the history of English speech, the physical implications of the noun 'call' having been in some measure rubbed off, it came into religious use, so as generally to displace 'calling.' We say the 'call' not 'calling' of Abraham; but if Scripture had used a substantive, 'calling' would have been installed by our translators in this phrase. The NT 'calling' is a single definite act in the past, whether personal conversion [sometimes acceptance of Divinely imposed duty] or the historic mission of Christ. He who 'called' us is holy (1Pe 1:15). In our modern use of 'calling,' something seems borrowed from the idea of a *worldly* calling, viz. *habitualness*. Acc. to Murray's *Dictionary*, 1Co 7:20 introduced—almost by an accident—the use of 'calling' for worldly rank, station, external surroundings. 'Hence,' it adds, '“calling” came to be applied to the various means of bread-winning.' [The exegesis of the verse is disputed, but the view the *Dictionary* proceeds on seems to be right. It is not, of course, pretended that 'calling' in 1Co 7:20 means *exactly* trade or profession. St. Paul would never make it matter of conscience that a Christian should refrain from changing his trade]. Both these senses—viz. (1) station, and (2) trade—are often (unwarrantably, the *Dictionary* seems to think, as far as etymology goes) regarded as Divine vocations. This is surely obscure. If 1Co 7:20 taught so little, can we hold it responsible for a twofold set of meanings? May not professional 'calling' rather mean, in the first instance, 'what I am called'—William [the] Smith, John [the] Tailor? a still humbler etymology. However that may be, the idea of Divine vocation in daily concerns could not be ruled out from Christian thought. Thus inevitably Christians have been led to formulate the idea of a *lifelong Divine vocation*, covering all externals, but centring in the heart. It may be repeated that 'calling' (the substantive) is not found in the Gospels; of course the word is not found anywhere in the Authorized and Revised Versions in the sense of 'trade.'

2. Secular calling.—It is unnecessary to pass under review the occupations followed by our Lord in youth and by His Apostles. See artt. Trades, Carpenter, Fishing, etc.

3. Spiritual calling

(a) *Our Lord Himself*, who calls all others, was ‘called of God’ (Heb 5:4) to the Messiahship. It is an irrelevant sentimentality that dwells too much on the ‘carpenter of Nazareth.’ Jesus was full of the consciousness of His calling, its requirements, its limitations. Not to cite the Fourth Gospel—abundant signs of this, but in the usual golden haze blurring all sharp outlines—we have Mar 1:38 (?) Mar 2:17; Mar 10:45, Mat 5:17; Mat 15:24 etc. etc. It is one of the services of Ritschl to recent theology—with anticipations in von Hofmann—that he has made prominent the thought of Christ’s *vocation*, displacing the less worthy and less ethical category of Christ’s *merit*. In the Gospels this vocation is expressed by the word ‘sent’ or I ‘came’ (as above; or ‘him that sent me,’ Joh 4:34 etc.), not by ‘call.’ If there is any one point in our Lord’s life where it may be held that the ‘call’ definitely reached Him,—where He became conscious of Messiahship,—we must seek it at His baptism (Mar 1:9-11; three parallels).

(b) In dealing with *the call addressed by Christ to His disciples*, we begin with the Apostles. Taking the different Gospels together, we seem to recognize three stages. (1) According to St. John, Christ’s first disciples were Galilaeans who, like Himself, had visited the Jordan in order to be baptized by John: Andrew, John, Simon Peter, Philip, Nathanael (presumably = Bartholomew; see art. Bartholomew, above), and presumably James the brother of John (Joh 1:35-51). The only one mentioned as called with a ‘follow me’ is Philip (Joh 1:43); and it is possible that this is rather an invitation to follow on the journey to Galilee than through life (and death). For the rest, we have acquaintanceships and attachments apparently forming themselves—elective affinities displayed, rather than the Master’s will exercised *ad hoc*; but the result, according to St. John, is the formation of a small yet definite circle, who are disciples (Joh 2:2; Joh 2:12; Joh 2:17 etc. etc.) of Jesus now, as others are (and as they themselves previously were) of John the Baptist. (2) The Synoptists tell us of the call in Galilee (‘Come ye after me,’ Mar 1:17 || Mat 4:19; ‘He called them,’ Mar 1:20 || Mat 4:21) of Peter, Andrew, James, John. The first two are called with a sort of pleasantry; they are to be ‘fishers of men,’ in allusion to their former occupation. St. Luke has the same narrative (Luk 5:1-11) in a more picturesque form; the borrowing of Peter’s boat, in order to teach from it as a pulpit; payment after sermon in the form of a miraculous draught of fishes; Peter’s fear as a sinner at the near presence of the supernatural; the same kindly *bon mot*; all four fishermen [Luk 5:7] on the spot; all four becoming disciples. Here the call (see art. Disciple below) involves leaving everything to follow Christ (Luk 5:11, Mar 10:28; cf. Mar 1:18; cf. Mar 1:20, Mat 19:27; cf. Mat 4:20; cf. Mat 4:22). Previous

acquaintance with these men may have induced Jesus to begin His teaching by the Sea of Galilee [an ‘undesigned coincidence’?]. Other members of the disciple circle in Galilee must have been added one by one; some by elective affinity! Not all volunteers might be repelled like the scribe of [Mat 8:19](#) || [Luk 9:59](#). Matthew the publican, however ([Mat 9:9](#), [Luk 5:27](#) Levi, [Mar 2:14](#) Levi the son of Alphaeus), is called straight from his place of toll to ‘follow,’ and instantly obeys; a memorable incident. (3) The final ‘call’ in this series appears when Jesus ‘calls to him whom he himself will,’ and ‘appoints twelve, that they may be with him, and that he may send them forth to preach and ... cast out devils’ ([Mar 3:13](#) etc.; so too, though less clearly, [Luk 6:13](#); not in [Mat 10:1](#) ‘his twelve disciples,’ [Mat 10:2](#) ‘the twelve apostles’). (4) Or, if there is another stage still, it is marked when they are ‘sent out’ for the first time ([Mat 10:5](#), [Mar 6:7](#), [Luk 9:1](#)), or when in consequence of this the name ‘apostles’ (see art. Apostle) is attached to them. Thus, in the case of at least twelve men, the call has issued in a very definite calling; permanent, and in a sense official.

(c) Another group possesses a varied interest. It includes volunteers; it relates ‘calls’ to service addressed to those who were *not destined to be Apostles*; it offers examples of the call *rejected*. There are four cases; the rich young ruler ([Mar 10:17](#) etc. and parallels), and a group of three found together ([Luk 9:57-62](#); partial parallel [Mat 8:19-22](#)). The scribe (see Mt.) who volunteers means, or professes to mean, discipleship in the intenser sense. He will follow ‘wherever the Master goes’; he will ‘leave all,’ like the Twelve; the stumbling-block of property, which was too much for the young ruler, is no stumbling-block to him. This volunteer meets not with welcome but rebuff; and, so far as we know, there is an end of *his* gospel service. Again, the man whose father is just dead—that seems the inexorable sense of the words—is needed immediately as a herald of the ‘kingdom of God’ (so Luke). And the other volunteer, who, with less urgency (so far as we are told) is anxious ‘first’ to bid farewell to his home circle, is ‘looking back’ from the *plough*. St. Luke seems well justified in making these narratives introduce a wider mission (that of the ‘Seventy’). And here we get important light on the demand that the rich young ruler should give away his property. This may have seemed to our Lord’s discernment necessary for the man’s own safety—does not the sequel point in that direction? But, even independently of that, though a Christian might be a man of means (see below), a wandering preacher could hardly be. These were calls to service, which met, temporarily or finally, with tragic refusal. Whatever else the refusal may have implied is God’s secret.

(d) So far we have dealt chiefly with *authority*; when we consider the few cases in the Gospels where the call is generalized—‘not the righteous but sinners’ ([Mar 2:17](#) || [Mat 9:13](#) || [Luk 5:32](#)); ‘many called, few chosen’ ([Mat 22:14](#))—*invitation* comes to the front. The parable depicting the Kingdom of God as a feast ([Mat 22:2](#) ff.),

Luk_14:16 ff.), while, of course, a parable and not to be pressed too far, emphasizes this. Its language recalls Proverbs 9. And it has been remarked that the well-known lovely 'gospel invitation' (Mat_11:28-30) strongly suggests Divine Wisdom speaking. More questionable is the idea started by Bruce in the *Expos. Gk. Test.* that Jesus literally invited outcasts to a free meal at a public hall in the name of Levi (Matthew)—a sort of Free Breakfast or Midnight Supper. On the other hand, the very earliest form of the general call is pure authority; 'Repent' (Mat_4:17, Mar_1:15).

In all these cases, language itself helps us to vindicate the great truth, that the call of Christ is not merely a call to some external form of service under rapidly vanishing conditions, but a call addressed to heart and conscience; in other words, that Christianity is essentially a religion. Of course, this truth becomes clearer in the Epistles, or in the Fourth Gospel, than in the earlier and less reflective Gospels; but, in regard to our 'calling,' as in all respects, the teaching of Christ Himself traces the plain outlines within which His Apostles afterwards work. Perhaps we ought to note here a difference at least in language between Christ and St. Paul. To the latter, the 'called' are *eo ipso* the 'elect' or 'predestinated' (Rom_8:29-30; Rom_8:33); to Christ, 'calling' (inviting) comes first (Mat_22:14), and *selection* follows; 'after trial,' as it has been expressed. Our Lord's words, therefore, mark our Christian calling as a calling to service and as a probation. Though we are admitted to His friendship and love, all is not assured. According to His language in the Fourth Gospel, one 'given' to Christ may 'perish' (Joh_17:12). The 'unfruitful' branch is 'taken away,' 'cast forth,' 'burned' (Joh_15:2; Joh_15:6). All must stand before His judgment-seat; a thought which the parables spoken in view of separation, parables addressed to His own, particularly emphasize (Matthew 25; some parallels). All must 'take up the cross' and 'follow Christ' to the uttermost (Mar_8:34 etc. etc.). The last command addressed to a friend by Christ, like the first, is 'follow me' (Joh_21:19; Joh_21:22).

The question has been raised whether Jesus' call did not imply a sort of fanaticism based on a mistaken expectation of the near end of the world. This is at least suggested by the purely eschatological view of the Kingdom of God (see art. Kingdom of God, below) in the Gospels, as taught by Bousset, J. Weiss, and others. If the imputation of fanaticism were historically warranted, all Christians must have been required to live in a fashion possible only to the first few; the call to repent must have been swallowed up in the call to share the Master's wandering life; our 'high calling' (Php_3:14), as declared by Christ, must have been deeply tinged with delusion. It is enough to point in reply to women friends of Jesus; to homes whose hospitality He consented to share; to a convert under exceptional circumstances not called nor even permitted to be with Christ, but sent home to be a witness there (Mar_5:19 || Luk_8:39). The grain of truth in this heap of error has been indicated above. Our Christian calling is not merely to salvation, it is to service. One may add, that the principles of the Master's own teaching are likely to reveal lessons of severity

for the Christian conscience which have been neglected in the past—to the great loss of both Church and world.

Literature.—See further, for (a), the present writer's *Christ and the Jewish Law*; A. Ritschl, *Justification and Reconciliation*, vol. iii. (translation) p. 445; Baldensperger, *Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, 1888 [2nd ed. 1892, 3rd ed. with altered title in progress]; artt. by present writer on 'Dawn of Messianic Self-consciousness' in *Expos. Times*, 1905; a different view, Forrest's *Christ of History and of Experience*, 1897, p. 93 ff. For (b) see Bruce, *Training of the Twelve*; Latham, *Pastor Pastormn*; for (c) and (d) compare *Ecce Homo*, ch. 6, 'Christ's Winnowing Fan' [characteristically dwelling rather on the *moral* aspects of the Divine message]; also Bruce's treatment of Mat 9:9-13 and parallels [notes on all three should be read in *Expos. Gr. Testament*]. The last paragraph of the above article refers to discussions begun by J. Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*, 1892; Bousset, *Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judentum*, 1892; cf. also especially J. Weiss, *Die Nachfolge Christi und die Predigt der Gegenwart*, 1895; good reply in Harnack's *Wesen des Christenthums*, 1900 (translation, 'What is Christianity?'); interesting reference to such views and to later developments in Lewis Muirhead's *Bruce Lecture on 'The Eschatology of Jesus,'* 1903.

Robert Mackintosh.

☩ Calvary

CALVARY.—See Golgotha.

☩ Camel, Camel's Hair

CAMEL, CAMEL'S HAIR.—The camel is by far the most useful of all animals in the East. There are two kinds of camels—the Turkish or Bactrian camel and the dromedary. The first is larger, has a double hump, and is capable of sustaining greater burdens; the latter is swifter, has a single hump, and is far less affected by extreme heat. The camel has been domesticated from time immemorial; it is now at least nowhere found in its aboriginal wild state, and nature has adapted it to its specific environment. Its nostrils are close and flat, to exclude the dust of the desert; its feet are heavily padded, and its anatomy shows provision for the enduring of great privation. It mocks hunger and thirst alike; it can go without water from sixteen to forty days.

The camel forms the staple wealth of the Arab of the desert, who utilizes every part of the animal, even to the dung, which is used as fuel. Its flesh was forbidden to the Jew (Lev 11:4, Deu 14:7). Its milk is extremely nutritious, and on fermentation becomes an intoxicant. A thick mat of fine hair protects the animal against the extremes alike of heat and cold.

The camel is mentioned three times in the Gospels, on two occasions as a synonym for size or bulkiness; Mat 19:24 (= Mar 10:25, Luk 18:25), 'It is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God'; and Mat 23:24 'Ye blind guides, which strain out the gnat, and swallow the camel.' In the former of these passages two attempts have been made to evade the Oriental hyperbole, firstly, by reading κάμιλος, 'a rope,' for κάμηλος; and, again, by explaining the 'eye of the needle' as the small door for foot-passengers which is generally made in the frame of the large entrance-door of an Eastern house. The expression 'eye of the needle,' however, is only the English equivalent of the Greek words denoting a 'hole.' The eye of a needle stands for something narrow and hard to pass, as in the Egyptian proverb, 'Straiter than the eye of a needle' (Burckhardt, 396). A similar proverb is given by Freytag (ii. p. 19), 'Narrower than the shadow of a lance and than the hole of a needle.' And in the Koran we have (vii. 38), 'As for those who declare our signs to be lies, and who scorn them, the doors of heaven will not be open to them, nor will they enter Paradise, until a camel shall penetrate into the eye of a needle'—that is, never.

In the second of the two passages above, the camel is contrasted with the gnat, 'Ye blind guides, which strain out a gnat, and drink down a camel.' The gnat stands for an emblem of smallness in the Koran (ii. 24, 'God is not ashamed to strike a proverb out of a gnat'). In Arabic the elephant rather than the camel is chosen to designate hugeness, as in the song of Kaab ibn Zuheir—

'If there stood in the place which I stand in an elephant,

Hearing and seeing what I see and hear.

His shoulder muscles with dread would be twitching';

and the camel is an emblem of patience and silent endurance, and goes by the name of 'the father of Job.' The elephant must have been a not unfamiliar object in Palestine in the first century, but would naturally be thought of in connexion with Hellenism and idolatry.

Camel's hair or wool, as it is called, is woven by the Arabs into tent-covers, and also into rough outer garments for the peasantry. In Israel this coarse mantle was the

badge of the prophet (Zec_13:4 'The prophets shall be ashamed each one of his vision, when he prophesieth; and they will no more wear a hairy garment in order to deceive'); and in 2Ki_1:8 Elijah is described as being an 'owner of hair' שער בעל, that is, wearing this garment of the prophets; Authorized Version, 'an hairy man'), and girt with leather. As the successor of Elijah and of the prophets, John the Baptist adopted the same dress (Mat_3:4, Mar_1:6). It is generally supposed that the Oriental mystic or *sufi* is so named from his dress of wool (*suf*); cf. Rev_11:3.

T. H. Weir and Henry E. Dosker.

☩Cana

CANA (Κανὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας) is mentioned four times in the Fourth Gospel. It was the scene of our Lord's first miracle (Joh_2:1; Joh_2:11); the place to which 'a certain king's officer (βασιλικός), whose son was sick at Capernaum,' came to find Jesus (Joh_4:46); and the native place of the disciple Nathanael (Joh_21:2). After the miracle, Jesus 'went down' (κατέβη) to Capernaum; and the king's officer besought him to 'come down' (καταβῆ) to heal his son. Those references place Cana of Galilee on higher ground than Capernaum. There is no other direct evidence as to its position.

Josephus states (*Vita*, 16) that he resided for a time 'in a village of Galilee which is named Cana.' From this village he made a descent during the night upon Tiberias (17). Later (41) he speaks of residing in the great plain, the name of which was Asochis. If these residences are one and the same place, the Cana of Josephus may well be *Khirbet Kâna* or *Kânat el-Jelîl*, on the N. slopes of the plain of Buttauf, and about 8 miles N. of Nazareth. This, however, would not decide the site of St. John's Cana. [The Κανὰ of *Ant.* xv. v. 1 should be, according to *BJ* i. xix. 1, Καναθά].

Etymology and tradition are divided between the above mentioned site on the plain of Buttauf and *Kefr Kennâ*, a hamlet on the direct road to the lake, and about 3½ miles N.E. of Nazareth, where there is a fine spring. Etymology certainly favours *Khirbet Kâna*, the doubling of the medial 'nun' being against *Kefr Kennâ*. Tradition is indecisive. The references in Placentinus (*Itin.* 4), Phocas, John of Würzburg, Quaresmius (*Elucidationes*, ii. 852f.), etc., favour *Kefr Kennâ*, where the monks of the Greek and Latin Churches have considerable ecclesiastical properties. On the other hand, the notices of Theodosius (a.d. 530), Saewulf, Brocardus, Fetellus, Marinus Sanutus (p. 253), and others, suit the northern site.

In later times, Robinson (*BRP* [Note: RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ii. 348f., iii. 108) supports the claims of *Khirbet Kâna*, and is followed by Hitter, Thomson, Ewald, Socin, Keim, and others. Eusebius and Jerome (*Onom. s.v. Κανα*) identify Cana with *Kanah** [Note: This Kanah is probably the modern village of Kana, 7 miles S.E. of Tyre (Encyc. Bibl. ii. 2652; Hastings' DB ii. 831).] in Asher (*Jos. 19:28*). This could not be *Kefr Kennâ*, which is not in Asher, but might be *Khirbet Kâna* (*Encyc. Bibl. i. 638*). Other recent writers contend for *Kefr Kennâ*, among whom are Guérin, de Saulcy, Porter, Tristram, etc. The balance of evidence is perhaps on the side of the northern site (Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible i. 346 b). Conder (*PEF* [Note: EF Palestine Exploration Fund.] *Mem. i. 288*) suggests as a possible site a spot nearer to Nazareth than *Kefr Kennâ*, called 'Ain Kâna, and not far from Reineh. Dr. Sanday appears to support this, and claims Guthe as agreeing (*Sacred Sites*, 24 n. [Note: note.]).

Literature.—Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible i. 346; *Encyc. Bibl. i. 637*; Robinson, *BRP* [Note: RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ii. 348f., iii. 108; Conder, *PEF* [Note: EF Palestine Exploration Fund.] *Mem. i. 288*; Stanley, *SP* [Note: P Sinai and Palestine.] 368; Guérin, *Galilée*, i. 175 ff.; Thomson, *Land and Book*, 425 f.; Tristram, *Land of Israel*, 455; Socin, *Pal.* [Note: Palestine, Palestinian.] 358. 367; Murray, *Pal.* [Note: Palestine, Palestinian.] 366; Buhl, *GAP* [Note: AP Geographic des alten Palästina.] 219 f.; Ewald, *Gesch. vi. 180 n.* [Note: note.] ; Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, iv. 116 n. [Note: note.] ; Ritter, *Comp. Geogr. iv. 378f.*

A. W. Cooke.

☞Canaanite

CANAANITE.—See Cananaean.

☞Canaanitish

CANAANITISH.—The Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 rendering of *Χαναανίαια* (Authorized Version 'of Canaan') in *Mat. 15:22* (only here in NT). The word is used to describe the woman who came out of the borders of Tyre and Sidon, desiring to have

her daughter healed who was grievously vexed with a devil. St. Mark (Mar_7:26) calls her a Greek (Ἑλληνίς), a Syro-phœnician (Συροφοινίκισσα) by race. A Canaanite, signifying properly ‘dweller in the lowland,’ is used in a wider or a narrower meaning in the OT, Canaan being a name applied either to the strip of seacoast from Gaza to Sidon, or, more loosely, to the whole possession of Israel, or that part which lay west of Jordan (Gen_10:19; cf. Jos_5:1, Num_13:29, Gen_11:31). The LXX Septuagint renders Canaanite (כְּנַעֲנִי) indifferently by Φοῖνιξ and Χαναναῖος (Exo_6:15, Jos_5:1, Num_13:29, (Num_13:30), Jdg_1:30-33, while in Exo_16:35 and Jos_5:12 we find כְּנַעֲנִי translation by μέρος τῆς Φοινίκης and χώρα τῶν Φοινίκων. These coast inhabitants being the great traders of the old world, ‘Canaanite’ or ‘Phœnician’ was often used simply to mean ‘a merchant’ (Isa_23:8 [LXX Septuagint ἔμποροι], and cf. Hos_12:7, Zep_1:11).

The woman who came to our Lord was a ‘Canaanite’ in the sense that she belonged to the stock of the old Phœnicians of Syria termed ‘Syro-phœnician’ to distinguish them from those of Africa. These were heathen, and between them and the Jews existed the bitterest hostility; see Josephus *circa (about) Apion*. i. 13 (who mentions the Phœnicians, especially of Tyre, with the Egyptians as bearing the greatest ill-will towards the Jews). This fact makes instructive a comparison between our Lord’s treatment of this woman and His dealing with the woman of Samaria; cf. especially Joh_4:9 with Mat_15:26. The Clementines (*Hom.* ii. 19, iii. 73) mention her by the name of Justa, and maintain that the Lord first won her from heathendom, and after that was able to heal her daughter, whose name is given as Bernice.* [Note: Χαναναῖος is to be distinguished from Κανανίτης, TR Καναναῖος (Mat_10:4), which means a Zealot, and is the designation of the Apostle Simon. See Cananaean.]

Literature.—The Commentaries on the Gospels, esp. Swete on Mar_7:26; the articles in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible and the *Encyc. Bibl.*; Trench, *Miracles, ad loc.*; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 37ff.; *Expos. Times*, iv. [1892] p. 80ff.; W. Archer Butler, *Serm*, i. 155 ff.; Lynch, *Serm. to my Curates*, p. 317ff.; Ker, *Serm.*, 2nd ser. p. 200ff.; Bruce, *Galilean Gospel*, p. 154ff.

J. B. Bristow.

CANANaeAN.—‘Cananaean’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 , following the reading *Καναναῖος* adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, WH [Note: Hestcott and Hort’s text.] , and modern scholars generally) or Canaanite (Authorized Version , following the TR [Note: Textus Receptus.] reading *Καναανίτης*) is a description applied by St. Matthew (Mat_10:4) and St. Mark (Mar_3:18) in their lists of the Twelve to the second of the two Apostolic Simons, who is thus distinguished from Simon Peter. There can be no doubt that ‘Canaanite,’ which means an inhabitant of Canaan, is a false rendering. The Gr. for Canaan is *Χαναάν* (Act_7:11; Act_13:19), and for Canaanite, *Χανααναῖος* (Mat_15:22) not *Καναανίτης*. Transliterating the *Καναανίτης* of the TR [Note: R Textus Receptus.] , the Authorized Version should have spelled the word ‘Cananite,’ as indeed was done in the Geneva Version, and in some editions of the Authorized Version , though not in that of 1611. But it is practically certain that *Κανααναῖος* (which in the text of Mk. especially is very strongly supported, e.g. by \aleph BX Δ Λ) is the correct reading. The word seems to be a construction from the plural form \aleph \aleph \aleph of the late Heb. \aleph \aleph , corresponding to the Biblical \aleph \aleph , ‘jealous’ (see Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] , i. ii. 80 f.; and note that the noun \aleph \aleph , which in the Heb. text of the OT is used in the sense of ‘zeal’ as well as of ‘jealousy,’ is sometimes rendered in the LXX Septuagint by *ζηλος* [Isa_9:6; Isa_26:11]). This is borne out by the fact that St. Luke, on the two occasions on which he gives a list of the Apostles (Luk_6:15, Act_1:13), employs *ὁ Ζηλωτής*, instead of *ὁ Κανααναῖος*, to describe Simon—which seems to show that the two epithets are synonymous.

Jerome, who in the Vulgate adopts the form ‘Cananaeus,’ in his *Com. in Matt.* interprets it ‘de vico Chana Galilaeae’; and he has been followed by many scholars in modern times, who have taken the name to be a corruption of *Καναῖος*, and to mean ‘a man of Cana, probably Cana in Galilee. This view, however, now obtains little support, though Cheyne (*Encyc. Bibl.* ii. col. 2624, iv. col. 4535) appears to favour it. Meyer (*Com. on Matt.* [Note: Matthew’s (i.e. prob. Rogers’) Bible 1537.] , *in loc.*), while holding that the form of the word makes the derivation from Cana impossible, maintains that it is nevertheless ‘derived from the name of some *place* or other’; and would explain its use in Mt. and Mk. from the fact that Simon, as a *quondam* zealot, ‘bore the surname \aleph \aleph , *ζηλωτής*, a name which was correctly interpreted by Luke; but, according to another tradition, was erroneously derived from the *name of a place*, and accordingly came to be rendered *ὁ Κανααναῖος*.’ This is ingenious, but

seems needlessly far-fetched. It is quite arbitrary, too, to say that the form *Καναναῖος* must be derived from the name of a place. The termination *-αῖος* is common in the Grecized rendering of names of sects (e.g. *Φαρισαῖος*, *Σαδδουκαῖος*, *Ἑσσαῖος*; see Grimm-Thayer, *Lexicon*, s.v. *Καναναῖος*). And *Καναναῖος* from *קַנְנַאָה* is as natural as *Φαρισαῖος* from *פְּרִישִׁי*, *stat. emphat.* of Aramaic *פְּרִישִׁין* for Heb. *פְּרִישִׁים* (see Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii. ii. 19).

J. C. Lambert.

☪ Candle

CANDLE.—Candles were not much in use in an oil-bearing country like Palestine, and are not referred to in the Bible. But the word occurs in the Authorized Version 8 times as the translation of *λύχνος* ('lamp'); and *λυχνία* ('lampstand') is always translated 'candlestick.' [On the other hand, *λαμπάς*, which is generally translated by its derivative 'lamp,' should be rendered either 'torch' or 'lantern'; for it generally refers to a lamp which could be carried out of doors (*Mat_25:1* ff., *Joh_18:3*, and even *Act_20:8*, where the *λαμπάδες ἱκαναὶ* may have been torches that had been brought in by those who had assembled by night), thus corresponding to Heb. *לַפִּיד*].

The *λύχνος* (Heb. *נֵר*, *נֵר*, the latter used only in a figurative sense) was, as a rule, an earthenware vessel, like a tiny flat teapot, with a flaxen wick (*Mat_12:20*) in the spout, and supplied with oil (mostly from olives, but also from sesame, nuts, radishes, or fish), through a hole in the centre, from an *ἀγγεῖον* (*Mat_25:4*) or other vessel. It could either be carried about (*Luk_15:8*) or set on a stand (*Mar_4:21* etc.). For illustrations of lamps see Hastings' B [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] , vol. iii. p. 34.

In the teaching of the Son of Man the illuminating sign of God's presence in the world is *human* example and *personal* witness, as, e.g., in the ministry of John the Baptist (*Joh_5:35*). The Christian life is to be one that lightens and kindles others (*Mar_4:21*), and points men to the 'Father of lights' (*Mat_5:16*). It must, therefore, first be itself lit. That is the key to the difficult passage in *Mat_6:22* f., *Luk_11:34* f. Light may be everywhere, yet it is of no use unless received by the eye, which is the lamp of the body. Sin makes a man see dimly or double, and must be renounced with an undivided

mind if the life is to be illumined with Divine truth and love (*Expos.*, 2nd ser. i. [1881] 252 ff.; cf. 180 ff., 372 ff.).

But one other important quality Christ illustrated by the use of the lamp, viz. *watchfulness*. It was the custom in private houses, as well as in the temple, to keep lamps burning through the night (Pro 31:18). So, in view of the subtlety and suddenness of temptation and trial, the disciple must have his loins girded and his lamp lit (Luk 12:35). The parable of the Ten Virgins with their *λαμπάδες* teaches a similar lesson. Of Christ as the Lamb it is said that He is Himself the lamp (*λύχνος*) of the Holy City (Rev 21:23).

A. Norman Rowland.

☩ Candlestick

CANDLESTICK.—In Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 of the Gospels this word is without exception correctly changed into ‘stand,’ *Ἰστῆ* being the stand which held the little oil-fed lamp. It might mean anything from a luxurious candelabrum, generally of wood covered with metal, to a bit of stonework projecting from a cottage wall. It was to the lampstand in lowly domestic use (cf. 2Ki 4:10) that Christ referred in Mar 4:21 as being necessary to complete the value of the lamp for those in the house (Mat 5:16) and those who enter it (Luk 8:16; Luk 11:33). And the lesson is that if we have received a truth or a joy through Christ, who is the Light of the World, it is common sense and common justice not to hide it in fear or selfishness, but to use it as a means of illustrating our Father God and illumining those around us (Mat 5:16). Practical illustrations of this parable are found in Mar 5:19-20, Mat 10:27; Mat 10:32, Luk 10:21; Luk 17:18 (cf. Luk 15:6; Luk 15:9; Luk 15:32).

Literature.—Maclaren, *God of the Amen*, p. 292; *Expositor*, 2nd ser. i. [1881] pp. 180 ff., 252 ff., 372 ff., 6th ser. 271 ff.

A. Norman Rowland.

☩ Capernaum

CAPERNAUM

1. The name.
2. Description of the localities.
3. Identification.
4. Capernaum and Bethsaida.
5. References in NT.
6. History.

Literature.

The question as to the position of Capernaum is of great importance for the Gospel story. It is the pivot on which hinges the determination of the scene of the greater part of our Lord's active ministry. The three places, Capernaum, Chorazin, and Bethsaida, must all be taken together, and they must in any case be not far from the Plain of Gennesaret. This plain is undoubtedly the modern *el-Ghuweir* (*i.e.* 'the little *Ghôr*' or 'hollow'); there is also no doubt that Chorazin is the modern *Kerâzeh*. The present article is written in the belief that Capernaum is *Tell Hûm* (which is the view of the majority of scholars), and that Bethsaida was the port (now called *el-'Araj*), on the Lake, of Bethsaida Julias (*et-Tell*).

1. *The Name.*—The correct form of the name is undoubtedly Καφαρναούμ. This is found in all the oldest authorities to the end of the 4th cent. (Evv. codd. opt.; Verss. antiq. Latt. Syrr. aegypt. Goth.; Josephus *BJ*, *Onomast.* Euseb. Hieron.). The spelling Καπερναούμ begins to appear in the 5th cent., but after that date rapidly covered the ground. In Josephus (*Vita*, § 72), mention is made of a village the name of which Niese prints as Κεφαρνωκόν, but there are many various readings, and the text is pretty certainly corrupt. The exact relation of the ancient name to the modern does not work out very clearly. It is easy to understand how *Caphar* (mod. *Kefr* = 'village'), as a habitation of living men, might become *Tell* in the sense of 'a heap of ruins' (strictly = 'mound,' but there is no mound on the site). But there are difficulties in the way of regarding *Hûm* as a contraction for 'Nahum'; and some good philologists (Buhl, *op. cit. inf.*, cf. Socin, Guthe, *ib.*) prefer to regard *Tell Hûm* as a corruption of *Tenhûm* or *Tanhûm*, which occurs in Jewish, authorities.

2. *Description of the localities.*—The beautiful Plain of Gennesaret is closed on the north-east by a spur of the hills which slopes down gradually to the Lake. In the hollow formed by this, on the rising ground where the caravan-route begins to ascend

the ridge, is the ruined *khân* of *Khân Minyeh*. On the low ground beneath, and also on the ridge above, there are a few more inconspicuous remains; and between the *khân* and the Lake is a fountain ('*Ain et-Tîn*). Rounding the little promontory, on which is a German hospice, we come to a bay, on the further side of which is a group of springs. One of these is described by Sir Charles Wilson as 'by far the largest spring in Galilee, and estimated to be more than half the size of the celebrated source of the Jordan at Baniyas' (*Recovery*, etc. ii. 348). The waters of this spring come to the surface with great force, and, after being collected in a strongly-built reservoir, they were carried by an aqueduct, in part cut through the rock, round the promontory and to the rear of *Khân Minyeh*; from thence they were used to irrigate the plain. The modern name of this fountain is '*Ain et-Tâbigha*. The ancient name was 'Seven Fountains' (*Itin Hieros.* ed. Vindob. p. 138) or *Heptapegon* (of which *et-Tâbigha* is an echo). A full mile and a half, or two Roman miles farther, are the ruins of *Tell Hûm*. These cover a considerable extent of ground, half a mile in length by a quarter in breadth. The houses generally were built of blocks of black basalt. A single public building of larger size (74 ft. 9 in. × 56 ft. 9 in.) was of white limestone. This is commonly identified with the synagogue.

'Seen alone there might have been some doubt as to its character, but compared with the number of ruins of the same character which have lately been brought to notice in Galilee, there can be none. Two of those buildings have inscriptions in Hebrew over their main entrances; one in connexion with a seven-branched candlestick, the other with figures of the paschal lamb, and all without exception are constructed after a fixed plan, which is totally different from that of any church, temple, or mosque in Palestine' (Wilson, *Recovery*, etc. ii. 344).

Two Roman miles up the course of a stream which enterst he Lake just beyond *Tell Hûm*, are ruins which bear the name of *Kerâzeh*; but between *Tell Hûm* and the mouth of the Jordan there are no more ruins and no special features. Across the Jordan a little way back from its mouth, is *et-Tell*, which is now generally held to mark the site of Bethsaida Julias. This was in ancient times connected by a paved causeway with a cluster of ruins on the shore of the Lake, now known as *el-'Araj*.

3. Identification.—It will be seen that there is really not very much choice. Chorazin is certainly *Kerâzeh*, and Bethsaida Julias, built by the tetrarch Philip, is pretty certainly *et-Tell*. The alternatives for Capernaum are thus practically reduced to *Khân Minyeh* and *Tell Hûm*. And the broad presumption must be in favour of the latter, as Capernaum was no doubt the most important place at this end of the Lake, and the ruins are here far more extensive than those at *Khân Minyeh*, as well as demonstrably ancient. The *khân* at *Khân Minyeh* appears to have been built in the 16th cent. (Sepp, *op. cit. inf.* p. 165), though the place name first occurs in the time of Saladin.

Is this broad presumption overruled by any decisive consideration? A few minor arguments have been adduced against it. Capernaum was a place where tolls were collected (Mar_2:14 ||), and it is thought that this would be more natural on the main caravan road: but a place of the size of *Tell Hûm* must in any case have had its tolls, and there was certainly a road along the north end of the Lake leading to Bethsaida Julias (Guthe). The bay of *et-Tâbigha* is much frequented by fish, and the beach is suitable for mooring boats. But there is little, if any, trace of ruins that are not quite modern. The ruins about *Khân Minyeh* are also inconsiderable, though further excavation is needed to bring out their real character.

The point that seemed for a time to outweigh all the rest turned upon the position of the fountain. Josephus, who is our earliest and best authority, expressly says that the Plain of Gennesaret was watered by the fountain of Capernaum (*BJ* iii. x. 8). The only fountain to which this statement can apply is that of *et-Tâbigha*. There are other fountains, but none of them could be said in any sense to irrigate the plain as in ancient times this fountain certainly did. This indication might seem *prima facie* to support the claims of *Khân Minyeh*. The fountain is a short mile from this site, and two short (Roman) miles from *Tell Hûm*. But it has to be remembered that these large villages or towns on the Sea of Galilee had each its 'territory.' Thus Josephus speaks of the 'territory' of Hippos (*Ἰππινηή*, *BJ* iii. iii. 1); and the 'Gerasene' demoniac (in Mar_5:1-17 ||) is a case of the same kind—the swine were not feeding in the town itself but in its territory. In like manner the fountain was situated within the territory of Capernaum, whether it was at *Khân Minyeh* or at *Tell Hûm*.

This leaves room for the natural presumption to tell in favour of *Tell Hûm*. And the identification is confirmed by the fact that the pilgrim Theodosius (*circa* (about) 530 a.d.), coming from the West, arrived at Heptapegon before he came to Capernaum: this he would have done if it were at *Tell Hûm*, but not if it had been at *Khân Minyeh* (*Itin. Hieros.* p. 138; cf. *JThSt* [Note: *ThSt* Journal of Theological Studies.] v. 44). Other indications, whether Biblical or derived from the narratives of the pilgrims, are all indecisive.

Just for a time there was a certain swing of the pendulum (which may be said to have reached its eight in the last decade of the last century) in favour of *Khân Minyeh*. But the balance of the criticism of the last fifty years is pretty clearly on the side of *Tell Hûm*. But absolutely decisive results can only be obtained, if at all, by thorough and systematic excavation.

4. *Capernaum and Bethsaida*.—The two questions of Capernaum and Bethsaida are so closely connected, that a word should be added upon the latter. The only Bethsaida in these parts known to general history is that of which we have just spoken as located

at *et-Tell* to the east of the Jordan. It has often been thought necessary to postulate a second Bethsaida, which is most commonly placed at the bay of *et-Tâbigha*. The main reasons for this are two. (a) In Joh 12:21, the Bethsaida of the Gospels is described as ‘Bethsaida of Galilee,’ whereas Bethsaida Julias was, strictly speaking, in Gaulanitis (*BJ* ii. ix. 1). (b) The phrase εἰς τὸ πέραν in Mar 6:45 seems to imply that Bethsaida was on the opposite side of the Lake to the scene of the Feeding of the Five Thousand. These reasons are, however, insufficient to warrant the invention of a second Bethsaida so near to the first, and itself so wholly hypothetical. In the bay of *et-Tâbigha* there are no ruins to prove its existence. On the other hand, (a) there is evidence enough to show that ‘Galilee’ was often loosely used for the country east of Jordan and of the Lake (*BJ* ii. xx. 4, iii. iii. 1; *Ant.* xviii. i. 1, 6); and the geographer Ptolemaeus speaks of Bethsaida Julias as ‘in Galilee,’ just as St. John does (Buhl, *GA^P* [Note: *AP Geographic des alten Palästina.*] p. 242). Political boundaries were so shifting, and the adjustments of territory in these little principalities were so constantly changed, that a loose use of terms grew up, and the more familiar names were apt to displace the less familiar, (b) The phrase εἰς τὸ πέραν cannot be pressed; it might be used of an oblique course from any one point on the shore of the Lake to any other: Josephus (*Vita*, § 59) uses διεπεραιώθην of taking ship from Tiberias to Taricheae, which are on the same side of the Lake, and very little farther from each other than Bethsaida from the scene of the miracle.

5. References in the Gospels.—So far as our Lord had any fixed headquarters during His Galilaean ministry, they were in Capernaum. It is called His ‘own city’ (ἰδία πόλις) in Mat 9:1. The same close connexion is implied by the special reproach addressed to the city in Mat 11:23 (= Luk 10:15). The public ministry, in the more formal sense, was opened here by the call of the four leading Apostles (Mar 1:16-20); and here, too, were the labours of which we have a graphic and typical description on the Sabbath that followed (Mar 1:21-34 ||). We have repeated mention of a particular house to which our Lord resorted, which was probably St. Peter’s. During the early part of His ministry He must have spent much time here, but during the latter part His visits can have been only occasional.

Perhaps we should be right in inferring from the presence of the ‘centurion’ (Mat 8:5 ff., Luk 7:2 ff.) that Herod Antipas had a small garrison here. St. Luke tells us that this centurion, though a Gentile, had built the synagogue of the place. Is it too sanguine to believe that this was the very building the remains of which are still most conspicuous among the ruins? There appears to be good reason for the view that they are really the remains of a synagogue. A comparison with similar buildings elsewhere in Galilee brings out the distinctive features of the ground plan, and the presence of religious emblems seems to render this probable. The richness of the architecture (cf.

pl. xvii. in the present writer's *Sacred Sites of the Gospels*) may seem to suggest that the ruins date from the palmy days of Galilaeen Judaism (a.d. 140-300), and Schürer refers them to this period. But there is one argument that perhaps points in a different direction. There was a synagogue at Chorazin hardly less elaborate than that at Capernaum, though with its ornaments cut in the black basalt, and not in limestone (Wilson, *Recovery*, ii. 3, 4, 7). Now, we know that when Eusebius wrote his *Onomasticon*, the site of Chorazin was already 'deserted' (*Onomast.*, ed. Klostermann, p. 174). This desertion is not likely to have been very recent. And it is perhaps after all more probable that elaborate building took place at a time when Galilee had a prince of its own with architectural ambitions, who must have gathered around him a number of skilled artificers at Tiberias. The Herods were all builders; and the period of their rule was probably that in which Galilee enjoyed the greatest material prosperity.

6. *Later history.*—From a.d. 150 onwards the shores of the Sea of Galilee became a stronghold of Rabbinical Judaism. The fanaticism of this district would not tolerate the presence of Christians; it is expressly stated by Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxx. 11; cf. Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*, ii. 261) that down to the time of Constantine no one had ever dared to erect a church either at Nazareth or Capernaum, or at other places mentioned in the neighbourhood. That means that there must have been a complete break in the Christian tradition; so that, when we read later that a church was built on the supposed site of Peter's house, it is not likely that the guess had any real authority (*Itin. Hieros.* pp. 112 f., 163, 197). Still Capernaum was one of the sacred places, and from the 4th cent. onwards it was frequented by Christian pilgrims. Eusebius (and Jerome after him) mentions the place as on the Sea of Gennesaret, but throws no further light upon it beyond fixing its distance as two Roman miles from Chorazin (*Onomast.* pp. 120, 174). We have seen that Theodosius came to it from Tiberias after passing through Magdala and Seven Fountains (*Itin. Hieros.* p. 137 f.). Arculfus (*circa (about) 670 a.d.*) did not enter Capernaum, but saw it from a neighbouring height stretching along the Lake, and observed that it had no wall (*ib.* p. 273 f.). The nun who tells the story of St. Willibald (*circa (about) 723 a.d.*) makes him first come to Capernaum, then to Bethsaida, then to *Corazaim, ubi Dominus daemioniacos curavit*, where there is an evident confusion between Chorazin and Gerasa (mod. *Kersa*), the scene of the healing of the demoniac. The same blunder occurs in the anonymous *Life*, so that it probably goes back to St. Willibald himself (see Tobler, *Descript. Terr. Sanct.* pp. 26, 63). We have seen that the history of *Khân Minyeh*, so far as we can trace it, belongs to the Saracenic and Turkish periods. Saladin halted at *al-Munaja* in 1189, but the building of the *khân* is referred by Sepp to Sinan Pasha under Suleiman the Magnificent (1496-1566).

Literature.—The most important descriptions and discussions are as follows:—On the side of those who would place Capernaum at *Khân Minyeh*: Robinson, *BRP* [Note: RP

Biblical Researches in Palestine.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ii. 403-408, iii. 344-360; Sepp, *Neue Entdeckungen* (Muncheu. 1896); G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [Note: GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.] 4 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 456, and in *Encyc. Biblica*. On the side of those who identify Capernaum with *Tell Hûm*: W. M. Thomson, *L^B* [Note: The Land and the Book.] (ed. 1901) pp. 350-356, cf. also 359 f.; Sir Charles Wilson, *The Recovery of Jerusalem* (London, 1871), ii. 375-387; and a solid phalanx of the most judicious German writers, e.g. Furrer in Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexikon* (1871); Socin (in Baedeker's *Pal.* [Note: Palestine, Palestinian.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 291 f.); Schûrer, *GJV* [Note: JV Geschichte des Jûdischen Volkes.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ii. 445 f.; Guthe, *Kurzes Bibelwôrterbuch*, and elsewhere; Buhl, *GAP* [Note: Geographic des alten Palâstina.] (1896) pp. 223-225, cf. 242. The writer of this article gave a hesitating adhesion to the former view in *Sacred Sites of the Gospels* (Oxford, 1903), but retracted that opinion in *JThSt* [Note: Journal of Theological Studies.] for Oct. 1093, vol. v. pp. 42-48.

W. Sanday.

☞ Captain

CAPTAIN.—1. This word is the Authorized Version rendering of two Greek terms in the Gospels:—(1) *χιλιαρχος*, properly 'leader of a thousand' (Joh 18:12, Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'chief captain,' (Revised Version margin) 'military tribune'; see also Mar 6:21, Act 21:31-33; Act 21:37; Act 22:24; Act 22:26-29; Act 23:10; Act 23:15; Act 23:17-19; Act 23:22; Act 24:7; Act 24:22-23, Rev 6:15; Rev 19:18). (2) *στρατηγός*, properly 'leader of an army,' 'general' (Luk 22:4; Luk 22:52; see also Act 4:1; Act 5:24; Act 5:26).

1. *χιλιαρχος* is used (a) in a vague general sense of a superior military officer, and (b) technically as the Greek equivalent of the Roman *præfectus* or *tribunus militum*. The Roman garrison in the citadel at Jerusalem, consisting of a cohort (*τάγμα* = NT *σπειρα*, 'band' [*καθηστο γὰρ ἀεὶ ἐπ' αὐτῆς τάγμα Ῥωμαίων*, Josephus *BJ* v. v. 8]) of provincial troops, Syrian Greeks, and Samaritans, whose commandant would be a *civis Romanus* (Act 22:28), while they would be presented with the Imperial franchise on their discharge, was reinforced during the Passover by additional troops which were

stationed in one of the Temple buildings (Mommsen, *Prov. Rom.* [Note: Roman.] *Emp.*, English translation ii. 186). The χιλίαρχος is also called φρούραρχος by Josephus (*Ant.* xv. xi. 4, xviii. iv. 3); see Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] i. ii. 55. The legion consisting normally of 6000 men, the six *tribuni* took command for two months in turn. Palestine, however, being a Roman province of the second rank, did not possess a full legionary garrison. Mommsen gives its strength, at a subsequent period, as consisting of a detachment (*ala*) of cavalry and five cohorts of infantry, or about 3000 men.

2. στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ, the commandant of the Temple Levites. Josephus mentions the ‘captain’ (στρατηγός) of the Levitical guard in the time of Claudius (*Ant.* xx. vi. 2), and in that of Trajan (*BJ* vi. v. 3). Possibly the officers (ὑπηρέται) who assisted in the arrest of Jesus (Joh 18:3; cf. Joh 7:32; cf. Joh 7:45) belonged to this body. This ‘captain’ of the Temple (2Ma 3:4 ὁ προστάτης τοῦ ἱεροῦ) is mentioned in Jer 20:1 LXX Septuagint as ἡγούμενος and in Neh 11:11 as ἀπέναντι τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ ‘the ruler of the house of God’ (Vulgate *prineeps domus Dei Dei* = *הר אֵי שׁ* Mishna, *Middoth* i. § 2). The duty of this ‘captain of the mount of the Temple’ was to keep order in the Temple, visit the stations of the guard during the night, and see that the sentries were duly posted and alert. He and his immediate subalterns are supposed to be intended by the ‘rulers’ (ἄρχοντες) mentioned in Ezr 9:2 and *Neh. passim* (στρατηγοὶ or ἄρχοντες). See Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii. i. 258. The chief constable of this priestly corps of Temple police was naturally himself a Levite.

Literature—Josephus, *Ant.* x viii. 5, xv xi. 4, xviii. iv. 3, xx vi. 2, *BJ* v. v. 8, vi. v. 3; Schurer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] i. ii. 55, ii. i. 258; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, article ‘Captain.’

P. Henderson Aitken.

II. Besides these two military or semi-military uses of ‘captain’ in the Gospels, we have to notice the employment of the term as a title for Christ in Heb 2:10 (Authorized Version and (Revised Version margin)) and Heb 12:2 ((Revised Version margin)). In both cases the corresponding word in the Greek text is ἀρχηγός, a word which otherwise is found in the NT only in Act 3:15; Act 5:31 (both times in Acts applied to Christ, and in each case rendered ‘Prince,’ with ‘Author’ as a marginal alternative in Act 3:15).

In accordance with its derivation (ἀρχή and ἡγέομαι), ἀρχηγός originally meant a leader, and so naturally came to be applied to a prince or chief. From this the transition was easy to the further meaning of a first cause or author, which is not infrequent in the philosophical writers. For the ‘Captain’ of Authorized Version in Heb 2:10, Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 substitutes ‘author,’ giving ‘captain’ in the margin; and in Heb 12:2 both VS^S [Note: SS Versions.] have ‘author,’ though Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 again gives ‘captain’ as a marginal rendering.

But when Jesus is called ἀρχηγός τῆς σωτηρίας (Heb 2:10), the meaning is not merely that He is the Author of our salvation. The context suggests that the idea of a leader going before his saved ones (cf. Heb 6:20) ought to be adhered to (see Davidson, *Hebrews*, *ad loc.*). Similarly when He is called τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγός (Heb 12:2), the idea is that of one who has led the way along the path of faith. In both cases the term ‘Captain’ may be unsuitable, since it is apt to suggest military images which had no place in the writer’s mind; but ‘leader,’ at all events, should be retained, since the idea of leadership and not of authorship seems best to express his purpose (see Bruce, *Expositor*, 3rd ser. viii. [1888] p. 451). For a full treatment of the subject in its apologetic and homiletic aspects, Bruce’s chapter on ‘The Captain of Salvation’ (*op. cit.* pp. 447-461) should be read in whole.

Literature.—The *Lexicons* of Grimm-Thayer and Cremer, s.v.; W. R. Smith in *Expos.* 2nd ser. [1881] ii. 422; D. Brown, *ib.* 5th ser. [1895] ii. 434 ff. See also C. J. Vaughan, P. Rendall, and B. F. Westcott on Heb 2:10; J. A. Selbie in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible iv. 102^a; and P. H. Chase, *Credibility of the Acts*, 129 f.

J. C. Lambert.

Care

CARE (μέριμνα, μεριμνάω, μέλω, ἐπιμελέομαι).—The teaching of Jesus on care has been slightly obscured for English readers of the NT by the change in meaning through which this word and the word ‘thought’ have passed. Properly meaning *trouble* or *sorrow*, ‘care’ was from an early period confounded with Lat. *cura*, and from the idea of *attention* thus obtained was held to express the particular trouble of the mind due to over-attention, viz. *anxiety* (see Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible i. 353), while in modern language care, and especially its compounds ‘careful’ and ‘carefulness,’ are often used in a sense which indicates no trouble, but the well-directed effort of the mind in relation to present affairs and future prospects. The Authorized Version

rendering ‘take no thought’ (Mat_6:25; Mat_6:31; Mat_6:34) is still more misleading. As used by the translators, it meant ‘distressing anxiety’ (see Trench *On the Authorized Version* p. 39; Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible iv. 754). That the phrase μὴ μεριμνᾶτε is not ‘take no thought,’ but ‘be not anxious’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), seems clear by the derivation of μεριμνα from μερις, with its sense of dividing and, as applied to the mind, of distraction; and is rendered certain by comparison with the word θορυβάζω or τυρβάζω coupled with it in Luk_10:41, and with the expressive phrase μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε used in Luk_12:29, which expresses the metaphor of a ship tossed and helpless on the waves (see Cox in *Expositor*, 1st ser. i. [1875] p. 249).

The warning of Jesus against care is therefore in no sense applicable to reasonable forethought (πρόνοια). Man cannot live his life like the birds and the flowers, without a sense of the present necessity and the impending future. He can and must think, plan, and toil. The forethought and work necessary to provide food and raiment for himself and for those dependent upon him, are part of the Divine discipline of character. A careless life would be essentially a godless life. But Christ’s reproofs are directed against all feverishness and distraction of mind. Whatever is the exciting cause of the distress—how food is to be obtained (Mat_6:25-26, Luk_12:23-24) or clothing (Mat_6:28; Mat_6:30, Luk_12:27-28), how the unknown future is to be met (Mat_6:34) though there seems no obvious source of supply (Mat_10:9; cf. Mar_6:8, Luk_9:3; Luk_10:3-4), though the duties of life press hardly (Luk_10:41), and though there is impending and certain peril (Mat_10:19; Mat_12:11), He says, ‘Be not anxious.’

The argument of Jesus against care is clothed in language of rare geniality and felicitousness. ‘Which of you by being anxious can add a cubit to his stature’ [rather, ‘a span to his age’]? Worry does not help forward the great designs of life. It cannot even accomplish ‘that which is least.’ It may take a span from one’s age; it cannot prolong life. It is futile, and it is needless as well. Nature reads to man the lesson of trust. The wild flowers, though their life is so brief, are decked with loveliness by the great God. God takes care for the flowers. And He is *your* Heavenly Father. The argument is *a minori ad majus*. God’s care for the flowers is a constant rebuke of His children’s feverish anxiety concerning their own wants. The Providence, unforgetful of ‘that which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven,’ is, in relation to His children, an all-wise and all-loving Fatherhood.

But the geniality of the argument does not disguise the seriousness with which Jesus regarded care. The context of the *locus classicus* (Mat_6:25-34, Luk_12:22-34) is not the same in the two Evangelists. St. Matthew attaches the warning against care to the

saying, 'No man can serve two masters ... ye cannot serve God and mammon.' In Lk. it follows as a deduction from the parable spoken against covetousness and the closing saying, 'So is every one that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God.' There is no need to decide the question of the priority of the two accounts, for the moral context of both is practically the same. Care arises from a division at the very centre of life, an attempt to serve both God and mammon, to 'worship the Lord and serve other gods,' or it arises from the radically false idea that 'a man's life consisteth in the abundance of the things which he possesseth.' Such a false estimate of values, involving the desire for and the pursuit of material goods for their own sake, inevitably produces the fever and distraction of mind called care, and it is the moral condition out of which it arises, as well as the consequences which it engenders, that makes it so serious a fault in the eyes of Christ. 'The cares of this life' are part of the hostile influences which choke the good seed of the kingdom, so that it bringeth forth no fruit to perfection (Mat 13:22; cf. Luk 8:14). In a mind so preoccupied by worldly interests and anxieties the word of Christ may survive, but it never comes to maturity, or produces its potential harvest in life and service. Hence the severity which underlies the gentleness of Christ's rebuke of Martha (Luk 10:41-42). She was distracted about much serving, anxious and troubled about many things, and her worry spoiled her temper, and the service of Christ to which her love for Him impelled her. So serious indeed may be the consequences of this distress of soul, that Jesus, in His warning against the evil things which may overcharge the heart, and make men utterly unprepared for the coming of the Son of Man, combined with surfeiting and drunkenness 'the cares of this life' (Luk 21:34).

In opposition to care Jesus sets trust in the Heavenly Father. The assurance of His intimate knowledge of life and all its needs, and of His loving care, ought to exclude all anxiety concerning the wants of the present, and all fear of the future. But trust in God's love must be continually subordinate to the doing of God's will. The assurance of His Fatherly love and providential care is mediated to loving obedience. Thus in sending forth the Twelve (Mat 10:8; cf. Mar 6:8, Luk 9:3), and in the case of the Seventy (Luk 10:3-4), Jesus bids them make no elaborate provision for their physical needs. God takes care of His servants when they are in the path of obedience to His will. And similarly, when He warns His disciples that they shall be brought before the ecclesiastical and civil authorities because of their allegiance to Him, He calls upon them to have no anxiety as to the reply they shall give (Mat 10:19, Mar 13:11, Luk 12:11). Jesus would have them believe that the moral order and the providential order of the world are essentially one, and are both controlled by the love of the Heavenly Father, so that they who seek His Kingdom and do His will shall not want any good thing.

Christ's own life is the supreme example of perfect peace, conditioned by absolute trust in the Heavenly Father, and loving obedience to His will. The pressing necessity

gave Him no anxiety, and the impending peril no fear. 'Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on thee, because he trusteth in thee' (Isa 26:3).

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Care'; Maclaren, *Serm. pr. in Manchester*, 1st ser. p. 235; Dale, *Laws of Christ*, p. 157; Hunger, *Appeal to Life*, p. 149; Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] Macleod, *Serm.* p. 119; Fairbairn, *City of God*, p. 317; Drummond, *Nat. Law in the Spir. World*, p. 123; *Expositor*, i. xii. [1882] 104, iii. ii. [1885] 224; Moore, *God is Love*, 82; Allon, *Indwelling Christ*, 110; Zahn, *Bread and Salt from the Word of God*, 287.

Joseph Muir.

⚠️Carpenter

CARPENTER.—Mat 13:55 'Is not this the carpenter's son?' The question of Christ's own countrymen, when they were offended at the lowly station of the Teacher at whose wisdom they marvelled, tells us the exact conditions under which Jesus passed His early years. The parallel Mar 6:3 'Is not this the carpenter?' is still more interesting, for it tells us how Jesus Himself was occupied in His youth and early manhood. This flashlight photograph of the artisan in the workshop is all we know of the eighteen years between the visit to Jerusalem in His boyhood and the baptism which marked the entry on public life. The passage Mat 13:53-57 || Mar 6:1-4 presents a curious and quite undesigned antithesis to Sir 38:25-34, specially these words, 'How can he get wisdom that holdeth the plough?... so every *carpenter* [Heb. כַּרְמֵל, Gr. τέκτων, Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'artificer'] and workmaster that laboureth night and day.... They shall not sit high in the congregation ... and they shall not be found where parables are spoken.' Possibly this reference explains why the people were specially offended at Jesus the carpenter for presuming to speak in the synagogue and in parables. The passage of Sirach quoted is from the chapter describing the honour of a physician, with which may be compared the proverb, 'Physician, heal thyself,' quoted by Christ in similar circumstances at Nazareth, when they said, 'Is not this Joseph's son?'

An attempt to make Mar 6:3 conform to Mat 13:55 is seen in some old MS^S [Note: SS Manuscripts.] (including the good cursives 33-69) as well as in Ethiopic and Arm. versions, where we find 'carpenter's son' in place of 'carpenter.' This reading must represent a very old text, for Origen (*circa (about) Cels. vi. 36*) says, 'Nowhere in the Gospels current in the Churches is Jesus Himself called a carpenter,' alluding apparently to other Gospels in which this trade was ascribed to Christ. It is also clear

that the TR [Note: R Textus Receptus.] reading must be as old, for Celsus founded on it. One may gather that the change in MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] and versions was not merely accidental or harmonistic but deliberate, and due to those who considered that Jesus was dishonoured by being described as a carpenter. Justin Martyr (*Dial. circa (about) Tryph.* 88) supports TR [Note: R Textus Receptus.] in an interesting manner when he says that Jesus, ‘when amongst men, worked as a carpenter, making ploughs and yokes, thus teaching the marks of righteousness, and commending an active life.’ Such making of ploughs and yokes is precisely the kind of work expected of a country carpenter like one at Nazareth, though possibly Justin’s words are a rhetorical expansion of Mar_6:3. A curious anecdote is recorded by Farrar, to the effect that Libanius, a pagan sophist and devoted admirer of Julian the Apostate, inquired of a Christian, ‘What is the carpenter doing now?’ The answer was, ‘He is making a coffin.’ Very soon afterwards came the news of Julian’s death. [Strangely enough, in relating this anecdote, Farrar himself quotes in *Life of Christ* ‘carpenter’s son,’ but in *Life of Lives* he has ‘carpenter’].

Whichever of the above readings be adopted, however (and in Mar_6:3 the TR [Note: R Textus Receptus.] is supported by all the chief MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.]), the probability is that Joseph by this time was dead, and that Jesus as his reputed son had carried on the business. Nor are we to reckon this as anything derogatory to the Lord. On the contrary, it is another proof of His condescension, when, though He was rich, yet for our sakes He became poor (2Co_8:9). By His toil at the bench He has dignified and consecrated manual labour. We may derive the practical lesson expressed in Faber’s hymn, ‘Labour is sweet, for Thou hast toiled.’ Even more to us than St. Paul the tent-maker is Jesus the carpenter. He was not an Essene, holding Himself aloof from temporal affairs, but a true Son of Man, taking His part in the business of life. Before He preached the good tidings of the kingdom, He preached the gospel of work. The work that His Father had given Him to do was not the exceptional duty of the teacher, but the ordinary industry of the artisan. His first pulpit was the carpenter’s bench, and His first sermons were the implements and utensils He made for the country folk of Galilee.

Attempts have been made to find in Christ’s parables and other utterances some reference to the trade in which for so many years He was actively engaged. The metaphor of the green wood and the dry (Luk_23:31), and the similitude of the splinter and the beam (Mat_7:3-5), are the nearest approaches to such reminiscences (cf. also one of the recently discovered ‘Sayings of Jesus’: ‘Cleave the wood, and there you will find me’), but are too slight to found on them any inference. Yet may He not have often sighed in the workshop of Nazareth as He handled the nails and the hammer, and thought of the day when the Son of Man must be lifted up? As in Holman Hunt’s famous symbolical picture, the figure of the young carpenter with

outstretched arms released from toil as the sun went down, would make the awful shadow of the Cross.

Literature.—The various *Lives of Christ*; WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] App. on Mar 6:3. With Holman Hunt's *Shadow of Death*, referred to above, may be compared Millais' *The Carpenter's Shop* (otherwise known as *Christ in the House of His Parents*). See *The Gospels in Art*, pp. 110 and 112; Farrar, *Christ in Art*, p. 274 ff.

Arthur Pollok Sym.

☩Cave

CAVE (τρυπή, ἵπ, σπήλαιον).—Caves, both natural and artificial, abound in Palestine; the soft chalky soil of Syria readily lends itself to both. Caves were used in Palestine for a variety of purposes; originally as dwelling-places* [Note: Recent excavations in Palestine have thrown considerable light on Troglodyte dwellings, see PEFSt, 1903, pp. 20-23.] (cf. the 'Horites' or 'cave-dwellers,' Gen 14:6; Gen 36:20 ff., Deu 2:22, see also Gen 19:30). In the Haurân there must have been many of these; sometimes regular underground towns, such as the ancient Edrei, existed:† [Note: Wetzstein, *Reisebericht über Hauran und die Trachonen*, p. 44 ff.] even at the present day there may be seen in Gilead (*Wâdy Ezrak*), a village, named Anab, of Troglodyte dwellers; in this village there are about a hundred families.‡ [Note: Nowack, *Hebräische Archäologie*, i. 136.] Caves were used, further, as places of refuge (Jdg 6:2, 1Sa 13:8; 1Sa 14:11, 1Ki 18:4, Heb 11:38, Rev 6:15), as hiding-places for robbers (Jer 7:11, cf. Mat 21:13, Mar 11:17, Luk 19:46), as stables,§ [Note: Conder, *Tent Work in Palestine*, p. 145.] as cisterns,|| [Note: | PEFSt, 1903, p. 315.] as folds for flocks,¶ [Note: *Jewish Encycl.* iii. 634.] and, above all, as burying-places (Gen 23:19; Gen 49:29, Joh 11:38); the accounts of the burial caves discovered in the lower strata of the site of ancient Gezer are of the highest interest.** [Note: * See PEFSt, 1902, pp. 347-356; 1903, pp. 14-20; 1904, pp. 18-20, 113, 114.]

It is, however, in reference to the place of birth and the place of burial of Christ that the chief interest in caves centres here. Justin Martyr (*Dial. circa (about) Tryph.* lxxviii.), in recounting the story of the birth of Christ, says that it took place in a cave (ἐν σπηλαίῳ τινι) near the village of Bethlehem.†† [Note: † Cf. also Tobler, *Bethlehem in Palästina*, pp. 145-159; Palmer, 'Das jetzige Bethlehem' in *ZDPV* xvii. p. 89 ff.] That cave stables, both ancient and modern, are to be found in Palestine, admits of

no doubt. Conder‡ [Note: ‡ Op. cit. p. 145.] says that there are ‘innumerable instances of stables cut in rock, resembling the Bethlehem grotto. Such stables I have planned and measured at Tekoa, ’Aziz, and other places south of Bethlehem, and the mangers existing in them leave no doubt as to their use and character.’ It seems, therefore, not unreasonable to accept the ancient tradition that Christ was born in a cave. See art. Bethlehem.

Rock-hewn tombs, or caves for burial, were of four distinct kinds: (1) tombs which were cut down into the rock, in the same way in which graves are dug at the present time in European countries; the body was let down into these; (2) tombs cut into the face of the rock, into which the bodies were pushed; (3) tombs, somewhat like the last class, excepting that within, against the wall, there was a kind of step, about two feet high, upon which the body was laid; (4) tombs which were little more than a shelf cut into the rock, just long enough and high enough to hold the body. The first three of these classes varied very much in size; in the case of the first, the top, which was level with the ground, was covered with a stone slab; the others were closed by means of a stone slab which could be pushed aside (Mat 27:60), or else a small door was fixed at the entrance. Tombs were not infrequently furnished with an antechamber, from which one entered into an inner space, the tomb proper, through a low doorway. As a rule, a raised shelf ran round the burial-chamber, and upon this the body was laid; that part on which the head rested was slightly higher.* [Note: Nowack, Heb. Arch. i. 191; Benzinger, Heb. Arch. pp. 225-227; Latham, The Risen Master, pp. 32 ff., 87, 88, and see the two illustrations at the commencement of the work.] See Burial, Tomb.

The data to be gathered from the Gospels are not numerous; see Mat 27:60, Mar 15:46, Luk 23:53, Joh 11:38; Joh 20:1-12.

Literature.—Guthe in *ZDPV* [Note: *DPV Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.*] , ‘Zur Topographie der Grabeskirche in Jerusalem,’ xiv. 35-40; Schick in *ZDPV* [Note: *DPV Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.*] , ‘Neu aufgedeckte Gräber,’ xvi. 202-205, where a very interesting plate is given; T. Tobler, *Bethlehem in Palästina*, pp. 124-227, S. Gallen, 1849; Badeker, *Palestine and Syria*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. cxi ff., Leipzig, 1898; the references, given above, in *PEFSt* [Note: *EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.*] . See also W. R. Smith, *RS* [Note: *S Religion of the Semites.*] 197 f., and the ‘Index of Subjects’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible , Extra Volume.

W. O. E. Oesterley.

☞ Celibacy

CELIBACY.—According to the ordinary Jewish view, marriage was of universal obligation (cf. for instance, *Yebamoth* vi. 6; *Kethuboth* v. 6, 7; *Gittin* iv. 5). There does not appear to be evidence whether exceptions were recognized as possible because of some special vocation, as that to particular forms of the prophetic office. In the time of Christ the Essenes in general eschewed marriage, though one section of them practised it (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. i. 5; *BJ* ii. viii. 2). The teaching of Christ does not contain any explicit reference to this difference between the Essene practice and the ordinary Jewish view. His teaching about divorce and His reassertion of the primitive law of marriage (Mat 5:31-32; Mat 19:3-9, Mar 10:1-12, Luk 16:18) imply not only that He was dealing with marriage as an existing Jewish institution, but also that He contemplated it as a permanent element in Christian life. It is not unnatural to draw a similar inference from His presence at the marriage at Cana (Joh 2:1-11).

St. Matthew records a saying of Christ in which it is contemplated that by a special vocation some are called to celibacy. Christ's prohibition of divorce led the disciples to say that, without freedom to divorce, 'it is not expedient to many.' Our Lord in His reply recognized that there are some for whom this 'saying' of the disciples is true, but only those 'to whom it is given.' He explained that there were three classes who might be regarded as having the vocation to celibacy:—(1) 'Eunuchs which were so born from their mother's womb,' *i.e.* those whose physical constitution unfitted them for marriage; (2) 'eunuchs which were made eunuchs by men,' *i.e.* those 'who by actual physical deprivation or compulsion from men are prevented from marrying' (Alford); (3) 'eunuchs which made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake,' *i.e.* those who by voluntary self-sacrifice abstained from marriage in order that they might be (a) more faithful citizens of the kingdom of heaven in their own personal life, or (b) more effective instruments for the strengthening or expansion of the kingdom of heaven. He then repeated in a different form, 'He that is able to receive it, let him receive it' (Mat 19:10-12), the previous statement that the 'saying' of the disciples, to which He had thus given a higher and deeper meaning, was not a maxim for all His followers, but only for those who, having the Divine call to the celibate life, had with it the Divine gift of power to obey the call. This particular saying is not recorded by any of the Evangelists except St. Matthew. There is a connected line of thought, however, in words recorded by St. Luke; for in Luk 18:29-30 (also in TR [Note: R Textus Receptus.] and (Revised Version margin) of Mat 19:29 and in TR [Note: R Textus Receptus.] of Mar 10:29) a wife is mentioned among those relatives whom Christ contemplates His disciples as leaving for the sake of the kingdom of God (Lk.), or for His name's sake (Mt.), or for His sake and the sake of the gospel (Mk.); and it is promised that those who make such acts of

self-sacrifice shall receive great rewards in the present time and shall hereafter inherit eternal life. In Mat 19:30 and Mar 10:31 the warning that 'many that are first shall be last; and the last first' is associated with this promise; and in Mat 20:1-16 the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard is added to illustrate that maxim.

It is a mistake to interpret Mat 5:28 ('Every one that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart') as a condemnation of marriage; the context shows the meaning to be that to cherish the desire for fornication or adultery is the same thing as committing those sins in the heart. Nor is there any disparagement of marriage in the words, 'They that are accounted worthy to attain to that world and the resurrection from the dead neither marry nor are given in marriage' (Luk 20:35); the meaning is shown by the context to be that the physical accompaniments of marriage belong to the present world, not to the future life, which, as it has not death, has not birth. Luk 14:26 ('If any man cometh unto me, and hateth not his own ... wife, ... yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple') refers not to celibacy, but to the general law that a Christian must be prepared to surrender everything human for the sake of Christ, if called by God to do so, or if such surrender be necessitated by faithfulness to the obligations of the Christian religion.

On the whole, then, the teaching of Christ may be summarized to the effect that (1) marriage is a good state, contemplated as the usual lot, in ordinary Christian life, of those who have not received some special call; (2) celibacy is the subject of a distinct vocation involving dangers and having attached to it high promises. It is probable that the regard paid to celibacy in the Christian Church was based partly on the references to it in the teaching of Christ, and partly on inferences connected with the fact of His birth from a virgin. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iii. xv. 97) quotes as a saying of Christ, with the introduction 'The Lord says,' the following: 'He who is married, let him not put away his wife; and he who is not married, let him not marry; he who with purpose of chastity has agreed not to marry, let him remain unmarried.' Some have thought this saying to be a reminiscence of 1Co 7:8 to 1Co 11:27 ascribed to Christ because of the words 'not I, but the Lord' in 7:10; but Clement apparently has our Lord's words in Mat 19:12 in view, for a little later in the same chapter he says, 'They who have made themselves eunuchs from all sin for the kingdom of heaven's sake, these are blessed, they who fast from the world.'

Clement of Alexandria also refers to a conversation between our Lord and Salome mentioned in the lost 'Gospel according to the Egyptians' (*Strom.* iii. vi. 45, ix. 63, 64, 66, xiii. 92; *Exc. Theod.* [Note: Theodotion.] 67). Our Lord is there reported to have said that death would have power 'as long as ye women bear children'; that He 'came to destroy the works of the female'; and that the kingdom of God would come 'when ye shall have trodden down the garment of shame, and when the two shall he

one, and the male with the female, neither male nor female.’ Part of this last quotation is also in pseudo-Clement of Rome, 12: ‘The Lord Himself, being asked by one when His kingdom should come, said, When the two shall be one, and the outside as the inside, and the male with the female, neither male nor female.’ In interpreting these sayings, notice must be taken of Clement of Alexandria’s comment that our Lord spoke in condemnation not of marriage, but of sins of the flesh and the mind, and to show the natural connexion between death and birth; and of the further words of Salome, ‘Theo I did well in not bearing children,’ with our Lord’s reply, ‘Eat every herb, but that which hath bitterness do not eat.’ It is possible that in these passages the ‘Gospel according to the Egyptians’ preserved an echo of Mat_19:12, or some saying of our Lord unrecorded in the NT. It is not likely that the actual words were spoken by Him, since, as Lightfoot (*Apostolic Fathers*, i. ii. 237) pointed out, they differ in character from the utterances recorded in the authentic Gospels, and the reference to Salome as childless contradicts facts, though, as regards this last point, ‘Then I did well in not bearing’ might easily be a copyist’s mistake for ‘Then I should have done well if I had not borne’ (καλῶς οὖν ἐτοίησα for καλῶς οὖν ἂν ἐτοίησα)

Literature.—Neander, *Life of Jesus Christ*, § 224; Lange, *Life of the Lord Jesus Christ*, ii. 473, 474; Stier, *Words of the Lord Jesus*, iii. 13-18; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 335, 336; Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, pp. 122, 123; Alford on Mat_19:11-12; Knabenbaner on Mat_19:12; Dykes, *Manifesto of the King*, p. 245 ff.; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, i. 352 ff., ii. 73 ff.; Martensen, *Christian Ethics*, iii. 7-46.

Darwell Stone.

Cellar

CELLAR.—Used only once in the Gospels, in Luk_11:33, where Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 gives ‘cellar’ for Authorized Version ‘secret place,’ following the correct reading κρύπτη, ‘a vault,’ ‘crypt,’ or ‘cellar,’ not κρυπτόν, ‘hidden.’ Josephus uses the same word, κρύπτη, in a way to make its meaning very clear: ‘They set a tower on fire, and leapt into the ‘cellar beneath’ (*BJ*, v. vii. 4).

Abundant proof is forthcoming from the examination of the ruins of many ancient Eastern houses, from allusions in the Bible (cf. 1Ch_27:27-28) and in other writings of the times, as well as from modern dwellings in the East which are typically Oriental, that many ancient houses were provided with ‘cellars beneath,’ and that ordinarily these ‘cellars’ were used as store-houses rather than as dwelling-places.

Looking at the passage Luk 11:33 in the light of the connexion in which we find it in Mat 5:14-16 and Mar 4:21, the idea is that a course of concealment on the part of Christians is unreasonable, and contrary to the Divine design. Christians are 'the light of the world,' the light by which the mass of mankind may see the things of religion. As such they cannot escape observation if they would, and they should not wish to escape it if they could, for this would be contrary to the very purpose of God in making them sources of light. The unreasonableness of such a course, from cowardice or any other motive, is what is set forth in this and the other significant figures used by our Lord: 'No man, when he hath lighted a lamp, putteth it in a cellar, neither under a bushel, or a bed (Mk.), but on a lamp-stand, that they which come in may see the light.' The very purpose in lighting the lamp is that men may see it, or see by it. Is it, then, to be put in the cellar, where people do not live, or under a bushel or a bed, where it would be obscured? Is it not rather to be put on the lamp-stand, where all comers may see it, and see by it?

Literature.—Meyer, *Com. in loc.*; *Expositor*, ii. i. [1881] p. 252ff.

Geo. B. Eager.

⚡Census

CENSUS.—This English word does not occur in the NT, the Greek term ἀπογραφή being rendered **taxing** in Authorized Version and **enrolment** in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 both in Luk 2:2 and in Act 5:37. In the former case, with which we are mainly concerned, 'enrolment' is certainly the better word; for the purpose of the enumeration was apparently not fiscal. That mentioned by Gamaliel, however, was a valuation as well as an enumeration, and it was called 'the taxing' with some reason. It was also better known than the other; *par excellence* it was 'the census' because a great tumult arose under Judas of Galilee in connexion with it, which made the occasion famous. That which took place at the time stated by St. Luke was so little known by the period when his Gospel was written, that he thinks it needful to insert a note about its date, lest it should be mistaken for the other. 'This was the first enrolment made when Quirinius was governor of Syria.' This note, however, has been itself a matter of great perplexity, because the date thus indicated does not apparently tally with the ascertained facts of secular history. For the discussion of this intricate question see articles Birth of Christ, Dates, and Quirinius,

The nature of the census of Luk 2:1-3 is a topic of some interest, on which light has been shed by Ramsay in *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* (1898). It seems to have been an enrolment by households, such as Kenyon (*Classical Review*, March 1893), Wilcken,

and Viereck have shown was the practice in Egypt. Augustus had a great belief in the proper and systematic enumeration of his subjects, and the reckoning of them by households was a method which was carefully followed every fourteen years in Egypt. Many of the actual census papers have been found in that land in recent times, the earliest as yet discovered referring to the year 20 a.d. (Ramsay, *op. cit.*, Preface, p. x note). This was quite different from the fiscal statistics compiled annually under the direction of the provincial governors of the Roman Empire, papers dealing with which have also been found. The household enrolments took place in cycles of fourteen years, and were dated according to the emperor in whose reign they were carried out. No mention was made in them of the value of property and stock, as in the annual returns, and the only financial purpose they served was to determine who were liable for the poll-tax exacted from all subjects between the ages of fourteen and sixty. This poll-tax was the tribute (κῆνσος) referred to by the Pharisees in the question to Christ as to the lawfulness of payment (Mat 22:17; see art. Tribute) It would seem that in Syria women as well as men were required to pay this tax (Ramsay, *op. cit.* 147 note); and if that was the case also in Palestine, this fact may possibly explain why, on the first occasion when the enrolment that was the basis of the poll-tax was made, Mary accompanied Joseph to Bethlehem despite her critical condition.

The discovery of the household-enrolment papers in Egypt throws light on the statement of Luk 2:1 'there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be enrolled.' 'All the world' (πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην) was formerly supposed by some scholars, such as Kitto (*Cycl. of Bib. Lit.*, art. 'Cyrenius'), to mean merely the whole land of Palestine, so as to escape the difficulty that secular history, so far as then known, was silent as to any general census. The meaning of the phrase cannot be so restricted. It means certainly the whole of the Roman Empire, which in the days of Augustus meant for all practical purposes 'the inhabited earth.' Not only was Rome itself included, with all the provinces, whether in Italy or elsewhere, but also those lands which, though having kings of their own, were really under the Roman suzerainty. Such was that portion of Syria under the dominion of Herod the Great.

The silence of history as to such an enumeration as was now to be made is no proof that it did not take place; for of other enumerations to which casual allusion is made by historians, Augustus himself in his record of his achievements makes no mention, except in so far as Roman citizens were concerned. The counting of alien subjects was probably not deemed of sufficient importance to be chronicled. Moreover, the household enrolments which have been traced back in Egypt by extant papers to a.d. 20 suggest at least that there may have been earlier ones in a.d. 6 and b.c. 8, which brings us back to the approximate period to which St. Luke refers. It may here be

observed that the Evangelist does not actually say (Luk 2:1), and very likely does not mean, that the intention of Augustus was that one single enumeration should be made of the whole Roman world. The tense of ἀπογράφεισθαι rather signifies that a census of this nature on the household-enrolment principle was to be the practice, this being the first occasion of its being ordered; which precisely tallies with the following verse when rightly rendered, 'This was the first enrolment made at the time when Quirinius was governor of Syria.' A fuller discussion of this latter statement is reserved for the article Quirinius.

The enrolment with which we are particularly concerned, then, would be appointed for b.c. 8; but in the case of Herod's kingdom it was not achieved till about a couple of years later, apparently for reasons which Ramsay has indicated, but which need not here be reproduced. They refer to the strained relations which then existed between Augustus and Herod. When it was made, the usual Roman method of enrolment at the residence of those enumerated was not followed, but one more in consonance with Jewish ideas. The people had often before been numbered by their tribes, and Herod probably judged that, especially on this first occasion of such an enrolment, the use and wont would be more acceptable to his subjects than a method new to them, and would be less likely to arouse resentment or even tumult. The Roman practice was to interfere as little as possible with the usages of the nations which had been subjugated; and therefore we may reckon that the particular method of taking the census would be left to the decision of the ruler of the district. Accordingly it was arranged that the tribal method should be followed, and that in subordination thereto the enrolment should be by persons registering themselves at the place from which the head of the family had sprung. Hence we read that 'all went to enrol themselves, every one to his own city. And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judaea, to the city of David, because he was of the house and family of David, to enrol himself with Mary who was betrothed to him' (Luk 2:3-5). If, as Mat 1:25 leads us to believe, Mary was actually recognized at this period as Joseph's wife, she would be enumerated as one of his household, whatever her own lineage was; but if St. Luke's expression 'betrothed' is to be pressed, would indicate not merely that the marriage was not publicly known or officially recognized, but that she herself must also have been of the family of David, and as such was enrolled in her own right. It may also be observed that the great gathering of those who claimed to be of 'the stock of Jesse' would help to explain how, when Joseph and Mary arrived, 'there was no room for them in the inn' (Luk 2:7).

Literature.—*Lives of Christ and Commentaries on St. Luke*; articles in Bible Dictionaries, as Smith, Kitto, and Hastings; Ramsay, *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* (1898); Zumpt, *Das Geburtsjahr Christi* (1869); Zahn, art. in *Neue kirchl. Ztsch.* (1893); Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] i. ii. 105.

☒ Centurion

CENTURION (Lat. *centurio*; in Mark always κεντυρίων [Mar_15:39; Mar_15:44-45]; in Matt. [Note: Matthew's (i.e. prob. Rogers') Bible 1537.] and Luke and Acts εκατοντάχης acc. to κ', or εκατόνταρχος in other uncials; the latter form being more Attic, the former more frequent in Hellenistic [cf. Blass, *Gram.*, English translation p. 28, on fluctuation between first and second declensions]; in Polybius the centurion is called ταξίαρχος).—As the name denotes, a centurion was an officer in the Roman army who had command of a *centuria* containing 100 men. The legion at its full strength consisted of about 6000 foot-soldiers, consequently it included 60 centurions. These were of different ranks or degrees of promotion and importance, according to the position occupied in battle by their special company or maniple. Though laughed at for their hob-nailed shoes and thick calves (Juv. *Sat.* xvi. 14. 24) and for their general unkempt roughness (*ib.* xiv. 194), these officers were the very 'backbone of the army.' Their badge of office was the vine-rod (*vitis*), which they freely used on the men, even without the authorization of the tribune (cf. Tacitus *Annal.* i. 23). Polybius describes the ideal centurion as 'not so much overventuresome and fond of danger as possessing the faculty for command, steady and serious (βαθεῖς ταῖς ψυχαῖς); not prone to rush into battle nor eager to strike the first blow, but ready to die in defence of their posts if their men are overborne by numbers and hard pressed' (vi. 24; cf. Vegetius, ii. 14).

The centurions mentioned in the NT are attractive specimens of the manly, serious-minded, generous Roman. In the Gospel narrative two centurions find a place. The one ([Mat_8:5-13](#) || [Luk_7:1-10](#)) resident in Capernaum may probably have been in Herod's service; but in any case he was a Gentile, for in his humble faith Jesus sees the first-fruits of a world redeemed, and recognizes that even if 'the children of the kingdom' prefer the outer darkness to the light and joy within, the provided feast will still be furnished with guests. The distinctive characteristic of this centurion's faith was his persuasion that a word of command uttered by Jesus could set in motion forces sufficient for the emergency, even as the κέλευσμα of the Roman officer at once accomplished his will. The μόνον εἰπὲ λόγῳ is the key to the incident, and absolutely differentiates this centurion from the βασιλικός of [Joh_4:46](#), who insisted that Jesus should 'go down' and heal his son.

The centurion charged with superintending the crucifixion of Jesus ([Mar_15:39](#) || [Mat_27:54](#) || [Luk_23:47](#)) paid so striking and unexpected a tribute to His greatness, that it finds a place in each of the Synoptic Gospels. The terms of the tribute are best understood from the account of St. Luke, who frequently preserves what is evidently the original form of a saying. Certainly ‘son of God’ in the mouth of a Roman could mean little more than St. Luke’s ‘just man.’ But the expression ‘son of God’ might be suggested by the ‘Father’ in our Lord’s last cry.

Literature.—Ramsay’s *Rom.* [Note: Roman.] *Antiq. s.v.*; St. George Stock’s *Caesar de B. Gall.* pp. 208-215; J. E. B. Mayor’s *Juvenal*, notes on passages cited above.

Marcus Dods.

☩ Cephias

CEPHAS.—See Peter.

☩ Ceremonial Law

CEREMONIAL LAW.—See Law.

☩ Certainty

CERTAINTY.—The ways in which ‘certainty’ is expressed in the Gospels are frequently indirect. So far, however, as certainty is expressed by direct terms, various phrases are employed for the purpose. Of these the most frequent are ἀσφαλῆς and its derivatives ἀσφαλιζω, ἀσφάλεια, ἀσφαλῶς. These always express objective security; the certainty which is or might be verified, and which consists in an accurate correspondence with facts.

Thus in his preface St. Luke ([Luk_1:4](#)) says he has ‘traced the course of all things accurately ... that thou mightest know the certainty ...’ (ἀσφαλεια, cf. [Act_5:23](#), [1Th_5:3](#)); the traitor says, ‘Take him and lead him away safely’ ([Mar_14:44](#) ἀσφαλῶς, cf. [Act_2:36](#); [Act_5:23](#); [Act_16:23](#)); Pilate says, ‘Command that the sepulchre be

made sure’ (Mat 27:64-66 ἀσφαλιζω, cf. Act 16:24). With these passages may be compared the use of ἀσφαλῆς elsewhere in NT. viz. Act 21:34; Act 22:30; Act 25:26, Php 3:1, Heb 6:19. The derivatives of βέβαιος are also employed, but with a force more or less distinctly moral or subjective. Thus the disciples are said to have ‘preached everywhere, the Lord working with them and confirming the word’ (Mar 16:20 βιβαιόω, cf. Rom 15:8, 1Co 1:5; 1Co 1:8, 2Co 1:21, Col 2:7, Heb 2:3; Heb 13:9). Sometimes it is the disciples themselves who are ‘confirmed’ or ‘established.’ Outside the Gospels βέβαιος and βεβαιωσις occur with some frequency, being specially characteristic of the Ep. to Heb. (cf. 2Pe 1:10; 2Pe 1:19, Rom 4:18, 2Co 1:7, Heb 2:2; Heb 3:6; Heb 6:18-19; Heb 9:17, Php 1:7). In Luk 23:47 ὄντως occurs, ‘Certainly this was a righteous man’; and in Luk 4:23 ταντως, ‘Doubtless ye will say to me ...’ (cf. Act 21:22; Act 28:4, 1Co 9:10); but these are adverbial qualitatives of no great importance. [It is hardly necessary to remark that in the great majority of the passages in which the word ‘certain’ occurs in the English versions, it renders the indefinite pronoun τις, where it has nothing to do with certainty, but is merely an idiomatic phrase equivalent to ‘some’ in a quite indefinite sense].

With this use of language it is instructive to compare the opposite ‘uncertainty’ which is expressed by ἀτορία, ἀτορευομαι, commonly translated ‘perplexed,’ though the meaning is rather that of hesitancy than of perplexity, as one finds no way out of a difficulty, and so is brought to pause. These words occur in Luk 21:25 and Joh 13:22 ‘doubting of whom he spake’ (cf. Act 25:20, 2Co 4:8, Gal 4:20). It is also worth while to compare such occasional use of τισις as ‘given assurance unto all men’ (Act 17:31); and that of πληροφορία, ‘full assurance’ (Col 2:2, 1Th 1:5, Heb 6:11).

But apart from special terms expressing certainty, the broad fact itself has, of course, a large place in the Gospels and in the mind of the Lord Jesus. This is usually represented by saying that a person or a thing is ‘known,’ where οἶδα is the verb employed. This verb is a ‘perfect-present,’ and by its very form indicates the possession of knowledge, not its acquirement. In a number of passages the sense is accordingly best rendered not by ‘I know,’ but by ‘I am sure of.’

The following are instances from the Gospels of this way of expressing certainty:—‘Fear ye not, for I am certain that ye are seeking Jesus who was crucified’ (Mat 28:5); ‘Master, we are certain that thou speakest and teachest straightforwardly’ (Luk 20:21); ‘We speak what we are certain of, and bear evidence

of what we have seen' (Joh_3:11); 'No longer do we believe through thy report, for we ourselves have heard and are certain' (Joh_4:42); 'What sign doest thou that we may feel certainty, and may trust thee?' (Joh_6:30); 'This is Jesus the son of Joseph; we are certain of his father and mother' (Joh_6:42, cf. Joh_7:27); 'Give glory to God; we are certain this man is a sinner. He therefore answered, If he is a sinner I am not so certain; of one thing I am certain, that, being blind, henceforth I see' (Joh_9:24-25); 'Even now I am certain that whatsoever thou mayest ask of God, God will give thee' (Joh_11:22); 'He that hath seen beareth witness, and his witness is true (ἀληθινή), and he is certain that he speaketh true (ἀληθῆ), that ye also may believe' (Joh_19:35, cf. Joh_21:24). sometimes οἶδα is used of God's knowledge with its unerring certainty; and at other times of man's knowledge of God which springs from personal trust and love.

It is characteristic that the grounds on which certainty is shown in the Gospels to rest are moral grounds rather than intellectual; for commonly it is moral certitude, not scientific security, which is in view. On the one hand, the foundation of certainty is the faithfulness of God: this is well illustrated in the case of Zacharias (Luk_1:18-20), and in that of Mary (Luk_1:37-38). On the other hand, certainty is won through men's trust (πίστις) in God or in Christ. So the Lord said, 'Whosoever shall say unto this mountain ... and shall not doubt (διακρίνω) in his heart, but shall believe ... he shall have it' (Mar_11:23 | Mat_21:21). To Peter as he began to fear and sink He said, 'O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?' (διστάζω, Mat_14:31). And when it is recorded of the disciples to whom the Lord appeared after His resurrection, that 'they saw him, and worshipped, but some doubted' (διστάζω, Mat_28:17), He met this mixed regard by a great personal affirmation, and a great charge laid on them, which formed in point of fact the strongest appeal to their most certain trust. See, further, art. Assurance.

Literature.—See the it. at Assurance, and add—E. White, *Certainty in Religion*; J. Clifford, *Christian Certainties*; W. R. Harper, *Religion and the Higher Life*, pp. 88-100; G. A. Coe, *Religion of a Mature Mind*, 109-132; A. E. Garvie, *The Gospel for To-day*, 34; *Princeton Theol. Rev.* i. 138 (Warfield); *Homiletic Rev.* xlvi 413 (Wright); *Expos. Times*, vii. 438, 533.

E. P. Boys-Smith.

CHAFF.—The term used in English to denote the protective coverings and appendages of the growing corn—the glumes, scales, and awns—after they have been dried in the ripening of the plant and in the wind and sun, and separated from the grain and straw. The Greek word is ἄχυρον (Lat. *palea*), ‘mostly used in plural for chaff, bran, husks’ (Liddell and Scott); perhaps derived from ἄχ, indicating its pointed nature. But the older authorities, and most writers on the Greek of the NT, incline to regard the ἄχυρον as including the cut or broken-up straw which mingles with the chaff proper.

Schleusner, controverting the opinion of previous lexicographers, says that the word for the outer integuments (*palea*) is ἀχονη, and that ἄχυρον includes *totum calamum frumenti inde a radice usque ad spicam quae grana continet*, and that it is equivalent to the Heb. תֵּבֶן *tebhen*; and Post (art. ‘Straw’ in Hastings’ B [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.]) suggests the use of the Arab. [Note: Arabic.] word *tibn*, which denotes the nugled chaff and cut or broken straw.

In reaping it was often the practice to leave all the straw, except an inch or two cut off with the ear. The dust of the chaff is in the LXX Septuagint χνοῦς (Psa_1:4; Psa_35:5, Isa_29:5, Hos_13:3), and once χνοῦς ἀχύρου (Isa_17:13), and once κονιορτός (Job_21:18).

The combination of broken straw with the chaff is explained by the process of harvesting, threshing, and winnowing in Palestinian agriculture. The threshing-machine, or threshing-waggon (see art. ‘Agriculture’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible), which, by repeatedly passing over the sheaves, broke up the short straw into fragments, separated the grain from its dried envelopes. The threshing-floor was so placed, usually in an elevated and breezy position, that the wind could be utilized to separate the lighter, heavier, and heaviest materials from one another, and the method of winnowing secured that the grain should fall in the centre, the heavier straw at a small distance from the grain heap, while the broken straw and chaff (ἄχυρον) were carried away by the wind, either out of the threshing-floor, or so that it could be swept together for burning. The complete separation of the chaff, which included fragments of the awns and straw, from the corn was effected by means of the winnowing-fan (πτύον), the broad shallow shovel with which corn after threshing was thrown up against the wind, and so finally cleansed of the chaff. See art. ‘Shovel’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible . This final stage of the winnowing process is referred to by John the Baptist in the only occurrences of the word ‘chaff’ in the NT (Mat_3:12, Luk_3:17).

The imagery of the threshing-floor was finely adapted to express the sweeping reform of the national life which the ardent soul of the Baptist expected to characterize the coming of the Jewish Messiah. The chaff well represented (1) the insincerity and hypocrisy of the national religious leaders, profession without substance, looking at a distance like grain, but proving on near inspection to be chaff; and (2) the light irresponsibility, the absence of true principle, in the people who accepted this formalism and pretence as genuine grain of godliness. And the winnowing represented the readiness with which such unsubstantial elements of national character would be carried away by the first wind of trial, or burnt up by the divinely authorized Messiah, whose coming John expected to be with swift discrimination and judgment. John looked for the immediate separation of the false from the true, the bad from the good. The Christ would come as Malachi (Mal 3:1-5) predicted, with searching and striking condemnation of all that was worthless and injurious; and the comparative slowness and indirectness of our Lord's method was the moving cause of his perplexed question, when he heard in the prison the works of Christ, and sent his disciples to ask, 'Art thou he that should come, or look we for another?' (Mat 11:3, Luk 7:19).

Literature.—Mackie, *Bible Manners and Customs*, pp. 34-36; Tristram, *Eastern Customs in Bible Lands*, ch. 6; Jahn, *Biblical Archaeology*, pp. 66-73; Thomson, *Land and the Book*, pp. 538-540; Nowack, *Heb. Arch.* i. 233 f.; artt. 'Agriculture,' 'Chaff,' 'Straw,' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible .

T. H. Wright.

☞ Chains

CHAINS.—The usual NT word for 'chain' is ἄλυσις. πῆδαι (Mar 5:4 Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 fetters) are for binding the feet. δεσμός is a more general term, meaning anything to tie or fasten. Authorized Version renders δεσμοί, 'chains,' in Jud 1:6, but Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 substitutes 'bonds.' For critical reasons 'chains' disappears from 2Pe 2:4.

In NT chains invariably denote instruments for binding, or restraining the liberty of the person, e.g. the demoniac (Mar 5:3), St. Peter (Act 12:8), the dragon (Rev 20:1). Imbeciles appear always to have received consideration, if not even reverence, in the East; but demoniacs, and persons suffering from certain forms of delirium, have been treated with horrible cruelty. Often they are loaded with chains and bound to a staple

firmly fixed in the ground. The tortures applied are ostensibly for the purpose of driving out the evil spirit that possesses them.

Under the Roman law, *vincula*, was a form of punishment, or of safe custody. The prisoner was chained to a soldier, who was responsible for his safe keeping. The chain was fastened round the right wrist of the prisoner and the left wrist of his guard. To this chain St. Paul refers (Act_28:20, 2Ti_1:16). For greater safety two soldiers might be assigned as guards to one prisoner, a hand of each being chained to one of his. Thus St. Peter was confined in the stormy days of the persecution (Act_12:6); and St. Paul, when Lysias thought him a dangerous person (Act_21:33). The use of *πέδα* in their modern form may be seen to-day at Acre, in the groups of Turkish prisoners chained together by the ankles.

W. Ewing.

☞ Chamber

CHAMBER.—See Closet, and Guest-Chamber.

☞ Chance

CHANCE.—The word occurs only once in Authorized and Revised Versions of the Gospels, viz. in Luk_10:30, where in the parable of the Good Samaritan the priest is said to have been going down that way ‘by chance.’ In the original the phrase is *κατὰ συγκυρίαν*, Vulgate *accidit ut*. The word *συγκυρία* is found nowhere else in NT, and rarely in the Gr. authors. The idea of ‘chance’ is ordinarily expressed in Gr. by the nouns *τύχη*, *συντυχία*, or by the verb *τυγχάνω*. Neither of these nouns occurs in NT, and the verb, in its intransitive sense of ‘chancing’ or ‘happening,’ but rarely. Examples are 1Co_15:37 *εἰ τύχοι σίτου*, which Authorized and Revised Versions translates ‘it may chance of wheat’ (the only other occasion on which the word ‘chance’ is found in Authorized and Revised Versions of NT), and 1Co_14:10 *εἰ τύχοι*, Authorized and Revised Versions ‘it may be.’

In the Gospels *τυγχάνω* is used in its Intransitive sense, with the idea, viz. of ‘happening,’ only once, and that is, curiously enough, in TR [Note: R Textus

Receptus.] reading of Luk 10:33, the verse immediately preceding the one under consideration, where the robbers are said to have left their victim ἡμιθανῆ τυγχάνοντα . The τυγχάνοντα here, as Meyer and others have pointed out, is not simply equivalent to ὄντα, though the Authorized Version translators appear to have so regarded it. The expression properly means ‘half dead as he chanced to be.’ The shade of suggestion is that the robbers left him in complete indifference to his fate, to live or die just as it might happen. The fact, however, that τυγχάνοντα is lacking in $\aleph B \Delta \Lambda \Xi$, *al.* justifies its omission from the text by Wll and other critical editors.

Unlike τύχη and συντυχία, συγκυρία does not denote ‘chance’ in the proper sense of the word, *i.e.* something which ‘falls, out’ independently of the ordinary laws of causation (‘chance’ comes from the Low Lat. *cadentia*, ‘a falling,’ and may have been suggested by the falling of the dice from a dice-box). Derived as it is from σύν and κωρέω (‘fall in with’), it corresponds almost exactly to our word ‘coincidence.’ All that our Lord’s use of the phrase κατὰ συγκυρίαν accordingly suggests is, that by a coincidence of events a certain priest came by just as the wounded traveller lay helpless on the road. And, as Godet remarks, He may even have used the expression with a kind of irony, since ‘it is certainly not by accident that the narrator brings those two personages on the scene’ (*Com. on Lk. in loc.*).

Apart from any further occurrence of the word ‘chance’ in Authorized and Revised Versions of the Gospels, the idea of hap or chance may seem to be conveyed by the use of ‘haply’ in Mar 11:13, where Jesus is said to have come to the fig-tree, ‘if haply he might find anything thereon,’ and in Luk 14:29, where He Himself says of the builder who could not finish his tower, ‘lest haply when he hath laid a foundation, and is not able to finish it.’ But in both cases we have to do in the original simply with conjunctions and particles, εἰ ἄρα in the one passage and μή ποτε in the other.

As a matter of fact, the idea of chance was as foreign to the ancient Jewish as to the modern scientific mind; for while the scientist holds that the universal reign of law renders the operation of chance impossible, the Hebrew may be said to have believed (cf. Pro 16:33) of every so-called chance that ‘Eternal God that chance did guide.’ In popular language the idea of things happening by chance appears to be admitted in both OT and NT (cf. 1Sa 6:9, Ecc 9:11, 1Co 15:37), as it constantly is among ourselves. But in the case of the Scripture writers, at all events, it denoted only human ignorance of proximate causes, not the occurrence of events independently of the Divine will (with 1Sa 6:9 cf. 1Sa 6:12, with Ecc 9:11 cf. Ecc 9:1, with 1Co 15:37; cf. 1Co 3:7, Gal 6:7 f.).

As bearing upon the subject of chance, reference may be made to the casting of lots by the Roman soldiers for the garments of Jesus. The incident is mentioned by every one of the Evangelists, and is explained by John as referring only to His seamless tunic (Mat 27:35, Mar 15:24, Luk 23:34, Joh 19:23-24). Among the Jews the casting of lots was regarded not as a reference of a question to the fickleness of chance, but as a solemn appeal to the Divine judgment (cf. Pro 16:33). And though by the time of Christ such a game of chance as dice-playing (κυβεία) had been introduced into Palestine (cf. St. Paul's ἐν τῇ κυβείᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, 'by the sleight of men,' lit. 'by the dice-playing,' because of the trickery and cheating which had come to be associated with the game), it was repudiated by those who adhered strictly to the Jewish law (see Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. i. 36). With the Roman soldiers it was otherwise. Dice are thought by some to have been an invention of the Romans, and certainly dicing was very common among them. In his famous 'Crucifixion' in the Church of Sta. Maria degli Angioli at Lugano, Luini represents the four soldiers as rising from a game of dice to dispute with one another the possession of the seamless robe. And more than one writer who has sought to describe the awful scene of Calvary has considered it natural to suppose that the soldiers would amuse themselves during the hours of waiting by playing their favourite game (see Farrar, *Life of Christ*, *ad loc.*). No information is given us by the Evangelists as to the manner in which the lots were cast. But it may be that a cast of the dice-box was the plan which suggested itself most readily to those rude men, and that they actually gambled for the Saviour's coat while He hung above them on the cross, dying for the sins of the world. See, further, art. Lots (Casting of).

J. C. Lambert.

Character

CHARACTER may be defined as the result of the interaction between a personality and its environment; or, if the word is used in its special and favourable sense, as the advantage gained by personality over its environment, especially by the exercise of the will. In the terms of Aristotle (*Nic. Eth.* i. vii. 15), it is 'an energy of the inner life on the lines of virtue.' The question to be answered is, How have the life and gospel of Christ made this more possible? First, He diminished the moral weight and dread of life's environment. Secondly, He enlarged the resources and opportunities of personality.

1. The following are some of the powers which the soul has to meet in conflict:

(1) *Suffering*.—‘If a perfectly good man foreknew what was going to happen to him, he would co-operate with nature in both falling sick and dying and being maimed, being conscious that this is the particular portion assigned to him in the arrangement of the Universe’ (Epictetus). Christ inspired men to put their foot on disease as an evil (Mat 10:8, Mar 16:18), and won His first fame by His own powers of healing (Mat 4:23-25; Mat 11:4-6 etc.). Such deeds were good on the Sabbath day (Luk 6:6 ff.), for it was a breaking of Satan’s tyranny (Luk 13:16).

(2) *Death*.—He died to ‘deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage’ (Heb 2:15). Jesus not only so faced death as to convince a Roman centurion and a dying criminal that He was more than man (Mat 27:54, Luk 23:40 ff.), but did not in His teaching allow it to have a decisive place in life, except to the fool (Luk 12:20). He spoke of it as a sleep (Joh 11:11 ff.), which the good man need not fear (Mat 10:28), and as a going to the Father and His many abiding-places (Joh 14:1-3).

(3) *The world*.—

‘If but the Vine- and Love-abjuring band
Are in the Prophet’s Paradise to stand,
Alack, I doubt the Prophet’s Paradise
Were empty as the hollow of one’s hand’ (Omar).

Jesus was in complete independence of all that the world offers, accepting poverty (Luk 9:58), repudiating popularity (Joh 6:15), not expecting to be waited on (Mar 10:45). ‘Be of good courage,’ He said, ‘I have overcome the world’ (Joh 16:33); and on account of the promise of His presence His disciples were built up in the same αὐτάρκεια (Php 4:11).

(4) *Racial barriers*.—‘It is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to join himself or come unto one of another nation’ (Act 10:28). Jesus struck at the limitations of race prejudice and enmity in the parables of the Good Samaritan (Luk 10:20 ff.) and the Last Judgment (Mat 25:31 ff.). Though He sought first the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Mat 10:5 f.), He ‘opened the Kingdom of Heaven to *all believers*’ (Mat 8:10-13, cf. Mar 7:29), and thereby achieved on moral lines what the status of Roman citizenship created on legal lines. His short career was an encounter with the dead hand and narrowing force of nationalism (Mar 12:9, Mat 21:42-44), and it was in the name of Son of Man that He lived and died.

(5) *Caste distinctions*.—‘It was the hereditary disability the Aryans had succeeded in imposing upon races they despised, which, reacting within their own circle and strengthened by the very intolerance that gave it birth, has borne such bitter fruit through so many centuries’ (Rhys Davids, *Hibbert Lectures*). ‘A workshop is incompatible with anything noble’ (Cicero). Jesus kept the same way open to all without regard to social or religious status; did not reject the rich (Mat 8:7; Mat 9:18 f., Luk 7:36), but counted their wealth a disadvantage (Mar 10:21; Mar 10:23, Luk 6:20). He chose His companions from men who were mostly of no class (Mar 1:16; Mar 2:14), was known as the friend of publicans and sinners (Mat 9:11, Luk 15:1-2), and threw away His own triumph to give Zacchaeus a moral chance, ‘forasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham’ (Luk 19:1-10).

(6) *Family control*.—‘To every individual,’ says Sir Henry Maine, referring to the Roman civilization, ‘the rule of conduct is the law of his home, of which his parent is the legislator.’ Though Jesus maintained the sanctity of the marriage tie (Mat 19:4 ff.), and illustrated as well as taught filial obedience and honour (Luk 2:51, Joh 19:26-27, Mar 7:11 ff.), He broke the decisive control of the family for the sake of the individual personality (Mat 10:35-37; Mat 12:48-50, Luk 9:59-62; Luk 11:27-28, Mar 10:28-30).

2. In the second place, Christ enlarged the resources and opportunities of personality, by making the soul conscious and confident of a new environment, in which it could find release and reinforcement. The secret of this spiritual environment which awakens and sustains the soul’s faculties of faith, hope, and love is grace, in which alone they can move and have their being. The essential fact of grace is illustrated in the teaching of Christ chiefly in the following doctrines—the Divine Fatherhood, the Divine Forgiveness, the Divine Indwelling, and the Divine Reappearing. All that was dim or distorted in the human views of these truths, which mean so much to personality and character, He rectified and made authoritative.

(1) The clear revelation of the Divine *Fatherhood* had this immense bearing on character, that it brought out the worth of the individual soul. It is not necessary here to argue the question whether we are really God’s sons, apart from faith in Christ. It is enough for the purpose that Christ undoubtedly used the truth of the Divine Fatherhood as the chief motive to the new ethic. The first and most important effect on character is that the starting-point is *trust*. Trust in God is illustrated in contentment with circumstances, courage in regard to human opposition. Whatever be the straitness of life and however menacing the future, there may well be trust in One who cares for the individual with more than the purpose and solicitude of an earthly father (Mat 6:7-8; Mat 7:11, Luk 12:6-7; Luk 12:22-30). And as for hostility, it is well worth standing firm for truth and righteousness, for thus the approval of the Father is gained (Mat 5:11-12; Mat 16:24-27, Luk 12:4 ff., Joh 15:26 f., Joh 16:1-3).

The natural vehicle of such trust is prayer, which Jesus Himself used for the solution of His perplexities and the bearing of His burdens (Luk 10:21, Mar 14:35 etc.), and which the disciples were also to use freely and urgently (Luk 11:5-13; Luk 18:1).

This leads to the second characteristic of a life that acts on the teaching of the Divine Fatherhood—its religion will be in spirit and *truth* (Joh 4:23). Prayer is no mere performance, but secret and real (Mat 6:5-8), in faith (Mar 11:22-24), with a softened heart (Mar 11:25), and looking for the highest things (Joh 15:10; Joh 16:26). Religion is not a matter of external or traditional compulsion, but rests upon a gospel of Divine love (Mat 11:28; Mat 23:37, Joh 6:44-45). The Father can care for nothing that is not spontaneous and sincere like childhood (Mar 10:15; Mar 10:51-52; Mar 14:9, Mat 18:21-22), and the fruit of real growth (Joh 15:8). The consummation of life is to be so sanctified by the truth as to enjoy God as Christ the Son Himself did (Joh 17:20-26).

And the bearing of the Divine Fatherhood on our relations to our fellows produces a wise *tolerance*. The disciples of Christ are to imitate the character of Him who ‘maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust,’ and refuse to treat any man as an enemy (Mat 5:43-48). Indeed, the truth of the Fatherhood is the great inspiration to kindness and charity. The positive character of the ‘Golden Rule,’ which is its Christian distinction, is directly drawn from the ways of the ‘Father in heaven’ (Mat 7:11-12), and the blessedness of peacemakers is in being called sons of God (Mat 5:9). The parable of the Good Samaritan (Luk 10:25-37) illustrates in particular what the parable of the Great Assize (Mat 25:31-46) sets forth with ideal completeness, that there is no real love to God which is not expressed in spontaneous and appropriate help to every human being that requires it. Thus in the teaching of Christ went forth ‘an edict of Universal Love’; ‘humanity was changed from a restraint to a motive (*Ecce Homo*, ch. 16).’ And that this was the secret of the Christian message, is indicated in the parting commission, ‘Go ye and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost’ (Mat 28:19).

(2) The gospel of Divine *Forgiveness* has had a distinctive and powerful effect upon the characters of those who have accepted it. Indeed, it has produced a new type of character, which can be described only as being born again (Joh 3:3, 2Co 5:17-18). Forgiveness was by no means a new idea, for it has never been set forth with more beauty and completeness than in the Prophets and the Psalmists of the Old Testament. But Jesus was the first to apply it to the individual soul with the view of producing the character of a child of the Kingdom; and it was this which made His teaching seem revolutionary and even blasphemous in the eyes of the guardians of the Old Covenant (Mar 2:5-12, Luk 7:39-50). The average good person is now as much as ever inclined to resent the ‘opening of the Kingdom of heaven to all believers’

through the remission of sins. It contradicts the view accepted by all average moralists that it is by the maintenance of virtue that heaven must be won, and that any contradictory doctrine must loosen the bands of character. Their view is necessary as a caution, not only against the Antinomians, who treat the fact of forgiveness as a term of logic, and argue 'let us sin that grace may abound,' but also against all who preach faith as something apart from ethical enthusiasm. But St. Paul had learned the secret of his Master when he flung himself into the advanced position of 'justification by faith.' It was Jesus Himself who had the daring originality to base character on a new foundation without fearing to debase it (Luk 7:47-50, Mat 26:27-28).

It must, however, be remembered that it was not so much the intention of Jesus to set up a rival type of character, as to restore the character of those who had lost it; to give a new chance to the personality that was overborne and fettered by its environment. He was essentially a physician of the sick (Luk 5:27-32), a seeker of the lost (Luke 15; Luk 19:10, Mat 18:12 ff.), a giver of rest to the heavy laden (Mat 11:28 ff.), fulfilling the words, 'He shall be called Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins' (Mat 1:21, cf. Joh 3:17). The great contribution, then, to the forming of character in the gospel of Forgiveness is not that it adds anything to the ideal of virtue, but that it unseals the great motive of humble and adoring gratitude, and opens the way for that tide of love which is itself the fulfilling of the Law (Luk 7:47; Luk 19:8-9). The business of Jesus was not the chiselling and polishing of character, but primarily its creation among the multitudes who would be shut out by the Pharisees from the kingdom of righteousness. The gospel does not so much teach now to be good as why to be good. Yet it must be admitted that in this teaching of grace as a redeeming power, Jesus did not simply profess to level sinners up to the virtuous. Rather He made the beatitude of the forgiven appear in comparison with the self-complacency of the virtuous as sunshine to moonlight (Luk 6:22-26; Luk 18:9-14). The result of thus opening the fountains of a great deep was to be seen in a new humility and tenderness, an unexampled moral scrupulousness and solicitude, for the pride of the natural man is overwhelmed by the sense of what he owes (Mat 18:21-35, Joh 21:15-19, Gal 2:20, Col 3:12-13).

(3) The third illustration of grace through which the scattered forces of character can be regathered is the Divine *Indwelling*, which, although not made conspicuous in the Synoptists, is essential to the Christian conception of character. The remarkable transformation which came over the chief Apostles after the events of Calvary and the Garden, was expressly attributed by them to the fulfilment of Christ's promise to return and dwell in them through the Spirit (Act 19:1-6; Act 2:16 f., Act 2:38, Joh 14:15-18). The character that has learned its worth from the Divine Fatherhood, and found its release in the Divine Forgiveness, gains its strength and means of independence from the Divine Indwelling. The real strength of character from the

Christian point of view lies in the sense of weakness and the dependence on grace. Its ideal is not self-possession and self-complacency, but a possession by Christ (Gal 2:20), and a pleasing of Christ (Php 1:20). And because its standard is so high, namely, the perfection of God Himself (Mat 5:48), the only chance of attaining it is to realize that the sufficient power comes from the imparted life (Joh 20:21-23), to take the yoke of Christ (Mat 11:29), or to abide in Him (Joh 15:4). If we can rely on God's Fatherhood, we can be sure He will give the best gift, the Holy Spirit (Luk 11:13), which is to enable the disciples to do greater things even than Jesus Himself (Joh 14:12), because thus His own power will be multiplied in and through them (1Jn 4:12-13).

From the Christian point of view, then, character depends for its final strength and beauty on the measure of its surrender and receptivity. Its turning-point is found in that decisive acceptance of Christ which is called 'conversion,' and which is not mere acquiescence, but allegiance as well, not only requiring an attitude of the soul, but also its adventure with and for the Lord it has recognized. When room has been made for the Divine indwelling in immediate sequence to the Divine forgiveness, there may be an assurance that through grace and with much patience the fruits of Christian character will come (Mar 4:8; Mar 4:20; Mar 4:26-29). Christian character depends on Christ's indwelling; for its virtues, which are more appropriately termed graces, are called 'fruits of the Spirit,' indicating that they are not the attainment of the old nature, but the growth of the new, according to the 'law of the Spirit of life which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.' In Gal 5:22-23 they are thus given: 'love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, temperance'; and in 2Pe 1:5-8: 'faith, virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and love.' From which it will be seen that there is no ordered system of ethics in the New Testament; but the sum and substance of it is that life is primarily to be the gradual demonstration of the Divine indwelling, that the world may see that Christians are alike possessed and controlled by a power and spirit not their own.

(4) There is one further contribution to the making of character in the name of grace which belongs to the Christian revelation, viz. the Divine *Reappearing*. However erroneously it was conceived, there can be no doubt that it exercised a powerful effect upon the moral qualities of the early Christian community (1Th 1:9-10), and its essential truth is still responsible for much that is unique in Christian ethics. It was sufficient to slay worldly ambitions outright, so that men sold their possessions (Act 4:34), and at a later age secluded themselves in hermit or monastic dwellings. The journey of Israel to the Promised Land became the framework of the Christian conception of life—a pilgrimage through a wilderness. The result of this view has been the withdrawal of much imagination and energy from the problems of the present world in the name of an expected heaven—whereas the real watching is in right employment here and now (Luk 17:20-21; Luk 19:11-27). But it would be a mistake to

miss the great contribution made by the doctrine of Christ's reappearing to the improvement of character (Luk 12:35-37, 1Th 5:23). When it is understood in the light of the words and example of Jesus Himself rather than of Messianic expectations, which again and again He disappointed in favour of spiritual interests (Luk 9:54-55, Joh 6:14-15; Joh 6:25-26; Joh 6:41; Joh 6:65-68, Act 1:6-8), its effect is purifying and searching to the last degree, and arms the personality with the weapon of a new hope in the conflict with its environment (Php 3:13-14). The reappearing of the Saviour, whether it be when physical disabilities fall from us at death, or in some other way, is essentially a final judgment (Mat 7:21-23; Mat 13:30; Mat 25:31-33; cf. 2Co 5:10) in which hidden things will be brought to light (Luk 8:17; Luk 12:2-3, Mat 25:35-45).

Firstly, it gives a motive to *purity of life* which no other religion has been able to supply (1Jn 3:3; 2Pe 3:11-14), and to a consecrated use of every natural faculty (Rom 12:1). The promise of the resurrection rescues the body from the contempt with which philosophers were inclined to regard it, for as companion of the soul it is both sacred and serviceable (1Co 6:19-20). It is to be changed from a body of humiliation to the likeness of the body of His glory (Php 3:21), and meantime its members are to be disciplined as instruments of righteousness (Rom 6:13), every ability being turned to good account (1Pe 4:10-11, Col 3:16-17).

Next, it gives a deeper sanction to the *social relationships* of life. The spiritual side of marriage has been greatly developed by the revelation of the issues of life (Mat 19:4-9, Eph 5:22-33). The relations of parent and children, of master and servant, were likewise dignified by being seen *sub specie aeternitatis* (Col 3:20-25; Col 4:1), and in the remembrance that for responsibility we must give account (Luk 12:45-48). It was this truth which gave its special meaning to Church membership, so that the Christian community was knit together with bonds unknown in any contemporary clubs or guilds (Mat 18:19-20, Eph 1:18-23; Eph 2:19-22, 1Co 12:12-30). Though there was discontent and division in the Church, and even an occasional subsidence to the vicious levels of pagan society, the ideal could be steadily built up again in the sure hope of a radiant future, when the secret working of the absent Bridegroom in His own should be accomplished (Eph 5:27, Col 3:3-4; 1Pe 1:3-5). And this hope was a continual summons to every Christian to rise and be worthy of his calling (Rom 13:11, 1Co 3:10-15; 1Co 9:24).

Finally, the hope of a Divine reappearing exercises its influence upon the common toil and *appointed duty* of every day. It is as if the owner of an estate went away entrusting to each man his work, and bidding the porter to watch (Mar 13:34). It is required that a steward be found faithful (1Co 4:1-4); and it is well for the Christian if he has used to advantage the talents given (Mat 25:19-23), and the opportunities offered on every hand for the wider human service (Mat 25:34-40), for there is an

appropriate reward (1Co 3:12-14). Lowly service is the path to ennoblement and the seats of influence (Mar 10:43-45, Luk 12:42-44).

The promise of the Divine Reappearing thus supplements, as it were, the promise of the Divine Indwelling; for whereas the latter brings out the need for the Christian's faith in a power not his own, the former requires that he be faithful with the powers that are his own. And taking all four aspects of the revelation of grace through Jesus Christ together, we see that they equip His followers for that conflict with environment out of which character emerges, by giving the soul a new *worth, freedom, power, and motive*.

This revelation is above all in the Cross, in which Christ was most fully manifested (Luk 9:22, Joh 10:11; Joh 12:23). There we see convincingly the love of the *Father* (Rom 8:32, 1Jn 4:10), who counted men of such value (Mat 18:2-14, Luk 15:10) that He would have all to be saved though at infinite cost (Joh 3:14-16). There is the place of the breaking forth of *forgiveness* (Mat 26:28), the supreme illustration of that redeeming love by which men's freedom is purchased (1Pe 1:18-19, Rom 14:7-9, Rev 1:5-6). There the life was surrendered to the Father (Joh 10:17-18), to be bestowed as an *enabling* power (Joh 14:12-14, Act 4:10) by an indwelling Spirit (Joh 1:12, Rom 8:9 ff.), wherewith He might bring many sons to glory (Heb 2:10). And there, finally, the eternal *future* was clasped to the tragic present (Joh 12:24-32) as the ever-living Son submitted to taste of death (Heb 2:9; Heb 2:14), that neither earthly trouble nor spiritual principality might ever separate His people from Him (Rom 8:31-39, Php 1:21-23).

In another summary, it may be said that the Christian ethic revolves between two poles which are discovered in the light of Christ's teaching, the inwardness of religion, and its practical nature. The first had been neglected by the Jew and the second by the Greek. And one-sidedness is still only too possible, when, for instance, in the name of Christianity the ascetic visionary holds to the first alone, or the social revolutionary to the second. But all ethical deductions can and must be rectified by reference to the work and word of Christ, who started from inward character and aimed at social regeneration.

And in a final analysis of what Christ has distinctively done for character, it may be said that (a) He treated the personality as a *whole*. All ethical systems are based on one or other element of our threefold nature. The pivot of the good life was, according to Socrates, *knowledge*; according to Epicurus, *feeling*; according to Zeno, *the will*. Christ gave a due and natural place to each of these; for character with Him was not a system, as it was with Greek, Jew, or Roman, or as it is with Confucian or Mohammedan, but a growth from within, deeper even than our own nature, rooted in the ever-living grace of God. (b) He treated it as *free*. This also is crucial to Christian

character, and depends on the truth that the ultimate fact of life is not Fate, but a God of grace, a Father. Jesus looked for repentance as the first consequence of His good tidings (Mar_1:15). Whatever a man's past had been, he could be released and renewed, if out of the darkness and bondage he put forth the hand of faith. And so in the last resort life is self-determined. These two essential truths for the making of character, viz. the integrity and the freedom of personality, have been recognized and realized in the light of the four great truths enumerated above. Thus Christ has enlarged the resources and opportunity of personality, and enabled it to be victorious over its material and moral environment.

Literature.—Sidgwick, *History of Ethics*; Martineau, *Types of Ethical Theory*; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*; Illingworth, *Christian Character*; Wilson Harper, *The Christian View of Human Life*; Church, *Discipline of Christian Character*; Knight, *The Christian Ethic*; Martensen, *Christian Ethics*; Garvie, *The Christian Personality*; Kilpatrick, *Christian Character and Christian Conduct*, etc.; Herrmann, *Protestant Ethics*; Sermons by Butler, Newman, Martineau, Paget, Maclaren, Inge, etc.

A. Norman Rowland.

Character Of Christ

CHARACTER OF CHRIST

Introduction: (a) Aim. (b) Sources: (1) their trustworthiness; (2) their sufficiency. (c) Theological value of a study of the character of Christ.

i. Formative influences—.

1. Parentage.
2. Home.
3. Education.
4. The years of silence.

ii. The Vocation of Christ, the determining principle of His character—.

1. His Designation of His vocation.

2. His Dedication to His vocation.
3. His Confirmation in His vocation.

iii. Characteristics of Christ—.

1. Spiritual-mindedness: (1) His knowledge; (2) His teaching; (3) effect of His presence.
2. Love to God: (1) obedience, (2) trust.
3. Love to men.

iv. Social relations, and virtues manifested therein—.

1. Family.
2. Friends: (1) His dependence upon them; (2) His self-communications to them; (3) their response to Him.
3. Mankind: (1) lowliness; (2) considerateness; (3) compassion; (4) forbearance and forgiveness.

v. Virtues of His vocation—.

1. Faithfulness.
2. Courage.
3. Patience.
4. Calmness.
5. Self-sacrifice.

Concluding Estimate—.

1. His absolute goodness.
2. His sinlessness: (1) testimony of those who knew Him.; (2) His own self-knowledge and self-witness.

Literature.

Introduction.—(a) The aim of this article is to make a purely ethical study of the character of Christ. In such a study there must be no dogmatic presuppositions regarding the constitution of His person, whether favourable or hostile to the statements of Nicene orthodoxy. There must be no abstract separation of His humanity from His Divinity, and no attempt to relegate certain acts or phases to one side and others to the other side. We must proceed in the case of Jesus Christ as we do in that of the great men who have forced succeeding ages to the task of understanding them, though it may well be that in the end we shall be constrained to set Him, with reasoned conviction, in a class apart, high above the greatest of men.

(b) The sources for such a study are, of course, the four Gospels. It is obviously impossible to appeal to the Epistles, save for any reminiscences they may contain of the *historic* Christ. Their conceptions of the *risen* Christ cannot come here into view. In thus restricting ourselves to the earthly life of Christ, we are not excluding any view which faith might take of His present existence. If Christ be alive now, He must be the same, morally, as He was when on earth. There is no other Christ than the Christ of the Gospels.

As soon as we turn to the Gospels, we are met by various critical problems. The solution of these must be sought in the various works which are devoted to their discussion. For the study in which we are to be engaged two positions are essential, which may be stated here as *assumptions*, though they are in reality *conclusions* of the study itself. (1) The first is the *trustworthiness* of the Gospels as portraits of Christ. Grant the ordinary critical results, that the Gospels were written late in the 1st cent., that contemporary ideas and experiences have influenced their authors or editors, that in some cases the Evangelists have misunderstood or misreported their Master; yet the fact remains, that the character of Christ, as presented in these documents, was not, and could not have been, an invention or a fiction, a product of progressive meditation, or a creation of enthusiastic feeling. Do justice to the portrait of Christ, let its harmony and its uniqueness, its profound naturalness and its transcendent loveliness, make their due impression, and the conclusion presses, that the Christ of the Gospels is not a construction but a memory, an actual Figure, once beheld by eyes of flesh, and now discerned through a medium upon which contemporary influences have had no distorting effect, and which, accordingly, permits Him to be known as He was.

It may be said that, while these remarks are true of the Synoptic Gospels, they cannot fairly be applied to the Fourth Gospel. A distinction, however, must be observed. The Synoptic Gospels are mainly ethical in their aim and method. Ontological and theological conclusions are certainly suggested; but they are not explicitly stated. In

the Fourth Gospel these results are avowed in the Prologue, referred to again and again in the body of the work, and summarized in the conclusion. While thus frankly theological, however, it presents its doctrinal positions as the result of an ethical study, which it also gives. With the correctness of these doctrinal inferences we are not concerned. Our sole interest lies in the portrait of Christ; and with respect to it two things are certain: it is in complete harmony with that given by the Synoptists, it is another picture of the same person; and it can be regarded, as little as that of the Synoptists, as an invention or fiction. For our present purpose, accordingly, which is ethical and not theological, we shall use the materials presented in the Fourth Gospel, for a study of the character of Christ, with the same freedom and confidence with which we turn to the Synoptic narratives.

(2) The second assumption follows naturally upon the first, and maintains the *sufficiency* of the Gospels for knowledge of Christ. It is obvious that they do not aim at *extensive* completeness. They are not chronicles; nor are they biographies in the modern sense. A shorthand report of the sayings of Jesus, a minute record of His life, during even the short period covered by the narratives, would have swelled their brief outlines to portentous volumes. It is certain that they do aim at *intensive* or central completeness. We do not need to *know everything about* a man in order to *know him*. For the purpose of character study, much that is interesting, that affectionate curiosity would like to know, is needless and irrelevant. The materials of our study must be, and need only be, such words and deeds as express the whole man, and are the organic utterance and outcome of his very self. This is one aspect of the uniqueness of the Gospels, one element in the proof that they are memorials, not inventions, that the Christ they represent is a unity. There is not the faintest trace of artificiality, of an ingenious synthesis of heterogeneous elements. No portrait painter, no artist in words, ever invented a figure of such perfect harmony. There are many things about Christ which we should like to know; but such things have been told as enable us to know Christ. From the Gospels we learn enough to know what manner of man He was. And if He be alive now, and able to influence persons now living on this earth, it is certain that His communications will be simply the unfolding and the application of the character which was expressed in such words and deeds as the Gospels record.

(c) The relation of a purely ethical study of the character of Christ to the theological consideration of His person is obvious. The one presents the problem with which the other deals. However high we may place Christ as a moral teacher, or even as the founder of a religion, nevertheless, if His moral type remain the same as that recognizable in other pure and lofty souls, if His moral achievement is generically the same as theirs, there can be no problem of His person. Christology is not merely an impossibility, it is a huge irrelevancy. Only if a study of the character of Christ raise from within the question of His relation to men on the one side and to God on the

other, can there be a theological problem of the constitution of His person. Only in that case are the Christological elements in the NT warranted, and the long controversies of subsequent theological development justified. If the Divinity of Christ is not to be a dead dogma, soon to be abandoned by the minds which it perplexes and the religious instincts which it depresses; if it is to be a living conviction, sustaining faith and unifying thought, it must not be treated as though it hung, gaunt and naked, in a metaphysical vacuum; it must be regarded and expounded in its organic connexion with the character of which it is the necessary presupposition, and from which it derives its intellectual cogency. The only pathway to faith is that trodden by the first disciples. Belief in the Godhead of Christ, if it is to be more than a mere theologoumenon, must be rooted in acquaintance with Him; and that acquaintance is informed and enriched, made close, luminous, and full, through the medium of the portraiture in which the character of Christ is disclosed to our reverent gaze.

i. Formative influences.—In the making of men, three factors are to be distinguished—influences operating from without, the reaction of personality, and the agency of the Divine Spirit. It would be a mistake, in the case of Christ, to concentrate attention wholly upon the second of these, as though He were a mere apparition in the moral universe, standing in no vital or intelligible relation to His visible or invisible surroundings. The other factors are amply recognized in the Gospel narrative. The first of them alone comes into view in our present study. The operations of the Spirit of God belong to the theological interpretation of the character of Christ, and can be understood only from the point of view of a definite conception of His person, to which our present effort is introductory. We approach our subject, accordingly, by briefly indicating the influences which operated on the youth of Jesus.

1. Parentage.—Pre-natal influence, whose mode of operation is beneath observation, is an undoubted fact. Parentage affords the conditions, physical and psychological, under which that recapitulation of the ancestral past, which gives to human character its richest and most interesting elements, takes place in the individual. If we conclude (anticipating our judgment) that in Jesus there is reproduced and perfected the highest type of OT spiritual life, the *conditio sine qua non* of this most lovely product is to be found in His parentage. This thought does not even suggest a supernatural birth. The question of the Virgin-birth is part of the wider and profounder problem, which we are not now facing, whether His person is to be regarded as an evolution from beneath or an incarnation from above, the entrance of God, at the crisis of human need, for the redemption and perfecting of men. It remains true, however, that whether we assume or deny the Virgin-birth, it is to His mother we are directed in our view of His parentage. The idea of her sinlessness is certainly not even suggested in any record of her life; it is merely the logical result of the blunder of making the sinlessness of Jesus depend on physical conditions. Yet it is beyond all

doubt that she belonged to the inner circle of those who, in Israel, best preserved the spiritual heritage of the race; and it is beyond cavil that of this deeply exercised generation of waiting souls she was herself a choice and lovely representative. With a fitness which suggests, in its tenderly human and deeply religious quality, a Divine selection, she filled the office of living personal medium, through which the stream of spiritual energy, which flows through the whole history of Israel, poured in upon her Son, to well up within His soul in the finest features and characteristics of the national religion. In part, at least, we understand Jesus through His mother. Most assuredly, He was more than a Hebrew; but He was a Hebrew born. What He came to be is determined, in His case as in others, by the dark and mystic tabernacle wherein His physical frame was formed, by the bosom whereon He lay, and the life-force whereby His own was nourished. Preparation is thus made in birth for a character which shall be true to the national type, and, at the same time, deeply and broadly human.

2. Home.—Of all the characters who have risen to eminence from the lowliest surroundings, Jesus Christ is the most remarkable. What attracts attention to His home, however, is not the contrast between His early circumstances and His later attainments, but the harmony between the setting of His childhood's years and the noblest of His manhood's virtues and achievements. The chief quality of His home was its pure humanity. None but the simplest elements of human life are here. The home at Nazareth is as far removed from luxury and artificiality on the one hand, as it is from squalor or depravity on the other. The inward features of the home correspond with its outward conditions. The father and mother belong to what we know as 'the special seedplot of Christianity.' They were 'poor in spirit'; they 'waited for the consolation of Israel.' Lofty aspirations, prayers and songs inspired and moulded by OT conceptions and forms, conversation enriched by the ideas of the profoundest thinkers on religion whom the world has ever known, lives instinct with pure and passionate devotion to God: amid such benign and holy influences the plastic soul of Jesus grew to its maturity. Such a home provides a perfect environment for One whose personal secret is His communion with God, whose message is God's fellowship with men.

Without mere fancifulness we can conceive what the childhood of Jesus really was—contented, happy, trustful. Certain features of His manhood, His freedom from extremes of feeling, His openness of mind, His wide and deep charity, find the conditions of their growth in His childhood's home, with its thorough naturalness and its nearness to central truth regarding God and man.

The words which record that 'Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and men' ([Luk_2:52](#)), describe a perfectly normal human growth, a development without breach or strain or crisis, conducted by the Spirit of God,

toward the realization of the Divine ideal of humanity. It is impossible to reconcile them with an abstract conception of His Godhead; impossible also to reconcile them with an equally abstract conception of His '*mere* humanity' (whatever that may be). But it is certain they present a unique fact, which must have full weight given to it in any estimate of the character and the person of Christ. It might be suggested, indeed, that the complete normality of His growth may have been imperilled by communications made to Him by His mother regarding the mystery of His birth or the greatness of His vocation. Such communications, however, were not made before His twelfth year. Mary's words in the temple ([Luk 2:48](#)) make that certain. Even on the supposition that certain communications were made at a later date, they may have aided Him in the discovery of His relation to God and His mission to men; but the thoughts they may have awakened in His mind would not then act injuriously upon the growth of a perfectly proportioned human character. The greatness which was coining upon Him was leading Him nearer to men, not farther away from them. We must always look for what is unique in Christ *within* and not *beyond* His normal human character.

3. Education.—Hellenic or Roman culture might be brilliant, but it was narrow, limited to the conditions of life in a Greek city, or to the uses of a ruling race. Its faults are plain; intellectual pride, superficial cleverness, abundance of ideas together with dearth of ideals. Conceive now the training of a Hebrew boy. Ignorant of much that a Greek lad knew, he was thoroughly instructed in the books of the OT. These constituted a national literature, which, on any fair comparison, vastly excels the utmost that the Hellenic spirit could produce, in its power to quicken and direct the activities of the soul, to deepen it, and to enrich it with noblest conceptions of human life and destiny. Such a literature is the most splendid instrument of education the world has ever seen; and such was the education even of a carpenter's son in an obscure village. No doubt even a system so excellent might be perverted; but always in education the result is determined not by the perfection of the instrument, but by the reaction of the pupil. From school Jesus might have gone on to be a Rabbi of the common dogmatic and narrow type. If He did not, if His thought is wide, His insight deep, His spirit noble and gentle; if He moves on the plane of the greatest prophets of the OT, and sees beyond their highest vision; we must trace this result to His education, and to the response made to it by His quick and intelligent sympathy. It is because He is moulded by the influences of the OT that His character is at once more spiritual and more universal than it would have been, had He been steeped to the lips in Hellenic culture. The measure of His acquaintance with the apocalyptic literature which many of His contemporaries were studying, cannot accurately be determined. But we shall make a profound mistake, if we imagine that we can explain His teaching or understand Himself by any such reference. We can come within sight of Him only by retracing the steps of His own education, and approaching Him from the point of view of the OT. The groundwork of His character and the spring of His thinking are to

be found in the OT. What He came to be or to reveal, beyond that stage of moral and religious attainment, stands in organic connexion with it. Other educational influences must be remembered and their power duly estimated: the historic scenes which were within His view, with the splendid and tragic memories they were fitted to awaken; the highways of the world's business which were visible from the hills behind which Nazareth lay; the pleasant country which was spread all around His home. Such aspects of His character as His intense patriotism, His wide humanitarian sympathies, and His feeling for nature, find their antecedents in the physical surroundings of His early years.

At this point we pause to note an incident which enables us, as efficiently as a score of haphazard reminiscences would have done, to discern the fruition of His life's preparation, so far as it had gone. Here it is well to remind ourselves of the reverence which is due to all childhood in our endeavour to analyse its utterances. 'How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?'

(Luk 2:49).* [Note: ἐν τοῖς σοῦ πατρὸς μου. Our argument is not affected whether we adopt the above rendering (AV and RVm), or that of RV, 'in my Father's house.'] No platitudes as to moral paternity, no pedantic references to the Trinity, help us to understand this wondering question. The words have no doctrinal meaning. They ought not to be used as proof of a dogma. Did Mary ask her Son what He meant? If she had asked, could He have made her understand? The words, however, while thus far removed from ontological problems, do reveal most surely what manner of child He must have been who uttered them. He must have lived till that hour in a fellowship with God which had known no interruption, which had been so deep and holy and tender, that Mary's word, applied to an earthly parent, provides its secret. 'Thy father and I,' said His mother; and He replied, surely not in any self-conscious, didactic mood, but in glad and confident adoption of her word, 'my Father's business.' It is certain that one who uttered this phrase out of the fulness of a child's unreflective experience, had never passed through the agonies of a violated conscience. His experience is not the abnormal type to be seen in St. Paul, Augustine, Luther, Bunyan, but the profoundly normal type of the human relation to God, as God designed it to be. Operating *upon* Him, through parentage and home and education, operating *within* Him in ways beneath consciousness and beyond observation, the Divine Spirit had led Him into, and enabled Him to abide within, a continuous, loving fellowship with God, of which the earthly relationship of father and son is the reflexion and the symbol. It is certain that Jesus never knew any inward dislocation of spirit, never passed through agonies of conviction, or emerged into the rapture of an experience which overwhelmed the judgment with surges of emotion. His character is not created by the healing of some deep breach of soul. It bears none of the marks of manufacture. It is a steadfast growth, the uninterrupted unfolding of the wealth of ethical meaning that lay, from the beginning, within His soul. From the village street

He passes to the temple courts, to find Himself there at home, and to occupy Himself with His Father's concerns. From the temple He returns to His village home, without surprise and without disappointment, still to be in His Father's presence, and to be about His Father's business. 'He went down with them, and came to Nazareth; and he was subject unto them' (Luk_2:51).

4. The years of silence.—For eighteen years we lose sight of Jesus. When they are past, not His physical frame only but His moral stature also has reached its fulness. The years themselves, apart from the incidents which must have filled them, are the most potent of the formative influences which are our guide to the understanding of Jesus. There are certain deeply marked features of His character, which are the imprint upon Him of the passage of these silent years.

(1) *Quietness and confidence.*—In His manhood there is no restlessness as of one who is uncertain of his goal, none of the strained eagerness of one who is still in pursuit of undiscovered truth. Plato's image of the aviary in no way resembles the mind of Jesus. No distinction is to be found in Him between possessing and having. He possesses, or rather is possessed by, fundamental and universal principles. His life and teaching are their exposition and illustration. We may debate their validity, but we cannot dispute the absolute certainty with which He grasped them. Eighteen years of silence had breathed their restfulness into Him, and conferred on Him the precious gifts of a quiet mind and an assured heart.

(2) *Foresight.*—Jesus had no magical acquaintance with future events. Yet it is most noteworthy that He moved amid the circumstances of His life with no hesitating step. It is not merely that, as a religious man, He knows that God has a plan for Him, and will submit to it, whatever it brings Him, however grievous or disappointing; but also that *He knew what the plan was*. He was in the secret of His Father. In His speaking and acting there is no trace of hesitation or doubt. He never acts on a mere balance of judgment, never wastes a moment on conjecture, not one moment on regret. He acts with instant perception of what is wanted, and goes forward with confident step and calm foreseeing eye. He marvels (twice it is recorded of Him, Mat_8:10, Mar_6:6); but it is the wonder which is at once the parent and the child of knowledge, not the stupid astonishment of mere ignorance. Events which threatened destruction to Himself and His mission were met by Him with solemn recognition as the issue of a purpose which He served with full intelligence. Such calm wisdom, such quiet faithfulness, such undisturbed peace, had a history; and it lies in these eighteen years of silent waiting.

(3) *Serenity and self-possession.*—He was haunted by misconception, beset by malice, harassed by malignity. Yet He preserved an austere reserve, which permitted no rash action, no unguarded speech. He met His enemies with a silence which was no dumb

resentment, but was on some occasions a most moving appeal, on others a most solemn judgment. No man can be thus silent who is driven ignorantly toward an unknown destiny. The silence of Jesus is proof that His life lay within both His purview and His command. Only in solitude and obscurity can such qualities be developed. Eighteen silent years are not too much to make a soul like that of Jesus Christ, strong, deep, calm, and wise. Not dogmatic prejudice, but respect for the unity of Christ's character, and for the self-evidencing truth of the portrait presented in the Gospels, condemns, as an outrage upon all psychological probability, the practice of packing into the three recorded years alternations of thought and purpose, and tracing supposed distinctions between the hopes with which He began His career and the convictions which were forced upon Him toward its close. Naturalism of this sort is simply unnatural and foolish. There is nothing too great to be the outcome of years so sublimely silent. What He is to be was then formed within His soul. What He has to say was then laid up for utterance. What He has to do and endure was then foreseen and then accepted.

ii. The Vocation of Christ.—The unity of Christ's character stands out impressively in the Gospel portrait. The allowances we make, and the averages we strike, in estimating the conduct of other men, are not needed in His case. Woven of the strands of common life, it is yet 'without seam throughout.' When we seek to explain this unity, it is not enough to refer to the will of Christ, as though it were a power operating in an ethical vacuum. His is the normal human will, which realizes its freedom by identifying itself with some all-determining principle. When we ask, further, what this principle is, which thus determines His will and unifies His life, we shall be in error if we regard it as an absolutely new idea, to be ascribed to His inventive genius. He is not with complete appropriateness to be designated a religious genius. He has nothing to reveal which is new, if by that epithet we mean to indicate a conception which has no organic relations with the past. Jesus, as believer, thinker, preacher, starts from the OT. His originality consists in perfectly understanding it, in carrying out into concrete reality its ruling conceptions. When, therefore, we seek for the determining principle of the life and character of Christ, we must turn to the OT. From childhood to manhood He lived the life of the ideal Israel, in communion with God and consecration to His service. What is unique in Him is not some idea, derived we know not whence, but His actual adoption of the purpose of God toward Israel as the purpose of His own life. When we endeavour to enter sympathetically into the experience of the Prophetic authors of the OT, and when we compare with their writings the character and career of Jesus, we are led to the conclusion: First, that the core of the OT religion is God's redeeming purpose toward Israel; and, second, that the vocation of Christ, as understood and accepted by Himself, was to fulfil that purpose. In the nature of the case we cannot have from Jesus a narrative of the experiences which culminated in this great resolve, or an abstract statement of His ideas upon the topic of redemption. Yet, as we follow the occasions of His life, we

overhear pregnant sayings, and we observe significant incidents, which corroborate and illustrate the impression which His whole career makes upon us. These we may thus arrange—

1. His Designation of His vocation.—When we inquire how Jesus designated His life's aim, we are met early in the narrative with one general, yet most definite statement. He is addressing an audience composed of His own disciples, together with a wider range of auditors for whom also His words are meant. We have, indeed, no verbatim report of what is usually called the Sermon on the Mount. Its theme, however, is unmistakable. It is the Kingdom of God as it exists at the stage which, in the person of the Speaker, it has now reached. Plainly, the Kingdom, as Jesus proclaims it, is a new thing. Its righteousness is new. Its blessings are new. At once the question arises, and was thrown at the Preacher with bitter controversial animus, How does this new Kingdom stand related to that which had endured through the centuries of Israel's history, which was now indeed obscured by political oppression, but which was destined one day to receive a glorious vindication? How do its new views of God and man and duty compare with the venerable system of law, of which the Scribes and Pharisees were the acknowledged defenders?

Then Jesus pronounces words which place Him in the central stream of the Divine purpose, and designate Him as its goal and its complete realization: 'I came not to destroy, but to fulfil' (Mat_5:17). It is noteworthy that to 'the Law' Jesus adds 'the Prophets,' thus emphasizing that element of the OT religion which the legalists of His day were most apt to neglect. He grasps the OT as a spiritual whole, and this totality of Divine meaning He declares it to be His vocation to fulfil. He has come into the world to carry forward all that had been signified by Law and Prophets to an end foreseen, or at least felt, by OT believers, but not attained in their experience. In Him the OT religion is at once perfected, and accomplished as an abiding reality.

Such a consciousness as this may well suggest thoughts as to the person of Him who thus asserts Himself. What is important for us now, however, is the fact that it was His consciousness, that the vocation thus announced was the end for which Jesus lived, and constituted the organizing principle to which is due the perfect unity of His character.

The same impression of the loftiness and the definiteness of His vocation, as Jesus conceived it, is deepened by a consideration of other sayings in which He condensed the purpose of His life. While, of course, critical conclusions are manifold, it is not reasonably open to doubt (*a*) that Jesus claimed to possess authority to forgive sins, and so dispense the characteristic blessing of the New Covenant (Jer_31:34, Mat_9:6); (*b*) that He claimed to possess a knowledge of God which, in its immediacy and fulness, was generically distinct from that enjoyed by the most advanced OT saint,

and to be empowered to reveal God, thus known, to men (Mat_11:27); (c) that He regarded His death as laying the basis of the New Covenant, and being, therefore, the medium of its blessings (Mat_26:28 and parallels).

Again, we cannot fail to feel, in connexion with such words, the drawing on of a mystery in the person of Him who uttered them. Turning aside, however, from all such suggestions, and refraining from all doctrinal construction, we are, nevertheless, not merely permitted, but constrained, to observe that they described the commission under which He acted. They disclose the root of conviction from which His character grew. Take this away, and His character falls to pieces, and becomes no more an ethical unity, but a congeries of inconsistencies. The belief that He was commissioned of God to execute the Divine purpose towards Israel, and, through Israel, towards the world, moved Him from beginning to end of His career, and made Him the character which He was, which we come to know in the Gospels, and which has put its spell upon all subsequent generations.

2. His Dedication to His vocation.—The determining purpose of His life was not made known to Jesus for the first time in the experiences of His baptism. The consciousness which He then manifests had certainly a history. The experiences through which He then passed imply a perfectly prepared soul. In His whole bearing, from the moment of His approach to John, there is not a trace of hesitation or bewilderment. A new thing, no doubt, came to Him; but it did not take Him by surprise or usher Him into a calling which He had not foreseen, or from which He had shrunk. By the discipline of the silent years in Nazareth, by the operation of the Divine Spirit, acting along with all external instrumentalities and beneath the conscious movements of His own spirit, His mind had been informed of the task which awaited Him, His faculties had been exercised in the appropriation of so great a destiny, His soul had been fed at sources of Divine strength, and thus enabled to accept in deep surrender the Divine appointment. His character, when first we see Him pass out of obscurity into the light of history, is not like an unfinished building, with scaffolding to be cleared away, and much still to be done before it be beautiful or habitable. It is like a living organism, rooted in the discipline of past years, perfected by adequate preparation, and now ready for its destined uses and its full fruition. His thirtieth year found Him well aware of His vocation, and waiting only for the summons to take it up. The cry of the Baptist reached Him in Nazareth, and He knew that His hour was come. ‘Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to the Jordan, unto John, to be baptized of him’ (Mat_3:13). His baptism is at once Christ’s dedication of Himself to His vocation, and the first step in its accomplishment. His experiences at such an hour are too intimate and profound to be comprehended even by the most reverent study. But their meaning must gather round three points—(1) First, the word ‘thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness’ (v. 15). In this pregnant saying we are conveyed back to the heart of the OT. God is righteous when He fulfils the obligations which He imposed on Himself when He

instituted His covenant with Israel. It is still His righteousness which moves Him, when, after Israel has sinned itself out of the covenant relationship, He promises a New Covenant, and brings near a better salvation. This is the righteousness which Jesus has full in view on the verge of Baptism. If this righteousness is to be fulfilled, He who is the executor of the Divine purpose must not shrink from His task, whatever it may bring Him, and he who has a lesser function in the Kingdom must not withstand or hinder Him through any mistaken reverence.

(2) Second, the symbolic deed of baptism. Here also the only possible clue is to be found in the OT. There we see the godly in Israel, themselves right with God, bearing in their own souls the load of the people's transgressions. What is thus, through successive generations, done and suffered by exercised believers, is assigned in Deutero-Isaiah to the Servant of the Lord, who is in that writing the ideal Israel making atonement for the sins of the actual Israel. In descending to baptism, Jesus is certainly not acknowledging personal unworthiness. It is not even enough to say that He is vicariously confessing the sins of others. He is definitely assuming the place and office of the Servant of the Lord. Himself righteous, He assumes in His deepest soul the load of human sin, and thus at once fulfils the righteousness of God and 'makes many righteous.' The Baptism of Christ, accordingly, is at once the culmination of a life's experiences, the product of long years of thought and prayer, and the inauguration of a career whose movement and whose goal were already plainly before His inward eye.

(3) Third, the Divine response (v. 16f.). A decision, whose issues we cannot calculate, was accompanied by a pain which we cannot fathom. The doctrine of the two natures, even supposing it to be proved, throws no light on the experiences of that hour. Jesus never found relief in His Divinity from His human suffering. He took refuge in prayer ([Luk 3:21](#)). The Father answered with an endowment ample enough even for the task, an assurance strong enough to raise Him above all doubt. The terms in which the assurance is given form a synthesis of the two great figures through whom in the OT the consummation of the Kingdom is achieved, the Messianic King and the Servant of the Lord ([Mar 1:11](#)), and afford additional proof of the consciousness with which Jesus began His ministry. What we observe in lesser men, we see in Jesus—a great purpose determining the life creating the character. In His case, as in others, to miss the purpose leaves the character a hopeless enigma, the life a meaningless puzzle.

3. His Confirmation in His vocation.—Jesus does not sweep forward in emotional enthusiasm from Baptism to the announcement of His claims. The tide of His endowment 'drove' Him (St. Mark's phrase) not to cities and throngs, but into desert solitudes, there to win through conflict what was His by right. Jesus certainly did not describe to His disciples in full detail the strife by which He won His soul. Something

He did tell, and told it, as alone it could be told, in symbols. The point at issue in the conflict is the vocation to which Jesus has just dedicated Himself. That vocation is the synthesis of all the lines of action by which, in the OT, God's purpose was being gradually fulfilled; and specially the synthesis of sovereignty and service. The strain of the Temptation is directed to the rending asunder of these two. The effort to which Jesus is summoned is to hold them together in indissoluble connexion, and not, under whatever subtle seductive influences, to snatch at the one and renounce the other. Any breach between them will mean the defeat of the Divine righteousness. Failure here will make Jesus not the Servant of the Lord but His adversary, servant of His enemy. The stages of the Temptation, accordingly, turn upon the humiliations which the element of service will bring into His career, and their supposed incompatibility with the sovereignty, which is His goal. Surely hunger and toil and poverty are insuperable barriers in the way of reaching that supremacy which Jesus would exercise with such benignant grace! The alternative lay clear before Him, the pathway of supernatural power, leading away from normal human experience, or the pathway of service and suffering, leading nearer and nearer to the throbbing heart of humanity. Jesus made His choice, and in that great decision gained His vantage ground. As for Him, He would be man, and would stand so close to men that He could assume their responsibilities and bear their burdens. Thus Jesus won His victory, a solitary man, in death grips with evil, with no strength save the Spirit of God, no weapon save the Word of God. It was a complete victory. Within a character, thus welded by trial, there was no room hereafter for breach with God or with itself. Though other assaults will be made, though they be made by His dearest (Joh 2:3-4), His most loyal (Mat 16:22-23), though in one final onslaught they wring from the Victor sweat of blood, the certainty of their overwhelming defeat is already guaranteed. In studying the character of Christ, we are led from one surprise of loveliness to another; but we are never in any uncertainty as to its permanence, never haunted by any dread of its failure. From the beginning there is the note of finality and absoluteness.

iii. Characteristics of Christ.—All character study is necessarily incomplete. A character which could be exhaustively analysed would not be worth the pains taken in making the necessary investigations. The quality of mystery certainly belongs to the character of Christ to a degree that suggests a source of power, deeper and less restricted than that which would suffice to explain shallower and more intelligible personalities. No biography has ever comprehended Him; the intent meditation of nineteen centuries has not exhausted His fulness. It would, accordingly, be both pedantic and unreal to attempt a logical articulation of the elements of His character or a classified list of His virtues. It seems best, therefore, in this article to move from the more general to the more particular, without too great rigidity of treatment. We begin, then, with those impressions of His character which are at once the broadest and the deepest.

1. Spiritual-mindedness.—St. Paul's great phrase in Rom 8:6 φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος, 'the general bent of thought and motive' (Sanday-Headlam) directed toward Divine things, which is applied even to the best men we know, with reserves and limitations, exactly expresses the prevailing direction of Christ's life and character. He possesses the spiritual mind to a degree which stamps Him as being at once unique among men, and also true and normal man, realizing the ideal and fulfilling the duty of man as such. He moves habitually in the realm of heavenly realities. He does not visit it at intervals. He dwells there, even while He walks on earth, and is found amid the throngs and haunts of men. He carries with Him the aroma of its holiness and peace and blessedness. That His disciples were 'with him' (Mar 3:14) was the secret of their preparation, the source of any wisdom they manifested, any success they achieved. The most mature experience of the power of Christ, and the most lofty conception of His person, find their ultimate warrant in this, that the unseen world becomes visible in His character. Apart from this, they are composed of things so unreal as feelings and opinions. Illustration and proof of the spiritual-mindedness of Christ are too abundant to be specified in detail. The following points will suffice to indicate its quality and significance.

(1) *His knowledge.*—He Himself, on one occasion, distinguished the objects of His knowledge as heavenly things (ἐπουράνια), and earthly things (ἐπίγεια, Joh 3:12). The former are the mysteries of the Kingdom, the counsels of Jehovah, which in the OT He makes known by the medium of the prophets. The latter are the facts of human nature, as that is essentially related to the being and character of God, and is capable of receiving and experiencing the powers and truths belonging to the Kingdom of God. There is no doubt as to the kind of knowledge He evinced, and believed Himself to possess, regarding heavenly things. He is not inquiring like Socrates, nor reasoning like Plato, nor commenting like a scribe. He knows with absoluteness and fulness (Mat 11:27). He beholds with immediate direct vision (Joh 1:18; Joh 6:46). He reports what He sees and hears (Joh 3:11; Joh 8:38; Joh 15:15). 'He does not in any formal way teach the religion which lives in Him... The thing itself He merely expresses, nay, still more presupposes than expresses' (Beyschlag).

Christ's knowledge of earthly things, *i.e.* His insight into the subjective experiences of men and the moral condition of their souls, has the same note of absoluteness; and His judgments upon them and His dealings with them have an authority and finality which would be unwarrantable did they not rest on perfect discernment (Mar 10:21, Luk 7:39, Joh 1:42; Joh 1:47; Joh 2:25). Of this He Himself could not but be aware; and, indeed, He expressly made it His claim (Joh 13:18). Peter's heart-broken appeal (Joh 21:17) belongs to the incidents of the Forty Days, and so cannot be used directly as proof; but no doubt it reflects the impression which the historic Christ made upon

those who knew Him, viz. that He saw into their inmost souls with a discernment as intimate and deep as God's, which, like God's, could neither be evaded nor hindered.

Whether Christ possessed supernatural knowledge of facts in the order of external nature has been much discussed, but does not now concern us. We are not even concerned at present with any explanation of His knowledge of Divine things. But we are bound to note, and to give full weight to the fact, that in the Gospel portraiture the world of heavenly realities, both in themselves and in their earthly manifestations and applications, is open to Jesus, that He is in complete spiritual affinity with it, and speaks upon all matters that belong to it with definite and self-conscious authority. Even if His Divinity be denied, it must be allowed that He is a man possessed of undimmed spiritual vision.

(2) *His teaching.*—Jesus is not a lecturer, making statements, however brilliant and luminous, of the results of investigation. He is a revealer, disclosing in 'the mother-speech of religion' the heavenly realities which were open to His inward eye. His teaching, therefore, is inexhaustible, begetting, in the process of studying it, the faculty of ethical insight, and continuously raising, in the effort to practise it, the standard of the moral judgment. Yet it retains the quality of spiritual delight which enchained its first listeners. It is *gracious* in its unfoldings of the Divine compassions; in its disclosure not merely of the fatherliness, but of the fatherhood of God; in its invitations, pleadings, promises; and, most of all, in its astounding declaration, which pride deemed blasphemous and humility never questioned, of the Divine forgiveness, deep, and free, and fearless. It is *holy* and *spiritual*, rejecting conventional piety, emphasizing, as even the OT had not done, the inward state of a man's heart Godward, describing the type of character required in citizens of the Kingdom in terms of such unearthly purity and loveliness, as would produce despair were any other than Himself the speaker. It is *universal*, perfecting the Law and the Prophets, in this respect also, that it declared the height of spiritual privilege to be attainable, not merely by Israel, but by man as such, irrespective of merit or privilege.

Such a voice had never been heard in Israel; not Hosea's, with its tears of Divine compassion; not Isaiah's, with its royal amplitude; not his who in pure and lofty song heralded the return from Babylon; not John's as it rang out from hill to hill his summons to repentance. Astonished by its novelty, wooed by its charm, bowed by its authority, the multitudes followed a little way as it called them heavenward; and some elect souls rested not till they too entered the universe of truth whence Jesus uttered His voice. The greatest foe to faith is the haste which seeks to construct dogmas about Christ before Christ is known. To some souls the time for dogma comes late, or not at all. In any case, dogma, however accurate, must rest on the trustworthiness of Jesus in His disclosure of spiritual fact.

(3) *The effect of His presence.*—A spiritual mind produces upon those who come under its influence a twofold impression, that of remoteness and that of nearness and sympathy. This is conspicuously the case with Jesus. We have abundant evidence of His having a dignity of presence, which smote with awe those who had but occasional glimpses of Him, and filled at times His most familiar friends with fear, and also of His being the kindest, gentlest, and most sympathetic of souls. It could not be otherwise. To have discerned the end which created His career, to make choice of it with such full intelligence of all that it involved, to live for it in such entire consistency with its scope and requirements, means a moral grandeur unapproached by sage or prophet. Separated from the mass of men, removed from their pursuits, He must have been. Yet the very greatness of His vocation, the very depth of His insight both into the purpose of God and the need of man, produced in Him, along with that deep distinctiveness, the kindest appreciation of the little things which make up the life of man, the most sympathetic interest in ordinary human concerns, and an entire approachableness to the humblest applicant for counsel or comfort. This combination of a majesty which smites to the ground the instruments of prostituted justice, with a manner so tender that babes smile in His arms and women tell Him the secret of their care, must have its source deep in the heavenly region which was His habitual abode.

2. Love to God.—The heavenly region which Jesus inhabited was not an abyss of being where the finite loses itself in the absolute. It was a realm of persons, Divine and human, who dwelt together in intelligent, spiritual fellowship. The doctrine of ‘the One,’ which is found in every climate and revives in every century, is not the clue to Jesus’ thought of God. The key to His theology is the doctrine of the Father; His love to the Father is the motive of His life. He proclaimed love to God, absorbing all energies, comprehending all activities, as the first, the great commandment, of which the second, love to man, is the direct corollary. But when we compare His own obedience to the first commandment with that of other men, a very significant distinction is to be observed. The most devout souls in their nearest approach to God are conscious that their love is not perfect. This defect is due in part to sin, and the chastened soul rebukes the coldness of its affection; and in part to finitude, and the adoring soul continually aspires after higher attainments. In the case of Jesus, the note, either of compunction or of aspiration, is never heard. The explanation of this is not that in later recensions of the tradition such notes were struck out, in deference to a mistaken sense of reverence, or to support a novel view of His person; but that the impression of complete spiritual attainment belongs to the very essence of the character as set forth in the Gospels. We may dispute whether such a character ever *existed*; but we cannot question the fact that such a character has been *portrayed*, with a verisimilitude which makes the portraiture a greater miracle than the actual reality of the character depicted would have been. Jesus loved God perfectly: this is the only fair interpretation of the record. There is no trace of moral disparity, no failure of mutual understanding, no sign of effort on the part of Jesus to cross a

chasm, however inconsiderable, between Himself and God. He receives the communications of the Father's love without perturbation or amazement, as of one overwhelmed by the Divine condescension; and He responds without extravagance of emotion, in words which do not labour with overweight of meaning, but are easy, natural, simple, and glad, the very language of One who is the Son of such a Father. He and the Father are one. The Synoptic picture, as well as that of the Fourth Gospel, makes this feature plain. There can be no doubt that this fact raises the Christological problem in its profoundest form. What man is He who thus receives and returns the love of God?

Two of love's characteristic manifestations, moreover, are found in Christ in perfect exercise. (1) *Obedience*. We have seen that the character of Christ is created by the vocation to which He dedicated Himself. We now observe that this vocation is, in the view of Jesus, nothing impersonal, but is the personal will of the Father. This is the Father's 'business,' and to it He, as the Son, is entirely devoted. The will of the Father does not mean for Jesus a series of commands. It is rather to His deep conviction a purpose, moving throughout His whole life, and comprehending every detail of His activity. The obedience of the Son, accordingly, is not a series of events. It is the identification of His will with the will of the Father, and a complete reproduction of that will in the whole conduct of His life. Sayings in the Fourth Gospel, such as [Joh_4:34](#); [Joh_6:38](#); [Joh_8:29](#), bring into clear utterance the impression conveyed by the whole career of Jesus, and express an obedience which has lost the last trace of distance between the will of the Son and the will of the Father. Again, we must postpone all discussion of the possibility of such obedience, and must emphasize the actuality of the representation. Two things are plain: first, Jesus was conscious of being in complete and constant harmony with God, and profoundly unconscious of even the slightest failure to fulfil the whole will of God; and, second, those who knew Him best believed that in Him they had witnessed a unique moral achievement, viz., an obedience absolutely perfect, both in its extent and in its inward quality. (2) *Trust*. 'Perfect love casteth out fear' ([1Jn_4:18](#)). Jesus' trust in God was, like His obedience, complete. It amounted to an entire and unflinching dependence upon God, so that whatever He did, God wrought in Him. In other servants of God we observe, even in their deepest experiences, a certain dualism of self and God, a self assisted to a greater or less degree by God. This account would not be adequate to the experiences observable in the record regarding Christ. He is, without doubt, a person, not will-less, but acting in complete self-determination, and yet His deeds are the Father's. No process of analysis can distinguish in any word or deed of His an element which comes from Himself and another which comes from God. In Christ we find a perfect spiritual organism—a man so completely inhabited by God that His words and deeds are the words and deeds of God. Follow Him in His career, as it passes with unbroken steadfastness from stage to stage of an unfolding purpose, study Him in His dealing with men, and note the sureness of His touch,

penetrate the secret of His consciousness as He from time to time lifts the veil (Joh 5:20; Joh 5:30; Joh 7:16; Joh 12:49; Joh 14:10; Joh 14:24); and the result to which we are forced is, that here is a human life rooted in the Divine, filled and environed by it. This is, of course, no ontological explanation; but it states the ethical and spiritual phenomenon which demands an explanation; and this explanation must reach to the sphere of personal being.

Precisely at this point, however, when the facts we are describing seem to pass beyond the limits of normal human experience, we are summoned to observe that the trust and obedience of Jesus were not maintained without strenuous solicitude, or the use of those means which aid the human spirit in its adherence to God. His obedience was not easy. His will, in its ceaseless surrender, was subjected to increasing strain. He learned obedience by the things which He suffered (Heb 5:8). The 'disposition of obedience' was always present. 'But the disposition had to maintain itself in the face of greater and greater demands upon it. And as He had to meet these demands, rising with the rising tide of the things which He suffered, He entered ever more deeply into the experience of what obedience was' (A. B. Davidson on Heb 5:7-10). His ability to bear the strain to which He was thus subjected is due to a trust in God which was continually revived by His habit of prayer, to which there is such frequent and significant reference in the narrative (Luk 3:21-22, Mar 1:35, Luk 5:16; Luk 6:12-13, Mat 14:23, Luk 9:18; Luk 9:28, Mat 26:36-44, Luk 23:46). An increasing revelation of the Divine will, an unceasing advance in obedience, a continuous exercise of trust, are the strands woven together in the character of Christ. The product is that perfect thing, a life which is His own, and is entirely human, which is also, at the same time, the coming of God to man.

3. Love to men.—The source of this characteristic, which shines resplendent from every page of the narrative, is to be found in that which we have just been considering, Christ's love to God. Here we must do justice to the facts brought before us in the portrait. The noblest servants of God in the field of humanity have done their work out of a sense of obligation. They have received so much from God, that they have felt themselves bound, by constraint of the love of which they are recipients, to serve their fellow-men; and in this service their love for men has grown, till it has become no unworthy reflexion of the love of God. It would be, however, a miserably inadequate account of the facts of Christ's ministry among men to say that He loved them out of a sense of duty, and served them in discharge of a debt which He owed to God. The vocation which formed His character was not bare will. It was love, seeking the redemption of men. Jesus' acceptance of this vocation meant that His love to God entered into, and blended with, the love of God to men. He loved God, and the love of God to Him became in Him the motive-power of His love to men. His love to God and His love to men constitute one energy of His soul. He turns toward the Father with the deep intelligence and the full sympathy of the Son;

and straightway He turns toward the world with the widest and tenderest charity (Mat 11:27-28, cf. Joh 10:15). Those, accordingly, upon whom Jesus poured His love, never sought to distinguish between it and the love of God. Enfolded by the love of Christ, they knew themselves to be received into the redeeming love of God; and their grateful love to Jesus was the proof and seal of the Divine forgiveness. 'Her sins, which are many, are forgiven: for she loved much' (Luk 7:47). Long before the doctrine of His Divinity was framed, the love of Christ was regarded by its recipients as the spiritual medium in which the Divine compassion reached them. Hebrew thought did not work with categories of being and substance. The human heart never works with categories at all. But it can identify love when it receives it; and therefore it makes an experimental synthesis of the love of Christ and the love of God, and sets Christ in a relation toward God occupied by no other man.

The love of God to man being such as He extends to no lesser creature implies that man has a value for God which no other creature possesses; and to Jesus man has the same supreme value. Of this value there are no earthly measurements, not any created thing (Mat 10:31; Mat 12:12), not any institution, however sacred (Mar 2:27), not even the whole world (Mar 8:36). Even the moral ruin, in which sin has involved human nature, does not diminish its value, but rather accentuates its preciousness, and adds to the love of God, and therefore also of Jesus, a note of inexhaustible passion (Mat 18:10; Mat 18:12-14). Christ's doctrine of man does not breathe the spirit of 18th cent. individualism. Not for man as a spiritual atom, self-contained and all-exclusive, does Jesus have respect. But for man akin to God, capable of Divine sonship, He has deep and loving admiration. Not for man, harassed with passions for whose might he is not responsible, guilty of acts which to comprehend is to pardon, does Jesus have regard. But for man, meant for so much and missing so much, framed for perfection, destroyed by his own deed, He has love and pity, throbbing in every word, passing through action and through suffering to the ultimate agony, the final victory of the Cross.

iv. Social relations.—We have now to follow the character of Christ, which we have been studying in its origin, its development, and its leading features, as it manifests itself in the relations in which He stood to His fellow-men. The narratives attempt no enumeration of incidents. They present us with typical instances, in which the true self of Jesus is disclosed. From these we are able to conceive the figure of Christ as He moved amid the circles where human life is ordinarily spent.

1. Family.—It is difficult, from the very scanty materials before us, to trace the relations of Jesus towards the members of His family circle, and to distinguish clearly their attitude towards Him. Yet the following points may be regarded as certain: (I) The life of Jesus, prior to His baptism, was spent within the family circle, and was characterized by two features. First, a loyal and affectionate discharge of the duties

of a son, presumably as bread winner for His mother. The very astonishment of His fellow-villagers at His subsequent career is sufficient evidence that during the period prior to His public ministry He fulfilled the ordinary obligations of family life. Second, a deepening sense of His vocation, which, while it did not render Him less dutiful as a son and brother, could not fail to give Him a distinctiveness which would inevitably excite adverse criticism on the part of His kindred, should they prove unsympathetic or unintelligent.

(2) The attitude of His mother towards Him, both before and after His baptism, was twofold. (a) Belief in His unique mission and extraordinary powers. Her words to Him in Cana of Galilee (Joh 2:3) are pointless, unless they express a persuasion, born of long pondering, and revived by the recent events connected with His baptism, that He has a mission which could be nothing less than Messianic, and that the time has come for the display of powers with which necessarily He must be endowed for the fulfilment of His task. (b) A profound misconception of the nature of His mission, and of the means by which it should be inaugurated and carried on, together with a critical attitude towards Him, in regard to what she evidently considered an inexplicable, and even blameworthy, negligence on His part to seize the opportunity presented in the circumstances of the feast. For this misunderstanding we need not greatly blame her, for it was shared by His disciples even after the Resurrection; unless, indeed, we conceive, what is most probable, communings between mother and son during those long silent years, which might lead us to marvel that she, who surely might have understood, failed as completely as others to discern His purpose.

(3) The attitude of His 'brethren' is still less intelligent. There is no suggestion in the narrative of any sympathy with Him whatsoever. After thirty years together, they could find no other explanation for His behaviour than temporary insanity, and could conceive no other plan than to put Him under temporary restraint. If His mother joined in this estimate and this proposal (Mar 3:21), it must have been with the conviction that she had the right and duty of intervening to save Him from Himself, and rescuing Him from a course which would prove fatal to His mission as she conceived it. It is certain that she joined His 'brethren' in making an approach to Him, with the obvious intention of inducing Him to change His plan of action (Mar 3:31). At a later stage His brethren offered Him a final challenge (Joh 7:3-4). They did not believe in Him (v. 5), and therefore their suggestion to Him has not quite the sense of Mary's at Cana of Galilee. It expresses their demand to have this matter of His Messiahship (about which *they* had no doubts) settled once for all by open demonstration: 'Manifest thyself to the world.'

Here, then, is the situation of Jesus with respect to His family. He loves His kindred as son and brother; but He knows that His vocation demands the sacrifice of family life, and this sacrifice, with its deep pain, He is prepared to make. He is called upon,

however, to endure a yet deeper pain. Not only has He to leave the dear fellowship of the home, and face a world which will prove in the end bitterly hostile, but among the members of the home He can find no understanding hearts to cheer Him and comfort Him on His lonely way. Worse still, when His nearest and dearest withstand Him, or seek to divert Him from His appointed path, He has to repel them in words which He knows must keenly wound them. To be tempted by His very love for His mother and His brethren to deviate from the line of obedience to His mission, must have put a peculiar strain upon His spirit, and brought Him most exquisite pain. In each of the incidents alluded to above we feel this note of pain: when He declines the intervention of His mother (Joh 2:4); when He turns from His mother and His brethren to His disciples (Mar 3:31-35); and when He has, in plain words, to state to His brethren that they and He belong to two different worlds of thought and action (Joh 7:3-9; cf. Joh 15:19). That between Him and His mother there was a bond of love deeper than all misunderstanding, gains pathetic proof when from the cross He commends her to His beloved disciple: 'Woman (the very word, *γύναι*, He had used in Cana of Galilee, courteous and affectionate, and yet suggestive of a cessation of the old relationship of mother and child), behold thy son.' 'Behold thy mother' (Joh 19:26 f.).

2. Friends.—The vocation of Christ was one which could be executed by Himself alone. Necessarily He lived in a deep spiritual solitude, to which no human being could have access. Yet no sooner did He take up the burden of His mission than He proceeded to surround Himself with companions, and to cultivate human friendships. In the relations of Jesus to His friends three points are to be noted.

(1) *His dependence upon them.*—It will be a profound mistake if we conceive the end for which Jesus lived in any barely historical or formal manner. The end was the Kingdom of God, or the New Covenant; but these titles do not, in the mind or language of Christ, stand for a political or ecclesiastical institution. They mean, fundamentally, an experience of God generically identical with that enjoyed in Israel, but perfected, and therefore also universalized. This experience is destined, in the counsels of God, for humanity. To secure it for mankind, so that under fit spiritual conditions all men may enter into it, is the task which Jesus in clear consciousness definitely assumed. Suppose Him, however, to have fulfilled His task as the Servant of the Lord, He will lose His labour, unless He secure representatives and witnesses, who shall declare to all whom it concerns the accomplishment of God's gracious purpose. This testimony, moreover, cannot be borne by mere officials. Suppose, for instance, that the Resurrection was a fact. Suppose, further, that it had been verified by the investigations of experts drawn from the chief seats of learning of the ancient world. Nothing is more certain than that this testimony, taken alone, would not have advanced by a hairbreadth the purpose to which Jesus devoted Himself. Testimony to

certain facts, there is no doubt He required; but this testimony would be valueless, did it not presuppose, and rest on, personal acquaintance with Himself, and participation in His own fellowship with God. His representatives must be His friends, bound to Him by personal ties of close and intelligent sympathy; capable of bearing witness, not merely to a series of His acts, but to His character and to His influence; having an understanding not merely of His doctrine, but of Himself. It was essential, therefore, that from the outset He should have friends about Him, to whom He should fulfil all the sacred obligations of a friend. When, accordingly, He comes to give them their commission, He makes it plain to them that His vocation is their vocation, having the same Divine origin, and carrying with it His own spiritual presence (Luk 4:18; Luk 4:21; Luk 4:43, Mat 15:24; Mat 10:40-42, Joh 20:21, Mat 28:19-20).

How much the friendship of His disciples was to Jesus, the whole narrative bears witness. Their faith in Him was the greatest encouragement, apart from immediate Divine assurances, that He could receive as He faced the appalling difficulties of His task. There is an unmistakable note of pathos in His clinging to His disciples, when the natural support of family loyalty is denied Him. They were to Him brother, sister, mother. There can be no doubt that, had His three most intimate friends watched unto prayer, His last agony would have been alleviated. It is the pathos of His position that His friends never knew how much He depended on them. To them He was the Strong One upon whom they leaned, from whom they took everything, to whom, in unconscious selfishness, they gave but little. Love must have been to Jesus a constant hunger. Never in all His life did He get it satisfied; and yet it never failed, but remained the master passion of His soul. 'Having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end.'

(2) *His self-communications to them.*—The chief thing a friend can give to a friend is himself; and Jesus poured out on His friends the wealth of His personality: His love (Joh 13:34), His knowledge (Joh 15:15), His example (Joh 13:15); so that, when He reviews His life, He can plead with His Father His own perfect fulfilment of love's obligations (Joh 17:6; Joh 17:8; Joh 17:12). The riches of Christ, thus bestowed upon them, vivified their imagination, quickened their emotion, enlightened their understanding, subdued and renewed their wills, till they came to be not wholly unfit representatives of Him on whose errand they went. This influence, which Jesus exerted, had none of the aspect of an impersonal force. It consisted in the touch of spirit upon spirit in the mystic depths of fellowship; and this touch is not to be conceived as having the equal pressure of the atmosphere. Under certain conditions, which are necessarily too deep and delicate for analysis, the love of Christ gathered an intensity which made His friendship in these instances special and emphatic (Joh 11:3; Joh 11:5; Joh 13:23). Yet so exquisite was His tact, so evident His goodwill, that those about Him, though they might quarrel among themselves for pre-eminence, never brought against Him the charge of favouritism. They knew He

loved them according to the measure of their receptivity, and with a reserve of tenderness and power for ever at their disposal. They assented as in a dream to His own word, 'Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends' (Joh_15:13). Afterwards they awoke, and remembered, and understood.

(3) *Their response to Him.*—It is impossible to miss the brighter aspect of their attitude towards Him. *They were glad in His company*, happier than the disciples of the Pharisees or of John, happy as sons of the bride-chamber (Mar_2:19). This joy of theirs in His presence throws a very lovely light upon His character. He knew the goal toward which His steps were taking Him, and was standing within sight of the cross. Yet no shadow from His spirit clouded theirs. They rejoiced in Him, and in the new world of religious experience to which He introduced them. They knew themselves to be possessed of privileges, which from the point of view of the OT had been no more than an aspiration. In the fellowship of their Master and Friend they stood nearer to God than the ripest saint of the OT, immeasurably nearer than any legalist of their own day. This joy of theirs in Him is, besides, reflection and proof of His joy in them. It is strange, when we consider the spiritual elevation at which He lived, but it is certain, that He had a very real joy in their presence. He delighted to stimulate their minds by questioning, to enrich their conceptions by definite teaching. He welcomed every indication of their growing intelligence; and when He discerned that they were awake to His meaning, 'He rejoiced in the Holy Spirit' (Luk_10:21).

They trusted Him.—The result at which Jesus aimed in all His dealings with them was the production in them of faith; and by faith He meant a trust in Himself as complete as that which men ought to repose in God. Without doubt, this raises far-reaching questions regarding His personal relation to God. But the fact itself remains, as an element in the portrait of Christ, whether presented by the Synoptics or by the Fourth Gospel, that Jesus directed men to Himself as the source of all good, whether lower or higher (Mat_8:10; Mat_8:13, and many instances connected with the healing of the body; Luk_7:50, and other instances where spiritual effects are secured by faith, which are to be found in the Synoptics, and more copiously in the Fourth Gospel). His 'training of the Twelve' was not wholly fruitless. They gave Him what He sought, though not with the largeness and simplicity for which He longed.

It is noteworthy that their faith in Him is not to be gauged by its verbal expression. That might be surprisingly full, while the faith might be most rudimentary; or the expression of faith might well-nigh be silent, while yet the trust itself remained, scarce distinguishable from despair, and yet a root whence life might come. From the beginning Jesus produced an impression upon those admitted to His company, for which they felt there was only one possible interpretation; and this, even at that early stage, they stated with great fulness (Joh_1:41; Joh_1:45; Joh_1:49). Jesus, however, did not consider that His end was gained, but proceeded with His education

of these men, and allowed all factors in the case, especially such as seemed to exclude the possibility of Messianic glory, to make their due impress. Then, at the proper psychological moment, He put the supreme question—‘Who say ye that I am?’ and received from Peter’s lips the confession of His Messiahship (Mat 16:16 f.). Even then Jesus was under no illusion with respect to the faith which had received such emphatic expression. He made allowances for an eclipse of faith which might seem total; but still, in spite of all appearances, He believed in His disciples’ faith in Him, not indeed in their intellectual or emotional utterances, but in the surrender of their wills to Him, and their personal loyalty.

We are thus recalled to the darker side of their relations with Him. Indeed, readers of the narrative are apt to be more severe in their judgment upon the disciples than was the Master Himself. Certainly their defects and shortcomings are patent enough, and the contrast between their Master and them can scarcely be exaggerated. He has not where to lay His head; their minds are occupied with the question of rewards (Mat 19:27). He is meek and lowly in heart; they dispute about pre-eminence (Mat 18:1-3, Luk 22:24). His kingdom is for the poor in spirit; they lay plans for private advantage (Mat 20:20). It is not of this world; to the end they are thinking of physical force (Luk 22:49). He invites all to His fellowship; they are narrow and exclusive (Mar 9:38-40). Fury is not in Him; they would invoke judgment upon adversaries (Luk 9:54-56). They boasted their courage; but in the hour of His uttermost peril ‘they all forsook him, and fled’ (Mat 26:56). There can be no doubt that these things greatly moved Him, but the note of personal offence is entirely lacking. There is astonishment at their slowness, but no bitterness or petulance: ‘Do ye not remember?’ (Mar 8:18); ‘Are ye also even yet without understanding?’ (Mar 15:16); ‘Have ye not yet faith?’ (Mar 4:40). Sometimes silence is His severest answer: ‘Lord, here are two swords! It is enough!’ (Luk 22:38). He makes His very censures the occasion of further instruction: ‘It is not so among you.... The Son of Man came to minister’ (Mar 10:43-45). Even when His spirit was most grieved, there was no flash of resentment, but only the most poignant tenderness: ‘Simon, sleepest thou? couldest thou not watch one hour?’ ... (Mar 14:37); ‘The Lord turned, and looked upon Peter’ (Luk 22:61).

This ignorance and waywardness on the part of His disciples, combined with their genuine love for Him and His abounding love for them, constituted a very severe trial of Jesus’ fidelity to His vocation. ‘The greatest temptation,’ says a keen analyst of character, ‘is the temptation to love evil in those we love, or to be lowered into the colder moral atmosphere of intense human affection, or to shrink from what is required of us that would pain it.’ Jesus loved His friends. He knew that His course of conduct would inflict upon them unspeakable disappointment and distress; and this knowledge must have filled His own heart with keenest pain. When, accordingly, the disciple who most clearly confessed His Messiahship denounced the path He had

chosen, the path of suffering, as inconsistent with the rank He had led His friends to believe was His, He felt Himself assailed in what the author above quoted ventures to call His 'weakest point.' It was *the* Temptation repeated; and as such He repelled it with hot anger.

In the case of one of the Twelve, it is to be noted that his criticism was not a temptation, because it was not the result of uncomprehending love, but of intelligent and bitter hate. Judas discerned the inevitable issue of Jesus' line of action; perceived that it involved all his own secret ambitions in utter ruin; and in revenge determined to be the instrument of the destruction which he foresaw. Again and again Jesus interposed to save him by warnings, which Judas alone could comprehend in their dreadful significance: 'One of you shall betray me' (Joh_13:21; cf. Joh_6:70 'One of you [the Twelve] is a devil'). In the end He had to let him go: 'That thou doest, do quickly' (Joh_6:27). The depth of Jesus' acquaintance with God, the honour He put on human nature, may be measured by His dealing with Judas. There are some things God cannot do. This Divine inability Jesus recognized, and made it the norm of His own dealing with souls. We need not apologize for Jesus' choice of Judas. He chose him for the very qualities which led Him to the others, and which were, perhaps, present in Judas in a conspicuous degree. He loved him as He loved the others, and with a yet deeper yearning. But there came a time when, in imitation of the Father, He felt bound to stand aside. To have saved Judas by force would have violated the conditions under which the redemption of man is possible.

Even the briefest review of Christ's relations to His friends constrains the inference that, in the essential qualities of friendship, He is perfect; and the supposition becomes altogether reasonable, that, if He were alive now and accessible, the possession of His friendship would be salvation, and the loss of it would be the worst fate that could befall any human being.

3. Mankind.—The attitude of Jesus toward His fellow-men is determined by the function which He had been led, through His deep sympathy with God, to assume on their behalf. He believes Himself called to 'fulfil,' *i.e.* to perfect, and so to accomplish as permanent spiritual fact, the religion of the OT. We must not raise premature questions, but we must not evade plain facts. Jesus springs from the OT. He transcended it in this, that He believed the privileges of the New Covenant were to be verified, consummated, and bestowed upon men, through His mission. This mission He accepted, in clear prevision of what it involved, and in deep love to God and to men. It is plain that such a position carries with it unique authority, and warrants claims of extraordinary magnitude. He who knows Himself to be the mediator of the highest good to men knows Himself to be supreme among men. This consciousness is clear and unmistakable in the utterances of Jesus. He presents Himself to men as the object of a trust and a reverence that are nothing less than

religious (Mar 2:17, Luk 19:10, Mat 10:32; Mat 18:20). He passes verdicts upon their inner state that are not less than Divine in their insight and their absoluteness (Luk 9:57-62, Mat 9:2; Mat 9:6). He makes demands which no one has a right to make who does not know Himself to be completely the organ of the Divine authority (Mat 4:19; Mat 9:9; Mat 19:21; Mat 10:37). He claims to be the arbiter of the final destinies of men (Mar 8:38, Mat 7:21-23; Mat 13:41; Mat 16:27, together with the undoubted teaching of the so-called eschatological discourses Mat 25:1 ff.), a function which in the OT belongs not even to Messiah, but to Jehovah alone (Joe 3:12, Mal 3:1; Mal 4:3). Such a consciousness, whose intensity suggests, if it does not prove, a unique constitution of the person of Christ, throws into high relief aspects of the character of Christ which seem at a cursory glance incongruous with it.

(1) *Lowliness.*—The self-assertion of Jesus is not the assertion of a self independent in its power and dignity, but of a self which has no interest save the cause of God, no glory that is not His. At the heart of the self-assertion of Jesus there is profound self-renunciation. It would be a mistake to describe Jesus as selfless. He has a self, which He might have made independent of God, which, however, in perfect freedom of act, He surrendered wholly to God. The lowliness of Christ, accordingly, is not mere modesty or diffidence. It is the quality of a self, at once asserted and denied. This paradox is carried out during His whole career. In youth, when the purpose of His life is being formed, there is no irritable self-consciousness. In manhood, when the knowledge of His mission is clear and full, and the spiritual distance which separated Him from other men is obvious to His inward eye, there is no outward separateness of manner. The life of the common people was His life, without any trace of condescension or hint of masquerade. His acceptance of the lowly conditions of His life is so complete, that there is no sense of incongruity on His part between what He was and the world He lived in. In His teaching He is able to attack pride without any risk of having imputed to Him a pride more subtle and more offensive. More remarkable still, He offers Himself as a pattern of the very humility He is inculcating, without raising any suspicion of unreality. The words, ‘I am meek and lowly in heart’ (Mat 11:29), on the lips of any other man, would refute the claim they make. In His case it is not so. They mean that the self which lays its yoke on men is already crucified, and has no claim to make on its own behalf. Toward the close of His life its open secret is given, when, at the Last Supper, in full consciousness of His personal dignity, He washed the feet of those who, He knew, would fail Him in the end, and of one by whose impending treachery His own would soon be nailed to the cross.

(2) *Considerateness.*—With His idea of man and His conception of His vocation, it was impossible for Jesus to regard human personality as other than sacred. All the dues of humanity, accordingly, He paid with scrupulous exactitude. It would be superfluous to search in the narratives for instances of His justice, honesty, and truth. The distinctiveness of His calling kept Him apart from the ecclesiastical and political

institutions of His country; but He was careful not to disturb them, even when He felt most critical of them (Mat 17:24-27, Mar 12:17), and the charge of rebellion was readily seen by Pilate to be baseless. The same distinctiveness deprived Him of a business career, and, therefore, of the sphere wherein many virtues are most severely tried; but it is noteworthy that the disciple company had a treasurer, whose duty it was to take care of the money intrusted to him, and whose dishonesty became a step toward Calvary (Joh 12:6). Towards individuals His attitude was wholly without respect of persons. He paid men the honour of being perfectly frank and fearless in all His dealings with them. He did them the justice of letting them know the judgment He passed upon them. Herod, Pilate, the Pharisees, stood before His bar and heard their sentence. His fairness is never more conspicuous than in His dealing with Judas, whom He would not permit to suppose that he was undetected, Jesus fully recognizing that a man's probation can be carried on only in the light.

But there is due to human nature more than the strictest honesty or truth. Jesus' authority over men, instead of leading Him to be careless in the handling of a soul, impelled Him to an exquisite carefulness which extended from the needs of the body to the more delicate concerns of the mind. If He imposes heavy tasks, He remembers the frailty of the human frame: 'Come ye apart, and rest awhile' (Mar 6:31). If the coming grief saddens His companions, He turns from His own far deeper sorrow to still their tumultuous distress: 'Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid' (Joh 14:1). If He must rebuke, His reproaches pass into excuses: 'The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak' (Mat 26:41). Most lovely of all is His treatment of those who might seem to have forfeited all claim to respect. He laboured by a more emphatic courtesy, a more tender chivalry, to bind up the broken self-respect, and to rebuke that insolent contempt of the sinful and degraded which so deeply dishonours God. Before the ideal in publican and harlot He bowed in reverence, and constituted Himself its resolute defender.

(3) *Compassion.*—The respect which Jesus has for human nature becomes, in presence of human need, a very passion for helping, healing, saving. The qualities which most deeply impressed the men and women of His day, and which shine most clearly in His portrait, are not His supernatural gifts, but His unwearied goodness, His sincere kindness, His great gentleness, His deep and tender pity. By these He has captivated the imagination, and won the reverence of humanity. The narratives have felt the throbbing compassion of Jesus' heart, and have used the very phrase with a sweet monotony (Mar 1:41, Mat 20:34; Mat 9:36, Luk 7:13, Mat 14:14; Mat 15:32).

The compassion of Jesus is manifest in *the wonderful works* which are ascribed to Him. All of them, with the exception of 'the coin in the fish's mouth' and 'the withering of the fruitless fig-tree,' which have a special didactic aim, are works of mercy. They are, no doubt, proofs of power; but they are essentially instances of the

sympathy of Jesus, in virtue of which He enters into the fulness of human need. The instinct of one Evangelist has no doubt directed subsequent thought toward the truth. When Jesus wrought His healing miracles, He was fulfilling a prophecy which had special reference to sin (Mat 8:17). By no easy exercise of power did He relieve the distresses of men, but by a real assumption of their sorrow. Every such act stands in organic connexion with the deed of the Cross, in which He bare the sin which is the root of all human infirmities.

Yet more conspicuously the compassion of Jesus is to be seen in the *method of His ministry*, which led Him to seek the company of sinners, not because their sin was not abhorrent to His nature, but because He loved His vocation, and loved those who were its objects. The disinterestedness which Plato ascribes to the true physician deepens, in the case of this Healer of men, to a pure and burning passion. Twice His compassion found vent in tears: once in presence of man's mortality, once in sight of the city whose abuse of privilege had earned extremity of woe. There are depths here we cannot fathom, since there is mercifully denied us perfect knowledge of the evil which Jesus' knowledge of God fully disclosed to His view. Knowing God, living in unbroken fellowship with Him, Jesus knew, as none other could, what sin and death were. He lived and died with the spectacle of their power ever before Him. His knowledge is the measure of His compassion, and both are immeasurable.

(4) *Forgiveness*.—Without doubt, Jesus believed Himself to be the agent of the Divine love, the mediator of the Divine forgiveness. He had power *on earth* to forgive sins (Mat 9:6). This forgiveness He announced as the prerogative of His office; but the actual experience of forgiveness, as the redeeming act of God, came through the love which Jesus Himself manifested. His welcome of sinners was their reception into the fellowship of God. This is a fact which no prejudice against doctrine ought to invalidate, which, probably, no doctrine can adequately explain. Hence follow two features of the portrait of Christ, each most significant and suggestive. He accepted the gratitude of forgiven sinners as though He were God's own representative (Luk 7:40-50); and He regarded sins committed against Himself as committed against God, who in His mission was seeking to save men. His forgiveness of such offences, accordingly, is not measurable in terms of quantity—unto seven times or seventy times seven; but has the very qualities of boundlessness and inexhaustibleness which He attributes to the forgiveness of God. There is only one limitation, and that does not belong to the character of God, but to the constitution of human nature. There is a sin which hath never forgiveness (Mat 12:31-32, Mar 3:28-29, Luk 12:10). It does not consist, however, in a definite offence against God or His Christ, but in a frame of mind, an habitude of soul, which is psychologically beyond reach of forgiveness. Apart from this limit, which on God's side is none, forgiveness is infinite.

When, accordingly, we proceed to examine the sins committed against Jesus, we perceive that they form an ascending scale of guilt, according to the advancing measure of light and privilege against which they were committed, and so also of pain to Him and of peril to the transgressors. First, there is the sin of those who were directly responsible for His death. Dark and dreadful though this was, compounded of the vilest qualities of polluted human nature, it was, nevertheless, even in its deadliest guilt, not a sin against absolutely clear conviction. Hence the victim of so much wrong prays even while the nails rend His flesh: 'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do' (Luk_23:34). It is impossible to narrow the scope of this petition to the unconscious instruments, the Roman soldiers; it must extend also to the Jews themselves, to the mob, and even to their more guilty rulers. Peter (Act_3:17) and Paul (1Co_2:8) cannot have been mistaken in their interpretation of the crime which slew their Lord.

Second, there is the sin of those who deserted Him in His need, and especially of him who denied his Master with oaths and curses. They were bound to Jesus by every tie of affection and of loyalty. He trusted them, and they failed Him. Yet it could not be said of them that they *knew* what they did. Their action was without premeditation, without real sense of its meaning. A spasm of overpowering fear confounded their intelligence and destroyed their resolution. Shameful it was, and must have wrung the heart of Jesus with anguish; yet at its worst it was committed against the Son of Man, not against the Holy Spirit. They knew not what they were about to do, but He knew (Mar_14:27), and broke their hearts with His free forgiveness (Mar_14:72).

Third, the sin of Judas. Of all the crimes of which guilty man is capable, treachery is, in the judgment of all men, the most dreadful; and therefore Dante (*Inferno*, xxxi. 134) has placed Judas in the jaws of Lucifer. Did Judas, then, commit the sin against the Holy Spirit? It is profitless to discuss the question. No absolute verdict is possible. It is certain that Jesus dealt with Judas, in clear light of truth, with the utmost consideration, and with far-reaching forbearance. Appeal after appeal He made to him, seeking to reveal him to himself, while scrupulously shielding him from the suspicions of his fellows, and retaining him to the last possible moment within the sphere of loving influence. Finally, He gave him that permission to do wrong which human freedom wrings from Divine omnipotence, and which is, at the same time, God's severest judgment upon the sinner (Joh_13:27, Mat_26:50 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). Who can tell if it be not also God's last offer of mercy? In the end (perhaps not too late), the goodness of Jesus smote with overwhelming force upon the conscience of Judas. He 'repented himself' (Mat_27:3). Whatever value may be attached to such repentance, whatever destiny may have awaited Judas beyond the veil of flesh, which he so violently tore aside, there can at least be no more impressive testimony to the forbearance, the love, and the wisdom of Jesus, than this overwhelming remorse.

v. The Virtues of His vocation.—The end for which Jesus lived determined all His actions, and called into exercise all the virtues of His character, as well the more general characteristics of spiritual-mindedness, love to God, and love to men, as the specific virtues of His social relations. The vocation of Jesus, however, as Servant of the Lord was definite; and with respect to it He had a definite work to do. Questions as to the conceptions which it implies with respect to the constitution of Christ's person do not now concern us. But we are concerned to observe that, in His discharge of His duty, certain aspects of His character shine forth with special beauty. They are such as these—

1. Faithfulness.—There is an unmistakable note of compulsion in His life. He has received a precise charge, and He will carry it out with absolute precision and unswerving fidelity. This is the mind of the boy, when as yet the nature of His mission cannot have been fully before Him (Luk 2:49). This is the conviction of the man, who has come to know what office He holds, and what is the thing He has to do or endure (Mat 16:21, Mar 8:31). Many specific expressions (e.g. Joh 4:34; Joh 9:4-5; Joh 11:9-10) and the whole tenor of His life convey the same impression of a man looking forward to a goal, in itself most terrible, yet pressing toward it with unwavering determination. The imperative of duty, and the burden of inexorable necessity, are laid upon His conscience; and He responds with complete obedience.

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who displays a singular insight into the ethical conditions of Christ's work, mentions the virtue of fidelity as being conspicuous in 'the Apostle and High Priest of our confession' (Heb 3:2; Heb 3:6), and draws a far-reaching parallel and contrast between Him and Moses, as between a son and a servant. In filial faithfulness there are three aspects: (a) perfect identification with the Father's will, (b) entire absorption in the Father's concerns, (c) free access to the Father's resources; and these are plainly seen in Christ's discharge of His duty. There is not the slightest trace of servility. The will to which He yielded absolute devotion is that of One whom He perfectly loved and trusted, to whom He could freely come for everything He required. The absolute control of the Divine resources, which is attributed to Him in the Fourth Gospel (Joh 13:3), is borne out by every trait of the Synoptic portrait. He was not toiling with inadequate resources at an uncomprehended task. Even when the strain upon His will is heaviest, and His whole soul shrinks from what lies before Him, there is one word which delivers His faithfulness from any suspicion of bondage: '*Father*, if it be possible' ... (Mat 26:39; Mat 26:42, Mar 14:36, Luk 22:42).

2. Courage.—The courage of Jesus Christ is the crown of His faithfulness. It was not tested by such occasions as the sinking ship or the stricken field, but by conditions yet more severe. Outraged prejudice, wounded pride of caste, threatened privilege, were banded together to destroy Him. They disguised themselves in zeal for the honour of

God. They, no doubt, attracted to their side sincere, though unenlightened, loyalty to His cause; and Jesus must have known the reformer's keenest pain, the sense of wounding good and true men. They sought alliances with powers most alien to their professed aims. They found support in the ignorant enthusiasm of the multitude, who mistook the aims of Jesus, and in the more culpable misunderstanding of His disciples and friends. The Fourth Gospel is surely historic in representing the breach between Jesus and the leaders of the religious world of His day as having taken place in the opening weeks of His ministry. It is inconceivable that the wide divergence of His views from those of the Pharisees and Sadducees should not have been manifest in the very first announcement of them. He certainly was not, and His adversaries could not have been, blind to the issues of the controversy. It had not proceeded far, when it became apparent to them that it could be terminated only by their defeat or by His destruction. With unscrupulous plans and bitter hate they laboured to compass His ruin. With sublime courage He persevered in His vocation, though He was well aware that every step He took only made the end more certain. When the end comes, it finds Him spiritually prepared. He moves with firm and equal tread. From the loving fellowship of the Supper He passes, without bewilderment, to the conflict of Gethsemane. From the shadow of the trees and the darker shade of His unknown agony, He goes to face the traitor, with no other tremor than that of amazement at such consummate wickedness (Luk 22:48); and surrenders Himself to the instruments of injustice, less their captive than their conqueror. Amid the worst tortures men can inflict, we hear no murmur. We do not merely observe, with what of admiration it might have deserved, a stoical fortitude, which proudly repels every assault on the self-sufficiency of the human spirit. We observe a more moving spectacle, the Servant of the Lord accepting unfathomed pain as the crown of His vocation, thus rendering to the Father a perfect obedience, and finishing the work given Him to do.

3. Patience.—It is an error to describe patience as a 'passive' virtue, if by that epithet is indicated the spirit which makes no resistance, because resistance is seen to be futile. Patience is rather the associate of courage, and springs from the same root, namely, identification of will with a great and enduring purpose. Jesus has made the eternal purpose of God for the redemption of man the controlling principle of His life; and therefore He is enabled to be patient, in the widest and deepest meanings of the term. *He patiently waits for God.* This lesson He learned from the OT; this gift He acquired in that deep communion with God, which was the privilege of the OT believer, and is the heart of all true religion. Nothing is more remarkable in a man so intense, endowed, moreover, with supernatural powers, than His reserve. He is eager for the achievement of His task, straitened till His baptism be accomplished (Luk 12:50). Yet He is never betrayed into rashness of speech or action. He maintains His attitude of intent expectancy. The idea of an 'hour' for Himself, and for His work, and for His great victory, known to the Father, and made known at His discretion, lies deep in the heart of Jesus (Mar 13:32; Mar 14:41, Luk 10:21, Joh 2:4; Joh 4:21;

Joh 4:23; Joh 5:25; Joh 5:28; Joh 7:30; Joh 8:20; Joh 12:23; Joh 12:27; Joh 13:1; Joh 17:1). To Him time was the measure of God's purpose; death, 'God's instant.' He μακροθυμεῖ, *suffers long with wayward or injurious persons*. God hides Him in His pavilion from the strife of tongues, and from that sense of personal injury which enkindles temper and provokes unadvised speech. So identified is He with God, that offences against Himself lose themselves in Divine forgiveness. His meekness is not weakness, but that amazing strength which can take up a personal wrong, and carry it into the Divine presence with vicarious suffering. He ὑπομένει, *endures in undying hope the severest trial* (Heb 12:2-3). The idea that His death was unexpected by Jesus, and felt by Him to demand an explanation which He attempted to provide in obscure suggestions and laboured analogies, is most false to the profound unity of His character. The Cross is the key to His character. This was the climax of His mission, the introduction to the victory which lay beyond; and this, when it came, He endured with a 'brave patience' which was rooted in His assurance that His vocation was from God and could not fail. This was His victory, even His patience (Rev 1:9).

4. Calmness.—The patience of Jesus has for its inner correlative deep serenity of soul. He lived in God; and, therefore, He was completely master of Himself. We observe in Him, as a matter of course, that control of the so-called lower desires of our nature which was the Greek conception of sober-mindedness or temperance. We see, beyond this, a more remarkable proof of self-possession in His control over the very motives and desires which impelled Him to devote His life to the service of God and man. There is no feeling of strain in the utterances of His soul as He speaks of or to His Father. The phenomena of excitement or rapture, which disfigure so many religious biographies, are wholly absent from the record of His deepest experiences. In His attitude toward men, whom He regarded it as His mission to save, there is perfect sanity. The harsh or strident note, which is scarcely ever absent in the speeches of reformers, is never audible in His words. His love for men is not a mountain torrent, but a deep, calm current, flowing through all His activities. We cannot, with verbal exactness, attribute to Him the 'enthusiasm of humanity,' which the author of *Ecce Homo* regards as the essential quality of a Christian in relation to his fellow-men, if, at least, the phrase suggest even the slightest want of balance, or any ignorance of the issues of action, or any carelessness with respect to them. He is the minister of the Divine purposes, never of His own emotions, however pure and lofty these may be. Yet we are not to impute to Him any unemotional callousness. He never lost His calmness; but He was not always calm. He repelled temptation with deep indignation (Mar 8:33). Hypocrisy roused Him to a flame of judgment (Mar 3:5; Mar 11:15-17, Mat 23:1-36). Treachery shook Him to the very centre of His being (Joh 13:21). The waves of human sorrow broke over Him with a greater grief than wrung the bereaved sisters (Joh 11:33-35). There were times when He bore an unknown agony, which could be shared by none, though He sought for human

sympathy up to the very gates of the sanctuary of pain (Joh 12:27, Mar 14:32-34). Yet, whatever His soul's discipline might be, He never lost His self-control, was never distracted or afraid, but remained true to His mission and to His Father. He feels anger, or sorrow, or trouble, but these emotions are under the control of a will that is one with the Divine will, and therefore are comprehended within the perfect peace of a mind stayed on God.

5. Self-sacrifice.—'Christ pleased not Himself' (Rom 15:3). These words, brief though they be, sum up the character of Christ as St. Paul conceived it. They convey, without doubt, the impression made by the record of His life. If this estimate is just, if Christ was an absolutely unselfish man, if 'He made a full sacrifice of Himself, His character stands alone, unique in the moral universe. We cannot make this statement without raising problems of immense difficulty, which it is the business of theology to face. But no mystery beyond ought to restrict our acknowledgment of ethical fact. Christ had a self, like other men, and might have made it, in its intense individuality, His end, laying a tax upon the whole universe in order to satisfy it. The ideal of self-satisfaction was necessarily present to His mind, inasmuch as it is inevitably suggested in all self-consciousness. It was definitely presented to Him in His temptation in the wilderness. But once for all in that initial conflict, and again and again in life, He beat back the temptation, rejected that ideal, surrendered Himself to His vocation, and sought no other satisfaction than its fulfilment. His life is a sacrifice. He set the world behind His back, and had no place or portion in it (Luk 9:58). The way He went was the path of self-denial and cross-bearing (Mar 8:34, Joh 12:25-26). His death was a sacrifice. The death of one whose life was a sacrifice must have had sacrificial significance for God and man. It could not be a fate to be explained by an after-thought. It must have been essentially an action, a voluntary offering made to God, laid on the altar of human need. The story of the Passion, read from the point where He steadfastly set His face to go to Jerusalem to the point where He went, *as He was wont*, to the Mount of Olives, and so through every detail of suffering, portrays, indeed, one led as a lamb to the slaughter, but as certainly one who, having power to keep His life, laid it down, in free surrender, in deep love to the Father (Joh 10:17-18). He was endowed with powers which He might have exerted to deliver Himself from the hand of His enemies; He did not so exert them. He did not even employ them to win one slightest alleviation of His sufferings. He might have saved Himself; yet, with deeper truth, Himself He could not save. The self-sacrifice of Christ is the foundation of the Kingdom of God, the purchase of man's redemption, the basis of that morality which finds in Him its standard and its example.

Concluding estimate.—When we have studied the character of Christ from the points of view suggested in the foregoing scheme, we are conscious that we are only on the threshold of a great subject, to whose wealth of meaning no formal study can do

justice. The character of Christ presents 'unsearchable riches' to every sympathetic student. Every generation, since His bodily presence was withdrawn, has been pursuing that investigation; none has comprehended His fulness, or been forced to look elsewhere for information and inspiration. He has laid upon us the necessity of continuously seeking to understand Him, and of applying, in the manifold occasions and circumstances of life, the fulness of the moral ideal presented in Himself.

1. When, however, we pause in our detailed study—to whatever length we may have carried it—or in our application of His precept and example—however successfully, or with whatever wistful consciousness of failure, we may have pursued it; when we lift our gaze afresh to the portrait presented in the Gospels, the impression deepens upon us with new and overwhelming conviction, that in Christ there is achieved, as a fact of the moral universe, **goodness**, not merely comparative, but absolute. It is not merely that among the choice spirits of our race He occupies the front rank, but that He stands alone. Jesus Christ is the Master of all who seek to know God, in the sense that His character is supreme and final in the moral progress of humanity. He is completely human. Like men, He pursued the pathway of development. Like men, He was assailed by temptation, and waged incessant warfare with evil suggestions. Yet He is absolutely unique. He is not merely better than other men. He is what all men ought to be. It is not merely that we see in Him an approximation to the moral ideal, nearer and more successful than is to be discerned in any other man; but that we find in Him the moral ideal, once for all realized and incarnated, so that no man can ever go beyond Him, while all men in all ages will find it their strength and joy to grow up toward the measure of His stature. Again and again we are made to feel, when we contemplate such virtues as have been adverted to in the preceding pages, e.g. love to God, love to men, consecration, unselfishness, and the like, that there is the note of absoluteness in His attainment. Between Him and the ideal there is no hairbreadth of disparity. His fulfilment of the will of God is complete. What God meant man to be is at once disclosed and finished.

2. The positive conception of the absolute goodness of Jesus carries with it the negative conception of His **sinlessness**. As we stand before the figure in the Gospels, our sense of His perfection reaches special solemnity and tenderness in the impression of His stainless and lovely purity. Attempts, no doubt, have been made to fasten some charge of sin on Jesus, e.g. that of a hasty or imperious temper; or even to extract from Himself some acknowledgment of imperfection (Mar_10:18). These attempts have totally failed, and have exhibited nothing so clearly as the fact that they are afterthoughts, designed to establish the *a priori* dogma that sinlessness is an impossibility. Such procedure is, of course, wholly unscientific. If a record, otherwise trustworthy, presents us with the portrait of a sinless man, we are not entitled to reject its testimony because, if we accept it, we shall have to abandon a dogma or

revise an induction. When, accordingly, we study the NT with unprejudiced mind, two great certainties are established beyond question.

(1) *The impression of His sinlessness made upon His disciples.*—Some of these men had been in close contact with Him, a fellowship so intimate that it was impossible that they could be mistaken in Him. Through this intimacy their moral ideas were enlarged and enriched; their spiritual insight was made delicate and true. The men who created the ethic of the NT are the spiritual leaders of the human race, and they owed their inspiration to their Master. They knew all the facts. They were spiritually competent to form a sound estimate. Without a tinge of hesitation they ascribe to Him complete separation from the very principle of evil (1Pe 2:22, 2Co 5:21, 1Jn 3:5, Heb 4:15; Heb 7:26). They assign to Him an office which required absolute sinlessness, knowing that any proof of deviation from the holiness of God would have reduced the claim they made on behalf of their Master to utter confusion (Act 3:14; Act 7:52; Act 22:14, 1Jn 2:1). A group of men, who knew Christ thoroughly, believed Him to be sinless. A generation, which had the facts fully before them, accepted this as the truth regarding Jesus of Nazareth. Add to this the mysterious effect the personality of Jesus had upon those whose contact with Him was brief, even momentary—Pilate (Luk 23:4), Pilate's wife (Mat 27:19), the centurion who superintended the judicial murder (Mar 15:39, Luk 23:47), the malefactor who died beside Him (Luk 23:40 ff.). Among all the witnesses the traitor himself is the clearest and fullest (Mat 27:4).

The knowledge which spirit has of spirit, the insight of our moral nature, the verdict of conscience, are all confounded if the taint of sin lay on the soul of Jesus.

(2) *His own self-knowledge and His own self-witness*, which establish the fact of a conscience at once perfectly true and absolutely void of any sense of sin.

(a) He taught His disciples to pray for forgiveness; but He never set them the example of asking it on His own behalf. He was their example in prayer as in all else; but that which is a constituent element in the prayers of all sinful men, the confession of sin and the supplication of forgiveness, does not appear in any prayer of His. There is even a scrupulous avoidance of any phrase which would seem to include Himself in the class of those whose prayers must contain this element, e.g. Mat 6:9; Mat 6:14; Mat 7:11, where 'ye' is emphatic and significant.

(b) He is absolutely intolerant of evil. He counsels the extreme of loss in preference to its presence (Mar 9:43-49). He traces it to its source in heart and will, and demands cleansing and renewal there (Mar 7:15-23). Yet nowhere does He bewail His own pollution, or seek for cleansing. He lives a life of strenuous devotion; but there is not a hint of any process of mortifying sin in His members. Such unconsciousness of sin

is a psychological impossibility, if His was simply the goodness of an aspiring, struggling, human soul, striving after the ideal, and ever drawing nearer it. By the very height of His ideal He would be convicted of shortcoming. But nothing in His language or bearing suggests, even remotely, such a conviction. We know this Man, and we know that in His own consciousness there was no gulf between Him and perfection, and that to His own deepest feeling there was between Him and the Father perfect moral identity. If this Man be a sinner, the competence of the moral judgment is destroyed for ever.

(c) He required moral renewal on the part of all men (Mat 18:3, Joh 3:5). But there is no record of the conversion of Jesus, and there is no hint of a belief on His part that He needed it. True, He accepted, or rather demanded, baptism of John; but His action, as interpreted by Himself, plainly implies that in uniting Himself with the sinful people, He was under constraint of love, and not under the compulsion of an alarmed and awakened conscience. That there was anything in His experience analogous to a death to sin of His own, and a rising into a life of new obedience, is contradicted by every line of the Gospel portrait.

(d) He loved and pitied sinners. His sympathetic treatment of them stands in lovely contrast with the cruelty of the Pharisaic method. Yet, in all His dealing with sinners, He preserves the note of ethical distinction. He unites Himself with sinners. His sin-bearing is a fact, even before Calvary. Yet at the point of closest and most sympathetic union with sinners there is complete inward aloofness from their sin. The contention that only a sinner can properly understand a sinner and fully sympathize with him, is purely *a priori*, and absolutely refuted by the ministry of Jesus. Did any philanthropist, any lover of souls, ever sympathize as Jesus did with sinners? Long before Christ, Plato had noted and disposed of the fallacy that a man needs to be tainted with sin before he can effectively deal with it. 'Vice can never know both itself and virtue; but virtue in a well-instructed nature will in time acquire a knowledge at once of itself and of vice. The virtuous man, therefore, and not the vicious man, will make the wise judge' (*Republic*, 409). Let us add, not a wise judge merely, but a loving friend and helper. Sin is a hindrance, not a help, in loving. The crowning help which Jesus bestowed on sinners was the forgiveness of sins. This was beyond doubt a Divine prerogative, both in the minds of those who observed His conduct and in His own. If He exercised it, therefore, while aware of His own sinfulness, He was uttering blasphemy, and the worst verdict of His critics was justifiable. His forgiving sin is absolute proof that to His own consciousness He was sinless.

(e) He died for sinners. What has just been said of His forgiving sinners applies with yet mightier force to His deed in dying. He believed it to be of such unique value for God that, on the ground of it, He could forgive the sins of men. Without trenching on

the discussions that gather round the death of Christ, and without attempting any dogmatic statement, we are safe in asserting that to Jesus His blood was covenant blood, ratifying the New Covenant which had been the profound anticipation of OT prophecy (Jer 31:31-34). No man, conscious of being himself a sinner, could have supposed that his death would create the Covenant and procure the forgiveness of sins. Since Jesus certainly believed that His death would have this stupendous effect, it is certain also that He believed Himself to be utterly removed from the need of forgiveness.

What is thus to be traced, as the implication of our Lord's dealing with sinners, becomes in the Fourth Gospel His explicit self-assertion. It may be that, had these utterances stood alone, they might have been discounted as due to dogmatic preconceptions on the part of the writer. Since, however, they are in complete psychological harmony with the whole Synoptic portraiture, they cannot be thus explained away. They are, besides, precisely what might be looked for, and carry with them strong internal evidence of their genuineness. Innocence may be unconscious of itself, but not that sinlessness which is the correlate of perfection. Self-knowledge must accompany that goodness which grows toward maturity, and maintains its integrity against temptation. Jesus did not live in a golden mist. He may be trusted in His self-witness; and the occasions mentioned in the Fourth Gospel on which He bore such witness are precisely those of great trial or deep experience, when a man is permitted, nay required, to state the truth regarding Himself. He bears witness: (α) before His enemies, as part of His self-defence (Joh 8:46), arguing from His purity of heart to His undimmed vision of things unseen; (β) to His own, as example and encouragement (Joh 15:10), revealing the secret of a serene and joyful life, as part of His last charge and message; (γ) to His Father, in an hour of sacred communion (Joh 17:4), as the review and estimate of His life; (δ) on the cross (Joh 19:30), as the summary of His long warfare, the note of final achievement of the whole will of God.

If Jesus were in any degree sinful, He must have known it, and had He known it He would have told us. If He knew it and did not tell us, we should have just cause of complaint against Him, since, in that case, He must have allowed a false impression to grow up regarding Him. If He was sinful and did not know it, He must fall out of the rank of the best men, because in that case He lacks the noblest and most moving element in the character of those who have agonized heavenward,—a deep sense of demerit and an adoring sense of the grace of God. But, in truth, the mere statement of these alternatives and inferences is intolerable. The conscience of the race has been created by Jesus Christ. His character is at once the rebuke and the inspiration of every age. He is the moral ideal realized once for all. There is no other, no higher

goodness than that which is incarnated in Him; and, as has been said, 'the difference between the highest morality that exists and a perfect one is a difference not of degree, but of kind' (Davidson, *Theol. of O.T.*).

To this affirmation regarding Jesus we are constrained to come. Nothing less is a fair interpretation of the record. He stands alone. Man though He be, He is distinguished from all men by unique moral and spiritual excellence. Between Him and God there is a relationship to which there is no parallel in the case of any other man. The absolute distinctiveness of the character of Christ is not a dogma, constructed under philosophical or theological influences. It is a fact to which every line of the portrait bears unanswerable evidence. Stated as a fact, however, it becomes at once a problem which cannot be evaded. 'Whence hath this man these things?' How the answer shall be framed,—whether the Nicene formula is adequate, or, if not, how it is to be corrected and supplemented, is the task laid upon the intellect and conscience of the Church of to-day. It is certain that upon the earnestness and honesty with which she takes up that task will depend her vitality and her permanence. It is certain also that intellectual progress in apprehending the mystery of the Person of Christ will be conditioned by moral progress in apprehending, appropriating, and reproducing the perfection of His character.

Literature.—The main source for any character study of Christ must be sought in the Gospels themselves. The *Lives of Christ* will, of course, give abundant information and help: Neander, Edersheim, Didon, Weiss, Beyschlag, Keim. Works dealing directly with the character of Christ as an ethical study seem to be rare. All Dr. Brace's works are penetrated by the ethical spirit: *Training of the Twelve, Kingdom of God, Galilean Gospel, Apologetics, Humiliation of Christ*. Seeley's *Ecce Homo*, and Abbott's *Philochristus* are helpful. An anonymous work, *The Gospel for the Nineteenth Century* (Longmans, Green, & Co.) has a most valuable study of the character of Christ. Robinson's *Studies in the Character of Christ* (Longmans, Green, & Co., 1900), Ullmann's *Sinlessness of Jesus*, Forrest's *Christ of History and Experience*, and Prof. Garvie's recent papers in the *Expositor* on 'The Inner Life of Christ,' Godet's *Defence of the Christian Faith*, Mackintosh's *Primer of Apologetics*, Nicoll's *The Church's One Foundation*, all deal with aspects of the subject. References also are to be found in works on *Systematic Theology*, by such writers as Dorner, Martensen, Oosterzee, and in last-named author's *Image of Christ*, as well as in treatises on *Christian Ethics*; cf. also Stalker's *Imago Christi*; Fairbairn's *Studies in the Life of Christ*, ch. iii.; Herrmann's *Communion with God*, p. 70ff.; Liddon's *BL* [Note: L Bampton Lecture.] , Lect. iv.

T. B. Kilpatrick.

⚠Charger

CHARGER.—The utensil referred to (Mat_14:8; Mat_14:11, Mar_6:25; Mar_6:28) was a flat tray or salver (Gr. πινάξι) with a narrow rim, and was usually made of brass, the surface being plain or ornamented with engraved or embossed designs, and varying in size from one to three feet in diameter. At an Oriental meal the tray is laid upon a low stool, the dishes being placed upon it, while those who partake sit or recline around it. The tray is also carried around by an attendant when presenting wine or drinks composed of water flavoured with lemon, rose, or violet essences.

In the two passages that describe Salome's request at Herod's birthday feast, the charger is mentioned as an essential part of the stipulation. In both narratives the demand is for the head of John the Baptist in a charger. In explanation of this it has to be noted that the daughter of Herodias had demeaned herself to play the part of a hired Oriental dancer, with the usual accompaniments of paint and jewellery, loose and showy costume, and gestures of indelicate suggestion. The appearance and dancing of the young princess had captivated the guests already exhilarated by the royal banquet, and prepared them to applaud anything clever and audacious from the same person. The king entered into the spirit of the occasion, and treating her as a paid performer, offered her for her services anything she might desire. And so when she requested that the head of John the Baptist might be served up to her on one of the trays from which the guests were being regaled, the unfeeling jest implied that this would be to her both her professional fee and her portion of the feast.

It was John the Baptist's last testimony against the artificial and insincere spirit of the age. When such a crime could be so lightly committed, the day of the Lord upon the nation could not be far off. Afterwards, when Herod addressed his questions to Christ, it was to find Him absolutely silent (Luk_23:9). The atrophy of moral feeling may be gradual, and be relieved by intervals of wrestling and regret, but at last unwillingness to feel becomes inability to feel.

A touch of witty caricature or grotesque exaggeration has often since then given pass and plausibility to something essentially wrong and in itself repulsive. When society is made selfish and artificial by luxury and the love of pleasure, it will keep its oaths of personal vanity although the gratification should stifle the voice of sincerity and truth.

G. M. Mackie.

☞ Chickens

CHICKENS.—See Animals, p. 64^a.

☞ Chief Priests

CHIEF PRIESTS (ἀρχιερεῖς).—In the Gospels ἀρχιερεὺς properly denotes the individual who for the time being held the office of Jewish high priest; and when the word occurs in its singular form, ‘high priest’ is the almost invariable rendering it receives throughout the NT, both in Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 (in Luk_3:2 ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Ἄννα καὶ Καϊάφα is rendered in Authorized Version ‘Annas and Caiaphas being the high priests,’ and in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘in the high priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas.’ In Act_19:14 ἀρχιερεὺς, as applied to ‘one Sceva, a Jew,’ is rendered ‘chief of the priests’ in Authorized Version, ‘a chief priest’ in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). For a general treatment of the office of the ἀρχιερεὺς in NT times, and also of the use of the word as a title of Christ by the author of Hebrews, reference must be made to art. High Priest. But in the Gospels and Acts the word occurs very frequently in the plural form (cf. Josephus *Vita*, 38, *BJ* iv. iii. 7, 9, 10, and *passim*), and on all such occasions, both in Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, it is translated ‘chief priests.’ It is these ἀρχιερεῖς, not the ἀρχιερεὺς proper, with whom we are concerned in the present article.

The precise meaning of ἀρχιερεῖς, as we meet it in the Gospels and Josephus, is not easily determined. A common explanation used to be that these ‘chief priests’ were the heads or presidents of the twenty-four courses into which the Jewish priesthood was divided (1Ch_24:4, 2Ch_8:14, Luk_1:5; Luk_1:8; Josephus *Ant.* vii. xiv. 7), or at least that these heads of the priestly courses were included under the term (see, e.g., the Lexicons of Cremer and Grimm-Thayer, s.v. ἀρχιερεὺς; Alford on Mat_2:4). It is true that some support for this view may be found in the expressions ‘all the chief (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘chiefs’) of the priests’ (2Ch_36:14, Neh_12:7), ‘the chief priests’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘the chiefs of the priests,’ Ezr_10:5). But it is noticeable, as Schürer pointed out (‘Die ἀρχιερεῖς im NT’ in *SK* [Note: K Studien und Kritiken.] for 1872), that in the LXX Septuagint the word ἀρχιερεῖς is never used of the heads of the priestly courses, and that the nearest

approximations to this term are such phrases as ἄρχοντες τῶν πατριῶν τῶν ἱερέων (1Ch 24:6) ἄρχοντες τῶν ἱερέων (Neh 12:7). And most scholars now take the view that the ἀρχιερεῖς were high priests rather than ‘chief priests,’ not leading representatives from the general body of the priesthood, but members of an exclusive high priestly caste.* [Note: In accordance with this view, Dr. Moffatt, in his Historical New Testament, renders ἀρχιερεῖς; ‘high priests,’ a plan which has also been adopted by the editor of The Corrected English New Testament (1905).]

As applied to this high priestly class, the word ἀρχιερεῖς would seem to denote primarily the official high priest together with a group of ex-high priests. For by NT times the high priestly office had sunk far from its former greatness. It was no longer hereditary, and no longer held for life. Both Herod and the Roman legates deposed and set up high priests at their pleasure (Josephus *Ant.* xx. x. 1), as the Seleucidae appear to have done at an earlier period (2Ma 4:24; Josephus *Ant.* xii. v. 1). Thus there were usually several ex-high priests alive at the same time, and these men, though deprived of office, still retained the title of ἀρχιερεῖς and still exercised considerable power in the Jewish State (cf. Josephus *Vita*, 38, *BJ* ii. xii. 6, iv. iii. 7, 9, 10, iv. iv. 3). In the notable case of Annas, we even have an ex-high priest whose influence was plainly greater than that of the ἀρχιερεὺς proper (cf. Luk 3:2, Joh 18:13; Joh 18:24, Act 4:6).

But Schürer further maintains that, in addition to the ex-high priests, the title was applied to the members of those families from which the high priests were usually chosen—the γένος ἀρχιερατικόν of Act 4:6. It appears from a statement of Josephus that the dignity of the high priesthood was confined to a few select families (*BJ* iv. iii. 6); and that this was really the case becomes clear upon an examination of the list which Schürer has compiled, from the various references given by the Jewish historian, of the twenty-eight holders of the office during the Romano-Herodian period (*HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. i. 196 ff., 204). Above all, in one passage (*BJ* vi. ii. 2) Josephus, after distinguishing the υἱοὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων from the ἀρχιερεῖς themselves, apparently combines both classes under the general designation of ἀρχιερεῖς. Schürer accordingly comes to the conclusion, which has been widely adopted, that the ἀρχιερεῖς of the NT and Josephus ‘consist, in the first instance, of the high priests properly so called, *i.e.* the one actually in office and those who had previously been so, and then of the members of those privileged families from which the high priests were taken’ (*op. cit.* p. 206). These, then, were

in all probability the ‘chief priests’ of the Authorized and Revised Versions . They belonged to the party of the Sadducees (Act 5:17; Josephus *Ant.* xx. ix. 1), and were, formally at least, the leading personages in the Sanhedrin.† [Note: When ἀρχιερεῖς are mentioned in the NT along with γραμματεῖς and πρεσβύτεροι, they almost invariably occupy the first place.] But in NT times their influence, even in the Sanhedrin, was inferior to that of the scribes and Pharisees, who commanded the popular sympathies as the high priestly party did not (Josephus *Ant.* xiii. x. 6, xviii. i. 4; cf. Act 5:34 ff; Act 23:6 ff.).

Literature.—Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii. i. pp. 174-184, 195-206, and ‘Die ἀρχιερεῖς im NT’ in *SK* [Note: K Studien und Kritiken.] , 1872, pp. 593-657; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i. p. 322 *t.*; Ewald, *H^l* [Note: I History of Israel.] vii. p. 479 ff.; Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible , artt. ‘Priests and Levites’ and ‘Priest in NT’; Hauck-Herzog, *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , art. ‘Hoher Priester’; *Jewish Encyc.*, art. ‘High Priest.’

J. C. Lambert.

☩ Childhood

CHILDHOOD.‡ [Note: For the Greek terms relating to the period of childhood, see following article.]

i. The Childhood of Jesus.—In the Lukan narratives of the Infancy and Childhood our Lord is described both as τὸ παιδίον Ἰησοῦς in His earliest years (Luk 2:27; Luk 2:40 : so also in Matthew 2 throughout), and as Ἰησοῦς ὁ παῖς when twelve years old. Beyond, however, the brief stories of Matthew 2 and Luke 2 we seek in vain for any information having any authority whatever concerning the early years of Jesus, or, for that matter, any part of His life prior to the Ministry. And what small fragments these beautiful stories are! This dearth of information for which so great a craving has been felt has repeatedly been remarked on: yet, after all, need we wonder very much at the silence of the Evangelical narratives concerning these matters? The early life of Jesus appears not to have come within their scope; for the purpose of the Evangelical compilation was not to furnish a ‘Life’ in the modern sense, but to set forth a gospel.

Their interest in Jesus in this respect begins pre-eminently with His baptism, as the simple exordium of St. Mark's Gospel indicates—'The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ.' Even in the case of St. Luke's Gospel, with its peculiar stock of early narratives in chs. 1, 2, the preface to the Acts indicates that its great concern was with the things that Jesus *did* and *taught* (Act_1:1). Whatever may be our views as to the source and authority of what is recorded in Matthew 1, 2, and whether we care to use the term 'envelope' (see Bacon, *Introd.* p. 198) or not in speaking of this portion of the Gospel, it is clear that these two chapters are something superadded to the main body of the Synoptic tradition; and it is the same with Luke 1, 2. The main narrative begins in the case of each of these Gospels at ch. 3, where parallels with St. Mark also begin to be furnished.

All that we have in the Canonical Gospels concerning the childhood of Jesus, strictly speaking, is found in Luk_2:40-52. The first twelve years are covered by Luk_2:40, whilst Luk_2:52 has to suffice for all the remaining years up to the commencement of the Ministry. The writer has nothing to tell save the story of the Visit to the Temple, and contents himself for the rest with simple general statements in Hebraic phraseology that irresistibly reminds us of what is said of 'the child Samuel' (1Sa_2:21; 1Sa_2:26). He has used practically the same formula to cover years of John the Baptist's history (Luk_1:80). As for the story of the Visit to the Temple, there is that about it which carries conviction that we have here a genuine and delightful glimpse of our Lord in His childhood—one only glimpse, which, however, suffices to show us what manner of child He was, on the principle of *ex uno discc omnes*. It is to be noted that there is no hint that He was regarded as a prodigy by His parents and the neighbours with whom He travelled up to Jerusalem. The element of the merely marvellous is at a minimum. The wonder that does show itself is in the region of the spirit, and appears in the beautiful intelligence and rare spiritual gleams (Luk_1:47-50) which the Boy displayed, astonishing alike to the Rabbis and to His bewildered parents.

The silence and restraint of the Canonical Gospels on this subject are best appreciated when viewed against the background which the Apocryphal Gospels supply. Perhaps the most valuable service that the latter writings render is that comparison with them so strongly brings out the intrinsic value and superiority of our Canonical Gospels. They show us conclusively what men with a free hand could and would do. This is conspicuously the case with reference to the early years of Jesus. The extravagant and miraculous stories told concerning His infancy and childhood, taken by themselves, would suffice to crush out the historicity of Jesus and consign Him to the region of the mythical. We seek in vain in these writings for anything like a sober account of our Lord's growth and general history during this period: we find nothing but a congeries of grotesque wonder-tales concerning the doings of the Boy. His miraculous powers prove to be of singular advantage to Joseph, for when a beam

or plank has been cut too short Jesus rectifies the mistake by merely pulling it out to the required length. He changes boys into kids, and anon restores them to their former condition. He carries both fire and water quite easily in His cloak. When playing with other boys and making figures of various beasts and birds, Jesus makes those He had formed walk and fly, and eat and drink. Wonderful works of healing are also ascribed to the Child; and some of them take strange forms, in curious contrast to the stories of the works of Jesus found in our Gospels. e.g. Simon the Cananaean as a boy is nigh to death through having been bitten by a serpent. Jesus makes the serpent itself come and suck out all the poison from the wound; then He curses it, and immediately the creature bursts asunder. The cure of demoniacs, of lepers, of the blind and maimed and sick, and the raising of the dead, are all ascribed to the Child Jesus, and always with more or less grotesqueness of circumstance. Strangest thing of all, a whole series of vindictive and destructive miracles are given which offer the most flagrant contrast to all that we know of our Lord, and which, if true, would have made Him a veritable terror to all with whom He came into contact. Boys who thwart Him in play are immediately struck dead: others who take action against Him are blinded. It is true the mischief is usually repaired by Him in response to earnest entreaty; but the vengeful malevolence is conspicuous throughout. In the stories, again, relating to His early education, Jesus is represented as being *un enfant terrible* to more than one master to whom He was sent to learn His letters. But a comparison of the story of the Visit to the Temple, as told in the *Arabic Gospel of the Infancy* and other such writings, with the narrative as we have it in Luke 2, serves as well as possible to show the untrustworthy character of the Apocryphal Gospels, whatever curious interest may attach to them. For the simple and natural statement of St. Luke, that 'all that heard Him were amazed at His understanding and His answers,' we find Him represented as not only getting the upper hand of the great Rabbis in relation to the knowledge of the Torah, but as giving profound instruction to philosophers in astronomy, natural science, and medicine, explaining to them 'physics and metaphysics, hyperphysics and hypophysics,' and many other things.

The Apocryphal writings which, in particular, abound in these tales of the childhood of Jesus, are the *Gospel of pseudo-Matthew*, the *Protevangelium of James*, the *Arabic Gospel of the Infancy*, and the *Gospel of Thomas* in its various forms. The Thomas Gospel is mainly answerable for the stories of vindictive miracles referred to above. The Syriac form of this Gospel is entitled in the MS (6th cent.) the 'Boyhood of Our Lord Jesus.'

With every allowance for whatever scanty touches of beauty and elements of value may here and there be found, a survey of this Apocryphal literature gives fresh force to Edersheim's remark (*Jesus the Messiah*, bk. ii. ch. 10): 'We dread gathering around our thoughts of Him the artificial flowers of legend.' In default, however, of authentic records there remains one expedient for meeting the deep silence of our Gospels

which modern writers who essay the construction of a 'Life of Christ' are full ready to make use of. All available knowledge regarding the times in which our Lord lived, the surroundings and conditions in which He grew up, and the manner in which Jewish boys were educated (see artt. Boyhood and Education), can be employed to help us to form a sober and reverent conception of Him in the days of His childhood. Perhaps, indeed, such matters in their general treatment enter into some Lives of Christ even to prolixity. It is a true instinct, however, which bids us set aside early and mediaeval legends, with all their *naïveté*, and frame a conception of Him as living the life of a normal Jewish boy of His own time and station, distinguished only by a rare personal charm of goodness and grace. The unfolding of a human life in growing beauty and nobility of character more truly proclaims 'God with us' than could such miraculous accompaniments as would tend to make the Child an object of mingled wonder and fear. Painters who have represented the Holy Child in simple human grace, without the encircling nimbus, have not on that account fallen behind others in suggesting His true Divinity.

'He came to Nazareth, *where He had been brought up*' (Luk 4:16)—how much that phrase covers! The great factors entering into His education were home training, the synagogue both as a place of worship and as a school, the many-coloured life of the district in which He spent His youth, the natural features of the locality, and all the scenery round about Nazareth, so full of beauty and stirring historical associations. Later on, after He had attained 'years of discretion,' in our phrase, becoming a *bar-mizvah* (בֶּרֶךְ מִצְוָה = son of commandment = one responsible for compliance with legal requirements), as the Jews express it, His repeated visits to Jerusalem to attend the feasts would also count for much. If we are to understand the visit mentioned in Luke 2 to be the first that Jesus paid to Jerusalem (though the narrative does not explicitly say it was), we may take it that at the age of twelve (Luk 2:42) He was regarded as having reached that important stage in a boy's life, although the usual age for such recognition was somewhat later.

Jesus belonged to a people unsurpassed for the care bestowed upon the education of children. His earliest teacher would be His mother; and we cannot doubt that of all Jewish mothers none could excel Mary ('blessed among women') in all such work. Among other things He would probably learn from her the *Shema*' (Deu 6:4)—that sacred formula which attends the devout Jew from his earliest years to his latest moment. This is quite consistent with the fact that education was one of the things for which the father was held responsible as regards his son. At an early age Jesus would be sent to school at the synagogue, there to be taught by the *hazzan*, or schoolmaster, to read and recite the Jewish Scriptures. The instruction given did not go beyond this, with writing and possibly a little arithmetic as additional and subordinate subjects. It was in a supreme degree a religious education, designed to fit

children for the practical duties of life. The education of Jesus was just that of the great mass of the people: unlike Saul of Tarsus, no *bêth ha-Midrâsh*, or college of Scribes, received Him as a student ('Whence hath this man these things?' Mar_6:2; cf. Joh_7:15). As a schoolboy, too, Jesus would have His recreations. School hours were not excessive, amounting to no more than four or five hours a day. Truly Jewish games, however, were but few. They had little or nothing corresponding to our school sports; and the cult of athletics was looked upon as something alien. Little children, like those of other times and races, found amusement in playing at doing as grown-up people did: and the words of our Lord in Mat_11:16-17 very likely contain not merely the result of His observation, but a memory of His own childhood. For the rest, as a boy He would find abundant means of recreation in rambling round about Nazareth amidst the sights and sounds of nature. The open-air atmosphere of His preaching, with its abundant allusions to the life of the field and to the varied aspects of nature, betokens an early-formed and loving familiarity.

On His visit to Nazareth, described in Luke 4, 'He entered, *as His custom was*, into the synagogue on the Sabbath day' (Luk_4:16): and that custom, we may be sure, was a growth from His earliest years. Children, in those days, were admitted to religious celebrations in the Temple at an early age. A boy's religious life was considered to begin at the age of four. Both boys and girls accompanied their mothers to the synagogue when very young. And Sabbath by Sabbath, throughout His early peaceful years, Jesus was found in the synagogue with His mother Mary; and a benediction and a joy it must have been to all the frequenters of that synagogue at Nazareth to look upon the fair, winsome, earnest face of the Child. When we read, as we do, of boys playing in the synagogue during worship and causing annoyance to their elders, it interests us to recognize the counterpart of a familiar experience in modern times; but without taking anything from the naturalness of our Lord's boyhood, it is impossible to think of Him in any such association. We can only think of Him as showing forth a spirit of wondrous grace, a growing responsiveness towards the prayers and praises, becoming more and more familiar and dear, a deepening love of the noble words in which He heard the laws, the hopes and the faith of Israel set forth. The whole unfolding of His life in all the religious discipline and education of the home, the synagogue and the whole round of the Jewish year of feasts and fasts, must have been beautiful to those to whose care He was entrusted. When a boy became *bar-mizvah*, there was a lightening of the paternal responsibility regarding him, and a sense of relief surely found expression in the benediction pronounced by the father on that occasion—'Blessed be He for having freed me from this punishment.' There could have been no room for such an utterance when Jesus left His mother's side, henceforth to take His place among the men in the congregation.

Our most profitable reflections on the childhood of our Lord, however, are best summarized in the saying of Irenaeus, to the effect that, in completely participating

in the conditions of human life, He became a child for the sake of children, and by His own experience of childhood He has sanctified it (*adv. Haer.* ii. xxii. 4).

ii. Childhood in the teaching of Jesus.—It was only to be expected that Jesus would exhibit an unquestionable love for children; and it is in complete accord with the whole tenor of His teaching that He should specially emphasize the importance and value of the child. The well-known words of Juvenal, ‘Maxima debetur puero reverentia’ (*Sat.* xiv. 47), gain their profoundest significance when the attitude assumed by our Lord towards children is considered. The story of Jairus’ daughter (τὸ θυγάτριόν μου is the father’s appealing expression in Mar_5:23) suggests a special tenderness in Jesus towards children for whom His healing was sought; He could not resist such an appeal as, ‘Sir, come down ere my child (τὸ παιδίον μου) die’ (Joh_4:49); and it was anything but indifference to the woes of a little heathen girl (ἡ θυγάτριον, Mar_7:23) which made Him apparently reluctant to yield to the entreaties of the Syrophœnician woman. Such cases, we may be sure, are only representative of many more. And that our Lord Himself had a singular attraction for children admits of no doubt. His triumphal Entry into Jerusalem and the Temple cannot have been the only time when He had child-friends to greet and attend Him (Mat_21:15). It was no new thing for parents to seek a Rabbi’s blessing for their children, but it was a unique charm in Jesus which led mothers—surely mothers were at least among ‘those that brought them’—to desire His blessing for their little ones (Mar_10:13-16 and parallels). St. Mark’s special touch in describing how He welcomed them (ἐναγκαλισάμενος, Mar_10:16) is entirely true to the spirit of the Master. His benediction was as remote from the perfunctory as it could be.

The teaching of Jesus concerning children and childhood gathers round two occasions—when He blessed the little ones (as above), and when He rebuked the ambition of the disciples,—see Mar_9:33-37, Luk_9:46-48, and Mat_18:1-14, with notable amplifications.

(a) In the former instance the untimely interposition of the disciples leads to the saying, ‘Of such is the kingdom of God.’ In Mark and Luke this is followed by a further solemn saying—‘Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein.’ Though Matthew lacks this in this connexion, he has a corresponding utterance in Mat_18:3-4. Wendt (*Echre Jesu*, English translation ii. pp. 49, 50) considers that all the stress of these words lies on the *receptivity* demanded by Jesus on the part of those who would enter the kingdom. ‘Not the reception of the kingdom of God at a childlike *age* (*sic*), but in a childlike *character*, He declares to be the indispensable condition of entering the kingdom of God; and

under this childlike character He does not understand any virtue of childlike blamelessness, but only the receptivity itself....' And no doubt in the second of these sayings the manner in which men are to receive the kingdom is set forth with emphasis. Those who find themselves for one reason and another outside the kingdom, can obtain admission there into only when the offer of its gracious blessings is received, not with 'blamelessness' indeed (which is out of the question here), but, with the simple trust, the unpretentiousness, the earnest desire and the reality which are characteristic of a child. But there is something more than this in the words of Jesus. The first saying has hardly its due weight given to it if we stop here. 'Of such is the kingdom of God.' The kingdom *belongs* to such. And we cannot accept 'the childlike' as the complete equivalent of 'such.' Wendt, it is true, acknowledges children to be 'susceptible subjects for the preaching of the kingdom of God' (as above, p. 50); but are we to understand that they are to be invited to receive it as having been *outside from the first*? We verge here on controversies that have loomed large on the troubled way of the diversified development of Christian thought and opinion. But the saying of Jesus, as it stands, surely implies that the kingdom comprises not only the childlike, but little children *qua* children as well. They are its inheritors. They may forfeit its blessings subsequently by their own act, or others may be specially responsible for their failing to retain their inheritance (Mat_18:6); but that is another matter. As Bengel says (on Mat_19:14), 'τοιοῦτος notat substantiam cum qualitate.' And the relation of our Lord to humanity at large makes this but the natural interpretation of His words. 'If they who are like little children belong to the kingdom of heaven, why should we for a moment doubt that the little children themselves belong to the kingdom?' So Morison, who is altogether admirable on this point (see especially *Com.* on Mat_19:14).

(b) The way in which Jesus dealt with the disciples' dispute concerning precedence (Mar_9:33-37 and parallels) further brings out the qualities of childhood which were most precious in His eyes, and the value and importance He attached to little children themselves. The little one He called to Him and so lovingly embraced (St. Mark's special touch again), was held up to the disciples as an example and guide to greatness. To be great in the kingdom of heaven (Mat_18:1; Mat_18:4) it was necessary to have a spirit of simplicity and humility such as was seen in the child in whom self-regard and self-seeking had as yet no place. It is one of our Lord's great paradoxes. To be childlike is to be truly great. The same truth is emphasized in a saying which in varying form is found twice over in each of the Synoptics—the man who wishes to be first shall be last; the man willing to be least shall be great. We here learn further how Jesus regards little children as in a real sense belonging to Him. To receive a little child *as belonging to Him*, bestowing loving care upon it, is a high service rendered to Him and to God by whom He was sent. In Mat_10:40-42 the importance attached to such service is strikingly expressed in the progressive series in

which Jesus promises a reward to those who thus receive His messengers—a prophet, a good man, ‘one of these little ones.’ It is most natural to understand that in using such an expression as the last our Lord actually referred to some children who were hard by when He was speaking. And as here, so in the more extended sayings in Matthew 18, whatever the reference to childlike and lowly-minded disciples in general, the words of Jesus must apply to children themselves. The terrible warning of Mat_18:6 applies to those who hinder such little ones in relation to the kingdom. Though it is not expressly so stated, what is said about receiving children suggests that such a wrong done to any child is as a wrong done to Christ Himself. The preciousness of a little child in the sight of ‘our Father in heaven’ is emphatically asserted by Jesus in Mat_18:10-14. The children’s angels, He says, are ever in the presence of God (v. 10). Whether this remarkable saying be understood as referring to guardian angels or to representative angels (in some way corresponding to the Zoroastrian *fravashis* or ‘spiritual counterparts’—see art. by Dr. J. H. Moulton in *Journal of Theol. Studies*, July 1902), it clearly declares that no little one is an object of indifference with God, no wrong inflicted upon a child can escape His notice. The closing saying of this group (vv. 12-14) embodies the illustration of the one stray sheep, found in another connexion in Luke 15, and teaches that, whatever ruin may befall ‘one of these little ones,’ it is not a matter of the Divine pleasure and ordination that even one such should be ‘cast as rubbish to the void.’ See also art. Children, which is written from a different standpoint.

Literature.—The various Lives of Christ (Edersheim, Keim, Didon, Farrar, Andrews, D. Smith, etc); artt. Boyhood, and Education; cf. art. ‘Education’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible and the *Encyc. Biblica*; Brough, *Childhood and Youth of our Lord*; G. A. Coe, *Education in Religion and Morals*, 1904; S. B. Haslett, *Pedagogical Bible School*, 1905; R. Rainy, *Sojourning with God* (1902), p. 151; Donehoo, *Apocryphal and Legendary Life of Christ*; Ramsay, *Education of Christ*; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, ii. 48 ff.; G. B. Stevens, *Theology of the NT*, pp. 81, 93.

J. S. Clemens.

☞ Children

CHILDREN.—In the regeneration of society which has been wrought by the forces brought into the world by Christianity, the family, of course, has had its part. Or rather, since to Jesus also the family was the social unit, this regeneration began with the family and spread outwards from it. The emphasis laid by our Lord on the institution of the family deserves even to be called extraordinary. Not only did He

habitually exhibit sympathy with domestic life in all its phases, and particularly reverence for women and tenderness for children: and not only did He adopt the vocabulary of the family to express the relations subsisting between Himself and His followers, and even as His choicest vehicle for conveying to them a vitalizing conception of their relations to God, 'from whom,' as that one of His servants who best represents His teaching in this aspect of it declares, 'every family in heaven and on earth is named' (Eph_3:15); but, deserting His customary reserve in dealing with social institutions, in the case of this one alone did He advance beyond general principles to specific legislation. (Cf. F. G. Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*, p. 145 ff.).

This specific legislation does not directly concern children. It is true that childhood owes as much to the gospel as womanhood itself (cf. e.g. Uhlhorn, *Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism*, p. 182). And the causes of the great revolution which was wrought by the gospel in the condition of children and the estimate placed on childhood, are undoubtedly rooted in the life and teaching of our Lord, and are spread on the pages of the Gospels. But we shall search in vain in the recorded teaching of Jesus for either direct legislation, or even enunciation of general principles regulating the relations of parents and children, or establishing the position of children in the social organism. He has left us no commandments, no declarations, not even exhortations on the subject. He simply moves onward in His course, touching in life, act, word on the domestic relations that were prevalent about Him, and elevating and glorifying everything that He touched. Thus He has handed down to us a new ideal of the family, and lifted to a new plane our whole conception of childhood. (Cf. Shailer Mathews, *The Social Teaching of Jesus*, p. 101 ff.).

The domestic economy which forms the background of Jesus' life, and is assumed in all His dealings with children and in all His allusions to them and their ways, is, of course, the wholesome home-life which had grown up in Israel under the moulding influence of the revelation of the Old Covenant. Its basis was the passionately affectionate Semitic nature, and no doubt certain modifications had come to it from contact with other civilizations; but its form was determined by the tutelage which Jehovah had granted His people. (Cf. Edersheim, *Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Days of Christ*, chs. vi.-ix., and *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, bk. ii. chs. ix. and x.; also Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, articles 'Child,' 'Family.' For later Jewish child-life see Schechter, *Studies in Judaism*, xii.; and, above all, L. Löw, *Die Lebensalter*. Cf. also Ploss, *Das Kind in Brauch und Sitte der Völker*).

The tender love which the Hebrew parent bore to his child, and the absorbing interest with which he watched and guided its development, doubtless find partial expression in the multiplicity of designations by which the several stages of childhood are marked in that pictorial language. Besides the general terms for 'son' (*ben*) and

‘daughter’ (*bath*), eight of these have been noted tracing the child from its birth to its maturity: *yeled* (fem. *yaldâh*), the ‘birthling’; *yônçk*, the ‘suckling’; *ôlçl*, the suckling of a larger growth, perhaps the ‘worrier’; *gâmûl*, the ‘weanling’; *taph*, the ‘toddler’; *’elem*, the ‘fat one’; *na’ar*, the ‘free one’; *bâhûr*, the ‘ripe one.’ (So Hamburger, *RE* i. 642, after whom Edersheim, *Opp. citt.* p. 103 f. and i. p. 221, note 3).

This series of designations may, of course, be more than matched out of the richness of Greek speech. Here the general term of relation, ‘child’ (* [Note: Those terms which occur in NT are marked by an asterisk.] τέκνον, dimin. * [Note: Those terms which occur in NT are marked by an asterisk.] τεκνιον), parts into the more specific ‘son’ (* [Note: Those terms which occur in NT are marked by an asterisk.] υἱός, dimin. υἱάφιον, υἱίδιον) and ‘daughter’ (* [Note: Those terms which occur in NT are marked by an asterisk.] θυγάτηρ, dimin. * [Note: Those terms which occur in NT are marked by an asterisk.] θυγάτριον); while the multitude of terms describing stages of growth quite baffles discrimination. The grammarians have handed down to us each his several list, among which that of Alexion (*Eust.* 1788, 22), for instance, enumerates ten stages between the newborn infant and the mature young man: * [Note: Those terms which occur in NT are marked by an asterisk.] βρέφος; * [Note: Those terms which occur in NT are marked by an asterisk.] παιδίον; * [Note: Those terms which occur in NT are marked by an asterisk.] ταιδάριον; ταιδίσκος; * [Note: Those terms which occur in NT are marked by an asterisk.] παῖς; παλλαξ, or βούκαις, or ἀντίπαις, or μελλεφηβος; ἐφηβος; μαιράκιον or μεῖραξ; * [Note: Those terms which occur in NT are marked by an asterisk.] νεανίσκος; * [Note: Those terms which occur in NT are marked by an asterisk.] νεανίας. Needless to say, the sequences of such lists cannot be taken too strictly. And equally needless to say, they by no means exhaust the synonymy. Alexion’s list, for example, does not contain even all the terms of this class that occur in the Gospel narratives. The series afforded by them would run something like this: βρέφος, νήπιος, θηλάζων, παιδίον, παιδάριον, παῖς, νεανίσκος, to which would need to be added the distinctively feminine θυγάτριον, κοράσιον [ταιδίσκη], παρθένος.

It is not difficult to recognize the general distinctions between these terms. (For the detailed synonymy see especially Schmidt, *D. Synonymik d. griech. Sprache*, circa (about) 69, for the terms belonging distinctively to childhood; circa (about) 152 for

those describing the stages between childhood and maturity; and circa (about) 47 for some terms denoting youthfulness; cf. Thayer, *Lex. NT*, s.v. ταῖς). Τέκνον (with its diminutive τεκνίον, Joh 13:33 only) is, like υἱός and θυγάτηρ, used in the Gospels only of relationship, literal or figurative, never of age (for the synonymy of τέκνον, and υἱός, and παῖς, see an interesting discussion by Höbne in Luthardt's *ZKW* [Note: *KWL Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft und kirchl Leben.*] , 1882, p. 57 ff.; and cf. Cremer and Thayer, s.vv.). For the rest, βρέφος is here, as in post-Homeric Greek in general, distinctively the 'newborn baby' (1Pe 2:2), the 'child in the arms' (in Homer it is the unborn child, the embryo, as also often in later Greek, e.g. Luk 1:41; Luk 1:44): and νήπιος and θηλάζων (the NT substitute for θηλασμός, θηλαμινός) range with it as descriptive of early infancy. Παιδίον, is equally distinctively the 'little child,' although its application is somewhat broad: now it is entirely synonymous with βρέφος (Luk 1:59; Luk 1:66 etc., Mat 2:8 etc., Luk 18:15-16), and again it designates a little maiden of twelve years of age (Mar 5:41-42). Its companion diminutive παιδάριον is ordinarily employed of a somewhat older 'lad,' and may very well be so used in the only passage where it occurs in the Gospels (Joh 6:9). The simple παῖς has a range sufficiently wide to cover to these stages, from infancy itself (e.g. Mat 2:16) up to youthful maturity (Hippocrates says up to the age of 21). It designates, says Schmidt (p. 429), 'the child of all ages up to complete young manhood; παιδάριον, the child up to his first school years; παιδίον, exclusively the little child.' Νεκνισκος is the appropriate designation of every stage of youthful maturity from so early an age that μειράκιον or ταῖς might be interchanged with it up to so late a period—about 40—that it is on the point of giving way to old age. Of the distinctively feminine terms that occur in the Gospels, παρθένος is a term of condition rather than of age, and occurs only in connexion with Mary (Mat 1:23, Luk 1:27) and in the parable of the Ten Virgins (Mat 25:1; Mat 25:7; Mat 25:11), and παιδίσκη is employed only in the secondary sense of 'maid-servant' (Mat 26:69 and parallels, Luk 12:45). The diminutives θυγάτριον and κοράσιον, though capable of employment with quite a wide range, yet naturally imply tenderness of years where tenderness of affection is not obviously conveyed by them (e.g. Mar 7:25, Mat 9:25 ||). Thus it appears that in the narratives of the Gospels there is brought into contact with our Lord every stage of childhood and youth from the cradle to maturity—the baby on its mother's bosom (Luk 18:15), the little child, boy (Mar 9:24) and girl (Mar 7:25) alike, children of a larger growth (Joh 4:27, Luk 8:51), and the maturing youth (Luk 7:14, Mat 19:20).

What Jesus did for children, we may perhaps sum up as follows. He illustrated the ideal of childhood in His own life as a child. He manifested the tenderness of His affection for children by conferring blessings upon them in every stage of their development as He was occasionally brought into contact with them. He asserted for children a recognized place in His kingdom, and dealt faithfully and lovingly with each age as it presented itself to Him in the course of His work. He chose the condition of childhood as a type of the fundamental character of the recipients of the kingdom of God. He adopted the relation of childhood as the most vivid earthly image of the relation of God's people to Him who was not ashamed to be called their Father which is in heaven, and thus reflected back upon this relation a glory by which it has been transfigured ever since.

The history of the ideal childhood which Jesus Himself lived on the earth is set down for us in the opening chapters of Matthew and Luke, especially of Luke, whose distinction among the Evangelists is that he has given us a narrative founded on an investigation which 'traced the course of all things accurately from the first' (Luk 1:3). Accordingly, not only does he with careful exactitude record the performance by our Lord's parents in His behalf, during His infancy, of 'all things that were according to the law of the Lord' (Luk 2:39); but he marks for us the stages of our Lord's growth in His progress to man's estate, and thus brings Him before us successively as 'baby' (Luk 2:16 βρέφος), 'child' (Luk 2:40 παιδίον), and 'boy' (Luk 2:43 παῖς), until in His glorious young-manhood, when He was about 30 years of age, He at last manifested Himself to Israel (Luk 3:23). The second chapter of Luke is thus in effect an express history of the development of Jesus; and sums up in two comprehensive verses His entire growth from childhood to boyhood and from boyhood to manhood (Luk 2:40; Luk 2:52). The language of these succinct descriptions is charged with suggestions that this was an extraordinary child, whose development was an extraordinary development. Attention is called alike to His physical, intellectual, and spiritual progress; and of each it is suggested that it was constant, rapid, and remarkable. Those who looked upon Him in the cradle would perceive that even beyond the infant Moses (Heb 11:23) this was 'a goodly child'; and day by day as He grew and waxed strong, He became more and more filled not only with knowledge but with wisdom, and not only with wisdom but with grace, and so steadily advanced 'not alone in power and knowledge, but by year and hour in reverence and in charity.' Man and God alike looked upon His growing powers and developing character with ever increasing favour. The promise of the goodly child passed without jar or break into the fruitage of the perfect man: and those who gazed on the babe with admiration (Luk 2:20; Luk 2:30; Luk 2:38), could not but gaze on the boy with astonishment (Luk 2:47) and on the man with reverence.

It is therefore no ordinary human development which is here described for us. But it is none the less, or rather it is all the more, a normal human development, the only strictly normal human development the world has ever seen. This is the only child who has ever been born into the world without the fatal entail of sin, and the only child who has ever grown to manhood free from the deterioration of sin. This is how men ought to grow up: how, were they not sinners, men would grow up. It is a great thing for the world to have seen one such instance. As an example it is indeed set beyond our reach. As the ideal childhood realized in life, it has ever since stood before the world as an incitement and inspiration of quite incalculable power. In this perfect development of Jesus there has been given to the world a model for every age, whose allurements has revolutionized life. He did not, as Irenaeus (*adv. Haer.* ii. xxii. 4, cf. iii. xviii. 4) reminds us, despise or evade the humanity He had assumed; or set aside in His own person the law that governs it: on the contrary, He sanctified every age in turn by Himself living His perfect life in its conditions. 'He came to save all by means of Himself,' continues Irenaeus, 'all, I say, who through Him are born again unto God,—infants and children, and boys, and youths.... He therefore passed through every age, becoming an infant for infants, thus sanctifying infants; a child for children, thus sanctifying those who are of this age, being at the same time made to them an example of piety, righteousness, and submission; a youth for youths, becoming an example to youths, and thus sanctifying them for the Lord.' ... On the few details given us of the childhood of our Lord see artt. Boyhood of Jesus and Childhood.

During the course of His life begun with this ideal childhood, Jesus came into contact with every stage of youthful development, and manifested the tenderness of His feeling for each and His power and willingness to confer blessings upon all. A lurid light is thrown upon the nature of the world and the character of the times into which He was born by the slaughter of the Innocents, which marked His advent (Mat 2:16-20). But one function which the record of this incident performs is to serve as a black background upon which His own beneficence to childhood may be thrown up. Mothers instinctively brought their babies to Him for benediction; and when they did so, He was not content until He had taken them in His arms (Mar 10:16; cf. Mar 9:36). His allusions to children in His teaching reflect the closeness of His observation of them. He celebrates the delight of the mother in her baby, obliterating even the pangs of birth (Joh 16:21); the fostering love of the father who cuddles his children up with him in bed (Luk 11:7); the parental affection which listens eagerly to the child's every request, and knows how to grant it only things that are good (Mat 7:9, Luk 11:11; Luk 11:13). He notes the wayward impulses of children at play (Mat 11:18, Luk 7:32). He feels the weight of woe that is added to calamities in which the children also are involved (Mat 18:25); and places among the supremest tests of loyalty to Him, the preference of Him even to one's children (Mat 19:29, Luk 14:26; Luk 18:29; cf. Mar 10:29).

A number of His miracles, worked for the benefit of the young, illustrate His compassion for their sufferings and ills. The nobleman's son at Capernaum, whose healing Jesus wrought as a second sign when He came out of Judaea into Galilee (Joh 4:46-54), was at least a 'child' (παῖς, Joh 4:51), for so the servants call him in cold sobriety; and probably was a 'little child' (Joh 4:49), although it is, of course, possible that on the lips of the father the diminutive expresses tenderness of affection rather than of age. The possessed 'boy' (παῖς, Mat 17:18, Luk 9:42)—the only son of his father (Luk 9:38)—whom Jesus healed as He came down from the Mount of Transfiguration (Mat 17:14-21, Mar 9:14-29, Luk 9:37-43), and whose affliction had dated from his earliest infancy (ἐκ παιδιόθεν, Mar 9:21), was more certainly distinctively a 'little child' (Mar 9:24). Jairus' 'little daughter' (θυγάτριον, Mar 5:23)—also an only one—whom Jesus raised from the dead in such dramatic circumstances (Mat 9:18-28, Mar 5:22-43, Luk 8:41-56) and who is spoken of in the narratives indifferently as 'child' (παῖς, Luk 8:51; Luk 8:54), 'little child' (παιδίον, Mar 5:39-41) and 'maiden' or 'girl' (κοράσιον, Mat 9:24-25, Mar 5:41; ταλιθά, Mar 5:41), we know to have been about twelve years old (Luk 8:42). We are not told the exact age of the 'little daughter' (θυγάτριον, Mar 7:25—here probably the word is the diminutive of age, not of affection, as it occurs in the narrative, not the conversation) of the Syrophenician woman; but we note that St. Mark calls her also distinctively a 'little child' (παιδίον, Mar 7:30). The only son of the widow of Nain (Luk 7:11-18), the desolate state of whose bereft mother roused so deeply the pity of our Lord | (Luk 7:13), is addressed indeed as a 'young man' (νεανίσκος, Luk 7:14), a term so broad that it need imply no more than that he was in his prime; but the suggestion of the narrative certainly seems to be that he was in his youthful prime (Luk 7:15). Thus is rounded out a series of miracles in which our Lord shows His pity to the growing youth of every stage of development.

When on that great day on the shores of Gennesaret Jesus appeared to His disciples and gave to His repentant Apostle His last exhortation, He commanded him not merely 'Feed my sheep,' but also 'Feed my lambs.' Though the language, doubtless, rather expresses His love for His flock than distributes it into constituent classes, we may be permitted to see in it also the richness of our Lord's sympathy for the literal lambs of His fold. Certainly He provided in His kingdom a place for every age. and met the spiritual needs of each. Touching illustrations of this are offered us at the two end stages of youthful development (Luk 18:15 βρέφος; Mat 19:20 νεανίσκος), in the blessing of little children and the probing of the rich young ruler's heart, which are brought into immediate contiguity in all three of the Synoptics as if they were

intended to be taken together as a picture of our Lord's dealing with youth as a whole, perhaps even as together illustrating the great truth that in the kingdom of God the question is not of the hour of entrance,—first or eleventh,—but of the will of the Master, who doeth what He will with His own (Mat 20:15).

What is particularly to be borne in mind with respect to the blessing of the little children (Mat 19:13-15, Mar 10:13-16, Luk 18:15-17), is that these 'little children' (παιδία, Mat 19:13-14, Mar 10:13-14, Luk 18:16) were distinctively 'babies' (βρέφη, Luk 18:15). Therefore they needed to be received by Jesus 'in his arms' (Mar 10:16); and only from this circumstance, indeed, can all the details of the narrative be understood. It is from this, for example, that the interference of the disciples, which called out the Master's rebuke, 'Let the little children come to me; forbid them not,' receives its explanation. The disciples, to speak briefly, had misapprehended the nature of the Lord's mission: they were regarding Him fundamentally as a teacher sent from God, who also healed the afflicted; and they conceived it to be their duty in the overstrain to which He was subjected to protect Him from needless drafts on His time and strength by the intrusion of those needing no healing and incapable of instruction. It seemed to them out of the question that 'even the babies' (Luk 18:15) should be thrust upon His jaded attention. They should have known better; and Jesus was indignant that they did not know better (Mar 10:14), and took this occasion to manifest Himself as the Saviour of infants also. Taking them in His arms and fervently invoking a blessing upon them (Mar 10:16 κατευλόγει), He not only asserted for them a part in His mission, but even constituted them the type of the children of the kingdom. 'Let the little children come unto me,' He says; 'forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God.' And then proceeding with the solemn 'Verily'—'Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, shall in no wise enter therein' (Mar 10:14-15, Luk 18:16-17; cf. Mat 19:14).

Wherein this childlikeness, in which alone the kingdom of God can be received, consists, lies on the face of the narrative. Certainly not in the innocence of childhood, as if the purpose were to announce that only the specially innocent can enter the kingdom of God. Our Lord was accustomed to declare, on the contrary, that He came to call not the righteous but sinners, to seek and save that which was lost; and the contradiction with the lesson of the publican and the Pharisee praying in the temple, which immediately precedes this narrative in Luke, would be too glaring. But neither can it consist in the humility of childhood, if, indeed, we can venture to speak of the most egoistic age of human life as characteristically humble; nor yet in its simplicity, its artlessness, ingenuousness, directness, as beautiful as these qualities are, and as highly esteemed as they certainly must be in the kingdom of God. We cannot even suppose it to consist in the trustfulness of childhood, although we assuredly come much nearer to it in this, and no image of the children of the kingdom could be truer

than that afforded by the infant lying trustingly upon its mother's breast. But, in truth, it is in no disposition of mind, but rather in a condition of nature, that we must seek the characterizing peculiarity of these infants whom Jesus sets forth as types of the children of the kingdom. Infants of days (βρέφη, [Luk_18:15](#)) have no characteristic disposition of mind; and we must accordingly leave the subjective sphere and find the childlikeness which Jesus presents as the condition of the reception (not acquisition) of the kingdom in an objective state; in a word, in the helplessness, or, if you will, the absolute dependence of infancy. What our Lord would seem to say, therefore, when He declares, 'Of such is the kingdom of God,' is, briefly, that those of whom the kingdom of God is made up are, relatively to it, as helplessly dependent as babies are in their mothers' arms. The children of the kingdom enter it as children enter the world, stripped and naked,—infants, for whom all must be done, not who are capable of doing.

There was another occasion on which even more formally Jesus proclaimed to His disciples childlikeness as the essential characteristic of the children of the kingdom ([Mat_18:1-4](#), [Mar_9:33-37](#), [Luk_9:46-48](#)). The disciples had been disputing among themselves who of them should be greatest. Jesus, calling to Him a little child, placed it in their midst and said, 'Verily I say unto you, Except ye turn and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven.' There could not have been uttered a more pointed intimation that the kingdom of heaven is given, not acquired; that men receive it, not deserve it. As children enter the world, so men enter the kingdom, with no contributions in their hands. We are not, indeed, told in this narrative, in express words, that the child thus made the type of the children of God was a 'newborn baby' (βρέφος): it is called only a 'little child' (παιδίον). But its extreme infancy is implied: Jesus took it in His arms ([Mar_9:36](#)) when He presented it to the observation of His disciples; and we must accordingly think of it as a baby in a baby's helplessness and dependence.

We do, to be sure, find in our Lord's further words a requisition of humility ([Mat_18:4](#)): 'Whosoever then shall humble himself like this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven.' To become like a little child may certainly involve humility in one who is not a child; and it is very comprehensible that our Lord should therefore tell those whom He was exhorting to approach the kingdom of heaven like little children, that they could do so only by humbling themselves. But this is not the same as declaring humility to be the characteristic virtue of childhood, or as intimating that humility may ground a claim upon the kingdom of heaven. What our Lord seems to tell His followers is that they cannot enter the kingdom He came to found except they turn and become like little children; and that they can become like little children only by humbling themselves; and that therefore when they were quarrelling about their relative greatness, they were far from the disposition which

belongs to children of the kingdom. Humility seems to be represented, in a word, not as the characterizing quality of childhood or of childlikeness, but rather as the attitude of heart in which alone we can realize in our consciousness that quality which characterizes childhood. That quality is conceived here also as helplessness, while childlikeness consists in the reproduction in the consciousness of the objective state of utter dependence on God which is the real condition of every sinner.

From the point of view thus revealed in object-lesson and discourse, it was natural for our Lord to speak of His disciples as 'babes.' 'I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth,' He cries on one momentous occasion (Mat 11:25, Luk 10:21), 'that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes' (νηπίοις, the implication of which is precisely weakness and neediness). And then He proceeds with a great declaration the very point of which is to contrast His sovereign power with the neediness of those whom He calls to His service. Similarly as the end approached and the children (παῖδες) in the temple were greeting Him with hosannas, He met the indignant challenge of the Jews with the words of the Psalmist: 'Yea, did ye never read, Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast ordained praise?' (Mat 21:16). The meaning is that these childish hosannas were typical of the praises rising from the hearts of those childlike ones from whose helplessness (because they owed much to Him) His true praise should spring.

From the more general view-point of affection our Lord derived the terms by which He expressed His personal relations to His followers, and a large part of the vocabulary of His proclamation of the kingdom of God is drawn from the relationships of the family. His disciples are His 'children' (τέκνα, Mar 10:24), or with increasing tenderness of expression, His 'little children' (τεκνία, Joh 13:33), His 'babies' (παιδιά, Joh 21:5), and perhaps with even more tenderness still, simply His 'little ones' (οἱ μικροί, Mat 10:42 etc., but see art. Little Ones). Similarly the great King, whose kingdom He came to establish, is the Father of His people; and they may therefore be free from all fear, because, naturally, it is the good pleasure of their Father to give the kingdom to them (Luk 12:32). Every turn of expression is freely employed to carry home to the hearts of His followers the sense of the Fatherly love for them by Him who is their King indeed, but also their Father which is in heaven (Mat 5:16; Mat 5:45; Mat 5:48; Mat 6:1; Mat 6:4; Mat 6:6; Mat 6:8-9; Mat 6:14-15; Mat 6:18; Mat 6:32; Mat 7:11; Mat 10:20; Mat 10:29; Mat 13:43; Mat 23:9, Mar 11:25, Luk 6:36; Luk 11:13; Luk 12:30; Luk 12:32, Joh 20:17); and they accordingly His sons (Mat 5:9; Mat 5:45, Luk 20:36), His children (Joh 1:12; Joh 11:52), and therefore heirs of His kingdom. In this representation, which finds its most striking expression in such parables as that of the Prodigal Son (Luk 15:11 f.), it is, to be sure,

rather the relationship of father and child that is emphasized than the tenderness of the age of childhood. Neither is it a novelty introduced by our Lord; it finds its root in Old Testament usage. But it is so characteristic of our Lord's teaching that it may fairly be said that the family was to His mind the nearest of human analogues to the order that obtains in the kingdom of God, and the picture which He draws of the relations that exist between God and His people is largely only a 'transfiguration of the family.'

Such an employment of the relationships in the family to figure forth those that exist between God and His people could not fail to react on the conceptions which men formed of the family relationships themselves. By His constant emphasis on the Fatherhood of God, and by His employment of the helplessness of infancy and the dependence of childhood as the most vivid emblems provided by human society to image the dependence of God's people on His loving protection and fostering care, our Lord has thrown a halo over the condition of childhood which has communicated to it an emotional value and a preciousness, in the strictest sense, new in the world. In the ancient world, children, though by their innocence eliciting the affection, and by their weakness appealing to the sympathy, of their elders, were thought of chiefly as types of immaturity and unripeness. The Christian world, taught by its Lord, reverences their very helplessness as the emblem of its own condition in the presence of God, and recognizes in their dependence an appeal to its unselfish devotion, that it may be an imitator of God. This salutary respect and consideration for childhood has no doubt been exaggerated at times to something very much like worship of the childlike; and this tendency has been powerfully fostered by the prevalence in sections of Christendom, since the 14th cent., of an actual cult of the infant Saviour (cf. E. Martinengo-Carresco in *The Contemporary Review*, lxxvii. 117, etc.), and the early rise and immense development in the same quarters of a cult of the Madonna, to the tender sentiments underlying which all the resources of the most passionate devotion, the most elevated literature, and the most perfect art have been invoked to give widespread influence (see especially Zöckler, art. *Maria die Mutter des Herrn* in *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , xii. 309, etc., who gives an extensive classified bibliography. Cf. in general H. E. Scudder, *Childhood in Art*, also in *The Atlantic Monthly*, lv. and lvi.). Such exaggerations cannot, however, obscure the main fact that it is only from Jesus that the world has learned properly to appreciate and wholesomely to deal with childhood and all that childhood stands for. Cf. art. Childhood.

Benjamin B. Warfield.

☩ Children Of God

CHILDREN OF GOD.—The teaching of Jesus Christ about the children of God cannot be understood apart from His teaching about the Fatherhood of God: indeed, it is from the latter standpoint that it must be approached. In such an approach the main positions seem to be as follows:—

(1) Jesus asserts absolutely the fatherly nature of God. His use of the name ‘Father’ implies that the fatherly nature is eternal in God. God does not become Father; He is ‘the Father.’ All knowledge of God is deficient which does not ‘know the Father’ (Mat 11:27, Joh 14:6-11). This fatherly nature of God necessarily manifests itself in all God’s dealings. He cannot be other than Father, and ‘he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust’ (Mat 5:45).

(2) This eternal Fatherhood in God is complemented by an eternal Sonship in God. Jesus used habitually the name ‘My Father.’ It implied a special relationship between the Father and Himself, which is summed up by John, ‘The only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father’ (Joh 1:18).

(3) The fatherly heart of God does not rest satisfied in the eternal Sonship in God. He desires the response of filial love from all who are capable of giving it (cf. esp. Luk 15:1-32, Joh 4:23). Jesus assumed that the filial attitude is expected from all men. This is implied in His method of teaching. The Divine Fatherhood is woven into its texture. Therefore the picture of God the Father is offered to everybody, with its necessary appeal to the hearer to enjoy the filial relationship. Since the outlook of the gospel is universal, the sonship may be universal. Even ‘publicans and sinners’ may enjoy the filial feeling.

(4) But Jesus taught plainly that this filial attitude is not general amongst men. He told the Jews that they were of their father the devil (Joh 8:44), and distinguished ‘the good seed, the sons of the kingdom,’ from ‘the tares, the sons of the evil one’ (Mat 13:38); cf. also Mat 23:13-33.

(5) Certain conditions are laid down as essential to the enjoyment of the filial relationship to God. These conditions are usually described by Jesus in terms of character. The children of God are ‘peacemakers,’ are those who love their enemies, and who do the will of the Father (cf. Mat 5:9; Mat 5:44; Mat 12:50): they ‘do good and lend, never despairing,’ and are ‘merciful’ (Luk 6:35-36). But in the discourses in John’s Gospel, Jesus Himself is offered as a touchstone for the filial relationship (cf. Joh 8:42-47). In this connexion the demand for the new birth must be noticed. Jesus connected entrance into that Kingdom which He came to found, with being ‘born anew’ (Joh 3:3); He demanded that His disciples should be converted and become as

little children if they would enter the Kingdom (Mat_18:3 ||). It may fairly be said that in the mind of Jesus there is an intimate connexion between these two modes of teaching. The moral character befitting the children of God is secured by the new birth 'of water and of the Spirit' (Joh_3:5).

From these propositions we can gather the teaching of Jesus about the children of God. The relationship is apprehended by Jesus ethically, not physically. To identify Divine sonship with human birth brings the relationship down to the physical sphere. Jesus kept it in the religious sphere. The Fatherhood of God is an ethical attitude eternally present in the Godhead; man's Divine sonship is his ethical response to this Divine Fatherhood. God is ever waiting to welcome men as sons, and to give them the position of sons at home (Luke 15). But their assumption of this filial position depends upon their adoption of the filial attitude, 'I will arise and go to my father.' As Wendt says, 'God does not *become* the Father, but *is* the heavenly Father, even of those who *become* His sons.... Man is a true son of God ... from the fact of his comporting himself as a son of God' (*Teaching of Jesus*, i. p. 193).

This religious attitude which betokens Divine sonship, includes four elements, (a) Children of God love their heavenly Father. Love is the golden bond in all home relationships. Jesus declares it to be the sovereign law in the true relationship between man and God. For He taught that the greatest commandment is to love the Lord our God with all our heart and soul and mind and strength (Mat_22:37, Luk_10:27). When claiming to have come forth from God, He said to the Jews: 'If God were your father ye would love me,' where love of Himself is identified with love of the Father whom He revealed.

(b) Children of God obey their heavenly Father. This is implied in all Jesus' exhortations to men to do the will of God. It is clearly stated in these sentences: 'Whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother' (Mat_12:50); 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven' (Mat_7:21); cf. also Mat_21:31; Mat_24:45 ||.

(c) Children of God trust their heavenly Father. This mark of Divine sonship is emphasized in the Sermon on the Mount. Jesus exhorts His disciples not to be as the Gentiles, but to rely upon their heavenly Father's knowledge of their needs and His desire to help them. Anxiety must be banished from the hearts of God's children, who are fed and clothed by their Father (Mat_6:25-34, Luk_6:22-34).

(d) Children of God try to be like their heavenly Father. They are to be perfect, even as their heavenly Father is perfect (Mat_5:48). This must not be interpreted, as it often is, 'Be as perfect as your Father.' Its exhortation is to take the fatherly

character of God as the standard of perfection. 'Be ye perfect, *even as* He is perfect.' The Father loves all men: let His children do likewise. By thus taking the fatherly character of God as the standard, His children will fulfil the second great law, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself' (Mat 22:39). The natural man adopts other ideals of perfection; but the children of God try to be like their Father.

Jesus gave immortal expression to the desires characteristic of the children of God, in 'the Lord's Prayer.' That prayer is put into the lips of those who can say 'Our Father which art in heaven.' It includes all the marks of God's children that have been found elsewhere in the teaching of Jesus. The hallowing of the Father's name implies the sanctification of His children after His likeness. The prayer 'Thy will be done' lifts us to the loftiest level of obedience. Only those who trust God can pray 'Give us our daily bread,' and can limit their desires for material good to such humble bounds. The prayer breathes throughout the spirit of love: that spirit is the warp into which the weft of the petition is woven.

The blessings enjoyed by the children of God are all the good that Jesus Christ came on earth to offer to men. This good is summed up in the phrase 'the kingdom of God' or 'the kingdom of heaven.' All the children of God are members of that Kingdom; cf. Mat 13:38; Mat 18:3-10. The Kingdom is God's proffered blessing: 'It is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom' (Luk 12:32). The Kingdom includes the blessings of forgiveness (Mat 6:14 ||); of guardian care (Mat 6:33); of the Holy Spirit (Luk 11:13); of eternal life (Joh 5:21-26; Joh 17:3); and finally, the enjoyment of the Father's house (Mat 25:34, Joh 14:2-3).

This identification of the blessings enjoyed by the children of God with the good of the Kingdom, leads naturally to the statement that the ethical attitude characteristic of the children of God can be secured by faith in Jesus Christ. He not only spoke of Himself as the Son of God; He also declared that His revelation of Sonship made sonship possible to men. Considerable importance attaches to the solemn words in Mat 11:27 'All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him.' They declare that the knowledge of the Father must be experimental. Only one who has lived as a son can know the Father. Men do not know God primarily as Father. They think of Him as King, as Judge, as Law-Giver; and because they are sinners they cannot know Him purely as Father. The shadow of the broken Law falls across God's face, making it appear the face of a judge, and falls upon the attitude of men, chilling it into that of servants. But 'the Son' knows God as Father. He has no fear of Him as Judge; He claims to be Himself the King in the kingdom of God (Mat 25:40); He is conscious that He has never broken God's law. Therefore He can know God as the Father; and He is able to reveal God to men as Father. Jesus does this by ransoming captive spirits from the bondage of sin

and death (Mat 20:28), by persuading them to trust the fatherly love of God, and by strengthening them to break away from the self-life in favour of the life of surrender (Mat 16:24-27 | |).

The close connexion between this great word and the gracious invitation which follows it (Mat 11:28-30), must not be overlooked. That invitation shows the universality of Christ's outlook. The Son is willing to reveal the Father to *all*. But the connexion explains the personal note in the invitation. Jesus does not say 'Go to the Father'; He says 'Come unto me, and I will give you rest.' This is because He is the revealer of the Father; and the rest He offers is rest in the Fatherhood of God. The chapter describes the discouragements that darkened the noon of His ministry. He found rest to His own soul in the Father: 'I thank thee, O Father ... Even so, Father' (Mat 11:25-26). This rest He desires to give to others. The only way in which men can come to the Father is by coming to Himself.

Two things are implied. One is that the Fatherhood of God is made accessible to men in Jesus Christ. He is the appointed trysting-place where men are sure to meet their heavenly Father. He was lifted up as an ensign (Isa 11:10; Isa 11:12): when the nations see Him they know where to seek God. The children of God are scattered on the dark mountains of ignorance. Jesus is the trysting-place where they are gathered at the feet of their heavenly Father (Joh 11:52). If men come to Him, they see the Father. The other fact is that Jesus gives men knowledge of the Father by teaching them to live as God's children must live. They must be meek and lowly in heart (cf. Mat 5:3-5); He can make them so. They must also learn obedience to the Father's will. He offers to teach them this, saying with marvellous condescension, 'Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me.' He is wearing the yoke of obedience to the Father, and He finds it 'easy.' A yoke is made for two. Jesus invites each man desiring to be a son of God to put his shoulder under the other end of His own yoke. Then he will walk in step with the great Elder Brother. Thus learning from Jesus, he will become a worthy child of God.

This great word has special significance because it forms a link between the Synoptic teaching and the teaching of Jesus in John's Gospel. There the enjoyment of filial privileges is made to depend upon man's relation to the Son (see especially Joh 5:19-47; Joh 6:28-40; Joh 8:19; Joh 8:23-56). The words declaratory of the love of God in sending the Son to save men are variously assigned to Jesus and to the Evangelist. But even if they are the Evangelist's reflexion upon the words of Jesus, they do no more than sum up the teaching of the Lord in the chapters quoted above.

In particular, it may be noted that Jesus claimed kinship with the Father because 'I do always the things that are pleasing to him' (Joh 8:29). This is in harmony with His reference to men who do the Father's will, as His 'brethren' (Mat 12:50). Men who

accept His revelation of God and duty become His brethren; all these 'brethren' are related to God as His children. They comport themselves in a befitting manner, which is essentially different from the self-centred conduct of unregenerate men. This filial demeanour is gained by faith in Jesus as the Saviour. He offers Himself to men as the Redeemer, through whom they can break away from sin and adopt the filial attitude toward God (Mat 23:8, Joh 10:15; Joh 10:25-29).

This conception of the teaching of Jesus on this subject is expressed by the Evangelist John in the striking sentence, 'As many as received him, to them gave he the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God' (Joh 1:12-13). Here men are described as *becoming* children of God by believing on the name of Jesus. They attain the dignity by a new birth that is from above. Their natural birth does not make them children of God. Before they stand in this relationship they must receive a Divine energy. This energy is brought to them by the Word made flesh, who offers Himself to the world. Moreover, this reception of Christ is a continuous exercise of faith (τοις πιστεύουσιν), implying an attitude Godward that is maintained from day to day.

If an illustration may be permitted, it would seem that Jesus represents men as like Robinson Crusoe's first canoe. It was designed to float in the water and was capable of doing so: but it could not get into the sea. So it lay on the shore like a log. Man is designed for fellowship with God, and is capable of living in filial relationship with Him. But before he can realize this destiny, he must be carried away from his native selfishness and be launched on the sea of Divine love. Jesus Christ is the mighty deliverer who can lift men out of death in sin and bring them to the Father. When men believe on Him, this purpose is fulfilled. They realize their destiny and become children of God. Then they spread their sails to the wind of heaven, and have 'life that is life indeed.'

The scope of this article does not include the general teaching of the Epistles on this topic. But a brief reference must be made to that teaching in so far as it involves a distinct reference to Jesus Christ. In general it may be said that the teaching of the Epistles reproduces all the main features of the teaching of Jesus. The children of God are possessors of a new life that has come to them by faith in Jesus Christ: Rom 8:1-14, Gal 2:20, 1Jn 2:23; 1Jn 5:13. This new life manifests itself in a new moral state befitting God's children and due to the power of Christ: Gal 5:16-26, Eph 2:1-10, Col 3:5-10. In this connexion it may be noted that Christians are called 'children of light,' who before becoming Christians were 'children of disobedience,' suffering 'the wrath of God' (Eph 2:2; Eph 5:6, Col 3:6). Thus Christ is the Saviour through whom the children of God are reborn and morally renewed.

In particular, three descriptions of God's children are connected with aspects of Christ's work. (α) As Redeemer, He secures man's adoption into the family of God (Rom 8:14-16, Gal 3:23 to Gal 4:6). This 'adoption' has been interpreted, in connexion with the antithesis between sonship and servitude, to denote the emancipation of sons enslaved by sin. This is the shade of meaning prominent in Galatians. In Romans the idea of adoption of those not previously sons is emphasized. In both cases, however, the adoption is due to the redeeming work of Jesus Christ, ministered to men by the Holy Spirit. The word 'adoption' is not used in Hebrews. But the idea is found there in the figure of the Author of salvation leading many sons to glory (Heb 2:10). (β) As High Priest, Jesus secures access to the Father for all who come unto God by Him (Eph 2:18, Heb 7:24-25). This priesthood is exercised by Him as our 'Brother,' and was granted to Him in view of His experience of our temptations (Heb 2:17; Heb 4:15). (γ) As King, Jesus Christ bestows a rich inheritance upon all His brethren. The children of God are 'joint-heirs with Christ' (Rom 8:17).

In regard to this whole question, it should be remembered that in all probability our human speech cannot describe adequately relations that reach into the eternal, and concern God. The figure of 'children' is an analogy rather than an exact parallel. Therefore we should be misunderstanding the teaching of Jesus if we pressed the analogy too far and sought to discover the exact counterpart of each element of the human relation in that which we bear to God. Also it is important to recall that Jesus was not concerned with abstract relations. His purpose was practical and religious, and He used terms just so far as they served that purpose. His terminology was consistent; it may not seem conclusive on all points that suggest themselves to abstract reasoning.

Literature.—Articles in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible on 'God, Children of,' 'Jesus Christ,' 'Romans,' and 'Regeneration'; Commentaries on the NT, especially those of Sanday-Headlam, Westcott, and Lightfoot; Fairbairn, *Christ in Modern Theology*; Watson, *The Mind of the Master*; Bruce, *Kingdom of God*, and *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*; Beyschlag, *NT Theology*; Coe, *Religion of a Mature Mind*, 187-216, *Education in Religion and Morals*, 65 ff., 373 ff.; Dalman, *Words of Jesus*; Stevens, *Christian Doct. of Salvation*, and *Theol. of NT*.

J. Edward Roberts.

CHILIARCH (χιλίαρχος).—The title of this military officer is twice used in the Gospels: Joh 18:12 and Mar 6:21 (Authorized Version ‘captain,’ ‘high captains’; Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘chief captain,’ ‘high captains’; (Revised Version margin) ‘military tribune(s), Gr. chiliarch(s)'). It is the Greek equivalent for the Roman office of *tribunus militum*, an office of great historical antiquity, from the analogy of which the famous *tribuni plebis* took their name. The *tribunus militum* is called by Mommsen ‘the pillar of the Roman military system’; he was an officer commanding a cohort. See, further, Legion.

A chiliarch with his ‘band’ (σπειρα) is represented by St. John as coming with Judas to take our Lord in the Garden of Gethsemane. If this is to be understood strictly as standing for a *tribunus militum* and his cohort, the use of so large a force would point to a great (real or assumed) fear of popular disturbance on the part of the authorities. The words may, however, be used in a general sense for a body of troops under an officer (see Westcott, *ad loc.*).

In St. Mark’s account of the martyrdom of John the Baptist, Herod the tetrarch of Galilee is represented as making a feast to his μεγαιστᾶνες (highest civil officials), χιλιαρχοι (highest military officers), and πρωτοι της Γαλιλαιας (leading provincials). These ‘chiliarchs’ were officers of the army of the tetrarch, which would be organized on Roman models. For the association of μεγαιστᾶνες and χιλιαρχοι cf. Rev 6:15. (See Swete’s *St Mark*, *ad loc.*).

M. R. Newbolt.

☞ Choice

CHOICE.—In the Gospels, choice is always expressed by one small group of closely connected words, viz. ἐκλέγομαι, ἐκλεκτός, ἐκλογή. And these at once define the nature of the choice, which is not that of ‘decision,’ but that of ‘selection.’ Perhaps the English term which more precisely than any other answers to ἐκλέγειν is to ‘cull,’ to choose here and there one, that is to say, out of a larger number laid out in view. And this force of the word is rather emphasized by the fact that in the NT the active voice of the verb is not employed, but only the middle or passive, with derivatives which are passive in character. It is not, then, the action of choosing which is prominent, but its result; or else the status or nature of that which is chosen. And this point is of some importance in view of the use to which some passages of the NT have

been put by those who have attempted to elaborate from them doctrines of election or predestination. Stress is never laid chiefly on the election or predestination of the Almighty, but on the fact that such and such are actually found among those whom God has culled for Himself, and who constitute His own people. It would be an advantage to accurate Christian thought if the rendering 'elect' were eliminated from the NT, and were replaced by 'chosen' or 'select,' although it is a direct derivative of the original.

The central meaning of the terms employed is well shown in the following cases:—'He marked how they chose out the chief seats' (Luk_14:7); 'Mary hath chosen the good part' (Luk_10:42); 'He called his disciples, and chose from them twelve, whom also he named apostles' (Luk_6:13), with which other passages relating to the choice of the Twelve should be compared, viz. Joh_6:70; Joh_15:16; Joh_15:19; Joh_13:38, Act_1:2, and, as essentially the same, Act_1:24; cf. also 1Co_1:27-28, Jam_2:4. A further selection for some special service is indicated in such passages as—'God made choice among you that by my mouth ...' (Act_15:7, cf. Act_6:3; Act_15:22; Act_15:25); 'Many are called, but few chosen' (Mat_22:14). And by an almost insensible gradation the use of the word passes on to such instances as the choice of Saul, 'a chosen vessel' (Act_9:15), 'the Christ of God, his chosen' (Luk_23:35; cf. Luk_9:35), and the chosen people of God (Act_13:17, Eph_1:4; 1Pe_2:4; 1Pe_2:6; 1Pe_2:9). The last named appear in a group of passages in the Gospels (on the lips of Christ Himself) which are of apocalyptic character, and in all which the English rendering is unfortunately 'elect'; e.g. 'Shall not God avenge his chosen?' (Luk_18:7); 'For the sake of his chosen whom he chose, he shortened the days' (Mar_13:20; Mar_13:22; Mar_13:27 || Mat_24:22; Mat_24:24; Mat_24:31). To these there are many similar instances in the Epistles (Rom_8:33; Rom_11:5; Rom_11:7; Rom_11:28, Col_3:12, 2Ti_2:10, Tit_1:1; 1Pe_1:1; cf. Rev_17:14). Individuals are spoken of as chosen (Rom_16:23; 1Pe_5:13, 2Jn_1:13), and also angels (1Ti_5:21); while God's purpose of selection is mentioned (Rom_9:11), and the status of those selected (1Th_1:4; 1Pe_1:10).

From the foregoing it is clear that in the Gospels, and in the NT generally, 'choice' expresses a selection of some among other alternatives, and commonly selection for some special service; God's people being selected that they may become His servants who serve Him and so serve all in the furtherance of His purposes of love, rather than on their own account alone. Moreover, God's choice is always viewed as an actual fact seen in its results, and never as an intention in advance; except perhaps in reference to St. Paul's apostolate and Jacob's destiny, both of which are, however, so referred to only when seen in retrospect. See Elect, Freewill.

E. P. Boys-Smith.

☞ Chorazin

CHORAZIN.—Mentioned once only in the Gospels, Mat 11:21 = Luk 10:13, along with Bethsaida, as one of the ‘cities’ (πόλεις) where most of Jesus’ mighty deeds were done. The name is not found in the OT nor in Josephus; and it is not certain whether it be the same place as ברנים or ברניים mentioned once in the Talmud (hoth, 85), where the superior quality of its wheat is praised. Jastrow’s gives ‘near Jerusalem,’ Dalman’s ‘יִסְבְּרִי’ name of place.’ One MS has ברניים, two ב’; see Rabbinowicz, ae Lectiones; Neubauer, Géographie du Talmud, p. 220. Most MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] of the NT spell Χοραζ(ε)iv, others, especially in Luke, Χωραζiv; so Stephen in Luke, but not Elzevir, Mill; D [Note: Deuteronomist.] both times Χωροζαiv, and the same form prevails in the Latin texts: *C(h)orozain*. Why the editions of the Peshitta, even Gwilliams’, spell כּוֹרָזִין *Kôrāzîn*, we fail to see. Barhebraeus gives expressly כּוֹרָזִין *Kurzîn* as the vocalization of the Peshitta, and *Chorazin* as that of the Greek.

Neither the grammatical form of the name (on which see Schwöbel, *ZDPV* [Note: *DPV Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.*] xxvii. 134) nor its etymology is sufficiently clear. The place has been identified with *Khersa* on the eastern shore of the Lake of Galilee, but more probably with *Khirbet Kerâzeh*, 4 kilometres N. of Tell Hûm, first discovered by Thomson in 1857. Eusebius calls it a κώμη (*oppidum*), 12 Roman miles from Capernaum, in his time deserted; but 12 seems to be a misspelling of the MS for 2, as given by the Latin translation of Jerome (Eusebius, *Onomasticon*, ed. Klostermann, 174. 25, 175. 25). * [Note: In the Latin text (OS2 114. 7) the name is spelt ‘Chorazin’, not ‘Chorozain,’ as stated in Encyc. Bibl., where also the modern name Kerâzeh is once spelt with K, as if it were ק.] On the ruins of Kerâzeh, especially its synagogue, see the literature quoted by Schürer, *GJV* [Note: *JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.*] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] § 27, n. [Note: note.] 59. Cheyne’s list of Proper Names (in the Queen’s Printers’ *Aids to the Student of the Holy Bible*) recommends the pronunciation *Cho-ra’zin*; this is supported by the modern form *Kerâzeh*, if it be the same name; the accentuation of the first syllable, common in German, has the support of *Kurzîn* in the Peshitta; in Latin *Choroza in*. The mediaeval explanation of the name ‘hoc mysterium meum’ = רֵאִי הוּא, goes back to Jerome (*OS* 61. 8). There

was once a tradition that the Antichrist was to be born in Chorazin, and that its inhabitants were proud of this, and therefore the place was cursed by Jesus; see *Expos. Times*, xv. [1904] p. 524. The name Chorazin is, like that of Nazareth, an interesting illustration of the scantiness of our literary tradition.† [Note: Among the mighty works done in Bethsaida the feeding of the 5000 is certainly to be reckoned (Luk 9:10 ff., where ἐπισιτισμος of v.12 is to be explained from Βηθσαιδά = οἶκος ἐπισιτισμοῦ [OS 174. 7, 188. 75]). Hence it is tempting to find one of the mighty works done at Chorazin in the healing of the demoniac in the land of the Gerasenes or Gergesenes (8:26), and to combine this name with Chorazin. In his *Philologica Sacra* (1890, p. 21) the present writer suggested that the prominent part played by the swine in that story may be derived from a local name like Ras el-chinzir or Tell abu-l-chinzir. The plural of chinzir (swine) is chanazir, of which Chorazin might be a transposition.]

Eb. Nestle.

☩ Chosen One

CHOSEN ONE.—This, like ‘Beloved’ (wh. see), seems to have been a pre-Christian designation of the Messiah, ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου occurs in the LXX Septuagint of Isa 42:1, and is there defined as Ἰσραήλ. But in the Book of Enoch ‘the Elect one’ is a common title of the Messiah (cf. 40:5, 49:2, 51:3, 5, 52:6, 9, 61:5, 8, 10, 62:1). Traces of it still survive in the Gospels, but there seems to have been a tendency to avoid its use, perhaps on the ground that it might seem to favour so-called ‘Adoptionist’ views of the nature of Christ’s relation to God. Luk 9:35 substitutes ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος (⋈^L [Note: L Bampton Lecture.] ⋈ (I), 274^{mg} Syr Sin a ff. 1. vg. codd. aeg. aeth.^{cod.} arm) for Mk.’s ὁ ἀγαπητός, and in Luk 23:35 we have ‘the Messiah of God, the Elect.’

Elsewhere the evidence is more doubtful, ὁ ἐκλεκτός τοῦ θεοῦ occurs in Joh 1:34 in ⋈^{*} [Note: In the Latin text (OS2 114. 7) the name is spelt ‘Chorazin’, not ‘Chorozain,’ as stated in *Encyc. Bibl.*, where also the modern name Kerâzeh is once spelt with K, as if it were ק.] 77, 218, Syr Sin Curse, and is adopted by Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, ii. 309. Lastly, ‘approved Son’ is given by Syr Sin in Joh 3:18 for τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. St. Mark and the editor of the First Gospel after him seem to have avoided the ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου of the LXX Septuagint (Isa 42:1) in their

accounts of the Baptism and Transfiguration, and to have fallen back on a Christianized version of Isa 42:1 preserved for us in Mat 12:18-21, in which ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου had taken the place of ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου of the LXX Septuagint .

Connected with the use of this title of the Messiah in the Gospels is the question as to the meaning of the aorist εὐδόκησα in Mar 1:11 = Mat 3:17 = Luk 3:22. Bacon (*Journ. Theol. Lit.* xvi. 136-139) urges that this means '(on whom) I fixed my choice,' i.e. 'whom I elected,' and refers in the thought of the Evangelist to the Divine election of Christ by God (cf. *AJTh* [Note: *JTh American Journal of Theology.*] ix. 451 ff.). So far as the First Gospel goes, there is much to be said for this. We might bring together the following passages Luk 3:17, Luk 17:5 ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα, Luk 11:27 πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου, LUK 28:18 ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῶ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς, and possibly the ἦλθον of Mat 10:40; Mat 15:24, as all in the mind of the Evangelist referring to the Divine choice, endowment, and mission of the eternally existing 'Son' (cf. Mat 11:27) into the world. To these should be added the citation in Mat 12:18 'Behold my son (servant?) whom I adopted, my beloved in whom my soul was well pleased,' where the aorists are most easily explained as expressing the Divine selection and appointment of the Messiah in a pre-temporal period. In the thought of the Evangelist, Jesus, born of the Virgin by the Holy Spirit, was the pre-existent Messiah (= Beloved) or Son (Mat 11:27) who had been forechosen by God (Mat 3:17, Mat 17:5), and who, when born into the world as Jesus, was 'God-with-us' (Mat 1:23). In this respect the writer of the First Gospel shows himself to be under the influence of the same conception of the Person of Christ that dominates the Johannine theology, though this conception under the categories of the *Logos* and the Divine *Son* is worked out much more fully in the Fourth than in the First Gospel. On the other hand, terms such as 'choice,' 'adoption,' which at an early period seem to have been borrowed from the Jewish Messianic doctrine to express it, and which survive here and there in the Synoptic Gospels and in the Acts (cf. Act 9:22 [Fl. Gig.] and 2Pe 1:17) are absent from St. John. Such terms were probably gradually dropped out of use because they could be used to support the view of the adoption of the man Jesus to be the Son of God, which they certainly did not originally express.

W. C. Allen.

CHRIST.—See Atonement, Authority of Christ, Birth of Christ, Dates, Death of Christ, Messiah, Person of Christ, Preaching Christ, etc. etc.

☩ Christ In Art

CHRIST IN ART

i. Symbols.—The representation of Christ by means of symbols is not earlier than that by means of pictures. There are found in the Catacombs at Rome at the commencement of Christian art not only the Fish symbol, but also pictures of the Good Shepherd, and of our Lord in certain Gospel scenes, all before the middle of the 2nd cent.; and of these the Good Shepherd carrying a sheep occurs in the Catacomb of Domitilla before the end of the 1st century, it will be, however, convenient to begin with the Symbols, proceeding thence through the Types to more direct representations of Christ.

1. **The Fish** was the most popular symbol of our Lord in the middle of the 2nd cent., and continued so till the end of the 4th, when it suddenly went out of use. More than one cause made it so general. Originating as an acrostic (the Greek word for ‘fish,’ ΙΧΘΥΣ, standing for Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, Θεοῦ Υἱός, Σωτήρ), it formed a most convenient secret sign among the Christians, being readily understood by the initiated as representing Christ in the fulness of His divinity. It carried with it also the thought of the sacramental feeding upon the Son of God, which is so prominent in early Christian art: e.g. the two paintings in the crypt of Lucina, which belong to the middle of the 2nd cent., and represent two baskets of bread, each containing a glass cup of wine and resting upon a fish. The earliest known representation of this symbol is even more significant: it occurs in the *Fractio Panis* fresco, recently discovered by Wilpert in the Catacomb of Priscilla, which belongs to the beginning of the 2nd cent., and is a picture of a primitive celebration of the Communion,—seven people are seated at a table on which lie live loaves, two fishes, and a two-handled mug, while the bishop or president at the end of the table is in the act of breaking a loaf. In this deeply interesting picture of the Eucharist we see a further reason why the Fish symbol was felt to be appropriate; it carried the mind to the miracle of the loaves and fishes, which was an early type of the Eucharist because of Joh 6:9-59. The Fish symbolizes not only the Eucharist, but the sacrament of Baptism as well; this is brought out by the common representation of a fish as swimming in the water (see below under ‘Symbolic Scenes’). ‘We little fishes,’ says Tertullian (*de Bapt.* i.), ‘after the example of our *Ichthus* Jesus Christ, are born in water.’ Cf. St. Clement below, under ‘Other Symbols.’ This double symbolism is tersely expressed in the 2nd cent, inscription of

Abercius recently discovered by Ramsay at Hierapolis:—‘... everywhere was faith my guide, and gave me everywhere for food the *Ichthus* from the spring.’

2. Other Symbols.—The Fish was early combined with other symbols, such as the Dove, the Cross, the Ship, the Shepherd, and especially with the Anchor, the combination of the Fish and the Anchor (first found on the sarcophagus of Livia Primitiva about the middle of the 2nd cent.) being a hieroglyph for the common epitaph ‘*Spes in Christo.*’

There is an early mention of Christian symbols in St. Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* iii. 11): ‘Let the engraving upon the gem of your ring be either a dove, or a fish, or a ship running before the wind, or a musical lyre, the device used by Polycrates, or a ship’s anchor, which Selencus had carved upon his signet. And if the device represent a man fishing, it will remind us of an apostle, and of children drawn out of water.’

All these symbols, it will be noticed, are common ones, such as would not excite comment among pagans. However, the Dove (at first a symbol of peace) and the Ship (which represented the Church), the Lyre (a symbol of Orpheus, see below) and the Anchor of hope (see also under ‘Cross’) are not direct symbols of Christ; nor, except by way of the Eucharist, are they representations of bread, wine, or the grape. The *Agnus Dei*, a post-Constantinian symbol, may more conveniently be considered under the head of ‘NT types.’

In mediaeval art a trace of the Fish symbol survived—as indeed it survives to-day—in the *vesica piscis*, a figure which is still customarily restricted to the seals of ecclesiastical persons and corporations. The Dove, at first used as an emblem of peace, sometimes with an olive branch in its mouth (though it occurs in pictures of the Baptism of Christ in the Catacombs), was the recognized symbol of the Holy Spirit in the apsidal mosaics of the 4th and 5th centuries, and thus has continued ever since: the Lamb, the Hand of God, and the Cross (see below), found in connexion with the Dove in these mosaics, also continued as common symbols in the Middle Ages, when interlaced triangles and circles further represented the Trinity.

Two emblems of immortality, the Peacock (from the fabled indestructibility of its flesh) and the Phœnix, rising from its ashes, were early used as types of Christ. The Star (Rev 22:16) and the Sun (Mal 4:2) were also used; the Rose and Lily (Son 2:1) were very favourite subjects of decorative art after the 13th cent., but they came to be used rather as emblems of Christ’s Mother than of our Lord Himself, and often as badges of the royal houses in England and France: the Pomegranate, split open, originally a type of Divine grace, became similarly common as a Tudor badge. In the Middle Ages, when great emphasis was laid upon the Eucharistic sacrifice, symbols of the Passion were much in vogue, in addition to the Vine and Corn, the Chalice and the

Host. Hence the use of the Pelican, the great prevalence of the *Agnus Dei* and the Crucifix, and the constant use of the Instruments of the Passion, in addition to the almost infinite varieties of the Cross. The Instruments of the Passion, so common still in decorative art, are the Crown of Thorns, the Nails, the Coat and Dice, the Scourges, Pillar, Ladder and Sponge, the Five Wounds, Hammer, Pincers; to which are sometimes added the Sword and Staff, Lantern, Thirty Pieces and Cock, the Pierced Heart, and the Vernicle or Napkin of Veronica, and the Superscription INRI. The Passion-flower, a popular emblem at the present day, was introduced by the Jesuit missionaries from Mexico, as containing symbols of the Twelve Apostles, the Five Wounds, the Three Nails, and the Crown of Thorns.

3. Sacred Monograms.—The Alpha and Omega naturally appear early (though not in monogrammatic or interwoven form) because of Rev 1:8; the first instance in the Catacomb of St. Priscilla, 2nd cent.—‘Modestina AΩ,’ which means ‘Modestina live in Christ.’ Some of the sacred monograms are really contractions; for instance, the familiar IHC and XPC are the first two and the *last* letters of IHCOYC and XPICTO C, just as MR stands for MARTYR, or DO for DOMINO; contractions of this sort were extremely common in sepulchral inscriptions (e.g. ‘Lucretia pax tecum in DO’), but there was no fixed method; the abbreviations IH and XP alone are sometimes found, and also the initials IX, which, combined, formed the earliest or pre-Constantinian monogram (the first instance being in a 3rd cent. fresco in the Catacomb of SS. Peter and Marcellinus). None of these, however, are found by themselves, but only as abbreviations in the course of an inscription. The Constantinian monogram \square (for XP) is the first to stand alone, though it does also occur in inscriptions (e.g. ‘Roges pro nobis quia scimus te in \square ’); this monogram was considered a form of the Cross (see below); it is characteristic of the conversion of the Empire, and is rarely found subsequent to the Sack of Rome by Alaric in 410. It is often surrounded by a wreath, and often has the A and Ω on either side to mark the divinity of our Lord; in a 4th cent. lead coffin from Saida in Phœnicia, the letters of the old symbol IX Θ YC he between the arms of the monogram. Three main variations of it appear in which the Cross is made more apparent \square , and \square , but these are later and less common.

The contraction IHC, as subsequently Latinized, into IHS, is now called the Sacred Monogram *par excellence*, and is as popular as it was in the Middle Ages and in the 17th and 18th centuries, when it was almost the only symbol of the kind; this was owing mainly to its being misunderstood as the initials of ‘Jesus Hominum Salvator’ (or even of ‘In Hoc Signo’); in mediæval times the confusion may not have arisen, in spite of the ambiguity of the Greek Θ [Note: Law of Holiness.] in Gothic character,

for the letter J [Note: Jahwist.] was often replaced by IH or HI [Note: I History of Israel.] , and 'Ihesus' was a common way of spelling the holy name. Meanwhile the contraction of the title XPS has been almost forgotten; its use in such an inscription as IHS XPS NIKA would seem strange to our eyes; but HIS XPS occur on a portrait of Christ in the Codex Egberti (*circa (about) 1000*), and are not unknown in late mediaeval art, e.g. both are found among the tiles of Malvern Abbey.

The initials of the Superscription INRI ('Iesus Nazarenus Rex Judaeorum'), which now rank next to the IHS in popular estimation, do not seem to have appeared till the 13th cent., after which they became the favourite abbreviation of painters (cf. below under 'Crucifixion').

4. The symbol of the Cross eventually supplanted altogether that of the Fish. But in early Christian art representations of it are very rare, and at first only given in a disguised form, although the sign of the Cross was already so greatly revered towards the end of the 2nd cent, as to be used by Christians before almost every act of daily life,—dressing, eating, bathing, going to bed, etc.,—'quaecumque nos conversatio exercet, frontem crucis signaculo terimus,' etc. (Tert. *de Coron. Mil.* iii.). This great reserve was due partly to the natural shrinking from the portrayal of an instrument which was still in use for the most degraded form of execution, partly also to the fact that *all* Christian symbolism was necessarily of a hidden nature in the ages previous to the Peace of the Church. Thus the first representations of the Cross are very indirect; the cross-marks on the round Eucharistic loaves, which are found as early as the 2nd cent, (on a sarcophagus in the Catacomb of Priscilla), merely represent the folding up of the corners of the bread to make it round. The Anchor (a symbol which is rare after the 3rd cent.) often has a crossbar so marked as to be clearly symbolic; it was, in fact, according to Marucchi, a hidden form of the Cross, a symbolized hope in the Cross.

The earliest representation of the Cross by itself—the *swastica* or 'fylfot'—which is found in the Catacombs in the 3rd cent, and is not uncommon in the earliest Christian textiles—was a form so 'dissimulated' as to pass unnoticed among pagans who were accustomed to its use as a conventional ornament. Only one undisguised Cross occurs in the Catacombs during the ages of sepulture (*i.e.* before the Sack of Rome in 410), and this is the so-called Greek or equilateral Cross +, which has no special connexion with the Eastern Church; a small 4th cent, example of this Cross has been found in the nameless *hypogeum* near St. Callistus. There is a Cross, still dissimulated, in a 4th cent, fresco in the Catacomb of Callistus, a green tree with two branches, under which are two doves; for the rest, in the Catacombs the earliest 'true and proper Cross,' as Wilpert calls it, the earliest, that is, which is not a bare symbol, is in the Catacomb of Ponziano—a gemmed *Latin* Cross of the end of the 5th cent.; another similar example in the same place is attributed to the 6th or 7th. In a late 4th cent,

mosaic in the church of St. Pudenziana, Rome, is one of the few undisguised Crosses that have been discovered of an earlier date than the 5th cent.; it stands in the midst of the half dome of the apse, and is of the so-called Latin shape (*crux immissa*), and gemmed; but the use of the Latin Cross did not become common till the 6th century.

The *crux commissa*, or Tan Cross, appears earlier; for, though a more exact representation of the actual instrument of death, it would pass unnoticed as the letter \square . Of this form Tertullian says (*adr. Marc. iii. 22*), 'Ipsa est enim littera Graecorum Tan, nostra autem T, species crucis.' The Cross was probably recognized as hidden in the pre-Constantinian form of the Monogram; and though it is still disguised in the 'Constantinian Monogram,' yet this symbol \square was considered as a Cross in the 4th cent., and it must have been the 'Cross' which Constantine saw in the sky, since the Cross is always represented by this Monogram in contemporary art. In the later varieties of the Monogram, as we have seen, the Cross was more plainly introduced, e.g. \square .

Later ages increased the number of forms till there were about fifty, not counting subdivisions, which are duly named by the mediaeval heralds, e.g. the Cross Potent, Fleurie, Fleurettée, Patonce, Moline, Botonnée, Pommée, Urdée, Fourchée, Paternoster, Triparted, Crescenced, Interlaced, etc, in addition to the familiar Maltese Cross worn by the Knights Templars and the Knights of St. John, the Cross of St. James borne by the Knights of St. Iago, the Saltire of Scotland and Ireland, etc. It may be added that the use of small Crosses carried about the person dates from the 5th cent., when also processional Crosses came into use (e.g. a Cross is carried, and candles, in a 5th cent, ivory, at Trèves): it was not till later that the processional Cross came to be taken from its staff and placed on the altar during service time; indeed, the use of an altar-Cross continued to be far from universal throughout the Middle Ages.

5. The Crucifix, which became the principal feature of mediaeval churches, is naturally of still later date than the Cross, for the motives which caused the early Church to shrink from an open representation of the latter would apply still more to the realism of the Crucifix. In addition to this, the blithe spirit of Christian art in the first four centuries was certainly against the portrayal of scenes of suffering and sorrow; representations of scenes from the Passion are very rare (see below), and pictures of death or martyrdom do not occur.

That the death upon the Cross was 'foolishness' to pagans as well as a stumbling-block to the Jews (1Co 1:18; 1Co 1:23), is curiously illustrated by the caricature of the Crucifixion which was scratched on the wall of the pages' quarter at the Palatine in the latter part of the 2nd cent., and was discovered in 1856; the figure on the Cross has an ass's head, and by it stands a worshipper with the scrawled inscription AAE Ξ A

MΕΝΟΣ ΣΕΒΕΤΕ ΘΕΟΝ ('Alexamenos adores his god'). This caricature is, as a matter of fact, the only picture of a crucifixion that has been found within the first four centuries.

The earliest Christian example of any kind is on a panel of the 5th cent, doors of St. Sabina at Rome, about a century and a half after Constantine had abolished the penalty of crucifixion. The next is in a 5th cent, ivory in the British Museum. The third is in a Syrian MS of the year 586, and is the earliest dated example. But all these three belong to the category of 'Scenes from the Gospels.' The earliest actual Crucifix that is extant is a small amulet at Monza, which was given by Gregory the Great to Adaluwald the son of Queen Theodolind, and belongs therefore to the end of the 6th century. Early Christian literature (the reliability of which is illustrated by every fresh discovery in the realm of archaeology) is markedly silent on the subject, the first mention of a picture of the Crucifixion being in the middle of the 6th century. At the close of that century Gregory of Tours supplies the earliest mention of an actual Crucifix, when he tells us that there was one in a church at Narbonne, and that Christ appeared in a vision to rebuke this representation because of its nakedness. About the time of Charlemagne (800) the use of Crucifixes became very general, and they gradually ceased to be of the ideal type; but as this development belongs rather to the representation of Christ in 'Scenes from the Gospels,' the details are given below under that head.

ii. Types

1. Pagan.—Early Christian art is classical not only in its reserve about the Cross, not only in its use of the ordinary classical decorative subjects, but also in its use of certain pagan myths as symbolizing aspects of the Christian faith. It is remarkable that the moral value of the better elements of mythology should have been thus recognized at the very tombs of martyrs who had suffered at the hands of paganism. The figure of *Orpheus* was familiar as a funereal symbol among the ancients because of his fabled rescue of Eurydice from Hades: in the Catacombs it was adopted by the Christians as a symbol of the attractive power of the Master. There are five instances of Orpheus with his lyre in the Catacombs, the earliest being of the 2nd century.

Sometimes Orpheus is represented in his conventional Phrygian costume playing upon the lyre, while various beasts, birds, and reptiles listen to him; sometimes it is sheep that gather round, for Orpheus was a shepherd, and thus his story was interwoven with the Good Shepherd theme; sometimes the figure of Orpheus is even painted in the centre of a vault—in the place usually reserved for the Good Shepherd.

The story of *Psyche* was similarly used, typifying here the love of God for the soul. *Ulysses and the Sirens* occurs several times on Christian sarcophagi, and *Hercules*

feeding the dragon with poppy-seed is also found. The *peacock* and the *phoenix*, symbols of immortality, and thus of Christ triumphing over death, as well as the *dolphin*, carrier of souls to the Isles of the Blessed, were other pagan types that continued in use among the Christians. In this connexion may also be mentioned the ancient Egyptian symbol of the so-called Nile key , * [Note: See art. 'Cross' by Count Gohlet d'Alviella in Hastings' forthcoming Diet, of Religion and Ethics.] which was used in textiles by the Christians in Egypt for several centuries after the conversion of that country.

2. OT types.—OT subjects are common in the Catacombs, and in some the principal figure is identified with Christ. This is the case with *Moses striking the Rock*, where Moses becomes the type of Christ and the water a type of Baptism, the point being sometimes emphasized by the conjunction of Christ drawing a fish out of the water, or in the sarcophagi by the raising of Lazarus. The *Sacrifice of Isaac* was also a favourite subject as typical of the Sacrifice of Christ. The story of *Jonah* was the most popular of all (there are 57 examples), as a type of the Resurrection which had been established by Christ Himself (Mat. 12:40). In the story of *The Three Children* the figure of the Son of Man is sometimes introduced. Although such OT subjects as *Adam and Eve* do not readily admit of the same typical treatment, yet in some 4th cent. sarcophagi Christ is introduced as the Logos standing between them. Representations of *Noah* appear as early as the end of the 1st cent., but the ark is a symbol both of deliverance and of Baptism (1Pe 3:21), so that Noah represents the saved rather than the Saviour. From the 4th cent., when mosaics came into use, OT subjects were largely employed in the great apsidal decorations of the succeeding centuries; but all that need here be mentioned are the 6th cent. mosaic of St. Vitale at Ravenna, where Abel with a lamb and Melchizedek with a loaf stand as types of Christ on either side of the Christian altar,—which is draped and has on it a two-handled chalice and two loaves,—and the 7th cent. mosaic at St. Apollinare in Classe, where Abel, Melchizedek, and Abraham leading Isaac stand round a similar altar.

3. NT types.—The earliest manner of representing our Lord as a solitary figure was under the type which He Himself had given—that of the *Good Shepherd*. In its reserve, its tenderness, its gracious beauty, the figure of the Good Shepherd was characteristic of the first Christian art, and its subsequent disappearance was also characteristic of much.

This figure, which appears first in the Catacomb of Lucina in the early part of the 2nd cent. and became thereafter exceedingly common, was in no sense an attempt at portraiture. The Shepherd is always a typical shepherd of the Campagna, a beardless youth, bareheaded, clad in the tunic of the peasant; the tunic is generally sleeveless, with sometimes a small cape over the shoulders, while leggings complete the realism of the attire. There are two distinct classes of Good Shepherd pictures in the

Catacombs:—(a) 21 represent him feeding his flock (in one case he protects it against a pig and an ass); these belong to the 3rd and 4th cents.; (b) 88 pictures represent him carrying a sheep (very rarely a kid—there is probably no foundation for the beautiful idea in M. Arnold's famous aonnet); in these the sheep, according to Wilpert, represents the soul of the departed person. Class *b* begins very early, 3 examples of the end of the 1st cent. occurring in the Catacomb of St. Domitilla. In spite of the realism of the Good Shepherd pictures, there is a certain hieratic grace and dignity about the figure that marks it at once as a Christian subject, though the figure of a shepherd was common enough in pagan art (e.g. the Hermes Kriophoros bearing a ram, or the Apollo Nomios) to make it both a safe and an accessible model for Christians. The theme is varied in many ways: occasionally the Good Shepherd carries a kid, sometimes other sheep or goats stand near him; in a fresco in the Catacomb of St. Callistus he is surrounded by the Four Seasons; sometimes he sits and plays upon a syrinx; sometimes he carries a crook, and sometimes a milk-pail, a symbol of the gift of life,—indeed, the sheep and the milk-pail are occasionally represented by themselves, e.g. in the crypt of St. Lucina two sheep stand by an altar on which lie a milk-pail and a crook. Tertullian (*circa (about) 200*) mentions the painting of the Good Shepherd on chalices as a common custom (*de Pudic. vii.*). Statues were probably not introduced before the time of Constantine, but an exception was made in the case of the Good Shepherd; and the most lovely example of all is the statue of the 3rd cent. which was found in the Catacomb of St. Callistus, and now stands in the Lateran Museum. Pictures of the Good Shepherd have become popular again in our own time, but they are attempts at portraiture and very far from the idealistic type—it may almost be called a symbol—of the early ages, which represents a shepherd as Christ, and does not attempt to portray Christ as a shepherd.

The symbolism of the Good Shepherd, which had held so prominent a place in the affections of the Church, disappeared rapidly after the 4th cent., and was replaced by another NT type, very different in its meaning, the *Agnus Dei*, the mystic Lamb of St. John the Baptist and of St. John the Divine. Apparently it was not possible for men's minds to keep in view the two ideas at once of Christ the Shepherd and Christ the Lamb, though this is attempted in the Catacomb of St. Domitilla (2nd cent.), where the Lamb bears the crook and milk-pail of the pastor. The earliest known instance of the identification of Christ with the Lamb is on the spandrels of the sarcophagus of Junius Bassus, who died in 350: Christ is represented among the Three Children, striking water from the Rock, raising Lazarus, multiplying the Loaves, baptized by John, while another spandrel represents the giving of the Law; and in each case all the characters (with the exception of Lazarus) are represented as lambs. In the Catacomb of SS. Peter and Marcellinus there is a fresco (*circa (about) 400*) of the Lamb, haloed but with no Cross, standing on hillock from which four streams issue. Apocalyptic scenes were the favourite subject of the great apsidal mosaics of the 5th

and 6th cents., and naturally the 'Lamb, standing as though it had been slain,' became more and more the favourite type of Christ. Often the Lamb was accompanied by twelve other lambs issuing from Bethlehem and Jerusalem, to represent the Apostles, as in the apse of SS. Cosmas and Damians at Rome, a.d. 530.

There is something significant in this identification of the Lord with humanity, paralleled as it is by the earlier tendency to represent under the Fish symbol not only Christ Himself, but also the Christian convert. Established as the type was before the end of the 4th cent., it was not till the 5th that the Lamb was pictured with the nimbus and the cross. By 692 this method of representing Christ had so superseded all others, that the Council in Trullo (Quinisext) decreed 'that henceforth Christ shall be publicly exhibited in the figure of a Man and not of a Lamb,' in order that 'we may be led to remember Christ's conversation in the flesh, and His passion, and saving death, and the redemption which He wrought for the world.' None the less, although the positive object of the decree was attained, the representation of the *Agnus Dei* was one of the most common symbols of the Middle Ages, in sculpture, in glass, in metal work and embroidery, and sometimes in painting, as in the culminating example of the Van Eycks' great picture at Ghent (*circa (about)* 1430), where the Lamb stands wounded upon an altar, the blood flowing into a chalice, surrounded by a great company of angels and saints. Thus, this type has proved a most enduring one, in spite of the growing use of actual representations of our Lord after the Quinisext Council.

III. Portraits of Christ.

1. Scenes from the Gospels.—The earliest pictures of Christ are not attempts at portraiture, but represent His figure only as occurring in scenes from the Gospels: the figure is needed to explain the subject, but it is the figure of a man of varying type, and, as in all early Christian art, without attributes; the character is determined only by its position and by the fact that Christ, like the Apostles and generally other Scripture characters, is always represented as wearing the pallium of the philosopher (not the toga), a convention which has survived down to our own time, though realists like Tissot have begun its destruction. It was not till after the Peace of the Church that the head of Christ was distinguished by a nimbus: this custom began in the Catacombs *circa (about)* 340, and the nimbus was reserved for the figure of Christ till the end of the 5th cent., when it was given to the Saints as well, and the nimbus of Christ began to be distinguished by a cross within the circle. Among the earliest instances in which the figure of Christ appears are those which represent Him in the same guise as that which was so common in later ages, viz. as an *infant in His Mother's arms*; but it was for a different reason, since the Mother and Child are but parts of a complete scene, such as that of the Visit of the Magi.

The earliest of all is in the Capella Greca in the Catacomb of St. Priscilla, and belongs to the beginning of the 2nd cent., where three Magi approach the Mother and Child with their offerings: this subject was a very common one, fifteen instances being mentioned by Wilpert in the Catacombs, and it continued so in the succeeding ages of sculpture and mosaic. In the Catacomb of St. Priscilla there is another fresco (of the first half of the 2nd cent.), representing the Virgin and Child sitting, while a figure (the prophet Isaiah) points to a star. The picture of the Virgin and Child in this well-known fresco is very beautiful, recalling in stateliness and grace as well as in design Raphael's treatment of the subject: nothing could be more unlike the hieratic stiffness of the intervening Byzantine and Gothic types. The figure of the Child is naked in this instance, though in some it is draped; but in all, the treatment is that which we are accustomed to associate with the Renaissance. A fine 3rd cent. fresco in the same catacomb has the figure of a female *orans* (representing a consecrated virgin) in the midst, while a bishop on one side sits in his cathedra, accompanied by his deacon, and in the act of dedicating a virgin; he points to the figure on the other side of the picture, which is that of the Virgin Mary holding the Child Christ in her lap. There is also one instance of the Child lying alone in a manger (now much decayed) given by de Rossi. To carry the subject a step further, the important 6th cent. mosaics of St. Apollinare Nuove at Ravenna must be mentioned: along one wall of the nave a procession of male martyrs approaches Christ enthroned between angels, and along the other a procession of female martyrs approach the Virgin and Child similarly enthroned between angels; the Virgin has a plain nimbus and that of the Child contains the cross, while both figures are of the lofty hieratic type that endured for so many subsequent centuries; but it is remarkable that (while the figure of the enthroned Christ on the other wall is approached directly) the procession of female martyrs is led by the Magi, and thus the common tradition is still preserved by which the Mother and Child appear as part of this Gospel scene. This may be taken as a transitional instance, leading on to the later manner of representing the Virgin and Child, which has been the chief theme of Christian art since that age, and the occasion of so many masterpieces, from Cimabue, Giotto, Filippino Lippi, Botticelli, Della Robbia, and the great company of Christian sculptors, Raphael, Michael Angelo, Murillo, and countless others down to our own time.

In the 2nd and 3rd cent. frescoes of the Catacombs the adult figure of Christ appears in many pictures of Gospel events; and it is remarkable that there is in the Catacomb of St. Pretestato a scene from the Passion which is almost as early as the first Virgin and Child,—viz. of the first half of the 2nd cent.,—and yet occurs once only: the *Crowning with Thorns* is the subject represented, and other scenes from the Passion may have occupied the now vacant spaces which form part of the scheme; yet no other picture of any Holy Week event occurs in the Catacombs. It is remarkable also that the subject most referred to by indirect type—the Resurrection of our Lord—is never once illustrated until the 4th cent.; while the figure of *Christ raising Lazarus*

appears as early as the beginning of the 2nd cent., and occurs in no less than 53 extant examples. It must always be borne in mind that the Catacombs were not, as is popularly supposed, the ordinary churches or hiding-places of the Christians, but were designed and used for burials and services in connexion with the departed, and their art is entirely confined to subjects within this purpose. Thus, the Gospel events are all chosen with reference to two themes—the deliverance and blessedness of the departed, and the sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion, which were closely bound up with the thought of the faithful departed, as is shown by the reference to baptism in 1Co_15:29, and by the many chapels for and pictures of the Eucharist in the Catacombs. Thus, the Raising of Lazarus, the scenes of Healing, the Conversation about the Living Water with the Samaritan woman (as well as the pictures in which our Lord does not appear, such as Jonah and Daniel), all refer to deliverance from the powers of death; while the Baptism of Christ, the Multiplication of the Loaves and Fishes, and the Miracle at Cana, are chosen for their reference to the Sacraments. There is a good deal of convention in the treatment of these subjects—e.g. Lazarus is represented as a mummy erect in a classical doorway, while Christ—youthful and beardless—touches him with a rod. The same scenes are carried on in the sculptures of the sarcophagi—Lazarus, the Miracles of Healing, of the Loaves, of Cana, the Epiphany, as well as the Good Shepherd; while in the 4th cent. sarcophagi are found the Entry into Jerusalem, and Christ before Pilate; the limited funereal cycle of subjects is widened out, and in the 5th cent. ivories and the carved doors of St. Sabina there are added Christ Preaching, the Agony in the Garden, the Betrayal, Christ bearing His Cross, Christ and St. Thomas, the Resurrection, and the Ascension.

But the number of events illustrated did not increase rapidly; even in modern times it has continued to be limited, as we are reminded by a comparison with Tissot's illustrated Life of our Lord. The following list of the subjects from the life of Christ which are illustrated in ancient and mediaeval art is given by Detzel; those which occur in the Catacombs we have italicized:—

Nativity, Virgin and Child, Circumcision, Presentation, Visit of Magi and Shepherds, Flight into Egypt, Christ among the Doctors;—Baptism, Temptation, Miracle at Cana, Samaritan Woman, Healing of the Palsied, of the Woman with the Issue, of the Blind, of the Man with Dropsy, Lepers, Raising of Lazarus, of the Man at Naio, of Jairus' Daughter, Feeding of the Multitude, Casting out Devils, Stilling of the Storm, the Transfiguration;—Entry into Jerusalem, [Jesus taking leave of His Mother, by Durer], Washing the Disciples' Feet, Last Supper, Agony in the Garden, Betrayal, Trial, Scourging, Crowning with Thorns, Carrying the Cross, Crucifixion, Descent from Cross ['Pietà' pictures], Burial, [Idealizations of the Passion or 'Misericordienbilder,' as, e.g., in the legend of the Mass of St. Gregory], Christ in Hades; Resurrection, and the subsequent events—Christ greeting the Women, 'Noli me tangere'—Journey to

Emmaus, Christ appearing to the Apostles, Christ and St. Thomas, *Draught of Fishes at the Sea of Tiberias*, Ascension, [*Last Judgment*].

The set of fourteen pictures found in Roman Catholic churches and called the 'Stations of the Cross,' some of which are legendary, are of post-Reformation origin. One scene from the Gospels, the Crucifixion, must be taken separately.

The Crucifixion as a scene from the Gospels (not in isolation) first appears in the 5th cent. on the wooden doors of St. Sabina at Rome. In this earliest example the primitive feeling is shown by the fact that no actual cross appears; Christ and the two thieves stand, almost completely naked, with the elbows near the body and the hands stretched out and nailed to little blocks of wood; the Christ is bearded and with long hair, and his eyes are open; the sculptor has filled up the background with a suggestion of the walls of Jerusalem.—The second example is also of the 5th century. It occurs on an ivory box in the British Museum: the cross is shown, and the Christ is nailed to it with arms stretched out horizontally; His face is youthful and beardless, His eyes open, and His body naked but for the loin-cloth; on one side stands a reviling Jew, on the other Mary and John, while near them Judas hangs from a tree: in this sculpture the title appears REX IVD. It is on another panel of the same box that the earliest representation of Christ bearing the cross appears.—The third Crucifixion is a miniature in a Syrian book of the Gospels, now at Florence, by Rabulas, a monk of Mesopotamia, and is dated 586: the Christ is bearded, and wears a long tunic; as in the former example, the feet are separate and the arms horizontal; the two thieves, St. John and the women, and the two soldiers with the spear and sponge, are included in the picture.

The history of the development of the Crucifix may be thus summarized. Appearing first as a scene of Gospel history in the 5th cent., it continued infrequent for another century, after which, in the 6th cent., the Crucifix in isolation begins also to appear. During the 5th, 6th, and 7th centuries it has the following characteristics: the Christ wears either a loin-cloth or a long tunic reaching to the ankles, there are nails in the hands and generally in the feet also, the feet are always separate, either with or without the block or 'suppedaneum,' the Christ is always living, He wears neither the royal crown nor the crown of thorns, the title, when there is one, consists generally of the letters IC XC, the cross is either *commissa* (☩) or *immissa* (†); certain adjuncts also appear, the sun and moon generally, the thieves often, Mary and John generally, the two soldiers sometimes, sometimes also the soldiers dicing, and sometimes Adam and Eve.

About the time of Charlemagne (800) there was a great increase in the use of the Crucifix; and in addition to the early or Ideal type, a second type, the Realistic, began

to appear. The Ideal type continued till the end of the 13th cent. (e.g. in the Codex Egberti at Trèves, *circa (about)* 1000, where the Christ is represented with a youthful, almost girlish face, and living, though without the royal crown, which is often added at this period to emphasize the triumphant aspect of the Crucifixion). The Realistic type, in which the Christ is represented dying, as in modern crucifixes, had become in the 11th cent. a distinctive mark of the Eastern Church, and figures in the disputes which ended in the great schism of 1054: Cardinal Humbert accused the Greeks of putting a dying Christ upon their crosses, and thus setting up a kind of Antichrist; the Patriarch Michael Cerularius retorted, in the discussion at Constantinople, that the Western custom was against nature, while the East was according to nature. None the less, the Eastern type had already found its way into Italy itself through the influence of the Byzantine craftsmen who worked there, and it spread steadily throughout the West, till by the 13th cent. it was the dominant type all over Christendom. There was sometimes in the transitional period a mingling of the types, as, e.g., in the Crucifix over the gate of St. John's Church at Gmünd, where the figure is youthful, with open eyes and in a tranquil posture, without the crown of thorns, but the wounds and blood are shown, and the arms are bent and the head drooping. The complete Realistic type is well illustrated in the altar-cross at the Klostersneuburg, Vienna, a.d. 1181, where the body is collapsed, the knees bent, the arms wrung, and the head sunk. In the 13th cent. the Crown of Thorns appears, and the feet are laid one over the other, so that the figure is held by three nails instead of four. The Realistic tendency of the Middle Ages entirely ousted the earlier triumphant type, and in the 14th cent. only the dead Christ is found upon the Cross in art. The revival of painting at this period led to a further increase of Realism, and the artists who pioneered the Renaissance delighted in the display of their anatomical knowledge: none the less there is much majesty of quiet reserve in such Crucifixions as those of Angelico in the 15th or that of Luini at Lugano in the 16th century. Among the famous examples may be mentioned those of Giotto (at Padua), Mantegna, Perugino (at Florence), Antonello da Messina, Martin Schongauer, Hans Memling, Raphael, Tintoret, Veronese, Rubens, and Vandyke,—the later being the more painful. The great Crucifixion by Velasquez, in the 17th cent. at Madrid, illustrates the furthest point which was reached. Westcott truly says that it 'presents the thought of hopeless defeat. No early Christian would have dared to look upon it.' The same type—a tortured figure hanging low from the hands—continued in the Crucifixes of the 18th cent., though the mediaeval type was revived in the 19th, and at the present day there is a tendency to revert to the earliest Ideal type which showed Christ 'reigning from the tree.' There can be little dispute as to the fact that the mediaeval Crucifix did tend to over emphasize one aspect of our Lord's life, though its constant use in Lutheran churches forbids us to connect it specially with one set of opinions. There would perhaps have been less feeling on the subject among English people if the Ideal type had been used—the benedictory figure, draped and crowned, which

embodies the idea but does not attempt to represent the appearance of our Lord's death.

2. Symbolical Scenes.—As we have seen, the earliest of any representations of Christ is under the form of the Good Shepherd, and occurs before the end of the 1st cent., while close upon this come pictures of Him in His Mother's arms, and a picture of His Baptism and of the Crowning with Thorns in the first half of the 2nd century. Before the close of the 2nd cent. there appear representations of Him in scenes that are symbolical of Christian doctrine; and the earliest of these are in connexion with the Sacraments, while in the 3rd and 4th centuries the pictures of Him surrounded by Saints in glory begin to appear.

(a) *Sacrament Pictures.*—In addition to the Gospel scenes of the Feeding of the Multitude, the Miracle of Cana, and the Baptism of Christ, in the Catacombs, there are Sacrament pictures that are purely symbolical.

In the Sacrament Chapels of St. Callistus, whose decorations belong to the second half of the 2nd cent., there is a figure of our Lord, beardless and wearing the pallium as usual, stretching out His hands in the gesture of consecration over a tripod on which lie loaves and the mystic fish, while an *orans*, typical figure of the soul of the person buried in the tomb, stands by. Among other pictures in the same place is one supposed to represent the Seven Disciples at the Sea of Tiberias after the Resurrection; Christ is giving them bread and fish, while further along in the same picture a fisherman is represented drawing a fish out of the water, to symbolize union with Christ in baptism, and further still is Moses striking the rock: thus Baptism and the Eucharist are symbolized together. This connexion of the two Sacraments is very common, and often it is done by the juxtaposition of the Feeding of the Multitude, of which there are in the Catacombs 28 examples in all, and Moses Striking the Rock, of which there are no less than 68 examples. In the same chamber is a picture of the baptism of a catechumen, and near it the Baptism of Christ in the river, out of which a fisherman is drawing a fish. In other places the idea is abbreviated into a mere hieroglyph of loaves or loaves and fishes.

In the Middle Ages there was a very popular form of Sacrament picture, which had reference, however, to the sacrifice and not to Communion, viz. the 'Mass of St. Gregory,' referred to above, where Christ appears upon the altar with the attributes of His Passion, wounded, and crowned with thorns. The modern Eucharistic pictures of our Lord, which are common among both Catholics and Protestants, need only the bare mention here.

(b) *Pictures of Christ in Majesty.*—There are no pictures of our Lord alone, or of Him as the central dominating figure of a formal group, till the 3rd century. Up till

then—from as early a period as the end of the 1st cent.—the artists, when they wished to represent Him alone (as often in the centre of a decorated vault), were content to do so under the type of the Good Shepherd. At the beginning of the 3rd cent. there appears in the Catacomb of St. Pretestato the earliest picture of Christ as a solitary figure; He sits reading the Law; the face is young and beardless, and the hair is so ample as to give almost a feminine aspect. In the same century pictures occur of our Lord sitting in judgment surrounded by saints, as, e.g., in the Nunziatella cemetery, where the Christ, beardless as usual, but with hair falling over the forehead, holds a scroll of the Law, and in the panels round the vault are four saints alternating with four *orantes*. There are seven examples in the Catacombs of Christ seated in the midst of the Twelve Apostles, and one of Him with the Four Evangelists, and also nine busts, all painted in the 4th cent., *i.e.* the Constantinian era; besides one of Christ giving crowns to saints, which is not earlier than the beginning of the 4th century. There is a sculpture of Christ enthroned on the sarcophagus of Junius Bassus († 350); and the same subject is often beautifully carved on the ivories of the 4th, 5th, and 6th centuries. By the end of the 4th cent. the great mosaic pictures of Christ in glory begin, the earliest being in the church of St. Pudenziana in Rome, *circa (about)* 390. These became thenceforward the leading feature of the apsidal decoration of the basilicas in the 5th and 6th centuries; and they are by far the greatest and the most imposing of the early pictures of our Lord. He is represented in these mosaics as enthroned in the glory of the Apocalypse, among the angels, the Apostles, and other saints and martyrs. The last great mosaic of our Lord occurs over the central door within the nave of St. Sofia, Constantinople: in this famous picture Christ sits upon a throne, while an emperor prostrates himself at His feet, and on either side are medallions of the Virgin and St. Michael.

Pictures and statues of our Lord in Majesty are common in the Middle Ages, when other symbolical representations occur. A favourite one (which is often found in the uppermost light of stained glass windows, and in other forms of art) is the Coronation of the Virgin by our Lord, which, like the Mass of St. Gregory, is characteristic of the change that had come over Christendom at that time. There should be mentioned also, as illustrating the lowest depths of materialism in religious art, the anthropomorphic representations of the Holy Trinity, which appear as early as the 9th cent.; in some the Son bears a cross, while the Father is distinguished by a tiara, and the Holy Spirit by a dove over His head; in others there are two human figures with a dove between them; in others the Father holds a Crucifix upon which a dove descends: there are even examples of a human figure with three faces.

A new type of symbolical Portrait—the ‘Sacred Heart’—has been popular among Roman Catholics since Margaret Mary Alacoque started that cultus in 1674. As a symbol by itself the Heart is already to be found in the 16th cent.—often with the Crown of Thorns, or the Nails, and the monogram IHS. In the Sacred Heart pictures

and statues which appeared after the new cultus had been started, the heart of the Saviour is, by a violent symbolism, disclosed within His breast; it is marked with a wound, surmounted by a Cross, and often surrounded by flames and the Crown of Thorns.

3. Types of Portraiture.—In the first five centuries three distinct types appear in the portraiture of Christ. They are thus classified by Detzel:

First type.—A youthful beardless figure of purely ideal character, such as is found in the usual classical subjects, thus representing the perfect and eternal humanity of our Lord. Kraus calculates that there are 104 examples of this type in the Catacombs, 97 in the sarcophagi, 14 in the mosaics, 45 in gold glasses, 50 in other arts, and 3 in MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] . Although the earliest representations are of this kind (indeed the 3rd and 4th cent. pictures of Christ in Majesty are as purely ideal as are the 1 James , 2 nd cent. pictures of the Good Shepherd), there are instances also of the beardless Christ in the mosaics (e.g. in the Raising of Lazarus at St. Apollinare Nuova, and the Throned Christ at St. Vitale, both of the 6th cent.), in the time of Charlemagne, and as late as the 13th cent., e.g. in the golden altar at Aix-la-Chapelle, where the Christ is of youthful aspect and enthroned.

Second type.—Christ is represented bearded, in the fulness of manly strength; thus there is still the conception of an ideal humanity, immortal and unmortified, without harshness and without sorrow. Examples occur frequently in the mosaics of the 4th to 6th cents., as at St. Pudenziana, St. Maria Maggiore at Rome, St. Apollinare in Classe, and St. Vitale at Ravenna; and also in the late 7th or 8th cent. fresco of the Catacombs of St. Generosa.

Third type.—The Byzantine type, which appears thrice in the Roman mosaics of the 5th and 6th cents. (e.g. at St. Paolo fuori le Mura), and embodies the growing monastic asceticism of the time. Christ in this type appears older and more severe, with longer hair and beard, deep-set eyes and hard features. This developed into the still harder and stiffer ‘debased Byzantine’ type.

To these may be added the *Modern type*, in which artists innumerable have striven to embody their highest conceptions of human perfection and Divine goodness. After the long sleep of pictorial art, the revival of sculpture and painting gave us such statues as the Beau Dieu of Amiens, and all the famous pictures of such artists as Orcagna, Fra Angelico, Masaccio, Perugino, Raphael, Leonardo, Luini, Michael Angelo, Titian, Dürer, Guido, Murillo, Rubens,—to mention only some typical instances,—and the many works of our own times. All have followed in the main the type which the mediaeval and Renaissance artists obtained from the legendary descriptions which are mentioned below.

iv. The Question of the Likeness of Christ.—It is obvious from what has been already stated, that no true portraits of Christ have come down to us, and that no attempt was made at reproducing His likeness in the first centuries. The earliest portraits varied much in type, and had only this in common—that they were all idealistic, representing the countenance of a man unmarred by faults or peculiarities; while, in particular, the art of the Catacombs and of the earliest sculpture, with entire disregard of historic actuality, represented the Lord under the type of a beautiful youth. The early controversy as to the appearance of Christ shows how entirely all tradition of His actual appearance was lost.

Influenced by certain OT passages (*e.g.* Isaiah 53), Justin Martyr had already said, in the earliest extant references to the aspect of Jesus, that He appeared ‘without beauty’ (*Tryph.* 14, 36, 85, 88); later, Clement of Alexandria had also argued in favour of Christ being ‘unlovely in the flesh’ (*Strom.* iii. 17); Tertullian went so far as to say. He was ‘not even in His aspect comely’ (*circa (about)* Jud 1:14). So we find that Celsus taunted the Christians for worshipping one of mean appearance, to which Origen replied (*circa (about)* *Cels.* vi. 75, 76) that Christ’s person must have had about it something noble and Divine, and quoted the Transfiguration to show that His aspect depended upon the capacity of the spectator. St. Jerome, on the other hand, appealed to Psalms 44 as a proof of Christ’s beauty; and thus there arose two schools—those who held that He was ‘fairer than the children of men,’ among whom were St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, and St. Chrysostom, and those who, in their ascetic reaction against the vices of pagan beauty-worship declared that He had ‘no form nor comeliness’ and ‘no beauty that we should desire him,’ among whom were St. Basil and St. Cyril of Alexandria.

If we turn from these disputations to the Gospels, we find, indeed, no descriptions of our Lord, but we discover on every page One whose personality had a wonderfully attractive power, and whose dignity impressed friends and foes alike. And we may conclude that the instinct of the Church as a whole was right in attributing beauty to the Son of Man, since the Incarnation was the taking on of the perfection and fulness of humanity. At the time of the controversy, those on the extreme ascetic side went so far as to make hideous pictures of the Redeemer; but the idealism of early art had an easy triumph in the end, because Christ is indeed the Ideal of humanity, and the outward form of man is ultimately the expression of the soul within.

The fact that the early portraits of Christ are purely ideal is the more remarkable, because there are strongly characterized portraits of St. Peter and St. Paul of the 2nd and 3rd centuries. The representations of Christ in the Gospel scenes of the 2nd and 3rd cents are, as has been stated above, merely figures of the classical type necessary for the determination of the incident depicted, and only to be distinguished by the

situation in which He is represented, and partly by the pallium in which He and the Apostles are always portrayed.

It is hardly necessary to dwell on the portrait of Himself which Christ was fabled to have sent to Abgar, king of Edessa, by the hand of Thaddaeus; or on the various legends of Veronica and her napkin. St. Peter's at Rome claims to possess the true handkerchief of Veronica; but of this relic Bartier de Montault, who saw it in 1854, says that 'the place of the impression exhibits only a blackish surface, not giving any evidence of human features,' and he adds that the supposed copies of it have no iconographic value whatever (*Ann. Archéol.* xxiii. 232).

The emperor Alexander Severus (*acc.* 222) placed in his *lararium* the image of Christ, as well as those of Abraham and Orpheus; a sect of Gnostics also venerated images of Christ, Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle; but in neither case is it claimed that actual portraits were used. Eusebius (*circa (about)* 325) tells us that a bronze statue of Christ stretching out His hands to a kneeling woman had stood till the time of the emperor Maximin Daia (*acc.* 308) at Caesarea Philippi, and that he himself had seen it at Paneas (*Historia Ecclesiastica* vii. 18): in his time it was regarded as a representation of Christ, erected in gratitude by the woman whom He had healed of the issue (also called Veronica). Most historians hold with Gibbon, that it was really the statue of an emperor receiving the submission of a province, and that this accounts for the inscription, 'To the Saviour the Benefactor'; but, on the other hand, it is urged as improbable that Eusebius should have mistaken so familiar a subject, or that it should have been removed by Maximin from its public position and ultimately destroyed by Julian the Apostate (*acc.* 361) if a pagan character could have been proved for it. There is thus a chance that one supposed actual portrait of Christ did exist before the 4th century.

Eusebius himself, however, in his well-known letter to Constantia (*Migne, Patr. Gr.* xx. 1515), says plainly that images of Christ are 'nowhere to be found in churches, and it is notorious that with us alone they are forbidden,' and mentions that he took away from a woman two painted figures like philosophers which the owner took for representations of Paul and the Saviour, 'not thinking it right in any case that she should exhibit them further, that we may not seem like idolaters to carry our God about in an image.' Here both the dislike of anything like portraits of Christ and the reason for that dislike are plainly stated. However, the establishment of Christianity in the Empire rapidly caused a change of feeling, and images were soon common. With the half-pagan people this led to idolatry, and the Iconoclastic Controversy in the East (716-842) was the result: one of the earliest incidents in that long struggle was the removal by Leo the Isaurian of the statue of Christ which stood over the bronze gateway of his palace at Constantinople; in its place he set up a plain cross. The second Council of Nicaea (787) vindicated the use of images; but they were not

finally restored till 842. The West was untouched by the controversy, and the use of all kinds of images went on unchecked; but in the East statues are not allowed within the churches—but only pictures—to this day. The pictures of the East have retained their rigidly conservative character; but in the West the greatest artists have striven from age to age to represent our Lord in the utmost majesty and beauty.

The type which they ultimately settled upon was doubtless influenced by the supposed descriptions of Christ's appearance, though none of these have any historical value.

The most famous is the letter of 'Lentulus, president of the people of Jerusalem,' to the Roman Senate, a forgery of about the 12th century. 'There has appeared in our times,' writes the supposed Lentulus, 'a man of tall stature, beautiful, with a venerable countenance, which they who look on it can both love and fear. His hair is waving and crisp, somewhat wine-coloured, and glittering as it flows down over his shoulders, with a parting in the middle, after the manner of the Nazarenes. His brow is smooth and most serene; his face is without any spot or wrinkle, and glows with a delicate flush. His nose and mouth are of faultless contour; the beard is abundant, and hazel coloured like his hair, not long but forked. His eyes are prominent, brilliant, and change their colour. In denunciation he is terrible; in admonition, calm and loving, cheerful, but with unimpaired dignity. He has never been seen to laugh, but oftentimes to weep. His hands and his limbs are beautiful to look upon. In speech he is grave, reserved, modest; and he is fair among the children of men.' This beautiful description was doubtless influenced by earlier works of art and embodied earlier traditions, as that, for instance, of St. John Damascene, the champion of images against Leo the Isaurian (*circa (about) 730*) and the last of the Greek Fathers; he described our Lord as beautiful and tall, with fair and slightly curling locks, dark eyebrows which met in the middle, an oval countenance, a pale complexion, olive-tinted, and of the colour of wheat, with eyes bright like His Mother's, a slightly stooping attitude, with a sweet and sonorous voice and a look expressive of patience nobleness, and wisdom (J. Dam. *Opp.* i. 340). In another place (*ib.* 630) he indignantly reproaches the Manichees with the view once held by earlier Fathers, that the Lord was lacking in beauty.

Thus we may safely conclude that there is no authentic portrait or description of Christ, while admitting that the type accepted for more than a thousand years is all that a Christian can desire, since it is that of a perfect humanity in which, so far as men could portray it, the fulness of God dwells bodily.

Literature.—Wilpert's *Roma Sotterranea* (1903) gives for the first time accurate reproductions of the frescoes in the Catacombs, with an exhaustive study carrying on the work of de Rossi (*Roma Sotterranea*, 1864-1867, translation by Northcote and

Brownlow). Garrucci's *Storia dell' Arte cristiana* (1873-1881) is being supplanted by the accuracy of mechanical reproductions. Also by Wilpert are *Principienfragen der christlichen Archaologie* (1889), *Ein Cyclus christologischer Gemalde* (1891), *Die Gottgeweihten Jungfrauen in den ersten Jahrhunderten* (1892), *Fractio Panis* (1896), *Die Malereien der Sacraments-Kapellen* (1897). The Catacombs are also described by O. Maruechi, *Le Catacombe Romane* (1903). See also A. Venturi, *Storiu dell' Arte Italiana* (1901), an exhaustive illustrated history, in progress; H. Detzel, *Christliche Ikonographie* (1896); V. Schultze, *Archaologie der altchristlichen Kunst* (1895); F. X. Kraus, *Geschichte der christlichen Kunst* (1896); O. Marucchi, *Eléments d'Archéologie Chrétienne* (1900). Among earlier works are Rohault de Fleury, *L'Évangile* (1874), *La Messe* (1883-1889); Grimouard de Saint-Laurent, 'Iconographie de la Croix' in Didron's *Annales* (1869). W. Lowrie's admirable illustrated handbook on *Christian Art and Archaeology* gives a bibliography of special works on early painting, sculpture, ivories, mosaics, etc. Westcott, in his *Epistles of St. John*, Appendix iii., cites the Patristic authorities. The dictionaries by Smith-Cheetham (*DCA* [Note: CA Dictionary of Christian Antiquities.] , 1875-1893), Kraus (*RE* [Note: E Realencyklopädie.] , 1886), and Martigny (*Dict. des antiquités chretiennes*, 1877 and 1889) are all somewhat out of date, but the first is the best. Slighter books are A. Pératé, *L'Archéologie chrétienne* (1892); F. W. Farrar, *The Life of Christ in Art* (1894), which is useful but not always accurate; E. L. Cutts' handbook on *Early Christian Art* (1893). Wyke Bayliss' *Rex Regum* (1898) is a quite uncritical attempt to prove the existence of authentic portraits, based partly on Heaphy, *Likeness of Christ* (1880). Mrs. Jameson's *History of Our Lord* (1864), *Legends of the Madonna* (1857), *Poetry of Sacred and Legendary Art* (1848) are naturally in need of some revision. Later works are J. Hoppenot, *Le Crucifix dans l'Histoire* (1899); M. Engels, *Die Kreuzigung Christi* (1899); J. Cartwright, *Christ and His Mother in Italian Art* (1897); J. L. French, *Christ in Sacred Art* (1900); A. Venturi, *La Madonna* (1900), and many general books on art and artists.

Percy Dearmer.

☞ Christ In Jewish Literature

CHRIST IN JEWISH LITERATURE.—In spite of the fact that Jewish literature covers the whole period from the time of Christ to the present day, and that the relations between Jews and Christians during that period have usually been far from friendly, the references to Christ in the writings of Jews are, comparatively speaking, few and unimportant. What there are do not add anything to our knowledge of the history of the life of Christ. Such interest as they possess is due to their significance as indications of the way in which Jews were wont to think and speak amongst

themselves of the Founder of Christianity. And it is safe to assert that in general they did not often occupy their thoughts with Him. Whatever may have been the reason, they very seldom mentioned Him; and they seem to have neither received any direct impression, nor inherited any tradition of His spiritual greatness. The few allusions to Him contained in the Talmud and the contemporary literature are, for the most part, contemptuous references to one who deceived Israel, and who owed his birth to the unfaithfulness of his mother. But they are a mere drop in the ocean of the Talmud, and do not warrant the assertion of a general and bitter hatred on the part of the Rabbis towards Him. In the mediaeval literature the scattered hints of the Talmud were developed into the book called the *Tôl'dôth Jçshû*, which is a mere lampoon, and in some parts a very disgusting one. But there is good ground for saying that this book was not countenanced by the best representatives of the Jewish religion, and did not express their opinion. It is on a level with such misrepresentations of the Roman Catholic and Protestant religions as find favour with the ignorant and bigoted of the opposite party, but are repudiated by the responsible leaders on either side. Instances are to be found in which leaders of Jewish thought in the Middle Ages have made reference to Christ in the language of civil courtesy, or even of appreciation. It is true that such allusions are mostly contained in speeches addressed to Christians on the occasion of public debates, and were, perhaps, influenced by the thought of the danger incurred by plain speaking. But there is evidence to show that in writings intended only for Jews the writers could refer to Jesus without bitterness, and point out what they deemed to be His mistakes without blackening His character. In modern literature the chief Jewish historians write of Jesus as of a great historical personage; and though they, naturally, do not see in Him as much as Christians see, they honestly try to present historical truth and to avoid traditional prejudice. It is only in modern literature that there is to be found a serious and deliberate Jewish opinion about Jesus, a real contribution to the study of His life and character. The earlier references illustrate chiefly the effect of persecution and mutual hatred upon the Jewish mind.

In accordance with the brief sketch just given, it will be convenient to treat the subject chronologically under the three heads of (i.) the Talmudic Literature, (ii.) the Mediaeval Literature, (iii.) Modern Literature.

i. Christ in the Talmudic Literature.—The period included under this head extends from the time of Christ Himself to the closing of the Babylonian Talmud, *i.e.* about five centuries. The literature comprises several works besides the Talmud, and falls chronologically into two main groups. The first group is that whose chief representative is the *Mishna*, the code of the Traditional Law completed by R. Judah the Holy, about a.d. 220. To this group also belong the *Tosefta*, a collection of traditions partly coinciding with the *Mishna*, and the *Midrashim* known as *Siphraç*, *Siphra*, and *Mechilta*. The second group contains the *Gemârâs*, *i.e.* the commentaries

on the Mishna made in the schools of Palestine and Babylonia respectively, and forming, together with the Mishna, the Jerusalem Talmud and the Babylonian Talmud. The Gemaras contain many traditions not included in the Mishna but contemporaneous with it; such a tradition is called a *Baraita*. To this same group belong the earlier parts of the *Midrash Rabbah*, *Pesikta*, and *Tanhuma*, though the date of compilation of these is much later. The Rabbis whose works form the first group are called *Tannaim*, those of the second *Amoraim*; and it is usual to distinguish the two periods before and after the closing of the Mishna, as the Tannaite and the Amoraite periods respectively.

The question has often been raised whether there is any mention at all, in the Talmud, of the historical Jesus of Nazareth. Until recently, Jewish writers have usually answered this in the negative. They have pointed out that the person supposed to be Jesus is described as a contemporary either of R. Joshua b. Perahiah or of R. Akiba, thus either a century before or a century after the beginning of the Christian era. This is true, but it only shows the anachronism of the tradition. For the person so indicated is called variously Ben Stada, Ben Pandira, Jeshu, Jçshû ha-Nôtzri (*i.e.* the Nazarene), Jçshû b. Pandira; and what is said of this person makes it impossible to doubt that the reference is to the historical Jesus. The following passages decide the question.

Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Sanh.* 107b, ‘Jçshû ha-Nôtzri practised magic, and deceived and led astray Israel.’

Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Sanh.* 43a, ‘Jçshû (ha-Nôtzri) had five disciples.’

Tos. *Hull.* ii. 22, 23, ‘There came in Jacob, a man of Chephar Sechanja, to cure him in the name of Jçshû b. Pandira.’

Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Sanh.* 43a, ‘On the eve of Passover they hung Jçshû ha-Nôtzri.’

It is not likely that there should have been a second Jesus the Nazarene, otherwise wholly unknown, who ‘deceived and led astray Israel,’ who was executed for doing so, who had disciples, and in whose name those disciples sought to heal the sick. It is now generally admitted by Jewish writers that the reference is to the historical Jesus. At the same time it is possible that the name Ben Stada did not originally refer to Jesus, although in the later tradition the two are identified.

The present writer has suggested elsewhere (*Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*, 345 n. [Note: note.]) that Ben Stada denotes ‘that Egyptian’ who is mentioned in Act 21:38; Josephus *Ant.* xx. viii. 6, *BJ* ii. xiii. 5. As to the meaning of the two

names, Ben Stada and Ben Pandira, various explanations have been proposed; but none has, in either case, been generally accepted. The Talmud (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Shabb. 104b*) explains *Stada* as equivalent to *Stâth dâ*, 'such a one has been unfaithful,' and refers it to the alleged illegitimate birth of Jesus. But this is certainly not the original meaning of the epithet. That *Stada* is made up of the Latin words 'sta' 'da,' and denotes a Roman soldier, is a mere guess, with nothing in its favour. *Pandira* has been explained as *πενθερός*, or *πάνθηρ*, or *παρθένος*; but beyond some likeness of sound there is nothing to recommend these suggested equivalents. The riddle is as yet unsolved.

The following summary contains all that the Talmudic literature has to say about Jesus. The passages referred to will be found in full and translated in the present writer's work already mentioned.

Jesus, called *ha-Nôtzri*, B. Stada, or B. Pandira, was born out of wedlock (M. *Jeb. iv. 13*, cf. Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Shabb. 104b*). His mother was called Miriam, and was a dresser of women's hair (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Shab. ib.* where 'Miriam megaddelah nashaia' is a play on 'Miriam Magdalaah,' *i.e.* Mary Magdalene). Her husband was Pappus b. Judah, and her paramour Pandira. She is said to have been the descendant of princes and rulers, and to have played the harlot with a carpenter (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Sanh. 106a*). Jesus had been in Egypt, and had brought magic thence. He was a magician, and deceived and led astray Israel. He sinned and caused the multitude to sin (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Sanh. 107b*). He mocked at the words of the wise, and was excommunicated (*ib.*). He was tainted with heresy (*ib. 103a*). [He] called himself God, also the Son of Man, and said that he would go up to heaven (Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] *Taan. 65b*; Jesus is not mentioned by name, but there is no doubt that He is meant). He made himself live by the name of God (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Sanh. 106a*, also anonymous). He was tried in Lydda (Lûd) as a deceiver and as a teacher of apostasy (Tos. *Sanh. x. 11*; Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] *Sanh. 25c, d*). Witnesses were concealed so as to hear his statements, and a lamp was lighted over him that his face might be seen (*ib.*). He was executed in Lydda, on the eve of Passover, which was also the eve of Sabbath; he was stoned, and hung, or crucified (*ib.* and Tos. *Sanh. ix. 7*). A herald proclaimed, during forty days, that he was to be stoned, and invited evidence in his favour; but none was given (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Sanh. 43a*). He (under the name of Balaam) was put to death by Pinhas the Robber (Pontius Pilatus), and at the time was thirty-three years old (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Sanh. 106b*). He was punished in Gehenna by means of boiling filth (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Gitt. 56b, 57a*). He was 'near to the kingdom' (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Sanh. 43a*). He had five disciples (*ib.*). Under the name of Balaam he was excluded from the world to come (M. *Sanh. x. 2*).

The several items of the foregoing tradition about Jesus are of various date. The Mishna does not contain the names Jeshu, B. Stada, or B. Pandira; so that it is not absolutely certain that Jesus is referred to in the Mishna at all. The Tosefta contains all three names, but not *Çshû ha-Nôtzri*. Neither *Siphrc*, *Siphra*, nor *Mechilta* contains any allusion to Jesus. The main authorities, therefore, for such allusions in the Tannaite period, are Tosefta and the *Baraitas* embedded in the Gemaras. The *Baraitas* contain the statements that Jesus brought magic from Egypt, that he deceived and led astray Israel, that He was tried at Lydda and hung on the eve of Passover which was also the eve of Sabbath, that a herald proclaimed the approaching execution and invited evidence in his favour, and that he had five disciples. The statements contained in Tosefta have been noted above.

The tradition concerning Jesus appears to have started with R. Eliezer b. Horkenos; at least it cannot be traced earlier. R. Eliezer was the chief disciple of R. Johanan b. Zaccai, who died about a.d. 80, and was living in Jerusalem at the time when Jesus was crucified. R. Eliezer was an old man in a.d. 109, and died probably in a.d. 117. Both he and his brother-in-law R. Gamaliel (grandson of the Gamaliel of Acts) had dealings with Christians. The tradition passed from R. Eliezer to R. Akiba and from him to R. Meir, in each case from teacher to disciple. The tradition represented by R. Gamaliel passed to his grandson R. Judah the Holy, who gathered in also the tradition of R. Akiba and R. Meir. This completes the Tannaite period.

In the Amoraite period the tradition is twofold, Palestinian and Babylonian. The former contains very little that is new. R. Johanan was a disciple of R. Judah before mentioned, and his disciple R. Abahu uttered the famous dictum: 'If a man say to thee "I am God," he is a liar,' etc. On the whole, the Palestinian Rabbis took very little interest in the tradition about Jesus.

The Babylonian tradition starts with Rab, who was a disciple of R. Judah; and though Rab himself did not add anything concerning Jesus, his disciple R. Hisda gave the explanation of the relation of Jesus to Stada and Pandira. It was he also who quoted the saying that '*Çshû ha-Nôtzri* burned his food in public,' *i.e.* was tainted with heresy. A contemporary of R. Hisda and, like him, a disciple of Rab, R. Judah b. Ezekiel handed on the tradition to R. Joseph, who corrected the explanation of the name *Stada*, and mentions 'Miriam Megaddelah,' evidently supposing that Mary of Magdala was the mother of Jesus. R. Papa, disciple of Abaji, who received the tradition from R. Joseph, added the remark about 'her who was descended from princes,' etc. A few of the statements concerning Jesus in the Gemaras are anonymous, notably the story of His excommunication by His teacher R. Joshua b. Perahiah, and His punishment in Gehenna.

The Talmudic references to Jesus afford no ground for correcting the narrative of the Gospels. There is sufficient likeness between the general outlines of the Jewish and the Christian traditions to show that the same person is referred to; but it is very doubtful if the Jewish tradition rests upon a knowledge of the Gospels. It is hardly more than a careless memory, retained in unfriendly or indifferent minds. There is also no warrant for arguing, from the Talmudic allusions, that Jesus actually lived a hundred years before the time usually accepted as the date of His birth. An equally good case might be made out for placing Him a century after that date. Rabbinical chronology is to be used only with great caution; and the statement that Jesus was the disciple of R. Joshua b. Perahiah (who did live about 100 b.c.), is made in the Talmud without the support of any authority. Moreover, the story, as referring to Jesus, appears only in the Babylonian Gemara; the Palestinian version does not give the name of the disciple who was excommunicated. There is nothing to show how Jesus came to be associated, in the tradition, with the famous Rabbi of a century before His time.

It is from the Talmudic allusions to Jesus that the mediaeval caricature of Him was elaborated, which will be described in the following section. It is therefore important to note that the chief points in the Talmudic tradition which furnished the base for that caricature were His alleged illegitimate birth, and His character as a magician and a deceiver. The former is a coarse interpretation of the Christian assertion that Jesus was not the son of Joseph, while the latter is due to His reputation as a worker of miracles, and to the undoubted fact that He had created a serious dissension amongst the adherents of the Jewish religion.

Literature.—Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*, 1904; Laible-Dalman, *Jesus Christus im Talmud* [English translation by Streane]; also, Mead, *Did Jesus live 100 years b.c.?*

ii. Christ in Mediaeval Jewish Literature.—There are to be distinguished a popular and a serious treatment of the subject by Jewish writers in the Middle Ages. On the one hand, there is the book called the *Tôl'dôth Jçshû*, which relates the story of Jesus as of a vulgar impostor; on the other hand, there are references to Jesus by Jews of repute which are dignified and respectful in tone, and show a real desire to be fair towards the Founder of that Christian religion whose adherents had inflicted such injuries on Jews.

(a) *The Tôl' dôth Jçshû*.—In the printed editions this is a small book of some 24 pages, in which is told the story of the birth, public career, and death of Jesus, and the origin of the Christian Church. It makes no pretension to be a serious history, though it certainly does not deserve the torrent of abuse which its Christian editors have poured out upon it. It is merely a rather stupid and silly tale intended to tickle the

ears of ignorant Jews, and to satisfy their contempt and hatred of the Christian religion by mockery of its Founder. To Christian readers it is, of course, highly offensive. But it should be remembered that the book was not written for Christians, and also that Christian treatment of Jews made such retaliation only natural.

What the origin of the book was is not certainly known. Traces of statements contained in it are found in the writings of Tertullian and Eusebius; but the first evidence of the existence of a distinct book of this character appears only in the 9th century. In the work *de Judaicis superstitionibus*, written about a.d. 830 by Agobard of Lyons, there is an extract from a written Life of Jesus, which has considerable likeness to the *Tôl'dôth*; and a similar writing, perhaps the same, is mentioned by Rabanus Maurus in 847. The *Pugio Fidei* of Raymundus Martinus (13th cent.) contains the whole of the *Tôl'dôth* as known to him. From this time onwards the *Tôl'dôth* has never wholly disappeared; but it was, naturally, never published by Jews, or even acknowledged by them. Christian writers who succeeded in finding a copy speak of it as being jealously secreted by Jews, and to be obtained only by bribery. Buxtorf in 1696 (*Bibliotheca Rabbinica*, p. 148) says: 'We procured a copy from a friend who bought it from "verpo quodam" for some Hungarian gold pieces.' The copies so obtained were written in Hebrew, but it would seem that the original language was German, or at all events the vernacular of the country where the book first appeared. The translation into Hebrew was presumably made in order to render the book accessible to all Jews.

In the case of a work which existed only in manuscript, it is inevitable that there should be considerable differences in different copies. S. Krauss, who is the chief authority on the subject, enumerates 22 complete Manuscripts and 6 fragments of the *Tôl'dôth*, which he arranges in five groups, according to their points of resemblance, it seems likely that these were not all derived from a single original, but rather that the story, founded on the scanty notices in the Talmud, was told and circulated orally, and in course of time written down by several hands in different countries. With the exception of the fragments, no existing MS of the *Tôl'dôth* appears to be older than the 16th century. There are five printed editions, the best known being those of Wagenseil (in *Tela Ignea Satanæ*, 1681) and Huldreich, 1705.

A short summary may suffice to indicate the contents of the book; and for this purpose the Wagenseil edition will be followed. Johanan, a pious youth in Jerusalem, is betrothed to Miriam, the daughter of a widow. Joseph Pandira, of the tribe of Judah, forms a plan to seduce Miriam, and effects his purpose on a Sabbath eve. Three months afterwards, Johanan, learning the condition of Miriam, consults R. Simeon b. Shetah, and accuses Joseph Pandira. Having, however, no proof, Johanan deserted Miriam and went to Babylonia. In course of time Miriam bears a son, who is Jesus. The boy is placed under the tuition of R. Elhanan, and by his conduct causes

the Rabbis to suspect his birth. R. Simeon b. Shetah reveals the story, and Jesus is expelled from the community. He first went to Upper Galilee, and thence to Jerusalem, where he contrived to learn the secret of the Ineffable Name (of God). By the help of this he worked miracles, and proclaimed himself the Son of God, born of a virgin. The queen of Jerusalem, Helena, believed in him, by reason of the miracles. The leaders of the Jews, becoming alarmed, set up Judas, one of themselves, as an antagonist to Jesus. They allowed him to learn the Name, and arranged a trial of strength between him and Jesus. The latter was defeated, and condemned to death, but made his escape. Judas followed him, disguised as one of his disciples, and contrived to steal from him the Divine Name, which Jesus kept written on parchment and hidden in an incision in his flesh. Jesus, in order to obtain possession of it again, went once more to Jerusalem. There Judas betrayed him to the rulers. He was captured, scourged, stoned, and hung—upon the stalk of a cabbage, because no tree would consent to bear him. After he was dead, Judas stole the corpse and flung it in the ditch of his garden. The disciples, not finding the body, said that Jesus had risen from the dead. The queen believed this, and the Jews were again alarmed. The corpse, however, was discovered, and dragged before the queen at the tail of a horse. The Christians were furious against the Jews. One of the latter, Simon Kepha, undertook to solve the problem by completely separating the Christians from the Jews. He learned the Name, worked miracles; and, having thus gained the confidence of the followers of Jesus, proclaimed to them, in his name, new laws of religion. They accepted his teaching. Thereupon he withdrew into a town, built especially for him, where he remained, sitting upon a stone, until his death. After his death another Christian teacher arose in Rome, who annulled the laws given by Simon Kepha, and gave new ones, instituting baptism instead of circumcision, and the Sunday in place of the Sabbath. The new teacher, however, in trying to perform a miracle, was killed by a stone falling upon his head. ‘So let all thine enemies perish, O Lord.’

The other editions follow, more or less closely, the line sketched out above, though in detail there is considerable variety. All of them describe the seduction of Miriam by Joseph Pandira, some with a disgusting relish of obscenity. The remainder of the story is variously embellished with wonderworking and low comedy, and that word-play in which Jewish wit delighted. There is not the faintest ray of genius, or the least sign of literary skill in any of the versions, or the slightest indication that He of whom the story was told was a great or a good man. If, as Krauss is bold to affirm, the *Tôl'dôth* was intended seriously as a history of Jesus, it says little for the intelligence of its author and its readers. It is rather the wretched device by which ignorant and persecuted Jews revenged themselves, and found a pitiful amusement in mocking the Christ of their persecutors. It remains, an unseemly relic of evil days, but still claiming a place in mediaeval literature; and if it bears witness against those who wrote it, it does so no less against those whose cruelty drove them to write it (see

Krauss, *Das Leben Jesu nach jüd. Quellen*, 1902, for an exhaustive treatment of the whole subject).

(b) *Polemical references to Christ.*—We pass to a pleasanter region of literature, one where mention is made of Jesus in terms which, if not such as Christians would use, are very different from those of the *Tôl'dôth*.

The references to Jesus in the mediaeval Jewish literature, apart from the *Tôl'dôth*, are not numerous. The reasons for this seem to be two: (1) that in controversy with Christians the Jews were not disposed to say more than they could help upon a subject where every word was likely to give offence and draw down persecution upon themselves; and (2) that the Jews were well aware of the difference between the Founder of Christianity and His followers. Their main quarrel was with the latter; and in their theological arguments they defended the unity of God, and denied the Trinity, upon Scripture grounds, with hardly any reference to the actual Jesus. To the Jews He was, of course, only a man. To the Christians He was God; and there was no common ground between them, or any occasion for debate as to His personal character and the events of His life. The controversy between Jews and Christians was fought in regard to principles, not persons, and was further embittered by mutual hatred. The Jews, if left to themselves, would never have mentioned Jesus at all, though armed at all points against Christians. Even in their own writings intended for Jewish readers, they say extremely little about Jesus, and in what they do say there is no attempt to estimate His character. For them He is simply 'that man,' or 'he who is known.'

The foregoing may be taken to represent the general attitude of the mediaeval Rabbis towards Jesus; indeed, it is found in much later times. It may be described in the phrase 'cold neutrality'; and it remained unaltered until the great Jewish historians of the last century made a serious study of Jesus as a figure in their national history. The attitude of Jews towards Christians began to change much earlier; but that does not come within the scope of this article.

The mediaeval Jewish references to Jesus may be illustrated from the report of a disputation, held at Paris on June 25, 1240, between R. Jehiel and a certain Nicolaus Donin (fragment published by Wagenseil in his *Tela Ignea Satanæ*, 1681). The Christian, who was a converted Jew, quoted the passages from the Talmud (described in § i. of this article) as evidence of Jewish blasphemy. The Jewish champion denied that these referred to the Jesus whom Christians worshipped:

'In truth, we have not spoken thus against the God of the Gentiles (*i.e.* Christ), but only against another Jesus, who mocked at the words of the wise, and did not believe in their words, but only in the written Law, as thou dost. And thou mayst know that

this is true; for behold, it is not written “Jesus the Nazarene,” but “Jesus Gereda.” Moreover, if it had been he (*i.e.* Jesus the Nazarene), he not only did this, but also deceived and led astray Israel, and made himself God, and denied the essence (of religion). But, clearly, it was another man, who did not deny the written Law, but only the oral, and is called a *min* (heretic)’ (p. 16 in Wagenseil). R. Jehiel also lays stress on the fact that the man of whom the Talmud speaks was a contemporary of R. Joshua b. Perahiah, while the Jesus of the Christians lived a century later (p. 21). He says that it is quite possible that both were called Jesus, ‘just as there are many boys in France called Louis, who are not on that account kings of France.’ Being solemnly adjured to declare his real thought on the matter, he says: ‘As I live, and hope to return home in safety, we have not thought of him (*i.e.* Christ) that he should be “condemned to filth” (according to the Talmudic assertion), nor have we said these things concerning him’ (p. 24).

A further illustration is found in the book entitled *Juhasin*, by R. Abraham Zacuth (b. 1504). This is a sort of dictionary of biography for the period of the Talmud, but containing also references to other periods. On p. 15 (ed. Filippowski, London, 1857) is the following notice of Jesus:

And the truth (is this) that the Nazarene was born in the fourth year of the reign of Jannai II., *i.e.* Alexander (Jannaeus); this is the year 263 from the building of the Temple, and the 51st year of the Hasmonaeans, and the year 3675 from the Creation (b.c. 85). Although the Nazarenes say that he was born in the time of Herod, the slave of the Hasmonaeans, in the year 3760 (from the Creation), and that he was hung 35 years before the destruction (of the Temple), being 32 years old, to our shame and to declare to us that at once, speedily, 40 years in advance, the Temple was destroyed for the guilt of what we did to him. But this is not so; for his birth was 89 years before the birth which they affirm. And the truth is that he was born in the year 3675, and in the year 299 (of the Temple) he was arrested (*i.e.* b.c. 49), and he was 36 years old in the third year of Aristobulus, the son of Jannai. And for this reason the sages of Israel, in the controversy which they have had with the Nazarenes, have written that in the Talmud there is no mention of the Nazarene whom they mean. Moreover, in the chronicles of the Nazarenes there is a dispute amongst them as to the year in which he was born.’ There is a further reference in the same book, p. 86, where the writer deals with the assertion that Jesus was the contemporary of R. Akiba, his mother having been the wife of Pappus b. Jehudah (see above, in § 1). The writer decides against this, and says: ‘According to the knowledge of the Nazarenes, the man who is known was in the time of R. Eliezer; and thus it appears in ch. i. of *Aboda Zara* that R. Eliezer talked with Jacob, a disciple of Jeshu the Nazarene.’ A few lines farther down he quotes from Rashi the words, ‘Ben Stada is the man who is known, the Nazarene’; but they are not found in the passage to which he refers, nor are they mentioned by Rabbinowicz.

It will be observed that the above passages deal only with the chronology of Jesus, and this is, with a few exceptions, the sole point on which the mediaeval Rabbis enlarge in their references to Him. The reason is, of course, their desire to ward off the charge made by the Christians, that the Talmud contains blasphemous allusions to Jesus. The following references, which all deal with chronology, may serve to illustrate this side of the subject:

R. Abraham b. David in the *Sepher ha-Kabbalah*, 1195 (Neubauer, *Med. Jew. Chron.* ii. 53), R. Jehudah ha-Levi (*Cusari*, ed. Buxtorf, p. 240). R. David Gans in *zemah David*, 1592 (edition of 1785, pt. ii. p. 12^b). The last comes nearer to the Christian date. He says: 'Jesus the Nazarene was born in Bethlehem, a "parsah" and a half from Jerusalem, in the year 3761 from the Creation, *i.e.* the year 42 of Augustus Caesar. Abarbanel (*Maj. Jeshua*, p. 67^a, cited by Eisenmenger, *Entd. Judenthum*, i. 239) maintains strongly the Talmudic date, and ends thus: 'And the wise men of that time bore witness concerning him his friends and companions' [*i.e.* the friends of R. Joshua b. Perahiah whose disciple Jesus was said to have been], 'and how shall we believe the substitution of [another for] him, from the month of men who did not know him, and were not there?... And we will not depart from the truth and tradition of our fathers, who did not tamper with the fact, and who related the facts as they took place without addition or omission; and all this shows that this [the Christian] theory is untrue.'

The fullest and most elaborate statements of the chronological argument, from the Jewish side, are those of R. Salman Zebi (cited in Eisenmenger, i. 231) and R. Abraham Perizzol (contained in the same work, pp. 250-253).

There are, however, one or two mediaeval Jewish works which deal with more than the chronological question. Wagenseil (in *Tela Ignea Satanæ*) published the *Nizzahon* (which he distinguishes as *N. Vetus*), composed by a writer in the 12th cent., as he supposes. Buxtorf, misled by the name, attributed the work to R. Lipman in the 15th cent., the author of another book bearing the same title, and also published by Wagenseil. The author of the older work was acquainted with the Gospels, and he ranged over the whole field of Jewish Christian controversy, refuting the Christians out of their own Scriptures. His arguments all tend to show that Jesus was not God; but it is worthy of note that he very seldom speaks disrespectfully of Jesus Himself. His quarrel is with the Christians, not with their Master.

Another work of a similar character is the *Hizzuk Emunah (Munimen Fidei)* of R. Isaac Troki, a Karaite, written about 1575 (printed by Wagenseil in the *Tela Ignea Satanæ*). The author shows an even wider acquaintance with the NT than the writer of the *Nizzahon* possessed; and he mentions the fact that he read the NT in the translation made by Budnaeus in 1572. He lays stress on the fact that Jesus stood much nearer to

Judaism than His followers did; that He never claimed the title of God; that He said, 'I am not come to destroy the law and the prophets'; that He enjoined the keeping of the Commandments on one who would obtain eternal life; that He gave many precepts which His followers disregarded. He does not hesitate to admit a saying of Jesus as true, though he immediately turns it against the Christians. All through the book his arguments are directed against what Christians asserted about Jesus, hardly at all against what Jesus said of Himself. And he may perhaps be claimed as a forerunner of the later Jewish historians who have really tried to be fair in writing of Jesus, who have at least abandoned the attitude of cold neutrality, and have scorned the wretched mockery of the *Tôl'dôth*.

It will have been observed that nothing has been said of the opinion of Maimonides about Jesus. In such of his works as the present writer has been able to consult he has found no allusion whatever. Dr. M. Friedländer, in his work on *The Jewish Religion*, p. 227, quotes from Maimonides, but without giving the exact reference, the following: 'Also Jesus the Nazarene, who imagined he would be the Messiah, and was killed through the court of Law, is alluded to in the Book of Daniel, as it is said, "And the sons of the transgressors among thy people will rise in order to establish a vision, and will stumble." Can there be a greater stumbling than this?' This is interesting as being more than a mere chronological note.

On the whole, the attitude of the mediaeval Rabbis towards Jesus was one of indifference. Apart from the necessity of controversy or the exposition of their own tenets, they had little inclination or occasion to mention Him. In Him, as a man, they had no interest. Their tradition taught them that He was one who had 'deceived and led astray Israel,' and they would not be at the pains to show that, although not God, He was still a good man. Controversy with Christians turned mainly on the questions of His Deity and His Messiahship, and the Rabbis fought the battle with texts, while they left the personality alone. It is probable that the great majority of the mediaeval Rabbis were utterly ignorant of what Jesus had said and done; they were concerned to defend themselves against the charge of blasphemy based on the Talmud, and for that purpose worked out the chronological argument. But only one or two seem to have had the courage to read the NT; and in studying their works, the present writer is inclined to believe that these Jewish controversialists had not altogether failed to perceive that Jesus was a great man. This may be a mistaken impression; it is at least a charitable one. We shall find in the modern historians a welcome change from the mediaeval attitude towards Jesus; and to the consideration of those modern writers we must now proceed.

Literature.—'Disputatio R. Jehielis,' 'Nizzahon Vetus,' and 'R. Isaaci Hizzuk Emunah' in Wagenseil, *Tela Ignea Satanæ; Liber Juhasin*, ed. Filippowski, London, 1857; also,

Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, and incidental references as given above, where they occur.

iii. Christ in modern Jewish Literature.—So far as the modern Jewish attitude towards Jesus differs from that of the mediaeval writers, it is to be found in the works of the great historical scholars of the last century, and in a few utterances by liberal Jews at the present day. A part from these, the influence of which, however, must tend to promote a truer view of Jesus amongst Jews, the mediaeval attitude towards Him still widely prevails. New editions of the *Tôl'dôth* are still published, and find readers among the uneducated, in Russian Poland. And, as regards the educated, there is still the same cautious reserve which so far as possible avoids mention of Jesus. The late Professor Theodores of Manchester, in a lecture on the Talmud, delivered in 1874, took elaborate pains to show that Jesus was not referred to at all in that work. And later still, Dr. M. Friedländer, in his book on *The Jewish Religion*, makes only the slightest reference to Jesus, and, so far as the present writer has observed, does not offer any opinion of his own upon the subject.

The first Jewish writer who fairly broke away from the traditional attitude towards Jesus was Grätz, in his *Gesch. der Juden* (vol. iii. 1856). He boldly declared (p. 224 n. [Note: note.]) that in estimating Christianity the historian must take his stand on the historical, *i.e.* the critical, method. He made no apology for the shock which he must have given to the majority of Jews by his new departure. And he was not afraid to express high admiration for the character of Jesus as a man. He formed his views upon the subject mainly under the influence of Strauss and Baur, by whose help he was enabled to put aside as unhistorical most of the non-Jewish elements in the Gospel representations of Jesus, and to emphasize the strong affinity between His teaching and Judaism. Grätz claims that Jesus was, in the main, an Essene, as the Baptist also had been; that His whole purpose was that of a moral reformer, and that He had no intention of attacking Judaism, even the Pharisaic Judaism, as such, but only the depravity of those who professed it. The objections to this view are obvious; but the fact that Grätz presented a portrait of Jesus in which the Jewish lines were overdrawn and the rest nearly obliterated, does not lessen his merit as the first Jew who gave a real portrait of Jesus at all. Later Jewish writers have, on the whole, followed the lead of Grätz; some of the exaggerations of his work have been toned down, and more recognition has been given to the originality of Jesus; but the general outline of his work is still maintained, according to which Jesus was a high-minded and saintly Rabbi, whose fate it was to be maligned and persecuted, and whose enemies were His own professed followers quite as much as His Jewish contemporaries.

The work of Jost (*Gesch. d. Judenthums u. s. Sekten*, 1863) shows less of exaggeration than that of Grätz, and perhaps even more of personal veneration

towards Jesus. Jost's chief contribution is his indignation against the 'judicial murder' of Jesus. There was no regular trial, such as Jewish law required. There was only a high-handed act of violence on the part of the chief priests.

He says: 'We hold it to be historical honesty, without regard to misinterpretation, to give to the fact its right name, in order to throw the responsibility upon those fanatics who did such a deed by their own power. It was not the Jews who crucified Jesus. Thousands of them revered in Jesus their teacher and friend.... It is time at last to judge without prejudice the authentic records of the Evangelists, who relate the course of events in simple words, albeit according to traditions of very unequal worth. Only the most blinded partisan can wish to justify the crucifixion of Jesus as it was effected, and to burden afresh the whole nation, or its law-abiding posterity, with the hateful deed of Caiaphas and his associates.'

J. H. Weiss (*Gesch. d. jüd. Tradition*, 1871, Hebrew) is interesting chiefly as showing how the radical influence of Grätz and Jost reacted upon the more conservative Jew. Weiss asserts the Essenism of Jesus (i. p. 232), and remarks that His deplorable fate was due not to His teaching, which was not new, but to the means which He took to promote it.

'For he claimed to be a prophet, and drew away many in Israel to believe in his Divine work and his miracles. And he said, before the multitude and even before his judges, that he was the Son of God. These three claims were the reason for all that was done against him.'

Weiss, beyond question, here puts his finger on the real Jewish grievance against Jesus—'He spake as one having authority, and not as their scribes.' Grätz and Jost had made it impossible for a Jewish historian to revert to the mediaeval attitude towards Jesus; but one seems to hear, in Weiss, the echo of the ancient condemnation, 'He was a magician, and deceived and led astray Israel.'

The *Jewish Encyclopedia* may be taken as the authorized exponent of Jewish opinion, and in its 7th volume it contains a careful and critical article upon 'Jesus.' It is the work of three writers, Jacobs, Kohler, and Krauss; and is written with a full knowledge of recent Christian as well as Jewish scholarship. It is admitted that, while the teaching and practice of Jesus were in many respects Jewish and even Essene, He yet departed widely in other respects from Essenism, particularly in His association with publicans and sinners. His attitude towards the Law, insisting on the spirit rather than on the Halachic development of it, is represented as not necessarily or essentially un-Jewish. He was, in fact, the representative of the *Am-ha-aretz*, the 'people that knoweth not the Law'—a rather acute remark. Weiss was right in pointing to His assumption of power and authority as the reason 'of much modern antipathy to

Jesus, so far as it exists.' He did not, at least publicly, claim to be the Messiah; and His trial and execution were quite irregular. But, after all, it is freely admitted that 'a great historic movement, of the character and importance of Christianity, cannot have arisen without a great personality to call it into existence and give it shape and direction. Jesus of Nazareth had a mission from God; and he must have had the spiritual power and fitness to be chosen for it.' That is finely said, and it is with one exception the fullest Jewish recognition of the greatness of Jesus that is known to us. That exception is contained in an article by C. G. Montefiore (*JQR* [Note: *QR Jewish Quarterly Review.*] , 1894, p. 381 ff.). He there speaks of Jesus as 'the most important Jew who ever lived, one who exercised a greater influence upon mankind and civilization than any other person, whether within the Jewish race or without it.' ... 'A Jew whose life and character have been regarded by almost all the best and wisest people who have heard or read of his actions and his words, as the greatest religious exemplar for every age.' ... 'It may be asked, "Was Jesus an original teacher, and on what grounds does his originality depend?" Now there is no *a priori* reason why Jesus should not have been original. Jewish authors sometimes write as if there were an antecedent improbability in his having made any big religious or moral step in advance.' ... 'A religious teacher might, I suppose, be called original who combined and collected together the best elements of religion existing in his time, emphasized those most important and fruitful, developed them, drew out their implications, and rejected or ignored other elements which either did not harmonize with the first, or which, though he and his contemporaries may have been unaware of it, belonged in reality to a lower level and an outgrown age. I am inclined to believe that herein to a great extent lay the originality of Jesus.' Mr. Montefiore's article shows how it is possible for a Jew to remain a whole-hearted Jew, while yet he feels a frank admiration and reverence towards Jesus. With his full recognition of the spiritual grandeur of Jesus, the fullest that would seem to be possible without crossing the frontier of Judaism, we will close this study of Christ in the Jewish literature. (See, further, the histories of Grätz, Jost, and Weiss; *Jewish Encyc.* vol. vii., and *JQR* [Note: *QR Jewish Quarterly Review.*] , 1894).

R. Travers Herford.

☞ Christ In Modern Thought

CHRIST IN MODERN THOUGHT

1. The modern spirit

(1) *Its genesis.*—The modern spirit manifests its characteristic modes of thought by contrast with the mediaeval age. It carries to their ultimate result the tendencies that produced the Reformation and the Revival of Letters. It has revealed itself in positive and distinctive form only in our own day and after a long process. A brief general statement of the course that process took will serve to indicate at once its legitimacy and the extent to which it was likely to affect ideas of Christ.

In essence and at the outset the gospel appeared as a revolutionary idealism, inverting the old standards of excellence and the old criteria of truth, yet not outwardly revolutionary in its immediate aims. Continuous with this instinct grew up the mediaeval mind. It is a mind which sees its ideals with the vividness of reality and in the same instant confesses the no less insistent reality of the actual, and the impossibility of transforming it as yet by the ideal. It is a mind therefore of compromises and contrasts. Familiar as a summary of the mediaeval spirit at its maturity are these: (a) the contrast between this world and the other world; (b) the contrast between faith and reason, philosophy and theology; (c) the contrast between the secular and the sacred—which three are all aspects of one fundamental antagonism, that, viz., between the natural and the supernatural. The practical consequences of these postulates everywhere penetrated the common life and thought. The 16th cent. awoke to the keenest consciousness of their baleful influence. What characterized that age was its fresh sense of the reality of this life and of nature, and of the interests of both. Baptized anew in mental and spiritual experience, its loftier minds were enabled to initiate those departures from the mediaeval system which were destined to determine the most powerful currents of the modern spirit and which still rule modern thought. Modern thinkers frankly abandon the idea of irreconcilable difference between nature and the supernatural. They acknowledge no revealed thought that is beyond their Judgment, and believe in nothing which is in its nature inexplicable or irrational. They work in a spirit of rational freedom led by the conviction that there are not two worlds but one; that it is one mind that lives in both; that not the spiritual *and* the natural, but the spiritual *in* the natural, is the formula alone adequate to represent the truth. The modern spirit differentiates itself from the mediaeval by conceiving the distinction between nature and spirit as one not of separation but of unity. To *spiritualize the natural* by force of insight into its deeper meaning is the ruling motive, the starting-point being experience—the experience in one life of both realms.

(2) *Its characteristic impulses.*—Only by a slow and gradual logic has clear self-consciousness of aim been reached. Among the contributory causes four are of special importance: the rise of speculative philosophy; the scientific movement and the application of scientific method in historical and critical research; the growth of socialistic theory; revived interest in the psychological processes that enter into the construction of knowledge.

In *speculative thought* the new point of view formulates itself in theoretic form under the name of the 'absolute' standpoint. Absolute here means that the universe is wholly knowable. The term does not exclude relativity; it only excludes an unknowable relativity divorced from all the phenomena of being and action. It points to two facts that must never be lost sight of, viz. that the Ultimate Reality is not abstract but the highest concrete, and that it can be reached by confidence in the power of Reason. The idealistic systems of Germany, in spite of their excesses, did magnificent service by their imperishable vindication of both truths. The *scientific spirit* observes patiently that it may define accurately. It is the spirit which takes nothing on trust, and seeks a reason for everything. It ranges knowledge in diverse spheres according as the facts it studies fall within the perceptions of sense, or manifest themselves in history, or are known in personal emotion and insight. Each science rests on its own proper principles, obtained from a study of its own facts, without reference to ideas drawn from other departments. Only thus is it possible to bring into clear relief the specialities and differentiae of the various kinds of knowledge, and so establish the contribution of each to final truth. The scientific spirit has given birth to modern *History* and *Criticism*. *Social theory* embraces innumerable divergences of opinion, all of which have been influential in directing attention to the social situation and its effects on character. The Socialistic controversy has enormously deepened the feeling of human solidarity. Liberty, we are learning, does not depend on the absence of social pressure. Social power is the organ of personal character. The new *psychology* is the latest conspicuous intellectual movement of the time. It is the peculiar product of modern philosophy. Kant's achievement was to reassert against Hume's scepticism the claims of reason; but also to limit their range; to show that there are elements in the mind which underlie the very possibility of experience, and therefore cannot be derived from it: which elements are beyond the reach of Reason. In effect Kant showed that life is more than knowledge. That persuasion rules the modern world. The key to all problems lies in man; and the key to the nature of man lies not solely in his thought, but mainly in his will. The whole man is seen in man active. There is an enhanced idea of personality. That idea carries with it two others whose significance for religious reconstruction we cannot overestimate. There is (a) the *ethical* character of man's experience; his life is the fulfilment of relations with others; (b) the *revealing* power of his experience; to the whole man in action and passion the inner meaning of things comes nearest.

Under the above mentioned impulses the modern mind has passed through the realms of nature, history, personal experience to a more complete mastery of knowledge. The effort has brought great gain to theology.

(3) *Its influence on theological method.*—Contemporary theological aims illustrate the direct effect of the foregoing forces in at least four directions: (a) towards a more

scientific system of theology; (b) towards a better appreciation of the nature of religious experience; (c) towards insistence on moral personality as the determining principle in theological construction; (d) towards recognition of the 'social consciousness' as contributory to theological truth.

'Scientific' applied to theology signifies a new method. The motive here is to vindicate for theology a sphere of knowledge of its own, precisely as for any other science; and to assert and defend the right of theology to employ a method peculiar to its own facts, appropriate to its own sphere. The vindication successful, it follows at once that both theology and natural science may pursue each its own independent path, limited only by its own law, yet both moving in real harmony. The antagonism between science and theology vanishes. The vulgar conception of the supernatural, indeed, vanishes too; but simply because the richer idea has taken its place of an inherent Divine Spirit in nature and in man, both of which are moments within the Spirit of the Divine Being. The facts alluded to in the *ethical* and *social* constituents of theological truth reveal the partial character of the sources from which in the past doctrinal construction has drawn. They were chiefly two, the intellect of Greece, the polity of Rome. Greek philosophy and Roman jurisprudence, working on the Christian facts, yielded the orthodox formulas. The genius of Northern Europe had later to enter in and infect the conscience of the Church with its own deep feeling. The temper of the present age is its fruit. It offers a wide contrast to the earlier age. It is an age less of intellect than of feeling; it is less objective, precise, actual, but more inward, refined, wistful. Ultimate explanations take with us a touch of what is subjective and personal. Personality is one of the dominant categories of the hour. It is just what may be looked for that theology should seek to interpret its problems in terms of personality. The new method is a radical departure from the old. It begins with religion as actually experienced in personal life, and from that reaches, so far as it can, the thought of God and the nature of Christ; whereas the dogmatic method begins with the thought of God authoritatively given and passes on from that to religion. The new method can never reach belief in any attribute of the Divine Nature which is not involved in religious experience. Merely metaphysical conceptions of Divine truth in terms of 'substance' or 'essence,' as these are commonly taught, fail to satisfy. A sufficient self-revelation of God can be given only in a full personal life. Fresh grace is discovered in the conscience. What the higher nature of man, his Moral Reason, witnesses to, that is the sure guide to the apprehension of Divine reality and the true foundation of religious feeling. For in that nature man is at his best; there relation to God finds place, His revelation is received and His life shared. With the ethical goes *pari passu* the social. Society arises where the mutual intercourse of moral spirits is possible. The conviction has grown, in a degree unknown to earlier times, that such intercourse, realized in a true brotherhood of mutual service, may minister untold blessing to men. The 'social consciousness' is simply the growing sense of the power, the worth, the obligations of our intercourse with one another.

From the intercourse of man with man, the communion of God with man is known. Growth in religious knowledge follows the laws of a deepening friendship.

The working motive here is worthy of special remark. It is that man has discovered *within himself* the starting-point and the test of religious verity. His deepest assurance comes to him as the outcome of his experience in life, as a person, active and patient, growing stronger as faculty springs up within him at life's stern challenge. Finite human experience, imperfect though it be, affords real if limited knowledge of the Infinite. And this knowledge is to be gained, not by putting ourselves outside of experience and by way of contrast constructing a Being with qualities diametrically opposed to the human, but rather by seeking to understand experience, and to determine which alone of the qualities and purposes it contains have permanent meaning and worth. The religious transition of the last four centuries has been a slow but continuous passage from the Aristotelian principle, that there is no 'proportio' between the finite and the infinite, to the principle first adopted by the Lutheran divines, that the finite is *capax infiniti*.

2. Modern conceptions of Christ.—Modern conceptions of Christ vary according as one or another of the characteristic forces of the modern spirit predominates. We may range them in a threefold order: (1) the Christ of Speculation or the Ideal Christ, (2) the Christ of Experience or the Ethical Christ, (3) the Jesus of History or the Historical Christ.

(1) *The Christ of Speculation.*—Each of the transcendental philosophies involved a speculative Christology. The first phase appears in Kant (1724-1804). The work of Kant in religious theory is the work of a pioneer. His equipment was not rich enough in mind or heart for more. Hume, as he tells us, 'awaked him out of his dogmatic slumber,' but only in philosophy. In religion he stood in line with the previous age. He shared the unhistorical views of the 18th cent, and its 'rational' religion. What of personal religion he knew, he knew intensely, as the class to which he belonged, the poorer citizen class, knows it; but, like that class also, with narrowness. It was a Christianity of heart and will, as practised among the common people, which was real to him. He stood quite outside Christianity in its ecclesiastical or mystical forms. Religious experience of any independent type, except as a department of moral life, he was unconscious of. He had no consciousness of God distinct from the dictates of conscience. Hence, when he came to rationalize his religious experience, the outcome, as was natural, was the simple translation into forms of reflexion of an imperious moral sense. The Kantian position is usually termed Ethical Deism. The extreme deistic view is, that creation is left to itself save for occasional Divine interferences. Kant's central doctrine is in harmony—asserting 'the absolute value of the ethical life.' God having originally created man and endowed him with reason and free will, nothing further is necessary on the Divine side for moral advance or

redemption. Each man, as a moral personality, rests entirely on himself, on his own reason and freedom, and may make moral progress quite independently. His moral consciousness is conceived as so absolutely self-sufficient as to have no need of outward aid, whether from Nature, or Society, or God. On this general idea he constructs his conception of Christianity and Christ in his treatise, *Religion within the Bounds of mere Reason* (1793).

He starts with the perception of conscience of a *radical evil* dwelling in human nature as an indubitable fact of experience. The return to good prescribed by the moral law can be accomplished only by a thorough revolution of the entire mode of thought which establishes a new character, one susceptible of good, on the basis of which progressive moral improvement is made possible. The means by which this change in man is brought about is that the idea of moral perfection, for which we are destined from the first, is brought to a new life in his consciousness. But in no way can the ideal of a humanity well-pleasing to God be brought home to us more vividly than under the image of a man, who not only himself promotes the good by word and deed, but is also ready for the benefit of the world to endure all sorrows, since we measure the greatness of moral strength by the hindrances to be overcome. In the historical figure of Jesus this ideal appears. Not as though the idea of a humanity well-pleasing to God were first invested with power and obligation by means of an example furnished by experience; rather has the idea its reality in itself, since it is founded on our moral reason. Only as an *historical exemplar* of this eternally true idea can such a figure as that of Jesus be presented to us. In Him the ideal of the good appeared in bodily form. When we believe in Him as the Son of God, the object of our saving faith is this eternal ideal of God-pleasing humanity, *not the historical man*; the ideal of which the historical man is but the highest representation. Incarnation is the 'personalization of the Moral Ideal.' Jesus first declared the moral to be the only saving, and afforded in His life and death an example of it. This exhausts the significance of His Person.

Opposition to Kant's interpretation of religion as mere ethics and of Christ as a Moral Example, impelled more genial minds like Hamann, Herder, Jacobi, and others to reactionary insistence on the immediacy of the religious consciousness and the speciality of the Christian revelation; but with neither critical nor philosophical depth. The direct succession from Kant appears in **Fichte** (1762-1814), who was impressed with Kant's results, started from them as a disciple, and later carried them to further consistency, and in so doing advanced decisively beyond them.

With Fichte, Christ was the first to apprehend the Divine, the first to recognize clearly and embrace freely the Divine will, and hence is the first-begotten of God. The manner of His apprehending was peculiar to Himself. The immediate unity of God and man in the spirit in which religion consists, came to Christ not by speculative

philosophy or tradition as it does to us, but simply through His existence. This knowledge was to Him the primary and absolute thing, immediately identical with His self-consciousness. In Him, therefore, it may be said that God became incarnate. Fichte labours under the delusion of conceiving personality as a *limit* of the Divine nature. That God in becoming man might not annihilate but enhance personality and raise it to its true infinite capacity, had to be discerned. The attempt came with **Schelling** (1775-1854), whose philosophy is a philosophy of the Incarnation. His problem is determined for him by the conclusions of Fichte. According to the latter, the relation of the subject and object, human and Divine, is a unity of simple identity. But such an identity, it is to be noted, ignores the characteristic *differentia* of the human, *i.e.* that in the essence of the human which it is necessary to safeguard in its union with the Divine. The unity with which Christology is particularly concerned, cannot be understood if the two members of the antagonism are not thought out purely by themselves according to their idea. The unity is not a true unity if the members of the antagonism are not united by that which distinguishes and opposes them. Those two considerations, the essential unity of the subject and object, and their unity in the midst of their differences, form Schelling's contribution to this high debate. Together they yield his doctrine of the Absolute.

Whatever is, nature and spirit, is within the Absolute. It embraces all reality. It is the meeting point,—the neutrum, the 'indifference point,'—of subject and object, preserving the opposite alongside the negation for each *per se*. Moreover, it is living, concrete, being by ceaseless self-birth a mobile, willing, creative unity, and on that very ground necessarily a growth or historical process (*Werden*). In history the Absolute realizes itself. It could not become manifest in itself; to manifest itself it submits to limitations. The manifestation is not in any one form of finite limitation, but in the whole field of history. The finite or the historical is that in which the Absolute has its life: the form in which the Absolute reveals itself. It is thus not merely finite, it contains the Infinite within it; the human holds the Divine. The domain of history is the birthplace of spirit; history itself is the incarnation of God. Everything is explainable by this idea; God in His growth (*Werden*) or the Son of God. Nature points to Him, and has in Him its final causes; history unfolds the aspects of His life; religion experiences Him as personal freedom from personal evil.

The same idea is the essence of the Christian religion. Christ, in His historical individuality, is not the Son of God: the eternal Son of God is collective humanity, and what is true of collective humanity is not to be limited to Him. The Incarnation is falsely received when received as an isolated fact in time—it was from all eternity, and is not to be interpreted in an empirical way. Christ, however, is in a sense the beginning of this incarnation; since without Him it could not have come to be or he known. In Him God first becomes truly objective. As such He is the archetypal Man, the universal ideal Man. None before Him revealed God in such a manner, and from

Him all men since have learned. But He is not the God-man. Of peculiar significance is the description Schelling gives of the manner in which Christ objectifies the ideal or Divine principle immanent in history. At one period he teaches that the Divine can manifest itself only in an endless series of finite forms, in the totality of which its inner essence is to be known. Here there are two points which reveal how far short of the truth of the ancient Creeds such theories fall. In the first place, the finite forms are a mere series of fugitive appearances of the Infinite, into no one of which the Divine veritably enters to abide: they can only signify the Divine. And secondly, so long as it is so the finite forms are essentially equal to each other: they represent a uniform series. On this line of thought the difficulty of appreciating Christ aright is insuperable. In the last and highest form of his philosophy, Schelling set forth a more fruitful estimate of the finite forms which reveal the Divine. He gives them more substance and concrete content. He arranges and organizes them, not in a monotonous series, but in ascending scale according to the measure in which the Divine spirit rises victorious in each. He is thus enabled to point to the uniqueness of Christ, and to place Him at the head of the series. From another direction deepening experience led him to a richer appreciation of Christ's Person. The power of evil, he came to see, was too vast to be overcome by man alone; the redemption of the personal spirit is necessarily the work of God, and can be effected only by the immediate presence of God in human consciousness and knowledge. The more mightily evil had come forth in personal form, the more necessary was it that spirit should appear in human form as mediator—for 'only the personal can heal the personal.' God must become man. In Christ He did thus become man. In the Personality of Christ the Divine spirit is not simply signified, it is actualized. In Him the single personality is regarded as capable of taking up the perfect will of God into itself, and thereby of attaining absolute worth and becoming a true representative instead of a transitory husk of the Divine life. *The infinite significance* of personality is declared.

In **Hegel** (1770-1831) speculation reaches its culmination. Possessed of an imperial intellect, he succeeds in constructing a system (Absolute Idealism), with extraordinary skill and infinite detail, which co-ordinates and harmonizes into organic unity the various principles of his predecessors. His indebtedness to Kant and Schelling is real, and to the latter special. In the working out of the Hegelian scheme, logical considerations are determining. The process of human knowledge, with its alternate analysis and synthesis, is the type of the larger process of the universe. All progress is through distinction, and moves through the three steps of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. A simple truth, once discovered, is affirmed as if it were the whole. Presently a larger experience forces man to the recognition of its apparent opposite, only to be succeeded later by the reconciliation of both in a higher unity. Given this simple formula, Hegel will build you the universe.

Hegel admits with Schelling the absolute unity of all things and the identity of the subject and object. But while Schelling, in order to explain how everything is derived from this unity, takes his point of departure in the Absolute, Hegel starts from the Idea (German, *Idee*), and professes by the force of dialectic alone to make all things spring from the Idea. The Idea includes the Absolute (which is the pure idea considered in itself and in an abstract manner), Nature (which is the idea manifested and become object), and Spirit (which is the idea turning back on itself and beholding itself as soul, as society, as God). The whole course of history is the coming to consciousness of the Absolute as Spirit, an august process which culminates in religion. The world of concrete finite experience is not outside of God, but is a moment in His consciousness. History is not un-Divine, but is the manifestation of God, a process within His infinite Spirit. Religion is the function of the human spirit through which the Absolute comes to full self-consciousness, and as such is the synthesis of finite and Infinite. Its highest form is the Christian religion.

In the eternal Idea there is but one Son, who exists in the first place simply for the 'thinking speculative consciousness,' but who, in order to be universally accessible, must also exist for the 'sensuous representative consciousness,' must be seen to sensible intuition as an historical event. The Idea must realize itself in fact if all men are to be made conscious of it and the unity of Divine and human it stands for. 'It must become an object in the world. It must *appear*, and that in the sensuous form appropriate to Spirit, which is the human' (*Phil. [Note: Philistine.] of Religion*, English translation p. 336). This is what has happened in Christianity. 'Christ has appeared; a Man who is God; God who is Man.' Christianity centres in the historic Christ. 'The manifestation of God in the flesh took place at a determinate time and in this particular individual.' In consequence of the Incarnation of God in Christ, man has learned the universal truth that it is eternally and essentially characteristic of God to be and to become man, that God's true existence is in humanity which is termed His Church, and that man is essentially one with God.

It is unquestionable that the broad effect of such speculation was to evaporate the facts of Christianity, and to substitute a 'somewhat else' (ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον) for the firm truths of a revealed religion. A God personal only in man, such as the Absolute, clearly implies that God is not personal. An ideal relation without personality has been likened to a painted horse which you cannot ride; and when the abstraction of the metaphysician interwoven in the universe is offered to us as the object of Christian belief, one who feels anything of the burdens and problems of life will turn away like Jacobi, little caring to know of a God who made the eye but sees not, the understanding but neither knows nor wills. An Incarnation which maintains a continuous manifestation of God, of which all men are the bearers, which is never complete, and which dismisses Christ's pre-existence, sinless birth, resurrection,

Divine authority and sole mediation, is not only irreconcilable with Scripture statements, but wholly inadequate to the requirements of the Christian consciousness.

But whatever view be taken of the speculative movement as a whole, certain outstanding services to Christological theory cannot be denied it. It has revolutionized the study of Christ's Person, and in so doing reacted on the whole theological field. By constructing a theory in which the Infinite and the finite, the Divine and the human, are not exclusive of each other, it demonstrated the *rationality* of the Incarnation. By its discovery of the spiritual principle in Nature, History, Man, as the truth which gives them all their reality and unity, and by the identification of this principle with Incarnation, it showed the *naturalness* of Christ's Incarnation. By its insistence on the truth that the organon of religion is not different in kind from that of philosophy, it has, so to speak, rehabilitated the validity of religious facts, the treatment of which with the contemptuous indifference characteristic of the previous age becomes hereafter an unphilosophical dogmatism. It has vastly widened the range and deepened the bases of belief in the Incarnation, and made possible a fresh and thorough investigation, in the way of criticism and understanding, into the data which support that belief.

(2) *The Christ of Experience*.—The Christian facts and the Christian consciousness assert themselves in the experiential theology initiated by **Schleiermacher** (1768-1834). As Kant inherited the sturdy conscience of the Lutheran Reform in his 'categorical imperative,' so Schleiermacher embodies its religious fervour in his 'feeling of dependence,' or *experience of God*. When Kant describes the essence of religion as the recognition of all our duties as the commands of God, he says the same thing in balder language, in language less mystically attractive, than that of Schleiermacher when he asserts that the essence of the religious life is the sense of utter and all-round dependence on God. From his training among the devout brethren of Herrnhut, and by a natural temperament of warm susceptibility, Schleiermacher was more akin to Schelling than to Kant, who reiterates the essentiality of duty as Kant does, but of duty inspired by something higher than Kant dreamed of. What is this something higher? Schelling had termed it 'faith,' 'fidelity to yourself and God.'

'By religiosity—the inner power and spirit of religion—I understand not an instinct groping towards the Divine, and not mere emotional devoutness; for God, if He be God, must be the very heart of life, of all thinking and all action, and not a mere object of devout passion or of belief. That is no real knowledge of God where He is merely object; either God is not known at all, or He is at once subject and object of knowledge. He must be at once our very self, our heart of hearts, yet comprehending all other hearts.' 'Faith is to be understood in its original sense of a trust and

confidence in the Divine.’ Fundamentally this is Schleiermacher’s view, when he bases his thought on ‘experience’ (*Reden uber die Religion*).

Religion is the *element of life* whose influence penetrates all other parts of life. Religion is not a knowing; nor an action: it is a *feeling*. It is not as science, the knowledge of finite things in relation to each other. It is not as philosophy, the knowledge of the nature of the Supreme Cause. It is not as morals, which is rather the full exercise of its impulses in action. It contemplates the universe indeed, but not to discover the relations of its parts; rather to watch it reverently in the representations and acts characteristic of it, and to let itself be seized and filled in childlike passivity by its immediate influences. It is the immediate consciousness of the universal being. ‘Thus to see and find in all that lives and moves, in all becoming and change, in all action and suffering, thus to have and know life itself only in immediate feeling as this being, this is religion.’ Its seat is in the soul. The central quality of the soul or self-consciousness is a certain emotion engendered by the contact of the objective world with the individual; an emotion which is prior to both thought and action, and animates both. It is this emotion which, as the centre of existence and the meeting-point of the individual and the universe, constitutes the religious sphere of man. It is thus not the mystical sense of absorption in the Infinite. Mysticism has always supposed that the experience of God can be reached only by means which are independent of the world and the ordinary experiences of life; it takes the whole world of sensible objects and human interests to be a barrier between the soul and God; the way of perfection consists in escaping from all these until the impassioned soul in its upward flight loses itself in the formless and viewless light of God. Schleiermacher, on the contrary, teaches that the experience of God’s real existence is not something apart from all the human interests of life. It can come through these interests only by deepening them. The roots that join man to God are the same as those that join men to one another and to Nature, only they go deeper. The religious experience, again, is marked by spontaneity. It is in every man with the original impress which his individuality gives it. Its range and variety are infinite. It may be known to us, shining, as it were, through the beauty and glory of the world in which we live. Sometimes in sorrow and suffering it comes as ‘a deeper voice across the storm.’ So, too, it may arise when the presence of something true or beautiful or good uplifts us above ourselves. In short, everything visible and invisible, every part and event of experience, may become an appearance of God, and be a means of grace. Every experience may be a religious experience. A strong current of individuality is characteristic of religion. There is no such thing as an absolute religion. And there is no man without religion. Hence, too, the relation of the founder or teacher of any historic religion to that religion is intimate and necessary; the study of his character indispensable to the true understanding of it and its after growths.

On the basis of these ideas Schleiermacher constructs his view of Christ and the Christian religion (*Reden*, and *Der Christl. Glaube*). Here the point of departure is Christian experience and the historic Jesus. For Schleiermacher there is not religion, but simply religions; the historical relationships of the religions he does not know. Every new religion rests upon a new intuition of the universe. Jesus of Nazareth had such an intuition. What was it? The idea of Christianity is stated, in the fifth *Rede*, to be that the ruin of the finite in its alienation from God is removed: 'ruin and redemption are in this mode of feeling inseparably bound up with each other, and form the fundamental relations by which its form is determined.' Christianity makes 'religion itself the matter of religion.' Christ discerned in all things the Divine clement. He discerned at the same time an irreligious principle everywhere. And the clearness with which He saw the need and the means of overcoming the unspiritual by the spiritual constitutes what is specific to Him and His faith. What is Divine in Him is not His purity or originality of character; but the 'splendid clearness with which the idea He had come to represent shaped itself in His soul, the idea that all that is finite needs the help of something higher to be connected with the Deity; and that for the man who is entangled in the finite and particular, salvation is to be sought only in redemption.' 'This consciousness of the uniqueness of His knowledge of God and being in God, and of its power to communicate itself and stir up religion, this was the consciousness of His mediatorship and Divinity.' To those who come to know Christ it does communicate itself with salutary energy, so that they become new creatures: He is the cause of the new life. In this relation He is the ideal type of humanity, and possessed a unique perfection. The proof lies in the existence of the Church, on the one hand, and the inexplicability of His religious consciousness by natural forces. He is perfect in what concerns His religious consciousness; here He was what He was by a primitive communication from God, in virtue of which also He was sinless. Otherwise He was truly man and subject in all respects to the laws of human growth. Divine in a sense, He was not veritably God; had no pre-temporal being, or miraculous birth, or bodily resurrection. He is Divine simply in the unique and perfect satisfaction He supplies to the needs of the believing conscience; and in the unique and perfect manner in which He Himself realized this satisfaction in His Person.

The culminating point of Schleiermacher's theory is the affirmation of the supernatural consciousness of Christ and the absolute value of His Person. In this regard his influence on subsequent theology has been of rare fruitfulness. From a multitude who own his inspiration, two may be selected as having, in an original manner, corrected and enlarged his principles: Rothe and Ritschl.

Rothe (1799-1867) was probably the most eminent divine of the middle of last century. He maintained throughout his career, amid the strong intellectual and critical currents of that time, in all of which he shared, a personal faith of extreme warmth and tenderness in Christ's Person. 'Bear with you the living certainty of the

reality of the historical fact Christ, and simply live your human life in the light of that certainty,' was the ruling motive of his inner life and also of his whole theological work (*Theol. Ethik and Dogmatik*).

Rothe takes his start with Schleiermacher in the consciousness, the feeling of God which is found therein. In the personality of man, this, the Divine principle, is at war with the lower or material principle, its contrary spirit. Not until the lower is vanquished is man free or truly himself. Its conquest is the moral task of mankind. The task can be discharged only in a moral progress of two stages, in which the whole nature of the material principle shall make itself felt and be transformed, and in which the whole nature of the spiritual principle shall display itself. The first stage involves the passage of man through sin. In the second, man will reach complete unity with God. The race of Adam is humanity in the first stage; Christ crowns it. In completing its task, He brings with Him a new power, a miraculous force, which serves as the point of departure for a new development of the race. Here the moral evolution is at the same time religious, since the more subordinate the insistence of sin, the more direct the emergence of the spirit of holiness of the new power, the more perfect, *i.e.*, the assimilation to God. The appearance of Christ is due to a creative act. For although the world and man are made by God in an organic oneness, they are not so made that He cannot enter in. In Christ He does thus enter. In Christ He posits a new commencement of humanity; and in order to prepare for it Rothe admits a special revelation in miracle and inspiration. The new power, the advent of Christ, are by supernatural conception. The ministry of Christ was a continuous spiritualization and growing deification; in actualizing the constant conquest of sin, He at the same time unfolds the wealth of the life of God. The living substance of God comes forth in Him. The historical growth of Jesus is the divinization of man at the same time as it is the Incarnation of the Logos; its course is uninterrupted from His birth to the sacrifice of Calvary which marks its last step and its triumphant close. Triumphant, for the Redeemer could not die; face to face with Him, the Holy of God, death had no power. When then His spiritualization is achieved, Jesus lets fall His earthly envelope; and from that hour is truly God. Not that He is to be identified with God the Father. God-man on earth, He remains such in the heavens, liberated from His physical organism, and invested with a body corresponding to His celestial estate. But no material barrier now restrains His power, His Spirit acts without hindrance on the world. The glorified Lord reveals Himself as 'central individuality,' *i.e.* the secret of the increasing triumph of the spiritual principle from age to age. When the totality of His disciples are gathered, the Incarnation will be complete and the creation of the universe closed. At this stage God will live no longer in man only, but in the organism of renewed humanity ('Auf diesem Punkt ist das Menschsein Gottes zu seinem Menschheitsein,' *Dogm.* ii. 179).

Rothe's is a grandiose conception of *Moral Incarnation* exhibited with incomparable vigour of thought. Christ is no incarnation of the mythical sort, as in the imagination of India. Nor is He as one of the Heroic age, such as most primitive peoples magnify. He is man truly, yet less individual man than man generic, while at the same time God, the potency that rules the whole world-process. In its cosmical significance the Christian interpretation of Christ has never before received so impressive a statement.

Less original than Schleiermacher or Rothe, **Ritschl** (1822-1889), taking impulse from both, elaborates a system less speculative, more positive and Scriptural. His, like theirs, is a doctrine of redemption, and rests on experience. He construes his material, however, by a widely divergent method. The critical results of Tübingen had affrighted him with their divorce of the facts of Christ's life from the idea of His Person. The metaphysical and emotional elements in the idea of Christ's Person current in the schools around repelled him. Ritschl had a singularly self-conscious and self-reliant character, and at the bar of the rich ethical experience yielded by the inner secrets of conscience his sense of the insufficiency of contemporary tendencies deepened. Injustice was done, he felt, to the historical and social and practical aspects of Christian truth. From that standpoint he directs a pungent criticism against the theological methods in vogue. They sought to construe Christianity by reference to the conception of God reached by a consideration of His relations to the finite world and human history and experience. Ritschl seeks the meaning of God as it is disclosed in the workings of the soul of Christ and in the activities of His earthly life. It was in that soul and in His earthly experience that the work of Christ in the salvation of men was achieved. Not in the heavens by transactions on man's behalf within the Trinity, as the orthodox schools taught; nor by His immanent operations in cosmic and human progress, as speculation dreamed; but in the moral personality and acts of the Redeemer. The process of redemption is not metaphysical or evolutionary, it is psychological. It was not to provide the prior conditions which should release the mercy of God, on the one hand; or, on the other, to overthrow an enemy encamped in man. Yet it was more than the announcement as by a prophet that God had forgiven or was ready to forgive. Both Anselm and Socinus failed Ritschl. According to his view, what is meant by God in Christ reconciling the world to Himself is that when God took human nature in Christ He actualized the forgiving presence of God. God in Him was in human nature, not on a visit, not arranging the conditions on which it could be redeemed, but actually redeeming and appropriating it. Christ revealed the Father not by holding Him up to be seen, but by bearing Him in upon us, leavening us with Him practically and consciously. The field of Christ's work lay therefore in His own spiritual history, and among the conditions of spiritual human nature (cf. Forsyth, *Religion in Recent Art*, Lect. 7). This is Ritschl's first important deflexion from Schleiermacher's procedure. The Christian consciousness or experience to which he appeals is found in the contemplation of the historic Jesus, as made known in the

Gospel records. It is not to be regarded in isolated individualism, as was the case with Schleiermacher's appeal to the inner consciousness. It has in consequence an objective character alien from his method and from the subjectivism and sentimental piety often accompanying it. There is a second deflexion of not less importance. The Christian experience to which Ritschl appeals is realized socially and practically in the Kingdom of God.

'There must be added [to Schleiermacher's theory] the pregnant truth that this religion, like all religions and all spiritual activities, can only be rightly set forth in the fellowship which, on the presupposition of the redeeming work of the Founder, exists as the sharing and spreading of this redeeming activity. Redemption, the Redeemer, and the Redeemed Community stand for theological knowledge in an inseparable relation' (*Just. and Recon.* i. p. 495 f.).

Ritschl's doctrine of the Kingdom is specially worthy of study. The Kingdom of God in his view is at once (a) a moral ideal, (b) a social organization, (c) a religious good. The Kingdom and not the individual man is the object of the Divine electing love. To the Kingdom, the Fellowship of Faith, belongs redemption, which is appropriated by the believer only as a member of it. And he shares in it in the measure in which he discharges his obligations towards it; it is as he loves and serves his neighbour that he is justified of God. The reciprocal action and reaction of the community of believers engenders experience of Christ, by which men learn His worth for them. As the value of each is determined by his service to the whole, so is Christ's *worth* (equivalent in Ritschl's phrase to His nature in so far as it can be known to us) to be estimated by His work.

On such principles, what, then, is the worth of Christ? Christ has the worth of God. He is a prophet sent from God, yet more than all the preceding prophets of the OT. He makes Himself known as, and is, the Son of God.

In the moral world all personal authority is conditioned upon the nature of one's vocation and upon the connexion between one's fitness for his special calling and his faithful exercise of it. Accordingly the permanent significance of Jesus Christ for His community is based, first, on the fact that He was the only one qualified for His special calling, the introduction of the Kingdom of God; that He devoted Himself to the exercise of this highest conceivable calling in the preaching of the truth and in loving action without break or deviation; and that, in particular, as a proof of His fidelity, He freely accepted in willing patience the wrongs which the leaders of the Israelitish nation and the fickleness of the people brought upon Him, and which were so many temptations to draw Him back from His calling. Second, the work of Jesus Christ in His calling or the final purpose of His life, viz., the Kingdom of God, is the very purpose of God in the world, and is thus recognized by Christ Himself. The

solidaric unity between Christ and God, which Jesus accordingly claims for Himself, has reference to the whole extent of His activity in His calling, and consists in the reciprocal relation between the love of God and the obedience of Jesus in His calling. Now Jesus, being the first to realize in His own personal life the final purpose of the Kingdom of God, is therefore alone of His kind; for should any other fulfil the same task so perfectly as He, yet he would be unlike Him because dependent upon Him. Therefore, as the original type of humanity to be united into the Kingdom of God, He is the original object of the love of God, so that the love of God for the members of His Kingdom also is mediated only through Him, When, therefore, this Person, active in His peculiar calling, whose constant motive is recognizable as unselfish love to man, is valued at His whole worth, then we see in Jesus the whole revelation of God as love, grace, and faithfulness' (*Unterricht*, pt. i. §§ 21-22). There is a third consideration (§ 23), Christ's lordship over the world and resurrection. 'These relations which are necessary to the full appreciation of Jesus and are apparent in the account of His life, are referred to in the confession of the Godhood of Christ which the Christian community has made from the beginning' (§ 24).

In sum, Christ's Divinity is confessed when it is seen that His will was in perfect identification with the Divine purpose in things or the will of God; and that He displayed in the moral sphere the highest Divine attributes. He is the Son of God by His perfect knowledge of the Father's will and by His perfect obedience to it. After this manner He fully revealed the essence of God; and that in the activities of a human life; and in a sinless human life. The Divinity of Christ is thus not based, as is usually done, on the supernatural facts of pre-existence, virgin birth, miraculous works, and resurrection. These, however, are not denied; only, Ritschl would contend, the right appreciation of their truth comes after the moral witness, from reflexion on believing experience.

Ritschlian principles and results have been the subject of violent polemic. It is with their broad effect only that we are here concerned. What that is, is obvious. Ritschl has brought back men's thought to Christ as the centre of Christianity, to Christ's character as moral power, and to religion as the builder up of spiritual life by enlightening the conscience and educating the will. Religious truth can be verified by the moral sense. It is a question of fact; inner fact, no doubt, and not scientific, but truer than what is outward. But when the theological reasoner abandons the ground of fact and the safe circle of practical reason for the shifting mirages of speculation, then he uses words without meaning. Christian verity rests primarily on internal experience, and answers to the most urgent necessities of the moral life. It has, indeed, other relations and aspects that transcend experience and, consequently, our understanding. All that can be said there is, *Exit in mysteria*. Ritschlian modesty is often misunderstood. But it has served to clear the ground within the range of

spiritual experience, and floods this ground with light. There is no true doctrine that can contradict this light, or shelter itself from its penetration.

The influence of Ritschl is the predominant theological force of the hour. It is felt wherever the attraction of religious problems is felt. He is best interpreted, not as the propounder of a 'theology without metaphysics,' or a 'religion without mysticism' (for he propounds neither), but as an exponent of the 'Christian consciousness' of Schleiermacher. He closes so far the movement begun by the latter. That movement is familiar to religious thinkers in this country in the more sober theology of Coleridge, of Maurice, and of Erskine of Linlathen, who may justly be termed the guides of the higher religious thinking in England in the first half of last century. **Coleridge** (1772-1834), adopting Kant's forms of thought and imbibing Schleiermacher's spirit, introduced the fruits of their teachings into England, where thought was dominated by Locke in philosophy and Paley in theology. The 'Reason' of Coleridge is the 'Practical Reason' of Kant, which grasps the higher principles. Like Schleiermacher, he falls back on experience as the test of sacred truth. He believes Christian truth because it 'finds' him. Coleridge shared in all the characteristics of the German school from whom he borrowed. He was no metaphysician. He was a great interpreter of spiritual facts, a student of spiritual life, a subject of spiritual experience. He saw in Christianity the true explanation of the facts of our spiritual being. He brought human nature near again to Christianity. He changed the conception of Christianity from being a traditional creed till it became a living expression of spiritual consciousness. 'After him,' says Mark Pattison, 'the evidence makers ceased as beneath the spell of some magician.' The line of thought marked out by the disjointed reflexions of Coleridge was continued by **F. D. Maurice** (1805-1872), who had been influenced also by Erskine, and still more by his own inner conflicts. His best energies were absorbed in the interpretation of religious thought from the standpoint of the Incarnation. By it alone, according to his view, could our nature be sufficient for perfect life. Quite in the style of the later Ritschl, he rests faith on historic fact, and finds the essential ground of human life in the Personality of Christ as the Revealer of the Divine will and character. Akin, in like manner, is his insight into the social aspects of Christian truth, the spring of his abounding personal philanthropy, and the inspiration of that movement which had for its chief tenet the social utilization of religion, the movement of Christian Socialism. More apart and less orthodox stood **Thomas Erskine**, who recalls his friend Fichte in not a few touches of nature and conviction. He was no student as Coleridge, nor of practical bent as Maurice. Meditative and introspective, he sought the truth by patient thoughtfulness and deduction from his own experience—deeper thought, not larger knowledge. He brings out an aspect of the 'theology of consciousness' not emphasized hitherto, viz. that religious experience is a growing and endlessly growing inner perception.

The experiential movement has a second phase, which calls for some mention in its bearing on present-day ideas of Christ. It is a phase outside the Churches, although not always, or necessarily, hostile to them. It shows itself in the rise of *ethical societies* in America, France, Germany, Holland, and this country. Its aims are familiar to us in Britain from the writings of **Matthew Arnold** (1822-1888). Much theological liberalism moves in the same direction.

In the last forty years a succession of writers has maintained that while the moral and practical elements of Christianity are entirely commendable and necessary, its theology is discredited, and must be abandoned. The aspirations of such writers are not to be confounded with those of writers still more radical, who denounce not only the theology, but the ethics as well, of the Christian Church,—writers including men so widely parted from each other as Nietzsche the Darwinian and Maeterlinck the mystic. Of these societies it is relevant to our purpose to say that they cannot be viewed as within the line of progress. The Ethical Theology, and in particular the school of Ritschl, is sometimes set side by side with them. But without warrant. These societies, often divergent from one another, have a certain unity, and it is precisely by the principle of that unity that they separate themselves from the ethical movement in theology as well as from orthodox Christianity. The Person of Christ is all in all to these last. It is nothing to those schools. They are inimical not only to historical Christianity, but to the historical Christ. They combine in identifying all, in historical Christianity and in the historical Christ, that is not purely moral and spiritual, with the mere swathing bands which the spirit is to outgrow. Nurtured on the modern conscience, they have not drunk its deepest draught, that inner power of Divine mystery which awakens conscience and deepens it as nothing else. The spiritual side of the Christian conscience, in its sense of sin and revelation of Divine pity and forgiveness, is unfelt. It is here, too, that so much 'Broad' or 'Liberal' religious thought fails. There is a liberalism which is only the rich and complex manifestation of the magnificent capacities of the Christian Faith claiming all life for Christ; and there is a liberalism which, when extracted from the haze which its upholders cast around it, is found to be, in its underlying postulates, totally inconsistent with the historic faith. It seeks a purely spiritual Christ. And when it has found Him, He is neither truly human nor Divine; He is at once a non-historical and a non-mysterious Being. Undogmatic Christianity is simply abstract theism. Against its empty abstraction of the Divine Spirit, and its anaemic conception of Christ's Person, the experience-theology is a passionate protest.

(3) *The Christ of History*.—Concurrently with the foregoing movements has gone another, simpler indeed, and, since there are no truths which more readily gain assent or are more firmly retained than those of an historical order, more within the grasp of the popular mind, but also for that very reason more nearly touching the instincts of the popular faith—the historical and literary criticism of the Scriptures. It

finds its sources and growth both within and without the ecclesiastical sphere. It is part of the general movement of science, the application of the methods of science, observation, hypothesis, and induction, to the facts of Hebrew and Christian history. It was not likely that the universal spirit of investigation and discovery should feel itself free to range over the whole field of secular history, and be restrained from operating in the departments of sacred. And so the Scriptures have been taken, as scholarship had already been taking the classical books of the ancient world, as a literature of many fragments and times, and of varying authority. Their commands and teaching and records, all alike have been judged according to the occasion and circumstances in which they were given forth. In other words, they have been interpreted, not absolutely, but relatively. The Bible, as to its text, structure, the authorship of its several parts, and its literary and didactic form, is read and understood like all other ancient literature. Then, too, from the theological fluctuations of the 18th and 19th centuries, special impulses entered. Religion, as Coleridge reminds us, consists of ideas and facts both; the Christian religion blends together inseparably the historical and the spiritual. The variations in religious and philosophical theory in consequence closely affect the character of historical study, and in an instance such as that of the Christian history, where the historical substance is large, with effects of the gravest kind. Further, the emergence of the hypothesis of evolution in scientific circles in the middle of last century, and its rapid acceptance and application to all kinds of knowledge, created a temper of naturalism, which reacted on Biblical criticism and Christological doctrines. Especially in the forms of Positivism (Comte) and of Agnosticism (Huxley and Spencer), this temper rejects every form of theism which asserts the personality of the Divine Being and the beneficent character of His relation to the world of men and things; and, professing itself ignorant of anything better, has lost all belief in any wisdom or love but that which springs from the brains and hearts of men. It is a theory which limits knowledge to experience, and experience to the physical senses—the sensations produced in us by the external world. It has its own view of history, and of Christian history, as a natural evolution. The new historical sense, combined with the new interpretation of Christianity, in terms of the facts of man's existence and human experience, incited to a re-reading of the Biblical records and a resetting of their material data, which has to an extraordinary degree stimulated the interest of the general mind, and most powerfully influenced the growth of a purely *humanitarian* conception of the Person of Christ. 'History,' says Mommsen, 'has a nemesis for every sin.' For seventeen centuries the facts of Christ's life had been carelessly or impatiently treated: they were now to take emphatic revenge.

The process begins with **D. F. Strauss** (1808-1874). Strauss runs his theory through the Gospels like a ploughshare through a field of daisies. His interest is of a purely negative character. He disintegrates the narratives and dissolves the facts in a series of writings, in which, with frankness and lucidity, he expounds what it has become

common to call the point of view of modern science as to Christ's Person. His object throughout was polemical. It was to find a way out of supernaturalism. Whatever system furnished him with the means of attaining his object he eagerly embraced. In his first book he employs, on the basis of the well-known Hegelian distinction between the idea and the fact, the notional and the historical, his mythical theory as a means of exit; in his last, Darwin and natural science come to his aid.

It is by his 'mythical theory' that Strauss is best known. 'Myth,' he says, 'is the creation of fact out of an idea.' The miraculous is a foreign element in the Gospel narratives of Christ which defies all historical treatment, and the conception of the myth is the means which we shall use in order to eliminate this element from our subject. The mythical principle is well expressed by de Wette: 'When any record relates inconceivable things in good faith, it is to be considered, not as historical, but as mythical.' Strauss lays it down as an absolute principle that miracles are impossible, so that every narrative which is in disaccordance with the laws of nature is pronounced to be mythical. The narratives connected with the birth of John the Baptist are poetical myths. That prophet having afterwards played a great part, and having been found in relation with Jesus, the Church judged it appropriate to glorify him in this way. The two genealogies of Jesus have nothing historical about them: they are the work of Judaizing Christians, who believed that the Messiah must necessarily descend from David. The history of the birth, baptism, and temptation of Jesus are myths designed to establish His supernatural origin. Jesus was a disciple of John the Baptist, whose work at the outset He undoubtedly wished only to continue; but by degrees He came to believe Himself the Messiah, and hoped to found a political kingdom by supernatural means. Putting the moral laws above the Mosaic, He abolished the latter. He made missionary journeys. He did not perform miracles; but could heal demoniacs, and on that account all sorts of marvellous facts have been attributed to Him. He did not foretell His death or resurrection. He did not institute the Lord's Supper. The disciples, convinced that the Messiah could not remain in the tomb, had visions and hallucinations which showed Him to them risen again. Life did not exist in Christ in a perfect manner; He is not the ideal of humanity. The traditional faith is entirely without historical foundation.

The work of Strauss was continued with modifications peculiar to themselves by Bruno Bauer and others, and suggested the more serious labours of the Tübingen School, headed by **F. C. Baur** (1792-1860). The all-important problem was now the historical reality of Jesus. Baur, differing in this from Strauss, seeks a solution through St. Paul, and a critical investigation of the sources of Christianity. His theory shows the influence of the Hegelian category of thesis and antithesis.

In four Epistles—in Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Galatians—we have, according to Baur, authentic Apostolic documents, genuine Epistles of Paul. They are our best

authorities on every question touching the origin, nature, and principles of primitive Christianity. They reveal antitheses of thought, a Petrine and a Pauline party in the Church. The Petrine was the primitive Christian, made up of men who, while believing in Jesus as the Messiah, did not cease to be Jews. The Pauline was a reformed and Gentile Christianity, which aimed at universalizing the faith in Jesus by freeing it from the Jewish law and traditions. The universalism of Christianity, and therefore its historical importance and achievements, are thus really the work of the Apostle Paul. His work he accomplished in the face of, and in spite of, the opposition of the older Apostles. The men who had been with Jesus did not understand Him; Paul did by natural ability. Not the unity but the differences and antagonisms of the Apostolic Age are the key to all its problems, the point on which the constructive historian must stand if he would do his work. The memorials of the struggle and of the compromises by which it was ended lie in the canonical literature of primitive Christianity. They are best understood as *Tendenz-schriften*.

It is not easy to affirm what position Baur assigns to Christ. He is preoccupied with Paul. In a study on the meaning of the expression 'Son of Man,' he strives to reconstruct, by means of the historical data which the Gospels furnish us, the consciousness which Jesus had of Himself and His Messianic character, but the results at which he arrives are vague and contradictory. Sometimes he admits that the historian finds in Jesus certain characteristics which indicate that He possessed qualities unknown to other men; sometimes he affirms that it is less the original Person of Christ than faith in His Person that has been the basis of the historical development of Christianity.

Baur's picture of the early Church and of Christ is now everywhere recognized as utterly incorrect in its chief and essential features. Why is this? Simply because he was under the domination of a rigid philosophical system which narrowed his outlook, and prevented him from seeing a multitude of historical facts of a different character from those upon which he based his reconstruction. The scholars who have done most to secure recognition for those new facts are Ritschl and Renan. The essence of the advance made by Ritschl lies simply in the denial that the evolution of early Christianity was a purely immanent process, and in the recognition of certain outside forces as determinative factors in the development. The cardinal factor assumed by him was the spirit of the Graeco-Roman world. According to his view, the rise of the Catholic Church, which means the substitution of institutionalism, ecclesiasticism, and sacerdotalism for the spiritual individualism of the earliest period, was due primarily to the influence of the Graeco-Roman spirit which came into the Church with the conversion of the Gentiles in the 1st cent., and which was thenceforth a controlling influence in its development. Essentially in his spirit a group of younger historians have sought for still other outside factors, and greatly enlarged the historian's outlook.

E. Renan (1823-1892), trained for the Romanist priesthood, which he renounced, and attracted for a time by German Idealism without settling in it, encountered influences which were to enlighten the obscurity that his Catholic education and German initiation had left in his thought. His special work was done in the Semitic domain.

A visit to Palestine in 1860 offered the occasion for a *Life of Jesus*. In reading the Gospel in Galilee, he tells us, the personality of this great Founder had forcibly appealed to him; and the first sketch of the book was traced amidst the scenes of the Gospel history. It is no common book, the *Vie de Jésus*. It sketches a life of Christ which has won wide attention and acceptance. Jesus of Nazareth was a simple, contemplative, innocent, rustic saint, with a villager's childlike ideas of the kingdoms of the world and the glories of a court. These ideas He expresses in His parables about kings, says Renan, with the most delightful naïveté and want of *connaissance des choses*—but with a religious fire of love burning in His heart, a profound apprehension of God as His Father, and that ardour to bring others to the same love or Him which gives force and breadth to the least experienced wisdom. His whole nature revolted against the hard and false sanctimony of the Pharisees. With regard to the Law, He had eagerly accepted the teaching, then widely disseminated among the Jews, of the school of Hillel. But it would not be for even the widest interpreters of the Law, says Renan, that Christ could have felt any great fascination. The Psalms, Isaiah, and more recent Messianic literature had for many reasons a greater imaginative charm for His genius. From the Book of Daniel He drew the Messianic title 'Son of Man,' which, with a fine appreciation of His own exquisitely human genius, He reserved specially for Himself. Moreover, the attempt in these books to sketch the future course of history was the origin of Christ's own millennial dreams, and the source of much of His imaginative power over His countrymen. Then there was the freedom of His life in Galilee. 'That mountain summit of Nazareth where no man of modern days can sit without a troubled feeling about his destiny, there Jesus sat twenty years without a doubt. Delivered from self-seeking, the source of our troubles, which makes us seek bitterly for some interest in virtue beyond the tomb, He thought only of His work, of His nation, of the human race. Those mountains, that sea, that azure heaven, those high tablelands on the horizon, were for Him not the melancholy vision of a soul which interrogates nature about its lot, but the certain symbol, the transparent shadow, of an invisible world and a new heaven.' Thus love of His spiritual Father, Hebrew poetry, the living spirit of the Law, the visions of a Messianic age that should include the whole race of man, His ignorance of science and belief in the plenary force of Divine volition, the political freedom of His time which scarcely interfered with individual action, the beauty of nature about Him, and His wonderful power of inspiring love in the simple men who came to Him—all tended to raise to the highest intensity a character of marvellous breadth and force. Jesus did not come 'stainless out of the struggle of life.' It was the instinct of genius for acting upon the world that led Him into the Messianic groove of thought. It was that that soiled His purity,

though without it He never could have founded a lasting Church. If He had any original defect of nature, it was the universal Eastern fault of a want of sincerity with Himself. The growing fascination of His spiritual and Messianic ideas gave Him impatience of the appetite for miracle on the part of the people. The demand for miracle He had to meet, and was not above getting up fictitious miracles as a sort of 'pious fraud,' e.g. the resurrection of Lazarus. The same necessity led Him into fanaticism, which eventually urged Him to death; 'the tone which He had taken could not be sustained; it was time for death to come and unloose the knot of a situation of the extremest tension.'

Renan's *Life of Jesus* is penetrated by a profound feeling of His human personality, its charm, its potency, its pre-eminence, its capability to create a faith. It has been shown to be inaccurate in details, and meagre and uncertain in its knowledge, especially of the Jewish environment in which Jesus grew up. It displays an excess of precision in the psychology of illusion, a too ready emotion, and a want of *gravitas*. Yet withal the book did this service, that it introduced into the reading of Christ's life on its human side a greater sense of reality than modern criticism had hitherto attained. For the action of ideas, as in Strauss and Baur, Renan substitutes the play of individual passion and character. The arid logic of the Germans is absent, and something of the wonder and beauty of the NT story is not wholly lost. It is here that the arrears in the 'scientific' or 'historical' Christ have most to be made up. The Apostolic conception of the Saviour, however uncritical and untrustworthy in details at the bar of modern history, embodies in that very supernaturalism which is the *bête noire* of the scientific mind, a spirit so potent as to seem to those who gave the record the most striking reality in His life. To reproduce that spirit in natural terms calls for a depth of feeling and width of experience which the critical movement so far has shown no signs of possessing. There hangs about its Christological creations such a rawness as to tempt one to the statement that it has not yet found the equipment adequate to its task. Christ must be interpreted *from within*. The interest of His life is in large measure independent of its historical framework, as the orthodox construction has rightly seen, and as criticism itself acknowledges when it starts from the teaching of Christ in preference to the events of His career. Higher instincts, therefore, than the merely intellectualist instincts of 'science' or 'history,' instincts akin to the poet's when he grasps the very spirit of poetry, or the artist's when his unique sensibility unveils a new revelation of beauty, are requisite if the mystery of Christ is not to be profaned. Hostility to the supernatural is an unscientific dogmatism. Equally unscientific is the explanation of it as 'myth' or 'vision.' The supernatural in Christ took such a hold on the minds of those who gave themselves to Him, as to render them readier than otherwise to reduce His human nature in its interests. The supernatural in Christ is that in Him to which the Church has at all times clung as the sustainer of her intensest faith and hope. It has enriched and not weakened the life of the spirit. What is the secret? How explain the tenacity with

which the supernatural in Christ has fastened on the conscience of Christendom? Is it not that it has shown at all times power to embody men's highest religious hopes and aspirations, and has satisfied them? And should this not strengthen rather than lessen belief in its reality? Science has here a problem not to be evaded. In reaching a solution, the *psychological* trend science has recently taken cannot fail to furnish important data. A true 'philosophy of the unconscious' is a desideratum. Already we have learned many facts having an intimate bearing on the old Christological problems. What they suggest is that within the depths of a single personality there may coexist parallel states of spirit-life; a consideration which, if vindicated, will make us pause before repeating the dogmas of negation which were framed with regard to simpler and narrower facts.

A sense of such necessity is apparent in the most recent phase of 'scientific' reconstruction of the Life of Christ. The articles of **P. W. Schmiedel** and others in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, the *Jesus* of **W. Bousset** of Göttingen (translation Williams & Norgate), and the *Jesus* of **Arno Neumann** (translation A. & C. Black), based on essentially rationalist principles, manifest an advance on the old rationalism. They seek the secret of *Jesus* in a *psychological uniqueness*. They are indeed in line with previous radical tradition in rejecting the integrity of the Gospels as a reliable source of information, and in reducing to a minimum the available historical material at their basis, in regarding the major portion of the written record as artificial and adapted, of the nature of pious legend and idealizing poetry, and in asserting the impossibility of considering the claims Christ made for Himself an adequate foundation for such a superstructure as the Church reared in the dogma of His Divinity; yet they are confident where earlier effort was often in doubt; they are also more reverent, genial, and expectant. A firm historical foundation is acknowledged, and that both in facts regarding His Person and particularly in His words and teaching. They are facts, too, which point to a 'sovereign self-consciousness,' worth to men more than kings and prophets had been, potent over present powers and offering promise of constant conquest (Bousset, *Jesus*, p. 96). 'He bound His disciples to His Person as never again one man has bound men.' His uniqueness is not to be confounded with singularity, but denotes unequalled excellence in goodness and greatness. He constrains not physically but psychically; He overpowers us inwardly by His spirituality, His purity, truthfulness, and love. He is the Master of the inner life. 'We may also speak of Him as "the Redeemer." ' Not in the sense that His death was a propitiatory sacrifice without which the God of love would not have been able to forgive us our sins. Not in this sense: yet it was indeed His special work to redeem by guiding us from the letter to the spirit, from the feeling of a slave to the love of a child, from self-seeking to brotherly love, from the dominion of the visible to that of the invisible; and His death showed that He was ready and determined to offer in order to procure these benefits, not His labour only but also His life (Neumann, *Jesus*, c. [Note: circa, about.] 19). Not Divine, He is none the less not to be denied worship. The interest of the situation

here created is vast. It is not only the new facts and the finer appreciation of them, but the plane in which they stand and the wide range of it. Scientific criticism has tapped a new source. Discussion of the philosophical implications involved in the wider range of facts discernible will lead thought to a *new Idealism* which, analyzing the 'transcendental' element in man more clearly, will the better and the more convincingly interpret the Divine in Christ.

In close association with the larger view of history and science in influencing religious ideas is the great democratic movement of the modern world. Our sense of growth in knowledge has reacted upon our anticipations and hopes for the *social state* of men. It is only natural that the relation of Christ to the social problem should have come to occupy a foremost place, and that the traditional Christian ideas should be greatly affected by it. Almost every variety of socialist aspiration has made its appeal to Christ. It is remembered that He pronounced a special Beatitude on the poor, called to Himself the weary and heavy laden, offered a personal friendship to the publican and sinner, commanded His followers to be helpers of men's material needs; that He was Himself of the poor, and denounced in unmistakable terms, if not the rich and capitalism, then their closest neighbour, Mammon. The situation in itself is of the deepest interest, but its Christological import is but slight. Christ's supernatural dignity is ignored. He is looked upon as nothing more than man, and even then as nothing more than a 'Social Reformer,' the 'people's man,' 'Jesus the demagogue,' an unmysterious human leader of the poor, claimed now for this school and now for that, according to the partial and prejudiced predilections of His sponsors. To the great majority the Christ of the Creeds is an object of complete indifference, if not of dislike, while the Christ of the Churches, of worship, and of believing experience, is unknown or scorned. The transcendency of the Divine Life depicted in the Gospels finds no echo in their hearts.

It remains merely to remind ourselves that these three movements of Christological conception are all needful. They are not to be separated or considered antagonistic. They are complementary, helping each other to the new and richer belief in Christ. That belief will exhibit the ideal content of Christ's Person as the sum of all experience and all existence, seeing Him in all Nature, in all the forms of Nature, in all human life, in the whole range of life's experience, as that in which they all alike find at once their living energy and their goal, the ground and the final end of the successively emerging and developing phenomena that we behold as Nature, History, Experience. It will not be like the older faith, a strange hybrid, compounded part of philosophy, part of history, part of moral effort; it will be the apprehension of a Person behind the facts and processes of all three, reached through the study of His working in them and the sense of kinship with and nearness to Him; who thus known will not be found to be summed up in them but rather sums them up in Himself,

whose History no history has yet exhausted, whose Life not all the lives of men have outgrown.

Literature.—*General*: Indispensable books in German dealing with the whole subject for the whole period are Pfleiderer, *Religionsphilosophie auf geschichtl. Grundlage* (*Philosophy of Religion on the basis of its history*, 4 vols., Williams & Norgate); Pünjer, *Gesch. der christl. Religionsphilosophie*, 2 vols. (vol. i. translation, T. & T. Clark); Dorner, *Entwicklungsgesch. der Lehre der Person Christi* (translation, 5 vols., T. & T. Clark). The best writings in English relevant to the article are Principal Fairbairn's *Christ in Modern Theology*, *Philosophy of the Christian Religion*, *Studies in the Life of Christ*. On the specific characteristics of the modern spirit there are suggestive chapters in George Brandes' *Main Currents in XIXth cent. Literature*, vol. i.; Royce, *Spirit of Modern Philosophy*; Merz, *Hist. of European Thought in XIXth century*; cf. also Ziegler, *Die geistigen und socialen Strömungen des 19ten Jahrhunderts*, Berlin; and Flint's *Hist. of the Philosophy of History*, vol. i.

Special: On the Idealistic movement; for Kant, *Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft* (translation by Semple); for Schelling, *Die Methode des academ. Studiums*, and *Philos. Untersuchungen* (not translated); for Hegel, *Philosophie der Religion* (translation by Speirs and Sanderson); for Lamennais, *Essai sur l'Indifference*, and *Esquisse d'une Philosophie*; for Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection*, *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit*; for F. D. Maurice, *Kingdom of Christ*, *Essays*; for T. H. Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, *Two Sermons*, etc.; for the Cairds, Ed. Caird, *Evolution of Theology*, *Critical Philosophy of Kant*; John Caird, *Fundamental Ideas of Religion*, *Philosophy of Religion*. For sketch of later developments in Germany see Frank, *Gesch. und Kritik der neueren Theologie*.

On the Experience movement there is an extensive literature associated with Schleiermacher, his theology and his influence on theology; and with Ritschl and his school (chiefly in German), cf. in English, Pfleiderer, *Development of Theology in Germany and in Great Britain* [Note: reat Cranmer's 'Great' Bible 1539.] *Britain in 19th century*; Adams Brown, *Essence of Christianity*; Oman, translation of Schleiermacher's *Reden*, Introduction; Garvie, *The Ritschlian Theology*; M. Arnold, *Literature and Dogma*, *Last Essays on Church and Religion*; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*.

On the Historico-critical movement noteworthy are the following: Gardner, *A Historic View of the NT*; Moffatt, *Historical NT*, Prolegomena and General Notes; O. Cone, *Gospel Criticism and Historical Christianity*; Schweitzer, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*; Otto Schmiedel, *Die Hauptprobleme der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*; the works of Strauss, Renan, Keim, etc., to be found in translations.

On the Social and Psychological influences consult C. C. Everett's *Psychological Elements of Religious Faith*; Valli, *Il fondamento psicologico della Religione*; Naumann, *Das soziale Programm der evangelischen Kirche, Jesus als Volksmann*; Jamas, *Varieties of Religious Experience*; Hyde, *Outlines of Social Theology*; King, *Theology of the Social Consciousness*; Dole, *Theology of Civilization*; Nash, *Genesis of the Social Consciousness*; Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question, Jesus Christ and the Christian Character*; Weinel, *Jesus im XIXten Jahrhundert*; Du Bose, *The Gospel in the Gospels*.

Minor books worth study are Kaftan, *Kant der Philosoph des Protestantismus*; Bergmann, *Ethik als Kulturphilosophie*; Goguel, *Wilhelm Herrmann et le problème religicux actuel*; Mellone, *Converging Lines of Religious Thought, Leaders of Religious Thought*; Mallock, *Reconstruction of Belief*; King, *Reconstruction in Theology*; Gordon, *The Christ of To-day*; Van Dyke, *The Gospel for an Age of Doubt*; Macdonnell, *Christ*; Sheldon, *An Ethical Movement*; Dole, *The Coming People*; Coe, *Religion of a Mature Mind*; F. W. Newman, *The Hebrew Jesus*; Hughes, *Ethical Christianity*; Blatchford, *God and My Neighbour*; J. M. Robertson, *Pagan Christs*; Cairns, 'Christianity in the Modern World' (*Contemp. Rev.* 1903-1904).

The works of Nietzsche and Tolstoi may be had in excellent translations.

On Christ in modern English literature cf. Armstrong, *Faith and Doubt in the Century's Poets*; Wilson, *Theology of Modern Literature*; Lyttelton, *Modern Poets of Faith, Doubt, Paganism*; Stubbs, *The Christ of English Poetry*; Stopford Brooke, *Theology in the English Poets*.

A. S. Martin.

☞ Christ In Mohammedan Literature

CHRIST IN MOHAMMEDAN LITERATURE—i. **In the Koran.*** [Note: The form in which the name 'Jesus' appears in the Koran is 'Isâ (عيسى), which appears to represent 'Esau' rather than 'Ieshua.' A similar variety is said to be found in Mandaic documents (Brandt, *Die Mandäische Religion*, 1889, p. 141); but this, like their Yahyâ for ('John,' may be due to Moslem influence. It seems unlikely, though not wholly impossible, that Mohammed may have confused the personalities of Esau and Christ; it is more probable that the Koranic form is due either to intentional alteration or to mishearing. Fränkel (*WZKM* iv. 336) suggested that the initial *ʾ* instead of the final was due to mishearing on Mohammed's part, whereas the other alterations were due

to his desire to make the word rhyme with Mûsâ (Moses); and this accounts for the facts (cf. Sycz, *Biblische Eigennamen im Koran*, 1903, p. 62). It is, however, equally likely that the alteration was due to Mohammed's informant, who may have been moved by some superstitious consideration.] –The earliest mention of Jesus Christ in the Koran is in ch. 19, the *Suratu Maryam*, which was delivered in Mecca. It refers to His birth—

‘Make mention in the Book, of Mary, when she went apart from her family eastward, and took a veil to shroud herself from them, and we sent our spirit to her, and he took before her the form of a perfect man. She said: “I fly for refuge from thee to the God of Mercy: if thou fearest Him.” He said: “I am only a messenger of thy Lord, that I may bestow on thee a holy son.” She said: “How shall I have a son, when man hath never touched me? and I am not unchaste?” He said: “So shall it be. Thy Lord hath said, Easy is this with me, and we will make him a sign to mankind and a mercy from me; for it is a thing decreed. And she conceived him and retired with him to a far-off place. And the throes came upon her by the trunk of a palm. She said: “Oh, would that I had died ere this, and been a thing forgotten, forgotten quite.” And one cried to her from below her, “Grieve not thou.” Then came she with the babe to her people, bearing him. They said: “O Mary, now hast thou done a strange thing, O sister of Aaron; Thy father was not a man of wickedness, nor unchaste thy mother.” And she made a sign to them, pointing towards the babe. They said: “How shall we speak with him who is in the cradle, an infant?” It said: “Verily, I am the servant of God; He hath given me the Book, and He hath made me a Prophet” ’ (vv. 16-24, 28-32).

The child is represented as miraculously speaking in defence of His mother. He claimed to be the servant of God to whom a revelation—the Book—was made. It is said that this refers to the Injil, or Gospel, revealed to Him whilst yet in His mother's womb. The idea of speaking in the cradle is taken from the apocryphal Gospel of the Infancy. The idea of the palm tree is taken from a story in the History of the Nativity of Mary, when she rests under it on the way to Egypt.

In *Suratu'z Zukhruf* (ch. 43), also a Meccan *Sura*, we read—

‘And when the son of Mary was set forth as an instance of Divine power, lo! thy people cried out for joy thereat. And they said: “Are our gods or is he the better?” ... Jesus is no more than a servant whom we favoured and proposed as an instance of Divine power to the children of Israel. And he shall be a sign of the last hour’ (vv. 57-61).

The idolaters of Mecca put the question recorded in the second of the above verses to Mohammed, when he condemned their gods. The Christians worship as a God, Jesus whom you praise: do you, therefore, condemn Him as you do our gods? We are quite

willing to let our gods be treated as you treat Him. This seems to be their line of argument, and it led to the emphatic declaration that whatever the Christians might think of Him, in the opinion of Mohammed He was 'no more than a servant.'

All the other references to Jesus Christ occur in Medina *Suras*. We give the principal ones in their historical order.

In *Suratu'l Baqarah* (ch. 2) we read—

'And to Jesus, son of Mary, gave we clear proofs of his Mission, and strengthened him with the Holy Spirit'* [Note: By 'Holy Spirit' Mohammed means Gabriel.] (v. 81).

'To Jesus, the son of Mary, we gave manifest signs, and strengthened him with the Holy Spirit' (v. 254).

In the *Suratu Ali Imran* (ch. 3) there are several references—

'Remember when the Angel said: "O Mary, Verily, God announceth to thee the Word from Him. His name shall be Messiah, the son of Mary, illustrious in this world and in the next, and one of those who have near access to God. And he shall speak to men alike when in the cradle and when grown up, and he shall be one of the just." She said: "How, O Lord! shall I have a son, when man hath not touched me?" He said: "Thus will God create what He will. When He decreeth a thing, He only saith Be, and it is." And He will teach him the Book and the Wisdom and the Law and the Evangel, and he shall be an apostle to the people of Israel' (vv. 40-43).

It is said that Mary was thirteen or fifteen years old when the announcement was made to her. The commentators say that Jesus was specially set apart to speak in the cradle, and later on to the Jews.

The phrase 'son of Mary' had become so fixed in Mohammed's mind that he puts it into the mouth of the Angel, even when he is addressing Mary herself. There are several interpretations of the words 'teach him the Book.' The most generally received one is that it refers to the Divine books of previous prophets other than the Law of Moses. There is a curious saying of Imam Mohammed bin Ali Baqir—

'Jesus was so intelligent that, when nine months old, his mother sent him to school. The master said the Bismillah—"In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate"—which the child at once repeated after him. The Master then gave a number of words to be read, of which the first was *abjad*. Jesus wished to know why he should do this, upon which the master became angry and struck him. The child said: "If you know, explain; if you do not, listen. In *abjad*, a stands for Allah la ilah

(‘there is no God but God’), *b* for Bahjat Ullah (‘grace of God’), *j* for Jalal Ullah (‘glory of God’), *d* for Din Ullah (‘religion of God’).” ’

Mohammed says that Jesus was sent as an apostle to the Jews, in order to show that his Mission was limited, whilst that of Mohammed was for all people. In Medina, the idea of a Mission far beyond the confines of Arabia had now taken hold of Mohammed’s mind, and he thus suggests by the reference to the limited Mission of Jesus his own superiority.

In v. 43 of the above ch. 3 a miracle is also referred to—

‘ “How have I come,” he will say, “to you with a sign from your Lord; out of clay will I make for you, as it were, the figure of a bird; and I will breathe into it, and it shall become, by God’s leave, a bird. And I will heal the blind and the leper, and, by God’s leave, I will quicken the dead.” ’

It is said that the bird was a bat which flew away whilst they looked at it, and, when out of sight, fell down dead. Traditions also state that he cured fifty thousand people in one day, and raised not only Lazarus, but also Shem, the son of Noah, from the dead. The story of the bird was evidently suggested to Mohammed by the account of the creation of twelve sparrows from mud, recorded in the apocryphal Gospel of Thomas the Israelite.

In the same *Sura* the death of Jesus is referred to—

‘O Jesus! verily I will cause thee to die. I will take thee up to myself and deliver thee from those who believe not’ (v. 48).

The commentary *Ma’alim* says that he died for three hours and then went up to heaven: others say it was seven hours. *Jalalain* says that God took him away in a trance. Others interpret it in the sense of protection from adversaries, or the destruction of evil which would hinder the ascent to the world of spirits. The difficulty the commentators feel over this verse is that it clearly contradicts *Sura* 4:155 which distinctly denies that Jesus was put to death. In v. 52 Jesus is compared to Adam, that is, neither had a human father.

The next reference is in *Suratu’s Saff* (ch. 61), and is intended to show that Jesus had foretold the advent of Mohammed—

‘Remember when Jesus the son of Mary said, “O children of Israel! of a truth I am God’s apostle to you to confirm the Law which was given before me, and to announce an apostle that shall come after me whose name shall be Ahmad” ’ (v. 7).

Mohammed here confounds the term 'Parakletos,' the Comforter promised by Jesus to His disciples, with the word 'Periklytos,' which has somewhat the same meaning as *Ahmad*, from the root of which his own name Mohammed ('praised') also is derived.

The next reference is in *Suratu'l Hadid* (ch. 57)—

'We gave him the Evangel,* [Note: By 'the Evangel' Mohammed evidently meant the revelation which he supposed Jesus received in the same mechanical way as he received the Koran.] and we put into the hearts of those who followed him kindness and compassion.'

The next reference is in *Suratu'n Nisa* (ch. 4). It is a denial of the crucifixion of Jesus. The Jews are reproached for speaking against Mary, and—

'for their saying, "Verily we have slain the Messiah, Jesus the son of Mary, an apostle of God." Yet they slew him not, and they crucified him not, but they had only his likeness ... they did not really slay him, but God took him up to Himself' (v. 156).

Mohammed here adopts the view of Basilides, an early heretic, who affirmed that the spirit who constituted Jesus the Son of God left Him before the crucifixion. He did it to prove that Jesus was not really a man, but only the semblance of one; and this is opposed to the Koran as well as to the Gospel. Mohammed apparently did not see the inconsistency of adopting the views of Basilides. Another verse denies the Divinity of Christ.

'The Messiah, Jesus son of Mary, is only an apostle of God, and His word which He conveyed into Mary, and a Spirit from Him. Believe, therefore, in God and His apostles, and say not "Three" (*i.e.* there is a Trinity). Forbear! it will be better for you. God is only one God. Far be it from His glory that He should have a son' (v. 169).

In a later *Sura*, *Suratu'l Maida* (ch. 5), we read—

'Infidels now are they who say, "God is the Messiah, son of Mary" ' (v. 76). 'When God shall say, "O Jesus, son of Mary, hast thou said unto mankind—Take me and my mother as two gods besides God?," he shall say, "Glory be unto thee, it is not for me to say that which I know to be not the truth" ' (v. 116).

Mohammed represents Christians as worshipping a Trinity consisting of the Father, the Son, and the Virgin Mary. The undue veneration paid to the Virgin Mary may have misled him in his earlier days, but he had opportunities of correcting his error; and yet in this the latest of the *Suras* he makes the charge. By this time his breach with the Christians was complete, he had no hope of winning them, nothing to gain from

them, and so he either seeks to misrepresent their chief dogma, or, at least, takes no pains to ascertain what it really was.

In the same *Sura* we have a passage which has given rise to many traditions—

‘Remember when the apostles said, “O Jesus, son of Mary, is thy Lord able to send down a furnished table to us out of heaven?” ’ (v. 112). ‘Jesus, son of Mary, said: “O God our Lord! send down a table to us out of heaven, that it may become a recurring festival to us” ’ (v. 114).

Mohammed may have had some idea of the Lord’s Supper when he recited these words, or of the love-feasts which were ‘recurring festivals’; but the commentators do not so interpret it. Some say it was a parable, and that a table did not actually come down; but most consider that a real table descended. Jesus made the ceremonial ablutions, recited the names of God, and then said the prescribed prayers. After this he uncovered the table and found, according to one account, many kinds of food; according to another, a fish ready cooked, without scales or prickly fins, dropping with fat, well seasoned, surrounded with all kinds of herbs, and leaves on which were olives, honey, cheese, and so on. Jesus restored the fish to life, then caused it to die again, and fed one thousand three hundred persons with it. Still the fish remained whole. The table then flew up into heaven. The miracle was repeated for forty days.

ii. The following traditions referring to Jesus Christ are found in the *Qisasu’l Anbiya* or **Tales of the Prophets**.

One day Mary in the house of her husband had arranged a *purdah* behind which she intended to bathe. Then Gabriel in the form of a beautiful young man appeared. Mary feared, and said: ‘I seek protection of God from thee, if thou fearest.’ Gabriel said: ‘I am sent to thee from thy Lord that a beautiful child may be given to thee.’ Mary said: ‘Whence shall a child come to me, for no man has touched me, I am not an evil-doer.’ Then Gabriel came near to Mary and breathed on her. Some say on her sleeve, others on her neck, some on her womb. Some say that this breath was a sneeze made by Adam and preserved by Gabriel.

Mary spoke of her conception to her cousin Joseph, who was to come into the house. He in sorrow expressed his doubts about her, and, on being told to speak his mind freely, said, ‘There is no cultivation without seed, and no seed without a tree.’ Mary said: ‘If you say God at first made the trees, then they were produced without seed: if first He made seed, then seed came without a tree.’ Joseph said: ‘Is a child born without a father?’ Mary said: ‘Yes, without parents, just as Adam and Eve were.’

Joseph assented, and expressed regret for the doubts he had entertained. Then Mary told him about the good news Gabriel had brought.

They say that Jesus in the womb spoke with his mother and said the *Tasbih: Subhana' llah*—'I extol the holiness of God.' When the days of her confinement drew near, Mary was told to go to Bethlehem, lest her people should injure the child. Mary and Joseph went, under the guidance of Gabriel. The pangs of child-birth coming on, she got off her riding animal and rested under a date tree. Then Christ was born. Immediately a spring appeared and angels bathed the child. It is said that Jesus said then to his mother, 'Do not sorrow, God has provided this fountain.' Then ripe dates fell at her feet, and she said: 'O Lord, Thou hast granted me sustenance.' The reply came, 'O Mary, thy heart turned to me, love for Jesus has come into it; be tranquil, sustenance will be provided, eat and drink and have joy in the Messiah.'

Then Mary said to Gabriel: 'If people ask how the child was born, what shall I reply?' He said: 'Say, "I have seen no man, I am fasting; I speak with none about it."' It is said that when the Jews found her and the child under the tree, they began to make a tumult and reproached her, saying, 'Neither thy father nor mother were evildoers.' She replied: 'I am fasting to-day, whatever you want to know, ask the child.' They became very angry, and said: 'How shall we speak to the infant?' However, they asked him the circumstances of his birth. He said: 'I am the slave of God, appointed to be a prophet and a blessing in whatever place I may be, and He has ordered me to keep the fast and almsgiving as long as I live. I am not appointed a tyrant, but the peace of God is upon me from the day of my birth to the day of my death and resurrection to life again.' Having said this, he did not speak again till the natural time for an infant to speak arrived. Having witnessed the miracle, the Jews gave up their suspicion and reproach, and said that this was the prophet of whose birth the preceding prophets had spoken.

Then Mary went to Jerusalem, where, seeing the miracles done by the child, people sought to destroy him. Then, by the order of God, Mary took him to Egypt. Some say she went with Joseph and the child to Damascus, to the house of a rich man, who protected and provided for them. He nourished many lame and blind persons. At this time a very valuable article of his was stolen, and no trace of the thief could be found. Jesus said: 'Such a lame and such a blind man stole the thing.' When accused, the blind man said: 'How could I see to steal?,' and the lame man, 'How could I walk to do so?' Jesus said: 'The blind man carried the lame man, who then from a shelf took the goods and divided the booty.' So the theft was found out.

Then Jesus, having received from God the gift of prophecy, returned to Jerusalem and invited the Jews to embrace the strong religion; but they were displeased, and only his apostles followed him.

It is said that the term *hawari*,* [Note: Really the Ethlopic for 'messenger,' apostle.] 'apostle,' comes from a word meaning 'to whiten,' and that the apostles were so called because they were fullers by trade. Jesus said to them: 'Just as you make clothes clean, so by faith in God cleanse your hearts from the dust of sin.' Then they asked for a miracle. Jesus took various clothes and filled a jar with them. Some time after he took them out, when they were all of one colour. These twelve men then believed in him. God told Jesus to tell people first, that 'God is one without a partner,' then to tell them of the coming of Mohammed as a prophet, and say: 'A prophet will come after me, Ahmad by name. Then Jesus, wearing a woollen cloth, with staff in hand went here and there. At night he used a stone for a pillow and lay on the ground. His food was barley bread and greens. He cared nothing for worldly wealth. He never desired the society and friendship of women. His life was one of great simplicity. Seeing his fatigue in walking, his disciples brought him an animal to ride; but after using it once he returned it to them, for the anxiety of providing it with fodder was more than he could bear. They then wished to procure him a house; he declined it on the ground that if he lived long it would go to ruin; if he soon died, some one else would get it.

One day he saw an old man sitting by the grave of his son. Jesus, after two prostrations in prayer, said: 'O certain one, rise by the order of God.' The grave opened, and the corpse came forth and said: 'O Lord, why didst thou call me?' The Jews said: 'We have never seen such a sorcerer.'

It is related that God ordered Jesus to go to the king of Nasibin, a proud and infidel ruler. Jesus went with his twelve disciples, and on arriving near the place said: 'Who of you will go and announce to the people of this place my arrival?' James and Thomas and Simon Peter went. When near the place, Simon told the other two to go on and give the news, and he would wait; so that if evil should fall on one of them he might make some plan. Then James and Thomas entered the city, and cried out, 'Jesus the Prophet of God and the Spirit of God has come to the city.' The people seized Thomas and took him to the king, who said: 'Who has spoken here of a prophet, and God, and the Spirit of God? if he does not repent, I will kill him.' Thomas said: 'I will not repent. Let the king do as he wills.' Then by the order of the king the people cut off the hands and feet of Thomas, and left him in an unclean place. Simon then came and sought the audience of the king, and begged to be allowed to interrogate Thomas. He then asked him how he supported the statement he had made. Thomas replied that Jesus worked miracles, for the blind and lame and sick were healed. Simon said: 'Doctors do this; what other proof have you?' 'Jesus knows what people eat, and drink, and say in their houses.' Simon said: 'This too can be done by intelligence and hearing: give another proof.' 'He makes birds of mud, and makes them fly.' Simon said: 'This is simply magic: give another proof.' Thomas said: 'He raises by the order of God the dead to life.' Simon then said to the king: 'If

this is so, it is advisable that your honour should send for Jesus, and see whether what Thomas says is right: if he raises the dead he is a true prophet.' The king approved, and sent for Jesus, to whom Simon told all that had passed. Jesus asked what miracles were called for. Simon said to heal the hands and feet of Thomas; then to state what each one in the assembly had eaten, and what stores he had; then to make mud birds fly. Jesus did all these things. Salman al-Farisi says that when all the sick in Nasibin were healed, the people asked Jesus to raise the dead. Jesus said he would do so. They came to the grave of Shem, son of Noah, and said, 'Revive him.' Jesus made two prostrations in prayer and prayed to God. Then by order of God the earth opened, and a person with white hair and beard came forth from the grave, and, having saluted Jesus, said to the people: 'Certainly, Jesus is a prophet of God. All of you should believe in him and obey him.' Then Jesus said to Shem: 'In your lifetime no one had white hair; how is it yours is white?' He replied: 'When I heard your voice, I thought the day of judgment had come, and my hair turned white with fear.' Jesus said: 'How long have you been dead?' He replied: 'Four thousand years.' Jesus wished to pray for his life, but Shem said: 'Again I must die, I have no wish to live on, if you will ask God to have mercy on me.'

One day when a crowd was following Jesus, they said they were hungry. The Apostles urged him to relieve them. This relief came in the form of a tray of food from heaven. When Jesus and the Apostles saw it, they offered thanks to God. Then Jesus said: 'Let the most pious one amongst you lift up the cover of the tray.' The Apostles requested him to do it. He did so, and then they saw on the tray a fish without bones from which oil was flowing, and round it were all kinds of vegetables, but there was no garlic or leeks. Near the head of the fish was some vinegar, and near the tail some salt. Round it were placed five loaves, and on each loaf were a few olives, five pomegranates, and five dates. Simon, on seeing this, said: 'This is heavenly food.' Then Jesus told the people to eat. The Apostles said: 'You eat and then we will.' Jesus said: 'I do not eat. Let the people for whom I obtained it eat.' Then the people ate. The sick, after eating this food, were restored to health. Multitudes ate, but the food was not less. It is said that for forty days this tray came down each morning and remained till mid-day. Then the word came to Jesus: 'Only the poor, the orphans, and the sick should eat.' The rich murmured, and God threatened them with punishment. Some said: 'Make the fish alive again, and we will believe.' Jesus did so; but they believed not, and seventy men perished.

A man came to Mary one day, and said: 'The king has said that a ryot each day is to make a feast for him and his army. To-day it is my turn, and I have not the means to do it.' Mary turned for aid to Jesus, who hesitated; but Mary said that aid would be a great favour to the ryot. Jesus then sent for the master of the house, and said: 'Get ready jars and pots, and fill up with water,' which Jesus changed into pure wine. In other pots cooked meat was found, and newly baked bread on trays appeared. The

king wished to know where the wine came from. The man replied, From such and such a place. The king, knowing the wine of that place, said: 'Why dost thou lie? no such wine is to be found there.' Then the man confessed that a neighbour had by his prayers provided all. The king then called for Jesus, and said: 'The heir to my throne died a little while ago, restore him to life.' Jesus said that his return to life meant many evils to the country. The king said: 'Let the country be ruined if I only get one glimpse of him.' Jesus said: 'If I raise him, will you let me go in peace?' The king agreed; so the prince came to life, and Jesus went away. But the prince was a tyrant, and the people killed both father and son.

One day Jesus met a Jew with two loaves. The Jew agreed to share food; but when he saw Jesus had only one loaf, he hid one of his, and next morning appeared with one only, and denied that he had more. Then Jesus, when going on the way, asked a shepherd to feed him, who said: 'Tell one of my men to slay a sheep that it may be cooked.' Jesus from the skin and bones revived the sheep. 'Who art thou?' said the shepherd. 'Jesus, son of Mary.' Then Jesus asked the Jew where the two loaves were. He swore he had only one. Jesus remained quiet. At the next stage he had a calf killed, and they all ate of it, and again he restored the calf to life and gave it back to its owner, and again asked the Jew where the two loaves were. He again denied that he had two. They then come to a city where the king was sick and at the point of death. Then the Jew told the nobles that he could cure all diseases and even raise the dead. They said: 'Cure the king and we will give you much money.' He began to beat the king with his staff, and the king died. The nobles ordered that he should be hanged. Jesus, seeing this, said: 'If I raise your king, will you forgive my friend?' Jesus raised the king and released the Jew. The Jew was profuse in his thanks. Jesus said: 'Where is the second loaf?' The Jew said he had only one.

Jesus went one day to an infidel king like Pharaoh, and called upon him to embrace Islam. The king, being annoyed, determined to kill him. Jesus hid in a mountain cave, and after a few days told his disciples that this revelation had come: 'Truly I will raise thee up and bring thee back to myself.' The Apostles wept at the idea of separation from him. He said: 'You weep now, when the enemy comes you will forsake me.' They declared that they would allow no enemy to come near him, and would protect him. They also said: 'Will another prophet come after thee?' He said: 'Yes, of the Quraish tribe, an unlettered prophet, Mohammed, superior to me, will come. Tell the generations to come to follow him.' He then added: 'Now I make Simon my Khalifa (successor), all of you obey him.' They agreed. He said: 'After my death trays full of light will come, and by the blessing of that light you will know the languages of all tribes.'

Some say that the Jews, by the advice of that bad king, and by means of an old Apostle, seized Jesus and imprisoned him all night, and in the morning prepared a

cross on which to crucify him. Then great darkness fell, and angels released Jesus from prison and carried him up on high, and took the old man prisoner. The Jews, thinking he was Jesus, quickly killed him, and he was crucified, though he protested that he was not Jesus, but the man who had betrayed him. The Jews did not believe it. All historians say Mary was then alive. Others say the Jews watched and guarded the cave where Jesus was, but Jesus at night was taken up under cover of darkness. In the morning the Jews sent a man to find Jesus, but he returned and said that no one was there. Then the Jews said: 'Thou art Jesus,' and crucified him.

Others say the Jews imprisoned him with eighteen men in a house. Jesus said: 'If one of you will assume my appearance, God will reward you in Paradise.' One agreed. Jesus ascended on high. In the morning the Jews said, 'There were eighteen men with Jesus; one is short.' The prisoners said Jesus had gone on high; but the Jews saw one like Jesus and crucified him. After a few days Jesus returned to the Apostles; then he died, but God restored him to life and made him like an angel.

It is said that at the last day, when Dajjal the cursed, with Imam Mahdi, collects the people at morning prayers, Jesus will appear on the Mosque at Jerusalem, and will descend to join Imam Mahdi, and kill Dajjal. He will engage in *Jihad*, or wars of religion, and bring people to Islam. Such will be his justice that the lion and the sheep will dwell together, and children will play with serpents. When Jesus dies again, the burial prayers (*namaz-i-Janazah*) will be said over him, and he will be buried in the tomb of Mohammed at Medina.

Literature.—The Christology of the Koran is the subject of a considerable literature, which is best represented in recent times by Ed. Sayous, *Jésus-Christ d'après Mahomet*, Paris, 1880. Somewhat earlier are Gerock, *Versuch einer Darstellung der Christologie des Korans*, Hamburg and Gotha, 1839; and Manneval, *La Christologie du Koran*, Toulouse, 1867. See also H. Preserved Smith, *The Bible and Islam*, New York, 1897; and the missionary tract 'Islam and Christianity,' American Tract Society, 1891.

In the post-Koranic literature of Islam three classes of writers are occupied with the Person of Christ, for different purposes.

1. *The theologians*.—These persons, so far as they argue with Christians, are compelled to discredit the Christian Gospels, against which they urge objections often identical with those popularized in recent times by Strauss. The remarkable treatise by Ibn Hazm (d. 1063 a.d.), published in Cairo, 1903-4, represents the extreme of negative criticism. The author refuses to trust the Gospels even for the names of the Apostles; nothing whatever, he holds, is known about 'Isâ beyond the statements of the Koran. For the mode in which his arguments can be met we may refer to St. Clair Tisdall, *Muhammadan Objections to Christianity*, 1904. Ibn Hazm's view is not

generally popular among Moslems; and some, such as Fakhr al-din al-Razi (d. 1209), a commentator of high repute, even use the Gospels to illustrate the Koran. This practice is imitated by the Egyptian mufti, Mohammed Abdo, from whom Islam expected so much, in the commentaries which are published in the Cairene bi-monthly *Manâr*. It is not unusual to find illustrations of the Koran from the Gospels in commentaries by authors who would not consult them; in such cases they are given after a chain of authorities going back to one of the companions of the Prophet.

2. *The preachers.*—The Moslem sermon ordinarily consists largely of anecdotes or maxims connected with persons of eminence. These include prophets; Greek, Roman, and Persian sages; companions of the Prophet; and Moslem saints. In the works of these writers the name of 'Isâ figures very frequently, the sayings and doings assigned to Him being sometimes traceable to the Gospels, but often assigned in different works to a variety of persons. A great quantity bearing the name 'Isâ are to be found in the great homiletic encyclopaedia called 'Revival of the Religious Sciences,' by al-Ghazzali (*ob.* 1126 a.d.), whence they were collected and translated in the *Expository Times* (Nov. and Dec. 1903, and Jan. 1904) by D. S. Margoliouth.

3. *The story-tellers.*—The profession of these persons does not differ technically from that of the preachers; but, as their purpose is only to entertain, they may be distinguished from those who aim at reforming. The work by Tha'libî (d. 1036) cited above, called 'Tales of the Prophets,' emanates from this class, whom the more serious preachers reproach for their mendacity (*Luzumiyyat* of Abu 'l-'Alâ of Ma'arrâh, ii. 77, Cairo, 1895). The stories told by them are often purely the product of their fancy, though at times they go back to some apocryphal Gospel, or some passage of the Old Testament. The character of Christ, as it appears in Moslem fabrications, is modelled on that of the *Sufi* saint, who is a benevolent ascetic. Ibn 'Arabi (d. 1240 a.d.), the chief mystical writer of Islam, accounts for the mild, philanthropic, and non-resistant character of Christianity by the fact that its founder was fatherless. That Christ will return to judge the world *according to the law of Mohammed* is a text on which his 'Meccan Revelations' contain many a homily. The Christian doctrine of the 'Son of God' was attributed by ingenious Moslems to a *misreading* of Psa 2:7 'Thou art my Son,' in Arabic *bunayya*, which should have been read *nabiyyun*, 'a prophet,' two words which, in the ordinary Arabic writing, are barely distinguishable (*al-Bhaith al-Musajjam*). In the anecdotes told by the preachers, the Apostles are ordinarily made to address him as 'O Spirit of God' or 'O Word of God,' for both of which there is authority in the Koran. As has been pointed out above, the third Person of the Trinity was supposed by the Moslems to be the Virgin.

E. Sell and D. S. Margoliouth.

☩ Christ In Reformation Theology

CHRIST IN REFORMATION THEOLOGY.—It is commonly said that the whole Christian Church has taken its doctrine of the Person of Christ from the Eastern Church, and simply adopted the definitions formulated at the Councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, and Chalcedon; and further, that at the Reformation the Reformers contented themselves with brushing away the meaningless refinements of the Scholastic divines of the Middle Ages, and accepted without change the conclusions come to in the Councils of the undivided Church. Neither of these statements is strictly accurate. They have this basis of truth that both East and West accepted the same forms of sound words, and professed the Creeds and verbal definitions sanctioned by the Œcumenical Councils down to that of Chalcedon, but they do not take into account the fact that verbal statements may cover a great deal of divergence in intellectual views—a divergence which in the present case was not merely in intellectual conception, but represented fundamentally distinct types of Christian piety.

The Western Church owed very little to the Eastern, and had a Christology of its own with a clearly marked history, from Tertullian to Augustine; and its intellectual definitions corresponded to a definite type of Christian piety. Athanasius and Augustine alike dwell on the mystery lying in the union of the Divine and the human in the Person of Christ the God-man, and can express their thought in the same language; but for Athanasius the mystery lies in the union of two natures, while for Augustine the mystery lies in the Person. ‘My Saviour,’ says Athanasius, ‘must be the great God who made heaven and earth; and He must unite the human and Divine natures which He possesses, in a union which for me is a mystery to be believed, but which my intelligence can never explain or penetrate.’ The Greek type of piety fed itself on the mysterious union of natures; the Incarnation was the central thought in Christianity, and salvation appeared to the Eastern Church as a species of diffusion of the Incarnation: men were saved when they were absorbed in the Divine. Augustine felt as strongly the need for a Saviour who was both God and man; and, inheriting the theology tradition of the West, first established by Tertullian and confirmed by Ambrose of Milan, he found a clue to a statement of the Person of Christ in the NT phrases, ‘the *form of God*,’ and ‘the *form of a servant*,’ and held that these two forms coexisted in the unity of the Person (see above, p. 854^a). There was no mystery in the natures. They did not coalesce or blend or unite so far as the natures themselves were concerned. The Person possesses both these forms simultaneously; the one and the same Person was at one and the same time in the *form of God* and in the *form of a servant*; and in this unity of the Person lay the mystery. ‘Filius Dei semper, filius hominis ex tempore, tamen unus Christus ex unitate personae. In cœlo erat quando in terra loquebatur. Sic erat filius hominis in cœlo, quomodo filius Dei

erat in terra; filius Dei in terra in suscepta carne, filius hominis in cœlo in unitate personae' All believers feel this unity so very strongly that they instinctively create this unity of the Person for themselves. The unity exists in the heart of every Christian. The common Christian thought is that there is a Man in whom God dwells, and who is God. This is the mystery of the Person. 'Proprium illius hominis sacramentum est.'

It is evident that the piety which dwells on the mystery of the Person as opposed to the mystery of the union of the natures has its attention directed to the personal saving acts rather than to the passive condition of incarnation, and sees its salvation worked out for it in the life, death, and rising again of the Divine Person, rather than in the diffusion of the Incarnation. Thus two types of Christian piety correspond to the two differing intellectual conceptions of where the mystery lies in the Person of Christ, and each can accept the same verbal definitions.

Luther and all the Reformers held the Western conception of the Person of Christ. For Luther and for Calvin the most venerated creed was the Western symbol which is called the Apostles' Creed, which in its old Roman form can be traced back to the first half of the 2nd century. Luther and Calvin both placed it in their catechisms for children. Calvin declares that the whole of his *Institutio* is its exposition, and Luther always understood the Nicene and the Athanasian Creeds to be explanations of the Apostles' Creed. For Luther, as for Augustine, Jesus is a Man in whom God dwells, and who is God.

Luther always declared that he accepted the doctrine, and nothing but the doctrine, of the ancient Church on the Person of Christ. 'No one can deny,' he says, 'that we hold, believe, sing, and confess all things in correspondence with the Apostles' Creed, that we make nothing new therein, nor add anything thereto, and in this way we belong to the old Church, and are one with it.' The Schmalkald Articles and the Augsburg Confession begin with stating over again the doctrines of the Old Catholic Church, founding on the Nicene Creed, and quoting Ambrose and Augustine; and Luther's contention always was that, if the sophistry of the Schoolmen could be cleared away, the old doctrines of the ancient Church would stand forth in their original purity. When he spoke of the Scholastic Theology as sophistry, he attached a definite meaning to the word. He meant not merely that the Schoolmen played with the outsides of doctrines, and asked and solved innumerable trivial questions, but also that the imposing edifice they erected was hollow within, and had nothing to do with the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. He maintained that in the heart of the system there was, instead of the God whom Jesus had revealed, the abstract entity of pagan philosophy, an unknown deity—for God could never be revealed by metaphysics. All this sophistry he swept away, and then declared that he stood on the ground occupied by the theologians of the ancient Church, whose faith was rooted in

the triune God, and in belief in Jesus Christ the Revealer of God. The old theology had nothing to do with Mariolatry or with saint-worship; it revered the triune God and Jesus Christ, His Son, the Saviour of mankind. Moreover, Luther believed, and rightly believed, that for the Fathers of the ancient Church, the theological doctrines in which they expressed their conceptions about God and the Person of Christ were no dead formulas, but were the expression of a living Christian experience. Luther took the old dogmas, and made them live again in an age in which it seemed as if they had lost all their vitality and had degenerated into mere dead doctrines on which the intellect could sharpen itself, but which were out of all relation to the practical religious life of men. That is to say, in other words, Luther gave to theology a religious interest, and this was a recovery of something which had been lost. Mediaeval theology had little sense of religion. Religious phenomena, like the appearance of St. Francis and the existence of the 'Brethren,' were not taken into serious consideration by theologians. The *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas gives little insight into the deep and genuine religious experience of the writer, and gets no inspiration there. The efforts of the Schoolmen were directed solely to the exposition of the philosophical implications of traditional doctrines; they ignored the relation to actual religious life in the Church, apart from which theology becomes unreal. Probably it requires a succession of religious geniuses to maintain the right connexion between theology and contemporary religious experience, and it is the opinion of Ad. Harnack that the Church had no genius between Augustine and Luther. No one realized that a supreme utterance of faith like St. Bernard's hymn—

‘Jesus, our only joy be Thou,

As Thou our prize wilt be;

Jesus, be Thou our glory now,

And through eternity’—

and such experience as finds expression there, formed any part of the material of theology. And so theology missed its opportunities of serving the Church. Had theology undertaken the task of understanding and interpreting words like these, it would have cleared the path to new truth, and set pious souls free. As it was, for want of its proper food, theology languished, and simple saints, though at times soaring on the wings of faith, still carried their crutches lovingly about with them. ‘They still believed in an exclusive priesthood, in magical sacramental grace, in prayers to saints, and works of merit and Papal dispensations. Even the ‘Brethren’ who, all through the Middle Ages, pointedly ignored the ecclesiastical system and obstinately put to all who tried to force doctrines upon them the question, ‘Where did Christ teach that?’ were strangely without any impulse to state a theology of their

own. For centuries the breath of pure devotion to Christ never fertilized the learning of the schools, and no genius arose—no great churchman in whom personal religion was the inspiration of a mind at once critical and constructive. Not till Staupitz, on his visit to Luther's convent, recommended the old German theology of Tauler to the youthful scholar-monk, did the secret of Christian piety once more find lodgment in the soul of a religious genius, who saw how to make the thoughts of faith supreme throughout the whole sphere of religion—in church life, in ritual and theology, as well as in the lonely heart. Through Luther came the rediscovery that there was theological material in the living experience of Christian souls. And since in the Christian soul Christ is always enthroned, this amounted to a rediscovery of the place of Christ in theology. Directing itself thus to experience, theology realized that its important task is not to give the metaphysical assurances about Christ's Person with which the Schoolmen laboriously occupied themselves, but to explain the nature of His saving work which makes believers hail Him as Lord.

But if Luther accepted the old formulas describing the nature of God and the Person of Christ, he did so in a thoroughly characteristic way. He desired to state them in plain German, so that they could appeal to the 'common man.' Neither he nor any of the Reformers believed that theology, which for them was, or ought to be, the most practical of all disciplines, was a secret science for experts, described in a language which must be unintelligible to the multitude. He confessed with some impatience that technical theological terms were sometimes necessary, but he did not like them, and he used them as little as possible.

'Quodsi odit anima mea vocem *homoousion*, et nolim ea uti, non haereticus ero, quis enim me coget uti, modo rem teneam, quae in concilio per scripturas definita est' (Erlangen ed. Lat. xxxvi. 506). Like Athanasius, he preferred the word *oneness* to express the relation between the Persons in the Trinity. He even disliked the term *Trinity* or its German equivalents *Dreifaltigkeit*, *Dreiheit*. 'Dreifaltigkeit ist ein recht böse Deutsch, denn in der Gottheit ist die höchste Elnigkeit. Etliche nennen es Dreiheit; aber das lautet allzuspöttisch ... darum lautet es auch kalt, und viel besser sprach man Gott denn die Dreifaltigkeit' (Erlangen² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , xii. 408). He called the technical terms used in the old creeds *vocabula mathematica*, and did not use any of them in his Small or Large Catechisms.

In framing his conception of what was meant by the Person of Christ, Luther, like all the Reformers, started from the saving work of the Redeemer. He approached the Person of Christ from our Lord's mediatorial work, and not from any metaphysical way of thinking what Godhead must be, and what manhood must be, and how Godhead and manhood can be united. He rises from the office to the Person, and does not descend from the Person to the office.

‘Christ is not called Christ because He has two natures. What does that matter to me? He bears this glorious and comforting name because of His office and work which He has undertaken’ (*ib.* xii. 244).

It is a true appreciation of His work that leads to a real knowledge of His Person. ‘He who, with Peter, has a true view of the office which Christ must exercise in the world, and effect with us, must conclude with Peter that Christ must be God in like omnipotence’ (*ib.* vi. 286). ‘To remove from us the burden of sin, death, hell, and the devil, and to vanquish their power, and to bring again righteousness, life, and salvation, are the works neither of men nor of angels, but only of the One, Eternal, Divine Majesty, the Creator of heaven and earth. *Therefore* must this seed of Abraham be true, everlasting, Almighty God, equal to the Father from all eternity’ (*ib.* xix. 18). He who accomplished an effectual redemption for fallen and enslaved humanity must needs be Divine. The idea of a redeemer of man, Himself no more than man, or rather, Himself less than the one eternal God, was to Luther an absurdity. Redemption and Godhead were inseparably bound together.

So, like Athanasius, Luther found in his salvation the proof of the Divinity of the Saviour. Beneath all the reasonings of the great Alexandrian there lay his fundamental Christian experience that the Saviour who redeemed him must be the great God who made heaven and earth. It was the same with Luther.

In the second article on the Creed in his Catechism, he says, ‘This means that I believe that Jesus Christ, true God ... is my Lord who has redeemed me,’ and again: ‘We must have a Saviour who is more than a saint or an angel; for if He were no better and greater than these, there were no helping us. But if He be God, then the treasure is so ponderous that it outweighs and lifts away sin and death; and not only so, but also gives eternal life. This is our Christian faith, and therefore we rightly confess: “I believe in Jesus Christ His only Son, our Lord, who was born of Mary, suffered and died.” By this faith hold fast, and though heathen and heretic are ever so wise, thou shalt be blessed’ (Erlangen ed. xlvii. 3, 4).

Jesus Christ was for Luther *the mirror of the fatherly heart of God*, and therefore was God; God Himself was the only Comforter who could bring rest to the human soul burdened by sin and grief; and the Holy Spirit was God. The old creeds confessed One God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and the confession contented him, whatever words were used. Besides, he rejoiced to place himself side by side with the Christians of the ancient days, who were free from the sophistries of the Schoolmen, and to feel that he also belonged to the ancient Church, the communion of the saints.

But although Luther and the other Reformers accepted the theology of the ancient Church and introduced its creeds into the reformed services of public worship, they

put a richer meaning into the doctrine of the Person of Christ than had ever been done before their day; and the thought of the Divinity of Christ meant more to them than it had done to their early predecessors. Jesus, the Saviour, seemed to be God in a more intimate way to them than to the earlier divines. The old theology had stated the doctrine of the Two Natures in the Person of Christ, in such a way as to suggest that the only function of the Divine nature was to give to the human work of the Saviour such an importance as to make it effective. This is seen in Augustine, in Anselm, and in the Reformed Scholastics of the 17th century. Luther and his fellow-Reformers always refused to take this limited way of regarding the Divinity of Christ. They did not refuse the expression 'Two Natures in One Person,' but Luther makes it plain that the words suggested an idea which he believed to be wrong, and which had to be guarded against. He declares frequently that we must beware of thinking that the Deity and the humanity of Christ are united in such an external fashion that we may look at the one apart from the other. When we see Jesus, we perceive God and man really and intimately united.

'This is the first principle and most excellent article, how Christ is the Father: that we are not to doubt that whatsoever the man says and does is reckoned, and must be reckoned, as said and done in heaven for all angels; and in the world for all rulers; in hell for all devils; in the heart for every evil conscience and all secret thoughts. For if we are certain of this: that when Jesus thinks, speaks, wills, the Father also wills, then I defy all that may fight against me. For here in Christ have I the Father's heart and will' (Erlangen ed. xlix. 183, 184).

Luther's sense of the rich and full Divinity of Christ is not won at the expense or neglect of His humanity. On the contrary, he believed that the reason why the Schoolmen had made so many mistakes was that they had practically omitted the humanity of Christ altogether. They had obscured His humanity by a multitude of conceptions and fancies which Luther could not abide. The legends of meaningless miracles and supernatural claims attributed to the infant Jesus, he characterizes as 'pure foolishness.' For it widened the gulf between Him and us. Where a mediaeval preacher delighted in recounting marvels taken from apocryphal sources, emphasizing all that tended to put Christ in a different order of being from us, Luther dwelt continually on all His characteristically human traits, on all that made Him one with us.

'The deeper we can bring Christ into our humanity, the better it is,' he says in one of his sermons (Erlangen ed. vi. 155). So his frequent pictures of the boyhood of Jesus are full of touches from the family life of the home at Wittenberg. The boy Jesus lived just like other boys, was protected, like them, by the dear angels, was suckled at His mother's breast, learned to walk, ate and drank like other children, was subject to His parents, ran errands for His mother, brought her water from the well,

and firewood from the heap in the yard, and finally, when He grew up and became stronger, began to ply the axe to help His father (*passim*). And this, Luther asserted against those who had erected it into an article of faith that Christ from the first moment of His life was so full of wisdom that there was nothing left for Him to learn. He will have nothing to do with those who ascribe to Christ only a mutilated humanity. 'By humanity I mean body and soul. And this I wish to emphasize because some, like Photinus and Apollinaris, have taught that Christ was a man without a human soul, and that the Godhead dwelt in Him in place of the soul' (Erlangen ed. x. 131).

As with every other article of his creed, Luther had a practical religious interest in holding so firmly to the humanity of Christ. The human life of Jesus glorified humanity, and was a pledge of the final glory of all redeemed humanity.

'It is,' he says in his exposition of Joh 1:14, 'the most precious treasure and highest comfort that we Christians have, that the Word, the true natural Son of God, became man, having flesh and blood, like any other man, and became man for our sakes, that we might come to the great glory: thereby our flesh and blood, skin and hair, hands and feet, belly and back, sit in heaven above, equal to God, so that we can boldly bid defiance to the devil and all else that harasses us. We are thus made certain, too, that they belong to heaven and are heirs of the heavenly Kingdom' (Erlangen ed. xlvi. 12 f.). It was no mere semblance of a man who was now exalted at the Father's right hand, but one who was bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh, to whom no human experience, save sin, was foreign,—a boy who enjoyed his play and helped in little household duties, a man who shared the common lot of toil and weariness and temptation, a real man living a true human life under conditions not so far removed from our own. Having life—a true human life—He understands us fully, and we can know Him, and God through Him. Through Him alone can we come to know God. 'Outside of this Christ no other will of God is to be sought.... Those who speculate about God and His will without Christ, lose God completely' (Walch's ed. vol. v. p. 198).

With the Reformers, therefore, the historical life of Jesus is of the utmost importance, far exceeding all metaphysical dissertations upon the nature of a God-man. We can all have naturally a human sympathy with that marvellous life; but faith, the gift of God, is needed to see the Divine meaning in that life and death. The meaning, put in its briefest form, is that in Jesus we see God appearing in history and addressing man. Hence the Person of Christ was something more than a mere doctrine for them—an intellectual something outside us. It must be part of that blessed experience which is called Justification by Faith. It is inseparably connected with the recognition that we are not saved by the good deeds we are really able to do, but solely by the work of Christ. It is what makes us cease to trust all work-righteousness,

and to confide ourselves to God alone, as He has revealed Himself in Jesus Christ. When we know and feel that it is God who is working on our behalf, then we instinctively cease trying to think that we can work out our own salvation (Erlangen ed. xii. 244). Hence the Person of Christ must always be something more than a mere doctrine for the true Christian. It is something which we carry about with us, as part of our lives.

‘To know Jesus in the true way means to know that He died for us, that He piled our sins upon Himself, so that we hold all our own affairs as nothing, and let them all go and cling only to the faith that Christ has given Himself for us, and that His sufferings and piety and virtues are all mine. When I know this, I must hold Him dear in return, for I cannot help loving such a man.’

Here we reach the kernel of the Reformation thought about Christ Jesus, and the master-thought which distinguishes its theology from all previous teaching about God and the Person of Christ.

Luther lets us see, over and over again, that he believed that the only thing worth considering in theology was the Divine work of Christ and the experience we have of it through faith. He did not believe that there was any real knowledge of God without these limits. Luther, as Ad. Harnack says, ‘in his relation to God, only thought of God at all as he knew Him in Christ.’ Beyond them there is the unknown God of philosophical paganism, the God whom Jews, Turks, and pagans ignorantly worship. No one can really know God save through the Christ of history. Hence, with Luther, Christ fills the whole sphere of God: ‘He that hath seen me hath seen the Father,’ and conversely, ‘He that hath not seen me hath not seen the Father.’ The historical Jesus Christ is for Luther the revealer, and the only revealer, of the Father. The revelation is given in the marvellous experience of faith in which Jesus compels us to see God in Him—the whole of God, who has kept back nothing which He could have given us. This is the distinctive mark of the way in which the Reformers regarded Christ; all theology is Christology; they knew no other God than the God who had manifested Himself in the historical Christ, and made us see in the miracle of faith that He is our salvation.

‘There is only one article and rule in theology. He who has not a full and clear grasp of it is no theologian; namely, true faith and trust in Christ. Into this article all the others flow, and without this they are nothing’ (Erlangen ed. vol. lviii. 398). ‘In my heart there rules alone, and shall rule, this one article, namely, faith on my dear Lord Christ, which is, of all my thoughts on things spiritual and Divine, the only beginning, middle, and end’ (*ib.* lviii. 63).

The early Christians had said of Jesus that He must be conceived of as belonging to the sphere of God (2 Clement, i.: ἀδελφοί, οὕτως δεῖ ἡμᾶς φρονεῖν περὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

ὁ, ὡς περὶ θεοῦ). The Reformers added: and that He fills the whole sphere of God, so that there is room for no other vision of God than that which Christ gives us. This master thought of Reformation theology simplified Christian doctrine in a wonderful way. It justified Luther's rejection of the complicated discussions of the Schoolmen, and his accusation that what he called their 'sophistry' was partly pagan; and it also showed clearly that Christian worship ought to be simplified too.

The reader of the second part of the second book of the *Summa Theologiae* of Thomas Aquinas cannot help seeing that the really evangelical aspirations of the great Schoolmen are everywhere thwarted and finally slain outright because the theologian has to start with the thought that God has been first defined as either the *Absolute*, or the *Primum Movens*, or the *Causa efficiens prima*, or the *Intelligens a quo omnes res naturales ordinantur in finem*—conceptions which can never imprison, without destroying, the vision of the Father who has revealed Himself to us in Jesus Christ. What have Christians to do, the Reformers asked, with a great Eternal Something, which is not the world, when they have the Father? It would have been well had their followers in after generations realized this principle, and the Church might have been spared the 17th cent. Scholasticism, where God was defined as the *Principium essendi et cognoscendi*, where His purpose in salvation became a Divine decree, taking the place of the category of substance, and where theology, borrowing as much from Aristotle as from the Scriptures, became a second-rate metaphysic.

The older theology had never grasped the thought that Jesus Christ filled the whole sphere of God. It limited the work of Christ to the procuring of forgiveness of sins, and left room outside Christ for many operations of Divine grace which were supposed to begin when the work of forgiveness was ended. So there grew up the complex system of expiations and satisfactions, of magical sacraments and saints' intercessions, which made the mediaeval Christian life so full of superstitions, and, to all seeming, so empty of Christ. To the mediaeval theologian all these could be justified, because they came from that portion of the sphere of God which was, as it were, beyond Christ. The influence of Christ was exhausted, they thought, when bare forgiveness had been won; and the grace needed for all holy living came from operations of the grace of God which did not necessarily come through Jesus Christ. But when the Reformers thought of God, they thought of Christ and of Christ alone. The grace of God was always to them the grace of Christ; the Holy Spirit was the Spirit of Christ; the presence of God was the presence of Christ, and the possession of God was the possession of Christ. They could not, therefore, regard grace as a mysterious something, different from the soul and outside it, and at the same time different from Christ and outside Him also. Grace became simply the possession of, and the presence of, Christ, who is the whole God. This simplified the Christian life,

and swept away at once the whole complex system which had bred so much superstition.

This characteristic of Reformation thought and of Reformation piety, that Christ fills the whole sphere of God, appears everywhere in the writings of the Reformers and in the rites and worship of the Reformed Churches, and may be illustrated, if not exhaustively described, in the following instances of its application.

1. The Reformers swept away every contemplation of intercessors who were supposed to share with our Lord the procuring of pardon and salvation, and they declared against all attempts to distinguish between various kinds of worship, which could only lead pious souls astray from the one worship due to God in Christ. The Romish Church said that saints did not receive actual worship, and that images were revered only in the same sense as copies of the Scriptures. Calvin has no difficulty in showing that these distinctions were not popularly grasped.

‘Such subtle distinctions,’ he says, ‘as *latría, doulía, hyperdoulía*, are neither known nor present to the minds of those who prostrate themselves before images until the world has become full of idolatry as crude and plain as that of the ancient Egyptians, which all the prophets continuously denounced; they can only mislead, and ought to be discarded. They actually suggest to worshippers to pass by Jesus Christ the only Mediator, and betake themselves to some patron who has struck their fancy. They bring it about that the Divine offices are distributed among the saints as if they had been appointed colleagues to our Lord Jesus Christ; and they are made to do His work, while He Himself is kept in the background like some ordinary person in a crowd. They are responsible for the fact that hymns are sung in public worship in which the saints are lauded with every blessing just as if they were colleagues of God.’ In this connexion he quotes the ‘impious stanza heard in many churches’: ‘Ask the Father, command the Son,’ addressed, of course, to the Virgin; and the invocation of St. Claud as ‘the life and resurrection of the dead.’* [Note: Calvin, *Opera Omnia* (Amsterdam, 1667), viii. 38, 39.]

In the same way he inveighs against the doctrine of works of supererogation as derogatory to the merits of Christ, and says that ‘in making up the treasury of the Church, the merits of Christ and of the martyrs are thrown together in the slump,’ ‘mixing up the blood of Christ with the blood of martyrs, and forming out of them a heterogeneous mass of merits or satisfactions.’† [Note: Calvin, *Necessity of Reforming the Church.*]

In conformity with these thoughts, the Confessions of the Reformation all agree in repudiating prayers to the saints. The Augsburg Confession says:

‘The Scripture teacheth not to invoke saints, nor to ask the help of saints, because it propoundeth to us one Christ: the Mediator, Propitiatory, High Priest, and Intercessor. This Christ is to be invocated, and He hath promised that He will hear our prayers, and liketh this worship, to wit, that He be invocated in all afflictions: “If any man sin, we have an advocate with God, Jesus Christ the righteous” ’ (1Jn_2:1). The Second Helvetic Confession in its fifth chapter lays down the rule that prayer is to be through Christ alone, and saints and relics are not to be worshipped. And all prayer-books and liturgies in every branch of the Reformed Church, even when taking over, with little alteration, old forms of prayer, carefully exclude addresses to the Virgin or to any of the saints.

In any case, the theoretic distinctions between reverence and worship never applied to the adoration of the consecrated host. This even in theory was absolute worship, and was felt to be abhorrent and profane by the Reformers, who had experienced spiritual communion with the living Christ. Calvin calls it a ‘theatrical exhibition.’

2. The Reformers insist on the necessity of Christ, and Christ alone, for all believers. Their confessions abound in expressions which are meant to magnify the Person and work of Christ, and to show that He fills the whole field of believing thought and worship; and, as Reformation theology was based on experience rather than on philosophy, and aimed at expounding the faith of the pious believer rather than at unfolding metaphysical mysteries, we find a constant reference to the various names and offices of Christ and to the manifold aspects of His work.

The brief Netherlands Confession of 1566 has no fewer than three separate sections: on ‘Christ, the only Mediator and Reconciler,’ on ‘Christ, the only Teacher,’ and on ‘Christ, the only High Priest and Sacrifice.’ The Heidelberg or Palatine Catechism, calls Christ ‘my faithful Saviour,’ and says that we can call ourselves Christians, ‘because by faith we are members of Jesus Christ and partakers of His anointing, so that we both confess His Holy Name and present ourselves unto Him a lively offering of thanksgiving, and in this life may, with free conscience, fight against sin and Satan, and afterwards possess, with Christ, an everlasting kingdom over all creatures.’ The Scots Confession abounds in phrases intended to honour our Lord Jesus Christ. It calls Him, ‘Messiah,’ ‘Eternal Wisdom,’ ‘Emmanuel,’ ‘our Head,’ ‘our Brother,’ ‘our Pastor and great Bishop of our Souls,’ ‘Author of Life,’ ‘Lamb of God,’ ‘Advocate and Mediator,’ ‘the onlie Hie Priest.’ The English Prayer-book, while for the most part reflecting the stereotyped conclusion of the breviary *per dominum*, in the endings of the Collects introduces new forms, such as, ‘for the honour of our Advocate and Mediator, Jesus Christ,’ and ‘through the merits of Jesus Christ our Saviour.’ All the Confessions and Liturgies of the Churches of the Reformation abound in the same or similar expressions.

3. The Reformers declare that Christ is the *only* revealer of God.

‘We would never recognize the Father’s grace and mercy,’ says Luther in his Large Catechism, ‘were it not for our Lord Jesus Christ, Who is the mirror of the Father’s heart.’ ‘We are not affrayed to cal God our Father,’ says the Scots Confession, ‘not sa meikle because He has created us, quhilk we have in common with the reprobate, as for that He has given us His onely Son.’ The instructions issued by the Synod which met at Bern in 1532 are very emphatic upon this thought, as may be seen from the headings of the various articles: (Art. 2) ‘That the whole doctrine is the unique Christ’ (*Das die gantze leer der eynig Christus sye*); (Art. 3) ‘That God is revealed to the people in Christ alone’; (Art. 5) ‘That the gracious God is perceived through Christ alone, without any other mediation’; (Art. 6) ‘A Christian sermon is entirely about and from Christ.’ It is said under the third article, ‘His Son, in whom we see the Work of God and His Fatherly heart toward us ... which is not the case where the preacher talks much about God in the heathen manner, and does not exhibit the same God in the face of Christ.’

The means of this revelation are the Spirit, which all the Confessions unite in declaring to be the gift of Christ, and the Holy Scriptures. The claim of the mediaeval Church to be the sole trustworthy exponent of the Scriptures had barred the way to Christ through the Word, and had driven men to seek contact with Him in the sacraments, a region where they were more at the mercy of ecclesiastical assumption. The Church itself had used the Bible chiefly as a quarry for proof-texts of ecclesiastical dogmas. But for the Reformers the Scriptures are the plain man’s guide to Christ. In them Christ Himself speaks to each soul.

In the Formula of Concord it is said that Christ ‘offers Himself in the Word as Redeemer.’ The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England say: ‘Both in the OT and in the NT everlasting life is offered to mankind *by Christ*.’ The Scots Confession says: ‘We believe and confess the Scriptures of God sufficient to instruct and make perfect the man of God. So do we avow the authority of the same to be of God, and neither to depend on man or angels.’ In the decrees of the Bern Synod (1532) Scripture is called ‘a witness to, a means of access to, and a remembrancer of Christ.’ And again it is said that ‘the Scripture leads us to Christ and teaches (Him) as the Saviour.’

We thus see clearly that the Reformers’ conception of Christ as the revealer of God at once restored the Scriptures to their rightful place in popular religion, and gave to the Bible a new unity. To the mediaeval Church it had been a difficult collection of isolated doctrinal texts; to the Reformers it formed a complete book with one centre, the Person of the Redeemer.

4. The conception that Christ filled the whole sphere of God, which was for the Reformers a fundamental and experimental fact, enabled them to construct a spiritual doctrine of the sacraments, which they opposed to that of the mediaeval Church. It would be unfair to ignore the germ of an evangelical idea even in the materialistic Romish doctrine of transubstantiation. While the way to Christ through the Scripture was barred by the refusal of the Church to place the Bible in the hands of the people, here was one way in which the common man might suppose he got into direct contact with his Redeemer. We see this religious use of this doctrine in its crudest form in the hymn of St. Francis:

‘Oh, how pure and worthy should be the priest

Who touches the living, glorified Jesus.

Let the whole earth tremble,

Let the heavens thrill with joy,

When Christ the Son of God descends upon the altar.’

What made the sacrament holy to Francis was the personal presence of Christ. Nevertheless, the ordinary attitude to the sacraments was grossly superstitious. The doctrine of transubstantiation, interpreting the presence of Christ in a material sense, practically annulled the reference to Christ altogether, and made the sacrament an exhibition of the magic powers of the priesthood. The sacraments were looked upon as magical channels of Divine grace. The accepted doctrine was, in the words of the decrees of the Council of Florence, that ‘while these others (the sacraments of the OT) do not convey grace but only figure the grace given by the Passion of Christ, these sacraments of ours both contain grace and confer it upon the worthy receiver.’ Thus in theory, as in practice, the sacraments usurped the place of Christ. Now, although it was the various theories about the sacraments that caused the chief differences among the Reformers themselves,—Luther, with his mediaeval philosophy, insisting that, by virtue of Divine omnipresence, the words, ‘This is my body,’ might be literally and physically true; Calvin, with his more spiritual doctrine, insisting that the presence of Jesus is in spiritual power; Zwingli, casting overboard the whole question of the real presence and dwelling only on the memorial aspect of the feast,—still, with all their varying ideas, the Reformers united on the thoughts that the efficacy of the sacraments depended entirely on the promises of Christ contained in His word, and that the virtue in the sacraments consisted in the presence of Christ to the believing communicant. What was received in the sacrament was not a vague, mysterious, not to say magical, grace, but Christ Jesus Himself. He gave Himself in the sacraments, in whatever way His presence might be explained. The efficacy of

the sacrament depends on Christ, not on any magical powers of priests; and what is received in the sacraments is not any mysterious grace, but Christ Himself.

All the Reformers taught that the efficacy of the sacraments depends on the promise of Christ contained in their institution, and they insisted that word and sacrament must always be taken together.

Thus Luther points out in the *Babylonish Captivity of the Church*, that one objection to the Romish practice is that the recipients 'never hear the words of the promise which are secretly mumbled by the priest,' and exhorts his readers never to lose sight of the all-important connexion between the word of promise and the sacraments; and in his Large Catechism he declares that the sacraments include the word. 'I exhort you,' he says, 'never to sunder the Word and the water, or to separate them. For where the Word is withheld we have only such water as the maid uses to cook with.' The Augsburg Confession says, 'The sacraments are effectual by reason of the institution and commandment of Christ.' Non-Lutheran Confessions are equally decided on the necessity of connecting the promise and the words of Christ with the sacraments. The Second Helvetic Confession says, 'There remains efficacious in the Church of God, Christ's primal institution and consecration of the sacraments, so that those who celebrate the sacrament, not otherwise than the Lord instituted it at the beginning, enjoy even now that primal most glorious consecration of all. And therefore, in the celebration of the sacraments the very words of Christ are recited.' The Thirty-nine Articles declare that the sacraments are effectual because of 'Christ's institution and promise.' The Heidelberg or Palatine Catechism of 1563 says that the sacraments 'are holy and visible signs ordained of God to the end that He might thereby the more fully declare and seal unto us the *promise* of the Holy Gospel.'

Further, against the Roman doctrine of sacramental grace we have these Reformation statements. In the articles of the Bern Synod (1532) we are told that the sacraments are mysteries of God, 'through which, from without, Christ is proffered to believers.' The First Helvetic Confession (1536) says, concerning the Holy Supper, 'We hold that in the same the Lord truly offers His Body and His Blood, that is, Himself, to His own.' The Second Helvetic Confession (1562) declares that 'the Body of Christ is in heaven at the right hand of the Father,' and enjoins communicants 'to lift up their hearts and not to direct them downwards to the bread. For as the sun, though absent from us in the heaven, is none the less efficaciously present ... so much more the Sun of righteousness, absent from us in the heavens in His Body, is present to us not indeed corporeally, but spiritually by a life-giving activity.' The French Confession of 1557 says that the sacraments are pledges and seals, and adds. 'Yet we hold that their substance and truth is in Jesus Christ.' So the Scots Confession of 1560 declares that 'we assuredlie beleeve that be Baptisme we ar ingrafted in Christ Jesus to be made partakers of His justice, be quhilk our sinnes ar covered and remitted. And alswa, that

in the Supper richtlie used, Christ Jesus is so joined with us, that Hee be cummis very nurishment and fude of our saules.’ In the *Manner of the Administration of the Lord’s Supper* the Scottish Reformation Church directed the minister in his exhortation to say to the people: ‘The end of our coming to the Lord’s Table ... is to seek our life and perfection in Jesus Christ, acknowledging ourselves at the same time to be children of wrath and condemnation. Let us consider then that this sacrament is a singular medicine for all poor sick creatures, a comfortable help to weak souls, and that our Lord requireth no other worthiness on our part, but that we unfeignedly acknowledge our naughtiness and imperfection.’

The Reformation was a revolt from a system which removed God far from the common man’s understanding by means of metaphysical speculations, and brought Him near only in superstitious and materialistic ways, through sacraments and priests. It was seen again that in Christ God had come close to the ordinary believer, and the appeal to religious experience proved that alike in prayer, in worship, and in teaching, Christ filled the whole sphere of God. Jesus was God appearing in history and addressing man.

Literature.—Luther, *Opera*, 2nd Erlangen ed.; Calvin, *Opera Omnia (Corpus Reformatorum)*, 1893 ff.; John Knox, *Works*, ed. D. Laing, 1846-64; Lindsay, *History of the Reformation*, vol. i. 1906, vol. ii. 1907; E. Donmergue, *Jean Calvin*, 1899 ff.; Th. Harnack, *Luther’s Theologie*, vol. i. 1862, vol. ii. 1886; Köstlin, *Luther’s Theologie*, 2nd ed. 1901; Müller, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformirten Kirche*, 1903; Schaff, *History of the Creeds of Christendom*, 1877; and the standard works on the History of Dogma and on Christology.

Thomas M. Lindsay.

☩ Christ In The Early Church

CHRIST IN THE EARLY CHURCH.—To treat this subject exhaustively, it would be almost necessary to write a complete history (if such a thing were possible) of the early Christian Church. Christ fills the field of vision. Christian life and Christian thought centre round His Person. It is obvious that in an article of limited length, only salient points can be touched upon, a few typical quotations given, and lines of thought suggested rather than developed.

The first Christians happily knew little of the distinction between the theological and the practical. Belief and life were one. Still, for clearness’ sake, it is proposed in this article to discuss separately, as far as possible, (1) the beliefs of the early Church

concerning the Person of Christ; (2) the feeling of the early Church as expressed in practice and devotion, with regard to the living Christ and His present relationship to mankind.

The term 'early Church' is, of course, an elastic one. It can scarcely, from a theological point of view, be limited to a shorter period than that which is closed by the Sixth Œcumenical Council (a.d. 681). But within these limits a very special interest attaches to the pre-Nicene period, both from its comparative nearness to the time of Christ, and from the extreme value and interest of its records, scanty though they are. It is with this period (from the closing years of the 1st cent, to a.d. 325) that this article will chiefly deal.

i. Beliefs of the early Church as to the Person of Christ.—1. (a) The earliest Christian writing extant outside the limits of the NT, and one which was for long on the verge of admission into the Canon, is the *Epistle to the Corinthians*, usually assigned to Clement, bishop of Rome. It was written probably about a.d. 95, to exhort a disordered church to unity and charity. Its interest is therefore chiefly practical, but it should be noted that at least once a doxology is addressed directly to Christ as to a Divine Person (20); that His unique dignity and pre-existence are evidently assumed in such a phrase as 'the sceptre of the majesty of God, even our Lord Jesus Christ, came not in the pomp of arrogance, or of pride, though He might have done so' (16); and that Christ is spoken of as shedding His blood for the salvation of the whole world (7).

(b) The so-called *Second Epistle of Clement* dates probably within the first half of the 2nd cent., and is a sermon rather than a letter, the earliest Christian sermon extant after the NT. Here Christ is definitely spoken of as 'God' (1), as pre-existent (14); and His Incarnation is described in the remarkable words, 'the Lord who saved us, being first spirit, then became flesh' (9).

(c) The seven genuine *Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch* are in some respects the most notable writings of the 2nd century. They were written by him while he was on his way to martyrdom at Rome, probably in the year a.d. 107, and are addressed to the Churches of Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Rome, Philadelphia, Smyrna, and to Polycarp of Smyrna. With Ignatius, Jesus Christ is 'our God' (Eph 1:18, and elsewhere). His blood is 'the blood of God' (*ib.* 1). He is 'the only Son of God' (*Rom.* [*Note: Roman.*] 1); 'the unerring mouth in whom the Father hath spoken' (*ib.* 8). Ignatius speaks in significant language of the Incarnation, of the human life, sufferings, resurrection, and continued existence of Christ; and of His double nature; 'There is one only physician, of flesh and of spirit, born and unborn, God in man, true life in death, Son of Mary and Son of God, first passible and then impassible, Jesus Christ our Lord' (*Eph.* 7; cf. also *ib.* 18, 19, 20; *Trall.* 9; *Smyrn.* 1-3). The Virgin Birth of Christ is also distinctly alluded to in *Eph.* 18, 19.

(d) Another writing usually classed among the 'Apostolic Fathers,' is the so-called *Epistle of Barnabas*, of which the probable limits of date are between a.d. 70 and 132 (Lightfoot). The writer speaks of Christ as 'Lord of the whole world, unto whom God said from the foundation of the world, "Let us make man after our image and likeness" ' (5).

(e) A mystical work which enjoyed considerable popularity in the early Church, the *Shepherd*, attributed in the Muratorian Canon to that **Hermas** who was brother of Pope Pius i. (a.d. 140-155), contains incidental statements about Christ which point generally in the same direction as those quoted above. The Son of God existed before all creation, and was God's fellow-counsellor in the work of creation (*Simil.* ix. 12). He supports all creation (*ib.* 14). At the same time the language of Hermas about the Incarnation is vague, almost as if the Son of God and the Holy Spirit were identical (*Simil.* v. 6). It is scarcely fair, however, to interpret this as if it were a careful theological statement. Hermas evidently was not a man of deep thought or originality. His aim is practical rather than doctrinal. Probably such expressions are to be understood in the same sense as 1Co. 15:45.

2. A very interesting feature of the first half of the 2nd cent, is the rise of *the Apologists*, men of learning who had exchanged heathenism for Christianity, and who addressed heathen readers in justification or explanation of their new faith, (a) **Aristides** the philosopher (about a.d. 125), addressing the emperor Hadrian, speaks of Jesus Christ as 'God' who 'came down from heaven, and from a Hebrew virgin took and clad Himself with flesh; and in a daughter of man there dwelt the Son of God.'

(b) **Justin Martyr**, in his *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*, traces not only prophecies of Christ in the OT, but identifies Him with the God, or the 'angel of the Lord,' who appeared in the OT theophanies, and with the Divine Wisdom of Proverbs 7, etc. Justin practically anticipates the Nicene formula ὁμοούσιος τῷ Πατρὶ (128), though, as in the case of Hermas, some of his statements are vague, and, if pressed verbally, might appear inconsistent with later definitions. There can be no question, however, that he teaches the pre-existence and the Divinity of Christ, and that his writings were deeply influenced by the Logos doctrine of St. John.

(c) One of the most beautiful as well as most intellectual productions of the early Church is the anonymous *Epistle to Diognetus*. Here Christ is spoken of as 'the very Artificer and Creator of the Universe'; and the Father sent Him into the world, 'as sending God,' 'as a king might send his son who is a king' (7).

3. It was, however, the necessity of meeting both outside attacks on Christianity, and misconceptions of it from within, that gradually forced Christian writers to define more clearly and exactly the nature of Christ. This process of theological definition,

which began towards the end of the 2nd cent., culminated in the decisions of the great Councils. Early in the 2nd cent, had begun to appear the curious half-heathen travesties of Christianity which are classed under the general name of *Gnosticism*. These may be described as attempts to combine Christian ideas and phraseology with ideas drawn from Greek and Oriental religions. The Gnostic systems really differed from Christianity on first principles, as they were generally dualistic, and assumed the essential evil of matter. They denied in consequence the perfect humanity of Christ (a tendency alluded to in the later writings of the NT; cf. 1Jn 4:2 f.), and the true union of human nature with the Divine nature in one Person. The Gnostic Christ was not really born of Mary, nor did He truly suffer.

(a) The first and chief opponent of Gnosticism, one of the most extensive writers of the early Church, was **Irenaeus**, bishop of Lyons from 177-202 (?). He meets the Gnostic systems by stating what was definitely believed about Christ in the Christian Church, which is the repository of truth,—truth inherited from the Apostles, preserved by the Church, and the same in all parts of the Church (i. 10, iii. 1, 4, 24). Irenaeus states this faith of the Church in language very similar to that of the later Creeds. The Church, he says, believes in ‘one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who became incarnate for our salvation; ... and the ascension into heaven in the flesh of the beloved Christ Jesus, our Lord, and His future manifestation from heaven in the glory of the Father to gather all things in one, and to raise up anew all flesh of the whole human race, in order that to Christ Jesus, our Lord and God and Saviour and King, every knee should bow,’ etc. (i. 10). Irenaeus clearly teaches the pre-existence of Christ, that He was begotten and not created (iii. 18); that His humanity is perfect, sinless, yet absolutely real and not Docetic (*ib.*); and that He is God and man in one Person (iii. 16). Perhaps the most remarkable contribution of Irenaeus to Christology is his teaching that all mankind is gathered together and summed up in the Incarnation (‘in seipso recapitulavit,’ iii. 18, etc.).

(b) In the East, Gnosticism was met by the great writers of the School of Alexandria, **Clement** and **Origen**, who further developed the conception of Christ as the Logos who is immanent in the Universe. Origen was in some respects a thinker in advance of his age, and his teaching was undoubtedly misunderstood by his successors. Whether his doctrine of Christ was altogether in harmony with the later definitions of the Councils has often been questioned. That it was really so has been maintained strongly by Bishop Bull in his *Defence of the Nicene Creed*, and by Bishop Westcott. Origen certainly taught the eternal generation of the Son of God (*de Princ.* i. 2), which doctrine supplies the basis of the reply to the Arian quibbles about the posteriority of the Son to the Father; the reality of the Incarnation (*de Princ.* ii. 6); and he spoke of Christ as the God-man (θεάνθρωπος).

4. The 3rd cent, is marked by a series of heresies which from different points of view attacked the doctrine which, as we have seen, had been consistently held in the Church, though at times vaguely stated, of the unique relationship of the Son to the Father, in other words, of the Divinity of the historic Christ. How, it was asked, could the Divinity and the eternal pre-existence of Christ be reconciled with the *unity* of God? There were two principal heretical answers to this problem, and they may be called 'heretical' in a sense that Gnosticism was not, because they arose within the Church itself, and claimed to be the original doctrine.

(a) The *Adoptianists*, who seem to have been the doctrinal successors of the early Judaic-Christian sect of the Ebionites, and whose chief teachers at Rome were Theodotus and Artemon, all taught a subordination, to a greater or less degree, of the Son to the Father, even making Christ nothing more than a highly exalted man, who was 'adopted' to His Sonship by the Father. This last point was reached by the teaching of the brilliant Paul of Samosata (260-270), who was condemned by a series of Councils at Antioch, and finally deposed in 270.

(b) On the other hand, the *Monarchians* or *Patripassians*, represented by Praxeas, Noetus, and Sabellius, so merged the personality of the Son and the Holy Spirit in the unity of the Father, that it practically followed from their teaching that the historic Christ was actually the Father Himself who was incarnate, and suffered on the cross, so that, in the spiteful epigram of Tertullian, Praxeas 'put to flight the Comforter and crucified the Father.'

The most important opponents of these heresies were **Hippolytus**, bishop of Portus (d. 258?), and **Dionysius**, bishop of Rome (d. 269). Only a fragment remains of the writings of the latter; and those of the former, as well as the exact nature of his teaching, are wrapped in considerable obscurity.

The controversies of the 3rd cent, obviously still waited for a final solution. It is quite evident that the general conscience of the Church revolted against both Adoptianism and Patripassianism, though the uncertainty of theological terms, the absence of a fixed theological vocabulary, and the difficulty of arriving at common action owing to the stress of frequent persecutions, rendered it difficult for the Church as a whole to come to close quarters with these different forms of error. This slight sketch of pre-Nicene theology should, however, be sufficient to show that, despite the absence of any statement of faith common to the whole Church, there is an overwhelming consensus of Church belief from the first to the effect (1) that the historic Jesus Christ was truly God, pre-existent with the Father; (2) that He was also truly man; (3) that in Him are permanently united God and man in one Person.

5. The Edict of Milan (312) introduces a new era of Church history. Persecution ceased, Christianity tended at once to become the recognized religion of the Empire. This sudden outburst of popularity brought into the Church an influx of ill-instructed converts, who were naturally eager to assimilate Christianity as far as possible to their old heathenism.

(a) The teaching of *Arius*, a parish priest of Alexandria, who had, however, previously studied at Antioch, brought swiftly the crisis when the Church must definitely and clearly state her belief as to the Person of Christ. We thus enter upon the era of the great Councils, called 'Œcumenical,' as involving an appeal to the universal conscience and witness of the Christian Church throughout the world.

Arius seems to have taught a form of Adoptianism: Christ was the Son of God, and prior to all other created things, and yet Himself a creature. To pay Divine honours to a creature, however exalted, was, of course, really idolatry; but for this very reason Arianism was popular with those nominal converts who had never in their heart relinquished their old polytheism. To the teaching of Arius, the Church at the Council of Nicaea (325), mainly through the exertions of the great *Athanasius*, opposed the key-word of the Nicene Creed. Christ, the Son of God, is 'of one substance' (ὁμοούσιος) with the Father, *i.e.* He is, and was from all eternity, of the same Godhead as the Father. Strife and controversy raged round this celebrated phrase during most of the 4th century. It was defended consistently by Athanasius, Basil, and the two Gregorys (of Nyssa and Nazianzus). Ultimately all attempts to substitute for it some vaguer expression failed, and the Council of Constantinople (381) definitely re-affirmed the Nicene statement. The absolute Deity of Christ in the fullest sense of the term was thus finally vindicated. Other problems, however, remained.

(b) *Apollinarism*, a reaction against Arianism, ascribed to Christ an imperfect *human* nature, in which the Divine nature took the place of the human 'spirit' (πνεῦμα), the highest part of man's rational nature. This error was condemned at Constantinople (381); and it seems that at some later date other clauses were added to the original Nicene Creed, derived apparently from a Jerusalem baptismal creed, which emphasized the true and perfect humanity of Christ.

(c) The Council of Ephesus (431) dealt with a further problem, the 'Hypostatic Union,' *i.e.* the union of two whole and perfect natures, Divine and human, in the one Person of Christ. (α) The teaching of *Nestorius*, in which there are distinct traces of Gnosticism, practically made two persons of Christ, by denying that the infant child of Mary could properly be called 'God'; and by asserting apparently that at some time after the birth of Jesus, the Divine Logos united Itself with Him. The key-word which the Church adopted to refute Nestorius was the title *Theotokos*, 'mother of God,'

applied to the Virgin Mary. (β) A reaction in an opposite direction led *Eutyches* a few years later to exalt the Divinity of Christ at the expense of His humanity, by teaching that the humanity was in some way swallowed up in the Divinity. The famous ‘Tome’ of Pope Leo I. stated the balance of faith clearly and antithetically, and the fourth Council (Chalcedon, 451), in condemning Eutyches, laid down that the two natures of Christ are to be acknowledged ἀσυγχύτως (‘without confusion’), ἀτρέπτως (‘without change’), ἀδιαίρετως (‘without division’), ἀχωρίστως (‘without separation’). The same truths were stated in a Latin dress, for liturgic use, about this time, in the so-called ‘Athanasian’ Creed.

(d) Eutychianism, however, with its disproportionate reverence for the Divinity of Christ, proved too fascinating for the Eastern mind to be disposed of by the Council of Chalcedon. Political as well as religious causes entered into the long ‘*Monophysite*’ controversy. The fifth Œcumenical Council (Constantinople, 553) again condemned those who were unwilling to admit the full and perfect humanity existing in the one Person of Christ. The sixth Council (Constantinople, 681) marks the last phase of the long debate. *Monothelism*, the last stronghold of Monophysitism, was overthrown by the statement of two wills in Christ, human and Divine, the former perfectly subject to the latter.

The steps by which the halting theology of the pre-Nicene period led finally to the full statement of the Catholic faith, were a legitimate and, indeed, a necessary development. It is not one of the least evidences to a Divine power working in the Christian Church, that, in an age of cosmopolitan superstition and intellectual unrest, all attempts to assimilate Christianity to heathenism were rejected, and a clearly defined and balanced statement of truth emerged and gained almost entire possession of the field. With all its mystery, the Catholic faith of Nicaea and Chalcedon was felt by the common Christian conscience alone to satisfy all the different sides of truth as they are contained in Scripture, and to do justice to all that Christians from the first had believed concerning their Master. To-day there is practically no alternative left between the Nicene Creed and humanitarianism. If the latter is true, the appearance of Christ and its subsequent effect on the world must remain an insoluble enigma,—a miracle even more difficult of credence than the stupendous statement of the Nicene formula.

ii. Devotion of the early Church to Christ.—Whatever uncertainties or faulty definitions may be detected in the statements of pre-Nicene theology, there is no uncertainty as to the attitude of the early Church towards the personal Christ. *Lex supplicandi, lex credendi*. In the devotion which made men and women and little children live and die for Christ, we shall find even a surer guide than in the attempts of Christian writers to explain their belief. From the very first Jesus Christ stands out

in all the records of the early Church as the personal, living Master, not merely the Shepherd and High Priest of His faithful ones, but the true Lord and King of the Universe. He is the object of passionate love, obedience, prayer, and worship.

1. (a) To Clement of Rome, Christ is ‘the high priest of our offerings, the guardian and helper of our weakness’ (36). Through Him the Father ‘instructed us, sanctified us, honoured us’ (59).

(b) The unknown author of the *Second Epistle of Clement* opens his sermon with a burst of enthusiastic gratitude: ‘What recompense then shall we give to Him (Jesus Christ)? or what fruit worthy of His own gift to us? And how many mercies do we owe Him! For He bestowed the light on us; He spake to us, as a father to his sons; He saved us when we were perishing—He called us when we were not, and from not being He willed us to be.’

(c) The epigrammatic sentences of Ignatius glow with passionate love to Christ. ‘Jesus Christ’ is ‘our inseparable life’ (*Ephesians* 3); true Christians are ‘arrayed from head to foot in the commandments of Jesus Christ’ (*ib.* 9); faith and love in Jesus Christ are ‘the beginning and the end of life’ (*ib.* 14). ‘He that possesseth the word of Jesus is able to hearken to His silence’ (*ib.* 15),—a remarkable and pregnant phrase. Ignatius desires suffering and martyrdom that he ‘may attain Christ,’ and ‘rise free in Him’ (*Rom. [Note: Roman.]* 4, 5, 6). The blood of Jesus Christ is ‘eternal and abiding joy’ (*Philippians* 1). Those who ‘speak not concerning Jesus Christ’ he looks on as ‘tombstones and graves of the dead, on which are inscribed only the names of men’ (*ib.* 6).

(d) The *Epistle to Diognetus* speaks of ‘the Word, who was from the beginning, who appeared as new and yet was proved to be old, and is engendered always young in the hearts of saints,—through whom the Church is enriched and grace is unfolded and multiplied among the saints, grace which confers understanding and reveals mysteries’ (11).

(e) Justin Martyr describes how, after searching vainly for truth and satisfaction among the Stoics, the Peripatetics, the Pythagoreans, and the Platonists, he at last was led by the advice of a certain aged man whom he met on the seashore to study the Scriptures, and to conceive a love of Christ. ‘Straightway,’ he says, ‘a flame was kindled in my soul’ (*Trypho*, 8).

2. Not only was Christ loved, He was also *obeyed*. His commandment must take precedence of every other claim. To Hermas, divorce and remarriage after divorce are as absolutely forbidden as unchastity (*Command.* iv. 1). Justin Martyr similarly

regards as absolute the teaching of Christ respecting divorce, forgiveness, charity, endurance of injuries, swearing, and civil obedience (1 *Apol.* 15-17).

3. That the personal Christ was *worshipped* by the early Church as Lord and God is indisputable. Prayer and thanksgiving were addressed directly to Him.

(a) The famous letter of Pliny to Trajan (a.d. 113?) speaks of having elicited from Christians, who had been examined, that it was their custom on a fixed day to assemble before daylight and sing alternately 'a hymn to Christ as God.'

(b) A remarkable hymn attributed to Clement of Alexandria, intended apparently to be sung by Christian children, in which Christ is addressed throughout and praised as Ruler, Shepherd, and King, is found in his *Paedagogus* (iii. 12). Of a slightly later date are such hymns as the *Gloria in excelsis* and the *Hail gladdening Light*. Indeed, it seemed to the Church, when confronted by the Arian problem, one of the most convincing proofs of the error of the teaching of Arius, that Christ had always received Divine honours in the Church.

(c) The personal nearness of Christ to the believer during Christian worship was especially associated with the Eucharist. To Ignatius, 'the Eucharist is the flesh of Jesus Christ,' though the false teachers deny it (*Smyr.* 6). 'There is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup unto union with His blood' (*Philippians* 4). To Justin Martyr, the Eucharist, the conditions of receiving which are belief, baptism, and a life according to the commandments of Christ, is not common bread and common drink, but the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus, by which our blood and flesh are nourished (1 *Apol.* 66). To Irenaeus and the Christian Fathers generally, participation in the Eucharist is the actual means whereby Christians share in the life and resurrection of Christ.

(d) The testimonies of the Christian martyrs are most suggestive. Ignatius, brought before the emperor Trajan, calls himself *Theophorus*, 'Bearer of God,' saying that he bears the Crucified within his breast. Polycarp of Smyrna, when called upon by the pro-consul to revile Christ, confessed in memorable words, 'Fourscore and six years have I served Him, and He hath done me no wrong. How then can I blaspheme my King and Saviour!' And the apparently contemporary record of the martyrdom of Polycarp closes with the significant words: 'The blessed Polycarp was apprehended by Herodes, when Philip of Tralles was high priest, in the proconsulship of Statius Quadratus, *but in the reign of the Eternal King, Jesus Christ.*' The martyrs of Lyons and Vienne (177) are spoken of in the contemporary letter which describes their sufferings (*Eus. Hist. Eccl.* v. 1) as 'hastening to Christ'; 'through them Christ showed that things which appear mean and obscure and contemptible to men are with God of great glory.' One of them, St. Blandina, 'was clothed with Christ, the mighty and

conquering Athlete.’ Their patience manifested ‘the measureless mercy of Christ.’ And with one and all who suffered, the simple confession of the name of Christ seems to have been the strength which sustained them. St. Perpetua, the African martyr (early in the 3rd cent.), was comforted before her sufferings by a vision of Christ as an aged man, a shepherd, sitting in the midst of a spacious garden, who said to her, ‘Thou hast done well, my child, in coming.’ St. Maximus, who suffered under Decius, declared, ‘These are not torments, but anointings which are laid upon us for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ’ (Ruinart, *Acta Martyrum*, p. 204). Phileas of Thmuis, put to death in Diocletian’s persecution, said in his last words: ‘Now we begin to be disciples of our Lord Jesus Christ. Beloved, attend to the commandments of the Lord.—Let us call upon Him, the spotless, the infinite One, who sitteth upon the Cherubim, the Maker of all things, who is the Beginning and the End, to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen’ (*ib.* p. 521).

4. Interesting light on early Christian feeling is thrown by the funeral inscriptions and symbols of *the Catacombs*. As a rule, the inscriptions are of extreme brevity. Their leading thought is that dead Christians are with Christ in a continued existence of peace and joy. The aspirations and prayers of their friends on earth go with them, and the departed in turn remember the living in prayer to Christ, e.g. ‘Vivas’; ‘Vivas in Deo Christo’; ‘In pace’; ‘Deus refrigeret spiritum tuum’; ‘Quam stabile tibi haec vita est’ (*i.e.* the life beyond the grave); ‘Spiritus tuus in pace et in Christo’; $\mu\eta\eta\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma$
 $\theta\epsilon\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \eta\mu\omega\acute{\nu}\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \upsilon\mu\omega\acute{\nu}\ \pi\rho\upsilon\chi\alpha\varsigma$ (προσεύχαις).

5. Most of the early Christian pictures of Christ are merely symbolical, the Lamb and the Fish being the most common. But the earliest personal representation is suggestive; it is the figure of the Good Shepherd, sometimes bearing the lost sheep on His shoulders, sometimes surrounded by His flock. This tender personal relationship between the soul and the Saviour, or between the Church and her Lord, which stands in such striking contrast to the trials and sufferings that surrounded the daily life of the Christian in a hostile world, was evidently the aspect which appealed most deeply to the heart of the early believer.

6. The relation of Christ both to His Church and to the world was also set forth impressively in the so-called ‘majesties,’ with which from the 4th cent. onwards the Christian art began to adorn the churches. In these pictures Christ is represented as reigning now in glory, bearing the symbols of His royal, prophetic, and priestly offices. It was not merely to an historic Christ that Christians looked back, or a future coming to judgment that they anticipated, though both these conceptions were vividly present in the mind of the early Church. It was a Christ actually in possession of His Kingdom, even now ruling over the nations, and surrounded by His worshipping saints (who even in this present time shared His throne), that dominated the thought

of the early centuries. So in the great mosaics in the Church of St. Cosmas and St. Damian at Rome (6th cent.), the colossal figure of Christ stands in the apse, fronting the worshippers, portrayed on a dark-blue ground amid golden-edged clouds of sunset; His right hand is raised in blessing, His left holds a written scroll. The figures of St. Peter and St. Paul, with palm-trees of Paradise and the phœnix (the emblem of the Resurrection), stand on each side of the Christ, and beneath His feet flows the river Jordan. Below this again is the representation of the Lamb, with the four rivers of Paradise and twelve sheep on either side.

The representations of the suffering and dying Christ, which became the favourites of a later age, have, of course, an independent value. Nevertheless there is a peculiar beauty and significance in the mingled majesty and tenderness of those earlier pictures of the living Christ, which expressed the love of those whose faith in Him had literally overcome the world. See Christ in Art.

7. The two strands of theology and devotion which we have endeavoured to trace in the early Church seem fittingly to meet in the most remarkable man after St. Paul whom the Church has seen, the great Athanasius. It was largely due, as we have seen, to him that the traditional belief of the Church, at the greatest crisis of Church history, took its clear and definite and accurately reasoned shape in the Catholic creeds. And it is interesting to note that the secret of Athanasius' defence of the *Homoousion* was seen by his contemporaries to lie in his own personal devotion from childhood onwards to the Person of the Redeemer. 'Athanasie était enflammé, dès sa jeunesse, de la passion qui fait les saints, l'amour de Jésus Christ' (De Broglie, *L'Église et l'Empire*, i. 372). 'His maintenance of dogma was a lifelong act of devotion' (Bright, *Church Hist.* p. 149). The great treatise *On the Incarnation of the Word*, which marks an epoch in theological writings, is no mere dogmatic statement, but glows with the pure passion of belief. It is the work of one who profoundly and from the heart believes in Christ as a living Person, in His present power, and His absolute claim upon mankind. The power of the Cross of Christ and His Resurrection from the dead are to Athanasius the greatest of facts, unparalleled in history, illimitable in their future consequences. 'The achievements of the Saviour,' he says, 'resulting from His becoming man, are of such a kind and number that if one should wish to enumerate them, he may be compared to men who gaze at the expanse of the sea and wish to count its waves ...; to sum the matter up, behold how the Saviour's doctrine is everywhere increasing, while all idolatry and everything opposed to the faith of Christ is daily dwindling and losing power and falling; and thus beholding, worship the Saviour, who is above all and mighty, even God the Word' (54, 55).

8. Not only on the highways of Church history does the figure of the living Christ stand out as the central object of Christian love and loyalty. Such a wonderful production as the Hymn of St. Patrick, with a quotation from which we will close this brief survey,

illustrates the impression which the preaching of Christ produced upon the infant nations just emerging from barbarism. It belongs to the 5th or 6th cent., a time when the civilization and empire of Rome were failing, and men were clinging to Christ as the one power which could guide and set free their lives:

‘Christ with me, Christ before me,
Christ behind me, Christ within me,
Christ beneath me, Christ above me,
Christ on my right, Christ on my left,
Christ in the fort,
Christ in the chariot-seat,
Christ on the poop.
Christ in the heart of every man who thinks of me,
Christ in the mouth of every man who speaks to me,
Christ in every eye that sees me,
Christ in every ear that hears me.’

Literature.—*The Apostolic Fathers*, one volume edition, containing text, translations, etc., by Lightfoot and Harmer (Macmillan, & Co., 1891); ‘The Apology of Aristides,’ *Texts and Studies*, Cambridge, 1891; *The Ante-Nicene Christian Library* (T. & T. Clark); Smith-Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography* (Murray, 1877-1887 [the articles on ‘Athanasius,’ ‘Origenes,’ and ‘Christology’ are especially useful]); Smith-Cheetham, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities* (1875-1880); Wace-Schaff, *Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (Oxford and New York, 1890-1900), especially the volumes ‘Eusebius,’ ‘Athanasius,’ and ‘The Seven Œcumenical Councils’; Schaff, *History of the Christian Church* (T. & T. Clark); Bright, *History of the Church, 313-451* (Parker & Co., 1888); Ruinart, *Acta Martyrum* (Ratisbon, 1859); Newman, *Arians of the Fourth Century* (Longmans & Co.); Bull, *Works* (edited by Burton, Oxford, 1846); Burn, *Introd. to the Creeds* (1899).

A. R. Whitham.

☩ Christ In The Middle Ages

CHRIST IN THE MIDDLE AGES.—The Christology of the Middle Ages was, of course, the outgrowth of that of the earlier time, and each medieval type can readily be traced to its source. The main lines of influence are: that of Augustine, working directly through the continued use of his writings, and indirectly through the personality and writings of Gregory the Great [Note: reat Cranmer's 'Great' Bible 1539.] , Anselm of Canterbury, Bernard of Clairvaux, Abelard, Peter Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, etc.; that of the Neo-Platonie pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, working directly through the continued use of his writings, and indirectly through the propagation of his modes of thought by Maximus the Confessor, Scotus Erigena, the German Mystics, etc.; Adoptianism, which flourished in the immediately post-Apostolic (if not in the Apostolic) times, was vigorously propagated in Armenia, and perpetuated there by the Paulicians even down to the present time, had a vigorous development in Spain during the 8th and 9th cents., and affected much of the dissenting evangelical thought of the mediaeval time; and the Gnostic-Manichaeian modes of thought, perpetuated from the early time, and reappearing in the Catharistic sects. For the Greek Church the Christology of John of Damascus, who in the 8th cent. reduced to system the net results of the Christological controversies of the three preceding centuries, continued to be normative during the Middle Ages, and little independent theorizing seems to have found place.

1. Beyond almost any other Christian thinker, **Augustine** magnified Christ. This name, drunk in piously and deeply, even with his mother's milk (*Conf.* iii. 8), never lost its power over him even during his years of wandering. Having become emancipated from Manichaeian dualism through the study of Neo-Platonic writings (Plotinus, Amelius, *et al.*) he found himself unable with satisfaction to fix his gaze upon the glories of the invisible and unchangeable God until he had embraced that 'Mediator between God and man, himself man, Christ Jesus,' 'who is over all, God blessed for ever,' 'the way, the truth, and the life.' Yet he did not at once grasp the mystery of the Incarnation, and he failed for a time to attain to anything higher than Adoptianism. He thought of Christ 'as of a man of excellent wisdom,' virginborn and surpassing other men, an example to us of 'contemning temporal things for the obtaining of immortality.' Fully assured of the unchangeableness of the Divine Word, he was unable to believe that He ate, drank, slept, walked, rejoiced, was sad, and discoursed; and so felt compelled (against Arians and Apollinarians) to insist upon a complete humanity in Christ to which such actions and experiences would be appropriate (*Conf.* vii. 24, 25). Though strongly influenced by Neo-Platonism, which generally made for Monophysitism, Augustine was a Dyophysite of the most pronounced type. Yet one would search in vain in his writings for any accurate

definition of the relations of the Divine and the human in the Person of Christ, or of the manner in which the Divine Logos and the man Jesus were united in a single personality. He guarded carefully against any admission of a blending of Deity and humanity, as well as against the supposition that Christ's humanity is converted into Deity. He calls the humanity of Christ 'garment,' 'temple,' 'vehicle,' 'instrument.' By virtue of its association with Deity, the soul of Christ possessed perfect knowledge from the very beginning; and His disclaiming of knowledge about this or that was for the sake of His disciples. Yet Augustine denied freedom of choice to the humanity of Christ, which he made subject to predestination. He regarded the Incarnation of the Logos as necessary in order that our souls might become His members, and that the devil might be vanquished by the same nature that he had seduced. The Incarnation was the work of the entire Trinity, and the Word stood in no nearer relation to the Son than did the entire Trinity (cf. Harnack, *Dogmengesch.* iii. 116 [English translation v. 226]). The following sentence is highly significant:

'God assumed (*suscepit*) our nature, *i.e.* the rational soul and flesh of the man Christ, by an assumption singularly wonderful and wonderfully singular, that, no merits of his own righteousness having preceded, he should thus become Son of God from the beginning in which he began to be man, that he himself (the man Christ) and the Word might be one person' (*de Correptione et Gratia*, 30).

Augustine seems never to have reached a thoroughly wrought-out and self-consistent Christology. He was uncertain whether the Incarnation was necessary to man's redemption, conceiving it possible that God might have chosen another way. The body of Christ he regarded as a part of the Adamic mass, which was constituted a body by the act of assumption, conceived by Mary not by carnal concupiscence, but by spiritual faith (Dorner, *Pers. [Note: Persian.] of Christ*, ii. i. 398). By the Incarnation our souls become Christ's members, and the devil is vanquished by the same nature that he seduced. As in accordance with the Divine plan of redemption Christ must needs purchase sin-cursed men with His own death, He assumed a human body with all human affections and infirmities, including mortality, yet without concupiscence. In assuming human nature He cleansed it. 'He became man in order that He might make us gods.' Yet He did not renounce the 'form of God,' but continued with the Father in heaven, while Jesus was sojourning upon earth. His emptying was merely an occultation. Like St. Paul, Augustine laid the utmost stress on the humiliation involved in the Incarnation, the human life, and the obedience even unto death; and yet he insisted that the Divine nature as being absolutely immutable could only join sympathetically with the human in psychical and physical suffering. The atoning work of Christ he thought of as redemption from the power of the devil—who had taken up his abode in human souls deserted by God because of sin, and who was conceived of as having a sort of vested right in them—quite as much as reconciliation to God. By receiving the penalty of sin, and not taking upon Himself the fault (*culpa*), He blotted

out both penalty and fault for us. Christ's death possessed atoning power because of His virgin birth, spotless righteousness, and voluntary obedience to God. The temporal death of Christ frees believers from eternal death.

Side by side with Augustine's magnifying of Christ went his disposition to exalt the Church and its sacraments. He supposed that the benefits wrought for man through the Incarnation and sufferings of Christ become available for man only through the medium of the sacraments of which, the Church is the sole dispenser.

2. Gregory the Great [Note: reat Cranmer's 'Great' Bible 1539.] was not an original thinker on Christological questions. He went far beyond Augustine in his ecclesiasticism and sacramentalism, and while professing to be a devout follower of Augustine, greatly enervated his doctrines in reproducing them. In his teaching regarding the atoning work of Christ he laid more stress than did Augustine on the rightful power of the devil over mankind, and the ransom paid him by Christ in His death. The God-man, virgin-born and without concupiscence, he regarded as both a mediator between God and man, and an example for us. The atoning work of Christ does not avail for human salvation unless man fills up by a life of humility and suffering that which remained of the sufferings of Christ. 'He who strives to be redeemed and to rule with Him must be crucified.'

'Without intermission the Redeemer offers up a burnt-offering for us, in that without ceasing He shows to the Father His incarnation on our behalf; since His incarnation is an oblation for our cleansing: and when He showed Himself as man, by intervening, He washed away the faults of man. And by the mystery of His humanity He perennially offers sacrifice, because these faults also which He cleanses away are eternal' (*Moral*. i. 24).

He laid much stress upon the constant intercession of Christ; but this was supposed to be mediated by angels, saints, alms, masses, and by other forms of meritorious works. In fact, he was so overmastered by the efficacy of sacramental forms and the continuous sacrifice, that he regarded the death of Christ as not absolutely necessary for man's, redemption. God who created us might have delivered us from the consequences of sin without the death of Christ. He thought of the death of Christ as an exhibition of the Divine love, and as an example wherewith to teach us not to fear the misfortunes and sufferings of this world, but rather to avoid earthly good fortune. His sacrificial view of the Lord's Supper, with its sacerdotal accompaniments, greatly enervated his conception of the Person of Christ and its historical significance. In this rite the suffering of Christ is repeated continuously for our reconciliation, 'the whole Christ being in each portion' of the consecrated elements. In the words of Harnack:

'Christ as a person is forgotten. He is a great title in dogmatics ...; but the fundamental questions of salvation are not answered in relation to him, and in life the baptized person has to avail himself of "means" which exist partly side by side with him (Christ), partly without him, or only bear his badge' (*Dogmengesch.* iii. 241 f. [English translation v. 271]).

Fear and hope take the place of faith and love; fear of punishment takes the place of repentance for sin. Thus the mediaeval type of ascetical piety was fully established (cf. Harnack, *l.c.*).

3. A vigorously led Adoptianist movement in Spain during the later years of the 8th century, probably influenced by Saracen thought, led Alcuin, supported by Charlemagne and the Council of Frankfurt (794), to set forth as the Christological teaching of the Frankish Church, in opposition to the Nestorian doctrine, alleged to be involved in the Adoptianism of bishops Elipandus of Toledo and Felix of Urgel, a doctrine scarcely distinguishable from Eutychianism. Alcuin insisted that Christ is not 'man,' but the 'God-man'; that He is not 'in everything like us apart from sin,' but 'in many things.' He taught that in the union of the Divine and the human the human personality was blotted out (*deletri*) or consumed (*consumi*) by the Divine, and that the Divine personality took the place of the destroyed human personality. 'In the assumption of flesh by God the person of man perished, not the nature' (*adv. Felicem*, 2. 12). Thus Adoptianism provoked a reaction in the Western Church against an extreme as well as against the natural and proper interpretation of the Chalcedonian Symbol; and while it did not lead to the general acceptance of pure Eutychianism, it came perilously near eliminating from Western Christology the conception of the real and complete humanity of Christ.

It has been pointed out by Dorner, with admirable insight (ii. i. 270 ff.), that while Christ continued to be regarded by the Greek Church as the revealed wisdom of God, and stress was laid upon His prophetic office employed in the diffusion of enlightenment as embodied in the 'orthodox faith,' in the Latin Church He was regarded during the mediaeval time as first and foremost a King, Christianity was regarded as a means of securing power, and the hierarchy was supposed to have been appointed by Christ to occupy His place, rule in His stead, virtually to supersede Him in personal government, and to abolish any direct intercourse between Him and believers. No longer was personal fellowship of the believer with Christ thought of as the supreme good or even as a possibility. Having founded the Church and endowed it with plenary powers, Christ was no longer needed as a personal presence, and was deistically regarded. If a personal and highly sympathetic supernatural was desiderated, this was to be found in the Virgin Mary, who had already been exalted to almost Divine proportions. The Church came to be regarded as the present living incarnation of Christ.

4. Next to that of Augustine, the most potent influence on mediaeval Christology in the West was that of the unknown writer (probably active during the later years of the 6th cent.) whose *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, *Heavenly Hierarchy*, *Divine Names*, and *Mystical Theology* were credited to **Dionysius the Areopagite**, converted by St. Paul on the occasion of his visit to Athens. The writer was thoroughly imbued with the Neo-Platonic thought of Plotinus, Proclus, Jamblicus, etc., and wrought out a magnificent and highly impressive scheme of Christian theosophy on a Neo-Platonic basis. The credit of these works was greatly enhanced by the supposition that they constituted the esoteric teachings of the Apostle Paul, which were too spiritual and exalted for the people of his time. In *The Divine Names* (ii. 10):

‘The Son is all in all and the head of all things ..., for He is the fulness and cohesiveness of all things, and He conserves and firmly binds the parts by the wholeness, and He is neither part nor whole for He is above these, but both part and whole as having embraced all things; for He is exalted above nature, and is antecedent to causation; and He is the perfect among us imperfect, and imperfect among the perfect angels as being superperfect and anteperfect, and having no point of comparison with them as regards perfection; and He is the formative principle in things taking form as the creator and originator of all form, and without form with respect to things that have received form as being above form.’

Much more is said by way of emphasizing the absolute transcendence and the relative immanence of the Son.

This view of Christ and the world would seem to preclude belief in a specific Incarnation; but the devotion of pseudo-Dionysius to the creed of the Church and his sense of the reality of historical Christianity held him back in some measure from sheer Docetism. He maintained, therefore, that the Deity of Jesus in its exceeding goodness came even to our nature and truly assumed the substance of our flesh, so that the Most High God could be called man, the super-essential essence thus shining forth out of humanity. He communicated Himself to us without mixture or change, suffering no harm from His unspeakable humiliation. He was supernatural in our natural, super-essential in what belongs to our essence, and He possessed in a unique manner all that is ours, of us, and above us. True to his pantheistic conception that God can be named with the names of all His creatures, pseudo-Dionysius asserts that He who is the author of man was truly man as to His entire nature. Yet He was not merely man, and not merely superessential in relation to man; but He is actually man above men and according to men, or, in other words, He is the archetypal man of whom all individual men are the unreal copies. In a superhuman manner He performed human acts. He was a man humanly born, but man above man; and inasmuch as in Him God had become man, He developed a Divine-human energy (*Ep. ad Caium*, iv.). The pseudo-Dionysius found it practically impossible to find any place

in the Universe for the God-man Jesus Christ, thus vaguely and Docetically conceived (Dorner). To assign Him a place in the earthly sphere would be degrading; to place Him in the heavenly order would involve Docetism. Without being quite willing to do so, he virtually relinquished the historical Christ, retaining only the eternal. These writings figured largely in the Christological controversies in the East during the 7th and 8th centuries.

5. Maximus the Confessor (d. 662), though a staunch advocate of Dyothelitism, taught a form of mysticism derived largely from the pseudo-Dionysius. Banished by the Eastern Emperor because of his uncompromising opposition to Mono-theitism, he made Carthage the scene of his later activities, and from this vantage ground diffused throughout the Western Church the pseudo-Dionysian mysticism. He regarded the pseudo-Dionysius as the holy revealer of Divine mysteries, as the 'all-holy,' the 'great saint,' the 'God-revealer,' and he had no doubt as to his identity with St. Paul's Athenian convert. Almost equally with the Areopagite, Maximus falls into pantheistic and Docetic conceptions.

The fulness of the Godhead which was in Christ by nature is in Christians by grace, as far as their nature is capable of receiving it. Man on account of his love to God becomes God for God; on account of his love to man he becomes man for man. Christ is continually and of His own will mystically born, for He is made flesh in and through the redeemed. The Logos became the Son of Man in order that He might make men gods, and sons of God.

The Incarnation can hardly be said to have been regarded by Maximus as more than a theophany, and it was by no means limited to Jesus. If the latter participates in the Divine more fully than other men, it is only because His nature laid hold of it more fully (cf. Dorner, ii. i. 228 ff.). The heterogeneous mixture of pseudo-Dionysian Neo-Platonic mysticism and mystagogy with Dyothelitism in Maximus opened wide the door in the West as well as in the East for the influence of the former.

6. That the influence of the Areopagite and of Maximus was brought mightily to bear upon the orthodoxy of the East is manifest in the *Fountain of Knowledge* of **John of Damascus** (d. about 754), who yet uncompromisingly maintained the persistence of two wills in the Person of Christ (Christ unitedly willing in correspondence with each of the two natures), and the freedom of His human will. The pseudo-Dionysian formula, 'Divine-human energy,' he understood to imply a Divine and a human activity each permanently differentiated from the other; yet he was at great pains to show the unity of the two natures (cf. Dorner, ii. i. 210). The permeation of the human nature by the Divine involved in his conception the deification of the human. He illustrates the relation of the Divine and the human in Christ by the permeation of iron by heat. The human intellect of Christ, by virtue of this permeation, participated

in the all-comprehending Divine knowledge from the beginning. He takes a Docetic view of the NT representation that Jesus grew in wisdom and favour. So also he regards Docetically the prayers of Christ. God constituting the personality in Christ, there was no occasion for prayer except to furnish an example to us and to do honour to God. Yet he was very far from accepting the Eutychian idea that Divine attributes were communicated to the human nature. While the flesh became the flesh of the Word, and the soul of Jesus the soul of the Word, the human nature remained unaltered in essence. Solely on the ground of the fellowship of the Divine and the human was the flesh of the Lord enriched by the Divine activities. It is evident that this great thinker, whose *Fountain of Knowledge* is still normative in the Greek Church, failed to gain a perfectly consistent view of the relations of the Divine and the human in the Person of Christ.

7. The views of the pseudo-Dionysius and Maximus reappeared among the monks of Mount Athos about the middle of the 14th cent. (**Hesychasts, Quietists**), and occasioned the Hesychastic controversy, the chief opponents being the leaders of the party that was promoting union with the Latin Church. The cause of the Hesychasts was ably defended by Nicolaus Cabasilas, bishop of Thessalonica, and by Marcus Eugenicus, archbishop of Ephesus. The Christology of Cabasilas is highly transcendental. He regarded Christ as the resting-place of those human yearnings that are directed towards the highest good, as the luxuriant pasture of the thoughts, as the eternal good incorporated with time. Although he held fast to the Chalcedonian doctrine of two natures and two wills, he yet regarded the Word as super-essential even in the Incarnation, and the humanity of Christ as superhuman and deified though of like substance with us. The sacraments of the Church he regarded as the channels through which life streams forth from Christ to us. Baptism represents the generation in us of the new Christ-life. Everything pertaining to man's salvation was accomplished by the death and resurrection of Christ. Baptism simply transfers the saving efficacy to the individual. The purification of human nature accomplished in the Incarnation in Christ is accomplished in the individual Christian by his partaking of the Divine-human nature present in the Eucharist. Appropriating Christ in this feast, we enter into a blood-relationship with God and Christ; and as Christ's humanity became deified in the Incarnation, so do believers by partaking of Him.

8. In the West, **John Scotus Erigena** (d. about 880) translated, under the patronage of Charles the Bald, the pseudo-Dionysian writings, by which, as well as by the writings of Maximus, he had been profoundly influenced. Through him the Neo-Platonic mysticism was transplanted to the West, and came to exert a marked influence on later Christological thought. His teachings were even more openly pantheistic than those of his Oriental masters, and his denial of the reality of derived existence and his thoroughgoing Docetism make it extremely difficult to interpret much of the language in which he strives to give a certain value to the historical facts

of redemption. While asserting that Christ took upon Him the form of a servant and human nature in its entirety, he shows at once how little his language accords with common-sense usage by saying that the human nature that the Word assumed contains in itself the entire visible and invisible creation. Christ's mission was to call back effects into causes, and thus to prevent causality itself from perishing. Thus in assuming and renovating human nature He renovated the whole of the creation visible and invisible. In assuming and renovating human nature thus with its universal contents, Christ raised it in Himself above all that is visible, and converted it into His Deity. He saved the entire human nature which He entirely assumed entirely in itself and entirely in the entire race. Entire humanity is exalted in Him and sits at the right hand of God, having become God in Him. It is manifest that such conceptions of incarnation leave no place for evangelical views of sin or redemption. By his seeming recognition of the historical life of Christ he can have meant only to set forth belief in a theophany which had the effect of furthering and facilitating the rise of men above theophanies to the archetypal (cf. Dorner, ii. ii. 294 ff.).

9. A far more evangelical type of mystical Christology is found in the writings of **Hugo of St. Victor** (d. 1114) and **Richard of St. Victor** (d. 1173). In them the theosophy of Erigena was transformed into ecstatic enjoyment of God Himself. They were unable to find satisfaction in the Church doctrine of the transubstantiation of the bread and the wine into the body and the blood of Christ as the form in which Christ may be enjoyed, but yearned for a spiritual union with Christ, the transubstantiation of the believer by an ecstatic exaltation into a mystical union with Christ. The Christology of Hugo and Richard was clearly that of the pseudo-Dionysius and of Erigena; but with them the Incarnation was conceived of more distinctly as a historical fact, and the ecstatic union of the believer with Christ did not so clearly involve loss of individual consciousness and virtual absorption.

10. The pantheistic features of the teaching of Erigena found their most extreme development in **Amalric of Bena** (d. 1204), who identified God with the world and with man. Yet he did not wholly ignore the historical, and maintained that God revealed Himself as Father in Abraham, as Son in Mary, and as Holy Spirit daily in us. He declared that we are the natural members of Christ, because the identical soul of Christ dwells in all good men. Spiritual exaltation from Christ dwelling in us emancipates us from all moral obligation, and makes sins of the flesh a matter of indifference.

11. More profoundly philosophical but scarcely less destructive to the Christology of the NT and to true religion was the mysticism of **Master Eckhart** (d. c. [Note: circa, about.] 1327). He refused to recognize any distinction between man and God, in nature or in persons. All creatures he regarded as a 'pure nothing.' Every believer is God's only-begotten son in the same sense in which this is true of Christ. 'Whatever

God the Father has given to His only-begotten Son in human nature, He has given wholly to me. Here I except nothing, neither union nor sanctity.' 'Whatever the Sacred Scripture says concerning Christ is also absolutely true of every good man.' Eternal generation applies to every good man as fully as to Christ. In fact, man as well as God may be said to have created the heaven and the earth, and to have generated the eternal Word.

12. In **John Tauler** (d. 1361) we have a highly Neo-Platonic mode of thought combined with the most devout and heartfelt recognition of the Incarnation and the propitiatory sufferings of Christ as absolutely necessary for our salvation. Christ's being is cause, essence, and beginning in relation to all things. He is the life of the living, the resurrection of the dead, the restorer of the deformed and disordered who have corrupted and spoiled themselves by sin, the beginning of all light, the illumination of all those who are illuminated, the revealer of obscurity according to what it is proper for us to know, and the beginning of all beginning. His being is inconceivable and unspeakable, and without names. In becoming flesh and making atonement for the guilt of humanity He is its Redeemer. The Holy Spirit took of the most pure blood of the virginal heart of Mary, which was glowing with the powerful flame of love, and created of it a perfectly pure little body with all its members, and a pure clean soul, and united these together. This soul and body, the Person of the Son of God, who is the eternal Word and the reflexion of the Father's glory, from genuine love and mercy, for the sake of our blessedness, took upon Himself and united with Himself into the unity of the Person. Thus the Word became flesh and dwelt with us. The humanity of Christ he regarded as even in the humiliation permeated by the Divine, and sharing in the possession and use of the Divine attributes. The same was true even when He suffered and died on the cross. According to its lower powers Christ's soul was subject to needs. From this point of view he could say that not a drop of His Deity came for one moment to the help of His poor agonizing humanity in all its needs and in its unspeakable sufferings. Tauler is never weary of emphasizing the importance of the death of Christ. He speaks of the whole human race as fallen into eternal death and the eternal wrath of God, with the loss of the Holy Spirit, the Comforter. Christ broke the bands of eternal death in His death on the cross, and made a complete peace and reconciliation between man and the Heavenly Father. This reconciliation is confirmed by the gift of the Holy Spirit. The sufferings and death of Christ he regarded as an equivalent for man's guilt, as a fulfilling of the Law which we were under obligation to fulfil, in that He suffered in our place and on our behalf. Tauler dwelt with great persistence and with remarkable pathos on the details of the sufferings of Christ and His infinite love for the souls of men. It will not be practicable to give here any further phases of mystical Christological thought.

13. Scholastic Christology next demands attention. **Anselm of Canterbury** (d. 1109), in some respects the most important of the mediaeval theologians, wrought out no new theory of the Person of Christ; but his satisfaction theory of the Atonement, involving the abandonment of the supposition that the death of Christ was a ransom paid to the devil, and basing the necessity of the death of the God-man on the infinite weight of sin and its infinite offence to the honour of God, was an important contribution to soteriology. Satisfaction to the Divine majesty could not be made by man, seeing that he is finite, or by the Son of God alone, seeing that He owed no satisfaction; but it must be made by the God-man. While perpetuating the Augustinian modes of thought as they had been modified by Gregory the Great [Note: reat Cranmer's 'Great' Bible 1539.] , Alcuin, etc., Anselm was also greatly influenced by the Neo-Platonic semi-panteism of Erigena. In opposition to the tritheism of Roscellinus, which seemed to him to require the Incarnation of Father, Son, and Spirit, and not of the Son alone, as the means of man's redemption, he insisted that it was impossible for Father and Spirit to become man. The Incarnation merely accomplished the union of the Divine and human personalities, and not the union of the Divine and human natures. The Divine Person became man and formed one Person with the humanity assumed, but not the nature. There was no transformation of Deity into humanity or of humanity into Deity. Not the Divine nature but the Person of the Son became man. If the Divine Person alone and not the Divine nature took part in the Incarnation, it is plain that we cannot speak of the three Persons having become man in Christ, unless we hold that several persons could become one person (Dorner, ii. i. p. 442 ff.). Anselm as a Realist insisted that in the Incarnation the Logos united Himself not with an individual man, but with impersonal humanity, in this opposing the Nominalists, who insisted that the humanity of Christ was individual and personal.

14. Abelard (d. 1142) was essentially Sabellian in his doctrine of the Trinity, and insisted that, being unchangeable, God could not have become something which He was not eternally. He rejected such expressions as 'God is man,' 'Man became God.' He affirmed 'God did not become anything in and through the Incarnation.' He preferred to say in effect, 'in the man Jesus, God worked'; that 'in Jesus the wisdom of God revealed itself, in order to lead men to salvation by doctrine and example' (*Theologia Christiana*, iv. 13). This thought he is never weary of iterating and enforcing, that whatever our Lord did in the flesh was for our instruction by way of example. This includes His walk, His death, and His resurrection. He regarded Incarnation in the proper sense of the term as unthinkable and impossible, because of his conception of the omnipresence and the unchangeableness of God.

15. Peter Lombard (d. 1160), in his *Sentences*, which became the text-book of mediaeval scholasticism and thus exerted a moulding influence upon later scholastic thought, asked and sought to answer nearly every conceivable question respecting Christ. His great master was John of Damascus; but he was well acquainted with

Augustinian thought, and no doubt with the works of Anselm and Abelard. He was also somewhat familiar with Neo-Platonic modes of thought without being overmastered by them. He sees no reason why Father or Holy Spirit might not have become incarnate, but finds especial appropriateness in the fact that He who created the world should deliver it, that He who proceeded from another rather than He who is self-existent should be sent on the mission of redemption. It would have been less fitting for Him who is Father in heaven to become Son in the sphere of revelation. The human nature that the Son assumed comprised body and soul, the substance of humanity. This humanity, which was impersonal, was free from any stain of sin; yet, because He so willed, the liability to punishment which clung to humanity in general remained. Though as regards His flesh He descended from Adam and Abraham, He did not sin in Adam, there being no concupiscence in His conception. The question then arises, whether the Personality or the nature of the Son assumed humanity. As he felt the necessity of maintaining that the Son, as distinguished from the Father and the Spirit, became incarnate, and as nature is what the Persons of the Godhead have in common, while personality connotes the distinctions in the Godhead, he could only answer that the Personality and not the nature of the Son assumed humanity (against Augustine). But he seems to have held that in and through the Son the Divine nature as such united itself with, and appropriated to itself, humanity. Yet, in agreement with John of Damascus and the Antiochene theologians of the 4th cent., he thought it advisable to avoid the expression 'the Divine nature became flesh.' In further discussing the significance of the Incarnation, he rejects the Eutychian and the Nestorian views of the union of Divine and human in the Person of Christ. He denies that out of the two natures was formed a single compound nature. The Word of God, on the contrary, was simply clothed with body and soul as with a garment, in order that He might appear in a form accommodated to human vision. Thus he virtually denied the reality of the union, and reduced to a mere theophany the Incarnation of the Son. The humanity being regarded as a non-essential, accidental feature of the Son of God, its end and aim was solely that of manifestation, and God might for this purpose have used some other means for helping man than that of Incarnation. He regarded Christ's mediatorial work as accomplished by His humanity alone, the Divine nature remaining apart by itself. We are reconciled with the Son as with the Father and the Spirit. The entire Trinity blots out our sins through the mediation of the humanity of Christ. The work of atonement is accomplished chiefly, if not exclusively, by Christ in His humanity setting forth by His sufferings the fact of God's reconciliation, and by thus awakening in men love for God and a desire to follow Christ's example of love to God and self-sacrifice for men. In some passages he seems virtually to deny that God became objectively a man in Christ, and to maintain that the humanity of God was a purely subjective conception of the human mind. Moreover, reconciliation was not really effected by Christ, but God intended that His life and death should be regarded as propitiatory. His denial of personality to the humanity of Christ necessitated his denial of the growth of Christ in grace and

wisdom. Peter Lombard's denial that God became anything through the Incarnation which He was not before, involves the doctrine more fully wrought out by his successors and known in the history of doctrines as Nihilianism. This conclusion had already been reached by Abelard (see above); but the general orthodoxy of Peter Lombard gave it increased importance.

16. Gerhoh of Reichersberg (d. 1169) protested most earnestly against the Nestorianism or Nihilianism involved in the teachings of Abelard and Peter Lombard, and maintained that 'the man born of the virgin mother is in truth also to be called the Most High, not only in the nature of the Word always most high, but also in His human nature that has been exalted even to the point of sitting with God the Father.' He claimed for the humanity of Christ 'the same glory, omnipotence, omniscience, omnivirtue, omnimajesty, which belong to the Most High Father,' and held that 'the man in Christ is to be adored with worship' in the highest sense. 'Christ who is everywhere, according as He wills, cannot be shut up in a place, however beautiful or desirable.' The body of Christ 'so grew, became so dilated, that it filled the whole world.' Again he speaks of Christ's body as 'a spiritual body that has overstepped every limitation of time and space.' Thus we see in this German theologian a strong reaction against French Nominalism towards the Realism of Eutychianism and Neo-Platonism, which was to go to the utmost extreme in German Mysticism (see above) and to be perpetuated in Lutheranism.

17. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) built upon the foundations of his Scholastic predecessors, and was much influenced in his Christology by the works of John of Damascus and the pseudo-Dionysius. Like most of the mediaeval theologians, he denied the necessity of Incarnation apart from human sin; yet he guarded carefully against representing it as a mere accident as regards God, a mere assumption of flesh by God as a garment. He insisted upon a personal union of God with humanity; and yet denied that 'the Divine Person so assumed one human nature that it could not assume another.' 'That which is uncreated cannot be comprehended by a created thing.' While he opposed the Nihilianism of Abelard and Peter Lombard, he yet minimized the part taken by the Divine essence in the Incarnation. Like most of his mediaeval predecessors, he denied the personality of the humanity in Christ. Personality it found in the Logos as a distinction Divinely conferred. Like Peter Lombard also, he maintained that not the Divine nature (which would involve Father and Spirit as well as Son), but only the Divine Person of the Son, became in any sense united with humanity in the Incarnation. This union bestowed upon humanity nothing of the Divine nature, but only such created graces as humanity was able to appropriate. 'The soul of Christ is a creature, having finite capacity.' This creaturely grace was bestowed in perfection at the moment of incarnation in such measure that its increase is inconceivable. Christ's knowledge did not embrace the Divine knowledge, it being 'impossible for any creature to comprehend the Divine essence.'

Whatever has been, is, or will be, was within the sphere of the comprehension of Christ's soul in the Word; but not the knowledge of the possible, involving a knowledge of the Divine essence. Thus even the time of the Divine judgment which Christ professed not to know He really knew, but was ignorant of only in relation to others. Thomas also denied omnipotence to the soul of Christ on the same ground. Only as the instrument of Deity could the human soul exert superhuman influence. He maintained that in Christ there were two wills, a Divine, which was the active cause of all He did, and a human, which was purely instrumental. In the human will he distinguished between the sensuous (*sensitiva*) will and the rational will, the former sometimes willing things other than God willed, but not contrary things; the latter co-operating and harmonizing perfectly with the will of the Word. Yet, while His human will was free, Christ did not have the power to decide for Himself, but was determined by God. Like Peter Lombard, Thomas ascribed Christ's mediatorial function to His humanity and not to His Deity. He agreed with most of his predecessors in denying the necessity of the Incarnation and suffering of the Son for man's salvation, maintaining that without injustice God might have freely pardoned human sin. Yet he recognized the propriety of the plan of redemption actually adopted. The very least degree of suffering on the part of the God-man would have sufficed. He finds difficulty in reconciling Christ's sufferings with His blessed fruition, and reaches the conclusion that the higher aspect (the essence) of His soul continued in perfect fruition while the lower suffered. It is evident that this great thinker, while rejecting Eutychianism, Nestorianism, and Adoptianism, failed to reach a self-consistent view of the relation of the Divine and the human in the Person of Christ.

18. We must conclude our survey of Scholastic Christology with some account of the contribution of **John Duns Scotus** (d. 1308). Although Scotus differed in many respects from Thomas, and gave his name to a party antagonistic to the latter (Scotists *versus* Thomists), in Christology he was content for the most part to follow in the path that had been so well beaten by Thomas and his predecessors. Like these, he maintained that the union of the Divine and the human was only a relation so far as the Divine was concerned, and that for the Divine to become anything that was not eternal is inconceivable. More than Thomas he laid stress on the relative independence and separateness of the human in Christ. Independence he regarded as indispensable to personality. He supposed that the human nature of Christ was such that it would have attained to personality apart from the Word; yet a personality dependent on God, and not, like the Divine, incommunicable. More than Thomas also he kept clear of Adoptianism, and guarded against representing Christ's humanity as a selfless husk (Dorner). He regards Christ's humanity by virtue of Divine predestination and grace as exalted to a dignity not possessed by nature. Scotus had an exalted idea of human nature as such, and attributed to it a capacity for the Divine that enabled it through the Word to gain an intuitive view of creation that may be said to be infinite

in its scope. In the Incarnation the infinite ethical susceptibility of the human soul was filled by the infinite God. He did not regard the humanity as merely passive and instrumental. In joining itself with the will of the Son that was seeking union with humanity, the human will of Jesus was not passive, but being wrought upon by the Divine it determined itself to increasing susceptibility to the Divine. He attributes to the humanity of Christ growth in knowledge and volition, and suffering of soul and body. He regards as miraculous and inexplicable the fact that the Divine nature did not swallow up the human so as practically to annihilate it, but rather caused it to retain its true humanity. The necessity of supposing the humanity of Christ active in the Incarnation, doubtless had to do with the stress that Scotus laid on the immaculate conception of Mary in whom this activity could be assumed. In some respects Scotus advanced beyond any of the Scholastic theologians in his efforts to solve the mysteries of the Incarnation.

19. The Christology of the Evangelical sects of the mediaeval time (Petrobrusians, Henricians, Arnoldists, Waldenses, Taborites, Lollards, and Bohemian Brethren) may be characterized in general as naïvely Biblical, and accordant with that of the orthodox teachers of the 2nd and 3rd centuries. Much of the mediaeval Evangelical Christology, as well as much of the Anabaptist Christology that was its outgrowth, savoured strongly of Adoptianism. This was no doubt due in part to the widespread influence of the Paulicians, who were transported in large numbers from Armenia to Bulgaria by the Eastern Empire during the early Middle Ages. All the Evangelical sects of that era laid the utmost stress upon obedience to the precepts of Christ, especially the Sermon on the Mount, and on following the example of Christ. While they kept the humanity of Christ constantly before them, they worshipped Him as God, repudiating utterly all Mariolatry, and all worship of images, holy places, saints, martyrs, etc. They seem not to have concerned themselves at all about the relations of the Divine and the human in the Person of Christ, but to have been content with the NT representations accepted in a devout and simple-minded way. It is probable that nearly all of them would have accepted without hesitation the so-called Apostles' Creed, but would have hesitated to accept the so-called Athanasian Creed. The inquisitors frequently charge the Waldenses and related parties with denying the true Deity of Christ, although they had the profoundest reverence for Him and gladly gave their lives for Him. The Catharistic sects, following the Gnostics and Manichaeans of the earlier time, denied the true Deity of Christ (regarding Him as one of many angelic beings or emanations), and the reality of His Incarnation and suffering.

Chiliastic views were widely prevalent among the heretical offshoots of the Franciscans, Joachimites, Olivists (followers of Peter Olivi), Taborites, etc.

20. The idolatrous disposition of the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches in the mediaeval times created an insatiable demand for holy objects connected with the Person and the life of Christ (articles of clothing, fragments of the cross, etc.), and especially for portraits and statuettes produced from life by contemporaries or miraculously formed. In the East the ikons, as they existed at the beginning of the Middle Ages (close of the Iconoclastic Controversy), which had long before become conventionalized, furnished the models for all later productions, and little scope was given to the imagination of the artist or the exploitation of fraudulent antiquities. In the West unlimited license was given to both. The Abgar picture (see Abgar), whether what purported in the 4th cent. to be a contemporary portrait had been preserved or not, was sure under the circumstances to reappear in the mediaeval West, and it could hardly have been expected that one church would be allowed to enjoy a monopoly of an object at once so desirable and so easily made. There is no sufficient foundation for the story that the handkerchief-portrait remained in Edessa till 944, whence it was taken to Constantinople by Imperial order, and thence went to Italy in the 14th cent., presumably in connexion with the Crusades. It is not likely that so perishable an article would have lasted for six centuries, to say nothing of the thousand years that have elapsed since its supposed removal from Edessa, and the ecclesiastics of the mediaeval time were so unscrupulous in providing themselves with revenue producing holy objects that no dependence can be placed on their accounts of their sources. It may safely be assumed that neither the Roman, the Genoese, nor the Parisian handkerchief-portrait is that which long abode in Edessa, and that all alike are of mediaeval or later origin, though the Genoese enjoys the honour of having been pronounced genuine by Pius ix. Even more manifestly spurious and lacking in antiquity is the so-called Veronica portrait, said to have been transferred by Boniface viii., in 1297, from the Hospital of the Holy Spirit to St. Peter's in Rome. Those who have been vouchsafed a glimpse of the sacred object represent it as almost completely faded out. The legend is that a pious woman (according to some the woman cured of the issue of blood), moved with compassion for Jesus, as, bleeding and sweating, He was going to the cross, gave Him her head-cloth to wipe His face with, and that Jesus imprinted His features upon it and returned it to her as a token of love. The name Veronica was by some supposed to be the Latin equivalent of the name of the woman; but by others it is taken to mean 'true image,' as etymologically it might. The Roman Church has canonized this purely mythical woman as St. Veronica. The picture, according to copies made before it faded out, represents an oval bearded face with thin hair reaching to the temples, eyes closed, and a somewhat agonized expression. This inartistic picture became a model for Correggio and other artists of the later Middle Ages. The stories about the sweat-cloth image, and probably pictures purporting to be the original, may have found place as early as the 7th or 8th cent.; but those exhibited in the mediaeval and later times were probably of purely mediaeval origin, and were no doubt freely produced as they were needed. Rome was not allowed to monopolize the 'original' Veronica portrait, Milan

and Jaen having put forth rival claims. Many other pictures, equally lacking in authenticity and with similar claims to antiquity, were produced and exhibited during the Middle Ages, portraits of the earlier time (4th cent. onward) being for the most part taken as models. The symbolical representation of Christ as a fish was perpetuated from the earlier time. Christ as the Good Shepherd, with the face of a beardless youth, was a common form of representation during the Middle Ages, as earlier. It is the opinion of many that the artists of the Renaissance, while influenced to some extent by the older portraits, drew freely on pagan materials, using especially the earlier representations of aesculapius to aid their imaginations in depicting the ideal Christ. Crucifixes with agonized face and bleeding wounds were freely used during the Middle Ages. It needs scarcely be said that the Evangelical and Catharistic parties utterly repudiated the use of pictures of Christ and crucifixes as idolatrous.—See Christ in Art.

Literature.—Writings of the theologians whose opinions are presented: works on the History of Doctrines by Harnack (German and English), Baur, Seeberg, Thomasius (ed. Seeberg), and Loofs; Bach, *Dogmengesch. d. M.A.*, 1873-5; Schwane, *Dogmengesch. d. mittlcren Zeit*, 1882; Reuter, *Gesch. d. Aufklärung im M.A.*, 1875-7; Dorner, *Entwicklungsgesch. d. Lehre v. d. Person Christi*, 1853 (also English translation); works on Church History by K. Müller, Moller, Gieseler, Neander, Schaff, and Hase; art. on 'Christologie,' 'Christusbilder,' and on theologians and systems concerned in *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyclopädie fur protest. Theologic und Kirche.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , and in Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*; Gottschick, 'Studien zur Versöhnungslehre d. M.A.' in *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.* xxii., xxiii., and xxiv.; Döllinger, *Beitrage zur Sektengesch. d. M.A.*, 1890; Denifle, *Archiv f. Lit.- u. Kirchengesch. d. M.A.*, 1885, and onward.

Albert Henry Newman.

☞ Christ In The Seventeenth Century

CHRIST IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.—The 17th cent. is the age of Protestant scholasticism. A strong Catholic reaction had set in, which weighed on the minds of the defenders of the Protestant faith, and shackled the freedom of theological thought. In their treatment of the Christological problem, both Lutheran and Reformed theologians clung fervently to the traditions of the past, and to the Confessional theology of the previous century. The main results were regarded as finally attained; and while the religious motive was not wanting, the genial spirit that had guided Luther in his most surprising paradoxes was now weighed down by the love

of system and scholastic disputation. Instead of reconsidering the first principles involved, the orthodox theologians wasted their ingenuity in inventing distinctions to conceal the most obvious doctrinal inconsistencies.

1. The **Lutheran Church** led the way in this scholastic development, by its endeavours to set in clearer light the unity of the God-manhood of Christ. The Formula of Concord (1577, published in the *Book of Concord*, 1580) struck a compromise between the divergent views of the Brenzian and the Chemnitzian doctrine. It held that the two natures of Christ had direct and real communion with each other; and it condemned as Nestorian the view that rested the unity of Christ upon the unity of the *Person*, as if the natures were combined in an external way, like two boards glued together. There was a real passing over of the properties of the Divine nature to the human nature; not in the sense that the human nature was essentially altered thereby, or made the Divine properties its own by a 'physical communication' or 'essential transfusion,' but in the sense of a real and permanent communication, such that Christ 'performed all the works of His omnipotence in, through, and with His human nature.' It was admitted that this majesty communicated to the human nature was hidden or withheld during Christ's earthly life; He did not always manifest it, but only when it pleased Him to do so; or (as it is elsewhere expressed) He 'divested Himself of His Divine majesty in the state of His humiliation,' though retaining it through the personal union. By the resurrection this occultation of the Divine majesty came to an end, and He was placed in the plenary use, revelation, and manifestation of all Divine powers, so that 'now not only as God but also as man He knows all things, is able to do all things, and exercises an omnipresent dominion.'

This Formula of Concord proved in reality a formula of discord to the Lutheran divines; it was variously interpreted, and not even universally accepted. The theologians of Helmstädt, who followed the more moderate Chemnitzian view, were all the more opposed to the Formula that it was interpreted by the Swabian theologians in a sense that restored the Brenzian tradition. The Swabians presented the doctrine of the *Communicatio idiomatum* in the most uncompromising form; and, in the most incautious and absolute terms, they attributed the Divine attributes of eternity, omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience to the earthly human Christ. For a time the Swabian views prevailed; but something had still to be done to harmonize them with the historical facts of Christ's earthly life. A new controversy arose, in which the differences between Chemnitz and Brenz reappeared in an acuter form, as to what was involved in the state of humiliation, or the extent to which the human Christ had divested Himself of the Divine powers. The controversy raged chiefly between the theologians of Giessen and Tübingen. The theologians of Giessen, following the line of thought of Chemnitz and the divines of Helmstädt, endeavoured to reconcile theory with fact by distinguishing between the *possession* of Divine

powers and their *use*. Looking to the facts of weakness, ignorance, and growing development in the life of the earthly Christ, they maintained that, while possessing all Divine properties, Christ did not make use of them in the state of humiliation, but entered on the full exercise of His powers at His exaltation. Only occasionally (miracles, transfiguration) did rays from the Divine majesty shine through; in general the Logos remained quiescent, and the human nature, though Divinely endowed, did not advance to the actuality of exercise (κένωσις τῆς χρήσεως). This doctrine was contested by the theologians of Tübingen, who regarded the distinction as futile and involving a betrayal of the Lutheran position. They insisted that there would be no real communication of Divine attributes to the humanity unless the human Christ both possessed and used them. They would admit only that the earthly Christ hid His majesty for the time, and usually made a veiled use of His Divinely communicated powers (κρύψις). This theory was apparently more logical than that of the Giessen theologians; but neither could be harmonized with the facts of Christ's earthly life, and the Tübingen theory brought the inconsistency into more startling evidence. The Giessen distinction between use and possession of Divine powers might be applied with some meaning to the property of omnipotence; but it had no conceivable meaning as applied to omniscience or omnipresence. But it fared even worse with the Tübingen view when brought face to face with the facts. For how could a Christ who possessed and used the property of omnipresence in His humanity be at the same time and in the same nature circumscribed in time and space? How could a growing intelligence be at the same time endowed with absolute omniscience? Or how could the weak, human, suffering Christ be also in the full exercise of His omnipotence? The Tübingen theologians did their best to solve these startling contradictions by making small concessions, and minute distinctions that concealed these concessions. Thus they maintained that the earthly human Christ exercised His omnipresence not *actu naturæ* but *actu personæ*; or, in other words, that the Person exercised it while the human nature remained under limitations—a verbal distinction which left the difficulty where it was. In regard to the omniscience of Christ, which seemed to clash with the fact of His gradual growth in knowledge, they submitted that omniscience was not incompatible with growth in a perfected human nature; and they suspected Mar 13:32, where Christ confesses His own ignorance, of being an interpolation. Or, again, when pressed with the facts of Christ's suffering and weakness as being inconsistent with a full energizing omnipotence, they admitted that Christ, for the sake of His redemptive work, 'retracted' somewhat of His Divine majesty. They made a distinction between the 'reflex' and the 'direct' use of omnipotence, declaring that Christ, *qua Sacerdos*, withdrew the reflex use of His majesty with reference to His own body, while He still, *qua Rex*, exercised the direct use of it in reference to creation.

These explanations of an intelligence that writhed under its own obvious inconsistencies, served only to bring in doubt the reality of Christ's human life, and more moderate views at length prevailed. The *Saxon Decision* of 1624 expressed a view favourable to the Giessen theology: 'We constantly affirm that He used His royal majesty most freely when, how, and where He would; but we deny that Christ as a man, immediately from His incarnation, always, fully, and universally exerted His Divine majesty of omnipotence and omnipresence, ... since Christ could not have been taken, crucified, and put to death had He willed to use fully and universally His omnipotence and omnipresence.' The Tübingen theologians adhered to their views till nearly the end of the century, but they became more and more isolated in their opinion. The common Lutheran view was that represented by Quenstedt, the Lutheran Aquinas, who completely systematized the Lutheran doctrine. He held that, from the first moment of the Incarnation, Christ was, even in His human nature, in possession of the Divine majesty, and did exercise it occasionally when His work made it expedient to do so; but He abdicated its plenary use. The human Christ on earth emptied Himself by giving up for the time the glory of the μορφή θεου, *i.e.* the 'divinae majestatis plenarius, universalis, et non interruptus sive indesinens usus.' He thus reduced the possession by the human Christ of omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience to a mere potentiality. Christ was omnipresent while on earth, but not *actu*; He was everywhere present in fact, but not in act. He was omnipotent, but He preferred usually to act according to His natural powers. He had the *primum actum* of omniscience, but not the *secundum actum*; He had the potentiality of absolutely Divine knowledge, but ordinarily He willed not to use it.

On the whole it must be admitted that the Lutheran theologians had little success in their efforts to unify the God-manhood of Christ. Their well-meant endeavour to supplement the defects of the two-natures theory by a doctrine of intercommunication brought only more prominently into relief the contradictions involved. The further development of doctrine in this century shows that the Lutherans themselves were becoming less sure of their own principles. The old axiom that the human was susceptible of the Divine (*finitum capax infiniti*) was still maintained in its non-ethical sense, but it was surrounded with more definite cautions and limitations. Thus, in order to meet the charge made against them by G. Calixtus, and still more forcibly by the Reformed and the Roman Catholic Churches, that by their doctrine of *Communicatio idiomatum* they overthrew the distinction between the human and the Divine, they distinguished more carefully than hitherto between a *personal* and an *essential* communication of properties. It was insisted that the Divine properties communicated did not become the essential properties of the human nature, but were only personally possessed and exercised. Or, as it was otherwise expressed, the human nature of Christ possessed the Divine powers, not by absolute appropriation (μέθεξις), but by conjunction (κατὰ συνδιασμόν, *per unionem et*

conjunctionem, Meisner, Hollaz, Buddeus). Still further, it was held that the principle *finitum capax infiniti* was applicable in the case of Christ alone. It was admitted that human nature was naturally and in general incapable of receiving the Divine powers, and that the human nature of Christ had been endowed with this capacity by a special act of the Divine power. When the principle of the *Communicatio idiomatum* is thus narrowed down on this side and on that, the old dualism reappears, and the Lutheran doctrine of the thorough union of the Divine and the human is in a state of collapse. Later attempts to rescue the *Communicatio idiomatum* from oblivion by removing it from its basis, the doctrine of the two natures (Dorner, and still more elaborately H. Schultz, *Lehre von der Gottheit Christi*), only repeat the mistake of pouring new wine into old bottles; for, as Baur says, when once the duality of natures is abandoned, there can be no further talk of a *Communicatio idiomatum*. Schultz tries to revitalize the doctrine in its triple form by an infusion of new ideas which have little historical connexion with it, and which could be better expressed in less scholastic forms.

The different kinds of *Communicatio* as given by Quenstedt may be here tabulated:—

I. Genus *idiomaticum*, where the qualities of either nature are attributed to the person: (a) when the person is the subject: Christ is eternal: Christ has died; (b) when the concrete human nature is subject: the Son of Man is from heaven; (c) when the concrete Divine nature is subject: God has suffered.

II. Genus *apotelesmaticum*, marking some activity in the redemptive work in which both natures concur: God is redeemer (*i.e.* God incarnate): the Son of Man is redeemer (*i.e.* He who is Son of Man and Son of God): the blood of Christ cleanses (*i.e.* the blood of Him who is both God and man).

III. Genus *majestaticum*, the attribution of Divine properties to the human nature: (a) *Divina nomina*; (b) *Opera divina*; (c) *Cultus divinus*; (d) *Essentialia Dei attributa*: *e.g.* omnipotence, omnipresence, omniscience. The main controversy raged around this last genus.

2. The Reformed Church took a different path. Its theologians held fast to the principle of the Middle Ages, that finite human nature is not *capax infiniti*; but they applied it, as the Middle Ages had failed to do, to set in stronger relief the reality of Christ's human life. They considered the unity of Christ to be sufficiently safeguarded by the fact of the personal unity and the correspondence of the two natures, and emphasized the distinctness of the natures to the point of being charged with Nestorianism by their Lutheran opponents. Instead of such a communication between the natures as the Lutherans maintained, they were content to think of the human nature of Christ as working in harmony with the Divine through the anointing and activity of the Holy Spirit. Through this Holy Spirit, coming by way of the Logos, the

human nature of Christ received certain Divine charisms; but it did not receive the absolute Divine attributes, or any other powers than such as a human nature, remaining human, could receive. Thus they claimed for the human Christ sinlessness, infallibility in His teaching, and abiding fellowship with God the Father; but they were earnest also in maintaining a true growth in Christ of positive knowledge, holiness, and power. Not even did the risen and exalted Christ surpass the limits of the human, or arrive in His humanity at complete coincidence with the Divine. On the other hand, they balanced this doctrine of a truly human development by the position that the personality of Christ lay in the Logos, who, in assuming this human nature, and appearing on earth in lowly guise, at the same time also remained outside of the human Christ, clothed with all the attributes of heavenly glory. (The Logos was *totus in carne*, but also *totus extra carnem*). Their theory results practically in the doctrine of a *double life*, the eternal life of the Son of God, the pure Logos *ex carnc*, who remains unchanged in heavenly dominion and glory; and the life in time of the man Christ Jesus, the Logos Incarnate, the God-man in lowly form. (This is the interpretation given by Bruce, *Humiliation of Christ*, 163 ff., Schultz, *Gottheit Christi*, 180, and others). It may be mentioned, as indicating the growing importance attached to the humanity of Christ, that the idea of Christ's *pre-existent humanity* gained ground during this century as well among the Reformed as the Lutheran divines. It recommended itself to the Lutheran theologian as exalting the human nature, and affording some support to his doctrine that the whole earthly life of Christ rested on the voluntary self-humiliation of the God-man; while to some of the Reformed side it seemed to explain the position of Christ as the type and instrument of creation, and the medium of revelation prior to the Incarnation.

Comparing the views of the Reformed and Lutheran Churches, we may say that while both adhered to the ancient formula of Chalcedon, the Lutheran Church emphasized the Divinity of Christ, and the Reformed Church the humanity. In the Lutheran field of vision stands the figure of the Divine, omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent Christ, upon which the humanity hangs like a thin transparent garment; while, for the Reformed Church, the human Jesus of Nazareth stands in the foreground, and the Divinity lies in the background of faith, constituting a union with the human Jesus that is beyond comprehension. It cannot be said that either Church solved the problem of Christ's Person, for indeed no solution is possible on these terms. So long as the Divine and the human are defined by categories that are absolutely inconsistent—omnipotence and weakness, omniscience and ignorance, the infinitude of omnipresence and local bodily finitude—the union of these in one person is inconceivable. It is only when we read the glory of God in the face of Christ, and realize that the central and essential attributes of God are love, grace, compassion for human frailty and need, that we can recognize the Divine and the human as one, and acknowledge in Christ the revelation of the Divine, the Word of God Incarnate.

3. Outside of the orthodox theology a freer development of thought took place, under the influences derived from the anti-Trinitarianism of the 16th cent., and the growth of modern philosophy. **Socinianism** was a growing power, and the influence of its criticisms passed into every land. The Socinians made a clean sweep of the old Trinitarian and Christological dogmas, and so cut the knot of the intellectual difficulties involved. In their view it was irrational and unscriptural to speak of God as being three. It was equally irrational to think of God generating a Son after the manner of corruptible animals, or to speak of two natures, each complete in itself, coming together and forming one person. The rational and Scriptural doctrine was that Christ was *verus homo*. Yet, having once made this fundamental position clear, the Socinians made many concessions in favour of Christ's uniqueness in respect of Divine supernatural endowment. He was born supernaturally of a virgin. He was equipped for His work on earth by ascending into heaven, and receiving there all needful supernatural knowledge. He also exercised supernatural powers on earth; and after His ascension He was exalted to the right hand of God, and was endowed with new Divine powers for the guidance of His Church. As thus exalted He might be called God, and Socinus himself went so far as to justify the adoration of Christ. This Socinian doctrine rests on the same presupposition as the orthodoxy of the day, viz. that the supreme and essential characters of Deity are omnipotence, omniscience, unchangeableness; but by applying this conception logically to the Person of Christ, Socinians emptied their Christology of all religious value. For union with God is the need of the human heart; and the doctrine of the God-man, contradictory as it was, held a truth for which Socinianism found no expression.

4. The **Arminian** doctrine was a *via media* between the Socinian and the orthodox doctrine. The Arminian theologians adhered to the doctrine of the Trinity, but maintained that the Son, as begotten of the Father, was essentially subordinate, though still a Person within the Deity. They also maintained the full humanity of Jesus. Though one with the Son or Logos, He lived a truly human life; He had a human body and a human soul, and, according to Curcellaeus, a human personality. The union with the Logos appeared in the communication to Jesus of Divine spiritual powers, but only of such as were possible to a creature. While they held His actual sinlessness, they denied His impeccability. Had they carried out their conception logically, they could scarcely have halted short of Socinianism.

Before the close of the century the Arminian Christology had multitudes of adherents, not only in Holland but also in Switzerland and England. In the latter country Deism had already begun to undermine the Trinitarian and Christological doctrines, and Arminian and even Arian views were widely spread within the Church. The whole tendency of the period was towards a more frankly humanitarian view of Christ's Person; and leading representatives of thought, like Milton, Locke, and Newton, whose sympathies were with the Christian faith, were estranged from the orthodox

rendering of the Christian verities. The great variety of view, prevailing both in the Churches and beyond them, indicated the approaching dissolution of the old dogma, while as yet the rationalism of the age had little to set in its place.

5. In this as in other centuries, **Mysticism** pursued its own path, and afforded to some minds relief from the high and dry dogmatism of orthodoxy. Starting from the true thought of the affinity of God and man, the *Mystics* tended either to lose sight of the historical Jesus entirely, or to see in Him but one manifestation of the eternal Word. Jacob Böhme may be taken as their noblest representative. Böhme stood too near to the Christian faith to sublimate Christ, and see in Him nothing more than the type of a universal incarnation; but history and dogma are but the material of his all-mastering speculation. The Trinity represents for Böhme the thought that God has life and movement, that He is no abstract, changeless entity apart from the world, but a living God, working in and through all, the source and goal and spirit of all, the unity in which all contradictions are resolved. He interprets the dogma in a variety of ways. The Father is the abyss; the Son is the first forthgoing of desire in the form of will; the Spirit is the eternal out-breathing of that will. Or, the Father is the originating will, the Son is the power of love which the will generates in determining itself, and the Spirit is the will's eternal outgoing. Or again, the Father is the source of all powers, Himself the one all-inclusive power; the Son is the heart and kernel of all powers; and the Spirit is their living movement. But Böhme sees the Trinity everywhere: in the soul of man (power, light, and the spirit of understanding), in plants (power, sap, peculiar virtue), nay, in all things that conceivably exist—even in the burning candle with its heat, light, and ascending air. In similar ways Böhme descants on the Person of Christ,—His double birth, in time and in eternity; His double body, the heavenly and the mortal. In spite of their incoherence, one may gather from Böhme's writings a suggestion here and there, but so far as definite ordered thought goes, his vagaries resemble the play of shadows on a wall. His meaning may be profoundly spiritual, but his language is a perverse interweaving of physics and chemistry with ethics and theology.

In no century was the *rabies theologica* more pronounced. The scholastic extravagance of the orthodox doctrine did not fail to work injuriously and sometimes disastrously on the religious life, while the intellectualism of the more critical circles did not directly serve the growth of religious piety. For the evidence of true and sincere devotion to Christ in this age we must look rather to the obscure and humble in the Churches, who found sustenance for their souls in a faith that surpassed all formulas, and which no scholasticism or criticism could rob of its transcendent power.

Literature.—Planck, *Gesch. der prot. Theologie von der Concordienformel bis in die Mitte des achtz. Jht.*; Schneckenburger, *Vergleichende Darstellung des Luther. u. Reform. Lehrbegriffs*; Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, div. ii. vol. ii.;

Schultz, *Gottheit Christi*; A. Réville, *The Deity of Jesus Christ*; G. Bonet-Maury, *Des origines du Christianisme unitaire*; A. B. Bruce, *The Humiliation of Christ*; artt. in *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyclopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] on 'Kenosis,' 'Communicatio Idiomatum,' and on the various theologians referred to.

J. Dick Fleming.

Christian (The Name)

CHRISTIAN (The Name).—The word 'Christian' occurs in the NT only in Act 11:26; Act 26:28 (about 20 years later), and 1Pe 4:16. The author of Acts alludes to it once in his earlier treatise (Luk 6:22), however, putting into the mouth of Jesus a sentiment whose linguistic form, at least, is coloured by the experiences and terminology of the Apostolic age. In some other passages where it is apparently mentioned (e.g. Act 5:41, Jam 2:7), the 'name' is not 'Christian' but 'Christ,' while the references in Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. iii. 3) and the Pompeii inscription (C/L [Note: *IL Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.*] iv. 679), it may be noted in passing, are too uncertain to be used as evidence for the title. Other and later inscriptions, however, are accessible.

For the origin and primitive usage of the term we are thus thrown back upon the three first-named passages. Of these, the fontal reference in Act 11:26 explains that the name by which the religion of Jesus has been known for nineteen centuries was coined by the pagan slang of Antioch on the Orontes, a city which, like Alexandria, was noted for its nicknames. Yet the title is not a rough *sobriquet*. It expresses a certain contempt, but not derision, though St. Luke does not inform us whether it was coined by the mob or by government officials. 'Christian' (Χριστιανός) simply means 'a follower of Christ,' just as *Pompeianus* or *Herodianus* denotes 'a follower or partisan of Pompey' or 'of Herod.' 'Christ' was thus taken as a proper name. It meant no more to these Syrian pagans than some leader of revolt or obscure religious fanatic in Palestine. His name was ever on the lips of a certain set of people, and it was but natural that these should, for the sake of convenience, be distinguished as 'Christ's adherents' or 'Christians.' Unconsciously, in giving the title—which there is no evidence to show was applied previously to Jews—these citizens of Antioch were emphasizing one deep truth of the new religion, viz. that it rested not on a dogma or upon an institution, but on a person; and that its simple and ultimate definition was to be found in a relationship to Jesus Christ, whether 'Christos' to these Syrian Antiochenes was some strange god (Act 17:18) or a Jewish agitator. An outstanding

trait in the Christians whom Pliny found in Bithynia was that they ‘sang a hymn to Christ as to a god’ (Plin. *Ep.* x. 90, *ad Trajan.*) at worship. From the impression made by facts and features like this, it was but a step to designate the new sect as ‘Christ’s folk or party.’

It was neither the original nor the chosen name of believers in Jesus Christ. Their inner titles (see Weizsäcker’s *Apost. Age.* i. p. 43 f.) were ‘brethren,’ ‘disciples,’ and ‘saints,’ all of which preceded, and for some time survived alongside of, ‘Christians.’ Nor could the title have been coined by the Jews, who would never have admitted that Jesus of Nazareth was the ‘Christ.’ To them believers in Jesus were ‘Nazarenes’ or ‘Galilaeans.’ It was the pagan community of Antioch alone that would invent and apply this title. Now a name implies life. Titles are not required unless and until a definite, energetic fact emerges. And the need evidently felt for some such designation as ‘Christian’ arose from two causes: (a) from the conspicuous extension of the new movement throughout the country and the city, and (b) more particularly from the predominance of Gentile Christians, who could not be provisionally grouped, like most of their Jewish fellow-believers, with the community and worship of Judaism. There was a Jewish ghetto at Antioch. But the local, heterogeneous paganism yielded an incomparably richer harvest to the efforts of the Christian age is, so that the general success of the movement produced, for the first time, a noticeable alteration in the proportions of Jewish and Gentile Christians—so noticeable, indeed, that, as the historian points out, it necessitated an attempt on the part of the outside public to verbally classify the adherents of the new faith. The significance of this step is patent to the historian. He signalizes the crisis. The Christianity he knew was overwhelmingly a Gentile Christianity, and in [Act 11:26](#) he is keen to mark its debut, as well as to suggest that the name ‘Christian’ was primarily and principally applied to Gentile Christians. ‘Truly,’ as Renan observes, ‘it is remarkable to think that, ten years after Jesus died, His religion already possessed, in the capital of Syria, a name in the Greek and Latin languages. Christianity speaks Greek, and is now finally launched into that great vortex of the Greek and Roman world which it will never leave.’ Its weaning from the breast of Judaism had commenced. And this was due to that increasing sense of Christ’s personal authority which has been already noted (cf. Amiel’s *Journal Intime*, English translation p. 3f.). The more the significance of this came to be grasped, as the new faith expanded beyond the precincts of Judaism, the more did the distinctive universalism of the Gospel assume its true place.

For, while the basal conception of ‘Christian’ is Semitic (‘Christ’), the linguistic termination (*-ieni*) is either Latin or (more probably) Greek. Even were it Latin, it would be hasty to attribute (with Baur) the origin of the term to Rome, where Tacitus is our first pagan witness for its currency about a.d. 110. Early designations in $\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota\alpha\iota$

(cf. Mar_3:6, Justin's *Dial.* 35) were not infrequent among the Greeks of Asia Minor, and it is arbitrary scepticism to hold that St. Luke in Act_11:26 must have antedated and misplaced the origin of the name, or that Tacitus has done the same. The latter (*Annal.* xv. 44) describes Nero's victims as 'men whom the common people loathed for their secret crimes, calling them Chrestians. The name was derived from Christ, who had been put to death by Pontius Pilate, the procurator, during the reign of Tiberius.' Long before that period it must have been the interest of the Jews and Christians alike to differentiate themselves to some degree, one from the other. And the circumstances of the Neronic *émeute*, which was probably instigated by the Jews, must have made the distinction plain, once and for all, to the local authorities. The inherent probabilities of the case, therefore, seem to preclude any reasonable suspicion of a *hysteron-proteron* upon the part of the Roman historian; nor is it unnatural, even for rigid historical criticism, to admit that the distinctive name of 'Christian' may have been coined and current nearly twenty years earlier upon the banks of the Orontes. In short, both passages in Acts give one the impression of being historically authentic reminiscences; had the author been more anxious to emphasize the new name, he would not have employed it so sparingly and incidentally. It is curious to notice that, outside the Church, Epictetus, slightly later than Paul, used 'Galilaeans,' while Marcus Aurelius employed 'Christians.'

In 1Pe_4:16 (cf. Luk_6:22, Joh_16:2), together with Pliny's letters (*Epp.* x. 96, 97) less than fifty years later, we catch one glimpse of the connexion between the name 'Christian' and the civil or social penalties in which it involved believers (cf. Mommsen and Ramsay in *Expositor*, 4th series [1893], vol. viii.). To 'suffer as a Christian' *i.e.* (for being a Christian) covers a wide range of experience, from molestation to official and even capital punishment. The latter extreme, however, is not prominent in this passage, although the term *ἀπολογία* certainly suggests it. But the vague outline of 1Pe_4:14-17 is filled out and vividly coloured by the later evidence of Pliny and of the 2nd cent. martyrs' literature, which shows how Christianity was treated as a forbidden or illicit religion, hostile to the national cult, and therefore exposing any of its adherents, without further question, to the punishment of death.

How soon and how far the mere name of 'Christian' was thus a capital offence, it is not easy to determine, but by the 2nd cent. the ordinary formula of confession before a magistrate was, 'I am a Christian.' This was put forward as the natural and sufficient reason for refusing to swear by the genius of the Emperor, and it was usually accepted by the authorities as final. Polycarp's martyrdom at Smyrna is our earliest case in point. But the story of the martyr Sanctus in Gaul, not long afterwards, shows how widespread was this habit. When tortured by the authorities, 'he steeled himself so firmly against them, that he would not so much as tell his name

or nation or city. All his answer to their inquiries was, “I am a Christian” ’ (Eus. *Historia Ecclesiastica* v. 1). Pliny’s account of his own judicial proceedings is equally blunt and plain. When people were accused of Christianity, he writes, ‘I asked them personally whether they were Christians; if they confessed it, I asked them a second and a third time, threatening them with punishment. Then, if they adhered to their confession, I ordered them off to execution.’ The test applied to doubtful cases was that of offering worship to the Emperor’s statue. ‘No real Christian,’ says the governor, ‘can he made to do that.’ Nor could the name of Christian be legally borne by any one who added sacrilege to high treason, in refusing to worship the ancestral gods of the State. Christianity, *ipso facto*, was a challenge to these deities. Hence to avow the name of ‘Christian’ was to expose oneself to pains and penalties, either voluntarily or involuntarily incurred.

Both 1Pe 4:16 and Act 26:28 denote the use of the title by outsiders (Jam 2:7 referring probably to ‘Christ,’ not ‘Christian’), and this is corroborated by the evidence of Christian writings in the 2nd cent., where we find that its comparatively rare occurrence is confined mainly to the Christian apologists, *i.e.* to writers who were principally concerned with the outward relations of the faith to society and to the State. Traces of its use among Christians themselves are to be found, however, in Asia Minor during the first quarter of the 2nd cent. (Ignatius—himself a native of Antioch—and the *Didache*, cf. *Mart. Polyc.* 3, ‘the God-beloved and God-fearing people of the Christians’), in Gaul by the middle of the 2nd cent. (Eus. *Historia Ecclesiastica* v. 1), and elsewhere (cf. *Ep. ad Diogn.* ‘Christians are in the world as the soul is in the body,’ etc. etc.). Gradually, as time went on, the title came to assume the position of authority which it has occupied for centuries, though it does not seem to occur on a tomb till the close of the 3rd cent. (Asia Minor). And this process was marked, if not accelerated, by a double play upon the word. (i.) It was often pronounced or mispronounced *Chrestiani*, as if derived from the familiar proper name *Chrestus* (cf. Suet. *Claud.* 25), the vernacular adjective *χρηστός* being equivalent to ‘kindly,’ ‘excellent,’ ‘worthy’ (cf. 1Pe 2:3, perhaps a slight play on the word). Such is the reading of *κ* in the NT passages, of most of the inscriptions, of Tacitus (apparently), and of Suetonius (*Claud.* 25, ‘Chresto’) certainly. Writers like Justin, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria catch at this idea. On the principle of *nomen et omen*, they retort upon their critics and opponents, ‘If our name has this meaning, why hold it up to opprobrium? Does it not suit our characters?’ Perhaps, too, as Harnack conjectures, the very choice of the imperfect *appellabat*, instead of the present *appellat*, indicates that Tacitus seeks to draw a distinction between the popular mistake in a.d. 64 and the more correct usage of his own day (*circa (about)* 110). ‘The common people used to call them *Chrestians* (while nowadays, of course, we know that their proper name is Christians).’ (ii.) The other play upon the word was more private, though it also may have originated in some popular etymology. It was

connected with *Christos* as ‘the anointed.’ ‘We are called Christians,’ says Theophilus (*ad Autol.* i. 12), ‘because we are anointed with the oil of God’ (χριστόμεθα ἔλαιον Θεοῦ, cf. Tert. *Apol.* 3, and Justin’s *Dial.*).—These and other motives contributed to render the term so popular, that there are traces, as early as Tertullian (*loc. cit.*) and Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* ii. iii. 3), of a disposition to ignore or deny its pagan origin and to represent it as a creation of the Apostolic or early Christian consciousness. So holy and catholic a title, it was felt, must have arisen inside the Church. Ignatius twice employs it in order to plead for Christians who are Christians in deed as well as in name (*Magn.* 4, *Romans* 3)—a significant allusion. And he usually employs ‘Christianity’ (which first occurs in his Epistles, cf. *Magn.* 10, *Phil.* [Note: Philistine.] 6) as the antithesis to Judaism.

Two and a half centuries later came Julian’s reaction against the title. It was dictated, as Gibbon admits, partly from a superstitious fear of the sacred name, and partly from contempt for it and for its bearers. ‘As he was sensible that the Christians gloried in the name of their Redeemer, he countenanced, and perhaps enjoined, the use of the less honourable appellation of Galilaeans’ (*Decline and Fall*, ii. 540, Bell’s ed.). Naturally this restriction had but a limited and transient effect. ‘Christian’ became more and more the watchword of the Church, despite the rise of ‘catholic’ within and the use of ‘Nazarene’ (in the East) without.

In the modern usage of the term, three points are of especial interest. One is the frank denial, by Strauss and others, of any right, upon the part of modern Christians, to the title in question (see an uncompromising article in the *Fortnightly Review*, March 1873, entitled ‘Are we yet Christians?’), presupposing that the Apostles’ Creed is the norm of Christianity. The opposite view is well put by Rathbone Greg (*Creed of Christendom*, vol. i. p. xlix f.). The second point is the deliberate repudiation of the name, as savouring of sectarianism, by certain Unitarians (cf. the first volume of Dr. Martineau’s *Life*, by Drummond and Upton). And, thirdly, it is interesting to notice that an American sect, dating from the revival of 1801, called themselves by the name of ‘Christians’ (pronouncing the first *i* long), in order to bring out their unsectarian principles.

Bunyan made ‘Christian’ the antithesis to ‘graceless,’ and various other definitions, practical and philosophical, have been essayed. For Mr. Samuel Laing’s, see his *Problems of the Future* (ch. viii.), and cf. Mr. Le Gallienne’s *Religion of a Literary Man* (ch. vii.), and Sir John Seeley’s *Natural Religion* (pt. ii. ch. iii.). ‘He who can pray the Lord’s Prayer sincerely must surely be a Christian,’ says Rothe; while Martineau’s definition, in reference to a church, runs thus: ‘imbued with Christ’s spirit, teaching His religion, worshipping His God and Father, and accepting His law of self-sacrifice.’ Perhaps the data of the NT would be covered adequately by the

declaration that the name 'Christian' belongs to any one who can call Jesus 'Lord' in the sense of 1Co_12:3. See, further, the following article.

Literature.—Besides the articles in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible i. pp. 384-386 (Gayford), and *Encyc. Bibl.* i. 752-763 (Schmiedel), the Commentaries on Act_11:26 and Histories of the Apostolic age (s.v.), consult Lipsius, *Über d. Ursprung u. d. ältesten Gebrauch d. Christennamens* (1873); Keim, *Aus dem Urchrist.* (1878), pp. 1-78; Carr in *Expositor* (June 1898), pp. 456-463; Harnack, *Ausbreitung des Christenthums* (1902), pp. 37-38, 54, 57, 294-297 [English translation, see Index, s.v.]; also Zahn, *Einleitung in d. NT*, ii. pp. 34, 39-42; Renan, *Les Apôtres*, p. 234 f.; Westcott's note in his *Epistles of St. John*; Farrar, *Paul* (ch. xvi.); Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, pt. ii. vol. i. 400 f., vol. ii. 134. On the later use and form of the word consult Blass, *Hermes* (1895), p. 465 f.; Kattenbusch, *Das apost. Symbolum*, ii. 557 f.; Watkins, *Christ. Quart. Review*, i. p. 47 f.; Ramsay, *Church in Roman Empire* (Index, s.v.); Sanday in *Church Times* (June 21), 1901; and Leslie Stephen, *An Agnostic's Apology* (pop. ed.), 130.

James Moffatt.

☩ Christianity

CHRISTIANITY is the name given to the religion founded by Jesus of Nazareth, which is professed by more than one-fourth of the human race, including the foremost nations of the world. As an abstract name for a fully developed religion, it was not, and could not be, in use from the beginning. Only gradually, as the Christian community reached self-consciousness, and more especially as need arose from without of distinguishing its adherents from those of other religions, was a distinctive name adopted.

It is not the object of this article to sketch in outline the history of Christianity, to rehearse its doctrines, describe its triumphs, or vindicate its claims. But in a Dictionary of this kind it seems desirable to inquire into (1) the history of the name itself; (2) the proper connotation of the name and the best mode of ascertaining it; hence (3) the significance of the changes which have passed over Christianity in the process of its development; and (4) the essential character of the religion named after Christ and portrayed in the Gospels.

i. History of the name.—This is fully discussed in the preceding article.

ii. Connotation of the name.—The difficulties which arise when we attempt to mark out the correct connotation of the word are obvious, and the reason why some of them are insuperable is not far to seek. A definition should be simple, comprehensive, accurate; whereas Christianity is a complex multiform phenomenon, one which it is impossible to survey from all sides at the same time, and accuracy cannot be attained when a word is employed in many different senses, and when that which is to be defined is regarded from so many subjective, diversified, and sometimes incompatible points of view. The essence of a great historical religion—with a record extending over some two thousand years, taking different shapes in many diverse nationalities, itself developing and altering its hue and character, if not its substance, in successive generations—cannot easily be summed up in a sentence. Whilst, if an attempt be made to describe that element of permanent vitality and validity in the religion which has remained the same through ages of growth, unaltered amidst the widest external and internal modifications and changes, the character of such a description obviously depends upon the viewpoint of the observer.

A religion may be viewed from without or from within, and an estimate made accordingly either of its institutions and formularies and ceremonies, or of its dominant ideas and prevailing principles. To the Roman Catholic—who represents the most widely spread and influential of the sections of modern Christianity—its essence consists in submission to the authority of a supernaturally endowed Church, to which, with the Pope at its head, the power has been committed by Christ of infallibly determining the Christian creed, and of finally directing Christian life and worship in all its details. The Catholic Church, according to Möhler and the modern school, is a prolongation of the Incarnation. To the Orthodox Church of the East, the paramount claim of the community on the allegiance of the faithful depends on its having preserved with purity and precision the formal creed, fixed more than a thousand years ago, from which, it is alleged, all other Christians have more or less seriously departed. The Protestant regards his religion from an entirely different standpoint. He may be of the ‘evangelical’ type, in which case he will probably define Christianity as the religion of those who have accepted the authority of an inspired and infallible Bible, and who trust for salvation to the merits of the death of Christ as their atoning Saviour. If he claims to be a ‘liberal’ Protestant, he will describe Christianity as a life, not a creed, and declare that all attempts to define belief concerning the Person of Christ and other details of Christian doctrine are so many mischievous restrictions, which only fetter the free thought and action of the truly emancipated followers of Jesus.

Under such circumstances, can any considerable measure of agreement as to the real essence of Christianity be reached, or a truly scientific definition be attained? The acceptance of the supernatural authority of a single community would put an end to all discussion, but those who appeal to such authority are not agreed amongst

themselves. As an alternative, it has been usual of late to fall back on history as the sole possible arbiter. The historian can only recount with as much impartiality as possible the sequence of events in a long and chequered career, and leave the warring sects and parties to settle their differences as to what true Christianity is, without making any attempt to judge between them.

Both these methods—the purely dogmatic and the purely historical—virtually give up the problem. A better course than either may be adopted. The historical method must be employed at the outset; a careful induction must lay the basis for subsequent deduction and generalization. Christianity is an organism possessing a long and complex history, not yet finished. That life-history is better known and understood now than ever, from the upspringing of the earliest germ onwards, and the laws which have regulated its growth and the principles operating in its development, can be determined in broad outline by the scientific historian without much fear of contradiction. But the analogy between the growth of the Christian religion and that of an animal or vegetable organism in physical nature, fails in certain important respects. On the one hand, the growth of Christianity is not yet complete, the great consummation is as yet invisible. On the other, the origin of the religion of Christ cannot be compared with the deposit of a tiny and indeterminate and almost invisible germ. Before the period covered by the NT writings had passed, what may be called the formative and normative stage of the religion was complete. Sufficient advance had been made to enable any critical student to arrive at a standard by which the true character of subsequent developments may be judged. Criticism, for the purpose of determining the facts of history, must not be excluded from any scientific inquiry, as it virtually is by those who invoke the infallible authority of a Church or a Book. But, on the other hand, criticism must not be merely subjective and arbitrary, else religious truth is simply that which every man troweth, and Christianity nothing more than what individual Christians choose to think it. By a candid and careful comparison of the religion in its simplicity and purity with the various forms it has assumed in the course of centuries amongst various nations and races, an answer may be obtained to the question, What is Christianity? which is neither purely dogmatic on the one hand, nor purely empirical on the other. As Dr. Hort said of the Church, ‘The lesson-book of the Ecclesia is not a law-book but a history,’ so the history of Christianity becomes a lesson-book for all who would understand its real essence.

The question thus opened up is emphatically modern. As the name ‘Christian’ was not given till those outside the pale of the Church found it necessary to differentiate the believer in Christ from the adherent of other religions, so the need of a scientific definition of Christianity was never felt by faith, nor could one be formed, till the standpoint was occupied from which the young science of Comparative Religion has taken its rise. We have therefore to ask, What was precisely the nature of the religion founded by Christ as recorded in the Gospels and Epistles? Has it remained in

substance the same without fundamental change? If, as is obvious, it has markedly altered during a long period of growth and expansion, has its development been legitimate or illegitimate? That is, has the original type been steadfastly maintained, or has it been seriously perverted? Is a norm fairly ascertainable and a return to type from time to time possible?

iii. Changes in Christianity in the course of its development.—During the lifetime of Jesus, discipleship was largely of the nature of personal attachment; it implied confidence created by the teaching, the character, and the works of the Master. Even during this period, however, not only was there room for reflexion and inquiry to arise, but eager inquiry was inevitable. The appearance of a unique personality who spoke as no other man spoke and wrought works such as none other man did, irresistibly suggested the question, ‘Who art thou, what sayest thou of thyself?’ Jesus Himself occasionally prompted such inquiry, and was not satisfied with an undefined loyalty. Once, at least, He pointedly asked His disciples, ‘Who say ye that I am?’ (Mat_16:15). Again and again in the course of His ministry a sifting took place, as the Master made more exacting demands upon the allegiance of His followers, and showed that a cleavage must take place between those who really understood the drift of His teaching and were prepared at all costs to obey it, and those who did not. The tests which were applied were for the most part practical in their character, ‘Whosoever doth not bear his own cross and come after me, cannot be my disciple’ (Luk_14:27). But the ‘offences’ which caused many to forsake Him as a teacher were often occasioned by His departure from traditional and familiar teaching, His assertion of superiority to the highest Jewish law (Mat_5:21-48), and His claims to a unique knowledge of the Father (Mat_11:27) and such a relation to Him, that His disciples were called on to believe not only the words that He spoke, but in Himself. Christ’s ministry ended, however,—and, considering its brief and tragic character, it was bound to end,—without any clearly formulated answer to the question as to what constituted true discipleship, and how His followers were to be permanently distinguished from the rest of their nation and the world.

The question now arises, whether the normative period of the religion ends with the death of Christ, May it be said that when His life is over, the work of the prophet of Nazareth is complete, His words have all been spoken, His religion propounded—it remains that His followers obey His teaching? This position has often been taken, and is usually adopted by those who reject the supernatural element in Christianity. Lessing is the father of those who in modern times think it desirable to return from ‘the Christian religion’ to ‘the religion of Jesus.’ Harnack on the whole favours this view, as when he urges that ‘the Gospel, as Jesus proclaimed it, has to do with the Father only, and not with the Son’; or again, that it is ‘the Fatherhood of God applied to the whole of life—an inner union with God’s will and God’s kingdom, and a joyous certainty of the possession of eternal blessings and protection from evil.’ But he

elsewhere rightly admits that 'a complete answer to the question, What is Christianity? is impossible so long as we are restricted to Jesus Christ's teaching alone.' The more powerful a personality is, 'the less can the sum-total of what he is be known only by what he himself says and does'; we must therefore include in our estimate the effects produced in his followers and the views taken by men of his work. See art. Back to Christ.

Further, if the miracles of Christ, and especially the great miracle of His Resurrection, be accepted, the whole point of view is changed. The disciples, during the short period of His ministry, were slow and dull scholars; only after the outpouring of the Spirit were they able to understand who their Master was and what He had done. Hence the Church with a true instinct included the Acts and the Epistles in the Canon, as well as the Gospels, and to the whole of these documents we must turn if we would understand what 'Christianity' meant to the Apostles and the first generation or two of those who followed Christ. Without entering into controversy such as would arise over exact definitions, we may say broadly that Christ became in thought, as He had always been in practice, the centre of His own religion. It circled round the Person, not so much of the Father as of the Son, yet the Son as revealing the Father. Personal relation to Christ continued to be—what it had been in the days of His flesh, but more consciously and completely—the all-important feature in the new religion. Significance attached not so much to what Christ said—though the authority of His words was supreme and absolute—as to what He was and what He did. His death and resurrection were seen to possess a special significance for the religious life of the individual and the community, and thus from the time of St. Paul and the Apostles onwards, but not till then, the Christian religion was fairly complete in its outline and ready for promulgation in the world.

But it is clear that the real significance of some features in the new religion could be brought out only in the course of history. The first great crisis which tested the infant Church arose over the question whether Christianity was to be a reformed and spiritualized Judaism or a universal religion, for the whole world and for all time. The controversy recorded in Acts 15, aspects of which emerge so frequently in St. Paul's letters, was fundamental and vital; the very existence of Christianity was at stake. It was chiefly to the Apostle Paul that the Church owed her hardly won freedom from the bonds of Jewish ceremonial law and the national and religious limitations identified with it. Henceforward in Christ was to be neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but He Himself was all and in all.

The next two changes are not so clearly definable, though they are hardly less important and far-reaching. They were never brought to a definite issue before a council or assembly, and they do not come within the limits of the NT period. None the less they were fundamental in their character. They concern respectively creed

and practice, doctrine and organization. In the first flush of enthusiasm which belongs to the earliest stage of a religious movement, the emotional—which means very largely the motive or dynamical—element is both pure and powerful. Belief, worship, spontaneous fulfilment of a high ethical standard, religious assurance and confident triumph over the world—all seem to flow forth easily and naturally from the fresh springs of a new life. But, as man is now constituted, this happy condition cannot last very long. A stage succeeds in which the white-hot metal cools and must take hard and definite shape. Faith passes into a formulated creed, the spirit of free, spontaneous worship shrinks within the limits of reverently ordered forms, the general sense of brotherhood narrows down into the ordered relationships of a constituted society, charismatic gifts are exchanged for the privileges which belong to certain defined ranks and orders of clergy; and, when the whole process is over, whilst the religion may remain the same in appearance, and to a great extent in character, it is nevertheless seriously changed. In Christianity such processes of development were proceeding, gradually but on the whole rapidly, during the latter half of the 2nd and the opening of the 3rd century. By the middle of the 3rd century the transmutation was well-nigh complete.

If at this stage the question, What is Christianity? were asked, a twofold answer would be returned. So far as its intellectual aspects are concerned, the substance of the Christian faith is summed up in certain forms of words accepted and accounted orthodox by the Church. So far as external position and status are concerned, the test of a man's Christianity lies in his association with a definitely constituted community known as the Church, possessing an organization of its own, which, with every decade, becomes more fixed and formal, less elastic in its constitution, and more exacting in its demands upon those who claim to be regarded as true Christians.

Such changes as these are in themselves not to be regarded as marking either an essential advance or a necessary retrogression. All depends on the way in which they are carried out. In human life, as we know it, they are inevitable. The mollusc must secrete its own shell if it is to live in the midst of a given environment. At the same time, in the history of a religion, such a process is critical in the extreme. The loss of enthusiasm and elasticity may be counterbalanced by increased consolidation, by the gain of a greater power of resisting attacks and retaining adherents. If the complaint is made that the expression of belief has become stiff and formal, the reply is obvious that genuine faith cannot long remain vague and indeterminate. The Christian must know what is implied in worshipping Christ as Lord, must learn the meaning of the baptismal formula, and must belong to a specific community, which for the sake of self-preservation must impose conditions of membership and translate abstract principles into definite codes and prescriptions. If a community is to exist in the presence of a hostile world, or to do its own work well as its numbers multiply, it must organize; and thus ecclesiastical orders, rules, and formulae inevitably arise.

But the mode in which such processes are carried out varies considerably. The formulation and consolidation may be inefficiently done, in which case the young community is in danger of falling to pieces like a rope of sand. Or the organization may be excessive, in which case formalism and fossilization set in. One of the chief dangers arises from the influx of unworthy or half-hearted members, those with whom religion is a tradition, not a living personal energy. 'When those who have laid hold upon the faith as great spoil are joined by crowds of others who wrap it round them like an outer garment, a revolution always occurs.' And especially when at such an epoch it is sought to define the essentials of a religion, there is the utmost danger lest secondary elements should be confused with the primary, lest an orthodox creed should be substituted for a living faith, and outward conformity with human prescriptions take the place of personal allegiance to a Divine and living Lord.

Whatever be thought of the way in which this all-important change was effected in the first instance,—that is to say, the transition from Christianity viewed as a life to Christianity viewed as a system of dogmatic belief and ecclesiastical organization,—few will deny that before long the alteration was so great that it may be said the religion itself was transformed. By the orthodox Roman Catholic this transformation is considered to be Divinely ordered; the process is regarded as one of steady advance and improvement—as a perfect child might pass into an equally admirable youth and man. According to Newman's theory, the original germs of doctrine and worship were developed normally and legitimately as determined by the criteria he specifies—Preservation of type, Continuity of Principle, Power of assimilation, Logical sequence, and the rest. Loisy, who is severely critical of the documents of the NT, holds the same view of the development of an infallible Church. To the eyes of others the change effected between the 2nd and the 6th centuries appears to be one of gradual but steady degeneration. In their view a living religion has hardened into a technical theology, vital union with Christ has passed into submission to the ordinances of a fast deteriorating Church, and the happy fellowship of believers in a common salvation and the enjoyment of a new life has almost disappeared under the heavy bondage of ceremonial observances and ecclesiastical absolutism.

The substitution of the worship of the Virgin Mary as an intercessor with her Divine Son for reverent intercourse with Christ Himself; the offering of the sacrifice of the Mass by an officiating priest for the benefit of the living and the dead, instead of a simple observance of communion with Christ and fellow-disciples at the Lord's Table; the obtaining of absolution only after private confession to a priest Divinely appointed to dispense it, in place of free and direct forgiveness granted to the penitent believer in Christ,—changes like these made in a religion are not slight and superficial. To some they represent a transition from crude infancy to vigorous maturity; to others they indicate deep-seated degeneration and the utter perversion of a pure and

spiritual religious faith. An organism in process of growth depends upon its environment without, as well as its own living energies within. The history of the Christian Church does not present a complete parallel to this. No true Christian can believe either that it was left to a chance current of events, or that it was simply determined from without by natural causes. But the external factors which largely influenced the development of Christianity—Jewish beliefs and precedents, Greek philosophy and intellectual habitudes, Roman polity and law, the superstitious ideas and observances of paganism—must be taken into account by those who are studying the nature of the change which came over Christianity in the first thousand years of its history.

The point at issue in the 16th cent. between Roman Catholics and Protestants, one which still divides Christendom, concerned the real nature of this development. Had the growth of fifteen hundred years in doctrine, worship, and organization simply made explicit what was implicit in the New Testament; or were the accretions to the original faith excrescences, exaggerations, or more serious corruptions; and how was a line to be drawn between false and true? The Reformation was a protest against abuses which had become ingrained in Catholicism. The need of 'reform in head and members' had been felt and acknowledged long before, and only when repeated efforts to secure it peaceably had proved futile was it seen that a violent cataclysm like that brought about by Luther was necessary before effectual improvement could be attained. The Reformers claimed to be returning to original principles—to the New Testament instead of the Church; to justification by faith instead of salvation by baptism, absolution, and the Mass; and to direct acknowledgment of the Headship of Christ instead of blind submission to the edicts of His vicar upon earth. Luther, who had intended only to remove some obvious abuses which disfigured the creed and practice of the Church he loved, found himself cutting at the very roots of ecclesiastical authority and institutional religion. But, consciously or unconsciously, the movement of which he was partly the originator, partly the organ and servant, meant a resolute effort to return to the faith and spirit of primitive Christianity.

This effort was not final, of course. It is easy now to condemn Luther's procedure as illogical and indefensible, to say that he should either have gone further or not so far. Doubtless the result of the conflict between Romanism and Protestantism in the 16th cent. was not ultimate: the issues raised by Luther went deeper than he intended, but they were not deep and far-reaching enough. To every generation and to every century its own task. But the whole Reformation movement showed that Christianity as a religion possessed remarkable recuperative power; that the organism could throw off a considerable portion of what seemed its very substance, not only without injury to its life, but with marvellous increase to its vigour; and that the essence of the religion did not lie where the Roman Catholic Church had sought to place it. Subsequent history has confirmed this. 'Evangelical revivals,' great missionary

enterprises, remarkable extensions of the old religion in new lands and under new conditions, unexpected manifestations of new features and resuscitation of pristine energies, have during the last two or three centuries illustrated afresh the same power of recovery and spiritual reinforcement, and raised afresh the question as to what constitutes the essence of a religion which is so full of vitality and so capable of developing from within unanticipated and apparently inexhaustible energies. The Christianity of to-day embraces a multitude of systems and organizations, it includes most varied creeds and cults, it influences societies and civilizations that are worlds apart, and the question is perpetually recurring whether there be indeed one spirit and aim pervading the whole, and if so, where it lies and what it is.

This question becomes the more pressing when the future is contemplated. Many are prepared for still more striking developments in the 20th century. The spectacle of two or three great historical Churches on the one hand preserving the kind of stability which is gained by outward conformity to one doctrinal creed and ecclesiastical system, and, on the other, an almost endless diversity of sects and denominations, with a tendency to fissiparous multiplication—cannot represent the τέλος, the ideal, the goal of the Christian religion. Christianity cannot be identified with one Church, or with all the Churches. Whilst many of these are enfeebled by age, the religion itself is young with a perpetually renewed vigour, and not for centuries has it shown more certain signs of freshly budding energy. Each new age brings new problems. As they arise, the power and permanence of a religion are tested by its ability to grapple with and to solve them, and by its success or failure is it judged. The problems of the present and the near future are mainly social, and the complaint is freely made that Christianity has proved itself unable to cope with them. But the principles and capabilities of a religion cannot be gauged by those of its representatives and exponents at a particular epoch. The assailants of Christianity as it is are often the allies of Christianity as it should be and will be. History has too frequently suggested the question which the poet asks of the suffering Christ—‘Say, was not this Thy passion, to foreknow | In death’s worst hour the works of Christian men?’ What new regenerative influences, swaying the whole of society with wider and freer quickening power, will be developed in the 20th cent. none can tell. But the present state of Christendom, no less than a survey of two thousand years of history, is anew compelling men to inquire, What, then, is the essence of Christianity?

iv. Essential character of Christianity.—The interpretation of the facts thus hastily sketched appears to be this. Christianity in the concrete has been far from perfect, that is obvious; its serious and widespread corruptions have often proved a scandal and a stumbling-block. But neither has its history manifested a mere perversion of a great and noble ideal. Again and again in the darkest hour light has shone forth, and at the lowest ebb a new flood-tide of energy has arisen, making it possible to

distinguish the real religion in its purity and power from its actual embodiment in decadent and unworthy representatives.

What we see in Christian history, as in the personal history of Christ upon earth, is the progressive development of a Divine Thought unfolding itself in spite of virulent opposition, under pressure of extreme difficulties, struggling against the misrepresentations of false friends and imprinting its likeness upon most unpromising and unsatisfactory material. When it first appeared on the earth, embodied in the Person and the Work, as well as the teaching, of Jesus Christ, the Divine Idea shone with the brightness of a new sun in the spiritual firmament. It was not developed out of Judaism, the Jews were its bitterest opponents; it was not indebted to Greek philosophic thought or to Roman political science, though afterwards it made use of and powerfully influenced both; it had nothing in common with the current superstitions of Oriental religions; it did not owe its origin to some cunningly devised religious syncretism, such as was not uncommon at the time when Christianity began to infuse life into the declining Roman Empire. A new idea of God, of man, and of the true reconciliation of man to God, formed the core and nucleus of the new faith. In the earliest records this idea appears as the germ of a nascent religion, a sketch in outline which remains to be filled up. In the history of nineteen centuries its likeness is to be discerned only as an image reflected in a dimly burnished mirror, in a troubled and turbid pool. None the less the dominant idea remains; as St. Paul expresses it, the light of the knowledge of the glory of God is seen in a face—the face of Jesus Christ (2Co_4:6). Lecky, writing simply as a historian of European morals, describes it thus (*Hist. Eur. Mor.*¹¹ [Note: 1 designates the particular edition of the work referred] (1894) ii. 8 f.)—

‘It was reserved for Christianity to present to the world an ideal character, which through all the changes of eighteen centuries has inspired the hearts of men with an impassioned love; has shown itself capable of acting on all ages, nations, temperaments, and conditions; has been not only the highest pattern of virtue but the strongest incentive to its practice; and has exercised so deep an influence that it may be truly said that the simple record of three short years of active life has done more to regenerate and to soften mankind than all the disquisitions of philosophers, and all the exhortations of moralists.’

Whether the spectacle of an ideal human character alone has done this remains to be seen, but it is possible with care to distinguish between the glory of the Divine Thought and the imperfect medium through which its light has filtered. We see truth manifested amidst crudities and insincerities, amidst falsehoods which are bad and half-truths which are often worse; a pure and lofty character struggling, mostly in vain, for adequate expression; a kingdom not come but coming, of which we cannot say ‘Lo here’ or ‘Lo there,’ for it floats only in the midst of men as they move, in

their hearts as they ponder and feel and hope—not as an achievement, not as a possession, but as a magnificent conception, an earnest longing, and a never fully attained, but ever to be attained, ideal.

In what, then, lies the perennial and imperishable essence of the ever changing phenomenon called Christianity? The unknown writer of the *Epistle to Diognetus* wrote in the 2nd century—

‘What the soul is in the body, this the Christians are in the world. The soul is spread through all the members of the body, and Christians through the divers cities of the world. The soul hath its abode in the body, and yet it is not of the body. So Christians have their abode in the world, and yet they are not of the world.’

If for ‘Christians’ we read ‘Christianity,’ where is the soul, or vital spark, of the religion to be found? Nearly all are agreed that the centre of the Christian religion is, in some sense, the Person of its Founder. De Pressense closes an article on the subject by saying, ‘Christianity is Jesus Christ.’ But it is the sense in which such words are to be interpreted that is all-important. The relation of Christ to the religion called by His name is certainly not that of Moses to Judaism, or that of Confucius to Confucianism. But neither does He stand related to Christianity as do Buddha and Mohammed to the religions named after them. Not as a prophet of Nazareth, a religious and ethical teacher, however lofty and inspiring, does Christ stand at the centre of history. As Dr. Fairbairn has said, ‘It is not Jesus of Nazareth who has so powerfully entered into history; it is the deified Christ who has been believed, loved, and obeyed as the Saviour of the world.... If the doctrine of the Person of Christ were explicable as the mere mythical apotheosis of Jesus of Nazareth, it would become the most insolent and fateful anomaly in history.’ And as the secret is not to be found in the ethics, neither does it lie in the ‘religion of Jesus.’ Harnack is the modern representative of those who take this view when he says:

‘The Christian religion is something simple and sublime; it means one thing and one thing only: eternal life in the midst of time, by the strength and under the eyes of God.’

That is a fine definition of Theism, not of the historical Christianity which has done so much to regenerate the world. Nor can the essence of any religion be said to lie in its life, if by that be meant temper and conduct. These are fruits, and by their healthiness and abundance we judge of the soundness and vigour of the tree. But the life of a religion in the proper sense of the word lies far deeper.

The chief modern definitions of Christianity have been ably summarized and reviewed by Professor Adams Brown, who, in his *Essence of Christianity*, has produced an

illuminating study in the history of definition which goes far to solve the problem before us. Schleiermacher, Hegel, and Ritschl are epoch-marking names in the history of Christianity during the last century, and their attempts at definition probably meet better than most others the conditions demanded by modern inquirers. Schleiermacher's view is thus summed up by Professor Adams Brown—

‘Christianity is that historic religion, founded by Jesus of Nazareth and having its bond of union in the redemption mediated by Him, in which the true relation between God and man has for the first time found complete and adequate expression, and which, throughout all the changes of intellectual and social environment which the centuries have brought, still continues to maintain itself as the religion best worthy of the allegiance of thoughtful and earnest men.’

Hegel represents Christianity as the absolute religion, because in it is to be seen worked out in history the eternal dialectic immanent in the Being of God Himself, the ultimate principle of the Godhead, the Father, being revealed in the Son, the principle of difference, returning again in the synthesis of redemption. Finally, in the Holy Spirit Father and Son recognize their unity, and God as Spirit comes to full consciousness of Himself in history. Christianity, he says, is essentially the religion of the Spirit. Ritschl lays more stress on the idea of the Kingdom of God, but he follows in the steps of Schleiermacher when he defines Christianity as—

‘the monotheistic, completely spiritual, and ethical religion, which, based on the life of its author as Redeemer and as founder of the kingdom of God, consists in the freedom of the children of God, involves the impulse to conduct from the motive of love, aims at the moral organization of mankind, and grounds blessedness on the relation of sonship to God, as well as on the kingdom of God’ (*Justif. and Reconc.*, English translation p. 13).

Dorner is one of the best representatives of the many who lay chief stress upon the Incarnation as the ‘central idea and fundamental fact’ of Christianity, and who find in mediation through incarnation its archetypal thought. Professor Adams Brown himself considers the chief difficulty in framing a definition of Christianity to lie in the attempt to reconcile its historical and its absolute character, its natural and its supernatural elements—the two contrasted tendencies which mark respectively (1) its resemblance to other faiths, and its realization of their imperfect ideals; and (2) its difference from all other religions as the one direct and supreme revelation from God Himself. His own solution may be indicated in the following sentences:—

‘Christianity, as modern Christian thought understands it, is the religion of Divine sonship and human brotherhood revealed and realized through Jesus Christ. As such it is the fulfilment and completion of all earlier forms of religion, and the appointed

means for the redemption of mankind through the realization of the kingdom of God. Its central figure is Jesus Christ, who is not only the revelation of the divine ideal for man, but also, through the transforming influence which He exerts over His followers, the most powerful means of realizing that ideal among men. The possession in Christ of the supreme revelation of God's love and power constitutes the distinctive mark of Christianity, and justifies its claim to be the final religion' (*Essence of Christianity*, 309).

These definitions are cumbrous, and no one of them is fully satisfactory. It is, however, clear that Christianity can never be properly defined if it is regarded merely as a philosophy, a system of ideas; or as a code of ethics, providing a standard of conduct; or as an ecclesiastical system, embodying rites and ceremonies of worship and institutions which are understood to be channels of salvation for mankind. It is a religion, that is, its root or spring lies in the relations which it reveals and establishes between God and men. It was the interpretation of the Person of Christ, the significance found in Him and His work, that changed the whole view of God and of human history, first for the Apostles and afterwards for all who followed them. Christ was to them doubtless a Lawgiver, His command was final. He was also an Example, perfect and flawless, the imitation of whom formed the highest conceivable standard of life. But unless He had been much more than this, the Christianity of history would never have come into being; and if it had had no other gospel for men than the most sublime human prophet could bring, it would not have regenerated mankind as it has done.

A religion may be described objectively or subjectively, from without or from within. As an objective religion in the world, Christianity is an ethical and spiritual monotheism of a high type, the highest that has been known in history, when its character and effects are fully estimated. So far there is general agreement. But the logical *differentia* has yet to be specified, and here opinions vary. If the characteristic and distinguishing doctrinal teaching of Christianity be considered, it may be said that the Incarnation is its central idea. But this must never be interpreted apart from Christ's whole work, including His death and resurrection, and the main purpose of that work, the Redemption of mankind, that Salvation and Reconciliation which He has made possible and open to all. Opinions may differ as to the exact mode in which this has been effected, but the Cross of Christ is its central feature. Christianity without a Saviour is a face without an eye, a body without a soul.

If the Christian religion be regarded from within, as a subjective, personal experience, its essence lies in a new life, conceived in a new spirit and animated by a new power. This power is directly imparted by the Spirit of God, but on the human side it arises from the new conceptions of God given by Christ and the new relation to

Him established through the redemption and mediation of His Son. If the religion be viewed on its racial and social side, it may be described as having for its object the establishment of a brotherhood of mankind based on the Fatherhood of God and the Elder Brotherhood of Christ; a view of man which implies the inestimable individual worth of each, and the ultimate union of all in a renewed Order of which Christ has laid the foundation, given the foretaste, and promised the complete consummation and fruition.

The secret of the power of Christianity lies in the conviction which it engenders that—granted the fundamental principles of Theism—God has Himself undertaken the cause of man; that He enters into man's weakness, feels with his sorrows, and, chiefly, that He bears the terrible burden of man's sins; all this being assured by the gift of His Son and the work which the Son Himself has accomplished and is still carrying on by His Spirit. The metaphysical nature of Christ's Person may not be capable of being adequately expressed in words; the full scope of His redeeming work may be variously understood and may be incapable of being condensed into a formula; while Christians may widely differ as to the way in which the benefits of that work are best appropriated and realized and distributed by His Church in the world. But the essence of the religion lies in its conception of the spiritual needs of man, the ends for which he exists, his sin and failure to realize those ends; in its proclamation of Christ, the once dying and now ever living Lord as Himself the Way, through whom sin may be forgiven and failure remedied; and above all, in the moral and spiritual dynamic which is supplied by faith in the great Central Person of the whole religion, and the life in Him which is rendered possible for every believer by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

As to the claims of Christianity to be the only permanent, universal, and final religion for mankind, no vindication of them can amount to actual demonstration. But the argument would take the direction of inquiring whether history thus far confirms the high claim of Christianity to suffice for the needs of man as man. Is Tertullian's phrase *anima naturaliter Christiana* borne out by facts? Has Christianity, not in its miserably imperfect and often utterly misleading concrete forms, but in the idea of its Founder and the best attempts made to realize it, shown the 'promise and potency' of a universal religion for the race? Such an argument would have to take full account of criticisms like those of Nietzsche and his school, who complain that Christianity in its tenderness towards the weak and erring, in its hallowing of sorrow and its preoccupation with the evil of sin, profoundly misunderstands human nature and man's position in the Universe; that it amounts, in fact, to a worship of failure and decay. These criticisms have not been widely accepted as valid, and they can easily be met—they were, indeed, substantially anticipated by Celsus and refuted by Origen. But such objections are sure to recur, together with kindred difficulties arising from a naturalistic view of man which claims to be supported by physical

science. They can be effectually repelled only by practical proof that the teaching of Christianity accords with the facts of human nature and meets the needs of human life more completely than any other system of philosophy or religion.

On the other hand, the triumphs which Christianity has already achieved; the power it has manifested of being able to satisfy new and unexpected claims; the excellence of its ideal of character, one which cannot be transcended so long as human nature continues to be what it is; the success with which it has brought the very highest type of character within reach of the lowest, as attested by the experience of millions; the power of recovery which it has exhibited, when its teaching has been traduced and its spirit and aims degraded by prominent professors and representatives;—these, with other similar characteristics, go far towards proving the Divine origin of Christianity, and its claim to be the perfect religion of humanity, sufficing for all men and for all time.

It is certain, however, that if the true spirit of the Christian religion is to be rightly displayed generation after generation, and its work rightly done in the world, there must be a constant 'return to Christ' on the part of His Church. The phrase, of course, must be adequately interpreted. Much has been said concerning the 'recovery of the historical Christ' as characteristic of our time, and the expression represents an, important truth. Christ is seen more and more clearly to be 'the end of critical and historical inquiry' and 'the starting-place of constructive thought.' But it is the whole Christ of the NT who is the norm in Christian theology, the object of Christian worship, the guide of Christian practice. The Christ of the Epistles cannot be separated from the Christ of the Gospels. The modern attempt, fashionable in some quarters, to distinguish between the Synoptic Gospels on the one hand as historic, and the Fourth Gospel and the Epistles on the other as dogmatic, cannot be consistently maintained, and does not adequately cover the facts of the case. The Sermon on the Mount does not reveal to us the entire Christ, nor the first chapter of St. John, nor the Epistle to the Romans; but there is no inconsistency between these representations of the Christians' Lord. There is no contradiction between the Christ of the Synoptic Gospels and the Christ of Apostolic experience and the Christ of historical Christianity, except for those who reject the element of the supernatural, which, as a matter of fact, pervades the whole. The Christ of the NT is the object of Christian faith, as well as the Founder of the Christian religion in its historical continuity. To Him it is necessary for His Church—compassed with ignorance and infirmity and not yet fully purged from its sins—continually to 'return,' generation after generation, if His religion is to be preserved in its purity and transmitted in its power. The vitality of Christianity in the individual heart and in the life of the community depends upon the closeness of personal communion with Christ maintained through His indwelling Spirit. 'To steep ourselves in Him is still the chief matter,' says Harnack in one place. 'Abide in me and I in you,' was His own word to

His first disciples, and it must ever be obeyed, if the characteristic fruit of that Vine is to be seen in abundance on its dependent branches.

What the Christianity of the future might be and would be, if this command were adequately fulfilled, none can say; the capacities of the religion have been as yet only partially tested. In Christ, as St. Paul taught, are 'all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge'—the treasures of all-subduing love, of assimilating and transmuting power, of uplifting and purifying grace for the nations—'hidden' (Col 2:3). And the treasure is still hidden, because His followers, its custodians and stewards, do not adequately make it known—have not, indeed, adequately discovered it for themselves. But if in every generation there be, as there should be, a renewal of the very springs of Christian life by fresh recourse to the Fountain-head, then new claims, new needs, new problems, will only afford occasion for new triumphs of Christ and His Cross—the message of Divine self-sacrifice to the uttermost in redemption, as the one means of salvation for a sinning and suffering world.

Literature.—From amongst the vast number of books which bear on the subject of this article, a very few recent volumes and articles may be mentioned here:—R. S. Storrs, *The Divine Origin of Christianity*, 1885; A. Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums*, 1900 [translation by T. B. Saunders, *What is Christianity?* 1901], and *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, 1902 [translation by J. Moffatt, *The Expansion of Christianity*, 1905]; A. M. Fairbairn, *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, 1893, and *Philosophy of the Christian Religion*, 1902; W. Adams Brown, *The Essence of Christianity*, 1903; see also the article on 'Christian, The Name of,' by P. W. Schmiedel in the *Encyc. Bibl.* i. 752 ff., and that on 'Christianity' by T. M. Lindsay in the *Encyc. Brit.*⁹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred]

W. T. Davison.

☩ Christmas

CHRISTMAS.—See Calendar, and Dates, § 1.

☩ Christology

CHRISTOLOGY.—See Person of Christ.

⚠ Chronology

CHRONOLOGY.—See Dates.

⚠ Church

CHURCH.—It is proposed in this article to deal with the references to the Church in the Gospels, particularly as they bear upon Christ's relation to the Church. The other books of the NT, and the beliefs and practices of the early ages of Christianity, will be referred to only as far as they appear to throw light upon the teaching and actions of Christ as recorded in the Gospels. It will be assumed that the accounts of the life and teaching of Christ contained in the four Gospels as well as the narrative of the Acts are substantially historical, and that the thirteen Epistles usually ascribed to St. Paul are genuine. Without this limitation the inquiry would be of quite a different character.

The historical society known as the Church has never claimed to have come into complete existence until the day of Pentecost, and its growth and organization were a gradual process. We shall not, therefore, on any theory, expect to find in the Gospels a complete and explicit account of the foundation and characteristics of the Church, and it will be a convenient method of procedure to take the chief elements of the conception of the Church which was generally accepted at a later date, when the community was fully constituted, and to inquire how far these can be traced back to the teaching of Christ Himself, and how far they may be regarded as later accretions, or the natural but not necessary development of ideas which existed before, if at all, only in germ. Now our knowledge of the first days of Christianity derived from the NT is but fragmentary, and the period immediately following is one of great obscurity; but from the middle of the 2nd cent. there is no doubt about the prevalent and almost universal belief of Christians with regard to the Church. It was believed that the Church, as it then existed, was a society founded by Christ as an integral part of His work for mankind. It was further believed that the Church possessed characteristics which were summed up under the words, One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic. And while it was believed that the Church stood in the most intimate spiritual relation to Christ, it was also held that its outward unity and continuity were secured by a definite organization and form of government, the essential features of which had been imposed upon the Church by the Apostles, acting under a commission given them by Christ Himself. The Church was further regarded as the instrument appointed by Christ for the completion of His work for mankind. The fact that these

beliefs were generally held, at all events from the middle of the 2nd cent. onwards, suggests the following division of the subject. First, it will be asked whether the belief that it was Christ's intention to found a visible society is borne out (1) by what we know of His own actions and teaching, and (2) by the records of the earliest days of Christian life. Secondly, the characteristics ascribed to the Church in the Christian creeds will be examined in the light of the NT writings.

i. Indications of a visible Church.

1. In the teaching and actions of Christ: (a) the Messianic claim and the Kingdom of God; (b) the body of disciples; (c) the institution of sacraments.
2. In the earliest period of Christian history.

ii. Characteristics of the Church.

1. Unity: (a) essential and transcendental; (b) taking outward expression; (c) imperfect.
2. Holiness.
3. Catholicity.
4. Apostolicity: (a) doctrine; (b) worship; (c) discipline.

Note.—The words 'Church' and 'Ecclesia.'

Literature.

i. Indications of a visible Church.

1. In the Teaching and Actions of Christ.

(a) *Relation of Christ to the Messianic Hope and the Kingdom of God.*—The idea of a covenant relation between God and man is found in the earliest records of the Hebrew race. Covenants were at first made with individuals and families; but with the beginning of Jewish nationality there is a consciousness of a peculiar relation between the nation and Jehovah. The idea of a national God was, of course, shared by the Jews with all the nations with which they came into contact; but as their conception of the Deity advanced, and their religion developed through monolatry into a pure monotheism, the idea of Jehovah as a national God passed into the idea of the

selection of Israel by the one God of all the earth for a special destiny and special privileges. Thus the Jewish religion was a religion of hope, and its Golden Age was in the future. This national hope became closely associated in thought with the kingdom,—at first the actual kingdom, and then the kingdom to be restored in the future. After the fall of the actual kingdom, the idea of the future kingdom became, to a great extent, idealized, and in close connexion with it there grew up the expectation of a personal Messiah. It is not necessary for the present purpose to inquire when this expectation first becomes apparent, or to trace the growth of the Messianic hope in detail. The important fact is that at the time of Christ's birth Israel as a nation was looking for a kingdom of God and a Messianic King. With many, perhaps with most, the expectation may have been mainly that of an independent and powerful earthly kingdom; but the remains of Jewish literature in the last century before Christ show that the more spiritually minded Jews undoubtedly looked for a kingdom which would indeed have Jerusalem for its centre, and of which the faithful Jews would be the nucleus, but which would also be world-wide and spiritual in character. It must also be noticed that the doctrine of a Remnant, which had taken strong hold of the Jewish mind since the time of Isaiah, had accustomed them to think of a community of the faithful, within and growing out of the existing nation, who should in a special sense be the heirs of the promises.

The most conspicuous feature in the teaching of Christ, as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels, is undoubtedly His claim to be the Messiah, and His announcement of the coming of the Kingdom of God. In using these terms, He must have intended to appeal to, and to a great extent to sanction, the ideas and hopes of those whom He addressed. And yet it very soon became plain that the kingdom which He preached was something very different from anything that the most spiritual of the Jews had conceived. The old Jewish kings had led the people in war, they had judged them in peace, they had levied tribute; but these functions Christ expressly disclaimed. He would not allow His followers to think of appealing to force (Mat 26:52), He repudiated the idea of being a ruler or a judge of ordinary contentions (Luk 12:14), He accepted the payment of tribute to an alien potentate as a thing indifferent (Mar 12:17). But, on the other hand, the great acts which Jehovah Himself had performed for the Jewish nation, in virtue of which He Himself had been regarded as their King, Christ performed for a new nation. Jehovah had called Abraham and the patriarchs, and had attached them to Himself by intimate ties and covenants, and out of their seed had formed a nation which He ruled; and, in the second place, He had given this nation His own law. So Christ called from among the Jews His own disciples, from whom He required an absolute personal devotion, and to them He delivered a new law to fulfil or supersede the old (Mat 5:17). See, further, art. Kingdom of God.

What is the relation of the Kingdom of God to the Church?—The two things are not simply identical, and the predominant sense of the Kingdom in the NT appears to be

rather that of a reign than of a realm. But these two ideas are complementary, and the one implies the other. Sometimes it is hardly possible to distinguish between them. It may be true that 'by the words the Kingdom of God our Lord denotes not so much His disciples, whether individually or even as forming a collective body, as something which they receive—a state upon which they enter' (Robertson, *Regnum Dei*); but at the same time the whole history of the growth of the idea of the Kingdom led, naturally, to the belief that the Kingdom of God about which Christ taught would be expressed and realized in a society. The teaching of Christ about the Kingdom of Heaven does not perhaps, taken by itself, prove that He was the Founder of the church; but if this is established by other evidence, it may at least be said that His Kingdom is visibly represented in His Church, and that 'the Church is the Kingdom of Heaven in so far as it has already come, and it prepares for the Kingdom as it is to come in glory.'

(b) How far the line of action adopted by Christ during His ministry tended to the formation of a society.—Christ began from the first to attach to Himself a number of disciples. Their numbers varied, and they did not all stand in equally close relations to Him; they were indeed still a vague and indeterminate body at the time of His death, but they tended to define themselves more and more. There was a process of sifting (Joh 6:66), and immediately after the Ascension an expression is used which suggests some sort of list (Act 1:15). As much as this, indeed, might be said of most religious and philosophical leaders, but Christ did more than create an unorganized mass of disciples. From an early period He formed an inner circle 'that they might be with him, and that he might send them forth' (Mar 3:14). The name 'Apostles' may have been given to the Twelve in the first instance with reference to a temporary mission, but subsequent events showed that this temporary mission was itself only part of a system of training to which Christ devoted more and more of His time. The Twelve became in a special sense 'the disciples,' and this is what they are usually called in the Fourth Gospel. The larger body are also disciples, but the Twelve are their leaders and representatives. Their representative character culminates at the Last Supper, where the Eucharist is given to them alone, but, as the event showed, in trust for the whole body.

Certain sayings recorded of Christ in connexion with the Apostles and their functions will be noticed later. For the present it is enough to call attention to the fact that, apart from any special saying or commission, the general course of Christ's actions not only tended to produce a society, but provided what is a necessary condition of the effectiveness and permanence of a society—the nucleus of an organization; and that the greater part of His labours was directed towards the training of this inner circle for carrying on a work which He would not complete Himself.

(c) *The significance of the institution of the sacraments.*—A society, to be plainly visible and unmistakable, requires some outward act or sign of distinction by which all its members can be recognized. Circumcision had been such to the Jews. And in order to be both effective and permanent, a society further requires some definite corporate action, binding upon all its members, and relating to the object for which the society exists. The observance of the Law has been the corporate action of the Jews. No society has, as a matter of fact, succeeded in maintaining itself in existence for an indefinite period without such signs of distinction and corporate actions. Both requirements were supplied by Christ, if the Gospel narrative may be trusted, in the sacraments which He instituted. In Baptism He provided a definite means of incorporation, and in the Eucharist a corporate act and a visible bond of union. This is indeed only part of the significance of the sacraments, but when they are regarded from another point of view it becomes all the more striking that the means appointed to convey the grace of God to the individual should be necessarily social in their character. The general tendency of the teaching of Christ, in the Sermon on the Mount and elsewhere, with regard to the Jewish Law and to the relation of the inward and outward, gives great significance to the fact that He should have ordered any external acts of the nature of sacraments, and makes it still more remarkable that He should have laid emphasis on their necessity as a condition of entrance into the Kingdom and to the possession of life (Joh 3:5; Joh 6:54). And the fact that these are necessarily social is of primary importance in considering the relation of the Church to Christ.

It thus appears from a general view of Christ's ministry as recorded in the Gospels, without taking into consideration particular sayings ascribed to Him, that before the Ascension He had provided everything that was necessary for the existence of a society, for the development of an organization, and for its permanence and corporate action. The only thing wanting to the complete constitution of the Church was the fulfilment of the promise of the gift of the indwelling spirit, for which the disciples were bidden to wait (Luk 24:49, Act 1:4).

2. In the earliest period of Church history.—The conclusions to which the Gospels appear to point will be corroborated if there is evidence that a society actually did exist immediately after the events recorded in the Gospels. Of this early period the only existing record is that which is contained in the Acts. There is also contemporary evidence of the ideas of a somewhat later period in St. Paul's Epistles. If the evidence of the Acts is accepted, there is no doubt of its general tendency. Immediately after the Ascension there appears a well defined body of disciples, led by the Apostles (Act 1:13-15). At the day of Pentecost this body is fully constituted for its mission, and receives a large accession of numbers. The mention of definite numbers (Act 1:15; Act 2:41; Act 4:4) shows that there was no doubt who the persons were who belonged to the society. Nor is there any doubt, from the constant mention

of baptism throughout the book, that this was the invariable means of acquiring membership. It is expressly mentioned even in the exceptional case recorded in [Act 10:47](#) f. Throughout the whole narrative the Apostles appear as the leaders and teachers of the whole community. Membership implies adherence to their teaching and fellowship, with 'the breaking of bread' and common prayer as a bond of union ([Act 2:42](#)). The practice of community of goods is an evidence of the closeness of the bond, while the fact that this was voluntary shows that 'neither the community was lost in the individuals, nor the individuals in the community' (Hort, *Christian Ecclesia*, p. 48). The meetings of the Church must have been in houses, and none in Jerusalem can possibly have contained all the disciples; but no importance is attached to the place of meeting, nor are house congregations ever spoken of or alluded to as separate units of Church life. A theory has been formed that the Church as a society arose out of a federation of house assemblies, but there is absolutely no trace whatever of such a possibility in the Acts: the whole body of disciples is the only unit. The word *ecclesia* occurs for the first time in [Act 5:11](#), and there it is the whole body which is spoken of. In the course of time the increase in the number of adherents led to an advance in organization, the Apostles delegating some of their functions to a lower order of ministers, and soon afterwards persecution caused an extension of the Church to other parts of Palestine. But there is as yet no subdivision; questions which arise in Samaria and Joppa are dealt with at Jerusalem ([Act 8:14](#); [Act 11:1](#) f.). This state of things, however, could not last. When the process of extension had gone further, it became impossible to administer all the affairs of the community from a single centre. And so when a body of Christians established themselves in Antioch, a new use of the word *ecclesia* appears ([Act 11:26](#)). Hitherto it has meant the whole body of the brethren; now it is applied also to parts of the whole. Each centre is capable of separate action, and deals with local affairs, while remaining in close union with the whole. And so the step which was perhaps the most momentous of any that have been taken in Church history—the mission of Paul and Barnabas—was apparently the work of the Church in Antioch alone, without any reference to Jerusalem ([Act 13:1](#) ff.). This mission led to the foundation of a large number of local *ecclesiæ*, each of which was provided by the Apostle with a local ministry ([Act 14:23](#)), while he exercised a continual supervision over them, and visited them as often as circumstances would allow. The difficult questions which arise out of this great extension of the Church are referred to the 'Apostles and presbyters' at Jerusalem. The precise relations between the authority of the whole body and the legitimate independence of the local communities are undefined, but the recognition of the unity of the whole Church and of the Apostolic authority is unmistakable. In the Epistles of St. Paul the term *ecclesia* is constantly used of the local communities, of which he had frequent occasion to speak; the church in a city ([1Co 1:2](#)) or even in a house ([Rom 16:5](#), [Col 4:15](#)) is a familiar expression, and the churches of a region are spoken of ([1Co 16:1](#); [1Co 16:19](#)) in a way that possibly suggests the beginnings of a provincial organization. But 'the Church' is the one undivided Church of which these

several churches are only local divisions. It is in the Epistle to the Ephesians that his doctrine of 'the Church' culminates. It is particularly with reference to this teaching that a distinction has been drawn between the *actual* and the *ideal* Church. This distinction is a real one, if it means that the ideal of the Church has never yet been realized in fact. But neither St. Paul nor any other NT writer draws any distinction, or appears to be conscious of the need of any. The Church, like the individual Christian, is regarded as being that which it is becoming. As the individual Christian, in spite of his imperfections, is a saint, so the existing body of Christians whom he is addressing is the Body of Christ, which is to be presented a glorious Church, holy and without blemish (1Co_12:27, Eph_5:27). See Organization.

ii. The Characteristics of the Church.—Assuming now that the Church is a society founded by Christ to carry on His work for the redemption of mankind, the characteristic notes of the Church, as they have been embodied in the Creeds, may be considered with reference to the teaching contained in the Gospels. It is convenient to state at the outset what the principal passages in the Gospels are which bear upon the subject. In the first place, all the teaching relative to the Kingdom of God bears more or less directly on the Church. Some points with regard to this have already been noticed. Then there are the two passages in which the word *ecclesia* is used, Mat_16:13-20; Mat_18:15-20. In connexion with the former, the other two 'Petrine' texts, Luk_22:28-32 and Joh_21:15-17, may be considered. There are also the charges given to the Apostles in general, Matthew 10, Mar_3:13-15; Mar_6:7-13, Mat_28:16-20, Joh_20:21-23, and the accounts of the institution of the Eucharist. And there is the long passage John 14-17, which specially bears upon the relations of Christ to the Church. The authenticity or credibility of some of these passages has been disputed on various grounds, but it will be assumed for the present purpose that they contain a credible record of the teaching of Christ. It will be convenient to consider this teaching under the heads of those notes of the Church which have been commonly ascribed to it from early times, and have been embodied in the Creeds.

1. Unity.—If the conclusion already reached about the origin of the Church is true, it is clear that it must be one society. The teaching of Christ on this point, as recorded in the Fourth Gospel, is very emphatic (Joh_17:21-23), and He bases the unity of the Church on the unity of God (cf. Eph_4:4-6). It is also to be a visible unity, for it is to be a sign to the world: 'that the world may believe.' It is, however, implied that it will be a progressive unity, not at once perfectly realized (Joh_17:23; Joh_10:10). This is illustrated by St. Paul, who speaks of unity as a thing to be gradually attained to (Eph_4:13). These three points may be taken in order.

(a) If the unity of the Church is based upon the unity of God, it follows that it is an *essential and transcendental*, and not an accidental unity; *i.e.* it is not a merely political or voluntary association of men combining together with a view to effect

certain ends, nor is it merely occasioned by the social instincts of human nature. These lower kinds of unity are not, indeed, excluded by the higher, but they are by themselves an insufficient explanation. It has been maintained that the idea of the unity of the Church is an afterthought, caused by the strong tendency to religious associations which prevailed in the Empire in the early ages of Christianity. Abundant evidence already exists, and more is being accumulated, of the existence of this tendency; but even if it should be shown that non-Christian associations influenced the manner in which the Christian community framed its external life and that they assisted its growth, this would not in the least disprove the essential unity of the Church. As far, however, as investigation has gone at present, it seems that the Church owed remarkably little to heathen precedents. The fact that from the earliest times there were some who more or less separated themselves and stood aloof, has been alleged as a proof that unity was not regarded as essential. But imperfection, as has already been noted, is a condition of the earthly state of the Church; and the strong condemnation with which separation is invariably spoken of in the NT and by all early writers, is very strong evidence of the belief of the Church that unity is one of its essential marks. The existence from the first of the power of excommunication (1 Corinthians 5, etc.), is further evidence to the same effect.

The unity of the Church is, then, a theological unity, arising from the unity of God, from the fact that all members of the Church are members of Christ and abide in Him as the branches abide in the vine, and from the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. From this flows a moral unity of thought and action among the members of the Church, who are bound together by the invisible bonds of faith, hope, and love.

(b) But this invisible unity will express itself, as far as regards that part of the Church which is on earth, in an *outward* form. There has not unnaturally been a good deal of conflict of opinion throughout the greater part of Church history as to the precise nature of the outward form which is necessary. Confining ourselves to the teaching of Christ upon the subject, the first thing to be noticed is that institution of the visible actions called sacraments which has been already spoken of. The necessity for performing certain outward actions at once distinguishes those persons who perform them, and these particular actions are social in their nature, and cannot be performed except in connexion with a visible society. In the next place, the administration of sacraments implies discipline, for a certain amount of organization is necessary in order to enable a society to act, and social actions cannot be performed in isolation. For this Christ provided by the institution of a ministry in the persons of the Apostles, to whom He expressly committed the sacraments. It follows that among the things which are necessary to their valid administration, the preservation of the order instituted by the Church under the direction of the Apostles must be reckoned. And while the Church has recognized all its members as valid ministers of Baptism in case of necessity, the administration of the Eucharist has been

confined amongst most Christians to those who have received special Apostolic authority for the purpose.

It is further held by a very large number of Christians, that in addition to the external bonds of union formed by the sacraments and the Apostolic ministry, the Church on earth, being visible, must have a visible head, and that this headship was given by Christ to St. Peter, and by implication to his successors. Union with the earthly head of the Church is therefore necessary to avoid the guilt of schism. It is alleged that this is the natural sense of the passages which record the special charges given by Christ to St. Peter (Mat 16:13-20, Luk 22:28-32, and Joh 20:21-23), and that this interpretation of His words is borne out by the claims made from the earliest times by the bishops of Rome, and allowed or acquiesced in by the Church at large. It is argued, on the other side, that the passages in question were not interpreted in this sense by early Church writers, and that the testimony of the Acts and Epistles and of early Church history shows that such a position was not actually held by St. Peter. The controversy is of such enormous proportions that it can only be alluded to here, but a few of the innumerable books that deal with the subject are mentioned in the list of Literature at the end.

(c) These inward and outward bonds of union give a real numerical unity to the Church, so that it will be one in any one place, one throughout the world, and one in all time. Nothing less than this can satisfy the conception of unity put before us in the NT. But it must be noted, in the third place, that unity may be real while it is still *imperfect*. The perfection of the Church, in respect of unity as well as of all other characteristics, is possible only when all its members are perfect, and therefore it cannot be fully realized in this life. Any loosening of those bonds which have been mentioned, whether inward or outward, must necessarily impair unity. It is not necessary that there should be an outward breach. A lack of charity, leading to party spirit, such as existed at Corinth, was regarded by St. Paul as impairing the unity of the Church although no visible severance had taken place. A want of faith, or errors concerning the faith, must have the same effect. A departure from the faith of the Church on fundamental matters is called 'heresy,' and any great want of either charity or faith on the part of a section of the Church commonly leads to a breach of the external conditions of union, which is called 'schism.' This again admits of different degrees, and is of two principal kinds. A suspension or refusal of communion between two parts of the Church undoubtedly amounts to a schism, even though both parts retain the due administration of the sacraments and the Apostolic ministry. Such a schism has arisen between the Churches of the East and the West, and it was the work of centuries of gradual estrangement, so that it is impossible to say at what precise moment the want of intercommunion became such as to amount to a formal schism. There is a breach of a very similar character between the Anglican Churches and those which adhere to the Roman obedience. There is also another kind of

schism, which is caused when bodies of baptized persons form new associations which do not claim to be connected with the Apostolic Church, or which reject the sacraments. There is no other cause for such breaches of outward communion than the imperfection of the faith and charity of the members of the Church. But if such imperfection does not in itself destroy the unity of the Church, the external consequences which naturally result from it do not necessarily do so. Heresy and schism impair unity, but do not altogether destroy it, just as the spiritual life of the individual is not altogether destroyed even by grievous sins.

1. *The Invisible Church.*—So far only the unity of that part of the Church which is on earth has been spoken of. But members of the Body of Christ do not cease to be united to Him, and therefore to each other after death. That part of the Church which has passed away from earth is called the Invisible Church, in contrast to the Visible Church upon earth, but they are essentially one. With regard to the state of the departed, very little direct teaching is recorded to have been given by Christ Himself, and we must not presume to speculate too much where knowledge has been withheld. Perhaps little more can be said than that in the parable of Dives and Lazarus (Luk 16:19-31) Christ gave a general sanction to current Jewish beliefs as to the state of the departed, and that His words to the penitent thief (Luk 23:43) assure us that union with Himself is not impaired by death. If this is so, it is sufficient justification for the universal belief of early Christians, that the Invisible Church is united to the Visible by common worship.

2. *Holiness.*—The Church may be called holy because it is a Divine institution, of which Christ is the head, and the special sphere of the working of the Holy Spirit, or because its members, being united to Christ as the branches are to a vine or the limbs to a body, are called to a life of holiness, and have a real though imperfect holiness infused into them. Something has already been said on these first points, and it is hardly necessary to show at length that Christ required holiness from His followers (Joh 17:16-19, Mat 5:48). It is no less evident that the holiness spoken of here and elsewhere is a progressive holiness.

One difficulty which has arisen with regard to this characteristic of the Church is that the want of holiness in many of those who have fulfilled the outward conditions of Church membership has often in Church history led to attempts to secure greater purity by a sacrifice of external unity. The Novatians, the Donatists, and many later bodies of separatists, have made such attempts. The persistency of this tendency in the face of such teaching of Christ as is contained in the parables of the Tares and the Draw-net is somewhat surprising, but at all events it testifies to a deep underlying conviction of the necessity of holiness. St. Paul emphasizes the holiness of any body of Christians which he addresses, by giving them the title of ‘saints,’ however imperfect many of the individuals might be (Rom 1:7, 1Co 1:2, 2Co 1:1, Eph 1:1,

Php 1:1, Col 1:2; cf. Act 9:32). They are both individually and collectively a holy temple, and the habitation of the Holy Spirit (1Co 3:10-11; 1Co 3:16; 1Co 6:19, Eph 2:16-22). And, as has already been pointed out, he does not draw any sharp line of division between the imperfect society on earth and that which shall be perfected hereafter (Eph 5:25-27): he regards both the individual and the society as being already that which they are becoming.

‘As a whole the Church is holy in that it retains faithfully those means of sanctification which Christ gave her, holy Sacraments, holy laws, holy teaching, so that, amid whatever imperfections, her whole aim is that the tendency of her acts and her teaching shall be to promote holiness and the inward spiritual life.... An university is learned, or a city rich, which abounds in learning or riches, although there may be many unlearned or poor, and although the learned or rich may yet be short of the ideal of learning or wealth.’—Forbes, *Nic. Creed*, p. 278.

3. Catholicity.—The earliest extant use of the word ‘Catholic’ as applied to the Church is in Ignatius (*ad Smyrn.* viii. 2): ‘Wherever the bishop appears, there must the multitude be; just as wherever Christ Jesus is, there is the Catholic Church.’ The natural sense of the word would appear to be that of the Church throughout all the world as opposed to that in one place; but this is not the sense in which the term has been commonly used. The Church has been called ‘Catholic’ not because it has actually extended throughout the world, for this it has never yet done, nor even simply because it is destined to be so extended, but rather as possessing characteristics which make it capable of being a universal religion, adapted to all classes of men in all parts of the world, and throughout all time. Even apart from particular words of Christ, such as those recorded in Mat 28:19, nothing is more apparent in His teaching than that the religion which He taught was intended to be a universal religion, in special contrast to Judaism, which, like the religions of the ancient world generally, was a strictly national religion, and appealed only to a part of mankind. In spite of the many anticipations of universalism which are to be found in Jewish prophecy, the controversy which took place in the early Church about the observance of the Jewish law shows with what difficulty the idea was accepted by those who had been Jews. This quality, again, of universal applicability to all men at all times can belong only to a Divine revelation sufficient for the needs of all mankind. Such a revelation Christ professed to give, and the Catholicity of the Church must depend upon its faithfulness to the fulness of the truth revealed in Christ. And so, in addition to the idea of universal extension, the word Catholic has been used to convey the idea of orthodoxy in the communion of the Church. The well-known definition of Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat.* xviii. 23) co-ordinates these two ideas. ‘The Church is called Catholic because it extends throughout the whole world ... because it teaches completely all doctrines which men ought to know ... because it brings into subjection to godliness the whole race of men ... and because it treats and heals every

sort of sins ... and has in it every form of virtue.' In this sense the Church was called Catholic when it was very far from being extended even over a considerable part of the world, and the term can be applied even to the Church in a particular place, as being in communion with and possessing the characteristics of the whole. So in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* he is spoken of as 'Bishop of the Catholic Church that is in Smyrna.' The Church or any part of it approaches the ideal of Catholicity in proportion as it possesses all the qualities which are necessary to make it literally universal; and, on the other hand, 'everything which hinders or lessens the capacity of the Church to be universal, everything which deprives it of part of the full truth or inserts in its teaching anything which does not belong to the truth, everything which cramps its power of getting rid of sin and increasing godliness, has a tendency to draw the Church away from the ideal of its Catholic life. To become such that it could not appeal to the whole world or to all classes of men, to deny essential parts of the revealed faith, to become in its accepted principles a necessary instrument of some sins or a necessary opponent of some virtues, would be, in proportion as this was wilful and deliberate and fully carried out, a sinking below the minimum which the note of Catholicity requires' (Stone, *The Church*, p. 59).

4. Apostolicity.—It has already been pointed out that Christ selected twelve of His followers to stand in a specially close relation to Himself, and to be charged with a special mission. In what is probably the earliest account of their appointment (Mar_3:14), it is said they were to 'be with him,' and that He would 'send them forth.' Hence they were called Apostles (Luk_6:13). The nature of this relation and this mission must now be examined in order to ascertain the sense in which the Church may be called Apostolic. It may first be noticed that a sharp distinction has sometimes been drawn between the position of the Twelve as representative disciples, that is, as standing in a specially close relationship to Christ, of the same kind, however, as that of other disciples, and their position as Apostles, that is, as men sent forth on a special mission. No such sharp distinction is drawn in the NT, nor does it appear to be necessary. The two things are spoken of in the passage of St. Mark just referred to as two sides of the same fact, not as two separable things. The close discipleship was necessary to fit the Apostles for their mission, and it therefore formed part of it.

The nature of this Apostolic mission is stated in the most comprehensive terms in Joh_20:21. 'As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you'; that is to say, it was the task of carrying on upon earth the work of Christ Himself. It seems to be of little or no consequence to our estimate of the nature of the Apostolic functions whether others besides the Twelve were present upon the occasion when these particular words were spoken. The Twelve are frequently called 'the disciples,' especially in the Fourth Gospel. And the mission of the Apostles is not a separate thing from the mission of the Church. If, as St. Paul so constantly teaches, the Church is one body with many

members, the acts of the organs of the body are the acts of the body itself. St. Paul insists equally strongly upon the unity of the whole and the differentiation of function within the whole. And so the point to be considered is not whether a separate mission was given to the Apostles apart from that of the whole Church, but rather what special functions of the Church were committed to the Apostles to be performed, by themselves or under their direction, on the Church's behalf.

(a) One principal object with which the Apostles were sent out in the first instance was undoubtedly that they might *teach* (Mar 3:14). And it is equally clear that this was not merely a temporary, but a permanent function. Even the special directions given to them on their first sending out (Matthew 10) are not intelligible unless a continuance of the work of teaching be understood. And the Twelve were specially trained by close and continual intercourse with Christ for the work of being witnesses to Him (Act 1:8), and it is clear that they considered this as one of their special functions (Act 1:22, Act 2:32, Act 3:15, Act 4:33 etc.). And although this personal witness to the actions and words of Christ was necessarily confined to those who had been with Him, the transmission of the witness and the function of teaching in general are permanent. The commission given by Christ to the Twelve to make disciples of all the nations (Mat 28:19-20) is one which was not, and could not be, accomplished by themselves in person, and it implies the continuance of the teaching office of the Church until this end is accomplished. So it is recognized as one of the special duties of those who were appointed by the Apostles to take part in their work (1Ti 3:12-13; 1Ti 5:17; 1Ti 6:20, 2Ti 1:14; 2Ti 2:2, Tit 2:15 etc.). It is this teaching work of the Church which corresponds to the prophetic office of Christ Himself.

(b) *The worship of the Church.*—The Sacraments, which were especially committed to the Apostles, have been spoken of as social acts necessary to the existence and cohesion of the Church as a visible society. They are also means by which the relation of the Church to God is expressed, and channels by which the individual receives Divine grace. The worship of the Church centres and culminates in the Eucharist, the specially appointed action by which the Church takes part in the sacrifice offered by Christ. It makes a memorial of that part of His sacrificial work which has been accomplished in time (Luk 22:29, 1Co 11:26), and it unites itself with Him in His present mediatorial work of pleading that sacrifice in heaven (Heb 7:24-25). So the whole Church, as the Body of Christ, takes part in His priestly work (1Pe 2:9, Rev 5:9-10), and this has always been emphasized by the language of all the liturgies. See artt. Lord's Supper, Sacraments.

(c) *Discipline.*—A visible society could hardly exist, or at least continue to exist, without some form of discipline. Christ sanctioned for His followers (Mat 18:15), not only individual remonstrance, which may be considered as the gentlest form in which discipline can be administered (cf. 1Th 5:14), but also, in the case of the failure of

this, the collective censure of the community (cf. 1Ti 5:20, Gal 2:11), and in the last resort the exercise of the natural right of a society to expel one of its members (cf. 1Co 5:5, 2Co 2:5-10). These last passages alone would suffice to show, what is certain enough, that the power of excommunication was recognized and practised in the Church from the earliest times.

A still more emphatic commission was given by Christ to St. Peter (Mat 16:19), and to 'the disciples' (18:18). Whatever may be the exact meaning of these words, it is difficult to give them any interpretation which does not include the idea of jurisdiction. At all events the words in Joh 20:22-23 relate directly to discipline, and are of the most unqualified character. If the historical character of these passages is admitted, there can be no doubt that a disciplinary commission was given. There have been, however, differences of opinion as to the persons to whom it was given. The chief views held on this point may be roughly classed under four heads.

(α) It has been held that the position of St. Peter was different in kind from that of the other Apostles, and that jurisdiction was given directly to him alone, and to the other Apostles through him, and that the same holds good of his successors. (β) That jurisdiction was given directly to all the Apostles, and is inherent in their office and in that of their successors, but that it can be legitimately exercised only by those who preserve the unity of the Church by being in union with St. Peter and his successors. (γ) That jurisdiction was given equally to all the Apostles and their successors as the Divinely appointed organs of the Church, and that only a primacy of honour belonged to St. Peter or is due to his successors. 'All the Apostles were equal in mission, equal in commission, equal in power, equal in honour, equal in all things, except priority of order, without which no society can well subsist' (Bramhall). (δ) That the Apostles received no gift of jurisdiction from Christ Himself, and that any powers which they or their successors exercised were gradually conferred upon them by the act of the Church or of parts of it.

Closely connected with directly disciplinary functions are those general powers of direction and administration which must be exercised in a society by some persons appointed for the purpose. That they were used by the Apostles, even with regard to secular matters, is plain from the Acts and Epistles. The Apostolic background is everywhere present in the former book, and St. Paul assumes such powers throughout (e.g. 1Co 11:34). It is by the exercise of such powers of discipline and government that the Church participates in the kingly office of Christ.

We may therefore conclude that the Church may be said Apostolic in so far as it has held fast to the teaching, worship, and discipline of the Church as intrusted by Christ to the Apostles, and according to the order established by them.

Note.—The words ‘church’ and ἐκκλησία.—The word ‘church’ is found in a great variety of forms in the Teutonic and Slavonic languages as the exact equivalent of ἐκκλησία, which has passed into Latin and all the Romanic and Celtic languages. There has been much dispute about its ultimate derivation. Suggested derivations from the Latin *circus* and from the Gothic are now set aside by philologists as impossible. The only derivation that will bear examination is from the Greek κυριακόν. This is used in the *Apost. Const.* (*circa (about) a.d. 300?*) and in the canons of several councils early in the 4th cent., and was afterwards fairly common in the East. It means ‘of the Lord,’ and is used of ‘the house of the Lord, δῶμα being understood. The derivation of ‘church’ from κυριακον is not free from philological difficulties, and there is no sufficient historical explanation of the curious fact that a less common Greek word should have been adopted by the Teutonic languages in place of the usual ἐκκλησία. But there is no other even plausible explanation of the derivation of the word ‘church.’

The word ἐκκλησία is common in classical Greek in the sense of an assembly of the people—literally, *the calling them out* (ἐκκαλέω) by the voice of a herald or otherwise. It is used in the LXX Septuagint as the translation of the Hebrew word *kâhâl*, which has a similar derivation and meaning. Another word, ‘*çdhâh*, is commonly translated by συναγωγῆ, and means properly the congregation itself, whereas *kâhâl* means rather the assembly of the congregation; but there is no sharp distinction between the words, and in the later books of the OT ‘*çdhâh* almost disappears, and *kâhâl* or ἐκκλησία combines both shades of meaning. There is little or no evidence as to the precise contemporary ideas which would have been conveyed to a Jew of our Lord’s time by the use of these words, but they could not fail to recall the thought of Israel as the congregation of God, and to suggest the idea of a Divine society.

It has often been supposed that the word ἐκκλησία was intended to convey the idea of a people or a number of persons called out of the world for the special service of God. The idea of Israel as a chosen people and the idea of the special election and vocation of Christians occur constantly in the Scriptures, but they never appear to be

connected with the words *ἐκκλησία* or *kâhâl*. In both these words the idea of the summons to the assembly, which is their original significance, practically disappears, and the words mean simply the assembly itself, or the people who meet in assembly. See artt. 'Congregation' and 'Church' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible .

The fact that the word *ἐκκλησία* is found in the Gospels only in the two passages of St. Matthew already discussed, has led some to suppose that these passages are later insertions into the original narrative, made at a time when the idea of the Christian society had been developed, and when it was desired to add authority to the idea by a reference to the teaching of Christ. If, however, the view taken above of the general tendency of Christ's work and teaching is correct, His connexion with the Church does not depend upon these two passages only, and there would be much difficulty in explaining the fact that this term and no other was universally applied to the Christian society from the time of the Apostles onwards, unless it were the natural equivalent of Aramaic terms used by Christ Himself.

Literature.—The number of books which deal with the subject of the Church from exactly the point of view taken in this article may not be very large, but the literature which bears more or less upon the original constitution and characteristics of the Church is of stupendous extent; and the most that can be done here is to mention a very few specimens of different classes of books which relate to different parts of the subject. In the first place, most commentaries on the NT deal with the exegesis of the passages which bear upon the Church, but it is not worth while to attempt a selection here. The writings of most of the early Fathers contain either contributions to the history of the growth of the Church, or information as to the opinions of the writers on the subject. A few specially important works are mentioned below. During the Middle Ages there was a great mass of literature dealing with the Papal authority and the relations of the Church to the State. From the time of Hildebrand onwards this aspect of the question was especially prominent. The Reformation period naturally produced abundant discussions in which the presuppositions of the Middle Ages were to a great extent laid aside. In modern times, and especially during the last fifty years, the early institutions of the Church have been investigated with great minuteness, especially by German writers, and there has been a great abundance of general Church Histories, which often contain discussions on the doctrine of the Church. This is also dealt with in all treatises on Christian doctrine to a greater or less extent, and from all points of view. The books mentioned below must be regarded merely as examples of the different kinds of works in which the subject may be studied.

Early Writers: Patres Apostolici (ed. Lightfoot); Irenaeus, *circa (about) Haeres*, iii. 1-9; Tertullian, *de Praescr. Haeret.*; Cyprian, *de Unitate Eccles.*, *de Lapsis*; Augustine, *de Baptismo*, and *circa (about) Donatistas*.

General Church Histories: Neander, *History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church* (English translation 1851); Gieseler, *Compendium of Eccles. Hist.* (English translation 1846); Renan, *Origines du Christianisme* (1883); Schaff, *History of the Apostolic Age* (1886); Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age* (English translation 1895); Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire* (1893); Cheetham, *History of the Christian Church* (1894).

Church Organization: Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der Alt. kath. Kirche* (1857); Lightfoot, *The Christian Ministry* (1868); Hatch, *Organization of the Early Christian Churches* (1880); Sohm, *Kirchenrecht* (1892); Gore, *The Ministry of the Christian Church* (1888); Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry* (1902).

Doctrinal Books (General.): (Roman Catholic) Scheeben, *Handbuch der Kath. Dogmatik* (1878); Schoupe, *Elementa Theologiae Dogmaticae* (1861); Hunter, *Outlines of Dogmatic Theology* (1895); (Lutheran) Dorner, *System of Christian Doctrine* (English translation 1880); Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics* (English translation 1866); (non-Catholic) Harnack, *History of Dogma* (English translation 1894); Seeberg, *Dogmengesch.* (1886); (Anglican) Forbes, *Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles* (1867), and *Explanation of the Nicene Creed* (1865); Mason, *The Faith of the Gospel* (1888); Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles* (1896); Stone, *Outlines of Christian Dogma* (1900).

Books bearing more exclusively on the subject of this article: Lacordaire, *Conférences de l'Église* (1849); Seeley, *Ecce Homo* (1866); Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims* (1898); Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia* (1893); Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood* (1897); Robertson, *Regnum Dei* (1902); Tyrrell Green, *The Church of Christ* (1902).

J. H. Maude.

Chuza

CHUZA (Χουζᾶς).—The ἐπιτροπος or house-steward of Herod the tetrarch, and husband of Joanna one of the women who, having been healed either of a sickness or of an evil spirit, attached themselves to Jesus and ‘ministered unto him of their substance’ (Luk 8:3). Chuza is identified by Mr. Stanley Cook (*Glossary of Aramaic Inscriptions*, Cambr. 1898) with the father of one Hayyân whose family erected a rock-cut tomb at

el-Hegr in Arabia, with the inscription: אחדה בוזא בד לחץ 'To Hayyân, son of Kûzâ, his posterity (erected this tomb).' The monument is probably of the 1st cent. b.c. or a.d. Blass (of the Gospels), on the authority of , a 7th cent. MS of the Vulgate, identifies the name with the Greek Κυδίας; but this seems more than doubtful. Chuza may have been of a Nabataean family, married to a Jewish wife. Joanna is also mentioned ([Luk_24:10](#)) as one of the women who came early to the sepulchre to anoint the Lord's body (See Joanna).

Chuzas is preferred by the American Committee of Revisers as the more proper spelling of Chuza.

Literature.—Expositor, v. ix. [1899] 118 ff.; Edersheim, *Life and Times*, i. 429, 572.

R. Macpherson.

⚔ Circumcision

CIRCUMCISION (מילה, περιτομή).—With the origin* [Note: Its very early origin is shown by the fact that the rite was originally performed with a stone implement, see Riehm, HWB, art. 'Beschneidung'; cf. [Jos_5:2](#).] of this rite we are not here concerned; as regards the three main theories—that it was a tribal mark, that it was of the nature of a sacrifice to the deity, and that it was practised from hygienic motives—see the Literature at the end of this article.

Circumcision was very far from being confined to the Hebrews; it was practised by the ancient Arabs (Eusebius, *Praep. Evangelica*, vi. 11; W. R. Smith, *Rel. of the Semites*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 328; Wellhausen, *Reste Arab.* [Note: Arabic.] *Heident.*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] pp. 174-176; H. H. Ploss, *Das Kind in Brauch und Sitte der Völker*, i. 295-300; Bertherand, *Médecine et Hygiène des Arabes*, pp. 306-314) as well as by the Mohammedans (Nöldeke, *Sketches from Eastern Hist.* p. 68), by the Ethiopians (Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 4), by the Kaffirs (J. G. Frazer, *Golden Bough*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , i. 327) and other African races (Hartmann, *Die Völker Afrikas*, i. 178; Ploss, *op. cit.* i. 295 f.), by many central Australian tribes (J. G. Frazer, *Totemism*, p. 47; Lagrange, *Études sur les religions sémitiques*, p. 239 ff.; Ploss, *op. cit.* ii. 250, 255, who says it is practised by the central, northern, and northwestern tribes, but not by those in the east and

south-west), by the Egyptians (Ebers, *aegypten und die Bucher Mose's*, i. 278; Lagrange, *op. cit.* p. 241 ff.), and by the Aztecs and other Central American races (*Jewish Encyc.* iv. 97), etc.

The great difference between the *national* observance of the rite by the Hebrews (however one may seek to account for the somewhat conflicting statements in Gen 7:12, Exo 4:25-26, and Jos 5:5; cf. Joh 7:22)[†] [Note: It is noteworthy that as a physical act circumcision is not considered in the book of Deuteronomy, though it is used in a figurative sense, 10:16, 30:16.] and that of other peoples was, firstly, that its significance was wholly *religious*,—the outward symbol of a covenant with God,—it was a religious act, whereas, among other nations, whatever the reason may have been for practising circumcision, it did not occupy a position like this;[‡] [Note: A certain religious element, though in quite a subordinate sense, has been observed in the performance of the rite in some races, e.g. among the Polynesians (see Ploss, *op. cit.* i. 299 f.). In later Judaism, when sacrifices had ceased, circumcision and the keeping of the Sabbath were regarded as substitutes for sacrifices.] and secondly, that the Hebrews performed circumcision on the eighth day after birth,^{*} [Note: This applies also to the Samaritans.] *i.e.* in infancy, whereas among other races it almost invariably took place at the age of puberty.[†] [Note: An exception to this is found among the Persians, who circumcise their children at any age from eight days to ten years, though it is unusual to do so at the earliest age (see, further, Ploss, *op. cit.* p. 248ff.).] It is possible that this difference between the Mosaic Code and the usage of others was due to the more humane character of the former, which enjoined the rite at a time when least painful.[‡] [Note: Bertherand, *Médecine des Arabes*, p. 306; Driver, *Genesis*, p. 190.]

It was the custom among the Hebrews at all times, as it is among modern Jews,[§] [Note: The so-called Reform Jews are an exception.] to give a boy | [Note: | Girls receive their name on the day of birth.] a name at his circumcision[¶] [Note: With this may be compared the custom among some primitive races of changing the name at circumcision.] (see Luk 2:21). The rite had to be performed on the eighth day after birth, even though that day happened to be a Sabbath; technically this was a breaking of the Sabbath, but the law concerning circumcision took precedence here (see Christ's words in Joh 7:22 f.). If, however, from one cause or another, e.g. sickness, a child's circumcision had to be postponed, the rite could under no circumstances be performed on the Sabbath.^{**} [Note: * Cf. A. Asher, *The Jewish Rite of Circumcision*, p. 41 f.] In the time of Christ the ceremony was performed in the house; by the 7th cent. it had become customary to perform it in the synagogue; the modern Jews, however, have gone back to the earlier custom, and have their children circumcised

at home.†† [Note: † For an account of the ceremony as performed at the present day, see Singer, Authorized Daily Prayer-Book, pp. 304-307; Asher, op. cit. p. xix f. Some interesting details will also be found in Jewish Encyc., art. 'Circumcision.'] How fully the Law was fulfilled in the case of Christ is seen from Luk 1:59 'On the eighth day they came to circumcise the child [John]' (cf. Act 7:8, Php 3:5), and Luk 2:21 'And when eight days were fulfilled for circumcising him, his name was called Jesus' (cf. Gal 4:4).

Whatever may have been the original object and signification of circumcision,‡‡ [Note: ‡ See a remarkable art. by J. G. Frazer in The Independent Review, Nov. 1904.] it had lost its primary meaning long before the time of our Lord. By the time of the Babylonian exile it had become one of the distinguishing marks of Judaism; yet in spite of this, it is remarkable to find that in later days there arose a divergence of opinion among the Jews as to the need of circumcision for proselytes. Hellenistic Jews did not enforce circumcision in the case of proselytes, affirming that baptism was sufficient (see the *Jewish Encyc.* iv. 94, 95, where further details are given); the Palestinian Jews, on the other hand, would not admit proselytes without circumcision. The view of the latter ultimately won the day, but the episode testifies to the fact that, in the opinion of a very influential and important class of Jews, circumcision and baptism were analogous rites. Now there was one element in circumcision which may possibly have been of greater significance than is often supposed. It was an essential part of the rite that blood should be shed (cf. the 'Mezizah' cup, an illustration of which can be seen in the *Jewish Encyc.* iv. 99); but blood represented life, was even identified with life (Lev 17:11; Lev 17:14, see art. Blood); it is therefore difficult to get away from the conviction that when a child was circumcised he was consecrated to God by the fact that his life (*i.e.* under the symbol of blood) was offered to God. The fact of circumcision being called 'the sign of the covenant' (Gen 17:11 בְּרִית אֹת; cf. also the modern name מִילָה בְּרִית, and the words in the service at a circumcision: 'From this eighth day and henceforth may his blood be accepted, and may the Lord his God be with him')* [Note: Singer, op. cit. p. 307.] supports this view, for no covenant was ratified without the shedding of blood.† [Note: See Trumbull, The Blood Covenant, passim; W. R. Smith op. cit. p. 314 f., Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia², p. 57 ff.] *i.e.* the symbolic laying down of a life.

If circumcision, then, was in a certain sense a *death* (or at least a symbol of life laid down), there is a very striking analogy between it and baptism; cf. the words of St. Paul in Rom 6:3 ff. 'Are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so

we also might walk in newness of life ...' Both circumcision and baptism were a figurative death, by means of which a new spiritual life was reached. In the later Jewish literature this view was held with regard to circumcision, as the following quotation, for example, will show: 'According to Pirke R. El.... Pharaoh prevented the Hebrew slaves from performing the rite; but when the Passover time came and brought them deliverance, they underwent circumcision, and mingled the blood of the Paschal lamb with that of the Abrahamic covenant, wherefore (Eze_16:6) God repeats the words: *In thy blood live.*' ‡ [Note: Jewish Encyc. iv. 93b.] The same thought is brought out in the modern 'service at a circumcision,' when the *Mohel*^s [Note: An official specially qualified to perform the rite.] says, in reference to the newly circumcised: 'Let thy father and thy mother rejoice, and let her that bare thee be glad; and it is said, And I passed by thee, and I saw thee weltering in thy blood, and I said unto thee, "In thy blood live." ' | [Note: | Singer, op. cit. p. 305.]

Taking these facts together, we must regard the circumcision of Christ as of the highest significance; for it was not only a fulfilling of the Law, but inasmuch as it was symbolic of a life laid down, it must also be regarded as a 'parable' of the Crucifixion (cf. Milton, *Poetical Works*, 'Upon the Circumcision'; Keble, *Christian Year*, 'The Circumcision of Christ').

Literature.—H. H. Ploss, *Das Kind in Brauch und Sitte der Volker*, i. 295-300, ii. 250 ff., Stuttgart, 1876, *Geschichtliches und Ethnologisches über Kuaben-Beschneidung*, Leipzig, 1885; A. Asher, *The Jewish Rite of Circumcision, with the Prayers and Laws appertaining thereto* (English translation), 1873, very useful, but must be used with caution; Stade in *ZATW* [Note: ATW Zeitschrift für die Alttest. Wissenschaft.] , 1886, a most interesting and instructive article on the origin of the rite in the Hebrew nation; an article in *ZDPV* [Note: DPV Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.] xvii. 89 ff. is also useful; Harper, *Priestly Element in OT²* [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , Chicago, 1905, 149 f., and the lit. there; Driver, *Genesis*, London, 1904, pp. 189-191; Bertherand, *Médecine et Hygiène des Arabes*, Paris, 1855, gives many interesting details concerning the modern rite among Arabs generally, though the work deals mainly with Algeria. There is also much information to be gathered here and there in J. H. Petermann's *Reisen im Orient*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1860. The articles in the works on *Hebräische Archdologie* by Nowack and Benzinger, as well as that on 'Beschneidung' in Hamburger's *RE* [Note: E Realencyklopädie.] , should be consulted; cf. also art. 'Circumcision' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible and in the *Encyc. Bibl.* and the *Jewish Encyclopedia*.

W. O. E. Oesterley.

◻ Circumstantiality In The Parables

CIRCUMSTANTIALITY IN THE PARABLES.—A parable consists of two members, viz. an illustration and a didactic part, which, according to the view we hold, may be called either the interpretation or the application. Both members are necessary to make the parable complete, though the didactic part need not be expressly stated, the circumstances in which the illustration is given making its purpose plain.

Unfortunately the parables of Christ are mostly preserved only in fragmentary form. We have the illustrations, but not the lessons they were designed to enforce; and as we are uncertain as to the connexion in which those illustrations were given, it is sometimes difficult to make sure what Christ intended to teach by them. But if the Evangelists give little, sometimes even a misleading, light as to the context in which the parables were spoken, they record the illustrative portions of them with much fulness of detail. Particularly is this the case with those parables in which the illustration is in the form of a narrative. The story is told with much circumstantiality. Many little touches are introduced to heighten the effect. We are almost inclined to forget, at times, that the story is told with a purpose, so fully and circumstantially are its details narrated. Among the Evangelists, St. Luke is the most pronounced in the circumstantiality with which he reproduces the stories which Christ introduced in His parables. He likes to linger over them. He elaborates with a fulness of detail that brings the scene vividly before the mind. But though St. Luke is pre-eminent in this respect, all the Synoptists present the illustrative portion of the parables with more or less circumstantiality. And this feature of the parables suggests some questions which we may consider under the following heads:—(1) In how far is the circumstantiality of the narratives authentic? (2) If we accept the traditional principle of parabolical ‘interpretation,’ can we fix a limit beyond which it is illegitimate to interpret the details? (3) If we reject this principle of parabolical ‘interpretation,’ can we meet the objection that the circumstantiality of the illustrations is empty ornament?

1. The question of the authenticity of the circumstantiality of the illustrations is in many cases forced upon us by the fact that details which are recorded by one Evangelist are omitted by another. For instance, in the parable of the Sower, St. Matthew and St. Mark say of the seed that fell by the wayside, that the fowls came and devoured it up, but St. Luke adds that it was trodden down (Luk 8:5). Again, in the parable of the Patch on the Old Garment, St. Matthew and St. Mark describe the patch as a piece of undressed cloth, while St. Luke heightens the folly of the proceeding by making the patch first be cut out of a new garment (ἀπὸ ἱματίου καινοῦ σχίσσας, Luk 5:36). In many cases we find the explanation of such variations in the

details of the parables in the desire of the Evangelists to emphasize the point and heighten the effect of the illustration. Such is possibly the case with the examples just given, and many other instances of the same tendency might be cited. To give a few more,—in the parable of the Supper (Mat 22:1-14, Luk 14:15-24), St. Matthew merely says that the guests made light of the invitation and went their ways, one to his farm, another to his merchandise (Mat 22:5); while St. Luke puts various excuses into the mouth of the guests (Luk 14:18-20). In the parable of the Lost Sheep (Mat 18:12-14, Luk 15:4-7), St. Luke represents the owner as taking the lost sheep, when he has found it, upon his shoulders. In the parable of the Houses built upon the Rock and upon the Sand (Mat 7:24-27, Luk 6:47-49), St. Matthew says merely that the wise man built upon the rock and the foolish upon the sand; but St. Luke represents the one as having to dig and go deep to find a foundation, while the other builds without a foundation, upon the earth. But in other cases we must assign a different motive for the variation in the details of the parables. Many seem due to an allegorizing tendency on the part of the Evangelists. They regarded the characters and events of the narratives as the counterparts of like characters and events in the religious sphere, and introduced details from this latter sphere into the illustration. Thus, for instance, when we compare St. Matthew's version of the parable of the Supper with St. Luke's (Mat 22:1-14, Luk 14:15-24), many of the new features in St. Matthew appear to be due to this tendency. The Supper of St. Luke has become the marriage-feast of the king's son, *i.e.* the Messiah; the king, in spite of the refusal of the guests, sends them a second invitation (Mat 22:3-4); they ill-treat and slay the servants who bring the invitation, and the king sends forth his armies to destroy them and to bum their city (Mat 22:6-7). Evidently these details are suggested by the thought of Israel's behaviour towards her God, and the fate that overtook her. Again, in the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, St. Mark relates that they took the son and slew him and cast him out of the vineyard; while St. Matthew and St. Luke reverse the order, and make them first cast him out and then slay him, with evident reference to the fate of Jesus (Mat 27:31-33, cf. Heb 13:12). Again, in the parable of the Watchful Servants (Mar 13:33-37, Luk 12:35-38), St. Luke represents the master as girding himself and making them sit down to meat and serving them, though he has himself borne witness (Luk 17:7 ff.) to the unlikelihood of such conduct on the part of any ordinary master. Such extraordinary condescension is probably an allegorical feature introduced with reference to the Parousia.

2. If we accept the traditional principle of parabolical 'interpretation,' in how far are we justified in seeking to interpret the circumstantial details so largely present in the parables? There are some who insist that every little detail is significant, and who regard that as the true method of interpretation which seeks to find some spiritual truth to correspond to every item of the illustration. 'Quanto enim plus solidae veritatis,' says Vitringa (quoted by Trench, ch. iii.) 'ex Verbo Dei eruimus, si nihil obstat, tanto magis divinam commendabimus sapientiam.' Teelman (quoted by

Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, i. p. 270) insists that in every parable every word must be significant. And Petersen (*ib.* p. 271) maintains that Christ never introduces the slightest detail into any parable which is not designed to correspond to something in the interpretation. On the other hand, it has been generally recognized that there are limits beyond which the details of the illustration must not be pressed. ‘Sunt autem quae et simpliciter posita sunt,’ says Tert. (*de Pudic.* 9), ‘ad struendam et disponendam et texendam parabolam.’ Chrysostom (*in Mt. Hom.* lxiv. 3) lays down the rule: οὐδὲ χρῆ πάντα τὰ ἐν ταῖς παραβολαῖς κατὰ λέξιν περιεργάζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ τὸν σκοπὸν μαθόντας, δι’ ὃν συνετέθη, τοῦτον δρέπεσθαι καὶ μηδὲν πολυπραγμονεῖν περὶ αὐτῶν. But great difference of opinion exists, even among those who profess to observe Chrysostom’s canon, as to where the πολυπραγμονεῖν begins. Indeed, if the principle of ‘interpretation’ be admitted at all, if the parables, as such treatment of them involves, in spite of all protest to the contrary, are really allegories, it is difficult to see on what ground a line can be drawn beyond which it is illegitimate to interpret the details. The more perfect the allegory, the more will it admit of interpretation down to the minutest circumstance. And so long as the significance attached to these details is relevant to the tenor of the whole, the interpreter may well demand on what ground it may be objected that the details in question are not to be regarded as symbolical. The artificiality of the method and the unsatisfactoriness of the conclusions may be urged as an objection to the general principle of parabolical ‘interpretation’ underlying such method, but on that principle the method itself appears thoroughly defensible.

3. If we reject the principle of parabolical ‘interpretation,’ does not the circumstantiality of the illustrations become mere useless ornament? This is an objection raised against those who contend that the parables are not to be regarded as allegories of which we have to seek the interpretation, but as comparisons between the principle involved in some case taken from everyday life and a similar principle which it is desired to establish in the spiritual sphere. Those who maintain this view insist that it is only the principles or relations involved in the two different spheres that are compared, not the details on either side. There is only the one point of comparison between the two cases, only the one lesson enforced by the parable. In answer to the objection that this seems to reduce the fulness of detail with which the illustrations are elaborated to mere useless ornament, it is replied that though the details are not regarded as significant in the symbolical sense, they are yet full of significance as serving to bring out with force and clearness the thought which it is the purpose of the parable to enforce. Were the illustrations not presented with such circumstantiality, they would not be so convincing as they are. The scene is brought vividly before our eyes; our interest is awakened, our sympathy enlisted. Many of the details which cause such trouble to the allegorical interpreters, as, e.g., the injustice

of the Judge ([Luk_18:1-8](#)) and the fraudulence of the Steward ([Luk_16:1-12](#)), may easily be explained from this point of view. The injustice of the Judge serves to bring out more forcibly that it was the importunity of the widow that overcame him; the fraud of the Steward emphasizes the fact that it was for his wisdom alone that he was commended. And so with all the details with which the parables are supplied. There is no useless ornament. Every little touch serves to bring out more clearly the central thought enforced by the illustration, and so contributes to the effect of the parable.

Literature.—See the list at the end of article Parable.

G. Wauchope Stewart.

City

CITY.—In the East the city developed from the necessity of protection from hostile invasion, and its characteristic was the wall or rampart. It was the wall that originally constituted the πόλις, though in later times its position amongst the Jews was determined by its ability to produce ten men qualified for office in the Synagogue (see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'City'). The κώμη was the village or hamlet, without walls, and was generally a dependency of some neighbouring city. In [Mar_1:38](#) the word κωμόπολις is used, apparently as a designation of a large unwallled village or town. Bethlehem and Bethsaida, though generally classed as cities, are spoken of as κῶμαι in [Joh_7:42](#), [Mar_8:23](#); [Mar_8:26](#), the natural inference from which is that the words 'city,' 'town,' and 'village,' though having, as with us, a technical signification, were occasionally used in a looser and less precise manner.

The government of the πόλις was modelled on that of Jerusalem, where the Sanhedrin (wh. see) was the supreme authority on all matters which, after the Roman domination, did not fall within the province of the Roman governor. According to the Talmud (Mish. *Sanh.* i. 6), in every Jewish city there was a Council of twenty-three which was responsible to the Sanhedrin ([Mat_5:22](#)). Josephus knows nothing of such a Council. The Court which he mentions (*Ant.* iv. viii. 14) consisted of seven judges, who had each two Levites as assessors. The College of Elders who presided over the Synagogue had also judicial functions, but what was its relation to the Council is not easy to determine. The gates of the city were places of public resort; the money-changers facilitated trade; and the various guilds of artisans had special districts allotted to them.

In the time of our Lord, Palestine was a land of cities. Galilee, measuring fifty miles north and south, and from twenty-five to thirty-five east and west—about the average size of an English shire—is said by Josephus (*BJ* iii. iii. 2) to have had a population of 3,000,000. Allowing for patriotic exaggeration, the fact that the soil was so fertile as to make it a veritable garden, and that it was traversed by the three main trade routes of the East, would account for an exceptional density of population. Round the Lake of Galilee there were nine cities with not less than 15,000 inhabitants, some of them with considerably more, so that there must have been along its margin an almost unbroken chain of buildings. The blending of the Jewish with the Greek civilization must have given to these cities a striking picturesqueness alike in manners, customs, attire, and architecture. Tiberias, built by Herod Antipas, was a stately city, whose ruins still indicate a wall three miles long. Its palace, citadel, and public buildings were of the most imposing description, but it was almost wholly Gentile, no Jew who had the pride of his race setting foot within the walls of a city polluted alike by the monuments of idolatry and by its site on an ancient burial-place. Cities like Bethsaida and Capernaum, again, were preponderantly Jewish. Taricheae, not mentioned in the Gospels, is described by Pliny (*HN* v. xv. 11) as one of the chief centres of industry and commerce, and by Josephus (*Ant.* xiv. vii. 3) as a stronghold of Jewish patriotism. Everywhere in Galilee there was an intense civic vitality. The problems of a complex civilization were presented with peculiar force. The Gospel narrative stands out from a background of a richer and more varied life than probably ever existed elsewhere in an organized community, and it reflects in a wonderfully accurate manner all its various phases. This is, indeed, one reason of its universal applicability. It is the application of absolute principles of conduct to typical situations of the most complex character.

This density of population passed over the Lake of Galilee to the region eastward. The Decapolis (Mat 4:25) consisted of a group of ten or more cities east of the Jordan, united in a league for purposes of defence. These were Greek cities in the province of Syria, but possessing certain civil rights, such as coinage, etc., granted them by Rome. The cities constituting the Decapolis are variously named. Pliny (*HN* v. xviii. 74) enumerates them as follows: Scythopolis, Hippos, Gadara, Dion, Pella, Gerasa, Philadelphia, Canatha, and, with less probability, Damascus and Raphana. To the north of Galilee again lay the Phœnician cities of Tyre and Sidon (Mat 15:21). Tyre, even in its decline, was a noble city, with a teeming population. The circumference of its walls is given by Pliny as nineteen Roman miles. Inland, Caesarea Philippi nestled at the base of Mt. Hermon, in a situation of remarkable beauty and fertility. This city received its name from Herod the Great, who built there a temple to Augustus. It was in its neighbourhood that Peter made his striking confession (Mat 16:13 ff.). The cities of Samaria to the south occupy no large place in our Lord's mission. Though Jesus passed through Samaria (Joh 4:4), it is not recorded that He visited its capital, and the disciples were specially enjoined to refrain from preaching the gospel in any

city of the Samaritans (Mat_10:5). Samaria was itself a beautiful city—one of the cities rebuilt on a magnificent scale by Herod the Great owing to its strategic situation—the population being mixed, half-Greek, half-Samaritan, wholly alien, therefore, in sympathy from the Jews, alike through the Samaritan hostility and the Greek culture. The city of Sychar (Joh_4:5), the scene of our Lord's conversation with the Samaritan woman, is generally identified with the modern 'Ain 'Askar, at the foot of Mt. Ebal, about a mile from Nâblus (Shechem). Judaea, with its desolate mountain ranges, was never rich in cities. Jericho lay on its borders, situated in an oasis of remarkable fertility, a city of palms, in striking contrast to the stony and barren region of which it was the gateway. Jericho was rich in the natural wealth of the East, but singularly poor in heroic memories.

But to the Jew the city of cities—the city that symbolized all that was highest alike in his political and religious aspirations—was Jerusalem. Twice in St. Matthew's Gospel Jerusalem called 'the holy city' (Mat_4:5; Mat_27:53), and as such it was enshrined in every Jewish heart through the noble poetry of the Psalter. It was the city where God had His chosen seat, and round which clustered the heroic traditions of the Hebrew race—the city, indeed, with which was intertwined the very conception of Judaism as a national religion, for in the Temple of Jerusalem alone could God be worshipped with the rites He had Himself ordained. The cities of Galilee owed their greatness and importance to commercial or political causes. Though some were preponderantly Jewish, and others, such as Tiberias, almost exclusively Gentile, there was yet in them all a mingling of races and a tolerably free and humane intercourse. Samaria was a great Roman stronghold, dominating the main trade-route from Caesarea on the coast to the East. But Jerusalem remained a city of the Jews, cherishing its own ecclesiastical traditions, and holding its patriotic exclusiveness with a narrowness all the greater from the pressure of the Roman subjection. It had almost complete autonomy under the Sanhedrin. Caesarea was the seat of the Roman Procurator, except during the great Jewish feasts, when he found it necessary to reside at Jerusalem to restrain the turbulence of a fanatically patriotic people who were ready to court martyrdom for the national cause. It is perhaps significant, as showing the ecclesiastical character of the population of Jerusalem, that it was a priest and a Levite who first passed the man lying wounded and bleeding on the road to Jericho (Luk_10:31 f.).

In the time of our Lord, then, the Jews had made the transition from a life mainly pastoral and agricultural to the more advanced life of the city. The Twelve and the Seventy are sent to preach the gospel in cities, and when they are persecuted in one city they are to flee to another (Mat_10:1 ff., Mat_10:23, Luk_10:1). Jesus, after He had given instructions to the Twelve, departs to preach and to teach in their cities (Mat_11:1). The conception of the city as the flower and fruit of the highest civilization is emerging, and the *civitas Dei* is taking the place of the *regnum Dei*, and

thus bringing Hebrew into line with Greek ideals. This fact is very significant for the modern presentation of the gospel. It is sometimes assumed that Christianity is possible only for a primitive community, and many modern ideals of communal life are based on the supposition that the city is wholly an artificial product, and that the way of true progress lies in reverting to village communities. All through the Christian centuries there has been a tendency on the part of many who have felt with singular intensity the influence of Jesus, to seek the cultivation of the Christian life either in isolation or in withdrawing themselves from the strenuous civic activities. The Christian ideal of saintship has been largely that of the cloister. But it is becoming more and more realized that Jesus lived His life in a crowd, that He was so seldom alone that occasions when He sought solitude are specially noted, and that it was the sight of great masses of people that most powerfully touched His emotions (Mat 14:14, Luk 19:41). The gospel of Jesus is essentially a social gospel. Its ideal is a civic ideal. Its precepts have no meaning and no applicability except to those who are living in a community. Its ultimate goal is the 'holy city, new Jerusalem, descending from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband' (Rev 21:2). The fact is noteworthy as showing the place and influence of Christianity in the natural evolution of humanity. For the history of civilization is the history of cities. Babylon, Nineveh, Jerusalem, Athens, Rome, Alexandria, Venice, Florence, and the mediaeval cities all mark stages in the development of the higher culture of the race. The modern city, indeed, still lacks its *raison d'être*. It is as yet a huge amorphous entity, presenting problems which, so far from finding solution, are only now beginning to be fully faced. And the supreme test of the Divine power of the religion of Jesus in our day will lie in its capability of giving to the city rational meaning, of transmuting the blind force of economic pressure to the law of reciprocal harmony, of so applying the principles of the gospel to the marvellous complexities of our civic life as to educe the noblest faculties of the individual while securing the unity of communal existence.

Literature.—Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii. i. 154 ff., 160 f.; G. A. Smith, *HGH* [Note: GH Historical Geog. of Holy Land.] pp. 420-435; Fairbairn, *City of God*, pp. 349-370; Westcott, *Hebrews*, pp. 386-389.

A. Miller.

Claim

CLAIM.—The term expresses a twofold relationship, either to a claim as advanced and enforced or as accepted and complied with. The assumption or imposition of a claim upon another is an act of authority, a relationship of established right and superior

power; while the recognition and discharge of the same claim represent the corresponding social duty.

The narrative of the Gospels describes how Christ moved amid the social and religious relationships of the world into which He came. It tells how He knew all things in the heart of man (Joh 2:23-25), and occasionally drew the attention of His disciples to the real importance of certain personalities and actions (Mat 16:6; Mat 11:11, Luk 21:1-4), where a wrong impression might have been produced; but, as a rule, He does not take the initiative in criticising and condemning in detail the standards, methods, and institutions then prevailing in society. His kingdom is declared to be entirely distinct from that of the world, and it is only when challenged on a question of right conduct that He lays down the principle that whatever Caesar has an undisputed claim upon ought to be regarded as his, and whatever belongs to God should be rendered to Him only. On the ground of previous and higher claims, He expels those who had obtained the privilege of traffic within the temple area, inasmuch as the place had been dedicated to its Owner as a house of prayer (Mat 21:13). The victims of masterful temptation and difficult surroundings (Mat 11:19, Luk 7:37; Luk 18:13; Luk 22:61, Joh 8:11) are regarded with pity and hopefulness. His direct and indignant exposure is reserved for the attempt to give religious sanction to evaded duty (Mar 7:11), or where the name of religion is made unlovely by the proud and harsh claims of those who profess it (Mat 6:2; Mat 23:4-7; Mat 23:23).

Otherwise Christ moves amid the relationships of common life and the claims of organized society, using them as the field of parable and the vehicle of His teaching concerning the kingdom that was at hand. Thus He refers to purchasers of property, money-lenders and interest, employers of labour and the rights of the labourer. Similarly, we have allusions to war, judicial punishment, parental authority, marriage and divorce, fasting and sumptuous living. With regard to all such relationships and connected claims Christ uses the vocabulary and valuation current in the world. The prodigal son declares that he has forfeited the right to which he had been born (Luk 15:19); Zacchaeus (Luk 19:9) and the woman bowed down with infirmity (Luk 13:16) have, as children of Abraham, a family claim that should shut out more distant considerations. This fact gives emphasis to the exceptional instances of Naaman and the widow of Sarepta (Luk 4:25-29). The Syro-Phœnician woman quite understands that local opinion as to race privilege does not allow her to share on equal terms with Israel (Mat 15:27-28). The lineage of natural descent implies that of ethical resemblance (Mat 23:31, Joh 8:39). Parental affection is the basis of the assurance that our Heavenly Father will act still more wisely and lovingly towards His children (Mat 7:11 || Luk 11:13). It is after the fullest recognition of the beauty and power of family claims that Christ calls His disciples to an even more intense and constraining relationship (Mat 10:37, Luk 14:26).

The claims of neighbourhood and hospitality are frequently alluded to. Lazarus, even in Abraham's bosom, must be willing to serve one who had been an earthly neighbour (Luk_16:24). A neighbour can be put to any inconvenience on behalf of a stranger guest in their midst (Luk_11:5-8). The action of the woman who anointed Christ and bathed His feet with tears is shown to be right, inasmuch as the claim of a passing guest was greater than that of those who were always present (Mar_14:3, Luk_7:37-38, Joh_12:7-8).

By the same use of current language and thought, religion is a codification of things bound and free, prohibited and permitted (Mat_16:19; Mat_18:16). Its duties, as imposed by the scribes and Pharisees, are like the load on the submissive baggage animal (Mat_23:4). John forbids those who taught in Christ's name without having the qualifying claim of discipleship (Mar_9:38). With the formal appeal of a litigant, 'Legion' demands a proof of Christ's right to interfere (Mar_5:7). Satan is another taskmaster with claims to be satisfied, and disease is the mark of his property and power (Luk_13:16). Rabbinical rules so far supersede the commandments of God that Christ can be condemned as an enemy to religion (Mat_23:13-39, Mar_3:10; Mar_7:5; Mar_7:9; Mar_10:5; Mar_11:17, Luk_13:14). Afterwards, to one who understood it all, it was evident that attention to their own claims had blinded the religious leaders of Israel to the presence of the Lord of Glory (1Co_2:8), just as the worship of nature, degraded and degrading, had darkened and alienated from God the heart of the Gentile world (Rom_1:21).

It is thus evident from the Gospel narratives that the Hebrew-Roman world, into which Christ came as the Son of Man, had reached a high stage of development with regard to social authority and obedience. The areas of privilege and exemption were carefully marked off from those of servility and compulsion. Legislated right and wrong, like guarding cherubim, faced each other at all the gates of public life. The rich and noble confronted the poor and unclassed, the strong and conquering had their counterpart in the subject and enslaved, the wise and enlightened stood out in relief from the ignorant and barbarous, the male had defined authority and predominance over the female, and free-born citizens exercised a jealous censorship over the admission of strangers and foreigners. The universal pressure of such claims and obligations gave sedimentary stratification to all that was highest and lowest in social order, and only the infusion and uplift of a new volcanic force could invert its masses and confuse such established lines of cleavage.

It was largely due to this prevalence of legal relationship that the first presentation of the gospel to the world took the familiar form of forensic process and judicial pronouncement. A similar desire to present afresh to the present age the mind of Christ and the spirit of His kingdom would in the West draw upon the discoveries of physical science, the principles of commercial expansion, and the incentives of

political empire. In the East it would measure the following of Christ with the self-denial of the devotee, likeness to Him with the claims of caste, and turn towards our Heavenly Father the venerated claims of ancestor-worship.

There were, however, two great relationships in the Hebrew-Roman world that were strangely marked by aloofness and disruption, namely, spiritual fellowship between God and man, and the racial status of Jew and Greek. Among the Jews the voice of prophecy and of direct communication with God had ceased. The word of Ezekiel (Eze 37:11) had been fulfilled, 'Our bones are dried, and our hope is lost.' The message of religious teaching had dropt its preface, 'Thus saith the Lord,' and had come to express the contention of a sect, the presentation of a view, the quotation of hearer from hearer. On this account the teaching of Christ arrested the ear as sounding a note that had become unfamiliar, the voice of original authority. In the Roman world, the most sincere and eloquent teacher of the age (Lucretius) had shown that there was no Divine care for man as had been once supposed, for in his vision of the opened heavens he had seen the gods in a happy seclusion of their own, undisturbed by the sound of human pain and sorrow (*de Rer. Nat.* iii. 18 ff.; cf. Homer, *Il.* vi. 41 ff.). In that jaded and disenchanted day the most popular and reasoned religion could only unite gods and men in the creed of avoided care.

With regard to the mutual recognition of Jew and Gentile, the antagonism was regarded on both sides as radical and permanent. The Jew despised the Gentile as 'flesh and blood,' humanity without religion; the Gentile saw in the Jew the negation of all social instinct, the genius of unnatural hate, religion without humanity. It must have been indescribably wonderful in such an age to learn that 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself' (2Co 5:19). It was a great task that was soon to confront the gospel, for the Jew had to be convinced that the alien had been divinely provided for in the promises (Eph 2:19), and the Gentile had to learn that there was no place for pride where a wild branch had been grafted contrary to custom into a cultivated stem, and owed not only its sustenance but the higher quality of its new fruit to that incorporation (Rom 11:17-24). And yet in a quarter of a century after Christ's death it could be stated as something that had passed beyond comment and controversy,—'There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus' (Gal 3:28; See Power). The Christian was thus a 'new creature,' and for him all things had become new (2Co 5:17); but this did not mean that he had any resident authority enabling him henceforth to please himself. Everything was in Christ Jesus. To come to Christ was to accept His yoke, and the spirit of bondage (Rom 8:15) had only been exchanged for a nobler constraint (2Co 5:14). Wherever there was freedom from the law of sin and death, there was the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus (Rom 8:2).

George M. Mackie.

☞ Claims (Of Christ)

CLAIMS (OF CHRIST).—In any attempt to arrive at the truth with regard to the person of Christ, it is with the self-consciousness of Jesus and His witness regarding Himself that we must begin. To answer the question, ‘What think ye of Christ?’ we need above all to know what Christ thought of Himself. It was the men who knew Jesus only in an external fashion that took Him to be John the Baptist, or Elijah, or Jeremiah, or one of the prophets (Mat_16:14). It was one who had come into the closest contact with the mind of the Master, and had learned to judge Him, not by outward signs merely, but by His implicit and explicit claims, that broke into the great confession, ‘Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God’ (Mat_16:16). Hence it becomes a matter of the highest importance to consider the testimony of the Gospels as to our Lord’s personal claims.

1. The fundamental claim of Jesus was a claim to *moral authority*. And this authority was asserted in two ways. (a) He claimed the authority of a *master*, an authority over the will and the life, to which obedience was the only natural response. It was by this most probably that the earliest disciples were first impressed. ‘Follow me,’ Jesus said to men (Mat_4:19; Mat_4:21 || Mat_8:22; Mat_9:9 || Mat_19:21 ||, Joh_1:43); and they either rose up straightway and followed Him (Mat_4:20; Mat_4:22 || Mat_9:9 ||), or if they failed to do so, ‘went away sorrowful,’ feeling in their inmost hearts that they had made ‘the grand refusal’ (Mat_19:22 ||). (b) But, further, He claimed authority as a *teacher*. If His immediate followers were first impressed by His claim to be obeyed, it was the authority of His teaching that first struck the multitude and filled them with astonishment (Mat_7:28-29). It was not only that He constantly placed Himself in opposition to their acknowledged instructors, those scribes who sat in Moses’ seat, and set His simple ‘Verily I say unto you’ against all the traditional learning of the synagogue. He did much more than this. He claimed the right either to abrogate altogether or to reinterpret in His own way laws which were regarded as clothed with Divine sanctions—the law of retaliation (Mat_5:38 ff.), the law of divorce (Mat_5:31 f.), and even the thrice-holy law of the Sabbath (Mat_12:1 ff., Mat_12:10 ff. ||, Luk_13:14, Joh_7:23). See art. Authority of Christ.

2. But moral authority, like all other forms of authority, must rest upon a power that lies behind. *What right has Jesus to speak thus?* men would ask; What right to call upon us to leave our homes, our friends, our all, to follow Him? What right to bid us accept His teaching as a perfect revelation of the will of God, and His interpretation of the Law as its true fulfilling? Moral authority quickly disappears when there is no moral power at the back of it. But our Lord’s claim to authority rested upon an underlying claim to *holiness*—a claim which His hearers and disciples were in a

position to verify for themselves. There is nothing which gives a man such sway over the consciences of other men as the possession of true holiness; while there is nothing more certain to be found out than the lack of this quality in one who professes to have it. It was the holiness of Christ's character that made His words fall with such convincing weight upon the hearts of men and women. It was His holiness that gave Him the right to command, and made them willing to obey. According to the Fourth Gospel, it was the Baptist's testimony, 'Behold the Lamb of God!' (Joh 1:36), that brought the first pair of disciples to Jesus. They came to see if this testimony was true (cf. Joh 1:37 ff.), and what they saw bound them to Jesus for ever. Publicans and sinners drew near to Him (Mat 9:10, Luk 15:1), not, as His enemies insinuated (Mat 11:19 ||), because He was a sinner like themselves, but because they saw in Him One who, with all His human sympathy, was so high above sin that He could stretch out a saving hand to those who were its slaves (Mat 9:12 ||, Luk 7:36-50; Luk 19:2-10). And this holiness, which others saw and felt in Him, Jesus claimed, and that in the most absolute fashion. He claimed to be without sin. He claimed this not only when He said to His foes, 'Which of you convicteth me of sin?' (Joh 8:46), but by the attitude of His whole life to the facts of moral evil. He claimed it by calling Himself the Physician of the sinful (Mat 9:12 ||), by assuming the power to forgive sins (Mat 9:6 ||, Luk 7:47 f.), by never making confession of sin in His own prayers, though enjoining it upon His disciples (Mat 6:12 ||), by never even joining with His disciples in common prayers, of which confession would necessarily form an element (on this point see Forrest, *Christ of History and of Experience*, p. 22 ff.; *Expos. Times*, xi. [1900] 352 ff.). See, further, artt. Holiness, Sinlessness.

3. A very important aspect of Christ's claims is their point of connexion with the national hope regarding the *Messiah* (which see). There can hardly be any doubt that from the very beginning of His public ministry the Messianic consciousness was fully awake in the heart of Jesus. We see the presence of this consciousness in the Temptation narratives (Mat 4:1-11 ||), in the sermon in the synagogue of Nazareth (Luk 4:17 ff.), in the claim of the preacher on the Mount that He came to fulfil the Law and the Prophets (Mat 5:17). At a later stage He welcomes and blesses Peter's express declaration, 'Thou art the Christ' (Mat 16:16 f.), and, finally, He accepts the homage of the multitude as the Son of David (wh. see), who came in the name of the Lord (Mat 21:9 ||), and dies upon the cross for claiming to be the King of the Jews (Mat 27:11, cf. Mat 27:37). And if until the end of His ministry He did not call Himself or allow Himself to be called the Messiah (Mat 16:20), this was clearly because the false ideals of the Jews regarding the Messianic kingdom made it impossible for Him to do so without creating all kinds of misunderstandings, and so precipitating the inevitable crisis before His work on earth was accomplished. But by His constant use of the title 'Son of Man' (wh. see), Jesus was giving all along, as Beyschlag says (*NT Theology*, i. 63), 'a veiled indication of His Messianic calling'; for hardly any one now doubts that He used this title with precise reference to the well-known passage in the

7th chapter of Daniel (Dan 7:13 ff.), and that by so describing Himself He was claiming to bring in personally and establish upon earth that very kingdom of God which formed the constant theme of His preaching (see Mat 26:64).

4. But if Christ's use of the title 'Son of Man' shows how He claimed to fulfil the Messianic idea, His further claim to be the *Son of God* (wh. see) shows that He filled this idea with an altogether new content, which formed no part of the Messianic expectation of the Jews. No doubt in popular usage the title 'Son of God,' through the influence especially of Psa 2:7, had become an official name for the Messiah (Mat 8:29, Mar 14:61, Joh 1:49). But Christ's claim to be the Son of God evidently meant much more than this. In asserting His Divine Sonship He was not merely affirming His right to an external title of honour, but was giving expression to a consciousness of relationship to God the Father which was absolutely unique, and in which the very essence of His Messiahship consisted. It is true that in the Synoptics He does not expressly designate Himself the Son of God, as He does in the Fourth Gospel (Joh 5:25; Joh 9:35 [*var. lect.*] Joh 10:36; Joh 11:4); but at all events He repeatedly calls God His Father, and refers to Himself as 'the Son' when speaking of God, and that in a sense manifestly distinct from the general idea of God's universal Fatherhood (e.g. Mat 11:27; Mat 12:50; Mat 18:10). In the Fourth Gospel, quite apart from those passages in which Christ assumes the title 'Son of God,' the sense of this unique relation to God as bearing upon His saving relationship to men meets us everywhere, but especially in the farewell discourse and the intercessory prayer which followed (John 14-17). But in the Synoptics also this Divine consciousness appears repeatedly (e.g. Luk 2:49, Mat 7:21; Mat 10:32; Mat 16:17; Mat 22:2 f., Mar 12:6), and it finds full expression in that great saying, 'All things have been delivered unto me of my Father; and no one knoweth the Son save the Father; neither doth any know the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him' (Mat 11:27, Luk 10:22), which serves in St. Matthew's account as the ground of the Saviour's universal invitation and of His promise of rest for the soul (Luk 10:28 ff.). See *Preaching Christ*, 5 (c).

5. In connexion with His eschatological teaching, and forming its central and most essential feature, is the claim made by Christ to be the *final and universal Judge* of men. Not only did He declare the fact of His own Return, an astonishing declaration in itself, but He affirmed as the purpose of His Second Coming the Judgment of the world. This claim to be the arbiter of human destinies is distinctly announced again and again (Mat 7:22-23; Mat 16:27, Mar 8:38). It is further implied in the parables of the Wise and Foolish Virgins (Mat 25:1-13) and the Talents (Mat 25:14-30), and is set forth in detail in that solemn picture of the Last Judgment by which these parables are immediately followed (Mat 25:31-46). The testimony of the Synoptics with regard to this claim of our Lord is supported by the testimony of the Fourth Gospel to the same effect (Joh 5:27 ff., cf. Joh 5:22), and is confirmed by the fact that throughout

the rest of the NT the office of the final Judge is constantly assigned to Jesus (Act 10:42; Act 17:31, Rom 2:16; Rom 14:10, 2Co 5:10, 2Ti 4:1; 2Ti 4:8; 1Pe 4:5, Jam 5:8-9), an office, be it noted, which was never ascribed to the Messiah either in the OT revelation or in the popular Jewish belief (see Salmond, *Christian Doct. of Immortality*, p. 318). This is in some respects the most stupendous of Christ's claims. It was a great thing for Jesus of Nazareth to assume the titles and functions of the Hope of Israel, to declare Himself to be the Fulfiller of the Law and the Expected of the Prophets. But it was something greater still to claim that with His Return there would arrive the grand consummation of the world's history (Mat 25:31), that before Him all nations should be gathered (Mat 25:32) and all hearts laid bare (Mat 25:35-36; Mat 25:42-43), that the principle of the Judgment should be the attitude of men to Himself as He is spiritually present in the world (Mat 25:40; Mat 25:45), and that of this attitude Christ Himself should be the Supreme Judge (Mat 25:32-33). See art. Judgment.

6. That the doctrine of Christ's *pre-existence* is specifically taught in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel, is apparent to every reader (Joh 1:1 ff., Joh 1:10; Joh 1:14; Joh 1:18). But it is not less plain that, according to the author, this doctrine was not simply a solution forced upon the Christian mind by a consideration of Christ's other claims and of His whole history, but was the unfolding of an affirmation made by Christ's own lips (Joh 6:2, Joh 8:58, Joh 17:5; Joh 17:24). In spite of all that has been said by writers like Beyschlag (*op. cit.* i. 254) and Wendt (*Teaching of Jesus*, ii. 169), the theory of an ideal pre-existence is quite inadequate as an explanation of such language. Only by maintaining that John's picture of Jesus and presentation of His words is no record of historical fact, but a theologically determined construction of his own, can we escape from the conclusion that, as Jesus claimed to be in an absolutely unique sense the Son of the Father, so also He claimed to be the personal object of the Father's love and the sharer of His glory before the world was. See art. Pre-Existence.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, artt. 'Son of Man,' 'Son of God'; Denney, *Studies in Theology*, ch. ii.; Forrest, *Christ of History and of Experience*, Lect. ii.; Beyschlag, *NT Theol.* i. 56-79, 236-266; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, ii. 122-183; Weiss, *Bib. Theol. of NT*, i. 73-92; Stalker, *Christology of Jesus*; Ullmann, *Sinlessness of Jesus*, 69-81; Salmond, *Christian Doct. of Immortality*, 313-325; Robbins, *A Christian Apologetic* (1902), 59-87; Forrest, *Authority of Christ* (1906).

J. C. Lambert.

CLEANNES.—See Law, Purification.

☩Cleansing

CLEANSING.—See Temple.

☩Cleopas

CLEOPAS (Κλεόπας, [Luk_24:18](#)).—One of the two disciples to whom the Lord appeared on the afternoon of the Resurrection day as they went to Emmaus, distant about two hours from Jerusalem (See Emmaus). The omission of all reference to the story in 1 Corinthians 15 is not a sufficient ground for questioning its truth. We have no guarantee that St. Paul's knowledge extended to all the actual events of the Passion and Resurrection period (cf. Chase, *Credibility of the Acts*, p. 184). The story may have been received by the Evangelist from Cleopas himself: it bears marks of its early origin in the primitive Messianic ideas it preserves, and in the use of the name Simon for St. Peter. By some (Theophylact, Lange, Carr) the unnamed companion of Cleopas is identified with St. Luke himself; but this is unlikely, as both appear to have been Jews (οἱ ἄρχοντες ἡμῶν, [Luk_24:20](#)), though they do not speak in a tone of such personal nearness to Jesus that we can accept the conjecture that they were of the Eleven. The two were in high dispute about late events, Cleopas apparently taking the more optimistic view, as, in spite of all, he clings to the few facts which make for belief. The inability of both to recognize Jesus is explained in St. Luke to be due to spiritual dulness (οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν ἐκρατοῦντο, [Luk_24:16](#)). The pseudo-Mark (whose allusion does not depend on St. Luke, for he gives a different sequel in Jerusalem) says that the Lord appeared 'in another form' (ἐν ἑτέρῳ μορφῇ, [Mar_16:12](#)); an interpretation favoured by Augustine, who compares the effect of the Transfiguration (μετεμορφώθη, [Mar_9:2](#)). Whatever the cause, the Lord treated them with tenderness ([Mar_9:25](#) ἀνόητοι, 'O foolish men,' Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, not 'fools,' as Authorized Version; cf. Ramsay on [Gal_3:1](#)).

The discourse in which they were enlightened furnishes from Christ's own lips what in fact became the kernel of the preaching of the Apostles, as seen in the sermons recorded in the Acts (e.g. [Act_2:22-36](#); [Act_17:3](#)) and in the Gospels. The two disciples had already given the summary of the earthly life of Jesus ([Luk_24:19-24](#)). He now shows that it was required by OT prophecy that all this should be the means

by which He was to enter into His glory (Luk_24:27 should be read in the light of Luk_24:44-47). It is this teaching that invests the narrative with its peculiar value for the Church, and was doubtless a prime cause of its preservation.

Many of the speculations about the phrase, ‘He made as though He would go further’ (Luk_24:28), would have been avoided if the real spiritual meaning of the incident had been discerned. Knowledge of the Lord’s presence is vouchsafed only in answer to prayer, it is not forced on anyone. This is the NT Penueel (cf. Gen_32:26 with Luk_24:30). It is a too rigid interpretation which regards the breaking of the bread here as a celebration of the Eucharist; rather it was an ordinary meal at which the Stranger, who had so impressed them on the road, was put in the place of honour. Something in His manner suddenly confirmed the suspicion of His identity which was forming itself in their minds. The result which the Lord desired, the corroboration of their faith, having been reached, He vanished from sight. To carry the tidings to Jerusalem, ‘they who had dissuaded their unknown Companion from making a night journey now have no fear of it themselves’ (Bengel).

Literature.—Aug. *Ep.* 149; Stier, *Words of the Lord Jesus*, English translation, vol. viii.; Trench, *Studies in the Gospels*, p. 324 ff.; Latham, *The Risen Master*; Swete on Mar_16:12; A. Carr in *Expositor*, Feb. 1904; Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 315; Ker, *Sermons*, 2nd ser. p. 264 ff.; *Expos. Times*, xvii. [1906] 333 ff.

C. T. Dimont.

☩ Cleophas

CLEOPHAS.—This form appears in some Latin MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] , and is retained in the Vulgate (though against the evidence of Codex Amiatinus) in both Luk_24:18 and Joh_19:25. It was adopted by the early English versions (Wyclifite, Tindale), and passed into the Authorized Version of 1611. It still stands there in Joh_19:25 for Clopas (wh. see), but in Luk_24:18 it was replaced in 1629 by Cleopas (wh. see).

C. T. Dimont.

☩ Cloke

CLOKE (the spelling in both Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 of the modern ‘cloak’).—There was originally a marked distinction between Classical and Oriental costume, a distinction which was lessened under the cosmopolitanism of the Roman Empire; thus the Greek words used in the NT bear different meanings. The two normal Classical garments, the χιτών and ἱμάτιον of Mat 5:40 and Luk 6:29, translated ‘coat’ and ‘cloke,’ were usually of extreme simplicity.

The χιτών, *tunica*, tunic, or shirt (see art. Coat), was the under-garment worn indoors by men and women alike, an oblong strip of material doubled round the body and fastened at the shoulders, without any shaping or sewing, sometimes girt and sometimes ungirt. The *sâdin* of the Jews differed from this in being longer and furnished with sleeves; over it was worn the *kěthôneth*, a long sleeved tunic, open in front, but folded across and girt; this latter formed a second *tunica*, which is the χιτών, apparently, of Mat 5:40 and Luk 6:29. Oriental influences led to the adoption of the long tunic in Rome under the name of *tunica talaris*, a garment which, in Cicero’s time, was regarded as a mark of effeminacy; in later years it was known in its white form as the *tunica alba* or alb. The ἱμάτιον, over-garment or ‘cloke,’ was, with the Greeks and Romans, originally an oblong strip, thrown over the tunic (χιτών) when the wearer went out of doors; in its simplest form it was the *pallium*; more elaborately folded, it was the *toga*. Thus the χιτών and the ἱμάτιον are the under and the over-garment, though what we call underclothing was often worn also. But the use of sleeves among the Orientals made a still greater distinction in their over-garment; the *mě-’îl* and *simlâh* of the Jews were sleeved garments rather like a modern overcoat, open in front, and reaching to the feet. The ‘long robe’ of the scribes and Pharisees (Luk 20:46) was the *mě-’îl*, rendered by St. Luke as στολή, which merely means a long sleeved garment, a *tunica talaris*, in fact; for which reason the ‘great multitude’ of the Apocalypse (7:9, 13) are also described as wearing στολὰς λευκάς, that is, long white tunics, or *tunicae albae*, though in Rev 3:5 the more general word is used—ἐν ἱματίοις λευκοῖς, ‘in white garments’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885).

The classical over-garment appeared in many varieties besides the changing fashions of the *toga*. The *pallium*, Greek in its origin, had become international in its character at the time of the Roman Empire, and was regarded as the mark of a philosopher or teacher; so Justin Martyr preached in the ‘philosopher’s robe,’ and was thus recognized by Trypho as a teacher (*Tryph.* 1). It was for this reason that the *pallium* was chosen by the artists of the Catacombs as the distinguishing dress of

Christ, the Apostles, and the Prophets, and has continued so by an artistic convention that has lasted from the 2nd cent. to the present day. The chlamys, *χλαμῖς*, *sagum* or *paludamentum*, was made of a smaller oblong strip, fastened by a buckle on the right shoulder (as in the Apollo Belvidere); it was a light military cloak, and was the 'scarlet robe,' *χλαμυδα κοκκινην*, which the soldiers put upon our Lord in mockery (Mat 27:28). The seamless 'coat,' for which the soldiers cast lots at the Crucifixion, is distinguished by St. John (Joh 19:23) by the word used for a tunic or under-garment, *χιτῶν*, and not by any of the terms used for the various forms of outer garment, such as we should expect if the 'coat' were the Jewish *simlâh*.

Another common form of outer garment is the *φαιλόνης*, the 'cloak' which St. Paul left at Troas (2Ti 4:13). This was the *paenula* (*φαινόλης*, *φενόλης*, *φαινόλιον*), a heavy woollen garment, generally red or dark-yellow in colour, worn as a protection against cold and rain, at first especially by travellers and by artisans and slaves; hence on the one hand its use by St. Paul, and on the other its frequent occurrence in the Catacombs of Rome (where the *tunica*, the *tunica talaris*, dalmatic, chlamys, *pallium*, and the *laccrna*, a cope-shaped garment, are also found, while the toga occurs only once). The *paenula* was the original of the Eucharistic chasuble, and resembles it exactly in shape (a circle or ellipse, with a hole in the centre), though not in material. As time went on, it was used by all classes, and after the Peace of the Church it became in course of time restricted to bishops and presbyters. It is worn by the ecclesiastics in the famous 6th cent. frescoes at Ravenna, where appear also the *tunica talaris*, still adorned with the orphrey-like strips of the *clavus*, the dalmatic, *lacerna*, and the *pallium*, which, by the process of *contabulatio* or folding, has come to resemble a long stole, and is distinctive of bishops. Thus, while the toga, chlamys, and the original *tunica* disappeared, and are to us typical of classical antiquity, the *paenula*, *pallium*, *laccrna*, dalmatic, and *tunica talaris* were handed on as ecclesiastical vestments (chasuble, pall, cope, dalmatic, and alb), the last named forming a link not only with imperial Rome, but also with the East. See, further, art. Dress.

Literature.—A. Conze, *Die antike Gewandung*; Keil, Benzinger, and Nowack, *Heb. Arch.*; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Dress'; Schurer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.], Index, s.v. 'Clothing'; Wilpert, *Die Gewandung der Christen in den ersten Jahrhunderten*. and *Un capitolo di storia del vestiario*; Braun, *Die presterlichen Gewänder des Abendlandes*, and *Die pontificalen Gewänder des Abendlandes*; Duchesne, *Origines du culte chretien*.

Percy Dearmer.

☒ Clopas

CLOPAS (Κλωπᾶς).—Mentioned in Joh_19:25 as a relative, probably the husband, of one of the women who stood by the cross (Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ). By Chrysostom he was identified with Alphaeus; but this is improbable (See Alphaeus). For his connexion with Joseph and the family of Jesus, see art. Brethren of the Lord and Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , vol. i. p. 322. According to certain apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, he is the same as the Cleopas of Luk_24:18. In that case the devotion which kept Mary of Clopas near the cross till the end finds a counterpart in her husband's sorrow at the Crucifixion. But the identification rests on the derivation of both names from a common Greek original, Cleopatros, and is denied by those who regard Clopas as a Semitic name (see Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, English translation p. 315, n. [Note: note.] 2).

C. T. Dimont.

☒ Closet

CLOSET (ταμεῖον).—Mat_6:6, Luk_12:3 Authorized Version .

The older form of the Gr word was ταμεῖον (found in some NT MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.]), but the later language frequently shows the coalescence of two following *t* sounds.* [Note: J. H. Moulton in Expositor, 6th ser. ix. [1904] 361: 'ταμειον , τειν and ὑγεια are overwhelmingly attested by the papyri, where there are only rare examples of a curious reversion, like that in Mat_20:22' (where WH read τειν, elsewhere πειν καταπειν); cf. Liddell and Scott sub voce, WH, Notes on Orthography, n. 146-170. The Textus Receptus, according to Scrivener, has the older form in Mat_6:6, but the later one in the three other places.] The etymology (cf. ταμιας, 'distributor,' 'treasurer, 'steward,' etc., akin to Πέμνα) shows that 'store-chamber' is the primitive meaning of the Gr. word (*i.e.* not small sitting-room or bedroom). In this sense it occurs in Luk_12:24, and even the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 , following Vulgate and Luther, have been *compelled* to break their rule of uniformity

of rendering in this case. The four occurrences of the Gr. word are dealt with as follows in the versions:—

| | AV | RV | Vulgate | Luther |
|------------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|------------|
| <u>Mat_6:6</u> | closet | inner chamber | cubiculum | Kammerlein |
| <u>Mat_24:26</u> | secret chambers | inner chambers | penetralibus | Kammer |
| <u>Luk_12:3</u> | closets | inner chambers | cuhiculis | Kammern |
| <u>Luk_12:24</u> | store-house | store-chamber | cellarium | Keller |

The Peshitta has ܡܢ ܥܘܢܐ (wánâ) in all four passages, and it seems a pity that ‘store-closet’ or ‘store-chamber’ was not used by Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 in the same way throughout.

Every Jewish house, except the very smallest butts, would have a small room opening out from the ‘living-room,’ as our workmen’s cottages have small pantries, larders, etc., in many cases; but few houses would have a small room specially for private prayer. Yet, curiously, many writers have assumed that Jewish houses did have ‘prayer closets’; usually, they say, in the upper part of the house, * [Note: Carr, Cambridge Bible for Schools; Tholuck, Sermon on the Mount; Lange, St. Matthew; after Kuinoel, and Vitringa, de Syn. i. i. 6.] and many identify it with the ὑπερῶον (ܥܠܝܐ, ‘*ăllyyâh*). Is there any ground for this? The ‘upper rooms’ mentioned in NT were usable as guest-chambers (Mar_14:15, etc.), large enough to accommodate thirteen persons reclining round tables, and (perhaps) even 120 persons (Act_1:15). Would the individual worshipper be able to enter such an important room in a house, and ‘shut the door’ (Mat_6:6) against the rest of his family? Others (e.g., Keil, *Biblical Archaeology*, § 95) think of the frail summer-house on the flat roof.

According to modern European ideas, the Vulgate *cubiculum*, ‘bedroom,’ would suit the context and circumstances well in Mat_6:6, perhaps in Mat_24:26 and Luk_12:3, but not at all in Luk_12:24. Moreover, (a) this rendering loses the connexion with the etymology; (b) the use of separate bedrooms is not common in the East; (c) there are other Gr. and Syriac words to express the idea.

It must be noticed that Mat 6:6 is founded on Isa 26:20, εἰσελθε εἰς τὰ ταμεῖά σου, ἄποκλεισον τὴν θύραν σου. But the motive in Isaiah is fear, in Matthew desire of loving communion. ταμεῖον occurs 40 times in LXX Septuagint . In most cases it retains the meaning ‘store-closet’ (Deu 28:8, Sir 29:12, etc.). In other cases it is a private chamber of some sort as in Mat 6:6 : e.g., Gen 43:30, Deu 32:25, Jdg 3:24. The last case is noticeable. ταμεῖον is defined by τῷ θερινῷ, and represents ἡדר (heder), while ὑπερῶον in the context is ἄλγυᾶ, rather implying a distinction. The summer ‘upper room’ (Authorized and Revised Versions ‘parlour’) had a summer ‘closet’ (Authorized and Revised Versions ‘chamber’) attached to it. In the one Eglon was with his attendants till Ehud came, but they afterwards supposed that Eglon had retired into the other, and would not disturb him.

We now get a group of passages which explain ταμεῖον. In Exo 8:3 (7:28), Jdg 15:1-2 (4)K 6:12, 11:2, 2Ch 22:11, etc., it is the special ‘store-closet’ (leading or opening out from the larger room) in which the bedding required by night was stored during the day (τὰ ταμεῖα τῶν κοιτῶν or ταμεῖον κλινῶν).† [Note: Lane, Modern Egyptians, ch. v.; Purdoe, City of the Sultan, i. 22: Kitto, Pictorial Bible on Pro 6:16 and 2Ki 11:2 : Hastings’ DB ii. 434a.] In such a ‘closet’ the Philistines were hiding while Delilah practised her wiles on Samson (Jdg 16:9; Jdg 16:12, LXX Septuagint , also Ecc 10:20). In such a ‘closet’ for holding the bedding, the baby prince Joash was concealed when Athaliah murdered the rest of the royal family. Samson was possibly in the ‘living-room’ when his wife’s father prevented him from entering the ταμεῖον (Jdg 15:1 LXX Septuagint , note the variant of A εἰς τὸν κοιτῶνα). Such small rooms or closets could be used as more private sleeping-rooms if required, and would also be available for private conference, concealment, or any similar purpose, as well as for the normal use of storing the bedding and other things which were not immediately required. Our Lord advised their use for private prayer. Thus storage was the *primary* purpose of the apartment. The other uses were secondary ones, or adaptations.

The Authorized Version ‘closet’ is therefore quite as correct as the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘inner chamber.’ Of course we do not think of an European cupboard with shelves, in which a person could hardly stand. But Dryden (*Fables*) possibly uses ‘closet’ in the sense of a ‘store-closet,’ as ταμεῖον in Luk 12:24, though he *may* have meant ‘private chamber’:

‘He furnishes her *closet* first, and fills

The crowded shelves with rarities of shells.’

Shakespeare has the other use:

‘The taper burneth in your closet’ (*Jul. Caes.* ii. 1).* [Note: A late member of the Abp. of Canterbury’s ‘Assyrian Mission’ informs the writer of this article that the Peshitta word in the form ta-wáná is still retained in certain parts of the mountain districts, where many old (classical) Syriac words are still in use, but it is not used colloquially in the plains. Ta-wáná is always the little room leading from the large living room; it is that in which the spare bedding is stored. Its primary meaning is therefore “store-room.” Bp. Maclean (*Dictionary of Vernacular Syriac*) gives the meanings “closet,” “store-room,” but if he had reversed these two words, i.e. putting “store-room’ first, I think it would hale been better.’]

On the curious Latin renderings of *d (promptalibus) e (promptuariis)* in Luk_12:3, and *d (promptuarium)* in Luk_12:24, cf. Rönsch, *Itala and Vulgata*, pp. 32 and 48, and Plummer, ‘St. Luke,’ in *International Critical Commentary*.

George Farmer.

☩Clothes

CLOTHES.—See Dress.

☩Cloud

CLOUD.—The cloud appears in the Gospels at our Lord’s Transfiguration (Mat_17:5 || Mar_9:7, Luk_9:34) and (if we may treat the first verses of the Book of Acts as practically part of St. Luke’s Gospel) at His Ascension (Act_1:9). Twice also it has a place in His own prediction of His coming again (Mat_24:30 || Mar_13:26 || Luk_21:27, Mat_26:64 || Mar_14:62).

The most interesting occurrence of this cloud is that in connexion with the Ascension; but it is its appearance above the Mount of Transfiguration that rules the interpretation of its significance. For there a voice comes out of it which is that of the Heavenly Father: it is seen to be the veil of the Divine Presence. Veiling the glory which no mortal might see and live, veiling yet revealing the Presence of God, the

cloud has two aspects, of which the greater and more characteristic is not the negative one of veiling, but that positive aspect in which it attests and manifests the Divine Presence. To come under its shadow (a 'shadow,' it would seem, of light, since it was νεφέλη φωτεινή) awoke in the disciples the dread felt by Jacob at Bethel. And for the same reason—that this cloud is a 'gate of heaven,' at which a man may stand to hear the voice of God. Here, in this bright cloud, the two spheres, earthly and heavenly, open upon each other. The cloud is less a veil than a lifting of the veil. Here the invisible barrier becomes a portal of heaven, through which may come the voice of the Almighty, and entering by which Christ is passed into heaven. It is a 'cloud of heaven': with earth and human life upon this side of it, and on the other side (not sky and stars, but) the invisible things of God, the heavenly sphere, the other world.

Thus in our Lord's Ascension we do not conceive of Him as 'going up' farther than would symbolize and declare His departure from this world: 'He was taken up, and a cloud received Him out of their sight'—they saw Him go and they saw what door opened to receive Him. As identifying this cloud with 'heaven,' compare [Act_1:9](#), 'a cloud received him,' with [Act_1:11](#) 'received up from you into heaven': with which agrees [2Pe_1:17-18](#), 'there came a voice to him out of the excellent glory ... and this voice we (ourselves) heard brought out of heaven.' The voice out of the cloud was 'out of heaven'—the disciples in beholding Christ enter the cloud 'beheld him going into heaven.'

If for us the cloud is as a door which closes, a veil that hides (as God verily is a God that hideth Himself), this is of grace: 'thou canst not follow me now' ([Joh_13:36](#))—'ye cannot bear it now' ([Joh_16:12](#)). And the cloud is, for Christ's disciples, itself an excellent glory, since He is now passed within it (not behind as our earthly sun), filling it with brightness of light. He, our Redeemer and Advocate, the Lord who is our Brother, is now within the cloud that covers Sinai, that leads through the wilderness, that shines above the Mercy-seat; that is to say—in all that by which God draws near to man (in His law as in Sinai, in His providences as in the shepherding of Israel, in religious life and worship as in the Holiest of all), Christ is present, and the love which He has made known, bestowed and sealed. To His disciples the Law is no more a threat and fear, but is written upon the heart for honour and obedience; and God's providence is trusted—the sheep follow, for they know His voice; and for the deep things of the soul there is a great High priest passed into the heavens, and they that know His name come boldly to the throne of grace.

Literature.—The Comm. *in loc.*, esp. Swete on [Mar_9:7](#); Ruskin, *Fronde Agrestes*, p. 178; Huntingdon, *Christian Believing and Living*, p. 168; Westcott, *Revelat. of the*

Risen Lord, p. 180; Milligan, *Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord*, p. 21 ff.; Paget, *Studies in the Christian Character*, p. 246 ff.

Arthur W. Wotherspoon.

☩Coal

COAL.—This word occurs in the Gospels only in Joh_18:18; Joh_21:9 (Gr. in both ἀνθρῶν ἀκτῶν, meaning properly ‘a brazier filled with lighted charcoal’). As a mineral, coal does not exist in Palestine except in the *Wâdy Hummanâ* in the Lebanon, and was mined there only during the rule of Muhammad Ali about 1834 (Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, 1886, iii. 193). The rendering ‘coal’ must be taken as = ‘charcoal.’ Both in ancient and in modern times, the latter substance, prepared from native timber, has been the common fuel of the East. The destruction of the forests of Palestine and Syria may be assigned as the main reason for the absence of timbered gables, and the universal prevalence, instead, of brickwork cupola roofs, and also for the wretched substitutes for fuel now employed by the natives, such as sun-dried cakes of chaff and dung, etc. The charred roots of the desert broom (*rôthem*, see Psa_120:4) make an excellent fuel, and are much in demand in Cairo (Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of Bible*, 1889, p. 360).

The geological survey of Palestine reveals its uniformly cretaceous formation, extending from the Lebanon ranges to the plateau of Hebron. The earlier rocks of the carboniferous period, if they do exist there at all under the subsequent strata, are buried at quite inaccessible depths. Traces of carboniferous outcrop, but destitute of carbonaceous deposits, have been found in the sandstone of the southern desert and the limestone of the *Wâdy Nasb*.

Literature.—W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, 1886, iii. 193; Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of Bible*, 1889, p. 360; Conder, *Tent Work in Pal.* [Note: Palestine, Palestinian.] ii. 326; Hull, *Mount Seir*, etc., 1889, p. 194; Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, p. 280; Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible*, article ‘Coal.’

P. Henderson Aitken.

☩Coat

COAT.—This word in the Gospels usually represents the Gr. χιτῶν, *i.e.* the tunic or long close-fitting under garment worn in Palestine, as opposed to the ἱμάτιον or full and flowing outer garment (see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , art. 'Dress').

Our Lord's instructions to the Twelve included one which forbade their wearing or having in their possession more than one such garment (Mat_10:10, Mar_6:9, Luk_9:3; cf. Luk_3:11). And in the Sermon on the Mount (Mat_5:40; cf. Luk_6:29) we are bidden to cultivate such a spirit of meekness as would be illustrated by a readiness to part even with one's cloak (ἱμάτιον) to him who took away one's coat.* [Note: In Luke the order is transposed, the cloak coming before the coat, this being the order in which these two garments would be torn off.]

The soldiers at the Crucifixion (Joh_19:23-24) took possession of the Saviour's garments, according, we suppose, to the usual practice. The outer robes they divided into four parts, one for each of the quaternion, but for the coat (τὸν χιτῶνα), in close fulfilment of Psa_22:18, they cast lots, not wishing to tear it up, because it was 'without seam, woven from the top throughout.' Josephus (*Ant.* iii. vii. 4), quoted by Bp. Westcott, tells us that the long robe (χιτῶν ποδῆρης) of the high priest was of this character: 'This vesture was not composed of two pieces, nor was it sewed together upon the shoulders and the sides, but it was one long vestment, so woven as to have an aperture for the neck' (Whiston's translation). Bp. Westcott further quotes Chrysostom, who perhaps wrote from personal knowledge, as thinking 'that the detail is added to show "the poorness of the Lord's garments, and that in dress as in all other things He followed a simple fashion." ' Others incline to the view that there is a parallel suggested between the Eternal High Priest's garment and that of the Aaronic high priest. In any case the seamless robe of Christ has often been taken as a type of the One (ideally) Undivided Church, *e.g.* by Cyprian in a famous passage (*de Unit. Eccl.* § 7), where he contrasts the 'incorrupata atque individua tunica' of Christ with the prophet Ahijah's robe, which he tore *in duodecim scissuras* in token of the disruption of the kingdom (1Ki_11:30 ff.), and concludes: 'sacramento vestis et signo declaravit ecclesiae unitatem.' For the part which the Holy Coat has played in legend at Trèves and elsewhere, those who are curious in such matters may consult Goldenmeister and v. Sybel, *Der Heilige Rock zu Trier und die 20 anderen heiligen ungenahnten Rocke*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1845.

We may note finally: (1) that the word 'coat' (so Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ; Authorized Version 'fisher's coat') in Joh_21:7 stands for the large loose garment (ἐπ

ενδύτης) which St. Peter threw as a covering over his almost naked body when he left his fishing and came into the Master's presence; (2) that it was the under-garments (χιτῶνες) that the high priest rent when he 'heard the blasphemy' at our Lord's trial (Mar_14:63; see Swete's notes, *in loc.*). See also Cloke, Dress.

C. L. Feltoe.

☩Cock

COCK.—See Animals, p. 64^a, and following article.

☩Cock-Crowing

COCK-CROWING (ἀλεκτοροφωνία).—The word occurs only in Mar_13:35, where it is evidently used to designate the third of four parts into which the night was divided—'at even, or at midnight, or at the cock-crowing, or in the morning.' In OT times there were only three watches in the night—the first, the middle, and the last; but by the time of Christ the Roman division into four watches had become common, though it had not altogether superseded the threefold division of the Jews. The night was reckoned, roughly speaking, from our 6 p.m. to 6 a.m., and these twelve hours were divided into four watches of three hours each. Jerome says: 'Nox in quatuor vigiliis dividitur, quae singulae trium horarum spatio supputantur' (*Ep.* cxi. 8). The cock-crowing in Mar_13:35 thus refers to the third watch of the night, between the hours of 12 and 3.

Although the noun 'cock-crowing' occurs only once in the NT, each of the four Evangelists records the fact that on the night of the betrayal Jesus forewarned Peter that before the cock crew he should thrice deny his Lord, and each of them also records a crowing of the cock immediately after the denial (Mat_26:34; Mat_26:74-75, Luk_22:34; Luk_22:60-61, Joh_13:38; Joh_18:27). In St. Mark we have the variations—all the more significant because of the writer's commonly acknowledged dependence upon the Petrine tradition—that Jesus said to Peter, 'Before the cock crow *twice*, thou shalt deny me thrice'; and in correspondence with this a record of two distinct cock-crowings (Mar_14:30; Mar_14:68; Mar_14:72).

Attempts have been made to distinguish between these two cock-crowings in St. Mark as occurring at definite seasons of the night, the one about midnight and the other at the first approach of dawn, just before the commencement of the fourth or morning watch, and to define the second of the two as the *gallicinium* proper, and consequently the only one of which the other three Evangelists take notice. No doubt it is true that in the most distinctive sense of the word ‘the cock-crowing,’ as an indication of time, refers to the breaking of the dawn; thus in the Talmud it is prescribed that at cock-crow the benediction shall be used: ‘Praised be Thou, O God, the Lord of the world, that givest understanding to the cock to distinguish between day and night.’ But as a matter of fact cocks crow during the night, in the East as elsewhere, at irregular times from midnight onward; and the narrative of Mar 14:66-72 does not suggest that there was an interval of anything like three hours between the first cock-crowing and the second. The probability is that Jesus meant no more than this, that before Peter himself had twice heard the cock crow he should thrice have been guilty of his great denial. And if we accept St. Mark’s narrative as embodying Peter’s own account of the incident, it will seem natural that the disciple to whom the warning was directly addressed, and on whom it would make the deepest impression, should distinguish between two separate cock-crowings where others thought only of the last.

There is no mention of the cock in the Mosaic law, and the supposed allusion to the breed in 1Ki 4:23 (בִּרְבֵרִים, translated ‘fatted fowls’ both in Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) is very doubtful. It may be that Solomon had imported these birds from the East; but, on the other hand, the fact that in the Talmudical literature the cock is always called by the name *tarnĕgôl* (תַּרְנְגוֹל), suggests rather that it was introduced into Palestine from Babylonia.* [Note: A reference to the cock is found by some scholars in Pro 30:31 (EV ‘greyhound’), where the וַרְיָד (îr) of MT is rendered by the LXX ἀλέκτωρ; similarly Aquila and Theodotion, the Peshitta (‘ăbhakhâ) and the Vulgate (.)].] But while the domestic fowl was quite familiar to the Jews of our Lord’s time, both the Mishna and the Midrash state that, so long as the Temple stood, the breeding or keeping of cocks in Jerusalem was forbidden, on the ground that by scratching in the earth they dug up unclean things, thus spreading the contagion of Levitical uncleanness, and even contaminating the sacrifices of the altar. On this ground exception has sometimes been taken, especially from Jewish sources, to the statements of the Evangelists as to the crowing of the cock in Jerusalem on the night before the crucifixion. But if such an ordinance existed, it is very unlikely that it could be strictly enforced in a city like Jerusalem, with a large and mixed population. In particular, we must remember that cock-fighting was one of the favourite sports of the Romans; and the Roman soldiers of the garrison would concern themselves very little about any Jewish prohibition of this kind.

Literature.—Grimm-Thayer, *Lexicon*, s.v. ἀλεκτοροφωνία; Smith's *Lat.-English Dict.* s.v. 'Vigilia'; Meyer's Commentary on *Matthew*; Lange's *Life of Christ*; Andrews, *Life of our Lord upon the Earth*, p. 521; *Encyc. Bibl.* and *Jewish Encyclopedia*, articles 'Cock' and 'Day'; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, articles 'Cock' and 'Time,' cf. Extra Vol. p. 477 f.

J. C. Lambert.

☞ Coins

COINS.—See Money.

☞ Colt

COLT.—See Animals, p. 63^a, and Entry into Jerusalem.

☞ Comfort

COMFORT.—The English word 'comfort' means being made strong together. The idea seems to be that sorrow weakens or shatters the whole system of the afflicted man, and that the dispelling of his grief braces him up anew. The sore is not merely plastered over or covered with a surface skin, but healed, so that the sufferer becomes as vigorous as before. Such is, indeed, the comfort imparted by Christ. In connexion therewith the words παρακαλέω and θαρσέω, or θαρρέω, are both employed. In NT 'beseech,' 'entreat,' 'exhort' are all used as equivalents for παρακαλέω, while παράκλησις is most frequently rendered 'consolation' in Authorized Version, and θαρσέω or θαρρέω (the former in imperat. only) is commonly translated 'to be of good cheer.' But both παρακαλέω and παράκλησις are occasionally rendered 'comfort' in Authorized Version (e.g. Mat 5:4, 2Co 1:3), while in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'comfort' has usually been substituted for 'consolation' of Authorized Version in the rendering of the noun. In three places (Mat 9:22, Mar 10:49, Luk 8:48) Authorized Version renders θάρσει 'Be of good comfort.' In the first two Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 substitutes 'Be of good cheer,' and

in the last drops θάρσει from the text. In Jn. παράκλητος, which occurs four times (Joh 14:16; Joh 14:26; Joh 15:26; Joh 16:7), always appears in Authorized and Revised Versions as ‘the Comforter.’

While the mission of Christ was mainly to save men from their sins, it was also His purpose to bring them true relief from their troubles. In His sermon at Nazareth (Luk 4:16-27) He applied to Himself the prophecy of Isaiah (Isa 61:1-3), which tells that the Messiah was ‘to comfort all that mourn.’ He would indeed have failed to fulfil the Messianic expectation if He had not set Himself, alike by His person, His gospel, and His work, to heal the broken in heart and to comfort the people of God’s choice (cf. Isa 40:1). Among pious Jews the phrase had become a holy oath, *Ita videam consolationem*, etc. (Alford on Luk 2:25). Thus Simeon is said to have been ‘looking for the consolation of Israel’ (*loc. cit.*), where παράκλησιν has almost a personal import as though equivalent to τὸν Χριστὸν Κύριον. The whole gospel of Jesus Christ is therefore one of good tidings to the afflicted, the destitute, the oppressed. The removal of the cause of woe involves the furtherance of the cure of woe. In answer to the Baptist’s question, Jesus named, as one of the signs that He was ὁ Ἐρχόμενος, ‘the poor have good tidings preached to them’ (εὐαγγελίζονται). Accordingly, in the very forefront of His programme as announced in the Sermon on the Mount, Christ gave the beatitude of comfort to the mourners (Mat 5:4). As the Revealer of the Father, moreover, He was bound to make comfort one of the most prominent features of His ministry, not less in action than in word. The Fatherly pity (Psa 103:13) and the Motherly tenderness (Isa 66:13) of the All-merciful must be set forth by the Son of God, if, looking on Him and listening to Him, men were to be able to see the image and to hearken to the voice of God.

Christ is well fitted to afford comfort not only by His Divine knowledge of our deepest needs and of what best meets these needs, but by His own human experience of affliction and woe. The Man of Sorrows, the One acquainted with grief, as well as the God of all comfort, He can appreciate the necessity of consolation as well as apply the consolation that is availing. Having suffered in temptation, He is able to succour them that are tempted (Heb 2:18). The pangs of Him who ‘himself bare our sicknesses’ fitted Him for being the true Physician for the wounded in heart. Through His own weariness He has won multitudes of the heavy-laden to come to Him for rest.* [Note: In Expos. Times, viii. 239 and x. 48, Nestle shows that rest and comfort are ‘almost identical for Semitic feeling.’] The exceeding sorrow even unto death of His own soul as He took the cup from His Father’s hand that He might taste death for every man, has made Him able to give ease and peace to His people in the valley of the shadow. One of the occasions when comfort is most needed is bereavement: and perhaps the tears of Jesus at the tomb of Lazarus (Joh 11:35) have been as potent to

solace the stricken as His word to the widow of Nain, 'Weep not' (Luk 7:13). When upon the cross He commended to one another's care and sympathy the Virgin Mother and the beloved disciple: 'Woman, behold thy son!' 'Behold thy mother!' (Joh 19:26-27), we see how truly Christ entered into the heart of the afflicted children of men.

Christ's dealing with His own chosen followers was one of special tenderness in their hour of sorrow. He knew that while on the whole His departure was expedient for them, yet it would be a terrible wrench, and expose them to bitter persecution. He therefore consoled them when sorrow filled their heart by telling them that He would not leave them orphans (ὄρφανούς, Authorized Version 'comfortless,' Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'desolate'). After His ascension He would be nearer to them in spiritual presence than when with them in the flesh (Joh 14:18-20, cf. Mat 28:20). By rising from the dead He would be Victor over the world in its direst and fiercest assault, and if they shared with Him the world's hate they would also share His triumph. The discourse (John 14-16) which began, 'Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me,' fitly ended, 'In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world.'

The idea of future compensation for present sufferings is not wanting in the 'consolation in Christ.' In His Father's House are many mansions, on entering which He goes to prepare a place for His disciples, where they shall both behold, and be partakers of, His glory (Joh 14:2; Joh 17:22-24). The same idea of a compensating 'weight of glory' for 'light affliction which is but for a moment' (2Co 4:17) is involved in the parable where Abraham says of Lazarus, 'Now he is comforted' (Luk 16:25). On the other hand, those who are now satisfied with their riches and have no hunger for righteousness, the men of the world who have their portion in this life, 'have received their consolation' (Luk 6:24-25).

See also following article.

Arthur Pollok Sym.

Comforter

COMFORTER (παράκλητος).—A term applied to Christ in (Revised Version margin) of 1Jn 2:1, and four times (Joh 14:16; Joh 14:26; Joh 15:26; Joh 16:7) to the Holy Spirit. For the meaning of the original and the probable source from which St. John derived it, see art. 'Paraclete' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. 665-668. The

active sense is confined to ecclesiastical usage, and may have been emphasized by translators, from its appropriateness to the circumstances amidst which the word first occurs in Joh_14:16; but the passive sense may still be traced in relation to the Father and the Son, the Spirit being called and sent by Them to the help of men, as well as for the purpose of witnessing for God at the tribunal of the human reason (Joh_15:26). The English term is, however, quite inadequate. Whilst there is a suggestion of actual consolation in Joh_14:16, the principal points of St. John's teaching are that the mission of the Spirit is contingent upon the departure of Christ (Joh_16:7), is thenceforward continuous and permanent (Joh_14:16), and includes functions in regard to both classes of men, the disciples and 'the world.' The latter He will convict (Joh_16:8-11) in respect of the three decisive matters of sin, righteousness, and judgment. With still a significant preference for words of an intellectual bearing, He will continue and complete the instruction begun by Christ (Joh_14:26), and guide the disciples 'into all the truth' (Joh_16:13). See art. Holy Spirit. The predominant cast of these phrases, almost all pointing to mental processes, is in itself a sufficient evidence of the unfitness of the term 'Comforter,' for which 'Paraclete' (wh. see) might with advantage be substituted.

R. W. Moss.

☞ Coming Again

COMING AGAIN.—Though He had appeared in the world to found the kingdom of God and fulfil the Messianic hope in its true spiritual meaning [See Advent], Jesus repeatedly gave it to be understood that the object of His mission would not be perfectly attained in that first coming among men. There was to be a break in His visible connexion with earthly affairs (Mat_16:21); He would depart for a time (Joh_14:19; Joh_16:7); but He promised that He would come again to continue His work and carry it on to complete fulfilment. As the clouds of danger gathered, and a violent death loomed in view, He began to speak with growing frequency of a marvellous and triumphant return, in which His living presence and power would be gloriously revealed. His sayings on this subject, however, are not always easy to interpret; they do not all refer to the same event; we find in them traces of His having in His mind more than one coming, and, in several cases, it is only by a careful study of the context that we can discover to which coming His words were meant to point.

The comings of which Jesus spoke from time to time may be distinguished as follows:

1. His coming after His death to make patent to the disciples His continued and exalted life, and thereby to establish their faith in Him as their ever-living Lord. He predicted a meeting with them in Galilee (Mat 26:32, Mar 14:28), and indicated that though for a little while they should not see Him, yet after a little while again they should see Him (Joh 14:19; Joh 16:16).

2. His coming to enter into fellowship with the disciples in a closer spiritual reunion. As the Risen One, He was to return to them and abide with them continually (Joh 14:8-22), manifesting His presence through the Paraclete, the Spirit of truth, and guiding, teaching, sustaining them by His gracious working in their hearts (Joh 14:16-17, Joh 15:26, Joh 16:14). It would appear that in this sense Jesus regarded His coming again as a vital experience, to be shared by all believers in all after generations, thus foreshadowing His abiding presence through the Spirit in the Christian Church.

3. His coming to remove the disciples from their toils and struggles on earth, and take them to the place He would prepare for them in His Father's house (Joh 14:2-3), that where He was they might be also.

4. His coming at the great crises of history to bring to their disastrous issues the sins of societies, nations, and religious institutions, and to vindicate His power over all the corrupt agencies in the world that oppose His truth. In the solemn discourse on the future recorded in Matthew 24 and Mark 13, there are certain passages which, as usually interpreted, convey the impression that the destruction of Jerusalem and the fall of the Jewish State was one such momentous crisis that Jesus had particularly in view (Mat 24:15-22; Mat 24:32-34, Mar 13:14-23; Mar 13:29-30; cf. Luk 19:41-44; Luk 21:20-23; Luk 21:32-33; Luk 23:28-30), although His words may be recognized as covering also all other marked epochs in history, in which His triumphant glory and the impotence of all the world-powers that come into conflict with Him are made clear. The course of events which was to culminate in the ruin of Jerusalem was to be the first startling revelation of His victorious energy in asserting His supremacy in the affairs of men and nations; and this is apparently suggested, in vivid figurative language, by the statement to the high priest, 'Henceforth'—from this time onward—'ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven' (Mat 26:64), as if a process of judicial and retributive manifestations of His power in human history would then begin.

5. His final coming at the end of the dispensation He had inaugurated, to sit in judgment over all classes and nations of men, to apportion their merit and demerit, decide their destinies, overthrow all evil, and bring the kingdom of God to its supreme triumph and glory. This final and most decisive coming—which will be more fully discussed under Parousia—is described in terms that betoken the appearance of

Jesus in august splendour and irresistible authority. He is to come in the glory of His Father with His angels, and reward every man according to his works (Mat 16:27); seated on the throne of His glory, He is to gather before Him all nations, and separate them one from another as a shepherd divides His sheep from the goats (Mat 25:31-32). That is to be the Last Day, the termination of the existing order of things, when all pretences will be exposed, obstinate unbelief and ungodliness punished, and faithfulness crowned with its eternal reward.

That these several comings were present to the mind of Jesus, seems sufficiently evident when His recorded utterances are duly weighed. We may assume that they were regarded by Him as the forms of manifestation by which, in the future, He would give proof of His living presence and conquering power. They were the varying stages in the development, after His death, of His victorious work for the establishment of righteousness and the destruction of evil. Hence they could all be conceived and predicted under one name; but, as Beyschlag remarks, under the conditions of prophecy, each stage was not seen as something apart; they were felt and described as so many phases of the whole, according to the suggestion of the moment (*NT Theol.* i. 202). On that account there is discernible in the predictions of Jesus an occasional blending of one coming with another; at least in the reports furnished by the Evangelists it does not always distinctly appear to what precise form of His future manifestation His words apply. Probably in the consciousness of Jesus all His future comings were wrapped up, as in a seed, in the thought of His spiritual coming, His coming in the fulness of His spiritual life and power, as an effective and abiding force on the side of God, to act on the hearts and lives of His faithful followers, and also on the general life of the world. This view makes His several comings fall into line as phases or stages of a continuous process, in which, sometimes through the quickened vitality of His Church, sometimes through the catastrophic action of the moral laws and forces which lie behind the movements of human society, His invincible operation should be revealed, until the final consummation is reached in the sovereign manifestation of His authority and glory at the end of the age.

It has been suggestively shown by Wendt (*Teaching of Jesus*, vol. ii. 297, 305) that it is on the utterances of Jesus regarding His spiritual coming in the hearts of believers that the Fourth Gospel lays the principal and almost exclusive stress; and probably it is in the light of Jesus' predictions of this spiritual or dynamical coming that we are to find the clue to what He meant in His sayings respecting the historical coming or comings, and the great apocalyptic coming, which the Synoptics report with special fulness and detail. The coming again of Jesus may thus be conceived as a series of manifestations of His living presence and activity in the world, culminating in a glorious triumph at the Last Day, when He shall sit as Judge of all.

☩ Coming To Christ

COMING TO CHRIST.—Under this heading we bring together a number of passages, all sayings of Jesus, most of them in the Fourth Gospel, which express at once His widest invitation to men and His strongest claims upon them. Outside these there is a much larger group of passages, occurring in all the Gospels, many of which are intimately connected with the inner group. The expression thus frequently occurring, and used in the few passages first mentioned to convey the deepest truths of the gospel, is based on the everyday events of our Lord's ministry and of ordinary life. In its literal meaning it occurs constantly throughout the Gospel narrative. We may here disregard this widest class of passages, which speak of the multitudes who, from very various motives, 'came to Christ' to see and to hear Him, and fix our attention on those which have a moral and spiritual significance. The latter, bearing directly on the proclamation of the Kingdom of God and on the conditions of membership in it, are of supreme importance.

The constructions used in these groups of passages may here be noticed. In nearly all of them we have the simple verb ἐρχομαι followed by τρος with the accusative. In Mat_11:28 we have the interjectional adverb δεϋτε with τρος and the accusative. In the kindred passage, Heb_7:25, the compound τροσερχομαι occurs with the dative. In a closely allied group of passages, which we shall have occasion to notice later, ἐρχομαι is followed by οτισω and the genitive. The call to the earliest disciples is δεϋτε οτισω μου (Mat_4:19, Mar_1:17). In some passages (Mat_16:24; Mat_19:14, Joh_5:40; Joh_6:44; cf. Joh_7:34; Joh_7:36; Joh_8:21 f., Joh_13:33) the aorist of ἐρχομαι is used, the 'coming' being regarded as complete, while in others the use of the present indicates that the 'coming' is thought of as in progress (cf. Westcott on Joh_6:44). In Joh_6:37 a ηξει with τρος and the accusative signifies arrival, attainment. In many passages of the second group, some of which will be used in illustration of the subject, we have the fact of the coming without the use of any of the phrases here mentioned.

Among the crowds who flocked to Jesus were many who came, or who were brought by their friends, because of some special need. Blind and deaf and dumb came to have their lost senses restored (Mat_9:32 ff; Mat_20:29 ff., Mar_7:32 ff., Joh_9:1 ff.

et al.). Lepers cried to Him for cleansing (Mat 8:2 ff. || Luk 17:12 ff.). The lame and the palsied came, or were brought, to Him for renewal of their powers (Mat 9:2 ff. || Joh 5:2 ff.). More than once the friends of the dying or the dead came beseeching Him to give them back their loved ones from the grasp of death (Mat 9:18 ff. || Joh 11:1 ff.). Obviously this ‘coming’ was in most cases much more than a mere physical fact. The whole motive does not in all cases lie open to us, but in many we know, and in others there is no room for doubt, that there was behind the coming an attraction of His person, a perception of and faith in His power to bless, a confidence in His mercy and grace, apart from which even the most needy would not have been moved to come to Him. This is in some instances conspicuously clear, and is recognized by Jesus with joy. Thus the ‘faith’ of the centurion (Mat 8:5 ff.) is declared to be greater than any He had found in Israel. For her ‘great faith’ the prayer of the Syro-Phœnician woman is granted (Mat 15:32 ff.). The latter is one of many cases in which the faith of those who came to Him was tested by Jesus before He complied with their request (cf. Mat 9:28, Joh 4:48, and many others). This testing of faith shows the spiritual significance of the incidents, even where the blessing craved and granted, looked at merely from the outside, is purely physical. This is still more the case where the need which brought men to Christ was not physical, but moral or spiritual, e.g. Nicodemus to some extent (John 3), Zacchæus the chief publican (Luk 19:2 ff.), the woman who was a sinner (Luk 7:36 ff.), and many others.

From these cases we pass by an easy transition to the higher level of meaning of the phrase ‘coming to Christ.’ The passages in which this occurs are entirely words of Jesus. He calls men to come to Him. For the most part His call is that of gracious, loving invitation. But the condemnation of the Jews because they would not come to Him (Joh 5:40; cf. Mat 22:3, Joh 16:9) shows that under the graciousness of the invitation there lies the assertion of a paramount claim. These are two aspects of Christ’s call which it may be well to consider to some extent apart. Experimentally they must always go together.

In Mat 11:28 ff., we have the great call of Jesus to those who ‘labour and are heavy laden,’ with its promise of ‘rest.’ These verses bear a likeness to several passages of the OT, especially to Jer 6:16 ‘Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.’ But the Heb. word מְרוּיַע ‘rest,’ is rendered in the LXX Septuagint not by ἀνάπαυσιν, the word used in Mat 11:29 (cf. ἀναπαύσω, Mat 11:28), but by ἀγνισμὸν (or ΑΓΙΑΣΜὸν). Some have thought that there is here an echo of the words of Jesus ben Sira (Sir 6:24 f., Sir 6:28 f., Sir 51:23-27), with which our Lord was probably familiar (see *Expositor’s Greek Testament, in loco*). But the words of Christ, in the greatness of the call and of the promise, and in the connexion of both with His own

person, go far beyond those of Ben Sira or anything which we find in the canonical books of the OT. The call is probably addressed in the first instance to those who, groaning under 'the yoke of the law,' which generations of Rabbinic teaching and Pharisaic formalism had made intolerable, had no hope of rest for their souls. But it goes beyond that, as the whole ministry of Christ shows, to all those on whom the burdens of life press heavily, and especially to those who are being borne down by the weight of sin. To all Christ offers 'rest,' a ceasing from the crushing weight and from the hopeless toil, an inward, satisfying peace.

The words of Jesus in [Joh_7:37](#) (cf. [Joh_6:35](#)) are even greater than those just considered. Under the natural figure of 'thirst' and the companion figure of 'hunger,' He speaks of the deepest needs and longings of the soul of man—not those which are passing and accidental, but those which are essential and permanent, above all, the need of God—and promises to all who come to Him a perfect and abiding satisfaction. They should not only themselves be satisfied, but by the 'receiving' of the Holy Spirit should become sources of blessing to others.

To these two great promises we may add the words of Jesus in [Joh_5:40](#), which imply, under the condemnation of those who would not come to Him, a promise of 'life' to those who do come. This evidently means a life other than that which they already had, a life in union with God as contrasted with their life apart from Him, a life in whose abundance man finds perfect satisfaction and the purpose of God is realized, a life which is eternal. Into the enjoyment of this life he who 'cometh to Christ' enters at once, but its full realization belongs to the future.

The supreme promise of Christ, embracing and transcending all others, is implied in [Joh_14:6](#) 'No man cometh to the Father but by me.' Access to God, fellowship with Him, are dependent on coming to Christ, and are promised to all who come to Him (cf. [Joh_6:37](#) b).

We infer from our study of the passages cited, that, on one side, 'coming to Christ' is practically synonymous with faith in Him. It is the active movement of the soul towards Christ. More than once 'cometh' and 'believeth' occur as parallel, if not virtually synonymous, expressions (cf. [Joh_6:35](#); [Joh_7:37](#) f.). 'The first word presents faith in deed as active and outward, the second presents faith in thought as resting and inward' (Westcott on [Joh_6:35](#)). The 'coming' is the response of the soul in its natural cravings, in its need, in its sin, to the call of Christ. It is its recognition in act, the act of trust, of His readiness to receive and His power to bless.

This, however, is only one side of the meaning of the phrase. There is another which is largely overlooked, perhaps because it does not immediately appeal to man's sense of need.

Christ's condemnation of the unbelieving Jews (Joh_5:40) has already been mentioned. This implies that man's destiny depends on his attitude to Christ. In Luk_6:46 ff. this is still more clearly stated. 'Coming,' the first movement of the soul to Christ, is associated with, and derives spiritual and permanent value from, hearing and doing the words of Christ. The mere lip acknowledgment of Him is nothing, or worse than nothing, for it brings disaster; the heart acknowledgment, issuing in obedience, is everything. This is stated even more strongly in Luk_14:26 'If any man cometh unto me, and hateth not his own father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple.' The next verse carries us a step further, from the 'coming to' to the 'coming after,' from the negative 'hating' or renunciation to the positive 'bearing' or 'taking up' of the cross (cf. Mat_16:24, Mar_8:34, Luk_9:23). These are Christ's conditions of discipleship, stringent, at first sight even repulsive. Mat_10:37 may be compared with Luk_14:26, not as toning down the demands of Christ, but as helping us to understand them. He claims to be the first, and in a profound sense the only object of man's affection and devotion. None other shall stand before Him, none other beside Him. There is here no condemnation, no abrogation of the claims of human affection, which are Divine in their origin, and have been strengthened and beautified under the influence of Christ. But there is a demand that these shall stand aside, shall be put aside ruthlessly and with the heart's whole passion, so far as they come into conflict or rivalry with the claims of Christ. The 'great possessions' of the rich young ruler stood between him and Christ. Father and mother, wife and child, do the same with others. If so, 'he cannot be my disciple.' Further, Christ demands the taking up of the cross; that is, not the acceptance of trials, often trifling trials, as they come to us, to which in common use this great word has been reduced, but the readiness, for His sake, to follow Him to shame and to death.

While, then, 'coming to Christ' means, on the one hand, faith in Him, a movement of the soul to Him for the acceptance of the blessings He offers, it means, on the other hand, no less clearly an absolute surrender of the soul, of the whole man to Him. This aspect of the truth already emerges in Mat_11:28 ff. 'Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me.... For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.' This involves the recognition of Him as 'Lord,' a whole-hearted obedience, an absolute surrender in which nothing, not even the dearest object of earthly affection, shall weigh with us against Him, a readiness to suffer shame and death for His sake. This is to 'come to him' in the fullest sense, to come 'to' in order to coming 'after'; this is to become His disciple. It seems harsh and repellent: it is not really so. It is the detachment from the lower in order to attachment to the higher. It is the weaning, it may be the wrenching, of the soul from all else, that it may be united to God. There is no other way to the highest good.

The call of Christ, whether it be regarded as an invitation or as a claim, raises in an acute form the question of His Person. Its bearing on this can only be indicated, not fully discussed, in this article. Christ's call is, on the one hand, a universal call. The 'all ye' of Mat 11:28 has no limits of space or time within the limits of human personality and need. It is the gospel for all men of all times and of all lands. It is the keynote of the whole NT and of all evangelical thought and preaching. On the other hand, Christ's call is an exclusive call. It is 'Come *unto me*,' shutting out all other teachers or saviours. He professes to be able to satisfy all human need, even the deepest—that of the consciousness of sin. He claims to be the only object of affection and obedience. He declares Himself the only way to God. Either His professions and claims are false and absurd, or He is more than a man, more than the greatest among the great, than the best among the good. If we admit His claims—and they find the fullest justification in the history of faith—we must make our confession with St. Peter: 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God' (Mat 16:16).

Another question, the full discussion of which lies beyond the scope of this article, must be mentioned. The movement of the soul to Christ does not originate with itself. Jesus traces it to the 'drawing' of the Father (Joh 6:44 f.; cf. Joh 12:32). In this we have a suggestion of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. But it is obvious that this involves neither compulsion on the one hand nor lessening of human responsibility on the other. A man's coming to Christ, under the Divine influence, is a voluntary surrender. A man's refusal to come is and will be just ground of condemnation.

It remains only to point out the harmony of the rest of the NT with the teaching of Christ in the Gospels in respect of our subject. The phrase 'coming to Christ' belongs, it is true, almost exclusively to the Gospels, and is found in its highest meaning mainly in that of St. John (but see 1Pe 2:4, Rev 22:17, and cf. Heb 7:25). But all the NT is Christocentric, and implies a call to men to come to Christ. 'In none other is there salvation: for neither is there any other name under heaven that is given among men wherein we must be saved' (Act 4:12), sums up the whole teaching of NT history and letters. But there is a difference between the Gospels and the other books which it is important to notice, not a difference in essential truth, but in the point of view from which it is presented. In the Gospels, 'Come unto me' is the personal call of Christ as teacher and Lord. In the rest of the NT the call is to the crucified and ascended Christ. This is indeed anticipated in the Gospels (e.g. Mat 20:28, Joh 12:32 et al.), but its full development before the death of Christ would have been premature, if not impossible. Immediately after the Crucifixion and Ascension, however, these two great historical facts are placed in the foreground of Apostolic preaching, e.g. in St. Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2), in his remonstrance with the people after the healing of the lame man (ch. 3), in the declaration before the Council (Act 5:29 ff.). They are the central truths of the Pauline and other letters: 'We preach Christ crucified' (1Co 1:23), 'Far be it from me

to glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ' (Gal 6:14), 'He is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near to God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them' (Heb 7:25, cf. Rev 5:9 etc.). We must interpret the invitation and the claim in the light of the Cross and of the Throne.

Literature.—Westcott's and Godet's Commentaries on John's Gospel; *Expositor's Greek Testament*; Commentaries on the Gospels; Edersheim's *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, artt. 'Jesus Christ' (Sanday) and 'Kingdom of God' (Orr); Denney's *Studies in Theology*; Drummond's *Relation of Apostolic Teaching to the Teaching of Christ*; Hort's *The Way, The Truth, and The Life*; Stevens' *Theol. of the NT*; Wendt's *Teaching of Jesus*; Beyschlag's *NT Theology*.

Charles S. Macalpine.

⚠️ Commandments

COMMANDMENTS.—As commandments (ἐντολαί) Jesus recognizes (1) the injunctions of the Decalogue, (2) certain other requirements of similar ethical character laid down in the Law. In one instance (Mar 10:5) the Mosaic regulation for divorce is quoted as a 'commandment,' but its temporary provisional nature is clearly indicated. 'This commandment,' given for a time in view of special circumstances, is implicitly contrasted with the true and abiding ἐντολαί. In the case of a purely ritual ordinance the term προσέταξεν is used (Mat 8:4, Mar 1:44, Luk 5:14).

The main passages in which our Lord defines His attitude to the commandments are: (1) the exposition in the Sermon on the Mount (Mat 5:17-48); (2) the criticism of Pharisaic tradition (Mat 15:1-20, Mar 7:1-23; cf. also Matthew 23); (3) the reply to the rich young ruler (Mat 19:17-21, Mar 10:19; Mar 10:21, Luk 18:20-22); (4) the dialogue with the lawyer (Mat 22:35-40, Mar 12:28-34, Luk 10:25-37). The treatment of the Sabbath commandment (Mar 2:24-27, Luk 6:1-10; Luk 13:10-16) will have to be considered under Law and Sabbath.

It is assumed by Jesus that the commandments were given directly by God, and as such they are contrasted with the 'traditions of men' (Mat 15:6, Mar 7:8-9). This assumption of their Divine origin determines His whole attitude towards them. As ordained by God they are valid for all time and authoritative; the keeping of them is the necessary condition of eternal life (Mat 19:17, Mar 10:19); men will take rank in the Kingdom of Heaven according to their obedience to the commandments

(Mat 5:19). It is objected to the Pharisees as their chief offence that they have perverted and overlaid with tradition the commandments of God (Mat 15:3, Mar 7:7).

In view, then, of the Divine origin of the commandments, Jesus accepts them as the eternal basis of morality. His own ethic is presented not as something new, but as a truer and more inward interpretation of the existing Law. It has been maintained (most notably in recent times by Tolstoi) that Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount enacts an entirely new moral code,—five new laws in contrast to those ordained ‘in old time.’ This, however, is opposed to His own declaration, ‘I came not to destroy but to fulfil.’ The authority which He claims for Himself is not an authority to originate laws, but to explain more fully in their Divine intention those already laid down by God. ‘It was said to them of old time,—I say unto you,’ implies an opposition not of the Decalogue and the new Christian code, but of the ancient interpretation of the Decalogue and the Christian interpretation. Where the men of old time stopped short with the letter, Jesus unfolds the inward principle which must henceforth be accepted as the true aim of the commandment. ‘Thou shalt not kill’ prohibits anger, scorn, contention. ‘Thou shalt not commit adultery’ demands chastity of heart as well as of outward act. The law that forbids false swearing requires in the last resort abstinence from all oaths, and perfect simplicity and truthfulness. The case is somewhat different with the two remaining rules which are subjected to criticism (‘an eye for an eye,’ ‘thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy’). Here our Lord indeed appears to set new laws of His own over against the imperfect maxims of the ancient morality. But He is still emphasizing what He conceives to be the real drift of the Divine legislation, in contrast to the false and limited constructions which men had placed upon it.

The ethical teaching of Jesus is thus based on the Divinely given commandments. It claims to be nothing more than a ‘fulfilment,’ a reinterpretation of them in the light of their inward spirit and purpose. At the same time, they are so transformed by this unfolding of their ultimate intention, as to result in a code of morality which is radically new. This is recognized in the Fourth Gospel, where the originality of the Christian law is brought into clear prominence (see art. New Commandment). It remains to consider how Jesus, while accepting the commandments, replaced them in effect by a new ethic, different in character as well as wider in range. The process by which He thus transformed them can be traced, with sufficient distinctness, in the Synoptic teaching.

(1) The Moral Law is freed from its association with outward ritual. Jesus does not definitely abrogate the ritual ordinances (‘ye ought not to leave the other undone,’ Mat 23:23), but He makes the distinction plain between these and the higher obligations, justice, mercy, and faith. He subordinates the law of the Sabbath to the requirements of duty and humanity (Mar 2:27, Luk 6:9; Luk 13:15-16); He confronts

the formal piety of His time with the Divine demand as stated by Hosea: 'I will have mercy and not sacrifice' (Mat 9:13; Mat 12:7); He challenges the whole system of rules concerning meat and drink by His great principle, 'that which cometh out, not that which goeth in, defileth a man' (Mat 15:11, Mar 7:15). This principle, applied to its full extent, meant the abolition of the Levitical law.

(2) In a similar manner the 'traditions' which had gathered around the Law and obscured its genuine meaning are swept away. The ethical teaching of Jesus is directed, in the first place, to restoring the commandments to their original simplicity and purity. In the glosses and corollaries with which Pharisaic ingenuity had overlaid them, He sees an attempt to narrow the scope and weaken the full stringency of the Divine law. He instances the casuistry which made it possible to evade a strict obedience to the command, 'Honour thy father and mother' (Mat 15:5-6, Mar 7:10-13). As against such trifling with the law of God, He insists on an honest acceptance of it in its plain and literal meaning. The ten thousand commandments into which the Decalogue had been divided and subdivided are to give place again to the simple ten.

(3) Not only is the Moral Law restored to its original purity, but it is simplified still further. While accepting the commandments as all given by God, Jesus recognizes that they are of different grades of importance. When the young ruler asked Him which of them were life-giving, He singles out the more distinctively ethical: 'Do not commit adultery, do not kill, do not steal, do not bear false witness, defraud not, honour thy father and mother' (Mar 10:18-19, Mat 19:18-19, Luk 18:20). So the question of the lawyer, 'Which is the great commandment?' is admitted by Jesus to be a just one. It is significant that in His answer to it He does not quote from the Decalogue itself, but from Deu 6:5 and Lev 19:18. He thus indicates that it is not the formal enactments which are sacred and binding, but the grand principles that lie behind them. Those sayings extraneous to the Decalogue, which yet lay bare its essential meaning, are 'greater' than any of the set commandments.

(4) The two requirements thus singled out are declared to be not only the greatest, but the sum and substance of all the others. The Law in its multiplicity runs back to the two root-demands of love to God and love to men. Of these two, Jesus insists on the former as 'the first and great commandment.' The duty of love to God is at once the highest duty required of man, and that which determines the right performance of all the rest. In this sense we must explain the words that follow: 'The second is like to it' (Mat 22:37-39, Mar 12:29-31). Its 'likeness' does not consist merely in its similar largeness of scope or in its similar emphasis on love, but in its essential identity with the other commandment. The love to man which it demands is the outward expression, the evidence and effect of love to God (cf. Gal 5:6 'Faith that worketh by love'; 1Jn 4:20 'He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how

can he love God whom he hath not seen?'). Thus in our Lord's summary of the Law we have more than a resolution of the Ten Commandments into two, corresponding broadly to the two divisions of the Decalogue. We have a clear indication that even those two are ultimately reducible to one.

(5) In this 'summary' the Moral Law, however simplified and purified, is still presented under the form of outward enactment. The early Catholic Church so accepted it, and set the *nova lex* imposed by Jesus on a similar footing with the Law of Moses. Jesus Himself, however, passed wholly beyond the idea of an outward statutory law. His demand is for an inward disposition so attuned to the will of God that it yields a spontaneous obedience. This demand is implicit in the 'summary,' couched though it is in the terms of formal enactment. It says nothing of particular moral actions, and insists solely on love, the inward frame of mind in which all right conduct has its source and motive: 'A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good' ([Luk_6:45](#)); 'Either make the tree good and his fruit good, or else make the tree corrupt and his fruit corrupt' ([Mat_12:33](#)). The ultimate aim of our Lord's ethical teaching is to produce a morality which will be independent of outward ordinance, and arise spontaneously out of the pure heart.

Thus the Decalogue, which in appearance is only revised and expounded, is virtually superseded by Christ. He bases morality on a new principle of inward harmony with God's will, and discards the whole idea involved in the term 'commandment.' It follows that in three essential respects His ethic differs from that which found its highest expression in the Decalogue. (a) Its demands are positive as distinguished from the old system of prohibitory rule. The Rabbinical precept, 'Do not to another what would be painful to yourself,' is adopted with a simple change that alters its whole character ([Mat_7:12](#)). Where there is an inward impulse to goodness, it will manifest itself in active love towards men, in positive obedience to the will of God. (b) The ethic of Jesus makes an absolute demand in contrast to the limited requirements of the ancient Law. The chief purpose of the exposition in the Sermon on the Mount is to illustrate and enforce this difference. 'I say unto you, Refrain not only from the forbidden act, but from evil looks and thoughts. Obey the Moral Law without condition or reservation. Be perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect' (cf. the 'seventy times seven' of [Mat_18:22](#)). This absolute demand is likewise involved in the substitution of an inward spirit for a statutory law. The moral task is no longer outwardly prescribed for us, and makes an infinite claim on our willing obedience. (c) As opposed to the Decalogue with its hard and fast requirements, the teaching of Jesus imposes a 'law of liberty.' The moral life, springing from the inward disposition, is self-determined. It possesses in itself a power of right judgment which makes it independent of any outward direction. It originates its own rules of action, and adapts them with an endless flexibility to all changing circumstances and times.

Our Lord's 'fulfilment' of the ancient Law has thus its outcome in a new morality which cannot be separated from His gospel as a whole. What He demands in the last resort is a change of nature such as can be effected only by faith in Him and possession of His spirit. The ultimate bearing of His criticism of the commandments is well indicated in the words of Luther: 'Habito Christo facile condemus leges et omnia recte judicabimus. Immo novos decalogos faciemus, qui clariores erunt quam Mosis decalogus, sicut facies Christi clarior est quam facies Mosis.' See also Ethics.

Literature.—The various Commentaries (in their section on the Sermon on the Mount), e.g. Holtzmann (1901), J. Weiss in Meyer's *Com.* (1901); Loisy, *Le discours sur la montagne* (1903); also articles on same subject in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible*, Extra Vol. (1904) [cf. art. 'Decalogue' in vol. i.], and *Encyc. Bibl.* (1903); Weizsacker, *Das Apost. Zeitalter* (English translation 1897), i. 35 ff.; Pfeleiderer, *Das Urchristenthum* (1887), 489-501; Wernle, *Die Anfänge unserer Religion* (1901), 23-69; Herrmann, *Ethik* (1901), 124-140; Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christenthums*, 45 ff.; Bruce, *Apologetics* (1895), 346 ff.; Holtzmann, *Neutest. Theologie* (1897), 130-160. To these may be added Tolstoi's *My Religion*, and *The Spirit of Christ's Teaching*; also books of popular or homiletical character, such as Horton, *Commandments of Jesus*; Gore, *Sermon on the Mount*; Dykes, *Manifesto of the King*.

E. F. Scott.

☞ Commerce

COMMERCE.—See Trade and Commerce.

☞ Commission

COMMISSION.—Christ's last recorded words to His disciples, as contained in Matthew's Gospel, are weighted with the impressiveness befitting such an occasion. They contain a commission, which focusses the duty of professed followers with regard to His own Person and Work. All four Evangelists give this Commission in one form or another (Mat 28:18 ff., Mar 16:15 ff., Luk 24:46; Luk 24:49, Joh 20:21; Joh 20:23). Without discussing the critical questions raised by these passages, what follows is based on their historicity, as that has been held by the Christian Church.* [Note: It should be noted, however, that as Mar 16:9-20 is lacking in the best MSS, modern scholars are practically unanimous in holding that these verses did not form a part of

the original Gospel, so that it is doubtful whether they possess any independent value.]

On two other occasions our Lord formally commissioned His Apostles. First, the Twelve were sent forth on a trial mission (Mat_10:5-6, Luk_9:1 ff.). That mission was limited, both as to area—the towns and villages of Galilee—and to objects—the lost sheep of the house of Israel. It aimed (1) at preparing the way of the kingdom of heaven, which our Lord came to found; and (2) at training the Apostles themselves in faith and fortitude for the more responsible work afterwards to devolve upon them. Later, seventy disciples were chosen (Luke 10), and sent—also, apparently—to itinerate in Galilee. Their instructions were similar to those of the Twelve. But, as opposition had now become more pronounced, greater emphasis is laid on it; and the brethren, like *carabinieri* patrols in modern Italy, travelled two and two. The instructions given to both the Twelve and the Seventy may be called lesser commissions in comparison with the great Commission of Matthew 28. As these commissions were local, temporary, and provisional, it is unnecessary to do more than mention them, except for purposes of comparison and contrast. At one point, however, there is an interesting link between them and the great Commission. After giving His instructions to the Twelve, Christ fell into an audible soliloquy, and went on (Mat_28:16-20) to speak of the trials, the duties, and the supports of those who in subsequent ages were to carry on His missionary work.

That Christ should speak frequently to the disciples about their future work during the forty days between His resurrection and ascension, is what might be expected. This accounts for the various forms under which all four Evangelists record His Commission. Conditions of time, place, and circumstances call for fuller, or more condensed, general, or particular statements. Processes of repetition, condensation, expansion, or omission in recording the subject of conversations which extended over nearly six weeks, were present to each writer's consciousness as he penned his narrative. Grotius, as quoted in Poli, *Syn.*, says: 'Uno compendio Matthaens complectitur praecipua capita sermonum quos Christus cum Apostolis non in monte tantum, sed et Hierosolymis, antea et post, in caelum jamjam ascensus, Bethaniae habuit.' Notwithstanding these conditions, certain essential features of the Commission correspond in the Gospels, as the following table shows:

Contents of Commission Common to Evangelists.

| <u>Mat_28:18</u> ff. | <u>Mar_16:15</u> | <u>Luk_24:46-49</u> | <u>Joh_20:21-23</u> |
|----------------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Universal Mission | Universal Mission | Universal Mission | Mission of undefined |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| | | | range |
| Baptism | Baptism and Faith | Repentance and Remission of sins | Message whose substance is Forgiveness |
| Promise of spiritual Presence | — | Promise of Comforter | Gift of Holy Ghost. |

‘All power is given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of (μαθητεύσατε) all nations, baptizing them into (εἰς) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world’ (Mat_28:18-20). These words constitute the charter of the Christian Church. They define in a solemn, authoritative, formal manner, the Commission under which the Apostles and that Church of which they were representatives were to prosecute to its consummation the work begun at Christ’s Incarnation. If our Lord gave this Commission in presence of the five hundred witnesses referred to by St. Paul in 1Co_15:6, we can understand the remark of Mat_28:18 that ‘some doubted,’ for these doubters could scarcely at this stage be any of the Eleven. Should this be so, ‘it follows that the Lord Himself here committed His formal institutions and commissions to the whole assembled Church, with the Apostles at her head, just as at a later day He poured out His Spirit upon the whole assembled Church. And from this, then, we argue that, according to the law of Christ, the Apostolic office and the Church are not two divided sections. In the commission to teach and to baptize, the Apostolical community is one, a united Apostolate involving the Church, or a united Church including the Apostles’ (Lange, *Com. on Matt.* [Note: Matthew’s (i.e. prob. Rogers’) Bible 1537.] , Edinburgh ed. p. 560). Joh_20:21-23 Luk_24:46-49.Mar_16:15 ff.

Peculiarities in two of the Synoptists’ accounts are noticeable. St. Luke tells how Christ opened the understanding of His disciples that they might understand the Scripture testimony to His suffering and resurrection on the third day. This is the line which we should expect Christ to take, if, on any of the occasions when He discussed their future work with the Eleven, He referred to His own part. The Divine necessity for His death would most readily impress itself on their minds when associated with intimations thereof in the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms.

Mar_16:17 f. [a passage that is very early, even if not from the pen of St. Mark],* [Note: The critical questions connected with Mar_16:9-20 will be found thoroughly discussed in Swete’s Gospel according to St. Mark, Macmillan, 1898, pp. xcvi-cv.]

where the promise of miraculous gifts (σημεῖα) is made, has occasioned difficulty, because it seems strange that any of the Evangelists should have omitted to mention so great an endowment. On the other hand, the historicity of these verses is strongly urged by Calvin on *a priori* grounds. He argues that the power of working miracles was essential to the establishment of the disciples themselves, as well as necessary for proving the doctrine of the gospel at its commencement, that the power was possessed by only a very few persons [but cf. Mar 16:17, where the power is to belong to them *that believe*] for the confirmation of all, and (though not expressly stated by Christ) granted only for a time.

Turning now to St. Matthew's narrative, as fullest and most formal, the first noticeable thing is that the Commission proper is prefaced by our Lord's claim of universal *power*; and concluded with a promise of His abiding *presence*. The risen and glorified Christ speaks as Lord and King of heaven and earth, in 'the majesty of His exalted humanity and brightness of His divinity' (Lange). His disciples, having to undertake a superhuman task, required to be assured that they were backed by superhuman authority. Nothing but the assurance of such power at their disposal could nerve men to attack those strongholds of sin and Satan which must be overthrown before the kingdom of heaven can be established in human hearts. Meyer defines the power here claimed by Christ as the '*munus regium Christi* without limitation.'

By the *promise* 'And, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world,' Christ assures His followers that the universal power possessed by Himself will be at their disposal when engaged in doing His work. The mystery of Christ's name Ἐμμανουήλ—God with us, is here fulfilled—in the fullest sense, as if He, the risen, exalted, all-powerful head of the Church, 'stretched out His hand from heaven' (Calvin). He is present in the Person of the Holy Spirit (Joh 14:16; Joh 14:26) through His Word (Joh 14:25) and Sacrament (Mat 26:28). This promise is made to the whole Church in the widest sense, as well as to the Apostles and all who should take up their official work in propagating and preserving the Christian Church as missionaries and pastors. Alford says: 'To understand μεθ' ὑμῶν only of the Apostles and their (?) successors, is to destroy the whole force of these most weighty words.... The command is to the Universal Church, to be performed in the nature of things by her *ministers and teachers*, the manner of appointing whom is not here prescribed, but to be learnt in the unfoldings of Providence recorded in, the Acts of the Apostles, who by His special ordinance were the founders and first builders of that Church, but whose office, *on that very account, precluded the idea of succession or renewal.*'

The Mediatorial Presence is to last unto the end of the world—whether that refer to the end of the material order here, or the end of the present moral and spiritual

order, for Christ's return will make all things new. Schaff points out that 'unto' (ἕως) 'does not set a term to Christ's presence, but to His *invisible and temporal* presence, which will be exchanged for His *visible and eternal* presence at His last coming.' An important link between the power and promised presence—one which connects them also with the intervening Commission—is this: The power is placed at the disposal *of*, the presence granted *to*, those alone who obey the command, Go and disciple the nations.

The Commission itself is evangelistic, or missionary, and pastoral—the one merging into the other, with Baptism as the link connecting these two departments. Its order is threefold—*Discipling, Baptizing, Instructing*. All nations are to be brought to the obedience of the faith. Their standing is to be sealed and ratified by the sign of the gospel. Then their instruction is to go on, that so these baptized scholars in the school of Christ may reach up to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.

(1) 'Go ye therefore and make disciples of (μαθητεύσατε) all nations.' 'Demonstrably, this was not understood as spoken to the Apostles only, but to all the brethren' (Alford). Go forth—out of the bounds of Israel—and disciple the nations,—convert them, enrol them as scholars in the school of Christ. St. Mark specifies the means by which this discipling is to be accomplished—'Preach the gospel' (κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον); herald the good news of a crucified, risen, and exalted Saviour. By the mention of 'all nations' the restriction of Mar 10:5-6 is now removed: for the middle wall of partition, that divided Jew from Gentile, was broken down by Christ's death. Christ's words give no hint of an answer to that question, soon to disturb the early Church, about the method of Gentile admission; but the principle of their admission is emphatically laid down. The corresponding words in Mar 16:15 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature' (πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει), emphasize the universality of the gospel message even more strongly than those of Matthew. All the world is the sphere, every creature the object, of evangelistic effort.

(2) 'Baptizing them.' The Church of Christ being a visible community, to be gathered out of the world until it become itself universal, has its peculiar rites, by which that visibility is manifested. Besides being channels of Divine grace, they are seals of Divine favour, and pledges, on the part of disciples, of obedience to Divine commands. Baptism is the initiatory rite. It signifies both the bestowal and the reception of that grace of God in Christ which brings salvation. It testifies to the adoption of believers by grafting into the body of Christ, the washing of regeneration, and the imputation of a new righteousness on God's part. The person baptized, on the other hand, ratifies by his signature the faith in Christ through which these blessings are appropriated. A profession of that faith has been required in all ages of the

Church from those of mature years when seeking admission to her pale. This profession was manifestly intended by our Lord when He instituted the rite of Baptism. A minority of the Christian Church confine the rite to those who are capable of cherishing and professing such a personal faith. See art. Baptism.

Baptism is 'into' (εἰς) the name of the triune God—by the authority and unto the authority of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The unity in Trinity of the Godhead is distinctly marked by the use of the singular τὸ ὄνομα instead of τὰ ὀνόματα. These words, 'into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,' have been used for ages as our formula of Baptism when admitting candidates into the covenant of Redemption—'into the name,' 'as the expression, according to the common Scripture use, of the whole character of God, the sum of the whole Christian revelation. The knowledge of God as Father, the spiritual birthright of sonship, the power and advocacy of the Spirit—all these privileges belong to those who, in the divinely appointed rite, are incorporated into the Divine name' (G. Milligan in *Expository Times*, vol. viii. [1897] p. 172).

(3) Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.' The process begun *before*, must be continued *after* Baptism. Admission into the Church—whether visible or invisible—is only the beginning of Christian discipleship. Eternity cannot complete the process of learning what has to be known of an infinite God, and the relation of His creatures to Him. It is part of the pastoral duty of the Christian ministry to inculcate the truth as it is in Jesus, that every member may be built up into the full manhood of the Author and Finisher of our faith. The subject-matter of teaching is the doctrines and precepts of Christ, which lie at the root of Christian faith and Christian practice. On all the members of His Church it is incumbent to be diligent scholars in the school of Christ, learning obedience to His commandments from those appointed as teachers. On some of these learners the additional duty rests of being official expounders of His law—teachers in their turn—devoting their lives, as the Apostles did, to edify the body of Christ.

The place assigned to Word and Sacrament in the spiritual perspective of this Commission is well worthy of notice. It portrays the minister of the gospel in the character of a teaching prophet rather than in that of a sacrificing priest. The ministry is first a ministry of the Word, and then of the Sacraments. Thus Baptism—the Sacrament of regeneration—is closely associated with preaching and teaching; while the Lord's Supper—the Sacrament of sanctification—is not directly mentioned, although included among the 'all things whatsoever I have commanded you.' The Word must not be exalted at the expense of the Sacraments, nor the Sacraments at the expense of the Word. When each is assigned its true place as a

means of grace, the work of evangelizing and edifying, committed to His Church by Christ, will most surely prosper.

Literature.—Besides the Comm. *in loc.*, see Latham, *Risen Master*, 273 ff.; Denney, *Death of Christ*, 69 ff.; *Expos.* 6th Ser. v. 43, vi. 241; *Expos. Times* iv. 557, vi. 419. For a clear statement of the views of those who question the authenticity of the Commission, see Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, i. 79, *Expansion of Christianity*, i. 40 ff. For the Baptismal Formula see Resch and Marshall in *Expos. Times* vi. 395 ff.; and the discussion by Chase and Armitage Robinson, in *JThSt* [Note: ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.] , July 1905, Jan. 1906.

D. A. Mackinnon.

☩ Common Life

COMMON LIFE.—The teaching of our Lord upon this subject is no more restricted and definite than it is upon any other of life's relations. It was never His purpose to draw up anything like a code of laws for the regulation of human life. Indeed, it is just this indefiniteness, this liberty, this leaving all detail to the spiritual guidance which He promised, that has made the religion of Jesus so far transcend every other religion that has been given to men. Christ left His teaching unrestricted, that by its inner and spiritual power it might be able to adapt itself to the ever-changing needs and thoughts of men. That doctrine which makes itself particular, which binds itself up with the peculiar circumstances of a definite people, a definite clime, a definite era, must of necessity pass away with those circumstances to which it specially applied. Our Lord, in that He laid down principles, not rules, has given us that which will apply to all peoples and climes and eras. Christianity is the universal faith, because it is founded upon the universal needs of the human heart (Joh_8:31-32; Joh_14:12-13).

It is, of course, true that Christianity is particular to this extent, that its Founder faces and combats those particular evils which chanced to be most prevalent at the time when He lived on earth. Had renunciation of the world in the monastic sense been as widespread as it became two centuries after His death, we should certainly have had more definite teaching upon our subject. But it was Pharisaism that He had to oppose, not asceticism. There were, indeed, the Essenes at the time of Christ, but that community was never a large one, nor were their tenets so opposed to the truths He taught as to demand His special attention. The Baptist, it is true, was an ascetic (Mat_3:4 || Mar_1:6, Mat_11:18 || Luk_7:33); but we never find him commanding others to lead his life. John preached repentance, but a repentance that did not entail renunciation of the world. Even the publicans and the rough soldiery of Herod,

when they came seeking his advice, were not required to give up professions so fraught with temptation. All that be asked of them was that they should perform the duties of their callings honestly and honourably (Luk 3:10-14). It was therefore in opposition to the ritualism of the Pharisees alone that Christ had to develop His teaching as to common life. Purity and holiness in the eyes of the Pharisees were matters of ceremonial observance far more than of heart and life; and to such an extent had they elaborated the Mosaic ritual, that it was no longer possible for the poor man and the toiler to attain to holiness in the sense which they had rendered popular. Only the wealthy and the leisured could win their esoteric righteousness. It is for this reason that we so continually find our Lord in strenuous opposition to all externalism. It is ever the religion of heart and life, not that of ceremonial, that He demands of His followers. Consider, for example, His fulfilling of the Law in the Sermon on the Mount. Throughout it is the Law's moral requirements that He treats of; and the discourse is prefaced by the assertion that the righteousness of the new kingdom must start by exceeding that of the scribes and Pharisees (Mat 5:20). He speaks of least commandments, the breaking of which does not exclude from the kingdom (Mat 5:19); and which He accounts the greater and which the less is manifested by His saying—'First be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift' (Mat 5:24). From a similar standpoint He treats the observance of the Sabbath, subordinating all external and ceremonial requirements to those spiritual commands of love to God and to our neighbour which He made all-important (Mar 2:23-28, Luk 6:1-12; Luk 13:10-17). In regard to the question of washing the hands before eating, He comes into open conflict with the Pharisees, upbraiding their hypocrisy, and contending that defilement comes not from external things, but from within the heart (Mat 15:1-20, Mar 7:1-23).

All this tends towards the placing of a higher value upon common life. He is thus clearing the way for the reception of the thought that God may be as truly served in the round of daily life and toil as in those observances distinctively called religious. We have the boldest assertion of this truth in the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican (Luk 18:9-14), wherein He points out that the strictest—nay, the supererogatory—performance of ritual cannot win justification in the sight of God, while simple repentance, utterly without these things, is assured of pardon and peace. We are not told whether the repentance of this publican entailed the giving up of his profession; but in the case of Zacchaeus there is evidence that it did not (Luk 19:1-10). Apparently, then, in the eyes of our Lord, even this, the most despised of callings, could be followed by a member of the kingdom. Levi, it is true, was called to leave all and follow (Luk 5:27 f.); but his case we must regard as an exception. He showed a special aptitude, and was called to a special office.

But it is rather the whole tendency of the teaching and example of Jesus, than any explicit statement, that in Christianity assigns to common life a dignity which it

receives in no other religion. That Christianity so early developed monkish asceticism cannot be adduced as an argument against Christ's teaching. The life of Jesus is throughout a clear admission of the value of that probation which God the Father and Creator has allotted to mankind. Jesus as the universal Man, the Example for all the world, assumed for Himself the most universal experience. For thirty years He lived the common life of a labouring man, working like any one of His brethren in the carpenter's shop at Nazareth. We have Him described as a carpenter, as one well known to His fellow-townsmen, as one but little distinguished from His brothers and sisters (Mat 13:55 f., Mar 6:3). Commonplace daily toil and family intercourse, and that throughout a period of thirty years, were thus the training which the Heavenly Father accounted the best for His Son who was to be the Saviour of the world. In this lowly sphere the Son of God grew 'in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man' (Luk 2:52). Than this there could be no stronger argument for the value and the nobleness of common life in the eyes of the Father and the Son. It is impossible to conceive that He who thus honoured the common lot could desire any renunciation of it on the part of those who wished to be His followers. Those who were called to be His missionaries must of necessity give up all to do a higher work, but not to attain a higher life. It is to be noted that when for a time that work is in abeyance, His chief disciples return to their old calling (Joh 21:3).

The whole attitude of Jesus towards the world of nature and of man is in accordance with His claim to be the Son of the Creator. He clearly recognized the wisdom and the beauty and the love that shine forth in Creation and Providence. The lilies of the field and the fowls of the air, the sunshine and the rain, are used by Him as evidences of the goodness of the Father. His teaching is bound up in closest harmony with the things of earth and time. For Him the family ties are types of Heaven. His kingdom is far more a family than a nation. The names of father, mother, brother, sister, wife, are ennobled by His use of them. From all the callings of men He draws images of Divine things. The physician, the sower, the reaper, the fisherman, the vinedresser, the shepherd, the king at war, the housewife at her baking, the commonest incidents of daily life, the simplest phenomena of nature,—all have a place in His doctrine; all are used to illustrate the character and development of His kingdom. He did not, it is true, enlarge upon the relations of life. That was not His mission. His reformation was to proceed from within, not from without. But everywhere there is the manifest acceptance of the order, alike social and natural, which God has ordained. Even the civil order, with which He came into contact in no ideal form in the Roman domination, receives His sanction. 'Render unto Caesar,' He says, 'the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's' (Mat 22:15-22, Mar 12:13-17, Luk 20:20-26). There is duty to God and duty to civil order, and these must not conflict in religion's name: the former should include the latter. Marriage is recognized by Him as a holy tie, an indissoluble Divine institution, and thus obtains a position more honourable than it had ever held before (Mat 19:3-9, Mar 10:2-12). His

presence and first miracle at the wedding at Cana of Galilee (Joh_2:1-11)—a miracle which shows His deep sympathy with even trivial human needs—is in itself a consecration of marriage. That episode strikes the keynote of His life,—a life lived amid His fellows, sharing their joys and sorrows, their trials and temptations, their feastings and their mournings. The Son of man came eating and drinking, with no ascetic gloom; came to live in, and thus to sanctify, the whole round of common life.

Yet in the view of our Lord all these things had but a transitory value. They were but means to something higher. They were the temporal and seen, from which the unseen and eternal was to be extracted. In so far, then, as they conflicted with that higher good, that eternal treasure, Christ demanded renunciation in regard to them. His treatment of the young ruler (Mat_19:16-22, Mar_10:17-27, Luk_18:18-27) illustrates well this attitude. Wealth is not in itself an evil, but it is a great danger, and in certain cases it may destroy the life of the soul. For some, therefore, it is wiser and safer to discard it. It has an engrossing power that deprives the soul of its proper nourishment (cf. the parable of the Rich Fool, Luk_12:16-21). It tends to harden the heart against compassion and charity, to make the man self-sufficient, to give a physical delight so great as to close the eyes to that which is spiritual (cf. the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, Luk_16:19-31). But there are other blessings far more innocent that possess a like danger. Things as precious and as natural as the hand and eye and foot may yet lead to sin and obstruct the passage to the higher life (Mat_5:29 f., Mar_9:43-48). In such cases, too, these must be renounced. Even the family ties, if they become so binding as to come between the soul and its true weal—the service of God in Christ—must be broken; for the kingdom of God is the one aim and purpose of the spiritual man, and nought must be permitted to interfere therewith (Mat_10:37 || Luk_14:26, Mat_6:33). Even life itself must be laid down for the sake of Christ (Mat_10:39, Luk_17:33, Joh_12:25).

Christ's teaching as to worldly good is particularly revealed in the parable of the Unjust Steward (Luk_16:1-12). There He calls the command of wealth and natural advantage by the name of 'the unrighteous mammon,' thus pointing to its seductive power and contrasting it with the true spiritual good. He calls it also 'that which is another man's' in distinction to 'that which is your own.' Of earthly good we are but the stewards. Wealth is never really our own. We may use it or abuse it, but sooner or later we must resign its control. The spiritual gifts of God are of a nature totally different. They become truly ours, a part of our true self. Yet the unrighteous mammon can be so employed as to win us spiritual advantage. By its means we can make us friends who will receive us into everlasting habitations. As the unjust steward employed his power to his own worldly advantage, so must we with the wisdom of light use to our highest advantage the worldly power which is ours which is always one with the service of God.

There is a remarkable passage in Mar_10:29 f. (cf. Mat_19:29 and Luk_18:29), which promises that earthly loss suffered for Christ's sake and the gospel's shall receive an hundredfold reward 'now in this time' in the same kind in which the loss was suffered. That the Christian in his profession and practice of love to all men must have the family ties strengthened and extended an hundredfold, is readily to be understood: but the promise of lands is not so simple. To the mind of the present writer it suggests the great truth, which Christ's own life exemplified, that only the child of God is capable of the pure and perfect enjoyment of all that God has made. Only to the eyes of him whose heart is filled with the Father's love, is all the beauty of the Creator's work displayed. As one with the Father through Christ, as sharing the purposes of God, as beholding the Divine plan and submitting to and working for it, the Christian possesses the world in a sense in which no other can. It is his to rejoice in and to use for God's glory. (Cf. *Expositor* 1st ser. iv. [1876] 256 ff.).

To sum up the whole, we may say that there are two great ideas which underlie all Christ's teaching:—(1) The inestimable value of the human soul (Mat_16:26, Mar_8:36 f., Luk_9:25), to the salvation of which all must be subordinated, for the sake of which all things, if necessary, must be renounced: the Gospel, therefore, which gives this salvation is all-important, and its service must have no rival; and (2) the recognition of common life and daily toil, with all that these terms include, as the ordinances of a loving Father by whose Providence they are designed to be the chiefest elements in fitting men for citizenship in the Kingdom of Heaven. He who uses well the talents which God gives, in the sphere in which his lot is cast, who is faithful in a little, shall have his reward hereafter in the obtaining of a larger sphere wherein to exercise for God's glory those very qualities, purified and ennobled, which his earthly diligence has made his own (Mat_23:14-30, Luk_19:11-27). Work that is the expression of love to God and man is always noble; and there is no work on earth that may not be performed to God's glory.

Literature.—Beyschlag, *New Testament Theology*, ii. 250 ff.; Weiss, *New Testament Theology*, ii. 347 ff.; the standard Commentaries on the Gospels, and works on the Parables; Stopford Brooke, *Christ in Modern Life*, p. 1 ff.; R. W. Dale, *Laws of Christ for Common Life*, esp. chs. i. xi. xii. xiv.; J. T. Jacob, *Christ the Indweller*, ch. ix; R. Glaister, 'Christ's Sympathy in Life's Commonplace,' *Exp. Times*, x. 360 ff.; J. W. Diggle, *Short Studies in Holiness*, 197.

W. J. S. Miller.

COMMUNION.—It is surprising that neither the substantive (κοινωνία) nor the verb (κοινωνεῖν), which represent the concept of ‘communion’ in NT, is to be found in any of our four Gospels. It would, however, be unsafe, and indeed untrue to fact, to assume on this account that the idea of communion is wanting. While there is an absence of the words concerned, there is no absence of the conception itself. A careful study of the Gospels, on the contrary, not only reveals a plain recognition of this vital aspect of the religious life, but also (and especially in the records of our Lord’s teaching preserved by St. John) presents the conception to us with a certain clear, if unobtrusive, prominence.

The subject contains three distinct parts, which will naturally be considered separately: (1) The communion of Christ with the Father; (2) our communion with God; (3) our communion one with another.

1. The communion of Christ with the Father.—The more conspicuous aspect of our Lord’s communion with the Father as reflected in the Gospels, is that which characterized His earthly ministry. But it is not the only aspect presented. Christ Himself clearly claimed to have enjoyed pre-existent communion with His Father (Joh 17:5; Joh 17:24), and the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel in three or four weighty clauses confirms the claim. This pre-existent communion included both unity of essence and life, and fellowship in work, (a) The Word was πρὸς τὸν θεόν (Joh 1:1), realizing His very personality ‘in active intercourse with and in perfect communion with God’ (Westcott, *in loc*). His nature was the nature of Deity (καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος, *ib.*). His Sonship is unique (Joh 1:14; and for the uniqueness of the relationship cf. the important Synoptic passage, Mat 11:27 = Luk 10:22). His is the πλήρωμα—the sum of the Divine attributes (Joh 1:16, cf. Col 1:19; Col 2:9; Eph 1:23), and He is μονογενὴς θεός (Joh 1:18)—‘One Who is God only-begotten’ (Westcott). (b) The pre-existent communion not merely consisted in identity of essence, but was also expressed by fellowship in work. The Word was the Agent in the work of Creation (Joh 1:3; Joh 1:10, cf. also 1Co 8:6, Col 1:16 : His work in sustaining the Universe so created is taught in Col 1:17, Heb 1:3). See art. Creator.

Our Lord’s realization of His Father’s presence during His life upon earth was constant. That He Himself laid claim to such fellowship is beyond contention. He did so directly in His words (Mat 11:27 = Luk 10:22, Joh 12:49-50; Joh 14:6; Joh 14:10-11; Joh 16:28; Joh 16:32), emphasizing especially His unity with the Father (Joh 10:30-38; Joh 12:44; Joh 14:7 ff.), and accepting with approval the title of ‘God’ (Joh 20:28-29). He did so even more impressively, if less directly, by assuming His Father’s functions in the world (Mar 2:5; Mar 2:7 = Mat 9:2-3 =

Luk 5:20-21; Luk 7:48) and representing Himself as controlling Divine forces and originating Divine missions (Mat 11:27 a, Joh 15:26; Joh 20:22-23). Moreover, any attempt to explain away that intimate knowledge of God which the Gospels consistently ascribe to Him, is compelled to disregard not merely the passages in which His own words and actions distinctly assume it, but also not a few in which, whether with approval or with disapproval, others recognize that He claimed to possess it (Joh 5:18; Joh 10:33; Joh 13:3; Joh 19:7, cf. also Joh 17:7-8). See Claims of Christ.

But apart altogether from His specific claim to the enjoyment of this Divine fellowship, we have abundant evidence of its existence in His earthly life itself. The sense of communion was an integral part of that life. It is one of those elements in His personality that could not be eliminated from it. A Christ unconscious of intercourse with God would not be the Christ of the Gospels. It was this sense of communion that moulded His first recorded conception of duty (Luk 2:49, Authorized Version or Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). The thirty years of quiet preparation for a three years' ministry (the proportions are suggestive; for other examples of equipment in seclusion see Exo 3:1, Luk 1:80, Gal 1:15-17) may without doubt be summed up as one long experience of fellowship with His Father. And the recognition of this union, which marks His first thoughts of His mission, and which must so largely have constituted His earthly preparation for it, is found to be His constant support amid the stress of the work itself. It is present in a special manner in the Baptism which signaled the beginning of His ministry among men (Mar 1:10-11 = Mat 3:16-17 = Luk 3:21-22). It is His stay alike before the labours of the day begin (Mar 1:35), at the very moment of service (Mar 6:41 ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; cf. also Mar 7:34; Mar 8:24, Joh 6:11; Joh 11:41), and when refreshment of soul is needed at the close of the long hours of toil (Mar 6:46 = Mat 14:23, Luk 5:16). The Gospels, indeed, make it plain that He regarded such communion as a condition on which the accomplishment of certain work depended (Mar 9:29, cf. Joh 5:30), and we cannot fail to observe the frequency with which both He and His biographers insist that the Divine Presence is with Him in all His words and works (Luk 4:14; Luk 4:18, Joh 3:34; Joh 5:19-21; Joh 5:36; Joh 8:16; Joh 8:26; Joh 8:20). So constant is the communion, that even the most familiar objects of Nature convey to Him suggestions of the Father in heaven (Mat 6:26; Mat 6:28). It is noteworthy that retirement for intimate converse with unseen realities is especially recorded as preceding Christ's action or speech at certain great crises in the development of His life-mission (Luke is particularly careful to draw attention to this; see Luk 3:21; Luk 6:12-13; Luk 9:18; Luk 9:28 ff., Luk 22:41; Luk 23:46; cf. also Mar 9:2, Joh 12:28; Joh 17:1 ff.), and that intercession for individual men had its place in this sacred experience (Luk 22:31-32; cf. Luk 23:34, Joh 17:6-26).

Thus constantly, alike at critical junctures and in more normal moments, did the sense of His Father's presence uphold Him. In one mysterious moment, the full meaning of which baffles human explanation. His consciousness of it appears to have wavered (Mar 15:34); yet even this cry of desolation must not be considered apart from the certain restoration of the communion revealed in the calm confidence of the last word of all (Luk 23:46). See art. Dereliction.

One further point maybe briefly suggested. Our Lord's communion with the Father was not inconsistent with His endurance of temptation. Nay, it was under the strong impulse of that Spirit whose presence with Him was at once the sign and the expression of His union with God (see Mar 1:10), that He submitted to the assaults of evil (Mar 1:12-13, note ἐκβάλλει, = Mat 4:1 = Luk 4:1). The protracted testing (ἦν πειραζόμενος, analytical tense, cf. the suggestion of other occasions of temptation in the plur. ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου, Luk 22:28, and Joh 12:27), successfully endured, itself became to our Lord the means of a fresh assurance and (perhaps we may add) a fuller realization of fellowship with the spiritual world (Mar 1:13 διηκόνουν—impf.). In this respect, as in others also, His life of communion, while in one sense unique (Luk 10:22), is seen to be the exemplar of our own.

2. Our communion with God.—The reality of the believer's communion with God is plainly revealed in the teaching of the Gospels. This communion is presented sometimes in terms of a relationship with the Father, sometimes in terms of a relationship with the Son, sometimes in terms of a relationship with the Spirit; but all three presentations alike are relevant to our study (1Jn 2:23 b, cf. 1Jn 1:3, Joh 14:16-17).^{*} [Note: It is scarcely necessary to point out that for purposes of doctrine, I Jn. ranks as practically a part of the Fourth Gospel.] if our outline is to be at once clear and comprehensive, we must treat the passages concerned under two headings. The first (*a*) will include those that deal with the *state* of communion with God into which a man is brought when he becomes the servant of God; the second (*b*) those that relate to the *life* of conscious communion with God which it is his privilege to live from that time forward. The distinction, as will shortly appear, is by no means an unnecessary one, the second experience being at once more vivid and more profound than the first need necessarily be.

(*a*) It is clear that in the case of every believer the barrier raised between himself and God by his sin has been broken down. In other words, he has been restored to a *state* of communion with God. The means by which this *state* is brought about have both a Divine and a human significance. It is in considering their Divine aspect that we reach the point of closest connexion between the communion of believers with God and the communion of Christ with His Father. For these in a true sense stand to one another in

the relation of effect and cause (cf. what is implied in such passages as Joh 1:16; Joh 14:6; Joh 14:12; Joh 17:21-23). It is in virtue of our Lord's perfect fellowship with God that through His life and death we too can gain unrestricted admission to the Divine Presence. This truth is all-important. It needs no detailed proof. The whole story of the Incarnation and of the Cross is one long exposition of it. Perhaps it is symbolically represented in Mar 15:38. The conditions required on the human side for restoration to the state of communion with God appear plainly in our Lord's teaching. This state is described in varied language and under different metaphors. Sometimes it is presented as citizenship in God's kingdom (Mar 10:14-15, Joh 3:3); sometimes as discipleship (Luk 14:26, Joh 8:31), friendship (Joh 15:15), and even kinship (Mar 3:32-35) with Christ Himself. In other places it is spoken of as a personal knowledge of Him (1Jn 2:3); in others, again, as a following in His footsteps (Mar 8:34, Joh 8:12); and in yet others as the possession of a new type of life (Joh 3:16 : for the definition of eternal life as 'knowing God' see Joh 17:3, 1Jn 5:20). As one condition of finding this experience, which, in whatever terms it be described, places men in a new relationship with God, Christ mentions childlikeness of disposition (Mar 10:15). As other conditions He emphasizes poverty of spirit (Mat 5:3, Luk 18:9 ff.) and the performance of the Divine will in a life of righteousness and love (Mar 3:35, Luk 6:35-36; Luk 8:21, Joh 8:31; Joh 14:23, cf. 1Jn 1:6; 1Jn 2:3-6; 1Jn 3:6). In one very important passage, addressed both to the multitude and to His own band of disciples, He may perhaps be said to include all individual conditions. 'If any man willeth to come after me, let him renounce himself' (Mar 8:34 and ||). This saying has a meaning far more profound than that suggested by our English versions. Taken with the explanation contained in the verse that follows, it really leads us to the basis of communion. All communion between two persons, whether human and human or human and Divine, is possible only in virtue of some element common to the natures of both (see Joh 4:24; Joh 8:47; cf. the same principle differently applied in Joh 5:27). Man's sole possibility of communion with God lies in his possession, potential or actual, of the Divine life (cf. Joh 1:9). But joined to the 'self' (the second ψυχή of Mar 8:35) which is capable of union with God, he is conscious also of another 'self' (the first ψυχή of Mar 8:35) which is incongruous with that close relationship to Deity. The condition of realizing the one 'self,' and with it, in natural sequence, communion with God, is the renunciation of the other and lower 'self.'

So both Mar 8:34-35 : the ἑαυτον of Mar 8:34 is thus equivalent to the first ψυχη of Mar 8:35 The 'taking up his cross'—*i.e.* for his own crucifixion thereon—defines the 'renouncing himself' more closely. The teaching of the whole passage is the Evangelic representation of the Pauline doctrine of self-crucifixion, cf. Gal 2:20; Gal 5:24.

To change the figure somewhat, the unity of life involved in the idea of communion between man and God can be attained only through man's rising to God's life. This, it is true, would have been outside his power had not God first stooped to *his* level. But in the Incarnation this step of infinite condescension has been taken, and by it the possibility of mankind's rising to the life of God—in other words, the possibility of its entering into a state of communion with God—has been once for all secured. In order to make this state of communion his own, Christ teaches, each individual man must now leave his lower life, with all that pertains to it, behind; must be content to 'renounce himself'; must be willing to 'lose' that life' which cannot consist with the Divine life. So complete, indeed, is to be the severance from the past, that the experience in which it is brought about is called a 'new birth' (Joh 3:3), as real as, though of a type essentially different from, the physical birth (Joh 3:6). When with this self-renouncement is combined that faith in Christ which leads to union with Him and reliance upon Him (πιστεύειν εἰς—Joh 3:16; Joh 3:36; Joh 6:29; Joh 11:26), we have the experience which sums up into one great whole the various individual conditions required on the human side for entering into the state of communion with God.

(b) Quite distinct in thought from the *state* of communion into which all believers are brought, is the *life* of communion which it is their privilege to enjoy. The one is always a fact, the other is also a consciously realized experience. Like so many of the blessings revealed in NT, such a life of communion is too rich an experience to be described in any one phrase or under a single metaphor. In different contexts it is presented in different ways. Sometimes, for example, it is set forth as an abiding in Christ who also abides in the believer (Joh 15:4 ff.). In other places it is represented as an indwelling of the Spirit (Joh 14:16-20; Joh 16:7; Joh 16:13-15, 1Jn 2:20; 1Jn 2:27; 1Jn 3:24; 1Jn 4:13), whose presence, to believers (as in a deeper sense to their Lord) the sign and expression of union with God, is to be with them from the moment of their initiation into the new life (Mar 1:8 and || ||, 1Jn 3:24; 1Jn 4:13). Yet another statement, emphasizing in a remarkable metaphor the inwardness and intimacy of the union that results, sets the experience before us as a mystical feeding upon Christ (John 6, esp. Joh 6:53-58, cf. also Joh 6:35). But while there is variation in the language in which this sense of the Divine Presence is set forth, there is no question as to the reality of the experience itself. It is the inspiration of this Unseen Presence that shall give to believers definite guidance in moments of crisis and perplexity (Mar 13:11 and || ||, Luk 12:11-12). It is in this communion with God that they will find their surest refuge against fears and dangers (Mar 13:18 = Mat 24:20) and against the assaults of temptation (Mar 14:38 and || ||). Such fellowship, too, is their ground of certainty, alike in their teaching (Joh 3:11—note the plurals; 1Jn 1:1-3) and in their belief (cf. Joh 4:42). It is, moreover, the source of all their fitness for service (cf. Gabriel's suggestive speech, Luk 1:19) and the means of all

their fruit-bearing (Joh 15:1-10). As would have been expected, the full significance of this converse with God is not understood, nor is its closest intimacy appropriated, in the earliest days of initiation. Knowledge of God, like knowledge of men, has to be realized progressively (cf. χάρις ἀντὶ χάριτος, Joh 1:16). There are degrees of intimacy (cf. Joh 15:15 and the suggestive interchange of ἀγαπᾶν and φιλεῖν in Joh 21:15 ff.), and the extent to which the believer is admitted into fellowship is proportionate to the progress he has made in the lessons previously taught (cf. the significant connexion between Mar 8:31; Mar 8:27-29, which is clearly brought out in the emphatic καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν of Mar 8:31 : cf. also Mar 4:33, Joh 16:12). The reason for this basis of progress is plain. An important element in communion being self-adjustment to God's will (cf. our Lord's own illustration of this, Mar 14:36 and ||), the degree of intimacy that ensues will naturally be conditioned by the extent to which this element is rendered prominent. Thus, while its neglect will open up the possibility of lapsing even to one who has been on intimate terms with Christ (Mar 14:18, Joh 13:18), its constant and progressive practice may bring a man to a union with God so close as to constitute his complete possession by Divine influence (cf. the Baptist's magnificent description of himself as a 'Voice,' Joh 1:23, taken from Isa 40:3). And the fellowship so enjoyed and ever more intimately realized under the restricted conditions of earth, is to find its perfect consummation only in the hereafter (Joh 12:26; Joh 14:2-3; Joh 17:24, cf. 1Jn 3:2). See art. Abiding.

The means by which, according to the Gospel teaching, the believer will practise this life of communion with God, may be briefly indicated. Prominent among them is seclusion from the world for the purpose of definite prayer. The importance of this our Lord emphasized by His own example. He also enjoined it upon His followers by oft-repeated precepts (Mat 6:8; Mat 7:7-8; Mat 26:41 and ||, Luk 6:28; Luk 18:1). At the same time the Evangelic teaching does not aim at making recluses. There are active as well as passive means of enjoying intercourse with God, and our Lord's whole training of the Twelve indicates, even more clearly than any individual saying (cf. Joh 17:10), His belief in the Divine communion that is found in the service of mankind. The sense of fellowship with God vivified in secret devotion is to be realized afresh *and tested* in contact with men (so 1Jn 4:8; 1Jn 4:12; 1Jn 4:16).

Two more points call for separate attention. (1) Before His death our Lord ordained a rite which not only symbolizes the union of His followers with Himself, but is also a means of its progressive realization. If an intimate connexion between the Lord's Supper (Mar 14:22 ff. and ||) and the Jewish Passover may, as seems reasonable, be assumed, that conception of the Christian rite which represents it as a means of communion between the individual soul and its Saviour would appear to have a basis in the foundation principle on which all ancient worship, whether Jewish or heathen, rests—the belief that to partake of a sacrifice is to enter into some kind of fellowship

with the Deity. This aspect of the Lord's Supper does not, of course, exhaust its meaning (see art. Lord's Supper), but it is certainly prominent, and it is emphasized both by St. Paul (1Co_10:18) and by Christ Himself (Joh_6:56, where the eating would certainly include that of the Lord's Supper, even though, as is most probable, it does not refer to it exclusively).

(2) One more suggestion may be put forward. Our Lord seems to hint at a special means of communion with Himself which is really a particular extension of the self-renouncement considered above. This is a mysterious fellowship with Him in His own sufferings for mankind (Mar_10:38-39 = Mat_20:22-23 a; for a symbolical illustration see Mar_15:21). It is only a hint, but the words are significant; and, taken in conjunction with St. Paul's ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου (Col_1:24) and his purpose τοῦ γινῶναι ... κοινωνίαν παθημάτων αὐτοῦ (Php_3:10; cf. also 2Co_1:5; 2Co_4:10; 1Pe_4:13), would certainly seem to imply that the believer's own sufferings for Christ's sake may become a medium through which he may enter into close communion with his Lord.

Even this brief study will have revealed that the Gospel conception of the Christian's communion with God is essentially different from that of the Quietist. Whether we have regard to our Lord's example or to His teaching, whether we are thinking of the status of fellowship or of its conscious practice, the means by which the Divine communion is realized are not exclusively periods of secluded contemplation. In Christ's own life upon earth the two elements of active and passive fellowship are signally combined. The sense of union with the Unseen Father, fostered in lonely retreat, is also intensified in moments of strenuous activity. In His thoughts for the lives of His followers, too, the consciousness of God's presence is secured not alone by solitary worship, but also by the doing of the Divine will, by the earnest struggle to subdue the lower self, and even by active participation in the very sufferings of Christ. So the servant, as his Lord, must practise the communion of service as well as the communion of retirement (cf., again, Joh_17:15). The desire for the permanent consciousness of the more immediate Presence must be sunk in the mission of carrying to others the tidings of salvation (Mar_5:18-20 = Luk_8:38-39). It is but natural that in the moment of special revelation on the mountain the disciple should long to make it his abiding place (Mar_9:5 and ||); but his Master can never forget the need of service on the ordinary levels of life (Mar_9:14 ff. and ||). And the experience of the one is the source of power for the other (Mar_9:29, cf. Joh_15:4).

3. Our communion one with another.—Just as our communion with God was seen to bear a close relation to our Lord's communion with the Father, so our spiritual fellowship one with another rests upon the fellowship of each with Christ. As we had occasion to point out above, communion between any two persons is possible only in

virtue of some element common to the natures of both. This common possession in the case of believers is the life, the 'self,' which is called into being and ever progressively realized in their individual communion with Christ. The possibility of our spiritual fellowship with one another rests ultimately upon what He is and our relationship to what He is (see 1Jn 1:1-3, and especially 1Jn 1:7; cf. also 1Co 10:16-17). His Presence is the bond of union in which we are one, and in which we realize the oneness that we possess (Mat 18:20). Indeed, the two types of communion—the communion with God and the communion with our fellow-believers—react each upon the other. On the one hand, as we have just seen, our communion with men rests upon our communion with Christ; on the other hand, our Divine fellowship may be intensified (Mat 18:20 again and Mat 25:40) or impeded (Mat 5:23-24; Mat 6:15; Mat 25:45, Mar 11:25) by our relations with our fellow-men.

That our Lord looked for the unity of His followers is not open to question. He both prophesied it (Joh 10:16) and prayed for it (Joh 17:11 b, Joh 17:21). An intimate friend, clearly one of an inner circle of disciples and probably John himself, understood its attainment to be part of His purpose in dying for mankind (Joh 11:52). Moreover, it is natural to suppose that the desire to ensure it would contribute to His decision to found an organized society (Mat 16:18) and to institute an important rite (Mar 14:22 ff. and ||) for those who should believe in Him. The unity of His followers was even to be one of the grounds on which He based His appeal for the world's faith (Joh 17:21 b). Of His wish for this unity, therefore, there can scarcely be reasonable doubt. But when we ask in what He meant the unity to consist, agreement is not so easily reached. The expression of His followers' unity certainly includes kind and unselfish relations with one another—mutual honour and service (Mar 10:35-45 = Mat 20:20-28), mutual forgiveness (Mat 6:14, Luk 17:3-4), mutual love (Joh 13:34; Joh 15:12). It is exemplified further by participation in the common work (Joh 4:36-38). Another very special means of its realization, the Lord's Supper, we have already indicated. Although this particular aspect of the rite is not actually revealed in the Gospel narrative itself, it will scarcely be questioned that one of the great truths which it both signifies and secures, is that of the fellowship of Christ's followers. The sacred service in which the believer may realize communion with His Lord (see § 2 above), is also a means by which he is to apprehend his oneness with all other believers (see 1Co 10:17).

While, however, it is plain that in Christ's teaching the communion of Christians is at once attested and secured by means like these, it is disputed whether He designed their unity to be simply a spiritual or also an external one. Three important passages may be very briefly considered. (1) Joh 10:16 affords no support to the upholders of an external unity. The true rendering is unquestionably, 'They shall become one *flock*' (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ; cf. Tindale and Coverdale), and not, 'There shall be one *fold*' (Authorized Version ; cf. Vulgate). The unity mentioned here

is one that is realized in the personal relation of each member of the flock to the Great Shepherd Himself.—(2) There is teaching a little more definite in Joh 17:11; Joh 17:21-22 In both these places our Lord makes His own unity with the Father the exemplar of the unity of believers. Reverence forbids any dogmatic statement as to the point to which this sacred analogy can be pressed. But Christ's own words in the immediate context contain suggestions as to His meaning in using the analogy. It is noticeable that here also, as in Joh 10:6, the underlying basis of unity is the believers' personal relation to Christ (and the Father). 'That they may be one, even as we are one,' in Joh 10:22, is at once defined more closely in the words, 'I in them, and thou in me' (Joh 10:23). The resultant unity is gained through the medium not of an external, but of a purely spiritual, condition (ἵνα ὅσιν τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἓν, Joh 10:23). In the same way, in the statement of Joh 10:11, it is a spiritual relationship to God that will yield the unity Christ craves for His disciples. This unity will follow upon their being 'kept ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι σου.' It will be assured if their relationship to the Father is a counterpart of what had been their relationship to Christ (Joh 10:12), *i.e.* a personal relationship. Whatever, therefore, be the exact meaning which the analogy used by our Lord was intended to convey, His own language in the context appears to make it plain that it must be interpreted with a spiritual rather than with an external significance.—(3) This conclusion derives not a little support from the incident of Mar 9:38 ff. When a definite test case arose, He declared the real fellowship of His followers to depend not upon any outward bond of union between them, but upon each bearing such a relationship to Himself as would be involved in His working ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι μου. True, the man in question may not have been a nominal disciple of our Lord, but that in His view he was a *real* disciple is distinctly stated (Mar 9:40). This instance, therefore, may be regarded as a practical application on the part of Christ Himself of the teaching under consideration; and thus it strongly confirms the interpretation that we have put upon it. It would be outside the scope of the present article to consider arguments for or against the corporate unity of Christians drawn from other sources, some of which are very strong and all of which must, of course, be duly weighed before a fair judgment on the whole question can be reached. But so far as the subject-matter before us is concerned, we find it hard to resist the conclusion that such external unity formed no part of the teaching of Christ and the Gospels.

One word must be added. The 'communion of saints' joins the believer not merely to his fellow-Christians upon earth, but also to those who have passed within the veil (cf. Heb 12:1). This aspect of communion is not emphasized in the Gospels, but there are indications that the fellowship of believers upon earth was linked in the thought of Christ to the yet closer fellowship of those beyond death. At any rate, it is worthy of notice that in instituting the sacred rite which, as we have seen, at once witnesses

to and secures our communion one with another, our Lord carefully pointed forward to the reunion that will take place in the world to come (Mat_26:29; note μεθ' ὑμῶν); and that in a few suggestive words He represented the earthly gathering as incomplete apart from its final consummation in the heavenly kingdom (Luk_22:16). See further artt. Fellowship, Unity.

Literature.—*DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] , s.v.; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, ii. 151 ff.; Weiss, *NT Theol*, ii. 367 ff.; Beyschlag, *NT Theol*. i. 217 ff.; Herrmann, *Com. of the Christian with God*; Maclaren, *Holy of Holies*, chs. xvi.-xix.; MacCulloch, *Comparative Theology*, 216, 254; Stearns, *Evidence of Chr. Experience*, 179; Strong, *Historical Christianity*, 11; Westcott, *Historic Faith*, 123, 247; McGiffert, *Apostles' Creed*, 32, 200; *Expos. Times*, iii. 197, v. 464 (R. F. Weymouth); Tasker, *Spiritual Communion*.

H. Bisseker.

☩ Compassion

COMPASSION.—See Pity.

☩ Complacency

COMPLACENCY

Of Scripture words expressive of the idea of complacency as distinguished from benevolence, we find in the Heb. of the OT גָּבַח, נָצַח, variously rendered in the LXX Septuagint by θέλειν ἐν, or by some derivative of the verb δέχουαι. In the NT the expressions used are εὐδοκέω, εὐδοκία, εὐαρεστέω, εὐαρειστος, ἀρείσκω. The words ἀγαπάω, ἀγάπη are also used in this sense. In the OT we find גָּבַח 'take pleasure in,' in 1Sa_18:22 translation in the LXX Septuagint by the phrase θέλω ἐν, where Saul's servants say to David. 'Behold the king taketh pleasure in thee,' meaning that he was willing to regard with satisfaction a matrimonial alliance between David and Saul's daughter. Similarly the word נָצַח 'delight,' is rendered by the same Gr. equivalent in 1Ch_28:4, where David says of God, 'He liked me to make me king.' נָצַח is used of

God's pleasure in the work of the Servant of Jehovah in Isa 42:1, where the LXX Septuagint reads τροσεδέξατο αὐτὸν ἡ ψυχὴ μου, 'my soul has accepted him'; St. Matthew, on the other hand, translates the whole phrase נִפְשִׁי רִצְתָהּ בְּתִירִי by ὁ ἀγαπητός μου ὃν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ, rightly rendered in the Authorized Version 'my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased.' Here, apparently, the thought of the LXX Septuagint inclines more to the idea of the Divine act of will by which the Servant of God was appointed to his mission, while St. Matthew emphasizes the love with which, because of His redemptive work, the Father regards His Son, and so he prefers 'my beloved' to 'mine elect' as a rendering of בְּתִירִי (Mat 12:18). In other passages also where the word רִצְתָהּ is used, as in Isa 53:10, the LXX Septuagint makes prominent the idea of the good pleasure of the Father's will.

Again רִצְתָהּ is used in Pro 16:7 of the favour with which God regards the ways of the righteous, where the LXX Septuagint renders the passage, 'The ways of righteous men are acceptable (δεκταί) with the Lord'; and the Authorized Version, 'When a man's ways please the Lord, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him.'

In the NT, where εὐδοκέω, εὐδοκία, are used, it is not always apparent how far the thought of complacency and how far that of will or choice is predominant. Εὐδοκία evidently occurs in the latter sense in those passages which refer to election, the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God. So Eph 1:5; Eph 1:9, Php 2:13 etc. According to Cremer, εὐδοκέω '(1) relates to a determination when it is followed by an infinitive, Luk 12:32 ...; (2) Where the matter under consideration is the relation of the subject to an object, the latter is expressed in profane Greek by the dative, rarely by the addition of ἐπί τινα.... In the NT the accusative occurs only in Heb 10:6; Heb 10:8 (from Psa 40:7),' and here εὐδοκησας is obviously parallel to ἠθέλησας. 'Elsewhere ἐν ...' So in Mat 3:17 || Mar 1:11 || Luk 3:22, and again Mat 17:5. 'This mode of indicating the object is justified by the circumstance that εὐδοκεῖν may be classed among the verbs which denote an emotion, a mood, a sentiment cherished towards any one = to take pleasure in something, to have an inclination towards it.'

'Complacency,' as the word is commonly used, means a state of being pleased or gratified, and is synonymous with 'pleasure,' 'gratification,' 'satisfaction.' The appropriateness of such a word in the department of Biblical theology is suggested by what we know to be its recognized use in the sphere of ethics. Complacency, as a

mental state, arises when there is perceived in the object contemplated some quality or qualities which call forth a feeling of pleasure or satisfaction. The object may be something without, upon which the mind can rest with pleasure, or it may be in the mind itself, when, in seasons of reflexion, thought turned inwards upon itself is in a condition of perfect harmony, finding in itself no jarring element. The mind or soul is self-complacent when it is at peace with itself, satisfied that all is as it ought to be, no disturbing or self-accusing thoughts arising. Again, the mind is said to regard with complacency any outward object, animate or inanimate, which suggests thoughts of order and beauty, as when it is affected with pleasure or contentment by the contemplation of the beauty of nature, of a fair landscape, or of the harmony of earth and sky. The word applies also to relations between intelligent beings, as between friends, between husband and wife, parent and child, brothers and sisters, when one is satisfied with the character, or state of health, or conduct, or prosperity of the object of his affection or interest. Complacency arises in the mind when one's efforts in any direction are successful, and the object aimed at is attained. The artist, or the composer in prose, poetry, or music, regards his work with complacency when he has succeeded in giving adequate expression to his ideas, the workman when he is successful in his workmanship, the merchant or tradesman when his enterprise accomplishes the end at which he aims, the philanthropist when his efforts for the material or moral or spiritual well-being of the objects of his interest are rewarded, and he sees the fruits of his labours in the happiness and the gratitude of his fellows.

In ethics, complacency is considered as one of the forms of love, and as such is distinguished from benevolence. The distinction is well put by Edwards in his 'Dissertation concerning the Mature of True Virtue' (*Works*, ed. London, 1834, vol. i. pp. 123-125):

'Love is commonly distinguished into love of benevolence and love of complacence. Love of *benevolence* is that affection or propensity of the heart to any being which causes it to incline to its wellbeing, or disposes it to desire and take pleasure in its happiness. And if I mistake not, it is agreeable to the common opinion that beauty in the object is not always the ground of this propensity, but that there may be a disposition to the welfare of those that are not considered as beautiful, unless mere existence he accounted a beauty. And benevolence or goodness in the Divine Being is generally supposed, not only to be prior to the beauty of many of its objects, but to their existence; so as to be the ground both of their existence and of their beauty, rather than the foundation of God's benevolence; as it is supposed that it is God's goodness which moved Him to give them both being and beauty. So that, if all virtue primarily consists in that affection of heart to being which is exercised in benevolence, or an inclination to its good, then God's virtue is so extended as to include a propensity not only to being actually existing, and actually beautiful, but to possible being, so as to incline Him to give a being beauty and happiness.

‘What is commonly called love of *complacence*, presupposes beauty. For it is no other than delight in beauty, or complacence in the person or being beloved for his beauty.... When any one under the influence of general benevolence sees another being possessed of the like general benevolence, this attaches his heart to him, and draws forth greater love to him than merely his having existence; because so far as the being beloved has love to the being in general, so far his own being is, as it were, enlarged, extends to, and in some sort comprehends, being in general, and therefore he that is governed by love to being in general must of necessity have complacence in him, and the greater degree of benevolence to him, as it were out of gratitude to him for his love to general existence, that his own heart is extended and united to, and so looks on its interest as its own. It is because his heart is thus united to being in general that he looks on a benevolent propensity to being in general, wherever he sees it, as the beauty of the being in whom it is; an excellency that renders him worthy of esteem, complacence, and the greater goodwill.... This spiritual beauty, which is but a *secondary* ground of virtuous benevolence, is the ground, not only of benevolence but *complacence*, and is the primary ground of the latter; that is, when the complacence is truly virtuous. Love to us in particular, and kindness received, may be a secondary ground, but this is the primary objective foundation of it.... He that has true virtue, consisting in benevolence to *being* in general and in benevolence to *virtuous* being, must necessarily have a supreme love to God, both of benevolence and complacence.’

According to this exposition, complacency as a moral quality is the result, for the most part, of benevolence reacting upon itself, love making the object beloved become worthy of affection. What one loved at first out of mere benevolence becomes an object morally beautiful, worthy of love, and thus an object of complacency. Scripture illustrations of the Divine love as benevolence and as complacency naturally suggest themselves, and enable us to understand how the latter is often the fruit of the former. The work of Creation is a typical instance of the benevolence of God, the Almighty forming the world out of nothing, bringing light out of darkness, beauty out of chaos, life out of death. When, at the completion of His work, God beheld the product of His benevolence, and pronounced all very good, He showed complacency. So also with regard to the work of Redemption, God’s love to the ruined world (Joh 3:16) was the love of benevolence. His love to sinners as redeemed, made a new creation by that love, is the love of complacency (Mat 3:17).

Keeping this distinction in view, we find in the Gospels not a few instances in which the expression ‘complacency’ may be fitly applied to describe that particular aspect of the love of God, or of the love of Jesus Christ, or even that feeling of grateful affection and devotion which the Divine love kindles in the hearts of true believers, to which the Evangelists direct our attention. If complacency means pleasure in the contemplation of beauty, or pleasure in the results of benevolence, (1) the expression

may with all propriety be in these respects used to describe the love of God the Father to God the Son, or again the love with which the Father contemplates the fruits of the Divine work of redemption in the hearts and lives of the redeemed. (2) It may be applied also to the witness of Jesus to His own character, life, and work, and to His gracious acceptance of the faith and devotion of His disciples. (3) Lastly, it is appropriate as a description of the joy and peace with which believers realize the love of God and the grace of Christ, and of their satisfaction with the all-sufficiency of the Redeemer's work.

1. *The love of God the Father to God the Son, especially with regard to His life and ministry.*—The ineffable love, with which from all eternity the Father has regarded the Son, is referred to in those passages which speak of the glory which Christ had with the Father before the world was (Joh_17:5; Joh_17:24), or which describe Christ as 'the only-begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father' (Joh_1:18). But the Divine complacency, in the aspect of delight in the contemplation of the beauty of Christ's character and work, is that upon which special emphasis is laid in the Gospels, in which our attention is carefully directed to the Father's interest in the ministry of His Son, and to His sympathy and satisfaction with Christ's perfect submission to His will, in connexion with His voluntary humiliation and suffering for the sake of man. And, it is worthy of special note, it is in this connexion that we find the expression 'be well pleased,' 'take pleasure in' (εὐδοκεῖν ἐν), where text and context plainly indicate that the thought of complacency is intended, as distinguished from the other sense in which the words εὐδοκεῖν, εὐδοκία occur in the NT, that of the Divine election, the will or purpose of God, 'His mere good pleasure.' The Gospels mention two occasions on which the words, 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased,' were uttered by the voice of God Himself.

At the Baptism, God spoke thus (Mat_3:17 || Mar_1:11 || Luk_3:22). By these words He testified the peculiar pleasure with which He regarded His Son at the moment of His consecration to His mission; His satisfaction with the spirit of submission to the Father's will which had characterized Jesus throughout the years of obscurity during which He prepared Himself for His ministry, and the lowliness with which He submitted to the baptism of John—because thus it became Him 'to fulfil all righteousness'; and His gracious acceptance of the voluntary offering which the Son now made to the Father. It was the moment of consecration to that ministry of humiliation to fulfil which Christ had come into the world. Therefore, in token of His acceptance of that act of submission, which spoke thus, 'Lo, I come to do thy will, O God,' the Father spoke thus from heaven in the audience of men and angels, 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.' We may not, indeed, here or in the other case in which this voice from heaven was heard, leave out of sight the additional thought suggested by the tense of the last word, εὐδόκησα, the Greek

arist—the thought, that is, of the complacency with which from all eternity the Father had regarded the Son. But this is the central thought of the passage, the peculiar pleasure with which the Father contemplated the Son’s voluntary humiliation, His submission to the Law, and His resolve to fulfil all righteousness by a life of lowliest service.

Again, with equal appropriateness these words were used in the parallel case of the Transfiguration (Mat 17:5, cf. Mar 9:7, Luk 9:29), when Jesus entered upon the final stage of His ministry. Then, in full view of the cross, at the close of our Lord’s conference with Moses and Elijah concerning ‘his decease which he was about to accomplish at Jerusalem,’ that Divine voice spoke in the audience of Jesus and the three disciples. Thus a second time God set the seal of His Divine approval to His Son’s submission, and testified to the complacency with which He regarded His resolve by His death to make atonement for the sins of the world.

In this connexion may be noted also those passages in which Jesus speaks of the glory of God in the triumph of redeeming love. Such are: Joh 10:17 ‘Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I might take it again’; Joh 13:31-32 ‘Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified in him, and God shall glorify him in himself, and shall straightway glorify him’; to which may be added St. Matthew’s translation of Isa 42:1 in Mat 12:18 ‘My beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased.’

The thought of God’s complacency in connexion with His contemplation of the fruits of Christ’s redemptive work in the regeneration and reconciliation of the world is suggested by the closing words of the Angels’ Song (Luk 2:14 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), ‘on earth peace among men in whom he is well pleased’ (ἐπὶ γῆς εἰς ἡνι ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας), where again we find the technical word, if such it may be called, for this aspect of the Divine love.

It is now very generally admitted that this is the sense in which εὐδοκίας, *bonae voluntatis*, ought to be rendered. That is to say, here we have the assurance of another voice from heaven, a message expressly sent at the time of our Lord’s nativity, for the comfort of those who waited for the consolation of Israel, of the complacent regard with which the Father, contemplating the objects of His grace, looked upon them as identified with His well-beloved Son. ‘The eye of God could again with complacency rest upon mankind,’ regarding them as being represented by His Incarnate Son, and in view of that state of spiritual excellence to which His work was destined to raise them. The expression is thus used in an ideal or prophetic sense, not of mankind as they actually were, but of the objects of the Divine love as, through their Representative, they should yet become.

The same thought, that of the pleasure which God the Father takes in the spiritual welfare of His children, is suggested by passages which speak of God's joy over the return of penitent sinners. Such are: Joh_10:17, Luk_15:7; Luk_15:10; Luk_15:22; Luk_15:24; Luk_15:32 (in the parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin, and the Prodigal Son, in which Luk_15:22; Luk_15:32 are especially notable, where Jesus mentions the joy of the father over the son's return, and the reason which the father gives for that joy: 'It was meet that we should make merry, and be glad: for this thy brother was dead, and is alive again; and was lost, and is found'); our Lord's assurance in another place that the prayer of the Publican was accepted of God (Luk_18:14); and again His testimony that prayer and almsgiving, if prompted by the right spirit, are rewarded by the Father who seeth in secret (Mat_6:4; Mat_6:6).

2. Christ Is Represented as regarding with Complacency

(a) *His own character and work, and His perfect harmony with the Father.*—This appears in many passages, especially in the discourses recorded by St. John. In conversation with the Woman of Samaria, Jesus declares that He only can bestow the gift of living water which the soul of man requires; and, in connexion with the same incident, tells His disciples that it is His meat and drink to do the Father's will and to finish His work (Joh_4:10; Joh_4:34). Again He says to the Jews that He is in full accord with His Father in respect of will and of work (Joh_5:17; Joh_5:19), that 'the Father loveth the Son, and showeth him all things that himself doeth.... That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father' (Joh_5:20-23). In His discourse on the Bread of Life (ch. 6) we find expressions indicative of His conviction that His work is in all respects well pleasing to the Father (Joh_5:37 ff.). He challenges His adversaries to convict Him of sin (Joh_8:46). He enjoys perfect communion with the Father (Joh_7:28-29). He claims that the Father glorifies Him, and bears witness of Him (Joh_8:54, cf. Joh_8:16-18). He declares that He only is the Good Shepherd, and all that came before Him were thieves and robbers (Joh_10:3; Joh_10:5; Joh_10:8, cf. Joh_10:11; Joh_10:14). He speaks of the excellence and thoroughness of His work, and of the satisfaction with which the Father regards it (Joh_10:17 ff.). He speaks of the success of His mission, and testifies the complacency with which He surveys His ministry. On the night of the betrayal He declares that hostility to Himself means hostility to the Father (Joh_14:21; Joh_14:24, Joh_15:23). A distinct note of triumph marks His closing utterances. So in Joh_12:23 ff., cf. Joh_13:31 ff.; and again, when He bids His disciples be of good cheer, for that He has overcome the world (Joh_16:33). Addressing the Father Himself in His intercessory prayer, He says: 'I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do' (Joh_17:4); and again, speaking of the disciples: 'Those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition' (Joh_17:12). Lastly, one of His last words from the cross is the exclamation of triumph, 'It is finished' (Joh_19:30). The force of such passages cannot be mistaken.

They show the Christ seeing ‘of the travail of his soul,’ and expressing Himself as ‘satisfied,’ His complacency, as He surveys the work of redemption, appearing as a true parallel to the judgment pronounced by God upon the work of creation, when ‘God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good’ (Gen_1:31).

With the instances cited above may he compared in this connexion such a passage as that where Jesus, confirming the joy of the seventy disciples in the success of their mission, says: ‘I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven.... Notwithstanding in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you; but rather rejoice that your names are written in heaven’ (Luk_10:18; Luk_10:20).

(b) Jesus further expressed complacency with respect to *the wisdom of the Divine counsels*, and as He contemplated *the fruits of His work in the hearts of believers*. With regard to the first point, we note that which St. Matthew and St. Luke record—Christ’s ascription of praise to the Father who ‘hid these things from the wise and prudent, and revealed them unto babes’ (Mat_11:25 ff. || Luk_10:21 ff.). With regard to the second, instances abound in the Gospels. Thus Jesus testified the pleasure with which He regarded the faith of Peter, as when at the first He welcomed him, and showed him what he should yet become (Joh_1:42, cf. Luk_5:10); and when, towards the end of His ministry, He accepted Peter’s confession (Mat_16:17-18). He showed gracious appreciation of the character and devoutness of Nathanael (Joh_1:47-49). Again He expressed satisfaction with the loyalty of His followers, whom He promised to reward at the time of the final consummation (Mat_19:27-29 || Mar_10:28-30 || Luk_18:28-30; cf. Luk_22:28-30, Joh_13:1-10). As He showed pleasure in the faith of His immediate disciples, so also He welcomed that of others, as when He spoke with signal approbation of the devotion of Mary of Bethany (Luk_10:42), who had ‘chosen the good part,’ and of whose offering of gratitude at the supper in the house of Simon the leper He said that she had wrought a good work upon Him which could not be forgotten (Mat_26:12 || Mar_14:6-9 || Joh_12:3-5). He said of the simple faith of the Roman centurion at Capernaum: ‘I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel’ (Mat_8:10 || Luk_7:9). Similarly, He expressed delight in that of the Woman of Canaan (Mat_15:28). He testified concerning the sinful woman in the Pharisee’s house, that ‘she loved much,’ wherefore her sins, which were many, were all forgiven (Luk_7:4 ff.).

Again, an illustration of complacency is found in the blessing pronounced by our Lord upon little children (Mat_19:13 || Mar_10:13 || Luk_18:16 || cf. Mat_18:2 ff. || Luk_9:47-48); while the value which He attached to their faith and devotion is clearly shown in the incident of the children in the Temple, when Jesus silenced the cavils of the Pharisees and priests, and demanded, ‘Have ye never read, Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise?’ (Mat_21:16). Again, Jesus commended the liberality of the widow’s offering (Mar_12:43-44 | Luk_21:3-4). He

noted with pleasure the gratitude of the Samaritan whom He had cured of leprosy (Luk 17:18-19), and regarded with complacency even the work of the exorcist who cast out devils in His name yet did not join the company of Jesus (Mar 9:39 || Luk 9:50). Christ's delight in receiving sinners and acknowledging their faith is a conspicuous feature in the Gospels. The parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin, and the Prodigal Son (Luk 15:5-6 || Mat 18:13-14, Luk 15:9 etc.) are full of this lesson. Lastly, that at the Judgment of the Great Day, Jesus will, as Judge, not only justify, but reward with liberal commendation and distinguished honour all faithful disciples, according to the service rendered by them to their Master or to their Master's servants, is the central lesson of the parables of the Pounds and Talents (Luk 19:17-19, Mat 25:21; Mat 25:23) and of the discourse on the Last Judgment (Mat 25:34-40).

3. Of complacency *on the part of man*, considered as a virtue, i.e. *pleasure in the contemplation of moral and spiritual beauty*, we find one notable illustration in the Gospels, in the Baptist's testimony to Jesus in Joh 3:29 ff., where John expresses his pleasure in the success of Christ's ministry, and compares Jesus to the bridegroom and himself to the friend of the bridegroom, who 'rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegroom's voice.' Such complacency as that, sympathetic interest in the Saviour and His scheme of salvation, and grateful acquiescence in the will of God for man's salvation, is alone legitimate on the part of fallen man. As to complacency in view of man's own knowledge and attainments, Jesus teaches that it is wholly inadmissible. No man, in the imperfect state of this present life, has a right to be satisfied with himself. Self-complacency is a sure sign of ignorance and spiritual blindness. The penitent publican, not the complacent Pharisee, is justified of God (Luk 18:11-14). The followers of Jesus must, when they have done all, confess that they are unprofitable servants (Luk 17:10 f.); and Jesus, while generously acknowledging the faithfulness of His disciples and assuring them that they shall in nowise lose their reward, expressly warns them that the last may be first and the first last (Mat 19:30 || Mar 10:31, cf. Mat 20:16).

Literature.—Cremer, *Bib.-Theol. Lex. s.vv.* εὐδοκέω, εὐδοκία, etc.; the Comm. of Alford, Meyer, Lange, etc.; Bengel's *Gnomon*: Herzog, *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] , artt. 'Gott,' v. 262 ff., 'Liebe,' viii. 388 ff., 'Versöhnung,' xvii. 92, 124, etc.; Jonathan Edwards, ed. London, 1834, vol. i. pp. 123-125, cf. *ib.* cclxxii. f., pp. 237, 240; Sartorius, *Doctrine of the Divine Love*, p. 215; Martensen, *Christ. Dogmatics*, p. 303; Schleiermacher, 'Der christliche Glaube,' ii. 199 (*Theol. Werke*, Bd. 4).

Hugh H. Currie.

☩ Conception

CONCEPTION.—See Virgin Birth.

☩ Condemnation

CONDEMNATION.—The disappearance of the term ‘damnation’ in the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 of the Gospels is suggestive of more sober and reasonable thoughts about the Divine judgment against sin. Condemnation at the last may indeed fall like a thunderbolt upon the rejected (Mat 21:19). The fig-tree in the parable has a time of probation and then may be suddenly cut down (Luk 13:6-9). At the *Day of Judgment* the universal benevolence of God experienced here (Mat 5:45, Luk 6:35) will give place to His righteous wrath against the persistently rebellious. Condemnation is the irrevocable sentence then passed upon the abusers of this life (Mat 25:41-46). Especially will this sentence of rejection and punishment descend then upon the hypocrite (Mar 12:40). The state of the condemned will be a veritable Gehenna (Mat 23:33). *Weeping and gnashing of teeth* picture the dreadful condition of condemned souls (Mat 22:13; Mat 24:51; Mat 25:30). Not only, we must suppose, punishment by pain for rebellion, but regret at past indifference, remorse at past folly, shame at past malice, will be the terrible feelings lacerating souls that have found not forgiveness but condemnation. The condemned will regret their indifference to Christ’s demands, which they have ignored (Joh 3:36). They will be tortured by the keen perception of their extreme folly in rejecting the knowledge they might have used (Luk 11:31-32). They will feel the shame of having their secret thoughts of evil exposed to a light broader than that of day (Mat 23:28). This will be the condemnation to perpetual darkness for those who have loved darkness more than the light (Mat 8:12; Mat 22:13; Mat 25:30).

But in this present life there is always at work a certain inevitable and automatic Divine condemnation. ‘The earth beareth fruit of herself’ (*αὐτομάτη*, Mar 4:28), and yet the fact is due to the directing will of God. So, even in this life, the Divine condemnation of evil is being worked out, without that irrevocable sentence which constitutes the final condemnation. The guest may already feel the lack of a wedding-garment (Mat 2:11), and so, warned by the present workings of condemnation, escape the last dread sentence. Nothing but what God approves can endure the stresses and storms that are imminent (Luk 6:46-49). Without the sap of God’s favour the vine must already begin to wither (Joh 15:6).

But this present immanent condemnation is rather a most merciful conviction of sin and wrongfulness (Joh 16:8-11). In this present age condemnation is not final for any; nay, God's purpose is the eternal security of men in true peace and true happiness (Joh 3:17; Joh 12:47). So far from condemnation being any man's sure fate, there is no need for any member of the human family to have to undergo such judgment as might result in condemnation (Joh 5:29). The strong assertion in the present ending to the second Gospel, 'He that believeth shall be condemned' (Mar 16:16), is surely the expression of the true conviction that Christ is the only Way to avoid condemnation (cf. Joh 3:36). Condemnation is God's prerogative, and not the privilege or duty of the individual Christian as such: 'Condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned' (Luk 6:37).

W. B. Frankland.

☩ Confession (of Christ)

CONFESSION (of Christ).—The words 'confess' and 'confession' are employed in common usage to express not only an acknowledgment of sin, but an acknowledgment or profession of faith. The Authorized Version affords many illustrations of this use, and the examples are still more numerous in the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, which in several passages has quite consistently substituted 'confess' and 'confession' for 'profess' and 'profession' of the Authorized Version in the rendering of ὁμολογέω, ὁμολογία (2Co 9:13, 1Ti 6:12, Heb 3:1; Heb 4:14; Heb 10:23). A corresponding twofold use of terms meets us in the original, the verbs ὁμολογέω and ἔξομολογέω being used to denote both confession of sin and confession of faith (e.g. for ὁμολογέω, Mat 10:32 and 1Jn 1:9; for ἔξομολογέω, Mat 3:6 and Jam 5:16). The noun ὁμολογία, however, in NT Greek is employed only with reference to the confession of faith.

In the OT it is Jehovah who is the personal object of the confessions of faith which we find on the lips of psalmists and prophets (e.g. Psa 7:1; Psa 48:14, Isa 12:2; Isa 61:10 and *passim*); but in the NT it is Jesus Christ whom men are constantly challenged to confess, and it is around His person that the confession of faith invariably gathers. This lies in the very nature of the case, since personal faith in Jesus Christ constitutes the essence of Christianity, and confession is the necessary utterance of faith (Rom 10:10, cf. Mat 12:34 b).

i. What is meant by the confession of Christ.—In the earlier period of the ministry of Jesus the faith of His followers did not rise above the belief that He was the

long-expected Messiah; and it was this conviction which was expressed in their confessions. Typical at this stage are the words of Andrew, 'We have found the Messiah' (Joh 1:41). It is true that even in this earlier period Jesus is sometimes addressed or spoken of as the 'Son of God' (Joh 1:34; Joh 1:50, Mat 8:29 || Mat 14:33); but it is not probable that in these cases we are to understand the expression otherwise than as a recognized Messianic term (cf. Psa 2:7), so that it does not amount to more than a recognition that Jesus is the Christ. And yet even this was a great thing—to see in the man of Nazareth the Messiah of prophecy and hope. It marked the dividing line between those who believed in Jesus and those who believed Him not. St. John tells us that the Jews had agreed that if any man should confess Jesus to be Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue (Joh 9:22); that they actually cast out, for making such a confession, the blind man whom Jesus had cured (Joh 9:34); and that through fear of excommunication many of the chief rulers who believed in His Messiahship refrained from the confession of their faith (Joh 12:42). It was no small thing to confess that Jesus was the Christ, crude and unspiritual in most cases as the notions of His Messiahship might still be.

But in the minds of the Apostles, though crude ideas were far from vanishing altogether (cf. Mat 20:20 f., Mar 10:28, Luk 22:24), there had gradually grown up a larger and deeper conception of their Master's person and dignity; and St. Peter's grand utterance at Caesarea Philippi, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God' (Mat 16:16 ||; cf. Joh 6:69), shows a great extension of spiritual content in the confession of Christ, as our Lord's language on the occasion plainly implies. The Apostle's language seems to enfold, in germ at least, the doctrine of Christ's divinity; and it formed the high-water mark of Apostolic faith and profession in the pre-Resurrection days.

After the Resurrection had taken place, faith in that transcendent fact, and readiness to bear witness to it, were henceforth implied in the confession of Christ (Joh 20:28-29, Rom 10:9). But while any profession of faith would have as its implicate the acceptance of the great facts of the historical tradition, all that was actually demanded of converts at first may have been the confession, 'Jesus is Lord' (1Co 12:3; cf. Php 2:11, 2Ti 1:6): a confession of which an echo perhaps meets us in their being baptized 'into (or in) the name of the Lord' (εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, Act 8:16; Act 19:6; ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου, Act 10:48). At a later time the growth of heretical opinions rendered it necessary to formulate the beliefs of the Church more exactly, and to demand a fuller and more precise confession on the part of those who professed to be Christ's disciples. In the Johannine Epistles a confession on the one hand that 'Jesus Christ is come in the flesh' (1Jn 4:2-3, 2Jn 1:7), and on the other that 'Jesus is the Son of God' (1Jn 4:15), is represented as essential to the evidence of a true and saving Christian faith. With this developed Johannine type of

confession may be compared the later gloss that has been attached to the narrative of the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch (Act 8:37, see (Revised Version margin)), which is not improbably the reproduction of a formula of question and answer which had come to be employed as a baptismal confession in the early Church.

It may be noticed here that it was out of the confession of personal faith which was demanded of the candidate for baptism that the formulated 'Confessions' of the Church appear to have sprung. There can be little doubt that the so-called Apostles' Creed was originally a baptismal confession. And Hort, Harnack, and others have shown that what is known as the Nicene Creed is in reality not the original creed of the bishops of Nicaea, but a creed which gradually grew up in the East out of the struggles of the Church with varying shapes of heresy, and the nucleus of which is probably to be sought in the baptismal formula of the Jerusalem Church (Hort, *two Dissertations*, ii.; Harnack, *History of Dogma*, iii. 209; Herzog-Hauck, *Realencykl.*, art. 'Konstantinopolitanisches Symbol').

ii. The importance attached to the confession of Christ.—We see this (1) *in the teaching of Christ Himself*. He showed the value He set upon it not only by the deep solemnity of His affirmations upon the subject, but by expressing the truth in a double form, both positively and negatively, declaring that the highest conceivable honour awaits every one who confesses Him before men, and the doom of unspeakable shame all those who are guilty of denying Him (Mat 10:32-33, Luk 12:8-9; cf. Mar 8:38). We see it in the pathos of the warning He gave St. Peter of the approaching denial (Mat 26:34; cf. Mar 14:30, Luk 22:34, Joh 13:38), in the look He cast upon him when the crowing of the cock recalled that warning to his mind (Luk 22:61), in the Apostle's bitter tears as he remembered and thought upon the word of the Lord (Mat 26:75, Mar 14:72, Luk 22:61-62), and in the thrice-repeated 'Lovest thou me?' (Joh 21:15-17) recalling the threefold transgression. But, above all, we see it in the words addressed at Caesarea Philippi to this same Apostle, who, though afterwards he fell so far in an hour of weakness, rose nevertheless on this occasion to the height of a glorious confession (Mat 16:17-19). The evident emotion of Jesus at St. Peter's language, the thrill of glad surprise which seems to have shot through Him and which quivers through the benediction into which He burst, the great benediction itself,—these things show the supreme worth He attached to this confession of His strong Apostle. But especially we see the significance of St. Peter's utterance in the everlasting promise which Christ then gave not to him merely, but to all who should hereafter believe on His name and confess Him after a like fashion: 'Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it' (Mat 16:18). Whether the 'rock' is St. Peter's confession or St. Peter himself is a matter of little moment; for if the latter is meant, it is undoubtedly as a type of believing confession that the Apostle receives the splendid promise, and it is on the

firm foundation of such confession as his that Jesus declares that His Church shall be built.

The view of a certain class of critical scholars (e.g. Holtzmann, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* xxi. p. 202; Harnack, *History of Dogma*, i. p. 79 n. [Note: note.] 2; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, ii. p. 351 n. [Note: note.]) that Mat 16:18 f. are not authentic utterances of Jesus, but a subsequent addition intended to canonize the dogmatic and constitutional situation of a later age, is not one that commends itself to those who do not accept the views as to the composition of the First Gospel which are represented by these writers and by Holtzmann in particular. There is no textual ground for objecting to the authenticity of the words, while there are very strong psychological grounds for accepting such words as true. See the admirable remarks of Prof. Bruce, *Expos. Gr. Test., in loc.*

(2) If Jesus laid great stress upon the confession of Himself, the importance of such confession is not less prominent *in the teaching of the Apostles*. Even if baptism 'into the name of the Lord Jesus' did not imply an explicit confession of Jesus as Lord (though this seems by no means improbable), at all events the Christian baptism which meets us constantly from the earliest days of the Church (*Acts, passim*) clearly involved, in the relations of Christianity whether to the Jewish or the Gentile world, a confessing of Christ before men. St. Paul makes very plain his conviction that, in order to salvation, believing with the heart must be accompanied by confession with the mouth (Rom 10:9-10), though he also enlarges our conception of the forms which confession may take when he finds a confession of the Christian gospel not only in words spoken but in liberal gifts cheerfully bestowed for the service of the Church (2Co 9:13). In 1 Timothy he commends the young minister of the Church in Ephesus because he had 'confessed the good confession in the sight of many witnesses' (1Ti 6:12), and finds in this matter the perfect example for Christian imitation in the 'good confession' which Christ Jesus Himself witnessed before Pontius Pilate (1Ti 6:13); while in 2 Timothy we have an evident re-echo of the Lord's own language in the warning, 'If we shall deny him, he also will deny us' (2Ti 2:12).

In the Epistle to the Hebrews Jesus is described as 'the Apostle and High Priest of our confession' (Heb 3:1), and that confession the author exhorts his readers to hold fast (Heb 4:14, Heb 10:23). In the Johannine Epistles, as we have seen, confession begins to assume a more theological form than heretofore, but the writer is not less emphatic than those who have preceded him in insisting upon its spiritual value. In one place it is said to be the proof of the presence of the Spirit of God (1Jn 4:2), and in another it becomes not the proof merely, but the very condition of the abiding of man in God and God in man (1Jn 4:15).

iii. The reason for the importance attached to confession.—When we ask why such supreme value is set upon confession by Christ and His Apostles and all through the NT, there are various considerations which suggest themselves. (1) *Confession is nothing else than the obverse side of faith*. The two necessarily go together, for they are really one and the same spiritual magnitude in its inward and outward aspects. The word of faith, as St. Paul says, is at once in the mouth and in the heart (Rom_10:8), and whatever value belongs to faith as a vital and saving power necessarily belongs to confession also. (2) *It is the evidence of faith*. Like all living things, faith must give evidence of itself, and confession is one of its most certain and convincing signs. According to St. Paul, it belongs to the very spirit of faith to believe and therefore to speak (2Co_4:13); and if the readiness to confess Christ begins to fail, we may take it as a sure evidence that faith itself is failing. How significant here are the words of Jesus to St. Peter just before He warned him of the sifting trial which was near at hand, ‘Simon, Simon, behold Satan asked to have you that he might sift you as wheat: but I made supplication for thee that thy faith fail not’ (Luk_22:31-32). (3) *It is a test of courage and devotion*. A hard test it often is; witness St. Peter’s fall. But it is by hard trials that the soldier of Christ learns to endure hardness, and gains the unflinching strength which enables him to confess the good confession in the sight of many witnesses (1Ti_6:12), and not be ashamed of the testimony of our Lord (2Ti_1:8). (4) *It has a wonderful power to quicken faith*. It both begets faith and quickens faith in others, as we shall see presently; but what we are speaking of now is its reactive influence upon the believer himself. It is a matter of common experience that nothing transforms pale belief into strong full-blooded conviction like the confession of belief in the presence of others. Something is due to the shaping power of speech upon thought, but even more to the definite committal of oneself before one’s fellows, and the kindling influences which come from the contact of soul with soul. And it is not till men have publicly confessed their belief in Christ that faith rises to its highest power, so that ‘belief unto righteousness’ becomes ‘confession unto salvation’ (Rom_10:10). It is to the psychological experiences that were naturally attendant on the public confession of Christ that we must attribute much of the language used in the NT with regard to the effect of baptism upon the soul (Act_22:16, Rom_6:3 ff., Gal_3:27, 1Co_12:13; 1Pe_3:21). And it is worth noting how the author of Hebrews connects in the same sentence holding fast ‘the confession of our hope’ and drawing near to God in ‘fulness’ or ‘full assurance’ of faith (Heb_10:22-23; cf. Heb_4:14; cf. Heb_4:16).

(5) But, above all, the value attached to confession in the NT seems to lie in the fact that *it is the great Church-building power*. The grand typical case of confession of Christ is that of St. Peter at Caesarea Philippi (Mat_16:15-16); and this was the occasion on which Jesus for the first time spoke of His Church, and declared that on the rock of Christian confession that Church was to be built (Mat_16:18). So it proved to be in after days. It was by St. Peter’s powerful testimony to Jesus as the risen Lord

and Christ (Act 2:32-36) that 3000 souls on the day of Pentecost were led gladly to receive the word, and in baptism to confess Christ for themselves (Act 2:37-41). St. Paul knew the mighty power that inheres in confession, and both in his preaching and writing made much of the story of his own conversion (Act 22:6 ff; Act 26:12 ff., Gal 1:15 ff.), thereby confessing Jesus afresh as his Saviour and Lord. It was above all else by the personal confessions of humble individuals—a testimony often sealed with blood (Rev 2:13; Rev 12:11)—that the pagan empire of Rome was cast down and the Church of Christ built upon its ruins. And it is still by personal confession, in one form or another, that the word of the Lord grows and multiplies, and His Church prevails against the gates of Hades. It is by testifying to Jesus Christ as Lord that men become the ambassadors of Christ to the souls of other men. The secret of the influence exerted by such confession lies not only in the appealing grace of the Lord whom we confess, but in the subtle and mysterious power of a believing and confessing heart over its fellow. ‘Blessed influence of one true loving human soul on another! Not calculable by algebra, not deducible by logic, but mysterious, effectual, mighty as the hidden process by which the tiny seed is quickened, and bursts forth into tall stem and broad leaf, and glowing tasselled flower’ (George Eliot, *Scenes of Clerical Life*, p. 287).

J. C. Lambert.

☩ Confession (of sin)

CONFESSION (of sin).—In the OT a large place is given to the confession of sin, as being the necessary expression of true penitence and the condition at the same time of the Divine forgiveness. Witness the provisions of the Mosaic ritual (Lev 5:3 ff.), the utterances of the penitential and other psalms (e.g. Psa 32:5; Psa 51:3 ff.), and prayers like those of Ezra (Ezr 10:1), Nehemiah (Neh 1:6-7), and Daniel (Dan 9:4 ff., Dan 9:20). It may surprise us at first to find that in the Gospels the confession of sin is expressly named on only one occasion, and that in connexion with the ministry of John the Baptist (ἐξομολογούμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν, Mat 3:6, Mar 1:5). But apart from the use of the actual phrase, we shall see that the Gospel narratives take full account of the confession of sin, and that, as in the OT, confession is recognized both as the necessary accompaniment of repentance and as the indispensable condition of forgiveness and restoration to favour, whether human or Divine. There are three topics which call for notice: (1) confession of sin to God; (2) confession of sin to man; (3) Christ’s personal attitude to the confession of sin.

1. *Confession of sin to God*.—It is to God that all confession of sin is primarily due, sin being in its essential nature a transgression of Divine law (cf. Psa 51:4). And in the

teaching and ministry of Jesus the duty of confession to God is fully recognized. Our Lord begins His ministry with a call to repentance (Mat 4:17, Mar 1:15). In the midst of His public career He characterizes the generation to which He appealed as an evil generation because of its unwillingness to repent (Luk 11:29; Luk 11:32). Among His last words on earth was His declaration that the universal gospel was to be a gospel of repentance and remission of sins (Luk 24:47). And as confession is inseparable from true penitence, being the form which the latter instinctively and inevitably takes in its approaches to God, we may say that all through His public ministry, by insisting upon the need of repentance, Jesus taught the necessity of the confession of sin.

But besides this we have from His lips a good deal of direct teaching on the subject. The prayer which He gave His disciples as a pattern for all prayer includes a petition for forgiveness (Mat 6:12, Luk 11:4); and such a petition is equivalent, of course, to a confession of sin. In the parable of the Prodigal Son the prodigal's first resolution 'when he came to himself' was to go to his father and acknowledge his sin (Luk 15:17-18); and his first words on meeting him were the frank and humble confession, 'Father, I have sinned' (Luk 15:21). The parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, again, hinges upon this very matter of the acknowledgment of sin and unworthiness. It was the total absence of the element of confession from the Pharisee's prayer, and the presence instead of a self-satisfied and self-exalting spirit, that made his prayer of no effect in the sight of God; while it was the publican's downcast eyes, his smitten breast, his cry, 'God be merciful to me a sinner!' that sent him down to his house 'justified rather than the other' (Luk 18:10-14; cf. the words of Zacchaeus, another publican, Luk 19:8).

Under this head may be included one or two cases of confession of sin to Christ. When Peter cries, 'Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord' (Luk 5:8), and when the sinful woman in the house of the Pharisee silently makes confession to Jesus as she washes His feet with her tears (Luk 7:37-38), it is too much to say of these confessions, in Pliny's language (*Ep. x. 96*) with regard to the hymn-singing of the early Christians, that they were offered 'to Christ as to God.' But they were certainly made to one who was felt to be raised above the life of sinful humanity, and to be the representative on earth of the purity and grace of the heavenly Father.* [Note: It is a point worth noticing, in the comparative study of the Gospels, that St. Luke, who is pre-eminently the Evangelist of salvation for the sinful, supplies us with the great bulk of the Gospel evidence that the Divine forgiveness is conditioned by the confession of sin.]

2. Confession of sin to man.—According to the teaching of Christ and the Gospels, confession of sin should be made not only to God but to man, and, in particular, to any one whom we have wronged. In Mat 5:23-24 confession to a justly offended brother is directly enjoined; and more than that, it is implied that the very gifts laid

on God's altar are shorn of their value if such confession has not first been made. In [Luk 17:4](#) again, our own forgiveness of an offender is made to depend on his coming and confessing, 'I repent.' But apart from this confession to the person wronged, a wider and more public confession of sin meets us in the Gospels. The necessity of such confession is implied, for instance, in our Lord's denunciations of hypocrisy—in His condemnation of the life of false pretence ([Mat 23:14](#)); of the cup and platter outwardly clean, while inwardly full of extortion and excess ([Mat 23:25](#)); of the whited sepulchres fair to look at, though festering with rottenness within ([Mat 23:27](#)). It is implied similarly in His frequent commendation of simplicity and single-mindedness, and honest truth in the sight both of God and man (cf. [Mat 6:22-23](#); [Mat 7:3-5](#); [Mat 8:8](#); [Mat 9:13](#)).

It seems to be recognized in the Gospels that acknowledgment of sin to man as well as to God has a cleansing power upon the soul. There may, of course, be a confession that is spiritually fruitless, to which men are urged not by the godly sorrow of true repentance, but by the goads of sheer remorse and despair. Of this nature was the confession of Judas to the chief priests and elders ([Mat 27:4](#), cf. v. 5). On the other hand, the confession of the penitent thief to all who heard him ([Luk 23:41](#)) was the beginning of that swift work of grace which was accomplished in his heart through the influence of Jesus. It illustrates George Eliot's words, 'The purifying influence of public confession springs from the fact that by it the hope in lies is for ever swept away, and the soul recovers the noble attitude of simplicity' (*Romola*, p. 87).

3. Christ's personal attitude to the confession of sin.—That our Lord never made confession to man, and never felt the need of doing so, is sufficiently shown by His challenge, 'Which of you convicteth me of sin?' ([Joh 8:46](#)). But did He make confession of sin to God? The fact that John's baptism was 'the baptism of repentance' ([Mar 1:4](#) ||), and that the people 'were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins' ([Mat 3:6](#)), together with the further fact that Jesus Himself came to the Jordan to be baptized ([Mat 3:13](#), [Mar 1:9](#), [Luk 3:21](#)), might be so interpreted. But against such an interpretation must be set the attitude of John both when Jesus first came to him ([Mat 3:14](#)) and afterwards ([Joh 1:29](#)), the language of Jesus to the Baptist ([Mat 3:15](#)), the descent of the Spirit ([Mat 3:16](#)), and the voice from heaven ([Mat 3:17](#)). The baptism of John, we must remember, had more than one aspect: it was not only the baptism of repentance, but the baptism of preparation for the approaching kingdom of heaven ([Mat 3:2](#)) and of consecration to its service ([Luk 3:10-14](#)). It is not as an act of confession, but as one of self-consecration (including, it may be, an element of sympathetic self-humiliation, cf. [Php 2:8](#)), that the baptism of Jesus is to be regarded. He had no sins to confess, but He knew that John was the prophet divinely commissioned to inaugurate the kingdom of righteousness (cf. [Mat 21:32](#)), and to inaugurate it by the rite of baptism ([Mat 21:25](#) ||). And by submitting Himself to John's baptism He was openly dedicating Himself to

the work of that kingdom, and taking up His task of fulfilling all righteousness (Mat 3:15). (See Sanday in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. 611; Lambert, *Sacraments in NT*, p. 62 f.; *Expos. Times*, xi. [1900] 354).

But, above all, it is to be noted that while Jesus taught His disciples to pray for the forgiveness of sins, we never find Him humbling Himself before God on account of sin, and asking to be forgiven. And the complete silence of the Gospels upon this point acquires a fuller significance when we observe that there is not the slightest evidence that He ever engaged in common prayer with the Apostles. When Jesus prayed to the Father, He seems always to have prayed alone (Mat 14:23; Mat 26:36 ||, Luk 9:18; Luk 11:1; cf. Joh 1:7, where He prays in the presence of the disciples, but not with them). The reason probably was that while the attitude of a sinful suppliant and the element of confession, whether uttered or unexpressed, are indispensable to the acceptableness of ordinary human prayer, these could find no place in the prayers of Jesus. (See Dale, *Christian Doctrine*, p. 105 f.; Forrest, *Christ of History and of Experience*, pp. 22 ff., 385 ff., *Expos. Times*, xi. [1900] 352 f.).

Literature.—Young's *Analyt. Concord. s.v.*; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Confession'; Ullmaon, *Sinlessness of Jesus*, p. 69 ff.; and for special points the works quoted in the article.

J. C. Lambert.

☩ Consciousness

CONSCIOUSNESS.—We have to consider, so far as the facts recorded in the Gospels permit, our Lord's consciousness of Himself and of His mission. The subject is difficult. It is beset by perplexing psychological and theological problems. It also demands very careful treatment, for it opens up discussions which may soon pass beyond the limits prescribed by reverence. We shall be guided by the following division:—

- I. The data, as found in the Gospels.
 - i. Certain narratives that reveal the consciousness of Jesus.
 - ii. The implications involved in His teaching generally, and in the impression He produced upon His disciples.
- II. Psychological problems.

- i. Growth.
 - ii. The Divine consciousness and the human.
 - iii. Knowledge and ignorance.
- III. Theological results.
- i. Uniqueness of our Lord's personality.
 - ii. His Divinity.

I. The Gospel Data

i. *Narratives revealing the, consciousness of Jesus.*—1. Among the narratives which, in a specially clear way, reveal our Lord's consciousness, one of the most remarkable refers to a very early period of His life. St. Luke tells us (Luk 2:41-52) of His visit to Jerusalem at the age of twelve years. When, after long searching, He is found in the Temple, and His mother questions Him, 'Why hast thou thus dealt with us?' His reply shows plainly that extraordinary realization of God which is the most outstanding characteristic of His consciousness: 'How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be in my Father's house?' (or, 'about my Father's business,' ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου). Here is evident the work of the child's imagination, in which the dominant idea controls absolutely everything else, and the most unlikely events appear perfectly natural: 'How is it that ye sought me?' What is extraordinary is the nature of this dominant idea. Already, at the age of twelve, our Lord knows God as His Father, and that in a manner so intimate and so peculiar that ordinary human relationships are as nothing in comparison with the relation to God. The doing of God's will is already the supreme motive. It is to be noted also how the 'my Father' of His reply contrasts with the 'thy father' of Mary's question. It is perhaps more natural to regard this as the inevitable reaction of His consciousness than as a deliberate correction of His mother. If so, it is all the more impressive. It shows how fundamental was the position in His mind of the filial relation in which He stood to God. How unlike this was to the Jewish mind of the time is shown by St. Luke's statement about Joseph and Mary: 'They understood not the saying which he spake unto them.'

2. The Baptism occupies an important place in the data of our subject. It is clear that all the Evangelists intend to point out that our Lord's baptism was unlike all others performed by John the Baptist. It was not a baptism of repentance. This is most clearly shown in St. Matthew's account. John felt the difficulty and 'would have hindered him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? But

Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it now; for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him.’ John discerned the incongruity, and our Lord acknowledged it, but gave a reason which showed how distinctly He realized His unique position and calling. The baptism was part of God’s will for Him. It had a necessary place in His life and work. It is also noteworthy that the descent of the Spirit and the voice from heaven are stated by St. Mark to have been manifested to our Lord Himself. With this St. Matthew and St. Luke agree. Only from St. John do we learn that the Baptist shared the experience. In view of what has gone before, we cannot look upon this event as the beginning of our Lord’s knowledge of His unique Sonship. It was, rather, an objective Divine confirmation of the truths which He already knew from the testimony of His inner consciousness. It was manifested to Himself and to the Baptist when the time had come for the public proclamation of the gospel of the Kingdom. It was a witness to His Sonship, ‘Thou art my beloved Son’; to His sinlessness, ‘in thee I am well pleased’; and to His Messiahship, ‘He saw the heavens rent asunder, and the Spirit as a dove descending upon him’ (see [Isa 42:1](#)).

Careful study of the Gospels shows that these three elements in our Lord’s consciousness are those which are disclosed most frequently in His life and teaching.

Some able students (*e.g.* Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, i. p. 96 ff., English translation) think that at the Baptism Jesus first attained to the consciousness of His Messiahship, though already aware of His Sonship. But, as has just been pointed out, the answer which He gave to John the Baptist reveals a fully developed sense, not merely of His sinlessness and relation to God, but of His mission. The testimony of even one Evangelist (St. Matthew) on a point like this is superior, as evidence, to any amount of psychological speculation.

3. The Temptation of our Lord, following immediately ([Mar 1:12](#)) after His Baptism, shows the nature of the internal conflict which He had to face when He set about the work of His life. There was no struggle with doubt as regards God, or Himself, or the end which He sought. The force of every temptation depended indeed on the clearness with which these were realized. His victory was an overcoming of the tendency to escape from the limitation, the lowliness, and the self-sacrifice which, to human thought, seem so unbecoming the Son of God in His great work of establishing the Kingdom.

It is impossible in the short space available here to deal with all the definite instances of self-revelation which are given in the four Gospels. It must suffice to dwell briefly upon a few of the more remarkable, and to mention such of the rest as cannot be omitted. It may be added that, to those who have really considered the question, almost every incident in our Lord’s life is, in some way or other, a manifestation of His superhuman consciousness.

4. One of the most noteworthy instances is that given by St. Matthew (Mat 11:25 ff.) and by St. Luke (Luk 10:21 ff.). St. Luke introduces the passage with the remarkable words, 'In that same hour he rejoiced in the Holy Spirit, and said.' It is a proof that the Apostles recognized our Lord's utterance on this occasion as the open expression of His communion with God. The insight into the heart of God, which was the secret of the inner life of Jesus, finds here such utterance as human language can give it. He addresses God as 'Father, Lord of heaven and earth,' a great expression which foreshadows the truth which follows: 'All things have been delivered unto me of my Father; and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him' (Mat 11:27). It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of these words. They contain four great assertions about our Lord and His work: (1) His universal authority; (2) the mystery of His person, known in its fulness to the Father only; (3) the unique relation of the Son to the Father, as involved in the Son's perfect knowledge of the Father; (4) the knowledge of the Father, so far as it is possible to man, is to be had only through the Son. This short passage contains the whole Christology of the Fourth Gospel. It records for us an occasion when our Lord permitted His hearers to gain some insight into His consciousness of God, of Himself, and of His mission.

Among the many important passages which agree with those which have been discussed, may be mentioned the following: (1) The account of our Lord's reception of the disciples of John the Baptist who brought their master's doubts to Him for solution (Mat 11:2-7 and Luk 7:19-24). Here our Lord's perfect confidence in His mission is obviously based upon His consciousness. The contrast with the intensely human searchings of heart displayed by John in his time of trial is very striking. (2) The narrative which includes the confession of St. Peter and the teaching which followed it (Mat 16:13 ff., Mar 8:27 ff.; Luk 9:18 ff.). The announcement of His approaching death and the tremendous terms in which He claims the utmost self-sacrifice from His disciples, give an extraordinary depth to the revelation of our Lord's self-knowledge contained in this narrative. (3) Every incident and every teaching belonging to the last period of the ministry reveals the overpowering intensity of His consciousness of the mission which He had to fulfil and of its dependence upon Himself. All the circumstances of His public entry into Jerusalem are notable in this respect (Mat 21:1-16, Mar 11:1-11, Luk 19:29-47, Joh 12:12-19; see especially Luk 19:39-45 in St. Luke's account). (4) His answers to those who questioned His authority (Mat 21:23-end, Mar 11:27 to Mar 12:12, Luk 20:1-19) are equally impressive. The parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, which is given in all the Synoptic Gospels, is very striking, as showing how our Lord made an essential distinction between Himself and all other messengers of God. (5) The description of the Future Judgment (Mat 25:31-46, cf. Mar 8:38, which shows the same conception, and proves that the idea is not peculiar to St. Matthew among the Synoptists), contains as lofty a conception of the dignity of the Son as any passage in the Fourth

Gospel: 'Then shall the king say' (Mat 25:34; Mat 25:40). What a depth of consciousness is involved in the words, 'ye did it unto me' and 'ye did it not to me' (Mat 25:40; Mat 25:45).

It would be possible to give many more instances almost as impressive. The fact is important, as showing that here we are dealing with an essential element in the Gospel history. So far our instances have been taken from the Synoptic Gospels, and mainly from narratives which are common to them all. When we turn to St. John, we find the self-revelation of Christ on every page, almost in every paragraph. See, as examples, Joh 1:51; Joh 2:19; Joh 4:26; Joh 5:17-29; Joh 6:38-42; Joh 6:61-62; Joh 8:14; Joh 8:46, (sinlessness) Joh 8:55; Joh 10:38; Joh 12:49-50; Joh 13:3; Joh 14:9-10 etc. The climax is reached in ch. 17, in which we are admitted to the sanctuary in which the Son pours out His heart in the presence of His Father. Here are evident all the elements already noted as peculiar to our Lord's thought about Himself and His mission: His unique Sonship, His sinlessness, His Messiahship, His universal authority, the mystery of His relation to the Father.

ii. *Implications of His teaching and the impression He produced.*—When we come to consider how this consciousness is implied in His teaching generally and in His effect upon mankind, we find ourselves face to face with a mass of materials so great that selection becomes very difficult. It must suffice to point out certain classes of facts—

1. His mode of thinking and speaking about God. God is, for Him, 'the Father.' Sometimes, with clear reference to His own unique relationship, our Lord calls God 'my Father' (Mat 7:21; Mat 10:32-33; Mat 11:27; Mat 16:17; Mat 18:19; Mat 18:35, Mar 8:38; Mar 13:32, Luk 10:22; Luk 22:29, Joh 5:17; Joh 6:32; Joh 8:19, and throughout chs. 14-17, etc.). But it is perhaps even more remarkable that when Christ is teaching His disciples to think about God as their Father in heaven, and speaking of Him as 'the Father' or 'your Father,' He always adopts the manner of one who knows this truth from within. It is not a doctrine which He has learned from Scripture, or proved by reason, or even gained by vision or revelation. It is spontaneous, a truth welling up from the depths of His being, and as essential and natural to His thought as breathing to His bodily life. To Him God, His Father, was an ever-present reality, the greatest and most intimate of all realities. He knew God as none else knew Him (Mat 11:27). He abode in His Father's love (Joh 15:10). These expressions describe in the simplest possible way the spirit which is manifested in all our Lord's utterances. Take, as an example, the Sermon on the Mount, the most distinctively ethical part of His teaching. Here, if anywhere, we should expect this purely religious apprehension of God to become dormant. In the introduction (Mat 5:3-13), the promises all reveal a deep insight into the purposes and nature of God: they view the world with its many kinds of people from the Divine point of view (see also Mat 5:16; Mat 5:20; Mat 5:45; Mat 5:48; Mat 6:1; Mat 6:4; Mat 6:6; Mat 6:8-9; Mat 6:14-15; Mat 6:18; Mat 6:20;

Mat 6:24; Mat 6:26 ff., Mat 7:11; Mat 7:21), All through, human things are viewed in the light of God's character. Jesus knew all these things about human life because He first knew God. Instances of this underlying consciousness might be multiplied indefinitely.

2. His self-assertion. It has often been pointed out (especially by Liddon in his *Divinity of our Lord*, Lect. iv.) that qualities which are incompatible in any other character combine freely and harmoniously in the character of Jesus. The most remarkable instance is the union of self-assertion with the most perfect humility. To those who believe in the Deity of Christ, the reason, the 'why,' of this fact is not far to seek. 'But the how' remains a difficulty. How is it that all seems natural and inevitable in the portrait as we find it in the Gospels? The answer must surely be that the self-assertion is the necessary expression of a real consciousness. It is well to be reminded how tremendous the self-assertion is. The following passages are a selection: Mat 5:11; Mat 5:22; Mat 5:28; Mat 5:34; Mat 5:39; Mat 5:44; Mat 7:21-22; Mat 7:28-29 (the former verses show this 'authority' which astonished the multitude) Mat 8:6; Mat 8:10; Mat 8:22; Mat 10:15; Mat 10:32-33; Mat 10:37-39; Mat 11:27-29 (in these passages we have the self-assertion and the humility side by side: 'I am meek and lowly in heart' follows the illimitable claim of Mat 11:27-28) Mat 12:6-8; Mat 12:41-42; Mat 16:24 ff; Mat 22:45; Mat 25:31 ff., Mar 2:28; Mar 8:34 ff; Mar 10:29; Mar 12:6; Mar 13:26, Luk 9:23-28; Luk 14:26 ff; Luk 21:12 ff., and throughout St. John's Gospel (see especially Joh 5:17-18 ff., Joh 8:12 ff., Joh 10:30; Joh 14:6 ff. etc.). In these passages our Lord declares Himself greater than Abraham, David, Solomon; greater than the Temple, the Sabbath, the Law; He claims for Himself all the homage and devotion of which the hearts of men are capable; He calls Himself 'the King,' and describes Himself as the Judge of all the nations; He demands as His right that honour which belongs to God alone (Joh 5:17-24). Yet He is among men 'as he that serveth' (Luk 22:27).

3. The effect of this consciousness upon those who were brought under His influence is very evident. The impression which Jesus produced upon the minds and hearts of men was quite unique. He not only preached Himself, He revealed Himself. This revelation carried conviction with it. It is plain that He designed His ministry to be such a revelation. It was not His usual method to say exactly who He was, but rather to lead His hearers on until they were able to make that discovery for themselves (Mat 16:13-20). We speak of our Lord 'claiming' such and such things; but whenever He made an assertion about Himself, it was because it was necessary that His hearers should know the truth on account of its essential importance for themselves. His object was to lead them to give Him the whole faith and love of their hearts, because in so doing they attained their highest good. A notable instance of the effect of our Lord's self-revelation occurs in the case of St. Peter (Luk 5:8), 'Depart from me: for I am a sinful man, O Lord.' Here the depth of the impression is shown by the moral

effect (cf. Job 42:5-6 and Isa 6:5). It is clear that St. Peter was impressed not merely by the miracle, but by the moral glory of Christ. The miracle was but the occasion when there came to him a sudden insight into the character of Jesus. The intense faith which our Lord awakened in the hearts of those who responded to Him testifies to His self-revelation. He looked for a faith which rested in Himself as its object. Such faith always called forth His highest approbation. Almost every page of the Gospels witnesses to the truth of this. The case of the Centurion (Mat 8:5-13, Luk 7:1-10), though perhaps the most striking instance, is yet only typical. The principle involved in it may be found everywhere; see Mat 8:2-3; Mat 8:22; Mat 9:22; Mat 9:28; Mat 10:22; Mat 12:30; Mat 13:58; Mat 15:22-28; Mat 19:29, Mar 1:40-41; Mar 2:5-11; Mar 5:34; Mar 9:23-24; Mar 9:37; Mar 10:29; Mar 10:52; Mar 13:9; Mar 14:3-9, Luk 7:37-50; Luk 9:23-26; Luk 10:13-16; Luk 10:42; Luk 13:34; Luk 14:25-33; Luk 17:17-19; Luk 18:22; Luk 19:40, Joh 5:24; Joh 6:29; Joh 6:35; Joh 7:37-38; Joh 8:12 etc. The extraordinary claim involved in these passages, and in many others, would strike us much more than it does were it not for the fact that the experience of the Christian centuries has amply justified it. Christianity, together with all the moral and spiritual benefits which it has bestowed upon mankind, is the effect produced not primarily by any doctrinal system or method of organization, but by a personality. It was the deliberate aim of our Lord, with full consciousness of the method He was adopting, to influence humanity by the revelation of Himself.

II. Psychological problems.—These are many and difficult.

i. *Growth*.—In the case of a merely human intelligence, growth is a necessary element; and a psychological examination would aim at tracing the course of development by showing how the mind reacted upon the circumstances or its history and environment. Our Lord was truly human; but He was not merely human, and therefore it is unsafe to reason from ordinary experience apart from the facts of His life as given in the Gospels. Concerning His early years, we are distinctly told that there was development. ‘The child grew and waxed strong, filled (becoming full, *πληροούμενον*) with wisdom’ (Luk 2:40). And again (Luk 2:52), ‘Jesus advanced (*προέκοπτεν*) in wisdom and stature.’ The language in both places implies growth in the true sense of the term. We are not, then, to imagine the infant Jesus looking out upon the world, from His mother’s arms, with eyes already gleaming with the fulness of that superhuman knowledge which He afterwards possessed, as certain ancient pictures would suggest. In His consciousness, as in His bodily frame, He developed from helpless infancy to maturity. But there is unmistakable evidence that, as His consciousness unfolded, it attained, in ways which were to it perfectly normal and proper, experiences which are unique among the phenomena of human existence. It is clear from what has been already stated, that Jesus, from His childhood, possessed a consciousness of God as His Father which was utterly different from the faith to which

others attain through teaching and the influence of religious surroundings. The incident of His childhood which reveals this fact must be viewed in the light of the self-revelation which fills all His teaching. Then its meaning is clear. We learn that His knowledge of His Father in heaven and of the loving harmony of will which subsisted between them was not a revelation imparted when the time of His public ministry drew near. It was an essential element in His earliest spiritual experiences. So far we are carried by the mere facts. Every attempt at a theological, or even psychological, co-ordination of these facts will carry us much further, and show that this inexplicable knowledge of God and consciousness of harmony with Him form together the ruling and guiding principle of our Lord's whole life.

We have already passed in review the large classes of passages which show most distinctly our Lord's self-revelation of His consciousness of union with His Father. The force of these passages is greatly augmented when certain negative characteristics most clearly manifested in the Gospels are taken into consideration.

1. There is no trace in our Lord's teaching or life of any effort to arrive at truth by means of reasoning. Jesus was never a seeker for truth: it was not any task of His to discern God's will before He began to do it, or to satisfy His own intelligence before He taught others. In dealing with the things of God, He moves with the absolute certainty of One who knew the truth from within. His use of Holy Scripture is never an effort to fortify His own mind: He speaks and acts as One who knew Himself a superior authority. Just as He was greater than the temple and Lord of the Sabbath, so is He above the Law and able to take the position of One who has the right to modify it or deepen it on His sole authority (see Mat 5:17; Mat 5:21-22; Mat 5:28 etc. Mat 7:28-29; Mat 12:6, Mar 2:28). When, in His teaching, He reasons from Scripture or from nature, it is simply that He may convey to others, in a way which corresponds to their mental equipment, the truth which He Himself knows independently. In such cases there is always some degree of that 'fulfilling of the Law,' that drawing out of a deeper meaning, of which so many instances occur in the Sermon on the Mount. Perhaps the most remarkable example is His proof of the future life from the revelation at the Bush (Mat 22:32, Mar 12:26-27, Luk 20:37-38). Here the real proof is the manifestation of the character of God as it is involved in the declaration to Moses. See for other instances of argument of this kind from Scripture, from reason, or from nature, Mat 5:45; Mat 6:8; Mat 6:24; Mat 6:26 ff., Mat 7:11; Mat 7:16; Mat 12:3 ff., Mat 12:11-12; Mat 12:25 ff., Mar 2:9; Mar 2:17; Mar 3:4; Mar 7:17 ff; Mar 10:3 ff; Mar 12:35 ff., Luk 13:15; Luk 14:5; Luk 14:28 ff., Joh 13:14. It is quite plain in these and all other instances that our Lord is reasoning, not in order to satisfy His own mind, but to carry conviction to the minds of His hearers. There is not the faintest trace of the struggle for truth.

2. There is no sign that progressive revelations were made to Him during the course of His ministry. Many efforts have been made to show that Jesus attained at certain turning-points to new views of His mission, and of the means by which His work was to be accomplished. It is certainly true that in His teaching it is possible to discern two stages, the first marked by a broad and more ethical treatment of the Gospel of the Kingdom, the second dealing with the means by which the Kingdom is to be established, His own Person, sufferings, and death. But it is quite impossible to show that these two stages are not essential parts of one organic whole. The truth is that they are perfectly consistent, and form together one great scheme of revelation. To suppose any change of purpose, or even fresh insight into the means by which our Lord's mission was to be accomplished, during His ministry, is to go beyond the evidence afforded by the Gospel history, in obedience to some *a priori* psychological or theological theory. It is supposed by some that He began with the belief that the Kingdom would be, somehow or other, introduced miraculously when the people as a whole were ready to receive it, but that, as time went on, and He found Himself rejected by the leaders, He became convinced that the Kingdom was already being realized in the hearts of the faithful, and finally saw that it was necessary that He Himself should die for its advancement. But how is this consistent with such passages as these: Mar 1:17; Mar 1:25; Mar 1:34; Mar 1:37-38; Mar 1:43; Mar 1:45; Mar 2:20; Mar 3:12, and the corresponding passages in St. Luke; also the whole Sermon on the Mount in St. Matthew? Why should our Lord so sternly and so consistently forbid the spread of popular excitement if He thought the Kingdom would suddenly appear, supervening miraculously upon the old order? Here is clear proof that from the beginning He understood the spiritual nature of the Kingdom. Why again should He, from the beginning, foreshadow the days of mourning 'when the Bridegroom shall be taken away,' unless He had in view all along the great sacrifice which was to end His ministry? (See Mat 9:15, Mar 2:19-20, Luk 5:34-35. This saying obviously belongs to the earlier days, when the disciples of Jesus were marked by their joyous acceptance of all the good gifts of their Father in heaven). These conclusions are greatly strengthened by a consideration of the crisis which was brought about by the feeding of the five thousand. That there was a crisis is evident from Joh 6:15; Joh 6:24; Joh 6:66 compared with Mat 14:23-24 and Mar 6:45-47. But it was not a crisis in the consciousness of Jesus. It concerned rather the response of the people. Now at last they are utterly disappointed of their hopes of a worldly Messiah, and the very manner of their disappointment shows our Lord's perfect consistency. His conduct throughout is that of one whose mind is made up and whose course is absolutely clear. At the very end, it may be thought, we have, in the Agony in the Garden, a crisis at which He became at last fully persuaded of the necessity of His death. But surely it is much more in accordance with the whole history to regard this as a moral crisis, when, for the last time, He was tempted to turn aside. There are indications that, all along, this temptation was presented to Him (see Mat 16:22-23,

Mar 8:32-33, Joh 12:27). Our Lord's utterances before the Agony show the very fullest consciousness of His mission, and of how it was to be accomplished.

3. Repentance had no place in the consciousness of Jesus. As Harnack (*What is Christianity?*, p. 32 f.) puts it, 'No stormy crisis, no breach with His past, lies behind the period of Jesus' life that we know. In none of His sayings or discourses ... can we discover the signs of inner revolutions overcome, or the scars of any terrible conflict. Everything seems to pour from Him naturally, as though it could not do otherwise, like a spring from the depths of the earth, clear and unchecked in its flow.' This is the strongest proof of our Lord's perfect sinlessness. It is incredible that the keenest spiritual insight ever possessed by man should have been blind to its own condition. In confirmation of this the following passages are important: Mat 5:20 ff; Mat 7:11; Mat 18:24-25; Mat 18:35, Mar 9:42 ff., Luk 13:3; Luk 13:5; Luk 17:10 etc. show our Lord's sensitiveness to the presence of sin in the hearts of men; how He recognized its universality in the world, and how high was His standard. Mar 1:11, Luk 6:40, Joh 4:34; Joh 8:29; Joh 8:46, give a direct insight into His consciousness of His own moral condition. Luk 5:8; 1Pe 2:22; 1Pe 3:18, 1Jn 2:29; 1Jn 3:5; 1Jn 3:7, 2Co 5:21, Heb 4:15 etc. show the impression He produced, in regard to this matter, upon the minds of His disciples. Our Lord's consciousness of union with His Father was not marred by any sin within His own soul.

On the subject of growth, then, our data lead us to the conclusion that there was a real development in the consciousness of Jesus during His youth, but that this development was completed, certainly in all its essential elements, before He began His ministry.

ii. The most perplexing of all the psychological problems opened up by our subject is that which is presented by the endeavour *to distinguish the Divine and human elements in our Lord's consciousness, and to define the mode of their union*. What in general the contents of His Divine consciousness were, so far as they have been revealed to us, we have seen above. But it is extremely hazardous to draw negative conclusions from these positive results, and every attempt at definition of the two elements involves negative as well as positive statements. Psychologically, we are presented with an insoluble problem. There are no facts, and no laws, known to the science of mind which can help us to understand the consciousness of Jesus. That He knew as man knows there can be no question. All the evidence we possess points to mental growth during the years of His youth; and though, as we have seen, the facts of His history during the period of His ministry do not warrant us in attributing to Him progressive attainments in the knowledge of Divine things, it is clear that ordinary human knowledge came to Him as it comes to us. It is often said of Him, that He 'came to know' (γινῶναι, Mat 12:15; Mat 22:18; Mat 26:10, Mar 2:8; Mar 8:17,

Joh 4:1; Joh 5:6; Joh 6:15; Joh 16:19; see Mason, *Conditions of our Lord's Life on Earth*, p. 130 ff.). Again, we are told that He was guided by the evidence of His senses: 'When Jesus saw it, he was moved with indignation' (Mar 10:14); 'He came forth and saw a great multitude, and he had compassion on them' (Mat 14:14); 'When he drew nigh, he saw the city and wept over it' (Luk 19:41). Such passages are convincing; and others, which tell of a supernatural knowledge of the thoughts and motives of men or of events (e.g. Joh 1:48; Joh 4:18, Mat 21:2, Mar 14:13, etc.), do not weaken their force. But side by side with this human consciousness we find unmistakable evidence of a consciousness which knows the heart of God from within, and which therefore sheds an unparalleled illumination over the whole realm of spiritual things. Jesus could say of Himself, 'No one knoweth the Son save the Father; neither doth any know the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him.' Such an assertion would be folly or worse were it not justified by the contents of His teaching. But the truth is that what Jesus showed mankind about the Father and His Kingdom, His Love and His holiness, and the revelation which Jesus gave of human life as seen in the light of this Divine manifestation, have ever remained the highest heights of spiritual vision. And, more wonderful still, this revelation has proved itself, as He foretold, inseparable from the Person who gave it. The teaching, Divine though it is, has ever been subordinate to the Teacher. It is always Jesus Christ who reveals the Father. Here then are the two elements, a consciousness of God and of Himself in relation to God different in kind from anything known in our experience, and side by side with it ordinary human knowledge based on the evidence of the senses. Harnack puts the problem thus: 'How He came to this consciousness of the unique character of His relation to God as a Son, how He came to the consciousness of His power, and to the consciousness of the obligation and the mission which this power carries with it, is His secret, and no psychology will ever fathom it' (*What is Christianity?* p. 128).

iii. *Knowledge and ignorance.*—We cannot enter here upon a general discussion of this question. It must suffice to note that our Lord in one instance pointedly confessed ignorance (Mar 13:32), that He asked questions, evidently to gain information (Mar 5:30; Mar 6:38; Mar 9:21, Joh 11:34), that He showed surprise (Mat 8:10, Mar 6:6), that He sought for what He could not find (Mat 21:19, Mar 11:13), and that there is no trace in the Gospels of His possessing supernatural knowledge of human and secular things beyond what was necessary for His work. These facts may be connected with the following statements made by our Lord Himself: 'The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father doing' (Joh 5:19); 'I can of myself do nothing; as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is righteous; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of him that sent me' (Joh 5:30); 'My teaching is not mine, but his that sent me' (Joh 7:16); 'He that sent me is true; and the things which I heard from him, these speak I unto the world' (Joh 8:26); 'I do nothing of myself, but as the Father taught me, I speak these things' (Joh 8:28); 'I speak the things which I have

seen with my Father' (Joh 8:38); 'The Father which sent me, he hath given me a commandment, what I should say and what I should speak'; 'The things therefore which I speak, even as the Father hath said unto me, so I speak' (Joh 12:49-50); 'The words that I say unto you I speak not from myself; but the Father abiding in me doeth his works. Believe me that I am in the Father and the Father in me' (Joh 14:10-11); see also Joh 14:24; Joh 14:31, Joh 15:15, Joh 17:7-8). From these statements it surely follows that our Lord's Divine knowledge was imparted to Him in His communion with His Father. Apart from this means of knowing, He depended simply upon His human faculties. 'This being the case, we must see that, if anything which could not be known naturally was not made known to Him by the Father, it would not be known by Him' (Bishop O'Brien of Ossory, quoted by Canon Mason, *op. cit.* p. 192). The psychology of this communion with the Father, as a means of knowledge, is doubtless beyond us; but the facts given in all the Gospels agree with the statements of our Lord Himself as recorded by St. John. See, further, Authority of Christ.

III. Theological results.

i. The first result is an extraordinary emphasis upon *the uniqueness of our Lord's personality*. In the psychological sphere the consciousness of Jesus Christ is as miraculous as His resurrection is in the physical. There is this difference, however, that His consciousness is a fact which comes in all its freshness before everyone who reads with clear eyes the story of His life. It is the most truly living element in the Gospels, and it is the same in them all. It is a concrete fact, not an abstract doctrine. To attribute its unity and concreteness to the sudden development of a dramatic instinct among certain religiously-minded Jews of the 1st cent., is as impossible as to derive its amazing spiritual elevation from an idealizing tendency among those who believed in God and His promises, and were looking for the Messiah and His Kingdom. Every attempt at explanation of this kind has proved, and must ever prove, a failure. The truth and vividness of the Gospels flow from the reality of the Christ whom they portray, and the consciousness of Jesus is the soul of that reality.

ii. The study of the consciousness of our Lord is *the most convincing proof of His Divinity*. When such passages as Joh 5:17-30; Joh 8:12-58; Joh 10:27-38; Joh 14:1-10 are compared with such as these from the Synoptics—Mat 11:25-30; Mat 25:31-46, Mar 8:34-38; Mar 10:28-30; Mar 12:35-37; Mar 14:7, Luk 9:22-27; Luk 9:57-62; Luk 10:21-24; Luk 10:42; Luk 12:8-10; Luk 19:40; Luk 20:13-15—and both series are discerned to be the inevitable and consistent utterances of the mind of Him who called Himself the Son of God and the Son of Man, the conclusion is irresistible, unless, indeed, preconceived views of the nature of the Universe forbid the inference, that the traditional doctrine of Christianity is the only adequate interpretation of the facts of the life of Jesus.

Literature.—Weiss, *Leben Jesu*; Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*; Mason, *Conditions of Our Lord's Life on Earth*; Gore, *Dissertations and Bampton Lectures*; Liddon, *Divinity of Our Lord*; Baldensperger, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*; Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*; Adamson, *Studies of the Mind in Christ*; Fairbairn, *Place of Christ in Modern Theology*; Godet, *New Testament Studies*; Row, *Jesus of the Evangelists*; Keim, *Jesu von Nazara*; Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums* [English translation *What is Christianity?*]; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*; R. Mackintosh, articles on 'The Dawn of the Messianic Consciousness' in *Expos. Times*, 1905.

In some of these, and in many other works which might be named, will be found a great deal of rather free speculation based upon psychological considerations, and often but loosely connected with the statements of the Gospels. The present writer has endeavoured to keep as closely as possible to the historical evidence. On account of the peculiar nature of the problem, he is convinced that psychology affords but little assistance, and he regards even an isolated statement by one of the Evangelists as evidence of higher quality than *a priori* arguments of any description. Yet he has not forgotten the views of modern critics, and has been careful to show, by an array of references to texts, that the principal contents of our Lord's consciousness are witnessed to by all the original authorities.

Charles F. D'Arcy.

☩ Consecrate, Consecration

CONSECRATE, CONSECRATION.—In the Authorized Version of NT 'consecrated' occurs twice. In both places the reference is to the work of Christ, but to two different aspects of that work, neither of which is suggested by the rendering 'consecrated.' (1) In Heb 7:28 the word used is τετελειωμένον = Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'perfected.' Our Lord, as 'a Son perfected for evermore,' is contrasted with human high priests 'having infirmity.' The connexion of thought, obscured in the Authorized Version, is with Heb 2:10; Heb 5:9 etc. The perfection of Him who 'abideth for ever,' and whose priesthood is inviolable, is the result of the human experience of the Divine Son. By His life in the flesh, His lowly obedience, and His sufferings, He has gained that abiding sympathy with men which fits Him to be 'the author of eternal salvation.' (2) In Heb 10:20 the word used is ἐνεκαίνισεν = Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'dedicated,' lit. 'made new.' Jesus 'dedicated for us a new and living way' into the Holy Place. The thought is that by means of His own blood our High Priest passed into the Divine presence, inaugurating a way for us. Because He passed through our human life, and out of it by the rending of 'the veil,

that is to say, his flesh,' He is not only our representative, but also our forerunner; in full assurance of faith we also may draw near and follow Him into that heavenly sanctuary.

In the (Revised Version margin) 'consecrate' is found three times, viz., Joh_10:36; Joh_17:17; Joh_17:19. ἀγιάζειν, of which 'consecrate' is an alternative rendering, is usually translated 'sanctify.' The exception in the Authorized and Revised Versions is the first petition of the Lord's Prayer (Mat_6:9 = Luk_11:2)—'Hallowed be thy name.' Here the Rheims version has 'sanctified be thy name'; on the other hand, Wyclif has 'halowe,' 'halowid' in Joh_10:36; Joh_17:17; Joh_17:19.

The distinction between 'consecrate' and 'sanctify' turns rather upon usage than upon etymology. Both words mean 'to make holy.' But a person or a thing may be made holy in two different ways: (1) By solemn setting apart for holy uses, as when in the LXX Septuagint ἀγιάζειν designates the consecration of a prophet (Jer_1:5, cf. Sir_45:4; Sir_49:7); (2) by imparting fitness for holy uses, as when St. Paul speaks (Rom_15:16, cf. 1Th_5:23) of his offering as 'made acceptable' because it has been 'sanctified by the Holy Spirit.' On these lines it now seems possible and desirable to distinguish the two English words which mean 'to make holy.' Ideally, consecration implies sanctification. But in modern English 'consecrate' suggests the thought of setting apart for holy uses, whilst 'sanctify' has come rather to imply making fit for holy uses.

The rendering 'consecrated' better suits the context of Joh_10:36 'Say ye of him, whom the Father consecrated and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am Son of God?' Jer_1:8 supplies a suggestive OT analogy, for the word of the Lord reminds the young prophet that, in the Divine counsel, he was set apart for holy uses before his birth. The thought would be more appropriately presented by 'consecrated' than by Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'sanctified' (LXX Septuagint ἡγιασθα). Similarly, as our Lord declares in His argument with the Jews (Joh_10:36), the Father consecrated His Son to His redemptive mission before sending Him forth to His work. More is implied in this statement than that the Father 'chose' or 'set apart' His Son. All things were given into His hand (Joh_3:35), and amongst the all things were 'life in himself' (Joh_5:26), fulness of grace and truth (Joh_1:14), and the Spirit 'without measure' (Joh_3:34). 'The fact belongs to the eternal order. The term expresses the Divine destination of the Lord for His work. This destination carries with it the further thought of the perfect endowment of the Incarnate Son' (Westcott, *Com. in loc.*). It is only in this sense of complete equipment that the Divine Son was made fit for His sacred mission; the Holy One had no need of sanctification 'in a way of qualification,' as the Puritan divines used the word, when

they meant inward cleansing from sin and the Holy Spirit's bestowal of purity of heart.

Our Lord's words, 'I consecrate myself' (Joh_17:19), are best understood in the light of His earlier saying that 'the Father consecrated' Him (Joh_10:36). The two statements are complementary. His consecration of Himself was the proof of His perfect acquiescence in the Father's purpose concerning Himself, His disciples, and the world. The secret of His inner life was continually revealed 'in loveliness of perfect deeds' which constrained men to acknowledge the truth of His words, 'I seek not mine own will, but the will of him that sent me' (Joh_5:30); the law that ruled His every word and work He was soon to fulfil to the uttermost; His readiness to drink the cup which the Father was about to put into His hands was involved in His calm word, 'I consecrate myself'; its utterance in this solemn hour affords a glimpse of the spirit of absolute devotion to His Father's will in which Jesus is finishing His work and consummating in death the self-sacrifice of His life. And as for the sake of His disciples Jesus consecrates Himself, He prays for them, knowing that the future of His kingdom depends on their having the same spirit of complete consecration to the Divine will.

Commentators who follow Chrysostom in regarding ἀγιάζω as practically equivalent to προσφέρω σοὶ θυσίαν (cf. Euth. Zig. ἐγὼ ἐκουσίως θυσιάζω ἑμαυτόν), and as connoting the idea of expiatory sacrifice, support their interpretation by references to OT passages in which ἀγιάζειν (= שׁׁׁׁׁׁׁ) is a sacred word for sacrifices, as, .g., Exo_13:2, Deu_15:19 ff., 2Sa_8:11 (cf. Meyer, loc.). They are obliged to give the word ἀγιάζειν two different meanings in the same sentence, as does the (Revised Version margin) : 'And for their sakes I consecrate myself, that they themselves also may be sanctified in truth.' But it is not from the word ἀγιάζειν, that the nature of Christ's death is to be learnt; that which differentiates the consecration of Christ from the consecration of His disciples is brought out rather by the other words in this pregnant saying. The consecration of Jesus is His own act, but He does not pray that apart from Him the disciples may follow His example and consecrate themselves; His consecration is the pattern of theirs, therefore the same word is used of the Master and of His disciples; but without His consecration 'for their sakes' (ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν), their consecration would be impossible, therefore it is said of the Master alone that He consecrates Himself on behalf of others.

If ἀγιάζειν be uniformly rendered 'consecrate' in our Lord's intercessory prayer, it will be seen that He twice expresses His yearning desire for the consecration of the men whom His Father had given Him out of the world: (1) Joh_17:17 'Consecrate

them in the truth'; as Jesus sends forth His disciples on the same mission which brought Him into the world at His Father's bidding, He asks that they also may be set apart for holy service, and may be divinely equipped for their task, even as He was, by the indwelling of the Father's love (Joh 17:26). They possess the knowledge and the faith that the world lacks, for they have come to know and to believe that the Father sent the Son (Joh 17:8; Joh 17:25, cf. Joh 17:21; Joh 17:23). It is because Jesus desires intensely that the world may know and believe, that He so fervently prays for the consecration of the men whose faith and knowledge qualify them to speak in the world the word which He has given them. (2) Joh 17:19 'And for their sakes I consecrate myself, that they also may be consecrated in truth.' Reasons for departing from the rendering of the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 and the (Revised Version margin) have been given above. No doubt it is important to remember that men 'having infirmity' need by inward sanctifying to be made fit for the holy service to which they have been consecrated; but the emphatic words, 'they also' (*καὶ αὐτοί*), suggest not a contrast, but a resemblance,—a consecration common to the Master and His disciples. It is a resemblance not in the letter, but in the spirit. Between their work as witnesses and His as Redeemer there was a contrast; but their lives might be ruled by the 'inward thought' (1Pe 4:1 (Revised Version margin)) which constrained Him to suffer for their sakes. For the disciples of Jesus real consecration consists in having the mind which was in Him, who 'humbled himself, becoming obedient *even* unto death, yea, the death of the cross' (Php 2:8). It should also be noted that the consecration spoken of in Joh 17:19 is, alike in the case of Jesus and of His disciples, 'not a process but an act completed at once,—in His case, when gathering together in one view all His labours and sufferings, He presented them a living sacrifice to His Father; in theirs, when they are in like manner enabled to present themselves as living sacrifices in His one perfect sacrifice' (W. F. Moulton, *Com. in loc.*). See, further, art. Sanctification.

J. G. Tasker.

⚠️ Considerateness

CONSIDERATENESS.—It was a saying of St. Francis, 'Courtesy is own sister to Love'; but considerateness is more than courtesy (wh. see), for it takes account not only of our neighbour's feelings, but of all his circumstances and all his wants. Our Lord 'knew all men, and knew what was in man' (Joh 2:25); and in this knowledge we find Him acting always with the most exquisite care for all their needs. Their *bodily* needs He anticipates and provides for, as in the case of the hungering multitudes (Mat 15:32, Mar 8:1-3, Luk 9:13, Joh 6:5), where, moreover, He takes care also that nothing of the store He had provided should be lost (Joh 6:12), and in the case of His

over-wrought disciples ('Come ye apart and rest awhile,' [Mar_6:31](#)). To which may be added His directions regarding Jairus' daughter, when He had raised her from the dead ('He commanded that something should be given her to eat,' [Mar_5:43](#)). Still more beautiful is Christ's delicate consideration of men's feelings. Among the many rays of 'his own glory' ([Joh_2:11](#)) manifested forth in His first miracle, we must not omit His considerateness for the mortification which the falling short of their wine would cause to His peasant hosts, and His taking care that none save His mother and the servants knew whence the new and better supply was drawn ([Joh_2:9](#)). As instances of His considerateness of men's *spiritual* needs, we may cite His giving scope for the strong faith of the good centurion by *not* going to his house ([Mat_8:5](#) ff., [Luk_7:2](#) ff.), while by *going with* Jairus He supports his weak faith, and is beside him when the stunning message reaches him, 'Thy daughter is dead: why troublest thou the Master any further?' ([Mar_5:35](#)); His whole action in the case of the woman taken in adultery ([Joh_8:1-11](#)); and His attention to the still deeper need of the woman with the issue of blood, whose faith, great as it was, required to be adorned with gratitude to, and confession of, her healer ([Mar_5:29-34](#)). Extreme pain tends to make men forget everything except their own suffering: it only brought out the more the all-embracing considerateness of Christ. His words from the Cross to the Virgin Mother and St. John ([Joh_19:26-27](#)) teach, no doubt, the new relationships created for believers by the gospel ([Mar_10:30](#), cf. [Rom_16:13](#); but they exhibit also His considerate care not needlessly to mention a relationship which might so easily have exposed St. Mary to hustling by the mob, or to syllable names which would have been repeated by irreverent tongues. The post-resurrection sayings to Mary Magdalene ([Joh_20:15](#); [Joh_20:18](#)), to St. Thomas ([Joh_20:27](#)), and to St. Peter, who, as he had thrice denied his Lord, is thrice restored with delicate allusion to, but not mention of, his threefold fall ([Joh_21:15](#); [Joh_21:17](#)), are examples no less shining and illustrative. (Cf. Bishop Paget's sermon on 'Courtesy' in *Studies in the Christian Character*, p. 209).

J. Cooper.

☞ Consolation

CONSOLATION

1. The word 'consolation' (*παράκλησις*) occurs only twice in the Gospels ([Luk_2:25](#); [Luk_6:24](#), both Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). *παράκλησις*, however, is a word of common occurrence in the rest of the NT, where in Authorized Version it is usually rendered 'consolation,' although not infrequently

‘comfort.’ In Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘comfort’ has been substituted for ‘consolation’ except in Act 4:36 (‘exhortation,’ marg. ‘consolation’) Act 15:31 (‘consolation,’ marg. ‘exhortation’), Heb 6:18 (‘encouragement’). Besides meaning consolation or comfort, παράκλησις sometimes denotes exhortation, and is so rendered both in Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885. When it is said of Simeon that he was ‘looking for the consolation of Israel’ (Luk 2:25), the word is used by metonymy for the Messianic salvation as bringing consolation to the Chosen People. Similarly the Messiah Himself was known to the Rabbins as מְנַחֵם, ‘the Consoler,’ or ‘Comforter,’ of Israel (see Schöttgen, *Hor. Heb. et Talm.* [Note: Talmud.] ii. 18). In Luk 6:24 the rich are said to have received their consolation, *i.e.* the comfort which comes from worldly prosperity, in contrast to those spiritual blessings which Jesus had just promised that His disciples should enjoy in spite of poverty, hunger, and tears (Luk 6:20-23, cf. 2Co 1:3-5).

2. Consolation in the teaching of Christ.—First of all, there will ever stand the words: ‘Come unto me, all ye that travail and are heavy laden’ (Mat 11:28-30). Amid outward storm and inward fear the Lord greets His disciples: ‘Be of good cheer: it is I; be not afraid’ (Mar 6:50). The Physician of the ailing body and sick soul addresses the weary sufferer: ‘Son, be of good cheer; thy sins are forgiven’ (Mat 9:2). To us to-day His Holy Spirit breathes the same blessings in the gospel of mercy and peace, the Spirit by whom He is with us ‘all the days, even unto the completion of the age’ (Mat 28:20). His words do not pass away (Mar 13:31), and from His Divine lips no word is void of power (Luk 1:37). ‘Peace be unto you’ is the first message of the ascended as of the risen Lord (Joh 20:21; Joh 20:26). Still He loves ‘to the uttermost’ (Joh 13:1); still He can bear to lose not one of those whom His Father has given Him (Joh 18:9), and still no enemy shall snatch them from His hand (Joh 10:28). Even the hairs of the head of the children of God are objects of His watchfulness (Luk 12:7; Luk 21:18), to number them and to preserve them. So, truly, His service should be without fear (Luk 1:74). Amid the storms of this changeful life we cry: ‘Carest thou not that we perish?’ (Mar 4:38),—and nevertheless the very purpose of His mission was and is that we should have life, and have it more abundantly (Joh 10:10). There is no uncertainty on His part,—eternal life is the settled purpose of God for man (Joh 6:40). The grace He bestows is in its nature prolific, and its fruit is eternal life (Joh 4:14; Joh 4:36). He gives the Kingdom of God (Luk 12:32). His message is a *gospel* (Mat 4:23). His ears are never closed to our cry (Mat 21:22). All things are possible with Him (Mar 10:27).

To these higher thoughts may be added precious truths which have a like consoling power in the conflict with evil ever surging within and without. Our Lord knows our human nature through and through (Joh 2:25). His purpose is to avert judgment and not to condemn whilst there is time for salvation (Joh 12:47). His condemnations

were against hypocrisy and hardness of heart and contempt of His gospel. He came bearing our infirmities and saving us from our sins (Mat_1:21; Mat_8:17, Luk_19:10). What is done to the poor, sick, bereaved, afflicted, is done to Him; and He will remember (Mat_25:40). His blessing abides with the poor, meek, sincere soul, faithful to the end (Mat_5:3-12; Mat_10:22). In this life the disciple must be content to expect little of worldly success, and yet he shall not be unconsolated (Mat_10:25, Mar_10:30, Joh_16:33). To His disciple Christ promises: 'I will love thee' (Joh_14:21). See also art. Comfort.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , artt. 'Paraclete,' 'Comfort.'

Grimm-Thayer, *Lex.* s.v. *ταράκλις*.

W. B. Frankland.

☞ Corban

CORBAN is a Hebrew word (קרבן) which appears in the Greek of Mar_7:11, transliterated *κορβᾶν* or *κορβάν*, and in this form passes into the English Versions. The same word in a modified form occurs also in Mat_27:6, *εἰς τὸν κορβανᾶν*, 'into the treasury.' The termination *-ας* in *κορβανᾶς* is the Greek method of indicating the Aramaic determinative in קרבן. Codex B reads *κορβᾶν* for *κορβανᾶν*.

The word has three meanings: (1) An offering, both bloodless and otherwise. In this sense it occurs about 80 times in OT, always in Leviticus and Numbers, except twice in Ezekiel. In Authorized and Revised Versions it is rendered 'offering' or 'oblation,' but in LXX Septuagint it is rendered by *δῶρον*, 'a gift,' and this is the translation given to *κορβᾶν* in Mar_7:11. (2) A vow-offering, something dedicated to God. In this sense it occurs in the Heb. and Aram. [Note: Aramaic.] portions of the Talmud, and also in Josephus. In his *Antiquities*, iv. iv. 4, Josephus says of the Nazirites: 'They dedicate themselves to God as a *corban*, which in the language of the Greeks denotes "a gift." ' So also in *circa (about) Apion*. i. 22, he speaks of *corban* as a 'kind of oath, found only among Jews, which denotes "a thing devoted to God." ' (3) The sacred treasury into which the gifts for the Temple service were cast by the pious; or, the treasure therein deposited. Thus, in *BJ*, ii. ix. 4, Josephus says that Herod 'caused a disturbance by spending the sacred treasure, which is called *corban*, upon aqueducts.' So in Mat_27:6 the high priests say to one another: 'It is not lawful to

cast them (Judas' silver pieces) into the treasury (εἰς τὸν κορβανᾶν, B* κορβᾶν), for it is the price of blood.'

The passage in which *corban* occurs in our English Bible is Mar_7:11. Our Lord is there replying to the criticism of the Pharisees that the disciples ate food with hands ceremonially unclean. Christ's reply is a retort. He accuses the Pharisees of attaching too much value to the tradition of the elders, so as even in some cases to set aside in their favour the plain moral commandments of God. The words of Jesus are: 'Is it well for you to set aside the commandment of God, in order that ye may observe your tradition? For Moses said, Honour thy father and thy mother; and, He that speaketh evil of father or mother, let him die the death. But ye say, If a man has said to his father or mother, That wherewith thou mightest have been benefited from me is *corban*, that is, a gift, [he is absolved]. Ye no longer allow him to do anything for his father or mother.' The same incident is recorded, with slight variations, in Mat_15:3-5.

Commentators are divided as to whether the dedication was meant seriously, and the property actually given to God and put into the treasury; or whether the utterance of the word was a mere evasion, and when the magic word *corban* had been uttered over any possession, the unfilial son was able to 'square' matters with the Rabbis, so as to be free from obligation to support his aged parents (Bruce on Mat_15:5). It must be admitted that the Jews were much addicted to making rash vows. One tractate in the Talmud, *Nedarim*, is specially devoted to the subject. We there find that the customary formula among the Jews for devoting anything to God was, 'Let it be *corban*'; though, to allow a loophole of possible escape from the vow if they regretted it afterwards, they were in the habit of using other words which sounded like *corban*. *Nedarim*, i. 2, says: 'When any one says "*konâm*, or *konâh*, or *konâs* (be this object, or this food)," these are by-names for *korbân*.' These words came to be used as a mere formula of interdiction, without any intention of making the thing interdicted 'a gift to God'; e.g., a man seeing his house on fire, says, 'My tallith shall be *corban* if it is not burnt" (*Ned.* iii. 6). In making a vow of abstinence a man says: '*Konâs* be the food (vi. 1) or the wine (viii. 1) which I taste.' When a man resolves not to plough a field, he says, '*Konâs* be the field, if I plough it' (iv. 7), Repudiation of a wife is thus expressed, 'What my wife might be benefited by me is *konâs* (לִי נִהְיֶה אֲשֶׁרֶץ קוֹנָם), because she has stolen my cup' or 'struck my son' (iii. 2). In viii. 11 we have the very same formula as in Mar_7:11, except that we have the subterfuge or substitute, קוֹנָם for קָרְבָן, לִי נִהְיֶה אֲשֶׁרֶץ קוֹנָם, קָרְבָן (Lowe's *â*, p. 88).

It is not necessary to think that Jesus had such cases of recklessness in His mind. We prefer to believe that He was thinking of *bonâ fide* vows, made to the Temple,

hastily, perhaps angrily, without sufficient regard to the claims of aged parents. The question was a very intricate one, What ought the Rabbis to advise the man to do? The Law was most emphatic in its insistence that all vows, when once made, must be kept (Deu 23:21-23). Which has the higher claim on a man's conscience? The service of God, promoted by the gift, and the Law obeyed by keeping the vow inviolate? or, the support of poor aged parents, the Law broken and the vow violated? It was a delicate matter, and we can scarcely wonder that the Rabbis of Christ's day adhered to the literal significance of Deu 23:21-23, and held that nothing could justify the retractation of a vow. In other words, they allowed the literal and the ceremonial to override the ethical. Jesus disclosed a different 'spirit,' as He ruled that duty to parents is a higher obligation than upholding religious worship, or than observance of a vow rashly or thoughtlessly made.

In *Nedarim*, ix. 1, we find Eliezer ben Hyrkanos (*circa (about)* a.d. 90), who in many respects felt the influence of Christianity, give the same view as the Lord Jesus with regard to rash vows. We translate the passage thus—

'R. Eliezer said that when rash vows infringe at all on parental obligations, Rabbis should suggest a retractation (*lit.* open a door) by appealing to the honour due to parents. The sages dissented. R. Zadok said, instead of appealing to the honour due to parents, let them appeal to the honour due to God; then might rash vows cease to be made. The sages at length agreed with R. Eliezer that if the case be directly between a man and his parents [as in Mar 7:11], they might suggest retractation by appealing to the honour due to parents.'

The words of R. Meîr (*circa (about)* a.d. 150) are also interesting in this connexion as given in *Nedarim*, ix. 4-

'One may effect a retractation of a rash vow by quoting what is written in the Law. One may say to him: If thou hadst known that thou wast transgressing such commandments as these, "Thou shalt not take vengeance nor bear a grudge"; "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart"; "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" [Lev 19:17 f.]; "Thy brother shall live with thee" [Lev 25:36],—wouldst thou have made the vow? Perhaps thy brother may become poor, and thou (because of thy rash vow) wilt not be able to support him. If he shall say, If i had known that it was so, I would not have made the vow,—he may be released from his vow.'

These quotations show that, in some directions, the spirit of humaneness was triumphing over the literalism which Jesus combated in His day.

Literature.—The Mishnic treatise, *Nedarim*; artt. on 'Corban' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, *Encyc. Bibl.*, and *Jewish Encyc.*; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus*, ii. 17

ff.; the Commentaries of Wetstein, Grotius, and Bruce on [Mat_15:5](#) and [Mar_7:11](#); Lightfoot's *Hor. Heb.*, and Wünsche's *Erläuterung, in loco*.

J. T. Marshall.

☞Corn

CORN.—In Authorized Version of the Gospels ‘corn’ is used to translate four distinct words in the original:

(1) σπόριμα: ‘Jesus went on the Sabbath day through the *corn*’ ([Mat_12:1](#)). Here ‘corn’ should be ‘cornfields,’ the rendering of Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 in this verse, and of both Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 in the parallel passages in Mk. ([Mar_2:23](#)) and Lk. ([Luk_6:1](#)). σπόριμα properly means *seed land* (σπειρώ), and in classical Greek is not found in its NT sense of ‘cornfields.’

(2) σῖτος, in [Mar_4:28](#), where a contrast is drawn between the different stages in the growth of the cornstalk—‘first the blade, then the ear, after that the full *corn* in the ear.’ In LXX Septuagint, as in classical Greek, σῖτος is a generic word for cereals, but refers especially to wheat as the staple grain food. Corresponding to this, we find that elsewhere in the NT, both in Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, the word is always translated ‘wheat’ ([Mat_3:12](#); [Mat_13:25](#); [Mat_13:29-30](#), [Luk_3:17](#); [Luk_16:7](#); [Luk_22:31](#), [Joh_12:24](#)).

(3) στάχυς = ‘an ear of *corn*’ ([Mat_12:1](#) || [Mar_4:28](#)). So in LXX Septuagint as an equivalent for עֶשְׂבָהּ in [Gen_41:5](#) etc.

(4) κόκκος = a single grain or ‘corn.’ It is rendered ‘corn’ only in [Joh_12:24](#) (Authorized Version): ‘Except a *corn* of wheat [ὁ κόκκος τοῦ σίτου] fall into the ground and die ...’ (cf. the use of the words ‘peppercorn,’ ‘barleycorn’). Elsewhere in Authorized Version ([Mat_13:31](#) || [17:20](#) ||), as always in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, it is rendered ‘a grain.’

‘Corn’ is thus used in Authorized Version in four distinguishable senses—as applying to a cornfield, to a ripe cornstalk, to an ear of wheat, and to a single grain. And it is noteworthy in each case how intimately the Gospel references to corn are associated

with our Lord's revelation of the mysteries of the Kingdom and the truth regarding His own person and saving work. The parable of the Blade, the Ear, and the Full Corn was used to unfold the law of growth in the Kingdom of God. The incident of the plucking of the ears of corn in the cornfields on the Sabbath day served as the occasion for a notable declaration regarding both the dignity of the Son of Man and the graciousness of Him who loves mercy more than sacrifice. The death and fruitful resurrection of the grain of wheat became the prophecy and type of Christ's Passion and consequent power to draw all men unto Himself. And these lessons from the corn in the records of the Lord's ministry may be greatly extended as we recall what He said about the sowing of the corn (parable of the Sower) and its reaping (the Tares and the Wheat); how He saw in the white fields a vision of a great spiritual harvest only waiting to be gathered (Joh 4:35); how at Capernaum He turned the people's minds from the barley bread of the previous day's miracle to think of Himself as the Bread of Life (John 6); and said of the broken loaf at the Last Supper, 'Take, eat, this is my body.'

For further information the reader is referred to Agriculture, Barley, Sowing, etc.

Literature.—Candolle, *Origine des Plantes Cultivées*; Löw, *Aramaische Pflanzennamen*; Tristram, *Natural History of the Bible*; see also Bruder's *Concord. NT Graeci*; Grimm-Thayer's *Lex. s.vv.*

J. C. Lambert.

Corner-Stone

CORNER-STONE (שֹׂהַר אֲבֵנִים, κεφαλή γωνίας).—The quotation from Psa 118:22 occurs at the close of the parable of the Wicked Vinedressers (Mat 21:42, Mar 12:10, Luk 20:17). A question was asked about the punishment of such unfaithful servants and the transferring of the vineyard to the charge of others; and the quotation afforded Scripture proof that the necessity for such a transference, however surprising to those rejected, may actually arise in God's administration of His kingdom.

1. *Literal meaning of corner-stone.*—The term 'stone of the corner' is applied in Palestine not only to the stones at the extreme corners of a building, but to the stone inserted in any part of the outer wall to form the beginning of an interior room-wall at right angles to it. It applies especially, however, to the stone that is ἀκρογωνιαίος, belonging to an extreme corner of the building. In the construction of a large edifice, the foundations are generally laid and brought up to the surface of the ground, and

are then left for several months exposed to the rain, so that the surrounding earth may settle down as close as possible to the wall. When the first row of stones above the ground line is to be laid, the masons place a long, well-squared block of stone at the corner to be a sure rest for the terminus of the two walls. It is the most important corner-stone (Eph 2:20).

2. Selection and treatment of the corner-stone.—It is always carefully chosen, and is specially treated in view of the service expected of it. (a) It must be sound, in the case of sandstone being free from weakening cavities, and in the case of limestone being without any white streaks of spar that under pressure and strain might lead to cleavage.—(b) It must be carefully dressed so as to be quite a rectangular block, whereas the ordinary stones usually slope away at the back, and the empty spaces are filled in with stone chips and plaster. It is expected to be in close and solid contact with whatever is under it and above it.—(c) In preparing a place for it, the mason gives it a more liberal allowance of mortar so as to increase the power of adhesion. These qualifications are summarized in Isa 28:16. Thus the corner-stone is expected to be strong and sound in itself, and able to control the tier that belongs to it, and check any tendency to bulge either outwards or inwards.

The thought of Mat 21:44 and Luk 20:18 passes beyond the idea of a corner-stone, which is required to remain in its place, and neither falls on any one nor is fallen upon. The transition is so abrupt that some have been inclined to attach importance to the fact that the addition is omitted in Mar 12:1-12, and that certain ancient authorities (e.g. D [Note: Deuteronomist.] 33) omit it even in St. Matthew. It is a similar conception that appears in 1Co 1:23; 1Pe 2:6-7, namely, that of a stumbling-block on the public highway. The 'way of life' was a familiar religious term, 'the Way' being a descriptive epithet which Christ applied to Himself (Joh 14:6), and one of the first designations of the Christian Church (Act 9:2). The same situation of conflict is presented in Isa 8:14, where the fear of the Lord would be to some a sanctuary, a place of safety and rest by the way, but to others a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence. Those who marked out to their own liking the moral highway of the nation had obscured the truth that Israel existed for God, not God for Israel, and left no space for the sufferings of Christ. It was an error of blindness like that of the house-builders concerning the rejected corner-stone. They should have made allowance for the immovable object of bed-rock truth that had the right of priority. In the Syrian town of Beyront one of the carriage roads has at one point a third of its width occupied by an ancient saint-shrine, with its small rough room and dome. It is a useless and inconvenient obstacle to the traffic, but any petition to have it removed would be frowned down as an act of irreverence and infidelity. The shrine was there before the road.

3. *Oriental respect for the builders.*—In connexion with the rejection of a particular stone, it has to be remembered that the ancients had no explosive by means of which to lighten their labours. The work had to be done by hammer, chisel, and saw, though they knew how to insert wooden wedges in prepared sockets in the line of desired cleavage, and make them expand by soaking with water. They would naturally pass by a stone that required a great deal of work and yielded only ordinary results. They carried this principle to the length of often taking prepared stones from one building for the erection of another at a considerable distance, as when the carved stones of the Ephesian temple of Diana were taken to build the church of St. Sofia in Constantinople, and the ruined edifices of Roman Caesarea supplied the material for the city wall of Acre. It would, however, sometimes happen that a stone discarded by certain builders would be recognized by a wiser master as that which he needed for an important place in his building, and this gave rise to the proverbial saying quoted in Psa 118:22, which is familiarly repeated and applied to-day in Syria.

The epigrammatic value of the saying is enhanced by the fact that in the East the master-knowledge of the different trades has always been carefully guarded, and a sharp distinction is drawn between the man who thinks and plans and the man who by his elementary manual labour merely carries out the orders of another. In the art of building, a familiar proverb says, 'One stroke from the master, even though it be behind his back, is better than the hammering of a thousand others.' In explanation of this the story is told of a Lebanon prince who engaged a master-mason to build a large bridge of one arch over the river Adônîs, and agreed to defray all costs and give the master a certain sum when the work was done. When the bridge was constructed, and nothing remained but to remove the scaffolding, the master claimed his remuneration; and as the prince argued for a reduction of the sum, the master declined to remove the scaffolding. Other men were engaged to do this, but they found it to be such a complicated and dangerous task that they abandoned it, and 'the original builder had to be called in on his own terms. He stepped forward, and, standing with his back to the network of supporting beams, gave a single tap with his hammer to a particular wedge. Its removal liberated the supports, and as he hurriedly sprang back, the scaffolding collapsed, and left the empty arch of the completed bridge. He alone knew how to do it. Similar proverbs are current with regard to the baker, tailor, carpenter, blacksmith, teacher, doctor, and almost every form of technical industry and specialized profession. The master in his trade occupies a position of respect similar to that of the father in the family and the sheikh in the tribe. In no department is this submission more thoroughgoing than in the deference shown to the Rabbis and priests as the trained masters of religious observance and ecclesiastical duty. In consequence of this the people of the country find a keen though guarded enjoyment in any situation that seems to discredit the wisdom of the wise.

4. *Figurative applications of the corner-stone.*—In Jdg 20:2 and 1Sa 14:38 the word *pinnôth* ('corner-stones') is translated 'the chiefs' of the people, as being those whose opinions and actions gave stability and direction to others. In Isa 19:13 it is stated that the error of Egypt was through her trust in the princes of Zoan and Noph, who were I the corner-stones of her tribes. In the East, the mason in laying a row of stones begins with the corner-stone, and some twelve feet farther down, or at the other terminus of the wall, if it be short, another stone of the same height is laid with lime, and then the mason's measuring-line is stretched tightly over the outer top-corner of each. This gives the line of frontage and elevation to all the stones that fill in the space between them. Zoan and Noph, the corner-stones, being themselves in a false position, affected all between that took measure from them. In Zep 1:16; Zep 3:6 the same word is translated 'towers,' as the corners of the wall were especially fortified; and in 2Ch 26:15 'bulwarks' (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 in all three passages 'battlements'). In Job 38:6 the act of laying the foundation corner-stone of a house is made to describe that of the creation of the world. In Jer 51:26 the inability of Babylon to furnish any more a corner-stone is made to figure its perpetual desolation. In Zec 10:4, in the prophecy of the pre-eminence of Judah, the corner-stone is a conspicuous emblem, along with the tent-peg and the bow, as signifying that that tribe was to excel in the peaceful industries of the city and the field, and in the art of war.

Such were the meanings of the rejected corner-stone that in their Messianic application were hidden from those who crucified the Lord of glory (1Co 2:8), but were revealed to the Gentiles, the 'other husbandmen,' when the word of acceptance and service came to them (Eph 2:19-22).

It is a tragical error to suppose that the message of the rejected corner-stone was exhausted in the forfeiture and fate of Israel. The city of God is still being built, and blindness with regard to the corner-stone, the mystical presence and the missionary command of Christ, may again expose the builders to scorn, and necessitate another transference of the service.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , art. 'Corner-stone'; *Expositor*, 5th ser. ix. [1899] p. 35 ff.; *Expos. Times*, vii. 372, xiv. 384; Jonathan Edwards, *Works* [1840], ii. p. 61 ff.; Maclaren, *Sermons Preached in Manchester*, 1st ser. p. 1 ff.

G. M. Mackie.

COSAM.—A name occurring in the Lukan genealogy of our Lord (Luk_3:28).

☩ Cosmopolitanism

COSMOPOLITANISM.—That the Jews were of all nations the most exclusive, was familiar to classic writers (cf. Juv. *Sat.* xiv. 103 ‘non monstrare vias eadem nisi sacra colenti,’ and Mayor’s references *ad loc.*); though both political and social conditions in the 1st cent. had made cosmopolitanism more possible than it had ever been before (cf. Juv. *ib.* iii. 62 ‘in Tiberim Syrius defluxit Orontes’). Under the Roman emperors the world was becoming more and more one great State; St. Paul’s Roman citizenship stood him in good stead in Philippi as in Jerusalem (Act_16:21; Act_22:25). Even in Palestine there were distinctly cosmopolitan elements, as was inevitable in the case of a country lying across the great trade routes of the world. Decapolis was almost entirely Greek; in Galilee there had for long been a large Gentile population; and foreigners as well as proselytes from all parts of the empire found their way to Jerusalem (Act_2:7; see Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] , Index, s. ‘Hellenism’; and Merrill, *Galilee in the Time of Christ*). The presence of foreigners, however, is seldom mentioned in the Gospels, save for a few references to centurions (Mat_8:5, Luk_7:2; Luk_23:47), strangers from Tyre and Sidon (Mar_3:8), a short journey to Decapolis (Mar_7:31, where, strangely enough, the Aramaic word ‘Ephphatha’ finds special place in the text), and the notice of the Greeks who sought for Jesus at the feast—though no account of His interview with them is given (Joh_12:20). Traces of a cosmopolitan atmosphere may be detected in Mar_15:21 (‘Simon, father of Alexander and Rufus’), in the Greek names of two of the disciples (Andrew and Philip), and the trilingual ‘title’ on the cross (Joh_19:20).

Jewish exclusiveness was apparently endorsed by Christ Himself (Mat_5:47 (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) 6:7, 32); the Twelve are forbidden to go into any way of the Gentiles (Mat_10:5); and the Syrophœnician woman is at first addressed in thoroughly Jewish language (Mat_15:21, Mar_7:24). On the other hand, our Lord speaks the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luk_10:30 ff.); commends the faith of a Roman centurion as greater than any faith He had found in Israel (Mat_8:10, Luk_7:9); and, notwithstanding His first words to the Syrophœnician woman, recognizes and rewards the greatness of her faith (Mat_15:21 ff., Mar_7:24 ff.). Simeon welcomes the infant Messiah as a light to lighten the Gentiles (Luk_2:32), in spite of the markedly Jewish tone of Luke 1, 2. St. Matthew is the narrator of the visit of Wise Men from the East (Mat_2:1); and if he traces the genealogy of Christ to Abraham (Mat_1:2) St. Luke takes it back to Adam and God (Luk_3:38).

It is true that the Gospels are full of protests against Jewish exclusiveness (Mat 3:9 ‘Think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father’; cf. Joh 8:37 ff., where the claim founded on descent from Abraham is contemptuously dismissed; also Mat 12:41 f., Luk 11:31 f. ‘the men of Nineveh ... the queen of Sheba shall rise up in the judgment with this generation and shall condemn it’; Mat 8:11 f., Luk 13:29 ‘many shall come from the east and the west ... but the sons of the kingdom shall be cast forth’; and Mat 11:21, Luk 10:13, where the unrepentant Bethsaida and Chorazin are contrasted with Tyre and Sidon). So far as this break with the Jews shows itself, it rests on (a) enthusiasm for humanity; cf. esp. the references to publicans and sinners, Mat 9:11; Mat 11:19, Mar 2:15, Luk 5:30; Luk 7:37; Luk 15:1, and the fragment in Joh 7:53 to Joh 8:11; (b) the universalism of the gospel, Mat 24:14, Mar 14:9 (‘what she hath done shall be preached in all the world’), Mat 28:19, Mar 16:15, Luk 24:49 (‘make disciples of all the nations’); so Joh 3:16; Joh 12:33 (‘I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto myself’); the same thing would result from Mat 20:28, Mar 10:45 (‘to give his life a ransom for many’), if carried out to its logical conclusion; (c) anti-legalism in regard to the Sabbath (Mat 12:1, Mar 2:23, Luk 6:1; Luk 13:14), ceremonial ablutions (Mat 15:1, Mar 7:19), the provisions of the Law (Mat 5:21; Mat 5:33; Mat 5:38; Mat 5:43), and the inadequacy of the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees (Mat 5:20). It is noteworthy that the ground of marriage fidelity is carried back from Moses to the Creation (Mat 19:4, Mar 10:6), and the Sadducees are referred, on the subject of the resurrection, to God’s language to the pre-Mosaic patriarchs (Mar 12:18, Luk 20:37); still Christ regards as final a combination of Deu 6:4 and Lev 19:18 (Mar 12:28 ff.), and He asserts that His purpose is not to destroy the Law but to fulfil it (Mat 5:17, cf. Mat 3:15).

The real nature of Christ’s teaching cannot be understood apart from the deductions from it in the Acts, where the recognition of the cosmopolitanism of the gospel is forced on the Apostles almost against their will (Act 8:26; Act 10:11; Act 10:34; Act 11:20), and even opposed by a powerful party in the Church when explicitly stated by St. Paul (Act 15:5): but it reaches its full statement in Rom 10:12, Gal 3:28, Col 3:11 (‘neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free’), and Php 3:20 (‘our citizenship is in heaven’). (Cf. J. R. Seeley, *Ecce Homo*, ch. xii. ‘The Universality of the Christian Republic’). It will thus be seen that the recognition of cosmopolitanism in the sense of a universal mission of Christianity is, in the Synoptic Gospels, only slight (cf. Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*, English translation vol. i. pp. 40-48, especially the statement that, omitting what is probably unauthentic, ‘Mark and Matthew have almost consistently withstood the temptation to introduce the Gentile mission into the words and deeds of Jesus,’ p. 40). St. Luke differs from them in a slight colouring of expression rather than in the narration of fresh facts. St. John had both watched and taken part in the expansion; but the universalism of the Fourth Gospel is chiefly confined to the striking use of the expression ‘the world’ (see above

and Joh 4:42; Joh 6:51; Joh 12:47; Joh 17:23 etc.), which silently bears out the view—to a Christian, abundantly confirmed after 70 a.d.—that the Jews were a reprobate people. From the rejection of one race followed the acceptance of all (Rom 11:11-12). See also articles Exclusiveness, Grecians, and Universalism.

W. F. Lofthouse.

☞ Couch

COUCH.—The word ‘couch’ is found in Luk 5:19; Luk 5:24 (as translation of κλινιδιον), where Mat 9:2; Mat 9:6 and Mar 2:4; Mar 2:11 have ‘bed’ (κλινη and κροβάττος respectively; κλινη also in Luk 5:18). It is found also in (Revised Version margin) of Mar 7:4 as translation of κλινη. In Act 5:15, where the Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 have ‘beds and couches,’ the correct text is ἐπὶ κλιναιῶν καὶ κροβάττων, ‘small beds and couches,’ or, as some render, ‘small couches and beds.’ The fact is, the terms used for ‘couch’ and ‘bed’ are not always sharply distinguished—certainly not by translators. The distinction made by Bengel and Kuinoel between κλινῶν (TR [Note: R Textus Receptus.] of Act 5:15) and κροβάττων, that the former denotes ‘soft and costly,’ and the latter ‘poor and humble,’ beds is quite arbitrary (Meyer). In English usage the distinction between ‘bed’ and ‘couch’ is clear enough; a couch is a piece of furniture on which it is customary to repose or recline when dressed. A like distinction was made by the Romans, and in a measure by the Jews in the time of Christ, when ‘couches’ were often used for the purpose of reclining at meals. They were known among the Romans as *triclinia*, because they ran round *three* sides of a table. Such ‘couches’ were undoubtedly in common use among the Jews of Christ’s day, though they are not mentioned in the Gospels in express terms, unless, against the best authorities, we accept καὶ κλινῶν in Mar 7:4. They were provided with cushions, such as are now in vogue, on which the left elbow could rest, so as to leave the right arm free; and were often arranged around three sides of a table in the form of a parallelogram, the fourth side of which was left open for the convenience of those waiting on the guests.

This practice of reclining at table first appears in the Bible in the prophecy of Amos (Amo 6:4, cf. Eze 23:41), and is denounced by the prophet as of foreign origin and as savouring of sinful luxury. The ‘couches’ there coming into view were of costly cedar-wood inlaid with ivory (Amo 6:4); the feet were plated with silver, and the

backs covered with gold-leaf (cf. Son_3:10). They were usually furnished with pillows and bolsters, often of fine Egyptian linen or silk, and richly embroidered coverings, costly rugs, etc. (cf. Pro_7:16). The Tel el-Amarna tablets show how early such luxury prevailed in Palestine, and state that even in those ancient times couches of rare and costly wood inlaid with gold were sent as presents from Palestine to Egypt.

Keeping this in mind will throw light on some otherwise obscure passages in the Gospels, e.g. where the woman is spoken of (Luk_7:36-38) as washing and anointing the feet of Jesus while He was 'sitting (reclining) at meat in the Pharisee's house'; where our Lord washed the feet of His disciples while they were at supper (Joh_13:5); and where it is said of the beloved disciple at the supper that he, 'leaning back, as lie was, on Jesus' breast,' spoke to Him of His betrayer (Joh_13:25).

There is reason to believe, however, that among the Jewish people in general, in the most ancient times and later, the 'bed,' so far as use went, was 'bed' and 'couch' in one—a plain wooden frame with feet and a slightly raised end for the head (Gen_47:31), differing very little, indeed, from the bed of the Egyptians represented on the monuments (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* i. 416, fig. 191). In the daytime and at meals people sat on it, in the most ancient times, perhaps, with crossed legs; and then at night they placed it here or there, as the season or need suggested, and slept on it. In the East to-day the beds are often made by laying bolsters on the raised part of the floor, or on the low divans which run along the walls, and the sitting-room of the day becomes a bedroom at night. (See Bed, Closet).

Geo. B. Eager.

☞ Council, Councillor

COUNCIL, COUNCILLOR.—See Sanhedrin.

☞ Counsels Of Perfection

COUNSELS OF PERFECTION.—See Perfection (human).

☞ Countenance

COUNTENANCE.—See Face.

☞ Courage

COURAGE.—ἀνδρίζομαι, the Gr. equivalent for Heb. **גִּבּוֹר** and **אַמִּץ** is not found in the Gospels, and, except in 1Co 16:13, not in the NT. The valour of the battlefield, so often commended in the OT, nowhere comes into view. Christ's kingdom is not of this world. It does not call for the prowess of the warrior. But there was no taint of cowardice in Jesus, and to be His disciple did not involve any slackening of moral fibre, or impairing of true manliness. He foresaw a situation bristling with menace to His followers, and courage was therefore a prime desideratum in His disciples, as it was an outstanding quality of His own nature. With unsparing hand He lifted the curtain of the future, and disclosed to all who would follow Him the hostility and peril which discipleship must involve (Mat 5:11; Mat 10:16-39; Mat 24:9 ff., Mar 13:9-13, Luk 21:12 ff., Joh 15:20; Joh 16:2). He who would follow Christ must not be faint-hearted or double-minded (Luk 9:62), he must be prepared to surrender many interests that were formerly dear to him, brace himself even to the renunciation of the closest earthly relationships, and, recognizing that the disciple is not greater than his Master, be ready to tread the same rough path, and bear the same cross. The demand for courage is all the more severe that it is not the courage of resisting, but of enduring wrong. The disciple of Jesus is called to meekness, to the patient endurance of suffering wrongfully inflicted, to the heroism of a calm and trustful heart. But the meek temper is not the sign of weakness. It is restrained strength. It is the high courage of endurance, in the spirit and for the sake of Christ. It is of this sustained heroism that Jesus says, 'In your patience (ὑπομονή, 'patient endurance') ye shall win your souls' (Luk 21:19), 'He that endureth to the end shall be saved' (Mat 10:22; Mat 24:13); and those who, in spite of pain and persecution, confess Him before men, He declares He will confess before His Father and the holy angels (Luk 12:8, cf. Mat 10:32).

Of this high moral courage Jesus Himself is the supreme example. The emphasis which is so rightly laid upon His gentleness and compassion tends to obscure His strength and virility. But the remark in Act 4:13 'When they saw the boldness of Peter and John ... they took knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus,' is the record of the dominant impression made by Jesus, upon His enemies. The depth and warmth of His sympathy had not deluded them into the thought that He was deficient in courage. They bore witness to His fearlessness and fidelity to truth (Joh 7:26, Mat 22:16). His fearless exposure of hypocrisy (Mat 15:1-14, Mar 7:1-13, Mat 23:1-39 et al.), His disregard of, or opposition to, religious practices which had been invested with the sanctity of Divine law, and the performance of which was the hall-mark of righteousness (Mat 9:14; Mat 12:1; Mat 12:9, Mar 2:18-22; Mar 7:1, Luk 3:33;

Luk 6:1-6), His defiance of social and religious caste in receiving sinners and eating with them were the moral utterances of a courageous righteousness and love (Mat 9:10, Luk 15:2). In circumstances of danger He is calm and self-possessed (Mat 8:26). He does not rush into danger, and more than once retires from scenes where His life is threatened (Luk 4:30, Joh 8:59; Joh 10:39). At those times He felt that His hour had not come. His courage was inspired by faith in God (Mat 8:26), and was controlled by obedience to the Divine will. When He knows that His hour has come, He presses to the cross with an eagerness which made those who saw Him afraid (Mar 10:32). But it is only as we enter into the consciousness of Jesus and see Him in His perfect purity of soul taking upon Him the sin of the world, that we feel the wonder of His heroism. We do not marvel that He shrank from the cup His Father gave Him to drink. We are amazed equally at the love and at the courage which bore Him through until He said, 'It is finished' (Joh 19:30). See, further, Fear.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , art. 'Courage'; Aristotle, *Ethics*, iii. 6-9; Denney, *Gospel Questions and Answers*, p. 85 ff.

Joseph Muir.

☞ Course

COURSE.—See Abijah, and Priest.

☞ Court

COURT (αὐλή, translation 'court' in Rev 11:2, 'sheepfold' or 'fold' in Joh 10:1; Joh 10:16, and 'palace' [Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'court'] in Mat 26:3; Mat 26:69 etc.).* [Note: 'In kings' courts' of Luk 7:25 represents ἐν τοῖς βασιλικοῖς [only occurrence of this Gr. word in NT].] —The 'court' is an essential part of the typical Oriental house. The Eastern house represented on the monuments of Egypt and Assyria is much like that now found, and doubtless found in the time of Christ, in Palestine. It is built around an open square called 'the court,' into which each room opens, seldom one room into another. Sometimes the house has more than one 'court,' if the wealth or the official station of the owner warrants it.

In the richer private and public houses the 'court' is fitted up with great magnificence. In Damascus we find several courts connected with a single house, in

some cases of rare richness and beauty. The houses of two or more storeys have chambers on each floor opening on to a common balcony running round the inside of the court, with a staircase in a corner of the court open to the sky. This type of 'court' is usually paved with marble or flagging, and has a well or fountain in the centre (2Sa_17:18), with orange and lemon trees and other shrubs around it. Some of them are planted with choice tropical trees, and the walls, verandahs, staircases, etc., are covered and adorned with creepers and vines of untold varieties.

In Mat_26:69 it is said that 'Peter sat without, ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ,' *i.e.* in the 'court' of the high priest's house (Mat_26:58). It was during the trial of Jesus; and 'without' is used in contrast with an implied 'within'—the interior of the audience-room in which Jesus was appearing before the authorities. Peter was not allowed into this room, but was out in the open air of the 'court'; and this was 'beneath' (Mar_14:66), *i.e.* on a somewhat lower level than the audience-chamber.

The 'court of the Gentiles,' which was 'without the temple' (Rev_11:2), was on the lowest level or terrace of the Holy Mountain, and separated from the 'Sanctuary' or 'Mountain of the House' by a stone wall four or five feet high, called 'the *Soreg*.' All Gentiles were warned to remain outside of this sacred enclosure under penalty of death (cf. Act_21:28-29; Act_24:11; Act_26:21). See also artt. Door, House.

Geo. B. Eager.

☞ Courtesy

COURTESY.—The courtesies of life have always received more strict and formal recognition in the East than in the West. The people of Palestine in Christ's time were no exception to this rule. They were punctilious about those conventional forms which hedge in and govern social life, and were not slow to resent the breach or neglect of these forms when it affected them directly (Mat_22:2-7, Luk_14:16-21). A remarkably complete picture of the ordinary forms of courtesy observed by them may be made up from the Gospel narratives. The incidents of Christ's life, together with His sayings and parables, show us the marked deference paid to authority, position, and learning (Mat_17:14; Mat_22:16; Mat_22:24; Mat_23:6-7 etc.), the elaborate and somewhat burdensome hospitality bestowed on friends and strangers when received as guests into a house (Luk_7:44-46), the embracing and prolonged salutations practised (Mat_26:49, Mar_14:45; cf. Luk_10:4 f., Luk_15:20; Luk_22:47, Mat_10:12), the formalities observed in connexion with feasts in rich men's houses (Mat_22:12, Luk_14:17).

These courteous habits must not be regarded as mere superficial forms. The fact that the neglect of them, especially if believed to be intentional, caused such serious offence to the suffering party, is a sufficient evidence that they were more than surface forms. At the same time the courtesies practised were not always sincere (note the kiss of Judas), and were, moreover, occasionally violated in a peculiarly flagrant manner, as we learn from the treatment Christ received once and again from those who opposed Him, especially the treatment He received immediately before His death. The warm Oriental temperament, indeed, which had so much to do with creating these courtesies, and which found so much satisfaction in observing them, was ready, under certain circumstances, to violate them to an extent that the colder Western temperament would never have done.

Christ's attitude towards the established rules of courtesy is a question of interest and importance. His relation towards these time-worn rules was the same as His relation towards the Law of Moses. He observed them in the spirit and not in the letter, and only in so far as they sincerely revealed His thoughts and feelings. They were never mere forms to Him, much less forms used to hide the real intents of His heart. That His attitude was not the conventional attitude of others, but was peculiar to Himself, like His attitude towards the Law (Mat_5:17), is evident from the following considerations: (1) He recognized and followed the customary laws in so far as they served to express His real sentiments (Luk_7:44-46; Luk_10:5, Joh_13:4 ff.); (2) He transgressed them boldly at times, as in His cleansing of the Temple, His injunction 'Salute no man by the way' (Luk_10:4), and His intercourse with tax-gatherers and sinners; (3) He gave a larger and more humane interpretation to them by His generous and considerate treatment, not only of tax-gatherers and sinners, but of women, children, Samaritans, and others who were regarded as more or less outside the ordinary rules of courtesy.

There are two instances where Jesus seems to fail in the matter of courtesy—in His reply to His mother, 'Woman, what have I to do with thee?' (Joh_2:4), and in His reply to the Syro-Phœnician woman, 'Let the children first be filled: for it is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it unto the dogs' (Mat_15:26 || Mar_7:27). It is only in appearance, however, that He offends against courtesy in these instances. The study of the passages with the aid of a good commentary will clear up any difficulty attaching to them.

Literature.—Van Lennep, *Bible Lands, their Modern Customs*; G. M. Mackie, *Bible Manners and Customs*; Geikie, *Holy Land and the Bible*; Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine* [contains *passim* personal experiences which throw light on the tedious courtesies of the East]; Martensen, *Christian Ethics*, i. 202 ff.; T. Binney, *Sermons*, ii. 226; Paget, *Studies in the Christian Character*, p. 209 ff.; Dale, *Laws of Christ for Common Life*, p. 107 ff.; *Expositor*, 1st. ser. iv. [1876] p. 179 ff.

☞ Covenant

COVENANT.—In order to a correct apprehension of the term ‘covenant,’ as it is used by our Lord in the Gospels, a brief survey of the OT usage is necessary.

The covenant conception is of frequent occurrence in the OT. Used at first in connexion with single transactions and partial aspects of the religious intercourse between God and man, it later becomes the formula designating the entire structure and content of the religion of Israel in its most comprehensive sense. This latter representation occurs as early as Gen 17:1-14, Exo 19:5; Exo 24:7-8, and often in Deuteronomy. The earlier covenants belonging to the time of Noah and Abraham (Gen 6:18; Gen 9:8-17; Gen 15:18) do not yet possess this comprehensive character, but appear as solemn religious rites whereby some particular promise of God is made sure. Whether the word *b^erith* (בְּרִית) originally meant ‘enactment,’ ‘appointment,’ ‘law,’ a meaning which it undoubtedly has in several instances, or did from the beginning signify a two-sided agreement, cannot be determined with certainty, It seems easier to conceive of the former sense as developed out of the latter than the reverse. At any rate, the comprehensive signification in which it stands for the whole religious relationship between God and Israel, rests on the idea of the covenant as a two-sided agreement. It should be remembered, however, that the two-sidedness never extends so far that God and Israel appear on an equal footing in the determination of the covenant. The planning and proposing of the covenant belong exclusively to God. Still the fact that Israel voluntarily accepts the covenant is as strongly emphasized (Exo 19:5; Exo 24:3; Exo 24:7, and elsewhere). Indeed, the covenant idea serves primarily to express the free, ethical, historically originated bond that exists between God and Israel. Its covenant character marks off the religion of Israel as a religion of real, conscious, spiritual fellowship between God and His people, in distinction from the religions of paganism, in which either the Deity and the creature are pantheistically fused, or the God-head after a deistic fashion is so far removed from the creature as to render true communion impossible, and where the relation between a national god and his worshippers is not a matter of choice but of necessity on both sides.

In the early Prophets the conception of the covenant is not particularly prominent. With Hosea, the figure of marriage, probably not viewed as yet by the prophet as a species of covenant, serves the same purpose. There is no reason, however, for denying that Hosea knew the covenant conception in its comprehensive religious sense, and on this ground to call in question the genuineness of 8:1. Greater

prominence the covenant idea obtains from the age of Jeremiah onwards. Besides the emphasis thrown on the ethical-historical character of Israel's religion, two other important principles attach themselves to the term, partly developing out of the principle just stated. On the one hand, the covenant idea begins to express the continuity of God's dealings with His people; as it is a bond freely established, so it is the fruit of design and the fountain of further history, it has a prospective reference and makes Israel's religion a growing thing; in a word, the covenant idea gathers around itself the thoughts we have in mind when speaking of a history of redemption and revelation. On the other hand, inasmuch as God is the originator of the covenant and has solemnly bound Himself not merely to fulfil His promises to Israel, but also to carry out His own purposes contemplated in the covenant, the same bond which originally expresses the freedom of the relation between God and Israel can also become the pledge of the absolute certainty, that God will not finally break with His people, Israel's infidelity notwithstanding. In Isaiah 40-66, and especially in Jeremiah, the covenant thus stands to express the continuity and sureness of the accomplishment of the Divine purpose with reference to Israel. Out of the combination of these two ideas arises the Messianic or eschatological significance which the covenant idea obtains in both these prophets. In Isaiah 40-66 it is more than once introduced to emphasize the infallible character of the Divine promise given of old (Isa 54:9-10; Isa 55:3; Isa 59:21; Isa 61:8). In two passages (Isa 42:6; Isa 49:8) the servant of Jehovah is designated as עַם בְּרִית, a somewhat obscure phrase, of which the two most plausible interpretations are, either that the servant will be the instrument of realizing the future covenant between God and Israel, or, placing the emphasis on עַם, that he will be the means of establishing a people^e, a^e in which Israel, in contrast to its present scattered condition, will once more become a unified, organized nation. These two passages are of importance, because they bring the idea of the covenant into connexion with the "figure of the Servant of Jehovah, which, assuming that the latter was Messianically interpreted by our Lord and applied to Himself, would explain that He represents Himself as the inaugurator of a new covenant.

In Jeremiah the covenant idea appears as a Messianic idea in two forms. In so far as the promise given to the house of David was a promise pledged in solemn covenant, the Messianic blessings are a covenant gift (Jer 33:20-21; cf. Psa 89:28, Isa 55:3). This is an instance of the old application of the idea to a concrete promise, which, however, in the present case, owing to the wide scope of the promise involved, would easily become identified in the mind of later generations with the expectation of an eschatological covenant in the comprehensive sense. The latter is the other form in which Jeremiah uses the covenant with reference to the future (Jer 31:31; Jer 31:34). This is the only place where the notion of a new covenant occurs explicitly, although the thought itself is not foreign to the older prophets. Hosea has

it in the form of the new marriage which Jehovah will contract with Israel. Jeremiah conceives of the new covenant as the outcome of the covenant character of the relation between God and Israel in general. To the prophet's mind religion and the covenant have become so identified that the covenant idea becomes the stable, permanent element in the historical development; if in its old form the covenant disappears, then in a new form it must reappear. The newness will consist in the twofold feature, that the sin of the people will be forgiven, *i.e.* the former sin, and that the law of Jehovah, instead of being an outward, objective covenant obligation, will become an inward, subjective covenant reality, written on the heart in consequence of the universal and perfect knowledge of Jehovah which will prevail. This passage in Jeremiah lies at the basis of the NT use of the phrase 'the new covenant.'

Two further passages in the prophets, to which a Messianic application of the covenant idea could easily attach itself, are Zec 9:11 and Mal 3:1. In the former passage the original reads: 'Because of the blood of thy covenant, I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water'; the LXX Septuagint has, in the second person of address to Jehovah, 'Because of the blood of thy covenant, *thou* hast sent forth,' etc. On the former rendering the covenant is the covenant made with Israel, or, since this interpretation of the suffix 'thy' is deemed impossible by some, we may refer the suffix to the compound phrase 'covenant blood,' and understand the phrase 'thy covenant blood' of the sacrificial blood by means of which Israel continually upholds and renews the covenant with Jehovah. On the rendering of the LXX Septuagint the covenant is represented as the covenant made and maintained by Jehovah. In the Malachi-passage the coming of the 'angel' or 'messenger of the covenant' is predicted. This 'angel of the covenant' is not identical with the Lord, but as a distinct person he accompanies the coming of the Lord to His temple. He is called 'the angel of the covenant,' either because he realizes the covenant, or because his coming is in virtue of the existing covenant. It is easy to see how on either view a significant connexion could be established between the Messiah and the covenant.

The LXX Septuagint regularly renders *b^erith* by *διαθήκη*, the later Greek versions prefer *συνθήκη*. The latter term better expresses the idea of a two-sided agreement; but probably this was precisely the reason why the LXX Septuagint translators, desiring to emphasize the one-sided Divine origin and character of the covenant, avoided it. It should also be remembered that in not a few instances *b^erith* in the original meant not a covenant but an authoritative disposition, which, as stated above, is according to some scholars even the primary meaning of the word. On the side of the Greek, also, there were considerations which explain the choice of *διαθήκη*

η, in preference to συνθήκη. It is true, in classical Greek the former meant usually a testamentary disposition, and might in so far have seemed unsuitable as a rendering for *b^eerith*. But occasionally at least διαθήκη could stand for a two-sided agreement (Aristoph. Av. 432). The verb διατιθεσθαι was not bound to the notion of ‘testament,’ but signified authoritative arrangements generally. And above all things it should be noted that the testamentary διαθήκη among the Greeks before and at the time of the LXX Septuagint translation differed in many respects from our modern Roman-law ‘testament,’ and possessed features which brought it into closer contact with the Hebrew *b^eerith*. The διαθήκη was a solemn and public transaction of a religious character, by which an irrevocable disposition of rights and property was made, and which for its effect was not dependent on the death of the διαθέμενος, but immediately set in operation certain of the duties and relationships established. Thus conceived, the διαθήκη could all the more easily become the equivalent of the *b^eerith* between God and Israel, because already in the OT the idea of ‘the inheritance’ had significantly attached itself to that of the covenant.

In the NT the noun used is always διαθήκη, but the cognate forms of συνθήκη appear in the verb (Luk 22:5) and the adjective (Rom 1:31). διαθήκη occurs in the NT 33 times. The word retains the one-sided associations of the LXX Septuagint usage, yet in most cases the NT writers show themselves aware of the peculiar covenant-meaning descended with it from the OT. An additional possibility of interpreting it in the sense of testament was furnished by the fact that the blessings of the Messianic era were derived from the death of Christ. Hence in Heb 9:16-17 the new covenant is represented as a testament bestowing upon believers the eternal inheritance, because the death of Christ had to intervene to make the bestowal effectual. As Ramsay has pointed out (*Expositor*, Nov. 1898, pp. 321-330), this representation is based on Roman law, according to which a testament has no force until the death of the testator. On the other hand, the Pauline representation of Gal 3:17-18 is based on the Graeco-Syrian law of the earlier period, under which the διαθήκη, once made, could not be subsequently modified, and took effect in certain directions immediately. No reflexion is here made on the death of the testator. Still, that διαθήκη, does not here have the unmodified OT sense of ‘covenant,’ but means ‘testamentary disposition,’ is plain from the fact that ‘sonship’ and ‘heirship’ are connected with it in the course of the argument. These two passages in Hebrews and Galatiana are the only NT passages which explicitly refer to the testamentary character of the διαθήκη. In how far in other instances the associations of the

testament idea lay in the speaker's or writer's mind cannot be determined with certainty (cf. Act 3:25 *ὑπὲρ τῆς διαθήκης*; Gal 4:24 *διαθήκη γεννώσα εἰς δουλείαν*)

In the Authorized Version of the NT *διαθήκη* is in 14 instances rendered by 'testament' (Mat 26:28, Mar 14:24, Luk 22:20, 1Co 11:25, 2Co 3:6; 2Co 3:14, Heb 7:22; Heb 9:15 bis. Heb 9:16-18; Heb 9:20, Rev 11:19). As a marginal alternative 'testament' is also offered in Rom 9:4, Gal 3:15; Gal 4:25, Heb 8:6; Heb 12:24; Heb 13:20. In all these cases, except in Heb 9:16-17, the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 has replaced 'testament' by 'covenant,' offering, however, the former as a marginal alternative in Mat 26:28, Mar 14:24, Luk 22:20, 1Co 11:25, 2Co 3:6; 2Co 3:14, Gal 3:15; Gal 3:17, Heb 7:22; Heb 8:6-9 bis., Heb 8:10; Heb 8:13; Heb 9:15 bis., Heb 9:20, Rev 11:19. In the American Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 the marginal reading 'testament' has in all these cases been dropped, except in Heb 9:15; Heb 9:20. The principle by which the Revisers were guided is plain. The only question can be whether, in view of what was stated above, they were right in rendering 'covenant' and not 'testament' in Gal 3:15; Gal 3:17. The point to be determined in each case is not whether the associations of 'testament' were present to the speaker's or writer's mind, but whether those of 'covenant' were absent: only where the latter is the case ought 'covenant' to be abandoned, and Gal 3:15; Gal 3:17 seems to belong to this class. What motives in each case underlie the choice of 'testament' and 'covenant' in Authorized Version is not so plain. Possibly these motives were not always exegetical, but derived from the usage of earlier (English and other) versions. The following explanation is offered tentatively: wherever the contrast between the old and the new *διαθήκη* is expressed or implied, 'testament' was chosen, because 'testament' had long since, on the basis of the Latin Bible, become familiar as a designation of the two canons of Scripture, in the forms 'the Old Testament,' 'the New Testament.' This will explain Mat 26:28, Mar 14:24, Luk 22:20, 1Co 11:25, 2Co 3:6; 2Co 3:14, Heb 7:22. In Heb 9:15-20, of course, the import of the passage itself required 'testament.' Heb 8:6. ('a better *covenant*') Heb 8:7. ('that first *covenant*') Heb 8:8. ('a new *covenant*') Heb 8:9-10; Heb 8:13 ('a new *covenant*'), Heb 9:1 ('the first *covenant*'), Heb 12:24 ('the new *covenant*'), seem to run contrary to the explanation offered, but in each of these instances the context furnished a special reason for favouring 'covenant': in Heb 8:6-13 the discourse revolves around the quotation from Jeremiah, which had 'covenant'; Heb 9:1 is still continuous with this section, and in Heb 12:24 the contrast between the mediatorship of Moses and that of Jesus, and the reference to the transaction of Exodus 24, suggested 'covenant.' In 2Co 3:6; 2Co 3:14 'testament' was especially suitable, because here the idea of *διαθήκη* might seem to approach that of a body of writings (2Co 3:14 'the reading of the Old Testament'). Strange and

unexplained is Rev_11:19 ('the ark of his testament'), cf. Heb_9:4 ('the ark of the covenant').

It seems strange at first sight that a conception so prominent in the OT is so little utilized in the NT. Perhaps the main reason for this was the intensity of the eschatological interest in that age, which made other terms appear more suitable to describe the new order of things felt to be approaching or to have already begun. On the whole, the covenant idea had not been intimately associated with eschatology in the OT. The consciousness that the work of Christ had ushered in a new state of things for the present life of the people of God, distinct and detached from the legal life of Judaism, for which latter the word 'covenant' had become the characteristic expression, dawned only gradually upon the early Church. The phrase 'Kingdom of God,' while emphasizing the newness of the Messianic order of things, leaves unexpressed the superseding of the Mosaic institutions by the introduction of something else.

With this agrees the fact that the conception of Christianity as a covenant is most familiar to precisely those two NT writers who with greatest clearness and emphasis draw the contrast between the Mosaic forms of life and those of the Christian era, viz. St. Paul and the author of Hebrews. Even with St. Paul, however, the contrast referred to finds only occasional expression in terms of the covenant: as a rule, it is expressed in other ways, such as the antithesis between law and grace, works and faith. The Epistle to the Hebrews is the only NT writing which gives to the covenant idea the same central dominating place as it has in the greater part of the OT.

In the Gospels the word 'covenant,' in a religious sense, occurs but twice, in Luk_1:72, and in the words spoken by our Lord at the Supper. In the former passage the covenant with Abraham is referred to, and the Messianic salvation represented as a fulfilment of the promise of that covenant. The emergence of the idea here is in harmony with the best OT traditions: it expresses the consciousness of the sovereign grace and undeserved faithfulness of God which pervades the prophetic pieces preserved for us in the gospel of the incarnation according to St. Luke. Of course, in a broad sense the idea of the relation between God and Israel embodied in the word 'covenant' underlies and pervades all our Lord's teaching. Notwithstanding the so-called 'intensive universalism' and the recognition of religion as a natural bond between God and man, antedating all positive forms of intercourse, our Lord was a thoroughgoing supernaturalist, who viewed both the past relationship of God to Israel and the future relationship to be established in the Kingdom not as the outcome of the natural religion of man, but as the product of a special, historic, supernatural approach of God to man, such as the OT calls 'covenant.' While probably the legalistic shade of meaning which the word had obtained was less congenial to Him, He must have been in full accord with the genuine OT principle expressed in it.

Mar_8:38 and Mat_12:39 speak of the Jews as an ‘adulterous generation,’ and probably the later prophetic representation of the covenant as a marriage-covenant lies at the basis of this mode of statement.

The words spoken at the Supper were, according to St. Matthew (Mat_26:28) and St. Mark (Mar_14:24), τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἶμά μου τῆς διαθήκης (AD in Matthew and A in Mark τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης); according to St. Luke (Luk_22:20) and St. Paul (1Co_11:25) τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινῆ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου [in 1 Cor. ἐμῷ αἵματι]. There is some doubt, however, about the genuineness of the context in St. Luke in which these words occur. In D [Note: Deuteronomist.] and some other MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] , Luk_22:19 b (beginning with τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν) and Luk_22:20 are lacking. The textual-critical problem is a very complicated one (cf. Westcott and Hort, *Notes on Select Readings* in the Appendix, pp. 63-64; Haunt, *Ueber die ursprüngliche Form und Bedeutung der Abendmahlsworte*, pp. 6-10; Johannes Weiss, *Das älteste Evangelium*, pp. 294-299; Johannes Hoffmann, *Das Abendmahl im Urchristenthum*, pp. 7, 8 [all of whom adopt the shorter text]; Schultzen, *Das Abendmahl im Neuen Testament*, pp. 5-19; R. A. Hoffmann, *Die Abendmahlsgedanken Jesu Christi*, pp. 7-21 [who are in favour of the TR [Note: R Textus Receptus.]]. It ought to be remembered, though it is sometimes overlooked, that the rejection of Luk_22:19 b, Luk_22:20 as not originally belonging to the Gospel is by no means equivalent to declaring these words unhistorical, *i.e.* not spoken by Jesus. Wendt, *e.g.* (*Die Lehre Jesu* 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 496), assumes the originality of the shorter text in St. Luke, and yet believes, on the basis of the other records, that Jesus spoke the words which St. Luke, for reasons arising out of his ‘combination-method,’ omitted. (Similarly Haupt, p. 10). Still, as a matter of fact, with some writers the adoption of the shorter text is accompanied by the belief that it represents an older and more accurate tradition of what actually took place. On the other hand, it remains possible, even in retaining the TR [Note: R Textus Receptus.] as originally Lukan, to believe that St. Luke’s source supplied him with a highly peculiar version of the occurrence preserved in Luk_22:15-19 a, and that he assimilated this to the other more current representation by borrowing Luk_22:19 b, 20 from St. Paul. On the whole, however, the acceptance of the genuineness of the longer text naturally tends to strengthen the presumption that a statement in regard to which all the records agree must be historical. Contextual considerations also seem to speak in favour of the genuineness of the disputed words. If Luk_22:19 b, Luk_22:20 do not belong to the text, St. Luke must have looked upon the cup of Luk_22:17 as the cup of the Sacrament, for it would have been impossible for him to relate an institution *sub una specie*. But this assumption, viz. that the cup of Luk_22:17 meant for St. Luke the cup of the Sacrament, is impossible, because

Luk 22:18 comes between this cup and the bread of Luk 22:19. Further, Luk 22:18 so closely corresponds to Luk 22:18 as to set Luk 22:15-18 by themselves, a group of four verses with a carefully constructed parallelism between the first and the third, the second and the fourth of its members respectively; and inasmuch as Luk 22:17 belongs to this group, it cannot very well have been connected by the author with Luk 22:19 in such a close manner as the co-ordination of the cup and the bread in the Sacrament would require. In general, the advocates of the shorter text do not succeed in explaining how the author of the Third Gospel, who must have been familiar with the other accounts, and can hardly have differed from them in his belief that the Supper was instituted as celebrated in the Church at that time, could have regarded Luk 22:15-19 as an adequate institution of the rite with which he was acquainted. It is much easier to believe that a later copyist found the cup of the Sacrament in Luk 22:17, and therefore omitted Luk 22:20, than that a careful historian, such as St. Luke was, should have deliberately entertained this view, even if he had found a version to that effect in one of his sources.

Altogether apart from the textual problem in St. Luke, the historicity of the words relating to the covenant-blood has been called in question. Just as the saying about the λίτρον in Mar 10:45 and Mat 20:28, so this utterance has been suspected since the time of Baur on account of its alleged Paulinizing character. Recently this view has gained renewed advocacy by such writers as W. Brandt, *Die Evangelische Geschichte*, pp. 289 ff., 566; Bousset, *Die Evangeliencitate Justin des Märtyrers*, p. 112 ff.; Wrede, *ZNTW* [Note: *NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissen. schaft.*] , 1900, pp. 69-74; Hollmann, *Die Bedeutung des Todes Jesu*, p. 145 ff. The principal arguments on which these writers rest their contention are, that whilst to St. Paul the idea of the new covenant is familiar, no trace of it appears elsewhere in the teaching of Jesus; that it is expressive of an antithesis to the OT religion and its institutions out of harmony with Jesus' general attitude towards these; that in Justin Martyr's version of the institution the disputed words do not occur (so Bousset); that the structure of the sentence in Matthew and Mark still betrays the later addition of the genitive τῆς διαθήκης (so Wrede). The mere fact, however, that a certain conception occurs with a degree of doctrinal pointedness in Paul, does not warrant us in suspecting it when it occurs in the mouth of Jesus. With St. Paul himself the shade of meaning of the word is not in every passage the same. It cannot be proved that the Apostle read into what were to him the words of the institution an anti-Judaistic significance, such as belongs to the conception in Gal 4:24 and 2Co 3:6. Even the characterization of the διαθήκη as καινή does not require us to assume this. Even to St. Paul, we shall have to say, the phrase καινή διαθήκη has in the present instance the more general soteriological associations, in view of which the antithesis of the new to the old and

the superseding of the old by the new recede into the background. The new covenant is the covenant which fulfils the OT promises, rather than the new covenant which abrogates the OT law. With still more assurance we may affirm this of the words as ascribed to Jesus in Mark and Matthew. Here (apart from the hardly original reading of A and D [Note: Deuteronomist.] in Matthew and A in Mark) the explicit designation of the διαθήκη as καινή is not found. While the thought of the substitution of one covenant for another is undoubtedly the logical correlate of the statement even in this form, yet such an inference, if present at all, can have lain in the periphery only, not in the centre of the consciousness of Him who thus spoke.

It ought to be observed that the literal rendering of the words is not: 'This is *my* covenant-blood,' with the emphasis on the pronoun, but: 'This is my blood, covenant-blood.' The enclitic μου is too weak to bear the stress the former rendering would put upon it. Accordingly, μου belongs neither to διαθήκη nor to the compound idea 'covenant-blood,' but to the noun 'blood' only, as is also required by this, that τὸ αἷμά μου should be the exact correlate of τὸ σῶμά μου. The other construction, 'my covenant,' could only mean either 'the covenant concluded with me,' as in the original of Zec 9:11, or 'the covenant made by me as a contracting party,' as in the LXX Septuagint rendering of that passage, hardly 'the covenant inaugurated by me between God and you.' And yet the last it would have to mean here, if μου went with διαθήκη. By these considerations we are led to adopt the rendering 'this is my blood, covenant-blood'; and this rendering makes it appear at once, that our Lord does not in the first place contrast *His* covenant-blood with the Mosaic covenant-blood, but simply speaks of His blood as partaking of the character of covenant-blood after the analogy of that used by Moses. But even if the comparison with the Mosaic covenant bore more of an antithetical character than it does, it would still be rash to assert that such an antithesis between the relation to God inaugurated by Himself and that prevailing under the Mosaic law could find no place in our Lord's consciousness, especially towards the close of His life. His attitude towards the Mosaic law, as reflected in the Gospels, presents a complicated problem. This much, however, is beyond doubt, that side by side with reverence for the Law there is, both in His teaching and conduct, a note of sovereign freedom with regard to it. From the position expressed in such sayings as Mar 2:21-22; Mar 7:15-23 to the conception of a new covenant superseding the old there is but one step.

We take for granted that the words were actually spoken by Jesus. In view of the fact that He uttered them in Aramaic, the question, whether the rendering of Matthew and Mark or that of Paul and Luke more nearly reproduces the original, becomes

difficult to decide and also of minor importance. Zahn (*Evan. d. Matt.* p. 686, note 52) suggests that from the Aramaic form דדיתקא רמי both renderings might, without material modification of the sense, have been derived. That the thought is in both forms essentially the same will appear later, after we have inquired into the content of Jesus' statement.

The intricate problems connected with the institution of the Supper can here be touched upon in so far only as they bear upon the meaning of the words relating to the covenant. We give a brief survey of the various interpretations placed upon those words.

First we may mention the interpretation according to which the covenant spoken of by Jesus stands in no real connexion with His death. Most modern writers who detach the original significance of the act of Jesus from His death, assume that the reference to the covenant is a later addition. Thus Johannes Hoffmann makes Jesus say no more than 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood,' and interprets this as meaning, that the disciples must be closely knit together as members of one body, Himself forming the centre. The meal is a meal of friendship. The Saviour even at this eleventh hour did not expect to die, but confidently looked forward to the immediate glorious appearance of the Kingdom of God. With this thought in mind He asked the disciples to unite themselves symbolically into the little flock for which the Kingdom was appointed.

Dismissing this and similar views, because they leave the covenant words out of consideration, we note that Spitta has developed a hypothesis which, while cutting loose the Supper from the death of Christ, nevertheless interprets its symbolism as a covenant symbolism (*Zur Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristenthums*, i. pp. 207-337). According to Spitta, the covenant is none other than the Davidic-Messianic covenant promised by the prophets, and inasmuch as this covenant had been frequently represented under the figure of a great feast, our Lord could by means of the Supper give to the disciples a symbolic anticipation of its approaching joys, the more so since the figure of a banquet to describe the eschatological Kingdom occurs also elsewhere in Jesus' teaching. The partaking of this Messianic feast could be represented as a partaking of the Messiah ('This is my body,' 'This is my blood'), because the Messiah was the Author and Centre of these future blessings. Jesus, while knowing that His death was at hand, yet in faith projected Himself beyond death into the time of the Kingdom: the Supper was to Him a feast of joy, not a memorial of death. It was a single triumphant anticipation of the great feast of victory, not intended to be repeated as a rite. The present description of the covenant as a *new* covenant in the Pauline-Lukan record is, according to Spitta, a later modification of the conception in an anti-Judaistic direction. So far as its understanding of the term

'covenant' is concerned, this hypothesis has a certain OT basis to rest upon. To be sure, the Davidic covenant, to which Spitta makes Jesus refer, is in the OT a past covenant, a covenant made with David, the pledge and basis of future blessings, not a name for the blessings of the Messianic age themselves. But this might easily become blended with the prophetic prediction of a new covenant in the Messianic time, and then actually the covenant of David could become equivalent to the Messianic blessedness (cf. Isa 55:3 'the sure mercies of David'). There is, however, no prophetic passage which joins together the conceptions of the Messianic covenant and of a feast, so that no explanation is offered of the association of the one with the other in the mind of Jesus. The account of Exodus 24 far more plausibly explains the combination of these two ideas, for here the covenant and the feast actually occur together. And if this be the more direct source of our Lord's reference to the covenant, then it follows that the blood and the covenant stand in a much more direct connexion with each other than Spitta assumes. According to Spitta, it is the blood which represents the personality of Jesus, who is the Author and Centre of the covenant. According to Exo 24:8 it is the blood directly inaugurating the covenant. Apart from every reference to Exodus 24, when the blood is brought into connexion with the covenant ('this is my blood of the covenant'), it becomes entirely impossible to think of anything else than a covenant based on sacrificial blood: every other mode of joining these two terms is artificial. Spitta's further assumption, that the eating of the bread and the drinking of the wine stand for a partaking of the Messiah's body and blood, as a symbol of the eating of the Messiah, altogether apart from His death, is highly improbable. The feast as a whole might be the symbol of a participation in the Messiah, though even the examples quoted by Spitta of this mode of speaking are not sufficient to prove a current usage, if the sacrificial meal be left out of account. Assuming, however, that the general phrase 'eating the Messiah' was familiar to Jesus and the disciples outside of every connexion with the sacrificial meal, the distributive form in which the records present the thought, that of eating the Messiah's body and drinking His blood, could hardly have possessed such familiarity, and compels us, while not rejecting the idea of appropriating the Messiah, to think of Him as appropriated in His sacrificial capacity.

We turn next to the theories which recognize that the covenant stands through the blood in connexion with the death of Jesus. When the blood is called 'covenant-blood,' this undoubtedly implies that Jesus' death is instrumental in introducing the covenant. Justice is not done to this when merely in some indirect way the death is supposed to prepare the way for the covenant, viz., in so far as it forms the transition to a higher life which will enable Jesus to bestow upon His disciples the covenant-blessings. Thus the direct nexus between the blood and the covenant is severed. The view stated is that of Titius (*Die neutestamentliche Lehre von der Seligkeit*, i. p. 150 ff.). According to this writer, the Supper is to be explained not from the idea of the forgiveness of sin, but from that of the communication of

life. Titius does not identify this covenant with the consummate eschatological state; it is something intermediate between that and the communion with God into which Jesus introduced His disciples before His death. The new covenant is made possible by the death of Jesus, because through this death He will be raised into heaven, whence the powers of eternal life can descend upon His Church through the gift of the Holy Spirit. It may be justly objected to this construction, that in it the death of Jesus appears not as a source of blessing by itself, but as a more or less accidental entrance into the life of glory, from which the blessing flows. As Titius himself admits, in the abstract it would have been quite possible to procure the new covenant and the perfected communion with God without the intervention of Jesus' death, viz., if it had pleased God to exalt the Messiah in some other way. Thus it becomes difficult to understand how so much emphasis can be placed by Jesus upon the appropriation of His death, or how He can require the disciples to drink His blood. The appropriation symbolized certainly cannot relate to the accidental form in which the blessing is prepared, it must have reference to the substance of the blessing itself. If the death is the object of appropriation, then it must possess a direct and intrinsic significance for the covenant in which the disciples are to share.

This is recognized by Wendt (*Lehre Jesu* 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 502 ff.), according to whom Jesus regarded His death as a covenant-sacrifice, standing in the same relation to the new covenant predicted by Jeremiah as the sacrifice brought by Moses sustained to the Sinaitic covenant. In his opinion, the record of Exodus 24 shows that the Mosaic sacrifice had nothing to do with atonement, but consisted of burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, meant as a gift to God expressing the people's consent to His revealed law, and hence became a seal of covenant relation. The sacrifice pledged both God and the people. In analogy with this, Jesus represents His death as a gift dedicated to God, for the sake of which God will establish the new covenant, *i.e.* the state of salvation in the Kingdom of God, not, to be sure, on any strictly legal principle of recompense, but in harmony with His inexhaustible goodness and grace. Wendt's interpretation is wrong, not so much in what it affirms as in what it denies. That Jesus regarded the sacrifice of His life as a gift to God, and ascribed to it saving significance because it was an act of positive obedience, may be safely affirmed. The confidence, however, with which He appropriates the effects of this act to the disciples does not favour Wendt's assumption, that He made these effects dependent on a gracious will of God, imparting to the sacrifice a value which intrinsically it did not possess. But, apart from this, the analogy with the Mosaic sacrifice leads us to believe that Jesus did not confine Himself to viewing His death under the aspect of a gift. The prominence here given to the blood forbids us to interpret the sacrifice as exclusively, or even primarily, a symbol of gratitude or consecration to God. Even though the sacrifices brought were not specific sin-offerings, but burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, this

does not eliminate from them the element of expiation. The Law itself speaks of expiation in connexion with the burnt-offerings (Lev 1:4), and the Passover-sacrifice, closely akin to the peace-offerings, certainly had expiatory significance. It may even be doubted whether the idea of a gift to God, except in the most general sense in which every sacrifice is a gift, was present to the mind of the author of Exodus 24. When Moses calls the blood sprinkled on the people 'the blood of the covenant which Jehovah has made with you,' this can scarcely mean 'the blood by the dedication of which God is induced to make the covenant.' It must mean either 'the blood by whose expiatory power the covenant is inaugurated,' or 'the blood by which, as a bond of life between God and the people, the covenant is established and maintained.' Perhaps it may express both of the thoughts just mentioned, since the ideas of *expiatio* and *communio* were often united in the conception of sacrifice. Besides this, the association in the mind of Jesus between the new covenant and the forgiveness of sins is rendered highly probable by the joint-occurrence of the two ideas in the Jeremiah-passage, where the forgiveness of sins is named as the great blessing of the new covenant. Now, if Jesus had this thought in mind, and spoke at the same time of the sacrificial pouring forth of His blood, then it was almost impossible for Him not to unite the two thoughts, so as to conceive of the blood as a blood of expiation securing forgiveness. It is by no means necessary to rest this argument on the words in Matthew 'unto the forgiveness of sins.' Supposing that these words are a later interpretation of the thought, we shall still have to recognize them as an essentially correct interpretation, which merely resolves the ὑπερ of Mark and Luke into περι + εἰς.

A further argument may be added to this from the part which the covenant conception plays in the second part of the Book of Isaiah in connexion with the figure of the Servant of Jehovah, who is called, as we have seen, the עַם בְּרִית. In our opinion, although this has been denied by Ritschl and others, there can be no doubt that the Servant-of-Jehovah-prophecy, and particularly Is 53, was an influential factor in determining the Messianic consciousness of Jesus. In this prophecy, however, the sacrificial role of the Servant, in an expiatory, vicarious sense, is so distinctly delineated, that, once finding Himself in the chapter, Jesus could not conceive thereafter of His death, or of the relation of His death to the covenant, on any other principle than is here set forth (cf. Denney, *Death of Christ*, pp. 13-56).

As a matter of fact, the trend of recent investigation of the problem of the Supper is towards the acknowledgment, that the words, as they stand, not merely in Luke and Paul, nor merely in Matthew, but even in Mark, clearly express, and were intended by the writers of the Gospels to express, the expiatory interpretation of the death of Jesus. So far as the purely exegetical determination of the sense of the words *ex animo auctorum* (in distinction from the estimate put upon their historic credibility) is

concerned, the traditional Church-doctrine is being more and more decisively vindicated. True, many modern writers, while granting this, emphatically deny that our Lord spoke, or could have spoken, the words which St. Paul and the Synoptists attribute to Him, or that what He spoke can have had the meaning which the words in their present setting and form convey. The two main reasons for this denial are, that, on the one hand, the teaching of Jesus about the sinner's relation to God is such as to leave no room for sacrificial expiation as a prerequisite of the sinner's acceptance, forgiveness flowing from God's free grace; and that, on the other hand, in the early Apostolic Church the expiatory interpretation of the death of Jesus is not present from the beginning, as it would have been if Jesus had taught it, but marks a subsequent doctrinal development. Neither of these contentions has sufficient force to discredit the unanimous witness of St. Paul and the Synoptists. In point of fact, Jesus nowhere represents the forgiveness of sins as absolutely unconditioned. It is one of the gifts connected with the state of sonship in the Kingdom. Consequently, it is bound to His own person in the same sense and to the same degree as the general inheritance of the Kingdom is. Unless one is ready to assert with Harnack, that in the gospel, as preached by Jesus Himself, there is no place for His person, it will be necessary to believe that our Lord considered His own Messianic character and work of supreme importance, not merely for the preaching, but also for the actual establishment of the Kingdom of God. This being so, it became necessary for Him to combine with the specific form He gave to His Messiahship a specific conception of the manner in which the blessings of the Kingdom are obtained by the disciples. His views about the forgiveness of sins would be less apt to be determined by any abstract doctrine as to the nature of God, than by the concrete mode in which the developments of His life led Him, in dependence upon Scripture, to conceive of the character of His Messiahship and its relation to the coming of the Kingdom. If He anticipated death, as there is abundant evidence to show He did, from a comparatively early point in His ministry, then He could not fail to ascribe to this death a Messianic meaning; and this Messianic meaning, if there was to belong to it any definiteness at all, could hardly be other than that portrayed by the prophet Isaiah in the suffering Servant of Jehovah.

It is quite true that the silence observed by our Lord in regard to this important matter till very near the close of His ministry is calculated to awaken surprise. But this silence He likewise preserved till the same point with regard to His Messianic calling in general; the problem is not greater in the former respect than in the latter; the reasons which will explain the one will also explain the other. Nor should it be forgotten that, side by side with His high conception of the love of God, Jesus ascribed supreme importance to the Divine justice. He carefully preserved the valuable truth contained in the exaggerated Jewish ideas about the forensic relation between God and man (cf. Keim, v. 331, 'A continual oscillation between the standpoint of grace and that of Jewish satisfaction can be established'). Recognizing

this element in His teaching as something He did not hold prefactorily, but with great earnestness of conviction, we have no right to assert that every idea of expiation and satisfaction must have been on principle repudiated by Jesus as inconsistent with the love of God. Nor is there much force in the second contention, namely, that the absence of the expiatory interpretation of the death of Jesus from the early Apostolic preaching proves the impossibility of deriving this doctrine from Jesus. The doctrine is certainly older than St. Paul, who declares that he ‘received’ ἐν πρώτοις, as one of the fundamental tenets of the Apostolic faith, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures (1Co_15:3). This ‘receiving’ on the part of St. Paul is separated by no more than seven years from the death of Jesus; according to recent schemes of chronology, by an even shorter interval. When in the discourses of the earlier chapters of Acts the emphasis is placed on the resurrection rather than on the death of Jesus, this must be explained from the apologetic purpose of these discourses. They were intended to prove that, notwithstanding His death, Jesus could still be the Messiah. Probably even upon the disciples themselves, at that early date, the full meaning of the teaching of Jesus concerning His death had not dawned; but if it had, to make this the burden of their preaching to the Jews would have been an ill-advised method. We know from these same discourses in Acts that the disciples looked upon the death of Jesus as foreordained. It is not likely that, holding this, they can have rested in it as sufficient for their faith, and entirely refrained from seeking the reasons for the Divine foreordination, which in this, as well as all other cases, must have appeared to them teleological. In the light of this, the references to Jesus as the Servant of God, which occur in these early discourses, sometimes in connexion with His suffering, become highly significant, partly because they sound like reminiscences of Jesus’ own teaching, partly because they render it probable that our Lord’s death was interpreted in dependence on Is 53. Finally, attention should be called to the central place which the forgiveness of sins occupies in the early Apostolic preaching. The prominence of this theme requires for its background a certain definite connexion between the Messiahship of Jesus and the forgiveness of sins, and this is precisely what is afforded by the expiatory interpretation of the Saviour’s death (cf. Denney, *The Death of Christ*, pp. 65-85, where the preceding points are luminously discussed).

On the grounds stated we conclude that there is neither exegetical nor historical necessity for departing from the old view, that Jesus represented His death as the sacrificial, expiatory basis of a covenant with God. The next question arising is, Who are meant as the beneficiaries of this expiation on which the covenant is founded? At first sight it would seem as if only one answer were possible, viz. those to whom He gives the cup in which the wine, the symbol of the expiating blood, is contained. Nevertheless, the correctness of this view has been of late strenuously disputed. This has been done mainly on the ground before stated, that for the disciples the whole

tenor of our Lord's teaching represents the forgiveness of sins as unconditioned, assured by the gracious love of God as such. Hence it is assumed that Jesus intended the covenant-sacrifice not for His disciples, but for the unbelieving mass of the people, who were so hardened in their unbelief as to render an atoning sacrifice necessary in order to their reacceptance into the favour of God (thus Johannes Weiss, *Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*, p. 28 ff.; and R. A. Hoffmann, *Die Abendmahlsgedanken Jesu Christi*, pp. 60-88). Weiss, while believing that the covenant-blood is primarily shed for the nation, would not exclude the disciples from its effects. Hoffmann, on the other hand, distinguishes sharply between those who are concerned in the covenant-sacrifice as its direct beneficiaries, *i.e.* the enemies of Jesus, and those whom He desires to appropriate the spirit of His self-sacrifice for others, and therefore invites to eat His body and drink His blood. The words spoken with the cup express on this view two distinct thoughts: (1) the blood is covenant-blood for the unbelieving Jews; (2) the blood as the exponent of the spirit of self-sacrifice of Jesus must pass over into the disciples, so that they too shall give their life for others. In other words, the disciples do not drink the blood in the sense in which it is defined by the phrase τῆς διαθήκης, but in the sense in which it symbolizes the subjective spirit on Jesus' part which led Him to offer His life for others. It will be readily perceived that this introduces an intolerable dualism into the significance of the blood: it must mean at the same time objectively the life poured forth in death as the principle of atonement, and subjectively the life pouring itself forth in death as the principle of self-sacrifice. There is no hint in the words themselves at any such double meaning. From the simple statement no one would guess that the blood is drunk by the disciples in any other capacity than that in which the Lord describes it, as 'blood of the covenant.' St. Paul and St. Luke have not understood Jesus in the manner proposed; for, according to their version, the cup, that which the disciples drink, is the new covenant itself in the blood, not merely the blood which for others is the covenant-blood. Hoffmann has to assume that St. Paul and St. Luke misinterpreted the intent of Jesus, and regards Mark and Matthew as giving the correct version. But even into the words of St. Mark and St. Matthew his view will not fit readily. If our Lord invited the disciples to drink His blood, in the sense of receiving into themselves the spirit of His self-surrender to death, the description of this blood as covenant-blood becomes irrelevant to the expression of this thought. Whether the blood is covenant-blood or serves any other beneficent purpose, is of no direct consequence whatever for the main idea, *viz.*, that it is the exponent of a spirit which the disciples must imitate, nay, the introduction of the former thought only tends to obscure the latter. Our Lord certainly did not expect the disciples to make the sacrifice of their own life a covenant-sacrifice in the sense His was for the nation. The ὑπὲρ πολλῶν in Mark and the περὶ πολλῶν in Matthew, to which Hoffmann appeals, cannot prove the exclusion of the disciples from the covenantal effect of the blood. The phrase is derived from Isa 53:11-12, where it

serves to affirm the fruitfulness. the efficacy of the self-sacrifice of the Servant of Jehovah. This simple thought suffices here as well as in Mar_10:45 to explain Jesus' statement that many will be benefited by His death. Who the many are, disciples or non-disciples, the ὑπὲρ πολλῶν alone does not enable us to determine.

The one question that still remains to be answered is, whether the covenant-blood appears in the words of Jesus, 'This is my blood of the covenant,' primarily as the blood which through expiation inaugurates the covenant, or primarily as the blood which by being sacramentally received will make those who receive it partakers of the covenant. Both meanings are equally well suited to the words themselves. In order to choose definitely between them, we should have to enter upon the extremely complicated discussion that has of recent years been carried on, and is still being carried on, concerning the origin of the Lord's Supper and the significance of the act performed and the words spoken by our Lord on the last evening of His earthly life. A few remarks must suffice to indicate the bearings of this problem on the question before us. The two views above distinguished coincide with the so-called parabolic or purely symbolic and the so-called institutional or sacramental interpretation of the transaction. According to the former, Jesus did not mean to institute a rite, did not intend the act to be repeated, but simply enacted before the eyes of His disciples, in a visible parable, the drama of His death, indicating by the parabolic form He gave it that His death would be for their good through the inauguration of a covenant. According to the latter, Jesus instituted, and for the first time caused His disciples to celebrate, a rite in which He made the partaking of bread and wine, as sacramental symbols of His body and blood, to stand for the appropriation of His expiatory sacrifice and of the covenant founded on it.

It ought to be observed that these views are not in themselves mutually exclusive. The parabolic significance of the body and blood, as symbolizing death, must on the second view be assumed to form the background, expressed or presupposed, of the sacramental transaction—expressed, if the breaking of the bread and the pouring of the wine be made significant; presupposed, if the broken bread and the poured wine be made the starting-point of the observance. That the so-called parabolic view is frequently advocated in a form which excludes the sacramental complexion of the act, is due not so much to the view itself, but largely to a general theory on the nature of the parables of Jesus.

Jülicher, the foremost representative of the parabolic interpretation of the Supper (cf. *Theologische Abhandlungen C. v. Weizsacker gewidmet*, p. 207 ff.), is also the strenuous advocate of the theory that in every genuine parable of Jesus there can be but one point of comparison. Consequently it is insisted upon that, if the broken bread and the wine stand as figures for the death of Jesus, figures which involve the

destruction of these elements, they cannot at the same time stand as figures for the appropriation of the benefits of His death, because this would involve the usefulness of the elements, the very opposite of their destruction. Jülicher was not at first disposed to carry this to an extreme, but admitted that as a secondary point of comparison the usefulness of the bread and wine as food and drink might have stood before the mind of Jesus. Others, however, demand that on the parabolic view every figurative significance of the eating and drinking must be rigorously excluded, and make this a ground of criticism of said view, because in the records the eating and drinking are undoubtedly made prominent (cf. Johannes Hoffmann, *Das Abendmahl im Urchristenthum*, pp. 61-65, and Jülicher's review of Hoffmann's book in *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1904, col. 282 ff.).

Jülicher's canon of interpretation, while on the whole representing a sound principle of exegesis, leads in single instances to the rejection of undoubtedly genuine material. It makes Jesus construct His parables with conscious regard to the unity and purity of their form, rather than with the practical end of their efficacy in view (cf. Bugge, *Die Haupt-Parabeln Jesu*). Where, as in the present case, the two points of comparison, that of the dissolution of the elements and that of their appropriation for nourishment, are so naturally combined into the one act of the meal, it were foolish to require the exclusion of either on the ground of a puristic insistence on the rules of formal rhetoric.

In all probability the combination of these two aspects of the symbolism was not first made by our Lord, but was antecedently given in the union of the OT sacrifice and the sacrificial meal. Schultzen (*Das Abendmahl im Neuen Testament*, p. 53 ff.) has shown, to our mind convincingly, that the eating of the bread and the drinking of the cup are placed by our Lord under the aspect of a sacrificial meal, for which His own death furnishes the sacrifice. As in the sacrificial meal the offerer appropriates the benefits of the expiation and the resulting benefits of covenant-fellowship with God (Exo 24:10-11, Psa 50:5), so the disciples are invited to appropriate by eating and drinking all the benefits of expiation and covenant-fellowship that are secured by the sacrifice of the Saviour's death.

We may assume, therefore, that both the symbolism of sacrifice and the symbolism of the sacrificial meal are present in the transaction performed by Jesus. But the question still remains unanswered, whether the former is present in explicit form or merely as the unexpressed background of the latter. Those who emphasize the symbolical significance of the breaking of the bread, a feature named in all the records, hold that the death is not merely presupposed but formally enacted. On the whole, however, the trend of the discussion has of late been in the direction of the other view, which attributes no special significance to the breaking of the bread or the pouring forth of the wine, but makes the broken bread and the wine, as symbols

of the death as an accomplished fact, the starting-point for the enacted symbolism of the sacrificial meal. It has been pointed out with a degree of force that the formula, 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood,' in the sense of 'This symbolizes what will happen to My body and to My blood,' is out of all analogy with Jesus' usual parabolic mode of statement, because elsewhere not the symbol, but the thing symbolized, always forms the subject of the sentence (so Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus*, p. 687, note 53). It may also be urged that the natural sequence, in case a parabolic enactment of the death of Jesus were intended, would have been as follows: 'He brake the bread and said: This is my body; and he gave it to them and said, Take,' and similarly with the cup. As the record stands, the pouring out of the wine is not mentioned at all. It seems that Jesus took a cup which had already been filled. If He had intended to give a parabolic representation of the event of His death, He would have taken pains to fill one before their eyes. The fact that with both elements the giving to eat and to drink precedes the declaration of what the bread and the wine stand for, favours the view that this declaration deals primarily with the symbolism of the sacrificial meal. The words, 'This is my body,' then obtain the meaning: To partake of this bread signifies the partaking of My sacrificed body in a sacrificial meal; the words, 'This is my blood,' the meaning: To partake of this wine signifies the partaking of My sacrificial blood in a sacrificial meal. Thus we would reach the conclusion that the phrase 'blood of the covenant' has for its primary import: blood through the partaking of which participation in the covenant is assured. The Pauline-Lukan version, 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood,' cannot be quoted with conclusiveness in favour of either view. This version may either mean: this cup is by the blood it contains the new covenant, or: this cup is the new covenant, which new covenant consists in My blood. Each of these two renderings leaves open the two possibilities, that the shedding of the blood is represented as the source of the new covenant, or that the drinking of the blood is represented as the participation in the new covenant. To prevent misunderstanding, however, it should be stated once more, that the sacramental interpretation of the words has for its background the symbolic significance of bread and wine as exponents of the expiatory death of Jesus itself.

In conclusion, we must endeavour to define the place of the covenant conception thus interpreted within the teaching of Jesus as a whole, and its correlation with other important conceptions. Like the Kingdom of God, the Messiahship, and the Church, the Covenant idea is one of the great generalizing ideas of the OT, the use of which enables Jesus to gather up in Himself the main lines of the historic movement of OT redemption and revelation. From the Kingdom the Covenant is distinguished in several respects. The Kingdom conception is more comprehensive, since it embraces the eschatological realization of the OT promises as well as their provisional fulfilment in the present life, being on the whole, however, eschatologically conceived, the present Kingdom-powers and blessings appearing as so many anticipations of the final Kingdom. The Kingdom is also comprehensive in this other respect, that it covers

indiscriminately the entire content of the consummate state, the external as well as the internal, the judgment as well as the salvation-aspect. Over against this the Covenant idea, while by no means pointedly excluding the eschatological state (in Hebrews the idea is used eschatologically, the new covenant coinciding with the αἰὼν μέλλων), yet is more characteristic as a designation of the blessings of believers in the present intermediate period. And among the manifold contents of salvation it pre-eminently designates the internal ones of forgiveness of sin and fellowship with God, as is already the case in the passage of Jeremiah.

If the word rendered by διαθήκη had in our Lord's mind the associations of the word 'testament.' and if the statement found in the context of Luke (Luk 22:29-30), 'I appoint unto you (διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν), even as my Father appointed unto me a kingdom, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom,' may be understood as having been suggested to Him by this testamental sense of διαθήκη, then this would bring the Covenant idea much nearer to the Kingdom idea, inasmuch as in the latter saying the full content of the blessedness of the final state is the object of the διατίθεσθαι. It is not certain, however, that the sequence of the narrative here in Luke is chronological, and that, therefore, these words were uttered immediately after the reference to the covenant-blood in the Supper. In Mat 19:27-29 words in part identical occur in a different connexion. In the Supper, God is the διαθέμενος, whereas here it would be Jesus. It is better, therefore, not to introduce the testamentary idea into the words of the Supper, and to adhere to the distinction between the Kingdom and the Covenant from the point of view already indicated. According to the Pauline interpretation, the Supper, and with it the Covenant, belong to the pre-eschatological state, in which believers are during the present life, for the Supper is a proclamation of the death of Jesus 'until he come' (1Co 11:26). The sayings in Mar 14:25, Mat 26:29, Luk 22:16; Luk 22:18 also mark the Supper and the participation in the Covenant as belonging to a state distinct from the final Kingdom of God. Our Lord, however, does not place this second stage of the covenant-life of the people of God in contrast with the former stage from the point of view that it involves the abrogation of the OT legal forms of life, as St. Paul does in 2 Corinthians 3 and Galatians 3. If it is a new covenant, it is new simply for the positive reason that it brings greater assurance of the forgiveness of sin and closer fellowship with God.

From the idea of the Kingdom that of the Covenant is still further distinguished, in that it appears in much closer dependence than the former on the Messianic person and work of Jesus. In our Lord's preaching of the Kingdom, His Messianic person and work remain almost entirely in the background, at least so far as the verbal disclosures on this subject are concerned, while the matter comes to stand somewhat

differently if the self-revelation contained in Jesus' Messianic acts be considered. The Covenant is explicitly declared to be founded on His expiatory death, and to be received by the partaking of His body and blood. This importance of the person and work of Jesus, both for the inauguration and the reception of the Covenant, agrees with the view that the Covenant designates the present, provisional blessedness of believers, for this stage is specifically controlled and determined by the activity of Christ, so that St. Paul calls it the Kingdom of Christ in distinction from the Kingdom of God, which is the final state. The Covenant idea shares with the idea of the Church this reference to the present earthly form of possession of the Messianic blessings, and this dependence on the person and work of the Messiah (cf. Mat 16:18; Mat 18:17). The difference is that in the conception of the Church, the organization of believers into one body outwardly, as well as their spiritual union inwardly, and the communication of a higher life through the Spirit, stand in the foreground, neither of which is reflected upon in the idea of the Covenant. The Covenant stands for that central, God-ward aspect of the state of salvation, in which it means the atonement of sin and the full enjoyment of fellowship with God through the appropriation of this atonement in Christ.

Literature.—Rückert, *Das Abendmahl*, 1856; Baur, *Varlesungen über neutest. Theologie*, 1864, pp. 102-105; Volkmar, *Die Evangelien*, 1870, p. 560 ff., *Jesus Nazarenus*, 1882, p. 112 ff.; Guthe, *de Fœderis Notione Jeremiana*, 1877; Keim, *Jesus of Nazara* (English translation), 1881, v. pp. 275-343; Wellhausen. *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, 1887, iii. p. 122; A. Brandt, *Zeitschrift f. wiss. Theol.* 1888, p. 30 ff.; W. R. Smith, *RS* [Note: S Religion of the Semites.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1894; Lobstein, *La Doctrine de la Sainte Cène*, 1889, pp. 62, 258; Bousset, *Die Evangeliencitate Justins des Martyrers*, 1890, p. 112 ff.; V. Zittwitz, *Das Christliche Abendmahl im Lichte der Religionsgeschichte*, 1892, p. 5 ff.; Jülicher in *Theol. Abhandlungen C. von Weizsacker gewidmet*, 1892, p. 217 ff.; Joh. Weiss, *Jesu l'rediget vom Reiche Gottes*, 1892 (2nd ed. 1900), p. 28 ff., *Das älteste Evangelium*, 1903, pp. 289-299; W. Brandt, *Die Evangelische Geschichte*, 1893, pp. 289 ff., 566; Spitta, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristenthums*, 1893, i. p. 207 ff.; Mensinga in *Zeitschrift f. wiss. Theologie*, 1893, ii. p. 267 ff.; Gardner, *The Origin of the Lord's Supper*, 1893; Haupt, *Ueber die ursprüngliche Form und Bedeutung der Abendmahlsworte*, 1894, p. 22 ff.; Schultzen, *Das Abendmahl im NT*, 1895, pp. 33-37, 41, 53, 55, 96; Grafe in *Zeitschrift f. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1895, pp. 101-138; Titius, *Die Neutest. Lehre von der Seligkeit*, 1895, i. p. 150 ff.; Joachim, 'Die Ueberlieferung über Jesus letztes Mahl 'in Hermes' *Zeitschrift f. Klassische Philologie*. 1895, p. 43; Zockler, 'Moderne Abendmahlscontroversen' in *Evang. Kirchenzeitung*, 1895, p. 108 ff.; Kattenbusch, 'Das heilige Abendmahl' in *Christl. Welt*. 1895, Nos. 13-15; Kraetzschmar, *Die Bundesvorstellung im AT* [Note: T Altes Testament.] , 1896; R. A. Hoffmann, *Die Abendmahlsgedanken Jesu Christi*, 1896, pp.

47-77; Schaefer, *Das Herrenmahl*, 1897, pp. 388-392; Ramsay in *Expositor*, Nov. 1898, pp. 321-330; Eichhorn, *Das Abendmahl im NT*, 1898; Smend, *Alttest. Religionsgeschichte*, 1899, p. 24 ff.; Giesehecht, *Die Geschichtlichkeit des Sinaibundes*, 1900; Wrede in *Zeitschrift f. d. Neutest. Wissenschaft*, 1900, pp. 69-74; Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1901, pp. 257-258, 502-509; Hollmann, *Die Bedeutung des Todes Jesu*, 1901, p. 145 ff.; Denney, *The Death of Christ*, 1902, pp. 46-60; Joh. Hoffmann, *Das Abendmahl im Urchristenthum*, 1903. The literature on the Lord's Supper is not given complete, but only in so far as it is of importance for the discussion of the Covenant idea. See, further, art. Lord's Supper.

Geerhardus Vos.

☞ Covetousness

COVETOUSNESS.—This word (Gr. *πλεονεξία*) has the root-idea of *greed*, shown in a strong desire to acquire, even more than in a keen wish to keep. In the Gospels, as elsewhere in Scripture [see, however, [Eph 4:19](#)], the term is confined to a reference to property; the verb (*πλεονεκτέω*) is wider in sense. As the complexity of social life increases, so may the shapes the evil can assume. To ordinary avarice have to be added subtle temptations in the realm of rank and fashion, conventional ambition, cultured ease, or delight in successful activity unsubordinated to ethical aims. The tinge of covetousness comes in wherever men so absorb their life in the temporal that they impair its high instincts for the spiritual. 'What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?' ([Mat 16:26](#)).

To the mind of Jesus what stands condemned is, characteristically, the possession of a certain spirit—the spirit of grasping selfishness. The forms assumed, the methods employed, are not minutely dealt with, and not matters for specific cure. Rather the one tap-root is to be cut, or a general atmosphere created in which the noxious weed must perish. And the almighty power to this end is the holy spirit of the gospel, which on the one hand is a spirit of loving trust towards God the Father in providence, and on the other a tender feeling towards fellow-mortals which prompts to ready sacrifice of all things to their good. The man with the great possessions ([Mar 10:17](#)), who attracted Jesus, had yet one luxury to discover—that of doing good, giving to the poor, and so coveting wealth of the right kind. Not the coming to our hands of earthly good is condemned, but the absence of the one spirit which shall inform and vitalize its use. The triumph of religion is to turn it into 'treasure in heaven' ([Mar 10:21](#)).

A classical passage is Mat_6:19-34, with which compare Luk_12:22-34; Luk_16:13-15. The higher life being concerned with faith and goodness and the things of the spirit—the realm revealed in the Beatitudes, it is clear inversion to be absorbed for their own sake in the things of time and sense. ‘Moth and rust’ are the emblems of their corruptibility; and they are unstable, like property exposed to ‘thieves.’ It is the mark of a pagan mind to be full of anxious and self-centred concern for meat and drink and raiment (Mat_6:32). Such persons reverse unconsciously Christ’s principle that ‘the life is more than meat’ (Mat_6:25); and the Pharisees, ‘who were covetous’ (Luk_16:14), by their blindness to the true order of importance called forth essentially the same rebuke, ‘that which is highly esteemed amongst men, is abomination in the sight of God’ (Luk_16:15). Though they had one eye for religion, they kept the other for the world, hence inevitably their truly distorted views. In the last resort of psychological analysis ‘no man can serve two masters’ (Mat_6:24), and the Pharisees are pilloried for evermore as the awful example of hypocrisy in this respect. With Jesus, in these passages, the first postulate of religious worth is, that people must be single-minded and whole-hearted in service—‘Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also’ (Mat_6:21). And to only one quarter can the enlightened heart turn—‘the kingdom of God and his righteousness’ (Mat_6:33). Coincident with that, as humble faith feels, all needed things shall be added unto us. With exquisite insight Jesus points to the fowls of the air and the lilies of the field as eloquent at once of the minuteness of Divine Providence, and the trust we may place in a Heavenly Father’s care. ‘Are not ye,’ He asks, ‘much better than they?’ (Mat_6:26). (Cf. as an enforcement of the lesson, Christ’s own unworldliness of character, and trustfulness in earthly matters. And as a counter-illustration to the Pharisees, cf. the convert from their straitest sect, St. Paul, who having food and raiment learned therewith to be content, 1Ti_6:8, cf. Php_4:11).

On a question arising of family inheritance (Luk_12:13-15), Jesus warns against covetousness, and for impressive depth nothing excels the summary there—‘A man’s life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth’ (Luk_12:15). As one concerned with the spiritual domain, Jesus refuses to touch the civil matter of property. Wisdom lay in leaving questions of the law to lawyers, although the consideration is doubtless implied that even then there should be found a permeation of the Christian spirit. The point which Jesus presses is the falsity of the vulgar notion that it is ‘possessions’ which make life worth living. Devotion to the outward is, in His gospel, vanity; the loving and discerning soul has God for its possession, and from sheer sympathy of heart joys in His work amongst men.

A parable follows (Luk_12:16-21), not necessarily associated originally with the foregoing incident, although in full affinity of theme. The Rich Fool is the personification of the successfully covetous man, and yet a revelation in almost the same breath of how little such success amounts to from the standpoint of eternity. He

sowed only to the world; therefore he reaped inwardly no riches of the spirit. ‘So is he,’ saith Jesus, ‘that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich towards God’ (Luk_12:21). There is affinity of teaching in the parable of *Dives and Lazarus* (which see).

Literature.—The standard works on the Sermon on the Mount and on the Parables. Among special discourses: F. W. Robertson, *Sermons*, 2nd series, Serm. I. (with which compare XVII. of 1st series); J. Service on ‘Profit and Loss’ in *Salvation Here and Hereafter*; J. Oswald Dykes, *The Relations of the Kingdom to the World*, pt. i.; A. Maclaren, *A Year’s Ministry*, 1st series, No. 16; J. Martineau, *Hours of Thought* ii. and iii., *Endeavours after the Christian Life*, pp. 76-86; Mozley, *University Sermons*, pp. 275-290.

George Murray.

☞ Cowardice

COWARDICE.—Cowardice must be distinguished from a natural timidity in circumstances of danger, from the awe which, in the presence of the miraculous or the extraordinary, may so possess the mind as for the moment to paralyze its activities, and above all from the fear of God, His paternal love, power, and holy judgment, which may be the strongest antidote to all base and servile fear, and the source of the highest courage. The distinction is partly preserved in the words φόβος and δειλία. The latter word is ‘always used in a bad sense’ (Trench, *Synonyms of the NT*, p. 34). It expresses ‘not the natural emotion of fear, but the cowardly yielding to it. It is the craven spirit which shrinks from duty, loses hope, abandons what it should hold fast, surrenders to the enemy, or deserts to his side’ (Bernard, *Central Teaching of Jesus Christ*, pp. 188, 189). δειλία occurs only in 2Ti_1:7, but δειλιάω Joh_14:27, and δειλός (Authorized and Revised Versions ‘fearful’) Mat_8:26, cf. Mar_4:40 and Rev_21:8. But the line of distinction cannot be drawn hard and fast by the use of these words. In Mat_8:26 (cf. Mar_4:40) the question τί δειλοί ἐστε, ὀλιγόπιστοι; is not so much a serious imputation of craven fear, as the expression of ‘personal fearlessness, to gain ascendancy over panic-stricken spirits’ (Bruce, *Expos. Gr. Test.*, *in loc.*). On the other hand, an ignoble fear in face of danger or difficulty, or the disapprobation and hostile sentiments of others, is sometimes in view when φόβος, φοβεῖσθαι are used (Mat_10:28, cf. Luk_12:4, Mat_25:25, Joh_7:13; Joh_19:38; Joh_20:19). When fear of physical consequences impairs fidelity to Christ, causing

men to be ashamed of Him (Mar_8:38, Luk_9:26), or even to go the length of denying Him (Mat_10:33), it incurs His severest disapprobation (Mat_10:33, cf. Rev_21:8). It is not cowardice to fly from the rage of the persecutor. Jesus not only counselled flight in circumstances of peril (Mar_13:14, Luk_21:21), but Himself evaded the malice which would have brought His life to an end before His hour was come, and His mission completed (Luk_4:30, Joh_8:59; Joh_10:39). It is only when the fear of man tempts to the compromise of truth, and the disowning of allegiance to Christ, that it becomes a snare and a sin. Cowardice is not ultimately evinced in feeling, but in action. It is cowardice when a man declines the task he was meant to render: 'I was afraid, and went and hid thy talent in the earth' (Mat_25:25); when he turns away, however sorrowfully, from the path of self-sacrifice which the call of Christ points out to him (Mat_19:22). (See Paget, *Studies in the Christian Character*, p. 104).

The antidote to cowardice lies in the fear of God, in His power over the soul as well as the body (Mat_10:28), the **יְהוָה יִרְאֵת** which drives out all baser fear; in the spirit of watchfulness and prayer that, in circumstances of trial, we do not fall into the temptation to forsake Christ or deny Him (Mat_26:41); but most of all in faith (Mat_8:6, Joh_14:1; Joh_14:27). Faith in the Fatherhood of God—that the manifest duty, however difficult and dangerous, is His will; that from Him life has its appointed twelve hours, and in the path of obedience to Him there is no possible foreshortening of them (Joh_11:8-10): that over all is His unsleeping and loving care—will save the soul from all base betrayals of itself and its Divine trust through fear. To this end was the Comforter promised and bestowed, that, co-operating with the spirit of men, He might brace them to consistent courage in action and endurance. And the effect of His presence and power is seen in the contrast between those who 'all forsook him and fled' (Mar_14:50), denied Him (Mat_26:69-74), 'gathered in an upper room for fear of the Jews' (Joh_20:19), and the same men, not many months later, impressing the authorities by their boldness (Act_4:13), and displaying, in circumstances of severest trial, minds delivered from all craven fear, and inspired with the high and solemn courage of faith. See art. Fear.

Literature.—Aristotle, *eth.* iii. 7; Strong, *Chr. Ethics*; Paget, *Studies in the Christian Character*, 100 ff.; Denney, *Gospel Questions and Answers*, 86 ff.

Joseph muir.

Creation

CREATION.—The beginning of the world, as the earliest starting-point of time, is mentioned in Mat_24:21, Mar_13:19. The other Gospel references to this subject

include one by an Evangelist and two by our Lord Himself. The first (Joh 1:3) teaches that the Divine Word, who afterwards became incarnate in Jesus (Joh 1:14), was the direct Agent in Creation (cf. Col 1:6, Heb 1:2; and see following art.). The second (Joh 5:17) occurs in a discussion on the Sabbath. In the words 'my Father worketh hitherto,' Jesus shows that the divine rest following the work of creation has been a period of continued Divine activity. His primary object is to justify His own works of healing on the Sabbath day, but He shows incidentally that the seventh 'day,' and therefore also the other 'days,' of Genesis 1 need not be understood in a literal sense. In the third allusion (Mat 19:4 ff., Mar 10:6 ff.) the words of Gen 1:27; Gen 2:24, describing the original creation of man and woman, are quoted in support of Christ's ideal of marriage (cf. Eph 5:31).

James Patrick.

✚ Creator (Christ As)

CREATOR (CHRIST AS).—The Synoptic Gospels do not bring forward any specific teaching of Christ as Creator. Whatever Jesus may have taught on this subject, the controlling purpose of the writers of these Gospels did not require the inclusion of it. Hence it is that only by implication is any doctrine of Christ's creatorship introduced into the Synoptic Gospels. The implication, however, is striking and worthy of notice.

1. *The assertion of original power, c.g.* the healing of the leper (Mar 1:41, Mat 8:3, Luk 5:13); the lordship of the Sabbath (Mar 2:28, Luk 6:5, Mat 12:8). The Sabbath is a Divine institution, and only the establisher of it could have power over it. The forgiveness of sins (Mar 2:5, Mat 9:2) is a prerogative of Godhead.

2. *The note of authority.*—The people felt this in Jesus' teaching (Mar 1:22, Luk 4:36). He claims authority for Himself (Mar 2:11, Mat 9:6, Luk 5:24). He gives authority to His disciples (Mat 10:1), and the unstated assumption is that it is by an original right inherent in Himself.

3. *Miracles.*—Jesus quiets the sea as one who has original power over it (Mar 4:39, Luk 8:24). This is the right of the Creator of it. He restores life to the dead (Mar 5:41, Luk 8:54; Luk 7:14). To give life is the prerogative of Creatorship. It is an original right of the Creator. Jesus exercises this right in His own name. He creates directly in the miracle of the loaves and fishes (Mar 6:41-44, Mat 14:19; Mat 15:36).

4. *Ownership.*—Jesus calls the angels His own (Mat 24:31). His lordship of the Sabbath implies ownership (Mar 2:28).

All these are clear, and the more significant because undesigned, narrations which imply the Creatorship of Jesus. If St. Paul held a supervisory relation to the Gospel of Luke, and St. Peter to the Gospel of Mark, as many of the best modern scholars believe, then we shall feel the corroborative evidence which is so outstanding in their Epistles for the Creatorship of Jesus.

This evidence in the *Pauline Epistles* lies in (a) the pre-existence of Christ (Rom 8:3, 1Co 10:4, 2Co 8:9, Gal 4:4, Eph 1:4, Php 2:6, Col 1:17, 2Ti 1:9). The self-impooverishment (*kenosis*) implies previous Divine fulness. If all things were created through (διὰ), in (ἐν), and for (εἰς) Him, He would necessarily be pre-existent. The Pauline Christ of the Epistles is not merely the historic Christ, but more especially the Creative Principle both in the world and in man. (b) Creation is through Christ (Col 1:16). He is the causal agent, according to the eternal purpose. (c) Creation is in Him, *i.e.* in the sphere of Christ, 'the creative centre of all things, the causal element of their existence' (Ellicott). Hence all things are to be gathered up in Him (Eph 1:10). (d) Creation is for Him. He is the goal as well as the explanation of all creation. 1Co 8:6 expands this idea, and makes Him both the source and the goal of all created things. (e) He is the bond which holds the whole fabric of men and things together. This is the doctrine of the Divine immanence (Col 1:17), and sets forth Christ as the eternally existent Creative Principle in all things. All this teaching is an amplification of the teaching of the Synoptics, and sets forth the cosmic relations of Christ in Creation in order to show more clearly His cosmic relation in Atonement and Salvation.

There are two passages in the *Petrine Epistles* which teach the pre-existence of Christ (the Spirit of Christ in the prophets, 1Pe 1:11; and Christ before the foundation of the world, 1Pe 1:20), but there is no direct teaching of Creatorship.

The Gospel of John opens at once into a circle of new and profounder conceptions of Jesus. He is the Eternal Logos who was in the beginning (Joh 1:1). He is the eternal and immanent Reason manifesting creative activities. He mediates the creation of the universe (Joh 1:3). The Prologue sets forth Jesus Christ in His fourfold mediation, (a) As the Eternal Logos, who was 'in the beginning with God, and was God' (Joh 1:1), He mediates the creation of all things (Joh 1:3). The whole process and product of creation lie inwrapped in the Logos. Neither angels nor other beings assisted. 'And without him was not anything made that hath been made' (Joh 1:3, cf. 1Co 8:6). (b) As the Creative Logos, He mediates life for men. He is immanent in the Creation. 'In him was life' (1Co 8:4), and 'He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not' (1Co 8:10). He was the ground and source of life. St. Paul's saying, 'The world through its wisdom knew not God' (1Co 1:21), shows the amazing inability of the world to recognize its Creator who was the ground of its own

life. Sin had indeed become darkness which was incapable of apprehending the light (Joh 1:5). (c) As the Logos made flesh or incarnate, He mediates a revelation of God to man (Joh 1:14-18). The whole measure of revelation lies in the incarnate Logos. 'God manifested' to men was manifested wholly in Jesus Christ. (d) As 'the only-begotten from the Father' (Joh 1:14), He mediates an atonement or reconciliation, through His death, between a holy God and alienated sinners. This is the climax of His wondrous mediatorship, and makes Him the perfected Mediator. The historic Christ is brought forward in this Gospel only enough to explicate or illustrate the eternal Christ, but it was in the historic Christ that the eternal and cosmic Christ was first recognized. The transactional phases of the historic incarnation lead, in St. John's view, straight to the eternal Logos who mediated the whole creation. Christ, as Creator, is so wrought into the Cosmos which He made and sustains, that upon the entrance of sin into the world He becomes of necessity the mediator of new relations between the sinner and God. His mediatorship of redemption rests on the fact that He was 'in the beginning' the Logos who mediated the creation of all things. Christ, as Creator, is the fundamental idea of this Gospel. It is the starting-point of the whole history of the earth and the heavens, of man, his fall and his doom, of the redemption and the final glory. It is the interpretive key to the whole framework of the Fourth Gospel, whose author sees the designed correspondence between the Creator and the created, and that creation was primarily intended to be responsive to Him. 'He came unto his own, and they ... received him not' (Joh 1:11), expresses the failure of creation to fulfil the Divine purpose. St. John gathers up all that the Synoptists have taught, but adds new conceptions of Jesus in a profounder interpretation of Him. He teaches (a) the pre-existence of Christ (Joh 1:30, Joh 3:13; Joh 3:31, Joh 6:62, Joh 8:56-58, Joh 14:11, Joh 17:5) more plainly and fully than the Synoptists; (b) His authority (Joh 17:2); (c) His inherent power to work miracles (Joh 2:8, Joh 6:11, Joh 11:43); (d) His ownership of all things (Joh 1:11). But new conceptions are added, (α) He is the source of an abiding or eternal life. He has power to give this life to Whom He Will (Joh 3:36, Joh 4:10; Joh 4:14, Joh 5:21-24; Joh 5:40, Joh 6:27; Joh 6:51, Joh 10:28, Joh 11:25, Joh 14:19, Joh 17:2). (β) His life is the light of men. But the fact that as Creator He is the source of both life; and light to men does not prevent their rejection of Him (Joh 1:4, Joh 8:12, Joh 9:5, Joh 12:35-36; Joh 12:46). (γ) He shows His identity with the Father: 'I and the Father are one' (Joh 10:30); 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father' (Joh 14:9, Joh 12:45). (δ) He shows familiarity with the life and conditions of Heaven (Joh 14:2, Joh 17:24).

But these conceptions of Christ, as well as those which St. John and the Synoptists have in common, rest on the fact of His having mediated the creation of all things. His rights in the whole creation, as well as the obligations which He has toward it, grow out of the fact of His Creatorship. The eternal and universal characteristics of

both incarnation and reconciliation are grounded in the creational character of Jesus Christ.

Literature.—B. Weiss, *Religion of the NT*, 190-191, and *Bibl. Theol. of NT*, ii. 99; G. B. Stevens, *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, 438; G. A. Gordon, *The Christ of To-Day*, 81-93; A. M. Fairbairn, *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, 341; D. F. Estcs, *Outline of New Testament Theology*; A. B. Bruce, *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, 335; H. R. Reynolds, 'St. John' (*Pulpit Commentary*), vol. i. 1-21. The literature on the subject is very scanty.

Nathan E. Wood.

⚡ Criticism

CRITICISM.—1. A little more than seventy years ago (1835-1905), a turning-point was reached in NT criticism, the importance of which is generally admitted. * [Note: See, e.g., Schwarz, *Zur Gesch. der neutest. Theol.*; Pfleiderer, *Development of Theology*, p. 133; Nash, *History of the Higher Criticism*, p. 123: 'Altogether 1835 is something more than a date in the history of literature. It stands for a new turn and direction in the Higher Criticism.'] In the year 1835 David Strauss published his *Leben Jesu* (to be followed exactly ten years later by F. C. Baur's *Paulus*). The mythical theory was remorselessly applied by Strauss to the whole of the Gospel history.

It must not be forgotten that from the middle of the preceding century Semler had applied the word 'myths' to some of the OT narratives, as, e.g., to the exploits of Samson; and later ⚡ at the beginning of the 19th cent. de Wette had not hesitated to point out the important part which, in his judgment, was played both by myth and by legend in the writings of the OT.† [Note: For a discussion of the differences between myth and legend, reference may be made to Knowling, *Witness of the Epistles*, p. 16 ff.] At the same time he had not hesitated to accentuate, in language very similar to some of the utterances familiar to us to-day, the difference which lay between the application of the mythical and of the legendary theory to the OT and to the NT.‡ [Note: See, e.g., Dr. Driver's remarks, *LOT* p. xvii, and further below.] There were, indeed, two parts of our Lord's *life*, the beginning and the end, which this earlier criticism did not scruple to regard as shrouded in darkness, and to relegate to the same domain of myth or legend. The supporters of this kind of criticism were content, as Strauss himself expressed it, to enter the Evangelical history by the splendid portal of myth and to leave it by the weary paths of a natural explanation. This method of

so-called natural explanation, which in its most crude form was characteristic of Paulus and the school which bore the name of Rationalists, a method which Strauss remorselessly attacked, became discredited and gave place to the mythical theory, which at least laid claim to thoroughness. But it is not too much to say that an explanation of the miraculous which is often akin to the crude exegesis of Paulus, meets us not infrequently in Strauss himself and in much more recent attempts to prove that miracles did not happen.[§] [Note: Lichtenberger, *History of German Theology in the 19th Century*, p. 328.]

But by another path of inquiry the way was being prepared for Strauss. In 1750, J. D. Michaelis published his *Introduction to the NT*, and in the fourth edition of that work he examined with caution and candour the origin of all the NT books. Michaelis was followed by Semler in his *Treatise on the Free Investigation of the Canon*, the very title of which seemed to mark the new principle of inquiry which was abroad. Semler has been recently called ‘the father of criticism’; and if that title is not always appropriate to him, we may, at all events, speak of his epoch-making influence, and of the break which he caused between the traditional views of inspiration and the free examination of the authority and origin of each sacred book. | | [Note: | Cf. B. Weiss, *Einleitung in das NT*, p. 5 ff.] The new century was marked by Eichhorn’s *Introduction*. This writer applied systematically the principle laid down by his forerunners, like Semler and Herder, and continued the attempt ‘to read and examine the writings of the NT from a human point of view.’ His rule was that the NT writings are to be read as human books, and tested in human ways.* [Note: Nash, *op. cit.* p. 114.]

But up to this time and even later, no systematic attempt, if any, was made, as by F. C. Baur, to place the NT in relation to the varying phases and circumstances of early Church history and life. Even de Wette, one of the best representative men of the period, who combined so remarkably deep evangelical piety with freedom from prejudice and with thoroughness of learning, was often undecided in his judgment, and his conclusions were vague and uncertain. The criticism characteristic of the time was carried on, as it were, piecemeal: one book was defended or attacked, or the alleged author was accepted or rejected, but there was no attempt to bring the books of the NT under one general conception.

There were henceforth two great critical movements proceeding side by side—the effort to interpret the Gospel narratives, and the effort to investigate the origin of the NT books.

To the former of these efforts Strauss stood in the closest relation, and he claimed to introduce a theory of interpretation which should be complete and final.† [Note: On

the unsatisfactoriness of the attempt to apply the mythical theory to the rise of the primitive Christian tradition, see esp. Fairbairn, *Philosophy of the Christian Religion*, p. 467 ff.] To the latter Baur stood in the closest relation, and he claimed to make good a theory which treated the books of the NT from the point of view not only of their origin, but of their purpose. Baur's book on the Pastoral Epistles, published in the same year as Strauss' *Life of Jesus* (1835), showed that his intention was to treat the NT books in connexion with their historical setting.

Some of the most successful attacks upon the first edition of Strauss' book were based upon the fact that he paid so little attention to the Gospel sources. A few pages are all that he devotes to the authorship of the Gospels, and it is no wonder that men like Tholuck rightly fastened on this weakness in their opponent's position, and that much of Strauss' own subsequent vacillation was due to the same cause.‡ [Note: O. Zockler, *Die christliche Apologetik im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, 1904, p. 16.]

But in 1864, apparently stirred by the reception given to Renan's *Vie de Jésus*, Strauss published his popular edition for the German people. And here he showed how thoroughly he was prepared to endorse Baur's view of the late dates of the Gospels, and to assimilate the methods and conclusions of the Tübingen school.§ [Note: See Lichtenberger, *op. cit.* p. 333; and J. E. Carpenter, *The Bible in the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 277, 278.] But, as Dr. Matheson and other writers have so forcibly pointed out, the two theories of Strauss and Baur are incompatible. The conscious tendencies and the dogmatic purpose discovered by Baur in the composition of the NT books cannot coexist with the purely unconscious working of myth.|| [Note: | Baur saw in the NT literature the workings of a compromise between the two radically antagonistic parties of Judaism and Paulinism. In the exigencies of his theory he divided the period of literary development into three divisions—(1) Extending to a.d. 70, a period including the Hauptbriefe of St. Paul and the Apocalypse of St. John. Here the antagonism was at its height between the original Ebionitic Christianity and Paulinism. (2) Extending to about a.d. 140, in which period we have the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, the former being Petrine, the latter (with the Acts) Pauline, but bearing marks of conciliation with reference to the above antagonism, and later the Gospel of St. Mark (also of a conciliatory type), whilst Ephesians and Colossians were invented by the Pauline party for the same conciliatory purpose. (3) Extending to a.d. 170, when the controversy was finally settled, and the conflicting extremes rejected by the 'Catholic' Church, a period marked by the Gospel and Epistles which bear the name of St. John, as also by the Pastoral Epistles assigned to St. Paul.]

That which is mythical grows up unconsciously. But if our Gospels were constructed to meet or to modify certain special historical circumstances, if they are to be regarded as artistic creations, or as 'tendency' writings, they cannot be mythical, as Strauss

maintained, nor can they be regarded as the spontaneous and unconscious workings of the human mind in its efforts to impart reality to its hopes. One cannot, in short, have the 'mythical' Gospels of Strauss and the 'tendency' Gospels of Baur.* [Note: Matheson, Aids to the Study of German Theology, p. 151; cf. also B. Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, i. p. 153.]

But while Strauss thus attempted to adapt this later work to some of the results and methods of the Tübingen school, he also came nearer to Baur in that he gave in this popular edition of his famous book an account of Jesus utterly incommensurate with the greatness of His influence and of the position which He achieved. Baur had taken little or no account of Jesus Himself and His Person, and now Strauss, by withdrawing what he had conceded in the second edition of his *Leben Jesu* as to the greatness and moral perfection of Jesus, was in a position no less impracticable than Baur's, so far as any satisfactory explanation of the work and person of the Founder of Christianity was concerned. We cease to be so much surprised that Strauss should regard the history of the resurrection of our Lord as a piece of colossal humbug, when the Jesus whom he depicted was so insignificant; or that Baur should regard this same account of the resurrection as a fact outside the province of historical inquiry, when he made no serious attempt to answer the question who Jesus was, or to understand Him and His life.

This supreme importance of the Person of Jesus had been rightly emphasized by earlier writers of the century. Paulus, with all his faulty method, had at least recognized that the miraculous in Christianity was Christ Himself, His Person. Schleiermacher had seen in Christ 'the greatest fact in history, the one only sinless and perfect Man, in whom the Divinity dwelt in its fulness.' Herder, of whom it has been said that his *Christliche Schriften* gave the first impulse to the immense literature generally known under the name of the *Life of Christ*, did not forget even in his constant denunciations of the corruptions of Christianity to hold up to admiration the Person of Jesus as the Prophet of the truest humanity.

This primary importance of the fullest consideration of the Person of Christ is nowhere seen more strikingly than in one of the earliest and most effective replies to Strauss' work, by C. Ullmann, a reply which so influenced Strauss that he modified his position, at least for a time, so far as to concede to Christ a place historically unique as a religious genius. As Ullmann insisted, Strauss was by his own fundamental philosophical assumptions debarred from doing justice to the Person of Jesus.† [Note: To the same effect Weinel, *Jesus im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, 1904, p. 42.] But if Strauss' position is correct, then it is impossible to understand why the disciples of Jesus should have regarded Him as the Messiah; for they could scarcely have done so, and with such surprising success, unless there had been something extraordinary

about Him. The dilemma, therefore, which Ullmann proposed was really this—*Did Christ create the Church, or did the Church invent Christ?* If the former, Jesus must have been no mere Jewish Rabbi, but a personality of extraordinary power; if the latter, we have an invention which would make the history of Christianity quite incomprehensible. It was, of course, open to Strauss to reply that whilst the powerful personality of Jesus had created the Church, yet subsequently mythical hopes and conceptions might have been at work, transforming and magnifying the idea of the Christ.‡ [Note: See Pfleiderer, *op. cit.* p. 220. For Ullmann and his reply to Strauss, reference may be made to Knowling, *Witness of the Epistles*, pp. 20, 132.] But at all events for a time Strauss hesitated. He not only acknowledged the supremacy of Jesus in the sphere of religion, but he maintained that He possessed such power over the souls of men, to which there may have been conjoined some physical force like magnetism, that He was able to perform cures which were regarded as miraculous. He even went so far as to consider the Fourth Gospel as a possible historical authority.* [Note: Lichtenherger, *op. cit.* p. 328.]

In face of all this confusion, and of the number of replies to Strauss and the position which they took up, it is easy to understand that the question of the sources of the Gospel history and a criticism of them assumed a growing importance. This importance Strauss had practically ignored, and now Baur's theory of early Church history and of the origin of early Christian documents was to be worked in to supply the want, and to be adopted by Strauss as a remedy for his own indecision or indifference as to the Gospel sources. Strauss felt, it would seem, the justice of Baur's reproof, viz. that he had written a criticism of the Gospel history without a criticism of the Gospels.† [Note: See Schwarz, *op. cit.* p. 545 f.]

But just as it may be affirmed that Strauss had started with dogmatic philosophical assumptions, so the same judgment must be passed upon Baur's starting-point. No one has admitted this more fully than Pfleiderer, so far as the first three Gospels are concerned (*op. cit.* pp. 231, 232).

Wilke and Weisse had already proved, says Pfleiderer, the priority of Mark (and had thus, with Herder, anticipated much later criticism), and it could only have been the fact that Baur was wedded to his dogmatic method which prompted him to place Mark's Gospel at least as late as a.d. 130, and to see in it a Gospel consisting of extracts from Matthew and Luke.

The impossibility of separating any account of the *life* of Christ from its sources became more and more evident in the succeeding literature.

2. Closely related in point of time to Strauss' popular book is that of the Frenchman **Renan**. To attempt any examination of the defects of this famous work would be beyond our province. But just as Strauss was blamed for his indifference to any treatment of the sources, *i.e.* the Gospels, so Renan was blamed for his half-and-half treatment of the same Gospels. For this he is severely taken to task by Schwarz.† [Note: cit. pp. 538-540; see also B. Weiss, *Life of Christ*, i. pp. 203, 205, Eng. tr.] He blames Renan for passing so lightly over the inquiries of a man like Baur as to the origin of our Gospels; and he points out that Renan's half-and-half treatment of these same Gospels, especially of the Gospel of John, avenges itself upon him, in that it leads him on from half-rationalistic explanations of the miracles to explanations which are adopted even at the cost of the moral perfection of Jesus. And in this connexion he refers, like other writers, to the explanation which Renan gives of the resurrection of Lazarus. Of course the earlier Renan placed the Gospels, the more difficult it was for him to account for the miracles which gathered around Jesus; and it is not too much to say that the earliest Gospel, St. Mark, the Gospel which Renan himself regarded as the earliest, is bound up with the miraculous. Renan's short and easy method was to declare dogmatically that there was no room in history for the supernatural. Like Strauss and Baur, Renan too had his assumption as to the historical worth of the Gospels; he too sets out with a general and comprehensive judgment as to their contents; for him the Gospels are not biographies, after the manner of those of Suetonius, nor are they legends invented after the manner of Philostratus; they are legendary biographies. 'I would compare them with the Legends of the Saints, the Life of Plotinus, Proclus, Isidorus, and other similar writings, in which historic truth and the purpose of presenting models of virtue are combined in different degrees.' It is not, perhaps, surprising that B. Weiss should speak of Renan's *Vie de Jésus* as not a history but a romance, and should add that, as our sources in their actual form were in many respects out of sympathy with, indeed almost incomprehensible to him, he could not escape the danger of rearranging them according to his own taste, or in a merely eclectic way.* [Note: Weiss, *op. cit.* pp. 184, 187.]

3. If we turn to **Theodor Keim** (1867-1872), to whom has sometimes been attributed *the* 'Life of Jesus' from a rationalistic standpoint, we notice that he too is severely taken to task by Pfleiderer for his unsatisfactory and fluctuating criticism of the Gospels as sources, and for his too close adherence to the views of Baur, especially in regard to the relation of the Synoptics to each other. St. Mark, *e.g.*, is a compilation from St. Matthew and St. Luke, and St. Matthew's is regarded as the earliest Gospel. In comparing Keim's various works relating to the life of Jesus, we certainly find a strange fluctuation with regard to his statements as to the sources and their validity. Thus he actually places St. Matthew in its primitive form as early as a.d. 66, and supposes it to have been revised and edited some thirty years later; St. Mark he

places about 100; and St. Luke, in which he sees a Gospel written by a companion of St. Paul, about 90.

But in 1873 Keim issued a book of a more popular character, and in this we find that the revision of St. Matthew is placed about 100, St. Mark about 120, St. Luke also about 100, while it is no longer referred to a companion of St. Paul. Some years later (1878) Keim's position with regard to the Gospels was again differently expressed, and he seems to be prepared to make certain concessions to his opponents, and to attach more weight to the two-document theory as the result of a fresh study of Papias.† [Note: Sanday, art. 'Gospels' in Smith's DB 2 ii. p. 1218.] But it will be noticed that Pfleiderer has nothing but praise for Keim's treatment of the Fourth Gospel, which in 1867 he places between 100 and 117, and a few years after (1873) as late as a.d. 130. It must not, however, be forgotten that, as Dr. Drummond rightly points out, Keim's position with regard to St. John's Gospel marks a very long retreat in date from the position of Baur, whilst Pfleiderer himself is the sole critic of importance who still places the Gospel in question at the extravagant date, 170, demanded by the founder of the Tübingen school.

But with all these variations as to dates, and with the free concession of the presence of mythical elements in the accounts of the great events of our Lord's life, Keim takes up a very different position from Strauss and Baur, and at all events the early members of the Tübingen school, with regard to the importance of the Person of Jesus and of our knowledge of Him. Nowhere is this more plainly seen than in the remarkable stress which he lays upon St. Paul's references to the facts of our Lord's earthly life and upon his high Christology. Baur and his followers had fixed men's attention upon Paul, Keim insists upon the unique and supreme importance of Jesus, and he sees in Him the Sinless One, the Son of God.

But Keim's portraiture of Jesus is marred by many inconsistencies. Thus he is prepared to admit that the miracles of healing may have happened in response to the faith evoked by the personality of Jesus, or he is thrown back in his treatment of the miraculous upon the old rationalistic methods; the atory, *e.g.*, of Jesus walking upon the sea had its origin in the words, 'Ye know not at what hour of the night your Lord Cometh.' In some respects it is not too much to say that even the moral sinlessness of Jesus is endangered, if not sacrificed. Keim rejects, it is true, the visionary hypothesis, but he finds no alternative except the conviction that nothing irrefutable can be known concerning the issue of the life of Jesus, an assertion equally unsatisfactory with that of Baur. He speaks sometimes of the early and Apostolic testimony rendered to the appearances of the risen Jesus, while at times he seems unable to realize the full force of this early testimony and its marked reserve. In his chronology we note another instance of Keim's arbitrary method, for he knows of no

going up to Jerusalem before the last Passover, and the public career of Jesus is comprised within a single year.

In spite of much that savours of subjectivity, Keim, however, stands out as the writer who, in the '*Life of Jesus* movement,' as Nippold has called it, has hitherto treated most fully of the Gospels as authorities, with the exception, perhaps, of Weizsäcker. We have seen how this need of a full treatment of the Gospels as sources had been felt since the days of Strauss' first edition of his *Leben Jesu*, and we shall see that this need is still further felt and emphasized.

4. Within a few years of the latest publication of Keim's work, two important Lives of Jesus, which are often mentioned together, issued from the press in Germany, viz. **B. Weiss'** *Leben Jesu* and **Beyschlag's** book bearing the same title. These books are of interest not only as important in the '*Life of Jesus* movement,' but as further and valuable attempts to deal with our Gospels and their sources. Here it must be sufficient to say that they testify to the new importance which had been given to the Synoptic problem by H. Holtzmann's book, *Die Synoptischen Evangelien*, 1863.

5. **Holtzmann's** book gains its value not only by its rejection of the 'tendency' theories with regard to the composition of the Gospels, but also because, in its advocacy of the two-document hypothesis, as we now call it, it marks a new departure, and lays down a foundation for future study.* [Note: See also J. Estlin Carpenter, *The Bible in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 301, and his remarks on the two-document hypothesis. He points out that the conclusion of Weizsäcker's investigations pointed in the same direction (cf. his *Untersuchungen über die Evangelische Geschichte*, 1869, 2nd ed. 1901).] Holtzmann's investigations had been published in the year before Strauss gave to the German people his popular *Life of Jesus*, in which, as we have seen, his account of the Gospels was still based upon the Tübingen researches; but Holtzmann's theory has a permanent interest for us to-day, while the author's subsequent statements of his views may be found in his published commentaries. It has indeed been said of the two-document theory that it may almost be reckoned to have passed out of the rank and number of mere hypotheses;† [Note: Moffatt, *Historical HT2*, p. 264.] and at all events any account of the life and teaching of Jesus, or any investigation as to the historical character of the Gospels, will have to take note of it not only in itself, but in its many possible combinations with other sources.

This statement can be easily verified by a perusal of recent expositions of their views by representative writers. We turn, e.g., to Wendt's *Die Lehre Jesu*, and we see how he allows a connexion in all likelihood between the statement of Papias as to St. Mark being the interpreter of St. Peter, and the actual contents of our earliest Gospel, and

how he finds in the *Logia* of St. Matthew an uncommonly rich and valuable material of Apostolic tradition, which may be placed by the side of St. Mark as a complementary source for a knowledge of the teaching of Jesus. Bousset, in his little but important book, *Was wissen wir von Jesus?*, is loud in his praises of the way in which modern research as to the original sources of the Synoptics harmonizes so strikingly with the famous statement of Papias. So, too, von Soden refers to the previous work of Weizsacker and Holtzmann, and speaks of two *Urevangelien* (although he uses this term with some hesitation), which go back one to St. Peter and the other to St. Matthew, and he finds it possible to trace a connexion between the familiar statement of Papias and our Gospela of St. Mark and St. Matthew (*Die wichtigsten Fragen im Leben Jesu*, 1904, pp. 42, 62).‡ [Note: So, too, Deissmann, 'Evangelium und Urchristentum' in *Beiträge zur Weiterentwicklung der christlichen Religion*, p. 128. Deissmann seems inclined to attach some considerable weight to oral tradition and its trustworthiness, a very important consideration.]

It must, of course, be remembered that, like H. Holtzmann, these other writers referred to did not regard the two-document theory as alone sufficient to explain the origin of the Gospels. Other material was no doubt present in the Synoptics in addition to the two documents, as we can see in the case of St. Luke (cf. art. Luke).* [Note: The two-document theory is sharply criticized by M. Lepin (*Jésus Messie et Fils de Dieu*, p. xxxvi, 1905), although he admits that it is adopted by a certain number of Romanist writers, e.g. Loisy, Batiffol, Minocchi, Lagrange. M. Lepin's contention is that the theory in question is not in agreement with the most ancient testimony, which regards St. Matthew as the first of the Gospels, composed for the Jewish Christians of the first days, and as an authentic work of the Apostle. He admits at the same time (p. xxxvi) that some Protestant writers claim to make this two-document theory accord with the full authenticity of the First Gospel (i.e. St. Matthew), and that admission is at least made of the semi-authenticity of this Gospel by those who claim to recognize in the primitive document, the *Logia* of Papias, the actual work of St. Matthew. He also observes that even Schmiedel allows that if St. Matthew was not the author of the *Logia*, he may at all events have been the author of a writing, more ancient still, upon which the *Logia* depended (*Encyc. Bibl. art. 'Gospels,'* ii. 1891). See also Stanton. *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, pp. 17, 18, for the fact that the Gospel which bears the name of St. Matthew is the most often quoted of the Synoptics in early days: and it is difficult, as even Jülicher allows, to account for the attribution of a Gospel to an Apostle so little known as St. Matthew.]

And it must also be remembered that Holtzmann did not start with a belief that the sources of the first two Gospels, St. Mark and St. Matthew, must correspond with the two documents referred to by Papias. On the contrary, the investigation of the Gospels showed him that there were two sources at the base of our Synoptic writings,

which closely resembled the statements of Papias with regard to the documents which he referred to St. Mark and St. Matthew.

6. But some half dozen years before Holtzmann's book was published, another, and in many respects a more serious, opposition to the methods of the Tübingen School, had made itself felt in the breaking away of **Albrecht Ritschl** from his former standpoint. In 1857 this final break was made, and for more than thirty years Ritschl was destined to be a great and growing factor of interest in the German theological world. Ritschl was keenly alive to the importance to be attached to the Person of Christ. In his treatment of the books of the NT he was to a great extent conservative, inasmuch as he accepted the traditional authorship of so many of those books, as, e.g., of the Gospel of St. John.

But, on the other hand, it is urged that Ritschl's own peculiar doctrine and the paramount stress which he laid on our experimental knowledge of Christ's power to confer spiritual freedom and deliverance, no doubt tended to make him independent of, if not indifferent to, the results of criticism. Ritschl and his distinguished follower **W. Herrmann** lay the greatest stress, and would have us lay the greatest stress, upon the impression made upon us by the 'historical' Christ. But it is not easy to ascertain what is meant by this 'historical' Christ, by loyalty to whom the true Christian is known, This is the favourite Ritschlian position, this insistence upon the impression which Christ makes upon the soul historically confronted with Him. But we naturally ask, From whence and from what is this impression derived? Not, surely, from the impression of the earthly life of Jesus alone, as Herrmann maintained, but from what Kähler has called the 'Biblical Christ'; the Christ of the NT is the Christ not only of the Gospels, but of the Epistles and of the Church.

It is urged, indeed, by the Ritschlians represented by Herrmann, that this faith in the historical Christ guarantees that, whatever criticism may effect, it cannot interfere with the truth and power of the position already won, and with the response made by the human soul to the perfection of Christ presented to us in the Gospels. But whatever may have been the case with Ritschl himself, it can scarcely be said that his method has prevented those who claim in some measure to be his followers from dealing very loosely with the Gospel miracles, or with such events as the Virgin-birth and the Resurrection of the Lord. And it is difficult to see how this process of solution can fail to weaken the impression made by the 'historical' Christ, and our confidence in the revelation which we owe to His life.

Many of those who are classed as Ritschlians dismiss in a somewhat arbitrary fashion sayings and deeds of our Lord which seem to them to admit of difficulty. The manner, e.g., in which **J. Weiss** has dealt with the oldest Gospel, that of St. Mark, in his *Das älteste Evangelium*, cannot be said to inspire a conviction of the truthfulness of many

of the most familiar Gospel narratives. Herrmann's own statements help us to see how subjective his method may become. He maintains, e.g., that through the impression which Christ makes upon us and our experimental knowledge of His power to confer freedom and deliverance, all uncertainty as to whether the figure of Jesus, which works thus upon us, belongs to legend or to history is in the nature of the case impossible.* [Note: See, e.g., *Communion with God*, p. 177, and cf. p. 81 ff. Eng. tr., for other statements made above.]

But it seems a curious argument to maintain that the impression which Jesus makes upon us is the positive revelation made by God in Christ, while the Gospels from which we derive that impression may or may not consist in this instance or in that of legendary and untrustworthy matter. Herrmann himself says that, in face of the seriousness of a desire for a salvation which means forgiveness of sins and life in spiritual freedom, the miracles in the NT necessarily become of minor importance ... he who has found Jesus Himself to be the ground of his salvation has no need of those miracles (*op. cit.* p. 180). But if Jesus is 'found' through the portrait of His life presented to us in the NT, it is not too much to say that that life is inextricably bound up, from its beginning to its close, with the miraculous, and that the impression which that life has made upon the world has been made by a record from which the miraculous cannot be eliminated. Conviction of sin, e.g., must precede deliverance from it; and St. Peter's cry, 'Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord' (Luk_5:8), resulted not only from Christ's teaching, but also from the proof of His miraculous power.

7. It is in this attitude towards the miraculous, and in this effort to lessen its scope, that we may find a point of contact between what we may call the 'scientific' and the Ritschlian school. In a large and growing number of German critics who might be described as 'scientific,' if not as radical, there is an acceptance of the miracles of healing as due to the power of the personality of Jesus and to the response of faith which He evoked. We may see this in more or less degree in the statements of O. Holtzmann (*Leben Jesu*, pp. 58, 149, 166), or in those of Furrer (*Das Leben Jesu Christi*, pp. 129, 130), or in Bousset (*Was wissen wir von Jesus?*, p. 56). So, too, statements of a similar kind meet us again and again in the account of the miracles of Jesus given us in the series of popular little books on the religious-historical aspects of Christianity, which is now in course of publication in Germany (cf. *Die Wunder im NT*, pp. 32 ff., 51 ff, by Traub).† [Note: See on the value of these little books the Hibbert Journal, January 1906.] And in our own country we remember how decisively Dr. P. Gardner would discriminate between mere wonders of healing and 'miracles proper,' and how he describes Jesus as a healer of disease as historic.* [Note: *A Historic View of the NT*, p. 141 ff.]

But at the same time it is evident how much there is which is arbitrary in this modern treatment of the miraculous. Thus Lepin justly criticises **Schmiedel's** attitude in this connexion.† [Note: *Jésus Messie et Fils de Dieu*, 1905, pp. lxvi, lxvii.] Schmiedel distinctly affirms that it would be wrong in any investigation of the miracle-narratives of the Gospels to start from any such postulate or axiom as that miracles are impossible (*Encyc. Bibl.* art. 'Gospels,' col. 1876). But a few pages later in the same article (col. 1885) he writes that it is quite permissible for us to regard as historical only those cures of the class which even at the present day physicians are able to effect by psychical methods—as, more especially, cures of mental maladies (cf. also Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums*, p. 18). The same occasional power is ascribed to Jesus by Professor N. Schmidt, *The Prophet of Nazareth*, p. 264.

So, too, Schmiedel (*op. cit.* col. 1882) and Wendt (*Die Lehre Jesu*, p. 471) agree in interpreting the words in our Lord's message to the Baptist as referring to the spiritually dead, 'the dead are raised' (Mat 11:5, Luk 7:22), just as in their opinion the preceding words are to be interpreted of the spiritually lame and blind. But, in the first place, there is no proof that the previous clauses are to be interpreted in any such spiritual sense, and the Evangelists evidently did not so interpret them. It is urged that we can find a precedent for this spiritual interpretation in the familiar passage Isa 35:5; but nothing is said in Isaiah of the raising of the dead, a fact entirely ignored by N. Schmidt, who is at one with Schmiedel and Wendt in their interpretation (*i.e.* p. 238). Moreover, it is very open to question if there was any Jewish expectation that the Messiah would raise the dead, so that St. Matthew and St. Luke had no ground of general belief upon which to base the raisings of the dead which they so evidently attributed to Jesus of Nazareth. Even if there are isolated statements in Jewish theology which attribute to the Messiah the power of raising the dead, it would seem to have been far more generally believed that God would Himself raise the dead. Further, even in those passages which do attribute this power to the Messiah, it is most important to remember that they refer to the resurrection of *all the dead*, and that there is no allusion of any kind in Jewish writings to the raising by the Messiah of single individuals (cf. Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i. p. 632).

But this attitude, maintained by some of Ritschl's followers and by the representative critics of the 'scientific' school, extends to a crucial question and a crucial miracle, viz. *the Resurrection of our Lord from the dead*. We may readily grant Ritschl's own acceptance of this fundamental historical fact of Christian belief.‡ [Note: See the remarks of Garvie, *The Ritschlian Theology*, p. 225.] But what is to be said of a large number of his followers? Some of them would no doubt allow that Christ awoke to a heavenly life with God, or they would labour to draw a distinction between the Easter faith and the Easter message; or they would allow that the Resurrection was a fact of

religious faith, or that, whilst the traditional record is often doubtful, the essential contents of the record are, and mean, everything. § [Note: Orr, Ritschlian Theology, p. 203.] But it is upon this question of the Resurrection that Feine rightly takes his stand, and upon the inclusion or exclusion of this fact in any satisfactory picture of the historical Christ. * [Note: Thus, in dwelling upon the contending parties and their disputes as to the 'historical' and the 'biblical' Christ, Feine writes: 'Die Streitfrage lief also darauf hinaus, ob die Auferstehung Jesu mit in der Bild des geschichtlichen Christi einzubeziehen sei oder nicht'; cf. *Das Christentum Jesu und das Christentum der Apostel*, 1904, p. 54.]

If we turn again to one of the most prominent critics who may be classed as Ritschlians, **A. Harnack**, we are not only met by his famous distinction between the Easter faith and the Easter message, but we also become aware that his classification of the Gospel miracles is not calculated to increase our belief and confidence in the character of the Gospel narrative. Harnack admits, indeed, that the spiritual power of Jesus was so great that we cannot dismiss offhand as an illusion the reports that He could make the blind to see or the deaf to hear. But, apart from these reports of surprising cures, Harnack would regard the stories of the miraculous which are connected with Jesus as arising from exaggerations of natural and impressive events, or from the projection of inner experiences on to the outer world, or from an interest in the fulfilment of OT records, or from various parables and sayings. In these and in similar ways the miraculous stories arose. And yet, after all is said, it will be noticed that there are narratives of miracles which do not fall under the above heads, and these Harnack comprises under one category as impenetrable stories, the secret of which we cannot solve. † [Note: See especially the reply of Prof. W. Walther of Rostock to Harnack's *Das Wesen des Christentums*, 1904, pp. 47, 48. Harnack's last category is expressed by the word 'Undurchdringlichea.' Reference should also be made to T. H. Wright's *The Finger of God*, 1903, p. 194, and his valuable Appendix on the view taken by Dr. Percy Gardner and by Dr. Harnack of our Lord's miracles, and also on early Christian and mediaeval miracles.]

8. One other and important point in which the 'scientific' German theologians and the left wing of Ritschl's followers agree is in *the rejection of the Apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel*. And with this rejection there must needs be a serious weakening of the evidence as to our Lord's Deity, although no doubt this evidence may be substantiated from the Synoptists alone. The remarkable thing is that both Ritschlian and 'scientific' critics are alike impressed with the indications that in the Fourth Gospel we are dealing with a source or sources full of minute details and vivid recollections.

Thus Wendt, while he refers the Gospel to some Christian of Asia Minor, admits that this Evangelist, whoever he was, belonged to the same circle in which the old Apostle St. John had lived, and that he thus had access to written information and to oral tradition received from the beloved disciple (*Das Johannesevangelium*, p. 216 ff.). P. W. Schmidt, in his *Die Geschichte Jesu* (1904, p. 95), cannot help feeling the force of the exact and minute geographical references which the Fourth Gospel contains, although he rejects the Johannine authorship. Von Soden, although he refuses to rank the Fourth Gospel amongst the historical sources for a 'Life' of Jesus, admits on the same page that the writer of that Gospel had access to good traditions in his notices of place and time, in the small details which mark his recitals, and in his information as to various personalities (*Die wichtigsten Fragen im Leben Jesu*, 1904, p. 5).[‡] [Note: See, further, Lepin, op. cit. p. 360. He rightly emphasizes the fact that Jülicher, in the last edition of his *Einleitung* (p. 324), dismisses the attribution of the Fourth Gospel to a prehyter John as without value, and regards the Gospel as composed by a Christian, dependent upon the Apostle John, at the opening of the 2nd century.] If we turn to English critics we find Dr. Percy Gardner inclined to follow Dr. Harnack's view that the Fourth Gospel was the work of John the Elder, who was a disciple of John the son of Zebedee. Dr. Gardner, too, is so impressed with the writer's precise local knowledge, that he thinks it may well have been derived from one of the Apostles, and very likely from John the son of Zebedee.[§] [Note: A Historic View of the NT, pp. 153, 184.]

So far as English criticism is concerned, it cannot be said that anything which has been urged has broken down the strong lines of defence which we owe to Lightfoot, Westcott, Sanday, and more recently to Dr. Drummond. As Dr. Stanton has rightly urged, there must have been good grounds for believing that the Fourth Gospel was founded upon Apostolic testimony, in order to overcome the prejudice which would be created by the contrasts between it and accounts which had been more generally received.* [Note: *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, i. p. 277; and cf. to the same effect, Sanday, *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, 1905, pp. 15, 41; see also Dr. Chase, *Cambridge Theological Essays*, 1905, p. 383. Mr. Conyheare has the boldness to assure us that any modern scholar who upholds the hypothesis of the Apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel is at least as wanting in perspective and insight as the much derided upholders of the view that the Pauline Epistles were only concocted in the 2nd cent. (*Hibbert Journal*, July 1903, p. 620). But he takes no notice of Dr. Drummond's defence, and, whilst he is loud in his praises of the Abbé Loisy, it may be of interest to note that another liberal Romanist, Père Calmes, has now given us an admirable defence of the Johannine authorship, *l'Évangile selon Saint Jean*, 1906. For a sharp and decisive reply to the extraordinary attack by Kreyenbühf upon the authorship, see Gutjahr, *Die Glaubenswürdigkeit des Irenäischen Zeugnisses über die Abfassung des vierten kanonischen Evangeliums*, 1904, p. 4 ff.]

9. But whilst, in the respects which we have mentioned, the position of the Ritschlian School is so unsatisfactory, we may welcome, with those who are not at all in sympathy with Ritschl's views or with the views of his followers, the witness borne by so many Ritschlians to a living Lord and the unique place which they assign to the Person of Christ in any account of Christianity.† [Note: See Orr, *The Christian View of God and the World*, pp. 53, 79, on the central place of Christ's Person in His religion. 'Ritschlianism is perhaps nothing more nor less than a determined attempt to find the whole contents of Christianity in the Person of Christ' (*Cambridge Theological Essays*, 1905, p. 517).]

Among those, *e.g.*, who are classed as Ritschlians we have on the one hand men like Troeltsch supporting strongly and ardently the value of the study of Comparative Religion for a right knowledge of Christianity, and maintaining that the religious-historical method should be applied to every department of theological thought; whilst Harnack, with Reischle, hesitates to follow, and is evidently alive to the fact that the method in question may be carried too far. Dr. Harnack's words on the subject are remarkable. He expresses his desire that the German theological Faculties may remain as for the pursuit of inquiry into the Christian religion, because Christianity is not a religion by the side of other religions, but *the* religion, and because Christ is not one Master by the side of other Masters, but *the* Master; the disciples were conscious that they possessed in Christ not merely a Master, but that they knew themselves to be men, new men, redeemed by Him, and that therefore they could preach Him as Saviour and Lord.‡ [Note: *Die Aufgabe der theol. Facultäten und die allgemeine Religionsgeschichte*, pp. 16, 17.] It is quite true that the American writer, Professor W. A. Brown, sees in some of Harnack's statements, and in his recognition of the gospel of Jesus as that which satisfies the deepest depths of humanity, the promise of a better understanding between the two parties in the Ritschlian ranks: 'With this recognition of the *anima naturaliter Christiana*, of a preparation for Christianity within the very nature of man, we find Harnack, even while insisting with Ritschl upon the originality of Christianity, admitting the complementary truth for which the speculative school contend.'§ [Note: *The Essence of Christianity*, 1903, pp. 286, 287.]

Unfortunately, however, the advocates of the religious-historical method, at least in its extreme form, show no disposition to confine themselves to the comparison of Christianity with other religions in respect to its inward witness alone; they extend this comparison to the historical facts of the NT, and they do as in a manner which savours of recklessness and extravagance. || [Note: | See, *e.g.*, Dr. Blass on Gunkel's extraordinary theory as to the resurrection of our Lord on the third day. *Expos. Times*, xvi. [1904] p. 14; and the present writer may refer to *The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ*, pp. 526, 527, or A. Meyer's *Die Auferstehung Christi*, 1905, p. 167.] The need

of caution seems to be admitted even by Pfleiderer when he writes, 'Before all things, we must guard against the constant practice of imagining that the inward affinity of religious conceptions implies a connexion in their external history.'¶ [Note: Early Christian Conception of Christ, pp. 153, 154.]

And when we turn to the Ritschlians, it is evident that men like Reischle are well aware of the many safeguards with which the religious-historical method and its study should be guarded.* [Note: * See his *Theologie und Religionsgeschichte*, 1904, p. 27 ff.] His criticism, e.g. that we should note not only points of likeness but points of unlikeness in any pursuit of the method in question, is endorsed by Heinrici and others, who have joined with Harnack in opposing the religious-historical study of Christianity as if it were only one of many religions. Thus Heinrici insists with great force that if the resurrection of Jesus is considered from the religious-historical point of view it is unique; and in the same manner A. Jeremias, in answer to Gunkel, insists that the resurrection of Jesus, as it is described as taking place, is without analogy in any other religion.* [Note: Heinrici, *Urchristentum*, 1902, p. 38; A. Jeremias, *Babylonisches im NT*, p. 43: 'Die Tatsache der Auferstehung Jesu Christi ist in der Religiongeschichte analogielos.'] In the same pamphlet Reischle warns us against the danger of attaching too great value to analogies, and transforming them into relations of dependence. He does not deny that analogies exist between Oriental religions and Christianity, but he is keenly alive to the fact that their right and correct appreciation is a very difficult matter. He allows, e.g., the existence of a Jewish Gnosticism in the Apostolic Age, but he regards as a fantastic hypothesis Gunkel's attempt to attach to this Jewish Gnosticism an important role in establishing points of connexion between Christianity and other religions (*op. cit.* pp. 30, 31). So, too, he rightly draws attention to the danger of overvaluing the form of an expression to the neglect of the actual meaning of its contents, and he quotes the sphorism, 'Si duo dicunt idem, non est idem' (*op. cit.* pp. 31, 33). He further illustrates this position by the use of the familiar formula, 'In the Name of Jesus,' of which Heitmüller has made so much.† [Note: *Im Namen Jesu*, 1903, p. 197 ff.] Such words might, no doubt, be employed as a magical or superstitious formula, but they might also be used as a confession of Christian faith in Jesus, or as an invocation to Him in prayer, or as an appeal to Him as the Mediator with God.

Once more, and above all, Reischle rightly insists upon the insurmountable limits which beset the religious-historical method in any endeavour to solve the problem of the personal religious life of great religious personalities. If this is difficult in the case of Paul, it is still more so, urges Reischle, in the case of Jesus (*op. cit.* pp. 42, 43).‡ [Note: See on this pre-eminence belonging to the Person of Christ in contrast to other

religions, Fairbairn, *Philosophy of Religion*, pp. 532, 533; and Söderblom, *Die Religionen der Erde*, 1905, pp. 62-64.]

10. But this acknowledgment of the marvellous personality of Jesus may not only be seen in the writings of the Ritschlian School and its various and variant members. We may recognize it—it is not too much to say—in German writers of every school and in German works which appeal to all sorts and conditions of men.

Amongst modern Church historians in Germany no name stands more deservedly high than that of von Dobschütz. 'The Apologist,' he tells us in the concluding words of his work on *Primitive Life in the Early Church*, 'could point triumphantly to the realization of the moral ideal among Christians of every standing. That was due to the power which issued from Jesus Christ, and actually transformed men. In the midst of an old and dying world this new world springs up with the note of victory running through it. "If God be for us, who can be against us?" "And this is the victory which overcometh this world, even our faith." ... Christianity possessed what the speculations of Neo-Platonism lacked, the sure historical basis of Jesus Christ's Person.' But the remarks of von Dobschütz are of further interest, because he again emphasizes the importance to be attached to the Person and work of Jesus, in his contribution to the 'Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher,' in the course of publication in Germany. Here, too, he dwells upon the Apostolic Age, and he points out that in it we do not only find Judaism with a strong addition of Messianic expectation; Jesus had transformed the stiff monotheistic belief in God into a living trust in God, and a joyous spirit of adoption as God's children had taken the place of Pharisaic self-satisfaction and timorous fear. § [Note: *Das Apostolische Zeitalter*, p. 5.] Or we turn to another series of books, of a somewhat larger and more expensive kind, entitled *Lebensfragen*, and here, too, we meet with the same emphatic testimony. Thus Weinel tells us that the Hegelian philosophy hindered Strauss from estimating or understanding the greatness of the personality of Jesus (*Jesus im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, p. 42, 1904). Again, a little later on (p. 64), in summing up the significance of modern criticism, he declares that no century has striven so earnestly to discover the features of the true historical Jesus as the nineteenth; and he points out that whilst almost all the witnesses whom he cites in proof of this occupy a critical standpoint in dealing with tradition, they show at least respect, and for the most part reverence, for Jesus of Nazareth, and have recognized the power of salvation in the gospel which He taught. And as this image of Jesus in its living reality and in its purity is placed before the eyes of men, he prophesies that it will win the heart of humanity until all men are more and more transformed into its likeness.

11. But then we have to face the remarkable fact that this picture of the wondrous personality of Jesus is most frequently derived by advanced critics from the Synoptics alone. The Fourth Gospel is ruled out of court, or at the best reduced to a testimony

of secondary worth. The account, e.g., of the raising of Lazarus, if it is no longer treated after the manner of Renan as a flagrant deception to which Jesus lent Himself, is regarded not as historical but as allegorical.* [Note: See, e.g., the remarks of Loisy, *Autour d'un petit livre*, 1903, p. 97 ff.; and, on the other hand, Loisy's fellow-countryman and religionist Th. Calmes, *L'Évangile selon Saint Jean*, 1900, pp. 68, 75.] But even in what is allowed to us of the Synoptic record, doubt is thrown upon our Lord's claim to judge the world, or upon His declaration that He would give His life as a ransom for many, to say nothing of the refusal to admit, as we have already noted, a large proportion of His miracles as historical.

In like manner the significance of St. Paul's testimony to the facts and teaching of the Gospels, as also the significance of his claim to work miracles in the power which Christ bestowed, is minimized, if not disregarded.

We thus owe this wonderful picture of a great personality mainly, if not entirely, to documents bearing the names of three writers of whom we are assured that we know very little, and whose claims to be the authors of the books (in their present shape at all events) which bear their names must be very largely and seriously discounted. And yet these obscure writers have given us the picture of a life and of a teaching the beauty and the excellence of which mankind has never ceased to acknowledge.

'Here,' says a learned and cultured Jew, after allowing that the Synoptic Gospels do contain teaching which in comparison with average Judaism is both valuable and original, both new and true, 'we have religion and morality joined together at a white heat of intensity. The teaching often glows with light and fire.... The luminous juxtaposition of even familiar OT doctrines may be novel and stimulating. The combination of Deu 6:4-5 with Lev 19:18—the love of God with the love of man—in Mar 12:29; Mar 12:31 was surely a brilliant flash of the highest religious genius.'[†] [Note: G. Montefiore, 'The Synoptic Gospels and the Jewish Consciousness,' in the *Hibbert Journal*, July 1905, p. 658.] Elsewhere he speaks of 'the first-classness' of the Synoptics, and points out that there are one or two facts which still tend to weaken the effect of the best Rabbinic teachings and sayings upon the average Jewish consciousness. The first fact is that 'these nobler sayings and teachings are buried in a mass of greatly inferior matter, so that they are difficult to unearth. They are not collected together in a lovely setting, united and illumined by the story of a noble life.' He further remarks that, suppose we make a selection of the great sayings and teachings of the Talmud and the Midrash, it must be admitted that the same 'powerful, driving, and emotional effect as the sayings and teachings of the Gospels' is not produced.[‡] [Note: p. 652.]

12. But we note that this picture is in many respects entirely opposed to current Jewish conceptions of the day. No one has emphasized this more strongly than Bousset in relation to the Jewish anticipations and expectations of the Kingdom of God. He insists, indeed, upon the Messianic consciousness of Jesus, without which he regards not only the whole work of Jesus, but the conduct of His disciples after His death, as unintelligible. But if Jesus regarded Himself as the Messiah, it is evident, continues Bousset, that He did so in a manner totally opposed to the predominant and current Jewish expectations. Spiritual conceptions of the Messiah were not altogether wanting, but political hopes always occupied the central place in the picture. In the sense of such hopes Jesus was not the Messiah, and would never have become so. He expected the sovereignty of God and not that of Israel, the victory of good and the judgment of evil, not the triumph of the Jew and the annihilation of the Roman; He preached a kingdom in which the vision of God was granted to the pure, and as the preparer for and the ruler in that kingdom He regarded Himself.[§] [Note: See Bousset's remarks in his *Was wissen wir von Jesus?* p. 61.] But the Synoptists no less than St. John furnish us with another picture which was even more decisively opposed to the current conceptions of the Jewish nation, the picture of a suffering Messiah. It is not too much to say that 'the idea of the Messianic sufferings and death is one that wakes no echo in the heart of any Jewish contemporary of our Lord, not excepting even His disciples.'^{*} [Note: Muirhead, *Eschatology of Jesus*, 1904, p. 256. See, further, Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, p. 308 ff.; J. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, 1877, pp. 356, 357; Row, *Jesus of the Evangelists*⁴, pp. 140, 213; Bishop Gore, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 192. The whole appendix in Schürer's *GJV* 3 ii. p. 553 ff., entitled 'Der leidende Messias,' should be consulted.] In short, the words of Dalman are amply justified, 'Suffering and death for the actual possessor of the Messianic dignity are in fact unimaginable according to the testimony of the Gospels' (*Words of Jesus*, p. 265, English translation).

'Nothing could mark more strongly the contrast between Jewish Messianic notions and the picture of the Messiah as realized in our Gospels, than the following passage from the *Jewish Encyclopedia*: "Jesus' word on the cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" was in all its implications itself a disproof of the exaggerated claims made for Him after His death by His disciples. The very form of His punishment would disprove those claims in Jewish eyes. No Messiah that Jews could recognise could suffer such a death." '† [Note: Professor Votaw (Chicago), 'The Modern Jewish View of Jesus,' in the *Biblical World*, xxvi. No. 2 [Aug. 1905], p. 110. The passage above is cited from the *Jewish Encyc.* vii. p. 166; and the present writer would venture to refer for further literature to the *Witness of the Epistles*, pp. 23, 360.]

This representation of a suffering Messiah which the Gospels presented so uncompromisingly, pressed hard for a solution upon the famous founder of the Tübingen School:

‘Never was that which bore the outward appearance of ruin and annihilation turned into such signal and decisive victory, and so glorious a passage into life, as in the death of Jesus. Up to this time there was always a possibility that He and the people might come to agree on the ground of the Messianic faith ... but His death made a complete and irreparable breach between Him and Judaism. A death like His made it impossible for the Jew, as long as he remained a Jew, to believe in Him as the Messiah. To believe in Him as the Messiah after His dying such a death involved the removal from the conception of the Messiah of all the Jewish and carnal elements which were associated with it’ (*Church History*, i. p. 42, English translation)

Baur’s solution of the difficulty forms one of the most curious pages in the history of modern criticism. He allows that nothing but the miracle of the Resurrection could restore the faith of the disciples after such a death as that of the Cross, and yet he assures us in the same breath that the question as to the nature and the reality of the Resurrection lies outside the sphere of historical inquiry. What history requires is not so much the fact of the Resurrection of Jesus, as the belief that it was a fact.

In more recent utterances we seem to catch an echo of Baur’s words, and his remarks anticipate Harnack’s familiar distinction between the Easter faith and the Easter message. The Easter faith, according to Harnack, is a conviction which tells us that the Crucified has achieved an inward victory over death, and has entered into eternal life. But this so-called Easter faith appears, not unjustly, to many thoughtful minds to do away with the need of Easter altogether. The Crucified overcame death on Good Friday, so far, that is, as an inward triumph was concerned. On Good Friday, and not upon the third day, He entered upon eternal life. And if nothing special happened on Easter Day, there seems to be little sense or point in talking about ‘Easter faith.’[‡] [Note: See Dr. Walther’s valuable criticism, *Ad. Harnack’s Wesen des Christentums für die christliche Gemeinde geprüft*, 1904, p. 134; and also Dr. F. Blass, ‘Science and Sophistry’ in *Expos. Times*, Oct. 1904.]

But, further, this contrast between the current ideas of the Messiah and the Messiahship of Jesus in the Gospels may be illustrated from the succeeding history of the Jewish nation and from the culmination of the Jewish hopes in the pretender Bar Cochba in the reign of Hadrian. The report was circulated that the Messiah had at last appeared, and fabulous numbers are said to have joined his standard in insurrection against the Romans. We know how the struggle ended in terrible disaster to the Jews, although for some few years they fought with all their characteristic stubbornness and desperation. But the chief actor in the drama, Bar Cochba, reveals to us only too

plainly the kind of Messiah whom the majority of the Jews expected, and whom they were prepared to welcome: 'Jesus offered Himself unresistingly to death; the impostor died in arms ... whatever Jesus Christ was not, this pretender was. Whatever this pretender was, Jesus Christ was not.'* [Note: Row, *Jesus of the Evangelists*, p. 147 ff.] One feature in the new Messiah's career may be specially noted, viz. the absence of any attempt on his part to work miracles, although no doubt all sorts of exaggerated stories of strength and power gathered round his name.† [Note: Edersheim, *History of the Jewish Nation*, p. 200 ff.] But if, as we are told, there was an irresistible tendency to attribute miraculous powers to the Messiah, if, as Professor Percy Gardner asserts, there was every probability that whether actual or not the miracles would be reported, how is it that no such miracles gathered around the name of Bar Cochba? Is not the only explanation to be found in the fact that Jesus of Nazareth actually worked miracles, while the pretender worked none?‡ [Note: See especially the *Church Quarterly Review*, Jan 1904.] Nor must it be forgotten in this connexion that the Jews in early times never attempted to deny that our Lord wrought miracles; on the contrary, they admitted the miracles, whilst they referred them to Satanic arts or to a knowledge of the sorcery which Jesus had brought with Him from Egypt.§ [Note: *Jesus Christ in the Talmud* (Laihle), p. 45 [Eng. tr].] In the same manner the modern Jews admit that our Lord gained His notoriety not merely from His teaching but from His miracles, specially from those which He wrought as a healer of the sick. 'It was not,' writes Dr. Kohler in the *Jewish Encyc.* vii. p. 167, 'as the teacher of new religious principles nor as a new lawgiver, but as a new wonder-worker that Jesus won fame and influence among the simple inhabitants of Galilee in his lifetime.' | [Note: | *The Modern Jewish View of Jesus*, by Prof. Votaw, p. 109, Chicago University Press, 1905.]

13. But there were other claims made by our Lord, in addition to the claim to work miracles, and of these great and supernatural claims it may be said that they cannot possibly be derived from the picture of the Messiah which meets us in the OT. Some words remarkable in their bearing upon this subject were uttered by Dr. Charles in speaking before the University of Oxford on 'The Messiah of the Old Testament and the Christ of the New Testament':

'As other claims which are without parallel in the Old Testament prophecy of the Messiah, we shall mention first His claim to judge the world; and next, to forgive sin; and, finally, to be the Lord of life and death. In the Old Testament these prerogatives belong to God alone as the essential Head of the kingdom, and appear in those prophetic descriptions of the kingdom which ignore the figure of the Messiah, and represent God as manifesting Himself among men. Here, then, we have the Christ of the Gospels claiming not only to fulfil the Old Testament prophecies of the various

ideals of the Messiah, but also to discharge the functions of God Himself in relation to the kingdom.’¶ [Note: *Expositor*, 6th series, v. [1902] p. 258. In Jewish apocalyptic literature, it should be added, the Messiah is in many cases the agent of God in the judgment which takes place at the beginning or close of the Messianic reign; even in the final judgment He is represented as God’s agent, and only in the later section of the Book of Enoch does He appear as the judge at the last day. We may also contrast our Lord’s own words as to His Parousia with the fantastic and grotesque descriptions of Jewish theology.]

Nor can it be said with any justification that these Divine prerogatives are ascribed to our Lord late in time, or that they were simply Christian accretions. We need look no further than St. Paul’s earliest Epistle, 1 Thess., to come across statements which can scarcely mean anything less than that our Lord was associated as Judge with God the Father; that He is the medium of salvation, and that we obtain life through His death; that the prayers of Christians are to be addressed to Him; that whether we wake or sleep our true life is in Him (cf. 1Th 3:13; 1Th 5:9-10). Nor is there any reason to suppose that in such statements to the Thessalonians St. Paul is putting forward a conception of Christ which differed from that entertained by the rest of the Church: * [Note: See, further. Dr. Sanday, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 231; Bishop Gore, *The Permanent Creed and the Christian Idea of Sin*, p. 10 ff. If we compare 1Co 2:8 and Jam 2:1, it is notable how both St. Paul and St. James can speak of Jesus as the Lord of the (i.e. the Divine) glory.’] ‘The Son of God,’ he writes to the Corinthians, ‘who was preached among you by us (not by St. Paul himself alone), even by me and Silvanus and Timothy, was not yea and nay, but in him is yea,’ 2Co 1:19 (cf. 1Th 1:1). Moreover, in the expression ‘the Son of God’ St. Paul’s teaching no less than that of the Gospels indicates a unique relationship between the Father and the Son; cf. e.g. Rom 8:3; Rom 8:32. And if we ask whence St. Paul’s conception was derived, it seems not unreasonable to maintain that it was derived from the statements and the teaching of our Lord Himself.

There is a famous passage contained in two of the Synoptic Gospels which so strongly resembles the phraseology of St. John that it has been called, and not unjustly, an aerolite from the Johannine heaven: ‘All things have been delivered unto me of my Father, and none knoweth the Son save the Father, neither doth any know the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him’ (Mat 11:27, Luk 10:22). Dr. Harnack, although he does not deny that Jesus spoke these words, weakens their force and meaning, and it is well to turn for a criticism of his statements to Dr. Swete’s remarks on ‘The Teaching of Christ,’ *Expositor* (6th Series, vii. [1903] p. 407):

‘The knowledge claimed is that of a son, and it rests upon sonship; it is a strange misreading of the words which reverse this order, as Professor Harnack seems to do—it is not knowledge which makes Christ “the Son,” but sonship which enables Him to know. He declares that He knows God as only a son can know his father, and that this knowledge is not a possession which other sons of God naturally share with Him, but one which belongs of right to Him alone, and to others only so far as He is pleased to impart it. This is to claim not only unique knowledge, but a unique Sonship. It is difficult to discover any essential difference between this statement of St. Matthew and the closing words of St. John’s prologue.’

The Abbé Loisy does not allow that our Lord ever spoke these words, but affirms that they are derived from some primitive Church tradition; and he goes so far as to suppose that they were derived, in part at all events, from Sirach 51.† [Note: See for a recent criticism, Cambridge Theological Essays, 1905, p. 455 ff.] But it is difficult to believe that such words could have found the place which they occupy in two of our Gospels unless they were spoken by our Lord. It should be remembered that they are regarded, not merely by conservative but by ‘scientific’ critics, as forming part of that ‘collection of discourses’ which probably comes to us from the Apostle St. Matthew. Indeed, Keim long ago affirmed that there is no more violent criticism than that which Strauss had introduced, viz., the repudiation of a passage so strongly attested. Moreover, the alleged dependences upon Sirach 51 are in reality very superficial; in some particulars the alleged likenesses are such as might be found in the utterances of any Jewish speakers. It may also be noted that while the points of comparison are preserved, the points of contrast are entirely omitted. For example, Jesus the son of Sirach in his prayer thanks God because He has hearkened to him and delivered him from peril; our Lord in His prayer thanks the Father for revealing to babes that which had been concealed from the wise and prudent.* [Note: Lepin, op. cit., Appendix, on the Abbé Loisy’s position, 1904.]

But it should further be borne in mind that these statements in Mt. and Lk. do not stand alone; that the Gospel which is probably the earliest of the Synoptics speaks of ‘the Father’ and of ‘the Son’ absolutely, and that the words employed can only be fairly explained as assigning to our Lord a unique relationship to God: ‘But of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father’ (Mar_13:32). If such words are suspected, we may fairly ask who would have been likely to introduce them? Dr. Schmiedel, who generously allows us to construct a ‘scientific’ ‘Life of Christ’ from five sayings and four incidents of the Gospels, does not attempt to deny that our Lord spoke these words; and although, of course, he uses them for his own purposes of exegesis, we may now take it that this representative of the most advanced criticism allows us to regard this verse in St. Mark’s Gospel as an utterance of our Lord Himself.† [Note: See art. ‘Gospels,’ Encyc.

Bibl. ii. 1881. For a valuable criticism of Schmiedel's position, cf. Fairbairn, *The Philosophy of the Christian, Religion*, p. 303.] Professor N. Schmidt refuses to accept even Mar 13:32, and regards the words in question, 'neither the Son,' as probably an interpolation (*The Prophet of Nazareth*, pp. 147, 231). Such words presuppose, he thinks, such a doctrine of subordination as was cherished in the Church of the second century. But has he forgotten the doctrine of subordination in 1Co 15:28, a passage which even he dares not refuse to St. Paul?

In addition to Dr. Swete's remarks, to which reference has been made above, we may cite the following passage, as bearing closely on our subject, from the Dean of Westminster's *Study of the Gospels*, p. 109: 'Observe that the titles "the Father" and "the Son" are used absolutely (*i.e.* in Mt. and Lk. *loc. cit.*). We are familiar with this use from St. John's Gospel. But it occurs but once again in the Synoptic Gospels, Mar 13:32.... It is an important fact to be borne in mind in connexion with the Christology of John's Gospel, that this special mode of speech is attested once for St. Mark and once also for the non-Markan document. We could hardly have stronger evidence, from the historical point of view, that our Lord Himself did thus speak of Himself absolutely as "the Son." It is not necessary to explain how unique is the claim which is put forward by this language.' † [Note: See, further, Sanday, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 211; Fairbairn, *op. cit.* p. 476; Headlam, *Critical Questions*, pp. 190, 191; *Cambridge Theological Essays*, 1905, p. 431.]

Professor N. Schmidt, indeed, has boldly argued against this uniqueness in His relation to the Father which our Lord claims, by asserting that He always availed Himself of the general expression 'Abba, Father,' and that the variants 'my Father' and 'your Father' were introduced by the Greek Evangelists. § [Note: *Bibl. art.* 'Son of God,' iv. 4696. This is one of the most painful articles in the whole of the four volumes, and we cannot be surprised that Professor Schmidt throws doubt upon our Lord's exact words, when at this time of day he can throw doubt, as in this same article, upon St. Paul's authorship of 1 Thessalonians. More recently Professor Schmidt has repeated these arguments, and he appears to regard Mat 11:25, Luk 10:21 as casting an undeserved reflexion upon the character of Jesus! (*The Prophet of Nazareth*, p. 152). On Schmidt's denial that our Lord ever called Himself the Son of Man see Stalker's *Christology of Jesus*, p. 72, and Muirhead's *Eschatology of Jesus*, p. 148). If the Gospels were written as late as Schmidt believes, it is certain that the introduction into all of them of such a title as 'the Son of Man' would have been regarded with the gravest suspicion, and would have failed to gain acceptance in Christian circles where our Lord's Godhead was fully recognized.] But, as M. Lepin has pointed out in his valuable book, it is to be noted that a distinguished Aramaic scholar, Dr. Dalman, does not hesitate to affirm, in contradistinction to the assertions of Dr. Schmidt, that the unique position assumed by Jesus follows from the invariable separation which He

makes between 'my Father' and 'your Father' (*Words of Jesus*, p. 281 [English translation]); and a few pages later Dr. Dalman writes: 'Nowhere do we find that Jesus called Himself the Son of God in such a sense as to suggest a merely religious and ethical relation to God, a relation which others also actually possessed, or which they were capable of attaining or destined to acquire' (p. 287).* [Note: See also Lepin, *Jésus Messie et Fils de Dieu*, pp. 297, 300, 2nd ed. 1905.]

14. We must remember, too, that not only do a great number of English and German writers of note acknowledge the closeness of St. Paul's acquaintance with our Lord's life and teaching,† [Note: See, e.g., Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii. p. 166 ff., where references to (1) the history, (2) the words of Jesus, are drawn out at length; J. Weiss, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 1903, p. 33 ff.; Weinel, *Paulus*, 1904, p. 246 ff.; P. W. Schmidt, *Die Geschichte Jesu*, 1904, ii. pp. 67, 68; Bacon, *Story of St. Paul*, 1905, p. 53; Fairbairn, *The Philosophy of the Christian Religion*, p. 443 ff.; Chase, *Credibility of the Acts of the Apostles*, p. 252 ff.; H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*, p. 96 ff.; Headlam, *Critical Questions*, 1903, p. 161 ff.; and the present writer would venture to refer to the last lecture in *The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ*.] but that this testimony of St. Paul is materially and increasingly strengthened by the large number of Epistles which are now almost universally acknowledged to have been from his pen. Some sixty years ago (1845), F. C. Baur, the founder of the Tübingen School, published his 'Life' of St. Paul, and accepted only four of the Apostle's letters, in which he believed that he could discover the notes of a fundamental difference between Paul and the Twelve; to-day at least double that number of the Epistles which bear St. Paul's name is accepted by nearly all critics alike. It would be easy to point in proof of this to Dr. C. Clemen's statements in his recent *Life and Work of St. Paul* (see i. pp. 6-162). We must not forget that Professor Schmidt is prepared to accept only the *Hauptbriefe* and Philippians, and that he regards even the former as having suffered insertions; thus, 1Co 15:5-11 is a later insertion (*The Prophet of Nazareth*, pp. 193, 200, 397). Colossians and even Philemon are rejected; and we are told, in the only reference to Bishop Lightfoot in the volume, that his is the ablest defence of these two Epistles, but that it fails to do full justice to the counter arguments (p. 194). It is not surprising after this that Professor Schmidt, following on the lines of Van Manen, rejects all the Epistles of St. Ignatius, and that he makes no reference to their acceptance by Lightfoot, Harnack, Zahn.

If we turn for a moment to the little books of a popular kind which are in course of publication in Germany, at the price of a few pence each, we find that to Professor Vischer of Basle (known to us in England first of all through Dr. Harnack) is committed the volume which treats of the Epistles of St. Paul. Vischer accepts all the Epistles, nine in number, which are accepted by Dr. Clemen; and even when he comes to deal with Ephesians (which Clemen rejects), he frankly acknowledges, with Erich Haupt in

the latest edition of Meyer's Commentary, that the alleged objections are by no means decisive, and that more is to be said for St. Paul's authorship than against it. In cases, moreover, in which the traditional structure of the Epistles is questioned, as in 2 Cor., it is frankly allowed that the separate letter alleged to be found in chs. 10-13 is, no less than the rest of the Epistle, the work of St. Paul; and even in the case of the Pastoral Epistles, the existence of genuine Pauline fragments is constantly maintained (see, further, von Soden's *Urchristliche Literaturgeschichte*, 1905, pp. 28, 162).

15. It has been recently said by Dr. Driver that 'the testimony to our blessed Lord's life and work is so much more nearly contemporary with the events recorded than can often be shown to be the case in the Old Testament, and also so much more varied and abundant, that by an elementary principle of historical criticism it is of proportionately higher value.'* [Note: *The Higher Criticism*, 1905, pp. ix and 32; cf. also and esp. Dr. Driver's remarks in his LOT6 p. xi, where the same point is more fully elaborated: 'Viewed in the light of the unique personality of Christ, as depicted both in the common tradition embodied in the Synoptic Gospels and in the personal reminiscences underlying the Fourth Gospel, and also as presupposed by the united testimony of the Apostolic writers belonging almost to the same generation, the circumstances are such as to forbid the supposition that the facts of our Lord's life on which the fundamental truths of Christianity depend can have been the growth of mere tradition, or are anything else than strictly historical. The same canon of historical criticism which authorizes the assumption of tradition in the OT forbids it—except within the narrowest limits, as in some of the divergences apparent between the parallel narratives of the Gospels—in the case of the NT.'] This claim to be so nearly contemporary with the events of the Gospels may fairly be made for the testimony of St. Paul; and even if Dr. Zahn is right in refusing to follow the recent trend of criticism, which places the Apostle's conversion within a year or two of our Lord's death, it is certain that St. Paul must have been acquainted, at a very early date, with those who had known the Christ, and who had recognized and felt His power (Gal 1:18-19, Rom 16:7). Professor Schmidt has lately argued (*The Prophet of Nazareth*, p. 157) that as the distance of time increased between Jesus and the later Pauline literature, the term Son of God assumed more and more a metaphysical significance. But Professor Schmidt accepts Philippians as undoubtedly the work of St. Paul. How then does he deal with the great Christological passage, Php 2:6 ff.? We are simply informed that this passage may easily be an interpolation (p. 195 f.).

It seems to the present writer quite beside the mark to maintain that, in investigating the facts and beliefs which lie between a.d. 30-45, we have no contemporary documents, that, in fact, none exist, and that our only guide is inference based on later writings and developments.† [Note: This is apparently maintained by Dr.

Moffatt, Historical NT2, p. 66.] We have already seen the inferences to be derived from the statements in one of St. Paul's earliest and practically undoubted Epistles, 1 Th., and that these inferences of necessity presuppose a preaching and teaching considerably anterior in time to the actual date of the Epistle mentioned.

Moreover, we may well ask. What is meant by the word 'contemporary'? General Gordon was murdered in the Sudan in 1884. If a man wrote an account to-day of the closing years of Gordon's life, we should scarcely refuse to give it the title of a contemporary record.‡ [Note: Prebendary Sadler (The Lost Gospel, p. 196), writing in 1876, well asks if we should refuse to describe an account of the Crimean War (1854-1855) as a contemporary history.] But we are separated from the death of Gordon by a longer period of time than that which elapsed between the conversion of St. Paul and his earliest written testimony to the belief and practice of the primitive Church.§ [Note: In this connexion we may recall Renan's words, 'Jesus is known to us by at least one contemporary piece of evidence, that of St. Paul' (Histoire du Peuple d'Israel2. 1887, i. p. xviii).]

16. But, further, in any attempt to estimate, however briefly, the bearings of modern criticism, it must not be forgotten that the Gospels are now placed at a much earlier date than formerly. | | [Note: | An excellent summary of data bearing out this in connexion with prominent critics is given by Lepia, op. cit. p. xxxi. Cf. also Deissmann, 'Evangelium und Urchristentum,' in Beiträge zur Weiterentwicklung der Christlichen Religion, 1905; and also Harnack, Chron. i. pp. 654, 655. In this first volume Dr. Harnack (1897) places the Synoptic Gospels well within the 1st century, and a.d. 110 is assigned as the furthest limit for the Gospel of St. John with the Epistles of St. John and the Apocalypse. In this and in other respects great jubilation was raised at Dr. Harnack's conservatism; but he soon made it clear that the acceptance of the date or the authorship of a book by no means involves the acceptance of its contents. Huba's series of 'Helps to the Understanding of the Bible,' which has had a large circulation in Germany, is not very satisfactory in relation to the Gospels. Hühn, however, admits that the 'Logia' which were used by Matthew, if not composed by him, date before a.d. 70. Of the author of the Gospel of Mark he holds that nothing definite can be known; but at the same time he speaks of Matthew as composed after 70, and of Mark as being of an earlier date. Luke is the latest of the three, and, like so many advanced critics, Hühn places Luke after 70 on the ground of 21:21-24. But it does not increase our confidence in Hühn's researches when he places St. John's Gospel at 135-140, and gives as one of his chief reasons the passage Joh 5:43, in which he sees a reference to Bar Cochba (a.d. 132), who came 'in his own name,' and was recognized as the Messiah of the Jews (Das Neue

Testament, 1904, p. 13 ff.). In answer to Huhn's inference from Luk_21:21 see Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, 1898, p. 41.]

Strauss long ago maintained that the Gospel story would be impregnable if it was certain that it was written by eye-witnesses, or at all events by men who lived close to the events. And this hypothesis of Strauss has at least been verified to this extent in our day, by the acknowledgment that all three of the Synoptics rest in no small degree upon genuinely Apostolic sources. Even Jülicher, who places our First Gospel at the year 100 or thereabouts, admits that the writer used our Second Gospel and a collection of *Logia* made by St. Matthew; and in this Second Gospel he sees the work of John Mark, founded on reminiscences of the Petrine circle. And if, as is generally admitted, the writer of our Third Gospel employed Mark and the Matthaean *Logia* among his chief means of information, he, too, must have based a great part of his work upon two Apostolic sources.* [Note: See *Biblical World* (Chicago), December 1895, art. 'Sources of the Life of Christ,' by Professor Burton; and the *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1905, art. 'The Synoptic Gospels and Recent Literature,' pp. 416, 417.]

The force of St. Paul's contemporary testimony we have already noted, and we are now able to point in addition to the Apostolic sources underlying our Gospels. And thus we have a twofold guarantee against the alleged process of idealization which magnified by degrees the deeds and sayings of Jesus, a theory which, as M. Lepin observes, is urged by writers in many respects so far removed from each other as Schmiedel and Loisy.† [Note: cit. pp. xlviii-l.]

17. And if modern criticism has strengthened the external evidence for the early date of our Gospels, may we not say that it has strengthened the internal evidence also? If we turn, for example, to the Gospel of St. John, we find a remarkable testimony in Furrer's well-known *Leben Jesu Christi* (1905), a testimony the force of which is increased when we remember the writer's close acquaintance with the geography of the Holy Land. Thus Furrer speaks of the definite and exact geographical notices which are scattered up and down the pages of the Fourth Gospel, many of which we know only through the author of the book, and which correspond so thoroughly to the actual conditions.‡ [Note: See, further, Sanday, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 113.] The narrator must thus have been a man who was acquainted with the home of Jesus by his own personal observation, so that we have the feeling that we are able to realize the scenes as it were with our own bodily eyes. If we consider the picture drawn by the Synoptists, we are again struck with its vivid reality, its truthful correspondence to the conditions, social and political, of the country, its acquaintance with the religious parties of the Jews and the Messianic hopes of the people, with its curious mixture of a foreign civilization and government with the

hereditary customs and judicial procedure of the Jews. But the picture thus presented to us could not have been drawn except by the hands of men contemporary with the events which they purport to describe. It would have been impossible after the fall of Jerusalem in a.d. 70 and the entire *bouleversement* which that catastrophe caused, to recreate, as it were, the conditions which prevailed socially, politically, religiously before that capital event.* [Note: Swete, *Critical Questions*, pp. 47, 48; and Lepin, *op. cit.* pp. xxi-xxx.] This impression of truthfulness which the contents of our Gospels cannot fail to make, is witnessed to even in quarters in which we might not altogether expect it. Thus Jülicher speaks of our Gospels as of priceless value as authorities for the history of Jesus; and even if much of their data may be uncertain, Jülicher nevertheless maintains that 'the impression of the Saviour which they leave on the reader's mind is a faithful one; if the total picture of Jesus which we obtain from the Synoptics displays all the magic of reality, this ... is owing to the fact that they ... painted Jesus as they found Him already existing in the Christian communities, and that their model corresponded in all essentials to the original.'† [Note: See *Church Quarterly Review*, l.c. p. 411; and also Jülicher, *Einleitung in das NT* 3, p. 294.]

18. In concluding this article, it will not be unfitting, especially in a Dictionary devoted to the subject of 'Christ and the Gospels,' to emphasize once again the importance attached to the Person of Christ in the current literature of to-day. It would be easy to refer in this connexion to the statements made by representative writers in England and America. We turn, *e.g.*, to Professor Nash's *History of the Higher Criticism*, and we find him speaking (p. 25) of 'that Christ who is humanity's Amen to all the Divine promises'; or to Dr. P. Gardner's *Historic View of the NT*, and we find him maintaining (pp. 88-91) that the founder of Christianity stands above all other religious teachers.‡ [Note: In a noteworthy passage (*op. cit.* p. 100) the same writer says, after referring to the fact that Jesus does not use the phrase 'Our Father in heaven' as including both Himself and His disciples: 'It would not show a want of the critical spirit to go further than this, and to maintain with Professor Harnack that Jesus assigned a special significance to His death in relation to the forgiveness of sins, claimed an unique dignity as King and Lord, regarded His death as a passage to glory, and anticipated a speedy return to the earth as judge.' It is disappointing to read the next paragraph: 'Yet I cannot persuade myself that on strictly historical grounds these statements could be definitely established.'] Even Professor Schmidt can speak again and again of the wonderful personality of Jesus: 'While other teachers may and will do much for our modern world, the healing, purging, elevating influence of Jesus is of priceless value. No man can come into contact with him without feeling that life goes out of him' (*The Prophet of Nazareth*, p. 360).

At the Liverpool Church Congress, 1904, one of the speakers on NT criticism, Professor F. C. Burkitt, remarked at the close of his speech that the only time when Christians would have cause to be afraid was when the far off figure of Jesus Christ no longer attracted the critic and the student, but that there was no evidence that that day was within sight. The last statement finds ample corroboration in the English and German literature of to-day.[§] [Note: See, e.g., Fairbairn, *Christ in Modern Theology*, pp. 18, 21; and Sir Oliver Lodge in *Hibbert Journal*, Apr. 1906, p. 644, where he ‘accepts the general consensus of Christendom as testifying to the essentially Divine character of Christ.’] We may look again at the little series of popular books to which reference has been made as in progress of publication for the German people. One of them is entitled *Die Quellen des Lebens Jesu*, by Professor Wernle of Basle, whose name is widely known in England for his works on the Gospels and the Beginnings of the Christian Religion. Here again we find this same primary importance attached to the Life and Person of Jesus, in spite of so much which betrays impatience of any definite dogmatic teaching. Whatever else, in Wernle’s view, we may learn from St. Paul, we may at all events learn this, that in Jesus, notwithstanding the fact that He died a death of shame on the cross, St. Paul saw his own life and that of the world divided, as it were, into two parts—with Jesus, without Jesus. In Jesus we behold a man who helps us to understand aright ourselves, the world, and God; who accompanies us as the truest friend and guide in the needs and struggles of the present, and to whom we can entrust ourselves with all confidence for the future. In the same series Professor Pfleiderer, who discusses the preparation for Christianity, finds in the sentence, ‘The Word was made flesh,’ the dividing line between the many and varied speculations of philosophy and the full and actual manifestation of the Divine Logos in the life of the Son of God (*Vorbereitung des Christentums in der Griechischen Philosophie*, p. 66). Another writer, Dr. Bousset, to whom reference has been made, and who is also well known to English readers, expresses himself in the little book *Was wissen wir von Jesus?*, which H. Holtzmann recommends as the best guide-book for the German laity, in almost rapturous language:

‘Gradually there rises before us a Form in which the soul rejoices, the Form of the great liberator, the mighty opponent of all forms of Pharisaism, and at all times the great upholder of simplicity in religion. And more even than this: there stands before us the Form of Jesus the friend of sinners, the preacher of the forgiveness of sins, who in all the greatness of His own moral strength condescends with all the tenderness of a woman to the lost and the outcast, the Form of One who, conscious of victory, could unite His disciples to Himself by an everlasting bond when the last sad night of His earthly life had come and death stood before His eyes.’

In this Personality Bousset finds the true origin of Christianity. Other factors no doubt contributed, but there was one factor above and beyond them all, the Person of

Jesus. Jewish Messianic hopes, Greek philosophy, the social conditions of the Roman Empire, the organization and the spirit of the religious social clubs and of the mysteries, all these contributed. One by one, in a few graphic pages, Bousset passes them in review, and shows how each of them was insufficient alone, because each of them wanted the distinctive power which made Christianity all-sufficient and all-victorious, the power of a life-giving Personality, the possessor and the bestower of new spiritual agencies, the bringer of life out of death. In words of almost evangelical fervour Bousset proclaims the presence in history of this unique personal power. None can doubt the power of personality in the religious life, and all religions which occupy the foremost place in the world testify to this in some measure more or less.* [Note: This insistence upon the importance of the personal influence is again notably marked in one of the most recent of popular 'Lives' of Jesus by Dr. Furrer of Zurich. See. e.g., the closing page of his *Leben Jesu*, 1905, p. 261, in which, after insisting upon regarding Jesus as man, he ends, as he himself expresses it, with the confession of the centurion, 'This man was the Son of God.' Furrer's treatment of his theme is marked by reverence and sympathy, and he rightly points out that, until the heart is in sympathy, no justice can be done to the holiest portraiture of humanity (Vorwort, p. v).]

In face of such acknowledgments, we cease to wonder that von Soden in his recent *Die wichtigsten Fragen im Leben Jesu*, 1904, devotes so much of his book to a consideration of the Personality of Jesus (p. 82 ff.). Amongst other matters of varied interest, he points out that there is no evidence that Jesus was influenced in any direct manner by Buddha or Plato, or by Philo and his predecessors (p. 108). He was the child of His people and country, He knew no foreign literature (p. 109), He was far removed from any association with the hard and gloomy character of Pharisaic piety, but at the same time His life was in harmony with all that was best in the Jewish and Greek types of humanity, and von Soden concludes his book (p. 111) by saying that this Personality which was beyond the invention of the Evangelists, and which is presented to us in a picture which knows no flaw, is an irrefutable, integral fact, and *the wonder of wonders* in the world's history rich in wonders. (See, further, the same writer's *Urchristliche Literaturgeschichte*, p. 5).

Once more; we turn to H. Wendt, another German well known in England, not only by his works on the Teaching of Jesus and the Gospel of St. John, but by two lectures delivered in this country in 1904. He speaks of the significance of Jesus in revelation (*The Idea and Reality of Revelation*, p. 28 ff.). Jesus is for him the highest revelation of God, although not the only one.* [Note: In this book (p. 88) Wendt speaks of the Gospel type of Christian piety which has no analogy in other religions, and the significance of salvation by Jesus Christ is found in His revelation, as perfect Son of God, of God's fatherly love, and in the powerful impulse which He has exerted on

men to draw them into this blessed sonship. This Gospel type, he adds, has found its expression in Apostolic times in many great passages of the Pauline letters, and above all in the First Epistle of St. John, which Wendt regards as the genuine work of the disciple who stood nearest to Jesus, the most beautiful record of a mind directly inspired by His words and life.] At the foundation of all the forms of Christianity there is a reverence for Jesus Christ as Saviour and Mediator. And Wendt concludes by assuring us that a large number of the German theologians of to-day aspire to lead Christianity back to its original form, to the simplicity and sublimity of the primitive teaching of Jesus (p. 91). There is much in such acknowledgments which carries us back to the confession of A. Réville. For him 'Jesus is supremely great,' and he adds, 'Let us fear nothing as to the glory of the Son of Man. We owe it to Him, to the Divine ideal dwelling within Him, that we know ourselves to be the children of God; it is in His pure heart that love between God and man has been realized, and in this He possesses a crown which none can ever take from Him' (*History of the Doctrine of the Deity of Jesus Christ*, English translation p. 164).

In such utterances as these, which might be easily multiplied, although they fall very far short of the language of the Church and the Creeds, we mark how the interest of thoughtful minds in Germany, America, France, England is centred in the Person of Christ, and how also many of these writers whom we have mentioned admit that there was a relationship between Jesus and the Father so intimate as to be, if not metaphysical, yet at all events unique, and that this is conceded by critics who would depreciate St. Luke's opening narrative of the Gospel history or St. Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi (Mat 16:16).

And as we listen to such utterances, sometimes full of hope and confidence, sometimes full of pathos and tender religious feeling, we are conscious that the old question, 'Lord, to whom shall we go?' has not lost its interest for the world or for ourselves, and we thankfully recognize the acknowledgment rendered even by the spirit of criticism and inquiry, as it searches into the will and the teaching of Him who alone is the Revealer of the Father, 'Thou hast the words of eternal life.'

Literature.—Lichtenberger, *Hist. of Germ. Theol. in 19th Cent.*, English translation; Mill, *Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels*; Pflleiderer, *Development of Theology, Germany and Great Britain*; J. E. Carpenter, *The Bible in the Nineteenth Century*; Nash, *Hist. of the Higher Criticism*; Matheson, *Aids to the Study of Germ. Theol.*; Fairbairn, *Place of Christ in Mod. Theol.*, and *Philos. of Christ. Rel.*; Schwarz, *Zur Gesch. der neuesten Theol*; A. S. Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought* (Bampt. Lect. 1862); Plumptre, *Christ and Christendom* (Boyle Lect.); Nippold, *Hdbch. der neuesten Kirchengesch.* vol. iii. pt. 2; C. L. Broun, 'Protest. Crit. of NT in Germany,' *Interpreter*, vol. ii. No. 1; W. Adams Brown, *The Essence of Christianity*; Weinel, *Jesus im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*; N. Schmidt, *The Prophet of Nazareth*, p. 21 ff.;

Harnack, *Chronol. der Altchrist. Litt.* i., and *Das Wesen des Christentums*; Cremer, *A Reply to Harnack on the Essence of Christianity*, English translation; Walther, *Ad. Harnack's Wesen des Christentums für die Christliche Gemeinde geprüft*; Herrmann, *Communion with God*, English translation; Orr, *Christ. View of God and the World*, and *Ritschlianism: Expository and Critical Essays*; Garvie, *Ritschlian Theology*; Reischle, *Theol. und Religionsgesch.*; Söderblom, 'Religionen der Erde,' iii. Hett 3, in *Religionsgesch. Volksbücher* and other volumes in the same series, as, e.g., 'Der Ursprung des Buddhismus' by Hackmann, and 'Welche Religion hatten die Juden als Jesus auftrat?' by Hollmann; Bousset, 'Die Religionsgesch. und das NT' in *Theol. Rundschau*, July 1904 and following numbers; Cumont, *Les mystères de Mithra*; A. Jeremias, *Babylonisches im NT*; Gunkel, *Zum religionsgesch. Verständniss des NT*; 'Impressions of Christianity from the point of view of non-Christian Religions,' *Hibbert Journal*, July 1905 and following numbers; Farnell, *Evolution of Religion*; Jordan, *Comparative Religion*; Cheyne, *Bible Problems*; Westcott, *The Gospel of Life*; Wace, *Christianity and Agnosticism*; Illingworth, *Reason and Revelation*; Swete, *The Teaching of Christ*; Stalker, *The Christology of Jesus*; Godet, *Defence of the Christian Faith*, English translation; Row, *The Jesus of the Evangelists*; Stanton, *The Jewish and the Christian Messiah*; Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, i.; Heunecke, *Neutest. Apokryphen*, 1904; Baldensperger, *Die Messianisch-apokalyptischen Hoffnungen des Judenthums*; Schürer, *GJV* [Note: JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred]; Muirhead, *The Eschatology of Jesus*; Votaw, 'Modern Jewish View of Jesus,' *Biblical World*, xxvi. 2 [1905]; Sanday, *Inspiration, and Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*; J. A. Robinson, *Study of the Gospels*; Gore, *The Permanent Creed and the Christian Idea of Sin, Contentio Veritatis*, 1902; Headlam, *Critical Questions*, 1903; *Cambr. Theol. Essays* (esp. those by Chase, Mason, Foakes-Jackson); *Criticism of the NT* (St. Margaret's Lectures), 1903; W. M. Ramsay, *The Education of Christ*; P. Gardner, *A Historical View of the NT*, with Sanday's criticism in *JThSt* [Note: ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.] , Jan. 1902; Moffatt, *Historical NT*; von Soden, *Urchristliche Literaturgeschichte*; Gamble, *Christ and Criticism*; Loisy, *L'Évangile et l'Eglise*, and *Autour d'un petit livre*; Lepin (esp. in reply to Loisy), *Jésus Messie et Fils de Dieu*, 2nd and 3rd edd. [Note: editions or editors.]; T. A. Lacey, *Harnack and Loisy*; Hollmann, 'Leben und Lehre Jesu' in *Theol. Rundschau*, April 1904 and following numbers; Luthardt, *Gesammelte Vorträge*, pp. 3-173; G. Uhlhorn, *Das Leben Jesu in seinen neueren Darstellungen*; E. de Pressensé, *Jésus-Christ*, pp. 4-56; Annibale Fiori, *Il Christo della Storia e della Scrittura*, 1905; Vischer, 'Jesus und Paulus' in *Theol. Rundschau*, April, May, 1905; Feine, *Jesus und Paulus*; Deissmann, 'Evangelium und Urchristentum' in *Beiträge zur Weiterentwicklung der Religion*, 1905; M. Dais, *The Bible*. See, further, books mentioned above, and in artt. Birth of Christ, Gospels, etc.

R. J. Knowling.

☩ Cross, Cross-Bearing

CROSS, CROSS-BEARING.—For the historical aspects of the literal cross, see Crucifixion.

The English word ‘cross’ is from the Latin *crux* through the French *croix*, Old French and Middle English *crois*. But σταυρός (from ἵστημι) is not synonymous with *crux*, but was originally a wider term, and, like σκολοψ, meant a stake (Hom., Herod., Thuc., Xen.). In the NT, however (not present in LXX Septuagint), it is used only in the sense of *crux*.

This article deals only with the figurative uses of the term in the Gospels or in relation to the death of Christ on the cross as interpreted in the Acts and Epistles. For the archaeological and magical history of the sign of the cross outside as well as within the pale of Christianity, see Zöckler’s *Das Kreuz Christi* (1875 [English translation 1878]), Goblet d’Alviclla’s *Migration of Symbols* (1894), and his art. ‘Cross’ in Hastings’ forthcoming *Dictionary of Religion and Ethics*. The true mysticism in the cross of Christ as conceived by St. Paul comes properly before us.

1. The use of the word by Jesus in the sense of *cross-bearing*.—On three separate occasions Jesus spoke of cross-bearing as essential to discipleship. The first is in Mat 10:38, when He sent out the Twelve on a special preaching tour at the close of the Galilaean ministry, just a little over a year before His death. Meyer, *in loco*, considers this passage proleptically misplaced by St. Matthew, and thinks it should come after Mat 16:24. But there is no need of this supposition, for the figure of bearing one’s cross would be quite intelligible to Jews since the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, Alexander Jannaeus, and Varus. Josephus (*BJ* v. xi. 1) even says that Titus crucified so many that there were not places for the crosses, or crosses for the victims. The Jews themselves had not favoured crucifixion, save Alexander Jannaeus, the ‘Thracian’ in spirit. Broadus (on Mat 16:24) rightly denies that this saying of Jesus about bearing one’s cross is an anachronism before His own crucifixion. He did bear His own cross (Joh 19:17), perhaps the crosspiece properly speaking; but so did the criminals usually who were crucified, for Plutarch says: ἕκαστος κακούργων ἐκφέρει τὸν αὐτοῦ σταυρόν (*de Sera Num. Vind.* 9). It is a general illustration that the disciples could have easily understood, though they were not yet able to see the evident prophetic allusion to Christ’s own literal experience. It is not without special point that Jesus thus expressed the fundamental principle of self-sacrifice under the image of the cross. He did not plainly say that He would be crucified till shortly before His

death (Mat_20:19), but Jesus Himself is conscious of the death on the cross which ‘He himself will be called upon to endure’ (Meyer on Mat_16:24).

The second time that Christ spoke of cross-bearing was when He rebuked Peter for playing the part of Satan (Mar_8:34, Mat_16:24, Luk_9:23). On the first occasion the Master was giving directions to the disciples about their preaching, but here He addressed this vivid condition of discipleship ‘unto all’ (Luk_9:23) as a ‘deterrent in a high degree, suggesting a procession of *furciferi* headed by Jesus and consisting of His followers’ (Swete on Mar_8:34). Many of the followers of Judas and Simon in Galilee had been crucified (Josephus *Ant.* xvii. x. 10). St. Luke adds ‘daily,’ though the aorist term ἀράτω is used. The permanence of this cross-bearing is emphasized by the present tense of ‘follow’ (ἀκολουθεῖτω).

St. Luke alone gives the third use of the expression (Luk_14:27), and it is in Peraea, not long before the raising of Lazarus from the dead. In this instance βασιτάζω, not αἶρω, is used, the only NT example of the figurative, as Joh_19:17 is the only NT instance of the literal, use of the verb with σταυρός (Plummer, *Internat. Crit. Com. in loco*).

2. The term ‘*Crucified*’ comes to be a favourite one with the name of Jesus. The angels at the empty tomb speak of ‘Jesus the Nazarene, the Crucified One’ (Ἰησοῦν ἡγεῖτε τὸν Ναζαρηθὸν τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, Mar_16:6, Mat_28:5). St. Peter in his great address on the day of Pentecost charges the Jews with having crucified Jesus (Act_2:36). He repeats the charge when brought before the Sanhedrin (Act_4:10). St. Peter elsewhere always (Act_5:30; Act_10:39; 1Pe_2:24) speaks of Christ as hanging on a tree (ξύλον); but this non-classical use of ξύλον as equal to gibbet or cross (the stocks in Act_16:24) is found in the LXX Septuagint as translation for Heb. עֲצָוֶה (Gen_40:19 etc.). St. Paul so uses the term also in Act_13:29 and Gal_3:13 (quotation here from Deu_21:23). Each example in the NT is a quotation from the LXX Septuagint. But in the LXX Septuagint ξύλον does not refer to crucifixion, but rather to the prohibited nailing up of unburied bodies after the manner of the heathen nations (1Sa_31:10). But St. Paul speaks rather of ‘Christ crucified,’ more properly, ‘Christ as crucified’ (predicate), Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον (1Co_1:23), and once he sharply accents the idea by saying Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καὶ τοῦτον ἐσταυρωμένον (1Co_2:2), in opposition to his Judaizing opponents. This was his method of openly setting forth (προεγράφη) Jesus as crucified (Gal_3:1), like a public placard. The blindness of the enemies of Christ comes out in St. Paul’s use of the term with the Lord of glory (1Co_2:8), and

yet He was crucified in weakness (2Co_13:4). Rev_11:8 merely identifies Jerusalem as the city where Jesus was crucified.

3. The cross as *the epitome of the gospel*.—The disciples naturally passed to this idea when they came to understand the meaning of the death of Christ. The cross that had seemed the destruction of their hopes (Luk_24:21) now became the symbol of the gospel of grace. ‘But we preach Christ crucified’ (1Co_1:23), says St. Paul, as opposed to Jewish spectacular apocalyptic and Greek philosophizing; and he preached nothing else, not simply at Corinth, for he had done so at Athens (Act_17:31), and this was the settled purpose of his ministry (1Co_2:2). It was not the example of Jesus that St. Paul preached, but Jesus as the crucified Saviour, who, and not Paul, was crucified ‘in your behalf’ (1Co_1:13). It was, in fact, by His death on the cross that Jesus made the sacrifice for our sins, in our behalf, and in our stead. We are under (ὑπό) a curse (Gal_3:10), and Christ became a curse (κατάρα) for (ὑπέρ) us, and so redeemed us from (ἐκ) or out from under the curse of the Law (Gal_3:13). He became the curse, and came between us and the overhanging law of God.

This conception of the cross reappears in Col_1:20, where Jesus is said to have made peace and reconciliation with God possible according to the good pleasure of God ‘through the blood of his cross.’ The word ‘blood’ is probably used here to emphasize, against the early Docetic Gnostics, the reality of the human nature of Jesus. So in Col_2:14 by a vivid image the Law itself is represented as nailed to the cross with the body of Christ, and so taken out of the way and no longer binding on us as a means of salvation (cf. Rom_7:4). In Eph_2:16 the cross is presented as the basis for a double reconciliation, both with God and so with each other, ‘through the cross, having slain the enmity thereby.’ So both Jew and Gentile have ‘access in one Spirit unto the Father,’ and the middle wall of partition is broken down. They form one body in Christ, the Church of all the elect of which Christ is head, one new man. ‘The word of the cross’ (1Co_1:18), then, is St. Paul’s message to men. It was to proclaim this truth that Christ sent him forth (1Co_1:17); and this he will do by holding fast to the great essential fact rather than by fine-spun theories (1Co_1:17; 1Co_2:5), lest the gospel be emptied of all real power (κενωθῆ).

4. The *shame* of the cross.—It was a real shame that Jesus underwent when He suffered on the cross as a common malefactor. The Jews considered as accursed one whose dead body merely was hung upon a gibbet, and St. Paul recognized this shame as belonging to Jesus (Gal_3:13). Jesus not only foresaw the fact and the character of His death, but was fully aware of the shame of the cross. This death, called by Cicero ‘crudelissimum teterrimumque’ (*in Verr. v. 64*), had its side of glory to Jesus, who saw the joy in store at the end (ἀντι) of the race, and so consciously despised the

shame (Heb 12:2). Here σταυρός is used without the article, as in Php 2:8, ‘in order to fix attention on the nature of the death’ (Westcott). It is in Php 2:8 that the cross is used to express ‘the very lowest point of Christ’s humiliation’ (Vincent). Jesus became obedient μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ. It is the bottom rung in the ladder that led down from the throne of God. The cross was a real stumbling-block to the disciples themselves till they were convinced of the fact of the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. It remained to the unbelieving Jews an insuperable barrier. It was so when Jesus spoke of it before the event (Joh 12:32-34 ‘Who is this Son of man?’). St. Paul found that Christ crucified was to the sign-seeking Jews a stumbling-block (1Co 1:23). The writer of Hebrews (Heb 13:13) urges Christians to go outside the camp of Judaism, as Jesus suffered outside the gate, when it was clear that the two ways must part, ‘bearing his reproach.’ The follower of Jesus must not be ashamed of the shame of the cross. Some of the Judaizers, indeed, were not willing to ‘be persecuted for the cross of Christ’ (Gal 6:12), but St. Paul did not seek to escape ‘the stumbling-block of the cross’ (Gal 5:11). Indeed, some carried their dislike of the cross to the point of enmity (Php 3:18). These men would endure neither persecution nor self-denial. But the philosophical Greeks took the matter more lightly, and considered the preaching of the cross to be foolishness (1Co 1:18; 1Co 1:23), though in truth the cross reveals the hitherto hidden wisdom of God (1Co 2:6 f.).

While the Christian is to share the shame of the cross, he is not to add to the suffering of Christ by crucifying Him afresh (ἀνασταυρώω, Heb 6:6).

5. *The triumph of the cross over the flesh and the world.*—In a mystic, yet real, sense the Christian is crucified with Christ on the cross: Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι, St. Paul said of himself (Gal 2:20). It is ‘a real crucifixion of heart and will’ (Rendall). This spiritual crucifixion of the old man on the cross is the common experience of all genuine believers (Gal 5:24, Rom 6:6) who have died to sin and have entered into the new life in Christ as symbolized by baptism. In a word, the power of the world over St. Paul’s fleshly nature is broken by the cross of Christ. There is a double crucifixion between him and the world (Gal 6:14). The world in its sinful aspects is dead to him and he to it. Hence not only is St. Paul not ashamed of the cross of Christ, as the Judaizers are who are seeking to enslave the Gentiles to the ceremonial law (Gal 6:12), but he finds his only ground of glorying in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ (Gal 6:14). This sublime mysticism does not degenerate into magic and crucifixes. The true philosophy of the cross lies in the spiritual interpretation of man’s victorious conflict with sin, which is made possible by the shameful death of the Son of God on the cross as the supreme expression of the love of the Father for sinful men, and as the propitiatory sacrifice on the basis of which the repentant soul can

find access to the Father. The 'blood of the cross' lies at the root of redemptive grace as set forth by Jesus (Mat 26:28), by St. Peter (1Pe 1:2), by St. Paul (Rom 3:24 f.), by the writer of Hebrews (Heb 9:14), and by St. John (1Jn 1:7).

Mention should be made of the ingenious theory of Prof. C. C. Everett in his *Gospel of Paul*, which denies the penal character of the death of Christ on the cross, and sees in this supreme event only the ceremonial defilement which Christians share who take Christ as Lord and who thus likewise become accursed (Gal 3:13), and so have the power of the Law over them removed. But this theory misses the deeper aspects of the whole problem, by overstraining an incidental truth connected with the death of Christ on the cross. See the matter well disposed of by Bruce, *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, p. 184 ff.

Literature.—Zöckler, *Das Kreuz Christi* (1875); Brandt, *Die Evangelische Geschichte*, etc. (1893); Fulda, *Das Kreuz und die Kreuzigung* (1878); Lipsius, *de Cruce* (1595); Everett, *The Gospel of Paul* (1893); articles on 'Cross' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, in Smith's *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.], in Herzog's *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyclopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.], and in the *Encyc. Bibl.*; Cremer, *Bibl.-Theol. Lex. of NT Greek* (1892); the Lives of Christ and Paul; the critical Commentaries; the Biblical Theologies.

A. T. Robertson.

☩ Crowd

CROWD.—In many passages of the Gospels we read of the rapid gathering of a crowd around Jesus. The healing of the man with the withered hand seems to have been the first occasion on which a great company was drawn to Him by curiosity or by the hope of healing. 'His fame went throughout all Syria. The multitude was gathered from Galilee, Jerusalem, Judaea, Idumaea, and from the district round Tyre and Sidon; the whole country was moved (Mat 4:25, Mar 3:7-9, Luk 6:17-19). When Jesus retired for quiet to a desert place after receiving the news of the death of John the Baptist, He was followed by a crowd of five thousand people (Mat 14:14, Mar 6:34, Luk 9:11).

The words used for 'crowd' are ὄχλος and πλῆθος (both usually rendered 'multitude' in Authorized and Revised Versions, but in Mar 2:4; Mar 5:27; Mar 5:30, Luk 8:19; Luk 19:3, ὄχλος is translated 'press' [Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'crowd']).

In classical Greek πλῆθος means the common people, the *plebs*, as opposed to ὄχλος, the inchoate throng that comes together on any special occasion, the *turba*. But in

the NT the distinction is not uniformly maintained; in Mar_3:7-9 the words are used interchangeably. St. Luke is more exact in his use of language, and in Act_15:30 uses *πλήθος* in a technical sense, common enough in the inscriptions, as meaning the membership of a political or religious association in its totality (Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, English translation 232). The question arises whether there were any special circumstances in those days that favoured the coming together of such masses of people upon very short notice.

1. The Messianic expectation was the motive of many such gatherings. The misgovernment under the Herods had cast the nation's thoughts back upon God, and the Messianic hope awakened with new power. The attention that John the Baptist attracted was due to the belief that he was the Messiah, a belief that he took pains to shatter. To John there flocked at the outset of his ministry the people in the neighbourhood, but afterwards the movement reached the north and the inflammable Galilee. Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. v. 2) says that John was put to death because Herod feared lest the crowds he was gathering about him should 'put it into his power and inclination to raise a rebellion, for they seemed ready to do anything he should advise.' It was in consequence of a similar movement among the Samaritans that Pilate was recalled. The bloodshed with which the movement was checked led to an information being laid against him at Rome (Josephus *Ant.* xviii. iv. 2). It is clear from these incidents that the Messianic hope was very present with the people; and whenever the times raised up a man who seemed to have a distinctive message, the Jews were more than willing to flock to listen to him.

2. The splendid road system of Palestine facilitated the gathering of such crowds. The Romans made their roads partly on commercial grounds, and partly to permit of the passage of troops among the turbulent people. The commerce of the country must have been considerable in spite of the grinding taxation. Herod's annual income (Josephus *Ant.* xvii. xi. 4) was 900 talents, nearly £400,000 of our money. The regular raising of such a sum implies a settled trade, and much coming and going between different parts of the country. The excellence of the roads is borne witness to by the fact that the Roman procurator, who resided at Caesarea, could reach Jerusalem with troops by way of Antipatris in less than twenty-four hours. The distance is about sixty miles. Along these splendid roads the crowd would stream on the first hint of the appearance of one who might be the Messiah.

3. The small size of the country must also be remembered. Palestine bulks so large in spiritual significance that one is apt to forget how small it is. And yet from the shore of the Dead Sea one may view the glittering snow of Hermon, while from the hill above Nazareth may be seen on the one hand the ships in the Mediterranean, and on the other the rolling hills of Gilead. This land, only about $\frac{1}{6}$ th the size of England,

was densely populated. To-day its population is a little over 600,000, but in OT and Roman times must have been very much larger. 2Sa 24:9 implies a population of 6,500,000; and, while it may be questioned whether the land ever could have carried so great a population as this, it is clear, both from the notices in history and from the existing ruins, that the desolations of to-day were formerly densely peopled. The population in the time of Christ is generally reckoned to have been about 2½ millions (Sanday, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, p. 16). See, further, art. Multitude.

R. Bruce Taylor.

☩ Crown Of Thorns

CROWN OF THORNS (στέφανος ἐξ ἀκανθῶν or ἀκάνθινος στέφανος, Mat 27:29, Mar 15:17, Joh 19:2; Joh 19:5).—This was plaited by the soldiers and placed on Christ's head in mockery of His claim to Kingship, after Pilate had condemned Him to be scourged. It was a garland hastily twisted from the twigs of some thorny plant, which it is difficult now to identify. Tristram (*Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 429) supposes it was the thorn-tree or *nubk* of the Arabs, which is very common in the warmer parts of Palestine. It abounds near Jerusalem, grows to a great size; its twigs are tough and pliant, and the spikes very sharp and numerous. Others incline to think it was the *Zizyphus Spina-christi*, a spiny plant covered with sharp prickles. The purpose of the soldiers was rather, perhaps, mockery of the Jews than cruelty to Christ. Pliny speaks (*HN*) of 'the meanest of crowns, a thorny one.'

In the writings of St. Paul a crown is promised to faithful followers of Christ, and in many parts of the NT Christ Himself is spoken of as wearing a crown. Sometimes the word for a victor's wreath is used (στέφανος), and sometimes that for a royal crown (διάδημα).* [Note: The distinction between στέφανος, the badge of merit, and διάδημα, the badge of royalty, is not consistently observed in Hellenistic Greek (see *Encyc. Bibl.* i. 963).] The emblematic significance, afterwards seen by the Church in the crown of thorns, is possibly hinted at in Heb 2:9 'crowned with glory and honour.' As a sacrificial victim, in being led out to death, often wore a garland of flowers, so Jesus, in the eyes of God and His own disciples, even in suffering the deepest humiliation, wears a crown of glory. In the death of Christ His Church sees mankind crowned with life, because the law of sin and death was thereby abrogated, and the Kingdom of heaven opened to all believers. The thorns with which a hostile world pierced the Saviour's brows are an emblem of the sin of man, the curse of thistles and thorns having been threatened after the Fall (see Dr. H. Macmillan's *Ministry of*

Nature, ch. v., where this idea is finely worked out). But these wounds become the world's salvation. Through the sinful cruelty of man new life comes to a condemned world. God thus makes the wrath of man to praise Him. What was meant as derision is really a prediction of glory. See also art. Thorn.

David M. W. Laird.

☩ Crucifixion

CRUCIFIXION.—Crucifixion was originally an Oriental punishment. It was practised by the Persians (Herod. ix. 122), by the Phœnicians and their colonists the Carthaginians (Valer. ii. 7), and by the Egyptians (Thuc. iv. 110). It was practised also by the Greeks, probably in imitation of the Persians (Plut. *Alex.* [Note: Alexandrian.] 72. § 2), and by the Romans, who, though Cicero ascribes its introduction to Tarquinius Superbus, probably learned it from their enemies the Carthaginians. Regarding it, however, as an ignominious doom, the Romans reserved it for slaves (whence it was called *servile supplicium*), the worst sort of criminals such as robbers (Sen. *Ep.* vii.), and provincials. To inflict it on a Roman citizen was reckoned an impiety (Cic. *in Verr.* v. 66). It was a horrible punishment. Cicero designates it *crudelissimum teterrimumque supplicium*. The verb cognate to *crux*, 'cross,' was *cruciare*, 'to torture' (cf. 'excruciating').

There were two kinds of cross:

1. The *crux simplex*, which was a single stake. Sometimes the victim was fastened to it by his hands and feet, the former being extended above his head. Usually, however, it was a sharpened stake (σκόλοψ), and the victim was impaled upon it. It passed through the length of his body, issuing from his month. Cf. Sen. *Ep.* xiv.: 'adactum per medium hominem qui per os emergat stipitem'; cf. *de Consol. ad Marc.* xx. The former method was called *affixio*, the latter *infixio*.

2. The *crux compacta*, which was composed of two pieces. It had three forms: (1) The *crux decussata* X, called also the *crux Andreana*, because it is said to be the cross on which St. Andrew suffered at Patrae. It was this form of cross that the Fathers had in view when in the crossing of Jacob's hands as he blessed Ephraim and Manasseh (Gen 48:13-14) they saw a prophecy of the Crucifixion. Cf. Tert. *de Bapt.* § 8; Isid. *Pel. Epp.* i. 362. (2) The *crux commissa* or St. Anthony's cross, resembling the letter T. Cf. Barn. *Ep.* § 9; Luc. *Jud. Vocal.* § 12. The upright was called *stipes* or *staticulum*, and the transom *patibulum* or *antenna*. (3) The *crux immissa*, which had the top of the upright protruding above the transom, †; From the middle of the

upright there projected a peg, the seat (*sedile*) or horn (*cornu*), on which, to support its weight, the body rested as on a saddle. Cf. Iren. *adv. Haer.* ii. 36. § 2: ‘Ipse habitus crucis fines et summitates habet quinque, duos in longitudine et duos in latitudine, et unum in medio in quo requiescat qui clavis affigitur’; Just. Mart. *Dial. circa (about) Tryph.* p. 318 C (ed. Sylburg.): τὸ ἐν τῷ μέσῳ πηγνύμενον ὡς κέρασ καὶ ἰ αὐτὸ ἔξεχον ἐστίν, ἐφ’ ᾧ ἐποχοῦνται οἱ σταυροῦμενοι.

It was generally assumed in early times that the cross on which Jesus suffered was a *crux immissa*. Thus Augustine (*in Psalm.*, ciii. § 14) finds in Eph 3:18 a mystic allusion to the cross: ‘breadth’ being the transom on which His hands were outstretched; ‘length,’ the upright on which His body was fastened; ‘height,’ the head of the upright protruding above the transom; ‘depth,’ the lower end buried in the earth. And it is a confirmation of this opinion that the board inscribed with His name and accusation was put up over His head (Mat 27:37), apparently on the projection of the upright.

The early Apologists fancifully defended the sacred symbol of the cross against the sneers of unbelievers by pointing to its appearance everywhere, as though nature and art alike did homage to it. It is seen in the quarters of the heaven, two transverse lines, as it were, running from N. to S. and from E. to W.; in a bird soaring upward with spread wings; in a man swimming or praying with outstretched hands; in the nose and eyebrows of the human face; in a ship’s mast and yard; in a galley’s oars projecting on either side; in the yoke of a plough and the handle of a spade; in the shape of trophies and *fascies*.* [Note: Mart. Apol. ii., ed. Sylburg. p. 90 C-E; Tert. Apol. § 16; Jer. on Mar 15:21. Cf. Lips, de Cruc. i. ix.] See Tree.

The *cruciarus* was spared no circumstance of ignominy. He was required to carry the transom to the place of execution;† [Note: de Ser. Num. Vind. § 9; Artemidor. Oneir. ii. 61; Wetstein on Mat 10:38.] he was driven thither with goad and scourge along the most frequented streets, that the populace might profit by so signal an exhibition of the terrors of justice; and a herald went before, bearing a board whereon the victim’s name and offence were inscribed.‡ [Note: HE v. 1; Lightfoot on Mat 27:31.] Thus burdened and tormented, Jesus went His sorrowful way from the Praetorium till He reached the gate of the city (Mat 27:32); and there His strength failed, and He could go no farther. Tradition has it that He fell. The soldiers relieved Him of His burden, and, impressing Simon of Cyrene, laid it on his shoulders. Even then Jesus was unable to walk unsupported, and had to be borne along to the scene of His crucifixion. Cf. Mar 15:22 φέρουσιν αὐτόν.

On arrival at the place of execution (See Golgotha), four soldiers were told off by the centurion in charge to do the work (cf. Joh 19:23). They proceeded in the customary way. First of all, the *cruciarus* was stripped naked, his garments being regarded as the rightful perquisites of his executioners.* [Note: Wetstein on Mat 27:35.] Then he was laid on his back over the transom and his hands fastened to either end. Thereafter the transom was hoisted on the upright and his feet were fastened to the latter. Usually the hands were nailed through the palms and the feet were fixed either by two nails, one through each instep, or by a single nail transfixing both through the Achilles tendon; sometimes, however, the hands and feet were simply tied.† [Note: Lips, de Cruc. ii. viii.] Though less painful at the moment, the latter was the more terrible method, since it protracted the victim's sufferings. He hung till he died of hunger and exhaustion, or was devoured by birds and beasts of prey.‡ [Note: ib. xii.-xiii.] The hands of Jesus were certainly nailed, but it seems that His feet were only tied (cf. Joh 20:20; Joh 20:25; Joh 20:27).§ [Note: Ev. Petr. § 6: τότε ἀτέσασαν τοὺς ἦλους ἀπὸ τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ Κυρίου] The sole Evangelic authority for supposing that they were nailed is Luk 24:39 [40], which is probably assimilated to Psa 22:16. From two circumstances, (1) that a soldier could reach the lips of Jesus with a short reed (Mat 27:48 = Mar 15:36 = Joh 19:29), and (2) that wild beasts could tear out the entrails of the *cruciarus* as he hung, | [Note: | Cf. Lips. de Cruc. ii. xiii.] it appears that the cross was of no great height. It was enough if the feet cleared the ground.

There was a humane custom among the Jews, based on Pro 31:6, that a potion of medicated wine should be administered to the *cruciarii* in order to deaden their sensibility. The merciful draught was provided by a society of charitable ladies in Jerusalem.¶ [Note: Lightfoot on Mat 27:34; Wetstein on Mar 15:23. See art. Gall.] It was offered to Jesus ere the nails were driven through His hands, and He raised it to His thirsty lips; but on tasting what it was He would not drink it. What was His reason for rejecting it? It was not that the endurance of physical pain was necessary to the efficacy of His sacrificial death; ** [Note: * Cf. Calv.: 'Nam et haec pars sacrificii et obedientiae ejus erat, languoris moram ad extremum usque sufferre.'] nor was it merely that He had a sentimental repugnance to the idea of dying in a state of stupefaction.† [Note: † Cf. Dr. Johnson: 'I will take no more physic, not even my opiates; for I have prayed that I may render up my soul to God unclouded.'] It was rather because He was bent on doing to the last the work which had been given Him to do. It was well for the penitent brigand that Jesus did not drink the potion.

It was usual for the victims of that frightful punishment, maddened by terror and pain, to shriek, entreat, curse, and spit at their executioners and the bystanders;‡

[Note: ‡ Cf. Cic. in Verr. i. 3, pro Cluent. 66; Jos. BJ iv. vi. 1, vii. vi. 4; Sen. de Vit. Beat. 19.] but Jesus endured the torture meekly. A cry broke from His lips as they were hammering the nails through His hands; but it was a prayer—not an appeal to them for mercy on Himself, but an appeal to God for mercy on them: ‘Father, forgive them: for they know not what they are doing.’§ [Note: § Luk_23:34, an interpolation, but unquestionably an authentic fragment of the Evangelic tradition. Cf. Wfi, Notes.] The transom with its quivering load was hoisted on the upright, and there He hung, conscious of all that passed around Him. It is said that St. Andrew, as he hung upon his cross at Patrae, taught the people all the while;||| [Note: ||| Ahdiae, Hist. Apost. iii. 41.] and Jesus also in His anguish was mindful of others. Two brigands had been crucified with Him, two of those outlaws who infested the steep road from Jericho to Jerusalem, and by their deeds of violence gave it the grim name of ‘the Ascent of Blood’ (cf. Luk_10:30); and when one of them, recognizing the majesty of the meek Sufferer, turned to Him and prayed Him to remember him when He ‘came in his kingdom,’ He granted more than he sought, promising him a place that very day in Paradise. And He thought of His mother, as she stood by distracted with grief, and commended her to the care of the beloved disciple. While He hung, He was compassed with insults. The Jewish rulers, exulting in their seeming triumph, mocked Him, and the multitude joined in the poor sport. So did the soldiers who were charged with the duty of watching the crosses lest a rescue should be attempted.* [Note: Petron. Sat.: ‘Cruciarum unius parentes ut viderunt nocturnam laxatam custodiam, detraxere pendentem’; Jos. Vit. 75: three cruciarum taken down; one recovered from his wounds.] Heated by their labour, they were refreshing themselves from their jar of *posea*, the vinegar which was the only drink allowed to soldiers on duty (See Vinegar). Jesus was in their eyes a pretender to the Jewish throne, a rebel against the imperial government; and, hearing the gibes of the rulers, they joined in, and, holding up their cups in mock homage, drank His Majesty’s health (Luk_23:36).

Crucifixion was a lingering doom. The victims sometimes hung for days ere they died of hunger, exhaustion, loss of blood, and the fever of their wounds,† [Note: Lips, de Cruc. ii. xii.] unless they were despatched either by a spear-thrust or by the *coup de grace* of the *crurifragium*, a brutality which the Romans practised usually on slaves, beating the life out of them by shattering blows with a heavy mallet.‡ [Note: ib. xiv.] It was, however, contrary to the Jewish law (Deu_21:23; Deu_21:23) that they should hang overnight; and it was the more necessary that the requirement should be observed in this instance, since the next day was not only the Sabbath but the Sabbath of the Paschal week, a day of special solemnity (Joh_19:31). Therefore the rulers waited on Pilate, and requested that Jesus and the brigands might be despatched by the *crurifragium*, and their bodies taken down from the crosses ere 6 o’clock that evening, when the Sabbath would begin. Pilate consented, and the

soldiers set about the brutal work. They despatched the two brigands, but when they came to Jesus, He was already dead. There was no need to strike Him with the mallet; but one of them, to ensure that He was really dead, drove his spear into His side. See Blood and Water.

The prominent characteristic of crucifixion was the ignominy of it (cf. Gal 3:13, Heb 12:2). This constituted ‘the stumbling-block of the cross’ (Gal 5:11) in Jewish eyes. Since it was expected that the Messiah would be a glorious and victorious King, it seemed incredible that one who was slain, and not only slain but crucified, should be the Messiah. In the eyes of the NT writers, on the contrary, its very ignominy constituted its supreme suitability to the Messiah. It identified Him utterly with sinners, making Him a sharer in the worst extremity of their condition. St. John recognized a providential dispensation in the enslavement of the Jews to the Romans, inasmuch as it brought about the Crucifixion (Joh 18:31-32). Had they been free, Jesus would have been stoned as a blasphemer; but since they were vassals of Rome, it was not lawful for them to put any one to death (Joh 18:31). The Sanhedrin’s sentence had to be referred to the procurator. It was invalid without his ratification, and it was executed by his authority after the Roman manner.

It is remarkable that, unlike the mediaeval artists, who loved to depict the Man of Sorrows as He hung on the cross abused and bleeding, the Evangelists have drawn a veil over the scene, detailing none of the ghastly particulars, and saying merely: ‘They crucified him.’ They recognized in the Crucifixion not the triumph of human malice but the consummation of a Divine purpose—‘the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God’ (Act 2:23). At the moment all was dark to the disciples; but when their minds were illumined by the Holy Spirit, they saw not only ‘the sufferings that befell Messiah’ but ‘the glories that followed these’ (1Pe 1:11). Their Lord had never seemed so kingly in their eyes as when He ‘reigned from the tree.’* [Note: To the LXX version of Psa 96:10 many codices add ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου after ὁ Κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν. So Old Lat. and Copt. versions, Just. Mart., Tert, Aug.; cf. Venant. Fortunat. Hymn. de Pass. Dom.:

‘Impleta sunt quae concinit

David fideli carmine,

Dicens: In nationibus

Regnavit a ligno Deus.’]

In early days, according to some authorities, Luk_9:31 ran: 'They were speaking of *the glory* which He was about to fulfil at Jerusalem.'† [Note: in Matth. lvii.: τὴν δόξαν ἣν ἐμδλλε σληροῦν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ. τούτεστιν, τὸ πάθος καὶ τὸν σταυρόν. οὕτω γὰρ αὐτὸ καλοῦσιν ἀεὶ. Euth. Zig. on Mat_17:3: τινὰ δὲ τῶν βιβλίων οὐκ ἔξοδον ἀλλὰ δόξαν γράφουσι. δόξα γὰρ καλεῖται καὶ ὁ σταυρός.] So Chrysostom quotes the passage; and this is the constant conception of the NT. 'We look upon Jesus,' says the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 'because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour' (Heb_2:9; cf. Php_2:8 f.).

Throughout His ministry Jesus recognized the inevitable necessity of His Passion. He had come to die. Cf. Mat_9:15 = Mar_2:20 = Luk_5:35; Mat_16:21 = Mar_8:31 = Luk_9:22; Mat_17:22-23 = Mar_9:31 = Luk_9:44; Mat_20:18; Mat_20:13 = Mar_10:33-34 = Luk_18:32-33. As early as the close of the 2nd cent. Celsus stumbled at the idea that Jesus foreknew and foretold all that happened to Him (Orig. *circa (about) Cels.* ii. 13). Strauss pronounces those intimations mere *vaticinia ex eventu*. A crucified Messiah was 'to Jews a stumbling-block and to Gentiles foolishness' (1Co_1:23); and the Apostles, eager to remove 'the stumbling-block of the Cross,' represented the Crucifixion as no ignominious catastrophe, but 'a link in a chain of higher knowledge, part of a Divine plan of salvation.' Keim, on the other hand, regards the announcement as 'the expression of a natural, reasonable, correct anticipation,' suggested by the fate of the Baptist and the difficulties wherewith Jesus was beset. The definite details, however, must be pruned away. In point of fact, the Lord's prescience of the end is inextricably interwoven with the Gospel history. The cross was His goal, and He knew it all along.

Literature.—In addition to the works quoted in the art. and the standard *Lives* of Christ, reference may be made to Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, 'The Crucifixion'; Newman, *Selected Sermons*, pp. 175-188; Liddon, *Bampton Lect.*⁸ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 472 ff.; Farrar, *Christ in Art*, pp. 389-423; Dale, *Atonement*⁷ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 436 ff.

David Smith.

CRUSE.—The word occurs frequently in the OT (generally as rendering of Heb. פִּתְיוֹת), where it means a ‘small earthen bottle or jar’ in common use among the Hebrews chiefly for holding liquids, such as water (1Sa_26:11) or oil (1Ki_17:12). ‘Cruse’ (marg. ‘flask’) is substituted by Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 for ‘box’ of Authorized Version in Mat_26:7 (|| Mar_14:3, Luk_7:37) as the designation of the ἀλάβαστρος used by the woman who anointed our Lord. See Alabaster and Anointing.

Dugald Clark.

☞Cry

CRY.—The term ‘cry’ occurs in the NT with various shades of meaning corresponding to different Greek words, which express sometimes articulate, sometimes inarticulate utterances; in some cases it connotes strong emotion, in others a more or less heightened emphasis is all that is expressed.

According to classical usage, the Gr. terms employed in the NT may be thus distinguished: ‘καλεῖν denotes “to cry out” for a purpose, to *call*; βοᾶν, to cry out as a manifestation of feeling; κροᾶζειν, to cry out harshly, often of an inarticulate and brutish sound’ (Grimm-Thayer, s.v. βοᾶω), κραυγαζειν is the intensive of κροᾶζειν. The corresponding nouns are βοή, ‘a cry for help,’ and κραυγή, ‘outcry, clamour’ (both rare in NT). To these should be added the use of φωνεῖν = ‘to cry’ (most freq. in Lk.).

In classifying the NT usage of the term, it will be convenient to group the instances in each case under the Greek equivalents.

A. (1) ‘to cry’ or ‘cry out’ (= κροᾶζειν, ἀνακροᾶζειν:

(a) of *articulate cries*, followed by words uttered (often with ‘saying’ or ‘and said’ added): of *joy*, Mar_11:9 and ||; Mat_21:15 (children crying in the temple, ‘Hosanna’); of *complaint or distress*, Mar_10:48 || Luk_18:39, Mat_20:31 (Bartimaeus); Mat_14:30 (Peter crying out while walking on the water);* [Note: Probably here should be added Mat_15:23 (‘she crieth after us’), where articulate cries seem to be meant, though the words uttered are not given.] Mar_1:23 || Luk_4:33 (ἀνέκροαξεν; Lk. adds ‘with a loud voice’); Mar_9:24; Luk_4:41 (demons crying out and saying), cf. Mar_3:11; Mar_5:7; of the *angry cries* of the multitude,

Mat_27:23, Mar_15:13-14† [Note: In || passages Luk_23:21 has ἑτερόφουνον λέγοντες, Joh_19:6 ἐκράυασαν λέγοντες.] (cf. Act_21:36); *in ref. to Jesus*, of solemn and impressive utterance, Joh_7:37 (cf. Joh_1:15; Joh_7:28; Joh_12:44).

(b) *of inarticulate cries: with ref. to the possessed*, Mar_5:5 (cf. Luk_8:28 ἀνακράξας); Mar_9:26 || Luk_9:39; *of the disciples*, Mat_14:28 ('and they cried out for fear'); *with ref. to Jesus*, of the cry on the cross (prob. inarticulate), Mat_27:50 ('cried ... with a loud voice, and yielded up his spirit').‡ [Note: In the || passages Mar_15:37 has ἀφείλς φωνήν μεγάλην, and Luk_23:46 φωνήσας φωνη μεγάλη.]

(2) 'To cry' or 'cry out' (= κραυγάζειν):

(a) *of articulate utterances* [cf. (1) (a)]: of joy, Joh_12:13 ('Hosanna'); of distress, Mat_15:22 (Canaanitish woman ... 'cried, saying': cf. v. 23); *with ref. to Jesus*, of utterance under strong emotion, Joh_11:43 ('Lazarus, come forth!').

(b) *of undefined or inarticulate utterance*: in the quotation from Isa_42:2, cited in Mat_12:19 ('He shall not strive nor cry' [κραυγάσει], *i.e.* indulge in clamorous self-assertion).

(c) 'Cry' = κραυγή: 'the loud cry of deeply stirred feeling of joyful surprise': Luk_1:42 (Elisabeth's greeting of the Virgin-mother: 'she lifted up her voice with a loud cry'); the midnight cry, Mat_25:6 ('Behold the bridegroom cometh').

For Heb_5:7 see below under B.

(3) 'To cry' or 'cry out' (= βοᾶν, ἀναβοᾶν, ἐπιβοᾶν):

(a) *of articulate utterances*: of solemn and impressive *emphasis* (= to speak with a high, strong voice), Mat_3:3 || Mar_1:3, Luk_3:4, Joh_1:23 (all in the quotation from Isa_40:3 'the voice of one crying,' etc.); of *distressful appeal*, Luk_9:38; esp. 'to cry for help to' (= קרא ל in OT), Luk_18:7 (the elect who day and night); *ref. to Jesus*, of the cry of agony on the cross ('My God, my God,' etc.), Mar_15:34 and || Mat_27:48.

In this connexion the passage in Jam_5:4 deserves notice: 'Behold the hire of your labourers ... crieth out (κράζει); and the cries (βοαι) of them that reaped have entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth.' Here the verb is used of crying for vengeance

(cf. Hab 2:11) and the noun (βοαι) of cries for help. The latter sense is esp. frequent in the Psalms (e.g. Psa 5:2; Psa 18:6; Psa 18:41 etc.), corresponding to the Heb. שָׁחַ and derivatives. This word is ‘used exclusively of crying for help’ (Driver).[§] [Note: Parallel Psalter, p. 441.] Though frequent in the Psalms (LXX Septuagint and Heb.), it occurs rarely in the NT.

(b) of *cries of joy, pain* (inarticulate): of *joy*, Gal 4:27 (quotation from Isa 54:1); cf. of *pain*, Act 8:7 (of unclean spirits crying with a loud voice).

(4) ‘To cry,’ ‘cry out,’ or ‘cry aloud’ (= φωνεῖν, ἐπιφωνεῖν):

(a) *emphatic*, followed by words uttered, Luk 8:8; Luk 8:54; cf. Luk 1:42 (ἀνεφώνησεν, ‘she spake out,’ Authorized Version ; ‘lifted up her voice,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885); of *angry cries of multitude* (ἐπιφωνεῖν), Luk 23:21.

(b) of the *inarticulate cries* of the possessed, Mar 1:23 (‘and the unclean spirit ... crying with a loud voice’).

(c) ‘cry’ = φωνή, esp. in the phrase φωνῆ μεγάλη, ‘with a loud voice or cry,’ added to verbs.

B. ‘Crying’ in Heb 5:7.—This passage, which has direct reference to our Lord, calls for special notice here: ‘Who, in his days of flesh, having offered up, with strong crying (μὲτὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς) and tears, prayers and supplications unto him that was able to save him out of death,’ etc. The ref. is doubtless primarily to Gethsemane (so Delitzsch, Westcott), though ‘a wider application of the words to other prayers and times of peculiar trial in our Lord’s life’* [Note: Westcott.] is not excluded. Schoettgen (*ad loc.*)† [Note: Cited in Westcott, *ib.*] quotes a Jewish saying which strikingly illustrates the phrase: ‘There are three kinds of prayers, each loftier than the preceding: prayer, crying, and tears. Prayer is made in silence; crying, with raised voice: but tears overcome all things.’ The conjunction of the terms mentioned often occurs in OT, esp. in the Psalms, e.g. Psa 39:13 :

‘Hear my *prayer*, O Lord,

And give ear unto my *cry* (שׁוֹעֵתִי);

Hold not thy peace at my *tears*.’

Also [Psa_61:2](#), and cf. [Psa_80:5-6](#).

The close association of the idea of prayer with that of ‘crying’ or ‘cry’ may be illustrated from the Gospels, esp. perhaps in the case of our Lord’s cries on the cross ([Mat_27:46](#); [Mat_27:50](#), [Luk_23:46](#)). According to Jewish tradition, in the solemn prayer for forgiveness uttered by the high priest on the Day of Atonement in the Holy of Holies, the words כפר השם אֱלֹהֵינוּ ‘O Lord, forgive,’ were spoken with heightened voice, so that they could be heard at a distance.

Literature.—Art. ‘Call’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible i. 343f., and the *Gr. Lexicons* under the various Gr. terms (esp. Grimm-Thayer).

G. H. Box.

☞Cubit

CUBIT.—See Age, and Weights and Measures.

☞Cummin

CUMMIN.—Cummin (or cumin) is the seed of the *Cuminum cyminum*, an annual herbaceous umbellifer. It has a slender, branching stem, and grows to the height of a foot. The seeds, which are ovoid in form, are strongly aromatic, and have a flavour not unlike that of caraway, but more pungent. Cummin was used by the Jews as a condiment, and also for flavouring bread. It has carminative and other medicinal properties, and was employed not only as a remedy for colic, but also to stanch excessive bleeding, and to allay swellings. It is indigenous to Upper Egypt and the Mediterranean countries, but it was also cultivated from early times in Western Asia, India, and China.

Cummin is mentioned twice in the Bible ([Isa_28:25-27](#) בַּסִּיחַ, and [Mat_23:23](#) κῦμινον). In the latter passage Jesus rebukes the Pharisees, because they paid tithe of mint, and anise, and , and omitted the weightier matters of the Law.

Literature.—*Encyc. Brit. s.v.*; Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*.

☩ Cup

CUP (ποτήριον, in general significance corresponding to the Heb. כּוּפּ and so used in the LXX Septuagint ; Vulgate equivalent is *calix*).

1. *Literal*.—A few references to the cup as a vessel in common use occur in the Gospels: Mar_7:3-4, Mat_10:42 (= Mar_9:41) Mat_23:25-26 (= Luk_11:39). The first of these passages is plainly an explanatory parenthesis furnished by the Evangelist for the information of readers unacquainted with Jewish customs. ποτήρια, he says, are amongst the things subject to ‘washings’ (βαπτισμοί)—which washings I were not such as simple cleanliness required, but were prescribed by the decrees ‘intended to separate the Jew from all contact with the Gentiles.’ The Talmudic tractate *Kelim* names seven kinds of things requiring such ceremonial purification, and amongst them are earthenware vessels and vessels of bone, metal, and wood. Resting on such Levitical prescriptions as are to be found in Leviticus 11 and Numbers 31, the purification of vessels was carried to the furthest extreme of stringent requirement by ‘the tradition of the elders.’ Vessels that had in any way come into contact with the common people (*‘am hâ’ârez*) were on that account to be cleansed. (Maimonides, *Yad. Mishkab and Moshab*, 11. 11, 12, 18).

The words of Jesus in Mat_23:25-26 are simply an instance of the use of a homely figure to express hypocrisy.

2. *Figurative*.—Our Lord uses the familiar Heb. figure of a ‘cup’ to denote the experience of sorrow and anguish in two instances: (1) in His challenge to James and John, checking their ambition (Mar_10:36; Mar_10:39 = Mat_20:22-23, ‘Are ye able to drink the cup which I drink?’); and (2) in connexion with His Passion, both in His cry of agony (Mar_14:36 || in Mt. and Lk. ‘this cup’), and in His calm rebuke of Peter’s hasty attempt to defend Him against His captors (Joh_18:11 ‘The cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?’). In each case there is the same reference to His singular experience of bitter sorrow which was no mere ‘bitterness of death.’

It is noticeable that in the Gospels the use of this figure occurs only in connexion with trouble and suffering. In the OT the use is much wider. Experiences of joy, blessing, and comfort are thus expressed (e.g. Psa_16:5; Psa_23:5; Psa_116:13, Jer_16:7), as well as those of trembling, desolation, and the wrath of God (Isa_51:17 ff., Jer_25:15 ff., Eze_23:32 ff., Zec_12:2). Rabbinic writers exhibit the figurative use of ‘cup’ for

trouble and anguish (Ges. *Thes.* s.v. כּוֹם). The kindred expression, ‘taste the taste of death,’ is also to be met with (Buxtorf, . s.v. טעם). The conception of death as a bitter cup for men to drink underlies it. (Note the Magnum gives ποτήριον ... σημαίνει καὶ τὸν θάνατον). Instances of this phraseology in the Gospels are (in the words of Jesus) Mar_9:1 (= Mat_16:28) and (in the words of the Jews) Joh_8:52. Cf. also Heb_2:9.

3. In the institution of the Lord’s Supper.—There are strong inducements to see in the cup in the Last Supper one of the cups which had a place in the later ceremonial of the Paschal feast. But was the supper the usual Passover? This is a much-debated question; but on the whole the weightier considerations seem to support the view presented in the Fourth Gospel, the account in which may be intended, as some suggest, to correct the impression given by the Synoptics. That is to say, the supper was not the Passover proper, and it took place on the day previous to that on which the Passover was eaten. It might still be held that it was an anticipatory Passover. St. Paul, it is true, speaks of the Eucharistic cup as ‘the cup of blessing’ (1Co_10:16), and one is inclined to make a direct connexion with the third cup at the Paschal celebration, which was known as the Cup of Benediction (הַכּוּפּוּס), and is often referred to in the Talmudic tractates (.g. , 51). If St. Luke’s account of the Last Supper were to be received without question, it would be tempting to trace three out of the four Paschal cups, viz. the one mentioned in Luk_22:17, the one common to the Synoptics—the cup of blessing, and the fourth, or Hallel cup, suggested by ὑμνήσαντες (Mar_14:26 = Mat_26:30), taking the hymn referred to as none other than the second part of the Hallel (Psalms 115-118), with which the Passover was usually closed. Luk_22:19 b, Luk_22:20, however, is not above suspicion: and on other grounds we cannot definitely connect the cup of the institution with the ceremonial of the Paschal feast.

But the cup was an important feature in other Jewish festivals and solemn seasons besides the Passover. And even though the institution took place at the close of an ordinary meal, the bread and the cup were accompanied with the due Jewish graces (Mat_26:26 f., Mar_14:22 f., Luk_22:17; Luk_22:19), and in the after-view the cup thus used, and with such significance, might well stand out as *par excellence* the Cup of Blessing.

The words of Jesus regarding the cup are given with some noticeable variation. Mk. gives τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ αἶμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν (Mar_14:24); and Mt. reproduces this with but slight changes, possibly of a liturgical

character (Mat 26:28). The wording in Luk 22:17 makes no reference to the ‘blood,’ whilst Luk 22:20 (referred to above) appears to be but an interpolation, clumsily (ἐν τῷ αἵματι ... το ... ἐκχυννομενον) combining the form in St. Paul with that in St. Mark. The solemn expression, ‘my blood of the covenant,’ or ‘my covenantblood,’ can be explained only by reference to Exo 24:6-8. St. Paul’s phrase, ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ... ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι (1Co 11:25), introduces an important difference of meaning as compared with the Markan formula. To lay stress on the idea of a ‘new covenant’ is all in keeping with the Pauline standpoint. One other point as regards the words of the institution alone remains to be mentioned. As with the bread eo with the cup, St. Paul alone represents our Lord as saying τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν (1Co 11:24-25). Is it possible, then, that no permanent sacramental rite was contemplated by Jesus in doing what He did at the Last Supper? Is the conception of a memorial celebration due rather to St. Paul as a prime factor in the development of Christianity? Obviously this is not the place to deal with this important question, and the attitude of historical criticism respecting it. We have assumed that what took place at the Last Supper was an ‘institution.’ See artt. Covenant, Lord’s Supper.

4. *In the Eucharist.*—(1) From the first the common usage in administration no doubt gave the cup after the bread, in accordance with the order observed in Mark, Matthew, and Paul. St. Luke in his shorter (and better supported) account (Luk 22:17-19) exhibits a noticeable divergence in placing the cup first in order. This may be due, as Wright suggests (*Synopsis of the Gospels*, p. 140), to some ‘local Eucharistic use.’ The *Didache* (ch. 9) also puts the cup first; but the fact as to the general established usage remains unaffected.

(2) As to the cup used in the communion there would at first be no difference between it and such vessels as were in ordinary use, and the materials of which the Eucharistic vessels were made were by no means of one kind. Zephyrinus of Rome, a contemporary of Tertullian, speaks of ‘patens of glass,’ and Jerome (*circa (about)* 398 a.d.) speaks of ‘a wicker basket’ and ‘a glass’ as in use for communion purposes. Cups of wood and of horn also appear to have been used in some cases. We find certain provincial councils in the 8th and 9th cents, prohibiting the use of such, and also of leaden vessels. Cups were sometimes made of pewter; and bronze, again, was commonly used by the Irish monks, St. Gall preferring vessels of this material to those of silver. At the same time the natural tendency to differentiate in regard to vessels devoted to such a special service must have begun soon to manifest itself. Where it was possible, at an early period the cup was made of rich materials, such as gold and silver. Similarly as regards form and ornamentation. Tertullian (*de Pudicitia*, 10) speaks of the cup as being adorned with the figure of the Good Shepherd. In the course of time we get chalices of great price and wonderful workmanship,

corresponding to the rare and costly Passover and other festal cups which Jews similarly cherish as art treasures.

It is needless to mention particularly the several kinds of chalices which came to be distinguished as the Eucharistic rites were made more elaborate. Our own times, again, it may just be noticed, have given us the 'individual communion cup,' which, on hygienic grounds, finds favour in some quarters. Though in some respects a modern institution, perhaps it may claim a precedent in the most primitive usage. The use of separate cups might be inferred from 1Co 11:17-34. Nor is the hygienic objection to the common chalice wholly new. The difficulty was felt in mediaeval times when the plague was so rife. In the 14th cent, special 'pest-chalices' were in use for sick cases.

(3) The custom of mixing water with the wine in the chalice, to which Justin Martyr makes a well-known reference (*Apol.* i. 67), accords with Jewish precedent. Speaking of the Jewish use, Lightfoot (*Hor. Heb.* on Mat 26:27) says, 'Hence in the rubric of the feasts, when mention is made of the wine they always use the word *mizgu*, they *mix* for him the cup.' Maimonides (*Hamez umaz.* 7, 8) assumes the use of water. If the cup our Lord gave to His disciples were one of the ceremonial Paschal cups, we may take it that it contained a mixture of water and wine. And if it were not, nothing is more likely than that the Apostles, in observing the rite, would follow the Jewish custom of mixture. A passage in the Talmud (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Berakhoth*, 50, 2) suggests that water was thus added to the wine for the sake of wholesomeness and in the interests of sobriety.

In the course of time various fanciful suggestions came to be made as to a symbolic purpose in connexion with the mixed chalice in the Eucharist, ignoring its simple origin in an earlier Jewish custom. Thus it was variously held that in this way the union of Christ and the faithful was signified; that the water from the rock was represented; that the water and the blood from the pierced side of the Crucified were commemorated. At last it was affirmed that the water was added to the cup 'solely for significance': and so the addition of a very small quantity of water (a small spoonful) came to be considered sufficient. 'One drop is as significant as a thousand' (Bona, *Rer. Liturg.* ii. ix. note 3—'Cum vero aqua mysterii causa apponatur vel minima gutta sufficiens est').

(4) Was wine from the first invariably used and regarded as obligatory in the Eucharist? Harnack ('Brod u. Wasser,' *TU* [Note: *U Texte und Untersuehungen.*] vii. [1892]) holds that it was not so up to the 3rd cent., and traces the use of bread and water (but see, in reply, Zahn, 'Brod u. Wein,' *ib.*; Jülicher's essay in *Theol. Abhandlungen*; and Grafe, *ZThK* [Note: *ThK Zeitschrift f. Theologie u. Kirche.*] v. 2). It would be difficult to maintain that the genius of the sacrament vitally depended on

the use of wine; but in its favour we have the great preponderance of custom and sentiment. In modern times there are those who, for one reason and another, feel a difficulty regarding communion wine, and are disposed to use substitutes of some kind. Such might be disposed to welcome a sort of precedent in the use permitted by Jewish regulations in certain cases as regards their festival cups. In northern countries, e.g., where wine was not accessible as a daily beverage for the mass of the Jews, syrup, juice of fruits, beer or mead, etc., are named as instances of allowable substitutes. Such substitutes are curiously included under the common appellation 'the wine of the country.' (See *Shulhan'Arukh, Orah Hag.* 182. 1, 2).

(5) The withholding of the cup from the laity in the Communion, which came into vogue in the Western Church, and is still a Roman Catholic usage, may be briefly referred to. It is admitted by Romish authorities that communion in both kinds was the primitive custom for all communicants. Cardinal Bona, e.g., says: 'It is certain, indeed, that in ancient times all without distinction, clergy and laity, men and women, received the sacred mysteries in both kinds' (*Rer. Liturg.* ii. xviii. 1). The practice of withholding the cup does not come into view before the 12th century. The danger of effusion was offered as a reason for it. Short of this, as an expedient against effusion, we find slender tubes (*fistulae*) or quills brought into use, the communicants drawing the wine from the chalice by suction. Another intermediate stage towards communion in one kind was the practice of intinction, i.e. administering to the people the bread dipped in the wine. This practice, however, was condemned in the West, but it remains as the custom of the Eastern Church still, the sacred elements in this form being administered to the laity with a spoon (λαβίς). Ultimately the rule of communion in one kind was ordained in the West by a decree of the Council of Constance in 1415; and the reason assigned for the decree was that it was 'to avoid certain perils, inconveniences, and scandals.' This momentous change, however, was not brought about without much demur and opposition. The decree of Constance itself did not immediately and universally take effect; for after this time there were even in Rome cases where the cup was administered. The great Hussite movement in Bohemia, contemporaneous with the Council of Constance itself, offered determined opposition to the withdrawal of the cup; and the kindred Utraquist Communion in that country continued for two centuries their protest as Catholics who claimed the celebration of the Lord's Supper in both kinds, after the primitive usage. The badge of the Utraquists, a large chalice together with a sword—significant conjunction!—bespoke the sternness of the conflict.

What really lay at the root of this prohibition of the cup was the tremendous dogma of transubstantiation, with all its implicates, together with a hardening of the distinction between the clergy and the people. The growth of this Eucharistic custom proceeded *pari passu* with the development of the dogma. Naturally, therefore, the

restoration of the cup to the people was a necessary part of the Reformation claim. It is also worthy of remembrance that even in the Tridentine Council there were not wanting Romanist advocates of this as well as other reforms; but 'no compromise' counsels prevailed, and the rule in its fullest rigidity was reaffirmed.

How strange to look back over the welter of controversy and the many saddening developments connected with but this one point of Eucharistic observance, away to that simple evening—meal which took place 'in the same night that he was betrayed'!

J. S. Clemens.

☩ Cures

CURES.—The details of medical knowledge possessed by the Jews of our Lord's time and of current medical practice can only be gathered piecemeal from various sources, and relate largely to what is known of these in OT and in post-Biblical times. It is not unreasonable to believe that from these sources one can with fair accuracy gather what was the knowledge and practice of our Lord's own generation. In the NT references are made to physicians in Mat_5:26, Luk_8:43. The value of diet and the use of oil and wine in cases of bodily injury are indirectly referred to in Luk_8:55; Luk_10:34. Visitation of the sick is a Christian virtue, and was warmly commended by Jesus (Mat_25:36; Mat_25:43), in terms implying that it was practised; but the Talmud, which also recognizes the virtue, makes an exception in cases where visitation might aggravate the disorder. The balm of Gilead had an ancient reputation for healing virtue, and the Pools of Siloam and Bethesda and the springs at Tiberias and Callirrhoë were reputed to be curative. Medical theory among the Jews was almost entirely borrowed empirically, and no system of medical training and education existed in Palestine in Bible times. Prevention of disease by sanitary precautions was more emphasized, and it has even been suggested that the whole Levitical legislation was based upon hygienic considerations, so far as these were understood. The priestly class were the depositaries of such medical knowledge as was possessed, although Solomon is said to have known about the use of drugs, and various references in the Talmud attribute to him a book of cures which was said to have been withdrawn from the people by Hezekiah.

In the time of Jesus medical practitioners would be in possession of such medical lore as was held and practised in former generations, and would therefore be familiar with the art of midwifery, and possibly had attained to considerable skill in its practice, though there are few references to surgical operations. Probably an aversion existed to surgery, as to the practice of bleeding, on account of the national belief

concerning the blood; but later this aversion was overcome, and Jewish physicians fell into line with the leading classical schools, which freely employed bleeding as a remedy. The Talmud (e.g. *Bekhoroth*, 45a; *Nazir*, 32b) bears witness to some anatomical knowledge possessed by post-Biblical practitioners, and from this and other Rabbinical sources the common maxims of the physicians, and indications of their principles and methods, may be not obscurely learned. The Talmud mentions myrrh, aloes, cassia, frankincense, cinnamon, spikenard, and camphire as having medicinal properties. Dietetic rules and sanitary regulations were also carefully enjoined, and many bodily disorders were treated by homely remedies. Wunderbar (*l.c. infra*) gives examples of the application of drugs and the like to various ailments, but also plainly shows that occult methods, involving astrology, and the wearing of parchment amulets or charms, were with more confidence prescribed. Various incantations were in use to prevent miscarriage, and to ward off the machinations of evil spirits from the cradle of the newborn. Drugs and magic were, in fact, generally employed, the chief reliance being placed on the latter.

With these methods our Lord's action in the healing of disease had no affinity. Necromantic or superstitious observances were entirely foreign to His spirit. He never taught that sicknesses were the result of the action of evil spirits [on [Luk_11:13](#) ff. see below, and art. Impotence]. And it is equally clear that He had no recourse to such medical knowledge as was familiar to the physicians of His time, and that He was not endowed with knowledge of disease and of the curative art in advance of His own generation. In the cures recorded in the Gospels He employs nothing beyond His word, addressed either to the patient or to a parent or friend, and sometimes a touch. For use of saliva, see art. Sight. The method of Jesus must be sought on an entirely different line.

In every process of healing, whether in the time of Jesus or in our own day, there are two elements: the physical, and the mental or psychical. On the one hand, the disturbing and enfeebling causes, functional or organic, in the bodily tissues and organs, are gradually removed by the action of drugs or other medical treatment. On the other, a new tone and vigour are restored to the unseen and intangible but essentially real 'life' of the patient. The two are most intimately and vitally connected with each other, and neither element can be ignored. Mind and body are mutually interpenetrative, and although the relations between them are in many respects still profoundly obscure, yet advancing knowledge only makes more certain what is already firmly established, that this interdependence and mutual influence are of the closest character. The uncertain and incalculable element in every sickness or feebleness, passing beyond all power to adequately diagnose, is the psychical. The physical condition may clearly point to a particular issue of the infirmity—recovery or death—and, so far as the physical goes, this might be determined with considerable accuracy; but the action of the incalculable element remains, cannot be predicted,

and may produce most surprising results. These are matters of common knowledge, and amount to commonplaces. But they must be steadily borne in mind when cases of restoration—those in process to-day, and those recorded in the Gospels—are considered.

The action of Jesus was upon the complex personality, body and spirit, but upon the body through the spirit. His power went directly to the central life, to the man, the living person, and this may be traced in all His dealing with disease and infirmity both of body and of mind (See Lunatic). The Divine power was, through His life, at one with itself, brought to bear with living energy on the unseen springs of the being. Consideration of the actual phenomena of our Lord's working in the restoring of the sick will make these facts more manifest.

1. *Our Lord's own dependence upon the Divine power.*—Not only did He declare this close, trustful dependence (Joh 5:19; Joh 5:30; Joh 8:28; Joh 10:25; Joh 10:32; Joh 10:37-38; Joh 14:10), but it is evinced spontaneously in His action (Mar 7:34, Joh 11:41-42). The customary association of prayer with His works of healing was proof of His uttermost dependence upon God. The power of prayer, which He marked as the condition of all human victory, He indicates as vital also to His own action (Mar 9:29). The prayer He desiderates is no slack and formal petitioning of a far-distant Deity, but a close absorption of life in a very-present Helper. And this was the quality of our Lord's own dependence upon God. He cherished the largest expectations from the power of the Living God, of which He was so conscious. He felt the throbbing in His own life of that Mighty Will and Love which animated all being, and therefore He intimated that the true value of prayer, for Himself and for mankind, was that it established in man a close sympathy with, and an absolute dependence upon, the Source of all healing and life.

2. His healings were an expression of *intensest sympathy with suffering humanity*. Compassion was the moving cause of many of His beneficent actions (Mat 15:32; Mat 20:34, Mar 8:2, Luk 7:13). True sympathy is a mighty human energy in which the Divine power is at work, and even on the lower levels of our feeble personal force it has a continuous tendency towards healing. Experience multiplies the evidence of this fact as the years pass. And we are led to conceive in some measure the vast resources of power in the full compassion of Him who was morally one with the Source of all love and pity. His sympathy was never vitiated or weakened by personal imperfection, and so it possessed the power of self-identification with God and man. The healing of the Issue of Blood (see article) shows that this sympathy with distressed humanity worked even apart from His direct will.

3. His conviction that *disease and suffering were not part of the right and natural order of things*. This feature is seen in all His actions, but found its clearest

expression in the case of the woman who could in no wise lift up herself (Luk 13:11-17) (See Impotence). 'Ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo these eighteen years, to have been loosed from this bond on the day of the Sabbath?' In addition to our Lord's antagonism to the pedantry and inhumanity of His critics, the underlying note is heard that humanity ought not to be held in bonds of sickness and infirmity. Disease and suffering and untimely death are not part of the natural, *i.e.* the right and Divine, order of things. And all the power of right is on the side of those who labour to set man free and to enable him to stand erect in body, mind, and soul before God and his fellows.

4. A clear feature in our Lord's healings was *His sense of the need of dealing with the sin which often lay at the root of the sickness and infirmity*. Jesus very carefully guards against the unwarranted assumption made by the friends of Job, and by the disciples (Joh 9:2), that sin was the secret cause of all suffering and pain. Other and Diviner reasons might account for much of the deprivation and trouble of man (Joh 9:3). But in two cases (Mar 2:5-10, Joh 5:14) He not obscurely marks the sin as the deepest cause of the weakness (see artt. Paralysis and Impotence). Sin is the violation of the whole nature of man, body, mind, soul, as well as disobedience to the Holy Will of God. It depresses the springs of personal vitality, and therefore continually makes for sickness and feebleness of body.

5. *Faith was required on the part of the one to be healed*. Faith must be clearly distinguished from mental assent and from credulity, which vainly arrogate to themselves that august word. Faith, as Jesus conceived it, was the noblest activity of man's being, the triumphant assertion of the essential and Divine part of his nature against all that dwarfs, disfigures, and oppresses it, and this faith our Lord most keenly desired to see. The absence of it, even the fear of its absence, chilled and dismayed His spirit (Joh 4:48, Mar 9:22-23 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). He marks faith as the truly favourable condition for His healing power to be efficacious (Mat 9:29, Mar 10:52, Luk 17:19; Luk 18:42, Joh 5:6). Apparent exceptions to this connexion between healing and faith may be traced in Mat 9:1-8; Mat 12:9-13, Luk 13:11-17; Luk 14:1-6; Luk 22:50-51, but in all these cases the details are not reported, the fact of the healing being in these instances less prominent than other features of the narrative, such as the controversy of Jesus with the cold critics in the synagogue, and the personal characteristics of the Saviour in His beneficent action with respect to Malchus. It has also been thought that demoniacs as such were incapacitated from the exercise of faith in Jesus. But while this is in part true, it is significant that our Lord does in these instances seek to gain access to the true personality and to set it free from the oppression of all alien powers (See Lunatic).

6. *Jesus laboured to produce this faith*.—Not only does He ask for it as a condition of healing, but He spends Himself in the effort to evoke it. His careful treatment of the

blind man (Mar 8:22-26), the deaf and dumb (Mar 7:31-37), the blind and impotent (Joh 9:1-7; Joh 5:6) is best understood as the effort of our Lord to produce the essential conditions of receiving His healing virtue. In each case the means used, as well as the words spoken, are adapted to the particular case. We have not one set of means used indiscriminately. The ears and the tongue of the deaf-mute are touched, the blind man in one case is led out of the town, saliva is applied to his eyes, and the touch of the Lord's hand; in the other the eyes are anointed and the patient is sent to a distant pool in the exercise of faith. The labour is to set free the patient from all unnatural conditions of mind and spirit and from hopelessness, which is the most unnatural of all to men to whom God is so near.

This effort in Jesus produced weariness. It involved a deep expenditure of nervous, physical, and spiritual energy, and often in the Gospels we read of the spent, tired worker seeking refreshment in rest and in solitude, and most of all in fellowship with God. 'He went out into the mountain to pray' (Mat 14:23, Mar 6:46, Luk 6:12).

7. Several of our Lord's cures were wrought while He was at a distance from the patient: the Syro-Phœnician's daughter (Mat 15:21-28, Mar 7:24-30), the nobleman's son (Joh 4:46-53), and the centurion's servant (Mat 8:5-13, Luk 7:1-10). Difficulty is felt by many on the ground that the power of a unique personality which they acknowledge in Jesus could not be active in these cases. Dr. Abbott discusses the third instance (*Kernel and Husk*, Letter 18), and, excluding any 'bonâ fide miracle,' he inclines to regard the story as due to an exaggeration or to the influence of the knowledge of his friend's intercession with Jesus, 'with a sentimental reserve in favour of brain-wave sympathy.' Since the time Dr. Abbott wrote, telepathy has become a recognized fact in psychical research, and we have no need to deny its possible action in these cases. But the explanation given of all His works by our Lord goes beneath all such conjectures and hypotheses. He ascribed His healing to the Divine power with which He was able to bring men into living communication. That Divine all-pervading Life which informed His humanity was not at a distance from any human life. Space and Time are to the Infinite Power non-existent, and only our bondage to the limited human ideas can present any difficulty.

8. In the three above cases and in the case of the demoniac boy (Mat 17:14-21, Mar 9:14-29, Luk 9:37-43) our Lord significantly seeks *the co-operation of parent and friend in the work of healing*; and the fact is most significant of the closeness of human sympathy, and most of all of that most vital and mysterious sympathy lying in the life-bond between parent and child, and the intimate dependence of these ties upon the life-giving power of the Almighty. These deep-lying sympathies that bind parents to their own offspring are essentially allied to the Divine power. They 'consist' by its indwelling, and Jesus desires this power to be informed by a living

faith, and so be at once at its highest point of energy and also in living union with God.

9. In some of the cures effected by Jesus *a process* is observable in the recovery. The nobleman's son was first set free from the fever, and from that decisive time began 'to amend.' The crisis was safely passed, and the rest was left to nature's gentle action. The Syro-Phœnician's daughter was delivered from her besetment and left 'thrown upon the bed,' physically prostrate, and requiring rest and care. The daughter of Jairus was ordered rest and food, and the blind man at Bethsaida was only by degrees restored to perfect sight. These indications, casually given, and probably not understood by the narrators, lead us to think that a similar process would be manifest in the other cures were they fully and adequately reported, and it is always a salutary reminder that our Gospels are only most fragmentary. It was a principle of Jesus not to do anything by extraordinary which could be accomplished by ordinary means.

10. The healing power of Jesus went out *freely* among the suffering multitude (Mat 8:16-17; Mat 14:34-36; Mat 15:30-31, Mar 1:32-34; Mar 6:53-56, Luk 4:40-41; Luk 9:11). The contagions influence of a multitude, in producing an atmosphere in which remarkable psychical phenomena are manifest and the result is seen in healing of the sick, is not uncommonly recognized in modern times. In this way are explained the miracles of which some genuine cases undoubtedly happened around the tomb of Becket, the healings that are associated with Lourdes, and many of the similar results that we may believe were gathered round famous saints like St. Francis of Assisi and St. Theresa. A contagion of expectation is initiated and spreads rapidly through a whole countryside, and this condition of expectation and hope is one which the most prosaic science recognizes as favourable to the production of real cures, especially of ailments a large element of which is nervous. We have seen that the working of Jesus did not disdain to utilize these and all other forces in human nature which make for healing; and by reason of His unique and perfect alliance with the Divine Source of all life and health, He was able to bring instantaneous and permanent relief and restoration to whole companies of sufferers.

11. Our Lord's method has *considerable affinity with modern medical science*. The power of the mind over bodily ailments, in the maintenance and restoration of health, is being increasingly acknowledged. Dr. Schofield says truly that most remedies, if not all, are partly psychical in their operation. Not only such prescriptions as change of occupation, environment, and climate, physical and mental shocks and emotional incentives, ethical and religious influences, travel, study, ambition and social influences, but also drugs, changes of diet, baths and waters, minor operations, depend much for their efficacy on their psychical action; while the personality of the doctor—in some cases the unintelligibility of his prescription and the magnitude of his

fee—are valuable therapeutic agents. In this way full recognition is given to the influence of any power which can set free the mind from its hopeless condition, its lethargy and depression, as a most potent force in the work of healing. Schmiedel (art. 'Gospels' in *Encyc. Bibl.*) says of our Lord's miracles: 'It is only permissible to regard as historical that class of healings which present-day physicians are able to effect by psychical methods.' But he overlooks the influence of mental action in the cure of all kinds of disease, and not only of mental diseases to which the above observations point.

Psychical methods, intelligently and of set purpose applied to the cure of bodily ailments, are as yet in their preliminary stages. On the same line, if on no other, much greater possibilities remain for human knowledge and power to achieve. No limit can be laid down beyond which the occult forces of human life may not be taken advantage of for the healing not of nervous diseases only, but of purely physical. Dr. Osgood Mason gives abundant evidence, from his own knowledge and practice, of the influence of suggestion, with or without hypnosis, in the healing of many physical ailments. And the Christian faith, based upon the suggestions found in the Gospels as they describe, without at all understanding them, our Lord's methods, is that Jesus Christ, by His commanding action upon the human mind and spirit, and by the Divine power dwelling in Himself, was able to control physical and physiological processes in the human body so as to produce curative effects of a permanent character.

Literature.—For ancient Jewish cures, see art. 'Medicine' (by Macalister) in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ; Wunderbar, *Biblisch-Talmudische Medicin*, 1850-60; art. 'Krankheiten und Heilkunde der Israeliten' in Herzog's *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyclopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] . For detailed accounts of individual cures wrought by Jesus, see the Lives of Christ and Comm. on Gospels, e.g. Gould on 'Mark,' Plummer on 'Luke' in *Internat. Crit. Commentary*; Trench, *Miracles*; Laidlaw, *Miracles of our Lord*; Belcher, *Miracles*. For valuable information and suggestion respecting psycho-therapeutics, consult artt. by Dr. Tuke on 'Influence of the Mind over the Body' in *Dict. of Psychol. Medicine*; Dr. Lloyd Tucker on 'Psychotherapeutics,' *ib.*; Dr. Osgood Mason on 'Hypnotism and Suggestion,' *ib.* 1901; and recent popular medical works by Dr. A. T. Schofield on *The Force of Mind*, and *Unconscious Therapeutics* (Churchill, London).

T. H. Wright.

CURSE.—Two widely different words are in Authorized Version translated ‘curse.’ It will be sufficient to trace their meaning, so far as the ideas represented by them are found in the Gospels.

1. **קָלַל, ἀνάθεμα**, ‘an accursed (Authorized Version) or devoted (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) thing.’ (a) In its higher application this word signifies a thing devoted—wholly or in part, permanently or temporarily, voluntarily or by Divine decree—to a use (or an abstinence) exclusively sacred. This is not a curse at all in the modern sense of the word; it corresponds more nearly to the nature of a vow. With this extension of meaning we may see a *genuine* instance in the special consecration of John the Baptist (Luk_1:15; Luk_7:33), and a *corrupt* instance in the system of Corban (Mar_7:11 ff.). (b) In its darker application it denotes an extreme and punitive ban of extermination. This is of frequent occurrence in OT, but in the Gospels no clear case is found, unless, indeed, under this head we include all the death-penalties of the Jewish law (Jn [?] 8:5), especially the punishment attempted (Joh_8:59; Joh_10:31 ff.) and finally inflicted upon Christ Himself on the charge of blasphemy (Mar_14:63 f., Joh_19:7). It is well to notice, in connexion with this kind of anathema, the strong expression used by Christ in addressing the Canaanitish woman, as one descended from a ‘devoted’ race (Mat_15:26). It may be added that profanity, in the special form of self-cursing, seems to have adopted language derived from this ban; see Mat_26:74, Mar_14:71 (*καταθεματιζειν* and *αναθεματιζειν*). Rom_9:3 naturally suggests itself as a verbal illustration; in other respects it is a complete contrast.* [Note: In Mat_15:4 || Mar_7:10 RV rightly substitutes ‘he that speaketh evil of’ for AV ‘he that curseth’: the Greek is *ὁ κακελογῶν* quoted from Exo_21:17.] (c) The ban of extermination gave place, under certain conditions, to the remedial discipline of excommunication; that is to say, a temporary ‘cutting off from the congregation’; referred to, as a Jewish institution, in Joh_9:22; Joh_12:42; Joh_16:2, and, as a Christian (apparently), in Mat_18:17. (See also Westcott on 1Jn_5:16).

2. **קָלַל, κατάρα**, ‘curse.’—() This is the word regularly used to denote a curse in the general sense, as the natural antithesis of a blessing; it is not charged (as ‘anathema’ essentially is) with sacred associations; its quality, which is capable of all degrees, from Divine to devilish, is to be decided by the context () The disappearance of cursing in the NT marks very forcibly the contrast between the spirit of the New dispensation and that of the Old; for in the OT its presence is at times painfully prominent. See Luk_9:54 f., where even the unauthorized additions of some MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] are undoubtedly a true comment. Such instances as are found or are alleged in the Epistles are judicial in tone, not irresponsible and malevolent. The exceptional case which occurs of a curse uttered by Christ (upon the

fig-tree [see art.], Mat_21:19 ff., Mar_11:12 ff.) is probably to be taken as a sign given to impress His warning of impending judgments (Mat_21:41; Mat_21:43; Mat_23:37 f., Mat_24:21 ff., Mat_24:32 ff. etc.). It is a reminder that we may not so exaggerate the goodness of God as to leave no place for His severity. Christ applies the words ‘ye cursed’ to those who shall be on His left hand at the Last Day (Mat_25:41). (c) Christ became a ‘curse’ (Gal_3:13, see Lightfoot, *ad loc.*). It belongs to the Epistles to unfold the bearing of this truth; but the fact is implied in the measures taken by the Jews, after the Crucifixion, to avert its consequences (Joh_19:31, cf. Deu_21:22 f.). In the Roman view the shame of crucifixion, in the Jewish view its accursed nature, formed the special sting of such a death. Hence in the matter of salvation, which ‘is from the Jews’ (Joh_4:22), the curse must necessarily be involved in the Death’s redemptive efficacy.

F. S. Ranken.

☞ Cushion

CUSHION.—In NT only in Mar_4:38 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 [Authorized Version ‘pillow’] for προσκεφάλαιον, a cushion for the head, but also for sitting or reclining upon (see references in Liddell and Scott, s.v.). By προσκεφάλαια LXX Septuagint renders תַּחֲטִיב of Eze_13:18 where the Arabic equivalent is *mekhaddût*. *Mekhaddeh* (sing.) is just the word used by the Sea of Galilee fishermen for the cushion they place in the hinder part of their fishing-boats for the comfort of the passenger to-day. These boats are probably similar to those used by our Lord and His friends, and on just such a cushion the present writer has often rested in crossing the same waters.

The cushions universally used to support the head or the arm in reclining on the *diwân* are in size about 24" × 15" × 5". They are usually made of straw—less frequently of cotton or hair—sewn into strong canvas, and covered with coloured print or silk. The larger cushions for the seat of the *diwân*, and employed in the boats, are of the same material. See Pillow.

W. Ewing.

☞ Custom

CUSTOM.—See Tribute.

☞ Cyrene

CYRENE (Κυρήνη) was a Greek settlement on the north coast of Africa, in the district now called Benghazi or Barca, which forms the E. part of the modern province of Tripoli. It was founded b.c. 632. It was the chief member of a confederacy of five neighbouring cities; hence the district was called either Pentapolis or Cyrenaica. Under the first Ptolemy it became a dependency of Egypt; was left to Rome by the will of Ptolemy Apion, b.c. 96; was soon after formed into a province, and later, perhaps not till 27, united with Crete, with which under the Empire it formed a senatorial province, under an expraetor with the title of proconsul. It was noted for its fertility and for its commerce, which, however, declined after the foundation of Alexandria. It produced many distinguished men, such as the philosophers Aristippus and Carneades, the poet Callimachus, and the Christian orator and bishop Synesius.

Jews were very numerous and influential there. The first Ptolemy, ‘wishing to secure the government of Cyrene and the other cities of Libya for himself, sent a party of Jews to inhabit them’ (Josephus, *circa (about) Apion*. ii. 4). Cyrenian Jews are mentioned in 1Ma 15:23, 2Ma 2:23 (Jason of Cyrene). According to Strabo (*ap. Josephus Ant.* xiv. vii. 2), the inhabitants of Cyrene were divided into four classes—citizens, husbandmen (*i.e.* native Libyans), sojourners (μέτοικοι), and Jews.

The Jews enjoyed equality of civil rights (*Ant.* xvi. vi. 1, 5). An inscription at Berenice, one of the cities of Cyrenaica, of prob. b.c. 13, shows that the Jews there formed a civic community (πολιτευμα) of their own, under nine rulers (C/G [Note: IG Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum.] iii. 5361). The Cyrenian Jews were very turbulent; Lucullus had to suppress a disturbance raised by them (Strabo, *l.c.*); there was a rising there at the close of the Jewish war, a.d. 70 (Josephus *BJ* vii. xi.; *Vita*, 76); and a terrible internecine war between them and their Gentile neighbours, under Trajan (Dio Cass. lxxviii. 32; Euseb. *Historia Ecclesiastica* iv. 2).

Simon of Cyrene (the father of Alexander and Rufus [wh. see]), who was impressed to bear our Lord’s cross (Mat 27:32, Mar 15:21, Luk 23:26), was doubtless one of these Jewish settlers. Other NT references to Cyrenian Jews are: Act 2:10 (at Pentecost), 6:9 (members of special synagogue at Jerusalem, opposing Stephen), 11:20 (preaching at Antioch to Greeks [or Hellenists]), 13:1 (Lucius of Cyrene, probably one of these preachers, a prophet or teacher at Antioch).

Literature.—Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, iii. p. 130 ff.; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geography*; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] i. ii. 283, ii. ii. 230 f., 245 f.; Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung* (1881), i. 458 ff.; art. 'Diaspora' (by Schürer) in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible*, Extra Vol. p. 96^b.

Harold Smith.

☩ Cyrenius

CYRENIUS.—See Quirinius.

☩ Daily Bread

DAILY BREAD.—See Lord's Prayer.

☩ Dalmanutha

DALMANUTHA.—Mar_8:10 only. The textual and geographical problems involved in this name have not found as yet a satisfactory explanation. After the feeding of the 4000, Jesus embarked with His disciples, and came, according to Mat_15:39, εἰς τὰ ὄρια Μαγδαλά (TR [Note: R Textus Receptus.]) or Μαγαδάν (all critical editions); according to Mar_8:10 εἰς τὰ μέρη Δαλμανουθά.

In Mt. the variations are few and unimportant, except the difference between Magdala and Magadan. For ὄρια we find occasionally ὄρια, ὄρη (with following ἀμαγδαλά), ὄρη. Cod. D [Note: Deuteronomist.] places τῆς before the proper name. Μαγαδά ν is the reading of \aleph BD (β^3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] - $\tilde{\alpha}$ v), Μαγεδάν of \aleph^c ; the Old Latin has *Magadan*, *Mageda*, *-am*, *Magidam*; Vulgate *Magedan*; syr^sin מַגְדָּן, cur מַגְדָּן, pal מַגְדָּן, pesh מַגְדָּן (*Magdu*; so also the Arabic Tatian). Most uncials and cursives Μαγδαλά; CM 33. 102, etc., Μαγδαλάν.

In Mk. τὰ μέρη is replaced by τὰ ὄρια in DΣ.

In Mk. τὰ μέρη is replaced by τὰ ὄρη in N.

In Mk. τὰ μέρη is replaced by τὸ ὄρος in 28, syr^{sin}; but in the latter the addition of a dot makes the plural; syr^{cur} is missing; B has the spelling Δαλμανουθα, 474 Δαμανουθά, 184^{ev} Δαλμουνουθά; Vulgate *Dalmanutha* (with unimportant variations); arm. *Dalmanunca*. But this is now replaced by:

Μελεγαδά (not Μαδεγαδά as read by Stephanus) in D*.

Μαγαιδά (not Μαγαδά as printed by Tischendorf) in D¹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] .

Μαγεδά in 28, 81.

Μαλδαλά in 1, 13, 61, 69, etc.

Syr^{sin} מגידן, syr^{pal} מגידן, Got. , Old Lat. , -an, -am, Magidan. It is a natural supposition that in Mk. all readings differing from μερη Δαλμανουθα are due to assimilation to Mt., perhaps under the influence of Tatian. The confusion of ὄρια and ὄρη (ὄρος) must be very early, and has its parallels in many passages of the OT, from Jos 11:16; Jos 15:11 to Eze 11:10, Mal 1:3. On its occurrence in syr^{sin} see especially Chase, *Syro-Latin Text of the Gospels*, p. 97, esp. n. [Note: note.] 2, where he justly remarks: 'This reading of the Sinaitic raises two questions: (a) Was there an early *Greek Harmony of the Gospels*?... (b) What is the relation of Sin. [Note: Sinaitic.] to Tatian?' On the Cod. 28 which supports the reading of syr^{sin}, see WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] ii. 242 ('which has many relics of a very ancient text').

That *Magadan*, not *Magdala*, is the true reading in Mt. is probable (independently of the witness of MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.]) on internal grounds; for it is difficult to explain how a name like *Magdala*, which was well known through Mary Magdalene, should have become *Magadan*. The introduction of both forms into MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] of Mk. points to the fact that there were several stages in the revision

of our MS^S [Note: SS Manuscripts.] . Both the readings, *Magadan* and *Magdala*, may, however, go back to the same Heb. מגדל, as is shown by Jos 15:37, where B has Μαγα δα Γαδ for Μαγδαλ Γαδ of A. Even for *Dalmanutha* such an explanation has been attempted by Dalman (*Gramm.* p. 133; change of γ into, and transposition of syllables Δαλμανουθά from Μαγδαλουθά = מגדלות. But in the 2nd ed. p. 168 he has left out this note and all references to this word).

That τὰ ὄρια in Mt. and τὰ μέρη in Mk. are almost identical expressions, is shown by Mat 15:21 εἰς τὰ μέρη Σιδῶνος καὶ Τύρου compared with Mar 7:24 εἰς τὰ ὄρια (T^R [Note: R Textus Receptus.] μεθόρια) Τύρου (καὶ Σιδῶνος), and by the fact that in the OT 4 of the 11 Heb. equivalents for ὄριον (יד, מוֹל, פאה, קץ) reappear among the 22 Heb. equivalents of μέρος. The next supposition is therefore that *Magadan* (or *Magdala*) in Mt. = *Dalmanutha* in Mark. But how is this possible?

Many explanations have been started. The one proposed by Dalman may be dismissed at once, as it is given up by himself; cf. also Wellhausen's remarks on it (*Ev. Marci*). Lightfoot and Ewald derived *Dalmanutha* from צלמן by the supposition of an Aramaic or Galilaean pronunciation. Keim (of Nazara, English translation iv. 238) explained it similarly as 'Shady Place.' Schwarz (*Das heilige Land*, p. 189) derived it from the cave Teliman (מליסאן), which cave, however, according to Neubauer, was in the neighbourhood of Herod's Caesarea. J. W. Donaldson (*Jashar: fragmenta archetypha carminum Hebraicorum*, editio secunda, 1840, p. 16) suggested: 'Δαλ- istud residuum esse veri nominis Μαγδαλά scil. מגדל-א, μανουθά autem repraesentare pluralem vocis מן pars, portio, quam in Graeco ΜΕΡΗ conversam habemus.' A similar idea was struck out independently by R. Hams (*Codex Bezae*, p. 188) and the present writer (*Philologica Sacra*, p. 17; Exp^T [Note: xpT Expository Times.] ix. 45), that *Dalmanutha* is the transliteration of the Aramaic equivalent of εἰς τὰ μέρη, which by some form of dittography took the place of the proper name. Against Harris see Chase, *Bezan Text of Acts*, p. 145, n. [Note: note.] 2; and against the whole suggestion, Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 66 f. Dalman doubts whether מן in Aramaic meant anything else but 'portion.' But in the Syriac Bible at least it is frequently used for the allotted portions of land (Jos 14:2; Jos 15:1, Isa 57:6). N. Herz saw in the word an Aramaized form of the Greek λιμὴν 'harbour' (Exp^T [Note: xpT Expository

Times.] viii. 563, ix. 95, 426). Others, finally, give no explanation, and consider *Magadan* and *Dalmanutha* as the names of two different places near each other, neither being very well known. But this leads to the topographical problem.

Eusebius in his *Onomasticon* has but one paragraph on a name beginning with M immediately after names from the prophet Jeremiah (Mephaath, Maon, Molchom, 48:21, 23, 49:1). It runs (in Klostermann's edition, p. 134 [= Lagarde, *OS* p. 282]):

Μαγεδάν (Mat 15:39). εἰς τὰ ὄρια Μαγεδάν ὁ Χριστὸς ἐτεδήμησεν, ὡς ὁ Ματθαῖος, καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Μάρκος δὲ τῆς Μαγεδάν μνημονεύει, καὶ ἐστὶ νῦν ἡ Μαγεδανὴ περὶ τὴν Γερασά ν.

In Jerome's translation:

'Magedan, ad cuius fines Matthaueus evangelista scribit dominum pervenisse, sed et Marcus eiusdem nominis recordatur, nunc autem regio dicitur Magedena circa Gerasam.'

The unique MS, in which the work of Eusebius is preserved, writes *Μαγαιδάν* (as D*) and *Μαγαιδανή*. Eusebius may have been reminded of the name by the occurrence of *Μαγδῶλω* beside *Μέμφις* in Jeremiah 51 (44):1, which he quotes a few lines before (ed. Klost. p. 134, l. 15). At all events it follows from the entry, that Eusebius did not find *Dalmanutha* in his text of Mark, and that he sought the place on the eastern side; but Gerasa seems too far from the Lake, unless we are to suppose that it had some sort of enclave on its shores.

A strange identification is that with the 'Phiala' Lake mentioned by Josephus *BJ* 1ff. x. 7 as one of the sources of the Jordan. See the Maps published by Röhrich, i. (*ZDPV* [Note: *DPV Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.*] xiv. 1891):

'Hunc fontem Josephus appellat *Phialam*, Marcus *Dalmanicha*, Mattheus *Magedan*, Saraceni *Modin*. Hinc est verus ortus Jordan; unde palcae hic missae recipiuntur in Dan subterraneo meatu ductae.'

Furrer (*ZDPV* [Note: *DPV Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.*] ii. 59) identified *Dalmanutha* with *Khân Minych*, which name he connected with *mensa* (the table where Jesus sat with the Twelve, first mentioned in the *Commemoratorium*, a.d. 808), and this with (Dal)manatha; but see against this Gildemeister (*ib.* iv. 197

ff.). Thomson (*L*^B [Note: The Land and the Book.] 393) suggests a ruined site up the Yarmûk half a mile from the Jordan called *Dalhamia* or *Dalmamia* (Robinson, *BRP* [Note: RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.] iii. 264, 'Delhemiyeh'); Tristram, a site one and a half miles from Migdel; Sir C. Wilson, a site not far from the same. The aged Prof. Sepp in a recent paper, 'Die endlich entdeckte Heimat der Magdalena' (*Volkschau*, iii. 3, pp. 199-202, 1904), argued for *Miqdal Gedor* or *Magdala Gadara*, a Jewish suburb of Gadara (Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] *Erubin* v. 7). Wellhausen has no doubt that it must be sought on the eastern shore, in the neighbourhood of Bethsaida (*Mar* 8:22), if this town itself did not belong to it. For he holds *Mar* 8:9 b, *Mar* 8:10 to be identical with *Mar* 8:13, the object αὐτοῦς of ἀφείς in *Mar* 8:13 being the ὄχλοι, not the Pharisees, and πάλιν he regards as a harmonistic insertion. He believes that *Mar* 8:13 originally followed immediately upon *Mar* 8:22 καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Βηθσαιδάν.

Thus not even the geographical problem is solved. If the suggestion on the origin of *Dalmanutha*, as put forward by Donaldson, Harris, and the present writer, were to turn out correct, it would have important consequences for the Synoptic Problem. For then this reading cannot well have had its origin in oral tradition, but presupposes a written (Aramaic) document as the basis of our Second Gospel.

Literature.—A collection of Notes on 'Dalmanutha' left by Gildemeister (*ZDPV* [Note: *DPV Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.*] xiv. 82); the monograph of Martin Schultze, *Dalmanutha: Geographisch-linguistische Untersuchungen zu Mar* 8:10, Oldesloe, 1884; A. Wright, *NT Problems*, p. 71; Henderson in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible; G. A. Smith in *Encyc. Bibl.*; Sanday, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, p. 22 f.; Merx, *Die vier kanonischen Evangelien*, ii. 2 (1905), p. 79 [warns against identification with *Eddelhemiye*, gives as reading of the Arm. *Dalmanoun*, and claims for the reading *Dalmanutha*, which is not recognized by the old texts (syr^{sin} D, Old Lat. Ulf.), an Egyptian origin].

Eb. Nestle.

☪ Dancing

DANCING

1. *Manner*.—The Oriental dance was performed either by an individual man or woman, or by crescent lines of men dancing together and holding each other's hands, or of women by themselves performing similar movements. The one at the end of the line waved a scarf and acted as *chorçgos*, or dance-leader. At times also a line of men and women, with hands joined, confronted another similar line, and the dance consisted in their alternate advance and retreat, accompanied by the hand-clapping of the onlookers beating time to the music, by the scarf-waving and occasional shout, and, at regulated intervals, the resounding tread of the dancers. In the case of the individual, the abrupt muscular actions were artistically relieved, as in the contrasting lines of male and female attire in the Western dance, by the soft and swaying undulations of the dancer's figure. The accompaniment of song, hand-clapping, and musical instruments served to control the energy and secure unity of movement.

2. *Place*.—On the occasion of a wedding in a peasant's house a space was kept clear near the door, and into it one after another stepped forward and danced, and retired among the shadows; the dancing of the bride receiving especial attention and applause. For dancing in companies, the flat roof, or any level space beside the house, was resorted to. In the cities and in the houses of the rich, the large reception room, or the open paved court, into which all the apartments opened, was available for the purpose. In festive processions the male or female performers, singly or in couples, stepped to the front and danced with sword and shield, and then gave place to others.

3. *Occasions*.—In the East, dancing has never been regarded as an end in itself and promoted as an entertainment chiefly for those actively taking part in it, but rather as a demonstration of feeling due to some special incident or situation. In family life this was principally the event of marriage (Mat 11:17, Luk 7:32); and a similar expression of feeling often attended the birth of a son, recovery from sickness, return from a journey, or the reception of a guest whose presence called for such a manifestation of grateful rejoicing. Birthdays did not usually receive such notice, as they lacked the element of relief from danger, recompense and rest after hardship, or the introduction of something new into the family conditions. Herod's birthday feast (when Salome danced before the guests, Mat 14:6, Mar 6:22) was an imitation of Gentile customs. More general occasions were the founding of a building, the ingathering of harvest, and the religious festivals of the year.

The prevalence of such a custom, embracing old and young, and including all classes, indicated a simple life, in which the feeling of the moment found hearty and uncritical expression. The view of life was one that recognized the easy and rapid interchange of joy and grief (Psa 30:5; Psa 30:11, Lam 5:15, Ecc 3:4). Further, it implied a very close connexion between mental and physical states. As there was a

union of mirth and dancing, so there was an equally natural correspondence between sorrow and sighing (Isa 35:10). Even in places dedicated to relaxation and delight, by the rivers of Babylon, it was impossible for captive exiles to sing the songs of the Lord's deliverance (Psa 137:1-4). The elder brother could take no part in mirth and dancing of which the occasion was so affronting and offensive to himself (Luk 15:25-28). Hence among a people marked by mobility of temperament and prone to extremes of feeling, the children in the market-place might well reproach their companions who heard the wedding music without rising to the dance, and the wail of bereavement without being moved to pity (Mat 11:17, Luk 7:32).

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , art. 'Dancing'; Delitzsch, *Iris*, 189 ff.; Thomson, *Land and Book*, 555 f.

G. M. Mackie.

☞ Daniel

DANIEL.—The influence of Daniel on the Apocalyptic conceptions of the Gospels is profound (see Apocalyptic Literature). For the possible influence of Dan 7:13 see Son of Man. The only passage in which the book is explicitly mentioned is Mat 24:15, where the phrase τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ('the abomination of desolation') is quoted. See art. Abomination of Desolation. It is to be noted that in the corresponding passage in Mark (Mar 13:14), no mention is made of Daniel. In view of the accepted priority of Mark and his closer fidelity, and also of Matthew's fondness for OT references, the absence of the clause raises the suspicion that it is not part of the original utterance, but a comment added by the latter Evangelist. In that case it would not be necessary to assume that Jesus meant to use the phrase in the same sense as it is used in Daniel. He may have only adopted or borrowed it as a current popular expression to describe some minatory event which He foresaw portending the forthcoming calamity.

A. Mitchell Hunter.

☞ Darkness

DARKNESS.—The word 'dark' is used in the sense of the absence of natural light in Joh 6:17; Joh 20:1. The darkness that lasted for the space of three hours at the crucifixion is referred to in Mat 27:45, Mar 15:33, Luk 23:44-45. For a brief summary

of the views held as to the nature of this darkness, see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Darkness.' It may suffice to remark that, the Passover falling at full moon, there can be no question here of a solar eclipse.

Generally 'darkness' is used in a metaphorical sense, but with slightly different significations. Darkness is the state of spiritual ignorance and sin in which men are before the light of the revelation of Jesus comes to them (Mat 4:16, Luk 1:79, Joh 8:12; Joh 12:45-46). This darkness the presence of Jesus dispels, except in the case of those who love the darkness and who therefore shrink back into the recesses of gloom, when the light shines, because their deeds are evil. Those who have a natural affinity to the light, when Jesus appears, follow Him and walk no longer in darkness.

But there is the deeper darkness that comes through incapacity of sight (Mat 6:23, Luk 11:35). This state results from long continuance in evil (Joh 3:19). It is the judgment passed upon the impenitent sinner. To love the darkness rather than the light is to have the spiritual faculty atrophied, and this is the Divine penalty to which he is condemned. The light that is in him has become darkness. The gospel contemplates for the human soul no more dire calamity.

And the final fate of the impenitent sinner is to be cast into outer darkness (Mat 8:12; Mat 22:13; Mat 25:30). There is a kingdom of darkness which wars against the light, and which has power at times to prevail (Luk 22:53). This is the darkness of sin, chosen and loved as sin, the instinctive hatred, inwrought with what is radically evil, of the Divine purity and light. It is the negative of all good—outer darkness, the darkness that has ceased to be permeated or permeable by any ray of light.

Darkness is twice used of secrecy or privacy (Mat 10:27, Luk 12:3). In these cases, however, a metaphorical use of the word is also implied. In the former passage the reference is to the darkness of perplexity and sorrow; in the latter, to the darkness of sin. See also Light, Unpardonable Sin.

In the later mystical theology there is a use of the term that may be here referred to. There is a 'Divine darkness' which is the consummation of the experience of the purified soul—the darkness that comes from excess of light. The pseudo-Dionysius speaks of the 'luminous gloom of the silence' which reveals the inner secrets of being, and in which the soul is raised to the absolute ecstasy. It is an attempt to express the infinitude of the susceptibility of the human soul to emotions of either joy or anguish. From the outer darkness to the light which is above light, and therefore inconceivable, the soul of man is capable of responding to every shade of experience.

Literature.—Cremer, *Bib. Theol. Lex.* s.vv. σκότος, σκοτια; Martineau, *Endeavours after the Christian Life*⁶ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 463 ff.; Phillips Brooks, *Candle of the Lord*, p. 74 ff.; *Expositor*, ii. iii. [1882] 321 ff.

A. Miller.

⚠️ Dates

DATES.—The chronological sequence of the Gospels is quite as important as that of the Epistles to the student of the beginnings of Christianity, and forms an essential branch of the study of the development of our Lord's revelation and His Messianic consciousness. The difficulties in the way of forming an exact time-table of the dates in the Gospels are due (1) to the indifference of the early Christians, as citizens of the heavenly city, to the great events that were taking place in the world around them; (2) to their lack of means of ascertaining these events, and their obliviousness of the important bearing they might have on the evidences of the faith; (3) to the fact that, the early Christian traditions being recorded in the interest of religion and not of history, the writers confined their attention to a few events, which were arranged as much according to subject-matter as to time sequence. The result is that there are many gaps which can be only approximately filled up by strict inference from casual remarks. The author of the Third Gospel is the only one to give parallel dates of secular history in the manner of a true historian, and to profess to relate things 'in order' (καθεξῆς, Luk_1:3). There are many inferences as to time to be drawn from statements in Mt., but they are of an accidental character. St. John marks points of time of significance in his own and in his Master's life, but his purpose is to trace the development of the drama of the Master's passion, not to suggest its chronological relation to the history of the world.

The early Fathers, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Africanus, and Hippolytus, were the first to attempt to arrange the events of the Gospel in chronological sequence. But these attempts are not always to be relied upon, owing to the difficulties of ascertaining many of the dates of secular history, to which reference has already been made, and which were still further increased in their case by the different ways of reckoning the years of reigning monarchs and of calculating time in the different eras. For example, Luk_3:1 'in the 15th year of the reign of Tiberius' may be reckoned from Augustus' death, Aug. 19 a.d. 14, or from the time when Tiberius was associated with Augustus in the empire by special law; but that law, again, is variously dated, being identified by some with the grant of the

tribunicia potestas for life in a.d. 13, but assigned by Mommsen (after Velleius Paterculus, ii. 121) to a.d. 11. So that we have to choose between a.d. 29, 28, and 26. Furthermore, the Roman calendar began on Jan. 1, so that the imperial year might be adjusted to the civil year (1) by counting the fractional year as a whole, and by commencing a second imperial year on the first New Year's Day of each reign,—Lightfoot (*Ignatius*, ii. 398) mentions the practice of Trajan and his successors of beginning a second year of *tribunicia potestas* on the annual inauguration day of new tribunes next after their accession,—or (2) by omitting the fractional year altogether, and calculating the emperor's reign from a fixed date, like Eusebius, who seems to commence each emperor's reign from the September following his accession (see art. 'Chronology' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible i. 418). The Julian reform of the Roman calendar, by which the year b.c. 46 was made to contain 445 days, in order to bring the civil year into line with the solar year, adds to the complications.

Furthermore, the Jewish calendar bristles with problems. Originally the Paschal full moon was settled by observation, but that became impossible when the people were spread over distant lands, and was also hindered by atmospheric causes; and, in any case, the beginning of the month was determined not by the astronomical new moon, but by the time when the crescent became visible, about 30 hours afterwards, the first sunset after that event marking the beginning of the new month. A fresh difficulty was created by the 13th month, Veadar, which was intercalated whenever the barley was not within a fortnight of being ripe at the end of the month Adar; but this was forbidden in sabbatical years, and two intercalary years could not be successive. The lunar year was correlated with the solar by the rule that the Paschal full moon immediately followed the spring equinox. There were also various calculations of the equinox, Hippolytus placing it on March 18, Anatolius on March 19, the Alexandrians on March 21.

And with regard to chronology in general it is to be noted that in the East the year almost always began with September. The Jewish civil year began in Tishri (Sept. [Note: Septuagint.]); the religious and regal in Nisan (April) (Josephus *Ant.* i. iii. 3), the order of months beginning with the latter, that of the years with the former. The Alexandrian year began on Aug. 29; the era of the Greeks started from Sept. [Note: Septuagint.] b.c. 312, the Olympiads from July b.c. 776. In the Christian era, also called the Dionysian after Dionysius Exiguus of the 6th cent., 753 a.u.c. = 1 b.c., and 754 a.u.c. = 1 a.d.

The points of chronology in our Lord's life which have to be settled before any table of dates can be drawn up are (1) date of nativity, (2) age at baptism, (3) length of ministry, (4) date of crucifixion. While no one of these can be verified with anything

like precision, it is certain that the accepted chronology, based on the calculations of Dionysius Exiguus in the 6th cent., is erroneous.

Dionysius started, seemingly, from Luk 3:1, the 15th year of Tiberius, placed the public ministry of our Lord one year later, and counted back 30 years, on the strength of Luk 3:23. This gave 754 a.u.c. for the year of Christ's birth. Following Hippolytus, he fixed on Dec. 25 in that year, and, according to the usual method for reckoning the years of monarchs, counted the whole year 754 as 1 a.d. (see Ideler, *Handbuch*, ii. 383 f.). That his views need correction will be proved in the course of this article.

1. Date of Nativity.—This may be fixed somewhat approximately by its relation to (a) the date of Herod's death (Mat 2:1-22), (b) the enrolment under Quirinius (Luk 2:1), and by (c) Patristic testimony.

(a) Herod's death, the *terminus ad quem* of the Nativity, is generally settled by the Jewish chronology in *Ant.* and *BJ*, in which are found indications of the dates of Herod's accession and death, and of the dates of his predecessor Antigonus, and of his immediate successors, Archelaus, Herod Philip, and Herod Antipas. For notice of Herod's death see *Ant.* xvii. viii. 1, 'having reigned, since he had procured the death of Antigonus, 34 years, but, since he had been declared king by the Romans, 37 years.' The death of Antigonus is noted in *Ant.* xiv. xvi. 4. 'This destruction befell the city of Jerusalem when Marcus Agrippa and Canidius Gallus were consuls at Rome, Olym. 185, in the 3rd month, on the solemnity of the fast, like a periodical return of the misfortunes which overtook the Jews under Pompey, by whom they were taken on the same day 27 years before.' The consuls mentioned held office b.c. 37, and 27 years from b.c. 63 (consulship of Cicero and Antonius), when Pompey took Jerusalem (*Ant.* xiv. iv. 3), allowing for the three intercalary months of b.c. 46, gives practically the same date, b.c. 37, for the confirmation of Herod in his kingdom. Herod's death might therefore be placed in the month Nisan (see below) b.c. 4 (Sivan 25 b.c. 37 to Nisan b.c. 4, according to the method of counting reigns, being 34 years).

Of Herod's successors (1) Archelaus, ethnarch of Judaea, was banished in the consulship of Lepidus and Arruntius (a.d. 6), in the 10th year of his reign (*Ant.* xvii. xiii. 2), or in the 9th (*BJ* ii. vii. 3), and therefore would have come to the throne b.c. 4, being probably banished before he celebrated the 10th anniversary of his accession. (2) Herod Philip died in the 20th year of Tiberius, having been tetrarch of Trachonitis and Gaulanitis 37 years (*Ant.* xviii. iv. 6), and would have commenced his reign b.c. 4-3.

There are two more data to help us to fix the year of Herod's death: the eclipse of the moon which preceded his last illness (*Ant.* xvii. vi. 4), and the Passover which followed soon after (xvii. ix. 3). The lunar eclipses visible in Palestine during b.c. 5-3

were those of March 23 b.c. 5, Sept. [Note: Septuagint.] 15 b.c. 5, March 12 b.c. 4. As it is quite possible that the final scene of Herod's life and his obsequies did not cover more than one month, we might, with Ideler and Wurm, fix on the eclipse of March 12 b.c. 4 (Wieseler, *Chron. Syn.* p. 56), which is also indicated by the Passover that immediately followed. b.c. 4, Herod's death, would therefore be the *terminus ad quem* of the Nativity.

But how long before b.c. 4 Jesus was born cannot decisively be said. The age of the Innocents, ἀπὸ διετοῦς καὶ κατωτέρω (Mat 2:16), would give b.c. 6 as the superior limit and b.c. 5 as the inferior, as this clause is qualified by the diligent investigation of Herod (κατὰ τὸν χρόνον ὃν ἠκρίβωσε παρὰ τῶν μάγων). This massacre, quite in keeping with the growing cruelty and suspicion of Herod, who had recently procured the murder of his two sons, Alexander and Aristobulus, was secretly carried out and seemingly of small extent, not being mentioned by Josephus, and being apparently limited to children to whom the star which the Magi saw in the east, at least six months before, might have reference. Although Mat 2:11 τὸ παιδίον does not suggest an infant babe, the stay of the Holy Family in Bethlehem, where the Magi found them, cannot have been long, the presentation in the Temple following 40 days after the Nativity. b.c. 6-5 would then be approximately the date of the Nativity.

Of the star in the east it cannot be said with truth that 'the star shines only in the legend' (von Soden in *Encyc. Bibl.* art. 'Chronology'), for the appearance of a striking sidereal phenomenon between the years b.c. 7 and b.c. 4 has been proved by Kepler and verified by Ideler and Pritchard. Kepler suggested that a conjunction of Saturn and Jupiter in the zodiacal sign of the Pisces, similar to that which took place in Dec. 1603, took place in b.c. 7. But this would be too early for the star that stood over Bethlehem. Wieseler (*l. c.* p. 67) therefore, elaborating another suggestion of Kepler, held that a brilliant evanescent star, similar to that which appeared in Sept. [Note: Septuagint.] 1606 between Jupiter and Saturn, and waned in March 1604, may have appeared then. The Chinese tables mention such an appearance in b.c. 4. Edersheim (*Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*) suggests that the conjunction in b.c. 7 first aroused the attention of the Magi, and that the evanescent star of b.c. 4 stood over Bethlehem. Two Jewish traditions, one that the star of the Messiah should be seen two years before His birth, and the other that the conjunction of Saturn and Jupiter in Pisces portended something of importance for the Jewish nation, might be mentioned. The former is found in the Midrashim, the latter in Abarbanel's *Com. on Daniel* (15th cent.). While no theory could be established on such a basis as this appearance, yet it may support a theory founded on more certain data. If the coming of the Magi took place shortly after the death of Herod's sons Alexander and Aristobulus (b.c. 7) and the mission of Antipater, his heir, to Rome (s.c. 6), their

question, 'Where is he that is born king of the Jews?' would, indeed, be startling to Herod.

(b) The enrolment under Quirinius (Luk 2:2 αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεῦοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου, 'this enrolment took place for the first time when Quirinius was governor of Syria'; cf. ὅτε πρῶτον ἐκέλευσαν ἀπογραφᾶς γενέσθαι [*Strom*, i. 147]). A Roman census took place in a.d. 6, after the deposition of Archelaus, and caused the revolt of Judas of Gamala (*Ant.* xviii. i. 1), who in consequence became the founder of the Zealot party, which resisted Gentile taxation and authority. This taxing (xviii. ii. 1) was concluded in the 37th year of Caesar's victory at Actium (a.d. 7). To this enrolment the author of Act 5:36 refers. But it cannot be the enrolment of Luk 2:2. And Josephus should not be accused of having ascribed to a.d. 7 what took place in b.c. 6-5, as the census he mentions was made after and in consequence of the removal of Archelaus. Mommsen and Zumpt suggest that Quirinius held office *twice* in Syria. And his, indeed, might be the name wanting in a mutilated inscription, describing an official who was twice governor of Syria under Augustus. But Saturninus was governor b.c. 9-7, and Varus b.c. 7-4, being in power after Herod's death; so that no place can be found for the rule of Quirinius before b.c. 4, the *terminus ad quem* of our Lord's birth. He may have come, b.c. 3-2, and completed a census begun by his predecessor. And there is also the possibility of his having received an extraordinary military command by the side of Varus. The *Annals* of Tacitus (ii. 30, iii. 22, 48) describe him as a keen and zealous soldier (*impiger militiae et acribus ministeris*), who had obtained a triumph for having stormed some fortresses of the Homonadenses in Cilicia, but who was distinctly unpopular on account of his friendship with Tiberius, his sordid life and 'dangerous old age.' Such an officer would have been a most useful agent for Augustus in preparing the document called by Suetonius (*Aug.* 28) the *rationarium imperii*, which contained a full description of the 'subject kingdoms, provinces, taxes direct and indirect' (*regna, provinciae, tributa aut vectigalia*, Tac. *Ann.* i. 11), made out by the emperor himself, especially as Varus was slack, and inclined to favour Archelaus. Certain riots mentioned in Josephus (*Ant.* xvii. ii. 4), in which the Pharisees appear, may have been due to the census. Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 34, 46; *Dial, circa (about) Tryph.* 78) appeals to the ἀπογραφὴ made in the time of Quirinius, whom he styles 'the first ἐπίτροπος or procurator in Judaea.' For until Palestine became a Roman province in a.d. 6 there could be no procurator in the strict sense of the term. Previous to that, if Q. did hold office, it would be as a military officer of Syria, and so he might be well described by the vague ἡγεμονεῦοντος, although the word is also applied (Luk 3:1) to Pilate, whom Tacitus styled procurator (*Ann.* xv. 44). With regard to the census, of which no mention is made in contemporary history, it is to be noted that there is

evidence that periodic enrolments, ἀπογραφαί, were made in Egypt (*Class. Rev.*, Mar. 1893). Prof. Ramsay (*Was Christ born at Bethlehem?*) builds on these. It is quite possible that a series of periodical enrolments in a cycle of 14 years were initiated by Augustus, an indefatigable statistician, in other parts of the empire, and that the first of these may have taken place in the days of Herod, who would have carried it out according to Jewish tastes, and so without much disturbance (unless the riots of *Ant.* xvii. ii. 4, *BJ* i. xxxiii. 2 might be connected with it), whereas the later census was conducted according to Roman ideas, and provoked a rebellion. If this be true, the first census would occur b.c. 7-5, just where it would be required. Some hold that it is possible that St. Luke made a mistake in the name Quirinius (C. H. Turner), and also in the census (von Soden).

(c) Patristic testimony, as represented by Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Hippolytus, and perhaps based upon Luk 2:2, favours a date between b.c. 3 and b.c. 2. Irenaeus wrote, 'Our Lord was born about the 41st year (b.c. 3, reckoning from the death of Julius Caesar b.c. 44) of the empire of Augustus' (*Haer.* iii. 21. 3). Clement stated, 'Our Lord was born in the 28th year (b.c. 3, counting from battle of Actium, b.c. 31) of the reign of Augustus, when first they ordered the enrolments to be made' (*Strom.* i. 147). Hippolytus said, in his *Com. on Daniel*, 'Our Lord was born on Wednesday, Dec. 25, in the 42nd (b.c. 2) year of the reign of Augustus.'

With regard to *the month and day of the Nativity*, no data exist to enable us to determine them at all. Farrar (*Life of Christ*, p. 9) inferred from the presence of the shepherds in the fields that it was during winter, but Lewin (*Fasti Sacri*, pp. 23, 115) argues for August 1 as the approximate date. The date of the Annunciation is given in Luk 1:26 as ἐν δὲ τῷ μηνὶ τῷ ἕκτῳ—'in the sixth month,' which is generally referred to Luk 1:36 οὗτος μὴν ἕκτος ἐστὶν αὐτῆι, κ.τ.λ., 'this month is sixth with her,' but which may with equal probability refer to the sixth month of the Jewish calendar, Elul, or to both dates, both terms of six months running concurrently. The date of the service of the course of Abia, the eighth in order (1Ch 24:10), for the year 748 a.u.c. (b.c. 6) has been calculated from the fact that the course in waiting on Ab 9 a.d. 70, when Jerusalem was taken, was the first, Jehoiarib (*Taanith* on 'Fasting,' p. 29a; *BJ* vi. iv.). This would give courses of Abia for 748 a.u.c., b.c. 6, April 18-24, and (24 weeks later) October 3-9. Six months from the latter date would give a day in March as the date of the Annunciation and a date in December for the Nativity; but six months from the former date would give Elul, or the sixth month of the Jewish year, beginning about Sept. [Note: Septuagint.] 19, for the Annunciation, and the third month, Sivan or June, for the Incarnation. Elul was the month of the constellation Virgo, who holds in her hand the *spica Virginis*, which may be 'the offspring of a

Virgin.’ The fourth month belongs to Cancer, among two stars of which is a group called ‘The Manger.’

Patristic tradition.—Hippolytus is the first to give Dec. 25 for the date of the Nativity. On his chair in the library of St. John Lateran in Rome his celebrated table is given. The second year of the cycle has April 2, γένεσις Χριστοῦ, evidently the conception, the calculation being made on the strength of Luk 1:36, which seems to imply an interval of 6 months between the conception of our Lord and that of the Baptist, and on the popular presumption that Gabriel appeared to Zacharias on the great Day of the Atonement, the 10th day of the seventh month. This would bring the conception of our Lord to the 14th day of the first month, or the Passover full moon. Hippolytus afterwards, in his *Com. on Daniel*, in order to allow for two additional years in our Lord’s life, altered the date April 2 to March 25, on which the Church has always celebrated the conception, and consequently the Nativity was assigned to Dec. 25. Edersheim (*The Temple*, p. 293) suggests the influence of the feast of the Dedication of the Temple, held on the 25th of Chislew.

2. The Baptism of Jesus might be settled, but not very approximately, by (1) the statement (Luk 3:23) that He was ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα ἀρχόμενος (at the beginning of His ministry); (2) the date of the Baptist’s preaching, Luk 3:1 ‘Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar ... the word of God came unto John the son of Zacharias in the wilderness’; and (3) by the retort of the Jews in Joh 2:20 ‘Forty and six years was this temple in building.’

(1) This is an elastic expression, which gave the Valentinian Gnostics a basis for their belief that Jesus was in His 30th year when He came to His baptism (*Haer*, ii. 25. 5). But as Irenaeus, in his reference to Joh 8:57 ‘Thou art not yet fifty years old,’ pointed out, 40, not 30, is the perfect age of a master (cf. Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Aboda Zara*); and on the strength of this statement the presbyters in Asia Minor, who misled Irenaeus, ascribed an age of 40 or 50 years to Jesus. Again, while the maximum age of a Levite was 50 years, the minimum varied between 20 (1Ch 23:24; 1Ch 23:27, where the change is ascribed to David), 25 (Num 4:3; Num 4:47 LXX Septuagint), and 30 (Num 4:3; Num 4:47 Heb.). This latitude, added to the general sense of ὡσεὶ (‘about’) and the vague ἀρχόμενος, which is omitted in Syriac Sin. [Note: Sinaitic.] , makes this indication of our Lord’s age indefinite, and capable of meaning either two years over or under 30.

(2) The preaching of the Baptist is the *terminus a quo* of the baptism of Jesus, and is assigned to the 15th year of Tiberius. Dating that reign from the death of Augustus, Aug. 19 a.d. 14, the 15th year corresponds with a.d. 28-29. B. Weiss and Beyschlag,

however, count from a.d. 12, when Tiberius was made co-regent with Augustus. W. M. Ramsay has pointed out that on July 1 a.d. 71, during the life of the Evangelist, Titus was similarly associated in the empire with Vespasian, which would give a.d. 26-27 as the first year of the Baptist's work. This would agree with the office of Pilate, who could hardly have arrived much sooner than a.d. 27, as he held office for 10 years, and was on his way to Rome in a.d. 37, when Tiberius died (*Ant.* xviii. iv. 2). We might, therefore, if it is permitted to follow Weiss and Beyschlag, fix on a.d. 27-28 for our Lord's baptism.

(3) Joh 2:20 τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἕξ ἔτεσιν ὠκοδομήθη ὁ ναὸς οὗτος (cf. Ezr 5:16 ὠκοδομήθη καὶ οὐκ ἐτελέσθη). The Jews do not refer, therefore, to the completion of the restoration, which took place much later (*Ant.* xx. ix. 7). This work was begun in the 18th year of Herod (*Ant.* xv. xi. 1, reckoning from b.c. 37, death of Antigonus), in the 15th (*BJ* i. xxi. 1, reckoning from b.c. 40). This gives b.c. 19-18, from which to a.d. 28 is 46 years. The Passover of a.d. 28 would be a likely date for the events of Joh 2:14-25. The time of Joh 1:19 to Joh 2:12 has yet to be settled. Prof. Sanday (art. 'Jesus Christ in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible' ii. 609) gives the time as 'Winter, a.d. 26.' Now there are certain indications of the time of year in which our Lord was baptized which show that His visit to the Baptist may have synchronized with the preparations for the Passover in the month Adar (cf. Joh 11:55 'And the Jews' passover was at hand, and many went out of the country up to Jerusalem before the passover to purify themselves'), while His sojourn and fast in the wilderness, of which St. Matthew and St. Luke give details, may have been due not only to a desire to be alone to reflect upon His mission, but also to the feeling of the necessity of a great self-restraint in order to check the urgings of His Messianic consciousness to manifest Himself to the Passover crowds in His connexion with His country as its Redeemer, with the Temple as the Son of God and its Priest, and with the world as its King. It was on His return from the desert that He was pointed out by the Baptist, when the marks of the recent struggle and fasting on His brow would have given additional point to the Baptist's remark, 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world' (Joh 1:29), which has a true Passover ring (cf. 'Christ our passover [or Paschal lamb, τὸ πάσχα] was sacrificed for us,' 1Co 5:7). Passover time would also account for the presence of so many Galilaeans in Judaea, while the atmosphere of the scenes of the baptism of Jesus and of His interviews with His first disciples in John 1 is spring, the budding life of the year, in the buoyant sunshine when men's hearts are most ready for a change of life. Nathanael, an Israelite without the guile of Jacob, at the feast exclusively for Israelites, is meditating under a fig tree, most likely on the story of Jacob. Passover seems a favourite time for baptism. It was after the Passover of Joh 2:13 that Jesus and His disciples baptized in Judaea, while John

was baptizing in aenon near to Salim (Joh_3:22 f.). And it is most improbable that Jesus would have stayed away from the Passover.

On the other side may be urged the fact that Bethabara, for which the best MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] , \aleph ABC, read 'Bethany,' has been identified by Conder with a ford called *Aburah*, N.E. of Bethshean, 'a site as near to Cana as any point on the Jordan, and within a day's journey' (art. 'Bethabara' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible). On the other hand, *Encyc. Bibl.* art. 'Bethany' follows Sir G. Grove and Sir C. W. Wilson (Smith's *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , s.v. 'Bethnimrah') in holding that Beth-aimrah on the east of Jordan, opposite to Jericho, is the place meant. Beth-nimrah, now known as *Nimrîn*, is 'beyond Jordan,' τέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου (Joh_1:28; Joh_3:26); it is well supplied with water, and accessible both from Jericho and Jerusalem, and may have produced the variants 'Bethahara' and 'Bethany.' Origen advocated Bethabara because he could find no Bethany beyond Jordan. But the variant Βηθαραβα for Βηθαβαρα is found in his text. That variant and the traditional site of our Lord's baptism, *Makhadet Hojla*, are strongly against Col. Conder's suggestion, while tradition connects our Lord's temptation with the district of Quarantania, named from His 40 days' fast; and something must be allowed for tradition in such matters. 'The third day' of Joh_2:1 may possibly be counted from Joh_1:43 'On the day after.' But it is probable, in fact it is to be inferred from His mother's information of the exhausted wine, that our Lord was not present on the first day of the marriage festivities, which generally extended over a week, and were concluded with a supper (art. 'Marriage' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible), and it was quite possible for Him and His disciples to have accomplished the journey from the vicinity of Jericho to Nazareth (about 60 miles) in three or four days; so that there is no necessity to select a site for His baptism within one day's journey of Cana. Again, the favourite time for such marriages was March (Wetzstein in *Ztschr. f. Ethnol.* v. [1873]). So that we have another indication of the early season of the year, which supports the hypothesis of a baptism at the Passover preceding the Passover of Joh_2:13, a period of time required for the preparation and selection of the disciples, and for the nursing of their nascent faith by miracles, of which one, a typical sign, as are all the seven signs in the Fourth Gospel, is narrated in Joh_2:1-12. To this faith referencasis made in v. 11 'And his disciples believed in him.' Nor does the Master's change of manner (v. 24 'But Jesus would not trust himself to them') suggest the beginning of a mission.

The order in St. Mark's Gospel is of little service here. For Mar_1:14 ('Now after that John was put in prison Jesus came into Galilee preaching') refers to an event, the imprisonment of the Baptist, which was clearly later than Joh_4:1, and is, therefore,

to be taken not as a note of time, but as a general introduction to the Galilean ministry, which forms the subject of the Second Gospel. The selection of the disciples (Mar 1:16-19), the missionary work of Mar 1:38 ἄγωμεν εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις, a portion of Mark 1-3, and apparently Luk 5:1-11 (the scene with Peter on the lake), may belong to the Galilean work previous to Joh 2:13. On this hypothesis, which fills in the awkward gap between the 13th and 14th verses of Mark 1, the baptism of Jesus would fall on the Passover of a.d. 27.

3. Length of the Ministry.—If the date of the beginning of the ministry be approximately fixed, the year of its close will vary according to the estimate we form of its length. Prof. von Soden (*Encyc. Bibl.* art. 'Chronology') reduces it to a one year basis, while Prof. Sanday (art. 'Jesus Christ' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. 610) requires nearly 2¼ years for his scheme of our Lord's ministry. This difference is due to the fact that St. John seems to extend that ministry over three Passovers, while the Synoptists mention but one Passover.

(a) In the Second Gospel there seem to be three data for a chronology. (1) Mar 2:23 mentions ears of corn (τίλλοντες τοὺς στάχους). As the earliest barley was in April, the latest in June, it is believed that the point of time we have here is Passover, which was of old associated with 'ears of corn'; the name of the month in which it was held being formerly 'Abib אֲבִיב or 'ear of corn.' (2) Mar 6:39 describes the miracle of the feeding of the 5000, in the course of which we read that the people were arranged in companies, πρασιαὶ πρασιαί (a phrase suggestive of garden-plots), and seated ἐπὶ τῷ χλωρῷ χόρτῳ, an indication of early spring. (3) Mark 11, final Passover. In these data Turner ('Chronology of NT' in Hastings' B [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.]) sees a suggestion of a two years' ministry. But it is evident that the arrangement of this Gospel is according to subject-matter, not to time. The time relation of the episode of the ears of corn cannot be satisfactorily settled with regard either to the events it precedes or those it follows in the narrative. It is, therefore, quite possible that it preceded the Passover of Joh 2:13. In St. Luke's Gospel it occurs shortly after the scene with St. Peter on the Lake (Luk 5:1-11), which must have preceded Joh 3:22, where Jesus and *His disciples* go into the land of Judaea and continue baptizing there; and in both the Second and Third Gospels it directly follows the question, 'Why do the disciples of John and of the Pharisees fast, and thy disciples fast not?', which occasioned the Parable of the Bridegroom and the Children of the Bridechamber, which seemingly but not really corresponds with the discussion in Joh 3:26 between the disciples of John and a Jew about 'purifying,' which evoked from the Baptist the rhapsody on the bride and bridegroom. For the questions are quite different, and belong to distinctly different contexts; that in the Synoptists being caused by the

feast of Levi and perhaps indirectly by the feast at Cana of Galilee, while that of the Fourth Gospel arose in connexion with the work in Judaea after the Passover of Joh 2:13.

No fresh light is thrown on the passage by the disputed point of time ἐν σαββάτῳ δευτέρῳ, which Wetstein explains as the first Sabbath of the second month, Scaliger as the first Sabbath after the Feast of Unleavened Bread, Godet as the first Sabbath of the ecclesiastical year. The ripeness of the wheat suggests the month of Iyyar or May. And it is quite possible to conceive our Lord in that month (called in the old style Ziv (η) or the 'month of flowers,' and in the new style 'Iyyar (יָאָר) or 'the bright and flowering month') teaching the people in the plain and on the hill to 'consider the lilies of the field, how they grow' (Mat 6:28). It seems not impossible, therefore, to reconstruct the Second Gospel on the basis of a single year following the Passover of Joh 2:13, with a year or greater part of a year previous to that Passover.

(b) St. Luke's Gospel is divisible into two parts. The second (Luk 9:50 to Luk 19:28 containing matter peculiar to him), being devoted to the doings and teachings of the Master as the days of His assumption were being fulfilled (Luk 9:51), seems to restrict the Lord's ministry to a single year, 'the acceptable year of the Lord' (Luk 4:19; cf. Isa 61:2). The reference to 'three years' in the parable of the Fig-tree (Isa 13:7), which suggested to many (Bengel among others) the beginning of a third year of ministry, is a vague expression to which Luk 13:32 ('to-day and to-morrow, and on the third day') might be a parallel. In Luk 4:14 to Luk 9:50 there is but one apparent reference to any work outside the Galilaean, Ἰουδαίας (≠ BCL) of Luk 4:44 being a variant for Γαλιλαίας. But 'Judaea' in the days of St. Luke included all Palestine (cf. Isa 23:5).

(c) The Fourth Gospel has seven notes of time between the Baptism and the Crucifixion:

- (1) Joh 2:13; Joh 2:23 'And the Jews' passover was at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem ... And he was in Jerusalem at the passover during the feast.'
- (2) Joh 4:35 'Say ye not, There are yet four months (τετράμηνος), and then cometh harvest? behold. I say unto you, Lift up your eyes, and consider (θεάσασθε) the fields that they are white already to harvest.'
- (3) Joh 5:1 'After these things there was a [or the] feast of the Jews, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem.'

- (4) Joh 6:4 ‘Now [the passover, το πάσχα, uncertain] the feast of the Jews was high.’
- (5) Joh 7:2 ‘Now the Jews’ feast of tabernacles was at hand.’
- (6) Joh 10:22 ‘Then the dedication took place in Jerusalem.’
- (7) Joh 12:1 ‘Jesus then, six days before the passover, came to Bethany.’

Joh 4:35 (α) οὐχ ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἔτι τετραμήνης ἐστὶν καὶ ὁ θερισμὸς ἔρχεται; (β) ἰδοὺ, λέγω ὑμῖν ... ὅτι λευκαὶ εἰσὶν πρὸς θερισμόν, is a difficult note of time. The simplest interpretation is to take a literally of a harvest still remote, and β spiritually of a harvest already ripening. Origen, however, held that it was already the middle or end of harvest when these things happened (*in Joan.* tom. xiii. 39, 41); but it is evident that our Lord made no long delay in Judaea after the unpleasantness that had occurred between His disciples and John’s, and it would not be long before the popular Baptist, with his great following, would hear of his greater Rival (Joh 3:26), or before the Pharisees would note the falling off of the Baptist’s followers. The fact that the impression His works in Jerusalem had made on the Galilaeans was still fresh (Joh 4:45), and that He did not tarry more than two days, possibly only one (μετὰ δὲ τὰς δύο ἡμέρας, Joh 4:43), among the kindly and believing Samaritans, and that He was wearied with the journey (Joh 4:6), points to no long interval between Joh 2:13 and Joh 4:45 and to no leisurely mode of travelling. Again, the word ἔτι has a touch of reality, which suggests the natural interpretation of τετραμήνης against those who would read the passage proverbially: ‘Is it not a saying that there are four months between sowing and reaping?’ There is nothing, however, to prevent one taking the lateness of the Galilaean harvest into account, and reading the passage thus: ‘Say ye not, ye men of Galilee, where the harvest is later than in Judaea, where Jeroboam held his feast of ingathering on the 15th day of the eighth month (1Ki 12:32) instead of on the 15th day of the seventh (Lev 23:34), that harvest is yet four months off?’ If these words were spoken towards the end of Nisan, the four months referred to would be Nisan (March-April, end), Iyyar (April-May), Sivan (May-June), and Thammuz (June-July, beginning). This would be in keeping with the fact that the harvest naturally varied not only with season, but also with elevation, etc., and that, while it commenced in the lowlands of the Jordan Valley in April, it ended on sub-alpine Lebanon in August (see art. ‘Wheat’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible).

Joh 5:1 'And there was a feast of the Jews, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem' (with alternative readings, ἑορτή and ἡ ἑορτή, the latter being supported by the Alexandrian type of text, doubtless through the influence of Eusebius, who maintained a three years' ministry with four Passovers). What this feast was cannot definitely be said. Irenaeus regarded it as a Passover. The early Greek Church identified it with Pentecost. Westcott (*ad loc.*) suggests Trumpets (September), as 'many of the main thoughts of the discourse—Creation, Judgment, and Law—find a remarkable illustration in the thoughts of the festival.' But Exo 19:1 states that it was in the third month (*i.e.* after Passover) that the Law was given on Sinai. This would correspond with Pentecost, which is described in the later Jewish liturgy as 'the day of the giving of the Law' (Saalschütz, *Das Mos. Recht*, p. 42a), and by Maimonides (*Moreh neb.* iii. 41) as 'dies ille quo lex data fuit.' Furthermore, the strict regulations and calculations of the Sabbaths of the harvest period between Nisan 16 and Pentecost, the Feast of Weeks, add point to the controversy concerning the Sabbath day (Joh 5:10-18). The voluntary nature of the cure, a contrast with the *signs* of Joh 2:11. and Joh 4:54 performed by request, suggests that this act was in accordance with the Pentecostal regulations of Deu 16:10, a free-will offering of His own hand, and according to Lev 23:22 the gleaning of His harvest for the poor.

There is a useful indication of time in Joh 5:33-36, where the Baptist, whose popularity is waning in Joh 4:1, and whose utterance in Joh 3:28-36 seems to contain a presentiment of doom—'He must increase, but I must decrease'—is referred to as a lamp that no longer shines. 'He was the burning and shining lamp, and ye were willing for a time to rejoice in his light.' It is probable that Herod Antipas, who was jealous and suspicious of the Baptist's influence (*Ant.* xviii. v. 1), seized the opportunity of his decreasing popularity to have him betrayed (παράδοθῆναι, Mar 1:14) and arrested. The report of that arrest may have reached our Lord on His journey through Samaria to Galilee (John 4). If so, the Synoptic statements of Mar 1:14, Mat 4:12, regarding His work in Galilee as connected with the imprisonment of the Baptist would be suitably introduced by the healing of the nobleman's son at Capernaum (Joh 4:46-51).

The interval allowed by the Synoptists between the arrest and the death of the Baptist, in which room is found for an extended work of Jesus in Galilee (Capernaum especially, Mat 11:1-30), for the Baptist's mission to Jesus (Mat 11:3), and for Herod's procrastination with the Baptist, whom he feared, tried to keep safe, and for whom he did many things (Mar 6:20), is also allowed in the Fourth Gospel. In it Jesus is represented as walking in Galilee (Joh 7:1-10) before the Feast of Tabernacles, nearly five months (Sivan 8-Tishri 15) after the Feast of Pentecost (Joh 5:1), but not afterwards,—a fact which is in agreement with the Synoptic account (Luk 9:10, Mat 14:13, Mar 6:31), which describes our Lord withdrawing from the jurisdiction of

Herod Antipas to Bethsaida Julias, Caesarea Philippi, and other districts of Herod Philip—the best of all the Herods—in consequence of the former’s identification of Him with the Baptist, whom he had beheaded (Mar_6:14).

With regard to the date of the Baptist’s execution, Keim, Hausrath, Schenkel, and others, on the strength of Josephus’ account of the defeat of Antipas by Aretas (a.d. 36), in connexion with his narrative of the Baptist’s death, which the Jews regarded as divinely avenged in that battle, have held that the divorce of Herod Antipas’ wife cannot have been long before a.d. 36. But Josephus notes also a dispute about boundaries in Gamalitis (*Ant.* xviii. v. 1) as subsequent to the divorce of the daughter of Aretas, which he describes as ‘the first occasion’ of the bitterness between him and Herod. And there is nothing in the annals of the Herods to controvert the date a.d. 28 for the scene in the castle of Machaerus as described in the Synoptics. In fact, a.d. 28 would be a more suitable date for the elopement of Herodias, and the description of her daughter Salome as τὸ κοράσιον (Mar_6:22; Mar_6:28), than a.d. 36. Herodias was the sister of Agrippa i., who (*Ant.* xix. viii. 2) was 54 years old when he died in a.d. 44, and was, therefore, born b.c. 10. Herodias must have been born shortly before or after, as she was betrothed by Herod the Great (*Ant.* xvii. i. 2), after the death of her father Aristobulus (b.c. 7), when quite a child, to Philip his son by Mariamne ii., daughter of Simon the high priest, whom he married in the 13th year of his reign, *circa (about)* b.c. 24 (*Ant.* xv. ix. 3). Herodias would, therefore, be about 37 years old, and her husband 52 in a.d. 28, and her daughter Salome not more than 18, as Herodias was married ‘when arrived at age of puberty’ (*Ant.* xviii. v. 4). In a.d. 36 she would be 45 years of age, and Salome 26. The former age is, therefore, more probable. The fact that retribution was connected with the defeat in a.d. 36 proves nothing, as retribution is proverbially long delayed.

The fourth point of time is Joh_6:4. The difficulty in it is the reading τὸ πάσχα. By many it is retained; by others omitted. If it is retained, there are three Passovers mentioned in Jn. (Joh_2:13, Joh_6:4, Joh_12:1), making the ministry extend over two years. But if it is removed, this feast of the Jews becomes identified with the Feast of Tabernacles of Joh_7:2. And the chronology of the ministry can be reckoned on the basis of a year and several months previous.

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <u>Joh_1:29</u> to <u>Joh_2:12</u> . | Work in Galilee. |
| <u>Joh_2:13</u> . | Passover in Jerusalem (Nisan). |
| <u>Joh_5:1</u> . | Pentecost in Sivan (May-June 1). |
| <u>Joh_6:4</u> . | Tabernacles in Tishri (September-October). |

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| <u>Joh 7:2.</u> | Tabernacles in Tishri. |
| <u>Joh 10:22.</u> | Dedication in Chislew (November-December). |
| <u>Joh 11:55.</u> | Passover in Nisan (March-April). |

Hort urges the omission of τὸ τάσχα, which is supported (1) by documentary evidence; (2) by the fact that χόρτος πολὺς of Joh 6:10 apparently = χλωρῶ χόρτῳ of Mar 6:39; (3) by the note (Joh 7:1), ‘After these things Jesus walked (τεριετατει) in Galilee,’ which implies some interval between the events of chs. 6 and 7, but on the Tabernacles hypothesis sufficient time would not be allowed, as the same feast was ‘near’ in Joh 6:4 and in Joh 7:2; and (4) it is said that St. John, who was writing for Christians who had holy associations with Passover and Pentecost but not with Tabernacles, would hardly have spoken of that feast as ‘the Feast’ κατ’ ἐξοχήν. On the other hand, it is more than probable (1) that Irenaeus would have mentioned Joh 6:4 among the Passovers, if he knew of it, even though ostensibly he was merely recording the Passovers at which our Lord went up to Jerusalem, as his main object was to confute the Gnostics, who held that Jesus suffered a year after His baptism (*Haer.* ii. 22. 3); (2) that ἔγγυς is a vague term allowing for comparative nearness, and our Lord did not hurry Himself for the feast, arriving only in the middle of it (Joh 7:14); (3) that Origen’s *Com. on St. John* clearly postulates the omission of a Passover between Joh 4:35 and Joh 7:2; (4) that St. John wrote as one familiar with Jewish fasts and feasts, and Josephus (*Ant.* viii. iv. 1) calls the Feast of Tabernacles ἐορτὴ σφόδρα παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβραίοις ἀγιωτάτη καὶ μεγίστη, and it is in OT sometimes called ‘the Feast’ (1Ki 8:2; 1Ki 8:65, Eze 45:25); (5) that the tradition of the Gnostics might have been more easily confuted by Irenaeus by a reference to a Passover in Joh 6:4 than by an attempt to identify the feast of 5:1 with a Passover; (6) that the Alogi, according to Epiphanius (*Haer.* 51, 22), found in Jn. only a Passover at the beginning and another at the end of His ministry; (7) that the words τὸ τάσχα might have easily been suggested by the discourse on the sacrificial feast and the ‘barley’ loaves (ἄρτους κριθίνους), which, however, has a nearer reference to the offerings (two leavened loaves of the best wheat, etc.) and customs of Pentecost, which was distinguished by thank-offerings (תְּחִנָּה תְּחִנָּה = εὐχαριστήσας) and festive gatherings for the poor (Lev 24:22); (8) that the insertion of a Passover here would break the unity of the plot and interfere with the development of the drama from Joh 2:13 to Joh 12:1, creating a gap between chs. 4 and 6 out of all proportion to the

other intervals in the Gospel after Joh 2:13. These reasons are not conclusive, but they are sufficient to prove the possibility of τὸ τὰσχα being an early gloss on ἡ ἑορτή.

The interval between the Feast of Tabernacles (Tishri, a.d. 28) and the Passover (14 Nisan, a.d. 29) is sufficiently ample to allow for the work in the towns of Caesarea Philippi (Mar 8:27), the preparation of the disciples for His death (Luk 9:22 f. = Mar 8:31), His Transfiguration six days after (Mat 17:1-13), His slow progress to 'Jerusalem, preceded by the Seventy' (Luk 10:1), 'when the days were well-nigh come that He should be received up' (Luk 9:51), the visit to Jerusalem at the Feast of Dedication (Joh 10:22), His work in the Peraea (Joh 10:40, Mar 10:1), and in the wilderness of Judaea (Joh 11:54). A ministry from Passover a.d. 27, when He was baptized, to Passover a.d. 29, is quite long enough to allow for the development of the life of the Master, and for the many journeys and missionary tours in a district as small as Wales, and where the festivals at the capital were so frequent. The details would be distinctly meagre for a longer mission.

4. Date of the Crucifixion.—The procuratorship of Pilate and the high priesthood of Caiaphas roughly indicate the date. Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. ii. 2) notes the appointment of Valerius Gratus by Tiberius (*circa (about)* a.d. 14-15), his return to Rome after 11 years (*circa (about)* a.d. 25-26), and the appointment of Pilate in his place. In *Ant.* xviii. iv. 2 we read that 'Pilate when he had tarried 10 years in Judaea made haste to Rome; but before he could reach Rome, Tiberius died' (a.d. 37). His office might be, therefore, dated a.d. 26-36. Pilate at the trial of Jesus seems to have already had trouble with the Jews and Galilaeans and Herod. His yielding to them in the present instance through fear of their accusing him to Tiberius, and his release of 'a notable prisoner' (δέσμιον ἐπίσημον, Mat 27:16), 'who for a certain insurrection made in the city and for murder' (Luk 23:19) 'was lying bound with them that had made insurrection' (Mar 15:7), imply at least part of the 10 years of cross purposes which marked Pilate's rule, but need not be ascribed to the censure received from Tiberius, *circa (about)* a.d. 33, on account of the votive shields (Philo, *Legat. ad Gaium*, § 38), as he had in his very first year of office experienced the inflexibility of the Jews (*Ant.* xviii. iii. 1). A Passover earlier than that of a.d. 28 would hardly suit.

The high priesthood of Annas, referred to in Joh 11:49; Joh 18:13; Joh 18:24, is a *terminus ad quem* of the Crucifixion, his deposition occurring about the same time as Herod Philip's death. It is assigned by Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. iv. 3, 6) to the 20th year of Tiberius. The latest possible date of the Crucifixion would thus be a.d. 34, the earliest a.d. 26.

As it is hard to believe that such an event would not be exactly chronicled by the Church, it is quite possible to regard Luk 3:1—'in the fifteenth year of Tiberius'—as

an indication of the 'acceptable year of the Lord' which terminated on the cross, whether with Bratke (SK [Note: K Studien und Kritiken.] , 1892) we regard that acceptable year as terminating in the 15th, or with von Soden (*Encyc. Bibl.* art. 'Chronology') in the 16th of Tiberius. A well-known tradition of the Church assigns the Crucifixion to the consulship of the Gemini, L. Rubellius and C. Rufius, a.d. 29, which year, according to the strict method of computation from Aug. a.d. 14, would correspond with Tiberius 15, but, counting as a year the semester Aug. a.d. 14-Jan. a.d. 15, when the consuls dated their term of office, would be Tiberius 16.

Among Patristic authorities for the year of the Crucifixion the following are chief:—Clement of Alexandria: 'With the 15th year of Tiberius and 15th of Augustus so are completed the 30 years to the passion' (*Strom.* i. 147). Origen: 'If you examine the chronology of the Passion and of the fall of Jerusalem ... from Tiberius 15 to the razing of the temple are 42 years' (*Hom. in Hierem.* xix. 13). Tertullian: 'In the 15th year of the reign Christ suffered ... in the consulship of Rubellius Geminus and Rufius Geminus' (*adv. Jud.* 1:8, but authorship doubtful); and Hippolytus, who in his work on *Daniel* stated: 'Our Lord was born on Wednesday, Dec. 25, in the 42nd year of the reign of Augustus.... He suffered in the 33rd year, on Friday, March 25, in the 18th year of Tiberius, and the consulship of Rufus and Rubellio,' evidently attempting to combine a three years' ministry with Luk 3:1. In his *Chronicle* the length of our Lord's life is estimated at 30 years. Dr. Salmon in *Hermathena*, No. xviii., suggests that Hippolytus altered the chronology of the latter work in a.d. 234, on discovering that St. John's chronology was incompatible with a one year's ministry. In the tables of Hippolytus the Passion is assigned to the 32nd year of the cycle, which, reckoning back by cycles of 112 years from a.d. 222, the first year of the cycle, is a.d. 29, which may have been suggested by the consulship of the Gemini, whose names he gives erroneously with or after the *Acts of Pilate* as Rufus and Rubellio. Other authorities who may be cited are Julius Africanus, who seems to hover between Tiberius 16 (in the Greek of Eusebius, *Dem. Evang.*) and Tiberius 15 (Latin of Jerome's *Com. in Dan.* ix.); Lactantius, who wrote: 'In the 15th year of Tiberius, that is, in the consulship of the Gemini' (*Div. Inst.* iv. x. 18); the *Liberian Chronicle*, which has, 'Under Tiberius, the two Gemini consuls, March 25'; and Augustine (*de Civ. Dei*, xviii. 54): 'Consuls the Gemini, March 25.' a.d. 29 is therefore well supported by Christian tradition. The note of the annalist Phlegon, referred to by Origen (*circa (about) Cels.* ii. 33), and the *Chronicle* of Eusebius (under Ol. 202. 4 = a.d. 32-33), which mentions the earthquake in Bithynia and the darkness at the sixth hour of the day, obviously comes from some unreliable Christian source.

(a) *Day of week and month.*—Some indications of the day of the week are found in Scripture. The general belief that the Crucifixion took place on Friday is founded on inference from the fact that He rose 'on the third day,' τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (1Co 15:4), the

Jews counting their days inclusively. Westcott, however, held that it took place on a Thursday, on account of the 'three days and three nights' of Mat 12:40, a saying found only there, and evidently equivalent to 'on the third day' (Gen 42:17-18, Est 4:16; Est 5:1).

(b) *Day of month.*—The question is, Did the Crucifixion take place on the Passover, Nisan 15, or on the day preceding, Nisan 14? This question also concerns the relation of the Passover to the Last Supper; for while, strictly speaking, both events took place on the same day, on the Jewish reckoning from evening to evening, according to the ordinary Roman method the Crucifixion fell a day later than the Supper. Sanday (*Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel*), Westcott (*Introduction to the Gospels*), and many others maintain that it took place on Nisan 14. The principal champion for Nisan 15 is Edersheim, who holds that the Last Supper synchronized with the Passover, and that the Pascha of which the Jews desired to partake was the *Chagîgah* or festive offering of the first festive Paschal day. The Synoptists in some places identify the last meal with the Passover, but in others give indications of an opposite view; while the Fourth Gospel gives unqualified support to the opinion that the feast of which our Lord partook had a quasi-Paschal significance, and preceded in order to supersede the Jewish Passover. A list of passages from the Gospels for both views makes this clear:

For Nisan 15, the Passover—

Mat 26:17 'The first day of the feast of unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the Passover?'

Luk 22:7 'Then came the day of unleavened bread, when the Passover must be killed.'

Mat 14:12 'And the first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the Passover.'

Luk 22:15 'With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer.'

For Nisan 14-

Joh 13:1 'Now before the feast of the Passover.'

Joh 18:28 'And they themselves went not into the praetorium, lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the Passover.'

Joh 13:29 'Buy that we have need of for the feast.'

Joh 19:14 'And it was the preparation of the Passover.'

Joh 19:31 'Since it was the preparation, and that Sabbath day was a high day.'

Mat 26:3-5 'Then assembled together the chief priests ... and consulted that they might take Jesus by subtilty and kill him. But they said, *Not on the feast day*, lest there be an uproar among the people' (cf. Mar 14:2).

Mat 27:62 'Now the next day, that followed the day of the preparation.'

Luk 23:54 'And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on.'

Other incidents in the Synoptics point to Nisan 14, such as the holding of the trial on the feast day, the purchase of linen and spices, the arming of Peter, the coming of Simon 'from the field' (Mar 15:21), the unseemly hurry with the trial, the execution and the final dispatch of the victims, the sword of Peter (Mar 14:47), the armed multitude with Judas (Mar 14:43), it being unlawful to carry arms on the feast day. It is to be noticed that Mt., Mk., and Jn. represent the Crucifixion as taking place on the *Paraskeue*, which is distinctly Friday in Joh 19:31, being mentioned in connexion with the Sabbath, and in Mar 15:42, where it is defined as προσαββατον. St. John in Joh 19:14 describes it as 'the preparation of the passover,' but as the weekly *Paraskeue* in Joh 19:31, and Joh 19:42 referring to the removal from the cross and the hasty entombment says 'for it was the preparation' and 'because of (διὰ = because it was) the preparation of the Jews.'

Against all these passages there stands one expression common to all the Synoptists, 'the day of unleavened bread,' for Luk 22:15 may merely indicate the Paschal nature of the Last Supper. That expression is, therefore, to be reckoned with.

Chwolson (*Das letzte Passamahl Christi*, p. 3 f.) maintains that the Synoptists start with an error, for 'from the Mosaic writings down to the Book of Jubilees ... indeed, down to the present day, the Jews have always understood by the phrase "the first day of the feast of unleavened bread" only the 15th and not the 14th, so that it would be a contradiction in terms to say with Mar 14:12, 'on the first day of unleavened bread when they sacrificed the Passover.' Ewald (*Antiquities of Israel*, p. 358 ff.) treats the Passover, which he shows from Exo 12:3-6 was originally fixed for the 10th of the month when the Paschal lamb was to be selected, as the preparatory expiatory festival of the Spring Feast of Unleavened Bread, just as the Day of Atonement, on the 10th day of the 7th month, preceded the great autumn festival of Tabernacles. 'Not till the 14th day, during the last three hours before and the first three hours after sunset, was the sacrificial animal slain and eaten.... It was always appointed for

the 14th, and in the earliest times at least the view was strictly upheld that the Feast of Unleavened Bread did not begin till the following morning.’ Philo distinguished the τὰ σάχα of Nisan 14 from the τὰ ἄζυμα of Nisan 15-21. Mar_14:1 unites without confusing them, ἦν δὲ τὸ σάχα καὶ τὰ ἄζυμα μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας.

It would seem that some technical error was committed by the Synoptists, which may have been due to (1) St. Peter’s inexact knowledge of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and probable identification of it with the removal of leaven before noon on Nisan 14 (Exo_12:15); (2) the custom of the Galilaeans, who, unlike the people of Judaea, who worked until the noon preceding, abstained from work the whole morning preceding the Passover, which was reckoned from evening to evening, and consequently would make their preparations after sunset on Nisan 13 (*Students’ Com.* on Mat_26:17); (3) some verbal confusion between the Syriac words for ‘before’ (*kedâm*, Mat_8:29) and ‘first’ (*kadmâyâ*, Mat_26:17) owing to Peter’s broad Galilaeian accent, which may have caused St. Mark’s mistake; (4) a comparative use of Gr. πρῶτος (cf. Joh_1:15 πρῶτός μου, ‘before me’; Joh_15:18 ἐμὲ πρῶτον ὑμῶν, ‘before you’), in which case Mat_26:17 would mean ‘on the day before the Feast of Unleavened Bread’; (5) a difference in the mode of reckoning the days adopted by St. John, who, according to Westcott (Joh_19:14), used the Western method of counting from midnight to noon, and by St. Mark, who adhered to the legal reckoning from evening to evening (Mar_15:42); (6) a natural confusion of the preparation of the Passover (Joh_19:14) on Nisan 13 with the weekly *Paraskeue* on Nisan 14 (Mar_15:42), or of the day when leaven was removed from the houses (Exo_12:15 [LXX Septuagint ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς πρώτης]) with the Festival of *Mazzôth*, which commenced after the Passover day. The argument that the expression ‘not on the feast’ (μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, Mat_26:5) cannot refer to Passover has to reckon with Exo_12:14 where the Passover is called ‘feast’ (ἑορτήν, LXX Septuagint).

Support for Nisan 14 as day of Crucifixion in NT and tradition (Christian and Jewish).—(1) 1Co_5:7 τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστός, identifies Christ with the Paschal lamb slain between ‘the two evenings’; and 1Co_15:20 identifies the Risen Christ with the First-fruits of the 2nd day of the Feast of *Mazzôth*, ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων. (2) The Quartodecimans, among whom was Polycarp, held a fast on Nisan 14 as the day of Crucifixion (letter of Irenaeus to Victor). (3) Jewish tradition fixes the Crucifixion on the *crebh Pesah* or Passover eve, and the Greek Church always used leavened bread in the Eucharist. (4) Apollinaris of Hierapolis (*circa (about)* a.d. 180)

pointed out that the 14th is connected with the Crucifixion. (5) Clement of Alexandria said that Christ did not eat the Passover, but suffered on the 14th. (6) Hippolytus of Portus declared that Christ ate a supper before the Passover, 'for He was the Paschal lamb who had been promised and was sanctified on the appointed day.' (7) Tertullian (*adv. Jud. 1:8*—a doubtful work) suggests Nisan 14. (8) Irenaeus (*Haer. iv. x. 1*), discussing Moses' prediction of Jesus, says, 'The day of whose Passion he did not ignore, but foretold it in a figure, calling it Pascha.' This is not very decisive, but suggests a memory of *1Co 5:7*. This view of Nisan 14 may be said to be the best supported in the first two centuries.

Tradition in support of Nisan 15.—Origen, in his comment on *Mat 26:17*, follows the Synoptic tradition: 'Jesus celebravit more Judaico pascha corporaliter.' Chrysostom declares (*Hom. in Mt. 82*) that the new feast appointed by Jesus superseded the Passover. Ambrose, Proterius and others follow on the same side. This view seems more recently popular than the other. But the controversy of Apollinaris in *περὶ τοῦ πᾶσχα λόγος* shows that there were some in the 2nd cent. who connected Nisan 14 with the Supper, and therefore Nisan 15 (according to Roman reckoning) with the Crucifixion.

The cumulative evidence of St. John, St. Paul, and the early Fathers, joined with the incredibility of Jesus having been arrested, tried, and executed on the great Sabbath of the Jewish Year, and the statement of the Synoptists that that day was the *Paraskeue*, seem to turn the scale in favour of Nisan 14 as the day of the Crucifixion. See also Last Supper. Nisan 14, a.d. 29, is the date to be now tested by other evidence.

Clement of Alexandria (*Strom. i. 147*) notes the various views of the Basilidians. 'With regard to the Passion, some, after precise calculations, say it took place in the 16th year of Tiberius on Phamenoth 25 (March 21); others on Pharmuthi 25 (April 20); others, again, on Pharmuthi 29 (April 24). March 18 and March 25, however, are the best supported. Epiphanius (*Haer. i. 1*) had seen copies of the *Acts of Pilate* which gave March 18 as the date, but the Quartodecimans kept March 25 on the strength of these *Acts*; this is evidence of some hesitation between these dates. Hippolytus (*Com. on Dan.*) gives March 25. With regard to this date, also given in the *Paschal Cycle*, Dr. Salmon says (*Hermathena*, No. xviii. p. 175): 'We can therefore regard the date March 25 as inseparably connected with the sixteen years' cycle of Hippolytus.' As the Easter full moon was on March 25 in a.d. 221, and, working on the principle that after 16 years full moons return to the same day, Hippolytus trusted his cycle that it must have been on the same day in a.d. 29. But, as Br. Salmon shows, in that year the full moon really fell on March 18, a week previous. An interesting confirmation of the date March 18 is given by the Jewish calendar of Paschal moons, from which it would

appear that Friday, which is generally accepted as the day of the Crucifixion, could not have fallen on Nisan 14 or 15 in the years a.d. 28, 31, 32, so that we are left to choose between 29, 30, 33, and of these a.d. 29 answers all the required conditions best, as the 14th day of the moon would fall in that year on Friday, March 18 (so C. H. Turner, 'Chronology' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible).

Dr. Salmon, in the article cited, said it was doubtful if Hippolytus had any historical authority for fixing on the year 29 over and above the reason 'that the day which his cycle exhibited as the Crucifixion Day should be a Friday,' and that 'the only years he would find fulfilling this condition were, 26, 29, 32, and of these 29 is chronologically the most probable.' Baron H. von Soden prefers a.d. 30, in which Nisan 15 would fall on Friday April 7, and opposes a.d. 29 on the ground that Nisan 15 fell on April 16 in that year. But the previous lunation, March 4-5, with 14th on March 18, would be more in keeping with the ripening of the barley harvest, and would have a prior claim.

The following table of dates is based on the arguments in the preceding pages, the years, months, and days especially, in each case, being offered as merely approximate.

Table of Dates of Events in the Gospels.

| | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| Herod's reign | b.c 37-4. |
| Restoration of temple commenced | b.c. 19-18. |
| Star in the east | b.c. 7-5. |
| Courses of Abia in temple | b.c. 6, April 18-24, Oct. 3-9. |
| Conception of Elisabeth | b.c. 6, Oct. [or April (25)]. |
| Annunciation (6 months after) | b.c. 5, March (25) [or Sept. (19)]. |
| Birth of Baptist | b.c. 5, June (24) [or b.c. 5, Jan.]. |
| Birth of the Christ at Bethlehem during an enrolment | b.c. 5, Dec. (25) [or a.c. 5, June]. |
| Circumcision | b.c. 4, Jan. (1). |
| Visit of Magi | b.c. 4, Jan. (6 <i>circa</i>). |

| | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| Presentation in temple 40 days after Nativity | b.c. 4, Feb. (2 <i>circa</i>). |
| Herod plans massacre | b.c. 4, Feb. |
| Flight into Egypt, apparently from Jerusalem | b.c. 4, Feb. |
| Death of Herod | b.c. 4, March (before Passover). |
| Archelaus ethnarch of Judæa | b.c. 4-a.d. 6. |
| Herod Antipas tetrarch of Galilee | b.c. 4-a.d. 37. |
| Return of Holy Family to Nazareth | b.c. 3. |
| The child Jesus in temple (12 years old) | a.d. 7. |
| Annas high priest | a.d. 7-15. |
| Caiaphas high priest | a.d. 24-34. |
| Pontius Pilate procurator of Judæa | a.d. 26-36. |
| Preaching of the Baptist (15th year of Tiberius), ‘beyond Jordan,’ in the Peræa, ‘where John at first baptized’ (<u>Joh 10:40</u>), ‘the country about Jordan’ (<u>Luk 3:3</u>) | a.d. 26-27. |
| Baptism of Jesus in Bethabara, John’s second sphere of work | a.d. 27 (Passover). |
| Selection and training of disciples, and work in Galilee, with Nazareth for a time as headquarters (<u>Mat 4:13</u>) (early chapters of Mt. and Mk. and <u>Joh 1:29</u> to <u>Joh 2:12</u>) | a.d. 27-28 (Passover). |
| Purification of the temple and work in the city during the Feast of Unleavened Bread (<u>Joh 2:13-23</u>) | a.d. 28, Passover, March 30-April 6. |
| Work in Judæa broken by conflict between His disciples and the Baptist’s (<u>Joh 3:22-36</u> ; <u>Joh 4:1-4</u>) | April 7-14 (<i>circa</i>). |
| Arrest of the Baptist by Herod (<u>Mar 6:17</u> , <u>Mat 14:3</u>) (probably at Ænon near to Salim, his third sphere of work) | April. |

Departure of Jesus into Galilee through Samaria April 14-18 (*circa*).
(Joh 4:1-45)

Work in Galilee, with Capernaum as centre April 18-May 14.
(Joh 4:46, Mar 1:14, Mat 4:12-13, where His
departure from Nazareth is noted; see also
Luk 4:16)

Jesus at Feast of Pentecost in Jerusalem (John 5) May 20 (*circa*).

Miracles in Galilee (Nain), and consequent fame
(Luk 7:11-17)

Injunctions to the Twelve, and their mission
(Matthew 10, Mark 6, Luke 9)

Deputation from the Baptist (Mat 11:2, Luk 7:18).

Jesus at Feast of Tabernacles (John 7) October.

Execution of the Baptist (Matthew 14, Luke 9, Mark
6)

Herod hears the fame of Jesus (Mat 14:1)

Return of the Twelve with this and other news
(Mar 6:30)

Jesus, in consequence, departs finally from Galilee
(Mar 6:31, Mat 14:13, Luk 9:10)

Work in Tyre and Sidon, Decapolis, and villages of
Cæsarea Philippi (Mar 7:24; Mar 7:31;
Mar 8:27, Mat 16:13)

The confession of St. Peter (Mat 16:16, Mar 8:29,
Luk 9:20, Joh 6:68-69)

The Transfiguration, 'six days after' (Mat 17:1,
Mar 9:2), 'about an eight days after' (Luk 9:28)

Prediction of death (Mat 17:22)

The great journey, which may be described as a
tour, whose final objective was Jerusalem,

commences 'when the days were well-nigh come that he should be received up' (Luk 9:51); given at great length (Luk 9:51 to Luk 19:28)

Rejected by a village or Samaria (Luk 9:52)

Mission of the Seventy before His face (Luk 10:1-17) [in Samaria, where He was in Roman territory, safe from Herod, Samaria having been added to the Province of Syria after the banishment of Archelaus, Jos. *Ant.* xvii. xiii. 5]

Sentence on Galilee and Capernaum (Luk 10:13-16, Mat 11:20-24)

Journeys towards Jerusalem, teaching in the towns and villages (Luk 13:22), moving southwards between the borders of Samaria and Galilee (17:11), the Jordan on His left hand

At the Feast of Dedication in Jerusalem a.d. 28, Dec. 10 (*circa*).

Escapes from city into the Peræa, σέραν τοῦ Ἰορδᾶνου (Joh 10:40, Mat 19:1, Mar 10:1)

Returns to Judæa for the raising of Lazarus at Bethany (Joh 11:7)

Withdraws to Ephraim (Joh 11:54) in wilderness of Judæa

Final journey towards city

Prediction of His death (Mar 10:32, Luk 18:31)

At Jericho: Zeehæus and blind Bartimæus (Luk 19:1-11, Mar 10:46; Mar 10:52)

Approaches city, at Bethany (Mat 21:1, Mar 11:1, a.d. 29, Nisan 9 (March 12). Luk 19:29, Joh 12:1) six days before the Passover

The chronology of the last six days is still further complicated by the difference between the Second and Fourth Gospels regarding the Anointing at Bethany. Mar_14:1-3 gives the account of the Anointing apparently in connexion with the date ‘after two days was the feast of the Passover and the unleavened bread,’ while Joh_12:1-3 gives the account of the Supper seemingly under the note of time, ‘Then Jesus six days before the Passover came to Bethany.’ Two ways of getting out of the difficulty are (1) by referring the note of time in Mk. to the events of Mar_14:1-2; Mar_14:10-11 as giving the connexion of the conspiracy of the chief priests against Jesus, and the offer of Judas, and regarding the scene of the Anointing as an intrusion of strange matter similar to Mar_6:14-29; Mar_7:25-30; (2) by restricting the application of the note of time Joh_12:1 to the arrival at Bethany. The notice of the day of the entombment (τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ, Joh_12:7) would come more appropriately on the date given in Mar_14:1, the reason of the mention of the feast in connexion with the date of Joh_12:1 ‘six days before,’ etc., being, perhaps, the fact that Jesus and His disciples made the house of Lazarus and his sisters the headquarters of His last mission to the city. Against this it may be urged that it is equally probable that this feast, which was attended by many out of curiosity to see not only Jesus but Lazarus whom He had raised (Joh_12:9), occasioned on the one hand the splendid reception given to Him by the multitude, and on the other the malignant opposition of the chief priests, who made plans to procure the death of Lazarus also (Joh_12:10). And the anointing of Jesus’ feet in so lavish a style would be in keeping with His entry as the Messiah, the Anointed, into the city, which follows in the Fourth Gospel. St. Mark’s order of events, however, is quite different. Our Lord proceeds straight from Jericho to Jerusalem by way of Bethphage and Bethany (Mar_11:1), and when He entered the temple and looked round on all things, the hour being late (ὄψιας ἤδη οὔσης τῆς ὥρας, Joh_12:11), He withdrew to Bethany with the Twelve. The cleansing of the temple, which immediately follows the entry in Matthew 21 and Luke 19, is thus reserved for the next day, and the banquet for the last evening spent in Bethany. May it not be possible that there were two banquets, and two similar acts of homage paid by women to Jesus, one at the beginning of His last mission, when His feet were anointed, and the other at the close of His mission, when His head was anointed, the former being recorded by St. John (Joh_12:2-8), who marks the commencement of the year’s work by the purification of the temple, the latter by the Synoptists, St. Matthew and St. Mark, who signalize its closing scenes with a similar act?

In the week itself there are three difficult notes of time. (1) ‘Then Jesus six days before the Passover came to Bethany’ (John_12:1 πρὸ ἕξ ἡμέρων τοῦ πάσχα, cf. Amo_1:1 LXX Septuagint πρὸ δύο ἐτῶν τοῦ σεισμοῦ [הַרְעָשׁ פְּנִיל שְׁנַתִּים], ‘two years before the earthquake’). Six days before Friday, Nisan 15, that is, according to Jewish

reckoning, six evenings before the evening that followed the sunset of Nisan 14, would give the evening that directly followed the sunset of the Sabbath of Nisan 9, in which case the Supper would take place in the evening that was the close of the Sabbath. Or if, as Westcott held, the Passion fell on Thursday, the arrival at Bethany took place on a Friday, in which case the Sabbath would be kept as a day of rest, and would be followed by a feast on the next evening. (2) 'After two days is the Passover' (Mat 26:1), or 'After two days was the Passover and the unleavened bread' (Mar 14:1). This date, including the day on which the words were spoken, but excluding that of the Passover, points to Wednesday, Nisan 13, the Crucifixion falling on Friday, Nisan 15. Bengel allows an interval of one day only, 'biduum a feriâ quartâ ad quintam qua; Paschatos et azymorum dies erat'; cf. Mar 8:31, where μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας = τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. (3) 'On the first day of the unleavened bread the disciples of Jesus came to him, saying, Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the Passover?' (Mat 26:17). Strictly speaking, that day would be Nisan 16, this feast commencing on the evening after the close of Nisan 15, the Passover, and lasting seven days. But this note of time refers probably to the legal beginning of the 14th day, the evening following the sunset of Nisan 13, or may be due to a confusion with the day Nisan 14 on which leaven was removed.

With regard to the method our Lord followed in His mission, see Luk 21:37 'And during the days he was teaching in the temple; but during the nights going forth to the mount that is called the Mount of Olives, he used to abide (ἠύλιζετο) there: and all the people came to him at early dawn (ὄρθριζε) in the temple to hear him'; cf.

Luk 22:39 'And he came out and went κατὰ τὸ ἔθος to the Mount of Olives; and his disciples followed. And when he was at the place' (ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου, evidently some familiar locality [see Joh 18:1-2 'Jesus went forth with his disciples beyond the brook Kidron, where was a garden, into the which he entered, and his disciples. And Judas also, which betrayed him, knew τὸν τόπον']). It would seem then that the night was generally spent in prayer on the mountain side during this mission. But the evening after the Triumphal Entry was spent in Bethany (Mar 11:11-12); yet evidently the greater part of night and morn was spent in prayer in the open air ἠύλισθη ἐκεῖ (Mat 21:17). This fact would explain His hunger on the morrow from missing the morning meal. For His practice of going out to pray 'a great while before day' see Mar 1:35.

The following is a provisional arrangement of the days and occurrences of the Last Mission:

Sabbath, Nisan 9, 6th Day before
Passover

Arrival in Bethany (Joh_12:1).

Supper in the evening (Joh_12:2-8).

The Anointing of His feet.

First Day of Week (Palm Sunday, ἡ κυριακή
ακὴ τῶν βαιῶν), Nisan 10, 5th Day
before Passover

Triumphal entry into Jerusalem (Mar_11:1-11,
Mat_21:1-11, Luk_19:29-44, Joh_12:14;
Joh_12:19).

Works of mercy in Temple (Mat_21:14-15).

Returns in the evening to Bethany (Mar_11:11,
Mat_21:17).

Second Day of Week, Monday, Nisan 11:
day of selection of Paschal lamb
(Exo_12:3), 4th Day before
Passover.

Returns on the morrow (τῆ ἐταύριον) from Bethany
(Mar_11:12); hungry after midnight vigil or early
morning prayer (Mar_1:35). Blasting of the
Fig-tree; sign of an unfruitful nature
(Mar_11:12-14). Purification of the Temple, more
drastic and thorough in Mar_11:15-18 than in
Luk_19:45; Luk_19:48 or Mat_21:12-13.

Leaves the city in evening (Mar_11:14).

Conspiracy of loes (Luk_19:47).

Third Day of Week, Tuesday, Nisan 12,
3rd Day before Passover.

Returns early (σῶσι) past the withered fig-tree
(Mar_11:20). Combination of foes, chief priests,
Sadducees, Pharisees, Scribes, Herodians.

Day of Questions and Answers touching the authority
of Jesus, the baptism of John, the tribute money,
the brother's wife, the first commandment of all.
'What think ye of Christ? Whose son is he?'
(Matthew 21, 22). 'From that day forth no man
dared ask him any more questions' (Mat_22:46).
Woes on Pharisees (Mat_23:1-36).

Jesus in Treasury, the widow's mite
(Mar_12:41-44). The visit of Greeks, and parable
of Seed-corn (Joh_12:20-36). Final Rejection
(Joh_12:37). Lament over Jerusalem
(Mat_23:37-39). Prediction of the destruction of
the Temple, and final scenes of the coming of the

Son of Man (24, 25).

Counsel of Caiaphas (Mat 26:3-5).

Fourth Day of Week, Wednesday, Nisan 13, 2nd Day before Passover.

‘After two days is the Feast of Unleavened Bread’ (Mat 26:2). It is supposed that our Lord remained all this day in Bethany, not returning to the city openly after Joh 12:36. The Anointing of His head at the Supper in the evening.

The Bargain of Judas.

The Day before the Passover, ἡ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα (Joh 19:14), Thursday, Nisan 14, Fifth Day of Week. τῆ δὲ πρώτη τῶν ἄζύμων (Mat 26:17), ‘the first day of unleavened bread’ evidently being identified with ‘the first day’ on which leaven was removed (Exo 12:15), the bread of Passover being unleavened (Deu 16:3).

The morning was occupied by disciples with preparations for the Supper (Mat 26:17-19), by Jesus in prayer.

(A) The events of the evening may be arranged according to the four Roman (as distinguished from the three Jewish) watches, ὄψε (6 p.m.-9 p.m.); μεσονύκτιον (9 p.m.-12); ἀλεκτροροφονία (12-3 a.m.); τοῦαι (3 a.m.-6 a.m.), used in the Gospels (Mar 13:35, Mat 14:25, Mar 6:48).

ὄψια or ὄψε, 6 p.m.-9 p.m.

The Supper with the Twelve, ὄψιας δὲ γενομένης (Mat 26:20, Mar 14:17). The washing of feet after Supper (δείκνυσι δὲ γινόμενου or during it, *sec v.l.* γινόμενου (Joh 13:2)). Departure of Judas. Institution of Lord’s Supper. Upper Room Discourses (Joh 13:31 to Joh 14:31). Departure from Upper Room (Joh 14:31).

μεσονύκτιον (9 p.m.-12).

Parable of Vine (John 15).
Promise of the Holy

Spirit (16). Prayer for disciples (17). Gethsemane (18:1, Mat 26:37-46, Mar 14:33-38, Luk 22:41-46). Agony, 'one hour' (Mar 14:37).

ἀλεκτοροφωνία 12-3 a.m. Cock-crow.

Arrival of Judas, Arrest of Jesus (Joh 18:2-12). Preliminary trial before Annas (Joh 18:13). Peter's denial; ἀλεκτωρ ἐφώνησε (Joh 18:27). Jesus sent to Caiaphas (Joh 18:24). Trial before Sanherdrin ὡς ἐγενετο ἡμέρα (Luk 22:66), τρωίας δὲ γενομένης (Mat 27:1 loosely), ἐτὶ το πρωι towards the morning watch (Mar 15:1 more precisely).

πρωῖα or σρωι 3 a.m.-6 a.m.

Led to Pilate πρωι (Joh 18:28), from Pilate to Herod (Luk 23:7), back to Pilate (Luk 23:11). 'Behold, the man I' (Joh 19:5). 'And it was the preparation of the Passover, and about the sixth hour' (Joh 19:14). Delivered to be crucified (Joh 19:16).

(B) The third, sixth, and ninth hours of the morning,

which were wont to be proclaimed by an officer of the Prætor (Smith's *Dict. Ant. s.v. 'dies'*), marked similar divisions of the day which for the Jews ended in the evening.

Preparation for Crucifixion.

6 a.m.-9 a.m.—‘And it was the third hour (*i.e.* 3rd after the last watch of the night [3-6 a.m.], or 9 a.m.); and they crucified him’ (Mar_15:25).

[There is no need to suggest a corruption of *F* for *Γ* or *vice versa* to explain the difference of Mar_15:25 and Joh_19:14, as the former hour marks the crucifixion and the latter the hour of sentence, between which some interval must have elapsed.]

9 a.m.-12.—Jesus on the Cross.

12-3 p.m.—‘And when the sixth hour (12) was come there was darkness over the whole land until the ninth hour (3 p.m.) ... and at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani?’ (Mar_15:33-34).

Between the evenings [הָעֶרְבַּיִם בֵּין Exo_12:6], as the Paschal lambs were being sacrificed in the Temple, Jesus gave up the ghost. The Removal from the Cross ensues, Pilate marvelling if He were already dead (Mar_15:44), ἡδὴ ἰψίας γενομένης (after 3 p.m.), the women following to the sepulchre and returning to prepare spices and ointment (Luk_23:55-56).

Friday, Nisan 15 (March 18).

The Passover, also the Weekly

Preparation, ἡ ταρρασκευὴ ἢ τὸ τροσάββατον (Mar_15:42).

Nisan 16, Saturday.

First Day of Unleavened Bread, coincided with weekly Sabbath.

‘The day of that (ἐκείνου) Sabbath was an high day’ (Joh_19:31, or ‘that (ἐκείνη) day of the week was a high day.’ ‘And (the women) rested

the Sabbath day according to the commandment' (Luk 23:56). This was a day of holy convocation in which no servile work should be done. Visit of Sanhedrin to Pilate, τῆ δὲ ἐπαύριον ἥτις ἐστὶ μετὰ τὴν σαββατικὴν (Mat 27:62). In the Grave.

Nisan 17, Sunday. The First Day of Week and Second of Feast of Mazzóth, on which sheaf of new corn was presented as first fruits, πρῶτη σαββάτου (Mar 16:9), τῆ δὲ μιᾶς τῶν σαββάτων (Joh 20:1, Luk 24:1), τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτων (Mar 16:2), εἰς μίαν σαββάτων (Mat 28:1).

After the Sabbath (διαγενομενον τοῦ σαββάτου), Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome, brought spices for the anointing (Mar 16:1).

It was still dark, σκοτίας οὐσης (Joh 20:1), in early dawn, ὄρθρου βραχέως (Luk 24:1, cf. Mat 28:1), very early after sunrise (Mar 16:2), when they came to the sepulchre, bringing the spices they had prepared (Luk 24:1). *Jesus rose early, ἀναστὰς πρωί (Mar 16:9).*

The first-fruits of them that slept. ἀρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων (1Co 15:20). Vision of angels to the women (Mar 16:5-7). Visit of Peter and John to the Sepulchre (Joh 20:3-10). Appearance of Jesus to Mary Magdalene (Joh 20:11-18); appearance to St. Peter (Luk 24:34).

4-6 p.m.—Appearance to two disciples, who would not have left Jerusalem until after evening prayer (cf. Act 3:1), on way to Emmaus (Luk 24:13 ff.).

8 p.m. (*circa*).—Appearance of Jesus to the Eleven and those with them (Luk 24:36). In the account of

interview with disciples (Joh_20:19 ff.), Thomas absent.

Sunday Week, Nisan 24.

Jesus appeared to the disciples, Thomas being present (Joh_20:26 ff.).

Between the evenings הָעֶרְבַּיִם פֶּיַךְ Exo_12:6], as the Paschal lambs were being sacrificed in the Temple, Jesus gave up the ghost. The Removal from the Cross ensues, Pilate marvelling if He were already dead (Mar_15:44), ἤδη ἰψίας γενομένης (after 3 p.m.), the women following to the sepulchre and returning to prepare spices and ointment (Luk_23:55-56). The Supper with the Twelve, ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης (Mat_26:20, Mar_14:17). The washing of feet after Supper (δείσινου δὲ γενομένου or during it, sec v.l. γινομένου (Joh_13:2). Departure of Judas. Institution of Lord's Supper. Upper Room Discourses (Joh_13:31 to Joh_14:31). Departure from Upper Room (Joh_14:31).

Friday, Nisan 15 (March 18).

The Passover, also the Weekly Preparation, ἡ παρασκευὴ οὐ τὸ προσάββατον (Mar_15:42).

Nisan 16, Saturday.

First Day of Unleavened Bread, coincided with weekly Sabbath. 'The day of that (ἐκ εἰνον) Sabbath was an high day' (Joh_19:31, or 'that (ἐκεινη) day of the week was a high day.' 'And (the women) rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment' (Luk_23:56). This was a day of holy convocation in which no servile work should be done. Visit of Sanhedrin to Pilate, τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον ἦτις ἐστὶ μετὰ τὴν παρασκευὴν (Mat_27:62). In the Grave.

Nisan 17, Sunday. The First Day of Week and Second of Feast of *Mazzóth*, on which sheaf of new corn was presented as first fruits, πρώτη σαββάτου (Mar_16:9), τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων (Joh_20:1, Luk_24:1), τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτων (Mar_16:2), εἰς μίαν σαββάτων (Mat_28:1).

After the Sabbath (διαγενομενον τοῦ σαββάτου), Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome, brought spices for the anointing (Mar_16:1).

It was still dark, σκοτίας οὐσης (Joh_20:1), in early dawn, ὄρθρου βαθέος (Luk_24:1, cf. Mat_28:1), very early after sunrise (Mar_16:2), when they came to the sepulchre, bringing the spices they had prepared (Luk_24:1). *Jesus rose early*, ἀναστὰς πρωί (Mar_16:9). The first-fruits of them that slept. ἀταρχῇ τῶν κεκοιμημενων (1Co_15:20). Vision of angels to the women (Mar_16:5-7). Visit of Peter and John to the Sepulchre (Joh_20:3-10). Appearance of Jesus to Mary Magdalene (Joh_20:11-18); appearance to St. Peter (Luk_24:34).

4-6 p.m.—Appearance to two disciples, who would not have left Jerusalem until after evening prayer (cf. Act_3:1), on way to Emmaus (Luk_24:13 ff.).

8 p.m. (*circa*).—Appearance of Jesus to the Eleven and those with them (Luk_24:36). In the account of interview

with disciples (Joh_20:19 ff.), Thomas absent.

Sunday Week, Nisan 24.

Jesus appeared to the disciples, Thomas being present (Joh_20:26 ff.).

Further appearances recorded by Evangelists:—To seven Apostles on the shore of the Sea of Tiberias (John 21). To the Eleven Apostles on a mountain in Galilee (Mat_28:16-20). To the Apostles in Jerusalem (St. Luke in Act_1:4). Ascension from Bethany forty days after Passion and ten days before Pentecost (Luk_24:50, Act_1:6-12).

Literature.—Josephus, *Ant.* and *BJ*; Irenaeus, *adv. Haer.*; Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.*; Hippolytus, *Com. on Dan.*, and *Paschal Cycle*; Origen, *Com. on St. John*; Ideler, *Handb. der Chronol.*; Wieseler, *Chronol. Synops. der Evang.*; Salmon in *Hermathena*, No. 18; Farrar, *Life of Christ*; Westcott, 'Gospel of St. John' (*Speaker's Com.*), and *Introduction to the Gospels*; Sanday, *Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel*, and art. 'Jesus Christ' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible; Hitchcock, *Studies in Our Lord's Last Mission*; Westcott and Hort, *Greek Testament*; artt. 'Chronology,' 'Fasts and Feasts,' 'Passover,' 'Pentecost' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible.

F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock.

☩ Daughter

DAUGHTER (θυγάτηρ).—The word 'daughter' is used in various sense in the Gospels: (1) in the literal sense, Mat_9:18; Mat_10:35, Mar_5:35; Mar_6:22; Mar_7:29, Luk_8:42; (2) as a term of kind address, Mat_9:22, Mar_5:34, Luk_8:48; (3) collectively for the inhabitants of a city, Mat_21:5, Joh_12:15 (cf. Zec_9:9); (4) as a term of address to the female inhabitants of a city, Luk_23:28; (5) in the Hebrew sense of descendant, Luk_1:5; Luk_13:16.

The diminutive θυγάτριον is found twice in the Gospel of Mark (Mar_5:23; Mar_7:25). Like all diminutives, it is a term of endearment.

Henry E. Dosker.

☒ Daughter-In-Law

DAUGHTER-IN-LAW (νύμφη).—The Greek word is presumably derived from the lost root νύβω, Lat *nubo*, ‘to cover,’ inasmuch as the bride was brought veiled to her bridegroom. Although the word applies to married women in general, its associated idea is that of youth. Hence its antithesis with πενθερά, the mother-in-law (Mat 10:35, Luk 12:53). The son usually brought his bride to his father’s house, where she was subject to the father’s wife, as was the son to the father and the daughter to the mother (Mat 10:35, Luk 12:53).

Henry E. Dosker.

☒ David

DAVID

For the student of the Gospels the most important OT passage concerning David is 2 Samuel 7. David expressed to Nathan a strong desire to build a temple for Jehovah in his new capital, a wish indicative of worldly wisdom as well as piety on the part of the king. Jehovah denies David’s request, but promises to build for him an everlasting house, a dynasty without end. David’s throne is to stand for ever. Psalms 2, 110 are founded on this notable promise, and the author of Psalms 89 in a far later time, when David’s throne had been overturned by the heathen, reminds Jehovah of His ancient promise, and pleads earnestly for the speedy passing of His wrath. The early prophets, Amos (Amo 9:11), Hosea (Hos 3:5), Isaiah (Isa 9:7; Isa 16:5; Isa 37:35), unite with the author of Kings (1Ki 2:45; 1Ki 6:12 etc.) in the expectation that the promise made to David in 2 Samuel 7 will not fail. The prophetic hopes for the future of Israel spring from Nathan’s message as branches from the trunk that gives them life. Jeremiah (Jer 23:5 f., Jer 33:15 ff.) carries forward the work of his predecessors of the 8th cent. b.c., asserting the perpetuity of David’s dynasty in most emphatic terms. Ezekiel (Eze 34:23 f., Eze 37:24 f.) cheers the discouraged exiles with the picture of a glorious restoration of the throne of David. The great ruler of the future will be a second David. In the period after the return from Babylon, the author of the last section of Zechariah (Zec 12:7 to Zec 13:1) describes the glories of the coming time in connexion with the Davidic dynasty: ‘The house of David shall be as God, as

the angel of Jehovah before them.’ The Messianic hope in the inter-Biblical period, like that of the OT, attached itself to David. The author of Ecclesiasticus (Sir 47:11) reminds his readers that the Lord exalted David’s horn for ever, entering into a covenant and promising him a throne of glory in Israel. About a century later the author of 1 Mac. (2:57) says, ‘David for being merciful inherited the throne of a kingdom for ever and ever.’ Most important for the student of the Gospel history is Psalms 17 of the Psalms of Solomon, a collection of patriotic hymns belonging to the period immediately following Pompey’s capture of Jerusalem (63-48 b.c.). Psalms 17 is a notable Messianic prophecy, prayer and prediction being freely inter-mingled after the fashion of the OT prophets and poets. The Messianic King is to be David’s son (Psa 17:4). Jehovah Himself is Israel’s King for ever and ever (Psa 17:1); but the Son of David is His chosen to overthrow the heathen, and institute a righteous reign in Israel (17:30, 42f.).

The four Evangelists unite in the view that the Messiah was to come from the seed of David (Mat 1:1, Mar 10:47, Luk 2:4, Joh 7:42). ‘The Son of David’ was synonymous in the time of our Lord’s earthly ministry with ‘Messiah’ or ‘Christ.’ Both the scribes and the common people held this view. When the children cried in the temple, ‘Hosanna to the Son of David’ (Mat 21:15), both the rulers and the multitude looked upon the words as a distinct recognition of the Messiahship of Jesus. The Epistles (Rom 1:3, 2Ti 2:8) and the Revelation (Rev 5:5; Rev 22:16) concur in calling attention to the Davidic origin of Jesus. The interest of NT writers in David is confined almost exclusively to his relation to our Lord Jesus as His ancestor and type.

Jesus refers to one incident in the life of David in reply to the accusation of His enemies as to His observance of the Sabbath (Mar 2:25, cf. 1Sa 21:1-6). This incident is said to have taken place ‘when Abiathar was high priest.’ [On the difficulties created by this statement see art. Abiathar.]

During the week preceding our Lord’s crucifixion, perhaps on Tuesday, He asked the Pharisees a question which put them to silence and confusion. Having drawn from them a statement of their belief that the Christ would be the son of David, He at once quoted David’s words in Psa 110:1 to show that the Messiah would also be David’s Lord (Mat 22:41 ||). Jesus wished to show His foes and the multitude that the orthodox view of the time overlooked the exalted dignity of the Messiah. He was to be far greater than David, for He was his Lord. See, further, Broadus on *Mt. ad loc.*, and, for the meaning of ‘David’ and ‘Moses’ in our Lord’s citations from the OT, art. Moses.

Literature.—Gore, *BL* [Note: L Bampton Lecture.] 196ff.; Gould, ‘St. Mark,’ and Plummer, ‘St. Luke,’ in *Internal. Crit. Com. in loc.*; *Expos. Times*, iii. [1892] 292 ff., viii. [1897] 365 ff.; *Expositor*, v. iii. [1896] 445 ff.

☞ Day

DAY

1. *Literal.*—The length of the ‘day’ among the ancients was reckoned in various ways: thus, from morning to morning (Babylonians), from sunset to sunset (Athenians), from noon to noon (Umbrians), from midnight to midnight (Egyptians), and from dawn to dark by the common people, ordinarily (see Plin. *HN* ii. 79). The early Israelites seem to have regarded the morning as the beginning of the day (cf. Gen 1:5; Gen 1:8 ff.), but they likewise (due to the influence of the new moon) reckoned it from ‘even unto even’ (Lev 23:32). In Luk 22:34 also the new day began after sunset (cf. Luk 4:40).

In the NT ἡμέρα was employed to express: (1) *the period of light in opposition to night* (Luk 6:13 ‘and when it was day,’—a frequent phrase in St. Luke’s writings, cf. Luk 4:42, Luk 22:66, Act 12:18; Act 16:35; Act 23:12; Act 27:29; Act 27:33; Act 27:39, also Joh 9:4, 2Co 11:25); (2) *the natural day*, including the periods both of light and darkness (Mat 28:1 ἐπιφωσκούση, cf. Luk 22:34); (3) *an indefinite period of time* (Luk 1:5; Luk 1:39 ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις, ‘in those days’; St. Luke is fond of this expression, it is not found in Jn., and occurs but four times in Mt. and the same number of times in Mk.; cf. Luk 2:1; Luk 4:2, Act 2:18; Act 3:24; Act 7:41 etc., also Mat 2:1; Mat 3:1, Mar 1:9; Mar 8:1; Mar 13:17; Mar 13:24 in true Hebraistic style).

Except the Sabbath, the days of the week were *numbered* by the Israelites, not *named*. Nor had the Hebrews any precise subdivision of the day, for they had no word for ‘hour’; even the Aramaic ܩܘܪܝܢܐ, which occurs in Dan 4:16; Dan 5:5, has no exact connotation. Like the Greeks, they seem to have learned from the Babylonians how to divide the day into 12 hours,—a division first met with in the NT: ‘Are there not twelve hours in the day?’ (Joh 11:9, cf. Act 2:15, Mat 20:3-6; Mat 27:45-46 etc.). The length of the hour, however, was for a long time a variable quantity, depending, as it did, upon the season of the year, for it was always reckoned as the twelfth part of the light period. It therefore ranged from forty-nine to seventy-one minutes, according to the calendar. The more common divisions of the day among the Hebrews were morning, noonday, and evening (Psa 55:17); but they frequently spoke of ‘sunrise’ and ‘dawn’ (Mar 16:2, Joh 20:1, Rev 22:16), ‘the heat of the day’ (Mat 20:12), ‘noon’ (Gen 43:16, Deu 28:29), ‘the cool of the day’ (Gen 3:8), and ‘between the two evenings,’ .e. towards evening (Exo 12:6; Exo 16:12, cf. Act 3:1;

Act 10:3; Act 10:30). The time of incense, and of cock-crowing (wh. see) was in the morning (Mar 14:30; Mar 14:72, Luk 1:10); the time of the ‘meal-offering’ was in the middle of the afternoon (1Ki 18:29; 1Ki 18:36); while ‘the time that women go out to draw water’ was towards evening (Gen 24:11).

2. *Figurative*.—Figurative and metaphorical uses of the word ‘day’ are also frequent in the NT: e.g. the day of Christ’s appearance, i.e. of His apocalypse, or self-revelation (Luk 17:30 ‘in the day that the Son of Man is revealed,’ ἀποκαλύπτεται, a technical expression: cf. Luk 17:24, Joh 8:56; Joh 14:20; Joh 16:23; Joh 16:26, Rom 13:12, 1Co 1:7-8, 2Th 1:7; 1Pe 1:7; 1Pe 1:13; 1Pe 4:13); ‘the day of his Parousia’ (Mat 7:22; Mat 24:36, Mar 13:32; Mar 14:25, Luk 21:34, 2Th 1:10, 2Ti 1:18, Heb 10:25); the days of His death and departure (Luk 5:35 ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμεῖς, ‘But the days will come,’ i.e. days very different from the joyous days of wedding festivity); the Last, or Judgment day (Joh 6:39; Joh 11:24; Joh 12:48, Mat 11:22, 1Jn 4:17, 1Th 5:2, 2Ti 3:1, Jam 5:3, and by contrast 1Co 4:3 ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπου ἡμέρας, which describes human judgment as opposed to Christ’s day of final account, ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου); His day of the offer of salvation (2Co 6:2, Joh 9:4; Joh 11:9); ‘the day of Christ’ (Php 1:10); ‘the day of the Lord’ (2Th 2:2, Rom 2:10, 2Co 1:14, Rev 6:17); ‘the day of God’ (2Pe 3:12); ‘the Lord’s day,’ ἡ κυριακὴ ἡμέρα (Rev 1:10); the day of the gift of the Spirit (Joh 14:20); the day of completed salvation (Rom 13:12); ‘the evil day,’ of trial and temptation (Eph 6:13); ‘as children of the day,’ i.e. as sons who abstain from doing evil (1Th 5:5; 1Th 5:8, Rom 13:13); a day of fuller knowledge (2Pe 1:19); and, lastly, the somewhat enigmatical passage, ‘Give us this day (σήμερον) our daily (τὸν ἐπιούσιον) bread’ (Mat 6:11, Luk 11:3); the latter expression (see art. Lord’s Prayer) is not found in classical Greek, and seems to have been specially coined by the Evangelists to convey in this single context the idea of ‘needful’ or ‘the coming day’s’; the Vulgate has *supersubstantialem* (cf. Amer. (Revised Version margin)). See, further, artt. Day of Christ, Day (That), Day of Judgment.

Literature.—Art. ‘Day,’ by H. A. White in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible , by Karl Marti in *Encyc. Bibl.*, and by F. W. Farrar in Smith’s *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; also ‘Tag’ in Riehm’s *HWB* [Note: WB Handwörterbunch.] ; esp. Swete’s Com. on *St. Mark*, and Plummer’s Com. on *St. Luke, ad loc.*; and cf. the artt. Time, Night, Eschatology.

George L. Robinson.

☞ Day (That)

DAY (THAT).—It was near the close of His ministry that the Lord began to speak especially of the Last Things. At an early stage we find a reference to ‘that day’ (Mat 7:22). The hypocrites will plead in vain, *in that day*, how they had professed Christ. The day is the Day of Judgment, the day of the sealing of citizenship in the Kingdom of heaven. There is also a reference to ‘that day’ in the Commission to the Apostles. It will be more tolerable for Sodom *in that day* than for a city that will not receive them (Luk 10:12). Here the parallel denunciation in the First Gospel gives ‘in the day of judgment’ (Mat 10:15). Thus ‘that day’ is a phrase to denote the terrible day which is ever imminent, the day of Christ’s coming to judge the world and inaugurate His universal reign. But among His last words the Lord included warnings of the fate of Jerusalem as well as of the doom of the world. These messages about the end of the city and the end of the world are intertwined in the Synoptic records of the close of His ministry. Reasonable care should not fail to disentangle the threads. The expression ‘in that day’ is used, for instance, to refer quite plainly to the fall of Jerusalem (Luk 17:31; in Mk. and Mt. ‘those days’). But then the phrase has its usual significant euphemistic use for the day of Christ’s coming in judgment in all three Gospels where they recount the Lord’s solemn warnings to be ready (Mat 24:36, Mar 13:32, Luk 21:34). ‘That day’ is in the foreknowledge of God alone; it will come on the whole world *as a snare* to the unready. It may be immediate in its coming (Luk 12:40), and it will be quick as lightning when it does come (Mat 24:27). Evidently ‘that day’ is an epoch; not an era, but the beginning of one era and the end of another. ‘That day’ of the revelation of the Son of Man will be as sudden and final as the experiences of Noah and Lot appeared to each (Luk 17:30). As the end of this present age is the beginning of the reign in glory of Christ and His redeemed, the allusion to ‘that day’ at the Last Supper may be understood in the same sense as hitherto. In ‘that day’ the Kingdom shall be established, and all things shall be new, and the King will drink the new wine first again in ‘that day’ (Mar 14:25, Mat 26:29). On this pathetic promise of the Saviour on the eve of His crucifixion Irenaens comments: *‘promisit ... ostendens, et hæreditatem terræ in qua bibitur nova generatio vitis, et earnalem resurrectionem discipulorum Ejus’* (v. xxxiii. 1).

St. John’s references to ‘that day’ are to an era, however, rather than to an epoch (Joh 14:20; Joh 16:23; Joh 16:26). ‘In that day’ the disciples shall recognize their Lord’s Divinity, and pray to the Father in His name. In the Fourth Gospel, therefore, the phrase describes the era which had its beginning at Pentecost when the Holy Spirit was bestowed so fully upon the Church.

Literature.—Cremer, *Bibl.-Theol. Lex.* s.v. ἡμέρα; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Eschatology of the NT'; Beyschlag, *NT Theol.* i. 190ff.

W. B. Frankland.

☞ Day Of Atonement

DAY OF ATONEMENT ([כַּפֻּרִים יוֹם] הַכַּפֻּרִים הַיּוֹם [του] ἐξιλασμοῦ).—The chief OT passages bearing on it are Leviticus 16; Lev 23:26-32, but some further details are given in Exo 30:10, Lev 25:9, Num 29:7-11. An earlier and simpler form of the ceremony is prescribed in Eze 45:18-20. The day is not mentioned in the Gospels, but it is referred to as ἡ νηστεία in Act 27:9 (also Ep. Barn. 7:3, 4, Josephus *Ant.* xvii. vi. 4).

1. It is not necessary in the present article to describe fully the ritual and worship of the day; only the salient features are here touched upon which offer some analogy with the Christian Atonement. The more important parts of the ceremony were, briefly, as follows:—

(a) The high priest procured and brought before the Tent a bullock as a sin-offering for himself, and two goats upon which lots were cast, one being destined as a sin-offering for the people, and the other to be 'for Azazel.' He sacrificed the bullock, and carried its blood into the Holy of Holies, where, after enveloping the mercy-seat with a cloud of burning incense, he sprinkled the blood before it. He then came out and sacrificed the goat for the people, and, re-entering the Holy of Holies, sprinkled its blood before the mercy-seat. He next sprinkled the blood of each animal on the altar of incense in the Holy Place; and, lastly, he sprinkled the mingled blood of bullock and goat on the brazen altar in the outer court. Thus the blood (the life) of the animals, representing the life of priest and people, was offered before God; and they, and the three parts of the Tent polluted by their presence during the preceding year, were cleansed, and atonement was made for them.

(b) The goat for Azazel was then brought near. The sins of the people were confessed over it, and it was led into the wilderness. The two goats were intended figuratively to represent one and the same being, who, though sacrificed, was yet living, and able to carry away the sins of the people. In the *Mishna* (*Yômâ* vi. 1, cf. Ep. Barn. 7:6) this thought was afterwards emphasized by the regulation that the goats must resemble each other as closely as possible.

(c) The high priest offered two rams as a burnt-offering for himself and the people, signifying the complete offering up of the worshippers' lives and persons to God.

(d) The skin, flesh, and dung of the bullock and the goat, whose blood had made atonement, were burnt outside the camp.

2. The great spiritual truths typified by this ceremony are to a certain extent drawn out in Heb 9:7-14; Heb 9:21-28; Heb 10:19-22.

(a) The high priest entered 'into the second [part of the Tent] once a year' (ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ, *i.e.* on one day in the year), Heb 9:7. But Christ entered into 'the Holies' once for all (ἐφ' ἅπαξ, Heb 9:12); and see Heb 9:24 f., Heb 10:11 f. Thus His blood—*i.e.* His life freed for eternal uses by death—is perpetually presented before God.

(b) The earthly 'holies' are 'made with hands,' 'types corresponding to the real ones' (ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν). But Christ entered into 'heaven itself,' Heb 9:24.

(c) The high priest entered 'in the blood of another' (Heb 9:25)—'with the accompaniment of [by means of, διὰ] the blood of goats and calves': Christ, with His own blood, Heb 9:12. And the Tent, 'the copies (ὑποδείγματα) of the things in the heavens,' must be purified with the former: but the heavenly things with better sacrifices than these, Heb 9:23. With regard to the meaning of this, Westcott says: 'It may be said that even "heavenly things," so far as they embody the conditions of man's future life, contracted by the Fall something which required cleansing. Man is, according to the revelation in Scripture, so bound up with the whole finite order, that the consequences of his actions extend through creation in some way which we are unable to define.'

(d) The sacrifices of the Day of Atonement (and other sacrifices—'the ashes of an heifer,' see Numbers 19) can effect only the purifying of the flesh; *i.e.* outward ceremonial cleansing. But if they can effect that, *a fortiori* the blood of Christ can purify our consciences from the defiling contact of dead works, Heb 9:13 f.

(e) The high priest entered alone; which fact signified that while the first Tent continued to have a standing among men (ἐχούσης στάσιν), the way for all men into 'the Holies' was not yet manifested, Heb 9:7 f. But now 'we have confidence which leads us to enter into the Holies in the blood of Jesus by a new and living way which

He inaugurated for us, through the veil, that is to say [the way] of His flesh,' [Heb_10:19](#) f.

The main truths, then, at which the writer of the Epistle arrives by direct reference to the Day of Atonement are: that Christ is both Priest and Victim; that His sacrifice is eternally efficacious, and that it is being eternally presented by Him in Heaven; that its effects are not ceremonial but spiritual; and that we now have free access to the Father.

3. But other points of analogy and contrast suggest themselves, some of which are partially supplied by the Ep. to the Hebrews.

(a) The high priest offered a bullock for the atonement of his own sins. 'The law appoints as high priests men possessed of weakness,' [Heb_7:28](#); [Heb_5:1-3](#). But the Son was 'such an high priest as was fitting for us, holy, guileless, undefiled,' [Heb_7:26](#). And the sinfulness of the high priest appears to have been the reason of his causing a cloud of burning incense to hide the mercy-seat from his sight. He was unfit, until atonement had been made for his sins, to look upon the place of God's Presence. But now that Christ has 'procured eternal salvation for us,' not only our High Priest but we ourselves may 'come boldly unto the throne of grace.'

(b) An obvious contrast between the Jewish and Christian Atonement is afforded by the fact that the former was possible only in the case of unwitting offences (*ἀγνοήματα*, [Heb_9:7](#)), sins committed 'in ignorance' ([Lev_4:2](#); [Lev_4:13](#); [Lev_4:22](#); [Lev_4:27](#), [Num_15:24-29](#), contrast [Num_15:30](#) f.). If Christ's Atonement were thus limited, our faith were vain, we should be yet in our sins.

(c) It is important to notice that the Jewish sacrifice was very different from those of the heathen. Its purpose was not to appease—to buy the goodwill of—a cruel and capricious deity. The offerings did not originate with men; they are represented as commanded and appointed by God Himself. They were due to His own loving initiative; He showed the way by which men, who were hostile by reason of their sins, might be reconciled to Him. So likewise 'God so loved the world that *he gave* his only-begotten Son' ([Joh_3:16](#)). Nay more; Christ the Victim voluntarily offered Himself ([Joh_10:17](#), [Mat_20:28](#) || [Mar_10:45](#)). Scripture nowhere speaks of God being reconciled to man; see [Rom_5:10](#); [Rom_11:15](#), [2Co_5:18-20](#). God is not hostile to us, although by His very nature He must be angry with sin and punish it; but we are hostile to God ([Luk_19:27](#), [Php_3:18](#), [Col_1:21](#), [Jam_4:4](#)).

(d) The ceremonies performed by the high priest were not a mere *opus operatum*, the magic of a medicine man. The whole congregation had morally to take an active part.

The Day of Atonement was to be a day of cessation from work, like a Sabbath, and a day when every man must afflict (אָפּוּ) his soul—i.e. render his soul contrite and penitent by means of fasting, self-humiliation, and confession of sins. It is true that Isa 58:4-7 denounces the outward expressions of this ‘affliction of the soul’ when they are unaccompanied by the necessary moral fruits, as Christ Himself does (Mat 6:16); but Lev 23:26-32, Num 29:7-11 clearly imply that real penitence is necessary for atonement. The Mishna also recognizes that, while the ceremonies of the day are effectual for Israel as a whole, individuals must appropriate the results by repentance. ‘If a man says, “I will sin and (then) repent, I will sin and (then) repent,” Heaven does not give him the means of practising repentance; and if he says, “I will sin, and the Day of Atonement will bring atonement,” the Day of Atonement will bring no atonement’ (ôâmâ viii. 8, 9). And similarly a Christian’s faith in the atoning death of Christ is not merely an intellectual acceptance of the fact that He died for each and all. Faith, as the NT teaches it, involves a conscious co-operation with Christ’s work. That work was not accomplished to free us from the necessity of doing anything. The atoning work of the God-Man is in living union with the longings and strivings of men for atonement, and thereby makes them effectual. But if a man does not repent,—does not wish to be free from sin,—for him the Atonement brings no atonement. The results of Christ’s death are ‘a power of God, leading to salvation’ (Rom 1:16); but the energy remains potential and useless until the human will renders it kinetic by deliberate appropriation.

(e) And this truth was foreshadowed in the Jewish atonement not only by the fasting of the people, but in the ceremony which formed the centre and kernel of it all. The killing of an animal and the shedding of its blood contained a meaning which far transcended that of mere death. The body is ‘the expression of life in terms of its environment’; the blood represents the life set free from its limiting environment for higher uses (Lev 17:11). When Christ, therefore, entered heaven ‘with his own blood’ (Heb 9:12), ‘to appear in the presence of God for us’ (Heb 9:24), He began ‘the died.’’ But ‘we reckon that one died on behalf of all; in that case *all died*’ (2Co 5:14); and as the high priest offered the blood of the which symbolized the life of the whole people, so ‘the life that died’ is our life, in complete union with Christ’s (Heb 10:19). The same truth is expressed in another form in Heb 10:1-10. Christ’s voluntary self-offering consisted in absolute obedience to the Father’s will, an obedience having its seat in a body prepared for Him. ‘In which will we have been sanctified through the body of Jesus Christ once for all.’ But that is rendered possible only because of His living union with us which makes us part of His body. ‘The Church is the extension of the Incarnation.’ And this vital union is strengthened and perpetuated by the faithful appropriation of it in the Sacrament of His body and blood.

(f) It has been said above that the goat ‘for Azazel’ (Authorized Version ‘scape-goat’) was considered figuratively to be the same animal as the goat that was sacrificed. Its blood was shed for the atonement of the people, and, at the same time, it took upon itself the burden of their sins in order to carry it away. There is no distinct reference to the scape-goat in Hebrews, but a possible allusion occurs in Heb 9:28, where the writer quotes Isa 53:12 (6). Christ was ‘once offered to bear (ἀνενγκεῖν) the sins of many.’ The verb seems to contain the double thought of ‘offering up’ and ‘taking up upon oneself’ as a burden; cf. Joh 1:29.

(g) After the atonement was completed and the sins carried away, there followed the sacrifice of the rams as a burnt-offering. It is peculiarly significant that in Lev 16:24 the high priest is bidden to ‘offer his burnt-offering and the burnt-offering of the people, and *make an atonement* for himself and for the people.’ The great atonement in the sanctuary, though complete, was only an initial act which needed the continued burnt-offering to render its effects permanent. This symbolizes the sequel and corollary of the truth which formed the subject of (d) and (e). Our own life having been offered upon Calvary in union with Christ’s, we ‘died with him,’ and we are ‘alive unto God’ through Him. That being so, we are bound to make an active appropriation of our part in His eternal presentation of the offering in heaven; we are bound to render permanent the effects of the great Atonement by yielding up our whole spirit and soul and body as a perpetual burnt-offering. See Rom 12:1; 1Pe 2:5, Heb 13:15.

4. The above suggestions are those dealing with the more fundamental points, but they are, of course, far from being exhaustive of the analogies which may be drawn. The isolation of the high priest when he entered the sanctuary suggests a comparison of Heb 9:7 (μόνος) with Heb 7:26 (κεχωρισμένος). His double entrance, first for himself and then for the people, seems to foreshadow the two entrances of Christ into the Unseen, once when He entered it at death, from which He returned victorious, and again when He entered it by His resurrection and ascension ‘to appear before the face of God on our behalf’ (Heb 9:24). Again, the return of the high priest to the people in the outer court at the close of the ceremony recalls the words of Heb 9:28, ‘a second time without sin shall he appear to them that wait for him.’ And, finally, the burning of the sacrifice outside the gate is used as yet another type of Christ (Heb 13:11 f.).

Literature.—1. On the ceremonies of the day; Comm. on Leviticus 16, esp. Dillmann; Mishna, *Yômâ* (ed. Surenhusius, with Lat. translation and notes, 1699); Maimonides’ account of the ceremonies (translation by Delitzsch at the end of his Com. on

Hebrews); Josephus *Ant.* iii. x. 3; art. in Hasting' *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] , vol. i. p. 199 ff.

2. On the significance of the ceremonies: Sheringham' *Yômâ*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , to which is added (p. 150 ff.) an elaborate comparison by Rhenferd of the work of the high priest with that of Christ; Comm. on *Hebrews*, esp. Westcott, with the Add. Notes on chs. 8-10; Milligan, *Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood*.

3. On the doctrine of the Atonement: M'Leod Campbell, *On the Nature of the Atonement*; R. W. Dale, *The Doctrine of the Atonement*; H. N. Oxenham, *The Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement*; F. D. Maurice, *The Doctrine of Sacrifice*; B. F. Westcott, *The Victory of the Cross*; Dorner, *System of Christian Doctrine*; esp. iv. 1-124. Intimately connected with the subject are treatises on the Incarnation.

A. H. M'Neile.

☩ Day Of Christ

DAY OF CHRIST.—This is the general expression used by certain of the NT writers to indicate that moment in time in which Jesus the Christ shall reappear to establish His Messianic kingdom. It marks the beginning of that new age which Jews and Christians expected would follow the present evil one. The term thus lacks the precise reference of the Day of Judgment (wh. see), and is also more general than the term Parousia; but all three of these terms refer to the same point in time, and represent different phases of the same event. It is spoken of indiscriminately as the 'day of Christ' ([Php_1:10](#)), 'day of the Lord' ([1Th_5:2](#)), 'day of Jesus Christ' ([Php_1:6](#)), 'day of our Lord Jesus Christ' ([1Co_1:8](#)), and 'day of our Lord Jesus' ([2Co_1:14](#)). It is generally thought of in connexion with the great assize which is to be established by the reappearing Christ ([1Th_5:2](#), [Php_1:6](#); [Php_1:10](#)). It was then that the process of sanctification was to reach its real completion ([Php_1:6](#)) and salvation be consummated ([1Co_5:5](#)). It was to come unexpectedly ([1Th_5:2](#); [2Pe_3:10](#)), but was to be preceded by certain premonitory conditions which had not been fulfilled at the time of the writing of 2 Thessalonians ([2Th_2:1-2](#)). There is no reference in the NT to an identification of the Fall of Jerusalem with this day, and all such interpretations must be read into it. In order to grasp its real significance, it is necessary to remember that the early Christians did not believe that Jesus had done strictly Messianic work during His earthly career, and that they looked forward to His return as the time when He would take up the work of the Messiah pictured in the apocalypses. This work was to be inaugurated with the resurrection of the dead, the

establishing of judgment, and the conquest of His enemies. In the Apocalypse (Rev 6:2; Rev 15:4; Rev 15:6; Rev 19:11; Rev 19:13) this period of conquest is prominent, but not in other portions of the NT. Here also there is to be noticed a distinction drawn between the 'day of Christ' and that 'great day of God' which follows the one thousand years' reign of Christ on earth. Such a view, however, is not clearly presented in other portions of the NT, the nearest approach being 1Co 15:23-24, in which Jesus is spoken of as giving over the kingdom to God the Father. See, further, Day of Judgment, Parousia.

Shailer Mathews.

☛ Day of Judgment

DAY OF JUDGMENT

i. In the teaching of Jesus.—1. The Day of Judgment is one of the concepts inherited by Jesus. Its origin is to be sought in the religious belief, common to practically all primitive peoples, in a tribal deity who would punish the enemies of the tribe. This elemental concept gained varied forms in the development of different peoples. In some cases it was never carried over into the field of individual ethics, and in others it shared in the moral growth of its possessors. In the case of the Hebrews it is to be seen in the 'Day of Jahweh,' which formed so large and important an element of the prophetic message. In its earliest forms the expectation of this day involved simply the punishment of the enemies of Israel by Jahweh the God of the nation. As the moral content of prophetism developed, however, this punishment inflicted by Jahweh was foretold to include the punishment of the Hebrew nation. Amos and the great prophets who succeeded him warned a luxurious nation that it had grown guilty and degenerate, and would be destroyed as an indication of Jahweh's righteousness (Amo 2:6-8; Amo 3:9-15; Amo 5:10-13; Amo 6:4-8). After Amos the Day of Jahweh never lost its religious colouring, but its use was extended until it included in its scope not only wicked Israel but a wicked world (Zep 1:2-18; Zep 2:4-15; Zep 3:8; Zep 3:14-20). Ezekiel conceived of it as a day of battle in which Jahweh would conquer Israel's foes (Eze 30:2 ff; Eze 34:12; Eze 39:8 ff.); but Malachi foretold the fearful punishment of all the wicked, Jews and Gentiles alike. It was this extension of punishment, and the increase in the number of the condemned, that gave particular force to the idea of the remnant which was to be saved.

Obviously the formal concept here is that of the Oriental monarch who establishes a court of justice, and decrees rewards and punishment. Jahweh was never conceived of by the prophets in terms of natural law, but always in terms of this analogy. In fact

it would be probably truer to say that the monarchical concept of God was not an analogy but something more. It was this concept which conditioned teaching as to punishment throughout the entire Biblical period. Subsequent to the prophetic era, under the influence of Persian dualism, there was a marked tendency to extend the range of judgment to nature as well as to men, and the God who sat upon the throne was more than a mere national deity judging the enemy of a particular people. This extension of the idea is to be found in the apocalypses, which in so many ways lie behind the Judaism current in the time of Jesus. In these apocalypses the Day of Judgment became one of the most essential elements in the Messianic scheme. The Day of Judgment of Messianism is the prophet's Day of Jahweh given new content by the appropriation of certain elements from the cosmic myths of Babylon, and new colour because of the new literary vehicle, the apocalypse. As a part of the more highly developed Messianism, it sometimes ceased to represent a single judicial act on the part of the sovereign Deity, and with something like a recurrence to the picture of Ezekiel, came to stand for the period of struggle in which the Messiah was to overcome and punish the enemies of a righteous nation. In its new form the thought of the day became increasingly transcendental, and joined to itself the idea of hell newly derived from the older belief in Sheol. In fact it would be difficult to understand the full force of the Day of Judgment, as it appeared both in Jewish and Christian literature, without reference to the fate of the dead. In the place of a penalty consisting of national punishment, there grew up during the Greek period of Jewish history a tolerably elaborate belief as to punishment inflicted upon individuals after death. It is difficult to know just when this idea of hell as a place of punishment, as over against Sheol as the abode of the disembodied dead, was first brought into relation with the Day of Judgment, but by the time of the apocalyptists we find the correlation complete (Ethiopic Enoch 27:2, 3, 48:9, 54:1, 2, 62:12, 13, 90:26, 27). In fact the punishment inflicted upon men is distinctly recognized as adjusted to the conditions of their life in Ethiopic Enoch 22:1-14.

Thus the Day of Judgment as a form of the Day of Jahweh became the central point in Messianic eschatology and the nomistic morality of Judaism. Different teachers elaborated its details in different ways, but, by the time Judaism was fairly developed, the Day of Judgment was conceived of as involving the examination of the records of each individual (Dan 7:10). More or less literally, books were believed to be kept in heaven, generally by one of the seven angels, in which the deeds of men were recorded (Ethiopic Enoch 89:61, 90:14-22, Ascens. Isaiah 9:21). In the final assize these books were opened and balanced, and the future of the individual was determined according to the preponderance of his good or evil deeds (Ethiopic Enoch 51:52, 15, 89:61ff., 90:17, 20, *pirke Aboth* 3:24, Ascens. Isaiah 9:22; cf. Luk 10:20, Rev 3:5; Rev 13:8; Rev 17:8; Rev 20:15; Rev 21:27). The difficulty in such a mechanical basis of judgment was to some degree mitigated by the introduction of something approaching the later doctrine of supererogation, by which the merit of

the patriarchs could be transferred to the Jews. This particular doctrine, however, it is difficult to trace distinctly in the days of Jesus, although later the transfer of merits from the patriarchs is distinctly recognized. From this idea of the assize, in which sentences were formally passed by the judge, arose the two opposing concepts of condemnation and acquittal. These two concepts are the two foci of much of the NT teaching concerning the outcome of conduct.

While Jesus opposed the mercantile conception of rewards and punishment, the Day of Judgment occupied a central position in His teaching. With Him as with all men of the prophetic type, the Judgment stretched across the horizon of human destiny. No action in life was morally neutral. A man would give account at the Judgment for the very words which he spoke (Mat_12:36). It was through the outcomes of life that Jesus estimated conduct, and these outcomes converged into what the Gospels designate the consummation of the age; that is, the great catastrophe in which the present evil age comes to a close and the new Messianic age begins.

2. The *terms* which the Gospels represent Jesus as using to indicate the Day of Judgment are various.

(a) Sometimes the great event which would determine the final destinies of men is called expressly 'the day of judgment' (Mat_10:15; Mat_11:22; Mat_11:24; Mat_12:36), or more simply 'the judgment' (Mat_5:21-22; Mat_12:41-44). These two terms are essentially the same.

(b) In one instance (Mat_11:22-23) the 'judgment of Gehenna' is mentioned, but this refers not so much to the Judgment-day itself as to the punishment inflicted upon hypocrites and sinners (cf. Mat_5:22).

(c) Parallel with these terms is 'that day' (Mat_7:22, Mar_13:32, cf. Mat_24:42; Mat_26:29, Luk_10:12). It is in this term that the day is described in the apocalypse of Mark (cf. Mar_12:40), for the Second Gospel does not use the term 'the day of judgment.' Possibly the same reference is to be found in the sayings of Jesus recorded in Joh_16:23-26. See Day (That).

(d) 'The day of the Son of Man' as a precise expression is found only in Luk_17:24-30, where the thought of Judgment is immediately related to the eschatological reappearance of Jesus as Christ. A similar, although not a precise, reference is to be found in other passages speaking of the Parousia, notably Mar_13:26; Mar_14:62 and their parallels.

(e) 'The last day' is a favourite expression of the Fourth Gospel, to denote the day on which men were to be raised from the dead (Joh_6:39; Joh_6:44; Joh_6:54;

Joh 11:24). That this day of resurrection is to be identified with the Day of Judgment appears not only from the entire drift of the Messianic expectation current in the time of Jesus, but also expressly in Joh 12:48.

3. The *time* of the Day of Judgment was not precisely fixed by Jesus, and in fact He is said to be ignorant concerning it (Mar 13:32); but the Gospels represent Him as announcing its coming before His contemporaries die (Mar 13:30; Mar 9:1 ||, Mat 10:23, cf. Joh 21:20-23), and this was the expectation of the Apostolic Church in general. Notwithstanding the indefiniteness of its coming, the day is one for which all should be watching (Mar 13:33; Mar 13:35; Mar 13:37; Mar 14:38, Luk 12:38; Luk 21:36), and its nearness can be argued from the signs of the times (Mat 16:3) as well as from various portents described in the phraseology of prophecy and apocalyptic.

Whether Jesus Himself regarded the Judgment-day as involving the fall of Jerusalem, or whether He regarded the inevitable destruction of the Jewish State as one of the forerunners of the Judgment, will remain a matter of dispute until the critical composition of Mark 13 is more precisely fixed. On the whole, however, in view of Jesus' forecast of the punishment to come upon the Jewish people both to Galilee and in Jerusalem, it seems probable that He did in some precise way correlate the fall of Jerusalem with the eschatological Judgment. But it would be a serious mistake to regard that destruction of Jerusalem as exhausting the content of His expectation of His Parousia. The punishment inflicted was to be universal, not Jewish. Had the disciples regarded the fall of Jerusalem as in any true sense the Judgment of the Parousia, it is inconceivable that the Fourth Gospel and the other portions of the NT written subsequent to a.d. 70 should have given no hint of such interpretation. To them as in the Synoptics the Judgment is not a process but a single event, future, eschatological. At the same time it is to be borne in mind that the Fourth Gospel appreciates the truth to which attention must be presently called, namely, that while the Judgment is eschatological (Joh 5:22; Joh 5:27; Joh 5:29-30; Joh 16:8), a man does not need to wait until that event to fix his destiny. That is already determined by the acceptance or rejection of Jesus (Joh 3:18-19; Joh 12:31). Such passages as contain the teaching are, however, not to be interpreted as indicating a loss of belief in the coming of the Judgment-day as a point in time, but rather as the Johannine equivalent and supplement of the Apostolic doctrine of justification by faith.

4. The *Judge* is apparently to be Jesus Himself in His Messianic capacity (Mat 13:30; Mat 24:50; Mat 25:12; Mat 25:19; Mat 25:31). At the same time, in the Synoptics God is also referred to as Judge (Mat 18:32; Mat 20:8; Mat 22:11, Luk 18:7). This double conception is to be found also in the apocalyptic literature, and is easily understood by reference to the representative character of the Messiah. In Luk 22:30 the Apostles are also regarded as judges in the case of the twelve tribes of Israel. This

is a form of the belief in the judicial prerogatives of the saints which seems to have been current in the early Church (cf. 1Co 6:2-3), and may be inferred also from the request of the sons of Zebedee to occupy seats on the right and left of Jesus when He came in His kingdom (Mat 20:21 || Mar 10:37). The Fourth Gospel represents Jesus as expressly denying (Joh 8:15; Joh 12:47), and also as affirming that He is the Judge (Joh 5:22; Joh 5:27; Joh 5:30; Joh 8:18). But such inconsistency can be resolved either by considering that Jesus at one time is thinking of His historical and at another of His eschatological duties, or by a reference to the general position of the Evangelist that the mission of the Christ in His historical ministry was for the purpose of salvation rather than for condemnation (Joh 3:16).

5. The *subjects* of the Judgment are men at large, with particular reference to those who have come in contact with the historical Jesus, including His disciples. The question as to whether those who never heard of Jesus are to be subject to this Judgment is not distinctly raised or settled in the Gospels, but the universality of the Judgment seems inevitable from Christ's warnings, notably in the parable of the Tares (Mat 13:24-30; Mat 13:36-43; Mat 13:47-50). These passages further indicate that at the Day of Judgment mankind will be gathered together before the Judgment-throne by the angels—a further utilization by Jesus of a conventional Messianic expectation.

6. The *awards* of the Judgment-day are: (a) for those who have accepted Him as Christ, eternal life, including the resurrection (Mar 9:47; Mar 10:17; Mar 12:25, Mat 19:23-24; Mat 25:46, Joh 5:29; Joh 6:39-40; Joh 6:44; Joh 6:54). (b) For the wicked the Judgment-day fixes the destiny of misery, which is described in a variety of figures, such as the Gehenna fire (Mar 9:47, Mat 5:22), destruction (Mat 10:28-29, Mar 8:36-37). The terror of the day is also forecast in the various portents with which it is to be ushered in, drawn from the figures of prophecy and apocalypse (Mat 24:6; Mat 24:8; Mat 24:49, Mar 8:11).

7. There is a critical question as to whether many of these sayings concerning a Messianic Judgment-day may not be a reflexion of the Apostolic hope rather than the express teaching of Jesus. This is particularly true in the case of all passages quoted from Mat 25:31-46. It is not possible, however, so to explain all the teaching contained in the Gospels. Objective criticism must decide that many, if not a great majority, of these sayings come from Jesus Himself. The only ground upon which they can be rejected as genuine logia is the dogmatic presupposition that Jesus was superior to, and independent of, current Messianism. Such a position is difficult, however, in view of the relation of Jesus to His times, and His undoubted expectation that He would return with completed Messianic dignity. It is an unsafe method of criticism which determines first what Jesus could or could not have said, and then makes this determination the critical criterion by which to decide His relation to the current of developing Messianism. His superiority to the apocalyptic expectation of

His contemporaries is no more marked than His use of certain elements of their hope for the coming of the eschatological Messianic era. Yet it is to be borne in mind constantly that here, as in so much of the teaching of Jesus, a new content is given by Him to current vocabularies and concepts. The standards of judgment are no longer those of the apocalyptic writers. Ethnic prerogatives are swept away. A man's destiny is to be settled not by his relation to Abraham, but by his relation to God. Not even those who called Him 'Lord,' but those who did God's will, were to enter the kingdom of heaven. Care bestowed upon a poor disciple was an assurance of the bliss of heaven. Such a change of moral values carries Jesus over into something other than a mechanical doctrine of rewards and punishments and of statutory merit. Instead of a balancing of good deeds and bad, it is evident from both the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel that He recognized in eternal life the *summum bonum*, which is quite other than the sensuous joys of Enoch and some of the Rabbis. Eternal life with Jesus is not an artificial reward, but rather the consummation of personality which is determined by faith and relationship with God, and includes the resurrection of the body. The Day of Judgment, however else it may be used by Jesus, is primarily a pedagogical point of contact with morals and religion. It is an integral point of His teaching, not in the sense that it was an opportunity for God to wreak vengeance upon the enemies of the Jews, but in that it expressed the outcome of life, which is always to be lived in view of an impending eternity. The imagery with which He clothes this fundamental idea is Jewish, and must be treated in the same method as all prophetic imagery. But in such treatment it is impossible to deny that Jesus distinctly teaches that the final destiny of mankind is a matter that lies beyond death, and is conditioned by one's life before death. Any constructive use of the concept of the Day of Judgment, as it is described in the Gospels, is accordingly subject to the general considerations which must obtain in the constructive use of the entire Messianic scheme of Judaism as it appears in the NT. So far as Jesus Himself is concerned, this is one of the inevitable problems of His position as a revelation of God in terms of a historically conditioned individuality. The truth of Christianity in this, as in others of its phases, does not rise and fall with the finality of its expository and pedagogical concepts. Within the concept of the Day of Judgment lies the profound recognition on the part of Jesus of the fact that a man's ultimate destiny will be fixed in accordance with the immutable laws of God. To be saved is something more than to win the blessings of an acquittal at the Judgment-day of Judaism. It is rather to possess a quality of life due to the soul's relation with God through faith, which will eventuate in those blessed results which are pictured by the Gospels in terms of the apocalypse.

ii. In the teaching of the Apostles.—In the teaching of the Apostles the Day of Judgment has a position quite as central as in the teaching of Jesus. But even more important is it in what may be called their system of teaching. With them as with Jesus, the chief end of faith is the achievement of salvation, that is, eternal life; but their thought is more formally concentrated on the events of the great day. St. Paul

draws out the logical relations of these elements more elaborately than any of the other NT writers, but it is easy to see that there is no radical difference at this point between him and them. All alike held that there was no escaping the Judgment of God (Rom 2:3, cf. Heb 9:27, Gal 1:6 f., Gal 2:6-9; Gal 2:15 f.).

1. The term 'day of judgment' does not occur in the Pauline teaching, and in fact only in 2 Peter and 1 John. The day is commonly denominated 'the judgment,' and even more frequently is referred to in specific phrases as 'that day' or 'the day' (1Co 3:13). With this must be identified also the 'day of Christ,' although the term has a somewhat wider connotation (See Day of Christ) (1Co 1:8; 1Co 5:5, 2Co 1:14, Php 1:6; Php 1:10; Php 2:16), or 'day of the Lord' (1Th 5:2). In one or two instances also it is called 'the great day' (Jud 1:6, Rev 6:17). The belief in the same great assize is to be seen lying behind the idea of condemnation (κρίμα) which is so frequently met with in the NT.

2. It is around this Day of Judgment, as one of the elements in the establishing of the Messianic era, that the 'judgment' of the Apostles continually circles. All of them referred to it as one of the things to be assumed as believed in by all Christians (Heb 6:2, κρίμα). It might seem strange to the heathen (Act 17:31), but it was one of the elementary expectations of all Jews and proselytes. It was to come within the lifetime of men living during the first age, and its awards would be final for the eternity which then began. Its subjects were to be all mankind, as St. Paul elaborately argues in the opening chapters of Romans. They were to be both the living and the dead. This, of course, implies the bringing of the dead from Sheol, and therefore accounts for the exceptional expressions which speak of the 'resurrection of judgment' (Joh 5:29, cf. Act 10:42, Rev 20:12-13). Such a resurrection of the dead must be treated as something other than the acquisition of the body of the resurrection, which was to be a part of the great reward of the believer. In accordance with the apocalyptic literature, angels were also to be judged, and that, too, by the saints (1Co 6:2-3).

3. This universality of the Judgment lay at the bottom of much of the discussion concerning justification by faith. The Christians believed that they, as well as others, were to stand before the Judgment-seat of Christ to give an account of the deeds done in the body. The conditions of acquittal at the Judgment were conceived by the Jerusalem Church as including participation in the blessings promised exclusively to Jews as sons of Abraham. In the case of the party of the circumcision, at least, it was the belief of the Jerusalem Church that believing Jews and proselytes alone were to be acquitted in the Day of Judgment. The Pauline position, that any one who had accepted Jesus as Christ was to be acquitted, was exposed to certain misapprehensions. On the one hand, St. Paul insisted that it was not necessary for

those who believed in Jesus as Christ to be subject to the Law as a statutory enactment; on the other hand, he was aware that the Christian life was far enough from being in absolute conformity with the will of God. How then could believers hope to be acquitted? His reply is that they *know* they are to be acquitted because they have the Holy Spirit, the first instalment of the heritage of salvation. His answer to the consequent question why a man who no longer feared condemnation at the Judgment of God should be good, constitutes one of the most vital of his ethical teachings. It amounts to this: Realize in conduct the moral possibilities of the regenerate self. His answer to the more particular question as to what should happen to erring Christians at the Judgment is equally profound. In 1Co 3:10 he argues that the foundation of faith in Jesus Christ must always abide, but that the building which each believer erects upon this foundation may be worthless. His figure clearly teaches that the Christian is subject to the Judgment as truly as any one else, and that although he will be given the body of the resurrection and the other blessings of salvation, he will also suffer certain losses. At this point, therefore, there is to be seen the rudiments of a logical doctrine as to rewards and punishment which is far enough from the mechanical expectation of the apocalypses. And, further, it must be added that the early Church believed that it was possible even for those who, so far as could be judged by ordinary standards, had accepted Jesus as Christ, to fall away and be ultimately lost. Christians were always in danger of committing sins which at the Judgment would shut them out of the kingdom of God (Gal 5:21, 1Co 6:9-11, Rom 13:2; Rom 14:23). It is clear, therefore, from such teaching, that St. Paul moved over into the moral as distinct from the purely formal field. The Judgment-day is something other than the time of registering the arbitrary decrees of God, and becomes the time when the ultimate destinies of men are determined by their actual moral conditions, these conditions including, rather than being supplanted by, faith in Jesus.

4. The details of the day are not clearly worked out by the Apostles. In their case, as in that of Jesus, there is the double expectation that both God and Jesus will be the Judge. In the Apostolic thought, however, the recognition of Jesus as Judge (assisted, as has already been pointed out, by the saints, 1Co 6:2) is very distinct. He is to sit upon the throne, and mankind is to stand before Him, and bow to Him, and be subject to Him. At the same time the correlation between His position and that of God is distinctly made (Rom 2:16). He is to be God's agent, and at 'the end' is to give over the kingdom to the Father (1Co 15:24).

5. In the Apocalypse there are two Judgment-days spoken of. The first, which is established at the appearance of Jesus, is confined to the worldly powers, and Satan is then bound and shut up in the abyss (Rev 20:1-3). Then follows the reign of Christ on earth for a thousand years, which is ushered in by the resurrection of the martyrs (Rev 20:4-6). At the end of this period of one thousand years the great day of God

(Rev 16:14) comes, in which all those believers who survive and the members of the one thousand years' kingdom are carried up to heaven, and all the dead are raised to stand before the Judgment-seat of God (Rev 20:12-13). Here again there must be a distinction drawn between the idea of the ascension from Sheol and the acquisition of the body of the resurrection. At this final Judgment the evil are sent to the lake of fire (Rev 21:8), where they continue in endless misery. In this last Judgment it may be noticed also that one's future is determined by the records in the books of the Judge (Rev 20:12-13).

6. As in the case of the teaching of Jesus, the award at the Day of Judgment for the wicked is eternal condemnation, which is described in a variety of ways, chief among which are 'destruction,' 'fire,' and 'death,' the general term for such misery being the anthropomorphic expression 'wrath of God.' For believers there is, on the other hand, salvation which, in the resurrection of the body, marks the completion of that eternal life already begun in the earthly life of the believer through the presence of the Spirit in the believer's heart.

7. It is improbable that the Church of the NT times ever ceased to think of the Day of Judgment as a distinct point in time, and of the coming of Christ as a definite event of the future (Act 24:25, Rom 2:3). See Parousia. Such late books as Jude and 2 Peter are particularly emphatic as to His coming, although the writer of 2 Peter is obviously perplexed at the delay in the return of Jesus (2Pe 3:4).

8. It is at this point, however, that one realizes more clearly than ever the impossibility of treating any one of the particular elements of the Christian eschatological Messianic hope apart from the others. The reason for this lies in the origin of the hope. In so far as it is not the outcome of the historical facts of Jesus' life, death, and resurrection, it is the bequest of Judaism to the Christian Church. As such, its component elements are really phases of one hope, and are so inextricably combined as to make it almost impossible to separate them. The Parousia, the Day of Christ, the Day of Judgment, the resurrection of the dead, are all alike different aspects of the same great event toward which the whole creation moves. They all embody the fundamental expectation of early Christianity, that the Christ who had been crucified would shortly return to establish His Messianic kingdom. In such an establishment there was involved the punishment of all those who were the enemies of God and of His Christ, as well as the rewarding of those who were His loyal subjects. Its terrors were as far as possible from being figurative to the early Christians. From the time of Pentecost onwards men were first warned of the approach of the Judgment which all Jews expected, and were then told how by faith in Jesus as Christ and Lord they might gain acquittal in that Judgment. It is further noteworthy that in all matters relating to the future condition of mankind and the method of escaping punishment and winning salvation at the Day of Judgment, all the

Christian writers are essentially at one. Differences in emphasis and methods of presentation should not be permitted to obscure this identity in elementals.

Such an expectation embodies both permanent and transitory elements. Those are transitory which depend upon an impossible cosmology and a literal monarchical conception of God's relation to the world. Those are permanent which embody the immutable laws of the moral world and the facts of the historical Jesus (including His resurrection). To distinguish between these two groups of elements is not difficult for the historical student, and will result in a larger appreciation of the fundamental truth of an apocalyptically conceived Judgment-day. See also Eschatology.

Literature.—This is voluminous, but it is often dogmatic and apologetic in character. The unhistorical method of treatment will be found set forth in all the old treatises on theology. On the Day of Jahweh see J. M. P. Smith, 'The Day of Yahweh,' *AJTh* [Note: *JTh* American Journal of Theology.] , 1901, p. 501 f. Views of Judaism may be found in Bousset, *Relig. des Judentums*, 245, 248; Weber, *Jüd. Theol.*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] § 88; Charles, *Crit. Hist. of Eschatology*; Volz, *Jüd. Eschatologie*. For general treatment see Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, ii. 274 f., 360 f.; Mathews, *Messianic Hope in the NT*; Muirhead, *Eschatology of Jesus*; Haupt, *Eschatol. Aussagen. J. Weiss (Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes)*, Wernle (*Beginnings of Christianity*), Fiebig (*Der Menschensohn*, Lect. iv.), and Baldensperger (*Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*) treat the subject from the point of view of Judaism, and of Jesus' teaching concerning His relation to the Kingdom of God. Teichmann (*Die Paulin. Vorstellungen von Auferstehung und Gericht*), Kennedy (*St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*), Kabisch (*Eschatol. des Paulus*) discuss the teaching of St. Paul on the subject. In general see Biblical Theologies, esp. those of Beyschlag and Weiss, and art. 'Parousia' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible .

Shailer Mathews

☪ Dayspring

DAYSPRING.—The dawn or beginning of the day; cf. for the word 1Sa 9:26, Job 38:12; in NT only Luk 1:78 (ἀνατολή), but cf. the prophecy quoted Mat 4:18 (φῶς ἀνέτειλεν αὐτοῖς). Zacharias saw, in the remarkable events taking place, the coming of the new day and the dawning of hope for Israel: 'the Lord, the God of Israel, hath visited and wrought redemption for his people' (Luk 1:68); 'the dayspring from on high shall visit us' (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 fut. ⚡ B). Ἀνατέλλειν is often

used for the rising of the sun (Mat_13:6, Mar_16:2, Jam_1:11) and stars (Num_24:17; 2Pe_1:19), and ἀνατολή, either in sing. or plur. form, for the East (Mat_2:1-2 etc.). In Rev_7:2; Rev_16:12 ἡλιον is added, and there Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 substitutes ‘sunrising’ for Authorized Version ‘east.’ In LXX Septuagint ἀνατολή occurs for the rising of the moon (Isa_60:19). Light frequently stands for salvation and deliverance (Isa_58:10; Isa_60:1, Mal_4:2, Luk_2:32), and was specially applied to the Messiah, cf. Joh_1:9 etc., Eph_5:14 (see Edersheim, *Life and Times*, ii. 166). For ἀνατολή ἐξ ὕψους in Luk_1:78 Vulgate has *oriens ex alto*.

Ἐξ ὕψους, ‘from on high,’ presents some difficulty, as dawn does not come from on high; perhaps the ref. to a bright shining star is more in keeping (Meyer); ‘He is the Daystar from on high, bringing a new morning to those who sit in the darkness and death-shadows of the world’ (Liddon, *Bamp. Lect.*⁸ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 248). Godet would connect these words with ἐπισκέπεται (‘it is from the bosom of Divine mercy that this star comes down, and it does not rise upon humanity until after it has descended and has been made man’), but this seems hardly necessary; ἐξ ὕψους represents ‘from God,’ and ἀνατολή ἐξ ὕψους is simply ‘God’s Messiah’ (Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, pp. 223, 224).

A different translation is based on the fact that ἀνατολή in LXX Septuagint stands several times for קַנְזַ, a ‘shoot’ or ‘branch,’ one of the prophetic names of the Messiah (Jer_23:5, Zec_3:8; Zec_6:12; cf. Jer_40:15 Theod. [Note: Theodotion.]). So Edersheim: ‘Although almost all modern authorities are against me, I cannot persuade myself that the expression rendered “dayspring” is not here the equivalent of the Heb. קַנְזַ Branch’ (*op. cit.* i. 158n. [Note: note.]). But it seems a fatal objection that none of the other expressions in the passage correspond (‘to shine upon’ ἐπιφᾶναι, ‘to guide’ κατευθῆναι); and ἐξ ὕψους causes much greater difficulty (cf. Isa_11:1). Bleek wishes to combine the two meanings by supposing a play of words on the sprouting branch and the rising star; no Hebrew word will bear the double meaning, but LXX Septuagint comes near identifying this Messianic name with the appearance of light when it renders Isa_4:2 (‘in that day shall the branch (קַנְזַ) of the Lord be beautiful and glorious’) by ἐπιλάμπει ὁ θεὸς ἐν βουλή μετὰ δοξῆς. If the source of Lk. be Aramaic, ἀνατολή may stand for some other word; cf. its use for קַנְזַ ‘brightness’

(Isa 60:19), and in one MS, Q^{mg}, for רָאָה 'rising' (Isa 60:3). See the *Comm.* of Godet and Plummer, *in loc.*

W. H. Dundas.

☞ Dead, The

DEAD, THE (οἱ νεκροὶ)

1. The reverence and regard due from the living to the dead, according to the ideas which the Jews shared with other nations, are clearly illustrated in the Gospels. All honour is paid to the corpse in preparation for burial: it is anointed with spices and unguents (Mar 16:1, Luk 23:56, Joh 19:39; cf. what Jesus says in Mar 14:8), and wrapped in fitting cerements (Mar 15:46 etc.). Reverent burial is given, the funeral train following the body borne uncoffined upon a bier (Luk 7:11-13). The omission of any mention of burial in the case of Lazarus in the parable (Luk 16:22), as contrasted with the case of the rich man, who 'had a funeral,' bespeaks a poor abject. The dead are bewailed by kinsfolk (Joh 11:31; Joh 11:33), by sympathetic neighbours, and by hired mourners (Mar 5:38, Mat 9:23). Jesus in the noteworthy saying in Luk 9:60 (= Mat 8:22), 'Let the dead bury their dead,' overrides a chief charge on filial affection, the burial of a father, as He emphasizes the paramount claims of discipleship. Such observances are not only the expression of natural grief; they involve belief in the continued existence of the dead, as is also the case with other forms of duty to the dead such as are insisted on in the Talmud. *e.g.* their wishes are to be respected and fulfilled (*Git. 14b*), they are free from all obligation (*Shab. 30a*), it is unlawful to speak evil of them (*Berakh. 19a*)—cf. the familiar proverb, *De mortuis nil nisi bonum*.

2. *The teaching of Jesus concerning the dead.*—Whatever may be gathered from the words of Jesus touching the state of the dead is to be regarded in the light of the current Jewish beliefs of His day, to see how far He sanctions such beliefs, and in what respects He corrects and modifies them. The tenets of the Sadducees, denying the resurrection, future retribution, and indeed any continuance of personal being after death, constituted a sectarian opinion from the standpoint of later Judaism. The Sadducees, it is true, seemed to adhere to the older teaching of the OT, wherein for the most part nothing is allowed concerning the dead (*rěphā'im*) but a thin, shadowy existence in Sheol. They were, however, influenced in this respect by Hellenism and their affectation of culture rather than by zeal for the earlier Jewish faith (Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. ii. 38 f.). The common belief, illustrated in the later literature of Judaism, was virtually that of the Pharisees, who

held that the soul is imperishable, that rewards and punishments follow this life under the earth (cf. Lat. *infernus*), that for the wicked there is an eternal imprisonment, but for the righteous a resurrection to eternal life (Josephus *BJ* ii. 8; *Ant.* xviii. 1). This resurrection is connected with the glory of the Messianic kingdom.

Jesus definitely repudiates the Sadducean view (Mar 12:24; Mar 12:27), and endorses, as to its substance, that of the Pharisees. (For a different view, cf. E. White, *Life in Christ*, ch. 16). In His dealing with the Sadducees and their catch-question on this subject (Mar 12:18-27 and parallels), He teaches that the dead are really alive and in a state of consciousness. So also in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Luk 16:19 ff.), with a sharp distinction between experiences of misery and bliss as entered upon by souls after death. This parable also favours the belief in the soul's direct and immediate entrance upon this new conscious state, as do our Lord's words in Luk 23:43 'To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.' We are not, however, to allow a literal interpretation of His language in this connexion to dominate our appreciation of what the Gospels afford as regards belief concerning the state of the dead. The expression 'Abraham's bosom,' e.g., is of no dogmatic value to us, though suitable and significant to the men of our Lord's day. Similarly with the other pictorial elements; they are only of the same order as the imagery with which other faiths have invested ideas concerning the hereafter. The matter of abiding importance here is the teaching that at death a judgment already takes effect, the portion of the soul in the after life being determined with direct reference to the life lived in the present world, with results that may be in startling contrast to the estimates of a man and his condition formed by his fellow-men here. This conception seems to find expression in a symbol found on early Christian tombs in Phrygia, viz. an open book or set of *tabellae*, which Ramsay explains as 'indicating death and the judgment of God after death; the tablets are open to indicate that the process of judgment has begun' (see art. in *Expositor*, March 1905, p. 223).

Such a representation of the condition of the dead in Hades is not, however, to be understood as excluding a remoter crisis in the soul's history, such as is suggested by the prominent NT conception of 'the judgment' and 'the day of judgment.' As Weiss says, the retribution thus set forth as befalling a soul in Hades 'does not exclude an ultimate decision as to its final fate' (*Theol. of NT*, i. p. 156 note, English translation). 'Abraham's bosom' or 'Paradise,' moreover, does not denote a final and 'perfect consummation and bliss,' in the eschatological views of the Jews in the time of Christ. The resurrection lies beyond. Jesus in His encounter with the Sadducees uses the language of His time, and speaks of the resurrection as a transition and crisis awaiting the dead (Mar 12:25, Mat 22:30). The wording of the Lukan account (20:35) is particularly noticeable—οἱ δὲ καταξιωθέντες τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν κ. τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν. There is an 'age to come' (rather than 'world,' see Dalman,

Worte Jesu, English translation p. 153), which is to be attained by those that shall have been deemed worthy of it, an age evidently to be thought of as ushered in by the resurrection from among the dead. That age (= 'the kingdom' elsewhere), embodying the highest hopes of the Jews for the hereafter, answers to all the highest conceptions as to human destiny found amongst people of other faiths. And evidently it is not immediately attained at death, according to the language of Jesus. If, then, an accumulation of weighty considerations seems to some to support the doctrine of an intermediate state for those who have passed from this life—a doctrine already familiar to the Jews in our Lord's time (see Salmond, *Chr. Doct. of Immortality*, p. 345 f.)—the teaching of the Gospels offers no definite opposition. A state, *i.e.*, not simply of vague gloom or attenuated being, but of vivid consciousness; for the blessed dead 'a condition in fellowship with God, containing in itself the germ of an everlasting heavenly life towards which it tends' (Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, English translation i. p. 223), with progress and growth from more to more; and in the case of others, a state affording room for the hope that there a solution is to be found for a multitude of otherwise inscrutable life problems in regard to man's salvation. Such comfortable words as Joh 14:2-3; Joh 17:24 do not conflict with this conception as regards the state of the blessed dead, and they are to be thought of as being 'with Christ' in a manner which is 'very far better' (Php 1:23) than what may be known in the present life.

Salmond (*op. cit.* ch. 5), arguing on the whole against the doctrine of an intermediate state, relies mainly on the fact that no positive doctrine of this kind is found in Christ's words, and observes that towards this subject 'His attitude is one of significant reserve'; but this *argumentum e silentio* of itself tells just as much one way as the other. Those who maintain that death brings irrevocable doom to all and admits immediately to full and final destiny, are hard pressed by manifold difficulties. What expedients they are driven to in order to mitigate these are illustrated, *e.g.*, in Randles' *After Death*. The author eagerly urges how much is possible in the way of repentance and pardon even in *articulo mortis*. 'After all intercourse between the dying and their friends has ceased, a saving work of God proceeds'; 'repentance and faith, pardon and sanctification, may proceed with speed and power such as were never evinced in previous years' (p. 250 f.). Greatly to the credit of his heart, in anxiously maintaining his position he also advances considerations which lead, he thinks, to the conclusion that 'the proportion of the finally lost to the saved will be about as the proportion of the criminal part of England's population to all the rest' (p. 244 f.)! The consideration of the solemn subject of final destiny lies beyond the scope of this article.

3. Christ's figurative use of the term 'dead.'—The use of the term as descriptive of a certain spiritual condition, unperceiving, unresponsive, is illustrated in the saying of Luk 9:60, quoted above. In Luk 15:24 it occurs as tantamount to 'lost.' The dead

spoken of in Joh_5:21-26, to whom the Son gives eternal life, are so described in virtue of their condition prior to their believing on Him.

Literature.—Artt. ‘Eschatology’ and ‘Resurrection’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible ; ‘Eschatology’ and ‘Dead’ in *Encyc. Bibl.*; ‘Duty to the Dead’ in *Jewish Encyc.*; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] (as quoted); Weiss, *Bib. Theol. of NT*, English translation in the relative §§; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, English translation in the relative §§; Stevens, *Theol. of NT*, p. 166; Salmond, *Christian Doctrine of Immortality*; Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*; Stanton, *The Jewish and the Christian Messiah*; Luckock, *After Death*; Randles, *After Death*; Beet, *Last Things*; White, *Life in Christ*.

J. S. Clemens.

Deaf And Dumb

DEAF AND DUMB

1. *Link between deafness and dumbness.*—(a) It appears impossible to separate these two maladies of deafness and dumbness, whether one approaches them from the standpoint either of the scientist or of the student. The consequence of the former disease is that the sense of hearing is diminished or abolished; the consequence of the latter is that the power of articulating sounds is defective or impossible. There is, indeed, no physiological connexion between the maladies; but the acute stage of either leaves the patient now with a correspondent incapacity of hearing, now with a correspondent incapacity for speaking. The acutest form of these maladies is seen when congenital; then the link is observed at its closest: the maladies, so to speak, draw into one, and the remedies which surgery or treatment, and the artificial aids of hand, or lip, or sign language can afford, are invariably applied as if these maladies had some common source and a unity of their own.

(b) This conception of an inherent unity between deafness and dumbness is curiously illustrated by the Greek adjective with which this article is chiefly concerned. *κωφός* is derived from the root *κωπ*, *i.e.* that which is smitten, crushed, or blunted, opposed to *ὀξύς*, ‘sharp,’ ‘keen.’ Thus *κωφός* is used in Homer of a blunt weapon,* [Note: xi. 390.] of the dumb earth† [Note: xxiv. 44.] [cp. Lat. *bruta tellus*], and, with a wonderful picturesqueness, of the noiselessness of a wave before it crashes upon the shingle.‡ [Note: xiv. 16.] It is thus only by a slight metaphorical turn that the

adjective stands to describe the impairment or loss of powers of the mind or body; and so of vision, of hearing, and articulating.

2. References in the Gospels.—In the Gospels κωφός (the word is not found outside them in the NT) is applied only to the two maladies under discussion, *i.e.* to describe the dwarfed and blunted powers of the deaf and dumb. Indeed, as it furnishes a common description of both maladies, a less careful student would be in danger, at least in the chief characteristic passage (Mar_7:31-37), of misrendering, or rather misapplying, the adjective, which plainly signifies ‘deaf.’ But later in the same Gospel (Mar_9:25) κωφός probably means ‘dumb.’ This free transference of the adjective by the same writer, as descriptive now of the one malady and now of the other, is clearly not due to any scientific knowledge of the Second Evangelist; it was enough for him that it connoted the crushing, maiming character of both diseases. It is curious to note that even St. Luke the physician, in the three passages in which the word occurs, uses κωφός in this double application (Mar_1:22, Mar_11:14 of dumbness, Mar_7:22 of deafness). St. Matthew again uses the expression indifferently as applicable to deafness (Mat_11:5) or dumbness (Mat_9:33).

It is, of course, mainly on our Lord’s works of healing that the interest of the question turns. A glance will be sufficient at the striking passage in the opening of St. Luke’s Gospel (Luk_1:5-22) in which the announcement of the birth of the Baptist was made to the aged Zacharias. It is significant to observe that Zacharias was on this occasion the victim not merely of lack of faith in the angel’s message, but of real alarm at the vision. The penalty for this lack of faith was temporary speechlessness. Its infliction was indeed pronounced by Gabriel, but it may well be supposed that it was brought about by natural causes. There are many instances in which sudden emotion has brought on deafness or dumbness, and, strangely enough, there are instances on record in which a sudden emotion, like terror, has led to the restoration of lost powers of this character. The medical faculty always regard hopefully patients who have become suddenly deaf or dumb from these instantaneous causes, and it may be assumed that neither Zacharias himself nor his friends regarded the visitation as permanent, apart from Gabriel’s consoling limitation of its consequences.

Two miracles recorded by St. Mark have suggestions about the deaf and dumb which are full of interest, and to which only inadequate commentary is possible within the space of this article. The former is that wrought by the Lord, on the edge of the Holy Land, upon an unnamed sufferer (Mar_7:31-37). He is described as deaf, and as having an impediment in his speech. The strange term* [Note: μογιλάλος; there is no English equivalent. The French word balbutiant approaches its meaning closely.] here employed (Mar_7:32), which does not occur elsewhere in NT and is found only once in

LXX Septuagint (Isa_35:8), indicates at once the closeness of link between the two maladies which has been already emphasized, and also declares that the man was not so dumb as he was deaf. He spoke, but only with difficulty; a trial, no doubt, to others as to himself. In this narrative, given by St. Mark with such extraordinary vividness of detail,† [Note: See present writer's article in Expositor (v. iv. [1896] p. 380) on 'He took him aside.'] —the taking aside, the mysterious remedies applied, the sigh, the word spoken, not of magic but of power,‡ [Note: The Aram. Ephphatha (v.34) applies not only to the man's hearing but to his speech; to the open ear, but also as by a frequent Hebraism to the open lip.] —in all these we see the Divine figure of the Son of Man as traced by St. Mark, in His compassion for suffering humanity, in His teaching as significant by action as by word, in His sublime confidence that He had that to give, for which He looked not in vain from heaven. St. Mark puts in simple, unscientific terms the record of the cure. The sufferer's ears were opened, his tongue was no longer a prisoner, speech came back orderly and intelligible to those around.

The other miracle, also recorded by St. Mark (Mar_9:14-29), is upon one whose dumbness was linked with demoniacal possession. An examination of the passage shows how the case had baffled Christ's disciples. The father of the possessed felt that he had in the Great Teacher his final resort. Our Lord's question elicited the reply that the malady, aggravated by demoniacal suggestion, was congenital. The man's dumbness was of the acutest form. The narrative of the miracle is not out of line with the experience of the medical faculty. It is not only that deafness and dumbness are allied, but the patient at his worst and unhappiest suffers some form of dementia or idiocy. With the former instance, which lacked the distressing epileptic symptoms, our Lord dealt directly. In the latter He faces an evil, hostile power, 'Thou speechless* [Note: The rarer word ἀλαλον is used in vv.17, 25.] and dumb spirit, come out of him, and enter no more into him.' The former cure was calmly, quietly brought about. This was accompanied by awful convulsions. But the issue in both was the same, neither physical defects nor demoniacal agency resisted the word of pity and of power.

It is to be observed that none of our Lord's miracles excited such interest or won such admiration as those wrought upon the deaf and dumb. This would answer to common experience, the restoration of sight to the blind, for it is none other than this which special treatment in Germany seems now and again to have brought about, and of which one marvellous instance is known to the present writer, would not cause such astonishment as the recovery of a deaf or dumb friend. Blindness does not interrupt personal relationship as deafness and dumbness do, and, the moment hearing and speech are recovered, the results and consequences are communicable to others. It is no wonder, therefore, that the astonishment of the multitude passed into praise. Its verdict was, 'He hath done all things well' (Mar_7:37).

3. *Spiritual applications of deafness and dumbness.*—The senses of which these human bodies of ours stand possessed are so wondrous in their character and operations, that one would expect to find in Holy Scripture lessons drawn from them of great spiritual import. And so it is. The open eye, clear, candid, trustful, is a figure of faith throughout both Testaments (Psa_119:18; Psa_121:1, Pro_20:12, Mar_8:18, Joh_12:40, Rom_11:8). With equal force the open ear is significant of obedience. Students of the Psalter and of the Prophets will bear in mind the denunciations poured, both for spiritual deafness and dumbness, upon a people which refused to listen to the voice of Jehovah, and which was silent when the Divine Name and His praise were concerned (Psa_81:11 etc., Isa_6:10). On the other hand, again, through both Testaments, from Samuel to St John the Divine, a commendation and blessing has ever attended the ear willing to receive, the lips open to prayer and to praise. It is in and through the combination of these that the message of the Gospel can be disseminated (Rom_10:10; Rom_10:17). And so of all the spiritual gifts, most dear to Apostolic men was *παρρησία*. (Eph_6:20), born of the courage of conviction, and marking a mind and temper capable of standing at the last before the Son of Man.

B. Whitefoord.

☩ Death

DEATH.—It belongs to the profoundly spiritual character of our Lord's thinking that He says comparatively little on the subject of physical death. His attitude towards it is indicated in the words, 'She is not dead but slecpeth' (Mat_9:28 = Mar_5:35, Luk_8:52). He recognized that man's true being was something apart from the mere bodily existence, and death thus resolved itself into a natural incident, analogous to sleep, which broke the continuity of life only in seeming. The idea is presented more definitely in the charge to the disciples, 'Fear not them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do,' etc. (Luk_12:4 = Mat_10:28), where it is expressly declared that life resides in the soul, over which God alone has power. The accident of death, of the separation of the soul from its material body, can make little difference to the essential man.

The three recorded miracles of raising from the dead are, in the last resort, concrete illustrations of this side of our Lord's teaching. The Johannine account of the raising of Lazarus is indeed bound up with a more complex theological doctrine; but the Synoptic miracles, in so far as they are more than works of compassion or exhibitions of Divine power, are indicative of the transient nature of death. Jesus awakens the daughter of Jairus and the youth of Nain as if from ordinary sleep. The life which to

outward appearance had ceased, had only been withdrawn from the body, and could be reunited with it at the Divine word.

Attempts have been made to connect these miracles and the whole conception of death as sleep, with the contemporary Jewish belief that for three days the soul still lingered in the neighbourhood of the dead body. The earliest stage of death might therefore be regarded as a condition of trance or slumber from which the spirit could yet be recalled. It is in view, probably, of this belief that St. John emphasizes the 'four days' that had elapsed since the death of Lazarus, whose soul must thus have finally departed from his body when Jesus revived him. But we have no indication that our Lord Himself took any account of the popular superstition, much less that He was influenced by it. His conception of death as a passing sleep was derived solely from His certainty that man, being a child of God, was destined to an immortal life. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob cannot be permanently dead, for God is not the God of the dead but of the living (Mat 22:31 = Mar 12:26). In virtue of their relation to God they must have passed into a more perfect life through apparent death.

The traditional view of death as something evil and unnatural had therefore no place in the thought of Jesus. He nowhere suggests the idea which St. Paul took over from the OT and elaborated in his theology, that death is the punishment of sin. This prevailing Jewish belief is indeed expressly contradicted in the words concerning the slaughtered Galilaeans and the eighteen on whom the tower of Siloam fell (Luk 13:1-4). Jesus there insists that death, even when it comes prematurely and violently, is not to be regarded as a Divine judgment. Sin is punished, not by physical death in this world, but by a spiritual death hereafter. This is doubtless the true interpretation of the warning, 'Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.' Destruction is in store for *all* sinners; and the punishment cannot therefore consist in death by violence, which falls on few. Much less can it consist in natural death, from which the good can escape no more than the wicked.

While thus regarding death as nothing but one of the incidents in man's earthly existence, our Lord anticipates a time when it will be done away. In the perfected Messianic, kingdom 'they cannot die any more' (Luk 20:36). Those who survive until the Son of man returns in glory 'will not taste of death' (Mat 16:28), since they will have entered on the new age in which it is abolished. Even in such passages, however, it is not suggested that death is an evil. The idea is rather that it forms part of a lower, imperfect order of things, and that this will give place entirely to a higher. Those who inherit the kingdom cannot die, 'because they are equal unto the angels' (Luk 20:36), and have so entered on another condition, governed by different laws. The cessation of death is conjoined with that of marriage (Luk 20:35-36). As the marriage relation is natural and necessary to man's earthly state, but has no place in the life of higher spirits, so with death.

Jesus, it is thus evident, has broken away from the Jewish conception, according to which the death of the body possessed a religious significance as the effect of sin. His own idea of its spiritual import is of an altogether different nature, and can be gathered with sufficient clearness from certain explicit sayings. (1) The willingness to endure death for His sake is the supreme test of faith (cf. 'Can ye drink of the cup that I shall drink of?' etc. [Mat 20:22 = Mar 10:38]; 'If a man hate not ... his own life also,' etc. [Luk 14:26]). (2) Death is the fixed limit appointed by God to all earthly pleasures and activities. The thought of it ought therefore to guard us against over-anxiety about the things of this world, and to keep us always watchful, and mindful of the true issues of life ('This night thy soul shall be required of thee' [Luk 12:20]; parable of Rich Man and Lazarus [Luk 16:20 ff.]). (3) Above all, death marks the beginning of the true and eternal life with God. This higher life can be obtained only by sacrificing the lower, and surrendering it altogether, if need be, at the call of Christ ('He that loseth his life for my sake shall find it' [Mat 10:39 = Mat 16:25, Mar 8:35, Luk 9:24]).

In several Synoptic passages Jesus speaks of a death which is spiritual rather than physical. He recognizes that the mass of men are in a condition of moral apathy and estrangement from God, and out of this 'death' He seeks to deliver them. His message to John the Baptist, 'The dead are raised up' (Mat 11:5 = Luk 7:22), would seem, in the light of the context, to bear this reference, as also the charge to the disciples, 'Raise the dead' (Mat 10:8). The same thought is expressed more unmistakably in the saying, 'Let the dead bury their dead' (Mat 8:21 = Luk 9:60), and in the words of the parable, 'This my son was dead and is alive again' (Luk 15:24). Such allusions are not to be explained as simply figurative. As 'life,' to the mind of Jesus, consists in moral obedience and communion with God, so in the opposite condition He perceives the true death. It involves that 'destruction both of soul and body' which is far more to be feared than mere bodily death.

The view represented by the Fourth Gospel gives a further development to this aspect of our Lord's teaching. Death as conceived by St. John is something wholly spiritual. The idea is enforced in its full extent that physical death is only a 'taking rest in sleep,' and in no wise affects the real life (Joh 11:4; Joh 11:11-14). Lazarus, although he has lain four days in the tomb, has never truly died; for 'he that believeth in me, when he is dead, continues to live' (Joh 11:25-26). The miracle by which he is 'awakened out of sleep' is meant to show forth, under the forms of sense, the inward and spiritual work of Jesus. He is 'the resurrection and the life.' He has come to raise men out of the state of death in which they find themselves, and to make them inheritors, even now, of the life of God.

To understand the Evangelist's conception, we have to remember that here as elsewhere he converts into present reality what is future and apocalyptic in the

Synoptic teaching. Jesus had spoken of life as a reward laid up in ‘the world to come,’ and had contrasted it with the ‘casting out’ or ‘destruction’ (ἀπόλεια) which is reserved for the wicked. These ideas reappear in the Fourth Gospel, divested of their pictorial, eschatological form. Life is a spiritual possession here and now, and has its counterpart in ‘death,’ which is likewise realized in the present world. St. John, indeed, contemplates a future in which the life, and by implication the death, will become complete and final (Joh 6:39; Joh 6:44; Joh 6:54); but they will continue the same in essence as they already are on earth.

Death is thus regarded not as a single incident but as a condition, in which the soul remains until, through the power of Christ, it passes into the opposite condition of life. It is not, however, a state of moral apathy and disobedience, or at least does not primarily bear this ethical character. Life, in the view of St. John, is the absolute, Divine life, in which man, as a creature of earth, does not participate (See Life). His natural state is one of ‘death,’ not because of his moral sinfulness, but because he belongs to a lower world, and the life he possesses is therefore relative and unreal. It is life only in a physical sense, and is more properly described as ‘death.’ The work of Christ is to deliver men from the state of privation in which they are involved by their earthly nature (Joh 3:6). As the Word made flesh, He communicates to them His own higher essence, and makes possible for them the mysterious transition ‘from death unto life’ (Joh 5:24).

In this Johannine doctrine Greek-philosophical ideas, transmitted through Philo, have blended with the original teaching of Jesus as recorded in the Synoptics. The simple ethical distinction has become a distinction of two kinds of being,—earthly and spiritual, phenomenal and real. Jesus ‘raises the dead’ in the sense that He effects a miraculous change in the very constitution of man’s nature. At the same time the ethical idea, while not directly emphasized, is everywhere implied. It is assumed that the state of exclusion from the true life is also a state of moral darkness, into which men have fallen ‘because their deeds are evil’ (Joh 3:19). The ‘freedom’ which Jesus promises is described in one passage (in which, however, the borrowed Pauline ideas are imperfectly assimilated) as freedom from sin (Joh 5:33-36). In the great verse, ‘God so loved the world,’ etc. (Joh 3:16), the ethical conception almost completely overpowers the theological. Men were ‘perishing’ through their estrangement from God, and from this death God sought to deliver them by His love revealed in Christ.

For the teaching of Jesus in regard to the significance of His own death see the following article.

Literature.—Cremer, *Lex. s.v. θάνατος*; Titius, *Die neutest. Lehre von der Seligkeit* (1895-1900), esp. i. 57-87, iii. 17-31; Fries, ‘Jesu Vorstellungen von der Auferstehung

der Toten,' *ZNTW* [Note: *NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissen. schaft.*] (Dec. 1900); Schrenck, *Die johanneische Ansch. vom Leben* (1898). See also the literature mentioned in art. Life.

E. F. Scott.

☠️ Death Of Christ

DEATH OF CHRIST

I. In the Gospels.—The aim of the present article is to examine the place of the death of Christ in the moral order of the world. What is the moral order of the world? The question may be answered as follows:—The will and purpose of God are in the way of coming to realization in the individual and social life and destiny of humanity. They are still very far from having attained to universal realization, but they are destined to reach it in the perfected kingdom of God. This is what is here understood as the moral order of the world. It began to exist and to be evolved on the earth with man's appearance as a being with a moral nature and created for a moral destiny. Its evolution is still very incomplete, but it is certainly though slowly making for a predestined end in which all men in Christ shall be morally perfect as God is; and in the moral relations of God to men, and of men to God and to one another, an order of perfect moral unity and universality shall reign for ever.

In this order of things, then, and its evolution, the death of Christ occupies a place of the highest importance and value. It is only from the point of view of this moral order of things and its evolution that the essential merits of His death can be properly understood. A consideration of it from the same point of view is called for by the methods of modern thought and inquiry. And it is only thus that the cultured Christian conscience can find true, adequate, abiding moral satisfaction. But it is necessary, in order to prevent confusion of ideas, to mark the important distinction that exists in the nature of things as they now are in man's moral history, between the moral *order* of the world and the moral *course* of the world. The moral order of the world as just defined is only one of the constituent factors of the world's moral course. Besides it there are two more. There is, on the one hand, the factor which consists of all those facts or phenomena in the individual and social life and history of mankind which fall under the designation of sin or moral evil; and, on the other, the moral government of God, which presides immanently, persistently, and universally over the relations between sin and the moral order of things or the order of righteousness. These three factors constitute that actual moral course that the world is ever following; and the predestined end of their relation to one another will be realized in the complete and

eternal victory and triumph of righteousness over sin, through the unerring and all-sufficient administrative judgments of God's moral government of the world (Mat 13:41-43, 1Co 15:24-28). It is the moral course of the world as so understood that explains the nature and methods of the historical revelation, contained in the Bible, of God's will and purpose in their relation to man's moral life and destiny. The course of the world as so understood occupied a determinative place in our Lord's conceptions of man's moral life and destiny (See Progress). And it was from the point of view of Sin, Righteousness, and Judgment that He contemplated the fullest and profoundest significance of His obedience unto death. It was on the place of His death in the moral order of the world, and as therein related to man's sin and God's governmental judgment, that He depended for the victory and triumph of Righteousness over Sin in the dispensation of the Spirit (Joh 17:7-11). From the point of view here raised His death may be considered in various aspects.

1. He was *put* to death on the Cross. How did this happen? What were His leading thoughts about it as so viewed? He lived and died without sin. He fulfilled all righteousness in the course of His obedience unto death, freely and perfectly uniting Himself and all the activities of His will and life with the will and purpose of God, and with Him His Father was well pleased. This means that although He appeared and lived and died in the moral course of the world, He was not of the world, had absolutely no fellowship with it in so far as it was under the domination of sin. He loved sinners in their character as moral beings with perfect love. But sin He hated with perfect hatred; and He lived and died to save men and the moral course of the world from it. His life of perfect union with His Father's will and purpose in all things implied not only that He lived entirely on the side and in the interests of the moral order of the world, but also that the latter found in Him, for the first time on earth, the One Individual moral Being in whom it had secured its perfect form of manifest realization, in so far as this was possible in one life in human form. It was this fact, on the one hand, and the hatred of the men over whom the world's sin had gained complete domination on the other, that determined His way to His destiny on Calvary. This conjunction of righteousness and sin, and their creative influence on His earthly history and experience, affected Him in three ways, each of which should have a regulative effect on every one's thoughts as to the meaning and value of His death.

(1) He regarded the existence of the sin that arose and developed in increasing antagonism against Himself and His mission, in the course of His ministry, as a thing that *ought not to be*. Saying after saying of His, bearing on this point, seems almost to convey the impression that He must have regarded this sinful and guilty opposition, without which He would not have been put to death, as not required by the interests and objects of the moral task which He had come into the world to accomplish (Mat 23:33-39, Luk 13:31-35; Luk 23:23-27, Joh 7:19; Joh 8:21-59; Joh 15:17-27; Joh 19:10-11). (2) Then, again, His own words show that the inward 'moral' struggles

and agonies of His life arose out of the prospect and contemplation of the development of the manifestations of the world's sin and unbelief against Him and against His claim to be entirely identified with His Father's will and purpose in all His words and deeds. His experience of inward crushing sorrow, arising from the cause alluded to, reached its culmination in the Garden of Gethsemane. But before the hour which He spent there in anguish and bloody sweat, He had foretastes of the terrible bitterness of the Passion which He knew was awaiting Him as His destiny (Mat_20:22; Mat_26:36-45, Joh_12:27). (3) In spite of these two facts as to our Lord's thought and experience in connexion with His death, He always cherished perfectly optimistic confidence and hope as to the issues of the latter. Through the discipline of experience and through prayer He became strong enough to be obedient even unto death. He had perfect faith in His Father as the Lord of heaven and earth. He knew that all the future interests and objects of His mission and work on earth were absolutely safe in His hands. He knew before He died that His death could not hinder, but would be made to further these objects and interests (Joh_12:24; Joh_12:32; Joh_16:7-11), and the first word He spoke about His death after He had risen from the dead was, 'Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?' (Luk_24:26).

2. The question now arises as to the *nature, meaning, and value* of our Lord's unique achievement on earth, which reached its perfect accomplishment in His death on the cross. This achievement from beginning to end was made by Him in His position as internally related to the moral order of the world, and through it to the world in its character, aspirations, and activities as under the domination of sin. His achievement, as so viewed, consisted in the perfect realization of His Father's will and purpose in His unique moral Individuality, and in all the manifestations of the latter in His relations with God and with men. It is to be observed, then, for one thing of highest importance, that this achievement of His, in its nature, meaning, and value, was purely, entirely, exclusively *moral*. There are two considerations which place this fact in the region of absolute certainty.

In the first place, the fact has its validity in the established nature of the moral order of the world and in Christ's own place in this order. This is an order of things which has its foundations in the moral nature of God; in the moral nature of man as made in the image of God as a Moral Being; in the fact and in the nature of the moral relations between God and men and between man and man; and also in the fact that Christ as the Son of God came into the world to qualify Himself for occupying His momentous position of mediation within the sphere of the moral relations of God to men and of men to God. These are all indisputable facts, and they make it certain that the essential nature and objects of our Lord's earthly achievement, which culminated in the manner in which He met His death on the cross, were absolutely and exclusively moral. That it was so in our Lord's own way of conceiving of the nature, meaning, and

value of His life of obedience unto death, is manifest from His own words, e.g., in Joh 16:7-11.

But, secondly, the same conclusion follows from His attitude of resistance to the whole system of *legalism* which He found Judaism had developed and set up, as an order of fixed and unchangeable conditions, in the relations between God and men—between Him and them as individuals, and between Him and the Jewish nation at large as His own peculiar covenant people. The effect of this system, as being both theoretically and administratively legal, was conceived and opposed by our Lord as subversive of that moral order of things in which inward, direct, universal, and eternal relations are established between God and men (Mar 7:1-23). And it is a fact written broadly and deeply in all the Gospels, that if there was anything that He ever attempted more manifestly, strenuously, uncompromisingly, and more persistently than another, it was this, viz.: to overthrow completely and for ever the entire order of ideas which rested upon the stupendous error that the direct relations between God and men are legal, that they are founded on legal conditions, that they are to be maintained, administered, and mediated by legal means, and that, therefore, they are not inward but external (Matthew 5-7; Mat 15:1-20; Mat 15:23, Luk 11:38-54, Joh 5:5-17; Joh 7:37-53; Joh 8:31-59; Joh 12:37-50). What, then, does His attitude of unreserved and bold antagonism to the legal system of Judaism imply in the point of view here considered? (1) It implies that in His position in the moral order of the world He stood on the eternal fact and truth that the direct relations between God as a Moral Being and men as moral beings are inward and therefore essentially moral. (2) It implies, again, that He stood upon the predestined fact and truth that His position and work of mediation within the domain of these relations were also essentially moral and therefore anti-legal.

3. But, further, it follows from the nature of our Lord's earthly task that the achievement of it in the manner in which He lived and died was a moral *unity*. His personality or moral individuality was a unity. His will was a moral unity, and the entire series of the manifold inward and outward free moral activities of His life until His last moment on the cross, were related to one another as a perfectly consistent order of moral unity. He came into the world, as He Himself always represented, on one entirely homogeneous moral undertaking; and when this undertaking was fulfilled, He spoke of it in terms which show that He regarded the finished task as one homogeneous moral result (Joh 17:4; Joh 19:28). In other words, our Lord's obedience in His manner of living and dying followed the law of moral continuity. His obedience unto death was regulated, on His part, by *one* determinative moral principle; but there was diversity of incidental moral significance and value in the various positions in which His moral vocation summoned Him to act, and to be faithful and loyal to this principle.

(1) What was the principle which constituted the perfect moral unity of His obedience unto death? It was perfect love, manifesting itself in perfect self-sacrifice and service, and, in doing this, ever paying perfectly wise and loyal regard to the moral requirements of human life and destiny on the one hand, and to the moral requirements of God's holy will and purpose in relation to those human requirements on the other (Mat 20:28; Mat 26:39, Mar 10:45, Joh 10:17-18; Joh 13:1-17; Joh 3:13-21; Joh 4:34; Joh 5:17-44; Joh 8:49-50; Joh 8:54-55; Joh 17:1-7; Joh 17:23; Joh 17:26). From such sayings of our Lord's as are here referred to, it is obvious that the principle which regulated all the moral activities of His life was, in effect, of the nature and compass just defined. There are no words of His reported in any of the Gospels which justify the making of any *essential* distinction between the nature of His obedience or moral achievement during the time of the Passion, and the nature of it prior to the hour when He allowed Himself to fall into the power of His enemies. The period of His Passion was indeed unique in two things as regards His own part in it. From the moment that He began to pray in Gethsemane till the moment when He said 'It is finished,' on the cross, He endured unspeakable suffering, physical and moral, altogether unparalleled in His antecedent experience. Again, it was precisely during this period of His extremest suffering that all His powers of moral activity were subjected to their severest strain, and that they, under this strain, reached the highest possible point of their morally victorious, triumphant achievement. But these two facts, so distinctive of His Passion, made no real breach in the moral continuity and unity of the moral achievement of His life as a whole. His moral suffering did not begin with the last tragic hours of His life. There was an element of moral suffering in the compassion with which He was so often moved. He had looked forward to His predestined 'hour'; and His words, 'I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!' (Luk 12:50), suggest that, in anticipation of His cross, He may have spent many an hour in painful moral wrestling, in view of His destiny, long before His anticipations began actually to be realized. In any case, it may be taken as certain that there was no form of inward moral activity called forth in Him during the hours of His Passion, which had not been evoked many times over in previous situations of His life. But on the cross these moral activities of His, in the superlative degree of their strenuousness and in the transcendent magnitude of their victory over sin and temptation, eclipsed all the moral achievements of His past life. And yet in reality He died, in the sense of all that was essentially moral, as He had lived. He lived and died determined by the same moral principle, in the same spirit of love and self-sacrifice and service, and in the same spirit of perfectly wise and loyal regard to all the demands of God's will and purpose on Him, and to all the demands on Him of the world's moral needs.

This view of the moral unity of the achievement of Christ's earthly activities is the truth as it was in His own thought. His thought was this: 'Therefore doth my Father

love me, because I lay down my life (ἐγὼ τίθημι τὴν ψυχὴν μου), that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father' (Joh 10:17-18). Now there is absolutely nothing in these words to justify any theologian in limiting the application of them to what our Lord did during the hours of His Passion. What He did then, in the exercise of His powers of moral activity, was to *submit*, in a way perfectly pleasing to God, to the sort of death predestined for Him. Again, for Him who was in God, and who had God in Him, 'it was not death to die.' He never was more alive, in the highest and deepest sense of the word as applied to a perfect moral being, than in the very moment on the cross when He cried with a loud voice, saying, 'Father, into thy hands I commend my *spirit*' (Luk 23:46). He did indeed lay down His life in submitting to His death, which He indisputably contemplated in the same way as St. Peter did in the words, 'Him ... ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain' (Act 2:23, cf. Mat 16:21, Joh 7:19; Joh 8:37). But how did it come to pass that He was able to lay down His life in dying, doing so in such a manner that His Father loved Him in the doing of it and for the doing of it? It so came to pass because He had never done anything else but lay down His life (ψυχὴ) in *living*. All the moral powers of holy love, self-sacrifice, and service that were individualized in Him as the incarnate Son of God and man's Redeemer,—these powers, which were *His* life, He laid down, consecrated, employed, every moment and in every situation of His life of free activity, in order perfectly to fulfill His life's vocation as determined for Him by His Father's will and purpose, and by the moral necessities of the world which He had come to save. And it was because He did all this in living that He was able so successfully and triumphantly to do it all in dying. And the effect of this truth is neither to dim the moral splendour nor to detract from the moral value of our Lord's death, but rather to reveal how great was the moral splendour and value of all the activities, words, and deeds of His life.

(2) But if His life prepared Him for dying, His death on the cross raised the moral splendour and value of His whole life to its highest powers of revelation and effect in the human soul and in the moral history of the world. The supreme distinction of the cross, as our Lord Himself understood it and trusted and hoped in it, as related to man's redemption, was the unique, stupendous, tragic conjunction of sin and righteousness and judgment, a moral tragedy of which the cross was but the outward visible symbol. The complex event for which the cross stands is the most momentous and the most creative moral event in the history of the world's moral course. In the tragic moral truth of this event God and Christ and man, God's righteousness and love in Christ, man's sin and salvation, and eternal judgment, were and are all directly concerned in the highest degree. The fact of Christ's death is thus pregnant with all the inexhaustible powers necessary for the moral regeneration of the individual human soul and of the human race. Out of this fact springs the inspiration necessary

to illuminate the human conscience with divinest moral ideas, and to make it live in the divinest power of moral sentiment. And it is in this internal moral renewal and its manifestations that the soul finds its true redemption and its highest life; so Christ Himself evidently thought (Joh_16:7-11).

4. It now remains to note, from the standpoint of the moral order of the world, some features of our Lord's place and work therein, as *the Mediator between God and men*. His work of mediation in the flesh ended with His death on the cross, and it was preliminary to His mediation in the Spirit (Joh_14:12-26; Joh_16:7-11). His mediation in the Spirit, which will be continued until the Kingdom of God is perfected, is dependent for its existence and efficiency on the moral and historical conditions provided in His earthly life of obedience unto death, and in the revelation of sin, righteousness, and judgment in which the completion of His work in the flesh issued. What, then, are the nature, the objects, and the methods of our Lord's mediation?

(1) Its general object is to save individuals from their sin by reconciling them to God, to perfect them as individuals in their moral nature and life, and to unite all who are thus saved in a life of eternal oneness with God, and with one another in Him.—(2) The sphere within which the mediation of Christ is carried on with a view to that end is that of the inward and immediate moral relations of God as a moral Being to men, and of men as moral beings to God. It was so even during the time of His earthly life and ministry in so far as His mediation took real saving effect in the moral nature and life of any of His disciples. It is so still in the current dispensation of the Spirit by whose agency His mediation is brought to saving effect in souls. All the methods of the Spirit's work and all the moral effects that result from it imply the existence of internal, direct, living, moral relations between the soul and God in Christ.—(3) The mediation of Christ, as brought to effect by the Spirit's work, is in every case a relation of His mediation to the *individual*. For the Spirit cannot work in any number of individuals as a body unless in so far as He works in the moral nature and life of each.—(4) The mediation of Christ operates through the Spirit's agency by means of moral illumination and power—and moral illumination is always moral power.—(5) The moral means in question consist in the revelation of the holy gracious love or righteousness of God as realized by Christ, and manifested in His life and death of perfect self-sacrifice for the world's salvation. The best name for all this is 'grace'—the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, or the grace of God in Christ, which was and is no other thing than the sum of the living activities of God as holy love, evoked by men's need of salvation from sin—men as moral beings. And this grace of God in Christ is moral. It is the highest and grandest form of the self-manifestation of God as a perfect moral Being.—(6) Hence it is only by means of appropriate moral conditions, existing in the individual's own moral nature and inner life, that he can enter into and abide in a saving relation to the grace of God as mediated by Christ through the work of His Spirit. And these internal moral conditions are repentance, faith, and the spirit

of free and loyal obedience to Christ or to God, all of which are essentially related to one another, in every one of which the whole of the individual's moral nature comes to forms of manifestation in harmony with the will of God, and all together have the effect of uniting the individual directly and inwardly with God in Christ.—(7) This internal, immediate union of the individual with Christ, and therefore with God, is the true way of salvation and life for man (Joh 14:6) This secures not only forgiveness, but every moral or spiritual blessing that the individual needs for this world and the next, every blessing that God has to give or that it is possible for Him to bestow in Christ and through the work of His Spirit in the heart. The inward, direct union of the individual with Christ through repentance, faith, and the spirit of obedience, means that the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has made him free from the law of sin and death (Rom 8:1-4). This law of the Spirit of life in Christ is the law of eternal righteousness. Thus the moral regeneration of the individual through his entrance into a state of union with Christ, and with God in Him, is a new life, which carries in it the whole principle of eternal righteousness; and his union with Christ, his dependence on Christ, his fellowship with Him in the love that is of God, are guarantees that the law of righteousness will eventually receive complete fulfilment through his walking not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. And what is the law of the Spirit of life and righteousness in Christ but the law of that moral order, through which Christ Jesus, by means of His mediation, first in the flesh and then in the Spirit, is establishing and perfecting all the moral relations of individual men to God and to one another in Him? This is the new creation that Christ is evolving in the moral course of the world by means of His mediation. And, having made peace by the blood of His cross, He will continue His mediation until He has reconciled all things in heaven and on earth unto Himself, and therefore to God (Col 1:20).

Literature.—Dale, *Atonement*⁷ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , *Christian Doctrine*, chs. x.-xii.; Bruce, *Training of the Twelve*, chs. xii., xvii., xviii., xxii., *Humiliation of Christ*, 317-400; *Lux Mundi*, ch. vii.; Denney, *Death of Christ, Atonement and Modern Mind*; Weiss, *Bib. Theol. of NT*, i. 419-452; Beyschlag, *NT Theol.* ii. 133-164; Kaftan, *Dogmatik*, p. 446 ff.

W. D. Thomson.

II. In the Epistles.—In keeping with the amount of space devoted in the Gospels to the story of Christ's Passion is the place assigned to our Lord's death in the Epistles, and the significance evidently attached to it. The material is so abundant that it is impossible to give it in full detail. All that can be attempted is a brief sketch covering the chief epistolary groups, in which, however, the Apocalypse may be included, as containing the 'Letters to the Seven Churches,' and forming an important part of the Johannine cycle. Two distinct features come before us: (1) the place given in the Epp. to the death of Christ; (2) the meaning assigned to it.

1. The place given to the death of Christ.—Beginning with *1 Peter*, we see the prominence which the subject occupied in the Apostle's mind when we find him in his very first sentence speaking of 'the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ' (1Pe 1:2), and thereafter referring repeatedly to those sufferings of Christ on our behalf (1Pe 1:18 f., 1Pe 2:21 ff., 1Pe 3:18, 1Pe 4:1) of which he himself had been a witness (1Pe 5:1).

Coming to *St. Paul*, we have not only the fact, apparent to every reader, that he set Christ's death in the forefront of all his teaching, but his testimony that in doing so he was following the example of the earlier Apostles and the primitive Church. 'I delivered unto you first of all,' he writes, 'that which also I received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures' (1Co 15:3). And St. Paul's preoccupation with the death of Christ was not a passing phase of his religious experience. We find him speaking of it in the first and last chapters of his earliest Epistle (1Th 1:10; 1Th 5:10). In the great Epistles of his middle period it is his dominating thought. The Ep. to the Galatians is a passionate *apologia* for the gospel which he preached (Gal 1:8 ff.), a gospel whose substance he sums up in the words 'Jesus Christ ... crucified' (Gal 3:1), and with regard to which he exclaims, 'God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ' (Gal 6:14). In 1 Cor. he declares that when he came to Corinth he determined not to know anything there save Jesus Christ and Him crucified (1Co 2:2); and further assures his converts, in a passage already referred to, that in proclaiming Christ's death 'first of all' he was only maintaining the Christian tradition as he had received it (1Co 15:3). In this same Epistle he hands on (1Co 11:23) the special tradition of the institution of the Lord's Supper, refers to that rite as the central purpose for which the members of the Church came together (cf. 1Co 11:18 with 1Co 11:20 ff.), and says that in the observance of this great solemnity of the Christian faith we 'proclaim the Lord's death till he come' (1Co 11:26). 2 Cor., besides many other references, contains the great classical passage in which Christ's death is set forth as the convincing proof of His love and the basis of the ministry of reconciliation (2Co 5:14 ff.). In Romans the expressions 'Christ died' and 'his death' occur more frequently than in all the rest of St. Paul's Epistles put together. 'Christ died for the ungodly,' we read (Rom 5:6); 'while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us' (Rom 5:8); 'he died unto sins once' (Rom 6:10); 'it is Christ Jesus that died, yea rather that was raised from the dead' (Rom 8:34). Similarly, the Apostle writes, 'We were reconciled to God through the death of his Son' (Rom 5:10); 'we were baptized into his death' ... 'buried with him ... into death,' 'united with him by the likeness of his death' (Rom 6:3-5). And when we pass to the last group of the Pauline writings, although we find that in two of them, Colossians and Ephesians, the writer has a larger outlook than before, and thinks of Christ's work now as having a cosmic and not merely a human significance (Col 1:15., Eph 1:10; Eph 1:20 ff.), he still exalts Christ's death as the very core of the work He did. It is 'the firstborn from the dead' (Col 1:18) who is 'the firstborn of every creature'

(Col_1:15). 'He is before all things, and by him all things consist' (Col_1:17); but it is 'through death' (Col_1:22), 'through his blood' (Col_1:14), 'through the blood of his cross' (Col_1:20), that He brings peace and redemption and reconciliation (cf., further, Eph_1:10; Eph_1:20 ff. with Eph_2:13; Eph_2:16, Eph_5:2; Eph_5:25).

Very different views have been taken of the relation in the mind of the author of *Hebrews* between the incarnation and the death of Christ. But in any case it is agreed that it is upon the latter subject that the writer's attention is especially fastened. It is in what he has to say about the death of Christ and its purpose that we find the real message of the work. It is to elucidate and illustrate this great theme that the author draws so freely upon his intimate acquaintance with the sacrificial rites and ministering priesthood of the OT Church (Heb_1:3; Heb_2:9; Heb_2:14; Heb_7:27; Heb_9:12 ff., Heb_9:26 ff; Heb_10:10; Heb_10:19 f., Heb_10:29; Heb_12:2; Heb_12:24; Heb_13:12).

With regard to *the Apocalypse*, it is noteworthy that at the very beginning of the book Jesus Christ is introduced to us as 'the firstborn of the dead,' and that the ascription immediately follows, 'Unto him that loveth us, and loosed us from our sins by his blood' (Rev_1:5). And very significant surely is the constant recurrence, throughout the book, of the figure of the Lamb, a figure the meaning of which is made clear when the Lamb is described as 'the Lamb that was slain,' the Lamb by whose blood men of every nation have been 'purchased unto God' (see esp. Rev_5:6; Rev_5:9; Rev_5:12, Rev_7:14, Rev_12:11). 1 Jn. is a treatise not on the death of Christ but on the 'word of life' (1Jn_1:1). Jesus is conceived of as the manifested life (1Jn_1:2), and union with Him through faith as the source of eternal life to men (1Jn_5:11-13). And yet the condition of our transition from death to life is the fact that Christ 'laid down his life for us' (1Jn_3:14; 1Jn_3:16), and a Christian life which can be described as a 'walk in the light' is secured only by the fact that Jesus Christ the righteous is 'the propitiation for our sins,' and that His blood 'cleanseth us from all sin' (1Jn_1:7, 1Jn_2:1-2).

2. The meaning assigned to the death of Christ.—Having established the place given in the Epp. to Christ's death, we must now consider the meaning which is assigned to it. (1) The fundamental thought in all the groups is that the death of Christ is a *manifestation of the love of God*. 'God commendeth his own love toward us,' says St. Paul, 'in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us' (Rom_5:8). This Pauline keynote is one that is constantly struck. In 1 Peter 'the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ' is brought into immediate connexion with 'the foreknowledge of God the Father' (1Pe_1:2)—a view of the Father's relation to the *death* of Jesus which must not be lost sight of when the Apostle exclaims in the next verse, 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his great mercy begat us again unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead' (1Pe_1:3). The

author of Hebrews declares that it was *by the grace of God* that Jesus tasted death for every man (Heb 2:9), and that it was *by the will of God* that we were ‘sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all’ (Heb 10:9-10). In 1 Jn. we have the great utterance, ‘Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins’ (Heb 4:10).

In all these writers, then, the grace of the Heavenly Father is the source of the redemption which is bound up with the death of Christ. In the case of St. Paul the attempt is frequently made to show that his teaching on the subject of Christ’s death as a necessary sacrifice for sin is inconsistent with the utterances of Jesus Himself (e.g. in the parable of the Prodigal Son, Luk 15:20 ff.) with regard to the Father’s spontaneous love for sinners. But whatever St. Paul said as to the propitiatory character of the death of Christ, it is evident that he never felt that he was compromising the love of God in any way. On the contrary, he saw in God’s love the original motive of Christ’s sacrifice (2Co 5:18), and in that sacrifice the commendation of the Father’s love (Rom 5:8).

(2) Further, the death of Christ is uniformly represented as *the supreme expression of the love of Christ Himself*. With St. Paul this is a central and constantly recurring thought. ‘The love of Christ constraineth us,’ he exclaims in one of his greatest passages, ‘because we thus judge, that one died for all’ (2Co 5:14). ‘Christ also,’ says St. Peter, ‘suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God’ (1Pe 3:18). In the view of the author of Hebrews, Jesus ‘offered himself’ (through His death, viz., as the preceding phrase, ‘the blood of Christ,’ shows) to purge the human conscience (Heb 9:14). And St. John writes, ‘He’ (*i.e.* Christ) ‘laid down his life for us’ (1Jn 3:16).

The Father and the Son are thus represented as working together in Christ’s death for man’s salvation, and working together from motives of love. As St. Paul expresses it, ‘God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself’ (2Co 5:19). But Christ is not the involuntary instrument of the Father’s love for men; He is Himself a willing sacrifice. He is the ‘Lamb of God,’ indeed, as the Baptist said (Joh 1:29; Joh 1:36); but He is not ‘brought as a lamb to the slaughter,’ as in the dim figure of the OT prophet. Rather, as in the conception of the writer of Hebrews, He is the High Priest who makes the offering, even more than the Lamb that is laid on the altar (Heb 9:11-14). St. Paul sums up the matter apart from the imagery of the Tabernacle and the Temple, and in the simple dialect of the heart, when he says, ‘The Son of God loved me, and gave himself up for me’ (Gal 2:20).

(3) But while springing from the Divine love, the death of Christ is represented in the Epp. not less clearly as *a propitiation for sin*. According to St. Paul, as we have seen, it was the initial article of the primitive tradition that ‘Christ died for our sins

according to the Scriptures' (1Co 15:3). And this part of the primary deposit of Apostolic testimony reappears in the witness of all the different epistolary groups. It reappears so constantly that no reader of the NT will challenge the statement that Christ's death is invariably associated with the putting away of sin (cf. 1Pe 1:18 f., 1Pe 2:24; 1Pe 3:18, Gal 1:4; Gal 3:13; Gal 6:14, 2Co 5:14, Rom 3:21 ff; Rom 5:8 ff., Heb 9:26; Heb 9:28, 1Jn 1:7; 1Jn 2:2; 1Jn 4:10). The discussion of the precise nature of the relation between these two magnitudes—the death of Christ and the sin of man—belongs properly to the doctrine of the Atonement (See Atonement, Ransom, Reconciliation, Redemption). But this at least may be said, that however the matter may appear to those who deal with it from the point view of a philosophy of the Atonement, any interpretation of the mass of NT evidence seems difficult and forced which does not recognize that, in the view of these writers, Christ's death was really our death in a vicarious and propitiatory sense—that Jesus Christ died on our behalf that death which is the fruit of sin, taking upon Himself the Divine condemnation of sin, so that there might be no condemnation to those who are found in Him. That this is the Pauline teaching is generally admitted (see Rom 3:22 ff; Rom 4:23 ff; Rom 5:6 ff; Rom 8:1 and *passim*). But it seems not less the teaching of the other Epistles, if we take the language of the writers in its general connexion and natural sense. Is not this what St. Peter means when he says, 'Who his own self bare our sins in his body on the tree, that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness' (1Pe 2:24); and when he says again, 'Because Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God' (1Pe 3:18)? Is it not the meaning of the author of Hebrews when he finds in the sacrifices of the Old Covenant types and shadows of the sacrifice of Christ, and speaks of Him as 'having been once offered to bear the sins of many' (9:28)? And is it not the Johannine view—also, seeing that we find 'Jesus Christ the righteous' described as 'the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the whole world' (1Jn 2:2; cf. 1Jn 4:10; see also Rev 1:5; Rev 5:6; Rev 5:9; Rev 5:12)?

(4) Once more, the death of Christ is set forth in the Epp. as *a death from which there springs a life of holiness*. These writers relate the death of Christ to the power as well as to the guilt of sin; they conceive of it not only on the side of its propitiatory effect, but as bringing a mighty regenerating influence into the life of man. St. Peter connects the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ with sanctification of the Spirit and obedience (1Pe 1:2), and His death upon the tree with our living unto righteousness (1Pe 2:24). The author of Hebrews, who says that Christ offered up sacrifice for sins 'once for all, when he offered up himself (Heb 7:27), also says that the blood of Christ, by cleansing the conscience from dead works, sets us free 'to serve the living God' (Heb 9:14). St. John, writing of those who are already Christians, declares that the blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, cleanseth them from all sin (1Jn 1:7). But it is above all in the Epistles of St. Paul that we find a full treatment of this idea of Christ's death as the secret spring of a new life in the

Christian himself, of a crucifixion with Christ whereby the very life of the Son of God flows into the heart (Gal 2:20); of a burial with Christ which leads to a walk in newness of life, and a union with Him by a likeness to His death which carries with it the promise and the potency of a likeness to His resurrection (Rom 6:4-5).

There are some modern writers who insist that there is a duality in St. Paul's view when he approaches the subject of Christ's death in its relation to sin, and who distinguish between what they call his juridical and his ethico-mystical doctrines of reconciliation. The former is sometimes represented as nothing more than the precipitate of the Jewish theology in which the Apostle had been trained, while the latter is accepted as the genuine and immediate product of his personal experience (Holtzmann, *NT Theologic*, ii. 117f.). The common tendency among such writers is to hold that the Apostle had two quite distinct theories, which lay side by side in his mind in an entirely unrelated fashion. He set himself, it is supposed, to the high argument of showing how God and man could be reconciled, but never took the trouble to attempt to reconcile his own thoughts about the efficacy of Christ's death. This, however, seems less than just to St. Paul. His theology as a whole hardly warrants the conclusion that he had no gift of systematic thinking, or that he would be content to allow his ideas on justification and regeneration respectively to lie together in his mind without concerning himself as to any possible connexion between them. It seems in every way more reasonable to think, for example, that in Rom 6:1 ff., the Apostle is not suddenly introducing a set of entirely new conceptions, connected with the sacrament of baptism, about a mystical fellowship with Christ in His death, considered as an archetypal dying unto sin, which conceptions stand in no sort of relation to all that has been said in Rom 3:25 ff., about justification through faith in the propitiating blood of Christ. Rather it appears natural to hold, in Professor Denney's words, that the justifying faith of which St. Paul speaks in the earlier passage 'is a faith which has a *death* to sin in it' (*Expositor*, 6th ser. iv. [1901] p. 306), so that when by faith we make Christ's death our own, sin becomes to us what it is to the Sinless One Himself—we died to it as He died, and in dying to sin become alive unto God.

Literature.—Denney, *Death of Christ, Studies in Theol.* chs. v., vi., *Expositor*, VI. iv. [1901] 299 ff.; Stevens, *Chr. Doct. of Salvation*, pt. i. chs. iv.-vii.; Seeberg, *Der Tod Christi*; Weinet, *St. Paul*, ch. xx.; Weiss, *Bib. Theol. of NT*, i. 419-452; Kaftan, *Dogmatik*, p. 446 ff.; *Expos. Times*, xiv. [1903] 169.

J. C. Lambert.

DEBT, DEBTOR.—The Jews, being an inland people, and not directly interested in the world's trade, were slow to gain touch with the credit-systems of more commercial communities. But by Christ's day their business ideas, modified already in part by the Phœnicians, are seen overlaid and radically affected by Roman domination. The people, on the one hand, as they listened to the reading of the Law in public, had the OT ideal before them, which was one of notable mildness, backed by humanitarian ordinances. Debt in their old national life had been regarded as a passing misfortune, rather than a basal element in trading conditions. In the popular mind it was associated with poverty (Exo 22:25), a thing that came upon the husbandman, for instance, in bad seasons (Neh 5:3). Being thus exceptional, and a subject for pity, little or no interest was to be exacted (Exo 22:25), and a strict tariff excluded many things from the list of articles to be taken in pledge (Deu 24:6; Deu 24:17, Job 24:3, Amo 2:8, etc.), while in the Seventh or Fallow year (Exo 23:10-11 ff., Lev 25:1-7), and again amid the joys of Jubilee (Lev 25:30 ff.), the poor debtor had ample reason to rejoice. There was harshness in the tone, on the other hand, of the Roman methods, which were developed more on the lines of modern commerce. Often the more impoverished the debtor, the greater the exaction, as Horace expressly puts it (*Sat.* 1, 2, 14), 5 per cent. a month (60 per cent. per annum) being cited by him as a rate of interest not unknown.

In the Gospels we have suggestions of the money-customs of the day at Mat 21:12-13, Mar 11:15-18, Luk 19:45-48, and Joh 2:13-17. There are pictures of indebtedness in the parables of the Two Debtors (Luk 7:41-42), the Talents (Mat 25:14-30), and the Pounds (Luk 19:11-27). Lending and repaying are seen in practice at Luk 6:34; also a credit system at Luk 16:6-7, if the reference there be to merchants, and not simply to those who paid rents in kind. Imprisonment for debt appears in Mat 5:25-26; and in unmitigated form in the story of the Two Creditors (Mat 18:21-35), with selling into slavery, accompanied by the horror of 'tormentors' (Mat 18:34), although the whole passage is to be interpreted with caution, because Jesus in the fancied features of His tale may be reflecting, not the manners of His own land, but the doings of some distant and barbaric potentate. Enough that in the time of Christ there was seizure of the debtor's person, and the general treatment of him was cruel.

But whatever the law and custom, it was not the manner of Jesus to attack it. The civil code was left to change to higher forms in days to come. The exhibition of a certain spirit in face of it was what His heart craved, a spirit which should do justice to the best instincts of a true humanity. We can transcend in loving ways the nether aims even of bad laws; and it was the evasion of clear duty in this respect, by those in the high places of the religious world, which moved Jesus most. He was the champion of the merciful essence of the old enactments (Mat 5:17), while others around Him, prating of orthodoxy the while, were harsh to those unfortunately in their power (Mat 23:14), all in the name of an ancient law whose real inwardness they missed.

The Sadducees, whose love of money was whetted by enjoyment of the Temple dues, were not the men to show mercy to a debtor, nor were the Pharisees behind them, more Puritanic in zeal, and rigidly enforcing the letter of their writs. 'An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth' (Mat 5:38), as an old catchword, would infect the spirit in which, in the name of 'righteousness,' they complacently sued. Jesus lays down no outward rules such as might bear upon the modern business world. There fair and square dealing must be a first postulate; but, in the light of His gospel, men should be keener than they are to note hardships, and their hearts warmer towards cases of distress. In the spirit of the Golden Rule (Mat 7:12, Luk 6:31-36) merciful dealings will show themselves in undefined ways; and the love of brothermen should counteract the love of money which prompts to stem exactions in every case alike. The soul saved by Christian feeling from sordid views of life adds to its true treasure by making the circumstances of unfortunate ones an exercise-ground for tender, pitying grace. The metaphors of Jesus in Mat 5:39-42 are exceeding bold, and the generous treatment there inculcated may sound almost incredible, not to say subversive of social order; but the enlightened heart will recognize at once the kindly and sacrificing spirit meant to be strongly emphasized. The dynamic in the whole matter, with Jesus, is the remembrance of the pitiful nature of our own plight before God, to whom on the strict requirements of law we are indebted in countless ways. The more this inward situation is brought home to us, the more we shall outwardly be compassionate in turn. Here comes in the moral grandeur of the Beatitude on mercy (Mat 5:7), a principle which melts into prayer when we connect it with the tender breathing of the Petition on forgiveness (Mat 6:12). The humble and the contrite heart holds the key to magnanimity. See, further, art. 'Debt' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible .

Debtor.—There remains the question of debt as the emblem of moral short-coming (ὁ φειλημα, Mat 6:12. See Lord's Prayer), and the Supreme Creditor's way with men in this regard, especially as depicted in certain well-known parables. The image is natural which pictures the Deity sitting like a civil judge, to try men for defaults; and while some think more of the majesty of the law, and what must be exacted to satisfy the interests of order, others love to dwell on the prerogative of mercy, and favour judgments which are ameliorative as well as punitive. No reader of the Gospels can fail to see the latter characteristic strong in the teaching of the Master. Pardon befits the royal clemency, and God is known in the kingdom for sovereign displays of grace. Yet due weight is given to the other aspect of the image also—the satisfaction of the law; for Jesus teaches that it is only the pure in heart who see God (Mat 5:8); the holiness that avails must be inward, not that of the legalist (Mat 5:20), and only they who are merciful obtain mercy (Mat 5:7). But what is characteristic in the Gospel treatment of the subject is not any dwelling upon absolute judgments—these are left to the Searcher of Hearts; rather we are taken by Jesus to the sphere of *proximate*

evidence, and shown that in the individual life the presence or absence of the forgiving spirit is sure token of the presence or absence of the Divine condescension as regards the person himself. In other words, principles discovered in the relations of men with each other are *a fortiori* valid for their relationship to God (Mat 6:14-15).

The elder brother of the Prodigal (Luk 15:25-32) illustrates the point; representing as he does the Pharisaic type of mind—common in all ages and pronouncedly so in the time of Jesus—which complacently fancies itself well within the Kingdom, but shows by its harsh attitude to fellow-mortals that it is inwardly not right with God. The elder brother is pictured, not without point, as remaining outside the banquet-hall, so long as he continued in his implacable mood.

The story of the Two Debtors (Luk 7:36-50) shows the vital contrast of the matter in the persons of the Woman who was a Sinner—truly gracious in her doings, because full now of penitence and faith and love—and Simon, hide-bound and censorious like his class, with no disciplined sense of having been humbled like her before God. The latter, like the debtor of the trivial fifty pence, had little reaction of wholesome feeling in his mind; the former had manifestly much, like the man over-joyed to find himself relieved from a financial peril ten times greater. This is a concrete instance of the method of the Master. Certain visible acts of the woman at the banquet bespoke the inward action of God's Spirit, and argued a state of reconciliation with Him. From the scanty graciousness of Simon, on the other hand, one inferred just as truly a heart imperfectly attuned to goodness, and knowing little of the joy of pardon. 'To whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little' (Luk 7:47). As to which is the root and which the fruit, rival systems of theology may battle; but the fact is, the two graces are eternal co-relatives, and either may be first in the order of thought when neither is entitled to absolute precedence in fact. See Forgiveness.

The parable of the Two Creditors (Mat 18:23-35) shows the other side of the shield from the Woman's case, in a person of downright inhumanity concerning whom it is equally clear that he had no saving experience of God's mercy himself. The story, as a story, is remarkable for simple force; we feel the horror of the implacable attitude of the servant forgiven for a great indebtedness, who failed to show goodwill in turn to a subordinate for a default infinitely less. Nemesis descends (Mat 18:34) when he finds he is not forgiven after all—he loses that which he had seemed to have (Mat 18:27). 'So likewise shall my Heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses' (Mat 18:35).

Jesus saw many around Him glorying in fancied privilege and very zealous for the Law, yet omitting its essential matters—justice, mercy, faith. To such especially this Gospel message was addressed; broadening out in what for Him was the supreme truth, that love to God is seen and tested in love to man. To be sympathetic,

sacrificing, generous, is not only the pier from which the heavenward arch springs, but the pier to which it returns. The forgiving God cannot possibly be seen in those who hide themselves from their own flesh (Luk_6:36).

Literature.—Besides art. ‘Debt’ in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , the Comm. on the passages referred to, and the standard works on the Parables, the following may be consulted:—Edersheim, *Life and Times*, ii. p. 268 ff.; Schurer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii. 1. 362f.; *Expositor*, i. vi. (1877) p. 214 ff.; Ker, *Serm.* 1st ser. p. 16 ff.

George Murray.

⚡ Decapolis

DECAPOLIS.—A league of ten Greek cities (ἡ Δεκάπολις) in eastern Palestine, which was probably formed at the time of Pompey's invasion of Palestine, 64-63 b.c. By the Greek cities Pompey was hailed as a deliverer from the Jewish yoke, and many towns elevated Pompey's campaign to the dignity of an era. The coins of Gadara, Canatha, Pella, Dion, and Philadelphia use the Pompeian era. At first the league must have comprised just ten cities. According to Pliny (*HN* v. 18), these were Scythopolis (*Beisân*), Hippos (*Susieh*), Gadara (*Umm Keis*), Pella (*Fahil*), Philadelphia ('*Amman*), Gerasa (*Jerâsh*), Dion, Canatha (*Kanawât*), Damascus, and Raphana. The formation of a confederation of Greek cities in the midst of a Semitic population was necessary for the preservation of Hellenic civilization and culture. From the days of Alexander the Great, who sought to Hellenize the Orient by founding Greek cities throughout the conquered lands, there were Greek cities in Palestine. The Seleucid kings of Antioch and the Ptolemies encouraged the immigration of Greeks into this region. Among the cities occupied before 198 b.c. by the incoming Greeks were Pella, Dion, Philadelphia, Gadara, and Abila in the region east of the Jordan. Hippos and Gerasa are first named in the early part of the 1st cent. b.c. (Josephus *BJ* i. iv. 8). Among the cities liberated by Pompey from the Jewish yoke, Hippos, Scythopolis, and Pella are expressly named; and Gadara, which had been destroyed by the Jews, was rebuilt (*BJ* i. vii. 7). Pompey annexed these cities to the province of Syria, but conferred upon them municipal freedom. All the cities of the Decapolis had in the Roman period the rights of coinage and asylum, and were allowed to maintain a league for defence against their common foes.

The first references in literature to the Decapolis are found in the Gospels. On our Lord's first journey through all Galilee, He was attended by crowds from all parts of

Palestine, among whom were persons from Decapolis (Mat_4:25). Most likely these were Jews, who formed a considerable part of the population even in Greek cities. The fierce Gerasene demoniac, whom our Lord healed, published in the Decapolis what things Jesus had done for him (Mar_5:20). The presence of two thousand swine on the eastern shores of the Lake of Galilee would of itself suggest the presence of a Gentile population in that vicinity. When our Lord returned from Tyre and Sidon to the Sea of Galilee, He crossed the upper Jordan and passed south through the district governed by the tetrarch Philip to the eastern shore of the Lake. In order to reach the Sea of Galilee, He went 'through the midst of the borders of Decapolis' (Mar_7:31). Hippos lay just east of the Lake, Gadara a few miles to the south-east, and in full view from the southern end; Pella and Scythopolis were not far to the south; while the other cities of the Decapolis lay to the north-east, east, and south-east of the Lake. Our Lord visited the Jewish population of Peraea in His later ministry, but He seems never to have made a tour to the great cities of the Decapolis. His rebuff in connexion with the destruction of the herd of swine was rather discouraging (Mar_5:17).

Two famous writers of the latter part of the 1st cent. a.d. speak of the Decapolis. Pliny not only preserves the names of the ten cities (*HN* v. 18), but also praises the small olives of the region (Mar_15:4). Josephus refers to Decapolis repeatedly. In the 2nd cent. a.d. Ptolemy (v. xv. 22) names eighteen towns as belonging to the league of Decapolis. He omits Raphana from Pliny's list, and adds nine, most of the new members of the confederation belonging to the district just south of Damascus. In his day Hellenic civilization and commerce in the region beyond the Jordan were at their zenith. The modern traveller, wandering over the ruins of temples, theatres, and baths at Gerasa, Philadelphia, and Gadara, is impressed with the glories of the Grecian life in Palestine during the period of our Lord's earthly ministry and for some centuries afterwards.

Literature.—Schurer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. i. 94 ff.: G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [Note: *GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*] 593 ff.; G. Holscher, *Palastina in der pers. u. hellen. Zeit*; Schumacher, *Across the Jordan*; Merrill, *East of the Jordan*.

John R. Sampey.

☞ Deceit, Deception, Guile

DECEIT, DECEPTION, GUILLE

1. *Words and references.*—Mar 7:22, Joh 1:47 (δόλος, ‘bait,’ ‘stratagem,’ ‘guile,’ ‘craft,’ ‘treachery’; cf. Rom 1:29, 2Co 11:13; 2Co 12:16, 1Th 2:3; 1Pe 2:1; 1Pe 2:22, Rev 14:5); Mat 13:22 (ἄτατη, ‘trick,’ ‘fraud,’ ‘deceit’; cf. Eph 4:22, Col 2:8, Heb 3:13); Mat 24:4, Joh 7:12 (τλανκω, ‘lead astray,’ ‘deceive’; πλάνος, ‘deceiver’; πλανη, a ‘leading astray,’ ‘cheating’; cf. 1Th 2:3, 1Jn 1:8).

2. Pfleiderer in *Early Christian Conception of Christ* (1905) devotes a chapter to the subject of Christ as the Conqueror of Satan—‘that old serpent, called the Devil, which *deceiveth* the whole world’ (Rev 12:9). His aim is to find parallels to Christ in various nature myths and heathen religions, and by so doing to explain the Gospel story as only a special embodiment of a universal tendency. While rejecting Pfleiderer’s theory, we admit that one of the most suggestive aspects under which the life of our Lord may be considered is to regard it as a deadly conflict between the Divine Representative of the Truth, and the instruments and agents of the spirit of deception and guile. Such a conflict was inevitable. The coming of One who had the right to say, ‘I am the light of the world,’ ‘I am the truth’; ‘every one that is of the truth heareth my voice’ (Joh 8:12; Joh 14:6; Joh 18:37), was bound to stir into bitter hostility all the forces of untruth and craft. The antagonism is set forth in universal terms in Joh 3:19-21. At every stage of the Divine drama we see that those ‘who loved darkness rather than light’—the men of perverted mind and crooked ways—turned from Jesus with aversion and sought His destruction. The whole significance of the struggle may be said to have been summed up and symbolized in our Lord’s conflict with the Pharisees. Their hostility to Him began in *self-deception*. Wedded to their own ideas and standard of character and duty, they resented His teaching. They could not conceive the possibility of a revision of life in the light of a larger and nobler ideal of righteousness. But the vision of moral beauty must either captivate or blind. Before long the Pharisees brought down on themselves the severest denunciations for their moral obtuseness, duplicity, and hypocrisy (Matthew 23, Joh 8:12-59). The estrangement was complete. To destroy Jesus they now ‘plumed up their wills in double knavery’ (Iago). In almost every glimpse we get of them they are moving in a murky atmosphere of craft, intrigue, and hate. They do not hesitate to resort to every artifice and stratagem which unscrupulous cunning could suggest. They endeavour, by subtle questions, to entangle Him in His talk (Mat 22:15); they attempt to deceive the people as to His true character (Mar 3:22-30, Joh 9:24); they plot together as to how He may be put to death (Joh 11:53); they enter into a covenant with Judas to betray Him (Mat 26:14-15); they set up false witnesses, and pervert and misrepresent His teaching (Mat 26:59-62, Luk 23:1). It was by deceit and guile that they obtained Pilate’s permission to crucify Him (Joh 19:12).

3. We gain a heightened impression of their character and conduct by contrast. While the men of deception and guile hated the Light, we see another class attracted by it. From the beginning of His ministry, Jesus drew to Himself the sincere, the childlike, the men of 'honest and good heart' (Luk 8:16). The first Apostles of the Lord were by no means exempt from serious faults and frailties of character; but, with the exception of Judas, they were singularly honest and upright men; men with a genuine enthusiasm for goodness. One of them drew from Jesus on His first approach the suggestive exclamation, 'Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile' (Joh 1:47). In the teaching and training of these first Apostles and disciples, our Lord especially emphasized the necessity of those virtues of character in which the Pharisees were so singularly deficient (Mat 5:8; Mat 7:1-4; Mat 10:16; Mat 11:25; Mat 18:3, Luk 12:1-3). In this connexion it is of vital importance to bear in mind Mat 6:22-23. There are various degrees and stages of deception and guile, beginning with over-intellectual refinement, and passing finally into deliberate fraud and treachery. But in every case it means the lack of the 'single eye,' or perfect sincerity, and simplicity of nature. And, therefore, if Christian men and women are to keep themselves free, not merely from 'fleshly lusts,' but also from the more subtle forms of 'spiritual wickedness,' they must be continually testing and reviewing their ideals and conceptions of character and conduct in the light of their Master's life and teaching. Unless they do this, the light that is in them will turn to darkness.

'There is, I believe,' says Bishop Gore, 'nothing to which in our time attention needs to be called more than to the fact that conscience is only a *faculty* for knowing God and His will. It is certain, unless it is educated, to give wrong information. *And the way to educate it is to put it to school with the "Light of the world."* Alas! there must be multitudes of respectable and self-enlightened people of whom it is true that the light which is in them is darkness' (*The Sermon on the Mount*, p. 147). The testimony of the late Dr. Dale is not less emphatic. 'I doubt whether most of those who have been formed by the faith and traditions of the Evangelical movement are sufficiently impressed by the necessity of educating the conscience.... This partly explains how it is that some Christian people are worse men—morally—than some who are not Christians. The faculty of conscience requires a great deal of education if we are to distinguish between the right and the wrong in all the details of life' (*The Evangelical Revival*, p. 98).

Literature.—In addition to the books already referred to, the reader may consult Newman Smyth, *Christian Ethics*; Prof. Knight, *The Christian Ethic*; F. D. Maurice, *The Conscience and Social Morality*; J. R. Illingworth, *Christian Character*; H. Wace, *Christianity and Morality*; R. W. Church, *Discipline of the Christian Character*.

Arthur Jenkinson.

⚠️ Decree

DECREE (Gr. δόγμα, Luk_2:1).—In the Gospel of Luke, the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem is traced to the fact that a census of the people of Israel was being taken, which made it necessary that Joseph and Mary, who were both of Davidic descent, should go up from their home at Nazareth to the City of David. This census was brought about by the issue of a decree of Caesar Augustus, that the Roman world should be taxed or registered. Historians find much to question here as to St. Luke's accuracy. Was it likely that Herod's independent kingdom would be included in such a decree? Is there any evidence that such an order on so great a scale was then issued? As to Cyrenius [Quirinius], in whose governorship of Syria this census is said to have taken place, can it be proved that he was twice governor of Syria? He was governor, some 10 years later, when the census took place, which caused the rebellion under Judas of Galilee, in 760 a.u.c. The researches of Wieseler, Zumpt, and W. M. Ramsay (*Was Christ born at Bethlehem?*) have shown, however, that St. Luke's statement is capable of a good defence, and may turn out to have full corroboration. Such a plain historical note, put in, with evident intention, by St. Luke, we should be slow to reject from one who is generally so well informed. See Augustus, Birth of Christ, Quirinius.

David M. W. Laird.

⚠️ Dedication, Feast Of

DEDICATION, FEAST OF (τὰ ἐγκαίνια).—This Feast was kept by the Jews on 25 Chislev and throughout the week following. The dedication commemorated in it was the dedication of a new altar by Judas Maccabaens in b.c. 164 (1Ma_4:36-59, 2Ma_10:1-8, Josephus *Ant.* xii. vii. 6, 7). The old altar of Zerubbabel's temple had been defiled in b.c. 167, when 'an abomination of desolation' was erected upon it (1Ma_1:54), and the climax was reached on 25 Chislev, when sacrifices were offered upon this idol-altar standing on the altar of God (v. 59). For three years this state of profanation had continued, but when the third anniversary of the desecration came round, the heroic efforts of Judas Maccabaens and his companions had reached such success that they were able to cleanse the Holy Place and to set up a new altar in place of that which had been defiled, spending a week in special services for its dedication; and, in order to commemorate this, Judas Maccabaens ordained 'that the days of the dedication of the altar should be kept in their seasons from year to year

by the space of eight days, from the five and twentieth day of the month Chislev, with gladness and joy' (1Ma 4:59).

The Feast is mentioned once in the Gospels (Joh 10:22) as the occasion of a collision between our Lord and the Jews in the temple, when He made the claim, 'I and the Father are one,' and the Jews took up stones to stone Him. The occasion of the incident is full of significance. When the Holy Place was being cleansed in b.c. 164, the question had arisen as to how the old altar ought to be treated, seeing that it had suffered from heathen pollution, and the conclusion reached was that it should not be used any more, but a new one dedicated in its place, and that the old one should be pulled down and its stones stored in a convenient place 'until there should come a prophet to give an answer concerning them' (1Ma 4:44-46). On the anniversary of this event, some two centuries later, there stood Christ in the temple courts, and in effect, though not in so many words, the question was actually put to Him whether He was the prophet foretold. 'How long dost thou hold us in suspense?,' they asked, 'If thou art the Christ, tell us plainly' (Joh 10:24). It was, indeed, a fitting occasion on which to raise the question, since the whole Festival breathed hopes connected with the national deliverance of Maccabaeian times, looking forward to another deliverance in the future such as would come with the Messiah. Unhappily the questioners were not sincere, and would not receive the testimony of our Lord, not even when He referred them to His works as proving His claims; and so the matter ended where it began. Had they listened, they would have found the Deliverer whom they were expecting, and incidentally also they would have learned the solution of the old difficulty about the stones of the desecrated altar—that these might lie where they were, being needed no more, for there was being dedicated another Temple to supersede the old (cf. Joh 2:19).

It is not quite clear how much of St. John's narrative belongs to Dedication, whether the incidents of Joh 9:1 to Joh 10:21 happened then, or whether they belong to the Feast of Tabernacles (Joh 7:2). These two Feasts had much in common; in fact, it appears that Dedication was to some extent modelled on Tabernacles (2Ma 10:6; cf. 2Ma 1:9). In particular, the ritual of both included a special illumination, which was so marked at Dedication that, according to Josephus (*Ant.* xii. vii. 7), the Festival was actually called 'Lights.' In either case, therefore, there is special point in our Lord's announcement in Joh 9:5 'I am the light of the world,' in which He pointed to the brilliant illuminations of the Temple and Jerusalem generally, whether at Tabernacles or Dedication, and claimed that, while these lamps and candles made the city full of light, He Himself was giving light to the whole world.

Literature.—Art. 'Dedication' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible and in *Encyc. Bibl.*; Schurer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] i. i. 217 f.; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 226, *The Temple*, 333 ff.

☩ Defilement

DEFILEMENT.—See Purification.

☩ Deliverance

DELIVERANCE (ἄφεσις).—The English word does not occur in the Gospels, except in a quotation from the OT (see below), but the Gr. word is found 8 times (in Mat_26:28, Mar_1:4, Luk_3:3; Luk_1:77; Luk_24:47 it is rendered ‘remission’ [of sins]; in Mar_3:29 ‘forgiveness’; in Luk_4:18 ^{bis} (a) ‘deliverance’ [Authorized Version], ‘release’ [Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885], (b) [to set] ‘at liberty’); while the fact of deliverance underlies all that is recorded of Jesus, and has coloured the entire thought of Christianity. To think of Christ is to think of Him as Saviour. In such utterances as ‘The Son of Man is come to save that which was lost’ (Mat_18:11), and ‘the Son of Man is not come to destroy men’s lives, but to save them’ (Luk_9:56), we have the keynote of Christ’s mission. He sounds it in the beginning when, preaching in the Nazareth synagogue (Luk_4:18), He declares His work to be, in the words of Isa_61:1, ‘to preach deliverance to captives.’ His days are passed in saving men from every slavery that binds them to the transient. This is at the root of all His acts of deliverance—even the healings. When He gives physical renewal to the lame, the diseased, the dumb, the blind, the paralyzed, it is always that they may the easier find spiritual perfection. Moral and spiritual deliverance are often associated with a bodily purification—greatly to the confusion of contemporary traditionalists. They are astonished that He should say to the one sick of the palsy, ‘Thy sins be forgiven thee’ (Mar_2:5), or to the leper, ‘Thy faith hath made thee whole’ (Luk_17:18). In the typical prayer taught to His disciples there is no word about life’s miseries, poverty, or pain: the petition is simply ‘Deliver us from evil’ (Mat_6:13, Luk_11:4): the soul’s need being eternal outweighs the need of mind and body. And we can hardly doubt that, as He looked upon that long and sad procession of the bodily wrecks that came to Him ‘at even’ (Mar_1:32), the heart of the Missioner in Christ was kindled by the vision of souls that would be set free to fulfil better their purpose of life when the numbed or tortured body was given rest and cure. Conscious of the necessities of daily life, He, better than all others, knows how temporary they are, and lifts His voice continually against the soul’s voluntary bondage to things material. ‘Seek ye first the kingdom of God’ (Luk_12:31); ‘Lay up treasure in heaven’ (Mat_6:20); ‘Beware, and keep yourselves from covetousness’ (Luk_12:15); ‘If thou wouldst be

perfect, go, sell that thou hast, and give to the poor ... and come, follow me' (Mat 19:21)—such phrases indicate the deliverance from the world and its anxieties which culminates in the invitation of Jesus—'Come unto me ... and I will give you rest' (Mat 11:28).

The highest of the self-chosen titles ring with deliverance. Jesus calls Himself the Good Shepherd, who will even give His life for the sheep (Joh 10:11); He is the Way, the Truth, and the Life (Joh 14:6), leading from earth and time to heaven and eternity; He is the Light of the World (Joh 8:12), to bring all wanderers safely from darkness and danger to light and safety. The Christian Church has always read in His titles, His words, and His actions this moral and spiritual significance. Christ has been, and is, the Saviour of men from sin and evil rather than from pain and suffering. See Forgiveness.

E. Daplyn.

☒ Demon, Demoniacal Possession, Demoniacs

DEMON, DEMONICAL POSSESSION, DEMONIACS

1. The demonology of the Gospels is based upon beliefs which were current among the Jews previous to the time of Christ; these beliefs arose gradually, and were ultimately stereotyped in the Talmud. For the proper understanding of Gospel demonology some insight into these Jewish beliefs is indispensable. But the demonology of the Jews was profoundly influenced and coloured, at different times, by Babylonian, Egyptian, Persian, and Greek teaching on the subject, while the beliefs of these highly cultured peoples were developments of the much earlier conceptions of man in a very much lower stage of civilization,—conceptions which are practically universally prevalent among savage races at the present day. To deal with the subject, therefore, in all its bearings would be impossible here; it must suffice to give references to a few of the many works which deal with the different branches of this vast subject. Details of Jewish demonology must, however, be given, for it will be seen that they are necessary for a proper understanding of Gospel demonology; added to these will be found some few references to the earlier beliefs upon which they are based.

For the beliefs of primitive man

Maury, *La Magie et l'Astrologie dans l'antiquite et au moyenage*, Paris, 1857; Frazer, *The Golden Dough* 2, ch. iii. *passim*. London, 1900; Lang, *The Making of Religion* 2,

ch. vii., London, 1900; Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, ch. xiv. etc., but the whole work should be studied. Cf. Réville's *Hist. of Religions*, chs. iii.-vi., London, 1884.* [Note: There are a number of works on Comparative Religion in which the beliefs in demons and the like are incidentally dealt with; but a detailed list of these would be inappropriate here.]

For Assyro-Babylonian beliefs

Budge, *Assyrian Incantations to Fire and Water*, London, 1883; Hommel, *Gesch. Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] und Ass.* pp. 237-269, 388 ff., Berlin, 1885; Jastrow, *Die Rei. Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] und Ass.* ch. xvi., Giessen, 1902 ff. [this is enlarged from the Eog. translation]; A. Jeremias, *Das AT [Note: T Altes Testament.] im Lichte des alten Orients*, pp. 218 ff., 330, 340 ff., Leipzig, 1904; King, *Babylonian Magic and Sorcery*, London, 1896, *Babylonian Religion and Mythology*, p. 200 ff., London, 1899; Lenormant, *La Magie chez les Chaldéens et les origines accadiennes*, Paris, 1875; Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures*, v., London, 1887; Stube, *Jüdisch-babylonische Zaubertexte*, Halle, 1895. Many indirect points of importance will be found in Ball's *Light from the East*, London, 1899; Morgenstern, 'Doctr. of Sin in the Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] Rel.' in *Mittheil. der vorderasiat. Gesellsch.* iii., 1905; Weber, 'Dämonenbeschworung bei den Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] und Assyr. [Note: Assyrian.]' in *Der Alte Orient*, vii. 4, Leipzig, 1906.

For Egyptian beliefs

Budge, *Egyptian Magic*, ch. vii., London, 1899; Ed. Meyer, *Gesch. des alten Aegyptens*, ch. iii., Berlin, 1887; Wiedemann, 'Magie und Zauberei im alten Aegypten,' in *Der alte Orient*, vi. 4, Leipzig, 1905, cf. also, by same author, and in same series, iii. 4, 'Die Unterhaltungslit. der alten Aegypter.'

For Persian beliefs

Darmesteter, *The Zend-Avesta* (Part i. 'The Veodidad'), Fargard xix., xxi.; Geiger, *Ostiranische Kultur im Alterthum*, § 38, Erlangeo, 1882; Haug, *Essays on the Sacred Language, Writings and Religion of the Parsis*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (translation by E. H. West), London, 1884; Spiegel, *Eranische Alterthumskunde*, vol. ii., Leipzig, 1871-1878; Stave, *Ueber den Einfluss des Parsismus auf das Judenthum*, Haarlem, 1898 [see especially the third division, §§ 4, 5. A most helpful book on this particular branch of the subject]; Windischmann, *Zoroastrische Studien*, pp. 138-148, Berlin, 1863.

For Greek beliefs

Gruppe, *Die Griechischen Culte und Mythen ...*, i. pp. 184-196, Leipzig, 1887; Maury, *Hist. des Religions de la Grèce antique*, i. pp. 565-581, ii. pp. 91-93, iii. pp. 419-443, Paris, 1857; Preller, *Griechische Mythologie*⁴ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , under 'Daemonen,' Berlin, 1887; Roscher, *Lexikon der Gr. und Rom.* [Note: Roman.] *Mythologie*, art. 'Daimon' [where full literature on the subject is given], Leipzig, 1884, etc. See also Lobeck, *Agioaphamus*, pp. 695, 696, 1092, Berlin, 1829.

For a *résumé* of Babylonian, Egyptian, Persian, and Greek influence on Jewish demonology, see the remarkably able series of articles by F. C. Conybeare in *JQR* [Note: QR Jewish Quarterly Review.] viii. ix. (1896, 1897). See also *Encyc. Bibl.* art. 'Demons,' §§ 7, 11.

2. The Old Testament.—The demonology of the OT is probably somewhat more complex than is sometimes assumed.† [Note: 'It is singular that the OT is so free from demonology, hardly containing more than one or two examples thereof' (F. C. Conybeare, loc. cit. above).] The analogy of other races would *prima facie* support the inference that the Israelites also had their beliefs in demons (see Literature below). Much weight cannot be laid on the (not frequent) occurrence of δαιμων and δαιμόνιον in the LXX Septuagint , as they stand for varying words in the original; but there are a number of Hebrew expressions which must be connected with demons, in all events as far as the popular imagination was concerned; these are: רַעַתַּת רִחַת 'evil spirit, Jdg 9:23, 1Sa 16:14; עֲשֵׂיִם רִחַת 'spirit of perverseness,' Isa 19:14 : שָׂדִים 'demons', Deu 32:17, Psa 106:37; שְׂעִירִים 'satyrs,' Lev 17:7, Isa 13:21; Isa 34:14; קִמָּב 'destruction,' conceived of as due to demoniac power, see the whole verse, Psa 91:6; עֲלִיקָה 'female blood-sucker,' Pro 30:15; לַיְלִית 'night-hag,' Isa 34:13-14; עֲזָאזֵל, Lev 16:8 ff. 'Azazel,' a desert spirit. This last instance clearly shows how firmly embedded in popular imagination was this belief in evil powers of the solitude.* [Note: Whitehouse in Hastings' DB i. 591a.] It is true that Babylonian influence during and after the Exile was responsible for much of this;† [Note: lb.] but that the Israelites from the earliest times, like every other race, peopled the world with innumerable unseen powers, cannot admit of doubt. According to OT conceptions, the evil spirits are not the subjects of some supreme ruler; in the earlier books they are represented as fulfilling the commands of Jehovah in doing harm to men, but later on they seem to enjoy complete independence, though even here the conceptions are

not consistent (cf. Job 1:6-12). When we come to the Apocrypha, we find that an immense development has taken place; see, e.g., Tob 3:6; Tob 3:8; Tob 6:7; Tob 6:17; Tob 8:2 f., Bar 4:7; Bar 4:35, Wis 2:24, Sir 21:27; cf. as regards other late literature the Book of Enoch 15. 16. 19. 53. The more important literature bearing on this branch of the subject is as follows:—

W. R. Smith, *RS* [Note: S Religion of the Semites.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 120 ff.; Wellhausen, *Reste Arab.* [Note: Arabic.] *Heident.* 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 148 ff.; Doughty, *Arabia Deserta*, ii. p. 188 ff.; Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*, pp. 68, 184, etc.; Nowack, *Heb. Arch.* ii. p. 186 ff.; Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures*, 1887, p. 146, etc.; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , the *Encyc. Bibl.*, and the *Jewish Encyc.* under artt. 'Demons,' 'Lilith,' 'Azazel'; Hamburger's *Real.-Encyc.*, Riehm's *HWBA*, Herzog's *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] under artt. 'Geister,' 'Feldgeister,' 'Dämonen,' etc. Other works that should be consulted are: Baudissin, *Studien zur Sem.* [Note: Semitic.] *Volksrelig.*; Lagrange, *Études sur les rel. Semit.* 2; Frazer, *Golden Bough*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , ii.

3. Later Judaism.‡ [Note: By this is meant the period during which the Talmud was in process of formation; it was not completed until about a.d. 500, but the traditions concerning demons and the general teaching on the subject (even in the latest portions) embody conceptions of much earlier date.] —The following are the Talmudic words for demons: , חבללה מלאכי (πνεύματα), שומא רות (πνεύμα ἀκάθαρτον), רעה רות (πνεύμα πονηρόν), שר רות (πνεύμα δαίμονος). See further below. While it is abundantly clear that external influences have left their marks on Jewish demonology, it is certain that much of the latter was of indigenous growth; the whole system, so immense, so intricate, and in many respects so puerile, is stamped too plainly with the Judaic genius for this to be questioned. Only a very brief summary of the main points can be here indicated.§ [Note: The details here given have been gathered from a large number of sources which cannot be individually specified; see the Literature at the end of this article.]

(a) *Origin of demons.*—As has not infrequently been found to be the case with Jewish tradition, there are varying accounts; in this case two distinct traditions exist. According to the one, it is said that the demons were created | | [Note: | It is their supposed creation on a Friday which makes this day one of ill-omen.] by God before

the world was made; Satan, ¶ [Note: Satan, according to another account, was created at the same time as Eve; Cain was their offspring (cf. Gen 4:1 where the Heb. קָנָה is not the usual word for begetting). ‘Baal-zebul’ is also regarded, in the Talmud, as a prince among demons, and is looked upon as the most evil of all evil spirits.] who is identical with the serpent, is the chief of the demons. They were of both sexes, and their species was propagated through cohabitation with Adam and Eve during a period of 130 years after the Creation. The other tradition is based on Gen 6:1-8 (cf. 2Pe 2:4-5); two angels, Assael and Shemachai, loved the daughters of men, and, forsaking their allegiance to God, descended from heaven to earth; one of these angels returned to heaven and did not sin, but the other accomplished his desire, and his offspring became demons.

(b) *The nature of demons.*—The general name for all demons is *mazzîkîn* (מַזְיִקִין), and this indicates their nature, מַזְיִק = ‘one who does harm.’** [Note: * This is illustrated in Joh 8:37; Joh 8:41; Joh 8:44 ‘Ye seek to kill me ... ye do the works of your father ... ye are of your father the devil.’] The head of them is Satan (הַשָּׂטָן = ‘the adversary’); it is his aim to mislead men into evil, and then to accuse them before God, hence the further name מַקְטָנֵר (κατήγορος) = ‘accuser’ (cf. Zec 3:1). He is at liberty to enter the Divine presence at all times (cf. Job 1:6) and accuse men before God; only on the Day of Atonement is he refused admittance. As the angel of death, he is identical with Sammael, who is known also as ‘the head of all the Satans.’ The kingdom of Satan (cf. Mar 3:23 ff.) consists of himself, as head, and an innumerable horde of angels or messengers (מַלְאָכִים) who do his will;* [Note: The very term ‘the angel of Satan’ is used, cf. ἀγγελος Σατανᾶ, 2Co 12:7.] this is the exact antithesis of the kingdom of God† [Note: the dualistic system of the Persians, which has influenced Judaism here.] (see, further, Satan). These constitute the first grade of demons, those who were created before the world was made; these were originally in the service of God, but rebelled against Him (cf. Luk 10:18).

There are also demons of a lower grade, those, namely, who came into being during the 130 years after the Creation, and who are semi-human;‡ [Note: Among the Greeks the demons stand between men and gods, and all the elements of mythology that were derogatory to the character of the national deities were referred to the demons. Greek influence, therefore, stimulated the growth of Hebrew angelology and demonology (Hastings’ DB, art. ‘Demons’).] they occupied a position between God and man.§ [Note: According to another tradition, these semi-human demons originated thus: God had created their souls, but before He had time to create their

bodies the Sabbath dawned; they were thus neither men nor angels, and became demons.] They have the names (besides those given above) of *shçdîm*, | | [Note: | A loan-word from Assy.-Bab. *šidu* = ‘good, or evil genius.’] *lîlîn* ¶ [Note: The Assy.-Bab. *lilitu*, ‘Lilith.’] and *rûhîn* (Aramaic; Heb. *rûhōth*** [Note: * They are also known under the general term *בְּיִשְׁתֵּי רִחְתִּין* (*τνεύματα σομηρά*); Blau holds that originally the *רִחְתִּין* were the spirits of the departed, see *Das altjüdische Zauberwesen*, p. 14.]); the first of these is their commonest name. The head of these lower-grade demons is *Asmedai* † [Note: † This is one of the chief signs of Persian influence; *Asmedai* is borrowed from the Persian demon of lust. *Aeshma daeva*.] (*Asmodaeus*, Tob 3:8, cf. Tob 6:14; Tob 8:3); they have the power of becoming visible or invisible at will; they have wings, and fly all over the world ‡ [Note: ‡ Cf. ‘the prince of the power of the air’ (Eph 2:2; Eph 6:12). It was a Persian belief.] for the purpose of harming men; in three respects they resemble man, for they eat and drink, they are able to propagate their species, and are subject to death; they also have the power of assuming various forms, but they usually choose that of men, though with the difference that their feet are hens’ feet, and they are without shadows; they are very numerous (cf. Mar 5:9)—7½ millions is said to be the number of them, while elsewhere it is stated that every man has ten thousand on his right hand, and a thousand on his left (cf. Psa 91:5-7). They live mostly in desert places (cf. Luk 8:29), where their yells can be heard (cf. Deu 32:10 ‘howling wilderness’); also in unclean places, where their power is great, e.g. in the *הַבַּסָּא בֵּית*; in waterless places (cf. Luk 11:24), for water is the means of cleansing; § [Note: § Drinking water at night is especially dangerous, presumably because the wrath of the demon would be aroused by the use of water during his privileged period of activity, the night-time.] and among tombs | | | [Note: | | | ‘Cemeteries were regarded with awe by the ancient Egyptians, because of the spirits of the dead who dwelt in them’ (Budge, *Egyptian Magic*, p. 219).] (cf. Mar 5:2), dead bodies being unclean; ¶ [Note: ¶ Even at the present day a cohen who looks upon a corpse is unclean.] they are most dangerous to the traveller, more especially if he travels alone; they tend to congregate together (cf. Luk 11:26; Luk 8:2; Luk 8:30); at certain times they are more dangerous than at others, viz. at mid-day, when the heat is intense, and from sunset to cock-crowing (cf. Psa 91:5-6, Mar 14:72, Joh 13:27; Joh 13:30), after which they return to their abode. Unlike angels, who understand only Hebrew (the ‘holy tongue’ *הַקֹּדֶשׁ לְשׁוֹן*), demons can understand all languages, for they are active among the Gentiles as well as among the Jews, whereas angels restrict their activity among men to the children of Abraham. The power for harm of the demons is greatest among the sick, among women in child-birth, among brides and bridegrooms, mourners, and those who are about to

become teachers; further, those who travel by night, and children who are out after dark are specially subject to their attacks. There is one demon, Shabriri, who makes people blind (cf. Mat 12:22), and there is a special demon of leprosy, and a demon of heart-disease. As emissaries of the angel of death, Sammael (the ‘full of eyes,’ cf. the Greek *Argus*), men are in constant dread of them (cf. Heb 2:14-16). It was also believed that demons were able to transfer some of their powers to men, and especially to women; so, for example, the secret of magic drinks, which could harm people in various ways (cf. Mar 16:18), and change them into animals; they could also endow men with the faculty of exercising the ‘evil eye’ (cf. Mar 7:22, see also Sir 31:13, and cf. Sir 14:8; Sir 14:10, Tob 4:16), by means of which the good fortune of others could be turned to evil; there is a special formula for use against the ‘evil eye.’* [Note: The superstition of the ‘evil eye,’ the possession of which is regarded as being due to the indwelling of an evil spirit, both in animals and in human beings, is still universally prevalent among the peasantry of all European countries; the writer has personally met with some curious instances in the country districts of Lower Austria.] There are certain animals in league with the demons (cf. Luk 8:32), such as serpents (cf. Mar 16:18, Act 28:3-6), bulls,† [Note: This is due to Assyro-Bah. influence: Satan is believed to dance between the bull’s horns.] donkeys,‡ [Note: This is due to Egyptian (Typhon-worship) influence; according to Plutarch the ass was considered demoniac (δαίμωνικον) in Egypt, because of its resemblance to Typhon (de Is. et Os. 30).] and mosquitoes. The *shçdim* are male demons; female demons are called *lilin*, ‘night-spirits,’ from the queen of the demons, Lilith (cf. Isa 34:14); they have long flowing hair, and are the enemies of children, for which reason special angels have charge of children (cf. Mat 18:10, Heb 1:14).

(c) *Safeguards against demons.*§ [Note: In the Talmud there is no word for ‘possession’; it is true that an ‘evil spirit’ is once spoken of as ‘dwelling’ in a person, but this is the same word as is used for the Shekinah ‘taking up its abode with’ someone; Shekinah, however, in the Talmud is not a personality, but rather an inspiration. A demon, or evil spirit, is said to take hold of a man, to injure him, or to speak to him; there may be one or two possible exceptions, but, generally speaking, demoniacal action is all external to those who are under its influence. This is in striking contrast to the Gospel accounts.] –God is the only ultimate protector against demons; but He sends His angels to counteract their deeds, and to help men to withstand their attacks (cf. Mat 18:10, Mar 1:13). At the same time, God has given to man various means whereby to nullify the machinations of demons. First among these is the saying of the *Shema*‘ (i.e. the Jewish profession of faith contained in Deu 6:4 ff.), because the holy name occurs in it; then, prayer to God (cf. Mar 9:29). There are also special formulas which are effective, either for warding off an attack or for throwing off the demoniacal influence, e.g. ‘The Lord rebuke thee, Satan’ (cf.

Zec 3:2, Jud 1:9); Psalms 91 is recommended for recitation before going to sleep; a demon may be chased away by repeatedly calling out his name, but uttering one syllable less each time; | | [Note: | See the use of a 'name' in Stube, *Jud. -bab. Zaubertexte*, p. 25, and many further details in Blau, *Das altjud. Zaubewesen*, pp. 61 ff., 156ff.; cf. To 6:10, 8:3. Exorcism of demons, to whom all sickness was ascribed, was very ancient in Egypt.] obedience to certain commands is also a safe-guard, e.g. fixing the *mēzuzâh*, ¶ [Note: A small glass or metal case, containing Deu 4:6-9; Deu 4:13; Deu 4:21 written on parchment, which is fixed upon the right-hand post of the door of the house and of each room. It was done in obedience to the command in Deu 11:20.] and wearing the *tēphillin*;* [Note: 'Head -ornaments': small leathern cases, containing Exo 13:1-10; Exo 11:1-6, Deu 6:4-9; Deu 11:13-14 written on parchment; these are bound round the head and left arm by means of long leather straps. This was done in obedience to the command in Deu 11:18. The Greek name (φ υλακτήρια) shows that they were regarded as safeguards, i.e. against demons (cf. Mat 23:5). Both this and the custom just mentioned are observed by all orthodox Jews at the present day.] to eat salt (cf. 'salt of the covenant,' Lev 2:13, see Mar 9:47-50) at and after meals, and to drink water is also efficacious. Demons love the darkness and hate the light (cf. Luk 22:53, Eph 6:12, Col 1:13), hence a lighted torch sends them away, but the light of the moon is most potent in scaring them. On Passover night the demons have no power.

4. The Gospels.—Demons are designated by various names in the Gospels, viz. δαιμόνιον Mat 10:8 (δαίμων is sometimes found, it would imply more definite personality), πνεῦμα Luk 9:39, πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον Mat 10:1 (τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα Mat 12:43), πνεῦμα πονηρὸν Luk 7:21, πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου Luk 4:33, πνεῦμα ἄλλalon Mar 9:17. In Matthew δαιμόνιον is almost always used; in Mark both δαιμόνιον and πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον occur frequently, though the latter predominates; in Luke there is a more varied use; in John the few references to a demon (the plural does not occur) are always in relation to Christ, and the word used is always δαιμόνιον. In the vast majority of cases these expressions are used in the plural form.

(a) *Origin of demons*.—The existence of demons is taken for granted in the Gospels, and nothing is said directly concerning their origin; however, as is shown below, Satan, Beelzebub, and the 'prince of the demons' are one and the same, and Christ speaks of His having seen Satan falling 'as lightning from heaven' (Luk 10:18). This last passage would seem to imply that Satan was in existence before the world was made, which would agree with the one rational tradition on the subject preserved in

the Talmud. There are, moreover, also one or two indications in other NT books which support this, e.g. 1Jn 3:8 'the devil sinneth from the beginning,' Rev 20:2 'the old serpent which is the Devil.'

(b) *The nature of demons.*—That possession often takes the form of a purely physical disorder is clear; yet from the expressions used to designate demons, given above, they were undoubtedly regarded as being morally evil. On the one hand, possession is frequently mentioned in the same category as ordinary sickness (e.g. Mat 10:1), dumbness is said to be due to possession (Mat 9:33, Luk 11:14), so too epilepsy (Mat 17:15) and blindness (Mat 12:22); demons are spoken of as taking up their abode in a man without his having, apparently, any choice in the matter (Mar 5:1 ff.); it is, moreover, noteworthy, that the wicked (*i.e.* Pharisees, publicans, and sinners) are never spoken of as being possessed (e.g. Luk 11:39 ff; Luk 15:1), and the possessed are permitted to enter the synagogue (Mar 1:23, Luk 4:33), which would hardly have been the case had they been regarded as notoriously evil; another fact which should be taken into consideration in this connexion is our Lord's words to the demons (see below). On the other hand, the evidence is still stronger for possession having been regarded as a moral as well as a physical disorder. Demons are directly referred to as evil (Luk 7:21; Luk 8:2); there are degrees of badness among them (Mat 12:45), some are merely malignant, some do more physical harm than others (Mat 15:22, where *κακῶς δαιμονίζεται* implies some specially virulent form of possession), some are referred to as being morally as well as physically harmful (Luke 8:2 *πνευμάτων πονηρῶν*, Luk 11:26);† [Note: also the distinction in Luk 13:32 *ἐκβάλλω δαιμόνια καὶ ἰασεὶς ἀποτελεῶ.*] in one case a demon is such that it can only be expelled by prayer (Mar 9:29),‡ [Note: The addition of *καὶ νηστεία* is not well attested.] which implies that in the generality of cases this was not necessary, and, indeed, we find this to be the case, since in every other recorded instance the *word* was sufficient. Then, again, Beelzebub, the prince of the demons, is identified with Satan (Mat 12:24-30, Mar 3:22-30, Luk 11:15-19, cf. Rev 16:14), and Satan himself is by name reckoned among the demons in Luk 10:17-20; and he is the originator of sin in man, as shown by the Temptation, the parable of the Tares (Mat 13:24 ff.), and the sin of Judas (see especially Luk 22:3). The demons are intangible, incorporeal,* [Note: Ignatius (ad Smyrn. iii. 2), who tells us that Christ said to His disciples after His resurrection: *οὐκ εἰμι δαιμόνιον ἀσώματος.*] and (if one excepts those passages in which Satan is represented as having been seen, e.g. Luk 10:18; Luk 4:5 ff.) invisible; 'the NT writers believed that the physical constitution of a spirit, whether holy or impure, was akin to vapour.' The demon enters (*εἰσέρχεται*) a man at will, and he goes out (*ἐξέρχεται*) at will (Luk 11:24), but in most cases he goes out only on compulsion

(ἐκβάλλειν); he is also able to take possession of animals (Mar 5:13); there are good grounds for the supposition that a storm-fiend was believed in, as will be seen by comparing the phraseology of the two following passages: Mar 4:39 ἐπετίμησεν τῷ ἀνέμῳ καὶ εἶπεν τῇ θαλάσῃ Σιώπα, πεφίμωσο; Mar 1:25 ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων Φιμώθητι....† [Note: Conybeare in JQR ix. 460; see also an example of a spell addressed to the storm-god in Sayce's Hibbert Lectures, p. 317.] Desolate places, such as the desert (Luk 8:29), or mountainous regions (Mar 5:5), or among tombs‡ [Note: the highly interesting inscription, the text of which is given in Deissmann's Bibelstudien, p. 26 ff.] (Mar 5:2), and waterless places (Luk 11:24), i.e. places to which men come only in small numbers or singly, are those for which demons have a preference. They are represented as congregating together (Mar 5:9, Luk 8:30), sometimes in sevens§ [Note: Companies of seven evil spirits are not infrequently mentioned in Assyrian incantations, e.g. 'there are seven wicked sons of the abyss,' which occurs in an incantation to fire; see Budge's Assyrian Incantations to Fire and Water; cf. also the 'seven wicked spirits' in ancient Babylonian belief (Sayce, op. cit. iii.).] (Luk 8:2; Luk 11:26, cf. Rev 1:4); for this reason the plural form is usually employed. In Mar 5:10 the demons beseech Christ not to send them out of the country; they are thus able to speak, or, at all events, so to overmaster their victim as to make his faculties their own (Mar 1:26). Nothing is said in the Gospels, directly, as to where the permanent home of the demons is, ¶ [Note: ¶ The 'eternal fire' is, according to Mat 25:41, reserved for the devil and his angels; but there is no mention of these in Luk 16:23 ff., where the flame in Hades is spoken of.] but the 'abyss' is spoken of as, apparently, a place whence they could not return if once banished there; this would, at all events, account for their entreaty not to be banished thither in Luk 8:31;¶ [Note: In the parallel passages there is no mention of the abyss (cf. Mat 8:31, Mar 5:10).] they clearly realized that a time of torment was in store for them (Mat 8:29), and that this torment might take place before the appointed time (Mar 5:7, Luk 8:26), and so the sight of Christ filled them with dread.

There is nothing in the Gospels to show that demons were believed to be the unquiet spirits of the wicked departed, and the belief that they were heathen gods is equally absent (cf., on the other hand, 1Co 10:14-22; 1Co 10:28).

(c) *Demoniacal possession, demoniacs.*—The usual term for this is δαιμονιζόμενος (e.g. Mat 4:24), but a number of other expressions for it are found in the Gospels, viz. δαιμονισθεῖς (Mar 5:18, Luk 8:36), ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ (Mar 1:23; Mar 5:2 ἐν

= 'in the power of'), ἔχων δαιμόνια (Luk 8:27), ἄνθρωπος ἔχων πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου (Luk 4:33), ἐνοχλούμενος ὑπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων (Luk 6:18), ἐλαυνόμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ δαίμονος (Luk 8:29), σεληνιαζέσθαι (Mat 4:24).

With but few exceptions those who are said to be possessed are grown-up men; the exceptions are: certain women who had been healed of evil spirits, and Mary Magdalene (Luk 8:2); the woman who had been bound by Satan for eighteen years (Luk 13:11; Luk 13:16); Peter's wife's mother (see below, Luk 4:39); a boy (Luk 9:39); and the little daughter of the Syro-Phœnician woman (Mar 7:25). It is, however, probable that others, besides men, are included in such passages as Mar 1:32 ff., Luk 7:21. The *signs* of possession may be thus summarized: dumbness (Mat 9:33, Mar 9:18), dumbness and deafness (Mar 9:25), blindness and dumbness (Mat 12:22), savage fierceness (Mat 8:28, Mar 5:4, Luk 8:29), abnormal strength (Mar 5:4, Luk 8:29), falling into the lire and water (Mat 17:15), convulsions (Mar 1:26; Mar 9:20, Luk 4:35), raving (Mar 5:5), grinding the teeth (Mar 9:18), foaming at the mouth (Luk 9:39; Luk 9:42). These are all signs of epilepsy (σεληνιαζέσθαι); in Mat 4:24 the σεληνιαζόμενοι are distinguished from the δαιμονιζόμενοι.*

[Note: See, further, Delitzsch, System der bibl. Psychologie, § 16.] Fever would also appear to have been regarded as a sign of possession, for Christ is said to 'rebuke' (ἐπιτίμησεν) the fever, the identical word which is frequently used by Him when addressing demons, e.g. in the next verse but one to the passage in question (Luk 4:41). One other sign of possession must be noted, a man who is 'mad,' in the modern sense of being out of his mind, is said to have a demon; this is said of John the Baptist (Mat 11:18), and of Christ (Joh 10:20).

A demoniac is spoken of as the dwelling-place of a demon (Mat 12:45), and a number of demons can dwell in one person (Mat 12:45, Mar 5:9, Luk 8:2). Sometimes the demon is differentiated from the man possessed (Mar 1:24), at other times the two are identified (Mar 3:11); striking in this respect is the passage Mar 5:1-20;† [Note: 'What in the demoniac strikes us most is the strange confusion of the physical and the psychical, each intruding into the proper domain of the other' (Trench, Miracles, ad loc.).] differentiation is strongly marked when an expression such as that in Luk 6:18 is used: οἱ ἐνοχλούμενοι ἀπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων. Lastly, the same outward signs are at one time spoken of as possession, at another as ordinary sickness (cf. Mat 4:25; Mat 17:15 etc.).

(d) *Christ and the demons.*—One of Christ's chief works on earth was to annihilate the power of demons; the demons themselves realize this (Mar 1:24, Luk 4:34, and cf.

1Jn 3:8); the destruction of their kingdom was necessary for the establishment of the Kingdom of God. Christ's attitude towards demons may be briefly summed up as follows:—With two exceptions (viz. the case of the woman 'bound by Satan' for eighteen years, Luk 13:11; Luk 13:16, and that of Peter's wife's mother, Luk 4:39) no instance is recorded of His laying His hands upon, or in any way coming in direct contact with one who is possessed by a demon. On the other hand, His words are never severe when addressing the possessed; very remarkable, moreover, is the fact that even when He speaks to the demon itself, Christ's words are never angry; He 'rebukes' the demon (Mar 1:25, Luk 4:35), but the words of rebuke are simply: 'Hold thy peace and come out of him,' or a command that He should not be made known[†] [Note: For the reason of Christ's not wishing to be made known see Sanday in JThSt, v. p. 321 ff., and Wrede, 'Zur Messiaser-kennthis der Dämonen bei Markus,' in ZNTW v. [1904] p. 169 ff.] (Mar 3:12, but cf. Luk 8:39); on one occasion the request of demons is granted (Mat 8:31-32 = Mar 5:12-13 = Luk 8:32). The power which Christ has over demons is absolute, they are wholly subject unto Him, and are compelled to yield Him obedience (Mar 1:27, Luk 4:41); that it is an unwilling obedience is obvious, and this is graphically brought out, e.g. when it is said of a demon that before coming out of a man it threw him down in the midst (Luk 4:35).[§] [Note: also, in the preceding verse, the exclamation of displeasure, Ἐα (= ἔπαυσα).] The recognition of Christ by demons is of a kind which is very striking, for He is not only recognized as Jesus of Nazareth, *i.e.* as one horn of men, but is also addressed as the 'Holy One of God' (Luk 4:34), and as the 'Son of God' (Luk 4:41), *i.e.* as one of Divine nature, and this latter title is emphasized by their knowledge of His power to cast them into the abyss (Luk 8:31), which also accounts for their fear of Him. The power of Christ over demons is regarded as something new* [Note: The method was new; cf., as regards Christ's general teaching, Mat 7:28-29 'They were astonished at his teaching; for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes.'] (διδασχῆ καὶνῆ, Mar 1:27); this was because the method of exorcism which was familiar to the Jews hitherto was the pronouncing of a magical formula over the possessed. In the Gospels, as a rule, the casting out of a demon is stated without specifying by what means it was done (Mk 1:34, Lk 7:21, 8:2), but we learn this from a number of other passages: λόγῳ (Mt 8:6), ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ (Mt 12:28), ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ (Lk 11:20), ἐπετίμησεν (Mt 17:18), ὑπάγετε (Mt 8:32), ἐξέλαθε (Mk 5:8, Lk 4:35); on one occasion the words are addressed to the mother of a child who is possessed: γεννηθήτω σοι ὡς θέλεις (Mt 15:28, Mk 7:29), the possessed child not being in His presence (Mk 7:30), so that His power did not depend on His visible personality.† Christ transfers this power of casting out demons (Mt 10:1, Mk 3:14); when His disciples cast them out it is by

virtue of His name‡ (τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν, Mt 7:22, Lk 10:17), but they are not able to do this without faith (Mt 17:20); we read, however, in Mk 9:38, 39 of one who was not a follower of Christ, but who was, nevertheless, able to cast out demons in His name (cf. Mt 12:27, Lk 11:9). In Mar 3:22 the scribes say of Christ that ‘he hath Beelzebub,’ and in Mar 3:30 occur the words, ‘because they said, He hath an unclean spirit.’ That Beelzebub the ‘prince of the demons’ and ‘unclean spirit’ are synonymous with ‘demon’ cannot be disputed. Christ is thus declared to be possessed;§ [Note: In the parallel passages (Mat 9:34; Mat 12:24 ff., Luk 11:14 ff.) there is no mention of Christ being possessed, the accusation is that He cast out demons by Beelzebub.] nevertheless, it is not this which calls forth His words, ‘whosoever shall sin against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness’ (Luk 11:29), but the fact that He was accused of being in league with Beelzebub; this is important, as it would seem to support the theory, which is elsewhere adumbrated in the Gospels, that possession was not necessarily, *per se*, a moral disorder; there is also reason to believe that at least some forms of possession were regarded as mental derangement: Christ speaks of John the Baptist having been looked upon as possessed (Mat 11:18, Luk 7:33); he was so regarded, because there seemed to be something eccentric about his behaviour; in Joh 7:20 Christ is said to be possessed by a demon, because He said they sought to kill Him; Joh 8:48-49, where it is said: ‘Thou art a Samaritan and hast a demon,’ points to the fact that a man who was possessed was despised because he spoke what was deemed nonsense; also, the supposed connexion between possession and mental derangement is pointedly brought out in Joh 10:20 ‘He hath a demon and is mad.’ While fully realizing that the Fourth Gospel stands by itself, it must be conceded that it contributes one very important consideration, especially as the idea of possession found there is not without parallel in the Synoptic Gospels, as shown above. The belief that possession was a species of mental derangement, wholly unconnected with the question of morality, is what the Fourth Gospel teaches; but then it must be remembered that ‘the devil’ and ‘Satan,’ who are identified | [Note: | Cf. Joh 13:2 ὁ διαβόλο: with 13:27 ὁ Σατανᾶ.] (as in the Synoptic Gospels), are differentiated from ‘demon’; whereas, according to the Synoptics, all belong to the same category, Satan being the chief (Mat 12:14). The passage Joh 10:20 receives additional significance in the light of the Heb. equivalent, compared, e.g., with Hos 9:7 ‘the man that hath the spirit is mad’ (הַרְדֵּת אִישׁ נַעֲמֵשׁ). Delitzsch (*NT in Heb.* renders Jn 10:20 δαιμόνιον ἔχει καὶ μαίνεται, by הוּא וּמְטַעַץ לוֹ שָׂדֵה, the last words of which should be compared with the rendering of the Pesh. ܦܫܘܬܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ.* [Note: The Syro-Hex., following the LXX, has a doublet, but the idea of madness is brought out in both.]

Gospel demonology may, therefore, be briefly summed up thus:—

(1) Demons are under a head, Satan; they form a kingdom. (2) They are incorporeal, and generally, though not necessarily, invisible. (3) They inhabit certain places which they prefer to others. (4) They tend to live in groups. (5) They have names, and are sometimes identified with their victims, at other times differentiated from them. (6) They are the cause of mental and physical disease to men, women, and children. (7) They can pass in and out of men, and even animals. (8) More than one can take possession of a man at the same time. (9) Christ made it one of His chief aims to overthrow this kingdom, and set up His own in its place. (10) He cast out demons through His own name, or by His word. (11) He could delegate this power, which was regarded as something new. (12) He never treats the possessed as wilful sinners, which is in strong contrast to His words to the scribes and Pharisees. (13) Only on the rarest occasions does He come into direct contact with the possessed. (14) His Divine and human natures are recognized by demons. (15) At His second coming the members of this kingdom are to be condemned to eternal fire.

5. In endeavouring to reach some definite conclusions on this difficult subject of Gospel demonology, it is well to place certain considerations in juxtaposition. On the one hand, the history of mankind shows that a superstitious belief in evil-disposed demons, to whom every imaginable untoward circumstance is attributed, is universal; there is a remarkable similarity, in essence, in the demonology of all times; it stretches, from the earliest times to the present day, like a great chain along the course of human history. The demonology of the Gospels shows itself, in many respects, unmistakably akin to this universal superstition. It is impossible to ignore the fact that, in its broad outlines, Gospel demonology is in accordance with the current Jewish beliefs of the time. It will, moreover, have been noticed, from the details given above, that the data in the Gospels themselves are inconsistent. Again, the way in which in the Gospels much is attributed to the action of demons (deafness, dumbness, etc.), looks naïve to modern eyes. There is also this further consideration which conspires in discrediting the Gospel accounts on the subject, viz. that those who at the present day believe in the continued activity of demons are almost invariably such as are on a low stage of civilization, or they are peasants in country districts who have but rare opportunities of coming into contact with cultured people. And, lastly, account must be taken of the fact that very few could be found nowadays who would claim to point to any instance in their experience of the existence of demoniacal possession; thus the only parallels to Gospel demonology would have to be sought among the acknowledged superstitions of the Middle Ages, and the like. These considerations tend to the conclusion that the Gospel accounts of demons cannot be regarded as essentially different from the innumerable accounts from other sources.

But there is a second set of considerations, and to ignore these would be most unscientific. When the whole chain of demonology, from primitive times to the present day, is considered, it is quite impossible for an unbiassed mind to be blind to

the fact that, in spite of many points of similarity and even of essential identity, the demonology of the Gospels offers something *sui generis*; one becomes conscious of the fact that this link in the long chain is very different from all the other links. Another thing that strikes the student of the subject as very remarkable is, that Gospel demonology and the current Jewish belief are not more alike than is the case; they agree in so many respects, that one feels that only the existence of some extraordinary factor prevents their being wholly identical. But more than this, the dissimilarity between the two is just as striking as their points of similarity: in the one there is nothing eccentric, nothing done for effect, or for self-glorification, * [Note: Christ's rebuke to His disciples in Luk_10:20.] there is no casting out of demons for the sake of exhibiting power, there is none of the 'wonder-working' which characterizes other systems; one object, and one only, runs through the whole of the accounts of the casting out of demons, namely, the alleviation of human suffering. To give in any detail the points of difference between the general subject of demonology and Gospel demonology would be impossible here, but, when the great mass of facts has been studied, the contrast between the two can be compared only to the contrast between folly and seriousness. Another conviction to which one is compelled in contemplating Gospel demonology in its broad outlines is that it is connected in the closest possible manner with the subject of sin; the *symptoms* of the 'possessed' in the Gospels are such as are common to humanity, and nobody doubts the accuracy with which these are described; the real *crux* arises when their cause has to be determined; this is ascribed by the compilers of the Gospels to the action of demons, *i.e.* to an evil agency; nowadays the same symptoms are ascribed to different causes—broadly speaking, to 'natural causes'; but may it not be that behind both theories there lies a deeper cause, the principle of Evil, occupying a vacant place in individuals which they themselves have provided by the abandonment of their self-control? There are cases in the Gospels to which this would not apply, but it is worth taking into consideration in contemplating the subject as a whole. It is well also to remember that the advance of Modern Science, especially in the domain of Psychology, has revealed problems whose most important result is to show how extremely little we know about such things as 'secondary personality,' the 'subliminal self,' 'change of control,' etc. etc.—in a word, how hidden still are the secrets of the region of the supersensuous.

Upon a subject that bristles with so many difficulties nobody would wish to dogmatize; no conclusion that has been reached is free from serious objections, and the same is the case with that here offered:—

Christ saw in the case of every 'possessed' victim a result of sin, not necessarily through the co-operation of the victims;† [Note: It is necessary to read Rom_7:7-25 and 1Co_10:14; 1Co_10:22; 1Co_11:17-32, esp. vv. 30, 32, in this connexion.] sin He

saw embodied in 'Satan,' who is identified with 'demon' (see above); he was the personification of the principle of Evil, which was manifested in men in a variety of ways. When Christ 'exorcized' a 'demon,' He, by His Divine power, drove the evil out, and at the same time obliterated the visible results of sin. When the words and acts of Christ came to be written down, they were not always understood;* [Note: This was often the case during Christ's lifetime (see Mar 8:21; Mar 9:32, Luk 9:45, Joh 3:10 etc. etc.).] they were, no doubt, in their broad outlines, correctly reproduced; but what more natural than that they should be told in accordance with the ideas then current? Not the essence but the form differed from the actuality.

Literature.—Blan, *Das altjudische Zauberwesen*, Strassburg, 1898 [most interesting and useful]; Brecher, *Das Transcendentale, Magie und magische Heilarten im Talmud*, Vienna, 1850 [for gaining an insight into the connexion between demons and magic, according to Rabbinical notions, this book is indispensable]; Franz Delitzsch, *System der biblischen Psychologie*, Leipzig, 1855; Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*⁵ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , chs. xiv. xxv., London, 1890; Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, Dresden, 1893; Kohnt, in *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vol. iv., issued by the ZDMG [Note: DMG Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.] , Leipzig, 1859, etc.; Schubert, *Die Krankheiten und Störungen der menschlichen Seele*; Stube, *Jüdisch-babylonische Zaubertexte* Halle, 1895; Trench, *Notes on the Miracles*¹⁴ [Note: 4 designates the particular edition of the work referred] , pp. 161-175; Weber, *Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandter Schriften*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (esp. § 54), Leipzig, 1897 [this most important work is an improved edition of the earlier *System der altsynagogalen palastinischen Theologie*]; Wrede, 'Zur Messiaserkenntnis der Dämonen bei Markus,' in *ZNTW* [Note: NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissenschaft.] , July 1904; Winer, *Biblisches Realwörterbuch*, Riehm, *HWBA*, Hastings's Dictionary of the Bible , the *Ency. Bibl.*, under 'Demon,' etc.

For the subsequent beliefs and superstitions about demons prevalent during the Middle Ages, and even up to the present day, a few references may be given out of a large number of works dealing with the subject:—

In the arts, in *JQR* [Note: QR Jewish Quarterly Review.] by Mr. Conybeare, already referred to, there is an admirable survey of the beliefs of the Church Fathers (viii. pp. 594-608, ix. pp. 59-72). Another work of M. Manry, who is one of the chief authorities on the subject, is his *Croyances et legendes du moyen-âge*, Paris, 1896. Andrew Lang deals with the psychology of the subject in his *Making of Religion*, mentioned above; so too Delitzsch, *System ...*, also referred to above. Two other books are, Nevins'

Demon Possession and allied Themes, New York, 1895; and Wall's *Devils*, a popular sketch of demons in ecclesiastical art, with good illustrations (London, 1904).

W. O. E. Oesterley.

☩ Den

DEN (Mat 21:13 = Mar 11:17 = Luk 19:46 σπήλαιον [ληστῶν]; elsewhere in the Gospels only Joh 11:38 to describe the tomb of Lazarus, ἦν δὲ σπήλαιον).—In estimating the meaning of our Lord's declaration that the Temple had been made a den *or* cave of robbers, the immediate occasion of the words must be kept in view. It was the feast of the Passover, and the Temple courts were crowded by those who sold sheep, oxen, and pigeons, while the moneychangers also carried on their trade. As no trace is found in the OT of such a market existing, it may be supposed it sprang up some time after the Captivity. It would plead for justification the needs of the new condition of the nation. Foreign Jews would thus be able to obtain on the spot both the Temple half-shekel required by the Law (Exo 30:13), and also animals necessary for sacrifice, probably with the additional advantage that the latter would have an official guarantee of Levitical fitness for sacrifice, which must be obtained for any animal purchased elsewhere.

The profits from these sources were enormous. It has been calculated that the annual income derived from money-changing can hardly have been less than £8000-£9000, while the sale of pigeons is specially referred to as furnishing alone a large annual income. These profits appear to have been largely, if not entirely, appropriated by the priests. Certain booths are frequently mentioned as belonging to the 'sons of Hanan' (Annas), and appear to have existed until about three years before the destruction of Jerusalem, when they were destroyed. Besides the mere fact that the Temple was made a house of merchandise (Joh 2:16), many passages in the Rabbinical writings appear to indicate that the Temple market was notorious for dishonest dealings, upon which passages it has been remarked (*Speaker's Com. in loc.*) that the spaces in the court were probably let out to traffickers at an exorbitant rate. The remembrance of this state of things gives new force to the quotation from Jer 7:11 here used by our Lord.

Josephus (*circa (about) Apion. ii. 24*) writes: 'The Temple ought to be common to all men, because He is the common God of all'; but, far from its being thus, it had become the possession of a few. 'Ye gather together here money and animals, as robbers collect their booty in their den' (Fritzsche, quoted by Lange).

Those who ought to have been the first to teach others the sacredness of the place had seized upon it, as robbers would seize some den or cave in the mountains, in which they might maintain their unity for the purpose of spoil. See, further, art. Temple in vol. ii.

Literature.—Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, also *The Temple*, etc.; Farrar, *Life of Christ*; Derenbourg, *Hist. de Pal.* [Note: Palestine, Palestinian.] ; and the *Comm. ad loc.*

J. B. Bristow.

☩ Denarius

DENARIUS.—See Money.

☩ Denial

DENIAL.—The verb ἀρνεῖσθαι, ‘to deny,’ is used in contrast with ὁμολογεῖν, ‘to confess’ (Mat 10:32 f. || Luk 12:8 f., where ἀπαρνεῖσθαι is also employed; cf.

2Ti 2:12, where ἀρνεῖσθαι is used specially of the verbal denial of Christ, due to fear of suffering). As confession of Christ (wh. see) is the outward expression of personal faith in Him, so denial of Him is (1) the withholding, (2) refusing, or (3) withdrawing such confession. In the first of these categories are included those who, like some members of the Sanhedrin (Joh 12:42), believed on Christ, but did not confess Him; in the second, those who did not believe on Him, and as a natural result did not confess Him; and, in the third, those who have confessed Him, but, through fear of men, deny Him in times of persecution. It is the third class to which reference is made in Mat 10:33 ‘Whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven.’ Open disavowal of faith in Christ (‘before men’) is taken as a clear indication of the offender’s attitude towards Him, and eventuates in his exclusion from the blessings of the perfected kingdom in heaven. Such disavowal must be deliberate and persistent, and is to be distinguished from a momentary lapse of personal weakness, like that of Simon Peter, which by timely repentance became the means of strengthening his character, and enabling him to strengthen others (Luk 22:32). In the narrower and stricter sense, therefore, denial means public apostasy from faith in Christ, the guilt of which is visited with a punishment in exact correspondence with it.

1. The discourse in which the great warning against denial is found (Mat 10:17-33), and which was addressed to the Twelve in view of their Apostolic mission after the Resurrection, evidences its lateness by the serious situation depicted, in which exposure to the severest forms of persecution is contemplated, including punishment in the synagogues, arraignment before Gentile tribunals, and death itself. It must belong at earliest to the period of growing opposition, and has been assigned to as late a date as the close of the ministry. The Second Evangelist places a portion of it in the eschatological discourse spoken on Olivet to the four disciples on the Wednesday or Thursday of Passion-week (Mar 13:9-13). Christ no doubt foretold almost from the outset of His ministry that His disciples would be exposed to reproach and obloquy (Mat 5:11 f.), but the first intimation of serious opposition synchronizes with the first plain intimation of His own death (Mar 8:34 f.). It was in prospect of the undisguised hostility awaiting them in connexion with their Apostolic mission that Christ cautioned His disciples against the danger of denial. If He suffered death for claiming to be the Messiah (Mar 14:61-64), it is evident that those who afterwards proclaimed Him as such must run the risk of sharing a fate like His.

2. Due stress must be laid on the fact that the object of denial is the *person* of Christ, not simply His message or His words, which in any case derive their ultimate authority from His person. It is admitted that 'His earlier demand that men should fulfil the condition of participation in the Kingdom of God by repentance and trust in the message of salvation, became narrowed down afterwards to the demand that men should unite themselves to Him as the Messiah, and cleave fast to Him in trust' (Wendt, *Teaching*, ii. 308). But the force of the concession is quite destroyed by the further representation that 'union to the person of the Messiah is nothing else than adherence to the message of the Kingdom of God brought by Him' (p. 310.) This is to reduce the person of the Messiah to a compendious formula for His teachings, and ignores the fact that, after the great confession at Caesarea Philippi, Christ grounded on His Messiahship a claim to absolute self-surrender and self-sacrifice (Mar 8:34 f.). Devotion to Himself is henceforward made the supreme test of discipleship, and the withdrawal of such devotion seals the doom of the offender hereafter. We are in a region where personal relations and obligations are everything; where the injury done by denial is not measured by the rejection of a message merely, but by the wound inflicted on One who has rendered unparalleled services.

3. It is the rupture, though but for a moment, and without deliberate intention, of tender, intimate, personal ties by the act of the disciple, that renders the great denial of the chief Apostle so affecting an incident (Mat 26:69 ff., Mar 14:54; Mar 14:66-72, Luk 22:54 ff., Joh 18:15-18; Joh 18:25-27). His fall is the more surprising by reason of Christ's clear announcement of it beforehand, and Peter's strong protestations of fidelity (Mat 26:34 f., || Mar 14:30 f., Luk 22:33 f., 61, cf. Joh 13:37 f.). Deep as the fall was, however, care must be taken not to exaggerate

its criminality. That the thrice-repeated denial was due to want of faith or devotion on the Apostle's part, there is nothing to show. It was indeed ardent attachment to Christ that led him, after his hasty retreat, to follow at a distance, and seek admission to the house of Annas, before whom the preliminary examination of Christ took place. He was determined to keep near his Master, and it was doubtless this very determination that betrayed him into sin. When challenged in the porch by the maid who kept the door, he gave an evasive reply (Joh_18:17, Mar_14:68), fearing that to own his discipleship would lead to his exclusion from the premises. When taunted later on with being a disciple by the rough servants gathered round the fire in the courtyard (Joh_18:18; Joh_18:25), he denied it in more categorical fashion, hoping thereby to evade further remarks, and avoid the summary ejection which would have followed the detection of his previous falsehood. Having travelled so far on the downward path, it became well-nigh impossible to turn back, and on being charged by one of the kinsmen of Malchus with having been with Christ in the garden at the moment of the arrest, overcome by fear that he might be called to account for his rash act, he denied his Master for the third time, and backed up his denial with oaths and curses (Joh_18:26 f., cf. Mat_26:74). It has been suggested that his falsehoods would sit lightly on his conscience, on the ground that he felt justified in giving no kind of information about himself or his Master which might compromise a movement which he imagined was but temporarily arrested. He probably experienced no scruples in deceiving his Master's enemies, especially as this seemed the only way of carrying out his purpose to keep as near to Christ as possible without risk of detection. But when all due allowance is made for the excellency of his motives, his conduct is utterly indefensible. When he affirmed so confidently that he was ready to go to death, what he thought of was a public testimony to Christ, for whom he counted no sacrifice too great. 'A great deed of heroism is often easier than loyalty in small things,' and Peter, who had courage enough to defend his Master at the cost of his life, displayed lamentable weakness in a minor emergency. The sound of cock-crow, announcing the approach of dawn, was a painful reminder that he had proved lacking in genuine fidelity, and false to the pledges so recently given. But that his love to Christ still remained the same, was abundantly evidenced by his subsequent act of sincere contrition.

W. S. Montgomery.

Dependence

DEPENDENCE.—1. The feeling which impels men to look up to, and depend upon, a Power higher and other than themselves is essentially human, universal, and, in the position which it occupies in their lives, most prominent. It supplies them with an

intuitive hope, which is quickened by their sense of need and helplessness, that this Power will supply their wants, and fill the mysteriously void places of their being. This hope finds expression in the universal desire for communion with that Power by prayer, worship, sacrifice, and so on. Some of the most beautiful aspirations which breathe out of the Psalms of the Jewish Church are the outcome of men's longing after and dependence upon God (cf. Psalms 42; Psa 73:21-28; Psalms 108; Psalms 139, etc.); and when the Psalmist sings 'My soul cleaveth (קָרַבָּה, LXX Septuagint ἐκολλήθη) after thee' (Psa 63:8), he is putting into words, suited to his own individual experience, the same idea which St. Paul says, in his address to the assembled Athenians, is universally human (ζητεῖν τὸν θεόν, Act 17:27). A direct relationship, which is personal, is everywhere in the OT postulated (cf. e.g. Gen 5:22; Gen 5:24; Gen 6:9, Mal 2:6, Amo 3:3) as existing between Jehovah and His people. On the one side is the Supreme Personal Will which projects Itself into a world of created intelligences, either in the form of law objectively revealed (Deu 5:2, cf. the prophetic formula, 'Thus saith the Lord'), or in that form which, in the words of the writer of the Fourth Gospel, 'coming into the world lightens every man' (Joh 1:9, cf. Rom 2:15, Jer 31:33). On the other, there is the being made in 'His own image' (Gen 1:26 f., Gen 5:1, Gen 9:6, cf. 1Co 11:7, Jam 3:9, Sir 17:3, Wis 2:23) whose life, touching His life at all points, owes its existence to the continued exercise of His will (cf. Act 17:28).

We have here, not the antithesis of eternal and temporal, finite and infinite, so much as an emphatic synthesis effected by a close personal relationship, in which we may say consists all that is essentially true in religion. The error into which Schleiermacher, for example, fell when he made religion consist in a feeling of dependence (*Abhängigkeit*) on a Higher Power is obviously an error of defect, as it leaves out of account the element of Personality just referred to (see his *Christliche Glaube*). At the same time it would be a mistake no less fatal to eliminate this feeling from the domain of man's spiritual life; for it is one of the ultimate realities of our being, finding expression in a variety of ways according to the individual life which is lived.

2. The sense of dependence upon God is seen most clearly and fully in the life of Jesus Christ. It is focussed, as it were, in the story of the Incarnation, and in the circumstances in which the Incarnate life was passed from childhood onwards. In this, as in other respects, that life is the epitome of all that is true in the life of man. The time when the foreordained 'mystery of God' (1Co 2:1, cf. Eph 3:3-5; Eph 6:19, Col 1:26 f.) should be revealed, depended on the wisdom and will of the Father (Gal 4:4 cf. Mar 1:15). The manner of its revelation was conditioned by the laws of motherhood ('made of a woman, made under law,' Gal 4:4, cf. Luk 2:6, where the natural law of parturition is referred to explicitly), and the safety of the Divine

Child's life depended on the vigilance of Joseph (Mat 2:13-15) no less than on the maternal tenderness and love of His mother. His education was that of a Jewish child in a pious Jewish home, where the language spoken was the current 'Hebrew' or Palestinian Aramaic (see a very useful article, 'The Dialects of Palestine in the time of Christ,' by Ad. Neubauer in *Studia Biblica*, vol. i. pp. 39-73 [Oxford]; with this we may compare a similar discussion by J. B. Mayor in his *Epistle of St. James*), which was Jesus' mother-tongue (cf. Mar 3:17; Mar 5:41; Mar 7:34; Mar 14:36; Mar 15:34, Joh 1:42, Mat 5:22). In point of fact, it is not too much to say that He was governed in His earthly life, physical and intellectual, by the ordinary laws of nature. If He violated these laws, even in the interests of His work, He had to pay the penalty which nature inexorably demands (cf. Mat 4:2 = Luk 4:2, Mar 11:12 = Mat 21:18, Joh 4:6; Joh 19:28, and Mat 8:24).

In the moral sphere we observe the same phenomenon, which finds a prominent place in the Christological teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Even as we are, so is He, 'compassed with infirmity' (Heb 5:2). Like ourselves in all things, 'apart from sin,' He suffered from the assaults of temptation (Heb 4:15, cf. Heb 2:18). He had, as we have, to learn slowly and with pain the moral virtue of obedience, notwithstanding the unique character of His Sonship (Heb 5:8). In Him also the law, by which alone progress is assured, exacted implicit submission, although the lesson was hard (Heb 2:10, cf. Heb 5:9, Heb 7:28). That Jesus was fully conscious of the necessity of this bitter experience is seen from His own saying, in which He delves the threatened persecution of Herod, and which contains the same verb as is used in Hebrews, to denote the final cause of His sufferings (τελειοῦμαι, Luk 13:32).

Even in the sphere of His mental life we find Him depending on the laws which govern intellectual growth universally. Side by side with His physical growth, as the Lukan narrative tells us, there was a corresponding expansion of His intellectual and spiritual faculties (Ἰησοῦς προέκοπτεν τῇ σοφίᾳ καὶ ἡλικίᾳ καὶ χάριτι κ.τ.λ., Luk 2:52, with which we may compare the words in Luk 2:40, where the participle πλῆρουμένον in conjunction with σοφία is a distinct assertion of continuous and gradual development). Nor have we any just reason to suppose that the operation of this law ceased at any given stage in His life. On the score of credibility it will be found as difficult to believe that gradual growth along these lines ever found a place in Jesus' life, as to believe that it entered so completely into the warp and woof of His experience that it accompanied Him all through His life, even to the very end (cf. art. 'The Baptism, Temptation, and Transfiguration: A Study,' in *Ch. Quart. Rev.*, July 1901). There is no period in the life of Jesus when we can say, 'at this point He ceased to learn, or to advance towards perfection' (τελειώσις, cf. 'Additional Note' on Heb 2:10 in Westcott's *The Epistle to the Hebrews*). His lesson was only finally

‘learned’ in its entirety when, yielding Himself unreservedly into His Father’s hands, He became ‘obedient unto death, yea, the death of the cross’ (Php 2:8), and ‘the author (αἴτιος) of eternal salvation’ (Heb 5:9) to all who are so far partakers of His Life that they too learn the meaning of perfect obedience (ὕπακοή). See art. Accommodation, p. 15.

In close connexion with what we have been saying is the repeated disavowal by Jesus of all intention to assert His own will (cf. τὸ θελημα τὸ ἑμὸν, Joh 5:30; Joh 6:38, see also Mat 26:39; Mat 26:42 = Mar 14:36 = Luk 22:42). His complete dependence on the will of His Father may, perhaps, suggest fewer difficulties to the student of Jesus’ life than His continuous insistence in setting that will, as it were, over against and above His own. At the same time we must remember that by this differentiation He deliberately reminds us, again and again, how complete His subordination, in the sphere of His human existence, has become, not only in word and deed, but also in His inner life of thought and intention. He has laid aside the power of doing anything ‘of himself’ (Joh 5:30), because the will of His Father is for Him the object of thought and loving service (ὅτι ... ζητῶ ... τὸ θελημα τοῦ σέμψαντος με). The accomplishing of the work (Joh 4:34) which that will has put before Him is the nourishing sustenance (ἐμὸν βρωμα) which is necessary for the building up of His life. ‘The will of God’ (τὸ θελημα τοῦ θεοῦ) is the sovereign objective of Jesus’ life, and perfect conformity to it in every point is the goal of His life’s work. Looking over the uses of the word θελημα in the NT, we find that it is almost universally used of the carrying out *by others* of the purposes of God, the accomplishment in the world of that which the Divine will ordains for execution (for other usages of this word, see Joh 1:13, Luk 23:25, etc.). It is in this sense pre-eminently that the word is used in connexion with Jesus’ work (cf. Joh 6:39 f., where the will of God, in the redemption of humanity, is the object of the Incarnation, and furnishes the work which Jesus avowedly sets Himself to accomplish). We are thus not surprised at the transference of the words of Psalms 40 to the work of Christ by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Ἴδοὺ ἤαν τοῦ τοῦῃσαι τὸ θελήμα σου, Heb 10:9), who sees in this passage the aptest illustration of the object of Jesus’ life.

3. This protracted and willing subordination on the part of Jesus had its final reward in that perfect harmony between His own and His Father’s will, which left no room, in the sphere of His human activity, for anything but the most complete community of interests. Looking at this side of His life, we can appreciate the element in His teaching, so constantly emphasized, which insists on the lowliest and most complete

self-surrender in others. He, the Man Jesus, succeeded in bringing His human will into absolute conformity with that of His Father, and so He teaches men to pray, 'May thy will be done ... on earth' (Mat 6:10; cf. Mat 26:42 = Luk 22:42). Our right to participate in the privileges of that family relationship which Jesus is not ashamed to own (Heb 2:11) depends on the fidelity with which we enter, by our actions, into the spirit guiding His own work (see Mat 12:50). This is the touchstone by which men shall be ultimately tested, and by which their right of entry into the Kingdom of heaven shall be decided (Mat 7:20).

4. Nor must we forget that this phenomenon is observable in Jesus' relation to His fellow-men. And here it is significant to note that, although always willing to exercise the prerogatives of His Divine Sonship in favour of the distressed, yet He never works a miracle on His own behalf. If He is hungry or thirsty, He trusts to the kindness and goodwill of others (Joh 4:7; Joh 19:28 ff., Mat 21:18 f., Mat 4:2 ff., Mar 1:13; Mar 1:31). The lack of sympathy has a marked effect on the power of His ministrations ('And he could there do no mighty work,' Mar 6:5), and He recognizes that, in certain cases at least, the exercise of His power of miraculous healing may be marred or promoted by the absence or presence of a sympathetic trust on the part of those with whom He is dealing ('All things are possible to him that believeth,' Mar 9:23, see Mat 9:28 f., with which we may also compare a remarkable extension, in the application of this rule to the sufferer whose friends stand sponsor, as it were, for his faith and trust [τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν, Mat 9:2]). Indeed, the presence of a captious spirit in His hearers moved Him, on more than one occasion, to indignation or grief (cf. μετ' ὀργῆς, Mar 3:5; ἐμβριμώμενος, Joh 11:38), feelings which were also aroused in His breast by any action tending to stifle in others the expression of their trust in, and sympathy with, His work and Person (cf. the emphatic verb ἠγανάκτησεν, Mar 10:14).

Closely allied to this is the impatience which Jesus shows with the spiritual dulness of His disciples (Mar 9:19, Joh 11:19; Joh 20:29, Mat 26:10, Mat 8:17; Mat 8:21 etc.). It appears sometimes as if, in His eagerness to discover the smallest germs of spiritual reciprocity, He would gaze into their very hearts. In all the four Gospels the word βλεπεῖν (with compounds) is used to denote this anxiety on the part of Jesus (cf. e.g. ἐμβλεψας αὐτῷ, Mar 10:21; ἐμβλεψα; αὐτοῖς, Mar 10:27, Mat 19:26; see also Joh 1:42 and the pathetic use of the same verb in Luk 22:61 (ἐνεβλεψεν τῷ Πιτρῷ). For the use of the verb τεριβλεσσεσθαι, which is almost confined to St. Mark, compare Mar 3:5 = Luk 6:10, Mar 3:34; Mar 10:23. Even when dealing with the question of the profound, vital union of Himself with those who believe in Him, Jesus is fully conscious that His

work is conditioned by their attitude to Him. The imperative clause ‘abide in me’ (Joh 15:4) is supplemented by another clause, which may be interpreted as containing a contingent promise, ‘I will on that condition abide in you,’ or, more probably, as a complementary imperative, ‘permit me to abide in you.’ In either case it is true to say that Jesus here recognizes and teaches the doctrine that ‘the freedom of man’s will is such that on his action depends that of Christ’ (see Plummer’s ‘St. John’ in *Cambridge Greek Testament, in loc.*).

5. Not the least remarkable feature in the teaching of Jesus is that on which the writer of the Fourth Gospel lays particular stress. The union between Him and the Father is so complete, that He describes it as a mutual indwelling or co-existence (Joh 10:38; Joh 14:10 f., Joh 14:20). He derives from the Father, as the ultimate source of each (Joh 16:13), both the terms of the message He delivers (Joh 8:28; Joh 7:16 ἡ ἐμὴ διδασχῆ, Joh 12:49) and the power which renders His work ‘coincident and coexistent with that of the Father’ (Joh 5:19, see Westcott’s *Gospel of St. John, in loc.*). Jesus refuses to claim the right or even the ability to act separately from the Father, and the character of His works is determined by the fact that it is not He Himself who is the author of them, but the Father dwelling in, speaking and acting through Him (cf. Joh 5:30; Joh 14:10). It is quite true, in a very real sense, to say with Westcott that ‘Christ places His work as co-ordinate with that of the Father, and not as dependent on it’; at the same time it is true in a sense no less real that ‘the very idea of Sonship involves ... that of dependence,’ as will be seen if we refer to such phrases as ἀπ’ ἐμαυτοῦ (Joh 5:30), ἐξ ἐμαυτοῦ (Joh 12:48). What this phraseology implied, in the mind at least of the writer of the Fourth Gospel, will perhaps be better understood by observing his use of it in other connexions (cf. e.g. Joh 11:51, where the ‘prophecy’ of Caiaphas is made to depend for its validity on the χάρισμα inherent in the high priestly office; see also Joh 15:4, Joh 16:13, where the deeds done and the words spoken are relegated to a higher source than to the energy possessed by the actors).

6. Another side of Jesus’ self-revelation as to the condition of dependence in which His spiritual life on earth was lived, is to be found in His doctrine of *our dependence upon Him*. Just as He can do nothing ‘of himself,’ but traces the source of His manifold activities to the mutual indwelling of the Father and Himself, so He tells His disciples they are powerless for good if they are ‘apart from’ Him (χωρὶς ἐμοῦ οὐ δύνασθε ποιεῖν οὐδέν, Joh 15:5). He is the derived source of their vital energy in the same sense that the tree is the source of the fruit-bearing life of its branch. It is significant that this writer uses the same verb and preposition (μένειν ἐν) to express the nature of the union of the Father and Jesus, and that of Jesus and those who

believe in Him (cf. [Joh_14:10](#), [Joh_15:4](#) etc.). The words of St. Paul to the Athenians, ‘In him we live and move and have our being’ ([Act_17:28](#)), are as true of Jesus as they are of all the children of men, ‘for both he that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified are all of one’ (ἐξ ἑνός, [Heb_2:11](#)). It is this very likeness (ὁμοίωμα, [Php_2:7](#), cf. [Heb_2:17](#)) of nature which makes interdependence, in the sphere of active work, between Christ and believers a prominent feature in all sound Christologies (cf. [Mar_16:20](#), [1Co_3:9](#), [2Co_6:1](#)). The well-known Pauline ἐν Χριστῷ (cf. [2Co_5:17](#), [1Co_15:22](#), [Col_1:28](#) etc.) is balanced by the no less Pauline Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν ([Rom_8:10](#), [1Co_1:30](#), cf. [Eph_3:17](#), [Gal_2:20](#)).

Life in Christ is the normal condition of redeemed humanity ([1Co_15:22](#)). As the head is the seat of the vital functions in the human body, and without the head the body is helpless and lifeless, so Christ is the source of the Church’s life and energy ([Eph_4:15](#) f., [Col_1:18](#); [Col_2:19](#) etc.). Her capacity for development springs directly from Him, considered in relation to His place in her constitution ([Eph_2:20](#) f.), and it is impossible even to conceive of the Church apart from this relationship ([1Co_3:11](#)). ‘The Head,’ ‘the chief corner-stone,’ ‘the foundation,’ are the principal Pauline formulae used by the Apostle to picture the mysterious nature of a union upon which the very existence of the Church depends. The symbol of the marriage relationship, with all the consequences involved, is not only found in the Johannine idealism ([Rev_19:7](#); [Rev_21:2](#); [Rev_21:9](#)), but discovers itself underlying St. Paul’s ideas as to the nature of the tie which binds the Church to Christ, in its aspect both of loving equality ([Eph_5:28](#) f.) and of dependent subordination ([Eph_5:24](#); [Eph_5:33](#)).

Relative to what we have been saying, it may not be amiss to recall the difficult words of St. Paul, which emphasize this side of a mysterious truth—‘Now I ... fill up on my part that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for His body’s sake, which is the Church’ ([Col_1:24](#), cf. the strange translation of this sentence in *Moffatt’s The Historical New Testament*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred]). It is as if the Apostle said that Christ is still, in a certain sense, subject to His Father’s disciplinary control (cf. [Act_9:4](#), [Joh_15:1](#) f.), where the Father, as the husbandman, prunes the branches, and consequently the tree out of which the branches grow. The tribulations and disappointments which the Church experiences from age to age are manifestations of the same spirit of unbelief and opposition encountered by Jesus during His work on earth ([Joh_15:18-21](#); [Joh_17:14-16](#)). Nor ought we to be surprised if we observe this continued display of hostility in one form or another, because Jesus Himself knew that it would be so, and that He was the object of opposition. He said that the world would hate to accept the directing influence of that body which professes to derive its life directly from His Life (cf. [Luk_6:22](#); [Luk_21:17](#), [Mat_10:22](#); [Mat_24:9](#); [1Pe_2:21](#); [1Pe_4:13](#) f.).

The other side of the same truth is not forgotten by Jesus, who taught that the conscious recognition of His claims over the lives of His followers, and the consequent acts of goodwill towards the latter, will not escape His notice (cf. ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστὲ, Mar 9:41, and εἰς ὄνομα μαθητοῦ, Mat 10:42). See also Mat 25:40; Mat 25:45, where, in His solemn portraiture of the Judgment Day, Jesus emphasizes the great truth of His self-identification with all who have their lives grounded in Him (cf. τούτων τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν ἐλαχίστων, Mat 25:40).

7. We must not close our consideration of this subject without referring to a feature of the Christian life which is supplementary to and dependent upon the foregoing. The life of the believer is not bounded by his own immediate interests, although as an individual that life is immeasurably enriched and ennobled by its personal contact with, and share in, the Incarnate Life of Jesus Christ. In the parables of the Vine and the Good Shepherd He leads to the conclusion that all His disciples stand in a relationship to each other of the closest kind. There is an interdependence between them which springs out of their common relationship to Christ their Head. This truth is especially dwelt on by St. Paul in his reasoning on the variety of work but unity of purpose which characterizes the lives of professing Christians considered in their corporate capacity, and as constituent parts of a great whole. No individual life can be considered as self-centred in the sense of its being independent of the lives of its fellows. However unconscious one may be of the fact, it nevertheless remains true that no single member of 'the body of Christ' (σῶμα Χριστοῦ) is unaffected by the fortunes of its brethren. Various as are the functions of the parts, vital as is the dependence of each on Him in whom their common life has its roots, it is still the truth that the fulness of the life of every individual is affected by the joy or the sorrow, the strength or the weakness, of every other (cf. 1Co 12:12-30, Gal 3:27 f., Col 3:11, Eph 3:15 f.). The recognition of this common share in the one higher life is necessary as affording scope for the exercise of the greatest of all human virtues (ἡ ἀγαπῆ, 1Co 13:13).

The incapability of fully appreciating this feature of Jesus' teaching, which is ultimately bound up with His ideals and aspirations, will largely account for the signal failure of Christendom to realize that spiritual as well as visible unity of life and purpose to which He looked forward in the later stages of His ministry. Oneness is just the characteristic which cannot be predicated of the Christian community. More especially is this the case if we consider the nature of the oneness aspired after by Jesus for His followers—a oneness which has its roots in the Divine life, and 'in which each constituent being is a conscious element in the being of a vast whole' (ἵνα ὅσιν

τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἓν, Joh 17:23; cf. Joh 17:11; cf. Joh 17:21-22, Rom 12:5, 1Co 12:20; see also Westcott's *Gospel of St. John*, p. 246 f.).

The opening years of the twentieth century give promise of a profounder realization of this Divine idea; and the craving after unity, in some sense at least, may issue in a truer conception of the inter-relations of Christian people, in a real synthesis of the individual's freedom and his subordination and dependence as a member of that which is essentially one whole (cf. ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος, ἐν σῶμα οἱ πολλοὶ ἐσμεν, 1Co 10:17). Perhaps it is not without significance that, in recording the prayer of Jesus for His Church, St. John uses the present tense of the verbs πιστεύω and γινώσκω (Joh 17:21; Joh 17:23), which points to the ultimate, albeit gradual, acquirement by 'the world' of that faith and knowledge which the spectacle of a union so vital and so profound is calculated to impart.

Literature.—W. R. Harper's *Religion and the Higher Life* will be found very useful in connexion with this subject; as will also A. Dorner's *Grundprobleme der Religionsphilosophie*, especially Lecture II. in that volume. Westcott's *Gospel of St. John* and *The Epistle to the Hebrews* will be found in places very helpful; as also his *Christus Consummator*, *The Incarnation and Common Life*, and *Christian Aspects of Life*; cf. G. B. Stevens, *The Theology of the New Testament*; B. Weiss, *Biblical Theology of the NT*; Liddon, *Some Elements of Religion*; Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, English translation (T. & T. Clark); Hall, *The Kenotic Theory*; Bruce, *The Humiliation of Christ*; Gore, *Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation, The Church and the Ministry, The Body of Christ*; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*. See also articles in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible : 'Communion' (J. Armitage Robinson), 'Church' (S. C. Gayford), 'Kingdom of God' (J. Orr; with which may be studied articles 'Messiah' and 'Eschatology' [especially §§ 82, 101] in the *Encyc. Bibl.*), 'Jesus Christ' (Sanday; which might be studied in conjunction with Edersheim's *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, B. Weiss, *The Life of Christ*, O. Holtzmann, *The Life of Jesus*).

J. R. Willis.

Dereliction

DERELICTION.—Mat 27:46 = Mar 15:34. About three o'clock in the afternoon, when Jesus had hung for six hours on the cross, the bystanders were startled by a loud cry from the meek Sufferer: *Eli, Eli, lama 'azabhtâni*, * [Note: Psa 22:1 עֲבַחְתָּ לְמַן אֱלֹהֵי אֱלֹהֵי].

For עֵי Mt. gives Aram. שִׁבְקִהֲנִי (σαβαχναυει), D [α]ζαφναυει, being a reminiscence of the original. Mk. further aramaicizes אֱלֹהֵי into אֱלֹהֵי. Cf. Dalman, of Jesus, p. 53 f.] ‘My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?’ It was a sentence from that psalm which, says Tertullian,† [Note: Marc. iii. 19.] ‘contains the whole Passion of Christ.’ What was it that wrung from His lips that exceeding bitter cry? The Evangelists have not drawn the veil aside and revealed what was passing in the Redeemer’s soul, and it becomes us to refrain from curious speculation, and recognize that there is here an impenetrable mystery. Yet it is right that we should seek to enter into it so far as we may, if only that we may realize its greatness and be delivered from belittling thoughts.

An explanation has been sought mainly along two lines. (1) *Jesus was standing in the room of sinners and enduring vicariously the wrath of God.* This opinion is at once unscriptural and irrational. It was indeed possible for God to inflict upon Jesus the punishment which is due to sinners; but it is inconceivable that He should have transferred His wrath from them to Him—as it were saying, ‘I will be angry with Him instead of them.’ Jesus never endured the wrath of God. ‘We do not suggest,’ says Calvin,* [Note: ii. 16. § 11.] ‘that God was ever His adversary or angry with Him. For how should He be angry with His beloved Son in whom His mind rested?’ At every step of His progress through the world He was the beloved Son, and He was never so well pleasing to the Father as in that hour when He hung a willing victim on the cross, ‘obedient even unto death’ (Php 2:8). His sacrifice for the sin of the world was not merely His death; it was His entire life of unspotted holiness and vicarious love (cf. Heb 9:14). His death was not the whole of His sacrifice, but the consummation of it. He bore the sin of the world from Nazareth to Calvary, and, if God was angry with Him at the last, He must have been angry with Him all along.

(2) *Jesus was not really forsaken by God, but His soul was clouded by the anguish of His flesh and spirit, and His faith, hitherto victorious, gave way.* ‘We have here,’ says Meyer, ‘the purely human feeling that arises from a natural but momentary quailing before the agonies of death, in every respect similar to that which had been experienced by the author of the psalm.’ It was a ‘subjective feeling,’ and there was no ‘actual objective desertion on the part of God.’ This explanation is very inadequate. At the ninth hour the worst was over, and the end was at hand. It is incredible that He should have faltered then after enduring the sharpest pangs with steadfast fortitude. Whatever His dereliction may have meant, it was no mere subjective feeling, but an objective reality, and it came from God.

According to the *Wolfenb. Fragm.*, the cry of Jesus was a despairing confession that His cause was lost: God had failed Him. But He had foreseen the cross all along. See Crucifixion. According to Renan, it was wrung from His lips by the ingratitude of men:

‘He repented suffering for a worthless race.’ The *logion* is indubitably authentic; it is one of Schmiedel’s ‘absolutely credible passages’ (*Encyc. Bibl.* art. ‘Gospels,’ § 139).

If Jesus was indeed the eternal Son of God, ‘bearing our sins in his body on the tree’ (1Pe 2:24), it is in no wise strange that His experience at that awful crisis should lie beyond our ken; but some light is shed upon the mystery by the profound truth, so often reiterated in the NT, that it was necessary for Him, in order that He might redeem the children of men, to be identified with them in every particular of their sorrowful condition. That He might ‘redeem us from the curse of the law’ it was necessary that He should be ‘made a curse for us’ (Gal 3:13); ‘it behoved him in every respect to be made like unto his brethren, that he might prove a merciful and faithful High Priest’; and it is because ‘he hath himself suffered, having been tempted,’ that ‘he is able to succour them that are being tempted’ (Heb 2:17-18). The uttermost strait in human experience is the passage through the valley of the shadow of death, and nothing but the sense of God’s presence can relieve its horror (cf. Psa 23:4). Had Jesus enjoyed the consciousness that God was with Him in that dread extremity, He would have been exempted from the most awful experience of the children of men, and His sympathy would have failed us precisely where it is most needed. And therefore the sense of the Father’s presence was withheld from Him in that awful hour.

It was not necessary to this end that the Father should be angry with Him. When the eternal Son of God became man, He was made in every respect like unto His brethren; and what differentiated Him from them was the closeness of His intimacy with God and the singular graces wherewith God endowed Him. He had a unique acquaintance with the Father’s purposes, but He had this because the Father showed Him all things which He did (Joh 5:20); He had marvellous wisdom, but it was the Father’s gift (Joh 7:16-17): ‘the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father’s that sent me’ (Joh 14:24); He wrought miracles, but of Himself He could do nothing (Joh 5:30): ‘the Father abiding in me doeth his works’ (Joh 14:10). ‘God,’ says St. Peter, ‘anointed him with the Holy Spirit and with power,’ and ‘he went about doing good, and healing all that were under the tyranny of the devil; *became God was with him*’ (Act 10:38). Had the Father at any moment refrained from His ministration and left Him alone, Jesus would have been even as the rest of the children of men. And thus is revealed something of the mystery of the Dereliction. That He might be one with the children of men in their uttermost strait, the communion of God was withheld from His beloved Son, and He passed through the valley of the shadow of death alone, without that presence which had hitherto cheered and supported Him (cf. Joh 16:32).

Literature.—Bruce, *Humiliation of Christ*, Lect. vii.; Dale, *Atonement*, Note G; Wendt, *Lehre Jesu* [English translation ii. p. 249 f.]; Meyer on Mat 27:46; *Expos.*

Times, iv. [1893] 511 ff.; Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, 'The Crucifixion'; Mrs. Browning, *Cowper's Grave*.

David Smith.

☒ Desert

DESERT.—See Wilderness.

☒ Desire

DESIRE.—'Our nature corresponds to our external condition. Without this correspondence there would be no possibility of any such thing as human life and human happiness: which life and happiness are, therefore, a result from our nature and condition jointly: meaning by human life, not living in the literal sense, but the whole complex notion commonly understood by these words' (Butler's *Analogy*, pt. i. ch. 5, § 1). This is one of the observations of Bishop Butler in which he anticipates the conclusions of modern science. The nature of man corresponds to external nature; organ and environment, faculty and its sphere of operation are in correspondence. Man is in relation to the world in which he lives, and his whole life is a process of adaptation to the life of the Universe. All the endowments of his nature, whether intellectual, emotional, or volitional, whether they are bodily or mental, may fruitfully be looked at as teleological, as a means towards the great end of living. The teleological relation begins in the individual ere consciousness awakens in him, and he is so constituted that he acts in relation to the environment ere he can consciously adapt himself to it. Even consciousness may be looked at as part of a process of adaptation. Bishop Butler also remarks that 'the several external objects of the appetites, passions, and affections, being present to the senses, or offering themselves to the mind, excite emotions suitable to their nature' (*l.c.* ch. 4. § 1). In his view there is not only a general correspondence between man and his environment, but a special adaptation between the several aspects of nature and the particular characteristics of man. Appetites have their objects, and these objects excite emotions in man suitable to their nature. Passions and affections have also their objects and their suitable emotions. Every external object makes its own appeal, and the inward nature of man makes a response in correspondence with the appeal. Nor does the Bishop limit the meaning of the word 'object' to those things which appeal to man directly through his senses, and which are presented to him, as it were, ready made. That there are such objects it is not necessary to affirm. But the

objects which appeal to man are not limited to those which nature presents to him. Within the range of his interests are included not only the world as it is presented to perception, but the world as it has been transformed by human reflexion, as it is filled with the achievement of the ages, and pervaded by the life, the imagination, and the reflexion of man. Objects are not merely what is presented to the senses, but what is presented to man as constituted by the experience of the race, by the education of the individual, by the results of art, science, poetry, philosophy, and theology,—in short, by all the wide interest with which man has invested the world of his experience. Appetites have their respective objects, though even the appetite of a rational being has something which transcends sense, and even into appetite may enter that element of infinity with which a rational being invests all his objects.

Coming more closely to the subject, we take a description of Desire from Professor Mackenzie: 'In the case of what is strictly called desire, there is not merely the consciousness of an object, with an accompanying feeling of pleasure and pain, but also a recognition of the object as a good, or as an element in a more or less clearly defined end' (*Manual of Ethics*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 46). Three elements appear in this description. There is, first, the consciousness of an object; there is, second, the feeling of pleasure and of pain; and there is, third, the recognition of the object as a good, or as an element in a defined end. If all these elements are involved in Desire, then Desire can be experienced only by beings who live a reflective life. They must be conscious beings; they must have the consciousness of an object, and be able to associate that object with pleasure and pain; and they must be able to reflect on the object, and judge it to be a good, or an element in a defined end. It may be well to have a term the meaning of which is such as has been defined by Professor Mackenzie; but is Desire such a term? Is it so in the ordinary use of language, or is it so in the accepted use of psychological writers? What of those writers who define the good in terms of pleasure and of pain? If we were to accept the definition of the term Desire as it is set forth by Professor Mackenzie, we should be constrained to say that the presence of Desire always involves the action of reflective judgment, the presence of ideas or trains of ideas to consciousness, and a comparison of possible processes which might lead to the accomplishment of a wished-for end. As a consequence, we should be compelled to shut out from the region of Desire not only all the lower forms of life, but also all those people who do not live a reflective life. It seems, then, that the definition of Desire given by Professor Mackenzie is an ideal one. It describes Desire as it is felt by a fully developed, reflective consciousness, a consciousness in possession of trains of ideas, and of the world as built up of such mental attainments and experiences. Along the whole course of mental growth, from the first beginnings of conscious life up to the complete attainment of self-mastery, Desire may be considered to be present, and to afford a ground of action. As a definition of life must include all living things, so a

definition of Desire must include every feeling which in common language can lay claim to be a desire. There is an element of desire in every case in which there is subjective selection, or rejection of one object and the preference of another. In the simplest mental experience, even in those in which the living being reacts against the environment, whether it means the avoidance of pain or the attainment of pleasure, there is the germ of desire. Movements that result in pleasure attract attention. Movements which procure the removal of pain, and become inseparably associated with that result, are elements in the making of a world, and that world grows into the world of Desire. It may be that reactions against the environment correspond to stages in the growth of mind, so that we might properly ascribe Desire to movements for the attainment of objects of which the organism is aware through the senses; but it is not necessary for us to enter into the discussion of that topic. As Dr. Ward says, 'Provided the cravings of appetite are felt, any signs of the presence of pleasurable objects prompt to movements for their enjoyment or appropriation. In these last cases we have action determined by perceptions. The cases in which the subject is incited to action by ideas as distinct from perceptions, require a more detailed consideration; such are the facts mainly covered by the term "desire" ' (art. 'Psychology,' *Encyc. Brit.*⁹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] vol. xx. p. 73 f.).

Without entering on the question as to whether action can be determined by perceptions, or the further question as to whether there can be perceptions apart from something like ideation, we are disposed to contend that where there is awareness of an object, and a movement towards the appropriation of it, there must be the rudiments of Desire. It is not necessary, however, to discuss the matter, for it is not to be questioned that by ideas, and trains of ideas, and ideas, as Dr. Ward points out, 'sufficiently self-sustaining to form trains that are not wholly shaped by the circumstances of the present—entirely new possibilities of action are opened up' (p. 74). Ideas and trains of ideas form elements in shaping a world of desire. It is not possible to mark off the area where these properly begin, any more than we can delimit the sphere of intellection, and say where it begins. But for our purpose it is sufficient that the presence of reflective thought does mark a terminus; on one side there is mental action of a simpler sort, and on the other side the fulness of a reflective life. But apparently there is desire on both sides.

Taking the definition of Professor Mackenzie as a goal and an ideal, we ask, In what ways have thinkers looked at Desire in the past, and what is the view they take of it in the present hour? To set this forth with fulness would be a great task. For Desire, the analysis of it, and the place assigned to it, mark off the schools of philosophy from each other, and, according as they view it, it gives the keynote to different systems of ethics. From the time of the beginnings of Greek thought down to the present time, the attempt to find a sufficient definition of Desire has ever been

renewed, and at present the old controversy between Plato and the Sophists has its counterpart in the controversy between Green and his supporters on the one hand, and Sidgwick and the various supporters of Hedonism on the other. Both the theory of knowledge and the theory of conduct are involved in the discussion of the question.

One of the many debts which the world owes to Socrates is the introduction of the conception of a supreme end of life. That there is one end which all men seek, and that every action must be judged by reference to that end, brought unity into man's conception of human life. Up to the time of Socrates men had thought of conduct as obedience to certain practical rules, useful from the point of view of prudence. But Socrates showed that men's thoughts and actions must be guided by their desire for something which they regarded as desirable. Rules were simply the ways by which the desirable end could be obtained. Illustrations of this principle abound in the statements ascribed to Socrates. A religious man desires to win the approbation of the gods; a just man is persuaded that the practice of justice will bring satisfaction; a man seeks knowledge because it is a satisfaction to know. Thus, in all departments of life there is some desirable end, and the thought of a desirable end actually defines Desire as it appears to Socrates.

While a great advance was made when the thought of a supreme end of life dawned on the human mind, yet the question arose as to the nature of the end, and it received different answers. Is the end pleasure, or a pleasurable state of feeling? Is it the avoidance of pain, or is it indifference to, or superiority over, both pleasure and pain? Is pleasure—pain, or indifference to pleasure—pain, or any other description of the end of life something to be referred to and determined by the individual man, or must we bring the thought of common life to bear on the solution of the problem? If we refer to the individual man the power of deciding what is the end of life and what is desirable as a means to that end, are we to think of the end in terms of pleasure as it appears to the cultured man, a man who is familiar with ideas and trains of ideas, or are we to think of pleasure as it appears to the natural man? All these questions were keenly debated in the schools of Greece, and all of them have a bearing on the definition of Desire.

Nor is it easy to say what are the views of the great masters of Greek thought on the question of desire. It is perhaps comparatively easy to say what were the views of Aristippus or of Epicurus, but not so easy to say what were the views of Plato or of Aristotle. Still a brief description may be useful. We quote from Dr. Jowett. 'Plato, speaking in the person of Socrates, passes into a more ideal point of view, and expressly repudiates the notion that the exchange of a less pleasure for a greater can be the exchange of virtue. Such virtue is the virtue of ordinary men who live in the world of appearance; they are temperate only that they may enjoy the pleasure of intemperance, and courageous from fear of danger. Whereas the philosopher is

seeking after wisdom and not after pleasure, whether near or distant: he is the mystic, the initiated, who has learned to despise the body, and is yearning all his life long for a truth which will hereafter be revealed to him. In the *Republic* (ix. 582) the pleasures of knowledge are affirmed to be superior to other pleasures, because the philosopher so estimates them; and he alone has had experience of both kinds. In the *Philcbus*, Plato, although he regards the enemies of pleasure with complacency, still further modifies the transcendentalism of the *Phaedo*. For he is compelled to confess, rather reluctantly, perhaps, that some pleasures, *i.e.* those which have no antecedent pains, 'claim a place in the scale of goods' (Jowett's *Plato*, vol. iv. p. 29 f.). Plato rejects the view that pleasure is necessarily preceded by pain. 'True pleasures are those which are given by beauty of colour and form, and most of those which arise from smells; those of sound, again, and in general those of which the want is painless and unconscious, and the gratification afforded by them palpable to sense and unalloyed with pain' (*Philcbus*, 5f. A, Jowett's translation). He prepared the way for the fuller analysis of pleasure and desire which we owe to Aristotle, for he showed that pleasures which accompany the active discharge of function are pleasant in themselves; the pleasures which are truly desirable are the pleasures of the wise, all others are a shadow only (*Rep.* 583 B). Thus Plato rejects the earlier theories of movement and replenishment, distinguishes pleasures that are preceded by pain and want as pleasant only by contrast, and as it were by accident, from those pleasures which accompany active discharge of function; and he sets forth as the only true pleasure the pleasure of the good man. Pleasure, according to Plato, is always a process towards the normal condition of a subject, and is never in itself an end. The absence of finality from pleasure proves that pleasure taken by itself could never be the end of life. The treatment of pleasure and pain is conducted by Plato always from a moral point of view.

While Aristotle builds so far on the results of the analysis of Plato, yet he is dissatisfied with the argument that pleasure cannot be the *summum bonum* because it is a mere process towards an end. Pleasure, he contends, is an ἐνέργεια; it arises from the unimpeded operation of our faculties; it arises when an organ which acts perfectly comes into contact with its appropriate object, just as pain is the outcome of thwarted action on the part of either a sensitive or an intellectual faculty (*Ethiopic Nic.* vii. 12, 1153. 13). The moral value of the feelings of pleasure and pain arises, says Aristotle, out of the fact that by means of them man passes from a state of a merely cognitive and intellectual being, and becomes a moral and active being. 'It is when the sense perceives something as pleasant or painful that the mind affirms or denies it, pursues or avoids it' (iii. 7. 2, 43f. 8). Aristotle has ever before him the unity and wholeness of human nature. He is never merely intellectual, and is never wholly practical. He always lays stress on the correspondence between the speculative and the practical sides of human nature. Truth and error in the

intellectual sphere become good and evil in the moral sphere. What the mind affirms as truth and error in the intellectual sphere becomes pursuit and avoidance in the practical sphere. In both spheres the mind is active. Impressions in the cognitive sphere become, through the activity of the subject, objects of cognition; feelings of pleasure and pain, through a similar activity of the subject, are translated into objects of desire or aversion; become motives to action.

Two main factors, according to Aristotle, enter into the conative nature of man. It is difficult within our limits to expound this fully. But, briefly, it is that Desire and Reason must co-operate in order that a moral conclusion may be carried into effect. Moral choice or προαίρεσις may be described as νοῦς ὀρεκτικῶς, reason stimulated by desire, or ὄρεξις διανοητική, desire guided by understanding. The significant part of the view is that both the irrational and the rational elements must act together; desire and reason are constant elements in distinctive moral action. For the merely logical understanding never leads to action. Reason, as mere reasoning, is powerless to shape the will, and mere appetite is quite as powerless. In order to cause action, pleasure and pain must be translated into the higher forms of Good and Evil. Desire must always have an object (ὀρεκτικὸν δὲ οὐκ ἄνευ φαντασίας (433^b. 28)); but the object of desire determines conduct only when thought has marked it out, defined it, and in a word constituted it (τὸ ὀρεκτικὸν κινεῖ οὐ νοηθῆναι ἢ φαντασθῆναι (433^b. 12)).

‘The true object of consciousness in this union of desire and reason is not two objects,—one of desire, another of reason,—it is one single common force which finally becomes the principle of action. And when we ask how this object of our final wish is framed, the answer must be, that it is so through the agency of reason. Ultimately, and transcendently in fact, there is no difference between the object of thought and the object of wish; the βουλευτόν and the νοητόν are merely different aspects of one and the same great generality. Even in our own experience it is thought which determines desire: and the principle and starting-point of conduct turns out to be an exercise of reason. And when Aristotle proceeds to state more definitely what is this object of perfect wish which thus determines and regulates our natural desires, he becomes still more of an idealist. For while the object of wish to any individual is but the apparent and relative good, still to a perfect man it is the absolute ideal good: and the aim of life comes to be an attempt to make our practical views in life elevate themselves to the full height of the absolute ideal of goodness.... The same writer who reproduces Plato’s idea of good as the constructive reason which gives both knowledge and reality to things, now finds the determining aim of conduct in an absolute ideal which constitutes the pattern to which morality must raise itself’

(*Aristotle's Psychology in Greek and English, with Introduction and Notes*, by Edwin Wallace, M.A., Introduction, p. cxxiii f.).

We quote from Mr. Wallace, whose work represents the high-water mark of Aristotelian exposition, as it sets forth in brief space an interpretation of Aristotle which deserves study. It may be that Mr. Wallace has read Hegel into Aristotle, but in the present case he is right in saying that for Aristotle the world of desire is a rational world, and that the ground of conduct is the union of desire and reason. In short, the view of Aristotle corresponds to the definition of desire set forth by Professor Mackenzie. 'It is then,' says Aristotle, 'on good grounds that people have viewed as springs of action these two faculties of desire and practical intellect: for the faculty of desire has itself a motive force, and the intellect excites to action just in so far as the object of desire supplies it with a starting-point: just as, similarly, imagination when it moves to action does not do so independently of desire. The spring of action thus resolves itself into one single thing, viz. the object of desire' (Wallace's translation p. 179).

As to the question whether animals can have desires, Aristotle decides that 'no animal can have the faculty of desire unless it have imaginative power' (Wallace, p. 183); but then, as imaginative power is connected with the reason or the senses, so animals may have the imaginative power connected with the senses, and thus have what can be designated desires. But they do not possess the kind of desire which forms itself as the conclusion of syllogism, so that their desire is destitute of any faculty of deliberation. 'In the case of men, however, sometimes the images of sense overcome and move the rational volition; sometimes, as in incontinence, two things overcome and stir up one another, desire thus following on desire, much as a ball that players toss about; but the normal and natural course is always that in which the superior course of reason is the more supreme and stimulates to action' (pp. 184-185). Desire thus, according to Aristotle, implies deliberation, choice, the use of means towards an end. In a significant passage in the *Nicomachcan Ethics* he says (we quote the paraphrase of Sir A. Grant): 'If the object of purpose is that which, being in our power, we desire after deliberation, purpose will be a desire of things in our power. After deliberating we decide, and form a desire in accordance with our deliberation' (Grant's *Aristotle's Ethics*, vol. ii. p. 23). Desire ranges, according to Aristotle, through all life. Wherever life is in presence of an object there is rudimentary desire. The animal world feels it in presence of an object present to its senses. A self-conscious being feels desire in proportion to its realization of self, and to its realization of the objects as existing in an ordered world. It is possible to regard the teaching of Aristotle as containing in itself the fuller analysis of desire as that analysis has been conducted by English Hedonists and by the English Neo-Hegelians.

Were there space, it would be instructive to trace the analysis of desire, or rather the description of desire, in subsequent philosophical speculation. But that would far exceed our limits. Nor is it necessary, for there is not much to be added to the result won by Aristotle until we come to the Utilitarian school of England. Some valuable remarks occur in Spinoza's *Ethics*, but the current of modern speculation on the topic was set agoing by Hobbes. For the history of the process, readers may be referred to Professor Watson's (Kingston, Canada) *Hedonistic Theories*, and to Dr. Albee's (Cornell University) *A History of English Utilitarianism*. In addition to the account of the main ethical theory known as Utilitarianism, and a criticism of it, there will be found in these able books a particular account of that doctrine we have immediately in hand. In the posthumous work of Professor Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, there is a lengthened and incisive analysis of Desire; and in the posthumous work of Professor Sidgwick, *The Ethics of T. H. Green, Herbert Spencer, and J. Martineau*, as also in the various editions of the *Methods of Ethics*, we find a criticism of Green. These two works represent the most recent, as they also represent the most searching, accounts of Desire which can be found in the whole range of philosophical speculation.

In the analysis of Desire, as in the analysis of Knowledge, the work of Locke was epoch-making. He stated the problem in a form which occupied the thoughts of all his successors in England. Berkeley, Hume, Hartley, Tucker, Stuart Mill, and Spencer are in the succession, and all of them attack the problem of the will from the point of view of pleasure and desire. We take the statement of Locke's position from the admirable work of Professor Watson, *Hedonistic Theories* (p. 111 f.):

'Why does the same man will differently on different occasions? The reason is to be sought in the character of Desire as the imagination of pleasure. To different persons, or to the same person under different circumstances, one pleasure presents itself in his imagination as preferable to another. Under the impulse for knowledge one man will forget his bodily wants until hunger drives him to his meals; another man will neglect study, and live for the pleasures of sense, unless he is driven to change his course by the stronger impulse of shame. But as each man's desire is determined not by him but for him, and the desire determines the will, what he prefers in any case is that which alone he can prefer, and freedom is a word without meaning.'

This, then, is the problem which the majority of English ethical thinkers had before them. A man's desires are determined for him not by him, and the desire determines the will. Nor is much added to the solution of the problem from the time of Locke to that of Stuart Mill. Hume had tried to prove the utilitarian doctrine of the particular virtues, and Stuart Mill, using the same argument, sought to prove the general principle of Utility.

‘The sole evidence, of apprehend, it is possible to produce that anything is desirable, is that people do actually desire it. If the end which the utilitarian doctrine proposes to itself were not, in theory and in practice, acknowledged to be an end, nothing could ever convince any person that it was so. No reason can be given why the general happiness is desirable, except that each person, so far as he believes it to be attainable, desires his own happiness’ (*Utilitarianism*, ch. iv.). Farther on in the same chapter he identifies pleasure and desire. ‘Desiring a thing and finding it pleasant, a version to it and finding it painful, are phenomena entirely unseparable, or rather two parts of the same phenomena.’ Thus Mill would find it necessary to show that people never do desire anything save pleasure or happiness. On this Sidgwick remarks: ‘As a matter of fact, it appears to me that throughout the whole scale of my impulses, sensual, emotional, and intellectual alike, I can distinguish desires the object of which is something other than my own pleasure’ (*Methods of Ethics*, p. 45).

In truth, the Hedonistic account of Desire, from Locke to Mill, and including Sidgwick in some measure, is inadequate, because it is too exclusively psychological. Psychology, as it is usually conceived, cannot give a full account of Desire. For psychology deliberately limits itself to a description of mental processes, events, and occurrences, taken in abstraction from the self whose the mental states are, and from the outer world. An analysis of mental states can never give a complete account of the system to which the self belongs, and of the interests and values which are such because they are referred to the self. Thus the psychological account of Desire, and its relation to will, set forth by English Hedonism, is defective, not psychologically, but in reality. It is the merit of Green, and specially of those who with him have so fruitfully worked at ethical problems under the inspiration of Kant and Hegel, to point out that mental and moral values cannot be appraised, and cannot be the objects of desire, if we look at them in abstraction from the self, and from the world-system. In the *Prolegomena to Ethics* and in the Introduction to Hume, Green has brought the self in its concrete reality within the vision of English thinkers. He has been ably helped by such writers as Professor Muirhead in his manual *The Elements of Ethics*, by Professor Watson in *Hedonistic Theories*, and Professor Mackenzie in the *Manual of Ethics*. Other writers might be mentioned, but these will suffice to show the significance of the new departure in Ethics, and of the introduction of the self into English philosophy. Desire, according to Green, involves consciousness of self and of an object, and is to be distinguished from instinctive impulse, which implies only the feeling of self. A consciousness of self is something beyond self-feeling, is really a transformation of self-feeling. Self-consciousness being also a consciousness of objects, is thus the basis of desire and of knowledge. Even in the desire for food, what is desired is really some ulterior object, not the mere pleasure of eating. But most of our desires are for objects which are not directly dependent on animal susceptibility at all, or which, even where so dependent, are transformed by the

addition of new elements derived from self-consciousness itself. There is a real unity in all our desires, only it is the unity of the self, not the unity of desire.

‘There is one subject or spirit, which desires in all a man’s experiences of desire, understands in all operations of his intelligence, wills in all his acts of willing; and the essential character of his desires depends on their all being desires of one and the same subject which also understands, the essential character of his intelligence on its being an activity of one and the same subject which also desires, the essential character of his acts of will on their proceeding from one and the same subject which also desires and understands’ (*Prolegomena to Ethics*⁴ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 138).

It is well to have an emphatic statement of the unity of the thinking, willing, feeling subject placed on record; for up to Green’s advent we were allowed to see thinking, willing, feeling, but the self was altogether out of sight. At the same time, while Green lays stress on the unity of the self in all its activities, and rightly so, there seems to be a defect in his analysis. He seems to take for granted that the self-conscious self, in its conscious apprehension of objects as desirable, will always act wisely, prudently, and rightly. But does not the self-conscious being, in making a choice, sometimes choose unwisely and wrongly? As Sidgwick points out, ‘It seems to me to be fundamentally important to distinguish between choice (even deliberate choice) and judgment as to choice-worthiness, since they may diverge’ (*The Ethics of T. H. Green*, etc. p. 30). Are we to hold that a man, following out what he thinks self-interest, clearly seeing the end in view and choosing appropriate means for its accomplishment, if he acts self-consciously, is always acting rightly? For Green in his description of the self-conscious subject does not seem to contemplate the possibility of wrong or vicious action. He takes for granted that the process of the self-conscious being on his way towards the appropriate action, towards the satisfaction he will feel when the object is attained, will always be right. But may there not be all the characteristics of the action of the self-conscious being, as these are described by Green, present in the course of conduct of a man who wades through slaughter to a throne? In truth, there is needed a further analysis, leading us beyond the mere processes of a self-conscious being, in order to find a justification for man’s action. We need a better description of the desirable than any that can be found in Green. All that he sets forth with regard to Desire and the self-conscious subject and its action may be true, and truly realized in the case of the man who has an unworthy end in view. He may identify himself with his object, he may find satisfaction in the attainment of it, and yet the choice may not be worthy.

It is the experience of mankind that a man may make an unworthy choice, may form a wrong ideal, may be mistaken, and yet may all the time act as a self-conscious being. So a further criterion is needed in order to guide men in their choice, in order that it

may be a worthy choice. True, the values of life lie in their relation to the self. And the realization of the self is one of the great ends of life. But the self has to grow in relation to the ideal, and the ideal has to grow as well. How shall a man learn to recognize the true ideal, and to desire it? Here we ought to enter into the religious experience of man to realize the fact that man has formed wrong conceptions of life, has worshipped false ideals, and desired unworthy ends. One might pass into the sphere of that religious experience which has had its highest expression in the Scriptures. There, too, we are in a universe of desires, and the task of Scripture is to teach man what to desire. Scripture recognizes the possibility of wrong desire leading to wrong action, and it also recognizes that towards the making of desire all the faculties of man contribute. What it teaches is largely the reversal of human ideals: it puts last what men have put first, and it places in the front place, as the best and mightiest, what men have despised and forgotten. The self-conscious being has to be taught something which it would never have learnt through the mere exercise of self-conscious activity. It is not necessary to enter into an analysis of Scripture terms, or to trace the history of the term 'desire' through the Scriptures. For Scripture proceeds on the fact that men have had wrong desires, false ideals, and have pursued wrong objects; so it proceeds to teach them what is the really good, the true ideal; and, further, to give to men the power to recognize the good, the true, and the beautiful, and to desire them. We need this education, and the world of desire cannot be really described until we bring in the revolutionary power of religion, and learn to know that reversal of human judgments inaugurated by Christ.

Here, too, the strongest influence in this education is the commanding power of personality. It is not without significance that in the last resort Plato and Aristotle were driven back to the concrete standard of the 'good man.' Through the influence of personality men learn to recognize ideals and to love them. Around personalities cluster the thoughts, emotions, aspirations, tendencies which help to form the world of desire. It is so in the OT, where it is said of their devotion to the living God of Israel: 'Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee' ([Psa_73:25](#)); or, 'To thy name and to thy memorial is the desire of our soul' ([Isa_26:8](#)). It is recognized that there is a world of wrong desires, objects which the self-conscious man may desire, long for, strive after; and the story of the Bible is the attempt to implant in these self-conscious beings the power to free themselves from that world of false desire. In the NT the first step towards that freedom is to bring men into contact with a living personality, in whom is sphered all perfection, whose service is perfect freedom, and through whom they may learn what to desire and what to long for, and what to attain. The laws of desire, as these are in human nature, and as they are disclosed to us through research and reflexion, rule in this sphere; but then they have new material to illustrate their working.

Illustrations of the working of Desire abound in religious experience. To enter into them would occupy us too long. It need only be said that attachment to a pure and holy Personality, love to One who is the ideal of human life, purifies the world of desire and intensifies the power of action. Men who have felt the expulsive power of a new attraction and the intensive power of a holy love are lifted into a new world, and those who love Christ learn that the world of their desires is formed by Him; they learn to love what He approves, and to hate what He hates. The world in which they live, the universe in which their desires terminate, are constituted by the Person and by the Love of Christ. See art. Ideal.

Literature.—Jowett's *Plato*; Aristotle's *Ethics* (Grant's ed.), and *Psychology* (ed. Edwin Wallace); Mackenzie, *A Manual of Ethics*; Muirhead, *Elements of Ethics*; Watson, *Hedonistic Theories*; Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*; Sidgwick, *Methods of Ethics*, and *The Ethics of T. H. Green*, etc.; Shadworth Hodgson, *The Metaphysics of Experience*, esp. vol. iv.; Albee, *A History of English Utilitarianism*; Douglas, *Ethics of J. S. Mill*; Ward, art. 'Psychology' in *Encyc. Brit.*⁹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; James, *Principles of Psychology*; Bowne, *Introduction to Psychological Theory*, and *Principles of Ethics*.

James Iverach.

Use of the term 'desire' in the Gospels.—In AV of the Gospels the word 'desire' is of frequent occurrence. As a noun it is found only once (Luk 22:15), as the equivalent of ἐπιθυμία, but in the verbal form it represents no fewer than 8 verbs in the original:—ἐπιθυμέω (Mat 13:17, Luk 16:21; Luk 17:22; Luk 22:15), θέλω (Mar 9:35, Luk 5:39; Luk 8:20; Luk 10:24; Luk 20:46), αἰτέω (Mat 20:20, Mar 10:35; Mar 11:24; Mar 15:6; Mar 15:8, Luk 23:25), ἐξαιτέω (Luk 22:31), ἐρωτάω (Luk 7:36; Luk 14:32, Joh 12:21), ἐπερωτάω (Mat 16:1), ζητέω (Mat 12:46-47, Luk 9:9), παρακαλέω (Mat 18:32). Twice we have the adj. 'desirous' (Luk 23:8, Joh 16:19), but in both cases the vb. θέλω is used in the Greek. In RV, however, αἰτέω, ἐξαιτέω, ἐρωτάω (except in Luk 7:36), and ἐπερωτάω are rendered by 'ask,' ζητέω by 'seek,' and παρακαλέω by 'beseech'; so that ἐπιθυμέω and θέλω are left as the two verbs which in a more exact use of language have the meaning of 'desire.' When we distinguish between them, ἐπιθυμέω may be regarded as denoting the desire of the feelings (θυμός), θέλω the desire of the will. In the latter the element of purpose and resolve is usually more strongly present (cf. Joh 8:44 τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν θέλετε ποιεῖν). Sometimes, however, θέλω is used where a distinction from ἐπιθυμέω can hardly be pressed (see the parallel passages Mat 13:17, Luk 10:24).

In the language of Christ and the Gospels, desire in itself is, properly speaking, neither good nor bad, its quality depending altogether upon the subject who experiences it or the object to which it is directed. The scribes 'desire' to walk in long robes (Luk_20:46); while many prophets and righteous men have 'desired' to see Christ's day (Mat_13:17 || Luk_10:24). The Prodigal 'desired' (ἐπεθύμει, EV 'would fain') to fill his belly with the husks that fed the swine (Luk_15:16); and Jesus said, 'With desire I have desired (ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα) to eat this passover with you before I suffer' (Luk_22:15). But owing to the corruption of the human heart, 'desire' tends to have a predominantly bad meaning, and so ἐπιθυμία comes to denote the sinful 'lusting' of a sinful will. In Mar_4:19 ('the lusts of other things') the word is already passing over to this fixity of a dark connotation; the 'other things' may not be evil in themselves, but as they are allowed to choke the word and render it unfruitful, they have to be classed as 'thorns.' In Mat_5:28 ἐπιθυμησαι expresses 'lust' in the specific sense in which it has come to be used in modern speech, as unholy sexual desire. In Joh_8:44 ἐπιθυμίας denotes the very 'lusts' of the devil as they are seen reappearing in his children.

According to the teaching of Jesus, impure desire, apart altogether from overt acts of sin, is itself a transgression of the Divine law (Mat_5:28). This is the point at which Christ's ethical teaching so immeasurably transcends that of all other masters, and specifically the 'righteousness' of the scribes and Pharisees of His day. He taught that goodness and badness essentially lie not in the outward conduct but in the will and the heart, and that it is by the evil thoughts and feelings which issue from within that a man is defiled (Mat_15:19 f.). It is this same teaching with regard to ἐπιθυμία, now used definitely in the sense of 'lust' or sinful desire, that we meet again in characteristic forms in the writings of St. Paul and St. James. St. James (Jam_1:14 f.) in his powerful figure shows how a man, seduced by his own ἐπιθυμία, begets the sin which issues finally in death. St. Paul (Rom_7:8 ff.) tells how the commandment οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις stirred up in his heart πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν, and so forced him at length to understand that nothing but the law of the Spirit of life could set him free.

Literature.—Moulton and Geden's *Concordance to the Greek Testament*, and the Lexicons of Grimm-Thayer and Cremer, s.vv. ἐπιθυμία, ἐπιθυμέω, θελω; Müller, *Christian Doct. of Sin*, i. 157 ff.; Martensen, *Christian Ethics*, ii. 85 ff.; Liddon, *Elements of Religion*, p. 148 ff.; Dykes, *Manifesto of the King* p. 245 ff.; *Expositor*, iv. iv. [1891] 42 ff.; Milton, *Paradise Lost*, ii. 681 ff.

☒ Desolation

DESOLATION.—The history of Israel had given to this word in the time of Christ a peculiar and sinister significance. To nearly all the prophets the idea of a wasted and depopulated land, such as is given in the graphic description of [Isa 1:7-9](#), is familiar. When Jeremiah and Ezekiel, who most frequently use the words, mention [תְּרִבָּה](#) or [שְׁמֵדָה](#), they always have one thing in their mind—the vision of a once peaceful and flourishing place which by fire and sword has been laid waste, and is left uninhabited. Few countries have suffered so much as Palestine from the havoc wrought by civil war and foreign invasion. To understand the full force of the term ‘desolation,’ we have to add to the features of war, as known to us, something which was then the frequent accompaniment of conquest—the carrying away of a whole population captive. And to the bitter memory of bygone devastation we have to add the apprehension of what might at any time happen if the country were swept by the Romans, of whose methods their own historian wrote, ‘they make a solitude and call it peace’ (Tac. , 30). The word ‘desolation,’ then, understood in the sense in which it was used when the Authorized Version was made (‘I desolate—I make a countrey unhabyted,’ Palsgrave, a.d. 1530), gives the exact sense of both the Hebrew and the Greek ([ἐρημωσις](#)). It is in this sense that the word is used in the passage where Jesus pronounces doom upon Jerusalem ([Mat 23:38](#), [Luk 13:35](#)). The words, ‘Your house is left unto you desolate,’ are a reminiscence of [Jer 22:5](#) (LXX Septuagint —[εἰς ἐρημωσιν ἔσται ὁ οἶκος οὗτος](#)), and it makes little difference whether [ἐρημος](#) stand in the text or not; the general idea is that the house (*i.e.* the city, not the temple) is ‘abandoned.’ There is not necessarily in this passage any prediction of the fall of Jerusalem, though the context may seem to suggest this. The idea is rather that, the glory of Jerusalem consisting in her being the city of the great King, she loses all when He abandons her. If she rejects Him, and He departs, she is a forsaken city (cf. the passage in Bunyan’s *Holy War* where Emmanuel leaves Mansoul; also Josephus *B.J.* vi. v. 3). Grimm-Thayer interprets ‘desolate’ here as ‘bereft of Christ’s presence, instruction, and aid.’ Contrast with this the promise to the disciples in [Joh 14:18](#), which the Authorized Version renders, ‘I will not leave you desolate’ ([ὀρφανούς](#)).

In another passage ([Mat 12:25](#), [Luk 11:17](#)), ‘Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation,’ Jesus uses as a forcible illustration that fatal tendency to

faction and internal discord which had so often brought His countrymen to ruin (cf. e.g. Josephus *Ant.* xiv. iv. 2). See also art. Abomination of Desolation.

J. Ross Murray.

⚠️ Despise

DESPISE

1. ἀθετεῖν.—(1) The primary signification of the word is to *render or consider invalid* (ἀθετοῦν), to *set aside something laid down* (θετόν τι), to *bear oneself toward a thing as if it were not, to ignore*: Mar_7:9 ἀθ. τ. ἐντολήν (Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘reject’), to set aside the command of God, replacing it by tradition, and thus to deprive it of its force, by teaching and practice (cf. Isa_24:16, Jud_1:8). Hence (2) to *thwart the efficacy of anything*: Luk_7:30 τ. βουλὴν τ. θεοῦ (Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘reject’), to *set at nought as superfluous and invalid* (cf. Gal_2:21; Gal_3:15, Heb_10:28). Hence (3) of persons, to *ignore, bear oneself towards them as if they were not, or as if they need not be regarded or honoured*: Mar_6:26 αὐτήν (Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘rejeet’), *break faith with*, and then *disappoint* (Field, *Ot. Norv. in loc*; cf. Psalms 14 :(15) 4), Luk_10:18 (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘reject’), to *ignore, to treat with contempt as deserving no recognition* (cf. 1Th_4:8). To ignore the messenger is to ignore the Son whose message he bears, and this is to ignore the Father who has sent the Son (Joh_12:48, Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘reject’). To ignore Christ and refuse His word is not to escape responsibility, or to disprove His claims. Denial is not disproof. ‘The word cannot be banished. It still clings to the hearer as his judge. Spiritual judgment is a consequence involved in the rejection of the revelation: it is self-fulfilled: it cannot but be carried out.’ Though rejected now, ‘the word of Christ must justify itself’ (Westcott); cf. Isa_33:1.

2. ἐξουθενεῖν (-δενεῖν, -δενοῦν [see WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort’s text.] , App. P. 106]), to *hold or treat as of no account, despise utterly, set at nought*: Luk_18:9 (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘set at nought’). The Pharisees ‘invented the most high-flown designations for each other, such as “Light of Israel,” “Glory of the Law,” etc., but they described the vast mass of their fellow-countrymen as “accursed” for not knowing the Law (Joh_7:49), and spoke of them as empty cisterns’ (Farrar, *in*

loc., cf. Rom 14:3; Rom 14:10, 1Co 16:11, Gal 4:14 etc., Pro 1:7). The same word translation by both Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'set at nought,' is used of the contempt and mockery with which Jesus was treated by the rulers (Mar 9:12 ἵνα ἐξουδενηθῆ; Luk 23:11 ἐξουθ. αὐτὸν ὁ Ἡρῴδης), where the special significance of the word is that He was treated not even as a criminal, deserving examination of his case and righteous judgment, but as a mere cypher, to be utterly despised; cf. Act 4:11, Psa 21:6, Isa 53:3 [Symm. [Note: Symmachus.]], Eze 22:8.

3. καταφρονεῖν, *to look down upon* from a position of superiority, whether assumed or real, *to think lightly of*, *to neglect*, *to disdain*, with more or less actively hostile design (cf. Herod, i. 5. 66, viii. 10). Mat 6:24 || Luk 16:13 : two masters, with opposing interests, cannot be served by the same person, the esteem in which they are held will vary according to the reward offered; one will be actively honoured and diligently served, the other will be thought lightly of and his interests will be neglected. Mat 18:10 : μικροὶ are not to be held in disdain. (1) They are under the special care of God. Adopting the current Jewish doctrine of angels as guardian spirits, our Lord tells His hearers that children have friends in the court of heaven, in close nearness to the King Himself, whose 'Face' they always see; there they are not thought lightly of, here they must not be despised. (2) Accepting the order of the verses, there is a close connexion between 'despising' and 'offending.' No hostile action must be taken towards them, even unconsciously, no carelessness as to conduct or example which might hurt them; 'hindrances' to the life of young disciples, 'despised' because of their weakness, are sins against His love to them. (3) If the connexion with Mat 18:1-4 is original, the young are not to be 'despised,' because the childlike disposition is the true way to eternal life; the humility which is essential for entering into the Kingdom of heaven has its symbol in the consciousness of weakness and imperfection that belongs to children, who are therefore not to be 'despised' but 'received' (cf. Pro 13:13, Gen 27:12).

The active hostility implied in the word is seen in Rom 2:4 τ. μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς: God's longsuffering not only treated with contempt, but also opposed by being sinned against (cf. 1Ti 4:12). In Heb 12:2 αἰσχύνῃς καταφρο., the simply passive sense is given—enduring with the resignation that arises from the disdain of real superiority. 'What men count shame was seen by Christ in another light. From His position, raised infinitely above them, He could disregard their judgment' (Westcott, *in loc.*).

ἀθετεῖν and ἐξουθενεῖν are not used by classical writers, καταφρονεῖν is in constant use from Herodotus onwards.

R. Macpherson.

☒ Despondency

DESPONDENCY.—Despondency fills so frequent and serious a place in human life that we could hardly have felt that our Lord was ‘tempted in all points like as we are’ (Heb 4:15), if He had not experienced it. But the profound depression in the garden of Gethsemane, even if it were alone, and the memorable word, ‘My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death’ (Mat 26:38 || Mar 14:34), testify that He had such experience. What was the cause of this depression in Gethsemane? Was it due to bodily exhaustion, the body affecting the mind and making it more sensitive to sad surroundings? Was it due to the mental strain of publicity and opposition, or to loneliness and the pain of failure? (‘He came unto his own, and his own received him not,’ Joh 1:11). All these were elements in the despondency of Elijah when he sat under the juniper tree, and requested for himself that he might die (1Ki 19:4). And we may not say that such influences were wholly without effect on our Lord; but in His case, as we learn from His own words, the great cause of despondency was the pressure on His spirit of what He saw near before Him, His cross—that death in which He was (in St. Peter’s language) to bear our sins in His own body (1Pe 2:24), or (in St. Paul’s) to be made sin for us (2Co 5:21), and in which He was to endure that sense of separation from God which was so new to the experience of the well-beloved Son. But why was the depression so great now in Gethsemane when He had looked forward to this from the beginning of His ministry, saying in an early stage of it, ‘The Son of man must be lifted up’ (Joh 3:14)? Part of the answer to this question must be that our Lord’s mind, being truly human, was liable to those often mysterious alternations of feeling which, in common men, we call changes of mood. As He drew nearer the accomplishment of the great work of atonement, we find Him sometimes hastening eagerly towards it, full of great purpose, even of joy, and at other times foreseeing the darkness of the experience and shrinking from it. At one of the stages of His approach to that event, and of His own inward acceptance of it, namely after the dismissal of Judas, this joyful anticipation was expressed by Him in language even of exultation—‘Now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in him’ (Joh 13:31). At another stage He speaks in quite a different manner, ‘Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour’ (Joh 12:27).

Dr. Maclaren has finely illustrated this alternation of feeling. ‘Like some great pillar elevated on a mountain, when the thunder-clouds fill the sky, it stands out grim and

dark; and then, in a moment, the strong wind sweeps these away, and the sunlight smites it, and it shines out white and lustrous. With such swift alternations ... to Jesus Christ the Cross was dark and the Cross was radiant' (*Last Sheaves*, 27).

The Gethsemane experience was perhaps that in which our Lord felt most profoundly the dark and heavy pressure of the anticipation of the Cross. How dark and heavy that was appears in the 'sweat as it were great drops of blood falling down upon the ground' (Luk 22:44), in the 'strong crying and tears' (Heb 5:7), and perhaps as much in these words of His prayer, '*if it be possible*'—in His seeking a possibility of the cup passing from Him, although He had said long before, 'The Son of man must be lifted up' (Joh 3:14), and was to say soon after, 'For this cause came I unto this hour' (Joh 12:27). See, further, art. Agony.

J. Robertson.

☒ Destruction

DESTRUCTION.—The Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 translation of ἀπώλεια in Mat 7:13. In Mat 26:8 and in the parallel passage in Mar 14:4 ἀπώλεια is translated 'waste' in both Versions, and in Joh 17:12, the only other instance where the word is used in the Gospels, both render it 'perdition.' In Mat 7:13 our Lord speaks of 'destruction' as the opposite of life eternal. In profane authors ἀπώλεια invariably means, as its derivation from ἀπόλλυμι implies, *extinction*, *annihilation*; and this fact has been largely used by the advocates of the Conditional Immortality theory in support of their contention. Still the 'destruction, spoken of by our Lord in Mat 7:13 has been held by expositors with practical unanimity from the first to mean a continued life, whether endless or not, of misery after death. All the same, it has been admitted generally, e.g. by Cremer, that eternal misery as a meaning of ἀπώλεια 'is a signification peculiar to the NT, and without analogy in classical Greek.' There appears, on the whole, to be general agreement that whether 'destruction' means a terminable or interminable life of misery after death, it does, at any rate, mean a prolongation of existence: it is exclusion from salvation, whether final or not. Whether or not there is a term to the duration of misery hereafter—presuming that there is a continuance of life after death for those who go in the way of destruction—does not enter into the scope of this note (See Eternal Punishment), but it may be remarked as significant that the 'lost sheep' are spoken of by our Lord as being found again, and that the word for 'lost' is the participle of ἀπόλ

λυμι. This is one of the considerations that have made many feel warranted in holding ‘the larger hope’ even for those who go meanwhile in ‘the way that leadeth to destruction.’

J. Cromarty Smith.

☩ Devil

DEVIL.—See Demon and Satan.

☩ Devotion

DEVOTION.—The word does not occur in the Gospels, but the idea is present everywhere, as marking the attitude of the man Jesus towards God, and thus providing a standard for imitation by every other man. Intrinsically the word denotes the act of presenting solemnly some gift or service to a deity, or to any one invested in thought for a time with some of the qualities or claims of a deity; but its use has been extended to cover alike such service itself, and even the psychological condition from which the act springs. As such, a correct analysis must find blended in devotion each of the three elements—thought, emotion, and volition—which are the mutually dependent fragments of the unit of personality, expressing itself as a whole in the exercises often called devotions. The intellectual element is a recognition of the dignity and patient grace of God, the sensitive a feeling of gratitude and desire to please, the volitional a strong resolve to carry out that desire; and these three pass together quickly into appropriate action, the whole man in the harmony of all his powers indicating by praise or service the depth of his loving regard.

In some definitions, too much prominence is given to the will, and devotion is confused with religion generally, as in Aquinas, *Summa*, ii. 2 lxxxii. 1: ‘Devotio nihil aliud esse videtur, quam voluntas quaedam prompte tradendi se ad ea, quae pertinent ad Dei famulatum.’ In certain phrases the word is used as a synonym for worship, or even for a form of worship, as when devotion to the Sacred Heart is spoken of; and in others, as ‘feasts of devotion,’ it acquires an entirely technical sense, implying the absence of express obligation, with an appeal only to the discretion and good feeling of the worshipper. But, in the better use internal devotion is contrasted with external worship (Atterbury, *Sermons*, iv. 213), and may be resolved into four principal constituents. The self-conscious determination of the will towards God is followed by the actual exaltation of the soul to God and its suffusion

with the reverent sense of His nearness and mercy. This is exhibited in various loving acts and exercises, such as prayer and praise. And the whole is effected in the heart under the influence of the Holy Spirit.

1. In the case of *Christ* each of these phases of devotion is represented in the Gospels, (a) Though but a mere lad, He indicates already a habitual Godward set of His will (Luk_2:49, Heb_10:7); and afterwards He speaks of His purpose, sometimes with quiet assurance (Joh_5:30; Joh_6:38; Joh_7:18), sometimes with a certain glow of satisfaction (Joh_4:34, Joh_17:4). Hindrances and sore temptations, in which the play of a natural and useful instinct may be traced, did not divert Him (Luk_9:51; Luk_22:42). Glad, complete conformity with the will of God, such as is an integrant of every right conception of heaven, is set forth as on earth the aim of every disciple (Mat_6:10), reached at once and maintained without defect, though not without effort (cf. Harnack, *What is Christianity?*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 129 f.), by Him alone who could say, 'I and the Father are one' (Joh_10:30).

(b) Instances of the exaltation of His soul in the calm sense of security because of the accord of His will with that of the Father, occur in the impression His fearlessness made at the cleansing of the Temple (Joh_2:16 f.)—in His endowment with 'honour and glory' at the Transfiguration (2Pe_1:17)—in the strengthening ministry of angels after the Temptation (Mat_4:11), and the Agony (Luk_22:43 (Revised Version margin)). The joy of Mat_11:25 and Luk_10:21 is another instance, as is also the outburst of triumphant relief at the retirement of Judas (Joh_13:31 f.). Nor should His perfect repose in the midst of peril (Mar_4:38 f.), and in the presence of angry or eager mobs (Luk_4:29 f., Joh_8:59; Joh_10:31 f., Joh_6:15), be overlooked. Partial and auxiliary explanations may be found in the exhaustion of fatigue or the mastery of His nerves; but the real cause was moral and not physical, and should be sought in the self-consciousness of Jesus, in the stable correlation of His will and God's. The two streams of volition, human and Divine, met and merged in Him; and thus He becomes for men at once an example of perfect devotion and a pledge of perfect grace.

(c) The exercises appropriate to devotion, which, however, so far from confining itself to them, enriches the entire nature and affects every relation of life, are praise and prayer (see sep. artt.), with the addition of meditation, and occasionally of fasting or some form of self-discipline. The prayer and praise are not exactly such as accompany public worship, but assume rather the character of communion or reverent conversation, the element of specific supplication being often, not always, absent. In the case of Christ the praise is illustrated in such passages as Luk_10:21 f., the practice of meditation and prayer in the lonely night-watches and the desert in Mar_6:46, Luk_5:16, whilst the supplication becomes more specific in Luk_6:12, in Gethsemane, and perhaps also on the Mount of Transfiguration. Of actual fasting by

Jesus as a definite process of devotion, there is no certain case in the Gospels; but there is no reason to suppose that He did not follow the usage of His country on the Day of Atonement. Fasting, too, is associated with the Temptation (Mat 4:2), of which one lesson is that a pure conscience and an ideal conformity with God can be attained or retained only by self-discipline and hard steadfastness under testing. And even in the Sermon on the Mount the practice is guarded from abuse, and implicitly commended in Mat 6:16 ff.; and the supposition is warranted that our Lord was prepared to exemplify in His own person whatever He recommended to His disciples. His life, as well as His teaching, shows that fasting in itself has no devotional or any other religious value, but is serviceable only when and in so far as it promotes the closeness of communion with God. See Fasting.

(d) The plenary presence of the Holy Spirit with Christ is an implication of the NT, which, however, is comparatively reticent as to the Spirit's influence in the interval from the Temptation to the eve of the Passion. The action of the Spirit at the Temptation is referred to by all the Synoptists (Mat 4:1, Mar 1:12, Luk 4:1), and His aid must be regarded as part of the explanation of Christ's sinlessness on this and all subsequent occasions. Not only were His miracles wrought in the power of the Spirit (Mat 12:28, Luk 4:14; Luk 4:18), but His oneness with the Spirit made His life uninterrupted devotion, and 'through the eternal Spirit' He 'offered himself without blemish unto God' (Heb 9:14). The rapture of His soul is attributed to the influence of the Spirit in Luk 10:21, though this particular is omitted in the corresponding narrative of Mat 11:25. And the devotion of Christ is an example for man, not only because it exhibits human triumph over temptation and human fellowship with God, but also because of the similarity of the means and aids. His complete unction is the promise and measure of the anointing available to every one.

2. In the case of *man*, devotion appears in the Gospels as an act or state of the entire personality, with all its powers harmoniously and intensely engaged. Prominence is given to the same elements as are traceable in the devotion of Christ Himself, whilst ample safeguards against error and fanaticism are provided. The great rule of Deu 6:5 is adopted by Christ, and applied in each of the Synoptics (Mat 22:37, Mar 12:30, Luk 10:27) with little variations of phrase that add to the uncompromising vigour. In the Sermon on the Mount the exclusiveness of devotion, as admitting no rival claim and absorbing supreme affection, is recognized in Mat 6:21; Mat 6:24; so in another connexion in Luk 16:13. And in the closing discourses Christ puts Himself forward as actually and solely central to the life of His disciples (Joh 14:6), the source of all their strength, the right object of their trust and love (Joh 15:9-11, Joh 16:22), with the recurring refrain, emphasized by its modifications, 'Abide in me' (Joh 15:4-5 et al.). Fruitfulness in the graces of personal character, and then secondarily in obedience and service, results from the deliberate regarding of Christ as 'all in all,' as so filling up the sphere of thought and desire as to control everything else therein.

The last clause in Joh_15:5 means by implication that possibilities to the disciple are proportionate to the closeness of his devout union with his Lord; and that union may, and should, reach a stage of completeness, in which the indwelling Christ becomes the unquestioned ruler of all within the heart, and the whole life in the flesh is lived 'in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God' (Gal_2:20). It is the crown of Christian devotion, not the joint sovereignty of Christ and the ego, but the loving and eager retirement of the ego that Christ may be substituted, appropriating its functions and reigning in its stead. Thus Christ Himself teaches in one of the most sacred parts of Scripture: 'I in them' (Joh_17:23; Joh_17:26) is the final and fullest blessing and privilege conceivable in that hour of vision for those whom He loved 'to the uttermost' (Joh_13:1 (Revised Version margin)).

(a) Specifically, as might be expected before Pentecost, the Gospels give more prominence to the action of the human will as a condition of discipleship than to its subsequent concentration as the condition of progress and perfecting. But the example of Christ Himself is, in this matter, a sufficient safeguard and sanction, and is enforced by teaching of at least two types. 'If any man willeth to do his will' (Joh_7:17), supplies the key not only to the knowledge of the things of the Kingdom, but also to the fulfilment in personal character of God's purpose of sanctification, Bengel's *suavis harmonia* being both a cause and the effect of insatiable yearning. Again, glad consent, with persistency of will, is an important element in our Lord's frequent exhortations to His disciples to 'abide' in Him or in His word (Joh_15:4; Joh_8:31 et al.). One of the characteristics of the Johannine setting of the Gospel, as of the prophecies of Jeremiah in the OT, is the emphasis laid on the sustained determination of the will towards God.

(b) The exaltation of spirit, accompanying and enriched by this firmness of purpose, receives more adequate expression in later times, but is far from being left entirely without illustration. Such passages as Joh_12:19; Joh_12:32 speak of a magnetic influence on the part of Christ, to which the response was at the beginning more than that of admiration, and soon deepened into supreme and rapturous attachment. The *Magnificat* (Luk_1:46-55) and the *Nunc Dimittis* (Luk_2:29-32) anticipate the exultation of men, partly at the accomplished work of Christ, partly at the abundance and the effect of His grace to the individual; and the self-forgetfulness of grateful and passionate devotion is illustrated in Luk_7:37-48. Mary's 'Rabboni' (Joh_20:16) and Thomas' 'My Lord' (Joh_20:28) express absorbed attachment as well as conviction. In the parables the joy is occasionally festal and general, but sometimes becomes that of personal and assured possession (Mat_13:44; Mat_13:46), or is even lifted up into likeness to the Saviour's own joy, incapable of dimness or of eclipse (Joh_15:11, Mat_25:21). The disciple in his Lord's bosom (Joh_13:23; Joh_13:25) is a type and guarantee.

(c) The loving acts and exercises in which the devout spirit beneficially expresses itself are of almost infinite variety in their character, and, though their most ingenious exhibition is met with subsequently, they are not left without trace or starting-point in the Gospels. Beyond the example of the Saviour, an encouragement to quiet meditation may be found in Mar_6:31, a commendation of private prayer in Mat_6:6. Self-discipline, as removing the occasions of sin and as aiding the communion of the human spirit with God, is enjoined in such passages as Mat_5:29-30, though in others the object becomes the avoidance of conduct that might offend or imperil the souls of the weak.

That self-discipline is in itself and apart from its motives meritorious, is nowhere taught by Christ, and such a notion is quite contrary to the genius of Christianity. Christ's treatment of fasting is an illustration. He evidently looked forward to its practice by His disciples not only in their association and in times of general calamity and mourning (Mat_9:14-15, Mar_2:18-20, Luk_5:34-35), but individually under the prompting of personal need and as a preparation for personal blessing. That an access of spiritual power might thereby be secured is a legitimate inference from Mat_17:21 and Mar_9:29, though textual evidence is against any specific reference to fasting in these verses, the corruption of which may well have been due to the incorporation of a devotional gloss. In Mat_6:16-18 it is assumed that disciples will fast; injunctions are given with a view to secure purity of intention, and the good effect is guaranteed in the 'recompense' of the Father. Hence private fasting as an observance is distinctly recognized by Christ. According to His rule, invariable except in the case of prayer (where, moreover, the prescription is that of a model rather than a form). He does not prescribe forms. He puts in its right place of control the object of pleasing the Father, who sees in secret, and knows the whole heart and way of a man. And with this implicit injunction of fasting, and protection against its misuse and perils, He leaves every disciple to determine for himself the best application of the principle in the interest of the well-being and enrichment of the soul.

(d) Before Pentecost the action of the Holy Spirit in human devotion is, for the most part, anticipatory and a matter of promise, but as such is none the less important. His presence is that which will prevent the disciples from becoming 'desolate' and without resource (Joh_14:18) on the departure of their Master; and, being present, He will act in them as the Father's Paraclete (Joh_14:16 et al.), advocating the cause of God and promoting all Godward impulse and desire. Specifically, He will guide 'into all the truth' (Joh_16:13), bringing the disciples into right relation, both intellectual and practical, with saving truth, and maintaining within them a condition of composure and serenity (Luk_1:79). The power to do 'greater works' is associated with the return of Christ to His Father (Joh_14:12), and therefore, by implication, with the mission of the Spirit; and if the complaint is sometimes just that those greater works are not being done, the cause is to be found not in the inadequacy of

opportunity or resource, but in the defectiveness of personal devotion. Its degree is commensurate with that of right volition on the part of the disciple, and with that of possession on the part of the Spirit; and these two, again, are mutually dependent. 'In the Spirit' by fixed and abiding purpose, is the law on the one side; the Spirit in the disciple is the correlated privilege, with the absolute harmony between Christ and the Spirit as the only limit of possible human experience, and as its inspiration and pledge.

Literature.—Dykes, *Manifesto of the King*, 333-437; Stalker, *Imago Christi*, ch. vii.

R. W. Moss.

☩ Didrachm

DIDRACHM.—See Money.

☩ Didymus

DIDYMUS.—The alternative name of the Apostle Thomas, given in three passages in the Fourth Gospel (Joh_11:15; Joh_20:24; Joh_21:2 Θωμᾶς ὁ λεγόμενος Δίδυμος).

The adj. δίδυμος is regular Greek from Homer onwards, with the meaning 'twofold'; hence δίδυμος as subs. = 'a twin.' Δίδυμος is the translation, as Θωμᾶς is the transliteration, of דָּאָם = תְּאֵמָה 'a twin.'

Why St. John calls special attention to this name is not clear. Westcott suggests that Thomas may have been familiarly known in Asia Minor among the Gentile Christians as *Didymus*. Joh_4:25 ('Messiah ... which is called Christ') shows that Thomas was not called *Didymus* as an additional name. See Thomas.

E. H. Titchmarsh.

☩ Dinner

DINNER (ἄριστον, Mat 22:4, Luk 11:38 [(Revised Version margin) ‘breakfast’] Luk 14:12).—In the East there is no meal properly corresponding to our breakfast. Even the guest is allowed to depart in the morning without ‘bite or sup.’ Eating and drinking early in the day are held to be marks of effeminacy and self-indulgence, and are regarded as bad for the system. Many, especially when on a journey, are content with one meal in the twenty-four hours, taken after sunset. In general, however, a light meal is eaten about the middle of the day, consisting of bread, olives, fruit, *leben* (sour curded milk), cheese, etc.; but the principal meal is in the evening. Eating at other times is quite casual and informal. It is probably correct to say that in NT ἄριστον and δεῖπνον correspond respectively to our luncheon and dinner. See, further, art. Meals.

W. Ewing.

Disciple

DISCIPLE

1. In the NT ‘disciple’ (sing. and plur.) occurs very frequently in the Gospels and Acts, but not elsewhere in NT. In every case it represents the Gr. μαθητής = (1) ‘learner,’ ‘pupil,’ in contrast to ‘teacher,’ as Mat 10:24; and (2) ‘adherent,’ one who is identified with a certain leader, or school, and adopts a corresponding line of conduct, as Mar 2:18 ‘Why do John’s disciples and the disciples of the Pharisees fast, but thy disciples fast not?’ cf. Joh 9:28 ‘Thou art his disciple; but we are disciples of Moses.’ Our Lord Himself points to and discourages a loose use of the term ‘disciple,’ according to which it meant no more than ‘hearer,’ when He says, ‘If ye abide in my word, then are ye truly my disciples’ (Joh 8:31; cf. His statement of the conditions of discipleship, Luk 14:26-27; Luk 14:33 and Joh 15:8). As used by the Evangelists, ‘disciples’ has sometimes a broader and sometimes a narrower significance. For the former, see Luk 6:13; Luk 6:17 ‘a great multitude of his disciples,’ Act 6:2 ‘And the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them,’ cf. Act 4:32. It is evident that to St. Luke τῶν πιστευσάντων and τῶν μαθητῶν were equivalent expressions. Hence, when we read in Act 19:1 f. of ‘certain disciples,’ who when they ‘believed’ heard nothing of the gift of the Holy Ghost and were baptized ‘into John’s baptism,’ we must understand thereby *Christian* disciples, though in an ‘immature stage of knowledge’ (see Knowling’s note on the passage, *Expos. Gr. Test.*). For ‘disciples’ in the narrower sense = the inner circle of the followers of Jesus, ‘the Twelve,’ see Mat 8:23; Mat 11:1; Mat 14:15; Mat 26:18, and frequently. Thus, as applied to the

followers of our Lord, ‘disciples’ is a term of varying content. It is of interest in passing to note the various appellations by which the disciples address the Saviour, expressing divers aspects of the relation which they held to subsist between themselves and Him. He was to them (1) Teacher (διδάσκαλος), Mar_4:38, Joh_13:13 f.; (2) Superintendent (ἐπιστάτης), only in Luk_5:5; Luk_8:45; Luk_9:33; Luk_9:49; (3) Lord (κύριος; from Luk_6:46 we should gather that this was the designation most usually adopted by the disciples); (4) My Teacher (ὄββι), Mat_26:25, Mar_9:5, Joh_4:31; Joh_11:8.

2. Restricting ourselves to the more limited sense in which ‘disciples’ is used of the followers of our Lord, we may note the *composition of the Twelve*. The Synoptics and Acts provide the following lists:—

| <u>Mat_10:2</u> ff. | <u>Mar_3:16</u> ff. | <u>Luk_6:14</u> ff. | <u>Act_1:13</u> . |
|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Simon. | Simon. | Simon. | Peter. |
| Andrew. | James. | Andrew. | John. |
| James. | John. | James. | James. |
| John. | Andrew. | John. | Andrew |
| Philip. | Philip. | Philip. | Philip. |
| Bartholomew. | Bartholomew. | Bartholomew. | Thomas. |
| Thomas. | Matthew. | Matthew. | Bartholomew. |
| Matthew. | Thomas. | Thomas. | Matthew. |
| James of Alphæus. | James of Alphæus. | James of Alphæus. | James of Alphæus. |
| Thaddæus (Lebhæus). | Thaddæus. | Simon the Zealot. | Simon the Zealot. |
| Simon the Cananæan. | Simon the Cananæan. | Judas of James. | Judas of James. |
| Judas Iscariot. | Judas Iscariot. | Judas Iscariot. | Judas of James. |

Comparing these lists, it is apparent that common to them all is the division of the Twelve into groups of four. The sequence of the groups is the same in each list. Within the groups the order of the names varies, save as regards the first name of each of the three groups, which in all the lists is the same—the first, fifth, and ninth places being occupied in all by Simon (Peter), Philip, and James of Alphaeus respectively. See, further, art. Apostles, p. 103^a f., and the separate articles on the above names. Act 1:13. Luk 6:14 ff.

3. *The calling of the Twelve.*—If this phrase be taken quite strictly, there is no difficulty in determining when and under what circumstances the call to which it refers was given. The Synoptic accounts are in virtual accord. They show that it was not at the outset of His ministry that our Lord increased the company of His immediate followers until it numbered *twelve*. That increase took place when the fame of His teaching and words, as He went through the towns and villages of Galilee, ‘preaching the gospel of the kingdom, healing all manner of disease and all manner of sickness’ (Mat 9:35), both attracted to Him the attention of the populace, and so excited the resentment of the scribes and Pharisees that they began to take counsel with the Herodians ‘how they might destroy him’ (Mar 3:6). The need for more labourers was evident, and not less evident to Jesus the signs that the time for training such labourers might be short. St. Matthew tells, immediately before he records the calling of the Twelve, that when Jesus ‘saw the multitudes he was moved with compassion for them, because they were distressed and scattered, as sheep not having a shepherd. Then saith he unto his disciples, The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few. Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he send forth labourers into his harvest’ (Mat 9:36 ff.). That summons to prayer becomes more urgent and pressing in the light of St. Luke’s record, that immediately prior to His choosing the Apostles our Lord ‘went out into the mountain to pray; and he continued all night in prayer to God. And when it was day, he called his disciples, and he chose from them twelve’ (Luk 6:12 ff.). The immediate purpose of the call is expressed by St. Mark thus: ‘And he appointed twelve that they might be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, and to have authority to cast out devils’ (Mar 3:14 f.) On the question whether some of the Twelve had not received a previous call, or perhaps more than one previous call, to be followers of Jesus, and if so, in what relation these earlier callings stand to the appointment of the Twelve, see art. Apostles.

4. *The training of the Twelve.*—When St. Mark tells us (Mar 3:14) that Jesus ‘appointed twelve that they might be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach,’ he discloses the characteristic and the all-important feature of the method of their training. They were to see the works of the Saviour and to hear His words,

and in addition to that they were to be constantly in contact with His personality: they were to be *with Him* (see above, p. 107).

That ‘course of instruction,’ as Keim calls it, which contact with Jesus secured to His disciples, was maintained with very slight interruption from the calling of the Twelve until the Betrayal. The chief intermission, of which we have any word, of the intercourse of Jesus with His chosen followers, was occasioned by that mission on which the Twelve were sent quite soon after their call (Mat 10:5). The interval occupied by the mission was probably not more than a few days—‘at least a week’ (Latham, *Pastor Pastorum*, p. 301). That mission was a testing of the Apostles themselves, not less than an act of service to those to whom they were sent; and the test was so endured that it needed not to be repeated. The Twelve went forth under the conditions which Jesus prescribed: they delivered the message He bade them, and they used freely the power to heal with which they were entrusted. No similar service separated them again from their Master,—unless, indeed, they had part in that mission of the Seventy of which St. Luke tells (10:1ff.). The time would yet come for them to deliver their testimony and to fulfil their ministry. Meanwhile the Saviour jealously guards for them the precious opportunities which remain for free intercourse with Himself. He leads them away from the crowds, taking them now to ‘a desert place’ (Mar 6:31), and again to the remote ‘parts of Caesarea Philippi’ (Mat 16:13). We gain the impression that as the brief spell of His own earthly ministry neared its term, our Lord concentrated Himself increasingly upon the inner band of His followers. Ewald is true to the indication of the Gospel narratives when he says that ‘the community of His friends’ was to our Lord ‘during the last year and a half the main object of His earthly labours’ (*III*, vol. vi. 417).

Should it be asked more particularly what was the *instruction* of which the Twelve were the recipients, a full answer would require a recapitulation of all the teaching of Jesus. This much may be said here, that the Twelve shared the instruction given to ‘the multitude,’ with the added advantage of the explanations which they sought, and which our Lord freely accorded them, ‘when he was alone,’ ‘privately.’ See Mar 4:34, on which Swete (*Gospel according to St. Mark*, p. 84) comments:

‘Exposition now regularly followed (*ἐπέλυεν πάντα*) the public teaching.’ Furthermore, the Gospels contain records of discourses addressed only to the inner circle of the disciples. Among such discourses should be reckoned in all probability part at least of the group of addresses known as the ‘Sermon on the Mount’—notably the part contained in Matthew 5, which bears all the marks of a discourse to more immediate followers. Not, however, that the more immediate followers are in this particular connexion to be restricted to the Twelve, since the discourse in Matthew 5 must—in spite of the position St. Luke gives to his version of it (Luk 6:12 ff.)—be placed earlier than the calling of the Twelve; it ‘has throughout the character of an early and

opening discourse.’ None the less it is to be accounted among our Lord’s less public utterances: it is ‘Jesus’ address of welcome to His band of disciples’ (Keim, *op. cit.* 286-290). Again, in Mat_10:5-42 we have what appears at first sight to be a sustained address to the Twelve in reference to their mission. But on a comparison with Mar_6:8-11 and Luk_9:2-5 it seems likely that only Luk_9:5-14 were spoken with direct reference to the mission, and that Luk_9:15-42 are grouped with them, though coming from a later time, because they contained sayings of Jesus in reference to a kindred topic—the future missionary labours of the Apostles. Yet further must be added to the discourses delivered to the Twelve alone, the apocalyptic discourse Matthew 24 (cf. Mark 13 and Luke 21), with its parabolic sequel in ch. 25; and the discourse in the upper room on the night of the Betrayal (John 14-16). And when we endeavour to tabulate the instruction imparted more privately to the Twelve, we may not omit the *signs*, each so full of teaching for them, of which they alone—and in one case but three of their number—were the spectators. The Walking on the Sea, the Transfiguration, the Cursing of the Barren Fig-tree, the Feet-washing in the Upper Room, the Miraculous Draught of Fishes (Joh_21:4 ff.),—these all surely formed part of the lessons most indelibly impressed on the Twelve.

Our Lord Himself has characterized for us the purpose and the content of the teaching He imparted to His followers. It was that to them might be given ‘the mystery of the kingdom of God’ (Mar_4:11). ‘As given to the Apostles it was still a secret, not yet to be divulged, nor even except in a small degree intelligible to themselves’ (Swete, *op. cit.* p. 72). The Kingdom, the characteristics of its subjects, its laws, its service, and, finally, its Lord reigning through suffering—such in broad outline was the course of the instruction imparted by Jesus to the Twelve. It moved onward from the simpler to the more profound. ‘At first, sayings are given them to remember; latterly, they receive mysteries on which to meditate. In the Sermon on the Mount men are told plainly what it is desirable for them to know; afterwards, the teaching passes through parables and hard sayings up to the mysteries conveyed by the Last Supper’ (Latham, *op. cit.* 120). But no teaching, not even the teaching of Jesus Himself, could overcome the reluctance to believe that it behoved that the Christ should suffer, or arouse anticipations of the glories that should follow. The crucifixion and death of our Lord found the Eleven unprepared, and ready to despair, though they still held together in the bonds of a love they had acquired in the school of Jesus. It needed the actual fact of the Resurrection, and converse with the risen Saviour, and the illumination of the Spirit, to bring them to a true understanding of all that reiterated teaching concerning His death and His rising from the dead which Jesus had given ‘while He was yet with them.’ But once that understanding was attained by the disciples, the truth against which their minds had been stubbornly closed became central in their proclamation. There is abundant evidence that the Apostles were slow learners—men with no special quickness of insight, and with the hindrance of strongly developed prejudice. It is also evident that their slowness and prejudice have for us

an apologetic value (see esp. Bruce, *Training of the Twelve*, p. 482: 'They were stupid, slow-minded persons; very honest, but very unapt to take in new ideas... Let us be thankful for the honest stupidity of these men, it gives great value to their testimony. We know that nothing but facts could make such men believe that which nowadays they get credit for inventing'). It concerns us yet more to recall the evidence which their training affords of the patience and transforming power of Him who now, not less truly than in the days of His flesh, calls weak men to Himself that they may be with Him, and that He may send them forth to bear witness on His behalf, enduing them with His Spirit, that their testimony, like that of the Apostles, may not be in vain. See also art. Apostles.

Literature.—Bruce, *The Training of the Twelve*; Latham, *Pastor Pastorum*; Neander, *Life of Christ*; Ewald, *History of Israel*, English translation vol. vi.; Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, English translation vol. iii.; Weiss, *The Life of Christ*; Sanday, *Outlines of the Life of Christ* [art. 'Jesus Christ' in Hastings *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.]]; Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*; Greenhough, *The Apostles of Our Lord*.

George P. Gould.

Discipleship

DISCIPLESHIP.—In the Gospels no word expressive of 'discipleship' occurs, although they are full of the living reality which it expresses. This is not surprising, for it is never God's way to teach abstract truth, but truth embodied in actual life. From the concrete and the living facts it is left to us, by the exercise of our natural faculties, to abstract the generalization or induction which presents the idea in its purity. Christ always followed the Divine method; and, accordingly, while He made disciples, and trained them in discipleship, He hardly made any attempt to define or describe what this involves; nor did He give much instruction which represented with any directness the ideal that He had in view. From these negative facts themselves the primary truth on this subject may be learnt: Discipleship, in the Christian sense, is essentially a matter for living realization rather than for psychological analysis or formal compliance.

If for His followers later the making of disciples began with preaching the gospel, for the Lord Himself it commonly began with the authoritative appeal, 'Follow me.' There were, of course, times when this summons called a man literally to arise and go with Jesus to some new place and duty; as when the first among the Twelve 'left the nets and followed him' ([Mar_1:18](#); [Mar_1:20](#)). But the same summons was still

employed by the Lord after His resurrection, when it could have no such literal signification (Joh 21:19). And there is a group of instances (Mat 10:38; Mat 16:24, Joh 12:26) in which 'bearing the cross' and 'disowning oneself' are conjoined with the call to follow Him, where it is clear that 'following' has wholly a spiritual sense. The fact that we speak of 'following an example' too often leads to the misinterpretation of this pregnant call to discipleship which was so characteristic of the Lord Jesus. It is no injunction to copy Him, though, of course, the imitation of Christ must enter into the aim of every disciple. That, however, belongs to a rather later stage of discipleship, while the summons to 'follow' is its initiation. The choice of this word rests upon the ancient metaphor of a 'way of life' which Christ adopted for Himself when He affirmed 'I am the Way,' and which underlay and coloured not a little of His language. So the call, 'Follow me,' is an appeal to trust His guidance, and venture oneself along the track that He explores into the unknown regions of life, with the need of 'bearing the cross' and 'losing life to find it.' 'Come on! Fear not to go through the valley of the shadow of death with me in the quest of life. "He that is near me is near the fire; he that is far from me is far from the kingdom." ' Thus at the threshold of discipleship lies the requirement which He always made of those to whom He rendered service,—the requirement of courageous trust or 'faith.' And for such as are ready to obey this first appeal to 'follow' He opens 'a new and living way through the veil' which hides so much of the realms of life from our eyes. And this way is 'human to the red-ripe of the heart,' and fit for human feet to travel, for the way is 'His flesh,' His mortal life, His human nature—what for us men and for our salvation He came down to make His own.

There are some few sayings in which the Lord delineates the features of discipleship under one or another of its aspects. *E.g.* 'A disciple is not above his master ... it is enough for the disciple that he be as his master.... If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more them of his household?' (Mat 10:24 f.). And in close connexion with this stands the reiterated teaching, 'Whosoever he be of you that renounceth not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple' (Luk 14:25-33). Elsewhere He emphasizes not the outward lot, but the inner character of discipleship: *e.g.* 'Come unto me all ye that labour.... Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am gentle and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls' (Mat 11:28 f.). The same gentleness and lowliness which are ever ready to render loving service are again taught as characteristics of discipleship in the action of washing the disciples' feet on the last evening, when, having sat down again, He said, 'Perceive ye what I have done to you? Ye call me Teacher and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, the Lord and the Teacher, washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I gave you an example that ye also should do as I have done to you' (Joh 13:12 ff., cf. also Luk 22:24-26, Mar 9:33-37, Mat 23:10-12). What the disciple must learn is not mainly 'teaching'; he must 'learn Christ.' 'Truth is in Jesus,'—'the Truth and the Life,'—and the disciple must glow 'in the knowledge and love of God

and of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord.’ So love is what must be learnt above all else, and affords the test of true discipleship. ‘By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another’ (Joh_13:35). And the Lord traces discipleship down to its roots when He declares, ‘No man can come to me except the Father which sent me draw him.... It is written ... They shall all be taught of God. Every one that hath heard from the Father, and hath learned, cometh unto me’ (Joh_6:44 f.).

A large proportion of the Lord’s teaching bears, of course, upon the nature of discipleship and the character of the disciple, even when it is not cast in the form of dealing with this directly. *E.g.* the Beatitudes (Mat_5:3 ff.) are, under one aspect, all so many facets of discipleship; metaphors like ‘the salt of the earth,’ the ‘light of the world’ (Mat_5:13-14), ‘a little flock’ (Luk_12:32), ‘the branches of the vine’ (Joh_15:5), ‘every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted’ (Mat_15:13), and many another, including those developed into parables,—all sketch some features of discipleship, as do such sayings as that one must be reborn, and much of the teaching concerning the Kingdom.

The final charge which the Lord laid upon the disciples whom He had trained and tested Himself was, ‘Going forth, make’ ye disciples of all the nations’ (μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, Mat_28:19). Discipleship for all is thus set forth as His own ultimate aim. In reading the words one must carefully guard against the lamentable imperfection of rendering in the Authorized Version, and borrowed thence in some of the language of the Book of Common Prayer; also against the faulty punctuation of the sentence which is found alike in the Authorized Version and the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885. ‘Teaching’ is no translation of μαθητεύσατε, which means far more; while a colon ought to replace the comma after ‘nations,’ and only commas, or at the most semicolons, should separate the succeeding clauses. Without attention to this, the great importance of this passage must be missed. Rightly read, it gives the Lord’s own interpretation of how discipleship is constituted. The whole commission is, ‘Make disciples of all’; and three steps are then indicated in so doing, which answer to three essential factors in discipleship—(1) Baptizing into the Name; (2) teaching to observe all commands; (3) the constant spiritual presence of Christ. There is no complete discipleship without these three elements. The first is the portal of discipleship, the admission to a new destiny; at once the begetting of a new life on the part of God, and the profession of a new hope and purpose on the part of those whom He claims as His children. The second is the training needed to make the promise good; for only in the course of life’s discipline can character be formed or resolutions realized,—it is ‘in our endurance that we must win our souls.’ The third is the pledge that none shall ever be left to face the stress of life’s probation alone, but that for every disciple union with Christ is a support which may be securely trusted,

the Divine Incarnation working itself out for ever till the goal shall be reached, when 'God shall be all, in all' (1Co 15:28). The first disciples understood the charge which had been given them, and acted on the lines laid down from the earliest day on which they began to 'make disciples' for their Lord. So when, on the day of Pentecost, those who had been touched by Peter's preaching put the inquiry, 'Brethren, what shall we do?' the answer of the Apostle was explicit: 'Repent ye ... be baptized ... ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit' (Act 2:37-38). Here are the same three elements of discipleship; for 'repentance, (μετάνοια) is the form which 'observing all things commanded' necessarily takes to start with in those who are passing from walking in their own ways to following the way of Christ; while the Holy Spirit is, of course, the Spirit of Christ present permanently with those whom He unites to Himself. See also preceding article.

Literature.—Seeley, *Ecce Homo*, ch. vii.; Latham, *Pastor Pastorum; Expositor*, iv. iv., [1890] 286 ff.

E. P. Boys-Smith.

⚠️ Discipline

DISCIPLINE.—The Gospels reveal a twofold discipline—that which Christ Himself experienced, and that to which He subjects His servants. It will be convenient to treat these separately.

1. *The discipline to which Christ submitted.*—The NT teaches clearly that even our Lord required to be 'perfected' (τελειωθῆναι) in order to ensure the consummation of the work for which He had become incarnate. Such a τελείωσις consisted in His being brought 'to the full moral perfection of His humanity, which carries with it the complete ness of power and dignity' (Westcott); and its necessity is recognized, not by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews alone (Heb 2:10; Heb 7:28 etc.), but also by Christ Himself (Luk 13:32).

It is taught with equal clearness that our Lord attained His 'perfection' through the discipline which He voluntarily endured. This included several elements. (1) Among the most important was the discipline of *temptation* (Mar 1:12-13 ||, Heb 2:15); and in this connexion it is important to remember that His testing was not only searching in its strength, but repeated in its assaults (note plur. Luk 22:28, and cf. Mar 14:32 ff. || Heb 4:15). (2) A second element in His discipline was that of *delay*. The incarnate Son, with His love eager for the completion of His saving work, must have

exercised no ordinary self-restraint, as, amid the opposition of foes and the misconception of friends, the stages of its progress passed slowly by (Luk 12:50; cf. the probable force of the temptation in Mat 4:8-9 and of ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι in Joh 11:33; cf. also 2Th 3:5). (3) The discipline of *sorrow* was also included in this ‘perfecting’ of Christ. His experience of sorrow was limited to no single kind. He felt the force of all the ills that vex our human life. In a most suggestive citation one sacred writer shows in how real and literal a sense He took our human sicknesses upon Him (Mat 8:16-17, cf. Mar 5:30). He knew no less the pang of regret with which a pure man views opportunities wasted by those for whom he has cherished high ideals (Luk 19:41-44,—note ἐκλαυσεν). His, too, were the tears shed over a family bereaved and a ‘loved one lost’ (Joh 11:35). (4) The last aspect of Christ’s discipline of which mention must be made was that of *pain and suffering*. Of this there is no occasion for offering detailed illustration. The story of His sufferings is the story of His life (for a few examples see Mar 8:31 || Mar 14:32 ff. || Mar 15:16-39 ||, Heb 5:8; note the use of παιδεύω in Luk 23:16; Luk 23:22).

The experience of this discipline, revealing itself under different aspects and affecting His human nature at different points, was necessary to the fulfilment of our Lord’s mission. It was in virtue of His ‘perfection’ through suffering that He reached His absolute sympathy with humanity, and in consequence His complete qualification to be its Saviour (Heb 2:18; Heb 4:15-16; Heb 5:2). See Perfection.

2. The discipline which Christ imposes upon His followers.—Discipline is an essential part of the Christian life, and the NT points out several forms under which it is to be experienced. In some of these it is restricted to a certain number of those who call themselves by the name of Christ. (1) There is, for example, a discipline to which Christians are rendered liable by *falling into error* (1Co 11:29 ff., esp. note παιδεύομεθα in 1Co 11:32; see also παιδεύω in Rev 3:19). (2) The discipline of *persecution* also does not of necessity come to all Christians. At the same time, as both record and exhortation prove, it is no uncommon experience. It certainly befell our Lord’s early followers (Mar 13:9, Mat 10:22-23, Joh 15:21; Joh 16:33; cf. the Epp. *passim*, and see esp. Heb 12:4-13, where παιδεία is cited in this reference), and He Himself attributed a special blessedness to those who found a place in its honoured succession (Mat 5:10-12). (3) In a third aspect, however, discipline falls to the lot of every Christian. No man can be a true follower of Christ who is not willing from the first to practise the discipline of *self-renunciation*. Such self-renunciation, indeed, is one of the conditions of entering His service (Mar 8:34 ff., Mat 10:38). And there is to be no limit to the sacrifice required. It must be endured even to the severance of earth’s closest ties (Mat 10:37) and the loss of life itself (Mat 24:9, Joh 16:2). Few things are

more impressive than the manner in which, from the very beginning of His ministry (cf. Mar 1:17-18), our Lord assumed His right to claim from His followers that utter self-repudiation, and confidently expected on their part a willing response to His demand (Mat 9:9; Mat 19:21).

One particular aspect of this Christian self-denial calls for separate consideration. The Gospel teaching affords little support to those who have sought to express self-renunciation in the form of morbid asceticism. Christ's own example, in suggestive contrast with that of His forerunner, leads us to the very opposite conception of religious discipline (Mat 11:18 f.). Along the pathway of poverty (Mat 8:20) and persecution (Joh 7:19; Joh 8:37) to which He called His disciples, He Himself walked; yet alike in His own life and in His thought for them (Mat 9:14, cf. 1Ti 5:23) ascetic discipline received no prominence. There appears to be just a hint of it in one of His sayings (Mat 19:12, cf. 1Co 7:32 ff.), but even there it is distinctly stated less as a rule for the many than as an ideal for some few to whom a special call might come. In Christ's view the 'fasting' consequent upon real sorrow was so inevitable, that any merely formal anticipation of it was to be deprecated rather than approved (Mat 9:15). See, further, art. Asceticism.

For ecclesiastical 'discipline' see art. Church.

H. Bisseker.

☒ Discourse

DISCOURSE.—No attempt is here made to discuss in all its bearings the general theme of the discourses of Jesus. His Teaching, Parables, Sermon on the Mount, etc., receive attention in special articles. All that is here undertaken is to mention in some sort of classification all the discourses, and to append a brief outline of their principal characteristics.

i. Classification and Mention.—The difficulties of any attempt at classifying the discourses of our Lord are apparent at a glance. They arise alike from the forms in which the discourses are recorded and from their character and contents. Considering the fact that our Lord did not write anything, or even cause His discourses to be exactly reported; considering, too, the great variety of occasions which called forth His utterances, and His own easy freedom and mastery of method in dealing with these occasions; considering, further, the differences in length, form, contents, and yet the cross-similarities and repetitions which the discourses exhibit, we see at once that a scientific and satisfactory classification is impossible. Yet there are obvious

advantages for study in mentioning the discourses in some sort of orderly way. For our purpose it will not be necessary to take account of critical questions concerning the differences between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics, or between the Synoptics themselves, or to pay attention to matters of harmony and chronology, though under each grouping the commonly accepted order of events is followed. The classification proposed runs upon the general principle of audiences, and groups the discourses according as they were delivered to (1) individuals, (2) a select few, or (3) the public. Subdivisions will be apparent under these general heads.

1. *Interviews with individuals.*—Leaving out colloquies with particular persons in presence of others, there are to be mentioned under this head only (1) the discourse with Nicodemus on Regeneration (Joh 3:1-21), and (2) the discourse with the woman of Samaria on Worship and Salvation (Joh 4:5-26).

2. *Talks with a few.*—These may be subdivided as follows: (1) Discourses with others than the disciples. At these we cannot be sure of the absence of disciples, but their presence is not stated or certainly implied, and the words were not specially addressed to them. To this class belong: the discourse on Forgiveness, with the parable of the Two Debtors, given at the house of Simon the Pharisee (Luk 7:36-50); the beginning of the discourse on Tradition (eating with unwashed hands), though later ‘he called the multitudes,’ ‘and the disciples came unto him’ (Mat 15:1-20, Mar 7:1-20); the Denunciation of the Pharisees and Lawyers at the house of a chief Pharisee (Luk 11:37-54); the discourse at another Pharisee’s house, where He discussed Modesty, Giving Feasts, and spoke the parable of the Great Feast and Excuses (Luk 14:1-24); finally, the discourse at the house of Zacchaeus, with the parable of the Pounds (Luk 19:1-27).

(2) Discourses with the disciples and others. Here the audience consisted in part of the disciples and in part of others, the presence of both classes being either distinctly stated or clearly implied. As to the numbers present, the circumstances seem to restrict them somewhat, though it is difficult to say just to what extent, and therefore how far these should be regarded as properly public discourses. To this class belong: the discourse on Fasting (Mat 9:14-17, Mar 2:18-22, Luk 5:33-39); the response to objectors on Sabbath Observance (Mat 12:1-8, Mar 2:23-28, Luk 6:1-5); responses about Following Him (Mat 8:19-22, Luk 9:57-62); response to the lawyer about Eternal Life, and parable of the Good Samaritan (Luk 10:25-37, cf. Luk 10:23); on Divorce (Mat 19:3-12, Mar 10:2-12); response to the Rich Young Ruler, with discourse on the Perils of Wealth and on Forsaking All and Following Him (Mat 19:6-30, Mar 10:17-31, Luk 18:18-30); the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard (Mat 20:1-18); response to the request of certain Greeks, with remarks on His Death and Glory (Joh 12:30-36). Other discourses of the last Passover week seem

to have been given in presence of the crowd, though directly addressed to smaller groups.

(3) Discourses with the disciples alone. These contain some of the most notable of our Lord's utterances. In some cases others than the Twelve were present, but usually the audience was all, or a portion of, the Apostles. It will not be necessary to observe this distinction in the enumeration. This group of discourses may be subdivided into two kinds. (a) Short occasional discourses: the explanation of the Parable of the Tares, with the short parables that follow (Mat 13:36-52); the caution against Pharisaic Leaven (Mat 16:4-12, Mar 8:13-21); remarks about His Church upon Peter's confession (Mat 16:13-20, Mar 8:27-30, Luk 9:18-21); the immediately following discourse on His Death and on Self-Denial (Mat 16:21-28, Mar 8:31 to Mar 9:1, Luk 9:22-27); talk after the Transfiguration (Mat 17:9-13, Mar 9:9-13); a second foretelling of His Death and Resurrection (Mat 17:22-23, Mar 9:30-32, Luk 9:43-45); discourses at the Mission and Return of the Seventy (Luk 10:1-24); teaching as to Prayer, with parable of the Friend at Midnight (Luk 11:1-13); parable of the Unjust Steward (Luk 16:1-13); teaching as to Offences, Faith, Service (Luk 17:1-10); third prediction of His Death and Resurrection (Mat 20:17-19, Mar 10:32-34, Luk 18:31-34); talk about Faith suggested by the Withered Fig-tree (Mat 21:20-22, Mar 11:20-26); talk following the Washing of the Disciples' Feet (Joh 13:12-20); institution of the Lord's Supper (Mat 26:26-29, Mar 14:22-25, Luk 22:19-20); after the resurrection, talk with the Two Disciples on the way to Emmaus (Luk 24:17-27); with the Apostles, Thomas absent (Luk 24:36-49, Joh 20:19-25); talk with some of the Apostles at the Sea of Galilee (Joh 21:4-23); the Great Commission (Mat 28:16-19).—(b) Extended discourses. Probably some of those mentioned in the preceding group were longer in reality than in report. But of the longer discourses with the chosen few we have the following: the Mission and Instruction of the Twelve (Mat 10:1-42, Mar 6:7-13, Luk 9:1-6); on Humility, Offences, Forgiveness (Mat 18:1-35, Mar 9:33-50, Luk 9:46-50); discourse on the Mount of Olives on His Second Coming and the Final Judgment (Matthew 24, 25, Mark 13, Luk 21:7-36); the Farewell Discourse and Prayer (John 14-17).

3. Public addresses.—Of these we may again in a general way distinguish three groups, according to the extent either of the actual discourse or of the form in which we have it. (1) Discourses mentioned with some general description or remark, but with little or no detail of contents. Here we have: the beginning of His ministry (Mat 4:17, Mar 1:14-15, Luk 4:14-15); the sermon at Nazareth (Luk 4:16-28); the first preaching tour in Galilee (Mat 4:23-24, Mar 1:39, Luk 4:44); at Capernaum (Mar 2:1-2; Mar 2:13); the second preaching tour in Galilee (Luk 8:1-3); at Nazareth again (Mat 13:54-58, Mar 6:1-6); the third preaching tour in Galilee (Mat 9:35-38, Mar 6:6); a tour alone after sending out the Twelve (Mat 11:1); teaching and

journeying (Luk 13:10; Luk 13:22, cf. Mat 19:1, Mar 10:1); teaching in the Temple (Mar 11:17 f., Luk 19:47-48; Luk 21:37-38).

(2) Short occasional discourses. Of these there are a great number and variety, spoken sometimes to great multitudes, sometimes to groups, but publicly: on Blasphemy (Mat 12:22-37, Mar 3:19-30); on Signs (Mat 12:38-45); latter part of discourse on Eating with Unwashed Hands, and Traditions (Mat 15:1-20, Mar 7:1-23); on Signs again (Mat 16:1-4, Mar 8:11-12); on Demons and Signs again (Luk 11:14-36); on Confession, Worldliness, Watchfulness (Luke 12); on Repentance, with parable of the Barren Fig-tree (Luk 13:1-9); on the Good Shepherd (Joh 10:1-18); on His Messiahship and Relations with the Father (Joh 10:22-38); Sabbath Healing, parables of Mustard Seed and Leaven (Luk 13:10-21); on the Salvation of the Elect (Luk 13:23-30); Lament over Jerusalem (Luk 13:34-35); on Counting the Cost of Following Him (Luk 14:25-35); reproof of the Pharisees, with parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Luk 16:14-31); on the Coming of the Kingdom (Luk 17:20-37); on Prayer, with parables of the Importunate Widow, and of the Pharisee and Publican (Luk 18:1-14); the colloquies with His critics in the Temple, on His Authority, on the Tribute to Caesar, on the Resurrection, on the Great Commandment, on the Son of David (Mat 21:23 to Mat 22:46, Mar 11:27 to Mar 12:37, Luke 20); remarks on Belief and Unbelief (Joh 12:44-50).

(3) Extended discourses. Only a few of the great discourses of our Lord are reported *in extenso*: the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5-7, Luk 6:17-49)—in a sense public, though addressed primarily to the disciples; discourse at the feast in Jerusalem on His Relations with the Father (Joh 5:19-47); on John the Baptist and suggested topics (Mat 11:7-30, Luk 7:24-35); the first great group of parables, the Sower, etc. (Mat 13:1-53, Mar 4:1-34, Luk 8:4-16); discourse in the synagogue at Capernaum on the Bread of Life (Joh 6:22-65); colloquy in the Temple on His Mission (John 7, 8); second great group of parables, the Lost Sheep, etc. (Luk 15:1 to Luk 17:10); last public discourse, Denunciation of the Pharisees (Mat 23:1-39, Mar 12:38-40, Luk 20:45-47).

ii. Some Characteristics.—A survey of the discourses of Jesus presents in a general way some of their characteristics, which may be summarily outlined as follows:

1. Their great variety. (1) Of occasion. (2) Of contents. (3) Of form.

2. Their wonderful charm. (1) Of personality—even in the report: how much more in His presence! (2) Of sympathy. (3) Of manner.

3. Their authority. (1) Consciousness of God. (2) Self-assertion.

4. Their power. (1) 'Magnetism'—personality, demeanour, tone. (2) Thought—then and evermore.

Literature.—Broadus, *Harmony of the Gospels*, and *Lectures on Jesus of Nazareth*; Clark, *Harmony of the Gospels*; Weiss, *Life of Christ*; Stier, *The Words of Jesus*; Wendt, *The Teaching of Jesus*; Swete, *Studies in the Teaching of our Lord*; Brown, *Exposition of the Discourses and Sayings of our Lord*; Bruce, *The Training of the Twelve, The Galilean Gospel, With Open Face*; Nicoll, *Life of Christ*; Stalker. *I mago Christi*.

E. C. Dargan.

Disease

DISEASE

- i. Current preconceptions prevalent in time of Christ.
- ii. References to sickness and disease in the Gospels.
 1. Diseases resulting in physical defect or incapacity.
 2. Fever and allied diseases.
 3. Cutaneous affections.
 4. Dropsy.
 5. Nervous diseases.
 6. Nervous and psychical disorders.

Literature.

i. Current preconceptions in time of Christ.—Two ideas respecting disease had a powerful influence on conceptions current in our Lord's day: (1) The belief that all sickness and physical disease and pain were penalties imposed as the result of sin; (2) the idea that demonic agency was concerned with all human suffering. These kindred and allied ideas have been common among ancient peoples, and were strongly developed among the Babylonians, Persians, and Greeks.

Sayce, in his *Hibbert Lectures* (310, 334-5), gives evidence of the ancient Akkadian belief that disease and sickness were caused by specific malevolent spirits which possessed the person. The demons had been eaten with the food, drunk with the water, or inbreathed from the air; and until the evil power had been expelled the victim had no chance of recovery. Exorcism was effected by the sorcerer-priest, the intermediary between mankind and the spiritual world, using magic spells consisting of the names of deities, the name signifying the personality of the god, who was compelled by this use of the name to attend to the exorcist.

Among the Semites any mysterious natural object or occurrence appealing strongly to the imagination or exciting sentiments of awe and reverence was readily taken as a manifestation either of Divine or of demonic life (W. R. Smith, *RS* [Note: *S Religion of the Semites.*] 119 ff.). The demons, if offended, avenged themselves by sending various forms of disease. Indications are found in the Gospels that such ideas were not extinct in the time of Christ. The old Semitic strain of conception was modified and quickened by contact with Babylonian, Persian, and Grecian peoples, and prevailed with considerable force in the later Judaism. The NT reflects the ideas of a time when the older conceptions were breaking up, but had not yet disappeared.

Our Lord gives no sanction to any such thought of disease, and when the disciples betrayed their mode of thought (Joh_9:2) He took occasion to combat the ancient superstition. Although He did frequently mark sin as the cause of much physical weakness and disease (see art. Impotence), yet He denies that all sickness was penal in character. Other ends were in the Divine purview besides the punishment of personal sin (Joh_9:3). In St. Luke's Gospel high fever seems to be attributed by implication to an evil agency, and Jesus is said to have rebuked (*ἐπετίμησεν*) the fever (Luk_4:38-39); but probably this must be explained as a reflexion of the current preconceptions. In Luk_13:16 no reference is necessarily made to sin having given power to Satan to afflict the woman. Demons were associated with disordered conditions of human life, as disease and infirmity: with dumbness (Mar_9:17, Luk_9:39), with deafness and dumbness (Mar_9:25), with blindness and dumbness (Mat_12:22), and with epilepsy (Mar_1:26; Mar_9:20, Luk_9:39). These physical defects are not necessarily manifestations of demonic influence, but are regarded as in close alliance with them. In St. Luke's Gospel, also, it is noteworthy that a distinction is recorded as made by Jesus between the exorcism of demons and ordinary cures (*ἐκβάλλω δαιμόνια καὶ ἰάσεις ἀποτελῶ*, Luk_13:32).* [Note: Hobart (Medical Language of St. Luke) and other writers claim to trace in the writings of the Third Evangelist the influence of a medical training. But the argument may be easily pressed beyond the truth. St. Luke's style and vocabulary have many affinities with classical Greek, and many of the medical expressions he uses occur in the LXX, and

may have come to the Evangelist from that source. The varied terms applied to the lunatic (or epileptic) and the demonized, which give a plausibility to the suggestion that the Evangelist distinguished between these ailments, are found not in Luke, but in Matthew (see art. Lunatic).] See, further, art. Demon.

ii. References in the Gospels to sickness and disease.

The terms employed by the Evangelists to denote bodily ailments are—

(1) ἀσθένεια, literally *want of strength* (α priv. and σθένος), primarily denoting weakness, and usually ‘infirmity’ or ‘infirmities’; in Act 28:9 translation ‘diseases’ (ἔχοντες ἀσθενείας); in Mat 8:17 translation ‘infirmities,’ and associated with νόσος; in Joh 11:4 Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘sickness’; elsewhere [Luk 5:15; Luk 8:2; Luk 13:11-12, Joh 5:5] ‘infirmity’; associated with νόσος in Luk 4:40.

(2) μαλακία (μαλάσσω, ‘soften’) denotes:

(a) softness or effeminacy, as well as sickness; (b) periodic and chronic sickness and consequent languor of body. The word is used in Mat 4:23-24; Mat 9:35; Mat 10:1, where it is associated with νόσος. The first named passage is one in which the various ailments that our Lord healed are enumerated and apparently discriminated (cf. Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885).

(3) νόσος (from νη- ‘not,’ and σός ‘sound’ [?]) is employed to indicate more acute and violent seizures than μαλακία; found in Mat 4:23-24; Mat 8:17; Mat 9:35; Mat 10:1, Mar 1:3-4; Mar 3:15, Luk 4:40; Luk 6:17; Luk 7:21; Luk 9:1. In the Markan and Lukan (exc. Luk 4:40) passages the diseased are distinguished from the demonized.

(4) νόσημα, a disease or sickness, Joh 5:4 (only).

(5) τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας is a frequent expression for those that were sick, and in Mar 1:34 we have the fuller expression πολλοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας σοικίλαις νόσοις.

Of the presence of specific diseases much fuller indications are more or less distinctly given in the OT than in the NT. Instances of these may be understood as included in the miscellaneous cases of sickness and disease which our Lord repeatedly dealt with. Among them are various forms of skin disease, which were and are very common in the East; also of fever and allied disorders, extending to plague and pestilence; diseases of the digestive organs; infantile and senile diseases; affections of the brain or other parts of the nervous system; and disordered conditions of the psychical side of human nature. All of these are referred to in the OT with some amount of definiteness as to symptoms.

The diseases mentioned in the Gospels, and dealt with in direct and Divine fashion by Jesus (see art. Cures), include cases of physical defect; fevers and kindred diseases; skin diseases, notably that of leprosy; a solitary case of dropsy; ailments and infirmities that were nervous in character; and others which were a combination of nervous and psychical disorder. These various afflictions are not always to be certainly identified with particular forms of disease with which modern medical science is familiar. The description of the cases is, for the most part, far removed from being scientific, but yet enables us to broadly distinguish them from one another and to classify them with fair exactitude.

1. Diseases resulting in physical defect, or incapacity

(1) *Defect in the organs of speech.*—The case of the dumb man recorded in Mat 9:32-33 was associated with features of mental disturbance leading the people to attribute the dumbness to demonic possession. ‘When the demon was cast out, the dumb spake,’ as though no physical defect existed apart from the psychical disturbance. Interesting cases are known in which mental derangement has been manifested in an inhibition of one of the senses. Ray (*Factors of an Unsound Mind*) gives an instance in which the patient was unable to see the Column in the Place Vendôme in Paris, and believed it to have been removed. A similar inhibition, resulting from psychical rather than physical causes, might be applied to the organs of speech.

(2) *Defect in the organs of sense.*—Among defects notably common in the East is that of blindness (see art. Sight, B). Deafness is usually accompanied by dumbness, being indeed often the main cause of it—the term deaf-mute thus accurately describing the limitation. See Deaf and Dumb.

(3) *Defects in the organs both of sense and speech.*—In Mat 12:22 blindness and dumbness are combined, together with mental disturbance. In this case the restoration is not spoken of as a casting out of the demon, but as a healing (ἐθεράπευσ

εν), indicating that there was serious physical defect to be remedied. Mat 17:14-20 = Mar 9:17 ff. = Luk 9:37-43 records in case in which both deafness and dumbness were found along with epilepsy and periodical mental derangement. Mt. and Lk. do not give the features of deafness and dumbness, but confine themselves to the mental features, which they do not describe so fully as Mark. Mar 7:32-37 is a peculiarly interesting instance of deafness combined with incapacity of speech. The description is κωφὸν καὶ μογιλάλον. The deafness might give rise to the stammering, and the fact that total dumbness had not resulted rather points to a comparatively early stage of the affliction. The signs employed by Jesus in the healing are exactly adapted to reach the intelligence of such a defect-bound soul (see art. Cures).

2. Fever and allied diseases.—Various diseases of a kindred nature to fever were common in the East and from the earliest times, and were probably not very rigorously distinguished from each other: fever, ague, and a wasting disease resembling Mediterranean fever. The NT speaks of πυρετός, ‘fever,’ in Luk 4:38 and Joh 4:52. The term in Mat 8:14 and Mar 1:30 is πυρέσσοῦσα; while in Luk 4:38 the illness of Peter’s wife’s mother is spoken of (possibly with a reference to the division made by the Greeks into greater and lesser fevers) as one in which the patient was συνεχόμενη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ, indicating a continued and probably malignant fever, rather than an intermittent feverish attack such as characterizes ague. The super-normal feature of the healing consisted in the immediacy of the recovery without the regular debility following the disease. The ailment described in the Gospels was probably a form of malarial fever which prevailed in the valleys of Palestine and round the Sea of Galilee.

3. Skin diseases.—The OT bears witness to the prevalence in Palestine of many forms of cutaneous disease, and the writings of travellers and eye-witnesses testify to the fact that these are still fearfully common, being perhaps the most characteristic malady of the East. These varieties of skin disease are not referred to in the NT, the only one in evidence there being that most dreaded affection of the skin, which was also in the worse forms a serious constitutional malady affecting the whole organism, which bears the name *Leprosy* (wh. see).

4. A solitary case of dropsy is recorded in Luk 14:2, described as ὕδρωπικός. No account is given of the trouble, the controversy with the Pharisees regarding the right use of the Sabbath being the main interest. No indication is given as to the seat of the disease which caused the dropsy, whether kidneys, heart, or liver.

5. Diseases of the nervous system.—Out of 22 cases of healing wrought by Jesus upon individuals, 8, and most probably 10, are to be classed among nervous disorders, either with or without the complication of psychical disturbance. The general exorcisms which mark our Lord's career are of the same order, and among the general healings of sickness and infirmity which are recorded some may reasonably be supposed to be of the same character, and possibly many of them were purely nervous or hysterical afflictions. Disease of brain centres or of the nerve may also account for some of the cases of blindness. The attempt, however, to show (1) that our Lord's healings may be all reduced to cases of hysteria and of temporary nervous disorder, such as readily yield to treatment by known therapeutic remedies, and (2) that these are the best attested of the miracles, signally fails (see art. Miracles); and yet it may be freely recognized that many of the ailments cured by Jesus belonged to the nervous category. It still remains that those who desire to minimize to the fullest extent the super-normal powers of Jesus are not helped by these facts, for in order to deal effectively with these troubles He must not only have removed the disturbing cause in the psychical nature, but also brought a Divine power to bear on the whole nervous system, dispersing in some cases organic defect and disease.

Under this head are included—

(1) *Paralysis or Palsy* (see art. Paralysis).

(2) *Epilepsy*. The cases in the NT of this distressing nervous malady are complicated with forms of mental disturbance (see art. Lunatic). But it may be supposed that among those who were regarded as possessed and whose restoration was included under the general exorcisms, some were cases of simple epilepsy (wh. see).

(3) Probably the two cases of *general impotence* must be included here—mentioned in Joh_5:2; Joh_5:9 and Luk_13:11-17 (see art. Impotence).

(4) In all likelihood also the man with the *withered hand* was one nervously afflicted. The case is recorded in Mat_12:9-13, Mar_3:1-5, Luk_6:6-11. The incapacity and wasting might be due to (a) infantile paralysis, the disease arresting the development and growth of tissue, leaving the limb shrunk and withered; or (b) it may have been congenital; or (c) it might be due to some direct injury to the main nerve of the limb, preventing its proper nutrition.

Among the halt and withered of Joh_5:3 probably there were cases of chronic rheumatism, joint diseases, and other wasting ailments, in many instances complicated with nervous exhaustion and weakness, if not with positive disease.

6. Nervous and psychical diseases.—Cases of lunacy, of epilepsy combined with insanity and perhaps those allied with idiocy, and others generally described as instances of demonic possession are given in the Gospels, and are to be recognized as having a twofold causation, on the one side physical, on the other psychical; and the problem as to which of these is primary in any particular case is not to be lightly determined. In this connexion arises the outstanding question as to the possibility of a genuine spiritual possession (see art. Lunatic), a matter which may well remain with us for some time yet as a challenge both to medical and to theological investigation. The science of anthropology may throw much light upon it, and possibly in the course of further inquiry some of the conclusions of that science may be found in need of serious modification.

Literature.—For facts relating to the nature and spread of disease in Oriental lands, and especially in Syria, consult Hirsch, *Handbook of Historical Pathology* (Sydenham Soc. Tr.); Macgowan in *Jewish Intelligence* and *Journal of Missionary Labours*, 1846; Thomson, *Land and Book*, pp. 140-149, 356, and, for leprosy, ch. 43; also consult generally 'Krankheiten' in Herzog's *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred to]; Jahn, *Archæologia Biblica*, pt. i. ch. xii.; J. Risdon Bennett, *Diseases of Bible*; Hobart, *Medical Language of St. Luke*; Mason Good, *Study of Medicine*; art. by Macalister on 'Medicine' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible. For Talmudic conception of disease and medical treatment in vogue, see Wunderhar, *Biblich-Talmudische Medicin*.

T. H. Wright.

 Dish

DISH.—1. The only place in the NT (Authorized and Revised Versions) where this word is found is in the record of the betrayal of Jesus given by two of the Synoptists (Mat 26:23, Mar 14:20).

The form of the Greek equivalent (τρούβλιον, Vulgate *catinum* [Mar 14:20], but in Mat 26:23 Vulgate has *paropsis*, for which see below) is that of a diminutive, although there is no example of a cognate or simpler form (see Liddell and Scott, s. v.). With it we may compare the diminutive ψωμίον (Joh 13:26 ff.) in the latest Apostolic account of the same period of Jesus' life. The use of this word, as well as of another (ἐμβάπτειν) occurring in the same context, by these two authors would seem to prove beyond doubt a close literary relationship between their writings—not,

indeed, a relationship of direct inter-dependence (cf. Wright's *Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek*, p. 140), but rather one of common dependence upon the same or kindred sources, oral or written (cf. the 'anonymous fragment' μήτι ἐγὼ εἰμι, ῥαββεί; Mat 26:25).

A comparative study of the four records which tell of Jesus' reference to His impending betrayal brings to light some not unimportant minor differences, and at the same time reveals the agreement of all the writers in the belief that He knew of the intentions of Judas, and warned the latter against the dark deed. To the Markan account which makes Jesus answer the anxious question of His disciples (μήτι ἐγὼ;) by the vague statement, '(it is) one of the twelve who is (now) dipping with me in the dish,' which is equivalent to the previous ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ (Mar 14:18; on this, however, cf. Gould's *St. Mark, ad loc.*), St. Matthew not only adds a more distinct note by employing the aorist (ἐμβάψας) instead of the present Middle (ἐμβαπτόμενος), by which he evidently intended to convey the idea of time, but he also informs us that Jesus gave a direct affirmative reply (σὺ εἶπας) to Judas' question. On the other hand, St. Luke agrees with St. Mark in leaving out all reference to an indication of the traitor beyond the statement that one of those present at the meal (ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης, Luk 22:21) was guilty, while the author of the Fourth Gospel agrees with St. Matthew in making Jesus, by a sign (ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ὃν ἐγὼ βάρψω τὸ ψωμίον καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ, Joh 13:26), point him out to his fellow-disciples.

One thing seems to emerge clearly from the fourfold account, there was but one τρύβλιον on the table, and each one dipped his bread into it as he ate (see O. Holtzmann's *Leben Jesu*, English translation p. 458). This dish contained a sour-sweet sauce (ἡρῆ), which was composed of 'a cake of fruit beaten up and mingled with vinegar' (see *Encyc. Bibl.* art. 'Passover, § 17ⁿ; cf., however, B. Weiss' *The Life of Christ*, iii. p. 279). Into the sauce pieces of unleavened bread and bitter herbs were dipped and handed round by the chief person of the assembled party, which was evidently preliminary to the general partaking of the dish (cf. μετ' ἐμοῦ, Mat 26:23 = Mar 14:20). It seems that this was a custom of late introduction into the Passover rite, and that it was intended to enrich the meaning of the feast by a symbolic reference to the brick-making period of Israel's Egyptian bondage (see art. 'Passover' in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible* iii. p. 691^b).

Most scholars have sought to establish the relative positions of Jesus and Judas at this Passover feast from the incidents referred to by all four Evangelists (cf. Edersheim's *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. pp. 493-507; art. 'Apostle John' in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible* ii. p. 681^a; Farrar's *Life of Christ*, ii. 284 ff. etc.). The variety of conclusions arrived at shows how impossible it is to settle a question of the kind. If, indeed, opposite each *triclinium* at the table there had been a τρύβλιον, then the answer of Jesus to His disciples' questions would show clearly that Judas reclined immediately on His left. This, however, as we have already intimated, is not probable; and the only data by which an approximately correct impression may be received lie in the words spoken by Jesus to Judas himself, and recorded partly by St. Matthew and partly by St. John (cf. Mat_26:25 and Joh_13:27 ff.). It seems more than probable that the traitor reclined somewhere in close proximity to Jesus, that their hands met as both dipped together into the dish (cf. the use of the Middle voice by St. Mark; see Bengel's *Gnomon of NT* on Mar_14:20), and that in this way Jesus was able to convey privately to Judas the fact that He knew of the latter's intention.

2. A very good example of the way in which the didactic sayings of Jesus were caught up and handed down by His different hearers is afforded by the Matthaean and Lukan versions of the words by which He denounced the legal quibblings and Pharisaic hypocrisy of His day (Mat_23:1 ff., Luk_11:37 ff.). There is just sufficient identity both in language and sense to guarantee the genuineness of the teaching. At the same time there is a marked variety in details as to locality, wording, and even as to the particular objective of Jesus' remarks. According to St. Luke, Jesus denounces the Pharisees, while a guest in the house of one of their number, for their punctiliousness in keeping the outside of their vessels clean, their own hearts all the time being full of uncleanness. The contrast is between the outside of their utensils (τὸ ἔξωθεν ... τοῦ πίνακος) and their own inner lives or characters (τὸ δὲ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν, Luk_11:39). Here we may notice that the word translated 'platter' is the word used to denote the flat dish (Authorized and Revised Versions 'charger') on which (ἐπὶ πίνακι) the Baptist's head was sent to Herodias (Mat_14:8; Mat_14:11 = Mar_6:25; Mar_6:28). On the other hand, St. Matthew makes Jesus utter this discourse to 'the multitudes and to his disciples' in the Temple (Mat_23:1; cf. Mat_24:1). The denunciation is more sustained and rhetorical, as becomes the situation. When the writer comes to the contrast spoken of above, he makes Jesus institute one between the outside of the dish and its contents, looked on as the outcome of rapacity and gluttony (ἐξ ἀρπαγῆς καὶ ἀκρασίας). This is again more suitable to the word he employs, which is the only place in the NT where it is found (τὸ ἔξωθεν ... τῆς παροψίδος stands opposite to ἔσωθεν = τὸ ἐντὸς

... τῆς παροψίδος, see Mat 23:25 f.; cf., however, WH's [Note: H's Westcott and Hort's text.] text in Mat 23:26).

The word παροψίς was originally, in Attic Greek, used of *entrées* or dainties (see Liddell and Scott, s.v.). It afterwards came to be applied to the four-cornered ('quadrangulum et quadrilaterum vas,' see art. 'Meals' in *Encyc. Bibl.* iii. 2998, n. [Note: note.] 1) dish in which they were served; and, lastly, it became a name for dishes generally used at table.

In both these cases of variation it is possible to see the hand of the editor carefully compiling and arranging his materials before their publication in permanent form.

J. R. Willis.

Dispersion

DISPERSION (διασπορά).—The word (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 of Joh 7:35, Jam 1:1; 1Pe 1:1) is a collective term denoting either the Jews resident outside their native country, or the lands in which they lived.

1. The Pharisees and chief priests sent officers to arrest our Lord, and He told them that in a little while He would go where they could not find Him or be able to come to Him. The Jews who were present asked where He could possibly go that they could not find Him. Would He go to the 'dispersion among the Greeks' (εἰς τὴν διασπορὰν τῶν Ἑλλήνων)* [Note: For the genitive, cf. 1Pe 1:1.] and teach the Greeks? *i.e.*

would He make the dispersed Jews a starting-point for teaching the Greeks?

Narrow-minded Jews, distinct from 'the people' (ὁ ὄχλος) of Joh 7:31; Joh 7:40, they would not dream of defiling themselves by going out and mixing with Gentiles, and they sarcastically suggested that that was the only way in which Jesus could escape them.

2. It is unnecessary in this article to deal fully with the history and fortunes of the Dispersion; but a very brief sketch may be useful. In the time of Christ the Jews of the Dispersion were to be found in six main colonies: Babylonia, Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor, Greece, and Rome.

(a) *Babylonia*.—The Jews in the far East were the descendants of those who remained when small bodies returned under Zerubbabel and Ezra. And their numbers were afterwards increased by a transportation of Jews to Babylonia and Hyrcania under Artaxerxes III. Ochus (358-338). Many have thought that 1Pe 5:13 refers to a community of Christians among the Jews in Babylon; but this is improbable (see Hort, *1 Peter*, pp. 5 f., 167-170). From Babylon, Jews moved in many directions to Elam (cf. Isa 11:11), Persia, Media, Armenia, and Cappadocia. The Babylonian Jews were the only portion of the Diaspora which maintained its Judaism more or less untouched by the Hellenism which permeated the West. Their remoteness, however, did not prevent the loyal payment of the annual Temple-tax, which was collected at Nehardea and Nisibis and sent to Jerusalem (see below).

(b) *Egypt*.—Jews had migrated to Egypt as early as 586, when Johanan son of Kareah conducted a small body of them, including Jeremiah, to Tahpanhes (Jeremiah 42, 43). Jews also settled (Jer 44:1) in Migdol, Noph (Memphis), and Pathros (Upper Egypt). The great majority of the colonists in *Alexandria* must have settled there early in the period of the Ptolemies, in which case they may have been among the earliest inhabitants of Alexander's new city; and they undoubtedly received special privileges (Josephus *circa (about) Apion*. ii. 4; *BJ* ii. xviii. 7 f.). The kindness which they received in Palestine from Ptolemy I. Soter induced numbers of them to migrate to Egypt during his reign. And many more may have been transported as prisoners of war during the subsequent struggles between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. Philo (*in Flace.*, ed. Mangey, ii. 525) less than ten years after our Lord's death says that two entire quarters of Alexandria were known as 'the Jewish,' and many more Jews were sprinkled over the rest of the city. Another congregation of Jews was formed at *Lcontopolis* in the nome of Heliopolis on the Eastern border of the Nile delta. The high priest Onias, son of Simon the Just, was granted permission by Ptolemy VI. Philometor to settle there when he fled with some adherents in 173 or 170 from his enemies Antiochus IV. Epiphanes and the sons of Tobias. He built a fortress, and within it a temple where the worship of Jehovah was carried on. This continued till a.d. 73, when the temple was destroyed by order of Vespasian (Josephus *Ant.* xiii. iii. 2, xiv. viii. 1; *BJ* i. ix. 4, vii. x. 2-4).

(c) *Syria*.—The Egyptian Diaspora had been formed largely owing to the increased facilities for travel and intercourse resulting from Alexander's conquests. And the same causes operated in Syria. Damascus had received Israelite colonists in very early times (1Ki 20:34). In Nero's reign there were, according to Josephus (*BJ* ii. xx. 2), no fewer than 10,000 Jews in the city. Antiochus IV. Epiphanes conceded to the Jews the right of free settlement in Antioch; and, owing to the successes and prestige of the Maccabees in Palestine, the neighbouring provinces of Syria received a larger admixture of Jews than any other country (*BJ* vii. iii. 3).

(d) *Asia Minor*.^{*} [Note: It is convenient to use the term, although its first known occurrence is in Orosius (Hist. i. 2. 26), a.d. 417. He speaks as though it were his own coinage: 'Asia regio vel, ut proprie dicam, Asia minor.')] —Through Syria Jews passed to Asia Minor and the neighbouring islands, Cyprus, Crete, etc., where from b.c. 130 and onwards they flourished under Roman protection. See Hort, *1 Peter*, Add. note, pp. 157-184, and Acts 13-20.

(e) *Greece*.—It is related in 1Ma 12:21 that the Spartans sent a letter to the high priest Onias saying 'it hath been found in writing concerning the Spartans and the Jews that they are brethren, and that they are of the stock of Abraham.' This, though legendary, implies that there was at least an acquaintance between members of the two races. Jewish inscriptions, moreover, have been found in Greece; and there were firmly established Jewish communities in Thessalonica, Berea, and Corinth when St. Paul visited them (Acts 17, 18).

(f) *Rome*.—The first contact of the Jews with Rome was in the time of the Maccabees; embassies were sent by Judas and Jonathan, and a formal alliance was concluded by Simon in b.c. 140 (1Ma 14:24; 1Ma 15:15-24). A few Jews probably reached Rome as traders; but the first large settlement dates from the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey, b.c. 63. Julius and Augustus admitted them to a legal standing throughout the Empire (see the series of enactments in Josephus *Ant.* xiv. viii. 5, x. 1-8); the latter allowed them to form a colony on the further side of the Tiber; but they soon gained a footing within the city, and had synagogues of their own. Tiberius in a.d. 19 banished 4000 to Sardinia. In the early days of Claudius the Jewish cause was upheld at court by the two Agrippas; but before 52 'Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome' (Act 18:2)—'impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes' (Suet. *Claud.* 23). Under Nero the Jews in Rome once more gained ground.

3. The Jews dispersed in these various settlements did not entirely cut themselves off from their national centre, Jerusalem. Even the Jews at Leontopolis, though their worship was strictly speaking schismatical, did not allow their religious separateness to quench their national feeling. They embraced Caesar's cause in Egypt, contrary to their first impulse, because of the injunctions of Hyrcanus the high, priest at Jerusalem, and Antipater the Jewish general (Josephus *Ant.* xiv. viii. 1; *BJ* i. ix. 4).

There were two important links which bound the Diaspora in all parts of the world to their mother city.

(a) The annual payment of the Temple-tax (the half-shekel or didrachm), and of other offerings. One of the privileges which they enjoyed under the Diadochi and afterwards under the Romans was that of coining their own money for sacred purposes. [It was this sacred coinage that foreign Jews were obliged to get from the money-changers in

exchange for the ordinary civil money, when they came to Jerusalem for the festivals, Mat 21:12, Mar 11:15, Joh 2:14 f. And it was this variety of coinage that enabled our Lord to give His absolutely simple but unanswerable decision on what the Jews thought was a dilemma; deep spiritual meaning, no doubt, underlay His words, but their surface meaning was sufficient to silence His opponents: 'Render to Caesar the civil coin on which his image is stamped, and render to God the sacred coin which belongs to Him and His Temple worship,' Mat 22:21, Mar 12:17, Luk 20:25]. The sacred money was collected at different centres (cf. Mat 17:24 οἱ τὰ δίδραχμα λαμβάνοντες) and carried under safe escort to Jerusalem (Philo, *de Monarch*, ii. 3). Josephus relates (*Ant.* xvi. vi.) that the Jews in Asia and Cyrene were ill-treated, and that the Greeks took from them their sacred money; but that decrees were issued by Augustus, Agrippa, and two proconsuls to the effect that the sacred money of the Jews was to be untouched, and that they were to be given full liberty to send it to Jerusalem. The Babylonian Jews made use of the two strong cities Nehardea and Nisibis to store their sacred money till the time came to send it to Palestine. 'The Jews, depending on the natural strength of these places, deposited in them the half-shekel which everyone, by the custom of our country, offers to God, and as many other dedicatory offerings (ἀναθήματα) as there were: for they made use of these cities as a treasury, whence at the proper time they were transmitted to Jerusalem' (*Ant.* xviii. ix. 1). Such priestly dues as consisted of sacrificial flesh, which could not be sent to Jerusalem, were paid to any priest if there happened to be one at hand (*Challa*, iv. 7-9, 11; *Yadaim*, iv. 3; *Chullin*, x. 1; *Terumoth*, ii. 4).

(b) The pilgrimages made to Jerusalem by immense numbers of foreign Jews at the three annual festivals—Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles. Josephus says that Cestius Gallus had a census made during the Passover, and the priests reckoned 2,700,000 people (*BJ* vi. ix. 3), in round numbers three millions (*id.* ii. xiv. 3).

In reading the Acts it is evident that, had there been no foreign dispersion of the Jews, the rapid progress of Christianity could not have been what it was. At the feast of Pentecost there were gathered Jews from the four quarters of the Diaspora—the far and near East, Europe, and Africa; and soon afterwards Jews received Apostolic teaching at many centres, and when converted helped to spread it throughout the known world. But it is important to remember that before that time One greater than the Apostles came, more than once, into immediate contact with the masses of pilgrims who visited Jerusalem for the festivals. As a boy of twelve He first met them (Luk 2:42), and He probably attended many festivals in the 18 years which intervened before His ministry (see Luk 2:41). At a Passover He displayed to them His Divine indignation at the desecration of God's sanctuary (Joh 2:13-17), and many believed on Him when they saw His miracles (Joh 2:23). It would seem as though the longing seized Him to bring all these thousands of foreigners to His allegiance at one stroke,

by revealing to them His true nature. If we may say it reverently, it must have been a temptation to Him to send them back over many countries to tell all men that God had become man. But His own Divine intuition restrained Him (Joh 2:24 f.). Immediately before another Passover He saw the crowds moving along the road on their way to Jerusalem; and they came to Him, and He fed them (Joh 6:4-18). Here, again, the temptation offered itself in their wish to make Him king; but He resisted it, and was able to persuade them to leave Him (Joh 6:14 f.). At a feast of Pentecost (so Westcott) He suddenly appeared in their midst at Jerusalem, and many believed Him to be the Messiah when they heard His preaching (Joh 7:2; Joh 7:10-31; Joh 7:40 f.). Yet again at a Passover the crowds of pilgrims gave Him another opportunity of becoming king (Mat 21:1-9, Mar 11:1-10, Luk 19:35-38, Joh 12:12-15), but He chose rather to gain His kingdom through death. It was for their benefit that the inscription upon the cross was trilingual—Aramaic, Greek, and Latin (Joh 19:20). A Jew from Africa, on his way into the city, was forced to perform an office which few envied him at the time, but which has never been forgotten by the Christian Church (Mar 15:21). Thus time after time the accounts of His miracles and preaching, and finally of His patient suffering and His death, and perhaps also reports of His resurrection, would be carried back by wandering Jews into ‘every nation under heaven.’

4. One colony of the Diaspora possesses a special importance in connexion with Christianity. Among the Alexandrian Jews originated the Greek translation of the OT—the version used by our Lord, the Apostles, and the great majority of the early Church. It remained in almost complete supremacy among Christians until it was superseded by the Vulgate. See art. Septuagint. The importance of Alexandria in connexion with the Fourth Gospel would be enormous if the contention of some writers were true, that St. John derived his doctrine of the Logos from Alexandrian philosophy. The doctrine, however, has affinities rather with Jewish than with Alexandrian thought. The most that can be said is that St. John may have employed the term because it already had a wide currency among both Jews and Greeks (see Westcott, *Gospel of St. John*, pp. xv-xviii, and art. ‘Logos’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible).

Literature.—Besides the authorities cited in the article, see artt. ‘Diaspora’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible (Extra Vol.), ‘Dispersion’ in *Encyc. Bibl.* (with the literature there), and in Smith’s *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] . Much illustrative matter may be gathered from Jewish histories, especially Schurer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] . See also E. R. Bevan, *The House of Seleucus*; J. P. Mahaffy, *The Empire of the Ptolemies*.

A. H. M’Neile.

☒ Ditch

DITCH (βόθρυος, Mat_15:14, Luk_6:39; rendered ‘pit’ Mat_12:11).—The parabolic language of our Lord in the first two parallel passages is suggested by the frequency of danger from unguarded wells, quarries, and holes. Into these the blind easily fell; and the risk increased if the leader of the blind were himself blind. The metaphor has been interpreted as referring to Gehenna: more probably it refers simply to danger of hurt, or even ruin, from wilful or careless perversion of the truth leading to moral wandering and fall. For the idea, cf. Pro_19:27 ‘Cease, my son, to hear the instruction that causeth to err,’ and St. Paul’s taunt of the Jew as ‘a guide of the blind’ (Rom_2:19).

R. Macpherson.

☒ Dives

DIVES.—The Latin adjective for ‘rich,’ commonly employed as a *quasi*-proper name for the rich man in our Lord’s parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Luk_16:19-31). This use of the word Dives, derived, no doubt, from the Vulgate, is common in English literature, and can be traced back at least to the time of Chancer, who, in *The Somnour’s Tale*, lines 169, 170, says:

‘Lazar and Dives liveden diversly,
And divers guerdon hadden they ther-by.’

Compare also *Piers the Plowman*, passus xvi. lines 303, 304:

‘And Dives in his deyntes lyuede. and in douce uye;
And now he buyeth hit ful bitere. he is a heggere of helle.’

Although we are not concerned in this article with the interpretation of the parable as a whole, we may yet appropriately refer to the various opinions which have been held as to who was intended by our Lord under the figure of the rich man.

The noticeable circumstances that in this alone of all His parables our Lord names one of the characters, *i.e.* Lazarus, while the other chief character, the rich man, is

significantly nameless, and that the parable has no prefatory introduction, such as 'He spake another parable,' or the like, have given rise to the conjecture that this is not a parable pure and simple, but that it is either a narrative of facts, or that persons more or less known are alluded to in the story.

1. Some, as Tertullian and Schleiermacher, have supposed that in Dives allusion was made to Herod Antipas, and that Lazarus represents John the Baptist, who is referred to in v. 18, cf. also v. 18, where our Lord speaks about adultery. This, however, is surely an extravagant notion which scarcely needs refutation.

2. Another equally improbable suggestion, put forward by Michaelis, is that Dives represents Caiaphas, son-in-law of Annas, and that Lazarus is Christ; and so the five brethren of the rich man are explained as the five sons of Annas (Josephus *Ant.* xx. ix. 1).

3. Closely connected with this opinion is another which has the support of Ambrose, Augustine, Teclman (quoted by Trench, *Parables*), and others, according to which, while Lazarus is Christ, Dives is the Jewish people who despised and rejected Him who for their sakes was poor and afflicted. This, however, is an allegorizing of the parable which, though attractive at first sight, will not bear close examination.

4. Another interpretation, supported by Aphraates, Augustine (as an alternative), Gregory the Great, and Theophylact, and widely held in all sections of the Universal Church, is, that Dives represents, as in the last case, the Jewish people, but that Lazarus represents the Gentiles. Bleek, Godet, and Alford reject this view, the two latter saying that the very name Lazarus (*i.e.* a Jewish name) is against it. Yet, though not the primary, this may be a true application of the parable, and is not lightly to be set aside.

5. According to a tradition alluded to by Theophylact and Euthymius Zigabenus, Dives and Lazarus were actual persons known at the time, and our Lord, while honouring the poor man by naming him, passes over the guilty rich man's name in merciful silence.

6. The interpretation which best suits all the facts of the case is that the rich man is a typical instance of the religious leaders of the people, Pharisees and Sadducees, and that Lazarus is a representative of the despised publicans, or of the neglected 'common people.' If this is the primary significance of Dives and Lazarus, then we can see, as stated above, that interpretation 4 is not lightly to be set aside; for if Pharisees and Sadducees despised and neglected those of their own nation, much more would they contemptuously overlook 'sinners of the Gentiles.' Under this head it has been debated whether Dives is a typical Pharisee or a Sadducee. Didon (*Life of*

Christ), Mosheim, and Wetstein hold that he is a Sadducee, since the Pharisees were not characterized by luxurious living or by unbelief; but if, with the majority of expositors, who say that the connexion of the parable with what precedes requires it, we hold him to be a Pharisee, he is at least a Pharisee who, as Stier says, 'lives as a Sadducee.'

As to the special sin of Dives, opinions have differed. All, however, concur in pointing out that he is not accused of any positive crime,—his sin is negative. It may be, indeed, that our Lord in the parable glances back at what is said in vv. 13-16; yet Dives' chief sin most evidently was that he left undone the things which he ought to have done. He is an instance, in fact, of one who did not make to himself friends of the mammon of unrighteousness. Doubtless the cause of this was his virtual unbelief in a kingdom of God here implying a brotherhood of all men, and a kingdom of God hereafter implying a retribution.

Euthymius says that some asserted that, according to a tradition, the rich man was called Ninevis; and Tischendorf (*Gr. Test. in loc.*) quotes a scholion εὔρον δὲ τινες καὶ τοῦ πλουσίου ἐν τισιν ἀντιγράφοις τοῦνομα Νινεύης λεγόμενον. Further, the Sahidic Version adds to the mention of the rich man: 'whose name was Nineue.' It has, however, been suggested (Rendel Harris, *Expositor*, March 1900) that this name may have been evolved from the words 'hic dives,' or 'en dives,' accompanying some ancient pictorial representation of the parable. Harnack (*ib.*), however, has thought that the word may be a corruption of Φινεῆς (Finaeus in pseudo-Cyprian, *de Pascha Computus*, circa (about) 17), and 'that since in Num_25:7 Phinehas is said to be the son of Eleazar, an attempt has been made to suggest that the poor man ... was the rich man's own father.' See art. Lazarus.

Albert Bonus.

☩ Divinity Of Christ

DIVINITY OF CHRIST

- I. Preliminary considerations.
 1. The mystery of Christ.
 2. The movement 'Back to Christ.'

3. Certain results of the movement.

II. Bases of Christological belief.

1. Primarily a new experience.

2. Analysis of the experience.

(a) Christ's Messianic character.

(b) His self-consciousness: (α) His interior life, (β) His method in teaching, (γ) His sinlessness, (δ) His oneness with God.

(c) His appeal to deeper personality.

(d) His teaching and works.

3. Validity of the experience.

III. Beginnings of the doctrine of Christ's Person in the NT.

1. General character of the doctrine.

2. Divine names applied to Christ.

3. Divine properties and acts attributed to Christ.

4. Divine relations as to God, man, the world.

IV. Subsequent development of NT ideas.

1. History of the doctrine.

(a) Patristic.

(b) Mediaeval.

(c) Modern.

2. Denial of the doctrine.

- (a) Its history and motive.
- (b) Its failure.

Literature.

I. Preliminary Considerations

1. *The mystery of Christ.*—The historic question of Jesus to His disciples, ‘Who do men say that I the Son of Man am?’ (Mat 16:13, Mar 8:27, Luk 9:18), was put not to confound, but to reveal, by awakening the desire for knowledge. The intelligent answer to the question preserves the precious truth, which is nothing less than God’s *age-long secret about Himself*. The disciples had been nurtured on a religious literature in which the whole national and individual future was seen blending in one anticipation, the coming of God to His people to deliver and save. One like the Son of Man comes, and there is given to Him dominion and glory and a kingdom which shall not pass away. This was the figure in which the Jewish imagination clothed the Jewish hope. Modern criticism dwells upon the factors in history which determined the form in which this hope took shape. The Hebrew religion, we are assured, was wrought out under constant pressure of disaster. It was the religion of a proud, brave people, who were constantly held in subjection to foreign conquerors. Hence came a quality of intense hostility to those tyrannous foes, and also a constant appeal to the Divine Power to declare itself. The hostility and the appeal inspire the Messianic Hope. Was there nothing more? Surely behind the history and the imagination lay elemental forces of the soul. What lend essential and abiding worth both to the Hebrew hostility to Gentile oppression and the Hebrew appeal to Jehovah’s righteous right hand are a faith and a passion which, if quickened into power by the vicissitudes of history, were themselves underived from history, and native to the spirit of the nation. Nor in this high conviction do the Hebrews stand alone. Everywhere, wherever thought has advanced sufficiently near its Object, it has come to a yearning, at times poignant, for closer contact. The numerous idolatries of the lower religions are simply the objectivation of this desire. The no less numerous conceptions of Divinity in more cultured peoples are due to the same stress. There has been a ceaseless demand of the human race for an embodiment of Deity. The demand is a product of the hungry human heart for closer communion with God and larger loyalty to Him.

The existence of an instinct so universal is the guarantee of its fulfilment. The two considerations, that the Hebrew race had worked out the conception of the Messiah, and that the ethnic peoples were quite familiar with Divine incarnations, processes both present admittedly to the mind of the Early Church, furnish no evidence to the contrary. In themselves they prove nothing against a true Incarnation historically manifested, if it can be shown that its historical manifestation is not wholly traceable

to naturalistic origins in the Hebrew and ethnic genius. The presence, in particular, of many myths parallel to the Christian story need not mean that the Christian story is itself a myth. As has been well said, 'If the Christian God really made the human race, would not the human race tend to rumours and perversions of the Christian God? If the centre of our life is a certain fact, would not people far from the centre have a muddled version of the fact? If we are so made that a Son of God must deliver us, is it odd that Patagonians (and others) should dream of a Son of God?' (Chesterton, *Religious Doubts of Democracy*, p. 18). False beliefs live by the true elements within them. A persistent belief occurring in many false forms is likely to be true, and may reasonably be expected to occur in a true form. Each redeemer of heathenism is a prophetic anticipation of the satisfying of human desires in Jesus Christ, precisely as the Messianic disclosures of the OT were to the people of whom according to the flesh He came. They are anticipations only: since neither the pagan foregleams nor the Hebrew forecasts offered sufficient data for a complete or consistent delineation of an actual Person. * [Note: Westcott, *Gospel of Life*, pp. 295-297.] The earlier experiences of men made the gospel intelligible, but they had no power to produce it. It satisfies and crowns them, but does not grow out of them. The Person, when He came, did more than satisfy the old instinct by which men had hope, He reinforced and extended it: His advent not only accomplished the past promise, it gave earnest of greater things to come: He thus represented human ideals indeed, but still more Divine ideas. The highest prophecies of His appearance reveal, amid the circumstantial details, the element of mystery; that mystery is not eliminated when the Life appears. It is the singular significance of Jesus Christ that both in the anticipations of Him and in His actual appearance the details always lead on to inquiry as to what is not detailed, the facts to something beyond themselves; the Man and His words and works to the question Who is He? and Whence is this Man?

2. The movement 'Back to Christ.'—The question is prominently before the present age. The modern mind asks it with revived interest. Modern knowledge in its several departments of philosophy, history, science, has developed along lines and in obedience to principles which appear able to dispense with the old theistic axioms. God and Conscience are not so vividly active. And yet, on the other hand, the ancient instinct of the race for communion with God is assertive as ever. It turns for comfort almost exclusively to the Christian tradition. The Christian tradition, however, it is convinced, needs revision; and here the central necessity is the treatment and true understanding of the Person of Christ. The cry is 'Back to Christ.' It is a cry dear to all who desire a simpler gospel than that set forth in the Creeds; all who are wearied with speculation on the elements of Christian truth, or are distraught with the variety of interpretation offered of it; all who are eager to embrace the ethics and as eager to abjure what they term the metaphysics of the Christian system. The movement referred to is natural; and its plea so plausible as to merit attention. The aim is nothing short of recovering the image of the original Founder of the Faith, expressed

in His authentic words and acts; to bring back in all the distinct lineaments of a living Personality the great Teacher whom we now see in the Gospels 'as through a glass darkly.' It seeks by a study of the original records in the light of all the historical and critical aids now open to us, and guided by the modern idea of evolution, not only to bring us face to face with Jesus of Nazareth, to listen to His direct words of wisdom, but to trace all the steps of His spiritual advance, all the steps by which He grew into the Messiah of Israel and the Ideal of humanity, giving the deepest interpretation to the prophetic dream of His nation, and so lifting it into that higher region in which the freely accepted Cross became the necessary means to the deliverance of man. The 'Jesus of history,' it is argued, has been buried in the 'Christ of dogma'; the Church in handing down the Saviour has presented Him with adoring hands and in idealized form. The more we throw off her encrustments, the nearer we get to the original, the nearer we are getting to the real Jesus, and, in Him, to the truth of our religion.

However natural the hope of such minds, it is based on illusion. It proceeds on erroneous ideas as to what we may learn from the past. 'What has been done,' says the adage, 'even the gods themselves cannot make undone.' All that historical reversion can do is to suggest that in the onward movement something precious has been left behind which it were well to recover before going further. There is no such Christ, no such Christianity in the first century as is sought for: a Christ and a Christianity purely invariable and true for all time and in every place. That is a conception which, the more it is studied, the more it will be found to be a pure abstraction to which no concrete *in rerum natura* corresponds. The absolute value of the Christian Faith, the real stature of the Christ, cannot be established by merely dropping the historical surroundings or setting of the traditional truth. The old truth that lived spiritually in the minds of those who first livingly apprehended it, and which has pulsed all through the historical process, has to be caught up again, realized in its essential vitality, and formulated anew in harmony with the modern spirit. We have to ask, Was the Christian Idea given in itself apart, in isolation, abstractly, and may this, as the 'essence,' substance, or soul of the gospel, be rediscovered? Or, on the contrary, was the Christian Idea planted as a Life in a company of believers who manifested its power in their lives, so that it cannot be reduced to an invariable essence except by an unreal process of abstraction? Cf., further, art. Back to Christ.

3. *Certain results of the movement.*—The effort to 'rediscover Christ' (the phrase is Dr. Fairbairn's) is important less in its avowed aim than in its subsidiary results. Through them it yields a real contribution to theological progress. We proceed to indicate three such results: (1) a *new idea of the nature of Christian doctrine*; (2) the insistence on *the distinction between primary and variable elements in doctrines*; (3) the deepened consciousness of *the extent of variation*.

(1) The same divines who have busied themselves in the search for the Christ of history have been instrumental in exhibiting Christian thought on His Person as *a process*. In that sphere of thought they have rigorously applied the idea of development, not indeed for the first time (since John Henry Newman, fifteen years before Darwin's *Origin of Species* was published, had fascinated their fathers by his use of the idea), but with a more thorough insight than Newman, and with better tests, furnishing in consequence widely different results from his. They are enabled to distinguish between Creed and Doctrine, between articles of faith and the whole process of reflexion, even of a conflicting character, by which articles of faith are reached and defined. By them interest is transferred from the result to the process. The forces entering into the process are minutely analyzed. It is discovered that theology has a history; that its history is mixed up with general history; that it has been moulded by a vast deal external to the subject-matter of theology; and not only so, but even, as some (notably Harnack) contend, has been substantially and in its inner essence modified, if not perverted, in the process. It is seen that Christian dogmas were once inchoate; passed through many stages under influences social, political, intellectual; and that they have a constant tendency so to do in adapting themselves to their environment—that, in short, they are not dead formulas, but a living organism.

(2) The emergence of so many factors merely accidental has brought into clearer perspective *the reality immanent in the process*. Besides the soil and the influences on growth, there is the seed, the Divine Truth on which human thought and earthly event exercised themselves. It is traceable to the teaching and life of Jesus and His Apostles. Only fragments of His utterances have been preserved to us, but the brief discourses and conversations that we read in the Gospels stand unique in spiritual power among the utterances of the world. They represent a large body of teaching, lost to us in form but preserved in its fruits; for out of His spiritual wealth there poured throughout His ministry an abundance of spoken truth that remained to perpetuate His influence and serve as the foundation of Christian doctrine. Together with His life they formed and still form Truth, not simply in a definite invariable quantity, but as a constant fountain and source of truth, ever open and flowing for them who believe. He gave a new light on all things to men; and by an inevitable necessity they proceeded to apply, and still must apply, what He has shown, to the interpretation of all they thought and knew. Thus Christian doctrine bases itself ultimately on two sources: (a) the Facts as to Christ's teaching and life; and (b) the Experience of believers in Him interpreting life and its problems in the light of those facts. Christian doctrine has grown up as a vital thing in the soil of actual life; in the experience of Christian living. Jesus appeared among men and lived and taught. He gave the Truth by what He was, by what He said, by what He did. Words, Works, Personality: all preached. This rich and various utterance fell into the hearing and the hearts of men and women who became His followers. Into their very being it entered

with transforming power, making them 'new creatures.' By and by it filtered through their minds and life, and expressed itself in the form which their own experience gave to it. It is this reproduction of the truth Jesus brought that constitutes Christian doctrine. Its fundamental elements are to be kept clearly in view—viz. the Christian Facts and the Experience of Believers.

(3) The *origin of variation in doctrinal belief* immediately becomes manifest. Believing experience cannot be expected to be invariable. Still less the expression of experience. Variety of views enters. There are differences of mind, of education, of disposition and degrees of sympathy, of ability to apprehend and explain: differences all of them, when given free scope, likely to lead to mixed results. Present-day religious thought is profoundly impressed with the fact and with the necessity of it. And if in consequence the theological mind is infected with a certain sense of insecurity, there is compensation in the new breath of freedom. Obviously it is gain to be able to review the doctrinal process and results of the past, to disentangle the Divine Truth from its temporary formulation, and to elaborate it anew in such wise as will subserve the highest interests of men to-day, as well as do justice to its own ever fresh wealth of content. (Cf. the interesting exposition in Dr. Newton Clarke's *What shall we think of Christianity?* Lect. ii.).

II. Bases of Christological belief

1. *Primarily a new experience.*—The new methods found early application to the doctrine of Christ's Person. That doctrine is central in the Christian system. It is by Christ, His Person and Work, that salvation is mediated. Historically and experimentally the Church learned it so. A study of the NT and of the two subsequent centuries is chiefly a study of one great fact or truth, to the understanding and interpreting of which the mind and life of the period were devoted, and devoted with absorbing interest—the Person of Christ. That problem soon became at once the impulse and the starting-point of an entire science of God, of man, and of the essential and final relation between God and man. But primarily the question at issue was simply that of His Person. It was provoked by Christ's own questions and by His claims. Its urgency was enhanced by the experience of believers. Their experience was unprecedentedly novel. Unlike that of Hebrew faith, its ground was individual and personal.

Its origin lay in the *revolutionary impression His presence created* in the heart, an impression which came as a thing incomparable, and remained as the most precious fact of life. It grew as a new power in the soul to resist and overcome sin, assuring not the promise only but the potency of real holiness, imparting to the latent faculties of the changing heart an increasing plenitude of spiritual force making for righteousness. Concurrently with this feature in the new experience went another, or

two others. Awakened by the sense of power in the inner life imparted by Christ, men came to understand what the evil is from which God seeks to save them, and what the good is which He seeks to impart to them. In Christ moral goodness, the righteousness of God, laid its inexorable claims upon man's life, determining feelings and shaping resolutions as does the real entrance of God into our hearts. *The impression of Christ was thus seen to be the power of God.* A further step was won when reflexion forced forward the question how it could be so, in what mode the nature of Christ's Person must be regarded in the light of the above experiences. But the root of the matter was reached when the fact was realized that the more the strength of His character overwhelmed them, the more undeniable was made the reality of God to them. That was reached, however, at the very outset. It was *the primary conviction* which entitled to the name of believer, and confession of it meant salvation. It formed the fundamental basis of Christological belief. Jesus comes acting on human hearts with winsome gentleness, with a soul-moving sorrow for sin, and with a great enabling power. The high demands He brings raise no fear, for He who demands approaches with the means of fulfilling, which He is ready to impart. Herein rests the real originality of His message, by which His gospel differentiates itself from all other religions on the one hand, and from all merely philosophical or ethical Idealisms on the other; in virtue of which also all interpretations of His Person on humanitarian lines prove inadequate. On this point a clear understanding is indispensable. It is to be insisted that the 'Christ of History' and the 'Christ of Experience' were not separable to the mind of the disciples; they were one and indivisible. Their Christ is not the Teaching of Jesus alone, or His Works alone; or both together alone, but both together along with what they revealed regarding the inner life of Jesus, and what they created in the inner life of believers. It is impossible to separate the last from the first. It is illegitimate to seek to resolve it into a creation of the religious idealizing faculty of believers in Him. The thought of the Apostles consciously felt itself engaged not in evolving dreams and speculations of its own, but in striving to receive and appreciate a truth which was before, above, independent of them. By no single fact in His biography does His message, in this view, stand or fall, but by Himself whom the facts reveal; the facts come embedded, and are vital because thus embedded, in one cardinal fact, Himself. He came to them not as a prophet, although He had much in common with the prophets; nor as a culture-hero, the offspring of spiritual imagination; but as an inner force of life absolutely unique; an inner experience in which God entered into their hearts in a manner heretofore unparalleled, being borne in on them rather than presented to their imitation, leavening them practically with Himself, and demonstratively in such a way that henceforth to their very existence in God, He, the Revealer, must belong. In the NT we move amid scenes where the common has been broken up by vast events. God from the Unseen has struck into history a fresh note, and a new era has opened. The whole suggestion is of possibilities and resources waiting to be disclosed. (Cf. Wernle, *Beginnings of Christianity*). The beginning of Christianity is neither a theological idea

nor a moral precept; it is an experience of a Fact, the Fact of Christ, revealing and imparting the life of God.

The impression Christ made on those who saw and heard Him is a solid fact which no criticism can upset. Is it possible to get behind this fact? The effort is strenuously made by many. What was He who produced the impression reported in the Gospels? Better still, What was He who produced not this or that impression, but the resultant of actual and permanent impressions which He has made upon the world? In seeking an answer, historical and critical research has been lavished on every aspect of the question. Christ's teaching, career, personality, have been studied as never before. The result is that He is better known to us than to any previous age. It is at the same time being increasingly felt that a naturalistic reconstruction of His life is not possible. Candid students of the anti-supernaturalist camps (*e.g.*, in history, Keim [*Jesus of Nazara*]; in philosophy, Ed. Caird [*Evol. of Religion*]; in science, Sir Oliver Lodge [*Hibbert Journal*, iii. i.] and Prof. James [*Varieties of Religious Experience*]) practically confess the failure of past attempts, and succeed in evading the postulate of Divinity only by attributing to the human life so ample a magnificence as to make it embrace all that Christian thought understands by Divinity. The new rationalism shows how decidedly the old materialism has spent its force. Of special interest is its frank recognition of the presence and vitality of experiences on which hitherto naturalism has set taboo. The more the new criticism endeavours to revivify the dead past and live over again the life of the disciples who enjoyed the personal communion of Christ, the more it sees it must combine in itself all the qualifications necessary for seeing and understanding all that He really was. This conviction, however, involves the finding of a place for criteria for the adjudging of Christ, specifically extra-naturalistic, but not extra-scientific, and spiritual; and where this happens without prepossession, the irresistible sense of Christ's transcendence impresses. His mystery remains (*cf. Contentio Veritatis*, Essay ii.; also Rashdall, *Doctrine and Development*, v. and vi.).

2. Analysis of the experience.—But if we cannot go behind the fact in the sense of reaching something more ultimate, we may analyze its elements. It will be found in content to comprise at least four constituents: His teaching and works; His growing consciousness of His own nature; His response to prophetic promise; His appeal to deeper personality.

(a) Of these the most obvious is the third, the contemporary *conviction of His Messianic dignity*. 'That Jesus is the Christ' is one of the dominating ideas of the Gospels and Epistles. More than one recent writer (Martineau, Meinhold, Wrede, etc.) have sought to show that Jesus did not accept the title of Messiah; but not even these deny its attribution to Him by the disciples, and that as their main view of His Person. Careful analysis indicates that in whatever respects the Synoptics differ in their

representations,—and they are not absolutely harmonious,—they yet represent a general agreement of view, and set forth what the primitive belief was. In that belief Jesus stands forth as Messiah, Himself accepting as appropriate what they attribute; a sublime figure, not merely human, or exalted to Messiahship only by self-mastery and self-dedication, but by peculiar nature and special appointment. The endeavour to reduce the Evangelic description of Messiah to human dimensions is ludicrously inadequate to the facts. If it be the case that His disciples ‘caressed Him in the most familiar manner as a fellow-human being’ (Crooker, *NT Views of Jesus*, p. 25), the statement is crudely one-sided, since the familiar fellowship He vouchsafed, as is very evident, is but the framework of an intimate disillusionment on the part of His followers, and a growing revelation on His part. We can trace the stages by which the higher idea was unfolded to them. It came in a series of disappointments, intended, probably, to wean them from the popular ideas of what the Messiah should be. There is first the death of the Baptist, the prophet of Messiah. Then there is the refusal to commit Himself to the enthusiasm of those who would have made Him a king (Joh 2:24; Joh 6:15). Again, Christ avoids or evades the challenge to manifest Himself to the world (Joh 7:4; Joh 7:6). Lastly came the crisis, as it were, the open challenge to prove His Messiahship by a sign and legitimate His claim, a challenge refused (Luk 22:67; Luk 23:35). Hand in hand with this progressive disillusionment of all that was contrary to His thought in current Messianic ideas went the progressive revelation of the true Messiah,—a revelation which became at once a testing and a discipline of the character of the disciples, and an unfolding of undreamt of forces in His; so that at last they fell at His feet and worshipped, while others acknowledged Him as ‘Lord and God’ (Joh 20:28); and still others plainly felt that He was ‘ascending to the Father’ (Joh 20:17). That Jesus claimed to be the Messiah, and gave His sanction to the belief on the part of His disciples is certain* [Note: The inquiry into the Messiah-consciousness of Christ has led so far to little agreement. Opinions multiply. The main points under consideration are: (1) Did the Messiah idea enter into His ministry at all? (2) If it did, when? From childhood? at baptism? at some later point in His ministry? and from what causes? (3) How did He conceive of His Messiahship? Was His conception complete at first, or the subject of development? (see art. Messiah). Probably it is true to say that the present popular study of Christ’s self-consciousness is less fruitful for the interpretation of His Person than the older method of studying His God-consciousness. His life is not so much a self-witness as a revelation of the Father.] (see next sect.); no less certain (and admitted) is it that the disciples believed Him to be the Messiah. The point of importance for the present is, how the belief originated with the latter. It is a practice among many scholars to reverse the actual facts. They argue as if the belief had been first formulated and officially offered, so to speak, for their acceptance, a formal external idea taken up because it had been put forth by Jesus as a scheme in which to frame His person; in the light of which they are to regard His life and words; exercising a prodigious

influence on, and lending a force to, His words and a sanctity to His person beyond that which, but for it, they could possibly have had (cf. such writers as Mackintosh, *Nat. Hist. of Christ. Relig.*; Percy Gardner, *Historic View of NT*, ch. iv.; Estlin Carpenter, *First Three Gospels*, chs. ii., iii.). The actual facts of Christ's career, *i.e.*, are conformed in the NT narratives to already existing Messianic traditions. And because of this the accumulated sanctities of the old religion were laid claim to by the new, whereby the latter maintained itself in face of the opposition which it encountered at the first and found a soil prepared for its reception. The contention cannot be sustained. It may receive some countenance from the circumstance that the writers of the NT never record any fact or incident merely as fact or incident, but as part of the substance of the gospel, illustrating and conveying spiritual principles. But the very ease with which the NT method of presenting historical circumstance might be turned to account under the influence of Messianic bias becomes valuable evidence against that hypothesis. For although the NT history is presented with a bias, *i.e.* as bearing and bodying forth a Person, the presentation, whether that of the Synoptics, or of the Fourth Gospel, or of St. Paul and the others, cannot with any measure of success be wholly identified with or wholly summed up in that of the Messiah. The Messianic claims of Jesus may be made (as they are made) to rest on the facts; but the facts are not exhausted in those claims, even in the immensely enriched and original form in which Jesus made them. There are other portrayures of Jesus in the NT besides that of Him as Messiah; and even those writers who set forth to portray Him solely as Messiah cannot be restrained from bursting through their self-imposed limits, in fidelity to the facts, and portraying Him as more than they meant. Moreover, the same writers convey to us the explicit assurance that they have not apprehended all the truth about His Person. Subsequent theology accepted the assurance, departed widely from the purely Messianic portraiture, yet claimed, and with perfect justice, that the new departures were in no sense new additions to the original Gospel, but fresh interpretations, designed to recover and vitalize truths discernible in the Gospels, but imperfectly understood by the Gospel writers.

(b) What has been adverted to finds illustration in another source of Christological idea, *the self-consciousness of Jesus*. In the most noteworthy discussion of this subject, that of Baldensperger (*Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*), only about one half of the work is taken up with determining the sense in which Jesus regarded Himself as Messiah; the second part is devoted to other aspects arising out of His self-designations, His teaching as to the Kingdom, etc. Withal, much that cannot be excluded from Christ's self-revelation is not even touched upon. Any adequate exposition of Christ's idea of His own nature will include the following features: His interior life, His method in teaching, His moral perfection, His oneness with the Father.

(α) The *true secret of Christ's life* is not open. Who can ever know His intimate mind? Could He have revealed it even if He would? We know His words and deeds; we distinguish the forces He set agoing in the world's history; we venture on assertions of growth both of idea and of action in His life; but where was the source of these? or what the process? or when the great choices and decisive operations of His marvellous soul? What were the supremely triumphant and supremely terrible moments of His life? What were the events in which He 'found Himself'? His abounding energy implies a rich self-consciousness; the completest self-consciousness rests on a plenitude of interior self-relationships. That these last existed in Him we are certain. But in what manner or in obedience to what impulses, who can discern? The records give results not processes, and just at those points where our curiosity is most eager, the limitations of our power to perceive are most urgent. We see but a few things. We observe the self-indulgence of His own consciousness again and again. We have glimpses of its exercise in solitary communings with God, in a life of intercourse with men, in the collision with incident and event. Above all, we know it in its great occasions,—Baptism, Temptation, Discussion with the Doctors, Transfiguration, Agony in the Garden, Resurrection, Ascension,—all of which are equally discoveries of His nature to Himself and revelations to His disciples. Because the meaning of these events seems to lie on the surface, we must be careful not to give them a superficial reception. They must be so received when regarded as parts of a religious idea, and not, as they are, experiences of a real Person. They constitute events which were no mere form gone through to proclaim a spiritual truth to men or to certify to them by wondrous signs a new relation opened for them with God. They were not dramatic: they were as personal to Him as they are instructive for us. He did what He did because He was what He was—from a deeper necessity than any deliberate persuasion that His disciples needed this or that teaching at this or that time. These events are far from summing up His inner life. They are but flashes out of a deep darkness. They reveal a life that is really human, in constant communion with a source of sustenance beyond the human, receiving the fulness of that source and translating it into earthly relations, yet with a self-possession and self-knowledge, *i.e.* a consciousness differentiated and personal. But the revelation does not uncover all the secrets of that life, leaving nothing to elude or bewilder. There are reservations in the knowledge given (cf. Dale, *Atonement*, pp. 45, 47). And these are not to be identified with the necessary inscrutabilities inherent in all finite personality. They are the intimations of a glory in His nature which separates it from all common natures, signs that in Him there are abysses of impenetrable splendour into which finite natures may not enter, however closely they may touch.

(β) Christ's *method in teaching* was characteristic. He taught neither as the scribes (Mat 7:29), nor as a prophet (Mat 11:9). And this because of His own nature and the nature of His message. He came not as a teacher; compelling assent by the complete

answer to every difficulty, silencing dispute with arguments. He was more personal and spiritual. His teaching did not profess to offer an absolute intellectual proof of itself which must convince all sufficiently intelligent persons. It claimed the belief of all men, but not on the ground of its incontrovertible evidence; on the ground rather that all men were created to be good, and to know the truth, and would know it if their perceptions were not dulled and distorted by sin. It convinced only by a process which at the same time purified. He made His message not an argument but a force.

Hence His method was both declarative and suggestive; both thought and incentive to further thought. At times He is clear and authoritative; His words are such that men may refuse them but cannot mistake them. At other times He shrouds His doctrine in parables, and, pointing to principles, leaves them to work and unfold their purport as men are found ready to receive them. This was so, because the teaching was not simply of truths but Truth, infinite, inalienable, imperishable; the fulfilment of all partial truths. His 'Verily I say' asserts His belief that it was so. The 'mind of Christ' which the teaching offers is not mere neutrality but soul, personality—back to which the teaching goes for justification. He appeals to no higher sanction than Himself. For Himself also He assumes a right to revise the law of Moses (Mat_5:21), and claims authority over every individual soul (Mat_19:29). For this reason it is futile to found an argument against the final and the revealed character of His message on its fragmentariness or its want of originality, futile also to limit His teaching to any detached portion of its recorded whole, *e.g.* the Sermon on the Mount. The fragments are numerous enough to enable us with ease to trace His mind. They form a unity which is not a new edition simply of anything preceding. That some of His thoughts and precepts were anticipated by Jewish and ethnical men of wisdom does not detract from His originality (see art. Originality), because that consists, not in isolated truths, but in the remarkable sum of truth in which they take their appropriate and articulate place. That doctrine again explains the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount more fully than the Sermon sums up the doctrine. The method of Christ challenges reflexion and suggests as origin of His teaching His own statement 'from God' (Mat_11:27, Joh_7:16).

(γ) What is meant by *the moral perfection* of Christ is at times misconceived, yet embodies a difference in His nature as compared with ordinary men that is perfectly realizable. Ullmann in a treatise of great power has made it familiar under the term 'sinlessness' (*Sinlessness of Jesus*, T. & T. Clark). The term has been objected to as a negative conception, the negative absence of evil, a negative difficult to prove from the limited induction available in a life of a few years. To give the conception a concrete expression may be impossible; but the term is of value as pointing to the stainless purity of Christ. His moral self-witness is in the highest degree positive.*
[Note: The passage, 'Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is

God' (Mar_10:18 | |), is still a difficult question of criticism and interpretation. That it is a self-depreciatory word is the least tenable explanation. That, as a self-depreciatory saying it is the only certainly authentic word of Christ with reference to His moral nature (Schmiedel, Encyc. Bibl, ii. 1881), is perverse (cf. Marcus Dods, The Bible, its Origin and Nature, p. 205).]

It implies not simply the consciousness of flawless conduct, but the consciousness of perfect character as well as the assurance of power to create in others perfect character. Man may fail to meet his moral obligation in three ways: by falling short of his ideal of duty, by forming lower ideals than he ought, by direct transgression. And the witness of the ordinary conscience is that man has failed in all three, and has reason to fear God. The peculiarity of Christ's moral life is that all suspicion of this is wholly absent. He never confesses sin. He never fears any consequences of His acts either from God or from men. He seeks forgiveness, but only for others. He dreads sin, but not for Himself. He claims to be apart from it. He gives the impression of breathing an atmosphere in which sin cannot be. He is possessed with a holy energy, constant and powerful. Yet His moral life finds exercise not in abstracts but within conditions of earthly existence. He fought His way through those experiences which make goodness difficult. For this reason His goodness is both provable and imitable. The crux of the proof must rest less in special pleading for particulars of conduct than in a central view of His moral personality. Particulars have been contested. He has been charged with harshness to His mother (Joh_2:4); with petulance (Luk_2:49); with brusque contempt (Mat_7:6); with discourtesy and personal bitterness (Luk_11:37 ff.); with violation of property rights (Mar_5:13; Mar_11:2-6; Mar_11:15); with underrating family duty and affection (Mat_10:37, Luk_14:25-26); with defective and impracticable theories as to civic virtue, wealth, almsgiving, non-resistance, etc. (For these and others cf. such writers as Voysey, Dole, Philip Sidney, Goldwin Smith; and the tendency of younger Unitarians). Charges on particulars cannot be met except in the light of character. The above are all defensible consistently with the character of Jesus as that character appears in the record. Nor need we resort to the plea (Martineau) that the blemishes are due to the fault of the delineators. Christ's moral nature is a unity. It is a unity in virtue of that principle by which He knew Himself to be always doing the will of God. He knew Himself to be in the activity of spirit and will what God in nature gave Him to become. In this respect He felt Himself solitary among men, and acted on the feeling. His perfection thus consists, first, not in any completeness of precepts given or concrete relations sustained in conduct—these flow from it; but in the possession of that spirit and of those principles which not only supply all due regulation as occasion requires, but give unity, consistency, and purity to the moral life. In the light of this consideration we argue for His constant maintenance of moral supremacy in particular acts. His moral consciousness penetrated all His thought and feeling, and all expressions of both. It was the secret, further, of His power over sin, both in the world (cosmic) and in man: His power 'to

overthrow sin' and 'to forgive sins.' He did not disregard sin. He inherited the teaching of His race as to sin, a teaching characteristically striking and comprehensive. He appropriates all its truth, and develops it in His own original spirit. He did this just because He was so pure. Sin was the haunting dread of His days. In meeting its malign force and subduing it, He broke His life. Against it He put forth all His strength, and in so doing rose to the fulness of stature we know, 'being raised up by God to his right hand.' More by what He did against sin than by what He declared of sin or of His own goodness did He prove His sinlessness. He did what He was. His presence raised the disciples, as His story raises us, to a level which, like Him, knows no sin (1Jn_3:5-6; 1Jn_3:9).

(δ) His *equality with God** [Note: See below under 'Divine designations,' 'Son of Man,' 'Son of God.'] connects itself chiefly (in the Synoptics) with the thought of His sinlessness and His power to forgive sins (Mat_9:2-6, Mar_2:10, Luk_5:20; Luk_5:23. Less unquestioned is Mat_28:19, where He includes Himself in the unity of the Divine name). St. John's Gospel is full of the idea (Joh_5:22 f., Joh_6:33-35, Joh_8:42; Joh_8:58, Joh_9:25 f., Joh_10:9, Joh_11:25, Joh_14:1; Joh_14:6; Joh_14:9, Joh_15:5 f., Joh_15:23), and to this point attacks have in consequence been directed with vigour (cf. in particular Martineau's *Seat of Authority*; and for an effective rejoinder, Forrest's *Christ of History and Experience*, Lect. i.).

(c) As remarkable a factor as any in the spell Christ laid on man's spirit has been His *appeal to the deeper forces of personal being*. There have been those whose presence seemed to lower for the time being the vitality and intelligence of those who came into contact with them, and so acted as to destroy their self-possession. Some men overawe and paralyze others who come within the field of their influence. The power of Christ acted contrariwise. It empowered. He revealed men to themselves in revealing Himself to their inner sense. In receiving Him into their hearts new powers therein arose, reserve forces showed themselves; His influence was that of reason begetting reason, love begetting love. In fellowship with Him men came to higher ideals. From Him, in fact, mankind has learned to know itself as it ought to be, and to estimate its own best possibilities. He has lifted up human aspiration more than any other. The reason of this may be found in the fact that He appealed persuasively to human instinct. To appeal to such instinct is often to create it. When a child is told a story of heroism, when rough untaught natures are softened by the beauty of tenderness seen or pictured, there is a creation of courage or gentleness where it was not before. When the instinct is quickened we know that it is native. The movement Christ initiated has proved of unrivalled creativeness in the history of human instinct and in every direction of human activity. 'The idea of Jesus is the illumination and inspiration of existence' (Phillips Brooks, whose *Bohlen Lectures*, 1879, are an eloquent exposition of Christ's creative influence, in moral, social,

intellectual, emotional life). The first perception of this fact glows through the NT writings: not one of the writers fails to make us understand that the One he writes about is One who has opened new powers in, and disclosed new horizons to, his own soul. This is their witness—a witness corroborated by every succeeding age—that He called them, and in communion with Him, He made them ‘a new creation,’ disciplining and elevating character, calling out a higher faith, creating profounder emotions, inspiring with ever-increasing reverence, and bringing into play those higher and more creative faculties of the soul that see the things of God in a wide perspective impossible to the reason.

(d) The specialities of Christ’s *teaching and works* may be briefly indicated. Their speciality has been challenged. The opinion of a recent Gifford lecturer is shared by many, that ‘it is difficult, if not impossible, to select any special article of religious faith which is in its general aspect a doctrine peculiar to Christianity. Its uniqueness lies rather in what some would call the personality of the founder’ (Wallace, *Lectures*, iii.). That is true; but its suggestion is not true, that there is no uniqueness in the teaching of Christ. The uniqueness of the Teacher draws with it uniqueness in the teaching; and that both in its method (see above) and in its substance. Similarly His works exhibit higher potency than the ordinary human. A strong feeling to this effect is resulting from the minute analysis which at the present time both the ‘Words’ and the ‘Miracles’ are undergoing (cf. Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*; Dalman, *Words of Jesus, et al.*). His dependence on others, His anticipations by others, are less confidently asserted. It is difficult, if not impossible, to discover any form of Gentile culture which is likely to have entered into the formative influences of His mind. From Greek philosophy He probably lived remote as much by natural temperament as by patriotic interest. He was not beyond its range, but then as now the Jew had a wonderful power of living in the fire without suffering the smell of it to pass upon his garments. Every Jew appeared in his own eyes to stand morally and intellectually on a higher level than the Gentile; his system of education seemed less destitute of vivifying and invigorating ideals. He was nurtured on the history, the scenery, the religion of his land, all of them of exquisite interest, stimulating the fresh mind in the highest degree to habits of independent wisdom (cf. Ramsay, *Education of Christ*, ch. 3). Of Jewish sects and teachers three have been suggested as contributory forces: the Pharisees, the Baptist, the Essenes. The first proved His worst foes; they had an influence, but it was solely negative. The second is remarkable for his consciousness of his own inferiority, of Christ’s higher range in mission and higher rank in Person. Of the third let Hausrath judge: ‘From the Essenes His whole conception of the world separated Him.’* [Note: It hardly comes within the scope of this article to consider the alleged influence of Buddhism or Mithraism.] There can be little question that the impulse to reflexion was fostered in Christ by study of the sacred books, the Law and the Prophets, under the usual Rabbinical direction. The master-words of His teaching are drawn thence. The substance of His

teaching, in numerous details, is defined negatively by contrast with the comments of the scribes and positively by 'fulfilment' of the Law through a clearer discernment and profounder enrichment of the proper principles of the Law. The substance of His teaching in its main positions is intrinsically so separate from even its closest approximations in previous prophecy as to be justly entitled to the claim of originality. The source of its originality was in Himself. Christ's teaching is His own exposition of the Divine life which was revealed in Himself† [Note: Perowne's Hulsean Lects, pp, 93, 94.] (Mat_11:25-27). 'Out of a perfect relation with God flows His teaching like a crystal stream.' Its form is drawn from the religious vocabulary of the time; its matter from His own mind. In this connexion the following is admirably put, and meets a common objection:

'It is not enough to show that particular statements of our Lord may be found embedded in earlier writings which consist mainly of foolish superstitions and childish conceits. It would be strange indeed if, with the Scriptures in their hands, the great teachers of Israel never said, or never uttered in pregnant phrase, any of those lofty spiritual truths which shine forth from the pages of the prophets. But if we find, on referring to contemporary literature, that such references are only like rare jewels shining among vast heaps of error and superstition, that they are only like flashes of lightning in an all-embracing night, then their concurrence in nowise diminishes our wonder. The problem only takes another shape. How is it, we ask, that out of all this spiritual lumber the soul of Jesus only selected what was good and great, and rejected all the rest? How is it, *e.g.*, that from the teaching of Hillel He took (if, indeed, He took anything *directly* theocoe) only what was eternally true, rejecting at the same time all the frivolous ritualism and puerile casuistry in the consideration of which Hillel spent his life? Remember again that it detracts in nowise from our Lord's claim to originality, that even His master thought had been partially or casually expressed by those who went before Him. The question to be decided in our Lord's day was this, Which of all the thoughts about God that have passed through the mind of saints and prophets should become the master-thought of religion, which should condition and determine all the rest? It would not be true to say that Jesus *selected* one, as though He had been passing all in review and comparing them. No, the truth is that Jesus laid hold of one by His Divine intuition, in virtue of His direct insight into the nature of God' (Moorhouse, *Teaching of Christ*, p. 66 f.).

When we add that Christ's teaching was given, so to speak, casually; not systematically, in no ordered or finished statement; that the whole is comparatively small, and yet that it is easy to draw up from the scattered sayings a sum of doctrine coherent, self-consistent, and completely satisfying to the needs of the soul, further cogency is lent to the witness, 'Never man so spake' (Joh_7:46), and point to the question, 'Whence hath this man this wisdom?' (Mat_13:54). See artt. Originality and Uniqueness.

To His words have to be added His works. His ordinary doings were those of a good man (Act 10:38). His miracles proved a special presence of God with Him (Joh 3:2). There is a crude view of the Gospel wonders which has made many see in them an unimportant part of the Gospel story, and even feel it desirable to do without them. So long as they are looked upon as thaumaturgic signs or violations of Nature's sequence, so long will both religion and science reject them. If, however, they are considered as indications of laws which embrace and in a sense unite the seen and unseen worlds, it is of immense importance to Christianity that they should occur in connexion with the foundation of that faith. As a matter of fact, in face of all attempts to explain them or explain them away, a certain robust sense of the general mind has refused to concur in any view that denies their reality or their essential place in the history. They reveal Christ no less than His doctrine. They constitute warrants of His Divine power: they also form part of the Gospel. They stand as a real item in the list of testimonies to His impression. They are one of the modes in which His life found utterance, 'an authentic element of the original gospel offered to faith' (A. B. Bruce, *Apologetics*, p. 376; *Miraculous Elements in Gospels*, chs. vi. and viii.). In this respect they are on a different plane from the prodigies credited to pagan heroes. That men might see the will of God at work, Jesus did the works of His Father. A reckless historical scepticism evaporates the miracles partly into odd natural events, partly into nervous healings, partly into gradually growing legends. Sane criticism, however, admits their congruity with the record, their naturalness to His Person, and their value to faith. The supreme miracle of the Resurrection (wh. see) is of primary import.

3. *Validity of the experience.*—The lines thus traced converge in one picture. Their effect is striking, and of the cumulative kind. They may not produce infallible certainty of the truth of Christ's Divinity. But no infallible certainty can be given. The Christ they portray is not absolute in the sense of abstract; He is absolute in the sense of the fullest concrete; all the elements, therefore, which go to make up this impression of His Person contribute to the proof of its power: by exhibiting what He is they testify to Him: their witness is, 'This is the Son of God.' It was men's experience of Christ as Divine that gave them the right to affirm His Divinity. *Is the witness true?* The contention here made is that what we know along many lines as the Christian experience is a new and distinctive development, and demands a new and unique factor introduced to the human consciousness. Is the contention verifiable? The witness is an interpretation: can we trust it? Has the impression an exact equivalent behind it of objective fact? What were the dimensions of the objective fact capable of producing this inner effect? The answer must be that the same law of rationality holds here as in other parts of knowledge. The effect must have an adequate cause. What the soul realizes as the highest in its inner feeling is proof of reality that the reason may recognize. If the soul attains the vision of a Reality whose authority over it is absolute and from whom it receives a power that masters all other powers, then it

knows the meaning of God. The finality of such experience cannot be questioned, when its source is personality (personality being the only full reality of which we have knowledge), and its seat the moral disposition and not individual temperament. Now to those conditions the impression of Christ recorded in the Gospels conforms. Behind the records He stands, greater than themselves, and that by their own showing; and because of this they furnish to their readers a vision which does not fade but grows, a power that is new and permanent, a command from which the conscience cannot dissent, a mastery that sets free. He Himself had this effect on men as they companied with Him; the record of their intercourse with Him has the same effect. The effect is a fact of continuous experience fundamentally identical in kind throughout the Christian centuries. Both are the envelope that enwraps Truth transcending time and place. Only the universal and everlasting can transcend the limitations of our separateness and speak in the same manner to thousands of different souls. The phenomena of Christian history are so diverse in kind from those of other historic faiths as to require the supposition of a supernatural origin (cf. Illingworth, *Personality Human and Divine*, p. 200). The witness that God Himself is here stepping into the history of the race must be accounted true.

III. Beginnings of the doctrine of Christ's Person in the NT

1. *General character of the doctrine.*—It has been necessary to make the above analysis of the bases of belief in Christ as presented in the Gospels and to justify it, because it is only by understanding them fully that we gain any test by which to determine the character and worth of the belief itself, or reach the point of view for appreciating aright its beginnings and its growth. It is a doctrine that *has no finality*. It is based on an experience which cannot rest, but must grow with the growth of all life, and pervade all other experience of life. It is a doctrine therefore that has a history down to the present, and which is destined to continue beyond the present. We are now in the midst of a new growth of its meaning. In moving on we can purchase security only by retracing our steps, unravelling the web of the past and weaving it over again. Recurrence to the original will reinvigorate like the touch of earth to the feet of Antaeus. In the first expression there is a universality which is apt to be lost in the divisions of later opinion: there is an implicit fulness in the beginning which is not completely represented in any subsequent stage. To that beginning we now advert. In the conviction that 'in Christ' they were 'a new creation,' 'partakers of a Divine nature' (2Co_5:17; 2Pe_1:4), the Apostles must seek expression of their conviction. The expression runs over into every phase of their thought and life. It breeds in them a sense of new relation to Christ akin to that felt towards God, originating a new thought of His Person. We see it in the Names they give to Him, in the Properties and Attributes they ascribe to Him, in their acceptance of wonders attending His Origin and His passing from sight, in the relations they proceed to institute between Him and previous history as well as future ages. The NT idea of His

Divinity is not to be built up as an induction from these particulars; these, on the contrary, are the reflexions, inevitable and faint, of the experience of His Divinity; they are the inward seeking utterance.

It is an utterance that is quite spontaneous. It is the outcome of religious faith not of philosophic interest. The speculative instinct is wholly secondary to the spiritual facts. But while this is so, the philosophic interest is there, and that of necessity. While the Person hidden behind the life of the NT is vaster than the NT record of Him, it remains true that if that Person were to survive and His impression, they must be shown to ring true to the intellect. What happens to the emotions suggests problems to the mind. Proved facts, even those 'deep-seated in our mystic frame,' have to formulate themselves in thought. And so the moral life created by Christ furnished material for new great convictions fitted to be at once its expression and its safeguard. The doctrine of His Person was the necessary correlate of the impression of His Personality.

In the facts thus noted is to be found the answer to two inquiries of rationalism. On the one hand, it is asked, Why is He never called God? and on the other, Why such *diversity of view among the writers*? Take the latter first. The criticism here has been carefully made by Dr. Martineau (*Seat of Authority*, p. 361) and others, who urge that Jesus was construed successively into (1) the Jewish ideal or Messiah, (2) the Human ideal or Second Adam, (3) a Divine Incarnation. This construction of theories is asserted to be only a fanciful achievement of early Christian thought. 'The personal attendants of Jesus worked out the first; the Apostle of the Gentiles, the second; the school whence the Fourth Gospel proceeded, the third.' In reply it may be affirmed that such criticism holds its ground only by (a) doing violence to the facts on which it seeks to rest, by subjecting them to a narrowly subjective standard: the facts include those in which Christ is represented as accepting the name of Lord; by (b) an arbitrary application of the idea of development to the narrative. It is possible to prove the alleged constructions to have been made successively only by a series of unwarranted eliminations. The Synoptists are not without knowledge of (2) and (3), nor is (1) unknown to St. Paul and the Fourth Gospel. The facts, when viewed without prepossession, point to no such clear-cut theories. They do, however, indicate both movement and diversity of belief, changes constantly going on in the opinions respecting Christ's nature, and very material differences in individual emphasis and interpretation, a movement and diversity only less remarkable than the unmistakable unity pervading them. It was natural that men of the character and training of St. James and St. Peter should discover in OT conceptions of the Messiah approximate lines of thought wherewith to describe their experience of Christ. Temperamental and other causes led St. Paul and St. John as naturally to give representations of their experience such as they have done, the former anthropological and practical, the latter contemplative and mystical. As types these three are distinguishable, but not

exclusively of each other. There are others also, as, e.g., that of the Ep. to the Hebrews, of Ephesians and Colossians, of the Apocalypse. These expressions differ among themselves, and differ in precisely the manner that is natural and desirable. The variety is that of life and reality. These all represent differences that are not separate developments of substance in the doctrine so much as precious elements constitutive of a richer fulness than any one of them or all of them; a fulness of necessary mysteriousness. They represent no signs of a struggle to assert Divinity in opposition to a bare humanity: of such a struggle there is not a trace in the NT.

As to the second point of criticism, it is possible with some reason to maintain that the term θεός is never applied to Christ. The matter is still in dispute among scholars. The crucial passages are (not taking into account Joh 1:1; Joh 20:28, 1Jn 5:20, Heb 1:8 ff.) Rom 9:5, Tit 2:13, Act 20:28, 1Ti 3:16, Php 2:6, 2Pe 1:1, Col 2:9. In 2Pe 1:1 the rendering, 'Our God and the Saviour Jesus Christ,' is not excluded; similarly Tit 2:13. In Rom 9:5 the doxology may be regarded as referring to God. In 1Ti 3:16 the true text is ὁς not θεός. In Act 20:28 the Authorized Version reading is probably correct ('God'). Col 2:2, Eph 5:5, 2Th 1:12, Tit 2:13 have been adduced as proofs that St. Paul speaks of Christ as God; but erroneously. The two strongest passages are Php 2:6-8, Col 2:9. But if the texts are not unambiguous, *that does not affect the truth of the Divinity of Christ*. It was scarcely natural for a Jew to use the Divine Name in any connexion (cf. Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, § vii., also p. 233). If it were used, it applied to God in His absolute being. Cf. Westcott, *Ep. of St. John*, p. 172. God manifesting Himself in Christ was affirmed in a variety of other modes. The Apostles were not so much concerned to 'prove His Divinity' as to persuade men to accept Christ as their Saviour. The question whether He was God or not was in this view a subordinate question. They wrote about Him as they preached, in His human manifestation and in His Exalted Glory. From that point of view they neither missed the consciousness of His Godhood nor failed abundantly to declare it. The declarations they make are of One who, they were persuaded, was absolutely unique in position, in character, in work; One whose relationship to God was perfect, who was the Saviour, Light and Life of men. Are such declarations consistent with anything short of His Divinity?

2. Divine designations applied to Christ.—Of the names implying distinctiveness of nature assigned to Christ in the Gospels and Epistles, there are four of supreme import: (a) 'Son of Man,' which stands by itself; (b) 'Son of God,' with which may be set as allied in significance, 'Son of the Highest,' 'Only-begotten Son,' 'My beloved Son' (or 'My Son, my Chosen'), and 'The Son': (c) 'Christ'; (d) 'Lord.' Others are the 'Word of God' and 'the Word'; 'Son of David,' with which may be placed 'Root and offspring of David,' and perhaps 'Prince of life' and 'Prince'; 'Saviour'; 'Image of God'; 'Second Adam'; 'First and Last'; 'The Holy, Just One.'

Son of Man.—To this title there attaches a peculiar interest, which is reflected in the amount of discussion it has excited. Controversy circles round its use, its source, its meaning. It occurs in all the four Gospels. It is the one name Christ is represented as reserving for His exclusive use. That He did so is plainly implied in the narratives.

His use of it has been denied (cf. Bruno Bauer, Volkmar, Oort, Lietzmann, etc.). One of the most capable of recent critics (Wellhausen, *Das Evang. Marci*) argues that the term, if used at all by Christ, was not made current by Him but by the Christian community, and came into use in the following manner. The early Christians believed that Jesus had prophesied His Parousia. They hesitated to make Him say so outright, and hence represented Him as saying only that the 'Man' of Daniel should appear with the clouds of heaven. He could say that without meaning Himself. But the Christian interpretation soon read Him into the announcement, then used the title in the prophecies of the Passion and Resurrection, and finally as a simple equivalent of the first person singular on the lips of Jesus. The position, in this and other forms, fails to account, *inter alia*, for two facts: (a) the term is not found in St. Paul or elsewhere in NT, but almost solely on the lips of Jesus (instances to the contrary are Joh 12:34, Act 7:56); (b) if a coinage of the Early Church, how does it—a term denoting lowliness—harmonize with the evident endeavour to portray a glorified Christ?

The expression occurs in previous Hebrew and Aramaic literature. The references of importance are in Ezekiel, Daniel (Dan 7:13), and Enoch, in all of which the Messianic significance is not indisputable (see Schmidt, art. 'Son of Man' in *Encyc. Bibl.*, who inclines to refer even Dan 7:13 to Michael, not Messiah). In what sense is it to be understood? The commonly accepted view (e.g. Beyschlag—Wendt) may be thus stated: Christ was desirous of being recognized as the Messiah. He was not desirous of fulfilling the current expectations of what the Messiah should be and do. He therefore did not apply the current designations of Messiah to Himself, but, finding one term, 'Son of Man' (in Daniel), employed it as expressing (1) Messianic character, and (2) much more than the expected Messianic character, viz. the generically human character.

Dalman (*Words of Jesus*) has adduced grave considerations against this view. It is a view, he holds, started by the Greek divines, and has no basis in primitive Christian thought. He maintains that Christ adopted it from Dan 7:13, and used it of Himself in its original sense, a sense which was not widely prevalent in His time as applicable to the Messiah. There 'the emphasis rather lies on the fact that in contrast with the winged lion, the devouring bear, the four-headed leopard, the fourth beast with ten horns terrible exceedingly beyond its predecessors, he appears unarmed and inoffensive, incapable through any power of his own of making himself master of the world; he is only as a son of man. If ever he is to be master of the world, *God* must make him so.' The 'Son of Man,' on this view, is not the son of man in the sense of

being a man like other men. but as being a man distinct from other men, in the sense that God has given him to be what he is. The expression intimates less his human nature than his Divine. 'Son of Man' denotes 'that member of the human race, in his own nature impotent, whom God will make Lord of the world.'

To indicate results, it may be taken that there is a fair consensus of agreement on the following points: (a) that the use of the title as applicable to Himself is due to Christ; (b) that a wider source than the passage in Daniel is probable; (c) that in meaning it embodies a composite conception, combining various OT suggestions, and these the most rich and salient; the seed of the woman, the one like a son of man, the suffering Servant of Jehovah, the ideal people, the recipient of special privilege, the apportioner of judgment, of celestial origin. In wealth of content the expression stands alone. It was thus peculiarly appropriate as a self-designation of Christ. In it there met the two divisions of Messianic reference, those pointing to the glory and those pointing to the humiliation of the Messiah, comprising elements seemingly incongruous and irreconcilable, yet in essentials capable of being unified in a single character. In the course of His ministry He was to manifest Himself as the conqueror of Satan, as perfect man, as concentrating His race in an intense personal life, as conscious of a special mission from God, of absolutely intimate relation to God, of perfect dependence upon God, and as sharing with God in the judgment of the world, characteristics all of them Messianic, and impossible to be included in any of the terms of Messianic intention more fully than in this, the 'Son of Man.' Its meaning on His lips goes further than even the fulness of Messianic intention; so that it is not at once intelligible ('mystifying title' of Weisse and others is not justified), a feature it shares with Him whom it designates and the hopes it unified. In it these features find place: much contemporary Messianic belief of a familiar kind; less prominent ideas that had before this time passed into the background; novel functions in Christ's conception, such as the life of the Son of Man as a life of service, and His death as necessary to redeem men; and the combination of all these in a new synthesis which was not simply a mosaic of old data or gathering up of the disparate details of earlier expectation, but which was reached by the entrance of a new thing that made the fulfilment infinitely more glorious than the promise might have seemed to warrant (cf. art. Son of Man).

Son of God ('the Son,' 'My Son'). This title, like the former, belongs to the OT writings, being found in Gen 6:2, Exo 4:22, 2Sa 7:14, Psa 2:7; Psa 82:6; Psa 89:27, Job 1:6; Job 38:7, Hos 1:10; Hos 11:1, and there applied in various connexions: to offspring of the gods, to angels, to judges, to Israel as a people serving Jehovah, to individual Israelites, to the theocratic king, to the Messiah (Dalman and others object to 'Son of God' as a Messianic title). The expression 'Son of God' [or 'My Son'] occurs in the Synoptics 27 times, and 'the Son' 9 times. In St. John 'Son of God' occurs 10 times and 'the Son' 14 times. Both occur in St. John's First Epistle, in several of St.

Paul's, in Hebrews, in Revelation. In the Gospels they are applied to Christ by the Father, angels, demoniacs, Himself (rarely, and only in St. John), disciples (*N.B.*—St. Peter's confession, Mat 16:16), elders, high priest, centurion. In determining its meaning, we may exclude the idea of pagan influence. There is little probability that the cult of the Roman emperors suggested either the word or its idea. Its application to believers (Mat 5:9; Mat 5:45, Luk 6:35, Eph 1:5, Joh 1:12, 1Jn 3:1-2, Rom 8:14; Rom 8:19, Php 2:15) does not necessarily confine its import to the merely human sphere, Its previous usage in the OT could not fail to prepare the way for a connotation of special relationship to God.

That the term contains Messianic reference is contested by few. In line with it are to be explained the testimony of the demoniacs (Mat 8:29 || Luk 4:41), and the heavenly voices at the Baptism and the Transfiguration (Mat 3:17; Mat 17:5). Here, too, possibly lies the reason for Christ's use of the term in debates with the Jewish leaders (Joh 3:18; Joh 5:15 ff; Joh 8:25 ff.). The Messianic sense is obvious in St. Peter's confession (Mat 16:16); less so in that of the centurion (Mar 15:39). The answer to the high priest's question was treated as blasphemy (Mat 26:63 ff.), because by it He claimed more than Messiahship. St. John's statements enhance the feeling of the Synoptists. He points clearly to Christ's use of the term and in the solitary sense. He is careful in his use of names, and would hardly put into Christ's mouth a self-designation without some warrant of sanction from His personal usage. But the Synoptists are not without traces of the same clearness. In Mat 22:41-46, Mar 12:35-37, Luk 20:41-44, the inference is inevitable that the Messiah is the son of One more exalted than David.

What meaning did Christ attach to the term? The above passage is significant. He is not denying Davidic descent. He affirms it (see on the other side Wellhausen, *Evangel. Marci*). By His descent from David He satisfies one condition expected in the Messiah. That fact, however, does not preclude Him from satisfying further conditions not included in the Messianic prophecy, evincing a power in Him which points to another and higher origin. This further scope in His filial relation is intimated in such passages as Mat 11:27; Mat 16:17, Luk 10:22, Mat 3:11, Mar 4:11, Luk 8:10, Joh 8:35-36; Joh 15:10; Joh 4:34 etc.). He taught the disciples to call God 'our Father,' and called God His own Father in a special sense. He asserts that He alone adequately reveals and knows God. He suggests a special sonship in the parable of the Wicked Husbandman (Mar 12:6). The double strain is present in His consciousness. He is Son in the Messianic sense. He is also Son in a Divine sense: of absolute oneness with the Father. He has the mission of the former with its dignity: He has the infallible knowledge with perfect obedience of the latter. Both features emerge in the Synoptics as in the Fourth Gospel. Both are not justly interpreted in such a sense as suggests a merely ethical relation to God, a relation which others may actually possess or are destined to attain. In them there is the basis of the ethical but of the

essential as well. The Sonship of Christ is human and historical yet solitary and transcendent.

St. Paul corroborates the Evangelic positions. The earlier Epistles contain a large amount of teaching as to the Person of Christ. We have lucid references to the Sonship: 1Th 1:10, Rom 8:3; Rom 8:32, 2Co 4:4, Rom 1:4, 2Co 1:19 ff., Gal 2:20, Eph 4:13, Rom 1:9, Gal 1:16; Gal 4:4, where, through the position assigned to Him on the one hand, and on the other the special Spirit dwelling in Him, equality with God is asserted and Divine functions attributed. In one passage, 2 Thessalonians 2, Christ, while not named 'Son,' is regarded in His capacity as the opponent of Antichrist as a consubstantial representative of God. This idea in another context we have in Col 1:13-15, Heb 1:2-8; Heb 3:3 etc.

A survey of the texts reveals a complex conception, including (1) a Messianic predicate asserting the place of Christ as the complete antitype of the theocratic king; (2) an ethical identity in the realization of Divine holiness in a stainless life; (3) a spiritual unity revealing itself in a perfect harmony with the mind of God and a perfect obedience to His will, which were as much innate properties of His personality as achievements of His moral self. In addition, the conviction of His pre-existent glory* [Note: See art. Pre-existence.] and of His cosmic agency necessitates (1) a physical descent from Deity by a creative act of the Divine Spirit (See Annunciation and Virgin-birth); and (2) an equality of essence in virtue of which Divine acts and qualities are ascribed to Him. Cf., further, art. Son of God.

Christ ('the Christ'), **King of the Jews**, **Lord**, may all be taken together. 'Christ' is the Greek equivalent of *Messiah*. Both words signify 'the Anointed.' While applied in the OT to prophets (Psa 105:15, 1Ki 19:16) and high priests (Zec 4:14), the name is specially identified with the kings, from the passage (Psa 2:2) implying that they were under the special protection of Jehovah, and exercised righteous government. Later, when Israel had come under Gentile rule, the idea entered into the name that the Messiah would overthrow the secular might and liberate the people, *i.e.* be at once the Saviour of the faithful and the Prince or King of the saved. In the NT the name is accorded to Jesus everywhere. It is practically His surname, a circumstance remarkable when it is remembered that He forbade its use in His earthly life. He is greeted also as 'King' and as 'Son of David,' recognitions of Him as Messiah. That He Himself accepted the role appears from the following: (a) His sanction of the terms 'Son of Man' and 'Son of God' as applicable to Him; (b) His consciousness of being endowed with the Spirit of God (Luk 4:18 ff.), a mark of the Messianic King (Isa 11:2) and of the Servant of Jehovah (Isa 42:1; Isa 61:1); (c) His self-witness as to His being the Son and Heir of God (Psa 2:2); (d) His assurance of the reference in Psalms 110 to Himself, where the King in Zion is in His view the Messiah; (e) He spoke of the building of the Temple in the same sense in which the Messiah is the builder of the Temple

(cf. Mat 26:61, Mar 14:58 with Zec 6:12-13); (f) He spoke of His kingdom and therefore Messianic rank; (g) He described Himself as Judge of the world—a Messianic function; (h) He commended St. Peter's confession (Mat 16:17); (i) He acknowledged His Messiahship before His judges (both Sanhedrin and Pilate); (j) He was put to death as 'King of the Jews.' Messiahship, it has been said, is not Divinity (Ottley, art. 'Incarnation' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible). True, but Messiahship as enriched by Christ is. The new features with which He fulfilled the old conception, suffering and resurrection, brought it as near Divinity as was possible for the Hebrew mind. In them was concentrated the work of salvation, always assigned in NT to Jehovah Himself, in the OT always and in all its parts assigned to Christ. The step is but so short one from the unhesitating acknowledgment of the Divinity of Christ's work to that of the Divinity of His nature.

The step is taken when He is called Lord. Christ refers to Himself as 'your Lord' (Mat 24:42). There is evidence of growth in the meaning of Lordship in NT usage. Resch has shown that the name was interchangeable in instances with 'Master' and 'Rabbi.' Between that stage and the view of the Epistles that Christ is Lord over Nature, the Universe, the Church (Col 1:16-18, Php 2:10 ff. etc.), there is a wide gulf. The transition was probably effected in Hellenistic circles, and aided by the use of 'Lord' as a title of the Roman Emperor and associated with the divine honour paid to him.

The Second Adam (the Man from Heaven) is a designation peculiar to St. Paul. In idea it is more speculative than the foregoing. The impulse to its construction is to be found in the Apostle's conversion through the glorified appearance of the Risen Christ on the way to Damascus. On the ground of that experience he contrasts men, as he finds them, subject to sin and death, and this man exalted over both (1Co 15:45-49, Rom 5:12-21). The religious and moral destinies of the human race are traced to the action of two typical men, the first Adam, 'a living soul,' and the second Adam, 'a quickening spirit.' In so thinking, he gives an original turn to his Messianic views. The ordinary Messianic hopes of his nation he shares. He is acquainted also with the tradition of the life and teachings of Christ. But neither his intellect nor his conscience, endued with fresh vision and power by Christ risen, could rest satisfied with those. He departs from them, but not to supersede, rather to develop. He regards Christ as the foretold of the prophets (Rom 1:2), His ministry as a manifestation of the righteousness of God (Rom 3:21), His death and resurrection as the fulfilment of foreshadowings in the OT Scriptures (1Co 15:3-4). He shares with the Synoptists and Acts the position that Christ is the Saviour and bringer-in of the kingdom of righteousness; with them he applies to Christ the names 'Son of God,' 'Christ,' etc., in a sense of exceptional dignity. What they had reached by a gradually increasing insight he won by the vision (Gal 1:16), and from the point of view of his spiritual intuition he reads the Person of Christ. What he had seen colours all his

thought, which is essentially a Christology centring in the idea of 'the Lord of Glory.' the term signified, of Christ's work, relief from the oppression and burden of sin and the law and death, with hope of regeneration for himself and all men; it signified, of Christ's Person, that He was Spirit (2Co 3:17); man, 'in the likeness of sinful flesh' but 'the man from heaven' whom the heavenly principle made perfect (2Co 5:21), pre-existent (Rom 8:3, 1Co 10:1, Gal 4:4) and 'head of every man' (1Co 11:3), human nature in its archetypal form, particularly in creation (1Co 8:6 etc.). That He of whom all this was affirmed was not conceived to be an ordinary human personality in His intimate nature, goes without saying. Taken in conjunction with other terms used, the 'Lord of Glory' declares Divinity. In the later Epistles, Eph., Col., Ph., Ti., Tit., the Divinity is explained in the same directions with greater precision and fulness, and exemplified in fresh relations.

The fact that these writings contain a more developed Christology than that of the undisputed Epistles has been made a ground for discrediting them. But without good reason. The later thought is in organic line with the earlier; both fix attention on what Christ did and does, and not on what He taught; both rise to the thought of the glorified Christ through the work of Christ on earth. The later illustrates and emphasizes rather than increases the heavenly dignity of Christ, assigning an increment of function rather than of rank (cf. Lightfoot, *Col.* p. 120).

In the Ep. to the Hebrews there is a remarkable type of doctrine which has not yet been definitively located. It has very little in common with the NT writings generally, or even with the Pauline. Its conception of Christ's Person is characterized by significant differences in substance and expression. After a prologue (almost in the manner of the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse, which looks like a summary of previous thought) it proceeds to its main thesis, the superiority of the New Covenant over the Old. In the first seven chapters Christ is presented as the Son, the Revealer, and the King-Priest. As the Son, He has been prepared for in Israel (Heb 1:1), has participated in the creation and is its consummation (Heb 1:2), is the manifestation of the Father's glory as its effulgence (*ἀπαύγασμα*), and the expression of the Divine essence (*ὑπόστασις*) as its embodiment (*χαρακτήρ*) (Heb 1:3), and is now at the Father's right hand. As the Revealer, He is superior to angels and Moses; while yet a 'partaker of flesh and blood' (Heb 2:14), wherein He has done away with sin and death, establishing and vindicating His glory by His sufferings. As the King-Priest He realizes in perfection the qualifications of the priesthood imperfectly met in the OT system. In his exegesis the author applies to Christ two series of OT texts, the one having in view in their original meaning the Messiah (Heb 1:5, cf. Psa 2:7; Ps 1:8, 9, cf. Psa 45:7-8), the other relating to God (Heb 1:6, cf. Psa 97:7; Ps 1:10-12, cf. Psa 102:26-28). All three aspects point to such pre-eminence of Christ as makes Him incomparable with men, to be equalled with God alone. It is at the same time a

pre-eminence appropriated in His human experience, made His own by obedience—a point insisted on. These two form the idea of Christ: He is God who by a Divine Incarnation fulfils Himself in man; and He is man who by a human faith and endurance realizes himself in God. If the terminology is less Hebraic than in St. Paul or the Synoptists, the motive is the same, viz. to express in the terms available the new contrasts and special aspects of Christ's Person impressed on the author's mind by his independent experience of Christ.

The Logos ('the Word') is the term distinctive of St. John (Joh 1:1; Joh 1:14, 1Jn 1:1, Rev 19:13). It is introduced in a way which indicates that it was familiar to the writer and his readers. As a term it is traceable in both Palestinian and Alexandrian thought. Its idea is Hebraic not Philonian, and to be taken in connexion with 'the *Only-begotten*.' It is no impersonal abstract Idea. The Logos is, as in the Targums, personal and active as the equivalent of God manifesting Himself (1Jn 1:2). He is an historical human life (Joh 1:14, Joh 1:1-3), a fact not to be minimized. Yet His coming within the conditions of humanity was the coming of One who had been pre-existent with God in and from the beginning (Joh 1:1, Joh 3:13; Joh 3:31, Joh 6:62), sharing in the life of God and in the Divine acts of creation and preservation, and operative in previous history as an illuminating and quickening potency in the hearts of the righteous (Joh 1:3-4; Joh 1:9; Joh 1:12, Joh 10:16; Joh 10:16; Joh 11:52). Complementary is the thought of the Apocalypse of His eternity or semi-eternity in nature, the Alpha and Omega, and in redemptive activity—'Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,' and of the perfect and perpetual adoration accorded to Him with God in heaven. The recital of the work of the Logos, so brief, covering the vastest realms, cosmic, historical, personal, in the most summary space, is majestic. The absence of any line of intermediate beings between God and man is notable. The identification of the Word with God (θεός) is deliberate. The description gives no plausibility to the view that here we have a category taken from philosophy and applied loosely to the facts. There is nothing in the Synoptic representation of the human character and consciousness of Christ which unfits it or renders it inadequate for the Logos conception; equally there is nothing in the Logos conceived as becoming incarnate in the man Jesus which contradicts or impairs the reality or the completeness of His humanity as portrayed in the Synoptics.

The two are adequate and congruous to each other. They are also necessary to each other, each being a torso without the other. The source of the doctrine was the actual experience of the author, but it is the experience of a mind of profound spirituality and devout idealism. He gives the impression of having been determined in the particular cast he gives his doctrine by contemporary circumstances. A specific method is apparent. It is not that he seeks to prove that 'Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God' (Joh 20:31); it is the special manner of his proof that differentiates his

record, and above all the specially intense feeling towards Christ that pervades it, characteristics that have led some to assert that he sees Christ as primarily Divine and less human than the Synoptists see Him. It is truer to say that he sees Christ both as more Divine and more human than the Synoptists; driven beyond them by deepened experience of Christ on the one hand, and that richer reflexion on the other hand to which he was incited by the increasing Gnostic licence of the age. Gnosticism was a subtler foe than current Messianism. Its sophisms could be met only by a simpler and profounder—simpler because profounder—truth. The Fourth Gospel gives that truth. It attempts a portrait of Christ corresponding to the most intimate and overwhelming sense of His power conceivable, at once wholly revealing God, and the Divine revelation of the whole nature, life, and destiny of man. Hence to the historian it is an enigma, to the devout a poem. Its outline is simple and free because so broad and high. Its structure is less of the historic than of the spiritual sense. The test of its genuineness, like that of art, is not in its technique but in the dim and powerful feeling of infinite meaning it throws upon the reader. It is in consequence the most fruitful of all the sources of subsequent thought.

3. Divine, properties attributed to Christ.—We may note, to begin with, the ascription to Christ of what had been ascribed by OT prophets to Jehovah (cf. Psa 45:6; Psa 45:8 with Heb 1:8-9; Isa 7:14; Isa 9:6 with Mat 1:23; Jer 23:5; Jer 23:8 [where the ‘Branch of David’ is called the ‘Lord our righteousness’] Jer 33:16 with the NT term ‘Root of David’ applied to Christ; Mal 3:1, where the messenger about to come to his own temple is called ‘Lord,’ with Mar 1:2, Luk 1:76). Again, the tempting of Jehovah (Num 14:2; Num 21:5; Num 21:8, Psa 95:9) is the tempting of Christ (1Co 10:9). In Heb 1:10-11 what is attributed to Jehovah in Psa 102:26 is attributed to Christ. In Joh 12:40-41 it is asserted that the language of Isaiah (Isa 6:9-10) concerning Jehovah refers to Christ. Isa 45:23, compared with Rom 14:10-11, shows that the judgment-seat of God is that of Christ. From Joe 2:32 and Rom 10:13 the name of Jehovah is the name of Christ.

More impressive are the references to Christ’s participation in Divine *attributes*. He has self-existence like the Father (Joh 5:26), and therefore His life is eternal (Joh 1:4; Joh 11:25; Joh 14:6, 1Jn 1:2; 1Jn 5:11-12). He has pre-existence; cf. the Apostolic testimony (Heb 7:3, Rev 1:8; Rev 22:13) with Christ’s (Joh 8:28; Joh 17:7). He cannot yield to death or see corruption (Resurrection narratives, also Joh 10:16, Rom 1:4, Heb 7:16, Joh 11:25, Act 13:37; Act 2:27), He will come again (Joh 14:3; Joh 14:28, Act 1:11, 1Co 11:26 etc.), He gives life to others (Joh 5:25; Joh 5:21; Joh 6:40, Php 3:10-11), He has all power (Mat 18:18, Rev 1:8, Joh 5:19, Heb 1:3, Php 2:9), including power over nature and man (miracles and healings, cf. Luk 6:19; Luk 8:46, Mat 9:28, also Rom 8:10-23), a power He can communicate to disciples (Act 9:34; Act 3:16; Act 4:16). St. Paul attributes to Him the Divine plenitude (Col 2:9). He has superhuman knowledge of God and superhuman insight

into man (Joh 16:30; Joh 2:24, Rev 2:28), He is unchangeable as Jehovah (cf. Psa 102:26 with Heb 1:11-12, also Heb 13:8).

Of Divine *acts* asserted of Christ are the following:—Creation (Joh 1:3, Col 1:16-17, Heb 1:2; Heb 1:10); Providence (Heb 1:3, Joh 5:17, Col 1:17); Redemption (Act 20:28, Joh 13:18; Joh 13:10; Joh 13:16, Mat 9:13, Eph 5:20, passages too numerous to be specified); Forgiveness of sins (Mat 9:6, Mar 2:16, Luk 5:24 etc.); Judgment (Joh 5:22; Joh 5:27, Act 17:31, Rom 14:10, Mat 25:31-46); Restitution of all things (Php 3:21, 1Co 15:24-28). Finally, the whole atmosphere of feeling and disposition towards Christ in the NT is one of worship. He claims it, and His disciples accord it. The faith given to God is given to Him (Joh 14:1 etc.). Examples of doxologies are 1Pe 4:11, 2Ti 4:18, Rev 1:6; 2Pe 3:18, Rev 5:13. The honour of the Son equals that of the Father (Joh 5:23, Php 2:9; Php 2:16, Heb 1:6). The Blessing of God is invoked from Christ not less. Distinctively Christian worship is a calling upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ (1Co 1:2, Act 9:14). Distinctively Christian belief is the confession that Jesus is the Messiah, or that He is the Son of God (Rom 10:9, 1Jn 4:15) Baptism is into His name (Act 2:38; Act 8:16), the Lord's Supper is significant of His Death and its specific virtue, new life (1Co 10:16; 1Co 11:26).

A patient study of the texts cited in the two preceding sections will set in relief several facts as to Apostolic reflexion on Christ's Person. The beginnings lie unquestionably in the Messianic hope and in Christ's claim to be the Messiah. The first proclamation of the gospel we have in the discourses in Acts, the one burden of which is the Messiahship of the Master. The Apostles there speak out of an experience whose roots lie in the nation's past, and which are renewed into fresh growth by Christ. The proof they offer is the evidence of facts and of what the facts point to They detail three distinct orders of facts: the life and works of Christ, the death on the Cross, the resurrection and exaltation. They emphasize the peculiar and wondrous power revealed in all three and especially in the last, in which they find the key to the whole—the Risen Lord. Traces of transcendental interest are not absent (Act 5:31; Act 3:15; Act 3:26; Act 10:42; 1Pe 1:23; 1Pe 4:5; 1Pe 1:11; 1Pe 1:20, Jam 2:1; Jam 5:8-9; Jam 1:18; Jam 1:21), the perception of dignity and powers beyond the Messianic attaching to Him. This type of thought is common to St. Peter, St. James, St. Jude. It is a simple objective, practical presentation of Christ, yet with features of its own so specifically new as to make it impossible to identify it with the existing religious schools. The other writings base themselves upon those beginnings, the Synoptics most obviously. They give the facts with fulness which are given in the Acts discourses in sum. They show the process of the movement, of which Acts gives the results. There are, however, important differences. The conviction of the higher nature of Christ is more prominent; it in fact pervades them; it is not imposed on their substance as an after-thought or under the stress of polemical tendency; it is part and parcel of the whole. Their portraiture is the portraiture of One who is man

yet stands apart from men in character, and takes the place of God in the heart. Of speculation there is no sign. The growth of conviction is gradual, indeed, but comes in natural course by contact with facts. With the Synoptics we place the Apocalypse. Speculative features appear in St. Paul (earlier and later Epistles), the Fourth Gospel, Epistle to Hebrews, in the doctrines of 'the Man from heaven,' 'the Second Adam,' the Logos and the 'Revealer,' and 'High Priest of the New, Covenant' respectively.

There is a wide cleavage of opinion on questions as to the source and worth of the aforementioned factors. Were they due to the influence of the Hellenistic schools, or did they descend in the Palestinian tradition? Are they alien accretions to be cast aside, or are they of the essence of the Christian message? Much ingenuity has been expended in trying to prove that the original facts have been largely worked over in the Synoptic and in the Pauline and Johannine doctrines.

In the former case, it is maintained, there was a twofold process of adapting prophecy to suit the facts of the life, and of adapting the facts of the life to suit prophecy; in the case of the latter the facts of the life are interpreted in the light of some of the fundamental ideas of the Greek cults and philosophy, taking on along with the forms much of the substance of Greek religion. Thus originated the scenery of hyper-physical events that surrounds the life in the one instance, and the Logos Christology in the other. Both, it is alleged, changed the true character of the gospel, and are entirely inappropriate to its inner spirit. Such contentions have certainly not yet been made good. They have nevertheless served to discover deep affinities existing between Apostolic thought and the higher mind of that age, affinities not directly derived from each other. Considerations are constantly increasing to vindicate the real independence of the Apostolic mind, and its essential continuity with the fundamental religion of the Hebrew race and the religious consciousness of Jesus. It is not intrinsically different from them. Its novel constituents are not alien; they do not arrive from without, they are perceived within, as the result of the life and teaching of the Founder of their faith and still more as the effect of His character. There is a freedom both in previous Jewish religious ideas and in the religious consciousness of Jesus which assured to them a vast future vitally and organically related to them, to which the above theory does scant justice, and which suggests the warrant of truth to the Apostolic developments.

IV. Subsequent development of NT ideas

1. *History of the doctrine.*—The Logos idea became the centre of a remarkable theological growth which engrossed the intellectual energy of the first five centuries. During that period the subtle Greek mind left its mark so substantially on the current forms of Christian belief as to render it problematical how far the definitions of the great Councils really embody the essence of the original faith. The naturalness of the

development is acknowledged. Its necessity was created by certain obvious causes due to the historic character of the Church, and its presence as a living organization in the world. The age which witnessed the dissolution of paganism and the triumph of new ideals of thought and duty was one of missionary zeal and mental anguish. The early propaganda was extensive and intense. It had to confront the corruption of pagan morals and the medley of heathen beliefs. It had to justify its own novel convictions. Its final purpose was practical: to make men like Christ. A faithful delineation of what He was and did became imperative; still more a consistent conception of what made Him what He was. The Church offered a new life, whose experiences were of profound interest, created and sustained by Christ, to a world of almost feverish intellectual curiosity. The mystery of Christ which had revived Hebrew devotion began to fascinate and excite the Gentile mind. Speculation was stimulated, and increasing effort made to bring the potential elements of Christ's teaching within the scope of men's understanding. The new world was at its best in reflexion, it yielded to Christ only after understanding Him.

Something to be understood there was. The whole process is intelligible only on the assumption of the unhesitating acceptance of belief in Christ's higher nature. The problem to the Jews had been, Is this rabbi more than the Messiah? The problem to the Hellenic world now was, Is this Word more than our *λόγος*? and before the problem was solved to its satisfaction, Greek thought passed through an experience as recreative and revolutionary as Jewish aspiration had done in the Apostolic age. The answer, further, preserved the best ideal of classical culture, and translated it into a constituent treasure of the Christian consciousness. The result was the conquest of the older conceptions of deity, whether of prophets or philosophers, by a new conception, a monotheism identical with no previous form, the richest hitherto reached, and one which eventually proved capable of imparting a spiritual unity to men of vastly more educative value than any system of organized culture before or since.

(a) *Patristic age*.—At first (up to a.d. 300) the process is slow and uncongenial. There are parties of practical outlook only and others of conservative instinct which fail to comprehend the new situation. But in the better representatives of the Christian movement there is a readier courage and a more vigorous intellect. They manifest, indeed, no lapse from Apostolic attainments. The desire to keep to what is primitive is with them, as with the others, passionate, but in no narrow spirit. They are eager to search into the implications of their doctrine. But they plainly exhibit a want of equipment for the task. They are always vague, often conflicting. A clear theory cannot be gained from their writings. Both facts, the existence of sects which refused to theorize and the uncertainties of those who did, are alleged by some historians as a ground for denying to that age any assured belief in Christ's Divinity. The material for

judgment is not too abundant, but there are certain guiding facts. Christ is everywhere worshipped as God. Cf. Pliny's well-known letter to Trajan; the Vesper hymn of the Eastern Church, the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the *Tersanctus*, all in use in the 2nd century. Lucian's satire betrays a series of characteristic traits of Christians, including the worship of 'the crucified sophist.' There is the witness of the martyrs who preferred death to replacing Christ by the Emperor in their adoration. The baptismal professions of the period, too, maintain unimpaired the NT practice of combining the Son with the Father and Spirit. We distinguish between the popular belief embodied in the foregoing, and explanations of the belief in face of the Greek mind. The former was general—the latter were but tentative. The efforts of the *First Fathers* and *Apologists* were neither profound nor precise. They were directed towards three aims, (1) to justify the worship of Christ, (2) to define aright the relation of the Son to the Father, and (3) to elucidate the operation of the Word in creation. Their discussions have in view three types of opposition, of which the first refused to recognize Christ as the equal of God (Ebionism); the second denied His perfect manhood (Docetism); while the third, prepared for by Docetism and embracing an embarrassing mixture of tendencies known as Gnosticism, conceived amiss the relation between God and the Universe. The Christian thinkers were profoundly moved by this threefold antagonism. They keep their faith firm, but their apologetics are uncertain and incautious. An adequate philosophy is beyond their power. Let it be remembered, however, that the views they repel are also chaotic and crude: moreover, all of them represent some sort of a faith in Christ as a Being of a higher order. By the controversy conducted by writers such as Barnabas, St. Ignatius, Hennis, in particular, Church doctrine attains at this stage a certain measure of self-consciousness, especially over against Judaism, and to a slighter extent over against the abstract notions of heathen speculation.

Around the problems raised by the latter, thought in the next period deepens immeasurably, the seeds of all future discussion are planted, both of orthodox and heretical opinion. A succession of writers, interesting and copious in suggestion, including such names as Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, develop the Christian positions in various directions with dialectical skill and considerable spiritual insight: (1) the nature of our knowledge of God as relative and our knowledge of the nature of God as wholly separate from the created world, spiritual and immaterial; (2) our knowledge of the nature of the Logos as immanent in the Divine nature and expressed in the world of created things, as eternal and manifest in time; (3) our knowledge of the identity of the Son with the Father as one in essence as in will, related by generation, and of the identity of the Son with the human race as its 'recapitulation' or archetype, leading to affirmations of a real Fatherhood in the Godhead and the conception of the Divine Unity as a life of moral relationships. The stress of the argument came to concentrate itself in the third of these points, against the Adoptionists on the one hand, who secured the unity of God

by confining Christ within the limits of humanity, and against the Sabellians on the other hand, who secured it by treating the distinctions of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as simply modes of the one God. By the beginning of the 4th cent. this long interior process of conflicting reflexion was ready for a final issue.

It came in the Arian disputes, which for a century—to a.d. 451—filled the Christian world and passed through several phases. Arius was incited to action by the teaching of Alexander the bishop of Alexandria, who taught the eternal generation of the Son ('there never was a time when He was not'). He maintained that as a father must exist before his son, therefore the Son of God did not exist eternally with the Father; that not being eternal He was created, but before time began; that being created, He is in all things unlike the Father. The Council of Nicaea (a.d. 325), convened by the Emperor for the settlement of peace, decided against Arianism, and defined the authoritative doctrine to be that the Son is 'of one substance' (*ousia*) with the Father; that He was 'begotten, not made,' that 'there never was a time when He was not,' that 'He was not created.' The Nicene Creed was established largely by the brilliant advocacy of Athanasius, subsequently bishop of Alexandria. It was a signal triumph in favour of the *essential* Divinity of Christ as distinct from a merely moral likeness to God. There can be little doubt that Arian contentions propagated themselves over a wide area; and that partly through the ability of the Arian leaders to gather into association with themselves much floating dissatisfaction with the deeper currents discernible and now becoming dominant, and partly by the aid of political and secular methods. It is unquestionably the case, however, that the Arian position had a vitality of its own which the Athanasian dogmatics never wholly quenched, and which has burst out again and again in subsequent thought. It is the natural standpoint of all minds that, in seeking to appreciate Christ, start from the idea of God rather than the fact of Christ; its main interest is not religious but theistic, a theoretical deduction, not the statement of an inner experience. Athanasius met it on the basis of that Christian experience which initiated the problem, and from the beginning had determined its development. His instinct was justified; for although the Arian agitation protracted itself all through the 4th cent., it was gradually deserted by the more religious adherents, whom the Athanasian divines took pains to conciliate by removing false impressions, by deepening their thought, and by popularizing it with illustrations.

The second great Council, that of Constantinople (a.d. 381), saw practically the death of Arianism. It reaffirmed the Nicene dogmas against various novelties, and especially that offshoot of Arianism which denied the Divinity of the Holy Ghost (Macedonians). The third Council, at Ephesus (in 431), and the fourth, at Chalcedon (in 451), dealt with other three consequences of Arian doctrine, known as the Nestorian, Apollinarian, and Eutychian heresies. The three have reference to the *constitution of Christ's Divine-human Person*. Jesus Christ being Divine in the Nicene sense, in what

sense could He also at the same time be human? It had been determined that He was primarily Divine; not a man like other men, who became Divine, but the personal Logos of God manifesting Himself through the human person with whom He had entered into union. According to this view, He was necessarily two distinct natures, to one of which it seemed impossible to render all the significance of its proper functions, viz. the human nature. In particular, Was His knowledge limited? Had He a true body and a reasonable soul? Was His Person single?—problems which enlisted the most earnest interest of Athanasius, the Gregorys, Cyril of Alexandria, Leo of Rome, and, above all, Augustine of Hippo. Briefly the answers were: (1) as to Christ's human knowledge, that omniscience belongs to the God head of the Word, but that the human mind which the Word took was limited; (2) as to Christ's body, that it was a true body, really born of Mary, and passible in the experiences of life; (3) as to the union of the Divine and human natures, that these two were each perfect, without confusion, and united in one Person; 'although He be God and man, He is not two but one Christ.' In the words of Chalcedon, He is—

'One and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, the same being perfect in Godhead and the same being perfect in manhood, truly God and truly man, the same having a rational soul and a body, of one substance with the Father according to the Godhead, and the same being of one substance with us according to the manhood, in all things like unto us except sin ... one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, only-begotten, acknowledged in two natures, without fusion, without change, without division, without separation; the difference of the two natures having been in no wise taken away by the union, but rather the property of each nature being preserved, and combining to form one person and one hypostasis.'

Or, in the words of the last of the great Creeds, the so-called 'Athanasian,' which fairly represents the theology of the 5th century:

'He is not two, but one Christ; One; not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the manhood into God; One altogether; not by confusion of substance, but by unity of Person.'

(b) *Mediaeval period* (5th to 15th centuries).—The conciliar definitions remained undisturbed as the official formulas of the Church right through the Middle Ages up to the present; and without important modification or advance. To account for this prolonged acquiescence of the mediaeval mind is not at once simple, for the Nicene system is both uncritical and incomplete. The Church had to address herself to new and arduous tasks, chiefly of organization. She had assumed the external equipment of the Roman empire for practical efficiency in educating the multitude of peoples brought within her pale. Her paramount requirements were unity and a working belief. All available spiritual forces were ranged in a practical order for a practical

end. The effect on the doctrine of Christ's Person is observable in the following results: (1) the less speculative and more practical discussion of the older problems, especially those concerned with the effect of the Incarnation on Christ's knowledge and will; (2) the consideration of Christ's Person in association with the soteriological aspects of His Work; (3) the systematic co-ordination of the several parts of Christological science into a connected whole, and of the whole with other doctrines such as those of God and the Church; (4) the more lucid realization of the nature and principles of this doctrine in line with the elaboration of the doctrine of transubstantiation and the Mass; (5) the popular illustration of its truth, mainly in its place as part of the Trinitarian conception, by analogies drawn from outward nature, and still more from the human mind. Two subsidiary streams are not to be omitted, noteworthy because of their influence in helping to discredit the methods of the Schoolmen and in preparing for the Reformation; viz. (6) free and fruitless inquiry into '*quotlibeta*,' i.e. questions arbitrarily suggested and only remotely affecting religious interests or fundamental truth; and (7) the rise of mystical and pietist communities cherishing an emotional, sometimes sentimental, contemplation of the Saviour in His purely human qualities. Scholasticism has often been criticised; but it taught the thoughtful theologian at least one great lesson, that it is unsafe to develop the theological consequences of any doctrine without continual reference to the proportion of the whole. It effectually awakened also the more religious minds to return for that reference to the primitive sources in the Scriptures and the Fathers.

(c) *Modern* (from Reformation era, 16th cent., onward).—The new spiritual experiences in which the Reformation originated brought out into clearer relief the disparity between the matter and the method of the Scholastic disputations. A religious Reason began to assert itself independently of the Scholastic process. It gave the intellect a new freedom to question the authority and relevancy of the old; one of whose first utterances expressed dislike of further speculation as empty. It blessed only those energies which made religion inward and personal. As the previous centuries had deepened the mind sufficiently to speak for itself, so now the age was dawning which should so completely sanctify the moral nature as to make its instincts supreme. In Luther pre-eminently, but not less in Calvin, Zwingli, and others, the *ethical* interpretation of spiritual facts takes rise. Hence the immense importance ascribed to that act of faith by which the individual soul connects itself with Christ (justification by faith), in a union not of intellect but of heart. Out of the experiences of this inner union we reach the true knowledge of Christ (and also of God). 'The man now who so knows Christ that Christ has taken away from him all his sin, death and devil, freely through His suffering, he has truly recognized Christ as the Son of God' (Luther, *Werke*, xvii. 265). And when we thus know Christ, we 'let go utterly all thoughts and speculations concerning the Divine Majesty and Glory, and hang and cling to the humanity of Christ ... and I learn thus through Him to know the Father. Thus arises such a light and knowledge within me that I know certainly what God is

and what is His mind' (xx. i. 161). It is in the experience of redemption that we know the Redeemer. Modern religious theory has been one long endeavour to appropriate this position. It has sought to explicate its principles (1) by a more radical and penetrating criticism of the past; (2) by the application to the problems of Christian theism of other categories than that of the Nicene *ousia* or substance; (3) in particular by insistence on moral personality as the determining principle of theological construction.

When we look back at this great historical development, it is impossible not to be struck by the parallel between the age of early Christianity, the beginnings of the Middle Ages, and the Reformation. The bankruptcy of the pagan world was not its defect but its merit. It had generated a universal need and a universal mode of feeling which were incompatible with the highest culture which had generated them, but which were destined ultimately to combine that culture itself with something beyond, viz. the new Christian experience. The so-called Dark Ages were brought on by a new possibility and a new necessity, the necessity of disciplining the mass of believers to appreciate that combination and apprehend its elements of culture and faith,—a discipline which, when it had accomplished its ends, left its subjects with a deeper experience than ever, and a more positive possession of its substance. The first Reformers were clear on the central fact of this new experience. Their successors were forced by the exigencies of their ecclesiastical situation to limit themselves to simple defence of the fact. Later thinkers, with more freedom, and under the impulse of vast movements of philosophy and science, have gone on to unfold and organize its content. There is much that is still obscure. But we may venture to state these convictions, that although (1) the analysis of the forces that have entered into the development of Christian doctrine in the past, popular at present, has by no means vindicated beyond appeal its own presuppositions; nor (2) has it yet been proved that the predominant impulses of the modern spirit are sufficient adequately to mould anew all the facts and truths of the inherited faith; yet (3) it is indubitable that broad and abiding foundations are being laid for a system of religious thought at once expressive of the religious ideals of the age, and consistent with its historical and scientific temper. In elaborating that system it is already clear that two of its fundamental postulates must be these: (α) the principle that Christian truth is not the creation of the human intellect, nor are the forces of human reason and emotion sufficient to explain it; and (β) the principle of the absolute value of Christ's Person as the norm of all religious experience. *The Christological impulse is central.* In the moral personality of Christ, men are seeking better answers to the old problems. The past answers are not wrong; it is that they are not relevant. And this because of the growth, not of science but of conscience. The type of religious experience and emotion has changed, the experience is deeper, the emotion richer. The modern mind stands less awe-struck, perhaps, before the

Deity of Christ, but it is more conscience-struck before the perfection of His human character, within the sacred processes of which it wistfully looks for the mystery of His Divinity and the secret of God.

2. Denial of the doctrine of Christ's Divinity.

(a) *History and motive.*—Christianity has in all the stages of its evolution been accompanied by rationalistic hesitation. Based on experience, it has never commended itself to the reason un-enriched by that experience. A strong under-current of antagonism runs through the centuries. It is possible to indicate special periods when the antagonism becomes more pronounced. Such periods will be found, on the whole, coincident with the points of transition in the advance of the doctrine. It may well be, as modern Unitarians argue, that Christ was regarded at first as a man simply, 'a prophet mighty in deed and word' (Luk_24:19); but their contention that this is the point of view of the NT cannot be sustained. The Epistles, even the earliest, start from the Risen Christ, and the Gospel narratives are not to be comprehended apart from the initial experience of His higher dignity. Both sets of books owe their origin to the new sense as to His Person created by the new sense of power with which He possessed them. Their ostensible design is to set Him forth as 'Christ,' or 'Lord,' or 'Saviour,' or 'Word,' etc., *i.e.* as something more than man, to whom, as such, worship is paid. They show their authors busied with problems as to the constitution of His Person. Those problems emerged from the first, and among Jewish Christians who had to make clear to themselves Christ's true position if, in His lordship over them, they were no longer required strictly to follow the law of Moses, and were now required to conceive of the transcendence of God permitting fellowship with Him. But those were problems which could never have emerged at all unless from the conviction of His suprahuman rank. The opposition, *Ebionism*, was not so much concerned with denial of His superior dignity as directed to affirm the supremacy of the Father. Its protest was immensely strengthened when the conflict with Gnostic theories necessitated an alien apologetic with an unscriptural terminology, derived from Greek philosophy, both obnoxious (and probably bewildering) to the pious Jew.

The second serious outburst of hostility was occasioned by the Nicene theologians. In *Ebionism* the Jewish temper found vent. In *Arianism* it was the heathen intellect. Amid Gentile surroundings christological ideas had never ceased to grow. Tradition, Scripture, experience, combined to deepen the conviction of Christ's Divinity, and to enlarge the range of its problems. Hellenic rationalism confronted the Church at every point. It could not tolerate the thought of two Gods; and it had not yet grasped the unity of God as embracing eternal distinctions facing inward on each other. It revolted from an Incarnation in time and human form. It therefore denied to the Son coequality with the Father. Yet everything short of the full deity it was ready to

acknowledge. For the Arian Christ is no mere man: He is much more than man, only not God, but a kind of demi-god, the loftiest of all creatures, to be imitated and worshipped. The idea, from its wide acceptance in that age, must have embodied certain prevalent mental tendencies of the time. Its plausibility depends on the idea of God which it conceives, viz. that of an abstract, otiose Being, beyond interest in human things. It is an idea as far removed from modern modes as from the Gospel facts. It is more beset with difficulty than the conception it opposed. In later times it has been often revived, but never effectively, and mainly in individual opinion.

The sincere emphasis laid on the proper Divinity of Christ throughout the Middle Ages has been continued in the Churches of the Reformation. The opposition has been correspondingly sincere and continuous. Its course manifests remarkable variation. In the earlier stages it was determined chiefly by the common study of the Scriptures now distributed to the multitudes. Almost every phase of former heresy was reproduced, but without real advance in thought or real influence on orthodox opinion. Afterwards the special developments of Reformed theology, notably in the doctrine of the Atonement, created, both by natural evolution and by reaction, the powerful contrary movement of *Socinianism*. The Socinian argument, assuming that the Infinite and the finite are exclusive of each other, maintained the Incarnation to be impossible, rejected the pre-existence, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, asserted the essential moment of His person to be His human nature, rendered free from sin by the Virgin-birth, and free from ignorance by special endowments of knowledge. Socinians did good service by bringing into clear relief the Docetic elements in the traditional doctrine, and in preparing for a deeper appreciation of the humanity of Christ in the work of salvation. The reverent recognition of this last (*finitum capax infiniti*), that the human is capable of bodying forth the essence of the Divine nature as distinct from merely being the bearer of the Divine attributes, is the greatest step that has been taken since the Nicene definitions. It has incited to a speculative ardour, and secured a place for the application of scientific method, in dealing with the contents of Christian thought, that are rapidly working out its complete reorganization and reconstruction. To discern and describe the ideal unity of the higher spiritual life which will exhibit the Divine-human principle of Christ's Person in its fulness, is the task of the modern Church. The spiritual potentialities of the human mind are earnestly and perseveringly investigated. It is a complex process, building as largely on religious induction as on religious insight, and sustained by a magnificent confidence in the native powers of reason and conscience. But the same forces which have impelled to new Christological affirmation have infused new vigour into Christological doubt. The representatives of *Unitarianism* have been active and influential. They stand for a much more humanitarian view of Christ than either Arians or Socinians. But their phrase, 'the pure humanity of Jesus,' covers much diversity of conviction. Some are almost Trinitarians, approaching Christ on the Divine side, and affirming, in a real if unorthodox sense, His pre-existence, uniqueness,

sinlessness, and spiritual authority. Others contemplate the human side, believe that He was naturally born, and endowed with qualities and gifts differing in degree and not in kind from those which all men enjoy; that His character was a growth, and that by degrees He rose out of temptation and error into the serene strength of a pure and noble manhood; that He became a providential teacher and leader of men to a higher spiritual development. The Unitarian polemic killed popular Calvinism; in its higher forms it is rich in ethical appeal.

(b) *Failure.*—Unitarianism has at all times failed to lead. It has uniformly won a certain measure of popularity by successfully representing the dominant forces pulsating in the spirit of the age. But it is by not being an average that a man becomes a guide. Deniers of the Divinity have flourished in times of utter confusion, when whoever would attain some coherence of life and thought must let drop much that is held in solution, and show the path of progress by manifesting the direction of change. By this law Catholic theology has stood; to representative insight it has added prophetic foresight. The sense of its insufficiency, when brought home, has only driven it the deeper into the inner secrets of that experience which yielded its original impulse, and so it has escaped becoming a prey to the narrower reason and limited emotion of the Unitarian schools. See also art. Incarnation.

Literature.—Besides the works mentioned in the body of the article, (1) for the history of the doctrine the following are to be consulted: Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*; Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*; A. Réville, *Hist. of the Dogma of the Deity of Jesus Christ*; Hagenbsch, *Hist. of Doctrines*; Macarius, *Théol. dogmatique orthodoxe*; Hetele, *Hist. of the Councils*.

(2) For the dogmatic aspects of the subject the older manuals of Systematic Theology are still of value, e.g. Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology*; Dorner, *System of Christian Doctrine*; Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics*; cf. also Wilberforce, *Doctrine of the Incarnation*; Dale, *Christian Doctrine*; Gore, *The Incarnation*; Strong, *Manual of Theology*; and, for a more popular treatment, Liddon, *Divinity of our Lord*; Eck, *Incarnation*. Of recent standpoint are Nitzsch, *Evangel. Dogmatik*; Clarke, *Outline of Christ. Theol.*; Denney, *Studies in Theology*; Hodgson, *Theologia Pectoris*; Bovon, *Dogmatique Chrétienne*, and *Théol. du NT*; Fairbairn, *Christ in Modern Theology*; Powell, *Principle of the Incarnation*; H. Holtzmann, *Lehrb. der NT Theologie*.

(3) For the historical data of Christ's ministry, works, teaching, etc., see the numerous Lives of Christ, e.g. by Weiss, Byschlag, Keim, Renan, O. Holtzmann, H. von Soden, Sanday, Farrar, Stalker; G. Matheson, *Studies in Portrait of Christ*. Shorter dissertations on particular points form a large literature. Of special interest are those which attempt to define the primitive conception of Christ, such as Wrede's *Das Messiasgeheimniss in den Evangelien*; Stanton's *Messiah*; H. von Soden's *Urehrstl.*

Literaturgesch.; Pfeleiderer's *The Early Christian Conception of Christ*; Schmiedel's *Hauptprobleme der Leben-Jesu Forschung*; Estlin Carpenter's *First Three Gospels*; Mackintosh's *Natural History of the Christian Religion*.

(4) On the problem of Christ's Person for modern thought consult such works as Fairbairn's *Studies in the Life of Christ*, *Christ in Modern Theology*, and *Philosophy of the Christian Religion*; Adams Brown's *Essence of Christianity*; Losinsky's *Was Jesus Gott, Mensch, oder Uebermensch?*; Kalthoff's *Das Christusproblem*; Dykes in *Exp^T* [Note: xp^T Expository Times.] , Oct. 1905-Jan. 1906.

A. S. Martin.

⚖️ Divorce

DIVORCE.—The teaching of Christ on this subject in the earliest Gospel, that of St. Mark, is clear and decisive. It is given in Mar 10:1; Mar 10:12. The Pharisees came to Him with the question, Is it lawful for a husband to divorce a wife? The Pharisees themselves could have had no doubt upon the point thus broadly stated. Divorce was, as they believed, sanctioned and legalized by Deu 24:1-2. But they debated about the scope and limits of divorce (cf. Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Gittin*, 90a, where the views of the Schools of Hillel and of Shammai are given. The former allowed divorce for trivial offences, the latter only for immoral conduct). In putting the question to Christ, the Pharisees therefore had an ulterior object. They came, says St. Mark, 'tempting him,' knowing probably from previous utterances of His that He would reply in words which would seem directly to challenge the Mosaic Law (cf. His criticism of the distinctions between 'clean' and 'unclean' meats, Mar 7:14-23). Christ answers with the expected reference to the Law, 'What did Moses command?' They state the OT position: Moses sanctioned divorce. Notice how nothing is said as to grounds or reasons for divorce. Christ at once makes His position clear. The law upon this point was an accommodation to a rude state of society. But a prior and higher law is to be found in the Creation narrative, 'Male and female he created them' (Gen 1:27 LXX Septuagint), *i.e.* God created the first pair of human beings of different sexes that they might be united in the marriage bond. Further, it was afterwards said that a man should leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife, and that he and his wife should be one flesh. In other words, married couples were in respect of unity, as the first pair created by God, destined for one another. The marriage bond, therefore, which may be said to have been instituted by God Himself, must be from an ideal standpoint indissoluble. 'What God joined, let not man sunder.'

In answer to a further question of His disciples, the Lord enforces this solemn pronouncement. A man who puts away his wife and marries another commits adultery. A woman who puts away her husband and marries another commits adultery. Upon this point Christ's teaching passes beyond the ordinary conditions of Jewish society. No woman could divorce her husband by Jewish law. But that is no reason why the Lord should not have expressed Himself as Mk. records. There were exceptional cases of divorce by women in Palestine (cf. Salome, Josephus *Ant.* xv. vii. 10: 'She sent him [Costobar] a bill of divorce, and dissolved her marriage with him, though this was against the Jewish laws'). And there is no reason why He may not have been acquainted with the possibility of divorce by women in the West, or why, even if He had not this in view, He may not have wished to emphasize His point by stating the wrongfulness of divorce, on either side, of the marriage bond.

With this earliest record of Christ's teaching the fragment in the Third Gospel (Luk 16:18) is in agreement: 'Every one who puts away his wife and marries another commits adultery, and he who marries a divorced woman commits adultery.' That is to say, the marriage bond is indissoluble. The husband who divorces his wife and remarries commits adultery. And the man who marries a divorced wife commits adultery, because she is ideally the wife of her still living (first) husband.

In the First Gospel, however, we find this plain and unambiguous teaching, that divorce is inconceivable from an ideal standpoint, modified in a very remarkable way. In Mat 5:32 occurs a saying parallel in substance to Luk 16:18, but with the notable addition of the words, 'except for the sake of unchastity' (*παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας*). Thus modified, the Lord's teaching becomes similar to that of the stricter school of Jewish interpreters. The supposed sanction of divorce in Deu 24:1-2 is practically reaffirmed, the clause *הַבֵּר עֲרֻתָּהּ*, which formed the point at issue in the Jewish schools, being interpreted or paraphrased as *παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας*, by which is probably meant any act of illicit sexual intercourse. In other words, Christ here assumes that divorce must follow adultery, and what He is here prohibiting is not such divorce, which He assumes as necessary, but divorce and consequent remarriage on any other grounds. It might further be argued that the words *παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας* affect only the first clause, and that remarriage after divorce even on the ground of adultery is here prohibited. But if this were intended, it would surely have been explicitly expressed and not left to be inferred. And such teaching would seem to be illogical. Because, if adultery be held to have broken the marriage tie so effectually as to justify divorce, it must surely be held to leave the offended husband free to contract a new tie.

In view, therefore, of Mar 10:1-12 and Luk 16:18, it must appear that Mat 5:32 places the teaching of Christ in a new light. So far as Lk. is concerned, we might, with some difficulty, suppose that the exception 'save for adultery' was assumed as a matter so obvious that it needed no explicit expression. But in view of the disputes in the Jewish Schools, this is very unlikely. And Mar 10:1-12, with its criticism of the alleged Mosaic sanction of divorce, leaves no room for doubt that on that occasion at least Christ pronounced marriage to be a divinely instituted ordinance which should under no circumstances be broken by divorce. It would not, of course, be difficult to suppose that on other occasions the Lord Himself modified His teaching. We might suppose that He taught His disciples that, whilst from an ideal standpoint, marriage, for all who wished to discern and to obey the guidance of the Divine will in life, ought to be an indissoluble bond, yet, human nature and society being what they are, divorce was a necessary and expedient consequence of the sin of adultery. But a careful comparison of Mat 5:32 with Mark 10 and Luke 16 irresistibly suggests the conclusion that the exception in Mt. is due not to Christ Himself, but to the Evangelist, or to the atmosphere of thought which he represents, modifying Christ's words to bring them into accordance with the necessities of life. This conclusion seems to be confirmed when we compare Mat 19:1-12 with Mar 10:1 f. It is on many grounds clear that the editor of the First Gospel is here, as elsewhere, re-editing St. Mark (see *Expos. Times*, Oct. 1903, p. 45, and 'St. Matthew' in the *Internat. Crit. Com.*). Contrast with the logical and consistent argument of Mk. stated above, the account of the First Gospel. The Pharisees are represented as inquiring, 'Is it lawful for a man to put away a wife on any pretext?' Christ answers, as in Mk., that marriage from an ideal standpoint is indissoluble. The Pharisees appeal to the Law against this judgment. In reply we should expect the Lord, as in Mk., to state the accommodating and secondary character of the legal sanction of divorce, and to reaffirm the sanctity of marriage. But instead He is represented as affirming that *πορνεία* constitutes an exception. Thus He tacitly takes sides with the severer school of interpretation of Deuteronomy 24, and acknowledges the permanent validity of that Law thus interpreted in a strict sense, which immediately before He had criticised as an accommodation to a rude state of social life. This inconsistency shows that Mk. is here original, and that *κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν* and *μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ*. are insertions by the editor of Mt. into Mk.'s narratives, and confirms the otherwise probable conclusion that *παρὲς λόγου πορνείας* in Mar 5:32 is an insertion into the traditional saying more accurately preserved in Luke 16. The motive of these insertions can only be conjectured. But, in view of other features of the First Gospel, it is probable that the editor was a Jewish Christian who has here Judaized Christ's teaching. Just as he has so arranged Mat 5:16-20 as to represent Christ's attitude to the Law to be that of the Rabbinical Jews, who regarded every letter of the Law as permanently valid, so here he has so shaped Christ's teaching about divorce as to make it consonant with the

permanent authority of the Pentateuch, and harmonious with the stricter school of Jewish theologians. To the same strain in the editor's character, the same Jewish-Christian jealousy for the honour of the Law, and for the privileges of the Jewish people, may perhaps be ascribed the emphasis placed on the prominence of St. Peter (Matthew 10:2 *πρῶτος*, Mat 14:29-31, Mat 15:16, Mat 16:17-19, Mat 17:24-27, Mat 18:21), and the preservation of such sayings as Mat 10:5-6; Mat 10:23. And to the same source may perhaps be attributed the Judaizing of the Lord's language in such expressions as 'the kingdom of the heavens,' and the 'Father who is in the heavens.' See, also, artt. Adultery and Marriage.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Marriage'; Dykes, *Manifesto of the King*, 255 ff.; Newman Smyth, *Christian Ethics*, 410 ff.; *Expositor*, iv. vii. [1893] 294.

W. C. Allen.

⚡ Doctor

DOCTOR.—The English versions have been very inconsistent in the translation of *διδάσκαλος*, *νομοδιδάσκαλος*, *ῥαββει*, *νομικός*. They have generally followed Wyclif, who used *maister* for *διδάσκαλος*, and *doctour* only once (Luk 2:46). In the American Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'master' and 'doctor' disappear as translation of *διδάσκαλος*, and 'teacher' is uniformly used. The Authorized Version has 'teacher' only once in the Gospels (Joh 3:2) out of a very large number of instances of *διδάσκαλος*. The English Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 advances to only four uses of 'teacher' (Mat 23:6, Luk 2:46, Joh 3:2; Joh 3:10). *νομοδιδάσκαλος* occurs only three times in the NT (Luk 5:17, Act 5:34, 1Ti 1:7). In the last example Authorized Version has 'teacher' and in the other two 'doctor of the law.' Of course, 'doctor' is simply Latin for 'teacher,' but the American Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 would have done better to adopt 'teacher of the law' for *νομοδιδάσκαλος* also (Luk 6:17, Act 5:34).

The chief English Versions translate the word *διδάσκαλος* in Luk 2:46 as follows:

Wyclif, *doctours*; Tindale, *doctours*; Cranmer, *doctours*; Geneva, *doctours*; Rheims, *doctors*; Authorized Version, *doctors*; Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, *doctors*; Noyes, *teachers*; Bible Union Revision, *teachers*; American Revised Version NT 1881,

OT 1885 , *teachers*; Twentieth Century NT, *Teachers*. νομοδιδάσκαλος in Luk 5:17 and Act 5:34 is translated *doctour of the lawe* by Wyclif, who is followed with variations in spelling by Tindale. Geneva, Rheims, Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 , American Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 . The American Bible Union Revision has *teacher of the law* in Luk 5:17 and Act 5:34 also. Twentieth Century NT has *Teacher of the Law*.

It would seem that νομοδιδάσκαλος should be translated ‘teacher of the law,’ and διδάσκαλος ‘teacher’ always. The Old English word ‘doctor’ now often signifies a title. Pope’s phrase, ‘when doctors disagree,’ referred to teachers, νομικός used once in Mt. (Mat 22:35) and eight times in Lk., and is practically equivalent to νομοδιδάσκαλος. See Rabbi, Master, Teacher, Lawyer.

A. T. Robertson.

⚠️ Doctrines

DOCTRINES.—On the subject of doctrines in connexion with the Gospels but little light is shed by etymology.

Two words occur which have been translated ‘doctrine’—διδασκαλία and διδαχή. The former, which is by its form properly an adjective and denotes ‘of or belonging to a teacher’ (διδασκαλος), is used of the subject-matter of his teaching, as the analogous word, which is found in the NT only in the neuter form εὐαγγελιον, ‘that which pertains to an εὐαγγελος,’ is used in the sense of ‘the good news,’ ‘the gospel.’ The adjectival form διδασκάλιον, which in plur. in classical Greek means a teacher’s pay, as εὐαγγελιον means the reward given to a messenger of good news, does not occur in the NT. The word διδασκαλία, as meaning that which pertains to a διδάσκαλος, has in the NT special reference to the authority of the teacher. It is never used of our Lord’s teaching, and only seldom of that of the Apostles. Further, it occurs in the Gospels only in those passages (Mat 15:9, Mar 7:7) in which Jesus accuses the scribes of ‘teaching for doctrines the commandments of men,’ and quotes against them the Septuagint rendering of Isa 29:13.

Διδαχή, the common word for the act of teaching or that which is taught, occurs more frequently, It is used with reference to the teaching of Jesus in a general sense, as where the people contrast His methods with those of the scribes (Mat 7:28, Mar 1:22), and again of His preaching, as in connexion with the parable of the Sower, where St Mark says (Mar 4:2), ‘And he taught them many things in parables, and said unto them in his doctrine.’ Here διδαχή, ‘doctrine,’ exactly corresponds to ἐδιδασκεν, ‘he taught,’ and the phrase evidently means ‘in the course of his teaching,’ or ‘in the course of his remarks.’

In the same general sense the word occurs again in Joh 18:19, according to which the high priest examined Jesus concerning His disciples and ‘his doctrine.’ With reference to the subject-matter of His teaching it occurs in the answer of Jesus to the question of the Pharisees (Joh 7:15; Joh 7:17), ‘How knoweth this man letters (γραμματα), having never learned?’ The question refers to learning as it was understood by the scribes, that is, as theological science, those methods of Biblical interpretation in virtue of which they themselves were called scribes (γραμματεῖς), *i.e.* professional theologians. The answer of Jesus is, ‘My doctrine’ (ἡ ἐμὴ διδαχή) is not mine, but his that sent me’; in connexion with which Alford observes, ‘Here only does our Lord call His teaching διδαχή, as being now among the διδάσκαλοι, the Rabbis, in the temple.’ Elsewhere it is applied to Christ’s teaching by the Evangelists themselves, in whose case it is sufficiently explained by the general use of the word with reference to teaching of any kind, and by the fact that Jesus was regarded and addressed as Rabbi or Teacher, and accepted the title, It is, however, important to note that, except where it is used in its most general sense, the word ‘teaching’ (διδαχή) occurs in connexion with the marked contrast which all observed between the authoritative teaching of Jesus and the instructions of the scribes, who slavishly adhered to such doctrines and methods as were sanctioned only by Rabbinical tradition, and laid emphasis upon trivial questions to the neglect of the weightier matters of the Law (Mat 15:9 || Mar 7:7).

As regards the doctrines which Jesus taught in His own unique and authoritative way, it must be carefully borne in mind that He did not formulate them in the manner of a systematic theologian. They cannot therefore be rightly described as ‘doctrine’ in the technical sense of the word, and still less as ‘dogma,’ as that was understood by theologians of a later period; but rather as ‘apophthegms,’ to use the expression by which the LXX Septuagint rendered the words of Deu 32:2, where Moses says of his teaching, ‘My doctrine shall drop as the rain.’ There the Gr. word ἀπόφθεγμα, ‘a sententious saying,’ is made to represent the Heb. מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם ‘that which is received.’ This

word ‘apophthegm,’ indeed, corresponds very nearly to the expression τὰ λόγια, the sayings’ or ‘utterances ‘of which Papias speaks as forming the kernel of the Gospels, and which, according to that writer, were taken down by St. Mark as the amanuensis of St. Peter. Such a term, moreover, would aptly apply to the style of Christ’s doctrine, which, as Beyschlag remarks (*NT Theol.* i. 31), ‘is conditioned not merely by a necessity of teaching, but rather springs chiefly from the nature of the things to be communicated. These are just the eternal truths, the heavenly things in earthly speech, which can be brought home to the popular understanding only by pictorial forms. It is therefore the mother speech or religion which Jesus uses.’ As has been well observed, Christ’s teaching has to do with His own unique personality, with a Person much more than with doctrine properly so called. Again to quote the words of Beyschlag (*op. cit.* i. 29), ‘His teaching is that in His appearance and active life which is necessary to make that life intelligible to us, and without which the Apostolic teaching about Him would be only a sum of dogmatic utterances which we could not comprehend and whose truth we could not prove,—a result not a little awkward for that view which contrasts “the teaching of Jesus” as Christianity proper with the Apostolic “teaching about Christ” Taking due account of these considerations, we may yet gather from the sources at our disposal, the simple narratives of the Synoptic Gospels and the more elaborate narratives and discourses of the Gospel of John, sufficient materials to enable us to piece together a scheme of the doctrine of Jesus as He taught it and as it was understood by His immediate followers.

It appears most convenient to start, as has been suggested by Weiss, with the doctrine of the *Kingdom of Heaven* or the *Kingdom of God*.

The former of these expressions is peculiar to the Gospel of Matthew. The latter is more usual in the NT. Beyschlag suggests that the former was that which was most favoured by our Lord Himself (*op. cit.* i. 42). However that may be, it has for us the special interest that, as Alford points out, it is common among Rabbinical writers, a fact which seems to indicate that it was admirably adapted to illustrate the connexion between the current expectations of the Jews and the message addressed to them first by John the Baptist and then by Jesus, to the effect that the promise whose fulfilment they expected was already in course of being fulfilled. It is the natural link between the two dispensations. On the other hand, the peculiarly OT stamp which, though only by association, it bore, suggestive of Jewish theocratic ideas, would sufficiently account for the fact that in the other Gospels, specially designed to meet the wants of the Gentiles, to whom those ideas were strange and unfamiliar, it gave place to the alternative expression, ‘Kingdom of God. Practically, however, the two expressions mean the same thing. The earlier form may possibly, as has been suggested, have been by association so closely connected with the national hope of the Jews, and with that selfish exclusiveness which led them to regard

themselves as in a peculiar sense the elect people of God, as to seem to countenance the old narrow views of Messiah's kingdom, to the prejudice of the more spiritual and catholic teaching of Jesus Himself, which impressed itself the more strongly upon His followers the more successfully they sought to win the Gentiles to the faith of Christ. At the same time, they express at most only different aspects of the same truth—Kingdom of Heaven, as the phrase occurs in the Gospels, denoting a condition of things in which God's will is done on earth as it is done in heaven, while Kingdom of God refers more directly and specially to God as the Sovereign of that regenerated society which the expression is used to describe. See Kingdom of God.

This conception is the central point in Christ's teaching, by reference to which its most characteristic features may be most conveniently gathered into a connected system—as its relation to the OT, its revelation of the nature and will of God, its teaching as to the nature and person of Jesus Himself, its doctrine of man, and of God's scheme for man's salvation. This central theme attracts our notice in the beginning of the Gospels. It is the subject of the preaching of the Baptist and also of Jesus, whose message is briefly summed up in the words, 'The kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel' ([Mar_1:15](#)). The Sermon on the Mount itself starts with the idea of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the same thought is the subject of two successive petitions in the Lord's Prayer, 'Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven' ([Mat_5:3](#); [Mat_5:10](#) || [Luk_6:20](#), [Mat_6:20](#); [Mat_6:10](#) || [Luk_11:2](#)). The fundamental teachings of Jesus naturally group themselves round this central theme.

1. The Kingdom being the true Israel of God, the first point of doctrine that suggests itself concerns the King, the Supreme Ruler of the regenerated people. We have thus, as the words 'Kingdom of God' indicate, to deal first with *Jesus' doctrine of God the Father*. This, it is to be carefully noted, is not a new theology. The God whom Christ reveals is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob ([Mar_12:26](#)). That 'God is Spirit,' and can be worshipped only 'in spirit and in truth,' was not first taught to the woman of Samaria ([Joh_4:23](#)). That principle lies at the root of the teaching of the Law and the Prophets. Jesus accepted this fundamental doctrine, while at the same time He cleared it from those later speculations which tended to make of it a mere abstraction, or to accentuate the idea of the remoteness and incommunicableness of the Supreme Being. This He did by describing God, just as the Prophets and the Law had done, as infinitely holy, righteous, and loving. As Sovereign of the kingdom of righteousness and love, God makes holiness and love the essential laws of His kingdom, and commands His subjects to be as Himself. In particular, Jesus laid emphasis upon the Fatherhood of God, and taught His disciples to trust implicitly in the Father's care ([Mat_6:25-34](#) || [Luk_12:22-31](#)), and to believe that that care extended to the very details of their daily life; while He exhorted them not only to rely upon and claim His compassion and His forgiving love, but to imitate Him in

respect of these attributes, that they might 'be the children of their' 'Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust' (Mat_5:45; cf. v. Mat_5:48, Luk_6:35-38).

2. But the Kingdom of God, as Jesus proclaims it, resembles the Old Testament theocracy in this, that *the Supreme Sovereign reveals His will and rules His kingdom by One whom He has sent and to whom He has delegated His authority*. This, the hope of Israel, is an ideal which is already realizing itself. The prophecy of the Messiah is fulfilled in the person and work of Him whom God has sent. This is therefore the keynote of the gospel, that the Christ is come 'to fulfil all righteousness' (Mat_3:15), to give effect to every part of the constitution of the Kingdom. Thus Jesus appears as the Divine legislator. In this capacity He not only, as in His parables, explains and illustrates the principles of His government, but, as in the Sermon on the Mount, appears as the authoritative expositor of the Law of God. He announces that He is come not to destroy but to fulfil the Law and the Prophets (Mat_5:17), and in this connexion shows that the Law is not satisfied with the literal and formal obedience of the Pharisees, but extends to thought and motive; He warns His disciples that, except their righteousness shall exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees, they cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven (Mat_5:18-20); and in other passages He says that in the Day of Judgment men shall be judged so strictly that they shall give account of every idle word, and even of any neglect on their part of the law of kindness and compassion towards their neighbours (Mat_12:36; Mat_25:45).

This aspect of Christ's teaching, which is specially prominent in the Synoptic Gospels, has been represented by some as constituting the essence of His doctrine. But apart from the thought that, according to this view, the ethical teaching of Jesus would mean the enactment of a new code of religion and morality infinitely more difficult than the old which He professed to explain, it is abundantly clear from the Synoptists themselves, no less than from the testimony of St. John, that Jesus lays far more stress upon the subject of His own Person than upon any ethical doctrine or set of doctrines. In the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, as distinctly as in that of John, Jesus lays down as the first condition of membership of the Kingdom the duty of accepting His testimony concerning Himself, and of following Him. As we read in the Fourth Gospel that 'to as many as received him' Jesus 'gave the right to become children of God' (Joh_1:12), so, according to the testimony of all four, the Kingdom of God is come in the person of the Messiah (Mat_12:28 || Luk_11:20). The Person of Christ is the centre of the gospel.

A remarkable feature, indeed, of the Gospels is the fact that the essential Divinity of Christ, and even the express doctrine of His Messiahship, appear to have been made in His public teaching the subject of gradual development rather than of direct and explicit teaching. Jesus suffered not the confession of His Messiahship by the demons

whom He cast out of those who were possessed. And although, when He received the first disciples, John and Andrew, Peter, Nathanael and Philip, He accepted their confession that in Him they had found the Messiah (Joh_1:41-51), it was in but few cases that He declared Himself in so many words to be the Christ of God; as, for example, in that of His conversation with the woman of Samaria (Joh_4:26); again when He declared to His townsmen in Nazareth that Isaiah's prophecy of the Messiah as the great preacher and healer was fulfilled in Himself (Luk_4:21); and again when He answered the doubting question of the Baptist, 'Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?', by pointing to the testimony of His teaching and of His works of mercy (Mat_11:2-6 || Luk_7:19-23). For the rest, Jesus allowed the thought of His Divine claims to grow in the minds of His disciples, and it was not until within a few months of His death that Peter in their name confessed His Messiahship, when Jesus, in welcoming their faith, expressly declared that it had come to them by revelation from God. Nevertheless, throughout His ministry the personal element was the most prominent feature of His teaching. From first to last He asked of those to whom He spoke, not faith in doctrines so much as trust in Himself as the Sent of God who alone could reveal the Father's will.

And, notwithstanding the fact that He left the full recognition of His claims to develop gradually in the minds of His disciples, His testimony concerning Himself contained implicitly all the elements of a complete revelation of His Divine claims. Thus He familiarized His disciples with the use of names and titles, as 'Son of Man,' 'He who should come,' 'Son of God,' 'the Sent of God,' 'the Holy One of God,' 'the Christ,' which, they gradually came to recognize as indicative of those claims. (See also Names and Titles of Christ).

3. With regard to the Kingdom itself, Jesus spoke of it *now as a present thing, again as that which should be realized in the future*. So He said at one time, 'Theirs is the kingdom of heaven' (Mat_5:3; Mat_5:10), and again, 'Neither shall they say, Lo here! or, lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you' (Luk_17:21). Again He spoke of the Kingdom as future, and that in connexion with the final coming, the Parousia, of the Son of Man; so in the parables of the Great Supper (Luk_14:15; Luk_14:24), of the Marriage Feast (Mat_22:1-14), of the Ten Virgins (Mat_25:1-13). In this there was no real contradiction, for the central conception of the Kingdom is that of a gradual development, the future growing out of the present. We recognize this in several conspicuous parables, and no less in the practical means which Jesus adopted of founding and developing His Church, notably in His choice and training of the Twelve as the nucleus of that society of which the Kingdom should consist. Of the former, the most important in this connexion are the parables of the Sower (Mat_13:3-23 || Mar_4:1-20 || Luk_8:5-15), of the Seed growing secretly (Mar_4:26-29), of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven (Mat_13:31-33 || Mar_4:30-32). In these the obvious thought is that the Kingdom is already here, but only in germ, a

secret, but a present and a growing thing, the complete realization of which only the day of the Lord shall declare. The Kingdom is thus not such as the common expectation of the Messianic hope had led Israel to expect, a thought of which even the disciples found it hard to disabuse their minds—an external condition of society into which they should one day be ushered as a matter of favouritism or of covenant right, and in which there were places of pre-eminence which could be the objects of earthly ambition, or a condition of temporal benefit which could be enjoyed in the future irrespective of spiritual fitness. Instead of this it is a spiritual blessing, the gift of God to receptive souls, for the individual and for the community of believers a condition of heart and life gradually developed in them by the power of Divine love. So closely is future blessedness, the inheriting of the Kingdom, dependent upon present faith and patient persevering effort, that our Lord is careful to warn His disciples that while ‘it is’ their ‘Father’s good pleasure to give’ them ‘the kingdom’ (Luk 12:32), it is possible for the most highly favoured to come short of it, and ‘there are last which shall be first, and there are first which shall be last’ (Luk 13:30; cf. Mat 19:30; Mat 20:16 || Mar 10:31, Mat 21:31-32).

4. In this Kingdom *the conditions of membership* are manifestly of the first importance. These are (a) Repentance, and (b) Faith in God and in Jesus Christ whom He has sent.

Repentance (μετάνοια) means a complete and radical change of heart and life, a change so thoroughgoing that it can best be characterized by the word ‘conversion,’ a turning round. ‘Except ye be converted (στραφῆτε, ‘turn’), and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven’ (Mat 18:3), is the teaching of Jesus according to the Synoptics, to which His words to Nicodemus in the Fourth Gospel almost exactly correspond: ‘Except a man be born again (or ‘from above,’ ἄνωθεν), he cannot see the kingdom of God’ (Joh 3:3). Such a complete change as these words imply—‘change of mind’ (μετάνοια), ‘convert,’ ‘turn round’ (ἐπιστρέφειν, Mat 13:15), ‘new birth’ or ‘birth from above’ (γεννηθῆ ἄνωθεν, Joh 3:3), is necessary for all, as Jesus shows by addressing His teaching on this theme not only to Pharisees like Nicodemus, but to His own disciples—notably in the parable of the Unmerciful Servant (Mat 18:21-35), in which, in answer to a question of Peter, He likens the condition of all recipients of the Divine forgiveness to that of a man who owes a debt of ten thousand talents, clearly meaning by that the infinitude of man’s obligation to God. So universal and so heinous is sin according to the teaching of Jesus. Sin springs from the heart (Mat 15:18-20 || Mar 7:20-23), from its natural alienation from God, from the infirmity of the flesh (Mat 26:41 || Mar 14:38). Man is, moreover, tempted to sin by Satan as the author of evil; though Jesus does not teach any special doctrine of sin, or explain how evil first came into existence, but deals

only with sin itself as an awful and universal fact. Then, as all are tainted with the universal disease, and as the righteousness which God demands must extend to the whole nature, not merely to word and action but to the heart and motives, it follows that man is lost, unable to save himself, and therefore Jesus describes His mission as that of seeking and saving the lost (Mat_18:11, cf. Luk_19:10). All are thus dependent upon the sovereign pardoning grace of God, and so Jesus says, 'No man can come unto me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him' (Joh_6:44). But that this grace is not restricted in its operation by any hard and fast decree of election, Jesus teaches by the manner in which He describes His mission, which is that of seeking the lost 'till he find' them (Luk_15:4), and by the universal call which He addresses to the weary and heavy-laden (Mat_11:28).

While we may for convenience' sake distinguish between Repentance and Faith, Jesus so presents them as to represent Faith as the source of Repentance, the one involving the other and leading to it. Thus, to take one illustration, the repentance which in His conversation with Nicodemus He describes as a new birth, is spoken of in the same discourse as the result of an act of faith in Himself, which He likens to the simple look directed by the dying Israelites to the Brazen Serpent which Moses lifted up in the wilderness (Joh_3:14). As Weiss has well put it (*Bib. Theol. Of the NT*, i. 97)—

'The new revelation of God which is brought in the message concerning the Kingdom of God spontaneously works the repentance which Jesus demands. God does not demand that man should meet Him; He Himself meets man with graciousness, and thereby does the utmost that lies in His power to make man capable of the repentance in which He has His greatest joy (Luk_15:4-10). He does not make His revelation of salvation dependent upon the conversion of the people, as in the preaching of the prophets; He will work this conversion by the revelation of His grace.'

Thus, in the Gospel of John, Jesus makes faith in Himself the condition of salvation: 'He that believeth hath everlasting life' (Joh_6:48); and in line with such declarations is that doctrine, characteristic of the Johannine discourses, which seems to represent faith as knowledge, the acceptance of the testimony of the Son of God (Joh_3:18 f.). All that this means is that to accept Christ's testimony, and to accept Christ Himself as the revelation of the Divine grace, is to become a child of God and a member of the Kingdom of God.

Again, Jesus demands not only faith and repentance, but insists as strongly as John the Baptist or the prophets of the OT upon the importance of living proofs of faith, and of fruits meet for repentance (Mat_3:8-10 || Luk_3:8 ff., Mat_7:21-27 || Luk_6:43 ff.). Christ's disciples must prove their conversion and their right to the privileges of the Kingdom of God by their 'moral imitation of their Heavenly Father';

sonship must show itself by the family likeness. But as that ideal is far beyond the possibility of present attainment, the Christian life is described as a steep and narrow path, to press along which requires constant effort and unremitting watchfulness and prayer (Mat 7:13-21 || Luk 13:24; Luk 6:46; Mat 7:24-27 || Luk 6:47-49).

5. With regard to the significance of the Death and Resurrection of Jesus as *the ultimate conditions of the establishment of the Kingdom of God*, our Lord treated that doctrine as He did His Messianic claims in respect of His Divine nature. It is represented in the Gospels as the subject of gradual development, as a truth not at the beginning clearly made known even to the most favoured disciples, but taught first by suggestions and figures more or less veiled, then by warnings and predictions, which became clearer as the end drew near, to the effect that Jesus must die. Still it is present from the first, though only in germ, and though it is noted as that part of their Master's teaching which the disciples were most slow to apprehend. Thus it is represented as having been suggested so early as in the time of the Baptist, whose words, 'Behold the Lamb of God,' first led John and Andrew to follow Jesus (Joh 1:29; Joh 1:35-37). At a later period Jesus declared in express terms that 'the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many' (λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν), where the death of Jesus as a sacrifice of substitution appears to be distinctly spoken of (Mat 20:28, Mar 10:45). The doctrine that salvation can come only through the voluntary sufferings and death of Jesus is so clearly taught by our Lord's later utterances as recorded in all the Gospels, and particularly in the Fourth, as, for example, in the discourse on the Bread of Life ('the bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world,' Joh 6:51), in the discourse on the Good Shepherd ('the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep,' Joh 10:11; Joh 10:15, cf. Joh 10:17-18), etc., that it is hardly necessary to enumerate them. One of the strongest proofs that the disciples understood Jesus to lay special emphasis upon the necessity of His death as an atoning sacrifice, lies in the fact that so large a portion of the Gospels is devoted to the narrative of the sufferings, death, and resurrection of Jesus; while the full account which all the Synoptists give of the institution of the Lord's Supper (Mat 14:22-25 || Luk 22:17; Luk 22:20), and particularly the significant words of Jesus recorded by St. Matthew (Mat 26:28), 'This is my blood of the [new] covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins,' show that by appointing this ordinance by which to 'show forth his death,' as St. Paul expresses it (1Co 11:26), Jesus singled out this part of His work as constituting the central truth of His manifestation to men, and summing up and applying the whole.

Again, like the Apostles in the Acts and the Epistles, all four Evangelists represent the Resurrection as the necessary seal of Christ's atoning work, confirming His victory over death and him that had the power of death, and as a testimony to the Father's

acceptance of the sacrifice. So Jesus, in foretelling His death, conjoined with the prediction the assurance that He should rise again the third day. The Resurrection is the necessary complement of the Atoning Death.

6. Closely connected with these fundamental teachings of the Kingdom of God and the conditions of its realization are those which relate (a) *to the growth and maintenance of the Kingdom after Christ's Ascension, and (b) to the final consummation and the judgment of the world.*

(a) According to all the Gospels, the specialty of Christ's mission, as that was revealed to John the Baptist, was that He should baptize with the Holy Ghost (Mat 3:11 || Mar 1:8 | Luk 3:16; cf. Joh 1:33). All relate the descent of the Holy Spirit at the Baptism of Jesus (Mat 3:13-17 || Mar 1:9-11 || Luk 3:21-22). John the Baptist testifies (Joh 1:31; Joh 1:34) that He upon whom the Spirit descended and abode is He who baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. Jesus attributed His power to cast out demons to the Spirit of God (Mat 12:28). That the Spirit thus spoken of is a Person, and as such to be distinguished from Christ, is to be inferred from the solemn warning which Jesus addressed to those who attributed His miracles of exorcism to Satanic agency, when He said that blasphemy against the Son of Man should be forgiven, but that to blaspheme against the Holy Ghost was an unpardonable sin (Mat 12:31-32 || Mar 3:28 f. || Luk 12:10). Jesus taught, however, that the prediction of John was to be fulfilled only after the Son of Man was glorified. Thus we read, with reference to the promise that the Spirit should be in believers a perennial fountain of grace, 'This spake he of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified' (Joh 7:37-39). And Jesus Himself says (Joh 16:7) to the disciples, 'It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you.' The office of the Spirit is to abide with the disciples as the source of grace (Joh 7:39), to bring to their remembrance the teaching of Jesus (Joh 14:26, Joh 15:26) and guide them into all truth (Joh 16:13), to give them power to discharge their spiritual functions (Joh 20:22-23) as leaders and teachers of the Church, and, as the Spirit of wisdom and utterance, to inspire them to testify faithfully and courageously for Christ in presence of their persecutors (Mat 10:20 || Mar 13:11 | Luk 12:11, Luk 12:12). Further, His function is to 'reprove the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment' (Joh 16:8-11). With Christ's teaching concerning the Spirit His revelation of God was complete, and accordingly, in one of His last discourses after the Resurrection, He commanded His Apostles to 'make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost' (Mat 28:19).

(b) Our Lord's teaching concerning *the final consummation of the Kingdom of God* may be briefly summarized. The disciples were instructed to live in constant

expectation of His Second Coming (Mat 24:42-51 || Mar 13:33-37 || Luk 12:35-46; cf. Mat 25:13). That might occur at any time. His coming should, according to the prophecies of the OT, be heralded by certain signs in the world, by tumult and distress among the nations, and by portents in nature, earthquakes, storms, and the like (Mat 24:29 ff. || Mar 13:24 ff. || Luk 21:25 ff.). Nevertheless He should come as a thief in the night, and surprise the worldly and the careless in the midst of their business or their pleasure (Mat 24:43 ff. || Luk 17:27). Then also Christ should by His angels 'gather together his elect from the four winds' (Mat 24:31) for the purpose of taking them to Himself and saving them from destruction (Luk 17:34-35). In connexion with this, Jesus spoke also of a time of sifting, at which all unworthy members should be cast out (Mat 13:30; Mat 13:41; Mat 13:48 f., Mat 22:11-13, Mat 23:10-12, Luk 13:25). Finally, after the Kingdom had been thus purified should come the ultimate consummation. Jesus should appear as the Judge of all nations (Mat 25:31-46), coming in the clouds (Mat 26:64 || Mar 14:62 || Luk 22:69) to reward the righteous with eternal bliss in heaven and to sentence the wicked to eternal perdition (Mat 25:34-46). See also Leading Ideas.

Literature.—Cremer, *Bib.-Theol. Lex.* s.vv. διδασκαλία διδαχή *Comm.* of Alford and Meyer; Beyschlag, *NT Theol.* (2nd English ed.) i. 28-156, ii. 267-472; Schmid, *Biblical Theology of the NT*, 63-90; Weiss, *Biblical Theology of the NT*, 63-90.

Hugh H. Currie.

☞ Dog

DOG.—See Animals, p. 64.

☞ Dominion

DOMINION.—The word 'dominion' occurs only once in the Authorized Version of the Gospels, as part of the phrase 'exercise dominion over' (κατακυριεύουσιν), in that passage in the Gospel of Matthew (Mat 20:25) which records our Lord's reply to the ambitious request of Salome on behalf of her sons, and the words which He addressed to the disciples at the time. The Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 of this passage, as of the parallel text in Mark (Mar 10:42), is 'lord it over.' The same idea is expressed in a similar passage in Luke (Luk 22:25), which gives Christ's words at the Last Supper with reference to the dispute among His disciples as to precedence, by

the simple verb κυριεύουσιν, ‘exercise lordship over’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘have lordship over’).

Again, in all three passages the verbs which are so translated are followed in the parallel clause of the verse by the words ‘exercise authority over’ or ‘upon’ (Mat 20:25 Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 || Mar 10:42 Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 , Luk 22:25 Authorized Version), ‘have authority over’ (Luk 22:23 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), representing the words of the original κατεξουσιάζουσιν, ἐξουσιάζοντες. The word ‘authority’ (ἐξουσία) and the verbs formed from it thus suggest themselves for consideration in connexion with the word rendered ‘dominion’ in the passage in Matthew.

1. The passages quoted from the Synoptics illustrate a characteristic feature of the Gospels, the manner in which they represent Jesus as postponing the assertion of His kingly rights, and, in connexion with this, the express teaching which they attribute to Him as to the nature of the dominion which He claimed. Thus, as He withstood the temptation of Satan (Luk 4:6) to assume the royal sceptre which belonged to Him as Son of God, and to reign as the Divinely appointed king of a visible and temporal realm, so He resisted, as a repetition of that temptation, every suggestion or appeal that was made to Him, by the people or by His disciples, formally and publicly to appear as the Messiah. He would not suffer the people of Galilee to make Him a king (Joh 6:15). He declared to Pilate that, although royal authority was His by right, His kingdom was ‘not of this world, and was therefore not to be won or maintained and defended by temporal weapons (Joh 18:36-37).

Now the texts which have been quoted from the Synoptics may be regarded as the *loci classici* of the teaching of Jesus with reference to the nature of the sovereignty claimed by Him, and to the principle of that spiritual dominion of which He spoke. They occur in connexion with what the Gospels tell us regarding the Messianic expectations of the Twelve, who, like most of their countrymen, anticipated in the near, and even, at times, in the immediate, future, the visible establishment of the personal reign of Christ as Prince of the House of David. They were addressed to the disciples at the close of Christ’s ministry, in the one case in the course of His last journey to Jerusalem, in the other in connexion with the dispute at the Last Supper as to who should be accounted the greatest. The answer of Jesus in both cases—to the ambitious request of Salome, and to the dispute among the disciples—was the same, and the principle which He laid down was to this effect. For Master and for disciple the question of dominion is totally different from that which is agitated by the ambition of the world. Among the princes of the Gentiles the way to power and authority is the path of worldly ambition and self-assertion. It is not so in the Kingdom

of God. There not self-assertion but self-denial is the way to supremacy. The way to dominion is the way of service. Places of supremacy there certainly are in the Kingdom of God, and they are reserved 'for those for whom they are prepared' of the Father. But they are allotted upon a definite, intelligible principle, and that not of favouritism but of spiritual character. They who shall hold rank nearest to Christ in His Kingdom are they who shall most closely resemble Him in respect of lowliness, self-denial, and humble service. For disciple and for Master the law is the same in this respect, that 'he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.' So Christ is 'among you as he that serveth' (Luk_22:27). In laying down the principle, Jesus illustrated it by reference to His own mission. 'The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many' (Mat_20:28 || Mar_10:45). And here as elsewhere the disciple must be as his Master, attaining his place in the Kingdom only by the way of self-humiliation, self-denial, self-sacrifice.

2. The use in these passages, in immediate connexion with the idea of dominion, of the words 'have authority over,' 'exercise authority over' (ἐξουσιάζουσιν, ἐξουσιάζοντες), calls for some reference to the power or authority (ἐξουσία) attributed to Christ in connexion with His humiliation as well as with His exaltation. That during His ministry He possessed and exercised very complete and far-reaching authority, dominion in the sense of ἐξουσία, the natural synonym of κυριότης, 'lordship,' 'dominion,' is distinctly testified by all the Gospels.

Lordship (κυριότης) was expressly claimed by Him even in connexion with His state of humiliation. Thus, in controversy with the Pharisees, He claimed to be Lord of the Sabbath, and, as such, to be entitled to interpret the Sabbath law (Mat_12:8 || Mar_2:28 || Luk_6:5). St. Luke tells us in his account of the healing of the paralytic, that 'the power of the Lord was present to heal' (Luk_5:17). The message to the owners of the ass on which Jesus rode to Jerusalem was 'The Lord hath need of him' (Mat_21:3 || Mar_11:3 || Luk_19:31; Luk_19:34). When Jesus had washed the disciples' feet, and was applying the lesson of that incident, He said, 'Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am' (Joh_13:13).

As Son of Man, He was invested with special power (ἐξουσία) to work miracles. As such He is represented as exercising a delegated authority, acting according to His Father's will (Joh_5:30 ff.), but that with a spontaneity and directness unknown before. Such was His power over unclean spirits that they trembled and cried out at His approach, and were compelled to yield instant though fearful and reluctant obedience to His command (Mar_1:27 || Luk_4:36). With a word He controlled the winds and waves (Mat_8:26-31 || Mar_4:39-41 || Luk_8:24-25). So wide and great was His authority over the powers of life and death, that His word, even though spoken at a distance,

was sufficient to effect an instantaneous cure, as when His word of assurance spoken at Cana to the nobleman was followed immediately by the cure of his child who lay sick at Capernaum (Joh 4:50); and when He confirmed the faith of the centurion, who likened Christ's power over disease to his own authority over his soldiers, by speaking the word which healed his servant (Mat 8:8-13 || Luk 7:6-10). Three times He raised the dead with a word: in the case of the widow's son (Luk 7:11-16), in that of Jairus' daughter (Mat 9:18-26 || Mar 5:21-43 || Luk 8:40-56), and in that of Lazarus (Joh 11:1-44). He could even delegate to others His power over unclean spirits and to heal disease, as He did in His mission, first of the Twelve, and again of the Seventy disciples (Mat 10:5 ff. || Mar 6:7 ff. || Luk 9:1-6; Luk 10:1-16). Again, He claimed and exercised power on earth to forgive sins (Mat 9:6 || Mar 2:10 || Luk 5:24, cf. Luk 7:48).

3. According to the Johannine discourses, Jesus declared that the Father had committed to Him power to execute judgment 'because he is the Son of Man' (Joh 5:27). This function refers specially to His state of exaltation. He came not to judge, but to save the world (Joh 12:47); 'I judge no man,' He said to the Jews (Joh 8:15). At the same time His work and teaching, even His very presence in the world, meant a judgment, inasmuch as they compelled men to declare themselves either for or against Christ, and so pass judgment upon themselves (cf. Joh 9:39); and as Jesus said Himself, 'The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day' (Joh 12:48). To Jesus as Son of Man all judgment and authority and power have been committed. All things are given into His hands (Mat 11:27, Joh 3:35 || Joh 13:2), that He may guide and strengthen His Church (Mat 28:18), and at His second coming appear as the Judge of all nations (Mat 25:31 ff.). It is He who is to pass the final sentence upon the just and upon the unjust. On that day He will say to those who have falsely called Him 'Lord, Lord,' 'I know you not' (Mat 7:22-23). He will open to His faithful ones the door to the eternal festival of joy, but will close the door of the heavenly marriage feast on 'the unfaithful' (Mat 7:22-23; Mat 25:11-12, Luk 13:27-29). 'He shall sit upon the throne of his glory, and before him shall be gathered all nations' (Mat 25:31-32). In connexion with these predictions of the events of the Day of Judgment, Jesus says: 'The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them that do iniquity' (Mat 13:41). The angels are thus represented as being subject to the dominion of Christ in His exaltation, as His servants, obeying His behests; as even during His life on earth they appeared as ministering spirits obedient to His command, and waiting upon Him as courtiers upon their Sovereign (Mat 4:11; Mat 26:53, Luk 22:43).

Lastly, as the fruit of His work of redemption, and as part of the glory which He has won by His perfect submission to the Father's will, there is given to Him, in that time of waiting which must pass before the final completion of His kingdom, 'all power in

heaven and on earth' (Mat_28:18), as the Father has 'given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as he has given him' (Joh_17:2; cf. Joh_10:28). See also Power.

Literature.—Cremer, *Bib.-Theol. Lex.* s.vv. ἐξουσία, κύριος, κυριότης; Grimm-Thayer, *Lex. NT*, s.vv. κατακυριεύω, ἐξουσία, κύριος, κυριεύω; H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der NT Theol.* i. 319 f., ii. 409 ff.; Wendt, *The Teaching of Jesus*, ii. 276; Beyschlag, *NT Theology*, i. 59-191, 241; *Comm.* of Meyer and Alford.

Hugh H. Currie.

Door

DOOR (θύρα, cf. θυρωρός, 'doorkeeper,' 'porter').—The word 'door' is frequently found in the Gospels, sometimes in the literal, often in the figurative sense.

1. We need, first, to get clearly in mind the meaning of the term in Oriental usage. By 'door' is usually meant the outside or entrance 'doorway,' but often the 'door' in distinction from the 'doorway,' the frame of wood, stone, or metal that closes the doorway. The outside of the Oriental house has little ornament or architectural attractiveness of any kind. The 'door,' however, and the projecting 'window' above it, are exceptions to this rule. The doors, windows, and doorways are often highly ornamented (Isa_54:12, Rev_21:21), enriched with arabesques, and, if to-day it be the house of a Moslem, the door will have sentences from the Koran inscribed upon it (cf. Deu_6:9). The 'doors' are usually of hard wood, studded with nails, or sometimes covered with sheet-iron. They are often very heavy. They invariably open inwards, and are furnished on the inside with strong bars and bolts. They have usually wooden locks, which are worked by wooden keys of such size that they could make formidable clubs (Isa_22:22, cf. *Land and Book*, i. 493). There is an opening in the door for the insertion of the hand and the introduction of the key from the outside, the lock being reached only from the inside. On entering the 'door' there is usually a vestibule, where, in daytime, the 'doorkeeper' is found, and where the master often receives the casual visitor (cf. Gen_19:13; Gen_23:10; Gen_34:30 and Job_29:7).

The 'doors' leading into the 'rooms' or 'chambers' that open upon the court are not usually supplied with locks or bolts; a curtain, as a rule, being all that separates one of these 'chambers' from the 'court,' the idea being that all is private and secure within the outer gate (cf. Deu_24:10, Act_10:17; Act_12:13).

The 'doorway' consists of three parts: the threshold or sill (sometimes used for 'door'), the two side-posts, and the lintel (Exo 12:7 f.). The doors of ancient Egypt, and probably of contemporary nations, swung upon vertical pintles which projected from the top and bottom of the door into sockets in the lintel and threshold respectively. The commonest form of door had the pintle in the middle of the width, so that, as it opened, a way was afforded on each side of it for ingress or egress.

Occasionally we find that the 'chamber,' or private room, had its own door and fastenings. In Mat 6:6, 'When thou hast shut thy door,' the word used means not only closed, but fastened it—giving the idea of complete privacy. See art. Closet. In Mat 25:10, 'the *door* was shut,' it is clearly the outside or entrance-door that is meant. When this one outer door was shut, all communication with the outside world was cut off. Then nothing but persistent knocking at this door, and loud entreaty, would succeed in securing even a hearing. In this case the appeal was made to the bridegroom himself, who, to this day, is considered in the East sovereign of the occasion.

2. When Jesus said, 'I am the door' (Joh 10:9), He clearly meant to exclude every other form or means of mediation. But *through Him* there is an unhindered entering into and going out of the fold (cf. Num 27:17).

3. When it is said that Joseph, 'a rich man of Arimathaea,' begged the body of Jesus, laid it in his own new tomb, which he had hewn out in the rock, and rolled a great stone to the *door* of the tomb (Mat 27:60, Mar 16:3), we have a reference to a unique kind of door. The great roll-stone is often mentioned in the Talmud, but only in describing interments of the dead (Keim). It was clearly designed to protect the dead bodies and the other contents of the tomb from robbers, petty thieves, and birds and beasts of prey. One large tomb is now shown half a mile north of Jerusalem, which has a huge circular stone, like a great millstone on edge, cut from the solid rock, together with the channel in which it revolves. There are signs that it was originally furnished with a secret fastening, doubtless to protect the contents—spices, costly linen, jewellery, etc., against plunder. The 'Tomb of Mariamne,' recently uncovered south of the city, and the so-called 'Tomb of Lazarus' at Bethany, likewise have doors with similar 'roll-stones' (cf. art. Tomb). See also artt. Court, House.

Geo. B. Eager.

 Doubt

DOUBT

In Lat. *dubitare*, from *duo* ‘two’ and *bito* ‘go’; Germ. *Zweifeln*, *Zweifel*; from *zwei*, ‘two’; Mid. English *douten*, ‘to doubt,’ had the meaning of *to fear* (‘I doubt some foul play’ [Shakspeare], ‘nor slack her threatful hand for danger’s doubt’ [Spenser]), and this meaning, perhaps, survives in such expressions as ‘I doubt he will not come.’ But, as commonly used, *to doubt* means *to be of two minds*, *to waver*, *to hesitate*. It suggests the idea of perplexity; of being at a loss, in a state of suspense. The questioning attitude is implied. The word has, in short, a variety of meanings.

References in the Gospels.—The word ‘doubt’ occurs several times in Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 . It is used, however, to translate several Greek terms; nor are these invariably rendered by the word in question. A study of the respective passages reveals differing circumstances and conditions, different types of character, a variety of subjects exercising the mind. Doubt in several phases is in illustration.

(a) The doubt of perplexity. Thus in Mar 6:20, Luk 24:4, Joh 13:22—where the verb ἀπορέω occurs (the strengthened compound διαπορέω is found in Luk 9:7). There is no question in these passages of the apprehension of religious truth; the idea suggested is rather that of being taken aback, disturbed, distracted, by the unintelligible and the unexpected. Herod is ‘much perplexed’ (Mar 6:20 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 , cf. Luk 9:7) as he listens to the Baptist, as reports reach him concerning Jesus; he is puzzled, at a loss for explanations. And thus in Joh 13:22 ‘the disciples looked one upon the other, doubting of whom he spake’; the unexpected statement has bewildered them. Similar feelings may be recognized in the case of the women at the sepulchre (Luk 24:4); they are ‘much perplexed’; utterly unable, that is, to account for the empty tomb. A like meaning may, perhaps, be read into the ‘how long dost thou hold us in suspense?’ of Joh 10:24 (τὴν ψυχὴν ἡμῶν αἰρεῖς): the Jews being understood as professing an uncertainty which could be at once dispelled by some plain declaration on the part of Jesus.

(b) Wavering faith. A second group of passages, where the verbs μετεωρίζεσθαι and διατάζειν occur, has now to be considered. Again the word ‘doubt’ is found in Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 , but with reference to a mental condition other than that which has been noted in the preceding paragraph. A religious significance is now observable; the existence of faith is implied, but it is an imperfect, a wavering faith. Because of distractions of one kind or another, confidence is impaired. The doubters referred to are sometimes the ὀλιγόπιστοι; their faith not only wavering but small. Thus in Luk 12:29 ‘neither be ye of doubtful mind’ (καὶ μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε), the context supplies the explanation: anxiety about earthly

things is incompatible with absolute trust in the Fatherhood of God. So also in Mat_14:31 'wherefore didst thou doubt?' (εις τι ἐδίστασας;), where St. Peter's confidence has given way before sudden panic. And thus, perhaps, in Mat_28:17 'but some doubted' (ἐδίστασαν). What, precisely, the condition of these genuine disciples was is difficult to determine, but it was one which left them unreceptive while others were convinced of a manifestation of the living Lord. With this passage may be compared Luk_24:38; the διαλογισμοί (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'reasonings') being significant of fearsome hesitation on the part of those who could not at once realize that the mysterious visitor was none other than Jesus Himself.

(c) The critical attitude. This is implied by the verb διακρίνεσθαι; a term which, as used in NT, denotes the absence of faith, the paralysis of faith. It occurs but twice in the Gospels (Mat_21:21, Mar_11:23); where the power of faith is, by implication, contrasted with the impotency which is involved in the want of faith. Thought seems to be directed to the inevitable consequence of regarding Divine things as a subject for curious investigation rather than as matter of personal concern. On the one hand, there is the emphatic declaration which may be expressed in the words of Bacon, 'Man, when he resteth and assureth himself upon divine Protection and Favour, gathereth a Force and Faith [in its sense of fidelity] which Human Nature, in its selfe, could not obtaine.' On the other hand, there is the implied warning that, as the vision of God darkens and vanishes, man's capacity for useful action becomes weaker, until at length it dies away.

[For discussion of 'the doubt of Thomas' See Thomas and Unbelief].

Literature.—Lyttelton, *Modern Poets of Faith, Doubt, and Paganism*; Illingworth, *Christian Character*; James, *The Will to Believe*; Carlyle, *Sartor Resartus*; Browning, *Christmas-Eve and Easter-Day*; Tennyson, *In Memoriam* (edited, with commentary, by A. W. Robinson); Jowett, *Sermons*.

H. L. Jackson.

 Dove

DOVE (περιστερά).—Its gentle nature makes the dove a frequent simile in ancient literature. Christ bids His disciples to be harmless as doves, and to unite with such gentleness a wisdom like the serpent's (Mat_10:16). Meyer, *in loc.*, takes this to mean, 'Be prudent in regard to dangers in which you are placed, quick to see and

avoid dangers; and always be full of uprightness, never taking any questionable way of escape.' As the serpent is the most cunning of the beasts of the field, so should the Lord's disciples have wisdom to understand the subtleties of Satan; but no evil is to mix with such wisdom. Along with it there must be found a purity and simplicity of heart of which the harmless, gentle dove is the symbol. The truest wisdom for the Christian is to keep always the simplicity of the dove. A nature purified by the Spirit of Christ will have wise penetration enough to defeat all the wiles of Satan.

The dove, the emblem of perfect innocence, is used (Mat 3:16 and parallels) as a symbol of the Holy Spirit, who is the power and wisdom of God, acting on the spirits of men. When the dove appeared to sit on the Saviour's head, it denoted the Divine recognition of His holiness (Mat 3:17), and His official consecration to the Messianic ministry. As the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says, 'He was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners' (Mat 7:26).

It has been thought that the dove had a sacrosanct character among the Hebrews. Though it was a favourite food with some neighbouring peoples, it was not eaten in Palestine. Young pigeons and doves were offered in sacrifice, where no sacrificial meal was involved. So we find in the temple courts them that sold doves (Mat 21:12, Mar 11:15, Joh 2:14; Joh 2:16),—no doubt for such sacrifices,—whom Christ drove out, along with the money-changers. In Palestine the dove was considered sacred by the Phœnicians and the Philistines, and the Samaritans were often accused of worshipping it. There were holy doves at Mecca; and, according to Lucian (*Dea Syria*, 54), doves were taboo to the Syrians; he who touched them being unclean a whole day.

In Christian Art in representations of the Lord's Baptism, the presence of the Holy Spirit is indicated by the dove. In churches in early times the figure of a dove appeared in the baptisteries, a golden or silver dove being suspended above the font. Lamps, too, were sometimes made in the form of doves. In later times pyxes were sometimes made of gold and silver in the shape of a dove, and used for the reservation of the host.

Exclusive of the turtle-dove, four species of dove are found in Palestine: *Columba palumbus*, the ring-dove, or wood-pigeon; *Columba aenas*, the stock-dove, found in Gilead and Bashan and the Jordan Valley; *Columba livia*, the rock-dove, abundant along the coast and in the uplands; *Columba schimperi*, closely allied to the preceding, and found in the interior.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, s.v.; Thomson, *Land and Book* (1878), p. 268 ff.; *Expositor*, 1st ser. ix. [1879] p. 81 ff.

☞ Doxology

DOXOLOGY.—An ascription of praise to God in forms of words more or less fixed by usage. Though the term does not occur in the NT, it contains many doxologies, and they were an important element in the devotional life of the primitive Christians. This indeed was inevitable, because they carried with them what was best in the practice of Judaism, and were especially influenced in the expression of their worship by the language of the OT.

1. *The OT and Jewish usage.*—Doxologies are common in the OT, being found in germ even in its oldest portions. In the Song of Deborah praise is given to Jehovah for national deliverance (Jdg 5:2; Jdg 5:9; cf. Exo 18:10). In 1Ki 1:48; 1Ki 8:15 there is thankful recognition of Jehovah's power and control in national events. The Psalms are especially rich (Psa 28:6; Psa 34:2-3; Psalms 135, 146), though one form, 'give thanks unto Jehovah, for His lovingkindness endureth for ever,' seems to be the most common both in the Psalms and all post-exilic literature (Psa 106:1; Psa 107:1; Psa 118:1-3, 1Ch 16:34, 2Ch 5:13; 2Ch 7:3; 2Ch 7:6, Ezr 3:11). The regular liturgical conclusion of the services of the Temple, and afterwards of the Synagogue, came to be a doxology beginning 'blessed be (or 'is') God.' By the time of our Lord the employment of doxological expressions had increased so largely, that they were in the mouth of the people for any event which stirred their gratitude or wonder, in fact as thanksgiving for almost everything in life. Though the fundamental religious idea of the doxology, that Jehovah is the Holy One whose sovereign power must be acknowledged at all times, was a noble one, its use had too often degenerated into the veriest formalism.

2. *NT usage.*—Traces of Jewish custom may be seen in the Gospels (Mat 15:31, Mar 2:12, Luk 1:46; Luk 1:68; Luk 2:20; Luk 5:25-26; Luk 7:18). The words and attendant conditions of the life of Jesus so impressed the people that a new hope was born in them, and they praised God for signs of His returning favour to Israel through this prophet. Jesus does not yet receive Divine homage. No doxology is offered to Him anywhere in the Gospels, for the Messianic acclaim (Mar 11:9-10) is not to be so interpreted (see Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, 220ff., and Swete, *in loc.*). God alone has the right to such ascription, for He is 'holy'; He is ὁ εὐλογητός, the One to whom blessing is due (Mar 14:61), הַיְיָ בָּרֵךְ, הַקְרִישׁ being a well-known Jewish formula. See artt. Benediction and Blessing.

Immediately after the Resurrection, Jesus is associated with the Father in glory, and receives worship as Messiah and Son of God. This is the universal Apostolic view (Act 2:33-36; Act 3:13; Act 3:15; Act 5:31, Rom 1:4, Php 2:6-11, Heb 1:3; Heb 2:9, Jam 2:1; 1Pe 1:21). So the ascription of doxologies to the risen Christ naturally followed. But the doxology continued to be addressed most frequently to God the Father (Rom 11:36, Gal 1:5, Eph 3:20-21, Php 4:20, 1Ti 1:17; 1Ti 6:16; 1Pe 5:11, Rev 7:12). In several Jesus Christ is associated more or less directly with God the Father (Rom 16:27; 1Pe 4:11, Jud 1:25, Rev 5:13). Rom 9:5 and Heb 13:21 present battling evidence as to the recipient; but in 2Ti 4:18; 2Pe 3:18, Rev 1:6 glory is ascribed to Jesus Christ. Thus in conformity with Christian belief the OT usage was expanded, so that at a very early date there arose a Christian formula, which in the public adoration of the worship of the Church would serve in a secondary sense as a creed, expressing the doctrine that the risen Christ shared in Divine honour with the Father.

3. Structure.—The doxologies of the NT consist of three main parts.

(a) The Person to whom praise is given. This is, as we have seen, most frequently God the Father, though Jesus Christ is associated with Him. Attributes are often added, usually to emphasize the Divine blessing which has occasioned the praise. In Eph 3:20-21, e.g. a clause descriptive of the power of the Almighty serves to justify the Apostle's prayer for strength on behalf of his readers. See Rom 16:27, 1Ti 1:17; 1Ti 6:16; 2Pe 3:18, Jud 1:24-25, Rev 1:5-6; Rev 5:13.

(b) The second term is almost invariably δόξα ('glory'), either alone or with some significant addition (Eph 3:21), the chief exceptions being 1Ti 6:16 ('honour and power'), 1Pe 5:11 ('the dominion'). The amplitude of the doxologies in the Apocalypse deserves attention, the praise being threefold (Rev 4:11; Rev 19:1), fourfold (Rev 5:13), or sevenfold in its perfection (Rev 7:12). This full-voiced glory offered to the Lamb (Rev 5:13) in this book of Hebrew cast, shows how thoroughly it was the belief of the circle from which it issued that Jesus transcended every created being.

Except in 1Pe 4:11 the copula is omitted, so that it must be determined from the context whether the doxology is affirmative or precatory (see Lightfoot on Gal 1:5; Chase, *Lord's Prayer*, p. 169; *Didache*, viii. 2; Clement of Rome, 58).

(c) The third integral part of the doxology in its simplest form is εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ('unto the ages'), which denotes the eternity of the sovereign rule of the Lord. Before the mind of the Apostolic writers, however, the future rolls out in a series of aeons, so that the normal form is expanded very frequently into εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων

, in order to cover all possible periods of time (Gal 1:5, Php 4:20, 1Ti 1:17, 2Ti 4:18, Heb 13:21; 1Pe 4:11, Rev 5:13; Rev 7:12. See also Eph 3:21; 2Pe 3:18, Jud 1:25).

The conclusion of all doxologies except 2Pe 3:18 is ἀμήν.

4. *The Doxology in the Lord's Prayer* (Mat 6:13).—It can no longer be doubted that this was not a part of the prayer as it stood originally in Matthew. The uncial evidence is very weak (LΔΣ), and the variations in the early versions are numerous (Syr^{cur} omits 'and the power'; the Sinaitic is defective, and the old Latin (k) and the Sahidic differ from each other and from the Syriac). The form found in the *Didache* (viii. 2, x. 5) ultimately developed into the full expression ('the kingdom and the power and the glory'), which probably passed into the Syrian text from the liturgical usage of the Syrian Church. (See Hort's *Notes on Select Readings*, p. 9). Of this final doxology the original source may have been 1Ch 29:11, which shaped the Synagogue usage and thereby that of the Christian Church. No Jewish benediction was complete without reference to 'the kingdom' of Jehovah. 'It calls attention to this that He to whom the kingdom belongs, also has the power to hear the prayer which primarily has in view the establishing of that kingdom, and that He is therefore to be praised for ever' (Weiss). See, further, art. Lord's Prayer.

5. The Angelic Hymn (Luk 2:14), in its longer and less correct text, gave rise to the *Gloria in Excelsis* (*Apost. Const.* vii. 47). The *Doxologia Minor* ('Glory be to the Father,' etc.) may possibly be traced back to Mat 28:19, but there is no other sign of it in the NT. However, to follow the fortunes of these doxologies would carry us beyond our limits. (See Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*).

Literature.—*Jewish Ency.* vol. viii. art. 'Liturgy'; Herzog-Hauck's *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] vol. xi. art. 'Liturgische Formeln'; Chase, *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*; Westcott, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, Add. Note 'Apostolic Doxologies.'

R. A. Falconer.

Draught Of Fishes

DRAUGHT OF FISHES.—A twice repeated miracle: (1) at the beginning of the Lord's ministry, (2) after the Resurrection. The main points are similar, but differences in the details have always been considered important and significant.

1. Luk 5:1-11. At the Lake of Gennesaret, Jesus, after teaching from Peter's boat, bids him put out and let down the nets for a draught. He and his companions have toiled all the night without success, but obey, and enclose a great multitude of fishes, so that the nets are in danger of breaking. With the aid of their partners they fill the boats, which begin to sink. Peter, who some time before had been brought to Jesus by his brother Andrew (Joh 1:41) and had followed Him as His disciple (Mat 4:18, Mar 1:16), now begs Jesus to depart from him for he is 'a sinful man' [the vision of the Divine is the revelation of man's sin], but on a repeated command leaves all and follows Jesus.

2. Joh 21:1-14. Some days or weeks after the Resurrection, when the Apostles have returned to their work as Galilaean fishermen, after a night of fruitless labour, when they are drawing near the shore, an unrecognized voice hails them, asking if they have anything to sell for food. On their answering in the negative, they are advised to cast the net on the right side of the ship. Having done so, they are not able to draw the net for the multitude of fishes. Instinctively John recognizes the Lord, and tells Peter, who at once swims to land. On drawing the net, the number of 'great fishes' is found to be 153, yet the net is not broken. None of the disciples has any doubt that 'it is the Lord.'

The natural explanation of the miracle, that from a distance Jesus saw what those in the boat failed to observe, is possible, but is not necessary. The power is rather that of guiding to the required place. 'The miracle lies in the circumstances and not in the mere fact. The events came to men from the sphere of their daily labour, and were at once felt to be the manifestations of a present power of God' (Westcott, *Characteristics of the Gospel Miracles*),—in the second case the manifestation of the power of the presence of the risen Lord.

The significant differences between the details of the two incidents have been drawn out by St. Augustine (*in Joh. cxxii. 7*). 'The one miracle was the symbol of the Church at present, the other of the Church perfected; in the one we have good and bad, in the other good only; there Christ also is on the water, here He is on the land; there the draught is left in the boats, here it is landed on the beach; there the nets are let down as it might be, here in a special part; there the nets are rending, here they are not broken; there the boats are on the point of sinking with their load, here they are not laden; there the fish are not numbered, here the number is exactly given' (Westcott, *St. John, in loc*). For interpretations of the number of fish (Joh 21:11), see Westcott and other commentators.

Literature.—The *Comm.* and *Lives of Christ* on the two passages; Trench and Taylor on *Miracles; Expositor*, iv. vi. [1892] 18; F. W. Robertson, *The Human Race*, 125; Ruskin, *Fronde Agrestes*, 152.

☒ Draw-Net

DRAW-NET (σαγήνη, *seine*).—For fuller description see art. Nets. This kind of net is mentioned in the Gospels only in the parable of Mat 13:47-50, where it is very much in point. Being usually of great size and sweeping through an immense area, it collects many varieties of fish—worthless, undersized, even dead fish, as well as the choice and the living. The process of fishing with a seine gives the impression of comprehensiveness and completeness. To one who has watched it—the very gradual progress of the operation, the extended area slowly encircled, the final drawing up of the net on the beach, and the sorting of its varied contents, with the reservation of some and the rejection of others—the aptness of the parable becomes very apparent.

The parable closes the series of seven in Matthew 13, in which various aspects of the Kingdom of Heaven are presented. It is parallel in meaning to the second of the series,—the Tares and the Wheat,—yet it has its distinct individuality. It points, like that parable, to the intermixture of good and evil in the Church in its present stage, and it is implicit in the figure used that no absolute separation is possible or to be thought of now. But the emphasis of the parable and of the explanation added by our Lord, lies not upon the fact of the intermixture, but upon the certainty that there will be a decisive end to it. A time of deliberate (καθίσταντες) and final severance is announced as a warning to the evil, as an assurance to the good. The parable is concerned with the future rather than with the present, hence its suitability at the end of the series. As must be expected, the figure is not quite adequate. The whole operation of fishing is carried out by the same individuals. But the separation of the good and the evil at the end of the world will be effected not by the men through whom the Kingdom was extended, but by the angels, to whom this ministry is always assigned (Mat 13:41; Mat 24:31; Mat 25:31, Rev 14:18-19).

This parable, like that of the Tares, was much appealed to in the Donatist controversy. The Donatists, emphasizing purity as a note of the Church, maintained that all must be excluded from its outward communion to whom that note could not be attached. Augustine showed that such attempted separation was forbidden by our Lord, apart from the case of open evildoers, and that He had not contemplated a community in its present stage free from admixture of evil. The net must contain both good and bad fish till it is drawn to the beach. As against schism, he points out the folly of those who, like fish breaking through or leaping over the net to escape the company of worthless fish within, refuse to wait the final and thorough separation

appointed by God, and in mistakenly pressing the purity of the Church lose its catholicity (Augustine, *Enarr. in Psa 64:6*; cf. also *Enarr. in Psa 126:3*; *Coll. Carth. d. 3*; ad *Don. Post. Coll. 4, 8, 10*).

What conception of the Kingdom of Heaven is indicated by the parable? The parable may be said to be an expansion of the idea contained in 'fishers of men.' Taken by itself, it might seem to support the identification of the Kingdom of Heaven with the Church; but in other contexts the Kingdom of Heaven (or of God) requires a much more comprehensive explanation. Harnack's assertion that our Lord meant by this term, so constantly recurring in His teaching, only an inward experience of the believer (*Das Wesen des Christentums*, p. 35 ff.), seems quite unsuited to this passage. So, too, does the Abbé Loisy's explanation of the Kingdom as being still entirely in the future, and existing in the present only as an expectation (*The Gospel and the Church*, § ii.). The parable, naturally interpreted, certainly suggests a visible community. The Kingdom is conceived of both as inward and outward, consisting in its present stage both of those who are animated by its true spirit, and those who belong to it only so far that they are included in its external organization. Again, the Kingdom is represented as belonging to the present, and yet as awaiting its consummation in a future crisis of judgment. And it is in idea universal ('gathered of every kind'), tending to include all men within its bounds.

'The Kingdom in its highest and most Christian sense is the working of "invisible laws" which penetrate below the surface, and are gradually progressive and expansive in their operation. But in this, as in other cases, spiritual forces take to themselves an outward form: they are enshrined in a vessel of clay, finer or coarser as the case may be, not only in men as individuals, but in men as a community or communities. The society then becomes at once a vehicle and an instrument of the force by which it is animated, not a perfect vehicle or a perfect instrument,—a field of wheat mingled with tares, a net containing bad fish as well as good,—but analogous to those other visible institutions by which God accomplishes His gracious purposes amongst men' (Sanday, *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible*, art. 'Jesus Christ,' If. B. b. (2), (vi.)).

A. E. Ross.

Dream

DREAM.—The interest of the student of the Gospels in dreams turns upon the occurrence in the opening chapters of Matthew of the record of no fewer than five supernatural dreams (Mat 1:20; Mat 2:12-13; Mat 2:19; Mat 2:22). Later in the same Gospel mention is made of a remarkable dream which came to the wife of Pilate

(Mat 27:19). There is no reference to dreams elsewhere in the NT except in a citation from the OT in Act 2:17 and in an obscure verse in Jude (Jud 1:8).

No allusion is made in the Gospels, or indeed in the whole NT, to dreams as phenomena forming part of the common experience of man. Any such allusions that may occur in Scripture are, of course, purely incidental; they are therefore in the whole extent of Scripture very infrequent. Barely enough exist to assure us that dreams were thought of by the Hebrews very much as they are by men of average good sense in our own day. Men then, too, were visited with pleasant dreams which they knew were too good to be true (Psa 126:1), and afflicted with nightmares which drove rest from their beds (Job 7:14). To them, too, I dreams were the type of the evanescent and shadowy, whatever suddenly flies away and cannot be found (Job 20:8, Psa 73:20). The vanity and deceptiveness of dreams were proverbial (Ecc 5:7, Isa 29:8). The hungry man may dream that he eats, but his soul continues empty; the thirsty man may dream that he drinks, but he remains faint (Isa 29:8). Their roots were set in the multitude of cares, and their issue was emptiness (Ecc 5:3; Ecc 5:7). When the Son of Sirach (Sir 34:1-2) represents them as but reflexions of our waking experiences, to regard which is to catch at a shadow and to follow after the wind, he has in no respect passed beyond the Biblical view. (Cf. Delitzsch, *Biblical Psychology*, p. 328; Orelli, art. 'Träume' in *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred]).

The interest of the Bible in dreams is absorbed by the rare instances in which they are made the vehicles of supernatural revelation. That they were occasionally so employed is everywhere recognized, and they therefore find a place in the several enumerations of the modes of revelation (Num 12:6, Deu 13:1-5, 1Sa 28:6; 1Sa 28:15, Joe 2:28, Act 2:17, Jer 23:3; Jer 23:25; Jer 23:28; Jer 23:32; Jer 27:9; Jer 29:8, Zec 10:2; Job 4:13; Job 33:15 stand somewhat apart). In this matter, too, the Son of Sirach retains the Biblical view, explicitly recognizing that dreams may be sent by the Most High in the very passage in which he reproves the folly of looking upon dreams in general as sources of knowledge (Sir 34:6). The superstitious attitude characteristic of the whole heathen world, which regards all dreams as omens, and seeks to utilize them for purposes of divination, receives no support whatever from the Biblical writers. Therefore in Israel there arose no 'houses of dreams,' there was no place for a guild of 'dream-examiners' or 'dream-critics.' When on rare occasions God did vouchsafe symbolical dreams to men, the professed dream-interpreters of the most highly trained castes stood helpless before them (Genesis 37, 40, 41, Daniel 2, 4). The interpretation of really God-sent dreams belonged solely to God Himself, the sender, and only His messengers could read their purport. There could be no more striking indication of the gulf that divides the Biblical and the ethnic views of dreams.

If there is a hint of an overestimate of dreams among some Israelites (Jer 23:25 f., Jer 27:9), this is mentioned only to be condemned, and is obviously a trait not native to Israel, but, like all the soothsaying in vogue among the ill-instructed of the land, borrowed from the surrounding heathenism (cf. Lehmann, *Aberglaube und Zauberei*, p. 56). If there are possible suggestions that there were methods by which prophetic dreams were sought (Jer 29:8, 1Sa 28:6; 1Sa 28:15), these suggestions are obscure, and involve no commendation of such usages as prevailed among the heathen. All the supernatural dreams mentioned in the Bible were the unsought gift of Jehovah; and there is not the slightest recommendation in the Scriptural narrative of any of the superstitious practices of either seeking or interpreting dreams which constitute the very nerve of ethnic dream-lore (cf. F. B. Jevons in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible* i. 622).

Very exaggerated language is often met with regarding the place which supernatural dreams occupy in Scripture. The writer of the article 'Songes' in Lichtenberger's *Encyc. des Sciences Relig.* (xi. 641), for example, opens a treatment of the subject dominated by this idea with the statement that, 'as everywhere in antiquity, dreams play a preponderant rôle in the religion of the Hebrews.' Even M. Bouché-Leclercq, who usually studies precision, remarks that 'the Scriptures are filled with apparitions and prophetic dreams' (*Histoire de la divination dans l'antiquité*, i. 278). Nothing could be more contrary to the fact. The truth is the supernatural dream is a very uncommon phenomenon in Scripture. Although, as we have seen, dreams are a recognized mode of Divine communication, and dream-revelations may be presumed therefore to have occurred throughout the whole history of revelation; yet very few are actually recorded, and they oddly clustered at two or three critical points in the development of Israel. Of each of the two well-marked types of supernatural dreams (cf. Baur, *Symbolik und Mythologie*, ii. i. 142)—those in which direct Divine revelations are communicated (Gen 15:12; Gen 20:3; Gen 20:6; Gen 28:12; Gen 31:10-11, 1Ki 3:5, Mat 1:20; Mat 2:12-13; Mat 2:19; Mat 2:22; Mat 27:19) and symbolical dreams which receive Divine interpretations (Gen 37:5-6; Gen 37:10; Gen 40:5-16; Gen 41:1; Gen 41:5, Jdg 7:13-15, Dan 2:1; Dan 2:3; Dan 2:26; Dan 4:5; Dan 7:1)—only some half-score of clear instances are given. All the symbolical dreams, it will be observed further, with the exception of the one recorded in Jdg 7:13-15 (and this may have been only a 'providential' dream), occur in the histories of Joseph and Daniel; and all the dreams of direct Divine communication, with the exception of the one to Solomon (1Ki 3:5), in the histories of the nativity of Israel or of the nativity of Israel's Redeemer. In effect, the patriarchal stories of the Book of Genesis, the story of Daniel at the palace of the king, and the story of the birth of Jesus, are the sole depositions of supernatural dreams in Scripture; the apparent exceptions (Jdg 7:13-15, 1Ki 3:5, Mat 27:19) may be reduced to the single one of 1Ki 3:5.

The significance of the marked clustering of recorded supernatural dreams at just these historical points it is not easy to be perfectly sure of. Perhaps it is only a part of the general tendency of the supernatural manifestations recorded in Scripture to gather to the great historical crises; throughout Scripture the creative epochs are the supernaturalistic epochs. Perhaps, on the other hand, it may be connected with the circumstance that at just these particular periods God's people were brought into particularly close relations with the outside world. We have but to think of Abraham and Abimelech, of Jacob and Laban, of Joseph and Pharaoh, of Daniel and Nebuchadnezzar, of Joseph and the Magi, to observe how near at hand the suggestion lies that the choice of dreams in these instances as the medium of revelation has some connexion with the relation in which the recipient stood at the moment to influences arising from the outer world, or at least to some special interaction between Israel and that world.

In entertaining such a conjecture we must beware, however, of imagining that there was something heathenish in the recognition of dreams as vehicles of revelation; or even of unduly depreciating dreams among the vehicles of revelation. It has become quite usual to speak of dreams as the lowest of the media of revelation, with the general implication either that the revelations given through them cannot rise very high in the scale of revelations, or at least that the choice of dreams as their vehicle implies something inferior in the qualification of the recipients for receiving revelations. There is very little Scriptural support for such representations. No doubt, there is a certain gradation in dignity indicated in the methods of revelation. Moses' pre-eminence was marked by Jehovah speaking with him 'mouth to mouth,' manifestly, while to others He made Himself known 'in a vision,' or 'in a dream' (Num 12:6). And it is possible that the order in which the various methods of revelation are enumerated in such passages as Deu 13:1, 1Sa 28:6; 1Sa 28:15, Joe 2:28, Act 2:17 may imply a gradation in which revelation through dreams may stand at the foot. But these very passages establish dreams among the media stately used by God for the revelation of His will, and drop no word depreciatory of them; nor is there discoverable in Scripture any justification for conceiving the revelations made through them as less valuable than those made through other media (cf. König, *Offenbarungsbegriff*, i. 55, ii. 9 f., 63 f.).

It is very misleading to say, for example (Barry in Smith's *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] i. 617; cf. Orelli, *op. cit.*), that 'the greater number' of the recorded supernatural dreams 'were granted, for prediction or for warning, to those who were aliens to the Jewish covenant'; and when they were given to God's 'chosen servants, they were almost always referred to the periods of their earliest and most imperfect knowledge of Him'; and, 'moreover, they belong especially to the earliest age, and became less frequent as the revelations of prophecy increase.' As many of these dreams were granted to Israelites as to aliens; they do not mark any particular stage

of religious development in their recipients; they do not gradually decrease with the progress of revelation; they no more characterize the patriarchal age than that of the exile or the opening of the new dispensation. If no example is recorded during the whole period from Solomon to Daniel; so none is recorded from the patriarchs to Solomon, or again from Daniel to our Lord. If the great writing-prophets assign none of their revelations to dreams, they yet refer to revelations by dreams in such a way as to manifest their recognition of them as an ordinary medium of revelation (Jer 23:25; Jer 23:28; Jer 23:32; Jer 27:9; Jer 29:8, Zec 10:2). These passages are often adduced, to be sure, as suggesting that appeal especially to dreams was a characteristic of the false prophets of the day; and it is even sometimes represented that Jeremiah means to brand dream-revelations as such as lying revelations. Jeremiah's polemic, however, is not directed against any one particular method of revelation, but against false claims to revelation by any method. His zeal burns no more hot against the prophet that 'hath a dream' than against him that 'hath the Lord's word' (Jer 23:28); no more against those that cry, 'I have dreamed, I have dreamed,' than against those who 'take their tongue and say, He saith' (Jer 23:25; Jer 23:31). Nor does Zechariah's careful definition of his visions as received waking, though coming to him at night (Zec 1:8; Zec 4:1), involve a depreciation of revelations through dreams; it merely calls our attention to the fact, otherwise copiously illustrated, that all night-visions are not dreams (cf. Gen 15:12; Gen 26:24; Gen 46:2, Num 22:20, 1Ch 17:3, 2Ch 7:12, Job 4:13; Job 20:8; Job 33:15, Dan 2:19, Act 16:9; Act 18:9; Act 23:11; Act 27:24).

The citation in Act 2:17 of the prediction of Joe 2:8 suffices to show that there rested no shadow upon the 'dreaming of dreams' in the estimation of the writers of the NT. Rather this was in their view one of the tokens of the Messianic glory. Nevertheless, as we have seen, none of them except Matthew records instances of the supernatural dream. In the Gospel of Matthew, however, no fewer than five or six instances occur. Some doubt may attach, to be sure, to the nature of the dream of Pilate's wife (Mat 27:19). The mention of it was certainly not introduced by Matthew idly, or for its own sake; it forms rather one of the incidents which he accumulates to exhibit the atrocity of the judicial murder of Jesus. Is his meaning that thus God Himself intervened to render Pilate utterly without excuse in his terrible crime (so Keil, *in loc.*)? Even so the question would still remain open whether the Divine intervention was direct and immediate, in the mode of a special revelation, or indirect and mediate, in the mode of a providential determination. In the latter contingency, this dream would take its place in a large class, naturally mediated, but induced by God for the guidance of the affairs of men—another instance of which, we have already suggested, may be discovered in the dream of the Midianitish man mentioned in Jdg 7:13-15 (so Nösgen, *in loc.*). In this case, the five instances of the directly supernatural dream which Matthew records in his 'Gospel of the infancy' stand alone in the NT.

In any event, this remarkable series of direct Divine revelations through dreams (Mat 1:20; Mat 2:12-13; Mat 2:19; Mat 2:22) forms a notable feature of this section of Matthew's Gospel, and contributes its share to marking it off as a section apart. On this account, as on others, accordingly, this section is sometimes contrasted unfavourably with the corresponding section of the Gospel of Luke. In that, remarks, for example, Reuss (*La Bible*, NT, i. 138), the angel visitants address waking hearers, the inspiration of the Spirit of God renews veritable prophecy, 'it is a living world, conscious of itself, that appears before us'; in this, on the contrary, 'the form of communication from on high is the dream,—the form the least perfect, the least elevated, the least reassuring.' Others, less preoccupied with literary problems, fancy that it is the recipients of these dream-revelations rather than the author of the narrative to whom they are derogatory. Thus, for example, we are told that, like the Magi of the East and the wife of Pilate, Joseph 'was thought worthy of communion with the unseen world and of communications from God's messenger only when in an unconscious state,' seeing that he was not ripe for the manifestation of the angel to him, as to Zacharias and Mary, when awake (Nebe, *Kindheitsgeschichte*, 212, cf. 368). Of course, there is nothing of all this in the narrative, as there is nothing to justify it in any Scripture reference to the significance of revelation through dreams. The narrative is notable chiefly for its simple dignity and directness. In three of the instances we are merely told that 'an angel of the Lord appeared to Joseph,' and in the other two that he or the Magi were 'warned of God' in a dream, *i.e.* either by way of, or during, a dream. The term employed for 'appearing' (φαίνω) marks the phenomenal objectivity of the object: Joseph did not see in his dream-image something which he merely interpreted to stand for an angel, but an angel in his proper phenomenal presentation (see Grimm-Thayer, *s.v.* δοκέω, *ad fon.*; Trench, *Syn. NT*, § lxxx.; Schmidt, *Griech. Syn.* circa (about) 15). The term translated 'warned of God' (χρηματίζω) imports simply an authoritative communication of a declaration of the Divine will (so, *e.g.*, Weiss, Keil, Alexander, Broadus, Nebe), and does not presuppose a precedent inquiry (as is assumed, *e.g.*, by Bengel, Meyer, Fritzsche). The narratives confine themselves, therefore, purely to declaring, in the simplest and most direct manner, that the dream-communications recorded were from the Lord. Any hesitancy we may experience in reading them is not suggested by them, but is imported from our own personal estimate of the fitness of dreams to serve as media of Divine communications.

It is probable that the mere appearance of dreams among the media of revelation recognized by Scripture constitutes more or less of a stumbling-block to most readers of the Bible. The disordered phantasmagoria of dreams seems to render them peculiarly unfit for such a use. The superstitious employment of them by all nations in the lower stages of culture, including not only the nations of classical antiquity, but

also those ancient peoples with whom Israel stood in closest relations, suggests further hesitancy. We naturally question whether we are not to look upon their presence in the Scripture narrative just as we look upon them in the Gilgames epic or the annals of Assurbanipal, on the stèle of Bentrest or the inscriptions of Karnak, in the verses of Homer or the histories of Herodotus. We are not without temptation to say shortly with Kant (*Anthropologie*, i. § 29), ‘We must not accept dream-tales as revelations from the invisible world.’ And we are pretty sure, if we begin, with Witsius, with a faithful recognition of the fact that ‘God has seen fit to reveal Himself not only to the waking, but sometimes also to the sleeping,’ to lapse, like him, at once into an apologetical vein, and to raise the question seriously, ‘Why should God wish to manifest Himself in this singular way, by night, and to the sleeping, when the manifestation must appear obscure, uncertain, and little suited either to the dignity of the matters revealed or to the use of those to whom the revelation is made?’ (*de Prophetis et Prophetia*, ch. v. in *Miscell. Sacra*, i. pp. 22-27; cf. also Spanheim, *Dubia Evangelica*, 2nd pt., Geneva, 1700, pp. 239-240, and Rivetus, *in Gen.* [Note: Geneva NT 1557, Bible 1560.] *Exercit. cxxiv.*).

We have already pointed out how little there is in common between the occasional employment of dreams for revelations, such as meets us in Scripture, and the superstitious view of dreams prevalent among the ancients. It is an under-statement when it is remarked that ‘the Scriptures start from a spiritual height to which the religious consciousness of the heathen world attained only after a long course of evolution, and then only in the case of an isolated genius like Plato’ (Jevons, *loc. cit.* 622). The difference is not a matter of degree, but of kind. No special sacredness or significance is ascribed by the Scriptures to dreams in general. No class or variety of dreams is recommended by them to our scrutiny that we may through this or that method of interpretation seek guidance from them for our life. The Scriptures merely affirm that God has on certain specific occasions, in making known His will to men, chosen to approach them through the medium of their night-visions; and has through these warned them of danger, awakened them to a sense of wrong-doing, communicated to them His will, or made known His purposes. The question that is raised by the affirmation of such an occasional Divine employment of dreams is obviously not whether dreams as such possess a supernatural quality and bear a supernatural message if only we could get at it, but rather whether there is anything inherent in their very nature which renders it impossible that God should have made such occasional use of them, or derogatory to Him to suppose that He has done so.

Surely we should bear in mind, in any consideration of such a question, the infinite condescension involved in God’s speaking to man through any medium of communication. There is a sense in which it is derogatory to God to suppose Him to hold any commerce with man at all, particularly with sinful man. If we realized, as we should, the distance which separates the infinite and infinitely holy God from

sin-stricken humanity, we should be little inclined to raise questions with respect to the relative condescension involved in His approaching us in these or those particular circumstances. In any revelation which God makes to man He stoops infinitely—and there are no degrees in the infinite. God's thoughts are not as our thoughts, and the clothing of His messages in the forms of human conception and language involves an infinite derogation. Looked at *sub specic aeternitatis*, the difference between God's approaching man through the medium of a dream or through the medium of his waking apprehension, shrinks into practical nothingness. The cry of the heart which has really seen or heard God must in any case be, 'What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him?'

It should also be kept clearly in view that the subject of dreams, too, is, after all, the human spirit. It is the same soul that is active in the waking consciousness which is active also in the dream-consciousness,—the same soul acting according to the same laws (cf. Lehmann, *op. cit.* p. 397). No doubt there are some dreams which we should find difficulty in believing were direct inspirations of God. Are there not some waking thoughts also of which the same may be said? This does not in the least suggest that the Divine Spirit may not on suitable occasion enter into the dream-consciousness, as into the waking, and impress upon it, with that force of conviction which He alone knows how to produce, the assurance of His presence and the terms of His message.

'The psychology of dreams and visions,' writes Dr. G. T. Ladd, 'so far as we can speak of such a psychology, furnishes us with neither sufficient motive nor sufficient means for denying the truth of the Biblical narratives. On the contrary, there are certain grounds for confirming the truth of some of these narratives.... Even in ordinary dreams, the dreamer is still the human soul. The soul acts, then, even in dreaming, as a unity, which involves within itself the functions and activities of the higher, even of the ethical and religious powers.... The possibility of even the highest forms of ethical and religious activities in dreams cannot be denied.... There is nothing in the physiological or psychical conditions of dream-life to prevent such psychical activity for the reception of revealed truth.... It remains in general true that the Bible does not transgress the safe limits of possible or even actual experience' (*The Doctr. of Sacred Scripture*, ii. 436).

So little, indeed, do emptiness and disorder enter into the very essence of dreaming, that common experience supplies innumerable examples of dreams thoroughly coherent and consequent. The literature of the subject is filled with instances in which even a heightened activity of human faculty is exhibited in dreams, and that throughout every department of mental endowment. Jurists have in their dreams prepared briefs of which they have been only too glad to avail themselves in their waking hours; statesmen have in their dreams obtained their best insight into policy; lecturers have elaborated their discourses; mathematicians solved their most puzzling

problems; authors composed their most admired productions; artists worked out their most inspired motives. Dr. Franklin told Cabanis that the bearings and issues of political events which had baffled his inquisition when awake were not infrequently unfolded to him in his dreams. It was in a dream that Reinhold worked out his table of categories. Condorcet informs us that he often completed his imperfect calculations in his dreams; and the same experience has been shared by many other mathematicians, as, for example, by Maignan, Göns, Wähnert. Condillac, when engaged upon his *Cours d'Études*, repeatedly developed and finished in his dreams a subject which he had broken off on retiring to rest. The story of the origin of Coleridge's *Kubla Khan* in a dream is well known. Possibly no more instructive instance is on record, however, than the account given by Robert Louis Stevenson, in his delightful *Chapter on Dreams* ('Thistle' ed. of *Works*, xv. 250 ff.), of how 'the little people' of his brain, who had been wont to amuse him with absurd farragos, harnessed themselves to their task and dreamed for him consecutively and artistically when he became a craftsman in the art of story-telling. Now, they trimmed and pared their dream-stories, and set them on all fours, and made them run from a beginning to an end, and fitted them to the laws of life, and even filled them with dramatic situations of guileful art, making the conduct of the actors psychologically correct, and aptly graduating the emotion up to the climax. (See Abercrombie, *Inquiries Concerning the Intellectual Powers*, etc., part iii. § iv., esp. pp. 216-221; Carpenter, *Principles of Mental Physiology*, p. 524 f.; Lehmann as cited, p. 411; Volkelt, *Die Traumphantasie*, No. 15; Myers, *Human Personality*, etc., Nos. 417 f., 430, with corresponding Appendixes).

Instances of this heightened mental action in dreams are so numerous and so striking in fact, that they have given rise to an hypothesis which provokes Wundt's scoff at those 'who are inclined to think that when we dream the mind has burst the fetters of the body, and that dream fancies transcend the activity of the waking consciousness, with its narrow confinement to the limitations of space and time' (*Vorlesungen über die Menschen- und Thierseele*, Lect. xxii. pp. 366-370, English translation pp. 323-324). The well-known essay of Lange 'On the Double Consciousness, especially on the Night-Consciousness and its polar relation to the Day-Consciousness of Man,' printed in the *Deutsche Zeitschrift für christliche Wissenschaft und christliches Leben* for 1851 (Nos. 30, 31, and 32), still provides one of the most readable and instructive statements of this theory. But English readers will be apt to turn for it first of all to the voluminous discussions of the late Mr. Frederic W. H. Myers, *Human Personality and its Survival of Bodily Death* (London, 1903), where it is given a new statement on a fresh and more empirical basis. In Mr. Myers' view, the sleeping state is more plastic than the waking, exhibiting some trace 'of the soul's less exclusive absorption in the activity of the organism,' by which is possibly increased 'the soul's power of operating in that spiritual world to which sleep has drawn it nearer' (vol. i. pp. 151-152; cf. p. 135). Accordingly, 'these subliminal uprushes' which we call dreams, these 'bubbles

breaking on the surface from the deep below,' may be counted upon to bring us messages, now and again, from a spiritual environment to which our waking consciousness is closed. On hypotheses like these it is often argued that the sleeping state is the most favourable for the reception of spiritual communications. It is not necessary to commit ourselves to such speculations. But their existence among investigators who have given close study to the phenomena of dreams, strongly suggests to us that those phenomena, in the mass, are not such as to exclude the possibility or the propriety of the occasional employment by the Divine Spirit of dreams as vehicles of revelation.

That powerful influences should occasionally arise out of dreams, affecting the conduct and the destiny of men, is only natural, and is illustrated by numerous examples. Literature is crowded with instances of the effect of dreams upon life, for good and evil; and the personal experience of each of us will add additional ones. There is no one of us who has not been conscious of the influence of night visions in deterring him from evil and leading him to good. The annals of religion are sown with instances in which the careers of men have been swayed and their outlook for time and eternity altered by a dream. We may recall the dream of Evagrius of Pontus, recorded by Socrates, for example, by which he was nerved to resist temptation, and his whole life determined. Or we may recall the dream of Patrick, given in his *Confession*, on which hung his whole work as apostle of the Irish. Or we may recall the dream of Elizabeth Fry, by which she was rescued from the indecision and doubt into which she fell after her conversion. The part played by dreams in the conversion of John Bunyan, John Newton, James Gardiner, Alexander Duff, are but well-known instances of a phenomenon illustrated copiously from every age of the Church's experience. 'Converting dreams' are indeed a recognized variety (cf. Myers as cited, No. 409, i. pp. 126, 127), and are in nowise stranger than many of their fellows. They are the natural result of the action of the stirred conscience obtruding itself into the visions of the night, and, as psychological phenomena, are of precisely the same order as the completion of mathematical problems in dreams, or the familiar experience of the invasion of our dreams by our waking anxieties. In the providence of God, however, they have been used as instruments of Divine grace, and levers by which not only individual destiny has been determined, but the very world has been moved. (Cf. Delitzsch, as cited, and 'Dreams and the Moral Life,' in the *Homiletic Review*, Sept. 1890).

With such dreams and the issues which have flowed from them in mind, we surely can find no difficulty in recognizing the possibility and propriety of occasional Divine employment of dreams for the highest of ends. Obviously dreams have not been deemed by Providence too empty and bizarre to be used as instruments of the most far-reaching effects. Indeed, we must extend the control of Divine Providence to the whole world of dreams. Of course, no dream visits us in our sleep, any more than any

occurrence takes place during our waking hours, apart from the appointment and direction of Him who Himself never either slumbers or sleeps, and in whose hands all things work together for the execution of His ends. We may, now and again, be able to trace with especial clearness the hand of the great Potter, moulding the vessel to its destined uses, in, say, an unusual dream, producing a profoundly arresting effect upon the consciousness. But in all the dreams that visit us, we must believe the guidance of the universal Governor to be present, working out His will. It will hardly be possible, however, to recognize this providential guidance of dreams, and especially the Divine employment of particularly moving dreams in the mode of what we commonly call 'special providences,' without removing all legitimate ground for hesitation in thinking of His employment of special dreams also as media of revelation. The God of providence and the God of revelation are one God; and His providential and revelational actions flow together into one harmonious effect. It is not possible to believe that the instrumentalities employed by Him freely in the one sphere of His operation can be unworthy of use by Him in the other. Those whom He has brought by His providential dealings with them into such a state of mind that they are prepared to meet with Him in the night watches, and to receive on the prepared surface of their souls the impressions which He designs to convey to them, He surely may visit according to His will, not merely by the immediate operation of His grace, but also in revealing visions, whether these visions themselves are wrought through the media of their own experiences or by His own creative energy. It is difficult to perceive in what the one mode of action would be more unfitting than the other.

Literature.—Some of the special literature has been suggested in the course of the article. A good general account of dreams in their relations to the supernatural may be found in Alf. Lehmann's *Aberglaube und Zauberei*, Ger. translation, Stuttgart, 1898, p. 389 f. At the foot of p. 548 is given an excellently selected list of books on the general subject. On the history of the estimate of dreams in the nations into contact with which the Biblical writers came, see Lehmann ('Index'), and also the following: Ebers, *Aegypten, und die Bücher Mose's*, 321; Lenormant, *La divination et la science de présages chez les Chaldéens*, 126-149; Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire de la divination dans l'antiquité*, i. 276-329; Vaschide and Piéron, 'Prophetic Dreams in Greek and Roman Antiquity' in *The Monist* for Jan. 1901, IX., ii. 161-194; Audenried's ed. of Nägelsbach's *Homerische Theologie*, §§ 25-29, pp. 172-176; Aust, *Die Relig. der Römer*, 79, 108, 139, 160; Granger, *The Worship of the Romans*, 28-52. For dreams among the later Jews, see Hamburger's *RE* [Note: E Realencyklopädie.] i. 996-998; *Jewish Encyc.* iv. 655-657; and cf. Philo. *de Somniis*. For Patristic views: Tertullian's *On the Soul*, cc. 42-50; Synesius' *On Dreams*; and the interesting correspondence between Evodius and Augustine (*Aug. Epp.* 158, 159) may be profitably read. For the anthropological view see Tylor's *Primitive Culture* ('Index').

Benjamin B. Warfield.

Dress

DRESS. The words used in the original for articles of dress have lost much of their force through great variation in translation in the Authorized Version . For clothes in general ἔνδυμα occurs; its translation ‘clothing,’ Mat 7:15; ‘raiment,’ Mat 3:4; Mat 6:25; Mat 6:28; Mat 28:3, Luk 12:23; ‘garment,’ Mat 22:11-12. ἱμάτιον signifies an outer garment, a mantle or cloak; its translation ‘garment,’ Mat 9:16; Mat 9:20-21; Mat 14:36; Mat 21:8; Mat 23:5; Mat 27:35, Mar 2:21; Mar 5:27; Mar 6:56; Mar 10:50; Mar 11:7-8; Mar 13:16; Mar 15:24, Luk 5:36; Luk 8:44; Luk 19:35; Luk 22:36, Joh 13:4; Joh 13:12; Joh 19:23; ‘cloak,’ Mat 5:40, Luk 6:29; ‘clothes,’ Luk 8:27 (sing. in Greek); (plural) ‘clothes,’ Mat 21:7; Mat 24:18; Mat 26:65, Mar 5:28; Mar 5:30; Mar 15:20, Luk 19:36; ‘raiment,’ Mat 11:8; Mat 17:2; Mat 27:31, Mar 9:3, Luk 7:25; Luk 23:34, Joh 19:24. The scarlet or purple robe of Jesus is called ἱμάτιον in Joh 19:2, χλαμύς in Mat 27:28; Mat 27:31, ἐσθῆς in Luk 23:11, and in Mar 15:17; Mar 15:20 simply ‘the purple,’ τὴν πορφύραν (cf. Luk 16:19). ἱματισμός is translation ‘raiment,’ Luk 9:29; ‘vesture,’ Mat 27:35, Joh 19:24—in both passages it stands in antithesis to ἱμάτιον—and ‘apparel’ (ἐν ἱματισμῷ ἐνδοξῶ), Luk 7:25. στολή—the Lat. *stola*—is used for the long garments of the scribes, translation ‘long clothing’ Mar 12:38, ‘long robes’ Luk 20:46; for the ‘best robe’ of the Prodigal Son, Luk 15:22; for the ‘long garment’ of the Resurrection angel, Mar 16:5—in the parallel passage ἐσθῆσις, ‘garment’ is used, Luk 24:4. χιτῶν signified an under-garment, and is translation in Authorized and Revised Versions ‘coat’ in Mat 5:40; Mat 10:10, Mar 6:9, Luk 3:11; Luk 6:29; Luk 9:3, Joh 19:23. The plural is in Mar 14:63 translation ‘clothes,’ though in the parallel passage Mat 26:65 ἱμάτια is used. Closely connected with clothes we have λέντιον, the towel with which Christ girded Himself, Joh 13:4-5; σουδάριον, ‘napkin,’ of Luk 19:20, Joh 11:44; Joh 20:7; ὀθόνιον, ‘linen cloth,’ of Luk 24:12, Joh 19:40; Joh 20:5-7; σινδῶν, ‘linen cloth,’ of Mat 27:59, Mar 14:51-52; and βύσσος, ‘fine linen,’ Luk 16:18; ὑπόδημα, ‘shoe,’ Mat 3:11; Mat 10:10, Mar 1:7, Luk 3:16; Luk 10:4; Luk 15:22; Luk 22:35, Joh 1:27; σανδάλιον, ‘sandals,’ Mar 6:9; ζώνη, ‘girdle,’ Mat 3:4, Mar 1:6, ‘purse,’ Mat 10:9, Mar 6:8; τήρα, ‘scrip,’ Mat 10:10, Mar 6:8, Luk 9:3; Luk 10:4; Luk 22:35-36.

All the references to clothes in the Gospels are to male costume. There are very few indications of the materials of which they were made or of their shape. John the Baptist had his raiment (ἔνδυμα) of camel's hair, and a girdle of leather about his loins (Mat 3:4 ||)—like many a roughly clad man in Palestine to-day. The rich man of the parable was clothed in 'purple and fine linen' (βύσσος), Luk 16:19. The three body-garments commonly mentioned are the cloak (ἱμάτιον),—a word used also in the plural for 'garments' in general,—the 'coat' (χιτών), and the girdle (ζώνη). The headdress is never definitely mentioned, but we know that it was practically universal to cover the head.

These references indicate that the clothes worn by Christ, His disciples, and the great majority of His adherents, were of the simplest kind; but among the richer classes there are indications, as is seen in the references given above, of more sumptuous robes. Indeed, among the better class of townsfolk it is probable that Jewish costume was largely modified under Hellenic and Roman influence. In dealing with the former more important subject, the probable costume of the founders of Christianity, the most hopeful sources of information are (1) the costumes of Jews, and (2) the dresses worn to-day among people of simple life in modern Palestine.

1. The dress of orthodox Jews is as various as their language and lands of residence. Neither in the head-dress, nor in the long Sabbath robes of the Rabbis, nor in the ordinary under-garments, are there any uniform features. There are, however, two special garments which are worn by orthodox Jews the world over; these are the *tallîth* and the *arba' kanphôth*. The *tallîth*, or praying shawl, is a rectangular woollen shawl about 3 feet by 5,* [Note: Much larger tallîths are also worn, reaching at times even to the ankles. See art. 'Tallith' in Jewish Encyc. vol. xi.] usually white, with dark stripes across two of the sides. From each corner hangs a tassel or fringe; these are known as the *zizith*. Each consists of eight threads twisted together in five knots (See Border). The *tallîth* is always worn in the synagogue and at prayer time: it then covers the head and shoulders. Jews who affect special sanctity—especially those living in the Holy Land—often wear it all day, as was once the common custom. In the Middle Ages, in consequence of the persecution which the Jews then underwent on account of their religious customs, the habit of wearing the *tallîth* in public had to be given up; but as the Jews view the wearing of the fringes as a religious duty (Deu 22:12, Num 15:38), they made a special under-garment to carry them. This consists of a rectangular piece of woollen or even cotton material, about 3 feet long by a foot wide; it has a large hole in the centre through which the head is put, so that the garment comes to lie over the chest and back like a kind of double chest-protector. At the four corners are the *zizith*, and the garment is known as the 'four corners,' *arba' kanphôth*, or sometimes as the *tallîth katon*, or small *tallîth*. It

is worn by small children, but the *tallîth* proper only by a boy after he has become *bar mizvah*, a 'son of the Law,' at thirteen. As the earliest mention of the *arba' kanphôth* is in 1350, it is manifest that it cannot have existed in NT times. With the *tallîth*, however, the case is different. It is certain that this is the altered form of an outer garment which existed in early times, and was known in Heb. as the *simlah* and in Gr. as *himation*. In the 'hem' or 'border' (*κράσπεδον*, Mat 9:20; Mat 14:36, Mar 6:56, Luk 8:44) we have reference to the fringed border of the cloak; and even more definite is the reference in Mat 23:5, when the scribes and Pharisees are reproved for unduly lengthening the fringes (*τὰ κράσπεδα*) of their garments.

2. The clothes of the ordinary *fellah*, or peasant in modern Palestine, are five in number,—shirt, cloak, girdle, shoes, and head-dress.

The shirt or *kamîs* is a simple straight garment, extending from the neck almost to the feet, with short, or sometimes long, loose, sleeves. It is usually of calico; it may be of linen. Among the *fellahîn* it is white, among the Bedawîn (who often go about in nothing else) it is dyed blue. It is usually open in front more than half-way to the waist, but is brought together at the neck by a button or knotted thread. It is worn night and day.

Over the shirt is fixed the *zunnâr* or **girdle**, a most necessary article of clothing. It may be of leather, with buckles, or woven of camel's hair, or of brightly-dyed silk or cotton. The woven belt is wound tightly two or three times round the waist, and is fixed by tucking the free end into the belt itself. In the girdle is carried, as in NT days (Mat 10:8, Mar 6:8), the money, often knotted into a corner of a handkerchief, and also the pen and ink of the learned or the dagger of the fighter. When the man is 'girded' for work the *kamîs* is hitched up to the tightened belt, as high as the knees. The upper part of the shirt is commonly drawn up loose above the girdle, so that a considerable space is left between the chest and the shirt. This is known as the *u'bb* or 'bosom,' and in this are carried many things; for example, the bread and olives for the midday meal, the seed or corn for sowing (Luk 6:38), or, in the case of a shepherd, a newborn lamb or kid (cf. Isa 40:11).

In order of importance next comes the head-dress, of which two distinct types are in daily use—the turban and the *kufîych*. Under both of these is worn the *tekkîyeh* or *'arâkîyeh*, a small plain close-fitting cap of felt, wool, or even cotton; this is commonly not removed even at night. When one has worn thin, a new one is placed on the top, so that two or three layers are quite usual; and between the layers the *fellah* keeps small papers of value. When a turban is worn, the red fez or *tarbush* is placed over the skull-cap, and the *leffeh* or turban is wound round its sides. The *leffeh* among the *fellahîn* is usually of particoloured cotton or silk, red and white or

yellow being common. In the towns it is often ornamented with yellow silk worked in patterns; while the *haj* who has made the Mecca pilgrimage, and the Druse, wear plain white; and the *sherîf* or 'descendant of the prophet' wears green. The other form of head-dress is more ancient and the more primitive: probably it is more like the peasant dress of NT times. It consists of a *kufîyeh* or large napkin of white or coloured cotton or silk, as much perhaps as a yard square, folded diagonally to make a triangular piece, and laid on the head with the apex backward; and the *'akâl*, a rope-like circle of camel's hair, laid double over the top of the head to keep the *kufîyeh* in position. The free ends of the *kufîyeh* are wound round the neck according to taste, being used on journeys in the hot sun to cover at times, all the face below the eyes. It is a most efficient and practical head-dress, especially when worn over a felt *tekkîyeh*. The **napkin** referred to in [Luk 19:20](#) may have been of the same nature, and the napkins of [Joh 11:44](#); [Joh 20:7](#), though used to cover the face of the dead, may have been made for the head of the living.

These three garments are the essentials; in such will a man work all day, and, if very poor, even go journeys; but in the latter event he would be an object of pity unless he had an *'abâ* or **cloak**. This is made of camel's or goat's hair or of wool, and among the *fellahîn* is usually of white and brown in stripes or of plain brown. The superior qualities are often white or black. The ordinary *'abâ* is made of a long rectangular piece of material, with the sides folded in and sewn along the top; it is thus very square, when new, across the shoulders. It has no sleeves, and though there are slits just below the upper corners through which the arms may be put, it is almost always worn resting over the shoulders and upper arms. It extends half-way between the knees and the feet. During sleep, especially on journeys when the traveller has no bed, it is made to cover the whole person, the man either wrapping it round him, or, if there is a sack or mat on which to lie, curling himself under it as under a blanket.

Shoes are to-day almost universally worn; but a *fellah* with a new pair of shoes will often, when outside the town, prefer to save his shoes from wear and tear by carrying them. **Sandals** are still worn, but not commonly as formerly, when the sandal seemed to make the simplest foot-gear ([Mar 6:9](#)).

The costume of the Palestine peasant, above described, was probably, with no doubt differences in materials and in cut, the costume of the country folk of NT and pre-NT times. The *kamîs* is the equivalent of the $\chi\iota\omega\nu$, and that was the *kêthôneth* of the OT. Now, as then, it is at times woven in one piece without seam ([Joh 19:23](#)). The *'abâ* is the modern equivalent of the $\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\omicron\nu$, the *simlah* of the OT. It was the outer cloak which might not be retained as a pledge after sunset ([Exo 22:26](#)). It is quite possible that in [Mat 5:40](#) there is a reference to this. The Rabbis stated that the reason the cloak might not be removed was because the *zîzîth* with their blue and white threads

were a reminder of the Law. Christ teaches here that when a man does an injury, within legal limits, as in taking the shirt, His follower must be prepared to go a step farther, and give up even what the Law protects him in keeping. The reversal of the order in Lk., though more intelligible to Gentiles, misses the special reference to the Jewish Law. Like the modern 'abâ, the *himation* was cast aside for quick movement (Mar 10:50, Joh 13:4; Joh 13:12), left aside when working in the fields (Mar 13:16); and being dispensed with in fighting, might profitably be exchanged for a sword when danger was near (Luk 22:36). It might be spread on the ground to form a carpet for an honoured person (Mat 21:8), and might be used in lieu of a saddle, folded across an ass's back (Mar 11:7-8). In every one of these details the use of the modern 'abâ in Palestine could furnish parallels.

With respect to the *χιτών* in two separate references (Mat 10:10 etc. and Luk 3:11), two 'coats,' *i.e.* shirts, are spoken of rather as luxuries than necessities for the traveller—as is to-day the case with the *kamîs*. Two 'cloaks' would be such unlikely baggage as not to need mentioning.

The girdle or *zunnâr* is the equivalent of the *ζώνη*, as is specially shown in its use as a purse. There is, however, another girding referred to in some passages. John the Baptist's girdle may quite probably have been a broad 'loin cloth' extending from waist to knee,—a very ancient dress,—while over the shoulders hung a rough coarse-haired 'abâ. It is not unreasonable to suppose that, like the modern *dervîsh*, he wore his long hair uncovered. It is evident that his costume was intentionally distinctive. When Peter was found by the risen Master engaged in his old business of fishing, he, like the modern Galilaean fishermen when fishing near shore, was probably girded only with a loin-cloth, and therefore described as 'naked' (Joh 21:7). Christ girded Himself with a towel before washing the disciples' feet, to make Himself in outward form more like a slave (Joh 13:4-5). It is evident that in the crucifixion, at least of Jews, who would not have tolerated absolute nudity, the victim, after the removal of his clothes, was girded round the waist; Peter must have understood the words 'another shall gird thee' as foretelling that event (Joh 21:18).

The long garments of the scribes and Pharisees find their modern counterparts in the long cloak used by Moslem religious leaders, the *jibbch*, and in the velvet, plush, and silk robes of gorgeous colours favoured by the leading Rabbis of the Ashkenazim Jews, on Sabbath and feast-days. In city life, garments additional to those described above are always worn. Over the *kamîs*, but included within the girdle, is a striped coloured robe reaching to near the feet, called the *kumbaz*, and, among the better dressed, over this is worn the *sudrîyeh* or ornamental waistcoat. *Lebâs* or drawers, though utterly despised by the true Arab, are in common use in towns. Many other varieties of garments might be mentioned. Those already named and doubtless others all had

their counterparts in NT times, but there is no hint that any but the simplest forms of peasant dress were worn by Christ and His disciples. It has indeed been thought that the garments divided by the soldiers must necessarily have been five, of which four, the cloak (ἱμάτιον), the shoes or sandals, the girdle and the head-dress, were 'divided among them,' and the fifth, the χιτῶν or shirt of finer quality, woven perhaps by the hands of His mother herself, apportioned by lot.

The στολή was evidently considered among the circle of Jesus a robe of dignity; it is the 'best robe' brought forth for the returning prodigal; it is used to describe the clothing of the 'young man' at the tomb (Mar 16:5), and the imposing garments of the scribes (Luk 20:46 etc.).

The unsatisfactoriness of patching with new cloth a much worn garment (Mat 9:16, Mar 2:21), and the ubiquitousness of that scourge, the clothes-moth (Mat 6:19-20, Luk 12:33), are daily to be seen illustrated in Palestine. The custom of providing guests with clean 'wedding garments' is still known, though unusual, in the modern East. But the entertainment of the very poor by the well-to-do at such feasts, evidently then far from uncommon, must have made such a precaution absolutely necessary. In the account of the 'rich man' (Luk 16:19), we have reference to two of the expensive materials for dress—the purple dye obtained from the *murex* on the coasts of Tyre, and the βύσσος, or 'fine linen,' which was imported at great expense from Egypt.

Reference is made at the beginning to the various terms used to describe the robe put on Christ by the mocking soldiers. Of these the χλαμύς, or military mantle, fastened by a buckle on the right shoulder so as to hang in a curve across the body, would appear to have been the most distinctive and suitable for the purpose.

Literature.—Tristram, *Eastern Customs in Bible Lands*; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*; art. 'Dress and Personal Adornment in Modern Palestine,' by Masterman in *Biblical World*, 1902; Nowack's and Benzinger's *Heb. Arch.*; artt. 'Dress' or 'Costume' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible (by Mackie), in the *Encyc. Bibl.* (by Abrahams and Cook), and in the *Jewish Encyc.* (by Nöldeke).

E. W. G. Masterman.

DRINK, DRINKING.—See Eating and Drinking, Food, Lord’s Supper, Meals, Wine.

☒ Dropsy

DROPSY.—As the name (Gr. ὕδρωψ)* [Note: Not found in NT, only the adj. ὑδρωπικο; occurring in Luk_14:2.] would seem to imply, this disease is characterized by an accretion or accumulation of water in the cellular tissue or serous cavities. In the only place in the NT where a reference to it occurs, no mention is made as to whether the patient suffered from a general *anasarea* or a local dropsical swelling (Luk_14:2). The writer simply uses the adjective ὑδρωπικός (*sc.* ἄνθρωπος) instead of the noun. This is, however, in strict accordance with the usage of Greek medical writers, as we have it in the works of Hippocrates, Dioscorides, and Galen. That the disease was not unknown to the authors of some of the OT writings appears from the description of the trial by ordeal of a wife suspected of infidelity to her husband (Num_5:11-31). In Num_5:21-22 part of the punishment inflicted on the guilty woman was a dropsical swelling (cf. Josephus *Ant.* iii. xi. 6), which looks as if dropsy used to be considered as an affliction sent by God upon the wicked for continued wilful sin (cf. Psa_109:18, and see also the Mishnic tractate *Shabbath* xxxiii. 1), and especially for the sin of self-indulgence (cf. Horace, *Carm.* ii. ii. 13, ‘crescit indulgens sibi ditus hydrops’).

The healing of the dropsical man is introduced by St. Luke as part of a narrative which is peculiar to his Gospel, if, indeed, the parable in Luk_14:16-24 be not identical with that in Mat_22:2-14—a conjecture which does not seem likely (see, however, Wright’s *Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek*, p. 273 f.).

St. Luke alone of the Evangelists tells of Jesus being invited to partake of the hospitality of the Pharisees and of His accepting their invitations on three different occasions: ‘to eat’ (Luk_7:36), ‘to breakfast’ (Luk_11:37), ‘to eat bread’ (Luk_14:1). It was on one of these occasions, as He was sitting probably at breakfast or the midday meal (ἄριστον, Luk_14:12) on the Sabbath, that He healed the dropsical man.

Like the story of the healing of the woman with the crooked spine, told in the preceding section, it furnishes a vivid illustration of the way in which the protracted controversy about the Sabbath rest was conducted by Jesus against the Pharisaic sabbatarians of His time (cf. Mar_2:23 to Mar_3:5, Mat_12:1-13, Luk_6:1-11; Luk_13:10-17, Joh_5:9-18). It is not easy to determine whether the diseased man was specially introduced into the house for a malignant purpose, or whether he appeared there unbidden in order to claim the sympathy and the help of Jesus. The presence of

ἰδοῦ seems to imply that the latter was the case, and that the host was as much surprised as any one else at the turn of events. In any case he could not have been an invited *guest*, as Jesus could not in that event, with courtesy, I have dismissed him when healed, as St. Luke says He did (ἀπέλυσεν, [Luk_14:4](#)). Whatever was the immediate cause of the man's presence, Jesus utilized the opportunity thus afforded to emphasize once again His teaching on the Sabbath question. Here was a man afflicted with a most inveterate and dangerous malady, indicative of deeply rooted organic disease, and, according to contemporary belief, springing from moral as well as from physical sources. It was, moreover, a disease well known to those present; and it seems to have been more or less prevalent in that region down to recent times (see *Jewish Intelligence*, 1842, p. 319).

The persistent character of the espionage to which Jesus was subjected is well expressed by the periphrastic imperfect of *ταρατηρεῖσθαι* ([Luk_14:1](#)), a verb which is almost confined, in NT usage, to St. Luke (cf. [Luk_6:7](#); [Luk_20:20](#), [Act_9:24](#); see also [Mar_3:2](#) and [Gal_4:10](#)).

The question addressed by Jesus on this occasion to 'the lawyers and Pharisees' aptly illustrates His method of 'carrying the war into the enemy's camp' (cf. [Luk_13:15](#), [Mat_12:11](#) f., and [Luk_7:41](#) f.). The effect of the question, which placed them on the horns of an ugly dilemma, is vividly narrated. They were forced to be silent because they were completely nonplussed (οἱ δὲ ἠσύχασαν, [Luk_14:3](#)). This verb, which occurs in the NT only once outside of St. Luke's writings (see [1Th_4:11](#)), is often used in the sense of a silence produced by superior or determined argument (cf. [Act_11:18](#); [Act_21:14](#); see also [Neh_5:8](#) LXX Septuagint). The nature of the difficulty, in which Jesus placed His enemies, will be understood if we remember the almost incredible minuteness with which the law of the Sabbath was treated by the Jewish Rabbins, and the childish way in which they regulated whether a physician should perform a deed of mercy on that day (see Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii. pp. 96-105; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, App. xvii., and ii. pp. 59-61; Farrar, *Life of Christ*, vol. i. pp. 431-441).

Whatever might be the differences between the schools of Shammai and Hillel as to the class of works forbidden on the Sabbath day, the general practice of the Jews themselves was based on the recognition that danger to life superseded the Sabbath law, and the question of Jesus points out this with force. If they allowed a man to save his son or his ox from a position of imminent danger, and yet considered the Sabbath rest unbroken, how much stronger claim had a man, suffering from an incurable malady, upon Him whose power to heal had again and again been manifested?

It is possible, perhaps, to trace an element of scorn in Jesus' attitude on this occasion. The conjunction of the words υἱός and βοῦς is at least remarkable, and points to vehemence on His part in pressing the argument. The very feast at which He sat as guest was a proof of insincerity in their attitude. How prevalent the abuse of Sabbath feasting became amongst the Jews is noticed by St. Augustine (*Enarr. in Psa 91:1* : 'Hodiernus dies sabbati est: hunc in praesenti tempore otio quodam corporaliter languido et fluxo et luxurioso celebrant Judaei').

St. Luke does not tell us plainly whether Jesus used any visible means in performing the cure of the dropsical man. He, however, uses one word which may point to a treatment similar to what He employed on other occasions (cf. ἐπιτιθέναι τὰς χεῖρας, Luk 4:40; Luk 13:13, Mar 5:23 etc., and ἄπτεσθαι, Luk 5:13, Luk 22:51, Mar 1:41, Mat 20:34 etc.). It is, of course, possible that ἐπιλαβόμενος (Luk 14:4) may have been used by the writer of the narrative to correspond with the word ἀνασπάσει (Luk 14:5), in order to emphasize the force of Jesus' argument, and that Jesus, in actually laying hold of the dropsical patient, intended to convey objectively the lesson which each one of them ought to have learned from the toil involved in pulling a drowning animal out of a well.

The reference to the 'well' (εἰς φρέατος, cf. εἰς βόθυνον, Mat 12:11) is particularly appropriate when the nature of the disease is remembered, and shows how wonderfully every incident was used by Jesus to illustrate the lesson He meant to teach. A very similar instance is observed when He compared the woman with the diseased spine to the animal which, tied to his stall, required to be loosed therefrom even on the Sabbath day for his daily watering (Luk 13:15; 'congruenter hydropicum animali quod cecidit in puteum comparavit; humore enim laborabat,' Augustine, *Quaest. Evang.* ii. 29).

Literature.—Plummer, 'St. Luke' in *Internat. Crit. Com. in loc.*; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. p. 328; Trench and Taylor on *Miracles*; *Encyc. Brit.* art. 'Dropsy.'

J. R. Willis.

Drowning

DROWNING.—Drowning never was or could be a recognized form of capital punishment in so poorly watered a country as Palestine, as it was in Assyria and

Babylonia. It is mentioned in Mat_18:6 (|| Mar_9:42, Luk_17:2) as a fitting reward for those who 'offend one of these little ones which believe in me.' The last expression may either be taken literally, or this utterance of Jesus may be directed against those who cause the simple believer to stumble in his faith. The Greek word καταποντίζειν is used by the LXX Septuagint to translate the Hebrew מבע in Exo_15:4, and the expression used by Jesus may be a reminiscence of the drowning of the Egyptians in the Red Sea, or of the adventure of Peter (Mat_14:30), where the same word is employed.

In the Code of Hammurabi, drowning is the penalty for selling beer too cheaply (C. H. W. Johns' *Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, Contracts, and Letters*, p. 52 ff.), as well as for more serious offences. The keepers of the beer-shops appear to have been women, and it is curious that drowning seems to have been considered the form of execution proper to female criminals. In Moslem law as defined by Abu Hanifah (d. 767 a.d.), killing by means of drowning was not accounted murder, and no retaliation could be claimed.

T. H. Weir.

☒ Drunkenness

DRUNKENNESS.—Only one explicit utterance of our Lord relating to drunkenness is recorded (Luk_21:34). Elsewhere He warns against it indirectly, as in the parables where He holds up drunken servants to reprobation (Mat_24:49 = Luk_12:45). But His references to the vice are surprisingly meagre. That must not be regarded as a measure of the contemporary extent of the evil, nor as indicating any lack of concern on His part. Our Lord's attitude to the matter must be estimated in view of the sentiments and practices of His times.

The habit of drinking to excess was widespread. Hebrew literature provides ample proof of familiarity with its unvarying moral and social consequences. The scandals associated with the early Christian love-feasts (1Co_11:21, Jud_1:12) were doubtless partly a recrudescence of pre-Christian practices. While excess was unsparingly condemned by moralists, moderation was uniformly commended. Occasional maxims hint at the expediency of abstinence in the interests of moral integrity and personal security. But where that is actually practised, it is invariably the outcome of purely religious impulse. It would seem that the Nazirites, the Rechabites, and other ascetics realized that indulgence in wine was inimical to spiritual life (cf. Luk_1:15), or inexpedient in situations demanding the highest possible personal purity, or

inappropriate to persons of singular and abnormal holiness (cf. John the Baptist, with whom some seem to have compared Jesus unfavourably, [Luk_7:34](#)). To the ordinary Jew, however, habitual indulgence was a matter of course. Abstinence required strong reasons to justify it. The Babylonian Gemara would even seem to suggest that abstinence might be a positive sin. 'The Nazirite has sinned by denying himself wine.' It bases this opinion on an arbitrary and erroneous interpretation of [Num_6:20](#) (see *Jewish Encyc.* art. 'Drunkenness').

Jesus seems to have adopted the prevailing popular attitude. He instituted no campaign against the use of strong drink. He made it no part of His mission to denounce indulgence. He Himself followed the ordinary practices of His day, both using wine and giving His countenance to festivities in which wine played an important part (cf. [Joh_2:10](#)). His various references to the beverage indicate that He regarded it as a source of innocent enjoyment (cf. [Luk_5:30](#); [Luk_5:38-39](#); [Luk_7:34](#); [Luk_17:8](#)). Nevertheless, that He did not overlook the fact that excess was common, and that He had an open eye for the obtrusive evils of over-indulgence, is abundantly evident from other references, as in the parables. That He did not feel called upon to command or commend abstinence in spite of this is partly to be explained, perhaps, by the fact that drunkenness was the vice chiefly of the wealthy. That seems to be implicitly recognized in [Luk_21:34](#), where it is bracketed with surfeiting and subjection to the cares of this life, faults peculiarly associated with the rich or well-to-do. In the parable of the Householder ([Mat_24:45-51](#) = [Luk_12:42-46](#)), the drunken characters whom He holds up to contempt are servants of one in high position, forming the *ménage* of a luxurious household in which creature comforts would be plentiful. In the circles in which Jesus Himself principally moved, and to which He chiefly appealed, excess does not seem to have been so common as to call for urgent protest or the starting of a crusade against the use of alcoholic liquors.

Christ's attitude to the whole matter was determined by the fundamental purpose of His mission. Drunkenness in general He regards as the accompaniment and symptom of a carnal unregenerate state of heart, the outcome of wickedness that defies restraint. He implicitly recognizes it also as strongly contributory to spiritual demoralization, as inducing such blunting of the spiritual sensibilities and disabling of spiritual faculty as incapacitate the soul for the proper exercises of the devout life, and endanger its future by reducing it to a state of unpreparedness for the last Divine catastrophe ([Luk_21:34](#) ff.).

A. M. Hunter.

DUMB.—See Deaf and Dumb.

☩Dung

DUNG.—See Agriculture, p. 39^b.

☩Dust

DUST (κονιοτόπος, Mat 10:14, Luk 9:5; Luk 10:11, Act 13:51; Act 22:23; χάος = χοῦς, Mar 6:11, Rev 18:19. The former means properly dust stirred up or blown about, as ‘a cloud of dust’; the latter simply earth or soil thrown down or raised in a heap. In NT the two words are plainly synonymous).—The long droughts and fierce heat of Palestine, together with the softness of the limestone rock—the prevailing formation—make for the production of dust in great quantities. In high winds it penetrates to almost every part of the houses. The pedestrian suffers much from fretting of the feet by the dust, which neither sandal nor shoe excludes. This renders necessary, as well as pleasant, the washing of the feet when the journey is done (Luk 7:44).

An immemorial token of grief in the East is the casting of dust upon the person, especially upon the head, or the laying of the face in the dust; while of one utterly humbled, it is said that he ‘licks the dust.’

The throwing of dust in the air is still a not uncommon way of expressing rage, or emphasizing an appeal for justice. This is probably meant to show that Earth herself joins in the petition for redress of intolerable wrongs.

Our Lord’s direction that ‘the Twelve’ should shake off the dust of the cities that rejected their message, derived special significance from Jewish teaching. The very dust of a heathen road was held to produce defilement. To shake off the dust of their feet, as a testimony against house or city, meant that it had passed under the ban of their Lord, and the symbolic act proclaimed that ‘nought of the cursed thing’ clave to them. ‘In this sense anything that clave to a person was metaphorically called “the dust,” as, e.g., “the dust of an evil tongue,” “the dust of usury’; as, on the other hand, to “dust to idolatry” meant to cleave to it’ (Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. i. p. 644). The modern Oriental, if asked regarding any questionable business, will daintily grip the lapel of his robe or tunic and gently shake it, turning

aside his head as if he should say, 'Not even the dust of that transaction has touched me.'

W. Ewing.

☒ Duty

DUTY.—In the widest sense of the word, 'duty' is the correlate of 'ought.'* [Note: The word 'duty' occurs only once in the Gospels, when Jesus describes as unprofitable servants those who have only done what it was their duty to do (Luk_17:10). The word in the orig. is $\delta\varphi\epsilon\iota\lambda\omega$, a verb which is twice used in Jn (13:14, 19:7) to express the idea of oughtness or moral obligation (EV 'ought'). more commonly expressed by $\delta\epsilon\iota$. For examples of this use of $\delta\epsilon\iota$ in the reported teaching of Jesus see Mat_23:23; Mat_25:27, Luk_12:13; Luk_18:1 etc. For the distinction between $\delta\epsilon\iota$ and $\delta\varphi\epsilon\iota\lambda\omega$ see Cremer and Grimm-Thayer (s.vv.).] What I ought to be, to do, to feel, that is my duty. So the word covers the whole content of the moral ideal. But both to the plain man and to the philosopher duty usually has a narrower significance; and this we must make clear before we can trace the relation of the teaching of Jesus to the conception of duty.

Our type of duty is the soldier who kept guard at his post when Hereulaneum was overwhelmed by lava and ashes. His station in life prescribed an action; and he fulfilled it. What his motives were we do not ask; we do not inquire how he felt in the execution of his task, or what manner of man he was. He did what he was commanded; he did his duty. A man's duty, then, at any time is the action determined by his station in life. He stands under a rule, which he must obey and apply. Such obedience does not, however, cover the highest moral excellence. Two men both do their duty, say, to the poor; but the one is hard, unsympathetic, the other benevolent; the one is just, the other full of charity. Although in point of duty they do not differ, we feel that the latter is a better man than the former; for he stands nearer to the ideal of goodness. This is the popular view.

But among the ancients the Stoics, and in modern times Kant, have judged differently. They exclude the emotions, and measure moral worth by the degree to which duty, and duty alone, is the motive of action. No man is good unless he obeys the law, simply because it is the law. Duty for duty's sake is their watchword. 'The sage,' says Seneca,† [Note: Seneca, de Clem. ii. 6; contrast Joh_11:35.] 'will succour, will do good, for he is born to assist his fellow, to labour for the welfare of

mankind; but he will feel no pity.... It is only diseased eyes that grow moist in beholding tears in other eyes, as it is no true sympathy, but only weakness of nerves, that leads some to laugh when others laugh, or to yawn when others yawn.' Kant‡ [Note: Kant's Theory of Ethics (Abbott's tr. pp. 14-16); contrast 1Co_13:4.] argues in a similar way, but with greater depth and sincerity, that philanthropic action has true moral worth only if done by a man whose temperament is cold and indifferent to the sufferings of others, not from inclination, but from duty, simply because he respects the law under which he stands. Further, the moral judgment is directed not to what is done, but to what the agent intended to do, to what he has willed and taken every means in his power to bring about. But even this needs qualification. Kant holds that we must leave out of account the content of what is willed, and simply inquire whether the law is obeyed just because it is the law. And so we reach the bare conception of duty for duty's sake, and find the moral law reduced to the mere form of universality. The flesh and blood of goodness have vanished, and we are left with the spectre of a law characterized only by the admission of no exceptions.

But no one can rest satisfied with an abstraction. Kant, therefore, restores content to the idea of duty by throwing into the form of Law Universal the various kinds of action which Society enjoins or forbids. Thus we receive a code of moral laws, each demanding unconditional obedience. But this is not always possible. Conflicts of 'duties' will from time to time appear, not in the sense that Duty issues conflicting commands (for under any given circumstances only one action can be right), but in the sense that one of two *normal* lines of conduct must overcome and contradict the other. Thus arise the problems that have exercised casuists and made real tragedies. Am I to refuse either to kill my fellow-men or to defend my country? Am I to tell a lie, or to become the accomplice, however unwilling, in the murder of my friend?* [Note: cit. pp. 361-365.] Such problems are inevitable and insoluble, if we conceive duty as a group of co-ordinate and absolute laws of action. Conflicts must ensue in the application of such laws, once the ideal system of moral relations on which they are based fails to correspond point for point with the actual system in which they claim realization. But the world is full of imperfection and sin, and every man has sinned and is weak. Consequently the only possible choice may often lie between two lines of conduct, both of which are ideally wrong.

Moreover, if the moral ideal is expressed as a code of rules of action, morality tends to become no more than the rigid observance of ceremonies that characterized the Pharisee. Life hardens into conventionality, if the emphasis is laid on doing rather than on being. We do not deny that character must express itself in action; that charity without works is a contradiction; that the good will cannot be formed save by doing good. But deeds are particular, and relative to time and place; and an ethical code which prescribes or forbids particular acts not only loses touch with real life, but

diverts the attention from the spirit to the letter. In the same way the institutions by which a man's station and duties are determined tend also to become rigid and conventional.

Now Jesus Christ did not promulgate a new code of morals; nor did He do more than lay the foundations of a new society. Had He instituted a definite social, political, or ecclesiastical order, or prescribed a scheme of duties for His followers, the gospel would have possessed for Ethics only an historical interest, instead of affording, as it does, principles by which we may criticise every action and reform every institution. The words and works of Jesus are a well of living water, from which all men of whatever time or nation may drink. We do not disparage organizations and codes of duty. They are essential to the realization of any human ideal; and it is the part of practical Christianity to work out the gospel in a moral, social, and religious order, appropriate to the needs of each generation. In order to use ideas we must crystallize them; but in the process they become half-truths. The life of Jesus alone abides as the truth, reflected and refracted on the broken surface of the river of time.

We must, however, qualify what has been said in two respects. Jesus guarded the sanctuary of the family by the most stringent regulation of divorce. This was natural; for the family is the foundation-stone of the fabric of society. Where it does not remain pure and undefiled, to nourish love and duty, the nation becomes corrupt at its source. Again, Jesus instituted the Holy Sacraments by which we may participate in His living Body and Blood, *i.e.* in His Life and Spirit, to cleanse our hearts, to renew our wills, and to illuminate our minds with the vision of Truth.

Nothing can be gained by attempting to summarize the Sermon on the Mount. It is enough to emphasize three points.

1. Jesus turns the judgment and attention from the outward act to the *inward motive*, to the thought and feeling from which the act springs. 'Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: but I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart' (Mat 5:27 f.). A standard such as this must shatter the Pharisaic complacency that accompanies the outward observance of a code of duties.

2. In the same way Jesus lays stress on *being*, not doing, on *character*, not action. Blessed are the meek, the merciful, the pure in heart, the forgiving, they which hunger and thirst after righteousness. Not that deeds are unimportant or unnecessary. Far from it. But the vital thing is the *will*. So Jesus transcends the point of view of the casuist. In the Christian ideal there are no contradictions. In the Gospels there is no delicate balancing of considerations and consequences.

3. Jesus subordinates the love of our neighbour to the *love of God*. It is often said that the Second Commandment, ‘Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,’ is an adequate expression of the ultimate principle of morality. But the self that we love may be an unworthy self, perhaps even a sensual self. If so, we shall carry this conception into the treatment of our neighbour. There is much good-natured vice in the world. And apart from this, fashionable philanthropy is too often dominated by an ideal of mere comfort. That is why well-meant efforts at social improvement not seldom end in vanity and vexation of spirit. To avoid this, *altruism must draw its inspiration from true religion*. It must seek illumination from God, and in His light interpret the duty towards other men. In other words, the love of God, as He is seen and known in Christ Jesus, creates a new ideal of duty both in relation to ourselves and our neighbour. Finally, the Christian motive is not the abstract conception of duty for duty’s sake, but charity, the pure love of the full, concrete, and perfect ideal of humanity, realized for all time in the Person of Jesus Christ.

Literature.—Kant’s *Theory of Ethics*, translation by T. K. Abbott; T. H. Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics* (esp. bk. iii.); F. H. Bradley, *Ethical Studies* (Essay iv.); H. Sidgwick, *Methods of Ethics*, bk. iii.; Newman Smyth, *Christian Ethics*; Gore, *The Sermon on the Mount*,

A. J. Jenkinson.

☛Eagle

EAGLE.—See Animals, p. 65^b.

☛Ear

EAR.—Of the Greek words translated ‘ear’ in Authorized and Revised Versions, two (ὠτᾶριον, ὠτίον) refer exclusively to the bodily organ, and occur only in connexion with the case of Malchus (Mar 14:47, Joh 18:10; Joh 18:26, Mat 26:51, Luk 22:51). In Mat 28:14 the rendering is simply a paraphrase. In Mar 7:35 (ἀκοαί) ‘his hearing’ would be more exact. In all other instances the word οὖς occurs, and is used: (1) *literally*, to denote ‘the ear’ (Mat 10:27, Mar 7:33; Mar 8:18, Luk 1:44; Luk 12:3;

Luk 22:50), or (by transference) ‘the range of hearing’ (Luk 4:21); but more frequently (2) *figuratively*, to denote a spiritual faculty symbolized by the natural ear (Mat 11:15; Mat 13:9; Mat 13:15 (*bis*), Mat 13:16; Mat 13:43, Mar 4:9; Mar 4:23, Luk 8:8; Luk 9:44; Luk 14:35). The definitive passages for this use are Mat 13:3-23, Mar 4:2-20, Luk 8:5-15, where it forms the underlying subject of Christ’s first parable, ‘the Sower,’ a parable concluded in each account by the phrase, ‘He that hath ears (to hear) let him hear.’ Indeed, the general principle of speaking in parables is in these passages connected with ‘ears dull of hearing’ (Mat 13:13-15). Christ is speaking in reference to ‘mysteries’ (Mat 13:11, Mar 4:11, Luk 8:10), that is, Divine truths not necessarily puzzling in themselves, but undiscoverable by man apart from a revelation of them (see Moule on Eph 1:9; Eph 3:3-6, cf. also 1Co 2:7-10). When these have been revealed to him, man has the power to recognize their truth, fitness, and necessity (see Westcott on Heb 2:10; Heb 7:26), in proportion as he is determined to do the Divine will (Joh 7:17; Joh 8:43-47). This faculty of recognizing the voice of truth and (as it were) vibrating to its utterance is fitly referred to by Christ as a spiritual ‘ear.’

Literature.—Grimm-Thayer, s.v. οὖς; *Expositor*, i. ii. 472 ff.

F. S. Ranken.

☩ Earthly And Heavenly

EARTHLY AND HEAVENLY (ἐπιγειαίος, ἐπουράνιος).—The Gr. words are found in the Gospels only in Joh 3:12 [ἐπουράνιος, however, occurs as a variant reading (TR [Note: R Textus Receptus.]) in Mat 18:35, where some critical editors prefer οὐράνιος], in Christ’s conversation with Nicodemus, and are best interpreted in the light of the context. The attempt made by some commentators to explain them by collating passages where the same or similar words occur, yields no satisfactory result, the meaning of the words in these passages being so different from their meaning in Joh 3:12.

It is evident from the conversation with Nicodemus that the contrast drawn by Christ between things earthly and things heavenly was not a contrast between things natural and things supernatural, or things physical and things spiritual, or things easily understood and things unsearchable and profound, or things belonging to the present and things belonging to the future economy, or things moral in which faith is active and things heavenly where it is passive (de Wette). It was a contrast between truths

which were within the range of religious experience, and which should therefore have been within the knowledge and understanding of Nicodemus—‘a master of Israel,’ and truths pertaining to the gospel which were, for the time being, beyond the reach of the religious consciousness. The earthly things were those of which Christ had been speaking,—the necessity and mystery and reality of the new birth,—and also, as Godet rightly infers from Joh 3:12 (note use of plural instead of singular in addressing Nicodemus), the truths previously preached by Christ. These were all of a moral-religious character, and could be known and verified by the spiritually-minded. The heavenly things were those which were to be revealed to men through the completed redemptive work of Christ. Their nature may be gathered from Joh 3:13 ff. The Divinity and the atoning death of Christ, God’s eternal love, and salvation by faith, are indicated there as being among the heavenly things.

Literature.—Besides the Comm. on St. John, esp. Whitelaw and Godet, see Cremer’s and Grimm-Thayer’s *Lex. s.v.*; E. H. Hall, *Discourses*, 92; D. Wright, *Power of an Endless Life*, 158; J. H. Jowett, *Thirsting for the Springs*, 64; *Expos. Times*, xii. [1900] 50.

Morison Bryce.

☞ Earthquake

EARTHQUAKE.—Palestine abounds in traces of seismic and volcanic action. From the region of the Dead Sea northward along the Jordan valley and as far as Damascus the whole country must have been visited by tremendous earthquakes in prehistoric ages. Mention of several is made in the OT, sometimes coupled with significant reference to serious disaster and widespread alarm caused by them (1Sa 14:15, Amo 1:1, Zec 14:5 etc.). Regarded as supernatural visitations, signs of the times, they produced a deep impression.

Five times in the Gospels the noun σεισμός (fr. σειω, ‘to shake’) is used of an earthquake (Mat 24:7; Mat 27:54; Mat 28:2, Mar 13:8, Luk 21:11), and once (Mat 27:51) the idea is expressed by the phrase ἡ γῆ ἐσεισθη (Authorized and Revised Versions ‘the earth did quake’). In LXX Septuagint σεισμός (or συνσεισμος) is employed to render שָׁרַר of the original. Though specifically applied to an earthquake, σεισμός properly has a wider connotation: thus in Mat 8:24 it is used of a tempest (σεισμός μέγας ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ). Hence Alford thinks that in Mat 28:2 it denotes

not an earthquake, but the 'shock' produced by the rolling away of the stone from the sepulchre.

1. *Recorded earthquakes.*—Of these there are two, namely, the earthquakes at the Crucifixion and the Resurrection (Mat_27:51; Mat_27:54; Mat_28:2). The historicity of these earthquakes is disputed. St. Matthew alone mentions them; St. Mark (Mar_15:33; Mar_15:38) and St. Luke (Luk_23:44 f.), in agreement with St. Matthew in regard to the darkness and the rending of the veil, apparently know nothing of an earthquake at the Crucifixion [the Fourth Gospel has no allusion to any of the portents], and they are equally silent in the case of the Resurrection. Plummer ('St. Luke' in *Internat. Crit. Com.*) quotes a statement in the Gemara that some forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem the heavy gates of the temple were mysteriously flung open about midnight at the Passover; but it would seem that sufficient evidence of earthquake shocks being felt in or near Jerusalem at the date in question is wanting. Probably a legendary element must be recognized in the passages under consideration. At the same time it should be borne in mind that the circumstance narrated is 'not in itself incredible' (Cary, *Synop. Gospels*). Earthquakes are frequently accompanied by a 'strange, bewildering darkness' (Plumptre, *Bibl. Studies*), and if shocks did then take place they would naturally be interpreted of the 'sympathy of nature.' (Cf. Corn. a Lap.: 'The earth, which trembled with horror at the death of Christ, as it were leaped with joy at the Resurrection').

2. *Predicted earthquakes.*—Mat_24:7, Mar_13:8, Luk_21:11. The question arises, Do the Synoptists here preserve *ipsissima verba* of our Lord? It must be remembered that 'a generation and a half ... had passed between the events and the telling of the tale' (F. C. Burkitt); hence a possibility that the eschatological discourses as reported are coloured by events which had already taken place when the narratives were compiled. On the assumption that the predictions were uttered by Jesus, account should be taken of the fact that they are clothed in the language of current Messianic expectation. The setting up of the Kingdom was at hand; it would be consequent on that national disaster which, looming in the near future, would be presaged by phenomena in which men saw the dread precursors of catastrophe. And this actually came about: between the Crucifixion and the destruction of Jerusalem the earthquake was frequent; the earth was a prey to the most violent convulsions (Godet, *St. Mat.* p. 149; Renan, *L'Antichrist*, ch. xiv.).

Literature.—Gilbert, *Student's Life of Jesus*; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*], see Index; Gould, 'St. Mark' in *Internat. Crit. Com.*; Cary, 'The Synoptic Gospels' in *Internat. Handbooks to NT*.

H. L. Jackson.

☩ Easter

EASTER.—See Calendar, the Christian, p. 255 ff.

☩ Eating And Drinking

EATING AND DRINKING.—Eating and drinking are occasionally referred to in the Gospels as acts expressive of men's ordinary life. The simple natural life of Jesus was thus contrasted with the austere ways of the Baptist (Mat 11:19, Luk 7:34). The servant waits till the master has eaten and drunken, and afterwards he eats and drinks (Luk 17:8); in the days of Noah men went on eating and drinking, heedless of the coming flood (Luk 17:27-28); and the rich fool still says to his soul, 'Take thine ease, eat, drink, be merry' (Luk 12:19). The careless self-indulgence of the servant who, in his lord's absence, began to eat and drink with the drunken (Mat 24:49, Luk 12:45) is condemned on the one hand; and so, on the other hand, is that over anxiety which keeps saying, 'What shall we eat? or What shall we drink? or Wherewithal shall we be clothed?' (Mat 6:24-34, Luk 12:22-34). The scribes and Pharisees complained that Jesus ate and drank with publicans and sinners (Luk 5:30), which was His glory; and it will be the glory of those who continue with Him in His temptations that they will eat and drink at His table in His Kingdom (Luk 22:30). See Bread, Cup, Fasting, Food, Lord's Supper, Meals, Wine.

☩ Eber

EBER (Authorized Version Heber).—The eponymous ancestor of the Hebrews; named in our Lord's genealogy as given in Lk. (Luk 3:35).

☩ Ebionism

EBIONISM.—It would be going beyond the scope of this Dictionary to enter with any fulness into a discussion of the obscure and elusive subject of Ebionism as it meets us in its varying forms in the history of the early Church. What immediately concerns us is its bearing upon certain questions connected with the origin of the Gospels and the history and person of Jesus Christ Himself. But as these questions cannot properly be

handled till we have determined what we are to understand by Ebionism, a brief treatment of the general subject appears to be necessary.

i. Who and what were the Ebionites?—The name Ebionites (Ἐβιωναῖοι), it is generally agreed, is derived from the Hebrew *'ebyônîm* אֲבִיּוֹנִים 'the poor.'* [Note: Certain of the Fathers attempt to derive the name from a supposed founder called Ebion, who is said to have spread his doctrines among the Christians who fled to Pella after the fall of Jerusalem (Tertullian, *de præscr. Hæret.* 33; Epiphanius, *Hær.* xxx. 1, 2). But though Hilgenfeld has laboured to give historical reality to the figure of Ebion (*Ketzergesch.* pp. 422-424), modern scholars have practically agreed that he has only a mythical existence (Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, i. 299; Uhlhorn in *PRE3* v. 126).] It seems most probable that originally this name, like Nazarenes (Act_24:5), was applied to all Christians; but whether it was first adopted by the followers of Christ themselves or given them by others it is impossible to say. The comparative poverty of the great mass of Christians in the early days of the Church, especially in Jerusalem, where the name doubtless arose, might lead to its being used by outsiders as a term of contempt. On the other hand, the Christians of Jerusalem may themselves have adopted it because of the spiritual associations with which 'the poor' (רְלִים, אֲבִיּוֹנִים) are referred to in the OT (e.g. Psa_34:6; Psa_69:33; Psa_72:13, Isa_11:4; Isa_14:32; Isa_29:19; cf. S. R. Driver, art. 'Poor' in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible*; G. A. Smith, *Isaiah*, vol. i. ch. xxix. 'God's Poor'), and the blessings pronounced upon them by Jesus Himself (Luk_6:20, Mat_5:3). If it was first given as a name of reproach, it could very easily and naturally be accepted as a name of honour.† [Note: It is a later idea, evidently suggested by antipathy to the low Christological ideas with which Ebionism had come to be identified, that leads Origen (*c. Cels.* ii. 1, *de Princip.* iv. i. 22) and Eusebius (*HE* iii. 27) to treat the name as derived from the 'poverty' of the Ebionites in intelligence and knowledge of Scripture, and especially from the 'beggarly' quality of their Christology.]

After the name 'Christian' (cf. Act_11:26) had become the general designation for the disciples of Christ, 'Ebionites' appears to have been reserved as a distinctive title for Jewish as distinguished from Gentile Christians (Ἐβιωναῖοι χρηματίζουσιν οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὡς Χριστὸν παραδεξάμενοι, Origen, *c. Cels.* ii. 1), but specifically for those Jewish Christians who, in some degree more or less pronounced, sought to maintain as essential to Christianity the now obsolete forms of the OT religion (the Fathers from the 2nd to the 4th cent. *passim*). Thus Ebionism becomes a synonym for Jewish Christianity in its antithesis to the universalism of the Catholic Church; and it is in this broad and yet pretty definite sense that the word is properly to be employed

(Harnack, *l.e.* i. 289; Uhlhorn, *l.e. ibid.*). It is true that in the 4th cent. we find Jerome using the two names Nazarenes and Ebionites in speaking of the Jewish Christians, with whom he had become well acquainted in Palestine (*Ep. ad August.* cxxii. 13), and this has led some to suppose that he is making a distinction between two entirely different sects (so especially Zahn, *Kanonsgeseh.* ii. 648 ff.); but it is now generally held that in this case he was really using two names for the same thing, and that 'Nazarenes' and 'Ebionites' are both general designations for Jewish Christians as such (Harnack, *l.e.* p. 301; cf. Uhlhorn's art. 'Ebionites' in Schaff-Herzog, *Encycl. of Rel. Knowledge*, with his later art. 'Ebioniten' in *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred]).

While, however, it seems impossible to distinguish between Nazarenes and Ebionites, and improper in this connexion to think of a separation into clear-cut sects, there were undoubtedly differences of tendency within the general sphere of Ebionism.

From the first a stricter and a more liberal party is to be discerned (the οἱ διπλοὶ Ἐβιωνᾶι of Origen, *c. Cels.* v. 61), corresponding in some measure to the cleavage which emerged in the Council of Jerusalem (Act. 15:1-29)—a Pharisaic party which held the Law to be essential even for Gentile Christians, and a party of broader mind, which, while clinging to the Law for themselves, did not seek to impose it upon their Gentile brethren (Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* 47). Finally, with the rise of the Gnostic heresy, a Gnostic or syncretistic type of Jewish Christianity makes its appearance, to which the name of Ebionism is still applied (Epiphanius, *Hæc.* xxx. 1). This Gnostic Ebionism itself assumes various forms. It already meets us within the NT in the false doctrine which St. Paul opposes in Colossians, and in the teaching of Cerinthus to which St. John replies in his First Epistle. At a later period it is represented in the doctrines of the Elkesaites, who combined their Ebionism with influences drawn from the Oriental heathen world (Epiphanius, *Hæc.* xix. 2, xxx. 1; Hippolytus, *Philos.* ix. 13).

ii. The Ebionite Gospels.—As against the Tübingen school, which held that primitive Christianity was itself Ebionism, and which took, in consequence, a highly exaggerated view of the influence of Ebionitic thought upon the history and the literature of the early Church, it is now admitted by nearly all modern scholars that there are no writings within the Canon of the NT which come to us directly from this circle. On the other hand, two of the Apocryphal Gospels, the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* and the *Gospel of the Twelve Apostles* (otherwise known as the *Gospel of the Ebionites*), are immediate products of the Judæo-Christian spirit—the former representing Ebionism in its earlier and simpler type, and the latter that syncretistic form of Jewish Christianity which afterwards sprang up through contact with Gnosticism (see Gospels [Apocryphal]; and artt. 'Gospel according to the Hebrews' and 'Apocryphal Gospels' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, Extra Vol.). The extant

fragments of the *Gospel of the Twelve Apostles* show that its value is quite secondary, and that the author has simply compiled it from the Canonical, and especially from the Synoptic Gospels, adapting it at the same time to the views and practices of Gnostic Ebionism. Much more interest and importance attach to the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*. We have references to it, for the most part respectful and sympathetic, in the writings of Clement, Origen, Eusebius, and, above all, Jerome; while several valuable fragments of it have been preserved for us in the pages of Epiphanius. Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 25, 27) and Jerome (*Com. on Mat. 12:13*) both testify that this was the Gospel used by the Ebionites, and it is the latter who gives it its name of the 'Gospel according to the Hebrews' (*seeundum Hebraeos*). The numerous references in the Fathers to this work, and the extant fragments themselves, if they do not justify Harnack's statement that Jewish-Christian (*i.e.* Ebionite) sources lie at the basis of our Synoptic Gospels (*Hist. of Dogma*, i. 295), lend some weight to the idea that the distinctive features of the document, so far from being altogether secondary, ought to be regarded as indications of an early Aramaic tradition, which still held its own among the 'Hebrews' after the growing universalism of the Church had left it behind (see Prof. Allan Menzies in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, Extra Vol. 343a).

iii. Ebionism and the Canonical Gospels.—Apart from the existence of special Ebionite Gospels, the idea has been common, both in ancient and modern times, that certain of the Canonical Gospels owe something of their substance or their form to the positive or negative influence of Ebionite sources or Ebionite surroundings. (1) *The Gospel of St. Matthew*.—Jerome, who testifies, as we have seen, to the fact that the Jewish Christians of Palestine had a Gospel of their own (*seeundum Hebraeos*), also tells us that this Gospel was regarded by many as *Matthaei authenticum*, *i.e.* the original of Matthew (*Com. on Mat. 12:13*); and on one occasion refers to a copy of it which he himself had seen and translated as though he believed it to be the original Hebrew (*ipsum Hebraeum*) of St. Matthew's Gospel (*de Viris Illust.* ii. 3). Irenaeus, two centuries earlier, says that the Ebionites use only the Gospel of Matthew (i. xxvi. 2); a statement which points, at all events, to this, that even in his time the Jewish Christians of Syria attached themselves to a particular Gospel, and that between that Gospel and St. Matthew the Apostle a close connexion was believed to exist. Irenaeus does not seem to have been aware of the existence of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, and apparently confounded that work with the Canonical Matthew. But when his statement is taken together with those of Jerome, very interesting questions are raised as to the origin and connexions of the Synoptical Gospels, and of the First Gospel in particular, with the result that in modern theories upon this subject the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* has played an important rôle. It would be out of place to enter here upon any discussion of the questions thus raised (see Gospels). But it may be said that while the whole trend of recent scholarship is unfavourable to the views of those who would make the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* either the

'Ur-Matthaeus' itself or an expanded edition of it, some grounds can be alleged for thinking that it represents an early Aramaic tradition of the Gospel story which was in existence when the author of Canonical Matthew wrote his book, and upon which to some extent he may have drawn,—a tradition which would naturally be more Jewish and national in its outlook than that represented by the Greek written sources on which he placed his main dependence (see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , Extra Vol. 342 f.).

(2) *The Gospel of St. Luke.*—On the ground that much of the teaching which is peculiar to St. Luke bears specially upon wealth and poverty, it has frequently been alleged that the Evangelist made use of a distinctly Ebionitic source, or was himself in sympathy with Ebionism. It is true that the Ebionites, as we meet them later in Church history, resemble the Essenes in taking an ascetic view of life, and regarding voluntary poverty as a thing of merit and a means of preparing for the Messianic kingdom. But it is altogether a misrepresentation of the facts to say that this is the type of the ideal Christian life as it meets us in Luke, or that his references to riches and poverty 'rest on the idea that wealth is pernicious in itself and poverty salutary in itself' (Weiss, *Introd.*, ii. 309). The form in which the first Beatitude of Matthew (Mat 5:3) is given in Luke, 'Blessed are ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of God' (Luk 6:20), together with the closely following Woe pronounced upon the rich (v. 24), has especially been fastened on as a clear proof that these sayings proceed from an Ebionitic circle 'ascetic in spirit and believing poverty to be in itself a passport to the kingdom, and riches the way to perdition.' Similarly in the parable of Dives and Lazarus (Luk 16:19-31), it is supposed that Dives goes to the place of torment because he is rich, while the beggar is carried into Abraham's bosom simply because he is a beggar. Such interpretations, however, spring from a very superficial exegesis (cf. Bruce, *Expos. Gr. Test. on Luk 6:20, Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, p. 376 ff.). And, while it is true that St. Luke dwells, more than the other Evangelists, on the consolations of the poor and the perils of rich men (see, besides the passages already quoted, Luk 4:18, Luk 7:22, Luk 12:16 ff., Luk 16:1 ff., Luk 19:2 ff., Luk 21:1 ff.), the fact is sufficiently accounted for, on the one hand, by that humane and philanthropic spirit which is so characteristic of the Third Evangelist and so natural in one who is called 'the beloved physician'; and, on the other, as Zahn has suggested (*Einleitung*, ii. 379), by his sense of the appropriateness for one in the position of Theophilus, to whom his Gospel is immediately addressed, of our Lord's frequent warnings of the spiritual dangers of wealth and the worldliness to which wealth is so prone to lead. It is to be noted, however, that our Lord's strongest utterance against wealth is found in Matthew (Mat 19:24) and Mark (Mar 10:25), as well as Luke (Luk 18:25); and that a comparison of the Third Synoptic with the other two reveals occasional touches, on the one side or the other (note, e.g., the presence of ἀγγουῖς in Mat 19:29, Mar 10:29, and its absence from Luk 18:29), which an ingenious

theorist might very well use to support the thesis that Luke is not so Ebionitic as Matthew and Mark (see Plummer, 'St. Luke' in *Internet. Crit. Com.* p. xxv f.).

(3) It is curious to notice how, from the 2nd cent. to the 19th, *the Fourth Gospel* has been associated in two quite different ways with Ebionism, and specifically with Cerinthus, an Ebionite of the Gnosticizing type who taught in Ephesus towards the close of the Apostolic age. On the one hand, we have the statements of Irenaeus and others that the Apostle John wrote his Gospel to combat the errors of Cerinthus (Iren. iii. xi. 1) and the Ebionites (Epiphanius, *Hæer.* li. 12, lxix. 23); statements which should be taken in connexion with the well-known story, attributed to Polycarp, of the dramatic encounter between St. John and Cerinthus in the baths of Ephesus (Iren. iii. iii. 4; Epiphanius, *l.e.* xxx. 24).* [Note: In one version of the story it is the mythical 'Ebion' whom St. John meets in the bath.] Even down to recent times these statements have been widely accepted as furnishing an adequate account of the origin of the Fourth Gospel. Thus Ebrard says: 'We are thus led to the conclusion that the Cerinthian *gnosis* was the principal cause which induced John to believe that the time had come for him to make known his peculiar gift, which he had hitherto kept concealed.... He emphasizes faith in Jesus the Son of God (xx. 31) over against a bare *gnosis*' (Schaff-Herzog, *Encyc. of Rel. Knowledge*, ii. 1189).

At the opposite extreme from the belief of Irenaeus was the view of a sect referred to by Epiphanius (*l.e.* li. 3), and named by him the Alogi (because of their refusal to accept St. John's teaching regarding the Logos), who ascribed the Johannine writings to Cerinthus himself, and on that ground discarded them altogether. A parallel of a sort to this view was furnished by the Tübingen writers when they assigned the Gospel to some Gnosticizing dreamer of the 2nd century.

The residuum of truth that lies between these two contrary views may perhaps be found in the fact that the author was a contemporary of Cerinthus, and that he wrote his Gospel in full view of prevailing Cerinthian error. It is a mistake, however, to suppose that the work was intended as a direct polemic against Cerinthus and his followers.

'It is decisive,' says Meyer, 'against the assumption of any such polemical purpose that, in general, John nowhere in his Gospel allows any direct reference to the perverted tendencies of his day to appear; while to search for indirect and hidden allusions of the kind, as if they were intentional, would be as arbitrary as it would be repugnant to the decided character of the Apostolic standpoint which he took up when in conscious opposition to heresies.... We see from his [First] Epistle how John would have carried on a controversy, had he *wished* to do so in his Gospel' (Joh_1:44 f.; cf. Westcott, *John*, p. xli).

The author doubtless has in view the heresies of Gnostic Ebionism, but in the Gospel he refutes them only by the full and positive exhibition of what he conceives to be the truth about Jesus Christ. He tells us himself that his purpose in writing is that those who read 'may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God' (Joh. 20:31). What he means by 'the Christ, the Son of God,' he lets us see in the prologue; and his method in the rest of the work is to show by selected examples how this conception of the truth about Jesus Christ has been historically realized.

iv. Ebionism and the Person of Christ.—The distinctive feature of Judaic Christianity, when we first meet it, lies in its continued adherence to the Law; but with the growth of more definite conceptions regarding the Person of Christ, the question of the keeping of the Law recedes into the background, and Christology becomes the matter of supreme importance to the Church. From the beginning it was the tendency of Jewish Christianity to shrink from the idea of the Incarnation, and to be content to regard Jesus as the last and greatest of the prophets. And when the Church delined its Christological position, the Jewish section was found to be lacking at this particular and crucial point, and so the term 'Ebionism' came to be almost synonymous with the denial of Christ's Divinity and Virgin-birth. Irenaeus, after referring to the way in which the Ebionites clung to the Law of Moses and rejected Paul as an apostate, adds that, besides this, they teach *consimiliter ut Cerinthus et Carpocrates* (cf.

Hippolytus, *Philos.* vii. 34, τὰ δὲ περὶ Χριστῶν ὁμοίως τῷ Κηρίνθῳ καὶ Καρποκράτει μωθεύουσιν), denying the birth from the Virgin and holding Christ as a mere man.

Origen, more than half a century later, distinguishes between two classes of Ebionites (οἱ διττοὶ Ἐβιωναῖοι), one of which confesses, like the Church generally, that Jesus was born of a virgin, while the other affirms that He was born like the rest of men (c. *Cels.* v. 61). According to Jerome, it appears that by the 4th cent. the Ebionites of Palestine had made progress in their recognition of the Divinity of Christ and the Virgin-birth, for he says of them, *qui credunt in Christum filium dei natum de Virgine Maria ... in quem et nos credimus* (*Ep. ad August.* cxxii. 13).

But while it may be true of the vulgar or non-Gnostic Ebionites, over whom, as Harnack says, 'the Church stalked with iron feet' (*Hist. of Dogma*, i. 301), that their distinction from the Church tended more and more to disappear, the case was different with the Gnostic or syncretistic variety, of whom Cerinthus may be taken as an early type. To Cerinthus, according to Irenaeus (1. xxvi. 1; cf. Hippolytus, *Philos.* vii. 33), Jesus was nothing more than a naturally-begotten man—the son of Joseph and Mary—upon whom at His baptism the Christ came down from the absolute power (αὐθεντία) of God, thus making him the revealer of the Father and the miracle-working Messiah; but from whom this Christ-Spirit departed before the Passion, so that it was

only the man Jesus who endured the cross, while the spiritual Christ remained untouched by suffering.

In the case of the Elkesaites of a later period, we find Jewish monotheism combining itself not only with Greek speculation, but with strange heathen elements taken over from the Asiatic religions. This syncretism was characteristic of the age, and in that fact the strength of Gnostic Ebionism lay. It was much more aggressive than Ebionism of the simpler type, and had a far more widely extended influence. Of its fantastic and fugitive forms this is not the place to speak. But its Christology appears in general to have been akin to that of Cerinthus; in other words it was essentially Docetic, and involved a denial of any real and abiding union of the Divine and human in the Person of our Lord.

Literature.—On the general subject the following should be read: Neander, *Church History*, vol. ii. pp. 8-41 (Clark's ed.); Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, i. 287-317; *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , artt. 'Ebioniten,' 'Elkesaiten'; *Jewish Encyc.*, art. 'Ebionites.' For particular points see the various references given in the article.

J. C. Lambert.

☩ Ecce Homo

ECCE HOMO.—'Behold, the man!' (ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄνθρωπος or ἴδε ὁ ἄνθρωπος) ([Joh_19:5](#)) was the utterance of Pilate when our Lord came forth wearing the crown of thorns and the purple robe. We may believe that the words were spoken to excite the pity of the Jews. Pilate had given over our Lord to be scourged, and had allowed his soldiers to robe and crown Him in mockery, but all the time he was anxious to save Him from death; and there was undoubtedly an appeal to the compassion of the bystanders in the words, 'Behold the man.' Probably it was to mock the Jews that the soldiers had robed and crowned Him who was said to have claimed to be their king; and Pilate himself, we can see, was not unwilling to deal somewhat scornfully with them. But he does not seem to have looked scornfully, he rather looked pitifully, on our Lord Himself. And when he said, 'Behold, the man!' he was, as it were, pointing out that Jesus had suffered enough. But although Pilate's words were those of a weak but not wholly unfeeling man who wanted to move to pity those whom he was afraid to send angry and revengeful from his judgment-seat, he was really, although all unconsciously, paying an act of homage to our Lord. 'Ecce Homo.' He was bidding

men look to the perfect man, the incarnate Son of God, men's perfect example, their Divine yet most truly human Redeemer.

The scene of our Lord's appearing in the crown of thorns and the purple robe is naturally one to appeal to artists; and many great pictures, notably one of the greatest and most striking of modern times (by Munkacsy), have borne the title 'Ecce Homo!'

Ecce Homo is also the title of a very notable book by the late Sir John Seeley. The book cannot be discussed here. It deals with the manhood of our Lord in an original and striking way, and does not deny, although it does not discuss, His Divinity.

Literature.—Comm. on passage cited; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*; Knox Little, *Perfect Life* (1898), p. 140; R. J. Campbell, *City Temple Sermons* (1903), 50; Rosadi, *Trial of Jesus*; Farrar, *Christ in Art*, p. 384 ff.; art. 'Christusbilder' in *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyclopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] .

Geo. C. Watt.

Education

EDUCATION.—Among the Apocryphal Gospels' fables of what befell during the Silent Years, there are some that are concerned with the school-days of Jesus—mostly silly and sometimes blasphemous stories of the sort which St. Paul brands as 'profane and old-wifish myths' (1Ti_4:7). For instance, it is told in *Arab.* [Note: Arabic.] *Evang. Inf.* xlix. that the wondrous Child one day had a dispute with His teacher about the Hebrew alphabet; and when the latter would have chastised Him, his impious arm was withered, and he died. Such stories are, of course, absolutely unhistorical; but it is indubitable that during His early years at Nazareth Jesus had to do with school and teacher. It is mentioned incidentally by St. Luke that He could read (Luk_4:16), and by St. John that He could write (Joh_8:8); and it is impossible that He should have grown up without an education. It is not the least merit of the Jewish people that they recognized the value of education, and brought it within the reach of the poorest. 'Our ground,' says Josephus,* [Note: Apion. i. 12.] 'is good, and we work it to the utmost; but our chief ambition is for the education of our children.' A father, according to R. Salomo,† [Note: Wetsteinon 2Ti_3:15.] had as well bury his son as neglect his instruction; and it was a saying of R. Judah the Holy that 'the world exists by the breath of school-children.'

A child's first school was his home and his first teachers his parents, in accordance with Deu 6:6-7; and his instruction began very early, since youth was recognized as the season of opportunity. 'He who learns as a lad,' said R. Abujah, 'to what is he like? To ink written on fresh paper. And he who learns when old, to what is he like? To ink written on used paper.' † [Note: Taylor, Sayings of Fathers, iv. 27.] St. Paul testifies that Timothy had known sacred literature 'from his infancy' (ἀπὸ βρέφους), his teachers being—since his father was a Greek and apparently deceased—his grandmother Lois and his mother Eunice (2Ti 3:15; 2Ti 1:5); and Josephus says that 'from the very dawn of understanding' a Jewish child 'learned the Law by heart, and had it, as it were, engraved on his soul.' § [Note: Vita, 2.] It may be assumed that Joseph and Mary would be no less zealous than others in the discharge of this sacred and imperative duty.

When he reached the age of six or seven years, the boy was sent to the elementary school, which, since the subject of study was the Book of the Law, was styled the House of the Book (*bêth ha-Sçpher*). || [Note: | According to the ordinance of Joshua ben Gamla. Joshua was high priest from a.d. 63 to 65, but his ordinance was merely a reinforcement of existing requirements. Cf. Schurer, HJP ii. ii. p. 49.] This admirable institution, comparable to John Knox's parish school, was attached to the synagogue; and since there was a synagogue in every village in the land, there was also an elementary school in every village.* [Note: Lightfoot on Mat 4:23; cf. Luk 5:17.] The establishment of this system of education was ascribed to the celebrated Simon ben Shetach, brother of Salome Alexandra, the queen of Alexander Jannaeus (b.c. 104-78), and his successor on the throne (b.c. 78-69). Schürer† [Note: HJP ii. ii. p. 49.] summarily dismisses the tradition with the remark that 'this Simon ben Shetach is a meeting-place for all kinds of myths.' Whatever be the worth of the tradition, Josephus' reiterated ascription to Moses of the exceedingly thorough system of education which prevailed in his day, ‡ [Note: iv. viii. 12; c. Apion. ii. 25.] proves it no recent institution.

From the House of the Book such as desired to prosecute their studies and become teachers themselves passed into the Scribal College, styled the House of the Midrash (*bêth ha-Midrâsh*), § [Note: 'The Midrash may be defined as an imaginative development of a thought or theme suggested by Scripture, especially a didactic or homiletic exposition, or an edifying religious story' (Driver, LOT6 p. 529).] where the great Rabbis taught. There were several of these colleges in Palestine. Sometimes, like the Christian ἐκκλησία (cf. 1Co 16:19, Col 4:15), they met in an upper room in a private house, || [Note: | Lightfoot on Act 1:13; Taylor, Sayings of Fathers, i. 4: 'Let

thy house be a meeting-house for the wise.’] but generally in some special place. The college at Jabne, where R. Eleasar and R. Ishmael taught, met in a place called the Vineyard. The principal college was that of Jerusalem, and it met within the Temple-precincts (cf. Luk_2:46), probably in the Temple-synagogue. The Rabbi occupied a low platform, and his disciples sat round him on the floor, ‘powdering themselves in the dust of the feet of the wise,’ ¶ [Note: Taylor, Sayings of Fathers, i. 4, n. 11.] —an arrangement which explains St. Paul’s expression, ‘educated at the feet of Gamaliel’ (Act_22:3).

The disciples were employed in the study of the Oral Law—the Tradition of the Elders (Mat_15:2), which in those days was regarded with even greater veneration than the Written Law,* [Note: * Lightfoot on Mat_15:2.] and which until, at the earliest, the 5th cent. of our era† [Note: † See Margoliouth in Expositor, Dec. 1904, p. 403.] was preserved in the memories of the Rabbis and orally transmitted from generation to generation. The method of study was *Mishna*, i.e. ‘repetition,’ ‡ [Note: ‡ The Greek term δευτερωσις (cf. Jer. Algas. Quæst. x) is a literal rendering of Mishna.] the lesson being repeated over and over again until it was fixed in the memory; and proficiency lay in faithful reproduction of the *ipsissima verba* of the Tradition. It was a high eulogy of Eliezer ben Hyrcanus, a disciple of R. Johanan ben Zakai, when he was likened to ‘a plastered cistern which loses not a drop.’ § [Note: § Taylor, Sayings of Fathers, ii. 10.]

This mnemonic drill was not the sole employment in the House of the Midrash. Whatever difficulties they felt, the disciples propounded to the Rabbis for elucidation.

Often their questions were ridiculous quibbles, like that put to R. Levi ben Susi in connexion with Deu_25:9 ‘If his brother’s wife have lost her hands, how is she to loose his shoe?’ ||| [Note: ||| Lightfoot on Luk_2:46.] But they were not always quite so trivial. One much discussed *quaestio theologialis* was, ‘Are they few that are being saved?’ Some Rabbis held that ‘all Israel would have a portion in the world to come’; others, that as only two of all that came out of Egypt entered into the land of Canaan, so would it be in the days of the Messiah. ¶ [Note: ¶ lb. on Luk_13:23.] Another question was, ‘May a man divorce his wife for any cause?’ (cf. Mat_19:3). The strict school of Shammai permitted divorce only on the ground of unfaithfulness; but that of Hillel granted greater facility, allowing a man to put away his wife if he hated her; if he was dissatisfied with her cooking; if she went deaf or insane; if he saw another woman whom he fancied more. ** [Note: ** lb. on Mat_5:31.]

Not being designed for a Rabbi, Jesus never studied at any of the Scribal Colleges; but once He sat at the feet of the Rabbis in the House of the Midrash at Jerusalem—on that memorable occasion when, on attaining the age of twelve years and becoming ‘a son of the Law,’ He for the first time (?) accompanied Joseph and Mary on their annual pilgrimage to the sacred capital to celebrate the Feast of the Passover. He lingered in the city when His parents set forth on their return journey, and they found Him on the third day after in the school of the Rabbis. ‘Raise up many disciples’ was the Rabbinical maxim,* [Note: Taylor, Sayings of Fathers, i. l.] and the new recruit would be welcome when He took His place among the disciples. He was ‘sitting in the midst of the Teachers, both listening to them and questioning them’ (Luk 2:46), and evincing an intelligence which amazed them.

There prevailed in early times a singularly unhappy misconception, that the Holy Child was confounding the wise men by an exhibition of Divine wisdom. The *Arab*. [Note: Arabic.] *Evang. Inf.* (l.-lii.) declares that He was puzzling them with questions about theology, astronomy, physics, metaphysics, and anatomy, ‘things which the mind of no creature could reach’; and Origen says: ‘He was questioning the Teachers; and because they could not answer, He Himself was answering the questions which He asked.’ ‘He was questioning the Teachers, not that He might learn aught, but that by questioning He might instruct them.’† [Note: in Luc. Hom. xviii, xix.] This is rank Docetism, and is refuted by the Evangelist’s testimony that ‘Jesus made progress in wisdom and age’ (*HAIKIA*) (Luk 2:52), as it were, *pari passu*. He had a human education. His mind grew even as His body.

It made Jesus an object of disdain in the eyes of the rulers that He had never attended a Rabbinical College. They called Him ‘a Samaritan,’ which was a nickname that they had for one who had never sat at the feet of the Rabbis.‡ [Note: Wetstein on Joh 8:48.] At the same time they could not deny that He had a knowledge of the things of God far transcending their theological lore. Again and again He encountered the wise men of Israel in debate, and worsted them on their own proper field (cf. Mar 12:28-34 = Mat 22:34-40; Mat 22:41-46 = Mar 12:35-37 = Luk 20:41-44). And once, when they heard Him discoursing in the Temple-court, they marvelled whence He had derived His wisdom. ‘How,’ they asked, ‘hath this man learning, though he hath not studied?’ (Joh 7:15). His wisdom flowed from a higher source. The lofty truths which they were blindly groping after and ignorantly reasoning about, the Father had revealed to Him (cf. Joh 5:20).

All the vaunted wisdom of the Rabbis Jesus held in very slight esteem. It was not indeed His manner to despise the searchings of earnest souls after the knowledge of God, but the theology of His day was the very arrogance of ignorance, and blinded its

votaries to the truth. It is a pathetic fact that nothing so effectually prevented the recognition of Jesus by the men of Jerusalem as their fancied knowledge of the things of God. Bred in an atmosphere of disputation, they were all controversialists, and at every turn they would raise some theological objection to His claims. Once, when some wondered if He were the Messiah, others answered that His origin was known, and, according to the Rabbinical teaching, the Messiah would appear suddenly, none would know whence, like a serpent by the way or a treasure-trove (Joh 7:20-27; cf. Joh 7:41 f.). Again it was objected that He testified concerning Himself; and it was a Rabbinical maxim that a man's testimony concerning himself was invalid (Joh 8:13).^S [Note: Wetstein on Joh 5:31.] Thus it fared with the Messiah when He made His appeal to the men of Jerusalem. Their minds were fenced by an impenetrable barrier of theological prejudice. It was otherwise in Galilee. Among the unsophisticated folk of that despised province the gospel gained a fair hearing and a ready welcome. All the Apostles save Judas were Galilaeans. 'I thank thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth,' said Jesus, perhaps when He was leaving Jerusalem, rejected by her wise men (Joh 10:39-40),* [Note: and Lk. give this logion in different connexions, neither suitable (Mat 11:25-27 = Luk 10:21-22). It is probably one of the fugitive fragments which the Synoptists have preserved of the Judaeen ministry. It is remarkably Johannine. Cf. Joh 3:35; Joh 13:3; Joh 1:18; Joh 6:46; Joh 6:65; Joh 10:15.] 'that thou didst hide these things from wise and understanding, and didst reveal them to babes' (Mat 11:25).

It is important to take account of this. Does it not explain a difficulty which has been felt in connexion with the Fourth Gospel? St. John represents Jesus as a controversialist absolutely unlike the gracious Teacher of the Synoptists; and it has been alleged that these representations are incompatible. If Jesus spoke as the Synoptists report, He cannot have spoken after the Johannine fashion. But the difference is really a mark of verisimilitude. Jesus had different audiences in Galilee and in Jerusalem. To the simple people of the north He spoke the language of the heart, and couched His teaching in parable and poetry; but in Jerusalem He had to do with men whose minds were steeped in theology, and He met them on their own ground, talked to them in their own language, and encountered them with their own weapons. He adapted His teaching to His audiences. See, further, art. Boyhood.

Literature.—Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. ii. p. 44 ff.; art. on 'Education' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible and in *Encyc. Biblica*.

David Smith.

EGG.—See Animals, p. 66^b.

✚ Egypt

EGYPT.—The Gospel narrative comes into contact with the land of Egypt at one point alone, and then only incidentally, in a manner which seems to have exercised no influence and left no trace upon the course of sacred history. The record, moreover, is confined to the first of the Evangelists, and is by him associated with the fulfilment of prophecy, as one of the links which drew together the ancient Hebrew Scriptures and the life of our Lord. The narrative is simple and brief. St. Matthew relates that Joseph, in obedience to the command of God, conveyed by an angel in a dream, took refuge in Egypt with the child and His mother from the murderous intentions of Herod the king (Mat 2:13 f.). The return to Palestine, again at the bidding of an angel of the Lord in a dream, is described (Mat 2:19 ff.). Joseph, however, feared to enter Judaea because of Archelaus, Herod's son and successor; and in obedience to a second vision directed his course to Galilee, and settled at Nazareth (Mat 2:22 f.).

To St. Matthew it would appear that the chief interest of the history lies in its relation to OT prophecy. Both movements, the Flight and the Return to Nazareth, are described as fulfilments of the word spoken 'through the prophet' (Mat 2:15), or 'through the prophets' (Mat 2:23). In the first instance the passage quoted is Hos 11:1 'When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt' (לְבָנִי קָרָאתִי מִמִּצְרַיִם, LXX Septuagint τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ, 'his, i.e. Israel's, children'). Hosea recalls the deliverance and mercies of the past (cf. G. A. Smith, *Twelve Prophets, in loc.*); the Evangelist sees history repeating itself in a new exodus, which, like the earlier departure from Egypt, signalizes the beginning of a new national life, and is the promise and pledge of Divine favour. Egypt, therefore, to the narrator is no mere 'geographical expression.' The name recalls the memories of a glorious past, when Israel's youth was guided and sustained by the miracles of Divine interposition. And to him it is significant of much that this land should thus be brought into connexion with the birth of a new era for the people, in the Person of a greater Son, in whom he saw the fulfilment of the best hopes and brightest anticipations of Israel's ancient prophets.

The narrative of the Evangelist is absolutely simple and unadorned, and amounts to little more than a mention of the journey into Egypt made under Divine direction. No indication is given either of the locality or duration of the stay in the country. The impression conveyed, however, is that the visit was not prolonged.* [Note: Herod's death (Mat 2:19) would appear to have occurred not long after the 'Massacre of the innocents' in Bethlehem.] Had the case been otherwise, it would hardly have failed to find mention in the other Synoptic Gospels, if not in St. John. The absence,

therefore, of further record is hardly sufficient ground for throwing doubt upon the reality of the incident itself.

This brief statement is supplemented and expanded in the Apocryphal Gospels with a wealth of descriptive detail. The fullest accounts are found, as might be expected, in the *Gospel of the Infancy*, and the *Gospel of pseudo-Matthew* (see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , Extra Vol. p. 430 ff.).

In the *Gospel of the Infancy* (ch. ix. f.), Joseph and Mary with the Child set out for Egypt at cock-crow, and reach a great city and temple with an idol to whose shrine the other idols of Egypt send gifts. There they find accommodation in a hospital dedicated to the idol, and a great commotion is caused by their entrance. The people of the land send to the idol to inquire the reason of the commotion, and are told that an 'occult god' has come, who alone is worthy of worship, because he is truly Son of God. Thereupon the idol falls prostrate, and all the people run together at the sound. The following chapter narrates the healing of the three-year-old son of the priest of the idol, who is possessed by many demons, and whose sickness is described in terms similar to those used of the Gadarene demoniac (Luk 8:27, Mar 5:2-5). Thereafter Joseph and Mary depart, being afraid lest the Egyptians should burn them to death because of the destruction of the idol. Passing on their way they twice meet with robbers in the desert. In the first instance the robbers flee on their approach, and a number of captives are liberated. At a considerably later stage of their journey (ch. xxiii.) two handits are encountered, whose names are given as Titus and Dumachus, the former of whom bribes his companion not to molest Joseph and Mary; and the child Jesus foretells His crucifixion at Jerusalem thirty years later with these two robbers, and that Titus shall precede Him into Paradise. On the road the travellers have passed through many cities, at which a demoniac woman, a dumb bride, a leprous girl who accompanies them on their journey, and many others have been healed. Finally, they come to Memphis (ch. xxv.), where they see the Pharaoh, and remain three years, during which period Jesus works many miracles; returning at the end of the three years to Palestine, and by direction of an angel making their home at Nazareth.

In a similar strain the *Gospel of pseudo-Matthew* (ch. xvii. ff.) records the number of attendants, with riding animals, a waggon, pack-oxen and asses, sheep and rams, that set out with Joseph and Mary from Judaea. In a cave where they had stopped to rest they are terrified by dragons, which, however, worship the child Jesus; and lions and other wild beasts escort them on their way through the desert. A palm-tree bends down its boughs that Mary may pluck the fruit; and as a reward a branch of it is carried by an angel to Paradise. A spring also breaks forth from its roots for the refreshment of man and beast. And the long thirty days' journey into Egypt is miraculously shortened into one. The name of the Egyptian city to which they come is

said to be Sotines within the borders of Hermopolis, and there, in default of any acquaintance from whom to seek hospitality, they take refuge in the temple, called the 'capitol.' The 355 idols of the temple, to which divine honours were daily paid, fall prostrate, and are broken in pieces; and Affrodosius, the governor of the town, coming with an army, at sight of the ruined idols worships the child Jesus, and all the people of the city believe in God through Jesus Christ. Afterwards Joseph is commanded to return into the land of Judah. Nothing, however, is said of the actual journey, but a narrative of events 'in Galilee' follows, beginning with the fourth year of Christ's age.

According to the *Gospel of Thomas*, ch. i. ff. (Latin, Tisch. *Ev. Apocr.* [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] p. 156 ff.), Jesus was two years old on entering Egypt. He and His parents found hospitality in the house of a widow, where they remained for a year, at the close of which they were expelled because of a miracle wrought by Jesus in bringing a dry and salted fish to life. A similar fate overtakes them subsequently in being driven from the city. The angel directs *Mary* to return, and she goes with the child to Nazareth. The *History of Joseph*, ch. viii. f., states the duration of the stay in Egypt as a whole year, and names Nazareth as the city in which Jesus and His parents lived after their return into the land of Israel.

The Flight of the Holy Family into Egypt has been at all times a favourite subject for the exercise of Christian art. William Blake, Charles Holroyd, Eugène Girardet, Anthony van Dyke, William Dobson, and many others have painted the scenes by the way with a circumstance and detail which are indebted, where not wholly imaginary, to the accounts of the Apocryphal Gospels. The reality would doubtless differ widely from the tranquil and easy conditions under which it has usually been depicted, and from which most readers have formed their mental conceptions of the event. The simple reticence of the Gospel narrative is in striking contrast to the luxuriance and prodigality of miracle of the Apocryphal story. All that can be affirmed with certainty is that the flight would be conducted in haste and with the utmost secrecy, and probably for the most part under cover of night. See also Flight.

Literature.—For notes on the Gospel narrative see the Commentaries on St. Matthew; and for the Apocryphal additions to the history, Tischendorf's *Evangelia Apocrypha*, Leipzig, 1853. Certain features in the latter appear to betray Buddhist relations or parentage. For some account of the treatment of the subject in art, see Farrar, *Christ in Art*, pp. 263-273.

A. S. Geden.

☩ Eighth Day

EIGHTH DAY.—On the eighth day after birth, as is well known, Jewish male infants received the rite of circumcision, and, at all events by the time of our Lord, their proper name also, in memory of the change in Abraham's name (see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Circumcision'). Accordingly St. Luke records the fact that both Jesus Christ (Luk 2:21) and His forerunner John the Baptist (Luk 1:59 ff.) were circumcised and named on the eighth day (cf. Php 3:5, Act 7:8 etc.); for thus it became them 'to fulfil all righteousness' (*i.e.* to observe all the requirements of the ancient Law in the spirit as well as in the letter). See, further, art. Circumcision.

C. L. Feltoe.

☩ Elder

ELDER.—In the Gospels the term 'elder' (πρεσβύτερος) does not occur in the later Christian sense, denoting an officer of the Church (as in Act 14:23; Act 20:17, Tit 1:5, Jam 5:14; 1Pe 5:1). In the Gospel of St. John the word occurs only once, and that in the doubtful passage concerning the adulteress (Joh 8:9), where it has not any official sense, but simply means older in years. In the Synoptics there is more frequent use, mostly in the official sense. The few cases of unofficial meaning of the term are: Luk 15:25, where it describes the 'elder brother' in the parable of the Prodigal; and Mat 15:2, Mar 7:3; Mar 7:5, where it means 'the elders' of a former age, the men of old from whom customs and maxims are handed down. In all the other passages (Mat 16:21; Mat 21:28; Mat 26:3; Mat 26:47; Mat 26:57; Mat 26:59; Mat 27:1; Mat 27:3; Mat 27:12; Mat 27:20; Mat 27:41, Mar 8:31; Mar 11:27; Mar 14:43; Mar 14:53, Luk 9:22; Luk 20:1; Luk 22:52) the term 'elders'—invariably plural—bears the official meaning current among the Jews of our Lord's time. What is that meaning?

In the OT and Apocr. [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] there is frequent mention of 'elders' in the official sense (see, e.g., Gen 50:7, Exo 3:18; Exo 3:18, Lev 4:15, Num 11:25, Deu 31:28, Jos 20:4, Jdg 8:18, 1Sa 16:4, 2Sa 5:3, 1Ki 20:7, Ezr 5:5, Eze 8:1, Jdt 6:21, 1Ma 7:33; 1Ma 11:23, Sus 8, 18 etc.). From a study of these and similar passages it appears that in all the history of Israel, from the Egyptian bondage down to the time of Christ, 'elders' appear as an official class; but the descriptions and statements are not explicit enough to give a definite idea of how they were appointed to office, or of their exact functions. It is not improbable that they were chosen as representatives of the people; and the duties of the office appear to have been threefold—advisory, executive, judicial. Further, there is a distinction between

local 'elders' (those of a city) and 'the elders of Israel,' 'elders of the congregation,' 'elders of the people,' as they are variously called. We are now to inquire how far this OT use of the word is illustrated in that of the Gospels.

One passage only (Luk 7:3) seems to indicate the local 'elders'—those of Capernaum, the scene of the event described; and even here the turn of the expression, 'elders of the Jews,' might possibly point to national 'elders' present or resident at Capernaum. But on the whole it seems more natural to take the term here in its local sense. In all the remaining passages cited above, the reference is to the national 'elders.' From Vitranga (*de Synag. Vet.* iii. i. 1) downwards, NT scholars have held with apparent unanimity that the term designates the members of the Sanhedrin (wh. see). This view is sustained by the connexion and association of the term,—usually with 'scribes' and 'chief priests,'—and by Luk 22:66, where the Sanhedrin is called 'the presbytery,' or assembly of 'elders' (πρεσβυτέριον, cf. Act 22:5). There are various forms of expression: sometimes 'elders' simply, and sometimes 'elders of the people,' commonly associated with 'chief priests and scribes.' This is held by some to indicate that there were three orders or grades in the Sanhedrin, the 'elders' being the lay element, or representatives of the people. This may be the case, but is at best only an inference, neither contradicted nor supported.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Elder,' and the lit. there mentioned; *Jewish Encyc.* and lit.; Grimm-Thayer, *Lexicon of the NT*; Cremer, *Biblico-Theol. Lex.*; Vitranga, *de Syn. Vet.*; Schurer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]; Morrison, *The Jews under Roman Rule*; Weiss, *Life of Christ*; Edersheim, *Life and Times*.

E. C. Dargan.

☩ Eleazar

ELEAZAR.—An ancestor of Jesus, Mat 1:15.

☩ Elect, Election

ELECT, ELECTION (ἐκλέγεσθαι, ἐκλεκτός, ἐκλογή).—Though we have no reference in the Gospels to any conscious effort on the part of the writers to grasp the significance of the Divine action in choosing and rejecting the human objects of His favour and the

instruments of His will, we have sufficiently explicit statements, incidentally valuable, to show clearly that they inherited the OT conceptions on this question. The self-identification of Jesus with the ideal Servant of Jehovah (Luk 4:18 f. = Isa 61:1 f.) at the outset of His public ministry at once widens the scope of the revelation of His Father's elective activity, and emphasizes the profound depths in human-Divine relationships to which this activity in the freedom of its manifestation has penetrated. Once again, in what may without exaggeration be called the most critical moment of Jesus' public life, when suffering and death (Luk 9:31) assumed large proportions in His sight, the revelation of His position as the elect of God (ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος, Luk 9:35) not only assured His fearful disciples, but strengthened Himself in His often-expressed conviction that the consciousness of His eternal Sonship was well founded.

The variant reading ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος instead of ὁ ἀγαπητός (Mar 9:7 = Mat 17:5) is generally recognized as the genuine one, not only on account of the high authority of \aleph and B, but also because, according to an obvious canon of textual criticism, it is the more likely reading of the two (see Scrivener's . to the Criticism of the NT, ii. 247 f.; cf., however, Nestle's of the Greek NT² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 52, and art. 'Ascension of Isaiah' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , vol. ii. p. 501^a). The Matthaean and Markan versions bear evident traces of assimilation to the voice at Jesus' baptism. In this connexion it is important to remember how fully Jesus recognized that His position as the elect Son involved the fulfilment (ἐμελλεν τηροῦν, Luk 9:31) by Him of conditions foreordained as inseparable from His earthly life (cf. Luk 9:22; Luk 13:33; Luk 24:7, in each of which places is found St. Luke's favourite and emphatic *ΔέΙ*: see also Mar 8:31, Mat 17:21). The determining factor in the free choice (cf. ἐξουσίαν ἔχω θεῖναι αὐτήν, κ.τ.λ., Joh 10:18) by Jesus of the cross as the crowning act of His self-ahnegation was its absolute necessity (οὐχί ταῦτα ἔδει ταθεῖν, Luk 24:26). The ultimate synthesis of these apparently irreconcilable hypotheses may elude the keenest observation, but the reflexion that, in acting as He did, Jesus was fulfilling conditions which lie at the root of all well-ordered moral and spiritual activity (cf. ἔτρεπιεν αὐτῶ, Heb 2:10; ὥφειλεν, Heb 2:17) will serve to remind us of a sphere where these seeming contradictions are discovered to be profoundly at one, both in their origin and in the end at which they aim. It is noteworthy that St. Luke not only gives the burden of the conversation between Jesus and His heavenly visitants; he also implies that Jesus was there

informed in detail of the character of the death which He was about to suffer (συνελάλουν αὐτῷ ... ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ, Luk_9:30 f.).

How universally the title of ‘the Elect’ or ‘the Elect One’ had become identified with that of ‘the Christ’ is best seen in the contemptuous irony of the scoffing rulers who mocked on the day of the Crucifixion. The demonstrative οὗτος and the titular ὁ ἐκλεκτός combine to mark the emphasis with which they rejected the Messianic claims of Jesus; and not only the claims, but the foundation upon which those claims rested (cf. Luk_23:35). It is remarkable that St. Luke seems to be the only NT writer who has adopted the use of the word as a designation, strictly speaking, of the Messiah (cf., however, the variant reading ὁ ἐκλεκτός in the Baptist’s testimony to Jesus, Joh_1:34 WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort’s text.]). This statement is not affected by St. Matthew’s quotation from Isaiah (Isa_42:1), who may be regarded as the originator of the title. Here we have the idea in prominence, but by way of interpretation rather than by direct statement (cf. his use of the verb ἨΡῆΤΙΣΑ, Mat_12:18, instead of the merely descriptive Ὁ ΕΚΛΕΚΤὸς ΜΟΥ of Isa_42:1).

The only other writing of a late date in which ‘the Elect One’ appears as a Messianic title is the Book of Enoch, which seems to have been the chief means of popularizing its use. Indeed, it would be interesting to trace the influence of that work in this, as well as in other respects, upon the Gospels of the NT. Of the many names by which the coming Messiah is designated there, the favourite one seems to be ‘the Elect One’ (see 40:5, 45:3f., 49:2, 4, 51:3, 5, 52:6, 9, 55:4, 61:5, 8, 10, 62:1), and on a couple of occasions this is joined with another word or words which are equivalent to a characterization of the conditions upon which His election to the Messiahship rests (‘the righteous and elect one,’ 53:6; ‘the elect one of righteousness and faith,’ 39:6 [see *The Book of Enoch*, R. H. Charles’ ed. pp. 106-186]). A somewhat fantastic representation of the method by which the Divine election of Jesus was consummated occurs in *Hermas*, where the servant elected by his lord (ἐκλεξάμενος δοῦλόν τινα τιστὸν, κ.τ.λ.), after having approved himself as a zealous guardian of his master’s interests, is chosen by the latter (μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου εἶλατο κοινωνίον) to occupy the position of ‘great power and lordship.’ Whatever we may think of the orthodoxy of this teaching, it is at least interesting as showing how completely the habits of thought in the early Church were dominated by this aspect of the Incarnation, and how men strove by the aid of reason to harmonize the ideas underlying the titles of ‘Servant’ and ‘Son’ (see *Sim.* 5, i.-vi.).

As the Christological ideas of the early Church begin to emerge and to crystallize, we find this one holding a firm place, while at the same time another equally emphatic conception begins to assert itself. The election, by God, of Jesus was held to be a means to a wider end—the establishment of a chosen body which should exhibit on earth the graces and virtues of Him in and through whom their election was accomplished (cf. 1Pe 2:4 f., 9f., where the writer’s insistence on the profound oneness of Jesus and His people is fundamentally and essentially Pauline, though he elaborates no argument to prove what he States; cf. ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ, Eph 1:4).

‘The fundamental conception of Jesus dominating everything was, according to the OT, that God had chosen Him and through Him the Church. God had chosen Him and made Him to be both Lord and Christ. He had made over to Him the work of setting up the Kingdom,’ etc. (Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, English translation vol. i. p. 81). ‘The Christian community must be conceived as a communion resting on a divine election’ (*ib.* p. 148).

We must not forget, however, that this Divine election has its roots struck deep in the election which issued in the Incarnation, and that, apart from the latter, which is the *rationale* and guarantee of the former, we cannot believe in the existence of ‘an elect race’ (ὕμεις δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν, 1Pe 2:9). This was apprehended very soon by the Fathers of the Church, who never separate the idea of the election of Jesus from that of the community (ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς δι’ αὐτοῦ, κ.τ.λ., Clem. Rom. [Note: Roman.] *Ep. ad Cor.* lxiv.; cf. also the Paulinism ὁ λαὸς δὲν ἠτοιμάσεν ἐν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ αὐτοῦ, *Ep. of Barnabas* iii. 6). While it is recognized that the ultimate Author of all elective purpose is God the Father, it is agreed that the active Agent in giving expression to the Divine decree is the Son, apart from whom (εἰ μὴ δι’ ἐμοῦ, Joh 14:6) it is not only impossible for men to approach God, but even to hear the voice of that calling (κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου, Heb 3:1; cf. Heb 12:25) which He addresses to them in Christ (ὁ καλέσας ὑμᾶς ... ἐν Χριστῷ, 1Pe 5:10), and which, when heard, is the antecedent condition of their election (cf. 2Pe 1:10; see οἱ κλητοὶ καὶ ἐκλεκτοὶ καὶ πιστοί. Rev 17:14).

It will scarcely be contended that there is any practical difference in the Christology of those who speak of an election διὰ Χριστοῦ, and of those who in the same connexion use the phrase ἐν Χριστῷ. We are able, perhaps, to see in the former

expression an emphatic assertion of the delegated activity of Christ who prepares ‘for Himself’ a people (αὐτός ἐαυτῷ τον λαον τόν καινον ἐτοιμαζων ἐτιδειξη, Barn. v. 7, cf. xiv. 6) whose prerogatives and position shall be in correspondence with His royal priesthood, and with the Sonship to which He was chosen (1Pe 2:4; 1Pe 2:9, Rev 20:6; Rev 1:6; cf. Heb 7:24 ἀταράβατον τὴν ἱερωσύην, Rom 8:14-17 οὗτοι υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν ... συνκληρονομοὶ δὲ Χριστοῦ, κ.τ.λ.).

Nor is the teaching of Jesus Himself devoid of references to those chosen by God out of mankind ‘as vessels made to honour’ (cf. 2Ti 2:21, Rom 9:21). He indirectly tells us that ‘the elect’ have an influence in the Divine government of the world which makes for mercy and pity and salvation. The awful scenes accompanying the destruction of Jerusalem would result in the annihilation of its doomed inhabitants, were it not that, ‘for the sake of his chosen,’ the Lord (some of the old Latin versions read *Deus*) had determined to cut short the duration of that period (cf. Mar 13:20 = Mat 24:22, in both of which passages occurs the verb κολοβοῦν, found nowhere else in the NT, showing the interdependence of the two authors, although the forms of the verb in both places are not the same). St. Luke does not make any mention in this part of his record of the elect, but curiously enough he makes a reference to the vengeance of God being wreaked (ἡμέραι ἐκδίκησεως, Luk 21:22) on the unfortunate city, which reminds us of the words of Jesus contained in another passage in the same Gospel. Jesus there is said to speak of God ‘avenging his elect’ (ὁ δὲ θεὸς οὐ μὴ ποιῆσῃ τὴν ἐκδίκησιν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ, Luk 18:7). It may be permissible to conjecture that St. Luke omitted to mention Jesus’ reference to the elect in the former context because of the promise implied in the interrogatory sentence just quoted. On the other hand, it is possible that a displacement has occurred in the text, with the result that we have a double reference to God’s activity on behalf of His chosen, each being suitable to the textual position it occupies. The subject of the prayers of those who appeal (τῶν βοώντων αὐτῷ) ‘day and night’ is that, in the first place, they may lie delivered from injustice; and, secondly, that they may soon see the vengeance of God active on their behalf against those who oppress them (cf. ἐκδίκησόν με ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀντιδίκου μου, Luk 18:3, where the first idea is prominent; and ἐκδικεῖς ... ἐκ τῶν, κ.τ.λ., Rev 6:10, in which the second thought is emphasized; cf. also the reference to the cry of Abel’s blood for vengeance, cf. Heb 12:24 = Gen 4:10). It is possible that, by interpreting the cry of the elect in this twofold sense, we are able to obtain a clearer idea of the meaning of the ‘longsuffering’ of God with regard to them (μακροθυμεῖ ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς). The ambiguity of the expression is mitigated if we remember that the

patience of God is needed even by His elect, whose insistent (cf. φωνῆ μεγάλη, Rev 6:10, and ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός, Luk 18:7) appeal for vengeance on their enemies and oppressors is not in harmony with the voice of that blood by which they were redeemed (αἷμα ῥαντισμοῦ, Heb 12:24). Much more, of course, does the patient waiting of God, sometimes amounting even to seeming tardiness, reveal His tenderness when exemplified in the case of those who torment His elect (ὡς τινες βρῶ αδυτήτα ἠγοῦνται, 2Pe 3:9). Arising out of this thought we are not surprised to find on more than one occasion that not only is it insufficient for their final acceptance that men should be ‘called’ (cf. the contrast πολλοὶ κλητοὶ and ὀλίγοι ἐκλεκτοί, Mat 22:14), for this is in harmony with much of Jesus’ teaching elsewhere (cf. Mat 7:24; Mat 7:26 etc.), but that there is even a danger that the elect may lose that to and for which they were chosen (see ... ἀποπλανᾶν ... τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς, Mar 13:22, cf. Mat 24:24; εἰ δυνατόν can hardly be an implied assertion of the impossibility of success attending the efforts of the false teachers to lead astray the elect; it rather refers to that object which they had in view). Another and a further condition must be fulfilled before the chosen of God may claim the salvation to which they were elected (... τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ἡμῖν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, Mat 25:34; cf. Mat 20:23, Heb 11:6). On more than one occasion Jesus insists on the necessity of endurance or perseverance up to the very end of their experiences (ὁ ὑπομείνας ... σωθήσεται, Mar 13:13 = Mat 24:13; cf. Mat 10:22, Eph 6:18), and, on the other hand, we are justified in applying to this place His warning, which He gave to those whose joy in receiving the gospel message was but a transitory (πρόσκαιρος, Mat 13:21 = Mar 4:17) emotion. Of a like nature is the incidental remark of the seer of the Apocalypse, that Jesus’ companions in His warfare with ‘the beast’ are those who not only were called and elected, but whose calling and election had been crowned by their enduring faithfulness (πιστοί, Rev 17:14). We are thus able to appreciate the anxiety of later Christian writers, who emphasized this part of Jesus’ teaching, and who reminded their readers that their entrance into the eternal kingdom of Jesus was conditioned by their enduring zeal; for in this way alone their ‘calling’ and ‘election’ were made stable and lasting and certain (βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλήσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιῆσθαι, 2Pe 1:10, cf. Heb 3:14).

That Jesus held firmly by the Jewish belief in the election of that race to spiritual privilege, is evidenced by many signs both in His teaching and His methods of work. It is true that His words are in perfect harmony with the Baptist’s scornful warning

against that foolish pride of birth which leaves out of sight the responsibility involved by privilege (cf. Mat 3:8 f. and Joh 8:39 f.). At the same time, He is no less ready to assert the claims of His fellow-countrymen to the rights which were theirs as the Divinely chosen people (ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν, Joh 4:22; cf. τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων, Mat 15:26). The sting of His bitter denunciation of contemporary religionists lay in His recognition of their spiritual position, and of the fact that they of right were the teachers of the people (ἐπὶ τῆς Μωσέως καθέδρας, Mat 23:2, cf. Mat 23:13 ff.). In spite of many disappointing experiences, He was again and again amazed at the lack of faith and spiritual insight amongst 'Israelites' (Mat 8:10 = Luk 7:9; Joh 3:10, cf. Mar 6:6), and His pathetic lament over the decaying Jerusalem shows how eagerly He had hoped to make the Jewish nation realize its ancient place as the 'first-begotten' in the family of His Father (Exo 4:22, Jer 31:9, cf. Heb 12:23). His activity in this direction betrays itself both in His words which incidentally express His feelings (ἄφες πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκνα, Mar 7:27, Mat 15:24), and in His deliberate instructions to His disciples to confine their missionary labours 'to the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Mat 10:6). We are, however, bound to remember that St. Matthew alone records this restriction, and that there are some evidences of the abandonment of its strict enforcement even by Jesus Himself (Joh 4:39-42, cf. Act 1:8; Act 8:14 ff.).

Though Jesus felt Himself forced to recognize, in the attitude of the Pharisees and lawyers of His day, the failure of God's people to realize the Divine purpose in them, He also recognizes no less distinctly that, according to that purpose, theirs was a high destiny (... τὴν βουλήν τοῦ θεοῦ ἠθέτησαν εἰς ἑαυτούς, Luk 7:30 [cf. for the use of βουλή in this sense Act 2:23; Act 4:28; Act 20:27, Eph 1:11, Heb 6:17]), and it seems as if at times His realization of what this people might have become, and His keen disappointment at their actual achievement, led Him into speaking disparagingly of those who were outside the Jewish covenant (cf. the contrast ὑμεῖς ... ἡμεῖς Joh 4:23, which is the verbal expression of a contrast running through the whole narrative [see Westcott, *Gospel of St. John*, *ad loc.*]; cf. also the privilege involved in the word πρῶτον as well as the harsh contrast τέκνα [παιδιά] ... κυνάρια, Mar 7:27 f.).

We may here note that St. Matthew has preserved several fragments which deal with the claim of Israel as God's people to be the sole recipients of the gospel message (Mat 10:5 f., Mat 10:23, Mat 15:24, Mat 23:2 f.), though he also records sayings of Jesus which conflict with this (Mat 24:14, Mat 28:19, cf. Mar 13:10; Mar 11:17; Mar 14:9; Mar 16:15, Luk 24:47). Perhaps the most striking instance of these just referred to is that in which Jesus avers, as His reason for the evangelization of Israel

alone, that His ‘coming’ is imminent, and that no time is to be lost, because, in any event, the work will not be completed before that occurrence (... ἕως ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, Mat_10:23). It is evident that whatever may have been the case with regard to Jesus’ actual knowledge of the date of His *parousia*, those who heard His words understood Him to mean that it would take place soon (cf. καὶ τότε, Mar_13:25, Luk_21:27, Mat_24:30; οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη ἕως πάντα γένηται, Luk_21:32, see 1Th_4:15 ff.). Moreover, the Evangelists seem to have established an intimate connexion in the consciousness of early Christianity between His second coming and the preaching of His gospel to ‘the cities of Israel’ (Act_3:26, Rom_1:16; see Edersheim, *Life and Times*, i. 644 ff.; cf. also O. Holtzmann, *Leben Jesu*, English translation pp. 160, 301, etc.). ‘It might, of course, be objected, that the idea of the universality of the judgment leaves no sufficient reason for restricting the disciples’ work to the Jewish people, and that the heathen were perhaps even in more urgent need of the disciples’ preaching than the Jews, since to the latter had been given the Law and the Prophets. The justness of the objection may be granted. But against it we have set the belief in the election of Israel,’ etc. (O. Holtzmann, *op. cit.* p. 279 n. [Note: note.] 1). His own assertion with the limiting words *Εἰ Μὴ* (Mat_15:24) is strongly emphatic as to His conviction with regard to the Divine favour towards Israel. ‘The saying of Jesus to His disciples at the last supper, that they, to whom He committed His kingdom which He had received from His Father, would be beside Him ... sitting on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Luk_22:29 f.), indicates that He viewed the activity of His disciples, and therefore also their future judicial function, as primarily extending to the people of Israel. Also when Jesus spoke of a coming of the heathen from the east and west ... He was thereby thinking of an ingathering ... which, as a whole, consisted of native Israelites’ (Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, English translation ii. 349 f.).

Not only do we find Jesus recognizing and acting upon the OT conception of the national election of Israel—that preferential treatment which His fellow-countrymen claimed as of right—though He reminded them from time to time that in order to a genuine Abrahamic descent it was necessary to cultivate an ethical and spiritual likeness to their great forefather, which would alone complete their title to the promises made to them through him (cf. the implied contrast between physical and spiritual descent in the words σπέρμα and τέκνα, Joh_8:37; Joh_8:39; cf. Luk_3:8 = Mat_3:9). Jesus also Himself, in establishing His Kingdom amongst men, proceeds along lines exactly parallel to these. He assumes to Himself the right to select certain instruments whereby His designs may be furthered and ultimately accomplished. As He was the Chosen and Sent of His Father, so He is delegated to choose and send others, who were to be the few through whom God’s work upon the many was to be

accomplished (cf. Joh 17:18; Joh 20:21; Joh 13:18 etc.). It is true that at times Jesus speaks of His disciples as His Father's choice and possession (σοὶ ἤσαν, Joh 17:6), and that they are His by His Father's gift (μοὶ αὐτοὺς ἔδωκας, Joh 17:6; Joh 17:9; cf. καὶ τὰ ἐμὰ πάντα σὰ ἐστὶν καὶ τὰ σὰ ἐμά, Joh 17:10). At the same time He is no less emphatic in His declarations that they are His own elect, the result of His own discriminating choice (ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, Joh 15:19; cf. ἐγὼ οἶδα τίνας ἐξελεξάμην, Joh 13:18). Our knowledge of Jesus' acquaintance with the characters of His disciples prior to their selection by Him, is too scanty to permit us to judge accurately of His methods; but from the fact that they were for the most part natives of that part of Galilee where His earliest activity displayed itself, and that some of them were antecedently disciples of the Baptist, we are led to conclude that He possessed sufficient individual acquaintanceship to warrant His choice (cf. Mar 1:16 ff., Mat 4:18 ff., Luk 5:10 f.; see Joh 1:40 ff.). He seems, moreover, to have felt a heavy weight of responsibility on their account, and in the review of His work towards the end of His life, He seems to congratulate Himself on being able to render a good account of His stewardship in this respect. As the result of His guardianship (ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ... καὶ ἐφύλαξα, Joh 17:12), they all justified His choice with but one exception, and that exception had its mournful justification (ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ), and, in spite of the necessity of such failure (κατὰ τὸ ὠρισμένον, Luk 22:22; cf. Act 2:23, see also Luk 17:1 = Mat 18:7), its awful warning (οὐαὶ δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκεῖνῳ δι' οὗ, κ.τ.λ., Mar 14:21, Mat 26:24). The work which this chosen nucleus was destined to achieve finds also a definite place in the consciousness of Jesus as He looks out on the world and down the future ages. He does not, in fact, hesitate to name those who are to be brought to share in the glory and in the power of His judgment-coming, though they are scattered in all directions over the world (ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων ἀπ' ἄκρου γῆς ἕως ἄκρου οὐρανοῦ, Mar 13:27 = Mat 24:31), His elect (τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ).

The work wrought by the little band chosen by Christ, and continued by their successors from one generation to another during the period intervening between the initiation of His Kingdom and its consummation, can hardly be better delineated than in the words of the present Bishop of Birmingham: 'The Apostles were the first "elect" in Christ with a little Jewish company. "We,"—so St. Paul speaks of the Jewish Christians,—“we who had before hoped in Christ.” But it was to show the way to all the Gentiles (“ye also, who have heard the word of the truth, the gospel of your salvation”) who were also to constitute “God's own possession” and His “heritage.”

The purpose to be realized is a universal one: it is the reunion of man with man, as such, by being all together reunited to God in one body.... And the Church of the reconciliation is God's elect body to represent a Divine purpose of restoration far wider than itself—extending, in fact, to all creation. It is the Divine purpose, with a view to “a dispensation of the fulness of the times, to sum up” or “bring together again in unity” all things in Christ.... This great and rich idea of the election of the Church as a special body to fulfil a universal purpose of recovery,’ etc. (Gore, *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, p. 71 f.).

Here, then, we have in its incipient stages a revelation of this Divine process of working in its new and wider aspect. There is fundamentally no change of method, but rather a consecration of what has always in the OT been recognized as God's plan of work (cf. e.g. Amo 3:2, Deu 7:6 etc.). In the fresh start, so to speak, which He has made we find His choice not merely involved in the Incarnation as the mode of procedure, but in the election of the Man Jesus (Luk 9:35), whom He deliberately ordained or appointed (ἐν ἀνδρὶ ᾧ ὄρισεν, Act 17:31; cf. Act 10:38) for His work. Jesus, acting on authority delegated to Him, chooses certain men and sends them to carry out what He has commenced. In the end He breaks down all national barriers and limitations (Mat 28:19, cf. Mar 16:15), and people in every nation (ἐν παντὶ ἔθνει, Act 10:35) are accepted by Him so long as they ‘fear God and work righteousness.’

Keeping these facts and considerations in mind, we are at liberty to ask ourselves the very difficult questions, On what basis does the Divine election stand? Is there any antecedent condition in complying with which men are placed amongst the number of God's elect? From whatever point of view we look at this mystery, one thought, at least, clearly emerges: in His choice of Israel as the guardian of the sacred deposit of religious truth, God exhibited His wisdom in a way we, as students of the Divine government of the world, can discern and appreciate. Their genius for the work entrusted to them is universally recognized (cf., on the other hand, such passages as Deu 9:5 f., Deu 10:15, Jer 31:1; Jer 31:3, Mal 1:2 f., which, however, do not conflict with the general truth of our statement, though they emphasize the absolute freedom of God's choice). From them and from them solely have come into the world those truths which spring from a pure and spiritual monotheism; and we are not forbidden to recognize, in the analogous lessons taught to the world by other nations, that ‘the principle of selection’ (ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις, Rom 9:11) finds its place in their history too (see Sanday-Headlam, ‘Romans’ in *Internat. Crit. Com.* pp. 248 ff., 342 ff. etc.). When we remember that to the consciousness of Jesus the full and final revelation of His unique Divine Sonship was only made at His Baptism (Mat 3:17 = Mar 1:11 = Luk 3:22), and confirmed beyond doubt during the period of His Temptation, we are at liberty to believe that His previous life was a gradual preparation for His final election, as well as a proof that in selecting Him for His work

His Father had chosen the fittest Instrument to reveal Himself to mankind. Remembering, too, the gradual gathering together by Jesus of His little band of chosen disciples and followers, and the care taken by Him in training and disciplining them for their position and work, we are able to apprehend in some dim way the necessity of a moral and spiritual correspondence between Him who chooses and His chosen. The fact that Jesus Himself included Judas Iscariot amongst the number of His 'elect' (Joh_6:70) does not invalidate this contention, as we may well be allowed to believe that the unhappy traitor exhibited a character sufficiently endowed with spiritual possibilities to justify his election to the Apostleship. Perhaps he may be adequately described as one of those labourers who, having been hired (μισθώσασθαι ἐργάτας, Mat_20:1) to work in the vineyard, were ultimately rejected because they failed to correspond with their new environment.

We may here note two different uses to which the word 'elect' or its equivalent idea is put in the Gospels. (α) It describes those who are chosen for a certain definite work, and are for this purpose endowed with suitable characteristics, and elected to certain special privileges and spiritual graces (see Mat_24:22; Mat_24:24, Mar_13:20; Mar_13:22). For them endurance and active perseverance to the end alone ensure their final salvation (ἐν τῇ ὑπομονῇ ὑμῶν κτήσεσθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν, Luk_21:19), though they are always to remember that God's active sympathy is ever on their side (18:7). (β) it is also used of those whose salvation is assured by their sharing in the power and glory of the returning Messiah (μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς, Mat_24:31 = Mar_13:26; cf. ὀλιγοὶ ἐκλεκτοὶ, Mat_22:14).

In conclusion, we may be permitted to point out that in acting on 'the principle according to election,' God has for ever vindicated His justice and righteousness by choosing us 'in Christ' (see ἐν Χριστῷ, ἐν αὐτῷ, Eph_1:3 f.). By and in the Incarnation the human race and the separate individuals of the race have received those capacities and endowments which fit them for their work and for their Divinely appointed destiny (ὅς πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι, 1Ti_2:4). No one in the foreordaining counsels of God is contemplated as doomed to eternal exclusion from His presence (μὴ βουλόμενός τις ἀπολέσθαι, 2Pe_3:9), and if they are thus shut out finally (ὅπου ὁ σκόληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ, κ.τ.λ., Mar_9:48), it is because of their own deliberate action in causing their bodies to be servants of unrighteousness, and thus in being stumbling-blocks in the way of the salvation of their fellow-men (cf. Mat_5:28 ff; Mat_18:6 ff., Mar_9:42 ff. etc.). No excuse as to lack of opportunity or privilege will avail; for although inequality will always here as elsewhere exist, none

shall be judged apart from their capacities and opportunities (ἐκάστω κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν δύναμιν, Mat_25:15); and all shall be recompensed according to the knowledge they were able to acquire (Luk_12:47 f.). It is true that apart from Christ (χωρὶς ἐμοῦ, Joh_15:5) we are powerless for good; but as none, not even those who have never heard His name, are outside Him (τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν, Col_1:17; cf. Eph_1:10 f.), so none need be apart from Him in that profounder sense whereby human life becomes Divinely active and abundantly fruitful. To all is given the opportunity of attaining the end to which they are called and chosen.

J. R. Willis.

☩ Eli [Eloi], Eli [Eloi]

ELI [ELOI], ELI [ELOI], etc.—See Seven Words.

☩ Eliakim

ELIAKIM.—Two ancestors of Jesus bore this name, according to Mat_1:13 and Luk_3:30.

☩ Eliezer

ELIEZER.—An ancestor of Jesus, Luk_3:29.

☩ Elijah

ELIJAH (Authorized Version Elias) is mentioned in the Gospels on 9 occasions, reported in 15 passages (rejecting Luk_9:54). Of these passages only one, Luk_4:25 f., alludes to the story of Elijah as it is contained in the OT. Here Jesus justifies His performance of miracles in Capernaum, while refraining from working them in Nazareth, by citing the well-known story of Elijah's going away from Israel in time of famine to relieve the distress of a Sidonian widow (1Ki_17:8-9). All the other passages

refer to the present or future work of an Elijah who, according to common Jewish belief, still lived and would appear again upon earth.

The dominant note in the belief is that the prophet was to appear as the forerunner of the Messiah. This notion appears in its simplest form in the accounts of the avowal of the Messiahship of Jesus at Caesarea Philippi (Mat 16:13 ff., Mar 8:27 ff., Luk 9:18 ff.). The answers then given by the disciples to Jesus' question as to the popular estimate of Himself were varied, and doubtless representative: He was John the Baptist, Elijah, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets (cf. Mar 6:15, Luk 9:8). Only one, Simon, saw in the work of Jesus the consummation, rather than the postponement, of their Messianic hope. The period of Elijah the forerunner is past, and the Messiah is here.

The relation between the prophet Elijah, the lawgiver Moses, and the Messiah Jesus, is dramatically presented in the narrative of the Transfiguration (Matthew 17, Mar 9:2 ff., Luk 9:28 ff.). Here, too, the logical proof is presented that Elijah has come already, and is John the Baptist. When once Jesus has been accepted as the Messiah, the work of John cannot fail to be known as the great preparatory work of Elijah. This work finds expression in St. Matthew's report of Jesus' characterization of John (Joh 11:14; omitted from the parallel in Lk.).

The Baptist's denial that he was Elijah (Joh 1:21 ff.) is the natural expression of his lofty idea of the work of preparation for the Messiah contrasted with the insufficiency of the work he had actually been able to perform. The passage incidentally describes one of the functions of Elijah who was to come, viz., that he should baptize. Baptism was then one of the preliminaries of the salvation which the Messiah was to bring.

Elijah is mentioned again in connexion with the Crucifixion (Mat 27:46-49, Mar 15:34-36). The bystanders professedly misunderstood Jesus' cry, 'Eli, Eli,' as a call to Elijah. They proposed to wait and see if he would come down to help Him. Bearing in mind that Elijah is the forerunner of the Messiah, their curiosity seems not simply whether Jesus would have supernatural relief, as a man might, but whether Elijah would, by coming to His aid, prove that Jesus was after all the Messiah.

There remains the striking picture of the Baptist in the character of Elijah, drawn in Luk 1:19 ff. The passage clearly assumes the developed doctrine of the Messiahship of Jesus, and the career of John the Baptist is analyzed from this point of view. The high spiritual plane of the identification is obvious. John comes in the spirit and power of the great prophet, reconciling families, reducing the disobedient to obedience, preparing Israel for the coming of the Messiah. Only on this high plane could the identification be successful. The *work* of the forerunner here finds fullest expression. He not simply proclaims, he prepares. This is, however, the implication of the other

passages; otherwise the suggested identification of Jesus with Elijah would not have been possible, for it was the very works of Jesus that called out the suggestion. The same is true in the case of John.

The belief in the reappearance of Elijah, held by the Jews of NT times, is a later stage of the belief which is expressed in Mal_4:5 [English]: he would come before the great day of Jehovah to reconcile the hearts of parents and children. Sir_48:10 ff. describes the same work more elaborately, and forms an early interpretation of the passage in Malachi.

The Rabbinical writings abound in expressions of the same belief, with characteristic extravagances and specifications. These Jewish traditions know Elijah as zealous in the service of God, and as a helper in distress, as well as the forerunner of the Messiah. Naturally his work is in behalf of their own people, and is performed in connexion with their own institutions.

As the Jews elaborated the earlier doctrine of the Messiah, and as in their thought He became more and more exalted in holiness and majesty, the impossibility of His appearance in the midst of all the sin and shame of Israel was increasingly felt; and the character of Elijah, the holy prophet, zealous in his earthly life for the political and religious integrity of the nation, and already enshrined in tradition as having been spared death, was a fitting one to be chosen to carry on the great work of preparing Israel for the blessings of the Messianic era. Indeed, in some passages the doctrine of Elijah has developed to such an extent as well nigh to usurp the functions of the Messiah.

Literature.—Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie*, 192 and *passim*; *Jewish Encyc.* s.v.; Gfrörer, *Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 227 f.; Bacher, *Agade d. Tannaiten*, *passim*; Weber, *Altsyn. pal. Theol.* 337-339; Schurer, *GJV* [Note: JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ii. 524 f.

O. H. Gates.

☩ Elisabeth

ELISABETH.—The NT notice of Elisabeth is confined to the Third Gospel, and its brief record concerning her may well be due to St. Luke's acquaintance with Mary the mother of our Lord. It is interesting to know that she was a kinswoman (συγγενίς, Luk_1:36) of Mary, though it is unfortunately impossible to verify the exact

relationship that existed between them. Elisabeth is described, with her husband Zacharias (wh. see), as a faithful adherent of the OT type of religion—strict and regular in observance of the Law (Luk_1:6). She enjoyed the double distinction, according to Jewish thought, of being both a priest's daughter and a priest's wife (Luk_1:5). The joy of such a twofold honour was, however, diminished by the fact that she was barren (Luk_1:7), to an Oriental woman little less than a calamity. But a single event in the Gospel narrative at once dispelled her sorrow and entitled her to a place of honour not among Jewish women alone, but in the eyes of the whole world. In her old age (Luk_1:38) she became the mother of John the Baptist.

Between the promise and the birth of this child she was visited by Mary (Luk_1:39), who remained with her for a period of three months (Luk_1:56), and to whom she was made a proof of the Almighty's power (Luk_1:36-38). On Mary's appearance she received a special inspiration of the Holy Spirit, which even enabled her to recognize in her kinswoman the mother of her 'Lord' (Luk_1:41 ff.), and in Mary's Child a fulfilment of the promise of Jehovah Himself (Luk_1:45). Herein she unconsciously illustrated the meaning of her own name, which in its Hebrew form signifies 'God is an oath.'

On the theory (upheld by Burkitt, Harnack, *et al.*) that the *Magnificat* ought to be attributed to Elisabeth and not to Mary, see artt. Birth of Christ, p. 203^b note, and *Magnificat*.

H. Bisseker.

☩ Elisha

ELISHA (Authorized Version Eliseus).—The famous disciple, companion, and successor of Elijah. In NT he is only once referred to, viz. in Luk_4:27. Jesus, preaching in the synagogue at Nazareth, reminds His fellow-townsmen, who were unwilling to receive His teaching because He was one of themselves, that Elisha, who was an Israelite, healed but one leper, and he was a Syrian. He leaves them to draw the obvious inference as to the probable consequence of their rejection of Him. It is clear, however, that in this warning our Lord was looking far beyond Nazareth, and that He had in view the casting away of the Jews through unbelief, and the call of the Gentiles.

J. Cromarty Smith.

⚡ Eliud

ELIUD.—An ancestor of Jesus, Mat_1:14 f.

⚡ Elmadam

ELMADAM (Authorized Version **Elmodam**).—An ancestor of Jesus, Luk_3:28; perh. = Heb. *Almodad* (cf. Gen_10:26).

⚡ Emmanuel

EMMANUEL.—See Immanuel.

⚡ Emmaus

EMMAUS (Ἐμμαούς).—The question of Emmaus would seem at first sight to be simple, and the identification of this place easy. Indeed, Emmaus not being mentioned more than once in the Gospels, there are no different texts to be harmonized. We read in Luk_24:13 that Emmaus was a village 60 furlongs from Jerusalem, and that after having arrived there at the close of the day, and having sat with Jesus at a meal, the two disciples were able to return the same evening to Jerusalem and there find the Apostles still assembled together. The only parallel passage in Mk. (Mar_16:12), part of the unauthentic close of the Second Gospel, does not mention the name of the locality, and speaks only of an appearance to two disciples ‘as they walked on their way into the country’ (δυσὶν ... περιπατοῦσιν ... πορευομένοις εἰς ἀγρόν). On the other hand, Josephus says (*BJ* vii. vi. 6) that Vespasian established a colony of 800 Roman veterans on the lands which he gave them at a distance of 60 (*v.l.* 30) furlongs from Jerusalem, at a place called Emmaus. Now, there still actually exists to the west of Jerusalem, on the road which leads to Jaffa, a place named *Kolonieh*. It is true that the distance is less than 60 furlongs: authors estimate it sometimes at 45, but more frequently at only 35, furlongs. It might be held, however, that the territory of the colony extended over an area of several miles, and that it might, according to circumstances, be thus considered as being distant either 30 or 60 furlongs from the capital. Under these conditions nothing would seem to oppose our placing, on the

grounds indicated above, the Emmaus of St. Luke, identified with that of Josephus, at *Kolonieh*.

It must, however, be remarked that the different reading noted in the passage from Josephus (60 or 30) creates some uncertainty. It must also be noted that, according to some authors, the name *Kolonieh* is not to be explained by the Latin *colonia* at all, but by the name *Kulon* (Κουλόν), mentioned in Jos_15:59 (LXX Septuagint) as that of a town of Judah situated in the hill country. These difficulties, however, would not be altogether insurmountable if they were the only ones; a further and graver complication arises from the following facts.

In 1 Mac. an Emmaus is spoken of more than once as the scene of various occurrences: Judas Maccabaeus vanquished Gorgias there in b.c. 166-167 (1Ma_3:40; 1Ma_3:57; 1Ma_4:3-25; cf. Josephus *Ant.* xii. vii. 4); and in b.c. 160 Bacchides fortified it and placed a garrison in it (1Ma_9:50 f.; cf. Josephus *Ant.* xiii. i. 3). The position of this place is easy to determine; it must have been situated between Jerusalem and Jaffa, nearer the latter, at the spot where the slopes of the mountainous region descend towards the great maritime plain. In this quarter, indeed, is found a site which has left important ruins, and which is mentioned several times in the course of the first centuries of the Christian era under the name Emmaus. From the 3rd cent. onwards it was called Nicopolis, without the remembrance of the ancient Semitic name being lost; and, as is the case with most of those places with two names, under the Arab domination it resumed its earlier name and was called 'Amwâs, the appellation it still bears. Now, from the earliest times of ecclesiastical history, the opinion gained ground that this Emmaus-Nicopolis was the Emmaus of St. Luke. Eusebius, no doubt reflecting the views of Origen, and after him Jerome, maintained this identity (*OS*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 257. 21, 121. 6); and after them this view of the case held sway for a long time in the Church. If it is asked how this conclusion could be formed, seeing that Emmaus-Nicopolis is situated at a distance from Jerusalem which is estimated (according to the particular route adopted) at 180, 175, 170, or 166 furlongs, almost thrice the 60 furlongs mentioned above, the reply is promptly given: ✠ and some other MS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] read '160' instead of '60.' The tendency to identify Emmaus-Nicopolis and the Emmaus of St. Luke became so strong, so irresistible, that it led to a curious result: in the Middle Ages, at the time of the Crusaders and afterwards, the memory of Emmaus-Nicopolis having been lost, the Emmaus of St. Luke was looked for nearer Jerusalem, and when it was believed that it had been found, not only the name of Emmaus, but also that of Nicopolis, was given to it.

From the 13th cent. (1280) or perhaps from the last years of the 11th (1099, see *ZDPV* [Note: *DPV Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.*] xvi. p. 300), a tradition arose which for more clearness may be called the Franciscan tradition, and which places the Emmaus of St. Luke at *el-Kubeibeh*, to the N.W. of *Kolonieh*, at some distance to the north of the road from Jerusalem to Jaffa, and about 60 (more exactly 62-64) furlongs from the capital. Still, indeed, all the efforts of the champions of the Franciscan theory are directed towards establishing that the Emmaus of the Evangelist is *el-Kubeibeh*. Interesting ruins have been discovered there: those of a church dating from the time of the Crusades, and in the interior of its *eneinte* the remains of a more ancient structure, which might be those of a Byzantine church, but which the defenders of the Franciscan tradition consider to be the very house of Cleopas, around which the sanctuary had been built.

The first question to clear up is that of the text. Now several authors, and in particular P. Lagrange (*Rev. Bibl.* 1896, pp. 87-92), have, in the opinion of the present writer, shown irrefutably that the original reading must have been '60 furlongs,' and that '160' is a correction meant to enable the Emmaus of St. Luke to be identified with that of 1 Maccabees. 'The 160 furlongs,' Lagrange concludes admirably (p. 89), 'represent neither the ancient tradition, nor the universal tradition, nor the unconscious tradition. This reading is a critical one, imposed by the authority of a master, very probably Origen, and collides almost everywhere with the firmly assured tradition of the Churches. To judge from the manuscripts, the question is settled: we must read "60 furlongs." '

We must remark, further, that Emmaus-Nicopolis was a town before the Christian era and long beyond (πόλις, Josephus *BJ* ii. xx. 4), whereas the Evangelist speaks of a village (κώμη). Even after Emmaus-Nicopolis had been destroyed by the Roman soldiers of Varus (a.d. 4), it was not on that account a village; a ruined town is not a village. It was even the chief town of a toparchy (Josephus *BJ* iii. iii. 5; Plin. *HN* v. 14). The remains of a church have been found there, which date not merely from the Crusades, but very probably from the Byzantine epoch; it is in vain that a recent author (Barnabé), who favours *el-Kubeibeh*, has tried to prove that this church was really nothing but a hot-baths establishment. But it is also vain to seek to infer from the presence of a church, even an ancient one, that we have to do with the Emmaus of St. Luke.

Another very strong argument against Emmaus-Nicopolis is its excessive distance. It is worth noting what efforts its partisans make to show that the two disciples could have returned the same evening to Jerusalem, walking for this purpose five or six hours. One of the most convinced defenders of this theory, Schiffers, does not hesitate to affirm that they could have set out again from Emmaus as early as 3 o'clock in the

afternoon and arrived at Jerusalem at 9 o'clock (*Rev. Bibl.* 1894, pp. 26-40; see also his book *Amwâs, das Emmaus des heil. Lukas*, 1890). In that case it must be held that the words 'it is toward evening, and the day is now far spent' (Luk 24:29), may have been spoken immediately after noon.

The failure of the identification of Emmaus-Nicopolis with the Emmaus of St. Luke proves nothing in favour of *el-Kubeibeh*, which can produce only a late tradition in its favour. The argument which it has been sought to draw from the name *el-Kubeibeh* as an alleged corruption of Nicopolis (!) refutes itself. But the probabilities indicated at the opening of this article in favour of *Kolonieh* are greatly weakened by the undisputed fact that the ecclesiastical tradition of the first centuries pronounces in favour of 'Amwâs-Nicopolis; this fact proves that all recollection of an Emmaus situated nearer to Jerusalem had become effaced in the 3rd century. Under these circumstances the most elementary duty is to declare the problem unsolved, and incapable of solution under the present conditions and with the data which we possess.

Nor does the etymology of the name furnish any precise indication. We do not know to what Hebrew or Aramaic term *Emmaus* [we find also the forms *Ammaus, Ammaum, Emmaum*; Ἀμμαούς, Ἀμμαούμ, Ἐμμαούμ] corresponds. A vain attempt has been made to connect it with the root *hamam*, and to prove thereby that baths existed at this spot. An argument in favour of this has been based on the fact that the baths situated near Tiberias were called by the same name (cf. Jos 19:35 Hammath), but it is now known that the correct reading is *Ammathus* (Ἀμμαθούς; cf. *ZDPV* [Note: *DPV Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.*] xiii. pp. 194-198). It is on the frail basis of this hypothetical derivation that Mrs. Finn grounds her theory that Emmaus = *Urtas*, to the south of Bethlehem, near Solomon's Pools, 60 furlongs from Jerusalem (see *PEFSt* [Note: *EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.*] , 1883, pp. 53-64). It is by an equally dubious etymological process that Colonel Conder has been led to seek for Emmaus in *Khamasa*, to the S.W. of Jerusalem, at a distance, moreover, not of 60, but of 80-90 furlongs. We may also note the attempt to place the Emmaus of St. Luke at *Abu-Ghosh* (Kirieth-el-'Enâb). From the point of view of distance this would be sufficiently exact, but there is nothing to lead us to conclude in favour of this particular spot rather than any other within the same circuit.

Lastly, we recall the fact that the Talmud speaks of *Kolonieh* as being also called *Mosa* or *ham-Mosa*, a name which we may connect with the מוֹסָה of Jos 18:26 (LXX Septuagint : ἈΜΩΣᾶ, but also ἈΜΩΚῆ). Near *Kolonieh* there exists to-day a place called *Beit-Mizzeh*, which recalls *Mosa*.

Literature.—*PEFst* [Note: EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.] , 1874, pp. 149, 160, 162-164, 1876, pp. 172-175, 1879, pp. 105-107, 1881, pp. 46, 237 f., 274, 1882, pp. 24-37, 1883, pp. 53-64, 1884, pp. 83-85, 1885, pp. 116-121, 1886, p. 17, 1901, pp. 165-167, 210; *PEF* [Note: EF Palestine Exploration Fund.] *Memoirs*, iii. 36-42, 130 f.; *ZDPV* [Note: DPV Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.] xiii. 194-198. xvi. 298-300, xix. 222, xxv. 195-203; *MNDPV* [Note: NDPV Mittheilungen n. Nachrichten d. deutschen Pal. Vereins.] , 1901, 14 f.; *Rev. Bibl.* 1892, pp. 80-99, 101-105, 645-649, 1893, pp. 26-40, 223-227, 1894, p. 137, 1896, pp. 87-92, 1903, pp. 457-467, 571-599; Reland, *Pal.* 427, 758; Robinson, *BRP* [Note: RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.] iii. 146-151, 158; Tobler, *Top. von Jerusalem*, ii. 538-545, 752 f.; Schwarz, *Das heil. Land*, 98; Guérin, *Judée*, i. 257-262, 293-308, 348-361; Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, i. 116, 123 ff., 132, ii. 59; Sepp, *Jerusalem und das heil. Land*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , i. 54 ff., *Neue Entdeckungen*, ii. 228-253, 260-263; G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [Note: GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.] , 214; Buhl, *GAP* [Note: AP Geographic des alten Palästina.] 186; Conder, *Tent Work*, 8, 13, 140; Furrer, *Wanderungen*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 161-169; Le Camus, *Pays Bibliques*, i. 185-194, 204-207; Sanday, *Sacred Sites*, 29-31, 92; Zschokke, *Das neutest. Emmaus*, 1865; Guillemot, *Emmaus-Nieopolis*, 1886; Buselli, *L'Emmaus evangelico*, 1885-1886; Domenichelli, *L'Emmaus della Palestina*, 1889, *Ultime discussioni*, 1898; Schiffers, *Amwas, das Emmaus des heil. Lukas*, 1890; Rückert, 'Amwas, was es ist und was es nicht ist' in *Theol. Qschrift*, 1892; Barnabé, *Deux questions d'archéologie palestinienne*, 1892; A. Duc, *Die Emmaus-Frage*, 1905; Merx, *Die Evv. des Markus und Lukas*, 1905, p. 523 f.; see also the Bible Dictionaries, s.v.; the Comm. on St. Luke, *ad loc.*, and the Lives of Christ.

Lucien Gautier.

☞ Endurance

ENDURANCE.—The active qualities of perseverance and persistence, never absent from the biblical notion of endurance, form, in effect, the substance of the art. Activity, and need not be considered here. The passive aspect suggests an inquiry as to—

1. The *causes* of those trials which Christ had to endure.—Of (a) *supernatural* causes (1) the first, an all-inclusive cause, was the Divine will ([Joh_10:18](#)), recorded beforehand in OT Scriptures ([Mat_26:54](#), [Mar_14:21](#), [Luk_22:37](#); [Luk_24:25](#) f.), and

referred to constantly by Christ in words of resignation (Mat 26:42, Luk 10:21), often under the figure of a 'cup' (Mat 20:22; Mat 26:39, Joh 18:11). (2) A second supernatural cause (under Divine permission) appears in the agency of Satan, acting both directly, in temptation and opposition (Mat 4:3 ff; Mat 13:39, Luk 10:18), and also oftener indirectly, through the weakness (Mat 16:23, Luk 22:31) and wickedness (Luk 22:3; Luk 22:53, Joh 6:70; Joh 8:44; Joh 13:2) of men. These two causes, whether expressly referred to or not, are undoubtedly to be regarded as factors never absent (see Joh 19:11 and also Joh 12:31, Joh 14:30, Joh 16:11, where the title 'prince of this world' is significant in this connexion).

(b) *Internal* causes (supernatural also, in a different sense) were not wanting. (1) The prophetic mission of Christ (Joh 12:46; Joh 18:37) made suffering and death morally inevitable at the hand of man (Luk 4:24; Luk 11:49 f., 13:33f., Joh 7:7), light and darkness being essentially opposed (Joh 3:19 f.; cf., for illustration, a remarkable passage in Plato, *Rep.* vii. 517 B, where a similar inevitability is declared even in the case of Socrates). (2) The revelation of His Divine nature, implied in His relationship to the Father's Being (Joh 5:18; Joh 8:58; Joh 10:30 ff.) and prerogatives (Mat 9:2, Luk 7:48 f.) was bound to provoke deadly hostility in unbelieving Jews (Mat 26:65, Joh 19:7). It is at the same time clear, from Christ's anxiety to avoid publicity (Mat 12:16, Mar 7:36; Mar 8:26 etc.) and needless offence (Mat 17:27), that persecution and death were not courted by Him.

(c) The *external* causes were more complex. (1) Many trials arose from the imperfections of His disciples; their dulness (Mar 8:15 ff; Mar 9:32, Luk 24:25), spiritual powerlessness (Mat 17:16 f.), false zeal (Mat 15:23; Mat 16:23, Mar 9:38, Luk 9:54), mistaken aims (Mar 9:5; Mar 10:35 ff., Luk 22:24), and discreditable falls (Mat 26:56, Mar 14:66 ff., Luk 22:47 f.). But (2) most arose from Christ's rejection by 'His own' (Joh 1:11, Mat 23:37, Mar 12:6 ff., Joh 5:43; Joh 19:15) from motives (which He well perceived, Mat 9:4; Mat 12:25, Mar 9:33 f., Luk 6:8, Joh 2:25) of fear (Mat 8:34, Joh 12:42 f., Joh 19:12), policy (Joh 11:49 f., Mar 15:15), gain (Mat 26:14 f., Mar 10:22, Luk 16:14), envy (Mat 21:38; Mat 27:18, Joh 12:10), and hate (Luk 19:14, Joh 7:7; Joh 15:18; Joh 15:24); a rejection characterized in its display by indifference (Luk 14:18 ff.), ingratitude (Luk 17:17 f., Joh 5:15), contradiction (Joh 8:13), insult (Mat 10:25; Mat 12:24, Mar 15:32, Luk 7:34; Luk 22:63; Luk 23:11, Joh 8:48; Joh 9:24), treachery (Luk 11:53; Luk 20:20; Luk 22:48), injustice (Mar 14:55 f., Joh 19:4; Joh 19:10; Joh 19:18), violence (Luk 4:28 f., Joh 8:59; Joh 10:31), brutality (Luk 22:64, Joh 19:1-3 etc.), and death (Joh 19:18).

2. Some *features* of Christ's endurance are vitally connected with fundamental doctrines of His person and work. (1) It was *voluntary*. Of this the emphatic statement in Joh 10:17 f. leaves no doubt. Such an utterance may be hard to parallel, but

prudence would almost make it so; and the expressions used in Luk 9:31, Joh 7:33 f., Joh 8:21, Joh 13:31 seem to speak of a course equally spontaneous; indeed, in one case (Joh 8:22) a voluntary (*i.e.* a suicide's) death is actually suggested as their meaning! (2) It was *perfect*. (a) Under suffering: for His spirit, words, and demeanour were admittedly supreme examples of His own teaching, *e.g.* upon submission (Joh 18:22 f., Mat 5:39), retaliation (Luk 6:35; Luk 22:51), and love to enemies (Mat 5:44 f., Luk 23:34). (b) Under temptation: otherwise it would be inexplicable that Christ should have urged repentance as a first essential for others (Mat 4:17; Mat 11:20 f, Mat 21:38 ff., Luk 5:32; Luk 13:3; Luk 13:15, etc.), whereas He afforded no example of it in His own case. On the contrary, He laid claim to sinlessness both negatively (Joh 14:30) and positively (Joh 8:29), as unchallengeable (Joh 8:46). An intuitive perception of His sinlessness appears in the self-abasing awe of a few good men (Mat 3:14, Luk 5:8) more convincingly than in the ambiguous testimony of many other observers (Mat 27:3; Mat 27:19, Luk 23:47, Joh 19:4 etc.). (3) It was *human*. Christ's capability of human suffering is beyond question. No mention, indeed, is made of sickness in the ordinary sense; perhaps it is excluded; but all other bodily needs and infirmities were shared by Him (Mat 4:2; Mat 8:20; Mat 8:24; Mat 21:18, Joh 4:6 f., Joh 19:28). The emotions of His mind (Mar 3:5; Mar 7:34; Mar 10:14, Luk 19:41, Joh 11:35) and spirit (Luk 10:21, Joh 11:33; Joh 13:21) were evident from their outward traces, as well as from His own statements (Mat 15:32, Luk 22:15, Joh 11:15). On two occasions He referred to those of His soul (Joh 12:27, Mar 14:34). That this capability of suffering was not counteracted by the exercise of miraculous power is proved by His reference to His 'temptations' (Luk 22:28), by His prediction of sufferings on the part of His disciples similar generally to His own (Mar 10:38 f.), by the shrinking of His human will (Mat 26:39; Mat 26:42, Luk 12:50, Joh 12:27), by His refusal to allay His own hunger miraculously (Mat 4:3 f.), or to lessen His torments even by ordinary means (Mar 15:23), by His craving for the support of human sympathy (Mar 14:33 ff.), and by His reliance above all else upon the Father's presence (Joh 8:29; Joh 16:32) and the spiritual support of prayer (Luk 6:12; Luk 9:18; Luk 9:28; Luk 11:1; Luk 22:41 etc.). As man He met temptation (Mat 4:4), and overcame by faith (see Joh 11:41 f., Mat 27:43, and also the important expression 'my God,' Mat 27:46, Joh 20:17).

In some respects, however, His endurance differed essentially from that of believers. (1) It was free from the inherent tendencies of a sinful nature (Joh 14:30) and from the enslaving influence of sins committed (Joh 8:34-36). (2) It contained the additional elements of prescience and perfect consciousness. Predictions of suffering are numerous and detailed (Mat 17:22 f., Mat 20:18 f., Mat 26:2, Mar 14:18; Mar 14:30, Luk 9:22; Luk 9:44; Luk 12:50; Luk 13:33; Luk 17:25; Luk 22:37 etc.). The knowledge (Joh 18:4) whereby He 'saw' and 'tasted' death (Joh 8:51 f., Joh 10:12) was complete. (3) Above all, the relation between the Passion of Christ and the sin of the world (Joh 1:29), symbolized by the supernatural darkness, laid on

Him that infinite woe, almost amounting to despair (Mar_15:33 f.), the prospect of which was undoubtedly the main factor in the Agony and other forebodings.

3. There remain to be considered the *purposes* for the attainment of which Christ's endurance was a necessity (Luk_24:26). In the trials and temptations of (*a*) *His life*, two such purposes are prominently visible: (1) the fulfilment of all righteousness (Mat_3:15; Mat_5:17), described as a progressive course through service and suffering (Luk_22:27 f., Joh_13:14; Joh_19:30), in which Christ met continually the Father's approval (Luk_2:40; Luk_2:52, Mat_3:17; Mat_17:5, Joh_12:28), being declared to be the 'Son of God' ideally as well as actually. (2) The acquirement of sympathy; through experimental acquaintance with the weakness of the flesh (Joh_1:14, Mat_26:41). Numerous instances might be given of the sympathy of Christ with human nature in its aspirations (Mar_10:21; Mar_10:38 ff., Joh_21:17), weakness (Mat_12:15 ff.), weariness (Mat_11:28, Mar_6:31), misery (Mat_8:3), and shame (Mat_11:19, Luk_15:1 f.). To Him, therefore, as 'Son of Man,' ideally as well as actually, is given authority to exercise pardon (Mar_2:10), legislation (Mar_2:28), and judgment (Joh_5:27). Lastly, the great purpose which involved the endurance of (*b*) *His death* is in the main so clear as to leave no room for doubt. It may be summed up in the words 'forgiveness' (Mat_26:28), 'redemption' (Mar_10:45), and 'removal of sin' (Joh_1:29); to which, in Joh_11:50 ff., is added the gathering of all the children of God into one in Christ (cf. Joh_17:21 ff.), benefits potentially world-wide (Joh_1:29; Joh_6:51), but limited, in their highest realization, to believers (Joh_3:16 ff.). It need be no cause of surprise that these purposes are not more frequently enlarged upon in the Gospels, for they were incomprehensible to the disciples (and are remarked as such, Mat_16:22, Luk_9:45; Luk_18:34, Joh_13:7) until after the Crucifixion had taken place.

4. It may be added that Christ warned *His disciples* in all ages to expect trials comparable in some measure to His own (Mat_5:11 f., Mat_10:24 f., Joh_15:17 ff.), and accompanied in many cases by decline and apostasy (Mat_24:12; Mat_24:48 ff.). Hence He marked endurance as a continual test of genuineness (Luk_8:13; Luk_8:15) and an indispensable requisite for final salvation (Mat_24:13). At the same time He declared a complementary truth, namely, the Divine preservation of His 'own sheep' (Joh_10:28 f, Joh_17:12, Joh_18:9, Mar_13:22), a privilege commonly described as the 'perseverance of the elect.' However stated, the antithesis of these two truths is plain. The assurance in Joh_10:28 f. is largely parallel to that in Mat_16:18, except that the latter, the indestructibility of the Church, is more clearly collective in form. There are 'branches' (so it appears, Joh_15:2) even 'in Christ' that the Father takes away; moreover, the remarkable use of the imperative in Joh_15:4 suggests an element of conditionality in the abiding or perseverance referred to. The practical inference is intended to lie in a direction quite the opposite of false security and presumption (Mat_7:22 f., Luk_13:24 ff; Luk_21:34 ff; Luk_22:32 ff.). 'Perseverance is

undoubtedly the privilege of the elect, but there is no infallible sign of the elect except their perseverance' (Vaughan on Php_1:6).

F. S. Ranken.

☩ Enemies

ENEMIES (ἐχθρός).—1. Of public enemies: twice in the *Benedictus*, Luk_1:71; Luk_1:74, where the word implies Gentile persecutors. In Luk_19:43 it is spoken of the Romans and their threatened siege of Jerusalem. In the quotation from Psa_110:1 which occurs in Mat_22:44, Mar_12:38, Luk_20:43, Heb_1:13; Heb_10:13, the same word denotes all the world forces opposing Christ. 2. Of private enemies, in the correction of the old maxim enjoining hatred, 'Love your enemies,' Mat_5:43-44, Luk_6:27; Luk_6:35. 3. Of the devil and the powers of evil, in the parable of the Wheat and the Tares, Mat_13:25; Mat_13:39. 4. Of the spiritual forces acting in opposition to Christ, of which the strongest is death, 1Co_15:25-26. 5. Of wicked persons hindering the spread of Christ's influence, the enemies of the cross, Php_3:18. The word used in NT for enemies is usually applied elsewhere to private or personal enemies, not to public foes. See, further, artt. Forgiveness, Hatred, Love.

C. H. Prichard.

☩ Energy

ENERGY—The Gr. ἐνέργεια (translation 'working') is used only of supernatural spiritual working, and only in the Epistles; in Eph. and Col. of God, in Php_3:21 of the exalted Christ, in 2Th_2:9 of Satan. In Eph_1:19 we find in one sentence four terms expressive of power—ἐνέργεια, κράτος, ἰσχὺς, and δύναμις. These Divine qualities were exercised in the resurrection and exaltation of Christ, and the Christian soldier is exhorted (Eph_6:10) to obtain a portion of them in equipment for his spiritual warfare. Of these terms the chief is δύναμις, 'power,' of which the application is manifold. On three occasions (Luk_5:17; Luk_6:19; Luk_8:46 or Mar_5:30) it is specially used of a healing power (Authorized Version 'virtue') that issued or was drawn from Jesus as from a storehouse of spiritual energy. See artt. Force, Power, and Virtue.

1. 'Energy' in the physical sense means power or capacity of work. It includes the active and the potential side, force of motion and energy of position: two interchanging factors of which the sum total is constant. In its moral application there is a similar duality. The man of energy is not only an active agent, but also one in whom we recognize a reserve of power. This energy of character is partly physical, partly mental. It is altogether different from the purely physical quality of strength or might (κράτος, ισχύς), the virtue of the warrior or athlete. A physical basis is necessary, yet dauntless energy may be found in a feeble frame. The quality is essentially moral, because it involves the constant exercise of a powerful will. The fundamental requirement is unhindered mental force. Two modern statesmen may be instanced. One wrote in his diary the cardinal principles of his life—benevolence, self-sacrifice, purity, energy. Another expounds and exhibits the 'strenuous life.' The duty of work and the heroism of energy constitute a large part of the teaching of Carlyle. Such lessons and lives are illustrations of the spirit of Christianity. On the other hand, indolence and idleness are natural to many men and even to many nations. The habit of inactivity is fostered by mental indifference or the lack of any propelling emotion such as religion or patriotism. The duty and honour of work are Christian conceptions. In 2Th 3:8-11 we have an early indication of a long struggle, in the course of which sloth was enthroned as one of the seven mortal sins. (Cf. Paget, *Spirit of Discipline*, pp. 1-50).

2. The life of our Lord Himself furnishes the supreme type of Christian energy. Energy is measured by the amount of work it can accomplish within a given time. The ministry of Jesus was limited to a very brief period, but into that little space there was crowded a work that has no parallel in the history of the world. Energy is also measured by the vastness and continuance of its effects, and after nineteen centuries the quickening influence of Jesus is operating on the world with undiminished power. Jesus was never idle. For Him every hour had its appointed task (Joh 2:4), and every day was governed by a steady and strenuous purpose (Joh 9:4). He was sometimes weary in His toils (Mat 8:24, Joh 4:6), yet was ever ready to 'meet fresh calls upon His time and strength, His pity or His help. The reason was that the springs of His energy never ran dry. It is right to say that the secret of Christ's energy lay in His Divinely unconquerable will, but it is none the less true that the strength of His spirit was fed by His love to man and His faith in God. His boundless love and compassion for human beings inspired Him to go about doing good. His perfect faith in God enabled Him to feel, as no other on earth has ever felt, that nothing was impossible (Mat 17:20). But beneath all conscious faith and love there sprang up in the soul of Jesus a fountain of life and power through His abiding union with His Father. 'My Father worketh hitherto,' He once said, 'and I work' (Joh 5:17). 'He went about doing good,' St. Peter declared, 'for God was with him (Act 10:38).

3. The teaching of Jesus on this subject may be divided into two parts. (1) He enjoins many qualities that contribute to the life of strenuousness. Such are diligence (parables of Talents and Pounds, Matthew 25, Luke 19), readiness (Luk_12:35), use of opportunities (Joh_9:4), watchfulness (Mar_13:33), perseverance and importunity of prayer (Luk_11:5; Luk_18:1), constancy and continuance of service (Luk_12:42; Luk_17:10). Such precepts receive double force from the example of His life of unresting labour (Joh_5:17; Joh_9:4). In St. Paul the same lessons are illustrated and inculcated (1Co_15:10; 1Co_15:58).—(2) Faith is set forth as the supreme source of active energy. Faith receives healing; it can also bestow healing. Before its presence both bodily and mental diseases disappear. Sayings of Jesus to this effect are remembered as maxims and metaphors. ‘All things are possible to him that believeth’ (Mar_9:23; Mar_11:24). By faith mountains disappear and trees may be uprooted (Mar_11:23, Luk_17:6). Such sayings passed into ordinary speech (1Co_13:2), and the life of achievement was regarded as illustrative of the power of faith (Hebrews 11). The fact that men of faith are the possessors of boundless energy is indeed writ large in the history of the world. But the living faith enjoined by Jesus and practised in the planting of Christianity procured an immediate possession of surprising power. Exorcists and magicians were abashed; and demonic possession, still a plague of the East, disappeared before the advancing standards of the new faith. This spiritual energy depended on immediate communication with God. The last words attributed to Christ are these: ‘Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you’ (Act_1:8).

R. Scott.

☛ Enoch

ENOCH.—There is no mention of the patriarch Enoch in the Gospels except as a link in our Lord’s genealogy, Luk_3:37.

☛ Enos

ENOS.—An ancestor of Jesus, Luk_3:38.

☛ Enrolment

ENROLMENT.—See Census and Quirinius.

Enthusiasm

ENTHUSIASM.—*Enthusiasm* means etymologically a Divinely inspired interest or zeal (Gr. ἐνθουσαίω, to be inspired by a god, from ἐν ‘in,’ and θεός ‘god’); and therefore affords an appropriate modern rendering for the phrase πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ‘Holy Spirit,’ in the NT (Luk 1:5; Luk 1:35; Luk 1:41; Luk 1:67; Luk 4:1, Act 2:4; Act 4:8; Act 4:31; Act 6:3; Act 6:5; Act 7:55; Act 9:17; Act 11:24; Act 13:9; see Bartlet’s *Acts*, p. 386). The author of *Ecce Homo* has called attention to the *enthusiasm* Jesus required of, and inspired in, His disciples (pp. 141, 152, 154, fifth edition). His own life was marked by enthusiasm, intense and exalted emotions in regard to His vocation. As a youth He was *enthusiastic* for His Father’s house (Luk 2:49); at the Baptism He devoted Himself to His calling (Mat 3:15), and was conscious of receiving the Spirit (Mat 3:16), the spirit of zeal and power. His first enthusiasm to use the new energy afforded the occasion for the temptation in the wilderness (Mar 1:12 ‘straightway the Spirit driveth him forth’). In His call to His disciples, His teaching and healing, His journeyings from place to place in the early Galilaeen ministry (Mar 1:17; Mar 1:27; Mar 1:38; Mar 1:41), this mood of enthusiasm is dominant (Luk 4:1). The same impression is conveyed in St. John’s record: His answer to His mother in Cana, the casting out of the traders from the temple, the challenge to the priests, the confession of His Messiahship to the woman of Samaria, the forgetfulness of the needs of the body in His absorption in His work (Joh 2:4; Joh 2:17; Joh 2:19; Joh 4:26; Joh 4:32; Joh 4:34), have all the same characteristic of an intense, exalted emotion. His mood was mistaken for madness by His relatives (Mar 3:21), and His answer regarding His spiritual relationships would not remove their doubt (Mar 3:34-35). His demands on His disciples to abandon all, and to cleave to Him (Luk 9:60; Luk 9:62; Luk 14:26), and the Beatitudes He pronounced on the spiritually aspiring, and on the persecuted (Mat 5:6; Mat 5:12), spring from the same inward source. He was deeply moved by any evidence of faith which He met with (Mat 8:10; Mat 15:28, Luk 10:21, Mat 16:17, Joh 12:23, Luk 23:43). He even intensely desired to fulfil His vocation in His death (Luk 12:50). The Baptist contrasted his own baptism with water and the Messiah’s baptism with the Holy Spirit and fire (Mat 3:11). His words have been thus interpreted: ‘He baptizes with water, in the running stream of Jordan, to emblem the only way of escape, amendment. Messiah will baptize with wind and fire, sweeping away and consuming the impenitent, leaving behind only the righteous’ (Bruce, ‘St. Matthew’ in *Expositor’s Gr. Test.* p. 84). When Jesus presented the same contrast in His demand to Nicodemus (Joh 3:5), it is not probable that He referred to judgment, but to the inspiration which He brought to men in His ministry, the enthusiasm for God and His kingdom which He imparted. We have abundant evidence that He so inspired men in Galilee by His healing, teaching, forgiveness of sins, companionship

(Mar_1:27; Mar_1:37; Mar_2:12; Mar_2:19), and attracted many (Mar_3:7; Mar_6:53-56). The people believed Him to be John the Baptist, Elijah, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets (Mar_6:14, Mat_16:14). That this mood was temporary Jesus recognized in the parable of the Sower (Mar_4:5-6). The flame blazed up again for a moment among the Galilean pilgrims at the triumphal entry (Mar_11:8; Mar_11:10). The early ministry in Judaea and in Samaria, as recorded by John, made the same impression (Joh_2:23; Joh_3:26; Joh_4:39-42). After His Resurrection and Ascension the Christian Church received at Pentecost the permanent and communicable gift of *holy enthusiasm* (πνεῦμα ἅγιον, as explained above).* [Note: In this view of the meaning of Christian enthusiasm, as a power which finds its true source in the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, we get an interesting glimpse into both the history of language and the philosophy of that history, from the disrepute which attached to the word 'enthusiasm' during the age of Rationalism and Deism. Those were days when leaders in the Church set themselves to 'put down enthusiasm,' and Christian apologists were anxious to prove that neither Jesus Christ nor His Apostles were 'enthusiasts.' Hartley defines enthusiasm as 'a mistaken persuasion in any person that he is a peculiar favourite with God; and that he receives supernatural marks thereof' (Observations on Man, i. 490), a definition which entirely corresponds to the contemporary ideas on the subject (see J. E. Carpenter, James Martineau, p. 92). In the 18th cent. enthusiasm was a synonym for fanaticism; an enthusiast was simply a fanatic. And the constant application of the terms to the Evangelical Revival and its leaders shows that this debasing of their value was due to the spiritual deadness of the critics rather than to the extravagances of the enthusiasts. Similarly, the Jewish leaders said of Jesus, 'He hath a devil, and is mad' (Joh_10:20); Festus said to Paul, 'Thou art beside thyself' (Act_26:24); and some of the people of Jerusalem, when they witnessed the charismatic gifts bestowed upon Christ's followers on the Day of Pentecost, exclaimed, 'These men are full of new wine' (Act_2:13).]

It is a difficult problem whether in His early ministry Jesus was not led by His enthusiasm to show less reserve in the expression of His claims and less restraint in the exercise of His powers than was His practice afterwards, when He had learned from experience the peril this course involved of a premature close of His ministry. The solution of the problem depends on the answer given to the wider question, whether such a change of method, due to the teaching of experience, would be compatible with His unerring moral insight and sinless moral character, and the Divine guidance He constantly sought and found in the fulfilment of His vocation. If not, we cannot assume any such change. The question is discussed in *The Expositor*, 6th series, vol. vi. 'The Early Self-Disclosure.'

Literature.—Arthur, *Tongue of Fire*; J. C. Shairp, *Studies*, 362 ff.

☩ Entry Into Jerusalem

ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM.—This was one of the acted parables of Jesus, in which some immortal lesson is concealed. The washing of the feet, the entry, and the cleansing of the Temple, stand together as dramatic representations of the principles and ideas of the Kingdom of God; of the humility and self-denial required in the life of the Christian; of the mixture of condescension and majesty in the manner of the King's coming; and of the peace He gives and of the judgment that follows in His steps.

Of the Synoptic accounts Mk. seems the original. Mt. describes the entry in keeping with his representation of Jesus as the *Malkâ Mëshihâ* of the Jews, and in consonance with the prophecy of Zec 9:9. The Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 rendering of Mat 21:4 τοῦτο δὲ γέγονεν, 'Now this is come to pass,' seems to put the reference to the fulfilment of that prophecy into the mouth of Jesus. But the inference from Joh 12:15-16 is that the prophecy is an afterthought of the disciples, in the light of the Ascension; and the ten texts of 'fulfilment' in Mt. are always comments of the writer. Mt. seems to represent Jesus as riding on the she-ass and the colt (ἐπάνω αὐτῶν). In Zec 9:9 the Heb. ו, as Rosenmüller points out, is exegetical not copulative, and as 'ass' (המזר) is male, the proper rendering is 'sitting on an ass, even a colt, the foal of she-asses.' There is thus only one ass in Zechariah. The apparent duplication is due to Hebrew *parallelismus*. Mt. is accused of embroidering the historical statement by adding a second ass in order to show the exact literal fulfilment of prophecy (Kirsopp Lake, at Liverpool Church Congress). Robertson's attempt (*Christianity and Mythology*, p. 368) to explain the two asses mythologically as signifying that the 'Sun-god is at his highest pitch of glory and is coming to his doom,' is not to be taken seriously. Mt.'s penchant for 'doubles' being well known (cf. Mat 8:28; Mat 9:27; Mat 20:30-34), the passage must not be pressed. Bengel's comment is 'pullo vectus est, asinâ item usus, pulli comite.' Farrar suggested rendering ἐπάνω αὐτῶν = 'on one of them'; cf. Act 23:24. Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 32) speaks only of a colt, but, connecting the incident with Gen 49:11, describes it as 'tied to a vine.'

The prophecy Mat 21:5, a compound of Isa 62:11 and Zec 9:9, is taken partly from Heb., partly from LXX Septuagint. LXX Septuagint suppresses ὄνον, which is recovered from Hebrew. Mt. suppresses δικαιος και σωζων [ישע] Niph. ptcp.: *salvatus*

not *salvator*, trans. active, through influence of יְשׁוּעָה ('thy salvation') [Isa_62:11](#)], emphasizing *TPAI'*, 'meek' (עָנָו).

In Mt. there is a description of the commotion (ἐσεισθη) in the whole city; the question, 'Who is this?'; the answer, 'This is the prophet Jesus, he who is from Nazareth of Galilee,' and the greeting, 'Hosanna to the Son of David.' [Mar_11:1-10](#) adds some vivid details. The colt, never before used (so Lk.), was tied 'at the door without in the open street' (ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀμφοδου [not 'where two ways met,' *bivium*, Vulgate], Just. Mart, ἐν τινι εισόδῳ κώμης (*l.c.*); ἄμφοδα, αἱ ὁύμαι (Hesych.). The woven branches (στοιβάδες) cut from the gardens (ἀγρῶν, *v.l.* for δένδρων) are different from the κλάδοι (olive branches in classical Greek) cut from the trees, in [Mat_21:8](#). The cry of the people is 'Hosanna; Blessed in the name of the Lord (acc. to Hebrew accents and idiom, e.g. [Deu_21:5](#)), Blessed be *the kingdom that cometh*, even that of our father David.' Mk. treats the visit as one of inspection. Jesus retires, 'having looked round on all things, for the hour was late,' whereas Mt. and Lk. give it as prelude to the cleansing of the Temple. [Luk_19:29-45](#) gives additional touches. They placed Jesus on the colt ἐπεβίβασαν (ἐπεκάθισαν of [Mat_21:7](#) being doubtful); the exact place of the exhibition of popular enthusiasm is given, 'even now at the descent of the Mt. of Olives' (ἤδη πρὸς τῇ καταβάσει), from which, Dean Stanley states, the first view is caught of the south-eastern corner of the city as the road from Bethany begins to descend. The lament over the city, the retort to the Pharisees' objection, 'If these should hold their peace,' etc., are peculiar to Luke. The song is, 'Peace in heaven and glory in the highest,' a seeming adaptation of the 'Hosanna,' etc., to suit Greek taste, perhaps through the influence of the angels' song ([Luk_2:14](#)).

[Joh_12:12-19](#) describes the scene from the stand-point of the people in the city who went out to meet Him (εἰς ὑπάντησιν): the blending of the two streams of people, the οἱ προάγοντες, 'those going before' of the Synoptics being those who had gone out to meet Him and had turned back when they met Him at the head of the procession, and thus preceded Him to the city; the testimony of the people who were with Him to the new-comers *that* (reading ὅτι for ὅτε) He had summoned Lazarus from the tomb; and the fact that the people from the city took branches of *palm* trees (τὰ βαῖα τῶν φοινίκων [from class. βαῖς, 'palm-branch,' not from βαιός, 'small'; note the three different words for 'branch,' κλάδος, στοβάς, and βαῖον]. The prophecy is given in a

shorter form. Jesus is hailed 'King of Israel,' and the Pharisees comment on their own powerlessness and His popularity (Joh 12:19).

This entry was connected with Jesus' consciousness of His Messianic mission, gradually developing as His work assumed definite direction and His doctrine definite form; was conceived after the prophecies of the OT, and planned in order to satisfy the expectations of many who were waiting for the coming of the Kingdom of God, 'the consolation of Israel,' 'the redemption of Jerusalem' (Luk 2:25; Luk 2:35). After the feeding of the 5000 (Joh 6:14) the multitude recognized Jesus as the prophet that should come into the world, and would have seized Him and made Him a king, but He defeated their purpose; for He could not allow an emotional peasantry, ever ready to flock to the standard of a deliverer, to identify His Kingdom with this world, or His cause with that of a Judas of Galilee. Here He devises the entry on the lines of Jewish prophecy, which, though free from any hostile intention, was equivalent to a declaration that He was the Messiah, and implied that He was more. It was not directly urged against Him at His trial; but it supplied Pilate with his question, 'Art thou the King of the Jews?' and, accordingly, with the legal basis for his sentence. This and the cleansing were His two first and last actions as Messiah. They were followed by the Cross.

We may infer in some measure from the song, the prophecy quoted, and His mode of entry, how far Jesus fulfilled and how far He transcended the Messianic expectations of His day.

1. *The Kingdom of our father David.*—The Kingdom of God or of heaven in the sense of the rule or *Herrschaft* of God, 'the power of God in its present or future manifestation,' the spiritual sway and 'sovereignty of God' (Dalman. *Words of Jesus*, p. 94), not in the sense of Home Rule for the Jews, had always been the text of Jesus' public addresses (Mat 4:17). Shortly before this the Pharisees had asked when the Kingdom of God should come (Luk 17:20). And His answer was in keeping with His object of purifying the Messianic ideas and exalting the Messianic ideals of His age. It was the Kingdom of His Father (Mat 26:29) and of the Father of the righteous (Mat 13:43) that He proclaimed; it was the kingdom of their father David of which the people thought. And His question, 'What think ye of Christ?' (Mat 22:42), shows that He did not consider Davidic origin sufficient status in itself for the Messiah. 'The kingdom of our father David' recalls the grand ideal of the theocratic ruler, the representative of J" [Note: " Jehovah.], the ideal son to whose descendants that throne was ensured (2Sa 7:16), upon which the prophets of the OT continued to build their hopes—hopes which had become greatly modified and materialized during the struggle with Antiochus and Rome, and by contact with Grecian thought, and which made the ordinary Jew dream of a deliverer with all the heroic qualities of a Judas Maccabaeus, and the more philosophic think of an earthly empire, cosmopolitan and

world-ruling like the Roman. It was the idea in the prophets, chiefly in Dan 7:13-14; Dan 7:17, of a kingdom, holy, supernatural, universal and eternal, that Jesus sought to recover from the lumber-room of tradition; and in this He was assisted by the gradual revival of more spiritual Messianic hopes among thoughtful and devout Jews like Simeon and Anna (cf. also the angelic prediction of Luk 1:32 'And the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David'). The Gospels give an account of the general Messianic expectations. The Messiah was not to come from Galilee but from Bethlehem (Mat 2:5), was king of the Jews (Mat 2:2), was to perform miracles (Joh 7:31), to be a prophet (Joh 4:29), to appear mysteriously (Joh 7:27), to be a descendant of David (Mat 9:27), and to restore again the kingdom to Israel (Act 1:6).

2. *The address 'Son of David.'*—The Messiah is first designated υἱὸς Δαβὶδ in Ps-Sol 17:23—a title founded on Scripture expressions such as 'son' (Isa 9:6), 'seed' (Targ. [Note: Targum.] 2Sa 7:12), 'branch' (Jer 23:5 and Zec 6:13, where the Aram. [Note: Aramaic.] paraphrase for 'branch' is 'Messiah'). The Davidic descent of Jesus, never refuted by His opponents, was accepted by St. Paul (Rom 1:3). But Jesus based His authority on something higher than this (Mat 22:45).

3. *The song 'Hosanna ... highest'* (cf. Psa 118:25-26, the festal cry amidst which the altar of burnt-offering was solemnly compassed on the first six days of the Feast of Tabernacles, and on the last day seven times).—'Hosanna,' which may be a contraction for *Hôshî 'âh nâ* (σωσον δῆ, LXX Septuagint), or shorter Hiph. imper. with enclitic, הוֹשַׁעֲנָהּ, is evidently a salutation = 'greeting to (cf. Lat. *lo triumphe*) the Son of David,' not supplication as in Ps.; cf. *Didache*, x. 6, ὡσαννὰ τῷ θεῷ Δαβὶδ ('hail'). ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις (Mt.) = δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις (Lk.). In Psa 72:4; Psa 116:6 the Heb. הַ (= dat.) is found after Hiph. of הוֹשַׁע; but the fact that the branches at the Feast of Tabernacles were called 'hosannas' and Mt.'s remarkable omission from Zec 9:9 of הוֹשַׁע (σώζων, LXX Septuagint), which would have thrown a new light on this cry, seem to denude the expression of any special significance. See Hosanna.

Dalman suggests that the original cry of the people was 'Hosanna, Blessed in the name of J' [Note: "Jehovah.] be he that cometh' (*op. cit.* p. 222). It is also to be remembered that in the OT, J' [Note: "Jehovah.] Himself is generally represented as Saviour, while the Messiah was the prince of the redeemed people; the idea that the Messiah was the Redeemer being more recent. An interesting connexion between Psa 118:27 'Bind the sacrifice with cords or woven branches' (עֲבֹדֵי = στρούβαδες,

Mar_11:8) and the entry of Jesus is brought out in Symm. [Note: Symmachus.] συνδήσ
ατε ἐν τανηγύρει πυκάσματι.

It is possible to make too much of the ceremonies of the Feast of Tabernacles in connexion with this entry, which took place just before the Feast of Passover in spring. But it is equally possible that the song, etc., may have been due to reminiscences of the preceding Feast of Tabernacles, when Jesus was pronounced the prophet and the Messiah (Joh_7:41), and that the whole passage was sung, that which used to be supplication now passing into greeting. Our conclusion is, then, that though the song 'Hosanna,' etc., was used in salutation, it contains an allusion to the preceding Feast of Tabernacles, expresses the convictions of many of the people, and offers a remarkable parallel to Psa_118:25-27.

4. *The mode of entry.*—Some of the same Galilaean folk who wished to make Jesus a king before the time of Joh_6:15 have now, in their progress to the city, gathered around Him and escort Him, their national Prophet, with song. Others come from the city to meet Him, and receive Him with acts of homage which show that they regarded Him at the time as the prospective deliverer of the nation. In 2Ma_10:6-7 Judas Maccabaeus is welcomed with similar acclamations and 'branches and fair boughs and palms,' and in 1Ma_13:51 Simon. In 2Ki_9:13 the followers of Jehu, the newly proclaimed king, threw down their cloaks (ἱμάτια, as here) before him. Stanley also (5P [Note: P Sinai and Palestine.] 191) mentions that in recent times the people of Bethlehem cast their cloaks before the horse of the consul of Damascus. Dalman agrees with Wellhausen that the procession did not acquire its Messianic colour until a later period, and that few at the time thought of the prophecy in Zec. (*opcit.* p. 222). In the light of after events, Jesus entered the city as Messianic king, priest, and prophet. (1) The 'prince' had to provide the sacrifices 'to make reconciliation for or to atone for [לְכַפֵּר] the house of Israel' (Eze_45:15; cf. Eze_46:4-6 and 2Ch_30:14). So does 'the Lord's Anointed' here. (2) The priest presents the offering. So does 'the priest after the order of Melchizedek' (Psa_110:4) proceed, metaphorically speaking, to 'bind the sacrifice with cords unto the horns of the altar' (Psa_118:27). The harmony between the two offices of the Messiah as king and priest is well described in Zec_6:13 'and the counsel of peace shall be between the two' (so Rosenm.). The growing predominance of the priestly office of the Messiah is also expressed in the choice of the colt 'whereon never man sat' (Mk. and Lk.), cf. Num_19:3 'a red heifer ... upon which never came yoke.' (3) The prophetic character of the Messiah as the 'messenger of the covenant' (Mal_3:1), coming to His temple, J" [Note: " Jehovah.], 's prophet to the world and a light to the Gentiles (Isa_49:6), was suitably expressed by the proclamation of the people, 'This is Jesus the prophet,' etc., and by their testimony to His miracles, generally connected with a prophet. (4) There was another

ideal of the OT realized in Jesus on this occasion. The meek and afflicted [עני] saint of Psa 22:24, the Psalm appropriated by Jesus on the cross, was represented by Him who wept over the city and entered it ‘meek [עני Zec 9:9 = πραῦς, Mat 21:5; also in Mat 5:5 = Psa 37:11], and sitting upon an ass.’ Other significations of this Heb. adj., such as ‘poor,’ ‘oppressed,’ and ‘persecuted’ (in Isaiah), were also realized in Jesus. But it is His meekness that Mt. emphasizes, doubtless because of His riding on an ass. At one time the ass was not a despised animal. Judges rode on white asses (Jdg 5:10). But through contact with Gentiles the ass had fallen into contempt. For ὄνος Josephus substitutes κτήνος and ἵππος. LXX Septuagint in Zec 9:9 preferred ὑποζύγιον and πῶλος to the despised word. It was, however, the tradition that the Messiah should come riding on an ass (Sepp, § vi. c. 6). (5) The conception of Messiah as the suffering Servant of Deut.-Isaiah was, however, most of all exemplified by Him who on this occasion humbled Himself [ענן (Niph. of ענן in reflexive sense) Isa 53:7 = ἐταπεινώσεν ἑαυτόν, Php 2:8] in a voluntary manner in His progress to a death for His people.

Matthew describes Jesus as armed with authority (ἐξουσία, cf. Mat 8:9), and on this occasion depicts Him as the *Malkâ Mëshihâ* of the Jews. His authority is over all flesh, to make them feel their want of God and Him. The sense of power was derived from the sense of His mission and the consciousness that He was the Son of God, which made Him soar beyond the Messianic rôle and see Himself the Lord of the whole earth, holding sway by peace, spiritual peace, and by power, spiritual power. ‘He claimed for Himself.’ as Dalman remarks (*op. cit.* p. 313), ‘an exalted position such as had not been assigned even to the Messiah,’ and, as Harnack (*What is Christianity?* p. 141) observes, ‘He leaves the idea of the Messiah far behind Him, because He filled it with a content that burst it.’ It was in the same spirit that He affirmed His Kingship before Pilate (Mat 27:11).

The object of this entry was the inauguration of Jesus’ last mission to His people. The attraction of the provincial crowds, the Jerusalem populace, the Greeks and proselytes, if not the impressing of the Jewish hierarchy, this was the end desired, and in a great measure attained. He never seems to move in solitary state in the Temple; crowds are always around Him; He is the topic of the people’s conversation and the subject of the priests’ conspiracy. This was a suitable prelude to a great missionary enterprise all too brief, but crowded perhaps with more real work and witness for the King and His Kingdom than the preceding portion of His ministry. It led to the cleansing of the Temple on the same or the following day, and these together culminated in the Cross.

Literature.—Dalman, *Words of Jesus*; Harnack, *What is Christianity?*; Stanley, *SP* [Note: P Sinai and Palestine.] ; Farrar, *Life of Christ*; Edersheim, *Life and Times*; Hitchcock, *Mystery of the Cross*; artt. ‘Hosanna,’ ‘Messiah,’ ‘Prophets’ in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible .

F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock.

☞ Envy

ENVY—The word φθόνος occurs in the Gospels only in the two parallel passages Mat_27:18 and Mar_15:10 in connexion with the trial of Jesus. When the members of the Jewish hierarchy sought the death of Jesus at the hands of Pilate, they attempted to veil their motives under the pretence of loyalty to Caesar. Pilate was too astute a man to credit these professions for a single instant. He perceived (ἐγίνωσκε, Mar_15:10) the underlying feeling to be envy. If the word ἤδει (‘he knew,’ Mat_27:18) is significant, it supports the opinion that Pilate had previously become acquainted with the attitude of the chief priests toward Jesus. The message that Pilate later received from his wife (Mat_27:19) somewhat favours this opinion. In fact it was the business of Pilate to know of the person of Jesus and His relations to the leaders of the Jews, and nothing but the contemptuous indifference of a Gallio would have hindered him from the inquiries necessary for gaining this knowledge.

Perhaps it might seem at first as though the feeling which prompted the priests might more properly be termed jealousy. A comparison of the two feelings, jealousy and envy, readily shows the distinctive character of each: ‘Jealousy is the malign feeling which is often had toward a rival, or possible rival, for the possession of that which we greatly desire, as in love or ambition. Envy is a similar feeling toward one, whether rival or not, who already possesses that which we greatly desire. Jealousy is enmity prompted by fear; envy is enmity prompted by covetousness’ (*Century Dictionary*, s.v. ‘Envy’). ‘Envy is only a malignant, selfish hunger, casting its evil eye on the elevation or supposed happiness of others’ (Bushnell, *ib.*). In Trench, *Synonyms of the New Testament*, xxvi., the comparison is less happily stated. Apparently jealousy (ζήλος) ‘may assume two shapes; either that of a desire to make war upon the good which it beholds in another, and thus to trouble that good, and make it less; or, where it has not vigour and energy enough to attempt the making of it less, there may be at least the wishing of it less. And here is the point of contact which ζήλος has with φθονος: thus Plato, *Menex.* 242 A, τρωπον μὲν ζήλος, ἀπὸ ζήλου δὲ φθονος: the

latter being essentially passive, the former is active and energetic'. This citation from Plato shows that there may be a genetic relation between jealousy and envy, but it does not show that envy is passive. Trench quotes from Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, ii. 11, omitting ὁ δὲ τὸν πλησιον [παρασκενάζει] μὴ ἔχειν διὰ τὸν φθόνον [τὰ ἀγεθα]: 'One that is moved by envy contrives that his neighbour shall not have the good that he has or seems to have.' A careful examination of the use of φθονος in classic Greek authors justifies this statement of Aristotle, and reveals that it means the same active malignant feeling as is expressed in modern English by the word 'envy.' It was φθονος which moved the gods to prevent men from attaining a great or uninterrupted experience of prosperity. Pindar, the tragic writers, and orators also are found using the word to designate the active impulse to destroy another's prosperity so far as one has the power to do it.

The Septuagint, according to Hatch's *Concordance*, uses φθόνος only in the Apocryphal books. The most noteworthy instance is in Wis 2:24 'on account of the envy of the devil, death entered into the world.'

Since envy is an ill-will or malice aroused by the success or good gifts of another, it is the fitting word to designate the motive of the priests who protested their loyalty to Caesar. Envy is not a primary emotion. Other feelings prepare the way for, and may enter into, it. It is the result of a development in the life of selfishness (Jul. Müller, *Lehre von der Sünde*, i. 233 f. [English translation *Christian Doctrine of Sin*, i. 171]). In the Gospels this development is not difficult to trace. The deeds and words of Jesus were from the outset attended by suspicion on the part of scribes and Pharisees. His growing popularity aroused their jealousy. When they could charge Him with a compact with Beelzebub (Mat 12:22 ff., Mar 3:20 ff., Luk 11:14 ff.), they had begun to hate Him because of the popular confidence in Him, and especially because this confidence was of a degree and a quality which they never had received, and which they could not hope to receive. This occurrence was an attempt to discredit Him with the people, and it showed that envy had obtained full lodgment in their hearts. From that time onwards it had so large a share in their lives, that when they appeared before Pilate they were so mastered by this feeling to which they had given free rein for months, that they were unable to conceal it. See also artt. Covetousness and Jealousy.

F. B. Denio.

EPHPHATHA. An Aramaic word, found in the Greek text of Mar_7:34. We there read that Jesus said to a man who was ‘deaf and had an impediment in his speech, *Ephphatha*’ (ἐφφαθά). The Evangelist appends a Greek translation of the word: ὁ ἐστὶν διανοίχθητι, ‘that is, Be opened.’

There are two Aram. [Note: Aramaic.] words of which *ΕΦΦΑΘά* may be a transliteration: (1) ܦܦܬܐ; (2) ܦܦܬܐ. The former is a contraction of ܦܦܬܦܬܐ Imperative Ithpaal; and the latter is a contraction of ܦܦܬܦܬܐ Imperative Ithpeal of the verb ܦܦܬ ‘to open.’ In Greek MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] , 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] D [Note: Deuteronomist.] present ἐφφαθά, which is certainly Ithpeal, whereas ἐφφαθά may be Ithpaal. Jerome gives *Ephphetha*, and some Latin MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] give *effetha*, *ephetha*, and even *effeta*. Wellhausen in his Com. on Mar_7:34 prints ἐφφατα, but apparently without MS authority.

The form ἐφφαθά, when compared with its Aram. [Note: Aramaic.] equivalent ܦܦܬܦܬܐ, presents several interesting peculiarities bearing on the dialect spoken by our Lord. (1) We note the disappearance of the guttural ܦ. We know that in Galilee and Samaria the gutturals were much neglected, or even interchanged; and they are often ignored in transliterating Semitic words into Greek. Thus we find Μεσσίας from ܡܫܝܚܐ; Βηθεσδά from ܒܝܬ ܚܝܫܐ; γέννα from ܓܝܢܐ; Σίμων from ܫܡܝܘܢ (side by side with Συμεών, where the ε does duty for ܥ). (2) We note the assimilation of ܦ to ܦ, giving ἐφφαθά for ἐθφαθά; or in Aram. ܦܦܬܐ for ܦܦܬܐ. This is quite in accordance with a rule in Palestinian Aramaic, that frequently, and especially with the labials ܦ, ܡ and ܦ, the ܦ in the passive prefix ܦܦ is assimilated to the first radical (Dalman’s *Aramaische Grammatik*, p. 201). (3) It is noteworthy that we have the repetition of the aspirate letter ܦ. According to Hebrew analogy, ܦܦܬܐ ought to give ἐππαθά, inasmuch as the *daghesh* always indicates the harder and not the aspirated form of the letter ܦ. We infer, therefore, that in the Semitic language, which lies behind our Greek Test., there was a deviation from Hebrew rule as to the *daghesh*. If Heb. had been the basal language of the Gospels, we could not have had such forms as Βαρθολομαῖος from ܒܪ ܬܘܠܡܝ and

Βηθφαγή from פְּתַי בֵּית. The aspirated forms פ and ב after a closed syllable would be intolerable. The *daghesh forte* is also singularly treated in Μαθθαῖος from מַתְּתַי and Ζακχαῖος from זַכַּי (4) The appearance of ε in ἐφφαθα may possibly indicate that the dialect spoken by our Lord used the *Syriac* prefix פְּתַי *eth* with passive forms, and not פְּתַי *ith*, as is found in Palestinian Aramaic; in other words, used Ethpaal for Ithpaal.

As to what is the *subject* of the verb διανοιχθητι, ‘*Be thou opened,*’ there is room for difference of opinion. It may be the *mouth*, as in Luk 1:64 (so Weiss, Morison), or the *ear*, as in Targ. [Note: Targum.] on Isa 50:5 (so Bruce, Swete); or it may be the deaf *man* himself who is addressed. One door of knowledge being shut, the man is conceived of as a bolted chamber: ‘Jesus said to *him*, Be thou opened.’

Literature.—Zahn, *Einleitung in das NT* i. 1-24; Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Biblisch-Aramaisch*, § 5; Dalman, *Aram.* [Note: Aramaic.] *Gramm.* 201 f., 222; A. Meyer, *Jesu Muttersprache*, 52; Meyer, Bruce, Swete, etc., on Mar 7:34.

J. T. Marshall.

Ⲅ Ephraim

EPHRAIM.—Joh 11:54 only. After the raising of Lazarus, Jesus departed, in consequence of the plots of the chief priests against Him, ‘unto a country (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘into the country’) near to the wilderness, into a city called Ephraim, and there continued with his disciples.’

There are scarcely any textual variations. TR spells Ἐφραῖα; Lachmann, Tischendorf, Westcott-Hort spell Ἐφραῖμ; Stephanus, 1550, had on the margin the reading Ἐφραῖμ, which is supported by ⲛ L and Latin witnesses, and the name Σαμφουρείμ as to be supplied after χωραν. This is the reading of D, *Sapfurim* in its Latin part, for which Chase (*Syro-Lat. Text of Gospels*, 108) and R. Harris (*A Study of Codex Bezae*, p. 184) suggested that σαμ might be the Heb. שָׁם ‘the name’; but more probable is the identification with *Sepphoris*, which in *Jos. Ant.* xiv. 91 is spelt Σατφόροις (v.ll. Σαμφόροις and other forms); so Jerome (s.v. ‘Araba’ in *OS* 17. 13 f.): ‘Diocaesareae, quae olim *Safforine* dicehatur.’

Eusebius in his *Onomasticon* says (*ad Ephron*, Jos 15:9) καὶ ἔστι νῦν κώμη Ἐφραΐμ μεγίστη περὶ τὰ βόρεια Αἰλίας ὡς ἀπὸ σημείων κ; in the Latin rendering of Jerome: ‘est et villa pergrandis *Efrœa* nomine contra septentrionem in vicesimo ab aelia miliario’ (ed. Klostermann, p. 86. 1, 90. 18). With this has been identified *Afra* [=ⲓⲡⲓⲛⲓ Jos 18:23]: ‘in tribu Benjamin; et est hodie vicus *Efraim* in quinto miliario Bethelis ad orientem respiciens’ (p. 29. 4; the Greek text [28. 4: καὶ νῦν ἔστι κώμη Αἰφροῦλ ἀπό] is here defective); further, 1Ma 11:34 = *Jos. Ant.* xiii. 127 [ed. Niese]: τοὺς τρεῖς νομοὺς Ἀφαιρεμα (v.l. Ἀφέρεμα) καὶ Αὐδδα καὶ Ῥαμαθεῖν; finally, the notice of Josephus (*BJ* iv. 551), that Vespasian took Βήθηγά τε (earlier reading Βαιθήλ or Βηθήλ) καὶ Ἐφραΐμ πολίχνια. Since Robinson, the site has been sought at the modern *ct-Taiyibeh*, 4 miles N.E. from Bethel. Schürer (*GJV*³ i. 233) quotes Robinson, ii. 332-338; Guérin, *Judéc*, iii. 45-51; Buhl, *GAP* p. 177; Heidet, art. ‘Ephrem’ in Vigouroux’s *Dict.* ii. 1885 ff.; cf., further, art. ‘Ephraim’ by J. H. Kennedy in Hastings’ *DB*, and by T. K. Cheyne in *Encyc. Biblica*.* [Note: Schürer (*GJV*3 ii. 163, n. 435) is certainly right in rejecting the identification of Sappurim with Sepharvaim (2Ki 17:24) put forward by Resch (*TU* x. 4, pp. 141, 204) and approved by Blass (*Ev. sec. Joh.* 1902, p. xl), and in finding in Sappurim the name of the town Sepphoris, which covered a very large area. But it is not yet certain whether Codex D has preserved here a correct tradition. Luk 9:16 offers similar variations in the text (τολιν καλουμενην, τότεν λεγομενον, τότεν ἔξημον, etc). Ἐφραΐα might itself be derived from Sepphoris, the first letter being dropped after the ς of εἰς.]

Origen compares, for the retirement of Jesus, Mat 4:12 f. and then allegorizes: Ephraim, according to Gen 41:51 f. ‘καρτοφορῖα’; ἀτήλθεν ἐκεῖθεν εἰς τὴν χώραν ‘τοῦ ἄλου κόσμου,’ ἔλλυς τῆς ἐρήμου ‘ἐκκλησια’ εἰς Ἐφραΐμ τὴν ‘καρτοφοροῦσαν’ λεγομένη ντόλιν, etc. (new Berlin edition, pp. 420, 551). About the site he says nothing.

Eb. Nestle.

ⲓ Epilepsy

EPILEPSY.—There is but one specific instance of this awful malady recorded for us in the Gospels.† [Note: ‘Epileptic’ is substituted by RV for ‘lunatick’ of AV in Mat 4:24;

Mat 17:15 as tr. of σεληνιαζεσθαι.] This case is, however, common to all three Synoptists (cf. Mat 17:15, Mar 9:17 f., Luk 9:39); and the three accounts, while not in verbal agreement, are sufficiently harmonious to leave no doubt in the mind of the reader as to the nature and malignant character of the disease. It is noteworthy that the writers all attribute it to the active agency of demons; and this is the more remarkable as St. Matthew, in another place, appears to differentiate between demon possession and epilepsy (Mat 4:24 δαιμονιζομένους καὶ σεληνιαζομένους). Not only do the Evangelists record their own and the popular belief in the connexion of evil spirits with epilepsy; they also lead us to believe that Jesus exercised His power on the presupposition of the truth of this contemporary idea (cf. Mat 17:18, Mar 9:25, Luk 9:42).

It is well to remember in this connexion that medical thought at this time and, indeed, for a long period subsequent to this, was distinctly on the side of the Synoptists. Aretaeus (*circa (about) 70 a.d.*) in writing of it (*Sign. Morb. Diuturn. 37*) attempts to explain the reason why epilepsy was called 'the sacred illness' (ιερὴν κικλῆσκουσι τὴν ταθην). The remedy, according to this writer, belonged not to human but to Divine agency. Hippocrates, on the other hand, writing some five centuries earlier, refuses to accept the belief that there was anything supernatural about this disease. In his opinion it is to be explained in the same way as any other disease to which people are liable (ὥστε μὴδὲν διακρίνοντα τὸ νόσημα θεϊότερον τῶν λοιπῶν νοσημάτων, κ.τ.λ., *Morb. Sac. 303* [see Hobart's *The Medical Language of St. Luke*, p. 20]). The important place held by the belief in the malevolent influence of demons and in the powers of the exorcist will be recognized if we turn, e.g., to Tertullian, *Apol. 23*; Origen, c. *Cels. vii. 334*; *Apost. Constit. viii. 26*, amongst the written products of early Christian thought.

The word employed by St. Matthew in his description of the epileptic boy (σεληνιαζεται), as well as in his catalogue of ailments (Mat 4:24), shows that in the opinion of the ancients the moon had a preponderating influence in bringing on this disease (cf. Psa 121:6 for a reference to the baleful effect which the brilliant rays of the moon were supposed to exert, and which from the context seems to have been thought as deadly as sunstroke). This belief, too, descended far down into the Middle Ages; and, indeed, it can hardly be said to have altogether vanished from the popular mind, though it is probably now confined to the remoter quarters of human habitation.

A comparative study of the particular case described by each of the Synoptists reveals the fact that St. Mark gives a much more graphic and detailed account of the

symptoms than either of the other two. According to this writer, the boy was deaf and dumb, he was liable to be seized with convulsions at any time or place (ὅπου ἔάν, Mar_9:18), to fall violently to the ground, foaming at his mouth, gnashing with and grinding his teeth. Finally, he is said to be gradually wasting away as a result of the frequency of the seizures. He was, moreover, afflicted from his childhood with this awful malady, a by no means uncommon feature of such cases (see art. 'Medicine,' by A. Macalister, in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. 327^b). St. Mark also gives a vivid account of a fit which seems to have been brought on by the presence of Jesus, or by the excitement consequent on his introduction to that presence Mar_9:20). No sooner did he come before Jesus than a seizure with terrible convulsions took place, and falling on the ground he rolled about (ἐκυλίετο does not seem to be adequately treated in Authorized and Revised Versions) foaming.

Perhaps the most peculiar part of the Markan narrative is the account of the healing process. According to the Matthaean and Lukan versions, the cure was not only perfect, it was instantaneous (Mat_17:18 = Luk_9:42). St. Mark, on the other hand, says it was gradual and difficult of accomplishment. Jesus, adopting a tone of peremptory authority (ἐγὼ ἐπιτάσσω σοι, Mar_9:25), addressed the spirit as a person, and was answered by the latter, who caused his victim to utter loud cries and to writhe with violent convulsions before he obeyed the command. Nor was the completion of the cure yet reached, for an unconsciousness supervened so profound (ἐγένετο ὡσεὶ νεκρός, Mar_9:26) as to deceive many of the bystanders into the belief that death had claimed the victim. It was not until Jesus took the boy by the hand to raise him from the ground that the miracle took its final shape, and the people were enabled to witness and to marvel at 'the majesty of God' (Luk_9:43).

It is to be noted that this feature in the healing acts of Jesus does not stand alone in this place. It is revealed in another case also recorded by St. Mark. In a preceding section he tells of the healing by Jesus of a blind man at Bethsaida. The cure in this case, too, was effected gradually, and was completed only by the contact of His hands with the afflicted patient (see Mar_8:22-25).

That 'the scribes' seized the opportunity afforded by this case to carry on their controversy with Jesus and His disciples is implied in St. Mark, where the element of hostility is referred to (see Mar_9:14 'and scribes disputing against them' [πρὸς αὐτοῦς]). The method of healing adopted by Jesus was in striking contrast to that to which they were accustomed to lend themselves (cf. *Shabbath* 61 and *Tosefta Shabbath, in loc.*, where we learn of the employment of charms, such as amulets and winged insects of a certain kind, in the cure of epileptics). With Jesus it is the assertion of

personal superiority. His words carry with them the weight of indisputable authority. The command is that of One who claims the lordship over disease and death. At the same time directness and simplicity are the essential characteristics of His attitude and bearing. Nor did Jesus permit this contrast to pass unnoticed (see Mat 12:27, where He refers to a practice recognized as legitimate by the religionists of His day).

Exorcism was practised in public by men who professed to wield authority over the demon world (cf. Act 19:13, which is the only place where the word ‘exorcist’ occurs in the NT). These exorcists seem to have relied upon the repetition of certain names to effect their purpose, and along with this the recitation of special incantations, of which Solomon particularly was considered to be the author (see Josephus *Ant.* viii. ii. 5; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii. iii. 151-155, and also To 6-8 for the lengths to which belief in the efficacy of charms and incantations had made its way among the Jews). We must not forget, moreover, that the followers of Jesus framed their methods of healing the sick upon this contemporary model. The utterance of the name of Jesus found its place in their cures (Act 3:6; Act 16:18, Mar 9:38-39; Mar 16:17 etc., where ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ seems to be an essential part of the formula employed). See also Demon, Lunatic.

J. R. Willis.

☩ Epiphany

EPIPHANY.—See Calendar, p. 261 f.

☩ Equality

EQUALITY.—Equality in capability, responsibility, and future destiny is by no means taught by Christ in the Gospels. Christians are not reduced to one uniform level of worth and dignity, either here or hereafter. In the parables of the Talents and the Pounds the servants are not in a condition of equality during their period of probation or afterwards (Mat 25:14-30, Luk 19:11-27). The inequality of Dives and Lazarus here is an admitted fact, and their inequality beyond the grave is a sure consequence (Luk 16:25). Christ repeatedly admits without deprecation the inequality observable among men. ‘There are last which shall be first, and there are first which shall be last’ (Luk 13:30, cf. Mat 19:30). There is, indeed, no suggestion whatever that a certain level of equality, tried even by internal criteria, is to be aimed at. Growth in grace follows the law of life, an increasing increment following upon each further

increment (Luk 19:26). 'He that is but little in the kingdom of heaven' is *greater than John the Baptist* (Mat 11:11, Luk 7:28). Pre-eminence is not at all directly discouraged or deprecated, only it must be the deepest and truest excellence, apart from the odiousness of comparison with others. The sons of Zebedee are too anxious for the position of pre-eminence hereafter, and too heedless of the call to self-sacrifice now (Mar 10:37, Mat 20:21). All disciples are in danger of desiring to be honoured by titles here, instead of awaiting God's bestowal of dignity in the new life beyond (Mat 23:8-12). But, to be *greatest in the Kingdom of heaven* it is necessary to be as a little child here (Mat 18:4, Luk 9:48). Such lowly and meek Christians are called 'little children,' and the Lord identifies Himself with them (Mar 9:37). The disciple must not lord it over his fellow-disciples wantonly and arrogantly (Mat 24:48 ff.). Not only superiority, but even equality, is forbidden as the goal of effort. Mutual service is to be the aim of the Christian community—the first is to be *bond-servant* of all (Mar 10:44). This precept of service, instead of insistence upon equality (Luk 22:26-27), was beautifully and touchingly practised by the Master-Servant on the night of His betrayal (Joh 13:5). Every man is to descend below the level of equality and leave it to God to call him higher if it be good in His sight (Luk 14:10). Especially in respect of penitence for sin is it good to sink all considerations of comparative merit (Luk 18:14). Except in the ideal sense, equality is neither an established fact nor a correct principle in the Christian Society. We are sons of one Father, and so brothers; but brothers are not equal, for some are older or wiser or richer or better. We are servants of one Master, and so fellows; but in this service there are various offices and diverse stations. Unity rather than equality is the leading characteristic of the internal economy of the Kingdom of heaven (Joh 10:16; Joh 11:52; Joh 17:11 etc.).

Literature.—Bruce, *Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, pp. 178-225; Mozley, *Univ. Sermons*, p. 72 ff.; Newman, *Selected Sermons*, p. 260 ff.

W. B. Frankland.

Er

ER.—An ancestor of Jesus, Luk 3:28.

Error

ERROR.—As one who lived in the undimmed vision of holiness and truth, ‘who saw life steadily and saw it whole,’ Jesus must have felt with an intensity we cannot fathom how sin had distorted the reason of man as well as perverted his affections. All around Him He saw men walking ‘in the vanity of their mind, being darkened in their understanding, alienated from the life of God because of the ignorance that is in them, because of the hardening of their heart’ ([Eph_4:18](#)). He saw, also, as no one else had ever seen, that the recovery of those who had become ‘vain in their reasonings’ ([Rom_1:21](#)) was to be achieved less by attacking their godless errors than by aiming at the renewal of the moral and spiritual nature. *This is the fundamental and vital point to emphasize.* Underlying all Christ’s dealings with error there was the recognition of the dependence of men’s opinions and beliefs upon their character. We seldom realize how much we contribute to the judgments we form. We set out with the intention of being wholly governed by the object. We want to know what it really is, and not merely what it appears to be. So we approach it, examine it, and form our opinion of it. But the eye brings with it the power of seeing; what we see depends not merely upon the object, but upon the organ of vision. This is true especially with respect to all judgments of value, all questions of right and wrong, of duty and religion. The possibilities of error increase not merely with the complexity of the subject-matter, but with the way in which our interests and convictions, our desires and predilections, are bound up with it. In the region of the moral and spiritual life not only must the intellect be clear,—free from false theory,—but still more necessary is it that the heart be pure and the practice sound. To appreciate goodness a man must love goodness; must be, if not good, at any rate good in many ways. ‘Every one,’ said Jesus, ‘that is of the truth heareth my voice’ ([Joh_18:37](#)). This does not, of course, mean that all moral and religious errors are due simply to a depraved heart. Violent upholders of orthodoxy have been only too ready to assume that such is the case, and to silence the heretic by declaring him a bad man. But it does mean that there is a moral aptitude for Christian discipleship. It was inevitable that men who had no enthusiasm for goodness should misunderstand Christ and reject Him. It was equally certain that His ‘sheep’ would hear His voice and follow Him.

There are a few striking illustrations of these principles in the Gospels which demand our attention.

1. *The necessity for inward, moral clarity and simplicity* is strongly insisted on by Jesus ([Mat_6:22-23](#), [Luk_11:34-36](#)). ‘We so often talk as if we were only obliged to “follow our conscience”; as if no one could lay anything to our charge unless we were acting against the present voice of conscience. But this is very perilous error. We are also obliged to enlighten our conscience and keep it enlightened. It is as much liable to error as our uninstructed intelligence, as much liable to failure as our sight’ (Gore, *The Sermon on the Mount*, p. 146 f.). The thought is expressed in other forms equally suggestive. Thus the ‘pure heart’ is the condition of the vision of God ([Mat_5:8](#)). It is

the 'honest and good heart' which, having heard the word, keeps it (Luk_8:15). Heavenly truth is hid from the wise and prudent, but revealed unto babes (Mat_11:25). The disciples must be converted and become as little children (Mat_18:2-5, Mar_10:15).

2. *Our Lord's method of dealing with the ignorant and erring* is full of instruction. Take the case of the woman suffering from an issue of blood (Mat_9:20-22, Mar_5:25-34, Luk_8:43-48). It would be hard to exaggerate the poor woman's ignorance. Her mind was full of erroneous thoughts of Jesus. At best she looks upon Him as a worker of magic. She thinks that she may be able to steal a blessing from Him in the crowd. But there was working, even in that darkness, the precious element of faith. She trusted Jesus as far as she understood Him, and that was enough for the Master. He knew that faith in Himself, even though it were only as a grain of mustard seed, would break through the incumbent weight of error and ignorance, and offer a free way for His grace: 'Daughter, be of good comfort: thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace.' Jesus adopted essentially the same method in dealing with persons like Zacchaeus, Mary Magdalene, the woman of Samaria, and the 'publicans and sinners' generally. These victims and slaves of passion and ignorance were certainly not good. Their lives were stained by error and sin. The religious classes looked upon them as moral outcasts. And yet there were those among them open to conviction. Their wilful and passionate lives had not destroyed in them a strange yearning for better things. And when purity drew near to them, adorned with such Divine graciousness as it was in the Person of Jesus, they became responsive to it and yearned after it. That was faith, and Jesus saw in it a power which would work for the redemption of the whole nature. His one endeavour was to call it forth into fullest exercise. Erroneous thoughts of God and life, of duty and religion, would all slowly disappear under the influence of this new devotion to Himself. But, after all, those who responded to His invitations (Mat_11:28-30) were never numerous. The great mass of the people was untouched and uninfluenced. Sunk in stupid ignorance, vice, and worldliness, the masses, at the best, followed Him for a time in gaping wonder, thinking far more of 'the loaves and fishes' than of the new life and truth He placed before them. Hence the sad words with which Jesus upbraided 'the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done' (Mat_11:20-24).

3. *The Pharisees and the other religious leaders.*—At first it seems a strange thing that these men, on the whole, fell into the appalling error of rejecting Jesus. 'The gospel did not place itself, directly and at the outset, in opposition to the errors of the Pharisees.... But the dividing gulf was none the less real, and would baffle every attempt to fathom or bridge it over' (Reuss, *Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age*, p. 227). A few reflexions on the lines of the previous remarks will make this clear. The whole life and thought of the typical Pharisee was a closed system. His religion was already fully organized. 'In the hands of the Pharisees, Judaism finally became

petrified.’ It was a body of rules and doctrines which laid the main stress on conduct and outward ceremonies,—a rigid mould without plasticity or capability of expansion. It could only react in antagonism towards one who offered a religion of the spirit, a worship of the Father in spirit and in truth. The Pharisee did not know what to make of a renovating and inspiring call which bade him begin afresh, and completely revise his life and religion in the light of a higher ideal. He was self-satisfied, and resented criticism as an intolerable impertinence. He was like one who says that he must follow his conscience, but who does not continually seek to enlighten his conscience by confronting it with higher aspects of truth. He had ears, but he heard not; eyes, yet he was blind. This was the most fatal kind of error, the most hopeless of all moral states; and it was inevitable that it should come into deadly collision with Jesus. ‘While the Pharisaic spirit had changed religion into a narrow and barren formalism, the gospel carefully distinguished the form from the essence in things religious. Its estimate of man’s true worth and the certainty of his hopes rested not upon the outward conduct of the life, but upon the inward direction of the heart and feelings’ (Reuss, *The Gospel and Judaism*, vol. i. p. 227). The errors of the Pharisees and the bitter hostility to Jesus which they provoked may be studied in the following passages—they are a mere selection: Mat 6:1-8; Mat 12:1-45; Mat 21:23-46; Mat 23:1-39, Mar 3:1-6, Luk 6:1-11; Luk 11:37-54; Luk 18:9-14, Joh 5:30-47; Joh 7:14-52; Joh 8:12-59; Joh 9:1-41.

4. *The errors of the disciples.*—It is not necessary to go into details here. In responding to His call the disciples of Jesus had placed themselves in training for the higher life. They had passed into a school where the scholar’s ignorance and error would be dealt with patiently and wisely. They had much to learn, but the essential thing was that they were in communion with the Light of Life.

Literature.—Illingworth, *Christian Character*; Gore, *The Sermon on the Mount*; Reuss, *History of Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age*; A. J. Balfour, *Foundations of Belief*; *Personal Idealism*, Essay I. by Prof. G. F. Stout; Descartes, *Meditation IV*.

A. J. Jenkinson.

☞ Eschatology

ESCHATOLOGY

I. Eschatology in the Synoptic Gospels.

A. Current Jewish eschatological conceptions.

1. The coming Kingdom.
2. The Jewish supremacy.
3. The Messiah.
4. Various forms of the conception of the Messiah.
5. The preliminaries of the coming Kingdom.
 - (a) The heirs of the Kingdom.
 - (b) The Resurrection.
 - (c) Hades, Gehenna, Paradise.
 - (d) The Final Judgment.

B. The main features of our Lord's eschatological teaching.

1. His conception of the Kingdom of God.
2. His Messianic consciousness.
3. His view of the time of the Consummation.

II. Eschatology in the Gospel of John.

1. The idealizing style of the Gospel.
2. Its conception of Eternal Life.
3. Its attitude to Eschatology proper.

Literature.

The design of this article is indicated particularly under the letter B in the above Table of Contents. It is to set forth the main features of the teaching of our Lord regarding the Last Things. His doctrine is presumably discoverable from the Four Gospels, and is capable of being exhibited in a self-consistent form. Yet in view of the facts of the case and the present state of critical opinion, it will be necessary to keep certain distinctions steadily in mind.

We must distinguish between (I.) the Synoptic Gospels and (II.) the Gospel of John; and we must distinguish between (A) current Jewish conceptions and (B) the conceptions of Jesus. In proportion to our feeling of the real unity of our subject, it will be impossible to maintain these distinctions with rigidity; yet a total disregard of them is impossible to any one who would keep on terms with the criticism of the Gospels in our own day, or, what is more important, would appreciate in any just degree the holy originality of Jesus. The bearing, however, of what is called the *Synoptic Problem* upon any matter important to our purpose is so slight that we may safely ignore it, mentioning only that we assume as a good working hypothesis the prevailing critical theory, which gives precedence in point of time, and even, in certain aspects, of importance, to the Gospel of Mark.

I. Eschatology in the Synoptic Gospels.—

A. Current Jewish eschatological conceptions as Witnessed to by the Gospels.—So far as these are concerned, it does not seem necessary to make any distinction between the Synoptics among themselves or between them and John. It may be generally postulated, moreover, that the fundamental conceptions are those of the OT, although it will be found that some of these have undergone modification since the time of the latest canonical books. Our principal witnesses are naturally the Synoptics. In them we have the most accurate reports accessible to us of the words actually used by Jesus; and where His sayings, as there recorded, employ the language of eschatology, apart from explanations which give it a turn peculiar to Himself, we may assume that the language in its natural implications represents current Jewish belief.

1. The coming Kingdom.—It is clear that Jesus addressed people who had a perfectly distinct, though not accurately defined, idea of an *age* or *kingdom* to come, which should follow on the consummation (συντέλεια, Mat_13:39 f.) of the present age. He speaks, *e.g.*, of rewards to the faithful ‘in this *time* (καιρός),’ and of eternal life in the ‘world (αἰών) to come’ (Mar_10:30); and the phrase ‘Kingdom of God,’ which was constantly on His lips, while doubtless subjected to expositions which charged it with new meanings for His followers, yet rested on a view of things common to Him and to even irresponsive hearers. It meant the perfect form of the Theocracy of which all the prophets had spoken.

2. The Jewish supremacy.—It was generally believed that the Kingdom would come through an act of power, in which God would visit His people,—the Jews,—delivering them from all their enemies, so that they might serve Him without fear in holiness and righteousness for ever (Luk_1:74). Men of the type of Simeon, Zacharias, and Joseph of Arimathaea waited for the consolation of *Israel*. Such persons doubtless

believed with the prophets (e.g. Isa 11:1 ff; Isa 9:4 ff., Zec 9:9) that the supremacy of God's people would be maintained, if not actually accomplished, by methods of peace, and even in the spirit of brotherly alliance among the nations (see esp. Isa 19:24 f.), who would receive the 'law' from Mount Zion (Isa 2:2-4). Yet obviously both they and the general populace, and even the disciples after the Resurrection (Act 1:6), thought of a state of things in which the position of God's ancient people would be central and supreme.

3. The Messiah.—Beyond the general belief that the Kingdom would come through an act or series of acts of Divine power, there is abundant evidence that in the time represented by the Gospels there was among the Jewish people, though not confined to them,* [Note: On this cf. Tacitus, Hist. v. 3; Suetonius, Vesp. 4; Josephus, BJ vi. v. 4.] the definite expectation that the Kingdom would come through the advent of a personal Ruler—called by the Jews the *Messiah* or, in Greek, the *Christ* = '*the Anointed*'—on whom God would pour forth His Spirit in extraordinary measure. This belief, so far as the Jews were concerned, goes back to the testimony of the earlier prophets (esp. Isaiah and Micah), but its history within the OT period shows that it sometimes either disappeared altogether or retired into the background, its place being taken by such a view as that expressed in Jer 31:31 ff.—of a reign of Jahweh Himself through His law written on the hearts of His people.† [Note: On this fluctuation see esp. Riehm's *Messianic Prophecy*, T. & T. Clark, 1900.] We need not here inquire into the causes of this fluctuation. It is enough to remark that for about a century before the time of Christ the belief that the Kingdom would be established through an individual worldwide Ruler, who would exercise practically Divine powers, had been current in larger or smaller circles among the Jews. Sufficient proof of this lies in the circumstance that in the time of our Lord passages in the Prophets (e.g. Deutero-Isaiah) or in the Apocalypse of Daniel, which had originally no reference to an individual Messiah,‡ [Note: In the case of Daniel this is disputed by such competent scholars as Hilgenfeld and Riehm.] had come to be so interpreted. The interpretation is *current*. No other is even thought of. In some cases, no doubt—as notably in the fulfilments of prophecy marked by the First Evangelist—it may be difficult to decide whether the exegesis of a passage cited from a prophet is not of purely Christian origin; but there are unquestionably some cases (notably Dan 7:13) in which the importation of a reference to an individual Messiah into passages which really contain no such reference, is of pre-Christian date.

4. Various forms of the conception of the Messiah.—It is difficult to determine with any minuteness how the Messiah was conceived, as regarded either His Person or His work. In regard to the former, e.g., it would be unwarrantable to infer from Mat 1:23 (cf. Isa 7:14) that it was generally believed that He would be born of a virgin, and perhaps equally so to infer from the fact that the disciples (Mat 16:16) | [Note: |

Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten, Heft vi., Berlin, 1899.]), and perhaps others also (Mat 14:33), expressed their belief in the Messiahship of Jesus by calling Him the Son of God, the prevalence of a belief among Jewish theologians of the 1st cent. that the Messiah was of one metaphysical being with Jahweh. The utmost perhaps which we can affirm is that it was largely believed that the origin of the Messiah would be mysterious (Joh 7:27), and that this belief rested in all probability directly on the Messianic interpretation of Dan 7:13 ff. § [Note: On the antiquity of the Danielic conception itself see the interesting work of H. Gressmann, *Der Crsprung der isr.-jüd. Eschatologie*, p. 334 ff., Gottingen, 1905.] It seems possible, however, to distinguish two general types of belief regarding the Messiah and His work. The one may be called the *Prophetic*, the other the *Apocalyptic* type. The former type, which was the more popular and held its ground even with the scholars of the time (Mar 12:35 ff. | | [Note: | Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten, Heft vi., Berlin, 1899.]), rested on the early Prophetic testimony that the Messiah would spring from the house of David,—a belief of whose persistence and of whose correspondence with the actual fact the circumstance that Jesus is confidently affirmed or assumed by five of the NT writers (Matthew, Luke, Paul, author of Hebrews, author of Apocalypse* [Note: Mat 1:1, Luk 3:31, Rom 1:3, Heb 7:14, Rev 5:5.]) to have been of the seed of David may be considered the most striking proof. According to this type, so far as purely Jewish belief is concerned, the work of the Messiah, while superhuman, was conceived on comparatively secular lines. He would destroy his persistent enemies and establish a reign of lasting righteousness and peace over obedient and contented subjects. This type, taken by itself, hardly possesses for us eschatological interest. It belongs to a mode of conception in which the problems of death and immortality, if realized at all, cannot be solved. The sphere offered for solving them is too mundane. It is otherwise with the apocalyptic type of view, which rested mainly on the Book of Daniel, esp. Dan 7:13 ff; Dan 12:2 f. Whether or not the author of Daniel in the latter of these passages conceived of a resurrection from the dead available for all past generations of faithful Israelites, it seems certain that in the time of our Lord this sense was assigned to his words by those who, like the Pharisees, held the doctrine. According to Josephus,† [Note: xviii. i. 3; BJ ii. viii. 4.] the Pharisees held a fatalistic doctrine of the present life—but not of human conduct—which seems to have resembled that of the Stoics, and which made them for the most part averse to schemes of political revolution. Their participation, therefore, in the popular view of the ‘Son of David’ was more theoretical than real. Their tendency was to conceive the final Kingdom on strictly supernatural lines. It was a wonder that would not spring from earth, but would descend from heaven. The Messiah was the Man of Daniel’s vision, the Man of the Clouds.‡ [Note: Gressmann, l.c., p. 336.]

Two points have recently been much in dispute: (a) Whether in view of the grammatical possibilities of Aramaic, as used in the time of Jesus, He could have applied to Himself the phrase 'Son of Man' or 'Man' as a title, basing on [Dan_7:13](#); and (b) Whether He could have done this so habitually as our Gospels represent. Even those who, like Lietzmann[§] [Note: *Der Menschensohn, ein Beitrag zur neutest. Theol.* 1896.] and Wellhausen,[|] [Note: *Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten, Heft vi., Berlin, 1899.*] have reached on these points the most negative conclusions, do not doubt that in the latter part of His career, and perhaps habitually, Jesus held the apocalyptic view of the final Kingdom and of the glorious advent of the Messiah; and, even if we exclude the title 'Son of Man' from those passages in the Gospels which have no eschatological reference, there remains a sufficient number (about a third of the entire number, exclusive of John) where the eschatological reference is distinct. Thus, e.g., out of 32 instances of 'Son of Man' in Matthew's Gospel, 14 are apocalyptic.¶ [Note: Muirhead, *Eschatology of Jesus*, p. 218, London, 1904.]

It is indubitable that in the time of our Lord the Book of Daniel and other Apocalypses modelled on it were much read by a considerable portion of the Jewish people. Many of those whose views were influenced by this literature saw no inconsistency in combining with these views others derived from literature of the 'prophetic' type, e.g. *The Psalter of Solomon*,* [Note: * *Psalms of the Pharisees, commonly called The Psalms of Solomon*, Ryle and James, Cambridge, 1891.] embodying the ancient and still popular conception of the 'Son of David.' Yet, as this veneration for ancient prophecy was combined for the most part with political quiescence, it may perhaps be said that in the more reflective minds 'Son of David' and 'Son of Man' represented one heavenly ideal. Jesus Himself expressly repudiated the implications of 'Son of David' ([Mar_12:35](#) ff. | |); but it is remarkable that this did not hinder the prevalence in Christian circles of the Apostolic age of the belief that He was of the seed of David according to the flesh, and the Evangelists Matthew and Luke risked publishing pedigrees, whose apparent mutual inconsistencies constitute the chief difficulty of the modern mind in accepting the fact they were designed to establish.

Instructive in this connexion is the phrase 'Kingdom of the heavens' in Matthew's Gospel. The phrase is, of course, equivalent in meaning to 'Kingdom of God' which the other Evangelists employ. It need not, however, be questioned that Jesus, occasionally at least, used 'Kingdom of the heavens,' and it seems certain that He did not invent the phrase. It was current, and it pointed to the apocalyptic construction of the Messianic hope. The Kingdom belonged to the heavens, and would come thence to earth. It was the unlikeness of Jesus to the altogether wonderful Personage of the apocalyptic Messiah that offended the Pharisees. If He were the Messiah, why should He refuse a sign from heaven? ([Mat_16:1](#) ff.).

5. The preliminaries of the coming Kingdom.—Assuming this leading idea of a Kingdom to come, heavenly in its origin and nature, we must now ask how the various matters preliminary to or accompanying its advent were conceived.

(a) Who were *the heirs of the Kingdom*? There were people ‘just and devout’ (Luk_2:25) who ‘waited for the consolation of Israel,’ the still surviving type of Jahweh’s ‘poor ones’ who ‘cried unto him and he heard them’ (Psa_34:6). Such persons, however, did not advertise themselves, nor did they as a rule sit in the seat of the learned. The prevailing teachers were the scribes and Pharisees, whose yoke, practically intolerable, was yet theoretically imperative. It has been questioned how far readers of the Gospels get from them a fair impression of the moral and religious influence exercised by the teachers of the Law, and it has been contended, with perhaps some justice, that the impression so derived is as one-sided as the impression of the Roman Church one naturally gathers from histories of the Protestant Reformation. Still, the good type of scribe or Catholic is not due to the tendency against which the Evangelic text or the Reformation is a protest. It cannot be doubted that in the time of our Lord it was authoritatively taught by the Pharisees that the title to inheritance of the heavenly kingdom was a punctilious observance of the Law after the manner of their own practice. Their doctrine, indeed, on this point is not explicitly stated in the Gospels or in any contemporary documents. But the impression we gather from the situation depicted in the Gospels and from the record regarding the Apostle Paul favours the supposition that the view of the Pharisees in the time of Jesus is that represented by the Rabbinism of the 2nd cent., viz. that *the Messiah would come when Jahweh’s people, the Jews, were found generally and carefully observing the Law.** [Note: The Jerusalem Talmud (Taan. 64a) remarks on Exo_16:25 that ‘if Israel only kept one Sabbath according to the commandment, the Messiah would immediately come.’ See Edersheim’s *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. ii. p. 713.] And the ‘Law’ meant not simply the legal precepts of the Pentateuch (in particular the Priestly Code), it meant the ‘tradition’ of the elders. While the average man inevitably shook off the punctilios of obedience, and the Pharisees themselves took refuge from their own rigour in an elaborate casuistry, we cannot doubt that the generally accepted view was that the passport to the Kingdom was ‘the righteousness of the law.’

(b) *The Resurrection.* But generations of faithful Israelites passed, and the Messiah did not come. Would they miss the glory when it came? At least since the time of the Syrian persecution (b.c. 168-165)—the time of the Apocalypse of Daniel—it was taught that death formed no insuperable barrier to the inheritance of the Kingdom. Probably the author of Daniel (Dan_12:2 f.) had in view mainly (we cannot say exclusively) those Israelites who had sealed their fidelity to the law of Jahweh with their blood, but it may be taken for certain that, long before the time represented by the Gospels,

all idea of the blessings of the Kingdom being restricted to members of the holy nation who had suffered death for their fidelity (if such an idea was ever entertained), had completely disappeared. It was taught that there would be a resurrection of the *righteous* (Luk_14:14), *i.e.* of those who kept the 'Law' and the 'Tradition.'

(c) *Hades, Gehenna, Paradise.* There is nowhere in the Gospels an explicit statement of what was held regarding the state of the dead; but four times (Mat_11:23; Mat_16:18, Luk_10:15; Luk_16:23) the word *Hades* (Αἴδης) occurs. In the LXX Septuagint this word is the almost invariable equivalent of שְׁאוֹל; and when Jesus used it without comment, it must be held to have conveyed to His hearers the associations proper to that word. The NT as well as the OT* [Note: On this whole subject of the conception of Sheol, etc., cf. esp. A. B. Davidson, *Theol. of the OT*, p. 425 ff., T. & T. Clark, 1904] is dominated by a view of things in which the modern idea that annihilation may be the fate of some men has no place. The dead are in a land of darkness and forgetfulness, cut off from knowledge of affairs human and Divine. Still, in this condition—at most the pale reflexion of full-blooded life—they *exist*. Two things, however, must be observed: (i.) There is in the OT itself a marked, if not systematized, protest against the idea that permanent detention in Sheol or Hades can be the fate of the righteous, who had found their portion in the living God (see esp. Psalms 16, 73 and Job 14, 19). Historically, doubtless, the experience of suffering under the various oppressors of the nation (Assyrian, Chaldaean, Graeco-Syrian) had much to do with the development of this protest; but it is probably a mistake to suppose that it was when they were actually suffering under the yoke of the world-powers that the people of Jahweh adopted from foreign sources much or anything that bore on the problem of what lay beyond death. This caution applies specially to the relation of Hebrew thought to the mythological ideas of Babylon or Egypt. The impregnation of the Hebrew spirit with ideas coming from these sources dates in all probability from a much earlier period than the 6th cent. b.c. All we can say for certain, perhaps, is that the experience of national humiliation quickened in a special degree the peculiar Hebrew genius, leading it at this time (say from the 6th cent. onwards) to place the peculiar stamp of the Jahweh faith on mythical ideas or pictures, which in some cases it had carried with it since the days of its infancy in Mesopotamia. (ii.) Although there is no hint in the OT itself of effect being given to moral distinctions between the wicked and the godly in Hades itself, yet the suggestion of a possible escape for the godly from the gloom of the underworld could not but raise, and ultimately decide, another question, *viz.* whether the distinction between the godly and the wicked was not observed from the moment of death. For perhaps about 100 years before Christ the idea of separate compartments in Hades, for the godly and the wicked respectively, had more or less prevailed (see Apocalyptic Literature, esp. the part dealing with the Book of Enoch).

Obviously our Lord could not have uttered the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Luk 16:19 ff.), or said to the penitent malefactor (Luk 23:43), 'To-day shalt thou be with me in *Paradise*,' had He not been addressing people accustomed to the idea that in the intermediate state, previous to the resurrection and the final judgment, moral distinctions were accorded a real, if incomplete, recognition. It is obvious from the entire tenor of our Lord's references (see esp. the instructive passage Mat 5:21 f.) to *Gehenna* that He spoke to those to whom this term represented the utmost condemnation and punishment. It represented the fate of those who should still be enemies of Jahweh in that day when Jerusalem should be renewed by righteousness, and all flesh (*i.e.* all living) should go out and behold the car-cases of those who had transgressed, for 'their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched' (Isa 66:23 f.). See artt. *Gehenna* and *Paradise*.

(d) *The Final Judgment*. In our Christian minds, as with the NT writers, the idea of the *Resurrection* is inseparably associated with that of the *Judgment* which follows it. In the main track of OT thought, indeed, this association did not exist. The habit of conceiving the subject of the Divine favour or punishment rather as a *nation* than as a number of *individuals*, made it possible, or even natural, practically to ignore the individual side of the problem of life and death, and the distinction, natural to us, between this world and that which is to come is represented in the OT mainly by the distinction between this life *with* God and this life *without* Him. Under this view of things the prevailing conception of judgment in OT times is that of a manifestation of Jahweh's righteousness (whether it be through His 'messenger' [Mal 3:1] or through the Messianic 'Son of David' [Isa 11:1 ff.]), in which He effectually visits His people with His mercy, and breaks the arm of the unrighteous peoples, who forget God and oppress them. These heathen return to Sheol (Psa 9:17); but the covenant of Jahweh with His faithful people is established for ever. The history seems to show that it was possible for pious Israelites to rest in this view, merging individual hopes in hopes for the nation, until the actual disaster of the Exile shook their faith in the permanence of the collective unit of the Jewish State. From this time, however, as we see clearly from the writings of Jeremiah and Ezekiel (cf. esp. Ezekiel 18), the claims of the individual come into prominence. It was felt that in the righteousness of God one generation ought not to suffer for the sins of its predecessors. Each generation, even each unit of a generation, had its own rights. Yet, in fact, it seemed as though these rights were ignored. It is with the problem raised by this conflict between the prophetic conscience and the facts, that the apocalyptic literature from Daniel onwards is concerned. The solution obtained springs from the despair that lies on the border of hope. The mundane element in the old idea of a Prince of the house of David tends to disappear. The blessing, which could not spring from earth, was expected from heaven, and at the touch of the new power, coming thence, even the 'dust' of the earth (*i.e.* esp. dead Israelites who had kept the covenant) should awake (Isa 26:19). While, doubtless, the adumbrations of the conception of immortality

which we find scattered throughout the OT had their origin in the sentiment that it must be well with the righteous for ever, this positive aspect of the matter was inseparable from a negative. The righteous could hardly be vindicated unless punishment fell on the rebels and transgressors. Hence even in Dan 12:2, which cannot be said to teach a *universal* resurrection, among the ‘many’ who awake from the dust of the earth there are ‘some’ who arise to ‘shame and everlasting contempt.’ It was inevitable that these conceptions should be universalized. If, as even the former Prophets and Psalmists in their own fashion had taught, there was to be a *universal* judgment (*i.e.* a vengeance of Jahweh exercised upon all rebel Gentiles and upon the transgressors of the covenant in Israel), and if the collective unit of the *nation* was practically displaced by the *individual*, it is clear that the idea of universal judgment must have come to have for its counterpart the idea of universal resurrection. No doubt the conception was held vaguely, and was as little effective for practical consolation as it is to this day (cf. Martha’s attitude, Joh 11:24)—still it was there. When Jesus spoke of the ‘resurrection of the dead,’ or even of the Messianic ‘Son of Man’ as executing judgment, He was using language whose general implications were either entirely or (as in the case of ‘Son of Man’) at least partially understood by His hearers.

B. The main features of our Lord’s eschatological teaching,—Turning now to the subject of our Lord’s eschatological teaching, and looking to the present condition of critical opinion, we may make a distinction, which has in most respects only a theoretical value, between the eschatological views of the early Church as reflected in the Gospels and those held and taught by Jesus Himself. The Gospels are as a whole too entirely dominated by the spirit of truth as it was in Jesus to make it possible, without arbitrariness, to vindicate this distinction in detail. Yet the investigation in which we are engaged seems to reveal problems arising out of portions of even the Synoptic Gospels, in connexion with which it may be well to remember that the Master must not be measured even by His best reporters. The distinction may seem *a priori* to have even more warrant in reference to the Fourth Gospel, whose representation both of the Person and the words of Jesus stands in such obvious contrast to that of the Synoptics as to justify our dealing with it in a separate section. We may do this even though in the end we may find ourselves to agree with Haupt* [Note: Haupt, *Die Eschatol. Aussagen Jesu in den Synopt. Evangelien*, Berlin, 1895.] that the Johannine presentation of the eschatology of Jesus supplies just the kind of supplement to that of the Synoptics which a critical study of the latter led us to think necessary. We therefore consider at present only the eschatology of Jesus as presented in the Synoptic Gospels.

1. His conception of the Kingdom of God.—Both John the Baptist and Jesus preached, saying, ‘Repent: for the Kingdom of God (in Mt. most frequently ‘the Kingdom of the heavens’) is at hand.’ There seems no reason to doubt that in general

Jesus thought of the Kingdom just as John did. Modern writers on the Gospels, like Johannes Weiss† [Note: Johannes Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*, Gottingen, 1900.] and Titius,‡ [Note: Titius, *Die neutest. Lehre von der Seligkeit*, pt. i. 1895.] warn us with considerable justice against reading our own philosophical thoughts into the simple realism of the Bible. The Kingdom of God meant the perfect rule of God over all things in earth and heaven for the benefit of His people. It was eternal, it was universal in the sense of embracing people of all nations, though, of course, only those in each nation who did righteousness; and it embraced not earth only, but also heaven, whence it should come, and to whose type, as regarded at least the character of its subjects, it should be conformed. It may be postulated perhaps, further, that the Kingdom was conceived by Jesus, in at least its external features, on the closest possible analogy to an earthly kingdom. In two important respects, however, it differed from the latter. (a) It was not promoted by the weapons of flesh and blood. It was a Kingdom where rank—even that of the King Himself—was determined by the measure of service. The spirit of service was the spirit of lowly love. (b) It was a Kingdom which, while coming ultimately from God and heaven, came through a Mediator, by whom it would be administered. Since His baptism Jesus had the witness within Himself that He was the Mediator. He was the Messianic King who was truly the ‘Son of God’ (Psalms 2). To Him the whole trust of the Kingdom was given, even all power in heaven and earth. Barring the mystery revealed at His baptism, which concerned primarily Himself only, we must admit that such a view of things was inevitable to One who found the form and substance of His faith in the OT, and at the same time believed, in harmony with the earlier Prophets and the prevailing tendency of His own time, in a personal Messiah. We seem therefore warranted in assuming that such was the view of Jesus at the commencement of His ministry. The Kingdom was coming from heaven. He Himself was the Person appointed to establish it on earth. Beyond this, however, the witness of the OT and His own special experience previous to and at the time of His baptism would not necessarily carry Him. It is perhaps permissible to find in the story of the Temptation (Mat 4:1 ff., Luk 4:1 ff.) the record of a period when, not without a struggle with the prince of this evil world, He renounced the idea that the Kingdom was to come immediately through some dramatic catastrophic exercise of the heavenly power with which He felt Himself to be charged. It is more to our purpose at present to note that while He renounced this catastrophic ideal (if we may call it so) to the extent of refusing to allow it to deflect Him from obedience to the Divine word, He did not, according to the Synoptics, renounce it so far as His general view of the mode of the Kingdom’s advent was concerned. To the last He spoke in apocalyptic fashion of the Son of Man coming on the clouds. The glorious Parousia would illuminate simultaneously all quarters of heaven like the lightning (Luk 17:24). It would happen within that generation although He could not tell the day nor the hour, and it would be preceded by disasters on a great scale, affecting not simply the

human world, but the cosmical system. How far it is true to the mind of Jesus, as He spoke on earth, to take the language of the so-called 'great eschatological discourse' (Mark 13, cf. Matthew 24) with strict literalness, has been of late keenly debated, and some have been disposed to see in this discourse and matter harmonizing with it in the Gospels, an example of the way in which our Lord found it necessary to accommodate His language to conceptions which were inevitable for the hearers if not for Himself. Others may perhaps incline to a view which has been advocated by the present writer,* [Note: cit., Lect. i.] that the phenomena of this peculiarly apocalyptic discourse offer an occasion on which it is profitable to remember that the thoughts of Jesus far transcended those of even the most forward of His disciples. But, while we may well acknowledge a certain elusiveness in the language of Jesus in which He deals with the future, we cannot without violence to the Synoptic record refuse to admit that in His habitual view the Kingdom of God was not something that had already come with Himself, but was rather something that still lay in the future. Everyone sees that when Jesus said, 'The kingdom of God is at hand' (cf. ἤγγικεν = *has come near*), or bade the disciples pray, 'Thy kingdom come,' He must have thought of the Kingdom as being still in the future.

But what of the passages in which it seems to be implied that the Kingdom is already present? For instance Mat 11:11 (cf. Luk 7:28), in which John the Baptist is declared less than the least in the Kingdom of God, or Mat 12:28 (cf. Luk 11:20), in which the expelling of demons in the name of God is offered as proof that the Kingdom of God has come, or the parables (Mat 13:31 ff., Mar 4:30 ff.) in which the Kingdom of God is represented as actually in process of coming to its proper magnitude in the world, and therefore already rooted there? It is the *crux* of the student of eschatology in the Gospels to show how these two modes of conception, *presential* and *futuristic* (sometimes distinguished as *ethical* and *eschatological*), can be reconciled. Perhaps the most satisfactory recent treatment of the subject is to be found in a brief but brilliant essay of Professor Wernle.* [Note: Die Reichsgotteshoffnung in den ältesten christlichen Dokumenten und bei Jesus, 1903.] Wernle lays probably excessive stress on what he considers the 'ecclesiastical' element in the construction of even the Synoptic Gospels (esp. Matthew). But his book, read in the light of the contributions of predecessors to the same discussion (esp. Haupt, Titius, and Joh. Weiss), shows very convincingly that we must, in fairness to our authorities the Synoptics, and in view of the entire historical situation reflected in these writings, start from the fact that our Lord habitually thought and spoke of the Kingdom—however much He might identify it with Himself—as, so to speak, an *objective wonder of the future*. It does not, indeed, follow that this was the sole or even the most important aspect of it present to His mind; but it seems right that we should accommodate to it, if possible, those passages in which the Kingdom seems to be spoken of as if it were already present, and that this accommodation should be made apart from the intrusion of

distinctively modern thoughts. This Wernle has done with great plausibility in the case of the passages above referred to, pointing out that when regard is had to the context, literal or circumstantial, the difficulty disappears. Thus in the passage Mat 11:11 (Luk 7:28) a main element in the situation is a certain rivalry between the circle of John the Baptist and the circle of Jesus. The former approach the latter in an attitude of aggressive doubt. If Jesus is the Messiah, where is the Kingdom that should come with Him? In what respect are those who have attached themselves to Jesus better than those who hold to their old master, John? To such aggressive questioning the answer is: 'The Kingdom has come already. Its powers are seen working among us (Mat 11:5 f.). Those who keep apart from the sphere of these wonders, however truly they may fulfil otherwise the conditions of membership in the Kingdom, are yet actually standing on the outside.' On this reading, the passage, so far from being antagonistic to the eschatological view of the Kingdom, in reality strongly supports that view. For a main point of the argument is the assumption that, while a high ethical standard in practice may be expected of the children of the Kingdom or may be a condition of entrance into it, the Kingdom itself is something more than this. It is the product of a power altogether supernatural and apart from the will of men. Not righteousness, but the working of this power, is the criterion of the Kingdom. Else surely the Kingdom would be with the greatest of men born of women, and not (as it actually is) with men of even much less stature than his.

The same line of solution seems available in the case of the other passages. Thus in the passage Mat 12:22 ff., esp. Mat 12:28 (cf. Luk 11:14 ff., esp. Luk 11:20), a main element in the situation is again the element of attack. The Pharisees insinuate that the demons may be subdued by the power of Beelzebub, their prince. Jesus answers that such a state of the case is inconceivable. Satan cannot wish to overthrow his own work. If, on the other hand, the power be the power of God, then the Kingdom of God has come in effect. The strong man armed (the prince of this world and author of all evil in it) has been conquered and bound. Again, obviously, the criterion of the Kingdom is not simply the presence of the good, but the presence of the good in *power*. Finally, there are the parables in which the Kingdom is spoken of as something growing in the earth and therefore already planted. Note especially the parables of the Mustard-seed and the Leaven. Here, indeed, we are left to imagine the context in which the parables were uttered, as even Mark (Luk 4:36 ff.) in this instance follows the topical method of Matthew, and relates the parables only as specimens of the didactic method of Jesus (cf. Luk 4:33). But may we not reasonably suppose, as in the other cases, the context of a certain antagonism? Timid followers come to Him with a difficulty born of vision and reflexion: 'If Thus art He with whom the Kingdom comes, why is the word of the Kingdom really received by so few who hear it, or how shall even the wonders of God done in one little land affect the whole world?' To which Jesus replies in effect: 'Have patience, and you shall see.' The greatest things of the world are not always those that give promise of greatness. They are often those

whose beginnings are remarkably small, and yet connecting beginning and end is the one power. If this was the occasion of the utterance of the parables under discussion (and it seems difficult even to imagine another), it is obvious that both the question of the doubters and the answer of Jesus assume that the constituent of the Kingdom is the supernatural Divine power before which no opposition can stand. The question is, Can the power really be present when there is so little to show for it? And the answer is, Yes, it can. The same power that begins with little ends with much. We read our own thoughts into the simple intention of these parables, when we speak as if Jesus intended to teach that the manifestation of the Kingdom would not be catastrophic, but would be a matter of growth and development. Doubtless the parables, taken by themselves, are capable of bearing this meaning; but just this isolation of them from the general context of the situation reflected in the Gospel history is that of which we must beware. But there remains still what is, apparently, the most important passage, Luk 17:20 ff. Whether we translate 'in you' or 'among you' (ἐντὸς ὑμῶν, Luk 17:21), Jesus seems to say very emphatically that the Kingdom is present. On a nearer view of the passage, however, and a more careful articulation of its sentences, this appearance vanishes. Luk 17:21 must be understood in harmony with Luk 17:23 ff. (cf. the 'lo, here' and the 'lo, there' of Luk 17:21; Luk 17:23). The leading thought of the passage is the suddenness (in the special aspect of simultaneousness) of the manifestation of the Kingdom. The advent of the great day shall be like the lightning flash, of which you cannot say, 'here' or 'there,' for it is everywhere and all at once.

It thus appears that there is nothing in the Synoptics really antagonistic to the 'eschatological' view of the Kingdom. The Kingdom is not *present* in any sense not reconcilable with the fact that it is also and mainly future. No one may understand the Gospels who cannot accept the fact that in a perfectly distinct sense the teaching of Jesus was not modern. It was in the highest degree sane and authoritative, yet it remained true to the traditional view that the Kingdom would come by miracle and catastrophe. The unmistakable indications of this are the facts that the references to the Kingdom in the Synoptics are prevailing of futuristic implication (on this see Wernle, *op. cit.*), and that even in the Fourth Gospel there are numerous passages to show that Jesus never thought of the Consummation apart from the transcendent wonders of the Resurrection and the Judgment.

There was, however, one important modification of the traditional view. The Consummation and all that accompanied it were to be mediated and, indeed, effected by Himself. Prophecy, it is true, contained the promise of a Messiah. But the correspondences of fulfilment to prophecy are largely contrasts, and the impressiveness of history is perhaps mainly due to these contrasts. The efforts of the Evangelist Matthew to show—sometimes in strangely far-fetched ways—that Jesus

fulfilled the prophecies, are an instructive index of the difficulties felt by even the most spiritually minded Jews in reconciling the Messiahship of Jesus with the testimony of prophecy. It becomes important to inquire how in an eschatological aspect Jesus conceived His own Messiahship.

2. His Messianic consciousness.—Of great significance in this connexion is the Temptation. The record of this cannot rest on other testimony than His own, and the key to the juxtaposition of the narratives of the Baptism and the Temptation must be sought in His Messianic consciousness. The latter, therefore, we must try reverently to conceive. It seems true to say that the Temptation represents a contrast or conflict of faith that pervades our Lord's entire ministry on earth. In general it is the contrast between God and man, between what is omnipotent and what is humanly possible; in particular, it is the contrast between a measureless gift and the definite responsibility of using it aright. Jesus had received a practically limitless endowment. He was in the world as God, for He was the 'Son' of God accredited to His own consciousness by His Father. Yet He was flesh and blood, a genuine Brother of men. Each term of this contrast had its own place in the will of God. It was the task of the Messiah to reconcile them. Thus He would do the will of God. An unrestrained use of this gift would remove Him from the brotherhood of men; a refusal to use it meant the failure of His mission. How was a superhuman task to be done by One who should yet remain a man? The key to this problem was grasped in the victorious experience of the Temptation. What the solution meant in detail we learn from the subsequent history. Reading that history in the light of the Temptation-narrative, we seem to discern in it two principles: (a) the one is the principle of *faith*; (b) the other is the principle of *self-sacrifice*. These two principles have, of course, a common root in the one Messianic life; but it is useful to view them apart. The principle of *faith* covers the strictly supernatural side of the work of consummating the Kingdom. It is the *hope of what God will do through His Messianic Son in bringing the promised Kingdom from heaven to earth*. We cannot do justice to the consciousness of our Lord reflected in the Gospels if we fail to note the supremacy of this principle. If we may make for the moment the distinction between *faith* and *duty*, we must find what is at once deepest and loftiest in the consciousness of Jesus—not in the thought of what He Himself is to do in the fulfilment of the Messianic career but—in what God is to do in Him and through Him. He never loses sight of the 'one like unto a son of man' who is to come with the clouds and receive a dominion universal and everlasting. The Messiahship is not simply His present *task*. It is His *hope* for Himself and for the world. The eschatology of Jesus is mainly His hope of the accomplishment of an act of omnipotence, in which God will finally constitute the Messianic Person and functions. This hope was necessarily shadowy in circumstantial outline, but it rested on an absolutely substantial foundation. Its foundation was the presence of the Spirit that fell to Him as the Son of God. The gift of the Spirit, moreover, was not simply the ground of a hope that related primarily only to Himself. It was a leading of duty and a

power of benefit in relation to others. He could give to others helps that were not permissible to Himself. Hence there is a miraculous element in the Messianic ministry even on earth. The miracles are the premonitory signs of the final Messianic glory. They are the pledge that the Power which will be manifested in that glory is not far away. While these σημεῖα and δυνάμεις abound in the earthly ministry, they are always under the control of the principle of faith. No one is suffered to experience the extraordinary helps who does not believe.

The *other* principle, resting equally in the depths of our Lord's filial consciousness, is the principle of *self-sacrifice*. It is in the practical dominance of this principle that we may discern at once the originality of Jesus and the difference between His eschatology and that of contemporary Jewish faith. While He retains the traditional view that the Consummation will be effected in transcendent catastrophic fashion,—collapse of the present world, appearance of the 'Son of Man,' resurrection, judgment,—He reaches the conviction, possibly as early as the time of His baptism, that this Consummation will not be attained previous to His own death and resurrection. How entirely this conviction, once attained, dominated His conception of the Divine purpose and His teaching of His disciples, may be seen in the facts not only that in the Fourth Gospel the sacrificial death of the Messiah is prophesied by the Baptist, and is a matter of our Lord's consciousness from the very beginning of His ministry (Joh 2:19 ff.), but also that (as regards the latter point) there is little if anything in the Synoptic Gospels opposed to the Johannine view. This may not decide the comparatively unimportant question as to *when* our Lord attained the conviction that He must as the Messiah submit to a violent death, but taken along with the testimony of the rest of the NT (say, especially, the Pauline and Petrine Epp.) it shows conclusively the practically predominant importance of this *event*—or rather *signal service*—in the mind and faith of the Christian Church. For every *one* text in the Epistles that calls attention to the glory of the Kingdom that is to come in the incomprehensible power of God, there are probably at least *two* in which the emphasis rests not on the *power* of God the Father, but on the *love* of the Son of God. Indeed, it may be questioned whether there is a single reference to the Consummation in the Epistles or the Apocalypse of the NT which does not in its immediate context suggest that the centre of the coming glory is the Person of Him who was delivered for the offences of His people, but raised for their justification. Even in the Epp. to the Thessalonians, which are commonly supposed to represent the most primitive type of Pauline doctrine, it is not the 'Kingdom of God,' but 'His Son from heaven,' that is to believers the object of waiting (1Th 1:10).

This indissoluble connexion between the 'sufferings of the Christ' and the 'glory that should follow' (1Pe 1:11) could not have been fixed so securely in the mind of the first believers had it not been first in the mind of Jesus Himself. The Synoptics bear

witness to the importance of the connexion for Jesus not only by reporting the profoundly significant but isolated sayings, Mat 20:28; Mat 26:28 f. ||, but by the very distinct way in which they connect the critical incident of the disciples confessing their Master's Messiahship with the institution of a new order of lessons, the theme of which is the necessity and the near prospect of the Messiah's sufferings (Mat 16:21 ff. ||). This representation rests on a sure basis of reminiscence, and it seems to have a special guarantee in the fact that the teaching does not contain an articulated doctrine of atonement like that which is expressed in the Epp. (esp. Romans), but aims rather at expressing the necessity of the Master's sufferings in terms that apply equally to the disciple. Admitting the distinctiveness of the two sayings, Mat 20:28; Mat 26:28 f. ||, we seem warranted in saying that, according to the Synoptics, the view of things that practically determined the career of Jesus was that the good of which He possessed the pledge in His unique filial consciousness would not come during the period of His own life on earth. The spirit that brought help and healing to others was, as regarded Himself, a spirit of self-sacrifice. The sacrifice would culminate in His death. But the death would be momentary. In two or three days (cf. Hos 6:2) He would rise again. Yet the momentary death would not be in vain. The death and resurrection of the Messiah meant a conquest of death for a new believing Israel. The death would be the ransom price (λύτρον, Mat 20:28) which neither man nor angel could pay for the soul of a brother man. It would be the institution and support of the true and abiding temple of the Divine presence (Exo 30:11 ff., Job 33:18-24, Psa 49:6-9. See on this A. B. Bruce's *Kingdom of God*: T. & T. Clark, 1889). The thought of the redemptive value of the sufferings of Jesus as the Christ dominates the Fourth Gospel, most of the Epistles, and the Apocalypse of the NT. If it is not prominent, it is certainly present, in the Synoptic Gospels. The lack of prominence finds its explanation in the reserve that naturally characterized the utterance of Jesus regarding His own death. The presence of frequent or elaborate references to the matter in these Gospels would have taken from our estimate of their 'objective' character. Jesus may well have felt that the work of the Messiah was to die, not to explain the consequences or power of that death. Of this there would be *another* Witness. He who sacrifices himself commits his case to God and to posterity. This brings us to another matter.

3. His view of the time of the Consummation.—We have seen that Jesus did not dissociate Himself from the traditional view that the end would come in the form of a catastrophic transformation, culminating in the advent of the Messiah Himself, who would come from heaven. He seems rather everywhere, both by the assumptions and by the direct references of His language, to set His seal to this view. When we consider how widely His consciousness of personal concern in the accomplishing of the Kingdom must have caused His view of things to differ from all views that were by comparison tentative and theoretical, and reflect how much there is in the ethical

quality of His teaching, particularly in the parables which conceive the Kingdom under the analogy of natural growth, to suggest an openness of His mind to all that may be of abiding worth in the modern idea of evolution, the tenacity with which He adhered to the catastrophic view of the final event cannot but profoundly impress us. Reverent investigators will pause before accepting the conclusion that He was in this matter under some kind of delusion. They will strive rather to see in the attitude of One who was conscious of being not simply the herald but also the bearer of the Kingdom of God, a model for the attitude of all who would turn serious thoughts to the last things. Whatever else we bring to a study where there is room for all knowledge and all thought, we must give a final as well as a supreme and pervasive place to the wonder-working power of the living God. We have sure ground in the Synoptics for saying that, while Jesus regarded the work of His Father in heaven, even in what we call *nature* and *ordinary providence*, as wonderful (Mat 6:25 ff. etc.), this did not prevent Him from steadfastly contemplating a final wonder of destruction and reconstruction which should be the consummation of the Kingdom or its perfect establishment on earth. While so much is clear, there is very great difficulty involved in the question whether He predicted, so definitely and unmistakably as the Synoptics lead us to suppose, that the final wonder would be accomplished within the term of the generation then living. The problem is not to be solved either by the *quantitative* method of counting heads (whether Gospel texts or modern authorities), or by the *alternative* method of saying, Either He was mistaken, or such texts as Mar 9:1; Mar 13:30 || are false reports. It can hardly be doubted that Jesus uttered words which were naturally understood, by those who heard them and by others to whom they were reported, to mean that the final wonder—the Parousia of the ‘Man’ of Daniel’s vision and of age-long expectation—would happen within their own generation. It is inconceivable that an expectation so confident and definite could have rested on anything but a definite reminiscence of words used by Jesus which seemed capable of only one interpretation.

Is it, then, possible to justify such sayings as Mar 9:1; Mar 13:30 || apart from the blunt avowal that Jesus laboured under an illusion, and that He transmitted the illusion to His immediate followers not only *before* but *after* His death and resurrection? This has been felt to be among the most difficult questions of historical Christology, and various types of solution of the problem are still represented by leading authorities. These may be roughly classified under the heads: (a) *prophetic*, (b) *pictorial*, (c) *realistic*. Under (a) would be included all theories, such as that of Beyschlag, which emphasize the fact that in this instance at least Jesus spoke in the manner of an OT prophet, and that His utterance kept within the limitation common to all the prophets. This limitation required Him to see and announce the final salvation of Jehovah as about to happen within a measurable interval after the judgment (in this case the fall of Jerusalem) impending over the nation. Under (b) would be included theories of the type of Haupt’s, which emphasize the necessarily

pictorial character of language, which must express extra-mundane realities in mundane forms. Might not the assertion that the Son of Man would come on the clouds within their own generation be the most effective way of leading persons familiar with the apocalyptic style of language to the perfectly confident but also essentially spiritual type of faith represented in the NT literature? (c) The term *realistic*, finally, might describe all theories whose tendency is to insist on what has been called the 'biblical realism,' and to require us to put upon the language of Jesus the most literal or *natural* construction possible. The most distinguished representative of this type in its bearing on the present problem is perhaps Titius. Titius thinks that Jesus must be considered to have held in a *bonâ fide* sense the view which His words naturally express, viz. that His own generation would see the end of the present wicked world and the establishment on earth of the perfect heavenly Kingdom. But His confession of ignorance as to the day and the hour of the Consummation (Mar 13:32) shows that He held His own conviction in an attitude of reverent submission to His Father's will, which must have made the transition to acceptance of the differing reality easy and natural.

It is possible to incline to any one of the above types consistently with a reverential appreciation of the unique mental and spiritual equipment of Jesus; and valuable elements of truth may be found in them all. The opinion of English-speaking students of the Gospels has perhaps till recently inclined most to the *pictorial* type (*b*). For some time, however, this has been undergoing modifications from the increasing attention paid to the apocalyptic writings. This has fostered the belief that more regard than has been given is due to the realistic character of our Lord's mode of thought and utterance. On the whole, the variety and vacillation of opinion suggest the likelihood that we are not yet in a position to offer a solution of the problem that shall possess demonstrable certainty. Our information about Jesus, while adequate for spiritual and practical purposes, is insufficient for the purposes, or at least for the appetite, of biographical science. To a great extent we do not know, or are only slowly learning, either the exact occasions of His utterances or the amount of meaning they may have conveyed or failed to convey to those to whom they were delivered. Greater than the limitation arising from defective information, because more intimate to ourselves, is that connected with the inability of even the modern mind to find within itself a measure for the words of eternal life. To those to whom Jesus was and is the unique bearer of the Kingdom of God both to themselves and to the world, it must seem pertinent to ask whether those who can never stand in the centre of such responsibilities can properly estimate the things falling within the vision of the one Person, bearing our nature, who did and does so stand?

Without presuming to offer a key that fits the lock of all the critical difficulties, the present writer ventures to call attention to the view of the whole matter expressed in his *Eschatology of Jesus* (Melrose, 1904). While it does not meet the difficulties of

those whose view of the Person of Jesus is frankly naturalistic, it has some claim upon the attention of those to whom the historical Jesus was the unique manifestation in the flesh of the Power that is directing human history to its goal. To those for whom this conviction is fixed, the two following considerations may perhaps appear of paramount importance. The *one* is that many of the sayings of Jesus must have had a certain elusiveness. The mere fact that they were so habitually aphoristic and pictorial is itself almost a proof of this. Besides the meaning which immediately strikes us, there is a reserve of possible meaning which lies along the line of our vision, yet goes beyond what we actually see. There is a measure of this elusiveness in the language of all genuine seers. Must there not have been an extraordinary measure of it in the language of Jesus?

The *other* is that the elusive language of the seer is not *delusive*. Jesus does not set Himself to utter dark sayings; but His practical instinct keeps Him from dazzling His hearers with an excess of light. He gives them all the light they can take; but it does not follow either that this is all that fills the recesses of His own spirit, or, on the other hand, that in His utterance He is consciously keeping anything back. We must conceive the seer to deliver the truth in the form in which it holds his mind. But the *form* in this case is not the particular word or image. It is not even so impressive an image as that of the Son of Man coming with the clouds (Dan 7:13, cf. Mar 13:26; Mar 14:62 ||). The form concerns rather what may be called *spiritual emphasis*. It is the exact poise of the spiritual mind at the point of self-surrendering trust in the goodwill and immediate action of the good God. For such a mind the employment of definite words and images in relation to the secrets of the future may mean no more than a definite certainty of new and immediate manifestations of the Divine power and love. They do not necessarily mean a definite realization of the precise form in which the manifestation will be made. It is the definite certainty, not the indefinite form, which the words are calculated to convey. If they convey even to His most susceptible hearers something that is in one aspect more and in another less than this, this is due to the fact that their spiritual poise is inferior to His. The poise in their case is rectified by the subsequent teaching of the Spirit in the light of events.

Those who are able to accept this view will probably do so mainly for two reasons: (a) Because it explains the desire of Jesus to assure His faithful followers that they would live to see the manifestation of the Kingdom in power (Mar 9:1; Mar 13:30, Mat 10:23). (b) Because it explains the ability of the Apostles and Apostolic writers to accept apparently without any great travail of mind the disappointment of first hopes, or even to regard the disappointment as part-fulfilment (see, e.g., Joh 16:12 ff. and 2Pe 3:8 ff.). To these may perhaps he added: (c) That this view has no necessary connexion with the idea that Jesus in this matter *accommodated* His expressions to the limitations of the disciples. The idea of accommodation is no doubt suggested by Joh 16:12 ff.; but even if we suppose that the words of this passage are

a literal reminiscence of what the Master said, we must observe that one who *professes* to be accommodating his words to the limitations of his hearers takes thereby all sting from the charge that he has compromised the truth. Many reverent students of the Gospels will probably, however, prefer to regard the words of Joh 16:12 ff. not as a literal utterance of the Master, but rather as a devout recognition proceeding from the inner circle of disciples of an element or quality in their Master which, in spite of all the simplicity of His utterance and His impressive veracity, had eluded and mystified them. They thought they had understood, yet how much they had misunderstood! On this view Jesus did not ‘accommodate.’ He spoke as the word was given Him, in the style that is most faithfully reflected in the Synoptics. Whatever may be the truth about Joh 16:12 ff., we seem warranted in saying that Jesus had but one way of speaking of the Consummation. During all His ministry, and up to the end of it, He spoke of it as imminent. It was something for the generation then living. Act 1:6 and the other books of the NT outside the Gospels may be taken as proof that He spoke of it in the same way after His resurrection. If in this regard He was ‘limited’ in the days of His flesh, He was limited also when He wore the body that was from heaven: if He ‘accommodated’ in the one sphere, He ‘accommodated’ in the other also.

The NT as a whole is filled with an expectation, which in the form in which it was entertained was not fulfilled; and yet faith in Jesus and belief in the still coming Consummation lived on and live still. Our conclusion is, then, briefly as follows:—As a protest to His own people, Jesus predicted the downfall of the Jewish nation within a measurable period (see esp. Matthew 23, 24). While in all probability He depicted this catastrophe in colours that closely matched those of the event itself, the very intensity of His concentration upon a vision that might seem to concern only the Jewish nation serves to show that through the telescope of Jewish particularity He was looking out upon the whole human world. His vision was that of One uniquely alive to the purpose of God, of which He, the Messianic Son of Man, was the supreme executor. It was the vision of a prophet, seeing all things in relation to the Divine purpose, not the vision of a mere politician or patriot. The Jewish nation was chosen to bless the world with the knowledge of God. Failure to fulfil this vocation brought on it the destructive wrath of God; and the condemnation of the chosen people involved in an obvious sense the doom of the world. That ignorance of God and hostility, of which the Jewish obduracy was the signal example, would reach a climax in the murderous death of the Son of God. From that moment the forces of final reconstruction would set in. *When* the Consummation would be attained, *when* the Son of Man should come in His glory, and all evil and evil-doers be put away, no man or angel knew. Not even the Son, only the Father. But this much was certain. The power of the Prince of this world—the Prince whose power was manifest in sin, disease, and death—was broken. The proofs of that victory could not be long delayed.

Some would live to see signs of which they had not dreamt, that the Kingdom had come in power.

This covers in brief probably as much as we are able to report of the unique eschatological consciousness of Jesus. The account, however, would not be complete without a fresh reference to the blank space of our ignorance. This space we shall enlarge or diminish according to our estimate of the difference between the area of our knowledge, and that not merely of the general purpose of God, but of the consciousness of Jesus, the Son of God. All men are agnostics in the sense of admitting that they have not been made privy to the counsels of Creation and Providence; but besides this common agnosticism there is a kind peculiar to Christians, which breathes the spirit of faith and reverence. Christians believe that 'all things,' including especially human destiny, have been committed to the hands of Jesus Christ. In that faith they can anticipate with calmness the worst tragedies of personal or social history. They believe that there is no terror of the kingdom of darkness which the Son of God has not overcome with the armour of His holy light; but, *because* they believe this, they do not presume to possess, even in the measure of His Spirit to which they have attained, a key that will open every secret that was stored in the depths of His personality, even while He was on earth. The last mystery to Christians is no longer the mystery of death, judgment, and the hereafter. It is rather the mystery—which is also the *fact*—of Jesus Christ, the mystery of the relation of these things to Him, or rather, perhaps, of His relation to them.

II. Eschatology in the Gospel of John.—We pass by questions as to the date or authorship of this Gospel. The writing may be placed with confidence near the border dividing the 1st and 2nd centuries. It does not matter for our purpose on which side of the border it is placed. To the eyes of most Anglo-Saxon critics the Gospel reveals still the marks of an intimate of Jesus, and with them we assume that, even in the form in which we read the Gospel, it proceeded from the circle of a 'disciple whom Jesus loved.' We assume also—what probably no one denies—that there is but one mind between the author of the *Gospel* and the author of the *Epistles* that bear the name of John. Whoever was its author, the Gospel could not have reached so soon the position of authority it has held in the Christian Church since the 2nd cent., had it not been considered to express the living and profound belief of Christendom regarding what was most essential in the Person and History of Jesus. *This* is the matter of importance to our present inquiry. If we find that the view of our Lord's eschatological consciousness, which has seemed to us to be most reasonably deducible from the Synoptic Gospels, agrees on the whole with what is presented here, that view may be considered to have behind it a weight of authority that could not well be greater. For the authority is not simply the consciousness of an inspired Apostle or Apostolic man; it is that of the consciousness of the Church as a whole at the critical period of the close of the Apostolic age. We may fix attention on three

matters: (1) the idealizing style of the Gospel; (2) its conception of Eternal Life; (3) its attitude to Eschatology proper.

1. *The idealizing style of the Fourth Gospel.*—From the first it has been admitted that, as compared with the Synoptics, this Gospel is one rather of the mind than of the external actions of Jesus. Even the most remarkable external actions, the miracles, are but ‘signs’ of the mystery that is really important to us—that, viz., of the Person of the ‘Son of God.’ The ‘signs’ are recorded that we may believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and may have life through His name (Joh 20:30 f.). The Logos that was ‘towards God (πρὸς τὸν θεόν) and was God’ (Joh 1:1), was made flesh, and the writer and his companions beheld His glory, and reported the vision, not so much from literal reminiscence of the acts and words done and spoken by Jesus on earth, as under the inspiration of the Spirit that came according to promise from the presence of the Father and the Risen Ascended Son. The author is concerned rather with the discourses of Jesus than with His actions, and the discourses are, we believe, not so much *reported* as *interpreted*. They are the words of an eternal life in which the writer and his fellow-believers share (1Jn 1:1 ff.). Jesus is Himself the Word, the Truth, the Life. What is told of Him represents but a few out of many instances of His self-manifestation. They are like the sparks that witness to a hidden, mighty, and continuous electric stream. One consequence of this mode of treatment is that there is little in this Gospel to indicate that Jesus experienced anything of the sinless infirmity of flesh and blood. There is, e.g., no suggestion that He grew in knowledge of the path He had to tread as the Saviour of the world. There is no temptation, no agony in Gethsemane, no ignorance or doubt as to the times and seasons of the Consummation. The author does not, perhaps, consciously ignore these things, but to mention them is no part of his purpose to manifest the eternal life that was in the Son of God.

If such a view of the Person of Jesus were carried out with rigorous abstract logic, we should reach a result that would not only be glaringly at variance with the picture presented by the Synoptists, but would be indistinguishable from the heresy against which, at least in its germinal form, the author himself protests (1Jn 2:22; 1Jn 5:8), viz. that the incarnation of the Logos was mere appearance. The point to be observed is that the view is *not* carried out rigorously. The reason is that the author combines a sense of history with a sense of spiritual fact. But what mainly concerns him is the spiritual fact: what Jesus, who rose and ascended, is now to His Church, *that* in deep reality He has always been. No doubt He was truly human, and, because He was so, there was during His earthly sojourn real limitation, but the limitation was free because self-imposed (see, e.g., Joh 10:18), and behind it there was always the Divine reality. He was never other than the Logos, the eternal and only-begotten Son of God.

Even though it be conceded, as we think it must be, that neither as regards incidents nor discourses is the Johannine picture of Jesus so strictly historical as that of the Synoptists, it does not follow that it is not, in another than the literally historical sense, a deeply true picture. The guarantee of its truth is the fact that the Christian Church has accepted it, and in doing so has conquered both its own feeling of disappointment in the delayed *Parousia* and the unbelief of the world. The Church discovered, that is to say, the presence in the mind and utterances of Jesus of a quality of which it had not at first grasped the significance. His words were 'spirit and life' (Joh 6:63). They could be interpreted only by His own perpetual teaching through the Spirit of truth (Joh 16:13 ff.).

We may call this, if we choose, the *idealism* of the Johannine Gospel and of the early Church; but the question is worth pondering whether anything less than an idealism which rested on a sure, if profound, basis of truth, could have held the Church to its loyalty to the unseen Jesus in face of the disappointment of hopes which the Synoptic testimony, taken in its natural sense, had encouraged. In any case, the Johannine picture of Jesus may be considered to supply a striking confirmation of the opinion, already partly expressed in this article, that no amount of fragmentary sentences of Jesus, however accurately reported, and however definite their meaning may be when they are taken by themselves, can be a perfect index of a mind like His.

2. *Its conception of Eternal Life.*—Every reader of John notices the prominence of the words 'life,' or 'eternal life,' or 'spirit.' The phrase 'Kingdom of God' has practically disappeared, and 'life' or 'eternal life' takes its place. The fact is of importance to us in our present study, because it is the index of John's way of conceiving what in the Synoptic mode of speech might be called the *present* aspect of the Kingdom. Jesus appears as the possessor and even the direct dispenser of the Divine life. It is given to the Son to have life in Himself even as the Father (Joh 3:26), and no one can come to Him except it be given him from the Father (Joh 6:65). Yet neither the Father nor the Son dispenses life in its fulness till the Son is glorified through death, or returns to the glory which He had from the first with the Father (Joh 7:39). But once the life is imparted it is a new birth which carries its own promise. It is, in a proper sense, sufficient for itself. If a man is born of God, the Divine seed remains in him. Its product is righteousness, and its perfect fruition is likeness to the only-begotten Son Himself (Joh 3:5, Joh 9:2; Joh 9:4, 1Jn 3:2; 1Jn 3:9 etc.). It is clear that this mode of view brings the Divine boon nearer to the individual heart, and necessarily alters, at least for the individual, the perspective of the eschatology.

Not simply the great event itself,—the glorious *Parousia* of the Christ,—but the events of resurrection and judgment that accompany it, are regarded from within rather than from without. Those whose hope is set on Jesus do not lift to the heavens faces sick with deferred hope. They look within and behold Him with the vision of the pure

in heart. For them Jesus has come already and keeps coming. The supreme matter is to abide in Him or in His love by keeping His words. Let a man thus live and believe in Him, and he shall never die. Nothing, that is, not even what we call death, will break the continuity of his life (Joh 11:25 f.). The water of life that Jesus gives shall be in him a well of water springing up unto everlasting life (Joh 4:14). The *Judgment* similarly is, or tends to be, withdrawn from futurity. He who believes does not come to judgment; he has passed already from death to life (Joh 5:24, 1Jn 3:14). On the other hand, he who disbelieves is condemned already. Life has come to him, but he chooses death; light, but he chooses darkness. In turning from the only begotten Son of God he puts from him his chance of being saved from a Divine wrath already present (Joh 3:18 ff., Joh 3:36) Until he seeks the Father through Him who is the Way, the wrath of God abideth on him. Every thoughtful reader of Jn. perceives that such are the main ideas both of the Gospel and of the Epistles. He will hardly fail to reflect also that these are, and have remained ever since the time of these writings or earlier, the vital ideas of the Christian Church in its cultivation of individual and social life, both on its practical and its meditative side.—Comparing the Johannine testimony with the utterances in the Synoptic Gospels—few, it may be, but important—which reveal a consciousness in Jesus of a Kingdom of God that is present and not simply future, and considering especially the fact that in spite of their testimony to Jesus’ sense of the imminence of a Kingdom yet to come, there is not in the Synoptic Gospels the slightest indication that this tremendous prospect at all diminished His appreciation of the worth of those ethical precepts (e.g. those relating to marriage and the parental relation (Mar 10:2 ff; Mar 7:9 ff.) that have to do with the secular order, we shall hesitate before accepting the idea suggested by Joh. Weiss (*op. cit.*), that the precise meaning of the *ethical* utterances of Jesus is to be determined by our knowledge (?) of His eschatology, and that Jesus would not have spoken as He does, e.g., in Luk 14:26, had He not believed that within a generation the institutions of marriage and the family would cease, and that those who should survive this end of the world, being ‘sons of the resurrection’ (Luk 20:36), should be thenceforward as the angels (*ib.*). In this reference also the Johannine Gospel confirms our sense of an element in the equipment and outlook of Jesus to which justice can hardly be done by those who lay unqualified stress on the distinctively eschatological portions of the Synoptic Gospels.

3. Its attitude to Eschatology proper.—Yet it has to be observed, finally, that, while the futuristic element is not prominent in the Johannine Gospel, it is by no means eliminated. It may be felt, indeed, that the terms in which it is expressed involve a departure from (or, at any rate, a transformation of) the *objective* standpoint of the Synoptics. The last three words of the phrase, ‘the hour cometh *and now is*’ (Joh 5:23 ff.), suggest a state of mind in which the thought of a future radically or incalculably different from that which is already present to the vision of faith, is no longer keenly operative. The same is still more obvious in the Supper discourse (chs.

14-16), in reading which one feels that the line of distinction between the Lord's final coming to receive the disciples to Himself, and His continuous abiding with them or visitation of them through the comforting Spirit, tends to be a vanishing one.

Yet it does not follow that the distinctively eschatological utterances or references contained in the Johannine Gospel (e.g. Joh 5:28 f., Joh 21:22 f.) are of the nature of a formally dutiful acknowledgment of an earlier mode of speech and a still lingering form of popular Christian expectation corresponding to it. Such a view, at least, is not an exhaustive description of the state of the case. It seems true rather to say that the futuristic outlook, while it lost, even within the time covered by the NT writings, its first aspect of keen expectation, was yet to the last of that period felt to be—what it is still—an indispensable element of Christian faith. That the matter is looked at from within, and attention fastened not on what is to *come to us*, but rather on what *we are to become* (1Jn 3:2), does not alter the fact that the total on which we are looking belongs to the future as well as to the present, and that that future is in the wonderworking power of the Conqueror of death. It is *never* possible to neglect the aspect of futurity, and it is sometimes imperative to emphasize it. Such a passage as 1Jn 2:18 compared with Mar 13:5 f. shows significantly how much the Fourth Evangelist, in spite of the depth of his insight into the Master's mind (or, shall we say, *because* of that insight), was to the last influenced by the eschatological utterances of the Synoptic testimony. He recognizes the antichrists of his own day, and is confident that it is the 'last time.' The 21st chapter of the Gospel speaks similarly for the attitude of the Evangelist's circle. The chapter is an appendix, and Joh 21:22 f. show what is probably its main motive. The aged Apostle has passed away, and the question is raised, Did not the Master say that this disciple should not see death till He should come in glory? The expectation implied in the question connected itself in all likelihood with the utterance in Mar 9:1 ||. There was a general impression throughout the Churches of Asia that John was the person mainly intended, and a story was current to the effect that in predicting Peter's mode of death the Master had told that disciple of the survival of John. The author of the appendix claims to be in a position to tell the readers of the Gospel what the Master had really said. It was far from being a definite promise. It was only the hint of a possibility. The apology would hardly have been deemed necessary if the tendency to insist on a literalistic interpretation of the Synoptic testimony, placing the glorious final advent within 'this generation,' had not still been prevalent at the close of the 1st cent., *i.e.* at the time when John died.

Neither the author of the Gospel and the Epistles nor the author of the appendix to the Gospel has anything to object to the probability of an immediate Parousia of Jesus in glory; but the impression which their utterances leave upon our minds, and which from the first they were fitted to convey to the Church, is that the contrast important to the authors is no longer that between present and future, but rather

that between God and the world, between the love of the Father and the love of this present evil world. The matter of absorbing interest is not that the Son of God will come *again*, but that He *has come*. Life is not movement towards a point on a straight line: it is expansion from a centre, and because the centre is living he who is at the centre is also implicitly at the goal of the moving circumference.

The Evangelist has expressed this in very characteristic fashion in the closing words of his principal Epistle: 'We know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness. And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life' (1Jn 5:19 f.).

Those who find their own consciousness expressed in such words, and feel impelled to trace that consciousness to its historical source, will not readily suppose that they have found the source anywhere nearer than the consciousness of Jesus Himself. Who but He could have been the first either to possess eternal life or to know that He possessed it?

Literature.—For the literature on Eschatology in *general* or on *Scriptural* Eschatology see the art. 'Eschatology' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible and in *Encyc. Biblica*. It is indispensable for the student of the Gospels to understand the genesis and scope of Jewish apocalyptic literature, and for this purpose the Introductions in Driver's *Daniel* (in the 'Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges') and Scott's *Revelation* (in the 'Century Bible') will be found sufficient by most English readers. Of German works there may be mentioned, in this connexion, Hilgenfeld, *Jüdische Apokalyptik*, 1857 (still a standard work); Gunkel, *Schopfung u. Chaos*, and his *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verstandniss des NT*, 1895 and 1903; Bousset, *Der Antichrist*, etc., 1895, and his *Die jüd. Apokalyptik*, 1903; to which must now be added Gressmann, *Der Ursprung der isr.-jüd. Eschatologie*, 1905. On OT Eschatology see very specially A. B. Davidson's *Theology of the Old Testament* (T. & T. Clark, 1904), §§ xi. and xii.

In regard to the Eschatology of the Gospels a good list of books will be found in Moffatt's *Historical New Testament* (T. & T. Clark), p. 639 f., bearing especially on the theory of the 'Little Apocalypse,' which many scholars, following Colani and Weiffenbach, suppose to be incorporated in Mark 13, Matthew 24. Beyond the works of Haupt, Titius, Joh. Weiss, etc., mentioned in this article, the most comprehensive work, strictly *ad rem*, is probably Baldensperger's *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, of which only the First Part of the 3rd 'völlig umgearbeitete' edition, entitled 'Die Messianisch-Apok. Hoffnungen des Judenthums' (Strassburg, 1903), has as yet (1906) been published. A discussion of the matters specially emphasized by Joh. Weiss and Baldensperger will be found in a volume of the 'Decennial Publications of the

University of Chicago,' entitled *The Messianic Hope in the NT*, by Professor Shailer Mathews, Chicago, 1905. See also Porter's *Messages of the Apocalypses*, and his art. 'Revelation' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible . For illustrations of Rabbinical views and interpretations, current more or less in the time of our Lord, see very specially the latest edition of Edersheim's *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* (London, 1900), vol. ii., Appendixes 5, 8, 9, 13, 14, 17, 19; also Weber's *Jüd. Theologie*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , Leipzig, 1897. In P. W. Schmidt's *Die Geschichte Jesu* (Tüb. and Leipz. 1900), there is a section entitled 'Zukunftsprüche,' the views of which are defended in vol. ii. of the same work (1904), pp. 354-360. Of older works the following may be mentioned: I. A. Dorner, *de Oratione Christi Eschatologica*, Mtth. 24:1-36, Stuttgart, 1844; Herm. Cremer, *Die eschat. Rede Jesu Christi*, Mtth. 24 and 25, Stuttgart, 1860; E. J. Mayer, *Krit. Com. zu der eschat. Rede*, Mtth. 24 and 25, 1 Theil 'Die Einleitung,' Frankfurt-a-O. 1857: Rud. Hofmann, *Die Wiederkunft Christi u. das Zeichen des Menschensohns am Himmel* (Mtth. 24:30), gekronte Preisschrift, Leipzig, 1849; Wilh. Weiffenbach, *Der Wiederkunftsgedanke Jesu*, Leipzig, 1873 (424 pp.), also his 'Die Frage der Wiederkunft Jesu' in *Denkschrift des evangel. Predigerseminars*, Friedberg, 1901. Of pamphlets and magazine articles, in addition to the last named, may be mentioned Tholuck, *Die Consequenzen der Reden Christi über seine Wiederkunft u. sein Gericht* in 'Programm der Universität Halle,' 1871; C. Bruston, 'L'enseignement de Jésus sur son Retour' in *Revue de Théol. et de Philosoph.* 1890 (pp. 421-452, see also some earlier articles in the same Review); Kingman's art. in *Biblical World*, 1897, i. pp. 167-178; Pfeleiderer, 'Composition der eschat. Rede, Mtth. 24:4ff.' in *JDT^h* [Note: DTh Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie.] , 1868, pp. 134-149; Kienlen, 'Die eschat. Rede Jesu, Mtth. 24,' *ib.* 1869, pp. 706-709; Joh. Weiss, 'Die Composition der Synop. Wiederkunftsrede' in *SK* [Note: K Studien und Kritiken.] , 1892, pp. 246-270.

In regard to the Jewish Apocalypses, it would be ungrateful not to mention the invaluable editions of *Enoch*, *Baruch*, etc., published by Professor R. H. Charles, Oxford, Clarendon Press, since 1893, when his *Book of Enoch, translated from Professor Dillmann's Ethiopic Text*, appeared. See in this the discussion on 'Son of Man' as at Enoch 46:2, pp. 127-129, and 'The Son of Man: Its Origin and Meaning' (Appendix B), pp. 212-317. Since the publication of Charles' *Enoch* the philological question regarding 'Son of Man' has been keenly discussed by Lietzmann, Wellhausen, Schmiedel, Dalman, Fiebig, and others. See Muirhead's *Eschatology of Jesus* (Melrose, 1904), Lecture iv., and Riebov's *Messianic Prophecy*, 2nd English ed. (T. & T. Clark, 1900) pp. 354-356.

Lewis A. Muirhead.

⚡ Esli

ESLI.—An ancestor of Jesus, [Luk_3:25](#).

⚡ Essenes

ESSENES.—The Essenes were an ascetic community among the Jews, the existence of which can be traced for over two centuries, from about b.c. 150 to the Fall of Jerusalem. For original information regarding them we are dependent on Josephus (*B.J* ii. viii.; *Ant.* xviii. i. 5, xv. x. 4, 5, xiii. v. 9) and Philo (*Quod omnis probus liber*, chs. 12, 13, ed. Mangey, pp. 457-459). Josephus has also scattered references to individual Essenes, and the elder Pliny (*HN* v. 17) an appreciative notice of them, for which he was probably indebted to Alexander Polyhistor and his work 'On the Jews.' Other ancient authorities are either secondary or untrustworthy.

Josephus introduces the Essenes as one of the three 'sects of philosophy' which were influential amongst the Jews, the others being the Sadducees and the Pharisees; but from the descriptions given of their practices and organization, they seem to have corresponded more closely to a monastic order than to a sect or a religious party. Their name is probably, though not certainly, derived from the Aramaic form of the Hebrew word *hāsîdim* ('pious ones'), and this already suggests a close relation, especially in their origin, between the Essenes and the Pharisees. Their numbers are estimated by Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. i. 5) and Philo at 4000; and while there is no evidence of their existence as an order outside Palestine, within its area they were widely distributed, being found in a great many of the villages and small towns, as well as in Jerusalem, where there was a 'Gate of the Essenes.' The members of the order were celibates, living in community houses and owning nothing as individuals, but having everything in common. They are extolled for their piety, their industry, which was confined to agricultural pursuits, the simplicity of their food, and their scrupulous cleanliness. Further characteristics of their life were that they had no slaves, used no oil for the purpose of anointing, dressed in white, and rigidly prohibited the use of oaths except on the admission of a new member to the order.

The order was held together by the strictest discipline. Full membership was granted only after a novitiate of two years, and then upon an oath to reveal everything to the members and nothing to the outside world. Offenders against the rules of the order were punished by exclusion; and as they were still held bound by their vows, they were unable to return to ordinary life.

What makes the Essenes ‘the great enigma of Hebrew history’ (Lightfoot, *Col.*⁷ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 82) is that, while they are distinguished by exaggerated adherence to the Jewish Law and by special reverence for Moses as lawgiver, they betray at the same time certain ideas and practices which are foreign to Judaism, and seem incompatible with its spirit. The indications of incipient dualism which may be found in their abstinence from marriage and in other ascetic practices, find a parallel in their doctrine of immortality, wherein they agreed with the Pharisees against the Sadducees as to the immortality of the soul, but differed from the Pharisees in denying the resurrection of the body. And they deviated still further from orthodox Judaism in the practice of making a daily prayer to the sun ‘as if entreating him to rise,’ and in refraining altogether from animal sacrifice. It followed that they were excluded from the services of the Temple. On the other hand, they were rigid beyond all others in their observance of the Sabbath; and they went beyond the Pharisees in their absolute determinism, affirming ‘that fate governs all things, and that nothing befalls men but what is according to its determination’ (Josephus *Ant.* xiii. v. 9).

It is in this apparent eclecticism that the problem of the origin of Essenism consists. While it is impossible to deny the Jewish foundation on which it rests, it is equally impossible to overlook the presence of foreign elements. The source of these has formed the subject of endless discussion, and has been found by various writers in Parsism and Buddhism (Hilgenfeld), Parsism (Lightfoot), Syro-Palestinian heathenism (Lipsius), and Pythagoreanism (Zeller, Keim). But all attempts to demonstrate any necessary connexion or indubitable channel between any one of these and Essenism have failed. And it remains either to assume that foreign influences had percolated unobserved, or to suppose that the characteristic phenomena emerged independently in Persia, Greece, and Palestine.

The Essenes are not directly referred to in the NT; but some have without sufficient reason claimed John the Baptist, and even Jesus, as Essenes. It has also been alleged that their influence may be traced within the circle of Christian ideas and practices. The possible relation of Essenism to the heresy controverted by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Colossians has been discussed at length by Bishop Lightfoot in his edition of the Epistle (cf. his *Galatians*⁸ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 322 ff.), and also by Klöpffer, *Brief an die Kolosser*, pp. 76-95.

Literature.—Schurer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii ii. 188 ff. (with full Bibliography); Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums*, pp. 431-443; artt. ‘Essenes’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible (by Conybeare) and in *Encyc. Bibl.* (by A. Julicher), and ‘Essener’ in *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und

Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (by Uhlhorn).

C. Anderson Scott.

☩ Eternal Fire

ETERNAL FIRE.—An expression twice used by Christ in reference to the future punishment of the wicked. In Mat 18:8 βληθῆναι εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον stands in contrast to εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν; and from Mat 25:41 we learn that this eternal fire, into which the wicked are to be cast, was prepared not for them but for the devil and his angels. These are the only passages in which the expression is found in the Gospels; but equivalent terms occur. In Mat 18:9 the eternal fire is identified with the fire of Gehenna; and in Mat 25:46 we have κόλασις αἰώνιος. In Mat 3:12 and Mar 9:43 it is the unquenchable fire (ἄσβεστον), and in Mar 9:48 Gehenna is the place of punishment where their worm dieth not, καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται. The wicked after their separation from the righteous (Mat 13:42; Mat 13:50) are to be cast into a furnace (κάμινος) of fire.

A brief account of the origin of this phraseology will throw light on its meaning. The idea of punishment by fire comes from the OT. The destruction by fire of Sodom and Oomorrhah supplied the typical example, and it is frequently referred to as such (Deu 29:23, Isa 1:9; Isa 13:19, Jer 49:18, Amo 4:11, Wis 10:7, 3Ma 2:5; cf. such well-known NT passages as Jud 1:7). A similar judgment is spoken against Edom (Isa 34:8; Isa 34:10, where it is said that the fire is eternal and will not be quenched). In Amos 1, 2, Damascus, Gaza, etc., are threatened with the fire penalty. See for other examples of the unquenchable fire, 2Ki 22:17, Isa 1:31, Jer 4:4; Jer 21:12, Eze 20:47-48, Amo 5:6. The ‘everlasting burnings’ of Isa 33:14 refer, like the preceding, to temporal judgments. But there are passages which at least suggest the extension of the idea and its imagery to the future world. According to Deu 32:22 the fire of Jehovah’s anger reaches down to Sheol. Cheyne finds in Isa 50:11; Isa 66:24 a reference to the punishment of souls in the underworld: but Salmond and A. B. Davidson see in the latter passage only the description of a present-world penalty: and this seems the more natural interpretation. This passage seems to have suggested the later Jewish belief regarding eternal punishment, for certain expressions in it are used in this sense in the Apocryphal writings (e.g. Jdt 16:17, Sir 7:17) and by Christ (Mar 9:47). The scene of this judgment is, in all probability,

the Valley of Hinnom, regarded by the Jews as a place accursed on account of its Molech sacrifices; and the fires which were kept burning, through which the victims passed, would readily suggest the idea of Gehenna and its eternal fire.* [Note: Kimchi's statement, that a fire was kept constantly burning in Hinnom to consume the offal and the dead bodies which were thrown into it, comes too late (a.d. 1200) to be accepted without evidence.]

In the Apocryphal writings the fire penalty is extended without reserve to the future world, and in a greatly intensified form. Most of the writers have ceased to expect an equitable distribution of rewards and penalties in this life: their hopes are fixed on the future; and they, therefore, transfer the OT imagery of retribution to the life after death. The Book of Enoch is the great storehouse of teaching on this subject. For the impure angels and the faithless angelic rulers an abyss of fire is prepared, in which, after the judgment, they will be tortured for ever (10:6, 13, 18:11, 21:7, 10, 54:6, 90:24, 25). For human offenders, a fiery abyss is opened on the right hand of the Temple (90:26, 27); this is Gehenna. They descend into 'the flame of the pain of Sheol' (63:10), or into the 'burning fire of Sheol' (103:7, 8). Thus it appears that the NT 'eternal fire' of Gehenna is anticipated in this book: the only difference being that, while in the NT the fire prepared for the devil and his angels is identified with that into which wicked men are cast, in the Book of Enoch they are always distinguished.

Two questions arise regarding the nature of the eternal fire. Is it material? And in what sense is it eternal?

(1) In many OT passages, even where it is said that the fire is unquenchable, and will burn for ever, *material fire* is undoubtedly meant, for fire is one of the physical agents which God commonly employs in His temporal judgments, and its burning for ever must refer to the lasting destruction which it effects. Sodom, Gomorrah, and Edom are given as examples of places on which the doom of eternal fire fell, and they still bear its proof-marks. But in other passages the literal sense cannot be maintained, as, *e.g.*, where God's anger or jealousy and man's wickedness are said to burn *like* fire. Nor can it be allowed in passages like Isa 66:24 if Cheyne's interpretation is accepted; since undying worms, preying on souls or bodies that are being consumed by unquenchable fire, is an impossible idea. In the NT, as we have seen, Christ drew largely on OT imagery in speaking of the 'last things.' But the whole drift of His interpretation of prophetic language is at variance with the literal sense of the fire penalty. What He gives in His eschatological teaching is not a dogmatic but an imaginative presentation of the truth; and the imagery He employs belongs, not to the substance, but to the form of His thought. The prophet, like the poet and the artist, must present the future in terms and forms borrowed from present experience, and the underlying truth must be spiritually discerned. If, as Christ tells us, the

eternal fire was prepared for the devil and his angels, it cannot be material fire; for spirits cannot undergo physical torture.* [Note: Yet the contrary has been maintained on high authority. Augustine held that the fire was material, and that spirits may be tortured by it, since it is always the mind and not the body that suffers, even when the pain originates in the body. He also suggests that devils may have bodies made of air, 'like what strikes us when the wind blows, and thus be liable to suffering from fire' (de Cimt. xxi. 3, 9, 10). Th. Aquinas held that the fire is material (Summa Theol. pt. iii. supplmt. lxx. 3). And in our own day Ed. White inclines to the view that the wicked before extinction will be punished by material fire (Life in Christ, p. 352),]

Death by fire was the severest penalty under the Jewish law, and as it was inflicted only for the most shameful sins (Lev 20:14; Lev 21:9, Jos 7:25), a peculiar infamy was associated with it. Christ, therefore, when He employed this imagery in speaking of the doom of the wicked, intended to warn men that God has attached a terrible retribution to sin. At the very least it signifies an ordeal of suffering analogous to that which fire causes in the living tissues. To the question, How will the suffering be caused? Scripture gives only the figurative answer, 'as by fire.' Bp. Butler (*Anal.* pt. ii. ch. v.) thought that it might come in the way of natural consequence, without any direct infliction on the part of God. Sin, which yields pleasure *here*, becomes misery there without changing its nature, through the natural working of moral law. The agony of remorse, which sometimes overwhelms the sinner in this life, has been regarded as a foretaste of the eternal fire. The *pœna damni*, or the consciousness of being for ever cut off from the sight of God, the only satisfying good, will be, it has been said, intense suffering as by fire, when the distractions of the world have ceased to dazzle. And these will, doubtless, be elements in the retribution. But if this were all, a possible consequence would be that the penalty would fall most lightly on the most degraded. A soul that can be made miserable through remorse, or the conscious loss of God's presence, has not reached the lowest stage of hardening; while experience tells us that those who have reached this stage are least liable to suffering from such a source. In them remorse can be awakened, not by the *pœna damni*, but by suffering externally caused. And the language of the NT suggests that in the future world an environment is prepared, with its appropriate agencies and influences, for the punishment of those who are morally and spiritually dead. Such expressions as 'Depart into the eternal fire,' 'shall be cast into the lake of fire,' etc., clearly presuppose such an environment, one in which the least worthy shall suffer the most, 'be beaten with many stripes.'

(2) *Why is the fire called eternal?*—In Mat 25:41-46 the adjective αἰώνιος is used with reference to 'the fire,' 'punishment,' and 'the life,' and no satisfying reason has been given for saying that, as regards the first two, it means 'time limited,' and, as regards the last, 'time unlimited.' If Christ's purpose had been to call attention to the

duration of each, then 'endlessness' is the idea emphasized. But, except where this word or its Hebrew equivalent is applied to objects that, for the nonce, are invested with a *quasi*-eternity (Lev_3:17, Gen_17:8; Gen_49:26), it takes us into a sphere of being to which time measurements are inapplicable, and in which objects are presented in their relation to some eternal aspect of the Divine nature. Thus eternal life does not mean natural life prolonged to infinity; such a life might be lived without any experience of the eternal life, which signifies life in fellowship with, or that partakes in, the eternal life of God. God's relation to believers is such that between them and Him there is a community of life. Eternal fire, on the other hand, figuratively expresses the truth that, God's nature being what it is, there must be, under any economy over which He presides, a provision for the adequate punishment of sin. The eternal fire is such a provision, and, being eternal, it can be no mere temporary contrivance for tiding over an emergency, but must be the retributive aspect of the Divine holiness. God is, was, and ever shall be a consuming fire in relation to sin unrepented of; this is His unchanging and unchangeable attitude. Some of the OT saints were all their lifetime subject to bondage through fear of death, for to them Sheol (Isaiah 38) was a place where all life in fellowship with God was lost. But suppose that their worst fears had been realized, it would still have been true that they had had a passing experience of the life eternal. And similarly if, after ages of suffering, the wicked were to cease to be, it would, none the less, be true of them that they had been cast into the eternal fire. In Sodom, Gomorrah, Edom, etc., we have examples of what is meant by 'suffering the doom of eternal fire'; but this does not mean that ever since the fire destroyed the cities their inhabitants have been enduring its pains. Eternal fire may or may not mean everlasting suffering in it (see artt. Eternal Punishment and Retribution).

Literature.—Origen, *de Princip.* ii. x. 4-8, c. *Cels.* iv. 13, v. 15; Lactantius, *Inst.* vii. 21, 26; Augustine, *de Civ.* bk. xxi., *Ench.* cxi-cxiv., *de Gest. Pelag.* 10, 11; T. Burnet, *Concerning the State of Departed Souls*, 1738; Matt. [Note: Matthew's (i.e. prob. Rogers') Bible 1537.] Horhery, *Duration of Future Punishment*, 1744; J. Agar Beet, *The Last Things*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, also *Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*; J. L. Clarke, *The Eternal Saviour Judge*; H. Constable, *Duration of Future Punishment*; J. Fyfe, *The Hereafter*; F. W. Farrar, *Eternal Hope*, and *Mercy and Judgment*; Salmond, *Christian Doctrine of Immortality*; H. N. Oxenham, *Catholic Eschatology*; E. B. Pusey, *What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment?*; Ed. White, *Life in Christ*. See also Literature at end of art. Retribution.

A. Bisset.

∴ Eternal Life

ETERNAL LIFE.—This phrase occurs more than forty times in the New Testament. In many passages it denotes primarily a present possession or actual experience of the Christian believer, while in others it clearly contemplates a blessed life to come, conceived as a promised inheritance. The Greek expressions are ζωὴ αἰώνιος, ἡ αἰώνιος ζωὴ (Joh 17:3, 1Ti 6:12), ἡ ζωὴ ἡ αἰώνιος (1Jn 1:2). The word ‘life,’ or ‘the life’ (ζωή, ἡ ζωή), without the qualifying adjective ‘eternal,’ is often employed in the same general meaning.

There are passages in the Synoptic Gospels in which the phrase ‘eternal life’ is used synonymously and interchangeably with ‘the kingdom of God’ (Mar 9:45; Mar 9:47, Mat 7:14; Mat 7:21). The Kingdom of heaven and the life eternal are very closely related in the teaching of Jesus. Compare also the suggestive language of Rom 5:17 ‘shall reign in life through Jesus Christ.’ But it is especially in the writings of St. John that we find ‘eternal life’ presented as a heavenly boon which may become the actual possession of believers in the present life. God Himself is the source of all life, and ‘as the Father hath life in himself, even so gave he to the Son also to have life in himself’ (Joh 5:26). In the Word ‘which became flesh and dwelt among us’ there was a visible manifestation of the life eternal: ‘In him was life; and the life was the light of men’ (Joh 1:4); so that He Himself declares, ‘I am the way, and the truth, and the life’ (Joh 14:6). In accord with these statements the very life of God is conceived as begotten in the believer by the Holy Spirit, so that he is ‘born anew,’ ‘born from above’ (Joh 3:3-7). Thus begotten of God, the children of God become distinctly manifest, and God’s ‘seed abideth in them’ (1Jn 3:9-10). That is, in these Divinely begotten children of God there abides the imperishable germ (σπέρμα) of life from above, the eternal kind of life which the twice born possess in common with the Father and the Son. Hence it is that the believer ‘hath eternal life’ as an actual possession (Joh 3:36). He ‘hath passed out of death into life’ (Joh 5:24, 1Jn 3:14).

In Joh 17:3 we read what has to some extent the manner of a definition: ‘This is life eternal, that (ἵνα) they should know thee the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ.’ So far as this text furnishes a definition, it seems clearly to imply that ‘eternal life’ consists in such a knowledge of God and of Christ as involves a personal experience of vital fellowship. It carries with it the love and obedience which, according to Joh 14:23, bring the Father and the Son into the believer’s inmost life, so that they ‘make their abode with him.’ In view of the use of ἵνα in Joh 4:34, Joh 15:12, Joh 18:39 we need not refine so far as (with Westcott on this

passage) to maintain that the connective here retains its telic force and indicates an aim and an end, a struggle after increasing knowledge rather than the attainment of a knowledge already in possession. But it should not be supposed that any present knowledge of God and of Christ is inconsistent with incalculable future increase. While the essence of this Divine life consists in the knowledge of the only true God and His anointed Son, such knowledge is not the whole of eternal life, for other ideals with their additional content are also set before us in the teaching of Christ and of His Apostles. Whatever else is true touching this saving knowledge of the true God, its present possession is one of the great realities in the personal experience of the believer. In 1Jn 5:11-13 the gift and actual possession of this eternal kind of heavenly life are made emphatic: 'God gave unto us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath the life; he that hath not the Son of God hath not the life.' This language is incompatible with the thought that the 'eternal life' spoken of is merely a promise, a hope or an expectation of such life in a future state, as some of the older expositors maintained.

This heavenly kind of life in Christ, conceived as a present experience of salvation, is further confirmed and illustrated by what Jesus said of Himself as 'the bread of life' and the giver of the water that springs up into eternal life. We have, no doubt, the enigmatical words of profound mysticism in Joh 6:35-58. Jesus declares that He is 'the bread of life,' which 'giveth life unto the world.' 'I am the living bread which came down out of heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: yea, and the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world.' 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life: and I will raise him up at the last day.' 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me, and I in him.' 'He that eateth me shall live because of me.' 'He that eateth this bread shall live for ever.' These emphatic repetitions of statement would seem to put it beyond all question that their author meant to teach that the Son of God, sent by the living Father, 'lives because of the Father,' and imparts the eternal life of the Father to every one who believes in Him. Of this living bread the believer now partakes, and 'hath eternal life' (Joh 6:47; Joh 6:54). This life also is conceived as attaining a certain goal, or receiving a definite consummation 'at the last day.' For it is a permanent possession, and of a nature to advance from strength to strength and from glory to glory. The eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of Man have been thought by some expositors to refer to the partaking of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; but such a reference to an institution not yet established, and utterly unknown to His Jewish opponents, would have been strangely irrelevant. The life eternal into which the believer enters involves, as matter of course, all due allowance for Divinely appointed conditions, aids, provisions and means of nourishing the life itself; but to exalt these unduly is to divert the thought from the more central and profound mystic conception of Christ Himself as

the life of the world. So the remarkable sayings of Jesus in the synagogue at Capernaum, recorded in [Joh 6:32-59](#), are but another form and a mystic expression of His emphatic declaration in [Joh 5:24](#) 'He that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of death into life.'

The exact meaning of the word 'eternal,' when used to qualify 'the life,' is best understood when the life is conceived as issuing from the eternal Father, and so partaking of His Divine nature (cf. [2Pe 1:4](#)). Having life in Himself, and giving to His Son to have life in Himself ([Joh 5:26](#)), He imparts the same life to all who believe in the Son; and that life is in its nature eternal as God Himself. It is an eternal kind of life which belongs to the unseen and imperishable things (cf. [2Co 4:18](#)). In the Johannine writings the word 'life' or 'the life,' and the phrase 'eternal life,' are used interchangeably. The latter is the more frequent form of expression, but it is evident that the writer often employs 'the life' in the same sense. This life is spoken of in contrast with 'death' and 'perishing.' The believer 'shall not perish, but have eternal life' ([Joh 3:16](#)), 'hath passed out of *the* death into *the* life' ([Joh 5:24](#)), 'shall never see death,' nor 'taste of death' ([Joh 8:51-52](#)), 'shall never perish' ([Joh 10:28](#)). He who has not the life is in a condition of spiritual death, and must perish unless he receive the life of God, the eternal kind of life, which has been manifested in Christ. In these and other similar passages life and death are not to be understood as identical in meaning with existence and non-existence. The person who has passed out of death into life had existence before the new life came, and such existence, in estrangement from God and in disobedience of the gospel, may be perpetuated in 'eternal destruction from the face of the Lord' ([2Th 1:9](#)). So the 'death,' which those who 'perish' taste, need not be understood as annihilation, or utter extinction of being. As 'the death' is a condition of moral and spiritual destitution in which one has no fellowship with God, so 'the life' is the blessed experience of fellowship and union with Christ as vital as that of the branch and the vine. And this participation in the very nature of the Eternal God is the essence of the 'life eternal.'

In the writings of St. Paul we also find a mystic element in which we note the concept of eternal life as a present possession. The exhortation to 'lay hold on the life eternal,' and the designation of it as 'the life which is life indeed' (ἡ ὄντως ζωή, [1Ti 6:12](#); [1Ti 6:19](#)), may refer either to the present or the future; but when the Apostle speaks of believers as made alive and risen with Christ, and sitting with Him in the heavenlies ([Eph 2:5-6](#)), he implies a fruition that was already realized. It involved a positive experience like that in which 'the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made him free from the law of sin and of death' ([Rom 8:2](#)). He also has a wonderful appreciation of the heavenly illumination which 'shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ'

(2Co 4:6). This surpassing light is conceived by the Apostle as a product of the Spirit of the Lord, and a reflexion of the glory of Christ as seen in the mirror of His gospel. In that mirror the believer beholds the glory of his Lord reflected, and by the power of the heavenly vision he is 'transformed into the same image' (2Co 3:17-18). The Johannine doctrine of 'passing out of death into life' is conceived by St. Paul as a dying unto sin and being made alive unto God in Christ Jesus. The believer is 'alive from the dead' and 'walks in newness of life' (Rom 6:1-13). He has been 'crucified with Christ: and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me; and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, which is in the Son of God' (Gal 2:20). And so in Pauline thought the spiritual life of faith, enjoyed in fellowship with God and Christ, is a 'life hid with Christ in God' (Col 3:3), and 'the free gift of God' (Rom 6:23). This conception is in essential harmony with the doctrine of St. John. Eternal life is in its inmost nature the free, pure, permanent spiritual life of Christlikeness. It is a present possession, a glorious reality, a steadfastness of conscious living fellowship with the Eternal Father, and with His Son, Jesus Christ.

But in all the Gospels and in the Epistles we also find eternal life contemplated as a future glorious inheritance of the saints. In St. John's Gospel the 'eternal life' which the believer now 'hath' is destined to attain a glorious consummation in the resurrection 'at the last day' (Joh 5:40; Joh 5:45). For Jesus is Himself the resurrection as well as the life, and declares: 'He that believeth on me, though he die, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die' (Joh 11:25-26). Such a life must needs abide in eternal permanence. Jesus spoke of 'the water of life' which becomes in him who drinks it 'a fountain of water springing up into eternal life' (Joh 4:14). He spoke of food 'which abideth unto life eternal,' and of 'gathering fruit unto life eternal' (Joh 4:36, Joh 6:27). In all the Gospels He is represented as teaching that 'he that loveth [*or findeth, so Synopt.*] his soul loseth it; and he that hateth [*or loseth*] his soul in this world shall keep it unto life eternal.' We read in Mar 10:29-30 'There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, ... or lands, for my sake and for the gospel's sake, but he shall receive a hundredfold now in this time, ... and in the age to come life eternal' (cf. Mat 19:29 and Luk 18:29-30). These Gospels also speak of eternal life as an inheritance to be received at a future day (Mat 19:16, Mar 10:17, Luk 10:25; Luk 18:18). Such contrast of 'this time,' 'this world,' 'on the earth' with 'the age to come,' and 'in heaven,' implies possessions in some other age or world beyond the present. In the picture of the Judgment (Mat 25:31-46), the righteous who go 'into eternal life' are said to 'inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world,' and to enter into the joy and glory of the King Himself.

This idea of eternal life as a glorious future inheritance finds also frequent expression in the Epistles. Those who 'by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honour and immortality' shall receive eternal life as a reward of the righteous judgment of God

(Rom 2:7). All who are made free from sin and become servants of God 'have their fruit unto sanctification, and the end life eternal' (Rom 5:21; Rom 6:22). In the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb 1:14; Heb 9:15) we read of 'them that shall inherit salvation,' and of them that 'receive the promise of the eternal inheritance.' In 1Pe 1:4 the writer tells his readers that God has begotten them unto a living hope, 'unto an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved for them in heaven.' According to all these scriptures, eternal life is begotten in the Christian believer by the Holy Spirit of God, and is to be perpetuated through the ages of ages. It is eternal in quality as being a participation in the Divine nature of the Eternal One, and eternal in duration as continuing for ever and ever. It is a possession of manifold fulness, and is conditioned in a character of god-likeness, which 'has the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come' (1Ti 4:8). There can be no living this life apart from God, for it is begotten in the soul by a heavenly birth, and must be continually nourished by the Spirit of God. Such vital union with the eternal Spirit brings unspeakable blessedness in this life and in this world; but it is as permanent and abiding as the nature of God, and is therefore appropriately called an incorruptible inheritance. Each individual life, whose 'fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ' (1Jn 1:3), is conceived as continuing eternally in that heavenly fellowship. In this age and that which is to come, in this world and in any other, on the earth or in the heavens, the child of God abides in eternal life.

See art. Eschatology ii. 2, and so far as this subject relates to the Future State, artt. Heaven, Immortality, Resurrection.

Literature.—Gueder in Herzog, *Real-Encyclopadie* (ed. Plitt, 1881), vol. viii. pp. 509-517, also Kahler in same *Encyc.* (ed. Hauck, 1902), vol. xi. pp. 330-334; M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclopaedia*, vol. iii. pp. 313-317; Charles, *Crit. Hist. of Doctrine of Future Life*, pp. 368-370; Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, pp. 156-162; Drummond, *Relation of Apostolic Teaching to Teaching of Christ*, pp. 193-198; Hort, *The Way, the Truth, the Life* (Hulsean Lectures for 1871), Lect. iii.: Titius, *Jesu Lehre vom Reiche Gottes*, pp. 29-39; Wendt, *The Teaching of Jesus*, vol. i. pp. 242-255; Westcott, *The Epistles of John*, pp. 214-218; Beyschlag, *New Test. Theology*, vol. i. pp. 266-268, vol. ii. pp. 429-430; Holtzmann, *Neutest. Theologie*, vol. ii. pp. 516-518; Immer, *Theol. des NT*, pp. 512-515; Stevens, *Johannine Theology*, pp. 312-327, also *Theology of the NT*, pp. 224-233; Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. of the NT*, vol. ii. pp. 347-352.

M. S. Terry.

ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.— Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 of Mat 25:46 (εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον). The Authorized Version here and in 26 other passages has ‘everlasting.’ The adjective αἰώνιος occurs 70 times in the NT (1Ti 6:19 omitted in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), and in the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, with one exception (Phm 1:15), is uniformly rendered ‘eternal.’ This is a distinct gain, as it leaves the exact significance to be determined by use. Three passages should be examined: ‘Through times eternal’ (Rom 16:25); ‘before times eternal’ (2Ti 1:9, Tit 1:2); in these uses it is clear that ‘eternal’ and ‘everlasting’ are not interchangeable. This agrees with the LXX Septuagint, in which αἰώνιος is used of the rites and ceremonies of Judaism which are done away in Christianity (Exo 12:24; Exo 29:9; Exo 40:15, Num 18:19 and others). The suggested use of ‘aeonian’ has failed to find approval notwithstanding its advantages, and ‘age-long’ is inept.

For NT thought the use of the term in the Fourth Gospel should be studied. Excluding parallel passages, ‘eternal life’ is found 21 times in the Gospels, and of these 17 are in John. In this Gospel, as also in 1 Jn., the notions of succession and duration are eliminated, and ‘eternal’ becomes almost synonymous with ‘Divine.’ ‘It is not an endless duration of being in time, but being of which time is not a measure’ (Westcott, see Additional note on 1Jn 5:20). See Eternal Life.

In the Synoptic Gospels, to ‘enter into life’ and to ‘enter into the kingdom’ are used interchangeably (cf. Mat 19:16-17 with Mat 19:23, Mar 9:45 with Mar 9:47, Mat 25:34 ‘inherit *the kingdom*,’ and Mat 25:46 ‘unto eternal life’). In the Fourth Gospel ‘eternal life’ is the equivalent of ‘the kingdom of heaven’ of the Synoptic Gospels (cf. Joh 3:3; Joh 3:5, where ‘the kingdom of God’ occurs, with Joh 3:15). This suggests a very comprehensive and definite idea. ‘Eternal life’ is the life of the Kingdom of God, forgiveness, righteousness, salvation, blessing, whatever that life is declared to be in the teaching of Jesus. ‘Eternal punishment’ is the antithesis of ‘eternal life,’ the penalties upon all unrighteousness inseparably bound up with the Kingdom, and which, in His new teaching of the Kingdom, Jesus plainly sets forth. As a working principle, then, ‘eternal’ may be accepted as descriptive of things belonging to, essentially bound up with, the Kingdom, and is almost the equivalent of ‘Messianic,’ in the Christian, as opposed to the merely Jewish significance of the term, ‘that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name’ (Joh 20:31). These deeper meanings of αἰώνιος in the NT should serve to remove the question of the time element in future punishment from the unsatisfactory basis of mere verbal interpretations.

In collating the teaching of the Gospels, full emphasis must be given to the following postulates:

1. *The certainty of retribution is inseparably bound up with the revelation of Jesus as to the will and character of God.* The Father who ‘seeth in secret’ and rewards unobtrusive righteousness (Mat 6:1 ff.) will render to the unrighteous the due reward of their deeds (Mat 7:19; Mat 10:28; Mat 12:36; Mat 15:13; Mat 18:6; Mat 18:35, Luk 18:7 [*parallel passages omitted throughout*]). Hence the urgency of the call to repentance (Mat 4:17), and to the obedience of righteousness as in the Sermon on the Mount, and, at any cost, to ‘crucify the flesh’ which prompts to sin (Mat 5:29-30; Mat 18:8; Mat 18:8). In this Jesus takes His stand with the prophets of old and with the last of their order, John the Baptist (cf. Luk 3:7-14). The revelation of the all-perfect Father never weakens, but ever adds new emphasis to the call to a life of righteousness, and to the certainty of penalty for all unrighteousness.

2. *The characteristic teaching of Jesus as to the penalties of sin is bound up with His gospel of the Kingdom.*—The incomparable worth of the Kingdom, as the richest ‘treasure,’ and ‘pearl of great price’ (Mat 13:44-45), and the supreme quest of it as the first duty and sovereign wisdom of life (Mat 6:33), have, as their converse, the incomparable loss which the rejection of the gospel must inevitably entail. This is the supreme penalty—exclusion from the Kingdom, to be cast into the ‘outer darkness’ (Mat 8:12; Mat 22:13; Mat 25:30), denied by the Lord (Mat 7:23; Mat 10:33; Mat 25:12, Luk 13:25-27), shut out from the glad presence of the King (Mat 25:41). The use of the figures ‘weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth’ in the sentence of exclusion clearly indicates that *remorse* is one element in future retribution (cf. Luk 16:25 ‘Son, remember’).

3. *The hearing of the gospel adds to human responsibility, and increases the severity of the inevitable penalty of disobedience.*—This is the burden of much of the teaching of Jesus. Light is come into the world, and with the light a more solemn duty (Joh 3:19; Joh 9:41; Joh 15:22; Joh 15:24; Joh 16:9, Luk 12:47-48). It is the apostate disciple who, as salt which has lost its savour, is cast out (Mat 5:13). To His disciples Jesus gives the warnings of God’s searching judgment (Mat 5:22 ff.). To those who call Him ‘Lord, Lord,’ and in His name have done ‘many mighty works,’ He utters the dread ‘Depart’ (Mat 7:21-23, cf. Luk 13:25-27). It is the disobedient hearers of His word who are compared to a foolish builder whose house, built upon sand, is ruined by the storm (Mat 7:26-27). Those who deny Him, He also will deny (Mat 10:33); those who are ashamed of Him, of them will He be ashamed (Mar 8:38). It is the unfaithful servant (Mat 24:48-51), the unwatchful (Mat 25:1-13), the unprofitable (Mat 25:30), who are cast out of the Kingdom. It is the unfruitful branch of the vine that is cast forth, withered, gathered, cast into the fire, burned (Joh 15:6). The final condition of hopeless doom, the state of ‘eternal sin,’ is the direct result of self-willed, deliberate resistance to the Divine grace (Mar 3:29; see *Eternal Sin*). And in the larger issues the severity of judgment falls upon cities and

generations 'exalted to heaven' in privilege and opportunity, but doomed because of neglect (Mat 11:20-24; Mat 12:41-42).

In all this there is no reference to those to whom the gospel has not been made known. The mention of the Cities of the Plain (Mat 10:15) and that of the men of Nineveh (Mat 12:41) are too incidental and indirect to yield any determining principle. Even the great Judgment passage (Mat 25:31 ff.), if indeed it is to be interpreted universally as including all the nations of the earth, may be interpreted also as assuming a corresponding universality of knowledge, the gospel preached throughout the whole world. The judgments Jesus announces are vitally bound up with the message He brings. The problem of those to whom the offers of grace have not been made is not considered, and we are not justified in applying to *them* the severities of penalty and dread doom which, in the teaching of Jesus, fall only upon those who deny Him and reject His gospel.

4. The final triumph of the Kingdom, and consequent final separation of the righteous and the wicked.—This is again and again solemnly asserted and described. In the parables of the Tares (Mat 13:24 ff.) and the Drag-net (Mat 13:47 ff.), the ultimate overthrow, and, as the terms used would seem to imply, the final *destruction* of evil are decisively declared. From the explanation of the parable it is clear that the wheat and the tares represent *persons*—'the sons of the kingdom' and 'the sons of the evil one.' This sharp division of men into two classes entirely distinct is to human vision impossible. The facts of life show the presence of 'wheat and tares,' good and evil in every man. The difficulty is unresolved. The end is declared, but not the stages by which it is reached. The Kingdom is to be all righteousness, out of it is to be gathered 'all things that cause stumbling, and them that do iniquity' (Mat 13:41). Every plant not planted by the Father is to be uprooted (Mat 15:13), and every tree which beareth not good fruit is to be cut down and destroyed (Mat 7:19).

So far there can be little hesitation in setting forth the teaching of Jesus. The difficulties arise when we seek to determine exactly the nature and duration of the penalties and of the doom. The difficulty is accentuated by the fact that Jesus uses freely the religious symbolism current at the time. Gehenna, the worm that dies not and the fire that is not quenched, the outer darkness, the weeping and the wailing and the gnashing of teeth, were familiar figures, and are clearly used because familiar (see Eternal Fire). If, then, we ask how far Jesus gave His sanction to the popular notions behind the symbols, we are confronted with the difficulty of determining what those notions were. The use of these figures to describe the place of punishment in the world of spirits is admitted, but it is not so clear which of the three doctrines which have divided Christian thought—endless punishment, annihilation, restoration—was held. Support has been found for each opinion, and from the words of Jesus Himself quite opposite conclusions have been reached. In

what has been said above, *finality* would seem to be taught, but other opinions are held.

(1) Especially the great sayings in which the note of the universality of grace rings so clear (Joh 3:16-17), and the persistent search of the lost (Luk 15:4-8) and the all-embracing work of Jesus are so absolutely declared (Joh 1:29; Joh 12:31-32), have been dwelt upon as justifying 'the larger hope.' The exact award of penalty, the few and many stripes according to the measure of disobedience (Luk 12:47-48), the completed sentence implied in 'till thou have paid the last farthing' (Mat 5:26; cf. Mat 18:34-35), the startling symbolism of the phrase 'salted with fire' (Mar 9:49), which is said to teach 'that the destructive element performs a purifying part' (see *Internat. Crit. Com. 'Mark' in loco*), the use of κόλασις, *pruning*, 'suggestive of corrective rather than of vindictive punishment' (*Expos. Gr. Test. on Mat 25:46*), and the use of αἰώνιος as suggesting 'age-long,' have all been singled out as leaving room for the hope of final salvation through the fires of judgment.

The exact balance of the awards 'eternal life' and 'eternal punishment' (Mat 25:46) has often been insisted upon as teaching finality. As the life is certainly endless, so, it is urged, must the punishment be. But even this is not conclusive. The terms 'life' and 'punishment' point to an essential difference. Life is of God, essentially Divine; punishment is from God, a Divine act. It is well also to bear in mind that 'if good ever should come to an end, that would come to an end which Christ died to bring in; but if evil comes to an end, that comes to an end which He died to destroy' (Clemance, *Future Punishment*, p. 65).

But more than upon single texts, reliance is placed upon the revealed character and purpose of God in Jesus Christ.

(2) On the other hand, the strong terms, *destruction, perdition, unquenchable fire*, and the analogies of consumption of tares and chaff and withered branches by fire, are instanced as indicating annihilation. Two sayings of Jesus are indeed terrible in their severity, and ought not to be minimized: 'Be not afraid of them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell' (Mat 10:28). Whether the reference be to God as the object of fear (so Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, i. 201, and most commentators) or 'the tempter' and 'the devil whose agent he is' (so Bruce, *Expos. Gr. Test. in loco*), the statement as to the destruction of the soul itself remains. The same thought is suggested by the figure used in the saying, 'He that falleth on this stone shall be broken to pieces; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will scatter him as dust' (Mat 21:44). Were utter extinction of being to be taught, it could hardly be in plainer terms.

(3) In close association, and lending support to the theory of annihilation, is the doctrine of 'conditional immortality' or 'life in Christ.' According to this theory the object of revelation is 'to change man's nature, not only from sin to holiness, but from mortality to immortality.' Many sayings in the Fourth Gospel are pressed to support this theory, especially those where the gift of life is declared to be only through the Son, and to those only who abide in Him by faith (Joh 3:15-16; Joh 6:35; Joh 6:50-58).

It is this evident and apparently 'insoluble antinomy' which has led many to conclude 'that we have not the elements of a complete solution, and we ought not to attempt it. What visions beyond there may be, what larger hopes, what ultimate harmonies, if such there are in store, will come in God's good time; it is not ours to anticipate them, or lift the veil where God has left it drawn' (Orr, *The Christian View of God and the World*, 397). This conclusion, so far at least as the Gospels are concerned, may be accepted. In the teaching of Jesus the emphasis is always upon *present* opportunity, duty, responsibility. 'One said unto him, Lord, are they few that be saved? And he said unto them, Strive to enter in by the narrow door' (Luk 13:23). 'Walk while ye have the light, that darkness overtake you not. While ye have the light, believe on the light, that ye may become sons of light' (Joh 12:35-36). God's eternal grace and man's 'boundless power of resistance' stand over against each other. Jesus honours both, but nowhere in His reported sayings does He disclose the final issue.

The teaching of the Epistles does not come within the scope of this article, but this brief reference is necessary. To the present writer, at least, it does appear that St. Paul's faith reaches a final issue. By him an endless dualism is decisively rejected. 'That God may be all in all' (1Co 15:20-28) is the final goal; but what that includes, or how accomplished, is not declared; only of Christ it is said, and we may hold this faith confidently, 'He must reign till he hath put all his enemies under his feet.'

Literature.—This is very voluminous, and no attempt is made to include even all modern works. The following may be consulted:—(A) In favour of endlessness of punishment: Pusey, *What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment?*; S. Davidson, *The Doctrine of Last Things*; Salmond, *The Christian Doctrine of Immortality*.—(B) Treating the answer as unrevealed: Barrett, *The Intermediate State*; Beet, *The Last Things*; Clemance, *Future Punishment*; Orr, *The Christian View of God and the World*, Lect. ix.—(C) In support of annihilation: Row, *Future Retribution*; Stokes, *Conditional Immortality*; E. White, *Life in Christ*.—(D) Maintaining the 'larger hope': Cox, *Salvator Mundi*; Farrar, *Eternal Hope*, and *Mercy and Judgment*; Plumtre, *Spirits in Prison*, includes art. 'Eschatology' from Smith's *Dict. of Christian Biog.*; Jukes, *The Restitution of all Things*.—(E) On the general question: see Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible*, art. 'Eschatology'; Alger, *Doctrine of a Future Life*; also Greg's *Enigmas of*

Life, ch. vii., for a striking presentation of retribution as determined by the nature of sin; Stephen, *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography*, the Epilogue.

W. H. Dyson.

✚ Eternal Sin

ETERNAL SIN.—The Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 of Mar 3:29 (αἰωνίου ἀμαρτήματος, so \aleph BL [Note: L Bampton Lecture.] ; ζ^* vid D [Note: Deuteronomist.] read ἀμαρτίας); Authorized Version ‘eternal damnation’ (κρίσεως, so Acts 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred]), ‘a strong translation of an incorrect text’ (Morison). It is not surprising that the latter explanation of a difficult word (ἀμαρτήματα) should have found its way into the text of some later MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] . As an explanation of the correct text, ‘eternal judgment’—or, as the judgment is clearly adverse, ‘eternal condemnation’—is not without force. It has the merit of emphasizing the essential matter, which any interpretation, to be adequate, must take into account, that an ‘eternal sin’ is a sin which ‘hath never forgiveness.’ But this early gloss is inadequate. There is more than the emphasis of repetition. It is not the *penalty* of the sin, but its *nature*, which is declared; not the mere *duration* of the sin or of the sinning, but the *guilt*; not eternally sinning, but an eternal sin.

That sin tends to propagate itself is witnessed to by experience, and that continuance in sinning must exclude forgiveness is an essential principle of all moral judgment. Sin and penalty are of necessity coterminous. But *unforgiven* because *unrepented of* is true of *all* sin, and is no adequate explanation of an ‘eternal sin’ which carries the judgment ‘unforgivable.’ The absoluteness of the sentence is already declared in the words ‘hath never forgiveness;’ it is the ultimate ground of this judgment which is further declared.

‘Eternal sin’ finds its contrast and opposite in ‘eternal life,’ which is not simply or characteristically *endless* life, but essential, perfect life, ‘the life which is life indeed’ (1Ti 6:19 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), the life of the Kingdom of God (cf. Mar 9:43; Mar 9:45; Mar 9:47 and Joh 3:3; Joh 3:5; Joh 3:15) the life of God (1Jn 1:2 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). So ‘eternal sin’ is more than ‘sin eternally repeating itself,’ it is a fixed state of sin, sin which has become character, nature, moral death, which is death indeed. But see art. Blasphemy, p. 209^b. This is the final revolt of man, free will carried to its ultimate in the defiance of God, a final

condition, hopeless and beyond recovery, beyond the reach even of Divine illumination and influence. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews certainly contemplates in 6:1-8 the possibility of such fatal apostasy, cf. also 1Jn_5:16 'sin unto death' (see Westcott, *ad loc.*); but neither of these passages appears to the present writer to afford help here.

Two questions must be distinguished—the *actuality* and the *possibility* of this state of moral depravity. That the grace of God should prove unavailing is indeed hard to believe, and by many the thought is rejected utterly. Yet there is much in the teaching of Jesus and in human life to justify the fear that this possibility may become an actual fact. The hardening of the heart which follows all unfaithfulness is the witness in human life to what must inevitably result if unfaithfulness is persisted in, a fixed state of spiritual blindness and insensibility. There is a law of degeneration in the moral world as in the natural. But it is in the Scripture doctrine of sin that the full ground of this fear is seen. According to the teaching of Jesus, the measure of responsibility is 'the light that is in thee' (Mat_6:23), and sin is wilful disregard of the light of truth. To be blind is to be without sin; but to those who say 'we see,' and yet walk in darkness, 'sin remaineth' (Joh_9:41). So every increase of light brings increased responsibility (Joh_3:19; Joh_15:22); and for self-willed deliberate refusal of the Divine grace, refusal not in ignorance or misunderstanding but with full consciousness and choice of will so that the will itself becomes identified with evil, there can only be judgment, not because the Divine compassions fail, but because the redemption, as the Redeemer, is despised and rejected of men. In the final issue the free will of man is valid even against the beseechings of God (Joh_5:40, Mat_23:37).

The doom of the finally impenitent is here negatively told: 'hath never forgiveness'; but that includes the uttermost penalty, exclusion from the Kingdom of the Father, loss of the 'eternal life.' This is sin's last stage and uttermost working; it cuts the soul off from God, its source and life. 'Sin, when it is full grown, bringeth forth death' (Jam_1:15). See, further, art. Sin.

Literature.—The Commentaries on St. Mark; Salmond, *Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, pp. 306, 493; Row, *Future Retribution*, p. 254; Bruce, *Kingdom of God*, p. 319; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, English translation ii. 87; Stevens, *Theology of the NT*, p. 102; *Expos.* ii. iii. [1882] p. 321 ff.

W. H. Dyson.

ETERNITY.—There is no word either in OT Hebrew or in NT Greek corresponding to the abstract idea of eternity.

In Isa 57:15 both Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 have the phrase ‘the high and lofty One *that inhabiteth eternity.*’ Massoretic Text has שֹׁכֵן עֵר, lit. ‘dwelling for ever’—the thought of the writer being evidently the *unchangeableness* of God. עֵר probably comes nearest of all Hebrew words to express permanence. Originally it was a substantive connected with Assyri- [Note: Assyrian.] *adú*, meaning ‘time,’ ‘passing time,’ ‘the present.’ But in OT it is used adverbially to express indefinite duration of time generally in the future. Its use is mainly poetical: of God (Isa 57:15), His law (Psa 19:9), His attributes (Psa 111:3; Psa 111:10). But it is found also in connexion with things whose existence in Hebrew thought would be limited, e.g. a king’s life (Psa 21:6, Pro 29:14), the lip of truth (Pro 12:19).

A word of wider meaning and more general application is עוֹלָם, connected with Assyri- [Note: Assyrian.] *ullânu*, meaning ‘*remote time.*’ עוֹלָם is frequently used of the fast-days (Isa 63:9; Isa 63:11, Mic 5:1; Mic 7:14 etc.), people (Isa 44:7, Jer 5:15), hills (Gen 49:26, Hab 3:6). It is also used, like עֵר, of God or His attributes as existing from the remote past (Psa 93:2; Psa 119:52, Isa 63:16; Isa 63:19) to the remote future (Psa 138:8, Jer 31:3, 1Ki 10:9), specially in the phrase עוֹלָם וָעוֹלָם ‘from everlasting to everlasting’ (Psa 90:2; Psa 103:17, Neh 9:5 etc.). But in the case of עוֹלָם also there are many places in OT where its meaning is obviously limited to the affairs and lives of human beings, e.g. of a slave (Deu 15:7, 1Sa 27:12), of careless dwellers (Psa 73:12), and in the familiar phrase, ‘May the king live for ever’ (1Ki 1:31, Neh 2:3). Often, however, the word is used to indicate the writer’s hope or belief that a certain state of good [e.g. God’s covenant (Gen 9:16), or His promises (Isa 40:8), or His relations to His people (Psa 45:17; Psa 85:8, etc.)], may continue indefinitely. Particularly is this true of the Messianic hope (Isa 9:6, Psa 110:4; Psa 45:3). Sometimes this thought of permanence is emphasized by the use of the plural (Isa 26:4; Isa 45:17, Dan 9:24). In Ecc 3:11, a very difficult passage, (Revised Version margin) gives as an alternative rendering of עוֹלָם ‘*eternity.*’

The other Hebrew phrases worthy of note are צְהֵרָה ‘perpetuity’ in the frequent phrase לְעוֹלָם ‘for ever’ (Isa 13:20; Isa 25:8, Amo 8:7, Hab 1:4 etc.), and יָמִים אֲדָרָה ‘length of days,’ Deu 30:20, Job 12:12, Psa 21:4, and in the well-known passage Psa 23:6 ‘I shall dwell in the house of the Lord ever.’ Here the meaning is disputed, but the probability is that the highest anticipation of the Psalmist was to have the joy of

spending an indefinite period in the Temple in prayer and meditation. Similar to לְעוֹלָם is the phrase וַיֵּךְ לְרֹדֶף, lit. 'to age and age,' .e. to future ages (Exo 3:15, Psa 10:6; Psa 33:11; Psa 49:11). It is mainly poetical.

The idea of eternity, like the idea of immortality, was probably beyond the range of early Jewish thought. It arose after the Exile, partly through a natural development of the Hebrew conception of God, and partly through the force of circumstances. (1) The pious Jew, turning away more and more from the anthropomorphism of cruder religions, strove to differentiate the infinite God from finite man. God is transcendent—above the limitations of earthly existence. Hence He is eternal, from everlasting to everlasting. A thousand years in His sight are but as yesterday. (2) With the Exile came a decay of *national* ideals, and the Jew began to consider more his own personality and its relation to this eternal God. This thought developed slowly, and was mixed with various elements. The Jew found himself in an evil world. His own nation was oppressed, almost blotted out. Good men suffered; wicked men seemed to prosper. If the eternal, omnipotent God ruled the world, then all this must surely end. The Day of the Lord would come for oppressed Israel, for the oppressors, for the whole world, and (in Apocalyptic literature, Ps-Sol 3:16, 13:9 etc.) for the Jew himself. Then the present evil world (הַיְתָה עוֹלָם) would give place to a new and glorious era (הַבָּא עוֹלָם, see Generation). Whether this הַבָּא עוֹלָם would be *endless* the Jew did not at first stop to inquire. Sufficient for him that it *would* come with countless blessings in 'the end of the days' (הַיָּמִים קֵץ, cf. Mat 13:39; Mat 24:3). In the Book of Enoch, however, 'Time' is followed by 'Eternity' in the הַבָּא עוֹלָם. Later Judaism developed the idea, probably borrowed from the Zend religion, of a series of world epochs (cf. the world empires of Daniel's vision), followed by the Messianic age.

In the time of Christ, Jewish thought on the future had developed very much, and had assumed many forms (see Eschatology). Jesus must have sifted the various elements. He retained and perhaps developed the view of a new age (הַבָּא עוֹלָם) about to dawn on the world as opposed to the present (הַיְתָה עוֹלָם; Mat 12:32, cf. Mat 13:39; Mat 28:20).

'the kingdom of heaven' (שָׁמַיִם מְלֻכּוּתָהּ) would be established. Jesus endeavoured to concentrate the thoughts of His hearers on their relation to this kingdom, and the desirability of sharing it (see Life, Eternal Life). Doubtless this kingdom would be for ever and its members live for ever (cf. Dan 12:2 עוֹלָם חַיִּי 'eternal life'). The vexed question of the absolute endlessness of this kingdom, with its rewards and punishments, would probably never be raised in the minds of Jesus' hearers. At the same time, there is no evidence in the teaching of Jesus of any limit to the הַבָּא עוֹלָם,

and while the frequent adjective αἰώνιος, 'eternal,' must be taken in the Gospels as referring in the first place to this coming kingdom, it may, so far as we know, be taken as implying also that quality of absolute permanence with which that kingdom has always been associated in the minds of men.

Literature.—The subject is practically part of the larger topic Eschatology, and all books dealing with this latter subject refer more or less to Eternity. On the OT and Apocalyptic views see Stade, *Die Alttest. Vorstellungen vom Zustand nach dem Tode*; Schwally, *Das Leben nach dem Tode*; Schultz, *OT Theology*, vol. ii. pp. 364-398; Salmond, *The Christian Doctrine of Immortality*; Orelli, *Die hebr. Synonyma der Zeit und Ewigkeit*; Marti, *Geschichte der Israel. Religion*, pp. 270-310. On the NT see the various NT theologies, especially those of Beyschlag and H. Holtzmann. Cf. also Samuel Davidson, *Doctrine of the Last Things*; Toy, *Judaism and Christianity*; A. Beet, *Last Things*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*.

G. Gordon Stott.

⚡ Ethics

ETHICS.—A very little reflexion will reveal the unusual difficulties that lurk in a subject like the present—the Ethics of Jesus, or, of the Gospels. Even the uninitiated is aware that we cannot in strictness speak of the 'Ethics' of Jesus at all—in the sense, that is, of a doctrine systematically developed according to principles, and exhaustively applied to the facts of life. For His was no scientific or methodical spirit; His significance lies rather in the realm of personality, in the unique quality of His moral feeling and judgment, in the peculiar way in which men and things moved Him, and in which He reacted upon them. Hence we need not look for either an orderly arrangement of, or even an approximate completeness in, His ethical ideas. From the drama of His life we are unable to compile a system of morals, but we may see how a great Personality creates a moral standard by what He does and suffers, and how He elucidates it in His words.

But are we justified in connecting with Him the term 'ethical' at all? We speak accurately of Ethics or Moral Science only when we regard the conduct of men in their mutual relations as something by itself, abstracted from religious feeling and action, and when ethical ends and maxims are disengaged from religion, in virtue of their inherent worth; and such an independent position of Ethics, whether it appear worth attaining or not, is simply beside the mark in the case of Jesus. His moral and His

religious principles are so closely interwoven, His moral feeling, e.g. His love for man, is so inseparable from the religious basis of His belief in the Fatherhood of God, that it would seem to be impossible to delineate His 'Ethics' without at the same time treating of, say, the Kingdom of God, the Divine grace, or the final judgment. And if, nevertheless, we venture upon the task, we must never lose sight of the connecting lines that run between His ethical teaching and His religious principles.

Then there is the question whether our *sources* are at all sufficient for the full and accurate representation of the moral personality of Jesus. In restricting ourselves to the Synoptic Gospels, we are doing nothing more than recognizing the claims of historical science. But now, to what extent can we regard the three older Gospels as adequate sources for our theme? If we investigate the oldest of all, viz. Mark, we find that it nowhere makes any attempt to portray the Ethics of Jesus as such. In reporting His conflict and controversy with the Judaism of His time, it casts but an indirect light upon this side of His character, and that, moreover, in a series of isolated scenes. Of these the most outstanding are the Rabbinical disputations regarding the Sabbath (Mar 2:23 to Mar 3:6), purity (Mar 7:1-23), divorce (Mar 10:1-12); then come the important passages narrating the conversation with the rich man (Mar 10:17-27) and regarding the 'first commandment' (Mar 12:28-34). Various other aspects of His conception of life are vividly illustrated by such utterances as that to the paralytic (Mar 2:5 f.), about the physician and the sick (Mar 2:17) the true kinship (Mar 3:35), children (Mar 10:15 f.), and tribute-money (Mar 12:13-17). In the section dominated by the three predictions of His death (Mar 8:27 to Mar 10:45) we have a mass of admonitions to the disciples—concerning readiness to suffer, loyalty, courage, humility, reverence for childhood, etc. We have here something of the nature of a primitive Christian catechism; not instructions (as in the *Didache*, let us say) for tranquil seasons and everyday life, but rather articles of war for the *ecclesia militans* of the persecutions, a *manuale crucis*.* [Note: J. Weiss, *Das älteste Evangelium* (1903).]

An entirely different kind of appeal is made by the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew 5-7. In its extant form the Sermon is the promulgation of a great programme, in which the Evangelist seeks to give a definitive and approximately complete statement of *Jesus' relation to the Law*, with a reference, moreover, to the representatives of the anti-legalistic standpoint, who think that He is come 'to destroy the law.' It is the purpose of the writer to convince these that Jesus, being in a general way the Fulfiller of Prophecy, is, as a lawgiver, the fulfiller of the prophecy regarding the second Moses, whom God was to raise up in the last days (Deu 18:15), and who, so far from abrogating the Law, will rather consummate and even transcend it.† [Note: J. Weiss, *Die Schriften des NT, neu übersetzt und für die Gegenwart erklärt* (1905), i. i. p. 236 ff.] In our reading of the Sermon we cannot afford to ignore this design of the

writer; we must draw a distinction between what its words purported to him, and what they meant in the tradition he utilized. Similarly, in reading St. Luke's version of the Sermon on the Mount, we must bear in mind that he has materially abridged his material, not alone by discarding the Jewish and preserving only the typically human elements, but by considerably transforming it under the influence of his pronounced ascetic view.‡ [Note: p. 413 ff.] Both Mt. and Lk. thus throw us back upon the *source* of our Lord's words, in which the primitive Jewish-Christian community had grouped the Logia of Jesus for its own instruction. Hence we are forced to distinguish between the Ethics of the Evangelists and the Ethics of their source. Further, we must make a searching examination of the characteristically Lukan tradition as it appears in the parables of the Rich Man and Lazarus, the Good Samaritan, etc.;§ [Note: p. 380.] only so shall we be justified in attempting to answer the question, What was the ethical position of Jesus? An extremely complicated critical process must thus be gone through before we use our present authorities as documents for the solution of our problem. But as it is impossible to reproduce here the details of such investigation, only the results can be stated, with references to other works of the present writer.

In an account of the Ethics of Jesus, the reader also looks for a comparison and contrast between Him and His Jewish, perhaps also His Graeco-Roman, contemporaries. The fresh and original elements in His moral thought and feeling must be set over against traditional views. The favourite procedure in this connexion, that, namely, of placing His luminous figure on a background as sombre as possible, is one we cannot follow. Above all, the task of describing the ethical conditions of contemporary Judaism would take us beyond our allotted space, and is, moreover, beyond our capacity. Often as it has been tried, in more or less ingenious sketches, to reproduce some cross-section through the moral conditions of later Judaism, it has never been accomplished without subjective caprice and violent tendency-interpretations. Nor is this result to be wondered at; for it is quite impossible to describe faithfully, or estimate justly, the characteristic ethical complexion of a period so extensive as the two and a half centuries from b.c. 180 to a.d. 70, of the inner history of which we still know so little, which is represented by a literature so multiform, and of which the dominant currents veered so much—a period, moreover, meagrely equipped with first-rate or distinctly recognizable personalities. True, we can observe the behaviour of the circles from which sprang the Psalms of Solomon, we can lay our hand upon the devout breast of the pseudo-Ezra, we can enter into the spirit of the author of 1 Maccabees or Sirach; but how diverse are even these few casual types, and how impossible is it to make them fit into one harmonious picture! What, again, do we know of the Ethics of the Greek or Sadducean party? What vogue had the Essenes among the people? Are the Pharisees of the Psalms of Solomon identical with those of the time of Jesus? And, above all, what significance for our problem has the Talmud, so often named, so little known?

Here, in sober truth, so many unsolved enigmas await the historian, that one cannot but marvel at the assurance of those who, in face of them all, are ready to sketch the Ethics of later Judaism as a foil for the Ethics of Jesus. We for our part renounce any such design. We have not the daring to institute a comparison between the Ethics of Jesus and the complicated historical phenomena of the period, and then, as impartial judges, to proceed to measure out the light and shade. We content ourselves with the question, *How did Jesus regard and estimate the Judaism of His time?* It is beyond doubt that His moral sense was chafed by many things, and in particular by Pharisaism, and that a material part of His teaching was formulated in antagonism to the Rabbis. We too must feel this antagonism, if we are ever to understand Him.

If, again, we are required to answer the question as to wherein consists the new and original element in the Ethics of Jesus, we are brought to a complete standstill. In His conflict with Rabbinism He is in close alliance with the Prophets, and is certainly not outside their influence. But to assume that a great gulf is fixed between the religion of the Prophets and Psalmists and that of later Judaism, is to forget that a goodly part of both the Prophets and the Psalms was a contribution of the post-exilic period, and, above all, to overlook the fact that these writings form the background, or, we might even say, the native soil of Judaism. However profoundly they were misunderstood, still it was not possible to prevent the intermittent welling up, from the soil, of many a copious spring; and many a document of the later period bears clear testimony to their influence. Thus we can do full justice to the moral creed of Jesus only by giving adequate consideration to the circumstance that He lived in intimate sympathy and steadfast accord with the noblest and devoutest thoughts of His people's Bible. Hence, if in view of these facts we inquire concerning the originality of Jesus, the result will be a surprise. For we shall find that of almost all His ethical ideas there are anticipations, precedents, and even parallels in the OT, as also in contemporary Judaism. A mere glance at any collection of parallels, such as that of Wetstein, will be sufficient to purge us of the notion that the uniqueness or greatness of Jesus consists in the novelty of His ethical teaching. Theology is still tainted with the propensity, inherited from Rationalism, to see in the production of ideas the all but exclusive factor in the making of history or the progress of man. It often fails to realize how plentiful ideas are in times that are spiritually alive, or how in all ages humanity has been enabled to take a step in advance only by the emergence of a personality who, with unwonted energy, sincerity, and enthusiasm, absorbed, elaborated, and formed anew from his individual experience the choicest products of his age. So with Jesus; His ideas as such are neither so novel nor so revolutionary as to create a new world; they derive their procreative virtue solely from the fact that He made them *His own*, *lived* them, and *died* for them.

From these preliminaries we turn to the exposition proper, premising that we shall on principle forego any systematic or exhaustive development of the material from a

fundamental idea. Our purpose is to survey the figure of Jesus in its specific operation, and what better situation for this can we find than the actual scene of His conflict with His environment? It was the friction with that environment which kindled the fire within Him; it was His unconformity with it that gave Him the conviction of His peculiar heritage. Just as His anger at the profanation of the Temple moved Him to an involuntary display of a religious feeling superior to, and more delicate than, that of His fellows, so His collision with the leading representatives of Judaism evokes from Him not merely an indignant criticism, but also a manifestation of His own inherent character. In this connexion the great discourse against the Scribes and Pharisees in Matthew 23 (cf. [Luk_11:39-52](#)) furnishes invaluable testimony. Even if its artificial form (cf. the seven Woes) be derivative, still the majority of the sayings grouped in it, so expressive of individual feeling, so original in form, unmistakably show the characteristic touch of Jesus. In any case the discourse clearly reveals the distinction He drew between Himself and the Rabbis, and the traits in the latter by which the disciples, filled with His spirit, felt themselves repelled. It is, above all things, the *insincerity* of their practice, the contrast between the reality and the appearance, which is so vividly brought out in the metaphor of ‘whited sepulchres’ ([Mat_23:27](#)). The supreme business of the scribes,—to which they apparently devoted themselves with surpassing zeal,—viz. the instruction of the people in the law of God ([Mat_23:4](#)), they discharged in such a way as to superinduce the very reverse of what was intended: instead of bringing men into the Kingdom ([Mat_23:13](#)) they keep them out by imposing intolerable burdens, in the bearing of which they render not the slightest help. It is, in fact, evident that the work of leading men to God was for them a matter of no consequence whatever. A glaring light is thrown likewise upon the propaganda of the Pharisees ([Mat_23:15](#)): under their tutelage a proselyte becomes a child of hell, twice as wicked as themselves (or, as it was probably spoken at first, twice as wicked as he was before). These severe verdicts show at a glance how highly Jesus estimated the sacred and responsible office of the leaders of the people, which they so direly abused. With keen moral indignation He passes sentence upon the complacent and self-seeking father-confessors, who, on the pretext of pastoral zeal, with ‘long prayers’ devour widows’ houses ([Mar_12:40](#)). He shows inimitably the unscrupulousness of their over-scrupulosity: straining out gnats and swallowing camels, they are squeamish and strait-laced in regard to trifles, in the great moral matters lax for themselves and lenient to others, even to the point of apathy—and such has ever since been the practice of a hierarchy clothed with authority ([Mat_23:24](#)). In these utterances Jesus reproves chiefly the scribes’ insensibility to the primary moral sanctions; they keep cup and platter clean, but are indifferent to the nature of the contents; *non olet*, even though it has been accumulated by selfishness and greed, and is gorged with unbridled self-indulgence ([Mat_23:25](#)). While with painful precision they attend to the tithing of the meanest garden produce, they neglect the weightiest matters of the Law—justice, mercy, and faithfulness ([Mat_23:23](#)). In harmony with [Mic_6:8](#) He enunciates the principle that the primary

imperatives of morality surpass all ceremonial prescriptions in importance and urgency—a truth which, though ancient, needs ever to be emphasized anew. There can be no dubiety as to the purport of ‘justice’ or ‘mercy’ in this passage; they are meant to cover the great social obligations of the ruling to the dependent classes—the non-perversion of the Law, the succour of widows and orphans, the relief of the poor. As to the third injunction, the Evangelists do not seem to have been sure of its meaning; for ‘faithfulness’ St. Luke ([Luk_11:42](#)) substitutes the ‘love of God,’ probably interpreting *πιστις* as ‘faith’ (as Authorized and Revised Versions). Without doubt, however, Jesus intends this word also to connote a social and moral duty, viz. trustworthiness and candour in human relationships.

Mt. has in this verse inserted a clause ([Mat_23:23](#) b) which should almost certainly be deleted from Lk. ([Luk_11:42](#)), as a gloss involving a certain modification of the command. The preceding verses might lead us to infer that Jesus did not only set less store by the ceremonial law, but was willing to do away with it altogether. This, however, says St. Matthew, is not His meaning: ‘These (moral duties) ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.’ The Evangelist is, in fact, keenly solicitous lest Jesus be regarded as hostile to the Mosaic law, as he shows also in [Mat_5:17](#) and the prefatory words [Mat_23:2](#) f. (neither passage in Lk.), implying that the teaching of the scribes is good, but that their works are evil, since they do not practise what they preach. Taking into consideration the writer’s date and point of view, we can quite well understand the words; but we naturally ask whether this conciliatory and conservative attitude towards the ceremonial law truly represents the mind of Jesus?

The words about the cleansing of cups and platters, and about the tithing of mint, anise, and cummin, certainly sound so contemptuous as to compel us to ask whether Jesus set any value whatever upon the ceremonial side of the Law, and, in particular, upon the special casuistical precepts of the scribes. The question may be answered provisionally and generally: Jesus was not a Pharisee, and this means that His attitude towards many of the scribal maxims was a dissentient one; He was not a Judæan, but a son of the Galilaean peasantry, who knew how to evade the authority of Pharisaic doctors and lawyers, and who were, in consequence, liable to the curse merited by those who ‘know not the law’ ([Joh_7:49](#)); and, accordingly, He regards Himself and His followers likewise as above the Pharisees’ rules about purifying. But we also find explicit remonstrances against the ‘traditions of the elders’ so dear to the scribes ([Mar_7:5](#); [Mar_7:9](#); [Mar_7:13](#)); He characterizes them summarily as the ‘prescriptions’ (Authorized and Revised Versions ‘tradition’) of men ([Mar_7:8](#)), thus contrasting them with the commandments of God. In this He evinces His independent attitude, for a genuine Pharisee could live only by the belief that the additions to and amplifications of the Law, even if devised by human teachers, were yet expressive of God’s will. But Jesus goes still further, affirming positively that in their concern for

these traditions the scribes reject, pervert, and even make void the commandment of God (Mar 7:8; Mar 7:13). He gives as an example the gross case of one who evades the plain human duty of supporting his parents by the manœuvre of dedicating to the Temple the money he might have spared for them: once the fateful word ‘Corban’ is spoken, then every penny so consecrated belongs to God, and is, as sacred property, interdicted from all secular uses, and so from that of the parents. It is bad enough that a son should so act; but that jurists and theologians should *permit* him henceforward to turn his back upon father and mother, should declare his pledge to be inviolable, and refuse to ‘release’ him from it, is neither more nor less than the disannulling of the Fifth Commandment.* [Note: J. Weiss, op. cit. i. 1, p. 124]

Now the assertion that the great moral demands of God’s law are of more importance than any ceremonial obligations, is primarily directed only against the traditions and prescriptions of the Rabbis; in reality, however, it is a principle which threatens the very foundations of the Mosaic system. Already in the OT we see the strained relations between prophetic piety and priestly legality—brothers again and again at variance. In the personality and preaching of Jesus the prophetic religion reappears with unparalleled force and clearness, and braces itself to the work of overthrowing the fabric of Levitical ceremonialism. To treat the ethical and the ritual law as of equal validity belongs to the very nature of the priestly theocracy: the moment the former is placed on a higher level the whole edifice becomes insecure. In this reference St. Mark preserves a short but pregnant saying of Jesus (Mar 7:15), viz. ‘There is nothing from without the man that going into him can defile him, but the things which proceed out of the man are those which defile him.’ As He is here speaking of clean and unclean meats, He says, ‘Nothing going *into* the man,’ but He might equally well say, and certainly means, ‘Nothing from without the man coming *to* him,’ *i.e.* coming into contact with him. But this is the reverse of what stands in the Law. For the whole complex of the Mosaic-Levitical legislation rests upon the postulate that a man *is* defiled by outer contact and contamination, or by partaking of certain foods, *i.e.* that he thereby becomes separated from God, is excluded from the sanctuary and segregated from the sacred community. Now the principle enunciated by Jesus cuts the ground from under all the particular commandments of the ceremonial law. It carries, indeed, a dissolving and explosive force. But His standpoint differs from mere rationalistic ‘illumism’ by having a profoundly religious basis. Jesus had so intense a conception of man’s relation to God as an ethical one, that He could not tolerate the thought that God would exclude any one from His presence merely because he had touched a corpse or eaten swine’s flesh. It is the evil will, the impure heart, the false nature, that separate men from God.

All this, of course, is self-evident to us; but when Jesus uttered it, and acted upon it, He found Himself at cross purposes with the most exemplary personages of His generation, and compelled to resist the drift of an age-long tradition. He raised His

voice not only against the scribes, but against the very spirit of the Law they expounded. Moreover, in actual practice, His bearing towards the Law is quite unconstrained. He adds to the exceptions already conceded by the Rabbis (e.g. works of necessity on the Sabbath), and allows both Himself and His disciples a certain freedom, without taking counsel of the specialists. When challenged, He appeals to the example of David (Mar_2:23-26). It is manifestly gratifying to the narrator that Jesus was able to justify His action so adroitly by the methods of Rabbinical exposition. But this is only an *ex post facto* justification, of which the disciples certainly were not thinking as they plucked the corn; they had acted without deliberation, simply availing themselves of the freedom which their fellowship with Jesus had made a matter of course. We learn the true meaning of Jesus from the twofold declaration subjoined by St. Mark (Mar_2:27 f.). Doubtless what the *writer* means is that the 'Son of man,' i.e. the Messiah, is Lord of the Sabbath, and can absolve His disciples from its observance; but originally the saying must have run thus: 'Man has full power also over the Sabbath,' which, again, is of essentially the same tenor as the other, viz. 'the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath.'* [Note: See J. Weiss, op. cit. i. 1, p. 87.] This saying, too, is more than an article in a confession; it is really a declaration of war against Mosaism. Scribe and doctor regard the Law as an end in itself, and obedience to it as the final purpose of human life, even if such obedience involve sacrifice, and indeed the surrender of life itself. But the assertion of Jesus that the Law is given for man's sake, as something designed for his benefit, and the inference that he is free from it whenever its observance conflicts with his welfare, proceed from an entirely different point of view, and have far-reaching implications. The rigid and *doctrinaire* aspect of the Law is thus cancelled; its behests are viewed as means for the realization of God's purposes of love towards men. All this, however, shows but the birth-struggle of an entirely new religious conception, destined in its further growth to do away altogether with the Law *as law*. A similar instance is the declaration (Mar_10:1 ff.) that the Mosaic regulation regarding divorce was a concession to the Israelites' hardness of heart, and that it stands in antithesis to the statute originally promulgated in Paradise, which alone is the will of God and the precedent for man. Here the Mosaic ordinance is represented as something adventitious, as merely marking a stage meant to be left behind.

The boldness of Jesus in thus essaying to make a distinction within Scripture itself, and to discriminate between the law of God and human accretions, is of great moment for us. He has recourse to a mode of criticism which might be called subjective, but which really merits the attribute *prophetic*. This 'Prophet,' filled with Deity, this great religious Personality, ever directly conscious of His nearness to God, does not shrink from giving judgment as to what is the actual purpose of the Most High. Just as He fervidly announces the royal benignity of God towards both the evil

and the good, just as He confidently speaks to the contrite of the Divine forgiveness, and without misgiving assures the wretched of the Divine succour, so He also undertakes, in face of the law of Moses, 'that which was spoken to the fathers,' to set forth a new law, in the glad conviction that He is thus expressing the will of God. Hence it is a misapprehension of the tenor and scope of the 'antitheses' in the Sermon on the Mount to imagine that in these Jesus is merely impugning the prevailing exegesis of the Law, or merely endeavouring to bring to light the real design of its promulgator. No; the rhythmical repetition of the phrase, 'But I say unto you,' makes it abundantly clear that Jesus is here reaching beyond Moses. And this undoubtedly corresponds to the historical situation. Take, for instance, the first two enactments, viz. regarding murder and adultery; it is clear that what Jesus means is that God asks more than mere abstention from these crimes: He demands perfect self-control and integrity of heart. The unheeded moments when the animal nature starts up in a fit of anger or of impure desire are grievously sinful in the eyes of God, as well as the actual misdeeds.

The religious-historical situation is as follows. The Jewish people were under a theocracy, and for them the Law of Moses was by no means restricted to religious or moral matters; it was at once a civil and a penal code, an order of legal procedure and a manual for the priesthood. Now it is the bane of a theocratic constitution that the Divine law, ingrafted as it is upon common life, tends to lose its majesty and inviolability. It has to adapt itself to the varied facts of existence by means of saving clauses and casuistical methods; and such a *régime* fosters above all the notion that the will and judgment of God reach no further than the arm of the civil magistrate, and that it is only the completed act, and not the intention, that God brings to judgment. Thus the moral relation of man to God sinks to the level of a legal one. Such a deterioration and externalizing of the religious life must all but inevitably ensue when its regulation and guardianship are committed to priests and jurists. It is the 'Prophet,' however, who now takes up the word. With incisive force He makes it clear that God looks upon the heart, the thought, the secret motions of the soul, and brings these things before His judgment-seat, and that the sin of intention passes with Him for no less than the overt act. To assert such equivalence of thought and deed may seem to us almost to overshoot the mark; for we rightly place a high value upon the self-command which keeps desire from passing into action. But the apparently partial view is to be regarded as the natural reaction of the heart and the conscience against the legalistic ossification and externalization of religion.

The verdict of Jesus upon *divorce* points in the same direction. The argument upon which He bases His prohibition of the separation permitted by Moses merits our attention. The statute laid down in Paradise is to be preferred, as the law of God, not merely in virtue of its great antiquity, but also on intrinsic grounds. When a husband puts away his wife, he places her in a position of moral jeopardy; for, should she

associate herself with another man, whether in a second marriage or in a passing act of immorality, she thereby completes the dissolution of the first marriage, which hitherto was legally binding. The noteworthy element in this utterance is not that the ruptured matrimonial union is still binding, but in particular that the man is morally responsible for his wife, even after his dismissal of her; he must bear the guilt of her sin. Such is the only judgment possible, if marriage is to be regarded not merely as a legal bond, under the control of the civil magistrate, but as a moral covenant, for whose inviolability men are responsible, not to one another, but to God. See Divorce.

The profoundly irreligious subtlety of the lawyers is also exposed in Jesus' prohibition of oaths. First of all He shows that the evasions and periphrases by which those who swear hope to escape the danger of profaning God's holy name, are of no avail; every oath is and remains an adjuration of God. But more: to the finer religious feelings, every oath is a gratuitous and irreverent bringing down of the Most High into the sordid and trivial concerns of the hour—the grossest case being that of the impulsive Oriental who puts his head in pledge, as if he had power over life and death, forgetting his complete dependence upon God, and that life and death proceed from Him alone. Thus Jesus supersedes the scrupulous anxiety and the petty evasions of the Rabbis by a much deeper religious motive: the oath, in truth, is but an element in a world under the domination of sin and Satan (Mat_5:37), and he who feels God's majesty and purity in his inmost soul will have a sacred fear of bringing God upon such a scene, and will honour Him best by the plain and simple word of truth.

Of an entirely different character are the two final antitheses, viz. those relating to *non-resistance* and *love of enemies*, as given in Mat_5:38-48. In the foregoing precepts we have simply the utterances of a more earnest moral sensibility; here we have the language of exultant and heroic enthusiasm, not meant to be judged by commonplace standards. In lieu of the typically Jewish principle of retaliation, which was applied both in legal and in personal affairs, viz. 'eye for eye, tooth for tooth,' Jesus demands the entire renunciation of self-defence or self-vindication. Nay more; it is not mere tranquil endurance that He enjoins, but a readiness to present to the assailant the other cheek, to give more than what is asked, to surrender the cloak as well as the coat. These injunctions differ from those of St. Paul in Rom_12:19-21 in that they involve no thought of shaming or overcoming the adversary by pliancy and patience. St. Paul would seem, in fact, to have interpreted the words of Jesus in the practical didactic sense of certain Stoic admonitions. But the distinctive feature of the passage in the Sermon on the Mount is that the demands are made without any reason being assigned or any subordinate aim proposed, precisely, indeed, as if their authority must have been perfectly self-evident to the disciples. A theological exegesis has barred the way towards a right understanding of them by always starting from the question what these words mean *for us*, and how *we* shall obey them. And as a literal obedience to them seems to us impossible, recourse is had to new

interpretations and modifications, by which the strength of their tremendous claims is sapped. Instead of putting such questions, we would rather ask how the words are to be understood in their original setting, and how Jesus came to utter them in that form. Now it is evident that their essential feature is a thorough aversion to the principle of retaliation by which the ignobler instincts of the Jewish national spirit were sustained and intensified. This aversion on the part of Jesus is so strong that the most emphatic utterance of the opposite quality is for Him precisely the right thing; a consummate zeal for forbearance and renunciation whets His demands to their sharpest point. But what is the source of this enthusiasm? It is no mere reformer of Jewish morals that speaks here, no legislator for centuries yet unborn, but the herald and apostle of the imminent dissolution of the world and of the Kingdom of God already at the door! Hence a man can prepare himself for that day in no more worthy or more earnest way than by the surrender of all the present life is based upon—earthly repute, business capacity, personal property; all these are but obstacles and fetters. Whoso renounces willingly, whoso suffers gladly—he is truly free, and ready for the great day that is at hand. We can appreciate and vindicate the words only if we interpret them by the mood appropriate to the twelfth hour.

‘If so, they take our life,
Goods, honour, children, wife—
Let these things vanish all!
Their profit is but small:
The Kingdom still remaineth.’

The same enthusiasm pulsates through the words about love to enemies. It is unnecessary to paint the background of Judaism too black, to cavil at the Jewish ‘love to one’s neighbour’ as narrow and partial, or even to lay too great a stress upon the ‘hatred of one’s enemies,’ in order to feel that the demand of Jesus is not only something ‘new,’ but also a puissant, transcendent, superhuman ideal. He says, indeed, that the man who so acts will be perfect even as God is perfect, a worthy child of the all-loving Father. Now it cannot be sufficiently urged that this obligation to love one’s enemies neither issues from nor can be fulfilled amidst the normal emotions of everyday life. If it is to be real to us, *i.e.* truly realized and not merely assumed, then it demands an enthusiasm which, if not ‘contrary to the nature,’ is certainly ‘beyond the power’ of the natural man. None but the possessor of a spirit profoundly religious and animated by the love of God, could possibly love his enemies, at all events according to the special sense which Jesus gave to the universal command, viz. ‘Love them which hate you, pray for them which despitefully use you.’

Our view of this supreme command of Jesus thus brings us to the twofold law of love (Mar 12:29 ff., Luk 10:25 ff.). It is beyond question that neither this conjoining of love to God and love to one's neighbour, nor the focusing of the whole Divine law in that 'summa' is a specifically original thought of Jesus. According to the oldest form of the narrative (Luk 10:25 f.),* [Note: J. Weiss, op. cit. i. 1, p. 172 ff.] He elicits it from a scribe. Possibly enough there were earnest and pious Rabbis who, amid the jungle of thousands upon thousands of precepts, sought for some leading idea, and found in the requirement of love to God and man the nucleus of God's primal revelation: but none of them was ever able to carry such unification and simplification into full effect. Here again it is not the mere thought which matters, nor the fact that Jesus gave it utterance. The great thing is that, over and above, He furnished in His own life such an embodiment of the Law as carries conviction to all. In His personification of the ideal He welded the love of God and the love of man in an indissoluble union, in which they might foster and strengthen each other. He expressed the ideal in a perfect form, and stamped it upon the soul of the race. Since His day it has become obvious that the highest form of *religion* is that from which there radiates the soothing, genial, meek, and helpful *love of mankind*; obvious also, that that *love of man* is the deepest, the truest, the most enduring, the most exacting, which has its roots in the depths of a soul pledged to the Most High, a soul which is permeated by His truth, and has been apprehended by His holy and gracious will.

Literature.—J. Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*; Bousset, *Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judentum*; Jacoby, *NT Ethik*, bk. i.; R. Mackintosh, *Christ and the Jewish Law*.

Johannes Weiss.

☞ Eunuch

EUNUCH (εὐνοῦχος; σπάδων occurs sometimes in LXX Septuagint [see Gen 37:36 and Isa 39:7, with which, however, cf. the corresponding passage 2Ki 20:18]).—From the single reference in the Gospels (Mat 19:12) to the barbarous Oriental practice of mutilating individuals for certain purposes, we gather that the existence and purpose of eunuchs as a class were not unknown to the Jews of the time of Jesus. The religious disabilities under which men, deformed in this way, laboured, had the effect of making the practice (... εὐνουχίσθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων) abominable to the Jews (Deu 23:1; cf. Lev 22:23-25). On the other hand, Josephus informs us that eunuchs were a normal feature of the courts of the Herods; and from him we also learn what

share they were at that time supposed to have taken in the family intrigues (*Ant.* xv. vii. 4), and what base purposes they often subserved (*Ant.* xvi. viii. 1).

The passage containing the reference to eunuchs is peculiar to St. Matthew, and seems to be added to the Markan section, which deals with the question of divorce (Mar 10:2-12 = Mat 19:3-9), from a source unknown to the author of the latter (see Tischendorf's *Synopsis Evangelica*⁷ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred], § 113, 'Interrogantibus de Repudio respondet'; and Wright's *Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek*, 'Anonymous Fragments,' p. 267). The remark made by the disciples touching the difficulties arising out of Jesus' interpretation of the law of marriage, shows the widespread influence of the lax teaching on this subject characteristic of the school of Hillel (see art. Adultery, p. 30^a).

It matters not for our purpose whether in the reply of Jesus τὸν λόγον (Mar 10:11) be connected with οὐ συμφέρει γαμῆσαι (Mar 10:10), or, which is more intelligible to the present writer in the light of what follows, with the primal law quoted in Mar 10:5 (ἐνεκα τούτου ... οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν). All men are not in a position to accept a hard and fast rule. Men are constituted differently by nature, or adventitious circumstances produce artificial dissimilarities. There is no question as to the law of nature. The married life is the norm of man's condition; and the union effected thereby transcends every other natural bond, even that of filial affection. At the same time, Jesus would have His hearers understand that there are cases, and these numerous enough to be taken seriously into account, where the rule does not hold. It is not granted* [Note: The Lewis-Gibson Syriac Palimpsest adds 'by God.'] to every man to be in a position to fulfil the functions of the married state. Here it is of interest to note that Jesus, in speaking of three classes of 'eunuchs,' was making a distinction well known to those He was addressing. Moreover, the metaphorical use of the word in speaking of the third class finds also its place in the language of the Jewish Rabbins סְרִים, סְרִים שְׂמִים בִּירִי, סְרִים אָרָם, סְרִים חֲמָה cf. Lightfoot's *Horæ Heb. et Talmud.*, and Schöttgen's *Horæ Heb., in loc.*).

The well-known case of Origen, who literally emasculated himself 'for the kingdom of heaven's sake,' to which he afterwards seems to make pathetic, though incidental, reference in his commentary (*in Matt.* tom. xv. 1 ff.), was not the only example of a perverted interpretation of these words of Jesus. The Talmudic tractate *Shabbath* (152a) contains a reference to a eunuch of this class (cf. Midrash on Ecc 10:7), and the Council of Nicaea (c. 1) felt called on to deal with the danger, as did also the *Apostolical Canons* (c. 21), and the Second Council of Arles (c. 7). The common sense which thus prevailed amongst the guiding spirits of the Church is enhanced when we

remember that the disabilities attaching to self-mutilation had no reference to those who were eunuchs from their mother's womb, or who 'were made eunuchs by men' (see for examples of both, Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* vii. 32; Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica* vi. 15; Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica* viii. 24; cf. Bingham's *Ant.* iv. 9).

It is not without significance that in the conversation of Jesus with His disciples no mention is made of any word of condemnation by Him of the horrible practice of emasculation. The complete lack of the sense of the dignity of human life, so characteristic of the ancient world, and the absence of the feeling of human brotherhood, found expression in no more terrible way than in this consequence of the laws of slavery. Yet Jesus refers directly neither to the institution of slavery nor to this, its result. He prefers the plan of instilling principles which lead by the processes of thought and application to the recognition that God hath 'made of one (ἐξ ἑνός) every nation of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth' (Act 17:26; cf. Luk 10:29 ff; Luk 4:25 ff., Mat 8:11 = Luk 13:29). It is as if He had an unconquerable belief in the power of the human mind ultimately to accept the truth, and to reject, finally and for ever, what has been false, in its provisional solutions of life's problems.

And as it was with His treatment of this form of cruelty practised by the strong upon the helpless, so it was with the mutilation of the body self-inflicted for so-called religious purposes. To the present writer it seems probable that Jesus made a conscious and deliberate reference to this practice (see Driver's 'Deuteronomy' in *Internat. Crit. Com.* on Deu 23:1). Here, too, there is no condemnation expressed of an inadequate and artificial method which was the outcome of a legalistic conception of moral purity. It is rather by His positive teaching on the subject of purity that we are led to understand (ὁ δυνάμενος χωρεῖν χωρεῖτω) what are the lines along which we must move in order to reach the goal of perfect self-renunciation. There is another and a more excellent way of obtaining the mastery of the sexual passion than by literally 'cutting off' the offending fleshly member (cf. Mat 5:28 f. where the words βλέπων and ὀφθαλμός point to the radical character of the treatment insisted on by Jesus). The peculiarity about His method of treating this particular question is its loving cautiousness. It is not possible for all, but it is possible for some, to obtain as complete an ascendancy over this strong instinct as if they were physically sexless; while, of course, the resultant moral victory is of infinitely more value than the merely negative, unmoral condition produced by self-emasculation. Those who adopt His method 'make themselves eunuchs' with a definite purpose in view (διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν), and the interests which are created by that purpose are so

absorbing that neither time nor opportunity is given to the ‘fleshly lusts which war against the soul’ (1Pe 2:11).

The clear and definite teaching of Jesus on the subject of marriage will help to elucidate the words under review. The Divine idea (ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶν δύο ἀλλὰ μία σὺν ἑαυτοῖς, Mar 10:8), on which He laid special stress, involves mutual effort and restraint. It is not possible but that even under the most favourable circumstances duties will arise which will prove irksome, and not less so because they are peculiar to the married state. Indeed, the Hebraistic ἕσονται εἰς (Heb. יחדיו) emphasizes the truth that perfect union does not follow at once on the consummation of marriage. It is a gradual process, and, because it is so, it involves some amount of mutual self-abnegation. The cares and responsibilities which follow in the wake of those who are married necessarily mean absorption both of time and attention which may clash with the work given to some to do (cf. 1Co 7:33 f.). It is for this reason that these find themselves debarred from ever undertaking the duties attaching to marriage. They voluntarily undertake eunuchism because they are completely immersed in, and engrossed by, the work of ‘the kingdom of heaven.’ There is no need to suppose, as Keim does, that Jesus is here deliberately referring to Himself and to the Baptist. At the same time, we are able to see in His life the highest expression of that ‘blessed eunuchism’ (Bengel, of the NT, in loc.) which renounced all earthly ties for the sake of the work He was given to do* [Note: See Clem. Alex. Strom. iii. § 1 ff.] (cf. Joh 17:4); and if St. Paul, in view of a stern emergency, felt justified in enjoining upon even the married the necessity of adopting this condition (see 1Co 7:29), we know that he was speaking from the plane on which he himself stood (cf. 1Co 9:5; 1Co 7:7 f.). At the same time, the apparent harshness of his asceticism is softened by his repeated expressions of regard for the gift peculiar to each (ἴδιον χάρισμα). See, further, art. Marriage.

Literature.—*Ency. Brit.*⁹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] art. ‘Eunuch’; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* [Clark’s ed.] ii. 493; Morison, *Com. on Mt. in loc.*; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, ii. 72 ff.; *Expositor*, iv. vii. [1893] 294 ff.

J. R. Willis.

EVANGELIST.—Although the word ‘evangelist’ (εὐαγγελιστής) does not occur in the Gospels, it justly finds a place in this work because it is the name commonly given to the authors of the four Gospels. The verb εὐαγγελιζέσθαι, from which the substantive ‘evangelist’ is derived, signifies *to proclaim good tidings*. The corresponding verbs in Hebrew and Aramaic (Dalman, *NHWB* [Note: *HWB Neuhebräisches Wörterbuch.*] , s.v. כְּשַׁר, *Words of Jesus*, 103) sometimes bear only the meaning ‘announce,’ but their prevailing import is to announce *good tidings*. There is no reason to doubt that the Aramaic word or words used by our Lord concerning His message to mankind described it as the proclamation of good news. Hence in Christian circles the term acquired the specific sense of announcing the gospel. The word ‘evangelist’ is not found in classical Greek or in the LXX Septuagint, nor has it as yet been found in any papyri. So far as our present knowledge goes, it belongs only to the NT and to ecclesiastical Greek. It is used thrice in the NT, and in none of the instances is its meaning doubtful. It is applied to Philip (Act 21:8), either because of the labours described in Acts 8, or because he belonged to a class or order of Christian labourers whose function was to go abroad proclaiming the gospel to those who had not heard it. In the Epistle to the Ephesians, ‘evangelists’ are mentioned (Act 4:11) as an order or class, after the Apostles and prophets, and before pastors and teachers. Here, too, the most probable view is that those spoken of were missionary preachers. Again, Timothy is charged by St. Paul (2Ti 4:5) to ‘do the work of an evangelist.’ Whether Timothy is here called an evangelist is open to discussion, but the nature of the work he is bidden to perform is clear: he is to visit new communities in order to preach the gospel to them. The force of the word suggested by its etymology is, therefore, the meaning attaching to it in the three passages of the NT where it is found. This is the view of all modern scholars of any note. Some of the Greek expositors, misled by the usage of their own time, assigned, at least to the passage in Ephesians, the sense which it came to bear subsequent to NT times, that of author or writer of a Gospel; but this interpretation has no supporters to-day.

How did this second sense arise? Can any links of connexion be traced between the earlier and the later signification? Is it possible to ascertain the time at which the later usage began? These questions are best answered by studying the references to the term in the *Church History* of Eusebius. It is obvious at once that Eusebius had two senses of the word before him; that he knew that its original import was a preacher of the gospel, but that this meaning had been largely displaced by another, that of a writer of a Gospel. Speaking generally, the Church in the age of Eusebius understood by the word ‘evangelist’ the writer of a Gospel, though scholars like Eusebius himself were aware that in earlier times it had borne another meaning. Accordingly the references of Eusebius to the original force of the term are all associated with the earlier history of the Church. Thus he relates that the Apostle

Thomas sent Thaddaeus to Edessa as a preacher and evangelist of the teaching of Christ (*Historia Ecclesiastica* i. xiii. 4). Again he speaks of those who in the age of Trajan started out on long journeys and performed the office of an evangelist, filled with the desire to preach Christ to those who had not heard the word of faith, and to deliver to them the Divine Gospels (iii. xxxvii. 2). Once more, he tells that Pantaenus was a herald of the gospel of Christ to the nations of the East, and that he was sent as far as India. For, he adds, there were still many evangelists of the word who sought earnestly to use their inspired zeal, after the example of the Apostles, for the building up of the Divine word (v. x. 2). In all these passages 'evangelist' evidently denotes an itinerant preacher of the gospel. On the other hand, when Eusebius names John the evangelist (iii. xxxix. 5), he is speaking of him as the author of the Gospel, and the reference to the voice of the inspired evangelists and Apostles (ii. iii. 1) is probably to be explained in the same sense. How then was the transition effected from the one of these significations to the other? How was the title transferred from a preacher to a writer? There are those who think that even from the first the term denoted not so much a travelling preacher in general as a preacher who set himself to relate the life and words of Jesus. Teaching and specific teaching regarding the addresses delivered by Jesus and the miracles He performed was a characteristic of the evangelist from the first, hence there is little difficulty in realizing how the title passed from those who related to those who wrote our Lord's life, the latter meaning being only the natural development of the former. Even a scholar like Meyer (in Act 21:8) affirms that the chief duty of the evangelist was to communicate to his hearers historical incidents from the ministry of Jesus, and some later writers of all schools have embraced the same view. It is believed to be corroborated by the language just quoted from Eusebius regarding the distribution of the written Gospels by evangelists. But there is nothing to show that the first evangelists of the Church made special use of the facts of our Lord's life, and that their teaching or preaching differed in this respect from that of the Apostles. The wide acceptance in which the words 'evangel' and 'evangelize' are used in the NT is adverse to this conclusion. The earliest gospel was not the life of Jesus, but the message of salvation. To preach the gospel was necessarily to preach Jesus, but not to give any sketch of the life of Jesus such as is found in our four Gospels. Nor is the view probable in itself. A modern missionary relates the life of Jesus as he sees it expedient, but he does not make the communication of the details of that life to his hearers one of his chief duties. The same freedom was doubtless exercised in the earliest ages of the Church. One evangelist would tell less and another more of the life of Jesus as he preached. Even the same evangelist would vary the amount of detail he gave regarding the life and words of Jesus according to the varying needs of his hearers. Beyond all doubt most of the addresses delivered by the evangelists *were* largely occupied by an account of the career of Jesus, and especially of His sayings and His miracles; but this was true of every person who sought to propagate Christianity, and not distinctive of the evangelist as such. Further, it is difficult on this hypothesis to explain the fact that

the original signification of 'evangelist' as a preacher was current long after the Gospels had obtained the fullest recognition within the Church. The evangelists carried the Gospels with them if they were fortunate enough to possess copies; they referred to the Gospels as the authorities for the life of Jesus, yet they retained their title. There is no evidence that the later meaning drove out the earlier so long as the Church possessed evangelists or called them by this name. Undoubtedly the two meanings flourished side by side for a time.

If this argument is sound, the origin of the later import of the term must be sought in another quarter. That quarter is not remote. The Church possessed from early days four narratives of our Lord's life, and to these first the term 'Gospel' and subsequently its plural 'Gospels' was applied. It was necessary to refer to these writings individually, hence there arose the practice of speaking of the Gospel according to Matthew and the like: Matthew being regarded as the author of the Gospel bearing his name. Very soon it became necessary to find a term to serve as a common designation of the writers of the Gospels. No more suitable word for this purpose could be found than 'evangelist.' It was already in use in the Church; it stood in the closest affinity to the word 'evangel' or 'gospel,' which had acquired by this time its new sense of a written work, and the term once applied proved so useful that it immediately became popular. Just as the term 'gospel,' which denoted a spoken message, an announcement of good news, the Christian good news, was current long before the written books called Gospels existed, and nevertheless gave its name to them, so also was it with the term 'evangelist.' By a similar transition it became the designation of the writers of the Gospels. After the word 'Gospel' was used to denote a written narrative of the life of Jesus, the extension of the meaning of the word 'evangelist' to designate the author of such a work was only a question of time.

Is it possible to ascertain the date at which the term was first used in this specific sense? The evidence at present available shows that it was thus employed by Hippolytus and by Tertullian. The first occurrence of the word is in the *dc Antichr.* of Hippolytus (56), where St. Luke is spoken of as 'the Evangelist.' The generally accepted date of this treatise is about the year 201 (Harnack, *Chronol.* ii. 214; Bardenhewer, *Altkirch. Lit.* ii. 521). Tertullian in his *adv. Prax.*, which has been assigned to the years 213-218 (Bardenhewer, ii. 368; Harnack, ii. 286), speaks of 'the preface of John the Evangelist' (21, cf. 23). This evidence shows that towards the beginning of the 3rd cent. the term was used to denote the authors of the Gospels. The incidental manner in which both writers employ the word suggests that its use was not new. But this inference is precarious, and it is possible that Hippolytus was the first to employ it, and that Tertullian imitated his example and gave it a Latin form. The absence of the word from the opening chapters of the third Book of Irenaeus will appear to some to confirm the opinion that the use of the term is later than his time, but the proper conclusion is that a decisive verdict is impossible. All

that can be affirmed with confidence is that, as the term 'Gospels' was admittedly used in the plural in the time of Justin Martyr (*ap.* i. 66), the employment of the term 'evangelist' to describe the author of a Gospel could have begun in his age, but that the first occurrence of the word is half a century later.

In dealing with the topic 'Evangelist,' it is desirable to add a brief notice of the animal symbols by which the Gospels are designated. This symbolism makes no appeal to us to-day, but it enters so largely into early Christian art and poetry that some acquaintance with it is necessary. The symbolism is founded on the description of the four living creatures in the Apocalypse (4:7). The first creature is stated to have been like a lion, the second like a calf, the third had the face of a man, the fourth was like a flying eagle. It occurred to Irenaeus to compare, if not identify, these with the four Gospels, and it was therefore necessary for him to ascribe a particular symbol to each of the Evangelists. To him John is the lion, Luke the calf, Matthew the man, and Mark the eagle (*Hær.* iii. xi. 11). The mode of illustration pursued by Irenaeus strikes us to-day as forced and profitless, but the example he set was followed by Hippolytus (*Hipp.* i. ii. 183, Berlin ed.; cf. Bardenhewer, *Altkirch. Lit.* ii. 532). In a Syriac fragment he repeats the comparison, but advances an interpretation of his own. Now the lion is Matthew, the calf Luke, the man Mark, and the eagle John. The symbolism spread throughout the Church, but there was no agreement as to the connexion between the different living creatures and the separate Evangelists. However, the authority of Jerome (*Preface to Matthew*), despite the divergent opinion of Augustine (*Cons. Ev.* i. 6), prevailed throughout the West, and furnished the interpretation which is best known, as most largely represented in Christian art, and as embodied in the noble hymn of Adam of St. Victor, 'Psallat chorus corde mundo' (Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry*, 67). According to this view, St. Matthew is the man, St. Mark the lion, St. Luke the calf, and St. John the eagle.

Literature.—Commentaries on the NT passages; art. 'Evangelist' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible; works on the organization and history of the Early Church; Suicer, s.v.; Zahn, 'Die Tiersymbole der Evangelisten' in *Forschungen*, ii.; art. 'Evangelists' in *Dict. of Christian Antiquities*; Farrar, *Messages of the Books*, 13.

W. Patrick.

Evening

EVENING (ἡ ὄψια [*sc.* ὥρα], ἐσπέρα).—The Babylonians divided the day into equal parts by sun-watches. The 'sixty system' of minutes and seconds was in vogue among them. Among Syrian peoples also, it is likely, the same system prevailed. No trace of this is

found among the Israelites, however, in the pre-exilic period. Another marked difference between the Babylonians and the Israelites is noteworthy. With the Israelites the day began at sunset, with the Babylonians at sunrise. It is at least certain that the reckoning from eve to eve became the exclusive method in Israel with the triumph of the Law. A kindred system prevailed among Arabs, Athenians, and Gauls (Pliny, *HN* ii. 79). It was customary, too, in ancient Israel to distinguish between the 'first evening' and the 'second evening.' It is not certain just where they drew the line (Edersheim). The phrase 'between the two evenings' (*bên hâ'arbayîm*), [Exo 16:12](#); [Exo 29:39](#), as a designation of the time of the daily evening offerings, clearly meant some period in the late afternoon. The 'first evening,' it is generally thought, began about 3 p.m. and extended to sunset; the second began at sunset and continued into the night.

In [Mat 14:15](#); [Mat 14:23](#) we have the word 'evening' used in both senses. 'When it was evening' ([Mat 14:15](#)) clearly refers to the first evening (cf. [Luk 9:12](#) 'and the day began to decline,' Bible Union Ver.). For when the disciples suggested that Jesus send the multitude away, that they might go into the villages and buy themselves food, Jesus said they need not depart; and the feeding of the five thousand and the sending away of the multitude followed before 'he went up into the mountain apart to pray.' Then a second evening is spoken of in the words: 'And when the evening was come, he was there alone' ([Mat 14:23](#)). In the latter case, Jesus, after seeing His disciples off ([Joh 6:15](#)), evidently sought the mountain solitude, as He did on other occasions, to spend much of the night in prayer ([Mat 14:25](#)). This second evening, then, was evidently verging on the night.

Geo. B. Eager.

☛ Evil

EVIL.—It is customary to distinguish three kinds of evil: (1) what Leibnitz called *metaphysical evil*, *i.e.* the incompleteness and imperfection which belong more or less to all created things; (2) *physical evil*, *i.e.* pain, suffering, and death; and (3) *moral evil*, which is a vicious choice of a morally responsible being.

1. **Metaphysical evil.**—The writers of the OT were, for the most part, deeply impressed with the doctrine of God's transcendence; *i.e.* His unique and unapproachable majesty, power, and holiness. Hence the nothingness and transitoriness of all earthly and visible things are a constant theme with them: 'Behold, heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee,' etc. ([1Ki 8:27](#)); 'What is man that thou art mindful of him?' etc. ([Psa 8:4](#)); 'All flesh is grass,' etc.

([Isa_40:6](#)); ‘The inhabitants of the earth are as grasshoppers’ ([Isa_40:22](#)). Compared with God’s ineffable holiness, the holiest of created beings are, as it were, unclean. In heaven the holy angels veil their faces in God’s presence ([Isa_6:2](#)). The holy sanctuary of Israel required to be purged every year from its pollutions by the blood of sacrifices ([Lev_16:16](#)). All human righteousnesses are as a polluted garment ([Isa_64:6](#)).

In the NT there is naturally less stress laid upon the Divine transcendence. The theme of the NT writers is the love of God shown in the Incarnation. The eternal Son of God has taken upon Him human nature, to raise it into fellowship with God, to clothe it with the garment of the Divine righteousness, and to cause it to partake of the Divine immortality. Yet the awful and unapproachable character of God, and the infinite abyss which separates the Creator from the highest creature, are never lost sight of. He alone is the Absolute Good ([Mar_10:18](#)); He alone may lawfully be worshipped ([Mar_12:29](#); [Mar_12:32](#), [Rev_19:10](#)).

2. Physical evil.

(1) *Optimism and pessimism*.—Christianity may be classed philosophically as a moderate optimism. It is not an extravagant optimism, like that of Leibnitz, who maintained that this is the best of all possible worlds, or of Malebranche, who regarded it as the best conceivable. Christ would certainly not have endorsed the hyperboles of Pope, that all discord is harmony not understood, and all partial evil universal good; yet He must certainly be classed among the most pronounced teachers of optimism. As against all forms of Gnosticism and Dualism, He maintained that the Universe, in all its parts, is the work of a perfectly good Creator, and that, in spite of all appearances to the contrary, it is under the guidance of His fatherly Providence: ‘Behold the fowls of the air,’ etc. ([Mat_6:26](#)); ‘Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing?’ etc. ([Mat_10:29](#)); ‘He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good,’ etc. ([Mat_5:45](#)). The optimism of Jesus is particularly evident in His eschatology. He taught that in the end good will triumph over evil, and evil be absolutely excluded from the Universe: ‘In the end of the world the Son of man shall send forth his angels,’ etc. ([Mat_13:41](#), cf. [Mat_24:31](#); [Mat_25:30](#); [Mat_25:41](#)). He believed that there is a glorious goal to which the whole creation is moving. In one passage He calls it Creation’s *new birth* (*παλιγγενεσία*, [Mat_19:28](#)); but His usual term for it is the ‘Kingdom of God’ (or of Heaven): ‘Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father’ ([Mat_13:43](#)). For the coming of this Kingdom every Christian is directed to pray ([Mat_6:10](#)) and to watch ([Mat_24:42](#), [Mat_25:13](#)). That the material Universe will be glorified along with the spiritual is not distinctly stated by Jesus, but is a necessary inference from the doctrine of the resurrection of *the*

body, which was undoubtedly held by Him (Mat 5:29; Mat 10:28 etc.), though in a more spiritual form than was generally current (Mat 22:30).

(2) *Pain, sorrow, disease, and death.*—The Gospels lend no countenance to the view that moral evil is the only genuine evil, and that physical evil is not evil in the strict and proper sense. Pain, sorrow, disease, and death were regarded by Jesus as things which ought not to be, and He spent much of the time of His public ministry in combating them: ‘He went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed with the devil: for God was with him’ (Act 10:38). He committed the ministry of healing to the Apostles and other believers: ‘Preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand. Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils; freely ye have received, freely give’ (Mat 10:7). Death was regarded by Jesus as in an especial sense ‘the enemy.’ Its ravages affected Him with acute distress (ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτὸν ... ἐδάκρυσεν, Joh 11:33 ff., where consult the commentators). Three of His most striking recorded miracles were victories over death (Mar 5:41, Luk 7:14, Joh 11:43); and His own resurrection, according to the energetic expression of the Apostle, ‘abolished death, and brought life and incorruption to light’ (2Ti 1:10).

As to the causation of physical evil, there is a great difference of point of view between the OT and the NT. The OT upon the whole (Job 1:2 is an exception) regards physical evil as inflicted directly by God. According to the NT, however, physical evil is mainly the work of the devil. God tolerates, permits, and overrules, rather than directly inflicts it. Pain and disease and death belong to the devil’s kingdom, not to God’s; and their universal prevalence is a sign of the usurped authority over the human race of ‘the prince of this world.’ The preaching of the Kingdom of God and the emancipation of mankind from the devil’s thralldom were consequently accompanied by an extensive ministry of healing, and Christ appealed to His miracles as evidence that ‘the kingdom of God is come upon you’ (Luk 11:20). The NT does not, however, deny that physical evil is often inflicted by God for disciplinary or retributive purposes. Heb 12:6 lays especial stress upon the wholesome chastening of affliction which all the sons of God receive. Examples of penal or retributive affliction are Mat 9:2 (palsy), Mat 23:35 (war and massacre), Joh 5:14 (constitutional infirmity), Act 5:5 (death), Act 13:11 (blindness). Jesus, however, strongly protested against the idea that every calamity is to be regarded as a punishment for individual sin. This specially Jewish idea, which Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar develop at length in the Book of Job, is definitely condemned (Luk 13:4, Joh 9:3).

3. Moral evil.

(1) *Its nature and origin.*—The only possible way of accounting for moral evil without making God the author of it, is to attribute it to the abuse of free will on the part of created beings, angelic, or human, or both. The doctrine of free will has been severely criticised in all ages by the advocates of philosophical and theological necessity; but it has, notwithstanding, held its ground, and is at the present time the faith of all the most progressive races of mankind. That it was held by Jesus does not admit of reasonable doubt. Thus He habitually spoke of the power which men possess to resist God and to frustrate His benevolent intentions: ‘O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, ... how often would I (ἠθέλησα) ... and ye would not’ (καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησατε, Luk_13:34; cf. Joh_5:40, Mat_11:20 ff.). His general invitations to *all men* to be saved imply the same doctrine: ‘Come unto me, *all* ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest’ (Mat_11:28); ‘And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw *all men* unto myself’ (Joh_12:32).

The reality of Christ’s Libertarianism is not disproved by certain passages in the Gospels which seem at first sight to speak the language of Predestination, or even of Determinism (Joh_6:37; Joh_6:39, Mat_26:24 etc.). Predestination was not so held in Christ’s time as to exclude free will. Josephus says of the Pharisees: ‘When they say that all things happen by fate, they do not take away from men the freedom of acting as they think fit; since their notion is that it hath pleased God to mix up the decrees of fate and man’s will, so that man can act virtuously and viciously’ (*Ant.* xviii. i. 3).

Jesus accordingly attributed the origin of evil not to the will of God, but to the perversity of God’s creatures. Mankind, according to Him, is in rebellion against God; but the whole guilt of rebellion is not his. Before man existed, there were myriads of finite spirits, higher in the order of creation than he, and of these some fell from their original innocence and became devils. The chief of these, Satan, is ever seeking to seduce the human race from its allegiance to its Creator, and is therefore emphatically called ‘the tempter’ (ὁ πειράζων, Mat_4:3, 1Th_3:5), and the slayer of men (ἀνθρωποκτόνος, Joh_8:44). This last is the one certain allusion to the fall of Satan to be found in the Gospels (Luk_10:18 is doubtful). From it we learn that he once existed in a state of innocence (ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ), but did not persist in it (reading οὐκ ἔστηκεν with WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort’s text.]).

The position of Satan in the Universe is so exalted, and the power ascribed to him in the NT so great (cf. esp. Mat_4:8, Joh_14:30), that some have regarded Jesus as a *Dualist*. But the authority attributed to Satan in the NT, though great, is subordinate. The devils recognize the power of Jesus, and come out at His word (Mar_1:24; Mar_1:34; Mar_3:11 etc.). If Satan is ‘the strong man,’ there is a Stronger, who can bind him and spoil his goods (Mat_12:29). At the Temptation the devil acknowledged

that his power is a delegated one (ἐμοὶ παραδεδοται, Luk_4:8). His kingdom will surely come to an end; in fact its fall has already been virtually secured by the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus (Joh_12:31). His final punishment has been determined, and it will be fully adequate to his delinquency (Mat_25:41).

(2) *Original sin*.—There is no recorded teaching of Jesus about original sin. He recognized the fall of man (Joh_8:44), and the general sinfulness of the human race (Mat_7:11); but how He connected these two facts does not appear. It may, perhaps, be argued from Joh_9:1-3, that He would not have approved of any theory of original sin which regarded men as obnoxious to punishment from God merely because of an ancestral taint that they could not help inheriting. See, further, artt. Sin and Eternal Punishment.

Literature.—Athanasius, *contra Gentes*; Augustine, *Antipelagian Treatises*, etc.; Origen, *de Principiis* (esp. i. 5, 6); J. Muller, *The Christian Doctrine of Sin* (translation); Momerie, *The Origin of Evil*; Naville, *The Problem of Evil* (translation); Butler, *Analogy*; Le Conte, *Evolution*, ix.; Fairbairn, *The Philosophy of the Christian Religion*, i. 3, 4; Tennant, *The Origin and Propagation of Sin*; and *The Fall and Original Sin*; Bull, *The State of Man before the Fall*; Paley, *Natural Theology*, xxvi.; Harris, *pro Fide*, xiv; A. Moore, *Science and the Faith*, and *Essays*, i., iii., and *Oxford House Papers*, vol. ii.; artt. ‘Sin’ and ‘Fall’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible; Dixie, ‘The Necessity of Pain’ in *Oxford House Papers*; E. A. Abbott, *The Kernel and the Husk*, ix.; S. Laing, *A Modern Zoroastrian*. The subject is discussed in most systematic treatises on theology, ethics, and metaphysics.

C. Harris.

☩ Evil One

EVIL ONE.—See preced. art. and Lord’s Prayer and Satan.

☩ Evil Spirit

EVIL SPIRIT.—See Demon.

☩ Evolution (Christ And)

EVOLUTION (CHRIST AND).—The widespread acceptance of the Evolutionary philosophy, and the endeavours of its leading exponents to include the phenomena of religion within the sweep of its categories, have greatly accentuated the problem of the place of the Incarnation in the cosmic order, and of Jesus Christ, His Person, His work, and His redemptive function, in human history.

1. *The basis of discussion.*—At the outset we must distinguish sharply between the Materialistic type of the Evolutionary philosophy on the one hand, and the Theistic type on the other. The former may be described as including all efforts to explain the highest phenomena of the cosmos—including those of life, consciousness, and all forms of spiritual activity—in terms of mechanical motion and force. Such a philosophy rules out all recognition of the Divine Personality, of the possible independence of mind over matter, of the ethical responsibility and free spiritual activity of man, and of his capacity for immortal life. This disposes of the problem of the Incarnation as irrelevant, and throws us back on a purely ‘naturalistic’ explanation of the Person and life of Jesus Christ. The Theistic type of the Evolutionary philosophy, however—the central idea of which is that the goal of Evolution and not its beginnings provides us with the principle of cosmic interpretation, and that spirit and not matter furnishes the key to the riddle of the Universe—leaves us free to deal with the Supreme Person and Fact of history with open minds. Theism presents us with a conception of God as immanent in the Universe, but not as imprisoned within its material or psychical manifestations; as transcendent, living a free, self-determined life in virtue of His own eternal Being, yet not separated from the forces and phenomena of the cosmos, which are manifestations of His creative activity and expanding purpose. It also presents us with a conception of man as a created but free spiritual person, physically a part of nature, but ethically above it, and capable of coming into conscious personal relations with his Creator.

2. *Theistic theory of Evolution compatible with a process of Incarnation.*—It is manifest that the idea of Incarnation is not *a priori* incompatible with such a philosophy of God and man. It represents the Universe as God realizing His creative purpose; impersonally in Nature, personally in Man. Creation awakes in man to the sense of its own origin and the possibility of its own consummation in a life of free spiritual communion with God. Incarnation means that this fellowship is actually sought after and objectively consummated by an act of self-realization on the part of God. It implies the special compatibility of the Divine nature and the human personality. ‘God is, as it were, the eternal possibility of being incarnated, man the permanent capability of incarnation.’ ‘The nature that is in all men akin to Deity becomes in Christ a nature in personal union with the Deity, and the *unio personalis*, which is peculiar to Him, is the basis of the *unio mystica*, which is possible to all’

(Fairbairn, *Christ in Modern Theology*, pp. 473, 475; see also Clarke's *Outline of Christian Theology*, p. 275).

3. *The Person and work of Christ in such a theory.*—The historical realization of this possibility of Incarnation in Jesus of Nazareth raises the further question of His place in a philosophy of history, and in Christian theology. The Christian contention is that in Him the Evolutionary process finds its consummation on the one side—He was the Ideal Man made actual; and that a fresh Evolutionary start was made by the fusion of the Divine and human natures in Him on the other—He was the Son of God Incarnate, 'manifested to take away sin' (1Jn 3:5), and to project the race on the lines of its true development and life, which had been interrupted and swerved aside by the intrusion of sin into the world. This conception of the Person and work of Christ, while it falls into line with the Evolutionary idea in one direction, appears to fall foul of it in another, because of the claim it makes that there was in the nature of Christ an incommensurable factor, incapable of being explained by the laws of organic life, or by human psychology,—manifesting itself in a life of unique goodness and power, begun by a free special act of God in the Virgin-birth, and consummated by the objective Resurrection of our Lord from the dead.

This difficulty, however, on deeper consideration is not incompatible with a wider view of the Evolutionary process. There were several stages in the known pathway of the upward movement from the star mist, in which the process began, to man, in whom terrestrial evolution finds its consummation, when fresh phenomena appeared which cannot be explained in terms of those that preceded; *e.g.* at the emergence of organic life, of sentiency, and of ethical self-consciousness. So far, no rational bridge of theory has been found to span the gap between these diverse facts. It is, therefore, not unthinkable that there was in the Person of our Lord a superhuman element, which in Him mingled with the stream of human life, and started a fresh and higher line of evolution for the race. The question whether this was so in point of actual fact is thus purely one of evidence, and, if historically substantiated, must be accepted, whether we are able ultimately to 'account' for it theoretically or not. Our canons of Evolution must make room for all the facts of life and history, or be finally discredited as inadequate and obscurantist.

4. *Jesus Christ not explicable on naturalistic grounds.*—It is certain also that, so far, the innumerable efforts which have been put forth during the past century, from almost every conceivable point of view, to give a naturalistic explanation of the life and Person of Jesus Christ, have not, in whole or in part, disposed of this problem. There is no single theory or combination of theories which meets with general acceptance, even among those who take up a purely critical attitude; and when we confront them with the Christian consciousness which is the historical outcome of faith in the Divine nature and mission and work of Christ, they fail utterly to carry

conviction. (This last fact has so far not had its true place in the settlement of the problem). The Personality of Jesus Christ is thus still the unsolved problem of history, and it is more than doubtful if any fresh treatment of the question will succeed in bringing Him within the categories of an Agnostic Evolutionary Philosophy.

5. *Cur Deus Homo?*—The Theistic Evolutionist has next to face the old question of the purpose and aim of the Incarnation in the cosmic order. ‘Cur Deus Homo?’ becomes a more burning question than ever in a scheme of Evolutionary thought. Two hypotheses present themselves, according as we take an *a priori* or *a posteriori* standpoint, which may be called the *Evolutionary* and the *Redemptive*. The first makes the Christ the consummation and crown of the process of cosmic Evolution, and postulates the Incarnation as its necessary climax; the second occupies the old standpoint of Christian theology from the beginning, that, whether the Incarnation lay implicit or not in the process, it was historically conditioned by the fact of the sinful and ‘fallen’ state of humanity. The two views are not incompatible with one another, and both in combination are quite consistent with the teaching of Scripture. The upward striving of humanity for union with its Creator as personal finds its historical witness in (1) the universal function of worship, prayer, and sacrifice, and (2) the Hebrew prophetic vision of the Ideal Servant of Jehovah, and the Messianic hope; and it suggests, as God is personal, a corresponding act of self-revelation in a historical Person who would unite in himself the human aspiration and the Divine manifestation; while the gradual revelation consummated in the coming of Christ, and recorded in the Old and New Testaments, is in line with all the known laws of God’s evolutionary methods. On the other hand, it is unquestionable that the Scripture doctrine of the Incarnation is indissolubly associated with the redemptive purpose of God. This is its historical aim and character: ‘He was manifested to take away sin’ (1Jn 3:5, cf. 2Co 5:18-19 etc.). While, therefore, we are justified on *a priori* grounds in believing that ‘the Incarnation was no after thought’ (Dale, *Fellowship with Christ, and Other Sermons*, pp. 10, 252 f.), but that it would have taken place even if sin had not entered the world, the *form* which it took was historically conditioned by the actual condition of humanity; *i.e.* it was soteriological in its manifestation.

6. *Three pregnant aspects of the historical Incarnation.*—More particularly, the significance of the historical Incarnation as a redemptive and perfective process may be described under three pregnant headings. It was (1) the realization of the perfect type of humanity—Christ as the Ideal Man; (2) the achievement of a great restorative or saving work—Christ as the sufficient Saviour; (3) the beginning of a fresh departure in the upward Life of the Race—Christ as the Founder and Head of His Church, and the source of the higher spiritual movements of history. These three aspects of His work are specially related to His human life as our great Exemplar; to His Cross and Passion as our Sacrifice and Reconciler; to His Resurrection and Ascension into the unseen

world, and His influence through His Spirit on the individual and wider life of mankind.

(1) As the Ideal Man, Jesus revealed the possibilities and determined the type of perfect manhood for the race. This was done under special conditions, and at a given moment of time and place, race and environment. He was born in Palestine, during the reign of Herod, 'of the seed of David' (Rom_1:3); *i.e.* He was a Jew, conforming to the special conditions and demands of His own times, and limited by the intellectual and social horizon of His day. There was much, therefore, in the outward life of Jesus which was temporary and local in its manifestations. Yet beneath all this we see a true revelation of the Perfect Man, universal in its scope, yet appealing to each individual man as his exemplar; Ideal in its purity and holiness, yet throbbing with contagious life; beyond the reach of literal imitation, yet quickening each of His followers to the realization of his own individual life and personality. Looked at from within, His life is depicted in the NT as one of perfect and joyous obedience to the Father's revealed will (Joh_5:19), unbroken communion with Him (Joh_10:30), and supreme self-forgetfulness in the service of His brethren (2Co_8:9). Whatever transcendent elements may have been hidden (and sometimes patent) in the spiritual consciousness of Jesus, He is represented as truly temptable (Mat_4:1 etc.), as depending entirely on Divine help and grace for conquest over temptation (Joh_5:19 etc.), and as having triumphed absolutely over evil, so that He was 'without sin' (Heb_4:15). The impression left on those who knew Him best by this life of filial obedience and service was that it was of unique beauty and attractiveness (Joh_1:14), and yet capable of emulation by all, under their own individual conditions of life and service (1Pe_2:21). And this NT picture of Jesus as the Ideal Man is one that the noblest minds of Christendom throughout the centuries have accepted. There is no historical character that has ever threatened to divide the sovereignty of Jesus in the spiritual homage of men; and such 'detached' thinkers as Goethe and Carlyle, Strauss and Renan, Richter and Lecky have borne unqualified testimony to the solitary and unapproachable grandeur of the moral ideal incarnated in Him.

'In the fulness of the time.'—From the Evolutionary standpoint the question is often asked, whether such an ideal life must not necessarily have appeared as the consummation of the spiritual development of the race,—as the last link in the series. This *a priori* objection is of doubtful application, however, even in the lower ranges of organic life; and as regards the self-conscious aspiring life of men, it is demonstrably lacking in cogency. Jesus, according to Scripture, appeared in the 'fulness' of the time, and at that precise moment in the order of history which enabled Him best to fulfil His mission (Gal_4:4, Heb_1:1-4). The best minds of previous ages had been eagerly looking forward to a manifestation of the saving power of God (Mat_13:17, Luk_24:25, Act_3:18; 1Pe_1:10 etc.), and, if the actual historical manifestation of the Messiah for whom they waited was not in accordance

with their literal expectations, it was the true fulfilment of the spiritual movement of which their ideals and prophecies were a part. In Evolutionary language, the 'embryonic' Christ of prophecy became in due course the actual Christ of history, or, less figuratively, the dimly outlined Ideal Life of aspiration took objective form in the manifested life of the Son of God. Or, we may say that the right time for an ideal to be actualized in the life of humanity would be, at that precise moment when the capacity for conceiving and recognizing an ideal had been sufficiently developed to appreciate it. Before this, it would be wasted; later, it would have been belated; and Jesus came and embodied the Ideal Life just when humanity was capable of profiting by it, and of being stirred by it into higher aspiration and endeavour.

(2) The Redemptive work of Christ finds its place in an Evolutionary scheme of thought on cognate lines. It presupposes that a lapse, or at least a fatal halt, had occurred in the upward spiritual development of the race, and that all further progress was barred by the poisoning of the wells of progress by sin (see Fall). Before humanity could be released from this disability, which had interfered with the free interflow of the Divine and human fellowship, in the unrestricted action of which alone the spiritual life of man can develop, a process of reconciliation and at-one-ment with the source of the spiritual Life must be initiated. Apart from this, the presentation of an Ideal Life would be a mockery, for its realization would be impossible. Thus, as already stated, the historical Incarnation took a redemptive form, and it was consummated by an act of supreme sacrifice.

The process of 'progress by sacrifice' (see Bruce's *Providential Order*, ch. xii. p. 345 ff.) is deeply embedded in the organic world. The so-called cruel Law of *Natural Selection* is but another name for a rudimentary fact which finds its finest and most perfect realization in the Cross of Christ. In nature we find three grades or stages of this process. (1) The sacrifice of the weak for the strong, as when those creatures in every species which are ill-adapted for the propagation of their kind are elbowed out of existence by the vitally strong and efficient, and made 'subservient to another's good' in the way of food. (2) The sacrifice of the strong for the weak, exemplified in the action of the imperious parental instinct which is manifested by every living species above the very lowest, and which gradually increases in its range and its delicacy till it arrives through the higher mammals at man. Here there is more or less conscious self-denial on the part of the vigorous and capable organism on behalf of the helpless and the weak. (3) The sacrifice of the good for the bad, a fact manifested (in the necessity of things) only among ethical persons, and exemplified throughout history as one of the most potent forces for the uplifting and perfecting of humanity. These various stages of the sacrificial element in Nature do not exhaust the meaning of the Redemption wrought through the Cross of Christ, which has a unique character of its own as an 'atonement'; but they serve to link it with the

world-process, and to make it more or less evolutionally intelligible. (See further on this subject Griffith-Jones, *The Ascent through Christ*, bk. ii. ch. iii. pp. 283-306).

(3) The Risen Life of our Lord initiates the final stage in the spiritual evolution of the race, and completes the range of forces that work for the perfecting of the human soul in its upward march. The Resurrection and the Ascension indicate a fresh epoch in the history of mankind, both in the development of the individual soul and in the progress of society. A new type of character emerges, and a new community is born; each marking a higher achievement and indicating a further advance in spiritual life. Historical Christianity rests on the faith that Jesus rose again and passed into the unseen world, whence He continues to send forth His personal influence and saving grace by His Spirit among believers, and through them into the world at large. This He does first by quickening individual men in the New Life, enabling them to conquer sin, and to put forth the distinctive Christian virtues; and, secondly, by the perpetual renewal and invigoration of the Christian society or Church, which is composed of those believers who join in brotherly love in the active service of mankind in the name of their spiritual Head. This new force has leavened and in a measure created modern Western civilization, and though it has so far not succeeded in permeating it through and through with the Christian spirit, it is demonstrable that its finest and most potent elements are those derived from the Christian Ideal and ennobled by the Christian graces. The slowness of the world's spiritual development along Christian lines is undeniable, it is marked by ages of stagnation and by periods of unmistakable reaction; this, however, is entirely consistent with the laws of evolution through all its upward stages, and is inevitable when we remember the potent forces of spiritual degeneracy and inertia which oppose its march. It is clear that there is no rival directive or inspiring ideal among mankind that could take the place of Christianity without crying halt to all that is noblest in the life of the race. The future of the world lies with Christ, unless it is to fall back on a lower stage of ethical and spiritual development on its way to utter disintegration and decadence. Since the lines of cosmic development have so far been on the whole in an upward direction, and since there is no indication that the Christian ideal has lost its hold on the best minds of the race, or is less potent than formerly in regenerating individual souls and in inspiring the Church to ever fresh activity and influence, there is reason for confident belief that at last the race as a whole will be raised to the Christian level, and that the future is with Him of whom it is prophesied that He shall reign in undisputed sway over the affections and command the obedience of all mankind (Php_2:9-11, Rev_11:15 etc.). See, further, art. Incarnation.

Literature.—Griffith-Jones, *Ascent through Christ*; Gore, Bampton Lectures on *The Incarnation*; H. Drummond, *Ascent of Man*.

E. Griffith-Jones.

Exaltation

EXALTATION.—1. The general sentiment that the lowly in heart alone receive the true exaltation, is exceedingly prominent in both the Old and New Testaments. The life of Christ was throughout one of self-humbling, but He knew prophetically that it would end in the highest exaltation. In the Song of Mary at the Annunciation this principle of Divine procedure is stated: ‘He hath put down the mighty from their seats, and exalted them of low degree’ ([Luk_1:52](#)). In Christ’s parable of the Wedding Feast He insists on this principle, as against the self-seeking and pride of the scribes and Pharisees, who love the chief seats in the synagogue, and the foremost places at feasts. It is better to take the lowest room, and wait till the host shall give their proper place to one’s virtue and dignity, by saying, ‘Friend, come up higher’ ([Luk_14:10](#)). The behaviour of a Christian among his fellows should have regard to this principle. He is not to be forward to lay claim to that which may even be his right (cf. [Mat_23:12](#) || [Luk_14:11](#); [Luk_18:14](#)).

2. One of the clearest words of Jesus in regard to His own exaltation is [Joh_12:32](#). Some Greeks came desiring to see Him. Our Lord seeing in this desire of theirs something prophetic of the future ingathering of the Gentiles into His kingdom, opened up His heart to His disciples as to the way in which He hoped to conquer the hearts of men. He made somewhat enigmatic reference to His death. He knew that the hour had almost come for the suffering of the lowly Son of Man. But it is necessary that the seed which is to produce a great harvest must first die. So it is a law of the Kingdom of God that life in this world must be sacrificed, if need be, that life eternal may be gained as a permanent possession. After the Saviour’s life of service, the due reward will be honour from God. When the heavenly voice spoke, the Saviour was consoled and uplifted by the thought that He would cast out the prince of this world, and be lifted up ($\upsilon\psi\omega\theta\acute{\omega}$) as a victorious conqueror. It was a prediction of His final triumph over evil, and His eternal reign over all men. The outwardly shameful death of the cross would be His true exaltation as the world’s Saviour. By the identification of outward events with their inward meaning, He advances men’s thoughts to the idea of His exaltation to heaven as the victorious One. This anticipation of Jesus is the starting-point for the Church’s fully developed doctrine of the Exaltation. ‘He rose again from the dead on the third day, He ascended up into heaven, He sitteth on the right hand of God the Father, He shall come to judge the world at the last day.’ See artt. Ascension, Judgment, Session.

After the predictions of His suffering, He always spoke of His future glory. He would rise again from the dead ([Mat_16:21](#)). ‘In the regeneration the Son of man shall sit on the throne of His glory’ ([Mat_19:28](#)). ‘The Son of man shall come in the glory of his

Father with his angels, and then shall he render unto every man according to his deeds' (Mat_16:27). In the sayings in the Gospel of John there are many lofty statements as to His heavenly glory (cf. Mat_14:3, Mat_17:24 etc.).

David M. W. Laird.

Example

EXAMPLE

A. Linguistic usage.—The word 'example' (or 'ensample') occurs 15 times in the AV and 17 times in the RV of the NT. In the two versions it stands 7 times (1Co_10:6, Php_3:17, 1Th_1:7, 2Th_3:9, 1Ti_4:12, Tit_2:7 RV, 1Pe_5:3) for τύπος, once (1Ti_1:18 RV) for ὑποτύποις, once (1Co_10:11) in adverbial phrase for τυτικῶς, 5 times (Joh_13:15, Heb_4:11; Heb_8:5, Jam_5:10, 2Pe_2:6) for ὑποδειγμα, once (Act_20:35) as partial rendering of ὑποδείκνυμι, once (Jud_1:7) for δεῖγμα, once (Mat_1:19) as partial rendering of δειγματιζω, and once (1Pe_2:21) for ὑτογραμμὸς. For our present purpose Mat_1:19 falls quite out of account. δεῖγμα (Jud_1:7) is a 'specimen,' 'an (illustrative) exhibit'—in this instance set forth as a warning, though of itself this simple form hardly suggests either imitation or shunning, as ὑπόδειγμα does. The other passages all more or less illustrate the topic in hand. Besides these, there are, of course, many other passages which, though not employing the term 'example,' are no less relevant and significant than these.

Τύπος, whether tr. 'example' or 'pattern,' 'type,' has generally an important bearing upon our topic. Primarily the 'mark,' 'impression' of a stroke or blow (Joh_20:25 'print'), hence 'figure,' 'image' (Act_7:43), τύπος is generally 'pattern,' 'type,' 'example.' Sometimes the example is by way of warning, as 1Co_10:6; 1Co_10:11. Generally, however, it is an example to be imitated. A corresponding sense is to be ascribed to ὑποτύποις (1Ti_1:16, 2Ti_1:13). [In the latter passage Hofmann's and Cremer's interpretation 'Abbild' seems hardly warranted. Timothy is to hold fast the 'type' of doctrine which he had received from Paul, and this 'type' is not regarded as Timothy's copy of Paul's, but as something which had now become common to both].—ὑποδειγμα is a concrete illustration or exhibition, designed for imitation or for warning—generally the former. In one instance in the NT ὑποδειγμα is used for

after-representation (Ger. *Abbild*).—ὑπογραμμος is a ‘writing-copy’ (model), to be imitated by the pupil. Hence an example set before one for close imitation. This is perhaps the most vivid of the NT terms indicative of Christ’s exemplarship. The term itself implies the strictest imitation; though both the context and the general teaching of the NT will save us from the error of conceiving Christ’s example as something formal and external.

Among the other terms which give expression to the idea of Christian example, the most prominent are μιμέομαι and μιμητῆς (AV ‘follow’ and ‘follower,’ RV ‘imitate’ and ‘imitator’). The verb occurs 4 times in the NT (2Th 3:7; 2Th 3:9, Heb 13:7, 3Jn 1:11), in one of these instances in connexion with τῦτος. The noun occurs 6 times (1Co 4:16; 1Co 11:1, Eph 5:1, 1Th 1:6; 1Th 2:14, Heb 6:12—at 1Pe 3:13 the reading μιμηται is to be rejected), in every instance signifying ‘imitator’ in the ethico-religious sense. In Eph 5:1 we find μιμηταὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, in Heb 6:12 it is the exemplary saints who are to be imitated, in 1Co 4:16 St. Paul exhorts to the imitation of himself, rather than to turn away from him, inasmuch as he was their father in the faith. In 1Co 11:1 he bids his readers imitate him as he imitates Christ. In 1Th 1:6 it is ‘imitators of us and of the Lord,’ while in 1Th 2:14 it is ‘the churches of God in Judaea,’ of whom the Thessalonians had become imitators.

Jesus in gathering His disciples about Him generally bade men ‘follow’ Him (ἀκολουθεῖω; in one instance, Mat 4:19, δεῦτε ὀπισω). Primarily the expression means no more than ‘to accompany’ as a disciple, and yet manifestly it became, in our Lord’s use of it, one of the most characteristic and intensely significant expressions of the idea of discipleship in all its deepest import. So where Christ bids the rich young ruler sell all that he has and ‘come, follow me,’ or in the words on ‘taking up the cross and following,’ and elsewhere (see esp. Mat 19:21; Mat 10:36; Mat 16:24, Joh 12:26; Joh 21:22). The verb is not found in the Epistles, except at 1Co 10:4.

Christ is represented as the ‘image’—εἰκὼν—which Christians are to resemble (Rom 8:29, 1Co 15:49, 2Co 3:18, Col 3:10). But those passages also which represent Christ as the image of God must be taken no less into account; for Christ’s claim to an unconditional personal authority is expressly based upon the fact that He *is* the image—the apprehensible representation—of the invisible God (Joh 1:18; Joh 14:6 ff., 2Co 4:4, Col 1:15, Heb 1:3—in the last passage the word is χαρακτηρ). In this connexion mention must be made also of the expressions ‘children of God,’ ‘of your Father,’ ‘of the Highest’ (Mat 5:9; Mat 5:45, Luk 6:35; Luk 20:36). Also in the

Epistles the filial relation is made to imply the following of the example of God in Christ (e.g. Eph 5:1; Eph 5:8; 1Pe 1:14, 1Jn 5:21).

Besides the terms already considered, which give more or less formal expression to the Christian idea of exemplarship, there are many more, which—some of them in the most elementary and untechnical terms—no less definitely express the same thought. The very idea of discipleship in our Lord's teaching involved the idea of the personal exemplarship of the Master (see esp. Mat 10:24-25, Luk 14:26-27; Luk 14:33, Joh 13:35; Joh 15:8). The same thought is expressed in Eph 4:20 'Ye have not so learned Christ.' In Heb 6:20 Jesus is called our 'Forerunner.' His temptations are typical (Heb 2:9-18; Heb 4:15), and He is our example in the enduring of temptation (Heb 3:1 ff; Heb 12:3 ff.). True believers have the 'mind of Christ' (1Co 2:16, Php 2:5, cf. Rom 8:6; Rom 8:27; Rom 12:2). Christ is the 'life,' and as such is the 'light' of men (Joh 1:4; Joh 1:9; Joh 1:14; Joh 1:18, cf. Joh 3:19; Joh 8:12; Joh 9:5; Joh 12:35-36; Joh 12:46, 1Jn 1:1-3). He is Himself 'the way,' etc. (Joh 14:6). Believers are to 'put on' Christ (Rom 13:14, Gal 3:27, Eph 4:24, Col 3:10). The Christian's 'walk' is to be according to Christ (see esp. Joh 12:35, 1Jn 1:7; 1Jn 2:6, Eph 5:2; Eph 5:8, Col 2:6). Finally,—for an exhaustive study of the linguistic usage is not intended,—many of the most characteristic expressions of the thought of exemplarship in Christianity are effected without the use of any peculiar terms. The word 'as,' or something else equally simple and direct, often best serves the purpose (e.g. Mat 5:48; 1Pe 1:15, Eph 4:32; Eph 5:2, 1Jn 3:2; 1Jn 4:7-21).

B. The Doctrine

i. *The example of Christ.*—1. In the *teaching of Jesus* no truth is more essential than that God the Father Himself is the original and absolute example for all personal life. The Law is holy, for it is the expression of the will of God. But the letter apart from God's immediate personal will is dead. As Jesus expounds the Law, the disciples learn to look through the particular commandment to the personal will of the living God. It is not enough to keep the commandment in the most scrupulous fashion, as if it were something standing apart and complete in itself (Mat 5:20). We have to do directly with God Himself. His will and personal nature are our sole and absolute standard (Mat 5:44-48). In answer to the young ruler who asked what good thing he should do in order to have eternal life, Jesus refuses to be regarded as one who might propose some novel good—some good other than that which is already known from God. Apart from God there is no good (Mat 19:16-17). To love God is the first commandment; and the coming of His kingdom and the doing of His will should be man's first concern (Mat 22:38; Mat 6:10; Mat 6:33).

But Jesus does more than point to God as the absolute standard for personal life. He comes to make God known. It is not enough to know that God is the standard, so long

as God's nature is unknown. So Jesus was sent as the perfect revelation of the Father (Joh 14:9-10). Not that God was hitherto unknown: what the Jews worshipped they knew (Joh 4:22). Jesus came to complete the revelation of God. He gives a perfect interpretation of the mind and will of God, and in His own Person perfectly exemplifies that mind and will. He is conscious of perfect accord with the will of the Father (Mat 12:50; Mat 5:10-11, Joh 5:19; Joh 4:34; Joh 6:38; Joh 8:29; Joh 14:31). His words and acts He has learned from the Father, even from the Father's example (Joh 8:38; Joh 5:17; Joh 5:19). This principle determines His whole treatment of the Mosaic Law. The inevitable limitations of mere statutes He overcomes by an appeal to the Divine example and order (as in the case of the law of the Sabbath and the law of marriage, Joh 5:17, Mat 19:4-9, in the latter case appealing also to Scripture as well as to fact). And because He knows God as the Son knows the Father—immediately and perfectly (Joh 7:29; Joh 8:55; Joh 10:15, Mat 11:27), and because He perfectly fulfils the will of God, Jesus demands an unconditional following, which shall consist, not in copying the outward form, but in the most inward appropriation of the ruling principle of His life (Mat 7:21-27; Mat 28:20; Mat 10:32-39; Mat 11:28-29; Mat 20:24-28; Mat 16:24-25; Mat 20:22; Mat 26:39; Mat 8:19-22; Mat 19:21, Joh 15:8-10; Joh 8:12; Joh 12:35-36; Joh 12:44-50; Joh 13:12-17; Joh 15:4-7; Joh 17:21-23; Joh 21:22). He does not set Himself forth as a substitute for the Father, but as the One who knows God and teaches us to know Him. He is the Light of Life, the Way, the Truth, the Life, the visible manifestation of God (Joh 8:12; Joh 14:6; Joh 14:9). Christ's claim to absolute authority (which expressly included the judgment of the world, e.g. Joh 5:22) is based not upon His prophetic office alone, but upon that unity of word and deed which constituted the perfect revelation of the will of God. Jesus' own Person was not left out of His gospel (cf. Harnack's statement, *Wesen des Christentums*, p. 91: 'Nicht der Sohn, sondern allein der Vater gehört in das Evangelium, wie es Jesus verkündigt hat, hinein'). Not, indeed, as one doctrine among many, nor as an addition to the doctrine of the Father, did Jesus present the truth concerning Himself. But He claimed to be the perfect and unique embodiment and exemplification of the Father's will. Yet He is more than mere example. He does not merely *show* the way; He *is* the Way. At the same time He is the Truth and the Life. He gives not only the perfect example but also life-power. In this sense, therefore, Jesus, even according to His own teaching, is more than an element in the gospel: He is the very essence of the gospel.

2. Christ's demand of an unconditional personal following is reproduced in the *Apostolic preaching*. But after Christ's passion, resurrection, and exaltation, the thought of His exemplarship is expanded and heightened. The Christ who died for the sin of the world is the perfect revelation of God's holy love (e.g. 1Jn 4:9-10), while His exaltation, coupled with the gift of His Spirit, affords assurance that the coveted likeness to Christ and the promised sharing of His glory shall be realized (e.g.

Rom 8:2-3; Rom 8:26-39). The thought of Christ as our example is so variously and abundantly applied by the NT writers, that it will suffice here to notice particularly only the more characteristic passages. The concreteness of the revelation in a personal life is most frequently and most strikingly set forth by St. John (Joh 1:4; Joh 1:14; Joh 1:18, 1Jn 1:3; 1Jn 4:2-3). Jesus is the perfect example of the life of faith, even its Author and Perfecter (Heb 12:2). He was tempted like as we are (Joh 2:9-18; Joh 4:15), and is the perfect pattern of patient endurance of all temptation, even unto death (Joh 3:1 ff., Joh 12:3 ff., 1Pe 1:11; 1Pe 2:21-23; 1Pe 3:18; 1Pe 4:1; cf. Gethsemane and Calvary in the Gospels). He is our example of mercy and forgiveness (Eph 4:32, Col 3:13, 2Co 2:10); in self-denial and humble service (Php 2:5 ff., 2Co 8:9, Rom 15:2-3; Rom 15:7); in meekness, gentleness, and forbearance (2Co 10:1, Col 3:13, Eph 4:2; 1Pe 2:23); in the love that suffers, labours, and dies for others (1Jn 3:16, 2Co 4:10; 2Co 5:14-15, Eph 5:2; Eph 5:25, Gal 6:2, Php 2:5 ff.); in holiness and purity (Eph 4:20 ff., 1Pe 1:15, 1Jn 3:1 ff; 1Jn 4:17). And then, more broadly, believers are exhorted to 'put on Christ,' or 'the new man,' renewed after 'Christ's image (Rom 13:14, Eph 4:13-15; Eph 4:24, Col 3:10-11, Gal 3:27); and to 'walk' in, or according to, Christ (Eph 5:8, Col 2:6, 1Jn 1:7; 1Jn 2:6). The highest destiny of believers is to be made like Christ (Rom 8:29, 1Jn 3:2). In this connexion the significance of those passages in which Christ is called the image of God (Col 1:15, Heb 1:3, cf. Joh 1:14) should not be overlooked; for God has given us this perfect revelation *in a Person* just in order that we might find in Him our true example and archetype.

In addition to these and all other specific expressions of the thought of Christ's exampleship, there stands the great fact that the whole picture which the Evangelists drew of Jesus was made under the powerful influence of the twofold conviction that He was the image of the Father, so that by Him we know the 'Christ-like God,' and that He was the Ideal Man—not an ideal creation of human fancy, but the Ideal-Real come from God Himself.

3. It has already been briefly noted that Christ Himself as well as His disciples bore witness that He was to His own *much more than mere example*. The relation of His followers to Jesus is something more than that of those who are striving to copy a model. Christ is example in a deeper sense. He is not only 'type,' but also 'archetype' (e.g. 1Co 15:20 ff., 1Co 15:45-49, Rom 8:29, Heb 2:11-12; Heb 2:17). An example for personal life must in any case be something better than a mould for the multiplication of its own form. Personality is interested in inward traits and principles, which are to be independently developed in the greatest variety of forms. But Jesus' relation to us lies even deeper than this. He is the 'archetype,' the 'original,' of our personal life. Now an original is not passively there to be copied; it sustains some sort of active causal relation to the copy. So Christ is our example in this more vital sense: He is at once example and original (admirably expressed in Ger.

Vorbild and *Urbild*). As our 'original,' Christ not only (as in the case of mere examples in personal life) mysteriously impresses us, but also imparts life and power through His Spirit (Joh_1:16-17; Joh_5:24-26, Rom_8:2, Gal_2:20, Col_3:3-4, 1Jn_5:11 ff., and many more passages). He who, having fulfilled the Law, is henceforth Himself the Law (Rom_10:4, Gal_3:24, 1Co_9:21), has engaged to work likeness unto Himself in all who believe. So we may say with Augustine: 'Give what Thou commandest, and command what Thou wilt.' If Christ is to us mere example, without renewing power, we are, after all, 'under law,' and *not* 'under grace.' 'But the Word became not only flesh, but also spirit' (Kähler, *Wissenseh. d. ehr. Lehre*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 510. See Joh_20:21-22; Joh_6:63; Joh_7:39, 2Co_3:17-18). Yet the inward operation of the Spirit in producing likeness to Christ has constant and express reference to the historic Christ (Joh_16:14, 1Jn_4:2-3).

4. The actual *validity* of the picture of Christ as example implies the genuine humanness of the life and the adequate fulness and clearness of the picture. Furthermore, the example must be capable of universal application. As to the humanness of the life of Jesus, it is sufficient in this connexion to point out that the Biblical witness is without a trace of questioning as to its reality. Even the highest confessions of Jesus as the Son of God are never at the expense of the patent fact that He is truly man. As to the pictures of Christ in the Gospels, while these are not biographies, as that term is commonly understood, they do give a wonderfully luminous and vivid portrait of the personal life of our Lord. Using the historical material for the sake of its content of truth, they show us Jesus the Witness, in word and deed, of the holy love of God, and as the Bearer of love and truth and life to the world. Affirming love to God and man as the supreme law, He Himself fulfilled that law, gladly laying down His life that He might glorify the Father and bring salvation to the world. And this life of unimagined self-sacrifice He led to the end, in spite of manifold and tremendous temptations, without once deviating from the path appointed by the Father. And with it all there was no ascetical denial of the values that are primarily temporal: nor did He lose either joy or repose of soul through His sufferings and conflicts. A marvellous openness in word and deed was ever characteristic of Him who came a Light into the world. Besides all this, here is a life that manifestly reached its goal. The course of that life had been one continual renunciation of proffered worldly advantage and success; nevertheless its end was a unique triumph. For the real end was not Calvary, but the exaltation to the right hand of God. However hidden this end may be from the unbelieving world, Christian faith sees in the resurrection and exaltation of Christ the one supreme proof that righteousness cannot fail. This is the 'conviction of righteousness,' because Jesus has gone to the Father (Joh_16:10). Without such a revelation of the appointed end of faith and righteousness the example would be incomplete, and Christian ethics could not maintain its ideal.

This picture of Jesus is capable of universal application. It is true the vocation of Jesus was unique. And yet the principles which controlled that life—perfect trust in the Father, and perfect love to God and man—are manifestly applicable under all possible circumstances. Such love as Christ’s is the fulfilling of the Law. In one respect only is there a seeming limitation—for it is only seeming—to the universality of Christ’s example: He is without the struggle with inward sin—He can be no model for the transformation of a sinful life. Inasmuch, however, as the processes of renewal are not our affair—we need only to be joined to our Lord in faith and to follow Him—this is no lack. Although ‘a Jew of the first century,’ Jesus is the Son of Man, in everything essential to personality free from the limitations of His own time and people. He is not less the kinsman of all peoples; He is ‘the contemporary of every age.’

5. We have further to consider the *practical relation of the disciple to the example of Christ*. We are commanded to ‘follow,’ to ‘imitate,’ to ‘put on Christ,’ to ‘follow in his steps.’ But how are we to conceive the problem of discipleship? For, while the Church has never failed to hear the call of Jesus, ‘Follow me!’ the conception of discipleship has sometimes been much distorted. In the Middle Ages the dominant thought was asceticism. The ascetic imitation of Christ, of which St. Francis is the most noteworthy example, selects certain traits in His life, and by undue emphasis upon these, together with a neglect of others, produces a distorted image. Then there have been enthusiasts who thought to be able to follow Christ in sharing His redemptorial work—exaggerating and perverting such passages as Php 3:10, Gal 6:2, 1Jn 3:16. Again, rationalism has made of Christ simply a model of virtues to be copied. These three are perhaps the most important types of perversion of the NT idea of Christ’s exemplarship; but the three appear in various modifications and combinations. The only safeguard against such errors seems to lie in a consistent emphasis upon the *integrity* of the Biblical picture of Christ.

Among evangelical theologians the term ‘imitation’ of Christ is very commonly objected to as implying merely a formal copying of the Lord’s example. The word, of course, *can* be so understood; but so also may the word ‘following.’ In any event it must be insisted upon that the words ‘imitate’ and ‘imitator’ in the NT (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) have no such unevangelical meaning.

The believer’s practical attitude to the example of Christ may be profitably studied in the light of a few characteristic passages: (a) Answering to the frequent declaration of the absoluteness of Christ’s authority (e.g. Mat 23:8; Mat 23:10, Eph 1:22, Php 2:9-11), there are many passages which emphasize the obligation of *exclusive loyalty* to Him (e.g., 2Co 10:5; 2Co 11:3, Col 3:17, Eph 4:5). (b) We are to have the *mind of Christ*, and to set the mind on the things above, where Christ is (Col 3:1 ff., Rom 12:2, Eph 4:23). (c) We shall be transformed into the image of Christ by

beholding Him, though the energy that produces the result comes from ‘the Lord the Spirit’ (2Co 3:18—see also Drummond, *The Changed Life*). (d) Complementing the thought of meditation as a means to Christ-likeness, there are various passages which set forth the *more strenuous elements* in the following of Christ (e.g. Php 3:10-16). (e) Several passages bid us ‘*put on Christ*’ or the ‘*new man*’ (Rom 13:14, Eph 4:24, Col 3:10 ff.). This relates to the *formation of a Christian character*. (f) Jesus left us an example, that we should ‘*follow in his steps*’ (1Pe 2:21). Just as ‘the mind of Christ’ means *inward renewal*, and ‘*putting on Christ*’ means *character-building*, so ‘*to walk in his steps*’ may fairly serve as a motto for *the exercise of Christian love in all social relations*. (g) The example of Christ in His personal consummation is the believer’s most glorious *hope* (Rom 8:29, 1Jn 3:2-3, cf. Eph 3:19). And the hope set within us is guaranteed by the earnest of the Spirit. We *already* have a measure of Christ-likeness—we are *now* sons of God, and His power is working in us to finish the work begun (Rom 8:23, 1Jn 3:1-2; 1Jn 4:17, Eph 3:14-20, Col 3:10, Php 1:6).

But all these various aspects of our relation to our Example presuppose the vital fellowship of a personal faith. No ‘imitation’ of Christ is according to the gospel if it is anything else than an essential aspect of the life of faith. With all its rare beauty and power, the *Imitation of Christ* by Thomas à Kempis (?) is hardly conceived in the plane of the perfect law of liberty. And yet, over against the widespread questioning of the universal applicability of Christ’s example, as well as the ethical shallowness and indefiniteness of a religion of mere feeling, too much stress cannot be laid upon the vocation of the Christian to take up the cross daily and follow the Lord. ‘This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments’ (1Jn 5:3). The full gospel principle of the freedom of the Spirit being presupposed, the question, ‘What would Jesus do?’ (see Sheldon, *In His Steps*), is not unwarranted. But to walk in the Spirit implies that we are not seeking merit or virtue for our own satisfaction, but are seeking to glorify God. To do all ‘in the name of the Lord Jesus’—no more comprehensive or profound expression of the fundamental law of Christian living could be conceived; and just this, after all, is what is meant by following Christ. Our task is not in the narrower sense to copy Him, but to receive His Spirit, to understand His mind, to let Him be formed within us. So we shall also ‘walk’ in Him.

ii. *The example of the followers of Christ*.—‘One is your Teacher—one is your Master, even the Christ’ (Mat 23:8; Mat 23:10). ‘Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ’ (1Co 3:11). This relation of our Lord to us is unique and exclusive. He is our life. We have been renewed after His image. But just because this is so—just because He does beget in His followers a likeness to Himself—those who bear His image are fitted to be examples; only, of course, their exemplarship is relative and mediate. He who said concerning Himself, ‘I am the light of the world’ (Joh 8:12; Joh 9:5), said also to His disciples, ‘Ye are the salt of the earth, ye are the light of the world’ (Mat 5:13-16). But they are this just because

they are His followers, and in virtue of what they have from Him. In various ways our Lord recognizes the value of good example; for instance, where He warns against the *bad* example of the scribes and Pharisees (Mat 23:1-3). He prays for His disciples: ‘As thou didst send me into the world even so sent I them into the world’ (Joh 17:18). They were to be His witnesses; they were to do nothing in their own name. And yet, in order that they might be true witnesses, they must be sanctified in the truth. Their ministry for Christ must be, like Christ’s own ministry, an intensely *personal* one. And when the Lord gives to His disciples that ‘example’ of humble service in washing their feet (Joh 13:5 ff.), and elsewhere (Joh 17:21, Joh 13:35) shows that they shall preach Him through a life of love as well as by word, it cannot be doubted that He places a very high value on the example of His followers.

The NT writers generally, especially St. Paul and St. Peter, lay great stress upon the salutary effect of Christian example (1Pe 2:11 ff.; 1Pe 3:1-2; 1Pe 3:15-16, Php 2:15, 1Th 1:7-8, 1Co 7:16, 1Ti 6:1), with special emphasis upon the example of those who are in authority in the Church (1Ti 4:12, Tit 2:7-8, Heb 13:7; 1Pe 5:3). On the other hand, the danger of an example not positively evil but only doubtful is clearly set forth (e.g. 1Co 8:7 ff., Rom 14:13 ff.). St. Paul shows the peculiarity of repeated reference to his own example. Reckoning the passage Act 20:35 as an authentic report, and including all the Epistles that bear his name, there are not fewer than eight passages (Act 20:35, 1Co 4:16; 1Co 7:7-8; 1Co 11:1, Php 3:17; Php 4:9, 2Th 3:7-10, 2Ti 1:13) which distinctly commend to the Churches his own example, and a ninth (1Ti 1:16) in which the element of specific commendation is lacking. This fact is all the more striking because St. Paul is pre-eminent in the energy with which he repudiates all human merit. ‘Christ is all in all.’ It is St. Paul, moreover, who declares: ‘We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus as Lord, and ourselves as your servants for Jesus’ sake’ (2Co 4:5). There is, however, no real incongruity here. An examination of the passages in question will show that St. Paul nowise assumes authority in his own person. ‘Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ’ (1Co 11:1). This is thoroughly characteristic. It is but another way of affirming that his sole purpose is to lead them to purest, simplest devotion to Christ. ‘What then is Apollos? and what is Paul? Ministers through whom ye believed; and each as the Lord gave to him’ (1Co 3:5). St. Paul does not refuse to be judged as a minister of Christ and steward of the mysteries of God (1Co 4:1). He is but a servant and a witness. And if there is anything exemplary in him, it is only the faithfulness and sincerity of his own discipleship and service. ‘By the grace of God I am what I am’ (1Co 15:10). Glorifying is excluded. And neither St. Paul nor any other NT writer ever makes the virtuous life of believers a *principal* proof of the doctrine; it is, however, powerfully confirmatory. The Apostolic doctrine thus outlined is of such simplicity, that its universal acceptance in the Church is hindered only by the same carnal mind that caused many even in St. Paul’s day to ‘walk according to man’ (1Co 3:3).

Literature.—The leading recent treatises on Christian ethics, especially Martensen, Frank, Smyth, Kahler (*Wissenschaft der christlichen Lehre*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 3 Teil, 1905), Herrmann³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1904, and Haring, 1902; Luthardt, *Gesch. der christl. Ethik*, 1888, 1893 (English translation of vol. i. 1889); Bosse, *Prolegomena zu einer Gesch. des Begriffs 'Nachfolge Christi,'* 1895; Kahler, *Der sogenannte historische Jesus*,² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] etc., 1896, and *Dogmatische Zeitfragen*, 1898 (2 Heft, pp. 75-155); Herrmann, *Der Verkehr des Christen mit Gott*⁴ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1903 (English translation of an earlier ed.); J. Weiss, *Die Nachfolge Christi*, etc., 1894; Schlatter, *Der Glaube im NT*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; Lutgert, *Die Liebe im NT*, 1905; Feine, *Jesus Christus und Paulus*, 1902; Scholz, 'Das persönliche Verhältnis zu Christus und die religiöse Unterweisung' in *ZThK* [Note: ThK Zeitschrift f. Theologie u. Kirche.] , 1893; Ullmann, *The Sinlessness of Jesus*; Fairbairn, *Philosophy of the Chr. Religion*, 1902, and *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, 1893; Laidlaw, art. 'Image' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , vol. ii.; J. R. Seeley, *Ecce Homo*, 1865; Hughes, *The Manliness of Christ*, 1879; Stalker, *Imago Christi*, 1889; Drummond, *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*, and *The Changed Life*; Sheldon, *In His Steps*, 1897; F. G. Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Christian Character*, 1905; Thomas à Kempis (?), *The Imitation of Christ*.

J. R. van Pelt.

✚ Exclusiveness

EXCLUSIVENESS.—The term is here employed to denote that Christ's earthly ministry was confined to the people of Israel. The passages bearing on the subject leave no doubt that Christ regarded the Messianic mission entrusted to Him by the Father as limited to the Jewish nation, and in practice He kept within the limits imposed by the Divine decree. Only on one occasion do we find Him crossing the borders of the Holy Land into heathen territory (Mar 7:24), and on that occasion His object was not to extend the sphere of His work, but to secure an interval of rest and leisure for the private instruction of His disciples. When the Syrophœnician woman, seizing the opportunity presented by His presence in the neighbourhood, appealed to Him to heal her demoniac daughter, He justified Himself at first for refusing by the statement, 'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Mat 15:24). At an earlier date, in His instructions to the Twelve in view of their missionary journey, the area of

their work was sharply defined in the words, 'Go not into any way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Mat_10:5-6). It has been alleged that this restriction of His work was occasioned by want of sympathy with those outside the Jewish pale, in proof of which appeal is made to some of His sayings, such as those in which He characterizes Gentiles as 'dogs' (Mat_15:26 ||), directs His disciples to treat an impenitent offender as 'an heathen man and a publican' (Mat_18:17), and enjoins them to 'use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do' (Mat_6:7).

The fact of Christ's attitude of aloofness toward the Gentile world throughout His earthly ministry is quite evident. In explanation of it various considerations have to be taken into account. (1) His vocation as 'a minister of the circumcision' (Rom_15:8) led Him to avoid as far as possible work among Samaritans and Gentiles. As the Messianic King, who came in fulfilment of OT prophecies, His appeal would naturally be, in the first instance, to 'His own' (Joh_1:11). (2) The whole history of the Jewish people having been a preparation for the Kingdom of God, He recognized in its members 'the children of the kingdom' (Mat_8:12). By virtue of possessing the oracles of God, Israel alone was fitted to appreciate the message of the Kingdom, which could not be presented to the world at large without a preparatory training, involving more or less delay. (3) To secure a favourable reception for His message it was necessary to avoid, as far as possible, arousing the prejudice and alienating the sympathy of His Jewish hearers, who would have resented any teaching or practice tending to place Gentile communities on a level of privilege with themselves (Luk_4:25-29). (4) The shortness of His earthly ministry made it imperative that He should restrict the field to be evangelized, and not be diverted from His immediate purpose of establishing the Kingdom among the chosen people by the claims of those outside, however urgent and undeniable. (5) Assuming that the Kingdom was destined ultimately to be universal, its triumph among the Jews would evidently be the most successful method of securing its extension to other nations. As a matter of fact, it was Jewish adherents who afterwards became the agents of spreading it among the Gentiles.

Among the reasons why Gentiles were excluded from the scope of Christ's personal ministry, want of sympathy cannot be included. The evidence, instead of proving want of sympathy, is all the other way. He granted the request of the Roman centurion who sought the healing of his servant, eulogizing at the same time his faith as something without a parallel even in Israel (Mat_8:10). The apparent coldness of His demeanour toward the Syrophœnician woman was due to the embarrassing nature of her petition, which required Him to violate the principle by which His conduct had been governed hitherto. He was anxious to help, if He could do so without sacrificing the interests of those who had the first claim upon His services. The term 'dogs' has been objected to on the ground that it is insulting. The woman herself did not view it in this light, and her quick wit turned it into an argument in her own favour. The term

(κυνάρια), moreover, does not denote the ownerless dogs which act as scavengers in the East, but the household pets which serve as the children's playmates. The scruples which led Christ to withhold for a moment the help sought, were in the end overcome by the woman's faith, which won His cordial approval.

There is no trace of racial or religious bias in Christ's references to the heathen. Any repugnance implied in His language is toward what is evil in their system or in their conduct. It is their method of prayer with which He has no sympathy, and which He stigmatizes as unworthy of imitation. Their lives were often such as to make close association with them inadvisable, and the impenitent offender is regarded as on a par with them in this respect. Christ's attitude toward publicans, who are bracketed with heathen, was anything but unsympathetic; and if He felt toward heathen in the same way, they were objects not of dislike, but of the deepest compassion. See also artt. Gentiles, Missions.

W. S. Montgomery.

⚠️ Excommunication

EXCOMMUNICATION denotes the exclusion, either temporary or permanent, and specifically on moral or religious grounds, of a member of a religious body from the privileges which membership in that body ordinarily carries with it. The word does not occur in Authorized and Revised Versions, but we have in the Gospels several references to the practice as it existed among the Jews in the time of Christ, while certain words of Christ Himself supply the germs of the usage of the Christian Church as it meets us in the Apostolic age and was subsequently developed in the ecclesiastical discipline of later times.

i. Jewish excommunication.—Passing over the segregation of lepers, though this generally implied exclusion from the synagogue (Mat_8:4 || Luk_17:14),* [Note: Being forbidden to enter a walled town, they could not worship in the synagogue in such places; but in unwall'd towns a corner was frequently reserved for them in the synagogue, on condition that they were the first to enter and the last to depart (see Hastings' DB iii. 97a).] and coming to excommunication of the more specific kind, we find that it is certainly referred to four times in the Gospels, viz. Luk_6:22 ('blessed are ye ... when they shall separate you from their company'—ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς), Joh_9:22 ('for the Jews had agreed already that if any man should confess him to be Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue'—ἀποσυνάγωγος γένηται), Joh_12:42

(‘they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue’—ἵνα μὴ ἄποσυναγωγοὶ γένωνται), Joh_16:2 (‘they shall put you out of the synagogues’—ἀποσυναγωγούς ποιήσουσιν ὑμᾶς). It is not unlikely, however, that a fifth reference should be found in the ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω of Joh_9:34-35 (so AV^m [Note: Vm Authorized Version margin.] and many commentators). Meyer and Westcott (*Gospel of St. John*) object to this that no sitting of the Sanhedrin had taken place, and that the persons who cross-questioned the formerly blind man were not competent to pronounce the sentence of excommunication. It is true, no doubt, that excommunication properly denotes a formal sentence passed by the officials of the congregation (Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii. ii. 60),—though in Talmudic times a minor form of excommunication by an individual, and especially by a rabbi, was also recognized (*Jewish Encyc.* vol. v. p. 286 f.),—but as it was ‘the Jews,’ *i.e.* in the language of the Fourth Gospel the Jewish authorities, who expelled the man, it seems quite possible that the examination described in John 9 was of a formal nature. This is confirmed by the expressions, ‘they bring to the Pharisees him that aforetime was blind’ (Joh_9:13), ‘they called the parents’ (Joh_9:16), ‘they called a second time the man that was blind’ (Joh_9:24), which suggests an authoritative summons before an official body. And when we read in Joh_9:25 ‘Jesus heard that they had cast him out,’ this seems to imply that some grave act of formal censure had been passed upon the man.

Of the fact that excommunication was practised in the Jewish synagogue in the time of Christ, these passages leave us in no doubt. But now comes the question whether at that time there were different kinds of excommunication. In the Talmud two degrees are recognized, a minor, *niddûi* (נִדְּוִי), and a major, *ḥçrem* (חֲרֵם); the former being a temporary exclusion from the synagogue together with a restriction upon social intercourse with others, while the latter amounted to a ban of indefinite or permanent duration.* [Note: The attempt has sometimes been made to discover in the language of the Talmud a third and more awful kind of excommunication named *shammattâ* (שַׁמַּטָּא); and in accordance with this it has been supposed that there may be a reference to the three presumed degrees of Jewish excommunication in Luk_6:22—‘they shall separate you from their company (*ûi*), and reproach you (*ḥçrem*), and cast out your name as evil’ (*â*). But it is now generally acknowledged that the idea of this threefold distinction is due to a mistake, and that, as used in the Talmud, *â* is simply a general designation for both the *ûi* and the *çrem* (see Buxtorf, , s.v. שַׁמַּטָּא; Schürer, ii. ii. 60).] It must be remembered, however, that as an authority upon Jewish usages the Talmud does not carry us back to the earliest Christian age, and that for the practice of Jewish courts in the time of our Lord the

NT itself is our only real source of information. And while it has sometimes been fancied that in the Gospels we have an indication of two kinds or degrees of excommunication—the ἀποσυνάγωγος of Joh 9:22; Joh 12:42; Joh 16:2 being distinguished either, as something more severe, from the ἀφορίζειν of Luk 6:22, or, as something more mild, from the ἐκβάλλειν of Joh 9:34-35—the truth is that there are no adequate grounds for such discriminations. It is, of course, quite possible, and even likely, that in the time of Christ there were distinct grades of exclusion from the privileges of the Jewish community, corresponding to the later *niddûi* and *ḥçrem*,[†] [Note: It is perhaps suggestive that ἀνάθεμα is the constant LXX rendering of the OT ׀ (Jos 6:17-18; Jos 6:7; Jos 22:20, 1Ch 2:7), and that ἀνάθεμα and ἀναθεματιζειν meet us frequently in the NT as expressive of a curse or strong form of hanning (Mar 14:71, Act 23:12; Act 23:14; Act 23:21, Rom 9:3, 1Co 12:3; 1Co 16:22, Gal 1:8-9).] but the NT cannot be said to testify to anything more than the fact of excommunication itself.

For the immediate origin of the practice of excommunication as it meets us in the Gospels, we have only to go back to Ezra and the days after the Exile, when the strictest discipline was absolutely essential to the solidarity, indeed to the very existence, of the Jewish Church and nation. Ezra insisted that those Jews who had married foreign wives should either put away both their wives and the children born of them, or forfeit their whole substance and be separated from the congregation of Israel (Ezr 10:8). But the ultimate roots of the practice are to be sought in the Pentateuchal legislation, with its exclusion of the ceremonially unclean from the camp of the congregation (Lev 13:45-46, Num 5:2-3), and its devotion to destruction (׀, whence ׀) of whole cities or tribes as enemies of Israel (Deu 2:34; Deu 3:6; Deu 7:2; cf. Jdg 21:11, where the men of Jabesh-gilead themselves fall under the ban of extermination for not coming up to Mizpeh along with their brethren).

With regard to the grounds on which, in our Lord's time, sentence of excommunication was passed, the Talmud speaks of twenty-four offences as being thus punishable—a round number which is not to be taken too literally (*Jewish Encyc.*, art. 'Excommunication')—though later Rabbinical authorities have carried out the list into its particulars. When we read that the rulers decreed that any one who confessed Jesus to be Christ should be put out of the synagogue (Joh 9:22; Joh 12:42), this may show that they possessed a large discretionary power of fixing the grounds of ecclesiastical censure. But if the later lists of Talmudical writers rest on traditions that go back to the time of Christ, there were certain recognized categories of offence, such as 'dealing lightly with any of the Rabbinic or Mosaic precepts,' under

which it would be easy for the Jewish casuists to arraign any one who called Jesus Master or acknowledged Him to be the Messiah.

ii. Christian excommunication.—It lies beyond the scope of this Dictionary to deal with excommunication as practised in the Apostolic Church, and as it meets us especially in the Pauline writings. But in the teaching of our Lord Himself we find the principles at least of the rules which St. Paul lays down in 1 Corinthians 5, 2Co 2:6-11, 1Ti 1:20, Tit 3:10.

In Mat 16:19 Jesus promises to St. Peter the keys of the Kingdom of heaven, so that whatsoever he shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever he shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. In Mat 18:17-19 He makes a similar promise to the Church generally, or to the Twelve as representing the *ecclesia*—not ‘*qua* apostles with ecclesiastical authority, but *qua* disciples with the ethical power of morally disciplined men’ (Bruce, *Expositor’s Gr. Test.*, *in loc.*; cf. further Joh 20:23). And in the immediately preceding context (Mat 18:15-17) He gives directions as to the way in which an offending brother is to be dealt with in the Church. The injured person is first to go to him privately and endeavour to show him his fault. If he will not listen, one or two other Christian brethren are to accompany the first as witnesses—not in any legal sense, we must suppose, but because ‘consensus in moral judgment carries weight with the conscience’ (Bruce, *op. cit.*, *in loc.*). If he is still obdurate, the Church is now to be appealed to: ‘and if he refuse to hear the Church (ἐκκλησία) also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican.’ That ἐκκλησία in this passage means the community of Christian believers, and not, as Hort, for example, thinks (*Christian Ecclesia*, p. 10), the Jewish local community, seems in every way probable. Jesus had already spoken at Caesarea of the ἐκκλησία that is built on Christian faith and confession (Mat 16:18), and it was altogether natural that on this later occasion He should refer to it again in speaking of the relations between Christian brethren. But it would be a mistake to find in this passage any reference to a formal process of excommunication on the part of the Church. The offender of whom Christ speaks excommunicates himself from the Christian community by refusing to listen to its united voice, and the members of the community have no option but to regard him as an outsider so long as he maintains that attitude. That Jesus meant nothing harsh by the expression ‘as the Gentile and the publican,’ and certainly did not mean a permanent exclusion from the Christian society, may be judged from the way in which He treated a Roman centurion and a Syrophœnician woman, and from the name given Him by His enemies—‘the friend of publicans and sinners.’ No doubt in an organized society a solemn and formal act such as St. Paul prescribes in 1Co 5:4-5 is a natural deduction from the words of Christ in this passage; but it cannot be said that such an act is definitely enjoined by the Lord Himself. It is the attempt to find here the authoritative institution of

excommunication as a formal act of ecclesiastical discipline that gives a colour of justification to the contention of some critics (e.g. Holtzmann, *Hand-Commentar zum NT, in loc.*) that what we have in this passage is not an actual saying of Jesus, but a reflexion of the ecclesiastical practice in the Jewish-Christian circles for which the Gospel of Matthew was written.

From our Lord's teaching in this passage it seems legitimate to infer that, though excommunication may become necessary in the interests of the Christian society, it should never be resorted to until every other means has been tried, and in particular should be preceded by private dealing in a brotherly and loving spirit. From the two parables of the Tares and the Wheat (Mat_13:24-30; Mat_13:36-43) and the Draw-net (Mat_13:47-50) we may further gather that Christ would have His people to exercise a wise patience and caution in the use even of a necessary instrument. Mat_18:15-17 shows that there are offences which are patent and serious, and are not to be passed over. But from the two parables referred to we learn the impossibility of the Donatist dream of an absolutely pure Church. Not even those who have the enlightenment of the Spirit are infallible judges of character. The absolute discrimination between 'the good' and 'the bad' (Mat_13:48) must be postponed till 'the end of the age' (Mat_13:49). Only under the personal rule of the Son of Man Himself shall all things that offend (*πάντα τὰ σκάνδαλα*) be gathered out of His Kingdom (Mat_13:41).

Literature.—Artt. on 'Excommunication' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, *Encyc. Bibl.*, and Jewish *Encyc.*; Schurer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii. ii. p. 59 ff.; Weber, *Jüd. Theol.*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , Index, s.v. 'Bann'; Martensen, *Christian Ethics*, iii. p. 330 ff.; the Commentaries of Meyer, Alford, Westcott (*Gospel of St. John*), and Bruce (*Expositor's Gr. Test.*) on the passages referred to; Bruce, *Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, p. 42 ff.

J. C. Lambert.

☞ Excuse

EXCUSE.—'To make excuse' (*παραπεισθαι*), Luk_14:18, means to avert displeasure by entreaty, to crave indulgence, to seek to be freed from an obligation or duty. (Cf. the use of 'excuse' in Dampier, *Voyages*, ii. 1. 99: 'In the evening he sent me out of the palace, desiring to be excused that he could not entertain me all night'), *παραπεισθαι* is used by Josephus exactly as here of declining an invitation (*Ant.* vii. viii. 2). ἔχε με

παρητημένον (Luk 14:18-19) may be a Latinism for *habe me excusatum*, but see Meyer and Weiss *contra*.

These guests had evidently received a previous invitation, as is customary in the East, which they had accepted (Luk 14:16-17). Their unanimity, the absence of an adversative *ἀλλά* or *δέ*, and the order of the words, combine to make *παραιτεῖσθαι* a surprise when it comes (contrast Luk 14:15). They did not give a direct refusal, they were detained by certain hindrances which were not wrong in themselves, but they all showed the same spirit in rejecting the invitation because they preferred to follow their own inclinations. The first had bought a field, he was elated by his already acquired possessions (Trench, *Parables*), and alleged a necessity (*ἔχω ἀνάγκην*); ‘*saepe concurrunt tempora gratiae acceptissima et mundana negotia urgentissima*’ (Bengel). The second may illustrate the anxiety of getting; he alleges rather his plan and purpose (*πορεύομαι*). The third was detained by pleasure; his marriage seemed a sufficient reason, and he simply said *οὐ δύναμαι*. Gerhard sums up the hindrances as ‘*dignitates, opes, voluptates*,’ cf. Luk 8:14. ‘His omnibus mederi poterat sanctum illud odium Luk 8:26’ (Bengel).

‘Excuse’ is also used in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 for *πρόφασις* (Joh 15:22), so Wyc. [Note: Wyclif’s Bible (NT c. 1380, OT c. 1382, Purvey’s Revision c. 1388).], Vulgate (*excusatio*); Authorized Version follows Tindale ‘cloke.’ Cf. Psa 140:4 τοῦ προφασίζεσθαι προφάσεις ἐν ἁμαρτίαις; Vulgate ‘*ad excusandas excusationes in peccatis*.’ The Jews had no longer anything to plead in their own defence, as was possible in times of ignorance.

Literature.—Comm. of Meyer and Plummer, *in loc.*; works of Trench, Bruce, and Dods on *Parables*; Thomson, *LB* [Note: *The Land and the Book.*] p. 125.

W. H. Dundas.

☩ Exorcism

EXORCISM.—See Demon.

⚠️ Expiation

EXPIATION.—See Atonement, Death of Christ, Ransom, Reconciliation, Redemption.

⚠️ Extortion

EXTORTION (ἀρπαγή).—The word is used by Christ in His terrible arraignment of the scribes and Pharisees, on account of the way in which, by their methods of plunder, they openly violated the Scriptures they knew so well (Mat 23:25, Luk 11:39). Isaiah (Isa 16:4) had predicted the cessation of the extortioner as one of the signs of the Messianic reign. Ezekiel (Eze 22:12) had inveighed against this sin as one of the transgressions of Israel which called forth the Divine wrath. Yet they, who claimed to keep the Law to the letter, and who professed to be the teachers of the Law, fattened themselves on extortion and filled their cups by it. For the methods of extortion practised by the publicans see art. Publican.

Henry E. Dosker.

⚠️ Eye

EYE.—The OT usage of ‘eye’ (עַיַן), with its material and figurative senses, is found to be faithfully continued in the Gospels.

The almost invariable word used in the Gospels is ὀφθαλμός; in two passages (Mat 20:34, Mar 8:23) ὄμμα is found, but used only in the plural. The difference in meaning between the two would appear to be that ὄμμα refers to the material organ as distinct from its function, while ὀφθαλμός is not only the vehicle of vision but that which sees.* [Note: Perhaps somewhat in the same way that one can differentiate between a musical instrument and the music it gives forth.] The most usual verb used in connexion with the eyes is βλέτω (e.g. Mat 7:3, Luk 6:41), with its compounds διαβλέτω (Mar 8:25) and ἀναβλετω (Mat 20:34, Joh 9:12); more rarely we find ὀράω (Mat 13:15, Luk 2:30; Luk 16:23, Joh 12:40) and θεάομαι (Joh 4:35; Joh 6:5). A fairly frequent phrase is that of ‘lifting up (ἐταίρω) the eyes,’† [Note: It

occurs very rarely outside of Lk., Jn., and Acts.] e.g. Mat 17:8, Luk 16:23; Luk 18:13, Joh 4:35; in every case in which the eyes of Christ are mentioned this word is used (Luk 6:20, Joh 6:5; Joh 11:41; Joh 17:1).

The word 'eye' is used—

1. In the ordinary, *literal* sense: as illustrating the *lex talionis*, Mat 5:38;‡ [Note: in this connexion the Code of Hammurabi, § 196, 'If a man has caused the loss of a gentleman's eye, his eye one shall cause to be lost' (see Johns' The Oldest Code of Laws, p. 43).] of the eyes being heavy with sleep, Mar 14:40; of the multitude fixing their eyes on Christ, Luk 4:20; especially of Christ giving sight to the eyes of the blind, § [Note: Regarding methods of curing blindness see Encyc. Bibl. col. 1455 f.] e.g. Mat 9:29-30; Mat 20:33-34, Mar 8:23, Joh 9:6.

2. In a *literal* sense, but with a *figurative* sense implied: e.g. the words of Simeon, 'Mine eyes have seen thy salvation' (Luk 2:30), where there is primarily the literal looking down upon the babe before him, but also, by implication, the mental vision of God's salvation of which the visible child was the pledge; again, in the words, 'Blessed are your eyes, for they see ...' (Mat 13:16, see also Luk 10:23), where we have both the literal seeing of Christ and the seeing, in the sense of understanding, His teaching; further, a striking instance is contained in Luk 24:31, where it is said of the two disciples to whom Christ, after His resurrection, became known by the breaking of bread, that 'their eyes were opened, and they knew him.' There appears here (however it may be accounted for) an extraordinarily close connexion or correspondence between weakness in the bodily and the mental vision, for it is certain that their eyes were open, in the ordinary sense, before they recognized Christ. Another example is that in Joh 4:35 'Lift up your eyes and look on the fields, that they are white already unto harvest.' What the bodily eye saw here was evidently intended by Christ to be a symbol of the great work of evangelization which He desired the mental vision of the disciples to discern. Under this head would come also Mat 5:29 'If thy right eye causeth thee to stumble, cut it out and cast it from thee.' From the context the 'eye' is clearly used here in a material sense, while the 'cut it out' is equally clearly used in a figurative sense (cf. Mat 19:12).

3. In a purely *figurative* sense it is found in Mat 7:3-6 and Luk 6:41-42 (the mote in the brother's eye); also in Mat 6:22-23, Luk 11:34 ('The lamp of the body is the eye'), where the eye is spoken of as reflecting the spiritual condition of the heart, though even here it is possible that the thought of the expression of the material eyes may also have been in Christ's mind. Again, in Mat 20:15 'Is thine eye evil because I am good?' the eye is used figuratively to express an attitude of envy (see below).

Lastly, it must I obviously have been used in a purely figurative sense in Luk_16:23 ‘In Hades he lifted up his eyes ...’

4. There remains the strange expression ‘evil eye’ (ὄφθαλμὸς πονηρός, Mar_7:22). The meaning of this no doubt approximates to that of the similar expression in Mat_6:23; Mat_20:15, and, generally speaking, denotes envy;* [Note: the expression עין רעה Pro_23:6; see also Deu_15:9, 1Sa_18:9.] but it also implied demoniacal possession [see Demon, iii. (b)],† [Note: Among the Jews there was a special formula for use against the ‘evil eye.’] and the ‘evil’ referred not only to the possessed himself, but also to the harm which might be done to others who came under the influence of the ‘evil eye.’‡ [Note: For examples of the belief in, and effect of, the ‘evil eye’ in Syria at the present day, see PEFSt, 1904, pp. 148-156.]

W. O E. Oesterley.

☞ Eye-Witnesses

EYE-WITNESSES (αὐτόπται, Luk_1:2; cf. ἐπόπται in 2Pe_1:16).—We have the assurance of the Third Evangelist that the Gospels are founded not upon second-hand reports, but upon the direct testimony of those who were present. Similarly in Joh_19:35; Joh_21:24 (where the words μαρτυρεῖν and μαρτυρία are used), the record of the Fourth Gospel is certified to be reliable. (See Lightfoot on ‘The Internal Evidence for the Genuineness of the Gospel of John,’ in the *Expositor* for Jan.-Mar. 1890, pp. 1, 81, 176; and cf. art. Gospels).

T. Gregory.

☞ Fable

FABLE.—See Parable.

☞ Face

FACE.—Of the words translation ‘face,’ ‘countenance,’ the Heb. *pânîm* indicates *the front*, that which is presented to view, while *mar’eh* and the NT terms πρόσωπον, ὄψις, and ἐνώπιον correspond to *view, visage*, that which can be seen.

1. Physical appearance.—Beauty of face is frequently alluded to in the Bible in connexion with both men and women as a distinguishing personal charm, and a powerful influence for good or evil. The underlying thought is that a noble and beautiful face should be the index of a noble and beautiful spirit. There is a resemblance among the children of a king (Jdg 8:18). Along with this recognition there are intimations that the Lord seeth not as man seeth (1Sa 16:7), and that beauty is vain (Pro 31:30). In the mysterious personality outlined in Isaiah 53 one of the arresting features is the absence of such beauty in a face singularly marred, and according to common standards confessedly unattractive. While there is a dark type of comeliness (Son 1:5), yet, as might be expected among a people accustomed to olive and sunburnt tones of complexion, it is the exceptional characteristic of a fair and lustrous face that marks the highest form of beauty. In the poetry of the Arabs, when beauty of face is referred to, the usual and ever-sufficient simile is that of the full moon (Son 6:10), and in the descriptions of Paradise in the Koran the female attendants of the ‘faithful’ are called *houris*, ‘the white-faced ones.’ The illumination on the face of Moses is still recalled in the Jewish synagogue when the officiating Levite, in pronouncing the benediction (Num 6:24) at the close of the service, veils his face with the *tallîth*, or prayer-cloth. Similarly in the sacred art of the Church, the Transfiguration light on the face of Christ was perpetuated in the halo around the faces of the saints who suffered as His witnesses. In 2Co 4:6 the consummation of the gospel is described as the hope of beholding and sharing the manifestation of God’s glory as it had been seen in the face of Jesus Christ.

2. In the expression of character and feeling.—Although the face was understood to be only a medium or channel for the manifestation of inward thought and emotion, a more vivid impression was often gained by alluding to it as having the essentials of personality. Thus it has its own health (Psa 42:11), it produces gladness in others (Psa 21:6, Act 2:28), and pronounces rebuke (Psa 80:16), it falls (Gen 4:6), is lifted up (Psa 4:6), emits light (Psa 44:3). All emotions are marked upon it: it is impudent (Pro 7:13). harder than a rock (Jer 5:3), and may be a face of fury (Eze 38:18). In Luk 12:56 the face of the sky is referred to as conveying to those who could read it a sign of its intentions. The face being thus closely identified with the person, any violence offered to the face was in the highest degree affronting (1Sa 11:2, 2Sa 10:4, Mat 26:67). As the expression of the face was regarded as a trustworthy indication of the life within, the Pharisees cultivated an aspect of religious absorption; and Christ showed that the thought behind this device was essentially blind and irreligious, inasmuch as the true service of the Kingdom required the spirit of the Beatitudes

(Mat 6:17). As the emblem of perfected sainthood and ordered harmony, the Church in its final form is represented as having the beauty of a face without spot or wrinkle or any such thing (Eph 5:27).

The figure of the averted or hidden face (Deu 31:17, Isa 53:3) that declines to meet the look of supplication, owes its origin to the fact that Orientals are largely swayed by the strongest feeling of the moment, and can be moved from their previous purpose by well directed emotional appeals. When one man is seeking to appease or persuade another, it is customary, when the right moment has been reached, to put the hand quietly and tentatively under the chin, and thus turn the face so that eye may meet eye, and more kindly feelings prevail. Not to see the face at all is to intercept such emotional persuasion of prostration, pleading, and tears, and means that all hope must be abandoned.

G. M. Mackie.

❖ Fact And Theory

FACT AND THEORY.—Christianity is a religion which comes to man from God. It has to do with man's relation to God, and with God's will for man. Any knowledge, therefore, of the nature of Christianity depends upon revelation. This would still be true apart from the fact of sin and the fact that Christianity is a religion of redemption. For God is a personal Spirit; and the only way by which we can know even the finite persons about us is through their revealing themselves to us. When, further, we bear in mind the truth that God is an infinite Spirit, and that we men are finite, it at once becomes obvious that all knowledge of God as well as of His plan or purpose must rest upon a revelation by God. This revelation may be general. Thus the creation of the Universe and of man, with God's image in his heart and able to see God in the work of His hands, is to be regarded as an act of self-revelation on the part of God. But sin is a reality in this universe, and the noetic effects of sin have rendered necessary a special revelation of the holy God to sinful man. Sin has not only made man blind to spiritual realities, it has distorted the purity of the Divine image in man's heart and in nature. Accordingly special revelation must be external, consisting in supernatural acts of God to restore the image of God, and must also consist in a supernatural word-revelation or communication of knowledge to explain the meaning of these acts. Special revelation, then, being soteriological, accompanies the redemptive activity of God. This Divine redemptive activity is historical, and has entered this world of time and space. This was necessary, because sin, the effects of which the redemptive activity was to counteract, is a historical force at work in the world. Since, therefore, special revelation accompanies God's redemptive acts, it too

is historical, taking place under the category of time. Hence we have, first of all, God's redeeming acts, culminating in the Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection of Jesus Christ. These redemptive acts are also revealing acts. Thus God's Son came into this world in the flesh in order to save sinners, as St. Paul tells us (1Ti 1:15). But His incarnation is also a revelation of God, as we learn from the prologue to St. John's Gospel. But we have also a word-revelation accompanying the Divine redemptive facts or acts, and giving us their meaning. Indeed, that which rendered necessary the fact-revelation, viz. the noetic effects of sin, also makes necessary an authoritative word-revelation to explain to us the meaning of those acts. Christianity, therefore, consists in facts which have a meaning, or in the meaning of the facts, whichever way we choose to put it. Take away either the facts or their authoritative interpretation, and we have no Christianity left. The mere external facts apart from their meaning are, of course, meaningless, and therefore do not constitute Christianity; while the abandonment of the facts no less destroys the Christian religion, reducing it to a mere natural religion, or religious philosophy. Neither can the abandonment of the facts be justified because of the co-ordination of revelation and redemption, and of the historical character of the latter, to which we have already alluded.

This is the conception of revelation which the Scripture writers themselves give us. They claim that they were spoken to by God, and not merely that they had their religious intuition aroused by the facts of God's revelation. Hence their interpretation of the meaning of the great facts of Christianity, according to their own account of the matter, is not mere human reflexion upon the facts. If, therefore, we reject their interpretation of the facts as itself immediately from God, and therefore authoritative, we shall not be able to trust them for the occurrence of the supernatural facts, and shall be driven logically to deny the immediacy and supernatural character of the Divine activity in the facts themselves. The meaning of the term 'revelation' will have been changed. It will no longer signify the communication of truth by God's acts and words,* [Note: In speaking of word-revelation, we are not confounding revelation and inspiration; the former denoting the Divine supernatural communication of truth to the Scripture writer, the latter the Divine influence accompanying its record. The term 'word-revelation' is meant to denote especially the communication of truth to the Scripture writer in a supernatural manner. Of course, it should not be forgotten that inspiration is also necessary in order to render the truth infallible to us.] it will designate a product of the religious life of man. This does away with the absoluteness of Christianity, and is in direct contradiction to the account given by the Scripture writers themselves of the way in which Divine truth came to them. The question, therefore, really resolves itself into that of the trustworthiness of Christ and His Apostles as teachers of doctrine. The evidence for their trustworthiness is just the evidence for Christianity as a supernatural religion, which, of course, takes us far beyond the limits of this

article (cf. Warfield, art. 'The Real Problem of Inspiration' in *Pres. and Ref. Rev.* iv. p. 177 f.). But if we accept their authority (as we do, resting it on the above mentioned evidence), then Christianity consists in certain great facts, and in the true meaning of those facts. The meaning of a fact is its meaning for a mind. By their true meaning, of course, is meant their meaning for God. This meaning, therefore, He must authoritatively make known to us if we are to have any Christianity.

In the first place, then, to attempt to hold to the great supernatural facts of Christianity and to give up their meaning, is not only impossible, but, were it possible, would result in taking from the facts just that which makes them Christian facts, and which makes them constitutive of the essence of Christianity. There has been an attempt to distinguish between the facts of Christ's life as the permanent Divine element in Christianity and 'theories' as relative, human, and changing. This general tendency to separate between fact and theory in Christianity has assumed two forms: on the one hand, it is said that the Bible contains no explanation of the great facts of Christianity; on the other hand, it is admitted that the Bible does contain an explanation of the facts; but, while a special revelation in a series of supernatural acts of God is recognized, a special word-revelation is denied, and the whole doctrinal content of Christianity as contained in the Bible is reduced practically to human reflexion upon the acts of God.

In the former position, it is said that Christianity consists in facts, not in doctrines. We have in the Bible the fact of Christ, but no theory as to His person. We have the fact of the Atonement, but no theory or doctrine of its meaning.

This position has been held by R. J. Campbell and F. W. Farrar in their essays on the Atonement in a volume entitled *The Atonement and Modern Religious Thought*, 1900. For example, Farrar maintains that any attempt to explain the nature of the Atonement is a 'futile endeavour to be wise above what is written, and to translate the language of emotion into that of rigid scholasticism.' So also R. F. Horton, in his essay on the Atonement in a volume entitled *Faith and Criticism*, 1893, says that the NT contains no theory of the Atonement. (Horton has given up this position in his essay on the same subject in the same volume with Farrar's essay). A similar position seems to have been maintained by Astié, who is quoted by H. Bois in *De la Connaissance Religieuse*, p. 342; cf. Warfield, *The Right of Systematic Theology*, p. 30.

In regard to this position we should note, first of all, that 'bare facts,' *i.e.* meaningless facts, are impossible, for every fact has a meaning whether we know it or not. And still further, a 'bare fact' being a meaningless thing, there is no atonement in the 'bare fact' of Christ's death, and no Christianity in the events of His life regarded as 'bare facts.' If we clearly understand that a 'bare fact' is simply an

event in the external world apprehended by the senses, or a subjective fact of some self-consciousness, then it may be the statement of a 'bare fact' to say that a man called Jesus was born some 1900 years ago, but we are not to say that He was God's Son made flesh for our salvation; we can say that He died on the cross without going beyond 'bare fact,' or even that He expressed certain feelings, but we cannot say so much as that He died for our sin. It is not necessary to salvation that we should know the full and true meaning of Christ's death; we are not speaking, however, of the conditions of salvation, but of the essence of Christianity. And this lies in the meaning of the great redemptive facts of the Christian religion, or in the facts because of their meaning. We may conceive some false meaning of these facts, but like all facts they must have some meaning, and their true meaning is their meaning for God. Hence, as was said, if we are to know their true meaning, God must tell it to us. If, therefore, we were simply to hold to the facts of Christ's life considered as 'bare facts,' we should have taken away from them that which makes them Christian facts and redemptive facts. In short, this method of treating the facts of Christianity takes from them all that makes them constitutive of the essence of Christianity.* [Note: The necessity for an interpretation of the facts of Christianity has been shown by Denney, *Studies in Theol.* p. 106, and *The Death of Christ*, *Introd.*; cf. also J. Orr, *The Christian View of God and the World*, p. 25; H. Bois, *Le Dogme Grec*, pp. 110-117; Warfield, *The Right of Syst. Theol.* pp. 29-46.]

We should observe, next, that the modes of statement of all those who hold this position suggest the impossibility of holding to 'bare facts.' They speak constantly of the 'fact of the Atonement.' But this is quite ambiguous. If it means that the atonement is real, then it is a true statement, but a statement which involves a theory or interpretation of the fact of Christ's death as atoning for sin. But, taken as they appear to mean it, the statement involves an error. We may speak of the fact of Christ's death, but in this as a 'bare fact' there is no atonement. As soon as we call it an atonement we have interpreted it by a theory. So, when Farrar says it is a 'landmark of the death of Christ,' that it is 'not only the declaration, but the ground of pardon,' he has gone a long way toward understanding its meaning, and, according to his position, has made the mistake of 'translating the language of emotion into the rigidity of syllogisms.' And this same ambiguity often attaches to the language of those who do not hold this position. Thus the late Dr. Dale, in his book on the Atonement, first seeks to establish its fact and secondly its theory. In reality, however, the first part of his book contains more general, and the latter part more specific, statements of the doctrine or theory. Precisely the same ambiguity is seen in the article 'The Fact of the Atonement,' by R. Mackintosh (*Expos. Times*, May 1903), who speaks of the 'fact of Christ's death' and the 'fact of the Atonement' as equivalent terms, and again of the 'fact that Christ died for our sins,' which statement, of course, contains a doctrine.

But we must observe, finally, that it is not sufficient to show the necessity of an interpretation of the facts of Christianity. The question of an external authority in religious knowledge cannot be evaded by saying that the Bible contains no explanation of these great facts. Whatever may be said as to the authority of Scripture, it is evident that the Bible does contain an interpretation of the great facts of Christ's life. And whatever interpretation be put upon the language of Christ and His Apostles, it is plain that they had definite ideas as to who Christ was, why and how He came into this world, why He died, and what His death means. To take only a few instances, and those only in regard to one fact, viz. Christ's death, it is scarcely a matter for dispute that, when He speaks of giving His life 'a ransom in the place of many' (Mar 10:45, Mat 20:28), or of His blood as Covenant-blood 'shed for many unto the remission of sins' (Mat 26:28), He intended to convey a definite view as to the meaning of His death. * [Note: It is often asserted that the words first quoted show Pauline influence on the Evangelist. But the unwillingness to admit that Jesus uttered them rests on dogmatic grounds. There is no external evidence against them, and, as Denney has shown, they are perfectly in keeping with the context. So also Spitta's idea that the words Mat 26:28 have no reference to Christ's death, is admitted by him to be quite different from the view of the Evangelist (see Denney, *The Death of Christ*, pp. 38 and 40).] The same thing could be shown in regard to all our Lord's statements as to His Person and Work. The whole of the Pauline letters are occupied to a large extent with the interpretation of the facts of our Lord's Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection. It is not possible, then, to assert that the NT contains no interpretation of the facts which lie at the basis of Christianity.

We must therefore face the question of the authority of this interpretation. If we are unwilling to yield to its authority, and still insist upon the distinction between the facts as Divine and the theory as merely human, we shall be in the second position mentioned, that of those who recognize a supernatural revelation in a series of facts, but who reduce the whole doctrinal content of Christianity, as contained in the Bible, to human reflexion upon these facts (see Rothe, *Zur Dogmatik*, pp. 54-120; Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. des NT*⁷ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , § 1 c, also note 3 on p. 4. For other instances of this see Warfield, art. 'Revelation' in Johnson's *Encycl.* vol. vii. p. 79). But this position is not a logical one. For it is not the account which the Scripture writers give of their interpretation of the facts of Christianity. They claim a direct supernaturalism in the communication to them of truth. Hence, if by reason of an anti-supernaturalistic philosophy we reject this claim, and regard their interpretation of the facts as relative and conditioned by the conceptions of the time, we shall also be led logically to reject their statements as to the occurrence of supernatural facts. The consequence of this will be to regard the facts of Christianity, *i.e.* its whole historical basis, no less than the Scripture doctrine, as the mere 'husk' which contains the 'kernel' either of rational truth or of

Christian life; and thus Christianity will have been reduced to a mere religious philosophy or a mystical life. For, we are asked, can a history long past be the object of religious faith any more than a doctrine of a bygone age? Is not the whole of the historical and dogmatic element of the Scripture relative and temporally conditioned? Accordingly the logic of this position of recognizing a revelation only in fact, is to drive us to Rationalism or Mysticism. This is the result of abandoning the principle of external authority in religion. But rational truth and religious sentiment are not Christianity. If we are to have any Christian religion, we must have the great supernatural facts of Christianity and an authoritative interpretation of them. Whereas on this view revelation is only a product of the religious life of man.

Accordingly we are brought to a position opposite to that which we have been discussing, *i.e.* to the position which does not do justice to the facts of Christianity, subordinating them to a purely human theory. This tendency reduces Christianity to a philosophy of religion; the historical element being regarded as the 'husk' which contains the 'kernel' of eternal truths of reason.

This question of the importance of the historical element in Christianity was prominent in the 18th cent. (cf. Lipsius, 'Die Bedeutung des Historischen im Christentume' in his *Glauben u. Wissen*). The difficulty which was felt with historic facts was not, as more recently, that of attaining historic certitude. The clearest, most undisputed fact, it was held, could not support or be the content of religious belief. The objection was therefore a metaphysical, not a historical one. Hence all positive religions were regarded as but outward expressions of the pure religion of reason. This was the position of the Leihnitz-Wolffian philosophy (cf. Windelband, *Gesch. der Phil.* p. 30 ff.). Lessing also gave utterance to his famous saying that 'accidental historical truths' can never be the ground of 'eternal rational truths.' And he seemed to regard all of the historical element in Christianity as 'accidental,' for the ideal kernel of Christianity was just rational religious truth. In the same way Kant (*Die Relig. innerhalb d. Grenzen d. blossen Vernunft*) considered pure moral truth as the abiding kernel of all religions. Historical Christianity, he held, had clothed this with accretions which are symbolical representations of eternal truth. Fichte held practically the same position (see *Anweisung zum seligen Leben*) Thus by distinguishing between the 'kernel' and the 'husk,' and by finding the former in the truths of reason, the whole of Christianity was relegated to the category of husk. Christianity, accordingly, was reduced to a religious philosophy and destroyed, for it is not the product of human reflexion. An attempt at a more adequate view of history is seen in Schelling and Hegel, but with much the same result so far as historical Christianity is concerned, because of their adherence to the distinction between kernel and husk. History is regarded by them not as an 'outer' 'empirical' history, but as the history of God's life in the finite spirit. Thus the history of Christ is not important as the history of an individual, but in these symbols faith sees the eternal

course of the Divine life. Christ's death is simply a symbol of something which must be repeated in every man's inner life, and His bodily Resurrection a symbol of the return of the finite spirit to the Infinite. Thus historic Christianity is but one of the forms, albeit the highest, of bare natural religion, in this case construed upon a pantheizing basis.

In England, T. H. Green has given a Neo-Hegelian construction of Christianity which subordinates its facts and the Scripture interpretation of them to a philosophical theory (*Miscell. Wks.* 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] vol. iii. pp. 160-185, 230-276). God and man are identified. God is the ideal self of each man. Sin is self-assertion, and salvation consists in 'dying to live,' *i.e.* giving up this individualistic self-assertion. This is held to be the revelation of Christianity, but no value is attached to the historic Christ apart from the idea which He exemplified. This, it goes without saying, is Neo-Hegelianism and not Christianity. The claim, also, that faith which has a historic element in its content is therefore psychologically a 'historic faith' in the sense of a dead faith, is specious. Faith may have a historical element in its content without being changed as to its psychological character as trust in God. (For a critique of Green's religious philosophy see Kilpatrick in *The Thinker* for 1895; Rainy in the *Theol. Review* for 1899; Forrest, *The Christ of Hist. and of Experience*, Lect. 8).

From the standpoint of NT criticism, the art. by Schmiedel on 'The Resurrection and Ascension Narratives' in *Encyc. Bibl.* vol. iv. p. 4040 f., illustrates the same distinction between kernel and husk, and the giving up of the fact of the bodily Resurrection of Christ. Here an anti-supernaturalistic bias governs the whole discussion, though Schmiedel asserts that he does not presuppose the impossibility of a miracle.

The extreme result of this tendency to give up the authority of Scripture, and the consequent subordination of the facts of Christianity to a theory, is seen in an art. in the *Hibbert Journal*, Jan. 1905, entitled 'The Christ of Dogma and of Experience,' by W. A. Pickard-Cambridge. According to the author, the fundamental error in Scripture is its identification of Jesus Christ with the Spirit of God, communion with whom is the essence of religion. The Apostles were confronted with a personality of 'overwhelming attractiveness,' and so made this mistake. This, indeed, is Christianity without Christ. The author's Christ is a mere maot idealized by emotion.

In doing away with the historical element in Christianity, these thinkers have done away with Christianity itself. This is only to say that the great facts of Christ's life are a part of the essence of Christianity. The Christian religion is not a product of human ideas, but of a direct revelation of God to men, accompanying God's direct interference in the downward course of the world caused by sin, which is a historic

force. Thus, having abandoned all external authority, we lose the fact-basis as well as its Scripture interpretation, and are left with a philosophy of religion. But these so-called eternal truths are either purely human, in which case they cannot be eternally valid truth; or else man's thoughts about God must be held to be God's thoughts about Himself, in which case even natural religion vanishes in Pantheism. This type of religious philosophy may not admit the authority of the Scripture, but it should frankly admit that what it leaves us is not Christianity. It is, however, simply the logical result of the entire abandonment of the principle of external authority in religious knowledge.

When we turn from the philosophers to the 'liberal theology' represented by Biedermann, Lipsius, and Pfleiderer, we find that, notwithstanding the greater emphasis which they lay upon the historic Christ, their difference from the philosophers is not so much one of principle as of degree, *i.e.* of how much of Christianity they will retain as kernel and how much they will throw away as husk. This is determined largely by their philosophical standpoint. Hence in their case also there is a subjection of Christian fact and doctrine to an unauthoritative theory. That they do not differ so much in principle from the preceding philosophical solvent of Christianity can be seen from the following considerations. Wherever the principle of external authority is given up, we are sure to meet with the same distinction between kernel and husk in reference to Scripture fact and doctrine. And whenever this takes place, the Scripture idea of revelation has been changed, revelation being simply the product of religious thoughts and feelings in the mind of man. This makes it the product of natural development, and subjects it to the laws of psychic life. Accordingly we find that, while these theologians differ from the preceding construction of Christianity in laying greater emphasis upon Christ and in insisting that the essence of Christianity lies not in eternal truth so much as in Christ Himself (see esp. Lipsius, *op. cit.*), they nevertheless regard the Scripture facts as Scripturally interpreted, *i.e.* both fact and dogma, as but the 'sensuous representation' of rational religious truth.

Christ is probably of least significance in the theology of Biedermann, who held that Jesus is simply the first realization of the idea of Divine Sonship (*Dogmatik*, ii. § 815). Whereas Lipsius, though an opponent of the Ritschlian school, resembles it in the emphasis laid upon Christ. Thus in the essay already cited he says that the Christian religion is historical, and that the eternal good which it offers is bound up with the person of Christ. Christianity, he says, consists not in ideas which Christ illustrated, but in Christ Himself. But Lipsius distinguishes between kernel and husk, and between some facts and others. Thus he says that 'faith has to do not with single historical facts as such, but with their religious value,' and that 'there are facts about whose historicity there is little doubt, and which are of no importance for our religious life, and there are others about which there may be much doubt, and yet, as sensuous

representations of religious truths, they are of the greatest value.' Obviously, if facts about whose occurrence there is doubt are of such importance as 'sensuous representations' of religious truth, the really essential thing is the rational truth which they are supposed to represent. And this is actually the case with Lipsius' treatment of the great Christian facts. Thus the Cross is 'the symbol of the eternal truth that the old man in us must die, in order that man be born of God' (p. 138), though Lipsius does recognize in Christ's death more than a mere symbol (p. 139). At the same time the all-important thing is the idea symbolized. So also the Resurrection of Christ need not be true in its literal Scriptural form, but at the same time it symbolizes the truth of the entrance of Christ into the heavenly world. The 'form' in which we conceive it is expressly said to be of no importance. This is sufficient to show the complete subordination of Christian fact to philosophic theory in this movement. But not only are the great facts of Christianity put into the category of 'husk.' The dogmatic interpretation of them in the Scripture is also regarded as the external hull or symbol of rational truth. For, unlike the Ritschlian school, who hold that the Greek influence is largely later than the NT writings, the liberal theology carries this influence, and consequently the critical process of separating the kernel of truth from its husk, back into the NT. Thus Pfleiderer (*Glaubens- u. Sittenlehre*, p. 4) says that it is the business of Dogmatics to 'work over critically' the Scripture as well as the Church dogma in order to reach its abiding truth. The Scripture doctrine is said to contain a 'sensuous' element which is not rational and which must be rationalized.

It is evident that the principle of external authority in religious knowledge having been abandoned by this school also, the historic facts of Christianity as well as the Scripture interpretation are given up. Again, facts are subordinated to a human theory, and we have left a religious philosophy.

The subjection of the Scripture facts and doctrines to a subjective norm has taken also a more mystical form. This, indeed, is a natural consequence of the attempt to find a permanent basis for religious knowledge after the principle of external authority has been given up. For this kernel of rational truth seems to differ with each theologian, and does not afford that permanency which should characterize the essence of Christianity. These so-called eternal truths are temporally conditioned just as are the Scripture dogmas. To hold to them, therefore, is a species of dogmatism. Accordingly it is natural that a demand for a truly undogmatic Christianity should arise, seeking to be rid not only of Scripture doctrine, but also of the rational element into which it had been distilled.

This demand was made by Dreyer in his *Undogmatisches Christentum*, the first edition of which appeared in 1888. Coming from the camp of the liberals, Dreyer directed his polemic against 'liberalism' and 'orthodoxy' alike. The liberal theology fails to satisfy

the demands of the 'pious heart,' while orthodox dogma is in conflict with modern culture. We are therefore bidden to turn from dogma to the life of faith. Christianity is a life, not a series of facts or doctrines. Dogma is religious experience put into the form of concepts (p. 77). It is therefore put into a form of relative validity, and one that is continually changing. When these concepts are no longer valid, they no longer serve to express religious life, and must be rejected. The facts of Christianity fare no better at Dreyer's hands. He will not allow our idea of history to be governed by any dogmatic supernaturalism, and consequently, at the demand of an equally dogmatic anti-supernaturalism, he tells us the 'myth-forming process' is seen in the Gospel record of the life of Christ. Although something of external fact may remain, we can find no religious certitude in any historic fact, and are told to fall back on Christ's holy character, which is exalted above all the changes of theological science and historical criticism. This arouses life in us, and this life is the essence of Christianity, which is a life, not fact or doctrine.* [Note: In some respects Dreyer's position resembles that of the Ritschlians. Thus, e.g., Kaftan in his *Glaube u. Dogma* replied to Dreyer that instead of an undogmatic Christianity we need a 'new dogma' which grows out of Christian faith. Dreyer rejoined, in a later edition of his book, that he admitted a 'science of faith' (*Glaubenslehre*), and so did not differ from Kaftan. Kaftan again replied, saying that Dreyer held that this science of faith contained a symbolic element, and was only of relative validity. This seems to be the most essential point of difference between Dreyer and Kaftan, viz., the latter claims absolute validity for dogmatics as 'the science of faith,' while the former admits a relative element in this 'science of faith' which he refuses to call a dogma. Dreyer's view of the inner life of Christ, as independent of historical criticism, and as the source of Christian life, resembles that of Herrmann in his *Verkehr des Christen mit Gott*. But Dreyer is a mystic, while Herrmann is not. See also, Dreyer, *Zur undogm. Glaubensl.* [posthum.], 1901.] A somewhat similar position has been taken in France by A. Sabatier.† [Note: *Esquisse d'une Phil. de la Relig. d'après la Psych. et l'Histoire*, 1897 [also Eng. tr. 1897]. This book includes a lecture, 'The Vitality of Christian Dogmas,' published separately [also Eng. tr.]; also *Les Religions d'Autorité et la Religion de l'Esprit*, 1900 [also Eng. tr.].] His idea is that religion is life, not doctrine. External authority, whether of Scripture or the Church, kills religion. The essential thing in religion is life. But this life must express itself outwardly in institutions and symbols. Christian doctrines are but symbols of Christian life. They are higher than those of other religions because the life is higher. The essence of Christianity, therefore, is neither a series of facts nor a sum of dogmas, but a spiritual life.

We have not space to show the inconsistency of Dreyer's supposed escape from historical criticism, when he falls back on the inner life of Jesus as the ground of the life which constitutes the essence of Christianity; or to discuss the philosophy which

underlies Sabatier's books. We can only stop to indicate briefly that when we have separated Christianity from all external facts and have made its doctrinal content entirely the product of the religious life, we have done away with Christianity, because we have done away with all that distinguishes it from natural religion. Of course it is true that Christianity is a life hid with Christ in God. It is also true that Christian doctrine can never produce Christian life. St. Paul has taught us this. Man is dead in sin, and the revelation of Divine truth in the Bible will fail to produce spiritual apprehension or life; for 'the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit' (1Co 2:14). These great truths are emphasized in the Reformed Theology. But the type of thought we are discussing means that the essence of Christianity consists in a life which precedes and is independent of facts and doctrines, and that doctrine is the product of life. Thus to eliminate fact and doctrine from Christianity is to leave nothing but bare natural religious sentiment. And it is a mistake to suppose that Christianity is the product of the religious sentiment (see Warfield, *The Right of Syst. Theol.*). It is no more the product of this than it is of rational reflexion.

Furthermore, there is now left no basis for the affirmation that Christianity is the final religion, and its doctrine absolute truth. For we can never be sure that Christian life may not reach higher levels and embody itself in more elevated doctrinal symbols. Writers of this type might and do reply to this, that, even apart from fact and doctrine, the Christian life is not the bare religious sentiment, but the product of God's Spirit, and that it is therefore the true life, and its doctrinal product final truth. But when they affirm this, they abandon their position. For it cannot be proved that this life is the true life if the norm of truth be drawn from the life itself. We believe that Christian life is the true life because of a fact and a doctrine independent of this life, viz. that it proceeds from the regenerating activity of the Holy Spirit. But in affirming this we have asserted a great fact as well as a doctrine, each independent of, as well as at the basis of, Christian life. In short, if Christianity is separated from the great supernatural facts of Christ's life and from the great supernatural facts of the action of God's Spirit on men's hearts, as well as from its authoritative doctrinal content, then that which differentiates it from mere religious sentiment is gone. What, then, to sum up, is the attitude of this type of religious thinking to the question of 'fact and theory' in relation, especially, to Christ? This question may be answered by saying that the facts and doctrines of Christianity have been subordinated to a psychological theory that feeling and sensation precede and condition thought. And as a consequence, we are left with a human Christ whose portrait is the product of the religious sentiment.

At this point we are met with a reaction from the neglect of the historical element in Christianity, and also from the demand for an undogmatic Christianity. This has come from members of the Ritschlian school. Thus, e.g., Harnack (cf. his address, *Das Christentum u. die Geschichte*, 1896) and Herrmann (besides his *Verkehr* and *Begriff*

der Offenbarung, see esp. his *Warum bedarf unser Glaube geschichtlicher Thatsachen?* 1884) have attempted to defend the importance of the historical basis of Christianity against Lessing and Kant; and Kaftan (*Glaube u. Dogma*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1889) has written a reply to Dreyer, showing that the dogmatic element is essential to Christianity, and that what we need is a 'new dogma.' But this demand must be judged in the light of the motive, principles, and results of this theological movement. The fundamental motive of Ritschlianism is an apologetic one, viz., to find a ground of certitude in Christianity which shall be independent of the results of historical criticism and of metaphysics, and so to state the content of the Christian faith that it too shall be independent in both these respects. In order to accomplish this, it is common with theologians of this school to lay stress on the revelation of God in the 'historic Christ,' and to seek to find in Him the ground, as well as an essential element in the content, of the Christian faith. This ground of certitude and this dogmatic content are held to be independent of historical criticism and metaphysics, by means of their sharp distinction between religious and theoretic knowledge, the latter dealing with facts and their explanation, the former with religious values. In regard, then, to the historical element in Christianity or the Christian facts, this school emphasizes its importance as part of the essence of Christianity; but in order to maintain its independence of the results of historical criticism, falls back upon one fact, viz.—the so-called 'historic Christ.' It is not meant that Christianity is independent of the results of historical criticism in such a sense that, if there were no basis for their historic Christ in the Gospels, Christianity could still survive. Their idea is that the 'historic Christ' stands fast after historical criticism has done its work. But since this criticism is largely determined by an anti-supernaturalistic bias, it is evident that the historic Christ of the Ritschlians is not a Christ who is independent of historical criticism, but the Christ which a naturalistic criticism has left us. This shows that independence of the results of criticism is impossible, since Christianity is a historical religion. The supposed independence of its results turns out to be a surrender of all that is difficult to defend against a criticism which is determined by naturalism. Accordingly Harnack says (*Das Christentum u. die Geschichte*) that 'the tradition as to the incidents attending the birth and early life of Jesus Christ has been shattered.' This makes necessary the old rationalistic distinction between 'kernel' and 'husk,' and so in his lectures on the *Essence of Christianity* we are told that we must distinguish between the Easter message of the empty tomb, which is not essential to Christianity, and the Easter faith that Jesus gained a victory over death and still lives. Of course, if we follow this method, not only will all the external supernatural events of Christ's life have to be surrendered, but also those elements in His inner life which involve the supernatural must go. And so we find Herrmann in the *Verkehr* falling back upon the inner life of Jesus reduced to a merely ethical content.* [Note: It is true that both Herrmann and Reischle ('Der Streit über die Begründung des Glaubens

auf dem gesch. Christus,' Zeitsch. f. Theol. u Kirche, 1897) make a sharp distinction between the 'ground' and the 'content' of faith; and what they seek is an independent ground of faith. But it is also true that the ground of faith once determined becomes in their hands a norm for distinguishing between kernel and husk in its 'content.' Accordingly their idea of the 'content' of faith is one that fits in with their idea of its ground. Kahler (*Der sogenannte historische Jesus u. d. gesch., biblische Christus*², 1896) has criticised this distinction between the ground and the content of faith. But it is more important to note that the idea which these writers have of Christ as the ground of faith determines absolutely its content by acting as a principle by which to distinguish the abiding content of faith from its historical form, and thus makes room for endless subjectivity.]

Thus the Ritschlian attempt at independence of historical criticism results really in a surrender to a criticism determined by naturalism. The virgin-birth and the bodily resurrection of Christ are given up, and we have no longer the Christ of the Gospels, but the Christ of a Gospel reconstructed by the critics. It is the subordination of Christian facts to a human theory.

When we turn to the demand for a 'new dogma,' which we saw was emphasized by Kaftan (*Glaube u. Dogma*), we find the other principle of the school at work, viz.—the separation of theology from metaphysics, and the distinction between religious and theoretic knowledge. The watchword 'theology without metaphysics,' however, does not mean simply theology which shall be free from a speculative reconstruction as in the Hegelian school. It means a theology without any metaphysical elements, *i.e.* with nothing that transcends experience. Hence we must not only distinguish the 'historical Christ' from the Christ of an uncritical tradition; we must also distinguish Him from the Christ of a metaphysical dogma of Greek origin. Accordingly the doctrines of the Trinity and of the two natures in one person in our Lord are to be abandoned as metaphysical. The new dogma expresses itself in religious knowledge which springs from faith, and not in metaphysical propositions. Christ, therefore, is not Divine in a metaphysical sense as in the doctrine of the two natures, but simply in the religious sense that in the man Jesus we have the perfect revelation of God, or else that the term 'Divinity' expresses His value for the believer. This latter is Ritschl's position, and members of the school who have taken a more positive attitude than Ritschl have fallen short of asserting Christ's Divinity in any metaphysical sense (cf. Kaftan, *Dogmatik*; Lobstein, *Lehre v. d. ubernat. Geburt Christi*. Harnack, *op. cit.*, and H. Schultz, *Lehre v. d. Gottheit Christi*, occupy much the same position as Ritschl).

We must conclude that in the Ritschlian theology we have again the subordination of the great Christian facts and dogmas to a phenomenalist philosophy and a historical criticism subject to a naturalistic bias. This amounts to their subjection to a human

theory. For the fundamental question is—Upon what does this theology rest? Has it a more objective basis than rationalism and mysticism? It seeks to base revelation on Christ. The source of its dogma is not the individual Christian consciousness but the Christian life, or the revelation of God portrayed in the Bible. But its Christ is a human Christ who can give no absolute revelation of God; and the Scripture is not regarded as authoritative in any objective sense as containing a supernatural revelation, but simply as the record of the revelation by the human Christ. The Scripture is subjected to the Christian consciousness to such an extent that the Christian doctrines are not to be taken directly from Scripture as ‘external revelations,’ but only as ‘appropriated and ‘authenticated’ by Christian faith (cf. Kaftan, *Dogmatik*, § on the Scripture, p. 48). Thus the idea of revelation has changed its biblical sense of a supernatural communication of truth, and becomes the product of the religious life of those who stood nearest Christ. But the Christian life does not remove the noetic effects of sin all at once, and consequently this idea of special revelation does not meet the demand which made a special revelation necessary. In short, if we abandon the principle of external authority, we cannot escape the subjection of the facts and doctrines of Christianity to a philosophical theory.

The logical results of the abandonment of an external authority in religious knowledge have been recently exhibited in the new theological school which follows the method of Comparative Religion. For if Christ is only human, and the Christian revelation not supernatural, it will be impossible to maintain the absoluteness of Christianity as the Ritschlians sought to do. It will be impossible to maintain that Christianity consists in Christ and not merely in a principle of which He is the illustration. We thus have the distinction between the ‘Christian principle’ and the person of Christ. It is the distinction of the old rationalism, only now in quite a different form, since this school insists that principles can never be separated from their historical embodiment. Therefore the distinction between the ‘kernel’ and the ‘husk’ must be given up, since the kernel is always inseparable from its historical manifestation. All history is relative, yet not at all unimportant, for we cannot have religious truth except in a historically conditioned form. Thus, while a greater significance attaches to Christ than in the old rationalism, the great facts and the dogmatic content of Christianity have only a relative value, and are frankly given up at the demands of an avowedly naturalistic philosophy. This can be seen in Troeltsch, the dogmatician of the school (cf. his art. ‘Geschichte u. Metaphysik’ in *Zeitschr. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1898, pp. 55-67. Cf. also *Die Absolutheit des Christentums u. die Religionsgeschichte*, 1902). Troeltsch admits the significance of personality in the religious sphere, and that Christ is the source of our communion with God; but in view of the power of development in Christianity, he holds that it is not possible to limit God’s revelation to one person at the beginning of Christian history. Therefore the first form of Christianity, as connected with Jesus, is to be regarded along with later forms simply as illustrations of the Christian principle. Thus we have again the entire subordination

of the facts and doctrines of Christianity to the theory of the naturalistic evolution of religious ideas.

We conclude, then, that Christianity consists in a series of supernatural facts together with their meaning; that their true meaning is their meaning for God, and that therefore He must tell it to us; that the noetic effects of sin make it necessary that this be in a special and supernatural manner. The abandonment of the authority of Scripture for the interpretation of the facts leads logically to the abandonment of the facts themselves, *i.e.* to their subordination to a theory which distinguishes their accidental Scriptural form from their abiding philosophical content. The Ritschlian endeavour to stem the tide of this logic is unsuccessful, and the newest development in theology has cast aside the Ritschlian claim as to the absoluteness of Christianity and the Divinity of Christ, and has subjected Scripture fact and doctrine to an avowedly naturalistic philosophy. If, therefore, we are not to lose the supernatural facts and their authoritative interpretation, *i.e.* if we are not to lose Christianity, we must abide by the Scripture as an external authority.

Literature.—R. W. Dale, *The Atonement*, Introd. Lect.; *Faith and Criticism*, Essay on the Atonement by Horton; *The Atonement in Modern Religious Thought*, Essays by Campbell, Farrar, Adeney, Horton; Forrest, *The Christ of History and of Experience*, Lect. viii.; H. Bois, *Le Dogme Grec*; Warfield, *The Right of Systematic Theology*; Denney, *The Death of Christ*, Introd.; Griffin, 'Facts, Doctrines, and ideals' in *Pres. and Ref. Rev.*, July 1901; R. A. Lipsius, 'Die Bedeutung des Historischen im Christentume,' pub. in *Glauben u. Wissen*. p. 111; A. Sahatier, *The Vitality of Christian Dogmas and their Power of Evolution*, cf. also Part 3 of his *Outlines of the Phil.* [Note: Philistine.] *of Relig.*; Dreyer, *Undogmatisches Christentum*; Harnack, *Das Christentum u. die Geschichte*; Herrmann, *Warum bedarf unser Glaube geschichtlicher Thatsachen?*; Kaftan, *Glaube u. Dogma*; Kirn, *Glaube u. Geschichte*; Kahler, *Der sogenannte historische Jesus u. der gesch. biblische Christus*; Troeltsch, 'Geschichte u. Metaphysik' in *Zeitschr. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1898, esp. pp. 55-67; E. Cremer, 'Der Glaube u. die Thatsachen' in *Greifswalder Stud.* p. 261; Munchmeyer, 'Die Bedeutung d. gesch. Thatsachen f. den Glauben' in *Neue kirchl. Zeitschr.* 1895, p. 349; Seeberg, 'Brauchen wir ein neues Dogma?' *ib.* 1891; W. A. Pickard-Cambridge, 'The Christ of Dogma and the Christ of Experience' in *Hibbert Journal*, Jan. 1905; 'Romanus,' art. 'The Historical Jesus and the Christ of Experience,' *ib.* Apr. 1905; Schanz, 'Geschichte u. Dogma' in *Theol. Quartalschr.*, 1 Quartalheft 1905.

Compare also—Kant, *Die Relig. innerhalb d. Grenzen d. blossen Vernunft*; Fichte, *Anweis. zum seligen Leben*; Hegel, *Lectt. on Phil.* [Note: Philistine.] *of Relig.*; T. H. Green, *Miscell. Works*, iii. pp. 160-185, 230-276; Pfeleiderer, *Glaubens- u. Sittenlehre*, §§ on Christ: Biedermann, *Chr. Dogmatik*, ii. § 815; A. Sabatier, *Esquisse d'une Phil.*

[Note: Philistine.] *de la Relig.* etc., also *Les Religions d'Autorité et la Relig. de l'Esprit*; Harnack, *Wesen des Christentums*, Lectt. i.-iii.; Herrmann, *Verkehr des Christen mit Gott.*, also *Der Begriff d. Offenbarung*; Kaftan, *Das Wesen d. Chr. Relig.*, Absch. 2, Kap. 3; Reischle, 'Der Streit über die Begründung des Glaubens auf dem gesch. Christus' in *Zeitsch. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1897; Troeltsch, *Die Absolutheit des Christentums u. die Religionsgesch.*

C. W. Hodge.

☞ Faith

FAITH (Heb. אֱמוּנָה, Gr. πίστις).—

1. Introductory.
2. The idea of 'faith' in the OT.
3. Later Jewish idea of 'faith.'
4. 'Faith' in the Gospels: (1) in the Synoptics; (2) in the Fourth Gospel.
5. Some characteristics of the Johannine conception of 'faith.'
6. The Johannine and Pauline conceptions of 'faith' contrasted.
7. The place of 'faith' in the teaching of Jesus.

Literature.

1. *Introductory.*—In the NT the term 'faith' has two main meanings, which may be distinguished as active and passive senses, viz.: (1) *belief*, 'the frame of mind which relies on another,' and (2) *fidelity*, 'the frame of mind which can be relied on.' Of these the former is the predominant use, and is marked by a rich, copious, and distinctively Christian development.

The two senses—the active and passive—both logically and grammatically pass by an easy transition from one to the other, and are not always clearly distinguishable, or are actually combined (as, e.g., in οἱ πιστοί, 'the faithful,' applied to the Christian fellowship). In the OT the *quasi*-active sense of 'trust,' with the meaning 'exhibit

faithfulness or confidence,’ is expressed by the Hiphil **הֶאֱמִין** (constr. with **בְּ** = ‘to believe in reliance on in,’ followed by the object or ground of the belief; with **לְ** in a weaker sense, ‘to believe,’ the object here denoted by **לְ** being not so much that in which the confidence is reposed, as that on the (attesting) strength of which it is reposed in the absolute object). No noun-derivative from the Hiphil occurs in the OT (denoting ‘faith’ as an active principle). The substantive **אֱמוּנָה** ‘firmness,’ ‘steadfastness,’ ‘fidelity’ (notice the passive form) is the nearest equivalent for ‘faith’; but it always occurs with the passive sense, with the possible exception of **Hab_2:4** (‘the just shall live his faith’).* [Note: Targ., however, **יִחְקִימוּן קִישְׁמֵהוּן עַל**. Perhaps, as Lightfoot (, p. 148) suggests, the ‘transitional or double sense’ should be recognized in the passage.] In this passage the active principle of trust in God seems to be contrasted sharply with arrogant self-sufficiency.

The Gr. **πίστις** (**πιστεύω**), seems to have followed the reverse order of development (from active to passive). Here the predominant meaning is active ‘faith,’ ‘trust,’ ‘belief’ (in Classical usage, however, with the slightest possible association with religious ideas). The LXX Septuagint use of the word (**πίστις** = **אֱמוּנָה** usually; sometimes **אֱמָן** and **אֱמוּנָה**) probably reacted upon the Hebrew, and on this supposition it is possible to explain the active sense which is certainly present in Rabbinical Hebrew, and which may be seen in the late Hebrew of Sirach (e.g. **Sir_46:15**).† [Note: **ἐν πίστει αὐτοῦ ἠγαυβάσθη προφήτης**; Heb. **הוּהוּ שְׁנִרְרָ אֱמוּנָתוֹ בְּ** (Strack).] In the Aramaic of the Targums the active sense is fixed in a substantive derived from the Aphel, **הִיִּמְנָהּ** (used in **Gen_15:6** of Abraham’s *faith*). Cf. the Syriac equivalent of **πίστις** in the NT **ܦܝܣܬܐ**

2. The idea of faith in the OT.—Faith as an active religious principle is relatively far less prominent in the OT than in the NT. The solitary instance in which the active meaning certainly emerges in the Heb. substantive **אֱמוּנָה** has already been referred to. But even the verb (**הֶאֱמִין**) is by no means common with a religious connotation. Trust or confidence in God and the unseen are, of course, essential to spiritual religion, and receive manifold expression, especially in the Psalms (note the use in this connexion of **לְ־בָמָה (עַל, בְּ)** with God as object). But, as Lightfoot‡ [Note: cit. p. 151] has remarked, ‘it is indeed a characteristic token of the difference between the two covenants, that under the Law the “*fear of the Lord*” holds very much the same place

as “*faith* in God,” “*faith* in Christ,” under the Gospel. *Awe* is the prominent idea in the earlier dispensation, *trust* in the later.’

The object of ‘faith,’ as expressed (with a religious connotation) by the verb (אָמַן) in the OT, is sometimes the words or commandments of God, or a particular word or work of God, or the Divine revelation, or the Divine messengers the prophets, or God Himself in His own Person. Of this last usage the examples are the most important (Gen 15:8, Exo 14:31, Num 14:11; Num 20:12, Deu 1:32, 2Ki 17:14, 2Ch 20:20, Psa 78:22, Jon 3:5).§ [Note: Add to these the cases where it is construed absolutely: Exo 4:31, Isa 7:9; Isa 28:16, Psa 116:10; and Cf. Psa 27:13.] Here the verb is construed with אָ. The classical instance is, of course, Abraham’s faith (Gen 15:6), which, with a true instinct, has been recognized, both by Jewish and Christian religious exegesis, as the supreme example of faith in its active exercise as a religious principle.

3. Later Jewish idea of ‘faith.’—In early Rabbinical and other Jewish literature the term for ‘faith,’ besides its Biblical meaning of ‘faithfulness,’ also denotes active trust in God. This as a religious principle is emphatically praised by the Rabbis, and regarded by them as highly meritorious. The classical example is, as has already been stated, the faith of Abraham (Gen 15:6), which became one of the commonplaces of theological discussion not only in Rabbinical circles but also in the Hellenistic school of Alexandria,* [Note: In Philo the career of Abraham is made the subject of elaborate and frequent comment and allegory. Lightfoot (op. cit.) remarks: ‘If we look only to the individual man, faith with Philo is substantially the same as faith with St. Paul. The lessons drawn from the history of Abraham by the Alexandrian Jew and the Christian Apostle differ very slightly.’] while its occurrence in the NT is, of course, a familiar fact. The most instructive example in Rabbinical literature is to be found in the early Midrashic work the *Mekhilta* (on Exo 14:30).† [Note: The original can be seen in Weiss’ ed. of the *Mekhilta*, 25b, 26. The *Mekhilta* is a halakhic midrash on part of Exodus, dating in its present form from the first part of the second Christian century, but containing much earlier material. It is invaluable for illustrating early Jewish ideas and religious thoughts of the Apostolic age.] The passage runs as follows:

‘The people feared the Lord. So long as they were in Egypt they did not fear God, but now: the people feared the Lord, and they believed in the Lord and His servant Moses. If they believed in Moses, much more did they believe in the Lord. From this thou mayest learn that whoever believes in the faithful Shepherd is (regarded) as if he believed in the word of Him who spake and the world was.... Great is faith whereby Israel believed in Him who spake and the world was; for because Israel believed in the

Lord, the Holy Spirit abode upon them, and they sang the song: for immediately after the words: *they believed in the Lord and in Moses His servant*, follow the words (Exo_15:1): *Then sang Moses and the children of Israel this song to the Lord*. In like manner thou findest that Abraham our Father inherited this world and the world to come only by the merit of faith (אֱמִנָה) whereby he believed in the Lord, as it is said (Gen_15:6). he believed in the Lord, and He counted it to him for righteousness ... R. Nehemiah says: Whoever receives unto himself one precept (of the Law) in true faith (בְּאֱמִנָה) is worthy for the Holy Spirit to abide upon him; for so we find in the case of our fathers that because they believed in the Lord they were deemed worthy that the Holy Spirit should abide upon them, and they uttered the song. For it is said: believed in God and in Moses His servant; and (immediately afterwards) it is said: sang Moses and the children of Israel, etc. And so thou findest in the case of Abraham that he inherited this world and the world to come solely by merit of faith (אֱמִנָה בְּיָכוֹת), whereby he believed in the Lord, as it is said (Gen_15:6): believed, etc. And in the same way we find in the case of Moses, David, and Deborah that they (by reason of faith) sang a song, and the Holy Spirit abode upon them. And in like manner thou findest that solely by merit of faith was Israel redeemed from Egypt, as it is said: the people believed, etc. And so it is said (Psa_31:23): Lord preserveth the faithful, making mention of the faith of the fathers.... Of the righteous it is said (Isa_26:2): ye the gates that the righteous nation, which keepeth the faith, may enter in. Into this gate all the faithful (אֱמוּנָה בְּצִלִי) enter. David sings (Psa_92:1): is a good thing to give thanks unto the Lord, and to sing praises unto Thy name, O Most High: to show forth Thy loving-kindness in the morning and Thy faithfulness in the nights, with an instrument of ten strings and with the psaltery, with a solemn sound upon the harp. For Thou, O Lord, hast made me glad through Thy works, and in the operation of Thy hand will I exult. What is the cause of his joy here? It is the reward of faith which our fathers showed in this world, wherewith they trusted by day and night. For thus is it said: show forth thy loving-kindness in the morning and thy faithfulness in the nights. And in like manner is it said of Jehoshaphat (2Ch_20:20): they rose early in the morning and went forth into the wilderness of Tekoa; and when they went forth Jehoshaphat stood up and said: Hear ye me, O Judah, and ye inhabitants of Jerusalem! Have faith in the Lord your God, and so shall ye be established; and have faith in His prophets, and so shall ye prosper. And (so) it is written (Jer_5:3): Lord, do not Thine eyes look upon faith? And (Hab_2:4): righteous liveth of his faith. Also (Lam_3:23): are new every morning, Thy faithfulness is great. Also thou findest that the (Divine) intercourse is only accorded as the reward of faith, as it is said (Son_4:8): with me from Lebanon, my bride (' = Spirit), with me; of faith Shalt Thou be the familiar companion altogether (lit. 'the head'). † [Note: So the words of the original (הָאֵמֶן מִרְאֵשׁ תְּשׁוּרֵי) are under stood here. 'Bride' (כַּלְהָ) is a mystical designation of the

Holy Spirit or Shekinah,] In like manner it is said (Hos 2:19-20): *I will betroth thee unto me for ever; yea, I will betroth thee unto me with faith* (בְּאֱמוּנָה). Great is faith before God, for on account of faith it is that the Holy Spirit abides (upon Israel),’ etc.

In the early Rabbinical literature ‘faith’ wavers in meaning between ‘belief’ and ‘fidelity (to the Law).’ The former is prominent in the *Apocalypse of Baruch* (1st cent. a.d.) But the latter is characteristic of the later period, ‘faith’ and ‘works’ being co-ordinated or combined.* [Note: Charles’ note on Apoc. Bar. liv. 21: ‘Faith in the Talmud is in one of its aspects regarded as a work which, as the fulfilment of the Law, produces merit.’] ‘Faith’ (אֱמוּנָה) in the sense of fixed dogmatic belief is quite late in Hebrew literature (mediaeval times).

In Rabbinical Hebrew, besides the nouns אֱמוּנָה אֱמוּנָה, a Hipbil-substantival form הָאֱמוּנָה (= Aram. הַיְמוּנוּתָא) occurs (*Tosefta Baba Bathra* v. 8). For the Gospel-expression ὀλιγόπιστοι a Heb. parallel occurs in *Mekhilta* (on Exo 15:1) מְחוֹסְרֵי אֱמוּנָה ‘those lacking faith.’ So in the Pal. Targ. (on Num 11:32) הַיְמוּנוּתָא מְחוֹסְרֵי (‘Then rose up those who had lacked faith and gathered the quails,’ etc.); and *Gen. Rab.* § 32, אֱמוּנָה קְמִי ‘men of little faith’ (an exact parallel). In the Mishna, *Sota* ix. 12, the decline of the world is ascribed to the disappearance of ‘men of faith’ (אֱמוּנָה אֲשֶׁרִי).

4. ‘Faith’ in the Gospels.—The terms for ‘faith’ and ‘believe’ in contrast with those of the OT are characteristic of the whole NT language, and occur almost entirely with a directly religious connotation. In Philo the religious content of the terms had decidedly been heightened, but suffered from a certain vagueness in the conception of the object of faith, due to his transcendental philosophy. Faith, in Philo’s conception, rests rather upon the abstract Divinity than upon the personal God of grace and salvation, and is rather the fruit and crown of righteousness than its antecedent. In the NT it is all-important to distinguish the different connotations of the terms according as the object is (a) God; (b) the promises of God; (c) Christ; (d) some particular utterance, claim, or promise of God or Christ. ‘The last of these senses is the one most common in the Synoptic Gospels.’† [Note: Sanday-Headlam, *Romans*, p. 31 f. The passive sense of *τίσις* (‘faithfulness,’ ‘fidelity’) is very rare in the NT. The only instance in the Gospels seems to be Mat 23:23 (‘the weightier matters of the Law, judgment and mercy and faithfulness’ [*καὶ τὴν τίσιν*]).]

(1) *In the Synoptics.*—In its active sense of ‘faith,’ πίστις usually means here belief or trust in God or God’s power as manifested in Christ (the so-called ‘miracle-faith’).[‡] [Note: Nowhere in the NT is it used of man’s faith in man.] The response of faith conditions the granting of relief to those in bodily distress (Mar 5:34 ||, Mar 10:52 ||), the effect being proportionate to the degree of faith exercised (Mat 9:29 ‘According to your faith [κατὰ τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν] be it done unto you’; cf. Mat 15:28, Luk 7:9; Luk 7:50; and for degrees of faith see Mat 8:10 ||, Luk 17:5 etc.). In this connexion Mat 13:58 is instructive. We are told that ‘He did not many mighty works there [‘in his own country,’ Nazareth] because of their unbelief’ (‘lack of faith,’ ἀπιστία); cf. Mar 6:6. The term ‘faith’ is also applied to the *confidence of the disciple that the power conferred upon him will be effective* (in the performance of miraculous works), Mar 11:22-24, defined by Christ as ‘faith in God’ (Mar 11:22). Possibly, however, this passage (as has been suggested by Menzies[§] [Note: The Earliest Gospel, p. 211.]) is intended simply to bring home to the disciples the power of faith in accomplishing the seemingly impossible. ‘Jesus summons those who look to Him to have faith in God when they are in great danger, or when they are seeking with all their heart some boon which outward appearances declare to be all but hopeless’; the special and (apparently insurmountable) difficulty here being the insensibility of the Jewish people as a whole to the message of the gospel (symbolized by the withered fig-tree). Cf. the words of Christ to Jairus (Mar 5:36 ‘Fear not, only believe’), to the father of the epileptic (Mar 9:23 ‘If it be possible! All things are possible to him that believeth’), to the disciples in the storm (Mar 4:40 ‘Why are ye fearful? Have ye not faith?’).

The words about the power to remove mountains (Mar 11:23 f. || Mat 21:21 f.) occur also in a different connexion in Mat 17:20 (and in the rebuke administered to the disciples for their ‘lack of faith’ in dealing with the epileptic—a case of special difficulty). They have a proverbial ring, * [Note: For the possible interpretation of the words יראה יהוה בהר (Gen 22:14) as a proverb = ‘In the mountain (.e. when perplexity is at its height) Jahweh will provide,’ see C. J. Ball in note, loc. Cf. Zec 4:7.] and may easily have been used by our Lord more than once (cf. Luk 17:6 ‘If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye would say to this sycamine tree, Be thou rooted up,’ etc.).

In one instance ‘faith’ is used in the Synoptic Gospels in a way that suggests the technical sense so frequent in the Epistles, viz. Luk 18:8 (‘When the Son of man comes, shall he find faith on the earth?’) Here ‘faith’ = faith in Himself as Messiah and Redeemer.

In the Acts and Epp. πίστις, used absolutely, constantly occurs in a soteriological sense = ‘saving faith.’ It rapidly became a Christian technical term, and practically stood as a synonym for Christianity, marking out the new religion as essentially characterized by faith or belief in Jesus as Redeemer. ‘Believers’ becomes the designation of Christians; ‘to believe’ = to become a Christian. As contrasted with this usage, the term in the Synoptics is, to some extent, undeveloped in meaning. Yet how near the soteriological lies to the ‘miracle-faith’ comes out clearly in such a passage as Act 3:16 (the healing of the lame man at the Gate Beautiful) ‘By faith in his name hath his name made this man strong, whom ye behold and know; yea, the faith that is through him hath given him this perfect soundness in the presence of you all’; here ‘faith in the Name’ (of Jesus) is described as ‘faith brought into being by Him’ (ἡ πίστις ἣ δι’ αὐτοῦ),[†] [Note: also Act 14:9.] and the same conclusion results from a comparison of the language of Mat 9:2, Mar 2:5, Luk 5:20 (‘Thy sins are forgiven thee’), as well as from the language of Luk 7:50, Mat 9:22, Mar 5:24.[‡] [Note: also the use of πιστεύειν for saving faith in Christ, in Mar 9:42; Mar 15:32.]

(2) *In the Fourth Gospel* the absence of the substantive (πίστις)—which does not occur at all—is made up for by the frequent use of the verb (πιστεύειν).

πιστεύειν rarely occurs in the NT in the weakened sense ‘to credit,’ ‘give credence to’; only once apparently of a non-religious act (Mat 24:23; Mat 24:26, Mar 13:21—in the warning about false Christs, ‘believe it not’); elsewhere of assent given to some definite act, event, or fact in the religious sphere: of believing prayer (Mat 21:22 ‘Whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing ye shall receive’); of belief in the fact of the resurrection of Christ (Joh 20:8; Joh 20:25; Joh 20:29 bis); in God’s word of promise (Luk 1:45; cf. Act 26:27), in the declarations of Jesus whether regarding earthly or heavenly things (Joh 3:12; Joh 1:50, Luk 22:67); of faith generally in the word of salvation (Luk 8:12 ‘that they may not believe and be saved,’ cf. Joh 1:7).

The usual sense of the verb in the Fourth Gospel is a soteriological one. It expresses saving faith directed to the Person of Christ. In some instances, it is true, the immediate object of the faith is the wonder-working power of Jesus (the ‘miracle-faith’): Joh 4:48 (‘Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will in no wise believe’), Joh 11:40.[§] [Note: Mat 8:13, Mar 5:36; Mar 9:23-24, Luk 8:50.] But here also the same remark applies as to the similar cases in the Synoptics, that the soteriological meaning lies very close to, and is sometimes almost indistinguishable from, the other (cf. Joh 4:48 with Joh 4:53 and Joh 9:38, and Joh 11:40 with Joh 11:15 and Joh 12:39). In the following instances, however, the direct

soteriological significance is clear and unmistakable: Joh 3:15; Joh 3:18, Joh 4:41-42; Joh 4:53, Joh 5:44, Joh 6:36; Joh 6:47; Joh 6:64, Joh 9:38, Joh 10:25-26, Joh 11:15, Joh 12:39, Joh 14:29, Joh 16:31, Joh 19:35, Joh 20:31. Of these passages the two last are particularly instructive: ‘That ye may believe’ (Joh 19:35), and ‘These are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name’ (Joh 20:31). Here faith occupies a fundamental place. Its essential object is defined to be the belief that Jesus is ‘the Christ, the Son of God.’

Once again the conclusion is reinforced that the undefined ‘to believe’ is practically a synonym for ‘to be a Christian.’ Indeed, it may be inferred from the NT usage generally of πιστεύειν that before the disciples were called ‘Christians’ (Act 11:26), they were designated ‘believers’* [Note: οἱ πιστεύσαντες; (= those who had turned to Christ in trustful reliance) is perhaps used as a subst. in such passages as Act 2:44; Act 4:32, 2Th 1:10, Heb 4:3.] (οἱ πιστεύοντες is used as a participle in Mar 9:42, but as a subst. perhaps in Act 5:14 b ‘And believers were the more added to the Lord’). Sometimes οἱ πιστοὶ is used in an equivalent sense (e.g. Act 10:45; 1Pe 1:21, Rev 17:14; cf. the use of πιστός in Joh 1:27), and ἀπιστοὶ occurs in the opposite sense of ‘unbelievers’ (e.g. 2Co 4:6; 2Co 6:14 f.; cf. Joh 20:27, Mat 17:17, Mar 9:19, Luk 9:41). Cf. the cognate use of ἀπιστία, ‘unbelief’ (Mar 9:24; Mar 16:14, Mat 13:58, Mar 6:6; also in the Epp.); ἀπιστέω, ‘disbelieve’ (Mar 16:11; Mar 16:16, Luk 24:11; Luk 24:41, Act 28:24; 1Pe 2:7); and ὀλιγόπιστος, || ‘of little faith’ (Mat 6:30; Mat 8:26; Mat 14:31; Mat 16:8, Luk 12:28); ὀλιγοπιστία, ‘little faith,’ occurs Mat 17:20.

5. Some characteristics of the Johannine conception of ‘faith.’—The fundamental conception of ‘faith’ in the Fourth Gospel coincides with that of the other NT writers; it consists essentially in trustful self-committal to Christ and His salvation. Only it is concerned less than in the Synoptics with the appropriation of directly physical relief; it moves rather in the sphere of spiritual and eternal facts, and directs itself more exclusively to the Person of Christ. Trust in God and in Christ are equated (Joh 14:1); faith characterizes those who recognize His Divine mission (cf. also Joh 16:30), and they are described as those ‘who believe in his name.’ The result of faith is an acknowledgment of Christ’s unity with the Father (Joh 10:38, Joh 14:10).

Faith (πιστεύειν) and knowledge (γινώσκειν) are interchangeable ideas in the Fourth Gospel (cf. Joh 6:69, Joh 10:38, Joh 17:8), or rather they express the same truth

looked at from different sides. ‘To know’ (γινώσκειν) in the Johannine language expresses the perception of eternal truth; ‘to believe,’ its temporal discovery and appropriation. The former is therefore the fruit of the latter (cf. esp. Joh 10:38 ‘believe ... that ye may know’). The intellectual element is thus the product of a moral act, and is conditioned by it. Faith is not the result of logical operations, but is due to the Divine working (Joh 6:44 ‘No man can come to me, except the Father which sent me draw him’). Where faith is not attained, this is due to the distraction exercised by lower and earthly ambitions or ideals (‘glory one of another,’ Joh 5:44), or the deliberate choice of darkness rather than light (Joh 3:19, cf. v. 21). Trust is also shown to be characteristic of a real faith, which does not need ‘signs,’ and has risen above the necessities of ‘sight’ (Joh 20:29). The boon which faith appropriates is eternal life (Joh 5:24).

There is evident in the treatment of faith characteristic of the Fourth Gospel a spirit of protest against the false and exaggerated views of knowledge that were beginning to affect the Church. The subtle and pervasive danger of Gnosticism, with its dangerous glorification of a merely intellectual knowledge, and its contempt for simple faith, had to be met. This was effected in the Fourth Gospel, ‘on the one hand by deepening the idea of knowledge to the knowledge of experience’ (which is the fruit of simple faith), ‘and on the other by insisting upon the immediate entrance of every believer into the possession of salvation.’† [Note: B. Warfield in Hastings’ DB i. 836 (art. ‘Faith’).] The writer of the Fourth Gospel ‘would indeed have believers know what they believe, and who He is in whom they put their trust, and what He has done for them, and is doing, and will do in and through them; but this is not that they may know these things simply as intellectual propositions, but that they may rest on them in faith, and know them in personal experience.‡ [Note: Warfield, *ib.*] Nothing is more characteristic of the Johannine conception than the insistence on the *present* experience and participation in eternal life of believers. ‘He that believeth *hath* eternal life’ (Joh 3:36, Joh 5:24, Joh 6:47; Joh 6:54; cf. 1Jn 3:14-15; 1Jn 5:11-13). The inheritance of the true Christian was not merely a future boon,—though the future had in store for him a greater glory than that of the present,—but the simple believer, by the mere act of faith, was already placed on a plane of life to which no knowledge could attain.’

It is worth noting in this connexion that ἀλήθεια (which like πιστις is employed in the LXX Septuagint to translate תּוּמָא) seems to be used in the Fourth Gospel in the sense of *faithfulness, rightness, rectitude*, rather than with the meaning of intellectual truth. In Joh 1:14; Joh 1:16 χάρις και ἀληθεια = תּוּמָא תּוּמָא or תּוּמָא תּוּמָא, and by ἀληθεια α is to be understood ‘faithfulness corresponding to certain obligatory relations or to

certain promises' (Wendt* [Note: Teaching of Jesus, i. p. 259 (Eng. tr.). God's faithfulness to His promises, as shown esp. in blessing His people, is an attribute constantly insisted on in the OT.]). Cf. also the phrase *τοιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν* = 'to do the right,' *i.e.* to act conscientiously; also Joh 8:32; Joh 8:40; Joh 8:45-46, Joh 17:17; Joh 17:19, and possibly also in Joh 14:6; Joh 14:17, Joh 15:26, Joh 16:13, Joh 18:37 f.—in all which passages the connotation seems to be a *moral* one ('faithfulness,' 'rectitude') rather than a purely intellectual one ('truth').

6. The Johannine and Pauline conceptions of 'faith' contrasted.—This is not the place for an extended review of the Pauline view of faith, but one or two salient points of contrast with the Johannine may be briefly indicated. The different method of presentation in each case is explained by the different circumstances under which each was formulated. In the interests of spiritual religion the Apostle of the Gentiles was forced to wage uncompromising war with Jewish legalistic conceptions of religion, and prejudices in favour of their own privileged religious position, which (naturally enough) were ingrained in the Jewish consciousness, and threatened to pass over into the Christian Church.† [Note: As has already been pointed out above, 'faith' was regarded in Jewish circles as of the highest religious significance and value; only, in the background of the Jewish mind there always lurked the consciousness of privilege and superiority.] As against Jewish privilege and advantages, St. Paul vindicated and maintained the great principle that in the domain of salvation there is no distinction between Jew and Gentile, and that the Jew has no other righteousness than that which comes through faith in Jesus Christ (Gal 3:7 f.), being in this respect in exactly the same position as the Gentile (cf. Rom 3:30). From this certain important results follow: (1) That 'no man is justified by the law' (Gal 2:16; Gal 3:11, Rom 3:20), and (2) that 'a man is justified by faith alone, apart from works of law.' This thesis was splendidly developed by St. Paul in his great dialectic. The absolute sufficiency of this saving faith is above all shown in the contemplation of its object. 'It is because faith lays hold of Jesus Christ, who was delivered up for our trespasses and was raised for our justification (Rom 4:25), and makes us the possessors of the righteousness of God through Him, that there is no room for any righteousness of our own in the ground of our salvation (Rom 10:3, Eph 2:8)' (Warfield). See, further, Justification.

On the other hand, the Johannine presentation is determined by an environment of different circumstances. The false emphasis laid on a merely intellectual knowledge had to be met. Hence the insistence in the Fourth Gospel on the true knowledge of Christian experience which is the fruit of a simple faith. It is regarded as a precious and permanent present possession. Briefly, it may be said that 'faith with St. John is rather contemplative and philosophic, where with St. Paul it is active and enthusiastic.'‡ [Note: Sanday-Headlam, Romans, p. 32.]

7. The place of 'faith' in the teaching of Jesus.—Christ no less than St. Paul combated the prevailing tendency among the Jews to rest in a position of privilege (cf. Mat 3:9, Rom 2:17). But the dominant characteristic of His teaching, as reported both in the Synoptics and in the Fourth Gospel, is the consistent way in which He strives to draw all faith to Himself. Even when His language is general in character (Mar 11:22, Mat 21:22, Mar 9:24, Luk 18:8), He speaks in a way that necessarily fixes attention upon His own Person as God's unique representative on earth. The soteriological significance of the so-called 'miracle-faith' has already been pointed out above. This comes out especially in such a passage as Mat 9:2, where healing of the body is conjoined with the claim to forgive sins. That Christ is the proper object of this soteriological faith is sufficiently attested even in the Synoptic account (Luk 8:12-13; Luk 22:32, Mat 18:6 [|| Mar 9:42], Luk 7:50; cf. Luk 24:25; Luk 24:45). It is in the Fourth Gospel, however, in the intimate discourses of Jesus which are there preserved, that the fullest account is given of the teaching of our Lord on this subject. Here, as is natural, faith in its higher aspects is consistently and abundantly set forth, as reflected and mirrored in the recollection of the 'disciple whom Jesus loved.' In the Fourth Gospel we are confronted with the personal testimony of the disciple who was uniquely fitted both by temperament and by character to receive and assimilate the deepest thoughts of his Master.

The testimony of the Fourth Gospel on this subject cannot be more adequately summed up than in the words of Warfield: * [Note: cit. ib.] —

'In these discourses, too, Jesus' primary task is to bind men to Him by faith. The chief difference is that here, consonantly with the nature of the discourses recorded, much more prevailing stress is laid upon the higher aspects of faith, and we see Jesus striving specially to attract to Himself a faith consciously set upon eternal good. In a number of instances we find ourselves in much the same atmosphere as in the Synoptics (Joh 4:21 f., Joh 4:48 f., Joh 9:35); and the method of Jesus is the same throughout. Everywhere He offers Himself as the object of faith, and claims faith in Himself for the highest concerns of the soul. But everywhere He begins at the level at which He finds His hearers, and leads them upward to these higher things. It is so that He deals with Nathanael (Joh 1:51) and Nicodemus (Joh 3:12); and it is so that He deals constantly with the Jews, everywhere requiring faith in Himself for eternal life (Joh 5:24-25; Joh 5:28, Joh 6:35; Joh 6:40; Joh 6:47, Joh 7:38, Joh 8:24, Joh 10:25; Joh 10:36, Joh 12:44; Joh 12:46), declaring that faith in Him is the certain outcome of faith in their own Scriptures (Joh 5:46-47), is demanded by the witness borne Him by God in His mighty works (Joh 10:25; Joh 10:36-37), is involved in and is indeed identical with faith in God (Joh 5:25; Joh 5:38, Joh 6:40; Joh 6:45, Joh 8:47, Joh 12:44), and is the one thing which God requires of them (Joh 6:29), and the failure of which will bring them eternal ruin (Joh 3:18, Joh 5:38, Joh 6:64, Joh 8:24). When dealing with His followers, His primary care was to build up their

faith in Him. Witness especially His solicitude for their faith in the last hours of His intercourse with them. For the faith they had reposed in Him He returns thanks to God (Joh 17:8), but He is still nursing their faith (Joh 16:31), preparing for its increase through the events to come (Joh 13:19, Joh 16:29), and with almost passionate eagerness claiming it at their bands (Joh 14:1; Joh 14:10-12). Even after His resurrection we find Him restoring the faith of the waverer (Joh 20:29) with words which pronounce a special blessing on those who should hereafter believe on less compelling evidence—words whose point is not fully caught until we realize that they contain an intimation of the work of the Apostles as, like His own, bringing men to faith in Him (Joh 17:20-21).’

The fundamental position of faith in the Christian religion, which is so strikingly expressed and implied throughout the whole NT literature, justifies the distinction of the old and new covenants as the ages before and after the ‘coming of faith’ (Gal 3:23; Gal 3:25). At the same time the way had been prepared for this historically by the circumstances of the time. The more the fulfilment of Israel’s national hopes by special Divine interposition seemed to recede, the more stress was laid upon the necessity of trust and faith in the Divine ordering as a religious duty.

Literature.—A comprehensive treatment of the whole subject will be found in B.B. Warfield’s art. ‘Faith’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible . To the literature there cited add R. J. Knowling, *Ep. of St. James* (1904), p. xlii ff., 53 ff.; R. St. J. Parry, *Discussion of the Ep. of St. James* (1903), p. 43 ff.; J. R. Illingworth, *Reason and Revelation* (1902), p. 204 ff., *Christian Character* (1904), p. 63 ff.; G. Ferries, *Growth of Christian Faith* (1905); W. Herrmann, *Faith and Morals* (1904), p. 7 ff. See also artt. Belief, Doubt, Justification, Righteousness.

G. H. Box.

☞ Faithfulness

FAITHFULNESS.—The quality of being faithful. ‘Fidelity,’ in the sense of trustworthiness, is a synonym; so also ‘loyalty,’ ‘constancy.’ The thought is not primarily of belief entertained (although that is latent); rather of right conduct which, emanating from right motive, demands and receives confidence and approval. Thus George Eliot (*Span. Gipsy*, v.)—

‘The deepest hunger of a faithful heart

Is faithfulness.’

The noun does not occur in the Gospels. There is, however, allusion to those in whom the quality (πιστότης) is conspicuous; they are the ‘faithful’ (πιστοί) of Mat_24:45; Mat_25:21; Mat_25:23, Luk_12:42; Luk_16:10-12—where the word πιστός has the meaning of being trustworthy in the discharge of duty. It is their conduct, not their creed, to which attention is specially directed. At the same time it should be remarked that the πιστότης implied (certainly in Mat_24:45; Mat_25:21; Mat_25:23, Luk_12:42) is closely bound up with an allegiance owned and recognized. It is suggestive of faith which, because genuine, compels to loyal obedience, and cannot but issue in works (*‘La foi qui n’agit point, est-ce une foi sincère?’* Racine). The trusty are the trustful (cf. Lightfoot, *Gal.* p. 155); and it is precisely those who feel themselves able to cling to something external to themselves who are most solicitous that their lives should be spent in useful service. See Faith.

H. L. Jackson.

☩ Fall

FALL.—The various questions suggested in regard to the relation of the Fall to Jesus Christ may be treated under the following heads:

- i. The Messianic element in the story of the Fall.
 - ii. The Fall in its bearing on the work of Christ in (1) the Incarnation, (2) its redemptive aspects.
 - iii. The Fall in its bearing on the Person of Christ.
 - iv. Our Lord’s own teaching (or that of the Gospels) on the Fall.
- i. The Messianic element in the story of the fall.—It is not within the scope of this Dictionary to discuss the general character of the OT narrative of the Fall. We may here simply assume as accepted the view that in Genesis 3 we have an account, cast in the pictorial form characteristic of the period to which it belongs, of the beginning of human sin, with its attendant evils of suffering and death. Whatever opinion may be held as to the literary materials and composition of the narrative, it commends itself as in all essential features a unique and authoritative record of great fundamental facts of human life and history; and its Divine inspiration is sufficiently attested by the profound truthfulness and significance of its moral and religious teaching.

In the midst of this story of sin and judgment we find the first promise of restoration, and thus the Divine purpose of redemption is brought into association with the very beginnings of human evil. 'I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel' (Gen_3:15). That this utterance contains the germ of Messianic prophecy cannot be doubted; but care must be taken to make neither too much nor too little of this element in it, and to interpret the passage in accordance with sound principles of historical exegesis, with due reference to the context, and to the general characteristics of OT prophecy. The embodiment of this *Protevangelium* in the primitive religious tradition, and in the inspired record of it, is a testimony to the fact that the Divine purpose of redemption is coeval with the existence of human sin. From the time when the consciousness of guilt and corruption first dawned in the human heart, there was also present the hope of restoration, and of man's ultimate triumph over those powers of evil by which he had been temporarily vanquished. This is the germ of which all the redemptive promise and prophecy of the OT are the development. Three progressive ideas may be traced in the teaching of the passage. (1) Under the symbolism of the repulsion with which the serpent species is regarded, there is conveyed the truth that there would be continual and deadly conflict between the human race and the powers of evil, each seeking to destroy the other. (2) The hopeful element in the struggle is indicated, and man's final victory suggested, by the specific way in which the conflict is described—'It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.' (3) There underlies the statement with regard to mankind in general the remoter and deeper significance applicable to the representative Man, in and through whom the warfare was to be brought to a crisis and a victorious issue.

The order of these points may also be taken as indicating the line along which the full meaning of the saying would unfold itself. It is one of those pregnant utterances of revelation whose content is gradually realized and defined by the progress of events. The Messianic ideas contained in it are as yet vague and general, yet real; rudimentary, but fundamental; implicit rather than explicit; yet enough to keep a spark of hope alive, and to inspire faith and effort till clearer light came in the providential unfolding of God's redemptive plan.

ii. The Fall in relation to the work of Christ.—The fact of man's fallen condition, of which the narrative of Genesis 3 is the historical explanation, is the *raison d'être* of redemption, and thus the Fall is very closely related to the whole work of Christ at every point. But it is with the *effects* rather than with the manner or history of the Fall that the gospel is supremely concerned, and after the story has once for all been given at the beginning of revelation, it is thereafter but little referred to in Scripture, and is scarcely ever brought into direct relation with redemption, except in two classical passages in the writings of St. Paul, viz. in Romans 5 and 1 Corinthians 15.

Our attention will here be confined to those points in which the Fall comes into more direct relation with the work of Christ, or in which the fall of man in Adam and his restoration in Christ serve to illuminate each other.

1. The relation of the Fall to the Incarnation.—The question here raised is between the two views expressed respectively by the words of Augustine, '*Si homo non pecasset, filius Dei non esset incarnatus,*' and of Andreas Osiander, '*Etiamsi homo non pecasset, Deus tamen incarnatus esset licet non crucifixus.*' The common belief has hitherto been that the whole mission and work of Christ were solely conditioned by the Fall. But the other view with regard to the Incarnation, maintained by the Scotists in the Middle Ages and by other distinguished thinkers, has of late gained fresh currency, especially in connexion with modern evolutionary philosophy. The relation of the Fall to the Incarnation determines the place of the latter in the plan of redemption, and opens up the question whether the Incarnation was subsidiary to the Atonement, or the Atonement a development and modification of the Incarnation.

(i.) The view that an Incarnation was, independently of sin, the consummation of God's purpose in relation to mankind, has been supported by arguments which can here only be briefly mentioned.

(a) The metaphysical argument that a possibility of becoming man must have existed eternally in the being of God, otherwise no incarnation could have taken place. In other words, there was in God a 'self-disposition' for incarnation, a necessity (ethical, not metaphysical) for God, who is love, to make a perfect self-communication to His moral and spiritual creatures.

(b) The very conception of the *Mediator* in redemption implies a necessary and eternal relation both to God and to man, which, even apart from sin, would have found its issue in incarnation. The Mediator is necessary for the *perfecting* of the world no less than for its redemption, and has a cosmical significance wider and deeper than His work as Redeemer.

(c) As Christ is necessary for the world's perfection, the incarnation may be held to be involved in the 'eternal idea of the world.' This is the counterpart of the preceding arguments, and is as old as Irenaeus. It means that man has in his very nature a need and a capacity for Christ, corresponding to God's self-communicating love, and this quite apart from sin.

(d) To base the incarnation solely on the need of redemption, is to make Christ a means and not an end in Himself, or, in more modern language, to reduce the most glorious manifestation of God for the perfecting of humanity to an expedient contingent upon the untoward incident of sin. In Christ alone, as the centre and end,

is the highest possible for man realized; if this were dependent on the Fall, then sin would be a '*felix culpa*' in the most emphatic sense.

(e) These somewhat speculative lines of reasoning are not without Scripture warrant. In such passages as Col 1:15 ff. and Eph 1:9-10 f. we have at least a suggestion of a grand Christo-centric plan for the universe, antecedent to, and occupying a plane quite above, the contingency of human sin. Christ is here presented in relation to the Universe as 'the firstborn of all creation,' *in* whom and *unto* whom all things were created, in whom all things hold together, and who becomes also the 'head of the body, the Church,' and 'the firstborn from the dead.' It was God's eternal purpose 'to sum up all things in Christ,' 'in whom also we were made a heritage' (cf. also Joh 1:3, Heb 1:2, 1Co 8:6, Rev 3:14 etc.). Redemption is here presented as something which forms a harmonious part of a larger plan. Christ is at once the Alpha and the Omega, the medium and the end of creation, the beginning and the consummation of God's eternal purpose.

(ii.) The commonly received view that the Incarnation is simply a necessary part of the work of redemption, is supported by the *prima facie* teaching of Scripture. 'The Son of man came to seek and to save' (Luk 19:10); 'God sent forth his Son ... that he might redeem' (Gal 4:4 f.). These are examples of innumerable passages which represent the mission of Christ in this light. But to this it may be answered that, though historically and actually the Incarnation has taken this redemptive aspect, and is naturally and properly so presented in the Gospel, another view of it, under different conditions, is not excluded, of which, as we have seen, we are in fact permitted brief glimpses in a wider field of vision.

(iii.) Both the foregoing views may be united and harmonized in what is really the truest and deepest conception, viz. that God's purpose is an eternal and unchangeable unity, and every part of it, as wrought out in history, must be regarded as having its proper place in relation to the *whole*. It is by a misunderstanding of the absolute being and counsels of God that we discuss at all questions as to what might have been done under other conditions. The view of the question before us which is most worthy of a true conception of God, and which at the same time agrees with the broad teaching of Scripture, is that in the infinite counsels of Him who sees the end from the beginning, Redemption is wrought into the very fabric of God's eternal purpose, all parts of which—Creation, Redemption, Incarnation, Atonement, the Final Consummation,—hang together harmoniously as integral and correlated elements in one homogeneous, perfect, and unchangeable unity. The question as to the relation of the Fall to the Incarnation thus resolves itself into that of the place of the Fall in God's plan of the world; and we need not hold with hyper-Calvinists that sin was foreordained, in order to believe that the Fall, foreseen and permitted, enters into an intimate and essential relation to the whole of the Divine plan. In this plan

Incarnation holds a central place, and its redemptive significance is one aspect of a wider relation to the world, as the means for *perfecting* as well as for *redeeming* the human race. This view preserves the place of Redemption in the foreground of God's revealed plan, avoids the necessity of conceiving any change in the Divine purpose contingent upon sin, and at the same time gives the Incarnation that cosmical significance worthy of its transcendent character. Thus Christ is central and supreme, and the whole scheme of Redemption is presented in a true perspective, more in harmony with the requirements of modern thought.

2. The relation of the Fall to the redemptive work of Christ.—In the distinctively soteriological aspects of Christ's work, we are brought at once into close relation to the Fall. We have here to consider (i.) the reality and general nature of the Fall, as seen in the light of Redemption; and (ii.) the main points of detail in which the Fall and the redeeming work of Christ explain and illustrate each other.

(i.) The doctrine of the Fall is vital to the Christian system; the reality and general nature of the Fall, as a great downward and retrograde step in the history of mankind, are confirmed and illustrated by the redemptive work of Christ. This aspect of Christ's work, which occupies in Scripture the foremost place, is everywhere represented as rendered necessary by something grievously abnormal in the condition of the human race. The Scripture doctrine of sin as absolute evil; man's universal sinfulness, helplessness, and state of spiritual death, which form the very basis of Redemption; the representation of mankind as 'lost,' 'alienated' from God, and yet capable and worthy of being redeemed and restored;—all this, as so abundantly presented and emphasized in connexion with the atoning work of Christ, affords the strongest confirmation of the doctrine that man has fallen from a higher condition. Whatever may be said as to the Incarnation (see 1, above), it is clear that the great outstanding fact of the Atonement, with all the suffering and sacrifice which it involved, can only be accounted for at once by the dignity and the degradation of man,—in other words, by the Fall.

(ii.) This is borne out by the more specific teaching in regard to the Fall in its relation to the work of Christ in Rom 5:12-21 and 1Co 15:21-22; 1Co 15:45-49. The general and clear line of argument in the former passage brings out the following points:

Adam's act of *disobedience* involved all men in (a) Sin, and (b) Death. By *sin* is here meant both actual sinfulness ('for that all sinned,' Rom 5:12), and a condition of liability to penalty even apart from personal transgression (Rom 5:14). This latter, however, is not to be held in any sense as personal participation in or responsibility for Adam's offence, though it is the transmitted effect of it (see below). *Death* here apparently means physical death in the first place (as in Rom 5:14), but most probably includes also spiritual death. On the other hand, though the analogy is not

fully expressed, it is clearly implied that in the same way Christ's act of *obedience* brings (a) Justification and (b) Life; and in view of the emphatic reiteration, in various forms, of the surpassing fulness of Redemption in Rom 5:15-17, we may include under these terms: negatively, deliverance from *guilt*, from *sin itself*, and from *death*; and positively, *the bestowment of judicial and actual righteousness, and of spiritual and eternal life*.

Another question raised in this connexion is concerned with the precise moral relationship between Adam and his posterity on the one hand, and between Christ and His people on the other. Adam and Christ ('the second Adam') are represented as standing in an analogous relation to mankind, forming the basis in the one case of universal sin and death, and in the other of restoration for believers. In regard to Adam it has been variously held (1) that the relation between him and his posterity was virtually one of *identity*; mankind sinned in him and therefore share his guilt; (2) that the relation is *representative* or *federal*, Adam acting on behalf of his descendants; and (3) that the relation is *natural*, the evil effects of Adam's fall being communicated to the race through the ordinary channels of heredity. The third view preserves any elements of truth in the other two, while it best explains the facts in harmony with true ethical principles. The transmitted effect of Adam's sin consists mainly of the loss of moral balance, an inborn tendency of heart and will towards evil, a *disability*, though not a total inability, for goodness. Though men are not personally implicated in the guilt of Adam's transgression, their condition involves demerit and necessitates redemption.* [Note: Note ἀμαρτωλοί in Rom 5:19 and ταράττωμα, ταραβάσις in vv. 14, 15, 18; see Fairbairn, *Christ in Modern Theology*, p. 312.] Turning to the other side, though we are not warranted in carrying the analogy too far, we find on the part of Christ (1) a relation of *identity with the race* through the Incarnation; (2) a *representative* or covenant relation with His people (see 2Co 5:21 etc.), based on the one side on God's free grace, and on the other on believers' voluntary acceptance of it (Rom 5:17); and (3) a *vital union* between Christ and believers by which new life is imparted and the evil effects of the Fall counteracted (Joh 15:1-6 etc.).

Christ is thus a new beginning for the fallen race, a fountain of life and righteousness, as Adam was of death and sin. Adam was a true 'figure of him that was to come,' a type based not on mere analogy, but on deep and real correspondences between his relation as 'psychical' parent to his natural descendants, and Christ's relation to His people as the 'second Adam,' the 'spiritual' originator of a regenerated race.† [Note: See full and suggestive drawing out of the analogy in Fairbairn's *Christ in Modern Theology*, pp. 311-313.]

iii. The Fall in relation to the Person of Christ.—The Fall of Adam, as we have seen, introduced into the nature of all descended from him a fatal taint of sin, an insuperable moral disability. The question now before us is, How did Jesus Christ, the new Adam, as a true member of the fallen race, escape this evil influence? That Christ in His nature and Person was absolutely free from sin, is one of the clearest and most generally admitted as well as most vital facts of the gospel. Born into the world in the line of human descent, sharing human nature otherwise in its fulness, how was Jesus alone unaffected by the common heritage of sin?

The full answer to this question lies hidden in the mystery of the Incarnation; but an indication of the line in which the solution lies is given in the great fact of the Virgin Birth of our Lord. The historical reality of this part of the Gospel narrative has been assailed by modern criticism, but the doctrine still retains its place in the best philosophy of the Incarnation, and the truth has been rather confirmed than otherwise by impartial study of the records. As a fact, the birth of Jesus in a supernatural manner commends itself as peculiarly in keeping with the whole scheme of redemption. (1) It indicates a new departure, a fresh beginning, the introduction into the human race of a new element, and marks a break in the normal and fatal continuity of spiritual helplessness and decay. (2) It suggests, though it does not fully explain, means by which Christ could become true man and yet be preserved from the hereditary effects of the Fall. ‘The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee: wherefore also that which is to be born shall be called holy, the Son of God’ (Luk_1:35). Those who deny the Virgin Birth have still to explain the equally miraculous fact of the appearance of this single exception to the universal sinfulness of mankind. The manner of Christ’s birth, as recorded in the Gospels of Mt. and Lk., is so fully in harmony with His unique personality and character, that, though we cannot fully understand, we may at least be satisfied that all form parts of one Divine plan, and thus the moral miracle and the physical mutually support one another. See art. Virgin Birth.

iv. The Teaching of Christ and of the Gospels on the Fall.—Our Lord makes no reference to the story of the Fall in all His recorded teaching, His only allusion to our first parents at all being the general statement in connexion with marriage (Mat_19:4, Mar_10:6). But the doctrine of the Fall underlies the whole teaching of Christ on sin and redemption, and is particularly confirmed and illustrated in the following points:

(1) *The universal sinfulness of man.* This is taken for granted. ‘If ye then, *being evil*, know,’ etc. (Mat_7:11, Luk_11:13). This truth is involved in the whole character of our Lord’s mission and teaching. See also Joh_1:29; Joh_8:7. (2) *The inwardness of sin.* ‘Out of the heart come forth evil thoughts,’ etc. ‘... These are the things which defile the man’ (Mat_15:19-20 and ||). Cf. also Mat_5:21-28, Mar_10:5, Luk_6:45. (3) *The deep radical character of human evil.* ‘Ye must be born anew’ (Joh_3:7 and

Joh 3:3). (4) *The hereditary disability of human nature*. ‘That which is born of the flesh is flesh,’ etc. (Joh 3:6; cf. Joh 1:13). (5) Jesus everywhere indicates clearly His view as to *the original dignity and value of man*. ‘What shall a man be profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and forfeit his life?’ (Mat 16:26). Cf. Luk 15:10, Mat 12:12, etc.; and the general teaching of Jesus as to the Fatherhood of God. (6) The Fall may be said to be pictured for us more specifically in *the parable of the Prodigal Son* (Luk 15:11 ff.), and the corresponding parables of the Lost Sheep and the Lost Piece of Money in the same chapter. (7) Generally the whole mission of Christ to *ransom men* (Mar 10:45), to *save* (Mat 1:21, Luk 19:10 etc.), and to *restore* to Divine Sonship (Joh 1:12), is founded upon the doctrine of the Fall and the state of ruin resulting from it, combined with splendid possibilities of restoration through grace.

Literature.—On OT narrative and Messianic elements: Ryle’s *Early Narratives of Genesis*; all good Commentaries, such as those of Dillmann, Gunkel, and Driver.

On Fall and Incarnation: Dorner, *Person of Christ*, vol. iii. pp. 361-369, vol. v. pp. 236-248, also the same author’s *Christian Doctrine*, vol. iii. pp. 283-299; Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics*, pp. 258-263; Orr, *Christian View of God*, etc., pp. 319-327; Westcott, *The Gospel of Creation*.

On Adam and Christ: Relative sections of treatises on Systematic Theology, such as Dorner, Hodge; Orr’s *Christian View*; Fairbairn, *Christ in Modern Theology*; also Sanday-Headlam, *Romans* (on 5:12-21), and other good Commentaries; Beyschlag, *NT Theology*, vol. ii.

On Virgin Birth and Sinlessness of Christ: Sanday, *Bampton Lectures*; Gore, *Bampton Lectures*: all critical Lives of Christ: Griffith-Jones, *Ascent through Christ*; and for trustworthiness of Luke’s narrative, Ramsay, *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?*

On Christ’s teaching: all good treatises, such as Wendt’s; and works on NT Theology, as those of Weiss and Beyschlag.

J. E. M’Ouat.

False Christs

FALSE CHRISTS.—The term $\psi\epsilon\upsilon\delta\acute{o}\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\iota$ or pseudo-Christs occurs only in Mar 13:22 (cf. Mar 13:6) = Mat 24:24 (cf. Mat 24:5). Despite its omission in Mk. by D, etc., it probably belongs to the original text of the eschatological discourse. But this

discourse forms one of the sections in the Synoptic narrative which are specially permeated by reflexions of the Apostolic Church; and even after a small Jewish or Jewish-Christian apocalypse has been disentangled from the discourse, the remaining *logia*, of which this forms one, require to be carefully scrutinized. They do not belong to the primitive tradition of Christ's sayings. Over them lie traces of the experiences of the early Christians during the latter half of the seventh decade in Palestine, when the political convulsion of the country was accompanied by religious agitation and moral crises of a strange nature. The 1st cent. of our era was full of unrest for the Jews of Palestine. As the pages of Josephus testify, one rival Messiah followed another, each and all succeeding more or less in kindling the passions of the people against the Roman authorities. These popular leaders of revolt worked on the religious feeling of the nation. Messianic fanaticism became uncontrollable, and enthusiasts seduced the ardent by semi-political hopes (cf. Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] i. ii. § 20, and Volz, *Jüd. Eschatologie*, 209-210).

If the words 'in my name' (Mar 13:6 = Mat 24:5) mean 'in the name of Jesus,' it is difficult to understand them. For it is hard to think of any Christians claiming to be Jesus. Christian false prophets there might be, and were, but we have no evidence during the 1st cent. of pretenders to the name of Jesus. False Christs in this sense of the term are scarcely credible, though later ages have furnished specimens of the type, as, e.g., among some of the followers of George Fox the Quaker, who was himself accused of claiming to be Christ. Either, then, we must suppose that the phrase 'in my name' has been inserted by the Evangelists in order to stamp as Christian what was originally a Jewish prediction, or the phrase must be taken as equivalent to 'in the name of Messiah,' as is implied in 'I am he.' False Christs would thus be equivalent to false Messiahs (so Mar 13:21, Mat 24:23), and the *logion* would be a warning against the claims and pretensions of the numerous impostors who swarmed in Palestine down to the days of Bar Cochba (131-135 a.d.), their last representative. It is in the light of this retrospect that Justin Martyr (about 155 a.d.) quotes this saying in his *Dialogue* (82. 308 C) thus: 'Our Lord said many false prophets and false Christs would come in His name and deceive many; which is the case.' The false prophets, of course, are the heralds of the false Messiahs; they guarantee the movement in question by means of miracles. But occasionally a false Messiah may have been, as Theudas was, a false prophet as well. The *Didache*, curiously enough, omits all mention of false Messiahs, though it notices the danger of false prophets (xvi. 3; cf., however, what is said in xvi. 4 about the appearing of the world-deceiver as Son of God).

The locale of the false Messiahs (Mat 24:26) is either the wilderness (cf. Act 21:38), as in the case of Simon son of Gioras, or the inner chambers, as in the case of John of Giscala (cf. 1Ki 20:30)—alluding possibly to the current idea that the Messiah was to remain hidden for some time previous to His appearance in public. But whether the

one or the other happened to be chosen, the salient point is that in either case the elect are to be kept right by a wholesome scepticism. Christians, at Israel's great crisis, were to be *saved by unbelief* in pseudo-Messiahs and pseudo-prophets' (*Expos. Gr. Test.* i. 294). The situation would also manifest the difference between credulity and faith. Desperate situations foster an avid appetite for deliverance, which is too often indifferent to the particular quality of the aid offered. But faith keeps its head. Belief in Christ imparts a sanity of judgment which makes men cool even in emergencies. Finally, there is the thought that miracles of themselves are no guarantee of Divine authority.

The allusion in Joh 5:43 may be, but is not necessarily, to a single anti-Christ or pseudo-Christ, who, however, comes *in his own name* (cf. Loisy, *Le Quatrième Évangile*, p. 416). Neither here nor in Rev 13:11; Rev 20:10 have we to do with an epitome or individual incarnation of the deceivers foretold in the Synoptic narrative. The plane of thought is at once later and different.

Literature.—In addition to the literature cited above, consult the critical editors on the passages in question; and see V. H. Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, i. 125; Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, v. 238f.; and Bousset, *The Antichrist Legend*, p. 103f.

J. Moffatt.

False Prophets

FALSE PROPHETS

1. For the understanding of this expression in the NT, we must correctly apprehend the character of *the false prophets of the OT*. To earlier writers these men were essentially and consciously false, either prophets of false gods, holders of opinions which did not agree with the revealed character of Jehovah the God of Israel, or men who knowingly spoke falsehoods in the name of Jehovah. Modern biblical science takes a more lenient view. It does not deny the existence of such as either possible or actual (Jer 2:8, Eze 13:1-9), though in the matter of creed many of them were probably 'syncretistic' rather than simply 'anti-Jehovistic' (A. B. Davidson). The majority may be regarded rather as men accustomed to the outward signs of the prophetic office, the hairy mantle (Zec 13:4, cf. 1Ki 19:19), the methods of prophetic instruction (Jer 28:10), and the use of the prophetic formula, 'Thus saith Jehovah' (Jer 23:25; Jer 23:31, Eze 13:6), but who had never come under the influence of, or had failed to remain in personal contact with, the revealing Spirit 'who spake by the prophets.' Hence the message they gave was merely one that was

agreeable to the common thought of the people, whether it concerned the internal condition and life of the nation or its relation to surrounding States. It was principally in the later prophetic period of Micah, Jeremiah, and Zechariah that these prophets of smooth things, subject to no true and Divine revelation, came to be regarded as professional tricksters, making a living out of their false predictions (Mic 3:5, Zec 13:4-5). But whether from the desire of gain or of public favour, these false prophets expressed the optimistic, what would be regarded as the patriotic, view of the state and future of their country, and have been described as 'nationalistic rather than false.' It is this optimistic, nationalist outlook that particularly explains the reference in Luk 6:26, 'in the same manner did their fathers (speak well) to the false prophets.' The false prophets, as declaring the things the nation wished to hear, naturally succeeded in gaining general approval and credence. This is particularly shown in Jer 6:13-15 and Mic 2:11, and is confirmed by instances, not a few, in which the apparently unpatriotic attitude of the true prophet, compared with that assumed by the false, resulted in disfavour and even in persecution (1Ki 22:27, 2Ch 16:10, Jer 20:2). It was the false prophet, representing the national 'wish that is father to the thought,' of whom 'all men spoke well.' Our Lord therefore takes such as types of that ill-deserved general approval which may be won by flattery, by concealment of the truth, by the denying or minimizing of danger and of retribution: methods denied to those who 'are of the truth.' This view of false prophecy as the saying of things men wish to hear 'for the hire of wrong-doing,' is to be discerned in 2Pe 2:2 f., where the false prophet is the analogue of the false teacher, himself guilty of 'lascivious doings' (cf. 2Pe 2:13-19 for the character of this teaching).

2. The false prophets in the Christian Church.—In the NT as in the OT, the prophetic ministry must be regarded in its two branches as interpretative of God's mind and as predictive. False prophets of both these classes were to be expected in the Christian community. To grasp the significance of the warnings against these men, the importance of prophecy in NT times must be borne in mind. Prophecy was a more important gift than tongues (1 Corinthians 14), and the prophet is in the list of officers associated with the Apostles, taking, with this one exception, precedence of all other ranks. The prominence of the prophet may be seen in the *Didache* (c. 11), and in the part played by him in the Montanist movement. Hence their truth or falseness, their faithful use, or their abuse of the spiritual gift, was an important factor for the infant Church. Hence our Lord warns against them as 'wolves in sheep's clothing' (Mat 7:15), and St. John at the end of the Apostolic age repeats the warning (1Jn 4:1). In the former case the reference is apparently to their unethical teaching; in the latter to their denial or misinterpretation of the fact of the Incarnation. Without using the name, our Lord warns also against such men, as falsely predicting or announcing the Parousia (Mat 24:5-7). In 2Pe 2:1 stress is laid upon false teaching of an antinomian character, the authors of which are called 'false teachers,' but find their analogy in the 'false prophets' of the OT.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Prophecy and Prophets' (p. 111); Bonwetsch, *Die Prophetie in apost. und nach-apost. Zeitalter*; Harnack, *Lehre der Zwölf*, ad xi. 5; *Expositor*, v. ii. [1895] 1; *Expos. Times*, v. [1893] 122.

J. T. L. Maggs.

False Witness

FALSE WITNESS.—The prohibition in the Decalogue of bearing false witness was endorsed by Christ (οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, Mat 19:18 ||). Originally it dealt, not with lying in general, but with lying against one's neighbour, perhaps because this is the most frequent form of falsehood (see Dale, *Ten Commandments*, p. 208): Was it merely for brevity that the limiting clause was dropped by Christ? or did it not rather imply a broadening and deepening of the commandment? Like other sins, ψευδομαρτυρία come from the heart (Mat 15:19).

At the preliminary investigation before Caiaphas, the chief priests and the whole council *sought* (ἐζήτησαν) false witness on which such a capital charge might be based as would demand Pilate's attention (Mat 26:59, Mar 14:55); ὡς μὲν ἐκείνοις ἐδόκει μαρτυρίαν, ὡς δὲ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ψευδομαρτυρίαν (Euthym. Zig.); but the Evangelists seem to mean more than this. 'Hic (ἐζήτησαν) illa falsorum testium exorta copia' (Bengel). While nominally judges, they were really prosecutors, as they showed by disregarding the rule that witnesses for the defence should first be called (see Westcott on Joh 18:21). Though many false witnesses came (Mat 26:60) and bore false witness (Mar 14:56), yet their witness agreed not together (ἴσαι αἱ μαρτυρίαι οὐκ ἦσαν, *ib.*), *i.e.* they were not consistent with each other, since it was necessary that two at least should agree (Deu 17:6), and witnesses were examined separately, not in the presence of each other (see Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 560). Some (Erasmus, Grot. etc.) take ἴσαι in the sense of 'sufficient for the purpose, equal to the demand for weighty evidence, and justifying condemnation.' The parallel words in Mat 26:59-60 lend some support ('sought false witness against Jesus that they might put him to death; and they found it not, though many false witnesses came'); but it is a strong objection that οὐδὲ οὕτως ἴση is used of the witness of those who perverted His words concerning the temple (Mar 14:59), which constituted a very grave charge; cf. Act 6:13-14 (cf. *Expositor's Greek Testament* on Mar 14:56).

Even the spies who constantly laid wait for Him had caught up nothing to serve their purpose; but at last two false witnesses (Mat_26:60; τινες, Mar_14:57) came, who perverted certain words spoken at the beginning of His ministry (Joh_2:19); but their testimony also was not ἴση. Taking the meaning as ‘did not agree together,’ the difference may perhaps be traced in Mt. (δύναμαι καταλύσαι) and Mk. (ἐγὼ καταλύσω); certainly the perversion is evident, since they ascribed to Him that destruction which He ascribed to the Jews. It has been inferred from Mat_27:63 that the rulers knew the true meaning; but perhaps this is better referred to a knowledge of Christ’s words in Mar_8:31 etc. This false witness might have sufficed; no other charge could be so effective before the Roman Procurator as that of being a fanatical seducer of the ignorant populace, who might lead them on to wild tumultuous acts; while the claim that He would, or was able to, rebuild the temple within three days might be made to imply Divine or magical pretensions (see Edersheim, *op. cit.* ii. 559); but it also broke down (οὐδὲ οὕτως ἴση ἢ ἡ μαρτυρία αὐτῶν), cf. Psa_27:12; Psa_35:11.

On the law concerning false witness see Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible iv. 351^a; Edersheim, *op. cit.* ii. 558. Witnesses who contradicted each other were not considered in Rabbinic law as false witnesses in the sense of being punishable. The Sadducees were less severe than the Pharisees in the interpretation of Deu_19:16 f.; they held that the punishment should be inflicted only if the falsely accused had been punished, whereas the Pharisees demanded punishment if the sentence had been pronounced, whether it was executed or not.

Literature.—Besides, the works cited above, ref. may be made to Taylor Innes, *Trial of Jesus Christ*; and Rosadi, *Trial of Jesus, ad loc.*; Schurer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii. i. 194; *Expositor*, i. xii. [1880] 276 f.

W. H. Dundas.

Fame

FAME.—This term has had three meanings,—rumour, reputation, and posthumous renown. The last is modern; the Elizabethan usage lies between, or may include, the other two. Bacon, who left a Fragment on the subject, and who loved to quote the mythological idea of Fame as the daughter of the angry Earth and the sister of the warring Giants, understood by the term disturbing Rumour—a thing dangerous to governments. Milton, who in an early poem (*Lycidas*, 70 ff.) described ‘the last infirmity of noble minds,’ in a late poem analyzed the temptation to seek fame or

glory, and poured scorn on human judgments (*Par. Reg.* iii. 21-151). In the Gospels the meaning is simpler. The term describes the spreading talk of the admiring multitudes. It is a thing unsought, but unrestrainable, and in no small degree disquieting to the authorities.

We are told that early in the ministry of Jesus a fame of Him went through Galilee and the surrounding country, including Syria (Mat 4:24, Luk 4:14). Special occasions were the restoration of a demoniac (Mar 1:8, Luk 4:37) and the cleansing of a leper (Luk 5:15, cf. Mar 1:45). The First Gospel uses the term also in connexion with the restoring of Jairus' daughter and the giving of sight to two blind men (Mat 9:26; Mat 9:31). And, finally, this Gospel tells us that the fame of Jesus affected Herod (Mat 14:1 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'report,' cf. Mar 6:14, Luk 9:7).

An examination of the Greek text shows that in no two parallel passages is the same term used. The term of the first two Gospels (except in Mat 9:26) is ἀκοή (lit. 'hearing'; Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'report'), used also for 'rumours' in the eschatological discourse (Mat 24:6, Mar 13:7). St. Luke, however, eschews this word, and in his three passages uses three others: φήμη (lit. 'speech'; Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'fame,' Luk 4:14, so Matthew 9); ἦχος (lit. 'sound'; Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'report,' Luk 4:37); and λόγος (lit. 'discourse'; Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'report,' Luk 5:15). And elsewhere each Evangelist uses periphrasis. Thus we may conclude that the idea expressed by these terms was of an indefinite character. It included, in varying degrees, such elements as curiosity, attraction, wonder, faith, worship.

These passages, taken along with others that more directly express admiration or astonishment (Mat 7:28; Mat 12:23; Mat 15:31), or that relate the concourse and following of multitudes (Mar 3:7-9; Mar 6:34; Mar 6:55; Mar 10:46), show that during His whole public ministry the acts of Jesus arrested the gaze of men. Not only in Galilee, but in all the provinces of Palestine, and in cities of Syria, men talked and speculated regarding a new Figure that was in their midst. A few who cherished sacred tradition believed that the Messiah had come (Joh 1:41; Joh 1:49; Joh 7:40, Mat 16:4; Mat 21:9). Others less instructed talked wildly as if Elijah had descended, or the Baptist had risen (Mar 6:14-15, Mat 16:13-14), or some prophet of local tradition or expectation had appeared (Joh 7:40, Mat 21:11). Doubtless the multitudes that hung around Him were very mixed crowds. Vanity and selfishness mingled with their motives. They loved display. They desired a succession of palpable benefits. Some had political aims or ambitions. The majority failed to appreciate the renunciation and pure spirituality of the Teacher. And few were able to sustain the devotion of their higher moments. To Jesus it was often a relief to find a place of

solitude for meditation and prayer. Yet He acknowledged the true instinct of the untutored worshipper (Mat 21:16). And it is to the honour of human nature to remember that the common people heard Him gladly (Mar 12:37), and that not the nation at large, but the constituted authorities and their tools—a suspicious officialism, a proud and jealous priesthood—rejected the true Leader and Lord of men, the Shepherd and Bishop of souls. See, further, artt. Ambition and Glory.

R. Scott.

Family (Jesus)

FAMILY

1. Jesus as the member of a family.
2. Teaching of Jesus on the family.
 - (a) Marriage.
 - (b) Position of women.
 - (c) Filial obedience.
 - (d) The family and the Kingdom of God.

1. Whatever be the force of the phrase ‘the brethren of the Lord’ (see article s.v.), it is evident that Jesus took His place as a member of a human family in the fullest sense of the word. Such was the impression of His fellow-townsmen who saw Him in His daily life. The reticence of the Gospels about the childhood of Christ is in itself an indication that there was nothing which so differed from the ordinary family life of a Jewish household as to create a special tradition about His early years. It was not till a later age had forgotten the completeness with which the Lord identified Himself with human conditions that there appeared the painful attempts of the Apocryphal Gospels to break the silence of their Canonical prototypes. In the one authentic account of any event in the boyhood of Jesus (Luk 2:41-51), received perhaps from the Virgin herself (see Ramsay, *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* ch. iv.), He is seen to be as others ‘among their kinsfolk and acquaintance.’ For the rest we only know that ‘the moral perfections of God were being translated into those unostentatious virtues

which constitute the dignity and the happiness of a human home' (Dale, *Laws of Christ for Common Life*, xi.).

When we come to the history of the Ministry, two stages can be discerned in the change which came over the relations between Jesus and His earthly kinsfolk. (1) The calling of the first disciples, narrated in John 1, did not lead at once to the withdrawal of the Lord from His family. His mother was present with Him at the marriage at Cana, and after that event He went down with her and His brethren to Capernaum and made a short stay there (Joh 2:12, cf. Mat 4:13-16). (2) But when the Apostolic band was complete and the work of training them began in earnest, then He subordinated the claims of His family to the higher claims of His mission, and no longer lived continually in the home of His youth. Immediately after the final choice of the Twelve occurred the incident near Capernaum, when those from His house (οἱ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ) went out to stop Him from preaching, under the impression that He was mad; shortly afterwards His mother and His brethren try to call Him away, apparently for a similar reason (Mar 3:21). From this it may be gathered that they were now living at Capernaum. From Mar 6:3 it has been mistakenly concluded that they were still living at Nazareth, but the verse plainly draws a distinction between them and His sisters (named, acc. to Epiphanius, *Hær.* lxxviii. 9, Salome and Mary), who, either because they were married, or for some other reason, had settled down in their native town. Some have supposed that when the Lord left His family He dwelt in a house of His own in Capernaum. The Gospel of St. Matthew, it is true, speaks in a vague way of 'the house' (Mat 9:10; Mat 9:28; Mat 13:1; Mat 13:36; Mat 17:25), but a comparison of, e.g., Mat 9:10 with the corresponding passage in Luk 5:29 shows that it is not a house of Jesus which is meant. After leaving the family home, when He entered into a city, He depended on the hospitality of His friends. It was this literal homelessness which drew from Him the saying recorded in Mat 8:20 || Luk 9:58; for it is unnecessary to give these words, with Augustine and others, a figurative sense. It is not possible to discover the precise moment at which they were uttered, as the two Evangelists give them in different connexions, but they must belong to the period when the total failure of His kindred to understand His mission had made it impossible for Him to dwell with them any longer. The position given to them by St. Luke is the more probable. According to him, they were pronounced as the Ministry was entering upon its last stage (cf. Luk 9:51). Now in Joh 7:1-7 the Lord's 'brethren' are found arguing with Him as if He still lived with them. The incident there alluded to took place just before the Feast of Tabernacles in the second year of the Ministry. From this we may accept the conclusion suggested by St. Luke's order, that the Lord's home was closed against Him towards the end of the Ministry, rather than near its beginning, as the position given to the saying in St. Matthew might imply. Perhaps it is not without significance that in the next chapter of St. Luke is introduced another

home, that of Lazarus and his sisters at Bethany, in which the Lord was an honoured guest.

The reconciliation which the Lord's Passion won for all mankind was first reflected among His own kinsmen after the flesh. We cannot suppose that His mother had ever been parted from Him in any absolute sense, and after His resurrection His brethren also cast in their lot with those who believed in Him. According to the tradition which St. Paul received, the Lord Himself appeared to James (1Co_15:7). This moment was probably but the last in a series during which the surrender to the claims of Jesus had been steadily replacing previous unbelief. Such at least was the interpretation of later days, when the story was told that beneath the Cross (or even at the Last Supper, acc. to the version of Jerome, *de Vir. Illus.*, quoting the Gospel of the Hebrews) James swore that he would neither eat bread nor drink wine till the Lord rose from the dead. With his conversion came that of the other brethren, and they with the Virgin are found at the opening of the Acts (Act_1:14) among those who were waiting for the fulfilment of the promise of the Spirit. Thus the earthly family of Christ fittingly finds its place in the foundations of His spiritual family.

2. In the teaching of Christ, although the word 'family' does not occur, yet the institution is everywhere presupposed and its laws emphasized, as it is also connected with the first miracle recorded in the Fourth Gospel. (a) The pivot on which family life turns is *marriage*, and this subject holds a unique place in the teaching of Christ. On all other social topics He left no particular detailed instructions, but only general rules. On marriage His words are distinct and afford specific guidance about details. He lays it down that monogamy is not the result of any code of law, but a primal fact instituted 'in the beginning' (Mat_19:8). True marriage rests ultimately upon a spiritual basis, the physical aspect is but an accident. This is implied in the answer to the Sadducees (Mar_12:18-27). No human law, not even though it have the sanction of the name of Moses, can alter this. The possibility of ground for divorce is confined to the case of one offence (or even abolished altogether, if we regard the exceptive clauses in Mat_19:9; Mat_5:32 as later glosses on the Lord's words; see Wright, *Synopsis of Gospels*, on Mar_10:10, and cf. artt. Adultery, Divorce, and Marriage).

(b) The attitude of Jesus towards marriage was necessarily reflected in His *treatment of women*. In spite of all that can be urged to the contrary, it is clear that contemporary Judaism assigned to women a position far inferior to that of men. The tendency was rather to fall away from than to advance upon the standpoint of the OT. There woman is often found in a prominent and honourable place (e.g. Miriam, Num_12:2; Deborah, Jdg_4:4; Bathsheba, 1 Kings 1), but the days were now approaching when it could be said that he who talked with a woman was qualifying for Gehenna (*Pirke Aboth*, ed. Taylor, p. 29), an expression in which Judaism contrasted unfavourably even with the low estimate of women current among the

Greeks (cf. Aristotle, *Poetics*, 15; *Nic. Eth.* vii. 7). In the treatment which Christ accorded to women is found the very antithesis of this harshness. This is sometimes (e.g. Joh 2:4) obscured in the Authorized and Revised Versions by the employment of 'woman' as a rendering of *γῆβαι*, a translation which is far from reproducing the respectful tone of the Greek. Jesus readily accepted the help of women, an aspect of the Ministry on which St. Luke seems to desire to lay special stress (cf. Plummer, *Interned. Crit. Com.* on 'St. Luke,' Introd. p. xlii). He gave them equal rights with their husbands, implying that as far as divorce was lawful at all, a wife might put away a husband as much as a husband a wife, a doctrine tolerated rather than accepted by His countrymen. A like care to secure justice for women appears in the narrative preserved in Joh 8:1-11. This story, whether Apostolic or not, certainly reflects the teaching of Jesus by inferring that in such moral downfalls the crime is not always to be imputed to the woman alone.

(c) In another region of family ethics—the sphere of *filial duty*—our Lord again attacked contemporary Jewish conventions. Nominally, filial obedience was exalted to a high place by the teachers of the day, but in practice it might be reduced to a mere shadow by such vows as those alluded to in Mar 7:11. By sweeping away the sophistries with which these vows were defended, Jesus made parental claims absolute and inviolable.

(d) *The family and the Kingdom of God.*—Not only is life in a family the normal life of a disciple, as pictured in the Gospels, but the family supplies the analogy by which men are led to the better understanding of the Kingdom of God. In the First Gospel especially we constantly see on the throne of the Kingdom the 'Father who is in the heavens,' while the ideal of the citizens is to be His true 'sons.' This aspect of the Kingdom is made familiar to all Christians by the Lord's Prayer. In its clauses are represented successively all the integral elements in the relations of a father to his children, the reverence and obedience which he expects from them, the support, forbearance, and protection which he extends to them (cf. Robinson, *Church Catechism Explained*, ch. ii.). The exclusion from the Kingdom, which results when they are lost, is exhibited in the parable of the Prodigal Son.

This fundamental conception erects an insuperable barrier between the teaching of Jesus and those varieties of Socialism which aim at the abolition of the traditional form of the family, which rests on the assumption that marriage is a life-long obligation. 'An association terminable at the will of either party' (Morris and Bax, *Socialism*) is diametrically opposed to the Gospel doctrine. Christian Socialism, if it is to be true to the will of Christ, must work for the removal, not of the family, but of those forces which are injurious to its perfect development. But this does not make it impossible for circumstances to arise in the lives of particular individuals which

demand the postponement of family claims to those of the Kingdom of God. It is implied in Mar_10:28 ff. that the Twelve had put the following of Christ before the claims of home, and the reply which the remainder of this drew from Jesus makes it clear that the Christian must not draw back even from this if his own special call requires it. It is noteworthy that the First and Second Gospels seem to shrink from including the wife among the objects which are to be renounced, but both in the parallel passage here and elsewhere St. Luke inserts this also (cf. Mat_10:37 with Luk_14:26). The disciple is to 'hate' domestic claims if there is any danger that they may lessen the reality of his service, as comes to pass when 'not only have we family and friendship, but also these have us' (Martensen). But such a conflict of claims can arise in the eyes of Christ only when devotion to home ties is ὑπὲρ ἐμῆ. If a man cannot combine surrender to the bidding of the Gospel with the love of a wife, then he is right to remain unmarried (Mat_19:12). This is far from the exaggeration which sets up an irreconcilable difference between the love of God and the love of home. In the life of Christ Himself the two appear in their right proportions. For the correct view is not that of Tertullian, who saw in such passages as Luk_8:19-21 a censure of the mother and brethren of Jesus for their anxiety about Him (*adv. Marc.* iv. 19; *de Carne Christi*, vii.), but rather that of Bengel: 'Non spernit matrem, sed anteposit Patrem.'

Literature.—Westcott, *Social Aspects of Christianity*; Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Problem*, ch. iii.; Shailer Mathews, *The Social Teaching of Jesus*, ch. iv.; Gore, *The Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 68-73 (for the teaching on marriage); Harnack, *What is Christianity?* Lect. v. (English translation); Stalker, *Imago Christi*, ch. ii.

C. T. Dimont.

☞ Family (Jewish)

FAMILY

1. *Membership*.—Jewish family life, while having many points in common with that of the Gentiles, was marked by a higher standard of purity, the avoidance of infanticide, and the condemnation of the selfish cruelty that in human sacrifice gave the fruit of the body for the sin of the soul (Mic_6:7). The father was the head of the house, exercising restrictive authority over the wife, having complete disposal of the children, and giving his name to the family inheritance. Although living for years in another locality, he was regarded and registered as belonging to the place of his ancestral origin (Luk_2:4).

The wife, as being legally the purchased possession of her husband, was under his law,—the *bě'ûlâh* to her *ba'al*, or rightful possessor. Hence the land of Israel could be called the *bě'ûlâh* of Jehovah (Isa_62:4). Betrothal (Mat_1:18), as a covenant, was equivalent to marriage; it prevented the woman from being married to any other man until she had received a writing of divorce. Among the duties of the wife, apart from the maternal charge of the family, was the daily preparation of the bread (Mat_24:41), and the carrying of water from the village fountain (Joh_4:7). The desire for male children was universal (Joh_16:21), as these preserved the name and upheld the interests and rights of the family, and in due time enlarged its circle by bringing in daughters from other households. The pre-eminence of the father carried with it a corresponding responsibility of watching over the life and honour, the rights and welfare of his family. See artt. Divorce, Marriage.

2. *References to the family.*—It was out of such relationships that Christ drew examples that were familiar to all, when He spoke of fathers who knew how to give good gifts to their children (Luk_11:13), of sons who obeyed or disobeyed the father's command (Mat_21:28); and when, beyond the attachments of unselfish devotion fostered by the sacred institutions of the family, He set the higher claim of what was due to Himself from His disciples (Mat_10:37). The Lord's Prayer was a transfiguration of the family relationships.

3. *Religion in the family.*—It was especially in the superiority of its religious training that the Jewish home differed from the family life of the Gentiles. See artt. Boyhood, Childhood.

G. M. Mackie.

☞Famine

FAMINE.—Though the general fertility of Palestine is frequently alluded to in the Bible, yet the country was, as we know, by no means free from the danger of famine, whether brought about by drought or by the devastations of locusts and other pests, or by the destructive hand of man. Our Lord refers to the familiar instance of famine in the days of Elijah (Luk_4:25 f.) In order to illustrate the truth that no prophet is best received in his own country, He reminds His hearers that Elijah was at that time sent not to one of the many widows in Israel, but to the widow of Sarepta in the territory of Sidon.

In the parable of the Prodigal Son, it was 'a mighty famine' (λιμὸς ἰσχυρὰ) in the land of his distant exile that helped to bring the wanderer to his senses (Luk_15:14). He

had squandered all his patrimony by the time it arose, and in his distress he had to seek a living by feeding swine. Even thus, food was so scarce with him that 'he would fain have been filled with the husks that the swine did eat.'

Lastly, in the eschatological discourses of our Lord recorded by the Synoptists (Mat 24:7, Mar 13:8, Luk 21:11), 'famines in divers places' are included among the signs of the end. In St. Luke's account they are joined with pestilences, and in all three accounts with earthquakes. This portion of the prophecy at all events seems clearly to refer in the first instance to the approaching destruction of Jerusalem by Titus (a.d. 70), and only in a secondary sense, if at all, to the final end of all things. Josephus (*BJ* v. and vi.) again and again tells us that famine and pestilence were the terrible accompaniments of the city being taken by the Roman army; and these were no doubt in great measure due to its crowded state on account of the many pilgrims who had come up to keep the Passover.

C. L. Feltoe.

☞ Fan

FAN.—The fan (מִזְרָחַה *mizreh*, the *πύλον* of Mat 3:12 and Luk 3:17) was an implement used in the winnowing of grain (Isa 30:24 [where it is mentioned along with the רַחַת *rahath*, Authorized and Revised Versions 'shovel']). It was either a wooden shovel (Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible i. 51^a; Smith, *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] i. 31; van Lennep, *Bible Lands*, p. 83) or a pitchfork (Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iv. 509^a; *Encyc. Bibl.* i. 84; Mackie, *Bible Manners and Customs*, p. 42). The balance of probability is in favour of the latter.

We get no help from LXX Septuagint and Vulgate. LXX Septuagint omits the word; the Vulgate renders by *ventilabrum*, which was, according to some, a shovel (Ramsay, *Roman Antiquities*, p. 482), and, according to others, a fork (Smith, *Lat. English Dict. s.v.*). Pesh. has *raphsho'*, which means 'shovel.' There is, however, the significant fact that down to the present day two winnowing implements are used in Palestine which bear practically the same names as those which occur in Isa 30:24. These are the *miḍrâ* and the *raht*, and there is no substantial reason for doubting that they correspond respectively to the *mizrch* and the *rahath*. The *miḍrâ*, which we accordingly identify with the 'fan' of Scripture, is a simple wooden fork about six feet long. It has from five to seven prongs, which are set in separately and bound together with a wrapping of fresh hide. The natural shrinkage of the hide renders it a very effective ligature. The *raht* is a wooden shovel about five feet in length.

The winnowing of the mixed mass of grain, chaff, and short straw produced by threshing is begun by tossing it into the air with the *midrâ*. This process frees most of the chaff and straw, which are carried away by the wind (see Agriculture, p. 40), but a good deal still remains mingled with the pile of grain. A second winnowing is therefore needed, and for this the *raht* is used. See also Chaff.

Literature.—On the meaning of Christ's winnowing-fan see Seeley, *Ecce Homo*, ch. vi.

Hugh Duncan.

÷ Farm

FARM.—See Agriculture, and Husbandman.

÷ Farthing

FARTHING.—See Money.

÷ Fasting

FASTING.—In the time of Christ, fasting appears to have been a prominent characteristic of Jewish piety. The fasts were both public and private. Of public fasts only one in the year was ordained by the law of Moses, the Day of Atonement; in Act 27:9 it is called simply 'the fast' (cf. Josephus *Ant.* xiv. iv. 3; Philo, *Vit. Mos.* ii. 4; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] i. i. 322). The four annual fasts, established in memory of national calamities and referred to by Zechariah (Zec 8:19), had fallen into desuetude, and were not revived until after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. The late 'fast of Esther,' on the 13th of Adar (Est 9:31; cf. Est 4:3; cf. Est 4:16), was not at this time observed. But occasional public fasts were ordered from time to time during seasons of drought and public calamity. They were held on the second and fifth days of the week,—Monday and Thursday,—because Moses was believed to have gone up Mt. Sinai on a Thursday and to have returned on a Monday. They always began on the second day, so that a three days' fast would fall on the second, fifth, and second—Monday, Thursday, Monday (see *Didache*, viii.; *Const. Apost.* vii. 23; Epiphanius, *Hær.* xvi. 1). Apart from these public occasions, however, many individuals were in the habit of imposing extra fasts

upon themselves (Luk 2:37, cf. Jdt 8:6); and some, particularly among the Pharisees, fasted on Mondays and Thursdays all the year round (Luk 18:12; Lightfoot and Wetstein, *ad loc.*). Religious teachers, moreover, were apparently accustomed to lay down rules about fasting for the guidance of their disciples (Mar 2:18, Mat 9:14, Luk 5:33). The 'frequent fasts' of the Jews are alluded to by Tacitus (*Hist.* v. 4); and Josephus, speaking of the spread of Jewish customs among the Gentile cities, mentions fasting (*e. Apion.* ii. 40; cf. *Tert. ad Nat.* i. 13). Among the Romans a mistaken idea seems to have been current that the Jews fasted on the Sabbath (Sueton. *Aug.* 76).

The manner of fasting differed according to the degree of strictness of the fast. Thus, on less strict fasts, while abstinence from food and drink from sunrise to sunset was enjoined, washing and anointing were still permitted. The strictest fast, however, lasted from one sunset till after the next, when the stars appeared; and during these hours not only food and drink, but washing, anointing, and every kind of agreeable transaction, even salutations, were prohibited (Schürer, ii. ii. 119; Edersheim, *Life and Times*, i. p. 663, *Temple*, pp. 297-300). Fasting was generally practised in an ostentatious manner; on this point the testimony of Mat 6:16 is confirmed by the Mishna.

Passing on to consider the attitude of Jesus towards fasting, we remark that, while on the one hand there is no reason to doubt that He observed the prescribed public fasts, and while He may even have undertaken a voluntary fast of forty days at the commencement of His ministry (Mat 4:2; but see art. Asceticism), yet, on the other hand, it is evident that neither by practice nor by precept did He lay any stress on this form of devotion. His ordinary mode of life was so un-ascetic as to bring on Him the reproach of being a 'gluttonous man and a wine-bibber' (Mat 11:19, Luk 7:34). In His teaching He directly alluded to fasting only twice. The passages are as follow:

(a) Mat 6:16-18. Here voluntary fasting is presupposed as a religious exercise, but the disciples are warned against making it an occasion for a parade of piety. 'Thou, when thou fastest, anoint thy head, and wash thy face; that thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father which is in secret.' Jesus thus sanctions fasting, but only as the genuine expression of a devout and contrite frame of mind. Its whole value depends on the purity and sincerity of the motive with which it is undertaken. As for the pretentious externalism of the Pharisees, that has its own reward.

(b) Mar 2:18-22, Mat 9:14-17, Luk 5:33-39. In reply to the question of the disciples of John and of the Pharisees, Jesus deliberately refuses to enjoin fasting on His followers. Alluding to a Rabbinic ordinance that all mourning be suspended during the marriage-week, He says that fasting, which is a sign of mourning, would be inconsistent with the joy which 'the children of the bride-chamber' experience 'while

the bridegroom is with them.’ But He adds that the days of bereavement are coming, and then the outward expression of sorrow will be appropriate enough. Here, as in the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus certainly sanctions fasting as a form through which emotion spontaneously seeks expression. But to the form itself He attaches very slight importance. This is brought out clearly in the succeeding parables of the Old Garment and the Old Wineskins. It is futile to graft the new liberty of the gospel on to the body of old observances and practices, and yet more futile to attempt to force the whole new system within the ancient moulds. The new piety must manifest itself in new forms of its own. Nevertheless, while Jesus seems to suggest that the Jewish regulations are not in harmony with the Christian spirit, He can sympathize with the prejudice of conservatives who still cling tenaciously to the custom of their fathers. ‘No man also having drunk old wine straightway desireth new: for he saith, The old is good.’

The allusions to fasting in [Mar_9:29](#) and [Mat_17:21](#) are corruptions of the text; for similar combinations of prayer and fasting see [Tob_12:6](#), [Sir_34:26](#), [Luk_2:37](#). The second Logion of the Oxyrhynchus fragment discovered in 1897 commences with the words, λέγει Ἰησοῦς, ἐὰν μὴ νηστεύσητε τὸν κόσμον, οὐ μὴ εὕρητε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. Here, however, the fasting spoken of is obviously metaphorical. Another reference to fasting occurs in the fifth of the *New Sayings of Jesus*, published by Grenfell and Hunt in 1904, but the Logion is ‘broken beyond hope of recovery’ (*op. cit.* p. 18 f.).

On the general bearings of this subject see art. Asceticism.

F. Homes Dudden.

☩ Father's House

FATHER'S HOUSE (οἰκία τοῦ πατρὸς μου).—The name applied by Jesus in [Joh_14:2](#) to the eternal home, whither He goes to prepare a place for His disciples. To their fear lest they might never rejoin Him after the impending separation, He answers that in His Father's house there are many abodes (μοναί)—a place, therefore, for every one who believes in Him. See art. Mansion.

The expression occurs twice elsewhere in the Gospels, with reference to the Temple, and in both cases bears an emphatic meaning: (a) In [Luk_2:49](#) the words ἐν τοῖς τοῦ τ

αὐτοῦ μου, although capable of the translation ‘about my Father’s business’ (as in Authorized Version), are more properly rendered ‘in my Father’s house’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). This rendering is supported by the context. See Business. The first recorded utterance of Jesus has an all-important bearing on the question of the development of His Messianic consciousness. His visit to the Temple, in the dawn of manhood, awakened in Him the sense of a peculiarly close relation to God, whom He recognized henceforth as His Father. (b) In Joh 2:16 the words which appear in the Synoptic narrative as a quotation from the OT (‘It is written, My house shall be called,’ etc.) are given as a direct saying of Jesus, ‘Make not my Father’s house a house of merchandise.’ The Speaker thus declares by what authority He cleanses the Temple. As Son of God He has the right of ordering His Father’s house and casting out the intruders who have dishonoured it.

The ‘Father’s house’ of Joh 14:2 has been explained (on the analogy of the above passages) as the heavenly Temple, of which the Temple at Jerusalem was the earthly type (cf. Isa 6:1, Hebrews 9). Apart, however, from the particular difficulty that a temple could hardly be described as a place of *μοναί*, the whole tone of the passage demands a simpler explanation. Jesus thinks of the ‘house’ as a home, to which He is Himself returning, and in which He will be reunited at last with His disciples. The expression ‘Father’s house’ has already been used implicitly with this larger meaning in Joh 8:35 ‘The servant abideth not in the house for ever, but the Son abideth for ever.’

Theologically, the passage Joh 14:2 f. marks a departure from the prevailing type of Johannine thought. It withdraws into the future that communion with Christ and participation in His eternal life which are elsewhere regarded as present realities. It further identifies the *παρουσία* with the coming of Christ to the believer in the hour of death (Joh 14:3), not (as in the sequel of the discourse) with His abiding spiritual presence. The divergence, however, does not necessarily involve a contradiction. While maintaining that Life is given in the present, St. John looks to a future in which it will become fully manifest (cf. Joh 5:28-29, Joh 6:39 etc.). For the believer, as for Christ Himself, death is the transition to a larger ‘glory.’

The allusion to the ‘Father’s house’ is obviously figurative, and we cannot even infer from it that St. John conceives of the future world under forms of space. Such a conception seems, indeed, to be debarred by the great declaration (Joh 4:24) of the spiritual nature of God. The essential thought in the saying is simply that the believer will enter after death into that perfect communion with God which is impossible under the conditions of this world. In more than one Synoptic passage this communion is described by Jesus under the imagery of a feast (Mat 26:29; Mat 8:11, Luk 14:15 ff.). This image is replaced in the Fourth Gospel by the less vivid but more adequate

one of a perpetual sojourn with the Father in His house. But in both cases the image is only the vehicle, necessarily imperfect, of the spiritual idea, that the crowning blessedness of the believer will consist in nearness to God and perfect fellowship with Him.

This main idea is combined, in the Johannine passage, with several others which serve to render it more complete and definite: (1) The communion with God is mediated by Christ, who is Himself the Son, and therefore has the right to bring His chosen friends into His Father's house (cf. Joh 8:35-36; Joh 17:24). (2) It will be a lasting communion, not fitful and interrupted like that which is granted to us in the present. Those who were formerly servants will 'abide in the house for ever,' like the Son Himself. They will not be strangers, tarrying for an hour but will have *μοναί* appointed to them—fixed places which they can call their own. (3) The emphasis on the 'many mansions' would seem to suggest that the perfect communion with God does not involve a mere absorption in Him. Each life will maintain its own identity and receive its separate fulfilment. Jesus will be the same in the higher world as He was in this, and the disciples likewise will find themselves again, and resume their fellowship with each other and with Him. A certain resemblance can thus be traced between the thought of this passage and that of St. Paul in 2Co 5:1-4. The Apostle anticipates for each believer 'a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens,' which will take the place of the 'earthly house of this tabernacle.' The saying in the Gospel declares that there will be room for all these separate mansions within the one 'Father's house.'

Literature.—The various commentaries on St. John's Gospel, *in loco*, e.g. Holtzmann, Loisy, Weiss, Bugge, Calmes, Godet; Schrenck, *Die johann. Anschauung vom Leben* (1898), p. 157 f.; Grill, *Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums* (1902), p. 360, etc.; Titius, *Die johann. Anschauung der Seligkeit* (1900), ch. vi.; Ker, *Sermons*, ii. 247; Maclaren, *Holy of Holies*, 12.

E. F. Scott.

☩ Father, Fatherhood

FATHER, FATHERHOOD.—The one subject on which Jesus claimed to have unique and absolute knowledge was the Father (Mat 11:27). Yet, in saying this, He evidently did not mean that He knew all that God knows. He confessed or implied that His knowledge was limited (e.g. Mar 13:32, Mat 9:21-22); and the very fact that He looked up to God as His God is sufficient evidence that, by knowledge of the Father, He did not mean comprehension of the Infinite. The record of His life and teaching

makes it plain that His unique knowledge of God was knowledge of the Divine character and purpose. This was the sphere in which He lived and moved and had His conscious being. This was the sphere of His revelation.

In setting forth Jesus' conception of the Fatherhood of God, we shall consider (1) the use of the name 'Father'; (2) the meaning of Fatherhood; (3) the Fatherhood of God in the Fourth Gospel; (4) the place of Fatherhood in the teaching of Jesus; and (5) Jesus' conception of God compared with that of the OT and of His contemporaries.

1. Use of the name 'Father' by Jesus.—The first recorded sentence of Jesus (Luk 2:49), and that which was probably the last (Luk 23:46), both contain the name 'Father.' The boy of twelve felt an inward constraint to be engaged in the things of His Father, and twenty years later, expiring on the cross, it was into the hands of His Father that He commended His spirit. Throughout His ministry His use of this name is what we might expect from the scene which St. Luke records from His boyhood. 'The child is father of the man.' Whenever the personal relation between Him and God is involved, Jesus employs no name but 'Father,' if we except a single passage where He quotes from the 22nd Psalm (Mar 15:34). In each of the five prayers where the words of Jesus are given. He addresses God as 'Father' (Mat 11:25-27; Mat 26:39; Mat 26:42, Luk 23:34; Luk 23:46); and in the longest of these, which includes only three verses, the name is repeated five times (Mat 11:25-27). When speaking of God in the third person, Jesus refers to Him once as 'the Great King' (Mat 5:35), and once as 'Lord of the harvest' (Mat 9:38); but in almost every case He uses the name 'God' or the name 'Father.' He never employs such circumlocutions as 'the Blessed One' and 'Holy One,' and never uses abstract designations such as 'Place,' all of which were common in the synagogue. It is significant to compare with this usage that of Philo, whose commonest titles of God are abstract (e.g. τὸ ὄν, τὸ ὄντως ὄν, τὸ πρὸς ἅληθινὸν ὄν, ὁ ὢν—Drummond, *Philo Judaeus*, ii. 20). The name by which Jesus Himself addressed God was also the name which He put on the lips of His disciples. It was their privilege to share His communion with God (Mat 6:9; Mat 23:9).

2. The Meaning of Fatherhood.—What Jesus meant by the term 'Father' is to be learned both from His words and from His life. From His words we infer that He chose this term to describe the character of God. Thus He teaches that, as it is the very nature of a father to give good gifts to his children, so it is the very nature of God to give His good things to those who ask Him (Mat 7:11, Luk 11:13). Earthly fathers, though evil, give to their children; much more will God give, who is absolutely and unchangeably good (Mar 10:18). He is ready to bestow the Kingdom of heaven upon the poor in spirit, and to give the vision of Himself to the pure in heart (Mat 5:3; Mat 5:8); that is to say, He gives the best He has to any who will receive it. And even upon those who will not receive the best, He bestows much; for He maketh His sun to

rise on the evil, and sendeth rain on the unjust (Mat 5:45). Jesus exhorts His hearers to have this spirit in order that they may become sons of the heavenly Father and share His perfection (Mat 5:45; Mat 5:48). Accordingly the term 'Fatherhood' describes what God is in Himself. It does not concern merely or chiefly His relation to men, but it declares His very spirit, that which lies behind all relationships.

The story of the Lost Son perfectly interprets Jesus' conception of Fatherhood (Luk 15:11-32). The lost son does not stand for a lost Israelite merely, a fallen member of the theocratic people, but represents the *sinner*, whether Jew or Gentile. For, in the first place, the parable was spoken to justify Jesus' reception of publicans (Luk 15:1-2), and publicans were rated as no better than Gentiles (Mat 18:17); and, in the second place, the conclusion of Jesus in the parables of the Lost Sheep and the Lost Coin, which are manifestly parallel to that of the Lost Son, is perfectly general. He there declares that there is joy in heaven over one *sinner* who repents (Luk 15:7; Luk 15:10). Therefore, when Jesus, in the story of the Lost Son, says that the father watched and longed for his son's return, and welcomed him at last with kisses and a joyful feast. He teaches that the Fatherhood of God is essential, and therefore a fact of universal significance. It is in keeping with this when Jesus, addressing the *multitudes* as well as His disciples, said to all who heard Him, 'Call no man your father on earth: for one is your Father, who is in heaven' (Mat 23:1; Mat 23:9). If we had more of the addresses of Jesus to the multitudes, we should probably have more instances of this same usage.

Again, the very life of Jesus shows what He meant by the Fatherhood of God, for He surely felt that the spirit of this Fatherhood was manifested through Him. He portrayed His own attitude towards the lost when He drew the picture of the father and his lost son. His brotherhood interpreted the spirit of the Divine Fatherhood. But the brotherhood of Jesus describes what He was. He did not simulate brotherliness. It was by the very necessity of His holy and loving will that He was the friend of sinners. It is impossible, therefore, to suppose that, in His thought, the Fatherhood of God was something less than essential, a figure setting forth His gracious relationship to certain favoured people. As His own love flowed out to men irrespective of all merely outward circumstances, and as He believed that He knew the Father and was in harmony with His will. He must have believed that God loves men irrespective of all outward circumstances; in other words, that His Fatherhood is essential, and hence of universal significance.

It is true that Jesus considered Himself sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and that He confined His labours chiefly to them; but it is equally true that this was solely a matter of *order*. He told the Canaanitish woman that the children should be fed *first* (Mar 7:27), which plainly suggests that the gospel was for all, but that for some reason it was to be offered first to the Jews. Moreover, He granted the woman's

request, though He thus spoke; and in no case did He turn a Gentile away empty who came to Him for help. He healed a Samaritan leper ([Luk_17:18](#)), and the servant of a Gentile centurion ([Mat_8:13](#)). There is no indication that they were less dear to Him than were the Jews.

We conclude, therefore, both from the words and the life of Jesus, that He called God our Father, not because God created us,—a view common in Philo,—or because He rules over us, or because of the covenant which He made with Abraham, but simply and only because He loves us. The abstract statement that ‘God is love’ ([1Jn_4:8](#)) is a true interpretation of the word ‘Father’ as used by Jesus.

3. *The Fatherhood of God in the Fourth Gospel.*—The Fatherhood of God is more conspicuous in John than in the Synoptics, the word ‘Father’ occurring about 90 times as against 5 in Mark, 17 in Luke, and 45 in Matthew. Here also, as in the Synoptics, the word is found only on the lips of Jesus, with the exception of three passages where the author speaks from his own Christian point of view ([Joh_1:18](#); [Joh_8:27](#); [Joh_13:3](#)), and one passage in which he attributes his Christian usage to the Baptist ([3:35](#)).

The new feature of the subject in the Fourth Gospel is the emphasis laid on the universality of Fatherhood. Thus it is the *world* (*κόσμος*) which God is represented as loving up to the point of the highest sacrifice ([Joh_3:16](#)). It is *all men* whom Jesus will draw unto Himself ([Joh_12:32](#)). In offering life to a *Samaritan*, Jesus feels that He is accomplishing the Father’s will ([Joh_4:10](#); [Joh_4:34](#)), and a visit of certain *Greeks* brought before His soul the vision of a great harvest for the Kingdom of God ([Joh_12:20-24](#)).

Still more noticeable, and more divergent from the earlier usage, is the employment of ‘Father’ in an absolute sense. The extent of this usage in John is not altogether clear. In the conversation with the Samaritan woman, Fatherhood is plainly universal: ‘The hour cometh and now is when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth: for such doth the Father seek to be his worshippers’; ‘Believe me, the hour cometh when neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem shall ye worship the Father’ ([Joh_4:21](#); [Joh_4:23](#)). Another passage which admits of no doubt is [Joh_20:17](#) ‘I am not yet ascended to the Father. But go to my brethren and say to them, I ascend to my Father and your Father, and my God and your God.’ It is quite clear that the word ‘Father’ in the first clause is unlimited; for, in the later clauses, He who is here called ‘the Father’ is called by Jesus ‘my Father and your Father.’ Two other cases of what appears to be the same use of the word are [Joh_6:27](#); [Joh_6:46](#).

In about one quarter of the passages where God is called ‘Father,’ He is so called in reference to Jesus, and the language is ‘my Father’ (e.g. [Joh_2:16](#); [Joh_5:17](#);

Joh 6:32). Since, now, there are some passages in which the absolute sense of 'Father' is required, and since in the majority of the other passages, where the expression 'the Father' is used, there is nothing which requires us to adopt a limited idea of Fatherhood, it must be regarded as probable that the author *always* employed the word in an unlimited sense when he did not associate a personal pronoun with it. Thus the Fourth Gospel would place a very striking emphasis on the thought that the Fatherhood of God is essential and universal. Such emphasis on this point in the teaching of John was, of course, made natural by the missionary activity of the early Church, which had gone forward many years before the Fourth Gospel was composed.

The meaning of Fatherhood in the Fourth Gospel is the same as in the primitive tradition. It describes the character of God, and is expressed in love. It is perhaps probable that the author of the Fourth Gospel occasionally used the term 'Father' in a metaphysical sense (Joh 1:14; Joh 1:18), but he has put no words on the lips of Jesus which require to be taken metaphysically. He often represents Jesus as saying 'my Father,' but it is unquestionable that Jesus would have every man address God in just this way. He taught His disciples to say 'our Father,' which, of course, implies that each individual may say 'my Father.' When Jesus, to comfort His disciples, is represented as sending them the message, 'I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God' (Joh 20:17), He does not separate Himself from them by claiming a unique relationship to the Father, even God, but rather joins Himself closely with them by the thought that one and the same Father is theirs and His alike, one God the God of both. The Fatherhood of God according to Jesus, even in the Fourth Gospel, is one and ethical, but His appreciation and appropriation of that Fatherhood are unique.

4. *The Place of Fatherhood in the teaching of Jesus.*—In accordance with the fact that the sole subject on which Jesus claimed to possess unique knowledge was the character of God, or, as we may now say, the *Fatherhood* of God, we find that this truth is central and determinative in all His teaching. His conception of the Kingdom of heaven was dependent on His conception of the character of God. The Kingdom which He wished to see come on earth was the Kingdom of the *Father* (Mat 6:9), a Kingdom in which the will of the Father should be done. Therefore the conception of the Kingdom of heaven is not the fundamental thought of Jesus. Nor was His teaching determined by His sense of the imperfections of the Law. These imperfections He saw clearly, but not because of a critical analysis of the Law such as a philosophical student of history might make. He considered the Law from above, as one who possessed in Himself a higher standard, a more perfect knowledge of the Divine will. His work was, indeed, to fulfil the Law, and to establish the Kingdom of God on earth; but the inspiring and ruling thought in all His work was the truth of God's Fatherhood. What He teaches of man's relation to God is determined by this truth. It is gathered up in the thought of sonship. The lost son is to return to the Father. His life is to be

one of filial service in the Father's presence. And it is the goodness of the Father that draws him back.

The Fatherhood of God requires that the spirit of the religious life shall be love, out of which will be born perfect trust. It invites and draws man to communion with God, and determines the character of his devotion. What Jesus teaches of man's relation to man is also determined by His consciousness of the character of God. His morality is purely religious. The ethical life of His disciples is to be controlled by the fact of their sonship to God. The standard of that life is the very quality which constitutes the perfection of God (Mat_5:48). It is one and the same quality that makes Him the *Father* and makes man His *son*. Thus the entire teaching of Jesus is but the interpretation of the fact of God's Fatherhood. This is the sun in His heaven which lights and warms the broad field of human life.

5. Jesus' conception of God compared with that of the OT, and with views of His contemporaries.—The new revelation which Jesus gave of the character of God was put into a term which had long been applied to Him in Israel. The first of the great prerogatives of the Jewish people which are enumerated by St. Paul is the adoption (Rom_9:4), that is, the appointment of Israel to be in a peculiar sense God's son. This thought was derived from the OT. God's message to Pharaoh by Moses involved a paternal relation to Israel, for Moses was to say in God's name, 'Israel is my son, my first-born' (Exo_4:22). Again, Deuteronomy represents Moses as saying to the people, 'As a man chasteneth his son, so the Lord thy God chasteneth thee' (Deu_8:5; Deu_32:6); and the Lord says in Hosea that when Israel was a child He loved him and called His *son* out of Egypt (Hos_11:1; Hos_1:10). In these passages, and in a few more, God is thought of as a Father to the people of Israel as a whole; and He is the Father of Israel because He made them a nation and established them by His mighty power (Deu_32:6). So far His Fatherhood is wholly national. There are, however, other passages in which we have an individualizing of the thought of Fatherhood. Thus the Lord says of the theocratic descendant of David, 'I will be his father, and he shall be my son' (2Sa_7:14); and the Messianic king puts the decree of Jehovah concerning himself in these words, 'Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee' (Psa_2:7). There is also an individualizing of God's Fatherhood with reference to other persons, for the Psalter calls Him the Father of the fatherless; and His pity for those who fear Him is like the pity of a father for his children (Psa_68:5; Psa_103:13). Yet in all these passages we see only the relation of God to His chosen people, or to a particular class among them, or to His chosen king. 'Father' is a word of relation, not yet a description of God's very character. It marks an advance upon that conception of Fatherhood which is derived from the fact of creation, but it is still far removed from the view of Jesus. The OT gave to Jesus the name 'Father' for God, but He filled it with a new content.

When we come down from the OT to the time of Jesus, we find among the Jews a conception of God that is far more widely unlike that of the gospel, and which by contrast serves to bring out the thought of Jesus into strong relief. This Jewish conception of God was based on the traditional interpretation of the Law, not on the spiritual teaching of the Prophets. God was put further and further away; the conception of Him became increasingly abstract and transcendental.

Even as early as the translation of the OT into Greek (3rd cent. b.c.) this tendency towards a more abstract conception of God is manifest. The translators sought to remove the thought that God had come into actual contact with men. They do not, with Exo 15:3, call God a 'man of war,' but render the passage by 'the Lord who makes war.' Moses no longer goes up 'to God in the mount,' as the original reads (Exo 19:3), but he goes up 'to the *mount* of God.' Moses and those with him did not see the *God of Israel* (Exo 24:9-10), but they saw the *place* where He stood.

As in the Greek translation of the OT, so in the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan (1st cent. b.c.) appears the tendency to safeguard the holiness of God by removing Him far from men. An illustration may be cited from Gen 18:8. It is said there that the heavenly visitants ate of the repast which Abraham had provided, but Onkelos changes it to 'it *seemed* to him as though they ate.' Such was the method of the Targumists. With the removal of God far from men there came to be associated in the course of time an elaborate doctrine of angels—a natural if not necessary correlate of the transcendental conception of God.

But though the scribes removed God far from contact with man and the world, their conception of Him was unspiritual.

He is pictured in the Talmud of Jerusalem as a great Rabbi. He studies the Law three hours each day, and observes all its ordinances. He keeps the Sabbath. He makes vows, and on their accomplishment He is released by the heavenly Sanhedrin. He also fulfils the injunction to rise up before the hoary head (see Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, i. 276; Weber, *Jud. Theol.*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] pp. 17, 18). Thus the external, ceremonial conception of religion at last took complete possession of the future world, and threw the mesh of its enslavement to the letter even around God Himself. The prophet's spiritual conception of Jehovah was lost; the glow of lovingkindness which they beheld in His face faded out utterly, and there remained a Being who was called 'the Holy one,' interesting perhaps to the scribe, but whom no one could really love.

To this conception of God the revelation of His Fatherhood by Jesus formed an absolute contrast. The scribes put God in the seventh heaven; Jesus taught that He is near. The scribes held that He is intensely concerned with outward ordinances; Jesus

taught that He is full of love, and cares only for the heart of man. To the scribal mind God was the God of scribes; to Jesus He was the Father of all men. The religious teachers of Jesus' time fell very far below the prophetic conception of God; Jesus rose still further above it.

For the application of the term 'father' to Joseph, see artt. Birth of Christ and Joseph.

Literature.—The works on NT Theology by Holtzmann (H. J.), Beyschlag, Stevens, and Gould; Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*; Gilbert, *The Revelation of Jesus*; Bousset, *Die Religion des Judenthums*; B. Weiss, *Die Religion des NT*; Fairbairn, *Christ in Mod. Theol.* 440 ff.; Dale in *Expositor*, v. vii. [1898] 56, 150.

George H. Gilbert.

☞ Fathers

FATHERS.—The plural of 'father' is found in 14 passages in the Gospels, once (in the Greek) with no determining word (Luk 1:17), twice with the article only, 'the fathers' (Joh 6:58 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 7:22), and 11 times with a pronoun: 'our' (Mat 23:30, Luk 1:55; Luk 1:72, Joh 4:20; Joh 6:31); 'your' (Mat 23:32, Luk 11:47-48, Joh 6:49); 'their' (Luk 6:23; Luk 6:26). With one exception (Luk 1:17) where it means 'parents,' as contrasted with 'children,' it is always employed in the sense of 'ancestors,' as in innumerable passages in the OT (Gen 47:9, 1Ki 11:43; 1Ki 14:31; 1Ki 15:8 etc.), the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha (2Es 7:36, Ps-Sol 8:25, 9:19 etc.), and the historical Assyrian texts (*šarrani abi-ia* = 'the kings my fathers,' *K/B* [Note: *IB Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek.*] ii. 170, 172, etc.).

As early as about b.c. 200 the Heb. word 'âbóth came to have the narrower meaning of 'distinguished ancestors.' The long historical review in Sirach 44-49 opens (Heb.):

Let me now praise godly men,

Our *fathers* in their generations.

The fathers praised are Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Israel, Moses, Aaron, Phinehas, Joshua, Caleb, the Judges, Samuel, Nathan, David, Solomon, Elijah, Elisha, Hezekiah, Isaiah, Josiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Job, the Twelve, Zerubbabel, Joshua the priest, Nehemiah. In a sort of appendix (Sir 49:14-16) are given Enoch (again), Joseph, Shem, Seth, Enos, Adam. The Hebrew heading of these chapters, 'Praise of the fathers of

the world,' or, as Cowley and Neubauer render, 'Praise of the patriarchs,' cannot be urged, as it may be of much later date. The Greek heading πατέρων ὕμνος is of more value, as it may be pre-Christian. Among these distinguished ancestors or 'fathers' a group of three was early singled out for special notice—Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. God is several times described in the OT as 'the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob' or 'Israel' (Exo 3:6; Exo 3:16, 1Ki 18:36, 1Ch 29:18, 2Ch 30:6). In a tradition preserved in the Babylonian Talmud (*Berak. 16b*) it is said: 'Only three are called fathers.' It is assumed that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were 'the fathers' *par excellence*. The group is referred to 5 times in the Gospels (Mat 8:11; Mat 22:32, Mar 12:26, Luk 13:28; Luk 20:37), and probably, without the names, in one of the passages cited above (Joh 7:22 'not that it [circumcision] is of Moses but of the fathers'). The 'fathers,' then, in the language of our Lord and His contemporaries, could mean ancestors in general, or the ancestors of some particular period, as, for example, the wandering in the wilderness (Joh 6:31; Joh 6:49; Joh 6:58), or ancestors of notable piety or renown, more especially the three patriarchs who were regarded as the founders of the people.

The thought that the great goodness of some of the fathers, especially of Abraham, was helpful to their sinful descendants, which found expression in the phrase *zakkûth 'âbôth* 'merit of the fathers' so often met with in the Talmud, can be traced as far back as the time of Christ and the Apostles. It probably underlies the words of St. Paul: 'they are beloved for the fathers' sakes.' (Rom 11:28); and evidently lurks in the proud boast of being the seed of Abraham or children of Abraham (Mat 3:9, Luk 3:8, Joh 8:33; Joh 8:39 etc.). The phrase, however, is never met with in the Gospels. The allied belief that the holy fathers could effectually intercede for their wicked descendants, which is distinctly attested in some of the Pseudepigrapha (Syriac Apocalypse, Apocalyptic of Bar. 85:12, Sib. Oracles ii. 330-333), is implied in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. The rich man in Hades appeals, not to God, but to one of the fathers (Luk 16:24). Still there is no direct mention of their intercession in the Gospels.

The use of the term 'fathers' in the sense of 'distinguished teachers of the Law, who prolonged the line of tradition' which has become so widely known through the famous Talmudic tractate *Pirke Abôth or Masseketh Abôth*, is unrepresented in the Gospels, unless it is alluded to or echoed in the title 'father' applied to a living rabbi (Mat 23:9).

Literature.—R. H. Charles, *Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, pp. 69-70, note; Weber, *Jüd. Theol. auf Grund des Talmud*,² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] etc. 292 ff.; Schürer, *GJV* [Note: JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ii. 317.

⚠Fatlings

FATLINGS.—See Animals, p. 63^b.

⚠Favour

FAVOUR.—See Grace and Graciousness.

⚠Fear

FEAR (φόβος, φοβοῦμαι; in Mat 8:24 and Mar 4:40 ‘fearful’ = δειλός).—1. In many passages in the Gospels fear is a motive restraining or compelling action in the ordinary course of human relationships. Men fear others, and shape their conduct, at least in part, by their fears: e.g. Mat 2:22 (Joseph is afraid to return to Judaea); Mat 14:5 (Herod would not put John to death because ‘he feared the people’); Mat 21:26; Mat 21:46; Mar 11:32, Luk 22:2 (where the Pharisees ‘fear the multitude’); Mar 9:32, Luk 9:45 (the disciples are ‘afraid to ask’ the meaning of a saying); Mar 11:18 (scribes and Pharisees wished to destroy Jesus, ‘for they feared him’); Joh 7:13; Joh 9:22; Joh 19:38; Joh 20:19 (men are silent or secret ‘for fear of the Jews’). Similar passages are Mat 25:25, Mar 6:20; Mar 12:12, Luk 19:21; Luk 20:19 etc. This fear sometimes restrains bad men from carrying out their evil purposes; but quite as often turns others aside from the straight path of right.

2. The Gospels also mention frequently the fear which men feel in the presence of what they believe to be supernatural or superhuman. This is often an accompaniment of the miracles of Jesus. It is mentioned of the disciples, at the stilling of the tempest (Mar 4:41, Luk 8:25), when Jesus walked on the sea (Mat 14:28, Mar 6:50, Joh 6:19-20), at the Transfiguration (Mat 17:6-7 and parallels). So the people of Judaea were afraid when they saw the demoniac healed (Mar 5:15); so ‘fear took hold on all’ when the widow’s son was raised (Luk 7:16); and in the same way the centurion at the cross (Mat 27:54) and the witnesses of the Resurrection (Mat 28:4; Mat 28:8) were afraid; cf. also Luk 1:12; Luk 1:65; Luk 2:9; Luk 5:28 etc.

3. Especially worthy of notice are those passages in which Jesus exhorts His hearers *not to fear*. He reassures Jairus when word comes that his daughter is dead (Mar 5:36, Luk 8:50); and Peter when the miraculous draught of fishes fills him with a sense of sin (Luk 5:10); He meets the terror of the disciples on the sea with, 'It is I, be not afraid' (Mat 14:27); and touches them at the Transfiguration, with similar words (Mat 17:7). When He sends the disciples out to preach, it is with reiterated injunctions against fear. The servants will meet with hostility from the enemies of their Lord; but they must face such opposition without fear, 'for there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed' (Mat 10:24-27). They are to be fearless preachers of the gospel, because no hostility of men can prevent the triumph of truth. They are not to fear even those who can kill the body, for their power is strictly limited to the body (Mat 10:28, Luk 12:4); they are to remember God's thought for the sparrows, and to be assured of the greater value of the servants of His Kingdom, and so to escape from fear (Mat 10:31). If they are few in number facing a hostile world—a little flock surrounded by wolves—they are to remember the sure purpose of the Father and not to be afraid (Luk 12:32).

Moral courage is a vital necessity of Christian discipleship. The Master is keenly conscious of moral paralysis which comes from the fear of man. Rev 21:8 reflects His judgment when it groups 'the fearful' with 'the unbelieving' and 'the abominable' who are cast into the lake of fire which is the second death. And in our Lord's teaching faith is the antidote of fear. A true knowledge of the Father is the unfailing source of moral courage. 'Acquaint thyself with the Father and be delivered from fear' is the burden of His teaching. See *Courage, Cowardice*.

4. The almost complete absence of direct exhortation to fear God is a very noticeable feature of the Gospels. The fear of God is, indeed, mentioned in the *Magnificat* (Luk 1:50), in the parable of the Unjust Judge (Luk 18:2; Luk 18:4), and by the penitent thief on the cross (Luk 23:40); but in a direct injunction of Jesus only—if at all—in Mat 10:28 and the parallel passage Luk 12:5. Here, as already mentioned, Jesus is sending out the disciples with the exhortation not to fear—even those who kill the body. But He adds to the negative a positive injunction, 'Rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell'; or, as Lk. puts it, 'But I will warn you whom ye shall fear: fear him which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, fear him.' It is most natural to think with the majority of commentators that God is the object of fear in this exhortation; but there are some who urge, on the contrary, that the devil is intended.

A. B. Bruce ('St. Matthew,' in *Expositor's Gr. Test.*) says: 'Would Christ present God under this aspect in such close connexion with the Father who cares even for the sparrows? What is to be greatly feared is not the final condemnation, but that which leads to it—temptation to forsake the cause of God out of regard to self-interest or

self-preservation. Shortly, the counsel is: fear not the persecutor but the tempter, not the man who kills you for your fidelity but the man who wants to buy you off, and the devil whose agent he is.' Weymouth (*The NT in Modern Speech*) urges against the reference to God that ἐξουσία (Luk 12:5) usually denotes 'delegated authority,' 'power enjoyed on sufferance'; and refers to Luk 22:53, Joh 19:11, Act 26:18, Col 1:13, and Rev 13:7 for illustrations of the ascription of power to Satan. On the other side Plummer ('St. Luke' in *Internat. Crit. Com.*) says: 'There is little doubt that this refers to God, and not to the devil. The change of construction points to this. It is no longer φοβήθητε ἀπο τοῦτου but τοῦτον φοβήθητε, "fear without trying to shun," which is the usual construction of fearing God. Moreover, we are not in Scripture told to fear Satan, but to resist him courageously.'

It may also be urged that the extreme punishment of the wicked is nowhere described as an exercise of Satan's authority. Gehenna is 'the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels' into which in Mat 25:40-41 those on the left hand are sent by the King. The ultimate 'destruction' of wicked men, whatever that may actually mean, must be conceived as an act of God and as the exercise of His authority; cf. Mat 21:40-41 'The Lord of the vineyard ... will miserably destroy those wicked men.'

5. Looking at the teaching of Jesus as a whole, we notice that, while He constantly urges men to faith rather than to fear, and to a trust in God's fatherly goodness, such as makes filial love the ruling motive of religious life, He does not altogether discard the appeal to fear as a motive for right conduct. There is a severity of God which cannot be ignored. Such parables as the Rich Man and Lazarus, the Unmerciful Servant, the Wheat and the Tares, and others, whatever interpretation we may put upon their details, at least suggest a Divine and holy sternness in regard to which men should keep a wholesome fear. Nor is it only in parables that we find this element of our Lord's teaching. We have in the Sermon on the Mount such passages as Mat 5:21-30; Mat 7:13-14; Mat 7:21-27 : and with these we may compare Mat 11:20-24; Mat 12:32; Mat 16:25-26; Mat 21:44; Mat 26:24 and many others. The normal relation of the children of God to the Heavenly Father should be one of glad confidence and loving obedience. It should be ever approaching that perfect love which casts out fear; but men who are trifling with great moral issues have no right, according to the teaching of Jesus, to this happy emancipation. For them fear is wholesome and necessary; for God is the Holy Father, and persistent defiance of His will must be visited with stern and righteous doom.

Literature.—Cremer and Grimm-Thayer, δ. υν. φοβος, φοβίω; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , art. 'Fear'; Maclaren, *Serm. pr. in Manchester*, i. 194; Bunyan, *Pilgrim's Progress*, Christian's talk with Hopeful after Ignorance was left behind.

☩ Feasts

FEASTS.—The religious Feasts of the Jews in our Lord's time were not so many as the religious Feasts of the Christian Church of to-day as enumerated in the English Book of Common Prayer, but they meant very much more in the way of outward observance. In the first rank—like Christmas, Easter, Ascensiontide, and Whitsuntide—there stood out the three great Feasts of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles. Not unlike the Holy Days of the Church's Calendar, commemorating as they do various victories of the past, there were the annual Feasts of Dedication and of Purim, to which must be added the Feast of Trumpets together with its smaller counterpart in the monthly Feast of the New Moon. Corresponding to the Christian Sunday there was the weekly Feast of the Sabbath. Of these, Passover, Tabernacles, and Dedication are all specially mentioned in the Gospels, as well as the Sabbath, to which there are very many references, some merely incidental and some meant to show that it was our Lord's purpose to free the observance of that day from the artificial rules that had grown up about it in tradition. The Feasts are most prominent in the Fourth Gospel, where they are so mentioned as to form a framework into which the events of our Lord's Ministry fall. Three Passovers are there recorded: (1) Joh_2:13, when our Lord cleansed the Temple almost at the beginning of His Ministry; (2) Joh_6:4, just after the feeding of the 5000; (3) Joh_13:1 (cf. Mat_26:2, Mar_14:1, Luk_22:1), at the time of the Crucifixion and Resurrection.

It has indeed been contended that the reference to Passover in Joh_6:4 is a mistake, and that really there were only two Passovers in our Lord's Ministry, the one at the beginning and the other at the end; it has also been contended that there may have been other Passovers, which are not mentioned, and that our Lord's Ministry may have included so many as ten or twelve, lasting over 10 or 12 years; but neither of these contentions can be made good, and it seems more likely that the record as it stands is both accurate and complete (see Turner in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Chronology of NT').

Besides these three Passovers, mention is made of the Feast of Tabernacles in Joh_7:2, of the Feast of Dedication in Joh_10:22, and of some Feast not particularized by name in Joh_5:1. To these St. Luke adds mention of an earlier Passover, when our Lord was 12 years old and was for the first time (?) allowed to accompany Joseph and Mary as they went up to Jerusalem year after year for the Feast (Luk_2:41 f.).

The Feasts of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles were all of them Pilgrimage Feasts, that is to say. Feasts at which all male Jews above the age of 12 years were required to appear before the Lord in Jerusalem. It is noticed in Luk 2:41 f. that Joseph and Mary were both in the habit of going up to Jerusalem for the Passover every year. There was no requirement that women should thus attend at the Feasts, but Hillel seems to have encouraged the practice, and it was adopted by other religious women besides Mary (Edersheim, *Life and Times*, vol. i. p. 236). St. Luke in the same passage speaks of our Lord as going up at the age of twelve; that, too, was in excess of what was required by law, but was apparently in accordance with custom (so Edersheim, *op. cit.* p. 235; but cf. Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii. ii. p. 51, who represents that, strictly speaking, every boy who could walk ought to have attended, and that it was only by custom that boys who lived at a distance were allowed to wait till their twelfth year before going). Attendance at the Feasts was not confined to those who lived within easy reach, but Jews came as well from great distances, although naturally they could not attend so often as three times a year.

Schürer writes (*op. cit.* p. 290 f.): 'There was nothing that contributed so much to cement the bond of union between the dispersion and the mother country as the regular pilgrimages which Jews from all quarters of the world were in the habit of making to Jerusalem on festival occasions.' He quotes Philo (*de Monarchia*, ii. 1) as saying: 'Many thousands of people from many thousands of towns made pilgrimages to the Temple at every festival, some by land, some by sea, and coming from the east and the west, from the north and the south,' and refers to Josephus' estimate of the number of Jews in Jerusalem at the time of the Feasts as being so many as 2,700,000 (*BJ* vi. ix. 3).

In accordance with this it is definitely stated in the Gospels that four times during His Ministry our Lord went up to Jerusalem to keep the Feasts, twice for Passover, once for Tabernacles, and once for an unnamed Feast. Possibly He went up quite regularly three times a year, for the notice that He was in Galilee shortly before the second Passover (Joh 6:4) does not preclude the possibility of His having gone up a little later. At the first Passover mention is made of His disciples being with Him in Jerusalem (Joh 2:17; Joh 2:22), evidently having journeyed from Galilee with the same purpose as Himself, to keep the Feast. Similarly at Tabernacles it is stated that His brethren went up from Galilee to keep the Feast (Joh 7:10). In all the Gospel references to Passover and Tabernacles the impression is given of large crowds of Jews in Jerusalem. At the Feast of Dedication also our Lord was in Jerusalem, but that was simply because His work at that time lay close by. He did not go up to Jerusalem on purpose for it, since no pilgrimages were made except at the three great Feasts; but being close at hand He liked to mark the occasion by a visit to the Temple, and there found a considerable number of Jews resident in the

neighbourhood who had been attracted thither like Himself. See, further, the sep. artt. on Dedication, Passover, etc.

As regards the unnamed Feast of Joh 5:1, it is impossible to reach any certainty as to what Feast is intended. If the correct reading were ἡ ἑορτή, it would most naturally be the Feast of Tabernacles, which was above all *the* Feast of the Jews (Cheyne on Isa 30:29); but if the article be omitted, as almost certainly it should be, the expression is quite indefinite, and might refer to either Tabernacles or Passover or Pentecost, or to any of the smaller Feasts.

In attempting to decide between these, guidance may first be sought from the general sequence of events, so far as it is indicated by the following notes of time:

- (1) Passover, *i.e.* March or April, Joh 2:13.
- (2) A reference to harvest, Joh 4:35.
- (3) This unnamed Feast, Joh 5:1.
- (4) A second Passover, Joh 6:4.

Thus it appears that the unnamed Feast fell between the incident connected with the harvest in Joh 4:35 and Passover. This does not, however, give very much help, because Joh 4:35 may mean either that that was the actual time of harvest or that it was four months before harvest, so that it is impossible to tell whether the incident there described happened in the month of April or in midwinter. If that happened in midwinter, then Dedication (Dec.) and Purim (Feb.) are the only Feasts possible chronologically; but if, as is equally likely, that incident happened at harvest, then the chronology would admit almost any of the Feasts, either Pentecost (May), or Trumpets (Sept. [Note: Septuagint.]), or Tabernacles (Sept. [Note: Septuagint.]), or Dedication (Dec.), or Purim (Feb.). Thus the setting of the incident is quite indeterminate. In the description of the incident itself there are two points that need to be noticed. The one is that the introductory words are such as to suggest that the only reason for mentioning the Feast at all is to explain our Lord's presence in Jerusalem,—‘After these things there was a Feast of the Jews, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem.’ Since there were only three Feasts at which even the strictest Jews went up to Jerusalem, it appears that this must be one of those three, *i.e.* must be either Passover, Pentecost, or Tabernacles. At the smaller Feasts many of those Jews who were in or near Jerusalem would naturally congregate in the Temple courts (cf. Joh 10:22 ff.), but none were in the habit of going up on these occasions from other parts of the country. Accordingly, though Purim may seem suitable in other ways, it

quite fails to explain the one fundamental fact, our Lord's visit to Jerusalem, and the same objection lies against all the smaller Feasts. The second point to be noticed is that St. John's use of so vague a phrase in reference to one of the three great Feasts can mean only that he was himself unable to recall the exact occasion. The events recorded were quite clear in his mind, and he remembered that they had happened on one of the occasions when our Lord went to Jerusalem to keep the Feasts, but at which particular one he could not recall. This being so, it is useless to try now to discover the secret from his writings, but there is no need to feel disappointment at the absence of information on this point, as if some part of the significance of the incident were lost through ignorance of its occasion, for the circumstances would not have dropped out of St. John's memory as they did, if they had been essential to the understanding of our Lord's words or actions. See also art. Ministry.

C. E. Garrad.

☩ Feeding The Multitudes

FEEDING THE MULTITUDES.—The Gospels give us two accounts of multitudes miraculously fed by our Lord. In the first instance (reported in Mar 14:15-21, Mar 6:35-44, Luk 9:12-17, Joh 6:5-13) the number is given as 5000, exclusive (so Mt.) of women and children. In the second instance (reported in Mat 15:32-39, Mar 8:1-9) the number is given as 4000, Mt. again adding women and children.

1. It will be better to consider these instances separately, and to treat the feeding of the 5000 in the light of the first three Gospels. The Synoptics agree that the place was a desert one on the east side of the Sea of Galilee; and Lk. fixes it at Bethsaida Julias (see Capernaum). Mk. and Lk. connect the withdrawal to this place with the return of the Twelve and their report, Mt. with the execution of John the Baptist. Mk. seems to be correct, since he gives the specific reason that they needed rest, which they could not otherwise secure. All agree that a vast multitude followed them to their place of resort, thus defeating their purpose, and that it was the disciples who called the attention of Jesus to the needs of the people. Jesus then commanded His disciples to provide food for the multitude. One feels that He was preparing their minds for what He was about to do. Their astonishment at His command led them to point out the impossibility, if not absurdity, of the requirement, since they had but five loaves and two fishes. Then follows the astounding order to seat the people in groups easily accessible to the disciples, the blessing of the loaves and fishes, the distribution of the meagre supply, the satisfaction of the hunger of all, and the gathering up of the fragments.

Attempts have been made to rob this account of its miraculous character, the favourite method being to assume that the evident determination of Jesus to assuage their hunger induced those in the vast company who had supplies of food, to share, in the spirit of Jesus, with those who had none. The difficulty with this explanation is that the disciples, who had every opportunity of seeing what was done, thought that the multitude was fed with the five loaves and two fishes only. Against this, neither Mar 6:52 nor Joh 6:26 is evidence, as Beyschlag will have it (*Leben Jesu*, i. 330). The immediate context in both passages shows that both Jesus and the Twelve thought of the transaction as miraculous. Admitting the miracle, some have thought to explain it as a miraculous satisfaction of hunger with a little, rather than as a multiplication of the loaves and fishes. This is contrary to the text in all four of the Gospels, which unite in saying that twelve baskets of fragments were taken up. This would be more than there was at the beginning (see art. Basket), thus virtually affirming the multiplication. We are shut up, then, to the alternative of regarding the account as legendary, or else as a miraculous multiplication of their food supply. There are some difficulties in the way of believing it miraculous. (1) The question of Jesus, 'How many loaves have ye?' reminds one of the question of Elisha (2Ki 4:2), 'What hast thou in the house?' and so suggests an imitation of Elisha's miracle, as in fact the whole process of multiplication suggests the miracle of the meal in the jar and the cruse of oil of 1Ki 17:11-16. (2) The record is a trifle obscure. The whole stress is on the loaves, both in the gathered fragments, especially in Jn., and in the subsequent references of Jesus (see Mar 8:19), while the fish are ignored. (3) Usually, also, when such a miracle was performed, the observers are said to have been profoundly impressed (see Mar 4:41; Mar 5:42; Mar 7:37), but here no comment follows. (4) Besides, it seems to be in contradiction of His avowed purpose not to give the Jews what would be to them a convincing sign. As to all but the last of these difficulties, it may be said that they are, in themselves, not serious. The fourth assumes that the miracles of healing would not, but that a miracle such as the feeding would convince the Jews, and so be just the kind of sign the Jews demanded. But, in fact, the sign the Jews required and Jesus refused to grant was some miracle performed to order, and regardless of human need. Such a miracle as the feeding lacked these two characteristics. It was spontaneous, and it met a human want. In favour of the historicity of the miracle is the further fact that it is recorded in all the Gospels. The tradition was not open to question in the mind of any one of the Evangelists.

2. With regard to the second recorded instance, the feeding of the 4000, the case is quite different. It is found in but two of the Gospels. Lk. and Jn. evidently thought of but a single feeding. It is easy to see how the second account might have grown out of the first, and the similarities are so great as to suggest that it did have its origin there. The question of Jesus concerning the number of loaves, the remarkable circumstance that a second time the disciples had so little food with them, the seating of the people on the ground, the distribution to the Twelve for redistribution

among the multitude, the eating until they were filled, the gathering of the broken pieces into baskets, are suspiciously like the feeding of the 5000. It is difficult to see how the disciples, with the memory of the feeding of the 5000 fresh in their minds, could have questioned Jesus as to the source of supply for this second company. And here it is that the narrative as given by Jn. sheds light on the question under consideration. Jn. betrays the fact that the same narrative was differently told, since he combines elements of both narratives as related by Mt. and Mark. Mt. places the second feeding on a mountain; Jn. locates the feeding on a mountain. Jn. and Mt. and Mk. (second instance) agree that Jesus proposed the feeding. Mk., according to his usual custom of emphasizing the teaching as primary, and of making the miracles secondary, makes Jesus teach the shepherdless sheep out of sympathy, while Mt. makes this sympathy prompt Him to heal them, and Lk. combines the two; this in the first feeding. In the second this sympathy was elicited by their hunger. In the second the point of difficulty with the disciples (according to Mt. and Mk.), or with Jesus (according to Jn.), was not the expense, as in the first, but that of securing so much food in a desert place. This certainly looks as though Jn. had heard both accounts and deliberately undertook to combine them into one, or else as though the differences in the account of the same story led Mt. and Mk. to believe that there were two feedings. In any case Lk., by implication, and Jn., almost directly, favour the single feeding—that of the 5000. The only serious difficulty in this elimination of the second feeding is the record in Mar_8:19-20 (cf. Mat_16:9-10), according to which Jesus is made to refer to the two feedings as separate events. The denial of the second would make it necessary to affirm that the words of Jesus are incorrectly reported. But here Mt. is evidently dependent upon the collection of narratives by Mk., not Mk. upon the collection of sayings made by Matthew. Mt. and Mk. are not two independent witnesses. We may not be able to account satisfactorily for the misunderstanding of Mk. in this case, but his testimony could hardly offset that of Jn., unless we were obliged, which we are not, to suppose that Mk. got his information on this point directly from Peter. Even if this were so, we should have to make our choice between Peter and Jn., which, in view of all the facts, would turn out in favour of the latter.

The significance of the feeding of the multitude for the humaneness of Jesus is not less great than that of the healings. The power was His, and He used it for the good of His fellow-men in whatever way was needful for their immediate welfare, and for setting an example of helpfulness in the everyday affairs of life to His disciples in all the centuries to follow.

Literature.—Trench and Taylor on *Miracles*; Edersheim, *Life and Times*, i. 675 ff., ii. 63 ff.; Andrews, *Life of our Lord* [1893 ed.], 320 ff., 333 ff.; Bruce, *Training of the Twelve*, 118; Westcott, *Gosp. of St. John*, in loc.

C. W. Rishell.

☞ Feet

FEET.—The word occurs frequently in the Gospels. Figuratively it has a wide range of meaning. It is employed in phrases which express worthlessness ('to be trodden under foot,' Mat 5:13), supplication ('fell at his feet,' Mar 5:22; Mar 7:25), great honour or reverence (Luk 7:38-46 the woman who kissed Jesus' feet; Joh 11:2 Mary; Mat 28:9 'held him by the feet'), ignorant or blasphemous contempt (Mat 7:6 'trample under foot'), righteous condemnation or rejection (Mat 10:14 'shake dust off feet'), salvation through sacrifice (Mat 18:8 || Mar 9:45 cutting off hand or foot), discipleship (Luk 8:35 cured demoniac sitting at Jesus' feet; Luk 10:39 Mary), helplessness (Mat 22:13 'bind hand and foot'), complete triumph (Mat 22:44, Mar 12:36 || Luk 20:43 enemies of Messianic King put under His feet), absolute safety (Mat 4:6 || Luk 4:11 'lest thou dash thy foot against a stone'), subjection (Mat 5:35 earth the footstool of God's feet). In washing the feet of the disciples Jesus inculcates lessons of humility, mutual service, and the need of daily cleansing from sin (Joh 13:5-14). See artt. Bason, Foot.

Of the feet of Jesus Himself mention is made in the NT very frequently. Before His feet suppliants fell down (Mar 5:22; Mar 7:25, Luk 8:41), and also a Samaritan who returned to give thanks (Luk 17:16). At His feet sufferers were laid to be healed (Mat 13:30). Neglectful of the courtesies of a host, Simon the Pharisee gave Him no water to refresh His feet (Luk 7:44); but a sinful woman on the same occasion wet His feet with her tears, wiped them with the hair of her head, kissed them, and anointed them with ointment (Luk 7:38; Luk 7:44 ff.); and Mary of Bethany showed her great love and gratitude in a similar fashion, when she lavished the contents of her alabaster cruse of precious spikenard (Joh 11:2; Joh 12:3; cf. Mat 26:7, Mar 14:3) upon the feet which had brought the Lord from beyond Jordan (Joh 10:40; Joh 11:7) to speak the life-giving word at her brother's grave (Joh 11:43 f.). At Jesus' feet the restored demoniac sat (Luk 8:35), like Mary afterwards when she 'heard his word' (Luk 10:39). The two angels who guarded the sepulchre were seen sitting 'the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain' (Joh 20:12). It was His feet that the two Marys clung to when they first met Jesus on the Resurrection morning. [Though love prompted them to lay hold of Him, did reverence forbid them to touch more than His feet?]. When Jesus in the upper room showed His hands and His feet to His disciples (Luk 24:39 f.), it was doubtless to prove to them that He who now stood before them was the same Jesus who by hands and feet had been nailed to the cross (cf. Joh 20:20; Joh 20:25; Joh 20:27). St. Paul says of the ascended Christ that all things are put under His feet (Eph 1:22), and that beneath His feet death itself shall be destroyed (1Co 15:25 ff.). And in the Book of Revelation, when the heavenly Jesus appears to the seer of Patmos, the place of His feet has

been made glorious (cf. Isa 60:13). Those feet which were dust-stained in the house of Simon the Pharisee, and weary by the well of Sychar (Joh 4:6), and pierced with nails on the cross of Calvary, are now 'like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace' (Rev 1:15; cf. Rev 2:18).

It has been questioned whether the feet of Jesus were nailed to the cross. The doubt is based on the facts that in the Fourth Gospel Jesus mentions only His hands and side (Joh 20:20), and that sometimes in crucifixion the feet were simply tied to the cross. The nailing of the feet of Jesus would not have been disputed were it not part of an argument to prove that He did not really die on the cross. 'That the feet were usually nailed (in crucifixion), and that the case of Jesus was no exception to the general rule, may be regarded as beyond doubt' (Meyer on Mat 27:35). There is a difference of opinion as to whether the feet of Jesus were nailed to the cross separately, with two nails, or the one over the other with the same nail. In early art the feet are more frequently represented as separately nailed, but in later art as nailed together, the one over the other. Tradition favours the opinion that the feet were nailed separately. See art. Crucifixion.

Literature.—Meyer's *Com. on St. Matthew*; Ellicott, *Historical Lectures on the Life of Our Lord*, p. 353; Andrews, *Bible Student's Life of Our Lord*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 462 f.

John Reid.

Fellowship

FELLOWSHIP

Neither the word 'fellowship' (*κοινωνία*) nor any equivalent term occurs in the Synoptic Gospels, but the reality in faith, love, and joy is diffused like the fragrance of the flowers of Galilee through that bright spring of the world's life. As we pass to the Acts and Epistles, especially the Pauline, the word is found in a variety of meanings. Most frequently it is translated 'fellowship' (Act 2:42, 1Co 1:9, 2Co 6:14; 2Co 8:4, Gal 2:9, Php 1:5; Php 2:1; Php 3:10). It is rendered 'communion' in 1Co 10:16 ((Revised Version margin) 'participation in') and 2Co 13:14; 'contribution' (Authorized Version 'distribution') in 2Co 9:13, cf. Rom 15:26; 'communication' (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'fellowship') in Phm 1:6, cf. Heb 13:18. Though *κοινωνία* occurs only three times in the Johannine writings (1Jn 1:3; 1Jn 1:6-7), they are peculiarly rich in the religious ideas which give the

term its content. The conception of fellowship in the NT is not exhausted by the varied significations of any one word; it becomes plain only as we comprehend the meaning of the life of the Early Church.

i. Inherited forecasts.—Like most of the great religious conceptions of the NT, this idea has its roots deep in the OT. Isaiah proclaims that the religion of Israel can find its truest expression only in a spiritual fellowship of faith, independent of a national framework. In Israel there is an imperishable remnant, a stock from which new life will spring forth after desolation has swept over Jerusalem (Isa 8:13-18; Isa 37:31-32). By the time of Jeremiah the disaster of the nation had become so irretrievable that the prophet hardly dares to hope for more than the salvage of individuals from the wreck; but these rescued ones will form the true Israel under a new covenant (Jer 23:3-8; Jer 31:31 ff.). The Messianic blessedness which those prophets foresaw consisted of an intimate fellowship which, in the coming days, the redeemed company of Israel would enjoy with Jehovah (Isa 49:6-13, Jer 31:31 ff.). It was to be a fellowship of Israelites because it was primarily a fellowship with Israel's God (Isa 52:6-12; Isaiah 60). This thought of fellowship finds nowhere more vivid expression than in the Psalter. That storehouse of religious devotion is filled with prayers of communion with Jehovah, the supremely moral Person, righteous, faithful, holy, yet full of loving-kindness, who satisfies the needs of man by bringing him into fellowship with Himself (Psalms 16, 34, 40, 63). Though many of the psalms seem to be the utterance of individual yearning for God's presence, others express the religious desires of corporate Israel, a fellowship of saints with a common thirst for the springs of its life.

A special term had been coined for Israel in her religious rather than her national function—*kâhâl*,, which was rendered in the LXX Septuagint by ἐκκλησία ('church'). It signified the religious assembly of God's chosen people; but as this could never be completely realized, even in the great temple gatherings, the conception remained largely ideal. A rich spiritual legacy was transmitted from the OT in the words Israel, *ecclesia*, Kingdom of God; and though the Jewish heirs were unable to appreciate their inheritance, these two truths of the prophets and psalmists could never have quite perished—that there is an eternal commonwealth of saints, and that this fellowship of Israel is based upon fellowship with Jehovah.

ii. The Synoptic Gospels.—Jesus not only claimed to fulfil prophecy; by His words of grace He did much more than the most spiritually minded Israelite could have hoped. The spirit of the Lord which was upon Him awoke prophetic thoughts that had long lain in the hearts of those who were waiting for the consolation of Israel. He brought spring and quickened the seed sown in the past. He calls men to Himself and forms them into a new society, within which are to be enjoyed the blessings foretold by the

prophets. In this company is found religious fellowship, based upon forgiveness of sins and eternal life through the knowledge of God revealed by Jesus as Father, of which the OT saints had but partial enjoyment or glad anticipation. He places Himself at the head of this society, claiming that He alone can impart the knowledge of God which will give rest to the souls of men (Mat 11:27-30). Thus His followers, constituted into the society of the Messiah, become a Divinely ordered fellowship not dependent on outward organization, but united by a common faith in Jesus as the Revealer of God to them. They are the New Israel, the imperishable *ecclesia* (Mat 16:16-19).

This society is no closed circle. Associating Himself more or less intimately with groups of disciples, Jesus sends them forth with the knowledge they have gained concerning Him, to proclaim to the people that the new epoch of Divine rule is about to be inaugurated, and that they should prepare for its advent. The condition of membership in this brotherhood is to follow Jesus, even though this may seem to the man of the world to be nothing less than to lose one's life. Fellowship with Jesus costs much. Family ties may be severed, the hatred of the world may be vented upon His disciples, billows of persecution may sweep over them, but in this society is life indeed (Mar 8:34-38, Luk 14:25-35). Jesus offers His followers a fellowship in this new brotherhood, which more than compensates for any worldly friendship that they may have to renounce (Mar 10:26-31). Their true kindred, even like that of Jesus Himself, will be found among those united by spiritual affinities in this new circle. New virtues abound in this brotherhood. Love working in helpful ministries for others is of the essence of fellowship in Messiah's company. Rank is assigned, not as in worldly kingdoms, but by the degree of service rendered by each to all (Mar 10:35-45).

In time Jesus announces to His followers that His society, as the true Israel, is to take the place of the Jewish nation, which as such is becoming a *massa perdit*a. Out of this perishing world His disciples are saved into the eternal Kingdom, and as heirs of salvation they are in reality, as they were afterwards called, 'the saints of the New Covenant' (Mar 12:1-12). Before His death the Messiah gave concreteness to this fellowship by a solemn communion with His disciples in the Last Supper, which became the means of making real to them the blessings of the New Covenant. The connexion of the Supper with the Paschal meal, which may here be assumed as having existed, either by anticipation or directly, would suggest to the minds of the participants that in this New Covenant they were entering into fellowship with Jehovah, and that they were also binding themselves together as brothers in a new covenant with God (Mar 14:22-25). A promise of enlarging fellowship fitly closes the Gospel of Matthew in the words, 'Lo, I am with you to the end of the ages' (Mat 28:20), and gives us a glimpse of the transition from the earthly to the heavenly life of Jesus.

To sum up, the Synoptic Gospels show us the conception of an eternal Divine Commonwealth, made actual by Jesus in a society welded together by fervent loyalty to Himself as the Christ of God, and pervaded by a life of mutual service to the members. He brings His followers into true fellowship with Jehovah by revealing Him and pardoning their sins. They enjoy the life of a brotherhood, which is true life, in His company.

iii. The Primitive Jewish-Christian Church.—Fellowship is the most real definition of the unity which was a constituent quality of the Early Church. Intercourse, intimate and universal, among brethren, whose life was consecrated by a gracious Divine presence, and thus free from everything secular, constituted the Church as distinctively one. This unity was not expressed by any rigid cohesive organization, not even primarily by the leadership of the Apostles. Indeed, the disciples had been warned by their Lord not to allow themselves to be called 'Master' (Mat_23:10). A company of baptized brethren, they had received the Holy Spirit from their risen Lord, who had welded them into one. His personal gifts were manifest in each brother passionately devoted to his unseen Lord, and so on terms of friendship with all who loved Him.

The Church appears on the stage of the public world as a new sect, holding to the belief that Jesus is Messiah. Outwardly the brethren were probably indistinguishable from good Jews, and such organization as they had would follow the lines of their former life. But it would seem that they did not think of themselves as a new organization. They were slow to cast loose their hawsers and swing out into the stream as an independent Church. Led by powerful personalities, Peter, John, and James, who had been either intimate or of close kinship with Jesus, they regarded themselves as the true Israel, and for a while hoped that the nation would repent. Before St. Paul's time, however, there was a change, for we find that the brethren throughout Judaea were organized into distinctive communities, not as 'synagogues,' but as 'churches' (Gal_1:22). But in these churches the utmost freedom of the individual, which is essential for true fellowship, prevailed; for the Church grew not by official initiative, but by the prophetic power of the Holy Spirit impelling the brethren to spread far and wide the good news of their gospel.

Little as the primitive Christians differed outwardly from the Jewish world, their inner world was a new creation. It was a brotherhood of Divine origin; for not only were they baptized into the name of Jesus the Lord of life, but they had received the Holy Spirit. How sacred this fellowship was is manifest from the terrible punishment meted out to Ananias and Sapphira for violating the mutual trust that made the brother hood possible (Acts 5).

There were various manifestations of this fellowship. (a) It was a house-church. Brethren met as sons round the common board in the homes of those who could best provide accommodation, and partook of a daily meal consecrated to the memory of their unseen but present Lord. They held communion with one another because they held communion with the risen Jesus. Common prayers, songs, and thanksgivings rose to Jehovah from these family groups (Act 2:42; Act 4:23-32).

(b) This fellowship (*κοινωνία*) found further expression in a life of mutual service,—the rich for the poor, the strong for the weak. They rejoiced with those who rejoiced; they wept with those who wept. In fact, true *κοινωνία* could not be better defined than in the words of the Golden Rule—‘Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them’ (Mat 7:12). No formal ordinance, such as the community of goods, was enjoined on the brethren; their love welled forth in such a pure and powerful stream that it made its own channels. All blessings, earthly and spiritual, were spontaneously shared with those who were in need (Act 2:44-47; Act 4:32-35).

So we have in the earliest days a true fellowship a brotherhood united by love to a risen Lord, whom many of them had known on earth, and led without rivalry by favourite disciples of Jesus, enjoying gifts and graces from the ever present Spirit of their Lord. But that brotherhood gathered in the earthly Zion was nationalistic in sentiment. It was provincial in spirit, especially, it would seem, throughout Judaea, where the churches were in villages remote from the world of men.

iv. The Gentile Churches of the Pauline world.—With the rise of Antioch a peril threatened the prestige of Jerusalem. Could the fruit of the Spirit thrive equally well in the valleys and on the plains of Syria and Asia as on the isolated plateau of Judaea? If so, it was bound to be very much more abundant. Fortunately, Paul the Apostle to the Gentiles was a man of varied culture. While his world was in cities and he thought imperially, he never treated the Jewish mind lightly, and he knew what that mind was. He understood its worth and its rights. He could discern every wave of feeling, every gust that shivered duskily across it. So St. Paul was himself the greatest power of his day making for the unity of the Church. It was a passion with him to avert a breach which would be fatal; and he was successful, for the other Apostles responded nobly as brethren, and gave him the right hand of fellowship (Gal 2:2; Gal 2:9). But the sections thus united had to be cemented; so he devotes much energy to effecting a durable *κοινωνία* by organizing the collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem. In 2Co 8:4; 2Co 9:13 and Rom 15:26 the word *κοινωνία* is translated (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) ‘contribution’; but ‘there is always at the root of *κοινωνία*, in the NT, the idea of Christian communion in one form or another. Those who bestow make common cause with one another and with the recipients’ (Waite). The collection is a

religious act, because it is a mark of Christian fellowship. Indeed, the Macedonians regard it as a signal token of Divine favour to be allowed thus to help those from whom they had received the gospel; and the poor Jewish Christians, who had made experience of the liberal Christian kindness of the Gentiles, could hardly refuse to call them brethren (2Co_8:1-5; 2Co_9:11-14).

The Christian fellowship was world-wide. This brotherhood was one everywhere (1Pe_5:9), and in writing to the Corinthians St. Paul assumes that what he says will be of interest not only to them, but 'to all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours' (1Co_1:2). The Church of God which is in Corinth is a visible but partial manifestation of the larger whole. This idea persisted after the Apostolic age; for '*Brotherhood* alternates with *Ecclesia* in the oldest sets of ecclesiastical canons, while *omnis fraternitas* and *πᾶσα ἡ ἀδελφότης* are used to denote the whole of Christendom' (Lindsay). This world-wide brotherhood was not held together by any outward organization, though the Apostle Paul does group his churches by provinces. But organization is local: it does not follow the lines of provincial units. Of course, Christian life had to be expressed in outward fellowship wherever it was possible, so that all the brethren within a convenient radius, such as a city, would be grouped together to form the Church of God in that place. And the Spirit of God supplied these local churches with leaders who had the necessary gifts for the conduct of their life. This became the basis of a permanent ministry.

From the world they became outwardly separate, 'saints' chosen out of it and consecrated to God (Rom_1:7, 1Co_1:2, Gal_1:4), and so forming one family, 'the household' of faith (Gal_6:10, Eph_2:19), throughout the empire of this world. Hence great stress is laid upon the grace of hospitality (Heb_13:1-2). In that busy world with its thronged highways, the Christian was always sure of a warm welcome wherever there was a church or a group of brethren (see *per contra* 3Jn_1:9 f.), and the sufferings of the saints were made the occasion of active sympathy (Heb_6:10; Heb_10:33-34; Heb_13:3). St. Paul experienced many such marked tokens of fellowship, especially at the hands of the Philippians, for whom he cherished the deepest affection. They were unremittingly active in co-operation with him for the spread of the gospel; and whatever his needs, bodily or spiritual, might be, they were ready to do their best by gifts or sympathy to supply the lack. This was true fellowship (Php_1:5; Php_1:7; Php_2:18; Php_4:14-15). Philemon also was a real Christian, whose faith in, and love to, the Lord Jesus was manifested in his kindly offices towards all the saints; and the Apostle delicately suggests that he should not stop till his benevolence becomes complete and embraces even the slave Onesimus (Phm_1:6; Phm_1:15-16).

This religious idea of brotherhood issues in a new grace, 'love of the brethren' (φιλαδέλφια), which is to be cherished as an especial sign of Divine life (1Th 4:9, Rom 12:10, Heb 13:1; 1Pe 1:22). A fine word, ἀπλότης ('singleness'), is used by St. Paul to denote the quality of the man in whom fellowship (κοινωνία) is a ruling motive. He is ἀπλοῦς, 'single-minded,' 'liberal.' He does not serve God and Mammon. His eye is single. Looking only at the needs of his brother, he realizes the truth of the Lord's words that it is more blessed to give than to receive (Act 20:35). Among the brethren there is no almsgiving. All that is sordid in almsgiving is removed, and generosity becomes a choice token of fellowship (2Co 8:2; 2Co 9:11; 2Co 9:13). 'When men thankfully receive God's gifts, and in imitation of His bounty use them for the good of others, so that the recipients also thank God for the benefaction, it is as far as it goes the re-establishment of the right relation between God and men, and men and men.' The slave is not only made partaker of such bounty, but as he possesses this spirit he pays an ungrudging service to his master (Eph 6:5).

The fellowship of church with church was further increased by the visits of Apostles and teachers, as well as by the interchange of correspondence. What was of interest to one was of interest to all in so far as it touched their common gospel. While we do not find any uniform creed or liturgy in these Epistles, there was almost certainly a substantially similar form of worship, and in their prayers and hymns the brethren gave utterance to the same faith in Jesus Christ, and in their teaching they adhered to the common truths which the Apostles taught (Rom 6:17, Gal 1:8). We cannot fail to be impressed by the combination of a sense of unity with great individual freedom. The Spirit took the life of believer or church, and produced in it some distinctive grace or function, which brought diversity without disharmony, enrichment without lack of proportion. Manifold, however, as these gifts were, the greatest of all and that which lay at the root of their fellowship was love; for not only was it the best because the commonest, but it tempered and restrained the more individualistic endowments, which might easily destroy the harmony of the Christian company (1Co 12:31; 1Co 12:13). True fellowship demands variety in unity, individual freedom working at the impulse of a common spirit.

The noblest exposition of Christian fellowship, outside the Gospel of John, is contained in the Epistle to the Ephesians. In that prose poem in praise of unity, the Church is described as one body of which each Christian is, or should be, a perfect member. A Divine creation purposed from all eternity by the Father's love, it was made actual in history through Jesus Christ. The Church is one because of the unities on which it is based. Its members are baptized into the name of the one Lord whom they confess. They are inspired by the same Spirit, and there is one God and Father of all, who is above all and through all and in all (Eph 4:4-6). Historically the Church

became one when, in Christ, Jew and Gentile were both reconciled unto God in one body by the cross (Eph 2:14-18); and in the ages to come each individual with variety of function will reach his perfection in this perfect organism, and contribute to the completeness of the whole (Eph 4:7-13). A fellowship so sublime in its ideal must be undisturbed by selfish desires. Only where love, patience, long-suffering and humility reign will there be on earth 'a communion of the saints.' 'In the Apostle's eyes all true life in an Ecclesia is a life of community, of the harmonious and mutually helpful action of different elements, so that he is giving instruction on the very essence of membership when in each of the nine Epistles addressed to Ecclesiae he makes the *peace* of God to be the supreme standard for them to aim at, and the perpetual self-surrender of love the comprehensive means of attaining it' (Hort, *Christ. Ecclesia*, 123).

All the manifestation of fellowship among the brethren, the very brotherhood itself, is possible only because the individual members of the communion of the saints are in personal fellowship with Jesus Christ. He indeed is the fountain and source of communion. All human fellowship is derivative. The word *κοινωνία* is used by St. Paul only in 1Co 10:16 to express this personal fellowship with Christ, the thought being that in the Lord's Supper believers are united in close communion, because through the cup and the bread they are enabled to participate in the life of Christ Himself. But the idea is central in St. Paul's religion—'I no longer live, but Christ liveth in me' (Gal 2:20); 'For me to live is Christ' (Php 1:21). However, this fellowship of the individual is no selfish enjoyment. Only those who are 'rooted and grounded in love' are 'able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth and length and depth and height; and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge,' that they may be filled with all the fulness of God (Eph 3:17-19). Now the Apostle expects that even in his own imperfect churches there should be some real enjoyment of this fellowship with Christ. He reminds the Church of Corinth that they 'were called into the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord' (1Co 1:9), *i.e.* the fellowship of which He is the soul. Fractured though the Church is by schism and marred by impurity, it is a society of redeemed sons, whose destiny is to be conformed to the image of Him who is the firstborn among many brethren (Rom 8:29-30), and even now it must reflect with real truth some of the glory of that future fellowship. The same conception is conveyed in 2Co 13:14 in the words, 'the communion of the Holy Ghost'; for the Spirit who unifies the Christian society into a body of redeemed men who have experienced the unmerited favour of Christ and the love of the Father, is the Spirit of Christ (2Co 3:17-18). The Philippian Church also, pervaded by love and comforted by reciprocal compassion, has enjoyed fellowship because of the presence of this Spirit who brings the consolation of Christ Himself (Php 2:1).

The Johannine writings.—Assuming that the books which bear the name of John came from the Apostle, we may consider them together, for they bring before us the conditions of a later period. The Gospel and the Epistles at least are the mature work of one who seeks to set before his readers the mind of Christ, after the attempt had been made for half a century to work His teaching into actual life. Much must be taken for granted. The visible Church is one; the old problem of Jewish and Gentile sections is a dead issue. Now the Church is face to face with the world. Two spiritual forces are opposed—the realm of light over which the Son of God rules, and the world of darkness organized and directed by the Prince of Evil. Error concerning the Person of Christ, and lack of love of the brethren, are disintegrating the Christian society. So the author takes his readers to the fountain of Christian fellowship, and allows them to taste its quality as it was enjoyed by the disciples of Jesus, whom having loved He loved unto the end (John 13-17). These discourses illuminate the Lord's Supper, and the feet-washing serves as a noble approach to it. There are two prominent aspects of the Eucharist as interpreted by John: (a) that it is a feast for the spiritual nurture of the faithful (Joh 6:48-58); (b) that it sets forth the love of the Lord, and so becomes a love-feast of brethren. Love is the note of the conversations. Only through the clear atmosphere of love can they see their absent Master. If they obey Him and love one another, He will come to them bringing the peace and the joy which He alone can impart (Joh 14:21; Joh 14:23; Joh 14:27). So will there be, as Loisy says, 'a hierarchy of love,' the disciples loving one another with the new love which springs from their Master, and their Master loving them as the Father loves Him (Joh 13:34, Joh 17:26). These chapters teach respecting Christian fellowship that (i.) its source is God as revealed in Jesus Christ, (ii.) its agent is the Holy Spirit, (iii.) its condition in the believer is faith in and obedience to Jesus Christ, and (iv.) its fruit is a life of love, joy, and peace among brethren here, and perfect sonship hereafter.

Similar conceptions dominate the First Epistle of John. Fellowship with God is the goal of the Christian life (1Jn 1:3-4). Such fellowship comes through knowledge, which is only another aspect of the love of God (1Jn 4:7-8). But sin is a barrier to this fellowship, which would therefore be impossible were it not that it has been removed by the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ (1Jn 2:1-2). No sin is greater than hate; and since all love comes from God (1Jn 4:19), he who hates his brother cannot love God. If he love God, that love must first have come from God, and stream forth through the heart of the believer upon his brother. To live in loving fellowship with the brethren is at once the proof of fellowship with the Father and the ethical condition for receiving it, for only to hearts broadened and deepened by love can God reveal Himself and bring fellowship (1Jn 4:12-13; 1Jn 4:20-21).

This mystic, whose spirit was more responsive than any other to the mind of the Master, opens up the profound depth of that fellowship which the early Christian Church enjoyed, as we have seen, in no inconsiderable measure. Since Christ is the

soul of Christian fellowship, it is impaired by lack of truth concerning Him. But truth and love are inseparable. Therefore when we seek for the true unity of the Church of Christ, we must begin by keeping our Lord's great command to love the brethren, and thereby advance with all saints to a true knowledge of Christ.

Looking back through the dim distance we discover the foreshadowings of prophet and psalmist growing clearer, till in these latest books of the NT we can almost touch the reality on earth in this ideal of the Apostle whom Jesus loved. The supreme poetic description of that fellowship is the city of the King of Love in Revelation, whose citizens see the face of the Lord (Rev 22:1-5), the beatific vision for which the psalmists strained their eyes.

The Christian fellowship as it existed on earth in the 1st century was a stupendous creation. Philosophers had dreamed of Utopias. Humane Stoics had taught the brotherhood of man. But all attempts to realize these ideals had been comparatively ineffective. In the Christian Church, however, aliens and the disfranchised found fellowship with those who inherited religious promises and social privilege. Roman and Greek stooped to love the hateful Jew, and the Jew was willing to transfer the sacred name of Israel to Gentiles whose past was unclean. Well-born and slave greeted one another as brethren, without thereby disturbing social order. A love so compelling as to reverse the national and social values, must have been derived from a Presence altogether transcending the measurements of ordinary human life. Christian fellowship is not to be defined as intercourse glowing with human love at its highest. It is primarily a spiritual communion with the Supreme Person, whose love recreates life and makes it a complete expression of love. So the goal must be, as the writer to the Hebrews says, in the world to come, when Jesus shall have introduced His many brethren into the Holy of Holies, where they will, as a company of the redeemed, hold fellowship with the Father (Heb 2:5; Heb 2:10-11; Heb 7:25; Heb 12:22-24). See, further, art. Communion.

Literature.—Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*; Weizsäcker, *The Apostolic Age*; Lindsay, *The Christian Ministry in the Early Church*; v. Dobschütz, *The Early Christian Churches*; art. 'Communion' in Hastings' *DB* [*Note: DB Dictionary of the Bible.*]; Herrmann, *Communion with God*, pp. 49-133; Dale, *Fellowship with Christ*, Sermon i., also *The Living Christ and the Four Gospels*, Lects. i.-iv.; Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*.

R. A. Falconer.

FETTERS.—See Chain.

☒ Fever

FEVER (ὁ πυρετός, and in Act_28:8 οἱ πυρετοί, with corresponding participle in Mt. and Mk. πυρέσσοι). There are only five passages in the NT in which fever is spoken of, and three of these, viz. Mat_8:14 f., Mar_1:30 f., and Luk_4:38 f. are parallel passages. One cannot say with certainty what specific fever is alluded to in these passages, or in Joh_4:52, where the healing of the nobleman's son is spoken of. It may be, indeed, that St. Luke, whose training as a physician naturally led him to speak with exactness about medical matters, does specify the fever from which Peter's wife's mother was suffering (συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ). It has been contended that there was a specific fever known as 'the great fever,' and that it was this, whatever it may have been, from which the sick woman in Capernaum suffered. This, however, has been questioned, and perhaps it is rather the intensity of the fever than its specific character that is indicated by the word 'great.' Probably both Peter's wife's mother and the nobleman's son suffered from malarial fever. Professor G. A. Smith tells us that the region about Tiberias is a very feverish region, and Dr. Cunningham Geikie says that malarial fever was common at Capernaum. It is very likely that there has always been a good deal of malarial fever about the shores of the Sea of Galilee, and especially about the more northerly portion of these shores. The fever from which the father of Publius suffered (Act_28:8) was fever accompanying or accompanied by acute dysentery. See also artt. Cures, p. 403^b, and Disease, p. 463^b.

Literature.—NT Commentaries; artt. 'Medicine' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible and 'Diseases,' *Encyc. Biblica*; G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [Note: *GHL* Historical Geog. of Holy Land.] 1 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 449; Cunningham Geikie, *Life and Words of Christ*, ii. 5 f.

George C. Watt.

☒ Field

FIELD

The three Greek words (ἀγρός, χώρα, χωρίον) rendered 'field' in the Gospels are distinguishable in meaning, and sometimes require more specific renderings. ἀγρός in general means 'field' in the sense of cultivated land, or open country thought of as subject to cultivation: e.g. 'sowed good seed in his field' (Mat 13:24), 'lilies of the field,' 'grass of the field' (Mat 6:28; Mat 6:30), etc. χώρα denotes generally a region, or district of country, as 'the region of Trachonitis' (Luk 3:1), 'the country of the Gadarenes' (Mar 5:1); χωρίον is more distinctly locative, as 'a place called Gethsemane' (Mat 26:36), 'the parcel of ground that Jacob gave to Joseph' (Joh 4:5), etc. But, on the other hand, we find ἀγρός used also of the country in distinction from the city (Mar 5:14; Mar 6:56, Luk 8:34; Luk 9:12; Luk 23:26), χώρα used of fields of ripened grain, as in Joh 4:35 'Look on the fields, for they are white' (cf. Jam 5:4 'who have reaped down your fields'); and where St. Matthew uses ἀγρός of 'the field of blood' (Mat 27:8), St. Luke uses χωρίον (Act 1:19).

A knowledge of certain peculiarities of the fields of Palestine is helpful to the full understanding of several of the parables of our Lord and some other passages in the Gospels. There are now, as there were of old, numerous fields in Palestine where 'the lilies' and many other flowers grow in gorgeous profusion without human care or culture, and where 'the grass of the field,' including fibrous weeds as well as shortlived flowers, when dried by the tropical sun, are still gathered as fuel, and used to heat ovens for baking bread (cf. Mat 6:28; Mat 6:30). The argument of the Master, drawn from 'the grass of the field which to-day is and to-morrow is cast into the oven,' still holds good, and still finds abundant illustration. It is true occasionally now, also, that after the owner of the land has 'sowed good seed in his field,' an enemy will in sheer spite creep in secretly and 'sow tares,' the noxious darnel (*Lolium temulentum*); but see Tares.

In Palestine, as in all unsettled countries, it was common, and in parts of the land it is still common, to resort to the field (the cultivated land or the open country) as a fit place in which to hide treasure (cf. Mat 13:44) In ancient times the land was peculiarly subject to revolutions, exposed to raids from wandering tribes, and, in some districts, liable to plunder from robbers at home. So, in the absence of safety vaults and the like, owners of treasure who feared robbery or thievery (Mat 25:25), or who were setting off on a journey to a distant country, would bury their money, jewellery, etc., in the field. Then, if the owner were killed in battle, or died in a far country, no one might know where his treasures were hid; and, according to usage, such valuables when found, if no owner appeared to claim them, belonged to the owner of the land—a fact which gives point to the parable of the Hid Treasure

(Mat 13:44, cf. Job 3:21, Pro 2:4). Many persons are found digging for hid treasure in Egypt and Palestine to-day, and not a few spend their last farthing in the effort (cf. Thomson, *L^B [Note: The Land and the Book.]* ii. p. 640).

In the parable of the Sower (Mat 13:4, Mar 4:4, Luk 8:5), where the Authorized Version has 'some (seeds) fell by the wayside,' the picture is really of grains of wheat or barley which fell *on the trodden pathway* leading across the field, and so were left exposed where the birds could see and devour them (cf. Luk 8:5 'trodden under foot'). It is still common in Palestine to see flocks of birds following the peasant as he sows his seed, eagerly picking up every grain that is not covered by the quick-following harrow. And where it is said 'some fell upon *stony* places' (Authorized Version), the real allusion is to the underlying *rock* of limestone. The traveller finds numberless places where a broad, flat, limestone rock lies just beneath the surface of the field, with only a thin layer of earth upon it (cf. Luk 8:6; Luk 8:13 'the rock'). 'Stony ground' (Authorized Version, following early English versions) suggests a soil abounding in loose stones, such as is often found there producing good wheat; but the picture is rather of a soil into which the seeds could not sink deep, and, the film of earth being readily heated because of the underlying rock, they would come up sooner than elsewhere, and at first would look uncommonly flourishing; but, not being able to send roots deep into the moist earth (cf. Luk 8:6), when the hot, dry weather came the stalks would wither, and thus show that the fair promise of a crop there had been deceptive (cf. Psa 129:6 'grass upon the house-tops').

In the fields of Palestine, too, there are still found spots that are rich, but are peculiarly infested with briars and thorn-bushes, where one may see the wheat in scattered and spindling stalks struggling for life (cf. Mat 13:7). In Mar 2:23 and Luk 6:1 (Authorized Version) we have 'corn-fields' where the Gr. word (σπόριμα) is the same as in Mat 12:1, where it is rendered simply 'corn,'—'through the corn' (after Tindale). It is literally 'through the *sown* (places),' *i.e.* the grain-fields, as Noyes and Bib. Un. Vers. render it, fields of wheat or barley, not of maize or Indian corn, of course. The picture is of Jesus and His disciples *going along*, either through the standing grain, or by a footpath which bounded the fields, the grain in either case being within easy reach. It was customary then, as it is now, in Palestine, for the lands of different owners to be separated, not by fences or walls, but usually only by crude individual stones set up at intervals on the surface of the ground as landmarks (cf. Deu 19:14); and the roads, mere footpaths as a rule, were not distinct from the fields, as they are with us, but ran through them, so that the grain grew right up to the edge of the path. We are not meant to think of Jesus and His disciples as going ruthlessly through the fields and trampling down the grain, but as following one of these paths over or between the fields. But neither plucking the ears of wheat to eat, nor even walking across a pathless field, was, according to Jewish ideas (cf.

Deu_23:25), a violation of the rights of property any more than it is to-day among the Arabs. It was not of this, but of Sabbath-breaking, that the Pharisees complained.

Geo. B. Eager.

⚡ Fierceness

FIERCENESS.—The word ‘fierce’ occurs twice in Authorized Version (Mat_8:28 of the two demoniacs [χαλεποὶ], Luk_23:5 of our Lord’s accusers [ἐπίσχυον Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘urgent’]). But the purpose of the present article is to examine in what sense and to what extent this attribute may be attributed to Christ. The popular conception of Him is perhaps too much that of a speaker of smooth things. It is forgotten that He could utter on occasion words of fierce energy. The beauty of the unanswering innocence of the Passion, that type of silent suffering and enduring, has made His outbursts of fierce reproach or condemnation de from the memory. His ‘judge not’ (Mat_7:1), or His parable of patience that has its part in the ‘wheat and tares’ being allowed to grow together (Mat_13:30), or His doctrine of unlimited forgiveness (Luk_17:1-4),—these are thought to be entirely representative. Yet, while they undoubtedly indicate the prevailing elements, something would be lost in our understanding of Jesus if we overlooked the impassioned fierceness with which He sometimes acted and spoke.

Of recorded deeds the incident of the driving out of the vendors and money-changers from the temple precincts (Mat_21:12, Mar_11:15, Joh_2:15) is the most notable: but it is in the vigour of His language that the possibilities of fierceness in Him are most revealed. He has small patience with certain failings, such as the lack of an apprehensive faith or worldliness, or hypocrisy, or vanity. There is a denunciatory strain in Him much resembling the force of the Baptist’s ‘offspring of vipers’ of Luk_3:7. It is present in the Nazareth sermon in His OT illustrations of prophets not honoured in their own country (Luke 4); in His declaration of war with evil,—‘I am come to send fire on the earth’ (Luk_12:49), and ‘I came not to send peace but a sword’ (Mat_10:34); it even finds expression in the very phrase γεννήματα ἔχιδνῶν used by the Baptist (Mat_12:34). None of the mildness of diplomacy is in the message to Herod—‘Go ye, and tell that fox’ (Luk_13:32). When He encounters men or communities incapable of the heavenly vision, His words are swords. To trouble about them is to ‘throw pearls before swine’ (Mat_7:6). They are a ‘faithless and perverse generation,’ or ‘a wicked and adulterous generation’ seeking after a visible and tangible sign of spiritual things (Mat_16:4); they shall lose the Kingdom of God (Mat_21:43); the heathen of Nineveh shall show themselves better judges of eternal

realities (Luk_11:32); there is more hope for Tyre and Sidon (Luk_10:14) or for Sodom and Gomorrah than for the spiritually blind (Mat_10:15); ‘Ye are of your father the devil’ (Joh_8:44). The fierceness which marks His rejection of the third temptation (Mat_4:10) is paralleled in the ‘Get thee behind me, Satan’ with which Peter’s proffered intervention is repelled (Mar_8:33). The perverter of the simplicity of childhood is told that he had better have been drowned with a millstone about his neck (Mat_18:6). But the white heat of fierceness in the utterance of Christ comes when He meets with Pharisees, scribes, and teachers of the Law, who are unworthy of their high professions. They are ‘false prophets ... ravening wolves’ (Mat_7:15); ‘hypocrites’ is hurled at them in every phrase of Matthew 23, in the close of Luke 11, and in Mar_7:6, where Isaiah’s bitterest words against lip-service are quoted against them. They are ‘whited sepulchres,’ ‘blind guides,’ ‘sons of them that slew the prophets,’ ‘serpents.’ They ‘say, and do not,’ so that ‘the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom’ before them (Mat_21:31).

Thus to His Divine tenderness did Jesus add a strange fierceness, as though to teach that in faith’s war with darkness lightning has its place. See art. Anger.

Literature.—Seeley. *Ecce Homo*, ch. xxi.; Butler, *Serm.* viii.; Dale, *Atonement*⁷ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 338 ff.

E. Daplyn.

☞ Fig-Tree

FIG-TREE (in NT συκή, in OT תְּאֵנָה tē’cânâh; the *Carica*, L.).— The fig is the principal shade and fruit-tree of Palestine, growing in all parts, in many places spontaneously. It seldom surpasses 20 ft. [Post, in Hastings’ B [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] , s. v. ‘Figs,’ says 15 ft.] in height, but has a spread of from 25 to 30 ft. Its welcome shade and refreshing fruit make it the emblem of peace and prosperity (Deu_8:8, Jdg_9:10-11, 1Ki_4:25, Mic_4:4, Zec_3:10, 1Ma_14:12). Besides this general symbolism, two characteristics of the tree, appealing respectively to the eye and to the palate, have led to further comparisons.

(a) The fig-tree is conspicuous in early spring by the expanding of the tips of its twigs into little green knobs called פְּגִימ paggim (Gr. ἄλυσθοι, Son_2:13 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘green figs’) which are the flower-fruit buds, and together with the leaf-bud, which expands shortly after and soon overshadows the pag, or fruit rudiment, serve as the herald of the coming summer (Mat_24:32 and ||). This

phenomenon of 'all the trees' (Luk 21:29) is particularly noticeable in the fig-tree because of its early and conspicuous verdure. The ripening of the *pag* follows the 'appearance of the flowers on the earth,' and accompanies the 'blossoming of the vine' as the feature of the advancing season and the time of mating (Ca 2:13). In the same connexion may be mentioned the phenomenon of the dropping of great quantities of the immature fruit in consequence of imperfect fertilization, so that the scattered *paggim* covering the ground under the fig-trees become to the author of Rev 6:13 a symbol of the stars fallen to earth from the firmament, 'as a fig-tree casteth her unripe figs when she is shaken of a great wind.'

(b) The fig-tree has *two* (not three) successive crops of fruit each year. The *first-ripe* fig (Heb. בכורה *bikkûrâh*, Isa 28:4, Jer 24:2, Hos 9:10, Mic 7:1) is produced upon the old wood of the preceding year, the buds which remained undeveloped through the winter swelling into the little green *îm* already described, towards the end of the season of spring rains (March-April), and coming to maturity in June. The תאנה *tě'çnâh*, or autumn fig, is the fig of commerce, and is produced on the new wood of the same year. The leaf-bud, which expanded shortly after the and soon distanced it in growth, puts out in its turn a flower-fruit bud which matures in August, or later, according to the variety, the fruit hanging on the boughs until winter, when the branches are again left naked, grey, and straggling.

This phenomenon of successive fruitage in the fig-tree is doubtless the source of the description of the fruit-trees of the New Jerusalem (Eze 47:12, Rev 22:2 'the tree of life') as 'bearing fruit every month.' In the Talmud it is a symbol for the acquisition of learning, which, to be permanent, must come by little and little (Hamburger, *RE* [Note: *E Realencyklopädie*.] i. 3, s.v. 'Feige,' p. 360 with references). Hence the saying, 'Whoso sees a fig-tree in his dreams, his learning shall be safe from forgetfulness' (*Berakhoth*, 57). The capacity of the tree for prolongation of its bearing season leads in fact to certain representations which easily pass over into exaggerations and misunderstandings important to avoid.

Edersheim (*Life and Times*, bk. iv. ch. xvi. p. 246) refers to 'a species (the *Benoth Shuach*) mentioned in *Shebh*, v. 1, of which the fruit required three years for ripening,' but which may more reasonably be understood as simply a late-bearing variety whose fruit reached maturity only in exceptionally favourable seasons, not oftener than once in three years. So with the rhetorical passage of Josephus (*BJ* iii. x. 8) celebrating the delightful climate of the plain of Gennesaret. His statement that 'it supplies the principal fruits, as grapes and figs, uninterruptedly during ten months of the year,' cannot reasonably be made to prove more than the fact that in that semi-tropical depression, 600 ft. below sea-level, fresh fruit, *including* figs, could be obtained almost to the end of winter.

To explain the narrative of Mar 11:13 two other facts have been advanced of doubtful value and trust-worthiness. It is asserted that neglected relics of the autumn crop sometimes cling to the branches of the fig-tree throughout the winter; but Post (*l.c.* p. 6) was unable during a residence of 33 years in Syria to find, or hear of, such. The statement of Edersheim (*l.e. v. ii. p. 374*) that such left-over fruit about April 1 'would of course be edible' becomes admissible only by inserting a 'not' after 'of course.' It is also asserted that the *pag*, or green fruit, was eaten, even Benzinger (*PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] s.v. 'Fruchtbäume,' p. 304) declaring that 'Jesus might expect to find such winter figs (the *paggîm*) on a tree already in leaf at the season of Passover, that is before the time of the ripening of figs.' In the sense that the rudimentary fruit-buds would be discoverable under the leaves, upon examination (unless the tree had become sterile by reversion to the wild type, as sometimes occurs), this statement is true; the present writer has found such dry tasteless 'figs' at 'Ain Far'a near Jerusalem, on March 1, the size of an olive, though the tree was leafless. Boys sometimes nibble these buds, but to speak of the *paggîm* at this season as 'winter figs' is misleading. The evidence for the edible quality of the *pag*, drawn by Edersheim from the Talmud (Bk. v. ii. p. 375, referring to *Shebh. iv. 7* and Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] *Shebh. 35b*, last lines) suggests only that *at a later season* the unripe fruit was sometimes used as a condiment 'with bread.' This, however, was after the *paggîm* 'began to assume a red colour,' and not when the foliage had only just begun to cover the setting fruit-bud. Apart from the question whether a tree could be properly rebuked for the absence of a quite exceptional product, the alleged phenomena, whether of neglected relics of the autumn harvest, or use of the unripe fruit, have neither of them any real bearing on the difficulty that Jesus should approach a wayside fig-tree, *with the intention of staying His hunger*, when, as so frankly stated in the record itself, 'it was not the season of figs.'

2. The Gospel references to the fig-tree include both parables and incidents, and make allusion to phenomena both of its leafage and its fruitage. As questions arise to how great an extent the incidents may not be symbolic, parables becoming concrete in process of repetition, or even pure symbols, it is best to consider first the two instances in which the fig-tree is made the subject of undoubted parable by our Lord.

(a) *The parable of the Fig-Tree* (Mar 13:28-29 = Mat 24:32-33, paraphrased and interpreted Luk 21:29-31) is based on the early verdure of the tree. Its general sense is clear from Luk 12:54 ff. (= Mat 16:2-3 β text), a passage which leads to the insertion in Luk 21:29 of βλέποντες ἄφ' ἑαυτῶν (cf. Luk 12:57). The meaning is: As you judge by the softening, burgeoning twigs of the fig-tree that the harvest season is

approaching, so read the signs of the times. These (ταῦτα; Mar 13:29 treats the preceding context as if only *premonitions* of the Day had been spoken of, overlooking Mar 13:24-27; but cf. Luk 12:51-53; Luk 12:56 with Mar 13:12-13; Mar 13:29; πάντα ταῦτα, Mat 24:33 is more specific but less correct) signs prove that the judgment, the gleaning of God (cf. Mar 4:29, not ‘the kingdom of God,’ Luk 21:31) is close at hand. As regards closer exegesis and criticism, we must say, with E. Schwartz (‘Der verfluchte Feigenbaum’ in *ZNTW* [Note: *NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissenschaft.*] i. p. 81): ‘Whoever would interpret with exactitude will meet with more than one difficulty.’ Besides Schwartz, the reader may consult Gould, Swete, and Wellhausen, *ad loc.* The paraphrase of Lk. is the earliest attempt to interpret, but smooths over difficulties (note, e.g., the additions ‘and all the trees,’ ‘the kingdom of God,’ and other changes).

(b) *The parable of the Barren Fig-Tree* (Luk 13:6-9) stands in the same eschatological context as the warning to read the signs of the times (Luk 12:35 to Luk 13:9 paralleled by Mar 13:33-36; Mar 13:12-13), and forms its climax. One is tempted to conjecture that the problematic ‘parable’ referred to in Mar 13:28, Mat 24:32 (ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς συκῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολήν, cf. Mar 7:17 as against Luk 21:29 καὶ εἶπεν παραβολήν) was once no other than this. At all events it simply applies, in fuller form, the figure credited in Mat 3:10 = Luk 3:9 to the Baptist.

This is the common prophetic doctrine of the Divine ἀνοχή, the present a time of suspension of the Divine sentence to leave opportunity for repentance.

The once favourite allegorizing method of interpretation (e.g. the gardener=the Messiah, the three years=the three (?) Passovers of Christ’s public ministry) is now fortunately discredited. Yet it is incorrect, with Wellhausen (*Ev. Lucae, ad loc.*) to say that the fig-tree stands for the individual. Not merely is the girdled fig-tree an OT emblem of the punishment of Israel (Joe 1:7, cf. Luk 23:31), but the parable concludes a context wherein the men of Jerusalem, overwhelmed by the fall of the tower in Siloam, and the Galilaeans, cut down by the sword of Pilate, are brought forward as ‘signs of the times.’ The warning, accordingly, is certainly against ‘the overthrow of the Jewish people’ (T. K. Cheyne, *Encyc. Bibl.* s.v. ‘Fig-tree,’ col. 1521). ‘Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish’ is not spoken of the fate of individuals, but of the common overthrow, however this may be avoided by individual repentance; cf. Mat 12:38-45 = Luk 11:29-32.

3. *The cursing of the fig-tree* (Mar 11:12-14; Mar 11:20-25 = Mat 21:18-22).—Parabolic symbolism is so slightly concealed under the narrative features of this story that the majority of critics are disposed to regard it as a mere endowment of the Lukan parable of the Barren Fig-tree with concrete form, just as the parable of the Good Samaritan, and others, were long treated as instances of historical fact.

In favour of this explanation are several features of the narrative and its setting.

(a) The generally admitted incorporation of Mk. by Lk. implies that the omission of Mar 11:12-14; Mar 11:20-25 was deliberate. The most natural explanation of it is that St. Luke regarded the story as a double of his parable, Luk 13:6-9. Conversely the parable does not appear in Mt. or Mark.

(b) The withering of the tree (Mar 11:20-25), a sequel of the next day after the cursing (Mar 11:12-14), occupies a different position in Mat 21:19-22, taking place 'on the spot.' In both Gospels this appended sequel proves itself a secondary attachment, both by its material and its language. The contents of Mar 11:20-25 consist in the main of two *logia*, torn from their proper context (cf. Mat 17:20, Luk 17:6, and Mat 6:14-15) and characterized by non-Markan expressions (cf. 'your Father in heaven,' Mar 11:25). Such loose agglomerations of stray *logia* are frequent in our Second Gospel (Mar 3:22-30; Mar 4:11-12; Mar 4:21; Mar 4:25; Mar 8:15; Mar 8:34-36; Mar 9:42-50; Mar 10:10-12 etc.). In Mat 21:19-22 the language is alien (*παράχρημα*, 'on the spot,' Mat 21:19-20, occurs 17 times in Lk. and Acts, whereas Mt. and Mk. have invariably elsewhere *εὐθὺς* or *εὐθέως*), and the *logia* taken from Mk. produce duplication of Mat 17:20 and almost of Mat 6:14-15. By transposing the sequel into immediate juxtaposition with the cursing, and abridging Mar 11:20-25, Mt. avoids one of the two interruptions of the principal narrative of the purging of the temple and its consequences (Mar 11:1-10; Mar 11:15-18; Mar 11:27 ff.), and heightens the marvel, but fails to remove the evidence of his own dependence afforded by the duplication of Mat 17:20, and only brings into stronger relief the supplementary and supererogatory character of the sequel.

This superfluousness of Mar 11:20; Mar 11:25 is most apparent in the light of such attempted explanations as that of B. Weiss, who says: The cursing of the fig-tree was 'of course' meant by Jesus symbolically, the concrete fulfilment given it by God being without intention on Jesus' part. On this statement Wellhausen (*ad loc.*) comments sarcastically: 'Weiss understands him. God misunderstood him.' Nevertheless Weiss is clearly right in maintaining that the purpose of Jesus would be just as completely met if the story stopped with Mar 11:14 a.

But even more fatal than the superfluosity of the sequel is its perversion of the real symbolism of the incident. Nothing is said of that which analogy (Mat 3:10; Mat 7:18-19, Luk 13:6-9) proves to be the real moral lesson; but the appended sayings are adapted to find in it mere evidence of the wonder-working power of belief. The disciples are to learn that the prayer, or even the fiat, of faith—here taken as equivalent to undoubting assurance—can set at defiance the order of nature. This, the writer understands, was the purpose of the cursing. As part of the rebuke of the disciples half-heartedness (*δυσυχία*) in the case of the epileptic boy (Mat 17:19-20; cf. Luk 17:5-6, 1Co 13:2), the hyperbolic saying on mountain-moving faith is justified. Adapted along with Mat 6:14-15 to give the moral lesson of the withering of the fig-tree, both fall to a lower plane, scarcely above that of mere thaumaturgy. The symbolism of the cursing is lost in the mere wonder of withering a tree, a needless miracle of display.

(c) Even after recognition of the unhistorical character of the addition Mat 11:20-25, the incident of the cursing is still encumbered with inherent improbabilities, of which the most formidable is the imputation of hunger as the motive of Jesus' approach to the tree. It is not enough to admit that the curse must be explained, if at all, by the discovery, made upon close inspection, that the tree was empty, not only of those supposititious edible products which could not be reasonably expected, but of even the rudiments of a crop in the season, and to suggest that when Jesus arrived 'immediately the disappointment of unsatisfied hunger was lost in the moral lesson which flashed across His mind' (Post, *l.c.*). Change of motive is inconceivable, because hunger cannot have caused the approach. Relics of the last season's crop, if sought at all, would be sought on a tree whose still leafless branches left them in plain sight, not where they would be concealed by the foliage, if not thrust off by the new growth. So, too, of *paggîm*; but the degree of starvation necessary to suggest appeasing the stomach by *paggîm* at the season in question is improbable.

There remains as a historical basis for the story only the possibility that Jesus' footsteps might be attracted by the suggestion of a possible moral lesson in the precocious leafage of a wayside tree, the discovery that it covered no promise of fruit leading Him thereupon to an utterance in the vein of prophetic symbolism. Gould (*Internat. Crit. Com.* 'Mark,' 212) finds evidence in Hos 1:1-3, Joh 4:6-11, Mat 13:10-15 that 'such acted parables were not without precedent among the Jews.' More apposite might be the reference of $\Delta\iota\delta$. Mat 11:10 to prophets in the early Church who might 'do something as an outward mystery typical of the Church (Eph 5:32) because in like manner did the prophets of old time'; cf. Act 21:11. But the only real parallel in the story of Jesus is the *parable* (unaccompanied by any narrative of fact) of the Stater in the Fish's Mouth, Mat 17:24-27. The propensity of the reader, if not of the Evangelist himself, to take this symbolic direction to Peter as

implying the real execution of a miracle, shows how easily a symbolic sentence of death, directed against the fig-tree as the representative of unrepentant Israel, might be taken to imply its literal withering away.

Due consideration for all three objections leaves the question still open whether the story of Mar_11:12-14 records a specific utterance of this symbolic kind directed against a particular tree, on a particular occasion; or whether tradition and the Evangelist together have not simply localized between Bethphage ('Fig-town') and Jerusalem, on occasion of the supreme visitation of the latter, a visualized version of the parable Luk_13:6-9.

In favour of the former view may be cited critics no less radical than H. J. Holtzmann (*Hdkom. ad loc.*) and J. Weiss (*Das Aelteste Evangelium*, p. 268). Still more pronounced is Schwartz in favour of connecting the fig-tree of Mar_11:12-14, and even that of Mar_13:28 as well, with some sun-bleached skeleton from the orchards of Bethphage, a lone relic of the siege of Titus, pointed to by Jerusalem Christians as the memorial of Jesus warning and promise; but Schwartz would not admit a basis of fact for this early identification by tradition of 'the' fig-tree, but rather such as Cheyne instances in 'the inn' of the Good Samaritan.

The phenomena of the text indicate, however, that the process must at least precede our text of Mark. For our Evangelist the symbolic sense has already disappeared, leaving only the work of power. Before this stage of the process could be reached the parable of the Barren Fig-tree must already have been transformed by local tradition into symbolic cursing of some given tree, and the moral lesson have been subsequently eclipsed by the purely thaumaturgic interest.

More conservative criticism, while recognizing the secondary character of Mar_11:20-25, and perhaps admitting the fundamental identity of the symbolic cursing with the parable whose lesson is so obviously the same, may still demand more evidence before it surrenders the possibility that our Second Evangelist retains a substantially trustworthy tradition of the actual site and occasion of the utterance.

4. *The fig-tree of Nathanael* (Joh_1:48). Symbolism admittedly enters to so large a degree into the narrative of the Fourth Gospel (cf. e.g. Joh_9:7; Joh_12:33), that it is not surprising if the more radical school of interpreters, looking upon it as the uniform product of an allegorizing fancy, should find in the unexplained reference of Joh_1:48 the suggestion of an allegorical sense, the fig-tree having the symbolic meaning of religious instruction applied in the Talmud, or even playing the part of the sacred Bo-tree (*Ficus religiosa*) in Buddhist legend. The fact that commentators from Schoettgen and Lightfoot (*Hor. Heb. ad loc.*) downwards have inferred that Nathanael was 'aut orans, aut legens, aut meditans, aut aliquid religiosum praestans' is proof

that this mental association is natural; but it cannot be truly said that the Evangelist allegorizes. The words ‘when thou wast under the fig-tree’ are obscure, not because we fail to apply the key, but because the Evangelist has left something lacking. He utters an enigma, but gives no other clue than the recognition by Nathanael of Jesus’ supernatural knowledge. He wishes the reader to guess that Jesus had here proved Himself the καρδιογνώστης λόγος (cf. Wis_1:6-8), as in the case of the Samaritan Woman later (Joh_4:17-19; Joh_4:29); but he either does not trouble himself, or was unable, to relate the facts.

Cheyne indeed (*Encyc. Bibl. s.v. ‘Nathanael’*) considers the usual explanation ‘hardly adequate. If it simply means, “when thou hadst retired under the shade of the fig-tree for meditation or prayer,” we ask why the Evangelist did not express the Master’s meaning more distinctly (contrast Joh_4:18).’ His answer is a conjectural emendation of the Hebrew (!) in a supposititious source of the Gospel, מִתְחַנֵּן וְאֵתֶה ‘when thou wast making supplication,’ for הַתְּאֵתָה תַּחַת וְאֵתֶה ‘when thou wast under the fig-tree.’ But conjecture of this sort discredits itself. To every reader it is manifest that an element of the narrative is intentionally or unintentionally suppressed. If it be granted that ‘the Fourth Gospel is a composite work,’ it is not unreasonable to suppose its compiler to have left untranscribed that portion of his source which would have explained the allusion to the fig-tree, just as he has omitted in his story of the feeding of the multitude (Joh_6:1 ff.) Jesus’ motive for the miracle [logical unœ of this character form indeed a distinctive feature of this Gospel].

If the traditional view be maintained, the Evangelist’s reserve will be accounted for as reflecting the enigmatic nature of the actual dialogue, which, so far as bystanders were able to perceive, had no further explanation.

Literature.—Besides the works referred to in the art. the following may be consulted: Thomson, *L^B* [Note: The Land and the Book.] , pt. ii. ch. xxiv.; Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 352; Trench, *Parables*¹² [Note: 2 designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 346ff.; Bruce, *Parabol. Teaching*, p. 427 ff.; Trench, *Miracles*¹⁰ [Note: 0 designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 466 ff.; W. M. Taylor, *Mir. of Our Saviour*, p. 413 ff.; Liddon, *Sermons on Some Words of Christ*, p. 100; Godet and Westcott, *Comm. in loc.*; cf. Augustine, *Conf.* viii. xii. 28.

B. W. Bacon.

FIRE (πῦρ except in Mar 14:54 = Luk 22:56 where φως occurs) is referred to in the Gospels much more frequently in a figurative than in a literal sense.

1. The allusions to *literal* fire are the following. (a) Those concerned with the domestic use of fire for heating and cooking. In the better houses in Palestine the rooms were warmed by charcoal fires in portable braziers; in poorer houses the wood or other fuel was burned in a hollow in the earthen floor. The fire into which the epileptic boy fell (Mat 17:15 = Mar 9:22) would be of the latter description. The fire of coals kindled for warmth in the middle of the court of the high priest's house (Mar 14:54 = Luk 22:55-56, Joh 18:18),* [Note: In Mar 14:54 = Luk 22:56 φως is used instead of πῦρ (cf. Luk 22:55). In classical Gr. a similar use of the word is found in cases where a fire is thought of as the source of light as well as heat (so also 1Ma 12:29, cf. 1Ma 12:28 where πῦρ is employed). Its appropriateness in both the Synoptic passages is due to the fact that it was night, and, in the Lk. passage, to the further fact that it was the blaze of the fire which revealed Peter to the maid. In both cases RV brings out the meaning by rendering πρὸς τὸ θῶς 'in the light of the fire.'] and that employed for cooking on the shore of the Lake of Galilee (Joh 21:9), would be charcoal fires on the ground, (b) Fire from heaven (lightning, or something of the same kind, natural or miraculous) was a frequent form of Divine judgment in OT. One instance of this (the destruction of Sodom) is recalled in Luk 17:29, and another (in the life of Elijah) prompted the feeling and suggested the question of James and John in Luk 9:54.

2. The *figurative* references to fire are of various kinds. Since wood which was worthless for any other purpose was used as fuel, fire became an emblem of the judgment awaiting spiritual unfruitfulness (Mat 3:10 = Luk 3:9, Mat 7:19, Joh 15:6). A similar idea was suggested by the burning of other worthless things, such as chaff (Mat 3:12 = Luk 3:17) and tares (Mat 13:30; Mat 13:40; Mat 13:42). The 'furnace of fire,' which is part of the natural imagery of the parable of the Tares, becomes, in the parable of the Drag-net, a standing expression for the destiny of the wicked (Mat 13:50). Similarly we have 'eternal' (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) or 'everlasting' (Authorized Version) fire (Mat 18:8; Mat 25:41), 'unquenchable' fire (Mat 3:12 = Luk 3:17, Mar 9:43; Mar 9:48), and ((Revised Version margin)) 'the Gehenna of fire' (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'the hell of fire,' Authorized Version 'hell fire') in Mat 5:22, Mat 18:9 (= Mar 9:43; Mar 9:45; Mar 9:47). The last of these expressions is found in the same context as the other two, and gives the key to their meaning. From the OT associations of the valley of Hinnom the name *Gehenna* had in Christ's time been appropriated in Jewish thought for the place of the final punishment of the wicked—a place of burning and corruption, in which body as well as spirit would be tortured. In the passages above mentioned our Lord must be

understood to use the popular religious language of His time, though it may have been in a less literal and more parabolic sense than usual. To the group of sayings in [Mar_9:43-48](#) is attached another ([Mar_9:49](#)), in which fire is the emblem of the self-discipline in this world, by which the destruction of Gehenna in the next world is to be avoided. The destructiveness of fire made the phrase 'I will send fire' a common form of prophetic Divine threatening in OT, and this phrase is taken up by Christ ([Luk_12:49](#)) as expressing, in one aspect, the result of His earthly mission. Fire is used by John the Baptist as an emblem of the purity and intensity of the influence accompanying the baptism of the Holy Spirit which he foretold that Christ should bestow ([Mat_3:11](#) = [Luk_3:16](#)).

The eyes of the glorified Christ, as seen in the vision of the Apocalypse, are compared to a flame of fire ([Rev_1:14](#); [Rev_2:18](#); [Rev_19:12](#)).

Origen (*Hom. in Jer. xx. 3*) has preserved the following *agraphon* of Jesus: 'He who is near me is near the fire; he who is far from me is far from the kingdom.'

James Patrick.

Firkin

FIRKIN (μετροπής, [Joh_2:6](#) only).—An Attic liquid measure, which is generally regarded as the equivalent of the Hebrew *bath* (cf. LXX Septuagint [2Ch_4:5](#)), and is therefore 'able to contain seventy-two sextaries' (Josephus *Ant.* viii. ii. 9), accurately 71, 28 pints, or approximately 9 English gallons. 'Firkin' (Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885)—the *fourth* part of a barrel containing from 32 to 36 gallons—as a translation is sufficiently exact for ordinary purposes.

Previously emptied for the ablutions of the guests, the water-pots are filled afresh. Their character and contents prove the reality of the miracle. Very effective is the touch added by the expression ἕως ἄνω, 'up to the brim,' if only in presenting a sure basis for calculating the quantity of this wedding gift. The lowest estimate of the quantity of wine must be over 12 firkins or 108 gallons; yet, had the vessels been larger they had been filled; had there been more vessels, more wine. To such lavishness there need not be imputed indiscretion. Our Lord did not give simply to meet a pressing need, or even for future use, but rather to exemplify the illimitable power of the Giver. 'It is His first miraculous sign ... it must become the type of the fulness of grace and joy and strength which the only-begotten Son brings to the earth' (Godet on [Joh_2:6](#)).

Literature.—Art. ‘Weights and Measures’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible , iv. 911-913; *Encyc. Bibl.* iv. col. 5294 f.

Alex. A. Duncan.

☞ First And Last

FIRST AND LAST (ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος).—This title occurs three times in Rev. (Rev 1:17; Rev 2:8; Rev 22:13). In the first two passages it is clearly Christ who claims the title for Himself, as appears from the references to the Resurrection in the immediate contexts. In all probability the same is the case in the third passage (Rev 22:13), else there is an abrupt change of the speaker three verses later (Rev 22:16 ‘I, Jesus, have sent mine angel,’ etc.). However, Alford and some others hold that God the Father is the speaker in Rev 22:13.

‘The First and the Last’ is claimed by Jehovah as a description of Himself, with slight variations in the form, in Isa 41:4; Isa 44:6; Isa 48:12 (cf. also Isa 43:10). The Greek form of the title in Rev. is not identical with that given by the LXX Septuagint in any of these passages, in all of which the LXX Septuagint has differences representing differences in the Hebrew (Isa 41:4 ἐγὼ θεὸς πρῶτος, καὶ εἰς τὰ ἐπερχόμενα ἐγὼ εἰμι; Isa 44:6 ἐγὼ πρῶτος καὶ ἐγὼ μετὰ ταῦτα; Isa 48:12 ἐγὼ εἰμι πρῶτος, καὶ ἔτι ἐγὼ εἰμι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα). It is plain, however, that a supreme description of Jehovah in the OT is applied in Rev. to Christ, and the significance of the transference as regards the Christology of the book is unmistakable. Besides this, in Isa 22:13, where, as has been said, it is natural to regard Christ as the speaker, the title ‘the First and the Last’ stands between two others, ‘the Alpha and the Omega,’ ‘the Beginning and the End,’ the first of which is found also in Isa 1:8 and Isa 21:6, and the second in Isa 21:6, in which passages the speaker may be either Christ or, as is maintained by some (Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible , vol. iv. p. 263^a), God the Father, or ‘God in the Undivided Unity of His Being.’ It may be, therefore, that in Rev. itself we have the same supreme titles given to God the Father and to Christ. But whether this be so or not, once it is admitted that Isa 22:13 is spoken by Christ, the accumulation in that verse of descriptions which could only belong to the infinite being of God emphatically marks the belief of the author of Rev. as to the nature of Christ (see Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible , vol. ii. pp. 690^b, 691^b, vol. iv. p. 263^a).

Of the ‘Thirteen Principles of the Faith,’ formulated by Moses Maimonides (12th cent. a.d.), the fourth is: ‘I believe with perfect faith that the Creator, blessed be His

name, is the first and the last' (*Authorized Daily Prayer-Book of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Empire*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 89). Schoettgen says that the title was also given by the ancient Jews to the Messiah (*Hor. Heb. tom. ii. lib. i.* ['Nominum Messiae, quae divinam illius naturam indigitant']: ראשון Primus. Ipse Deus. Jesa. xlv. 6. *Ego, inquit, primus, et ego novissimus*; quibus verbis aeternitatem designatam voluit. Judaei vero antiqui etiam Messiam sic vocant').

The nature of God necessarily transcends definition, but 'the First and the Last' and the parallel titles are endeavours to suggest such conceptions of God as men can comprehend. It would not be enough to say that 'the First and the Last' is the equivalent of 'the Eternal.' The title recalls the old covenant name of God, Jehovah (Jahweh), and its interpretation in Exo 3:14. It seems plainly to be an expansion of that name, of which 'the Eternal' is not a satisfactory rendering. Exo 3:14 ('I am what I am,' or, more accurately, 'I will be what I will be') does not give to יהוה an abstract meaning. יהוה is γίγνομαι, not εἶμι. It does not mean be essentially, but phenomenally. The idea of יהוה is not of abstract existence, but of active being; manifestation in history. Jehovah is not a God who barely exists, but One who asserts His being, and enters into an historical relation with humanity. Not being determined by anything external to (before, or after) Himself, He is consistent with Himself, true to His promises, and unchangeable in His purposes. He will not fail or disappoint His servants. He will approve Himself. What He will be is left undefined, or defined only in terms of Himself, for the very reason that His providential dealings with His people in their ever-varying needs are inexhaustible—are more than can be numbered or expressed (see Driver on 'The Tetragrammaton,' *Biblica*, Oxf. 1885; and A. B. Davidson in Hastings' B [Note: *Dictionary of the Bible.*] , vol. ii. pp. 199^b, 845^a).

This interpretation of the Divine name is amplified in the prophets. Delitzsch on Isa 41:4 says: 'It is the meaning of the Divine name Jehovah which is thus unfolded ('I the Lord, the first, and with the last, I am he'), for Jehovah is God as the absolute, eternally existing, and absolutely free Ego'; and, on Isa 43:10 ('I am he: before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me'): 'He is the sole realization of the idea of God inherent in human consciousness, and He is this eternally. His being has no beginning and no end, so that no other being with Divine claims and character could precede or follow Him' (cf. also Isa 45:5; Isa 45:21-22, Isa 46:9-10, Isa 48:12). These chapters again and again insist on the 'fundamental truth that God is eternally the same (as He is the only) Self-existent Personal Being. To Him the whole range of creaturely existence in all its cycles must be visible,—and to Him only can it be so' (*Speaker's Com.*). The prophets emphasize the expression of the moral

unchangeableness of God in the name Jehovah (see esp. [Isa 26:4](#); [Isa 26:8](#); [Isa 41:4](#), [Hos 12:5-6](#), [Mal 3:6](#)).

It may be said, then, that the title ‘the First and the Last,’ as applied to Christ in Rev., recalls, and attaches to Him, all that the OT writers had realized of the nature of God. How much more it contains for a writer who uses it in the light of the Incarnation may be gathered from [Col 1:15-20](#), a passage related as resting upon the same Christological basis of faith, and which is indeed the ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος of Rev. written out at full length. Both authors alike claim for Christ absolute supremacy in relation to the Universe, the natural Creation, and in relation to the Church, the new Moral Creation, ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων. For both Christ is πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως,—prior to all creation and sovereign over all creation. He is the source of life to the Universe, the centre of all its developments, the mainspring of all its motions—ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα) (cf. [Joh 1:4](#) ὁ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν). And as all things had their origin in Him (the First), so all things return to Him as their goal and consummation (the Last)—τὰ πάντα δι’ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται (cf. [Rom 11:36](#), [Heb 2:10](#), where the reference is to God). All things have their sphere within the sphere of the life of Him who is ‘the First and the Last.’ In Him they originate and in Him they cohere—αὐτὸς ἐστὶ πρὸ πάντων, καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν (cf. [Act 17:28](#), in reference to God). He is the δεσμός of the Universe. And such also is His position in relation to the Church, the new spiritual creation—He is absolutely prior and sovereign, because there too He is the source of life. His Resurrection is the ground of His headship of the Church ([Rev 1:17](#). See Lightfoot and Meyer on [Col 1:15-20](#); cf. [Eph 1:10](#), [Php 2:8](#); [Php 2:10-11](#)).

It is interesting to trace the same underlying thought about the nature of God in Rev. and in the Fourth Gospel. A connexion has been pointed out between ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος of Rev. and the similar phrases of [Isa 41:4](#); [Isa 48:12](#) and the explanation of the Divine name Jehovah in [Exo 3:14](#). There seems to be a correspondence between the ἐγὼ εἰμι of the LXX Septuagint in these and other passages ([Isa 43:10](#); [Isa 43:13](#), [Deu 32:39](#)) and the ἐγὼ εἰμι of [Joh 8:24](#); [Joh 8:28](#); [Joh 8:58](#) (cf. also [Joh 13:19](#)). In all these passages the words have a pregnant meaning. In John 8, Christ presents Himself to the Jews not simply as the Messiah, but as One who has ‘life in Himself’ as being the spring of life. He is infinitely, as God is. He shares the being of God. Therefore he claims supreme control not only of the seen and the finite, but of the unseen and the infinite (see Westcott, *ad loc.*).

Cheyne (on Isa 41:4) thinks that the ἐγὼ εἰμι of Joh 18:5 is intended in the same sense, and finds this view confirmed by the supernatural effect of the sounds described in Joh 18:6.

All existence is necessarily relative to Him who is 'the First and the Last.' Nothing can enter into the final summing up of all things, or partake of eternity, which does not receive life from Him and is not conformed to His purpose. When Christ claims this title for Himself, it is plainly announced that the revelation of God in Christ, in what He was and what He did, is the key to the issues of human life. Christianity is final. See also art. Alpha and Omega.

A. E. Ross.

☩ First-Fruits

FIRST-FRUITS.—On the offering of first-fruits as a Jewish institution see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , vol. ii. p. 10 f.

The word rendered first-fruits (ἀπαρχή) occurs 8 times in the NT, and only in 1Co 15:20; 1Co 15:23 is it applied directly to our Lord: 'Now hath Christ been raised from the dead, the first-fruits of them that are asleep'; 'Christ the first-fruits; then they that are Christ's.' It is possible, as some have suggested, that there is a reference in v. 20 to the specific offering of the sheaf of the first ripe corn on the second day of the Passover feast (Lev 23:10-11). The coincidence of our Lord's resurrection on the 16th Nisan—the day on which the sheaf was offered before the Lord—would no doubt suggest the idea of the first-fruits to the Apostle's mind. But, even apart from this specific reference, the figure of the risen Christ as the first-fruits from the dead is perfectly natural. And there is more here than might be at first supposed. Christ's resurrection is the pledge of His people's resurrection, just as the first-fruits were the pledge of the harvest to come. Christ is the first to be raised from the dead, and so stands in the front rank alone, as the first-fruits were plucked before the rest of the produce was ripe; but, just as certainly as the harvest in due time followed the first-fruits, so shall those who sleep in Christ be raised up in due time, and stand in the second rank after Him. But, further, it is clearly implied here, and explicitly taught in other passages, that as is Christ the first-fruits, so shall be the rest of the harvest. There is implied here a community of nature and character between Christ, the first-fruits, and His people. It is only the *time* of their manifestation that is different. The portion gathered as first-fruits is of the same nature as the rest, and the rest is of the same nature and character and standing as

the first-fruits. This is indicated specially in Lev 23:21, where it is said that, as death came by man, so it is only by man that the resurrection can come, *i.e.* resurrection and triumph over death can be man's possession only when given him by one who is man like himself. Man, therefore, must be of the same nature and character and standing as Christ, the first-fruits. What is suggested here is plainly taught elsewhere (Col 3:4, Rom 8:29, 1Jn 3:2). Christ, according to these passages, is the first-fruits, the firstborn among many brethren, not only as the pledge that, as He rose, so His people shall rise from the dead, but also that *as* He is, in nature and character, so shall His people be. That is, perhaps, the most glorious promise of the resurrection first-fruits.

In Rom 8:23 the first-fruits of the Spirit received by Christ's people are referred to. That they have received the Spirit in some measure and have been sanctified inwardly, is the pledge that they shall receive it in yet greater abundance, that there shall be a final outpouring of the Spirit by which the body of man shall be redeemed even as the spirit has been sanctified—the psychical body being changed into a spiritual. In Rom 11:16; Rom 16:5, 1Co 16:15, Jam 1:18, Rev 14:4 the reference is to the future redemption of mankind, of which those already gathered in are the first-fruits and pledge. Those already redeemed and presented to God as holy are the first-fruits, the pledge of the coming harvest of a holy redeemed humanity.

Literature.—Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. i. 237; Edersheim, *The Temple: its Ministry, etc.*, xix.; Stapfer, *Palestine in Time of Christ*, bk. ii. ch. 13; Josephs, *Judaism as Creed and Life*, bk. ii. ch. 5; art. 'First-Fruits' in *Jew. Encyc.* vol. v.

J. Soutar.

☞ Firstborn

FIRSTBORN

One of the fundamental ideas with regard to Jehovah in early Israel was that of His being owner of the land, and consequently lord also of all that the land brought forth and of all that lived upon it (Lev 25:23, Psa 50:10-12). Closely connected with this idea was a further one to the effect that the land was held in tenure; Jehovah was the landowner, His people the tenants; but their tenancy depended solely on the will of Jehovah (Deu 30:20 etc.).* [Note: This OT conception is illustrated in the Gospels by the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, Mat 21:33 ff. and parallel passages; cf. also Mar 13:34.] As lord of the land and giver of all that it produced, tribute was

due to Him; this tribute took the form of the offering of first-fruits.† [Note: It will, of course, be understood that this was adapted to agricultural life from the earlier nomadic life with its flocks and herds (cf. Nowack, Heb. Arch. ii. p. 147 ff.).] Not only, however, was the land Jehovah's possession, but the people who lived upon it, and upon its produce, were likewise His; this would follow naturally by virtue of Jehovah's overlordship. Therefore, just as Jehovah, being owner of the land, received the first-fruits of its produce as tribute due to Him, so, being also owner of the people, did He receive the firstborn as, in the same way, a tribute due to Him. This is not definitely stated in the Bible, but the notices of child-sacrifice lead us to infer that at some early period the rite of the sacrifice of the firstborn was performed, and the analogy of the offering up of the firstlings of the flock points to a similar usage with regard to man (Exo 13:2; Exo 22:29; Exo 34:20); moreover, the prevalence of the practice among ethnologically allied races‡ [Note: e.g. the Moabites, 2Ki 3:27; the early Arabs (Wellhausen, Reste², pp. 115, 116); the Canaanites (PEFSt, 1903, passim); the Phœnicians (Rawlinson, Hist. of Phœnicia, ch. xi.); cf. the story of the attempted sacrifice of Isaac; see PSBA xxiv. p. 253 ff.] makes it in a high degree probable that originally the descendants of Abram sacrificed their firstborn as a tribute to the Deity (see below, 'Redemption of the firstborn'). As the firstborn are spoken of as being particularly the possession of Jehovah, one would expect to find them occupying the position of His special ministers; it is possible that this was the case originally (cf. Hannah's vow, 1Sa 1:11),§ [Note: There is a Talmudic tradition (Zeb. 112b), according to which the firstborn acted as officiating priests in the wilderness until the erection of the tabernacle, when the office was given to the tribe of Levi (Jewish Encyc. v. 396).] especially as in Num 3:12 it is said: 'Behold, I have taken the Levites from among the children of Israel instead of all the firstborn that openeth the womb among the children of Israel; and the Levites shall be mine' (cf. Num 3:45); as a matter of fact, however, the earliest Code commands the redemption of the firstborn: 'All the firstborn of man among thy sons shalt thou redeem' (Exo 13:13, cf. Exo 13:15; Exo 34:20).

From the foregoing one can understand that the term 'firstborn,' πρωτότοκος (that which, as the most precious, belonged, in the first instance, to Jehovah), came to be one of particular honour (cf. Exo 4:22, Jer 31:9), and it is used as such in reference to Christ (Rom 8:29, Col 1:15; Col 1:18).

The only occurrence of the term in the Gospels is in Luk 2:7 καὶ ἔτεκεν τὸν υἱὸν τὸν πρωτότοκον,* [Note: In Mat 1:25 τὸν πρωτότοκον is read by DC and the OL version only; it must therefore be rejected in this passage.] and apart from its significance to the Jewish mind as outlined above, its importance lies in its bearing upon the

question of the perpetual virginity of the mother of Christ. The term does not necessarily suggest the subsequent birth of other children; for, in the first place, as a title of honour it would naturally be mentioned in connexion with Christ by the Evangelist; and secondly, to Jews the significance of ‘firstborn’ lay in the special sanctity which attached to such;† [Note: Heb_1:6, where τὸν πρωτότοκον means ‘only-begotten.’] this is clear from what has been said in the previous section; indeed, St. Luke directly implies as much when he quotes, in substance, from Exo_13:2; Exo_13:12 ‘Every male that openeth the womb shall be called *holy* to the Lord’ (Luk_2:23).

Redemption of the firstborn.—In the passage Luk_2:22 ff. two distinct ceremonies are referred to: the presentation to the Lord, and the redemption; the former of these implies the actual dedication of the child to God (cf. 1Sa_1:28); from what has been said above, this ceremony must be regarded as the fulfilling in spirit of the primitive act of literally devoting (sacrificing) the firstborn son to the Deity. The distinction between the two ceremonies may be illustrated by the practice of modern orthodox Jews. The father of the child first presents his firstborn to the *cohen*, and makes a declaration ending with the words: ‘It is said, Sanctify unto me all the firstborn, whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and of beast; it is mine.’ This is a definite act of presentation to God, of renunciation on the part of the father,—the child is no longer his. This part of the ceremony corresponds to Luk_2:22-23; Luk_2:27-28. Then the father places fifteen shillings (five *sclaim* or shekels) before the *cohen*, who thereupon asks: ‘Which wouldst thou rather, give me thy firstborn son, the firstborn of his mother,‡ [Note: The law of the redemption of the firstborn ‘applies to the firstborn of the mother and not of the father. Hence the husband of several wives would have to redeem the firstborn of each one of them, while the husband of a woman who had had children by a previous marriage need not redeem her child although it was his firstborn’ (Jewish Encyc. v. 396). Moreover, the first male child of a woman need not be redeemed if a female child has been born before him.] or redeem him for five *selaim*, which thou art bound to give according to the Law?’ The father replies: ‘I desire rather to redeem my son, and here thou hast the value of his redemption, which I am bound to give according to the Law.’§ [Note: The money is sometimes returned, but the Jewish authorities do not look upon this with favour.] This ceremony corresponds to Luk_2:24. | [Note: | See The Authorized Daily Prayer-Book6 (ed. S. Singer), pp. 308, 309.] This redemption of the firstborn¶ [Note: According to Exo_13:13-15 the redemption of the firstborn was instituted as an abiding act of thanksgiving to Jehovah for having spared the firstborn males of the children of Israel in Egypt. Concerning the connexion between the offering of the firstborn and the Passover, see Nowack, op. cit. § 99.] (תִּמְךָ פְּדוּיָהּ) took place thirty

days after birth (Luk 2:22; cf. Lev 12:4, Num 18:16),* [Note: * The same custom is kept up by modern orthodox Jews; if the day falls on a Sabbath or a Holy Day, the ceremony is performed on the following day.] and the price of redemption was, according to Num 3:47; Num 18:16, five shekels; in Exo 13:13 the command to redeem the firstborn is given, though the price of redemption is not mentioned, while in Leviticus 12 there is no mention at all regarding the redemption of the firstborn, reference being made only to an atonement which has to be made for the purification of the mother; it may be owing to Leviticus 12 that in Luk 2:22 'their' purification is spoken of, *i.e.* of the child as well as of the mother; at any rate v. 24 seems to point to an amalgamation of the offerings due from the mother for purification, and on behalf of the child for redemption;* [Note: Among modern orthodox Jews, priests and Levites are exempt from the law of redeeming their firstborn; this applies also to those whose wives are daughters of priests or Levites.] in the modern service of prayer of thanksgiving for women after recovery from childbirth no provision is made for any offering.

Literature.—See the authorities referred to in the foot-notes.

W. O. E. Oesterley.

☞ Fish, Fisher, Fishing

FISH, FISHER, FISHING.—The present article is not concerned with the fish of the Mediterranean, nor with those which inhabit various watercourses in the Holy Land, nor even with those that belong to the lower course of the Jordan or of its southern tributaries, or of the other streams that flow into the Dead Sea. The only fish mentioned in the Gospels, the only ones, consequently, which come within the scope of this Dictionary, are those of the Lake of Gennesaret, to which we naturally add those that are found in the upper course of the Jordan or in the springs in the neighbourhood of the Lake.

Fish (OT דג, דגים,) are designated in the NT only by the general term ἰχθύς, alternating occasionally with its diminutive ἰχθύδιον, without the employment of the latter term necessarily marking any intended distinction; cf. for an instance in point, Mat 15:34 with Mat 15:36. Nowhere in the whole Bible do we find a special name for a definite species of fish.

Fish formed a large part of the food of the Lakeside population. This may be inferred from the threefold question of Jesus (Luk 11:11, cf. Mat 7:10), in which the commonest foods are enumerated: bread, fish, eggs. The same conclusion is implied in what is related with reference to the two multiplications of the loaves. On the occasion of the first (Mat 14:13-21, Mar 6:30-44, Luk 9:10-17, Joh 6:1-15) it is said that there was present a lad with five loaves and two fishes; in the account of the second (Mat 15:32-39, Mar 8:1-10) it is mentioned that, in addition to the seven loaves, there were also 'a few small fishes.' We may cite, further, Luk 24:42.

It is interesting to note that for the 'small fishes' of the other narratives the Fourth Gospel employs the term ὀψάριον, which properly signifies simply 'nourishment,' 'food.' Bochart (*Hieroz.* i. p. 41) has already shown that this word was employed in the same way by the best Greek writers, e.g. Plato, Menander, etc., and that σφοφάγιοι, is met with as synonymous with 'fish-eaters.'

It is legitimate to suppose that a trade in fish was carried on between the Lake of Tiberias and the rest of the country. The name of the town of Taricheae (Ταριχεῖαι), situated on the shore of the Lake, implies a business connected with salted provisions (τάριχοι). It may be that this traffic extended as far as Jerusalem; some have supposed that it was in this way that one of Jesus' disciples, the companion of Simon Peter, was known to the high priest (Joh 18:15 f.); but this is nothing more than an ingenious conjecture.

'Fisher'* [Note: So AV and RV in Mat 4:18 f. and Mar 1:16 f., but 'fishermen' in Luk 5:2. See Hastings' DB ii. 12a.] or 'fisherman' (Heb. דָּגָן) is expressed in the NT by ἄλειυς or ἄλιευς; the verb 'to fish' by ἀλιεῦειν. Several of the first and principal disciples followed the calling of fishermen. The Synoptics describe the scene when Jesus called them to follow Him (Mat 4:18-22, Mar 1:16-20, Luk 5:1-11). These three narratives contain the promise, 'I will make you fishers of men.' Lk. connects the story with the miraculous draught; cf. in this respect also Joh 21:6-11. In one of the parables of the Kingdom (Mat 13:47-50) Jesus compares the latter to a net; and the separation which the fishermen make, in their catch, between what is good and what is bad, is used to symbolize the separation of the righteous from the wicked at the Final Judgment. The criterion by which good and bad fish are distinguished is not expressly indicated. The point in view might be the difference between clean and unclean foods as defined by the Law (cf. Deu 14:9 f., Lev 11:9 f.); but there might be other motives, such as those which Lortet indicates in the case of modern fishermen, who reject certain fish on account of their inferior size (Poissons et

Reptiles du lac de Tibériade, p. 52), their disagreeable aspect (*ib.* pp. 32, 82), or their unpleasant muddy flavour (*ib.* pp. 35, 58, 64).

The fishermen sometimes carried on their trade in partnership, as is still the case at the present day, when the fishermen of Tiberias form a kind of corporation with fixed rules. The number of fishing vessels on the Lake at the beginning of the Christian era must have been very considerable. Josephus (*BJ* ii. xxi. 8) speaks of 330 (*v.l.* 230); see also Mar 4:36, Joh 6:23. Forty years ago Furrer found only a single boat; Lortet saw three in 1875 and six in 1880; Frei counted nine in 1886, and the present writer saw the same number in 1894, while in 1899 he noted fourteen; and no doubt the number has increased since then.

The fishermen made use of nets. One of the Greek terms employed (Mat 13:47) is *σαγήνη*, *seine*, 'drag-net,' a large net which two or more boats arrange in a circle in the lake, in such a way as to enclose a vast space with a kind of vertical wall. It is kept stretched by means of weights and floats. Then the two extremities are brought together, and the whole with its contents is dragged ashore. The other species of net mentioned in the Gospels (Mat 4:18) is the *casting net* (*ἀμφιβληστρον*), which a single man throws with a skilful turn of the hand, and which is of circular form, like an umbrella. Once it has been plunged in the water it is drawn out with the captured fish. This is still the method most frequently pursued in our own time. The other passages where nets are spoken of (Mat 4:20 f., Mar 1:18 f., Luk 5:2-6, Joh 21:6-11) use the general term *δικτυον*, which might be applied to any kind of net. Some texts speak of washing and of mending nets (Luk 5:2, Mat 4:21, Mar 1:19). See also Nets.

The Gospels only once mention line-fishing, namely in Mat 17:27, where we read of Peter casting the **hook** (*ἄγκιστρον*), which was certainly placed at the end of a cord or line, but we cannot say whether the latter was attached to a rod or long reed or was simply held in the hand. In the NT there is no mention of harpooning fish (contrast Job 41:7 [He 40:31]). At the present day we still meet with examples of this practice.

The waters of the Lake of Tiberias are exceptionally rich in fish, especially by the shore of el-Batiha (to the east of the mouth of the Jordan), and in the bay of et-Tabigha. These were in former times the favourite grounds of fishermen, and these spots are still preferred by them in our own day. There, on the shore of el-Batiha lay Bethsaida-Julias; and, if there were two Bethsaidas (a much controverted question; see artt. Bethsaida and Capernaum), the second was at et-Tabigha or in its vicinity. Now *Bethsaida* means 'house of fish,' 'fishery.' It was the native town of Peter and Andrew, of James and John,—all four fishermen,—as well as of Philip, whose occupation is unknown to us. According to Joh 21:2 Thomas and Nathanael (of Cana)

appear also to have been fishermen, at least occasionally. The dress of the fishermen was more than simple; according to Joh_21:7 Peter was γυμνός, 'naked'; it is not quite easy to see why so many exegetes maintain that this term does not imply complete nudity. It is certainly most natural to suppose that Peter had discarded all his clothes; the fact that he afterwards hastily girds on his ἐπενδύτης, lit. his 'upper garment,' does not necessarily prove that he was wearing another under it.

The fish of the Lake of Tiberias have been minutely studied and described by two experts, Dr. Lortet, dean of the Faculty of Medicine at Lyons, and Dr. Tristram. Out of 39 (Lortet) or 43 (Tristram) species known in Palestine, from 22 to 24 are found in the Lake of Tiberias and its immediate vicinity. They belong to a number of different genera. The genus *Chromis* has the richest representation of species: *Niloticus*, *Tiberiadis*, *Andreæ*, *Simonis*, *Microstomus*, *Flavii Josephi*, *Magdalenæ*; belonging to a genus near of kin is *Hemichromis Sacra*. These fish are the most abundant and make the best eating. The genus *Barbus* is also extremely prolific; three species belonging to it are found: *Canis*, which swarms, but is little appreciated; *Longiceps*, esteemed; and *Beddomii*, rare. Then, in the family of the *Cyprinides* come *Discognathus Lamta*; four species of *Capæta*: *Syriaca*, *Damascina*, *Socialis*, *Sauvagei*; *Leueiscus* (or *Phoxinellus*) *Zeregi*; *Alburnus Sellal*; *Acanthobrama Centisquama*; three species of *Nemachilus*: *Tigris*, *Galilæus*, *Leontinæ*. In the family of the *Blennides*: *Blennius Varus* and *Blennius Lupulus*. Finally, in the family of the *Silurides* we have the strange *Clarias Macracanthus*, already noted by Josephus (*BJ* iii. x. 8) under the name κορακίνος, which, in spite of its forbidding aspect, supplies an article of food not to be disdained. This fish has the strange peculiarity that, when it is withdrawn from its natural element, it utters cries like the mewings of a cat, and that it can live for several days out of the water.

A considerable number of the above species belong properly to Palestine, but the *fauna* of Palestinian fish shows, nevertheless, a close connexion with that of Africa and not with that of the Mediterranean basin. The ancients, e.g. Josephus, had already noted this fact, and they raised the question of the possibility of a subterranean communication between the waters of Egypt and those of Palestine. See also *Animals*, p. 66^a.

Literature.—Bochart, *Hierozoicon*, i. pp. 36-44; Lortet, *Poissons et Reptiles du lac de Tibériade*, 1883, and the same author's *La Syrie d'aujourd'hui*, 1884, pp. 506-510; Tristram, 'Fauna and Flora' (*PEF* [Note: EF Palestine Exploration Fund.] , *SWP* [Note: WP Memoirs of the Survey of W. Palestine.]), 1888, pp. 162-177, also *Natural History of the Bible*⁸ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1889,

pp. 282-294; J. G. Wood, *Bible Animals*, 1869, pp. 561-582; Ad. Frei in *ZDPV* [Note: *DPV Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.*] , 1886, pp. 101-103; Libbey and Hoskins, *Jordan Valley and Petra*, 1905, vol. i. p. 130 f.; G. R. Lees, *Village Life in Palestine*, 1905, p. 5 [with photograph of two fishermen of the Lake of Tiberias casting their nets].

Lucien Gautier.

☞ Flax

FLAX.—See Smoking Flax.

☞ Flesh

FLESH (σάρξ).—In every instance where this word is used by the Evangelists we observe that it is confined in its reference to the human race. The same remark, it may be noticed, holds good of the NT writers as a whole (cf., however, 1Co 15:39, and the plural σάρκας of Rev 19:18). The particular conception attaching to it varies in different contexts to a slight extent, though in almost every case a distinction or contrast is either stated or implied which has its roots in OT thought. It is interesting to remark that this is a word employed very rarely by St. Luke in either of his writings; and even when he does use it, we find that, for the most part, he is quoting from the OT (see Luk 3:6 = Isa 40:5 [LXX Septuagint], where in conjunction with πᾶσα α it is simply a synonym for all mankind; cf. Mat 24:22, Mar 13:20, Joh 17:2, and Act 2:17). The reference, of course, is to the human race in its present condition of weakness and need of help, as contrasted with the power and the active love of God (cf. Deu 5:26, Psa 56:4 [55:5 LXX Septuagint]).

In the only other place where the word is found in St. Luke's Gospel (Luk 24:39) we have it used simply to denote the substance flesh considered as a constituent of the human body. The risen Jesus is represented as inviting His disciples to assure themselves by touching Him that He had risen not merely in a spiritual, but in a corporeal sense. The antithesis is that of 'spirit' and 'body' (πνεῦμα and σῶμα), the latter consisting of 'flesh' and 'bones' (σάρξ and ὀστέα). See art. Body.

A still more emphatic expression signifying the distinction between man and God is found in St. Matthew's Gospel (Mat_16:17), where *σάρξ* is joined with *αἷμα* to denote man in his present condition of spiritual limitation and of defective knowledge. A somewhat similar antithesis is incidentally, albeit elaborately, pointed out by St. John (Joh_1:13), who, in his reference to the new life communicated through Christ to believers, lays stress on the fact that this higher life is not the result of human birth, whether the latter be considered as the outcome of a long line of descent (*ἐξ αἱμάτων*), or as springing from natural instinct inherent in the flesh (*ἐκ θελήματος σαρκός*), or even as the resultant of the will power resident in the entire man (*ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρός*). Their infused life has its roots in Him who is the source of all life (... *ἀλλ' ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν*), and is conditioned in every instance by their reception of the Word made flesh (*οἱ δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτόν*, see Westcott, *Gospel of St. John, ad loc.*, who notices a very early variant reading which would make 'the Word' the subject of the whole verse).

Another form of this antithetic relationship occurs in the same writing. In His conversation with Nicodemus Jesus draws attention to the limitations which surround the functions of man's nature considered on its sensuous side (*ἐκ τῆς σαρκός*), and those of the Spirit which finds scope for activity within another sphere of human life (*ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος*). It is not the antithesis of evil and good that is here referred to. It is simply that within the realm of man's being there are two principles of energy which take their origin from two orders of existence. The law of nature which compels like to produce like holds good in man's complex life, and so 'What is born of the flesh is flesh, and what is born of the Spirit is spirit' (Joh_3:6). With this we may compare another passage in the same Gospel where this idea is expressed in language more explicit still and as emphatic (Joh_6:63). The contrast here between spirit, which not only has life in itself but can communicate that life as it wills (*τὸ ζωοποιεῖν*), and flesh, which 'is of no avail' above its own sphere (*ἡ σὰρξ οὐκ ὠφελεῖ οὐδέν*), is categorically asserted.

So, too, on another occasion when engaged in controversy with the Pharisees, Jesus contrasts their method of judging with His own patience in that respect, and in so doing implies a further contrast—their imperfect and therefore incorrect judgment (*κατὰ τὴν σάρκα*) which is based on a superficial knowledge, and His just judgment which comes from His 'knowledge of all the circumstances, and aspects, and issues of

life' (ἡ κρέις ἢ ἐμὴ ἀληθινὴ ἐστίν, Joh 8:15 f.; see Westcott, *Gospel of St. John*, ad loc.).

Arising out of this conception we have the word employed to mark a psychological distinction between man's flesh and spirit. So real was this distinction to the mind of Jesus that we can almost hear in His words (Mat 26:41 = Mar 14:38) the echo of personal experience (... γρηγορῆσαι μετ' ἐμοῦ ... τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον ἢ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενῆς). In this place we may also notice that there was something present in the struggle engaged in by the disciples which was absent in the case of Jesus. They were unsuccessful in their efforts to 'watch,' because not only was their flesh 'weak,' but it had also to contend with an element of discord which further distracted their power for unremitting watchfulness. With Him was also present the flesh of weakness (see 2Co 13:4 ἐξ ἀσθενείας), but the relationship between His σὰρξ and πνεῦμα was not perverted by the indwelling presence of sin, or by the downward tendency inherited as the result of sin.

On one occasion Jesus quotes with approval the translation of the LXX Septuagint (Gen 2:24) where the word σὰρξ occurs meaning the entire man (Mat 19:5 f. = Mar 10:8), and that without any qualifying word. It would be a colourless interpretation of Jesus' words which would limit His teaching on the marriage relationship to a physical oneness following on and produced by the sexual union. The Hebraistic ἕσονται εἰς (Heb. וַיִּהְיֶה לֶם) implies a gradual movement from a physical union to a higher and more complex unity, so that where two separate beings formerly existed there is now but one (ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶν δύο, ἀλλὰ σὰρξ μία, which is Jesus' inference from the Heb. לֶשֶׁת בָּרָא; see art. Eunuch). It is because of the ultimately complete and spiritual character of this union that the sin which dissolves it and the human legislation which seeks to render it nugatory assume their dark proportions (cf. Gould, 'St. Mark' in *Internat. Crit. Com.* on Mar 10:8 f.).

Passing from the Synoptic to the Johannine use of this word, we find it clothing conceptions which are fuller and richer. In the simple but majestic sentence in which he announces the profound mystery of the Incarnation, St. John employs the word 'flesh' to express the totality of human nature, looked at on the side of its manifold limitations, that is to say, as it touches and is connected with the world of matter and of time (ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, Joh 1:14, with which we may compare the positive references to 'the soul' and 'the spirit' of Jesus in the same writing, e.g. Joh 12:27 ἡ ψυχὴ μου, Joh 13:21 τῷ πνεύματι, etc.). The phrase 'the Word became flesh' implies

the existence of an antithesis which has been reduced in its elements to a final and permanent synthesis. The Johannine conception leaves no room for doubt as to the perfection of the human nature of Jesus, which is universal both as regards time and race.

Keeping in mind this usage, we shall be enabled to apprehend more fully the thought underlying the language of Jesus about His power of imparting Himself in His perfect humanity (cf. Joh 6:51-56). His 'flesh,' by virtue of its union with His Divine Personality, is 'living' (ὁ ζῶν) food, and therefore possesses the power of communicating its life to all who will eat thereof (ἐὰν μὴ φάγητε τὴν σάρκα, κ.τ.λ.). Without this participation and consequent assimilation on the part of His followers, there can be no such thing as 'life' within them, for they deliberately reject what contains for them the germinal principle of that 'life' (οὐκ ἔχετε ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς).

The question may be asked whether it is possible to trace any likeness or fundamental connexion between the Gospel and the Pauline uses of σὰρξ. In St. Paul's writings very marked emphasis is laid upon this word, and for him it clothes a conception rich with ethical significance. The 'flesh' is the present abode of sin, which requires an obedient subject to execute its behests. So closely does he connect the power of sin with the existing weakness of the flesh that he does not hesitate to say from his own experience 'I know that in ... my flesh dwelleth no good thing' (Rom 7:18). At the same time, he is careful to point out that this is not the state appointed for man by God. The 'crucifixion' of the flesh is possible for every man who wills to walk not 'according to the flesh' but 'according to the Spirit' (οἱ ... τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν, κ.τ.λ., Gal 5:24, cf. Rom 8:4 f.), and those who have the indwelling presence of the Spirit are no longer in the flesh (ἐν σαρκί) but in the Spirit (ἐν πνεύματι, Rom 8:9). With these we may compare such expressions as 'the mind of the flesh' (φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός) and 'the mind of the Spirit' (φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος, Rom 8:6; ὑπὸ τοῦ νοῦς τῆς σαρκός, Col 2:18), from which we can gather how present to St. Paul's mind was the connexion between sin and the flesh, and at the same time how strong within him was the glorious hope that such connexion in the ultimate result was abnormal and destined for destruction. There is no sign in the Pauline terminology that he was influenced in his theological conceptions by the spirit of that Greek dualism which wormed its way into subsequent Christian thought with lasting and for the most part evil consequences (see Müller, *Christian Doct. of Sin*, i. 320 ff.).

The redemption and the quickening of the body (... τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος, Rom 8:23; ... ζωοποιήσῃ τὰ θνητὰ σώματα, Rom 8:11; cf. Rom 6:12, 2Co 4:11) are features essential to the scheme of salvation as outlined and systematized by St. Paul. The condemnation of sin 'in the flesh' by God, who for this purpose sent His Son 'in the likeness of the flesh of sin' (Rom 8:3), is evidence that there is, for him, no naturally essential connexion between the flesh and evil.

We are not without signs that this is just the point of view from which the Evangelists looked at this question (cf. Joh 1:14; Joh 17:2, Luk 3:6; Luk 11:34 = Mat 6:22), and that neither they nor the Apostle of the Gentiles were touched by that false belief which identified sin with matter, and, therefore, with 'the body of the flesh' (cf. Col 1:22; Col 2:11). The anthropology of the Gospels, as well as the psychological conceptions which emerge but rarely and incidentally from their pages, are essentially Hebrew, and are never stained by the potential immoralities which characterized the later Alexandrian and Hellenistic theology.

Literature.—Stevens, *The Theology of the NT*, pp. 189 f., 338 ff.; Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, i. 53-224, iii. 183, 255 ff., etc.; H. H. Wendt, *Die Begriffe Fleisch und Geist*; Laidlaw, *The Bible Doctrine of Man*, and his artt. 'Psychology' and 'Flesh' in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible*; Weiss, *Biblical Theology of the NT*, § 27; Cremer, *Bibl.-Theol. Lex. of NT Greek*, s.v. σὰρξ.

J. R. Willis.

✠Flight

FLIGHT.—The story of the flight of the Holy Family into Egypt is peculiar to the First Gospel (Mat 2:13 ff.). The omission of it, and also of the manifestation to the Gentiles (Mat 2:1-12), from the Third Gospel is surprising, since there rather than in Mt. we should have expected to find any story that brought Jesus into contact with the Gentile world. The surprise would deepen into suspicion were it not that the records of the Evangelists are so fragmentary; but that fact instantly relieves the strain.

O. Holtzmann, who cites the well-known omission in Act 9:19-26 of any reference to St. Paul's journey to Arabia (Gal 1:17), frankly states that 'the author who left out this journey of Paul to Arabia might well pass over, in his other account, the journey of the Holy Family into Egypt,' and that 'if we had in Matthew an account absolutely

above criticism, it would not be difficult to get over the gap in the narrative of Luke' (*Life of Jesus*, p. 85).

The silence of St. Luke does not, then, discredit the narrative of St. Matthew. But their records might prove to be mutually exclusive, so that acceptance of the one would involve rejection of the other. How stand the facts? According to the Third Gospel, Nazareth was, prior to their marriage, the home both of Joseph and of Mary (Luk 2:4; Luk 1:26), whereas St. Matthew (Mat 2:23) first associates them with Nazareth after their return from Egypt, and gives no hint of any previous residence there. Further, St. Matthew, having told the story of the Nativity (Mat 1:18-25), goes on to record the visit of the Magi (Mat 2:1-12), the hurried flight from Bethlehem and the sojourn in Egypt (Mat 2:13 ff.), whereas St. Luke records merely the circumcision of the child (Luk 2:21) and His presentation to the Lord (Mat 2:22 ff.), and then adds that 'when they had performed all things according to the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee, to their own city Nazareth' (Luk 2:39). From those words one would naturally infer that the return took place immediately after the events thus recorded, and that no room was left for the episodes of the First Gospel. Is that inference necessary, or even well founded? If the narrative of Acts must be so adjusted as to take in the sojourn of St. Paul in Arabia, he would be a bold critic who would maintain that the terms of the other narrative inevitably exclude the sojourn in Egypt. It is to be noted also that the timetable of the First Gospel is sufficiently elastic to embrace easily the events recorded in the Third. For we find there that, 'according to the time which he had carefully learned of the wise men,' Herod's inhuman edict included all the children in Bethlehem 'from *two years old* and under' (Mat 2:16).

The difficulty, therefore, is not one of chronology. Even if it were, such an objection would lose both point and edge in the hands of those who used it, except on the theory that Jesus was, after all, born in Bethlehem. For, even granting that the immediate return to Nazareth is the natural inference from St. Luke's account, yet the force of any argument based upon it fails the very moment that Nazareth and not Bethlehem is made the scene of the Nativity. On that showing, St. Luke's story is itself untrustworthy, and so cannot be used to discredit another story which is inconsistent with it.

The real difficulty is of quite a different sort: it is that we have not in St. Matthew 'an account absolutely above criticism.' It might very pertinently be asked if we have any right to expect such an account. Stories of the childhood of a great man are never written while he is still a child, but only after he has achieved greatness; and even then they are written, not necessarily because of their own intrinsic importance, but because they have caught some of the glory of the afterglow. Now, it was not until Jesus had already won His place in the hearts of men that our Gospels were written.

In the circumstances of the case, therefore, these records could not be other than fragmentary, and a fragmentary account can never be 'absolutely above criticism.'

But presumably the special criticism to which these incidents of the Infancy lie open, is that they are no more entitled to belief than, say, those recorded in the Apocryphal Gospels. The *Gospel of the Infancy*, e.g., weaves around the Flight into Egypt a fantastic garland of miracle and wonder. This wreath of fairy tales is by common consent stripped off and laid aside as unhistorical embellishment. Should not the Flight itself be laid with them as equally unworthy of credence? The question opens up a subject much too large to be discussed here. But one may at least ask if it is not too drastic a measure to destroy the ship because one has had to remove the barnacles, or to remove the peg because a worthless coat has been hung on it. Are these narratives so much of a piece that, if we reject some of them, we must reject all? Surely the fact is not without significance that the Evangelist preserves the story of the Flight, but records none of the marvels that have clustered round it. For if these other stories were extant when he wrote, he must have been cognizant of them, and his rejection of them must have been deliberate. On the other hand, if they were of a later growth, his tradition is thereby marked as older and, to that extent, more trustworthy.

But, says Keim (*Life of Jesus*, ii. 94), 'it bears all the marks of a poetic picture.' Is there, then, no poetry in real life? If a story is poetic, is it thereby branded as unhistorical? 'Intertwined with the narrative is a no less than threefold revelation by an angel, almost too much for the thrift of heaven.' The objection would be valid in the case of a story written in modern times by a man of the West, but is shorn of its force when one remembers that this story was written by an Oriental some eighteen centuries ago.

Much more apposite is the contention that 'the enormous toil of such a journey with a little child, was such as only legend, aided or not by miracles, could easily get over.' The toilsomeness of the journey is not denied; no one imagines that it was 'easily got over.' May not our Lord's own words ([Mat_24:20](#), [Mar_13:18](#)) be an echo of the hardships Joseph and Mary had to endure in bearing Him to a place of refuge? But the cogency of Keim's argument vanishes when we remember that this was a flight for life (see Innocents). In such circumstances, hardships are little accounted. But 'they might have found a nearer refuge among the Arabs of the south or west.' Surely this criticism is singularly inept. A temporary and brief refuge might thus have been found, but no one knew how long it would be ere the wanderers could safely return to their own land. What was needed was an asylum in which they could quietly abide till all danger was past, and where Joseph could find employment which would enable him to provide for his household.

Equally beside the mark is the attempt to explain the story as in some way parallel to the sojourn of Moses in Egypt. The two stories are rich, not in resemblance, but in contrast: they have absolutely nothing in common save the word 'Egypt.' The attempt to derive the one from the other is a triumph of misdirected ingenuity.

Quite as little avails the expedient of deducing the narrative from the prophecy of Hosea (Hos_11:1), as O. Holtzmann would evidently do. 'For the story about the Lord's childhood the Gospel of Matthew seems to have drawn principally upon certain indications in the Old Testament' (*Life of Jesus*, p. 86). One can readily enough understand how a Jewish Christian might see in the narrative of the Flight a richer fulfilment of the prophet's words, but it is almost incredible that the incident should be invented as a commentary on the words, and all the more so when the words in question are not a prophecy, but a historical reference. Still less credible does the suggestion become when we find that we should require to believe not merely that the Flight was invented to explain the prophecy, but further that the Massacre of the Innocents had next to be invented to explain the Flight, and the visit of the Magi to explain the Massacre. Acceptance of such a theory involves a much larger draft on one's credulity than does acceptance of the incident itself as historical.

The question may still arise, What motive led the Evangelist to record this event? Need we seek for any motive? He wanted to tell about Jesus: would it not be enough for him that this was a story of the childhood of the loved Master, and that he believed it to be authentic?

'Egypt has, in all ages, been the natural place of refuge for all who were driven from Palestine by distress, persecution, or discontent' (Farrar, *Life of Christ*, ch. iv.). It need create no surprise, therefore, that it was towards Egypt the fugitives bent their steps. There they would be without Herod's jurisdiction and beyond the reach of his vengeance; the road was a well-known one, and some three days would suffice to bring them to the frontier. Of the incidents of the journey we have no reliable information, nor are we told in what part of Egypt the wanderers at length found rest and refuge. Tradition has assigned this distinction to Matarieh (the ancient Heliopolis), which lies a few miles north-east from Cairo; and there is no good reason why the tradition may not be correct. It is known that in that neighbourhood there was a considerable Jewish population. That fact would have undoubted weight with Joseph, as it held out to him the prospect of obtaining suitable employment. The duration of the sojourn in Egypt has been very variously stated, some reckoning it as having extended over one, two, three, or even seven years. But we may take it as certain that it was in reality very brief, seeing the death of Herod occurred very shortly after the period at which the Flight must have taken place. See also art. Egypt.

Literature.—W. G. Elmslie in *Expositor*, i. vi. [1877] 401-411; Farrar, *Christ in Art*, 263-273. For a vivid conception of the circumstances of the Flight into Egypt, no less than of the relations between the Child Jesus and the slain infants of Bethlehem, see Holman Hunt's 'Triumph of the Innocents.'

Hugh Duncan.

☞ Flock, Fold

FLOCK, FOLD.—For a general treatment of these words see Sheep, Shepherd. But it may be noted here that, whereas in Joh_10:1; Joh_10:16 we find in Authorized Version 'fold' three times ('he that entereth not by the door into the sheep-*fold*'; and 'other sheep I have which are not of this *fold*; them also I must bring, and ... there shall be one *fold* and one shepherd'), there is in the original a marked distinction. Two words, absolutely unconnected with each other, are employed. In Joh_10:1, and in the first clause of Joh_10:16, the Greek word is *αὐλή* = 'enclosure,' 'court,' 'fold,' in the strict sense. It is the word used of the enclosed *court* of the high priest's palace (Mat_26:3, Mar_14:54, Luk_22:55, Joh_18:15), of the strong man's palace (Luk_11:21), and of the outer court of the Temple (Rev_11:2). In using this word our Lord seems to refer to those 'walls of partition' (cf. Eph_2:14) which separated the Jews from the Gentiles and made them a nation by themselves. Within this Jewish *fold* (*αὐλή*), our Lord tells us that, at the time when He spoke, He had a number of sheep who were His own; and also that, outside of it, among the Gentiles, dark and miserable as their condition was, He had other sheep, who were His already, and were known to Him, even if they knew it not themselves. These too, He announces, He must bring, and put them along with His Jewish-born sheep; 'and,' He adds, 'there shall be one *flock* (He uses here the other word *ποιμνῆ*), one shepherd.' He does not say there will be 'one *fold*' (*αὐλή*), or, indeed, any fold at all. He has unity in view for His sheep—union; but not such as is to be secured by the erection round His flock of such outwardly-enclosing, or constraining 'walls of partition'—geographical or racial—as had hitherto divided nation from nation and Jew from Gentile. The union whereof He speaks is to be the union of a flock, which is kept together on the one hand by its own instinct of gregariousness, or the mutual affection of the members, and on the other hand by its common subjection to its 'one Shepherd,' who loves it, died for it, and whom through all its members it knows. It does not, however, follow that this unity is not a visible unity. The unity of the *flock*, as it moves along the road under its shepherd's guidance, is just as visible to the beholder as the unity of the *fold* whose white walls gleam from the hillside. The

difference is not in regard to the visibility of the effect, but the nature of the unifying bond. The distinction is brought out in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 .

James Cooper.

☒ Flood

FLOOD.—The Flood is referred to only in Mat 24:38-39 and its parallel Luk 17:27. Jesus is speaking of the concealment of the day and hour of the coming of the Son of Man, and He uses the Flood as an illustration which would be well known to His hearers. Men and women were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered the ark; and did not know until the Flood came and took them all away. So it would be at the time of the coming of the Son of Man. Jesus was, at the time of speaking, warning men of His coming, and the warning was intended, doubtless, to be sufficient to turn them, if they would be turned, from their evil. The emphasis in the use of the illustration is upon the indifference and wickedness of the antediluvians, as paralleled by that of men in the future who would not receive and act upon the warnings now given. The Gospel use, then, of the Flood is, like the meaning of the word used (*κατακλυσμός*), neutral as to the important questions raised by the OT story of the Deluge. See art. 'Flood' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , vol. ii.

O. H. Gates.

☒ Flowers

FLOWERS.—Palestine has a flora of wonderful wealth and variety. The known species exceed three thousand, and even this large list is probably far from complete. But numbers alone convey no adequate idea of its varied nature. This little land contains within its narrow limits the most remarkable diversities of soil, surface, and climate. As is the land so is its flora, which at the one extreme, amid the heights of Lebanon, is Alpine in its character, and at the other extreme, in the gorge of the Dead Sea, tropical.

In the NT there are very few references to flowers, and these are of the most general character (Jam 1:10-11; 1Pe 1:24). In the Gospels the only mention of them is in the words of our Lord, 'Consider the lilies of the field' (Mat 6:23, Luk 12:27). It is noteworthy that it is to their beauty that Christ appeals; elsewhere in the NT flowers

are the emblem of frailty and evanescence. But in spite of the comparative infrequency of Scripture allusions to them or praise of their beauty, the Jews were lovers of flowers. This is attested by the floral ornamentation on the woodwork of the oracle (1Ki 6:18), the folding-doors (1Ki 6:35), and the pillars of the temple (1Ki 7:22), the brim of the molten sea (1Ki 7:26), and the golden candlestick (Exo 25:31; Exo 25:33). From the Mishna we learn that at the Feast of Harvest (Exo 23:16) the first crop of fruit offered at the altar was decked with flowers (*Bikkurim*, ii. 3).

Among the beautiful flowers of Palestine may be mentioned anemones, crocuses, cyclamens, gladioli, hyacinths, irises, poppies, roses, and tulips.

Hugh Duncan.

♩ Flute-Players

FLUTE-PLAYERS.—Flute-playing is referred to twice in the Gospels: once in the narrative as an expression of sorrow (Mat 9:23 ἀύλητάς, Authorized Version ‘minstrels,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘flute-players’); and once in the Lord’s teaching as an expression of gladness (ἠύλησάμεν Mat 11:17 with the parallel passage Luk 7:32 ‘we [have] piped’). The latter use, which is referred to several times in the OT and the Apocrypha (1Ki 1:40, Isa 5:12; Isa 30:29, Sir 40:21, 1Ma 3:45), is attested for the later Jews by the mention in the Mishna of ‘flutes for a bride’ (*Baba Mezia* vi. 1). The other use, the employment of flutes for mourning, seems to have been widely diffused and of great antiquity, for it is clearly alluded to by Jeremiah (Jer 48:36); and can be traced over a large part of the Gentile world—Phœnicians, Carians, Greeks, Romans, and probably Assyrians. In Greek society (or at least some sections of it) the custom was so general that the flute-player at funerals was described by a special term (τυμβαύλης aelian. *Var. Hist.* xii. 43). For the Jewish life of the 1st and 2nd cents. a.d. there is ample evidence in the Mishna and elsewhere. ‘Flutes for a corpse’ are mentioned in *Baba Mezia* vi. 1, and in *Kethuboth* iv. 4 is the often cited rule that a man who had lost his wife must engage, no matter how poor he might be, not fewer than two flute-players and one wailing woman. A remarkable historical illustration is supplied by Josephus (*BJ* iii. ix. 5). When the news of the capture of Jotapata by the Romans in the summer of 67 a.d. reached Jerusalem, ‘most people engaged flute-players to lead their lamentations.’ Another illustration comes from Roman history. At the funeral of the Emperor Claudius in 54 a.d. there were flute-players in the procession. These funeral musicians seem to have been generally, if not always, professionals, and to have been held in very low

esteem. The class seems to be unknown to modern Syrian society. The wailing woman remains, but the funeral flautist has gone (Bauer, *Volksleben im Lande der Bibel*, 1903, p. 213).

Literature.—Note of Wetstein on Mat_9:23; Wünsche, *Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien aus Talmud und Midrasch*, p. 125; Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, 261a; art. 'Music' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. 461.

W. Taylor Smith.

☒Foaming

FOAMING.—See Epilepsy.

☒Fold

FOLD.—See Flock.

☒Following

FOLLOWING.—'Follow' represents several Gr. words which it is desirable to distinguish as far as possible.

1. Most frequently, ἀκολουθεω with dative (but μεθ' ἡμῶν, Luk_9:49; ὀπίσω μου, Mat_10:38), in nearly every instance used of *following Christ*, except Mat_9:19, Mar_9:38; Mar_14:13; Mar_16:17 (Tr. W H). Joh_10:4; Joh_11:31. 2. ἐτακολουθέω, *to follow close upon* (Mar_16:20; 1Pe_2:21). 3. κατακολουθέω *to follow after* (Luk_23:55). 4. ταρρακολουθέω, *to follow so as to be always beside, accompany* (metaphor. in Mar_16:17 where Translation WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] give ἀκολ.; but 'there is a meaning of closeness of attendance which makes ταρρακολουθεω more individual and probable,' Gould). The same word in Luk_1:3 is translation in Authorized Version 'having had understanding of,' and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'having traced the course of,' where Eusebius and Epiphanius curiously took

ΤΑΣΙΝ as *mase*. ‘having followed the eye-witnesses and ministers of the word’ (see Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 17). 5. συνακολουθεω, *to follow with*, so Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 (Mar 5:37; Mar 14:51, Luk 23:49 with *var. lect.* ἀκολ. in the two former, probably a correction to the more usual form). 6. διώκο, *follow after* (Luk 17:23), often in LXX Septuagint in a good sense of those in search of one. 7. καταδιώκω (Mar 1:36), *to pursue closely*, ‘the κατα gives the idea of hard persistent search, as in our ‘hunt down’ (Gould). 8. δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου, ‘come ye after me,’ Mat 4:19 (Authorized Version ‘follow’); cf. Mar 1:17.

That great multitudes followed Jesus during His ministry is repeatedly noted; cf. Mat 4:25; Mat 8:1; Mat 20:29; Mat 21:9, Mar 5:24, Luk 23:27 (see Crowd, Multitude); publicans and sinners also (ἠκολούθουν, ⚭ B, Vulgate Mar 2:15, cf. Luk 15:1). ‘Follow me’ (ἀκολούθει μοι) was His call to discipleship, Mat 9:9 || Luk 9:59, Joh 1:43; δεῦρα ἀκολούθει μοι (Luk 18:22 ||) and δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου (Mat 4:19 ||) also occur. The command would be at once understood in this sense, for ‘it was not only the practice of the Rabbis, but regarded as one of the most sacred duties for a Master to gather around him a circle of disciples’ (Edersheim, *Life and Times*, i. 474). Hence ‘following’ was a mark of belonging to the band of disciples (Mar 9:38 ||). At first it might seem to imply only ‘come with me on this journey’ (cf. Joh 1:37; Joh 1:43), but gradually they learned that it meant abandonment of previous occupations (Mat 4:20; Mat 9:9) and duties (Mat 8:22), and possibly the dearest ties (Luk 14:26), as well as a participation in dangers and even death (Mat 10:28; Mat 10:38 f., Joh 16:2). Such an intensified meaning of following is seen in the case of Peter (Joh 1:40 f., Mat 4:19, Joh 21:19). The call of Jesus differed from that of other teachers in that He did not simply invite, but *commanded* obedience as One who had the right, and as if they literally belonged to Himself; the most peremptory claims to rule over the affections and wills of men are found in Mt. and Lk. rather than in Jn., and can be explained only by His being the supreme Lord of life (Liddon). Further, the disciples followed Him not merely to learn more doctrine, but to be prepared for future work (Mat 4:19; and of the Apostles, Mar 3:14). Mar 10:32 is especially noteworthy, describing vividly the manner of following on the last journey to Jerusalem.

The literal meaning tends to merge partly or wholly into the metaphorical sense of conforming to the example of Jesus in living, and also, if need be, in dying; cf. Mat 10:38 || Mat 16:24, Joh 8:12; Joh 12:20; Joh 13:36; 1Pe 2:21 (‘follow his steps’), Rev 14:4. The two meanings seem combined in Joh 21:19-20. Joh 21:20

implies that Jesus moved away, inviting Peter to follow along the rough shore perhaps for private conversation; and John though uninvited also followed. But there is probably a reference also to Joh 13:36; and the action of Peter was symbolical of that obedient following in the rugged path of Christian duty, in the work of the Apostolic ministry (Chrys.), in the way of martyrdom (Meyer), which would lead to participation in His Master's glory (see Godet's note). This command differed from the similar command given before the Resurrection, says Westcott, because 'it now required further the perception of His course; the spiritual discernment by which His movements can still be discovered; and yet, further, the readiness to accept martyrdom as the end.'

Luk 9:57 f. = Mat 8:19 f. is important. All three aspirants for admission into the inner circle seem to have been already disciples, cf. Mat 8:21, the use of 'Master' and 'Lord,' and the work contemplated (Luk 9:60; Luk 9:62). Probably the appointment of the Seventy was in view (Luk 10:1), or less likely, of the Twelve (so Trench, comparing Mat 10:1, which, however, does not apply to the *choosing*, but to the *sending out* of the Apostles). These were (1) a scribe (εἰς γραμματεὺς, Mt.), who came saying, 'Master, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest.' He meant, perhaps, 'to the end of the journey, wherever it might be, not aware of the continual wandering life led by Jesus' (Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, ii. 69); but he was warned of the utter homelessness of the Son of Man, and was shown the necessity of counting the cost (cf. Luk 14:25 f.). (2) Another was called to follow, and professed readiness to obey but alleged a hindrance: 'Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father.' The words 'go and bury' (ἀπελθόντι θάψαι), and 'leave the dead,' Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 (ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς), naturally imply, and are usually taken to mean, that his father was then lying dead (so early Fathers, Alford, Trench, Godet, Edersheim, etc.). It was a son's most sacred duty to perform the last offices, but this was one of the cases where the Call must take precedence of all else. His going might involve a delay of seven days (the period of pollution, Num 19:11 f.), during which good impressions might be dulled; and Jesus would have left the district whither, taking Lk.'s order, He was not to return. This man, too, was being called to active work for God; cf. regulations in Lev 21:11, Num 6:7. But some later commentators, as Theophylact, suppose that the father was still alive though weak and frail, and that the son wished to remain with him until his death. Thus the seeming harshness of Christ's reply would be mitigated; and it is pointed out that as the burial usually took place on the day of death, it was unlikely that the man would leave his home during the interval between these two events. Wendt (*op. cit.* p. 70) quotes a striking illustration in support. A young Turk was advised by a missionary in Syria to make a tour of Europe, and answered, 'I must first of all bury my father.' The missionary expressed surprise at the news of his death, as he had hitherto been in good health; but the young man

explained that he only meant that one must before all things devote himself to the duties owed to relatives. Jesus did not recognize such duties as sufficient to justify delay in preaching the gospel. Clem. Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] adopted a tradition that this man was Philip (τοῦ Κυρίου λέγοντος τῷ Φίλιππῳ, ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς, κ.τ.λ., *Strom.* iii. 4. 50, 51, Migne); if true, it may be taken as an admonition occasioned by some slackness or symptom of decadence on the part of the Apostle (Alf.). (3) A third offered to follow, but wished first to say farewell to his relatives: he showed a divided affection; apparently, therefore, his request involved special danger. A saying of farewell (ἀποτάσσεσθαι) in quite a different sense was necessary (Luk 14:33).

Augustine says of these three: 'obtulit se unus ut eum sequeretur et reprobatus est, alius non audebat et excitatus est, tertius differebat et culpatus est.' Edersheim sums up the three vital conditions of following as here illustrated: (a) absolute self-denial and homelessness in the world; (b) immediate and entire self-surrender to Christ and His work; (c) a heart and affections simple, undivided, and set on Christ and His work, to which there is no other trial of parting like that which would involve parting from Him, no other or higher joy than that of following Him (*Life and Times*, ii. 134).

For the result and rewards of following see Joh 8:12, Mat 19:27 f.

Literature.—Cremer, *Bib.-Theol. Lex.* s.v. ἀκολουθέω; art. 'Follow' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible; Trench, *Studies in the Gospels* (No. 6); Wendt, *The Teaching of Jesus*, ii. p. 70; Liddon, *The Divinity of our Lord*, Lect. iv.; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*; Commentaries of Godet, Westcott, etc.; Bruce, *Kingdom of God*, p. 222 f.; *Expositor*, iv. iv. [1891] 286 ff.

W. H. Dundas.

☞ Food

FOOD.—While this word does not occur in Authorized Version in the Gospels, the Greek words βρῶμα (Mat 14:15, Mar 7:19, Luk 3:11; Luk 9:13, and Joh 4:34) and βρωσις (Joh 4:32; Joh 6:27; Joh 6:55), rendered 'meat,' would be in each case better rendered 'food.' The first word, βρῶμα, means anything eaten; while the second, βρωσις, is used elsewhere in NT for 'the act of eating'; but in the Gospels three times (in John) for that which is eaten; twice as a general term for food (Joh 4:32; Joh 6:27), and once as contrasted with drink (Joh 6:55). In these passages in John's Gospel,

Jesus uses the term figuratively, of spiritual nourishment, which He Himself could give, describing His own body as ‘food indeed.’

The ordinary food in Christ’s day consisted chiefly of flesh, cereals, fruits, and herbs. Of flesh, that of sheep, oxen, kids, birds (Mat 12:12; Mat 25:32, Luk 13:15, Mat 10:29), as well as fish (Mat 7:10, Luk 24:42, Joh 6:9; Joh 21:13) was in common use. Of cereals, wheat and barley were favourite food-stuffs (Mat 3:12, Mar 2:23-25, Luk 3:17, Joh 6:9; Joh 21:13); of herbs there is mention of mint, anise, and cummin (Mat 23:23, Luk 11:42); of fruits, we hear of figs (Luk 13:7, Mat 21:18-19) and grapes (Mat 7:16, Mar 12:2). The cereals were prepared by grinding in crude mills, and the flour was made into loaves or cakes baked in ovens. Food was seasoned with salt (Mar 9:50); mustard leaves and cummin were used as condiments. See art. Meals.

John the Baptist, like some others of his day, lived nearer to nature, as a rebuke of prevalent luxury, and chose the native food of the wilderness, ‘locusts and wild-honey’ (Mat 3:4, Mar 1:6). Jesus came ‘eating and drinking’ the ordinary food of His time, rebuking the artificial abstemiousness of the Pharisees (Mat 11:18 f., Luk 7:33 f.), as well as the too great anxiety of many as to what they should eat or drink (Mat 6:25 f., Luk 12:22-26).

E. B. Pollard.

☞ Fool

FOOL.—This word occurs 6 times in the AV of the Gospels as the translation of ἀνόητος (Luk 24:25), ἄφρων (Luk 11:40, Luk 12:20), and μωρός (Mat 5:22; Mat 23:17; Mat 23:19). In the RV it occurs only twice (Mat 5:22; Mat 23:17), being in Mat 23:19 omitted from the text, and in the three remaining places the rendering given is ‘foolish.’ Further, μωρός occurs in Mat 7:26; Mat 25:2-3; Mat 25:8, and in these places, both in AV and RV, it is translated ‘foolish.’

These three Greek words, confused more or less by the principal versions,—the Harklean Syriac and Coptic are exceptions,—are not synonyms. Ἀνόητος implies a lack of comprehension or understanding, and so is very fittingly used in Luk 24:25. Ἄφρων, signifying ‘mindless’ or ‘senseless,’ frequently carries with it, in Biblical usage (cf. its constant employment in the LXX of Proverbs), an underlying meaning of moral defect,

impiety, or unbelief; while in *μωρός* (cf. *μωραίνεσθαι*, Mat 5:13 ‘to become insipid’) the predominant meaning is ‘dull,’ ‘witless,’ ‘stupid.’

The meaning of *μωρόε* in Mat 5:22 has been much discussed. Alford mentions three interpretations: (1) that it is to be understood as the ordinary Greek word for ‘fool’; (2) that it is a transliteration of the Heb. *מֹרֵה* (*môreh*), meaning ‘rebel’ or ‘perverse’ (cf. Num 20:10), a word which is put in R^Vm as an alternative to ‘fool’; (3) that it bears the sense of *ἄθεος* according to the Heb. usage of *נָבֵל* (*nâbâl*, and cf. 1Sa 25:25). However, there seems to be no real reason for supposing the word to be other than the Greek *μωρός* used in its ordinary Biblical sense.

Our Lord wished to emphasize the enormity of murder. He said, ‘Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not kill, and Whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment. But I say unto you that whosoever is angry [the inward feeling] with his brother, is in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca [a contemptuous utterance arising from the inward anger, and probably no definite word; see Raca], shall be liable to a more solemn judgment; but whosoever shall say, Thou fool [the angry feeling formulated in a definite word of contemptuous depreciation], shall be worthy of a more dreadful doom.’ This is, in the main, Augustine’s explanation (*de Serm. Dom. in Mont.* i. ix.); and thus our Lord leaves it to be inferred how heinous actual murder is in His eyes.

Every use of the word ‘fool’ is not, of course, condemned. Our Lord Himself (see above) and St. Paul (Gal 3:1) employed it in needful rebuke; but that use of it is condemned which springs from angry feelings, and which is one step on the way to violence or even to murder.

Literature.—Grimm-Thayer, *Lex.*, under the Greek terms; *Expos. Times*, iv. [1893] 495, 514, xi. [1900] 381; Law, *Serious Call*, ch. xxi.; Dykes, *Manifesto of the King*, 232.

Albert Bonus.

Foolishness

FOOLISHNESS.—In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus points out the grave sin of saying to our brother, ‘Thou fool’ (*μωρόε*, Mat 5:22). When He likened His critics to children

in the market-place who would play at neither a sad nor a merry game (Mat 11:16-19), was He not saying in His heart, ‘Ye fools’? But anger and contempt are the sources of the former; wonder and pity, mingled with indignation, shape the latter.* [Note: Luk 24:25 Σ ἄνοητοι ‘O foolish men’ [AV ‘O fools’ is too harsh]. See preceding article.] He who knew what was in man had occasion to marvel at the foolishness of men. That foolishness is a ruinous self-deception in spiritual things. He points out this folly in these classes:

1. *The foolishness of worldly men.*—God said to the rich man, ‘Thou fool’ (ἄφρων, Luk 12:20). The parable (Luk 12:16-21) was inspired by a request which showed to Christ a heart so absorbed in thought of material good that it could not listen to His message. That fact gives us the point of view from which to consider the parable. The good of life cannot be in earth’s riches which pass from owner to owner, and whose possession is at the mercy of death, which is only an accident to the immortal soul (Luk 12:20). Covetousness, a man’s absorption in heaping up and enjoying things, is folly in so far as it hinders him from attaining to the true riches, treasure of the soul laid up with God (Luk 12:15; Luk 12:21).

2. *The foolishness of the formalist*, who shuts his eyes (μωροὶ καὶ τυφλοὶ) to the spiritual side, the inward consecration which gives meaning and value to conduct or to things (Luk 11:40, Mat 23:17).

3. *The foolishness of the religious.*—This thought occurs more frequently. It is a mark of our Lord’s teaching that it is concerned rather with the subtler forms of evil which beset the religious class. He assumes that those sins of sense and temper which all the world condemns, need no condemnation from Him. This foolishness consists generally in a lack of seriousness, a lack of whole-heartedness and simplicity in faith and conduct. There are those who hear His words and do them not (Mat 7:26-27). These are believers whose whole spirit is a contradiction, children of faith in mind, children of unfaith in conduct. This foolishness of believers is the formative thought of the parables of the Unjust Steward (Luk 16:3-9) and of the Ten Virgins (Mat 25:1-13). The meaning of the former parable is said by Jesus to be, that the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light. That wisdom consists in greater singleness of vision both as regards ends and means. The steward sees his end clearly: he apportions his means to that end, uses as best he may what resources he has. The inference is left as to the wavering vision, both of end and of means, on the part of the children of light. The same thought is in the subsidiary and incidental lesson as to making friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness. Selfishness, not brotherliness, rules this fraudulent steward, but he sees clearly those facts of our human life, gratitude and kindness, which make

brotherhood possible, and he turns them to his ends. On the other hand, brotherhood is the faith of the children of light, and yet they greatly neglect this rich field. The parable of the Ten Virgins completes this teaching of the foolishness of a half-hearted faith. It hints the irrevocable loss believers bring upon themselves thereby. Life's opportunities come unexpectedly—calls to service, possibilities of honour and spiritual enriching—and the half-hearted miss these. Their heart-culture, their spirits' discipline have been sleeping: and the chances of life pass them by.

The seat of all these follies is the heart (Mar 7:22). It is not any mere action of the intellect which here comes into condemnation. All these forms of foolishness are a ruining self-deception. The mind is there the servant of the heart whose desires have confused and led it astray.

Richard Glaister.

Foot

FOOT.—The references in this connexion arise chiefly from the fact that the foot in relationship to the head is the inferior part of the body.

1. Humility and defilement.—A still lower level was reached by the shoes or sandals, which were in direct contact with the common earth. John the Baptist indicated his inferiority to Christ by saying that he was unworthy to unfasten His shoelatchet (Mar 1:7). To walk barefoot was the sign of a captive prisoner (Isa 20:4), and as a voluntary act of self-infliction often forms part of a personal vow. To be trodden under foot was the symbol of utter degradation (Mat 5:13, Luk 21:24, Heb 10:29). At the entrance to an Oriental house the shoes are removed, not merely for the sake of cleanliness as a preliminary to sitting down with the feet drawn under the dress, but also out of regard to the sanctity of family life, so that no defilement may touch the rugs and mats that have been hallowed by prayer and the Divine presence. He who stood on holy ground had to put off his shoes (Exo 3:5, Jos 5:15).

Orientalers are not accustomed to wear stockings with their open shoes, and it was an act not only of ceremonial duty, but of personal comfort, to bathe the feet after a journey over the hot and dusty ground. It was a courtesy due to a guest to see that this ministry was not omitted. Christ drew attention to the fact that in the house of one who prided himself upon his precise fulfilment of the Law this service had been more than rendered to Him by a woman whom the Pharisee despised as a sinner (Luk 7:44; Luk 7:46). The charge to His disciples to shake the dust from their feet wherever the message of the Kingdom was not received (Mat 10:14, Mar 6:11,

Luk 9:5; Luk 10:11), was a demonstration to both parties of the unfitness of such people for its membership. When Christ washed the disciples' feet, the cleansing meant not only that the feet under which His sacred hands had been placed could never turn aside to paths of evil, but that they could never be set down with harsh and proud authority over the lives and rights of others. His service could never lay upon those disciples any greater humiliation than had been rendered to them. It became a law of the Kingdom to 'wash one another's feet' (Joh 13:5; Joh 13:14).

2. Authority and subjection.—To approach the feet of the great was the conceded right of the weak in seeking the presence and help of the powerful. To kneel down and clasp the feet and even to kiss them is still the Oriental preliminary to an important request. When inferiors salute those of higher rank, the first act of gesture is to lower the hand towards the ground as if to imply that the whole body should be there. Sometimes the word is allowed to do service for the deed, as when the supplicant says, 'Allow me to kiss your feet.' The impression meant to be produced is that the party addressed has the power to do what is asked, and that the only unsettled point is the question of his willingness (Mat 18:29; Mat 20:20, Mar 1:40; Mar 10:17).

The foot on the neck as a symbol of conquest seems to have been borrowed from the primitive pastoral life. When an Oriental shepherd wishes to punish a straying and inattentive sheep, he casts it on its side, and with all his weight presses and rubs the iron-studded sole of his shoe against its neck (1Co 15:25; 1Co 15:27). In killing a serpent, the Syrian peasant, even with a stick in his hand, usually, after a blow or two, jumps upon the serpent, and by a quick succession of stamps bruises it to death (Psa 91:13, Rom 16:20). To sit at the feet of his teacher was the attitude of the disciple (Mat 10:24, Luk 10:39, Act 22:3). The Pharisees thus sat in Moses' seat (Mat 23:2).

The risen Lord was recognized by the marks in His hands and His feet (Luk 24:40); see Print. On Mat 18:8 || see Asceticism, p. 129.

G. M. Mackie.

☩ Footstool

FOOTSTOOL (ὑποπόδιον).—With the single exception of Jam 2:3 the word is used figuratively in the NT, to express the idea of 'subjection' or 'complete control.' In this sense it occurs frequently in the Gospels: e.g. Mat 22:44, Mar 12:36, Luk 20:43, where the Synoptists record Christ's quotation from Psalms 110—a psalm always

regarded by the Jews as distinctly Messianic. In Mat 22:44 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, on the authority of some of the most ancient MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] and versions, accepts *ὑποκάτω* instead of *ὑποπόδιον*, and translates, ‘till I put thine enemies under thy feet.’ Similarly in Mar 12:36 *ὑποκάτω* is read by many ancient authorities, and is adopted by WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort’s text.] . Here, however, Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 retains *ὑποπόδιον* (with marg. note); but (as also in Luk 20:43 and Mat 5:35) translates more correctly ‘footstool of thy (or his) feet’ instead of Authorized Version ‘thy (or his) footstool.’

In its application to Christ the word shows Him in His Kingly office triumphing over His enemies, and bringing all men into captivity to His obedience; cf. 1Co 15:25 ‘For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet.’

Dugald Clark.

⚡ Force

FORCE.—1. Force, as defined by modern science, is inherent in matter and inseparable from it. It is defined also as the power of doing work. The modes and the effects of its activities are mechanical. It can neither exist nor act, therefore, within the moral sphere of the universe. And from this fact it follows that force and its activities are entirely foreign to the essential facts and truths of Christianity. This truth is recognized by the four Gospels, for in their records of Christ’s life and mission, the entire import of which was moral, no word is employed capable of being construed into the meaning of force as just explained. The word ‘force’ occurs only twice in these records (Mat 11:12, Joh 6:15 Authorized and Revised Versions); and in both cases it is used as the translation of *ἀρπάξω*, which signifies *to seize or carry off* (an object by physical force or compulsion). It is the use of physical force or compulsion that is denoted by St. John’s statement that the people wanted to take Jesus by force to make Him a king; and it is probable that our Lord had the employment of force of the same kind in His mind when He said, as St. Matthew reports: ‘From the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence (*βιάζεται* = ‘is carried by force *or* assault’), and the violent (or assailants) take it by force’ (*ἀρπάξουσιν*). The order of ideas here expressed is exactly in terms of the principle of domination by force, which was universal in antiquity; a principle which was entirely antagonistic to His essential ideas as to the moral nature of the kingdom of heaven, and the moral conditions by means of which alone entrance to it

could be gained. And as He fully realized that the principle alluded to was hostile to the nature, interests, and laws of the heavenly kingdom, and warned His disciples against it (Mar_10:42-45), it may be concluded that He did not express Himself in the language of the force which the dominating powers of the ancient world employed, meaning thereby that places in the kingdom of heaven, as He understood and wished His hearers to understand the latter, were in great demand, and that men were eagerly doing their utmost to secure them. His real meaning is not quite apparent. He Himself represented the kingdom of God. He had come to found it. In His life and activities its principles came to perfect realization. To subject Him in any way to the abusive treatment of the force of dominating powers or authorities, was to do 'violence' in His Person to the kingdom of heaven; and it was also 'to take' the kingdom, in the sense of making it in His Person an object of violent abuse. When He spoke the words in question His ministry in Galilee was closing in disappointing circumstances. John the Baptist had been already made a victim of violent abuse; and He knew that His 'hour,' a more terrible destiny than John's, would not be long delayed. Might it not be His cross, then, that was in His mind when He spoke the words in question? [For the more usual view that the violence which takes the kingdom by force is the friendly violence of those who seek to enter it, see A. B. Bruce, *Expositor's Gr. Test. in loc.*, *Expositor*, i. v. [1877] p. 197 ff.].

2. 'Force,' however, is a term which is not always used in its strictly scientific sense. In ordinary use it is synonymous with *strength* or *power*. 'Power' is a word of frequent occurrence in the Gospels, and in many instances where it is employed it possesses moral significance of very high value. The word 'power' in the Authorized and Revised Versions of the Gospels is represented by two Greek terms in the original, viz. ἐξουσία and δύναμις, the former of which is sometimes translated by the word 'authority.'

Ἐξουσία may be taken first. Power in the sense of this word is not always spoken of as *Christ's* power; but it is as His power that it has its chief interest here. The power (ἐξουσία) that Christ possessed was a power in which might was combined with right; and this is why it is sometimes called authority in the Gospels and sometimes power. He was able to do things because He had the right to do them; and no one had any right to hinder Him or to call Him in question. And the things that He had the right and the power to do were all of a nature purely moral; and things, moreover, which He alone could do, and which were of transcendent importance. What were they? (1) He, as the Son of man, had power on earth to forgive sins (Mat_9:6, Mar_2:10). (2) He has power to give eternal life to those whom the Father has given to Him (Joh_17:2). (3) He has power, or authority, also to execute judgment, because He is the Son of man (Joh_5:27). (4) He is invested with all power in heaven and in earth (Mat_28:18). (5) Lastly, He had power to lay down His life on earth, and power to take it again

(Joh 10:18). The explanation of the various forms of power (ἐξουσία) possessed by Christ, and of the grounds on which His claim to the possession of them rests, lies in a domain of essential Christian truth.

It needs to be strongly emphasized that all the forms of the power in question are moral. The power to forgive sins, to judge men as moral beings, to give eternal life to men as moral beings, to lay down one's life in perfect self-sacrificing love and service for others' good, to exercise the moral government of heaven and earth,—to do all these things, to have the right and the power to do them, manifestly means the possession and the exercise of moral power of the highest possible order. Again, it is evident that this power in its nature and in all its forms of manifestation belongs to the supernatural order of things. But in the sphere of things into which the order of ideas considered here introduces one, the supernatural and the natural are one. It is within the sphere of the moral order of things that Christ, in His moral position as Mediator between God and men, exercised, or exercises, the forms of His power alluded to. And within this moral sphere there is no absolute distinction between the natural and the supernatural. Here all that is in harmony with God's will and purpose is in Him, and He is in it. This is the real truth; and whether it be called natural or supernatural is only a difference in name.

Once more, all the forms of power that Christ claimed for Himself were His by delegation from God. But this does not mean that He had the right and the power to exercise them in a *merely official* capacity, without their having any relation to and dependence on what He was as a moral Being. He was invested with them by God, as all but one of the passages referred to above indicate. But one of the passages tells us that He had power on earth to forgive sins *as the Son of man*; and another, that God had given Him authority to execute Judgment *because He was the Son of man*. He was both the Son of God and the Son of man in all that He was as a moral Being when on the earth, exercising the high moral powers that He claimed to possess. And it is as the same moral Being, now glorified, that He exercises every moral power that He claimed as His own by Divine gift and prerogative. In other words, the power to do all the things that have been specified is His because of what He *is as a moral Being*. To forgive sins, to judge men, etc., are all acts of moral power which belong to the administration of the moral order of the world as it now is *with Christ in it* as the one only Mediator between God and men. And the reason why the administration of all things belonging to the moral relations between God and men is in His hands, is—that in His life and death on earth He earned the moral right to occupy this momentous position of mediation and power. For He fills this position and administers its powers as one who has proved Himself all that God can be to men, and all that every man ought to become and be to God. He is thus, because of what He is, the Divinely human and the humanly Divine, true way of forgiveness, of judgment, of life, and of

moral government for men. From His Father's own commandment He had the power to lay down His life, in living and in dying to qualify Himself for this destiny of absolute pre-eminence in the moral universe. And as the Father commanded Him, so He did. Therefore His name is now above every name (Php 2:5-11, Joh 17:20-26).

Δύναμις is the other word which is translated 'power' in the Authorized and Revised Versions of the Gospels. It is note-worthy that none of the Evangelists includes the word 'energy' (ἐνέργεια) in his terminology; a word which St. Paul employed to denote the effectual working of God's redeeming power as manifested in (1) the raising of Christ from the dead, and in the setting of Him at God's right hand in the heavenly places, *i.e.* in the moral order of things (Eph 1:19-23); (2) the Divine grace that was bestowed on St. Paul himself by the working in him of Divine power (Eph 3:7); (3) the working of the same Divine power in the creation or evolution of an order of moral unity in the relations of *all* men to one another in Christ; (4) the working of the same power as in Christ as destined to fashion the resurrection body of believers into the glorious likeness of His own, 'according to the working whereby he is able even to subject all things unto himself' (Php 3:21). But the absence from the Gospels of the term 'energy,' which occupies a place of such extensive and high importance in St. Paul's general conception of essential Christianity, does not imply the absence from them of that order of Divine working for which the word stands in the Apostle's writings. The entire body of moral phenomena, reproduced by the Evangelists in their several records, and in which the power of God in Christ was manifested, was a revelation of the Divine energy in St. Paul's sense of the word. But, further, the meaning of the word ἐνέργεια is included in that of the word δύναμις as the latter is used in the Gospels; for in them it signifies, on the one hand, the possession of power capable of action; and, on the other, power manifesting itself in a state of activity, in which case it appears in the form of energy. Power, then, as δύναμις, holds a fundamental place in the Gospels as records of how Christ conceived it and manifested it in His activities.

(1) Christ regarded the power with which He associated Himself and His activities and their effects as moral, and as having its ultimate source in God. He conceived God as a moral Being, and to Him as such He ascribed the power alluded to (Mat 22:29; Mat 26:64, Mar 9:1; Mar 14:02, Luk 22:69).—(2) But, again, such being Christ's view, He never conceived of Himself as possessing and exercising power independently of God. His feeling of absolute dependence on God for power had a deep and controlling place in His consciousness. It was the feeling He gave unreserved and clear expression to when He said, for instance, 'The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do'; 'I can of mine own self do nothing'; and, again, 'The Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works' (Joh 5:19; Joh 5:30; Joh 14:10).—(3) It was,

therefore, through His dependence on God that our Lord obtained the power by means of which He was enabled to attain to His perfect moral self-realization, and by means of which He was enabled to finish the work His Father had given Him to do. And the question thus arises as to how He was kept in possession of a continuous supply of power for the great moral task and service of His life. The answer to this question is to be found in the Gospels. The secret of His strength lay in His inner life of perfect, never-broken union and fellowship with His Father in all things. But this life of union and fellowship with His Father needed itself to be continually maintained; and the Gospels also show how this was done by Him. He did it by paying perfect loyalty to His dependence on His Father; by striving in every situation of His life freely and perfectly to identify Himself with His Father's will and purpose for His life and His mission; by means of habits of self-discipline and prayer (Luk 3:21-22; Luk 4:1-14; Luk 6:12; Luk 9:28-35; Luk 22:39-46, Joh 3:34; Joh 8:28-29).

(4) Christ, moreover, believed that His disciples needed the same Divine power that was His strength, in order to be able to fulfil the moral task in life to which He called them; and He believed that this power would be available for them as it had been for Himself during His life on earth. His Spirit in them would be the very power (*δύναμις*) that had been His own. And in their task of overcoming temptation, of moral self-realization, of achieving good in service for the kingdom of God, they would find His Spirit's power all-sufficient for them. But they would need to remember that the servant was not greater than his Lord. They would need to depend on Him as He depended on God. They would need to abide in union and fellowship with Him. They must keep His words as being the Father's words. And they must also follow Him in the path of humility, self-discipline, prayer, and self-denial (Mat 10:38; Mat 17:19-21; Mat 26:41, Luk 11:9-13; Luk 22:31-32; Luk 24:49, Joh 12:24-26; Joh 13:13-17; Joh 14:10-18; Joh 15:4; Joh 17:11-19, Act 1:4-5).

(5) It was, finally, in the exercise of the Divine power here referred to that our Lord performed those extraordinary works of His to which the name 'miracle' has been given. In some of the Gospels they are called 'mighty works' (e.g. Mat 11:20, Mar 6:5, Luk 19:37). These works of power (*δυνάμεις*) were only special forms in which was manifested the same power that was revealed in so many other ways in the moral activities of Christ's life. He wrought His miracles by the same power that enabled Him perfectly to overcome all the temptations of His life, and to accomplish all those other things in which He fulfilled His Father's will and purpose.

Again, it never occurred to Him that in the doing of His mighty works He contravened or suspended any of those uniformities of nature to which the term 'law' is applied by modern science; though with many of those uniformities He was quite familiar, and, besides, attached to them great importance. The question raised for science by His

mighty works is in reality not a question of natural *law*; it is a question of natural *force* or *energy*. Are the forces inherent and operative in the physical or moral order of the world of such a nature as to render it impossible for the miracles ascribed to Christ's power to have happened? That is the real point at issue as between the testimony of the Gospels and Science. And the man of science who has the most extensive and the deepest knowledge of the energy or forces of the Universe, and who has therefore entered furthest into the presence of the marvels and the mysteries of these forces and their modes of manifestation, would be the last person to answer the question in the affirmative.

Once more, the mighty works ascribed to Christ in the Gospels are not the most wonderful of His achievements. It is often pointed out in defence of these mighty works, and rightly, that they were wrought to serve beneficent ends, that they were manifestations of power and love ministering in various ways to human well-being; and that as so viewed, they were originally and homogeneously related to all the other beneficent activities of our Lord's ministry. It is also argued in favour of the possibility and the historical truth of the miracles in question, that His perfect personal sinlessness and holiness was a moral miracle as great as, if not greater than, any of the mighty works reported by the Evangelists as performed by Him. There is justice in this argument. It was by the power of God immanent and operative in Him, and by His own free co-operation therewith, that He achieved His perfect moral self-realization in which He was morally as perfect as God. That was a miracle indeed; and, to say the least, there is no mightier work on record in the Gospels and represented there as wrought by Him in the exercise of the Divine power of which He was a personal organ. See, further, *Miracle*.

But that was only the beginning of the mightiest work of all with which the power of God in Christ is associated, and which is only coming slowly to manifestation in the moral progress of humanity. Christ in the power of His Spirit is in the moral life of mankind. He is morally re-creating the life of the human race. The moral order of the world is being evolved by means of His moral power as the Mediator between God and men. By means of His moral power in man's life and history, He is conducting humanity onwards in the path that will bring it to a perfect moral destiny in the kingdom of God. This is the greatest, mightiest of all His miracles; and whosoever understands the momentousness of the moral task it implies will not stumble at any of the mighty works on record in the Gospels.

Literature.—On ἐξουσία and δὴναως see the *Lexicons* of Cremer and Grimm-Thayer, s. vv. On Christ's miraculous power see art. 'Miracles' in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible*; Mozley, *Bampton Lectures*, esp. Lect. vi.

☒ Forerunner

FORERUNNER.—See John the Baptist.

☒ Foresight

FORESIGHT.—The interest of the student of the Gospels, and of the life of Jesus which forms their substance, in the topic of this article, is twofold. Jesus is represented in the Gospels as at once the object and the subject of the most detailed foresight. The work which He came to do was a work ordained in the counsels of eternity, and in all its items prepared for beforehand with the most perfect prevision. In addressing Himself to the accomplishment of this work Jesus proceeded from the beginning in the fullest knowledge of the end, and with the most absolute adjustment of every step to its attainment. It is from this double view-point that each of the Evangelists depicts the course of our Lord's life on earth. They consentiently represent Him as having come to perform a specific task, all the elements of which were not only determined beforehand in the plan of God, but adumbrated, if somewhat sporadically, yet with sufficient fulness for the end in view, in the prophecies of the OT. And they represent Him as coming to perform this task with a clear consciousness of its nature and a competent control of all the means for its discharge, so that His whole life was a conscientious fulfilment of a programme, and moved straight to its mark. The conception of foresight thus dominates the whole Evangelical narrative.

It is not necessary to dwell at length upon the Evangelists' conception of our Lord's life and work as *the fulfilment of a plan Divinely predetermined for Him*. It lies on the face of their narratives that the authors of the Gospels had no reservation with respect to the all-embracing predestination of God (cf. Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iv. 54-56); and least of all could they exclude from it this life and work which was to them the hinge upon which all history turns. To them accordingly our Lord is by way of eminence 'the man of destiny,' and His whole life (Luk 2:49; Luk 4:43) was governed by 'the δει of the Divine counsel.' Every step of His pathway was a 'necessity' to Him, in the fulfilment of the mission for which He had 'come forth' (Mar 1:38, cf. Swete), or as St. Luke (Luk 4:43) in quite Johannine wise (Luk 5:23-24; Luk 5:30; Luk 5:36; Luk 5:38, Luk 6:29; Luk 6:38-40 et passim) expresses it, 'was sent' (cf. Mat 10:40, Mar 9:37, Luk 9:48; Luk 10:16; Mat 15:24; Mat 21:37,

Mar 12:6, Luk 20:13, cf. Swete on Mar 9:37). Especially was all that concerned His departure, the accomplishment of which (Luk 9:31, cf. Luk 9:51) was His particular task, under the government of this 'Divine necessity' (Mat 16:21; Mat 26:54, Mar 8:31, Luk 9:22; Luk 17:25; Luk 22:22; Luk 22:37; Luk 24:7; Luk 24:44, Joh 3:14; Joh 20:9, cf. Act 2:23; Act 3:18; Act 4:28, and Westcott on Joh 20:9). His final journey to Jerusalem (Mat 16:21), His rejection by the rulers (Mar 8:31, Luk 9:22; Luk 17:25), His betrayal (Luk 24:7), arrest (Mat 26:54), sufferings (Mat 26:54, Mar 8:31, Luk 9:22; Luk 17:25), and death (Mat 16:21, Mar 8:31, Luk 9:22) by crucifixion (Luk 24:7, Joh 3:14), His rising again (Joh 20:9) on the third day (Mat 16:21, Mar 8:31, Luk 9:22; Luk 24:7; Luk 24:44)—each item alike is declared to have been 'a matter of necessity in pursuance of the Divine purpose' (Meyer, Mat 24:6), 'a necessary part of the destiny assigned our Lord' (Meyer, Mat 26:56). 'The death of our Lord' thus appears 'not as the accidental work of hostile caprice, but (cf. Act 2:23; Act 3:18) the necessary result of the Divine predestination (Luk 22:22), to which Divine $\delta\epsilon\iota$ (Luk 24:26) the personal free action of man had to serve as an instrument' (Meyer, Act 4:28).

How far the several events which entered into this life had been prophetically announced is obviously, in this view of it, a mere matter of detail. All of them lay open before the eyes of God; and the only limit to pre-announcement was the extent to which God had chosen to reveal what was to come to pass, through His servants the prophets. In some instances, however, the prophetic announcement is particularly adduced as the ground on which recognition of the necessity of occurrence rests. The fulfilment of Scripture thus becomes regulative for the life of Jesus. Whatever stood written of Him in the Law or the Prophets or the Psalms (Luk 24:44) must needs ($\delta\epsilon\iota$) be accomplished (Mat 26:54, Luk 22:37; Luk 24:26, Joh 20:9). Or, in another form of statement, particularly frequent in Mt. (Mat 1:22; Mat 2:15; Mat 2:23; Mat 4:14; Mat 8:17; Mat 12:17; Mat 13:35; Mat 21:4; Mat 26:56) and Jn. (Joh 12:38; Joh 13:18; Joh 15:25; Joh 17:12; Joh 19:24; Joh 19:36), but found also in the other Evangelists (Mar 14:49, Luk 4:21), the several occurrences of His life fell out as they did, 'in order that what was spoken by the Lord' through the prophets or in Scripture, 'might be fulfilled' (cf. Mat 2:17; Mat 26:54; Mat 27:9, Luk 24:44; in Joh 18:9; Joh 18:32, Luk 24:44 declarations of Jesus are treated precisely similarly). That is to say, 'what was done stood ... in the connexion of the Divine necessity, as an actual fact, by which prophecy was destined to be fulfilled. The Divine decree expressed in the latter *must* be accomplished, and *to that end this ... came to pass*, and that, *according to the whole of its contents*' (Meyer, Mat 1:22). The meaning is, not that there lies in the OT Scriptures a complete predictive account of all the details of the life of Jesus, which those skilled in the interpretation of Scripture might read off from its pages at will. This programme in its detailed completeness lies only in the Divine purpose; and in Scripture only so far forth as God has chosen to place it there for the

guidance or the assurance of His people. The meaning is rather that all that stands written of Jesus in the OT Scriptures has its certain fulfilment in Him; and that enough stands written of Him there to assure His followers that in the course of His life, and in its, to them, strange and unexpected ending, He was not the prey of chance or the victim of the hatred of men, to the marring of His work or perhaps even the defeat of His mission, but was following step by step, straight to its goal, the predestined pathway marked out for Him in the counsels of eternity, and sufficiently revealed from of old in the Scriptures to enable all who were not 'foolish and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken,' to perceive that the Christ must needs have lived just this life and fulfilled just this destiny.

That the whole course of the life of Jesus, and especially its culmination in the death which He died, was foreseen and afore-prepared by God, enters, thus, into the very substance of the Evangelical narrative. It enters equally into its very substance that *this life was from the beginning lived out by Jesus Himself in full view of its drift and its issue*. The Evangelists are as far from representing Jesus as driven blindly onwards by a Divine destiny unknown to Himself, along courses not of His own choosing, to an unanticipated end, as they are from representing Him as thwarted in His purposes, or limited in His achievement, or determined or modified in His aims or methods, by the conditions which from time to time emerged in His way. The very essence of their representation is that Jesus came into the world with a definite mission to execute, of the nature of which He was perfectly aware, and according to which He ordered the whole course of His life as it advanced under His competent control unswervingly to its preconceived mark. In their view His life was lived out, not in ignorance of its issues, or in the form of a series of trials and corrections, least of all in a more or less unavailing effort to wring success out of failure; but in complete knowledge of the counsels of God for Him, in perfect acquiescence in them, and in careful and voluntary fulfilment of them. The 'Divine $\delta\epsilon\iota$ ' which governed His life is represented as fully recognized by Himself (Mat 16:21, Mar 8:31, Luk 4:43; Luk 9:22; Luk 17:25; Luk 24:7, Joh 3:14; Joh 12:34), and the fulfilment of the intimations of prophecy in His life as accepted by Him as a rule for His voluntary action (Mat 26:54, Luk 22:37; Luk 24:26; Luk 24:44, Joh 20:9, Mar 14:49, Luk 4:21, Joh 13:18; Joh 15:25; Joh 17:12; cf. Mat 13:14; Mat 15:7; Mat 24:15; Mat 26:56, Mar 7:6). Determining all things, determined by none, the life He actually lived, leading up to the death He actually died, is in their view precisely the life which from the beginning He intended to live, ending in precisely the death in which, from the beginning, He intended this life to issue, undeflected by so much as a hair's-breadth from the straight path He had from the start marked out for Himself in the fullest prevision and provision of all the so-called chances and changes which might befall Him. Not only were there no surprises in life for Jesus (cf. art. Amazement, p. 48), and no compulsions; there were not even 'influences,' as we speak of 'influences' in a

merely human career. The mark of this life, as the Evangelists depict it, is its calm and quiet superiority to all circumstance and condition, and to all the varied forces which sway other lives; its prime characteristics are voluntariness and independence. Neither His mother, nor His brethren, nor His disciples, nor the people He came to serve, nor His enemies bent upon His destruction, nor Satan himself with his temptations, could move Him one step from His chosen path. When men seemed to prevail over Him they were but working His will; the great 'No one has taken my life away from me; I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again' (Joh 10:18), is but the enunciation for the supreme act, of the principle that governs all His movements. His own chosen pathway ever lay fully displayed before His feet; on it His feet fell quietly, but they found the way always unblocked. What He did, He came to do; and He carried out His programme with unwavering purpose and indefectible certitude. So at least the Evangelists represent Him. (Cf. the first half of a striking article on 'Die Selbständigkeit Jesu,' by Trott, in Luthardt's *ZKWL* [Note: *KWL Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft und kirchl Leben.*] , 1883, iv. 233-241; in its latter half the art. falls away from its idea, and ends by making Jesus absolutely dependent on Scripture for His knowledge of God and Divine things: 'We have no right whatever to maintain that Jesus received revelations from the Father otherwise than through the medium of the sacred Scriptures; that is a part of His complete humanity' (p. 238)).

The signature of this supernatural life which the Evangelists depict Jesus as living, lies thus in the perfection of the foresight by which it was governed. Of the reality of this foresight they leave their readers in no doubt, nor yet of its completeness. They suggest it by the general picture they draw of the self-directed life which Jesus lived in view of His mission. They record repeated instances in which He mentions beforehand events yet to occur, or foreshadows the end from the beginning. They connect these manifestations of foresight with the possession by Him of knowledge in general, in comprehension and penetration alike far beyond what is native to man. It may perhaps be natural to surmise in the first instance that they intend to convey merely the conviction that in Jesus was manifested a prophet of supreme greatness, in whom, as the culminating example of prophecy (cf. Act 3:22-23), resided beyond precedent the gifts proper to prophets. There can be no question that to the writers of the Gospels Jesus was 'the incarnate ideal of the prophet, who, as such, forms a class by Himself, and is more than a prophet' (this is what Schwartzkopff thinks Him, *The Prophecies of Jesus Christ*, p. 7). They record with evident sympathy the impression made by Him at the outset of His ministry, that God had at last in Him visited His people (Mar 6:15, Luk 7:16, Joh 4:19; Joh 9:17); they trace the ripening of this impression into a well-settled belief in His prophetic character (Mat 21:11, Luk 24:19, Mat 21:46, Luk 7:39, Joh 7:40); and they remark upon the widespread suspicion which accompanied this belief, that He was something more than a

prophet—possibly one of the old prophets returned, certainly a very special prophet charged with a very special mission for the introduction of the Messianic times (Mat 16:14, Mar 6:15; Mar 8:28, Luk 9:8; Luk 9:19, Joh 6:14; Joh 7:40). They represent Jesus as not only calling out and accepting this estimate of Him, but frankly assuming a prophet's place and title (Mat 13:57, Mar 6:4, Luk 4:24, Joh 4:44, Luk 13:33), exercising a prophet's functions, and delivering prophetic discourses, in which He unveils the future (Mat 24:21, Mar 13:23, Joh 14:29; cf. Mat 28:6, Luk 24:44, and such passages as Mat 26:32; Mat 26:34, Mar 16:7). Nevertheless it is very clear that in their allusions to the supernatural knowledge of Jesus, the Evangelists suppose themselves to be illustrating something very much greater than merely prophetic inspiration. The specific difference between Jesus and a prophet, in their view, was that while a prophet's human knowledge is increased by many things revealed to him by God (Amo 3:7), Jesus participated in all the fulness of the Divine knowledge (Mat 11:27, Luk 10:22, Joh 16:15; Joh 18:4; Joh 16:30; Joh 21:17), so that all that is knowable lay open before Him (Joh 17:10). The Evangelists, in a word, obviously intend to attribute Divine omniscience to Jesus, and in their adduction of instances of His supernatural knowledge, whether with respect to hidden things or to those yet buried in the future, are illustrating His possession of this Divine omniscience (cf. Muirhead, *The Eschatology of Jesus*, p. 119, where, in partial correction of the more inadequate statement of p. 48, there is recognized in the Evangelists at least a 'tendency' to attribute to our Lord 'Divine dignity' and 'literal omniscience').

That this is the case with St. John's Gospel is very commonly recognized (for a plain statement of the evidence see Karl Müller, *Göttliches Wissen und göttliche Macht des johann. Christus*, 1882, § 4, pp. 29-47: 'Zeugnisse des vierten Evangeliums für Jesu göttliches Wissen'). It is not too much to say, indeed, that one of the chief objects which the author of that Gospel set before himself was to make clear to its readers the superhuman knowledge of Jesus, with especial reference, of course, to His own career. It therefore records direct ascriptions of omniscience to Jesus, and represents them as favourably received by Him (Joh 16:30; Joh 21:17; cf. Liddon, *Bampton Lectures*, ed. 4, 1869, p. 466). It makes it almost the business of its opening chapters to exhibit this omniscience at work in the especially Divine form (Luk 16:15, Act 1:24, Heb 4:12, Psa 138:2, Jer 17:16; Jer 20:12; cf. Swete on Mar 2:8) of immediate, universal, and complete knowledge of the thoughts and intents of the human heart (cf. Westcott on Joh 2:25), laying down the general thesis in Joh 2:24-25 (cf. Joh 6:64; Joh 6:70, Joh 21:17), and illustrating it in detail in the cases of all with whom Jesus came into contact in the opening days of His ministry (cf. Westcott on Joh 1:47), Peter (Joh 1:42), Philip (Joh 1:43), Nathanael (Joh 1:47), Mary (Joh 2:4), Nicodemus (Joh 2:3), the woman of Samaria (Joh 2:4). In the especially striking case of the choice of Judas Iscariot as one of the Apostles, it expressly explains that this was due to no ignorance of Judas' character or of his

future action (Joh 6:64; Joh 6:70; Joh 13:11), but was done as part of our Lord's voluntary execution of His own well-laid plans. It pictures Jesus with great explicitness as prosecuting His whole work in full knowledge of all the things that were coming upon Him (Joh 18:4, cf. Westcott), and with a view to subjecting them all to His governing hand, so that His life from the beginning should run steadily onward on the lines of a thoroughly wrought-out plan (Joh 1:47; Joh 2:19; Joh 2:24; Joh 3:14; Joh 6:51; Joh 6:64; Joh 6:70; Joh 7:6; Joh 8:28; Joh 10:15; Joh 10:18; Joh 12:7; Joh 12:23; Joh 13:1; Joh 13:11; Joh 13:21; Joh 13:38; Joh 14:29; Joh 16:5; Joh 16:32; Joh 18:4; Joh 18:9).

It is difficult to see, however, why St. John's Gospel should be separated from its companions in this matter (Schenkel says frankly that it is only because there is no such passage in St. John's Gospel as Mar 13:32, on which see below. Whatever else must be said of W. Wrede's *Das Messiasgeheimnis*, etc., 1901, it must be admitted that it has broken down this artificial distinction between the Gospel of John and the Synoptics). If they do not, like St. John (Joh 16:30; Joh 21:17), record direct ascriptions of precise omniscience to Jesus by His followers, they do, like St. John, represent Him as Himself claiming to be the depository and distributor of the Father's knowledge (Mat 11:21-30, Luk 10:22-24). Nor do they lag behind St. John in attributing to Jesus the Divine prerogative of reading the heart (Mat 9:4, Meyer; Mar 2:5; Mar 2:8; Mar 8:17; Mar 12:15; Mar 12:44, Swete, p. lxxxviii; Luk 5:22; Luk 7:39) or the manifestation, in other forms, of God-like omniscience (Mat 17:27; Mat 21:2, Mar 11:2; Mar 14:13, Luk 5:4; Luk 19:30; Luk 22:10; cf. O. Holtzmann, *Was Jesus Ekstatiker?* p. 14 and p. 15, note). Least of all do they fall behind St. John in insisting upon the perfection of the foresight of Jesus in all matters connected with His own life and death (Mat 9:15; Mat 12:40; Mat 16:21; Mat 20:18; Mat 20:22; Mat 20:28; Mat 26:2; Mat 26:21; Mat 26:34; Mat 26:50, Mar 2:19; Mar 8:31; Mar 9:31; Mar 10:33; Mar 10:39; Mar 10:45; Mar 11:2; Mar 14:8; Mar 14:13; Mar 14:18; Mar 14:30, Luk 8:34; Luk 9:22; Luk 9:44; Luk 9:51; Luk 12:50; Luk 13:35; Luk 17:25; Luk 18:31; Luk 19:30; Luk 22:10; Luk 22:21; Luk 22:34; Luk 22:37; Luk 24:44). Nothing could exceed the detailed precision of these announcements,—a characteristic which has been turned, of course, to their discredit as genuine utterances of Jesus by writers who find difficulty with detailed prediction. 'The form and contents of these texts,' remarks Wrede (*Messiasgeheimnis*, etc. p. 88), 'speak a language which cannot be misunderstood. They are nothing but a short summary of the Passion history—"cast, of course, in the future tense." ' ' "The Passion-history," ' he proceeds, quoting Eichhorn, ' "could certainly not be more exactly related in few words." ' In very fact, it is perfectly clear—whether they did it by placing upon His lips predictions He never uttered and never could have uttered, is another question—that the Evangelists designed to represent Jesus as endowed with the absolute and unlimited foresight consonant with His Divine nature (see Liddon,

Bampton Lectures, ed. 4, p. 464 ff.; and cf. A. J. Mason, *The Conditions of our Lord's Life on Earth*, pp. 155-194).

The force of this representation cannot be broken, of course, by raising the question afresh whether the supernatural knowledge attributed by the Evangelists to our Lord may not, in many of its items at least, if not in its whole extent, find its analogues, after all, in human powers, or be explained as not different in kind from that of the prophets (cf. e.g. Westcott, 'Additional Note on Joh 2:24'; A. J. Mason, *Conditions*, etc. pp. 162-163). The question more immediately before us does not concern our own view of the nature and origin of this knowledge, but that of the Evangelists. If we will keep these two questions separate we shall scarcely be able to doubt that the Evangelists mean to present this knowledge as one of the marks of our Lord's Divine dignity. In interpreting them we are not entitled to parcel out the mass of the illustrations of His supernormal knowledge which they record to differing sources, as may fall in with our own conceptions of the inherent possibilities of each case; finding indications in some instances merely of His fine human instinct, in others of His prophetic inspiration, while reserving others—if such others are left to us in our analysis—as products of His Divine intuition. The Evangelists suggest no such lines of cleavage in the mass; and they must be interpreted from their own standpoint. This finds its centre in their expressed conviction that in Jesus Christ dwelt the fulness of the knowledge of God (Mat 11:27, Luk 10:22, Joh 8:38; Joh 16:15; Joh 17:10). To them His knowledge of God and of Divine things, of Himself in His Person and mission, of the course of His life and the events which would befall Him in the prosecution of the work whereunto He had been sent, of the men around Him,—His followers and friends, the people and their rulers,—down to the most hidden depths of their natures and the most intimate processes of their secret thoughts, and of all the things forming the environment in which the drama He was enacting was cast, however widely that environment be conceived, or however minutely it be contemplated,—was but the manifestation, in the ever-widening circles of our human modes of conception, of the perfect apprehension and understanding that dwelt changelessly in His Divine intelligence. He who knew God perfectly,—it were little that He should know man and the world perfectly too; all that affected His own work and career, of course, and with it, equally of course, all that lay outside of this (cf. Mason, *Conditions*, etc. p. 168); in a word, unlimitedly, all things. Even if nothing but the Law of Parsimony stood in the way, it might well be understood that the Evangelists would be deterred from seeking, in the case of such a Being, other sources of information besides His Divine intelligence to account for all His far-reaching and varied knowledge. At all events, it is clearly their conviction that all He knew—the scope of which was unbounded and its depth unfathomed, though their record suggests rather than fully illustrates it—found its explanation in the dignity of His person as God manifest in the flesh.

Nor can the effect of their representation of Jesus as the subject of this all-embracing Divine knowledge be destroyed by the discovery in their narratives of another line of representation in which our Lord is set forth as living His life out under the conditions which belong naturally to the humanity He had assumed. These representations are certainly to be neglected as little as those others in which His Divine omniscience is suggested. They bring to our observation another side of the complex personality that is depicted, which, if it cannot be said to be as emphatically insisted upon by the Evangelists, is nevertheless, perhaps, equally pervasively illustrated. This is the true humanity of our Lord, within the scope of which He willed to live out His life upon earth, that He might accomplish the mission for which He had been sent. The suggestion that He might break over the bounds of His mission, in order that He might escape from the ruggedness of His chosen path, by the exercise whether of His almighty power (Mat 4:3 f., Luk 4:3 f.) or of His unerring foresight (Mat 16:22 ||), He treated first and last as a temptation of the Evil One—for ‘how then should the Scriptures be fulfilled that thus it must be’ (Mat 26:54 ||)? It is very easy, to be sure, to exaggerate the indications in the Evangelists of the confinement of our Lord’s activities within the limits of human powers. It is an exaggeration, for example, to speak as if the Evangelists represent Him as frequently surprised by the events which befell Him: they never predicate surprise of Him, and it is only by a very precarious inference from the events recorded that they can ever be supposed even to suggest or allow place for such an emotion in our Lord (cf. art. Amazement, p. 48). It is an exaggeration again to adduce our Lord’s questions as attempts to elicit information for His own guidance: His questions are often plainly dialectical or rhetorical, or, like some of His actions, solely for the benefit of those ‘that stood around.’ It is once more an exaggeration to adduce the employment in many cases of the term $\gamma\iota\nu\acute{\omega}\sigma\kappa\omega$, when the Evangelists speak of our Lord’s knowledge, as if it were thereby implied that this knowledge was freshly born in His mind: the assumed distinction, but faintly marked in Greek literature, cannot be traced in the usage of the terms $\gamma\iota\nu\acute{\omega}\nu\alpha\iota$ and $\epsilon\iota\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\iota$ in their application to our Lord’s knowledge; these terms even replace one another in parallel accounts of the same instance (Mat 22:18 || Mar 12:15; [Mat 9:4] || Mar 2:8, Luk 5:22; cf. Mat 12:25, Luk 6:8; Luk 9:47; Luk 11:17, Joh 6:61); $\gamma\iota\nu\acute{\omega}\nu\alpha\iota$ is used of the undoubted Divine knowledge of our Lord ([Mat 11:25] Luk 10:22, Joh 10:15; Joh 17:25, Mat 7:22; cf. Joh 2:24-25; Joh 5:42; Joh 10:14; Joh 10:27); and indeed of the knowledge of God Himself (Luk 10:22; Luk 16:15, Joh 10:15 [Mat 11:27]): and, in any event, there is a distinction which in such nice inquiries should not be neglected, between saying that the occurrence of an event, being perceived, was the occasion of an action, and saying that knowledge of the event, perceived as occurring, waited on its occurrence. Gravely vitiated by such exaggerations as most discussions of the subject are, enough remains, however, after all exaggeration is pruned away, to assure us, not indeed that our Lord’s life on earth

was, in the view of the Evangelists, an exclusively human one; or that, apart from the constant exercise of His will to make it such, it was controlled by the limitations of humanity; but certainly that it was, in their view, lived out, so far as was consistent with the fulfilment of the mission for which He came—and as an indispensable condition of the fulfilment of that mission—under the limitations belonging to a purely human life. The classical passages in this reference are those striking statements in the second chapter of Luke ([Luk_2:40](#); [Luk_2:52](#)) in which is summed up our Lord's growth from infancy to manhood, including, of course, His intellectual development (cf. art. Children, p. 302), and His own remarkable declaration recorded in [Mat_24:36](#), [Mar_13:32](#), in which He affirms His ignorance of the day and hour of His return to earth. Supplemented by their general dramatization of His life within the range of the purely human, these passages are enough to assure us that in the view of the Evangelists there was in our Lord a purely human soul, which bore its own proper part in His life, and which, as human souls do, grew in knowledge as it grew in wisdom and grace, and remained to the end, as human souls must, ignorant of many things,—nay, which, because human souls are finite, must ever be ignorant of much embraced in the universal vision of the Divine Spirit. We may wonder why the 'day and hour' of His own return should remain among the things of which our Lord's human soul continued ignorant throughout His earthly life. But this is a matter about which surely we need not much concern ourselves. We can never do more than vaguely guess at the law which governs the inclusions and exclusions which characterize the knowledge-contents of any human mind, limited as human minds are not only qualitatively but quantitatively; and least of all could we hope to penetrate the principle of selection in the case of the perfect human intelligence of our Lord; nor have the Evangelists hinted their view of the matter. We must just be content to recognize that we are face to face here with the mystery of the Two Natures, which, although they do not, of course, formally enunciate the doctrine in so many words, the Evangelists yet effectively teach, since by it alone can consistency be induced between the two classes of facts which they present unhesitatingly in their narratives. Only, if we would do justice to their presentation, we must take clear note of two of its characteristics. They do not simply, in separated portions of their narratives, adduce the facts which manifest our Lord's Divine powers and His human characteristics, but interlace them inextricably in the same sections of the narratives. And they do not subject the Divine that is in Christ to the limitations of the human, but quite decisively present the Divine as dominating all, and as giving play to the human only by a constant, voluntary withholding of its full manifestation in the interests of the task undertaken. Observe the story, for example, in John 11, which Dr. Mason (*Conditions*, etc. p. 143) justly speaks of as 'indeed a marvellous weaving together of that which is natural and that which is above nature.' 'Jesus learns from others that Lazarus is sick, but knows without any further message that Lazarus is dead; He weeps and groans at the sight of the sorrow which surrounds Him, yet calmly gives thanks for the accomplishment of the miracle before it has been accomplished.'

This conjunction of the two elements is typical of the whole Evangelical narrative. As portrayed in it our Lord's life is distinctly duplex; and can be consistently construed only by the help of the conception of the Two Natures. And just as distinctly is this life portrayed in these narratives as receiving its determination not from the human, but from the Divine side. If what John undertakes to depict is what was said and done by the incarnated Word, no less what the Synoptics essay is to present the Gospel (as Mark puts it) of Jesus Christ the Son of God. It is distinctly a supernatural life that He is represented by them all as living; and the human aspect of it is treated by each alike as an incident in something more exalted, by which it is permitted, rather than on which it imposes itself. Though passed as far as was befitting within the limits of humanity, this life remains at all times the life of God manifest in the flesh, and, as depicted by the Evangelists, never escapes beyond the boundaries set by what was suitable to it as such.

The actual instances of our Lord's foresight which are recorded by the Evangelists are not very numerous outside of those which concern the establishment of the Kingdom of God, with which alone, of course, their narratives are particularly engaged. Even the few instances of specific exhibitions of foreknowledge of what we may call trivial events owe their record to some connexion with this great work. Examples are afforded by the foresight that the casting of the nets at the exact time and place indicated by our Lord would secure a draught of fishes (Luk_5:4, cf. Joh_21:6); that the first fish that Peter would take when he threw his hook into the sea would be one which had swallowed a stater (Mat_17:27); that on entering a given village the disciples should find an ass tied, and a colt with it, whose owners would be obedient to our Lord's request (Mat_21:2 ||); and that on entering Jerusalem to make ready for the final passover-feast they should meet a man bearing a pitcher, prepared to serve the Master's needs (Mar_14:13). In instances like these the interlacing of prevision and provision is very intimate, and doubt arises whether they illustrate most distinctly our Lord's Divine foresight or His control of events. In other instances the element of foresight comes, perhaps, more purely forward: such are possibly the predictions of the offence of the disciples (Mat_26:31), the denial of Peter (Mat_26:34 ||), and the treachery of Judas (Mat_26:21). There may be added the whole series of utterances in which our Lord shows a comprehensive foresight of the career of those whom He called to His service (Mat_4:19; Mat_10:17; Mat_10:21; Mat_20:22; Mat_24:9 f., Joh_16:1 f.); and also that other series in which He exhibits a like full foreknowledge of the entire history of the Kingdom of God in the world (cf. esp. the parables of the Kingdom, and such passages as Mat_16:18; Mat_24:5; Mat_24:24; Mat_21:43; Mat_24:14; Mat_26:13, Luk_19:11, Joh_14:18-19). It is, however, particularly with reference to His own work in establishing the Kingdom, and in regard to the nature of that work, that stress is particularly laid upon the completeness of His foreknowledge. His entire career, as we have seen, is represented by all the Evangelists as lying plainly before Him from the beginning, with every detail clearly

marked and provided for. It is especially, however, with reference to the three great events in which His work in establishing His Kingdom is summed up—His death, His resurrection, His return—that the predictions become numerous, if we may not even say constant. Each of the Evangelists represents Him, for example, as foreseeing His death from the start (Joh 2:19; Joh 3:14, Mat 12:40; Mat 9:15, Mar 2:19, Luk 12:49; Luk 5:34; cf. Meyer on Mat 9:15; Mat 16:21; Weiss on Mar 8:31; Denncy, *Death of Christ*, p. 18; Wrede, *Messiasgeheimnis*, p. 19, etc.), and as so ordering His life as to march steadfastly forward to it as its chosen climax (cf. e.g. Wrede, p. 84: ‘It is accordingly the meaning of Mark that Jesus journeys to Jerusalem because it is His will to die there’). He is represented, therefore, as avoiding all that could lead up to it for a time, and then, when He was ready for it, as setting Himself steadfastly to bring it about as He would; as speaking of it only guardedly at first, and afterwards, when the time was ripe for it, as setting about assiduously to prepare His disciples for it. Similarly with respect to His resurrection, He is reported as having it in mind, indeed, from the earliest days of His ministry (Joh 2:19, Mat 12:40; Mat 16:21, Mar 8:31, Luk 9:22), but adverting to it with paedagogical care, so as to prepare rather than confuse the minds of His disciples. The same in substance may be said with reference to His return (Mat 10:23; Mat 16:27, Mar 8:38; Mar 9:1, Luk 9:26-27).

A survey in chronological order of the passages in which He is reported as speaking of these three great events of the future, cannot fail to leave a distinct impression on the mind not only of the large space they occupy in the Evangelical narrative, but of the great place they take as foreseen, according to that narrative, in the life and work of our Lord. In the following list the passages in which He adverts to His death stand in the order given them in Robinson’s *Harmony of the Gospels*:

Joh 2:19; Joh 3:14, Mat 12:40 (cf. Mat 16:4, Luk 11:32), Luk 12:49-50, Mat 9:15 (Mar 2:19, Luk 5:34), Joh 6:51; Joh 7:6-8, Mat 16:21 (Mar 8:31, Luk 9:22), Luk 9:31, Mat 17:17 (Mar 9:12), Mat 17:22-23 (Mar 9:31, Luk 9:44), Luk 9:51, Joh 7:34; Joh 8:21; Joh 8:25; Joh 9:5; Joh 10:11; Joh 10:15, Luk 13:32; Luk 17:25, Mat 20:18-19 (Mar 10:33, Luk 18:31), Joh 12:28, Mat 20:26 (Mar 10:38), Mat 20:28 (Mar 10:45), Mat 21:39 (Mar 12:8, Luk 20:14), Joh 12:23, Mat 26:2, Joh 13:1; Joh 13:33, Mat 26:28 (Mar 14:24, Luk 22:20), Mat 26:31 (Mar 14:27, Joh 14:28), Joh 15:13; Joh 16:5; Joh 16:16; Joh 18:11, Mat 26:54 (Joh 18:11), Luk 24:26; Luk 24:46.

The following allusions to His resurrection are in the same order:

Joh 2:19, Mat 12:40 (Luk 11:30), Mat 16:21 (Mar 8:31, Luk 9:22), Mat 17:9 (Mar 9:9), Mat 17:23 (Mar 9:31), Joh 10:18 [Joh 16:16], Mat 20:17 (Mar 10:34, Luk 18:33), Mat 26:32 (Mar 14:28) [Mat 28:6 || Luk 24:8], Luk 24:46.

The following are, in like order, the allusions to His return:

Mat 10:23; Mat 16:27 (Mar 8:38; Mar 9:1, Luk 9:26-27), Luk 10:40; Luk 17:22, Mat 19:28; Mat 23:39; Mat 24:3 (Mar 13:4, Luk 21:6), Mat 24:34-37 (Mar 13:30, Luk 21:32), Mat 24:44; Mat 25:31; Mat 26:64 (Mar 14:62, Luk 22:69).

The most cursory examination of these series of passages in their setting, and especially in their distribution through the Evangelical narrative, will evince the cardinal place which the eschatological element takes in the life of the Lord as depicted in the Gospels. In particular, it will be impossible to escape the conviction that it is distinctly the teaching of the Evangelists that Jesus came into the world specifically to die, and ordered His whole life wittingly to that end. As Dr. Denney puts it (expounding Joh 10:17, on which see also Westcott's note), 'Christ's death is not an incident of His life, it is the aim of it. The laying down of His life is not an accident in His career, it is His vocation; it is that in which the Divine purpose of His life is revealed.' 'If there was a period in His life during which He had other thoughts, it is antecedent to that at which we have any knowledge of Him' (*Death of Christ*, pp. 259 and 18). Nothing could therefore be more at odds with the consentient and constant representations of the Evangelists than to speak of the 'shadow of the cross' as only somewhat late in His history beginning to fall athwart our Lord's pathway; of the idea that His earthly career should close in gloom as 'distinctly emerging in the teaching of Jesus only at a comparatively late period,' and as therefore presumably not earlier 'clear in His mind': unless, indeed, it be the accompanying more general judgment that 'there was nothing extraordinary or supernatural in Jesus' foreknowledge of His death,' and that 'His prophecy was but the expression of a mind which knew that it could not cease to be obedient while His enemies would not cease to be hostile' (A. M. Fairbairn, *The Expositor*, 1897, i.; v. iv. [1896] 283, 285). It is not less unwarranted to speak of Him as bowing to His fate only 'as the will of God, to which He yielded Himself up to the very end only with difficulty, and at best against His will' (Wernle, *Synopt. Frage*, 200).

Such expressions as these, however, advise us that a very different conception from that presented by the Evangelists has found widespread acceptance among a class of modern scholars, whose efforts have been devoted to giving to our Lord's life on earth a character more normally human than it seems to possess as it lies on the pages of the Evangelists. The negative principle of the new constructions offered of the course and springs of our Lord's career being rejection of the account given by the Evangelists, these scholars are thrown back for guidance very much upon their own subjective estimate of probabilities. The Gospels are, however, the sole sources of information for the events of our Lord's life, and it is impossible to decline their aid altogether. Few, accordingly, have been able to discard entirely the general framework of the life of Christ they present (for those who are inclined to represent

Jesus as making no claim even to be the Messiah, see H. Holtzmann, *NT Theol.* i. 280, note; Meinhold as there referred to; and Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis*, especially Appendix vii.). Most have derived enough from the Gospels to assume that a crisis of some sort occurred at Caesarea Philippi, where the Evangelists represent our Lord as beginning formally and frankly to prepare His disciples for His death (Mat_16:21 ||).

Great differences arise at once, however, over what this crisis was. Schenkel supposes that it was only at this point in His ministry that Jesus began to think Himself the Messiah; Strauss is willing to believe He suspected Himself to be the Messiah earlier, and supposes that He now first began to proclaim Himself such; P. W. Schmidt and Lobstein imagine that on this day He both put the Messianic crown upon His head and faced death looming in His path; Weizsäcker and Keim allow that He thought and proclaimed Himself the Messiah from the beginning, and suppose that what is new here is that only now did He come to see with clearness that His ministry would end in His death,—and as death for the Messiah means return, they add that here He begins His proclamation of His return in glory. To this Schenkel and Hase find difficulty in assenting, feeling it impossible that the Founder of a spiritual kingdom should look forward to its consummation in a physical one, and insisting, therefore, that though Jesus may well have predicted the destruction of His enemies, He can scarcely have foretold His own coming in glory. On the other hand, Strauss and Baur judge that a prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem too closely resembles what actually occurred not to be *post eventum*, but see no reason why Jesus should not have dreamed of coming back on the clouds of heaven. As to His death, Strauss thinks He began to anticipate it only shortly before His last journey to Jerusalem; while Holsten cannot believe that He realized what was before Him until He actually arrived at Jerusalem, and even then did not acquiesce in it (so Spitta). That He went to Jerusalem for the purpose of dying, neither Weizsäcker, nor Brandt, nor H. Holtzmann, nor Schultzen wdl admit, though the two last named allow that He foresaw that the journey would end in His death; or at least that it possibly would, adds Pünjer, since, of course, a possibility of success lay open to Him (cf. H. Holtzmann, *NT Theol.* i. 285-286, note). As many men, so many opinions. As the positive principle of construction in all these schemes of life for Jesus is desupernaturalization, they differ, so far as the prophetic element in His teaching as reported by the Evangelists is concerned, chiefly in the measure in which they explain it as due more or less entirely to the Evangelists carrying their own ideas, or the ideas of the community in which they lived, back into Jesus' mouth; or allow it more or less fully to Jesus, indeed, but only in a form which can be thought of as not rising above the natural prognostications of a man in His position. A few deny to Jesus the entire series of predictions reported in the Gospels, and assign them in mass to the thought of the later community (e.g. Eichhorn, Wrede). A few, on the other hand, allow the whole, or nearly the whole, series to Jesus, and explain them all naturalistically. Most take an intermediate position, determined by the principle that all which seems to

each critic incapable of naturalistic explanation as utterances of Jesus shall be assigned to later origin. Accordingly, the concrete details in the alleged predictions are quite generally denied to Jesus, and represented as easily explicable modifications, in accordance with the actual course of events, of what Jesus really said. The prediction of resurrection on the third day, for example, is held by many (e.g. Schwartzkopff) to be too precise a determination, and is therefore excluded from the prophecy, or explained as only a periphrasis for an indefinite short time, after the analogy of Hos 6:2 (so even B. Weiss). To others a prediction of a resurrection at all seems incredible (Strauss, Schenkel, Weizsäcker, Keim, Brandt), and it is transmuted into, at most, a premonition of future victory. By yet others (as Holsten) even the anticipation of death is doubted, and nothing of forecast is left to Jesus except, possibly, a vague anticipation of difficulty and suffering; while with others even this gives way, and Jesus is represented as passing either the greater part of His life (Fairbairn), or the whole of it, in joyful expectation of more or less unbroken success, or at least, however thickly the clouds gathered over His head, in inextinguishable hope in God and His interposition in His behalf (cf. the brief general sketch of opinions in Wrede, *Messiasgeheimnis*, p. 85).

Thus, over-against the 'dogmatic' view of the life of Christ, set forth in the Evangelists, according to which Jesus came into the world to die, and which is dominated, therefore, by foresight, is set, in polar opposition to it, a new view, calling itself 'historical,' the principle of which is the denial to Jesus of any foresight whatever beyond the most limited human forecast. No pretence is ordinarily made that this new view is given support by the Evangelical records; it is put forward on *a priori* or general grounds—as, for example, the only psychologically possible view (e.g. Schwartzkopff, *Prophecies of Christ*, p. 28; cf. Denney, *Death of Christ*, p. 11, and especially the just strictures of Wrede, *Messiasgeheimnis*, pp. 2, 3). It professes to find it incredible that Jesus entered upon His ministry with any other expectation than success. Contact with men, however, it allows, brought gradually the discovery of the hopelessness of drawing them to His spiritual ideals; the growing enmity of the rulers opened before Him the prospect of disaster; and thus there came to Him the slow recognition, first of the possibility, and then of the certainty, of failure; or, at least, since failure was impossible for the mission He had come to perform, of the necessity of passing through suffering to the ultimate success. So slowly was the readjustment to this new point of view made, that even at the end—as the prayer at Gethsemane shows—there remained a lingering hope that the extremity of death might be avoided. So far as a general sketch can be made of a view presented by its several adherents with great variety of detail, this is the essential fabric of the new view (cf. the general statements of Kähler, *Zur Lehre von der Versöhnung*, 159; Denney, *Death of Christ*, 11; Wrede, *Messiasgeheimnis*, 86). Only such parts of the predictive element of the teaching attributed to Jesus in the Gospels as are thought capable of naturalistic interpretation are incorporated into this new construction. By

those who wish to bring in as much as possible, it is said, for example, that our Lord was too firmly persuaded of His Messianic appointment and function, and was too clear that this function centred in the establishment of the Kingdom, to accept death itself as failure. When He perceived death impending, that meant to Him, therefore, return; and return to bring in the Messianic glory meant resurrection. When He thought and spoke of death, therefore, He necessarily thought and spoke also of resurrection and return; the three went inevitably together; and if He anticipated the one, He must have anticipated the others also. Under this general scheme all sorts of opinions are held as to when, how, and under what impulses Jesus formed and taught this eschatological programme. As notable a construction as any holds that He first became certain of His Messiahship in an ecstatic vision which accompanied His baptism; that the Messiah must suffer was already borne in upon His conviction in the course of His temptation; but it was not until the scene at Caesarea Philippi that He attained the happy assurance that the Messianic glory lay behind the dreadful death impending over Him. This great conviction, attained in principle in the ecstasy of that moment, was, nevertheless, only gradually assimilated. When Jesus was labouring with His disciples, He was labouring also with Himself. In this particular construction (it is O. Holtzmann's) an element of 'ecstasy' is introduced; more commonly the advances Jesus is supposed to make in His anticipations are thought to rest on processes of formal reasoning. In either case, He is pictured as only slowly, under the stress of compelling circumstances, reaching convictions of what awaited Him in the future; and thus He is conceived distinctly as the victim rather than as the Lord of His destiny. So far from entering the world to die, and by His death to save the world, and in His own good time and way accomplishing this great mission, He enters life set upon living, and only yields step by step reluctantly to the hard fate which inexorably closes upon Him. That He clings through all to His conviction of His Messiahship, and adjusts His hope of accomplishing His Messianic mission to the overmastering pressure of circumstances,—is that not a pathetic trait of human nature? Do not all enthusiasts the like? Is it not precisely the mark of their fanaticism? The plain fact is, if we may express it in the brutal frankness of common speech, in this view of Jesus' career He miscalculated and failed; and then naturally sought (or His followers sought for Him) to save the failure (or the appearance of failure) by inventing a new *dénouement* for the career He had hoped for in vain, a new denouement which—has it failed too? Most of our modern theorizers are impelled to recognize that it too has failed. When Jesus so painfully adjusted Himself to the hard destiny which more and more obtruded itself upon His recognition, He taught that death was but an incident in His career, and after death would come the victory. Can we believe that He foresaw that thousands of years would intervene between what He represented as but an apparent catastrophe and the glorious reversal to which He directed His own and His followers' eyes? On the contrary, He expected and He taught that He would come back soon—certainly before the generation which had witnessed His apparent defeat had passed away; and that He would then establish that Messianic Kingdom which from

the beginning of His ministry He had unvaryingly taught was at hand. He did not do so. Is there any reason to believe that He ever will return? Can the 'foresight' which has repeatedly failed so miserably be trusted still,—for what we choose to separate out from the mass of His expectations as the core of the matter? On what grounds shall we adjust the discredited 'foresight' to the course of events, obviously unforeseen by Him, since His death? Where is the end of these 'adjustments'? Have we not already with 'adjustment' after 'adjustment' transformed beyond recognition the expectations of Jesus, even the latest and fullest to which He attained, and transmuted them into something fundamentally different,—passed, in a word, so far beyond Him, that we retain only an artificial connexion with Him and His real teaching, a connexion mediated by little more than a word?

That in this modern construction we have the precise contradictory of the conception of Jesus and of the course of His life on earth given us by the Evangelists, it needs no argument to establish. In the Gospel presentation, foresight is made the principle of our Lord's career. In the modern view He is credited with no foresight whatever. At best, He was possessed by a fixed conviction of His Messianic mission, whether gained in ecstatic vision (as, *e.g.*, O. Holtzmann) or acquired in deep religious experiences (as, *e.g.*, Schwartzkopff); and He felt an assurance, based on this ineradicable conviction, that in His own good time and way God would work that mission out for Him: and in this assurance He went faithfully onward fulfilling His daily task, bungling meanwhile egregiously in His reading of the scroll of destiny which was unrolling for Him. It is an intensely, even an exaggeratedly, human Christ which is here offered us: and He stands, therefore, in the strongest contrast with the frankly Divine Christ which the Gospels present to us. On what grounds can we be expected to substitute this for that? Certainly not on grounds of historical record. We have no historical record of the self-consciousness of Jesus except that embodied in the Gospel dramatization of His life and the Gospel report of His teaching; and that record expressly contradicts at every step this modern reconstruction of its contents and development. The very principle of the modern construction is reversal of the Gospel delineation. Its peculiarity is that, though it calls itself the 'historical' view, it has behind it no single scrap of historical testimony; the entirety of historical evidence contradicts it flatly. Are we to accept it, then, on the general grounds of inherent probability and rational construction? It is historically impossible that the great religious movement which we call Christianity could have taken its origin and derived its inspiration—an inspiration far from spent after two thousand years—from such a figure as this Jesus. The plain fact is that in these modern reconstructions we have nothing but a sustained attempt to construct a naturalistic Jesus; and their chief interest is that they bring before us with unwonted clearness the kind of being the man must have been who at that time and in those circumstances could have come forward making the claims which Jesus made without supernatural nature, endowment, or aid to sustain Him. The value of the speculation is that it makes

superabundantly clear that no such being could have occupied the place which the historical Jesus occupied; could have made the impression on His followers which the historical Jesus made; could have become the source of the stream of religious influence which we call Christianity, as the historical Jesus became. The clear formulation of the naturalistic hypothesis, in the construction of a naturalistic Jesus, in other words, throws us violently back upon the Divine Jesus of the Evangelists as the only Jesus that is historically possible. From this point of view, the labours of the scholars who have with infinite pains built up this construction of Jesus' life and development have not been in vain.

What, then, is to be said of the predictions of Jesus, and especially of the three great series of prophecies of His death, resurrection, and return, with respect to their contents and fulfilment? This is not the place to discuss the eschatology of Jesus. But a few general remarks seem not uncalled for. The topic has received of late much renewed attention with very varied results, the number and variety of constructions proposed having been greatly increased above what the inherent difficulty of the subject will account for, by the freedom with which the Scripture data have been modified or set aside on so-called critical grounds by the several investigators. Nevertheless, most of the new interpretations also may be classified under the old categories of futuristic, preteristic, and spiritualistic.

The spiritualistic interpretation—whose method of dealing with our Lord's predictions readily falls in with a widespread theory that it is 'contrary to the spirit and manner of genuine prophecy to predict actual circumstances like a soothsayer' (Muirhead, *Eschatology of Jesus*, p. 10; Schwartzkopff, *Prophecies of Jesus Christ*, 78, 250, 258, 275, 312, etc.)—has received a new impulse through its attractive presentation by Erich Haupt (*Eschatolog. Aussagen Jesu*, etc., 1895). Christ's eschatology, says Haupt, is infinitely simple, and all that He predicts is to be accomplished in a heavenly way which passes our comprehension; there is no soothsaying in His utterances—'nowhere any predictions of external occurrences, everywhere only great moral religious laws which must operate everywhere and always, while nothing is said of the form in which they must act' (p. 157). A considerable stir has been created also by the revival (Schleiermacher, Weisse) by Weiffenbach (*Der Wiederkunftsgedanke Jesu*, 1873, *Die Frage der Wiederkunft Jesu*, 1901) of the identification of the return of Christ with His resurrection, although this view has retained few adherents since its refutation by Schwartzkopff (*The Prophecies of Jesus Christ*, 1895), whose own view is its exact contradictory, viz. that by His resurrection Jesus meant just His return. The general conception, however, that 'for Jesus the hope of resurrection and the thought of return fell together,' so that 'when Jesus spoke of His resurrection He was thinking of His return, and *vice versa*' (O. Holtzmann, *War Jesus Ekstatiker?* 67, note), is very widely held. The subsidiary hypothesis (first suggested by Colani) of the inclusion in the great eschatological discourse attributed by the Evangelists to our Lord of a 'little

Apocalypse' of Jewish or Jewish Christian origin, by which Weiffenhach eased his task, has in more or less modified form received the widest acceptance (cf. H. Holtzmann, *NT Theol.* i. 327, note), but rests on no solid grounds (cf. Weiss, Beyschlag, Haupt, Clemen). Most adherents of the modern school are clear that Jesus expected and asserted that He would return in Messianic glory for the consummation of the Kingdom; and most of them are equally clear that in this expectation and assertion, Jesus was mistaken (cf. H. Holtzmann, *NT Theol.* i. 312 f.). 'In the expectation that the kingdom was soon to come,' says Oscar Holtzmann in a passage typical enough of this whole school of exposition (*Was Jesus Ekstatiker?* p. 133), 'Jesus erred in a human way'; and in such passages as Mar_9:1; Mar_13:30, Mat_10:23 he considers that the error is obvious. He adds, 'That such an error on the part of Jesus concerning not a side-issue but a fundamental point of His faith,—His first proclamation began, according to Mar_1:15, with the *τεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*,—does not facilitate faith in Jesus is self-evident; but this error of Jesus is for His Church a highly instructive and therefore highly valuable warning to distinguish between the temporary and the permanent in the work of Jesus.' Not every one even of this school can go, however, quite this length. Even Schwartzkopff, while allowing that Jesus erred in this matter, wishes on that very account to think of the mere definition of times and seasons as belonging to the form rather than to the essence of His teaching (*The Prophecies of Jesus Christ*, 1895, English translation 1897, p. 319; *Konnte Jesus irren?* 1896, p. 3); and in that Baldensperger is in substantial agreement with him (*Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*¹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 148,² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 205). From the other side, E. Haupt (*Eschatolog. Aussagen Jesu*, 1895, p. 138 f.) urges that Jesus must be supposed to have been able to avoid all errors, at least in the religious sphere, even if they concern nothing but the form; while Weiffenbach (*Die Frage*, etc. p. 9) thinks we should hesitate to suppose Jesus could have erred in too close a definition of the time of His advent, when He expressly confesses that He was ignorant of its time (cf. Muirhead, *Eschat. of Jesus*, 48-50, and esp. 117). Probably Fritz Barth (*Die Hauptprobleme des Lebens Jesu*, 1899, pp. 167-170) stands alone in cutting the knot by appealing to the conditionality of all prophecy. According to him, Jesus did, indeed, predict His return as coincident with the destruction of Jerusalem; but all genuine prophecy is conditioned upon the conduct of the human agents involved—'between prediction and fulfilment the conduct of man intrudes as a codetermining factor on which the fulfilment depends.' Thus this prediction has not failed, but its fulfilment has only been postponed—in accordance, it must be confessed, not with the will of God, but with that of man. It is difficult to see how Jesus is thus shielded from the imputation of defective foresight; but at least Barth is able on this view still to look for a return of the Lord.

The difficulty which the passages in our Saviour's teaching under discussion present to the reverent expositor is, of course, not to be denied or minimized. But surely this difficulty would need to be much more hopeless than it is before it could compel or justify the assumption of error 'in One who has never been convicted of error in anything else' (Sanday in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. 635—the Whole passage should be read). The problem that faces us in this matter, it is apparent, in the meantime, is not one which can find its solution as a corollary to a speculative general view of our Lord's self-consciousness, its contents, and development. It is distinctly a problem of exegesis. We should be very sure that we know fully and precisely all that our Lord has declared about His return—its what and how and when—before we venture to suggest, even to our most intimate thought, that He has committed so gross an error as to its what and how and when as is so often assumed; especially as He has in the most solemn manner declared concerning precisely the words under consideration that heaven and earth shall pass away, but not His words. It would be sad if the passage of time has shown this declaration also to be mistaken. Meanwhile, the perfect foresight of our Lord, asserted and illustrated by all the Evangelists, certainly cannot be set aside by the facile assumption of an error on His part in a matter in which it is so difficult to demonstrate an error, and in which assumptions of all sorts are so little justified. For the detailed discussion of our Lord's eschatology, including the determination of His meaning in these utterances, reference must, however, be made to works treating expressly of this subject.

Benjamin B. Warfield.

✠ Forgiveness

FORGIVENESS

Three words are used in the Gospels which are rendered in English by the word 'forgive':—ἀπολύειν, *to set free*, once only, in Luk 6:37; χαρίζεσθαι, *to show oneself gracious*, or *forgive frankly*, in Luk 7:42-43; and ἀφιέναι, *to remit*, or *let off*, 37 times in the Synoptic Gospels. The noun ἄφεσις, 'remission' or 'forgiveness,' is found 8 times in the Synoptics, the words 'of sins' or 'of trespasses' being either added or closely implied.

In the treatment of the subject in this article three things must be borne in mind. *First*, that the words employed by Christ and the ideas they represent are not entirely new as they come from His lips. Our Lord presupposes and then puts His own characteristic impress upon a doctrine of forgiveness with which His hearers were for

the most part familiar, and which for us is embodied in the OT. *Secondly*, that no complete study of Christ's teaching concerning forgiveness can be made, unless other words, such as 'save,' 'justify,' and 'cleanse,' are taken into account, and the whole subject of release from the guilt and bondage of sin, as promised by Him, is kept in view. And, *thirdly*, that to stop short with the recorded words of Christ Himself on the matter is—speakingly reverently—not to know His whole mind upon it. It was impossible for Him in the course of His earthly ministry to set forth the full significance of His work for men, before it was accomplished. Hence for a complete account of the significance of His death we turn to the teaching of the Apostles, enlightened as they were by the Holy Spirit whom He had promised. In due course were revealed those 'many things' concerning His cross and passion which His disciples could not 'bear' during His lifetime. Down even to the very close of His short ministry on earth the rudimentary spiritual intelligence of the Apostles was unequal to carrying the full burden of the gospel as they afterwards understood it. The way in which that gospel was to be emphatically one of forgiveness, that 'through this man is proclaimed remission of sins, and by him every one that believeth is justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses,' was only made clear afterwards. It being therefore carefully borne in mind that the OT prepared the way for Christ's teaching on forgiveness, and that the Epistles developed and completed it, this article will deal only with that stage in the biblical doctrine of the subject which is represented by Christ and the Gospels. The consideration of it will be divided into four sections: (1) the Divine forgiveness of man, (2) Christ's own power to forgive sins, (3) the duty of men to forgive one another, (4) the extent to which authority to forgive is vested in the Christian community.

1. God the Father as forgiving the sins of men.—The first reference chronologically to this subject in the Gospels is found in the *Benedictus*, or Psalm of Zacharias (Luk 1:77). The prophecy concerning John the Baptist announces that he is to give 'knowledge of salvation unto his people, in the remission of their sins, according to the tender mercy of our God,' etc. The whole tenor of the canticle goes to show that God's ancient promises were about to be fulfilled in the coming of a Saviour through whom the great boon of remission of sins was to be secured in a fuller sense than had hitherto obtained. When the time came, John the Baptist is declared to have preached the baptism of repentance 'unto remission of sins' (Mar 1:4, Luk 3:3). In the same connexion may be taken the interpretation of the name Jesus in Mat 1:21 'he shall save his people from their sins,' and the 'Saviour, Christ the Lord,' of Luk 2:11, though the word 'forgiveness' does not occur. It was indeed implicit throughout our Lord's ministry, all His declarations concerning His coming 'not to call the righteous, but sinners' (Mat 9:13), 'to seek and to save that which was lost' (Luk 19:10), and His promise of 'rest to the souls' of men (Mat 11:29), showing that the object of His ministry was to reclaim from sin, by bringing men to that forgiveness and cleansing which God had promised through repentance and faith in Him.

The explicit references to forgiveness of sin are comparatively few, but they are clear and definite in character, and quite sufficient to establish doctrine on the subject. They are: (a) the petition in the Lord's Prayer, 'Forgive us our debts,' Mat 6:12 ('our sins,' Luk 11:3), combined with Mat 6:14-15, Mar 11:25, which assert God's willingness to forgive under certain conditions. With these join Luk 6:37, a parallel passage with a different turn of expression, 'Release and ye shall be released,' the reference clearly being to sin. (b) The parables of Luke 15, especially that of the Prodigal Son, and of the Pharisee and the Publican in Luk 18:9-14. (c) Our Saviour's prayer on the cross, 'Father, forgive them,' etc., Luk 23:34. (d) Statements concerning God's willingness to forgive all sins, including those 'against the Son of man,' but excluding the unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost, Mat 12:32, Mar 3:29, Luk 12:10; add also Mar 4:12, in which Isaiah's prophecy is represented as being fulfilled, 'lest they should repent and be forgiven (healed).'

Putting these passages together, we are warranted in concluding that Christ taught the readiness of the Father always to hear the prayer of the truly penitent and in His mercy to pardon their sins, the chief questions being, What is the exact nature of forgiveness? Is it free to all mankind, or to those only who are in covenant relation with Him? Is any condition besides that of repentance laid down?

The meaning of the word 'forgiveness,' and the relation between God and man implied in it, must be gathered largely from the OT. Doubtless under the old covenant a progressive revelation is to be recognized, an advance in spirituality of teaching being discernible in its later stages. Doubtless also it is necessary to bear in mind the distinction between the ceremonial standpoint of the Law with its elaborate ritual and appointed sacrifices on the one hand, and the more purely spiritual view of the prophet and psalmist on the other. But, broadly speaking, Christ, like the more 'Evangelical' OT prophets, represents forgiveness as a pure act of grace on the part of God, Who on the repentance of the sinner receives him graciously and pardons his transgression in the sense of replacing the offender in his former relation of acceptance and favour. Forgiveness is not mere remission of penalty, the forbearing to inflict deserved punishment, though such release is for the most part included. Punishment may still be exacted, but it has lost its penal character and becomes Divine chastisement inflicted for the improvement of the offender, or for the sake of others. Neither does forgiveness imply any false or arbitrary dealing with the past, any condoning of sin—which is essentially immoral—or ignoring of the transgression, as if it had not been committed—which would imply a weak and false attempt to secure the impossible. Nor, again, can any kind of remission of sins be predicated of God which implies unrighteousness in any form, the solemn sanctions of the eternal law of righteousness being secured by the conditions upon which forgiveness is granted.

But the essence of forgiveness lies in the establishment, or restoration, of a personal relation between sinful man and a grieved and righteously angry God. Omnipotence itself cannot erase the event from the history of the past, and holiness will not permit any concealment or pretence as to the heinousness of the offence committed. But the sin may be 'covered,' the guilt cancelled, in the sense that on certain conditions it shall be as if it had never been, so far as the relation between God and the sinner is concerned. Hence sin when forgiven is said to be 'cast into the depth of the sea' (Mic 7:19), 'cast behind thy back' (Isa 38:17), removed 'as far as the east is from the west' (Psa 103:12), 'remembered no more' (Jer 31:34) against the sinner.

Ritschl says: 'God, in forgiving or pardoning sins, exercises His will in the direction of not permitting the contradiction—expressed in guilt—in which sinners stand to Him to hinder that fellowship of men with Him which He intends on higher grounds.' It does not, he adds, 'free them altogether from the consciousness of guilt, but from that mistrust which, as an affection of the consciousness of guilt, naturally separates the injured man from the offender.' And again, it is 'a reconciliation of such a nature that while memory, indeed, preserves the pain felt at the sin which has been committed, yet at the same time the place of mistrust towards God is taken by the positive assent of the will to God and His saving purpose.'

Forgiveness can never be adequately understood by means of any figure of speech, commercial or other. It represents a relation of persons, and its essence lies in the restoration of impaired confidence, affection, and favourable regard. It has to do not only with the past, but the present and the future, and it is exercised by God towards men just in proportion as they are capable of receiving it.

Repentance is the one condition clearly laid down and repeatedly insisted on in the Gospels. It is necessary as between man and man, much more between man and God. When John the Baptist comes to prepare the way of the Saviour, nothing can be done without that thoroughgoing repentance which implies reformation so far as man can effect it. Repentance is indeed a necessary ingredient of forgiveness if the two terms are rightly understood. Sorrow for sin and complete renunciation of it are not arbitrary conditions which the Sovereign chooses to exact before bestowing a boon; they belong to the very essence of the personal relation between Father and son which has been impaired or broken by error and disobedience, and which is to be restored in forgiveness. For an impenitent sinner not to be punished is conceivable, but for such a one to be forgiven is a contradiction in terms. The necessity for a forgiving spirit in one who hopes himself to be forgiven is dealt with below.

God is then 'good and ready to forgive' (Psa 86:5), a God 'keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin' (Exo 34:7). It would, however, be misleading to generalize and say that this attribute of mercy obviates all necessity

for an atonement, or vindication of the law of righteousness, and that throughout the whole history of the world nothing more is needed to obtain Divine forgiveness of sin than confession and repentance on the part of man. The promises of the OT were given to those who stood in a covenant relation with God, in which His righteousness was effectually safeguarded. Christ's ministry was exercised amongst Jews in the first instance, and the presuppositions of OT Scripture must be taken into account.

The same may be said of the two gracious parables of our Lord which chiefly deal with this subject. It is impossible to found accurate doctrine on a parable only, and it is always a mistake to suppose that one parable can cover the whole range of doctrine. The three recorded in Luke 15 were uttered to show the nature of Christ's mission and His desire to seek and save the worst sinners, as well as the willingness of God to receive such, and the joy of heaven and earth when the penitent returns and is pardoned. The moral basis on which this becomes possible in the Divine government is another matter. The cosmic conditions of forgiveness are described in their proper place in Scripture. But in the parable of the Prodigal Son the lesson is impressed that the utmost failure in filial duty will be readily forgiven, if the wanderer will but repent and return. In the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican the essential teaching is the same—the danger lest those who comply with rules of ordinary morality should so plume themselves on their obedience as to lose the sense of their own deep need and ill-desert, and the fact that grave offenders against the fundamental laws of righteousness, like the publican and the harlot, may find their way into the kingdom of grace before the self-righteous Pharisee. But it would be utterly misleading, even to the subversion of the very foundations of ethics, if the inference were drawn that it matters nothing how deeply a man sins, provided that when his evil course is over he regrets his errors and asks for pardon, and that there is no reason in the moral government of the Universe why such a man should not be at once forgiven without infraction of the eternal law of righteousness.

This general conclusion is borne out by Christ's strong language concerning sin, and especially that sin which cannot be forgiven (see [Mat 12:32](#), [Mar 3:29](#), [Luk 12:10](#)). In spite of the long controversy which has taken place as to the mysterious sin against the Holy Ghost and the misunderstandings concerning it which have caused unspeakable spiritual anguish to thousands, there seems little question that the only sin thus pronounced unpardonable is that of wilful and persistent sinning against light till light itself is turned into darkness,—the perverting of truth at its very source, where the Holy Spirit Himself instructs the conscience, and thus poisoning the wells of the soul. Therefore, not in virtue of an arbitrary fiat of the Almighty, but by the necessity of the case, such sin cannot be forgiven. 'A lamp's death when, replete with oil, it chokes; a stomach's when, surcharged with food, it starves.' With this explanation harmonizes the Saviour's prayer in [Luk 23:34](#) 'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.' The sin of Christ's murderers, heinous indeed beyond

expression, was a sin against the Son of man, and—at least in the case of most of those implicated and so far as the full gravity of the offence was concerned—it was not such a deliberate and complete perversion of conscience as to amount to a sin against the Holy Spirit. The reason why the unforgiving cannot be forgiven is to be similarly understood. Hence the general doctrine is laid down in the Gospels in unmistakable terms, that God the Father is ready to receive and pardon all sinners except those who shut themselves out from its possibility by wilfully cherishing a spirit known to be evil, and deliberately hardening their own hearts against the grace which was ready to receive and renew them. See Unpardonable Sin.

2. It is clear that Christ's teaching concerning forgiveness was not exhausted by the proclamation of the Father's willingness to receive the penitent. *He Himself claimed the power to forgive*, which was recognized by all to be a Divine prerogative. In Matthew 9, Mark 2, and Luke 5 is recorded the narrative of the healing of the paralytic, which had evidently impressed itself strongly upon tradition, since it is given by all three Synoptists at greater length than usual and almost in the same words. It was one of the grounds of offence which ultimately caused the death of Jesus, that, whilst lowly in demeanour, He put forth claims for Himself so lofty that to a reverent Jew He appeared often to blaspheme. Jesus does not deny the fundamental assumption that none can forgive sins but God only. To a true believer in one God this is an axiom; there is but one Governor and there can be but one Fount of pardon. Jesus did not thereupon disclaim the possession of a Divine prerogative. He put His own claims to an easily applied test, Whether is it easier to tell a sufferer that his sins are forgiven, or to heal him of an incurable malady? In other words, any prophet may speak words of comfort or absolution, but one who shows the power of healing in order to establish his claim to pronounce forgiveness is no ordinary messenger, but proves Himself to be the Son of God with power. The whole incident evidently made a deep impression, for we are told that the people wondered, praised God, and acknowledged that unprecedented and superhuman power had been entrusted to a son of man.

The close connexion between the work that Christ did for the bodies of men and the power that He claimed over their souls in the forgiveness of sin, is suggested in other narratives, though somewhat less clearly. The inference has been drawn from Joh 5:14 and the early tradition recorded in Joh 8:11, that Jesus habitually pronounced remission of sin and gave power to amend the life in future, but the brief records in these cases hardly warrant such a conclusion.

The narrative of the woman who was a sinner, recorded in Luk 7:36-50, is full of instruction on the subject of forgiveness. The mission of Christ to save the outcast and the abandoned is here delicately and beautifully shown. The only doubtful point of interpretation relates to the ground of forgiveness as described in Luk 7:47. Many

commentators, including the chief Roman Catholic authorities, make the forgiveness extended to the woman to depend upon the love she showed, and at first reading this might seem warranted by the phrase 'for she loved much.' But on examination this is seen to be impossible. For (1) the whole scope of the parable of the two debtors shows that forgiveness precedes love; (2) the latter part of [Luk_7:47](#) enforces the same lesson; and so (3) does the absolution pronounced in [Luk_7:48](#). The only ambiguity lies in the pregnant use of ὅτι in [Luk_7:47](#), and the meaning of the clause may be expressed by the paraphrase, 'This is the reason why I tell you that her many sins are forgiven—for (see) she has shown much love; but he who is forgiven little, loves little.' Her repentance and acceptance had taken place before, her grateful love was manifested in return by the outpouring of the ointment; and in [Luk_7:48](#) Christ authoritatively confirms the assurance of her free and full pardon as One who had an absolute right to do so.

The doctrine of the forgiveness of sins on the basis of atonement through the death of Christ is not, properly speaking, revealed by Christ Himself. The Fourth Gospel contains passages like [Joh_1:29](#) and a reference in [Joh_19:36](#) to the Paschal lamb (?), but neither of these comes from the lips of the Master. The nearest approach to such teaching is found in the institution of the Lord's Supper and the reference to His blood as shed for the remission of sins in [Mat_26:28](#), also perhaps in the directions given to the Apostles in [Luk_24:47](#). By the time of St. Paul's earliest Epistles the doctrine of the atoning death of Christ as the ground of the forgiveness of sins was fairly developed, and the question is, How far had progress been made in this direction before the death of Christ took place? The answer appears to be that—as with the doctrines of the Incarnation and a Future Life in the OT—foreshadowings only had been given, hints and indications of a revelation which could not be clearly and definitely made until Christ's work was complete and the full gift of the Spirit bestowed. A reference is found in [Mat_20:28](#) to the giving up of life by the Son of man 'as a ransom for many,' but the Apostles could not in Christ's lifetime understand at all the need for His death and the full meaning of the shedding of His blood upon the cross; and its connexion with the forgiveness of sins dawned upon them only gradually under the illumination of the promised Spirit.

3. One of the most noteworthy features in Christ's ethical teaching was His inculcation of *the duty of almost unlimited forgiveness of man by man*. The standard thus set up was practically new. In Pagan ethics to revenge an injury and punish an enemy to the utmost was manly, to forgive was mean-spirited. Some affronts might be passed over by the magnanimous man, simply because it was beneath his dignity, or disturbing to his equanimity, to notice them. But the idea of not only abstaining from vengeance, but actually restoring an offender to a relation of kindly regard, on

the ground of human brotherhood and for the sake of helping an erring one to regain his forfeited position, was quite alien to the spirit of ancient morals.

Christ taught not only the duty of forgiveness on repentance, but that it was to be unlimited both in quality and in quantity. No offence was so serious, no repetition of offences so excessive, that forgiveness might be withheld, provided only that penitence were shown. The former of these points is not enlarged on by Christ, but it is involved in the proverbial completeness of the phrase ‘unto seventy times seven’ (Mat 18:22). Such forgiveness of injuries was based upon two fundamental principles of Christian ethics: (a) the duty of repressing all personal resentment, closely connected with the virtues of meekness and humility; and (b) that love to all men, including enemies, which—paradoxical as it might appear—Christ enjoined as fundamentally incumbent on all His disciples (Mat 5:44). The ‘love’ and forgiveness thus inculcated do not depend upon personal merits, for they are to be exercised even towards the unthankful and the evil. But the one necessary condition—repentance—is insisted on, else the moral character of forgiveness is lost. For, as already explained, forgiveness is a relation between persons, and if it be included as a duty in a moral code, it must imply an ethical relation, such as is altogether lacking if evil is condoned, or its seriousness slighted. Hence the offender must, so far as in him lies, put away the evil thing, if it is to be no longer a barrier between him and one whose course is determined by the law of righteousness. The truly moral nature of Christian forgiveness is brought out in Luk 17:3, where it is closely joined with the duty of reproofing sin—‘If thy brother sin, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him.’ With this may be compared Lev 19:17, where the reproof of an evil-doer is spoken of as a mark of love. Just as in the Law the righteous man is bidden to rebuke his neighbour and not ‘bear sin because of him,’ so under the gospel he is bidden to forgive the penitent wrong-doer, that he may help him to a better life.

The close connexion between God’s forgiveness of man and man’s forgiveness of injuries against himself is brought out in Mat 6:12; Mat 6:15, Luk 11:4; see also Luk 6:37 and Mar 11:25-26. In the last passage, as well as in Mat 5:23-24, the duty of being ‘in love and charity with our neighbours,’ and ‘in perfect charity with all men,’ is laid down as a condition of acceptable prayer to God. The reason is akin to that described above. There are some states of mind in which a worshipper is not fit to pray, in which he asks for blessings that he is not capable of receiving. The principle is not to be understood as a kind of Divine *lex talionis*, as in the parable of the Unmerciful Debtor (Mat 18:35)—that a man does not deserve mercy himself, if he will not show it to others, though this is true and appeals to a natural sense of justice. Rather is it to be understood that the unforgiving man shows essential impenitence, or at best an uneducated conscience in respect of his relations with his fellows. A man who cherishes hardness of heart towards those who have injured him so offends

against the law of love that he cannot be received by the God of love, and cannot enjoy the restored relationship which he asks for in the Divine forgiveness, the whole significance of which is due to the supremacy of love. Or, as Beyschlag expresses it, 'he who would belong to the kingdom of love as a recipient must belong to it as an agent.' The merciful alone can obtain mercy, or rightly use it when it is granted to them.

4. Similar principles to those which regulate the relation of individuals are to be applied *where Christian communities are concerned*. The two are closely connected, as is shown by the passage Mat 18:15-18. Christ deals first with the offending individual; if it can be avoided, recourse must not be had to the authority of the Christian society. It may be that personal remonstrance will suffice to set right the offender, or at least the moral influence of the brotherhood exercised in private by the presence of two or three witnesses. If the whole community is compelled to act, the utmost penalty inflicted is expulsion from the brotherhood, the only rights then remaining to the excommunicated person being the inalienable ones of a fellow-man.

The question of forgiveness or condemnation as exercised by the community arises from the phraseology concerning binding and loosing contained in Mat 18:18, with which should be compared the words addressed to St. Peter in Mat 16:18, and those addressed to a company which seems certainly to have included more than the Apostles, in Joh 20:23. The power granted to the Christian community in the words, 'Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained,' is not to be confused with Divine forgiveness of sins on the one hand, or with individual forgiveness on the other. Whilst more significant than the latter, it stops far short of the former. Individual Christians are to do their best privately to stop the progress of ill-feeling and enmity, but 'offences' will still arise. A power of checking them is therefore lodged with the community for the maintenance of purity and the avoidance of scandal. This is described as the power of 'binding and loosing.' Acting in the name of Christ, and presumably in the spirit of Christ, His Church will, He says, in a sense exercise His authority, and their action, whether of permission or prohibition, of condemnation or acquittal, will be ratified in heaven. This power, while great and important, is clearly not comparable to the Divine forgiveness of the individual sinner. This involves a full knowledge of circumstances and of the disposition of the inmost heart which no man can possess in relation to his fellow-man. No authority is given by Christ to a community—still less to a 'priest,' of whom it is needless to say that the Gospels know absolutely nothing—to exercise or to pronounce 'forgiveness' in the case of any individual. But just as an offender belonging to a Christian community needs to be rebuked by the Church in order that the Divine condemnation of wrongdoing may be echoed on earth, and earthly penalties may be inflicted which may arrest further evil and so prevent the terrible danger of worse punishment to come; so the penitent needs assurance from

an earthly authority to help him in his upward course of reformation, though the real and ultimate transaction of forgiveness must rest between himself and God alone. The high authority thus conferred upon the Christian society and the responsible character attached to its judgments depend entirely upon its possession of that spiritual discernment which the Holy Spirit alone can bestow, and its acting always in the name of Christ and under the direction and control of the Spirit of Christ.

Literature.—From amongst the numberless books bearing directly or indirectly on the subject may be mentioned: Beyschlag, *NT Theology*, bk. i. ch. iv. § 11, and ch. vii. §§ 3 and 4; Stevens, *NT Theology*, pt. i. ch. viii.; Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*, chs. 2 and 3; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*, chs. 22 and 23; Knight, *Christian Ethic*, ch. 11; and especially Ritschl, *Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, 1874, vol. iii. [English translation under the above title, 1900]; see also Bethune-Baker, art. 'Forgiveness' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible .

W. T. Davison

☩ Forsaken

FORSAKEN.—Mat_27:46 ||. See Dereliction.

☩ Forsaking All

FORSAKING ALL

ἀφιεναι, Mat_4:20; Mat_4:22 = Mar_1:18; Mar_1:20; Luk_5:11; Mat_19:27; Mat_19:29 = Mar_10:28-29 = Luk_18:28-29; ἀποτάσσεσθαι, 'renounce,' Luk_14:33. In Luk_9:61 ἀποτᾶσθαι τοῖς εἰς τὸν οἶκον μου may mean either 'bid farewell to those in my house' (cf. Mar_6:46, Act_18:18, 2Co_2:13), or 'renounce the things in my house,' *renunciare negociis domesticis* (Erasm.).

Jesus had two classes of disciples. First there was the multitude of those who believed on Him; and, while He required that they should give Him the chief place in their affection and shrink from no sacrifice for His sake, He allowed them to remain where He had found them, prosecuting their old avocations, yet rendering no small service to the Kingdom of Heaven by testifying to His grace and confessing what He had done for their souls. Then there were the Twelve, whom He required to be always

with Him, following Him wherever He went, sharing His lot, and entering by daily intercourse and discipline into the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven, that they might be fitted for the task of carrying on His work when He was gone. Some of the former, like the Gerasene demoniac, would fain have attached themselves to Him and joined the fellowship of His comrades; but He refused their offer. He had other work for them to do. 'Away to thine house unto thy people, and proclaim to them what great things the Lord hath done to thee, and how he had pity on thee' (Mar_5:19 = Luk_8:39).

In every instance He laid it down as the inexorable condition of admission to His inner circle that the man should forsake all—home, kindred, and possessions. 'Come after me,' He said to Simon and Andrew when He called them on the shore of the Lake of Galilee, 'and I will make you fishers of men.' And it is written that 'they immediately left their nets and followed him.' Then He called James and John, and they also 'left their father Zebedee in the boat with the hired men, and went away after him' (Mar_1:16-20 = Mat_4:18-22). And in His commission to the Twelve, when He sent them forth two by two to preach and heal, He reiterated this condition of Apostleship. He laid His hand on the tenderest of human affections and claimed for Himself a prior devotion: 'He that loveth father or mother above me is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter above me is not worthy of me. And one who doth not take his cross, and follow after me, is not worthy of me' (Mat_10:33; Mat_10:38).

Of course it was inevitable that those who followed Jesus wherever He went should share His homeless and desolate lot; but He had a special reason for His emphatic insistence on this condition. The men of His generation cherished a secular ideal of the Messiah. They looked for a king of David's lineage who should appear in might and majesty and, driving out the heathen, set up the fallen throne in more than its ancient splendour. Even the Twelve shared this ideal, and they clung to it to the last, reconciling themselves to the lowliness of their Master by the theory that it was only a temporary veiling of His glory, and that He would presently fling off His disguise and flash forth in His proper majesty. They had left all that they might follow Him, but they consoled themselves with the anticipation of a speedy and overflowing recompense. 'Behold,' said St. Peter after the young ruler's refusal to make the sacrifice which Jesus demanded, 'we have left all and followed thee: what then shall we have?' It was towards the close, and the Twelve were beginning to fear that they had been hugging a false hope, and would have no such recompense as they dreamed of. 'Verily I tell you,' answered Jesus, pitying their discomfiture yet resolute to correct their error, 'that ye that have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit upon the throne of his glory, shall yourselves also sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. And every one who hath left brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or children, or lands, or houses, for my name's sake,

shall receive manifold more, and shall inherit eternal life. But,' He added significantly, hinting at a reversal of their expectation, 'many last shall be first, and first last' (Mat_19:27-30 = Mar_10:28-31 = Luk_18:28-30). They were right in expecting a recompense, but their recompense would be other than they conceived.

As time passed and He still trod the path of humiliation, they fretted at His inexplicable procrastination; and, as the darkness deepened, and the toils closed about Him, they reasoned that the inevitable *dénouement* could be no longer deferred. During His last progress to Jerusalem, with His intimation of the Passion in their ears, they were dreaming their worldly dream. He was going up to the sacred capital, and, they assured themselves, it could be for naught else than the claiming of His crown; and James and John, conspiring with their mother Salome, approached Him and essayed to extort from Him a promise that they should be awarded the chief places beside His throne (Mat_20:20-28 = Mar_10:35-45).

Such was the Messianic ideal which dominated the minds of our Lord's contemporaries; and it was fraught with mischief, hindering more than aught else the recognition of His claims. In truth the marvel is not that so few accepted Him, but that with such an expectation any accepted Him. They were looking for a glorious Messiah, a king with a crown on his head and an army at his back; and Jesus presented Himself, the Son of man, meek and lowly, the very antithesis of what, they believed, the Messiah should be. He lost no opportunity of protesting against the unspiritual ideal, and not the least striking of His protests is this condition which He constantly and emphatically placed before those who desired to attach themselves to Him. A scribe once came to Him and said: 'Teacher, I will follow thee wherever thou goest.' What was his notion? He had been convinced of the Messiahship of Jesus, and, sharing the prevailing expectation, thought to reap a rich harvest of honour and emolument in the new era which would presently be inaugurated. Certainly, he argued, when Jesus won His own and rewarded His faithful followers, He would award the foremost place to one so distinguished by rank and learning.* [Note: So Chrysost., Jerome.] And how did Jesus answer? 'You are expecting,' He said, 'office and honour in an earthly kingdom. Realize the fact. If you follow me wherever I go, you must forsake all and share my lowly and painful lot. The foxes have holes, and the birds of the heaven nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay down his head'* [Note: τεῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίεκ cf. Joh_19:30 κλίνας τὴν κεφαλὴν. Jesus never rested till, His work being finished, He rested on the cross.] (Luk_9:57-58 = Mat_8:19-20).

Again, when He was travelling through Galilee on His last journey up to Jerusalem, He was followed by an enthusiastic throng. Knowing whither He was bound, they concluded that He was going to declare Himself king of Israel, and they were for

following Him all the way and sharing in His triumph. Suddenly He wheeled round (στο αφείς) and addressed them: ‘If any man cometh after me, and doth not hate his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, moreover, even his own life, he cannot be my disciple. Whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple.’ Then He added two parables,—the Unfinished Tower and the Two Kings,—warning against the folly of embarking upon an enterprise which one is incapable of carrying through. ‘So, therefore,’ He concluded, ‘if ye would follow me, understand the condition. Count the cost, and determine whether you are prepared to meet it. Every one of you Who doth not renounce all that he hath cannot be my disciple’ (Luk_14:25-33).

David Smith.

☞Forty

FORTY.—See Numbers.

☞Foundation Of The World

FOUNDATION OF THE WORLD.—The phrase καταβολή κόσμου occurs in Mat_25:34, Luk_11:50, Joh_17:24 (κόσμου is doubtful in Mat_13:35, see RVm). It is a common expression in the NT, e.g. Eph_1:4, Heb_4:3; Heb_9:26, 1Pe_1:20, Rev_13:8; Rev_17:8. In general it denotes a time sense, implying a strong declaration of priority. It always occurs with the prepositions από or πρό. καταβολή primarily means the laying down or founding of anything, hence the absolute beginning. κόσμος is a word of much more varied meaning, into the different phases of which we need not here enter. Its present use as applied to the Universe is well established. The whole expression is equivalent to the phrase found in Mar_10:6; Mar_13:19 ‘from the beginning of the creation’ (ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως). ‘Old Testament Hebrew has no term which would quite correspond to the Greek ὁ κόσμος’ (Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 162). Mat_13:35 is an unliteral rendering of Psa_78:2 מִקִּיּוֹם, which the LXX translates ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς. ‘The foundation of the world’ stands for the definite epoch when this present Universe was originated.

☛ Four

FOUR.—See Numbers.

☛ Fowl

FOWL.—The word ‘fowl’ is now almost restricted to poultry, and especially to that familiar bird in a farmyard, the ‘barn-door fowl’; but it is used in the NT in a wider sense. The Gr. word *πετεινά* (lit. ‘flying things’) does not indeed signify, as its derivation might imply, all winged creatures—a meaning sometimes attached to ‘fowls’ in Old English (Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible, art. ‘Fowl’). It denotes ‘birds,’ of which there are many species in Palestine, including some which are only birds of passage with us. Quite arbitrarily Authorized Version renders *πετεινά* by ‘birds’ in Mat 8:20; Mat 13:32, Luk 9:58; and by ‘fowls’ in Mat 6:26; Mat 13:4, Mar 4:4; Mar 4:32, Luk 8:5; Luk 12:24; Luk 13:19. In every case in which *πετεινά* occurs in the Gospels Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 gives ‘birds.’

Borrowing so much as He did from outward nature, our Lord often employed birds to illustrate His teaching. Their nests are contrasted with His own pillowless conch (Mat 8:20). In the parable of the Sower they devour the seed that falls by the wayside (Mat 13:4); in that of the Mustard Seed they lodge under the shadow of the huge plant which grew out of such a tiny germ (Mar 4:32). Their free undistracted lives play an important part in that cumulative argument which Christ builds up in the Sermon on the Mount against the tyranny of care. They neither sow, reap, nor gather into barns, yet the heavenly Father feeds them (Mat 6:26), *i.e.* they are inferior to man in two respects. For (1) they cannot anticipate and influence the future as man can by the exercise of his reason or the labour of his hands; (2) God is only their Creator, but He is man’s Father, and will not forget His child. Though the ‘fowls’ cannot foresee, or work, or trust, they have no care. Yet they are fed. How foolish of man, who can do all these things, to fall so far beneath the ‘fowls,’ and worry over food and drink, when his first duty is to seek the kingdom of God and His righteousness!

☒ Fox

FOX (άλώπηξ).—Foxes and jackals are referred to indiscriminately in Scripture, although the fox is somewhat smaller in size, and is generally found singly, whereas jackals prowl around villages in small packs. Both animals are of a timid nature, and exhibit similar cunning and stealth in securing their prey, and live in deserted ruins and among the rocks of the mountain gorges. Christ's allusion to them (Mat_8:20, Luk_9:58) takes its meaning from the fact that while places of refuge and rest were definitely allotted to such outcast creatures, the Son of Man had not where to lay His head. His reference to Herod as a fox (Luk_13:32) is not only expressive of contempt, but may allude to the cause of the king's hostility: he was the invader of vineyards who had taken his brother's wife. The verses that follow also indicate that Christ's death must be otherwise brought about. The petty and furtive intentions of Herod must give way to the grander rapacity of Jerusalem as the historical destroyer of the prophets.

G. M. Mackie.

☒ Fragments

FRAGMENTS (κλάσματα, pieces broken for distribution; cf. κλασμάτων ἄρτων of LXX Septuagint Eze_13:19).—All the Synoptists record that, when the miraculous feeding of the multitude ended, the broken pieces remaining over from the meal were gathered up and deposited in twelve baskets (Mat_14:20, Mar_6:43, Luk_9:17). St. John adds that this was done in obedience to Christ's command, addressed to the disciples, by whom apparently the work was performed (Joh_6:12). The surplus thus collected far exceeded the amount of the original stock, and bore witness to the abundance of the meal partaken of. The carefulness shown in collecting the remnants of food was intended to avoid any appearance of waste, and served to correct any tendency to undervalue what had come to the recipients so cheaply. The miracle was one of the very exceptional cases in which Christ provided for men's ordinary wants, was wrought only in view of the urgent necessity that had arisen (Mat_14:15), and, while it raised expectations of similar benefits in the future (Joh_6:26), was not designed to produce this result. The storing of the fragments for future use would tend to indicate that such miracles were not to be everyday occurrences. As in all Christ's miracles, there is strict economy of supernatural resources, which are resorted to only when natural resources fail.

Frankincense

FRANKINCENSE (לְבָנֹן, λιβανος).—One of the ingredients of incense (קְמוּרָה), Exo_30:34, and one of the gifts brought by the Magi to the infant Saviour (Mat_2:11). The name is derived from לְבָן ‘to be white,’ akin to which is ân, the name by which frankincense is known in Arabia. It is a fragrant gum or resin, the produce of the tree *Serrata*, of the natural order *Amyridaceae*, from which it is obtained by slitting the bark. The tree itself is a native of Central and Southern India, whence the gum, which requires no further preparation than being allowed to harden, is exported to Europe, the yellowish or inferior quality in larger quantities than the white. Some uncertainty has existed as to the source of the supply. It seems clear that no such tree existed in Palestine, but that the frankincense used there was imported through Arabia (cf. Isa_60:6, Jer_6:20, where ‘incense’ in Authorized Version ought to be ‘frankincense,’ and is so rendered in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). The opening up of India by Britain made it plain that the source of the supply, which had previously come through Persia, was to be found there.

The ritual use of frankincense, in the OT as among the heathen, denotes direct adoration. It is burned as an appendage to the *minhâh* (Lev_2:2). According to old allegorizing traditions, the frankincense offered by the Magi signified the Divinity of the Holy Child, the gold representing His royalty, the myrrh either His healing powers or His prospect of suffering.

Literature.—Birdwood, *The Genus Boswellia*, London, 1870, also in *Trans. Linn. Society*, xxvii., 1871; *Encyc. Brit.*⁹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] art. ‘Frankincense.’

S. J. Ramsay Sibbald.

Free Will

FREE WILL.—It is not easy to give a definition of Free Will that is not tautological,—indeed, strictly speaking, it cannot be defined. It may, however, be described as the ability to determine within oneself as to one’s acts or courses of action. We have not anywhere in the Gospels or, indeed, in the NT mention made in

specific terms of Free Will, or any statement made in so many words that either the Divine will or the will of man is free. We have little, in fact, of philosophical or philosophico-theological discussion of any kind in the NT. The nearest approach to such a thing is in Rom_9:18-24, where the question of human freedom is approached, and even there such discussion is rather deprecated, as verging on impiety, than entered upon. But while the question of the freedom of the will, whether the will of God or the will of man, is not formally dealt with in the NT, it is quite plain that God is regarded as acting freely, and that man is recognized as a free agent.

1. That God is not bound by any necessity external to Himself, that He acts according to the counsel of His will, is rather to be gathered from the general spirit of Scripture teaching than to be deduced from particular passages. The freedom of the Divine will is, indeed, plainly implied, although not explicitly mentioned, in such words as (Rom_11:34-36), 'For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor? or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of him, and through him, and to him are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen.' But Scripture simply accepts the freedom of the Divine will rather than formally states it. We cannot, however, think of God as acting other than freely, if we are to accept Him as a living God at all. Did we suppose that there was any necessity outside of Himself constraining Him to act in a certain way, we should be making an impersonal force the true Deity. We are constrained to believe that God acts freely. Yet to say that the Most High acts freely does not mean that He acts capriciously. He acts in accordance with His own nature. We can conceive that He might have made the material universe other than He has made it, but we cannot conceive Him as acting otherwise than in love and holiness and justice. Still, the necessity by which, in a sense, He may be said to act where His moral government is concerned is simply the necessity of being true to His own nature.

2. That man is a free agent is not stated in so many words in the NT, but is assumed everywhere. Surely when our Lord said (Mat_11:28) 'Come unto me all ye that labour,' and (Joh_5:40) 'Ye will not come to me that ye might have life,' He accepted the freedom of man as a reality. No doubt He also said (Joh_6:44), 'No man can come unto me except the Father which hath sent me draw him.' But in saying so He did not mean that men were mere passive instruments, but simply that all that appealed to the heart in favour of spiritual living was from on high, whence also all spiritual aids came. Those who hold that the will is not free, or, as we should rather put it, that men are not free to will, do not as a rule argue so much from Scripture, although they may do that in part, as from philosophical grounds, and what they regard as experience. No doubt those who regard liberty as incompatible with predestination may argue that predestination is the plain doctrine of Scripture, but the conclusion that because predestination is the doctrine of Scripture man cannot be free is their own, and is not taught in Scripture. Whether man is free or not is to a large extent a

question of merely academic interest, although not wholly so. We all act upon the hypothesis that we are free. Certainly the conclusion that men are not free operates against contrition for sin and repentance,—hinders one from feeling that he is guilty before God,—and perhaps it is partly with the desire to get rid of the sense of sin that some men argue against our possession of freedom. But in a general way we proceed on the assumption that men are free agents, hence the discussion of freedom is mainly one, as we have said, of academic interest. Scripture, as before remarked, accepts man's freedom as a fact, and we all have the consciousness of being free. It is argued, however, on various grounds that the sense of freedom which we have is illusive. In his *Outline of Christian Theology* Dr. W. N. Clarke mentions four grounds on which the doctrine of human freedom is challenged: viz. (a) Fatalism, (b) Predestinarianism, (c) Necessitarianism, (d) Determinism.

(a) There is perhaps no need of seriously discussing *Fatalism*, which seems to be a mere philosophy of despair. We all at times feel the strange inevitableness of things, but fatalism cannot commend itself to us as a reasoned philosophy.

(b) *Predestinarianism* in some form or other we can hardly avoid accepting, if we believe in an ordered universe; and to resolve predestination, in so far as rational and moral beings are concerned, into simple foreknowledge, does not materially, or at least very materially, help us. Of course it may be argued that the knowledge that a thing is to occur does not necessarily imply that the doer of it must do it. From the antecedents of a man we may judge tolerably well what his course of action in given circumstances will be, but our knowledge as to how he is likely to act does not affect his freedom,—does not compel him to act in the way foreseen. And so, it may be argued, the Divine foreknowledge of an action does not make the action inevitable, does not make it one that must be done. And this is perhaps formally true, but it is only formally so. What God foresees will be done has a material inevitableness about it, and will just as surely be done as if it had been predestinated. And if an action is predestinated, or even Divinely foreseen as being sure to occur, how can it be said that a man does it freely? Freedom seems incompatible with foreordination,—even with Divine foreknowledge. Yet no reasoning, however logical it may appear, can ever make us lose the sense of freedom. We may try to persuade ourselves that we are not free, but the sense of freedom will remain with us notwithstanding, and we shall go on acting as if we were free.

(c) We may say about *Necessitarianism*, or the doctrine that every volition is caused by its antecedents, that it is in a way true, but that, as urged against the freedom of the will, it neglects consideration of the fact that we ourselves are contributing all along to the antecedents which so far determine every volition.

(d) And with regard to *Determinism*, or the doctrine that all volitions are determined by motives acting on the will, it may be said that it also is true, but that motives acting on the will are not like forces acting on a body and producing a resultant which may be mathematically calculated. Our motives are our own feelings and desires, however these may be affected by objects without us, and our decisions to act depend upon what we are, though that is not simply what, as we might say, nature has made us, but what to a large extent we have made ourselves. To suppose that we can act without motive of some kind would be to suppose what is contrary to all experience, for we are always more or less conscious of being influenced by motives, but the action of motives is no mere mechanical action. Our freedom, indeed, as Martensen (*Christian Ethics*, § 31, pp. 109, 110) well points out, is conditioned, not absolute. We are not free save within certain limits, and many things—our native tendency to sin, heredity, environment, above all the force of habit—operate against our acting freely in accordance with our consciousness of what is best. But the sense of freedom which we possess is not illusive. We need, doubtless, the Divine aid in order to true religious living. But we are bound by no iron chain of necessity. We are, save in so far as we may have ourselves enslaved our wills, bound by no outward or inward constraint to will other than the good. And even the enslaved will can be made free by Divine grace.

3. The notion of moral freedom which is presented in the NT differs from all merely philosophical ideas on the subject. Here freedom means the being set free from the bondage of sin, and thus enabled to realize the ideal of human nature as created in the image of God (Rom 6:20 ff.). The freedom of the Christian will lies not in the power to do whatsoever we please, but in the power to choose and follow that for which God made us. God Himself is absolutely free, precisely because He is the absolutely perfect moral Being; and Christ's power to make others free springs from His own Divine freedom—that moral oneness with the Father in the strength of which He did always the things that were pleasing to Him (Joh 8:29). In Christ's gospel a freedom after His own pattern is offered to all. The Son can make us free so that we shall be free indeed (Joh 8:36). This freedom comes from union with Christ, for apart from Him we can do nothing (Joh 15:5). The doctrine of the indwelling of Christ through the Holy Spirit, and the consequent endowment of His disciples with freedom and power, was taught, according to the Fourth Gospel, by Jesus Himself (see esp. 14-17). It is constantly enforced by St. Paul as the testimony of his own experience. Apart from the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, the will is powerless to realize its own ideals (Rom 7:19 ff; Rom 8:2 ff.). But in accepting Christ as our Master, and yielding to His law as supreme, we pass into 'the glorious liberty of the children of God.' See, further, Liberty.

Literature.—Art. 'Will' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ; Martensen, *Christian Ethics*; T. H. Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*; Sir W. Hamilton, *Discussions* (appendix,

Philosophical); A. M. Fairbairn, *The Philosophy of the Christian Religion*; Albrecht Ritschl, *Justification and Reconciliation*; J. R. Illingworth, *Reason and Revelation*; W. N. Clarke, *Outline of Christian Theology*; R. Anchor Thompson, *Christian Theism*; and Philosophical and Theological works in general.

George C. Watt and J. C. Lambert.

☒ Freedom

FREEDOM.—See Free Will and Liberty.

☒ Friendship

FRIENDSHIP

1. Pre-Christian and Christian friendship.—Friendship was esteemed among the pagans and received memorable treatment at the hands of Aristotle (*Ethics*, Bks. viii. and ix.) and Cicero (*de Amicitia*). The latter said, ‘There is nothing in the world more valuable than friendship.’ Jewish literature treated the same subject, as, for example, in Sirach (Sir 6:15), ‘There is nothing that can be taken in exchange for a faithful friend.’ This appreciation of friendship as one of the chief means of happiness throws light upon the ancient attitude. The mutual kindness of friends, considered necessary to complete the happiness even of the philosopher, but which was confined to those of the same school or character, makes more prominent the absence of benevolence from the ancient system of virtue. Christianity has also a high regard for friendship, has ennobled it, but has at the same time placed limitations upon it.

(1) The *enlargement* of Christian friendship is twofold. (a) The area within which the grace may be displayed is much extended by the teaching of Christianity upon the dignity of woman, whereby marriage loses any trace of the offence with which even many enlightened Jews regarded it,* [Note: But cf. Pro 31:10 ff., and Sir 40:23 ‘A friend and companion never meet amiss, but above both is a wife with her husband.’] and becomes a lofty friendship. (b) This is further enlarged by the new ideal of benevolence, which is to penetrate all the relations of life. Humanity has been dignified by the Incarnation. Christian Ethics is not the successor to the virtues of paganism, but the new spirit that turned patriotism into brotherhood, elevated friendship into universal love; φιλία becomes ΦΙΛΑΔΕΛΦΙΑ. The exceptional exhibitions of goodwill and charity displayed by heathen, remarkable because of their

contrast with the prevalent selfishness, are taken for granted among the members of the Kingdom of God. Friendship ceases to be a luxury and becomes a responsibility. Love, the root of all Christian virtues, must pervade all the performances of life.

(2) The *limitation* placed upon friendship in the new religion follows from the doctrine of the Divine friendship, which causes a complete readjustment of human thought. The pagans found little spiritual rest or inspiration in their religion, and human friendship was neither a reflexion nor a suggestion of a Divine fellowship. With Christ, however, the love for God is paramount, and receives an importance far beyond any other relationship. 'Ye, my friends, shall leave me alone: and yet I am not alone, for the Father is with me' (Joh. 16:32). To furnish this higher friendship is the mission of Christ. He has come that we may have the power to become sons of God (Joh. 1:12). Religion takes precedence over friendship: man may not usurp God's place. The gospel which teaches that man attains his exaltation according as he bows down in humble submission to the will of God, necessarily modifies the view that human companionship is the most valuable thing in the world. The Christian doctrine of God recasts everything in a new mould. Theology reacts upon anthropology. 'God is the beginning and foundation of all true and lasting friendship' (Zwingli).

2. The teaching of Jesus on friendship.—This is suggestive and incidental rather than formal and detailed. In parables and conversations Christ indirectly drops sentences which show how general was His observation of all the relations into which people might enter. (1) In the parables of the Lost Sheep and the Lost Piece of Silver, He touches upon the much debated *basis* of friendship. The joyous discovery of lost possession leads to social communion. 'He (she) calleth together his (her) friends and neighbours, saying, Rejoice with me' (Luk. 15:6; Luk. 15:9). This act is the natural result of the instinct for association. The consciousness of joy breaks through the bounds of individualism and runs over into the sphere of human companionship; for the feeling that life's great emotions are too strong for narrow limits constrains men to seek this expansion among others. The soul delights in self-revelation. 'But no receipt openeth the heart but a true friend: To whom you may impart, Griefes, Joyes, Fears, Hopes, Suspicious, Counsels, and whatsoever lieth upon the Heart' (Bacon). This spontaneous overflow, due to the instinct of association, has been implanted by God; and friendship is thus one of the good gifts of Heaven. Cicero also assigned a similar spontaneity to this virtue.

(2) Several types of *false friendship* are suggested by Jesus. (a) The parable of the Unjust Steward (Luk. 16:1-9), 'who made friends out of the mammon of unrighteousness,' illustrates the *commercial* type. The material comforts of fellowship are gained by a clever distribution of money favours apart from all sympathy of heart or mind; and though Christ neither commends nor condemns, He indirectly reveals His mind in the remark, 'The children of this world are in their

generation wiser than the children of light' (v. 8). But true friendship is disinterested, and seeks the welfare of another rather than its own. 'Friendship is the wishing a person what we think good for his sake and not for our own, and, as far as is in our power, the exerting ourselves to procure it' (Aristotle, *Rhct.* ii. 4).—(b) The *exclusive* type of friendship is displayed in the parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15). The outwardly proper behaviour of the elder brother is marred by the lack of filial love; and his complaint, 'Thou never gavest me a kid that I might make merry with my friends,' shows how blind he was to the lavish affection of a father who bestowed his all upon him,—'Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine.' The son looked for a friendship apart from the nobler companionship of a loving father. His heart was not really in the home, for his secret longing was for the frivolous joys of the world, the merrymaking with friends, which he will have in isolation from the love of home. The unpleasant impression left by the picture of the elder brother is Christ's way of giving His opinion of a friendship which shuts itself up within the circle of favourite comrades, and is careless of the higher claims of love and benevolence. It then becomes a refined selfishness.—(c) The *irresponsible* type is described in Luk 11:5-8, where the householder is so comfortably settled in bed that he refuses to rise and give bread to a friend, who is unexpectedly called upon to show a greater service to his friend. 'Friend, lend me three loaves, for a friend of mine in his journey is come to me.' Friendship here recognizes no responsibilities, and will not discommode itself to the extent of getting out of bed. Are we mistaken in seeing a touch of irony in this portrayal of a bond which lasted only with the enjoyment of benefits, but could not stand the strain of any personal inconvenience? Friendship is mutual assistance. 'A friend loveth at all times, and a brother is born for adversity' (Pro 17:17).

(3) *The claim of old friends* was recognized by Jesus when He cast out the devils from 'Legion' (Mar 5:19). The evil spirit, always an isolating influence, had excluded this unhappy man from the comforts of home and companionship. But when he is healed and the craving for intercourse is awakened, Jesus directs it to old channels: 'Jesus saith unto him, Go home to thy friends and tell them how great things the Lord hath done for thee.' These associates and guardians of his youth had borne with him through the evil days, and Jesus will not be a partner to any indifference to those obligations contracted by former benefits. He knew how keen was the sting of 'friend remembered not.'

(4) Jesus placed *restrictions* upon friendship at the feast given by the rich Pharisee, and condemned the selfish narrowing of the acts of hospitality. 'When thou makest a dinner or a feast do not call thy friends ... but call the poor' (Luk 14:12-13). The force of the verb is not prohibitive, but restrictive: 'Do not habitually call' (μὴ φώνει). Friendship must have open doors, and recognize the larger hospitality. Thus Jesus

broadened the stream of friendship by bringing neighbours within the same flow of feeling, as is set forth in the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luk_10:30 ff.). 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' Nor did Jesus stop at neighbour. He included enemy also. The Christian must have no foes. 'I say unto you, Love your enemies' (Mat_5:44). The sentiment of love must pervade every motive, filling the soul with gentle kindness. Cicero had said that 'Sweetness both in language and manner is a very profitable attraction in the formation of friendship'; but what is with him an accident becomes an essential in the Kingdom of Jesus. The distinctive word with Christ is love and not friendship, and, by reason of this, Christianity excels the pagan ideals. The new commandment, 'that ye love one another' (Joh_13:34), decides all matters of conduct. True friends will not sanction any imperfection, or acquiesce in any weak neglect of talents in those whom they love; while at the same time the charity of the gospel will bear all things, will hope all things.

(5) Jesus also taught that the life of love was *endless*. The old friendships flourished under dark skies. Fears of an awful end haunted them, and when death came, 'They dreamed there would be spring no more.' But Christ has brought life and immortality to light through His gospel. He has spoken with certainty of the future, and has made the darkness beautiful. The Christian poet can rise out of the calamity of interrupted friendship into the repose of faith and self-control.

'Far off thou art but ever nigh,

I have thee still and I rejoice:

I prosper, circled with thy voice:

I shall not lose thee tho' I die' (*In Memoriam*, cxxx.).

Human affection will pass through the cleansing stream of death, and purified of all selfishness and evil will be made perfect in the presence of God.

3. The friendship of Jesus.—Christianity is a life as well as a system of teaching; and as each virtue or quality is best interpreted in the light of the highest example of its kind, so also human friendship becomes transfigured by the friendship which Jesus offers to all who will receive Him.

(1) *The friendship of Jesus as revealed in the Gospels.*—These narratives show how approachable Jesus was. His readiness to accept social invitations, to befriend all classes, to reveal His gracious message, testifies to His genius for friendship, and accounts in part for the contemptuous title, 'Friend of publicans and sinners.' He chose twelve 'that they might be with him' (Mar_3:14), and to these He revealed

what was dearest to His heart. On the Mount of Transfiguration He admitted three of them to the vision of His glory (Mat_17:1-13 ||): in Gethsemane He opened to the same three the door of His grief (Mat_26:36-46): He told His disciples of the stern struggle with temptation in the wilderness of Judaea. The house at Bethany was a second home to Him, and His love for 'our friend Lazarus' was manifested in His visit to the sisters, and in the grief that overwhelmed Him at the grave (John 11).

In the second part of the Fourth Gospel the affection of Jesus is seen to lack the slightest 'grain of depreciation,' which Schopenhauer recommends among friends. The constancy of the perfect Friend is the first theme of this intimate writing (John 13-17), a constancy unimpaired by sorrow or joy. The foreboding of death ('knowing that he would depart out of this world') threatened to draw away His mind, as also the vision of a transcendent glory ('that he would depart unto the Father') imperilled His attachment; but neither the excess of grief nor the ecstasy of gladness availed to weaken His fidelity to those whom He had chosen; 'having loved his own, he loved them unto the end' (Joh_13:1). In the following chapters the love of Jesus is unfolded with the eloquence peculiar to St. John's Gospel. Christ breathes about them the atmosphere of God's glory, lifts up their thoughts to the heavenly home, filling them with the fragrant truth of the endless love of God, all of which is summed up in terms of friendship in Joh_15:13-15. (a) Jesus is a perfect friend because of His *personal sacrifice*: 'Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friend' (Joh_15:13). Sacrifice is the most convincing evidence in the world, and the surrender of personal advancement for the sake of others is proof of the noble emotion of love. As there is nothing that a man can give in exchange for his life, the death of Jesus for us is the highest evidence of His perfect friendship. Sacrifice is also the food of love, and friendship is growth in self-sacrificing love. Each self-denial strengthens the bond of attachment, and when sacrifice is allowed its perfect work it forms a deathless union. Jesus experienced every stage of self-denial, suppressing His own desires, until His love, perfected through suffering, received its crown and goal on the Mount of Crucifixion. The sacrifice which was the evidence of His perfect friendship was also the only sustenance by which perfect friendship could be nourished. (b) Christ's friendship is an *ethical constraint*: 'Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you' (Joh_15:14). He is our kindest friend who makes us do our best, and who helps us to do what we thought we could not do. The consciousness of expanding power is purest joy. Christ arouses enthusiasm for the holy life, imparts new resolves to master temptation, and is the most effectual aid in the attainment of the ethical life. His friendship is our better self, our conscience. (c) There is *intimate communion* in the friendship of Jesus: 'Henceforth I call you not servants, but I have called you friends: for all things that I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you' (Joh_15:15). Friendship is fellowship in which undue reserve is cast off. When Christ spoke out on the most sacred matters of religion, and shared with others His knowledge of the Father, He did the friendliest of acts. Christ's love was the most

intimate relation into which any man could enter, and His constancy, devotion, communion, and inspiration gave Him the first place among friends.

(2) *The friendship of Jesus as revealed in Christian experience.*—The limits of human friendship are many, and suggest the blessings which all believers in Christ have enjoyed by their union with the living Saviour. In our human relationships no words are adequate to express the subtler and more refined emotions and convictions of the soul, so that when we strive to reveal our true self we stammer. Besides, we often cannot define these things to ourselves, and we require one who will first tell us our dream and then interpret it. Inhospitability of soul and our native bashfulness impede communion, while the sense of defect or unworthiness restricts our fellowship. Differences of experience separate us, so that we cannot match each other's moods. Distance and change of occupation place physical barriers, while too often the faults of temper and vexing cares drive apart those who once were knit together in sympathy. How precarious is our hold upon a friendship which 'death, a few light words, a piece of stamped paper,' can destroy. But Jesus transcends all these limits of human friendship. His spirit can commune with our spirits apart from language. He knows us altogether, and needs not that any should tell Him. He is master of large experience, having been tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin. Physical barriers are all removed, since He will never go away from us or forsake us. He is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. The universal testimony of the Christian Church is that as we abide in the presence of Jesus by prayer, self-denial, and meditation, we are uplifted in soul, encouraged in our holy endeavours, and made partakers of spiritual joy. The believer finds that Christ is the way to the Father, that Jesus leads us to that communion with God which is the greatest fact of all the world. Religion is friendship between the believer and the living Christ.

Literature.—Aristotle, *Ethics*; Cicero, *de Amicitia*; *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie fur protest. Theologic und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , art. 'Freundschaft'; Lemme, *Die Freundschaft*, Heilbronn, 1897; Bacon, *Essays*, Golden Treasury Series, 1892, p. 106; Hugh Black, *Friendship*, 1900; Hilty, *Briefe*, Leipzig, 1903; Tennyson, *In Memoriam*; Martensen, *Christian Ethics*, iii. 72 ff.; Stalker, *Imago Christi*, 93 ff.

James W. Falconer.

◻ Fringes

FRINGES.—See Border.

☞ Fruit

FRUIT.—The consideration of this term as it is used in the Gospels divides itself into three parts: (1) The natural application of the word ‘fruit’ (καρπός) to the products of the field and the orchard; (2) other references to fruit under their specific names; (3) the spiritual lessons derived from these allusions.

1. In its natural sense the word ‘fruit’ is used: (a) in reference to grain-crops (Mat 13:8, Mar 4:7, Luk 8:8; Luk 12:17); (b) physiologically, of the fruit of the womb (Luk 1:42); (c) of the fruit of (α) trees generally (Mat 3:10, Luk 3:9); (β) the fig-tree (Mat 21:9, Mar 11:14, Luk 1:36); (γ) the vine (Mat 21:41, Mar 12:2, Luk 20:10).

2. Other references to fruits under their specific names, without the use of the word ‘fruit’: (a) grapes (Mat 7:16, Luk 6:44); (b) figs (Mat 7:16, Mar 11:13, Luk 6:44); (c) husks (Luk 15:16, probably the fruit of the carob or locust-tree); (d) mulberry (Luk 17:16); (e) olives (Mat 21:1). Probably the ‘thorns’ (ἀκανθαι) alluded to in Mat 7:16 are not the so-called ‘Apple of Sodom,’ but a generic term covering all sorts of prickly plants. The parallel use with ‘thistles’ (τριβόλοι) suggests that the fruit was inconsiderable.

3. *Spiritual lessons.*—Christ Himself is intimately associated with (a) the Divine quest of fruit; (b) the Divine creation of fruit; (c) the Divine suffering and sacrifice of fruit-production. The processes of agriculture and horticulture are also, in many ways, utilized as symbols of the Christian’s culture of the soul.

(a) Jesus describes Himself (Matthew 21, Luke 20) under the figure of the Son whom the Master of the Vineyard sends to ask fruit of the husbandman. Our life is a rich gift to us from God; it is a garden which God has designed with lavish care, endowed with unlimited possibilities, and handed over to our complete control. He has a right to expect that we should use our opportunities.

(b) Jesus uses the figure of the John 15) and the Branches to express the vital and mysterious connexion that exists between Himself and His disciples, and the necessity for our dependence upon Him and His continuous inspiration, if we are to bring forth fruit. It is our responsibility to ‘abide in Him’ by keeping His commandments. But it is His obligation to create the fruit. We who cannot so much as make a blade of grass grow without His co-operation, are not expected to accomplish the impossible and bring forth fruit of ourselves.

(c) Jesus manifestly alludes to His own death and sacrifice (Joh 12:24) under the allegory of the grain of wheat which falls into the ground and dies, and afterwards rises in the new life of the fruit. This figure betokens the utter consecration and determination of the holiness of God to our redemption. We are apt to shudder and tremble before the holiness of God, as a thing of terrible and inaccessible majesty associated with the Great White Throne. That is because we have not taken full views, but have isolated one part from the rest. God is glorious in His holiness (Psalms 145); it is such holiness as man praises when he sees it; it is hospitable, friendly, and devoted to our welfare. It is determined even unto death to share its joy and health and purity with us (Joh 12:24; Joh 17:19).

In the Museum of the Vatican there is a little glass relic, taken from the Catacombs; it was made as an ornament to be worn round the neck of a woman, and was found in her grave; it represents Christ bringing again the fruit of the Tree of Life.* [Note: See *Rex Regum* by Sir Wyke Bayliss.] That relic summarizes the Divine aspects of the question of fruit as it is presented in the Gospels. It is Christ who loves fruit, and who desires to find it in us; and it is He who, in the inspiration and creation of the fruit, virtually gives Himself to us.

But, as in agriculture and horticulture the farmer and the gardener are co-operators with God in the production of the fruits of the earth and the fruit of the trees, so, in many ways, the Gospels lay upon us the injunctions of our duty.

(1) We are the ground which brings forth fruit, according as we receive the Word (Mat 13:19 ff., Mar 4:15 ff., Luk 8:12 ff.). If our hearts be like the wayside, trampled over and hardened by the interests and engagements of the world, or if they be readily affected by the opinions of men, or if they be choked by the cares of this life and the deceitfulness of riches, there can be no fruitfulness. It is our duty to prepare the ground by thought and prayer and a regulated life for the reception of God's truth. The harvest will correspond with the tillage.

(2) We are the branches which bear fruit according as we abide in the Vine (John 15). Just as the gardener prunes and purges a tree so that it may bring forth more fruit, so there are afflictions in this life which are only God's way of increasing our fruitfulness. The branches which draw most sustenance from the vine are the most productive, so the soul which keeps most faithfully the Lord's commandments abides the most in His love and is most fruitful.

(3) We are the grain of wheat which comes to fruit, if it dies (Joh 12:24-25). In the first place, the Master alludes to His own death. But the second reference of the figure is to the essential principle of ethical life—'Die to live.'

To Hegel, ‘the great aphorism (of Joh_12:25), in which the Christian ethics and theology may be said to be summed up, is no mere epigrammatic saying, whose self-contradiction is not to be regarded too closely; it is rather the first distinct, though as yet undeveloped, expression of the exact truth as to the nature of spirit. The true interpretation of the maxim—“Die to live,”—is, that the individual must die to an isolated life,—*i.e.* a life for and in himself, a life in which the immediate satisfaction of desire as his desire is an end in itself,—in order that he may live the spiritual life, the universal life which really belongs to him as a spiritual or self-conscious being’ (Edward Caird, *Hegel*, p. 213).

(4) We are the husbandmen, who are expected to tend the Vineyard (Luke 20), and to make it fruitful, and to yield up a proportion of the fruit at rightful times to the Lord of the vineyard. The original application of the parable is, doubtless, to the scribes and the chief priests who rejected Jesus, but it is equally applicable to any who think they can do as they please with their life and ignore all obligations to the Giver and Lord.

(5) We are the trees which are known by their fruit (Mat_7:20). Men do not gather grapes from thorns, or figs from thistles. A tree which is true to its nature and to its destiny brings forth its appropriate fruit. Man, who is by nature a child of God and by destiny an heir of Heaven, should produce the fruit of the Spirit of God.

Literature.—For 1 and 2 see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible and *Encyc. Bibl.* art. ‘Fruit.’ For 3, *Expos. Times* viii. [1897] 403 f., ix. [1898] 211 ff.; *Expositor* ii. vii. [1884] 121 ff.; Maclaren, *Holy of Holies*, 168-189; Hull, *Sermons*, i. 51 ff.; A. Murray, *Abide in Christ*, 30 ff., 140 ff.; Macmillan, *Bible Teachings in Nature*, 174 ff.

H. Herbert Snell.

☞ Fulfilment

FULFILMENT.—The primary meaning of the English word ‘fulfil’ is simply *to fill*—by a pleonasm, *to fill (until) full*. We find this use in literature—

‘Is not thy brain’s rich hive

Fulfilled with honey?’ (Donne).

Sometimes it is imitated even in modern English, though only by a deliberate archaism. For with us ‘fulfil’ is specialized to mean not literal material filling, but the

carrying out into act of some word—some promise, threat, hope, command, etc. When the Authorized Version was made, ‘fulfil,’ according to the great *Oxford Dictionary*, meant ‘fill,’ and *began to be used* by the translators in its remoter sense on the pattern of the Vulgate, which wrote (unclassically) *implere* and *adimplere* for Heb. מִלֵּא. Thus the transition from one sense to the other, or the metaphor of *filling* for *fulfilling*, is Hebrew. But in Greek, too, it is possible that the same metaphor sprang up independently of Hebrew influence; cf. classical references (under πληροῦν) in Cremer, also in Liddell and Scott (πληροῦν, ii. 5). In OT the usage is not very common. Possibly the earliest instance, chronologically, is Jer 44:25. What the Jews in Egypt have *said*, they *do*. Their threat to practise idolatry is not left an *empty* word; it is filled out, or filled up, in action. At Psa 20:5 we have the word used of answers to prayer: ‘Jehovah fulfil all thy petitions’; the empty vessel, as it were, standing to receive the Divine supplies. For ‘fulfilling law’ or ‘fulfilling a command’ there is no proper authority in OT, though Authorized and Revised Versions at times introduces the term (Psa 148:8; literally, the forces of nature ‘do’ God’s word). In 1Ki 2:27; 1Ki 8:15; 1Ki 8:24 we have the most important usage of all, the ‘fulfilling’ of the prophetic word or prediction. The passages referred to are marked by modern scholarship as Deuteronomic. We may therefore probably conclude that the theological conception of ‘fulfilling’ is part of the religious language of that great forward movement in OT history, the Deuteronomic reform. Along with these theological applications מִלֵּא may mean ‘fill’ anywhere in the OT. And so in NT (πληροῦν chiefly): in the parable of the Drag-net (Mat 13:48), the net is ‘filled’ with all kinds of fish; Mat 23:32, ‘Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers.’ More generally, however, the word bears its derivative sense, and has a theological application. Though rare in OT, the usage is quite common in NT, very noticeably, of fulfilled prophecy, in the First Gospel. A beginning of differentiation or specification is made in the NT in this respect, that while πληροῦν may mean ‘fill,’ the simpler but kindred form πιμπλάναι [others assume πλήθω as root form] never means ‘fulfil.’

A second metaphor underlies מִלֵּא. This is probably still later theological language. It means specially the fulfilling of prediction. We find it in Ezr 1:1 = 2Ch 36:22. According to Bertholet (on Ezr .c.; he refers to Dan 12:7 also), ‘Fulfilment ranks simply as the of the prophetic word, which, once spoken, enters among the powers of the real world and gradually works itself out.’ This word and metaphor are also common in NT. Sometimes we have τελεῖν and cognates; though here again there is a tendency (less marked, however, than with πληροῦν in contrast to πιμπλάναι) to

prefer a more specialized or technical term—τελειοῦν, τελειώσις. God's work is by the prophetic word, but till the fact matches the promise.

A third term and metaphor are of some moment in OT, but scarcely enter into NT—םקִיף, βεβαιοῦν. (God's promise may seem to be tottering to its fall,—He will buttress it; support it). See Jer_29:10, Isa_44:26, Rom_15:8; but in the Gospels only Mar_16:20 'confirming ... with signs following.' (How fully this is a synonym for מָלַךְ we see when we note the usage of מָלַךְ at 1Ki_1:14). מָשַׁב, lit. 'return' or 'reward,' occurs by an extension of meaning at Isa_44:26; Isa_44:28 for 'fulfil'; not imitated in NT. Also, as already implied, Authorized and Revised Versions sometimes introduces 'fulfil' or 'be fulfilled' where the original has merely 'do' or 'be.' And we cannot say that this is illegitimate. A very important passage is the last clause of Mat_5:18 Authorized Version ; but RV [Note: Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885.] 'till all things be accomplished' [to mark the contrast with πληρῶσαι, Mat_5:17. See below—4.—on both verses.]

We have then to look chiefly to מָלַךְ, πληροῦν, while not forgetting other forms. And the question may be raised, whether the NT writers were alive to the implication of steady quantitative growth towards fulfilment? Or had the original suggestions of quantity and of continuousness passed away,—was there assumed a mere between the word and its fulfilment? (If one pours water into a vessel, it fills degrees. But if one is fitting together a ball-and-socket joint, the socket is empty at one moment, full at the next. The two correspond, but their correspondence is not reached by gradual growth). We shall have to distinguish in this as in other respects between different senses of πληροῦν (or its synonyms).

1. Fulfilment of time. Here, if anywhere, we may expect to find the ideas of continuity and gradualness. Now 'fulfil' is constantly used in the OT of the elapsing of a given time—alike in Hebrew, Greek, and English; or, in NT, alike in Greek and English. It is used of the period of a woman's gestation (e.g. Gen_25:24; πληρόω, LXX Septuagint ; Luk_1:57; Luk_2:6—πιμπλάναι; Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'fulfilled' in all 3 cases). There is no more striking or more frequently noted parable of

The slow sweet hours that bring us all things good,

The slow sad hours that bring us all things ill;

or sometimes, as George Eliot has expressed it in *Adam Bede*, of ‘swift hurrying shame,’ ‘the bitterest of life’s bitterness.’ But the word is also used of other measured times—of periods fixed by OT law (e.g. Luk 2:21-22, *πιμπλάναι*, Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘fulfilled’; cf. Lev 12:4, *קָבַץ* (Qal); LXX Septuagint *πληρόω*). From such usages as these, we pass on to times of Divine fulfilment. ‘The fulness of the time came’ (*τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου*), Gal 4:4. And our Lord’s own message is summed up in Mar 1:15 : ‘The time is fulfilled (*πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς*) and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye and believe in the gospel.’ (Probably secondary in comparison with Mat 4:17, ‘Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand’; yet thoroughly significant of Biblical and primitive Christian beliefs, cf. Isa 61:2, Luk 4:19). The idea is, that God has fixed a time, ‘His own good time,’ as our pious phrase runs. (Is that a misquotation of Isa 60:22? Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘in *its* time’; Authorized Version [same sense; archaic English] ‘in his time’). The number seventy (70 years of exile, Jer 25:11 [Jer 29:10], cf. Dan 9:2; Dan 9:24) was specially important for this conception of a fixed period Divinely appointed. Yet we have signs that the ‘time’ or its ‘fulness’ is not, for the Bible writers, mechanically predetermined. The eschatological discourse (Mat 24:22 = Mar 13:20) tells us that the time of trouble, at the world’s end, shall be cut *short* out of mercy to God’s people. [Lk. omits, and inserts a reference to ‘times of the Gentiles’ which must be ‘fulfilled,’ Luk 21:24.] And it is possible that another popular religious phrase—the ‘hastening’ of God’s kingdom—may have Biblical warrant. It appears at Isa 60:22 [quoted above]. But when (as Marti advises) we refer back to Isa 5:19, we find that the word ‘hasten’ was introduced originally to express the temper of a sneerer—‘Let God hurry up, if He is really going to act [and not simply talk].’ So that ‘hasten,’ when used at Isa 60:22, may have come to mean no more than ‘fulfil.’ Cf. also Hab 2:4; 2Pe 3:4-9. Still, when the fulness of a Divinely appointed time is spoken of, all these qualifications drop out of sight. In some sense a period of time is Divinely ordained; and efflux time brings the day when God acts. Fulfilment of *time* is not indeed identical with fulfilment of God’s *promise* [or threat]. The first is a *condition* of the second. In regard to the first, at least, the quantitative sense of ‘fulfil’ is maintained in clear consciousness. (‘My time is not yet fulfilled,’ Joh 7:8 = ‘mine hour is not yet come,’ Joh 2:4).

2. *Fulfilment of joy* (*πληρόω*). Here again there is an ambiguity. When St. Paul says (Php 2:2) ‘Fulfil ye my joy,’ what does he mean? Is it (1) ‘Complete my happiness; unless I hear of your being thoroughly at one, I cannot be perfectly happy’? or (2) does he mean, ‘I have sacrificed many ordinary sources of happiness; give me this my chosen joy’? Authorities seem to prefer the first; perhaps, ‘complete the joy I already have in you.’ That is, ‘fulfilment’ of ‘joy’ is taken as a quantitative and continuous

idea. Elsewhere the phrase is peculiarly Johannine (Joh 3:29; Joh 15:11; Joh 16:24; Joh 17:13, with 1Jn 1:4, 2Jn 1:12). The Baptist, e.g. (Joh 3:29), has *his joy in full*. He has *all* the joy he *can expect*. Yet there is more than this in the words. He has full joy—‘rejoiceth greatly.’ In the Johannine passages the *two* thoughts seem included: the joy (Christ’s joy, e.g.) is given; and what is given is a full joy. So prominent is the latter thought—the more quantitative—that one is tempted to regard Authorized Version ‘full’ as a better rendering, in regard to *joy*, than the more literal ‘fulfilled’ of Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 .

3. *Fulfilment of prophecy or of Scripture or of Christ’s words* (usually πληροῶ, Mat 1:22 and very often; Mar 15:28 [doubtful text]; Luk 1:20, Joh 12:38 and elsewhere. In Christ’s words, Mat 26:54; Mat 26:56 [a ‘doublet’] = Mar 14:49 [Luk 22:53 has not the word]; Luk 4:21; Luk 21:22; Luk 24:44; cf. Luk 9:31 ‘his decease’; Luk 21:24 ‘times of the Gentiles’; Luk 22:16 the Passover ‘fulfilled in the kingdom of God’; Joh 13:18; Joh 15:25 and elsewhere. But τελειῶ, Joh 19:28. There is perhaps a slight difference in meaning—not the *word* of Scripture verified, but the terrible *things* spoken of in Scripture made actual—when we have τελέω at Luk 18:31; Luk 22:37. Purely in the sense of ‘fulfilment,’ perhaps, at Joh 19:28; Joh 19:30. συντελέω occurs Mar 13:4; the noun συντέλεια [τοῦ αἰῶνος ‘end of the world,’ (Revised Version margin) ‘consummation of the age’] in Mt.’s, Mat 24:3, and also at Mat 13:39-40, Mat 28:20. [Heb 9:26, συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων ‘end of the ages,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ; marg. ‘consummation’]. τελειῶ [Authorized Version ‘finish,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘accomplish’] is used in the Johannine discourses of Christ’s work [ἔργον, Joh 4:34; Joh 17:4] or works [Joh 5:36, cf. again Joh 19:30]). As far as the words rendered ‘fulfil’ are concerned, they are used in the same sense throughout; whether the fulfilment is of the past (the OT) in the present (Christ), or of the present (Christ’s words) in the (eschatological) future. And several Greek words are fairly represented by the same English meaning. Moreover, for a full index of the Scripture teaching we should need to include passages like Luk 24:25-27, where no word ‘fulfil’ occurs. (But we have it in Luk 24:44). This holds especially of the fulfilment of Christ’s own words. It is true, the word as well as the thought, occurs in the Fourth Gospel (Joh 18:9; Joh 18:32), but in the Synoptics the phrasing is different. The nearest approach is Mar 13:30 ||, ‘until all [these] things be accomplished (γένηται)—a difficult passage, discussed below (under ‘Fulfilment of law’). We must lay down, in general, that the NT thinks of fulfilment as occurring in detailed mechanical correspondence with the letter of prediction. God has said so-and-so, therefore it must happen exactly as was said. In Joh 19:28 it is difficult to take any other view of the Evangelist’s meaning than that

Jesus exclaimed 'I thirst,' because the Passion psalms had spoken of the cruel thirst of the Sufferer. We must not, of course, exaggerate the simplicity of the Bible writers. A few verses earlier, where Joh 18:9 interprets Jesus' protection of His disciples, at the moment of His own arrest, as the fulfilment of the word which He spake, 'Of those whom thou hast given me I lost not one,' the Evangelist knows perfectly, and trusts his readers to remember, that the true sense of Christ's words belongs to a different region. In that one instance, at least, he is consciously accommodating, as we might do in quoting a line of Shakspeare. And there is more. The Evangelist discerns in Christ's care for the disciples a type of the supreme spiritual transaction. Even outwardly, Christ saves others, while not saving but sacrificing Himself. Still, in general, the letter of the NT takes the letter of the OT as a magic book, foreshowing what must happen to Christ. Deeper views are no doubt latent in the NT, but they are nowhere formulated by it. They do not rise to the surface of consciousness in Evangelist or Apostle.

4. *Fulfilment of law [and prophets?]. [Fulfilment generally?]* The interpretation here raises very difficult questions, hardly to be settled without some critical surgery. First let us take what is simple; to 'fulfil' the Law is to obey it—*τελεῖν*—at Rom 2:27,

Jam 2:8; or *πληροῦν*, Gal 5:14, Rom 13:8; Rom 13:10. (On these last, see below).

Unambiguous, too, is 'to fulfil all righteousness' (*πληροῦσαι*, Mat 3:15); and the saying may well be historical, though unsupported in the parallels. It fits the circumstances (see present writer's paper on 'Dawn of Messianic Consciousness' in *Expos. Times*, 1905, p. 215), if perhaps tinged in expression with the Evangelist's phraseology. But what of Mat 5:17 ('Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets; I came not to destroy but to fulfil'—*πληροῦσαι*)? (a) Much has been written on this subject since the present writer discussed the passage in *Christ and the Jewish Law*, 1886. Even more decidedly than then, he must insist that if Mat 5:18—and especially if Mat 5:19—is a genuine part of Christ's discourse, we are shut up to understand 'fulfil' in the sense of 'obey' (so Cremer's *Lexicon*, bracketing Mat 5:17 with Mat 3:15). But (b) the case for omitting Mat 5:18—with its Pharisaic aspect, its at least seemingly exaggerated canonization of the whole letter of the Pentateuch—is being very strongly pressed to-day (e.g. Votaw, art. 'Sermon on the Mount' in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible*, Ext. Vol.). If Mat 5:18 [some would say Mat 5:18-19] be a gloss [or belong properly to a different context in a somewhat different form], we may render 'not to destroy but to *perfect* the law,'—raising it to its ideal height of purity, and carrying it to its ideal depth of inwardness. This view probably holds the field at present. It goes well with Mat 5:21, etc., where our Lord, in a series of brilliant paradoxes, sweeps away the mere letter of the OT [? or the legal glosses added to it by 'scribes and Pharisees' (Mat 5:20)]. But there are difficulties. It is 'hard' to think that our Lord ever exercised the supposed conscious detailed

intellectual criticism of the OT as such (so the late A. B. Davidson, in conversation with the present writer's informant). And would He have called His paradoxes a 'perfected' law? They are at least as like a 'destruction' of the *régime* of law! Moreover, we have the reference to the 'prophets.' (c) When 'fulfil' is predicated of 'prophecy,' the sense is well known; the 'prophets' become the predominant partner in such a juxtaposition as 'to fulfil *law and prophets*'; and we have to think of the OT's moral lawgiving as a sort of type, fulfilled, when the word of the prophets is fulfilled, in Christ's person. [*Christ and the Jewish Law* tried in a particular way to carry through this meaning of 'fulfil']. 'Law and prophets' repeatedly occur together in Christ's words, esp. in Mt. (also at [Mat 7:12](#), [Mat 22:40](#), [Mat 11:13](#) = [Luk 16:16](#), cf. [Luk 24:44](#)). We can hardly doubt that our Lord Himself used the expression; and it is probable, too, that He used it as a general designation for the OT. Still, it is conceivable that *the Evangelist* has brought in the phrase here. A further measure of critical surgery would then dismiss (c), and leave the field so far to (a) and (b). But (d) we might raise a new possibility, either by exegesis, or if necessary by a minor form of critical excision. We might take [Mat 5:17](#) b either as spoken here in pure abstraction—'I am not a destroyer but a fulfiller'—or as originally a separate *logion* worked into this context by the Evangelist.

In view of these rival interpretations one might turn for help to the Epistles. For, especially on ethical points, the teaching of Christ visibly moulds St. Paul's inculcation again and again. And in this way we might learn how the earliest Church understood its Lord's words. [Gal 5:14](#) and [Rom 13:8-10](#) [see above], while their use of *πληρόω* suggests [Mat 5:17](#), refer in substance rather to [Mat 22:35-40](#) [Mark's ||, ([Mar 12:31](#)) omits the very element which lives in the Epistles—love to God and man not only the chief duty but *the whole of duty*. In this case the Epistles decidedly support Mt.'s tradition. In Luke ([Luk 10:27](#)) we have an unwarranted suggestion that *the scribes* had already woven together [Deu 6:5](#) with [Lev 19:18](#). Thus Luke's tradition here seems still less exact. On Christ's originality in this matter, comp. Montefiore in *Hibbert Journal*, Apr. 1905]. Commentators seem to take [Gal 5:14](#)—'all the law is fulfilled (*πληροῦται*) in one word, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself'—as parallel not to [Rom 13:9](#) ('all the law is summed up—*ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται*—in Thou shalt love thy neighbour,' etc.), but rather to [Rom 13:8](#); [Rom 13:10](#), 'Love *πεπλήρωκε*—is the *πλήρωμα* of the law.' St. Paul then takes fulfil = obey, as in (a), above. But does St. Paul's language really support (a)? Is there not something more than *obeying law* in the Pauline thought of 'fulfilment' ([Rom 8:4](#))? The requirement—*δικαίωμα*—of the Law is fulfilled in those who walk not after the flesh but after the spirit. The utmost we can say is that *πληρόω*, in the sense of 'fulfil,' had been given such currency in the Greek version of our Lord's words that St. Paul instinctively weaves it in when he is quoting

another passage. Thus, after all, the evidence of the Epistles as to the original meaning of Mat 5:17 is neutral, or at any rate not decisive.

Summary.—In Mat 5:17, then, Christ claims either (a) to render a perfect obedience to law, or (b) to perfect the moral lawgiving of the OT, or (c) to fulfil absolutely the ideals of the OT generally, or (d) to be in general a fulfiller rather than a destroyer. (a) is not without evidence in its support. (b) is perhaps most generally popular. (c) we are inclined to regard as due to the mistaken intrusion in Mat 5:17 of [‘law] and prophets,’—words doubtless used by Christ (of the OT as a whole?) in other connexions. (d) was on the whole supported in the above discussion—if necessary, at the cost of regarding Mat 5:17 b as by rights an independent *logion*. (We have not discussed the extravagant suggestion that there was no Sermon on the Mount in Christ’s ministry at all).

Mat 5:18. We have quoted with sympathy a suggestion that this verse ought to be struck out of the context of Matthew 5. But there is no ground for denying that it represents one of the sayings of Jesus. We have Luke’s ||, Luk 16:17; and, besides that, all three Synoptics have a similar phrase in the eschatological chapter. There they coincide almost to a word—‘This generation shall not pass away till all [these] things be accomplished [γενηται]. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away’ (Mat 24:34-35 = Mar 13:30-31 = Luk 21:32-33). This (as has often been pointed out) must surely be an alternative version of the *logion* Mat 5:18. According to Matthew 5, Christ spoke of the perpetuity of the Law; according to Matthew 24, of the assured truth of His own words. We must note the presence of 3 corresponding clauses in each of the two passages: heaven and earth passing away—all things being accomplished—a Divine word not ‘passing away.’ In Mat 5:18 the first two elements jar against each other. The same sentence contains two limits—two clauses each beginning ἕως ἄν. In that respect Mat 24:34-35 shows to better advantage, and can advance the stronger claim to rank as the original. On the other hand, the verses in ch. 24 are themselves exceedingly difficult. It is no mere blind conservatism which hesitates to believe that our Lord pledged His supernatural knowledge for the conclusion of the world’s story within a generation. The words, as we have them, mean that and nothing else; and it is surely incredible that Jesus should have so erred. We do not deny that He may have expected the end shortly; there is at least a strong NT tradition, direct and indirect, that He did. We do say that He could not stake everything, with the very greatest emphasis, upon—a date! which besides was a *mistaken* date. B. W. Bacon’s solution is attractive—that the original *logion* referred to the *word of God*, but not specifically *either* to the OT law or to the Master’s own words, though different lines of tradition insisted on one or the other identification.

5. *'Fulfilment' in general.—Some individual passages.* (a) Luk_1:1 speaks of the things 'fulfilled' among us (πεπληροφορημένων; perf. particip. from a derivative of πληρόω, or at least of πλήρης). The connexion with v. 4—'the certainty of those things wherein,' etc.—makes Authorized Version's rendering tempting; 'things ... most surely believed.' But authority favours the rendering 'fulfilled.' Not, however, in the sense of 'Divinely fulfilled.' In these, the most classical verses from St. Luke's pen, we must look rather to classical models; and we should probably take 'fulfilled' as meaning 'fully accomplished.' So Holtzmann; or Adeney—'Luke will record complete transactions, a finished story.' Probably, therefore, there is nothing to be made of this passage. (b) In Luk_22:37 we read (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), 'This which is written must be fulfilled (τελεσθῆναι) in me, And he was reckoned with transgressors; for that which concerneth me hath fulfilment' (τέλος ἔχει). Here there is room for difference of opinion. Holtzmann is respectful to the passage—a 'valuable separate tradition of Luke's,'—but doubts whether the individual verse is a genuine saying of the Lord's. And he takes it as *meaning* merely that death, or *the end*, is hurrying near; on the analogy of Mar_3:26—Satan if divided against himself 'hath an end.' On the other hand, Adeney, like the Revisers (apparently), thinks that Divine fulfilment is pointed to here. It is an interesting possibility. We can hardly say more. (c) If the suggestion offered above—(d)—regarding Mat_5:17 b should be adopted—if that were originally a separate *logion*, or if, at any rate, it was spoken quite *in general*—then the central Gospel passage on 'fulfilment' gives us a general point of view, in the Master's own words.

Any of these individual passages, if such an interpretation as we have discussed is warrantable, centres round the idea of the fulfilment of prophecy; though Mat_5:17 b would mean something broader or something profounder than what the letter of the NT generally attains to. It will be interesting if we can regard such broader and profounder teaching as coming directly from our Master.

Different senses of 'fulfilment' reviewed again. These do not to any great extent correspond to different Greek words. To *fulfil* joy is πληρόω (usually in the passive), to *complete* joy, but (sometimes at least, we thought) to *give* joy in its *fulness*. To *fulfil* time (again usually a passive) is also πληρόω, but might be the kindred πιμπλάναι, which is used even in NT in the less theological applications. The appointed time—whatever authority enacted it—is now *full*. To *fulfil* Scripture—or *prophets' words*, etc.—is indifferently πληρόω (or cognates, possibly once πιμπλάναι, Luk_21:22 v.l.; and possibly, but not probably, once πληροφορέω, Luk_1:1; see above, 5), or τελέω (or cognate τελειώω; once τέλος ἔχειν); nor should we forget γίνομαι in

construction. To *fulfil law* in the Epistles is τελέω or πληρόω. In the Gospels we have πληρόω in kindred applications—once, ‘to fulfil righteousness’; and once, in the great passage, as we were inclined to think, in a purely general sense, ‘to fulfil.’ But see above, 4. Cf. further in Epistles πληροφορέω, ‘to fulfil one’s ministry,’ 2Ti 4:5; ‘fully to proclaim the message,’ τὸ κήρυγμα, 2Ti 4:17.

Can we unify these leading senses? Probably not; probably not any two. They are, of course, connected, especially the first three. It is God who gives joy in fulness, God who ordains times, God who keeps His promise. At His own time His keeping of promise fills His people with joy. Nay more; the fourth sense is also near of kin. Christ, the fulfiller of all promises, is also, on any view of particular passages, the supreme pattern of obedience, and the author of new obedience in others. But the word ‘fulfil’ probably does not occur *on the same ground* in any two of the senses discriminated above. There is, in some cases, an idea of fulness as against half fulness (of time, or of joy; two different fulnesses, therefore). In others (prophecy, or law) there is a mere idea of correspondence—fulness against emptiness, so to speak—the act answering to the word (but answering it in two different ways).

Fulfilment: modern theological study. The central subject is fulfilment of prophecy. (It has also the most passages). Modern study of ‘Prophecy and Fulfilment’—title of a book by von Hofmann—brings out a truth which (unless possibly adumbrated in our Lord’s words, Mat 5:17 b) is nowhere formulated in Scripture. Fulfilment is not only *like* what prediction expected, but is also in some ways *different*, because the prophets’ partial wisdom was not adequate to the *full* splendour of the *fulfilment*. Christ, in so far as He differs from the Messianic portrait of the OT, is not lesser but greater spiritually; He *necessarily* differs. It is true, some elements of the fulfilment are transferred to Christian eschatology. As yet they are unfinished things. But if the First Advent differed (for the better) from the letter of expectation, we may infer that there are symbolical or metaphorical elements in the prophetic pictures of the Second Advent and eschatology. All this, while not formulated in the NT, is learned by believing study of the phenomena of Scripture, and is our age’s proper contribution to the conception of fulfilment. The main lines of expectation fulfilled in Christ are perhaps three: (1) The hope of the Messianic King (Is 9 is the great passage)—most important, not because of its intrinsic spiritual depth (in that respect it did not stand very high), but from what we may call its dogmatic sharpness, and its emphasis in the NT age. It lent the Christian Church its first creed—viz. that ‘Jesus is Christ.’ It was fulfilled only through the transference of Christ’s royalty from temporal to exalted, or from present to future conditions. (2) There is the hope of God’s own coming to His people in person, Isa 40:10—and throughout Isaiah 40-55. This pointed strongly to Christ’s Godhead. (3) There is the type or ideal of the Suffering Servant, included in

Isaiah 40-55 (also in Psalms 22 and others), chiefly at Isa 52:13 to Isa 53:12. This teaching furnished Christian theology with its deepest elements. We can also now explain what amount of truth is conveyed by the idea of 'double fulfilments.' When the historical reference of a prophecy is to some lesser or earlier personage than Christ Jesus, yet if that person is important in the history of God's purpose, the *same principle* may be fulfilled partially in him which is (ultimately) more perfectly fulfilled in Christ. Thus we may have a multiple, a repeated fulfilment of great principles; yet all pointing on to Christ as the grand or absolute Fulfiller. We *do not* affirm a great cryptogram, with designed artful ambiguity. The prophetic human speaker did not mean two (and just two) sets of events. He meant one event. But his words were capable of meaning many. And something in his spiritual messages corresponds to Christ more than to Christ's forerunner. Again, individual or detailed fulfilments have their own subordinate place. Some indeed may be rather a play of pious fancy than a serious argument. The OT is full of plays upon words; and the NT citations of 'I called my son out of Egypt,' and of 'He shall be called a Nazarene' (Mat 2:15; Mat 2:23), are probably of this sort—things that carried more weight in Judaea long ago than they can possibly carry now. At times the resemblance to the OT is—innocently and unconsciously—filled out. The exact reproduction of Psa 22:8, which we find at Mat 27:43, is unknown to the earlier narrative of Mark. Where the matter is of some weight (e.g. probably the birth at Bethlehem), its chief importance is that it emphasizes or advertises the deeper analogies and correspondences in virtue of which Christ fulfils—and, may we say, transcends—the spirit or the religion of the OT; alike *in Himself* and *in His gospel*.

Literature.—See the Lexicons; also the following two articles, and the Commentaries. On Mat 5:17, etc., see further the present writer's *Christ and the Jewish Law*, 1886; works on the Sermon on the Mount (B. W. Bacon; Votaw, in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, Ext. Vol., and literature there quoted). On the fulfilment of *prophecy*, modern works by von Hofmann, Riehm (Muirhead's translation), A. B. Davidson, Woods (*The Hope of Israel*), etc. On the eschatological discourse, Schwartzkopff's *Prophecies of Jesus Christ* (English translation).

R. Mackintosh.

☩ Fulness

FULNESS (πλήρωμα).—The Gr. word is used in the Gospels in its natural, physical sense in Mat 9:16, Mar 2:21; Mar 6:43; Mar 8:20. It has a definite theological meaning in Joh 1:16 [the only place in the Gospels where it is translation 'fulness']. In the Epistles it is used: of time, to denote the period that fills up a certain epoch

(Eph 1:10, Gal 4:4; see Fulness of Time); of persons, the full number required to make up a definite figure (Rom 11:12; Rom 11:25); of measure, to indicate the full capacity, the entire content (1Co 10:26; 1Co 10:28, Rom 15:29), also this may be said to be its meaning in Rom 13:10 where love is spoken of as the *πλήρωμα νόμου*. The word has also a definite theological meaning in Col 1:19; Col 2:9, Eph 1:23; Eph 3:19; Eph 4:13. The central conception of the word, wherever used, seems to be *completeness*, the totality of the things spoken of, that which binds them into a symmetrical whole. Even when it is the latest addition that is indicated as the *πλήρωμα*, the word refers back to the beginning, and signifies the completeness effected by the addition. Thus in the passages in St. Matthew and St. Mark which refer to the sewing of the new patch on the old garment, it is not the patch that is the *πλήρωμα*, it is the completeness that results from the patch; and, as Lightfoot correctly points out, the idea meant to be conveyed is the paradox that it is this very completeness which makes the garment incomplete. A false show of wholeness is worse than an open rent,—an idea entirely in accordance with the method of the teaching of Jesus.

The theological meaning of *πλήρωμα* in St. John's Gospel must be taken in connexion with its use in St. Paul's Epistles. Granted the authenticity of the Epistles and the Gospel, St. John must have written more than a quarter of a century later, and must have addressed practically the same circle as that which St. Paul had in view in writing to the Colossians and the Ephesians. It is clear that St. Paul is dealing with the word in a technical sense as a word which is familiar to his opponents, but is used by him in a sense different from theirs; and St. John's use of the term is exactly similar. The *πλήρωμα* represented a leading thought in the Gnostic heresy, of which we find the first germs referred to in the vigorous polemic of St. Paul. Gnosticism was further developed by Cerinthus, a contemporary of St. John, and reached its culmination in the fully elaborated system of Valentinus. The problem with which these Gnostic heresiarchs were continually wrestling was one that is as old as human thought—how to pass from the infinite to the finite, and reconcile absolute good with the existence of evil. The details of the earlier systems with which the Apostles had to deal are unknown to us, but in the speculations of Valentinus, as preserved in the writings of the early Fathers, especially the *Philosophoumena* of Hippolytus, we have a system in which philosophical conceptions are clothed in Oriental imagery, and an attempt is made to give a consistent explanation of the mysteries of Creation, Sin, and Redemption.

From the Absolute Being or the Abysmal Depth, there issued twin emanations, having each a relative being in itself, but each pair, as they receded from the primal source of existence, had fainter traces of the pure Divine spirit. These emanations are

personifications of the Divine attributes, and in their totality constitute the realm of pure spirit—the *τλήρωμα* of the Godhead. Opposed to the *πλήρωμα* is the *κένωμα*, the *emptiness*, the realm of matter and material things, the shadow-world as against the world of reality. It is the philosophical distinction between the noumenal and the phenomenal, the realm of archetypal ideas and the objects of sense perception, with a moral significance imparted into it. In the *κενωμα*, the thirty aeons of the *τλήρωμα* have their material counterpart, presided over by the Demiurge or Creator, who has no organic relation to the spiritual realm. This world of chaos and ancient night receives from the *τλήρωμα* a spiritual principle, reducing it to a semblance of order, in the person of Sophia Achamoth, an emanation from the Sophia of the spiritual realm. The higher Sophia, the latest of the aeons, and the furthest removed from the Absolute, had been consumed with a desire to reach upwards to the Primal Glory, and to emulate the Uncreated by giving birth to another aeon. The result was an abortion,—a being spiritual in essence but out of harmony with the *τλήρωμα*,—which was cast forth from the spiritual realm and found a place of exile in the *κενωμα*. Here Sophia Achamoth imparted of her essence to the aeons of the void, and thus introduced a spiritual principle which was capable of redemption. To those who had in them this spiritual essence Christ was sent, each of the aeons contributing something of its own perfection to fit Him for His errand. The aeon Christ entered into the man Jesus, and through Him effected the redemption of those spiritual beings who were involved in the lower realm of matter, but who had received quickening through the infusion of the spiritual principle into the *κενωμα*.

What degree of elaboration this fantastic theory had reached in the age of St. Paul, and still later in that of St. John, there is not now material to decide; but there are distinct traces of it in the Epistle to the Colossians in the reference to principalities, dominions, and powers (Col 1:16); and we know that Cerinthus, a contemporary of St. John, thought out the religious problem on very similar lines, and used the word *pleroma* in a similar sense. We are to regard the use of the term, then, by the two Apostles as an assertion of the true doctrine of the *pleroma* as against a false doctrine which had wide currency. In the Logos, who became incarnate in Jesus Christ, the whole *pleroma* of the Godhead is contained. Jesus was not the last of the aeons, created as an afterthought. He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all created beings (Col 1:15). The long chain of mediators between God and man is relegated to the realm of myth, and the one Mediator, *μονογενής*, full of grace and truth (Joh 1:14), through whom alone God effects His purposes in Creation and Redemption, is held up for the adoration of all men. And this fulness of the Divine, which is in Him through the closeness of His contact with God, is imparted to His disciples (Joh 1:16) and to the Church which is His Body, and which in its ideality is

the fulness of Him who filleth all in all (Eph_1:23). The Church is here regarded as the complement of Jesus. The Head and the Body make one whole—the *pleroma* of the Godhead, the full realization of the Divine purpose which centres in the redemption of man. For through this Church, which on earth possesses the potentiality of the *pleroma*, by means of its varied ministries, the fulness which is in Christ the Head passes to the individual, whose destiny it is to attain to the perfect man, to the possession, in his degree, of the entire *pleroma* of the Godhead.

It is scarcely sufficiently recognized that the NT doctrine of the Church is a philosophy of the Social Organism which embraces all essential human activities (Eph_4:15-16). Our difficulty in apprehending it lies mainly in this, that the Apostles, seeing the temporal in the light of eternity, are constantly confusing the boundary lines which separate the actual from the ideal, the process from the consummation.

Literature.—Lightfoot on *Colossians*; Pressensé, *Heresy and Christian Doctrine*; Neander, *Church History*; Hippolytus, *Philosophoumena*; see also Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Pleroma,' with Literature there quoted.

A. Miller.

☛ Fulness Of The Time

FULNESS OF THE TIME (τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου).—An expression used by St. Paul (Gal_4:4) to mark the opportuneness of the coming of Christ into the world, and the ripeness of the age for the great religious revolution He was to effect. It emphasizes the unique significance of the period as the culmination of a long course of events, by which the way had been providentially prepared for Christ's appearance, and His introduction of a purer type of religion. The evidences of such a providential preparation are indeed remarkable. Along different lines of historical development a situation had been created at the very centre of the world's life, that was singularly favourable to the planting and spread of a loftier faith. The main factors usually recognized as contributing to this result were: (1) the peculiar condition which the Jewish people had reached; (2) the dissemination of the Greek language, culture, and commercial activity; and (3) the unifying influence of Rome.

1. *The peculiar condition of the Jewish people.*—Centuries of chequered discipline had fixed in the Jewish mind the belief in one true and perfectly righteous God, and subsequently to the return from the Exile there had been no relapse into idolatry. Latterly, indeed, through the influence of the scribes and Pharisees, legalism and formality had crept in, and the externalization of religion had been carried far; yet in

many classes of society there was a wistful straining after inner purity and a more living fellowship with God; and in spite of the soulless bondage of ceremonial observances, there was an amount of deep and reverent piety that kept the nation's heart sounder than might appear on the surface. At all events, nowhere else in the world did there exist so vivid a conception of the Divine holiness or so high a recognized standard of morality; nowhere else, therefore, were there so many devout minds ready to receive a new spiritual revelation, or so well fitted to furnish heralds and apostles for its propagation.

Then there was the revival of the Messianic hope, which, kept alive by the pressure of repeated misfortunes, had, under the tightening grip of Roman domination, sprung up with passionate intensity. The political situation was galling, and the Jewish people, pining to be free from the foreign yoke, consoled themselves with the thought of a glorious future. It was a time of high-strung unrest and expectancy; yet although the prospect of political emancipation was to a large extent entertained, there were multitudes of earnest souls yearning for a higher form of deliverance, the dawn of a reign of righteousness and peace, in the benefits of which not Israel only, but the whole world, should share.

Outside Palestine, again, the influence of Jewish religious ideas had been widely extended by means of the Dispersion. Conscious of being raised above the manifold forms of heathen superstition around them, the colonies of Jews settled in the trading cities of foreign lands felt themselves impelled to aspire after a certain elevation of life; while the loftier moral teaching they maintained in their synagogues attracted considerable numbers of proselytes from paganism. Thus the conception of the Divine unity and righteousness was being spread over a large section of the heathen world. So far, therefore, both at home and abroad the Jewish people had fulfilled their mission in the moral and religious preparation of the world for the entrance of Christianity.

2. *The dissemination of the Greek language, culture, and commercial activity.*—Ever since the conquests of Alexander the Great, the Greek tongue had attained supremacy among the civilized nations, and had become the current medium for the exchange of thought. Even the OT had to be rendered into Greek, in the translation known as the Septuagint. Moreover, Greek learning, literature, and speculation exercised a pervasive influence far and near. A significant indication of this is to be found in the rise among the Jews of the Dispersion of a school of thinkers who had imbibed the Greek culture, and who, quickened by the intellectual alertness of the Greek mind, were drawn to take part in the literary productivity of the age. The aim of this Graeco-Jewish school was to make the purer religious faith and knowledge of Israel accessible to the world. With its chief seat at Alexandria, its leading representatives, such as Aristobulus and Philo, endeavoured to show that the Mosaic

law, correctly understood, contained all that the best Greek philosophers had taught. Thus was brought about a mutual action and reaction of Jewish and Greek ideas, and a soil was being made ready for a more elevated spiritual teaching, based on the unity of the Godhead and the eternal obligation of righteousness.

At the same time the commercial enterprise of the Greeks was rapidly overcoming national exclusiveness, and producing a freer intercourse between men of different races. They were the cosmopolitans of the period—inquisitive, openminded, eager to enter into all vivid interests; and in the great trading cities in Asia Minor and along the Mediterranean shore they fostered the spirit of toleration and helped to secure full scope for the advocacy of all forms of belief.

But while thus stimulating intellectual receptiveness everywhere, the most important contribution of the Greeks in the preparation for Christianity was the universal prevalence they gained for their rich and expressive language, inasmuch as by this they supplied a common vehicle of intercourse, calculated to be of immense advantage in the announcement and promulgation of the Christian Evangel.

3. *The unifying influence of Rome.* That the entire known world was then embraced within Rome's imperial sway was a momentous factor in the situation which had been reached. As the barriers of language had been demolished through the influence of the Greeks, so through the influence of the Romans the barriers of nationality had been broken down. The whole world was but one country; and from the Euphrates to the Atlantic there was settled government, order, and the rule of law under one sovereign sceptre. In the lull of national strifes which had thus come—the *pax Romana*—merchant and traveller moved safely from land to land, and by the splendid system of roads for which the Roman Empire was famed, the lines of communication were opened in all directions. In this way Rome had performed its distinctive part by bringing about a political condition of the world hitherto unexampled in history.

Thus the three great races of antiquity had contributed their share towards the fulfilment of a manifestly providential design, and the period had now arrived when their several lines of historical development converged to a meeting-point, producing a combination of circumstances which rendered issues of vast moment possible. As it has been aptly put, 'the City of God is built at the confluence of three civilizations' (Conybeare and Howson's *St. Paul*, i. 2).

It is worthy of note also that the little country of Palestine, where the Founder of Christianity was to appear, lay at the very centre of the then known world; and in view of the fact that through the provision of a common language and free means of movement and intercourse the avenues of access were opened to every land, it

becomes clear that the most signal facilities were afforded for the dissemination of a faith that was destined to wield a world-wide power.

In addition to this, account has to be taken of the decay of the old pagan religions, and the simultaneous influx of Oriental ideas. There was a strange intermingling of races and also of religious beliefs, with the result that men's minds were unsettled, and a spirit of inquiry was awakened among those who had grown dissatisfied with the popular heathen cults.

Manifestly the age was ripe for a new revelation that would meet the deepest needs of the human soul; and in the situation created by the course of Jewish, Greek, and Roman history, the way for it had at length been prepared. Then Jesus Christ appeared. The 'fulness of the time' had come for the advent of the promised Saviour with His Gospel of life and grace for the regeneration of mankind.

Literature.—Ewald, *Hist. of Israel* (English translation), vols. v. and vi.; Hausrath, *The Times of Jesus* (English translation 1888), i.; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii. iii.; Pressensé, *Religions before Christ* (1862); Conybeare and Howson, *St. Paul* (1858), i. 4-14; *Lux Mundi*, 129-178; Edersheim, *Life and Times*, i. 3-108; Farrar, *St. Paul*, i. 115 ff.; Gwatkin, art. 'Roman Empire' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible; Wernle, *Beginnings of Christianity* (English translation 1903), i. 1-36.

G. M'Hardy.

☩ Funeral

FUNERAL.—See Burial, and Tomb.

☩ Furlong

FURLONG.—See Weights and Measures.

☩ Furnace Of Fire

FURNACE OF FIRE.—See Fire, p. 595^a.

Future

FUTURE.—See Eschatology.

Gabbatha

GABBATHA (Γαββαθα) occurs only in Joh_19:13, as the ‘Hebrew’ or, more correctly, Aramaic equivalent of λιθόστρωτος. For the etymology of the word see E. Nestle in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. 74 f., with the literature there cited. The word is apparently connected with a root גבב, of which the fundamental idea is that of *something curved or convex*. Hence it cannot be taken as identical in meaning with λιθόστρωτος, which implies a level tessellated surface. A surface of that kind on the summit of a hill, or with a rounded porch or an open cupola over it, beneath which might permanently stand, or be placed occasionally, the βῆμα or ‘judgment-seat,’ would best meet the conditions of the case. Such a spot might well be known amongst one class of the people (the Romans and their associates) as the Pavement, and amongst another as Gabbatha. The latter name has not yet been found elsewhere than in the NT. For the attempts to identify the locality, and for the usages involved in the reference, see Pavement.

R. W. Moss.

GABRIEL is mentioned in Luke 1 as appearing to Zacharias to announce the future pregnancy of Elisabeth and the birth of John, and to Mary with a similar announcement of the birth of Jesus. To Zacharias he declares that he is wont to stand in the presence of God, and that he is sent by Him on the mission stated. When he is asked for a sign, he is competent to impose the severe sign of dumbness until the fulfilment of the prediction that has been made. The Gospel mention of Gabriel, then, is as a messenger of the signal favour of God, at least in connexion with the Messiah and His forerunner.

He has a somewhat similar function in the only OT passage in which he is mentioned, Daniel 8-10. Daniel was perplexed at the strange vision which he had seen. Pondering over it, he sees one ‘standing before him like the appearance of a man,’ and a voice

is heard bidding Gabriel, for it is he, explain the vision. Daniel falls in a faint as the messenger approaches, and Gabriel lifts him up and explains the mysterious vision. Again he appears to the prophet under similar circumstances, and is now called ‘the man’ Gabriel. Still again Daniel has a similar experience (Dan 10:5 ff.). The details are identical or in harmony with the account in previous chapters, but the name of the messenger is not given. It is, however, generally assumed that the author had Gabriel in mind. He asserts that he is a prince who presides over the interests of Israel, as other supernatural beings preside over other nations.

Gabriel belongs to the creations of the imagination of the Jews in post-exilic times. When God had to them become universal and correspondingly great and glorious, but without parallel spiritualization of His attributes, He was thought to require agents whom He might send as messengers, ‘angels’ to transmit His messages. These angels were at first nameless, later they received names. Gabriel was one of the most important of them—one of four, of seven, of seventy, according to different enumerations in Jewish writings. See *Jewish Encyc. s.v.*

O. H. Gates.

☞ Gadara, Gadarenes

GADARA, GADARENES.—In the Authorized Version in Mar 5:1 and Luk 8:26 Jesus is said to have come into the ‘country of the Gadarenes.’ In the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 this is corrected to ‘Gerasenes.’ On the other hand, the Authorized Version in Mat 8:28 has ‘country of the Gergesenes,’ while the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 has ‘Gadarenes.’ These are the only passages—all referring to the cure of the demoniac and the destruction of the herd of swine—where Gadara is mentioned in Scripture. How the reading Γαδαρηνῶν crept in, or, if original, what exactly it meant, we may not be able to explain satisfactorily, but one thing is certain,—the miracle cannot have taken place at the city of Gadara, the modern *Umm Keis*. For that town stands on a high plateau on the further side of the wide and extremely steep gorge of the Hieromax river, and is about a 3 hours’ ride distant from the Lake. As Thomson says (*L^B [Note: The Land and the Book.]* ii. p. 354), ‘If the miracle was performed at Gadara, then the swine must have run down the mountain for an hour, forded the deep Jarmuk (Hieromax), ascended its northern bank, and raced across the level plain several miles before they could reach (the nearest margin of the lake—a feat which no herd of swine would be likely to achieve even though they were “possessed.”’ In short, no one who has *seen* the position of Gadara would ever dream of locating the miracle there. See Gerasenes.

Gain

GAIN.—The word ‘gain’ occurs ten times in the Authorized Version of the Gospels, and on every occasion in one of the sayings of our Lord. These passages fall into three groups: (1) The parallel records of a saying repeated by all the Synoptists (Mat 16:26, Luk 9:25, Mar 8:36); (2) the parables of the Talents and the Pounds (Mat 25:17; Mat 25:20; Mat 25:22, Luk 19:15-16; Luk 19:18); (3) the single record of the saying in Mat 18:13. It is (with the exception of St. Luke’s use of διαπραγματεύομαι, προσεργάζομαι, and ποιέ in the parable of the Pounds) always a translation of ΚΕΡΔΑΙΝΩ.

This verb and its cognate substantive κέρδος are used elsewhere in the NT by St. Paul (1Co 9:19-22, Php 1:21; Php 3:7-8, Tit 1:11), St. Peter (1Pe 3:1), and St. Luke (Act 27:21, a peculiar use, but not without classical parallels).

1. Mat 16:26 (|| cf. Php 3:7; Php 1:21) contrasts gain and loss as they touch the direct personal relation of the soul to God. A man may count the world a thing to be gained, and give his soul as the price of it; or, with the wiser Apostle, may reckon communion with Christ a gain worth the sacrifice of everything else; or, rising to the vision of the great beatitude, may look for the supreme gain, something better even than living here in Christ, to the life beyond the grave. This is the mystic’s conception of religion—‘I and God are alone in the world.’ All gain apart from union with the Divine is really loss; and loss, or what seems loss, incurred in achieving that union is gain. ‘Qui invenit Jesum,’ says Thomas à Kempis, ‘invenit thesaurum bonum; immo bonum, super omne bonum.’ The thought finds its simplest and at the same time its fullest expression in the parables of the Hidden Treasure and the Pearl of Great Price, whose finder sells ‘with joy’ all that he has, to buy what he has discovered.

2. The parables of the Talents and the Pounds express the gain to character which comes of faithful use of powers and abilities. The thought is of the realization of the possibilities that are in man and the subsequent fitness for higher work. Here the gain depends less on sacrifice than on diligence and faithfulness. This is a common conception of the meaning of the Christian religion. In it life is not a period of aspiration for an unutterable beatitude, but a time of training, in expectation of the gain of the Master’s praise and ultimate ability to do more and greater work for Him.

3. Mat 18:15, with which must be connected 1Co 9:19 ff., speaks of the gain of winning other souls for Christ. Here there is the need of sacrifice, the sacrifice of pride, of social and racial prejudice; and there is also the need of faithfulness and

diligence. This is the missionary's conception of Christianity. We find it in St. Paul and in all those after him who have felt the necessity laid on them, 'Woe is me if I preach not the gospel.' The joy of this gain is anticipated in Dan_12:3 (cf. Jam_5:19-20). Its greatness is most fully known when we realize that we share it with God Himself and His angels (Luk_15:6; Luk_15:9; Luk_15:22 ff.).

In all three classes of passages the language is that of the market-place where men get gain by bargaining or labouring; but it is immensely sublimated and purified of all selfishness and greed.

Literature.—Augustine, *Confessions*; Francis de Sales, *The Spirit*; Thomas à Kempis, *The Imitation of Christ*; *Theologia Germanica* (translation by S. Winkworth); Jeremy Taylor, *Holy Living*; Goulburn, *Thoughts on Personal Religion*; H. J. Coleridge, S.J., *Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier*; R. Southey, *Life of John Wesley*; Lives of eminent modern missionaries.

J. O. Hannay.

GalilaeAN

GALILaeAN (Γαλιλαῖος).—Twice Jesus is mentioned as a GalilaeAN: once by a maid-servant (Mat_26:69); once when Pilate was anxious to transfer the trial of Jesus from his own to Herod's court (Luk_23:6). It was during the trial of Jesus also that Peter was recognized as a GalilaeAN by the bystanders (Mat_26:73, Mar_14:70, Luk_22:59; see Galilee, § 7). In Joh_4:45 we read that Galilaeans, who had been at Jerusalem and had seen the works of Jesus there, received Him on that account in their own land. In Luk_13:1 we are told of Pilate's (evidently recent) punishment of some Galilaeans, whom he had slain even while they were sacrificing. This event cannot be identified with any revolt mentioned in history. Some suppose Barabbas to have been arrested in connexion therewith; some would associate it with the revolt of Judas of Galilee (Josephus *BJ* ii. viii. 1), but this took place, according to Act_5:37, more than twenty years before. Probably it refers to some small outbreak, severely punished by Pilate as usual (cf. Philo, *Leg. ad Gaium*, 37).

For characteristics of Galilaeans see Galilee, § 7, 'People.'

G. W. Thatcher.

Galilee

GALILEE

1. *Name.*—The English form of the name ‘Galilee’ is derived from the Hebrew גליל (âlîl), Aram. [Note: Aramaic.] גלילא (Gâlîla or G^{el}îla), through Gr. Γαλιλαία and Lat. *Galilœa*. The Heb. word denotes simply a ‘circuit’ or ‘district’, and in Isa 9:1 Galilee is called ‘Galilee ((Revised Version margin) ‘the district’) of the nations,’ and in 1Ma 5:15 Γαλιλαία ἀλλοφύλων (‘Galilee of the strangers’). In other passages of the OT it is simply called ‘the district.’

2. *History.*—When the Hebrew invasion of Palestine took place, the main part of Galilee was allotted to Zebulun, Asher, and Naphtali. According to Jdg 1:30-33, Zebulun was not altogether successful in driving out the inhabitant of their portion, while Asher and Naphtali had to be content to settle as best they could among the inhabitants, ‘for they did not drive them out.’ These inhabitants seem to have been Amorites and Hivites from the Lebanon. An account of one (or two) of the battles fought in this country is found in Judges 4-5. In the days of the Monarchy, Galilee always suffered in the Syrian wars. It was ravaged by Ben-hadad (1Ki 15:20), probably won back by Ahab, taken again by the Aramaeans under Hazael (2Ki 12:18; 2Ki 13:22), and recovered by Jeroboam ii. It was also on the high-road of the Assyrian invasion, and was won for Assyria by Tiglath-pileser iii. in 734 (2Ki 15:29), many of its inhabitants being carried into captivity. From this time up to the end of the 2nd cent. b.c. the population was heathen, with a small number of Jewish settlers, who attached themselves to Jerusalem after the return from the Exile. About the year 164, Simon the brother of Judas Maccabaeus pursued the Syrians to Ptolemais, and on his way back brought the Galilaean Jews and their property to Judaea (1Ma 5:21-23). Some 60 years later the whole state of affairs in Galilee was changed. According to Strabo, on the authority of Timagenes (Josephus *Ant.* xiii. xi. 3), Aristobulus (b.c. 104-103) conquered much of Galilee, and compelled the inhabitants to be circumcised and live according to Jewish laws. This work had probably been already begun by John Hyrcanus (b.c. 135-105). Herod at his death bequeathed Galilee to Herod Antipas, who succeeded after much opposition in having his legacy confirmed at Rome.

3. *Extent.*—The amount of territory covered by the name ‘Galilee’ varied in different times. Originally it comprised the hilly and mountainous country to the north of the Plain of Esdraelon or the smaller plain of *cl-Buttauf*. The boundaries were probably not well defined, but on the north it included Kedesh (Jos 20:7; Jos 21:32). It was later spoken of in two divisions—Upper and Lower Galilee (cf. Jdt 1:8, 1Ma 12:49), and in the Mishna is divided into three parts, these corresponding to the natural divisions of plain, hill-country, and mountain.

The boundaries of Galilee at the time of Christ are thus given by Josephus:

‘Now Phœnice and Syria surround the two Galilees, which are called Upper and Lower Galilee. They are bounded on the W. by the borders of the territory belonging to Ptolemais, and by Carmel, which mountain of old belonged to the Galilaeans, but now to the Tyrians; and next it is Gaba (*Jebâta** [Note: The identifications in brackets are those of Sir C. W. Wilson in Shilleto’s translation of Josephus.]), which is called “the city of horsemen,” because those horsemen that were dismissed by Herod the king dwelt therein; they are bounded on the S. by Samaria and Scythopolis, as far as the streams of the Jordan; on the E. by Hippene (the district of Hippos, *Sâsiyeh*) and Gadaris (the district of Gadara, *Umm Keis*), and also by Gaulanitis (*Jaulân*) and the borders of the kingdom of Agrippa; and their N. parts are bounded by Tyre, and the country of the Tyrians. As for what is called Lower Galilee, it extends in length from Tiberias to Chabulon (*Kâbûl*), and Ptolemais is its neighbour on the coast; and its breadth is from the village called Xaloth (*Iksâl*), which lies in the great plain, to Bersabe, from which beginning the breadth of Upper Galilee is also taken to the village Baca, which divides the land of the Tyrians from Galilee; its length is also from Meloth (*Meiron*) to Thella (probably *Tell Thala*), a village near the Jordan’ (*BJ* iii. iii. 1).

4. *Geography*.—The southernmost division of Galilee was Esdraelon (G. A. Smith, *HGH*L [Note: *GHL* Historical Geog. of Holy Land.] p. 379). It consists of (1) the triangular plain about 200 feet above sea-level, 29 miles long from the foot of Carmel to Jenîn, 15 from Jenîn to Tabor, and 15 from Tabor to the foot of Carmel; (2) the valley of Jezreel (*Nahr Jalûd*), running down for 12 miles from Jezreel to Bethshean, some 400 feet below sea-level. The Plain of Esdraelon is watered by the Kishon flowing to the Mediterranean; but, as the edges are somewhat higher than the centre, it is often marshy. It played a great part in the history of Palestine (cf. *HGH*L [Note: *GHL* Historical Geog. of Holy Land.] p. 391 ff.), but has no mention in the story of the Gospels.

On the other hand, the middle division of Galilee, known as Lower Galilee, contains nearly all the important sites of the Gospel record. Nazareth, Capernaum, Shunem, Nain, Cana, etc., are within its borders. It is bounded on the W. by the Plain of Ptolemais, on the S. by the Plains of Esdraelon and Jezreel, on the E. by the Sea of Galilee (though sometimes a part of the country east of the sea was considered Galilæan), and on the N. by a line passing from the N. end of the Sea of Galilee through Ramah to the coast. It consists of four chains of hills running east and west, intercepted by valleys and plains. The hills reach a height of about 1200 feet. The southern chain consists of the Nazareth hills, with Mt. Tabor; the next range contains the *Karn Hattin* of Crusading fame; the third, the city of Jotapâta; while the fourth

consists of the southern slopes of the mountains of Upper Galilee. The central plain of *cl-Buttauf* is about 500 feet above sea-level, while the coast of the Sea of Galilee is nearly 700 feet below sea-level. The whole country is well watered by streams flowing east or west, and was extremely fertile. The grass of the plains was green, and evergreen oaks grew on the hills. The cornfields gave a plenteous harvest, and pomegranates abounded.

Upper Galilee ranged from the N. boundary of Lower Galilee to the Tyrian boundary, which seems to have been at the time of Christ just south of Kedesh, which according to Josephus was a Tyrian fortress on the borders of Galilee (*Ant.* xiii. v. 6; *BJ* ii. xviii. l, iv. ii. 3). It is a land of mountains, where the hills run from 2000 to 4000 feet in height. It too was a fertile land, with thick woods, sycamores, olives, vines, and green pastures by its waters.

5. *Roads.*—‘Judaea was on the road to nowhere; Galilee is covered with roads to everywhere’ (G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [Note: *GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*] p. 425). Roads in the East even now are often mere tracks, scarcely recognizable by the Western. They are repaired for great occasions, and soon allowed to fall again into their natural condition. Remains of pavements, however, show that at the time of Christ the Roman genius for road-making had been at work in the district of Galilee. Especially was this the case on the great high-road, the ‘Way of the Sea,’ as it was called in the Middle Ages (from an interpretation of *Isa_9:1*), which crossed the middle of Lower Galilee. The eastern termini of the main roads were the two bridges which crossed the Jordan. These were (1) the bridge about half-way between Merom and the Sea of Galilee, now called the ‘Bridge of Jacob’s Daughters.’ To this came the road from Damascus and the intervening country. Westward from the river the road ran by Safed and Ramah to Ptolemais. From this a branch struck off a few miles west of the river, passed by Arbela (*Irbid*), and rejoined the highroad near Ramah. Another branch went southwards to the west coast of the Sea of Galilee at *Khân Minych*, and proceeded to Bethshean, where it joined the road from (2) the bridge a few miles south of the Sea of Galilee, now called the *Jisr cl-Mujâmia*. Over this bridge came the traffic from Arabia and Gilead. From it one road passed through Bethshean, the Valley of Jezreel, and the Plain of Esdraelon, to the coast of the Mediterranean, and so on to Egypt; another by Cana and Sepphoris to Ptolemais. The main road from the shore of the Sea of Galilee to the highlands went by the *Wady cl-Hammâm* past Arbela, then between Tabor and the Nazareth hills to Esdraelon. Along these and many other roads flowed a ceaseless stream of traffic, and the fulness of their life is reflected in the parables of Christ (cf. *Encyc. Bibl.* iv. 5191; *HGHL* [Note: *GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*] p. 430 f.).

6. Government.—Galilee was a part of the Roman Empire; that is, in the days of Christ it was under the emperors Augustus and Tiberius. Roman garrisons were in towns all round the country. Roman influence was felt everywhere. But the mass of the people had little or nothing to do with the Roman Empire directly. The direct government of the land was in the hands of Herod Antipas, to whom, with the title of ‘tetrarch,’ it was assigned by Augustus after the death of Herod. Antipas was 17 years old at his accession to power, and established his capital at Sepphoris. About the year 22, however, he built a new city on the shore of the Sea of Galilee, named it Tiberias in honour of the emperor, and made it his capital. This city was governed after the Greek model by a council of 600, with an Archon and other officers. In these two cities was centred the chief legal administration of affairs in Galilee during the life of Christ. But in Galilee, as elsewhere, the chief details of life were regulated by the Jews’ own religious laws rather than by ordinary civil enactments. The chief authority was the Sanhedrin (see Sanhedrin) at Jerusalem, to which appeals could be made when local doctors differed. The chief local difficulties were usually satisfied by the decisions of local councils (cf. Mat 10:17), probably associated more or less closely with the local synagogues (see Synagogue).

7. People.—Galilee was a populous country. ‘The cities lie very thick, and the very many villages are everywhere so populous from the richness of the soil, that the very least of them contains more than fifteen thousand inhabitants’ (Josephus *BJ* iii. iii. 2). In another place Josephus says there were 240 cities and villages in Galilee (*Life*, 45), and that many of these had strong walls. From each of these to the others must have been a network of tracks and roads in addition to the main roads (see above). and the land was a scene of constant activity. The bracing air of the hills and the activity of everyday life formed a people of energy and vigour. ‘The Galilaeans are inured to war from their infancy, and have been always very numerous; nor has their country ever been destitute of men of courage’ (Josephus *BJ* iii. iii. 2). Regarded with a certain amount of patronizing contempt by the pure-blooded and more strictly theologically-minded Jews of Jerusalem and its neighbourhood, they still had the religious zeal of country-folk. This zeal was quickened by their pilgrimages to Jerusalem, which made a greater impression on their active minds than on those who were more familiar with the life of the Holy City. At any apparent insult to their religion they were ready to break out in revolt. Before, during, and after the life of Jesus, Galilaean leaders arose and flew to arms in the vain attempt to secure religious autonomy. Yet they differed in many respects from their Judaeian brothers. The very technical terms of the market and the details of their religious customs varied from those of the South (cf. Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. i. 4). Their pronunciation of the Aramaic language had peculiarities of its own (Mat 26:73), one of these being the confusion of the guttural sounds. Besides, however, the natural bodily vigour and mental freshness of these highlanders, the most important difference between them and the people of Judaea lay in the different attitude in

daily life towards the larger world of the Roman Empire and Hellenistic influence. Knowledge of, at any rate spoken, Greek was to them a necessity of business, and no attempt could be made, as in Jerusalem, to avoid the study of it (cf. Moulton, *Prolegomena to Gram, of NT Greek*, 1906, p. 8). Many must have been, like Matthew, in Government employ. All were brought into daily contact with Greek and Roman modes of life and thought. It was to this people of larger experience of life and broader ways of thinking that Jesus appealed in the greater part of His earthly ministry, and from it that He chose the men who were first to make His message known to the world. See also art. Sea of Galilee.

Literature.—Artt. ‘Galilee’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible . and ‘Galilaa’ in *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; Neubauer, *Géog. du Talmud*; Guérin, *Galilée*; Merrill, *Galilee in the Time of Christ*; G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [Note: *GHL* Historical Geog. of Holy Land.] , chs. xx, xxi.

G. W. Thatcher.

☞ Gall

GALL (χολή, *fel*).—

In LXX Septuagint χολή represents (1) שרף (Deu 32:32, Psa 69:21); and (2) לענה *wormwood* (Pro 5:4, Lam 3:15)., ש and לענה are sometimes combined, e.g. Deu 29:18 שרף ולענה, LXX Septuagint ἐν χολῇ καὶ τιρκια, Vulgate *fel et amaritudiaem*; Lam 3:19 שרף לענה, LXX Septuagint τιρκια καὶ χολή, Vulgate *absynthii et fellis*.

It thus appears that χολή was used of any bitter drug, and there is therefore no discrepancy between Mat 27:34 οἶνον [ὄξος is a copyist’s assimilation to Psa 69:21] μετὰ χολῆς μεμιγμένον, and Mar 15:23 ἐσμυρνιασμένον οἶνον. The potion administered to the *crucifixus* (see Crucifixion) was composed of wine and a variety of drugs—frankincense, laudanum, myrrh, resin, saffron, mastich.* [Note: Wetstein on Mar 15:23.] Thus ‘wine mixed with gall’ and ‘myrrhed wine’ are equivalent phrases, signifying generally *medicated wine* (cf. Swete, *St. Mark, ad loc.*). Mat 27:34 and Act 8:23 are the only places in the NT where χολή occurs.

Games

GAMES.—In the Gospels there are none of the analogies from athletic contests which are frequently drawn in the Acts and the Epistles. This variety in the range of illustration is traced without difficulty to the different interests of the readers or hearers. The Hebrews, unlike the Greeks and Romans, gave little attention to games. The climate of their land may help to account for this, but the chief reason must be found in their view of life, which made it impossible for them to look upon games with the eye of the Greek. Where the Greek had his Isthmian games, the Hebrew had his Passover, or other solemn festival. The introduction of a gymnasium by Jason ([2Ma 4:7-19](#)) was accounted an act of disloyalty to the faith of his fathers, and a surrender to Hellenic influences. He was accused of neglecting the altar for the palaestra. Herod is said by Josephus (*Ant.* xv. viii. 1) to have instituted solemn games in honour of Caesar; but such practices never won the approval of the Rabbis, or of the nation as a whole. Jesus preached to a people who knew little of the games of the Greeks, and who had been taught to hate what they knew. But in Galilee the children played their immemorial games:

‘A wedding or a festival,
A mourning or a funeral,
As if his whole vocation
Were endless imitation.’

(Wordsworth, *Ode on Immortality*).

From such play Jesus drew a description of the generation which had listened to John the Baptist and Himself ([Mat 11:17](#), [Luk 7:32](#)). Two groups are playing in the market-place; the musicians are divided from the others. They pipe, but the children will not play: they suggest ‘funerals,’ but their comrades sulkily refuse to join. The parable is a vivid picture of the fickleness, sulkiness, and self-will of the contemporaries of Jesus. It is not necessary to read into the parable a condemnation of those who should have outgrown childish things but are still playing at life. The ‘musicians’ have been likened by some to Jesus and John the Baptist, by others to the people (see a discussion by Stalker in *Expositor*, 4th series, vol. vii. p. 29).

The soldiers probably played with dice when they cast lots for the garments of Jesus (Mat 27:35); and they may have been playing a game when they said to Jesus, 'Prophecy unto us, thou Christ; who is he that struck thee?' (Mat 26:68).

Jesus did not deal with the problems which arise in modern society from the growing importance of games in the scheme of life. As far as we know, He did not discuss the Rabbinical attitude to the Hellenic games; nor do the Apostolic writers hint of dangers to Christian converts from the contests. The ethical questions must be decided by an appeal to the interpretation of life in the Gospels, and especially to the estimate given by Jesus of the true relations between body and spirit. It is clear that to Him the body was not an end in itself (Mat 10:28), but must become the docile servant of the soul (Mat 18:8), even at the cost of severe discipline. Games will be approved where they give bodily effectiveness, that it may be the 'earthly support' of the endurance of the spirit. They will be condemned if they lead to a neglect of the serious interests of life (Mat 6:33), or of the duty owed to others. The Christian ideal of a life temperate and just does not include a life whose first interest is amusement, or one in which 'distraction' is necessary to prevent ennui (see Dorner, *Christian Ethics*, English translation p. 458).

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Games'; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.], Index, s. Games'; *Expositor*, i. v. [1877] 257.

Edward Shillito.

🌿 Garden

GARDEN (κῆπος).—In its most precise application the term refers to a level piece of ground enclosed by a wall or hedge, in which plants, shrubs, and trees are cultivated by irrigation. Its area, ranging from a small vegetable plot beside the house to the dimensions of a farm, is limited only by the supply of water. While not excluding the idea of garden familiar in the West, its meaning in general is often nearer to that of our *nursery-garden* and *orchard*. In the irrigated garden, vines, fig, walnut, pomegranate, lemon, and other trees are grown for the sake of ornament, shade, and fruit. In the Gospels mention is made of mint, anise, and cummin (Mat 23:23) as the cheap and common garden produce that occupied the laboured scrupulosity of the scribes and Pharisees, to the neglect of more important matters.

The fact of its being artificially and continually watered, distinguishes the garden proper from the ordinary grain field, the vineyard, and the plantation of olive or fig

trees. The necessity, however, of having a protecting wall for fruit trees gives also to such an enclosure in a more general sense the name and character of a garden. These may be resorted to and passed through without objection except during summer and autumn, when the fruit is ripening. Such may have been the garden of Gethsemane, to which Christ retired with His disciples (Joh_18:1-2). In the garden containing the tomb in which Christ's body was laid, Mary's expectation of meeting with the gardener or caretaker (Joh_20:15) at the time of Easter would rather point to the more careful cultivation of the irrigated garden.

To the Oriental the garden is a place of retirement and rest. Its sound of falling or running water is one of the luxuries of life. Its shade affords escape from the glare of the sun, and its recognized privacy forbids the introduction at the close of the day of disturbing news, exacting claims, or perplexing decisions. The voice of nature seems to say, 'I will give you rest.' It has thus become a symbol of Heaven, and supplies a common term of immortal hope to the three great monotheistic religions, inasmuch as the Christian 'Paradise' is the equivalent of the Jewish *Gan-Eden*, 'Garden of Eden,' and the Moslem *il-Gannat*, 'the Garden.'

G. M. Mackie.

☞ Garner

GARNER.—See Barn.

☞ Gate

GATE.—The gate of a city, like the entrance to a tent and the door of a house, was a place of special importance, and its original use gave rise to various associated meanings.

1. *Military and protective.*—As the weakest place in a walled city, it was the chief point of attack and defence. Its strength was the strength of the city (Gen_22:17, Jdg_5:8, Psa_24:7; Psa_127:5, Isa_26:2, Jer_14:2). It had a place of outlook over the entrance, from which those approaching could be seen, and intimation given as to their admittance. This was evidently a development of the watch kept at the door of the sheepfold (Joh_10:1-3). The gates of the city were closed at night, hence in the vision of the city where there is no night they remain unclosed (Rev_21:25). In the charge to Peter, where the gates of Hades are said to be unable to prevail against the

Church of Christ, the original meaning of defensive strength seems to pass into that of aggressive force (Mat 16:18).

2. Judicial and commercial.—The settlement of matters affecting contested right, transfer of property and internal administration, were attended to at the open space or covered recess behind the gate (Gen 23:10, Deu 25:7, Amo 5:12). The litigant was urged to come to terms with the adversary ‘in the way’ before the gate was reached, for there the judge sat, and behind him were the officer, the prison, and the official exactors (Mat 5:25-26). In times of industrial peace, the protective challenge became a fiscal inspection, and there the tax-collector sat at the receipt of custom (Mat 9:9).

3. Figurative and religious.—While the gates or doors of public buildings within the city might be lavishly ornamented (Isa 54:12, Rev 21:21; Josephus *BJ* v. v. 3, vi. v. 3), the gate of brass was the standard of external protection. The larger and more important the city, the more imposing would be its public gate. The Oriental name for the Ottoman Empire is the High Gate, or Sublime Porte. Christ’s allusion to the broad gate that led only to darkness and destruction, and the gate that, though narrow, conducted into a broad place capable of accommodating visitors from all lands (Mat 7:13-14, Luk 13:24; Luk 13:29), was in keeping with His other statements as to the startling difference between *His* Kingdom and the Empire conception of the world.

City gates, as well as those at the entrance to gardens and to the open courts around houses, frequently have a small inserted door from two to three feet square by which an individual may be admitted. It has sometimes been thought that this was referred to when Christ spoke of a camel passing through the eye of a needle (Mat 19:24); but there is nothing either in the sense of the original words or in Eastern custom to support such a supposition. See Camel.

Gates had distinguishing names, indicating the localities to which they belonged or into which they led (Gen 28:17, Nehemiah 3, Psa 9:13, Isa 38:10, Mat 16:18), or describing some characteristic of the door itself (Act 3:2). In the prophetic picture of Zion restored and comforted, the gates were to be called ‘Praise,’ and those which John saw in the New Jerusalem bore on their fronts the names of the ‘twelve tribes of the children of Israel’ (Rev 21:12).

For meanings connected more especially with the entrance to tents and houses see Door.

G. M. Mackie.

☞ Gehenna

GEHENNA.—The Heb. name *Hinnom* is generally preceded in the OT by the word *Gç*-, ‘valley’ (Jos_15:8 ff.), thus *Gç-hinnôm*, or ‘Valley of Hinnom,’ whence the NT word *γέεννα*, which is translated in both the Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘hell’ (Mat_5:22; Mat_5:29-30; Mat_10:28; Mat_18:9; Mat_23:15; Mat_23:33, Mar_9:43; Mar_9:45; Mar_9:47, Luk_12:5, Jam_3:6); from which also we obtain the English word *Gehenna*. Historically, this valley is the traditional site of the worship paid to Molech, first by Ahaz (2Ch_28:3), and later by Manasseh (33:6), who made their children pass through the fire; but which was later defiled by Josiah (2Ki_23:10), and thereafter seems to have been made the receptacle of the city’s offal; and in later Jewish thought became a symbol of the supposed place of future punishments (cf. *Enoch* xxvii. i). The NT use of *γέεννα* is exclusively in this figurative sense. Milton also employs it thus in his familiar lines:

‘The pleasant vale of Hinnom, Tophet thence,

And black Gehenna called, the type of hell’ (*Par. Lost*, i. 404).

Opinions differ as to the identification of the valley; but most authorities, including Robinson, Stanley, Buhl, and many others, as well as modern Arab tradition, identify it with the valley on the W. and S. side of the Holy City, the upper portion of which is called in Arabic *Wâdy er-Rabâbi*; the lower, *Wâdy Gehennam*, or ‘Valley of Hell.’ It is a ‘deep and yawning gorge’ (Wilson), and ‘never contains water’ (Socin), its descent from its original source to *Bir Eyyub* being approximately 670 ft. At the lower extremity are found numerous rock-tombs, for here seems to have been the potter’s field for the burial of pilgrims, which was purchased with the ‘30 pieces of silver,’ and known as Akeldama, or field of blood (Mat_27:3-8, Act_1:18-19). On the other hand, the Arab writer Edrisi of the 12th cent. a.d., followed by Sir C. Warren in an extended and somewhat convincing article on ‘Hinnom (Valley of)’ in Hasting’s *Dictionary of the Bible*, identifies it with the Kidron on the E. of Jerusalem, including also its continuation below the junction of the Eastern and Western valleys at *Bir Eyyub*; the whole of the valley in its descent toward the Dead Sea being known to the Arabs as *Wâdy en-Nâr*, ‘Valley of Fire.’ Still another identification is that advocated by Sayce, R. Smith, Birch, and others, who locate it between the Temple area and the City of David, identifying it with the valley known since Josephus’ day as the Tyropœon; but the first identification is, on the whole, the most probable.

Literature.—Robinson, *BRP* [Note: RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.] i. 353, 402 ff.; Stanley, *SP* [Note: P Sinai and Palestine.] 239, 571; Barclay, *City of the Great King*, 89, 90; Wilson, *Recovery of Jerusalem*, 6, 19, 307, *Lands of the Bible*, i. 403 ff.; Tristram, *Bible Places*, 152, 162; Couder, *Handbook to the Bible*, 329 f.; Baedeker-Socin, *Pal.* [Note: Palestine, Palestinian.] 99; Barrows, *Sacred Geog. and Antiquity*, 94-96; Ritter, *Geog. of Pal.* [Note: Palestine, Palestinian.] iv. 164 ff.; artt. ‘Gehenna’ and ‘Hinnom (Valley of)’ in Hasting’s *Dictionary of the Bible*; ‘Hinnom (Valley of)’ in *Encyc. Bibl.*; Swete, *Com. on St. Mark*, ad 9:45; Riehm, *HWB* [Note: WB Handwörterbunch.] ; Rosenmüller, *Biblisch. Geog.* ii. 156, 164; Smith’s *DB* [Note: *Dictionary of the Bible.*] , art ‘Hinnom (Valley of).’

George L. Robinson.

⚠️ Genealogies Of Jesus Christ

GENEALOGIES OF JESUS CHRIST

1. There is no evidence that any special stress was laid upon the Davidic descent of Jesus, either by Himself or in the preaching of the Apostles. It was assumed that He was ‘Son of David,’ and the title was given to Him as the Messiah; nor does it appear that His claim was ever seriously contested on the ground that His Davidic descent was doubtful. St. Paul in Rom 1:3 speaks of Christ as ‘born of the seed of David according to the flesh,’ and in 2Ti 2:8 he names this descent, along with the Resurrection, as one of the salient points of the gospel he preached: ‘Remember Jesus Christ, risen from the dead, of the seed of David, according to my gospel.’ Similarly in his speech at the Pisidian Antioch, as recorded in Act 13:23, he says: ‘Of this man’s (*i.e.* David’s) seed hath God according to promise brought unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus.’ St. Peter in his speech on the Day of Pentecost (Act 2:30) mentions God’s promise to David, ‘that of the fruit of his loins he would set one upon his throne,’ and points to its fulfilment in Christ; but in addressing Cornelius (Act 10:38) he speaks of Christ as ‘Jesus of Nazareth’; and this would seem to imply that the birth at Bethlehem, which brought into prominence the claim to Davidic descent, did not form part of his ordinary missionary preaching. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb 7:14) says: ‘It is evident that our Lord hath sprung out of Judah.’ In the Second Gospel blind Bartimaeus (Mar 10:47 f., cf. parallels) uses the title ‘Son of David’ in addressing Christ, and the crowds at the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem (Mar 11:10, cf. Mat 21:9 ‘Hosanna to the Son of David’) speak of the ‘kingdom that cometh’ as the ‘kingdom of our father David’; but in a difficult passage (Mat 12:35-37, cf. parallels) Jesus appears to raise difficulties as to the

appropriateness of the current application of the title to the Messiah (see Holtzmann, *Hdcom*.2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] *ad loc.*). In the Apocalypse the Davidic descent is apparently assumed (Rev 22:16) as well as the birth from the tribe of Judah (Rev 5:5); but the use of the phrase ‘the root of David’ in both passages shows that the essential and spiritual priority to David was more prominent in the writer’s mind than the physical descent from him. The evidence to be derived from the Fourth Gospel is of a doubtful character; in Joh 7:27 we find traces of the phase of Jewish thought according to which the Messiah would appear suddenly and his origin would be secret: the answer of Jesus implies that the people did indeed know His human, but not His spiritual, origin. It is clear from Joh 7:41 f., 52 that He was regarded by both the crowd and the rulers at Jerusalem as being of Galilaean, and therefore presumably not Davidic, parentage; it is by no means certain, and to many it may seem in no way probable, that the writer, in the interest of a ‘tragic irony’ (see Westcott, *Speaker’s Commentary* on Joh 7:42), refrained from noting the fact of the birth at Bethlehem, and the Davidic lineage of Joseph or Mary. Jesus’ words in Joh 7:28 f. show clearly that He did not choose to support His claim by an appeal to fleshly parentage; while the words of Philip (Joh 1:45 ‘We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph’), and of the crowd at Capernaum (Joh 6:42 ‘Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?’), left, as they are, without comment by the Evangelist, suggest that he was unacquainted with the story of the birth at Bethlehem, and laid no stress on the Davidic descent.

In all the books thus far mentioned no intimation is given whether the descent of Jesus is traced through Mary or Joseph: this fact must be recognized, however it is explained. In the Catholic Epistles there is no reference, direct or indirect, to the tribe or family of the Lord. The First and Third Gospels, which (at all events in their present form) teach the doctrine of the birth from a virgin, also contain formal pedigrees of Joseph, with the evident intention of proving that Jesus was the heir of David. In this lies the most important problem which the genealogies of Jesus present for solution.

2. The general facts in regard to the divergences of the two pedigrees of Joseph are well known. St. Matthew (Mat 1:2-17) begins with Abraham, and traces the line in fourteen generations to David; then through Solomon in fourteen generations to Jechoniah at the time of the carrying away to Babylon: then in fourteen (or thirteen according to our present text) generations through Shealtiel and Zerubbabel to Matthan, Jacob, Joseph, and Jesus. Thus he brings the Messiah into relation with all who, whether in a literal or a spiritual sense, could call Abraham their Father.

St. Luke (Luk 3:23-38) makes Joseph the son of Heli, and grandson of Matthat (by some identified without any proof with Matthan of Mat 1:15), and traces his descent

through Zerubbabel and Shealtiel to Nathan the son of David; then (with only slight or textually doubtful divergences from Mt.) back to Abraham; but, not stopping there, he carries the pedigree back to ‘Adam the son of God,’ thus bringing the Son of man into relation with all men whom God has created. A more detailed examination of the main characteristics of the two genealogies will show the fundamental differences of conception and treatment that exist between them, and prepare us for extracting whatever may be of value from the attempts that have been made to harmonize them.

3. St. Matthew’s genealogy.—The heading is translated in the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘The book of the generation (βιβλος γενέσεως) of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham’: in the margin the alternative rendering is given ‘the genealogy of Jesus Christ.’ If, as seems probable, the latter rendering is right, this heading will refer only to the pedigree which follows; the phrase βιβλος γενέσεως is most likely taken from Gen_5:1 (αὕτη ἡ βιβλος γενέσεως ἀνθρώπων: cf. Gen_6:9 αὗται δὲ αἱ γενέσεις Νῶε, and Gen_10:1), where it introduces a list of Adam’s descendants, and thus practically forms the title of a genealogical table. Zahn (*Einlcitung in d. NT²* [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , ii. pp. 270 f. and 290) argues without much cogency that the phrase could not be applied to a table of *ancestors*, and takes it as a title of the whole book; he is, however, no doubt right in rejecting the view that it refers to the narrative of the birth, or of the birth and infancy. Taken as the title of the pedigree, it indicates clearly the intention of the writer—to show that in Jesus, as the heir of David and of Abraham, were fulfilled the promises made to them: the pedigree itself is intended to illustrate this, rather than to prove it, and it is not easy to avoid the conclusion that it is quite artificial, as is indeed implied by the more or less arbitrary division into 3 sections containing twice seven names apiece.

Confining our attention for the moment to the direct male line, we note that in the first section the names are taken from 1Ch_2:1-15, and that if Salmon was the younger contemporary of Joshua (as is implied by his marriage with Rahab), there are only four generations to cover the 300 or 400 years between that time and David’s reign. In the second section the names are from 1Ch_3:1-16, but Joash, Amaziah, and Azariah are omitted before Jotham, and Jehoiakim before Jechoniah (= Jehoiachin). In the third section only Shealtiel and Zerubbabel are mentioned in the OT [the latter in 1Ch_3:19 is called son of Pedaiah, the brother of Shealtiel, but in Hag_1:1 and numerous other passages, he is called son of Shealtiel, or Shaltiel, but without any intimation that he was of Davidic descent; it is often assumed that Shealtiel adopted his nephew]. We have no hint as to the source from whence the remaining names were drawn. For about 460 years, from David to the Captivity, we have 14 names, and

know there should be 18; for about 590 years, from the Captivity to Christ, we have, against all reasonable probability, only 13 (perhaps originally 14) names.

We now turn to the notes inserted at different points in the pedigree. A very small point may perhaps guide us to a true conclusion in regard to these. Holtzmann (*op. cit.* on Mat_1:6) points out that the articles before *Δαυεὶδ τὸν βασιλέα* in Mat_1:6, and before *Ἰωσήφ τὸν ἄνδρα Μαρίας* in Mat_1:16, are incorrect: it seems probable that the compiler of the Gospel had a pedigree before him in which each step was given in the simple form 'Abraham begat Isaac' (*Ἀβραάμ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰσαάκ*), and that he added notes to this at certain points; in Mat_1:6; Mat_1:16 he did not notice that the use of the article became incorrect when the notes were added. This original document may or may not have ended 'Joseph begat Jesus' (*Ἰωσήφ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν*): it is perhaps the easiest solution of the difficulties of this verse to suppose that, if it did so end, the compiler omitted the last step, as in conflict with his belief in the Virgin-birth, and added a note to the previous step to explain the relation in which Jesus stood to Joseph. If in Westcott and Hort's edition of the NT the notes be struck out, it will be seen that a perfectly symmetrical pedigree of Joseph is left.

Mr. F. C. Burkitt, in a very important note on Mat_1:16-25 (*Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, Cambridge, 1904, vol. ii. pp. 258-266), argues with great force that the genealogy is an integral part of St. Matthew's Gospel, and that the compiler himself drew it up; but really his arguments apply only to the notes inserted in the genealogy. He discusses fully the reading in Mat_1:16, and concludes that we cannot look on the reading of the Sinaitic Syriac ('Jacob begat Joseph; Joseph, to whom was betrothed Mary the Virgin, begat Jesus, who is called the Christ') as containing traces of an original text. Zahn (*op. cit.* ii. p. 292 f.) thinks that the Curctonian Syriac ('Jacob begat Joseph, to whom was betrothed Mary the Virgin, who bore Jesus Christ') represents the Greek from which the Syriac version was made more closely than does the Sinaitic. If, therefore, the compiler followed a pedigree ready to hand, he did so only as far as the step 'Jacob begat Joseph'; and textual criticism will not help us to reconstruct the presumed original document beyond that point. In the usual text stress is laid on Joseph being the *husband* of Mary, probably to show that, as he recognized his wife's son as in a *legal* sense his own, Jesus was legally the heir of David. In the reading that probably underlies the Ferrar group of MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] ('Jacob begat Joseph, to whom being betrothed the Virgin Mary begat Jesus that is called Christ'), and also the Old Latin and Syriac versions, this point is missed, and there is little doubt that the Received Text is right.

Added to Mat 1:6; Mat 1:11 are notes which mark important turning-points in the history of the family: with David it attained to royal standing, which it lost under Jechoniah at the Captivity. In Mat 1:2 the addition of 'and his brethren' to the name Judah marks the beginning of the tribe, in that Judah is chosen from among his brethren as founder of the royal tribe. The addition of Zerah to Perez in Mat 1:3 marks the division of the tribe, and it is interesting to notice that we find an allusion to the house of Perez in Rth 4:12; perhaps, too, the compiler may have had in mind the strange story of Gen 38:28 ff., around which some Rabbinic lore may have clustered. The addition of 'and his brethren' to the name Jechoniah is more puzzling. Zahn (*op. cit.* p. 273) thinks it is meant to mark the fact that till then the fortunes of the Davidic house centred in the reigning monarch, who was heir of all the promises, but that from that time onward a number of Davidic families existed, any one of which might be destined to receive the inheritance. Thus it would mark the change from *the* reigning family of the second section to *a* family of royal descent in the third section. But it is not clear from the OT that Jechoniah (= Jehoiachin) had any brothers, for the text of 1Ch 3:16 seems suspicious. According to 2Ch 36:10 his successor Zedekiah was his brother, according to 2Ki 24:17 his father's brother. Possibly there has been some confusion with Jehoiakim, who had three brothers (including a Zedekiah) according to 1Ch 3:15; more probably the compiler has added the note, for the purpose indicated by Zahn, without regard for strict genealogical data.

The four notes not yet referred to are of special interest, naming four of the ancestresses of Solomon. The selection of these names was evidently made with a purpose; it seems as if the compiler wished to show that in the pedigree of the greatest of Jewish kings could be found instances of the breach of laws usually considered most binding. Tamar became a mother through incestuous intercourse with her father-in-law; Rahab was a harlot; Ruth was a Moabitess, and according to the Deuteronomic law (Deu 23:3, cf. Neh 13:1) no Moabite was ever to enter into the congregation; Bathsheba was an adulteress. Some have thought that these references to acknowledged breaches of morality in the pedigree of David's first great son form some kind of answer to the charges of immorality brought by the Jews against the Virgin: the argument would be that, if they did not reject Solomon in spite of acknowledged moral blots in his ancestry, they ought not to reject Jesus because of unfounded scandal. But this explanation is obviously unsatisfactory; there is no real force in such an argument, even supposing it to be worked out and not merely vaguely indicated; and all must feel that the compiler would have shrunk from drawing a parallel between the Mother of Jesus and notoriously sinful women; also the reference to Ruth remains unexplained, as she was guilty of no immorality. Burkitt (*op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 260) suggests a different explanation, that these four women are thrust upon our notice 'as if to prepare us for still greater irregularity in the last

stage.’ But again a comparison between the Virgin-birth and incestuous or adulterous intercourse can hardly have been possible for the compiler.

The simplest explanation is probably the right one: the God about whom Jesus taught had shown Himself ready, in the history of the royal family, to accept strangers and sinners. In the case of Ruth this is fully satisfactory; and the conduct of the other three women is represented in Scripture as justified or pardoned, Judah was obliged to say of Tamar, ‘She is more righteous than I’ (Gen 38:26); the remembrance of Rahab’s former life was blotted out by her subsequent faith (Jam 2:25, Heb 11:31); there is no intimation in Scripture that Bathsheba was morally responsible for the sin into which she was forced by a powerful king, and certainly the birth of Solomon is not represented as in any way displeasing to God, but rather the contrary (see 2Sa 12:25, where Nathan named the child ‘Jedidiah [‘Beloved of Jah’] for the Lord’s sake’; cf. the prophecy of 2Sa 7:13 f.). Probably the thought uppermost in the mind of the compiler would be God’s acceptance of these women, and not their sin.

In regard to Rahab, there is no evidence for her marriage with Salmon, nor is anything known that would be likely to have suggested the idea: it would seem that the compiler was determined to introduce the name, and therefore, without evidence and against all chronological probability, made her the wife of the father of Boaz.

This examination compels us to conclude that the genealogy is essentially and intentionally artificial; the word ‘begat’ (ἐγέννησεν) is not intended necessarily to imply physical birth, but merely marks the descent; the compiler was more interested in the throne-succession than the actual lineage, and used his material to illustrate and enforce his main proposition that Jesus Christ was the son of David and of Abraham, and he joined to the bare pedigree a sort of running commentary of notes.

Codex Bezae in Luke 3 gives a pedigree in the Lukan form, but the names from Joseph to David are taken from Mt.; the names Jehoiakim and Eliakim are inserted between Jechoniah and Josiah as if they referred to two different persons, instead of being two names for the same man; and also Amaziah, Joash, and Ahaziah between Uzziah and Joram (see Resch, *TU* [Note: U Texte und Untersuchungen.] x. 5, pp. 182-201, and Graefe in *SK* [Note: K Studien und Kritiken.] , 1898, 1).

4. *St. Luke’s genealogy.*—The descent of Joseph is traced through Nathan the son of David. It is possible that the family is referred to in Zec 12:12, where ‘the family of the house of Nathan’ is distinguished from ‘the family of the house of David,’ the latter phrase perhaps meaning the royal line. The rejection of the descent through Jechoniah may have been due to the influence of the prophecy of Jeremiah (Jer 22:30): ‘Thus saith the Lord, Write ye this man childless, a man that shall not

prosper in his days: for no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David, and ruling any more in Judah': but there is no apparent reason why the line of Nathan should be selected, unless St. Luke had evidence of the fact before him; and, in the case of a writer who so evidently based his work upon the results of careful research, it is only fair, and therefore scientific, to assume that he had such evidence. The agreement with St. Matthew's genealogy in the names Zerubbabel and Shealtiel has not been satisfactorily explained; it is, of course, open to any one to assume, without the possibility of either proof or refutation, that Jechoniah was actually childless, and adopted Shealtiel, a descendant of Nathan; but even so the further divergence in the descent from Zerubbabel remains as difficult as ever, for the pedigrees disagree with each other, and with the names given in 1Ch 3:19 ff. The number of derivatives of the name Nathan, and the repetition of the names Melchi, Joseph, and Jesus in the Lukan pedigree, can be taken equally well to prove its genuineness or the ingenuity of its compiler. Apart from small variations of little interest, there is nothing to notice in the names from David to Adam, except the insertion in Luk 3:36 of a second Canaan in agreement with the LXX Septuagint of Gen 10:24.

5. Historical value of the two genealogies.—From what has been said above, it appears that St. Matthew (or the compiler of the First Gospel in its present form) did not aim at historical accuracy; but from what we know of St. Luke's methods it may be assumed that he would not have inserted matter in his Gospel unless he had had satisfactory evidence of its genuineness and historical accuracy, and we have seen that the character of the list of names he gives, from David to Joseph, agrees well with this view. Attempts to harmonize the two genealogies have not been successful, and it is only necessary to indicate the general lines they have followed, and to collect such pieces of evidence as may throw light on the possible transmission of the pedigree.

The question was first discussed by Julius Africanus, who flourished early in the 3rd cent. after Christ, in a letter addressed to an unknown correspondent Aristides, of which a considerable portion has been preserved by Euseb. *HE* i. 7 (cf. Routh, *Reliq. Sacræ*, vol. ii. p. 228 ff.). In his text of St. Luke the names Matthat and Levi were evidently left out, so that he regarded Melchi as grandfather of Joseph. He supposed that Matthan, a descendant of Solomon, married a woman named, according to tradition, Estha, by whom he had a son Jacob. On Matthan's death, Melchi, a descendant of Nathan, married his widow, who bore him a son Heli. Heli died without children, and Jacob, in accordance with the levirate law, raised up seed to his brother, and begat Joseph. Thus Joseph was physically son of Jacob, legally of Heli. The difficulties of this theory are sufficiently discussed by Dr. B. W. Bacon in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Genealogy of Jesus Christ.' The various modifications of this theory that have been proposed (see, e.g., Farrar's *St. Luke* in the Cambridge

Bible for Schools, Excursus II.) in no way increase its probability, and practically no evidence can be adduced in support of it. Eusebius does indeed speak of a narrative (ἱστορία) which Africanus had received by tradition (*HE* i. 7; cf. vi. 31); Africanus, however, does not assert this in the fragments preserved, and himself admits that the conjecture is unsupported by evidence (εἰ καὶ μὴ ἐμμάρτυρός ἐστι), but claims that it is worthy of acceptance till a better or truer one is proposed.

Africanus does, however, mention people called 'Desposyni' on account of their kinship with the Saviour, and applies to them the epithet 'the before-mentioned,' so that in those parts of the letter that are now lost he may have specified more exactly how far his conjecture rested on evidence traditionally derived from them. After giving a very improbable story about the destruction of the public genealogical records of the Jews by Herod Antipas, he says that many people reconstructed their genealogies from memory or private sources, among whom were the Desposyni of Nazareth and Cochaba; probably, therefore, he derived from them the information that Joseph's grandmother was called Estha. The main interest of this statement is that, in spite of its being somewhat discredited by its context, it suggests a source from which St. Luke might possibly have obtained the pedigree he gives; we may well suppose that he pursued his investigations in Palestine during St. Paul's imprisonment at Caesarea.

Hegesippus (quoted by Euseb. *Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 19, 20, and 32; see Routh, *Reliq. Sacrae*, vol. i. p. 212 ff.) supports the statement of Africanus in reference to the Desposyni, though that term is not found in the fragments of his writings that are preserved: he states that when Domitian gave orders to kill those who were of David's race, certain heretics gave information against two grandsons of Judas the Lord's brother according to the flesh, as being of David's race and akin to Christ; Domitian, on finding out that they were ordinary peasants, and that the kingdom they expected was not of this world, released them, and issued an edict stopping the persecution of the Church; they took leading positions in the Church, and lived till the time of Trajan. He also relates that a similar accusation was brought against Symeon son of Clopas, 'the Lord's uncle,' who, in consequence, suffered martyrdom at the age of one hundred and twenty. It would appear, therefore, that nothing was known of any who claimed kinship with Jesus after the time of Trajan, so that the statement of Africanus probably rests, at the best, on mere tradition, and it is not wise to build much on it. The statement of Africanus about the destruction of genealogical records by Herod is most improbable, and tends to discredit his whole story; Josephus (*e. ap.* i. 7 and *Vita*, 1) speaks of the preservation of the genealogies of priestly families in public records in the Temple, but there is no certain evidence that those of other families were similarly preserved.

The expedient of supposing levirate marriages and adoptions is not only improbable, but fails to explain why the descent of Jesus is traced through Joseph. Burkitt (*l.c.*) is probably quite justified in saying that the compiler of the First Gospel was perfectly aware that the word ‘begat’ (ἐγέννησεν) was not literally true in the pedigree he gives, and that he would have felt no incongruity between the physical reality of the Virgin-birth and the legal descent from David through Joseph. But this reasoning can hardly be applied to the Third Gospel; the Virgin-birth is certainly not insisted on in it in the same way as in the First; the phrase ‘thy father and I’ in Luk 2:48 (cf. Luk 2:33; Luk 2:41) seems almost incompatible with the belief, and there is some reason for thinking, on textual grounds, that the original text has in places been altered; the words ‘as was supposed’ might easily have been inserted in Luk 3:23, although the variations of reading afford little or no evidence in favour of this supposition; above all, there is no reason to suppose that the writer had, or was likely to have, in mind the legal relation to Jesus in which Joseph, as husband of Mary, might be considered to stand. If, therefore, the suggestion first made by Annius of Viterbo in the 15th cent., and since adopted by many eminent theologians, that St. Luke gives the genealogy of Mary, could be accepted, it would have important results. It is a matter on which argument is hardly possible, the only point being whether any unprejudiced person could understand the words in Luk 3:23 to mean ‘being (as was supposed, son of Joseph, but really) grandson of Heli’—Heli being taken, without a shred of evidence, to have been the father of Mary. A passage has, indeed, been quoted from the Talmud (Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] *Chag. 77b*) to prove that Mary was called ‘daughter of Eli’; but this has been shown to be a mistake by G. A. Cooke, *Expos.*, Oct. 1895, pp. 316 ff. In the *Protevangelium Jacobi* her parents are called Joachim and Anna. The early Fathers generally assumed that Mary was of the same family as Joseph, and that her descent was involved in his; see, for instance, Euseb. *Historia Ecclesiastica* i. 7 *ad fin.* and *Qu. ad Steph.* iii. 2 (Migne, iv. col. 881 f.), where reasons are suggested why Mary’s genealogy was not given; this view is based on a mistaken interpretation of Num 36:8, as if all women were commanded to marry in their own families, whereas the regulation applied only to heiresses. Proof of the Davidic descent of Mary can be obtained from the NT only by assuming the truth of the doctrine of the Virgin-birth; it was no doubt on this ground that Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 32:14) inferred that Mary was of the tribe of Judah (cf. *Protev. Jacobi*, 10, where she is said to be of the tribe of David). St. Matthew (Mat 1:20) and St. Luke (Luk 1:27; Luk 2:4) assert the Davidic descent of Joseph, but not that of Mary; contrast Luk 1:5, where Elisabeth is said to be of the daughters of Aaron. Sanday-Headlam on Rom 1:3 point out that in *Test. XII Patriarch.*, we find the theory of a double descent from Levi and from Judah (*Sym.* 7 and *Gad* 8), and they remark that this is no doubt an inference from the relationship of Mary to Elisabeth (Luk 1:36).

We must conclude, therefore, that we have two independent attempts to establish the Davidic descent of Joseph, and that they can be harmonized only by suppositions which are incapable of proof and hardly probable.

Literature.—This is sufficiently indicated in the body of the article.

P. M. Barnard.

Generation

GENERATION.—A word of several meanings employed to render two different words in OT and four in NT. All are, however, related in thought, and all have a close connexion with the Gospels and Jewish thought in the time of Christ.

1. In OT 'generation' is used to render (1) the Heb. דֶּרֶךְ or דֶּרֶךְ, connected with Assyrian. [Note: Assyrian.] *dârú*, 'to endure,' means primarily *a period of time*. This meaning has survived in OT chiefly in poetry, and in the phrases וְדֶרֶךְ דֶּרֶךְ Ps 45:18; Psa 61:7, לְדֶרֶךְ דֶּרֶךְ Exo 3:15, דֶּרֶךְ דֶּרֶךְ Isa 51:9, Psa 72:5, and such like, to indicate time stretching away into the past (Isa 51:9), or (more generally) into the future (Psa 33:11; Psa 49:12). It may refer both to past and future (Psa 145:13), and is thus parallel to עוֹלָם (see Eternity).

Originally דֶּרֶךְ must have meant the period defined by the life of a man or of a family (Job 42:16). Hence by a loose usage it comes to mean the living in that period (Gen 7:1, Exo 1:6, Deu 2:14, Ecc 1:4, Isa 53:8 etc. etc.; cf. the modern use of the word 'age'). So also it may be used of a of men living contemporaneously and possessing certain characteristics (Deu 32:5, Pro 30:11-14).

(2) The other word in OT (rendered always plural 'generations') is תּוֹלְדוֹת. Here the root-idea is 'birth,' 'descent,' 'offspring,' from יָלַד 'to bring forth.' Hence it is used of genealogies (Gen 5:1; Gen 6:9; Gen 10:1; Gen 11:10; Gen 11:27, Rth 4:18 etc.), of divisions by families, etc. (Num 1:20; Num 1:22; Num 1:24 etc.). It is even used of the creation of the world (Gen 2:4 lit. 'the begettings of the heaven and the earth').

2. Of the four words rendered 'generation' in NT two are unimportant so far as the Gospels are concerned. (1) In 1Pe 2:9 'a chosen generation,' γένος ἐκλεκτόν, should

be rendered as in RV, ‘an elect race.’ (2) In Mat_1:1 the rendering should be ‘the book of the *origin* of Jesus Christ,’ using the word *γένεσις* in its widest sense. The meaning in Mat_1:8, Luk_1:14 is slightly different, and is best expressed by ‘birth’ (EV). (3) The most important word used in the Gospels is *γενεά*, meaning (a) ‘race,’ ‘offspring,’ ‘descent’; (b) the people of any given period; (c) a period loosely defined by the life of a man or of a family; (d) in such phrases as *εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν* (Luk_1:50) it is used, apparently as the equivalent of *דְּרִימֵי דְרִימֵי*, to express indefinite time, generally in the future. Cf. the expression in Eph_3:21 *εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων*, which, however, is considered by Dalman (*Words of Jesus*, p. 165, Eng. tr.) as referring to all the generations of ‘the current age’ of ‘the world period.’ But the phrase seems rather to be the strongest possible way of expressing ‘for ever.’ That *γενεά* (rendered ‘generation’) does express ‘the current age’ of ‘the world period’ is obvious in the Gospels (Luk_16:8, Mat_24:34, and less clearly Mat_23:36); also the *people* of that age (Mat_12:39; Mat_16:4, Mar_8:12, Luk_11:29). In the sense of (c) it is found only in Mat_1:17 and apparently never in its original sense (a). (4) This last is expressed by quite a different word, viz. *γέννημα*. In Mat_3:7; Mat_12:34; Mat_23:33, Luk_3:7, AV has the phrase ‘generation of vipers.’ The Greek is *γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν*, which RV renders ‘offspring of vipers.’ The rendering of AV is due to Tindale (see Hastings’ *DB* ii. 142^b). Elsewhere the word occurs as *γέννημα* (Mat_26:29, Luk_22:18, 2Co_9:10), rendered ‘fruit.’

G. Gordon Stott.

☞ Gennesaret, Lake Of

GENNESARET, LAKE OF.—See Sea of Galilee.

☞ Gennesaret, Land Of

GENNESARET, LAND OF.—Thither Jesus and His disciples repaired after the feeding of the 5000 (Mat_14:22, Mar_6:45). This miracle probably took place on the N.E. shore of the Sea of Galilee. When evening came, the Synoptists tell us, His disciples entered

into a boat, and crossing over the sea, came to the land, unto Gennesaret, ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν εἰς Γεννησαρέτ (Mat 14:34, Mar 6:53).

1. Name.—The ‘Land of Gennesar, or Gennesaret,’ is mentioned but twice in the Bible (Mat 14:34, Mar 6:53). The name ‘Gennesaret,’ however, occurs elsewhere: once as the name of the Lake, παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Γεννησαρέτ (Luk 5:1), once in 1Ma 11:67 τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦ Γεννησαῶρ, and is frequently found in Josephus, who uses both λίμνη Γεννησαῶρτις (*Ant.* xviif. ii. 1) and λίμνη Γεννησαῶρ (*BJ* iii. x. 7); in the Targums, , גניסר, גניסר, and גניסר; and in Pliny’s writings, (v. 15). The name of the Lake was derived from that of the Plain, and that in turn from the name of a city supposed by the Jews to have been situated on the W. shore of the Sea of Galilee; that portion of the plain bordering on Mejdel being called el-Mejdel. On the derivation of the word , see art. Sea of Galilee.

2. Situation.—It is usually identified with the little plain situated on the western coast of the Sea of Galilee, and known to the Arabs as *el-Ghuweir*, ‘little Ghor or hollow.’ This identification is as good as certain. The description of it as given by Josephus can apply to no other. Several years ago an attempt was made by Thrupp and Tregelles (in the *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*, ii. 290-308) to identify it with the plain of *el-Batihah*, on the N.E. shore of the Lake, but without success (cf. Stanley’s ‘Note’ in refutation, *SP* [Note: P Sinai and Palestine.] 455).

3. Size.—Shut in by the hilly promontory of *Khân Minyeh* on the N. and the still more prominent hills by Magdala on the S., and extending westward from the Lake only to the base of the rugged uplands of Galilee, its total area is exceedingly small. Its approximate measurements are about 3 miles long from N. to S. by 1¼ broad from E. to W. Stanley’s measurements are wide of the mark when he says that the plain is 6 or 7 miles long by 5 miles broad (*SP* [Note: P Sinai and Palestine.] 442); and even G. A. Smith exaggerates when he describes it as ‘four miles broad’ (*HGHL* [Note: *GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*] 443). Josephus’ measurements are more nearly correct, viz. 30 × 20 stadia; though in fact it is a little longer than 30 and not quite so broad as 20. In form it is somewhat crescent-shaped or semi-elliptical. Its surface is comparatively level. Its altitude, like that of the Sea of Galilee, is over 650 feet below the level of the Mediterranean.

4. Josephus’ description of the Land of Gennesaret.—

‘Its nature is wonderful as well as its beauty: its soil is so fruitful that all sorts of trees can grow upon it, and the inhabitants accordingly plant all sorts of trees there; for the temper of the air is so well mixed that it agrees very well with these several sorts; particularly walnuts, which require the coldest air, flourish there in vast plenty; there are palm trees also, which grow best in hot air; fig trees also and olives grow near them, which yet require an air that is more temperate. One may call the place the ambition of nature, where it forces those plants that are naturally enemies to one another to agree together. It is a happy contention of the seasons, as if every one of them laid claim to this country; for it not only nourishes different sorts of autumnal fruit beyond men’s expectation, but preserves them a great while; it supplies men with the principal fruits, with grapes and figs continually, during ten months of the year, and with other fruits as they become ripe through the whole year; for besides the good temperature of the air, it is also watered from a most copious fountain. The people of the country call it Capharnaum. Some have thought it to be a vein of the Nile, because it produces the *coracin* fish as well as that lake does which is near to Alexandria. The length of this country extends itself along the banks of this lake that bears the same name for thirty furlongs, and is in breadth twenty. And this is the nature of that place’ (*BJ* iii. x. 8).

This classical passage from Josephus, though probably coloured to some extent, gives substantially the truth about the Plain as it must have been in the time of Christ, and for this reason it is of the utmost importance. Jewish Rabbins of early times corroborate his description. They describe it as possessing both ‘gardens and paradises’; as one of the garden spots of the world; as irrigated and cultivated so that no portion of it was barren; and as being dotted over thickly with towns and villages. Indeed, ruins of villages have been found at three or four different localities in the Plain, viz. at the opening of *Wady el-Hamam*, at ‘*Ain el-Mudauwarah*, south of ‘*Ain et-Tin*, and on the N. side of *Wady er-Rubudiyeh*.

5. Its condition to-day.—Josephus’ account is especially interesting because of the contrast between its condition then and now. Then, it was a most charming spot—‘the unparalleled garden of God,’ as a certain Rabbi calls it; and ‘the gem of Palestine,’ as Merrill speaks of it (*Galilee in the Time of Christ*, 33): now, it is, as Thomson says, ‘pre-eminently fruitful in thorns,’ a veritable thicket of oleanders and nubk trees, of gigantic thistles and brambles. And yet even now one finds proofs of its former luxuriance in the wealth of its wild flowers, the heavy-headed wheat and barley growing here and there, and in the stoutness of the thorns and thistles almost everywhere.

(1) The *soil* is wonderfully rich, like that of the Delta in Egypt. It consists of basaltic loam formed by the mingling of decomposed basalt with the alluvium of the lake. All travelers—Seetzen, von Schubert, Ritter, Burckhardt, Robinson, Wilson, and

Thomson—praise the fertility of this Plain, and all except Stanley (cf. *SP* [Note: P Sinai and Palestine.] 451) lament its present desolate and uncultivated condition. The latter erroneously describes it as ‘cultivated everywhere.’ Only near Magdala are there signs of marsh.

(2) *Fountains and streams* supply it with water in copious abundance. Three winter torrents rush down from the hill country lying to the west, and bring with them abundance of water for the greater portion of the year. (a) One is known as the *Wady el-Hamam*, or the ‘Valley of Pigeons,’ a deep gorge bounded by almost perpendicular cliffs over one thousand feet in height, which enters the Plain from the S.W. This is a tremendous ravine, and from Josephus’ day has been known as the ravine of the ‘Robber Caves’—the chosen resort of brigands in former days. Thomson describes it in two connexions, as ‘a great chasm ‘and as a ‘profound gorge’ (*Land and the Book*, ii. 395-397), and as leading up to a fort or castle known as *Kal’at ibn Ma’an*, and still on to the village of *Hattin*. Down this valley are poured large volumes of water, and down through this same ravine, as through a funnel, rush sudden blasts of wind, which break upon the Lake. The ruins of *Irbid*, the Arbela of Josephus and 1Ma 9:2, are not far to the south. (b) Another torrent, entering the Plain from the W., is that known as *Wady er-Rubudiyeh*. This is the largest, and yields the most plentiful supply of water furnished to the Plain. It is used to irrigate the Plain both N. and S., furnishing nearly three times the volume of water supplied by ‘*Ain el-Mudauwarah*. (c) A third torrent enters the Plain from the N.W. It is called *Wady el-Amud*. Like *Wady el-Hamam*, it is a deep ravine, and scarcely less striking because of its narrowness. Its waters take their rise in the Jarmuk, the highest mountain in Galilee. For the greater part of its course it is called *Wady el-Leimum*. It is only a winter torrent. According to Thomson, all of these streams which enter the Plain disappear in summer before they reach the Lake.

Besides these waters which drain the region of Galilee immediately west of the Plain of Gennesaret, there are certain fountains in the Plain itself whose waters were used for irrigation: (a) ‘*Ain el-Mudauwarah*, or ‘Round Fountain,’ situated a little over a mile N.W. of Magdala, is the largest and most important. It is enclosed by a circular wall of hewn stones, 32 yards in diameter, surrounded by thick trees and brushwood, so that access is difficult; but it yields a copious stream of clear water, which flows across the Plain to the Lake, irrigating right and left. The pool itself contains two to three feet of water and certain fish. Ebrard (*SK* [Note: K Studien und Kritiken.] , 1867, pp. 723-747) identified it with the fountain of Capharnaum mentioned by Josephus, but this has been shown to be highly improbable. Two other fountains assist in watering the southern end of the Plain: ‘*Ain el-Bareidch*, or ‘Cold Spring,’ also known as ‘*Ain el-Fuliyeh*, or ‘Fountain of the Bean’; and ‘*Ain es-Serar*, somewhat further to the S.W. (β) ‘*Ain et-Tin*, or ‘Fountain of the Fig Tree,’ is another large and important spring. It is situated on the northern edge of the Plain, and bursts forth from under

the cliffs of *Khân Minyeh*. Unfortunately, it is too close to the shore of the Lake to be used extensively for irrigating purposes. The stream which issues from it is choked with a jungle of oleanders and papyrus. Robinson identifies this fountain with the spring of Capharnaum of Josephus. (γ) '*Ain et-Tabigha*, or 'Fountain of the Ruined Mill,' formerly supposed to be the scene of the miracle of the feeding of the 5000 (Mar 6:30-44), is another large spring of water—according to Tristram, the largest in Galilee, and about one-half as large as the fountain at Caesarea Philippi. It is not situated in the Plain, but considerably N.E., about half-way between *Khân Minyeh* and *Tell Hum*, the two rival sites of Capernaum; but its waters were formerly conducted by a channel cut in the rock around the promontory on which *Khan Minyeh* is situated, and made to irrigate the N. end of the Plain of Gennesaret. This aqueduct was discovered first by Sir Chas. Wilson, and since then the fountain has been generally considered to be the spring of Capharnaum of Josephus (cf. Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii. 429).

(3) *Products*.—With all these resources of irrigation, it is not surprising that the Plain of Gennesaret should be described by the Rabbins as the 'Garden of God,' or that its superior and delicious fruits 'were not allowed at the feasts in Jerusalem lest some might attend primarily to enjoy these fruits' (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Pesachim*, 8 b; Neubauer, *Géog. du Talmud*, 45 f.). But to-day, though its grapes, figs, olives, and walnuts have vanished, there are to be seen wild figs, oleanders, nubk trees, dwarf palms, papyrus plants, tall prickly centaureas: in summer, magnificent lilac-coloured convolvuli hanging in long festoons of blossom from the prickly shrubs; wild flowers of countless variety—tulips, anemones, irises; rice, wheat, the best and earliest melons and cucumbers in Palestine, sedges and rushes by the Lake; also thorns and thistles, especially in the central portion; in short, a tangle of luxuriant vegetation—a lovely floral carpet in February, a wilderness of thorns in summer. For here, indeed, Nature has lavished her glory in tropical profusion.

(4) *Roads*.—Two paths cross the Plain from S. to N.—the chief one leading from Magdala to *Khân Minyeh* in a direct course, and skirting the Lake shore within a few hundred feet; the other following the base of the hills along its western side, and striking over the hills northwards. One of the best views obtainable of the Plain is from the top of the ridge above Magdala.

(5) *Inhabitants*.—The Plain is without settled inhabitants to-day. The *Ghawarineh* Arabs, more especially a certain tribe named *es-Senekiyeh*, roam over it, using it as winter pasture land. Wilson recounts that gipsies from India have been known to sojourn there with their tents and flocks (p. 138). As a rule, solitude reigns except near the village of Magdala and at *Khân Minyeh*.

(6) *Health*.—Fever is still prevalent in this region as in the days of our Lord, when, not far distant, at least, Peter's wife's mother lay sick (Luk 4:38). Thomson speaks of 'the heat and malarial influences of the Plain.' This probably accounts in part for its present desolation, though under the Turk it has fared but little worse than other portions of the Empire.

Such is the land of Gennesaret, on the immediate edge of which lay Capernaum, and over whose 'Eden-like landscape' the feet of our blessed Lord so often trod as He went about preaching from village to village, healing the sick and raising to life the dead. One can almost see Him, in fancy, pushing out in a little boat along the embayed and shell-covered shore, followed to the water's edge by the multitudes who pressed upon Him daily from populous Gennesaret, and hear Him speaking to them, as they sit upon the shore, concerning the gospel of the Kingdom, drawing illustrations from the sower, who, going forth to sow, allows some seeds to fall by the wayside, others on stony places, still others where they are choked by thorns; and then, when He became weary, retiring to the mountains for rest and spiritual refreshment in prayer, only to return again and repeat His message of goodwill and comfort; until, finally, when the great tragedy on Calvary is ended and He is risen from the tomb, He reappears to those same disciples, who meanwhile have returned to their nets. Surely no other spot of like size can possibly be of equal interest, to the Christian who loves to trace the footprints of His Master's earthly career, with what has justly been called 'the most sacred region of the Lake,' 'the gem of Palestine.'

Literature.—Sanday, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, 39 f.; Tristram, *Bible Places*, 311-315, *The Land of Israel*, 565; Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, i. 86, ii. 293 f., 298, 408, iii. 166; G. A. Smith, *HGH* [Note: GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.] 443 ff.; Merrill, *Galilee in the Time of Christ*, 33, 34, art. 'Gennesaret, Land of,' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible; Robinson, *BRP* [Note: RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.] iii. 277ff., *Physical Geog. of the Holy Land*, 199; Cheyne, art. 'Gennesar' in *Encyc. Bibl.*; Wright and Hackett, art. 'Gennesaret, Land of,' in Smith's *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.]; Socin in Baedeker's *Palestine and Syria*, 291; Stewart, *Land of Israel*, 264; Conder, *Primer of Bible Geog.* 150 f.; Stanley, *SP* [Note: P Sinai and Palestine.] 444-454; Wilson, *Lands of the Bible*, 137; Geikie, *The Holy Land and the Bible*, ii. 331; Ritter, *Geog. of Palestine*, ii. 265; Buhl, *GAP* [Note: AP Geographic des alten Palästina.] 113; Neubauer, *Géog. du Talm.* 45f.; Josephus, *BJ* iii. x. 8; Ruetsche in *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] v. 6f.; Furrer in Schenkel, ii. 322; Swete, *Com. on St. Mark, ad 6:53*; Plummer, *Com. on St. Luke, ad 5:1*.

☞Gentiles

GENTILES.—In AV of the Gospels, ‘Gentiles’ and ‘nations’ are the translations of ἔθνη, RV agreeing with the rendering of AV in every place of the word’s occurrence. In Mt 6:7 (ἔθνηκοί) and 18:17 (ἔθνηκός) AV has ‘heathen’ and ‘a heathen man’ respectively; RV ‘Gentiles’ and ‘the Gentile.’ In Mt 5:47, where AV has τελῶναι, ‘publicans,’ RV with the reading ἔθνηκοί has ‘Gentiles.’ Ἕλληνες, occurring in John only, is rendered ‘Greeks’ in 12:20 RV and AV; in 7:35 RV has ‘Greeks,’ AV ‘Gentiles,’ with, however, ‘Greeks’ in the margin. Ἕλληνις (Mk 7:26) is translated ‘a Greek’ in both versions, but AV has ‘Gentile’ in the margin. The very wide diffusion of the Greek language after the conquests of Alexander the Great was the reason that in our Lord’s day ‘Greek’ was often used as an equivalent for ‘Gentile.’ See Greeks. The word ‘Gentiles,’ from the Lat. *gentilis* (adjective of *gens*, pl. *gentes*, ‘a race,’ ‘people,’ or ‘nation’), is used in the Vulgate to render the Heb. גֵּוִי and the Gr. ἔθνη, and has thus passed into English.

For a full discussion of the term ‘Gentiles,’ reference must be made to the Bible Dictionaries. It is only necessary here to allude to the origin and use of the expression in the OT. Just as ἔθνος in the Gospels, as a rule (for an exception see [Mat 21:43](#)), means the Jewish nation, and ἔθνη the nations other than Jewish, so in the OT גֵּוִי (i), as a rule (for an exception see [Lev 20:23](#)), stands for the former and the pl. גֵּוִיִּם (im) for the latter; and whilst often used in its purely ethnographical and geographical sense, with the meaning ‘foreigner,’ it is also constantly employed, especially in the Psalms, as a term of aversion and contempt, as connoting the practice of false religions and of immoral customs. The material and moral evils which the im had brought upon Israel in its later history tended to intensify the feelings of hostility with which the Jews looked out upon them from their own religious exclusiveness; and accordingly, in our Lord’s day and in the generations following (see Acts and the Epistles), they were regarded by the Jews generally as aliens, having no claim whatever to the Divine recognition. This must be borne in mind when estimating our Lord’s teaching on the subject.

A full consideration of the attitude of early Christianity towards the Gentiles requires a study of the Acts and Epistles at least, and is beyond the scope of this article: our

Lord's teaching, however, afterwards developed by His followers, is quite plainly indicated in the Gospels, and must form the basis of any adequate discussion of the subject.

The fact that Jesus did not pass His youth in the religiously exclusive atmosphere of Jerusalem, but in the freer and more liberal surroundings of semi-Gentile Galilee, fits in with the prophetic word of Simeon at the Presentation, and the declarations of His forerunner: He was to be 'a light to lighten the Gentiles' (Luk 2:32); and, God was able to raise up to Abraham children (Luk 3:8) who could not boast any natural descent from the patriarch. St. Matthew, although according to the usual account of his standpoint he had no especially Gentile proclivities, records two important prophetic utterances regarding the Gentiles as being illustrated and fulfilled in his Master's work: 'Galilee of the Gentiles; the people which sat in darkness saw great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up' (Luk 4:15-16), and, 'In his name shall the Gentiles trust' (Luk 12:21). At the beginning of His ministry, if we accept St. Luke's chronology (see Naaman), Jesus defied the Jewish prejudices of His hearers in the synagogue at Nazareth by citing cases of Gentiles blessed through the agency of Israel's prophets (Luk 4:25 ff.); and, when driven from His native town, He took up His abode in a city of despised Galilee which belonged to that less Jewish portion of it known as 'Galilee of the Gentiles' (Mat 4:15). Moreover, it was in the same Gentile-infected Galilee that the most important part of His ministry was carried on, and He even went into the borders of Tyre and Sidon (Mar 7:24), and also taught and healed those who came to Him from thence, together with those who sought Him from Decapolis (Mat 4:25), and from Idumaea, and from beyond Jordan (Mar 3:8); nor did He disdain to remain on one occasion for two days among the Samaritans at their request (Joh 4:40). In His public teaching He showed no prejudice in favour of the Jews in His assignment of praise and blame: the grateful leper whom He blessed was a Samaritan (Luk 17:16 ff.); it was a good Samaritan who was set forth as an example in one of His most famous parables (Luk 10:30 ff.); and He commended the faith of the centurion as being greater than any He had found in Israel (Mat 8:10). On the other hand, the evil generation of whom the Pharisees were representatives, He declared should be condemned in the judgment by Gentiles, the men of Nineveh and the queen of Sheba (Mat 12:41 f.); and, setting the seal to the teaching of His forerunner, He asserted in effect that the true children of Abraham were those who did the deeds of Abraham, and were not necessarily those who were naturally descended from him (Joh 8:39 ff.). In the Sermon on the Mount the same broad and world-wide outlook is manifested: there is hardly anything of importance in that great discourse which is local or temporary—it is obviously for all men and for all time. With this, too, coincides the teaching of His many parables about the Kingdom of heaven and that recorded in the Fourth Gospel—in this Gospel particularly all His utterances are in accord with His declaration to the Samaritan woman concerning the true worshippers (Joh 4:23), and with the

impression produced on the Samaritans that He was the Saviour of the world (Joh_4:42); for in this Gospel especially His words of warning, of encouragement, and of hope embrace all mankind: 'God so loved the *world* ... that *whosoever* believeth ... shall have eternal life' (Joh_3:16). And, finally, at the end of His ministry, in the allegory of the sheep and the goats, spoken exclusively with reference to Gentiles, He applies to those on the right hand the word 'righteous,' which in the Jewish language was so often the technical term to designate only the chosen people (Mat_25:37).

There are two passages in the Gospels which demand a passing notice, as they might seem at first sight to be in opposition to our Lord's usual attitude towards the Gentiles. One is His saying to the Syrophœnician woman, 'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Mat_15:24); and the other is His injunction to the Twelve, 'Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Mat_10:5; Mat_10:8). In the first case there is little doubt that our Lord's words were intended to test or to call forth the woman's faith, and are not to be understood as implying any unwillingness on His part to assist her (see Syrophœnician Woman). And in the second case we are to notice that the prohibition was laid upon the Twelve only, and had no application to His own conduct; and, further, that the prohibition was distinctly removed by Him after the Resurrection in the great commission recorded in Mat_28:19 'Go ye therefore and teach all nations' [in Mar_16:15 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature'], and in Act_1:6 'Ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.' And there are other passages, such as Mat_24:14; Mat_26:13, from which it is plain that our Lord contemplated the world-wide preaching of the gospel by His followers, the fulfilment, in fact, of the ancient prediction to the father of the faithful: 'In thy seed shall all the nations (*goyim*) of the earth be blessed' (Gen_22:18). See Missions.

Literature.—Grimm-Thayer and Cremer, *Lexx.* s.v. ἔθνος; art. 'Gentiles' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible and *Encyc. Bibl.*; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii. i. 51-56, 299-305, ii. 291-327; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, Index, s. 'Gentiles.'

Albert Bonus.

GENTLENESS.—St. Paul in 2Co 10:1 appeals to the meekness and gentleness (πραύτης καὶ ἐπιείκεια) of Christ. These qualities would be readily admitted to be so characteristic of Jesus as to require no specific illustration. Yet such is the objective character of the Gospels, that with the exception of His own claim to be ‘meek and lowly in heart’ (Mat 11:29) and the Evangelist’s application of the prophecy, ‘Behold, thy king cometh unto thee, meek ...’ (Mat 21:5), neither quality is directly attributed to Him, nor, with the exception of Mat 5:5, does either word occur in His recorded teaching.

These characteristics of Jesus are not easily defined in themselves, or distinguished from one another. (See art. ‘Gentleness’ in Hastings’ *DB*, vol. ii. p. 150). Πραύτης is rather an inward disposition of the mind, the quietness of soul which is the result of faith and self-restraint; ἐπιείκεια is an active grace, exhibited in human relations, ‘it expresses the quality of considerateness, of readiness to look humanely and reasonably at the facts of a case’; it denotes in Jesus the tenderness of His dealings with the moral and social outcasts, the burdened and heavy laden, the weak and ignorant; His gracious courtesy, geniality of address, thoughtfulness, and delicacy of touch. It is not the expression of a nature of such softness as to be always on the verge of tears, or of a sentimentalism which has little strength of conscience, and no power of moral indignation and repulsion. The gentleness of Christ can be appreciated only when it is related to certain other elements in His personality. (1) His consciousness of His Divine origin, and His royal vocation as founder of the Kingdom of God (cf. Joh 13:3-5). (2) His moral consciousness. His is not the gentleness towards the sinful which arises from moral indifference, or the desire of a sin-marred nature to be judged of leniently. He is conscious of sinlessness; He looks upon sin as the great tragedy of human life, but His passion for righteousness does not make Him harsh in judgment or unmerciful in dealing (cf. Mat 5:6-7). (3) His consciousness of Divine power. It is the gentleness not of weakness, but of might. The Lamb of God answering Pilate so mildly was conscious that twelve legions of angels stood at His disposal (Mat 26:53).

The Baptist, himself stern of soul, foresaw the coming of one greater than he—greater, but not more gentle. The axe, fan, and fire of judgment were at His command, and He would wield these instruments of wrath to the destruction of wickedness (Mat 3:10-12). But, to John’s intense disappointment, Jesus found His ideal and method not in these symbols of violence, but in the conception of the Servant of Jehovah, who did not strive or cry or lift up his voice in the streets, who did not break the bruised reed or quench the smoking flax (Mat 12:19-20; cf. Luk 4:16; Luk 4:19 and Mat 11:4-6, and see Isa 42:1-3).

The Gospels abound in illustrations of the winsome manner of Jesus. His reception of the little children (Mat 18:2; Mat 19:13), His thoughtfulness for the multitude lest they should faint by the way (Mat 15:32), the brotherly touch of His hand upon the leper (Mar 1:41), the delicacy of His approach to the sorrowing (Luk 7:13, Joh 11:35), His tender tones to His perplexed disciples—‘little children,’ ‘I will not leave you orphans’ (Joh 13:33; Joh 14:18), and His sense of their frailty in the words, ‘Sleep on now and take your rest’ (Mat 26:45), His consideration, even in the agony of death, for His mother (Joh 19:26-27),—are but examples of that gracious gentleness which consisted with, and was the expression of, a Divine dignity of love. His attitude to the sinful is distinguished by the same tenderness. His intense love of holiness, quick moral sensitiveness, and stainless purity, made Him uncompromisingly stern in His rebuke of a self-righteousness which had little capacity of repentance; but He combined with that a deep insight into the possibilities of sin-marred natures; and by His disclosure to them of dormant powers of being, and the tenderness of His dealing with them, He won them to repentance and a new life (Luk 7:36-50; Luk 19:1-10). And, similarly, His rebukes, touched by His gentleness, become appeals, and are charged with the inspiration of a renewed trust. His ‘O ye of little faith’ (Mat 8:26), ‘Can ye drink the cup that I drink of?’ (Mar 10:38), ‘Martha, Martha, thou art careful and troubled about many things’ (Luk 10:41), ‘Could ye not watch with me one hour?’ (Mat 26:40), ‘Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me?’ (Joh 21:15 ff.),—were rebukes whose gentleness could leave no bitterness or despair, but recalled the soul to its loyalty to Him. So, although Jesus never formally held forth ἐπιείκεια as an ideal of Christian life, He left us an example that we should follow His steps (1Pe 2:21).

Literature.—Trench, *Synonyms*, § xlii.; M. Arnold, *Literature and Dogma*, vii. 3; A. L. Moore, *God is Love* (1894), 134; G. Jackson, *Memoranda Paulina* (1901), 61; J. Watson, *The Inspiration of our Faith* (1905), 190; J. W. Jack, *After His Likeness* (1906), 88.

Joseph Muir.

☞ Gerasenes, Gergesenes

GERASENES, GERGESENES.—The ‘country of the Gerasenes’ (Γερασσηνῶν) or ‘Gergesenes’ (Γεργεσηνῶν) is mentioned in Scripture only in connexion with the healing of the demoniac. The Authorized Version reads ‘Gergesenes’ in Mat 8:28, and ‘Gadarenes’ in Mar 5:1 and Luk 8:26, while the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 reads ‘Gadarenes’ in Mt. and ‘Gerasenes’ in Mk. and Luke. There is

preponderating evidence in favour of the changes (the reading Γαζαρηῶν in ⌘ in Mt. is undoubtedly for Γαδαρηῶν. Many natives in the district surrounding the Sea of Galilee pronounce the Arabic ʿd and ʿdh like z—thus ‘Gadarenes’ they would pronounce ‘Gazarenes’). The neighbourhood of the town of Gadara must be pronounced absolutely impossible for the miracle (see Gadara). How then account for the reading ‘Gadarenes’? Perhaps, as Thomson suggests, the place where the miracle took place, ‘over against Galilee,’ was included within the district of Gadara. But as this would not be officially correct, Gadara having been the capital of the country to the *south* of the town, it might be better to say that popular usage gave to the whole district on the eastern shore of the Lake the name of the principal town. In the same way the reading Γερασηῶν *might* be explained—being derived from the large and important city of the Decapolis, Gerasa—the modern *Jerash*. (It need scarcely be said that this latter town is out of the question as the scene of the miracle, being some 30 miles from the Lake). The derivation of the reading from the Decapoltan city, while not perhaps impossible, is very improbable. A more likely explanation is at hand. According to Origen, the majority of the MS^S [Note: SS Manuscripts.] he had access to had the reading ‘Gerasenes.’ But this reading he objected to, inasmuch as he knew of only one *Gerasa*, the town of the Decapolis, which he rightly conceived could not have been the scene of the miracle. He suggested that ‘Gergesenes’ must be the true reading, as he knew of a town on the eastern shore of the Lake bearing the name *Gergesa*. Hence, on his authority, the reading ‘Gergesenes’ may have originated. But how then account for the, presumably, true reading which Origen found in the MS^S [Note: SS Manuscripts.] ? There can be here no certainty, but the probability is that Origen was right, and that the true name of the village or town where the miracle occurred, ‘over against Galilee,’ was Gergesa. It is extremely rare to find a soft changing into a harsh sound, such as *Gerasa* into *Gergesa*. But any one who has lived long in Palestine knows how common it is, among the uneducated natives, to find a hard sound like the second g in ‘Gergesa’ not only changing into a softer sound, but dropping out altogether. The pronunciation of ‘Gergesa’ among the common people would almost certainly be ‘Ger’sa’ (*Gerasa*). Hence from the common speech it would find its way into the text. The modern name of the village which has been identified as the scene of the miracle is *Kheresa* or *Chersa*, which is nearer to ‘Gerasa’ than to ‘Gergesa.’

The identification of the ruins of Kheresa with the Gerasa of the Synoptists is due to Thomson, (LB [Note: The Land and the Book.] ii. 355). The identification might have been made much earlier had not men’s minds been set on selecting some place near *Gadara*. Had the eastern shore of the Lake been carefully scrutinized in the light of the three passages, Mat 8:32, Mar 5:13, Luk 8:33, the identification of Kheresa with

the place described must have taken place. There is *one spot only* on the eastern shore which answers completely to the description of the Synoptists. On the eastern side 'over against Galilee' Jesus landed from the boat, and 'straightway there met him out of the tombs a man with an unclean spirit.' The encounter, then, must have been close to the shore. Were that all we had to guide us, identification of the spot would be impossible, for there are caves, which may have been used as tombs, all along the mountain side. But it would appear from all three Synoptists that the place where the swine were destroyed ran down somewhat steeply to the water's edge. Now, as we have said, there is *only one place* on the eastern side where the mountain comes at all near to the beach, and just there the incline is such that one rushing down would be precipitated at once by the impetus into the water. Everywhere else along the coast there is a broad belt—half a mile or more at most parts—between the foot of the hills and the Lake. This spot is at Khersa just below *Wâdy es-Semak*. Sailing up the Lake from *Wâdy Fîk*, which is almost exactly opposite Tiberias, the next valley, about a mile north, is *Wâdy es-Semak*. Close to the seashore directly below the *Wâdy* are the ruins of Khersa, the walls of which can yet be distinctly traced. Directly below Khersa the hills approach close to the Lake, leaving only a narrow pebbly strand, and here the slope of the mountain side is so steep and near to the water that a herd of animals would be likely in a headlong rush to be precipitated into the sea. In the mountains above, where in all probability the swine were feeding, there are numbers of caves and also rock-cut tombs where the demoniacs may have lived. See art. Demon.

Literature.—Thomson, *LB* [Note: The Land and the Book.] ii. ch. 10; Wilson, *Recovery of Jerus.* p. 368 f.; Schumacher, *Jaulan*, 179; Macgregor, *The Rob Roy on the Jordan*, p. 422 ff.; artt. 'Gadara' and 'Gerasenes' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible and in *Encyc. Biblica*.

J. Soutar.

☞ Gerizim

GERIZIM.—In relation to the life and teaching of Jesus, the interest of Mt. Gerizim lies in its being the mountain to which the woman of Samaria referred on the occasion when Jesus uttered His memorable words, 'Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father' (Joh 4:21).

The establishment of Mt. Gerizim and its temple as the sacred Place of the Samaritans in rivalry to Jerusalem, is bound up with the growth of the jealousy and hatred

between Jews and Samaritans, which had attained such magnitude in the days of our Lord. The story given by Josephus of the founding of the temple on Mt. Gerizim (*Ant.* xi. viii. 2-4) is that Manasseh, brother of Jaddua, high priest at Jerusalem, married the daughter of Sanballat (Nehemiah 4). For this marriage he was threatened with expulsion unless he divorced his wife. He thereupon appealed to Sanballat, who built for him the temple on Mt. Gerizim, and made him its first high priest. This story 'seems to be derived from some apocryphal Jewish account of the origin of the Samaritan temple' (Sayce, art. 'Sanballat' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible). According to Neh 13:28, a grandson of Eliashib the high priest was son-in-law to Sanballat, and was expelled for this 'mixed marriage.' More reliable, if less definite, ground is to be found in 2Ki 17:24-28, from which we learn that the king of Assyria sent back one of the priests whom he had carried away from the Northern Kingdom, to teach the heathen peoples whom he had settled there 'the manner of the God of the land.' Thus the worship of Jehovah was preserved in Samaria, and gradually asserted itself over the 'gods of their own' which every nation made. In the days of Ezra, when the temple at Jerusalem was being rebuilt, the Samaritans, who are called 'the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin,' desired to assist in the task, for they said, 'We seek your God as ye do.' This request was refused (Ezr 4:1-3), and thus the founding of a rival shrine became inevitable. See also art. Samaritans.

The claim of the Samaritans, that Mt. Gerizim was the true centre of the worship of Jehovah, rested upon a statement in their version of the Pentateuch (Deu 27:4 f. where 'Gerizim' is substituted for 'Ebal' of Massoretic Text) definitely prescribing that an altar should be built there. They also supported the claim of their shrine by traditions in which it was represented as the mountain on which Abraham prepared to sacrifice Isaac (cf. G. A. Smith, *HGH* [Note: *GHL* Historical Geog. of Holy Land.] 334, note), the place where Abraham was met by Melchizedek, and also the scene of Jacob's dream.

Apart from such traditions, the position of Mt. Gerizim and its *vis-à-vis* Mt. Ebal, at the head of the pass leading right through from the river Jordan to the sea, and also at the point where the great north road from Jerusalem to Galilee intersects this pass, has given them a commanding place in the topography of the Holy Land, and has led to their association with important events in the history of Israel. Shechem, which lay between Mt. Ebal and Mt. Gerizim, is associated with the entrance of both Abraham and Jacob into the promised land (Gen 12:6; Gen 33:18). It was near Shechem that Jacob purchased the parcel of land from the children of Hamor, on which he erected an altar, and sank a well for his family and flocks. It was in this parcel of land that Joseph was buried (Jos 24:32). Mt. Ebal and Mt. Gerizim, again, were the scenes of the great inaugural service of all Israel on taking possession of the promised land (Deu 11:29; Deu 11:32; Deu 27:11-12, Jos 8:33-34). And it was at Shechem that Joshua gathered together the people for the renewal of the covenant,

‘and took a great stone and set it up there under an oak that was by the sanctuary of the Lord’ (Jos 24:1; Jos 24:28). It was on Mt. Gerizim that Abimelech, Gideon’s son, spoke his parable of the trees (Jdg 8:31; Jdg 9:1; Jdg 9:7; Jdg 9:20). It was at Shechem also that all Israel gathered to make Rehoboam king (1Ki 12:1), and this was the original capital of the Northern Kingdom.

In order to understand the significance of the question which the woman put to Jesus at the well (Joh 4:20), it is necessary to remember that she must have been well instructed in the notable history of Mt. Gerizim, and would accept all the traditions of her people without question. At the same time her own religious faith was probably bankrupt. She had not found God on Mt. Gerizim. There is a vein of scepticism in her words, as of one who, having lost personal faith, points with scorn to the differences of those who worship the same God. Yet even in her scepticism there is a faint hope apparent that this ‘prophet’ may have a living message for her. On the historical question involved Jesus pronounces quite definitely in Joh 4:22, but not before He has lifted the whole subject out of this barren controversy and set it in relation to the fundamental principles of His teaching. There is embedded in the very beginning of the Samaritan worship of Jehovah the idea that Jehovah is the ‘God of the land’ (2Ki 17:27), and throughout the whole controversy between Jerusalem and Mt. Gerizim there is to be found the assumption that His worship must have a local centre. To this Jesus makes answer, ‘God is Spirit.’ It follows at once from this fundamental idea of the true nature of God that the essential quality in worship which is acceptable to Him is not the place where it is offered, but the disposition of the worshipper. Wendt points out that our Lord’s teaching in this passage as to the true nature of worship is a corollary of His teaching in the Sermon on the Mount, that the heart (the whole inward nature) is the true seat of the righteousness of the people of God. So that for the ethical expansion of Joh 4:23-24 we naturally turn to Matthew 5-7, even as in Joh 4:24 we find the great doctrinal foundation alike of right conduct and right worship.

Literature.—Stanley, *SP* [Note: P Sinai and Palestine.] v.; G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [Note: GHG Historical Geog. of Holy Land.] 120, 332; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] ii. i. 5; Muirhead, *Times of Christ*, 108; Dods, ‘St. John’ in *Expos. Bible*, ix. and x.; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, i. 320; artt. ‘Gerizim’ and ‘Shechem’ in *Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible*; Commentaries.

Andrew N. Bogle.

GESTURES.—Dr. Johnson defines ‘gesture’ as (1) ‘action or posture expressive of sentiment’; (2) ‘movement of the body.’ Adopting these definitions, we may consider the significance of the gestures recorded or implied in the Gospels.

1. Christ heals or blesses with an outward gesture.—In most of these cases the gesture is probably intended to confirm faith; a visible sign accompanies the action. Thus (a) we read of our Lord *taking* the sick person *by the hand*, as in the case of Simon’s wife’s mother (Mar_1:31 and || Mt.), Jairus’ daughter (Mar_5:41 and || Mt. Lk.), and the child with the dumb spirit (Mar_9:27). Similarly St. Peter takes by the hand the man at the gate of the temple and Tabitha (Act_3:7; Act_9:41). Dr. Swete (on Mar_9:27) suggests that this gesture was used when great exhaustion had preceded. (b) Jesus *lifted up His hands* to bless (Luk_24:50). (c) Jesus *stretched forth His hand* to heal, and *touched* or *laid hands on* the sick, as in the case of the leper in Mar_1:41 (and || Mt. Lk.). In Act_4:30 the Apostles speak of God the Father stretching forth His hand to heal. Other instances of Jesus’ touching the patients, doubtless, as a rule, to confirm their faith, are: the blind men in Mat_9:29; Mat_20:34 (the parallels to the latter in Mk.-Lk. mention no touching), the bier on which the widow’s son at Nain lay (Luk_7:14), the woman with the spirit of infirmity (Luk_13:13), perhaps the dropsical man (Luk_14:4, see Plummer, *in loc.*), Malchus (Luk_22:51, the only account of this healing). Further, St. Luke speaks of a large number of sick folk brought to our Lord at sunset, when He ‘laid his hands on every one of them and healed them’ (Luk_4:40, not || Mt. Mk.). The healings by anointing would also involve a touch, as by the Twelve (Mar_6:13), or in the case of the blind man anointed with clay (Joh_9:6); cf. Jam_5:14 for the custom in the Apostolic Church. Similarly we read of the sick touching Jesus,—the woman with the issue (Mar_5:27 (Mar_5:27 and || Mt. Lk.)), the sick at Gennesaret and the neighbor (Mar_6:56 (Mar_6:56 and || Mt.)); and Luk_6:19 (Luk_6:19) says that ‘all the multitude sought to touch Him, for power came forth from him and healed them all.’ This ‘touch’ of the Lord is recalled by the cures that are recorded to have been worked by handkerchiefs or aprons carried away from the body of St. Paul (Act_19:13), and by the shadow of St. Peter (Act_5:15, where it is implied that many tried to touch him). And inasmuch as the Apostles would follow the example of Jesus in lesser and greater things alike (cf. Act_4:13), we find that they adopted His gestures, whether for healings or for invocations of the Holy Spirit, or even in speaking. For the touching by laying on of hands, see Act_6:6; Act_8:17 f., Act_13:3, Act_19:6 and Act_9:12, Act_28:8; the last two are cases of healing, (d) Jesus *laid on hands* to bless, as in the case of the little children (Mar_10:16 and || Mt.). We read twice in Mk. of our Lord’s taking children in His arms (Mar_9:36; Mar_10:16 ἐναγκαλισάμενος), a gesture ascribed to Him in Mk. only, though a similar phrase is used of Simeon in Luk_2:28 ἐδέξατο αὐτὸ εἰς τὰς ἀγκάλας [αὐτοῦ]. In another way we read of

Jesus' blessing with a gesture of the hand, as at the Last Supper (λαβὼν—εὐλογήσας, Mar 14:23) and at the meal at Emmaus (Luk 24:30; Luk 24:35). (c) Jesus *breathed* on His disciples when 'sending' them after the Resurrection, saying, 'Receive ye the Holy Spirit: whosoever sins ye forgive,' etc. (Joh 20:22 f.). Here the gesture is of a different nature; our Lord, still using an outward sign, makes it signify that which is bestowed—the gift of the Spirit (πνεῦμα ἅγιον, without the article). Breath is the emblem of the Spirit, and by this gesture Jesus shows that the Holy Ghost is the 'Spirit of Christ' as well as of the Father (see Westcott, *in loc.*).

On the other hand, in some cases Jesus healed with a mere word. One cannot, indeed, always conclude that He did not use any outward gesture, such as touching, merely because an Evangelist is silent on the matter (e.g. cf. Mar 10:52 with Mat 20:34); but in some cases, at least, Jesus healed *in absence*. The following are examples of cases where apparently no gesture was used: the paralytic (Mar 2:10 and || Mt. Lk.), the man with the withered hand (Mar 3:5 and || Mt. Lk.), the centurion's servant (Luk 7:10), the ten lepers (Luk 17:14), the nobleman's son at Capernaum (Joh 4:50 ff.). We find the same difference in the healings in Acts; thus, in Act 9:34; Act 14:10 no gesture seems to have been used.

The use by our Lord of an outward gesture or sign in His ministerial acts was only in accordance with Jewish thought. We may recall Moses stretching forth his hand over the Red Sea (Exo 14:16; Exo 14:21; Exo 14:26; cf. Exo 17:11), and, by way of contrast, the stretching out of the hand in OT as an act of punishment (Exo 7:5; see other instances collected by Plummer in his note on Luk 5:13). It may be thought that this usage of Jesus in His ministry paved the way for His afterwards appointing outward signs in Baptism and the Eucharist, and for the Apostles' employing them for other Christian rites, such as ordination.

2. Christ uses gestures to emphasize His words, or as an expression of emotion.—(a) We read of the *stretching forth of the hand* toward the disciples when Jesus claimed them as His mother and His brethren (Mat 12:49); cf. St. Paul's gesture when addressing Agrippa (Act 26:1). We cannot put under this head the hand outstretched in Mat 14:31; Mat 26:23, as there it does not express emotion; but we may compare with the above gesture the hands outstretched in prayer (1Ki 8:22, Psa 28:2; Psa 134:2, 1Ti 2:8). A 4th cent. writer has interpreted our Lord's 'stretching forth his hands' (cf. St. Peter, Joh 21:18) of His accepting suffering voluntarily (*Testament of our Lord*, i. 23). (b) We read of many *gestures with the eyes*. Jesus looked up to heaven at the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand (Mar 6:41 and || Mt. Lk.), in His last prayer before going to Gethsemane (Joh 17:1), at the healing of the deaf man with an impediment (Mar 7:34), and the raising of Lazarus (Joh 11:41). It is doubtless due to the first two of these passages that we find

in many ancient Liturgies, from the *Apostolic Constitutions* onwards, this gesture ascribed to our Lord when He consecrated the Eucharist—as in the Greek St. James (in the Syriac St. James it is only implied), St. Mark both Greek and Coptic, Abyssinian (or Ethiopia), St. Basil, Roman and Ambrosian. The gesture is one of prayer, and implies that prayer accompanied the actions described (see Job 22:26; cf. the publican, Luk 18:13). Again, the references to the ‘glance’ or ‘look’ of our Lord are very frequent. In Mar 3:5 it conveys His righteous anger (|| Lk. does not mention the anger). In Mar 3:34; Mar 10:27 (and || Mt.) and Luk 6:20; Luk 20:17, it apparently emphasizes the truth taught. In Luk 22:61 it brings conviction of sin to St. Peter after his denials. In Mar 10:21 it is a mark of love; here, as so often, St. Mark alone relates the feelings of our Lord’s human soul. The glance to emphasize truth must also be understood where we expressly read of Jesus’ ‘turning’ to those whom He is addressing (Mar 8:33, Luk 7:9; Luk 9:55 etc.). On the other hand, no special significance must be attached to passages where our Lord’s ‘look’ is mentioned, but where it was merely that He might see, as Mar 5:32 (and || Mt.), Luk 19:5; Luk 21:1. Corresponding with this gesture of Jesus is the keen ‘gaze’ or ‘fastening of the eyes’ which we read of in the case of the people of Nazareth (Luk 4:20), the maidservant (Luk 22:56), St. Peter (Act 3:4; cf. Act 3:12), the Sanhedrin (Act 6:15), St. Stephen (Act 7:55), Cornelius (Act 10:4), St. Paul (Act 13:9; Act 14:9; Act 23:1)—all having ὀφθαλμια, one of St. Luke’s favourite words; in the case of St. Paul it is difficult to reconcile with the idea that the ‘stake in the flesh’ was ophthalmia. (c) The gesture of *kneeling* or *prostration* is mentioned only once of our Lord, in Gethsemane (Mar 14:35 and || Mt. Lk.), the first two Evangelists speaking of prostration, the third of kneeling. As standing was the usual attitude for prayer* [Note: Our Lord sat to teach, the usual custom (Mat 5:1, Mar 4:1, Luk 4:20; Luk 5:3, Joh 8:2, cf. Act 16:13).] (Mar 11:25, where see Swete’s note, Luk 18:11; Luk 18:13), we must interpret this kneeling or prostration as specially signifying deep distress, as in the early Church it signified special penitence, being forbidden by the 20th canon of Nicaea on festival occasions like Sundays and Eastertide (so Tertullian, *de Cor. Mil.* 3). And so it was significant of deep distress in the case of St. Stephen (Act 7:60), and probably of St. Peter when he raised Tabitha (Act 9:40); in the case of St. Paul’s farewells it would be due to the great solemnity of the occasion (Act 20:36; Act 21:5, cf. also 1Ki 8:54, Ezr 9:5, Dan 6:10, Eph 3:14). Nevertheless, the usual standing to pray would not preclude the gesture of prostration at intervals to express special devotion, as is the case to this day among all Eastern Christians. To signify reverence the gesture of kneeling or prostration is frequently practised in the Gospels. We read of many thus kneeling to Jesus—the leper (Mar 1:40 and || Mt. Lk.), demoniacs (Mar 3:11; Mar 5:6), Jairus (Mar 5:22 and || Mt. Lk.), the Syrophenician woman (Mar 7:25 and || Mt.), the rich young man (Mar 10:17), the blind man (Joh 9:38), Mary of Bethany (Joh 11:32), the lunatic’s father (Mat 17:14, not || Mk. Lk.), Salome (Mat 20:20, not || Mk.), the Magi (Mat 2:11), St. Peter at the miraculous draught of

fishes (Luk 5:8), and so the soldiers in derision (Mar 15:19 and || Mt.). The devil tempts our Lord to kneel to him (Mat 4:9 and || Lk.). The women prostrate themselves at the tomb (Luk 24:5). Cornelius attempts to do so before St. Peter (Act 10:25), St. John before the angel (Rev 19:10; Rev 22:8). (d) A gesture to emphasize speech may probably be understood in Mar 12:29 where it may be that Jesus pointed to the scribe's phylactery, which contained the words, 'Hear, O Israel,' etc. (c) An isolated gesture is the *stooping to write on the ground* in the 'Pericope adulterae' (Joh 8:6; Joh 8:8), apparently signifying 'intentional inattention.' Westcott (*in loc.*) remarks that the very strangeness of the action marks the authenticity of the detail. (f) We read of *gestures expressing grief*. Jesus sighed at weakness of faith (Mar 7:34; Mar 8:12), and groaned (or was moved with indignation, ἐνεβρομήσατο), shuddered (ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν), and wept at Lazarus' grave (Joh 11:33; Joh 11:35; Joh 11:38); He shuddered at the thought of the betrayal (Joh 13:21), and wept over Jerusalem (Luk 19:41 ff.).

To speak generally, it may be noted that the Fourth Evangelist is more chary of chronicling our Lord's gestures than the Synoptists. He dwells rather on Jesus' words than on the actions with which He accompanied them.

3. Various gestures by others.—To an Oriental people, gesture is almost as natural a method of expressing the meaning as speech. We find in the Gospels frequent references to such a method of communication. This is not only when no other is possible, as when dumb Zacharias *makes signs* (Luk 1:22) and the people make signs to him (Luk 1:62 : perhaps he was also deaf); just as in Acts, St. Peter has to make signs to procure silence in Act 12:17, and St. Paul in Act 21:40 and perhaps Act 13:16. But we find such expressive gestures as *shaking off the dust* (Mar 6:11 and || Mt. Lk.; this is our Lord's command to the Twelve), to signify the dissociating of oneself from an offender. So Paul and Barnabas did at Pisidian Antioch (Act 13:51), and so Paul 'shook out his raiment' against the unbelieving Jews at Corinth (Act 18:6). Again, *rending the garments* was a common Jewish gesture of consternation or grief, often mentioned in OT (e.g. Gen 37:29; Gen 37:34, Joe 2:13); in the Gospels we find it mentioned only of Caiaphas (Mar 14:63 and || Mt.); in Acts (Mar 14:14) only of Paul and Barnabas at Lystra. *Smiting the breast* as a sign of grief we find in Luk 23:48 (where D [Note: Deuteronomist.] adds τὰ μέτωπα), and in Mat 11:17 (ἐκόψασθε) and Luk 18:13. *Wagging the head* was the derisive gesture of the passers-by at the Crucifixion (Mar 15:29 and || Mt.; cf. 2Ki 19:21, Job 16:4, Lam 2:15, Sir 12:18; Sir 13:7). Pilate's gesture of *washing his hands* (Mat 27:24) has furnished a proverbial saying, but it was familiar to the Jews (Deu 21:6). The kindred idea of washing the hands to express innocency (*i.e.* ridding oneself of evil) is found in Exo 30:19 f. and Psa 26:6; Psa 73:13, and is a great feature of the Church Orders and the great Liturgies. Lastly, we notice *the kiss* as the sign of love, real or feigned,

as in the case of the sinful woman (Luk 7:45), of Judas (Mar 14:45 and || Mt. Lk.), and of the Ephesian elders (Act 20:37). It is true that the kiss was the ordinary way of greeting a Rabbi (see Swete on Mar 14:45), but in all these cases much more than ordinary courtesy is intended by the gesture, and probably *καταφιλεῖν* in these passages means ‘to kiss fervently,’ or (in the case of Judas) ‘ostentatiously.’ For the kiss in OT, cf. Gen 29:11; Gen 33:4; Gen 45:15, Exo 18:7, 1Sa 20:41, 2Sa 15:5; 2Sa 19:39; 2Sa 20:9, many of which passages speak of kisses of greeting like that of Judas, to which Joab’s is indeed strangely similar.

A. J. Maclean.

☩ Gethsemane

GETHSEMANE (Γεθσημανεῖ, perhaps for *גֶּתְשֶׁמַן* [ם] ‘oil press’).—Gethsemane is usually described as a ‘place’ with a garden attached to it; but, so far as the words of Scripture show, it may have been simply a garden. St. Matthew (Mat 26:36) and St. Mark (Mar 14:32) use the word *χωρίον*, St. Luke (Luk 22:40) uses *τόπος*, and St. John (Joh 18:1), describing it as *ὄπου ἦν κῆπος*, refers to it again (Joh 18:2) as *τόπος*. It lay east of Jerusalem, across the Kidron (Joh 18:1), at the foot of or upon the Mount of Olives (Mat 26:20, Mar 14:26, Luk 22:39 : cf. Euseb. 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 248. 18, and Jerome, *ib.* 130. 22). The traditional site is in the Kidron ravine, at a point about equidistant, as the crow flies, from the Golden Gate and St. Stephen’s Gate. It is easily reached by the road passing through the latter and crossing the Kidron bridge, just beyond which it lies, a square plot of ground with eight very ancient olive-trees. If the statement of Josephus (*BJ* vi. i. 1), that Titus cut down all the trees upon that side of the city, be correct, the tradition that those trees are as old as the Christian era, or the tradition as to the site, must be abandoned. Both probably are unfounded, and, according to the general consensus of opinion, this site was fixed upon at the time of the Empress Helena’s visit to Jerusalem (a.d. 326).

The scene of Christ’s agonizing prayers immediately before the betrayal, and of His betrayal and capture (Mat 26:36-57, Mar 14:32-53, Luk 22:39-54, Joh 18:1-13), it had long been a favourite resort with the Master and His disciples (Luk 21:37, Joh 18:2). See, further, art. Agony.

Literature.—Robinson, *BRP* [Note: RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] i. 234 f., 270; *PEFSt* [Note: EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.] (1887) pp. 151, 159, (1889) p. 176; Conder, *Bible Places*, 204; Le Camus, *Voyage aux Pays Bibliques*, i. 252 ff.; art. 'Gethsemane' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible (by Conder) and in *Encyc. Bibl.* (by L. Gautier); art. 'The House of Gethsemane' in *Expositor*, iv. iii. [1891] 220-232 (by E. Petavel). On the form of the name see Dalman, *Gram.* 152.

John Muir.

☩ Ghost

GHOST.—Used in the Gospels only in the phrases 'giving up the ghost' and 'Holy Ghost': a survival of the meaning commonly associated with it in the times of the translators, when it was used as equivalent to 'spirit' (Germ. *Geist*). The usage of the word 'ghost' as equivalent to 'spirit' has become archaic. The meaning now uniformly given to it makes its continued use in our Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 inexpedient. This was recognized by the American Revisers, who substituted 'Holy Spirit' in every instance for 'Holy Ghost.' See, further, artt. Holy Spirit, Spirit.

A. Mitchell Hunter.

☩ Gift

GIFT.—Christ continually reminds His disciples that the Father is the source of all gifts. To Him we must trustfully turn. 'Ask, and it shall be given' (Mat 7:7); 'Everyone that asketh receiveth' (Luk 11:10), and not only 'daily bread' (Mat 6:11, Luk 11:3), but 'whatsoever' is asked (Joh 15:16; Joh 16:23). He will never refuse the gift of the Holy Spirit to them that ask (Luk 11:11-13, Mat 7:11), for it is His 'good pleasure' to give them 'the kingdom' (Luk 12:32). When Christ has ascended, it is the Father who will send 'another Comforter' (Joh 14:16); and when trials and persecution shall arise, it is the Father by whom, Christ says, 'it shall be given you in that hour what ye shall say' (Mat 10:19). We see this confidence inspiring the multitude to glorify God 'which had given such power unto men' in the healing of the palsied man (Mat 9:8), and making the practical Martha say, 'I know that whatsoever thou shalt ask of God, God will give unto thee' (Joh 11:22).

It is notable that Christ's only recorded request for a personal favour should have been the occasion of that deep saying concerning 'the gift of God' (Joh 4:10). The word used (τὴν δωρεάν) implies a peculiar freedom in the giving; something of bounty not to be purchased. It is used nowhere else in the Gospels (save in the OT quotation in Joh 15:25); but in the Acts and Epistles it usually occurs as the distinguishing word for God's highest gifts, as of grace itself (Eph 3:7), of the 'heavenly gift' (Heb 6:4), of the 'unspeakable gift' (2Co 9:15), of the saving power of Christ's life and death (Rom 5:15), of Christ in us (Eph 4:7), or of the Holy Spirit (Act 2:38; Act 8:20; Act 10:45; Act 11:17). In Joh 4:10 some hold that our Lord spoke of Himself as 'the gift of God' (cf. Joh 3:16), others that He meant the unique opportunity the woman now had of gaining religious enlightenment from Him; and the two ideas blend in His words. But the uppermost thought would be the parabolic suggestion of the water for which Jesus had asked, and 'the gift of God' would most naturally be that 'living water' which He Himself could give her, and which would solve her dimly discerned problems of conduct and worship. The Jews had long connected the precious gift of 'living water' with that ever-new and quickening power of the Spirit which, coming from God, can alone satisfy the soul's thirst for Him (Zec 14:8, Jer 2:13; Jer 17:13). So Christ seems to use it here. If the woman but knew 'the gift of God,' that fount of the living Spirit which, springing up within, and independent of Samaritan books of the Law, is the assurance of eternal life (Jer 17:14), and if she could but recognize the supremacy of love and spiritual power in Him who was speaking, then she would not hesitate to ask an infinitely greater gift than He had asked of her. Thus Christ would be the agency; the Eternal Spirit would be 'the gift.'

The greatest of all gifts would be one's life. This Christ gave. All other gifts of His are included in this. They are the fruit of this complete self-surrender, which could yield up all things for love of men. True, He gave, and gives His disciples, the unfathomable gift of a Peace which the world could not give (Joh 14:27), a Rest for all weary spirits (Mat 11:28). To His own He is the Living Water (Joh 4:14), the Bread of Life (Joh 6:51). He gives the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven (Mat 16:10), the new commandment of Love (Joh 13:34), and Life Eternal (Joh 10:28). But the highest gift included these and more. It was the gift of His life, 'a ransom for many' (Mat 20:28, Mar 10:45). This He offered to the Eternal Father, to that Righteousness whose final decision was beyond the Son of man's bestowal: 'To sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give' (Mat 20:23, Mar 10:40). For the gift of the Holy Spirit see art. Holy Spirit. See also art. Giving.

Edgar Daplyn.

GIRDLE.—See Dress, p. 498^b.

☩ Giving

GIVING.—The duty of giving springs naturally out of the gospel fact. Jesus Christ is God's gift (Joh 3:16), and when St. Paul associates the liberality of the Christians of Corinth and this grace of God (2Co 9:15), he is true to the mind of Christ. Giving and receiving are correlatives: 'freely ye received, freely give' (Mat 10:8; the endowment is of Divine power and authority, and the service is to be as wide as human need; cf. Act 3:6). Throughout the Gospel narrative the welcome of Christ awakens generous impulses. The new resolve of Zacchaeus (Luk 19:8) is the free expression of his new life. The grace of Christ had come near to him, and he, in that high fellowship, could not but be gracious. So, generally, giving is the necessary expression of Christian faith and love, the spontaneous outcome of Christian life.

Almsgiving is recognized by Jesus as a part of 'righteousness' (Mat 6:1 f. Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), and the duty of practising it is often enforced (see Almsgiving). But the care of the poor by no means exhausts the activities of the generous spirit. Treasury gifts for the temple service were recognized by Jesus (Mar 12:41 = Luk 21:1), and gifts for the upholding of public worship are an essential part of worship.

So, too, Jesus accepted and honoured gifts directly bestowed upon Himself. 'Certain women which had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities ... ministered unto him of their substance' (Luk 8:2 f.). In the same spirit were Matthew's feast after his call (Luk 5:29), the anointing by the woman of the city (Luk 7:37 f.), and the supper at Bethany (Joh 12:2). These were acts of grateful love, and they were welcomed by Jesus. The incident of the outpouring of the spikenard (Joh 12:3 f. = Mat 26:6 f., Mar 14:3 f.) is the more significant because of the criticism it provoked, and the reply of Jesus, 'Ye have the poor always with you, and whensoever ye will ye can do them good' (Mar 14:7). Is there here a hidden rebuke for neglect of opportunities ever present, on the part of those who here professed disapproval of waste? Certainly the reply suggests the thought 'that expenditure in one direction does not disqualify for beneficent acts in another. The willing-minded will always have enough for all purposes' (Expositor's *Gr. Test.*, *in loco*). By accepting and honouring this costly act of thankful love Jesus sanctions the utmost that love prompts. It is in such giving that the joy of sacrifice is known and the secret of Jesus realized—'It is more blessed to give than to receive' (Act 20:35).

But all service is included in Christ's law of giving, not alms to the poor alone, but all the manifold expressions of love, the helpfulness which springs out of the new family bond of brotherhood. How this spirit works practically is illustrated in the ministry of Jesus. Once and again before His gracious acts of healing or of bounty, it is said, 'he was moved with compassion' (Mat_9:36; Mat_15:32, Mar_6:34); and His fellow-feeling found expression in the sending forth of the Twelve, the feeding of the multitude, and in teaching.

So is it with His disciples. All tender ministries are the expression of a Divine compassion, 'the exceeding grace of God in you' (2Co_9:14).

But the law of Christian service goes beyond this. It is founded in justice, the recognition of the true relations which men hold one to another in Christ. The second commandment of love to our neighbour (Mat_19:19; Mat_22:39) and the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luk_10:30 ff.) teach the true inwardness of generosity.

True helpfulness is that which is due from one man to another because of the ties of humanity. Hence the personal equation in beneficence. All true giving resolves itself into self-giving, the expression of sympathy, reverence, affection, the charity of personal care and thought (Luk_6:27-38). It is this service of man as man, and because of the ties of a Divine humanity, which is the service of Christ. 'Ye did it unto me' (Mat_25:40) covers the whole ground.

But while it is ever true that 'money values are not the standard of gifts in the Kingdom of God,' this must not be pressed so as to minimize gifts of money. These must often measure 'the moral value of the giver.' Indeed, this is the lesson of the Treasury (Luk_21:4), they 'of their superfluity,' she 'of her want.' The frequent references to money in the Gospels show the importance which Jesus attached to this factor in life. The stewardship of all possessions is taught in the parable of the Rich Fool (Luk_12:16 ff.; for 'rich towards God' cf. 1Ti_6:17 f.). Judgment is pronounced upon the selfish use of wealth in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Luk_16:19 ff.). Hence the warnings against covetousness (Luk_12:15). Giving, thus exercised, becomes a 'means of grace,' by which the heart is cleansed (Luk_11:41; a suggestive rendering of this saying is given in *Expositor*, II. v. [1883], 318, 'but as to what is within, give alms, and behold all things are clean unto you').

The test of the young ruler (Luk_18:22) is not so much 'a counsel of perfection' for all, as the word in season for the individual. The general lesson on wealth and its uses is in the parable of the Unjust Steward (Luk_16:1 f.). Confessedly difficult of interpretation as this parable is in detail, its main lesson can hardly be overlooked—Heaven, which cannot be bought by gold, may yet be prepared for by the best uses of wealth. The giving of money by men who know its value, and whose

keenest activities are directed to get it, is a searching test of their self-denial and devotion. True liberality is the Divinely appointed safeguard against covetousness, with this caution, 'to whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required' (Luk 12:48).

The question of definite 'proportionate giving' may be briefly dismissed. It has been sought to press the law of a tenth as binding upon all, and the words of Jesus (Mat 23:23) are quoted in support. But the ground is insufficient. An incidental reference cannot set aside the whole spirit of the Gospel. Any rule imposed from without is alien to the free spirit of love. Rules which the individual may lay down for his own guidance are for the individual conscience to determine, but 'the Christian law is the spirit of Christ, that Enthusiasm of Humanity which He declared to be the source from which all right action flows' (*Ecce Homo*). 'Charity has no other limit than charity itself' (Godet). Cf. Luk 6:30.

Literature.—*Ecce Homo*, ch. xvii.: Bruce, *Parabolic Teaching*, p. 371 f.; Westcott, *Incarnation and Common Life*, p. 195 f.; Gladden, *The Christian Pastor*, p. 371 f.; Ruskin, *Seven Lamps* ['Lamp of Sacrifice'], also *Architecture and Painting*, §§ 44-45, and *Arrows*, ii. 191; Butler, *Sermons*, ii., vi.

W. H. Dyson.

☩ Glad Tidings

GLAD TIDINGS.—See Gospel.

☩ Glory

GLORY.—There are few commoner words in the English Bible than 'glory,' and few more difficult of definition. The word appears on the surface to be used in a strange variety of meanings and applications, and with both good and bad connotation. Reputation, praise, honour (true and false), splendour, light, perfection, rewards (temporal and eternal)—all these varying conceptions seem covered by the same word.

Nevertheless the underlying thought is simpler than would appear. In the OT a large number of words are translated in English by 'glory,' but by far the most common is **וִדְבָב**, of which the root idea is 'heaviness,' and so in a metaphorical sense, 'weight,'

‘worthiness.’ The LXX Septuagint frequently employs δόξα to translate this, as well as a great number of other Hebrew words; and δόξα (with its connected verb δοξάζω) is the usual NT word rendered ‘glory.’ This word is derived, of course, from the root of δοκέω, ‘to think or suppose,’ and the primary meaning of δόξα is, no doubt, ‘thought or opinion,’ especially, favourable human opinion, and thus in a secondary sense ‘reputation,’ ‘honour,’ etc.

But an important new shade of meaning comes into the word when it is used in religious language. The δόξα of man, human opinion, etc., is shifting, uncertain, often based on error, and its pursuit for its own sake is unworthy. But there is a δόξα of God which must be absolutely true and changeless. God’s ‘opinion’ marks the true value of things, as they appear to the eternal mind; and God’s ‘favourable opinion’ is true ‘glory.’ This contrast is well seen in Joh 5:44; Joh 12:43. Hence ‘glory,’ whether applied to God Himself or to His works as seen by Him, must imply the absolute truth which underlies all phenomena. This gives us the connecting link between ‘the glory that cometh from God’ and the ‘glory’ which man conceives of as belonging to God Himself. The ‘glory of God,’ therefore, must mean His essential and unchanging Godhead as revealed to man. And the familiar ascription ‘Glory to God’ would imply not only a right human praise, but the assigning to God of what He truly *is*, for nothing higher can be given Him. Similarly the true ‘glory’ of man or nature must be that ideal condition, that final perfection, which exists as a real fact in the Divine mind. The glory of God is what He is essentially; the glory of created things is what they are meant by God to be, though not yet perfectly attained (Heb 2:10, Rom 8:18-21).

Passing on to that which this article is specially concerned with,—What is meant by the ‘glory’ and the ‘glorifying’ of Jesus Christ? It must mean (a) the revelation of His essential Deity, that which He *is* in the mind of the Father, though veiled from man by the limitation of the Incarnation. See Joh 17:5, Heb 1:3, 1Co 2:8, Jam 2:1. (b) The revelation of the ideal and perfect condition of human nature, as elevated by its union with God in the Incarnation to that which God means it to be by the law of its creation, that which already in the mind of God it essentially *is*. Then the glory of Christ is the explanation and justification of Gen 1:27 (cf. 2Co 3:18).

But besides this fundamental conception of ‘glory’ which springs out of the primary meaning of the Greek word, it is to be noticed that ‘glory’ in Scripture usually carries with it ideas of ‘light,’ ‘splendour,’ and ‘beauty.’ Thus pre-eminently ‘the glory of the Lord’ in the OT is the visible shining forth of light, by which the Divine Presence is recognized by man, the שְׁכִינָה of the later Jews. So the ‘glory’ appeared to Israel at

Sinai (Exo 24:16-17), at the door of the Tent (Lev 9:23, Num 14:10; Num 16:19), at the dedication of Solomon's Temple (1Ki 8:10-11), in the visions of Isaiah (Isa 6:1-3) and Ezekiel (Eze 1:28; Eze 3:23; Eze 8:4). Similarly the Messianic hopes of Israel are expressed under the figure of 'glory dwelling in the land' (Psa 85:9). See artt. 'Glory (in OT)' and 'Shekinah' in Hastings' B [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.]. Passing to the NT, the same conception of 'glory' is seen in St. Luke's account of the Nativity (Luk 2:9). And this is brought into direct connexion with the Person of Christ in the narratives of the Transfiguration, especially in St. Luke's (Luk 9:28 ff.). There the 'glory' of Christ shines forth visibly in the dazzling brightness of His countenance. It encompasses the forms of Moses and Elijah (Luk 9:31); it even transfigures material objects like Christ's clothing (Luk 9:29). With this passage should be compared the visions of Stephen in Act 7:55; of Saul of Tarsus (Act 9:3; Act 22:6-11; Act 26:13), and of St. John in Patmos (Rev 1:13-16).

A more metaphysical conception of the 'glory' of Christ is seen in St. John's Gospel. The Evangelist may indeed be alluding to the Transfiguration in Joh 1:14, and to the visible glory of Isaiah's vision in Joh 12:41. But in Joh 2:11 and Joh 11:40 he is evidently describing some revelation to the inward eye of what Christ essentially *is*, some intuition of His Divine power (only suggested by a visible 'sign') borne in upon the soul of the believer. In Christ's words and works His true nature, as the 'effulgence' of the Father's glory, flashes upon and illuminates not the intellectual faculties merely, but the whole being of man, filling it with the sense of light and beauty and satisfaction.

Thus we seem to arrive at a conception of 'glory' which combines both the ideas of δόξα, as 'splendour' and as the manifestation of eternal truth as it is in the Divine mind.

In this sense Christ looks forward to and prays for the 'glorifying' of Himself by the Father (Joh 13:31-32; Joh 17:1; Joh 17:5; Joh 17:24). This glorifying is in a true sense accomplished in the Passion, as issuing in the Resurrection, whereby the true nature of Christ and His redemptive work were recognized and rejoiced in by the faithful. There is a 'glory' which is yet to come, but the present revelation to the Church of Christ's glory is of the same order as the future one which will complete it (Joh 17:24). The Christian community, already ideally perfected by the separation of Judas (Joh 13:31), is henceforth to recognize permanently what individual intuition had already perceived and confessed at different points of the ministry. And this 'glorifying' of Christ is to be the 'glorifying' of the Father (Joh 17:1), for the completion of Christ's work will reveal the Divine mind and purpose to the Church; and it is also the 'glorifying' of the believer and of the Church as a whole (Joh 17:22), for the Church will be the permanent witness of God to the world (Joh 17:23), and man in union with Christ is on the way to attain the Divine ideal (Joh 17:26).

The same profound conceptions of 'glory' appear in the writings of St. Paul and St. Peter. The object of the Christian calling is 'the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ' (2Th_2:14). The invisible 'glory' of the Christian Church through its union with Christ by the Spirit is greater than the visible 'glory' of the Old Covenant (2Co_3:7-11). The 'glory' of God recognized in Christ by the believer is a new creation of light (2Co_4:6). Present limitations and sufferings will be abundantly compensated in the full future revelation of 'glory' (2Co_4:17, cf. Rom_8:18 ff.). Indeed, the 'glorifying' of the believer is already ideally complete (Rom_8:30); it will be visibly completed in the Resurrection of the body (Php_3:21, cf. 1Pe_5:1; 1Pe_5:4).

In the Resurrection life, therefore, Christ will be seen and known by all the faculties, the whole being of man redeemed, as sharing fully and essentially in the 'glory' of the Godhead. His Divinity will be recognized in the 'glory' which was ever inseparable from it; His humanity will be seen filled full, illuminated by its union with His Divinity, 'taken up into God' (*Quicunque vult*), and so constituting the perfect expression and vehicle of His Divinity (1Jn_3:2). Hence in the ideal and perfected Church, as described in the Apocalypse, both humanity and its material setting are illuminated with 'the glory of the Lamb,' whose glorified humanity is, as it were, the 'Lamp' (Rev_21:23) in which shines the 'glory' of the Godhead.

It will be seen that this one word 'glory' is really a summary of the Divine purpose for creation as revealed in Scripture—

'From Eden's loss unto the end of years.'

The 'glory of God' is revealed in the 'glory of Christ,' and both nature and man are in Christ progressing towards 'the liberty of the glory of the children of God' (Rom_8:21).

Literature.—Grimm-Thayer, *Bibl.-Theol. Lex.* s.v. δόξα; R. St. J. Parry, *Discussion of the Gen.* [Note: Geneva NT 1557, Bible 1560.] *Ep. of James* (1903), 36; and the Commentaries on the NT passages above cited, especially Westcott's *St. John*, 1890.

A. R. Whitham.

☞ Gluttonous

GLUTTONOUS.—In Mat_11:19 = Luk_7:34 we are informed that our Lord was reproached as a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber. The Greek is alike in both

passages—ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης. The English versions are probably right in their rendering of φάγος and οἰνοπότης as implying intemperate excess. But this hardly lies in the words themselves. φάγος (Liddell and Scott, s.v.) is found only in these passages and in later ecclesiastical writers. οἰνοπότης does by usage (not by etymology) imply excess (Anacreon, 98; Call. *Ep.* 37; Polyb. xx. 8. 2). In Pro_23:20 it answers to כָּסוּן יָיִן ‘one who is drunken with wine’ (cf. Deu_21:20, Eze_23:42, Hos_4:18 for use of the Heb. root); and it is parallel with μέθυσος in Pro_23:21. In Pro_31:4 (24:72 Swete) the verb οἰνοποτέω occurs in the bad sense. But it is possible that the real force of the insult to our Lord is shown by Deu_21:20. The rebellious son is to be brought by his parents to the elders, to whom the parents are to say, ‘This our son is stubborn and rebellious, he will not obey our voice, he is a riotous liver and a drunkard.’ He is then to be executed by stoning. It is true that the LXX Septuagint here συμβολοκοπῶν οἰνοφλυγεῖ has no resemblance to the phrase in the Gospels, but Pro_23:20 has μηδὲ ἐκτείνου συμβολαῖς as one half of the doublet, ‘among gluttonous eaters of flesh’ (בֶּשֶׂר בִּלְלֵי); and in Pro_23:21 Aq. [Note: Aquila.] , Sym., Theod. [Note: Theodotion.] agree in using the Deuteronomic word συμβολοκόπος for לָלֵי. Delitzsch in his *Heb. NT* uses the words found in Deu_21:20.

We need not wonder at the non-agreement with the LXX Septuagint . For the discourse has several indications of having been spoken in Aramaic, such as the paronomasia probably to be found in the cry of the children (Mat_11:17, Luk_7:32 ‘danced’ and ‘wept’; cf. Farrar, *Life of Christ*, i. 92; and the Peshitta), and the variation ἔργων—τέκνων (Mat_11:19, Luk_7:35) which is best explained by supposing some error in reading an Aramaic document.

George Farmer.

☞ Gnashing Of Teeth

GNASHING OF TEETH (ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν δδόντων, Mat_8:12; Mat_13:42; Mat_13:50; Mat_22:13; Mat_24:51; Mat_25:30, Luk_13:28).—A phrase describing a gesture which expresses mainly fury or baffled rage: Job_16:9, Psa_35:16; Psa_37:12, Act_7:54; cf. Psa_112:10 ‘The wicked shall gnash with his teeth, and melt away’; but these OT parallels* [Note: βρυγμος is used in Pro_19:12 of the roaring of a lion, and in Sir_51:3

of beasts ‘ready to devour.’] seem hardly sufficient to account for the set form which the phrase has in the Gospels.† [Note: The notion of some, that the phrase in the Gospels is based upon a conception of Gehenna as a place of extreme cold, and that ‘gnashing’ = ‘chattering of teeth,’ is very precarious.] The expression occurs in every case but one in parables of the Last Judgment, and even that exception (Mat_8:12) may be called a parabolic representation. This does not detract from the force of the warning, but rather the pictorial element is added because of the Speaker’s passionate desire to make the terrific consequences of sin vivid and memorable in order to the salvation of those that heard Him, and to deter them and us from the course that would lead to such a fearful end.

T. Gregory.

☩Gnat

GNAT.—See Animals, p. 67^a.

☩Goat

GOAT.—See Animals, p. 63^b.

☩God

GOD

Introduction.—The sphere of the revelation of Jesus was limited to the Fatherhood of God (see Father), and all His other references to the Divine Being are more or less incidental. They involve conceptions which He shared with OT prophets, and to some extent also with contemporary Judaism; but the form which some of these conceptions take in His teaching, and the relative emphasis which He laid upon them, are modified by that truth which was central and fundamental in His own experience and thought of God. Jesus, in all His references to God, spoke after the manner of a prophet, and not after the manner of the Rabbis or the Christian theologian. He never sought to prove the existence or the personality of God. These were invariably assumed. He never communicated any speculative views regarding the nature or the attributes of God. All that He said stood in direct relation to right conduct.

The aim of the present article is to set forth briefly those views of God, expressed or implied in the words of Jesus, which may properly be considered apart from the Divine Fatherhood, and which are, to some extent, characteristic of Jesus.

1. *God is one.*—To Jesus, as to His people through many centuries, God was one. He did not modify this ancient belief. To the scribe who asked which commandment was greatest, Jesus quoted the familiar confession from Deut. (Deu_6:4 ff.) which begins with the words, ‘Jehovah our God is one Jehovah’ (Mar_12:29); and the author of the Fourth Gospel represents Jesus as addressing these words of prayer to the Father—‘This is life eternal, that they should know thee, the *only* true God’ (τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν, Joh_17:3).

Jesus spoke of the Holy Spirit; and if there is any place at which He suggests a personal distinction in the Divine Being, it is here. It is necessary, therefore, to consider His words on this subject. His references to the Spirit in the oldest Gospels are extremely rare; and in only one instance do all the Synoptics agree in reporting the use of this term. This is the passage concerning blasphemy against the Spirit (Mar_3:29, Mat_12:31, Luk_12:10). There are three other* [Note: The Baptismal formula of Mat_28:19 is not included, for the evidence against its genuineness is regarded by the present writer as conclusive; and Luk_4:18 is a quotation.] occasions on which, according to one or two of the Synoptics, Jesus spoke of the Spirit. (a) The first of these occasions was when He spoke words of encouragement to His disciples in anticipation of their future need of support when called before governors and kings. According to Matthew (Mat_10:20), He said to them, ‘It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you.’ In Luke we have two passages referring to the same, or at least very similar occasions; one of these speaks of the Holy Spirit (τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα), while in the other Jesus is represented as saying, ‘I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to withstand’ (Luk_12:12; Luk_21:15). Mark has a similar word of Jesus, but puts it on a different occasion. The situation of the disciples is the same, and Jesus says, ‘It is not ye that speak, but the Holy Spirit’ (Mar_13:11). The thought which all the accounts have in common is that of Divine assistance. The agent who assists is either the ‘Holy Spirit,’ the ‘Spirit of your Father,’ or Jesus Himself.

(b) Another reference by Jesus to the Spirit is found in His reply to those who accused Him of working in league with Beelzebul. Here He said, ‘If I by the Spirit of God cast out demons’ (Mat_12:28); or, according to Luke, ‘If I by the *finger* of God cast out demons’ (Mat_11:20).

(c) Finally, according to Mark (Mar_12:36), Jesus referred to the 110th Psalm as spoken in the Holy Spirit. Mt. has simply ἐν πνεύματι, and Lk. no reference to the Spirit.

Now the language of these passages does not appear to suggest a different view of the Spirit from that of the old prophets. If Jesus as a rule represented His disciples as dependent on the Father, and the Father as caring for them, and then in a single instance, when speaking still of the Divine aid, said, 'the Spirit of your Father' or the 'Holy Spirit,' we cannot suppose that He made any personal distinction between them. His word is an echo of such a passage as Isa_61:1 'The Spirit of the Lord Jehovah is upon me,' and is in part a fulfilment of the promise in Joel (Joe_2:28) that the Spirit shall be poured out upon all flesh. The statement of Jesus regarding the 110th Psalm, that it was spoken in the Holy Spirit, is quite parallel to this word concerning His disciples. It shall be with them as it was with the author of this psalm. The Spirit of their Father will speak in them.

Again, when Jesus said, 'If I by the Spirit of God [or the *finger* of God] cast out demons,' it is manifest that His thought is that of God's presence and aid. It is like the language of Micah when he said, 'I am full of power by the Spirit of Jehovah' (Mic_3:8). The Fourth Gospel expresses the same thought when it represents Jesus as saying, 'The Father abiding in me doeth his works' (Joh_14:10).

Finally, when Jesus warned the scribes and Pharisees concerning the irremissible sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, it is obvious that we cannot draw any personal distinction between this Spirit and God. These men had attributed the manifestly good work of Jesus to the prince of bad spirits. Thus they had wilfully called good evil (cf. Isa_5:20). They had violated conscience; they had quenched, at least for the moment, this inner and fundamental voice of God. This manifestation of God within them is called the Spirit of God in accordance with OT usage, which ascribes a spirit to Jehovah, in and through which He reveals Himself to the spirit of man (e.g. Isa_42:1; Isa_63:11). See Unpardonable Sin.

The teaching of the Fourth Gospel (John 14-16) regarding the Spirit marks an advance on that of the Synoptics, both in quantity and in character; but this teaching, as it now stands, like the other discourses of John, cannot be attributed directly to Jesus. It appears to represent a stage of thought fully as late as that which we find in Mat_28:19. We need not, therefore, discuss it in this connexion, where we are concerned with the teaching of Jesus. And we conclude this paragraph with the statement that there is nothing in the narrative of the genuine teaching of Jesus which suggests a modification of the old prophetic conception of a pure monotheism.*
[Note: The story of the experience of Jesus at His baptism is probably to be traced

back to Himself. This speaks of a descent of the Spirit and a voice from God. It recalls Isa 61:1, and presupposes the same conceptions the Spirit.]

2. *God is holy.*—The conception which Jesus had of the holiness of God is implied rather than expressed in His teaching; yet though not directly stated, it is fundamental, and marks an advance on the teaching of the OT. How fundamental this conception was in the teaching of Jesus may be illustrated from the Sermon on the Mount. According to this, the standard of the Kingdom of God called for a righteousness that exceeded the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees (Mat 5:20). The Law declared that a man should not kill, but Jesus taught that anger exposed one to the same danger of judgment (Mat 5:21 f.). The Law declared against adultery, but He declared against the lustful desire (Mat 5:27 f.). Now this profounder conception of sin, this attaching of the gravest penalties to the secret feeling of anger and to the unclean desire, implies a clearer and more ethical conception of the holiness of God.

Again, Jesus' sense of the holiness of God is reflected when He says that it is the aim of His mission to call sinners (Mat 9:13, Mar 2:18 [Luk 5:32 adds, 'to repentance']); and His feeling is still more significantly seen in the Beatitude for the pure in heart (Mat 5:8). Finally, the intensity of His appreciation of God's holiness may be measured by the severity of His judgment on impenitent sinners. One of such tenderness of heart as Jesus showed in all His relations to others—a tenderness which He believed was an attribute of God—could not have uttered such words of judgment as Mar 3:29; Mar 12:9 and Mat 25:46, unless He had had an open vision of the Divine purity.

It is obvious from this brief survey that, to the thought of Jesus, the holiness of God was a fundamental fact, and it is equally plain that His conception of this Divine attribute was profoundly ethical. Its demands could not be satisfied, as the scribes taught, by the performance of any number of statutes. Nothing but a righteous state of the heart could satisfy them. Jesus taught His disciples to ask for the pardon of their sins, not on the ground of any fulfilment of the Law, any good works of any sort, but simply on the ground, as far as the human side of the pardon is concerned, that they themselves have a forgiving spirit (Mat 6:12, Mar 11:25). The ethical character of Jesus' conception of the holiness of God is seen also in His own relation to sinners; for it is clear that His thought of God's relation to sinners was illustrated by His own attitude toward them. Now we are told that He came into personal contact even with the worst of men. He ate with publicans and received harlots, having no fear of defilement from them. He represented God under the figure of a father embracing a son who had wasted his substance in riotous living (Luke 15).

In the thought of Jesus, therefore, the holiness of God did not imply, as with the scribes, that He was far removed from sinful men, being Himself subject to defilement. His holiness is not ritual, but purely ethical. It is that quality or side of His being which makes it incumbent on all men to 'hallow' His name (Mat_6:9). It is that which defines His character with reference to sin. It is that attribute of God which renders it impossible to trace the origin of evil up to Him. Jesus everywhere assumes that evil originates either in the freewill of man (Mar_3:28-29), or with a power called the 'devil' (Mat_13:39) or 'Satan' (Luk_13:16). It cannot come from God, for He is the one absolutely good Being (Mar_10:18).

The conception of the holiness of God involved in the teaching of Jesus, and perfectly illustrated in His character, is thus seen to have been fundamental in importance and ethical in nature. It has parallels in the OT, as, for example, in Psa_51:6 and Hab_1:13; but the clearness and intensity with which it is expressed in the Gospels are unique.

3. *God is near.*—There is a third feature of Jesus' thought of God which, though wholly incidental and subordinate when compared with His revelation of the Divine character, is nevertheless so conspicuous that it helps to mark off the Gospel from the writings of the Old Covenant, and far more noticeably from the views of contemporary Judaism. This is the conception of the nearness or presence of God. To a certain extent Jesus shared the thought of His countrymen, and used the current phraseology regarding God's habitation. Thus He spoke of heaven as the throne of God, and the earth as His footstool (Mat_5:34; Mat_23:22). The idea of a Divine revelation clothed itself to His mind in the imagery of an open sky, the descent of the Spirit, and a voice out of heaven (Mar_1:10-11). But there is no special emphasis in the teaching of Jesus on the thought that heaven is the dwelling place of God in a peculiar sense. The emphasis is laid on another point, viz. the practical thought of God's nearness. Though His throne is said to be in heaven, He is no 'absentee' God. On the contrary, He is personally present with men. One may meet Him in the inner chamber (Mat_6:6). He reveals the mysteries of the Kingdom of heaven unto 'babes' (Mat_11:25). He worked in and through Jesus (Mat_12:28), and Jesus said that God would speak in His disciples (Mat_10:20). This statement may well be taken as suggesting the way in which Jesus generally conceived of God's presence with men. It is an inner spiritual nearness, a fact of which the soul takes cognizance, and which is manifested to the world only through the life of the man who realizes it.

But God is present not only with those beings who are capable of communion with Him: He is present also in Nature. He arrays the lily in beauty (Mat_6:29), He cares for the birds (Mat_6:26), notes the fall of a sparrow (Mat_10:29), and is unceasingly active in works of mercy and kindness (Joh_5:17). How Jesus pictured to His mind this presence of God in the material world we cannot learn from the Gospels. His belief in

this particular, as also in regard to God's presence with men, was probably like that of the Psalmists and Prophets (see, e.g., Psa 23:4; Psa 139:7-12, Isa 40:11; Isa 66:13), though a more constant and marked element of His teaching. It was, doubtless, a consequence of His religious consciousness of God rather than a product of philosophic thought.

Literature.—See under art. Father.

George Holley Gilbert.

☩ Gods

GODS.—The single passage in the Gospels where the word θεοί occurs (Joh 10:34 f.) affords an excellent example both of the style of Jesus' arguments with His Jewish adversaries and of His attitude to the OT. The phrase, 'I said, Ye are gods,' is a literal quotation of Psa 82:6 (LXX Septuagint 81:6), and is introduced as such by the word invariably employed for that purpose (ἔστιν γεγραμμένον, cf. γέγραπται of Mat 4:3; Mat 4:6-7; Mat 4:10) It is plain that in quoting these words Jesus is arguing after the manner of the well-known *argumentum ad hominem*, from His use of the personal pronoun 'your,' as well as from His application of the title 'law' to the Psalms (ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν, cf. τῷ ὑμετέρῳ in Joh 8:17; and for a similar use of the term 'law,' cf. Joh 12:34; Joh 15:25). It is an appeal to authority, the validity of which His hearers would be the first to recognize. It was impossible for them to escape a conclusion so immediately the outcome of premisses universally accepted as true. At the same time it is an argument *a fortiori*. If their beloved Law, to which they were constantly appealing, hesitated not to designate as 'gods' (אֱלֹהִים) the judges whose partiality and injustice provoked their arraignment by God, and the solemn warning to 'judge the weak and fatherless, do justice to the afflicted and destitute' (Psa 82:3), surely the charge of blasphemy came badly from those men who recognized in this Law their final court of appeal. His claim to be 'the Son of God,' whom the Father, in a unique sense, both 'sanctified and sent,' could be judged by His works, and it was sufficient to contrast those works which they could daily witness with the works of men whom God designated 'sons of the Most High' (עֲלִיּוֹן בְּנֵי Psa 82:6).

Jesus in this place seems to adopt the interpretation of this Psalm which is given by the Targum, and which applies the title 'gods' to the earthly judges acting in their capacity as representatives of God. He, moreover, countenances the extension of the

term 'Law' to other portions of the OT besides the Pentateuch. This was a common practice in the writings of the Jewish Rabbins, who spoke of 'the threefold Law'—Pentateuch, Prophets, and Hagiographa (*Shabbath*, 88a). Compare also the Talmudic tractate *Sanhedrin*, fol. 91, 92, for the question of R. Joshua, 'In what manner is the Resurrection of the dead proved from the Law?' with the answer that it is said in Psa_84:4 'They shall praise thee'; not 'they have praised thee.' To the same question propounded by R. Chaia the answer is that the Resurrection is proved from Isa_52:8 (see Wüncbe, *Neue Beitrage zur Erlauterung der Evangelien aus Talmud und Midrash*).

There is another explanation current among the Jews which applied the term 'elôhim in this place to the israelites who stood before Mt. Sinai and received the law (τρός οὐς ὁ λογος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγένετο, Joh_10:35). If, said they, their fathers had not sinned in the matter of the golden calf, they would have been as the angels; they would neither have begotten children nor been subject to death. For this reason it was, according to this interpretation, that the Psalm says, 'they shall die like men' (כָּאָדָם v. 7), in spite of the fact that they were so marvellously privileged (see the Talmudic tractate *Zarah*, fol. 5. 1, quoted in J. Lightfoot's . Heb. et Talm. [Note: Talmud.] , vol. iii. p. 359).

The evidential value of the whole passage with respect to Jesus' attitude to the OT Scriptures will, to some extent at least, be measured by the nature of the clause, 'the Scripture* [Note: It is to be noted here that ἡ γραφή does not mean the OT in general, for which the word would be αἱ γραφαί, but refers to the particular passage quoted (cf. Joh_20:9; Joh_2:22 etc.).] cannot be broken.' If it is parenthetical, we have a direct assertion by Jesus that He regarded the OT as containing elements of abiding significance, and, moreover, that its meaning found its final and true explanation in His person and life (cf. Joh_13:18 and Mat_5:18 etc.). On the other hand, it is by no means certain that the clause is of the nature of a parenthesis, and not dependent upon the preceding conditional particle (εἰ). In this case the sense would be 'if the Scripture cannot be broken,' which would have the effect of presenting the *argumentum ad hominem* in a still stronger and more merciless form. This is again made more forcible by His use of the emphatic pronoun (ὕμεῖς), as if He intended to say, 'How is it possible for you, of all people, in face of the fact that you assert the inviolability of this passage, to find fault with the claims which I have put forward, and to say that I am a blasphemer?' (see Plummer in *Cambridge Greek Test.*, and Westcott's *Gospel of St. John*, *ad loc.*).

It might be possible for an objector to urge that the whole argument was unworthy of the dignity of its alleged Author, and was too like what His hearers would themselves employ. On the other hand, we know that He did not shrink, at times, from meeting the Jews on their own ground (see art. Accommodation, p. 19 ff.), and indeed it would seem that He had no option but to do so, if His teaching was ever to penetrate their understandings. Nor did He at any time avoid confounding His adversaries out of their own mouth (cf. Mat_22:45, Luk_10:36 f. etc.). At the same time it is evident that there is a profounder significance attaching to the quotation than at first sight appears, and it is in this fact that we have a more certain guide to the estimation in which the OT writings were held by Jesus. Whatever may have been the personal character of those who were designated *'elôhîm* in the Psalm, they were men unto whom the word of God had come, and who derived their title to be in a sense Divine from the fact that God delegated to them an authority which was His to give, and that He communicated His will through them to the people over whom they were placed.

The phrase ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, occurring as it does in this passage, can hardly have been recorded by the author of the Fourth Gospel without a conscious reference to that Personal Word, about whom he speaks in his Prologue. The Logos, pre-existent and active, was the means by which God was effecting the eternal movement of man towards Himself and of Himself towards man. This movement became finally complete in the union of the Incarnation, when God and man met in an everlasting unity (ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, Joh_1:14). Nor was this marvellous synthesis 'sprung upon,' so to speak, the human race. It was being foreshadowed continually in the OT. The prophetic 'Thus saith the Lord' (cf. e.g. Isa_38:1, Jer_19:1, Hos_4:1 etc.) was the outcome of a consciousness which felt its power to speak and act as God's earthly representative, and the fitness of this claim is vindicated by the oft-repeated assertion, 'The word of the Lord came unto [me]' (cf. Jer_16:1; Jer_10:1; Jer_9:17, Isa_8:1, Joe_1:1 etc.; see the emphatic הַיְהוָה הַיְהוָה in Eze_1:3, where the prophet lays stress on the reality of his experience).

The union of God and man accomplished in the 'Word made flesh' was indirectly suggested in the bold words of the Psalmist, 'I said, Ye are *'elôhîm*,' and it is not difficult to believe that in repeating this expression Jesus had in His mind the realization of this profound idea, and that He desired to disclose it as an accomplished fact to those who had ears to hear and hearts to understand (Mat_13:15).

J. R. Willis.

Gold

GOLD

1. *Value.*—The Bible references to gold are in terms of use and abuse, in accordance with the great fundamental truth, ‘The gold is mine, saith the Lord of hosts’ (Hag 2:8). Being the most precious of metals, it represents the possession and influence of wealth. It has a central place in the trilogy of life—length of days, riches, and honour (1Ch 29:28). It seems to have a purchasing power over the other two—on the one hand in securing the conditions that tend to prolong life (Psa 17:14; Psa 73:7; Psa 73:12), and on the other by influencing opinion in favour of its possessors (Mat 19:25, Jam 2:2). As the highest quotation of earthly values, it supplies a standard for estimating what surpasses it (Job 28:17, Psa 119:72; Psa 119:127, Pro 3:14; Pro 8:10; Pro 16:16; 1Pe 1:7; 1Pe 1:18). It is only when, as the most beautiful and precious material available, it is used to give visible form to the Divine glory that gold becomes a thing of worthlessness (Psa 115:4, Isa 31:7; Isa 46:6). The blindness that led to such idolatrous perversion among the Gentiles (Act 17:29) is also found among the Jews (Mat 23:16-17).

2. *Associated evil.*—As the emblem of wealth, gold is closely connected with that covetousness in the will and heart of man which is described as the motive and meeting-place of all idolatries (Col 3:5). Job can plead that he has not made gold his hope (Job 31:24). Solomon is commended because he did not make request for riches (1Ki 3:11). The deceitfulness of riches is given as one of the explanations of the unfruitful life (Mat 13:22). The self-centred ambitions and gratifications of wealth are all against the perception and service of a Kingdom in which even the poor seek the enrichment of other lives (Mar 10:24, 2Co 6:10). The order given to the disciples forbidding them to take gold or silver with them on their journey of proclamation (Mat 10:9), was not meant as a commendation of poverty for its own sake. Indeed, it was just because money, clothing, and the wayfarer’s staff were the often-proved necessities of ordinary travel, that the omission of them in their case would impart to their message about the Kingdom a meaning of instantaneousness and urgency. The guest-law of the land would provide food and shelter for the passing stranger; and where they were asked to prolong their stay, those who were thus interested in their words would attend to their wants.

After playing many parts, such as being a medium of decorative art, a standard of value, and a means of good and evil in society, along with higher uses in the coinage of empires and the representation of the Godhead, gold renders its last symbolic service in providing a pavement for the feet of the saints (Rev 21:21).

☞ Golden Rule

GOLDEN RULE.—This name is given to a saying of Jesus recorded in the Sermon on the Mount. In Mat_7:12 its form is fuller and probably more original than in Luk_6:31. The omission of the sentence, ‘for this is the law and the prophets,’ by the Gentile Evangelist, is in accord with the purpose of his Gospel; other variations may be due either to changes made in the course of oral transmission, or to divergences in two translations into Greek from the Aramaic. The two versions of the saying are as follows:

Mat_7:12 ‘All things therefore whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them: for this is the law and the prophets.’

Luk_6:31 ‘And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise.’

The saying is rightly called a *rule*, for it lays down a general principle for moral guidance, and furnishes a ready test of the social value of words and deeds. But it presupposes an ideal of social well-being which determines the end of conduct; its function is to prescribe means for the attainment of that end. To the disciples of Christ the coming of the Kingdom of God is the supreme end; for them this saying is, therefore, the *golden rule*, furnishing a standard of excellence whose practical value consists in its universal applicability. Interpreted in the spirit of Christ, the rule, ‘Do as you would be done by,’ implies the embodiment in action of the prayer, ‘Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth’; they who walk by this rule are doing all that in them lies to bring in the Golden Age. Disparagement of the saying is the result either of failure to fathom the depths of its meaning, or of the rejection of Christ’s teaching in regard to the blessedness in which all men’s good consists.

The interpretation of the Golden Rule is little, if at all, affected by the connexion of thought. In the two Gospels the context varies. Wendt follows Luke’s order, though this necessitates the reference of ‘therefore’ in Mat_7:12 to Mat_5:42—the verse which corresponds to Luk_6:30. On this supposition the word ‘therefore’ is made to appear superfluous; Zahn rejects it on slight MS authority, because it seems to introduce a summary, which he regards as out of place here (* \aleph L minn. Syr^{pesh} om. ω $\tilde{\nu}$). Yet Bengel’s pithy comment, ‘Imitate the Divine goodness,’ suggests a natural link with the previous verse: as the Father gives ‘good things’ to His children in response to the prayer which expresses desire to receive them, so the motive of His

children's actions should be a wish that others may share in the enjoyment of those good things from above. Another interpretation which preserves the unity of the Sermon on the Mount is that our Lord followed His encouragement to prayer by the reminder that if prayer is to be heard there must be a good life (Chrysostom). It is equally true, however, that the good life is impossible without prayer; the Father hears us when we ask His help, 'the most difficult duties of unselfish brotherly love to men become possible to us' (Dykes, of the King, p. 572). The two views are complementary and not mutually exclusive. If we are doing unto others as Christ would have us do, He assures us that His Father will hear our prayers; on the other hand, if we will pray, He assures us that His Father will bestow the gifts of grace which will enable us to walk in love. In our Lord's farewell discourse there is a similar interdependence of thought. Communion with the Father in Christ's name is a means to an end, even the hearing of much fruit (Joh 15:7 f.); on the other hand, it is to disciples whose lives are fruitful that the promise of receiving what they ask is given (v. 16).

The Golden Rule is not, as some philosophers have held, a mere *law of nature*. Nevertheless, at the basis of this contention there lies a truth, well expressed by Wesley: 'It commends itself, as soon as heard, to every man's conscience and understanding; insomuch that no man can knowingly offend against it, without carrying his condemnation in his own breast' (*Sermon xxx. § 22*). Hobbes declares that moral regulations, which he calls 'immutable and eternal laws of nature,' may all be summarized in the simple formula, 'Do not that to another which thou wouldest not have done to thyself.' 'It is clear,' as Sidgwick points out (*Hist. of Ethics*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 167 n. [Note: note.]), 'that Hobbes does not distinguish this formula from the well-known "golden rule" of the Gospel,—cf. *Leviathan*, ch. xv. p. 79, and ch. xvii. p. 85,—whereas the formula above quoted is, of course, the golden rule taken only in its negative application, as prescribing abstinences, not positive services.'

In its *negative* form the saying is found in both Jewish and pagan sources before the Christian era. Tobias is admonished by his father Tobit to love his brethren, 'and what is displeasing to thyself, that do not unto any other' (To 4:15). Hillel's concise reply to a Gentile inquirer who asked to be taught the whole Law while standing on one foot, was, 'What is hateful to thee, do not unto thy fellow-man; this is the whole law, the rest is mere commentary' (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Shab. 31a*). A saying of Confucius is, 'Do not to others what you would not wish done to yourself' (Legge, *Chinese Classics*, i. 191 f.). Gibbon (*Decline and Fall*, liv n. [Note: note.]) quotes from a moral treatise of Isocrates, ἂ πάσχοντες ὑφ' ἑτέρων ὀργίζεσθε, τὰυτα τοῖς ἄλλοις μὴ ποιεῖτε. The passage occurs in an address (written by Isocrates, a professional

writer) of Nicocles, king of Cyprian Salamis (*circa (about)* 374 b.c.), to his subjects, dealing with their duties as such (Isocrates, *Nicocles*, 61b).

The unique value of the Golden Rule of Jesus does not depend upon its never having been uttered by any earlier teacher in its *positive* form, but upon its connexion with His revelation of man's chief good, His perfect example of devotion to that good, and His power to inspire and sustain those who, at His bidding, become followers of that which is good. It remains true, however, that there is little evidence of the existence of any pre-Christian parallel to the positive rule. Diogenes Laertius (v. 21) tells us that Aristotle was asked how we should act towards our friends, and replied: 'as we would they should act to us.' The saying is quoted with no context, but a comparison with *Nicom. Ethics*, ix. 8 *fin.*, is in favour of its genuineness. Prof. Legge, commenting on the assertion that Confucius gave the rule only in a negative form, says: 'but he understood it also in its positive and most comprehensive force, and deplored, on one occasion at least, that he had not himself always attained to taking the initiative in doing to others as he would have them do to him' (*Encyc. Brit.*⁹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] vi. 264b).

In the Apostolic and post-Apostolic ages the negative form of the rule is more frequent, both in Christian and non-Christian writers. The oldest Christian authority is probably *Didache*, 1:2. It is also inserted in the Western text of Act 15:20; Act 15:29, but the source of the variant is uncertain. Zahn refers the addition to the *Didache*; but, as Rendel Harris says, 'the negative precept turns up everywhere in the early Church, having been absorbed in the first instance from Jewish ethics.' (Cf. Knowling's succinct note on Act 15:20 in *Expos. Gr. Test.*). Other examples are *Const. Apost.* vii. 1; Clem. Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] *Strom.* ii. 23, 139; Tertullian, *e. Marc.* iv. 16. In non-Christian authors the negative form of the rule is found in Philo (Eusebius, *Praep.* viii. 7. 6). One of the best of the Roman emperors, Alexander Severus, had it inscribed in his palace and on public buildings (Lamprid. c. 51). Westermarck (*Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, i. 693) directs attention to an interesting passage in Epictetus (*Fragm.* 42): the keeping of slaves is condemned in these words, 'What you avoid suffering yourself, seek not to impose on others.' The rule in its positive form is loosely quoted in Clem. Rom. [Note: Roman.] *ad Cor.* c. xiii., 'As ye do, so shall it be done unto you ... as ye are kind, so shall kindness be shown unto you.' Harless (*Christian Ethics*, p. 110) ascribes to Seneca the saying, 'ab altero expectes alteri quod feceris,'—a suggestive and rare contrast to the Stoic maxim, 'Quod tibi fieri non vis, alteri ne feceris.'

A fair inference from these facts is that the positive form of the Golden Rule has been generally regarded as marking a distinct advance upon the negative form, its ideal of social duty being higher and therefore more difficult to realize. But Professor Hirsch

takes the opposite view; in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* (vi. 22^b) he says: ‘ “What you would have others do unto you,” makes self and possible advantages to self the central motive; “what is hateful to you do not unto another” makes the effect upon others the regulating principle.’ But how can self-interest be the motive for doing good to thankful and unthankful alike? The positive precept puts ‘doing’ first, and bids us take thought in doing good; we are to give what would please us, if we were in the place of those whom we are trying to benefit, though it may be quite certain that we shall receive nothing in return. The command of Christ accords with His teaching that they are ‘blessed’ who do not invite to their feasts those who will probably return the invitation, but those who cannot make such recompense (Luk 14:12 ff.). It is still more difficult to understand how ‘doing nothing’ to another ensures that our conduct will be regulated by altruistic principles. To do no harm is consistent with extreme selfishness. ‘The negative confines us to the region of *justice*; the positive takes us into the region of *generosity* or *grace*, and so embraces both law and prophets’ (Bruce, *Expos. Gr. Test. in loc.*).

A subtle way of obtaining a negative result from the positive precept is mentioned by Schleiermacher (*Predigten*. iii. 84 ff.). One may say in haughty independence, ‘What I wish is that others would let me go my own way; therefore, I let them go theirs.’ It is rightly said, in reply, that such pride is incompatible with obedience to the command of Jesus. His words, ‘whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you,’ are a recognition of the fact of men’s mutual dependence. ‘We are members one of another, and our chief danger is not that we should forget our claims on others, but that we should neglect our duties to others; nevertheless there are occasions when our possibilities of doing good to others will be lessened by unwillingness to be served by others.

A practical difficulty presents itself to the minds of many who desire to walk in accordance with Christ’s rule. A king cannot do to his subject what he desires his subject to do to him, nor can a father to his child, nor a master to his servant. But our Lord’s command is ‘*even so* do ye unto them.’ The narrow interpretation is not only false to the spirit, but also to the letter. The saying of Christ leaves abundant room for good actions which the recipient may be known to be altogether unable to return,—another reason for refusing to see in the positive form of the Golden Rule an appeal to self-interest. The Gr. word used is οὕτως, not ταῦτα; its meaning is rightly given by Alford (*Com. in loc.*), ‘After the pattern of ὅσα ἂν ... Because what might suit us might not suit others. We are to think what we should like done to *us*, and then apply that rule to our dealings with others.’ A baldly literal interpretation would miss the beauty of St. Paul’s words, when, after enumerating the duties of servants to their masters, he says, ‘And, ye masters, do the same things unto them’ (Eph 6:9). The rule for masters and servants alike is ‘unto the Lord’; on each side of this and of

every human relationship there is opportunity for 'goodwill' and for 'doing the will of God from the heart' (Eph_6:6 f.).

Many modern writers regard the Golden Rule as identical with the ethical maxim of Kant: 'So act as to treat humanity, whether in thine own person or in that of any other, in every case as an end withal, never as a means only' (cf. Votaw in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , Extra Vol. p. 42^a; Gore, *Sermon on the Mount*, 170 f.; Loofs, *Predigten*, ii. 227). In the language of philosophy, Kant forcefully expresses what is implied in the simpler words of Jesus. Doubtless it is inconsistent with the Golden Rule to exploit men for gain or for pleasure; in a word, to have one ideal for ourselves and another for our neighbours. Loofs shows clearly how the *universality* of the ethical imperative on which Kant so strongly insists is a distinct note in the command of Jesus. He also makes an instructive application of this principle to a concrete case, and shows how vainly partners in guilt try to shelter themselves behind their own parody of this rule. As though mutual agreement could ever be any excuse for collusion in dishonest actions, deceitful evasions, or even immoral pleasures. His reply to those who act on the principle of the German proverb, 'The left hand washes the right, and the right hand washes the left,' is in substance as follows: Jesus does not say, 'Whatsoever one of you would that another should do to him, let him do the same to that other.' The rule is universal. There must be no arbitrary limiting of the extension of the term 'men' in the saying, 'Whatsoever ye would that *men* should do unto you, even so do ye also unto *them*.' A thief and his accomplice may, for the sake of dividing the spoil, wink at each other's crimes; that is what is called honour among thieves. But neither of the accomplices can wish to make the rule of action universal; they cannot desire to be deceived by all men as they have agreed to combine in deceiving others.

In the Golden Rule, John Stuart Mill found a fitting expression of the essential principle of his ethical system. 'To do as you would be done by, and to love your neighbour as yourself, constitute the ideal perfection of utilitarian morality' (*Utilitarianism*, p. 323). But when the crucial question is asked: How is the ideal perfection to be attained? the reply is that utility enjoins, 'as the means of making the nearest approach to this ideal,' that (1) 'laws of social arrangements,' and (2) 'education and opinion' should strive to 'establish in the mind of every individual an indissoluble association between his own happiness and the good of the whole' (*op. cit.* p. 323). But no external force, such as law or education, can supply either the motive for doing as we would be done by, or the power to fulfil the precept we approve. It is true that on the lips of Christ the Golden Rule has its perfect expression; but its superiority as an ethical maxim rests upon a broader basis. It is more to exemplify a rule than to formulate it; it is still more to furnish the inward inspiration which constrains men to obey it. The disciples of Christ have another Golden Rule for their actions one toward another; it is expressed in His words, 'as I

have done to you'; and their all-powerful motive is the assurance that 'ye did it unto me' (Mat 25:40) will be their abundant reward, if whatsoever they would have done to Christ Himself, even so they do unto men, serving them lowly and lovingly in His name and for His sake.

Literature.—In addition to the works mentioned in this article, see Sermon on the Mount and the excellent Bibliography of Votaw in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , Extra Vol. p. 44 f.

J. G. Tasker.

☩ Golgotha

GOLGOTHA (Γολγοθᾶ, Aram. [Note: Aramaic.] ܩܠܘܬܐ, Heb. ܩܠܘܬܐ [2Ki 9:35], 'skull').—The name of the place where Jesus was crucified. This name is mentioned by three of the Evangelists (Mat 27:33 'a place called Golgotha, that is to say, The place of a skull'; Mar 15:22 'the place Golgotha, which is, being interpreted, The place of a skull'; Joh 19:17 'the place called The place of a skull, which is called in the Hebrew, Golgotha'). The Greek equivalent (Κρανιον) is used by St. Luke (Luk 23:33 'the place which is called The skull,' Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). Vulgate uses here the Latin equivalent *Calvaria*, whence 'Calvary' in Authorized Version .

Three explanations of this name have been suggested: (1) Jerome (*Com. in Eph 5:14*) mentions a tradition that Adam was buried at Golgotha, and that at the Crucifixion the drops of Christ's blood fell on his skull and restored him to life. The skull often seen in early pictures of the Crucifixion refers to this. (2) It is supposed by some to have been the place of public execution, where bodies were left unburied (Jerome, *Com. in Mat 27:33*), but (a) it is most unlikely that dead men's bones would have been left lying about so near the city, when, according to the Mosaic law, they made any one unclean who touched them; (b) there was no reason why the place should have been named from the skulls rather than from any other parts of skeletons; (c) the expression is κρανίου τόπος, not κρανίων τόπος, as we should expect it to be if this derivation were correct. (3) The most probable view of the origin of the name is suggested by the form of the expression in St. Luke, 'the place which is called The skull.' It was probably so called because of its skull-like contour. The use of the article by the Evangelists seems to indicate that the place was well known, but they never call it a mountain. The Bordeaux Pilgrim (a.d. 333) speaks of it as *monticulus*

Golgotha, and the expression 'Mount Calvary' appears to have come into use after the 5th century.

The site cannot be identified with certainty. All that we know from the Bible is that it was outside the walls of the city (Heb 13:12, Mat 27:31-32, Joh 19:16-17), that it was nigh to the city (Joh 19:20), that it was in a conspicuous position (Mar 15:40, Luk 23:49), that it was close to some thoroughfare leading from the country (Mat 27:39, Mar 15:21; Mar 15:29, Luk 23:28), and that it was near a garden and a new tomb hewn out of the rock, belonging to Joseph, a rich man of Arimathaea (Joh 19:41, Mat 27:57; Mat 27:60, Mar 15:43; Mar 15:46, Luk 23:53). These particulars are not sufficient to justify a positive decision in favour of any one of the proposed identifications of Golgotha, but they seem to be decisive against the first of the four conjectures mentioned below, to bear against the second slightly, but against the third more heavily, and to be most nearly satisfied by the fourth.

1. The peculiar theory of Fergusson (*Essay on the Anc. Topog. of Jerus.* [Note: Jerusalem.]), and art. 'Jerusalem' in Smith's *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.]), that Golgotha was on Mount Moriah, and that the mosque of Omar is the church erected by Constantine over the Holy Sepulchre, was quickly shown to be untenable (e.g. by Bonar, art. 'Jerusalem' in Fairbairn's *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.]).

2. Barclay (*City of the Great King*, p. 79) and Porter (*Kitto's Cycl. of Bib. Lit.* art 'Golgotha') maintained that the site of the Crucifixion was east of the city, between the then existing wall and the Kidron Valley. This place could have been quickly and easily reached from the palace of Pilate and the judgment-hall, which probably stood at the N.W. corner of the Haram area. According to this view, the soldiers, instead of taking their prisoner across the city towards the west, or out in the direction of the Roman road, hurried Him through the nearest gate and crucified Him near the road leading to Bethany. Two objections are urged against this: (a) that the Gospel narratives imply that the road passing Golgotha was a more frequented thoroughfare than this road to Bethany, and that the great highways of Jerusalem are all on the north and west of the city; and (b) that there is no skull-shaped site in this region.

3. That Golgotha was where the Church of the Holy Sepulchre now stands, seems to have been almost universally believed from the age of Constantine down to the 18th century. It is now agreed on all hands that the present Church of the Holy Sepulchre occupies the site of the one erected by Constantine in a.d. 335. On what grounds did he select this as the true site of the Crucifixion? Those who still believe it to be the true site generally assume not only that the early Christians at Jerusalem had a knowledge of the places where the Lord was crucified and buried, but also that this knowledge was handed down as a reliable tradition through three hundred years,

notwithstanding the utter demolition of Jerusalem by Titus and again by Hadrian, and the altering of the whole aspect of the city by the latter when he rebuilt it as a Roman colony and changed its name to Aelia Capitolina. But Eusebius, in describing the discovery of the site by Constantine, says it had been 'given over to forgetfulness and oblivion,' and that the Emperor, 'not without a Divine intimation, but moved in spirit by the Saviour Himself,' ordered it to be purified and adorned with splendid buildings.

'Such language, certainly, would hardly be appropriate in speaking of a spot well known and definitely marked by long tradition. The Emperor, too, in his letter to Macarius, regards the discovery of "the token of the Saviour's most sacred passion, which for so long a time had been hidden under ground," as "a miracle beyond the capacity of man sufficiently to celebrate or even to comprehend." The mere removal of obstructions from a well-known spot could hardly have been described as a miracle so stupendous. Indeed, the whole tenor of the language both of Eusebius and Constantine goes to show that the discovery of the Holy Sepulchre was held to be the result, not of a previous knowledge derived from tradition, but of a supernatural interposition and revelation' (Robinson, *BRP* [Note: *RP* Biblical Researches in Palestine.] , Boston, 1841, ii. 75).

The same impression is made by the accounts of the writers of the 5th century, who, however, unanimously attribute the discovery not to Constantine, but to his mother Helena. Their story is that, guided by a 'Divine intimation' as to the place, she came to Jerusalem, inquired diligently of the inhabitants, and, after a difficult search, found the sepulchre and beside it three crosses, and also the tablet bearing the inscription of Pilate. At the suggestion of Bishop Macarius, the cross to which the inscription belonged was ascertained by a miracle of healing. The three crosses were presented in succession to a noble lady of Jerusalem who lay sick of an incurable disease. Two of them produced no effect, but the third worked an immediate and perfect cure. Eusebius, though contemporary with the alleged events, makes no mention of the discovery of the cross nor of the agency of Helena. But whether we accept the account of Eusebius or that of the writers of the 5th century, the traditional site of Calvary rests on a miracle, and, in the case of the latter, on a double miracle.

Those who now favour this site (*e.g.* Sanday, *Sac. Sites of the Gospels*, pp. 72-77) labour to show that there was a previous tradition which determined Constantine's selection of the spot, but the only proofs they adduce are: (*a*) vague allusions to visits made by early pilgrims to the 'Holy Places' of Palestine, an expression which is used of the Holy Land at large, and not of the Holy City only; and (*b*) the alleged regular succession of bishops from the Apostle James to the time of Hadrian, through whom a knowledge of the place might have been handed down. This regular succession of

bishops is more than doubtful. The only authority on the subject is Eusebius, who lived two centuries afterwards, and he says expressly that he had been able to find no document respecting them, and wrote only from hearsay. Moreover, even if it were possible to prove the existence of an earlier tradition, its value would be open to serious question, as is shown by the falsity of other traditions which did actually exist in the age of Constantine. For instance, Eusebius in a.d. 315 speaks of pilgrims coming from all parts of the world to behold the fulfilment of prophecy and to pay their adorations on the *summit* of the Mount of Olives, where Jesus gave His last charge to His disciples and then ascended into heaven. This is hardly consistent with the explicit statement of St. Luke ([Luk_24:50-51](#)) that 'he led them out until they were over against Bethany, and ... he parted from them and was carried up into heaven.' Other sites shown to pilgrims in that uncritical age were impossible, such as that of Rephidim in Moab. The Bordeaux Pilgrim places the Transfiguration on Olivet, and the combat of David and Goliath near Jezreel. The fact that no pilgrimages were made to the site of the Holy Sepulchre before the visit of Helena, though they were made in plenty to the summit of Olivet, goes to show that there was no tradition concerning the Holy Sepulchre.

In the present Church of the Holy Sepulchre are shown not only the site of the Sepulchre and the rock of the Crucifixion, with the cleft made by the earthquake and the three holes, five feet apart, in which the three crosses were inserted, but also a great number of other traditional sites. Almost every incident of the Passion and Resurrection is definitely located. The very spots are pointed out where Christ was bound, where He was scourged, where His friends stood afar off during the Crucifixion, where His garments were parted, where His body was anointed, where He appeared to His mother after the Resurrection, and to Mary Magdalene; the rock tombs also of Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathaea; the place where Helena's throne stood during the 'Invention of the Cross,'—and many others. The number of these identifications, all under one roof, does not increase our confidence in ecclesiastical tradition.

Not less damaging to the claims of the traditional site is the topographical evidence. Our Lord suffered 'without the gate' ([Heb_13:12](#)). The Church of the Holy Sepulchre lies far within the walls of the present city, and, as Jerusalem at the time of the Crucifixion was much larger than it is now, the fair presumption is that it included the site of that church rather than excluded it. If we place Golgotha at the traditional site, we make Jerusalem at the time of its greatest prosperity no larger than the poverty-stricken town of the present day, 'containing not far from 200 acres, from which 36 acres must be deducted for the Haram area' (Merrill). This difficulty arising from the present location in the heart of the city seems to have been felt as early as the 8th cent., and also in the 12th and 14th, but the first to reject the tradition openly was Korte, who visited Jerusalem in 1738, and who urged that the traditional

site could not have been outside the ancient city, because of its nearness to the former area of the Jewish temple. The argument against this site has been greatly strengthened by the determination of the rock levels of Jerusalem and the probable course of the 'second wall' of the three mentioned by Josephus. The first wall, that of David and Solomon, encompassed the Upper City (Zion), and its north line ran eastward from the tower of Hippicus to the wall bounding the temple area. 'The second wall had its beginning from the gate called Gennath, which belonged to the first wall, and, encircling only the northern quarter of the city, it extended as far as the Tower Antonia' (*BJ* v. iv. 2). This wall, which was probably built by Hezekiah, running in a circle or curve, seems to have had no angles like the first and third, and therefore to have required no extended description. If this curve included the Pool of Hezekiah (which must surely have been within the walls), it would naturally have included also the traditional site of the Sepulchre. If, in spite of the statement of Josephus, the wall be drawn with a re-entering angle so as to exclude the traditional site, there still remain apparently insuperable difficulties in the nature of the ground, since in this case the wall must have been built in a deep valley (Tyropœon), and must have been dominated from without by the adjacent knoll on which the Church of the Holy Sepulchre now stands (Acra). But 'fortresses stand on hills, not in deep ravines,' 'the wall must have stood *on the high ground*' (Conder). Immediately east of the Tower of David (at or near which Hippicus must have stood) a narrow ridge runs north and south, connecting the two hills Zion and Acra and separating the head of the Tyropœon Valley from the valley west of the Jaffa gate. As this is the only place where the wall could have protected the valley on the east and commanded the valley on the west, the natural course for the engineers would have been to build the wall along this ridge. Exactly along this ridge the remains of an ancient wall were found in 1885 by Dr. Merrill. One hundred and twenty feet of it were exposed in a line running north-west and south-east, at a depth of 10 or 12 ft. below the present surface of the ground. At some points but one course of stone remained, at others two, at others three. The stones correspond in size and work to those in the base of the Tower of David, a few yards farther south. This is probably a portion of the second wall. Later, another section, 26 ft. long, of similar work, was found farther north, besides traces at several other points. In explanation of the fact that entire sections are found towards the south and only debris of walls towards the north, Dr. Merrill cites the statement of Josephus, that Titus 'threw down the entire northern portion,' but left the southern standing and placed garrisons in its towers. From the statement that Titus made his attack 'against the central tower of the north wall' he argues further, that if the wall ran from near Hippicus to Antonia in such a way as to exclude the traditional site of the Sepulchre, the two parts of the wall after it was broken in the middle should have been designated the 'eastern' and 'western'; but Josephus calls them the 'northern' and 'southern,' a description which is obviously more appropriate to a wall which ran well to the west and north of the traditional site (*Presb. and Ref. Rev.* iii. p. 646).

Parts of an ancient ditch and remains of walls have been recently discovered east of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and Schick regards these as remains of the second wall and of the city moat. But, as Benzinger says (Hilprecht's *Explorations in Bible Lands in the 19th Cent.*), his explanation 'is not convincing in itself, and there stand opposed to it important considerations of a general nature,' such as have been cited above, e.g. the military objection to locating a wall in a valley dominated from without by higher ground, and the fact that, had this been the course of the wall, Jerusalem could not have accommodated its great population at the time of Christ.

The existence of an undoubted Jewish tomb at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, the one now called the Tomb of Joseph of Arimathaea, has been cited as evidence that the place was outside the old city wall, 'but we know from the Talmud that ancient half-forgotten tombs were allowed by the Jews to exist within Jerusalem, and any writer will admit that, in the time of Agrippa at least, this particular tomb was within the circuit of the town.' The third wall, which ran far to the north-west and north of the present city wall, was built by Agrippa only ten or eleven years after the Crucifixion, to enclose a large suburb that had gradually extended beyond the second wall. So that, even if it could be shown that the Sepulchre was outside the second wall, it certainly lay far within the line of the third, and in the midst of this new town which at the time of the Crucifixion must have been already growing north of the second wall. The words 'without the gate' and 'nigh to the city' could scarcely mean 'within the suburbs' (Schaff).

The genuineness of the traditional site has been defended by Chateaubriand (*Itinéraire de Paris à Jerusalem*), Williams (*The Holy City*), Krafft (*Die Topographie Jerusalems*), Tischendorf (*Reise in den Orient*), de Vogué (*Les Églises de la Terre-Sainte*), Sepp (*Jerusalem*), Clermont-Ganneau (*L'Authenticité du Saint-Sépulchre*), Sanday (*Sacred Sites of the Gospels*), and others. It has been attacked by Korte (*Reise nach dem gelobten Lande*), Robinson (*BRP* [Note: RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.]), and *Bibliotheca Sacra* for August and November 1847), Tobler (*Golgotha*), Wilson (*The Lands of the Bible*), Barclay (*The City of the Great King*), Schaff (*Through Bible Lands*), Conder (*Tent Work in Palestine*), and others.

4. The theory that Golgotha is the skull-shaped knoll above Jeremiah's grotto, outside the present north wall, near the Damascus gate, was first suggested by Otto Thenius in 1849. A similar view was put forward independently by Fisher Howe (*The True Site of Calvary*) in 1871. Since that time the theory has come rapidly into favour, and has been accepted by Gen. [Note: Geneva NT 1557, Bible 1560.] C. E. Gordon, Sir J. W. Dawson, Dr. Merrill, Dr. Schaff, Col. Conder, and others. It answers all the requirements of the Gospel narratives, being outside the walls, nigh to the city, in a conspicuous position, near a frequented thoroughfare—the main north road, and near

to ancient Jewish rock-hewn tombs, one of which was discovered by Conder about 700 ft. west of the knoll. The so-called 'Gordon's Tomb,' about 230 ft. from the summit of the knoll, is thought by Conder to be a Christian tomb of the Byzantine age; but Schick says it 'was originally a rather small rock-cut Jewish tomb, but became afterwards a Christian tomb.' The great cemetery of Jewish times lay north of the city.

Moreover, Jewish tradition regards this hill as the place of public execution, and the Jews still call it 'the Place of Stoning.' Christian tradition also, as old as the 5th cent., fixes this as the place of the stoning of Stephen. The fact that Christ was put to death by the Roman method of crucifixion and not by the Jewish method of stoning does not break the force of this argument, for there is no reason to suppose that Jerusalem had two places of public execution. No other place would have been so convenient to the Romans for this purpose, starting, as they probably did, from Antonia. The castle seems to have been itself a part of the outer ramparts on the north-east, with the north wall of the temple area stretching from it to the east and the second city wall to the north-west. There must have been some feasible route for the soldiers of the garrison, who were constantly going back and forth between this fortress and Caesarea. There was no such route to the east or south. To go west would have taken them through the heart of the crowded city, with its narrow streets and its perils from the mob. What more natural than that there should have been a road leading directly from Antonia to the open country northwards? Here, accordingly, only a short distance north of the city, we find the remains of a Roman road.

'If executions were to take place near the city, I think they must have been carried out on the line of such a road, where the soldiers would have free ground to act upon in case of an emergency, without being hampered by crowded streets, and where only one gate would be between them and their stronghold, and that one entirely under their own control' (Merrill).

Literature.—Artt. 'Golgotha' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible and *Encyc. Bibl.*, 'Sepulchre, The Holy,' in *Encyc. Brit.*⁹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 'Grab, das heilige,' in *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologic und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; Conder, *Tent Work in Palestine*, i. 372 ff.; *SWP* [Note: WP Memoirs of the Survey of W. Palestine.] 'Jerusalem,' 429 ff.; Merrill in *Andover Rev.*, 1885, p. 483 ff.; *PEFSt* [Note: EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.] , 1892, pp. 120 ff., 177, 188, 205; Wilson, *Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre*, 1906; and works cited in the article.

W. W. Moore.

☩ Gomorrah

GOMORRAH (גִּמְזָרָה, Γομόρρα [fem.] or Γόμορρα [neut.]).—

The word should be fem. in Greek as in Hebrew, but the final *α* led to its being treated as neut. plural. In the LXX Septuagint it is fem. 9 times, neut. 5 times, and in 5 passages the gender is indeterminate. In the NT it is fem. in 2Pe_2:6 and Mat_10:15 [CD], but neut. in *id.* [⊗AB].

The name occurs in the NT in Mat_10:15, Rom_9:29; 2Pe_2:6, Jud_1:7. (In Mar_6:11 it occurs in a sentence wrongly inserted in A and some Lat. MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] , whence it found its way through the Υ^R [Note: R Textus Receptus.] into the Authorized Version). In every case it is coupled with Sodom, as it is invariably in the OT. It is to be noticed, however, that Sodom is mentioned alone in Mat_11:23 f., Luk_17:29, Rev_11:8. Not only so, but in Luk_10:12, the parallel passage to Mat_10:15, Gomorrah is omitted. It seems probable, therefore, that in St. Matthew the insertion of the name is editorial and not original; and, moreover, the text is uncertain; ⊗AB Γομόρρων, C Γομόρρας, D [Note: Deuteronomist.] Γομόρας; again ⊗C insert *γῆ* before Γομ., while ABD omit it. Our Lord, then, used ‘Sodom’ (or ‘the land of Sodom’) alone; in Rom_9:29 the passage is a direct quotation from Isa_1:9; while the OT expression ‘Sodom and Gomorrah’ is found only in the two late, and closely connected, writings, Jude and 2 Peter.

For the lessons drawn by our Lord from the wickedness and the destruction of Sodom, see art. Sodom.

A. H. M'Neile.

☩ Good

GOOD (ἀγαθός, καλός).—It is not easy to define Christ's idea of what is good. His expressions vary from a conception of the Good as one with the infinitely and inimitably Perfect to the most commonplace uses of the word. He speaks of old wine as ‘good’ (Luk_5:39), of the wedding-guests as ‘both bad and good’ (Mat_22:10), of salt as ‘good’ (Mar_9:50 || Luk_14:34), of certain ground as being ‘good’ (Mar_4:8 ||

Luk_8:8), of God making ‘his sun to rise on the evil and on the good’ (Mat_5:45), and He says of Judas, ‘Good (καλόν) were it for that man if he had not been born’ (Mat_26:24 || Mar_14:21). Yet when the young ruler comes to Him with the same conventional usage of the word, ‘Good Master (διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ), what good thing shall I do to inherit eternal life?’ (Mar_10:17 || Luk_18:18; cf. Mat_19:16 f. and WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort’s text.]’s ‘Notes on Select Readings’ *ad loc.*), Jesus rejects the title as applied to Himself, and asserts that ‘none is good save one, even God.’ Whether this be read as ‘not denying that He is good, but insisting that none should call Him so who did not believe Him to be God’ (Liddon, *Bampt. Lect.* i. 23), or as ‘the self-judgment which felt hurt by the epithet good’ (Martineau, *Seat of Authority*, 651), there can be little doubt that Jesus purposely made use of the young man’s phrase to point him to the ideal Good. Behind the things to be done, which were in the questioner’s mind,—greater than matters of law or ritual, or even charity,—was the necessity that he should recognize the Supreme Good, the Eternal Spirit of all goodness. This did not imply that man should be hopeless of attaining a certain measure of the good, that it was something beyond the reach of the race, but that the fundamental idea of the good is God, and that to define or limit it is as impossible as to define or limit the Eternal Himself. Only on this occasion does Jesus so suddenly soar beyond the intention of any questioner who approaches Him. Elsewhere He tells a parable, and puts into the mouth of the master of the vineyard (a most human representative of the Heavenly Master) the question, ‘Is thine eye evil because I am good?’ (Mat_20:15); and He speaks of ‘the good man’ who ‘out of his good treasure bringeth forth good things’ (Mat_12:35 || Luk_6:45). So we may look upon the story of the Rich Young Man as a unique expression of Christ’s highest thought of the Good, but not as thereby ruling out all lesser conceptions. A man may begin to do good or to live a good life before he learns that the foundation of all the good he accomplishes or attains to is God Himself; that no ethical aims are good which lack a Divine sanction. It is better for a man when this inward recognition of the Eternal Goodness precedes the active goodness of his life, for then he finds the peculiar secret of St. Paul’s dogma (Rom_8:28), ‘All things work together for good to them that love God.’ But the doing of good for its own sake may be a man’s first step towards the Kingdom of God, and later he will be prepared for any self-denial or self-sacrifice that may bring him nearer the heavenly perfection (Mat_18:8 || Mar_9:43; Mar_9:45; Mar_9:47), when he has learned that it is God’s Kingdom he approaches and not the invention of his own sympathetic impulses alone.

In line with this thought of Christ’s is the liberty in the modes of doing good which He frequently asserted. With Him the present was always the fitting opportunity of the good, though He might occasionally ask the opinion of the Pharisees and scribes as to whether it was ‘lawful to do good on the Sabbath’ (Mat_12:12 | Mar_3:4, Luk_6:9).

Some element of altruism enters into all His conceptions of good. The Greek masters (especially Plato and Aristotle) assert the good of a man to lie in his 'well-being' (Sidgwick's constant rendering of εὐδαιμονία), a condition which depends on certain visible 'goods' that are his own personal possession, and in no way bring him into contact with less fortunate men, such 'good things' as wealth, health, beauty, and intellect. But Christ regards that alone as good which lessens the distance between man and man, and man and God. The good a man should seek is that of each and all men, even 'them that hate you' ([Luk 6:27](#)), for the doing of good to others is the final test of the practical value of religion, and became the distinctive note of the character of Christ in the Apostolic days when He was described as one who 'went about doing good and healing' ([Act 10:38](#)). This is indicative of all the visible elements of the good in His teachings. Love, His supreme dogma, finds its essence in self-surrender. The parables of conduct, such as the Good Samaritan, are insistent upon the actual doing of some good. When Jesus sends the Baptist His own record, the good things that will bear witness to Him, it is a tale of deeds of brotherly kindness, of help for the blind, lame, lepers, deaf, the poor, and even the dead ([Mat 11:5](#)). Zacchaeus is assured of his salvation when he has learned to share with his poorer brethren ([Luk 19:8-9](#)). The fact of giving is accepted by Christ as the evidence of a desire to do good ([Mar 14:7](#)). The good man is not only devout; his personal piety may be the surest basis for the true spirit of goodness in him; but the good must take form in some actual warring with the world's evils, some earnest attempt to remedy the miseries, sufferings, diseases, afflictions, sorrows, or poverty of men. This is the vital test applied in the great parable of the Judgment ([Mat 25:31](#) ff.). The Son of Man there asks no question as to spiritual apprehension, or intellectual convictions, or ecclesiastical obedience. 'The kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world—from the moment of the birth of mankind—is for those who saw and served the King in brethren who were hungry, thirsty, outcasts, naked, sick, or in prison. Christ sanctions the popular judgment of what constitutes a good man,—that effectiveness in well-doing which moves steadily and lovingly towards the ultimate conquest of the world, that social message of the gospel which is the enthusiasm of true goodness, and is able to 'overcome evil with good' ([Rom 12:21](#)). But all such doing rests on being. It is intimately connected with each man's own spiritual vision and condition, for it is the rudimentary realization of the Kingdom of heaven; it issues from that Kingdom which is 'within' ([Luk 17:21](#)), where 'glory, honour, and peace' are the blessings which come 'to every one that worketh good' ([Rom 2:10](#))—a Kingdom which a man may never have explored, but which is the ground from which grows all the practical good he does ([Mat 12:35](#)). If the tree is good, the fruit is good ([Mat 12:33](#)), and when the whole being of a man is awake to the inflowing of the Divine Goodness, he becomes the more keenly sensitive to Righteousness, Truth, Love, and the Brotherhood, and finds increasingly St. Peter's utterance at the Transfiguration to be his own: 'Lord, it is good for us to be here'

([Mat 17:4](#), [Mar 9:5](#), [Luk 9:33](#)). The Good enters imperceptibly; it is not born of the law, nor of any ethical analysis; and in the unexpectedness of its joy the disciple is conscious of having reached the highest heaven, of having found that delight in whatever is good which helps him to understand the true end of life, ‘to glorify God and to *enjoy* Him for ever.’”

Edgar Daplyn.

☩ Goodness

GOODNESS.—As resignation is the ideal of the Buddhist, and valour of the Mohammedan, so the essence of Christianity is goodness. Its Founder was the absolute personification of this characteristic quality. Nothing short of this could have so inspired the Apostles and Evangelists. Veiled within the few imperishable pages of the Gospels, and perhaps seen only by the meditating mind, is the figure of a perfect goodness once realized upon earth. It is not the novelty of His teaching that has attracted men, nor His deep sympathy with humanity, nor any spiritual utterances to the Father (which are all too rarely recorded). Behind the words and deeds of the four biographies stands a shining personality, a living type of goodness—One of whom they could speak as being ‘without sin.’ The Evangelists knew nothing of the dogmatic spirit, and could probably have given no clear definition and explanation of the sinlessness of Christ. To them He was the human expression of the Divine Goodness, and it mattered little whether a man should say that the Goodness was from eternity, so that by its nature sin had never been a moment’s possibility, or that at birth Christ had been uniquely endowed with a passion for goodness that turned naturally from everything selfish, injurious to others, or sinful either to God or man; or that at His baptism He had been set aside to that brief ministry (which is nearly all men know of His earthly life), when the voice from heaven was heard saying, ‘This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased’ ([Mat 3:17](#)). However its genesis might be spoken of, the ‘sinlessness’ of Christ is the utterance of the measure of His goodness as it affected the disciples. Throughout the Sermon on the Mount they would hear that note of human tenderness blended with unhesitating virtue which constitutes goodness. This alone could be the source of that merciful utterance which is perhaps His only new doctrine—‘Love your enemies.’

In His message of the Divine Fatherhood they would behold that goodness sending ‘rain upon the just and the unjust’ ([Mat 5:45](#)), forgiving the penitent as the father forgives the prodigal son ([Luk 15:11 ff.](#)), and even forgiving those whose repentance is yet to come ([Luk 23:34](#)). Such conceptions would be born of the goodness within Himself, that breathed out in the intense sympathy of the story of the woman taken

in sin (Joh 7:53 to Joh 8:11), or the defence of Mary Magdalene in the house of Simon the Pharisee (Luk 7:36 ff.), or in the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luk 10:25 ff.). The same spirit marks the greater number of the miracles. None could be considered as entirely separated from human interest and influence, and the great majority (thirty-one out of thirty-seven recorded) were wrought openly and intentionally for the good of others. The blind, the deaf, the palsied, the lame, the lepers, the lunatic, the hungry crowd, the timid fishermen, the mourners for the dead,—all shared in the effective power of the innate goodness of our Lord. It was as though, in His purity and sinlessness, the very forces of nature became obedient to His transparent will,—the one will that sin has never overcome, the one luminous purity in which sin has found no vitalizing atmosphere. He had been tried at the beginning of His mission, but the temptations of the desert had ended in triumph. The goodness that was the breath of His being rose instinctively above the low promptings of a selfish wonder-working, or the presumption of pride, or the vanity of power, even though over ‘all the kingdoms of the earth’ (Mat 4:1 || Luk 4:1, Mar 1:12). He spoke harshly to the Tempter, for goodness does not always win by mild passivity against evil. He who knows that God is the beginning and the end of all goodness will waste little time in diplomatic parley with the powers of darkness. Victory will often lie in swift attack. So the goodness of Christ is not lessened by His fierce handling of the money-changers and traders within the Temple (Mat 21:12 ff., Joh 2:13 ff.), for He knows that lower ideas of God and goodness will unconsciously prevail if the house of God becomes a place for barter and bargain. It is part of the same zeal that had kept Him about His ‘Father’s business’ in the days of His boyhood (Luk 2:49), though it takes the more vigorous form we might expect in manhood. The inward knowledge of the simplicity and holiness of His motives makes fear not only impossible, but non-existent; and this is the spirit that inspires every true missionary. He also, as his Master, would show the winning charm of the visibly good—the goodness embodied in a life rather than in doctrines only—that which in Christ could say to the world, ‘I am the bread of life’ (Joh 6:35; Joh 6:48), ‘I am the way, the truth, and the life’ (Joh 14:6), and ‘I am the light of the world’ (Joh 8:12, Joh 9:5), the witness of which is described by St. Paul, when he says that the fruit of the light is in all goodness and righteousness and truth’ (Eph 5:9).

The goodness of Christ brought a new force into Jewish religion, one that changed the nature of it. Judaism was formal, ceremonial, mainly an external worship. Its prophets had striven to kindle it into a moral and spiritual faith. But prophet and priest had stood apart. In Christ the middle wall was broken down, and into the old religion was poured the new spirit. Henceforth religion could not be separate from the moral life. A man could not be unrighteous, an evil-doer, and yet be religious. Goodness became a synonym for true and undefiled religion. For man, having once seen the perfect manhood of the Christ, and felt His power to overcome sin and death, had gained a vision of religion that might perpetuate such a type, and the

vision would not lightly fade. Through failures from within and tyrannies from without the Christian would bear witness to his Lord and to his faith, by a life of goodness modelled on that of his Master. This was the highest evidence he could offer of the Divine Incarnation.

Edgar Daplyn.

☩ Goodwill

GOODWILL.—See Complacency, p. 356^b.

☩ Gospel

GOSPEL.—‘Gospel’ is the modern form of the Anglo-Saxon word ‘godspell,’ representing the Greek word εὐαγγέλιον. Formerly it was thought to be the literal translation, meaning ‘good-story.’ But now it is generally accepted as meaning ‘God-story.’ εὐαγγέλιον was originally used for ‘the reward of good tidings,’ and traces of this usage are found in LXX Septuagint ; cf. 2Sa 4:10. But the word came to denote the ‘good tidings’ themselves; and this is the Christian usage. It may be noted here that Dalman (*The Words of Jesus*, p. 103) says: ‘In the verb בשר, which must be assumed to be the original Aramaic expression, the idea of glad tidings is not so inherent as in the Greek εὐαγγελίζεσθαι. Even in the OT (1Sa 4:17) בשר is used of mournful tidings.... It thus appears that the sovereignty of God is the content of a “message” or “tidings,” and not without further qualification of “a message of glad tidings.” ’ It would seem, however, that the choice of the Greek verb εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, as well as the contexts of the word in the Gospels, provide that ‘further qualification.’

1. The source for the Christian usage is found in Isaiah. In Isa 61:1 the prophet describes the function of the Servant of Jahweh (or perhaps his own function) in these words: ‘The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek....’ The word is εὐαγγελισασθαι. The meek are the exiles in Babylon. Good tidings are announced to them. God is coming to save them, and He is near. It is the acceptable year of the Lord, when He shall deliver His people from their enemies and restore them to their native land. A similar reference occurs

in [Isa 52:7](#). A messenger hastens to Jerusalem, as she sits in the dust of her ruins, bringing ‘good tidings.’ The exiles are to return to her, and she shall be inhabited again by her long-lost children. These instances exhibit clearly the meaning ‘good tidings’; and both are claimed in NT to describe the Christian message. St. Paul quotes [Isa 52:7](#) in [Rom 10:15](#); and Jesus makes [Isa 61:1](#) the text for His sermon at Nazareth ([Luk 4:18](#)).

This use of the word by Jesus stamps it at once with its Christian significance. ‘He began to say, To-day hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears.’ He claimed to be a preacher of good tidings to the poor. The poor, the captives, the blind, the bruised, are no longer political exiles. They are the bond-servants of sin, those who waited for the consolation of Israel, the poor and outcast to whom Judaism had no message of hope. He is Jahweh’s Anointed sent to bring good tidings of great joy to all the people ([Luk 2:10](#)). This description of His mission seems to have endeared itself to the heart of Jesus. He made frequent use of the word, and soon after the rejection in Nazareth He described His Messianic function by it: ‘I must preach the good tidings of the kingdom of God to the other cities also; for therefore was I sent’ ([Luk 4:43](#)). In particular, Jesus appropriated the name ‘gospel’ for the contents of His message. This was His description of it from the beginning of His ministry. St. Mark sums up that beginning thus: ‘Jesus came into Galilee preaching the gospel of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye and believe in the gospel.’ There are many proofs that Jesus used this word ‘gospel’ to describe His message; cf. [Mat 24:14](#); [Mat 26:13](#), [Mar 1:15](#); [Mar 8:35](#); [Mar 10:29](#); [Mar 13:10](#), [Luk 7:22](#) ||. It is not surprising, therefore, that the word came into general Christian use to describe the contents of the preaching of Jesus. All the Synoptics reflect this usage. In Acts and the Epistles it is an established custom. ‘The gospel’ became the normal Christian title for the message which Jesus came to proclaim, and which He sent forth the Apostles to preach to every creature.

2. But closer examination shows that the term was not used by the Evangelists to describe all that Jesus said; nor was the verb ‘preach good tidings’ descriptive of all His work. In Mt. this sentence occurs twice: ‘Jesus went about in all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of disease and all manner of sickness among the people’ ([Mat 4:23](#); [Mat 9:35](#)). It seems to be an accepted formula summarizing the work of Jesus. It contains three main words—‘teaching,’ ‘preaching,’ ‘healing.’ The same distinctions are noticed elsewhere. St. Luke distinguishes ‘teaching’ and ‘preaching the gospel’ ([Luk 20:1](#)); and in [Luk 9:2](#) he tells that the Twelve were sent forth ‘to preach the kingdom and to heal the sick.’ St. Mark does not contrast the two words ‘teach’ and ‘preach the gospel’ in the same verse; but in [Mar 1:14](#); [Mar 1:21](#), he ascribes to Jesus ‘preaching the gospel’ and ‘teaching.’ In the latter case the effect produced by His ‘teaching’ is different from that due to His ‘preaching.’

It would seem, therefore, that the work of Jesus was threefold: He preached the gospel, He taught, and He healed. If this distinction is valid, the term 'gospel' did not apply to all that Jesus said and did. It was reserved for the 'good tidings' that He preached. In addition to these 'good tidings,' there was 'teaching' that belonged to another category. Listeners would hardly describe such teaching as Mat 5:19-48 by the title 'good tidings,' nor could the word apply naturally to Mat 10:34-39; Mat 12:31-37; Mat 19:9-12; Mat 21:33-44; Mat 21:23-24. It seems clear that Jesus distinguished the gospel that He preached from the teaching that accompanied it.

3. What then was implied by the term 'gospel'? It was essentially 'news' or 'tidings.' It was the proclamation of a fact rather than instruction in the art of living well. It was offered to belief, and its acceptance must be preceded by repentance (Mar 1:15). It is called 'the gospel of God' (in Mar 1:14 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885); the 'gospel of the kingdom' (in Mat 4:23; Mat 9:35; Mat 24:14). St. Luke uses the compound phrase, 'the gospel of the kingdom of God' (Luk 4:43; Luk 16:16). These phrases must be studied, and in addition it must be noted that Jesus connected the gospel with His own person.

(a) The phrase 'the gospel of God' indicates a message from God and about God that is good news to men. It is certain that Jesus gave the world a new idea of God; and this gospel of Jesus was the revelation of God as 'our Father in heaven.' He did not discover the category of Fatherhood in its relation to God. This had been done under the Old Covenant. But He invested the idea with such radiance as to make it a new revelation. More specifically, He illumined the Fatherhood of God by teaching 'the infinite value of the human soul.' God is not merely the Father of a people. He is the Father of each individual soul (cf. 'thy Father,' Mat 6:4-18). His Fatherhood extends to all sorts and conditions of men (Mat 12:50). In particular, the Father seeks each sinner (Luk 15:1-10), and welcomes even the prodigal to His home (Luk 15:11-32). This 'gospel of God' includes, further, the good news to the heavily laden Jew that 'the Father seeketh true worshippers to worship in spirit and in truth' (Joh 4:23; cf. Mat 11:28), and that the Father is willing to forgive sins without sacrificial offerings (Mat 9:2 ||). And when the child of God has entered into this blessed relationship with his Father in heaven, that Father may be trusted implicitly (Mat 6:25-34). Prayer must be offered to this Father continually (Luk 18:1). The Lord's Prayer (Mat 6:9) 'shows the gospel to be the Fatherhood of God applied to the whole of life; to be an inner union with God's will and God's kingdom, and a joyous certainty of eternal blessings and protection from evil' (Harnack).

The Johannine tradition lays special emphasis upon this Divine Fatherhood in its relation to Jesus; the relation between the Father and His children is referred to in terms of love. Indeed, St. John sums up this aspect of the gospel in the immortal words, 'God is love' (1Jn 4:8). Jesus Himself spoke chiefly of love as the duty of man.

To love God and to love one's neighbour are the supreme laws for human conduct (Mat 22:37-39 | |). But by His constant speech about the Father, Jesus taught also God's love to men. This relation of love between God and man has been pointed to as the distinguishing feature of the gospel. Thus Réville writes:

'The Christian gospel is essentially characterized by its declaration that the bond between God and man is one of love. God is the Heavenly Father; man is the son of God; God loves man; man ought to love God; the relation between the principle of the universe and the individual is one of love, in which the two terms subsist. God and man—man not losing himself in God, God not remaining aloof from man—meet in a living communion, so that man's dependence on God should no longer be one of compulsion, but of free and joyful self-consecration, and that the sovereignty of God over man should no more appear a tyranny, but a rule which we love and bless. Such is the distinctive mark of the Christianity of Jesus, differentiating it from the other great religions.'* [Note: Liberal Christianity, pp. 69-70.]

(b) The phrase 'the gospel of the kingdom' describes the good news brought by Jesus in its relation to that Kingdom of God or of heaven which He proclaimed. It implies that the Kingdom has 'a gospel.' The gospel and the Kingdom are not co-extensive any more than the gospel and God are. But there is good news concerning the Kingdom, and this good news is an essential part of the message of the Kingdom. In brief, this gospel was that the Kingdom of heaven is opened to all believers. The message of Jesus was that the Kingdom was not for select classes or nations, but for all. All Jews were summoned to share it; even the publicans and sinners may come (Mat 21:31, Mar 2:15 | |). Nor are Jews alone to walk in its light. All nations must be invited to sit at its hospitable table (Mat 8:11; Mat 26:13, Mar 13:10). The conditions of entrance make it accessible to all. It is offered not to the rich or to the wise, but to all who will become as little children (Mat 11:25; Mat 18:3, Joh 3:3). Moreover, this Kingdom, which is offered to all, is a far higher good than men dreamed (cf. Mat 13:31; Mat 13:44-46). It is a spiritual blessedness, infinitely transcending the ceremonial righteousness secured by legalism, and the political supremacy envied by the patriots. The Kingdom, as Jesus preached it, offered the highest conceivable good to all men. It satisfied the religious instincts of the race; and because these are the deepest and most universal instincts, the message that they can be satisfied is indeed 'good news' (cf. Matthew 13 | |). Men had never found true satisfaction in the material forms of a ritualistic religion. These were the husks that contained no nourishment for the soul. Jesus preached 'the gospel of the kingdom' when He offered the highest spiritual good to all penitent and humble souls.

(c) But these two forms of the gospel do not exhaust its fulness. The presence of Jesus in the world was itself a gospel. He connected the good tidings with His own person. As the good news Rhoda brought to the praying Church was that Peter himself was at

the door (Act 12:14), so the presence of Jesus in the world was 'glad tidings of great joy to all people' (Luk 2:10). This was due to the significance attached by Jesus to Himself. He was the Messiah (Mat 16:16). His use of the title 'Son of man' implies His special significance for the race. In several of His parables He referred to Himself as the Son of God (Luk 20:13), as the Judge and King of men (Mat 25:31), as the bridegroom (Mat 9:15; Mat 25:6); these and other titles indicate the peculiar value of His person. The interest was not metaphysical but religious. His presence in the world manifested the love of God (Joh 3:16). It proved that God had not forgotten men, but had come to their help.

In this connexion the significance of Jesus' offer of pardon must be noted. He raised much opposition by claiming 'power on earth to forgive sins' (Mar 2:10 ||). Nevertheless He exercised the power (Luk 7:47, Joh 5:14; Joh 5:22). There is a close connexion between this 'good news' and the good news about God and about the Kingdom. The barrier between God and the soul is sin. It is sin that hinders enjoyment of the Kingdom. Therefore the best news that men can have is a message of full and free forgiveness for all repentant, trustful souls. And this was the message preached by Jesus. He removed pardon out of the sphere of material sacrifices in the temple, which limited the scope of forgiveness to a few, and He made forgiveness a possible boon for everybody. Thus He opened the way into the Kingdom even to the publicans and sinners.

(d) But the core of this aspect of the gospel is reached only when it is connected definitely with the redeeming work of Jesus. He was conscious of a profounder mission than *preaching* the gospel. More than once He gave utterance to words that touch the deepest mysteries of redemption. He came to give His life a ransom (Mat 20:28). He was the Good Shepherd giving His life for the sheep (Joh 10:11). He foretold His death and resurrection, directly He had brought His disciples to confess His Messiahship (Mat 16:21). On the betrayal night in the upper room, He gave the cup, saying, 'This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many' (Mar 14:24). It was impossible for Jesus to connect the gospel chiefly with His death, before He was crucified. But it seems unquestionable that He referred to His death as achieving a wonderful deliverance for men in respect of sin. The sacrificial element was not introduced into His life for the first time when He offered Himself to die. 'The Son of man came to minister'; and all through His ministry He was giving Himself up for others. Nevertheless, He looked upon His own death as having a peculiar significance, awful for Himself (cf. Mar 14:32-39 ||), but blessed for men (Joh 14:3). It is certain that His followers accepted this interpretation of the cross. At once the death of Jesus, followed as it was by His resurrection, was made the main theme of Apostolic preaching (Act 2:23; Act 3:14; Act 4:10 etc.). So central was this preaching about the death of Christ, that St. Paul identifies 'the gospel' with the message about 'Christ crucified' (1Co 1:17).

The meaning of the term 'gospel' as used by Jesus may now be summed up. It seems to describe the message He taught concerning—(a) the fatherly nature of God; (b) the inclusiveness and spirituality of the Kingdom; and (c) God's provision for men's deliverance from sin through His own mediation. This gospel was not only the theme of His preaching, but was exemplified continually in His manner of life. He revealed the Father by His own attitude to men. He illustrated the spirit of the Kingdom by seeking the lost. He mediated the grace of God by His unsparing self-surrender. In particular, He accepted death upon the cross in obedience to the Father's will, in order that thereby the scattered sons of God might be gathered again to their Father (Joh_11:52).

4. We must return now to the distinction between 'preaching the gospel' and 'teaching.' Much of the teaching of Jesus could not be directly classed under the 'gospel' as sketched above. It was ethical teaching. It rested upon the gospel as its foundation. It appealed ultimately to the nature of God for its sanctions. It was connected with the Kingdom, being the legislation that befitted such a Kingdom of grace. Nevertheless it was an ethical code, intended to guide those who have previously accepted the gospel. The teaching of Jesus is the law-book of the Kingdom. The gospel of Jesus is the manifesto of the Kingdom, explaining its nature and inviting all to become its citizens.

This probably explains the subsequent use of the term 'gospel.' Wonderful as the teaching of Jesus was, the gospel seemed still more marvellous. At any rate, that gospel seemed of first importance. It had to be preached before the teaching of Jesus could follow; and whilst points of contact could be found between the teaching of Jesus and other ethical systems, there was nothing in the world like the gospel of Jesus. And thus the term 'gospel' was most frequently on the lips of the Apostles; and by a natural process it was extended to cover the entire contents of their report of Jesus, including His teaching. All that the Apostles had to tell about Jesus was called 'the gospel.' This usage is reflected in Mar_1:1, where the word refers to the whole story of Jesus Christ.

5. Two points need a further reference. The gospel brought by Jesus was not entirely new. It had its roots in the past. The preaching of Jesus was in historic continuity with the preaching of the prophets and of the Mosaic law (Mat_5:17). But that earlier preaching was the faint light of dawn: His words are the strong light of noonday (Joh_8:12). Hitherto men had only heard rumours of varying trustworthiness; He brought official news that was full and final. Some keen-eyed spirits had caught sight of the Fatherhood of God, as the Alps may be seen from the terrace at Berne on a fine evening. But Jesus led men into the heart of the mountains. The hopes of the nation had hovered for centuries round a kingdom. But only Jesus disclosed the true nature of the shining city of God. Prophets had encouraged lonely exiles with the cry,

‘Behold your God cometh!’ But it was not until Jesus appeared that one who waited for the consolation of Israel could say, ‘Mine eyes have seen thy salvation’ (Luk 2:30). The gospel preached by Jesus gave full substance and final form to the faint and tremulous hopes of centuries. For this reason the gospel must be the unchanging element in the Church’s message. Being ‘news’ about God and the Kingdom, it cannot change until they change.

A distinction has been drawn between the gospel which Jesus preached and His ethical teaching. The Church’s teaching of the Christian ethics must be a changing message. It is the application of the principles of Christ’s teaching to present circumstances. The Christian ethic of the last generation is out of date in presence of to-day’s problems. The Church must study the ethical principles enunciated by Jesus, in order to apply them to modern needs. But whilst the Christian ethic develops and is modified by circumstances, the Christian gospel cannot change. It is good news about facts. It must be stated in modern phraseology, that men may hear it in their own tongue and understand it. But it remains an ‘Old, old Story’ through all time. If this distinction is remembered, it will explain the confusion that is felt in modern times as to the Church’s true function. All are agreed that this is to preach the gospel. But very different views are held as to what is included under the term. In particular, there is an increasing demand for a social gospel, whilst some maintain that the gospel cannot be concerned with social conditions. Probably the term ‘gospel’ is being used in two senses. As Jesus used it, ‘the gospel’ is a definite message, distinct from the Christian ethic, and also distinct from the work of healing practised by the Lord. But from Apostolic days onward the term ‘gospel’ has been used to cover the threefold function—preaching the gospel, teaching the ethic, and healing the sick. In its original and more limited sense, ‘gospel’ is simply the ‘news’ brought by Jesus. In its historical and broader sense, ‘gospel’ is the whole ‘God-story’: it includes the entire record of Jesus Christ’s life and work. Thus used, the term covers the ethic that Jesus Christ taught, and the social service that He practised. In this sense ‘gospel’ includes all ethical teaching and social service that are in accordance with the mind of the Master. It is open to question, however, whether the Church has not suffered loss by broadening the reference of this word. Jesus used it to describe the ‘good news’ He brought to the poor and the meek of the earth; and this ‘gospel’ must ever be the foundation upon which the Church builds, though the foundation is not to be confused with the fabric erected upon it.

6. A brief space must be given to the consideration of the gospel in the rest of NT in so far as it is connected with Christ. In one sense this would involve an exposition of many chapters of Acts and of all the Epistles, for He is ‘the head-stone of the corner,’ and the gospel is only ‘complete in Him.’ But all that can be attempted is an indication of the place occupied by Christ in the gospel as preached by the Apostolic, Church.

When we pass from the Gospels to the Acts and the Epistles, we are conscious at once of a change of standpoint. In the Gospels, Christ's disciples are a group of learners. They stand beside their Master at the very centre of truth, and they try to follow His gaze as it sweeps the horizon of the love and the kingdom of God. In the Epistles the relative positions are altered. The disciples have become teachers; but they do not stand by their Master's side at the centre. Christ alone is at the centre; the disciples are on the circumference of the circle and are gazing at Him. Their efforts are directed towards the Lord, whom they would persuade everybody to know (Act 2:38, 1Co 2:2). The Lamb is in the midst of the throne, and those who have been gathered into the Kingdom of God worship Him (Rev 5:6). The Apostles are seeking to obey their Lord's injunction to preach the gospel to every creature (Mar 16:15). But their interpretation of this command was to urge their hearers to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ (Act 16:31).

This identification of 'the gospel' with Christ Himself may be accounted for partly by the experience of the Apostles. They went forth as witnesses (Luk 24:48), not as philosophers. They had to tell what great things God had done for their souls. They could do this only by talking of Jesus. For He had become to them the mediator of God's redeeming love (Mar 8:29, Joh 1:41). They could not be witnesses concerning repentance and remission of sins without filling their lips with the one 'name given among men wherein we must be saved' (Act 4:12).

But another point must be considered. The Apostles were commanded to 'preach the gospel.' The instruction had a definite meaning because of their Master's use of the words. Jesus Christ preached the gospel of the fatherly love of God, establishing a Kingdom into which all men might be admitted, and He offered Himself as the authoritative proof of that love (cf. Mar 12:6 || Joh 8:42). The presence in the world of the Son of man, the Messiah of prophecy, demonstrated God's love in providing for men's deepest needs. Now it is evident that the crucifixion of Jesus shook such a gospel to its foundations. If the life of the Messianic Son of man ended with the cross, His speech about God's fatherly love and a heavenly Kingdom seemed worse than idle talk. How could the gospel preached by Jesus survive His death? Only if He Himself survived His death. To rehabilitate His gospel, His authority must be rehabilitated. This result was secured by the resurrection of Jesus and by His ascension. When they had seen Him 'alive after his passion,' His disciples were prepared to go and 'preach the gospel to every creature' (Act 1:3).

But it is evident also that these events themselves had profound importance. They did more than rehabilitate the authority of Jesus: they brought His own significance for the gospel into clear relief. Such unique events set the personality of Jesus in the heart of the gospel, investing Him with peculiar importance (Act 2:22-36; Act 3:13-26; Act 5:31, 1Jn 1:1-3, Rom 1:4; 1Pe 1:3-8). Although they could not

realize at once all that was involved in such events, the Apostles were compelled to take a new attitude to Jesus, and to adopt a fresh theory of His person. He had been their Master: now He becomes 'the Lord.' The primitive Christian community used the term before it was able to construct an adequate Christology. But it 'called Jesus "the Lord" because He had sacrificed His life for it, and because its members were convinced that He had been raised from the dead and was then sitting on the right hand of God' (Harnack). The significance of Jesus was decided religiously, though not metaphysically, at once. From the first, Jesus Christ had the religious value of God. Men were exhorted to believe in Him (Act 2:38). The final expression of the Apostolic meditation upon the person of the Lord was given by John (Joh 1:1-18). But in Apostolic thought the gospel could never be preached apart from Jesus Christ, nor could the significance of Jesus Christ be understood apart from the gospel. In Him God's redemptive purposes and the sinner's acceptance of them may meet. Thus He is the central figure in history (Col 1:15-19). He is at once the Saviour appointed by the Father (Act 2:23 ff., Rom 1:3; Rom 3:25, Gal 4:4) and the Head of the redeemed race (1Co 15:22-45, Gal 3:26, Eph 1:22).

But this conception of the person of Jesus gave a deeper meaning to the great events in His experience which had so affected His disciples. It may be said that the events and the person reacted upon one another. Such events glorified the person; the glorified person deepened the significance of the events. At the first the Crucifixion of Jesus was looked upon as the wicked act of the Jews, which God had frustrated and even turned to His own glory by raising Jesus from the dead (Act 2:23-24; Act 3:14-15; Act 4:10; Act 5:30). The Resurrection was accepted at once as a proof of Divine Sonship (*l.c.*). The Ascension not only sealed this proof of Jesus Christ's Messianic dignity, but also exalted Him to a place of sovereignty over the world (Act 2:33; Act 3:16; Act 3:21; Act 4:12; Act 5:31). But further reflexion upon them invested these unique events with profounder significance. His Death is the means whereby all men may be forgiven and may be reconciled to God—a sacrifice for the sins of the world (Rom 3:25, 2Co 5:20-21; 1Pe 1:19, 1Jn 1:7; 1Jn 2:2). His Resurrection is the earnest of the new life into which all those are introduced who are born anew by faith in Him (Rom 6:4, 1Jn 3:2-3). He is the first-fruits of them that sleep: His Resurrection involves the resurrection to eternal life of all in whom He lives (1Th 4:13 to 1Th 5:10, 1 Corinthians 15). His Ascension is the pledge of the glorification of all who are united to Him (Rom 8:29-30, Php 3:20-21).

This aspect of the gospel is reflected in the Apostolic preaching. The Apostles 'preached Christ' (1Co 1:23). All the sermons in the early chapters of Acts are full of Christ. The Epistles identify the gospel with Him (Rom 1:16). In particular, the preaching dwelt upon His Crucifixion, His Resurrection, and His Ascension, though the same 'mind' was discerned in the whole story of the Incarnation (Php 2:3). It should be remembered that all this reference to 'Christ and him crucified' as 'the gospel,' is

shot through and through with Jesus Christ's own message of the love of God in establishing the kingdom. Although the gospel as it was presented by the Apostles assumed a new aspect, becoming a message about Christ who died and rose and ascended to the Father's right hand, this was not intended to divert attention from the fatherly love of God and the Kingdom into which He invited men. But it was only through this message about Christ that such a gospel could be offered authoritatively to the world. Moreover, the gospel was seen in its true glory only when viewed through the medium of Christ's Death and Resurrection and Ascension. Without the interpretation of these events, God's fatherly love was a vague dream, and the heavenly Kingdom was an impossible ideal (1Jn 4:9-10, Eph 2:12-18; 1Pe 2:4-10). Thus Wellhausen, *IJG* [Note: *JG Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte.*] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 386, declares that St. Paul's especial work was to transform the gospel of the Kingdom into the gospel of Jesus Christ, so that the gospel is no longer the prophecy of the coming of the Kingdom, but its actual fulfilment by Jesus Christ. In his view, accordingly, redemption from something in the future has become something which has already happened and is now present. He lays far more emphasis on faith than on hope; he anticipates the sense of future bliss in the present feeling of being God's son; he vanquishes death and already leads the new life on earth. The presence of Christ among men is unceasingly emphasized as the supreme proof of the love of the heavenly Father (Gal 1:3-5; Gal 4:6-7, 1Co 1:9, Rom 3:24; Rom 11:33-36, 1Jn 4:9; 1Pe 1:3 etc.). 'The kingdom' is mentioned frequently as the objective of Christian effort (Act 8:12; Act 14:22; Act 19:8; Act 20:25; Act 28:23; Act 28:31, Rom 14:17, 1Co 4:20; 1Co 6:9; 1Co 15:24; 1Co 15:50, Gal 5:21, Eph 5:5, Col 1:13; Col 4:11, 1Th 2:12, 2Th 1:5, 2Ti 4:1; 2Ti 4:18, Heb 12:28, Jam 2:5; 2Pe 1:11, Rev 1:9; Rev 12:10); and the ideas of Jesus about the Kingdom are woven into the texture of Apostolic preaching. But the primary interest of the Apostles was to preach the gospel of the Kingdom; and that meant the proclamation of Jesus Christ as the Divinely appointed Saviour, through whom all men may share the privileges of sonship with God.

Finally, it may be pointed out that although the term 'gospel' already in Apostolic times was used in the broader sense with which we are familiar, yet the NT does distinguish the gospel, as a glad message of life and peace that everybody is urged to accept at once, from the ethical teaching that the converts must obey. The 'gospel' is news about God and the Kingdom, which is maintained as true against the older conceptions enshrined in Judaism. The writer to the Hebrews emphasizes the Christian gospel as the fulfilment of the types of the Old Covenant. St. Paul, who was dogged by Judaizers, fought to keep the Christian gospel free from the trammels of Judaic sacramentarianism. The NT writers preach the gospel as a message of transcendent importance and of great joy to all people. But they do not rest content

with preaching the good news. St. Paul spoke of a 'wisdom of God' which could be taught only to the spiritual (1 Corinthians 2). And most of the Epistles are attempts to explain that 'wisdom,' and to enforce obedience to it, on those who had already become Christians by accepting the gospel.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , artt. 'Gospel,' 'Jesus Christ,' and on Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and Epistles to Romans and Corinthians; Commentaries on the Gospels by Godet, Swete, Gould, Plummer, Westcott, and in *Expositor's Gr. Test.* For exposition of Christ's teaching: Bruce, *Kingdom of God*, and *The Training of the Twelve*; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*; Beyschlag, *NT Theology*; Denney, *Death of Christ*; Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*; Harnack, *What is Christianity?*; Mackintosh, *Essays Toward a New Theology*; Réville, *Liberal Christianity*; Watson, *The Mind of the Master*. For transition to Apostolic teaching: Harnack and Beyschlag, *opp. citt.*; Weizsacker, *The Apostolic Age*; Bruce, *Paul's Conception of Christianity*; Commentaries on Acts and Epistles. For general reference: Forrest, *The Christ of History and of Experience*; Newman Smyth, *Christian Ethics*; Briggs, *New Light on the Life of Jesus*.

J. Edward Roberts.

⚡Gospels

GOSPELS.—The canonical Gospels (including the Synoptic Problem) are fully discussed in separate articles, so that the scope of this article does not necessarily include more than the subjects indicated in the following outline:

1. Definition of the term 'Gospel.'
2. What brought Gospels, oral or written, into being.
3. Transition from oral to written Gospels.
4. Literary use of the term 'Gospel' in the Pauline Epistles.
5. Source of St. Paul's knowledge of the Gospel story.
6. Evidence of the existence of Gospels, oral or written, when St. Paul wrote.
7. A Gospel is not a *Life of Christ*.

8. NT use of the term 'Gospel' in the sense of a written document.
9. Principle which guided the Church in her selection of Gospel material.
10. Relation between the canonical Gospels and recent literary discoveries.
11. Discussion of the evidence from Papias as to an original Hebrew Gospel.
12. Other considerations bearing on an original Hebrew Gospel.
13. A possible theory of the Synoptic Gospels.

1. The word 'Gospels' in Christian terminology, and as employed in this article, signifies accounts of the earthly life of our Lord Jesus Christ, of His manifestation in the historical sphere, narratives of His words and works, it being unimportant whether such narratives were delivered by word of mouth or committed to writing.

The term εὐαγγελια occurs for the first time, in extant Christian literature, in the well-known passage in Justin Martyr's *First Apology*, c. 66, where he refers to it as being the usual designation of the Memoirs of the Apostles, οἱ γὰρ ἀποστολοὶ ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγελια, κ.τ.λ. Justin's language here certainly implies that, when he wrote, the term 'Gospels' was in common use in the Christian Church. The phrase τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων (c. 67) is intended only as a description, intelligible to heathen readers, of the nature and authority of the εὐαγγέλια.

2. The first question that presents itself is, *What was it that called Gospels into being?* The answer is to be found in that characteristic of Christianity by which it is distinguished from all other religions, viz., that it concerns the relation of mankind to a Person, not the relation of mankind to a new system of morals or philosophy. Jesus Christ was, of course, a great—we would say the greatest—moral teacher of mankind; yet the Christian consciousness has always felt that what Jesus was, and did, and suffered, has an importance and significance far transcending that which He taught. Christian ethics is derived from and dependent upon the Person of Jesus the Son of God manifested in time. If it be permissible to use in this connexion the metaphor in which the Nicene Creed endeavours to set forth the relation of the Second Person of the Trinity to the First, the ethical teaching of Christ is light generated from light. It is not that Jesus Christ is important and significant to the historian as the originator and promulgator of a singularly lofty code of morals, but rather that in the days of Caesar Augustus, 'the eternal life which was with the Father was manifested unto us'

(1Jn_1:2); and from that life so manifested certain new commandments of love resulted as a necessary consequence, and 'old commandments which we had from the beginning' (1Jn_2:7) awoke into new life, and put on a strength which they had not had before.

Nothing, perhaps, more clearly proves the truth of what has been just said as to the importance in the Christian system of the personal history of Jesus, than the fact that His human origin and His death are treated in the Gospel narrative as having a significance outweighing all else. In the case of all other great men, birth and death, which are universal and inevitable, have for the most part only a chronological importance. But in Apostolic references to the life of Jesus Christ His human ancestry is co-ordinated with His resurrection, e.g. Rom_1:1-4 'the gospel of God ... concerning his Son, who was born of the seed of David ..., who was declared to be the Son of God ... by the resurrection of the dead'; and 2Ti_2:8 'Remember Jesus Christ, risen from the dead, of the seed of David, according to my gospel.' Acknowledgment of the Lordship of Jesus, and belief in the historical fact of His resurrection, are declared to have saving efficacy (Rom_10:9). It is evident, therefore, that a narrative of the main facts in the history of Jesus must have been from the very first the foundation or framework of the preaching of those who propagated His religion. These preachers met inquirers for the way of salvation, not with a recitation of the Saviour's gracious words, but with 'truth embodied in a tale': 'Believe on the Lord Jesus and thou shalt be saved' (Act_16:31). A little consideration will make it clear that a proclaiming of the resurrection of One who had been slain entails of necessity an account of who and what manner of man He was, and why He was put to death.

From indications scattered through the Book of the Acts, we gather that an evangelic narrative described Jesus as fulfilling in His lineage, character, and actions the various foreshadowings of Messianic prophecy as hitherto accepted; while the fact that He had suffered, and died, and been raised the third day, was shown to reveal the Messianic character of passages of the OT which had not been hitherto clearly understood. The Resurrection, again, was declared to constitute an authentication by God Himself of the prediction of Jesus that He would come again to judge the living and the dead; and salvation from the terrors of the judgment to come was offered on the conditions of repentance, followed by baptism into the name of Jesus. This is the barest outline of the main features in the first Christian preaching: the accomplishment in Jesus of all that was hoped for in the Christ; His death and resurrection illuminating the dark places of prophecy, and proving the truth of His own claims; judgment; repentance; baptism.

It is scarcely necessary to add that these facts or requirements would be 'commended to every man's conscience' (2Co_4:2) by examples of the wisdom, sublimity, and beauty of the Saviour's moral and spiritual teaching. Of this we have an example in

St. Paul's speech at Miletus (Act 20:35). In this case the audience was composed of Christian elders; and it may be that a true instinct led the early preachers, in addressing the unconverted, to dwell on the Woes rather than on the Beatitudes. However this may be, the meagre sermon sketches contained in the Book of the Acts do not enable us to make a positive statement as to what the preachers said, beyond what is indicated in the outline given above.

3. We may say, then, that it was the needs of the Christian Church in her natural expansion that first called Gospels into existence. The language of St. Luke (Luk 1:1-2) confirms what we might have otherwise guessed as to the history of *the transition from oral to written narratives*. Those who had been privileged to be 'eye-witnesses and ministers of the word' 'delivered' (παρέδοσαν) to others what they deemed essential in what they had seen and heard in the course of their attendance on their Master, and 'many' of their hearers 'took in hand to draw up narratives' (ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν). It may be remarked in passing that St. Paul, who always claimed an authoritative knowledge of the capital events of the Evangelic history, uses the word παραδιδόναι of his own communications to his converts (1Co 11:2; 1Co 11:23; 1Co 15:3, 2Th 2:15; 2Th 3:6).

It is impossible to say how early the necessity for written Gospels arose. The expansion of the Church beyond Judaea began possibly immediately after the Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit; it certainly was in operation after the martyrdom of Stephen (Act 11:19). The number of those who could be reckoned as 'eye-witnesses and ministers of the word' cannot have been very great. Even if we make the large assumption that every one of the 120 persons who were gathered together for the election of Matthias (Act 1:15), or of the 500 brethren to whom the Lord appeared (1Co 15:6), could be so described, and that they were all subsequently engaged in active evangelistic work, yet the labour of spreading the new faith, even within the limits of Palestine, would have soon outgrown their power to cope with it. As far as the original witnesses were concerned, their memory would enable them to tell all that was necessary of the Saviour's life, even as much as is contained in the longest of our present Gospels. Indeed, there can be no doubt that from constant, perhaps daily, repetition of some portion of the story, the recollection of the whole would soon assume a stereotyped form. But as the number of evangelists who had not 'known Christ after the flesh' multiplied in every direction, it would very soon become impossible for the original witnesses even to instruct all those who were to teach others. To meet this imperative and growing need—the instruction of preachers—was, we may well believe, one of the objects with which the narratives alluded to by St. Luke in his preface were first drawn up. It is natural to suppose that at first such narratives were used to refresh the memory of the evangelists;

afterwards, when the first generation of believers had quite passed away, the written Gospels would be openly read, as being the most authentic account of what the original witnesses had seen and heard.

Dr. Salmon is of opinion that even before the Crucifixion some of our Lord's discourses, or portions of them, had been committed to writing. Without going so far as this, it is scarcely open to reasonable doubt that written Gospels of some sort were in circulation well within the period covered by the Acts of the Apostles. In order the better to see this, we shall examine the evidence supplied by the Epistles of St. Paul. His writings, from their extent and the comparative certainty with which they can be dated, afford the most satisfactory grounds on which to base a conclusion.

4. It is obvious that the question when the word εὐαγγέλιον was first used in the sense in which we use it when we speak of the 'Gospel according to St. Matthew,' is quite distinct from the question as to when such written narratives first appeared and received any degree of public recognition. The first step towards what may be called the literary use of the term εὐαγγέλιον is to be found in passages where the word is used, not of the 'good news' itself, but in the sense of someone's presentation of it.

1Th 1:5 'Our gospel came not unto you in word only.'

2Th 2:14 'God called you [unto salvation] through our gospel.'

Gal 1:11 'The gospel which was preached by me ... is not after man.'

Gal 2:2 'I laid before them the gospel which I preach among the Gentiles.'

Rom 2:16 'God shall judge the secrets of men, according to my gospel, by Jesus Christ.'

1Co 15:1 f. 'I make known unto you ... the gospel which I preached unto you ... in what words I preached it unto you.'

2Ti 2:8 'Remember Jesus Christ, risen from the dead, of the seed of David, according to my gospel.'

In these instances, certainly in most of them, the word 'gospel' means not so much St. Paul's manner or method of presenting the good news of salvation to his hearers, as the actual substance of what he said. It is true that the substance of what any preacher of the gospel would say would include more than a narrative without comment, such as is one of the Synoptic Gospels; yet St. Paul's gospel evidently did

contain some merely historical matter. This point will come up for consideration later. Here it is sufficient to say that the above instances of St. Paul's use of the word 'gospel' as meaning the substance of his evangelic preaching, would naturally suggest the application of the term to a narrative embodying all that it was necessary to know of the life of Jesus Christ as a means of salvation. So much was, no doubt, claimed by their compilers for the short narratives which St. Luke's Gospel was intended to supersede; much more may it be claimed for any one of the four Gospels which have come down to us.

5. An interesting question now arises, *What was the content of the Gospel presented by St. Paul to the Churches which he evangelized? and what was its relation to our existing Gospels, or any of them?* It ought to be unnecessary to remark that in an examination of the Pauline Epistles for the purpose of this question, any inference drawn from silence is peculiarly precarious. It is as unreasonable to expect to find Gospel material in St. Paul's letters as it would be to find it in the letters of a pastor or bishop of our own day. Paradoxical as it may at first seem, it is probably none the less true that the Churches to which St. Paul wrote had a more intimate and living acquaintance with the facts of the Gospel history than is usual with Christians in our own day. Every member of those Churches had been recently converted from either heathenism or Judaism. Consequently the interest they felt in their newly-acquired faith was fresh and absorbing; and the Apostle writes as though the main facts of the Gospel history were familiar to his readers. He is able to appeal in the most natural way to their knowledge of the character of Jesus, e.g. Rom_15:3 'Christ pleased not himself'; 2Co_8:9 'Though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor'; and 2Co_10:1 'I ... intreat you by the meekness (διὰ τῆς πραΰτητος) and gentleness of Christ.' It would doubtless be impossible to prove that St. Paul had in mind recorded sentiments of Christ similar to, or identical with, 'The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister' (Mat_20:28); 'The Son of Man hath not where to lay his head' (Mat_8:20, Luk_9:58); 'I am meek (πραῦς) and lowly in heart' (Mat_11:29). But it may be safely affirmed that there was in those to whom St. Paul wrote a knowledge of deeds and words of Christ that made the Apostle's appeal intelligible.

What then was the source of St. Paul's knowledge of the Gospel narrative? To many, perhaps most, Christians this question may appear superfluous, in view of the Apostle's own explicit statements: Gal_1:11 'The gospel which was preached by me ... came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ,' and 1Co_11:23 'I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you.' Even if we grant, what is likely enough, that the passage from Galatians refers to St. Paul's favourite doctrines, yet his language to the Corinthians seems to imply that his knowledge of an objective historical circumstance came to him in a miraculous manner. The present writer has no desire to minimize the miraculous element in the NT narrative, or to call in question the reality of St.

Paul's visions; but in this case an explanation can be given of the expression 'I received of the Lord' which will both satisfy the requirements of St. Paul's language and also take the matter out of the region of subjective visions, and so render the statement historically intelligible and verifiable. The question is, What would one of St. Paul's contemporary fellow-Christians have understood by 'I received of the Lord'? The answer is supplied by parallel phrases in the Book of the Acts, and by what we learn from that book and other sources as to the ministry of prophets in the Apostolic Church. When we read (Act 13:2), 'The Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul,' etc., and again, (Act 16:7) 'The Spirit of Jesus suffered them not,' it is natural to ask, How did the Holy Ghost speak? and how did the Spirit of Jesus control the movements of St. Paul and his company? It was through the utterance of an accredited prophet, or number of prophets, in either case. This is placed beyond doubt by an instance given later (Act 21:11), where a prophet, Agabus, begins his prediction with, 'Thus saith the Holy Ghost' (cf. Act 20:23 'The Holy Ghost testifieth unto me in every city'). We see, then, that Act 13:2 means that the separation of Paul and Barnabas was in consequence of an utterance of the prophets, or one of them, who are mentioned in the previous verse; while in Act 16:7 it was an utterance of Silas (see Act 15:32), if not of Paul himself (see Act 13:1, 1Co 14:37), that forbade the missionaries to cross the frontier of Bithynia.

We are now enabled to understand 'I received of the Lord' (1Co 11:23) in the same sense as we interpret 'The Spirit of Jesus suffered them not.' St. Paul did not really mean that his knowledge of the Gospel history had been acquired without human intervention, nor can he have intended his readers so to understand him. What he meant to convey was that he was convinced that the evangelist, or the source whence he derived his information, was indeed inspired by the Spirit of Jesus.

The alternative—evangelist, or source—has been purposely suggested, in order to leave it an open question, as, indeed, with our scanty information it must remain, whether St. Paul derived his knowledge of our Lord's life from oral teaching or from a written document. At the time of his conversion there was a Christian community of some importance at Damascus; and it is probable in the highest degree that the Church there had the advantage of hearing the story of Jesus from one of those who had companied with Him during His ministry. On the other hand, St. Paul's own statement (Gal 1:16-17), 'I conferred not with flesh and blood ... I went away into Arabia,' suggests a retirement for solitary study, meditation, and prayer. There does not seem any extreme improbability in supposing that even at that early date there was in circulation a Gospel narrative in Aramaic, or even in Greek. In any case, it is unreasonable to question that Saul the persecutor needed some instruction or study before he could 'proclaim Jesus, that he is the Son of God.'

It cannot be denied, however, that the language of the heavenly vision (Act 26:14), 'It is hard for thee to kick against the goad,' points most naturally to a long previous struggle between prejudices inborn and trained and the strange attractiveness of Jesus of Nazareth, whose glorious deeds and gracious words may have become known to the young Pharisee when he first arrived in Jerusalem from Tarsus. For him the gospel was a thing to which he could not be indifferent. It was either an execrable heresy or the only way of salvation. All that he had learnt from man urged him to 'crush it, like a vice of blood, upon the threshold of the mind' (*In Memoriam*, iii.); the preventing grace of God bade him 'embrace it as his natural good.'

All that we can certainly state with regard to the Gospel story known to St. Paul, however he acquired his knowledge, is that his allusions to it, direct and indirect, 'proceed,' to use Paley's phrase (*Evidences*, i. 7), 'upon the general story which our Scriptures contain'; while it certainly was not identical with any of the four we now possess. This latter point is proved by the enumeration in 1 Corinthians 15 of the appearances of the risen Lord. Of the five appearances there mentioned, two, namely that to James and that to 500 brethren, are not mentioned in the canonical Gospels. It is to be noted, as possibly significant, that the appearance to James was recorded in the Gospel according to the Hebrews (Jerome, *de Vir. illustr.* c. 2).

6. It would be irrelevant to the purposes of this article to call attention to any correspondences between the Pauline Epistles and our present Gospels other than those that are historical or literary. It would lead us too far afield to discuss St. Paul's Christology, and to inquire how far it was based on extant recorded statements of Jesus about Himself, how far on OT and subsequent Messianic conceptions, and how far on what we may for convenience call the Johannine theology, which, as distinct from its Johannine expression, seems to have existed in the Church from the beginning.

The faithfulness of God to His promise that the Christ should be not only of the seed of Abraham, but also of the lineage of David, is as markedly emphasized by St. Paul as it is in the Gospels: Rom 15:8 'Christ hath been made a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, that he might confirm the promises given unto the fathers'; words which echo those of Zacharias (Luk 1:72-73); Rom 1:3 'Born of the seed of David according to the flesh'; 2Ti 2:8 'Of the seed of David, according to my gospel.'

There is no explicit reference to the Virgin-birth in the Pauline Epistles. The expressions 'born of a woman' (Gal 4:4) and 'the childbearing' (1Ti 2:15) refer, the former probably, the latter possibly, to 'the seed of the woman' (Gen 3:15).

The account of the institution of the Lord's Supper, which St. Paul 'received of the Lord' (1Co 11:23-25), alludes to the betrayal of the Lord Jesus, and otherwise

approximates most closely to that given by St. Luke, who possibly in a second edition of his Gospel revised his account in accordance with information received from St. Paul. In the previous chapter (1Co_10:16) and in 1Co_14:16 we have allusions to the words of institution which have always been used in the blessing of the bread and wine.

St. Paul's references to the death of Christ are for the most part doctrinal, not historical. He insists on its voluntary character: 'He gave himself for our sins' (Gal_1:4; cf. Gal_2:20, Eph_5:2; Eph_5:25, Tit_2:14). The words of Jesus, extant only in Mat_20:28 'The Son of man came ... to give his life a ransom for many,' seem to underlie these passages, as well as those in which the death of Jesus is spoken of as an atonement or ransom (Gal_3:13, Rom_3:25, 1Co_15:3, 1Ti_2:6, Tit_2:14). Of course the sacrificial aspect of Christ's death is also strongly emphasized in His own words when instituting the Supper.

It cannot perhaps be certainly affirmed that Col_3:13 'Even as the Lord forgave you, so also do ye' (cf. Eph_4:32), was suggested by the sentiment of 'Father, forgive them' (Luk_23:34), for the verb is different, Lk. having ἀβημι, Col. and Eph. χαριζομαι. Nor can we base any argument on the statement in 1Th_2:15, that 'the Jews killed the Lord Jesus' (see Act_3:15). There remains one definite historical allusion, 1Ti_6:13 'Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed the good confession.' Our Lord's answer, 'Thou sayest' [*i.e.* 'yes'], to Pilate's question, 'Art thou the king of the Jews?' which is the only confession before Pontius Pilate reported in the Synoptic Gospels, hardly satisfies, important though it is, the requirements of St. Paul's solemn adjuration.

The proclamation by Jesus before Pilate of the nature of His Kingdom, and that He had come for the sole purpose of hearing witness unto the truth, which is recorded in the Fourth Gospel, is indeed a 'good confession'; and we must remember that although St. John did not commit his Gospel to writing until long after the death of St. Paul, yet, unless we are prepared to assert that it is a work of fiction, it seems unreasonable to question that the circumstances recorded in it, or some of them, were known to St. Paul. The omission in the Synoptic Gospels of the substance of 'the good confession' of which we are speaking is not more remarkable than their silence as to the appearances of the risen Lord to James and to '500 brethren at once.'

Passing on now to allusions by St. Paul to the moral and spiritual teaching of Jesus, there are only two explicit references to sayings found in our present Gospels. These are: (1) 1Co_7:10 'But unto the married I give charge, yea not I, but the Lord, That the wife depart not from her husband (but and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband); and that the husband leave not his

wife.’ Our Lord’s general prohibition of divorce is found in all three Synoptics; but the prohibition of divorce of her husband by a wife, of which, or its equivalent, St. Paul here chiefly speaks, is found only in Mar_10:12. It is conceivable that the prohibition was omitted by Mt. and Lk. either as unnecessary, such divorce being almost unheard of, or as implied in our Lord’s declaration that marriage, generally speaking, is indissoluble. (2) 1Co_9:14 ‘The Lord ordained that they which proclaim the gospel should live of the gospel.’ The reference is to ‘The labourer is worthy of his food’ (Mat_10:10), or, more probably, to the form preserved by St. Luke (Luk_10:7), in which ‘hire’ is substituted for ‘food.’ That the reference is to the latter form is almost certain from the fact that the saying is given in 1Ti_5:18 exactly as in Luk_10:7. The natural sense of 1Ti_5:18 is that the saying in question was already ‘Scripture,’ in the same sense as was the quotation from Dt. with which it is coupled. This view does not involve the assumption that St. Luke’s Gospel was then not only in circulation but also received as authoritative by the Church; it merely affirms that the saying was contained in some authoritative narrative of the life of Jesus, or some collection of His sayings.

The passages which speak of Christ as Judge at the Last Day (Rom_2:16, 1Co_4:5, 2Co_5:10), accompanied by angels (1Th_4:16, 2Th_1:7), and executing His will with fire (1Co_3:13; 1Co_3:15, 2Th_1:8); and that which states, as matter of common knowledge, that ‘the saints shall judge the world’ (1Co_6:2), can none of them be necessarily referred to the words and parables of Christ in the Gospels, which affirm the same things, inasmuch as these eschatological conceptions were part of the current Messianic ideas, and may all of them be derived from Daniel 7. There are, however, two details which cannot be referred to that source: (1) that the coming of Christ to judge would be heralded by the sound of a trumpet (1Th_4:16, 1Co_15:52), and (2) that it would be sudden and unlooked for (1Th_5:2). The wording of this latter passage is remarkable: ‘Yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night.’ The only place in our present Gospels where the judgment trumpet is mentioned is Mat_24:31, and in Mat_24:43 of the same chapter we have the illustration of the thief’s unexpected and unsuspected attack.

There are, in conclusion, a number of passages in which it is difficult not to see references to recorded sayings of Christ.

Rom_13:7 ‘Render (ἀποδοτε) to all their dues,’ etc. See Mat_22:21, Mar_12:17, Luk_20:25 ‘Render unto Caesar,’ etc. (ἀπόδοτε).

Gal_5:14, Rom_13:9 ‘Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,’ quoted as a summary of the second table of the Law. See Mat_22:40.

Rom_14:14 'I know, and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus, that nothing is unclean of itself,' based on our Lord's teaching in Mat_15:11, more distinctly brought out in Mar_7:15; Mar_7:19.

Rom_16:19 'I would have you wise (σοφούς) unto that which is good, and simple (ἀκεραιοῦς) unto that which is evil.' See Mat_10:16 'Be ye therefore wise (φρόνιμοι) as serpents, and harmless (ἀκέραιοι) as doves.'

1Co_6:7. When deprecating litigiousness, 'Why not rather take wrong, be defrauded?' See Mat_5:39-40, Luk_6:29-30.

1Co_7:1 'It is good for a man not to touch a woman.' This private opinion, or preferred sentiment, of St. Paul's, is in agreement with that remarkable saying preserved only by St. Matthew (Mat_19:12), 'There are eunuchs, which made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.' The caution with which our Lord prefaces this saying, 'All men cannot receive this saying, but they to whom it is given,' finds also an echo in St. Paul's conclusion: 'Howbeit each man hath his own gift from God,' etc.

1Co_9:17 'I have a stewardship intrusted to me.' See Luk_12:42 'Who then is the faithful and wise steward?' etc.

1Co_13:2 'If I have all faith, so as to remove mountains.' See Mat_17:20; Mat_21:21 = Mar_11:23.

Col_1:23 'The gospel ... which was preached in all creation' (ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει). See Mar_16:15 'Preach the gospel to the whole creation' (τασῇ τῇ κτίσει).

The meagreness of historical material contained in these references to Jesus, His acts and sayings, which are to be found in the Epistles of St. Paul, will cease to surprise us when we compare them with the baldness of the Creeds of the Church, even of the Constantinopolitan.

7. The truth is that we have been hitherto misled by the 'Lives of Christ' which have from time to time appeared. The assumption that underlies an attempt to write the *Life* of any one is that it is possible to give an account not only of his birth and death, but to arrange in some orderly chronological sequence the movements of his life, using the term 'movement' in its most comprehensive signification. This it is well nigh impossible to do in the case of our Lord's earthly ministry. Between the age of twelve years and His death the only events which really mark intervals are, His baptism by

John, the Temptation, and the Transfiguration. It is true that the Fourth Gospel notes the Passovers which took place during our Lord's ministry; but it cannot be said that any of the attempts to arrange the circumstances and discourses recorded in the Synoptics so as to fit in with St. John's notes of time have been such as to compel belief. Moreover, although conclusions based on internal evidence must always be more or less precarious, yet there are instances of sayings of Jesus which have an early place in the Synoptic record, but which from their tone it is difficult to assign to an early stage of our Lord's ministry.

A Gospel, in fact, is not a biography. What are of saving efficacy in the events of our Lord's life are His birth, death, and resurrection. The fact that 'He went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil' (Act 10:38), and that His example and His moral and spiritual discourses threw a new light on the relations of men to God and to one another, this too is of great importance; but there is not any practical significance whatever in the order in which this or that miracle was performed, or this or that discourse spoken. It is not likely that the Apostolic preachers dwelt more on the historical sequence of the works and words of Jesus than do those in modern times; and in consequence, speaking generally, such sequence would be disregarded, even by original witnesses. The events of any one memorable day might be remembered and repeated exactly in the order in which they had occurred; and thus we have, no doubt, in Mark 1 an account of the incidents that were indelibly impressed on Peter's mind in connexion with the day on which he finally left all and followed Jesus.

8. We are now ready to discuss the question, *Is there any instance in the NT of the term 'Gospel' applied to a written document?* There are perhaps two such cases.

Before citing them, it may be well to premise, (1) that they were written at a time when there must have been written accounts of some sort of our Lord's works and words, and when the term 'Gospel' was unquestionably applied to oral narratives of the life of Jesus; and also (2) that in Ignatius (*Phil.* [Note: Philistine.] 5) 'the Gospel' is quite naturally applied to the Evangelic story, and, being co-ordinated with 'the Apostles' and 'the Prophets,' implies that the story was written.

The passages are: Mar 1:1 'The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God'; and Rev 14:6 'I saw another angel flying in mid heaven, having an eternal gospel to proclaim unto them that dwell on the earth.' However visions are to be explained, they are essentially pictures, seen by the eye before they are interpreted by the mind. This picture of the angel 'having an eternal gospel' plausibly suggests a figure with a scroll or roll in his hand.

The opening clause of St. Mark's Gospel has indeed been explained as parallel to Php 4:15, where '*the beginning of the gospel* is relative to the person apprehending it' (Grimm-Thayer), as though it referred to the preaching of John the Baptist. This interpretation seems to the present writer far-fetched. It is surely more natural to take it as the title of the book, and, as Dr. Salmon thinks, modelled on Hos 1:2 Ἀρχὴ λόγου Κυρίου ἐν Ὠσηε. It is not easy to give reasons why a considerable interval should elapse between the application of the term 'Gospel' to an oral narrative, and to the same narrative when committed to writing. It may be fairly asked, How would the writer of the Second Gospel have been likely to describe his work? It is not probable that St. Mark's Gospel, as we have it, was actually the first narrative drawn up. Nor can it be fairly said that the language of St. Luke, in his preface, proves that he was unacquainted with the term 'Gospel' in the sense of a document. The use of a Christian technical term would have seemed to St. Luke out of place in a section in which he was carefully using what he deemed his best literary style.

9. What has been said in explanation of St. Paul's statement that his knowledge of Gospel facts had been received from the Lord, *i.e.* from a man inspired by the Lord, a prophet-evangelist, suggests the answer to the question, *How did the Church recognize the inspiration of the narratives which she finally, and at a very early date, acquiesced in as authoritative Gospels?* It was through the double and almost simultaneous action of the original Evangelist or Evangelists, and the judgment of the Church on the sections of the Gospel story delivered on successive Lord's Days, both directed and suggested and controlled by the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Jesus.

It is the intention of the writer of the present article to deal with this subject from the standpoint of the Christian Church to a greater degree than is usual now among critical writers. The indignant remonstrance of St. Paul to the individualistic Corinthians has a certain relevance to some modern exponents of early Christian literature: 'What? was it from you that the word of God went forth? or came it unto you alone?' (1Co 14:36). One sometimes hears or reads discussions on Christian literature which indicate that for the speaker or writer the Christian Church has no existence. The collection of writings which we call the NT is treated as though it were a fortuitous collection, the selection of which was determined arbitrarily, or at least on principles which have now no claim to respect; as though Christianity were merely a matter of literary or antiquarian interest, so that some new discovery might change our whole conception of Christ's work and words, or alter the value of the Gospels already received. Now the existence of the Christian Church during the first centuries of our era is a fact; a fact the recognition of which has no connexion with any special views we may hold as to what ought to be the constitution or organization of the Church in our own times. It is surely un-philosophical to ignore a fact which was admittedly one of transcendent importance to the first Christians. The Gospels, as we

have them now, are a product of the Church of Apostolic and sub-Apostolic times. It is, to say the least, conceivable that some principle determined the Church in her final selection of Gospels; and any suggestion as to what that principle was cannot be without interest, even if it fails to compel assent.

It may be proper to remark, by way of caution, that an inquiry into the principle or principles by which the Church was guided in her selection of authoritative Gospels is not precluded by any theory of inspiration. Even if we hold that the sacred books only are inspired, and that the Church was not inspired, or guided by the Holy Spirit, in her choice of them, the question must arise, How did the Church recognize the inspiration of the books?

‘As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you’ (Joh 20:21). These words of the risen Lord express the idea that the Church is the representative of Christ on earth, and that, as ‘in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily’ (Col 2:9), so is the Church His body, a body not only quickened by His life, but indwelt by His mind: ‘We have the mind of Christ’ (1Co 2:16). In the context immediately preceding this quotation, St. Paul claims for those who have this mind the possession of a special critical sense, a faculty of discernment in spiritual matters; and other passages exhibit the practical operation of this critical sense, as it may be termed, e.g. 1Co 14:29 ‘Let the prophets speak by two or three, and let the others discern,’ and 1Co 14:37 ‘If any man thinketh himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him take knowledge of the things which I write unto you, that they are the commandments of the Lord.’ This special sense was formed by those who had been ‘from the beginning eye-witnesses and ministers of the word.’ Their reports of what their Master had done and said, the conditions in which He worked, the tone and temper of His utterances, formed a standard by which it was possible to decide the claims to genuineness of stories told about Him. There is really nothing fanciful in this: it only supposes the Apostolic Church, or at least the leading members of it, to have had the same sort of sense of discernment which is undoubtedly possessed by good critics in other departments of literature. The very best attempts to imitate the style of a great poet or prose writer ring false in the ear of one who knows.

But not only did the Church, thinking through the accredited teachers ‘who had the spirit,’ or if it be preferred, the sanctified ‘common sense of most,’ determine which were the Gospels inspired by God; but also their form—at least so far as the Synoptics are concerned—was in all probability determined by the use made of them in the weekly Church assemblies. This use must have obtained from the very earliest times at which meetings were held for distinctively Christian worship. We cannot otherwise account for the familiarity on the part of his readers with the general tenor of the Evangelic story which is assumed by St. Paul in his Epistles.

In Justin Martyr's time (*Apol.* i. 67) the established custom was that two lessons were read, one from the Prophets, another from the Gospels. We cannot press Justin's language too closely, so as to exclude from public reading the non-Prophetical parts of the OT, or the Apostolic Epistles. We must remember that his intention was to give heathens a general idea as to the nature of the Christian worship; he was not composing rubrical directions for the clergy. It is more likely than not that more use was made of the Prophetical books than of any other portion of the OT: and in any case, it is to them that Justin most constantly refers his Gentile readers. That the Apostolic Epistles were also read in the Christian assemblies we know from other sources; but it is not likely that a Lord's Day ever passed without a recitation of some portion of the narratives of the works and words of Jesus.

When we examine the canonical Gospels with this consideration in our mind, we are struck by the fact that it is easy to imagine that the first three were compiled from sections read with a view to practical instruction, and that it is not so easy to think of the Fourth Gospel as having had this origin. The stories and discourses in the Synoptics have the effect of pictures reproduced in the words of the original witness, while the impression was still fresh in his memory, and before he had time to place them in any systematized doctrinal setting. St. John's Gospel, on the other hand, has the air of being an attempt to write a history, a spiritual history if you will, still a history, an orderly statement of words and deeds meditated on in the study, and recorded as they emerged from the writer's inner consciousness after the lapse of many years. To say this is not to undervalue the historical truth, much less the inspiration, of the Fourth Gospel. The difference between it and the Synoptics is similar to that between a diarist and a historian: a diary chronicles facts, a history interprets them.

It is possible that St. John's Gospel was known as a history for private reading only, for some considerable time before it was read in the congregation. This supposition would partly explain why so few of Justin's quotations of Christ's words are taken from it, although we have sufficient proof of his acquaintance with it. Even in our own day it is doubtful whether any judicious apologist for Christianity, in citing examples of our Lord's discourses to a non-Christian public, would make much use of the Fourth Gospel, though he might regard it as of inestimable value in his own devotional reading. He would feel instinctively that its wisdom is for those whom St. Paul calls 'the perfect,' or 'full grown,' not for 'babes' in Christ, much less for them that are without.' Moreover, apart from this difference in quality between St. John's Gospel and the Synoptics, the difference in literary style must have, even from the first, delayed its adoption in general public use. Those who think, as they read or listen, soon become aware that its simplicity of vocabulary and grammatical structure conceal great subtlety of thought: we are out of our depth after the first step.

10. A word is necessary as to *the relation between the, canonical Gospels and the fragments of early Gospel material* which have already repaid the patient toil of scholarly excavation in Egypt. In 1892 a fragment of the lost *Gospel of Peter*, discovered at Akhmîm in 1886-7, was published by U. Bouriant; and in 1897, Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt published a papyrus containing eight *Sayings of Jesus* in a more or less fragmentary condition; and another fragment of five *Sayings* has since appeared. We are not at all concerned here with the so-called Gospel of Peter. It is confessedly the production of a sect of Docetae not earlier than the latter half of the 2nd century. It is undoubtedly interesting and valuable, as illustrating the beliefs of Gnostics; but it has no claim whatever to be an original source of information. It is instructive as a harmonistic narrative based chiefly on the canonical Gospels.

To the student of the Gospels, the recovery of the lost Gospel of Peter, or of a portion of it, has the same kind, but not the same degree, of interest as the recovery of a lost work by Justin Martyr would have: it serves as an illustration of the way in which the canonical Gospels were employed in the 2nd century. But the case is different with the newly discovered *Sayings of Jesus*. These seem to claim to be Gospel material. The question is, Are they *bona fide* Gospel material which has been practically rejected by the responsible thinkers of the Church, or are they only pseudo-Gospel material?

We have seen that a complete 'Gospel' must have contained a narrative of those facts of our Lord's life which have a redemptive significance; but besides Gospels, it is very probable, indeed almost certain, that there were current in Apostolic times sayings of our Lord, without any note of the occasion when they were spoken. We have one such saying in Act 20:35, and in the extant Gospels there are many passages which it is difficult to believe are not based on collections of Sayings. An almost certain case is Luk 16:14-18, where we have a group of four Sayings, none of which has any connexion with the others, or with the parable that follows.

This example proves that the disconnected nature of the Sayings in the recently discovered papyri affords no presumption against their being genuine Gospel material. Moreover, the record by St. Luke of St. Paul's quotation (Act 20:35) of a saying of Jesus which is not found in any canonical Gospel, proves that while St. Luke was no doubt desirous to make his Gospel as full as possible, he was yet aware that there were accessible to him sayings besides those of which he made use. So that we cannot reject the papyri Sayings on the ground that the canonical Gospels must necessarily contain all the sayings of Jesus that were known in Apostolic times.

On the other hand, on the principles we have adopted, we must decide that St. Luke, in his selection of sayings and discourses, was guided by the Spirit of Jesus; and it may be remarked that the fact that he did *select* is a presumptive proof that he wrote at a

time sufficiently early for it to be possible for a Christian to consider any authenticated saying of Jesus to be not worth preserving. Contrast the eager anxiety of Papias to gather up every crumb from the recollections of early disciples. At best, the papyri Sayings belong to the same class as the interpolations in Codex D, that is to say, they are rejected Gospel material, rejected because the mind of the Church in the 1st cent. thought it to be unsuitable for preservation. The present conclusion to St. Mark's Gospel, on the other hand, and the *Pericope adulteræ*, are instances of floating Gospel material which have been stamped with the approval of the mind of the Church.

It may happen, however, that further discoveries and mature consideration will suggest that these papyri Sayings have only a relative value and significance, as being fragments of the very extensive religious literature of the 2nd century. If more of this literature had survived to our own day, we should be able to view them in a juster proportion. We know that, even in the lifetime of the Apostles, Christianity had developed so rapidly that there was an exuberant growth of 'divers and strange teachings' (Heb 13:9). Each of these sects, or schools of thought and speculation, must have had both its authorized expositions and its literary propaganda. We are apt to forget that the business of book production in the first centuries of the Christian era was enormous in volume.

We know from the lists given by Eusebius, and allusions in other authors, that our extant ante-Nicene Fathers represent a very small fraction of the literature of the Church before his time. We may judge from this fact how unlikely it would be that much of the writings of heretics would survive. Such literature did not belong to a body with a continuous organized life, as is the Christian Church, a life continuous in doctrine as well as by personal links. The doctrine of the Christian Church, being a living thing, grows and develops from one generation to another; but the new always has to reconcile itself with the old; they are connected. And so even uninspired Christian writings would continue to be preserved and respected long after they had ceased to be generally read. Whereas heresy, as it was called, is essentially transitory; its literature, even when not merely the expression of the thoughts of an individual, reflects the conception of only one generation. Those who inherit it have no reason for retaining interest in it after it has ceased to represent precisely their thoughts. On the whole, it seems to the present writer that these papyri Sayings of Jesus must be regarded as not an expression of the main line of Church thought of any century. They are, of course, profoundly interesting, as casting light on the religious conceptions of some, we cannot tell how many, in the 2nd cent., but they do not exhibit the general mind of the Church.

11. In any discussion as to *the language in which the first Gospel narrative was composed*, it is impossible to leave out of account the evidence preserved in the fragments of Papias that are cited in Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 39.

It is not intended here to give a résumé of the controversy that has raged over these few lines; but merely to state what seems to the present writer their most probable sense and value. The title of Papias' book was Λογίων Κυριακῶν Ἐξηγήσεις. Besides Eusebius, Irenaeus seems to be the only writer, of those whose works have come down to us, who exhibits a first-hand acquaintance with the book of Papias. The other writers who allude to him evidently knew no more about him than what they found in Eusebius or Irenaeus. The nature of the work may be guessed from what Papias himself states in one of the fragments: 'I shall not hesitate also to put down for you, along with my interpretations, whatsoever things I have at any time learned carefully from the elders.' The book, then, had a twofold character: *interpretations*, and also *oral traditions*. It is these latter to which Eusebius refers when he says that the book contained 'certain strange parables and teachings of the Saviour, and some other more mythical things'; and from the fact that Eusebius quotes from Papias two statements concerning the Gospels of Matthew and Mark respectively, it is at least probable that the *interpretations* dealt with our Gospels. Eusebius does not conceal his contempt for Papias' literary capacity: 'He appears to have been of very limited understanding (σφόδρα σμικρὸς τὸν νοῦν), as one can see from his discourses.' This adverse verdict is certainly borne out by the puerile extracts preserved by Irenaeus; and it does not seem reasonable to attribute Eusebius' hostile criticism to his want of sympathy with Papias' millenarian opinions. Eusebius speaks in unqualified praise of Irenaeus, who shared those opinions.

We may now discuss the term *λόγια κυριακά*, as it occurs in the title of Papias' book. The word *λόγια* may certainly be rendered 'oracular utterances,' as Professor Stanton points out (*The Gospels as Historical Documents*, p. 53); but *λόγια κυριακά* is not naturally rendered 'oracular utterances of the Lord,' in the sense uttered by the Lord,—which would be *λόγια Κυρίου*,—but oracular utterances relating to the Lord, just as *κυριακὸν δεῖπνον* does not mean the supper eaten by, or given by, the Lord, but the supper ordained as an institution by Him. *κυριακός* has the same force in the phrase *ἡ κυριακὴ ἡμέρα*.

As regards *λόγια*, it would, of course, be absurd to question the possibility that Papias was familiar with the word in the sense 'oracular utterances'; but it is more likely

that his use of *λόγια* was intentionally analogous to that found in the NT (Act 7:38, Rom 3:2, Heb 5:12; 1Pe 4:11), where the term, variously qualified, is used of the Scriptures of the OT. *λόγια κυριακά*, then, would mean Holy Scriptures connected with the Lord, *i.e.* the Gospels. This meaning harmonizes with what we have otherwise inferred as to the nature of the book written by Papias. It dealt primarily with interpretations of the Gospels, and secondarily with oral traditions, of which he was evidently a very uncritical collector.

Papias distinctly tells us, as Eusebius points out, that among his informants were persons old enough to have had personal intercourse with the Apostles. He distinguishes two classes of authorities: (1) Persons who could tell him what Andrew, Peter, etc., *said* (*εἶπεν*), 'and (2) what Aristion and the presbyter John, the disciples of the Lord, *say*' (*λέγουσιν*). Eusebius, who had read the book, states that the language of Papias implies that he was himself a hearer of Aristion and the presbyter John. We are certainly entitled to infer that they were his elder contemporaries; very much elder, if they really were 'disciples of the Lord' in the strict sense of the phrase. See, further, art. Aristion.

'The order of the list' of elders given by Papias is, as Professor Stanton remarks (*op. cit.* p. 168), 'a somewhat strange one.' He gives the true explanation as to why John and Matthew are mentioned last, *i.e.* 'For the very reason that they had embodied their testimony in writing, they were less important than the rest for the particular purpose of which he is speaking here—the illustration of the written "oracles" by matter orally handed down.' It may be added that the omission in this list of Mark and Luke was most probably due to the consideration that these Evangelists could not be supposed to be able, from personal knowledge, to add anything to what they had embodied in their Gospels. One cannot help noting that the other names, 'Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James,' are those of the Apostles who are introduced in the Gospels as making observations, and that the first three names occur in that order in the first chapter of St. John's Gospel. We do not know which James Papias meant. Moreover, while Eusebius expressly states that Papias 'mentions Aristion and the presbyter John frequently by name, and gives their traditions in his writings,' he does not quote from Papias any tradition whatever based on the authority of an Apostle. We are forced to the conclusion that in point of fact Papias had none to record; and that when 'he questioned those who had been followers of the elders in regard to their words,' he learnt nothing of permanent interest. It is impossible to imagine that if Eusebius had found in the book of Papias any statement whatever as from an Apostle, he would not have preserved it in his *History*.

Of the two celebrated remarks cited from Papias about the Gospels of Mark and Matthew respectively, the first is given expressly as the statement of the presbyter John, and it is natural to suppose that the second came from the same source. Papias was credulous and unintelligent; but he does not seem to have made any statement on his own authority; so that it would be unreasonable to discount the statements of the presbyter John because of the stupidity of the person who recorded them. On the other hand, it is unreasonable to assume that the nearness of the presbyter John to the times of the Apostles is a guarantee that his assertions as to the composition of the Gospels are altogether to be depended on. We need have no hesitation in rejecting any, or all, of them, if more convincing arguments oblige us to do so; but the demonstrated falsity of one statement would not of necessity throw discredit on the others.

Thus, that Mark was 'the interpreter of Peter' is so probable a tradition that it has met with general acceptance; it is, moreover, an assertion as to which it is quite impossible now to produce any rebutting evidence. But the assertion that Mark did not compose his narrative 'in order' is, at the present day, as generally rejected by those who have carefully studied the Synoptic Problem. Dr. Salmon, in particular, has pointed out that if we desire to follow the growth of our Lord's reputation as a teacher and healer, and the corresponding development of hostility against Him, we must consult the Gospel according to St. Mark in preference to the others.

Passing on to the statement of the presbyter John about St. Matthew, and judging it in the light of all the evidence at present available, we seem to find the same mixture in it of truth and error. The testimony of St. Jerome does not leave us room to question that there was an orthodox Hebrew Gospel which, as extant in his time, contained matters not found in any of the four canonical Gospels. This work had such a very limited circulation that it is impossible for us now to affirm with any confidence as to whether its peculiar features were in the original, or were later interpolations; but we have no rebutting evidence that in its original form it was not the work of St. Matthew. On the other hand, nothing is more certain than that the Greek First Gospel, which has always been known in the Church as the Gospel according to St. Matthew, is not in its present form, which there is no reason to think was ever different—a translation from one Hebrew original. How then are we to explain 'Everyone interpreted them,' *i.e.* Matthew's Hebrew *λόγια*, 'as he was able'? Dr. Salmon's solution seems to give the most likely explanation of this ambiguous phrase. John the presbyter meant that the Greek St. Matthew was a translation of the Hebrew St. Matthew, and not by the author himself. The assertion is of the same kind as that about St. Mark, that he did not write 'in order'; and both statements were suggested by an extreme theory of biblical inspiration, a theory which was very

generally held until quite recent times—the absolute inerrancy of Holy Scripture in every detail.

One has sometimes heard discrepancies between different historical statements in the OT explained by the assertion that the errors which cause the discrepancies were not in the original, as it left the hand of the Divinely inspired writer, but were due to the slips of uninspired copyists; and thus it is thought possible to reconcile belief in the inerrancy of the Word of God with the actual state of the case. The statements of the presbyter John about the Gospels of Mark and Matthew are best explained by supposing that he held some such theory of inspiration.

‘When he finds what seems a disagreement between the Gospels, he is satisfied there can be no real disagreement. Mark’s order may be different from Luke’s (who declares in his preface that it was his intention to write in order—γράφαι καθεξῆς); but, then, that was because it was not Mark’s design to recount the facts in their proper order.... if in Matthew’s Gospel, as he read it, there seemed any inaccuracy, this must be imputed to the translators: the Gospel as Matthew himself wrote it was free from fault’ (Salmon, *Introd. to NT*, p. 93).

The conclusion, then, to which we are driven is that if the existence of an original Hebrew Gospel depended on the testimony of the presbyter John, we could not safely make any positive affirmation on the subject. The only other witness to Matthew’s Hebrew Gospel who seems to be independent, *i.e.* Irenaeus, may not really be so. It has been generally believed that he adds to what Eusebius quotes from Papias a note of time, ‘while Peter and Paul were preaching and founding the Church at Rome’; but the Rev. J. Chapman has proved (*JThSt* [Note: *ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.*] vi. 563) that this clause is neither derived from Papias nor is it a note of time.

12. However, whether St. Matthew wrote a Gospel in Hebrew or not, there can be no doubt, both from *a priori* considerations and also from the internal evidence of the extant Greek Gospels, that there was current in the infancy of the Church a Gospel in the Hebrew language as then commonly spoken in Judaea. The last command of our Lord, as recorded by St. Luke (24:47), that the gospel should be preached, ‘beginning at Jerusalem,’ is in itself a sufficient proof that one of the first Gospels, in the sense in which we have used that word, must have been in the Aramaic tongue. Even if our Lord sometimes, and in some places, taught in Greek, yet Aramaic was His mother tongue, and that of His Apostles, and of the vast majority of His hearers. In the early Jerusalem Church it is plain that the Hebrews outnumbered the Hellenists (Act 6:1). These considerations make it certain that one of the forms which the Evangelic narrative assumed from the very first was in Aramaic. The facts that such a Gospel is not now extant, and that the external evidence for its existence at any time is so

scanty, are fully accounted for by the destruction of Jerusalem in the year a.d. 70. That world-shaking event, among its other immediate consequences, was followed by the disappearance of the Hebrew-speaking Church of Jerusalem. Then, after not many years, the Hebrew-speaking Christian community in Palestine lost touch with the main current of Christian thought, and, in consequence, sank to the position of an obscure sect with an out-of-date theology.

It has been stated above that the internal evidence of the extant Greek Gospels suggests an Aramaic original. It must be confessed that the presence in a Greek document of Aramaic turns of phrase does not necessarily prove that it is a translation from the Aramaic. Dean Armitage Robinson has given good reasons for his theory that the Aramaisms in the first two chapters of St. Luke's Gospel are due to a deliberate imitation of the LXX Septuagint of 1 Samuel. But there does not seem any likelihood that the author, or authors, of the common Synoptic narrative were, like St. Luke, conscious literary artists; and even if we cannot follow Weiss in every application of his conclusions, there remains proof enough to render the theory of an original Aramaic Gospel, as underlying the Synoptics, probable to a high degree. This supposition is even more plausible in the case of the portions of St. Matthew's Gospel which are peculiar to that Evangelist. Bishop Westcott long ago pointed out, with regard to the quotations from the OT found in the Synoptic Gospels, that, while the cyclic quotations, as he calls them, agree with the LXX Septuagint, those that are peculiar to St. Matthew seem to be independent translations from the Hebrew.

13. This is not a discussion of the Synoptic Problem; but it may not be out of place to conclude this article with a suggestion as to the relations of the three Synoptic Gospels to each other. It is generally held now that the First and Third Gospels are altogether independent of each other, but that Mt. and Lk. derived the matter which they have in common with Mk. either from St. Mark's Gospel, or from an earlier source from which St. Mark selected the incidents and discourses which he relates. On the hypothesis that Mt. and Lk. copied our St. Mark, we have to assume the existence of another early Gospel, from which they derived the non-Markan matter which they have in common. In this case we conclude that the details peculiar to St. Mark were an original feature of that Gospel, and that Mt. and Lk. for various reasons omitted them. On the other hand, if the common Synoptic matter and the matter common to Mt. and Lk. be both assigned to one original, it will then be natural to think of St. Mark's peculiar details as additions made by him, probably on the authority of St. Peter.

The problem has been rendered unnecessarily complicated by an assumption that it is impossible that an Evangelist should have omitted anything from his work which he had reason to believe was true. The fallacy of this assumption will be evident, whichever hypothesis we adopt. The simplest method to account for all the facts is to

suppose a Greek translation of an Aramaic original as the source of all the common Synoptic matter, and also of the matter common to Mt. and Lk. In this document the OT quotations would have been given in a LXX Septuagint form. At least two other sources must be postulated for the matter found only in Mt. and Lk. respectively. We have already found reason to hold that the matter peculiar to Mt. was a translation from an Aramaic original.

Whatever solution of the Synoptic problem be ultimately adopted by the general consensus of critics, it does not seem likely that the complicated hypotheses of the German school of a generation ago will again commend themselves to scholars of sober judgment. It is a sound canon of criticism that sources are not to be multiplied beyond the necessity of the case.

Literature.—The art. ‘Gospels’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible and in *Encyc. Bibl.*, where a full Bibliography will be found. Of the more recent literature the following select list may be offered: Westcott, *Introd. to Study of Gospels*⁸ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1895; A. Wright, *Compos. of Four Gospels*, 1890, with the same author’s Preface to *Synopsis*, 1896, and *Some NT Problems*, 1898; Sir J. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, 1899; Salmon, *Introd. to NT*, 1885; Rushbrooke, *Synopticon*, 1880; Abbott-Rushbrooke, *Common Tradition of the Synoptic Gospels*, 1884; Badham, *The Formation of the Gospels*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1892; H. Holtzmann, *Die Synopt. Evangelien*, 1863, *Einleit. in d. NT*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1892; B. Weiss, *Life of Christ*, Bk. i. ‘The Sources,’ 1882, *Manual of Introd. to NT*, 1886; C. Weizsacker, *Untersuch. üb. die evangel. Gesch.* 1864; Wendt, *Lchre Jesu*, 1886; P. Ewald, *Hauptproblem d. Evangelienfrage*, 1890; Sanday, ‘Survey of the Synoptic Question’ in *Expos.* 1891. A posthumous work on the Synoptic Problem by Dr. Salmon, entitled *Eclipse Observations of the Human Element in the Gospels*, will, it is hoped, be published this year (1906).

N. J. D. White.

☞ Gospels (Apocryphal)

GOSPELS (APOCRYPHAL)

i. Title.—In the sense in which the term is popularly understood, ‘apocryphal’ is synonymous with ‘spurious’ or ‘false’; when, however, it is applied as a title to writings of the early Christian centuries, it bears the significance of ‘extra-canonical.’

By Apocryphal Gospels are, accordingly, meant all writings claiming to be Gospels which are not included in the Canon of the NT, without any implication that their contents are necessarily false or of questionable origin. (See, further, for the meaning of the term, art. 'Apocrypha' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible i. 112 ff.; also Hennecke, *NT Apokr.* 3* ff., *Handb.* vii ff.; and Zahn. *Gesch. d. NT Kan.* i. 127 ff.).

ii. Origin.—For a generation after the death of Jesus, His teaching and the facts about His life were preserved by oral tradition in the circle of believers. With the rise of a second generation, however, the need was felt for reducing the oral reminiscences to written form. The reason for this was twofold. For one thing, the number of those who could give personal testimony of what Jesus did and said was rapidly becoming smaller; and for another, the Christian faith was spreading far beyond the limits of its original home in Palestine. Both these facts made it imperative that, if trustworthy accounts of the teaching and life of Jesus were to be preserved for the guidance of the scattered communities of Christians, the tradition should be committed to something more permanent and less liable to disturbing influences than oral reminiscence. The impulse of this necessity gave rise to our written Gospels, and to many other Evangelic records which have disappeared. Of the many attempts to write the story of Jesus, to which St. Luke in his prologue refers, none (with the exception of Mt. and Mk.) can be said with any certainty to have survived;* [Note: The probability is that most of them disappeared early, being unable to maintain their position alongside of the Gospels which are now in the Canon.] although it is possible that the *Gospel Fragment of Fayûm* may be the wreckage of one of them. In any case, some of the earlier non-canonical Gospels, which are extant in more or less fragmentary condition, are probably the products of the general desire, that was everywhere felt, to have a more certain knowledge of Jesus and His teaching than was possible from the oral instruction of wandering evangelists. The *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, which is but little later than the Synoptics, belongs almost certainly to this class; and the same may be true also of the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*.

The majority of extra-canonical Gospels are due, however, to other causes. Written at a time when the present Four Gospels were gaining, or had already gained, a place of exceptional authority,† [Note: The authoritative position of the canonical Gospels, which was beginning to be recognized before the middle of the 2nd century, was assured by the end of the century.] they came into existence in answer to two desires, urgently felt in certain circles of Christians. (1) The first was the desire, popularly entertained, for fuller information about the life of Christ than that given by the four Gospels. This intelligible and not unnatural curiosity was directed chiefly to the facts antecedent to Christ's advent, and to those periods of His life which the older Gospels left in shadow—His parentage, His birth and childhood, and the period after the Resurrection. It is noteworthy that the writers who endeavoured to satisfy

this desire for fuller knowledge made no attempt to fill up the silent years between Christ's childhood and His entrance on His public ministry, the reason in part probably being that 'it seemed too daring for them to illumine a darkness, for which there was not the slightest historical suggestion in the New Testament' (Hofmann, *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] i. 655). With greater probability, however, it may be said that the reason was, not so much any self-restraint through loyalty to the data of history, as the absence of any clear dogmatic motive; and dogmatic motives, as will appear, were almost invariably associated with the desire to satisfy curiosity. It may be safely assumed that, had any doctrinal interest called for the history of the silent years, no scruples about historical truthfulness would have prevented writers from enlivening them with the products of their fancy. In the main it is certain that the details furnished by the apocryphal writings regarding matters about which the canonical Gospels are silent, have little or no historical basis. They are in reality Christian *haggadoth*, popular stories similar to those in Jewish literature which were framed for purposes of pious entertainment and instruction. The *Gospels of the Infancy and Childhood*, for example, are full of legendary matter drawn from various sources, or freely invented by the fancy of the writers. Where the details are not entirely imaginative, they have their origin in the transformation of utterances of Christ into deeds, or in the literal interpretation of OT prophecies and Jewish expectations about the Messiah, or in the ascription to Jesus of miracles similar to those recorded in the OT (Hofmann, *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] i. 655).

As an example of the way in which the Christian haggadist worked, it may suffice to mention his treatment of OT texts. Psa 148:7 reads: 'Praise the Lord from the earth, ye dragons'; accordingly, in pseudo-Matthew dragons are represented as coming out of a cave and worshipping the child Christ. The picture of Paradise regained in Isa 11:6 ff. suggested the legend that all kinds of wild beasts accompanied the Holy Family on the way to Egypt (Cowper, *Apocr.* [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] *Gosp.* lix f.).

But although the Apocryphal Gospels abound in legendary accretions of this kind, the mistake should not be made of assuming that there is no authentic material in the additions to the narratives in the four Gospels. Oral tradition maintained itself for a time after our present Gospels were reduced to writing, and it is not improbable that genuine sayings of Christ and authentic details about His life have been preserved in uncanonical books. On this point see further in § iii.

(2) A much more powerful motive than the desire to satisfy curiosity, leading to the production of Gospel writings, was the dogmatic interest, the desire to find support for beliefs which were held in various sections of the Church. This was especially marked in Gnostic circles, where numerous Evangelic writings (running into thousands, Epiphanius says [*Haer.* 26]) were produced, claiming the authority of a secret tradition for their peculiar doctrines.

Even in the earlier Apocryphal Gospels, which are of the Synoptic type, it is clear that theological prepossessions played a considerable part, as indeed they did to some extent in the canonical Gospels. Thus, in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* the conception of Christ has an Ebionitic tinge, and in the *Gospel of Peter* there are expressions which betray Docetic sympathies on the part of the writer. The dogmatic motive is prominent as well in those writings which fill up with fictitious details the empty spaces of the Gospel narrative, and thus have generally been regarded as due to the desire to gratify the irrepressible longing for fuller knowledge. It is doubtful if this latter motive, although it was certainly operative, would have led to the invention of such a mass of fictitious matter, had it not been powerfully stimulated by dogmatic considerations. In the *Protevangelium of James* the legendary history of Mary's antecedents and of the circumstances of Christ's birth was due not merely to any *horror vacui*, but to the imperative dogmatic necessity, as the writer conceived it, of safeguarding in this way alike the true Divinity and the true humanity of Jesus Christ. Similarly, the *Childhood Gospel of Thomas*, with its repulsive stories of the child Christ's miraculous power and knowledge, would never have found acceptance in Christian circles had it not been for the witness which the miracles were supposed to bear to Christ's supernatural origin.

iii. Relation to Canonical Gospels.—The fragmentary condition and the uncertain text of many of the Apocryphal Gospels render a confident judgment as to their relation to the canonical Gospels exceedingly difficult. Where the question of affinity is raised, the problem to be solved is whether the uncanonical Gospels are dependent on the canonical, or draw from a common oral source. The latter possibility is one not to be dismissed without careful consideration; but, on the whole, the evidence points in almost every case to the use of some or all of the four Gospels by the authors of the apocryphal writings. Only in the case of one Gospel, the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, is there a strong consensus of opinion in favour of independence (see, however, vii. A. 1). Where there is an appearance of independence, this is frequently to be accounted for by a free manipulation and embellishment of old material, to bring it into line with the writer's peculiar point of view, or to suit it to the character of his surroundings.

While a large degree of dependence on the canonical Gospels must in general be maintained in regard to the Apocryphal Gospels, this must not be pressed so far as to

exclude the possibility of their embodying details drawn from reliable oral sources. The fact must steadily be borne in mind that the stream of living oral tradition continued to flow for several generations, though in ever decreasing volume, alongside of the written Gospels;* [Note: Traces of the influence of oral tradition on the canonical Gospels, after they were reduced to writing, are to be found in the well-known additions to John (8:1-11) and Mark (16:9, 20).] accordingly, where the uncanonical Gospels deviate from the canonical record, either by slight interpolations into common matter or by additions peculiarly their own, the possibility is always open that in these additions we have early and reliable traditions, either unknown to the four Evangelists or passed over by them as unsuitable for their purpose.

Two important considerations must, however, be kept in mind in estimating the trustworthiness of all such additions. In the first place, the authoritative position which the canonical Gospels early reached as authentic sources of the life and teaching of Jesus entitles them to be used as a touchstone of the probable authenticity of the additional matter contained in the Apocryphal Gospels. No saying of Christ or detail about His life has any title to be regarded as genuine if it does not fit into the conception which the four Evangelists have given us of the teaching and personality of Jesus. Secondly, when we keep in view the undoubted fact that fictitious writings were common in which the life and teaching of Christ were freely handled in the interest of heretical sects, it is clear that extreme caution must be observed in receiving as authentic any addition to the canonical record. If it would be less than just to say that all the Apocryphal Gospels stand in the position of suspect witnesses, with a presumption of unreliability against them in respect of their peculiar matter, it is nevertheless true that their exclusion from the Canon, as well as the notoriously tainted origin of some of them, render it imperative that their claim to embody a genuine tradition must be carefully sifted, and allowed only after the clearest proof.

iv. Value.—The question of greatest moment which arises in estimating the value of the Apocryphal Gospels naturally has reference to their worth as additional sources for the life and teaching of Jesus. From what has been already said about their origin and their relation to the canonical Gospels, their value in this respect will appear to be extremely slight. A comparison of the Apocryphal Gospels with those in the Canon makes the pre-eminence of the latter incontestably clear, and shows that as sources of Christ's life the former, for all practical purposes, may be neglected. The simple beauty and verisimilitude of the picture of Jesus in the four Gospels stand out in strong relief when viewed in the light of the artificial and legendary stories which characterize most of the Apocryphal Gospels. The proverbial simplicity of truth receives a striking commentary when (for example) the miracles of the Canonical Gospels are compared with those of the Apocryphal writings. The former, for the most

part, are instinct with ethical purpose and significance, and are felt to be the natural and unforced expression of the sublime personality of Jesus; the latter are largely theatrical exhibitions without ethical content. In them 'we find no worthy conception of the laws of providential interference; they are wrought to supply personal wants, or to gratify private feelings, and often are positively immoral' (Westcott). In a few of the Gospels which show signs of independence, there may be here and there a trace of primitive and trustworthy tradition; but all such details, which have a reasonable claim to be considered authentic, do not sensibly increase the sum of our knowledge about Christ. The conclusion, based on the comparison of the Apocryphal with the Canonical Gospels, is amply warranted, that in rejecting the former and choosing the latter as authoritative Scriptures the Church showed a true feeling for what was original and authentic.

Though the Apocryphal Gospels afford us little additional knowledge about Christ, they are invaluable as enabling us to realize more clearly the conditions under which the four Gospels were received in the Church, until they were finally established as authoritative in the Gospel Canon. The existence of so many Evangelic writings shows that for some time after the Canonical Gospels appeared, they had no position of commanding influence. The high place which oral tradition—'the living and abiding voice'—still retained in the estimation of the Church (cf. Euseb. *Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 39. 4) militated against the acceptance of any written Gospel as authoritative beyond the communities in which it was current. In the early part of the 2nd cent. we have, accordingly, to think of the four Gospels as having merely a local and circumscribed authority, while in different sections of the Church the production of Evangelic literature still proceeded, in which the tradition was handled more or less freely to suit the dominant conceptions and needs. But by the middle of the century there were indications that the four Gospels, already widely known through the constant intercourse that united Christian communities together, were being elevated above their competitors to a place of exceptional authority. This was due, not to mere good fortune or to any arbitrary dealing on the part of the Church, but to the superior claims of the writings themselves, which were recognized when the necessity arose of counteracting, by trustworthy and authentic records, the rapid growth of a pseudo-tradition in Gnostic circles. This rise of our four Gospels to a commanding and unchallengeable position bears witness not only to their inherent value,—which the Church, with a fine spiritual sensitiveness, perceived,—but to the conviction that, as opposed to fictitious writings which appeared under the names of Apostles, they embodied the testimony of Apostolic writers. By the time of Irenaeus (*circa (about)* 180) the Gospel canon may be regarded as definitely fixed; and although Apocryphal Gospels continued to circulate, the authoritative position of the four Gospels was finally assured.

Perhaps the chief value of the Apocryphal Gospels is to be found in the light which they cast on the conditions of life and thought in early Christian times. They are of service in the difficult work of reconstructing the complex environment in which Christianity grew up.

When, for example, one reads in the *Childhood Gospel of Thomas* the account of the miracles wrought by the child Christ, and marks the spirit of *diablerie* so frequently exhibited, one is conscious of nothing but a painful feeling of wonder, that fables so bizarre and so revolting could ever have been tolerated in a community of Christians. Of any ethical sympathy with the spirit of Christ, of any recognition of the beauty and simplicity of Christ's childhood, as He grew in grace and wisdom, in favour with God and man, there is in this Gospel hardly the faintest trace. Though worthless as an account of Christ's childhood, the *Gospel of Thomas* is yet a mirror in which we see reflected the curious condition of the society which accepted it. We see here, in a typical instance, how strong were the external influences which played on the development of Christianity in early times. In the process of permeating the heathen world with its great thought of Redemption and its lofty ethical sentiment, Christianity, as was inevitable, was itself coloured, and in certain circles distorted, by the foreign elements of its environment. Oriental mythology and Greek philosophy had met, and given rise to syncretistic systems which exerted a deep influence on men's conceptions of the Christian faith and life. Traces of this are clearly discernible in the Apocryphal Gospels, most plainly in the Gnostic Gospels. Buddhistic influences are possibly responsible for the childhood stories in the *Gospel of Thomas*.

The confusion and vagueness of the Christological views in the different Apocryphal Gospels also bear witness to the great variety of influences which were at work in the early Church, and enable us to realize with what trouble the conception of the Divine manhood of Jesus was eventually established. The indecision and one-sidedness which are revealed in doctrinal matters are also traceable in the interpretation of the ethical content of Christ's teaching and life. Ascetic and Encratite views are found in several Gospels, and no doubt were characteristic of all the Gnostic Gospels. A close sympathy with the true ethical spirit of Christianity is, however, noticeable in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, in which stress is laid on acts of mercy and brotherly kindness; and in the 'Traditions of Matthias' mentioned by Clement of Alexandria, and possibly identical with the Gnostic *Gospel of Matthias*, the doctrine of Christian responsibility for others' welfare, in its most stringent form, is very forcibly put: 'If the neighbour of an elect person sins, the elect has sinned; for if he had lived according to the counsels of the Word, his neighbour would have so esteemed his manner of life that he would have kept free from sin.'

The *apologetic* interest which is so characteristic of 2nd cent. writers (witness the *Apologies* of Aristides, Justin, Tertullian, etc.) is reflected in several of the Apocryphal Gospels.

Traces are to be found in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, in which the servant of the high priest is a witness to the Resurrection. A later stage of the apologetic movement may be observed in the *Gospel of Peter*, where Pilate is practically exonerated from blame for Christ's condemnation, and is made to bear witness to Christ's Divinity. In the *Acts of Pilate (Gospel of Nicodemus)* the movement has reached its climax in the reverence which the Romans pay to Jesus at His trial, in the miraculous homage of the Roman standards, and in the irrefutable evidence given of Christ's resurrection, to the conviction of His enemies.

A subsidiary element in estimating the value of the Apocryphal Gospels is their antiquarian interest. A passage in the *Protevangelium of James* (ch. 18) affords an interesting parallel to the scene in the fairy tale, 'The Sleeping Beauty,' when by a magic spell the whole of nature suddenly stands still, and all living beings are immovably rooted where they are. The *Childhood Gospel of Thomas*, useless as it is as a source of information about Christ's youth, gives a remarkably vivid and convincing picture of Jewish village life. Caution must be observed in trusting the details of Jewish life in the *Protevangelium*; many of them are entirely unhistorical.

v. Doctrinal characteristics.—As stated above in § ii., one of the main impulses which led to the production of Apocryphal Gospels was the desire to establish peculiar tenets held in certain Christian circles. Gospels of this type, although professedly narratives of our Lord's life and teaching, were in reality *Tendenzschriften*, doctrinal treatises conceived and written in the interests of a definite system of thought. Such were the numerous Gnostic Gospels, of which the smallest fragments remain. But even those Gospels in the production of which there was no deliberate dogmatic purpose, are doctrinally significant. It is true of them, equally with the canonical Gospels, that they were written in the interests of faith, ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν; the writers were not mere chroniclers of past events, giving information about One in whose life and personality they had no vital concern; they were believers, for whom Christ was Lord. The religious value which Jesus had for them, and the manner in which they conceived of His person, were reflected in their narrative of His life. However small the value of the writings may be as authentic sources of information regarding Jesus, they are interesting as showing by a side light what men thought about Him. How far the early Church as a whole was from any clear and uniform conception of Christ, is apparent from the Apocryphal Gospels. In them we have not only the reflexion of views representing the main stream of Christian thought, but

also the foreshadowings of doctrines which later, in their developed form, were rejected as heretical.

The majority of the Apocryphal Gospels betray a heretical tendency, which varies broadly according as the Divine or the human nature of Christ is denied. On the one hand, there is the *Ebionitic* conception of Jesus, with its rejection of His heavenly origin; on the other, the *Docetic*, with its obscuration or denial of His true humanity. Both these opposing views find expression in the Apocryphal Gospels. The former is found in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* and in the *Gospel of the Twelve Apostles*; the latter, somewhat veiled, in the *Gospel of Peter*, but fully developed in the Gnostic Gospels, in which the Saviour—the heavenly Christ—freed from the association with the phantasmal earthly Christ, and made the possessor of His full powers through the death and resurrection, declares the true wisdom to His disciples.

The *Childhood* Gospels stand in the main current of ecclesiastical doctrine in their view of the person of Christ. The *Gospel of Thomas* shows that the circles in which it found acceptance held to the doctrine of Christ's human and Divine natures. There are traces that point to a Gnostic origin, and to a conception of Christ in which His true humanity was obscured; but in the later form in which it was current in the Church, the humanity and Divinity of our Lord are alike emphasized. The child Jesus is a boy among boys, taking His part in the usual games and occupations of childhood; and yet the belief in His supernatural dignity is evidenced by the extraordinary miracles attributed to Him, and by His astonishing knowledge, which drew the confession from His teacher: 'This child is not earthborn; assuredly he was born before the creation of the world' (ch. 7). The *Protevangelium of James*, too, it is clear, was written in the interests of orthodoxy, which were imperilled, alike by the belief current in Jewish-Christian circles that Joseph was the father of Jesus, and by the Gnostic doctrine that, in being born of Mary, Jesus did not partake of her human nature, but passed through her like water through a pipe (Epiphan. *Hær.* 31. 7). In opposition to this double attack on the generally accepted doctrine, the writer of the *Protevangelium*, while not leaving it in doubt that Jesus was born as a human child (the infant took the breast from His mother), sought to make His Divinity secure by depicting Mary as holy from her birth, as fed only on angels' food, as conceiving by the word of the Lord, as bringing forth her child in virginity, and as remaining a virgin to the end. It is noteworthy that, although the primary object of the *Protevangelium* was to safeguard the orthodox conception of Christ's person against hostile attacks, the method adopted had the result of elevating Mary above the ordinary levels of humanity, and of initiating a movement which, deriving strength from other sources, terminated in the worship of Mary, the All-Holy mother of God.

vi. Influence.—Although after the 2nd cent. no Gospels were reckoned as authoritative except those now in the Canon, the Apocryphal Gospels continued to be

read for purposes of edification, both in public and in private. Those which were distinctly heretical gradually disappeared as the power of the Church grew, while those which were of a type similar to the canonical Gospels were unable for any lengthened period to maintain their position alongside their authoritative rivals. Still we find that the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* was read in some quarters in Jerome's day (end of 4th cent.), and was highly esteemed by that Father himself; while the vitality of the *Gospel of Peter* is evidenced by the fact that a large portion of it was placed in the grave of a monk in the early Middle Ages (8th-12th cent.). The popularity of the *Childhood Gospels* was remarkable, especially in the Churches of the East. There the *Protevangelium* was so highly prized as a book of devotion that it was used for reading in public worship, and furnished material for the homilies of preachers. Translations of it circulated in Syriac, Coptic, and Arabic, and, along with other childhood legends, its stories, often greatly embellished and exaggerated, found a place in a comprehensive *Gospel of the Infancy and Childhood*, the so-called 'Arabic Gospel,' which had a wide circulation not only in the Churches in the East, but in Mohammedan circles. Passages from the *Protevangelium* stand in the lectionaries of the orthodox Church, for use at the festivals held in honour of Mary and of her reputed parents, Joachim and Anna.

In the Western Church the Apocryphal Gospels were regarded with more suspicion. Towards the close of the 4th cent. their authority was repudiated in the plainest terms by Jerome and Augustine, the former characterizing certain stories as *ex deliramentis apocryphorum petita* (Tappehorn, *Ausserbiblische Nachrichten*, 15). On the other hand, their contemporaries, Zeno of Verona, and Prudentius, the greatest poet of early Christian times, drew from the *Protevangelium* in their works in praise of Mary. The combined influence of Jerome and Augustine, however, determined the ecclesiastical attitude to the Apocryphal Gospels, and the ban of the Church fell upon them under Damasus (382), Innocent I. (405), and Gelasius (496). In the long run this condemnation by ecclesiastical authority proved unavailing to check the popular appetite for the apocryphal legends; and by various devices the writings, which had incurred the censure of the Church, were brought back again into public circulation.

Harnack truly remarks that 'the history of apocryphal literature is a proof that the prohibition of books is powerless against a pressing need. In all sections and in all languages of the Church this literature is perhaps the most strongly represented alongside of the canonical writings, in a form, as one would expect, that is always changing to suit the taste of the age. It was really *apocryphal*, that is to say, it had what may be termed a subterranean existence; but, suppressed and persecuted though it was, it always forced its way back to the surface, and at last the public tradition of the Church was defenceless against it' (*Gesch. d. altchr. Litt.* i. lx. note 5).

Within a century after the *Decretum Gelasii*, Gregory of Tours in his book *de Gloria Martyrum* (i. ch. 4) had no scruples in using the extravagant legends contained in the 'Transitus Mariae'; indeed, so little store was apparently set by ecclesiastical condemnation, that about 435, thirty years after the decree of Innocent i., a mosaic of the Annunciation in S. Maria Maggiore in Rome, prepared under the direction of Sixtus iii., embodied apocryphal details. Apocryphal writings are used by pseudo-Chrysostom (*circa (about) 600*); and in the epic poem of the nun Hroswitha († 968), entitled *Historia nativitatis laudabilisque conversationis intactæ Dei genitricis*, the material is in part drawn from the later Gospels of the Childhood. From the 12th cent. onwards, the Apocryphal Gospels afforded an inexhaustible mine for poets and minstrels in Germany, France, and England; and numerous miracle-plays represented incidents drawn from the same source. A powerful impulse was given to the spread of these legends by the Dominican Vincent de Beauvais, who in his work entitled *Speculum Majus*, published about the middle of the 13th cent., and translated in the following century into many languages, transcribed large portions of *pseudo-Matthew* and the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, etc. The latter half of the 13th cent. also saw the appearance of a collection of legendary Lives of the Saints, the *Speculum Sanctorum*, better known as the *Golden Legend*, written by another member of the Dominican order, Jacobus de Voragine, Archbishop of Genoa. This work, in which many of the apocryphal legends find a place, had an immense influence, there being manuscript translations extant in English, German, French, Italian, and Spanish. With the invention of the printing-press this influence was largely extended, the *Legenda Aurea* and Vincent's *Speculum* being among the earliest books to be set up in type. From that time onwards, the stories of the Apocryphal Gospels have had an influence on popular Christianity in Catholic countries far exceeding that of the Biblical narrative.

Roman Catholic writers have denied their claim to be in any sense authoritative sources of Evangelic history, and have uttered warnings against their incautious use; an unfavourable judgment was passed upon them by the Papal Congregation of Rites as recently as 1884, in connexion with the proposal to celebrate in the following year the nineteen hundredth anniversary of the birth of Mary; but, all this notwithstanding, these apocryphal stories, likened by Harnack to twining plants which, when cut down, spring up again from beneath and choke much that is healthy, have securely rooted themselves in the popular imagination, and have been the fruitful source of many superstitious beliefs. Even Tapphorn, a Roman Catholic writer, who, in his scholarly treatise on *The Apocryphal Gospels of the Childhood*, etc., speaks with deep regret of the tendency to accept these writings as trustworthy historical sources, cannot resist the temptation to retain as much of their contents as has been taken up into ecclesiastical tradition. He accepts, for instance, as reliable, the names of Mary's parents, the circumstances relating to her birth, her dedication to the Temple service, the marvellous story of her death, resurrection, and ascension, and declares

that use of these apocryphal data may be made with an easy conscience for the purpose of religious edification (*op. cit.* 88).

The narratives of the Apocryphal Gospels have had an extraordinary influence on Christian art. Reference has already been made to the attraction which the legends had for poets from the earliest times, and especially since the date of the publication of the *Legenda Aurea*. (For details of the earlier poetry see von Lehner, *Die Marienverehrung*, 256 ff.). Sculpture and painting also owed many of their subjects to apocryphal sources, or were influenced in their treatment by apocryphal details. The history of Mary's reputed parents, her service in the Temple, her betrothal to Joseph, the Annunciation, the Birth of Jesus in a cave, the Flight into Egypt, the Assumption of Mary—these and other incidents described in the Apocryphal Gospels were favourite themes of painters and sculptors, especially during the Renaissance.

A marble tablet of the 4th or 5th cent. in the crypt of St. Maximin in Provence, represents Mary in the attitude of prayer, with the inscription in barbarous Latin, MARIA VIRGO MINESTER DE TEMPUIO GEROSALE—'The Virgin Mary, servant of the temple at Jerusalem' (von Lehner, *op. cit.* 327). The events in the life of the Virgin, arranged in a series, were depicted by different painters of the Renaissance, one of the best known series being that by Taddeo Gaddi in the Baroncelli Chapel at Florence (Mrs. Jameson, *Legends of the Madonna*, Introd. iii). Mary's presentation at the Temple, and her marvellous ascent of the Temple steps (narrated in *pseudo-Matthew*, ch. 4 and the *Nativity*, ch. 6), supply a subject for one of Titian's masterpieces (in the Academy, Venice), while her marriage to Joseph is represented in many fine pictures, notably in Raphael's beautiful early work (in the Pinacoteca, Milan). The Annunciation is a favourite theme in Christian art; in accordance with the narrative in the *Protevangelium*, Mary is represented either at the well with a pitcher of water or spinning wool for the veil of the temple (as in the mosaic, already referred to, in S. Maria Maggiore in Rome). Pictures of the Nativity betray the influence of the apocryphal stories; they show the mother and child and Joseph in a cave, where, according to the *Protevangelium*, Jesus was born; a dazzling light radiates from the face of the child; an ox and an ass (first mentioned in *pseudo-Matthew*) bow in adoration before Him—a frequent representation in early reliefs (von Lehner, *op. cit.* 314 ff.)—or in later pictures are introduced as mere picturesque details. An incident in the Flight to Egypt, the bending down of a palm-tree to yield its fruit to Mary, affords a subject for many beautiful works (*e.g.* by Pinturicchio, William Blake). The Assumption of Mary was frequently represented in paintings from the 10th cent, onward (*e.g.* Titian's in the Academy, Venice; Botticelli's in the National Gallery), while the consummation of her life is depicted in her coronation as Queen of Heaven (among others by Raphael, Fra Angelico, and Taddeo Gaddi). The second part of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*—The Descent into Hell—gives a subject to Fra Angelico (San

Marco, Venice) and to Durer (in his series of woodcuts composing 'The Little Passion').

The narratives in the Koran about Jesus, who is regarded as a forerunner of Mohammed, are drawn largely from apocryphal sources, either directly from the so-called *Arabic Gospel of the Infancy*, or indirectly from the popular tales which had an apocryphal origin. An account is given, for instance, of Mary's nativity,—in the Koran her parents are named Imran and Hanna,—of her dedication to the Temple, of the miraculous choice of Joseph to be her protector, etc. Jesus is represented as working miracles in His childhood; His making of birds out of clay (*Gospel of Thomas*) is mentioned. The Koran represents strongly Docetic views in its denial that Jesus died upon the Cross. In Sura 4. 156 the Jews are reported as saying: 'We have killed the Messiah, Jesus, the Son of Mary, the Messenger of God'; to which the answer is immediately given: 'Yet they did not kill and crucify Him, but a phantasm appeared to them.... In truth they did not kill Him, but God raised Him to Himself; for God is strong and wise.' Other legends about Jesus, not mentioned in the Koran, were collected by Moslem commentators, notably by Kessaeus. See art. Christ in Mohammedan Literature in Appendix to vol. ii.

vii. Classification.—The classification here adopted follows that given by Harnack (*Gesch. d. altchr. Litt.* i. 4 f.) and by Tasker (*Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible*, Extra Vol. 422 f.).

- A. Gospels of the Synoptic type, with some title to be regarded as embodying an early tradition.
 - 1. Gospel according to the Hebrews.
 - 2. Gospel according to the Egyptians
 - 3. Gospel of Peter.
 - 4. Fayûm Gospel Fragment.
 - 5. Oxyrhyncus Gospel Fragment.
- B. Heretical and Gnostic Gospels, written to establish peculiar conceptions of the person and life of Jesus.
 - 1. Gospel of Marcion.
 - 2. Gospel of the Twelve Apostles.

3. Gospel of Thomas.

4. Gospel of Philip.

C. Supplemental Gospels, written to throw light on the dark parts of Christ's history.

(a) Gospels of the Childhood, together with those dealing with the parents of Jesus.

1. Protevangelium of James with the recensions—

(1) Gospel of pseudo-Matthew.

(2) Gospel of the Nativity of Mary.

2. Childhood Gospel of Thomas.

3. Arabic Gospel of the Childhood.

4. History of Joseph the Carpenter.

5. The Departure of Mary.

(b) Gospels dealing with the Passion and the post-Resurrection life of Jesus.

1. Gospel of Nicodemus.

2. Legend of Abgar.

D. Gospel Harmonies, in which several Gospels are worked together into one.

Gospel of Tatian (*Diatessaron*).

A. Gospels of the Synoptic Type, with Some Title to Be Regarded as Embodying an Early Tradition

A. 1. **Gospel according to the Hebrews.**—The earliest mention of this Gospel occurs in the Ὑπομνήματα of Hegesippus about the year 180 (Euseb. *Historia Ecclesiastica* iv. 22. 8). The name 'according to the Hebrews' is not original; in the circles in which the Gospel was current, it apparently had no distinctive name, that which it now bears having been given to it by outsiders, to indicate that it was the Gospel in use

among Hebrew Christians, the descendants of the original Church in Judaea. There is some probability in the view, which is strongly advocated by Harnack (*Chron.* i. 637 f.), that the Gospel was in use in the Jewish-Christian community in Alexandria, and that the title was given to it to distinguish it from the Gospel used by the native Christian community, the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*. The language in which the Gospel was written (as we learn from Jerome, *contra Pelag.* iii. 2) was West Aramaic, the language of Christ and His Apostles,—a circumstance which betrays its influence on the narrative in the fact that the Holy Spirit is represented as female ('My Mother the Holy Spirit,' the Aramaic *ruha* being feminine). The Gospel was translated into Latin and Greek by Jerome, who had a very high opinion of it, and was inclined to regard it as the original Matthew; but it is more than probable that it had already circulated in a Greek version in different parts of the Church, and found considerable recognition. It was wrongly identified by Jerome with the Ebionitic Gospel—the *Gospel of the Twelve Apostles*, also attributed to Matthew—which was written originally in Greek, and was in use among the Gnostic Ebionites.

As the fragments which have been preserved to us show, the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* was of the Synoptic type. Whether it contained a story of the Nativity is uncertain, but (considering the Jewish-Christian standpoint of the book) highly improbable. Included, however, were the Baptism, the Temptation, the Lord's Prayer, the Healing of the man with the withered hand, the *pericope adulterae* (or something similar), the injunction to forgive unto seventy times seven, the conversation with the Rich Young Ruler, the entrance into Jerusalem, the parable of the Pounds, the Trial, the denial of Peter, appearances after the Resurrection, and sayings of Jesus not elsewhere recorded. As a rule, the fragments show a somewhat closer resemblance to Mt. than to the other Synoptics, but there are also details which have their nearer parallels in Luke.

The divergences from the Synoptics are in several cases remarkable in character, and point, in the opinion of many scholars, to an earlier and more reliable tradition. In the narrative of the Baptism, Jesus, in answer to the proposal of His mother and brethren that they should go and be baptized by John for the remission of sins, says: '*In what have I sinned, that I should go and be baptized by him? Unless perhaps this which I have said be ignorance,*'—an utterance which is generally interpreted as meaning that Jesus, though conscious of no sin, was humble enough not to make the claim of sinlessness. (This passage, regarded by some as primitive and authentic, is better understood as the product of reflexion at a time when Christ's baptism was felt to be a problem requiring solution. In the earliest days the presence of the problem was not felt. The writer of the Gospel, who holds to the sinlessness of Jesus, solves the difficulty by pointing to His deep humility).

After the Baptism, the descent of the Spirit is described with greater fulness than in the Synoptics; the dove is awaiting, but the voice from heaven is put into the form of an utterance by the Spirit: *'It came to pass, when the Lord was come up out of the water, that the whole fountain of the Holy Spirit came down and rested on Him and said unto Him, My Son, in all the prophets I awaited Thy coming, that I might rest on Thee. For Thou art my rest; Thou art my firstborn Son, who reignest for ever.'*

A passage, which probably belongs to the narrative of the Temptation, reads: *'The Lord said, Just now My mother, the Holy Spirit, seized Me by one of My hairs and bore Me away to the high mountain Tabor,'*—a fantastic description on the model of [Eze 8:3](#) and [Bel and the Dragon 36](#).

In the Lord's Prayer the fourth petition runs: *'Give us to-day our bread for to-morrow.'* In the Aramaic *mahar* ('to-morrow') we may have the word used by Jesus Himself; in which case $\epsilon\tau\iota\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$, translated 'daily' in [Mat 6:11](#), [Luk 11:3](#), would be an adjectival form derived from $\eta\ \epsilon\tau\iota\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha$ (the following day). On the other hand, there are scholars who believe that the converse is the case, and that *mahar* is an attempt to give the meaning of $\epsilon\tau\iota\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (Meyer in Henn. 18, *Handb.* 28 f.). The former alternative is the more probable.

The narrative of the healing on the Sabbath of the man with a withered hand represents the man as appealing to Jesus on the ground that he was a mason who earned his bread by working with his hands,—a detail which may well be authentic.

In the longest fragment of the Gospel we have a version of Christ's interview with the Rich Young Ruler, which shows notable differences from the Synoptic account. Where the Synoptists speak of the rich man's sorrow because of his inability to accept Christ's terms, the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, in vivid and homely language, represents him as showing astonishment and a touch of resentment: *'(He) began to scratch his head, and it did not please him.'* Whereupon Jesus rebuked him for claiming to have fulfilled the law, when he had neglected offices of mercy and brotherly kindness: *'How sayest thou, I have done the law and the prophets? Since it is written in the law, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself; and behold, many of thy brethren, the sons of Abraham, are covered with filth and are dying with hunger, while thy house is full of many good things, and nothing at all goes out of it to them.'* If this account is to be taken as genuine, it is clear that our estimate of the Rich Young Ruler's character, based on the Synoptic tradition, will have to be considerably revised. It is, however, more probable that in this passage we have a mistaken combination of the story of the Rich Young Ruler with the parable of Dives and Lazarus related by Luke.

After the Resurrection, Jesus is represented as appearing *first* to James, to release him from a vow which he had taken at the Last Supper: '*James had sworn that he would not eat bread from that hour, when he had drunk the Lord's cup, until He should see Him risen from those that are asleep.*' This is an obviously later form of the tradition of Christ's appearing to James, due most likely to the desire of Jewish Christians to exalt their head above the Apostles of Christ. It should be noted that James is here portrayed as one of Christ's followers who partook of the Last Supper,—an unhistorical detail. There is probably a confusion between James the Just and James the brother of John, an inference borne out by the reference to drinking the lord's cup (cf. Mat 20:22).

Into the difficult question of the relation of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* to the Synoptics, it is impossible in this article to enter with any fulness. That it is closely allied to them, especially to Mt., is clear from the character of the fragments. Three different solutions of the problem have been suggested, all of them supported by competent authorities. (1) *Hebrews* is held to be the original Aramaic Matthew (Hilgenfeld), or an elaboration of it (Zahn), and as such, the groundwork of our canonical Matthew. This view is now almost universally rejected. (2) *Hebrews* is held to be independent of the Synoptics, the affinity being explained by a common reliance on oral tradition. This view, which is the one at present most widely held, is strongly supported by Harnack, who goes so far as to express the hope (*Chron.* i. 645) that, after Zahn's penetrating discussion of the question, no one will have the hardihood to repeat the statement that the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* is based on one or more canonical Gospels. That hope has not been realized. For (3) the view has recently been confidently advocated by Wernle (*Synop. Frage*, 248 ff.) that *Hebrews* is dependent on all the Synoptics, making use of Matthew, and in some cases combining the accounts of Matthew and Luke. Meyer (in Henn. 18) supports this view, and strongly emphasizes the secondary character of the Gospel. In this judgment the present writer is disposed to concur. It appears to him that all the facts of the case are satisfactorily explained, if we hold that the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* was written by one who used canonical Matthew (and Luke), and built up his Gospel on the basis of a separate tradition, under the influence of his own doctrinal prepossessions.

But even should the view of the Gospel's independence be accepted, this does not necessarily imply that in it we are face to face with an earlier, or an equally early, stage of the primitive tradition. The realistic presentation, the fondness for little details, the quaint and, in some particulars, undignified language, which are characteristic of the Gospel, may possibly be indications that in some narratives we have the tradition in its original form; on the other hand, these features may with as much probability be due to later manipulation by popular evangelists. Details, such as Christ's words before His baptism, which are by some regarded as primitive on the ground that they are of such a character that they could not have been added later,

are believed by others (in our opinion more justly), to be products of an age of reflexion. Traces of a later age than that of the Synoptics are found in the Resurrection fragment: there is the unhistorical detail in reference to the appearing of Christ to James, and the later apologetic interest is shown in securing witness for the resurrection from the enemies of Christ. (After rising from the dead, Jesus handed the linen cloth to the servant of the high priest). The judgment is warranted that, while the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* probably retains in some points the freshness of the original tradition, it contains many elements that are secondary, and that, as a whole, it represents not an earlier, but a somewhat later stage of the Gospel tradition than the Synoptics. A date towards the end of the 1st cent. is probable.

On the view here taken of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, the value of its fragments as a source of the life of Jesus is inconsiderable. It cannot justly lay claim to be an authority, as Oscar Holtzmann regards it, on the same level as the Synoptics. Some sayings, however, ascribed to Christ and not elsewhere recorded, have a genuine ring, giving us, if not the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, at least true echoes of His voice. Christ is represented as saying to His disciples: '*Never be glad, except when ye look upon your brother in love,*'—a singularly beautiful precept condemning *Schadenfreude*, the disposition to rejoice in another's misfortune. The Gospel also reported a saying in which it was reckoned among the greatest offences that one should sadden the spirit of one's brother. Another striking saying, quoted from this Gospel by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* ii. 9. 45) and accepted by many as substantially a genuine utterance of Jesus, runs as follows: '*He that wonders shall reach the kingdom, and having reached the kingdom shall rest.*' In another passage (*Strom.* v. 14. 96) Clement records the saying in a longer form, which agrees almost verbally with one of the Oxyrhynchus sayings: 'He who seeks shall not cease until he finds; and when he finds, he shall be astonished, and being astonished he shall reach the kingdom, and having reached the kingdom he shall rest.'

The ethical teaching of the Gospel, from all that we can gather, was in sympathy with the mind of Christ, stress being laid on brotherly love and forgiveness. Doctrinally, the Gospel occupies the position of the old Jewish Church. It exhibits Jesus as 'the Messiah sent from God, not as the Son of God conceived of the Holy Ghost in a special sense, but as the long expected Messiah of David's race, in whom prophecy finds its fulfilment' (Handmann, *TU* [Note: U Texte und Untersuchungen.] v. 3, p. 125).

Literature.—Hilgenfeld, *NT extra can. receptum*, iv. p. 5 ff.; Nicholson, *Gospel according to the Hebrews*; Handmann, 'Das Hebraer-evangelium' (*TU* [Note: U Texte und Untersuchungen.] v. 3); Zahn, *Gesch. d. NT Kanons*, ii. 642 ff.; Harnack, *Gesch. d. altchr. Litt.* i. 6 ff., *Chronologie*, i. 631 ff.; Hennecke, *NT Apokr.* 11 ff., *Handb.* 21

ff.; Menzies in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , Ext. Vol. 338 ff.; Adeney in *Hibbert Journal*, Oct. 1904.

A. 2. Gospel according to the Egyptians.—This Gospel, whose ancient date may be inferred from the fact that, like the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, it bears no author's name, was current in native Christian circles in Egypt. Our information regarding it is very slight: it is mentioned by Origen in his discussion of the prologue in Luke's Gospel, and characterized by him, apparently on the ground of his own knowledge of it, as a heretical writing ('*Ecclesia quattuor evangelia habet, haereses plurima, e quibus quoddam scribitur "secundum aegyptios"*'—translation by Jerome). All that can with certainty be said to remain of the Gospel is a small group of sayings, recorded by Clement of Alexandria in treating of the attitude of different Christian communities to marriage. References to the Gospel are also found in Hippolytus (*Philos.* v. 7), who states that it was used by the sect of the Naassenes to support their peculiar views about the nature of the soul, and in Epiphanius (*Hæc.* 62. 2), who mentions its use by the Sabellians.

The fragments which remain are part of a conversation between Jesus and Salome, and are all of the same character, dealing with the transient (if not sinful) nature of the sex relations. They read as follows:

1. 'Salome asked, "*How long shall death reign?*" The Lord answered, "*So long as ye women give birth.*" When Salome had said, "*Then should I have done well, if I had not given birth?*" the Lord answered, "*Eat every plant, but that which is bitter, cat not*" ' (Clem. Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] *Strom.* iii. 6. 45).

2. 'When Salome inquired when those things [the coming of the Kingdom] should be, the Lord said, "*When ye trample on the garment of shame, and when the two become one, and the male with the female, neither male nor female*" ' (Clem. Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] *Strom.* iii. 13. 92).

3. 'The Saviour said, "*I came to destroy the works of the female*" ' (Clem. Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] *Strom.* iii. 9. 63).

The Encratite tendency of these sayings is recognized by the majority of scholars, but is energetically denied by Zahn, who, however, rejects No. 3 as not having stood in the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*. If the third saying be put aside, it is certainly arguable that the first two do not go much farther in an ascetic direction than Mat 22:30 ('In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels in heaven'). This view finds some support in the fragment of a Gospel discovered at Oxyrhyncus in 1903 (Grenfell and Hunt, *New Sayings*, 44). That Cassian,

the Gnostic leader of the Encratites, from whom Clement quoted the sayings, used them to support his ascetic condemnation of marriage, is not decisive. It is noteworthy that Clement rejected Cassian's interpretation, and understood the sayings in a mystical sense. If, however, the Encratite sense of the words be maintained, Harnack is certainly justified by Clement's attitude in concluding that 'Encratism cannot have been the aim of the Gospel, in fact cannot have been stamped upon it as its characteristic feature, but that probably only this one passage occurred in it which could be adduced in favour of the extreme ascetic practice' (*Chron.* i. 616). That the Gospel contained much else that was entirely free from suspicion of heresy is probable; and this natural inference becomes a certainty, if we accept the widely received opinion, that the *Gospel according to the Egyptians* was used as a principal authority by the writer of the so-called Second Epistle of Clement of Rome (c. 170). In this writing, besides a passage closely reminiscent of the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*,* [Note: 'The Lord Himself having been asked by some one, When will the kingdom come? said, When the two shall be one, and the outside as the inside, and the male with the female, neither male nor female' (2 Clem. xii. 2).] there are several, containing sayings of Jesus, of which some show verbal agreement with the Synoptics, while others, with considerable divergences, are similar in character. On the assumption, which is possible though incapable of proof, that 2nd Clement drew the sayings of Jesus recorded by him from one main source, and this was the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*, Harnack based the conclusion that the Gospel 'contained nothing heretical, else the Roman Church about 170 would certainly not have read it'; and, further, that it was an independent Gospel, having affinities with Matthew and Luke, and containing in some instances sayings in a form even more original than they (*Chron.* i. 619 f.). One must confess that so extremely favourable a judgment, reared on a somewhat uncertain basis, does not inspire entire confidence when over against it one places Origen's view of the Gospel as heretical and its use by the Naassenes and Sabellians. While it may be allowed that there were probably passages in the Gospel which ranked it with the Synoptics, it seems clear that it showed affinities with the speculative teaching of Gnostic schools. It contained references to ' manifold changes ' of the soul which were relied on by the Naassene sect in building up their system of thought; and Epiphanius in refuting the heresy of the Sabellians, who made use of the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*, declared that 'there were in it many things put into the mouth of the Saviour, and said as in a corner mystically, such as His declaration to the disciples that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit were one and the same' (*Hæer.* 62. 2).

With so little to rest a confident judgment on, it is extremely difficult to characterize this Gospel, but it may be near the truth to say that it was a Gospel of the Synoptic type with a slight Gnostic colouring.* [Note: Von Dohschütz (*Die urchr. Gemeinden*, 190) finds in the Gospel a trace of the Gnostic idea of the subversion of all ordinary

standards of value, from which 'it is only a short step to the perversion of all ethical conceptions.' This view is justly opposed by Zahn (NT Kan. ii. 640).]

The disposition to refer to this Gospel isolated fragments and utterances of Jesus, such as the *Fayûm Fragment* and the *Oxyrhyncus Sayings*, is extremely hazardous. All that can with certainty be said is that some of the recently discovered sayings 'belong to the same sphere of thought' as the Gospel. Further than that it is impossible to go (see Grenfell and Hunt, *New Sayings*, 27 ff.).

The date of the Gospel is about the middle of the 2nd cent., probably between 130 and 150.

Literature.—Hilgenfeld, *NT extra can.* iv. 42 ff.; Harnack, *Gesch. d. altchr. Litt.* i. 12 ff., *Chron.* i. 612 ff.; Zahn, *NT Kan.* ii. 628 ff.; Volter, *Petrusevangelium oder Aegypterevangelium*, 1893; Schneckenburger, *Ueber das Evangelium der Aegyptcr*, 1834; Hennecke, *NT Apokr.* 21 ff., *Handb.* 38 ff.; Tasker, *l.c.* 423 ff.

A. 3. Gospel of Peter.—In his enumeration of Petrine writings, Eusebius mentions (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 3) a Gospel which, along with the *Acts*, *Preaching* and *Apocalypse of Peter*, he declares to be spurious, and not considered authoritative by any ecclesiastical writer. Until fourteen years ago, our knowledge of the contents of the Gospel was of the scantiest description, being based on a slight reference by Origen, on a letter by Serapion, bishop of Antioch (end of 2nd cent.), and on a passage in Theodoret, now generally discredited, which states that the Nazarenes, who honoured Christ as a just man, used the *Gospel according to Peter* (*Haer. Fabb.* ii. 2). Origen's reference (*Com. in Matt.* [Note: Matthew's (i.e. prob. Rogers') Bible 1537.] bk. x. 17) tells us nothing more than that those who believed the brethren of Jesus to be the sons of Joseph by a former wife relied on the *Gospel of Peter* and the *Book of James*; from which we infer that the Gospel contained the narrative of the Virgin-birth. From Serapion's letter (part of it preserved in Euseb. *Historia Ecclesiastica* vi. 12), which was written to the Church in Rhossus in the diocese of Antioch, we gather the following facts about the Gospel. When on a visit to Rhossus, Serapion had the Gospel brought under his notice, as being the occasion of some ill-feeling in the Church. Not suspecting any heretical leanings on the part of those who were favourable to the Gospel, the bishop, without any careful examination of its contents, sought to establish peace by authorizing it to be read. Having learned afterwards that the Gospel had originated among the Docetae, he procured a copy from some members of that party, and found that, while it contained much true teaching, there were additions of a questionable character, to which he proceeded to call attention. Until recently this was all that was known of the *Gospel of Peter*; not a single fragment had been handed down; one could only gather that it was a Gospel with a slight Docetic colouring, but for the most part entirely orthodox.

Of this long lost Gospel we have now a fragment of considerable length dealing with the Passion and Resurrection of Christ. The fragment was found in the winter of 1886-1887 at Akhmîm, in Upper Egypt, by the French Archaeological Mission, and was published by M. Bouriant in 1892. The narrative claims to be the personal witness of the Apostle Peter, and reveals the Docetic tendency referred to by Serapion. The fragment begins at the end of the judgment-scene, after Pilate had washed his hands, and ends in the middle of a sentence, which introduces the narrative describing the appearance of Christ to His disciples at the Sea of Galilee. The nature of the contents can here only be indicated.

Herod is regarded as the real judge of Christ; throughout, there is the evident intention to exculpate Pilate, who washed his hands, while Herod refused. It is Herod who gives the order for the crucifixion, and his permission is required for the disposal of the body of Jesus. When Jesus was handed over to the people, it is stated that *'they clothed Him with purple and set Him on the seat of judgment, saying, Judge righteously, O King of Israel.'** [Note: Justin Martyr (Apol. i. 35) has a similar statement. 'They mocked Him and set Him on the judgment-seat, and said, Judge for us.' The corresponding passage in St. John's Gospel (19:13) reads: 'When Pilate, therefore, heard these words, he brought Jesus out and sat upon the judgment-seat' (και ἐκάθισεν ἐπὶ βήματος). It is, however, legitimate to translate ἐκάθισεν in the transitive sense, so that the verse would run: 'He brought Jesus out and set Him on the judgment-seat.' The passage in St. John, understood in this sense, is probably the source from which the statements in Justin and the Gospel of Peter are derived.] On the cross we learn that Jesus *'held His peace, as in no wise having pain.'* One of the malefactors reproached the Jews standing round the cross (not his fellow-sufferer, as in Luk 23:40), and *'they, being angered with him, commanded that his legs should not be broken, that he might die in torment.'* After referring to the darkness which came over the land, the narrative runs: *'And the Lord cried out, saying, My power, My power, thou hast forsaken Me. And when He had said this, He was taken up.'* After the death of Christ the Jews began to feel compunction for what they had done; they *'began to lament and to say, Woe for our sins; the judgment and the end of Jerusalem are nigh.... All the people murmured and beat their breasts, saying, If by His death those most mighty signs have happened, behold, how righteous He is.'* The Jewish authorities, having received soldiers from Pilate to guard the tomb *'for three days,'* themselves took part in the watch. The Resurrection is described with many miraculous details; there is a voice from heaven; two men, encircled by a great light, descend and enter the tomb, from which the stone rolls away of itself. Then the watchers *'see three men coming out of the tomb, the two supporting the one, and a cross following them; and the heads of the two reached as far as heaven, but that of Him that was led overtopped the heavens. And they heard a voice from heaven saying, Hast thou preached to them that sleep? And a response was heard from the*

cross, Yea.' When Pilate was informed of all that had happened, he said, '*I am pure from the blood of the Son of God.*' He was entreated by the Jewish authorities to command the centurion and the soldiers to tell nothing of what they had seen, '*for it is better (say they) for us to be guilty of the greatest sin before God than to fall into the hands of the people of the Jews and be stoned.*' The rest of the fragment deals with the visit of Mary Magdalene and other women to the sepulchre, and with the grief of the disciples. The fragment closes as follows: '*But we, the twelve disciples of the Lord, wept and were grieved; and each one, being grieved for that which was come to pass, departed to his home. But I, Simon Peter, and Andrew my brother, took our nets and went to the sea; and there was with us Levi, the son of Alphaeus, whom the Lord ...*'

The writer's peculiar point of view is clear from the quotations which have been given. (1) The most noticeable feature of the Gospel is its pronounced apologetic interest, shown in its friendliness to Pilate and its antipathy to the Jews. Pilate is freed from all blame in the death of Christ, Herod being the responsible judge; Joseph, who cared for the body of Jesus, is 'the friend of Pilate.' Pilate, too, is represented as acknowledging the Divine dignity of Jesus. On the other hand, the Jews acknowledge their sin in putting Jesus to death, and confess Him to have been a just man. The writer's fierce hatred of the Jews is betrayed in the utterance ascribed to the Jewish authorities, that they would rather be guilty of the greatest sin than fall into the hands of men. (2) The Docetic sympathies of the writer, which are somewhat guarded, are revealed in the statement that Jesus kept silence on the cross, '*as in no wise feeling pain*'; in the cry of dereliction, which points to a distinction between the impassible Divine Power residing in Jesus and His passible human nature; in the representation of Christ's death as a being taken up. That the Docetism was not of an extreme type is shown by the fact that the dead Christ is referred to as 'the Lord.' Gnostic influences are discernible in the speaking of the cross, and in the supernatural height of Jesus and the angels.

The Gospel is of the Synoptic type. It has close linguistic and material relations with the Synoptics, although there are many deviations in order and detail. There is a considerable probability that the author knew and made use of *all* our canonical Gospels, which he treated with great freedom, embellishing the narrative in the interest of his own point of view, and making additions of a legendary and highly miraculous character. That he had an independent tradition at his command is possible, and even probable (? ancient *Acts of Pilate*); but whether that be so or not, his Gospel adds nothing to our knowledge of the life of Christ. 'It appears to be a fair example of what may be called the second generation of non-canonical narratives, which are based upon the earlier and authentic records, and do not yet depart very widely from them, though they may have special tendencies in various doctrinal directions' (Kenyon, *Gospels in the Early Church*, 34).

The date of the Gospel is about the middle of the 2nd cent., although some critics put it considerably earlier. Its place of origin was almost certainly Syria.

Literature.—Bouriant, *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la mission archéologique française an Caire*, ix. i. 137 ff.; Harnack, *TU* [Note: U Texte und Untersuehungen.] ix. 2; Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Petrus*; von Schubert, *Die Komposition des pseudopetr. Evangeliumfragment*, (translation by Macpherson); Lods, *L'évangile et l'apocalypse de Pierre*; Robinson and James, *Gospel and Revelation of Peter*; Swete, *Gospel of St. Peter*; also editions by Rendel Harris, the author of *Supernatural Religion*, Rutherford (extra volume of Ante Nicene Library); Stülcken in Hennecke, *NT Apokr.* 27 ff. *Handb.* 72 ff.; and numerous magazine articles.

A. 4. **Fayûm Gospel Fragment.**—A number of papyri were, in the year 1882, brought from Fayûm, a province in Central Egypt, to Vienna, by the Archduke Rainer. Among these, Dr. Bickell of Innsbrück discovered a small Gospel fragment, dealing with the incident in which Jesus foretold the denial of Peter. The fragment, which is badly mutilated, was published in 1885 by Bickell, who confidently maintained that it was a part of a very ancient lost Gospel, of the class referred to in Luk 1:1. The contents of the fragment closely resemble the Synoptic narrative (Mar 14:27; Mar 14:29-30, Mat 26:31; Mat 26:33-34), with the omission of the verse containing Christ's promise to go before His disciples into Galilee after rising from the dead. Owing to the condition of the papyrus, the text, especially at the beginning of the fragment, is very uncertain; but, according to the reconstruction of Zahn (*NT Kan.* ii. 785), the translation is as follows:

'[When then had sung a hymn, after] supper, according to their custom, He said again. This night ye shall be offended, according to the Scripture, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered. But when Peter said, Even if all (shall be offended), I will not, He said, To-day before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny Me thrice.'

The nature of the document to which the fragment originally belonged is altogether uncertain. Bickell's opinion, that it is a part of a Gospel of high antiquity, has received the support of Harnack, who inclines to regard it as an excerpt from either the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* or the *Gospel according to the Egyptians* (*TU* [Note: U Texte und Untersuehungen.] v. 4. 493 ff., *Chron.* i. 590). On the other hand, Zahn believes it to be an extract from a Patristic writing, a free quotation from Mark made by a preacher or by the writer of a book for edification. This would satisfactorily account for the omission of Mar 14:28, (Mat 26:32). That the fragment probably belonged to a writing of this kind is further borne out by two striking deviations from the Synoptic phraseology. Instead of ἀλέκτωρ (cock) the fragment has

the more classical ἀλεκτριών; instead of the colourless φωνεῖν (crow) it has the more descriptive word κοκκῶζειν. 'The probability is that the canonical expression is the original, which a preacher replaced in the one case by a more elegant word, in the other by one more significant' (Zahn, *NT Kan.* ii. 788). Hennecke (*NT Apokr.* 9) thinks it possible that the fragment may have been a part of a collection of sayings, but subscribes to Krüger's judgment, that 'the possibility is not excluded that the fragment merely represents an extract from one of our Gospels, or belonged to a Gospel harmony, perhaps even is drawn from a homily, and that one is not justified in drawing far-reaching conclusions from it.'

Literature.—Bickell in *Zeitschrift für Kathol. Theologie*, 1885, iii. 498 ff.; Harnack, Zahn, Hennecke (in *opp. cit.*).

A. 5. Oxyrhyncus Gospel Fragment.—In the year 1903 Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt discovered at Behnesa, the ancient Oxyrhyncus, in Central Egypt, a small portion of a Gospel containing the conclusion of a discourse by Jesus similar to a part of the Sermon on the Mount. This they published, along with a second collection of 'Sayings,' in the following year. The papyrus is in a very broken state, only a small part of that which it originally contained being decipherable. From the handwriting the discoverers adjudge the fragment to have been written not later than a.d. 250, although the original composition was much earlier.

The translation of the fragment, slightly altered from that given by Grenfell and Hunt (*New Sayings*, 40), is as follows:

'[Take no thought] from morning until even, nor from evening until morning, either for your food what ye shall eat or for your raiment what ye shall put on. Ye are far better than the lilies which grow but spin not. Having one garment, what do ye [lack?] ... Who could add to your stature? He Himself will give you your garment. His disciples say unto Him, When wilt Thou be manifest to us, and when shall we see Thee? He saith, When ye shall be stripped and not be ashamed.... He said, The key of knowledge they hid: they entered not in themselves, and to them that were entering in they opened not; but ye, be ye wise as serpents and harmless as doves.'

The sayings here given are, for the most part, parallel to passages found in Matthew and Luke, in a form generally somewhat shorter than the canonical version. Christ's answer to the question of the disciples as to when He should manifest Himself, 'When ye shall be stripped and not be ashamed ...,' recalls the saying reported in the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*: 'When ye trample upon the garment of shame,' etc., and suggests the conclusion that the fragment stood in intimate relation with that Gospel. The simpler form of the saying in the fragment, and the more direct allusion to

Gen 3:7, point to an earlier date than that of the version in the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*. Though it is possible that the fragment represents a tradition independent of the Synoptics, it is more probable that the Gospel to which it belonged worked up the material found in Matthew and Luke into new combinations, and added matter drawn from other sources.

The date of the Gospel was probably somewhat earlier than the middle of the 2nd century.

B. Heretical and Gnostic Gospels.—Only a few of the more important Gnostic Gospels are referred to in this article. Many are known to us by name merely, or by some indication of the circles in which they were current. Although the Gnostics repudiated the canonical Apostolic writings, they sought in many instances to secure authority for their Gospels by attributing them to Apostles or to others well known in Apostolic times. Besides those mentioned below, there were *Gospels of Matthias*, of *Bartholomew*, of *Andrew*, of *Barnabas*; and even the name of *Judas Iscariot* was associated with the authorship of the Gospel. Gnostic Gospels sometimes bore the name of the founder of the school (Valentinus, Basilides, Cerinthus), but in these cases the writer of the Gospel claimed to have received his information from some Apostle or follower of an Apostle. OT names were also attached to some Gospels; Epiphanius (*Hæc.* 26. 2) refers to a *Gospel of Eve*. For whatever knowledge we have of these Gospels, readers are referred to Hofmann's article (*PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyclopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , i. 661 ff.) or to Tasker's article (*l.c.* 437 f.).

B. 1. Gospel of Marcion.—Shortly before the middle of the 2nd cent., Marcion, a native of Pontus, settled in Rome, where he devoted himself to the work of purifying the Church from all Jewish influences. The underlying principle of his system was the conception of the absolute antagonism between the God of the OT and the God of the NT. Only in Christ was the true God made known. He, accordingly, rejected the OT, and prepared for the Churches which he founded a canon of NT writings, divided into 'the Gospel' and 'the Apostle.' The original Apostles, he maintained, had misunderstood the teaching of Christ; only Paul had grasped the true significance of the gospel. Into his canon he admitted ten Epistles of Paul, largely expurgated, and one Gospel, which he claimed to be the Pauline Gospel (τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου, Rom 2:16). This Gospel, according to the testimony of early Church writers, was the Gospel of Luke, from which great omissions had been made to free it from all Jewish colouring. All citations from the OT were cut out, and everything else which looked with favour on the Jews. From the quotations given by Tertullian, Epiphanius, and others, it is possible to reconstruct Marcion's Gospel. The whole of the Infancy narrative, the Baptism, and the Temptation were omitted, nothing of the first three

chapters in Luke being retained but the chronological notice in 3:1. The history of Jesus commences with 4:14, and from that point to the end of the Gospel larger or smaller portions are excised, amounting in all to over 120 verses. Among the passages excluded are the parables of the Prodigal Son and of the wicked Husbandmen. In all, including the omissions of the first three chapters and part of the fourth, we find that Marcion's Gospel was shorter than Luke's by fully 300 verses.

Against all Patristic testimony some critics (Semler and Eichhorn in the 18th cent., Baur, Ritschl, and Schwegler in the 19th) maintained the priority of Marcion's Gospel to that of Luke. The traditional view was, however, so completely vindicated by Hilgenfeld and Volkmar, that Ritschl retracted. In our own country, somewhat later, the battle was refought, with the same result. The author of *Supernatural Religion* revived the theory of Marcion's originality, and called forth a reply by Dr. Sanday (*Gospels in the Second Century*, ch. viii.), in which he conclusively proved, to the satisfaction of his opponent, that Luke's Gospel was from *one* hand, the same characteristics of style being evident in Marcion's Gospel and in the sections of Luke not found in it.

Where the text of Marcion differs from Luke, there is evidence in some cases to show that the variance is due, not to any arbitrary change made by Marcion in the interest of his peculiar views, but to the copy of the Third Gospel which lay before him. The readings of Marcion thus deserve consideration in the study of Textual Criticism.

Literature.—Zahn, *NT Kan.* i. 674 ff., ii. 409 ff.; Sanday, *Gospels in the Second Century*, ch. viii., art. 'Luke, Gospel of' (Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. 168 f.); Salmon, *Introd. to NT*, 186 ff.; Westcott, *Canon of NT*, 314 ff.

B. 2. Gospel of the Twelve Apostles.—Among the heretical attempts to write the history of Jesus, Origen in his *Homily on Luk_1:1* ff. mentions 'the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles' (τὸ ἐπιγεγραμμένον τῶν δώδεκα εὐαγγέλιον). That this Gospel is the same as one which Epiphanius (*Hær.* 30. 3) describes as 'The Gospel according to Matthew' in use among the Gnostic Ebionites, is clear from the fact that in the opening passage quoted by Epiphanius we have the call of the twelve Apostles, of whom Matthew is specially addressed ('and thee, Matthew, I called, while thou wast sitting at the seat of custom'). Epiphanius further states that the Ebionites called their Gospel 'The Gospel according to the Hebrews,' a reference which may rest on a confusion on the part of Epiphanius (as Harnack thinks), but more probably is quite accurate. Nothing seems more likely than that the Gnostic Jewish-Christian sect, acquainted with the tradition that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, should have claimed that their Gospel was the genuine Gospel of Matthew, and, accordingly, the true Hebrew Gospel (Hennecke, *NT Apokr.* 24). If this be so, we have an explanation

of the error into which Jerome fell when he identified the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* with the *Gospel 'according to the Apostles'* in use among the Nazarenes (*circa (about) Pelag. iii. 2*). That these two Gospels were entirely different is apparent from the widely divergent accounts of the Baptism,—the one incident, common to both, described in their extant fragments.

All that remains of the Gospel of the Ebionites is found in Epiphanius (*Hæc. 30, 13, 14, 16, 22*). The Gospel opens with the ministry of the Baptist: *'It came to pass in the days of Herod, the king of Judaea, that John came baptizing with the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan.'* Then somewhat abruptly, after the manner of the Fourth Gospel, Jesus is introduced in the midst of the narrative dealing with the Baptist. *'There was a certain man named Jesus (and He was about thirty years old), who chose us.'* An account of the calling of the Apostles follows, special emphasis being laid on the call of Matthew. Then the broken thread of the narrative is again taken up. *'And John was baptizing, and Pharisees came out to him and were baptized, and all Jerusalem.... His food was wild honey, the taste of which was the taste of manna, like a honey-cake in oil.'* In the narrative of Christ's baptism which follows, *three* voices come from heaven; the first, *'Thou art My beloved Son, in Thee I am well pleased,'* being repeated for the benefit of the Baptist, *'This is My beloved Son,'* etc.; the second is addressed to Christ, *'I have this day begotten Thee.'* Another fragment describes the incident recorded in Mat 12:47-50 in words which vary only very slightly from the canonical version. Characteristic of the teaching of the Gospel are the two remaining fragments: *'I am come to destroy sacrifices, and except ye cease from sacrificing, wrath will not cease from you';* and *'Surely I have in no wise desired to eat flesh at this passover with you.'*

The tendency of the Gospel is characteristically Ebionitic. All that is reported of Jesus is in harmony with the views of the Gnostic Ebionites (Elkesaites), who combined the old Jewish-Christian belief in Jesus as a mere man, anointed to be Messiah through the descent of the Spirit at baptism, with the doctrine of a heavenly Christ, 'who wanders over the common earth among men, like a strange guest from heaven, in order that He may lead into His eternal kingdom all that is spiritual and pure in this impure material world' (Hennecke, 25). The matter-of-fact way in which Jesus is introduced in the Gospel ('there was a certain man named Jesus') points to the view that of Himself Jesus was nothing to the members of this sect, but only became significant as the object of faith through the descent of the heavenly Christ. The ascetic (vegetarian) views of the Ebionites and their hatred of sacrifices of blood are manifest in the fragments. In accordance with his vegetarian sympathies, the author removes locusts (*ἀκροιδας*) from the Baptist's diet, and by way of compensation states that the honey which he ate tasted like honey-cake (*ἐγκρις*) in oil. The play on the

words ἀκούεις and ἐγνώκεις shows that our Greek Gospels, and not a Hebrew original, lay before the writer.

The author in the composition of his work made use of the canonical Gospels in a free and clumsy manner. The narrative of the Baptism, in particular, is extremely awkward and badly told. No scruples deterred the writer from changing the words of Christ to the directly opposite sense by the simple insertion of a negative ('I have *in no wise* desired to eat this passover-flesh with you'; cf. Luk_22:15).

The date of the Gospel is late in the 2nd cent.; Zahn puts it at 170; Harnack not earlier than 180, and perhaps as late as the beginning of the 3rd cent.

Literature.—Credner, *Beiträge*, i. 332 ff.; Hilgenfeld, *NT extra can.* iv. 33 ff.; Zahn, *NT Kan.* ii. 724 ff.; Harnack, *Gesch. d. altchr. Litt.* i. 205 ff., *Chron.* i. 625 ff.; Meyer in Hennecke, *NT Apokr.* 24 ff., *Handb.* 42 ff.

B. 3. Gospel of Thomas.—A single citation from a Gnostic Gospel of Thomas is given by Hippolytus (*Philos.* v. 7), who states that he found it in a writing in use among the Naassenes: '*He who seeks me shall find me in children from seven years old; for there concealed in the fourteenth aeon I shall be made manifest.*' Origen (*Hom. in Luc.* i. 1) speaks of a *Gospel of Thomas*; and a Gospel bearing that name is placed by Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 25. 6) among heretical writings. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat.* iv. 36), referring to 'spurious and noxious Gospels,' mentions a *Gospel according to Thomas* written by the Manichaeans; and in another passage (*Cat.* vi. 31) he warns all against reading it, as it is written not by an Apostle, but by 'one of the three evil disciples of Manes.' The *Decretum Gelasii* condemns a *Gospel of Thomas* which was used by the Manichaeans. In what relation (if any) the Manichaean Gospel stood to the Gnostic Gospel, referred to by Hippolytus, is indiscoverable, as no fragment of the former is known. That the Gnostic Gospel bears some relation to the *Childhood Gospel of Thomas* is practically certain from what we know of the latter, and from the character of the passage cited by Hippolytus. There are indications in the *Childhood Gospel* which point to a Gnostic origin; and this being the case, if the two Gospels were entirely independent, it would be nothing less than marvellous that, while the one is composed of narratives of Christ's childhood, the only fragment preserved of the other should contain a cryptic utterance of Christ about children. (See below, C. (a) 2, where also literature will be found).

B. 4. Gospel of Philip.—A solitary fragment of this Gospel is preserved in Epiphanius (*Hær.* 26. 13), who states: 'The Gnostics cite a Gospel, forged in the name of Philip the holy Apostle, as saying:

'The Lord revealed to me what the soul must say in ascending to heaven, and how she must answer each of the upper powers: "I have known myself and gathered myself from all quarters, and I have borne no children to the Archon [the ruler of this world], but I have rooted up his roots and gathered the scattered members, and I know who thou art. For I am one of those who are from above." And so she is released. But if one be found who has borne a son, she is kept below until she is able to recover her own children and to educate them for herself.'

The Coptic Gnostic writing, the *Pistis Sophia*, bears witness to the existence in the 3rd cent. of the *Gospel of Philip* in Gnostic circles in Egypt. It is there stated: 'And when Jesus had made an end of speaking these words, Philip leaped up and stood, and laid down the book which was in his hand, for he it is who writes all things which Jesus said and did' (Harnack, *Gesch. d. altchr. Litt.* i. 14). It is clear from this notice, as well as from the passage quoted by Epiphanius, that the contents of the *Gospel of Philip* were not of the same character as those of the canonical Gospels, but were of an esoteric nature, revelations of hidden truth purporting to have been communicated by the Risen Lord. The extreme Encratite views of the Gnostic writer are apparent; the assertion of the soul that on earth it has abstained from marriage, is the only passport into heaven.

The *Gospel of Philip* belongs to the large class of Gnostic writings well described as Gospel-Apocalypses, which owed their origin to the peculiar conception which the Gnostics entertained regarding the person of Christ. The true Saviour was not the earthly Jesus, but the heavenly Christ who sojourned in Him, and who was fully liberated for the work of salvation by the Resurrection. Salvation consisted in freeing the souls of men from the dominion of the God of this world, by the communication of the heavenly knowledge (Gnosis); and this knowledge was revealed by Christ as a mystery to His Apostles, partly in parables whose meaning was hid from the common crowd, partly in a secret tradition given after the Resurrection. The true gnosis was reserved for the small number of *πνευματικοί*, whose spirit was derived from the upper world, and who, when purified from their connexion with the earth, returned into the kingdom of light. These views are clearly reflected in the fragment of the Gospel of Philip.

The date of the Gospel is towards the end of the 2nd century.

Literature—Harnack, *Altchr. Litt.* i. 14 f., *Chron.* i. 592 f.; Zahn, *NT Kan.* ii. 761 ff.; Hennecke, *NT Apokr.* 40, *Handb.* 91.

C. Supplemental Gospels, Written to Throw Light on the Dark Parts of Christ's History

(a) Gospels of the Childhood, together with Those Dealing with the Parents of Jesus

C. (a) 1. **Protevangelium of James.**—This writing, dealing with the history of Mary and the Infancy of Jesus, was first published in the West in a Latin translation by the French humanist Postellus about the middle of the 16th century. Some years later the Greek text was issued by Michael Neander. The title ‘Protevangelium’ (Earliest Gospel) occurs for the first time, so far as we know, in the edition of Postellus; the writing itself claims to be, not a Gospel, but a *history*. (‘The History of James concerning the birth of the All-Holy Mother of God,’ or something similar, is the title in the MS^S [Note: SS Manuscripts.] . See Tischendorf’s *Evang. Apocr.* 1). It is not improbable that the name ‘Protevangelium’ was given by Postellus himself, who had an extremely high opinion of the book. In earlier times it is never referred to as a *Gospel*, save in the lists of spurious writings condemned by ecclesiastical authority in the 4th and 5th cents.: ‘cetera autem (evangelia), quae vel sub nomine Matthiae sive *Jaeobi minoris* ... non solum repudianda, verum etiam noveris esse damnanda’ (Decree of Innocent i., a.d. 405). The person referred to as the author (‘I, James, wrote this history’) was in early times universally believed to be the Lord’s brother, the head of the Church at Jerusalem. The true author is unknown.

The earliest certain reference to the *Protevangelium* occurs in Origen (middle of 3rd cent.), who states that many, on the authority of the ‘Book of James’ (and the Gospel of Peter), believed the brothers of Jesus to have been the sons of Joseph by a former marriage. Allusions to details mentioned in the Gospel are found (c. 200) in Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* vii. 16. 93), and (c. 140) in Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 78; 100, *Apol.* 33); these, however, do not necessarily point to dependence on the *Protevangelium*, but may have been, and in Justin’s case probably were, drawn from floating tradition. Zahn dates the writing in the early decades of the 2nd cent.; but most scholars place it later, in the second half of the century.

In its present form the *Protevangelium* narrates the childlessness of Joachim and Anna, the shame and reproach that fell upon them on that account, and the birth of Mary in answer to their prayer (chs. 1-5). When Mary is three years old, she is taken to the temple, where she lives until her twelfth year, being fed by the hand of an angel (chs. 7, 8). The priests then consult as to what they should do with her, and are instructed by an angel, in answer to prayer, to summon the widowers of the people, each with a rod in his hand, that God may give a sign whose wife she should be (ch. 8). Joseph attends in obedience to the summons, and is marked out for the charge of ‘the virgin of the Lord’ by a dove coming out of his rod and alighting on his head. Joseph would fain refuse, because he has children and is an old man; but, being solemnly charged by the priest, he takes Mary to his house and immediately leaves home on business (ch. 9). Thereafter, the priests, desirous of having a veil made for the temple, summon ‘the undefiled virgins of the family of David,’ and among them Mary, who is chosen by lot to spin the true purple and the scarlet. With these she returns home (ch. 10). While drawing water at the well, she hears a voice

pronouncing her blessed. When she returns, trembling, to the house, an angel appears to her as she sits spinning, and announces that she will conceive by the power of the Lord (ch. 11). Then follows the narrative of the visit to Elisabeth, at the close of which it is stated that 'she was *sixteen* years old when these mysteries happened' (ch. 12). Joseph now returns from his work of building, and, on seeing her state, reproaches her (ch. 13). An angel of the Lord appears to him and informs him of the mystery (ch. 14). Joseph is accused of defiling the virgin of the Lord; and when both he and Mary proclaim their innocence, they are compelled to drink the water of ordeal, and are unhurt (chs. 15, 16). When the imperial decree of enrolment is issued, Joseph sets out to Bethlehem with Mary. On the way, near to Bethlehem, her days are fulfilled; Joseph leads her into a cave, and, leaving his two sons with her, goes to seek a woman to attend her (ch. 17). [At this point the narrative changes suddenly from the third person to the first: 'And I, Joseph, was walking, and was not walking']. Joseph sees the whole of Nature standing still; birds and sheep and men are motionless, a sudden arrest having been put upon their movements (ch. 18). A woman is found, who enters the cave, which is illumined by a dazzling light; the light gradually decreases, and the infant is seen, who takes the breast from his mother. Another woman, Salome, appears, and is incredulous when she is told of the virgin-birth; she seeks a proof, and her hand burns as with fire, but is restored when she touches the infant (chs. 19, 20). [The impersonal narrative is now resumed]. The visit of the Magi is next described in language very similar to that in Matthew (ch. 21). Herod, learning that he has been mocked by the Magi, orders the massacre of children under two years. Mary hides her child in an ox-stall (ch. 22). The rest of the narrative deals with John the Baptist and Zacharias. Zacharias, because he will not reveal where his son is concealed, is murdered in the temple. His body miraculously disappears, but his blood is found turned into stone (chs. 22-24). The narrative ends with a thanksgiving of James for having received the gift and wisdom to write the history (ch. 25).

There is a general agreement that the *Protevangelium*, as it has come down to us, is not in its original shape. The group of incidents dealing with Zacharias and John the Baptist are in no way essential to the author's purpose; they are indeed irrelevant and disturbing. An ancient apocryphal writing, of which Zacharias was the subject, is known to have existed; and it seems highly probable that part of this was awkwardly appended to the original Book of James. This happened, there is ground for believing, in the 5th century. That it did not form a part of the original writing finds some support in the fact that Origen, who refers to the *Protevangelium*, gives a different account of the death of Zacharias. There is considerable difference of opinion as to whether the rest of the book is the work of one author. The abrupt introduction of Joseph, speaking in the first person (chs. 18-20), gives convincing evidence that that section is not from the hand of the writer of the Gospel, although that by no means implies that it was introduced into his history by another. Harnack believes that the

original Book of James did not contain this narrative by Joseph; but if so, it was a singularly aimless piece of writing, stopping short of the consummation which gives the whole early history of Mary significance, and to which that history manifestly looks, namely, her giving birth to Jesus in virginity. We conclude that the *Apocryphum Josephi* (as Harnack calls it) was incorporated in his work by the author himself, and that not unskilfully, reference being found in it to details which had been already related. In the section dealing with Mary's connexion with the Temple, there are also signs of different sources. It is noticeable that, when Mary leaves the Temple under the care of Joseph, she is represented as being twelve years old; on the other hand, it is said that at the time of her pregnancy she was sixteen years old, although it is clear, from the main scheme of the narrative, that the conception took place soon after her departure from the Temple, during Joseph's absence from home on business. It is more than probable that we have a combination of two accounts telling of Mary's association with the Temple, one narrating her residence there until she was twelve years of age, the other representing her as being brought, when she was sixteen, to spin material for the temple veil, because she was of the family of David. There is no reason, however, for supposing that these different traditions were combined by any one else than the author of the history.

With the exception of the Zacharias group of incidents, the *Protevangelium* is a well-designed unity, a skilfully constructed romance, in which the author, with the help of material lying ready to his hand, achieved to his own satisfaction the definite purpose which he had in view. What this purpose was it is not difficult to divine. It was to defend the orthodox conception of Christ's person against a double attack, and to give an answer to those who taunted Christians with the lowly if not shameful birth of Jesus. Accordingly, Mary was represented as of royal descent, the daughter of a wealthy man, brought up in the pure atmosphere of the Temple; that was a sufficient answer to every calumny about her character, and to every sneer about her humble rank. Against the Gnostic view that Jesus, in being born of Mary, did not partake of her human nature, it was enough to mention that the infant took the breast from His mother. The whole strength of the author was, however, devoted to safeguarding the Divinity of Jesus against Jewish-Christian misconceptions. That end, he conceived, could be best attained by exalting the person of Mary, by revealing her as one who, from birth to womanhood, had retained an absolute purity and virginity. She was born, in answer to prayer, to parents who had long been childless; she was brought up in the Temple, and fed on heavenly food; in virginity she conceived by the power of the Lord; in virginity she gave birth; in virginity she remained to the end. At every stage her virginity is raised above suspicion; the drinking of the water of the ordeal guarded her virginity in conception; the witness of Salome established it in the birth; while the statement, given under the authority of James, that the brethren of Jesus were sons of Joseph by a former wife, was sufficient to remove any doubts of her virginity to the last.

The author of the *Protevangelium*, it is clear, was no Jewish Christian. His ignorance of Jewish usages is notably betrayed in the representation of Mary as a temple-virgin (an unheard of thing among the Jews), and in the water of the ordeal being administered to Joseph (see Numbers 5). The Hebraistic colouring is due to the sources which the writer used. In certain of the incidents he is influenced by OT narratives (birth and dedication of Samuel, Aaron's rod, etc.), which he doubtless read in the Greek version. The canonical accounts of the Annunciation and Nativity have been largely drawn upon. Conrady's views, that the *Protevangelium* was the source of Matthew and Luke (*Die Quelle d. kan. Kindheitsgeschichten*), and that it was originally written in Hebrew (SK [Note: K Studien und Kritiken.] , 1889, p. 728 ff.), have received no support. The former view Hennecke characterizes as 'kritische Geschmacklosigkeit.'

The *Protevangelium* was condemned by the Western Church in the decrees of Damasus (382), Innocent 1. (405), and Gelasius (496). Popular Christianity, however, demanded something in the place of that which had been forbidden, and letters were forged, one to Jerome from the bishops Chromatius of Aquileia and Heliodorus of Altinum, the other the answer of Jerome, from which it appeared that the learned Father had acceded to the bishops' request to translate into Latin the original Hebrew Matthew. This explains the appearance of *The Gospel of pseudo-Matthew*, which freely worked over the contents of the *Protevangelium*, gave an account of the Flight to Egypt and the miracles wrought on the way, and added narratives drawn from the *Childhood Gospel of Thomas*. A detail, which is frequently represented in Christian art,—the ox and the ass at the manger,—appears for the first time in this Gospel. The veneration of Mary, which received an impulse in the *Protevangelium*, has now grown to greater proportions; she is glorified as 'the Queen of the Virgins,' and her holy, nun-like manner of life is dwelt upon at considerable length. The date of *ps.-Matt.* is 6th century.

The Gospel of the Nativity of Mary, also connected with Jerome by another forged letter, covers the same ground as the *Protevangelium* (with the exception of the Zacharias legend). The aim of the book is to exalt Mary as the spotless virgin; after her betrothal to Joseph she does not go home with him, but returns to her parents' house. There she receives the angel's message. The Gospel closes with the bare mention of the birth of Jesus. This new recension of the *Protevangelium* was doubtless due to an orthodox revulsion of feeling against the somewhat coarse and extravagant nature of *pseudo-Matthew*. The date is probably late in the 6th century.

Literature.—Hilgenfeld, *Einleitung*, 152; Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocr.* xii-xxii; Zahn, *NT Kan.* i. 914 f., ii. 774 ff.; Harnack, *Altchr. Litt.* i. 19 ff., *Chron.* i. 598ff.; von Lehner, *Die Marienverehrung*, 223 ff.; Conrady (works cited above); Mrs. Lewis, 'Apocrypha: Protevang. Jacobi' (*Studia Sinaitica*, xi); Meyer in Hennecke, *NT Apokr.*

47ff., *Handb.* 106ff.; Tasker, *l.c.*; translation in Ante-Nicene Library, vol. xvi., Cowper, Orr (*NT Apocr.* [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] *Writings*), etc.

C. (a) 2. **Childhood Gospel of Thomas.**—This Gospel, which deals with the marvellous events of Christ's childhood, was widely read in early times in all branches of the Christian Church. In its present form it does not claim to be a *Gospel*; it is generally referred to as Παιδικὰ τοῦ Κυρίου—Incidents in the Lord's Childhood. There is everything, however, in favour of the view that the original form of the writing was a Gospel in use in Gnostic circles, referred to by Origen and Hippolytus (see B. 3). Besides the appropriateness of the citation of Hippolytus to a *Childhood Gospel*, the relation between the two writings is supported by a statement in Irenaeus (i. 20. 1) that the followers of the Gnostic Marcus had in their apocryphal books a story of Jesus as a boy putting His schoolmaster to confusion. This incident is found described twice over in the *Childhood Gospel of Thomas*. If the *Gospel of Thomas*, mentioned by Nicephorus in his *Stichometry* (date uncertain, 6th–8th cent.) as containing 1300 *stichoi*, had any relation with that known to us, the copy which lay before him was more than twice as long as the longest now extant.

The external evidence, then, converges on the view that our present Gospel was a compilation of stories drawn from a longer Gospel, which originated in Gnostic circles, the parts which were undisguisedly Gnostic in tone being omitted. This conclusion is confirmed by the character of the Gospel itself. A few Gnostic traces still remain, notably in the mysterious symbolism of the letters of the alphabet. The extraordinary miracles attributed to the child Christ, and His astonishing knowledge, were no doubt interpreted by Gnostics in a way to lend support to their own views. For them 'the worth of these miracles lay in the proof, which could be drawn from them, that Christ did not belong to this world, that even as a child He was raised beyond human development and limitation, to that as a child He could teach every human teacher' (Meyer in Henn. 64). The fragment in Hippolytus (quoted in B. 3) may have been a Gnostic utterance of the child Christ.

The figure of Jesus in this Gospel is a melancholy and hateful caricature of the grace, simplicity, and obedience of the Holy Childhood. The miracles which the child Christ is described as working are, for the most part, deeds of malevolence, or marvels without any ethical meaning. To the latter class belong His making birds of clay and causing them to fly; His carrying water from the well in His cloak after breaking the pitcher; to the former, His passionate vengeance on a boy who accidentally ran against Him, and was laid dead on the spot; the cursing of His teacher, who fell down in a swoon. The painful impression made by His petulant and vengeful spirit is not sensibly relieved by an occasional miracle of healing. His bearing and conduct are those of a spoilt and impudent child; in two instances He takes Joseph to task for

venturing to correct Him. A single extract will enable the reader to form some idea of the youthful Gnostic at school. A teacher, Zacchaeus by name, approaches Joseph, offering to teach Jesus letters, and how to greet His elders respectfully, and how to love those of His own age—much needed lessons! This is how Jesus profits by His attendance at school. ‘He looked upon His teacher Zacchaeus, and said to him: Thou, who knowest not the nature of the A, how canst thou teach others the B? Thou hypocrite! first teach the A if thou canst, and then we shall believe thee about the B. Then He began to question the teacher about the first letter, and he was unable to answer Him. In the hearing of many the child says to Zacchaeus: Hear, O teacher, the disposition of the first letter, and observe how it has straight lines and a middle stroke which crosses those which thou seest to belong to one another; (lines) which go together, raise themselves, wind round in a dance, move themselves, and go round again, which are composed of three signs, are of similar nature, of the same weight, of the same size. Thou hast the lines of the A.’ How vast is the gulf separating this absurd and pretentious display from the simple story of Christ among the doctors in the Temple! Here a forward and unbearably conceited boy, who is ready to teach his elders; there a child with the fresh wonder of life’s greatness in his heart, eager to learn, ready to obey.

Many of the stories here narrated of Christ have their origin in folk-lore and mythology. Similar stories are told of Krishna and Buddha. But in all countries the popular imagination has home unconscious witness to man’s greatness by its delight in tales of wonder-children. Legends of this nature were laid hold of by the Gnostics, and used in the interest of their peculiar speculations about Christ. ‘The wonder-child becomes a Gnostic, who looks down on the unspiritual world, and, in particular heartily despises the religion of the Jews’ (Meyer in Henn. 65) Apart from the speculations with which they were burdened, these stories took hold of the popular imagination in orthodox circles. The craving for the marvellous proved stronger than the sense of what was fitting in Jesus; and the silence of Christ’s childhood, which had been regarded as an evidence of His true humanity, became thronged with silly and repulsive exhibitions of power and knowledge, which were believed to be signs of His Divine dignity.

In its present form the *Childhood Gospel of Thomas* cannot be older than the 3rd century. The Gospel exists in several recensions, which vary considerably in length.

Literature.—Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.* xxxvi ff.; Zahn, *NT Kan.* i. 515, 539, 802, ii. 768 ff.; Harnack, *Altchr. Litt.* i. 15ff., *Chron.* i. 593ff.; Bost, *Les évang. apocr. de l’enfance de Jésus Christ*; Conrady, ‘Das Thomasevangelium,’ *SK* [Note: *K Studien und Kritiken.*] , 1903, p. 377ff.; Meyer in Hennecke, *NT Apokr.* 63ff., *Handb.* 132ff.;

Wright, *Contributions to the Apocr.* [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] *Literature of the NT*; Cowper, Orr (*opp. citt.*).

C. (a) 3. **Arabic Gospel of the Childhood.**—This is a late composition, in which are worked up the materials of the earlier *Childhood Gospels*. The compiler has also added many legends of a wildly fantastic and highly miraculous nature. One or two examples may suffice to show the character of the greater portion of the book. The Magi receive from ‘the Lady Mary,’ as a souvenir of their visit to Bethlehem, one of the swaddling bands in which the infant Jesus was wrapped. On their return home they show their trophy to the assembled kings and princes. A feast is held, and a fire is lighted, which the company worships. The swaddling band is thrown into the fire, and, when the fire had burned itself out, it is found unharmed. Whereupon the cloth is laid up with great honour in the treasure house. Again, the water in which the infant Jesus is washed has a marvellous virtue, and children whose bodies are white with leprosy are cleansed by bathing in it. A young man who by witchcraft had been changed into a male, is restored to human form by Mary’s placing Jesus on the mule’s back.

This Gospel was the main source of the knowledge of Jesus among the Mohammedans. For their edification, Kessaeus incorporated its stories, with much embellishment, in his history of patriarchs and prophets.

Literature.—Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.* [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] ; Thilo, *Codex Apocr.* [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] *NT*; Walker, (*Ante-Nicene Library*, vol. xvi.); Tasker (*l.c.*); Meyer in Hennecke, *Handb.* 102.

C. (a) 4. **History of Joseph the Carpenter.**—In Egypt, where feast-days were multiplied to celebrate events or to commemorate persons held in high esteem by the Church, the History of Joseph was written for the purpose of being read on 20th July, the alleged day of Joseph’s death. The narrative is placed in the mouth of Jesus, who discourses to His disciples on the Mount of Olives. After an introductory address, which has passages reminiscent of the Psalms, the Gospels, and St. Paul’s Epistles, the life of Joseph is shortly described, in which evident use is made of the *Protevangelium* or one of its sources (*Apocryphum Josephi*). The circumstances attending the death of Joseph are described at great length. We are told of his dread of death; we listen to a bitter lament for his sins (among them his venturing to correct Jesus as a child), and to a prayer to be delivered from the demons of darkness who lie in wait for his soul. When Death approaches with his dread retinue, Jesus drives them back. In answer to His prayer, Michael and Gabriel carry off the spirit of Joseph to ‘the dwelling place of the pious.’ Thereafter Christ comforts the mourners, and Himself bewails the death of Joseph. It is plain, from this survey of the contents

of the book, that its purpose was less to give the history of Joseph than 'to recommend Christianity as the deliverer in the extremity of death, and to teach the true Christian art of dying' (Meyer in Henn. *Handb.* 103).

The history, in all probability, was written in Coptic. Recensions of it in the Bohairic and Sahidic dialects exist, the latter fragmentary (Forbes Robinson, *Coptic Apocryphal Gospels*, 130 ff.). There is also an Arabic text, first printed in 1722.

Tischendorf puts the date of the history in the 4th century.

Literature.—Tischendorf, Meyer, Forbes Robinson (*opp. citt.*).

C. (a) 5. The Departure of Mary.—The growing veneration of Mary in the Church led to the invention of incidents in her life parallel to those in the life of Christ. This was the motive that gave rise to the Departure of Mary (*Transitus Mariæ*), otherwise known as the κοιμησις (the Falling Asleep), *Dormitio*, *Assumptio*. As Christ had risen from the dead and ascended into heaven, so must Mary have risen and ascended. The story runs as follows:

One day, when Mary, according to her custom, had gone to 'the holy tomb of our Lord' to burn incense and pray, the archangel Gabriel announces her approaching death, and informs her that, in answer to her request, she shall 'go to the heavenly places to her Son, into the true and everlasting life.' On her return home she prays, and all the Apostles—those who are already dead and those still alive—are gathered to her bedside at Bethlehem. The Apostles narrate how they were engaged when the summons came to them. The heavens are filled with hosts of angels; miracles of healing happen, and the sick crowd to the house. The Jews endeavour to seize Mary; but the Apostles, carrying the couch on which 'the Lady, the mother of God,' lay, are borne on a cloud to Jerusalem. Here Christ appears to her, and in answer to her request declares; 'Rejoice and be glad, for all grace is given to thee by My Father in heaven, and by Me, and by the Holy Ghost; whoever calls on thy name shall not be put to shame, but shall find comfort and support both in this world and in that which is to come, in the presence of My heavenly Father.' Then, while the Apostles sing a hymn, Mary falls asleep. She is laid in a tomb in Gethsemane; for three days an angel-choir is heard glorifying God, and when they are silent all know that 'her spotless and precious body has been transferred to Paradise.'

In this story, which has had a remarkable influence in the Roman Catholic Church, we have the clear signs of an advanced stage of the worship of the Virgin. Prayer to her is here enjoined; and the tendency disclosed, to find parallels between her life and the life of Christ, marks a definite stage of the movement which eventually made her a

sharer in the work of redemption. The epithet θεοτόκος (mother of God), which was first applied to Mary by Cyril of Jerusalem (beginning of 4th cent.), and played so large a part in the Nestorian controversy (from a.d. 428), occurs in this writing.

The *Transitus* was written at the close of the 4th cent. In the Gelasian Decree (496) it was included among those apocryphal writings which are ‘non solum repudiata, verum etiam ab omni Romana catholica et apostolica ecclesia eliminata atque cum suis auctoribus auctorumque sequacibus sub anathematis indissolubili vinculo in aeternum damnata.’ In spite of this the writing maintained its place, and by the 6th cent. it was held in the highest honour. It was in later days ascribed to Melito of Sardis (c. 170), and even to the Apostle John. Versions of it, in longer and shorter forms, are extant in Greek, Latin, Arabic, Coptic, and Syriac.

Literature.—Tischendorf, Wright, Forbes Robinson, Orr (*opp. Citt.*); Mrs. Lewis, ‘Apocrypha’ (*Stud. Sinaitica*, xi.).

(b) Gospels Dealing with the Passion and the Post-resurrection Life of Jesus

C. (b) 1. **The Gospel of Nicodemus.**—This Gospel, dealing with the Trial, Death, and Resurrection of Jesus, and with His Descent into Hades, is a combination of two earlier writings—(1) *Acta Pilati*, and (2) *Descensus Christi ad inferos*. The older Greek MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] contain only (1) with an independent conclusion, while there are clear signs that the compiler had not thoroughly mastered all his material. The earliest form is found in a Latin version, probably of the 5th or 6th cent.; but it was not until the 13th cent. that the name of Nicodemus was associated with it. The writing claimed to have been written in Hebrew by Nicodemus, and to have been translated into Greek by Ananias or aeneas Protector.

The contents of the Gospel are as follows:

(1) Jesus is accused by the Jews. Pilate orders Jesus to be brought before him. The messenger, by Pilate’s instructions, shows Jesus great respect. As Jesus enters the judgment-hall, the tops of the Roman standards bow down before Him (ch. 1). The charge that Jesus was ‘born of fornication’ is disproved (ch. 2). Pilate privately examines Him,—the passage is based on Joh 18:30-38,—and declares Him not worthy of death (chs. 3, 4). Various witnesses, among them Nicodemus and some who had been healed by Jesus, come forward and speak on His behalf (chs. 5-8). The Jews choose Barabbas instead of Jesus, and are reproached for their ingratitude by Pilate. Pilate washes his hands, and suffers Jesus to be led forth to crucifixion (ch. 9). Then follows an account of the crucifixion and burial, based on Luke 23 (chs. 10, 11). Joseph of Arimathaea is put into prison by the Jews for burying Jesus, but is

miraculously delivered (ch. 12). The guards at the sepulchre report the resurrection to the Sanhedrin, and are bribed to say that the disciples stole the body (ch. 13). A priest, a scribe, a Levite from Galilee bear witness to Christ's ascension; they are charged to keep silent, and are sent back to Galilee (ch. 14). On the proposal of Nicodemus, search is made for Jesus, but conclusive evidence is once more given of His ascension (chs. 15, 16).

(2) This purports to have been written down by Carinus and Leucius, sons of the aged Simeon, who had been raised from the dead by Jesus (ch. 17). 'A purple royal light' appears in Hades; John the Baptist announces the near approach of Christ to visit those 'sitting in darkness and the shadow of death' (ch. 18). Seth tells of his prayer for oil from the tree of mercy to heal his father, and of Michael's promise that he should receive it when the Son of God came to earth (ch. 19). A conversation takes place between Satan and Tartarus, who dread Christ's coming (ch. 20). The summons is made (Psa 24:7) in a voice of thunder to grant Jesus admission: Satan and Tartarus are powerless to exclude Him (ch. 21). Satan is delivered into the power of Hades, who reviles him vehemently, and consigns him to everlasting torment (chs. 22, 23). All the saints are gathered to Christ, and with them He comes up 'from the powers below' (ch. 24). The archangel Michael leads all the saints to Paradise, where they converse with Enoch and Elias and the penitent thief (chs. 25, 26). Having finished their writing, Carinus and Leucius are transfigured and vanish. Joseph and Nicodemus report everything to Pilate, who draws up an account of 'all that had been done and said concerning Jesus by the Jews,' and places it 'in the public records of his praetorium' (ch. 27). [In some MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] two other chapters are added: ch. 28 incorporates a Jewish chronology from Adam to Christ, which Annas and Caiaphas acknowledge, in Pilate's presence, to be a proof that Jesus was the long-promised Saviour; ch. 29 gives a letter from Pilate to Claudius, dealing with the 'cruel condemnation,' crucifixion, and resurrection of Christ].

The first part of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*—the *Acts of Pilate*—exists in various recensions, the earliest of which cannot be much older than the beginning of the 5th century. The question, however, is raised by references in Justin and Tertullian, whether these *Acts* are not based on much older documents. In his first *Apology* (ch. 35) Justin, after describing the crucifixion of Jesus, declares: 'And that these things happened, one may learn from the Acts drawn up under Pontius Pilate'; and again (ch. 48), when speaking of miracles which Jesus wrought, he adds a like testimony. Moreover, Tertullian in two passages (*Apol.* 5 and 21) speaks of a report sent to Tiberius by Pilate dealing with Christ; and in the latter passage, after giving a brief account of Christ's life and a detailed description of His death, resurrection, and ascension, he states: 'Pilate, who in his heart was already a Christian, reported all these things about Christ to Tiberius, who was emperor at that time.' Many scholars believe that the report referred to by Tertullian is preserved in the Letter of Pilate to

Claudius (ch. 29 of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*). On the other hand, Harnack holds the Letter to be later than Tertullian (*Chron.* i. 607 ff.). On the ground of Justin's references, Tischendorf (*Evang. Apoer.* lxiv), followed by Hofmann (*PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] i. 659), dates our extant *Acts of Pilate* in the 2nd century. Lipsius (*Die Pilatusakten*, 14 ff.), however, Harnack (*Chron.* i. 610 ff.), and others believe that Justin had no knowledge of any *Acts of Pilate*, and simply assumed their existence; while von Schubert, followed by Stülcken (*Henn. Handb.* 146 f.), maintains that Justin was acquainted with *Acts of Pilate* which probably formed the basis of the present *Acts*. The question is an intricate one, and cannot be fully discussed here. Tischendorf's conclusion may, however, safely be set aside. Harnack bases his judgment mainly on the ground that, if Justin had had any real knowledge of *Acts of Pilate* dealing with the facts which he narrates, he would have quoted from them, while, as a matter of fact, his quotations are from the Prophets and the Gospels. Against this it must, however, be urged that, if Justin had not had some definite knowledge to go upon, he would never have dared in an address to the Emperor to ground his case on documents which presumably were in the public archives. The present writer inclines to the view that *Acts of Pilate*, at least believed to be genuine, were in existence in the 2nd cent., and that our present *Acts* were influenced by them. Whether the 2nd cent. *Acts* were based on any authentic report by Pilate, it is impossible to say.

It is clear that the *Acta Pilati* in their present form are largely dependent on the canonical Gospels, and that many of the additions are fabrications put forward for apologetic reasons. The aim of the writer is to furnish convincing proof of the truths of Christianity; what could better serve his purpose than to show Pilate on the side of Christ, and to narrate incidents touching Christ's resurrection which not even His enemies could challenge? Heathen aspersions on the birth of Jesus are also disposed of by evidence given at His trial.

The second part of the Gospel—*The Descent into Hades*—represents in a developed form the tradition, early and widely accepted, which was based on 1Pe 3:19 ('He went and preached unto the spirits in prison'). Earlier traces of the same tradition are found in the *Gospel of Peter* ('And they heard a voice from heaven, saying, Hast Thou preached to them that sleep? And a response was heard from the Cross, Yea), and in the *Legend of Abgar*.

The *Gospel of Nicodemus* was taken up by Vincent de Beauvais in his *Speculum Majus* and by Jacobus de Voragine in his *Aurea Legenda*, and through these works it exerted a far-reaching influence.

Literature.—Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.* [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] liv ff.; Lipsius, *Die Pilatusakten, Apokr. Apostelgeschichten*; von Schubert, *Die Composition des ps.-petr. Evangeliumfragment*; Harnack, *Altchr. Litt.* i. 21 ff., *Chron.* i. 603 ff.; von Dobschutz, *Zeitschr. f. NT Wissenschaft* (1902), 89 ff., Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. 544 ff.; Mommsen, *Zeitschr. f. NT Wiss.* (1902) 198 ff.; Kruger, *Gesch. d. altchr. Litt.* 36; Stulcken in Hennecke, *NT Apokr.* 74 ff., *Handb.* 143 ff.

C. (b) 2. **The Legend of Abgar.**—In Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* i. 13. 6 ff.) we find letters purporting to have passed between Abgar v. king of Edessa, and Jesus. Eusebius states that the letters were preserved in the royal archives, and gives a literal translation of them from the Syriac. Abgar, who was suffering from an incurable disease, having heard of Christ's wonderful power of healing, wrote, entreating Christ to come and cure him, and offering Him a residence in Edessa, where He would be safe from the malice of the Jews. Jesus replied that He must accomplish His mission and ascend to Him who had sent Him, but that after His ascension He would send one of His disciples, who would cure the king and bring life to him and all who were with him. Then follows an account, also translated from the Syriac, of the fulfilment of Christ's promise in the sending by the Apostle Thomas of Thaddaeus, one of the Seventy, to Edessa.

The legendary character of the correspondence is beyond all doubt, although its genuineness was accepted by Eusebius, and has been defended by several scholars, among them Cureton and Phillips in England (see Phillips, *Addai the Apostle*, ix ff.). It had its origin some time after the introduction of Christianity into Edessa (c. 170), owing to a desire to have an Apostolic foundation for the Church. The date of it is probably the second half of the 3rd century.

The correspondence and the narrative of Addai's mission found a place, with many additions, in the Syriac *Teaching of Addai*, which dates from about 400. The legend had a wide influence, and found credence in all sections of the Church, notwithstanding the doubts expressed regarding it in the Gelasian Decree; a Greek recension of it—the Acts of Thaddaeus—contains in addition the story of the portrait of Jesus miraculously stamped on a napkin. See also art. Abgar.

The legendary letter of Christ was in widespread favour as a talisman to guard against dangers of all kinds. For this purpose it was placed at the city gate of Edessa and at the doors of private houses. Up to quite recent times copies of the letter were to be found framed in the houses of the peasantry in England (see Donehoo, *Apocryphal and Legendary Life of Christ*, 223).

Literature.—Lipsius, *Die edessenische Abgarsage*, 1880, *Die apokr. Apostelgeschichten*, ii. 2. 178 ff.; Zahn, *Forschungen*, i. 350 ff., *NT Kan.* i. 369 ff.;

Tixeront, *Les origines de l'église d'Édesse*, 1888; Harnack, *Altchr. Litt.* i. 533ff.; Kruger, *Altchr. Litt.* 228 f.; Phillips, *Doctrine of Addai the Apostle*, 1876; Stülcken in Hennecke, *NT Apokr.* 76 ff., *Handb.* 153 ff.

D. Gospel Harmonies, in Which Several Gospels Are Worked Together into One

D. Gospel of Tatian.—The Gospel of Tatian, better known as the *Diatessaron*,* [Note: *Diatessaron* (διὰ τεσσάρων) is variously interpreted. The expression is generally regarded as signifying a compilation in which only the four Gospels were used; but as the word was in use as a musical terminus technicus to denote a harmony, Tatian might have employed it as a description of his work, no matter how many Gospels he had drawn upon (Hamlyn Hill, *Earliest Life*, 21; Julicher, *Einleitung*, 391 f.).] was a Harmony of the four Gospels, in all likelihood written originally in Syriac for the use of the Church at Edessa. The author of the Harmony was a disciple of Justin Martyr in Rome; but, being condemned for heretical views, he returned to his native land in the valley of the Euphrates about the year 172. Between that date and the close of the 2nd cent. his 'patchwork Gospel' was written, in which, using the chronological scheme of the Fourth Gospel, he wove into a connected narrative the four different accounts of our Lord's life. It is doubtful whether, before the appearance of the *Diatessaron*, the four Gospels circulated separately in the Syrian Church; but however that may be, it was clearly Tatian's intention to provide a Gospel for popular use which should obviate the disadvantages of having the narrative of Christ's life in different forms.* [Note: To distinguish it from the fourfold form of the Gospel (Evangelion da-Mepharreshe, 'the Gospel of the Separated'), the *Diatessaron* received the name of Evangelion da-Mehallete, 'the Gospel of the Mixed'.] The evidence goes to show that the *Diatessaron* was in general use in the Syrian Church up to the beginning of the 5th cent. In the *Teaching of Addai* (c. 400) we read that 'a large multitude of people assembled day by day and came to the prayer of the service, and to the reading of the Old and New Testament, of the *Diatessaron*,' etc. (Phillips, *Addai the Apostle*, 34). In the middle of the 4th cent. Ephraem used the *Diatessaron* as the basis of his famous commentary on the Gospels. But from the 5th cent. onwards Tatian's Gospel was displaced from public worship by the new translation of the separate Gospels made under Rabbûla,—the Peshitta, the Syriac Vulgate,—although, largely owing to the commentary of Ephraem, it continued to be read and to exert an influence for many centuries later.

Neither the *Diatessaron* nor the commentary of Ephraem has been preserved to us in the original Syriac. There are, however, Latin and Arabic versions of the *Diatessaron*, and two distinct Armenian versions of Ephraem's commentary. For the reconstruction of the text of the *Diatessaron*, Ephraem's commentary is of the highest value, and the work has been brilliantly executed by Zahn (*Forschungen*, i.). Unfortunately, while

the Latin and Arabic versions keep Tatian's arrangement of the narrative, they are of no value for the restoration of the text. The Latin Harmony (Codex Fuldensis), which belongs to about the beginning of the 6th cent., gives throughout the text of the Vulgate; while the Arabic version, which was originally made in the 11th cent., is evidently a translation from a text of the *Diatessaron* which had been accommodated to the Peshitta. In the 9th cent. an epic poem entitled *Héliand* was written, based on a translation of the Codex Fuldensis. It became widely known, and to it our Anglo-Saxon forefathers were largely indebted for their knowledge of the life of Christ (Hamlyn Hill, *op. cit.* 20, 38).

In accordance with Tatian's peculiar views, the *Diatessaron* reveals a slight Encratite tendency. According to Theodoret (*Hær. Fab.* i. 20), it omitted the genealogies of Christ and everything dealing with Christ's birth ('all things that show our Lord to have been born of the seed of David according to the flesh'). The Birth-narratives of Luke and Matthew are, however, found in the Arabic and Latin recensions, as well as in Ephraem's commentary.

Literature.—Zahn, *Forschungen*, i. ii. iv. vii.; Ciasca, *Tatiani Evangeliorum Harmoniae, Arabice*; Harnack, *Altchr. Litt.* i. 485 ff., *Chron.* i. 284 ff.; T^U [Note: U Texte und Untersuchungen.] i. i. 196 ff., art. in *Encyc. Brit.*⁹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; Burkitt, *S. Ephraim's Quotations from the Gospel* (cf. also his *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*); Rendel Harris, *The Diatessaron of Tatian*; Hamlyn Hill, *Earliest Life of Christ*; Hemphill, *The Diatessaron*, etc.; Stenning in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, Ext. Vol. 451 ff.

A. F. Findlay.

Governor

GOVERNOR.—The word 'governor' (ἡγεμών, Lat. *praeses, dux*) is a comprehensive term, being the only Greek word which includes every class of provincial governor under the Roman empire. The following officials, for instance, are included under this title:—(1) Governors of Senatorial Provinces, namely, *pro consulibus* who are ex-consuls, and *pro praetoribus* who are ex-praetors. The former class ruled the governmental spheres of duty, Asia and Africa; the latter all other provinces which by the arrangement between Augustus and the Senate in 27 b.c. were put under the authority of that body, such as Sicily, Macedonia, Achaia. (2) Governors of Imperial Provinces, namely, *legati Augusti pro praetoribus* who are ex-consuls; *legati Augusti pro praetoribus* who are ex-praetors; *procuratores*; *praefecti Aegypti*, etc. Examples

of Imperial provinces are Syria, the Gauls (except Narbonensis), Judaea, and Egypt. These governors were all accountable to the Emperor, being put in charge of his provinces, but were by no means of equal rank. The *legati* were always members of the Senate, but the others were of the lower rank of *equites*. It was to this class that Pilate belonged (Matthew 27, 28; see under Procurator, Pilate). Every senator, being a member of the same class as the Emperor himself, was a possible rival to him; those of inferior rank were practically in the position of his servants.

Governors of provinces had certain powers of jurisdiction delegated to them, which it is now impossible accurately to define. These were embodied in *mandata* given to them before setting out. They were also, of course, influenced by the traditions of the province to which they were going. They administered the law with a competence and a justice which have never been surpassed. As the provinces had an appeal from their decisions to the Senate in the case of Senatorial provinces, and to the Emperor in the case of Imperial, it was dangerous for a governor to go against the strongly expressed wish of the subjects of Rome. A procurator, for example, could be cast aside by the Emperor and ruined for life, without the slightest chance of redress.

Governors were commonly changed annually. The emperor Tiberius, however, retained many governors for a number of years in one position, and he also instituted the custom of payment of definite salaries to such, thus doing away with the necessity for plunder in order to recoup themselves. The Roman system was sufficiently elastic to permit the appointment of officers for special service and the suspension of the regular order of things. It was probably under an arrangement of this kind that P. Sulpicius Quirinius was 'governor of Syria' (Luk_2:2) in a.d. 6-9 (Ramsay, *Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?* ch. xi.), in order to carry on a campaign against the Homonadenses, and leave the ordinary governor free for civil duties. See art. Birth of Christ.

In Mat_10:18, Mar_13:9, and Luk_21:12 'kings' are coupled with 'governors.' The reference here is to 'client-kings' of the Roman empire (such as Herod) as well as the ordinary governors. The territory ruled by such kings was part of the *imperium Romanum* in the fullest sense of that term. In other words, the Romans had suzerainty over these kingdoms; but they left them under the rule of their kings until they were sufficiently civilized to become ordinary provinces under ordinary governors. Then they were taken over. In Luk_21:12 the 'kings' are mentioned before the 'governors.' If this change is not accidental, it would appear that St. Luke wished βασιλεις to be understood in the sense of 'emperors,' a sense quite in accordance with the Greek. The plural need be no difficulty, as it was the common practice for emperors to have their successors invested with the imperial powers, while they themselves were still alive and active.

Literature.—H. F. Pelham, *Outlines of Roman History*, bk. v. ch. iii.; J. B. Bury, *A History of the Roman Empire*, ch. vi.; A. H. J. Greenidge, *Roman Public Life*, ch. xi.; for the regular course of an administrative career, see R. Cagnat, *Cours d'Épigraphie Latine*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (1898, with Supplement 1904), pp. 86-155; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] i. ii. 43-48.

Alex. Souter.

☩ Grace

GRACE (χάρις).—The Gr. χάρις, with which ‘grace’ in English fully corresponds, is one of those words (cf. ἀγαπάω, ἀγάπη, ‘love’) which have been raised to a higher power and filled with a profounder content by the revelation of Jesus Christ. In accordance with its derivation from χαίρω, it originally signified in classical Gr. something that gives joy or delight, hence *charm* or *winsomeness*. From this it came to be used in a subjective sense of a courteous, kindly, or, as we say, a ‘gracious’ disposition; and so became equivalent to *goodwill* or *favour*. From the sense of favour as an attitude of will and feeling, the transition was natural to ‘a favour,’ a concrete token of kindness and goodwill. Finally, as grace implies not only a giver but a receiver, it was employed to denote the *gratitude* felt by the latter for the favour bestowed, and the *thanks* by which gratitude is expressed (cf. the English phrase ‘grace before meat’). In nearly all these senses the word is found both in the LXX Septuagint and the NT. But, while the LXX Septuagint does not carry us beyond the point reached in the classical authors, when we pass to the NT the old meanings of χάρις are wonderfully enlarged, until, as Cremer says (*Lex. s.v.*), ‘it has become quite a different word in NT Greek, so that we may say it depended upon Christianity to realize its full meaning and to elevate it to its rightful sphere.’

1. Grace in the Gospels.—In Authorized Version of the Gospels, ‘grace’ occurs only 4 times, once in Lk. (Luk 2:40) and thrice in Jn. (Joh 1:14; Joh 1:16-17). When we turn to the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, however, and include the marginal readings, we find the word in 4 other Lukan passages. Thrice it is used as a marginal alternative for ‘favour’ or ‘favoured’ (Luk 1:28; Luk 1:30; Luk 2:52), while in one important passage (Luk 4:22) ‘words of grace’ is substituted for ‘gracious words.’ In every case, both in Lk. and Jn., the corresponding Gr. word is χάρις, with the exception of Luk 1:23 where the derivative vb. χαριτόω is used. Besides these

passages in which either in Authorized Version or Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 it is rendered 'grace,' χάρις occurs 4 times in Lk. (Luk_6:32-34; Luk_17:9) in the sense of 'thanks.'

(1) We observe that grace is not a word or idea that is used by the *Synoptists* generally, St. Luke being the only one who employs it. It is also worthy of notice that the term is not one which the Evangelist ever attributes to Jesus Himself. It is true that he represents Jesus as using χάρις 4 times, but only in the ordinary colloquial sense of thanks. Thus, although χάρις or 'grace' was to undergo something like a transfiguration through the influence of Christianity, and indeed was to become not only a specifically Christian word, but a word of which we might say that it shines like a jewel on the brow of Christ Himself, whose life and death and teaching gave birth to the ideas which it has come to express, it is not a term which we find in any of our Lord's recorded utterances.

In 4 out of the 5 Lukan passages in which 'grace' occurs, it has the ordinary sense of 'favour.' Twice the Virgin Mary is declared to have been the object of the Divine favour (Luk_1:28; Luk_1:30). Of Jesus it is said in one passage that the grace (or favour) of God was upon Him (Luk_2:40), and in another that He advanced in favour (or grace) with both God and men (Luk_2:52). The remaining passage (Luk_4:22) is the only Synoptic one which may possibly carry us on to the peculiar Christian significance of the word. When Jesus preached His first sermon in the synagogue at Nazareth, His fellow-townsmen are said to have wondered ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος. Authorized Version renders 'at the gracious words'; Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, more literally, 'at the words of grace.' But what does the expression mean? Does it point merely, as has commonly been supposed, to our Lord's winsomeness and charm as a speaker, His grace of manner, His possession of one of the most effective of the gifts of an orator? Or is χάριτος to be taken not as a Hebraistic gen. of quality, but as an objective gen., so that 'words of grace' = 'words about grace'? It is not impossible that by this phrase, which is thus capable of a double interpretation, St. Luke intended to convey a twofold meaning, and to let his readers understand that the words of Christ, as Dr. Bruce puts it, were 'words of grace about grace' (*Exp. Gr. Test. in loc.*). In any case, however, it seems probable that the objective meaning was the one immediately before the Evangelist's mind. The fact that genitives of quality are frequent in writings influenced by Heb., and that parallels to the use of χάρις to denote the quality of charm in a speaker can be adduced not only from the LXX Septuagint (Ecc_10:12, Psa_44:3, Sir_21:16), but from the classical authors (Hom. *Od.* viii. 175; Dem. *Orat.* li. 9), weighs little in comparison with the analogies offered

by the usage of St. Luke himself in Acts. It is admitted that *λόγος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ* (Act 14:3; Act 20:32) means the message of salvation, and that *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ* (Act 20:24) means the gospel of the grace of God in the full Pauline and Christian sense of the expression. Moreover, the text from which our Lord preached His Nazareth sermon (Luk 4:18-19, cf. Isa 61:1-2) lends itself most readily to this larger interpretation, and so do the opening words of the sermon itself, ‘This day hath this Scripture been fulfilled in your ears’ (Luk 4:21). Noteworthy, too, in this connexion is the fact that in quoting the glowing words of the Evangelical prophet regarding ‘the acceptable year of the Lord,’ Jesus made the utterance still more gracious by omitting any reference to a coming day of Divine vengeance (cf. Luk 4:19 with Isa 61:2). But, above all, we must bear in mind that whether the Third Gospel was written or not by Luke the companion of St. Paul, it is matter of common consent that strong Pauline influences run through it, and that more than any other it gives prominence to those aspects of our Lord’s life and teaching which present His gospel as a message of Divine grace. This is the Gospel of the publican (Luk 18:10 ff., Isa 19:2 ff.), of the ‘woman which was in the city, a sinner’ (Luk 7:36 ff.), of the malefactor forgiven even as he hung upon his cross (Luk 23:39 ff.). Above all, it is the gospel of the great ‘Parables of Grace’—the Lost Coin, the Lost Sheep, the Prodigal Son (15). It seems natural, therefore, to conclude that the Evangelist, on whom Christ’s grace to the sinful had made so deep an impression, intended in this ‘frontispiece’ to his story of our Lord’s public ministry, when he described the listeners in the synagogue as wondering at ‘the words of grace which proceeded out of his mouth,’ to set Jesus before us not merely as a winning speaker, but as the anointed herald of the grace of God. See also art. Graciousness.

(2) When we come to the *Fourth Gospel*, we find that in the Prologue the word ‘grace,’ no doubt through the Pauline teaching and its consequences, has blossomed fully into those greater meanings with which the Church had become familiar.* [Note: It is worthy of remark that while in the Prologue *χάρις* appears as a fundamental note of the revelation of Jesus Christ, the word is not used elsewhere in the work. In the rest of his Gospel, as in his Epistles, the author prefers the idea of love (Joh 3:16; Joh 13:1, 1Jn 3:16 and constantly). Like the Synoptists, he never once puts *χάρις* into the mouth of Jesus, not even in a passage like Joh 7:19; Joh 7:23 (cf. Joh 5:10-18), where Jesus is speaking of His relation to the law of Moses. Does this not go to support the essential historicity of Christ’s teaching as reported in the Fourth Gospel?] In Joh 1:14 the author describes the Incarnate Logos as ‘full of grace and truth’ in His revelation of the Father’s glory. The phrase recalls the frequent OT combination of ‘mercy and truth’ (רַחֲמִים וְאֱמֻנָה LXX Septuagint *ἐλεος καὶ ἀλή*

θεια) as a summary description of Jehovah's character (Exo 34:6, Psa 25:10; Psa 85:10; Psa 89:14 etc.). But the grace of Christ in the NT is something more than the mercy of God in the OT. It is remarkable that in the LXX χάρις is not considered a rich enough word to render the Heb. חַסֵּד. There χάρις signifies the Divine kindness or favour (corresponding to Heb. חַסֵּד, cf. Gn 18:3 and *passim*), but is not used of those energies which belong properly to the sphere of redemption. For the חַסֵּד or mercy of God the word ἔλεος is employed; so that in the LXX ἔλεος may be said to be a stronger and richer word than χάρις. When we come to the NT, however, the case is reversed. χάρις, as applied to the Christian conception of grace, has become a grander word than ἔλεος; for while ἔλεος denotes the Divine compassion in the presence of man's pain and misery, χάρις is used to express God's attitude to man's sin. It is more than a Divine attribute, although it is that. It is the sum of those Divine forces from which our salvation flows.

In Joh 1:16 the Evangelist says that out of Christ's fulness we all received, 'and grace for grace' (χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος). In its general use, as we have seen, χάρις passes from a disposition of goodwill to be applied to the blessings which goodwill bestows. Here the reference is to the blessings of the Christian salvation. Christ's fulness is inexhaustible, and His grace is constantly bestowing itself upon His followers. But 'grace for grace' does not mean merely 'grace upon grace'—one grace added to another. The force of the ἀντι is not to be neglected. In the next verse the author is going to contrast the NT system of grace with the legal system of the OT. And here, by a bold use of language, he applies to the economy of grace the very formula of the opposite dispensation, so as the better to bring out its 'complete gratuitousness' (Godet, *Com. on Jn. in loc.*). Under the Law, with its system of exchanges, a blessing was received as the reward of (ἀντι) merit, but under the gospel it is Christ's free grace itself, received and appropriated, which becomes our title to fresh and larger bestowals.

'For the law was given by Moses,' adds the Evangelist; 'grace and truth came by Jesus Christ' (Joh 1:17). Here we have the justification of what we said above as to the χάρις καὶ ἀλήθεια of the NT being much more than the ἔλεος καὶ ἀλήθεια of the OT. The Divine mercy (ἔλεος) was an essential part of the OT revelation. It was on Sinai itself, and in connexion with the giving of the tables of the Law, that God revealed Himself

to Moses as ‘a God full of compassion and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy and truth’ (Exo_34:6). But in comparison with the glory of the Christian revelation, the revelation to Moses was legal and hard. It lacked that element of spontaneous favour towards the sinful, and apart from every thought of merit gained by obedience, which belongs to the very essence of grace as we know it in Jesus Christ.

2. The grace of Christ in the Pauline Epistles.—In discussing the meaning of grace in the Third and Fourth Gospels, we have been obliged to anticipate in part what has now to be said about the Pauline teaching. For there can be no doubt that in the minds of both Evangelists that teaching was subsumed. It was the use which St. Paul had made of the word that determined its significance for Christianity ever afterwards.

(1) And first we notice that when the Apostle speaks of grace, he is invariably thinking of Jesus Christ in connexion with it. Most frequently it is the grace of God that he names; for God the Father is always recognized as the primal fountain of all the blessings of the Christian salvation, and no greater misrepresentation can be made of St. Paul’s gospel than to describe him as bringing the grace that is in Christ into some kind of opposition to the justice that is in God. Sometimes again ἡ χάρις stands alone; for the Apostle treats it at times not merely as a Divine attribute, but as the operative principle of the whole economy of redemption. But as it is Christ who embodies this great principle in His own person, as it is in Him that the Father’s grace is revealed, and by Him that it is mediated to men; as, to use his own words, ‘the grace of God was given you in Christ Jesus’ (1Co_1:4), and ‘grace reigns through Jesus Christ our Lord’ (Rom_5:21), he does not hesitate to speak of it again and again, and especially in the benedictions with which he concludes his Epp., as ‘the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ’ (Rom_16:20, 1Co_16:23, 2Co_13:14, Gal_6:18 etc.; cf. the opening salutations, Rom_1:7, 1Co_1:3, 2Co_1:2, Gal_1:3 etc.).

(2) When we ask how St. Paul arrived at this distinctive conception of the Christian gospel as an economy of grace, and of Jesus Christ as the dispenser of grace, the answer undoubtedly is that he owed it to that revelation of the Lord Jesus Himself near the gates of Damascus by which his whole life was suddenly transformed. As a Pharisee he had sought to earn salvation by his zeal for the Law. But everything he had done had proved ineffectual. The commandment which was unto life he found to be unto death (Rom_7:10). Nay, in his endeavours to be exceedingly zealous according to the Law he had been led into the greatest sin of his career—his furious opposition to Jesus Christ, his savage persecution of the saints. Then came the great, astonishing act of spontaneous grace. Christ appeared in person to this bitter enemy, convincing him beyond the possibility of doubt that that Jesus whom he persecuted

was no other than the Lord of glory, and at the same time addressing him in those tender and gracious and yet heart-shaking words of reproach and appeal by which Saul the persecutor was turned into the slave of Christ. From that day Christ was to Paul the Lord of grace no less than the Lord of glory. It was the grace of God in Christ, and that grace alone, which had called him and saved and made him what he was (Gal 1:15, 1Co 15:10). And that same grace which had redeemed Paul at the first was with him all along. It guided him in the path of wisdom (1Co 3:10). It enabled him to be more abundant in labours than all others (1Co 15:10). It taught him how to behave himself in the world (2Co 1:12). And when the messenger of Satan came to buffet him, and he thrice besought the Lord that this thing might depart, it was the Lord Himself who said to His servant, 'My grace is sufficient for thee' (2Co 12:7-9).

(3) What did St. Paul understand by the grace of Christ, as he used that term in his fully developed teaching? What distinctive contents did he put into this great Christian idea, which he knew in his own experience to be a great Christian fact? (a) We shall perhaps find our best starting-point in a passage in which he sets a certain view of that grace before the Corinthians as one with which his teaching had made them familiar. He regards it as an act of *astonishing self-sacrifice*. 'For ye know,' he writes, 'the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might become rich' (2Co 8:9). How much was involved in this self-sacrifice he shows more fully in another Epistle, where he describes it as a self-emptying, on Christ's part, of His Divine form, the assumption of a lowly human nature, and the rendering of a lifelong obedience even unto the death of the cross (Php 2:5 ff.). It is in this quality of self-sacrifice most of all that the grace of Christ in the NT differs from the mercy of God as revealed in the earlier dispensation. Christ's grace is not merely the compassion which a great and strong and blessed nature feels for one which is sinful and sorrowful and weak. It is the self-renouncing love which so yearns to save that it surrenders all the wealth that is its own, and welcomes all the poverty that is another's. It is that love which finds its crowning symbol, as it found its absolute expression, in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ. 'I am poor and needy,' said a saint of the OT, '*yet the Lord thinketh upon me*' (Psa 40:17). 'The Son of God,' exclaims St. Paul, '*loved me, and gave himself up for me*' (Gal 2:20).

(b) The *absolute freeness* of Christ's grace was another element in the Apostle's conception. This brings us to his characteristic antithesis between grace and law. We noticed this antithesis already in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel, but it was St. Paul who first formulated it when he wrote, 'Ye are not under law, but under grace' (Rom 6:14). Formerly the Divine blessings were secured by obedience to the Law. Righteousness was the fruit of works, and rewards were reckoned not as of grace, but as of debt (Rom 4:4). But now we are 'justified freely ($\delta\omega\rho\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$) by his grace through

the redemption that is in Christ Jesus' (Rom 3:24). The grace that saves us has nothing to do with works (Rom 11:6); it is the 'free gift' of God by 'the one man, Jesus Christ' (Rom 5:15, cf. Eph 2:8).

(e) Again, Christ's grace, in St. Paul's view of it, was marked by its *sin-conquering power*. Besides the great antithesis between grace with its free gifts on the one hand, and the Law with its works and debts on the other, we have in the Apostle's teaching a further antithesis between grace and sin. This antithesis follows of necessity from the former one, for it is the fact of the Law that leads to the imputation of sin (Rom 5:13), and it is the coming in of the Law that causes trespasses to abound (Rom 5:20). But that same grace of Christ which rises superior to the Law shows its power to master the sin which is the transgression of the Law. 'Where sin abounded, grace did abound more exceedingly' (*ib.*). And this superabundance of grace over sin is manifested in two distinct ways: (α) It removes the guilt of sin and the dread consequences which flow from guiltiness. This it does by not only forgiving the sinner (Eph 1:7), but justifying him freely (Rom 3:24), bestowing upon him the gift of righteousness (Gal 2:21), and giving him the assurance that as sin reigned unto death, even so shall grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life (Rom 5:21). (β) It breaks the dominion of sin over the sinners heart. The antinomian indeed may say, 'Let us continue in sin, that grace may abound.' But St. Paul's answer is, 'God forbid!' (Rom 6:2, cf. Rom 6:1). The free gift bestowed by the grace of the One Man (Rom 5:15) carries within it an 'abundance of grace' (Rom 5:17). And among the things included in this abundance of grace are a death to sin and a life unto God (Rom 6:2 ff.). The fact that we are not under the Law, but under grace, implies that sin's tyranny over us is broken (Rom 6:14), and that we have been set free from it (Rom 6:18) for a life of righteousness and holiness in the service of God (Rom 6:18; Rom 6:22).

(d) Finally, we may say that in the Pauline teaching the grace of Christ, the 'riches of his grace' as we have it in Eph. (Eph 1:7), stood for *the sum-total of all Christian blessings*. There is an abundance and superabundance in grace (Rom 5:17; Rom 5:20, 2Co 4:15), which makes it a stream of endless benefaction flowing from an inexhaustible fountain. Christ's riches are unsearchable (Eph 3:8), but all that Christ is His grace is, for grace is the most essential quality of His being, while He Himself is the very incarnation of everything we mean by grace. We are called by grace (Gal 1:15), and justified by grace (Rom 3:24), and sanctified by grace (Rom 6:14). Through grace also we obtain eternal comfort and good hope (2Th 2:16), and strength (2Ti 2:1), and liberality (2Co 8:1), and happy songs (Col 3:16). And so it was the great Apostle's custom, when he would gather up into a single word all his wishes and hopes and prayers for the Churches, to say, 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all' (2Th 3:18, Rom 16:24; cf. 1Co 16:23 etc.).* [Note: Besides the use of

the word 'grace' in the Pauline Epp. to designate the spontaneous favour of God to sinners as revealed and mediated by Jesus Christ, it is employed in various derivative senses, such as (Rom 5:2) the state of grace (status gratiae), a particular gift of grace (Eph 4:7), the special grace required for the Apostolic office (Gal 2:8-9, Eph 3:2; Eph 3:7). The discussion of these, however, lies somewhat beyond the scope of this Dictionary.]

3. The grace of Christ in the rest of the NT.—The material here is very much scantier than in the Pauline writings, but it is quite sufficient to show how deeply the great Pauline word had lodged itself in the general Christian mind. It is true that we do not find grace defined as to its nature by those antitheses of law and works and sin which give the Pauline conception its peculiar colouring, but the word is still used to express the Divine favour as revealed in Christ, and those saving blessings of which He is the Mediator. The chief relevant passages in Acts have been referred to already in connexion with the usage of the Third Evangelist. In 1 Peter we find the grace of salvation made to depend on the revelation of Jesus Christ, and associated in particular with the Saviour's sufferings and the glories that followed them (1Pe 1:9-13). The author of 2 Peter exhorts his readers to 'grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ' (2Pe 3:18). In Hebrews the fact that Jesus is our great High Priest is urged as the reason why we should draw near with boldness unto the 'throne of grace' (Heb 4:14-16); and the treading under foot of the Son of God is regarded as equivalent to doing despite to 'the Spirit of grace' (Heb 10:29). As in the Fourth Gospel apart from the Prologue, so in the other Johannine writings, love takes the place held by the idea of grace in the Pauline teaching. But the familiarity of the thought of Christ's grace is shown by its appearance in the forms of salutation (2Jn 1:3, Rev 1:4-5). And what could be more fitting than that the NT as a whole, of which grace is the distinctive watchword, and over every page of which we might inscribe the words 'Grace reigns,' should conclude, in the last sentence of the Apocalypse, with the benediction, 'The grace of the Lord Jesus be with the saints' (Rev 22:21)?

Literature.—The *Lexx.* of Liddell and Scott, Grimm-Thayer, and Cremer, s.v. χάρις; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Grace'; *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , art. 'Gnade'; Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. of NT*, Index, s.v., but esp. i. 385 ff.; Dieckmann, *Die christliche Lehre von der Gnade* (Berlin, 1901); Wells, artt. on 'Grace' in *ExpT* [Note: xpT Expository Times.] , viii. ix. [1897]; Bruce, *Expos. Gr. Test. ad Luk 4:22, Galilean Gosp.* ch. ii.; Dale, *Ephesians*, ch. x.; *Expositor*, i. xii. [1880] p. 86 ff., v. ix. [1899] p. 161 ff.

J. C. Lambert.

Graciousness

GRACIOUSNESS.—The word ‘graciousness’ does not occur in the Authorized and Revised Versions of the Gospels. The adjective ‘gracious’ occurs only once (Luk 4:22) in the Authorized Version and not at all in the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885. The idea, however, covered by the noun is of very frequent occurrence, and may truly be said to be one of the leading characteristics of Jesus Himself, and of the gospel He came to proclaim.

1. The passage Luk 4:22 is rendered in the Authorized Version, ‘And all bare him witness, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth.’ The Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 keeps more closely to the form of the Gr. expression, and renders ‘wondered at the words of grace.’ In so doing it departs from the general practice of the older English versions, which from Tindale onwards adopted the form of the Authorized Version. Wyclif and the Rhemish version support the rendering of the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, following in all probability the example of the Vulgate *in verbis gratiae* which they rendered literally. The best modern version (Weymouth’s) paraphrases and expands the expression thus, ‘wondering at the sweet words of kindness which fell from his lips’; while Weizsäcker’s admirable German version translates simply *die lieblichen Worte*. The best rendering, where the phrase is thus understood, is probably that of Plummer, ‘winning words.’ The words of the original, ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος, suggest such a rendering, since the original meaning of χάρις, as it is found in Gr. literature, is that of ‘comeliness’ or ‘winsomeness’ (see the *Lexicons* for examples). But general, popular, and attractive as such an interpretation is, another is probably the correct one. See preceding article.

2. The Gr. word χάρις occurs on several other occasions in the Gospels, and is variously rendered in the English versions. In order to gain a clearer idea of its meaning, it is necessary to examine these. Of the youthful John we read in Luk 2:40 ‘the grace of God was upon him,’ and of the child Jesus (Luk 2:52) that He ‘advanced in favour ((Revised Version margin) ‘grace’) with God and men.’ Weymouth uses ‘favour’ in both passages. On three occasions, in Luk 6:32-34, we have the expression, ‘What thank have ye?’ representing the Gr. ποῖα ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν; and the same sense of the word is found in Luk 17:9. The only other passage in the Gospels where the word occurs is in the prologue to the Fourth Gospel, where it is found three times (Joh 1:14; Joh 1:16-17), and is rendered in each case ‘grace.’ See Grace.

3. There remains for us to see how the quality of 'graciousness' is manifested in Jesus during His earthly ministry. Many who take the word 'gracious' of Luk 4:22 in the narrower sense noted above, look only for the 'graciousness' of our Lord to be revealed in His manner of dealing with men, in His outward conduct and speech. This view is, of course, true. His readiness to take part in all the festivities and social functions of everyday life marked Him off clearly to His contemporaries from the ascetic attitude of John the Baptist. His playful, gentle winsomeness that won the children to His knee was a scandal to His disciples. His brotherly attitude towards the diseased and stricken, His generous help, His readiness of sympathy, emboldened leprous, blind, and ashamed humanity to dare the publicity it shrank from, or the menace and rebuke of the crowd, to cast itself at His feet, and throw itself upon His gracious consideration. This same characteristic is revealed in His intimate association with the household at Bethany, and His special affection for John and Lazarus, as well as in such exquisitely human touches as His longing look of love given to the young questioner (Mar 10:21).

'Men could approach near to Him, could eat and drink with Him, could listen to His talk, and ask Him questions, and they found Him not accessible only, but warm-hearted, and not occupied so much with His own plans that He could not attend to a case of distress or mental perplexity' (*Ecce Homo*, ch. 5).

This peculiar graciousness was displayed in such acts as washing the feet of His disciples, and in His patient tolerance of the scepticism of Thomas.

But when we go deeper than form of speech or nature of deed, we find this quality still more clearly manifested. If 'graciousness' is to bear the richer meaning we have seen it may carry, then its significance in the words and works of Jesus is all the greater. His parables (e.g. the Lost Sheep, the Prodigal Son, the Good Samaritan), how full they are of this peculiar quality of the Divine revelation! His conduct to sinful men and women, how sharply did it contrast with the attitude of His contemporaries (Luk 7:36-50, Mar 10:35; Mar 10:45)! His prayer for His enemies shows with wonderful tenderness how this spirit did not desert Him at the moment of greatest trial, how inherent it was, therefore, in His very nature (Luk 23:34). In His thought the gracious method of His treatment of men was to become a general standard of conduct (Joh 13:15), and would even constitute the basis of final judgment (Mat 25:45). It should not be overlooked that, while St. Luke is the Evangelist who most frequently and clearly reveals this characteristic of Jesus, and dwells most distinctly upon it, each of the others supplies sufficient evidence to prove that St. Luke's picture is no imaginary one, nor even his emphasis exaggerated. See Grace.

Literature.—The various Commentaries on the passages cited, in particular on Luk 4:22 : Plummer, B. and J. Weiss (8th ed.), and B. Weiss (9th ed.); Adeney,

Introduction in *Century Bible*, pp. 6-13; The *Lexicons* of Grimm-Thayer and Cremer, s.v. χάρις; Ross, *The Teaching of Jesus*, chs. 7, 8; Phillips Brooks, *The Influence of Jesus*, pp. 17-25; Wendt, *The Teaching of Jesus* (English translation), vol. i. pp. 148-151; Bruce, *Galilean Gospel*, 30 ff.; artt. 'Grace' and 'Gracious' in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible*.

G. Currie Martin.

☞ Grapes

GRAPES.—See Wine.

☞ Grass

GRASS.—In the OT there are several Heb. words which are translated 'grass,' but they are all very general terms; in the NT the only word so translated is χάρις. Strictly speaking, no plant should be called a grass unless it belongs to the botanical order *Gramineae*, but this is a comparatively modern distinction. The Biblical writers do not, of course, employ the term with scientific precision. The modern Arab includes, under the common designation *hashîsh* (grass), field-flowers such as anemones, poppies, and tulips. If, as is probable, it was in this wider sense that Christ and His contemporaries used the word, it lends new point and charm to His appeal, 'If God so clothe the grass of the field' (Mat 6:30), and invests with fresh beauty the familiar words, 'All flesh is grass, and all the glory thereof as the flower of grass' (1Pe 1:24 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ; cf. Jam 1:10-11).

The true grasses of Palestine are very numerous; Dr. Post gives the figures for Palestine and Syria as 90 genera and 243 species (Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible* ii. 258). Pasture grasses vary greatly in quality and profusion according to climate, soil, and elevation. Turf is rare. Grass is much used as fuel (Mat 6:30), especially in districts where wood is scarce (see Oven).

Hugh Duncan.

☞ Grave

GRAVE.—See Tomb.

☩ Grave-Clothes

GRAVE-CLOTHES.—The account in the Gospels of the circumstances attending the burial of our Lord illustrates fully the general practice of the time with regard to grave-clothes. The body of Jesus, doubtless after being bathed, after the manner of the Jews as well as of the Greeks (Act_9:37, cf. *Gospel of Peter*, 6), was ‘wrapped’ (ἐνεπίλιξεν, Mat_27:59, Luk_23:53) or ‘swathed’ (ἐνείλησεν, Mar_15:46) in the shroud of linen cloth (σινδόνι) which Joseph of Arimathaea had procured on his way back to Golgotha, and which is described as ‘fresh’ or ‘unused’ (καθαρᾶ, Mat_27:59), in accordance with the sacred use to which it was put (cf. Mar_11:2). Spices were next crumbled between the folds of the linen (μετὰ τῶν ἀρωμάτων, Joh_19:40), and the whole was then bound together with strips of cloth (ὀθονίοις, Joh_19:40; cf. κειρίαις, Joh_11:44). The face was covered with a separate face-cloth or ‘napkin’ (τὸ σουδάριον, Joh_20:7).

In later Judaism it was held that the resemblance of the future to the present body was so close that men would rise in the same clothes in which they were buried, on the analogy of the grain of corn which comes up from the earth not naked, but clothed (cf. 1Co_15:37). And accordingly the Rabbis were in the habit of giving careful directions as to their grave-clothes (Weber, *Jud. Theol.*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 370). This frequently led, however, to such unnecessary expense in the way of luxurious wrappings, that by way of protest Rabbi Gamaliel left directions that he was to be buried in simple linen garments, while his grandson limited the number of grave-clothes to *one* dress (see Edersheim, *Sketches of Jewish Social Life*, p. 168 f.). At the present day, among Jews as well as Mohammedans, the corpse is attired in the ordinary holiday attire of life.

Literature.—See under art. Burial, also art. ‘Begräbnis bei den Hebraern’ in Herzog, *RE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , with the literature there cited.

George Milligan.

Greatness

GREATNESS

1. *The greatness of Christ.*—Greatness is an attribute which more than once in the Scriptures is applied to Jesus Christ. It is used both relatively, in passages which suggest a comparison between His powers and those of such OT heroes as Jacob (Joh_4:12), Jonah and Solomon (Mat_12:41-42), and Abraham or the prophets (Joh_8:53); and in an absolute sense, with reference to the esteem in which He was to be held in the eyes of Jehovah (Luk_1:32). In the teaching of Jesus Himself, however, greatness is less a status than a quality. In the few words in which He alludes to His own human greatness, He makes it to consist in capacity for service and for sacrifice (Mar_10:45 ||), and it is significant that in the Epistles also the attribute is ascribed to Him only where the idea of service and sacrifice is prominent in the context (Heb_4:14; Heb_10:21; Heb_13:20).

In one passage the greatness of the Son is compared with that of the Father (Joh_14:28). This is admittedly a difficult saying. The important point to be borne in mind is that the statement must not be interpreted apart from the rest of Christ's teaching concerning His relationship to the First Person in the Trinity. A careful study of His whole attitude seems to show that, whether He is here referring to such inferiority as is involved in His possessing the Divine essence by communication or to that which belonged to His subordination as being incarnate upon the earth, the words 'are perfectly consistent with the belief in the unity of the Divine nature, and therefore with the belief in the equality of the Godhead of the Son with the Godhead of the Father' (Westcott, *ad loc.*; cf. Godet, *ad loc.*).

2. *The greatness of Christ's followers.*—Christ has less to say about His own greatness than about that of His followers. For there is a greatness that belongs to His Kingdom, and this He covets for each one of them. So exalted is it that it surpasses the highest conception of greatness hitherto received (Mat_11:11 = Luk_7:28). But this greatness of the Kingdom differs essentially from that in which the world delights. The world has confused greatness itself with certain caricatures of it known as 'fame' and 'power.' The teaching of Jesus draws clear lines of distinction.

(a) Greatness is *not fame*. Men's fame consists in what others say about them; Christians' greatness consists in what they themselves are. Of the former consideration Christ bids His followers to be exultingly independent (Mat_5:11-12, note the strong word ἀγαλλιᾶσθε). Indeed, to share in their Lord's greatness will involve not praise but persecution (Joh_15:20). But upon the second consideration,

that is to say, upon their character, their claim to greatness wholly depends. And the character demanded includes, not the assertive qualities of notoriety, but the milder attributes of childlike humility (Mar_9:34, Mat_18:1; Mat_18:4, Luk_9:48), and obedience to the Divine law (Mat_5:19—a passage which has an important bearing on the relationship of the new dispensation to the old).

(b) Greatness is *not power*. This, it is true, is the current conception of it. In the world's view, to be great is to be able to exact from others as much as is possible of respect and service. The more servants a man has at his disposal, the wider the sphere in which he can command obedience, the greater he is held to be (Mar_10:42 ||). Such was also the disciples' conception. Two of them were ambitious of sitting the one on Christ's right hand and the other on His left in His Kingdom; the others were jealous, because they coveted these seats of authority for themselves (Mar_10:35 ff. = Mat_20:20 ff.). In striking contrast with this view Jesus places His own pronouncement on greatness. According to His teaching as well as His example (see above), to be great is not to exact, but to give, as much service as possible. A man's greatness is measured less by the service he commands than by the service he renders (Mar_10:43-45 ||). In a glorious paradox the highest in the Kingdom is he who assumes the lowest place (Mat_23:11, Joh_13:14-16, and, for the supreme example, Php_2:5-11).

The practical importance of such teaching can scarcely be over-emphasized. Until the time of the Incarnation the position of a servant was the lowest of all; but when the Son of God appeared, He, in St. Paul's words, 'took the form of a servant' ($\mu\omicron\rho\varphi\eta\nu\ \delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\upsilon$, Php_2:7), and from that day the whole status of honourable service, in whatever capacity, has been consecrated and raised. The position it occupies is no longer menial; it is the most exalted of all. The servant's life, indeed, may be a life of *greatness*, inasmuch as Christ has placed the very essence of greatness no longer in power to command, but in willingness to minister. The very title which our Lord uses of Himself in appealing to His own example (Mar_10:45 ||), suggests that the nearer a man's life approaches to the ideal of humanity, the more completely will he realize his greatness in the service of others.

The exact significance of the title 'Son of Man' (wh. see) has been much discussed. To the present writer the truest explanation appears to be that which makes it point to Christ as the ideal of humanity. That is to say, He was not only *a* man, but also the perfect representation of mankind. There was nothing in Him that is foreign to ideal human nature, nor anything lacking that belongs to it. He was, if we may so express it, the perfect specimen of what man was intended to be. It will be seen that, if this view is correct, the application of the title made above is justifiable.

One more saying of Jesus must be included in our study. To His followers, as we have shown, greatness does not mean power in any earthly sense. And yet the very men who refuse to exert such power shall be possessed by a power superior to all earthly might—the power of the Father’s protection (Joh 10:29—according to the probable reading).

H. Bisseker.

⚠ Grecians, Greeks

GRECIANS, GREEKS

i. Distinction of the Words.

1. Greek.—The name Ἕλληνας, derived from a small tribe living in Thessaly, was extended to include all of Greek race, whether natives of Greece or of the Greek islands or colonies. This is the use in classical Greek, and it also appears in the NT, e.g. Act 18:17 (TR [Note: R Textus Receptus.]), ‘All the Greeks took Sosthenes,’ etc.; Rom 1:14 (the Greek division of mankind into Greeks and non-Greeks or Barbarians); perhaps also 1Co 1:22-23 (Schleusner). This meaning was widened by the Jews to include all non-Jews who lived as the Greeks, using their language and manners. Where Ἕλληνας are opposed to Jews, the primary reference is to a difference of religious worship (Grimm).

So in LXX Septuagint of Isa 9:10 where Ἕλληνας appears for ‘Philistines’; cf. also 2Ma 4:13; 2Ma 6:9. Thus the Jews divided mankind into Jews and Greeks, which corresponds to the division of Jews and Gentiles; cf. Act 14:1; Act 19:10, Rom 1:16; Rom 2:9-10; Rom 3:9; Rom 10:12, 1Co 10:32, Gal 3:28, Col 3:11. In this sense Titus was a Greek (Gal 2:3), and also the father of Timothy (Act 16:3). This use of the word was continued by the Christian Fathers, such as Justin Martyr, Tatian, and Athanasius.

2. Grecian.—Ἑλληνιστής (from Ἑλληνίζω), Authorized Version ‘Grecian,’ one who copies the customs and uses the language of the Greeks, received among the Jews the technical meaning of a Jew of the Dispersion, born outside Palestine and living among the Gentiles. These remained faithful to Judaism, but spoke Hellenistic Greek, the vernacular of daily life in the Gentile world. In the NT Ἑλληνιστής is opposed to Ἑβραῖ

ος, a Palestinian Jew (see Trench, *NT Synonyms*); cf. Act 6:1. See J. H. Moulton, *Gram. of N.T. Greek*, ch. i.

ii. Greek Influence in Palestine.

1. Historical.—The conquests of Alexander the Great (b.c. 331) opened the East to Greek settlers. Numbers of his veterans settled in Syria, and Greek colonists were welcomed by his successors. Old towns (as Gaza, Askalon, Ashdod, and Samaria) were Hellenized, and new Greek towns (as Scythopolis, Pella, and Gerasa) were built. Alexander's policy of Hellenizing his conquests was to a great extent successful, and a large section of the inhabitants of Palestine favoured Greek culture. It appeared likely that Hellenism would slowly conquer Judaism, and that the zealous adherents of the Mosaic law would become a minority in the nation. Had this happened, the blending of Greek culture with Judaism might have taken place on Palestinian soil as it did in Alexandria. Judaism, however, was saved through the injudicious action of Antiochus Epiphanes, who ruled Syria b.c. 175-164. In b.c. 168, Antiochus endeavoured to thoroughly Hellenize Judaea. He forbade the Jewish worship, and ordered sacrifices to be offered to heathen deities in the cities of Judaea. The penalty of disobedience was death (1Ma 1:41-57). This led to the rebellion of the Maccabees. During the troubled years which followed, the Jewish national party regained much of their lost ground. Hellenism was discouraged, and even persecuted. Subsequently Jewish patriotism took the form of zealous observance of the Law, and there resulted the strongly marked division between Jew and Greek which we find in the Gospels.

2. Extent of Greek influence in Palestine in the time of Christ.

(1) *Greek districts.*—The districts of Palestine which in the time of Christ were chiefly Jewish were Judaea, Galilee, and Peraea (Josephus *BJ* iii. 3; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP* History of the Jewish People.] ii. i. 3 ff.). Close to these were districts predominantly Greek. The towns of Philistia had heathen temples. The whole seaboard of the Mediterranean was Greek except Joppa and Jamnia. On the north, heathen territory was reached in Caesarea Philippi, where there was a celebrated temple to Pan. On the east we find the Greek league of Decapolis (G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [Note: *GHL* Historical Geog. of Holy Land.] p. 593). Even in central Palestine heathen temples existed at Samaria and Scythopolis. In the Greek cities athletic contests took place, and the usual amusements of the theatre and gymnasium were provided. Thus within a few miles of the scenes of the Saviour's ministry there were Gentile cities with temples, society, and culture, fully Greek. But although Jesus went into the country districts of the Gentile portions of Palestine, we have no record of His entering any Greek cities. For instance, we do not know that He ever entered Tiberias, although frequently in that neighbourhood.

(2) *Jewish districts*.—Even in the Jewish districts of Palestine, Greek influence was distinctly felt. Foreign as the theatre and amphitheatre were to Jewish notions, they were built at Jerusalem by Herod the Great (Josephus *Ant.* xv. viii. 1), and they also existed at Jericho. Greek architecture found its way even into Herod's Temple. Even in the most Jewish localities there must have been a considerable number of Gentiles. Commerce and civilization bear witness to strong Greek influence. The Greek language must have been understood by many, although Aramaic was the usual tongue. This linguistic influence is evident in several ways: (a) the Greek words which are transliterated into Hebrew in the Mishna; (b) the three languages in which the inscription on the cross was written; (c) the Greek names of some of the Apostles, as Philip and Andrew; (d) the NT writers' use of the colloquial Greek as found on papyri; (e) the quotations from the LXX Septuagint in the NT. Hence Christ lived among a people which, although strongly Jewish, was greatly influenced by Gentile thought and civilization. (See Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. i. § 22; Edersheim, *Life and Times*, i. 84-92).

iii. Christ's contact with the Greeks.—In two cases only do we find it explicitly stated that Greeks came to the Saviour. These are:

(1) *The Syro-Phœnician woman* (Mar_7:26).—The Saviour was either on Gentile ground (note the strongly supported reading διὰ Σιδῶνος, Mar_7:37) or very near it (so Edersheim). The woman was a native of the country, and is called a Greek, in the sense of not being a Jew, and she was a heathen. Legends of the woman's life are to be found in *Clem. Homilies*, ii. 19.

(2) *The Greeks who asked to see Jesus* (Joh_12:20).—Some have considered that these Greeks were really Grecian Jews (properly Ἕλληνησται) (so Calvin, Ewald, and others). But there seems no reason for thinking that the word 'Greek' is not used here, as commonly, as equivalent to 'Gentile.' Evidently they were also proselytes (Joh_12:20 'to worship').

There are other cases in which Christ apparently came in contact with 'Greeks,' but without the term being used—(a) *The healing of the demoniac* (Mat_8:28-34, Mar_5:1-20, Luk_8:26-39). Notwithstanding the uncertainty in the name of the place, it was evidently on the eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee, where the inhabitants were mainly Gentile (note Decapolis, Mar_5:20). The keeping of so large a herd of swine betokens the presence of a Gentile population. (b) *The centurion whose servant was healed* (Mat_8:5-13, Luk_7:1-10). That the centurion was not a Jew appears from Luk_7:5. (c) *The healing of one deaf and dumb* (Mar_7:31-37). This was in the Greek region of Decapolis.

iv. Christ and the Grecians.—The Dispersion of the Jews had compulsory and voluntary causes. Large numbers of Israelites had been carried away captive by the Assyrians and Babylonians; and Pompey had taken many Jewish captives to Rome. But a much larger dispersion was due to voluntary emigration. From the time of Alexander the Great, Jewish colonies were gradually formed in the great commercial centres. Thus large numbers of Jews were to be found in Alexandria, in Antioch, in all the important cities on the Mediterranean, and even in Bithynia and Pontus. These Grecian Jews were active representatives of Judaism among the Gentiles, and won large numbers of proselytes from heathenism.

The word ‘Grecian’ (Ἑλληνιστής) does not occur in the Gospels, although, owing to the attendance of non-Palestinian Jews at the feasts and the residence of many in Palestine, our Saviour must often have met with Grecians. One reference only occurs, Joh 7:35. The Jews wondered whether Christ would go to ‘the dispersed among the Gentiles’ (ἡ διασπορὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων), and, from working among these Hellenistic Jews, proceed to teach even the Greeks (Ἕλληνας). In this surmise they really anticipated the way in which Christianity found in the Grecian Jews a bridge by which it passed to the conquest of the Gentile world.

For the Greek language see Language of Christ.

Literature.—Grimm-Thayer, s.vv.; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] , Index, s.vv. ‘Greek influences,’ ‘Hellenism’; Edersheim, *Life and Times*, i. 17-30, 84-92; artt. ‘Grecians,’ ‘Greece,’ in vol. ii. of Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible , and ‘Diaspora’ in Ext. Vol.; art. ‘Hellenism’ in *Encyc. Biblica*; M’Fadyen, art. ‘Hellenism’ in *AJT*^h [Note: JTh American Journal of Theology.] . x. 30.

F. E. Robinson.

☞ Greetings

GREETINGS.—‘To greet’ and ‘to salute’ stand in NT for the same Gr. verb, ἀσπάζεσθαι : Authorized Version renders indifferently ‘greet’ and ‘salute’; Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 almost uniformly ‘salute.’ The exceptions are Act 20:1 Authorized Version ‘embraced,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘took leave of’; Act 21:6 Authorized Version ‘took leave of,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘bade farewell’; Heb 11:13 Authorized Version ‘embraced,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT

1885 'greeted.' χαίρειν is used for 'greeting,' and in imper. in the sense of 'hail' or 'farewell'; *i.e.* χαίρειν is the greeting, while ἀσπάζεσθαι is general, circumstances determining in each case what the greeting is. Thus in Mar_15:18 ἤρξαντο ἀσπάζεσθαι αὐτὸν Χαῖρε, 'they began to salute him, Hail.'

The Oriental has always attached great importance to the formal courtesies of life. However easy in demeanour and free in conversation he may be, the laws regulating social customs, sanctioned only by immemorial usage, are punctiliously observed. Any breach of these is regarded as a grave offence. His honour (*sharaf*), in all matters of ceremony, is very delicate and brittle, but strangely tough in things of greater moment. He will bear lightly an exposure that would cover us with perpetual shame; treat him with less formal respect than he desires, and he will fall into a paroxysm of rage over his 'broken honour.'

Greetings vary with the rank of parties, from the abject prostration of the subject before his sovereign, to the familiar kiss of friendly equals. One of humbler station salutes in silence, showing respect by bending his hand to the ground, then touching his lips and forehead. He will, at times, kiss the hand of his superior, and raise it to his brow. One interceding for another (Mar_7:25), or begging a favour (Mat_18:26; Mat_18:29), will fall down flat; while in token of utter submission one may kiss a benefactor's feet (Luk_7:38; Luk_7:45). Slaves or servants kiss the sleeve or skirt of their lord's clothing. To touch (Mat_9:20) or kiss the hem of the garment indicates great reverence. Dervishes and other 'holy men' are thus saluted. In the Greek Church worshippers often kiss the skirt of the priest's robe. To kiss upon the cheek is a sign of warm affection (Luk_15:20), of the love and esteem of friends. This stains with a darker infamy the treachery of Judas (Mat_26:49 etc).

Usually the rider salutes the footman, the traveller those whom he passes on the wayside, the smaller party the larger (one speaking for the rest in each case), and the young the aged. In a crowded street it is, of course, impossible to greet everyone. Only venerable sheikhs, or men distinguished by rank, wealth, or sacred learning, are saluted. The Jews freed the Rabbis from all obligation to salute. To be saluted 'Rabbi' was a coveted honour (Mat_23:7, Mar_12:38). They merely acknowledged the salutation and passed on. The Moslem salutes both on entering (Mat_10:12) and on leaving a house.

To every form of salutation custom prescribes an answer. To use any other is regarded as proof of ignorance or vulgarity. The common salutation is *salâm 'aleik*, 'peace be upon you' (Luk_24:36), to which the answer is, 'And upon you be peace.' It is a Moslem's duty to give this salutation to another; but it may be omitted without sin.

When, however, the salutation is given, the Moslem is bound to return it. The Moslems claim this as ‘the salutation of Islâm, and not for the mouths of the heathen, with whom is no peace nor fellowship, neither in this world nor in the next’ (Doughty, *Arabia Deserta*, i. 503). Once Mr. Doughty was gravely imperilled because he ‘had greeted with *Salaam Aleyk*, which they [the Arabs] will have to be a salutation of God’s people only—the Moslemîn’ (*ib.* ii. 369). If a Moslem by mistake give it to a non-Moslem, it should not be returned. On discovery the former may revoke it, as he does should a Moslem fail to return it, saying, ‘Peace be on *us* and on the righteous worshippers of God’ (Luk_10:6). The insecure life of Hebrew and Arab, ever exposed to alarm of war or robber raid, no doubt gave special meaning to the greeting ‘Peace.’

At meeting of friends, greetings are lengthy and wearisome. Of the Arabs, Doughty observes, ‘The long nomad greetings ... are for the most, to say over a dozen times with bashful solemnity the same *cheyf ent, cheyf ent*, “How dost thou? and how heartily again?” ’ (*ib.* i. 433). Dr. Mackie gives a good example of the more elaborate trifling of the Syrians (*Bible Manners and Customs*, p. 150). The phrases are set and conventional, the maximum of words conveying the minimum of meaning.

The Rabbis forbade one mourning for the dead to salute. Interruption of prayer was forbidden, even to salute a king, nay, to uncoil a serpent from the foot. The Rabbis all agreed that, to avoid distraction, no one should be saluted immediately before prayer (Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus*, ii. 137). The nature of the salutations indicated above sufficiently explains these restrictions, and also enables us to understand the prohibition of Jesus, ‘Salute no man by the way’ (Luk_10:4). The urgency of that mission could brook no such delays.

W. Ewing.

☞ Grief

GRIEF.—See Sorrow.

☞ Grinding

GRINDING.—See Mill.

☛ Groaning

GROANING.—See Sighing; and Anger, p. 62^b.

☛ Growing

GROWING

Under this term students of the Greek Testament have to do with only one word—and that a verb, *αὐξάνω*. The consideration of the corresponding substantive does not properly form the subject of inquiry in this Dictionary. Rare in classical literature, *αὐξῆσις* is used only twice in the NT, viz. in Eph_4:16 and Col_2:19. The verb is, however, employed some twelve times within the four Gospels. It is a verb of exceedingly doubtful derivation, but probably is etymologically linked with the German *wachsen* and our own *wax*; less certainly with the Latin *augeo*. Its underlying meaning is that of additional size, bulk, or power. The normal usage of the verb in the Classics implies that such access comes from without, it is superimposed by some external agency. This significance lies both in the transitive and intransitive use of the verb, and affords, as will be seen, a striking contrast with its use in the Greek Testament. Quotations are not needful. The verb is employed by classical writers from Homer downwards to mark efforts to increase the power of the State or of a country, of special honour paid to parents, of the exaggerations of orators, of the waxing of the moon, of the noontide heat of the sun, of the height of the waves of the sea. Enough to say that in classical literature the verb marks an increase or addition to a person or thing brought about by external agency.

The Hebrew language is very rich in terms which signify ‘growth.’ There are some 16 words, verbs and nouns substantive, which bear this general meaning. It is enough to say here that they are capable of a single classification. One set of expressions corresponds to *αὐξάνω* in the sense already indicated; the other, which is preponderant, marks ‘growth’ of the physical order, seminal growth; and is applied with a great wealth of illustration to the life of plants, trees, the brute creation, and of man himself. Every student of the Psalter or of the Prophetic books is aware of the word-pictures here in which the writers take delight, a delight which is spiritual more than intellectual, of the heart rather than the mind. The natural laws of physical development are by these writers boldly made to apply to the spiritual

world. Jehovah, supreme in the one sphere, is supreme in the other. Growth is from within, but yet it is 'God who giveth the increase.'

When the student turns to the NT, and to the idea of growth which finds expression there, he finds that there is a greater affinity of conception between the inspired writers of both Testaments than there is between the writers of the NT and classical Greek writers. The affinity simply lies in the common conception, with its spiritual applications, of a germinal growth, expanding and blossoming unto fruitage whether in nature or in grace.

1. *References in the Gospels.*—With the above preliminaries, the issue may now be considered in relation to the four Gospels. And first, the less careful student must be warned that the quotation which records the pathetic plea of the disciples to their Lord, 'Increase our faith,'* [Note: Luk 17:5 πρόσθες ἡμῖν τίστιν.] stands out as an exception. The translation [Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885] may serve, but it is doubtful whether 'our' is admissible. Despite the verb, it is questionable whether the disciples then asked for a growth of that spirit of which they were consciously possessed. Were they not rather asking for some gift new and strange to their experience? In any case growth of the physical order is not in place here; for this we must look, as has been shown, almost exclusively to the verb αὐξάνω. This verb is of frequent occurrence in the Gospels, although only once employed by the Fourth Evangelist,† [Note: Joh 3:30 opposed to ἐλαττοῦσθαι.] when the Baptist's language is rendered as expressing the growing authority of the new Teacher, and the increasing number of His adherents. It is interesting to observe that with regard to all other instances of the occurrence of this word, they either apply, as here, to the Lord Himself, or else form a part of His own utterances; nor is the interest of the point largely affected by the admission that our Lord would normally use Aramaic. The Evangelists doubtless discovered in the verb αὐξάνω what they wished to convey about His childhood, and what they understood Him to teach in lessons drawn from the natural world.

In his unique account of our Lord's childhood the Second Evangelist declares of Him (Luk 2:40) that which he had in precisely the same terms declared of the Baptist (Luk 1:80), that 'the child grew and waxed strong, filled with wisdom'[of the Baptist, 'in spirit']; that is, the development of Christ, both spiritually and physically, was normal and equable in its character. The phraseology of St. Luke suggests a contrast with the Apocryphal Gospels, whose account of Christ's infancy makes Him appear a wonder-working prodigy, a phenomenal child, anxious for the display of supernatural powers. St. Luke will have none of this. He is not content with a single protest, for later (Luk 2:52) he solemnly declares that as the child Jesus advanced in years so He

developed in wisdom and in favour with God and men. Here, however, the ‘growth’ is not explicitly stated, the rare verb (προέκοπτεν) used marking rather advancement, or progress triumphing over difficulties in the way.

The remaining instances of the verb αὐξάνω appear for the most part in our Lord’s parabolic discourses. Thus it is seen to be the characteristic feature of the seed sown.‡ [Note: Mar_4:8, cf. v. 27 where growth is expressed by μηκύνηται.] There is a process of secret assimilation between it and the good ground; and growth, not sterility or a rash prematurity, is the consequence.§ [Note: The lessons as to hindrances to growth taught in the Parable of the Sower would need a separate study.] In the immortal contrast (Mat_6:28, cf. Luk_12:27) between the lilies of the field and the garish splendour of Solomon’s court dress, it is less upon the beauty of the flowers that Christ lays stress than upon their growth, gradual and all unconscious, spontaneous, effortless. In the parable of the Tares and Wheat this characteristic verb appears in the permission, at once generous and awful, of the master to his servants to let both grow together until the harvest (Mat_13:30). In the same parabolic discourse it is the growth of the mustard-seed, the development of the surprisingly little, which furnishes an analogue of the spread of the Church universal (Mat_13:31). Lastly, although we have not here the verb αὐξάνω, we find the mysterious condemnation passed upon the barren fig-tree (Mat_21:19), a condemnation of that which is purely physical, sterility in fruit, which fruit in the world of men as in the life of plants and trees is the consequence of all true growth.

2. The underlying idea.—It seems somewhat strange, since the OT is so full of religious teaching drawn from physical growth, that only in the one instance, quoted above, of our Lord’s childhood is a spiritual application of the idea directly made in the Gospel narrative. Christ, we may reverently say it, was content to lay the conception which was ever before Him, in garden, harvest field, and orchard, also before His own. If they had eyes to see these things, and ears to hear them,—if they would only ‘consider’ (Luk_12:24; Luk_12:27) them,—heart and conscience would do the rest. Then they, as we, would perceive this natural law in the spiritual world—a growing within, secret, beautiful, fertile, in men, and yet not of man, yielding the increase and harvest of the Spirit, His fruit rather than their works.

3. Application of the idea.—But if it is thought even by devout and careful students that such ideas are more than may be gathered from our Lord’s actual utterances, those who treasured His sayings in the Apostolic age did not think so. St. Peter and St. Paul no longer use the idea of growing as a metaphor. It is a gracious fact both for the Church and the individual believer. Thus the Apostle of the Gentiles uses the conception of inward Christian growth (Eph_4:15), and so as to form a shrine wherein

the Divine presence may be manifest (Eph 2:21); his prayer for his Colossian converts is that they may grow in further knowledge of God (Col 1:10); his promise to them if they 'hold the Head' (Col 2:19), is that they shall grow with a Divine increase. Twice he assures the Corinthians (1Co 3:8) that this growth, although in them, has a Divine origin. St. Peter (1Pe 2:2, cf. [2Pe 3:18]) shows that the Holy Scriptures have their own function in the growth of grace. It is enough; the conception is carried through from one Testament to the other, and its teaching is consecrated, its consolation is secured in and through Him whom the great Evangelical prophet (Isa 11:1) prefigured as the very symbol of growing: 'There shall come forth a shoot out of the stock of Jesse, and a branch out of his roots shall bear fruit,' That fruit is still seen in every plant planted by the Divine Husbandman (Mat 15:13).

Literature.—Reference may be made to Drummond, *Nat. Law in the Spir. World*, p. 123 ff.; Bruce, *Parabolic Teaching*, pp. 90-143; Marcus Dods, *Parables of our Lord*, 1st Ser. p. 47 ff.

B. Whitefoord.

Guard

GUARD.—1. Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 rendering of *κουστωδία* (Lat. *custodia*), Mat 27:65-66; Mat 28:11, Authorized Version 'watch'; obtained by the chief priests and Pharisees from Pilate to guard the sepulchre. The need of Pilate's authorization and the risk of punishment from him (Mat 28:14) show that this guard must have consisted, not of the Jewish Temple police, but of soldiers from the Roman cohort at Jerusalem; possibly, though not probably, the same as had guarded the cross (*ἔχετε*, Mat 27:65, is probably imperative, 'have (take) a guard'). A watch usually consisted of four men (Polyb. vi. 33), each of whom watched in turn, while the others rested beside him so as to be roused by the least alarm; but in this case the guards may have been more numerous.

2. 'A soldier of his [Herod's] guard' (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 translation of *σπεκουλάτωρ*, Lat. *speculator*, Authorized Version 'executioner') beheaded John the Baptist, Mar 6:27. *Speculatores* were originally spies or scouts (from *specula*, 'a look-out'); but we find them chiefly employed (a) as messengers or couriers, carrying official despatches; (b) as military executioners. A certain number were attached to each legion, besides others belonging to the Praetorian guard, who were closely attached to the Emperor's person and ready for any special service. There are many examples in classical writers (e.g. Seneca, *de Ira*, i. ii. 4), Acts of Martyrs, and

Rabbinic writings, of their employment as executioners; for reff. see Schürer, Wetstein, etc. The Herods had bodyguards (δορυφόροι, σωματοφύλακες, Josephus *BJ* i. xxxiii. 7-9, ii. xv. 1, etc.), and may have given them the Roman title of *speculatores*; or the word may here be used generally for an executioner. Herod sent some of his guards (δορυφόροι) to kill his son Antipater (*Ant.* xvii. vii. 1, *BJ* i. xxxiii. 7).

Literature.—Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] i. ii. 62f.; Benson, *Cyprian*, 505 n. [Note: note.] ; Golling in Hase and Iken's *Thes. Nov.* ii. 405; Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, ii. pp. 420, 547.

Harold Smith.

☪ Guest

GUEST.—Hospitality was, and to a large extent still is, one of the chief virtues of Oriental life. This was due in large measure to the nomadic character of Eastern peoples, among whom there was no provision for the traveller apart from private entertainment. The casual passer-by, the unknown stranger, even the enemy, were welcomed to tent or house, provided with food and lodging, waited on often by the host himself, and dismissed without being expected or even allowed to pay for their entertainment. Even yet, where the influence of travellers and tourists from the West has not corrupted the ancient manners, the offer of payment is regarded as an insult. The practice of ages has invested the guest with a peculiar sacredness: a breach of hospitality is an almost unheard of disgrace. Underlying this ready hospitality of the East is the idea that every stranger is *daif Ullah*, 'the guest of God.' The host himself is a sojourner (Heb. *gər*, Arab, *jar*) with God; the stranger is a fellow-guest, and loyalty to God demands that he should be hospitably entertained. Not unlike this, though on a higher plane, is the teaching of Jesus as to God's knowledge of and provision for our needs, which frees the trustful, childlike heart from all undue anxiety (Mat_6:25-34, Luk_12:22-31).

In the Gospels, however, it is not the free hospitality of the nomad desert life that meets us, but the more restricted hospitality of the town, of meals and banquets.

The word 'guest' occurs in Authorized Version of the Gospels only in Mat_22:10 f. (in the parable of the Wedding Feast), where 'guests' = ἀνακείμενοι; and in Luk_19:7, where 'to be guest' (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'to lodge') = καταλῦσαι. The

Gr. word ἀνάκειμαι, which indicates the reclining posture then generally adopted, occurs frequently in reference to meals or banquets, and is usually translated 'sit at meat' (e.g. Mat 9:10; Mat 26:7). In Joh 13:23 ἀνακειμένος is rendered in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'at the table reclining.' The same word is used in Joh 6:11 in the narrative of the feeding of the 5000, though they, of course, had neither couch nor table. In a few passages κατακλινω occurs, with the same reference to reclining at table; e.g. Luk 7:36 (of a meal at which Jesus was present as a guest) Luk 14:8 (in Christ's warning against seeking the chief places); cf. art. Guest-chamber. The cognate verb ἀνακλινω is similarly used several times, e.g. Mat 8:11; Mat 14:19 etc.

During His ministry Jesus was frequently invited to be guest in private houses. Thus Matthew (Levi) entertained Him when He had called him from the 'place of toll' (Luk 5:27 ff.); Martha 'received him into her house'! (Luk 10:38 ff.); Zacchaeus 'received him joyfully' (Luk 19:1 ff.). He was one of the guests at the marriage in Cana of Galilee (Joh 2:1 ff.), and after His resurrection He 'sat down to meat' in the house of the two disciples at Emmaus (Luk 24:30). The Pharisees complained bitterly of His eating with publicans and sinners, yet several of them invited Him to be their guest (Luk 7:36 ff; Luk 11:37 ff; Luk 14:1 ff.), not, as it seems, with the purest motives of hospitality. The words of Jesus to His host on one of these occasions (Luk 7:36 ff.) introduce us to the courtesies which, if not necessarily shown to a guest, were marks of honour and regard, the giving of water to wash the feet, the kiss of welcome, the anointing of the head with oil.

It should be noted here that the request of Jesus to the Samaritan woman, 'Give me to drink' (Joh 4:7), was virtually, according to Eastern ideas, a claim on her hospitality, and in ordinary circumstances it would have been recognized and responded to at once. Her astonishment at the request reminds us that between Jew and Samaritan there was no recognition of the law of hospitality (cf. Luk 9:53; Luk 17:18).

Some of the parables of Jesus reflect this aspect of Oriental life. The man to whom a friend has come unexpectedly at midnight is distressed because he has nothing in the house to offer him (Luk 11:5 ff.). In the parable of the Wedding Feast (Mat 22:1 ff.) we note the early invitation of the guests, the calling of them by servants on the appointed day (with καλέσαι τοὺς κεκλημένους, cf. Heb. קָרָא 1Sa 9:13; 1Sa 9:22), the provision of the wedding garment.

In some other passages in the Gospels we have what seem to be traces of Oriental ideas as to the reception of guests, e.g. the instructions to the Twelve (Mat 10:11; Mat 10:14; see also Mat 10:40-42), to the Seventy (Luk 10:5 ff.). There is an Eastern

saying that 'the guest while in the house is its lord'; the host often ministers to his needs with his own hands. With this we may perhaps compare such sayings as Mat 23:11. In Mat 8:11, Luk 13:29 the final blessedness of the Kingdom of Heaven is spoken of under the figure of a feast, at which guests from the east and the west shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob. Most striking of all is the great prophecy of final judgment (Mat 25:31 ff.), where the destiny of men is made to turn on their granting or refusing to Christ, in the person of 'one of these my brethren, even the least,' the position and provision of a guest.

Literature.—*Expositor's Gr. Test.*; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, artt. 'Guest,' 'Hospitality,' 'Host'; *Encyc. Bibl.*, artt. 'Meals,' 'Stranger'; *Jewish Encyc.*, art. 'Hospitality'; Vigouroux, *Dict. de la Bible*, art. 'Hospitalité'; Hamhurger, *RE*, art. 'Gast'; Schenkel, *Bibel-Lex.*, art. 'Gast'; Robinson, *BRP* [Note: RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.] ; Trumbull, *Studies in Oriental Social Life*, pp. 73-142; W. R. Smith, *RS* [Note: S Religion of the Semites.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; Van Lennep, *Manners and Customs in Bible Lands*; Burckhardt, *Notes on the Bedouins and Wahabys*; Doughty, *Travels in Arabia Deserta (passim)*; Wilkinson, *Manners and Customs of Ancient Egyptians*.

Charles S. Macalpine.

☞ Guest-Chamber

GUEST-CHAMBER.—This word occurs in Authorized and Revised Versions only in the parallel passages Mar 14:14, Luk 22:11. Peter and John, sent by Jesus to prepare His last Passover, are told to ask the master of the house to which they would be guided, 'Where is the (Mk. 'my') guest-chamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples?' The Greek word here used (*κατάλυμα*) occurs elsewhere in NT only in the narrative of the Nativity (Luk 2:7), 'There was no room for them *in the inn*' (*ἐν τῷ κατάλυματι*). It is used by LXX Septuagint as the rendering of *לַחֲבֵרָה* (Exo 4:24, Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'lodging place') and of *לַחֲבֵרָה* (1Sa 9:22, Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'guest-chamber'). [It may here be noted that the cognate verb *καταλύω*, rendered in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'lodge,' occurs in Luk 9:12; Luk 19:7]. The guest-chamber of the last Passover is also spoken of by Jesus as 'a large upper room' (*ἀνάγαιον*, Mar 14:15, Luk 22:12). With this may be compared the *ὑπερῶον* of Act 1:13; Act 9:37; Act 9:39; Act 20:8. It has been conjectured by some

that the ἀνάγαιον of Mk. and Lk. and the ὑπερῶν of Act 1:13 are identical, but there is no evidence in support of this.

We must associate several incidents in the life of our Lord besides the last Passover with the guest-chambers of the houses in which they took place, e.g. the anointing, in the house of Simon the Pharisee, by the woman who was a sinner (Luk 7:36 ff.); the later anointing by Mary of Bethany in the house of Simon the Leper (Joh 12:1 ff.); Levi's feast (Luk 5:27 ff.); the dinner, or rather breakfast (ἀριστήση), of Luk 11:37 ff.; and the miracle and sayings of Jesus recorded in Luk 14:1 ff.

The guest-chamber occupied in our Lord's time, as it does at the present day, an important place in the arrangement and economy of Oriental houses. In it all festivities took place; it was set apart also for the entertainment of guests during their stay. It varied in position and character with the size of the house. The smaller houses (see House) had only one court; in these the guest-chamber was on the ground-floor, the women's apartments being above. But in the larger houses of the wealthier classes, which had two or three courts, the women's apartments were hidden away in an inner court, and the guest-chamber occupied the first floor of the outer court (hence ἀνάγαιον, ὑπερῶν). In either case it was open to the court, so that all that took place in the one could be seen from the other. On the opposite side of the court was another chamber, equal in size to the first, but fronted with lattice-work filled in with coloured glass; this served as a winter guest-chamber. In some cases a room on the flat roof, the most pleasant and most retired part of the house, was used as a guest-chamber. This is the תלמוד of the OT (cf. 1Ki 17:19).

The guest-chamber was, of course, furnished according to the means of the owner of the house. Many no doubt were, as indeed they are still, like the prophet's chamber of 2Ki 4:10, furnished with 'a bed, and a table, and a stool, and a candlestick.' But those of the wealthy were furnished with the greatest luxury. In our Lord's time the custom of reclining at meals was common. The couches and tables, which in the larger houses were placed on a raised part of the guest-chamber called the *lîwan*, occupied three sides of a square, and the guests reclined with their heads toward the table, the feet outward toward the wall, and the left arm resting on a cushion. This must be borne in mind in reading such narratives as those of the two anointings and of the last Passover. The places at table were allotted to the guests according to a strict etiquette, as to the details of which there is considerable uncertainty. The eagerness of the Pharisees to secure for themselves the 'chief seats' (πρωτοκλισίαι) at feasts brought on them the rebuke of Jesus (Luk 14:7 ff.), and gave occasion to His warnings to the disciples to avoid such unseemly eagerness for personal honour (Mat 23:6, Mar 12:38 ff., Luk 20:45 ff.).

Besides the guest-chambers of private houses, there were, as there are now, in most villages one or more guest-chambers, provided and maintained at the public expense, for the accommodation of travellers who arrived in larger numbers than could be privately entertained. They were shelters for man and beast of a very simple kind. Some think that the 'inn' of Bethlehem ([Luk 2:7](#)) was of this character, but others are of opinion that it was rather an inn under the care of a host, like the πανδοχεῖον of [Luk 10:34](#).

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, artt. 'House,' 'Hospitality'; *Encyc. Bibl.*, art. 'House'; *Jewish Encyclopedia*, art. 'House'; Trumbull, *Studies in Oriental Social Life*, pp. 73-142; Van Lennep, *Manners and Customs in Bible Lands*, pp. 442, 589ff.; Robinson, *BRP* [Note: RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] i. p. 80 f., ii. p. 18ff.; Lane, *Modern Egyptians*, i. p. 5ff.; *Expositor's Greek Testament*, *ad loc.*; Swete, *Com. on Mark*; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i. 564, ii. 206, 483, 493.

Charles S. Macalpine.

Guide

GUIDE

1. *The word 'guide.'*—In Authorized Version of Gospels the noun 'guide' is found only in [Mat 23:16](#); [Mat 23:24](#), where it represents ὁδηγός (lit. 'a leader of the way'). ὁδηγός occurs also, however, in [Mat 15:14](#), where Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 has consistently substituted 'blind guides' for 'blind leaders' of Authorized Version (cf. [Act 1:16](#), [Rom 2:19](#)). As a verb, 'guide' in Authorized Version of Gospels represents two different words in the original. (a) ὁδηγέω (from ὁδηγός) in [Joh 16:13](#). ὁδηγέω is found also in [Mat 15:14](#), [Luk 6:39](#) (cf. [Act 8:31](#), [Rev 7:17](#)), but is there rendered 'lead' in Authorized Version, which Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 again properly changes to 'guide.' (b) κατευθύνω (lit. 'to make straight'), which occurs only once in Gospels ([Luk 1:79](#); but cf. [1Th 3:11](#), [2Th 3:5](#)). An interesting contrast might be drawn between the false ὁδηγοί, the 'blind leaders of the blind' ([Mat 15:14](#); [Mat 23:16](#), [Luk 6:39](#)), and the true ὁδηγός (who is also Himself ἡ ὁδός, [Joh 14:6](#)), who came into the world to 'set our feet straight' into the way of peace ([Luk 1:79](#)), who promised before His departure that He would send the Spirit of truth

to guide His people into all the truth (Joh_16:13), and who will Himself hereafter 'guide them to life-giving springs of water' (Rev_7:17). With Christ as ὁδηγός of His people cf. the ἀρχηγός of Act_3:15; Act_5:31, Heb_2:10; Heb_12:2.

2. Christ as our Guide.—To communities and to individuals, otherwise walking in darkness, Christ is their Guide, the Shepherd leading His sheep, the Light preceding His people. There can be only one Guide,—a man cannot follow the lode-star and also make for every flickering will-o'-the-wisp that allures and entices him. Christ has deliberately and finally claimed the guidance of mankind. He bade sincere aspirants after life follow, not the Law as such, nor even God as unincarnate, but *Himself*, the Law-in-character and the God-in-man (Luk_18:22, Mat_16:24, Joh_12:26). His guidance is to be universal in its scope (Joh_1:4; Joh_1:9), and will be sufficient in its nature (Joh_21:22). Without Him the mass of men are as sheep without a shepherd (Mat_9:36). He alone reveals God to man (Mat_11:27), and so displays the goal of man's being. He taught, therefore, as one having unique authority (Mat_7:29), and rightly draws all men to Himself (Joh_12:32). He Himself, and no other conceivably or possibly, is the Way as well as the Truth and the Life (Joh_14:6). Hence the warning: 'Take heed that no man lead you astray' (Mar_13:5). And so, on the other hand, the impossibility of the Christian's seeking any other guidance, expressed in St. Peter's exclamation: 'Lord, to whom shall we go?' (Joh_6:68). Of this sole claim and unique authority the three chosen disciples heard the ratification in the bewildering glory of the Transfiguration: 'This is my beloved Son: hear ye him' (Mar_9:7). This guidance Christ gives to His follower by His Holy Spirit, guiding into all the truth (Joh_16:13); and very especially through the Holy Scriptures, which tell of Him (Joh_5:39), and whose meaning He can make plain (Luk_24:27; Luk_24:45). Christ Himself ratified the guidance afforded by Scripture at crises of His life, in which example and precept were wedded together in indissoluble union, as in the Temptation, the Cleansing of the Temple, and on the Cross (Luk_4:1-44; Luk_19:46; Luk_23:46).

To put it in another way, the Father's will was Christ's will, even to the uttermost: 'Not what I will, but what thou wilt' (Mar_14:36). So Christ guides us to union with God, our true destiny; through Him we come to the Father (Joh_14:6). Hence His guidance is into peace (Luk_1:79), as the aged Zacharias felt and declared. It is the steady, unvarying guidance of the heart towards its Divine home, the love of God, as the name *Immanuel* suggests (Mat_1:23). It is an absolute guidance, or no guidance (Luk_9:57-62).

W. B. Frankland.

☩ Guile

GUILE.—See Deceit.

☩ Guilt

GUILT is the state of the sinner before God, whereby, becoming the object of God's wrath, he incurs the debt and punishment of death. So closely are Sin, Guilt, and Death connected, both in the OT and NT, that the terms are almost interchangeable, and can be adequately discussed only in relation to one another (see art. Sin). It will suffice in the present article to show that the removal of guilt was the object of Christ's death, and that the recognition of sin as guilt is in consequence a prominent, if not the primary feature of the teaching of the NT concerning sin.

1. The gospel, as first preached by the Baptist (Mat 3:2) and Jesus Himself (Mar 1:16, Mat 4:23; Mat 10:7), was the Kingdom of God. Even the Fourth Evangelist, who usually presents it as Eternal Life, witnesses to this fact (Joh 3:3; Joh 3:5). The message, therefore, as coupled with the summons to repentance, involves a restoration of personal relations, God reigning in the midst of a reconciled people. Baptism, though the symbolism of cleansing is employed, is 'unto remission' (Mar 1:4, Luk 3:3) rather than to the washing away of sins; remission being not a vital act by which sinners are made just, but a personal favour (Mat 6:12, cf. 1Jn 1:9) by which they are accounted righteous. The risen Lord expressly carries on this view of His atoning work into the proclamation of the completed Christian gospel. Remission of sins was to be preached in His name among all the nations (Luk 24:47, cf. Mat 28:19). To this message the primitive preaching shows an exact fidelity (Act 2:38; Act 5:31; Act 10:43; Act 13:38; Act 26:18). The expression 'blotted out' in Act 3:19 emphasizes forgiveness as the cancelling of an account. And the statement of St. Paul in Act 17:30 (cf. Rom 3:25), that God had 'overlooked' the times of ignorance, again gives prominence to the personal relation.

It is the guilt rather than the infection of sin which appears in *the teaching of Jesus*. The analogy between disease and sin, which the miracles of healing suggest, might appear to show the contrary. But it is doubtful whether the transition from the sickness of the body to that of the soul would have presented itself to the Hebrew in this form, and not rather through the conception of suffering as the punishment of sin. It is this, for example, that makes the problem of the 'marred visage' of Jehovah's Servant (Isa 52:13-15; Isaiah 53). And the interpretation given by our Lord Himself in the case of the paralytic seems to be decisive. His power to cure the body is the evidence, not of His power to heal the soul, but of His authority (ἐξουσία) to

forgive sins (Mar 2:10). It is the 'debts' which remain as the permanent result of past 'trespasses,' for which we ask forgiveness in the Lord's Prayer (Mat 6:12, Luk 11:4); and when we crave deliverance, it is not from the sick will, but from the 'Evil One' (Mat 6:13), the personal enemy of God who has received a guilty allegiance. The importance of this aspect of sin is further marked by the requirement of human forgiveness as the condition because the pattern of Divine remission (Mat 6:14; Mat 6:16; Mat 18:21-35). What, therefore, is removed is not, in the first instance, the subjective consequences, but an objective result of sin. If it be urged that Christ discharges the latter only in virtue of the fact that He destroys the former, as expressed in the words 'it is he that shall save his people from their sins' (Mat 1:21, but cf. Rom 5:9), the reply is that Jesus is here represented as Saviour in the sense in which Messiah was to save, and that this is determined by the meaning of 'salvation' as developed in the theology of the OT. The root idea of the Messianic salvation is liberation not remedy (Exo 14:13; Exo 15:2, Isa 45:17; Isa 46:13; Isa 52:10, Luk 1:69; Luk 1:71; Luk 1:77).

Again, attention must be paid to the prominence given to judgment, especially the Day of Judgment, in the Synoptic narrative (Mat 5:21-22; Mat 7:1-2; Mat 10:15; Mat 11:20-24; Mat 12:36-37; Mat 12:41-42; Mat 16:27-28; Mat 19:28; Mat 19:24 *passim* Mat 19:25 *passim* Mat 26:64, Luk 12:58-59). The unquenchable fire is not merely the automatic result of sin bringing forth death, but punishment inflicted by judicial sentence (Mar 9:43; Mar 9:48, Mat 25:41). The wicked are workers of iniquity giving account for idle words and deeds (Mat 12:36; Mat 16:27). Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, however it be interpreted, incurs condemnation as the unpardonable sin (Mar 3:28-29, Mat 12:31-32). It is the personal relation, and therefore the guilt of sin, which appears in the parables of the Lost Sheep, etc. (Luke 15). The joy of the angels is represented as arising out of the reconciliation between the Father and the penitent (Luk 15:10). The expiatory character of the Cross is not so fully evident. But Jesus gives His life a ransom (Mar 10:45 ||); the Agony was a cup given by His Father (Mar 14:36 ||); the sorrow of death was the forsaking by God (Mar 15:34 ||); the peace of Calvary the self-committal to the Father (Luk 23:46).

2. *The Gospel of St. John*, dwelling, as it does, upon the gift of God as life, truth, and light, might seem on a superficial reading to obscure, if not to ignore, the view of sin as guilt. But even the Prologue couples grace, or God's free favour, with truth as that which came by Jesus Christ, and that in antithesis to the Law given by Moses (Joh 1:17). The witness of the Baptist is to the Lamb of God (Joh 1:29; Joh 1:36), a sacrificial term involving expiation (Joh 19:36; cf. Exo 12:46, Num 9:12, 1Co 5:7, Joh 6:52 with Westcott's note). To believe on the name of the Son of God is to escape judgment (Joh 3:18; Joh 5:24). It is 'accusation to the Father' which the Jews have to fear (Joh 5:45). Through Christ we come to the Father (Joh 14:6). The commission of the risen Christ to His disciples is to forgive and retain sins (Joh 20:23;

cf. Mat 16:19; Mat 18:18). It is the confession and forgiveness of sins which the First Epistle represents as effecting the cleansing from sin and unrighteousness through the sacrificial blood and heavenly intercession of our Advocate with the Father (1Jn 2:1-2). The use of ἀνομία, 'lawlessness,' as a synonym for ἁμαρτία, 'sin,' implies the guilt of a broken law (1Jn 3:4). The condemnation or acquittal of the heart reflects the judgment of God (1Jn 3:20). In the Apocalypse, sin is set in relation to Him that sitteth on the throne (Rev 4:2), incurring His wrath (Rev 6:16), noted in His books (Rev 20:12), and receiving His plagues (Rev 15:1).

3. It is difficult to set forth *St. Paul's theory of guilt* without entering upon the whole question of his view of sin. But a few considerations will make it clear that he looks at sin, in the first instance, as incurring guilt. It is represented as an act committed against God (Rom 1:21). All its essential features are recapitulated in each individual sin or transgression. It is only through the Law that it can appear as what it is (Rom 3:20, Rom 7:7). It can only be separated from its actual manifestations by being represented, not as a predisposing cause of these, but as itself an act of disobedience on the part of Adam (Rom 5:19). Death is not so much its consequence as its punishment or wages (Rom 5:12, Rom 6:23), not following automatically, but inflicted by the sentence of an offended God (Rom 1:18, Eph 5:6, Col 3:6). It involves responsibility (Rom 1:20), desert (Rom 1:32), condemnation (Rom 5:16; Rom 5:18). The work of Christ is primarily an act of righteous obedience (Rom 5:18-19, Php 2:8), undoing the act of disobedience in which all sin is included; an offering for sin condemning sin in the flesh (Rom 8:3), and wiping off the score of trespasses (Col 2:14). Its effect in the broadest view is a reversal of the sentence of condemnation (Rom 8:1) and reconciliation with God (Rom 5:10, 2Co 5:18-20). St. Paul's view of the function of law must here be remembered. The analogy of a therapeutic drug, administered in order that the disease may declare itself, is apt to mislead. This is not in the Apostle's thought. For trespasses or transgressions are themselves sin, not merely its symptoms (Eph 2:1; Eph 2:5). It is the removal of these, not of a cause distinguishable from them, which is the purpose of the Cross (Rom 4:25; cf. Rom 5:8; Rom 8:32). Death, which passed upon all men in consequence of transgression (Rom 5:12), reigned from Adam to Moses (Rom 5:14). The figure is that of a ruler to whose sway all men have as a penalty been judicially consigned, and from whose custody the free favour of God in Christ releases them. 'All have sinned' (Rom 5:12), whether with or without an explicit publication of law. St. Paul would not have allowed that through an involuntary taint of heredity men had at any time suffered without personal guilt. The Gentiles have the Law, being enlightened by conscience (Rom 2:14-15; cf. Mat 25:31-46). Though the Law is not explicitly revealed, they are in effect transgressors. If in Rom 4:15 St. Paul declares that 'the law worketh wrath,' because 'where there is no law, neither is there transgression,' in Gal 3:19 he says rather that the Law was added (προσέτεθη), came

in between the promise and its fulfilment, because of transgressions; *i.e.* to bring home unmistakably to those who were already guilty the conviction of their offences.

So we are brought to the evidence of the doctrine of justification. Without pressing the forensic metaphor to a point inconsistent with St. Paul's thought, which would relegate the whole theology of guilt to a region of formal conceptions unchecked by experience, we are bound to remember that the Apostle is concerned with the probation of guilt assumed to exist, which is necessary before the sinner can throw himself upon the offer of free salvation secured to him through the gospel. Justification is not in itself a change of character, a transformation of life, but an alteration of status (Rom 5:1-2, Eph 2:13), a reversal of relations whereby the 'servants of sin' (Rom 6:17), 'the children of wrath' (Eph 2:3) become 'children of grace,' 'sons of God' (Gal 3:26). It is the antithesis of trespasses (Rom 4:25), no more to be confused with sanctification, which is its fruit (Rom 6:22), than is transgression with uncleanness, which is its issue (Rom 1:24). To be justified from sin is to have escaped—either by paying the penalty of death (Rom 6:7) or by believing in Christ Jesus (Rom 3:24-25)—from what in a figure is regarded as its claim or dominion over the life (Rom 6:12-14), involving an obedience or yielding of the members. This is entirely in harmony with the conception of sin, from which St. Paul starts, as a voluntary withdrawal of allegiance admitting of no excuse.

We shall be saved from confusion with regard to the Pauline view of guilt, and the necessity of conforming the whole doctrine of sin to this primary idea, by considering what he means by 'adoption' and 'grace.' There is no clear instance in any Epistle of the use of the word *χάρις* in its later ecclesiastical sense of an infusion of spiritual strength (see Sanday-Headlam, *Romans*, note on Rom 1:5 *χάρις*). In some passages, apart from other considerations, the term admits of this interpretation (*e.g.* Eph 4:7). But the root idea is the free favour of God through Christ (Rom 4:4; Rom 5:13). It is not, therefore, an imparted gift, but an attitude of the Divine Mind. Again, the conception of sonship, as applied to the relation of the believer to God, while not excluding community of nature, gives prominence rather to the elective purpose of the Father (Eph 1:5). It is not reached as a deduction from membership in Christ, as though the highest action of Divine grace were nothing more than the operation of a natural law. Modern theology, with its leading idea of solidarity, has tended to obscure the personal action of the Father in admitting mankind to fellowship. St. Paul's thought, on the other hand, is guided by the Hebraic conception of the son and heir, with its notion of privilege rather than primogeniture (Exo 4:22, Jer 31:9, Psa 89:27, Col 1:15, Heb 12:23; cf. Job 18:13, Isa 14:30). Thus the Christian attains his rank in the family of God by 'adoption' (Gal 4:5, Eph 1:5; cf. Gal 3:28, where sonship is presented as a privilege granted *δια τῆς τιστεως*). The Spirit which makes him a member of Christ is the 'Spirit of adoption' (Rom 8:15),

freely given by God to those whom He takes for His children (Gal 4:8, Rom 5:5; Rom 8:9-11, 1Co 12:13). Membership in Christ is thus rather the result than the cause of the filial relation. The Christian life depends, not upon the eradication of evil, but upon the forgiveness of sins (Eph 1:7), the clearing of the guilty on the part of a personal God in consequence of the personal satisfaction offered by Christ (Rom 3:21; Rom 3:28; Rom 5:8, cf. Exo 34:6-7). This view of sonship, as involving God's elective purpose and man's free response, frequently underlies St. Paul's argument. Isaac is the child of promise (Gal 3:18; Gal 4:23; Gal 4:28, Rom 4:20; Rom 9:8-9), Abraham the father of the faithful (Gal 3:7, Rom 4:12). The redemption of the body is itself an 'adoption' (Rom 8:23).

4. *The Epistle to the Hebrews* brings out the various elements in the conception of human guilt with conspicuous clearness. We have to do with the living God (Heb 3:12; Heb 4:12; Heb 10:31), who is a consuming fire (Heb 12:29), self-existent and separate from creation (Heb 12:18-21), the supreme lawgiver and judge (Heb 10:30, Heb 12:23), whom to see, therefore, demands a purifying separation on the part of His suppliant worshipper (Heb 9:14, Heb 10:22). What men need is boldness to approach His throne (Heb 4:16, Heb 10:19), and so to enter into His rest (Heb 4:1 ff.). But there is an obstacle, typified by propitiatory rites and attested by universal experience (Heb 9:6-10, Heb 10:3; Heb 10:11). The comers thereunto need a τελείωσις (Heb 2:10-11), the accomplishment of a preliminary act of satisfaction (Heb 2:17, Heb 5:9) which shall render them competent. The experience, which justifies the fulfilment of rites felt to be inadequate, is the fear of death (Heb 2:15), the spirit of bondage (*ib.*), the evil conscience (Heb 10:22). This is not the same thing as ignorance, error, or infirmity (Heb 5:2), all of which are recognized as present in human character and requiring to be dealt with. It is the consciousness that the offerer has a past which repentance cannot separate from him in respect of his relation to the Everliving (Heb 10:2-3; Heb 10:26-27), a record of offences for which none but One who Himself 'ever liveth' can atone by an abiding intercession (Heb 7:25, cf. Heb 10:12). The conscience must be purged from dead works (Heb 9:14, Heb 10:22), which are to be distinguished from their present results in character. The 'redemption of transgressions' (Heb 9:15; cf. Act 17:30, Rom 3:24-25), the removal of a burden (Rom 2:15 ἔνοχοι δουλείας, cf. Jam 2:10), is the method whereby consecration to God's service and boldness of access are secured. Even sanctification itself in Hebrews (Heb 12:14, cf. Heb 2:9-11; Heb 10:10; Heb 10:14; Heb 13:12) is, not indeed the formal consecration of the sinner, but the removal of the 'weight' of guilt (Heb 12:1), of which the fulness of faith (Heb 10:22) is the counterpart in spiritual experience.

5. *That guilt is original, i.e.* attaches to all mankind, and may be predicated of each individual before particular evidence of transgression, is implied in the facts of

redemption (see art. Sin), and explicitly taught in the NT. In the famous passage Rom 5:12-21 nothing is said of a transmitted tendency to sin, though it has been often supposed that this is implied. But St. Paul does say that death 'passed unto all men' through Adam's transgression. The context shows that death is here regarded as a punishment inflicted by God. And guilt is implied in the remarkable sentence 'all have sinned,' which interprets the statement that 'through one man sin entered.' How St. Paul reached this apparent paradox seems clear from a consideration of Jewish theology. The OT bears abundant witness to the belief that the sins (plural) of the fathers are 'visited' upon the children (Exo 20:5; Exo 34:7), while at the same time the teaching of Ezekiel balances it by an emphatic vindication of the separate responsibility of each soul (Eze 18:4; Eze 18:20). Apart from the narrative of the Fall, which indicates a penalty involving the seed of the woman (Gen 3:15-16), this is, perhaps, as far as the OT carries us. But the Book of Wisdom (Wis 2:24) represents death as entering the world through the envy of the devil, and Sirach (Sir 25:24) declares that sin originated from a woman, and 'because of her we all die.' The teaching of the Rabbis, however, differentiating the actual transgression of Adam from the potentiality of sin involved in his creation, expressly asserts that death was decreed against the generations of Adam. Elsewhere death is spoken of as incurred by the personal guilt of each individual, and the statement of the Apocalypse of Baruch (54:15, 19), that 'each of us is the Adam of his own soul,' looks like an attempt to express a mystery which alone can reconcile these divergent views. According to Weber (*Altsynag. Theol.* p. 216), the nett result of Talmudic teaching appears to be that 'by the Fall man came under a curse, is guilty of death, and his right relation to God is rendered difficult.' It is probably only in the sense of transmitted taint that Edersheim (*Life and Times*, etc. i. p. 165 ff.) disallows original sin as part of the doctrine of the older Rabbis; for, in common with other writers, he acknowledges the frequent assertion of inherited guilt. That St. Paul was familiar with this prevalent view hardly admits of doubt, or that he availed himself of it to interpret the relation of Jesus the Messiah to the whole human race, as giving the victory over sin, the wages of which is death (Rom 6:23), and the power of which is the outraged law (1Co 15:56).

Literature.—See art. Sin.

J. G. Simpson.

 Gulf

GULF (χάσμα, from χαίνω, *to yawn, gape, open wide*, Luk 16:26 only. *Chasma* (shortened, *chasm*) is the exact transliteration of the Greek, but this word, in general

use, is later than the Authorized Version . Tindale has ‘a great space,’ and the Geneva VS ‘a great gulfe,’ with ‘swallowing pit’ in the margin).—It is interesting to compare with this other representations of the division between the worlds of the unseen. In Plato’s vision in the *Republic* there is an intermediate space where judges are seated, who divide to the right hand or to the left according as men are found just or unjust. Return to the upper world is possible; but when any incurable or unpunished sinners tried to ascend, ‘the opening, instead of receiving them, gave forth a sound, and then wild men of fiery aspect, who were standing by and knew what the sound meant,’ seized and carried them to be cast into hell (Jowett’s *Plato*, iii. 512f.). Virgil’s vision is of ‘a cavern, deep and huge, with its vast mouth, craggy, sheltered by its black lake and forest gloom, o’er which no birds might speed along unharmed; such an exhalation, pouring from its black jaws, rose to the vault of heaven; wherefore the Greeks named the spot Avernus.’ The ‘dreadful prison-house’ is guarded by a ‘gate of ponderous size, with pillars of solid adamant; so that no mortal might, nay, nor the dwellers in the sky, are strong enough to throw it down in war’ (*aeneid*, vi. 236f., 553f.). Coming to Jewish representations, the Book of Enoch speaks of three separations between the spirits of the dead,—‘by a chasm, by water, and by light above it’ (ch. 22). In Rabbinical teaching (cf. Weber, *Jüd. Theol.*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 341) the separation between Paradise and Ge-hinnom is minimized; it is but ‘a wall,’ ‘a palm-breadth,’ a ‘finger-breadth,’ ‘a thread.’ With this representation the ‘great gulf’ of the parable is in striking contrast. It would be obviously wrong to interpret literally, or even to insist upon some spiritual counterpart of the detail of the parable, as it would be wrong to base upon the parable as a whole any doctrine of the future over and above its clear moral lesson and warning. But the solemn words of Jesus as to the possibility and danger of the fixity of character in evil must not be lightly set aside (see Eternal Sin).

Literature.—Bruce, *Parabolic Teaching*, p. 393; Salmond, *Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, p. 277.

W. H. Dyson.

☩ Hades

HADES.—See Dead, Eschatology, and Hell (Descent into).

☞ Hair

HAIR.—The Jews seem to have shared with other peoples the belief that the hair is really ‘a living and important part of the body’ (W. R. Smith, *RS* [Note: *S Religion of the Semites.*] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 324; Frazer, *Golden Bough*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , iii. 390). This lent importance to the oath by the head which was common among them (Mat 5:36), and it accounts for the attention given to the hair in connexion with vows (Act 18:18; Josephus *BJ* ii. xv. 1; on hair as offering and in vows see W. R. Smith, *l.c.* 323 ff.; Frazer, *l.c.* i. 370 ff.). In NT times long hair was regarded as a glory of women, but a disgrace to men (1Co 11:14-15). Opinion had changed since the days of Absalom.

Among the Arabs the ancient sentiment survives. Many stalwart men, not merely ‘immature lads’ (*RS* [Note: *S Religion of the Semites.*] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 326), take pride in their long glossy locks. It is interesting also to note a change from the NT attitude to women’s hair. The Jews in Poland permit no married woman to wear her own hair; it must be cropped close before the wedding, and replaced by a high head-dress of wool or silk. It is a terrible sin to neglect this rule (Hosmer, ‘The Jews,’ p. 363, in *Story of the Nations*).

It was customary to dress the hair with ointment (Mat 6:17), and women bestowed much care upon the *coiffure* (1Ti 2:9; 1Pe 3:3). It was a shame for a woman to appear with locks unbound and hair dishevelled.

Lightfoot (*Works*, ed. 1823, xii. 361) gives two Rabbinic quotations in point. ‘Kamitha had seven sons who all performed the office of high priests; they asked of her how she came to this honour? She answered, “The rafters of my house never saw the hair of my head” ’ (*Vayyikra Rabba*, fol. 188, 2). ‘The priest unloosed the hair’ of the suspected woman, about to be tried by the bitter water, ‘for greater disgrace’ (*Sota*, fol. 5. 1).

When Mary (Joh 12:3) wiped the feet of Jesus with her hair, she thus ‘testified that, as no sacrifice was too costly for her purse, so no service was too mean for her person’ (Godet, *in loc.*).

Abundant hair on head and chin has always been regarded by Easterns as lending dignity to manhood, and the beard is an object of special reverence. ‘I smooth my beard,’ says Doughty, ‘toward one to admonish him in his wrongful dealing with me, and have put him in mind of his honour. If I touch his beard, I put him in remembrance of our common humanity, and of the witness of God above us. The

beard is taken in Arabia for human honour, and to pluck it is the highest indignity. Of an honest man they say, “His is a good beard”; of a vile, covetous heart, “He has no beard” ’ (*Arabia Deserta*, i. 268). What indignity then He suffered of whom the prophet wrote, ‘I gave ... my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair’! (Isa 50:6).

Single hairs are taken to illustrate the minuteness of God’s care (Mat 10:30, Luk 12:7; Luk 21:18). White hairs are a symbol of reverend and glorious majesty (Rev 1:14). The long hair, as of women, adds to the grotesque and terrible appearance of the locust monsters (Rev 9:8).

The Baptist’s garment of camel’s hair (θριξ καμήλου, Mat 3:4) is probably identical with שער אֵהָרַב of Zec 13:4, and that of his great prototype (2Ki 1:8, where we should read with (Revised Version margin) ‘a man with a garment of hair’). The rough outer cloak generally worn is of goats’ hair. *Wabar al-ibil*, the hair, or wool, (θριξ can also mean ‘wool,’ *Il. iii. 273*, Hes. *Op. 515*) of the camel is softer, and of this an inner cloak is often worn, e.g. in winter by the fishermen on the Sea of Galilee.

Goats’ hair is not named in NT, but most likely this was the material in which the Apostle Paul wrought at his trade (Act 18:3), his native province supplying it in great quantities.

W. Ewing.

⚠️Hall

HALL.—‘Hall’ appears in the Authorized Version in a way to cause not a little confusion, as translation sometimes of ἀύλη and sometimes of πραιτώριον. In Mat 27:27 Authorized Version has ‘the soldiers of the governor took Jesus into *the common hall*’ (a circumlocution for πραιτώριον). In Mar 15:15 Authorized Version has ‘into *the hall called Praetorium*,’ as translation of law ἔσω τῆς ἀύλης ὃ ἐστὶν πραιτώριον. Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 has not entirely relieved this confusion. The English Revisers render πραιτώριον by ‘palace,’ following Rhem. [Note: Rhemish NT 1582.] ; while the American Revisers, more literally, give *praetorium*, the Latin word which was carried over, transliterated, into the Greek, and which denoted originally the praetor’s tent or abode, or the general’s headquarters. Tindale introduced ‘judgement-hall’ for πραιτώριον, and is followed by Authorized Version in

Joh 18:28; Joh 18:33; Joh 19:9 etc. The Authorized Version renders ἀὐλή by ‘palace’ in Mat 26:3; Mat 26:58; Mat 26:69, Mar 14:54; Mar 14:66, Luk 11:21, Joh 18:15, when the reference is to the place where the governor dispensed justice; by ‘fold’ in Joh 10:1; Joh 10:16 of the place where the sheep were kept at night; and by ‘court’ in Rev 11:2, as designating the court of the temple. Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 more consistently renders ἀὐλή by ‘court’ instead of ‘palace,’ everywhere except in Joh 10:1 ἡ ἀὐλή τῶν προβάτων, where it has ‘the fold of the sheep’ (cf. Authorized Version ‘sheepfold’), and in Joh 10:16, where it has simply ‘fold.’ Cf. Mat 26:3; Mat 26:58; Mat 26:69, where the inner court of the high priest’s official residence seems to be meant; in Mat 26:69 ‘Peter sat without in the palace’ (Authorized Version); ‘without’ stands in contrast with the audience-room in which Jesus was appearing before the authorities, *i.e.* Peter was not in the room of the official residence where the trial was going on, but out in the open court, around which the house was built; and this was ‘beneath,’ or on a lower level than the audience-room. See also Court, Praetorium.

Geo. B. Eager.

☞ Hallel

HALLEL (‘praise’).—A technical Hebrew liturgical term, applied in Rabbinical literature to certain Psalms and psalm-pieces of praise, which characteristically have as their keynote the expression *Hallelujah* (‘Praise ye Jah’). It is more particularly applied to one group of Psalms (113-118) regarded as a liturgical unit (so always in the Synagogue-liturgy).

Psalms 113-118 form ‘the Hallel’ κατ’ ἐξοχήν, as distinguished from the ‘Hallel of Egypt’* [Note: המצרי הלל Ber. 56. See J. Müller, . cit. p. 288. In a (Bab. . 118) Psalms 145-148 are apparently called a ‘Hallel.’] (Psalms 113-114) and the ‘great Hallel’ (הגדול הלל) which is usually understood to mean Psalms 136. In the Talmud and Midrash, however, the Psalms included in the ‘great Hallel’ are variously given, viz.: (1) Psalms 136, (2) Psa 135:4-21, and (3) Psalms 120-136. The question is discussed in Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] *Pes.* v. 7. See, further, Joel Muller, note to *Sopherim* xviii. 2 (p. 253). In one passage of the Mishna (*Pes.* x. 5) the Hallel (Psalms 113-118) is designated ‘Hallelujah.’ For ‘half-Hallel’ see below.

1. *Origin.*—In its present form the Psalm-group (113-118) seems clearly to have been compiled for liturgical purposes at a comparatively late date. The most probable view is that the collection was formed in Maccabaeen times for recitation on the Feast of *Hănukkâ* (Dedication), on the eight days of which it is still chanted in the synagogue.

Psa 118:24 ('This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it') points to some day of public thanksgiving; Psa 118:4-24 suggest the Syrian war, and recovery of and entrance into the Temple. At the same time, the collection embodies other elements. Thus Psa 118:25-29 seems to be an old song of praise for the Feast of Tabernacles. With this agrees the fact that, according to an old tradition preserved in the Jerusalem Talmud (*Sukka* iv. 5),* [Note: also Bab. Arakhin, 12a.] the Hallel was recited on 'eighteen days and one night of the year—the eight days of Tabernacles; the eight of *Hănukkâ*; Pentecost (one day); and the first day of Passover with its (preceding) night.' It is noticeable that Tabernacles and *Hănukkâ* are placed first in this list; and it should be remembered that the latter feast seems originally to have been regarded as a sort of extension or reduplication of the former (cf. 2Ma 1:9); Cheyne (*OP* [Note: P Origin of the Psalter.] p. 33, note n) remarks: 'that the recitation of the Hallel on these occasions [Dedication and Tabernacles] goes back to Simon can hardly be doubted.'† [Note: Peritz (*Encyc. Bibl.* s.v. 'Hallel') connects the liturgical recitation of the Hallel with the Passover-meal (he denies that it was sung in the Temple-service), and thinks that it attained its present compass only 'during the first half of the second century.' But this is to ignore the data given above, which connect it primarily with Tabernacles and *Hănukkâ*.] A curious indication of its liturgical use may perhaps be seen in the fact that the Midrash on the Psalms counts only *five* psalms in the Hallel, Psalms 115 not being regarded. The LXX Septuagint and many Hebrew MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] treat the latter psalm as part of Psalms 114. The reason assigned in one of the smaller Midrâshim is as follows: 'The Torâ consists of five-fifths; the Psalter of five-fifths; and the Hallel of five-fifths.'

2. *Jewish liturgical usage.*—As already stated, the Hallel, according to tradition, was regularly recited at the Feasts of Tabernacles, Dedication, Pentecost, and Passover (first day and preceding night).‡ [Note: With the doubling of the initial days of Festivals that takes place 'in exile,' the 18 days originally comprised in the above now amount to 21, and 1 night to 2.]

On certain other days of the year it became customary to recite the Hallel, viz.: on the last 6 days of Passover, and on new moons other than the new moon of Tishrî (which introduces the solemn penitential period). But this usage was apparently late and unauthorized. This is shown (*a*) by the omission on these days of two sections of

the complete Hallel, viz.: Psa 115:1-11; Psa 116:1-11;[§] [Note: Hence the designation 'half-Hallel' for this form.] and (b) that both Rashi and Maimonides protested against the use of the regular benediction before 'half Hallel,' on the ground that its employment on these days was merely a pious custom without authority.

The recitation of the Hallel is preceded and followed by special blessings. | [Note: | For these cf. Singer's Heb.-Eng. Prayer-Book, pp. 219, 224.] Certain parts are also recited with a responsive refrain:

(a) The first four verses of Psalms 118 are said by the Reader, the people responding after each: 'O give thanks unto the Lord; for He is good: for His mercy endureth for ever.' (b) The last nine verses of the same Psalm are also repeated, in part alternately, in part together, by Reader and congregation.

According to the Mishna (*Pes. v. 7*), which embodies old and (there is every reason to believe) trustworthy traditions as to the Temple-ritual, the complete Hallel was recited by the Levites during the slaughter of the Paschal lambs in the Temple-courts. ¶ [Note: For a graphic description of this see Edersheim, *The Temple: its Ministry and Services*, p. 191 f.] The use of Hallel in the Paschal meal at *home*, when the lamb was eaten, must be carefully distinguished from the above. Here the data are somewhat conflicting.

According to the Mishna (*Pes. x. 6 and 7*), the Hallel was here recited in two parts, and this is still the custom at the Jewish Paschal meal. The first part (Psalms 113-114) immediately follows the Haggâdâ proper (the narrative of redemption) and precedes the drinking of the second cup of wine. It is appropriately closed by a special benediction for redemption. The second part (Psalms 115-118, followed by 136 and the 'Blessing of Song') follows after the mixing of the fourth cup, when the banquet and grace after meat have been completed. And this arrangement is attested in the Mishna (*ib.*). The contents of the first part were, however, a subject in dispute between the schools of Shammai and Hillel, the former concluding it at Psalms 113, the latter at Psalms 114. The wording of the benediction for redemption was also not fully determined (*ib.*). It looks as though the recitation of the Hallel in the home-service were a reminiscence of the Temple-ritual, the family meal being partaken of between the two parts as a family sacrifice, just as the Passover lamb was sacrificed in the Temple during the singing of the Hallel. The custom, as the Mishna suggests, may quite well have arisen before the destruction of the Temple.

3. Usage in the Gospels.—It is usually assumed that the hymn referred to in Mat 26:30 | Mar 14:26 ('when they had sung a hymn' [ὕμνησαντες]) was the second part of the

Hallel (Psalms 115-118)* [Note: According to the school of Shammai, Psalms 114-118.] sung at the conclusion of the Paschal supper (see above). This is quite possible, in view of the probability that the custom had been established in connexion with the Paschal meal in the time of Christ.

In Delitzsch's *Heb. NT* the expression is well paraphrased: 'After they had completed the Hallel' (את־ההלל נמר). But there are some indications that the usage was subject to variation in the earlier period. Thus, according to one authority, for the 'completion' of the Hallel at the Paschal meal Psalms 25 might suffice (. 118). The expression ὑμνῆσαι certainly suggests a Paschal meal. It is significant, however, that it is absent from the Lukan account.

Literature.—Besides the works cited in the body of the article, the following are important: art. 'Hallel' in the *Jewish Encyc.*, with the authorities there enumerated; Delitzsch on Psalms 113; Büchler, *ZATW* [Note: *ATW Zeitschrift für die Alttest. Wissenschaft.*] xx. [1900] 114-135; Buxtorf, *Rabb. Lex.* (ed. Fischer) s.v. הלל; Hamburger, *RE* ii. 353 ff.

G. H. Box.

☩ Hallowed

HALLOWED.—Used of the name of our Father—first petition in the Lord's Prayer (Mat 6:9 || Luk 11:2), = 'revered' or 'counted holy.' It is, says Godet (*Com. in loco*), a prayer that 'unworthy conceptions of God and of His character may no longer prevail among men. The child of God beseeches Him to manifest with effect His holy character, in the conscience of men, so that all impure idolatry, gross or refined, as well as all formal Pharisaism, may be completely removed, and that every human being may unite with the seraphim in the anthem of adoration, "Holy, Holy, Holy." '

The verb ἀγιαξεν is in constant usage in LXX Septuagint to render the different forms of Heb. קדש (see Concord. s.v.). Isaiah (Isa 8:13; Isa 29:23) and Ezekiel (*passim*, e.g. Eze 20:41; Eze 36:23) employ the word (rendered 'sanctify' Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) of the Lord and His name, in exactly the same sense as the Lord's Prayer, of causing to be revered, whether by judgment or by deliverance. OT usage with reference to *Sabbath*, *firstborn*, etc., ought to be compared. Our Lord uses ἀγ. (1) of Himself (Joh 10:36; Joh 17:19) in the

sense of consecration ('sanctify' Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, cf. marg.) to the office of Messiah by His submitting to death; and (2) of His disciples (Joh_17:17; Joh_17:19) as consecrated by the truth. The root idea is setting apart for holy purposes, with the consequent development of a holy character. This ethical sense is derived from Lev_11:44 ἁγιασθήσεσθε καὶ ἅγιοι ἔσεσθε, ὅτι ἅγιός εἰμι ἐγὼ (see Lightfoot on Php_1:1). See, further, artt. Consecrate and Sanctify.

For usage of the English word see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible (s.v.).

R. Macpherson.

⚔Halting

HALTING.—A deficiency in gait, when one is not able to walk without limping. The word refers to the imperfection in the art of walking, rather than to the deficiency, injury, or weakness of the limb or limbs which is the cause. This differentiation is illustrated by a passage from Brand (1789): 'He hath a halt in walking occasioned by a lameness in one of his legs'; also Tennyson (*Guinevere*): 'If a man were halt or hunch'd'; Bunyan (*Pilg. Prog.* pt. ii.): 'Mr. Ready to Halt,' cf. Psa_38:17; Shaks., *Timon*, Ac. iv. Sc. i.: 'Thou cold sciatica, cripple our senators, that their limbes may halt as lamely as their manners' (an illustration also of the metaphorical use of the word 'halt' similar to that of 'lame'); so *Richard iii.*, Acts 1. Sc. i.—

'Sent before my time

Into this breathing world, scarce half made up,

And that so lamely and unfashionable

That dogs bark at me as I halt by them.'

'Halt' is the translation of *χολός* in Mat_18:8, Mar_9:45, Luk_14:21, Joh_5:3; but the translators of neither Authorized Version nor Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 maintain a close distinction between the lame and the halt. The halting are included in the general healings wrought by Jesus among the multitude, and many of them would doubtless be of a character to yield readily to the method of our Lord, acting as He did on the line of existing therapeutic forces, even while going far beyond our present knowledge and experience of these forces.

Hand

HAND (קַיִם, קַיִם ‘palm hollow of the hand’; χεῖρ; δεξιὰ ‘right-hand,’ ἀριστερά ‘left-hand’).—

OT usage.—In the OT there is a very large variety of meanings attaching to the word ‘hand’ and to expressions and phrases in which it occurs; a detailed consideration of these is not necessary here,* [Note: See art. ‘Hand’ in Hastings’ DB.] but a brief reference seems appropriate in view of the fact that NT usage is to some extent based, through the LXX Septuagint, on that of the OT. In its origin the Hebrew word probably meant ‘strength’ (cf. Assyrian. [Note: Assyrian.] *îdu* = ‘strength’),† [Note: Oxford Heb. Lexicon, s.v.] and it is used in this figurative sense in Jos 8:20 (‘there was not in them strength [lit. *hands*] to flee’), Psa 76:5 (‘none of the mighty men have found their hands,’ *i.e.* they are powerless). The word is used in a number of other figurative senses, see the *Oxford Heb. Lexicon* under קַיִם, instructive is the passage Exo 14:8 ‘the children of Israel went out with a high hand’ (cf. Exo 15:6; Exo 15:12, Num 11:23; Num 33:3); the reference is to the hand of Jehovah (‘with a high hand’ = with the *help* of the high hand, a meaning which the preposition עִם frequently has); the ‘hand,’ strictly speaking, the ‘right hand’ (יְמִינֵי), of God is the planet Venus;‡ [Note: For the proof of this statement see Nielsen, *Die Altarabische Mondreligion und die Mosaische Ueberlieferung* (Strassburg, 1904), pp. 111, 154 ff., where illustrations of S. Arabian cylinder seals are also given, showing ‘the hand of God’ with the planet Venus above it; the Divine hand has seven fingers.] this antique conception is much softened down, though a literal, anthropomorphic sense is still implied in the use of ‘hand’ in Psa 102:25 ‘The heavens are the work of thy hands.’

In reference to man the word is used (just as is the case in the NT) in a variety of senses, according to the phrase in which it is found: ‘to put one’s life into one’s hand’ (Jdg 12:3), means to be ready to jeopardize one’s life; ‘to clap the hands’ is a sign of joy (2Ki 11:12); ‘to fill the hand’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘consecrate’) is to install in office (Jdg 17:5; Jdg 17:12);§ [Note: On this idiom see *Encyc. Bibl.* ii. col. 1951.] ‘to lift up the hand’ (whether towards heaven or towards the altar is not always certain, see Nowack, *Heb. Arch.* ii. 260) was a symbolic action which accompanied an oath, it implied the calling of the Deity to witness | [Note: | A later

custom was to place the left hand on a tomb and quote Isa 58:11.] (Deu 32:40); the same action, with both hands, was the attitude adopted when blessing (Psa 134:2); ‘to open the hand’ is to show generosity (Deu 15:11); to place the hands upon the head was a sign of grief (2Sa 13:19); to kiss the hand towards was a sign of homage (to a heathen deity in Job 31:27); ‘to lay the hand upon the mouth’ was done in token of humility (Pro 30:32, cf. Isa 52:15); ‘to strike hands’ meant to go surety for someone (Pro 6:1). All these symbolic actions with the hand were common in the time of Christ, as they are at the present day also in Syria, Arabia, etc.

There is one other use of the word in the OT which demands a passing notice; it means a sign or monument (1Sa 15:12, 2Sa 18:18, cf. Gen 35:14); according to Schwally,[¶] [Note: *Das Leben nach dem Tode*, p. 58, note. See also CIS, No. 199 ff.] it was originally so called because a hand was depicted upon the monument or pillar, this hand being a token of that wherewith the vow had been made (the uplifted hand), or perhaps wherewith an offering had been brought; in view, however, of what has been said above, it is more likely that this band slash was a representation of the hand of the Deity.

Usage in the Gospels.—In a very large number of cases in which ‘hand’ occurs, it is used in the ordinary literal sense; there is no need to give references for these. Not infrequently there is the expression ‘at hand’ in the Authorized and Revised Versions where in the original *χειρ* does not occur: e.g. ‘the kingdom of heaven is at hand’ (ἤγγικεν); such passages do not properly belong to this article, and are not taken into account.

1. All those things which are done by means of the hand, or in which the visible part is done by the hand (such as the working of miracles, or taking hold of a person or thing) are described as being performed διὰ χειρός, διὰ τῶν χειρῶν, διὰ χειρῶν—τινος, Mar 6:2 etc.; ἐπὶ χειρῶν, Mat 4:6, Luk 4:11; εἰς τὴν χεῖρα, Luk 15:22. ‘Hand’ is used frequently as a synonym for ‘power’ (Mat 17:22, Mar 9:31, Luk 1:74; Luk 9:44); in the slightly different sense of ‘protecting power’ (Luk 23:46); still in the sense of power but coupled with the idea of ‘possession’ (Joh 10:28-29); as used in Luk 1:66 it contains the idea of God’s ‘furtherance’; then, again, it is used loosely, ** [Note: * This is quite in accordance with OT usage, cf. e.g. Gen 24:22 ‘hands’ used for ‘wrists.’] in the sense of ‘finger,’ in Luk 15:22 (‘put a ring on his hand’); lastly, it is referred to (in a peculiarly Oriental manner) as though it had, metaphorically speaking, sense: ‘if thine hand offend thee’ (σκανδαλιση), and the same idea is conveyed in Mat 6:3 ‘let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth.’

2. But the most interesting use of ‘hand’ in the Gospels, as in the OT, is seen in idiomatic phrases in which it occurs; these may be briefly enumerated as follows:—‘To wash the hands’ (ἀπονίπτειν τὰς χ.) was a symbolic action denoting a repudiation of responsibility or a declaration of innocence (Mat 27:24, cf. Psa 26:6; Psa 73:13); the same phrase, very nearly, νίπτειν τὰς χ., refers to the washing before meals in obedience to tradition* (Mat 15:2). To ‘lay hands on’ is used in several senses; ἐπιβάλλειν τὰς χ. ἐπὶ τινα (or simply with the dat.) means to take hold of with violent intent (Mar 14:46); ἐπιτιθέναι τὰς χ. (or τὴν χ.) ἐπὶ τινα (or with dat.)† is synonymous with healing (Mat 9:18, Mar 5:23); τιθέναι τὰς χ. ἐπὶ τινα is used of blessing children (Mar 10:16); ‘to put the hand to the plough’ (ἐπιβάλλειν τὴν χ. ἐπ’ ἄροτρον) is a metaphoric expression denoting the undertaking of some duty (Luk 9:62); different meanings attach to the phrase ‘to stretch forth the hands’: ἐκτείνειν τὰς χ. ἐπὶ τινα is used of taking someone prisoner (Luk 22:53), or (with the same construction) to indicate a person (Mat 12:49); ἐκτ. τὴν χ. in Mat 14:31 means to save from harm; the same expression in Joh 21:18 seems to be used in reference to the stretching out of the hands (in the sense of arms) on the cross. ‘To lift up the hands’ (ἐπαίρειν τὰς χ.) is the attitude of blessing (Luk 24:50); ‘to take by the hand’ (κρατεῖν τῆς χ.) means to take hold of someone with the purpose of helping (Mar 1:31); ‘to deliver up into the hands of’ (παραδιδόναι εἰς χ. τινος) is to give into the power of, with evil intent (Mat 17:22), while διδόναι τι ἐν τῇ χ. τινος means to commit to the care of (Joh 3:35); ‘to commend [the spirit] into the hands of’ (παρατιθέναι τὸ πνεῦμα εἰς χ. τινος) is to place oneself under God’s protection (Luk 23:46).

3. Lastly, there are many words in connexion with which ‘hand’ is not expressed, but implied; all these convey one or other, or both, of the root conceptions of this word, viz. strength and activity.

W. O. E. Oesterley.

☞ Handmaid

HANDMAID.—‘Handmaid’ (Luk 1:38; ‘handmaiden,’ v. 48; in the American Standard Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘handmaid’ in both passages) answers to the Gr. δ

οὐλη, which means literally, as the (Revised Version margin) shows, ‘slave.’ In the LXX Septuagint rendering of Hannah’s vow (1Sa 1:11), which is clearly echoed, almost cited, in Lk., δούλη represents the Hebrew *’âmâh*, which, with the Aramaic equivalent *’amta* and the Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *amtu*, seems to have been a common Semitic designation of a female slave in Canaan and the neighbouring countries. It was sometimes used in courteous self-depreciation (1Ki 1:17, 1Sa 25:24 f., 1Sa 25:28; 1Sa 25:31; 1Sa 25:41; the letter of an Assyrian lady in Johns’ *Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, Contracts, and Letters*, p. 378), and then was naturally applied to relation to God (the above-mentioned vow, also Psa 86:16; Psa 116:16). In the Aram. text, which probably underlay the Song of the Virgin, ‘handmaiden’ would be *’amta* with suffix (*Pal.* [Note: Palestine, Palestinian.] *Lect. of Gospels*, 1899, p. 234). The use of the word in the Gospels illustrates the Oriental habit of describing man as the slave of God, of which there are so many examples in the OT (Psa 19:11; Psa 19:13, Neh 1:6; Neh 1:11 etc.), in the so-called Babylonian Penitential Psalms, in ancient Semitic names—*Obadiah* found both in the Bible and on an ancient seal, *Abdeel* (Jer 36:26), *Abdiel* (1Ch 5:15), *Abednego* (Dan 1:7), *Abd Ninip* (*Tell el-Amarna Letters*, No. 53, Winckler), ‘*Abd Ashtoreth* (*KAT* [Note: AT Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Test.] [ZW] 129); and in names current in the Holy Land at the present time, such as *Abdallah* (for many examples from southern and central Palestine cf. *PEFSt* [Note: EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.] , 1904, p. 155, and 1905, p. 48f.). These illustrations, however, refer mainly if not entirely to men. In connexion with a list of personal names collected from various Moslem villages in the south of Palestine (*PEFSt* [Note: EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.] , 1904, p. 155), it is remarked that female names of the type of *Abdallah* have not been found. Still it must always have been easy for an Oriental woman to call herself ‘the handmaid’ of Deity. The transition from the courteous to the religious use would be readily effected.

W. Taylor Smith.

☞ Happiness

HAPPINESS

i. Pagan and Christian Ideals compared.—Happiness was much discussed among the Greeks under the term ‘well-being’ (εὐδαιμονία). Aristotle said: ‘For on the subject of happiness and what conduces to it, and of its opposites, exhortation or discussion is always conversant, and this because we needs do the things which procure it or any of

its constituents, and refrain from doing the things which destroy or impede it' (*Rhet.* i. 5). The differences of the philosophic schools arose from the question wherein this well-being consisted. Was it in knowledge, pleasure, virtue, freedom from pain, wealth, or well-doing? The record of the answers to this forms the history of ancient Ethics. Jesus did not use the word 'happiness' (εὐδαιμονία), or propound any theory of the relation between duty and pleasure; but absence of the word is no proof that the subject was foreign to His mind. It is inconceivable that the 'Son of Man: should neglect in His system so universal an instinct as the desire after happiness; for in the final summation joy must be a part of the perfect state. The comparison between ancient and Christian Ethics must not be made on verbal or literary lines, but the systems must be judged by their actual contribution to well-being or happiness.

(1) *The failure of Paganism.* The systems of Plato and Aristotle did not bring any large satisfaction with them, nor did they discover any permanent refuge for the race. Of all the products of Greek speculation, Stoicism survived longest, and had the largest influence upon the civilization of the world; but while, by its stern grandeur, it shaped a few noble characters which remained as a protest against the lax manners of the Empire, it failed to open up any fountain of joy for man. The Stoic sage was powerless to convert his theories into conduct, as he himself confessed; and the *passionlessness* of soul which he advocated was a poor match for the strong impulses of the human heart. Where reliance upon human reason was undermined, it was met with an impotent religiousness; and where reverence for the natural order was impaired, there was no message of a future life in which compensations would atone for present inequalities. Also the examples of the earlier leaders created a preference for suicide, which was a confession of failure to procure the well-being of life. Paganism withdrew from the struggle to provide happiness. It despaired, and was therefore defeated.

(2) *The success of Christianity.* The characteristic word of Christianity is *Life*; for while the moral code and example of Christ are superior to others, it is not on this that His supremacy rests. Christ's *Person* is the vital force of the new religion. 'As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself (Joh 5:26). This same blessing is bestowed upon all who believe in Christ; and so rich is this gift, that each believer becomes a constant source of life (Joh 6:57; Joh 7:38). Life is imparted to the believer in many ways, but chiefly through Christ's words (Joh 6:63; Joh 6:68; Joh 15:3). This life is the realization of all human aspiration, enabling the Christian to hold on with courage and hope in the face of temptation and doubts; and the history of our civilization is the evidence that Jesus has succeeded where all others failed. To an age that was exhausted and desponding, that had failed to satisfy the deep desires of human nature, Christ came with convincing and converting power. When He spoke, men believed and lived again. Through Him rose

‘One common wave of thought and joy,
Lifting mankind again.’

Stoicism and Neo-Platonism produced thoughts of great beauty and purity. ‘Yet neither of them could enable artisans and old women to lead a truly philosophic life. Christianity could and did; the apologists point triumphantly to the realization of the moral ideal among Christians of every standing. That was due to the power which issued from Jesus Christ and actually transformed man. The certainty and confidence of faith based on Him, with reliance on God’s grace in Jesus Christ, begat in Christians a matchless delight in doing good’ (von Dobschütz, *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, p. 329).

ii. The Teaching of Jesus.—The NT verbal equivalent for ‘happiness’ is ‘blessedness’ (which see), but it is not conceived in terms of pleasure. It is a religious idea, drawing its worth from the blessing which God imparts. The adjective ‘blessed’ occurs frequently in Mat 5:3-12. This representative discourse may be entitled ‘Christ’s way to happiness.’ Here Jesus describes how people become happy, but refrains from all abstract definition. Each of these Beatitudes falls into two parts. In the first half those virtues are mentioned the possession of which constitutes people happy; in the second part the reward or result of each virtue is given. The following statements may be made as to Christ’s teaching on this way: (1) The joy begins immediately on the commencement of the journey, and is not reserved for the future. Thus, all who are pure in heart *are* happy. (2) More depends upon the traveller than upon the outward conditions. Happiness rests in dispositions, such as purity, meekness, righteousness, peace, and not in possessions, such as wealth, health, fame. The happy man makes his own scenery. Christian joy, like other Christian graces, is inward; and the OT conception of blessedness, in so far as it consisted in prosperity and length of days, yields to a more spiritual ideal. All who go Christ’s way are like the *Happy Warrior*,

‘Whose high endeavours are an inward light

That makes the path before him ever bright.’

(Wordsworth).

(3) This happiness is not a passivity, but an activity, coinciding with some function of the will or mind. It cannot rise of itself as a mere state of emotion, but accompanies an act of service either for God or man. Happiness is associated with piety (Mat 5:3-6) and probity (Mat 5:7-11). It follows upon doing the will of God, or upon seeking the well-being of others. Socrates also regarded happiness as εὐπραξία,

well-doing. (4) This way, unlike the world's way, is endless, for the joy that begins on earth is an anticipation of the full joy of heaven (Mat 5:3 b, Mat 5:10 b). (5) The pursuit of this way is a duty. All who walk with Christ not only will but ought to rejoice. Happiness is an imperative, 'Rejoice and be exceeding glad' (Mat 5:12). The ethical ideal of Jesus differs from Hedonism, in which morality and happiness are synonymous terms, because with Him blessedness is the associate of virtue. Christ neither confuses nor separates these two. Happiness and virtue are twin stars. The further use of the Beatitude in Christ's teaching continues to emphasize the spiritual ingredients of happiness. In Luk 11:28, Joh 13:17, blessedness and *obedience* are associated; in Mat 16:17 blessedness and *knowledge* are united; in Joh 20:29 blessedness and *faith* are joined. In many places blessedness is reserved for the future (Luk 7:23; Luk 12:37-43; Luk 14:15). In the Fourth Gospel Jesus distinctly offers fulness of joy (Joh 16:24).

iii. Happiness as revealed in Christ's Person.—The birth of Jesus was a proclamation of joy (Luk 2:10). Though called the 'Man of sorrows,' He was not unhappy. Sorrows never distorted His soul, nor left the faintest shadow of melancholy or accidie. He was 'still cheerful and helpful and firm.' His first miracle contributed to the innocent pleasure of social intercourse (Joh 2:1-11). The impression left by His address was pleasing; nor was His voice the voice of grief (Luk 4:22). His gospel was a joyous prize (Mat 13:44-45). He delighted in healing pain (Luk 4:18). Instead of reflecting the sadness of households, Jesus removed it (Joh 11:23, Luk 8:52). He spoke of a joy that was His own peculiar and characteristic possession (Joh 15:11), and promised entrance into His own joy as a supreme reward (Mat 25:21). This joy He offered all who followed Him (Joh 16:24), and He was anxious to complete the joy of His disciples (Joh 15:11; Joh 17:13). Christ shunned the moroseness of asceticism (Mat 11:19), as He turned from the selfish happiness of the epicurean (Mat 20:28). The joy of Christ arose from several causes—(1) He was free from sin, that root of sorrow and bitterness: 'For by sinning we kept neither piety nor felicity' (Augustine). (2) He had the intense joys of a Saviour (Luk 15:7). His was the happiness that comes from being the creator of another's good (Luk 19:10). The keen pleasure of rescue work filled His soul (Luk 15:5; Luk 15:9; Luk 15:23). The thought of the countless hosts who would obtain eternal rest through His death was a secret potion to sweeten His bitter cup. For the joy set before Him He endured the cross. (3) The self-sacrifice of Jesus issued out of pure love (Joh 15:13). He was happy as a lover. (4) He rejoiced in the sense of Divine sonship. This was His earliest thought (Luk 2:49). To do the will of God was better than food (Joh 4:34). The knowledge of His Father was life (Joh 17:3). It was an incomparable ecstasy for Him to dwell upon the love of God (John 17). This relieved Him of fear (Luk 23:48, Mat 6:34); also it freed Him from the distracting care of false ambition (Joh 18:36). Being thus free from many of the vexing thoughts and struggles that disturb our peace of mind, He was able to find comfort in Himself and His cause. He was the first citizen in the Kingdom of Heaven,

which is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. Though tempted in all points like as we are, and acquainted with grief, Christ was nevertheless a man of joy.

Christ gives happiness by giving Himself. 'He that hath the Son hath life,' and the causes which led to His peace act in measure in all those who turn to Jesus. The first and last Beatitude of the Gospels is to those who believe in Him (Luk_1:45, Joh_20:29). All life culminates in God, and man's *summum bonum* is God as He is revealed in Christ. Partnership with Him, even when joined with personal suffering and sacrifice, is more valuable than all worldly prosperity (Mat_10:39). Plato had climbed to a lofty place when he declared that man's happiness was to be found in a supernatural good, in the knowledge of ideas, especially the idea of God. But Christianity rises higher. Jesus leads us up from imitation of God and acquaintance with Divine ideas to the sublime fact that we may know God personally. Not a resemblance, but a partnership; not a certainty that God is good, true, and wise, but a certainty that He loves us, and that we may love Him in return—this is the new faith (Joh_15:9). Jesus is the Christian's joy. Into our restlessness of soul, due in part to imperfect ideas, Christ comes with a fellowship and an ambition grand enough to supply man with the peace after which he is ever struggling (Mat_11:28). Through Christ our sins are forgiven, our anxieties removed, our sorrows softened, our hopes revived, while He alone imparts that supreme gift of fellowship with God which is our highest good. Thus purest happiness comes, which some will still prefer to call blessedness, as more appropriate to such intimate and spiritual relationships.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , artt. 'Beatitude,' 'Happiness,' 'Sermon on the Mount'; Hort, *The Way, The Truth, The Life* (Macmillan, 1894); Hilty, *Glück* (J. C. Hinrichs, Leipzig); *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , art. 'Glückseligkeit'; Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection: 'Prudential Aphorisms'*; Shairp, *Studies*, 362; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*¹⁵ [Note: 5 designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 114, 195; Carlyle, *Sartor*, 112, 132, *Heroes*, 64.

James W. Falconer.

☞ Hardening Of Heart

HARDENING OF HEART.—(a) The relation in Scripture between the blood and the life (Lev_17:11) is such that the heart is naturally 'the typical centre of personal life' (cf. Westcott on Heb_4:12 and 1Jn_1:7 Add. Notes); the seat of understanding (1Ki_3:9;

1Ki 3:12), affection (Deu 6:5), will (Jer 5:23), character (1Ki 9:4, Eze 11:21); the fountain at which all issues (Pro 4:23) may receive a Divine direction, (b) It is described as tender (2Ki 22:18 f.), hard (Exo 8:19), of flesh or of stone (Eze 11:19 ff.), not in the popular sense of merciful or cruel, but according to its receptivity (or otherwise) of Divine impressions. Of the Greek words employed to express such hardness the two more remarkable (see below) represent the heart as callous (*i.e.* ossified) or fat. (c) An important distinction is to be made between two expressions:—(i.) ‘**Hardness of heart.**’ To a certain extent this is an unavoidable infirmity of man’s natural condition. As such, it is the object of Divine condescension, which (as Christ directly asserts) is the explanation of much OT legislation (Mat 19:8 ||). It is referred to in the Gospels as (1) σκληροκαρδία, Mat 19:8 || Mar 10:5 [Mar 16:14]; as (2) καρδ. πεπωρωμένη, Mar 6:52; Mar 8:17. (ii.) ‘**Hardening of heart.**’ This is a voluntary process: the object therefore of Divine condemnation (cf. Mat 11:20 ff; Mat 13:15; Mat 23:37 ff., Rom 2:5). Its active nature, as distinguished from passive infirmity, is indicated by the form πώρωσις, Mar 3:5 (cf. Rom 11:25, Eph 4:18), in contrast to the pf. pt. pass. Mar 6:52; Mar 8:17. (d) Hardening is represented, alternatively with conversion, as a direct consequence of contact with grace and the gospel (Mat 13:15, Joh 3:19 f., Joh 9:39; cf. 2Co 5:10). The origin of the process is variously stated, according to the side from which it is viewed. Thus—(1) The heart *is hardened*, as though by the action of a mechanical law: Mat 13:15 = Isa 6:10 LXX Septuagint (cf. Act 19:9, Rom 11:7; Rom 11:25, 2Co 3:14). (2) Man *hardens his heart*. This aspect, though necessarily involved in man’s responsibility and often stated in the OT (Exo 9:34, 1Sa 6:8, 2Ch 36:13), is not expressly referred to in the NT, except in Heb 3:8 = Psa 95:8. (3) *God hardens it*: Joh 12:40 = a paraphrase of Isa 6:10; see Westcott, *ad loc.*, and cf. Rom 9:18. This is often known as ‘judicial hardening’: it is ‘the inexorable law of moral consequence’ (Westcott on Heb 3:8). It comes to pass that ‘he who *will not* turn at last *cannot*. And God, who established that law of man’s nature, is said in Scripture to *do* that which occurs under it or results from it’ (Vaughan on Rom 9:18). (e) In the OT the typical case is that of Pharaoh; in which all three statements are remarkably exemplified (Exo 7:14; Exo 8:15; Exo 9:12). Bunyan’s ‘Man in the iron cage’ is a powerful picture of hardening in its final stage: at the same time, the man who is past repentance is usually past feeling (Eph 4:18 f.).

F. S. Ranken.

HARLOT.—This is the term usually employed in Authorized Version as translation of πόρνη, the only other translation being ‘whore.’

The practice of prostitution dates from the earliest times. While in Egypt, the Israelites must have been familiar with the fact that prostitution prevailed in connexion with Egyptian cults. No sooner were they settled in Canaan than the purity both of their morality and their religion was endangered by the contaminating influence of Semitic rites, in which the consecrated harlot (*kēdçshâh*) played no small part. From glimpses of social life afforded us by the prophets (e.g. Jer 5:7, Hos 4:14), we can perceive the prevalence of ordinary prostitution in their day. One of the blessings of the Exile was the extinction among the Jews both of idolatry and of religious prostitution. The Apocrypha, however, witnesses to the continuance of the common harlot. She haunts the streets (Sir 9:7), and employs singing as one of her seductive arts (Sir 9:4). In the time of the Maccabees the Gentiles in Palestine ‘dallied with harlots,’ and had to do ‘with women within the circuit of the holy places’ (2Ma 6:4). Cf. also Pro 7:10.

The Gospels supply us with little information as to the extent of prostitution in Palestine during the time of Christ. In Mat 21:32 our Lord refers to harlots as a class. The woman of Luke 7, ‘who was a sinner in the city’ (Luk 7:37 v.l.), probably belonged to the class. In the parable of the Prodigal Son, the far country in which he devoured his living with harlots (Luk 15:30) might be supposed to be possibly within Palestine. Again, our Lord’s reference to the sin of fornication (Mat 19:9) suggests the existence of immoral women. The popular idea of Mary Magdalene as a woman of evil life is rejected by many of the best exegetes.

In Christ’s day, Palestine was in many ways demoralized by Greek and Roman influences. Wherever the Greeks and Romans went, the *ἑταίρα* and the *meretrix* abounded. Religious prostitution reappeared in connexion with the Mysteries of Aphrodite, which culminated in vicious orgies, and these rites were not confined to Greece. Pagan gods and goddesses ‘had their due secret solemnities whithersoever Greek (and partly Roman) colonists took their Lares and Penates’ (Baring-Gould in Chambers’ *Encyc.* vii. 369). Nor would the immorality of women employed in shameless rites be confined to religious ceremonies, any more than is the case to-day amongst similar women attached to Indian temples. In cities upon the coast of Asia Minor immoral cults prevailed in NT times.

To the Christian mind the matter of chief interest is the attitude of Jesus towards this class of sinners, and the significance of His gospel in respect of them. Here we cannot fail to contrast the harsh temper of the Pharisees towards such women with the holy and redemptive sympathy of Jesus. Even the austere John the Baptist had evidently

welcomed them as penitents and as candidates for baptism (Mat_21:32),—a fact of which Jesus reminded His Pharisaic hearers. Our Lord plainly indicated that sins of fleshly frailty are less heinous and less likely to prove fatal than lovelessness, spiritual pride, and hypocrisy; for ‘the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you’ (Mat_21:31). His compassionate tenderness in this connexion appears very beautifully in St. Luke’s story of the sinful woman, whose newness of heart was intensified by the love and gratitude consequent upon the pity and pardon experienced at the Saviour’s hands. It may be added in respect of guilt of this description, that the peace of conscience begotten of faith in the Redeemer’s atoning blood is oftentimes as deep as the sense of guilt was poignant. Nor should it be forgotten that the general effect of the way in which the Master admitted women to His intimate fellowship is to raise the status of woman in such a manner as to render her degradation through prostitution unthinkable.

Robert M. Adamson.

☩ Harvest

HARVEST.—See Agriculture.

☩ Hating, Hatred

HATING, HATRED.—Although the noun does not occur in the Gospels, yet the verb (μισῶ) is often found. The passages may be grouped as follows: (1) those which speak of the world’s hatred to Christ and His people; (2) those dealing with the Old Law, and Christ’s hatred of sin; (3) those which prescribe hate; (4) some remaining passages.

1. The world being opposed, according to St. John’s use of the term, to ‘all that is of the Father’ (1Jn_2:16), it was inevitable that the holy and sinless Jesus should arouse its antipathy; and this is specially noted in the Fourth Gospel. The world hated Him because He testified that its deeds were evil (Joh_7:7). Its instinctive opposition to the light as manifested in Him was immediately aroused (Joh_3:20). Thus He said ‘the world hath hated me’ (μεμίσηκεν, Joh_15:18), the perfect tense expressing ‘a persistent abiding feeling, not any isolated manifestation of feeling’ (Westcott); and it was ‘without a cause’ (δωρεάν, Joh_15:25), cf. Psa_35:19; Psa_69:4; no reason could be found for such hostility except that He condemned its wickedness. This

hatred carried with it hatred of the Father also (Joh 15:23), in which character He had revealed God to men, cf. Joh 15:24 ‘they have both seen and hated both me and my Father’; therefore they had no excuse for their sin, perhaps here the special sin of hatred to Him and His (Alford). Cf. in the parable of the Pounds, ‘his citizens hated him’ (Luk 19:14).

Christ’s disciples consequently may expect to experience the same hatred in proportion as they truly follow their Lord (Joh 15:18-20). ‘When they came before the world, it showed at once and decisively its position of antagonism to the gospel’ (ἐμίσησε, ‘hated,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 Joh 17:14) (Westcott), the ultimate cause being that men had no true knowledge of Him who sent Jesus (Joh 15:21). He foretold that they should be ‘hated of all men’ for His Name’s sake (Mat 10:22 ||), more precisely ‘of all nations’ (Mat 24:9); cf. for its fulfilment Act 12:3; Act 28:22, 1Th 2:14-15; 1Pe 2:12; Tacitus, *Ann.* xv. 44, ‘quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos appellabat’; Suetonius, *Nero*, xvi., ‘Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis novae et maleficae.’ In so far as the world-spirit crept in among the disciples, there would be similar exhibitions of hatred among themselves (Mat 24:10); cf. Gal 5:15, 1Jn 3:15, the deadly hatred of the Judaizers towards St. Paul, and the name ὁ ἐχθρὸς ἄνθρωπος apparently given to him in the Pseudo-Clementines. The world’s hatred, however, should be a cause of rejoicing (Luk 6:22), and not of wonder (1Jn 3:13, where ‘if,’ as in Joh 15:18, implies no doubt of the fact). The disciples might well suspect their loyalty if they escaped the enmity of those who hated their Lord (Joh 7:7), while their experience of it was a proof that they had been chosen out and united to Him (Joh 15:19-20), as also a pledge of their future glory (Rom 8:17, 2Ti 2:12; 1Pe 4:13); ‘Christianos quoque aut summo amore prosequuntur homines aut summo odio. Qui omnibus semper placent, sibi merito suspecti esse debent’ (Bengel).

Groups (2) and (3) raise an apparent difficulty: the feeling which is forbidden in the one seems commanded in the other. Westcott has a valuable note on 1Jn 2:9 which suggests the solution; ‘there is a certain ambiguity in the word “hate,” for it serves as the opposite both to the love of natural affection (φιλεῖν) and to the love of moral judgment (ἀγαπᾶν). In the former case hatred, which may become a moral duty, involves the subjection of an instinct; in the latter case hatred expresses a general determination of character.’ Thus μισεῖν as opposed to ἀγαπᾶν is condemned (Mat 5:43 f., Eph 5:28-29, 1Jn 2:9-10; 1Jn 3:14-15; 1Jn 4:20), while as opposed to φιλεῖν it may become a duty (Luk 14:26, Mat 10:37, Joh 12:25).

2. 'Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy: but I say unto you, Love your enemies' (Mat 5:43); 'do good to them that hate you' (Luk 6:27, omitted by best authorities in Mt.). The first part of the maxim is found in Lev 19:16; but in the latter clause Jesus 'is not quoting precisely any OT or extra-Biblical utterance on record (cf. Sir 18:13)' (Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, Extra Vol. p. 30). The question then arises—Is it a fair deduction from, and does it represent the spirit of, the OT, or is it an unwarranted extension and addition of the scribes? In favour of the latter it is urged that this hatred is not conceived of as following in Lev 19:18, and that passages much nearer the Christian standard are found. The utmost consideration was to be shown even to an enemy's beast (Exo 23:4); the fact that the owner cherished hate was no reason why help should be refused to him in his trouble (Exo 23:5). Cf. as to rejoicing over an enemy in calamity, Job 31:29; as to returning evil for evil, Pro 24:29; and as to the better spirit often shown in OT, Gen 45:1 f., 1Sa 24:7, 2Ki 6:22, Psa 7:4; Psa 35:13. Jewish sages ordained that 'if a man finds both a friend and an enemy in distress, he shall first assist his enemy,' in order to subdue his evil inclination; and held that it is not permitted to 'hate any one except only sinners who, having been duly warned and admonished, do not repent' (Kalisch on Leviticus, quoted in Alexander, *The Witness of the Psalms to Christ and Christianity*, p. 274). Pro 24:17; Pro 25:21-22 are sometimes quoted as approaching the Christian spirit, but the reason given in each case militates considerably against their force ('lest the Lord see it and it displease him, and he turn away his wrath from him,' 'and the Lord shall reward thee'). Hence some suppose that 'hate thine enemy' was an illegitimate inference ('pessima glossa,' Bengel) drawn by Rabbis from the precepts laid down concerning the Amalekites and other nations under the curse (Exo 23:23 f., Deu 7:1 f., Deu 23:3, Deu 25:17 f.); by giving to 'neighbour' the sense of 'friend,' and taking 'enemy' as meaning a 'private enemy,' they were easily turned into a justification of private hatred. On the other hand, it is held by many that this clause was really implied in Lev 19:18 and truly expressed the spirit of OT. The election of Israel, taken with the rules concerning the above nations, would foster an aversion to foreigners which was ever increasing in intensity; cf. Psalms 83, Jon 3:10 to Jon 4:11, Est. In time the Jews came to have such a profound contempt and disregard for all others as caused them to be charged with being enemies of the human race ('apud ipsos fides obstinata, misericordia in promptu, sed adversus omnes alios hostile odium,' Tac. *Hist.* v. 5, 2; 'non monstrare vias eadem nisi sacra colenti,' Juv. *Sat.* xiv. 103). Therefore Bp. Gore holds (*Sermon on Mount*, p. 97) that we must accept Mozley's conclusions, which are as follows,—The whole precept, as it stands, undoubtedly represents, and is a summary of, the sense of the Law; nor is there any occasion to refer 'it hath been said' to the Law in the case of 'Love thy neighbour,' and to the tradition of the scribes in the case of 'Hate thine enemy': all the other precepts which the Lord takes as instances of an inferior morality are precepts out of the Law, and there is no reason to distinguish this particular one from the rest with respect to its source. In the first place, it

applied to ‘neighbour’ and ‘enemy’ in a national sense, and tended to strengthen the union of Israelites; it was the inculcation of an *esprit de corps* which was the very bond of, and incentive to, union in the early ages. But it also referred to a private enemy, and was conceived in the general spirit of retaliation (cf. Mat_5:38 and such Psalms as 109).

It is evident from Mat_5:44 that Jesus took ‘enemy’ as meaning a ‘private enemy,’ who in the new Kingdom is to be loved, and to whom good is to be done. He used ἀγαπᾶν, not φιλεῖν, on which Tittmann (see Alford) says, ‘φιλεῖν, amare, pessimum quemque vir honestus non potest; sed poterit eum tamen ἀγαπᾶν, i.e. bene ei cupere et facere quippe homo homini, cui etiam Deus benefaciat. Amor imperari non potest, sed dilectio.’ Cf. Clem. Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] τὸ ἀγαπᾶν τοὺς ἐχθροὺς οὐκ ἀγαπᾶν τὸ κακὸν λέγει, and Aug. ‘sic dilige inimicos ut fratres optes, sic dilige inimicos ut in societatem tuam vocentur, sic enim dilexit ille qui in cruce pendens ait, Pater ignosce illis, quia nesciunt quid faciunt.’ According to the teaching of Christ, therefore, the hatred of sin only is permissible, which is the necessary corollary of the Gospel of Love, and is according to His own example; cf. Heb_1:9, Rev_2:6, where Lyra remarks (see Alford), ‘non dixit Nicolaitas, sed facta: quia personae sunt ex charitate diligendae, sed eorum vitia odio sunt habenda.’

3. Luk_14:25-26, Jesus turned and said unto the multitude, ‘If any man cometh unto me, and hateth not his own father, and mother, and wife (peculiar to Luke), and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple’; cf. Mat_10:37 ‘He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me’; and Joh_12:25 ‘He that loveth his life loseth it, and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal.’ We may at once dismiss such an interpretation as Renan put forward, viz. that Christ was here ‘despising the healthy limits of man’s nature,’ ‘warring against the most legitimate cravings of the heart,’ and ‘preaching a total rupture with the ties of blood.’ The whole tenor of His life and teaching is against such an idea. He forbade hatred even of an enemy (Luk_6:27); He condemned evasion of the Fifth Commandment (Mar_7:9-12), and taught the sanctity of the marriage bond (Mar_10:2-9); He showed tender thought for His mother (Joh_19:25 f.), and loved children (Mar_10:13 f.); His new commandment was ‘that ye love one another, as I have loved you’ (Joh_13:34). St. John certainly did not understand Luk_14:26 in Renan’s sense (1Jn_2:9; 1Jn_2:11; 1Jn_3:15; 1Jn_3:17; 1Jn_4:16; 1Jn_4:20); nor St. Paul (Eph_5:28, 1Ti_5:8, Tit_2:4, Rom_13:8), who would regard those acting in such a way as ἄστοργοι ‘without natural affection,’ a vice of the heathen (Rom_1:31).

Some have given to 'hate' in these passages the meaning of 'love less,' comparing Gen 29:30-31, Deu 21:15; but it follows from the above that Jesus cannot have intended to condemn *any* degree of right affection as if it amounted to loving others more than Him. 'The love which Christ condemneth differs not in degree, but in kind, from rightful affection. It is one which takes the place of love to Christ, not which is placed by the side of that of Christ. For, rightly viewed, the two occupy different provinces. Wherever and whenever the two affections come into comparison, they also come into collision' (Edersheim, *Life and Times*, i. 650). There is a foolish affection which would do injury both to the giver and the receiver (cf. Pro 13:24), and then hate is not only consistent with, but absolutely necessary for, the highest kind of love. It is 'that element in love which makes a wise and Christian friend not for time only, but for eternity.'

The words had special application to the time when they were spoken, and must have sounded strange to the multitude, which, for the most part, was following because of that very love of life which is condemned, desiring to get material benefits (cf. Joh 6:26). Jesus' enemies were becoming more violent, divisions in families would take place (Mat 10:34-36; cf. Exo 32:26 f., Deu 33:9), and discipleship would in many cases be impossible without the renunciation of the dearest ties. The mission field affords a parallel nowadays, where the hostility of relatives is often the greatest hindrance to the confession of Christ. The statement is made in the most startling form to arrest attention; conditions must be supplied as in Mat 5:29 f. Even where renunciation is not outwardly necessary, there must be potential alienation and the acknowledgment of Christ's claims as paramount. The key to the true explanation lies in 'yea and his own life also' (cf. Joh 12:25), it is presupposed that friendship is a source of enjoyment for ourselves; 'Jesus does not indicate a course of action whereby we do evil to others, but such as constitutes a painful sacrifice for ourselves' (Wendt). At bottom our own life only, the last citadel (Job 2:4), is to be hated, and everything else only in so far as it partakes of this principle of sin and death (Godet); 'secundum eam partem, secundum quam *se ipsum* odisse debet, a Christo aversam' (Bengel). 'He that so prizes his life that he cannot let it out of his own hand or give it up to good ends, checks its growth, and it withers and dies; whereas he who treats it as if he hated it, giving it up freely to the needs of others, shall keep it to life eternal' (Dods, *Expositor's Greek Test.*). 'Nec tamen sufficit nostra relinquere, nisi relinquamus et nos' (Gregory, *Hom.* xxxii.).

Westcott on Heb 7:3 quotes a striking passage from Philo which throws light on Luk 14:26; he describes the Levites as being in some sense 'exiles who to do God's pleasure had left parents and children and brethren and all their mortal kindred, and continues—ὁ γοῦν ἀρχηγῆτος τοῦ θιασοῦ τούτου λέγων εἰσάγεται τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῇ μητρὶ, Οὐχ ἐώρακα ὑμᾶς καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς οὐ γενώσκω καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς ἀπογινώσκω ὑπὲρ

ο τοῦ δίχα μεθολκῆς θεραπεύειν τὸ ὄν.’ For the abstraction of the sinful desire to injure from the word ‘hate,’ leaving in it nothing but an aversion of a purely moral kind, Wendt compares the use of ‘violence’ and ‘force’ in Mat_11:12, where ‘they are used only so far as they denote energetic seizure and appropriation, but not the unlawfulness of this seizure.’

4. Other passages—Mat_6:24 = Luk_16:13 ‘No man can serve two masters: for either he will *hate* the one and love (ἀγαπήσει) the other; or else he will hold to the one and despise the other. Here also ‘hate’ must get its full meaning in order to bring out the opposition and the division of the man’s nature who attempts to serve both God and mammon. The change of words in the second part is remarkable (καταφρονήσει for μισήσει. and ἀνθέξεται for ἀγαπήσει), ‘non dixit *odiet* sed *contemnet*: sicut solent minas ejus postponere cupiditatibus suis, qui de bonitate ejus ad impunitatem sibi blandiuntur’ (Aug.); to which Trench adds—‘No man actually and openly professes to hate God and love the devil; and therefore in the second clause, when the Lord is putting the converse case, He changes both words, which would be no longer the most appropriate; the sinner ‘*holds to*’ Satan when he follows his rewards; he practically ‘*despises*’ God when he heeds not His promises and His threatenings; however little he may acknowledge to himself or to others that he is doing either this or the other.’

Luk_1:71, ‘salvation from our enemies and from the hand of all that hate us,’ exhibits a parallelism with no particular distinction between the clauses, cf. Psa_18:17; Psa_106:10.

Literature.—Bethune-Baker’s art. ‘Hatred’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible ; Votaw’s art. ‘Sermon on the Mount,’ *ib.* Extra Vol.; Trench, *Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount*, also *Studies in the Gospels* (No. 12); Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, ii. 65-70; Mozley, *Lectures on the Old Testament* (Lect. viii.); Finlayson, *Expositor*, i. ix. [1879] 420 f.; Dykes, *Manifesto of the King*, p. 311 ff.; Butler, *Serm.* viii. ix.; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*, ch. 21.; Martensen, *Chr. Eth.* ii. 118 ff.; Gardner, *Conflict of Duties*, 133-148.

W. H. Dundas.

☞ Head

HEAD (κεφαλή).

1. *Natural importance.*—The relationship of the head to the body is that of master to servant. In this service the body is expected to ignore its own wants, and homelessness is to be without a resting-place for the head (Mat 8:20). The anointing of the head was an accompaniment of festive happiness (Mat 26:7, Mar 14:3, Luk 7:46), and this mark of joy was to be borrowed by Christian self-denial (Mat 6:17). A crown of thorns on the head was part of the mock dignity thrust upon Christ as King of the Jews (Joh 19:2).

The importance thus attached to the head gave a higher significance to the gestures which, among an emotional people, often emphasized or took the place of words. Such movements of the head are practised to-day in Palestine alike by young and old, and are resorted to on occasions similar to those described in the OT and NT. Thus a rapid shaking of the head from side to side, with a similar twirling of the open hand on the wrist, indicates that one is perplexed by some mystery, as when the owner of the garden asked why that useless fig-tree was still there (Luk 13:7). It also indicates that the hearer has not heard distinctly, or grasped the meaning of what has been said. An abrupt jerk of the head backward does duty, especially when at some distance away, for an emphatic 'No.' The bending of the head downward is the attitude of the inferior in the presence of his superior (Isa 58:5, Luk 18:13). The slow turning of the head once in one direction means that the words just heard or the scene witnessed pass all description. Such a gesture would be common among those who looked upon Christ's miracles of healing power. This motion, repeated several times, along with a dissociating wave of the hand, means contempt or disgust towards some action, or the abandonment of hope in the case of some party referred to (Jer 18:16, Zep 2:15). The movement of the head up and down is the soliloquy of one speaking to himself and saying, 'It is as I expected; I knew it must come to this' (Lam 2:15, Mat 27:39). The head laid to one side, with a slight protrusion of the underlip, means, 'Causes must have consequences, you may do as you please' (Psa 22:7). Such a gesture seems to fill the gap in the debate over the fig-tree in the garden (Luk 13:9).

2. *Figurative authority.*—The connexion thus recognized between head and body was used to express all situations involving a relationship of authority and submission. The patriarchal East, with regard to both secular and sacred matters, has always attached more importance to the sceptre than to the statute. It does not understand impersonal edicts, and gives its homage to the official who can enforce his decrees. Its conception of life is of graded authority rather than of democratic equality. It was not so much in disapproval of this as by way of supplying a new line of action to the familiar instinct, that Christ said that in the coming Kingdom of God the way to honour would have to be sought through abundant and self-humbling service (Mat 20:26 f., Mat 23:11). The customs of swearing by the head and of appealing to heaven and earth and Jerusalem, are condemned, because, while such a habit of

appealing under distress to the name of some one who could and must come to deliver and punish was a protection to the oppressed under primitive conditions of life, it was here diverted from its original meaning when the appeal was made to that which was not free, but already belonged to another. The practice was at once foolish and idolatrous. The true help is from the Lord which made heaven and earth; and this help is for those whose speech is 'Yea, yea; nay, nay' (Mat_5:33-37).

For the *headship of Christ* see following article.

G. M. Mackie.

⚠️ Headship

HEADSHIP

i. In the Gospels.—1. The word 'head' (κεφαλή), as applied to the relation of Christ to His Church, occurs only three times in the Gospels, and there in the passages in the Synoptics (Mat_21:42 || Mar_12:10 || Luk_20:17) in which, applying the lesson of the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, Jesus quotes Psa_118:22 in the Septuagint version, 'The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner' (οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας), where the expression κεφαλὴν γωνίας is an exact rendering of the Hebrew פִּנֵּה שָׂרֵי. The meaning of the passage is clear. The building of which the Psalmist speaks is the theocracy, Israel as the people of God. The corner-stone, a stone fitted into an angle of the building and binding together the walls which meet at that point, and without which the structure must collapse, represents the Messiah, through whom the theocracy finds its realization.

What the Psalmist says about the rejection of the stone on the part of the builders has been explained by some as an allusion to an alleged incident in the building of the Second Temple.

'Some stone, a fragment, we may conjecture, of the Old Temple, rescued from its ruins, had seemed to the architects unfit for the work of binding together the two walls that met at right angles to each other. They would have preferred some new blocks of their own fashioning. But the priests, it may be, more conversant with the traditions of the Temple, knew that that was the right place for it, and that no other stone would answer half as well. The trial was made, and the issue answered their expectations' (Plumptre, *Biblical Studies*, quoted by Perowne, *Psalms, in loc.*).

It is more likely, however, that this story was suggested by Psalms 118 than *vice versa*. Probably what was in the Psalmist's mind was Isa 28:16 'Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone.' Psa 118:22 was applied by Christ to His relation to the Church as uniting Jew and Gentile, and to His approaching rejection by Israel. Thus quoted and applied, the words of the Psalm speak of the Messiah as of Him 'upon whom depend the maintenance and development of the theocracy, without whom it would fall to pieces, as the corner-stone is the upholder and stay of a building' (Meyer). They speak of Christ as representing the principle of unity, that which constitutes the Church a grand whole. If we compare with this application by our Lord of Psa 118:22 the use made of the same figure by St. Peter in the Acts of the Apostles (Act 4:11) and in his First Epistle (1Pe 2:4-8), where he speaks of the Church as a temple built of living stones, and by St. Paul when he describes Jesus Christ Himself as the chief corner-stone of a holy temple (Eph 2:20), we find the connecting link between the idea of the Headship of Christ as it is expressed in the Gospels and the similar conception of St. Paul in his Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians (compare also 1Co 11:3).

St. Peter, while keeping to the architectural figure suggested by the passages quoted from the Psalms and Isaiah, and speaking of Christ as 'head stone of the corner' (κεφαλή γωνίας), adds the thought of life to that of unity. St. Paul, still further working out the same idea, adopts a different figure, that of the head as the seat of life in the body, that which controls and regulates the action of each individual member (Eph 1:22-23; Eph 4:15-16; Eph 5:23; Eph 5:28-30, Col 1:18; Col 2:19). See § ii.

2. The idea of Headship is suggested in the Gospels in connexion with another figure, in our Lord's similitude of the Vine (Joh 15:1 ff.), in which He illustrates and works out in detail the thought that He is the source of life and fruitfulness for the whole Church and for each individual member of the Church, the vital principle which unites all in one. As the head no less than the heart is the seat of life in the human body, inasmuch as the brain is the centre of the nervous system, and the nerves radiating from the brain and spinal cord are the source of the healthy activity of every part, the beautiful description which St. Paul gives (Col 2:19)—'the head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God'—corresponds to what Christ says in His parable of the Vine of the source of life and fruitfulness, with the thought of the healthy flow of life-giving sap which His words suggest: 'As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself except it abide in the vine, no more can ye except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me (χωρὶς ἐμοῦ—marg. 'severed from me') ye can do nothing' (Joh 15:4-5).

3. Again, the thought of Headship is involved in that view of the Church's relation to Christ which our Lord presents in the blessing pronounced on St. Peter at Caesarea Philippi (Mat_16:18-19), and in a passage from the same Gospel, in many respects similar, in which He repeats His promise of power to bind and to loose (Mat_18:18-20). These passages are the more worthy of note in this connexion, that they are the only instances in which the Gospels represent Jesus as using the expression 'Church' (ἐκκλησία). According to the first, that which constitutes the being and the strength of the Church is her faith in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of the living God. Jesus speaks of the community which is founded upon faith in the Christ as 'My church' (μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν), and then promises to invest this Church in the person of her representatives (in this case St. Peter as spokesman of the Twelve) with the power to bind and to loose. The other passage occurs in connexion with our Lord's injunction to make 'the church' the final court of appeal in cases of disputes among brethren. In it Jesus repeats the promise of power to bind and to loose, and states, in more universal terms than He employs in His promise to St. Peter, what constitutes the Church, or what entitles any body of believers to the name of 'Church.' That is the presence of Christ Himself in the midst of them. 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.' That which constitutes the Church and invests her with authority and power, that which is the source of her life and energy, is the presence with her of Christ as her living Head, in whose name and guided by whose Spirit she discharges her spiritual functions.

Literature:—Cremer, *Bib.-Theol. Lex. s.v. κεφαλή*; Grimm-Thayer, *Lex. Novi Testamenti, s.vv. κεφαλή, ἀνακεφαλαιόω*; *Comm.* of Meyer and Alford; Baethgen, *Psalmen, ad loc.*; Perowne, *The Psalms*, ii. p. 338; Beyschlag, *NT Theol.* i. 165 ff.

Hugh H. Currie.

ii. In the Pauline Epistles.—The Headship of Christ, suggested in the teaching of our Lord Himself, is expressly taught in the Pauline Epp., and is applied, moreover, to a much wider sphere than that of Christian discipleship. For while emphasis is especially laid on Christ's Headship over the Church, suggestions are given for a doctrine of His Headship over the human race and even over the whole created universe.

1. *Christ's Headship over the Church.*—In 1Co_12:27 (cf. Rom_12:5) we find St. Paul, in his desire to impress his readers with a sense of their unity and mutual dependence, describing the local church as 'a body of Christ' (σῶμα Χριστοῦ)—conceiving of it *i.e.* under the figure of a body whose several members (eye, hand, head, feet, Rom_12:21) are individual Christians. In Eph. and Col. this figure is

elaborated at more points than one. In the first place, Christ is no longer thought of as Himself the whole body, of which individuals are the members—the head being a particular member like the rest. The Church is now the body, from which He is distinguished as the Head (Eph 1:22 f., Eph 4:15 f., Eph 5:23, Col 1:18; Col 2:19). He is the vital centre, the ruling and directing power of the whole organism.

Moreover, as the use of the art. before *σῶμα* (absent in 1Co 12:27) now shows, it is the writer's intention that the figure should be applied not to any local church merely, but to the Church universal, and to this Church ideally conceived—the actual Church, no doubt, but regarded *sub specie aeternitatis*, so that the radiance of the heavenly antitype shines through the earthly form. To this Church, Christ is 'head over all things'; while it is 'his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all' (Eph 1:22 f.). See, further, art. Body, ii. (3).

2. *Christ's Headship over the human race.*—In 1Co 11:3 the Apostle writes, 'The head of every man is Christ.' Here we have a doctrine of Headship stretching out beyond the limits even of the universal Church. The statement, as Hort points out (*Chr. Ecclesia*, p. 151), is a natural application of St. Paul's view of Christ as the Second Adam (1Co 15:22; 1Co 15:45 ff., cf. Rom 5:12 ff.). The Incarnation not only reveals the kinship of the 'man from heaven' with all the sons of men; it sets Him before them as the true spiritual Head of humanity, in whom the race is ideally summed up.

3. *Christ's Headship over the universe.*—In Eph 1:10 we read that it is God's purpose 'to gather together all things under a head (*ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα*) in Christ, the things in the heavens and the things upon the earth.' And in Col 2:10 Christ is expressly called 'the head of all principality and power'—words which are explained in Col 1:15-16, where He is declared to be 'the firstborn of all creation,' in whom 'were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through him and unto him; and he is before all things, and in him all things consist.' In these passages there is affirmed of Christ a relation of Headship to the universe alike for the past, the present, and the future. In Him all things were created at the first. In Him they even now consist as their vital Head, the underlying ground of their very being. And unto Him from whom they had their origin they shall all finally return, in the day of that great consummation when God shall 'gather together all things under a head in Christ.'

With this Pauline doctrine of the Headship of Christ over (1) the Church, (2) the human race, (3) the universe, it is interesting to compare the teaching of the Fourth Gospel regarding (1) the union of Christ as the living Vine with His people as the branches (Joh 15:1 ff.); (2) the true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into

the world (Joh 1:9); (3) the creative Logos ‘without [whom] was not anything made that hath been made’ (Joh 1:3).

Literature.—The Comm. and NT Theologies on the passages referred to; Hort, *Chr. Ecclesia*, 144-152; Dale, *Eph.*, Lecture vi.; Bruce, *St. Paul’s Conception of Christianity*, 331 ff.

J. C. Lambert.

☩ Healing

HEALING.—See Cures.

☩ Hearing

HEARING.—1. There are two Gr. verbs (*ἀκούω*, *εἰσακούω*) used for ‘hear’ in the Gospels, and they are sometimes rendered in the Authorized and Revised Versions by ‘hearken,’ ‘listen’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), ‘come to the ears of,’ ‘to be noised.’ Another verb (*παρᾶκούω*) is used, Mat 18:17, and translated ‘refuse to hear’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), and Mar 5:36 where the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 is ‘not heeding’ (mg. ‘overhearing’). The noun (*ἀκοή*) also occurs, and is rendered ‘hearing,’ ‘fame,’ ‘report,’ ‘rumour.’

2. The most obvious meaning of ‘hear’ is, of course, *to be endowed with the faculty of hearing, as opposed to deafness*; and in this sense it is used in Mat 11:5 (Luk 7:22), Mar 7:37. (See Cures, Deaf and Dumb).

Next, perhaps, in order of common usage are such meanings of the word as (a) *to have immediate perceptual experience through the organ of hearing*—the object being either personal, as Mat 2:9 ‘Having heard the king,’ or impersonal, as Mat 11:4 ‘Tell John the things which ye do hear’; (b) *to find out (by hearsay), to have information about, learn (i.e. hear of mediately)*—the object again being either personal, as Mar 7:25 ‘A woman ... having heard of him,’ or impersonal, as Mar 6:55 ‘where they heard he was.’ In connexion with (a) and (b) it is interesting to note the passages in which the experience of Jesus is referred to: e.g. (a) Mat 8:10 (Luk 7:9) Mat 21:16; Mat 27:13, Mar 5:36, Luk 8:50; Luk 18:22; (b) Mat 4:12; Mat 9:12 (Mar 2:17), Joh 9:35; Joh 11:4; Joh 11:6.

3. The suggestive uses of the word, however, are those in which *more complex experiences* than the previous ones are signified by it. (a) The first usage to be named under this head is where the verb 'to hear' is used to mean *the receiving of inward communications*. For example, Jesus predicts the coining of the hour 'when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God' (Joh_5:25; Joh_5:28). Again He uses the word to describe *His own experience in relation to the revelation of the truth which He received from the Father and made known to men*, 'As I hear, I judge' (Joh_5:30); 'The things which I have heard from him (that sent me), these speak I unto the world' (Joh_8:26)—these as well as Joh_8:40 and Joh_15:15 are instances in point. The Evangelist John, speaking of Jesus, says, similarly, 'What he hath seen and heard, of that he beareth witness' (Joh_3:32). In two places Jesus refers to *the occurrence of this experience in the case of others*: 'Ye have neither heard his voice at any time,' He says to His Jewish audience, 'nor seen his form' (Joh_5:37); 'Every one that hath heard from the Father, and hath learned, cometh unto me' (Joh_6:45). Finally, the inward communication may be far otherwise than Divine in its source. To the Jews, Jesus is reported by the Evangelist John as having said, 'Ye do the things which ye heard from your father' (Joh_8:38), and later on in the same chapter (v. 44) their father is declared by Him to be the devil. It is characteristic that all the above usages are found in the Fourth Gospel. (b) In a few contexts the word 'hear' is used *with reference to God's attitude to prayer*. For example, we read that at the grave of Lazarus 'Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hearest me. And I knew that thou hearest me always' (Joh_11:41-42). In His teaching with regard to prayer Jesus warns His hearers against using vain repetitions, 'as the Gentiles do: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking' (Mat_6:7). To Zacharias the angel Gabriel is reported as having said, 'Fear not, because thy supplication is heard' (Luk_1:13). [ἰσρακοῦω is the verb used in both the preceding contexts]. The man, blind from his birth, whom Jesus cured on the Sabbath, thus addressed the Jews, 'We know that God heareth not sinners; but if any man be a worshipper of God and do his will, him he heareth' (Joh_9:31). (c) Another context may be noticed here, viz. that one in which Jesus, *describing the function of the Spirit, says of Him*, 'He shall not speak from himself; but what things soever he shall hear, these shall he speak' (Joh_16:13). (d) In certain passages *emphasis is placed on the privilege of 'hearing' or 'becoming acquainted with' the gospel*. 'Blessed are your eyes,' said Jesus to the disciples, 'for they see; and your ears, for they hear. For verily I say unto you, that many prophets and righteous men desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not; and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not' (Mat_13:16-17, Luk_10:24). The *duties attached to this privilege* may be grouped in the following way—(1) in respect to the exercise as such: 'He that hath ears to hear, let him hear' (Mat_11:16; Mat_13:9; Mat_13:43, cf. Mar_4:9; Mar_4:23; Mar_7:16, Luk_8:8; Luk_14:35); (2) in respect to that which the attention is given to: 'Take heed what ye hear' (Mar_4:24); (3) in respect to the manner of

hearing: 'Take heed therefore how ye hear' (Luk 8:18). (e) In a large number of passages, especially in the parable of the Sower, 'hearing' *either implies one or other of certain richer experiences, or it is explicitly connected therewith as a prefatory experience*. (1) Sometimes the experience implied, or mentioned as that in which 'hearing' fulfils itself (or does not fulfil itself), is *understanding or learning*. For example, referring to the multitude generally, Jesus said to the disciples, 'Therefore speak I to them in parables: because seeing they see not, and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand' (Mat 13:13, Mar 4:12, Luk 8:10). (See art. Seeing). 'Hear and understand, Not that which entereth into the mouth defileth the man; but that which proceedeth out of the mouth, this defileth the man' (Mat 15:10, Mar 7:14). 'With many such parables spake he the word unto them, as they were able to hear it' (Mar 4:33), etc. (2) Sometimes the experience is *believing*. For example, some of the Samaritans are reported as having said to the woman who conversed with Jesus at the well, 'Now we believe, not because of thy speaking: for we have heard for ourselves' (Joh 4:42). 'Verily, verily, I say unto you,' said Jesus to the Jews, when they were seeking to kill Him, 'He that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life' (Joh 5:24). 'This is an hard saying,' said many of the disciples after Jesus had spoken of Himself as the bread which came down from heaven, 'who can hear it?' (Joh 6:60). Cf. also the references in John 10 to the sheep 'hearing' the voice of the Good Shepherd. (3) Sometimes the experience is *doing, bearing fruit, or keeping*. For example, the verses at the close of the Sermon on the Mount, 'Every one which heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them ... Every one that heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them not' (Mat 7:24; Mat 7:26, Luk 6:47; Luk 6:49).^{*} [Note: In connexion with this passage it is worth noting that the point of difference between the 'rock' and the 'sand' as foundation is just that between 'hearing and doing' and 'hearing and not doing.' The basal element is the same in both cases—'hearing,' but that which gives it the cohesiveness and permanence of rock is 'doing'—habitual obedience.] 'He that was sown upon the good ground, this is he that heareth the word, and understandeth it; who verily beareth fruit and bringeth forth,' etc. (Mat 13:23, Mar 4:20, Luk 8:15). When it was told Jesus that His mother and His brethren stood without desiring to see Him, He said, 'My mother and my brethren are these which hear the word of God and do it' (Luk 8:21). When a certain woman out of the multitude said to Jesus, 'Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the breasts which thou didst suck,' He answered, 'Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it: (Luk 11:28, cf. Joh 12:47).

The above divisions represent the main usages of the word 'hearing.' It is interesting to notice the contexts in which (i.) the interest displayed in anticipation of hearing is described, and these may be collected together without further remark: Mat 12:42 (Luk 11:31), Mat 13:17 (Luk 10:24), Mar 3:8 (cf. Mat 4:25, Mar 3:20 etc.), Luk 5:1; Luk 5:15; Luk 6:17; Luk 15:1; Luk 19:48; Luk 21:38; Luk 23:8; and (ii.) those in

which certain emotional results are described as resulting from ‘hearing,’ e.g. wonder, astonishment, amazement, etc., joy, rejoicing, gladness, etc., indignation, wrath, etc., sorrow, fear, trouble, perplexity, offence (see articles on most of these subjects).

In conclusion, it may be pointed out that the antinomy which is found throughout Scripture and is testified to by the human consciousness in connexion with religious experience, viz. between ‘man’s working out and God’s working in,’ appears in what is said about ‘hearing’ in the Gospels. For along with exhortations addressed to men to ‘hear’ and to fulfil that experience in understanding, believing, and doing, there occurs a saying of Jesus like this, ‘Every one that hath heard from the Father and hath learned, cometh unto me’ (Joh 6:45). The ‘ability to hear’ (Mar 4:33, Joh 6:60) implies an inward communication from God and an exercise of man’s natural faculties.

Literature.—Grimm-Thayer’s *Gr Lex.* s.vv.; Moulton-Geden’s *Gr. Concordance*, etc.; see also Literature appended to art. Seeing.

A. B. Macaulay.

☞ Heart

HEART.—In the NT ‘heart’ (*καρδία*) is the word most commonly used to denote the inner nature of man, the secret core of his being, where the springs of his intellectual and moral activity reside. In this, its general significance, it is the equivalent of the Hebrew term לֵב or לִבָּב in the OT. Originally employed to designate the bodily organ which is the centre of the animal life, it came by a natural process of thought to be applied to the invisible centre of the thinking and responsible life. In this sense it occurs with notable frequency in the Gospels; but there, like the corresponding word in the OT, whilst always referring to man’s interior nature, it is used in a variety of applications, according to the particular functions or aspects of that nature which are meant to be expressed. This is the case also in the other NT writings.

i. Shades of meaning in the Gospels.—Heart in the Gospels is variously regarded—

1. *As the faculty of thought, intelligence, and memory.*—Persons are spoken of as pondering (Luk 2:19), musing (Luk 3:15), reasoning (Luk 5:22), having thoughts arising (Mat 9:4, Luk 9:47; Luk 24:38) in their heart; understanding or not with their

heart (Mat 13:15, Mar 6:52; Mar 8:17); keeping, or laying up, things said or done, in their heart (Luk 1:56; Luk 2:51).

2. *As the seat of the affections, emotions, and passions*:—e.g. of love for God (Mat 22:37, Luk 10:27), for earthly or heavenly treasure (Mat 6:19-21); of joy (Joh 16:22, Luk 24:32); of sorrow (Joh 14:1; Joh 16:8); of forgivingness (Mat 18:35), purity (Mat 5:8), humility (Mat 11:29); of good or evil dispositions (Mat 12:34-35), perverse inclination (Mat 5:28, Mat 24:48), luxurious tastes and desires (Luk 21:34).

3. *As the source of purpose and volition*.—The disciples are enjoined to settle in their hearts not to meditate what they shall say (Luk 21:14); the fell design of Judas was put into his heart by Satan (Joh 13:2); the adulterous act is virtually done in the intention of the heart (Mat 5:28).

4. *As the organ of moral discernment and religious belief, i.e. of conscience and faith*.—Reproofs are given for the hardness of heart which prevents the reception of the truth (Mat 19:8, Mar 3:5; Mar 16:14), and for slowness of heart to believe (Luk 24:25); there is an exhortation not to doubt in the heart, but believe (Mar 11:23); and the pure in heart have the promise of Divine illumination (Mat 5:8).

In one passage only we find the phrase ‘the heart of the earth’ (Mat 12:40).

ii. Christ’s emphasis on the heart.—The superlative importance which Christ attached to the heart and its right condition was one of the pre-eminent characteristics of His teaching. He possessed an unrivalled insight into the workings of the heart (Joh 2:24-25), and could read what was going on there with a penetration and accuracy often startling (Mat 9:4; Mat 12:25; Mat 22:18, Mar 2:8, Luk 9:47). But His unique peculiarity was the seriousness and persistency with which He dealt with the heart, and laboured for its purification as the one concern vital to the well-being of men. To the heart He always appealed, and on its deepest instincts He sought to bring His influence to bear; and although in many of His utterances the heart is not expressly named, it is still obvious that He had it directly in view. This was the ‘inwardness’ which constituted His great secret. The main points on which He insisted were:

1. *The heart as the source of all the good or the evil in men’s lives*.—He dwelt on this with special earnestness—e.g. in His reply to the tradition-bound objectors, ‘Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries,’ etc., ‘the things which defile a man’ (Mat 15:19 f.); and in that suggestive saying, ‘A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good, and an evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is evil’ (Luk 6:45); and the idea is to be found running through all His teaching.

2. *The dispositions and motives of the heart as determining the religious value of actions.*—Jesus unfailingly taught that the test of a man’s worth before God was not the outward propriety of his conduct, but the heart-inclinations and purposes by which he was swayed (Luk 16:15). Even a correctly decorous Pharisee like Simon did not stand so high in the Divine estimation as the frail woman who had erred sadly, because, while he was proud and self-satisfied in his moral respectability, she, amid all her failings, was melted into heartfelt penitence and gratitude (Luk 7:36-39). A man’s conduct may be free from all formal commission of impurity, but if he lust after a woman in his heart, the stain of impurity is already incurred (Mat 5:28). Many things outwardly right and proper were done by the religionists of His day—seasons of prayer duly observed, alms given, etc.—which yet He pronounced to be of little moral value because done from a false motive, the desire for social credit, ‘to be seen of men’ (Mat 6:2; Mat 6:5). On the other hand, humble and obscure actions, like the widow’s offering and the publican’s supplication, He declared to be of inestimable worth in the eye of Heaven, by reason of the genuine heart-feeling from which they sprang (Mar 12:41-44, Luk 18:13-14). And in the great Judgment-picture (Mat 25:31-46), He made it clear that it is the frank, unaffected generosity of the heart, finding expression in deeds of simple dutifulness, that ranks high in the Father’s sight and secures the reward of immortal blessedness. Always and everywhere He pierced below surface appearances, and demanded inner rectitude as the criterion of worth.

3. *The regeneration of the heart as essential both to a right relation to God and to true happiness.*—The repentance Jesus preached meant a change of heart (Mat 4:17; Mat 9:13, Luk 13:3); the conversion He urged as a necessity was a turning of the heart to God as the source of life and grace (Mat 13:15, Mar 4:12, Joh 12:40), a restoration of the childlike spirit (Mat 18:3), a new birth within, apart from which it is impossible to enjoy the blessings of the heavenly Kingdom (Joh 3:3-7).

iii. Evils counteracted by Christ’s teaching.—Of these, four at least may be specially noted:

1. *A pretentious ecclesiasticism.*—Men’s minds were drawn away from dependence on the mere institutional aspects of religion, and confronted with the absolute necessity of internal righteousness. When orthodox Jews took a stand on their connexion with an ancient religious organization with its high covenanted privileges, and boasted of being children of Abraham, Christ flatly challenged their right to such a title, because of the vile purposes they cherished in their hearts, which proved that they did not possess Abraham’s spirit (Joh 8:39). He avowed that a scorned publican like Zacchaeus, who was outside the pale of ecclesiastical recognition, was more truly a son of Abraham, in virtue of the higher dispositions which had been stirred in his heart, and which placed him in the line of moral and spiritual descent (Luk 19:9).

Again, in face of the arrogant presumption that restricted Divine blessing and salvation to those within the bounds of Judaism and its religious system, He held up the kind services of a generous heart as sufficient to raise even a Samaritan to a level of equal worth before God (Luk_10:30-37).

2. *An external ceremonialism.*—Jesus attacked, sometimes with fiery indignation, the superficiality of that righteousness which was based on a punctilious attention to certain prescribed observances,—the tithing of mint and cummin, when justice, mercy, and the faith of the heart were neglected (Mat_23:23, Luk_11:42); the fastings which had no genuine penitence behind them (Mat_6:17-18); the careful washing of hands, while the heart was inwardly defiled (Mat_15:2-3). It was His dominant idea that on the disposition of the heart the spiritual value of worship depends (Joh_4:24), and He had strong warnings to utter against the offerings at the altar when sinister feelings were nursed within (Mat_5:23), and the ascription of honour to God with the lips while the heart was far from Him (Mat_15:8). With scathing rebukes He exposed the pretensions of those who claimed peculiar sanctity on the ground of their ceremonial scrupulousness, characterizing them as whited sepulchres, outwardly fair, but inwardly full of uncleanness (Mat_23:27). Thus He represented all external acts of righteousness which do not spring out of an upright, pious heart as a mere hypocritical show, and not real righteousness (Mat_6:1-6).

3. *A legalistic moralism.*—In view of the fact that the great spiritual ideas inculcated by the prophets had been hardened into fixed laws and rules, in formal obedience to which righteousness was made to consist, Christ's endeavour to recall men to the supreme importance of inner motive was calculated to exert a powerful effect. The confidence which many had in their moral respectability was necessarily shaken when they found themselves forced to look within, and judge themselves by something higher than a legal standard; as, e.g., in the case of the young man who had great possessions, and whose conduct outwardly was without reproach (Mat_19:16-22). And there can be little doubt that the uneasiness and irritation created among the professedly religious classes by Christ's teaching was largely due to the consciousness it awakened in them of the insufficiency of the grounds on which their claim to righteousness was based. In the light of the stress He laid on the hidden springs of action in the heart, their moral regularity of life, founded on mere conformity to laws and rules, was bound to appear unsatisfactory and poor.

4. *A self-sufficient secularism.*—Such teaching, setting the renewed dispositions of the heart far above the riches and honours of the world in value, supplied a potent counteractive to the proud security and self-assumption which prosperous worldliness is apt to beget. It forced home the sense of something wanting within, even when the outward fortunes were flourishing. The parable of the Rich Fool is a vivid picture of the real poverty of the man who trusts in his worldly success and is not rich in the

things that belong to the inner life (Luk_12:16-21); while in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus there is another picture, fitted to break down the self-confidence of the prosperous, showing that the day will come when conditions may be reversed, and when heart-qualities alone will determine the status and happiness of men (Luk_16:19-31).

iv. The revivifying effect on religion.—By His insistence on the heart as the vital element in righteousness, Christ transformed the whole character of religion. He made it (1) *living*,—not mechanical, a matter of prescribed and outwardly imposed form, but dynamical, a free, spontaneous spring of high purpose and feeling; not something put on, but a bent and impulse of the spirit within. Thus He gave religion an elasticity and perpetual vitality which prophesy for its permanence and power,—‘a well of water springing up unto everlasting life’ (Joh_4:14). He made it (2) *effectually operative*,—an energizing force, working itself out in practical life, impressing its hallowed ideas and aims on the world of affairs, and proving its reality by the heightened quality of the actions to which it leads. And He made it (3) *a gracious influence*,—commending itself to the general conscience, winning reverence, inspiring self-devotion, and transmitting from heart to heart fervours of aspiration after the things of God.

Literature.—Cremer, *Bib. Theol. Lex. s.v. καρδια*; art. ‘Herz’ in *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, i. 265 ff.; Martensen, *Christian Ethics* (Individual), 80 ff.; Weiss, *Bib. Theol. of NT*, i. 124.

G. M ‘Hardy.

☞ Heat

HEAT (*καύσων*), Mat_20:12, Luk_12:55; Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885

‘scorching heat,’ with marg. ‘hot wind.’ *καύσων* in LXX Septuagint has both meanings: (1) scorching heat (Gen_31:40, Isa_49:10, Sir_18:16; Sir_43:22); (2) the east wind (קָדִיִם), hot, dry, dust-laden, withering up all vegetation, and blowing from the desert, like the simoom (Job_27:21, Jer_18:17, Eze_17:10; Eze_19:12, Jon_4:8, Hos_13:15), usually *ἄνεμος* or *πνεῦμα καύσων*. Authorized Version gives ‘burning heat,’ and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘scorching wind’ in Jam_1:11.

The first meaning seems preferable in Mat 20:12, though Trench (*Parables*) and others incline to (Revised Version margin) . ‘Onus intrinsecus, a labore; aestum extrinsecus, a sole’ (Bengel). Luk 12:55 belongs to a class of passages based on the observation of natural phenomena; cf. Mat 5:45; Mat 7:24 f., Mat 24:27, Luk 10:18, Joh 3:8; Joh 12:24. Here also the rendering ‘scorching heat’ is the more usual, and seems to agree better than ‘hot wind’ or ‘east wind’ with the mention of the south wind (νότος) which immediately precedes. Possibly, however, the distinction was not so clearly marked between these two winds, since in Eze 27:26 מִן־קֶדֶם (east wind) is translated in LXX Septuagint by τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ νότου.

The only reference in the Gospels to heat for the purpose of warmth is Joh 18:18 ‘a fire of coals’ (ἀνθρακιάν), *i.e.* ‘of charcoal’ (Revised Version margin) , coals having probably still this meaning at the time of the Authorized Version . See Wind.

Literature.—Grimm-Thayer, *Lex. s.v. καύσων*; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , and *Encyc. Bibl.* art. ‘Wind’; Thomson, *Land and Book*, pp. 295, 536 f.

W. H. Dundas.

☩ Heathen

HEATHEN.—The Anglo-Saxon *heathen*, ‘one who lives on the heaths and in the woods,’ as opposed to a town-dweller; cf. ‘pagan,’ from *paganus*, ‘a countryman or villager.’ This word is an indication of the fact that, as a rule, country-dwellers were Christianized later than those living in towns and cities. ‘Heathen’ occurs in Authorized Version of the Gospels in Mat 6:7; Mat 18:17, and not at all in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 , which gives ‘Gentiles’ and ‘Gentile’ respectively in these two places (see Gentiles).

It has been pointed out that *paganus* also means ‘a civilian’ in opposition to ‘a soldier,’ and that thus a pagan would also mean one who was not a soldier of Christ. This secondary meaning of pagan probably came into use through a contemptuous designation by soldiers of non-military persons as ‘countrymen.’

Literature.—Murray, *New English Dictionary*; and *Encyc. Bibl. s.v.*; Bigg, *The Church's Task under the Roman Empire*, Lect. ii. p. 42, note 2; Trench, *Study of Words*.

Albert Bonus.

☩ Heaven

HEAVEN (οὐρανός, sing, and plur.; in Mt. plur. chiefly, and always in ὁ πατήρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, and ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν).

Three uses of the word may be classified, omitting parallel passages—

(a) *Cosmological.*

‘Heaven and earth’ as constituting the entire Universe: as in the phrases ‘till heaven and earth pass away’ (Mat 5:18; Mat 24:35, Luk 16:17); ‘Lord of heaven and earth’ (Mat 11:25). Heaven is ‘the firmament,’ where are fixed the stars and ‘the powers’ (Mat 24:29), the sky (Mat 16:2 Authorized Version), the air (Mat 6:26; Mat 8:20; Mat 13:32, Luk 8:5, Authorized Version in each), the treasury of the clouds (Mat 24:30; Mat 26:64), the winds (Mat 24:31), the lightning (Luk 17:24), the rain (Luk 4:25); and from whence are signs and portents (Mat 24:30, Luk 21:11)

(b) *The abode of God and angels.*

Heaven is ‘the throne of God’ (Mat 5:34; Mat 23:22, cf. ‘Our Father which art in heaven,’ Mat 6:8; ‘your Father ... in heaven,’ Mat 5:16; Mat 5:45; Mat 6:1; Mat 7:11; Mat 18:14; Mat 23:9; ‘My Father ... in heaven,’ Mat 7:21; Mat 10:32-33; Mat 12:50; Mat 16:17; Mat 18:10; Mat 18:19; Mat 18:22 also ‘Heavenly (οὐρανιος) Father,’ Mat 5:46 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, Mat 6:14; Mat 6:26; Mat 6:32; Mat 15:13; Mat 18:35 (ἐπουρανιος)). Angels come from Heaven (Mat 28:2, Luk 22:43, cf. Mat 26:53), and return to Heaven (Luk 2:15), and are ‘the heavenly host’ (Luk 2:13), beholding God (Mat 18:10, cf. Luk 15:10), and doing perfectly His will (Mat 6:10).

(c) *As a synonym for ‘God.’*

The use of ‘Heaven’ for ‘God’ is put beyond question by Luk 15:16; Luk 15:21, where ‘sinned against heaven’ can only mean ‘against God.’ There are other uses only less certain—thus ‘from heaven or from men’ (Mat 21:25) is clearly ‘from God or from men’ (cf. Act 5:38 f.); so also ‘given him from heaven’ (Joh 3:27) must be ‘from God.’ But the most striking instance of this use of ‘Heaven’ as a synonym for ‘God’ is in the phrase ‘the Kingdom of Heaven,’ almost uniformly in Mt. for ‘the Kingdom of God’ of Mk. and Lk., and this in exactly parallel passages. It is quite possible to make

a distinction between these titles, but it seems best to accept them as synonymous.*
[Note: See Schürer, HJP ii. ii. 171; Wendt, Teaching of Jesus, i. 371 n.; Dalman, Words of Jesus, p. 93; Bruce, Expos. Gr. Test. on Mat 3:2 n., cf. also his Kingdom of God, p. 58, where a distinction is suggested; also Beyschlag, NT Theol., Eng. tr. i. 42, where identity of meaning is granted, but 'a mere paraphrase for God' denied; and Stevens, Theol. of the NT, p. 27 f.: 'interchangeably in Mt,' but 'of Heaven' denotes 'origin and attributes.']

Admitting the use of this metonymy, there can be no objection to its use in other instances where a clear meaning follows. Thus, 'bound, loosed in heaven' (Mat 16:19; Mat 18:18) = 'of God'; 'The keys of the kingdom of heaven' (Mat 16:19) = the authority of God; 'names written in heaven' (Luk 10:20) = acceptance with God, cf. Exo 32:32. The demand for 'a sign from heaven' (Mat 16:1, Luk 11:16), while it may refer to the expectation of some visible wonder out of the sky, has ultimate reference to some direct act of God. Anything 'from heaven' is an act of God, cf. the judgment upon the cities of the Plain (Luk 17:29), also the request of the disciples (Luk 9:54). Even the phrase 'treasure in heaven' has its exact equivalent in 'rich toward God' (Luk 12:21). Additional instances of the use of periphrasis are seen in 'joy in the presence of the angels of God' (Luk 15:10) for the joy of God; confess 'before the angels of God' (Luk 12:8, cf. Mat 10:32); power 'from on High' (Luk 24:49); Dayspring 'from on High' (Luk 1:78); 'from above' (Joh 19:11); 'in thy sight' (Mat 11:26); 'the Most High' (Luk 1:32; Luk 1:76; Luk 6:35, cf. Mar 5:7).

The transition from Heaven as the abode of God to 'Heaven' as a synonym for 'God' is illustrated in the custom of uplifting the eyes to Heaven when God is addressed. The thought of the Temple as the dwelling-place of God led to the habit in prayer of turning the face towards Jerusalem and towards the Temple (see 1Ki 8:44; 1Ki 8:48, Dan 6:10, Psa 28:2; Psa 138:2). With the higher faith of God's transcendence, as One dwelling in the Heaven of Heavens, came the custom of lifting up the eyes to the Heavens (Psa 123:1). The publican 'would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven' (Luk 18:13, cf. Ezr 9:6). So in prayer, Jesus 'lifted up his eyes' (Joh 11:41), 'to heaven' (Joh 17:1); 'looking up to heaven' (Mat 14:19, Mar 7:34). There are several passages which present difficulty, but whatever conclusion may be come to as to the objective occurrences in the opening of the heavens (Mat 3:16), and the voice 'out of the heavens' (Mat 3:17, Joh 12:28), or 'out of the cloud' (Mat 17:5), the subjective experience is the vital matter, the attestation to Jesus of His communion from and fellowship with God.

It is this which is symbolically represented in 'Ye shall see the heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man' (Joh 1:51). Here, in a figure, the mediatorship of Jesus is declared. His revelation of God to man and intercession for man with God. The striking saying, 'No man hath ascended into

heaven but he that descended out of heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven' (Joh 3:13), has additional difficulty. The weight of MS authority is against the last clause, and the words may have been added as a gloss after the Ascension. If, with the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, we retain them as the words of Jesus, they must be taken as qualifying the preceding utterance, which then becomes a declaration of His perfect fellowship with God (cf. Joh 1:18) rather than as a reference to Heaven as a place. The 'heavenly things' (Joh 3:12) are without doubt the things of God, the new revelation of His grace in Jesus Christ.

In what has been said above there is little that is distinctively Christian. The threefold use of the word 'Heaven' is common alike to the OT and Jewish thought of the time. But after this preliminary study we ought to be in a better position to consider the characteristic teaching of Jesus and the Christian faith.

1. The Kingdom of God finds its perfect realization in a future state, *a world above and beyond earth*, the Kingdom *in Heaven*. This is the reiterated lesson alike of parable and of direct discourse. All the judgment parables, where separation between the righteous and the wicked is declared, clearly teach a future inheritance of bliss or of woe. So the parables of the Tares (Mat 13:37 f.), the Virgins (Mat 25:1 f.), the Talents (Mat 25:14 f.), and the Unjust Steward (Luk 16:1 f., where under the figure of 'eternal tents' the future Canaan is 'the past idealized'). In accommodation to Jewish thought and hope, the reward is 'to sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven' (Mat 8:11, Luk 13:28), a hope which reaches beyond the life of earth. The final consummation must be where Jesus Himself is, and He, who came from heaven (Joh 3:13; Joh 3:31; Joh 6:33; Joh 6:38; Joh 6:41 f.), was 'received up into heaven' (Mar 16:19, Luk 24:51, Joh 20:17. The MS uncertainty here in Mk. and Lk. does not affect the argument, which has the testimony of the Apostolic writings). This is the final reward of the faithful, the inheritance of the Kingdom prepared before the foundation of the world (Mat 25:34; Mat 26:29, Joh 14:1 f.).

2. *The nature of Heaven.*—As the life of the Kingdom is fundamentally ethical (Mat 5:20; Mat 7:21), so is the nature of Heaven itself. It is the fulness of the eternal life, which in the Fourth Gospel is the synonym of the Kingdom. Then it is, and there, that 'the righteous shine forth as the sun' (Mat 13:43), a glory certainly of character whatever else may be implied. There, too, is the perfect vision of God (Mat 5:8).

It cannot be doubted that Jesus meant to localize the thought of Heaven. The sharp contrast between Heaven and earth (Mat 6:19-21) can have no other meaning. In His teaching God is no mere all-pervading Spirit, lost in negative infinitude. God, as transcendent, immanent, infinite, alone, does not satisfy His revelation of 'the Father in heaven.' That name implies that in some world beyond there is a supreme manifestation of His Presence,—a Father's House, an enduring Holy of Holies. This, for

Christian faith, is the Glory of Christ (Joh_17:5), and to be with Him where He is and to behold His glory is the hope set before us in the gospel (Joh_17:24).

What the activities of Heaven may be is told only in part. They that are accounted worthy to attain to that world 'are as angels' (Mar_12:25, Luk_20:36), and the ministry of angels enters into the Gospel story. The faithful are to be 'set over many things,' and to 'enter into the joy' of their Lord (Mat_25:21; Mat_25:23), which, in the light of the gospel, can only mean higher service.

As to *when* this inheritance is entered upon, very different conclusions are drawn even from the words of Jesus. The question is considered, for the most part, from the standpoint of retribution. So far as the reward is considered, it may be said definitely that the doctrine of an Intermediate State finds no support in Christ's gospel. The 'farewell discourses' of the Fourth Gospel would lose all their force by the introduction of this doctrine. So for Christian faith the highest hope of Heaven finds its confident expression in the words of St. Paul: 'absent from the body ... at home with the Lord' (2Co_5:8).

Literature.—This is chiefly of a devotional or sermonic character, but the authors referred to above should be consulted; also Salmond, *Christian Doctrine of Immortality*; and Alger, *Doctrine of a Future Life*. On the general subject, which lies outside the scope of the present article, and especially for the Jewish conceptions of Heaven, see the works on Biblical Theology; Morfill-Charles, *Book of the Secrets of Enoch*; art. 'Heaven' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible .

W. H. Dyson.

☩ Heavenly Things

HEAVENLY THINGS.—See Earthly and Heavenly.

☩ Hedge

HEDGE.—This word belongs to the vocabulary of the parables of Jesus. It occurs in that of the Vineyard (Mat_21:33, Mar_12:1), and in that of the Great Supper (Luk_14:23).

1. *Literal application.*—The hedge is a detail in the outfit of a vineyard, one of many other properties (Mat_21:33 ||) in such a possession. It is a feature in the landscape of Palestine in the other case ('highways and hedges,' Luk_14:23). There is a connexion between the uses and the associations of the word. The contour of the land is controlled by the tillage of the soil. Vines need hedges. The word (φραγμός) used for a hedge in the Gospels 'denotes a fence of any kind, whether hedge, or wall, or palings' (Hastings, *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] ii. 340^a). Another word might rather have called up a stone wall. φραγμός includes all the different kinds of hedges to be found in a country so furrowed with hills and valleys as is Palestine.

2. The *paraboli*cal use of the 'hedge' is rooted in the education of Israel. God made sea and desert a hedge of Palestine. Cf. Ellerton's hymn—

'Praise to our God, whose hounteous hand

Prepared of old our glorious land,

A garden fenced with silver sea.' ...

He hedged the people. He gave them individuals, institutions, the whole national economy, as hedges to protect their life and to restrain it. Enemies raided the land and broke down the hedges (Psalms 79, 80). Patriots and prophets saw and sang their gaps, and did their best to repair the historic institutional hedges. The tragedy of Jesus and the hedges was that He wanted them rooted up, while the chief priests hated the idea of their removal (Mat_21:45). Through the tragedy gleams the *philanthropic* import of the hedge (Luk_14:23). The eye of love sees humanity submerged. 'Them also he would bring.' He would make hedge-row people happy. He had seen their misery as He stole to silent midnight prayer, up the hillsides with their mosaic of fields, along whose hedges and through the gaps of which He passed to pray to the Father in secret. It is humanity's ragged regiment whom He would see housed by the compulsion of 'the love (Luk_14:23) that will not let them go.'

Literature.—Geikie, *Life of Christ*, i. ch. 17; Thomson, *Land and Book*, ch. 14; *Philochristus*, chs. 1-3 for 'Hedge of the Law.'

John R. Legge.

HEIR.—The heir (κληρονόμος) is one who enters on a position of privilege different from that of servants (Mat 21:38), through no personal exertion of his own, but as the result of filial relationship. This position is a thoroughly right and legal one, and absolutely valid. The thought of succession to a title upon the death of the present holder is not insisted upon. The son is naturally the heir, and the title is one of present privilege as well as the assurance of fuller possession in the future.

Christ, the Son, is the heir of all things (Heb 1:2; cf. our Lord's application of the term to Himself in the parable of the Wicked Husbandman, Mat 21:38). The complete lordship over Creation was given to Adam (Gen 1:28, Psa 8:6). The land of Canaan, again, was promised to Abraham and his seed (Gen 13:14-15). These assurances given to Adam and to Abraham were absolutely fulfilled in Christ, who, as the firstborn of all creation, Himself both the Agent of the Creator's work and summing up in His own Person all created objects (Col 1:15-17), enjoys an eternal and incorruptible inheritance. 'The heirship of the Son was realised in the Incarnation, and in its essence is independent of the Fall (Westcott on Heb 1:2), though conditioned by it as to its circumstances.' It was the sin of man which caused the suffering and humiliation through which Christ, after the work of redemption was complete, won a name which is above every name (Php 2:9). He had inherited in the eternal purpose of God (ἐθηκεν, Heb 1:2) a name more excellent than the angels (Heb 1:4).

The title of 'heir,' then, passes on to those who have obtained the blessing of Divine sonship in Baptism or Regeneration, corresponding spiritually to the promise made to Abraham. The Old Covenant (Testament) could not make men perfect, therefore God provided them with more strength, and in place of a worldly inheritance gave them a spiritual and eternal one. This title of heirship may be forfeited, if those who are called to it are not worthy of their inheritance. So Christ speaks in the Apocalypse: 'He that overcometh shall inherit these things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son' (Rev 21:7). We, then, being made children of God through faith in Christ, are heirs according to the promise made to Abraham, who was accepted through faith in God's word against all appearances. No longer servants, but heirs, we are entitled to the Divine privilege of sonship through adoption. We are called to inherit a blessing as all true servants of God through Baptism.

It remains to be seen who are specially mentioned in the Gospels as heirs to this privilege: (1) 'The meek shall inherit the earth' (Mat 5:5). (2) Those who have given up houses, lands, earthly relationships, etc., shall receive an hundred-fold and inherit eternal life, Mat 19:29, Mar 10:17, Luk 18:18. (3) The sheep in the parable of the Sheep and the Goats (Mat 25:34), *i.e.* those who have shown mercy to the weak and suffering, and whose service has been accepted by Christ as done to Himself, shall inherit the Kingdom prepared for them from the beginning of the world. But, on the

other hand, no fornicator or unclean person or covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the Kingdom of God and of Christ ([Eph_5:5](#)). See also Inheritance.

C. H. Prichard.

☩ Hell

HELL.—See Eschatology, Gehenna, and the following article.

☩ Hell

HELL (Descent into).—During the 16th cent. the Descent of Christ into Hades was made the subject of acrimonious debates. Though commentators still differ, they discuss the subject in a more peaceable spirit, and offer some hope of future agreement on the main question. We must review—(1) the evidence of the NT, (2) early Christian tradition, to explain (3) the insertion of such teaching in Creeds and Articles of Religion. We may then (4) summarize the history of the controversy in modern times.

1. The evidence of the NT.—It is important to distinguish between the bare statement of the Descent as a fact in the history of our Lord as the Son of Man, which is acknowledged by all who believe that He truly died, and any theory of His mission in the unseen world, which can claim acceptance only after careful scrutiny of incidental references to it in the NT supported by the independent testimony of the earliest Christian tradition.

Hades (Αἴδης), corresponding to the Heb. *Sheol*, which in the Authorized Version of the OT is rendered by ‘hell,’ means both in the LXX Septuagint and in the NT the abode of departed spirits. This was the general meaning of the word ‘hell,’ the *unseen, hidden* place which is the abode of the dead.

In the OT a sense of gloom and unreality was felt about the lot of the spirits of men taken away from the light and activity of earthly life. At first no distinction was supposed to exist in that shadowy realm between good and bad any more than between king and subject. But in NT times such ideas had grown up, and our Lord sanctioned current belief when in the parable of Dives and Lazarus ([Luk_16:19-31](#)) He contrasted happiness in the society of Abraham with misery ‘in corments.’ This agrees with His promise to the penitent thief ([Luk_23:43](#)): ‘To-day shalt thou be with me in

Paradise.’ St. Peter in his first sermon (Act 2:24-31) quotes Psa 16:10 and explains the words, ‘Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades,’ as a prophecy of the Resurrection of Christ, which received no fulfilment in the case of David. He distinctly implies that Christ’s soul passed into Hades at His death.

St. Paul (Rom 10:7), adapting Deu 30:13, teaches the same truth inferring that it is not necessary to search the depth, since Christ is risen from the dead. He regards the Descent as the preparation for the Ascension, Eph 4:9 ‘Now this, He ascended, what is it but that he also descended into the lower parts of the earth?’ In the LXX Septuagint rendering of Psa 62:10 (Psa 63:9), this phrase, τὰ κατώτατα τῆς γῆς, is referred to Hades. It is therefore probable that St. Paul uses it in the same sense.*
[Note: Some commentators explain the words as contrasting the earth beneath with the heavens above, and refer them to the Incarnation when Christ descended to the earth.] Obedience even unto death secured for the Lord the sovereignty of the underworld; His descent was the pledge of His lordship over it (Php 2:10).

The famous passage 1Pe 3:18-20 (cf. 1Pe 4:6) introduces the question of the object of the Descent: ‘Because Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God; being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit; in which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which aforetime were disobedient, when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing’; 1Pe 4:6 ‘For unto this end was the gospel preached even to the dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit.’

The earliest Christian tradition, which was probably independent of this passage, certainly supports the interpretation that Christ preached to the spirits of the men and women who were drowned in the Flood. Not until the time of St. Augustine was any other interpretation offered. The Apostle is endeavouring to encourage his readers in Christlike patience under persecution. Christ died, the just for the unjust, but His death in the flesh was followed by quickening in the spirit. Therefore we need not fear death, which will bring us freedom from sin and increase of spiritual energy. The reference which follows (1Pe 3:22) to the Ascension suggests that this preaching took place after Christ’s death, and not that Christ in Noah preached to the men of Noah’s time.

In view of modern interpretations, however, we must enter further into detail. πνεύμα τὰ in the NT generally refers to angels (Act 23:8), but it refers also to spirits of the dead (Heb 12:23, cf. Luk 24:37-39). And 1Pe 4:6 proves that this is the sense here.†

[Note: The tense of εὐαγγελίσθη shows that the preaching was regarded as a completed act in the past.]

Some critics suppose that the preaching was to the fallen angels mentioned in 2Pe 2:4, Jud 1:6; according to Baur, after Christ's death; according to Spitta, before the Incarnation. This view is regarded by Charles (art. 'Eschatology' in *Encyc. Bibl.*) as the only possible alternative. But Charles holds that Christ preached a gospel of redemption between His death and His resurrection. Salmond thinks that the key may be found in a non-canonical Jewish book. Others, again, think that Enoch was regarded as an incarnation of the Messiah, and that the passage refers to his preaching. But as Clemen says (*Niedergefahren*, p. 131), while we hear in the Book of Enoch (12:4ff., 13:8, 14:1ff.) of a preaching of punishment to fallen angels, we hear nothing of a preaching of salvation to the souls of men.

Perhaps the most extraordinary interpretation of all is that which Clemen quotes from Cramer. An unknown person, in possession of 1 and 2 Pet., is supposed to have been reminded by v. 22 of a former ὑποταγή of angels, and therefore on the basis of 2Pe 2:4 f. with which he compared Jud 1:6; Jud 1:14 and also the Book of Enoch, is supposed to have written in the margin: Ἐνώχ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν πορευθεῖς ἐκήρυξεν, κ.τ.λ., understanding πνεύμασιν of angels and ἐκήρυξεν of a *concio damnatoria*. Some one else at a later time, referring the first word to the souls of the departed and the latter to the preaching of salvation, reading ENΩΚ for ENΩΧ, and this again for ἐν ᾧ καί, took the whole into the text after 1Pe 3:18!

Such speculations are absurd. On the other hand, it is reasonable to explain the ἐκήρυξεν of the one passage by the εὐαγγελίσθη of the other, to maintain that repentance was offered, rejecting the suggestion that Christ preached only to the righteous, or to those who had repented at the moment of death, or to some the gospel and to others damnation.

If it is asked, Why should only the generation of Noah profit by it? we can say that they were typical sinners, cut off in their sins, whose fate was questioned at that time. Bigg shows that 'it is possible that St. Peter is here expressing in a modified form a belief which was current in the Jewish schools.' Certain passages in the Book of Enoch seem to mean that the antediluvian sinners have a time of repentance allowed them between the first judgment (the Deluge) and the final judgment; e.g. 69:26 'There was great joy among them because the name of the Son of Man was revealed unto them,' *Bereshith Rabba*: (a) 'But when they that are bound, they that

are in Gehinnom, saw the light of the Messiah, they rejoiced to receive Him'; (b) 'This is that which stands written: "We shall rejoice and exult in Thee." When? When the captives climb up out of hell, and the Shekinah at their head.'

We may hope that research will yet further enlighten us on these points. Enough has been said to prove that, in the words of Professor Charles (art. cited):

'These passages in 1 Peter are of extreme value. They attest the achievement of the final stage in the moralization of Shěôl. The first step in this moralization was taken early in the 2nd cent. b.c., when it was transferred into a place of moral distinctions, having been originally one of merely social or national distinctions. This moralization, however, was very inadequately carried out. What they were on entering Shěôl, that they continued to be till the final judgment. From the standpoint of a true theism can we avoid pronouncing this conception mechanical and unethical? It precludes moral change in moral beings who are under the rule of a perfectly moral being.'

2. Early Christian tradition.—The belief that Christ's descent into Hades changed in some way the condition of the faithful departed meets us in the earliest Christian tradition.

Ignatius (a.d. 115), writing to the Magnesians (c. ix.), says: 'Even the prophets, being His disciples, were expecting Him as their teacher through the Spirit. And for this cause He whom they rightly awaited, when He came, raised them from the dead.'

Justin Martyr, in his *Dialogue with Trypho* (c. 72) accuses the Jews of cutting out the following passage from Jeremiah: 'The Lord God remembered His dead people of Israel, who lay in the graves, and descended to preach to them His own salvation.'

Irenaeus quotes this passage both from Isaiah (in [Isa_3:22](#)) and from Jeremiah (in 4:36), and (in 4:55) without naming the author. It is probably a fragment from some Jewish Apocalypse. Irenaeus (4:42) also quotes a presbyter 'who had heard it from those who had seen the Apostles and from those who had been their disciples,' as saying that 'the Lord descended to the underworld, preaching His advent there also, and declaring remission of sins received by those who believe in Him.'

Tertullian (*de Anima*, c. 55) taught that Christ 'in Hades underwent the law of human death; nor did He ascend to the heights of heaven, until He descended to the lower parts of the earth, that there He might make patriarchs and prophets sharers of His life.'

We may even claim the heretic Marcion as a witness to this widespread tradition, though in his view, according to Irenaeus (1. xxvii. 3), it was Cain and the Sodomites and other sinners who were released by the Lord from Hades.

The apocryphal *Gospel of Peter*, which may be dated possibly from about a.d. 165, contains the following passage: 'They see three men coming forth from the tomb, two of them supporting the other, and a cross following them; and the head of the two reached to heaven; but that of Him who was led by them over-passed the heavens. And they heard a voice from the heavens saying, Hast thou preached to them that sleep? and a response was heard from the cross, Yea.'

The apocryphal *Gospel of Nicodemus*, a name given in the 13th cent. to two much older books, the *Acts of Pilate* and the *Descent into Hell*, tells the same story of the two brothers with a considerable amount of dramatic power.

Clement of Alexandria is the first Christian writer who brings the passage in 1 Peter into connexion with the tradition that Christ's Descent benefited OT saints. He taught that the heathen, as well as the Jews, shared in the revelation made to the souls in Hades. He quotes Hermas (*Sim.* ix. 16), who taught that the Apostles and first teachers of the gospel, when they entered into rest, preached to the souls in Hades. Clement (*Strom.* ii. 9, p. 452) explains the passage as including righteous heathens as well as Jews, though it is not clear that Hermas himself contemplated such an application of his words. The example quoted by St. Peter appeared to him to be only one example of a far-reaching law (*Strom.* vi. 6).

Origen seems to have been the first to suggest that, since the coming of Christ, the souls of the faithful can go at once to Paradise instead of Hades, regarding Paradise as an intermediate state (*in Reg. Hom.* 2). In his treatise against Celsus (2:43), to the scoff, 'You will not surely say that Christ, when He failed to persuade the living, went down to Hades to persuade those who dwell there?' he replies: 'His soul, stript of the body, did there hold converse with other souls that were in like manner stript, that He might there convert those who were capable of instruction, or were otherwise in ways known to Him fit for it.'

Athanasius speaks of the warders at the gates of Hell 'cowering in fear at the presence of the Lord,' quoting in this connexion Mat 27:54. He thinks (*de Sal. Aduent.* 9) of 'the soul of Adam as held fast under the sentence of death, and crying to his Lord evermore, and of those who had pleased God, and had been justified by the law of nature, as mourning and crying with him,' till God in His mercy revealed the mystery of redemption. He quotes 1Pe 3:19 in connexion with the Descent (*Ep. ad Epict.* 5).

The later Fathers, while they regarded Hades as a place of rest for the just, regarded Paradise as something better. Both Ambrose (*de Fide ad Gratian.* iv. 1) and Jerome (*Com. in Eccles.* c. iii.) followed Origen on this line of thought. This notion became the germ of the mediaeval doctrine of the *Limbus Patrum*.

Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat.* iv.) classed the doctrine of the Descent among the ten necessary dogmas, interpreting it as designed for the redemption of the just. 'Could you wish,' he asks, 'that the living should enjoy His grace, and that the holy dead should not share in freedom?' Having named OT saints, he explains John the Baptists question 'Art thou he that should come?' as referring to the Descent. In this opinion he was followed by Rufinus.

Hilary of Poitiers (on Psa 119:82) speaks of the souls of the faithful as knowing, on the witness of the Apostle Peter, that when the Lord went down into Hades, words of comfort were preached even to those who were in prison and were formerly unbelieving in the days of Noah. It is interesting to add that the Venerable Bede quoted the words, without naming the author, in order to condemn them, on the ground that the Catholic faith taught only the release of the faithful.

It was reserved for Augustine to give a new interpretation to St. Peter's words. In his earlier books he accepts the current teaching, but confuses Hades and Gehenna. In *de Gen. ad litt.* xii. 63, he says that there is reason for believing that the soul of Christ descended to the regions where sinners are punished, that He might release from torment those whom He, in His righteous judgment, which is hidden from us, found worthy to be loosed.

In his letter to Euodius, Bp. of Uzala, on the right interpretation of 1Pe 3:19, as Bp. Horsley puts it, 'he perplexes himself with questions.' Why, out of all the tens of thousands who had died before the coming of Christ, some at least, though heathen, penitent and believing, did He bestow the knowledge of the gospel on those only who had perished in the Flood? He accepts the common belief that Adam was released. He notes that some believed this of Abel, Seth, Noah, and other patriarchs. Still confusing Hades with Gehenna, he asks, How could Abraham's bosom be a synonym for Paradise? Were the patriarchs worse off than Abraham? If they were at rest, how could they be benefited by Christ's descent into Hades? What was done for the disobedient of Noah's time should be done for all who died in ignorance before or since. But the idea that a man might believe after death would weaken the appeal of Christian preaching to the 'terrors of the Lord.' Not able to believe in salvation without Baptism, he cuts the knot of the difficulty by denying that the words of St. Peter had anything to do with the descent of Christ into Hades. Christ preached in spirit in the days of Noah as in Galilee in the days of His flesh. Plumptre truly says: 'he leaves all the questions which he had started as to the descent itself

unanswered.’ Finally (*de Heres.* 79), he reckoned it a heresy to believe that Christ cleared Hell of all the souls that were then in torment.

3. Creeds and Articles of Religion.—At the end of the 4th cent., Rufinus, commenting on the clause ‘descended into hell’ in the Creed of his native city of Aquileia, noted that it was not contained in the Creed of the Church of Rome or in Eastern Creeds. This is true of Baptismal Creeds, but not of others. The words had found a place in three confessions of faith put forward by Arian Synods at Sirmium, Nice, and Constantinople.

| Sirmium, a.d. 359. | Nice, a.d. 359. | Constantinople, a.d. 360. |
|--|--|---|
| καὶ εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια κατελθόντα, καὶ τὰ ἐκεῖσε οἰκονομήσαντα. | καὶ ταφέντα καὶ εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια κατελθόντα | καὶ ταφέντα καὶ εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια κατεληλυθότα· |
| ὄν πυλωροὶ ἄδου ἰδόντες ἔφρον ξαν | ὄν αὐτὸς ὁ ἄδης ἐτρόμασε. | ὄντινα καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ ἄδης ἔπηξεν. |

It is interesting to compare also the recently discovered ‘Faith of St. Jerome,’ which contains the words ‘descended into hell, trod down the sting of death.’ It has been found by Dom G. Morin, O.S.B., in some four MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] , and is probably the Confession of Faith which Jerome notes in one of the letters he had drawn up for Cyril of Jerusalem. This ‘Faith’ contains elements which may have been drawn from his Baptismal Creed of Pannonia. In like manner it is possible that the Sirmium Creed, quoted above, at this point quoted the Baptismal Creed of the district, since Sirmium is in the south-east corner of Pannonia. But it seems that the Creed was drawn up mainly by Mark, Bp. of Arethusa in Palestine; and there are traces of the influence of Cyril of Jerusalem elsewhere in this document. The doctrine was one on which he felt strongly; and, therefore, in default of further evidence as to the Pannonian Creed, it is safer to trace to his influence the occurrence of the words in the Creed of Sirmium, on which the Creeds of Nice and Constantinople are dependent.

As regards the interpretation put on the clause in the Creed of Aquileia, Pearson is incorrect when he suggests that Rufinus merely regarded it as equivalent to ‘buried,’ which was omitted. The Creed certainly contained the word ‘buried,’ and Rufinus was at pains to show that this word in the Eastern Creeds, as in the Roman, included the idea of a descent into Hades. Swete (p. 61) suggests that Rufinus had lost the clue to

the interpretation of the clause, and that the addition was made long before his time, possibly to meet the Docetic tendency of the latter part of the 2nd century. The difficulty about this suggestion is that the Docetic apocryphal *Gospel of Peter*, as we have seen, distinctly teaches belief in the descent. The present writer would rather regard pseudo-Peter as witnessing to the common belief of the 2nd cent., and explain the addition in the Aquileian Creed as derived from the ordinary catechetical teaching, of which it may have been as 'necessary a dogma' then in Aquileia as in Jerusalem in the 4th century.

In the time of Rufinus it might seem more necessary to insist on such teaching in view of the rise of the heresy of Apollinaris, who denied that the Lord had a human soul. But Rufinus himself gives no hint of this. There is more reason to connect the occurrence of the clause in the so-called Athanasian Creed, now generally accepted as a Gallican writing of the 5th cent., with opposition to Apollinarianism, because the author obviously had that heresy in view. There is no proof, however, that the clause had yet passed into any Gallican Creed. By the end of the century we find it in the Creed of Caesarius of Arles, and in the century following in the Creeds of Venantius Fortunatus of Poitiers and of the Spanish Bishop Martin of Bracara. Thus it passed into the Received Text of the Western Creed.

During the Middle Ages the idea of the 'Harrowing of Hell' was made popular by the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, and as the theme of Mystery Plays, and at a later time by Christian Art. Discussion seldom arose. But the opinion of Abelard that the soul of Christ entered the underworld only virtually and not substantially, was condemned by the Council of Sens (1140) and Pope Innocent II. It found favour with Durandus and Pico della Mirandola, whose names may suffice to show that the debate was not extinct in the 15th century. During the Reformation period, controversy began to wax fierce, and was reflected in some of the more famous Articles of Religion. In the *Confession of Augsburg* the bare fact of the Descent is stated, but the *Geneva Catechism* taught that the Descent meant only the terrible anguish with which the soul of Christ was tried. The *Catechism of the Church of the Palatinate* explained that Christ descended in order that the Christian in all his mental and spiritual agonies might know that there was One who had borne them and could sympathize with them. These Catechisms reflect the opinion of prominent leaders of thought. Luther, in his *Table Talk* (ccvi.), spoke of the laying of the devil in chains as the purpose of the Descent. His view fluctuated, but in his Com. on [Hos_6:1](#) he wrote that Peter clearly teaches that Christ preached to some who, in the time of Noah, had not believed, and who waited for the long-suffering of God—that is, who hoped that God would not enter into so strict a judgment with all flesh—to the intent that they might acknowledge that their sins were forgiven through the sacrifice of Christ.

It was Calvin (*Institut.* ii. 16) who taught the revolting doctrine that the Descent means that in His suffering on earth, in Gethsemane and on the Cross, Christ suffered all the horrors of hell. To which Pearson's words are a sufficient reply: 'There is a worm that never dieth which could not lodge within His breast; that is, a remorse of conscience, seated in the soul, for what that soul hath done; but such a remorse of conscience could not be in Christ.' Zwingli (*Fidei chr. exp.*, art. 'de Christo,' 7) taught that when Christ died the weight of His Redemption penetrated to the Underworld.

The Westminster Standards practically ignore the question of the Descent. The *Confession of Faith* is wholly silent, and so is the *Shorter Catechism*. The only allusion to the subject is in the *Larger Catechism*, where the answer to Question 50 runs: 'Christ's humiliation after His death consisted in His being buried, and continuing in the state of the dead, and under the power of death till the third day; which hath been otherwise expressed in these words, *He descended into hell.*'

Bishop Alley of Exeter, in a paper drawn up for the Convocation of 1553 wrote: 'There have been in my diocese great invectives between the preachers.' He asked that some certainty might be set concerning this doctrine. Perhaps this explains the form which was given to the third of the Forty-two Articles of 1553.

'As Christ died and was buried for us: so also it is to be believed that He went down into hell. For the body lay in the sepulchre until the resurrection: but His ghost departing from Him was with the ghosts that were in prison or in hell, and did preach to the same, as the place of St. Peter doth testify.'

Bishop Alley's 'hope of certainty' was not fulfilled, and in 1563 the Elizabethan revisers, with rare wisdom, struck out the last clause.

The Roman Catechism* [Note: Rom. 95.] speaks of the release of holy and just men as the purpose of the Descent, of the imparting of the fruit of the Passion, and of the Beatific Vision.

4. Summary of the controversy in modern times.—We may begin this section with the names of Pearson and Hammond, who agreed in teaching that the only meaning of St. Peter's words was that Christ by His Holy Spirit inspired the preaching of Noah.

Hammond (*ad loc.*) writes: 'The spirits in the prison are those souls of men that lay so sheathed, so useless and unprofitable in their bodies, immersed so deep in calamity as not to perform any service to God, who inspired and placed them there.' He quotes [Isa 42:7](#); [Isa 49:9](#); [Isa 61:1](#) to prove that elsewhere it is 'a figurative speech to express wicked men.' 'By His Spirit is evidently meant that Divine power by which He

was raised from the dead after His crucifixion.’ We have already noted the objections to this interpretation, and also the fact that Pearson on this point confuses Hades and Gehenna. He writes, indeed, ‘less lucidly than is his wont,’ but in regard of the Descent regarded as a fact his final summary strikes no uncertain note.

‘I give a full and undoubting assent unto this as to a certain truth, that when all the sufferings of Christ were finished on the Cross, and His soul was separated from His body, though His body were dead, yet His soul died not; and though it died not, yet it underwent the condition of the souls of such as die; and being [*i.e.* since] He died in the similitude of a sinner, His soul went to the place where the souls of men are kept who die for their sins, and so did wholly undergo the law of death.’

Barrow taught to the same effect (Serm. xxviii.): ‘If we do thus interpret our Saviour’s *descent into hell*, for His soul’s going into the common receptacle and mansion of souls, we shall so doing be sure not substantially to mistake.’ He adds: ‘I cannot well be at the pain to consider or examine those conceits, which pretend to acquaint us why and to what effect our Saviour descended into hell.’ This almost contemptuous refusal to discuss the passages in St. Peter is partly explained by the gaps in the line of evidence of early Christian tradition which was known at that time. Coming from a man of Barrow’s calibre, it has probably had great weight.

On the other hand, Jeremy Taylor,* [Note: Eden, ii. 718, 720.] while he avoids any explanation of St. Peter’s reference to the Deluge, maintains the Patristic view that Christ improved the condition of holy souls.

‘And then it was that Christ made their condition better: for though still it be a place of relation in order to something beyond it, yet the term and object of their hope is changed: they sate in the regions of darkness, expecting that great promise made to Adam and the patriarchs, the promise of the Messiah; but when He that was promised came, He “preached to the spirits in prison,” He communicated to them the mysteries of the gospel, the secrets of the kingdom, the things hidden from eternal ages, and taught them to look up to the glories purchased by His passion, and made the term of their expectation be His second coming, and the objects of their hope the glories of the beatific vision.... But now it was that in the dark and undiscerned mansions there was a scene of the greatest joy and the greatest horror represented, which yet was known since the first falling of the morning stars. Those holy souls, whom the prophet Zechariah calls “prisoners of hope,” lying in the lake where there is no water, that is, no constant stream of joy to refresh their present condition (yet supported with certain showers and gracious visitations from God and illuminations of their hope); now that they saw their Redeemer come to change their condition, and to improve it into the neighbourhoods of glory and clearer revelations, must needs have the joy of intelligent and beatified understandings, of redeemed captives, of men forgiven after

the sentence of death, of men satisfied after a tedious expectation, enjoying and seeing their Lord, whom, for so many ages, they had expected. But the accursed spirits, seeing the darkness of their prison shine with a new light, and their empire invaded, and their retirements of horror discovered, wondered how a man durst venture thither, or, if he were a God, how he should come to die.'

Bishop Horsley's sermon on 1Pe 3:19 at the end of the 18th cent. is the next important contribution to the subject. He regretted the alteration of the Third Article of 1563. He found it difficult to believe that 'of the millions who died in the Flood all died impenitent.' He taught that Christ 'certainly preached neither repentance nor faith, for the preaching of either comes too late for the departed soul.' He faced the great difficulty why only this one class of penitents should be mentioned, having 'observed in some parts of Scripture an anxiety, if the expression may be allowed, of the sacred writers to convey distinct intimations that the antediluvian race is not uninterested in the redemption and the final retribution.' The following words also deserve quotation, for they go to the root of the matter. 'If the clear assertions of Holy Writ are to be discredited on account of difficulties which may seem to the human mind to arise out of them, little will remain to be believed in revealed or even in what is called natural religion.'

About the same time, Dr. Hey, Norrisian Professor at Cambridge, gave in his lectures a succinct account of the history of the doctrine, and discussed the difficulty of using the metaphor of descent in popular language (3rd ed. p. 654).

There is an excellent survey of the literature of the subject down to the middle of the last century in Dean Alford's *Greek Testament*. Both he and Bishop Wordsworth accepted the Patristic view that Christ preached salvation to the disembodied spirits of those drowned in the Flood if found penitent. Thus light is thrown on 'one of the darkest enigmas of Divine justice.' Bishop Harold Browne expounded the Article to the same effect, and has been followed recently by Bishop Gibson. But not all writers were equally bold. Bishop Harvey Goodwin was content with what was practically Pearson's position. Bishop Westcott (*Historic Faith*, p. 77) feared to say more on 'a mystery where our thought fails us and Scripture is silent.' Surely this is too dogmatic in face of the great consensus of opinion which interprets 1Pe 3:19 literally.

There is a full account of modern German literature on this subject in Clemen's *Niedergefahren zu den Toten*. He interprets 1Pe 3:19 as referring to human spirits, and builds on it an argument in favour of 'the larger hope,' though he does not commit himself to any theory of Universal Restitution. He makes much use of English books, especially Dean Plumptre's *The Spirits in Prison*.

This survey of the whole course of the controversy leads to the conclusion that eventually agreement will be reached as to the exegesis of the passage in 1 Peter. The weighty authority of Professor Charles may be invoked to prove that the interpretation which accepts Christ's mission to the dead fits in with our fuller knowledge of contemporary Jewish literature. It throws light on one of the darkest enigmas of the Divine justice. At the same time full justice will be done to the early Christian tradition that in some way or other Christ benefited the souls of the faithful departed. But it must be admitted that the bare statement of the Apostles' Creed asserts only that Christ's soul passed into the condition which our souls will enter at death, sanctifying every condition of human existence. Harnack writes that 'the clause is too weak to maintain its ground beside the others, as equally independent and authoritative,' but, as Swete (p. 62) says, he fails to point out in what the weakness lies, while 'to us it appears to possess in a very high degree the strength which comes from primitive simplicity and a wise reserve.'

Thus the consensus of theological opinion justifies the teaching of the poet of the Christian Year: * [Note: Keble, Easter Eve.]

'Sleep'st Thou indeed? or is Thy spirit fled

At large among the dead?

Whether in Eden bowers Thy welcome voice

Wake Abraham to rejoice,

Or in some drearier scene Thine eye controls

The thronging band of souls;

That, as Thy blood won earth, Thine agony

Might set the shadowy world from sin and sorrow free.'

Literature.—C. Bigg, *Com. on Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, Clark, 1901: C. Clemen, *Niedergefahren zu den Toten*, Giessen, 1900; Bishop Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , Methuen, 1898; Bishop Harold Browne, *The Thirty-nine Article*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1854; Bishop Pearson, *Expos. of the Apostles' Creed*, ed. Burton³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1847; E. H. Plumptre, *The Spirits in Prison*, Labister, 1885; S. D. F. Salmond, *Christian Doct. of*

*Immortality*⁵ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , Clark, 1903; F. Spitta, *Christi Predigt an die Geister*, 1890; H. B. Swete, *The Apostles' Creed*, Cambridge, 1899.

A. E. Burn.

☞ Hellenists

HELLENISTS.—See Grecians.

☞ Hem Of Garment

HEM OF GARMENT.—This is the Authorized Version translation of κράσπεδον in Mat_9:20; Mat_14:36 (of touching the hem of Jesus' garment with a view to healing). In these places, as on its occurrence elsewhere (Mat_23:5, Mar_6:56, Luk_8:44), Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 adopts the rendering 'horder.' See art. Border.

☞ Hen

HEN.—See Animals, p. 64^a.

☞ Herb

HERB.—In modern botanical science, 'herb' is a well-defined term, and is applied to plants whose stem dies down annually. In the Bible it is used in a popular sense, being employed to translate several Hebrew and Greek words of varying significance. In the NT it is (except in Heb_6:7, where the original has βοτάνη) the rendering of λάχανα (Mat_13:32, Mar_4:32, Rom_14:2) or λάχανον (Luk_11:42), which denotes garden-herbs or vegetables. Many of these, such as lettuce, parsley, mint, etc., are in constant use to the present day. Delitzsch (*Heb. NT*) renders this word by קָרֶף, which means 'green herbs' (cf. Deu_11:10, Pro_15:17). The other term, βοτάνη, means

‘pasture,’ but is evidently used (.c.) of herbage in general, including cereals. Delitzsch’s translation is עֵשֶׁב, ‘çsebh, which has the same signification. Hugh Duncan.

⚡ Hermon

HERMON.—A mountain on the north-eastern border of Palestine, the culminating point of the range of Anti-Lebanon, rising to an elevation of 9200 ft. above the sea. Its dome-like summit, usually covered with snow till late in summer, can be seen from almost every part of Palestine. Jesus in His youth must have often seen it from the hill west of Nazareth, and, during His ministry, from the Sea of Galilee. It is not mentioned by name in the Gospels, but is generally believed to be the ‘high mountain’ of Mat 17:1, Mar 9:2, and the ‘mountain’ of Luk 9:28 where the Transfiguration took place. This was probably not on the summit, which could be reached only by long and hard climbing, but on one of the elevated platforms on the southern slope. That Hermon, rather than Tabor (on which there was then a fortified city), is the ‘high mountain’ referred to, seems clear from the fact that the conversation (Mat 16:21-28) which preceded the Transfiguration by six days was closely connected with Peter’s confession; and this occurred at Caesarea Philippi (Mat 16:13-18), which stood just at the base of Hermon by the springs of Jordan. See also art. Transfiguration.

Literature.—For description of Hermon, see Robinson, *BRP* [Note: RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.] iii. 344, 357; Stewart, *Land of Israel*, 296-301; Conder, *Tent-Work*, ch. 8; *SWP* [Note: WP Memoirs of the Survey of W. Palestine.] (‘Jerusalem’ Volume, Appendix, and Volume of Special Papers).

W. W. Moore.

⚡ Herod

HEROD (Ἡρῴδης).—The rise of the Herodian dynasty* [Note: On the origin of the Herodian family, cf. Ant. xiv. i. 3; BJ l. vi. 2; Strabo, xvi. 2; Euseb. HE i. 7. 11, Chron., ed. Schoene, ii. 134, 138; Epiph. Hær. xx. 1; Derenbourg, Hist. de la Pal. 154; and Schurer, GJV3 i. 292, n. 3.] to the throne of the Hasmonæan priest-kings, begun by Antipater the Idumæan, and realized by his second son, Herod the Great,† [Note: On the title ὁ μέγας cf. Ewald, HI v. 418, n. 4; Madden, Coins, 105, n. 1.] was

closely connected with the ascendancy of Roman power in Palestine. Antipas or Antipater, the grandfather of Herod, had indeed been appointed governor of Idumaea by Alexander Jannaeus (*Ant.* xiv. i. 3), but it was not until after the death of Alexandra (b.c. 67) that Antipater, who had succeeded his father Antipas in Idumaea, found opportunity to advance his interests in the dissensions between Hyrcanus, the legal but weak heir to the throne in Jerusalem, and the younger but more vigorous Aristobulus. Allying himself with Hyrcanus, Antipater secured the aid of the Arabian king Aretas to establish his candidate in the government. Thereupon appeals were made by Hyrcanus and Aristobulus to the Roman general Scaurus, who had been sent by Pompey to Damascus. The Roman power, thus appealed to, at first favoured Aristobulus, but eventually, after Pompey had taken Jerusalem in b.c. 63, made Hyrcanus high priest (*Ant.* xiv. iv. 4; *BJ* i. vii. 6), and committed the administration to Scaurus, who in turn was succeeded by Gabinius. Antipater, however, proved himself useful to the Romans, both in the government and in their military operations against the Arabs, and also against the Hasmonaeans, Aristobulus and his sons Alexander and Antigonus. He thus acquired considerable political influence (*Ant.* xiv. vi. 4, viii. 1; *BJ* i. viii. 7; cf. Schürer, *GJV* [Note: *JV* Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] i. 343, n. [Note: note.] 14). After the battle of Pharsalus (b.c. 48) and the death of Pompey, Caesar confirmed Hyrcanus in the high priesthood, and made him ethnarch. Upon Antipater he conferred Roman citizenship and constituted him procurator of Judaea (*Ant.* xiv. viii. 3, 5, ἐπίτροπος in the sense of ἐπιμελητής; cf. Wellhausen, *IJG* [Note: *JG* Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte.] 4 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 316, n. [Note: note.] 2). Soon afterwards (b.c. 47) Antipater appointed his eldest son Phasaël governor of Jerusalem, and committed the administration of Galilee to his second son Herod, a young man about twenty-five years of age (*Ant.* xiv. ix. 2; the transmitted text reads πέντε καὶ δέκα, but is conjecturally emended by Dindorf and Bekker to read πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι; cf. Schürer, i. 348, n. [Note: note.] 30; Grätz, *Hist.* 77, reads ‘twenty’). The present article is concerned only with the Herods of the Gospels.

1. Herod the Great.—Among the first acts of Herod’s-administration of Galilee was the suppression of a band of robbers* [Note: Gratz (*Hist.* 78, less distinctly, ‘All true patriots mourned’) and Derenbourg (160 ff.) regard these robbers as patriots, the predecessors of the Zealots, Judas the Galilaean being the son of Hezekias (*Ant.* xvii. x. 5; *BJ* ii. iv. 1; Act 5:37). I. Broydé (*Jewish Encyc.* vi. 356) calls them ‘a band of fanatics, who had attacked heathen cities and robbed caravans’ (cf. also Well-hausen⁴, 317).] that harassed his country and parts of Syria (*Ant.* xiv. ix. 2; *BJ* i. x. 5). These he captured, and their captain, a certain Hezekias, he slew, along with

many of the robbers,—revealing in the energy with which he suppressed disorders a trait of character that even at this time attracted the attention of the Roman governor of Syria, Sextus Caesar, and that subsequently made him an acceptable ally of the Romans. This act, however, brought Herod under the suspicion of the leaders at Jerusalem, who persuaded Hyrcanus that Herod should be summoned before the Sanhedrin for trial for violation of the national law in putting Hezekias to death without trial. Herod obeyed the summons, but took care to have a sufficient bodyguard to accompany him. At first the members of the Sanhedrin were overawed by such a show of force. They were recalled to a proper sense of their duty by the courageous words of scornful rebuke spoken by Sameas the Pharisee (*Ant.* xiv. ix. 4; *BJ* i. x. 5).† [Note: *Ant.* xv. i. 1, where Pollio is said to have made this speech, and Sameas is called his disciple. In Talmudic tradition (cf. Derenbourg, 147 ff.) Sameas is called Simeon ben Shetah, identified by Derenbourg with Shemaia, who, with Abtalion (Pollio), was, he thinks, at that time at the head of the Sanhedrin (similarly Gratz, *Hist.* 79, and I. Broydé, *Jewish Encyc.* vi. 356; cf. also Schurer³, ii. 358 f.).] When the Sanhedrin was about to condemn Herod, Hyrcanus, who had received instructions from Sextus Caesar to have him acquitted, adjourned the sitting and advised Herod to withdraw from Jerusalem. This he did, returning to Damascus. When he had been appointed governor of Cœle-Syria by Sextus Caesar, he threatened Jerusalem with an army; but, having so far satisfied his anger, he withdrew, on the advice of his father Antipater and his brother Phasaël.

After the murder of Caesar (15 Mar. b.c. 44), and the poisoning of Antipater (43),—apparently with the knowledge, if not the consent and participation, of Hyrcanus (*Ant.* xiv. xi. 3, 6; cf. Wellhausen⁴, 319, n. 1, 327, n. 3),—Herod's fortunes reached their lowest ebb. Antony, indeed, while he was in the East, made Herod and Phasaël tetrarchs (*Ant.* xiv. xiii. 1; *BJ* i. xii. 5); but not long afterwards, Antigonus, with the help of the Parthians, gained possession of Jerusalem, capturing Phasaël and Hyrcanus. Phasaël killed himself; and Hyrcanus, after his ears had been cut off, was taken by the Parthians to Babylon. Herod, who with his family was in Jerusalem, escaped by night, and, after many difficulties, in the midst of which he was on the point of taking his life, came to the fortress Masada. Here he left his family in charge of his brother Joseph and hastened to Rome. Antigonus, in the meantime, had established himself in Jerusalem, where he reigned for three years (b.c. 40-37) as Matthias, the coins of Antigonus bearing the inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΑΝΤΙΓΟΝΟΥ נרל כהן יהמתתיה חבר (cf. Madden, *Coins*, 99 ff.).

In Rome, Herod had little difficulty, with the aid of Antony and the concurrence of Octavius, in convincing the Senate that they would be serving their own interests by making him king of Judaea instead of Antigonus, who had been placed on the throne

by the Parthians (*Ant.* xiv. xiv. 4; *BJ* i. xiv. 4). Appointed king by a decree of the Senate (b.c. 40), Herod now had before him the difficult task of conquering his kingdom. He returned to Palestine, raised an army, subdued Joppa, relieved Masada, and was eager to invest Jerusalem. The assistance of the Roman forces under Ventidius and Silo was far from effective; Galilee had to be conquered; it was not until the spring of 37 b.c. that the siege of Jerusalem could be seriously begun. It was during this siege that Herod, having put away his wife Doris and her son Antipater, celebrated in Samaria his marriage with Mariamne,* [Note: This conventional spelling is retained here, although Μαριαμμή is adopted in the Greek text, both of Naher and of Niese (though Niese reads in the text of *BJ* i. § 241, Μαριαμήν). The spelling Μαριαμνή is given as a variant by Niese in *Ant.* xv. § 207, but in *BJ* i. § 433 Μαριαμήν. In *Ant.* the MS E spells consistently Μαριαμή (except in xvii. § 335, where Μαριας occurs) as M does in *BJ*.] daughter of Alexander (son of Aristobulus) and Alexandra (daughter of Hyrcanus) (*Ant.* xiv. xv. 14; *BJ* i. xvii. 8; cf. *Ant.* xiv. xii. 1; *BJ* i. xii. 3).

Three months after the siege began, Jerusalem fell (*Ant.* xiv. xvi. 4; *BJ* i. xviii. 2; cf. Sieffert, *PRE* [Note: *RE* Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] vii. 762, l. 24 ff.). The city was saved from plunder and desecration only by a plentiful use of money on Herod's part. Antigonus surrendered himself to the Romans (*Ant.* xiv. xvi. 2; *BJ* i. xviii. 2), and at Herod's urgent request was beheaded in Antioch (*Ant.* xiv. xvi. 4; *BJ* i. xviii. 3). Herod also had forty-five members of the Sanhedrin slain, but passed over Pollio and Sameas because during the siege they had advised the city to yield to him (*Ant.* xv. i. 2).

Established in his kingdom by force of the Roman arms, and occupying the status of a *rex socius*, Herod fully understood that his continuance in power was dependent on the goodwill of Rome and her rulers. Hence, throughout his reign of thirty-four years, he did not fail to cultivate in every possible way friendly relations with his overlords. His government, however, though not without some following among the people, never obtained the cordial support or willing consent of the great majority of its subjects. At the beginning of his reign he treated the Sadducean aristocracy with severity, made the high priesthood subject to his own appointment, and deprived the Sanhedrin of all political influence. The Essenes and many of the Pharisees refused to take the oath of allegiance to him or to the Roman emperor. The incipient Zealots or patriotic nationalists, whether gathered in the robber bands of Galilee or cherishing more quietly the old Hasmonaean ideals, were his natural and determined enemies. Herod, moreover, had no natural claims to his throne. Of Idumaeen descent, he was in the eyes of his subjects but half-Jew (*Ant.* xiv. xv. 2), and had to endure, not only

from his enemies but within the circle of his own family, taunts upon his low origin. Careful though he was not to offend the religious prejudices of the people in some respects,—for Herod was wiser and more cautious than Antiochus Epiphanes,—his whole reign breathed the spirit of Hellenism and pagan secularization so offensive to the Jews. Even his self-denying and efficient provision for the country when visited by famine, or his remission in part of a burdensome taxation, or his magnificent restoration of the Temple, called forth only momentary gratitude in the hearts of the people. Successful at Rome, unsuccessful in Jerusalem, Herod greatly increased the material interests of his country, and by the favour of Rome enlarged its borders. But while he rebuilt the Temple and dedicated it with great splendour and large sacrifices—boasting that he had done what the Hasmonaeans were not able to accomplish—he placed above the Temple gate a golden eagle in honour of the Romans, built a theatre, amphitheatre, and hippodrome in or near Jerusalem for Greek plays and heathen games, and in other places erected temples for the cult of the emperor Augustus. He built or restored many cities and fortresses throughout his territory, and constructed a splendid harbour (*Sebastus*) at Strato's Tower, which he enlarged and called Caesarea. He colonized restless Trachonitis with Jewish warriors from Babylon, and extended his munificence far beyond the bounds of his own country, to Syria, Asia Minor, Rhodes, Greece, and Macedonia. Antony, Cleopatra, Agrippa, and Augustus were entertained by him with royal honours, and in his will he made handsome bequests to his friends of the imperial household in Rome.

It is customary to divide the reign of Herod into three periods. The first extends from his accession in b.c. 37 to the death of the sons of Babas in b.c. 25, when the last male representatives of the Hasmonaeon family were removed from his pathway. This period was characterized by the establishment and extension of Herod's power. The principal forces that he had to combat came from the royal family he had supplanted and to which he was allied by marriage. Alexandra, the mother of Mariamne, knew how to enlist the interest of Cleopatra, and Cleopatra had the ear of Antony. The measures adopted by Herod to meet the situation were not of the gentlest kind. He recalled Hyrcanus from Babylon, and though he treated him with every consideration, Josephus attributes to Herod the motive of wishing to get Hyrcanus in his power.* [Note: Mathews (Hist. of NT Times, 118, n. 1) rejects Josephus' account of Herod's motive (cf. also Schürer³, i. 378; Wellhausen⁴, 324; and Woodhouse, Encyc. Bibl. ii. 2206, n. 4). On the other hand, cf. Sieffert, PRE³ vii. 762, 1. 48ff., and the indications given above that Hyrcanus was implicated in the death of Antipater.] In view of the fact that Hyrcanus could not be appointed to the high priesthood, and that Aristobulus, the brother of Mariamne, was only about seventeen years of age, Herod made Ananel, a Babylonian Jew of priestly family, high priest. This did not please Alexandra, and she appealed to Cleopatra on behalf of her son. Thereupon Herod deposed Ananel and appointed Aristobulus in his stead. But the popularity of

the young Hasmonaean aroused Herod's suspicion, and Aristobulus was drowned soon after the feast of Tabernacles in the year b.c. 35. At the instance of Cleopatra, who learned of the event from Alexandra, Herod was summoned before Antony to give an account of the death of Aristobulus. Before answering the summons, Herod gave instructions to his uncle Joseph, in whose hands he left the government, that Mariamne should be put to death in the event of an unfavourable issue of his mission. Herod regained the favour of Antony, but had eventually to surrender to Cleopatra one of the most fruitful parts of his territory, the famous palm- and balsam-growing country about Jericho, together with the coast cities from the river Eleutherus to Egypt, with the exception of Tyre and Sidon. On his return from the conference with Antony at Laodicea (Syrian), Herod learned through his sister Salome, the evil genius of his family troubles, that Joseph had revealed his command to Mariamne. Joseph was put to death, but a fruitful soil for suspicion against Mariamne remained. When Cleopatra, who had accompanied Antony on his expedition to Armenia, returned through Judaea, Herod entertained her; and, although he successfully withstood her charms, he was compelled to rent from her the territory about Jericho, and to guarantee similar payments due to her from the king of Arabia. The debt thus contracted proved to be a bad one, for the king of Arabia was slow in meeting his financial obligations. Hence, when war broke out between Antony and Octavius, and Herod was desirous of giving aid to Antony, Cleopatra, never doubting that Antony would be victor, thwarted Herod's purpose and sent him instead against the Arabians, in the hope that the two kings would destroy one another. Herod at first defeated the Arabians, but finally suffered a severe reverse, through the treacherous intervention of Cleopatra's general Athenio. About this time an earthquake brought great suffering on the people, and Herod's soldiers were discouraged. The Jewish ambassadors sent to the Arabians had been slain, and Herod's condition seemed desperate. His own courage, however, inspired his troops, and a decisive victory was gained over the enemy.

But Herod had scarcely re-established his power when news of the battle of Actium (2nd Sept. b.c. 31) brought him face to face with the crisis of his reign. Before going to Octavius to learn his fate, Herod had the aged Hyrcanus put to death for plotting with the Arabian governor Malchus to escape from Jerusalem. * [Note: Josephus (Ant. xv. vi. 1), consistently with his account of Herod's motive in recalling Hyrcanus from Babylon, intimates that Herod sought an occasion of removing Hyrcanus. Schurer (i. 384) questions Josephus' account of the treasonable letter, on the ground that such an action would be unlikely in a man of Hyrcanus' age. He accepts the account of Herod's motive in this instance, however, regarding it as a more probable and a sufficient explanation of Hyrcanus' death (cf. also Mathews, 120, n. 3. On the participation of the Sanhedrin, cf. Ant. xv. xvi. 2, and Wellhausen, 327, n. 1).] Placing the government in charge of his brother Pheroras, and leaving his mother and sister at Masada, but Mariamne and Alexandra at Alexandrinum in care of Sohemus,

with instructions that Mariamne and her mother should be killed if disaster overtook him,† [Note: On the historicity of the two incidents related in *Ant.* xv. iii. 5-6, 9; *BJ* i. xxii. 4, 5; *Ant.* xv. vi. 5, vii. 1-6, cf. Schürer³, i. 385, n. 51; Mathews, 120, n. 4.] Herod went to meet Octavius in Rhodes. He appeared before the emperor in royal apparel, laying aside only his diadem. His appeal for favour was based on a frank avowal of his friendship for Antony, and of his desire to aid him at Actium. But Antony had refused to take his advice about Cleopatra, and had fallen. He now offered Octavius the same loyalty and support that he had given Antony. Moreover, Herod had already had opportunity of proving his loyalty to his new master by preventing Antony's gladiators from passing through his territory to join Antony in Egypt. At the close of the interview Octavius restored Herod's diadem, and confirmed him in his kingdom. In a short time Octavius even enlarged Herod's kingdom, restoring the territory taken from it by Antony for Cleopatra, and a number of cities, such as Gadara, Hippos, Samaria, Gaza, Anthedon, Joppa, and Strato's Tower. This was done in recognition of Herod's aid to the imperial army as it passed into Egypt.

When Herod returned from Rhodes, his old suspicions against Mariamne were aroused by discovering that Sohemus had repeated the folly of Joseph. Sohemus was executed, and soon afterwards Mariamne was tried on the charge of attempting to poison Herod, and put to death about the year b.c. 29. But Herod had loved her with a wild passion. After her death his remorse and an uncontrollable yearning for her (which Byron has finely expressed in one of his *Hebrew Melodies*) quickly brought him to the verge of insanity (cf. also Stephen Phillips, *Herod*). At length, when he fell sick in Samaria, Alexandra sought to gain possession of the fortresses in Jerusalem. But Herod, rousing himself from his stupor, had her put to death (b.c. 28). Costobar also and the sons of Babas were put to death on the evidence of Salome, who revealed the hiding-place of these men of Hasmonaeian descent* [Note: Just what their descent does not clearly appear from Josephus. They seem to have been related to the Hasmonaeans. They were to have been killed when Herod took Jerusalem. But Costobar saved them, and had kept them concealed until Salome, his wife, left him, and made the matter known to Herod.] and partizanship, and the part played by her husband in their protection (b.c. 25). Herod was now well established on his throne, in favour with Augustus, and triumphant over his enemies.

The second period of Herod's reign, extending from b.c. 25 to b.c. 13, was characterized by extension of his kingdom and great building operations. Trachonitis, Batanaea, and Auranitis were given to him by Augustus about b.c. 23 (*Ant.* xv. x. 1; *BJ* i. xx. 4), and to these the tetrarchy of Zenodorus together with the country of Ulatha and Panias was added about three years later (*Ant.* xv. x. 3; *BJ* i. xx. 4; Dio Cass. xlv. 9). During this period many cities were built or beautified by Herod, both in his own territory and in surrounding countries. Fortresses were constructed, and temples in

honour of Augustus adorned Samaria (Sebaste), Pania (Caesarea Philippi), and Strato's Tower (Caesarea). But the greatest of Herod's works of construction were the harbour at Strato's Tower and the Temple at Jerusalem. The latter, begun about b.c. 19, was partially completed in a year and a half (the inner temple), and the whole brought to a temporary completion in about eight years, when it was formally dedicated, although work was continued on it until the time of Albinus (procurator a.d. 62-64, cf. *Ant.* xv. xi. 5, 6, xx. ix. 7; Joh_2:20). Herod also built himself a magnificent palace in Jerusalem. Theatre, amphitheatre, and hippodrome were the scenes of plays and games not only in Caesarea and Jericho, but in Jerusalem. Mercenary troops, aided by spies and strict police regulations, kept the people in subjection. Outlying districts such as Trachonitis were colonized to suppress disturbances. Herod's power was at its height. In his court were men of Greek learning, such as Nicolaus of Damascus and his brother Ptolemy. As a *rex socius*, Herod had the right to issue copper coinage. His friendship with Rome was firmly established. He interested himself in the Jews of the Dispersion, and helped to secure them their rights in Asia Minor. He also made generous provision from his private means to alleviate the suffering caused by a famine (b.c. 25), and on two occasions remitted part of the people's taxes, one-third in b.c. 20 and one-fourth in b.c. 14. But the glory of his reign and the material splendour of his works were offensive to the religious consciousness of his subjects, and his sporadic acts of unselfishness failed to arouse any permanently cordial response in the people.

The last period of Herod's reign, from b.c. 13 to b.c. 4, was one of family intrigue which formed, as Wellhausen aptly puts it, 'a chapter of court history in true Oriental style.' After the death of Mariamne, Herod had married another Mariamne, daughter of a certain Simon, a priest whom Herod had made high priest. He had also other wives, seven in number. His first wife had been recalled to court. His sister Salome and his mother Cypros had already shown some ability in the gentle art of false suggestion. Herod's brother Pheroras, whom he had made tetrarch of Peraea and Idumaea, was at hand with his wife. There were present also the two heirs to the throne, Alexander and Aristobulus, sons of Mariamne I., both proud of their Hasmonaean descent, possibly a little haughty in their manner, certainly a little unwise in their confidential conversations; having a grievance in the unjust death of their mother, but no protection against its misuse by their enemies; holding their mother's opinion of Herod's kindred,—an opinion shared by Glaphyra, wife of Aristobulus and daughter of Archelaus, king of Cappadocia, and fully reciprocated in kind by Salome and Cypros. If to this we add the villainy of a scoundrel like Euryclyus, the presence of Antipater, Herod's eldest son, recalled to court for the purpose of checking presumptuous hopes of succession on the part of Alexander and Aristobulus; and, finally, the suspicious nature of Herod, now made more so by age, and the use of an absolute power over the lives of his subjects to extort evidence by torture,—under

such conditions as these, 'where many things were done and more were believed and repeated,' intrigue could hardly fail to ripen into tragedy.

Soon after the return of Alexander and Aristobulus from Rome, where they had been educated, they were suspected of plotting vengeance on Herod for their mother's death, and of entertaining premature hopes of succession to the throne. Herod himself preferred charges against them before the Emperor at Aquileia, but Augustus succeeded in effecting a temporary reconciliation. Subsequently Alexander was arrested, but released through the influence of Archelaus. Gradually, however, the meshes of intrigue closed around the Hasmonaean brothers. Permission was obtained from Augustus to bring them to trial, but the Emperor's suggestions about the constitution of the court were not strictly adhered to. Herod himself appeared as a witness against his sons, and the court condemned them by a majority vote, Saturninus and his sons dissenting. They were strangled at Sebaste (Samaria), and buried at Alexandrinum about the year b.c. 7. Finally, on the death of his brother Pheroras, Herod discovered that Antipater, who had gone to Rome bearing the will of his father, which named him as successor to the throne, was himself implicated in a patricidal plot. Thereupon Herod wrote to Antipater, urging with great solicitude and paternal affection his speedy return. On arriving in Jerusalem, Antipater was brought to trial before Varus, Nicolaus of Damascus appearing to prosecute the case for Herod. And when Antipater failed to clear himself, he was cast into prison, while Herod awaited permission from Augustus to put him to death.

Herod was now grown old. His physical constitution, naturally powerful and robust, began to give way. The hot baths of Callirhoë gave little or no relief to his disorders. It soon became known that he was suffering from an incurable disease, and the signs of popular rejoicing only embittered the last hours of his despotic reign. The stirring of his anger, as on a former occasion, seemed to rouse his waning energy. When the disciples of two popular teachers of the Law in Jerusalem, Judas and Matthias, cut down the golden eagle from the gate of the Temple, Herod promptly returned, and had forty-two of the participants, including their teachers, burned to death. His sufferings now became more intense. A bath in warm oil ordered by his physicians almost killed him, and in a fit of despair he even attempted to take his own life. Josephus also reports that he gave orders that at the moment of his death all the principal men of the country, whom he had gathered in the hippodrome at Jericho, should be put to death, in order that the people might have cause to sorrow at his departure. But this order was never carried out (cf. Wellhausen⁴ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 345, n. [Note: note.] 2). The imprisoned Antipater about this time, thinking that his father was dead, sought to escape; but Herod, learning of it, and having just received authority for his execution from Rome, gave the order for his death. On the fifth day after the death of Antipater, Herod died at Jericho, in March or April of the year b.c. 4, being about

seventy years of age, and having reigned thirty-seven years since his appointment by the Roman Senate and thirty-four since the taking of Jerusalem. His body was carried to Herodium, and interred with military honours.

Herod had received from Augustus at Aquileia the right to dispose of his kingdom as he willed, and apparently at that time contemplated abdication in favour of his sons, but was restrained by the Emperor (*Ant.* xvi. iv. 5). When he returned to Jerusalem, he made public announcement of his intention that the succession should go to Antipater first, and then to Alexander and Aristobulus. Before his death he made three wills. In the first, made about b.c. 6, Antipater was named to succeed to the throne, or, in case of his death, Herod (Philip) the son of Mariamne the high priest's daughter (*Ant.* xvii. iii. 2; *BJ* i. xxix. 2). In the second, made after the treachery of Antipater had been discovered, Antipas was named as his heir (*Ant.* xvii. vi. 1; *BJ* i. xxxii. 7). In the third, made shortly before his death, Archelaus was appointed to succeed to Judaea and Samaria, with the title of king; Antipas was given Peraea, with the title of tetrarch; and Philip, with a similar title, received Trachonitis, Auranitis, and Batanaea (*Ant.* xvii. viii. 1; *BJ* i. xxxiii. 7).

Although Josephus gives a very detailed account of Herod's reign, depending to a far greater extent on Nicolaus of Damascus than his occasional citations would indicate (cf. Schürer³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , i. 82 ff.), it is not historically probable that he has recorded every incident found in his sources, much less every incident that occurred during this period. For, while his representation has in its main features and even in most of its details the appearance of a faithful and trustworthy narrative, it is not unlikely that he has misunderstood or misrepresented some movements, such as the character of the robbers in Galilee; others he has neglected for some reason, such as the Messianic ideas of the time, and their popular influence witnessed by the Psalms of Solomon and the NT (cf. Mat 2:1 ff.; and Mathews, *Hist. 126, The Messianic Hope in the NT*, 13 ff.). It is possible also that Josephus misrepresented some details of the history through misunderstanding his sources, such, for example, as the day of the fall of Jerusalem, or, again, assigned wrong motives for actions, and even narrated as fact what did not happen. There are some descriptions of different events which reveal striking similarities, and there are some apparent inconsistencies. The narrative in *BJ* is closely parallel with that in *Ant.*, but in some instances the one contains what the other omits. However highly, therefore, we may estimate the trustworthiness of Josephus as an historian, his silence can be used as an argument against the historicity of an event, otherwise attested, only in case it can be shown that Josephus or his source could not have been in ignorance of the event, and would have had good reason to mention it had it occurred, and no good reason for omitting it if known. But even should this be established, the argument from silence would have only secondary value in confirming

a negative judgment, since any judgment in such a case must depend primarily upon the character of the source in which the event is recorded.

Both St. Matthew and St. Luke assign the birth of Jesus to a time shortly before the death of Herod (Mat 2:1 ff., Luk 1:5; Luk 1:26; Luk 1:56; Luk 2:1 ff.). This event, although not mentioned by Josephus, could not have taken place later than the spring of b.c. 4. St. Luke, indeed, brings the event more directly into connexion with the emperor Augustus by mentioning the imperial decree of enrolment, which caused the journey of Joseph and Mary from Nazareth to Bethlehem. St. Matthew, on the other hand, by narrating the visit of the Wise Men from the East (μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν, Mat 2:1), gives us a glimpse of Jerusalem and Herod wonderfully true to the historical and psychological probabilities that may be inferred from Josephus and other sources. The arrival of the Magi in Jerusalem, the form of their question revealing the fact that they were not Jews, the Messianic significance of their question and its appreciation by the people and by Herod, the consequent effect on the city and on the king, Herod's questioning of the scribes where the Christ, *i.e.* the Messiah, should be born, the answer according well not only with OT prophecy, but with the Messianic ideas of the time (cf. Zahn, *Matth.* 94, n. [Note: note.] 86; Bousset, *Religion des Jud.* 214), and, finally, the character of Herod, suspicious, dissimulating, treacherous,—the whole description vividly reflects the historical conditions of the closing years of Herod's reign. The local colouring betrays no false touch. The ideas and scenes are appropriate to the times, and the character of Herod is quite his own. When St. Matthew tells us that Herod in his anger at being deceived by the Magi slew all the children of two years and under in Bethlehem and its borders, we still recognize perfectly the man whose closing years were filled with passion and bloodshed. Josephus, indeed, does not mention the incident. What he does narrate of Herod, however, bears indirect testimony to a fact so entirely consistent with Herod's character. If the fact therefore be denied, the denial will rest on subjective rather than historical grounds.

Grätz, indeed, remarks (*Hist. of the Jews*, ii. 116): 'A legend of later date tells how Herod was not satisfied with shedding the blood of his own children, but how, in a passion, he ordered all children under two years of age in Bethlehem and the surrounding country to be massacred, because he had heard that the Messiah of the house of David had been born in that place. But Herod, criminal as he was, was innocent of this crime.' Similarly I. Broydé (*Jewish Encyc.* vi. 360), who, however, makes appeal to the fact that 'the massacre of the Innocents as related in the NT is now generally admitted by independent Christian thinkers to be legendary.' For this opinion, however, no historical evidence is advanced. The asserted legendary character of St. Matthew's narrative and its later date, even when strengthened by appeal to independent Christian thinkers, is only subjective and dogmatical. In the

latter case, indeed (cf. Holtzmann, *Handcom.*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 41), the attempt is made to ground such a judgment historically by comparing Mt. and Lk., and inferring from their differences the untrustworthy character of each. The fundamental objection to the historicity of the Gospel narratives is, however, not so much the differences between them, which simply prove their relative independence, as the supernatural facts which they record, and in particular, in this part of St. Matthew's narrative, the star of the Magi. Dr. Zahn (*Matth.* 98 f.) has suggested an interpretation of this phenomenon as a purely natural occurrence, described, however, not in terms of scientific precision but in popular language, and from the point of view of the Magi. But even should such an explanation be thought exegetically inadequate, the historicity of the narrative could be denied, and the narrative itself justly described as legendary, only on principles of interpretation whose 'independence,' by reason of their dependence on naturalistic premises, logically excluded from the sphere of history all miraculous events, and necessarily explained the narratives of such events as legendary in character and origin.

For an account of Herod's son Archelaus see Archelaus.

2. Antipas.—The second son of Herod and Malthake, the full brother of Archelaus, is called by Josephus Ἀντίπας (*Ant.* xvii. vii. 1) or Ἡρώδης (xviii. ii. 1). In the NT and on the coins only the name Ἡρώδης appears. Under his father's last will, as ratified by Augustus, Antipas received Peraea and Galilee, with the title τετραάρχης (see Tetrarch). He is commonly designated by this title in the NT, although the popular ὁ βασιλεύς occurs in Mar. 6:14 ff., Mat. 14:9.

We know little concerning the events of Antipas' long reign (b.c. 4-a.d. 39). The narrative given by Josephus is very meagre after the death of Herod the Great.* [Note: This meagreness, as compared with the detailed account of the life and reign of Herod the Great, is due doubtless to the failure, after Herod's death, of one of the principal sources upon which Josephus depended, Nicolaus of Damascus (cf. Schurer³. i. 53; Mathews, *Hist.* 134, n. 1).] Having little to tell of Archelaus, Josephus introduced very interesting digressions about the Pharisees, Sadducees, Zealots, and Essenes (*Ant.* xviii. i.-vi.; *BJ* ii. viii. 1-14). But, having equally little to tell of Antipas, he filled in his narrative in *Ant.* with an account of the Parthians and their relations with Rome—with which, indeed, Antipas was incidentally connected (cf. *Ant.* xviii. ii. 4, iv. 4; Schürer³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , i. 447). We learn from Josephus, however, that Antipas rebuilt and strongly fortified Sepphoris and Betharamphtha for the protection of Galilee and Peraea. He also built

and colonized Tiberias on the Sea of Galilee. On one occasion, when in Rome at the house of his brother Herod Philip (*Ant.* xviii. v. 1; cf. Mar 6:17), son of Mariamne the high priest's daughter, Antipas secured the consent of Herodias, his brother's wife, to leave her husband and marry him, on condition that he put away his own wife, the daughter of Aretas, king of the Nabataeans. When Antipas returned, his wife, who had learned of his understanding with Herodias, asked permission to go to Machaerus, a fortress near the border of her father's territory. Without suspecting her purpose, Antipas granted her request; but she continued her journey to Arabia, and enlightened her father concerning the dutiful intentions of his son-in-law. Because of this and certain boundary disputes, enmity arose between Aretas and Antipas, which eventually issued in war, and a crushing defeat for Antipas.

It is difficult to determine just how soon after the marriage with Herodias the war between Antipas and Aretas broke out. Vitellius, although harbouring an old grudge against Antipas, and thus naturally disposed to make haste slowly in coming to his assistance, was, nevertheless, under orders from Rome, marching against Aretas to punish him for his rough treatment of Antipas, and had got as far as Jerusalem when news came of the death of Tiberius (a.d 37). The defeat of Antipas can hardly have been later than the year 36. Josephus, however, remarks (*Ant.* xviii. v. 2) that the defeat of Antipas was popularly regarded as a Divine punishment for the murder of John the Baptist. Hence it has been inferred by Keim and others that neither the death of John nor the marriage with Herodias can have preceded this event by many years. Keim advocated the year 34 as the date of John's death, and assigned the death of Jesus to the year 35 (*Jesus of Nazara*, ii. 387 ff.). Sieffert dates the journey of Antipas to Rome, when he gained the consent of Herodias to their marriage, in the year 34 (*PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] vii. 769, l. 49). The concise character of Josephus' narrative, however, as well as the condition of the text in this section of *Ant.*, renders it precarious to infer, from the order of events, close chronological sequence (cf. Schürer³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , i. 443 ff.; Wellhansen⁴ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 354). Equally uncertain is the chronological inference from the popular connexion of Antipas' defeat with the death of John, since such a judgment is too flexible to furnish any very definite chronological datum.

The arrest, imprisonment, and death of John the Baptist are narrated in the Gospels and in Josephus (cf. Mat 4:12; Mat 11:2 ff; Mat 14:3 ff., Mar 1:14; Mar 6:17 ff., Luk 3:19 f., 7:18ff., 9:7ff., Joh 3:24; *Ant.* xviii. v. 2). Both sources give an account of John's preaching and baptism. Josephus mentions a political motive for John's arrest; but, while such a motive is not unlikely in view of the popularity of John's ministry (Mar 1:5, Mat 3:5, Luk 3:21, cf. Joh 5:35) and the Messianic character of his

preaching (Mar 1:9 ff., Mat 3:11 f., Luk 3:15 ff., cf. Joh 1:15; Joh 1:19 ff; Joh 1:37; Joh 3:28 ff.), it does not fully explain his death. We learn also from Josephus that John was imprisoned in the fortress of Machaerus, but nothing is said concerning the length of the imprisonment. The Gospels, however, give a personal motive for the arrest of John, indicate that the imprisonment lasted for some time,—probably about a year,* [Note: Jesus' Galilaeen ministry began just after the imprisonment of John (Mar 1:14, Mat 4:12). John's ministry was looked back upon as past at the feast of Joh 5:1; cf. Joh 5:35. Messengers came from the imprisoned John to Jesus in the midst of the early Galilaeen ministry. News of Jesus reached Herod about the time of the mission of the Twelve, and in this connexion the Gospels mention the fears of Herod that John was risen from the dead. The inference is not improbable that John's death was a matter of recent occurrence.] —and attribute his death to the enmity of Herodias (Mar 6:17-29, Mat 14:3-12, Luk 3:19-20). For John had rebuked Herod for his marriage with Herodias, and for this had been imprisoned. The imprisonment seems to have been moderated by the free access of his disciples to him, and Herod himself heard John from time to time. At length, however, on the occasion of a birthday feast,† [Note: On the meaning of γενέσιος in Mar 6:21, Mat 14:6, cf. Schürer³, i. 439, n. 27; Zahn, Matth. 504, n. 81; Jos. Ant. xix. vii. 1; Oxyr. Pap. i. 112. 4, iii. 494. 24, 521, iv. 736. 56, 57; Fay. Pap. i. 114. 20, 115. 6, 119. 30.] celebrated by Herod with the chief men of his government, probably at the palace in Machaerus, a favourable opportunity presented itself for Herodias to be avenged on John for his attack on her marriage. Salome, the daughter of her former marriage,‡ [Note: The reading Mar 6:22 αὐτοῦ in ⋈ BDLΔ, adopted by WH, is probably a corruption for αὐτῆς (cf. Swete, Gosp. acc. to St. Mk. 118; Schurer³, i. 441, n. 29).] danced before Herod and his guests. Herod was pleased, and promised to do for her what she might ask. At the suggestion of her mother, her request took an unexpected form; but because of his promise Herod granted her the death of the prophet, who, like his predecessor in the days of Ahab, had been bold to arraign immorality in high places.

The boyhood of Jesus and most of His public ministry were spent within the territory of Antipas. It was not, however, until the mission of the Twelve that Herod's attention was attracted to Jesus; for, though labouring on the shores of the Sea of Galilee, and from Capernaum as a centre extending His work into the surrounding country, Jesus apparently did not visit Tiberias. Shortly after Jesus learned that Herod had heard of Him, He withdrew from Galilee, going into the region of Tyre and Sidon (part of the Roman province of Syria). On one occasion Jesus warned His disciples against the leaven of Herod (Mar 8:15); on another the Pharisees, manifesting an unwonted interest in Jesus' safety, brought Him word that Herod was planning His death (Luk 13:31). The reply of Jesus on the latter occasion—'Go tell that fox'—shows

that He saw through the cunning design of Herod to be rid of Him. True to His own word,—‘for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem,’—it was not at the hand of Herod that the Saviour of the world suffered, but at the hands of the Roman world-rulers and their procurator, Pontius Pilate. At the trial of Jesus, Herod’s wish to see Him was at length gratified. For Pilate, when he learned that Jesus was of Galilee, and thus subject to Herod’s jurisdiction, at once sent him to Herod, who was in Jerusalem at that time. This act of consideration, prompted possibly by the strained relations between the two rulers (Luk 23:12; cf. Luk 13:1), proved an effectual peace-offering, and cemented anew the bonds of friendship between them. Herod, however, had no desire to assume responsibility for the death of Jesus. His desire to see Jesus sprang from simple curiosity, stimulated by the hope that He would perform some miracle in his presence. But Jesus was silent before Herod and His accusers. Herod, therefore, when he had mocked Him, sent Him back to Pilate arrayed in fine garments. [The part taken by Herod in the trial of Jesus is the subject of legendary elaboration in the apocryphal *Gospel of Peter*].

Stirred by envy at the advancement of her brother Agrippa to royal dignity, Herodias persuaded Herod, against his better judgment, to seek from Caligula a similar honour. When he came to Rome, however, Agrippa preferred charges against him, and called attention to the military supplies that had been collected by Herod. Herod was unable to deny the existence of the supplies, and was banished by Caligula to Lyons in Gaul, probably in the summer of a.d. 39 (cf. Schürer³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , i. 448, n. [Note: note.] 46; Madden, however, *Coins*, 122, gives the year 40). Herodias proudly refused the Emperor’s generosity, and accompanied her husband in his banishment (*Ant.* xvii. vii. 2; *BJ* ii. ix. 6). Herod’s tetrarchy was given to Agrippa.

3. Philip.—Philip was son of Herod the Great and Cleopatra of Jerusalem. When Archelaus went to Rome to secure the ratification of his father’s will, he left Philip in Jerusalem in charge of his affairs. Later, when Varus gave the Jews of Jerusalem permission to send an embassy to Rome to oppose Archelaus, Philip went also, at the suggestion of Varus, to profit by whatever course events might take. When Augustus ratified Herod’s will, Philip received Batanaea, Trachonitis, Auranitis, Gaulanitis, and the territory of Pnias (*Ant.* xvii. viii. 1, xi. 4, xviii. iv. 6; *BJ* ii. vi. 3). In Luk 3:1 the territory of Philip is described by the phrase, ‘the region of Ituraea and Trachonitis’ (τῆς Ἰτουραίας καὶ Τραχωνιτιδος χώρας; cf. Schürer³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , i. 425, n. [Note: note.] 23). The Trachonitis had on two occasions been colonized by Herod the Great—once with three thousand Idumaeans, and again with Jewish warriors from Babylon (*Ant.* xvi. ix. 2, xvii. ii. 1-3). But the population of Philip’s territory was chiefly Gentile, his coins, unlike those of

his brothers, bearing the image of the Emperor. Philip rebuilt Pnias, and called it *Caesarea* in honour of Augustus, and also Bethsaida on the Sea of Galilee, calling it *Julias* after the Emperor's daughter. His reign was a mild and peaceful one. He lived in his own country and administered justice as he travelled from place to place (*Ant.* xviii. iv. 6). He married his niece Salome, daughter of Herodias and Herod Philip (*Ant.* xviii. v. 4). The Gospels narrate a journey of Jesus into the territory of Philip when He went north from Galilee into the region of Caesarea Philippi (Mar_8:27, Mat_16:13; cf. Caesarea Philippi). Philip died in the year 33 or 34, in the twentieth year of Tiberius, having reigned thirty-seven years. His territory was added to the province of Syria, but was given shortly afterwards by Caligula to Agrippa. See also art. Herodias.

Literature.—Josephus; Derenbourg, *Hist. de la Palestine*; Madden, *Coins of the Jews*; Schürer, *GJV* [Note: JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (English translation of 2nd ed.) i. 338 ff. and index [very full citation of literature]; Hausrath, *Hist. of NT Times*, i. 207 ff.; O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, 71 ff.; Riggs, *Hist. of the Jewish People*, 143 ff.; Muir-head, *Times of Christ*; Farrar, *The Herods*; S. Mathews, *Hist. of NT Times*, 100 ff.; Mommsen, *Roman Provinces*, ii. 189 ff.; Ewald, *H^I* [Note: I History of Israel.] v. 395ff.; Grätz, *Hist. of the Jews*, ii. 57ff.; de Saulcy, *Hist. d'Hérode*; Wellhausen, *IJG* [Note: JG Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte.] 4 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 323 ff.; Keim in Schenkel's *Bibel-lexikon*, iii. 27 ff.; Westcott in Smith's *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , ii. 1048 ff.; Sieffert, art. 'Herodes' in *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; Hausleiter, art. 'Antipas,' *ib.*; von Dobschutz, art. 'Philippus der Tetrarch,' *ib.*; Woodhouse in *Encyc. Bibl.* ii. 2023 ff.; Headlam in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. 353ff.; J. D. Davis, *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] , artt. 'Herod,' 'Philip'; W. Milwitzky, art. 'Antipas' in *Jewish Encyc.*; I. Broydé, art. 'Herod,' *ib.*; S. Ochser, art. 'Philip,' *ib.*

W. P. Armstrong.

☞ Herodians

HERODIANS (Ἡρῳδῖαινοί).—Apart from the weakly attested reading in Mar_8:15, the Herodians are mentioned but three times in the NT and on only two occasions, Mat_22:16 being parallel with Mar_12:13. The name Ἡρῳδῖαινοί does not occur in

Josephus. In *BJ* i. xvi. 6 the form Ἡρώδαιοι is used of the party of Herod, and in *Ant.* xiv. xv. 10 the phrase οἱ τὰ Ἡρώδου φρονοῦντες occurs (cf. also *Ant.* xiv. vii. 4). (For the formation in -ιανός like Χριστιανός, cf. Blass, *Acta Apos.* 136, *Gram. of NT Greek*, § 27, 4; Harnack, *Mission u. Ausb. d. Christ.* 294 ff.; *Etym. Magn.* s.v. Ἡρωδιανός).

If the party of Herod in Josephus be the same as the Herodians of the NT (cf. O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgesch.* 157 f., but, on the other hand, Cheyne, *Encyc. Bibl.* ii. 2034), then the origin of the party must be sought in the time of Herod the Great. This view of the origin of the party will also determine our conception of its nature. It cannot have been a religious sect or party like the Pharisees or Sadducees, but was most probably a political party composed of the adherents and supporters of the Herodian dynasty. From the combination of the Pharisees with the Herodians (Mar 3:6), and their common action in Jerusalem (Mat 22:16, Mar 12:13), it is not unlikely that the Herodian party was composed principally of Sadducees (cf. Luk 20:19 and Mar 8:15 with Mat 16:6). After the death of Herod the Great, the deposition of Archelaus, and the establishment of Roman rule in Judaea, the aims and purposes of the party would naturally centre in Antipas. The presence of the Herodians in Galilee, indicated in Mar 3:6, cannot be set aside with the remark of Cheyne: 'This, however, is evidently a mistake. In the country of the tetrarch Antipas there could not be a party called the Herodians' (*op. cit.* ii. 2043). Members of a party which wished to see Antipas sit upon the throne of his father may have been in Galilee as well as in Jerusalem; for their ideal was a national one, differing from the ideal of the Zealots as royalist from democratic. Their union with the strong Pharisaic party, and their attempt to entrap Jesus with the question about tribute to Caesar, find explanation not in any sympathy with the Pharisees or fondness for the traditions which Jesus' activity imperilled, but in their readiness to oppose and suppress any Messianic agitation of the people.

Other views attach some religious significance to the party, connect them with the Boethusians or with the court of Antipas as members of the Herodian family, officers or servants, and attribute to them a friendly or hostile attitude towards the Roman sovereignty (cf. Tert. *ad Omn. Haer.* i.; Epiph. *Haer.* xx.; Steph. *Thesaur.* s.v.; Ewald, *HI* [Note: I History of Israel.] v. 409 f.; Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, 226; Edersheim, *Life and Times*, i. 237 ff., ii. 384; Bleek, *Syn.* ii. 327; Zahn, *Matth.* 528, n. [Note: note.] 44, 632, n. [Note: note.] 45).

Literature.—Keim in Schenkel's *Bibel-lexikon*, iii. 65 ff.; B. F. Westcott in Smith's *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , ii. 1054 f.; Sieffert in *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest.

Theologic und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , vii. 769; T. K. Cheyne in *Encyc. Bibl.* ii. 2043; D. Eaton in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. 362; K. Kohler, *Jewish Encyc.* vi. 360; J. D. Davis, *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] 293.

W. P. Armstrong.

☞ Herodias

HERODIAS (Ἡρῳδιάς).—Herodias was the daughter of Aristobulus (son of Herod the Great and Mariamne the Hasmonaeon) and Bernice (daughter of Salome, Herod's sister, and Costobar), and thus the full sister of Herod, king of Chalcis, and Agrippa i. (*Ant.* xviii. v. 4). She married first her half-uncle Herod, son of Herod the Great and Mariamne, the high priest's daughter. In Mar 6:17 and Mat 14:3 the first husband of Herodias is called **Philip**, the brother of Herod (Antipas). This Philip, therefore, most probably bore also the name 'Herod' (as did also his brothers Archelaus and Antipas), and is to be distinguished from Philip the tetrarch (Luk 3:1; cf. Mat 16:13, Mar 8:27), who married Salome, the daughter of Herod Philip and Herodias (*Ant.* xviii. v. 4). In Mar 6:17 the reading Φιλίππου is given by Tisch. (ed. maj. viii.) without citation of a variant. In Mat 14:3 Φιλίππου has the support of Ɀ BCL, etc., but is omitted in Daceff' g' kvg. In Luk 3:19 Φιλίππου is inserted by ACK, etc., cop syr^{utr.} arm^{cdd} aeth, but omitted by Ɀ BDL, etc. The reading thus appears to be original in Mk., probably original in Mt., and derivative in Luke. The statement (. *Bibl.* ii. 2032), 'In spite of Mar 6:17 we cannot hold that he ever really bore the name Philip,' as well as the remark of Schürer³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (i. 435, n. [Note: note.] 19), 'Since, according to Josephus, not the tetrarch but the above-named Herod was the first husband of Herodias, the statement of Mark and Matthew is evidently a mistake' (*ein entschiedenes Versehen*) are too positive. They do not rest on any more substantial evidence than the fact that Josephus calls this son of Herod the Great simply Herod. The argument that two sons of Herod would not have borne the same name Philip is weakened by the fact that even according to Josephus two sons of Herod bore the same name—Herod, son of Mariamne, the high priest's daughter, and Herod, son of Cleopatra (*Ant.* xvii. i. 3, xviii. v. 4). Herod Philip had been designated in the first will of Herod the Great as the alternate of Antipas in succession to the throne (*Ant.* xvii. iii. 2; *BJ* i. xxix. 2), but was subsequently omitted because of his mother's connexion with the plot of Antipater (*Ant.* xvii. iv. 2; *BJ* i. xxx. 7). He continued in private life in Rome, where Antipas,

while guest in his brother's house, persuaded Herodias to desert her husband and marry him. This second marriage of Herodias was especially offensive to the Jews, because her husband, to whom she had borne a child, was still alive (cf. Lev_18:16, Deu_25:5; also *Ant.* xvii. xiii. 1). John the Baptist rebuked Antipas for his action, and paid the penalty with his life for rousing the anger of an ambitious and unscrupulous woman. Her connexion with the downfall of Antipas has been mentioned (cf. art. Herod under 'Antipas'). In the last recorded incident of her life, when Herodias voluntarily followed Antipas into exile and haughtily refused the Emperor's bounty, she displayed, like her grandmother Mariamne when unjustly sentenced to death, the proud fortitude and fine dignity of the old Hasmonaean house now brought so low through its union with the Herods (*Ant.* xviii. vii. 2; cf. xv. ix. 5).

Literature.—Schürer, *GJV* [Note: *JV* Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] i. 435-449 (English translation, cf. Index); E. S. Ffoulkes in Smith's *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ii. 1055 f.; Sieffert in *PRE* [Note: *RE* Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] vii. 769 f.; Woodhouse in *Encyc. Bibl.* ii. 2033; Headlam in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. 360; I. Broydé in *Jewish Encyc.* vi. 360 f.; J. D. Davis, *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] 293 f.

W. P. Armstrong.

☞ Hezekiah

HEZEKIAH.—One of the kings of Judah, mentioned in Mt.'s (Mat_1:9 f.) genealogy of our Lord.

☞ Hezron

HEZRON.—A Judahite ancestor of Jesus (Mat_1:3, Luk_3:33).

☞ High Priest

HIGH PRIEST.—The terms ‘high priest’ and ‘chief priest’ in the NT represent the same original (ἀρχιερεὺς), varied in translation to correspond with the uses of the term as explained below. The office of high priest in the Jewish nation can be traced back to the early years of post-exilic times. The priestly writings then adopted as authoritative assign its origin to the time of Moses, but the earlier writings contain no suggestion of the existence of the office, and cultural conditions before the Exile preclude an early date for its establishment. Immediately after the Return the office was a religious one, the secular power being in the hands of the ‘prince’; for, great as was the emphasis in the new community upon law and ceremony, there seems to have been an equal emphasis upon the hoped for restoration of the State to a dignified and independent position. It very soon became evident that this hope was impossible of fulfilment, and the secular functions, so far as they were exercised by the Jews, were merged in the duties of the high priest. At first the position was for life and hereditary. In practice the principle was often violated, the violations being occasioned not so much by deliberate purpose as by the turmoils of Greek and Roman times. Moreover, internal conditions in the Jewish community were of themselves sufficient to have unsettled the principle. At the time of the Hasmonaean uprising, the assumption of high priestly functions and title by this family was essential to the success of the revolt. Under the Roman supremacy, the fortunes of the political parties in Rome added to the tendencies that made for the disappearance of the last vestige of permanence in the high priestly office, and at the time of Christ we find it entirely at the will of Rome, both as to appointment and tenure. Under these conditions there had grown up a caste of high priestly families, descended from high priests and otherwise connected with them; these formed a high aristocracy in Judaism, which was possessed of considerable authority, however difficult it may be to define the limits and extent of that influence. Very naturally the selection of the high priest was made from these families. The numerous references in the Gospels are ordinarily to this high priestly class, and when the Greek is so used it is translated ‘chief priests’ (see art. Chief Priests).

As far as concerns the high priest proper, he occupied the position of chief political authority among the Jews, as head of the Sanhedrin. Josephus declares (*Ant.* xx. 10) that there were 28 high priests from the time of Herod to the destruction of Jerusalem. Of these, the Gospels mention the tenth, Annas, appointed by Quirinius (a.d. 6), and the fourteenth, Joseph, surnamed Caiaphas, who was in office at the time of the crucifixion of Jesus and presided over the Sanhedrin at His trial. Previous to this trial there was a preliminary trial or hearing, whether with or without legal right, before Annas, father-in-law of Caiaphas. The Gospel narrative of these events, so far from being confused or improbable, is confirmed as entirely consistent and probable by the records of Jewish practice of those days. Annas was a man of long continued influence among his people. No fewer than six of the high priests of the

Herodian period are known to have been of his family. Other high priests after the end of their term of service are stated to have held high positions at home and abroad, and it is possible that some of the Gospel references to high or chief priests are to this group of ex-high priests together with the officiating priest.

The high priest was also at the head of the sacerdotal system, as the title, of course, implies. But although historically this was his chief claim to authority, his religious influence in the time of Christ was far less than his political power. The religion of the Jew was a matter quite distinct from the rites and ceremonies of the temple, though he might observe these with care. The very success of the high priests centuries before, in uniting the two offices of religious and secular ruler, had operated to foster the development of a religion of a different sort. It was now a religion of the scribes.

The high priest conducted the sacrifices only on special occasions. He was required to officiate on the yearly Day of Atonement; and on other festival days, such as New Moons and Sabbaths, he officiated at his pleasure. These distinctively priestly duties do not come into consideration in the Gospel narratives. The Epistle to the Hebrews, on the other hand, makes much mention of the office in order by that means to portray more clearly the work of Jesus in behalf of men; but one will be disappointed who goes to this Epistle to discover what were the high priestly functions at the time of Christ, or even to discover the theory of sacrifice and priesthood current in those days. The author does not describe the ceremonial as he and his readers knew it from daily observation or participation. He does not allude to it because it was something vital in the religious experience of the Jew. He describes it as he knew it out of the Jewish Scriptures, and he reflects upon it as dispassionately as a philosopher or a theologian. The OT priesthood and sacrifice did not really make atonement for sin; to the author they typified that atonement. In the real atonement Christ had a part similar to that played by the high priest in the sensuous, temporary, typical atonement of the earlier dispensation. He made reconciliation for the sins of the people ([Heb 2:17](#)); He was faithful, the recipient of a greater glory than Moses ([Heb 3:1-6](#)); sought not the office, but was chosen as was Aaron ([Heb 5:4](#)); He was of the order of Melchizedek ([Heb 5:10](#), [Heb 6:20](#)); was competent to sympathize with men ([Heb 2:18](#), [Heb 4:15](#)). He possessed an unchanging priesthood, sacrificing once for all (7), and the sacrifice was Himself. He has passed through the heavens, through the veil ([Heb 4:14](#)), and serves in a perfect tabernacle. As the work wrought by Him for men surpassed that of the high priest, so the terminology of the older dispensation is insufficient, and breaks down under the burden of the description. Jesus is not only the Mediator of the new covenant, the High Priest, but He is also the sacrifice itself. The author will not say that the death on the cross fitted into the OT sacrificial system, any more than he brings Jesus into that system as priest. It was in the new order of things, in the spiritual atonement, which was the real one, with spiritual

agencies and results, that His perfect humanity, His perfect obedience and sinlessness, found place. The temple is in the heavens whither He has gone to consummate the service of which His earthly career was an incident. See, further, art. Priest.

Literature.—Schürer, *GJV* [Note: *JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.*] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] §§ 23, 24; Beyschlag, *NT Theol.* ii. 315-331; Westcott, *Ep. to Hebrews*; Briggs, *Messiah of the Apostles*, 242-283; Ménégos, *Théol. de l'Épître aux Hébreux*, 102 ff., 197 ff.

Owen H. Gates.

⚡ Highway

HIGHWAY.—In the parable (Mat 22:9) where the invited guests all made excuse, the king sent his servants out ἐπὶ τὰς διεξόδους τῶν ὁδῶν, ‘into the highways’ (Authorized Version), to gather as many as they could find, and bid them to the feast. The Gr. phrase means literally ‘the partings of the highways’ (so Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), *exitus viarum* (Vulgate). This is the only occurrence of διεξοδοί in the NT, and it is impossible to determine with certainty what is meant by the expression. It may signify either the roads leading out of the town into the country, or the crossings of such, or the streets leading into the open spaces or square in front of the town. The idea is clear—where men both good and bad, Jew and Gentile, are most likely to be found. God’s purpose cannot be frustrated; and if the invited guests neglect the call, then others who have hitherto been looked down upon will take their place. The invitation is to all and sundry, which leads Whedon to say, ‘The good are not too good to need the gospel, nor the bad so bad as to have no hope if they will accept it.’ It was the poor, the outcast, the hopeless that were to be found on the highways: blind Bartimaeus (Mar 10:46) shouting, ‘Have mercy on me,’ and such as the lepers who stood afar off (Luk 17:13) uttering the same miserable cry. See, further, art. Roads.

R. Leggat.

⚡ Hill

HILL.—In Luk 3:5; Luk 23:30 ὄρος is distinguished from βουνός, which in LXX Septuagint commonly stands for הַר, and as representing the lesser eminence, is properly rendered ‘hill.’ Language like that of Luk 23:30 is used in hyperbole to-day by Easterns, of preparing a highway for royalty through a practically roadless country. In two cases (Mat 5:14, Luk 4:29) Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 retains Authorized Version rendering of ὄρος, ‘hill.’ In Luk 9:37 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 rightly substitutes ‘mountain.’ Perhaps we should read ‘mountain’ also in Mat 5:14. There is nothing to show that any particular city was referred to, but if the words were spoken on any height west of the Lake, Safed, with white walls gleaming in the sun, must have been a striking feature in the landscape. It stands literally ‘on a mountain,’ to the north, nearly 3500 ft. above the Sea of Galilee. Ancient Nazareth, however, was built on the slope of a hill to which ‘mountain’ could hardly apply.

Hill country (ἡ ὄρεινή, Luk 1:39; Luk 1:65). ἡ ὄρεινή is a frequent LXX Septuagint equivalent of הַר. The use of Heb. הַר closely resembles that of Arab, *jebel*, which denotes a single height, but also a whole range, as *Jebel Libnân*; or a definite part of a range, as *Jebel Nâblus*—this indicating that portion of ‘the mountain’ which is under the government of Nâblus. This expression and *Jebel el-Kuds* the present writer has often heard on Palestinian lips, without any sense of vagueness or confusion. הַר was ‘the mountain’—the central range as distinguished from the plain and the Shephelah on the west, and the ‘Arabah on the east. *Jebel el-Kuds*, ‘mountain of Jerusalem,’ is perhaps the nearest modern equivalent of ἡ ὄρεινή τῆς Ἰουδαίας, that part of ‘the mountain’ associated with the tribe of Judah. See, further, art. Mountain.

W. Ewing.

☞ Hindrance

HINDRANCE.—The life of communion with God and of obedience to His revealed will is regarded as the normal state and right relationship of man made in God’s image and for His glory. All defect and deflection from this standard are the result of external and internal hindrances. The world is an environment of hindrances and causes of stumbling (Mat 18:7). Such is the pressure of opposing influences that the entrance into life has to be by a narrow gate (Mat 7:13). Instances of these outward and inward difficulties are given in the parable of the Sower (Mat 13:18-23), and in that of the Tares their final elimination is predicted (Mat 13:41).

1. The following hindrances are specially emphasized: (1) *prosperity and power* (Mat 4:8; Mat 19:24, Luk 16:31; Luk 18:23); (2) *self-righteousness and the arresting effect of an inferior standard* (Mat 5:20; Mat 6:2; Mat 6:5; Mat 6:16; Mat 23:5-7, Luk 18:14); (3) *family claims and their displacing power* (Mat 8:21; Mat 10:37); (4) *want of faith* (Mat 14:31; Mat 17:20; Mat 25:25, Luk 22:32); (5) *blindness of heart* in its progressive stages of (a) ignorance (Mat 13:15, Luk 18:18; Luk 23:34, Joh 17:25, repeated in Act 3:17, 1Co 2:8), (b) indifference (Luk 7:32),—being the interval of apathy and discouragement that succeeds when ideals once regarded as final cease to fill the imagination and satisfy the heart, and institutions once held to be sacred fail to yield the expected results,—(c) inability to discern and feel (Mat 16:3; Mat 23:37), and lastly (d) conscious malignity towards the Kingdom of God (Mat 23:13; Mat 27:18, Mar 7:8, Luk 11:15; Luk 11:52, cf. Rom 1:32).

2. Comparative moral values are attached to these hindrances (Mat 8:10; Mat 11:21-24; Mat 12:41-42, Mar 12:41-44, Luk 7:47; Luk 17:16). Prayer may be offered for their removal (Mat 26:39, similarly 2Co 12:8).

3. Christ's relationship to the world-spirit is one of complete opposition (Joh 16:33; Joh 18:36). The victory that can be obtained over all hindrances makes a sanctified cross the emblem of the Christian life (Mat 16:24, Mar 8:34, Luk 9:23). This power to overcome, promised to those who abide in Christ (Joh 15:7), is referred to in the Epistles as already a verified fact in Christian experience (Rom 8:35-39, Php 4:13).

Stumbling-block, stumbling-stone (πρόσκομμα, προσκοπή, also σκάνδαλον, 'trap' or 'snare' [Rom 11:9], and frequently translation 'offence,' 'offend' [Mat 16:23; Mat 18:6-9; Mat 26:31, Luk 17:1]). The root-idea is that of encountering an obstacle where such ought not to be, as on a public road. In its fig. sense the offence is most blameworthy where the trust is most implicit and unreserved, as in the confidence of children (Mat 18:6).

In the East the bridle-path is seldom repaired. Stones may be cast out upon it in clearing the neighbouring fields; squared stones for building, collected at the road-side for transport, are often scattered over the path; if a bed of sand suitable for mixing with lime be found near it, the path may be dug into and the cavity left unfilled. No harm can arise from it, men say, except to those for whom it is decreed. The people of the village soon come to know of it, and they are under no obligation to strangers. The better prepared roads have generally been constructed for Government purposes and by forced labour, so that the people of the locality take little civic interest in their condition and preservation. Hence stumbling-blocks are frequently met with, and cause little surprise or comment.

In modern Palestine criminals and men of depraved life are called *mu'aththārîn*, 'those who have been made to stumble'; and the same epithet is applied to such as are in trouble through misfortune.

The Cross that made God the sacrificer and suppliant, and called for faith in a Saviour who could not save Himself, was a stumbling-block or offence to the wisdom of the world, and to all its religious traditions (Rom_9:33, 1Co_1:23; 1Pe_2:8).

G. M. Mackie.

☛ Hire

HIRE.—'Hire' (μισθός) occurs in two passages as the regular payment given for service rendered. In the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard (Mat_20:8) it is spoken of the day's wage, the denarius, owing by agreement to the workers. The proverbial phrase, 'The labourer is worthy of his hire' (Luk_10:7), is used by Christ in connexion with the mission of the Seventy. In Mat_10:10 τροφή, 'food,' is substituted for μισθός. The latter Greek word occurs again (Joh_4:36) as the wages of the reaper. It is used in a good sense as the reward of devotion and service to God (Mat_5:12; Mat_6:1; Mat_10:41, Mar_9:41, Luk_6:23), as well as to describe the 'empty popularity' attaching to the religious ostentation of the hypocrites (Mat_6:2; Mat_6:5; Mat_6:16). It is employed (Rev_22:12) of Christ's reward to His faithful followers: 'My reward is with me.'

The term 'hired servant' or 'hireling' (μισθωτός) is used in speaking of Zebcdee's servants (Mar_1:20), and of the false shepherd who deserts his flock at the approach of danger (Joh_10:12-13). A similar derivative (μισθιος) describes the father's servants in the parable of the Prodigal Son (Luk_15:19). The verb 'to hire' (μισθόω) occurs (Mat_20:1) of the householder who engaged the labourers for his vineyard. See also next article.

C. H. Prichard.

☛ Hireling

HIRELING.—A hireling is one who works for wages, an employé. Originally synonymous with ‘hired servant,’ it did not necessarily imply venal motive. Ben Sira was acquainted with devoted hirelings: ‘Entreat not evil thy servant that worketh, nor a hireling that giveth thee his life’ (Sir 7:20). Hireling now denotes a wage-earner who manifests certain baser qualities of human nature. Christ’s use of the word in Joh 10:12-13 to signify one who, because he cares more for his wages than for his work, proves unfaithful under trial, has determined its evolution into meaning an untrustworthy employé.

Calvin, who defines hirelings as ‘those who retain the pure doctrine, and who proclaim the truth, as Paul says, to serve a purpose rather than from pure zeal,’ discusses a question wont to be debated in times of persecution, viz.—Has that man to be reckoned a hireling who for any reason shrinks from encountering the wolves? He agrees with Augustine that parties may flee ‘if the public advantage of the flock be thereby promoted’ (Calvin on *John*, vol. i. p. 403f., Edinburgh, 1847).

D. A. Mackinnon.

⚠️ Historical

HISTORICAL.—1. The word ‘history’ is ambiguous. It may mean (1) the course of events; or (2) any record of the events—a history: or (3) the science, History, which understands the whole. Scientific history is comparatively a young thing; but already educated mankind are tending to refuse the name of ‘a history’ to anything under the second head which does not try to fulfil the requirements of science. What fails in that may be a chronicle, or may furnish useful materials to the true historian, but is not really history.

2. The aims of the science of history are twofold. (1) It must get at the facts; and to do that it must secure, as far as possible, first-hand evidence; (2) it must study the facts in their development or causation or connexion upon all sides. (1) In its search for first-hand evidence, the science of history has different kinds of material to work with. (a) The oldest material for history is tradition. All knowledge of past events lived at first in human memory before it assumed any more permanent shape. But tradition, unsupported or unassisted, is a bad witness. And in our own region there is no real historical tradition apart from the Christian records, etc. What is pretended by Catholicism in that sense is a make-believe, to cover over unwarranted innovations. The furthest admission we can make is that scraps of historical recollection, otherwise lost to us, may survive in Church legends, which were reduced pretty early to writing (the Thekla legend?). (b) The best of all witnesses is epigraphy.

Biblical learning owes something to this, and may come to owe a good deal more—no one can say. (c) The main source of historical knowledge is literature,—human speech reduced to the ordinary forms of writing. Less durable (as well as less stiff) than inscriptions, books are more numerous—so much more numerous, that they enjoy probably a better chance of survival. In our own field the Bible writings, though not absolutely isolated, stand head and shoulders above all other materials in point of importance. This is true on purely historical principles, theories of inspiration apart. (d) At the risk of making a cross-division, we must mention the importance of *foreign testimony*. The amount of this is increasing with modern study and research; and the significance generally attached to affinities between primitive Christianity and other civilizations or religions is also on the increase. (2) The most manifest result of study in the field of history is to give a better knowledge of detail. But we must not allow ourselves to suppose that events occur disconnectedly, one by one, and that the mind of the scientific thinker imposes connexions upon them. Science does not create, it elicits the hidden law; and anything that gives us greater knowledge of events increases our knowledge of the relations in which they stand to each other. Facts without theory are ‘blind,’ if theories without fact are ‘empty.’ The ideal goal of historical study, never, of course, to be reached, would be a scientific grasp of every past event in its full significance—reality completely reproduced in the historian’s intelligence. For the facts with which history deals are intelligent acts and intelligible processes. True, the unconscious tendency of the times may count for more than the conscious, perhaps selfish, effort of the great man. Or what he does unwillingly, as the executive of Providence and the *Zeitgeist*, may be the most significant and durable of all his acts. Yet history is man’s story; surely, then, man can read it!

3. The Christian study of Bible documents moves for great part of its way, though hardly to the very end [see below], upon historical lines. (1) Its admitted hermeneutical principle, since the days of Ernesti (*Institutio Interpretis NT*, 1761), is the ‘grammatico-historical’—*i.e.* *literal* and *historical*—method. Strictly, each sentence has one meaning, and only one—the meaning its human author designed; the meaning its first readers would naturally apprehend. This principle had to be laid down in face of the Church’s age-long hankering after ‘mystical’ interpretation. If the Scriptures may be allegorized, theology and faith itself rest upon a quicksand. (2) Criticism of the text, by all its methods, aims at discovering, with as much probability as can be attained, the original form of words used by the writer in each passage. It has nothing to do—unless with supreme caution, as *possible* evidence to the fact—with the question, which words appear to the student most seemly or most telling. Nay, there is a recognized principle that ‘the harder reading is probable’; though we must be able to discriminate the sort of ‘difficult’ reading which suggests a powerful while perhaps erratic mind, from that which rather suggests a blundering copyist. (3) Careful study of the text leads to a further set of inferences, chiefly or entirely drawn from internal evidence, regarding probable date and probable authorship. This is the

Higher Criticism—‘higher’ because dealing with larger questions than those of the text. (4) Even in Biblical Theology we are still occupied with the historian’s business. Before all things, we are reproducing past facts. Scripture includes great masses of doctrinal teaching; the Biblical Theologian seeks to put these in shape, as they stand—the affirmations of such and such books, or teachers, or ages. The result aimed at is not Divine truth as such, but various Biblical teachings about the truth; not a normative statement regarding realities which are real, but a historical statement regarding what was held or announced to be spiritual reality; historical, *not dogmatic*.

4. An attempt was made by a great theological leader, Schleiermacher, to bring even dogmatic theology under the same rubric. It was to be a branch of Historical Theology. Ceasing to be (primarily) a statement of truth, it was to be a statement of what a certain Church in a certain age has come to hold for true. The suggestion was ingenious, and avoided certain difficulties; but it led to other and worse difficulties. If Christian theology, in its central department, cannot pretend to set forth *truth*, it proclaims itself bankrupt. It can live upon nothing less than the truths regarding God and His purposes which He has been pleased to make known to us.

5. What shall we say, then, of the remainder of the Biblical territory? We were dealing, until the last paragraph, with stages in a process of historical study. We found that even doctrine was treated in Biblical Theology as a historical study, although on the systematic or dogmatic side it required us to occupy a different point of view from the historian’s. But what are we to say regarding the history of Israel? Or—coming closer to our ground—regarding the life as distinct from the teaching of Jesus? Or, in general, regarding the origins of Christianity? That which was higher than man or than history has appeared once for all upon the plane of human history. *The Word became flesh*. Unless this be denied, we have come to a point where the contents of our study burst the bonds of ordinary historical investigation. Difficulty arises in two forms. First, there is the minor difficulty connected with physical miracles. Can history adjust itself to them? If so, how? If not, what are we to conclude? But, in the second place, substantially the same question, issuing in substantially the same alternatives, repeats itself as regards the very kernel of the Christian faith. Have we in Christ, and, to a lesser degree, in His antecedents and environment, a unique Divine revelation, a unique Divine redemption? Then how is the historian to deal with Christ?

6. The question is more familiar in its less formidable shape, as regards miracles. (1) It may be held that facts convince us of miracle. History makes its investigation, and bears witness. It cannot demonstrate, but it announces a satisfactory probability. This is the attitude generally taken up by British scholars, e.g. in Dr. Sanday’s recent *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel* (though he has the wider as well as the narrower

problem before him). (2) Secondly, there is the claim of dogmatic naturalism—‘miracles do not happen’; for history, the miracle narrative is an interesting and instructive problem, the miracle itself a hallucination *a priori*, be the alleged evidence what it may. This mood of mind is sometimes confessed, but much oftener is silently at work behind a disguise. (3) There is an attempt by Harnack to strike out a *tertium quid*: ‘The historian cannot regard a miracle as a sure given historical event; for in doing so he destroys the mode of consideration on which all historical investigation rests.’ Belief in miracle is due to the ‘unique impression’ of Christ’s person, though ‘there has seldom been a strong religious faith which would not have drawn the conclusion’ that Christ wrought miracles (*Hist. of Dogma*, vol. i. English translation p. 65, note). This seems to mean that history is prevented from dealing with miracles by limitations of its own,—limitations which do not necessarily imply the absence of miracle from the world of real events. (4) Against the point of view which excludes miracles *a priori*, we might set a point of view which welcomes them *a priori* as congruous to a Divine revelation and Divine redemption. They are only signs—not the Divine content itself; but are they not fit signs?

7. On a first inspection, none of the views named is definitely anti-Christian unless the second. Naturalism, which refuses miracle out and out, is plainly pledged in logic to deny revelation. But, as we have said, the importance of the whole matter lies in its further implications. The same difficult decision is called for—not face to face with miracle, but face to face with the Christ. And the logic of the *third* position—the logic which leads Harnack, while believing in revelation, to ban miracle as a thing the historian must not touch—will inevitably be applied by others to Jesus Himself. They will repeat or extend the claim to be historians, thorough historians, nothing but historians. They will describe the teacher of Nazareth, the martyr of Calvary; but the Christ of God will be a magnitude as inaccessible to them as physical miracle is to Dr. Harnack (cf. art. ‘Jesus’ in *Encyc. Bibl.*). And if he is in the right, who can say that they are wrong? Analysis must go on to the end, and that great stumbling-block, the supernatural, be revealed plain in our path. Even if not formally declared an impossibility, supernatural revelation or redemption will be politely waved aside as irrelevant to the *historian*.

8. There is no question more important at the present moment than this. What is, e.g., a ‘historical’ view of the NT? Is it a view of the NT in its historical actuality, looked at round and round? Or is it a view hampered by the limitations of one of the special sciences? Ambiguity is always dangerous. People omit the Divine ‘Word’ under pretext of the second definition—That lies beyond the historian’s province! But presently they are found implying the *first* definition. History tells us everything! There is no Divine ‘Word’ at all—no supernatural salvation.

9. If history does not give full truth, what does? We shall probably be told, Metaphysics. The only court of appeal from 'scientific fact' is 'metaphysical reality.' Metaphysics is certainly pledged to many-sidedness, to all-sidedness. But the question remains, How far can metaphysics discharge its task? And, again, Can it do justice to the Christian origins? Idealistic interpreters of Christianity are very willing to undertake the championship of the Christ idea (e.g. Pfleiderer), but their patronage is not extended to the Christ fact. At any rate the majority, and those who know their business best, are found reducing Jesus of Nazareth to a *symbol*, very vaguely connected with any abiding spiritual reality. To a philosophical interpreter it remains 'foolishness' that the Divine Word literally and in deed *became flesh*. If the professional historian verges upon Ebionism, his philosophical colleague rarely escapes Docetism. Neither of these positions amounts to historical Christianity, which, amid increasing uncertainty in detail, may and ought to have increasing certainty in the fundamental outlines.

10. In the present writer's judgment the attempt to make history a special science, too coy or too scientific to deal with a (possibly real) supernatural, is hopelessly artificial. Scientific history must deal with all the demonstrable, nay, with all the probable, events of the real past. This may interfere with the rounded symmetry of the science; small loss, if it gives us wider and truer knowledge! Further, the writer's own belief is that (not a Christian *bias*, but) a Christian interpretation is indispensable; or, that experience bears its witness (cf. the fourth position, § 6, as against the first; still, he recognizes that many Christians and many useful theological workers will find themselves able to maintain the first position, and will prefer it). It is perfectly true that faith misleads and over-idealizes (Dr. Moffatt); yet that is a half-truth, or rather it is much less than the half. Better a dazzled faith than 'blind unbelief.' Amid superficial errors, Christian faith grasps the essential truth. Amid superficial accuracies, non-Christian historians (and non-Christian philosophers no less) throw away the kernel. The *vraie vérité*—to a Christian—lies neither in metaphysics nor in the abstract findings of historical science, but in the fellowship of Jesus Christ the living Saviour. 'This is the true God and eternal life.'

11. One form of putting this appeal sets the evidence of later Christian history, with its known developments, against the academic modern study of Christian origins. Christ has founded, and must have meant to found, a worshipping Church! The Germans can put this in a phrase—'der geschichtliche Christus' *versus* 'der sogenannte historische Jesus' (Kähler). There is a measure of truth in this. Indeed, it is bad *history* to forget, in studying origins, whereunto the origins grew. On the other hand, the appeal, put forward without qualification, helps the High Churchmen, if not the Ultramontanes. The Church of history is saccrdotal! Protestant evangelical Christians are forced by their faith, by their experience, into a fruitful alliance with sober all-round history. Like the Reformers, we must go back to the primary revelation.

Christianity, as the world knows it, is not the measure of Christ, nor His worthy interpreter. ‘Hear ye Him!’

Robert Mackintosh.

⚡Holiness

HOLINESS.—The word ‘holy’ is etymologically connected with ‘whole,’ ‘hale,’ ‘healthy,’ etc. (cf. Ger. *heilsam*, *heilig*). Modern lexicographers hesitate to speak with certainty in regard to the primitive meaning of the root whence this group of words is derived. *Murray’s English Dict.* is content to equate ‘holy’ with the Lat. *sanctus*, *sacer*, on the ground that ‘we cannot in Old English get behind the Christian sense.’ It is probable that the sense-development is either from *hailo*, *i.e.* inviolate, inviolable, that which must be preserved *whole*; or from *hail* in the sense of *health*, well-being.

In all the passages to which reference will be made, the Greek word is ἅγιος or one of its derivatives, with the exception of Act 2:27; Act 13:35, Luk 1:75, Heb 7:26, where ὅσιος or ὁσιότης is found. In Acts the words of Psa 16:10 are quoted twice; ‘thy Holy One’ is a title of the Messiah to whom pre-eminently belongs the OT designation of the theocratic nation,—οἱ ὅσιοι τοῦ θεοῦ, God’s pious ones. ‘The ὅσιος, the German *fromm*, is one who reverences the everlasting sanctities and owns their obligation’ (Trench, *Synonyms of the NT*, § lxxxviii.). In Luk 1:75 ‘holiness’ and ‘righteousness’ are closely associated, as is frequently the case both in classical and biblical usage. The words are complementary, though the sharp distinction drawn by Plato (*Gorgias*, 507 B) cannot be maintained: in the NT ‘righteousness’ cannot be limited to duties toward men, nor can ‘holiness’ be restricted to duties toward God. Righteousness is the manward, as holiness is the Godward aspect of pious character and conduct. Hence Jesus, our High Priest, is ‘holy’ (Heb 7:26); in His filial reverence and in His devotion to His Father’s will there is no flaw; He is, therefore, fitted to appear in the presence of God to do priestly service on our behalf. The LXX Septuagint usually renders תְּסִיךְ (‘godly’ or ‘beloved’) by ὅσιος (Deu 33:8, 2Sa 22:26, Psa 4:4 etc.), but שְׁקֵד is generally translated ἅγιος (Exo 19:6, Num 6:5, Psa 15:1, etc.).

Both ἅγιος and שְׁקֵד are used when holiness is ascribed to God as well as to persons and things. The question, therefore, arises—What is the primary meaning which underlies and connects these different applications of the word? If the fundamental

idea is , the progress of thought is from the negative to the positive, from men and things to God, from the cleansing which is an essential qualification for use in the service of God to purity as the central attribute of God Himself. But if the fundamental idea is Divinity, separation becomes a derivative conception; the progress of thought is then from the positive to the negative, from God to external things and persons. Every devoted to God must be separated from profane or common uses; and every devoted to God is not only thus set apart, but is also under moral obligation to fit himself for drawing near to God by separating himself from all that is sinful.

Those who regard *separation* as the radical meaning of ἅγιος make it almost synonymous with ἄγνός, which signifies *pure*, and sets forth a negative conception of holiness. Stevens (Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. 399) follows Trench, and interprets 1Jn_3:3—ἐκεῖνος ἄγνός ἐστιν—of God. But, as Westcott (*Com. in loc.*) points out, ἐκεῖνος in this Epistle always refers to Christ; it is in respect of His true humanity that it can be said 'He *is* pure,' and not only 'He *was* pure.' In His glorified state 'the result of the perfection of His earthly discipline (Heb_5:7 ff.) still abides.' According to St. John, a 'hope set on' (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) Christ is a constant incentive to strive after holiness; and the standard by which the disciple will always measure his attainments is the perfect purity of his Lord. Few will doubt the soundness of the inference which Westcott bases on his exposition of this verse and on his study of the words:

'Both ἄγνός and καθαρός differ from ἅγιος in that they admit the thought or the fact of temptation or pollution; while ἅγιος describes that which is holy absolutely, either in itself or in idea. God can be spoken of as ἅγιος but not as ἄγνός, while Christ can be spoken of as ἄγνός in virtue of the perfection of His humanity. A man is ἅγιος in virtue of his Divine destination (Heb_10:10) to which he is gradually conformed (ἀγιάζετε, Heb_10:14); he is ἄγνός in virtue of earthly, human discipline.'

This clear and helpful distinction assumes that the primary meaning of ἅγιος must be sought in the revelation of the essential nature of God; the various meanings of ἅγιος may thus be traced in orderly sense-development from its root το ἅγιος, 'religious awe,' 'reverence.' 'Holy is his name' (Luk_1:49) is the starting-point; things and persons are holy by reason of their being destined for Divine uses; the secondary meaning of separation from defilement arises at a later stage, as clearer perception

of the nature of God also reveals the need of preparation for His service by cleansing from all impurity.

This conclusion must be tested by a brief study of the Jewish conception of holiness. The etymology of שְׁקִיף (LXX Septuagint generally ἅγιος, sometimes καθαρός, never ὁσῖος) is disputed. Little can be learnt from the use of cognate words by non-Israelitish peoples. The profound and indeed unique meaning of holiness in the religion of revelation can be ascertained only from a careful investigation of the phraseology of the OT writers. An excellent sketch of the probable history of the word, which assumes that its fundamental idea is separation, is given in Sunday-Headlam's *Romans* (note on 1:7); but it is acknowledged that 'there is a certain element of conjecture ... which is inevitable from the fact that the earlier stages in the history of the word had been already gone through when the Hebrew literature begins.' There is, therefore, scope for further inquiry.

Kittel (*PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] vii. 566 ff.) maintains that the root-idea of the word is positive. Things are not holy because they are separated from other things; they are separated from other things because they are holy. When holiness is ascribed to vessels, animals for sacrifice, etc., either order of thought is suitable. But this is not the case when, e.g., the temple, Zion, and heaven are called holy; they are holy because they are the abode of God. If the primary meaning of holy is *that which belongs to God and is devoted to His service*, persons may be called holy who stand in a close relation to God, inasmuch as they are in a special sense His servants. Very instructive is Num_16:5 'In the morning the Lord will show who are his, and who is holy.' As applied to persons and to the nation, holiness acquired a deeper significance. In the Law of Holiness (Leviticus 17 ff.) the command. 'Ye shall be holy; for I the Lord your God am holy' (Lev_19:2), is seen to involve both external requirements referring to ritual, and inward requirements referring to moral character.

The holiness of God means, if the positive idea is primary, His 'essential Divinity.' Kittel's exposition accords with Bengel's saying that God's glory (דְּבָרֵי) is His disclosed holiness, and His holiness (שִׁשְׁקֵי) is His inner glory. God's holiness is 'that which proves Him to be God; that which is worthy of God.' Cf. 'The Lord God hath sworn his holiness' (Amo_4:2), with 'The Lord God hath sworn himself' (Amo_6:8). If it be said that this definition is vague, the reply is that 'the Divine essence cannot be expressed in a single formula which is suitable for all stages in the development of the OT idea of God.' It is a manifest advantage of this view that the evolution of the idea of holiness finds its explanation in the historical evolution of the idea of God. An early

stage is seen in 1Sa 6:20 'Who is able to stand before the Lord, this holy God?' None may approach Him save those who have complied with the prescribed regulations (cf. 1Sa 21:5). As the moral nature of God was more clearly apprehended, the conception of His holiness was spiritualized; in Hos 11:9 'I am God, and not man; the Holy One in the midst of thee,' the Divine holiness is the ethical motive of the resolve, 'I will not come in wrath ((Revised Version margin)) into the city.' Kittel rightly distinguishes God's glory from His holiness: 'O glory' is a cosmic predicate of God, and refers to the outshining of His attributes, which may be metaphysical or moral; but 'holiness' has always a tendency to acquire an ethical significance, and becomes at last solely His moral glory.

The fact that the conception of holiness varies with the conception of God explains the occasional deterioration of the idea. When stress was laid upon the transcendence of God, stress was also laid upon ritual purity. But, in general, later Jewish teaching has insisted upon moral as well as ceremonial purity as being essential qualifications for the service of the Holy One of Israel. Rightly to understand the meaning of 'holy' as used by our Lord and His contemporaries, it is needful to remember that for rabbinical Judaism holiness became 'synonymous with purity of life, purity of action, and purity of thought' (see *Jewish Encyc.* vi. 441^b). Holiness is 'an ideal state of perfection attained only by God' (Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] *Ber.* ix. 13a); but 'man grows in holiness the more he aspires to the Divine will, rising above the sensual' (*Yoma*, 39a). Dalman says (*Words of Jesus*, p. 202) that 'the Holiness' (שְׁדִקְיָהוּ) became a Divine title (*Siphre*, Num. 112, ed. Friedm. 33a).

The NT passages which fall within the limits of this article may be classified according as (1) holiness is ascribed to things, places, or persons by (a) the Evangelists, (b) our Lord; (2) holiness is ascribed to Christ (a) in the Acts, (b) in the Epistles.

1. Holiness in the Gospels.—(a) The Evangelists speak of 'the holy city' (Mat 4:5; Mat 27:53), 'the holy place' (Mat 24:15), 'his holy covenant' (Luk 1:72): Jerusalem and the temple are holy, as being the abode of God; the covenant made with Abraham is holy, as being a revelation of the gracious purpose of God in choosing a people to serve Him in holiness (Luk 1:75; see above on ὁσιότης). Persons are described as holy, because they are devoted to God's service: in the Gospels mention is made of 'the holy angels' (Mar 8:38, Luk 9:26), 'his holy prophets' (Luk 1:70), and Herod is said to have recognized the holiness of John the Baptist (Mar 6:20); in such uses of the word there is included an assertion of the moral purity which is an essential qualification for the service of God. In Luk 2:23 an OT quotation (Exo 13:2) explains that the offering of the parents of Jesus, when they presented their child to the Lord in the temple, was a recognition of the fact that every firstborn son was holy as belonging to God. The ascription of holiness to the Divine Spirit (Mat 1:18 etc.) will

be considered in paragraph (b); but here it may be noted that in the story of the Annunciation (Luk 1:35), Mary is told that the Holy Spirit shall come upon her with the result that her child shall be holy (τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον); and that once (Luk 4:1) Jesus is described as ‘full of the Holy Spirit.’ In Mar 1:24 = Luk 4:34 the man with an unclean spirit calls Christ ‘the Holy One of God,’ and according to the true text Simon Peter uses the same title (Joh 6:69). The phrase is a designation of the Messiah, described by John (Joh 10:36) as ‘him whom the Father consecrated’ (ἡγίασε. For this and other uses of ἁγιάζειν see art. Consecration). Finally, holiness is ascribed to God in the *Magnificat*, and the whole context (‘his mercy,’ etc.) shows that ‘holy is his name’ (Luk 1:49) is a declaration of the moral glory of God.

(b) Our Lord never speaks of any *person*, save the Father and the Spirit, as holy; and only once does He describe any *thing* as holy. His command, ‘Give not that which is holy to the dogs’ (Mat 7:6), is a proverbial expression whose origin is probably some Jewish exclamation of horror at the thought of profaning altar-flesh, which had been offered in sacrifice to God (Lev 23:6 ff. LXX Septuagint τὰ ἅγια). A similar saying is quoted from Aristotle: ‘Do not fling wisdom into the street’ (μὴτε ῥίψαι σοφίαν εἰς τοὺς τριόδους, *ap.* Themist. p. 234).

The application of our Lord’s words need not be limited to preachers of the gospel; and it is certain that they do not sanction any doctrine of reserve in the statement of truth; their obvious meaning seems to be that holy themes are not to be exposed to the contempt of the profane. John Wesley’s comment (*Sermon xxx.*) is both pithy and pertinent: ‘Beware of thinking that any deserve this appellation till there is full and incontestable proof.’ But ‘great and glorious truths’ are not to be forced upon those who ‘contradict and blaspheme.’ ‘Do not begin a discourse with these upon remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost.... The most probable way to make Felix tremble is to reason with him of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come.’

In each of the four Gospels there are passages in which our Lord speaks of the Holy Spirit, viz. Mat 12:32; Mat 28:19, Mar 3:29; Mar 12:36; Mar 13:11, Luk 12:10; Luk 12:12, Joh 14:26; Joh 20:22. In so speaking He definitely ascribes essential Divinity to the Spirit. Not in this way could He have spoken of ‘a created Intelligence above the angels’ but inferior to Himself. Moreover, this Divine agent is distinguished both from the Father who sends Him, and from the Son in whose name He is sent; and in the NT the phrase which normally describes Him—‘the Holy Spirit’—ascribes to Him the essential attributes of Deity, the moral glory of God.

In this sense Dalman's words (*op. cit.* p. 202f.) must be understood when he says, 'As regards content, there is no difference between "Spirit of God" and "Holy Spirit." ' He is careful to point out that, as 'the Holiness' had become a Divine title, 'it might readily be supposed that in the term קדוּשׁא דְּהוּי "the Holy Spirit," the word קדוּשׁא became in reality a name for God, so that τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ would represent it more accurately than τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. But in that case terms like קדוּשׁא דְּהוּי "thy holy spirit" (Psa 51:11), קדוּשׁי דְּהוּי "my holy spirit" (*Targ.* Is 42:1), would be impossible. And yet it must be maintained that the addition of אֱלֹהִים is expressly meant to specify Divinity as an attribute of the Spirit.' See, further, Holy Spirit.

The last recorded example of our Lord's use of the word 'holy' is in His intercessory prayer. He who never called any human being 'holy' prays that His disciples may attain unto holiness. His petitions are both negative and positive: from the corruptions of the world He asks that they may be kept in the name (Joh 17:11 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) which in its fulness it had been His mission to reveal. But it is not enough for them to be kept from entering the domain of the Evil One (Joh 17:15 ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ, cf. 1Jn 5:19 'the whole world lieth in the evil one'). If they are to continue Christ's work, they must be partakers of His holiness, for only in complete devotion of all their powers to the service of God can they share their Master's joy. Hence He also asks, as in absolute self-sacrifice He consecrates Himself, that 'they themselves also may be consecrated in truth' (Joh 17:19). In these petitions the love of Christ for His own finds full expression, and they are fitly introduced by the unique phrase 'Holy Father' (cf. 'Father,' Joh 17:1, and 'righteous Father,' Joh 17:25). In this glorious name of God 'all excellences meet'; purity and tenderness unite, majesty and pity combine. Christ regards this all-sufficient knowledge of God as 'an ideal region of security,' in which His disciples will be safe from harm. As long as they are 'in the name,' it will be impossible for thoughts of God's holiness to suggest that it is dangerous to approach the Holy *Father* (cf. 1Sa 6:20; 1Sa 21:5, and see above). Nor can the revelation in Christ of His 'pitying tenderness Divine' lead to sinful presuming on His grace, and to neglect of moral purity, without which none may hold communion with the *Holy Father*. Therefore, as in the OT the conception of holiness varies with the conception of God, so in the NT the climax of the revelation of the Father in the Son is reached in the harmonizing of the 'many-hued' manifestations (cf. πολυποίκιλος, Eph 3:10) of His glory in the pure, white light of His holy love. The opening petitions of the Lord's Prayer teach that His Kingdom will come and His will be done 'as in heaven, so on earth,' when in His Church on earth as in heaven the name of the Holy Father is hallowed (Mat 6:10 Ἅγιας θήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου ... ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς).

2. The holiness of Christ.—Outside the Gospels holiness is ascribed to Christ in the Acts and the Epistles.—(a) *The Acts*. St. Peter (Act 2:27) and St. Paul (Act 13:35) see in the resurrection of Jesus proof that He is God’s ‘Holy One,’ in whom is fulfilled the Messianic promise that He should not see corruption (Psa 16:10; (Revised Version margin) renders קִדְּוָה ‘godly or beloved,’ see above on ὅσιος). In the prayer of the early Church, Jesus is twice described as Jehovah’s ‘Holy Servant’ (Act 4:27; Act 4:30), and it is probable that St. Peter has in mind Isaiah 53 when he speaks of Jesus as ‘the Holy and Righteous One’ (Act 3:14, cf. Act 3:13). In these passages ἅγιος is applied to the ideal Servant, in whose consecration, even unto death, God’s moral glory was revealed.—(b) *The Epistles*. Our High Priest, for ever ‘separated from sinners,’ is ‘holy’ (Heb 7:26). Here ὅσιος is a comprehensive summary of those inward qualities which were manifested by our Lord’s dutiful submission to His Father’s will: pre-eminently He was ‘pure in heart,’ fitted to exercise, in the presence of God, His ministry of intercession. In Rom 1:4 ‘the spirit of holiness’ is not a synonym of Holy Spirit; holiness is ascribed to the spirit of the Incarnate Son. The πνεῦμα of Christ was human; in this respect He was ‘made like unto his brethren’ (Heb 2:17); but His spirit was holy, and in that He was ‘without sin’ (Heb 4:15), He was unique among men. His ‘spirit of holiness’ was ‘the seat of the Divine nature’; He was filled with the Holy Spirit, and being ‘essentially filled with God’ was ‘full of Divine unpolluted life’ (cf. Meyer, *Com. in loc.*). St. Paul declares that it was in complete accord (κατά) with the transcendent holiness which was the characterizing quality of the spirit of Christ that His Divine Sonship should be visibly manifested in the miracle of His resurrection. In 1Jn 2:20 ‘Ye have an anointing (χρῖσμα) from the Holy One,’ the reference may possibly be to God the Father; but almost certainly the Holy One is Christ (cf. 1Jn 3:3 ‘He is pure,’ and see above). The true reading in Heb 7:27 (αὐτοῦ not τὸ αὐτό), ‘His anointing,’ seems to remove all ambiguity. St. John says that Christians have a chrism from the Christ; and there can be little doubt that the predominant reference in chrism is to the Holy Spirit. It is ‘a faint prelude note,’ and in 1Jn 3:24 ‘the full distinct mention of the Holy Spirit comes like a burst of the music of the “Veni Creator,” carrying on the fainter prelude’ (*Expos. Bible*, p. 170).

The chief contributions to the formal exposition of the NT doctrine of holiness lie beyond the limits of this article. It need occasion no surprise that even to His disciples our Lord should not speak directly concerning holiness until in His farewell prayer He asked that the men called to continue His mission might share His consecration. The reason for His reticence is that ‘in Him, and for them, holiness imported something—far more and other than it did in the religion of the day.... Only as they saw their Lord devote His person in the consummating sacrifice would they be

prepared to realize what their Christian consecration involved' (Findlay, *Expositor*, vi. [1901] iv. 5). It is also significant that the prayer for His disciples' holiness should immediately follow the discourse in which our Lord expounds in welcome detail what is involved in the promise of the Spirit whose gracious indwelling is the secret of holiness.

The Gospels are, however, the supreme revelation of holiness. The imitation of Christ is the royal road to holiness; His teaching concerning union with Himself and the bestowment of the Holy Spirit reveals the secret of holiness. The writers of the Epistles, under the guidance of the promised Teacher, unfolded the implications of their own experience and the purpose of the Incarnation, the Passion, and the abiding Priesthood of the Son of God.

The stress laid on the positive idea, which is probably the primary conception of holiness, may serve to guard Christians against the error of supposing that holiness may be acquired by withdrawals and negations, or by compliance with external regulations. Holiness means the attainment of the Divine likeness, and this consists in moral qualities which are all comprised in holy love. The motive to holiness increases in strength as God is more perfectly known. In proportion as the Holy Father is known as He is, will be the gladness of our response to His claims, and the ardour of our desire to be like Him in this world. Into the world Christ sent the men for whose consecration He prayed, and His promise, 'Ye shall know that ye are in me' (Joh_14:20), conveyed to them His assurance that 'in the world' they should attain to holiness. Life in Christ is holiness.

Literature.—In addition to the books mentioned in the body of the article, see the *Comm.* on the various passages, and works on *Theol. of NT*; also Grimm-Thayer and Cremer, *svv.* ἅγιος, ὁσιος; art. 'Holiness' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible; Issel, *Der Begriff d. Heiligkeit im NT*; Askwith, *Christian Conception of Holiness*.

J. G. Tasker.

☩ Holy One

HOLY ONE.—The expression 'the Holy One,' or 'the Holy One of God,' is used several times in the NT to describe our Lord. It is in itself so remarkable, and used in a manner so calculated to arrest attention, that it has been surmised that we have here a characteristic designation of the Messiah (Meyer on Mar_1:24). While it may be doubted if so positive an assertion can be justified, the expression is sufficiently striking to require a careful examination into its origin and its significance.

A scrutiny of the passages in which the Authorized Version has rendered the Greek expression by 'the Holy One,' will show that for the word 'holy' we have two Greek words, ὅσιος and ἅγιος. Now, since the two passages in which ὅσιος occurs are in a quotation from the LXX Septuagint, and the signification of the term is most likely to be derived from a Hebrew original, it will be necessary to ask if these two words are uniformly used to represent corresponding Hebrew ones, or used indiscriminately to translation different Heb. Words in different places.

In the OT there are two distinct words used for 'holy,' הַמְּיָד and שְׁקֵדוּ, and it is to be carefully noted that in the LXX Septuagint, although ὅσιος translation הַמְּיָד about 30 times, and ἅγιος translation שְׁקֵדוּ, 100 times, in no single instance is ὅσιος used for שְׁקֵדוּ, or ἅγιος for הַמְּיָד. (See Trench, *NT Synonyms*).

It is reasonable, then, to look for the signification of ὅσιος in הַמְּיָד, and ἅγιος; in שְׁקֵדוּ. See art. Holiness.

A. Passages in which our Lord is described as 'Holy One,' ὅσιος being used. As a substantive expression it occurs only in Act 2:27; Act 13:35—in both cases a quotation from Psa 16:10—used first by St. Peter and afterwards by St. Paul,—οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὄσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν. Without a reference to the Hebrew, it might appear that such an expression, taken from the OT and applied by Apostles to Christ, would carry with it peculiar significance; but beyond the fact that the Apostles so used the expression, there is nothing in the words themselves to justify any unique position in which our Lord was described as 'holy.'

B. Passages in which our Lord is described as 'Holy One,' ἅγιος being used. If the examination of the foregoing passages prevents us giving to the word ὅσιος any peculiar significance which would make it describe our Lord as a being of peculiar holiness, the case is quite otherwise when we come to the expression ὁ ἅγιος.

1. *Use of the title.*—We find it first on the lips of the demoniac (Mar 1:24, Luk 4:34), who, in declaring his knowledge of Christ, describes Him as 'the Holy One of God' (οἶδ' ἅ σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ). The words probably made a deep impression on the disciples. We know how vague and uncertain were their views about their Master, and it would seem as if they seized on the demoniac's confession as a revelation of His

claims; for, the next time the title is ascribed to Him, it is by St. Peter himself, when striving to find words to answer our Lord's question if they too intended to abandon Him: 'Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we have believed and know that thou art the Holy One of God' (ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ [so correct reading], Joh 6:69).

St. Peter, in his speech to the people in Solomon's porch (Act 3:14), charges them with denying 'the Holy and Righteous One' (τὸν ἅγιον καὶ δίκαιον). St. John (1Jn 2:20) tells his readers that they have 'an anointing from the Holy One' (ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου). In Rev 3:7 our Lord so describes Himself in the address to the Church of Philadelphia: 'These things saith he that is holy' (τάδε λέγει ὁ ἅγιος).

2. Derivation of the title.—We have seen that the significance of ἅγιος is naturally to be looked for in the Heb. שָׁקֵט, which, like קֹדֶשׁ, is freely employed of places, things, and persons. Yet, while קֹדֶשׁ is used of God only in Jer 3:12 (LXX Septuagint ἐλεήμων) and Psa 145:17 (LXX Septuagint ὁσιος), where it is joined with a reference to His works ('holy in all thy works'), שָׁקֵט is used very frequently to describe God Himself. It is so found in the Books of Job, Psalms, Isaiah, Hosea, and Habakkuk, שָׁקֵט 'the Holy One,' LXX Septuagint ὁ ἅγιος. Besides the simple title 'the Holy One,' God is 24 times called by Isaiah 'the Holy One of Israel'; elsewhere only in Psa 71:22; Psa 78:41; Psa 89:18, Jer 50:29; Jer 51:5, [2Ki 19:22 = Isa 37:23] שָׁקֵט בְּאֵשׁ.

3. Its significance as applied to our Lord.—To men familiar with the OT expressions 'the Holy One' and 'the Holy One of Israel,' as describing God Himself, it would seem almost impossible that the expression could have been used of Christ without a distinct desire to connect His title with that of Jehovah. Every male firstborn was indeed 'holy to the Lord' (Luk 2:23). But on the lips of St. Peter and the demoniac it must he felt to have that special and distinct significance such as Jesus Himself implies in Joh 10:36, when speaking of Himself as one 'whom the Father sanctified (ἡγιασε) and sent into the world.' Spoken by our Saviour of His Father (Joh 17:11), it signifies that which He is absolutely; spoken of Christ Himself, it means both this and also His special dedication to the work of man's salvation (e.g. in Rom 12:1 it is used with the force of a sacrificial metaphor, the victim consecrated to God). Christ was indeed the Holy One of God above all others, but that which He was He came in a

measure to make His people, so that, in the language of the NT, those who through Him were consecrated and set apart were also *οἱ ἅγιοι*. See, further, art. Holiness.

Literature.—Trench, *NT Synonyms*, § lxxxviii.; Westcott on [Heb 7:26](#); Lightfoot on [1 Th 11:10](#); Jennings and Lowe, *Psalms; Jewish Encyc.* vol. vi. s.vv. ‘God’ and ‘Holiness’; Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 202.

J. B. Bristow.

☩ Holy Spirit

HOLY SPIRIT.—With the exception of the 2nd and 3rd Epistles of John, every book in the NT mentions the Spirit. On a comprehensive view, indeed, it may be said that to understand what is meant by the Spirit is to understand these two things—the NT and the Christian Church. Not that the two can be precisely co-ordinated; yet in them and in their mutual relations we have the only adequate witness to what the Spirit means for Christians. To the men who wrote the NT and to those for whom they wrote, the Spirit was not a doctrine but an experience: they did not speak of believing in the Holy Spirit, but of receiving the Holy Spirit when they believed ([Act 19:2](#)). In some sense this covered everything that they included in Christianity. The work of the Christ was summed up in the words: ‘He shall baptize with holy spirit’ ([Mar 1:8](#)). The acceptance of the gospel is the subject of the question: ‘Was it by works of law or by the hearing of faith that you received the Spirit?’ ([Gal 3:2](#)). The entire equality of Jews and Gentiles in the Christian community is asserted in the words: ‘God who knows the heart bore them witness in that he gave the Holy Spirit to them even as he did to us’ ([Act 15:8](#)). After this, there was no more to be said. Yet the very fact that all who speak to us in the NT are familiar with experiences of the Holy Spirit does not always make it easier for us to understand them. It is clear that, very various experiences are described in this way, and sometimes we cannot refrain from asking whether experiences which one writer recounts without any reference to the Spirit would not have been explained as ‘pneumatic’ by another; or *vice versa*, whether experiences ascribed to the Spirit by one writer would not in another have found a different interpretation. Further, there is the difficulty raised by the fact that while the experiences thus explained are represented, broadly speaking, as the work of the Risen Saviour, and as dependent somehow on His death and resurrection, the Spirit appears also in His life on earth. Was this the same thing? When we read that Jesus was baptized with the Holy Spirit, are we to suppose that He had experiences in consequence which were analogous to those of Christians in the Apostolic age? The purpose of this article is to bring out the facts as they are presented in the oldest

Gospel to begin with, and to show from later stages in the history the relation between the Spirit and Jesus the Christ.

1. The earliest reference to the Spirit is in the preaching of the Baptist. To the end John was conscious of the impotence and inadequacy of all his efforts: the true Helper of Israel, whatever else he might be, must be 'One mightier than I.' 'I baptize you with water, he shall baptize you with holy spirit' (Mar_1:8). A Christian Evangelist, like the author of the Gospel, might interpret such words in the light of his own post-Pentecostal experiences; and when we find the later Evangelists (Mat_3:11, Luk_3:16) add to 'holy spirit' the words 'and fire,' it is nearly certain that they have done so.* [Note: The reference of the 'fire' in this connexion to the fire of Gehenna seems to the present writer (in spite of Mat_3:12, Luk_3:17) simply incredible. The true key to it is Act_2:3, and the many passages in which the same or a similar figure recurs, e.g. 1Th_5:19, Rom_12:11, Act_18:25.] But it is not clear that for the Baptist the Holy Spirit of which he spoke was so clearly defined. He had not the Christian experience to put meaning into his words, and he can only have intended something which could be understood through its OT antecedents, or through experiences with which he had been in contact at an earlier period. The earliest form of the Gospel says nothing of such experiences, and when we look backward we cannot but be struck by the almost total disappearance of the Spirit from the apocalyptic literature of Judaism. 'First and Second Maccabees and Daniel are each in a different way witnesses for a very profound religious feeling of exactly the sort that in other ages, either earlier or later, would have been ascribed to the Spirit' (Wood, *The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature*, p. 71; cf. Gunkel, *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes*, p. 50 f.). Yet the Spirit is not appealed to in explanation. When we come to the Hebrew OT, however, the one idea which is dominant in connexion with the Spirit is the one which is wanted here to explain the prophecy of the Baptist—the idea of power as opposed to impotence. The inability of Egypt to help Israel is expressed by Isaiah in the words: 'The Egyptians are men and not God, and their horses flesh and not spirit' (Isa_31:3). Men and flesh are the impotent things, in contrast with the omnipotent, God and spirit. As A. B. Davidson puts it (*Theology of the OT*, 126), 'the Spirit of God *ab intra* is God active, showing life and power ... the Spirit of God *ab extra* is God in efficient operation, whether in the cosmos or as giving life, reinforcing life, exerting efficiency in any sphere.' John the Baptist was a worker for God, but he never claims for himself either to have the Spirit or to be able to give it; he has the sense, however, that when the Mightier than himself comes, He will lie distinguished in precisely these ways. He will baptize with 'holy spirit' in virtue of being full of the Spirit himself.

2. When Jesus comes to be baptized in Jordan, the remarkable phenomenon is that what for others is a baptism with water coincides for Him with a baptism in the Holy

Spirit. According to Mar_1:10, as Jesus ascends from the water, He sees the heavens cleaving and the Spirit as a dove descending upon Him. In the earliest Evangelist this is the experience of Jesus only: it is He who sees the Spirit descending, He to whom the heavenly voice is addressed. The later Evangelists may have conceived it otherwise, and extended the vision and the hearing of the voice to John the Baptist or even to the bystanders: it is indifferent here. All agree that on this occasion Jesus received the Holy Spirit, and in it the attestation of His Sonship, the call to His unique task, and the endowments needed to discharge it.

Critics have suggested that the curiously indirect way in which the baptism of Jesus and the descent of the Spirit are mentioned in Luk_3:21 f. is due to the writer's desire to slur over something which is really inconsistent with his account of Jesus' birth; but even if Luke had difficulty in adjusting these two things, as the Fourth Evangelist may have had difficulty in adjusting the incarnation of the Eternal Logos in Jesus with the descent of the Spirit upon Him in manhood, it is clear that for both the baptism was so securely fixed in the Gospel testimony that they had no alternative but to set it unambiguously down (cf. Joh_1:31-34).

Have we any means of saying what is meant by such words as the Evangelists employ in this connexion? Can we interpret Jesus' experience by what we read of spiritual gifts or states in the Primitive Church? Is it right to look in His life for such phenomena as we find, e.g., in Acts or in 1 Cor. ascribed to the Spirit? May we look for such sudden accesses of feeling as we connect with scenes like Act_2:4; Act_4:31; Act_13:9? Can there be such a thing as the rapture or ecstasy which seems to be meant by being 'in the Spirit' in Rev_1:10; Rev_4:2; Rev_17:3; Rev_21:10? These are not questions to be answered *a priori*. There must have been something in the life of Jesus as determined by the great experience of His baptism akin to the experiences which Christians subsequently ascribed to the Spirit, or they would hardly have traced both to the same source; and the more closely we look into the Gospels, the less does the emotionally colourless Saviour of popular art seem to correspond to the historical reality. The experiences of Jesus at the Baptism and the Transfiguration were not those of everyday life; they belong to 'pneumatic' as contrasted with normal conditions. So again it might be said that if the cleansing of the temple (Mar_11:15 ff.), the cursing of the fig-tree (Mar_11:14), the excitement (apparently) with which, on the way to Jerusalem, Jesus took the lead of His disciples, to their bewilderment and fear (Mar_10:32), had been told of anybody else, that other would have been described, on each occasion, as 'filled with the Holy Spirit.' However this may be (see J. Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*, p. 54 n. [Note: note.] ; O. Holtzmann, *Was Jesus Ekstatiker?*), the Evangelist makes no reference to the Spirit in this connexion. He leaves us to infer from the life which Jesus lived in the Spirit what the Spirit itself was. But it may fairly be said that some of the ideas which Christians subsequently connected with their own baptism were not without relation to the

baptism of Jesus and to the interpretation which they put upon it. It was the facts of His baptism which led them to believe (a) in a normal coincidence of baptism with the Spirit and water baptism, instead of in the displacement of the latter by the former; (b) in the Spirit received in baptism as specifically the spirit of sonship; and (c) in that same Spirit as one consecrating them to God and to service in His kingdom.

3. The first light is thrown on the nature of the Spirit as received by Jesus in the narrative of the Temptations. It is the Spirit which sends Him out to the wilderness, there to engage in conflict with the power of evil. The word ἐκβάλλει (Mar_1:12), though it must not be forced, suggests a Divine impulse which could not be resisted. Jesus was Divinely constrained—for the Spirit is always Divine—to face the ultimate issues of His work from the very beginning, to contemplate all the plausible but morally unsound ways of aiming at ascendancy over men for God, and to turn from them; to face the Prince of this world, and to demonstrate that that Prince had nothing in Him. The most elementary notion of the Spirit may be that of Divine power, but where we see it first at work in Jesus it is Divine power which is at the same time holy; it is at war, in principle, with everything which is unworthy of God; the kingdom which the Son of God is to found in the power of the Spirit is one which can make no kind of compromise with evil. It must be spiritual (in the complete Christian sense) in its nature—not based on bread; spiritual in its methods—not appealing to miracles which only dazzle the senses or confound the mind; and spiritual in its resources—not deriving any of its strength from alliance with Satan, from borrowing the help of the evil which wields such vast power among men, or from recognizing that it has a relative or temporary right to exist. ‘The spirit,’ as Mk. calls it (Mar_1:10; Mar_1:12), while Mt. has ‘God’s spirit’ (Mat_3:16), and Lk. ‘the holy spirit’ (Luk_3:22) or ‘holy spirit’ (Luk_4:1), is the Divine power with which Jesus was endowed at His baptism, and which committed Him to an irreconcilable conflict with evil. It is the conscious and victorious antagonist of another spirit, of which all that need be said is that it is not of God.

4. St. Luke tells us that Jesus returned from the Jordan ‘in the power of the Spirit’ into Galilee (Luk_4:14), and St. Peter in Ac (Act_10:38 f.) tells how God anointed Him (in the Baptism) ‘with holy spirit and power’; and it is under these conditions that the Evangelists conceive His whole ministry to be fulfilled. If they do not mention the Spirit at every step, it is because they think of Him as in full possession of it continually. It probably agrees, e.g., with the Evangelist’s own idea, to say that the passage in Mk. which immediately succeeds the Temptations illustrates first by Jesus’ power over men (Mar_1:16-20), next by His power or authority in teaching (Mar_1:21 f.), and, finally, by His power over demons (Mar_1:23 ff.), what is involved in His possession of the Spirit. A Divine power accompanied all His words and deeds, and made them effective for God and for His kingdom. The allusion in Mar_1:35 to His

rising early and going away to a desert place to pray suggests that, Divine as this power was, it wrought in, and in accordance with the laws of, a human nature which was capable of spiritual exhaustion, and had to recruit its strength with God. We do not find till we come to Mar_3:21 ('they said, He is beside himself,' ἐξέστη) any further indication of how His work in the Spirit affected Jesus. It is clear from this impatient word, in which the same charge is brought against the Lord as was afterwards brought against Paul (see 2Co_5:13, where ἐξέστημεν is opposed to σωφρονούμεν), that the tension of His spirit seemed at times abnormal: He was 'rapt' or 'carried away' by His earnestness, and became for the time unconscious of bodily needs or indifferent to them (cf. the fast in the wilderness, and Joh_4:31 ff.). Possibly even the charge brought against Him by the scribes, that He cast out devils by Beelzebub, in other words, that He was possessed Himself by a demon,—a charge mentioned in this connexion by Mk.,—appealed for support to this tension or rapture. If the character of Jesus' teaching and healing had been that of emotionless placidity, it would not have been even plausible to say δαιμόνιον ἔχει καὶ μαινεται (Joh_8:48; Joh_8:52; Joh_10:20 : these passages from the Fourth Gospel are guaranteed by their agreement with Mar_3:21 f.). There is no trace in the Gospel of any want of self-control,—no such frenzy as is ascribed to the Spirit in 1Sa_19:23 f., or in the description of the glossolalists in 1 Corinthians 14,—but there is a superhuman intensity implied which was felt throughout the life in word and deed.

5. The main interest of the passage Mar_3:20-35 lies in the word of Jesus Himself about the Holy Spirit: 'Verily I say unto you, All things shall be forgiven to the sons of men, the sins and the blasphemies, all that they have blasphemed: but whoso shall have blasphemed the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of eternal sin: because they said, He hath an unclean spirit' (Mar_3:28 f.). It is hardly doubtful that this is the true form of this much discussed saying of Jesus. The Holy Spirit is not here set in any contrast with Jesus, as though to blaspheme Jesus were a venial fault, but to blaspheme the Spirit an unpardonable one; on the contrary, the Holy Spirit is blasphemed when malignant hearts harden themselves to say of *Jesus*, 'He has an unclean spirit.' The Divine power which works through Jesus with such intensity, healing all who are under the tyranny of the devil, is in point of fact God's supreme and final appeal to men. It is such an exercise of power as is possible only for one who has already vanquished Satan, and is engaged in liberating his captives (Mar_3:27). No person with any sense for God in him can help being attracted by it to begin with. But if the other manifestations of this power should happen to provoke resentment,—if its ethical demands (as in the teaching of Jesus) should threaten seriously the reputation or the self-complacency of the insincere,—it is fearfully possible that they may set themselves against it, and so resist the Holy Spirit. Such resistance, once begun, may go to any length, even to the length of defiantly misinterpreting the life of Jesus, and

affirming it to be from beneath, not from above. This is the sin against the Holy Spirit. In principle, it is the everyday sin of finding bad motives for good actions; carried to its unpardonable height, it is the sin of confronting the Divine holy power which wrought so irresistibly and so intensely in Jesus, and saying anything—the maddest, most wanton, most malignant thing—rather than acknowledge it for what it is. The people who said, ‘He has Beelzebul’ (Mar_3:22), ‘He has an unclean spirit’ (Mar_3:30), were not giving expression to their first, but to their last thoughts of Christ. This was the depth which malignity in them had reached. The Holy Spirit receives here a certain interpretation from being contrasted with an ‘unclean’ spirit. ‘Unclean’ is a religious rather than an ethical word; the unclean spirit is one which has not and cannot have relations with God: it can only be excluded from His presence, as it excludes those who are possessed by it. The Holy Spirit is specifically God’s; it brings Him in His power to men, it is the very token and reality of His presence with them. But it is interpreted more precisely—and this is the point of Jesus’ argument as it is brought out in the parallel passage in Mt. and Lk.—by the works which it does. ‘If I in the spirit of God am casting out the demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you’ (Mat_12:28, cf. Luk_11:20, where for ἐν πνεύματι

θεοῦ we have ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ, the Divine power being the essential idea; cf.

Exo_8:10 (15)). When the superhuman power which displays itself with such intensity is manifested in works of this sort, it is clear that it is not merely superhuman, but specifically Divine. To withstand what is so unambiguously the redeeming power of God, and to do so deliberately and malignantly, in the spirit which will kill Jesus rather than acknowledge Him as what He is, is the unpardonable sin.

The form of this saying which appears in Mat_12:31 f. and Luk_12:10 has almost certainly been deflected in tradition. Mt. really has it in two forms, Mat_12:31 by itself corresponding to what we have in Mk., and Mat_12:32 to what we have in Luke. That is, Mat_12:31 f. is a doublet, in which the same saying is found, first as it appeared in the Gospel of Mk., and then as it appeared in the collection of discourses generally allowed to have been used by Mt. and Luke. What is meant in the second form, where a word spoken against the Son of Man is contrasted with blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, is not very clear. Mk., who puts the odious charge, ‘He has an unclean spirit,’ into connexion with the word of Jesus’ friends, ‘He is beside himself,’ might be regarded as giving a key to the meaning, were it not for the fact that ‘the Son of Man’ does not occur in his text at all. An impatient, petulant word, like ‘He is crazy,’ bursting in a moment of anxiety or irritation or misunderstanding from hearts that at bottom loved Him, was no doubt a sin; His friends ought to have been more capable of doing Him justice. But it was not a sin which committed the whole nature blindly and finally against God; it could be repented of, and when it was, then, like other sins, it would be forgiven. This would be the word spoken against the Son of Man. In contrast with such a momentary petulance on the part of His friends stands

the hideous expression in which hatred of God's present saving power reveals its utter antagonism: 'He has an unclean spirit.' Here the nature is finally committed against God; such a word blasphemes His Spirit—that is, it blasphemes God as He is actually here, working in Christ for man's salvation; as such it is sin absolutely, αἰώνιον ἁμάρτημα, *i.e.* sin which has the character, of finality, and can never be anything but what it is—sin past which one cannot see so as to infer the possibility of forgiveness either in this world or in the next.

6. The expulsion of evil spirits from the possessed is regarded in the Gospel as a chief manifestation of the possession by Jesus of the Holy Spirit. But all His miracles are to be understood in this connexion. Without going so far as to say that in the Temptation narratives He is represented as tempted to put to selfish uses the power just conferred through the Spirit in baptism for the ends of God's kingdom, it is a mark of historicity in the canonical Gospels that until He is baptized with the Spirit, Jesus works no miracle. It is the Spirit in which the power is given for all His mighty works (δυνάμεις). It is not likely, however, that when we read of power as having gone forth from Him (which in Mar 5:30 and Luk 6:19 may be only the Evangelist's reading of the facts, but in Luk 8:46 is distinctly ascribed to Jesus Himself), any reference to the Spirit is intended. The wisdom and the mighty works which astonished the Nazarenes (Mar 6:2) would no doubt be referred to this source by the Evangelist; and when in Mar 6:7 Jesus sends out the Twelve, giving them authority over the unclean spirits, it can only have been conceived as due to the transference to them of a part in that Divine power which had been so wonderfully operative in Him (cf. Num 11:17). The idea, however, that it was the Risen Saviour by whom the Spirit was given to the Apostles so dominated the Evangelists, that none of them refers to the Spirit in connexion with this mission of the Twelve during Jesus' lifetime. The Spirit of Jesus in Mar 8:12 is no doubt, as in Mar 2:8, His human spirit; but if we admit that it is to this that the Spirit of God is most akin, or most immediately attached, it is perhaps not fanciful to suppose that the sigh (ἀναστενάξας, cf. in a similar situation Mar 7:34) represents the grieving of the Spirit of God by the unbelief and hard-heartedness of man (cf. Eph 4:30, Isa 63:10). It is more hazardous to argue that only in 'pneumatic' and abnormal conditions—only in a psychological state extraordinarily and violently elevated above the level of common experience—did Jesus identify Himself with the Son of Man, who after a tragic career on earth was to rise again on the third day, or to come on the clouds of heaven (Mar 8:31; Mar 9:31; Mar 10:32 ff; Mar 14:62). Abnormal conditions such as are here supposed do not persist in sane minds, and to call Jesus an 'ecstatic' or a 'pneumatic' in this sense is only to avoid calling Him a fanatic by using a natural instead of a moral term to describe Him. Certainly the Gospel suggests in this period of His life accesses of intense emotion (Mar 8:33) and phenomena both in His aspect (Mar 9:15) and in His

conduct (Mar 10:32) which must have struck people as unusual, and due to something overpowering within, which it would have been natural to call the Spirit; but in point of fact there is no reference to the Spirit in this period. Perhaps the nearest approach to it is in Mar 10:38, where Jesus asks James and John, ‘Are ye able to be baptized with the baptism with which I am baptized?’ There is no doubt that Jesus speaks throughout this scene with unusual elevation of tone; and the figure of baptism, which He could hardly use without recalling the experience at the Jordan and all that His consecration there involved, lifts us into the region where the thought of the Spirit is near. Still, it is not expressed. The Triumphal Entry, the Cleansing of the Temple, and the Blighting of the Fig-tree are all acts implying intensity and elevation of feeling transcending common human limits: often other persons, visited by such impulses with startling suddenness, are said to be ‘filled with holy spirit,’ but in Jesus they do not seem to have made the same impression on bystanders. They did not apparently stand in relief in His life as they would have done in the life of others; little in it is specifically assigned to the Spirit, because the spiritual baptism at the beginning impelled and controlled it throughout. It does not really cast any light on Jesus’ experience of the Spirit, when in Mar 12:36 He quotes Psalms 110 by ‘David himself said in the Holy Spirit’: this merely represents the Jewish belief in the Divine inspiration of Scripture, a belief most distinctly preserved in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where OT quotations are introduced by ‘as saith the Holy Spirit,’ etc. (Heb 3:7; Heb 9:8; Heb 10:15; cf. 2Pe 1:21, 2Ti 3:16, Act 1:16). More important is Mar 13:11, which contains the only promise of the Holy Spirit in the earliest Evangelist. Referring to the persecutions which will come upon the Apostles after His death, Jesus says: ‘When they lead you to judgment and deliver you up, be not anxious beforehand what ye shall speak, but whatever is given to you in that hour, that speak; for it is not you that speak, but the Holy Spirit.’ The Spirit is here conceived as a Divine reinforcement in the very crisis of need. If fidelity to the gospel brings men to extremity, they will not be left there, but will have experience of superhuman help. It is important to notice that the precise character in which the Spirit which comes to the help of the disciples is here conceived as acting is that of a *παράκλητος* or *advocatus*—an idea of which ampler use is made in the Gospel and 1st Epistle of John. The term *παράκλητος* may be due to the Evangelist, but the conception of the Spirit’s function goes back to the Lord. It is not the Holy Spirit which is referred to in Mar 14:38; and in Mar 16:16-20, although mention is made, as is natural in a late passage based on other NT writings, of most of what are usually called spiritual gifts, the Spirit itself is not expressly named.

If, then, we try to sum up the oldest Evangelic representation, we can hardly say more than that the Holy Spirit is the Divine power which from His baptism onward wrought in Jesus, making Him mighty in word and deed—a power the character of which is shown by the teaching and by the saving miracles of Jesus—a power to which

the sanctity of God attached, so that it is Divine also in the ethical sense, and to blaspheme it is the last degree of sin—a power in which Jesus enabled His disciples to some extent to share, and which He promised would be with them in the emergencies of their mission—a power, however, which (contrary to what we might have anticipated) the Evangelist does not bring into prominence at any of the crises or intense moments of Jesus' life. It takes nothing less than that life itself, from beginning to end, to show us what the Spirit means. If the last Evangelist tells us that the Spirit interprets Jesus, the inference from the first is that Jesus also interprets the Spirit, and that only through Him can we know what it means.

7. If we turn from Mark to the other Evangelic source common to Mt. and Lk., we find little to add to this. Both our First and our Third Evangelists have everything which Mk. has, and their variations (e.g. Mat 3:11, Luk 3:16 as opp. Mar 1:8; Mat 12:31 f., Luk 12:10 as opp. Mar 3:28 f.; Mat 10:20, Luk 12:12; Luk 21:15 as opp. Mar 13:11) have been noticed already, or are of no consequence. But when we look at what is peculiar to Mt. and to Lk. respectively, there is more to say. Omitting for the moment the first two chapters in each, we notice these points.

(a) It is a mark of historicity in Mt. that in recording the Sermon on the Mount he nowhere alludes to the distinction of 'letter' and 'spirit' which occurs so spontaneously to the modern interpreter of the words of Jesus. On the other hand, in Mat 7:22 we have an utterance of Jesus reproduced in terms which have almost certainly been influenced by post-Pentecostal experiences of the Spirit. It was only then that men 'prophesied' in the name of Jesus, etc., and till they had done so, such language as this could not have been used. Comparison with Luk 13:25 ff. justifies us in saying that we have here the word rather than the words of the Lord. But in any case, the idea that the most amazing gifts of the Spirit are worthless apart from common morality—the idea expanded in 1 Corinthians 13—is here traced back to Jesus Himself. It is difficult to understand a Divine power, the action of which, so to speak, elevates and reinforces the nature, without raising the character; yet this is undeniably what is contemplated both by Jesus and by St. Paul. Perhaps the underlying truth is that the moral nature is the deepest and the hardest to penetrate by the Divine power, and may remain unaffected by it when other elements of our being have been subdued to its service. The unnaturalness of such a result is reflected on by Jesus in Mat 11:21 f., where woes are pronounced on the cities which had seen so many of His mighty works, yet had not repented. It is implied that these mighty works, the works of the Spirit in Him, were of such a character—that is, so holy and gracious—that they ought to have evoked penitence, and brought a new moral life into being. An interesting light is thrown on the Evangelist's own conception of the Spirit in relation to Jesus, by his application to our Lord of the prophecy in Isa 42:1-4 'I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles,' etc. (Mat 12:18-21). Here not only the power of Jesus, which gives Him assurance of final

victory (Mat 12:20), but His method and His temper—His meekness, patience, constancy—are ascribed to the Spirit. The presence and power of God are felt in His superhuman renunciation of the ordinary ways and tempers of men as much as in the superhuman resources which He wielded. It is again a mark of historicity in Mt. that we find no mention of the Spirit where in a writer dominated by the consciousness of a later time we should certainly have expected it—that is, in the passages which speak of what are sometimes called ecclesiastical prerogatives or functions (Mat 16:18 ff; Mat 18:15-20). Contrast with these Joh 20:22 f., Act 15:28. The Trinitarian baptismal formula, however it be explained, throws no light on the Spirit as an experience in the life of Jesus (Mat 28:19).

(b) St. Luke's interest in the Spirit, as the most conspicuous phenomenon in primitive Christianity, is well known, and it is apparent in his Gospel. Thus he describes Jesus, as the result of His baptism, as πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου (Luk 4:1), where the adjective seems intended to describe a permanent condition, as opposed to the verb (used of sudden and transient accesses of the Spirit in Luk 1:41; Luk 1:67). Similarly he says that in the wilderness ἤγετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι (Luk 4:1), which seems to signify an intense, rapt, and absorbed state of feeling, in which He was carried up and down the desert. The form of words is used elsewhere to describe either possession by an evil spirit (Mar 1:23 ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ) or ecstasy in the Divine (Rev 1:10 ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι). More instructive is the way in which St. Luke puts the whole ministry of Jesus under the heading of the Spirit. He returns from the Jordan to Galilee ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος, and it is this power which is the key to all the marvellous life which follows (Luk 4:14, cf. the summary account of Jesus' life by the same writer from the lips of St. Peter in Act 10:38). But though power—that is, the presence of God, who can do what men cannot do—is the fundamental note of the Spirit, it is not power undefined. St. Luke has no sooner spoken of Jesus as entering on His work in the power of the Spirit, than he interprets this by the scene at Nazareth where Jesus applies to Himself the prophecy of Isa 61:1 f. 'The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach glad tidings to the poor,' etc. (Luk 4:16 f.). 'The words of grace which proceeded out of his mouth' on this occasion (Luk 4:22), and the spiritual healings which He wrought, were as unmistakably tokens of the Spirit as the 'mighty works' which the Nazarenes had heard of as wrought at Capernaum.

If the reading of the TR [Note: R Textus Receptus.] in Luk 9:55 (οὐκ οἴδατε οἴου πνεύματος ἐστε ὑμεῖς) has any authority, it is to the same intent: the spirit in which Jesus came, to seek and save the lost, was the very opposite of that which wished to call down fire from heaven on the inhospitable Samaritans. There is an approach here to

the sense of 'temper' or 'disposition' for spirit, but it is temper or disposition regarded in relation to the power which produces it; the Divine power which works in Jesus makes Him a Saviour, and it is therefore quite different from that other power, whatever it be, which has found its instruments in James and John.

One of the most interesting singularities in Lk. is his reference to the Spirit in [Luk_10:21](#) || [Mat_11:25](#) 'In that hour Jesus rejoiced in the Holy Spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father,' etc. Both Evangelists, in giving the one passage in the Synoptic tradition which has the Johannine ring, are conscious of its peculiar elevation of thought and feeling, but only Lk. interprets it in this way. The authority on which he depended must have preserved for him the remembrance of a joyful excitement thrilling Jesus as He spoke. The context, too, favours this. The Seventy return to Jesus ([Luk_10:17](#)) exulting that even the demons are subject to them in His name. In a sudden flash Jesus reveals to them what He had seen in their absence, and through their little successes: ἐθεώρουν τὸν Σατανᾶν ὡς ἀστραπὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεσόντα. ([Luk_10:18](#)). It is in the consciousness of this final victory, and of His power to make even His feeble followers more than conquerors, that, after warning them not to trust in what they can do for God, but rather in God's faithful love to them, He breaks into what Lk. evidently regarded as His rapturous utterance. It is not with resignation, but with Divine exultant gladness, that Jesus accepts the Father's will as revealed in the results of His work. The Spirit is not connected with revelation either here or anywhere else in the life of Jesus, but only with the overpowering, joyful emotion of the hour. And the connexion of the Spirit and of joy is one of the most striking characteristics of the NT all through (see [Luk_1:14](#) f., [Rom_14:17](#), [Gal_5:22](#), [Act_13:52](#), [1Th_1:6](#)). No authority can be claimed for the v.l. in [Luk_11:2](#), according to which, instead of 'Thy kingdom come,' or 'Hallowed be thy name,' we should read, 'Thy Holy Spirit come upon us and cleanse us.' Yet it is in keeping with St. Luke's interest in the Spirit that this reading is found here and not in Mt.'s version of the prayer (see Plummer's *St. Luke*, p. 295 n. [Note: note.]). It is another proof of this interest that in [Luk_11:13](#) πνεῦμα ἅγιον replaces the 'good things' of [Mat_7:11](#) : for St. Luke, all 'good things' which Christians could ask from the Father were summed up in the Spirit. This is a clear case of later experience interpreting the words of Jesus and giving the sense of them in its own terms. Perhaps if another than Jesus had been in question, we might have read that the passionate words of [Luk_12:49](#) f. broke from His lips when He was 'filled with holy spirit'; but to the Evangelist Jesus is always 'full of the Holy Spirit,' and no such points stand in relief in His career. Oddly enough, Lk. omits any mention of the Spirit in connexion with Psalms 110 ([Luk_20:41](#) ff.), though both Mt. and Mk. seem to emphasize it, and in [Luk_21:15](#) he replaces the express promise of the Spirit, which he has already used in [Luk_12:12](#), by a more general promise of an irresistible power of speech such as he ascribes in [Act_6:10](#) to a man full of the Holy Spirit. There is no reference to the Holy Spirit in [Luk_23:46](#). The

last light the Evangelist throws on it is in Luk 24:49, where the Risen Saviour describes it as ‘the promise of my Father,’ and as ‘power from on high.’ The last word, therefore, brings us back to the first. The fundamental idea to be associated with the Spirit is that of Divine power: how the Divine power is to be further characterized, what it is ethically, and to what issues or in what temper it works, we can see only in the life of Jesus. He is the key to the interpretation of a term which of itself is indefinite indeed.

8. From the life of Jesus, as covered by the Apostolic testimony (Act 1:12 f.), we now turn to the chapters of Mt. and Lk. which tell the story of His birth. If Mk. is the earliest form of the Evangelic tradition, it is natural to say (whatever the Evangelist’s own Christology may be) that the Divine sonship of Jesus was originally connected with His baptism. It was there He received the Holy Spirit and heard the heavenly voice which said, ‘Thou art my Son.’ It would be all the more natural for Christians to say this who read in their Gospel of Luke (Luk 3:22), with *Codex Bezae*, ‘Thou art my Son, *this day have I begotten thee.*’ But as soon as reflexion woke, it would be apparent that Jesus could not suddenly, at the age of thirty or thereabouts, begin to be what He had in no sense been, or been destined and prepared for, before. This is the conviction which—not to speak of historical evidence—sustains the stories of the birth of Christ. He must always have been what Christians eventually knew Him in their own experience to be: He must always have been Son of God. If it is the Spirit which makes Him Son, then behind the baptism with the Spirit must lie a birth in which the Spirit is equally important: not only the equipment of this personality, but its origination, must be traced directly to God. And it *is* the origination of the personality of Jesus with which both Mt. and Lk. are concerned. Neither of them betrays any idea that the Son of God pre-existed, and that they are only narrating the mode in which He came from another order of being into this; and, difficult as it may be to understand how a companion and friend of St. Paul could ignore such an idea, we must abide by the facts as they are before us. No act of man, but only the power of God, lies behind and explains the existence of Jesus Christ in the world. In Mt. the story is told simply and briefly: Mary was found with child *ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου* (Mat 1:18; Mat 1:20). It is this which makes the Child to be *Immanuel*, ‘God with us.’ In Luke, though the setting is much more elaborate, the place and significance of the Spirit in the story are the same. The angel of the Annunciation says to Mary (Luk 1:35): *πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι· διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται, υἱὸς θεοῦ.* It is in virtue of this mode of origination that the future child is ἅγιον, Son of God. It is important to notice here the parallelism of *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* and *δύναμις ὑψίστου*. The two expressions are precisely equivalent. In the life and work of Jesus, the Divine power can reveal itself ethically (as the Gospel story shows in detail), but in the origination of His personality

there is no room for anything to appear but bare power. The action of the Spirit is to be conceived not as sexual but as creative. This marks the truth as well as the purity of the NT. In the OT, where the gender of רוּחַ can be determined, the feminine instances are to the masculine as more than two to one; but in the NT this is irrelevant. πνεῦμα is of no gender. Few will be persuaded by O. Holtzmann (*Leben Jesu and War Jesus Ekstatiker?* p. 41) that the Gospel according to the Hebrews, in which Jesus is introduced as speaking of the Holy Spirit as His mother, represents anything more primitive or original on that account. To call the Spirit either 'mother' or 'father' is equally inept and un-Christian: the Spirit is the power of the Highest, to which the presence of the Son of God in the world is due. In other words, the Divine Sonship of Jesus does not date from His baptism, as that of Christians; it is not with Him as with us an affair of re-birth, but of birth simply; it is native and original, with roots as deep as His being; He is not only υἱὸς θεοῦ , but μονογενής .

9. But it is not only the birth of Jesus which in Luke 1, 2 is connected with the Spirit: all the events of this period are transacted, so to speak, in an atmosphere agitated by the Spirit. The representation is conditioned partly by OT conceptions of the Spirit, and partly, no doubt, by primitive Christian experiences of it. Thus in Luk_1:15 the angel says of John: $\text{πνεύματος ἁγίου πλησθήσεται ἔτι ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ}$, words in which we can think only of a Divine energy or intensity of life which was to characterize the child from the first. Possibly the juxtaposition of this with the prohibition of wine and strong drink (cf. Act_2:13, Eph_5:18) suggests the excitement or stimulation of the nature by God as opposed to any natural intoxicant. Yet the work which John is to do in consequence ('many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God,' Luk_1:16), shows that the Divine power is conceived as working to ethical issues, and therefore as itself ethical. In the OT 'the spirit is never used as a cause except of those things which have to do with the affairs of the people of Israel' (Wood, *op. cit.* p. 9); and this is the point of view maintained throughout these chapters in Luke. The Spirit is connected with the Messianic age (this is universally the case in the NT), and with the preparations for the coming of the Messiah. In John, who comes 'in the spirit and power of Elijah' (Luk_1:17), it is a prophetic spirit, yet rather in the OT than in the NT sense: indeed, it is the outstanding feature in the consciousness of John that he neither has nor can impart holy spirit. When it is said that Elisabeth 'was filled with holy spirit, and lifted up her voice with a loud cry' (Luk_1:42), we must think of a sudden and overpowering access of feeling referred to God as its source. The same remark applies to Zacharias (Luk_1:67) as he utters the *Benedictus*: in both cases the emotion is one of joy (see above, § 7). More significant are the references to the Spirit in connexion with Simeon (Luk_2:25 ff.). He was a just and devout man, cherishing the Messianic hope, and it was probably conditioned by this character that $\text{πνεῦμα ἴην ἅγιον ἐπ' αὐτόν}$. Yet this

can hardly mean that he had an abiding possession of the Spirit. No such possession of the Spirit is contemplated anywhere in these chapters, and Simeon is presented to us only in relation to this one scene from the infancy of Jesus. All through his action here he is a Divinely impelled, Divinely illuminated man. This is what is meant by the words quoted. It is 'in the Spirit'—that is, under a Divine impulse—that he comes into the temple; it has been revealed to him 'by the Holy Spirit'—that is, he has had a Divine assurance granted him—that he will see the Christ before he dies. How this impulse or this revelation was imparted to Simeon the Evangelist does not tell, and it is vain to ask. But we need not say that it was not mediated at all, but blankly supernatural. The words in Luk 2:34 f. could not have been spoken by a young man; here 'old experience doth attain to something of prophetic strain.' Perhaps we may say as much of the ancient prophetess Anna (Luk 2:36 ff.). *προφητις* implies the Spirit, yet apart from this one occasion, at the presentation of the Child Jesus in the temple, when she gave thanks to God—no doubt in such an outburst of inspired feeling as is seen in the *Nunc dimittis*—we have no means of knowing how the Spirit expressed itself through her. For this sudden and eager outburst of thanksgiving (so much is implied in *αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐπιστάσα ἀνθωμολογεῖτο τῷ θεῷ*) we may perhaps compare St. Luke's account of the first Spirit-given utterances at Pentecost: 'We do hear them speak in our tongues the mighty works of God' (Act 2:11).

10. In the Synoptic Gospels, what is said of the Spirit no doubt bears the impress, here and there, of experiences which were familiar to the writers under that name, but these experiences do not come independently into view. It is otherwise when we pass beyond the Synoptics. Writers like St. Luke in Acts, and St. Paul in many of his Epistles, deal directly and formally with this subject. In the Gospel of John there is reached even a stage of conscious reflexion upon it which may almost be called a doctrine of the Spirit. And everywhere in the NT there are casual lights thrown upon it in which we can see its place in Christian thought and life. It is not intended here to follow out these in detail, but to indicate in outline the main features of the post-Pentecostal experience and conception of the Spirit, keeping especially in view their relation to Christ and the Gospels.

11. Although there might be reasons for beginning with St. Paul, it is more convenient to follow up Lk.'s Gospel by Acts. The first reference of this book to the Spirit is one of the most singular: Jesus is spoken of as having 'given commandment through the Holy Spirit unto the apostles whom he had chosen' (Act 1:2). Though Jesus in the Gospel speaks and acts from beginning to end as one anointed with Holy Spirit and power, there is no parallel to this expression. It seems to suggest that with the Resurrection the dispensation of the Holy Spirit began, and that the disciples were conscious, as they listened to the new and final charge of their Lord, that they were in contact, as they had never been before, with the powers of the world to come

([Heb 6:5](#)), the Divine inspiration of the Messianic age. This power with which the Risen Saviour is invested He bids the disciples themselves expect within a few days ([Act 1:5](#)). It is the promise of the Father: 'Ye shall receive power when the Holy Spirit is come upon you, and ye shall be my witnesses' ([Act 1:8](#)). This promise was made good at Pentecost, when 'all were filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance' ([Act 2:4](#)). The representation of the tongues in Acts 2 as foreign languages has to be controlled by St. Paul's description in 1 Corinthians 14. The miracle of Pentecost is not that the disciples spoke in foreign languages, which, in spite of the narrator, is meaningless and incredible, but that they spoke at all, that they spoke with tongues of fire, and that their speech was a testimony to Jesus, delivered with overwhelming Divine power. The whole Pentecostal phenomenon, including the emotional disturbance which suggested drunkenness ([Act 2:13](#)), and expressed itself in joyful if inarticulate thanksgivings ([Act 2:11](#), cf. [1Co 14:16](#)), has the character of a testimony to Jesus. The central thought of the whole is that of [Act 2:33](#) 'Having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured forth this which ye both see and hear.' Pentecost, or the gift and possession of the Spirit, is the proof to the world of the exaltation of Jesus. It is His Divine power which is behind this incalculable elevation and reinforcement of the natural life. This is the NT point of view throughout. There is such a thing as a spirit which is not of God, but *the* Spirit which Christians have and of which they speak is never anything else than the Spirit of Jesus. It is never an undefined impulse or stimulus—a vague excitement originating anyhow and tending anywhither: it is always referred specifically to Jesus, and it is fundamentally a token that He is there in power ([Act 5:32](#)). That there is an abnormal or pathological side to speaking with tongues need not be questioned; the equilibrium of a weak and sinful nature may easily be disturbed by the sudden irruption into it of such incalculable realities as the resurrection of Jesus, the redeeming love and the coming judgment of God; but any degree of disturbance is better than in difference and insensibility. The only question is how the disturbance is to settle—whether men are to rise out of it into the balance of a renewed nature at a higher level, or to sink out of it into the old torpor again. The disturbance itself is the work of God through His Spirit—the Spirit of the Risen Saviour—whatever the issue be. For other references in Acts to speaking with tongues as the most conspicuous sign of having the Spirit, see [Act 10:46](#), [Act 19:6](#) : probably this is what is meant when we read of the Spirit *falling* on (ἐπιπίπτειν) people as in [Act 8:15](#) f.

More important than speaking with tongues, even in Acts, is prophecy. St. Peter's sermon in Acts 2 is a specimen of Christian prophecy; this Spirit enables him to read the OT (Joel and the Psalms) in a Christian sense, and to find in it Jesus and the Messianic age. It is similarly inspired men—'by the παρακλήσις of the Holy Spirit'

([Act 9:31](#))—under whose ministry the Church is multiplied, Five such men are mentioned by name as working in the Church at Antioch ([Act 13:1](#) f.). The seven at Jerusalem ([Act 6:3](#)) are chosen as men full of the Spirit and faith. The daughters of Philip, who prophesied, were women who shared in this gift ([Act 21:9](#)). Sometimes the prophecy had the character of prediction: e.g. Agabus ([Act 11:28](#)) signified ‘through the Spirit’ an impending famine, just as at a later date ([Act 21:11](#)) he foretold what awaited Paul at Jerusalem: ‘thus saith the Holy Spirit.’ It is no doubt the utterances of such ‘inspired’ men that are in view when St. Paul himself says ([Act 20:23](#)): ‘The Holy Spirit testifieth unto me in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me’ (cf. [Act 21:4](#)). It is important to note that St. Paul did not find it necessary to obey when Christian men said to him ‘through the Spirit that he should not set foot in Jerusalem.’ In some way he could urge the Spirit within him against this spirit without: ‘I go bound in the spirit to Jerusalem’ ([Act 20:22](#), cf. [Act 19:21](#)). He felt a Christian obligation to go at all hazards, and went against all omens. Akin to these warnings is the general guidance of the Church and the Apostles by the Spirit, especially at important crises. For example, in chs. 8 and 10, where it is important to represent that the extension of the Church beyond the Jews was Divinely authorized, the whole story is told at the supernatural level, and the Spirit appears at every turn: ‘the Spirit said to Philip’ ([Act 8:29](#), cf. [Act 8:26](#)); ‘the Spirit of the Lord snatched Philip away’ ([Act 8:39](#)); ‘while Peter was pondering the vision, the Spirit said, Behold two men seek thee ... I have sent them’ ([Act 10:19](#) f.); ‘the Spirit bade me go with them, nothing doubting’ ([Act 11:12](#)). How the Spirit made such communications we need not inquire: but it is important to notice that they are not about indifferent things. There is nothing of the pagan oracle which deals with any question proposed to it: the Spirit gives direction only in the concerns of the Kingdom of the Messiah. For other and striking illustrations connected with this guidance of the Church in the preaching of the gospel see [Act 13:2](#) (where, no doubt, the Spirit spoke through an inspired man), [Act 13:4](#), [Act 15:28](#), [Act 16:6-7](#); [Act 16:10](#). The last verse probably shows that too hard and fast a line is not to be drawn between the voice of the Spirit and inferences drawn from facts by Christian intelligence.

One point of interest in Acts is the relation of the Spirit to baptism. The gift of the Spirit is itself represented beforehand as a baptism ([Act 1:5](#) ‘ye shall be baptized with holy spirit not many days hence’). After Pentecost, instead of displacing and annulling water-baptism, as we might have anticipated, the baptism with the Spirit is regarded as normally coincident with the other: ‘Repent and be baptized ... and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit’ ([Act 2:38](#), cf. [Act 9:17](#) ff.). When people believed and were baptized, and the Holy Spirit did not fall on any of them, it was abnormal and disconcerting,—at least on St. Luke’s theory ([Act 8:14-17](#)),—and steps were taken to remedy it. It must be remembered that the only baptism spoken of in Acts is that of adult penitent believers, and that for such persons the public confession of their faith, in a ritual act, was naturally the occasion of profoundly

moving experiences—experiences which, as rising into higher ranges of thought and feeling than usual, were ascribed by the early Church to the Spirit. To find in Act 8:14-17 or Act 19:1-7 an analogue of ‘confirmation,’ a sacrament supplementary to baptism, and capable of being conferred only by an Apostle or by a bishop as his successor, is an anachronism. The gifts of the Holy Spirit bestowed on these two occasions when Apostles prayed and laid their hands on the baptized, were what may be called spiritual gifts falling within the sphere of the senses; ‘they spoke with tongues and prophesied’ (Act 19:6). In confirmation, this is neither asked nor wanted, but this and nothing else is what is desiderated by St. Luke. The emotional stimulation, which liberates the hidden powers of human nature, is itself the gift of the Holy Spirit in virtue of which people become glossolalists or prophets. But though, for the reason already stated, the gift of the Spirit is the normal accompaniment of baptism, the order of the two things may be reversed. Cornelius and his household are baptized, not in order to receive, but because they have received, the Spirit (Act 10:44-48). And more important than any single observation is the fact that in Acts, as elsewhere in the NT, the reception of the Spirit is the whole of Christianity. ‘They received the Holy Spirit even as we did’ (Act 10:47, Act 11:15, Act 15:8 f.). All that makes a man a Christian is in this, and where this is there can be no distinction of Jew or Gentile more. The Church is one in the unity of the Spirit.

12. In St. Paul’s Epistles the Holy Spirit is mentioned nearly 120 times, and may be said to have a prominence and importance which it has nowhere else in the NT. It is impossible to discuss it in detail here. On the one hand, we have representations of the Spirit, and of the effects produced by its reception, entirely similar to those in Acts: St. Paul’s whole ministry, in word and deed, has been accomplished in the power of the Holy Spirit (Rom 15:13 f.); those who receive his gospel receive the Spirit; the chief *χαρίσματα*, or spiritual gifts, are speaking with tongues and prophesying (1Th 5:19-22, 1 Corinthians 12-14). Though St. Paul was distinguished himself, above everyone at Corinth, by his experiences of the glossolalic ecstasy, and thanked God for it (1Co 14:18), and though he discouraged the sober-minded Thessalonians who would have hastily repressed it (this is what is meant by ‘Quench not the Spirit’ in 1Th 5:19), he was not insensible to its dangers. There was something morbid in it; it might be tainted with vanity and self-indulgence; there was nothing in it to edify the Church. Good Christians might even be conceived as thanking God that they did *not* speak with tongues. Even the higher gift of prophecy needs criticism and control. The man who comes to the church with a ‘teaching’ or a ‘revelation’ may come in the Spirit,—he may be an inspired man,—but he is not irresponsible, nor is he exempt from the criticism and control of the Church. ‘Prophets’ spirits are subject to prophets’ (1Co 14:32): the Divine impulse under which the prophet in each case speaks is not an uncontrollable force which must have its way irrespective of order or decorum. Neither does it guarantee infallibility: the

human individuality counts for something in every utterance, and when two or three ‘prophets’ have spoken the others are to judge (1Co 14:29). The Christian common sense of the community, so to speak, is felt to be more inspired than the most ardent utterance of any individual. St. Paul even mentions among *χαρίσματα* one which he calls *διακρίσεις πνευμάτων*—the faculty of deciding on each occasion what is the true character of the impulse under which a man speaks, and in particular whether it is of God or not. The conception of a spiritual gift of this kind—an instinctive sense for what is or is not in keeping with the gospel—is peculiar. It brings us within sight of what is characteristically Pauline in the conception of the Spirit, namely, a possession of the Spirit which is beyond all particular ‘gifts’ or ‘operations’ of a spiritual kind, which is, in short, identical with Christian life. To quote from Mr. Wood (*op. cit.* 268): ‘Paul grasped the idea of the unity of the religious life, and spoke of the spirit not merely as God acting in an occasional extraordinary and emotional experience, but as being the Divine source and basis of all the Christian life. For him the Holy Spirit is the cause not only of religious experiences, but of religious experience. The test of the Spirit of God in a man is no longer subjective emotion, but the objective value of his life for the progress of the will of God as working itself out in the Church.’ In comparison with the Spirit in this large sense, the particular manifestations or gifts of the Spirit which are discussed at length in Romans 12, 1 Corinthians 12-14, Ephesians 4, have a subordinate though a vital importance. The main point is that for St. Paul Christian life and life in the Spirit are one thing. All Christian graces are the fruit of the Spirit (Gal 5:22). The Christian God is He who supplies the Spirit (Gal 3:5). To become a Christian is to receive the Spirit (Gal 3:2). To live as a Christian is to walk in or by the Spirit (Gal 5:16). The Spirit and faith are correlative terms, and each of them covers, from a different point of view, all that is meant by Christianity. Regarded from the side of God and His grace and power in initiating and maintaining it, Christianity is the Spirit; regarded from the side of man and his action and responsibility in relation to God, it is faith. The two are coextensive, and all Christianity is in each. This is vividly expressed in one of those sentences in which St. Paul concentrates his whole mind on the greatest things: *ἡμεῖς γὰρ πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης ἀπεκδεχόμεθα* (Gal 5:5). Here is everything that enters into Christianity and determines it to be what it is. Like the old religion, it has in *δικαιοσύνη* its hope or goal; but in its attitude to this, nothing is determined by law, in any sense of that word; there are only two powers of which St. Paul is conscious as counting for anything in his soul—the one is Divine (the Spirit), the other is human (faith); and though these are distinguishable, they cannot be known apart. Cf. 2Th 2:13 *ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος καὶ πίστει ἀληθείας*, where ‘in consecration wrought by God’s Spirit, and belief of the truth,’ is to be interpreted in the same way.

Without going into details, it is pertinent to point out the connexions between this Pauline conception of the Spirit and what we find in the life of Jesus. (a) To begin with, the Spirit is for St. Paul specifically Christian. It is not the power or the life of God *simpliciter*, but the power or the life of God as God has been manifested in Christ, and especially in His resurrection and exaltation. He calls it expressly the Spirit of Christ (Rom 8:9); it is an epistle of Christ that is written on men's hearts by the Spirit of the living God (2Co 3:3); he even goes so far as to say, the Lord is the Spirit (2Co 3:17), and he who is joined to the Lord is one spirit (1Co 6:17). The presence of the Spirit is, it may be said, the spiritual presence of the Lord; it is not an indefinite power of God, but the last Adam who has become life-giving spirit (1Co 15:45). When a criterion of 'spiritual' utterances is sought, it is found in Jesus (1Co 12:3): to say Jesus is anathema proves that it is not God's Spirit in which one speaks; but only in the Holy Spirit can one say 'Jesus is Lord.' To confess the exaltation, not of an unknown person, but of Jesus, and to live in the acknowledgment of Jesus at the right hand of the Father, is to be a genuine Christian. Passages like these prove that if there was any danger in the Pauline churches of an ecstatic enthusiasm doing less than justice to the historical character of Christianity, it was a danger to which St. Paul was alive from the first, and which he did his best to obviate. That St. Paul and the members of his churches had such an acquaintance with the historical tradition of Jesus as gave definite meaning to His name, the writer has no doubt.—(b) A further point in St. Paul's conception of the Spirit, which connects it essentially with Jesus, is seen in this: it is a spirit of adoption or sonship, breaking out in the loud and joyful cry, 'Abba, Father.' All who are led by it are sons of God. Because they are sons, God has sent forth the Spirit of His Son into their hearts (Rom 8:14 ff., Gal 4:6). It is not a spirit of δουλεία or δειλία (2Ti 1:7), but of trust and joy. (c) Especially as a spirit of sonship is it a spirit of freedom: ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμα· οὗ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου, ἐλευθερία (2Co 3:17). Ἐλεύθερος, ἐλευθερία, and ἐλευθεροῦν are great Pauline words in this connexion. What they suggest is the emancipation of the Christian life from everything statutory, whatever its origin. The Christian is not under law, but under grace; no statute contributes in the least degree to make him what he is, or to give him the experiences which he has; it is as he stands in the presence of the crucified and risen Christ, and abandons himself in faith to the Divine love there revealed, that the Divine power descends into his heart which annuls all the statutes and conventions he has ever known, and is itself *everything* to him henceforth. It is under the inspiration of this power, and of this power alone, that he now lives and acts; not conformity to any external standard, however high, but moral originality like that of Jesus, because inspired by the consciousness of Jesus and of all he owes to Him, is what is required of him at every step. That such a conception is not without moral perils, and that it is capable of being abused, St. Paul was well aware (Gal 5:13, Rom 6:14); but it is in one respect the fundamental truth of his

gospel, and he would never compromise upon it. That it has its basis in the teaching of Jesus—as its supreme illustration in the whole life of Jesus—we may see from the Sermon on the Mount, or from Mat 17:24-27, Joh 8:31-36.—(d) Again, the Pauline idea of the earnest of the Spirit (ἀροραβών 2Co 1:22; 2Co 5:5, Eph 1:14), or of the first-fruits of the Spirit (ἀπαρχή, Rom 8:23), according to which the Spirit is a guarantee of eternal life, is continuous with the teaching of Jesus. The Spirit is such a guarantee because it is a quickening spirit, ‘the Spirit of him that raised Jesus from the dead’ (Rom 8:11); it brings to men the life of God, the same life that was manifested in Jesus, and that made it impossible that He should be holden of death (Act 2:24). The argument, or rather the assumption of the Apostle, in all these passages is the same as that of Jesus in His answer to the Sadducees. When God has pledged His friendship to men as He did to the patriarchs in ancient days, or as He does to Christians now in making them, through the Spirit, partakers of His own life, He has entered into a relation to them to which death can make no difference. His love outwardly, His Spirit inwardly, both mean immortality. They both say of God’s flock: ‘They shall never perish; none can pluck them out of the Father’s hand’ (Joh 10:29). The only difference is that when immortality is deduced from the possession of the Spirit (that is, the life of God), it is referred, so to speak, to a natural or supernatural law, and we see it as part of a constitution of things; whereas when it is deduced from the friendship of God, we see it purely as a gift of His grace.—(e) Formally, there is one great contrast which brings out the meaning of spirit in St. Paul, but which cannot be directly connected with Jesus, the contrast of spirit and flesh. This pervades the Apostle’s writings, and is conspicuous in such passages as Romans 8, Galatians 5. The flesh represents for him sin in its virulent and constitutional character; the Spirit is the Divine power given to the believer in Jesus, which enables him to do what the Law could not do—to vanquish or put to death the flesh. Yet when St. Paul learned the lesson that only the Spirit could overcome the flesh, he merely learned what Jesus taught the rich ruler—‘There is none good but one, that is God’ (Mar 10:18)—with its necessary inference, that for any goodness we can ever attain we must be absolutely dependent on God. St. Paul’s gospel means not only that we must be so dependent, but that by God’s mercy such dependence is made possible for us: God puts His Holy Spirit in those who believe in Jesus, with their sanctification expressly in view (1Th 4:7 f.). There is, of course, a reference here to the OT conception of the Spirit in Eze 36:27; Eze 37:14.

The passages in which the Spirit is regarded by St. Paul as a source of knowledge or revelation are among the most difficult in his writings, and have nothing analogous to them in the Synoptic words of Jesus. Besides 1Co 12:8 (where the ‘word of wisdom’ and the ‘word of knowledge’ are mediated through the Spirit) and 1Co 14:26 (where it explains διδασχῆ, ἀ τοκάλυψις, etc.), there are the longer passages in 1 Corinthians 2

and Eph 1:17 ff. In both these passages a wisdom is spoken of which is imparted by the Spirit to believers (though ἡμῖν in 1Co 2:10 may refer only to the Apostles or other inspired teachers). The Spirit can impart this wisdom because it searches all things, even the depths of God. The contents of the wisdom in question are in both cases, apparently, eschatological. It is wisdom which God has foreordained ‘for our glory’ (not in honour of us, but with that glory in view which we are to share with the Lord of glory), 1Co 2:7. It speaks of the things ‘which eye has not seen nor ear heard ... all that God has prepared for those who love him’ (1Co 2:9), or, in the words of Eph 1:18, of ‘the hope attached to God’s calling, of the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints.’ Only the man who has the Spirit himself, who has had the eyes of his heart illumined, can receive, teach, or appreciate this wisdom. If we should say that we have a notable specimen of it in 1 Corinthians 15, then its Christian character is thoroughly safeguarded: it speaks not merely of the things that are freely given to us by God (1Co 2:8), but of the things that are freely given to us by God *in Christ*. It is *in Him* that all shall be made alive, and put on the body of glory (1Co 15:22, Php 3:21). It is *Christ* in us who is the hope of the glory contemplated for us in God’s wisdom (Col 1:27, 1Co 2:7). The power with which God wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead and set Him at His right hand in the heavenly places (Eph 1:18 f.), is the same as ‘the power which worketh in us’ through the Spirit (Eph 3:20), and it works in us to the same glorious issue. It is perhaps impossible for us to appreciate as revelation all the forms in which St. Paul’s thought and imagination clothed themselves as he laid hold of the hope of glory and immortality in Christ; but, judging from the combination of these passages, this seems to have been the substance of his Spirit-taught wisdom. On its agreement in substance with the mind of Christ see under (d) above. The truth of passages like 1Co 2:14-16 is generalized in such Johannine words of Jesus as ‘*My sheep* hear my voice ... you do not believe because you are *not of my sheep* ... every one that is *of the truth* heareth my voice’ (Joh 10:27; Joh 10:26; Joh 18:37). This again unites with Jesus the Pauline conception of the Spirit.

13. The NT books which were written under Pauline influence scarcely call for independent consideration. Hebrews has one reference (Heb 2:4) and perhaps a second (Heb 6:4) to the ‘gifts’ of the Spirit, the first alluding to them as God’s testimony to Christ; elsewhere it refers to the Spirit only as the speaker in the OT (Heb 3:7, Heb 9:8, Heb 10:15). In 1Pe 1:2 the striking expression ἐν ἀγιασμῷ πνεύματος, standing as it does between the ‘foreknowledge of God the Father’ and ‘obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ,’ is, no doubt, to be rendered, as in 2Th 2:13, ‘in a consecration wrought by the Spirit’; it is in this that God’s eternal purpose of redemption is realized. Probably in both places (1Pe 1:2, 2Th 2:13) there is an allusion to baptism. In 1Pe 1:11 the idea that the Spirit in the

OT (?) prophets was Christ's Spirit must be connected with the belief in the pre-existence of Christ; in 1Pe 1:12 the Holy Spirit sent from heaven is the power which attends the Christian evangelist and makes his words effective. This idea, of course, pervades the NT, and goes back to such words of Jesus as Mar 13:11, Luk 24:48 f. 'The Spirit of glory and of God' in 1Pe 4:14 recalls St. Paul's conception of the Spirit as the earnest of immortality; it is the spirit of the glory to be revealed because it opens men's eyes to the reality of it (1 Corinthians 2, Eph 1:17 f.), and ensures their entrance into it (2Co 5:5). In 2Ti 1:14 it is the indwelling Holy Spirit which enables one to guard the Christian deposit—a Christian inference from 1Co 2:12, Joh 18:37. In Tit 3:5 the thought of 1Pe 1:2, 2Th 2:13, is more articulately expressed: side by side with 'the laver of regeneration' we have 'renewal wrought by the Holy Spirit.' There is nothing more here than a fulfilment of the Baptist's words—'He shall baptize you with holy spirit' (Mar 1:8).

14. The Johannine books cover all the literary forms known to the NT,—Gospel, Epistle, Apocalypse,—and the Spirit is prominent in all. To understand them it is necessary to remember that all the experience of the Pauline churches lies behind them, and that the circumstances in which they originated have exercised a decided influence on their presentation of the facts and ideas with which they deal.

(a) To begin with *the Apocalypse*, the writer speaks four times of being, or being carried off, ἐν πνεύματι (Rev 1:10; Rev 4:2; Rev 17:3; Rev 21:10), an expression which, whether it is literary artifice or a description of remembered experience, suggests the condition of prophetic ecstasy in which he saw his visions. If St. Paul had spoken of the Spirit in that connexion, we should have referred for interpretation to 2Co 12:1 ff. The seven spirits before God's throne, whatever their connexion in the history of religion with the seven *Amshaspands* of Persia, are not numerically seven. In the Apocalypse they are treated as a unity; they are the Spirit of God in the completeness of its powers (Rev 1:4; Rev 3:1; Rev 4:5; Rev 5:6); and when Christ is spoken of as *having* the seven spirits of God, the meaning is the same as when we read in the Gospel (Joh 3:34) that God does not give the Spirit by measure to Him. This close connexion of Jesus with the Spirit (He first receives and then bestows it) is strikingly brought out in the Epistles to the Seven Churches. In all of them it is the Risen Christ who speaks; but at the end of each we read: 'He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the Churches' (Rev 2:7; Rev 2:11; Rev 2:17; Rev 2:29, Rev 3:6; Rev 3:13; Rev 3:22). In St. Paul's phrase, here too 'the Lord is the Spirit.' It is no other than Christ who speaks through the inspired prophet. And although ἐν πνεύματι probably means 'in an ecstasy,' it must be noted that there is nothing inarticulate or unbalanced about these searching letters. They are terrible in their calm as in their passion. Cf. the utterance of the Spirit in Rev 14:13. In Rev 11:11 and Rev 13:15 we are really on OT ground, and the Spirit is not specifically

Christian, but, as in OT *passim*, the principle of life. But the most striking utterance on the Spirit is Rev 19:10 ἡ γὰρ μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ ἐστὶν τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς προφητείας. This means that the Spirit, which, as we have already seen, is possessed by Jesus and bestowed by Him, has also Him as its object. In all the prophets—in all inspired men—what it does is to bear a testimony to Him. All the prophets, who are prophets simply through having the Spirit, are witnesses to Jesus. This agrees not only with the Gospel (Joh 15:26; Joh 16:14), but with such other words of Jesus as Act 1:8.

(b) Proceeding to the *Gospel* of John, we find, as in the Synoptics, that the Spirit is first mentioned in connexion with the baptism of Jesus. ‘I have seen,’ says the Baptist, ‘the Spirit descending as a dove out of heaven, and it abode upon him. And I did not know him, but he who sent me to baptize in water, the same said unto me, On whomsoever thou seest the Spirit descending and abiding on him, the same is he who baptizeth in holy spirit. And I have seen and borne witness that this is the Son of God’ (Joh 1:32 ff.). What strikes us here is the assumption that every reader will know what is meant by ‘the Spirit’ or by ‘holy spirit.’ The Gospel is meant for Christians to whom the Spirit is an experience, an experience which they owe to Jesus (for it is He who baptizes with holy spirit); an experience, however, which Jesus in His turn had had (He had been baptized with holy spirit).

It is often said that this idea to the descent of the Spirit on Jesus is only a piece of the Christian tradition, too firmly established for the Evangelist to be able to discard it, but really inconsistent with the conception of Christ in the Prologue. The Word incarnate (it is argued) cannot need to be baptized with the Holy Spirit. To say so is to assume that we know what is meant by the ‘Word incarnate’ without looking at the story of Jesus. The assumption cannot be justified. A great spiritual experience, according to all the Gospels, is connected with the baptism of Jesus; according to all the Gospels, also, it is the experience of receiving the Holy Spirit. If the Evangelist sets this down without embarrassment side by side with his prologue, the presumption is that he felt no inconsistency between them, and that there is none. His idea may rather be that it is the measureless gift of the Spirit in virtue of which Jesus *is* the Word incarnate. If He had not had this experience at His baptism, and all that flowed from it, He would not have been (or been recognizable as) the Son of God (Joh 1:33), as God manifest in the flesh, Immanuel.

Possibly part of the Evangelist’s interest in the baptism of Jesus lay in this, that in it the symbol and the thing signified coincided. Ordinarily, in the Baptist’s preaching, water and the Spirit are contrasted: here the one accompanies the other. This is the type of the Christian baptism with which the author and his readers are familiar. In it water and the Spirit normally coincide. This may seem a not very real idea to us; but we have to consider that even within the first century Christianity was assuming some

of the features of a sacramental system, that much in the mental sympathies of the early centuries found this congenial, and that it might seem not unimportant to find at the very beginning of its history its fundamental rite undergone by the Founder, and proved to be not only a form, but a power.

The turning of the water into wine is no doubt a symbol of the whole work of Jesus,—the raising of religion to a higher power, or, more specifically, the elevation of water-baptism into baptism with holy spirit. The Spirit, however, is not mentioned in this connexion, and we get into closer quarters with the subject in ch. 3. There the decisive word is Joh 3:5 ‘Except a man be born ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.’ It is not the mind of Jesus with which we are immediately dealing, but the mind of Jesus as interpreted in the mind of the Evangelist and in the circumstances of his time. Granting this, it seems to the present writer quite impossible to question either a reference to Baptism here or one to the Supper in ch. 6. Nor is the meaning of the reference doubtful. As in the baptism of Jesus, so in Christian baptism, water and spirit are not thought of as in contrast, but as in conjunction. No question is raised as to the conditions under which baptism was administered—conditions of penitence and of faith in Christ on the part of the baptized. These are assumed as familiar to everyone. But under these conditions the new birth is connected unequivocally with the Spirit and with the rite in the administration of which the Spirit is normally present. One of the great words and ideas of the Gospel is ‘life.’ Sometimes it is spoken of simply as the gift of God. The Father has given to the Son to have life in Himself, and the Son gives life to whom He will (Joh 5:21; Joh 5:26). Here, however, the life is conceived on the analogy of natural life, and the entrance into it is by a birth which depends on the act of God through His Spirit. The life with which we are here concerned is nothing less than the eternal life of God Himself (1Jn 1:2), and only God can beget it in the soul. To be born of God and born of the Spirit are the same thing (1Jn 2:29; 1Jn 3:9; 1Jn 5:18). When Jesus says, ‘That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit’ (Joh 3:6), He means that it is not anything we owe to our fathers and mothers, but only something we owe to God, which quickens the life of God in us. Put with this generality, it might seem as though the Spirit here had no connexion, or no particular connexion, with Christ; it is almost as though we were at the OT stage, at which the Spirit is merely a synonym for God acting. But to say this is to forget the connexion here asserted of the Spirit and the Christian sacrament of baptism. It is through baptism in the name of Jesus that the Spirit is received; and just as the πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν of St. Paul is the Spirit of the Risen Saviour, so here, in the sense of the Evangelist, it is the same Spirit, acting in and through the ordinance of the Risen Saviour, that is the source of all Divine life. As the conversation goes on, too, while the water, as merely symbolical, drops out (it only appears in Joh 3:5), and the Spirit

remains by itself (Joh_3:8), attention is directed to the Son of Man, lifted up as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, that whosoever believes may in Him have eternal life. Here we have the ideas introduced which define the Spirit—the experiences through which the experience of the Spirit comes to us with life-giving power. The new birth is mysterious, indeed, in all its aspects; it is like the wind which blows where it will. We cannot tell how it originates or in what it will end. But it is not blankly mysterious, and there is nothing magical in its connexion with the sacrament. It comes into experience along with other things which form part of the same system of reality with it,—the sin-bearing death of Christ, the proclamation of that death, and believing surrender to it. All this is concentrated and symbolized in baptism; and it is because of this that baptism and being born of the Spirit are represented as coincident. Baptism is a kind of focal point in which all the quickening powers of God in Christ crucified tell upon the soul under the conditions of penitence and faith which make them effective. The life that comes to us in this experience is the life of the Spirit, the Divine life; but quite definitely also it is a life which we owe to the death of Christ. (To apply this conception of baptismal regeneration to the case of infants is to desert the ground of experience, on which the Apostle speaks throughout, for what is to us an unconditioned void. In this adventure the NT gives us no assistance whatever).

At the close of ch. 3 we revert, apparently in words of the Baptist, really in words of the Evangelist, to the idea of the Spirit as bestowed on Jesus by God. He whom God sent speaks the words of God; He does this, and can do it, because God gives not the Spirit by measure to Him (Joh_3:34). Here the idea is like that in 1Co_2:11 : ‘As no man knows the things of a man save the spirit of a man which is in him, even so the things of God no man knows, but the Spirit of God.’ It is in virtue of having this Spirit, not partially but completely, that Jesus speaks the words of God; in distinction from those who had only partial and transient illumination, He has received the Spirit in its fulness and is the Word incarnate. To have the Spirit in this sense and measure, to be the Word made flesh, and to have all things put into His hand by the Father (Joh_3:34 f., Joh_5:20), are one and the same thing.

The absence of any allusion to the Spirit in ch. 4 (where Jesus offers the ‘living water’) and in ch. 5 (where we are told that the Son gives life to whom He will: with ζωοποιεῖν, v. 21, cf. St. Paul’s πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν, 1Co_15:45, and Joh_6:63) is very remarkable; but it has an exact parallel in the complete absence of the Spirit from Romans 6. When we come to ch. 6 it is different. The reference here to the Supper is as unmistakable as that to Baptism in ch. 3. The discourse starts from the bread of life, but the general idea of feeding on Christ or living on Him by faith, is specified as it proceeds, in agreement with the ritual of the Supper, into eating His flesh and drinking His blood. In the most intense and vehement expressions of this kind, indeed,

there is never anything more than in Joh 6:47 ('He that believeth hath eternal life') or in Joh 6:57 ('He that *cateth me* shall live by me'). It is not only conceivable, but highly probable, especially in view of a passage like 1 Corinthians 10, that when this chapter was written materialistic and superstitious ideas about the sacrament of the Supper were already current in the Church, and that the Evangelist has the express design of correcting them. He has no hesitation in using the boldest liturgical language: he speaks of eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of Man in a tone which seems almost intended to challenge, if not to defy, intelligence; he recognizes by doing so that only language of poetic intensity like this, to which it is absurd to *say* that a symbol is only a symbol, is appropriate in worship; yet just as in ch. 3 water is mentioned only once, and the Spirit afterwards spoken of independently, so here any risk of religious materialism is swept away in the words, 'It is the *spirit* which gives life ... the words that I have spoken to you are *spirit* and are *life*' (Joh 6:63). There is no depreciation of the sacrament here any more than in ch. 3, and no exaltation of the words of Jesus as opposed to it; but there is a safeguard against the superstitious abuse of it. It is nothing material, no *res sacramenti*, on which the believer depends for eternal life. No doubt Christ, the Christ who speaks of His flesh as true food and His blood as true drink (Joh 6:55), is, in all the truth of His humanity and His Passion, the meat and drink of the soul, and the believer realizes this in the sacrament; but it is not through the material elements that Christ sustains spiritual life; if His words are read in this sense, their character is misconceived; they are taken out of the region of spirit and life to which they belong, and in which alone Christ vivifies men.

One of the most characteristic passages on the Spirit is Joh 7:37 ff. On the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles, Jesus stands in the Temple and cries, 'If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink.' The words are on a level with those in ch. 4, in which He promises the living water to the woman at the well. But here Jesus goes further. 'He that believeth in me,' He adds, 'as said the Scripture, Out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.' Without discussing the reference to 'Scripture,' what does this mean? The Evangelist himself interprets the words: 'This he said of the Spirit which those who believed on him were to receive, for as yet there was no Spirit (οὐπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα), for Jesus was not yet glorified.' This is clearly written from the standpoint of experience and fulfilment. *After* Jesus was glorified through death and resurrection, those who believed had experience of His power such as they had never had before. They had owed Him much while they were with Him on earth; He had in a sense satisfied their own spiritual needs (Joh 6:68 f.); He had given them the bread of life to eat and the living water to drink. But now He did more. He came to them in a power which enabled them to be witnesses to Him; others obtained the Spirit through them; the living water which He had given them overflowed from them as from an inexhaustible spring. Whether this is what Jesus meant or not, it is true; it

answers to the facts of the case as the whole of the NT reveals them. Pentecost was inconceivable to the Evangelist except as the sequel to the Passion and Exaltation of Jesus; the possession of the Spirit which is the characteristic of the new era is determined in point of fact by these antecedents. We have seen the same connexion of ideas already in the chapters on the sacraments: the Passion of Christ is as unmistakably present in Joh 3:15 and Joh 6:52-59 as in Joh 7:39. It seems very gratuitous, then, to argue with Wendt that the Evangelist has mistaken Jesus, and that our Lord means no more here than in ch. 4.

The Johannine conception of the Spirit comes out most fully in chs. 14-16. The Spirit may be said to be the main subject in the discourses in which Jesus prepares the disciples for His departure. All the difficulties connected with the words of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel have to be allowed for here; to draw the line between what was literally said by Jesus at the moment and what is due to the commentary of experience interpreting His remembered words, might have seemed to the Evangelist himself not only unreal but unspiritual. The following points may be noted.

(1) The first hint of the future suggests the surpassing greatness of the experiences which the Spirit was to bring. 'He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go to the Father. And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son' (Joh 14:12 f.). The Spirit is not yet named, but we can see that it is in the writer's mind. The overwhelming experiences of the Apostolic age, the great movement then inaugurated, the new sense of the power of prayer as it takes hold of the name of Jesus, cast beforehand the shadow of their coming in these amazing words. This *is* a promise of the Spirit, though the name is not mentioned; and indeed nothing short of their fulfilment in the Apostolic age could have enabled the writer to recall such words, or to believe them, or to have any idea of what they might mean.

(2) Immediately after, the language becomes more precise, and the Spirit is expressly mentioned Joh 14:15 ff. 'If you love me, you will keep my commandments. And I will ask the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may be with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth; which the world cannot receive, because it does not see or know it (*αὐτό*). You know it; for it dwells with you, and shall be in you. I will not leave you desolate: I come unto you.' What strikes us first here is the new name given to the Spirit, *ἄλλον παράκλητον*. It is indeed only the name which is new: in idea it answers closely to the only promise of the Spirit which we find in the Synoptic Gospels. These older writers (apart from Luk 11:13, which is no real exception) only speak of the Spirit as a future possession of the disciples in Mar 13:11, Luk 12:12, Mat 10:19. The situation contemplated is that in which the disciples are brought before judges and kings to bear testimony to their Master. That is the hour in which

they need an *advocatus*, a counsel, a *παράκλητος*; and Jesus promises that they will have one in the Spirit. The expression ‘another advocate’ implies that the disciples have already had experience of *one*, namely, of Jesus Himself. As long as He was with them their strength was reinforced from *Him*; and when He goes, then, in response to His intercession, His place is taken by the Spirit. There is another power with them now which does for them what Jesus did before. Yet is it really another? In 1Jn 2:1 it is Jesus who is the *παράκλητος*, even after Pentecost; and even here (Joh 14:18) He says, ‘I come unto you.’ The presence of the Spirit is Jesus’ own presence in spirit; we are reminded again of 2Co 3:17 and of Mat 28:20. In the spirit Jesus will be with His own for ever, will dwell by them and be in them. What is meant at this point by calling the Spirit the Spirit of truth (Joh 14:17) is not quite clear, but some contrast is implied between it and the world (cf. 1Co 2:12). The world, as Plato might have said, is the great sophist; it is a realm of deceits and illusions, by which the mind of the disciple, were he left to himself, might easily be put at fault; but in the Spirit the disciple has a safeguard against its subtleties and sophistications; he is kept in the truth which sanctifies because it is one with God, truth as truth is in Jesus (Joh 17:17, Eph 4:21). There is no definition here of the relation of the Spirit to Jesus or to the Father, though it might be said that the Spirit is the *alter ego* of Jesus. Only, it is the Son who asks the Father and the Father who gives the Spirit; the three are one as they confront the disciples, co-operating for their salvation. In this Gospel, as everywhere in the NT, the Spirit belongs to the same region as the Father and the Son; it is included in what a Christian means when he speaks of ‘God.’ This is the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity; no man means all that a Christian means by ‘God’ unless he puts into ‘God’ all that is meant by the separate terms ‘Father,’ ‘Son,’ and ‘Spirit.’ This is a proposition which is securely based on experience, and which is implied in NT experience from the day of Pentecost onward (see Act 2:33, 1Co 12:4-6, Eph 2:18, Joh 14:26). More particularly, too, it may be said that the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel belongs to the Kingdom of God and to the religion of revelation: to the world it is unknown. And within the Messianic realm the full experience of it is ethically conditioned: ‘If ye love me, ye will keep my commandments, and I will ask the Father,’ etc.

(3) The next reference to the Spirit (Joh 14:26) is still more definite. ‘The Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, which the Father shall send in my name, he (*ἐκεῖνος*) shall teach you all things, and shall bring to your remembrance all things that I said unto you.’ Both the masculine pronoun (*ἐκεῖνος*) and the function (‘he shall teach’) represent the Spirit as personal, with a definiteness hitherto unnoticed. Not that suggestions of this are wanting elsewhere (cf. esp. 1Co 12:11), and, of course, it must be in the last resort meaningless to speak of the spirit of a personal God as itself impersonal; but very often the meaning is covered by the idea of an impulse communicated by God,

whereas here the personalizing is much more definite and conscious. The function of teaching or revealing, which, as we have seen above, has but a small space and a mainly eschatological reference in St. Paul, is far more prominent in St. John, and far more decisively defined by relation to the historical Saviour. The Spirit does not teach independently, but brings to remembrance all things that Jesus said to the Twelve, ὑπὸ μνήσει is a word on which it is worth while to dwell. The Evangelist gives us two illustrations of things which the disciples remembered after the Spirit came, and which received a new meaning as they rose in the spiritual light. When He rose from the dead, they remembered the word that He spoke about destroying the temple and rebuilding it in three days; it had slept in their memories, an inert, meaningless, and therefore forgotten thing; now it leapt into meaning, and they had a vivid recollection of it (Joh 2:22). Cf. 1Co 12:11 of the circumstances of the Triumphal Entry. We cannot think of these two illustrations without asking, What is involved in the spiritually quickened action of memory in such cases? Something is recalled, but it is not only recalled, it is for the first time understood; it is remembered because a key to it has been found; it is not only the dream, so to speak, which is recalled, but the dream and its interpretation together. Where events have deeply interested and impressed men, as the words and works of Jesus did the disciples, and especially where they have initiated great spiritual movements in which their significance has become apparent, memory cannot be insulated so as to perceive them in a purely neutral or 'objective' fashion. They are remembered in the heart as well as in the brain; they are remembered with an ardour which contemplates, explores, makes discoveries, worships; and when they are reproduced in the Spirit, it is not the unintelligent and misleading truth of an amateur photograph with which we are confronted, but something like the work of a great painter, something which is truer in a manner than the most literal recollection would be. It is not open to question that the Fourth Gospel is, in this sense, a 'spiritual' Gospel; it is the decisive proof that the words of Jesus in Joh 14:26 have been fulfilled. On the relation of Father, Son, and Spirit, this passage only confirms what has been said above under (2).

(4) In Joh 15:26 many have sought for more than it contains. Here it is the Son who sends the Spirit from the Father, and the Spirit is described as that which proceeds from the Father. To pretend that we can distinguish between the 'procession' of the Spirit from the Father and the 'generation' of the Son by the Father, is only to invite Gibbon's sneer about 'the science, or rather the language of metaphysics.' The really important point here is that which has already emerged in Rev 19:10 (see above): ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ. Christ is the Spirit's subject. The Spirit is the Spirit of truth because it bears witness to Him who can say, 'I am the truth' (Joh 14:6). The truth with which it deals is that which is incarnate in Christ, the very same truth to

which the Apostles also are to bear witness, because they have been with Him from the beginning (Joh 15:27).

(5) The climax of our Lord's teaching in this line is reached in Joh 16:7 ff. Here Jesus announces the paradoxical truth that it is expedient for the disciples that He should leave them, because the coming of the Paraclete is dependent on His departure. There are natural analogies to this: often there is a truer appreciation, even of a person who has been intimately known and loved, after death than before, a more adequate possession in memory than there was in actual intercourse. But more is meant here than that the disciples will get a better view of Jesus from a distance. It is Jesus Himself who is to send them the Paraclete, and He can do it, as He has already said (Joh 7:39), only on the ground of His death and exaltation. When He does do it, they have not lost Him, they really possess Him in the power in which He lives and reigns. The functions of the Spirit are here twofold, according as they have for their object (α) the world (Joh 7:8-11), (β) the Apostles themselves

(Joh 7:13-15). As for (α), it is the Spirit's function to convict the world, to reach its conscience with demonstration, in regard to certain subjects. This conviction is not wrought in an immediate supernatural way, but through the ministry of the Apostles; it is to them the Spirit comes, and through their preaching the world is convicted. It is convicted of sin, because men do not believe in Christ. This is perhaps the most general statement on sin in Scripture: it consists at bottom in refusing to believe in Christ. If men did believe in Him, sin in all its kinds would disappear. Conviction of it cannot be produced by denunciation, or satire, or clever exposures, or by what is miscalled knowledge of human nature; it can be produced only by witnessing to Christ in the power of the Spirit. The Spirit also produces in the world a conviction of conscience with regard to righteousness. This is connected with the exaltation of Jesus: 'I go to the Father and ye see me no longer.' When this exaltation is brought home to men's minds with the power of the Spirit (Act 4:33), they realize that there is such a thing as righteousness, and that the supreme power in the world is on its side. In a sense it might be said that it was easier to believe in righteousness when men saw it present in the world, incarnate in Jesus Christ the Righteous; but it is a more solemn sense of its reality and supremacy that rises in the heart when, through the power of the Spirit, we realize that that righteous One is seated at the right hand of the Father. The third point in regard to which the Spirit convicts the world is judgment. This may be said to combine the other two. Sin and righteousness are at issue with each other, and the Apostolic ministry, in the power of the Spirit, convinces men that in Christ a final judgment has been pronounced upon the issue. The protagonists in the great cause—Christ and the Prince of this world—have confronted each other decisively, and the Prince of this world has been judged (Joh 16:11; cf. Joh 12:31). A mind unenlightened or unconvinced by the Spirit might easily hold the opposite, and, looking to the life and death of Jesus, infer the

impotence of the good, its condemnation, as futile and ineffective, by the nature of things; but even in the Cross of Jesus what the Spirit-taught man sees is the condemnation of evil, the sentence which God has passed and will finally execute on the Prince of this world, the verdict of the supreme tribunal on behalf of the good. Sin, righteousness, and judgment are abstract ideas, and come home to men in their reality only when in the power of the Spirit they are interpreted in their connexion with Christ. In these verses (Joh_16:8-11) the main idea involved in the Spirit is that of power: it is what is required to make the Apostles' message effective (cf. Act_4:33, 1Th_1:5, 1Co_2:4, 2Co_6:6 f.). But when we pass to (β) Joh_16:12-15, the main idea is that of illumination. The Spirit is conceived as giving the disciples that comprehension of Christ which, according to St. Paul also (see 2 Corinthians 3), is necessary to make a man a fit minister of the new covenant, not of letter but of spirit. Both kinds of sufficiency—that of power and that of illumination—are of God, and specifically of the Spirit. If 2Co_3:8-11 state the dependence of the Evangelist on the Spirit, 2Co_3:12-15 state the dependence of the theologian on the Spirit. The idea underlying the latter passage is that of 2Co_3:12: Jesus is greater than His words. When the time comes for Him to leave His disciples, many things remain unuttered. Many things are involved in His presence in the world, and especially in His impending Passion, which He understands, but they do not and cannot: are these things to be lost for ever? Is the significance of Jesus to be so far thrown away? This is not what Jesus contemplates. On the contrary, the Spirit which He promises as the Spirit of truth will have this as His very task, to initiate them into the whole meaning of Jesus. He will lead them, not into all truth, but into all the truth—that is, the truth which is embodied in Him in all its dimensions. The new point which is emphasized here about the Spirit is that He shall not speak of Himself ($\acute{\alpha}\varphi'$ $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, *i.e.* of His own motion, self-prompted or independently). Many scholars, in reading what is told of spiritual gifts in Acts or the Pauline Epistles, have felt that the early Church ran a real risk. Who could tell whether the Spirit, under the impulse of which men uttered themselves, did not sometimes speak of itself, and say things which may have been in a vague sense $\pi\upsilon\epsilon\nu\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{\alpha}$, but were not in any true sense Christian? We have seen already how St. Paul met this danger. Partly (as in 1Th_5:19-22, 1 Corinthians 14) he provides for the control of 'spiritual' utterances by the gift of discernment or by the common sense of the Christian society. Partly (as in 1Co_12:3) he lays down a dogmatic criterion of what is genuinely Christian. This latter course is followed also in 1 Jn. (1Jn_4:2): the spirit which is really of God is that which confesses Jesus Christ as come in flesh, in contrast with a more 'spiritual' kind of spirit which did not allow the heavenly Christ to ally Himself permanently, and especially by birth and death, to our humanity. But what we have here in the Gospel is really more searching, and goes to the root of the matter. The Spirit, personally as it is here conceived, is not a pure spontaneity; it is always historically prompted and historically controlled. What

vindicates any utterance as spiritual is that it is a testimony to the historical Saviour. What the Spirit hears—all that He hears—He shall speak. It is not easy to say how the Spirit is conceived as hearing, but the main point is clear: hearing precedes speaking, and limits and controls it. In particular, it is said of the Spirit, ‘He shall announce to you the things that are coming.’ Westcott, interpreting τὰ ἐρχόμενα on the analogy of the Messianic ὁ ἐρχόμενος, and thinking of the needs of the Apostles at the stage of transition between the old and the new era, finds the main reference in this to be to the constitution of the Christian Church: the Spirit will enable the Apostles to understand (by anticipating?) the new age on which they are about to enter. Godet is inclined to render the words in a more prophetic sense, and regards them as having their fulfilment in the Apocalypse. This is too precise: perhaps if we said ‘in apocalypses’ (such as are suggested by 1Co_2:9 f., 1Co_14:6; 1Co_14:26, Eph_1:17 f.) it would be nearer the mark. It is a special function of the Spirit to animate hope by unveiling the future (H. Holtzmann, *Handcom. ad loc.*). But whatever the special reference in τὰ ἐρχόμενα may be, the work of the Spirit on this side is summed up in the words ἐκεῖνος ἐμὲ δοξάσει. In every sense of the terms the Spirit’s work is to testify to Christ—to what He is, to His words, to what He has done and suffered, to what He is to achieve. In this His function, if not His being, as the Spirit of truth is exhausted. And to say that He uses only what is Christ’s is not to narrow the range or the means of His action; for, as the Speaker goes on to say, ‘All that the Father hath is mine.’ All that belongs to the truth of God’s Fatherhood is revealed in the Son, and all that is revealed in the Son is interpreted and vivified by the Spirit. The most striking feature of this passage is, after all, that with which it opens: ‘I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now,’ with the implicit promise that they should hear the Spirit say them when they were able to bear it. The Apostolic reading of the truth, as truth is in Jesus, is perfectly conscious that it goes beyond the *ipsissima verba* which Jesus spoke on earth; but the Apostles would have felt it strangely unreal if they had been asked to cut down their testimony to Jesus to what Jesus Himself had expressly put into words. There were many things which circumstances made it impossible for Him to put into words—many things which it was rather for them to say about Him than for Him to say about Himself; but when they said these things, under the guiding and quickening impulse of His Spirit, they had no doubt that they were declaring the truth of Christ. It was a proof of ‘Christ speaking in them,’ as St. Paul puts it (2Co_13:3). Once they had listened to His voice on earth, now they heard Him in their hearts interpret all He had been, and between the voices they made no distinction. A great part of the peculiarity of the Fourth Gospel is covered if we say that the word of the Risen Saviour, speaking by His Spirit in the heart of the Apostle, is presented as though it had been actually spoken on earth. And, little as this may agree with our ideas of a purely historical narrative, it is a precarious operation to set aside such a testimony, based on Christian experience and

contemplated by Christ, as though it could be merely irrelevant to the Christian religion.

(c) The Spirit in the *First Epistle* of John does not call for separate treatment. One important passage has been already mentioned (Joh 4:2): another (Joh 5:6-8) in which the Spirit and the sacraments are again mentioned in conjunction is to be interpreted on the analogy of ch. 3 and ch. 6 in the Gospel (see the present writer's *Death of Christ*, p. 277 ff.).

The NT hardly invites to any discussion of the metaphysics of the Spirit. Of course, it is the Spirit of God, and Divine. It is part of the one Divine causality which—as Father, Son, and Spirit—confronts the sinful world, and works in unison for its redemption. It belongs unmistakably to the sphere of the Divine, not of the human. Yet there is something in man which is akin to it, and it is through it that God dwells in man, and makes him partaker of the Divine nature. As the Spirit of God, it cannot be truly thought of as impersonal, and yet it is far more frequently spoken of in a way which is satisfied by the conception of a Divine impulsion to or stimulation of human thought, feeling, or action, than as a distinct personality. This is so even in writers who, like St. Paul (1Co 12:11) and St. John (Joh 16:14), distinctly have the latter mode of representing the Spirit. Certainly the Spirit is not so unmistakably thought of as a person as is the Father or the Son. We never, for example, find the Spirit in the salutations of the Epistles: 'Grace to you and peace from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ' is never supplemented by 'and from the Holy Spirit.' Neither do we ever find the Spirit united with the Father and the Son in prayer, as, e.g., in 1Th 3:11 'Now our God and Father himself and our Lord Jesus Christ direct our way to you.' Even in the Apostolic benediction (2Co 13:14) it may fairly be questioned whether the Spirit is conceived as personally as the Lord Jesus Christ and God. As for attempts to distinguish within the Trinity the relation of the Spirit to the Father from that of the Son to the Father as 'procession' from 'generation,' the present writer can only repeat that they have no reality which he can apprehend. But the NT and Christian experience are at one in teaching that the Christian conception of God includes all that is meant by Father, Son, and Spirit; and as the omission of what is meant by any of these terms leaves the Christian conception unsatisfied, it may fairly be said that the doctrine of the Trinity is the fundamental doctrine of our faith. The Father, the Son, and the Spirit in their unity constitute the God whom we know as the God of our salvation.

Literature.—Gloel, *Der heilige Geist in der Heilsverkündigung des Paulus*, 1888; Gunkel, *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1899; Irving P. Wood, *The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature*, 1904; Weinel, *Die Wirkungen des Geistes u. der Geister*, 1899; Kahler, *Dogmatische Zeitfragen*, i. 167 ff.; Schmiedel, art. 'Spiritual Gifts' in *Encyc. Bibl.*; the books on NT

Theology; also literature mentioned under 'Holy Spirit' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible .

James Denney.

☩ Holy Thing

HOLY THING (τὸ ἅγιον)—1. Luk_1:35 Authorized Version 'Therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.' Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 prefers to render, 'Wherefore also that which is to be born shall be called holy, the Son of God.' On the expression τὸ γεννώμενον cf. Mat_1:20 τὸ ... γεννηθέν, and for the use of ἅγιον applied to our Lord, see artt. Holy One, Holiness.

2. Mat_7:6 μὴ δώτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσί—τὸ ἅγιον is usually taken to refer here to sacrificial meat or the provision of the priests. So Lange, Alford, and most Comm.; but Meyer objects to this as requiring to be more precisely designated, and urges that Christ has in view 'the holy' in general, and that what is meant by this is the *holy*, because *Divine*, evangelic truth by which men are converted. The fundamental idea of ἅγιος is consecration: τὸ ἅγιον, that which is consecrated or set apart to the service of God; its general opposite would be βέβηλος, 'profane.' (See Westcott on Heb_7:26 and literature of Holy One generally).

In Christian writings we find τὰ ἅγια used for the gifts as offered in the offertory or prothesis, *i.e.* the act of setting forth the oblation, and also for the consecrated gifts; thus in the Liturgy of the Nestorians we find the direction: 'And when the people have received the holy thing, the priest,' etc. (See Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, pp. 122, 301, 379, 398).

J. B. Bristow.

☩ Home

HOME

1. The expressions bearing the sense of ‘home’ are: (1) οἰκία (Mat 8:8; also Joh 14:2, where we may prefer ‘home’ to ‘house,’ the rendering of the Authorized and Revised Versions); (2) οἶκος (Mar 5:19, Luk 1:23-56; Luk 9:61; Luk 15:6; also Joh 7:53 Authorized and Revised Versions , in the section concerning the adulteress); (3) τὰ ἴδια (Joh 19:27, cf. also Joh 1:11 and Joh 16:32). As for (1) and (2), where we have the ordinary term = ‘house’ employed, it is to be noted that a house naturally becomes a ‘home’ under the associations of family life and affection; cf. the corresponding use of בית. (3), as a use of ἴδιος, illustrates a tendency to abbreviation and attenuation of phrasing in such connexions as this, ἴδιος, with the force of the possessive pronoun (= ἐαυτοῦ, ἐαυτῶν), appears in NT as in the LXX Septuagint , the OT, Apocrypha, and in such writers as Philo and Josephus (Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, English translation , p. 123f.). Cf., in this particular use, our expression ‘at his father’s,’ and the attenuated Fr. phrase *chez lui*. The Vulgate in Joh 19:27 has the strict parallel *in sua*.

2. The Gospels afford us a few glimpses of domestic interiors, forming a part of the simple background of the life of Jesus. We see the common domestic shadows of sickness and death beclouding the home of Simon Peter (Mar 1:30), of Jairus (Mar 5:22), of the Roman officer (Mat 8:5-6), of Lazarus and his sisters (John 11), and of others. Homely joys are illustrated in the marriage at Cana (John 2), in the sojourn of Jesus as a guest in the home at Bethany (Luk 10:28, Joh 12:1-2). Hospitality and entertaining are again exemplified in the ease of Levi (Luk 5:29) and of Simon the Pharisee (Luk 7:36). The ever-fresh interest attendant on the birth of a child as a notable incident in home life finds illustration in the story of the birth of John the Baptist (Luk 1:57-58). We have sight, too, of the sumptuous domestic establishments of the luxurious rich (Luk 16:19-20), in contrast with the simple abodes of the mass of the people and the condition of the homeless poor.

No people ever prized the sanctities and blessings of the home more than the Jews. Their wonderful legislation bearing on domestic affairs, the sentiments that find expression in Psalms 127, 128, and in the panegyric of the Good Wife (Pro 31:10-31), the importance attaching to the family as the unit of national life, all bear witness to this. The whole system of feasts and fasts, joyous and solemn, including the weekly Sabbaths and the yearly commemorations and seasons,—a system imparting so much colour and interest to the life of the people—also strongly tended to deepen the domestic sentiment, the home being to so large an extent the theatre for the prescribed rites and observances.

The general conditions of Jewish home life in our Lord’s day offered marked points of contrast with what largely obtains among Western peoples. The greatest simplicity in

the matter of meals and clothing, and the fewness of other wants, contributed to an easier condition of life in general. Grinding poverty was by no means common. Every man had a trade, and every father had to teach his son a trade; but a man was not obliged to toil long hours for a bare living. There was considerable leisure, and the Palestinian Jew had much time for contemplation, like the Arab of today. The man was often abroad in public places, frequenting discussions in the Temple and elsewhere, and mingling with his fellows. He was also charged with certain religious duties and observances from which women were exempt. The place of the woman, on the other hand, was preeminently in the home. (Note that one of the things desiderated for women in Tit 2:5 is that they should be οἰκουργοί). In this respect the Jews shared the sentiment of other Oriental peoples; but the lot of the Jewish woman was much superior to that of non-Jewish women in the East, and her position in the home was better than that of the Roman matron of that period. A serious menace to the home, however, existed in the conditions obtaining as regards divorce. We know how Jesus dealt with this great abuse of easy divorce (Mar 10:2-12 = Mat 19:3-9). Some of the Jewish Rabbis also (as Shammai) set themselves against the laxity that had grown up. On the whole, it is probable that general practice was much better than current precepts. A Talmudic saying is significant—‘The altar itself weeps over the man who puts away his wife’ (*Gittin 10b, Sanhed. 22a*).

The home as a factor in education was of the greatest importance. In our Lord’s time there was probably in addition only a school at the synagogue, taught by the *hazzan*. A religious atmosphere surrounded the Jewish child from the first, and the mother was the earliest teacher. As soon as the child could speak, his mother taught him a verse of the Torah (on the unity of God; and on the election of Israel). See art. Childhood.

3. All interest in this subject, so far as the Gospels are concerned, is focussed in the home at Nazareth, where Jesus spent nearly the whole of His life. Actual information as to the life in that home is of the scantiest; but there can be no question that the best traditions of the Jewish home at its best were all exemplified there. There could never have been a better mother-teacher than Mary. The round of religious observances and duties would not fail of scrupulous performance. The conditions of the home itself were no doubt of the simplest and lowliest kind; but an abundance of human affection was an ample compensation. There was nothing to cripple or blight in any way the wonderful young life that was there unfolding. There is room also for interesting reflexion as to the history and experience of that family circle at Nazareth during all the years that Jesus was a member of it. The great crises of all domestic life—births, marriages, deaths—must surely, some or all of them, have marked the history of the home of Jesus during those years. As we think of Joseph, who, as it is commonly agreed, appears to have died at an early period, and of our Lord’s

'brothers' and 'sisters' (Mar_3:31; Mar_6:3), there is every reason to conclude that within the circle of the home Jesus had the experience of human bereavement and sorrow, and also of rejoicing, as His very own.

4. From the day of His leaving Nazareth for the Jordan, Jesus ceased to have any settled home. 'The Son of Man,' He once said, 'hath not where to lay his head' (Mat_8:20 || Luk_9:58). It is true that this saying is not to be taken too literally (see Bruce, *With Open Face*, ch. ix.), for Jesus would be welcome in the houses of many friends, as He was notably in the home at Bethany. Still, during His public ministry He surrendered all the quiet joys of the old home life at Nazareth, and often in the course of His constant journeys must have had to endure the hardships and privations of a wanderer. When He called His first disciples to follow Him (Mat_4:18 ff. || Mar_1:16 ff., Luk_5:27 f.), He was summoning them to a life of homelessness resembling His own. He made readiness to leave home, with all its possessions and endearments, a test of fitness to be His true disciple (Luk_9:57-62 || Mat_8:19-22, cf. Mat_19:21 ||). And though He sent one home who wished to follow Him (Mar_5:19 || Luk_8:39), He taught that, in principle at least, His disciples should be willing to forsake not only house and lands, but parents and brethren and sisters, and even wife and children, for the Kingdom of God's sake (Luk_18:28 ff. || Mat_19:29, Mar_10:29 f.). See, further, art. Family.

Literature.—See the works cited at end of art. Childhood, and add E. Stapfer, *Palestine in the Time of Jesus Christ*, English translation, chs. vii. and viii.; Stalker, *Imago Christi*, ch. ii.; Dale, *Laws of Christ*, ch. xi.

J. S. Clemens.

☩ Honesty

HONESTY (the subst. does not occur in the Gospels; the adj. 'honest' is found in both Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 of Luk_8:15 as a rendering of *καλός* = Lat. *honestus*, 'noble,' 'excellent.' See Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible s.vv.).—This virtue does not take the prominent place in the teaching of Jesus Christ that it assumes in most systems of ethics. Our Lord never discusses or enjoins it. The reasons for His seeming neglect of the subject may be (1) that there was no dispute about it in His day, the Sixth commandment being taken for granted as universally binding, (2) that He went beneath the precept to the principles underlying it when (a) He discouraged covetousness (Mar_7:22, Luk_12:15), and (b) He bade His disciples do to others as they would that others should do to them (Mat_7:12 = Luk_6:31), and (3) that He treated considerations of property as of secondary

importance, so that when it was a question of suffering from dishonesty—not committing it, He advised submission (Mat 5:40); and when the question of the division of an inheritance was submitted to Him, He dismissed it as not within His province, and that with a tone of contempt, as though such a matter had not the importance people usually attached to it (Luk 12:13 f.). In life we see that dishonesty generally indicates a radical rottenness of character. It cannot be dealt with on prudential lines such as are indicated by the proverb, ‘Honesty is the best policy.’ By creating the Christian character, Jesus cuts out the roots of dishonesty in deceit, treachery, and greed; and implants those principles of truth and honour of which honesty is one of the natural fruits. The word rendered ‘honest’ in Luk 8:15 (καλῆ), really means ‘fair,’ ‘sound,’ ‘excellent.’ In the Synoptics, when Jesus speaks of a thief (κλέπτης), it is not to denounce his wickedness, but in one place (Mat 6:19-20, cf. Luk 12:33) to warn His disciples against making treasures of earthly things which thieves may steal or moths corrupt; and in another place (Mat 24:43, cf. Luk 12:33) to compare the suddenness and unexpectedness of His advent with the way in which a thief breaks into a house at night. In Joh 10:8 ff. the false leaders of the people are compared to ‘thieves and robbers’ who ravage the flock, in contrast to the Good Shepherd who tends it. In the parable of the Good Samaritan the subject of neighbourly kindness had fallen among robbers (Luk 10:30), whose excessive cruelty is described; but the point of the parable is not in their conduct, which is referred to only in order to show the depth of misery in which their victim was found. Jesus also refers to robbers, *i.e.* brigands (λησται), when He denounces the Jews for making God’s house ‘a den of robbers’ (Mar 11:17, Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ; cf. Mat 21:13, Luk 19:46), quoting Jer 7:11. Here it is not common dishonesty that rouses our Lord’s anger so much as the desecration of the house of God.

When the Jewish authorities came with an armed troop to take Jesus, He expostulated with them, asking if they had come out against a robber (ληστής, Mar 14:48; cf. Mat 26:55, Luk 22:52). In none of these cases does Jesus lay any stress on the question of dishonesty, the occasion not bringing it into discussion. His merciful words to one of the malefactors crucified with Him (Luk 23:43) cannot be taken as throwing light on His views of dishonesty and its pardonableness, because the man was probably a brigand insurgent and a follower of Barabbas, not a mere thief. Still it does indicate that gross sins, among which stealing may be included, can be forgiven in those who turn to Christ. The one strong condemnation of theft in the Gospels is St. John’s scornful description of Judas as ‘a thief’ (Joh 12:6), indicative of the vile hypocrisy of the man’s character.

In the parable of the Unjust Steward it might appear that Jesus was commending an act of dishonesty. This man having wasted his master’s goods and being called to

account, foresees that he will lose his situation. Accordingly, in order to have some homes to go to for a refuge, he buys the friendship of his master's debtors by reducing the amount of their debts (Luk 16:1-9). On the surface, at all events, this appears to be a fraudulent action; and yet the steward is commended for it, and held up to the disciples as an example for them to follow. It is to be observed, however, that the commendation comes from the rich man, not from Christ. The master in the parable commends his steward. Wellhausen—in opposition to Julicher—ascribes v. 8 to Jesus, citing as parallel Luk 18:6 According to this view, ὁ κύριος here means 'the Lord'—*i.e.* Christ, not 'his Lord,' as in Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885. But against that rendering is the fact that the rich man is called the steward's 'lord' throughout the parable. The natural conclusion is that the 'lord' referred to in v. 8 is the 'lord' previously mentioned in vv. 3, 5. Thus, as Dr. Plummer remarks, the argument, like that implied by the parable of the Unjust Judge, is *a fortiori*. Even a worthless, dishonest steward is commended by his master, at least for shrewdness; much more, then, should a true servant of Christ act wisely. Of course, it is only the prudence, not the dishonesty, that is commended. This parable is an extreme instance for the rule that in any parable the main lessons only should be sought, and not its details allegorized. Possibly we should accept the suggestion that the estate was farmed to the steward, who rack-rented the tenants and dishonestly appropriated the excess, so that his hasty reduction of their debts was only bringing them down to the right amount, that which the owner had been receiving; but of this there is no evidence. Mr. Latham put forward the view that the steward had been too scrupulous in studying the interests of his employer, to the neglect of the rights of the tenants, whom he ground down cruelly; and he took the parable as a warning against unwise zeal for God at the cost of unkindness to men, on whom in the name of God too heavy requirements are laid (*Pastor Pastorum*, pp. 386-398).

W. F. Adeney.

Honey

HONEY.—Honey is mentioned very frequently in the OT: twenty times in the proverbial expression 'a land flowing with milk and honey' (Exo 3:8; Exo 3:17; Exo 13:5; Exo 33:3, Lev 20:24, Num 13:27; Num 14:8; Num 16:13 f., Deu 6:3; Deu 11:9; Deu 26:9; Deu 26:15; Deu 27:3; Deu 31:20, Jos 5:6, Jer 11:5; Jer 32:22, Eze 20:6; Eze 20:15); or in other connexions, either literally, as a product of the soil and as food (Gen 43:11, Deu 8:8; Deu 32:13, Jdg 14:8 f., 18, 1Sa 14:25 f., 29, 43, 2Sa 17:29, 1Ki 14:3, 2Ki 18:32, 2Ch 31:5, Job 20:17, Psa 81:16, Isa 7:15; Isa 7:22, Jer 41:8, Eze 16:13; Eze 16:19, Sir 11:3; Sir 39:26); or figuratively, as a term of comparison for sweetness (Exo 16:31, Psa 19:10; Psa 119:103, Pro 5:3; Pro 16:24;

Pro 24:13 f., Pro 25:16; Pro 25:27, Son 4:11; Son 5:1, Eze 3:3, Sir 24:20; Sir 49:1). On the other hand, it is very rarely named in the NT, and especially in the Gospels. There is no direct evidence that the Jews were acquainted with any other honey than that of wild bees. Yet the fact that in 2Ch 31:5 honey is included among the products of which the first-fruits were to be offered, would appear to represent it as an object of culture, and the mention of 'wild honey' as part of the food of John the Baptist (Mat 3:4, Mar 1:6 [Syriac Sin. [Note: Sinaitic.] , perhaps under the influence of Deu 32:13 and Psa 81:16, has 'honey of the mountains']) appears to point by way of contrast to the existence of honey derived from domesticated bees. As to artificial honey, made from boiled fruits (dates, raisins, figs), and to which the Arabs give the name of *dibs* (the phonetic equivalent of Heb. שֶׁמֶח 'honey' [of bees]), it is not impossible that it was known to the Israelites and the Jews; but we have no decisive Biblical proof of this (cf. Josephus *BJ* iv. viii. 3; Urquhart, *The Lebanon*, 1860, i. p. 393; Berggren, *Guide Français-Arabe*, col. 266, Nr. 94 and 95).

The two parallel passages cited above, relating to the food of John the Baptist, are the only ones in the Gospels in which the word μέλι, 'honey,' is found. Wild honey (μέλι ἄγριον) is named along with locusts as forming the very simple and frugal sustenance of an ascetic, a Nazirite, such as John was.* [Note: One might be tempted, however, following a hint of Diodorus Siculus (xix. 94), to see in the 'wild honey' the designation of a vegetable and nutritive substance, such as the resin of the tamarisks or some other sweet and savoury exudation from a tree. To collect nourishment of this kind in the thickets along the Jordan would have been an easier task for the Baptist, and would have required less time, than to hunt for the honey of bees (cf. Berggren, op. cit. col. 564).] Further, in another Gospel passage (Luk 24:42) there is mention, at least in the TR [Note: R Textus Receptus.] and Authorized Version , of a piece 'of a honeycomb' (ἀπὸ μελισσίου κηρίου) as having been offered along with 'a piece of broiled fish' to Jesus after His resurrection. But a number of the most ancient MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] of the NT (אBBDLII) do not contain the former phrase, and the disposition of modern commentators, almost without exception, is to consider it as an addition. 'A singular interpolation, evidently from an extraneous source, written or oral,' say Westcott and Hort. The Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 omits it. But this method of solving the problem cannot be regarded as satisfactory and final. In fact, if it is very hard to imagine, to use the language of Dean Burgon, 'that such a clause as that established itself universally in the sacred text, if it be spurious,' it is much less difficult to explain 'how such a clause became omitted from any manuscript, if it be genuine.' One can discover no possible motive for the surreptitious introduction of these words into the text. On the other hand, if they are regarded as an integral part of the primitive and authentic

text, it is not impossible to disentangle the reason of their suppression in some MS^S [Note: SS Manuscripts.] . With a view to this we must place the narrative of Luk 24:41-43 alongside of Joh 21:9-13, compare these two descriptions of a meal, and note that in many of the writings of the Fathers, and probably in various attempts to establish ‘harmonies of the Four Gospels’ (but not in the *Diatessaron* of Tatian), these two scenes are in fact identified (although they differ in all their essential features). Now, perhaps, we may be able to explain how the mention of the honeycomb came to disappear. The influence of Lev 2:11 f., which forbids the use of honey (probably because easily subject to fermentation) in any kind of sacrifice; that of the allegorical interpretation of Son 5:1 (especially in the LXX Septuagint version) applied to Christ; an ascetic tendency to proscribe sweet foods; the possible intervention of the Valentinians with their *Veritatis Evangelium*; and, finally, the proneness to polemize against the Gnostics, who made large use of honey in their solemn ‘mysteries’ (cf. Carl Schmidt, *Gnostische Schriften in koptischer Sprache*, Leipzig, 1892, pp. 203, 508), and who may have appealed for support to this text;—such are the motives which, either singly or all combined, may have brought about the removal of the disputed words. The present writer is strongly inclined, in common with the three authors cited below in the Literature, to retain them as authentic.

Literature.—Burgon-Miller, *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, London, 1896, Appendix I. ‘Honeycomb,’ pp. 240-252; Merx, *Evang. des Markus und Lukas*, Berlin, 1905, pp. 540-543; Nestle, *ThLZ* [Note: hLZ Theol. Literaturzeitung.] , 1906, col. 40. See also, for bees, Bochart, *Hicroz.* ii. 502 ff.; J. G. Wood, *Bible Animals*, 1869, pp. 605-612; Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*⁸ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1889, pp. 322-326.

Lucien Gautier.

☩ Honour

HONOUR.—The codes of technical ‘honour’ are largely opposed to the teaching of Christ (Matthew 5, Luk 6:29). Therefore such conceptions of ‘honour’ must be regarded as briars choking the word (Mar 4:19); for whatever justification codes of ‘honour’ may claim (as from Mat 7:12), they are impatient of the spirit of meekness inculcated by Christ in precept (Mat 5:39) and in example (Matthew 27). So the Sons of Thunder would have vindicated summarily the honour of their Master (Luk 9:54). More generally, in the quest of honour, it is honour from God and not from men that is to be sought by the Christian—the glory of God rather than of men (Joh 12:43).

Worldly honour may be a source of severest temptation (Luk_4:7), for the disciple is not greater than his Master whose sinlessness was thus brought to view (Mat_10:24). Honour from God the Christian disciple will have: 'If any man will serve me, him will my Father honour' (Joh_12:26). And to be invited to the marriage-supper of the King's Son is a greater honour than any this world affords (Matthew 22). But this honour and blessing from God contrasts with the dishonour and scorn that the world is ready to shower upon followers of One who was despised and rejected. The wicked husbandmen did not honour the son of the lord of the vineyard (Mar_12:6); they killed him and put him to shame (Mark 15). The Christian therefore must not be found

'Seeking an honour which they gave not Thee.'

Nay, even the most sacred honour is not the right goal for the follower of Christ, as James and John were taught (Mar_10:37). Service, not honour, is the true aim for the life of self-sacrifice,—not to be honoured of all, but to be servant of all (Mar_10:44). Honour is included in the all-things left to follow Christ (Mat_19:27), and it is worth while to abandon all worldly things in exchange for the true life (Mat_16:26). Still further, the *tradition of men* must give place to the *commandment of God* (Mar_7:8). Dishonour now will give place to eternal and Divine honour in due season (Mat_19:28).

W. B. Frankland.

☛ Hook

HOOK.—See Fish.

☛ Hope

HOPE.—In considering the relation of hope to Christ and the Gospels, we are at once met with the fact that in the Gospels the word ἐλπίς does not occur at all, and ἐλπίζω only five times, viz. once in Mt (Mat_12:21), where the Evangelist quotes the LXX Septuagint, three times in Lk (Luk_6:34; Luk_23:8; Luk_24:21), and once in Jn (Joh_5:45); and in none of these instances does it refer to the theological virtue.

This absence of the word is the more remarkable, when we remember not only that Judaism, the religion in which our Lord and His disciples were reared, was essentially a religion of hope, but also that the result of the teaching of Jesus was vastly to enlarge and deepen that hope, by imparting to it the riches of the Christian faith.

Great as was the religious hope inspired by the older dispensation, it was small when compared with that 'better hope' (Heb 7:19) which rested on the unchangeable kingly Priesthood of Christ.

The disciples doubtless were too fully absorbed in the *present* to have felt deeply expectations for the future. They were held captive by the greatness of His personality and the depth of His love, and ultimately came to realize that they had in Him the Hope of Israel itself. And if Simeon, having received the Messiah into his arms, felt his greatest hopes realized, then the disciples, having found the Christ, must have been so absorbed by Him as to have had little room and little need for longings regarding the future.

But why did Jesus, who taught the necessity of *faith* (Mar 11:22, Joh 3:16) and the pre-eminence of *love* (Mat 22:40), remain silent as regards *hope*. It was due to the fact that in training His followers, the first necessity was to concentrate their attention on *Himself* as their present possession. Had He taught them fully of the fruition that awaited them at the end of the age, and had He thus made hope a distinctly prominent portion of His teaching, He would have dissipated their attention and diverted it from that which they most required to learn. St. Paul could teach, 'Christ our hope' (1Ti 1:1). Jesus had to lay the foundation by teaching, 'Come unto me' (Mat 11:28).

But if He did not give direct teaching on the point, He nevertheless laid deeply the basis upon which the Church's doctrine of hope was to be built; for He pointed the disciples, in His promises, to the blessings which they ultimately would enjoy. The promises of His resurrection, of His perpetual spiritual presence, and of His final return in glory, were sure foundations upon which the Church could build her doctrine, and on this basis the developed teaching of the Epistles rests. And if the death of Jesus rudely shattered the Messianic hope of the disciples, His resurrection, followed by the illumination of the Holy Spirit, restored it to them in a purified and spiritual form.

As we study in the Epistles the doctrine of hope, which was thus awakened and became an integral part of Christian life, we find it vitally connected by the Church with her faith in Christ risen and glorified. (1) His resurrection is regarded as the *ground* of the Christian's hope: by it Christians are begotten 'unto a living hope,' and through it their hope in God is established (1Pe 1:3; 1Pe 1:21). (2) *All* Christian hopes are realized in Him. Various objects worthy of hope are mentioned, such as salvation (1Th 5:8), eternal life (Tit 1:2; Tit 3:7), the glory of God (Rom 5:2, Col 1:27), the resurrection of the dead (Act 24:15; Act 23:6); but all these different blessings are summed up in Jesus Christ. When they hope for Him, they hope for them all; for in Him all the scattered yearnings of the human heart are united and find their

fulfilment. Thus it is that St. Paul calls Him 'our hope' (1Ti 1:1). (3) The Church therefore fixes her gaze on the heavens; for her Hope is there. She is ever 'looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ' (Tit 2:13), for then she shall lie like Him, for she shall see Him as He is; 'and every one that hath this hope set on him purifieth himself' (1Jn 3:2-3). Even inanimate nature groans for its coming redemption at the Parousia, having been subjected to vanity 'in hope' (Rom 8:20). (4) But while the full realization of Christian hope will not be reached until the return of Christ, yet even now the Church has a foretaste of the bliss that ultimately will be hers. For Christ now dwells in the Church and in the hearts of her members, and thus grants an earnest of final fulfilment. Christ in the Church and in the individual is 'the hope of glory' (Col 1:27), and therefore to be without Christ is to be without hope (Eph 2:12).

See, further, the following article.

Charles T. P. Grierson.

☩ Hopefulness

HOPEFULNESS (Christ's).—Knowing that all our possessions of grace come from Christ, in whom we believe all fulness dwells, and believing that He alone among the sons of men possessed perfect knowledge, we might be led to doubt whether we could justly attribute hope to Him. As regards His perfect knowledge, we must remember that uncertainty is no essential element in hope. Human hope may be proverbially disappointing, but that is due to the uncertainty of temporal things, and not to the nature of hope itself. Indeed, the glory of the Christian hope consists in the moral certainty of its grounds. It is a 'better hope' in part as being 'sure and steadfast' (Heb 7:19; Heb 6:19). The fact, then, that our Lord's faith rendered future objects of desire almost a present possession in no way prevented Him from experiencing this grace.* [Note: Westcott (Life, vol. i. p. 41) writes in his diary: 'The fact of our Lord never mentioning His own faith or hope is a proof of His Divinity.' This, however, can hardly be looked upon as a careful statement, but rather as a passing thought, and it was noted down early in his life (aet. 21).] As regards His possessing 'all fulness' as the God-man, and so being thought incapable of feeling hopefulness, it may be said that we clearly start our thoughts on a wrong line if we commence an investigation of this kind with our own *a priori* views of what the incarnate Son of God must have felt or not felt. We can in ourselves be no adequate judges of the limitations which Deity might set upon itself when taking our flesh. Our duty is to study the NT, and especially the Gospels, with the view of discovering what is there revealed as to the true nature of this act of Divine condescension. And such a study teaches us that in

our Lord's Person we have not only a revelation of the Father, but also a revelation of humanity at its highest. He loved to call Himself 'Son of Man,' because He thereby taught us to see in Him the ideal Man, and therefore we must expect to see in Him every truly human emotion (and hope is one of them) purified and perfected.

No teacher of mankind ever so frequently pointed to Himself in His teaching as Jesus did, and yet it is remarkable that He rarely revealed His own personal emotions. When He disclosed Himself it was as the source of all grace, so that men might be saved and nourished by His life. He was so absolutely *selfless* that He rarely sought sympathy by speaking of His heart's desires. It is not He but the Evangelists who tell us that He was weary, wept, exulted, marvelled. Thus it happens that He never definitely mentions His own hope. Indeed, strangely enough, the word ἐλπίς does not occur in the Gospels (see art. Hope). But as hope is a necessary element of Christian character, being one of the 'abiding' graces (1Co_13:13), Christ, if He be true man, must have experienced it. It is not *said* that He had faith, but must we not believe that His whole human career was sustained from the first consciousness of childhood to Calvary by faith, perfect in its range and steadfastness? The long nights of prayer surely tell us not only of a general attitude of dependence, but also of a definite trustful belief in the love and presence of His Father, which found its expression in petition. What habitual strength of faith is shown in such words as 'Thinkest thou that I cannot beseech my Father, and he shall even now send me more than twelve legions of angels?' (Mat_26:53).

No doubt His faith and hope are so raised above ours by their perfection, that they may no longer seem to be what to us are faith and hope. But He raised *all* human attributes to their perfection; not thereby altering their essential character, but rather exhibiting them as they ought to be in ourselves. And if He felt no hope, never rejoiced in coming good, never was upborne when wearing the cross by anticipation of the crown, but lived His life in the cold calm of duty, then the Stoic is the ideal of our race.

Not a few evidences, more or less indirect, of Christ's hopefulness are found in the Gospels. In one case its object was of a temporal nature, namely, when being 'hungry' He approached the fig tree, 'if haply he might find anything thereon.' (Mar_11:12 ff.)

Little reverence would be shown by interpreting this incident as feigned for the purpose of teaching a moral lesson. 'If He only pretended not to know that the tree was barren, we should expect the hunger also to have been pretended' (Mason, *Conditions of our Lord's Life*, p. 152). Rather have we an example of hope in the

mind of Jesus for a desired good, which circumstances disappointed, and which He turned to a moral purpose.

Evidence of His being cheered during His ministry by hope of the results of His spiritual labours may probably be seen in His words to the disciples when the Samaritan woman had left (Joh 4:27-38). He had gained one soul, and with prophetic vision saw the land filled with ripened souls ready for the spiritual reaper. His followers, too, would receive wages in the joy of souls won, and ultimately they, with the earlier workers of God who had sown the seed, would rejoice together. So full was His soul with joy of hope already realized, and with the prospect of still greater harvesting, that He was raised above the sense of hunger. The whole passage seems full of the deepest emotion of our Lord; and if so, hope was its strongest element. A similar anticipation of coming joy in the salvation of those He came to save may be felt in the words, 'Rejoice with me; for I have found my sheep which was lost' (Luk 15:6). Further, may we not see that hope realized was the cause of the strong movement of His soul, when He exulted ($\eta\gamma\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron$, Luk 10:21) in Satan's fall from heaven? It was a rejoicing of His innermost soul, because already He saw potentially accomplished the object of His mission. Similarly must we account for the deep feeling displayed by Him when visited by the inquiring Greeks (Joh 12:20-33). Here again is hope anticipative. He sees the uttermost parts of the world potentially present in the persons of these Gentiles, and He declares that 'the hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified' (Joh 12:23); and yet, foreknowing the terrible fate that awaited Him before the achievement of His desire, He alternated between the joy of hope and the sorrow of human dread, and prayed to be saved from that hour (Joh 12:27).

In His teaching to His disciples there is the oft-repeated lesson of His return to His Father (Joh 7:33; Joh 8:14; Joh 16:28). Doubtless His chief object was to explain His heavenly origin and to prepare them for His departure, but not a little pathos and increased depth may be recognized in such words if we see in them also a longing hope for the time when the bitter trials of His voluntary humiliation would cease. Thus in His High-Priestly prayer, now that He has finished His work, He pleads for the renewal of the glory which He had with His Father before the world was (Joh 17:1-5). And thinking of the loved ones to whom His parting would be so bitter a trial, He prays for the realization of the hope that they might ultimately be granted the beatific vision, beholding Him in His glory (Joh 16:24); then would He drink with them the fruit of the vine new in His Father's kingdom (Mat 26:29).

Perhaps the most clearly expressed example of hope on the part of our Lord, an example which unequivocally shows His feeling of the emotion, is to be found in the words with which He commenced the Paschal meal. 'With desire I have desired to eat

this passover with you before I suffer' (Luk 22:15). Here we have a distinct statement, that He held ardently an expectation of a future good before its realization.

We further find that His ministry was exercised in a spirit of intense *optimism* as regards both the community and the individual. This is the more remarkable when we recall that He more than any other saw the reality of human corruption. The hidden disease of society, with its outward religiousness and inward godlessness, led Him to predict the overthrow of the ecclesiastical and national life, like Jeremiah of old. But, unlike that prophet, He, notwithstanding His clear view of coming judgment, looked to the future with a splendid hopefulness. His kingdom would yet fill the world (Matthew 13); His gospel would be universally preached (Mar 13:10); and ultimately *all* men would be drawn unto Him (Joh 12:32).

The same optimism is to be seen in His dealings with individual sinners. In the most corrupt He saw germs of good; and thus could win sinful women from their ways (Luk 7:50, Joh 8:11), and publicans from their grasping worldliness (Mar 2:14, Luk 19:9); and He could discover sufficient moral worth in a dying thief and murderer to be able to promise him rest in Paradise (Luk 23:43). The hopefulness of Christ in His message to mankind is fully embodied in His saying, 'Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world' (Joh 16:33). Thus we see that our Lord was in hope, as in all else save sin, 'like as we are' (Heb 4:15). And if we in our trials are upborne by the hope of future bliss, He also was upborne to endure the cross and despise the shame by 'the joy that was set before him' (Heb 12:2).

Charles T. P. Grierson.

☛Horn

HORN.—The expression 'a horn of salvation' in the song of Zacharias (Luk 1:69) is undoubtedly a reference to the promised Messiah. A similar combination of words is found in Psa 18:2, but the conception is more probably due to Psa 132:17, 1Sa 2:10.

1. In the OT the word 'horn' is figuratively used in poetical and allegorical language: (a) for abstract notions of *strength* (Num 23:22, Psa 89:17-24), and hence of dignity (Psa 112:9) or pride (Psa 75:4 ff.); also, (b) in a concrete sense, to represent *kings and empires* (Dan 7:24; Dan 8:20 f., Zec 1:18 ff.). The rendering 'a mighty salvation,' Luk 1:69 (Pr. Bk. [Note: Bk. Prayer Book.]), paraphrases the sense but obliterates the associations. Hor. *Od.* iii. 21, 18 is quoted as an instance of the metaphor in ordinary literature, in which it is rare.

2. Inasmuch as the horn in animals is a weapon of attack rather than of defence, some have regarded it as a symbol of *aggressive* strength (see Delitzsch, Perowne, etc., on Psa_18:2): possibly *combative* strength, in which both ideas are included, would be a better definition. There are two classes of symbols expressive of such strength: (a) natural weapons (e.g. horn, right hand, arm, etc.), and (b) artificial weapons (arrows, axe, shield, etc.). When any distinction is to be made, the former class tends to represent that strength which is personal, inherent, immediate; the latter, to represent that strength in which second causes, instruments, agents appear (Isa_10:5; Isa_10:15).

F. S. Ranken.

☩ Hosanna

HOSANNA (הוֹשַׁעְנָא, Gr. ὠσαννά).—One of the Hebrew words which (like , Hallelujah, Sabbath, Sabaoth) have passed, transliterated and not translated, from the vocabulary of the Jewish to that of the Christian Church. In the NT it occurs only in three Gospels: in them it is found six times (Mat_21:9; Mat_21:15, Mar_11:9-10, Joh_12:13), but only in the history of our Lord's triumphant entry to Jerusalem on Palm Sunday, and only as a vocal cry uttered, either by the palm-bearing multitude who met Him, or by the children who hailed Him thereafter in the Temple (Mat_21:15). Among the Jews, however, the word came to designate not alone the cry, but also the of palms, myrtle, or willow which on their joyous feast of Tabernacles, and especially on its seventh day, the people were accustomed—for the Law did not enjoin this ceremony—to carry in procession with the priests to the fountain of Shiloah and thence again to the Temple, where these 'hosannas' were piled up and beaten against the altar. It is only with 'Hosanna' as a cry that we are here concerned; but we cannot forget that when, in honour of our Lord, the multitude raised the cry, they 'took branches of palm trees' (Joh_12:13) as well; and therefore, besides expounding the meaning of the cry, we must consider how a ceremony customary at the feast of Tabernacles came to be adopted, popularly, on an occasion when the worshippers were assembling at Jerusalem to celebrate a feast of a widely different character, that of the Passover.

Philologically, the word *Hosanna* is explained as a derivation from or contraction of Psa_118:25 (Heb.): *ânnâ Jahweh hôshî'âh-nnâ* ('I beseech thee, O Lord, save now'). This Psalm was sung, and this verse of it used as a refrain by the people, at the feast of Tabernacles; and the refrain was abbreviated, through constant popular repetition, into *Hôsha'nâ*, just as the old Canaanitish cry *Hoi Dod* (= 'Ho Adonis') was turned into a common interjection, *Hedad*.

The vocal 'Hosanna' was used by the Jews at the feast of Tabernacles when the branches also were employed; and on this account it has been asserted by Mr. Lewis N. Dembitz (in the *Jewish Encyc.* vol. vi. p. 276, s.v. 'Hoshana Rabbah') that 'the Gospels by a mistake place the custom in the season shortly before the Passover, instead of in the feast of Booths.' To this it may be answered, (1) that, according to another writer in the same *Encyclopedia*, Rabbi Kaufmann Kohler (vol. vi. p. 272), *Hosanna* 'became a popular cry used in solemn processions wherewith was connected the carrying of palm branches as described in 1Ma 13:51 and 2Ma 10:7.' But (2) the procession in 1Ma 13:51 was *not* at the feast of Tabernacles, which was kept on the 15th day of the 7th month (Lev 23:34), but at a wholly different season, 'on the three and twentieth day of the second month'; while the celebration in 2Ma 10:7, though 'the procession was *after the manner* of the feast of Tabernacles' (v. 6), was somewhat later in the year. Thus there was historical and uninspired (for the Jews did not hold the Books of Maccabees to be inspired) precedent for the employment both of the palm-bearing and the shout on other suitable occasions besides the feast of Tabernacles. And (3) was not the occasion of Christ's entry into Jerusalem one that must have seemed eminently suitable alike to His disciples who began it (Luk 19:37) and to the candid (Mat 21:15) and grateful (Joh 12:17) Israelites who joined them in the celebration of it? The Jews, we know, were accustomed to associate with the feast of Tabernacles the highest of those blessings which Messiah was to bring. It was as Messiah that Jesus now presented Himself. He had chosen to ride that day upon the ass's colt, in accordance with Zechariah's prophecy (Zec 9:9), just on purpose to make an offer of Himself to Jerusalem as her promised King (Mat 21:4, Joh 12:14). What, accordingly, would the people look for at His hands? What would they ask from Him? Salvation; but salvation not on its negative side alone, of deliverance, but on its positive side as well, of fruition. If the approaching feast of the Passover would remind them of the former, how their Egyptian oppressor had been smitten (Exo 12:29), it was the feast of Tabernacles which pre-eminently supplied illustrations of the latter: its branches and its booths were redolent of that first night of freedom which their fathers had enjoyed under the cool booths of Succoth (Exo 12:37). so refreshing after the dust and heat of the brickfield and the furnace. Both sides—the negative and the positive, the smiting and the booths—were in one chapter (Exodus 12): they could hardly remember the one without the other. The form, therefore, which the celebration of our Lord's entry into Jerusalem is described by the Four Evangelists as assuming, is not such as to require us to suppose that they made a mistake in placing it at the season of the Passover. On the contrary, it was neither unprecedented nor unnatural; and the fact that it was not a legally prescribed but only a popular ceremony, left them quite free to use it when they thought fit. It is not as if the Evangelists had transferred the unleavened bread of the Passover to the Feast of Tabernacles.

Hosanna is rendered in both Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 (cf. Psa 118:25, whence it is taken) ‘Save now.’ The *now* is not here an adverb of time, but an interjection of entreaty, as in ‘Come now’: the word means ‘Oh! save’ (*Jewish Encyc.*), or ‘Save, we beseech Thee.’ As given (1) absolutely, as in Mar 11:9 and Joh 12:13, the natural meaning of this would be an address to Christ, as Messiah, asking Him to bestow the salvation expected of Him; or, as our English hymn expresses it, ‘Bring near Thy great salvation.’ We can understand how, in this sense, ‘Hosanna’ should be followed by salutations or acclamations, ‘Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord (Psa 118:26, Mat 21:9, Mar 11:9), ‘Blessed is the kingdom of our father David, that cometh in the name of the Lord’ (Mar 11:10), or ‘Blessed is the King of Israel that cometh in the name of the Lord’ (Joh 12:13). All the different forms may have been used, for there was a multitude of speakers. The sequence of the thoughts is natural: for if Jesus be once conceived of as able to save (either by His own power or by that of Him that sent Him), the next thing, obviously, for His people to do, after asking Him to exert His power in their behalf, is to rejoice that He has come, and to bless Him for coming.

But (2) it is not only in this absolute construction that the Evangelists use the word *Hosanna*. St. Matthew employs it with a dative, ‘Hosanna to the Son of David’ (Mat 21:9); and both St. Matthew and St. Mark give us ‘Hosanna in the highest.’ Both these variations have been censured by Dr. Kaufmann Kohler (*Jewish Encyc. l.e. supra*) as ‘corruptions of the original version’: the addition ‘in the highest,’ he declares to be ‘words which no longer give any sense.’ But in a connexion which seems to justify St. Matthew, the dative is used alike in the OT (Psa 3:8 ‘Salvation belongeth unto the Lord’) and in the NT in a passage based upon that Psalm (Rev 7:10 ‘Salvation unto our God; and unto the Lamb’); while there is surely nothing ‘senseless’ in the thought that the salvation which God gives, or sends, to men should fill the highest heaven with rejoicings in His praise. We have the idea in the OT (e.g. Psa 8:1) and in the NT (Luk 2:14, Eph 3:10). To some Christian commentators, however, and those of no mean weight,—e.g. Cornelius à Lapse and Dean Alford,—St. Matthew’s use of *Hosanna* with the dative has seemed to render requisite a different interpretation of the word. *Hosanna* was, says Alford (on Mat 21:9), ‘originally a formula of supplication, but [became] conventionally [one] of gratulation, so that it is followed by a dative, and by “in the highest,”—meaning “may it also be ratified in heaven,”—and he cites 1Ki 1:36, where Benaiah answers David, saying, ‘Amen: the Lord, the God of my lord the king, say so too.’ Cornelius à Lapse takes ‘Hosanna to the Son of David’ as a prayer for Christ, offered by the people ‘asking all prosperous things for Him from God.’ Now, this would, in itself, be admissible enough. Of Messiah, even when thought of as Divine and reigning, the Scripture says, ‘prayer also shall be made for him continually’ (Psa 72:15). But it seems unnatural to postulate so violent an alteration in the meaning of the word—from ‘supplication’ to ‘gratulation,’ when, taken in its original meaning, it yields a sufficient sense: ‘Save now, for it is to

thee, O Son of David, that the power to save us has been given.’ It was not unnatural that the people should speak in this sense: as Jews they knew already that ‘salvation belongeth unto God’ (Psa_3:8). This view derives considerable confirmation from the parallel passage in the Apocalypse, where the whole scene in ch. Psa_7:14, and even the very words—‘the multitude before the throne and before the Lamb ... with palms in their hands’ (Rev_7:9, cf. Joh_12:13), who cry with a loud voice (cf. Luk_19:37), saying, ‘Salvation to our God ... and to the Lamb’—seems to be based on what happened at Jerusalem on that first Palm Sunday; as if the Seer were beholding the salvation come which that day was asked, and recognized that the palm-bearers of the earthly Jerusalem were precursors of the hosts of the redeemed. St. John, it will be remembered, has, in his Gospel (Joh_12:16), the remark, ‘These things understood not his disciples at the first, but after he was risen they remembered,’ etc. If, as seems clear, the vision is expressed in figures drawn from that event, then the acclaim in heaven must be held to settle the meaning of those Hosannas upon earth: the dative of the Apocalypse is the dative of the Gospel: it is the dative not of a prayer for Jesus, but of an ascription of salvation to Him as its Mediator and Bestower.

It remains only to be added that the Third Evangelist, while recording the same Triumphal Entry, and mentioning the acclamations of the people, omits alike the palm-branches and the word ‘Hosanna.’ The explanation, no doubt, of both omissions lies in the fact that St. Luke wrote especially for Gentiles: his readers would not have understood the Hosanna, and would have misunderstood the palms. To Greeks the palm-branch would have been, inevitably, the palm of pride and victory: not, as to the Hebrew mind, an emblem of peaceful rest, and freedom, and household joy. ‘Hosanna’ would have meant nothing at all. Therefore the Evangelist to the Greeks paraphrases the word, and paraphrases with it St. Matthew’s and St. Mark’s addition to it, ‘in the highest’; rendering the whole by ‘Peace in heaven, and glory in the highest’ (Luk_19:38). And, as St. Matthew had the dative of ascription, ‘Hosanna to the Son of David’—as looking for salvation to Him who had come to Jerusalem in this capacity; so St. Luke, in his paraphrase of the Hosanna, employs what we may call a dative clause: his ‘Peace in heaven, and glory in the highest,’ are introduced so as to show us these as the result of Christ’s coming as King in the name of the Lord: it is for these ends that He has come; and on this account the people call Him blessed. It was for these ends that He was born: wherefore the angels sang the same strain over Him at His Nativity (Luk_2:14); it is for these ends now that He paces forward to His cross: and therefore men, though as yet they understand it not (Joh_12:16), are moved, by a Power they know not, to bear Him record.

Literature.—Art. ‘Hosanna’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible and in *Encyc. Bibl.*; *Jewish Encyc*, *loc. cit.*; Milligan, *Com. on Gospel of St. John and Revelation*;

Westcott, *St. John's Gospel*; Cornelius à Lapide, Neale and Littledale, and Perowne, on Psalms 118.

James Cooper.

☩ Hospitality

HOSPITALITY.—This marked Oriental virtue prevailed in Palestine in Christ's day. Our Lord assumes its exercise, rather than directly enjoins it. His Apostles, later, however, prescribed hospitality as a reflexion of the Christ spirit (Rom 12:13, 1Ti 3:2, Tit 1:8, Heb 13:2; 1Pe 4:9), even towards an enemy (Rom 12:20). Because of the widespread prevalence of hospitality, inns (wh. see) were comparatively few; and even in *khans* or places of lodgment for strangers there were unfurnished rooms which were at the disposal of travellers, without cost. The innkeeper or host usually received remuneration for such extra service as the stranger might require, as in a case like that of the wounded man cared for at the Samaritan's expense (Luk 10:35). Since Jesus Himself 'had not where to lay his head' (Mat 8:20), He depended much upon the hospitality of the friendly disposed, as of Andrew and Peter at Capernaum (Mat 8:14), and of Mary, Martha, and Lazarus at Bethany (Joh 11:1-5); and frequently accepted the hospitality of house-holders (Mat 26:6, Luk 5:29; Luk 7:36 ff; Luk 19:5). On occasions of the great feasts at Jerusalem, guest-chambers were freely put at the disposal of visiting worshippers (Mar 14:14). When the Master sent out the Seventy, they were to take no purse, but to rely upon the hospitality of the people of the towns into which they might go (Luk 10:4 ff.); a blessing being left with the hospitable (Luk 10:6), while a woe is pronounced upon the inhospitable city (Luk 10:10-12). Christ said of His messengers that those who received them were in truth receiving Him (Joh 13:20). So incensed were two of His disciples at being refused entertainment in a Samaritan village, that they would have called down fire from heaven to destroy the people. But this spirit Jesus rebuked (Luk 9:52-56). The spirit of hospitality was manifested in giving not only lodging and food, but also water for the feet (Luk 7:44, cf. Joh 13:5); a servant usually unloosing and taking charge of the sandals (Luk 3:16). Sometimes a kiss characterized the hospitable reception (Luk 7:45).

The emphasis that Jesus laid upon the virtue of hospitality may be discovered in His description of the Last Judgment, in which the righteous are commended because 'I was a stranger and ye took me in' (Mat 25:35). See also art. Inn.

Literature.—Thomson, *L^B* [Note: The Land and the Book.] , *passim*; Edersheim, *Sketches of Jewish Social Life*; Trumbull, *Oriental Social Life*; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , s.v.

E. B. Pollard.

☩ Host

HOST.—See (1) Angels; (2) Hospitality, Inn, Invitation.

☩ Hour

HOUR.—1. In several of their accounts of Christ's healings, the Evangelists indicate the instantaneousness of the cures by some such expression as 'He was healed in the selfsame hour' (Mat_8:13, cf. Mat_9:22; Mat_15:28; Mat_17:18, Joh_4:53). More definitely the word is used as a division of the day (Mat_20:3; Mat_20:5-6; Mat_20:12; Mat_27:45-46, cf. Mar_15:33-34, Luk_23:44, Joh_1:39; Joh_4:6; Joh_4:52; Joh_19:14). The usual system of reckoning time was from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m., and again from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m. 'In the 1st cent. of our era the day was divided, in popular language, into twelve equal parts or hours, which varied in length according to the season.... The expression, "the first hour," indicated the time when the shadow on the dial reached the mark which showed that 1½ of the day had elapsed' (Ramsay, *Expositor*, March 1893, p. 216 f.). The question has been raised, because of the apparent divergence between Joh_19:14 and Mar_15:25, whether St. John adopted another method of reckoning in the Fourth Gospel, viz. from midnight to midday, and from midday to midnight. Prof. Ramsay maintains that, though the Roman civil day was reckoned in this way, it was not divided into hours; and that the note of time when the martyrdom of Polycarp took place, ὥρα ὀγδόη, does not prove its use in Asia Minor (*l.c.*). But the internal evidence of the Fourth Gospel points strongly to this mode of reckoning on the part of St. John. The tenth hour (Joh_1:39) is more probably 10 a.m. than 4 p.m., if the two disciples lodged with Jesus 'that day.' It harmonizes with the custom of Eastern women of drawing water in the evening, and accounts for the weariness of Jesus, if we take 'the sixth hour' of Joh_4:6 not as noon, but as 6 p.m. And although we cannot look for precision in point of time in Oriental writers, the divergence between the Synoptists and St. John as to the hour of Christ's condemnation and crucifixion is too wide to be intelligible on any other hypothesis than that they used different systems of reckoning. But if the 'sixth hour' of Joh_19:14 means 6 a.m., there is no divergence (see Westcott, *St. John*, p. 282;

Smith, *The Days of His Flesh*, pp. 528-529; and for the opposite view, Dods, *Expos. Gr. Test.* i. 698, 855, 856). See, further, artt. Day, Time.

2. But Jesus, living 'in feelings, not in figures on a dial,' and 'counting time by heart-throbs,' gave the word an intense significance. To Him days and hours were moral magnitudes. The appointed span was not small, but spacious ('Are there not twelve hours in the day?' Joh_11:9), to be employed in strenuous and loving obedience to the Divine will (cf. Joh_9:4). Until the sunset, He knew He had no reason to fear the hostility of men. Life would be as long as duty, and in the path of God's service there are no tragic foreshortenings (Joh_11:8-9). But the twelfth hour of the day was that to which He so pathetically refers as 'Mine hour.' At the marriage feast in Cana, when appealed to by His mother with a suggestion for His help, He replied, 'Woman, what have I to do with thee? Mine hour is not yet come' (Joh_2:4). This may simply mean that the time for giving such relief was not opportune, or that the opportunity for miracle-working, or the moment for self-manifestation, had not arrived. But the whole utterance produces the impression that the appeal had aroused strong feelings, and created a critical situation for Him.

'He was standing on the threshold of His ministry, conscious of His miraulous power, and He was questioning whether that were the hour to put it forth.... The supplying of wine to a company of peasants seemed so trivial, so unworthy of the Messiah, so insufficient for the inauguration of the kingdom of heaven' (Smith, *The Days of His Flesh*, p. 55).

But is there not even here a reference to what He calls peculiarly His hour—'the hour when the Son of Man should be glorified' (Joh_12:23; cf. Joh_17:1); the hour when He should be betrayed into the hands of sinners (Mat_26:45); the hour when the Father's will gave Him over to the power of darkness (Luk_22:53)? If Jesus went down to the Jordan in order to participate in the Baptism of Repentance, conscious that His vocation as Messiah was to be that of the Suffering Servant, and to take upon Himself the sins of His brethren, then the thought of His hour as the hour of His sacrifice could never be absent from His mind. And the simple suggestion of His mother, involving, as it did, for Him the first exercise of a power which came to Him as Messiah, raised suddenly and vividly before Him the issue of suffering, and called forth the intense feeling in the words, 'Mine hour is not yet come.'

A similar tumult of emotion was produced towards the end of His ministry, by the request of the Greeks to see Him (Joh_12:20). The reply of Jesus, 'The hour is come, that the Son of man should be glorified.... Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone,' is relevant to a prospect of possible exemption from the cross which the request raised in Him, rather than to the request itself. Once more an apparently innocent intrusion upon His thoughts had brought before Him the vision of

His hour. He saw that the glory would be won at a great cost, and the prospect of it brought distress of soul, and wrung from Him the cry, 'Father, what shall I say? Save me from this hour.' But immediately He saw through the pain the holy purpose of God realizing itself, and recovered His poise of soul and unflinching devotion. 'But for this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify thy name.'

It was by this simple word, therefore, that He expressed the conviction that His death was the climax of His life, and that the time of its accomplishment was with God. He would not forestall it by any premature manifestation of Himself to the world (Joh 7:6); and until His hour came, His enemies were powerless against Him (Joh 7:30, Joh 8:20). But when it came, He was not reluctant to recognize it. Though it was a dark hour, the hour of men with sinister purpose and in league with Satan (Luk 22:53), He knew it as the hour when He should depart out of this world unto the Father (Joh 13:1), the hour when God should glorify His Son (Joh 17:1).

With the approach of that hour which marked the climax and close of His earthly ministry, a wider horizon opens. A new day of God dawns, and in it also there is a critical hour—'the hour when the Son of Man cometh' (Mat 25:13). Even to Him the precise point of time was not disclosed (Mat 24:36). Of one thing He was sure, and gave repeated warning,—it would come upon men with startling suddenness: 'and in an hour when ye think not' (Mat 24:42; Mat 24:44; Mat 24:50; Mat 25:13, cf. Luk 12:39; Luk 12:49; Luk 12:46); and He enforces therewith His command to 'watch,' 'be ready,' so that, though it come suddenly, it may be a glad surprise.

Joseph Muir.

House

HOUSE οἰκία, οἶκος.—The word 'house' is used in the Gospels, in accordance with ancient Hebrew usage, in a twofold sense, as referring either to the dwelling, or to the family living in it. Thus we have (1) 'the house of Israel' (Mat 10:6), 'the house of David' (Luk 1:27), etc.; (2) 'built his house upon a rock' (Mat 7:24), 'the house of the ruler' (Mar 5:38), etc.

The 'house,' as a building, plays no such part in Oriental as in Western life and civilization. Climatic conditions in the East permit people to live much in the open. Accordingly we find artisans and merchants plying their trades in the street, or in open shops looking out on the street. Then the domestic life of the Oriental requires little beyond a sheltered place for sleeping and a quiet place for eating. The ordinary house of the ancient Hebrew, we may be sure, was much like that found in Palestine

to-day—it could hardly be cruder, or more primitive. As to Hebrew architecture, of either OT or NT times, the Bible has little to say. Architecture proper can hardly be said to have arisen among the Hebrews before the time of the kings, say, about b.c. 1000. Then, it would seem, it differed little from that of the Phœnicians, Assyrians, and Egyptians. The style of the house would naturally be determined largely by the location, the materials at hand, and the purpose to be served. Palestine, as known to history, has had few great forests, and little timber of any kind suited for building. (Solomon had to import materials for palace and temple, 1Ki 5:18). Houses built in the plains were usually constructed of mud, clay, or sun-dried bricks (cf. Job 4:19). ‘Houses of clay,’ or those built of sun-dried bricks, could be easily broken into—a fact that gives point to our Lord’s allusion in the Sermon on the Mount, when He would dissuade from laying up treasures ‘where thieves break through and steal’ (Mat 6:19), where it is literally ‘*dig through*’ ((Revised Version margin)). Great care needed to be taken with the foundations. In a limestone country like Palestine, if one dig deep enough, he finds almost anywhere a stratum of solid rock. It is still true that the wise man builds his house upon the rock (Mat 7:24). It is common there now to dig down to the rock and lay the foundation of even the ‘house of clay’ upon it. Mat 7:25 ‘It was *founded*,’ might well be rendered, ‘It was *foundationed* upon the rock,’ if we had such a word in English. St. Luke (Luk 6:48) says, ‘dug, and went deep, and laid a foundation upon the rock.’

In the mountainous regions limestone rock was the building material chiefly used, as it was abundant, easily quarried, and readily worked. The house of stone was, probably, modelled after, or developed from, the cave. The nature of the country invited to this. First the natural cave would be used, and, as there was demand, artificially enlarged. Then, occasionally, in some inviting place, a cave would be hewn out of the rock, *de novo*. Finally, a wall would be built in front for protection, or privacy, and so the cave would be converted into a sheltered dwelling. Henceforth it would serve as a model for detached stone houses. As a matter of fact, in the ancient village of Siloam are found all these kinds of houses, and they illustrate this process of development. (See *Jewish Encyc.* art. ‘House’). Bricks were sometimes used even in the mountain regions, though counted inferior to hewn stone (2Sa 12:31). Many stone houses were unpretentious and rude, being built of rough, unhewn stones; but some, then as now, were built of hewn stones, with vaulted stone roofs, e.g. the palaces of the rich, or of the ruling class (cf. ‘the house of the ruler,’ Mar 5:38, ‘the high priest’s house,’ Luk 22:54). Sometimes space for walking was left around the dome, but often all the space between the dome and the battlement (Deu 22:8) would be filled in, so as to give the much-desired flat roof—the favourite resort of the Oriental in the cool of the evening (2Sa 11:2), and an inviting sleeping-place in summer (1Sa 9:25). Such a house will often have a hut of branches, or of vine-covered trellis-work, on the roof (cf. 2Sa 16:22, Neh 8:16), and sometimes a more substantial room, where guests of honour are lodged (1Ki 17:19, 2Ki 4:10). For

‘summer parlour,’ cf. Jdg 3:20, (Revised Version margin) has rightly ‘upper chamber of cooling.’ (See Mar 14:15, and cf. ‘upper room’ elsewhere). From the roof one could easily see what was going on in the street, or on a neighbouring housetop (cf. 1Sa 9:25); indeed, could even step from roof to roof, and thus walk the whole length of a street, as the present writer once did in Damascus (cf. Mar 13:15; Josephus *Ant.* xiii. 140 [ed. Niese]).

The humbler house of the plain was very simple, having usually only one apartment, which some times sheltered both man and beast. The walls were sometimes smeared with clay (Lev 14:41), sometimes plastered (Eze 13:10, Deu 27:4). The roof was made, no doubt, as that of the common Arab house is made to-day, by laying rough beams about three feet apart, then laying reeds or brushwood close and thick across, covering it with something like the thickly matted thorn-bush called *bellan*, and then spreading over the whole, first a coat of thick mortar, and then one of marl or earth, and rolling it. Such roofs would require frequent repairing and rolling to keep out the rain, and, if neglected, would get so soaked with the tropical rains that they would cave in. In this way whole villages have had to be abandoned, and their houses left desolate. It was probably one of the simplest of such roofs that was ‘broken up’ (Mar 2:4) when the paralytic was let down from the housetop at Capernaum into the presence of Jesus to be healed. The whole affair would seem to have been the extemporaneous device of plain peasants, accustomed to open their roofs and let down grain, straw, and other articles, as they still do in that country (Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii. 6ff.). The furniture of such a house would be very simple,—a few mats, or pallets, spread on the ground floor for sleeping on at night, then rolled up and put aside in the day; latterly a ‘divan’ set against the wall on one side, a small table, a few rude chairs, a niche in the wall for the primitive little lamp, unless it was of a sort to hang from a rafter, and a few large jugs for grain, water, wine, or oil.

The palace of the rich would differ from such a house, of course, in having more rooms, and richer and more varied furniture. The numerous rooms, often preferably arranged in a suite on the ground floor around one or more open courts, were often built in storeys. Fine woods, olive, cedar, etc., were used for the doors and windows, and the floors were sometimes made of wood, but often of cement or stone, or even of rich mosaics; while the walls in rare instances were inlaid with ivory and beaten gold (cf. Amo 5:11, 1Ki 22:39; 1Ki 6:18; 1Ki 6:20).

The Graeco-Roman architecture of the Hellenistic period did not exert any very marked or lasting influence upon the architecture of Palestine, partly because of the Jewish antipathy to the Hellenizing tendency, and partly because it was confined to the larger buildings, such as palaces, baths, theatres, temples, etc. See, further, Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. ‘House.’

Literature.—The Heb. Archaeologies of Keil, Benzinger, Nowack; Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*; Tristram, *Eastern Customs in Bible Lands*; Mackie, *Bible Manners*, etc.

Geo. B. Eager.

☛ Household

HOUSEHOLD.—In Mat_24:45 (οἰκετεία), Luk_12:42 (θεραπεία) = servants, *i.e.* the dependants on an estate to whom the steward was bound in our Lord's parable to serve out rations at intervals of a day, a week, or a month. It was their dependent and helpless condition which was the test of the steward's faithfulness to his trust. The same English word translates οἰκιακοί in Mat_10:25; Mat_10:36, *i.e.* the inmates of a house, subordinate indeed to the master, but attached to him by ties of relationship or marriage. In Mat_10:25 there is a contrast and comparison between the οἰκιακοί (Christ's disciples) and the οἰκοδεσπότης (the Lord Himself), and Christ warns the Twelve that if He has been called Beelzebul (or Beelzebub) by His enemies (cf. Mat_9:34; Mat_12:24, Joh_8:48), those who belong to His household cannot expect to be free from this 'reproach of Christ.' In Mat_10:36 the contrast is between some members of a household and the rest. Here He warns them of the inevitable opposition that will arise when some in a house love Christ supremely, while others are hostile or indifferent to Him. The words of ancient prophecy (Mic_7:6) then receive a fulfilment. The very closeness of association emphasizes the antagonism, and 'a man's foes shall be they of his own household.'

C. H. Prichard.

☛ Householder

HOUSEHOLDER.—This term as well as 'goodman of the house,' 'master of the house,' are different translations of the same Greek word οἰκοδεσπότης. It is rendered 'householder' in the parables of the Tares and the Wheat (Mat_13:27), of the Owner bringing forth his treasures new and old (Mat_13:52), of the Labourers in the Vineyard (Mat_20:1), of the Vineyard let out to husbandmen (Mat_21:33), with special application to Christ as Head of the Church. The phrase 'goodman of the house' is applied (Mar_14:14, Luk_22:11) to the owner of the house in which the Last Supper was to be prepared. The translation 'master of the house' is found in Luk_12:39

Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 (Authorized Version 'goodman'), Mat_24:43, of the owner or overseer whose duty it is to protect his property against the thief in the night. It occurs also in the parable of the Great Supper, Luk_14:21 (corresponding to the king of Mat_22:2; Mat_22:7), also as denoting the head of the house whose persecution involves that of his subordinates, Mat_10:25 (see Household); and once more in the parable of the Unfaithful, against whom the door was shut, Luk_13:25 (cf. parable of the Ten Virgins, Matthew 25).

C. H. Prichard.

☞Huleh

HULEH.—See Jordan.

☞Humanity Of Christ

HUMANITY OF CHRIST.—The simplest fact about Jesus Christ, as we see Him pictured in the Gospels, is that He was a man. Whatever there was peculiar about His person, it did not destroy the reality of His humanity or take Him out of the *genus* 'man.' But this simple fact, seen in all its relations, admits of varied consideration, and indeed demands it.

1. *His human body.*—Jesus had a body, visible to the eye, giving the natural impression, as other bodies do, of reality. It came into life by the natural channel of birth (Mat_1:25; Mat_2:1, Luk_2:7); it grew as others do (Luk_2:40); was nourished by food as others are (Luk_7:34-36; cf. Luk_24:41-43); slept (Luk_8:23); was restricted by space as ordinary men are, and thus laboriously travelled about (Luk_8:1, Joh_4:4); was weary (Joh_4:6); suffered under the inhumanities attending the Trial and Execution (Joh_19:28; Joh_19:33), although, in the restraint of the Gospel narrative, no express mention is made of this fact; and truly died (as is made evident by the peculiar character of the phenomenon related in Joh_19:34, an unconscious testimony, by one not acquainted with the principles of anatomy, as to the reality of His death). See Body.

With the reality of His body is closely associated the fact of the temptability of Jesus. The Epistle to the Hebrews lays emphasis upon this fact as a part of His qualification for the work of Saviour (Heb_2:18; Heb_4:15), The Gospel history contains a narrative of temptation (Mat_4:1-11 ||) in which Jesus is assailed by solicitations addressed to

His physical appetite, to His love of display, and to His ambition. As the reality of the human body is the presupposition of the reality of the temptation, so the character of the temptation confirms the proof of that body. Shrinking from physical pain may have been a part of the agony of the Garden (Luk 22:42; Luk 22:44, cf. the interpretation given in Heb 5:7, Heb 5:8). Naturally the sacred history, which is engaged with things done rather than with inner processes which are concealed from human observation, and which finds no occasion to trace the course of inner temptations which never result in outward sin, makes no mention of the appeal which alluring objects must have made to the sensibilities of the man Jesus Christ. But the Epistle to the Hebrews ('in all points tempted like as we are,' Heb 4:15) sustains the inference which must necessarily follow from the possession of a human nature, that there were such appeals to the humanity of Jesus. See Temptation.

2. *His human soul.*—Had Jesus a true human soul? The answer to such a question is to be obtained only by observing the phenomena of His recorded life, and drawing the necessary inferences from what we see. The statement of fact is, fortunately, very clear and copious. The moment we study the account of His independent life we find the evidences accumulating that in its inward, as well as its outward, processes it is a truly human life. In the temple we find the exercise of a desire—curiosity—and the acknowledgment of mental processes both like those of other men and commanding their respect (His 'understanding,' Luk 2:46-47). In His home in Nazareth He followed a life of obedience (Luk 2:51 'subject'). As He grew in stature, so He did in 'wisdom' (Luk 2:52 *σοφία*, 'varied knowledge of things human and Divine,' Grimm-Thayer). At His temptation He showed an intellectual knowledge of the Scriptures (Mat 4:4; Mat 4:7; Mat 4:10). His discourses moved along according to the laws of human address, idea suggesting idea according to the laws of natural association. The lower ranges of reasoning are pursued by Him as by others, and once He even expresses His thought syllogistically (Joh 8:47). But the higher ranges of reason, the intuitive knowledge of the meaning of great truths, were peculiarly His, as is seen in the wider interpretation of the OT (Mat 5:17; Mat 5:21-48), and in the lofty ethical standard which He sets up, itself another instance of the larger interpretation of the OT, forming the still unsurpassed ideal of human conduct, more and more insisted upon in the social struggles for progress in our own time, the binding force and universal validity of the law of love (Mat 22:37-40). To this standard He held Himself (Joh 10:30; Joh 17:21, Mat 15:32; Mat 20:34). Thus He manifested at every essential point the possession of an *intellect* characterized by the same faculties and working by the same laws as our own. The same was no less true of the *sensibilities*, even those which we are inclined to view as trivial, the undue indulgence of which we stigmatize as weakness. Traces may be found of the operation of every one of the distinct emotions. Thus, for example, He had a love for esteem, manifested in His notice of the omission of certain acts of courtesy in Luk 7:44-46; He displayed the

natural affections, such as love of friends (Joh 15:15), of family (Joh 19:26), of country (Mat 23:37-39); He exercised complacent love (Mar 14:8), moral indignation (Luk 11:46, Joh 8:44); His spiritual background was that of joy and peace (Joh 14:27, Luk 10:21). The *will* was moved by appropriate considerations as ours is (Joh 7:1; Joh 7:10), and displays the same sort of activities, being sustained by the operation of the same forces as in ordinary men. Thus the struggle in time of temptation is to maintain His spiritual ideals (Mat 4:1-11, Joh 12:27), and Jesus concentrates His attention, as men who will be victorious in time of temptation must, upon the proper object of human attention, upon the great purpose for which He has come into the world (Joh 18:37; Joh 19:11). The virtues which may be particularly called the virtues of the will are exemplified, such as persistence, shown in His repeated healing upon the Sabbath (Joh 5:16, Mar 3:2-3), in His teaching sustained amid the constant evidence that the Jews were inclined decisively to reject Him (cf. the discourses in John 5 and foll. chapters). Even the more mysterious operations of the sub-conscious, or better of the supra-conscious, self are to be noted in Him, not merely in the displays of genius which He, as no other man, possessed, but in the manifestations of a power the operations of which first brought it to His empirical consciousness (Mar 5:30 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). In fact, the better psychologist a man is, the more clearly he can see, in the simple narratives of the Gospels, the operations of every fundamental faculty and law of the human soul.

3. *The necessity of Christ's humanity.*—To one who sees no Divinity in Christ, the question of the necessity of His humanity is meaningless, not to say impertinent. Of course, He must be human, says such a one, since this is the only path to leadership. God has committed His work for men in the world to men. Apart from those mysterious communications of revelation which selected teachers of men have had, the only possible teacher of men is a man who can approach them with messages which they can understand, in words appropriate to their nature. However true these general principles are, the standpoint here assumed is not that of the Gospels. To them, Christ 'came' to the earth (see Divinity of Christ); and the question arises why this is so, why He took upon Himself humanity and 'became flesh' (Joh 1:14). Did this question arise in the minds of the Apostles? and is there trace of speculation, or of interest as to it, in the Gospels? There are indisputable traces of both in the Epistles, especially in that to the Hebrews. It is represented in this Epistle that the object of Christ's coming in the flesh was particularly to offer His body a sacrifice (Joh 10:5; Joh 10:10, cf. Joh 2:9; Joh 2:14); but not merely this, for the possession of humanity itself affords Him a spiritual qualification for His priestly work, in that He shares the lot of men, and learns thereby how to sympathize with them in their temptations and their failures (Joh 2:17-18, Joh 4:15-16, Joh 5:2). There is also the suggestion of an idea which is brought out more clearly in the Fourth Gospel,—the same as that suggested above,—that the humanity was the necessary medium of the revelation of God, since it is through Jesus that God 'speaks' (Joh 1:1; Joh 3:11). This form of

presentation covers the point why the humanity was a necessity when once God had determined to enter upon the stage of human history as Redeemer. But St. John pushes the matter a little farther back. He begins with the eternal 'Word,' which was in the beginning with God and was God, and sets forth His appearing in the world under the figure of light shining into darkness (Joh 1:9, Joh 3:19, Joh 8:12), and needed because of the darkness. The ground of the Incarnation is found in this need, in the existence of sin, and the necessity of salvation through faith (Joh 3:16). It is to produce 'children of God' (Joh 1:12) that Christ comes. The coming is the manifestation of the glory of God (Joh 1:14), but that glory is the moral glory of 'grace and truth.' The culmination of the whole work of redemption is, however, the cross (Joh 3:14, Joh 10:17-18, Joh 15:13, cf. Heb 10:5; Heb 10:10), and it is the human body and soul of Christ that suffered there (Joh 19:28). This is the central idea of the Fourth Gospel; but other elements are not lacking, as the necessity of the humanity to the work of instruction, which was a main element of Jesus' work (Joh 3:11; Joh 3:19; Joh 3:31-32), and which culminated in the revelation of the Father, which needed humanity as the medium of communication to human beings (Joh 14:9, Joh 12:45, Joh 16:15). Union with the Father was also essential to Christ's work (Joh 14:11 etc.), because this consisted in the manifestation of God's name (Joh 17:6). The necessary spiritual sustenance, finally, was gained through the body and blood of Christ (Joh 6:35; Joh 6:50-51), that is, through what His humanity alone was capable of doing for man.

4. *Unique elements of this humanity.*—The humanity of Christ, in order to satisfy the conditions now before us, must be a reality. No 'phantom,' or merely phenomenal body, could perform the offices required in these Scripture passages of the humanity. But other elements also appear which give a new aspect to the human nature. Among these need not be reckoned the origin of the body of Jesus by miraculous conception, as related in the First and Third Gospels; for however the process of development from the first cell might be initiated, the resulting development must be in any case that of a human body. Side by side with evident human limitations, such as ignorance (as of the day and hour of His own return to the earth, Mat 24:36), there exist phenomena of a like nature altogether transcending humanity, such as the knowledge by which He not only 'knew what was in man' (Joh 2:25), read the thoughts of men often as an open book (Mat 9:4; Mat 12:25, Luk 6:8; Luk 9:47), but, above all, knew perfectly the will of the Father and the mysteries of Divine truth. He walked laboriously from Judaea to Galilee (Joh 4:4), but He could suddenly appear upon the surface of the sea in the storm, walking upon the water (Mat 14:25 ||). These and other such considerations (see Divinity of Christ) raise the question how these things could consist in Him, that is, the question of the nature of the Person of Christ, a question belonging to dogmatics, and thus lying outside of the scope of this article. But—this is the main point—whatever *more* than humanity there was in Christ, the evidence already cited is decisive as to the reality of His humanity.

5. *The unity of Jesus' consciousness.*—Christ was, then, a man. Does this word comprehensively express the Gospel teaching as to His person? He had a personality as men are persons. He had a consciousness which expressed itself by the pronoun 'I.' Was this a human consciousness, so that when asked as to Himself Jesus would have replied: 'I am a man'? There are two elements in the answer to this question. (a) Jesus' consciousness was a unity. He passes easily from the consideration of earthly to heavenly things, from walking upon the water to sitting quietly in the boat, as if both of these things belonged to Him equally. The impression made upon the unsophisticated reader of the Gospels is that of a single consciousness. In fact, in order to be explicable at all, the Gospels must convey such an impression. But pivotal passages, even those which have seemed to give a basis for the idea that He spoke now 'as God' and now 'as man,' do not justify such an inference when carefully considered. He did not mean in Mat 4:10 'Thou (Satan) shalt worship the Lord thy God (me),' and not I thee. He meant that the law of worship for any one, and for Him as bound to fulfil all righteousness (Mat 3:15), was the worship of the Lord only. In Mat 8:23-27 and parallels He was not in one capacity asleep in the boat and in another watching over the disciples in that storm, but He was totally asleep as He appeared. He did not chide them for lack of faith in such a waking providence of His own, of which they had no knowledge, but for their lack of faith in God (cf. Mar 4:40), whose messenger Christ was, and who would care for both Him and them. In Mar 5:30 and parallels it is not Jesus in one personality healing the woman and in another inquiring what had happened, that is brought before us; but God the Father made use of Him to answer the petition, unknown to Him but known to God, and He became conscious in this use of Himself that He was so used ('having come to perceive that the power which [often, on other occasions] went forth from him had [on this occasion] gone forth,' cf. Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885).

(b) The centre of this personality, the Ego of this undivided consciousness, is God. Whenever He speaks of His coming into the world, it is always God that speaks, not less in Mar 10:45 and parallels than in Joh 3:13; Joh 10:10. This fact stands side by side with such facts as the confession of ignorance. They are never allowed to get far apart. When we have the passage Mat 24:36 confessing ignorance, it is preceded by the glorious description of the return of the Son of Man in Divine majesty (Mat 24:30), and followed by the Judgment scene of Mat 25:31-46. There is no trace of a sense of transition or of shock in passing from one form of consciousness to the other, because there is no such shock, no transition (see Kenosis). The solution of this problem, of the unity of the consciousness in the midst of such apparent contradictions in the contents of consciousness, is, again, a problem of dogmatics.

6. *The significance of the humanity of Christ for religion.*—The interest of dogmatics in the humanity of Christ lies in the doctrine of a true Incarnation, which is the foundation of the doctrines of Atonement and Forgiveness. The interest of religion in

Christ's humanity is the interest of believers in the forgiveness of sins, who need to feel the identification of their Redeemer with themselves. It is not without profound significance that it is said that judgment is committed to the Son of Man (Joh_5:22). Whatever else of deepest truth there may be in it, there is this, that the sinner needs to feel the identification of his Judge with himself by the possession of a common human nature. When the Judge knows both the persistency and depth of sin on the one hand, and the weakness and temptations of man on the other,—then only will the sinner be assured that the proffered forgiveness is for him. It is, again, the interest of believers in God, who get higher ideas of God's goodness from the greatness of the condescension involved in His 'becoming flesh.' It is, further, the interest of believers in Jesus, who, when they understand that Jesus is identified with us by the possession of our common humanity, feel a new confidence; are stimulated to more frequent prayer; become conscious that He truly draws near to them; regard their varied lot in life, which He has shared, as sanctified thereby; bear with greater equanimity their sorrows, which He also bore; find in Him their pattern of life (see Obedience, § ii.); and thus see in Him not an abstraction, but a real, objective, and personal Redeemer and object of faith, a Captain, and the Head of the Church. See, further, Incarnation, Son of Man.

Literature.—Dale, *Christian Doctrine*, 45-73; Stalker, *Imago Christi*, *passim*; Ullmann, *Sinlessness of Jesus*, 52 ff.; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, ii. 136 ff.; Fairbairn, *Christ in Modern Theology*, 347 ff.; F. W. Robertson, *Sermons*, i. 99 ff.; |*Expositor*, v. iv. [1896] 388 ff. On the union of the human with the Divine in the Person of Christ see the Christological sections of standard works on Christian Doctrine.

Frank Hugh Foster.

☒ Humiliation Of Christ

HUMILIATION OF CHRIST

1. *Incarnation*.—Jesus Christ is a problem. And yet He is not so much a problem as man would be without Him. Indeed He is, in a true sense, the solution of the problem of man. Nevertheless, to the intellect, demanding that everything in the heavens above and on the earth beneath be reduced to 'the measure of man's mind,' He remains a problem. The expressions of His consciousness of pre-existence constitute one of the chief elements of that problem. But, taken in connexion with two facts of His history, even this aspect of His person is not so dense a problem as when it is considered by itself. These two facts are (1) the expressions of His self-consciousness, direct and incidental, as to His relation to God on the one hand, and to total

humanity on the other; and (2) His effects in the world and on the world. Even the pre-existence of Jesus Christ, when taken in connexion with these two outstanding facts, is, on the whole, a less problem and a smaller difficulty than the world of humanity would be without Him.

Furthermore, it would be more difficult to believe that a being who had the consciousness that Jesus had, who has done for humanity what Jesus has done, and who is to humanity what Jesus is, should have had the absolute beginning of His existence at a late point in time, than to believe that He came out of eternity and is of the eternal order. In other words, assuming and accepting the pre-existence of Jesus Christ, mystery though it be, it is easier to understand His unique earthly history, His character, His consciousness, His revelations, His work, His actual effects on the world and on men, both in the past and at the present, than it would be without that assumption. At all events, He has in several instances expressed the consciousness of having existed in a previous state before His advent into this world (Joh 3:13; Joh 6:62; Joh 8:58; Joh 16:28; Joh 17:5; Joh 17:24). This pre-existent state was one of intimate association and intercommunion with God and participation in the glory of the Eternal Father. It is also one of the underlying presuppositions in St. Paul's Epistles (1Co 8:6, 2Co 8:9, Php 2:5-8, Col 1:15-17). It is found also in an original setting in Hebrews (Heb 1:2-3).

Now, whatever may be the meaning of these great passages, whatever the pre-incarnate riches and glory of Christ, He voluntarily submitted to the surrender of the resources of a Divine state for the lowliness of a human lot and the extreme of human poverty, and to the relinquishment of His equal participation in the Divine glory in exchange for the nethermost depth of human humiliation. Exactly what was involved in His self-humiliation from the Divine to the human is treated specifically under the articles on Pre-existence, Kenosis, and Incarnation. Confining our attention, then, in this article to His earthly history, we find that His whole life, His entire sojourn on earth, was a humiliation. His incarnation was but the first stage in His humiliation, which continued by a deepening descent to the very end of His earthly life. His whole career in this world was a protracted humiliation or succession of humiliations between the humiliation of His incarnation and the humiliation of His crucifixion. It is worthy of note that the words of St. Paul, 'he humbled himself' (in Php 2:7), refer to experiences of His earthly life and not to the process of His incarnation.

2. His earthly life to the assumption of the Messianic mission.—The circumstances of His birth were most painful. It occurred, not in the sheltered privacy, and amid the comforts, of home, but while His mother was on a humiliating and painful pilgrimage, and among the feeding beasts, surrounded by the filth of a stable, and possibly under the observation of strange and uncouth men. But the child Jesus was not a year old

before He became the object of jealousy and persecution, and had to be taken on a long and painful journey into a foreign land to save His life—a baby fugitive on the face of the earth. Showing at the age of twelve a wisdom which astonished the wisest men of the nation, and which would have secured for Him recognition, position, power, and renown, He yet willingly returned to the obscure and humble home at Nazareth; and there for the space of nearly twenty years He submitted Himself, day after day, to the control of two plain peasant people, and to the occupation and drudgery of common manual labour.

3. *Humiliations of the Messianic ministry.*—He knew from the beginning what the Messianic mission meant and how it would end. It was not to Him an honour to be enjoyed; it was a burden to be borne. It cost Him a struggle to submit and adjust Himself to that which He knew was so fraught with difficulty, persecution, humiliation, loneliness, suspense, and suffering, ending with the final agonies and the death of abandonment and shame. This is the reason why He needed—and received—the expression of His Father’s approval at the moment of His self-dedication to the work of Messiah (Mar 1:11, Luk 3:22). This was the meaning of His temptation in the wilderness. This was why at the sharp turning-point in His ministry, when He looked out on the dark and lonely way of obedience unto death and deliberately chose to walk in it alone, He needed again—and again received—the assurance of His Father’s recognition, approval, and sympathy (Mar 9:7, Luk 9:35).^{*} [Note: See chapters on the Baptism, the Temptation, and the Transfiguration in the present writer’s *Son of Man*.] It was the burden of the Messianic task that made Him, beyond all men, a man of sorrows. More than once we are told that He wept; but never that He laughed. Almost from the beginning of His ministry He was looked on with jealousy and suspicion by the powerful leaders of the people, from whom He had a right to expect encouragement and support. They kept a watch on Him, they found fault with Him, they misconstrued His actions, they perverted His sayings, they dogged His steps, they nagged Him at every turn, they accused Him of being a law-breaker, a blasphemer, an impostor, a lunatic, a demoniac, an emissary of the powers of darkness (Luk 11:15). They laid plots to catch Him and to kill Him; and they never ceased until they succeeded. Not only so, but little by little He lost His early popularity and was abandoned by the people. He came to those whom He had the right to claim as His own; they refused to receive Him, turned against Him. His personal ministry was comparatively a failure, and He practically an outcast. He did not even have a refuge among the friends of His youth, the people of His old home at Nazareth. They also turned against Him, rejected His claims, drove Him out of their village, made a desperate attempt to kill Him (Mar 6:3, Luk 4:28). The members of His own family failed to understand Him, refused to accept Him, were alienated from Him (Joh 7:3). Probably they thought Him either a fanatic or a fraud. Probably on account of His strangeness and growing unpopularity they were ashamed of Him. He

was subjected to the humiliation and pain of constant misunderstanding and sometimes even criticism on the part of His own disciples. He was rebuked (Mat 16:22) and denied (Mat 26:69-74) by one of them, sold and delivered into the hands of His enemies and murderers for a few pounds by another (Mat 26:14-16), deserted by all (Mat 26:56, Mar 14:50). Added to these things, He suffered the humiliations of a painful poverty. Rejected at home, ejected from home, He had no place of His very own where He could feel that He might retire when weary or lonely or heart-sore, and enjoy rest without the fear of intrusion or molestation. He was dependent on charity, He was supported by charity (Luk 8:3). He had to borrow a room for His last meal with His disciples (Luk 22:11). He had to borrow an ass to ride into Jerusalem on the day of His triumphal entry (Luk 19:33-34). Another man's stable was borrowed for Him to be born in (Luk 2:7); another man's grave for Him to be buried in (Mat 27:59-60).

4. Trials and crucifixion.—His implacable enemies brought Him at last to bay. Deep in that memorable night when He was in the depths of the impenetrable gloom of Gethsemane, the sacred privacy of His last hours and His last prayer was invaded by a howling mob of underlings, hangers-on, and soldiers of the temple guard, guided by one of His own disciples (Mat 26:47, Luk 22:47). They took Jesus, and when they had bound Him with ropes (Joh 18:12), they led Him by the halter, as if He were a desperado, to the house of the high priest. He had a keen sense of this humiliation, and protested against it (Mar 14:48). Nevertheless, conscious though He was of His innocence of any evil deed or design, of His absolute purity, yea, even of His Divine dignity and mission, He submitted to the humiliation of being put on trial before the corrupt and conscienceless occupant of the high-priestly office and the whitewashed hypocrites who, for the most part, constituted the governing body of the nation. After the solemn mockery was enacted and they had condemned Him to death (Mar 14:64), they heaped on Him the most humiliating insults their malicious ingenuity could devise. They spat in His face (ἐνέπτυσαν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, Mat 26:67); they threw a cloth over Him and then beat Him on the head, mockingly demanding that He should tell them who it was that struck each blow (Mat 26:67-68). When it was morning, they bound Him again with ropes, and led Him thus to the Praetorium to secure sentence of death from the Roman Procurator (Mar 15:1, Mat 27:1). Pilate, though convinced of His innocence, did not care to involve himself in the trouble and annoyance of taking His part, and he was glad to shirk his duty and get rid of the embarrassment by turning Him over to Herod Antipas, who was at that time in Jerusalem (Luk 23:7). The poor prisoner, whom no one was found to befriend or defend, was dragged through the streets to another tribunal in the hope of finding some one who had the courage as well as the power to rid the earth of Him, and He had to suffer the humiliation of appearing as a culprit before this abandoned wretch. Herod was delighted to come face to face with Jesus, and now at last he was to have

the long-coveted opportunity of having Him show off with a few miracles in his presence. But, though he plied Him with all sorts of requests and importunities, Jesus answered him not a single word. But Herod was not to be balked. If he could not induce Jesus to entertain him in one way, he could at least force Him to furnish entertainment for him in another way. And this Herod, this creature of low cunning, this unwashed hog of a sensualist, this seducer of his own brother's wife, this cowardly murderer of the other of the two great prophets of the day, gratified his brutal instincts by joining his soldiers in putting Jesus to scorn. They dressed Him up in a gorgeous and glaring red mantle of mock royalty, and sent Him thus through the streets back to the Praetorium of Pilate (Luk_23:7-11). Pilate, overcome by the persistence of the Jewish leaders and by his own selfish and cowardly fears, decided at last to deliver Jesus up to the tender mercies of the human bloodhounds who could be appeased by nothing but His death. But before doing so, he made his soldiers strip Him and inflict on Him the terrible Roman flagellation (Mar_15:15, Mat_27:26), a punishment so severe that the victim often died under it. This bitter torture and bitterer humiliation Jesus endured in submission and silence. While the preparation is being made for the crucifixion, He is left in the hands of the soldiers, the whole cohort is invited in to enjoy the sport, and now for the third time He is made the amusement of a band of ruffians, for it is now their turn to have a little entertainment with the Nazarene fanatic. They torment Him as a cat teases and tortures a wounded bird before devouring it. They put on Him a scarlet military robe, and having twisted branches of thorn bushes into a sort of crown, they place it on His patient brow, put a mock sceptre in His unresisting hand, and then go down on their knees before Him, shouting, 'Long live the king of the Jews!' They too indulged in the sport of spitting on Him, and, yielding to the wild beast instinct which their opportunity had aroused in them, they kept beating Him over the head ($\epsilon\tau\upsilon\pi\tau\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\eta\ \nu\ \kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\eta\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, Mat_27:30; $\epsilon\tau\upsilon\pi\tau\omicron\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\eta\nu\ \kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\eta\nu\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu\omega$, Mar_15:19). While He was dressed up as a mock king, His face stained with blood and marred with spittle, Pilate, moved with pity, led Him out to the view of the clamorous mob, hoping that the spectacle of so abject an object might move them to pity (Joh_19:4-5). But it seemed the more to inflame their rage (Joh_19:6). His crucifixion was then finally decided on. And now a new humiliation was inflicted on Him. He leaves the Praetorium, and is led or driven along the crowded streets through the avenue of onlookers, bearing on His back the heavy wooden beam that was to be the instrument of His execution (Joh_19:17). It was the symbol of His degradation and the advertisement of His disgrace.

It may be well for us to stop and try to imagine what was passing in the mind of Jesus while all these horrors were heaped upon Him. We know He was accustomed, during the course of His ministry, to dwell, both in thought and in speech, on the horrors

that He knew awaited Him (Mat 16:21 ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν ... πολλὰ παθεῖν). If He so dreaded it from afar, how keen must have been the anguish of passing through it!

But these things were slight in comparison with what yet awaited Him; for the great humiliation was yet to come. He was to be subjected to the accursed and infamous death of crucifixion. When soldiers are to be put to death for desertion or treason, they are shot. The lowest of criminals, those upon whom we wish to heap disgrace in inflicting death, we hang on the gallows. What the gallows is to-day, the cross was in the days of Jesus. It was the method of execution that secured publicity, while it insured the utmost prolongation of the victim's misery. When the procession had reached the place, the cross was laid upon the ground, Jesus was denuded of all His clothing, He was stretched out upon the cross, long iron nails were driven through His hands and feet, the cross bearing His naked body was lifted up and dropped into its socket, and there, looking out on the sea of angry faces and suffering the infamous fate of the most abandoned criminal, hung Jesus, who, though He had the consciousness of having come from God and of being the sinless Son of God, yet willingly endured this humiliation that He might become the Redeemer of men. Wherefore all the ages and the highest of all the races of men have united with God in giving Him the name that is above every name, and with one accord agree in crowning Him Lord of all.

The descending scale of His humiliation, from the estate of conscious equality with God past all grades and levels down to the humiliation of the cross, has been grasped and, with a few master strokes, graphically portrayed by St. Paul in the great passage of Php 2:6-7 : the humiliation of the Divine to the level of the human, the humiliation of the human to the level of the servant, to the level of the outcast and condemned criminal, and, lastly, to the degradation of a punishment the most humiliating, the most shameful, the most bitter, the most revolting, the most horrible then or ever known among men.

Literature.—Works like those of Weiss, Beyschlag, Stevens on *Biblical Theology*; Gore's *Bampton Lectures*; Gifford, *The Incarnation*; Mason, *Conditions of our Lord's Life, on Earth*; Bruce, *The Humiliation of Christ* [giving on pp. 388-412 and 419-424 fine discussions of Kenotic literature]; Zockler, *Das Kreuz Christi*; Nebe and Steinmeyer, *Leidensgeschichte*; Stalker, *The Trial and Death of Christ*; the chapters of Keim and Edersheim on the Passion and Death.

Gross Alexander.

HUMILITY.—This virtue or grace distinguished the leaders of OT history like Abraham and Moses (Gen 18:27, Num 12:3), and was inculcated by the prophets as a chief duty (Mic 6:8). It belongs even to the earlier revelation of God's character ('that humbleth himself,' Psa 113:6), and is the key to man's communion with Him (Isa 57:15). In Judaism and the Rabbinical literature we meet with a variety of examples and maxims enforcing the truth that 'God is the highest type of humility.' These anticipations prepare us for the new and enlarged conception of humility which rills the NT, and was embodied in the teaching, example, and character of Jesus Christ. The moral quality of our Saviour's personality lies here (Mat 11:29), and on this foundation of astonishing humility, exemplified on the cross, St. Paul bases his great ethical appeal (Php 2:5 ff.). It may be claimed that the gospel alone has popularized humility, but the temper of Christ's disciples in every age proves that it is an excellence of rare and difficult attainment.

i. Use and meaning of the word.—The noun (ταπεινοφροσύνη, Heb. תַּעֲבָוּה, Vulgate *humilitas*, Germ. *Demut*) does not occur till it is employed commonly in the NT (Lightfoot on Php 2:3); it is 'a birth of the Gospel' (Trench, *Syn. of the NT*, § 42). In contrast to the low and servile sense attaching to it in classical writings, humility in the LXX Septuagint, Apocr. [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.], and NT becomes the designation 'of the noblest and most necessary of all virtues' (Cremer's *Lex.*). It rests on a lowly and unpretending view of one's self, and is opposed to the workings of the ambitious spirit (μεγαλοφροσύνη, ὑψηλοφροσύνη). The term refers mainly to inward character, and sometimes to outward condition. Of humility as the animating principle of Christian character, Jesus Himself was the great example, being 'lowly in heart' (Mat 11:29), not merely in appearance like the professional religious leaders of the time. Pharisaism is the deadly enemy of humility or the religion of healthy-mindedness. The moral temper that inspired Christ's life and service is echoed by St. Paul, when he singles out the motive that prompted his labours ('serving the Lord with all lowliness of mind,' Act 20:19). Elsewhere humility is enjoined, along with kindred graces, as the means of averting unholy disputes and of promoting co-operation in the Church and among the members of the Christian society (Mat 18:4; Mat 23:12, Eph 4:2, Php 2:3, Col 3:12). An exceptional use of the term occurs in Col 2:18; Col 2:23, where the Apostle guards his readers against the counterfeit of this virtue ('a voluntary humility'). In some instances the humble are viewed in the light of their earthly condition, which God may wonderfully raise and alter (Luk 1:52), and which, notwithstanding its indignities and trials, should be borne submissively and cheerfully (Jam 1:9). This class of sufferers corresponds to the afflicted and meek of the OT (עָנִי, עֲנָוִי), and would be numerous among the peasantry or *fellahîn* of an oppressed and lawless country (Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, s.v.). The 'poor in spirit' spoken of in the first of the Beatitudes (Mat 5:3, cf. Luk 6:20) are

probably best understood as placed in such circumstances. In agreement with this, Ritschl (*op. cit. infra*) defines ταπεινοφροσύνη as ‘that temper inclining to the service of God which accepts resignedly an oppressed and wretched condition.’ The term, therefore, as one of deep import, is freshly coined in the NT.

ii. Contrast between Greek and Christian Ethics.—The rise of this grace creates an epoch. ‘Humility is a vice with heathen moralists, but a virtue with Christian apostles’ (Lightfoot on Col 2:18). In particular, it marks the opposition to the Greek idea of ‘high-mindedness’ (art. ‘Ethics,’ by H. Sidgwick in *Ency. Brit.*⁹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred]), and the advance in ethical sentiment and the standard of judgment due to Christianity. A presentiment of the Christian virtue may be met with in Greek writers (see examples in Neander’s *Church History*, vol. i. p. 26 [English translation], and in Trench, *NT Syn.*), but their use of ταπεινός in any noble sense is rare. The Greeks undoubtedly had their distinguishing qualities, but this was not one of them.

Cf. interesting note of conversation in Morley’s *Life of Gladstone*, iii. p. 466. ‘Mr. G.—I admit there is no Greek word of good credit for the virtue of humility. J. M.—ταπεινοτης? But that has an association of meanness. Mr. G.—Yes; a shabby sort of humility. Humility as a sovereign grace is the creation of Christianity.’

Greek Ethics, as expressed and systematized by Aristotle, the ancient master of moral analysis and definition, fostered pride, the genius of later Stoicism, and regarded the humble as contemptible, mean-spirited, and without force or aspiration. Aristotle’s picture of the ‘great-souled’ man and his exaggerated sense of self-importance have a certain air of loftiness (μεγαλοψυχία), but fall below the standard which obliges the Christian to recognize his duty to others, and to treat with consideration those who are intellectually and socially inferior. The conception of humility, therefore, as it controls the Christian, lies outside the system of Aristotle (see *Nic. Ethiopic* bk. iv. ch. 3 [Sir A. Grant’s ed. vol. ii. pp. 72-78]). This difference between Greek and Christian ideas of greatness and humility is fundamental, and the change was brought about by Christ’s revelation of the character of God. Of Aristotle’s great-souled man it is said—‘his movements are slow, his voice is deep, and his diction stately’ (Grant, vol. ii. p. 77, note). This measured efflorescence of pride reappears in Christ’s portraiture of the Pharisee in the temple; but the Publican, the opposite and acceptable type, shows how influential, in Christian experience, is the thought of God, and how closely connected are humility, prayer, and confession of sin. In accordance with Augustine’s well-known saying (quoted by Calvin, *Institutio*, bk. ii. ch. 2), humility comes first, second, third, and always, among the precepts of the

Christian religion, and it marks the cleavage between Greek and Christian ideals. The magnificent figure drawn by the Greek philosopher disappears, and, instead, Christ presents the image of the little child (Mat_18:2).

iii. Our Lord's example and teaching

1. The great saying which goes to the root of the matter—'I am meek and lowly in heart' (Mat_11:29), has been variously interpreted (see art. by Herrmann, mentioned below), and even called in question as authentic. Martineau asks—'What meek and lowly soul was ever known to set itself forth as such and commend its own humility as the model for others?' and adds, 'did a Saviour bear such testimony of himself, his testimony would not be true' (*Seat of Authority in Religion*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 583). But the mode of speaking Christ adopted and the claim He put forward would not really seem incongruous in a 'Teacher of Israel' (Bruce, *Expos. Gr. Test.* note *ad loc.*); and, besides, the objection reads a false tone into the original utterance, and ignores the special nature of Christ's consciousness. Our Lord was more than a 'meek and lowly soul,' and had reason for presenting Himself as a model and a winning type to humanity. His humility clothed and concealed His essential dignity, and in speaking as He did He was conscious at the same time of standing in a unique relation to God (Mat_11:27, cf. Joh_13:3). Indeed, the union on Christ's part of 'unbounded personal pretensions' with an unconscious humility that regarded His importance to the world as 'an objective fact with which his own opinion of himself had nothing to do' (*Ecce Homo*, ch. 15) is undeniable, and reminds us that majesty and meekness were the two poles of His mysterious yet harmonious character. Christ's humility, however, does not rest on a phrase, but was carried out in the lowly setting of His earthly life. His cradle in the manger at Bethlehem and His subjection in the home at Nazareth, His quiet entrance, at the hands of the Baptist, on public life, His restraint in the use of His supernatural powers, and His dislike of consequent honour and fame, His frequent periods of retirement, His choice of followers and friends, His sympathies with little children and humble suppliants (Mar_10:13-16; Mar_7:24-30), His appreciation of the smallest offering and the simplest service (Luk_21:1-4, Mat_10:42), and, finally, His submission to the experiences concentrated in the week of His Passion and Crucifixion, all attest the consistency of His character as One who was 'meek and lowly in heart,' and who, at every step of His career, plainly and profoundly 'humbled himself' (Php_2:8).

2. Passing from Christ's example, the main lines of His teaching are two

(1) *Humility in relation to God, or the Law of Grace.*—We are introduced here to the most powerful among the motives to humility, and to a relation deeper than any that influences us in the society of our fellow-men. In Wendt's language—'Humility is the

conscious lowliness we feel before God in view of His superabundant love and holy majesty, and in contrast to our own unworthiness, guilt, and entire dependence on His grace' (*The Teaching of Jesus*, vol. i. p. 341, note [English translation]). We cannot therefore exaggerate our worth or assert our claims before God: the part we play is that of 'unprofitable servants' who, after all their performances, should be filled neither with the sense of merit nor the spirit of boasting (Luk 17:10). In the parable, which is a gem of teaching on this point, Jesus enforces on us the duty of humility towards God, the need of genuine self-abasement and confession of sin, as we see and feel our unworthiness in the Divine presence (Luk 18:9-14). He represents God as turning away from the shallow and sounding words of the Pharisee, but giving His mercy freely to the penitent publican who could not look up. For, as a fine Jewish saying puts it, 'While God despises what is broken among the animals, He loves in man a broken heart.' This is a fundamental law of the Kingdom of heaven and the indispensable condition of grace: 'for every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled, but he that humbleth himself shall be exalted' (cf. Pro 3:34; 1Pe 5:5).

Prof. Dowden, in writing of Milton's view of the intercourse between God and the soul, remarks—'There are two humilities—that which bows and that which soars, the humility of a servant who looks down, the humility of a son who gazes up. Milton's humility invigorates itself in the effort to ascend. He would not prostrate himself in the presence of material symbols, but would enter as a glad child into the courts of heaven' (*Puritan and Anglican*, p. 167). This is the humility that Christ welcomes, and that makes religion not stiff and heavy with ceremonial, but simple, reverent, glad, and pleasing to God. On no other terms is grace given or fellowship with God possible. 'Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in nowise enter therein' (Luk 18:17).

(2) *Humility in relation to men, or the Law of Service.*—While it is true that humility 'is not primarily concerned with our relation to other men, but with our relation to God, and springs from an intellectually true view of that relation' (Illingworth, *Christian Character*, 1905, p. 27), yet its importance in regulating men's ordinary conduct and intercourse did not escape Christ's notice. His striking lessons on this subject were called for at the time, and are far from being exhausted, for it is still true that 'the really humble man is as great in the moral world as he is rare' (Bruce, *Expos. Gr. Test.* on Mat 18:4).

(a) *The child, the unconscious type of humility* (Mat 18:1-4, Mar 9:33-37).—This was Christ's object-lesson on the question that caused frequent heartburning among the disciples, 'Who then is greatest?' etc. Their assimilation of their Master's mind proceeded slowly. As He went on absorbed in the thought of His approaching cross, His followers walked behind and stirred each other's worst passions by raising questions of place and precedence. At their next interview the Master of men set a

child in the midst of His disciples, and shamed them out of their unworthy temper. This is our Lord's rebuke of pride, rivalry, and ambition in their thousand forms, His reversal of our ordinary and selfish ideas of greatness, and His warning against the world's spirit of exclusiveness, intolerance, and class distinctions. The truly great is he who considers the claims of others and is slow to give offence (Mat 18:6), and who on all occasions appears simple, teachable, unpretending, indifferent to questions of rank and superiority, and willing to humble himself 'as this little child.' It is only the childlike heart that is capable of knowing God (Mat 11:25), and of finding the way into His kingdom. This image has stamped itself on the mind of Christendom, and this pattern of greatness is still fresh. Human character is once for all taught to mould itself after this original and lovely type. Christ first saw the hatefulness and unworkableness of a world without a child!

(b) *The servant, the practical example of humility* (Mat 20:20-28; Mat 23:1-12, Mar 10:35-45, Luk 22:24-27, Joh 13:1-17).—This ideal of service was presented on two distinct occasions: the one when the sons of Zebedee came forward with their request for the leading places in the Kingdom; and the other when the same love of dignity, and the jealous exclusion of each other's claims, gave rise to the strife that marred the Last Supper. In rebuking this spirit, Christ had in view not merely the mistaken tendencies of His disciples, who were already fired by the promise of individual 'thrones' (Luk 22:30) dear to the Israelitish imagination, but also the popular and prevailing standards of the time. The rulers of the Gentiles aimed at supremacy, and, in the exercise of a harsh authority, delighted to 'lord it over them'; and equally the scribes and Pharisees, in their fondness for places and titles of honour, coveted influence and recognition as the 'great ones' of Jewish society. Christ required a new standard and line of conduct from His followers. 'Not so shall it be among you.' Henceforth, greatness lies in conformity to a higher than the heathen or Jewish type: 'but whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister,' etc. The principle of this law is not impersonal, but personal; the seat of authority in the Christian religion and in Christian morals is Christ: 'even as the Son of Man came,' etc. (Mat 20:28). Finally, in one concrete act, Christ gave an illustration of the great principle He enunciated, when, at the Passover meal, He rose and 'took a towel and girded himself,' and washed the disciples' feet. This astonishing incident left an ineffaceable impression (1Pe 5:5), and warranted the literal saying: 'I am in the midst of you as he that serveth' (Luk 22:27). Such an ideal and example of service have slowly effected a revolution in the moral sentiment and practice of mankind. We may add, if Christ's setting forth of the child was evidence of His originality as a teacher, the substitution of the servant for the ruler was a no less striking proof of the uniqueness of His insight and methods.

'It is one of the achievements of Jesus that He introduced into the world a new ideal of greatness, such an ideal as men had never dreamed of' (D. Smith, *The Days of His*

Flesh, 1905, p. 442. Cf. Herrmann in art. below: 'Im NT ist ohne Zweifel der Eindruck wiedergegeben dass Jesus in dieser Beziehung seinen Jüngern etwas völlig Neues gegeben hat').

Some ideals are too airy and remote to come into touch with actual experience and practice, but Christ's Law of Service is capable of daily realization, and is within the reach of every one. It is open to all to do some simple deed of kindness, helpfulness, and self-denial, and no action inspired by Christ-like love and humility will pass unnoticed or unrewarded by the gracious Master and great Servant of all (Mat 25:40).

iv. Characteristics and Relationships.—A few further points of general and practical interest are suggested by this subject, and may be briefly touched on.

1. *Humility and character*.—In ordinary experience, humility is related to sin and penitence, and marks the feeling of unworthiness in the light of the illimitable moral ideal. In presence of the holy revelation of the Son of God, conscience becomes sensitive, and the sense of guilt, as in the case of Peter (Luk 5:8), weighs men down. 'This, however, is not one of the essential conditions of humility, for we know that humility was also an element in Christ's character' (Ritschl). The greatness of the Baptist was rooted in his humility and utter freedom from jealousy (Joh 3:27; Joh 3:30), and this grace has been the soil and safety of saints ever since. Keble treated others with a 'humbling humility' (Lock's *Life*, p. 233. Cf. MacEwen's *Life of Cairns*, p. 600: 'The first personal impression that he made on all who met him was one of wonder at his humility'). The child, to which Christ pointed, represents humility as part of the essence and permanence of Christian character, and remains an immortal type, preserving the wonder and bloom of the moral world.

2. *Humility and kindred virtues*.—No Christian grace is isolated or thrives alone. Humility is 'part of a great moral whole. Instead of proscribing, it promotes the growth of virtues unlike yet not unfriendly to itself' (Liddon on 'Humility and Action' in *University Sermons*). Thus it is closely connected with *Truth*, for humility or confession that does not rest on the recognition of facts is insincere and worthless. It is inspired by *Love*; ministering love appears always in the guise of humility. *Meekness* rests on humility as its foundation (Trench), and *Patience* expresses along with humility the practical virtue of the Christian religion, especially called for and tested in the world (Ritschl).

3. *Humility and self-consciousness*.—It has been the tendency of certain schools of theology and piety to make humility the result of self-contemplation, arrived at by the soul's reaction upon itself. This gives rise to artificial and extreme methods of discipline, and misses the healthy objectivity of the life that forgets self in the consideration and service of others (see Herrmann's art. for vigorous criticism of this

tendency and ideal of asceticism, derived from Augustine and Bernard. Cf. Harnack's *History of Dogma* [English translation], vi. p. 10, note). Humility is 'the eye which sees everything except itself' (quoted in Ritschl). Work and the school of life are the best discipline of humility, as of the other virtues.

'We are to respect our responsibilities,' wrote Mr. Gladstone, 'not ourselves. We are to respect the duties of which we are capable, but not our capabilities simply considered. There is to be no complacent self-contemplation, beruminating upon self. When self is viewed, it must always be in the most intimate connexion with its purposes' (Morley's *Life*, i. 214).

On the other hand, the externalizing of humility and the danger of parading it in rules and ceremonies that lead to self-humiliation must equally be avoided. Christ and His Apostles discountenanced all needless self-consciousness and show of virtue (Mat 6:1 ff., Col 2:23. Cf. Ritschl: 'Even in ascetic forms of worship there is no particular form of expression necessary to humility').

4. *Humility and individuality.*—This virtue is not to be cultivated to the neglect of manliness or at the expense of loyalty to religious and moral principle (Mat 10:32). Christ honours the spirit of energy and enterprise in us, and blames the hiding of our talents and the misuse of our opportunities through diffidence or cowardice (Mat 25:14 ff.). The manly and energetic character of the centurion, as shown in his faith, was doubtless as pleasing to Jesus as the soldier's reverence and humbleness of address (Luk 7:6). Humility or the fear of God should banish all unworthy fear. Christ's unflinching exposure of the scribes and Pharisees (Matthew 23) calls us to be courageous in adherence to truth and righteousness, and in view of evil and opposition, however powerful. It was a wholesome saying of the Rabbis: 'The disciple of the wise should have sufficient pride to stand in defence of the Law he represents.' Self-assertion has therefore its legitimate sphere, and the 'salt' of individuality in religion and in society should in nowise be lost. There is the danger, however, of exaggerating our own view and importance: 'it always needs much grace to see what other people are, and to keep a sense of moral proportion' (Denney, *Expos. Gr. Test.* on Rom 12:3). In the adaptation of the Christian Church to society, and to reconcile conflicting interests, it requires humility 'to adjust men in due order for the purposes of life' (T. B. Strong's *Christian Ethics*, Bampton Lect. 1895, p. 127).

5. *Humility and science.*—Christ's interview with Nicodemus teaches that the assumption of knowledge ('we know,' Joh 3:2) may cover only ignorance and confusion. The 'wise and understanding' (Mat 11:25) receive no new light: self-satisfied pride and prejudice are the foes of spiritual enlightenment and intellectual advance. The true student and investigator of nature must still feel, like Newton, that, notwithstanding his progress and attainments, the great ocean of truth

lies undiscovered before him. Docility, not dogmatism, is the mark of the inquirer, and the means of intellectual development. In this important and ever-changing region of science, R. H. Hutton has well observed that humility ‘means the docility of learners towards a teacher infinitely above them,’ and that it requires wisdom to see the true relations between different kinds of knowledge, and to keep physical knowledge from being turned to a false and dangerous use in the sphere of moral truth. Here also the master of truth and knowledge must take the place of a servant, and illustrate his greatness by his humility—‘and science is humble only when it uses its knowledge and its ignorance alike to help other men and not to lord it over them’ (Essay on ‘The Humility of Science’ in *Aspects of Religious and Scientific Thought*, 1901). So manifold is the function of this indispensable and crowning grace.

Literature.—Besides works above named, Grimm-Thayer’s *Lex.*; Moulton-Geden’s *Concord. to Greek Test.*; art. ‘Humility in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible’ vol. ii.; Herrmann in *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (‘Demut, Demutig’—an art. characteristic in its Ritschlian standpoint and criticism); E. Schreiber, art. in *Jewish Encyc.* 1904 (interesting and suggestive); B. Weiss, *Bib. Theol. of NT*, pp. 116, 117, and Ritschl, *The Christian Doctrine of Justif. and Reconcil.* ch. ix. § 65 (both in Clark’s translation); A. B. Bruce, *Training of the Twelve*, chs. xiv. xxi.; Professor J. Seth, *A Study of Ethical Principles*⁴ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred], p. 264; Rothe, *Sermons* (‘The Humility of the Lord’—Clark’s translation); Liddon, *Some Words of Christ* (‘True Greatness’); Church, *Cathed. and Univ. Sermons* (‘the Condescension of our Lord’); Dante, *Purgatory*, Cantos 10-12; R. Browning’s exquisite little poem, ‘Humility’ (*Asolando*); Kip. ling’s *Recessional*.

W. M. Rankin.

☞ Humour

HUMOUR.—Humour in its highest form is the sign of a mind at peace in itself, for which the contrasts and contradictions of life have ceased to jar, though they have not ceased to be; which accepts them as necessary and not without meaning and value, indeed as giving an added charm to life, because it looks at them from a point above them. In other words, humour is the faculty which lets a man see what Plato calls ‘the whole tragedy and comedy of life’ (*Philebus*, 50B)—the one in the other, comedy in tragedy, tragedy in comedy.

The Gospels make it plain that the environment of Jesus was quite a normal one. He had lived among men, worked, played, and talked with men from infancy to manhood, and was familiar with the language of men and with their habits of mind. Hence it may be noticed that in speaking to men He uses the language of reality and experience. His words are stamped as His own by their delicate ease, which implies sensibility to every real aspect of the matter in hand, a sense of mastery and peace. There lay a broad contrast between the common sense His hearers had gathered from experience and the moral ideals which He propounded, and it is quite clear that this contrast did not escape Him, nor can He have failed to see that, judged by the ordinary common sense of men, His sayings were absurd. With this consciousness of the superficial absurdity and the underlying value of what He said, He bade men when smitten on the one cheek 'turn the other' (Mat 5:39), go 'two miles' with the man who exacted one (Mat 5:41), yield the cloak to him who took the coat (Mat 5:40),—in fact, His followers were asked to be 'lambs,' missionaries 'among wolves' (Mat 10:16, Luk 10:3), and to 'leap for joy' when they were ill treated (Luk 6:23). In all these sayings there is obvious contradiction between the surface value and the thought beneath.

Again, there is abundant evidence of the use of the grotesque by Jesus—a use natural to homely and friendly talk. Would a father, for example, offer a hungry child a stone instead of bread, a snake instead of a fish, a scorpion instead of an egg (Mat 7:9-10, Luk 11:11-12)? The Pharisee, He says, is like a man who cleans the *outside* of his cup and forgets that he drinks from the inside (Mat 23:26). Do men, He asks, 'gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles'? (Mat 7:16). He urges His hearers not to cast their 'pearls before swine' (Mat 7:6). The idea of having 'a beam in one's own eye' is grotesque, as He meant it to be (Mat 7:3-5). When He bade His hearers take no care for the morrow, because caring for the morrow was the distinguishing mark of the *Gentile* as contrasted with the Jew (Mat 6:32), He spoke with full knowledge of Jewish character, and must have known that His hearers would smile. 'Do not even the publicans so?' (Mat 5:47), is an instance of *reductio ad absurdum*. 'Is it lawful on the Sabbath days to do evil or to do good?' (Luk 6:9), was, His critics on the spot would feel, an absurd question, except that it caught them in a dilemma. Similarly, to ask the rich young ruler if he had kept the commandments, 'Thou shall not kill,' etc., must have struck the onlooker as odd, and Jesus can hardly have failed to feel this (Mar 10:19). The simile that follows, of the camel and the needle's eye, shows recourse to the grotesque again (Mar 10:25). It should be remembered that Jesus' hearers were not unfamiliar with religious teaching given in ironic form.

There is humour in the appeal to the practice of the Egyptians and Syrians of calling their tyrannic and worthless rulers *Euergetes*, 'Benefactor' (Luk 22:25); and in the accompanying suggestion that the real chief among Christ's followers is 'he that doth serve' (Luk 22:26), there is a conscious reversal of ordinary notions, which would

make the hearers smile even while they realized the serious meaning. There is a hint of playfulness in the promise that Peter shall ‘catch men’ (Luk_5:10). The question put to the rich fool, ‘Then whose shall those things be?’ (Luk_12:20), has a grim touch,—there is a suggestion in it of reckonings grievously wrong; and something of the kind lurks in the tale of the man who built his house on the sand—a tale told, it must be remembered, by one who had been a τέκτων (Mat_7:26). There are other stories, too, of people of pretension who are ludicrously out in their reckonings, e.g. the king who went to war with a light heart (Luk_14:31), and the man who could not finish his tower (Luk_14:28). There is surely grim humour also in the words, ‘It cannot be that a prophet perish *out of Jerusalem*’ (Luk_13:33).

In conclusion, there are in the recorded sayings of Jesus many traces of their origin in conversation. He is a man speaking to men in the language of men, and pathos, contrast, humour, and spontaneity are the natural and pleasant marks of that language. He, like all great teachers, speaks from the abundance of His heart (Mat_12:34), and a smile is felt in His words, as in the words of all who see contradiction without loss of inner peace. See also art. Laughter.

Literature.—Martensen, *Christian Ethics*, i. 186.

T. R. Glover.

☞ Hunger

HUNGER.—The substantive ‘hunger’ (Authorized and Revised Versions) is the equivalent of a Greek word (λιμός) which in the NT is used either of the suffering of an individual (Luk_15:17, cf. 2Co_11:27), or, more generally, of the widespread plague of famine (cf. Mar_13:8, Luk_4:25 etc.; see Blass’ *Gram. of NT Greek*, p. 299, for the combination λοιμοὶ καὶ λιμοί [*parechesis*]). The more frequently occurring verb is an altogether different word (πεινᾶν), and it is sometimes found where we might expect λιμός or its cognates (Mat_5:6 and Luk_6:21). The latter occurs in but 6 places in the Gospels, while the former is found no fewer than 17 times.

There is, perhaps, no feature of Jesus’ human experience so vividly instructive as that which is portrayed for us in the simple incidental expression ‘He hungered’ (Mat_4:2 = Luk_4:2, Mat_21:18 = Mar_11:12). This is noted twice by the Synoptists; and though we have no such direct statement by St. John, we are not left by the latter without a reference to this side of ‘the humiliation of Christ.’ The story of Jesus’ conversation

with the woman of Samaria conveys the same impression as to the physical limitations to which He was subject with which we are struck in the Synoptic writings. The anxiety of the disciples for the satisfaction of their Master's needs (Joh 4:31 Παββει, φάγγε) explains at least one cause of the bodily weariness which compelled Him to rest 'thus by the well.'

It is of the greatest interest to notice that, on the two occasions when it is definitely stated that Jesus suffered the pangs of hunger, the writer has pointedly attached to the narrative a lesson of psychological and spiritual value. St. Matthew and St. Luke both inform us not only that on the completion of His forty days' fast 'he hungered'; they also tell us that the Tempter attacked Him on the side of His consequent weakness. 'If thou art the Son of God, command that these stones become bread' (Mat 4:3, cf. the stronger and more graphic mould in which St. Luke casts the narrative by adopting the singular τῷ λίθῳ τούτῳ for οἱ λίθοι οὗτοι and ἄρτοι for ἄρτοι, Luk 4:3), expresses the subtle nature of this temptation in a manner which is profoundly in keeping with all human experience (see F. W. Robertson's sermon on 'Elijah,' second series).

It is surely more rational to accept the Synoptic statement that this was, in point of fact, the first of the three temptations, for the reason given above, than to adopt the order given in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, as O. Holtzmann is inclined to do (cf. his *Leben Jesu*, English translation pp. 94 and 140-150). The author of this *Gospel* places the temptation by hunger after that on the high mountain, which he puts first in the series. Holtzmann, moreover, argues that the first temptation, according to the First and Third Evangelists, occurred last of all. Among other reasons for this inversion, he bases his statement on the fact that Jesus met the suggestion to convert the stone into a loaf by a quotation taken from Deu 8:3, whereas His answers to the other two are quotations from an earlier part, of the same book (Deu 6:13; Deu 6:16). To the present writer this looks like trifling with the evidence, and seems to expose this author to the charge of adopting any statement as having *prima facie* claims to being historical provided it be a contradiction of the sacred books. The very simplicity of the narratives as we have them forbids us to assume that the writers manufactured an order by means of 'a gradation as regards localities,' or by presenting a series of grand climacterics—'satisfaction of hunger, miraculous action, and sovereignty of the world.' [For the curious passage in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* (... ἐνθα αὐτὸς ὁ Σωτὴρ φησιν· ἄρτι ἔλαβέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐν μιᾷ τῶν τοιχῶν μου, καὶ ἀτήνεγκέ με εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ μέγα Θαβώρ) which makes Mt. Tabor the scene of the Temptation, see Origen, in *Joann.* tom. ii. § 6f., given in Nestle's *Graecum Supplementum*, p. 77. The same passage is quoted more than once

by Jerome, who each time refers it to the *Evangelium quod secundum* (juxta) *Hebraeos* (e.g. in *Isa* 15:11)].

The other recorded occasion on which Jesus suffered from hunger was at the end of His ministry, and during that week when His last conflict with the religious authorities of His nation culminated in His Passion and Death. The incident affords an example of the way in which the Evangelists, in their choice of literary material, were guided to subordinate the selection of historical facts to the moral and spiritual importance attaching to them. Neither St. Matthew nor St. Mark was deterred from relating the story of the fruitless fig-tree by a fear lest the appearance of harshness and petulance should detract from the moral dignity of their Master. Their portrait of Him was too faithful and their insight too keen to permit any suggestion, to themselves at least, of an unworthy display, in an angry moment, of thaumaturgical energy. See art. Fig-tree.

The union between Christ and His people, so repeatedly insisted on by Jesus as indispensable to their higher life (see, e.g., Joh 15:4 ff.), is postulated in His great eschatological discourse. The sufferings of redeemed humanity are His sufferings, and the loving service, which clothes the naked and feeds the hungry, is hallowed because it is done, not merely in His cause, but for Himself (Mat 25:35 ff; cf. Mat 10:40 ff.) There is something more in these words than an expression of sympathy by a brother who has himself experienced deprivation and suffering (cf. Heb 4:15), and who feels for one who is passing through similar stages. We have in them a vivid portraiture of that essential and spiritual oneness upon which the writer of the Fourth Gospel lays such emphasis (cf. Joh 14:20; Joh 17:21; Joh 17:23; Joh 17:26 etc.; see also Act 9:5 Ἐγὼ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς δὲν σὺ διώκεις).

It is not without significance that not only have we this mystic union adumbrated by the Synoptists which is elaborated and, inchoatively at least, systematized by St. John; we have also recorded in the writings of all three an incident illustrative of that complete companionship in privations as well as in privileges which He demanded as the essence of discipleship from the scribe who would follow Him whithersoever He went (Luk 9:38 = Mat 8:20; cf. Mat 10:38; Mat 16:24, Luk 9:23, Mar 8:34 etc.). The fact that the disciples suffered hunger is specifically mentioned by St. Matthew, though it is only to be inferred from the parallel passages in the other two Synoptists (cf. Mar 2:23 ff. = Mat 12:1 ff. = Luk 6:1 ff.). On this occasion Jesus takes advantage of the opportunity afforded by the carping criticism of the Pharisees to emphasize, by an appeal to the case of the hungry David, His teaching on the Sabbath question. A fine touch is added by each of the Synoptists which beautifully illustrates the spirit of *camaraderie* existing between Jesus and His disciples. The touch is incidental, and therefore the more effective. Each of the writers expressly states that it was the

disciples who were plucking the ears of corn and not Jesus, though each commences the narrative by making Jesus the subject of the story (ἐπορεύθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, κ.τ.λ., [Mat 12:1](#); ... αὐτὸν διαπορεύεσθαι, [Mar 2:23](#), [Luk 6:1](#)). It was through the disciples that the Pharisees attacked Him (cf., however, [Luk 6:2](#)); and it was in their defence that Jesus met them with the unanswerable argument taken from their own armoury—the OT.

It will not surprise us to find Jesus transferring the idea of physical hunger to the spiritual life and experience, as this habit of transposition forms one of the most attractive and powerful features in His teaching. Just as in man's physical life hunger is a sign of health, and becomes an evil only when its cravings cannot be satisfied, so Jesus counts those blessed whose soul's health is robust enough to cause them to cry out from hunger after righteousness (note the peculiar construction which has the accusative τὴν δικαιοσύνην after πεινῶντες instead of the genitive of classical writers; cf. *Od.* xx. 137; *Xen. Cyr.* viii. iii. 39; Plato, *Rep.* 521 A; see Blass' *Grammar of NT Greek*, p. 89 f.; and Liddell and Scott's *Lexicon*). That need, because it is felt, shall be met in the fullest possible way, hence their blessedness (ὅτι αὐτοὶ χορτασθήσονται, [Mat 5:6](#); cf. [Luk 6:21](#)).

On the other hand, they are to be pitied whose spiritual appetite is so deranged that they feel no need at all, because the day shall come when they must feel, and the pangs of hunger shall remain without hope of alleviation (ὅτι πεινάσετε, [Luk 6:25](#)).

That He possessed the power of permanently satisfying the deepest needs of the human soul, Jesus categorically asserts on more than one occasion ([Joh 6:35](#), cf. [Joh 4:14](#) and [Joh 7:37](#)). In these express assurances we may see the profoundest explanation of the words of the *Magnificat*: 'The hungry he hath filled with good things; and the rich he hath sent empty away' ([Luk 1:53](#)), which are but the echo of the words in which the Psalmist long before had clothed his experience ([Psa 107:9](#)).

J. R. Willis.

☞ Husband

HUSBAND (ἀνὴρ).—Betrothal and marriage were virtually one among the Jews. The former consisted in the simple act, on the part of the bridegroom or his deputy, of giving to the bride or her representative a written engagement, in the presence of two witnesses, or a piece of money, large or small, with the words, 'Be thou

consecrated unto me.’ Like marriage itself, of which it was the initiatory step, it could be dissolved only by death or divorce. Under the Mosaic Law, the marriage tie was comparatively easily broken, and divorces seem to have been quite common. During the period of the later prophets the ethical standard was considerably advanced (‘God hates putting away,’ Mal 2:16). Christ Himself utterly set aside the law of Moses, and limited the dissolution of the marriage tie to the one cause of adultery; and in this respect He apparently put the two sexes on the same plane (Mar 10:11 f.). The mercy of Christ towards sinners against the law of sexual morality as laid down by Himself is, however, beautifully illustrated in His treatment of the Samaritan woman (Joh 4:16-18), and in that of the woman taken in adultery (Joh 8:4-11).* [Note: This passage, whether genuine or not, is certainly a true reflexion of our Lord’s mind and character.]

In Mat 1:16; Mat 1:9 Joseph is called ‘the husband’ of Mary, indicating, in connexion with v. 25, that true marital relations existed between them. This is in evident conflict with the Apocrypha, which assigns to Joseph the place of a guardian rather than that of a true husband, in order to uphold the perpetual virginity of Mary. See, further, artt. Marriage, Wife.

Henry E. Dosker.

Husbandman

HUSBANDMAN (γεωργός).—Jesus knew well the life of the fields. His keen eye for illustrations fell readily on the most fundamental of occupations; one universal since the primeval days when simple patriarchs began to be husbandmen, and princes digged at the up-springing well (‘which the nobles of the people delved, with the scepter and with their staves,’ Num 21:18 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). Agriculture, in Israel’s best days, had been the chief employment, and still from out the scattered villages men were to be seen at work upon the croft like patches. As sure token of happy and successful labours, the plain was verdant with the growing grain, the vines hung graceful from the terraced slope. The human mind never fails to be arrested in religious mood by the mystic forces of nature; and in the case of the Jews there was this added discipline, that Scripture, read stately in their hearing, teemed with references to the tilling of the soil. Ready to the lips of Jesus, therefore, was an allusive speech which should prove powerful in appeal to educated and uneducated alike. The way into the popular sentiment was clear for Him. People were at least grounded in the elements of literary thought. On the principles and growth of the great Kingdom He could discourse profitably under the familiar images of

seed-time and harvest, tree or plant culture in their gardens, or the on goings in their season of the workers in the vineyard on the hill.

What probably commended this line of teaching to Jesus, however, was the fact that husbandry suggests, in singular fashion, the co-ordination of man's activity with God's. Without, on the one hand, what is graciously supplied to us—soil and seed, rain and sunshine—man's labour could be of no avail; yet, on the other hand, without that labour well directed, mankind would perish. The lesson is writ large in cultivated fields that faith and hope, zeal and patience, have a reward assured which comes immediate from the hand of God. Further, this rural imagery of Jesus met the fact that the minds hearing Him were not all equally ready to see the truth in His light. For such persons, pictures from the outer and familiar realm stored up material for self-culture in the future. And nothing better certifies the supreme instinct of the Master than this, that the thousand revelations of the natural science of to-day illustrate only the more those spiritual principles and universal laws of the unseen which He was wont to enforce by reference to phenomena around Him as He spoke.

The slighter glances recorded of Jesus in this realm are fairly numerous. Compare the references to plants and trees (Mat 7:16-20; Mat 12:33, Luk 6:43-45), the putting of the hand to the plough (Luk 9:62), the application of salt to the land (Mat 5:13, Luk 14:35), the ox fallen into the pit (Luk 14:5), the action of the airs of heaven (Luk 12:55, Joh 3:8), the glowing or beelouded sky (Mat 16:2-3, Luk 12:54), the buyer gone to survey his piece of ground (Luk 14:18), or busy testing his new teams (Luk 14:19), the deeply-suggestive corn of wheat (Joh 12:24), the sifting of the same (Luk 22:31), the tenant counting up his measures (Luk 16:7), labourers needed for the plenteous harvest (Mat 9:37-38, Luk 10:2), the growing whiteness of the crops (Joh 4:35), the fated twain of field workers (Mat 24:40, Luk 17:36), and the beautiful picture of the fig-tree at the approach of summer putting forth leaves upon its tender branch (Mat 24:32, Luk 21:29).

But chiefly in the exquisite parables do we see that power of observation in the material world which makes Jesus so engaging as a child of nature, who lived much, and lived free, in the open air of Palestine. As we move with Him by the highways and the hedges, we descry in one field the servant ploughing or feeding cattle (Luk 17:7), in another the well-remembered spot where gleams of joy lit up the rustic's eyes who hopped upon hid treasure (Mat 13:44). Here we have the corn-lands green with the sprouting of the tiny blade (Mar 4:26-29), tangled betimes with the tares (Mat 13:25); there the rocky and the thorn-choked patches (Mar 4:5-7); and over all the hovering birds (Mar 4:4), ready to devour the precious seed. We see the labourers standing in the market-place for hire (Mat 20:3), the prosperous farmer critical about his barns (Luk 12:18), the shepherd searching the grassy plateau for his sheep (Mat 18:12). Men are working in the clumps of vines (Mat 21:28), from which the

wine-press peeps (Mar_12:1), and where the watch-tower stands upon its bolder coign (Mar_12:1). See the garden where the tall mustard grows (Luk_13:19), and yonder the forlorn fig-tree (Luk_13:6) threatened with the axe. The whole world of nature, the varied scenes of toil, are laid amply under contribution, made the emblems and the witness of the highest things of the Spirit. (See art. Vine (Allegory of) for discourse upon the Vine and the Branches, Joh_15:1-8, where the Father is the Husbandman; cf. also art. Agriculture).

One parable must be specially noted—the story of the Wicked Husbandmen (Mat_21:33-43, Mar_12:1-9, Luk_20:9 ff.), which is an incisive review of God's relations with His people. Endless pains had been taken (Mar_12:1) with the vineyard of the Kingdom, yet when messenger after messenger came seeking fruit in the Divine name, they had been sent empty away, and contumeliously treated—one beaten, another wounded, a third killed (Mar_12:2-5). Nowhere does Jesus put Himself more clearly in line with the prophets. As the gloomy night is gathering fast around His own head, He feels full affinity of fate with them. In the passage He carries, indeed, the history of Israel's shameful conduct not only to the days of the Baptist, but even a little beyond the moment of utterance. We have insight into the marvellous composure of the heart of Jesus as He pictures His own case in the person of the one son, well beloved, who was cast out, bruised and bleeding, his body soon to be cold in death upon the highway (Mar_12:8). Thus, in tragic fashion, He broadens the charge against His opponents, with their complacent jealousy (Mar_12:7), by proving their conduct to be of a piece with Israel's cruel treatment of speakers for God in the past. The note of severity and moral indignation is unmistakable, but it is blended with one of wistful sadness. Not that His own approaching death troubles Him; He fears not as He enters into the cloud, and is ready to give His life as covenant blood for the setting up of the Kingdom. But His countrymen's wayward folly, and the terrible crisis at hand for the Jewish State, weigh heavy on His spirit. Their doom, He concludes, is written with God's own finger on the wall, for those who had the eyes to see: 'He will come, and destroy the husbandmen, and will give the vineyard unto others' (Mar_12:9).

George Murray.

☞ Husks

HUSKS.—The only mention of husks (κεράτια, so called from their shape, which resembles 'horns') occurs in Luk_15:16. Husks were the pods of the carob-tree, which is also known as the locust-tree (*Ceratonia siliqua*). This tree, which is common in Palestine, belongs to the order Leguminosae, and is an evergreen. It attains to a

height of about 30 feet, and has a dense foliage. Its leaves are of a dark, glossy green. The pods are from 6 to 10 inches in length and 1 in breadth. They contain a thick, sweet pulp, not unpleasant to the palate, and are used as food for pigs, cattle, and horses. They are also, because of their cheapness, eaten by the very poor.

Some have identified the pods of the carob with the ‘locusts’ (ἀκρίδες) which John the Baptist ate (Mat 3:4). It is true they are sometimes called ‘St. John’s bread,’ this name having been given to them by the monks of Palestine or by ‘pious pilgrims’ (Thomson, *LB* [Note: *The Land and the Book.*] p. 655), but there can be little doubt that the Baptist’s food was not carob-pods, but the insect, which is still eaten by the wandering Arabs. See Locust.

Hugh Duncan.

Hymn

HYMN

1. *Introductory.*—In the earliest period the terms ‘hymn’ (ὕμνος) and ‘to hymn’ (ὑμνεῖν) seem to have covered practically every kind of composition which was sung or rhythmically recited in Christian worship or the Christian assemblies.

In Col 3:16 and Eph 5:19 the three terms ὕμνος (‘hymn’), ψαλμός (‘psalm’), and ᾠδή (‘song’) are found together as descriptive of the acts of praise offered to God in the early Christian assemblies. ‘While the leading idea of ψαλμ. is a musical accompaniment, and that of ὕμν. praise to God, ᾠδή is the general word for a song, whether accompanied or unaccompanied, whether of praise or on any other subject. Thus it was quite possible for the same song to be at once ψαλμός, ὕμνος, and ᾠδή (Lightfoot on Col 3:16).

Specifically hymns came in course of time to be distinguished from psalms (*i.e.* the canonical Bk. of Psalms* [Note: It is possible that in Col 3:16, Eph 5:19 the term ψαλμός is similarly restricted in meaning,]) and canticles (‘poetical extracts from Holy Scripture which are incorporated among the Psalms in the Divine office’† [Note: Chr. Ant. i. 284.]). This, of course, applies to the period subsequent to the fixing of the Canon. But the earliest ecclesiastical hymns, in this sense, were not metrical.

The *ecclesiastical canticles* under the title of $\psi\delta\alpha\iota$ immediately follow the Psalter in certain of the Greek uncials and in a large number of the Greek cursive MS^S [Note: SS Manuscripts.] . Nine of them are now sung at Lauds in the office of the orthodox Greek Church. Codex A gives the following in the following order:‡ [Note: Swete, *Introd. to the OT in Greek*, p. 253 f.]

(1) Exo 15:1-18 ('song of Moses in Exodus'); (2) Deu 32:1-43 ('Song of Moses in Deut. '); (3) 1Sa 2:1-10 ('Prayer of Haonah'); (4) Isa 26:9-20 ('prayer of Isaiah'); (5) Jon 3:5-10 ('Prayer of Jonah'); (6) Hab 3:1-19 ('Prayer of Habakkuk'); (7) Isa 38:10-20 ('Prayer of Hezekiah'); (8) The Prayer of Manasseh; (9) Dan 3:26-30; (10) Dn 3:52-88; (11) *Magnificat*; (12) *Nunc Dimittis*; (13) *Benedictus*; (14) *Morning Hymn* (= full form of *Gloria in Excelsis*).

2. *Jewish Liturgical usage.*—In the Temple services the Psalms naturally played a great part. For the daily service the order of the Psalms, which were sung to a musical accompaniment by the Levitical choir, § [Note: Edersheim, *Temple*, etc. p. 143 f.] was as follows: 1st day of the week, Psalms 24; Psalms 2nd, Psalms 48; Psalms 3rd, Psalms 82; Psalms 4th, Psalms 94; Psalms 5th, Psalms 81; Psalms 6th, Psalms 93; Sabbath, Psalms 92. Special Psalms were also used for special occasions.

It has been questioned whether psalmody formed an element in the early synagogue-service (see esp. Gibson, *Expositor*, July 1890, pp. 25-27). It is true that in the Mishna | [Note: | Cf. esp. Meg. iv. 3.] the only elements explicitly recognized in the synagogue-service are: (1) the Shema'; (2) prayer; (3) the reading of the Law; and (4) the reading of the Prophets, and the benediction. But we know from the NT that in addition to this the practice of translating and expounding the Scripture-lection was also in vogue; and it may be inferred that on certain special occasions the 'Hallel,' at any rate, was recited in the synagogues (see Hallel). ¶ [Note: It is worth noting that the regular term employed in the Mishna is to 'read' (אָקֵר) the Hallel. In the Temple-service it was sung. Cf. also the benediction said before Hallel, which was probably the composition of the Pharisees ('who hast commanded us to read the Hallel').] But it is difficult to believe that other parts of the Psalter were not also recited there. The internal evidence of the Psalms suggests that some at least were specially intended for synagogue use: esp. the 'Hallelujah' Psalms (105, 106, 107, 111, 112, 114, 116, 117, 118, 135, 136, 146-150).** [Note: * Cf. Cheyne, *Origin of the Psalter*, p. 14, note g, and p. 363 f. Psalms 146-150 form a well-defined group in the synagogue-liturgy, and are used in the daily morning service (cf. Singer, *Heb.-Eng. Prayer-Book*, p. 29 f.). Compare with this the custom in certain parts of the early Church of reciting the "Hallelujah' Psalms daily. See Grunwald, *Heber den Einfluss*

der Psalmen auf die Katholische Liturgie, Heft iii. p. 23.] However this may be, it is practically certain that a part, at least, of the sacred poetry of the OT, such as the Red Sea Song (Exodus 15), the special psalms for the days of the week, the Hallel, and possibly, also, the ‘Psalms of Degrees,’ would be known in Palestine in their Hebrew form in the time of Christ from their liturgical use in public worship, esp. in the Temple.† [Note: † Cf. also the so-called Psalter of Solomon, which may have been intended ‘for public or oven liturgical use,’ and which almost certainly goes lack to a Hebrew original See ed. by Ryle and James, p. xci.] Examples of post-biblical poetry (Hebrew) of the early period (before the destruction of the Temple) are very rare. For an instance cf. Mishna, *Sukkâ* v. 4 (a liturgical piece).

3. *The Evangelical Canticles.*—The poetical pieces which we know as the *Magnificat*, *Benedictus*, *Nunc Dimittis*, and *Gloria in Excelsis* (Angels’ song), and which are embodied in the first two chapters of the Third Gospel, are probably the earliest examples of Christian hymns. They are ascribed to the Virgin Mary, Simeon, Zacharias, and the Angels respectively; but it is more probable that they are to be regarded as original liturgical compositions, reflecting the piety and devotion of the early Jewish-Christian community in Palestine. Probably, too, they are translations from Hebrew originals, and were at first sung or chanted in Hebrew.* [Note: See an article by the present writer in ZNTW vi. p. 80 f. (Feb. 1905), on ‘The Gospel Narratives of the Nativity,’ etc.] The hymns themselves are obviously modelled on the psalm-poetry of the OT, some of which, as has been pointed out, would be generally familiar *in its Hebrew form* to the Aramaic-speaking Jews of Palestine in the time of Christ.† [Note: op. cit. p. 95.]

For details as to the dependence of these hymns on the OT see the commentaries (in particular, Plummer, *Intern. Crit. Com.* on ‘St. Luke’). Notice the prominence of the idea of a Messianic redemption from sin, which is characteristically Jewish-Christian (cf. Luk 1:77 with Plummer’s note; and cf. Mat 1:21). For the poetical form and structure cf. esp. Briggs, *The Messiah of the Gospels* (1894), ch. ii., and *New Light on the Life of Jesus* (1904), ch. xiii. (the latter esp. valuable). The present writer finds himself in independent agreement with Briggs in regarding Mat 1:20 b, 21 as a translation from a Hebrew poetical piece.‡ [Note: That a Hebrew original underlies these two verses is shown by the fact that the play upon words in v. 21 (Jesus shall save) can be elucidated only by Hebrew—not Aramaic—phraseology (ישוע, יושע).]

According to the same scholar, the full number of poetical pieces given in Luke is seven, viz.: (1) The Annunciation to Zacharias (Luk 1:13-17); (2) the Annunciation to Mary (4 parts: Luk 1:28; Luk 1:30-33; Luk 1:35-38); (3) the Annunciation to the Shepherds (2 parts: Luk 2:10; Luk 2:12; Luk 2:14); (4) the Song of Elisabeth (Luk 1:42-45); (5) the Song of Mary (= *Magnificat*, Luk 1:46-55); (6) the Song of

Zacharias (= *Benedictus*, Luk 1:68-79); (7) the Song of Simeon (= *Nunc Dimittis*, Luk 2:29; Luk 2:32, to which should be appended Luk 2:34-35). Of these all but No. (5) are trimeter poems; (5) is a pentameter poem, as is also Mat 1:20 b. Mat 1:21. Probably all go back to two long poems (a trimeter and pentameter), from which the above are extracts.

4. *Other Hymns and Hymn-pieces.*—(a) It has been suggested with some plausibility that the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel ‘is a hymn to the Logos, composed independently of the Gospel and prefixed to it.’ § [Note: for details Briggs, *The Messiah of the Apostles* (1895), pp. 495-515; he compares the above to the ‘credal hymn’ in 1Ti 3:14.] Here also Professor Briggs detects a trimeter poem originally arranged in three parts. || For other possible extracts from early Christian hymns in the NT, reference may here be made to ‘Hymn’ in Hasting’s *Dictionary of the Bible* ii. p. 440 f.

In the Apocalypse, also, there are a number of songs (ὕμνοι) which may, perhaps, be regarded as traditional Jewish-Christian hymns (cf. Rev 4:11; Rev 5:9 f, Rev 5:12 f, Rev 11:17 f, Rev 15:3 f.).

It is possible that the curious phrase, ‘*Amen, come*’ (Rev 22:20), may be an acrostic reference to a Jewish hymn which is still sung in the synagogue (‘*En Kctóhçnú*, ‘There is none like our God,’ Singer, p. 167). This composition, in its present form, consists of 5 verses of 4 lines each. The initial letters of the lines of the 5 verses form the words בא אמן = ‘, come.’ || [Note: | Cf. Schiller-Szinessy in the *Ency. Brit.*, s.v.

‘Midrash’ (p. 286), and C. Taylor, *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, p. 78 f.; also an art. by the present writer in *Church and Synagogue*, iii. p. 41 f. (Jan. 1901).] Δ

Hebraized form (הַמְנוֹן) of the Greek term ὕμνος occurs in the Midrash (cf. *Ber. Rabba* viii. 9 = a hymn to a king).

(b) *The Hosanna-hymn*, or cry of praise of Palm Sunday, with which Jesus was greeted on His last entry into Jerusalem, ¶ [Note: Also afterwards by the children in the Temple, Mat 21:15.] is given in various forms in the Gospels. In its simplest form it

occurs in Mar 11:9 and Joh 12:13, which really give the cry of the multitude: בא הושע

יהוה בשם הבא ברוך. The additions that occur in the other passages (τῷ νιῷ Δαυεὶδ,

Mat 21:9; Mat 21:15; and ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις, Mat 21:9, Mar 11:10)** [Note: *

Mar 11:10 will thus be a later addition. It is noteworthy that the original form without these additions occurs only in the Fourth Gospel. Lk. (19:38) omits ‘Hosanna’ and alters the Psalm-verse into, ‘Blessed be the King that cometh in the name of the

Lord.’ See art. Hosanna.] seem really to be later amplifications due to liturgical influence, when ὡσαννά (which in its Hebrew form הוֹשַׁעֲנָה is really a cry addressed to God, ‘Save now!’) was misunderstood as a shout of homage or greeting = ‘Hail!’ or ‘Glory to.’ See Dalman, *Words of Jesus* (English translation), p. 220 f.

Cheyne’s explanation, *Encyc. Bibl.* s.v. ‘Hosanna,’ is hardly convincing. Lightfoot, in his interesting note on Mat 21:12 (*Horae Heb.* ed. Gandell, ii. 274 f.), ingeniously paraphrases, ‘Save us, we beseech Thee, O Thou [who dwellest] in the highest,’ taking ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις as a substitute for the Divine name. This is barely possible.

The Hosanna-cry (cf. Psa 118:25 f.) and the palm branches naturally suggest the Feast of Tabernacles, with the ceremonies of which they were most closely associated (esp. in the ‘Hosanna’ processions of the Festival). * [Note: For a description of these see Dembitz, *Jewish Services*, etc., p. 323 f.] It seems, however, that such processions might be extemporized for other occasions of a joyous character (cf. 1Ma 13:51, 2Ma 10:7), and this was the case in the scene described in the Gospels.

Wünsche, indeed (*Erläuterungen der Evangelien aus Talmud und Midrash*, p. 241), supposes that a confusion has arisen in the Gospel accounts between Tabernacles and Passover; but this is unnecessary. It is noteworthy that there seem to be traces in the Midrash on the Psalms of the Messianic interpretation of Psa 118:25.† [Note: also the citation of v. 22 ff. of the same Psalm in Mat 21:42.]

Literature.—The most important contributions to the subject of NT hymnody are the works of Briggs above cited. Reference may also be made to artt. ‘Hosanna’ in the *Jewish Encyc.* and *Encyc. Bibl.* respectively; also to ‘Hymns’ in *Encyc. Bibl.*; ‘Hymn’ in Hasting’s *Dictionary of the Bible*; ‘Hymn,’ ‘Canticle,’ in *Dict. Chr. Ant.*, and to ‘Kirchenlied i. (in der alten Kirche)’ and ‘Liturgische Formeln’ in *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyclopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] . Other references have been given in the body of the article.

G. H. Box.

 Hypocrisy

HYPOCRISY

‘Hypocrisy’ (ὑπόκρισις, ‘hypocrite’ (ὑποκριτής), ‘act the hypocrite’ (ὑποκρίνομαι). In the NT the verb appears only in Luk_20:20; ὑποκριτής only in the Synopp., but fifteen times in Mt. alone; ὑπόκρισις once in Mt. (Mat_23:28), once in Mk. (Mar_12:15), once in Lk. (Luk_12:1), and also in Gal_2:13, 1Ti_4:2; 1Pe_2:1. The root meaning of the word is *to distinguish between things*. From this it early came to mean to answer, and to interpret, dreams. By what link of association it came to be applied to *declamation* is less easy to determine. In this sense it is used by the Attic writers of orators and rhapsodists as well as of actors. Soon it was restricted to declamation on the stage, and then, by a process repeated in other languages, was used for acting a part, and so for acting a part for a base end, for giving oneself out to be what one knew one ought to be, but had no intention of becoming.

In the Apocr. [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] the word is found in this sense of acting a part, of feigning, and with varying shades of moral obliquity. In 2Ma_6:21-25, Eleazar is urged to eat his own meat while *feigning* to eat the swine’s flesh appointed by the king. Though the deception is urged as legitimate, Eleazar’s reply shows that the word already had bad associations. Similarly 4Ma_6:17. In Sir_32:15, as the opposite to fearing God and seeking the law, it is used almost exactly as in the NT. The LXX Septuagint uses the word in Job_34:30; Job_36:13, to translate חָתָה. In the first passage, it is an impiety which lays snares; in the second, it is an impiety of the heart which cherishes an inward bitterness against God. Here we have the true ancestry of the NT usage, which always includes the idea of impiety, of shutting out God and resolutely living in the darkness apart from Him. But the NT usage is also influenced by חָתָה, though the LXX Septuagint translates that word by δολιοῦν or δολοῦν. From the root idea of smoothness it came to be employed for flattery, and so for all kinds of evil deception. The kinship of the two words חָתָה and חָתָה may be seen in Dan_11:32, where those who are basely disloyal to the covenant expose themselves to the danger of being led into a false position towards God by smooth deceits.

Yet the conception of this vice in the popular mind of His time, to which our Lord appealed, was less determined by any particular Hebrew word than by the general teaching of the OT. The hypocrites speak with a double heart (Psa_12:2). They have smooth lips, and their profession is far beyond their performance (Psa_12:3). They imagine that wickedness can be shut up in the heart. They are brazen towards God, and deceitful towards men. They cease to hate evil and take to planning it (Psa_36:1-4). Above all, they attempt to deceive God (Psa_78:36) Hypocrisy is a thing God cannot tolerate (Job_22:16), and which He is continually exposing (Job_5:13). Idolatry is a sort of hypocrisy from which a man can keep by being perfect, *i.e.*

whole-hearted, with the Lord his God (Deu_18:13). The classical passage for a hypocrisy that practises the ceremonies and knows none of the duties of religion is Isaiah 1, but nearly every prophet has occasion to speak against the evil. All false prophecy was hypocrisy—the saying of the thing that pleased, and not of the thing that was true. The person most deceived was the hypocrite himself (Isa_33:14-15, Job_27:8), but he was also a danger to the society in which he lived (Job_15:34). To all the true prophets he was the supreme danger to the State.

The Talmud lays the same stress upon hypocrisy, as the opposite of faith in God. ‘There are four who cannot appear before God—the scoffer, the hypocrite, the liar, and the slanderer’—all vices of falsehood. ‘God hates him who speaks one way with the mouth and another way with the heart.’ ‘A society which has hypocrites for its members is abominable and falls into exile.’

Hypocrisy was plainly no new vice in our Lord’s time, but an ancient heritage into which the Pharisees entered. How, then, are we to account for the sudden prominence to which it is raised? No vice is held up to such unenviable notoriety in the Synoptics, no other combated with the same direct denunciation, while in John τὸ ψεῦδος is a conception only a little wider than ὑπόκρισις, and has the same condemnation. First of all, just because it is a sin of deception, it is mercilessly exposed, as if our Lord would give a practical demonstration that there is nothing hidden that shall not be made known. A sin which glories in misleading an opponent by smooth flatteries (Mat_22:15), which goes about in long robes and seeks to be revered by public salutations, which takes its honour for granted and cloaks oppressive avarice with long prayers (Mar_12:38-40), which cleanses the outside of the cup and platter while leaving them full of extortion and wickedness, which makes men hidden tombs, fair without and foul within (Luk_11:44), is met, as no other sin can be, by exposure.

Then the sin which lives by corrupting the conscience has cut itself off from the usual appeal of holiness and love by which our Lord seeks to win men from other sins. It substitutes traditional practices for living duties (Mat_15:6); it uses minutiae of ecclesiastical rule as a substitute for judgment and the love of God (Luk_11:42); it cannot receive the truth, because its eye is on man and not on God (Joh_5:44); it makes inquiries not in order to believe the truth, but in order to refute it (Joh_9:27-28); and it is chained to its error by a confident assurance that it alone is right (Joh_9:41). The only way of appeal left is direct denunciation.

Further, sin is, in a pre-eminent degree, the foe of all truth. The hypocrite is in a special sense the child of the father of lies (Joh_8:44). Hypocrisy is not a mere sin of impulse, but is the opposite of everything by which we may lay hold of truth and be

delivered. As surely as faith reaches out towards truth, hypocrisy struggles against it. Not being able to live with truth, it can defend itself only by persecution. 'Ye seek to kill me because my word hath not free course in you' ([Joh_8:37](#)). The same spirit made their fathers kill the prophets as a natural consequence of rejecting their message, and it is only another hypocrisy which makes the descendants repudiate their fathers' deeds while cherishing their fathers' spirit. The justification for the terrible assault on the Pharisees in Matthew 23, is that, sitting in Moses' seat, they show a spirit with which truth cannot dwell. The deep shadow is always in the bright sunlight, and the deep corruption is always in the place of opportunity. The Pharisees neither enter the Kingdom nor suffer others to enter. They are abundantly zealous, but in a bad cause. They pervert truth, debase it, fight against it. No appeal can touch them, and in the end their house is left to them desolate.

Then the evil of hypocrisy is more than negative. It does not stop with pretending to need signs, while it pays no attention to the evidence it has, and would be convinced by no evidence ([Mat_16:3-4](#)). Hypocrisy is also an active leaven—a dangerous assimilative principle—against the corruption of which no warning can be too ample. It is more than the shadow of truth, the absence of faith. It definitely works to debase the whole man, just as faith works to regenerate him. In addition to refusing to enter in, it takes away the key of knowledge ([Luk_11:52](#)). Against everything connected with the Kingdom of Heaven it is actively hostile.

In the Sermon on the Mount ([Mat_6:1](#) ff.) hypocrisy is set over against the Kingdom of Heaven as its opposite and its negation. In the realm of hypocrisy appearances meet every requirement; in the Kingdom of Heaven all is judged by the heart. Christ says, the issues of life are out of the heart alone; hypocrisy says, they are mainly out of ceremonies. Of the whole standard of the Kingdom of Heaven hypocrisy is the daily practical denial—its broad result being the external righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, without exceeding which we shall in no wise enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. So alien is the whole unreal pretence of religion, that there is a good secrecy at the other extreme from it. Deliberate care must be taken that one's righteousness be not done in the public eye. Not only is no trumpet to be sounded before us in the street; our praise is not even to find an echo in our own heart. Not only may prayer never be used for show; true prayer is with ourselves and our Father in secret alone. Not only may we not fast with a sad countenance; the head is to be anointed and the face washed as on a day of festival. Hypocrisy is the opposite of that singleness of eye which fills the whole body with light; it turns the light that is in a man to darkness. It attempts to serve two masters while serving none. It sees motes in its brother's eye while ignoring beams in its own. It is in sheep's clothing without, and a ravaging wolf within. It is the shadow of the light, the enemy of the truth. It is most of all hostile to the Kingdom of Heaven, just because that is the fullest light and the highest truth. Nor is that all. Hypocrisy, as the opposite and negation of the Kingdom of Heaven, is

as ready to corrupt Christianity as it was to corrupt Judaism. Even Christ's name it is capable of turning into a substitute, not a synonym, for the will of the Father.

From all other vices men are delivered by the life of faith. For this reason our Lord never directly assails vices of impulse. The publican and the harlot He treated as the lost sheep He had come to seek. For them He set wide the door of the Kingdom. But the door, He knew, could never be made so narrow that the hypocrites would not at least appear to enter. The new hypocrisy will be to come in Christ's name, saying, 'I am he' (Mar 13:6). Under that guise it will hide itself so dexterously as almost to deceive the elect; and it will use its opportunity, as hypocrisy has always done, to strangle truth by persecution. Just because hypocrisy is thus an enemy in the camp poisoning the wells, our Lord deals with it openly, directly, negatively, by the method of denunciation, as with no other form of evil.

The supreme evil of hypocrisy, as the negation of the life of faith, appears still more clearly in what our Lord says about the eternal sin. In John unbelief is spoken of as the abiding sin. 'For if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins' (Mar 8:24). Yet, from the context, it is apparent that the abiding evil is not the act of unbelief, but the absence of all love of the truth, of which the unbelief is the evidence. Christ came that the thoughts of many hearts should be revealed (Luk 2:35), and those who had cherished evil were as conspicuously displayed as those who had cherished good. The publican and the harlot who had secretly thirsted after righteousness came to be shown to have faith, though all appearances were against them; the Pharisee who had used his religious position to cover worldly ends was shown to want it, though all appearances were in his favour. While the publican came to the light, the Pharisee hated the truth and sought to repress it, and to do so sought to destroy Him who spoke the truth. Thus he showed himself of his father the devil, who from the beginning was a murderer as well as the father of lies. Here in John then we have juggling with truth, hypocrisies before God and the world and one's own soul, set forth as the cardinal sin which relates us as certainly to the spirit of evil as faith does to the spirit of good, and which works in hate, as surely as goodness works in love, and which leaves men to die in their sins, because it is hostile to all that could lead to penitence and pardon.

All this is in essential agreement with what the Synoptics say of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost (Mat 12:22-37, Mar 3:20-30, Luk 12:1-12). The Pharisees had reached a turning-point in their opposition. They believed in miracles, they looked for signs. The miracle could no longer be questioned, but they could call it a sign of Beelzebub. Though unable to deny either the power or the beneficence of Christ's work, being resolved not to accept the practical consequences of belief, they call light darkness and good evil. The actual sin against the Holy Ghost, therefore, is possible only when face to face with the highest thing in religion and its clearest evidence, but the

danger of coming to that point is present in all hypocrisy. Hypocrisy is ever an overweening pride, denying to other men the right to truth, and to God His power to see; and the eternal sin is only the finished result of what is always present in it. This connexion is most evident in the narrative of Luke, which begins with a warning against the leaven of the Pharisees which is hypocrisy. Nothing, it is said, can be covered, and the hypocrite has power to do only one great evil—to associate others in his spiritual destruction. Faith in the God who cares even for the sparrow can alone preserve from this fatal vice, a clear indication that hypocrisy is the negation of faith, or at least that faith is the negation of hypocrisy. The natural outcome of faith is confession before men, and the accompaniment of that is Divine protection until the day of the final award. On the other hand, to follow hypocrisy is to go the road that leads to the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost—the state of mind that has so juggled with good and evil that good has no power over it, the sin which no change of dispensation, or perhaps nothing in eternity any more than in time, can modify. This may be most apparent in Luke, but in Mark and Matthew also the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of truth, and the sin which is eternal is not an act of oversight or passion, but an irremediable state which could be reached only by a finished, proud, and tyrannical hypocrisy. See Unpardonable Sin.

In every form of evil, as Martensen rightly affirms, hypocrisy is present in a partial form. All sin is egoistic, yet every man depends on society—the sinner not least. Under some pretence of goodness alone can the egoist enter society. The seducer must swear false oaths, the deceiver feign friendship, the tyrant profess care for the commonweal. A finished life of wickedness would be one great lie, which would be the only ultimate form of atheism. And just because a God of truth cannot for ever be denied, hypocrisy conies to be more and more a spirit of hatred and opposition to truth. Thus it is, more even than *habit*, the cumulative element in devotion to evil. It is not only the greatest practical denial of God, it is also the greatest practical alienation from God. To be reconciled to God is primarily to be restored to truth. Wherefore hypocrisy may be taken not only as the negation of all Christ taught of God, but also as the negation of all Christ did to reconcile men to the Father, the negation of His work as a Saviour as well as of His work as a Revealer.

Throughout all the Christian centuries, wherever there has been a lively sense of the reality of Christianity, there has also been a lively sense of this shadow following the sun. The classical example of lying to the Holy Ghost found its occasion in the first flush of the Church's faith and love (Acts 5). The first great division of parties arose through the same vice, and arose almost with the Church's beginnings. The extreme bitterness of the Judaistic party was nourished by that external view of religion which could regard a ceremony as essential, and hatred as if it were godliness. Even Barnabas was almost carried away by their hypocrisy ([Gal_2:13](#)), showing how the vice seeks to deceive, if possible, the elect; while their attempts to suppress Paul were

limited only by their power and never by their scruples—showing that it is a vice which always persecutes as well as perverts. All the errors which cause men to fall away from the faith are, already in the NT, ascribed to the hypocrisy of men that speak lies (1Ti 4:2). Regarding this root of error in moral falsehood, and not in mere intellectual mistake, much might be said, but it must suffice to mention what Augustine says of Manichaeism. Long his difficulties seemed to him intellectual perplexity about the origin of evil. When, however, he saw that wickedness was no substance, but a perversity of the will, he discovered the true root of the error. ‘They preferred to think Thy substance did suffer ill, than that their own did commit it’ (*Conf.* vii. 4).

That, as our Lord predicted, hypocrisy has continued to work under the New Dispensation as under the Old, may be seen from the state of things in the Eastern Church as pictured by Eustathius, in the Western as drawn by Dante and Chaucer, and in later times as reflected in a literature too abundant and familiar to require to be named.

Literature.—Hamburger, *RE*, 1884, art. ‘Heuchelei,’ vol. i. p. 515; Cremer, *Bibl.-Theol. Wörterbuch*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 527; L. Lemme, *Die Sunde wider den Heiligen Geist*, 1883, and art. ‘Heuchelei’ in *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] : J. M. Schulhof, *The Law of Forgiveness as presented in the NT*, 1901, pp. 43-48; Martensen, *Christian Ethics*, 1st Div. ‘Individual Ethics,’ 1881 [English translation], pp. 114-118; *Eustathii Opuscula*, ed. by Tafel; *Exiles of Eternity*, by J. S. Carroll, 1903; Mozley, *Univ. Serm.* Serm. ii.; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*, 116 ff., 253 ff.

John Oman.

☞ Hyssop

HYSSOP (חִסְסוֹן, ὑσσωπος) is twice mentioned in the NT (Joh 19:29, Heb 9:19). We know that it was used for sprinkling (Exo 12:22), and that it grew on walls (1Ki 4:33). By Tristram it is identified with the caper-plant (*spinosa*); and this view is very generally accepted. It is open, however, to the serious objection that the caper is not well adapted for use as a sprinkler. Many still favour the opinion of Maimonides that it was the *satar* of the Arabs. This plant, which ‘springs out of the walls, those of the garden especially’ (Thomson, *B* [Note: *The Land and the Book.*] p. 112), is a species of *Satureia*. In Morocco, the name *sa'tar* is given to marjoram (*Origanum*). Carruthers

(*Bible Educator*, iv. 226) suggests that hyssop was a name applied to various plants of the genera *Thymus*, *Origanus*, and others nearly allied in form and habit. The balance of probability is in favour of this view.

Hugh Duncan.

☞ Ideal

IDEAL.—The word ‘ideal’ does not occur in Authorized and Revised Versions of the NT, nor is there any term in the Gr. text which exactly corresponds to the general notion of the English word.* [Note: The translators of the Twentieth Cent. ST render Eph 4:13 b ‘until we reach the perfection of manhood and that degree of development of which the ideal to be found in the Christ is the standard.’ But this is a paraphrase rather than a translation of the original.] The subject of the highest good or moral ideal, however, is one that is constantly present in the teaching of Christ, and is wonderfully illuminated by His own character and life and influence in human history. An ideal may be defined as a mental conception taken as a standard of absolute perfection. The word is used with regard to various kinds of excellence. There are intellectual and aesthetic ideals as well as those which are properly to be described as moral. But it is to the realm of moral worth that the notion of the ideal is peculiarly appropriated, and it is with the moral ideal alone that we are at present concerned.

In the history of Ethics, discussion has always centred in this question of the ideal, the *summum bonum*, the ‘chief end of man.’ Aristotle begins his *Nicom. Ethics* (1. i. 1) by describing the good as that at which all aim, and he goes on to say (i. ii. 2): ‘And, like archers, shall we not be more likely to attain what is right if we have a mark (σκοπός)?’ This σκοπός, the target or goal of human endeavour, is just the ideal. Aristotle takes the human σκοπός to be happiness, which he defines as ‘the active exercise of man’s living powers, according to their highest virtue, in a life affording full room for their development’ (i. vii. 15). It is a striking coincidence that the only occasion on which the word σκοπός is found in the NT is in the saying of St. Paul, ‘I press toward the mark (σκοπός) for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus’ (Php 3:14). The Christian ideal of St. Paul was very different from the pagan one of the Stagirite.

But the Apostle, no less than the philosopher, recognized the necessity of an ideal, and its power to shape the whole conduct of life.

It would be interesting to discriminate the various ideals or ultimate moral aims which, in the progress of the world's history, have been advocated by the representatives of the leading religious or philosophical systems. These ideals, however, do not directly concern us here. It will be sufficient in the course of the article to refer to them in passing, when they serve, by way of contrast, to bring more clearly into view the distinctive features of the Christian ideal. Applying ourselves to a special consideration of the latter, we shall deal with it (1) as it is set forth in the teaching of Christ, (2) as it is embodied historically in His own person, (3) as it is made real in human experience through His constraining power.

i. The Ideal as set forth in the teaching of Christ.—One great fault of all non-Christian, or pre-Christian, or imperfectly Christian ideals is their narrowness or one-sidedness: they ignore whole departments of the kingdom of moral worth, and do justice to one part of human nature at the expense of the rest. In contrast with this, the Christian ideal, as we meet it in Christ's teaching, strikes us by its comprehensiveness and perfect balance. A consideration of the following particulars may serve to bring out this rounded symmetry of the Christian conception of the highest good.

1. *It is an ideal of blessedness attained through perfection of character.*—Pope invokes happiness as 'our being's end and aim ... for which we bear to live, or dare to die' (*Epistle*, iv. 1 ff.). And Herbert Spencer, in his *Data of Ethics* (p. 46), affirms that 'no school can avoid taking for the ultimate moral aim a desirable state of feeling, called by whatever name—gratification, enjoyment, happiness.' Newman Smyth criticises Spencer's statement as a confusion between the form and the substance of the moral intuition (*Christian Ethics*, p. 86 f.). But if the conception of happiness is enlarged so as to include the appropriate Christian contents, if blessedness (wh. see), in other words, is taken as the NT synonym of happiness, little fault can be found with the language of either the poet or the philosopher. The Westminster Divines were very far from being mere Eudaemonists, but in the first question of the *Shorter Catechism* they define 'man's chief end' as consisting in this—'to glorify God, and to enjoy Him for ever.' If happiness is not the very substance of the Christian ideal, it is none the less, as Dr. Smyth himself says, 'its natural result and its necessary form' (*op. cit.* p. 119). By beginning His Sermon on the Mount with His great series of Beatitudes (Mat 5:1 ff., cf. Luk 6:20 ff.), Jesus places the ideal of blessedness in the forefront of His teaching. So far, therefore, we may say He is on the side of the Eudaemonists as against all who have sought to set up a hard abstract ideal of duty as the moral aim. But note the content of Christ's ideal, and it will be seen at once how far removed it is from ordinary Utilitarianism. The blessedness of which He speaks belongs to a character distinguished by meekness, mercy, purity of heart, and similar

spiritual qualities (Mat 5:3-12)—a character which finds its standard not in human perfection merely, but in nothing less than the perfection of the Heavenly Father Himself (v. 48). In its form of blessedness, happiness is to be desired by Christ's disciples; but only through perfection of character can this happiness come. No man will find delight in that vision of God which Jesus promises (v. 8), no man will 'enjoy God,' unless a resemblance to the perfection of the 'Father which is in heaven' has been growing up within his heart.

2. It is an ideal of natural as well as spiritual good.—Even when it is fully recognized that blessedness belongs to the Christian ideal, this blessedness is sometimes conceived of too narrowly. Not only is the spiritual set above the natural, as it ought to be, but the natural is ignored or despised and then refused its proper rights. This is the inherent fault of all ascetic ideals, whether pagan or Christian. Now Christ certainly exalted the spiritual above the natural. He made blessedness depend, as we have seen, upon inward qualities. Moreover, He taught that His disciples must be ready to make any sacrifice—to cut off hand or foot, to pluck out the right eye—for the sake of entering into life (Mat 5:29-30; Mat 18:8-9, || Mar 9:43 ff.), and that a man was nothing profited if he gained the whole world and lost his own soul (Mat 16:26). But the blessedness He holds before His followers is by no means a purely spiritual thing. The Beatitude of the meek is that they shall inherit the earth (Mat 5:5). The petition for daily bread is enshrined in the very heart of the Lord's Prayer (Mat 6:10-11). And when Jesus comes to speak more particularly of food and raiment, the very things which are most fundamental to our natural life in this world, while He forbids anxiety regarding them, the reason given is not that they are unworthy of a Christian's thought and care, but that 'all these things shall be added' unto those who seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness (Mat 6:25-33).

3. It is an ideal of social well-being attained through individual worth.—That the ideal of Jesus was a social one it is impossible to doubt. Deeply as He impressed upon His hearers the unspeakable value of the individual life or soul (Mat 10:30 f., Mat 16:26, Luk 15:4 ff. etc.), He never said anything to justify a religious individualism which concerns itself only with personal salvation. The very fact that 'the kingdom of God' (wh. see) is the phrase by which He most frequently refers to His moral ideal, shows that it was an ideal of social good. In this He was coming, so far, into touch with the prevalent Jewish conceptions of His time; for it was a social, not an individual good for which Israel looked. But whereas the Jews conceived of this social good on purely national lines, Jesus enlarged the bounds of the blessed society so as to make room in it for men of all nations. 'They shall come,' He said, 'from the east and west, and from the north and south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God' (Luk 13:29, Mat 8:11). Yet while His moral ideal takes not only a social form, but one of universal breadth, He always taught that it must be through making its power felt in the individual heart that the Kingdom of God would be realized upon

earth. This was where His teaching differed so greatly from the contemporary Jewish expectation, and from the thoughts of many in modern times who have been seized by the greatness of Christ's social purposes without grasping the individuality and spirituality of His methods. The Kingdom of God in popular Jewish hope was an exaltation of Israel brought about by deeds like those of Judas Maccabaeus. The Kingdom of God in the vision of many earnest dreamers and workers of our own days is the result of a social revolution brought about by political activity. According to Christ's teaching, the Kingdom of God can come only through the regeneration of individual hearts. 'The kingdom of God cometh not with observation,' He said, '... for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you' (Luk 17:20-21). That this, and not the marginal readings 'among you' [Authorized Version], 'in the midst of you' [Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885], is the proper rendering, seems to be confirmed by the second of the 'New Sayings of Jesus' discovered by Grenfell and Hunt (cf. p. 770^b below). And He summed up the whole matter when He set a little child in the midst and said, 'Except ye turn and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven' (Mat 18:3 ||; cf. Joh 3:3).

4. *The ideal is at once a reality in the present and a promise for the future.*—There are those who look for their *summum bonum* in the present hour, and whose philosophy of life was long ago summed up in the saying, 'Let us eat and drink; for tomorrow we die' (1Co 15:32, cf. Isa 22:13). There are others again who have, not unjustly, incurred the charge of 'other-worldliness,' because they have despised God's present mercies and neglected their own urgent duties, while fixing their thoughts upon the hope of future blessings and rewards. But in the teaching of Jesus the ideal good is at once realized in the present and consummated in the future. On the one hand, He proclaims that the Kingdom of God is not merely coming, but already come (Mat 12:28, cf. Mar 1:15); it is set up here and now within the individual heart (Luk 17:21); its Beatitudes are present realities (Mat 5:3-11; note not only the recurring 'Blessed are they, ye,' etc., but Mat 5:3; Mat 5:10 'theirs is [ἐστὶν] the kingdom of heaven'). On the other hand, He constantly taught His disciples to look to the future for the complete and perfect form of the Kingdom and its blessedness. His use of the phrase 'kingdom of heaven' as an alternative expression for 'kingdom of God' (and the evidence of the First Gospel points to the former as being the more habitual term on His lips), though it refers primarily, no doubt, to the spirituality of the Kingdom as coming from above and having its true home in the supersensible world, is surely not without its future reference. This Kingdom, which is heavenly in its origin and aims, is and must be heavenly also in its end. Christ's whole eschatological teaching, and especially everything that gathers round the thought of the Parousia, when all that is evil shall be cast out of the Kingdom (Mat 13:41 f., Mat 13:49 f., Mat 22:13, Mat 25:30), and the faithful servant shall enter into the joy of his Lord (Mat 25:21; Mat 25:23), points to the same conclusion. And if we are not

to reject the evidence of the Fourth Gospel, with respect even to its testimony as to the leading ideas in our Lord's teaching, the fact that in it 'eternal life' takes the central place which in the Synoptics is held by 'the kingdom of God' points once more to a future reference in Christ's ideal. For though futurity and everlastingness are not the fundamental conceptions in the category of eternal life, they are certainly necessary for the completeness of that life which Jesus promised to His disciples as their highest good.

ii. The Ideal as embodied historically in the Person of Christ.—So far, we have been thinking of the Christian ideal as set forth in our Lord's teaching. But now we must notice the fact that Jesus not only expounded an ideal, but realized it historically in His own person. It is here that the Christian ideal differs specifically from the loftiest ideals of the philosophers and moralists; it is an ideal which was once made actual in a human life. Jesus not only taught, but *was*. He brought down the ideal out of the region of dreams, and hopes, and words into the world of positive realities. In His own history He showed how blessedness might be attained through moral perfection; how the life of highest spirituality might prove to be the life of widest social beneficence; how it was possible, while enjoying all natural blessings as gifts from the heavenly Father's hand, to place obedience to the Father's will above everything else; how the narrow path of present duty might be illuminated by the splendours of the eternal world, while the assurance of something yet more glorious than now appeared might thrill the heart of the faithful wayfarer.

1. *Jesus Christ is the Ideal Man.*—His character is not merely perfect in some aspects, but perfect in all—so rounded and complete as to become an ideal for the woman as well as for the man, for the Greek as well as for the Jew, for the modern as well as for the ancient world. He is not merely free from flaws, but full of vital and creative forces; His perfection is that not of a marble image, but of a living spirit. This is the verdict of history, the verdict of all who simply read and ponder the records of His life. Even those who do not believe Him to be more than man join without demur in the universal chorus of acclamation. They acknowledge that Jesus stands alone in His moral grandeur as the incarnation of personal human worth, and that the historical Christ is the ideal of humanity.

2. *As an Ideal, Christ becomes an Example* (wh. see).—For whatever it may be in other spheres, in the moral world, at all events, ideals, from the nature of the case, are not merely standards of an abstract perfection, but goals after which we must strive,—targets, to use Aristotle's figure, at which we aim and shoot those arrows of the soul which are the living energies of our moral being. Jesus never set Himself before men's eyes as a beautiful but impossible ideal. He claimed to be an example (Mat 11:29; Mat 20:26-28 || Luk 22:27, Joh 13:15; Joh 13:34; Joh 15:12). As such He was taken by His first disciples (1Pe 2:21). And St. Paul, who saw the perfect and

ideal man in the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ (Eph 4:13), never doubted that the perfection of manhood which was found in Christ was something to be personally striven after. That was the σκοπός of the long race. On that the Christian must fix his eyes, towards that he must constantly press, if he would attain to the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus (Php 3:13 f.). See also Perfection (of Jesus).

iii. The realization of the Ideal through the constraining power of Christ.—We have seen that Christ in His teaching holds up an ideal, that He embodies this ideal historically in His own person, and sets it before us as an example which we must strive to follow. But to weak and sinful men and women this presentation by word and deed of a perfect moral ideal would be little else than a mockery, if Christ did nothing more than offer us an outward standard after which we were to strive. It is in a far deeper sense than this that He is the Christian ideal. In his famous theory of Ideas, Plato conceived of the Ideal Good as an archetypal essence which becomes an efficient cause, imparting to individuals a share of its own being, as the sun imparts ‘vitality, growth, and nutriment’ to the creatures on which its rays fall (*Rep.* vi. 509). And it is in this vital and archetypal manner that Jesus becomes the moral ideal of the human race. He gives what He commands, and so has a right to command what He wills. We have constant illustrations in the Gospels of this constraining power of the Ideal Goodness as it is presented to men and women in the person of Christ. The sinful woman in the house of Simon the Pharisee (Luk 7:36-50), Zacchaeus, the grasping publican of Jericho (Luk 19:1-10), Matthew, leaving the receipt of custom to become an Apostle (Mat 9:9 ||), may serve as examples. The author of the Fourth Gospel sums up the whole matter for us when he says: ‘As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God’ (Joh 1:12). And to St. Paul, who brooded much over this mystery of Christ as it had been revealed to him in a profound personal experience, the secret of spiritual life and growth presented itself as an unfolding of the Christ-nature implanted by the agency of the Holy Spirit in the believer’s soul. ‘Christ in you,’ he says, ‘the hope of glory’ (Col 1:27); and again, ‘I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me’ (Gal 2:20). And when in another place he describes believers as ‘foreordained to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren’ (Rom 8:29), he suggests a figure which helps us to understand how Christ the ideal is not merely an outward type but an inward archetype. The younger brothers of a house are conformed to the likeness of the firstborn not so much by personal imitation as by the operation of secret and vital forces which spring from the very fact of their birth as members of a particular family, and which lie far deeper than the workings of the individual will. And so it is as between Christ and His people. ‘For both he that sanctifieth,’ says another NT writer, ‘and they that are sanctified are all of one: *for which cause* he is not ashamed to call them brethren’ (Heb 2:11).

Literature.—Besides the particular references given in the art., mention may be made of Newman Smyth, *Chr. Ethics*, pt. i. chs. i.-vi.; Martensen, *Chr. Ethics*, i. 147-343; Green, *Prolegomena*, bks. iii.-iv.; Shairp, essay on 'The Moral Motive Power' in *Studies in Poetry and Philosophy*.

J. C. Lambert.

☛ Ideas (Leading)

IDEAS (LEADING).—The leading ideas of our Lord may be divided into two classes, Moral and Religious. This is not an artificial division: it corresponds to two stages in His public teaching which are very clearly marked in the Gospels. The earlier stage is prevailingly ethical, and finds its most characteristic utterance in the Sermon on the Mount. The later is, in comparison, distinctively religious, and deals with the relation of God to man. Yet we are not to separate the two elements, for they inter-penetrate one another. They are inter-dependent, and form together an organic whole.

i. Moral ideas.

1. The Kingdom.
2. The Pure Heart.
3. The infinite Value of the human Soul.
4. The Law of Love.
5. The Universality of Love.
6. The Great Example.
7. Self-renunciation.

ii. Religious Ideas.

1. The Fatherhood of God.
2. The Son.
3. Faith.

4. The Coming of the Kingdom.

5. The Paraclete.

i. Moral ideas

1. The Kingdom.—This idea must be placed first on account of its position in our Lord's teaching. 'Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand,' was the message of the Baptist and the first public utterance of Jesus (Mat_4:17, Mar_1:15). From the beginning the idea of the Kingdom may be traced throughout the Gospels, and everywhere it will be found to indicate the supreme blessing which comes to man from God. In Mt. it is usually termed the Kingdom of Heaven. Elsewhere the phrase Kingdom of God is uniformly employed.

The idea of a Kingdom of God does not appear first in the NT. in the OT, the sovereignty of God is a fundamental conception. Jehovah was regarded as King over His chosen people. Israel was a theocracy. Always, whether under judges, kings, prophets, or priests, the human leaders were looked upon as representatives or agents of Jehovah, the true King. The natural tendency was to regard this as the exclusive privilege of the chosen people. Nevertheless, in the OT is to be found the vision of a great world-wide Kingdom of God. In the Book of Daniel especially we find how, to the prophetic mind, there was opened the glorious prospect of a universal Divinely-established sovereignty. Dan_2:44; Dan_7:13-14 are the clearest. The latter of these two passages is especially important, because from it, most probably, our Lord adopted the title 'Son of Man' by which He usually described Himself. It was therefore a passage much in His thoughts, and it is scarcely possible to believe that, as He proclaimed 'the kingdom,' He had not clearly in mind the words 'His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.'

It is plain that among the Jews in our Lord's time there was a widely spread expectation of some great person who was to be leader of the chosen people, and through whom that people were to be established as a great world-power. The Jews of that age were looking for a kingdom. And to them came John the Baptist and then Jesus of Nazareth, proclaiming the coming of a Kingdom. As our Lord's ministry and teaching developed, He made it quite clear that the Kingdom He proclaimed was very different from the kingdom of popular expectations. Yet the two conceptions cannot be wholly unrelated. Our Lord would not have used the popular language if His meaning had no relation to the ideas of the popular mind.

This consideration is important, because of late years there have been efforts to show that the Kingdom, as conceived by our Lord, had no social content whatever; that, by

the Kingdom of God, He meant a spiritual illumination in the heart of the individual (Harnack, *What is Christianity?* Lect. iii. He holds that our Lord shared the eschatological ideas of the Jews of His time, but that the essence of His teaching is that the Kingdom is the rule of God in the heart of the individual). This view rests mainly on a single text, Luk_17:21 'The kingdom of God is within you,' and is supported by the consideration that the primary meaning of the word which is translated 'kingdom,' βασιλεία, is 'rule' or 'dominion.'

The sentence (Luk_17:21) 'The kingdom of God is within you' (ἐντος ὑμῶν) is capable of being translated, 'The kingdom of God is in the midst of you,' and this rendering suits the context better than any other, for the saying was addressed to the Pharisees. But it must be granted that the 'New Sayings of Jesus,' recently discovered by Grenfell and Hunt, have thrown fresh light on this question. The words occur in the Second Saying, and in a connexion which precludes the translation 'in the midst of you.' 'The kingdom of heaven is within you, and whoever shall know himself shall find it.' This is, at least, a very early witness to the sense attached to the words in primitive times.

But we cannot found our interpretation of our Lord's teaching on a single passage, especially when we are dealing with a leading conception which was always more or less in His mind. Some of the parables which were intended to throw light on the nature of the Kingdom, e.g. the Mustard Seed, the Tares and the Wheat, the Draw-net, seem explicable only on the understanding that the Kingdom was regarded as a visible community.

The only way of combining the two elements which seems to be truly satisfactory, is to regard the Kingdom as the rule of God, whether in the individual or in the community. It is then the *Summum Bonum*, the Absolute Good in which both the individual and the community find their realization. It is thus both a present blessing and an ideal to guide all future development. It is realized here and now whenever man stands in a right relation to God and to his fellows. Its perfect realization belongs to the great future: it is the end to which all creation and all history are tending. The Kingdom as a conception is thus at once moral, social, religious, and eschatological. All these aspects are distinctly visible in our Lord's teaching, and all are harmonized by the view which has just been adopted. We are now concerned with the moral aspect of this great idea.

The Sermon on the Mount, as we have it in Mt., must be taken as the fullest statement of our Lord's moral teaching. Whether it be accepted as a single discourse, or be regarded as a collection of sayings, the unity which pervades it and its perfect harmony with the rest of our Lord's utterances are manifest. Its place in the gospel of

the Kingdom, as proclaimed by our Lord, is clearly defined. The Sermon is a statement of the *Law of the Kingdom*.

This is evident from Mat 5:17-20, in which a general principle concerning the ethical relation of the gospel to the Mosaic Law is laid down, and from Mat 5:21-43, in which several important illustrations of the practical application of this new principle are given. Mat 6:1-33; Mat 7:21-27 agree with this view of the nature of the Sermon. In the former passage, the whole subject of rewards and motives is dealt with, and the end which is to govern our religious life (Mat 6:1-18) and our secular life (Mat 6:19-29) is declared to be, not the praise of men (Mat 6:2; Mat 6:5; Mat 6:16), not earthly rewards (Mat 6:19; Mat 6:25), but God's Kingdom and God's righteousness (Mat 6:33). This end includes all necessary goods (Mat 6:33). It therefore lifts the soul above anxiety (Mat 6:34). It is an eternal treasure (Mat 6:20). It must be pursued with whole-hearted devotion (Mat 6:24). In the latter passage (Mat 6:21-27) the importance of doing the will of God, as contrasted with mere profession, is insisted on as a condition of entering into the Kingdom.

It is thus perfectly clear that the whole Sermon on the Mount regards human life from the point of view of the Kingdom, and lays down the moral principles which belong to that point of view. It may therefore be fitly described as the Law of the Kingdom.

At the same time, it is necessary to observe that the Sermon on the Mount is not a new Decalogue. Our Lord did not issue commandments like those of the old Law. On the contrary, He laid down principles, and taught His disciples how to apply them.

This is an important distinction. Commandments which classify actions, forbidding some and enjoining others, however necessary they may be for purposes of moral education, have always this defect, that they are sure, sooner or later, to come into conflict, and so give rise to perplexity and to casuistry. Principles, on the other hand, are truly universal, and therefore cannot conflict. There are parts of our Lord's moral teaching which have seemed perplexing to many, e.g. Mat 5:34; Mat 5:39-42. But the perplexity vanishes when it is seen that these sayings contain not laws but examples, illustrations of the application of a principle (see Mat 5:20), which has been already laid down. As examples or illustrations, they must be considered in relation to circumstances, which inevitably limit every particular case.

Among moral principles laid down by our Lord, the Kingdom stands first and supreme. The passage which presents this truth most clearly has been already noticed. It occupies the whole of Matthew 6, which fills the central space in the moral teaching of Jesus as we have it in St. Matthew's report of the Sermon. Here we have the motives of conduct dealt with. First, the prevailing wrong motives are pointed out: the praise of men which too often destroys the reality of the religious life (Mat 6:2;

Mat 6:5; Mat 6:16; Mat 6:18); greed of gain, the laying up of earthly treasures (Mat 6:19-24), which makes the 'single eye' impossible; anxiety for the necessities of life, food and clothing, things that will surely be given us if we live a true life (Mat 6:25-34).

It is characteristic of our Lord that it is in connexion with this last subject that He reveals the true motive. He contemplates the life of the average man toiling for his daily bread and filled with anxiety lest that bread should fail. There is an extraordinary tenderness and sympathy in our Lord's language here. The passage is perhaps the most beautiful in all His teaching. And the lesson reaches the highest heights of spiritual vision. 'Seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things (the necessities of life) shall be added unto you' (Mat 6:33).

It is singularly impressive that this teaching should be given in connexion with those common everyday duties at which the vast majority of human beings must spend their lives. To the great mass of the world's toilers our Lord says: Be not anxious about your bodily needs. In doing your daily work, seek the Highest, and the necessities of life will not fail. And what is that Highest? It is the Kingdom and righteousness of God. The answer presents both sides of the truth, the external and the internal, the objective aim and the quality of character which corresponds to it.

When we come to consider more carefully what is the nature of this highest objective aim which is termed the Kingdom, we are met by the difficulty that our Lord nowhere gives a formal definition of it. His manner of referring to it is rather an indication that He desired in the first instance to convince His hearers of its existence, and for the rest to approach it in many different ways, so as to exhibit different aspects of a thing too great for its nature to be made evident by any one statement. But certain characteristics emerge with sufficient clearness. What these characteristics are will be seen as we examine the other leading ideas of our Lord's moral teaching. See also art. Kingdom of God.

2. The Pure Heart.—'Blessed are the pure in heart,' said the Lord; 'for they shall see God.' The idea expressed in this Beatitude is one of the most fundamental in the interpretation of the Law in terms of the gospel. Our Lord insisted upon the inwardness of all true goodness. An external morality had no value in His eyes. This teaching was not altogether new. Great prophets and psalmists had seen it (Jer 31:33, Psa 51:10). Greek philosophers had taught the priority of *being* to *doing*. But Jesus gave to the world as a whole what had hitherto been the possession of select souls. By showing the power of this principle to deepen the received code, He was able to alter the popular conception of the moral ideal. He taught that within the Kingdom the only goodness which would be recognized would be goodness of heart. All the examples which He gave to show that the righteousness of the Kingdom must

exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, display the operation of this principle. See Mat 5:22; Mat 5:28; Mat 5:34-37; Mat 5:44-48, Luk 6:45. Our Lord did not abolish the old Law. He fulfilled it (Mat 5:17). He penetrated to the inner meaning and deeper truth which underlay it. And what is true of the good is true also of the evil: its nature is spiritual, it proceeds from the heart, and is not merely concerned with the outward action (Mat 15:18-20, Mar 7:21, Luk 6:45, see also Mat 12:34-35).

There is a tendency to regard this purity of heart as concerned only with the negation of one class of fleshly appetites. Our Lord did indeed apply the principle most impressively with that reference (Mat 5:27 ff.) But, as all the illustrations show, the principle is one of universal application, and concerns the very essence of all goodness. It is the principle which the philosopher Kant stated in the terms: 'Nothing can possibly be conceived in the world, or even out of it, which can be called *good* without qualification, except a *Good Will*.' It is the doctrine which modern Ethics expresses when it declares that the goodness or badness of conduct depends upon the motive. In the last resort, the 'single eye' and the 'pure heart' are the same. They both express the inward determination to do the good just because it is the good, and for no other reason. The former regards this moral attitude from the point of view of the end which is aimed at, the second contemplates the disposition of the heart, the moral condition of soul, out of which the good inevitably springs.

3. The Infinite Value of the human Soul.—This idea is very frequent in the teaching of our Lord. Explicitly or implicitly, it occurs everywhere. See Mat 6:26 ff., Mat 10:29 ff., Mat 10:40; Mat 10:42; Mat 12:11-12 | Mat 16:26; Mat 18:5 ff., Mar 8:36-37; Mar 9:37; Mar 9:42, Luk 9:25; Luk 9:48; Luk 10:29 ff., Luk 12:7 ff., Luk 12:24; Luk 12:28; Luk 14:5; Luk 15:4 ff., Luk 15:8 ff., Luk 15:11 ff., Luk 19:10, Joh 3:16; Joh 4:7 ff; Joh 10:11 ff. All passages which tell of the love of God for the individual soul or of the sacrifice by which the salvation of the soul was effected, are witnesses to the same truth. Every person, no matter how poor, wretched, sinful or degraded, is of infinite value when compared with any mere thing. The gospel was preached to the poor. The Christ received the publicans and sinners who came to Him. None were too miserable or too lowly for His compassion. The Great Father in heaven is ever watching over His human children. The very hairs of their heads are all numbered. Better to die a miserable death than be the cause of injury to one of His little ones. God so cares for even the most sinful among His children, that He is compared to the shepherd seeking the lost sheep, to the woman searching for her lost piece of money. There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth. God is like a loving father who rejoices over the returning prodigal. As we have it in St. John, 'God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son' (Joh 3:16).

Apart from the religious value of these teachings, their ethical importance is incalculable. They conveyed to mankind one of the greatest gifts which even Christianity had to bestow: the belief that each human soul is of absolute value, above all price or estimation. It is the doctrine which philosophical Ethics expresses, when it declares that every person is to be regarded as an end in himself, never as a means only. This is the doctrine which underlies the mission of the Church to go and make disciples of all the nations (Mat_28:19). It is the principle which has overthrown tyrannies, abolished slavery, and justified all our modern enthusiasms for liberty and for the welfare of humanity.

This doctrine, combined with that of the Fatherhood of God, affords the true proof of individual immortality. Our Lord's teaching is quite clear on this subject. There must be a future life for men because God calls Himself their God. 'He is not the God of the dead, but of the living' (Mat_22:31 ff., Mar_12:27, Luk_20:37 ff.). That is, God cares for men, they are precious in His sight, therefore He cannot permit them to perish. The great Father will never forsake His children.

4. The Law of Love.—Christianity teaches us to think of love as the nature of God and as the highest law of human life. We owe this noble teaching to our Lord Himself. By precept and example He taught His followers to think of the Almighty as their Father in heaven. While never ignoring the justice, the righteousness of God, He made His hearers realize the supremacy of the Divine Love. Out of this great love of God should flow a human love of the same nature, a beneficent love (Mat_5:44-45, Luk_6:27-36), a love which embraces even those who are bitterly hostile. Not only so, but our Lord teaches that the Law of Love is the supreme law of conduct. It includes all the commandments (Mat_22:37-39, Mar_12:30 ff.). In strict accordance with this teaching is the Law of Service. He is greatest who serves best (Mat_20:25 ff., Mar_10:43 ff., Luk_22:24-27, Joh_13:5-17). Loving service is the true test of the life (Mat_25:35 ff.).

This teaching shows clearly that our Lord designed to give to men a blessing which should be, not merely an illumination for the soul of the individual, but a social bond. He set free a principle which would bless all in the blessing of each. That principle may be described as the family principle exalted to heaven for the good of all the earth. If God is 'Our Father,' then all we 'are brethren' (Mat_23:8). The kingdom of God is thus the kingdom of Love in which each is blessed in the blessing of all. And this is the true *Summum Bonum*, the ideal end, which finds its partial realization in every instance of genuine goodness in the individual life as well as in the life of the community, and which is the highest principle of all moral and social progress, its perfect realization is the great hope of the future, the coming of the Kingdom in glory.

5. The Universality of Love.—The Law of Love in its relation to our duty to one another is expressed by the command, ‘Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.’ But the question arises, What is the scope of this love? Or, as it was put to our Lord Himself, ‘Who is my neighbour?’ (Luk 10:29). The answer to this question is contained in the passage already referred to (Mat 5:43-48). Our love is to be, like God’s, a blessing for all who need it, the evil as well as the good, the just as well as the unjust, our enemies as well as our friends. In the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luk 10:30 ff.), the same answer is given in a way which makes its meaning even more distinct. To enforce the lesson, our Lord selected as the hero of His parable a man belonging to a race which was hated and despised by the Jews. There was an exquisite wisdom in this choice. Why not have made a Jew assist a Samaritan, or even a Gentile, in order to illustrate the principle? But our Lord wished to teach by an example appealing rather to the *humanity* than to the national feelings of His hearer. Had the act of mercy been shown by a Jew to a Samaritan it might have seemed condescension, a work of supererogation. Shown by a Samaritan to a Jew, the true character of the goodness it reveals becomes, from the Jewish point of view, far more evident. We are taught that love should be universal in its nature. It should break down the barriers erected by race, or privilege, or religion.

It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of this teaching. Ancient civilizations were for the most part founded on slavery or on the subjection of races or classes. Underlying the whole Jewish system was the idea of a privileged people. Our Lord broke through the most inveterate of prejudices, and taught the universal obligation to love and to bless. He laid the foundation of liberty and of philanthropy.

6. The Great Example.—In Mat 6:33, the ideal is set before us in two ways, as an objective aim and as a type of character: ‘Seek ye first his kingdom and his righteousness.’ The righteousness of God is the standard. There is, and must be, a correspondence between the outward and the inward, between the Kingdom of God as a universe of souls bound together by the great love of their Father in Heaven and their love one to another, and the moral condition of each individual soul. When the latter side is considered, we ask, What is its quality? what is its standard? The answer is—the character of God. This is implied in the very name ‘Father’ (Mat 5:45). The teaching is, ‘Be sons of your Father,’ be like unto God. Even more explicit is the statement in Mat 5:48 ‘Ye therefore shall be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect.’ This standard may seem too high. It may seem unreal to say to ordinary men and women, ‘Be perfect as God.’ But all realization of good character in human creatures is, so far as it goes, an imitation of God, a reproduction of the Divine. Goodness is always a following of God, though it be a very long way off. What we have here is the absolute standard, the highest possible ideal of character. Our Lord will set nothing lower before us. But the ideal is brought near to us in a way which is characteristic of Christianity. Jesus Christ Himself is the incarnation of the ideal. See

Mat 11:29; Mat 20:25-28, Mar 10:42-45, Luk 6:40; Luk 22:27, Joh 13:15; Joh 13:34-35; Joh 15:12. In these passages our Lord holds Himself up as an example. And there can be no doubt that the influence of His character has been as potent a moral force as His words. He elevated humanity by being what He was. It is very hard to realize how vast was the change effected by the teaching and example of Christ. The conception of the ideal of character was altered. To see this truth we have but to compare Aristotle's picture of the 'great-souled man' with our Lord. Noble and virtuous with the splendid but imperfect nobility and virtue of pagan Greece, the great-souled man is proud, self-satisfied and pompos. His very 'greatness,' as conceived by Aristotle, makes him a poor creature when placed beside Jesus of Nazareth. Above all, our Lord's example shows us the principle of love at work in human life.

7. Self-renunciation.—When dealing with the lofty principles of absolute morality, our Lord's teaching is characterized by the most extraordinary sweetness. With joyous confidence His thought lingers on the sunny heights of truth. But when He comes to speak of the struggle through which the soul must pass in its upward progress, His manner changes. There is an awful force in the language and imagery with which He teaches the necessity of self-sacrifice. From this we learn His attitude towards sin. See Mat 5:29-30; Mat 18:6-9, Mar 9:42-48; Mar 10:37-39. Such passages show that His tenderness towards the repentant sinner involved no condoning of sin. Our Lord received sinners, but He never regarded their sins with complaisance. The following passages are important: Mat 10:37 ff; Mat 16:24-27, Mar 8:34 ff., Luk 9:23 ff; Luk 14:25-35; Luk 17:33, Joh 12:25, also Mat 7:13-14, Luk 13:24 ff. In these passages the necessity of self-renunciation is expressed in terms of the most vivid intensity. Yet the denial of self is nowhere represented as an end in itself. It is a means, or rather the inevitable means. It is the way, not the goal. Yet it is a way which cannot be avoided if the goal is to be reached.

Our Lord clearly sets before us the reward of goodness and the punishment which awaits unrepented sin. The subject is a puzzling one, because of the ambiguities of language. But our thoughts will be set free from confusion if we consider our Lord's teaching as it stands, apart from certain popular misconceptions. It will be found that, in His teaching, the Kingdom is itself the reward. To gain this is to gain all, to lose it is to lose all. Sometimes it is described as 'the joy of thy Lord' (Mat 25:21), sometimes plainly as 'the kingdom' (Mat 25:34), sometimes as 'eternal life' (Mat 25:46). But all alike are ways of describing that one glorious end which is the *Summum Bonum*, the true and final good, that end in which God Himself with all His children shall have one undivided blessedness. To live for this reward is to live for the good itself. The goodness or badness of working for rewards depends altogether on the nature of the rewards which are sought. To work for selfish ends is always wrong,

to seek as a reward that great end which is the supreme and universal blessing is always right; it is indeed the essence of all goodness.

ii. Religious ideas.—We have considered the leading ethical ideas of our Lord's teaching. But, as must now be quite apparent, it is impossible to separate the ethical element from the religious. Though our Lord Himself advanced from a prevailing ethical stage of instruction to a stage which was more distinctively religious, yet in His thought the two are united. Indeed, the religious side of the truth is the more fundamental. It deals with the underlying principles. For example, when speaking of the ordinary work of human life, and giving the great rule, 'Seek first the kingdom,' He led His hearers on to the thought of the Fatherhood of God as the reason why they should renounce all anxiety and live for the higher ends (Mat 6:26; Mat 6:30; Mat 6:32).

1. The Fatherhood of God.—This idea stands first among those which belong to the distinctively religious side of our Lord's teaching. He gave it a fundamental position, and conveyed it in every possible way to the minds of His hearers. By word, by manner, by the manifestation of His own spiritual experience, and, above all, by being what He was, and at the same time declaring Himself to be a revelation of the mind and will of God (see Mat 11:27; Mat 25:31 ff., Joh 5:19 ff., Joh 8:12 ff., Joh 10:25 ff., Joh 12:44 ff., Joh 12:14-16), our Lord taught men to think of God as 'the Father,' and to attribute to Him all the benignity and bountifulness of the fatherly character. Here it is impossible to separate the teaching from the life of Christ. It is through the Christ Himself that man learns to know God as the Father. Jesus was intensely conscious of God's presence and relation to Himself. He saw into the heart of God with a clearness of vision unparalleled in human experience. He speaks of God out of a perfect knowledge, and whenever a human soul is able truly to hear, belief follows. The revelation of God made by Him carries conviction with it. It is so great a thing that it cannot but be true. When once man has grasped it, no other account of God can be accepted.

The idea of the Fatherhood of God occurs in the OT (Deu 1:31; Deu 8:5; Deu 32:6, Psa 103:13; see also Isa 63:16; Isa 64:8, Jer 3:4; Jer 3:19, Hos 11:1 etc.). It was not unknown to pagan thought; see Act 17:28. But, as taught by our Lord, the Fatherhood of God became a new thing. Fatherhood is not, in all states of society, suggestive of watchful, loving affection. It has sometimes connoted a very harsh rule. The fulness of meaning and the spiritual value which now belong to the idea as connected with our relation to God, are very largely derived from the teaching and influence of our Lord.

In the teaching of our Lord the Fatherhood of God is presented in three ways: (1) Jesus speaks of God as 'My Father.' This name was very dear to Jesus. It sprang from

His consciousness of relationship to God. Clearly, it bore a special meaning. He was Son of God in a unique sense. This truth is emphasized by the manner in which the expression 'My Father' is frequently used (Mat 10:32-33; Mat 11:27, Luk 2:49; Luk 22:29, Joh 5:17; Joh 10:29-30; Joh 17:5; Joh 20:17; see also Mat 7:21; Mat 16:17; Mat 18:10; Mat 18:19; Mat 18:35; Mat 20:23, Mar 8:38, Luk 24:49, Joh 5:20-45; Joh 6:32 ff., Joh 8:19 ff., Joh 8:14-16). These passages fully carry out the idea expressed in the announcements at His baptism and on the Mount of Transfiguration (Mar 1:11; Mar 9:7). (2) Our Lord taught His disciples to think of themselves as a family, with God above them as their Father. They were called into a specially close relationship to God, and became in that special sense His children. In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus addresses His disciples, and continually speaks to them of God, calling Him 'your Father' (Mat 5:16; Mat 5:45; Mat 5:48; Mat 6:1; Mat 6:8; Mat 6:14-15; Mat 6:32; Mat 7:11). 'Fear not,' He says, 'little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom' (Luk 12:32). In the Lord's Prayer the address 'Our Father' has reference to the disciples as the family of God. Perhaps we dare not limit the 'our,' but the prayer was given to the disciples for their own use, and the word was surely meant to have the effect of uniting them as a family under the headship of their Father in Heaven. (3) Our Lord's teaching regards God as the Father of all men. Mat 6:4-5, Luk 6:35 imply this great extension of the Divine Fatherhood. But clearer still are the parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Piece of Silver, and the Prodigal Son (Luke 15). The parable of the Good Samaritan extends the sphere of love beyond the bounds of Judaism, and throws light on such passages as Mat 6:24 and Luk 6:35. Its principle corresponds, in the human sphere, to that expressed by the words, 'God so loved the world' (Joh 3:16).

Our Lord, then, teaches us to think of God as the Father, and at the same time as Sovereign over the greatest of all kingdoms. The characteristic attribute of this paternal Sovereignty is love. His love is so wide that it includes the unthankful and evil, those who have turned their backs upon their Father's house and renounced His authority. It is the source from which springs all that is described as *Salvation*. It explains the mission of the Christ (Joh 3:16). It is the inner truth of the life of Him who came to seek and to save the lost. It is that Divine characteristic from which proceed 'joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth' (Luk 15:7). And when this love has won the sinner, it introduces him into a circle in which he is brought more immediately under the Divine Fatherhood. He becomes a member of the family, the Kingdom, that great order of things in which men feel and experience the love of the Great Father. Finally, there is that supreme degree of Divine Fatherhood which belongs to the relation between the Father and Him who is in a unique sense the Son. The life and death of Christ reveal the love of God to man because of this relation. God's love appears because He gave His only-begotten Son. See also art. Father.

2. The Son.—The second stage of our Lord's teaching is concerned mainly with Himself and His work for man. It is one of the great paradoxes of His personality, that while humility was one of His most marked characteristics, He yet preached Himself as none else ever dared to do. Sometimes the humility and the self-assertion occur side by side, expressed in a single utterance. 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls' (Mat 11:28-29). The invitation and promise here constitute a great claim. Yet He adds, 'I am meek and lowly in heart'; and the story of His life proves the truth of the assertion. Furthermore, these words follow one of the greatest statements ever made of the dignity of our Lord's person, and the extent of His authority: 'All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him' (Mat 11:27). This passage is but one out of many. Jesus continually asserted His right to the absolute devotion of the hearts of men. No sacrifice is too great to be made in His service. Even the dearest of human relationships must be counted as nothing in comparison with Him. He claims, as His right, the utmost allegiance (Mat 10:37-39; Mat 16:24-26; Mat 19:28-29; Mat 25:31 ff., Mar 8:34-38; Mar 9:37; Mar 9:41; Mar 10:29; Mar 13:13; Mar 14:7-9, Luk 9:23 ff., Luk 9:48; Luk 9:57 ff., Luk 10:22; Luk 12:8 ff., Luk 14:26 ff; Luk 18:29, and throughout St. John's Gospel. See, especially, Joh 5:17 ff; Joh 8:12 ff; Joh 10:30; Joh 14:6 ff.).

The only adequate explanation of these facts is that which the NT supplies, and which the Christian Church has always held: Jesus is Divine; He is the Incarnate Word of God (Joh 1:14). No other doctrine can justify the claim which He makes, and explain the life, work, and teaching by which that claim is sustained. Our Lord did not declare Himself Divine, nor did He even make open proclamation of His Messiahship. That was not His method. He avoided anything which would have inflamed the minds of the multitude (Mar 1:37-38; Mar 1:43-44; Mar 3:12, Luk 4:42-43; Luk 5:16; Luk 8:56, Joh 6:15). Further, He knew that faith springs into being not from names and titles, but from the recognition by the soul of that which is alone worthy to be the object of faith. Therefore He chose to reveal Himself gradually in His daily intercourse with His followers, and so lead them to discover the great truth for themselves (Mat 16:13-20). That our Lord deliberately followed this method is shown by the terms which He used when referring to Himself. For example, He habitually called Himself the **Son of Man**. The name presented a problem to all who heard it. It suggested a reference to Dan 7:13, but was not so definitely Messianic as to constitute a claim. It evoked the question, 'Who is this Son of Man?' (Joh 12:34). The name occurs about eighty times in the Gospels, and always as used by our Lord of Himself. It is so characteristic of His own point of view that it is not used by others. It clearly implies His humiliation, yet it is employed by Him pointedly in those passages

in which His glory is described. See [Mat_13:14](#); [Mat_19:28](#); [Mat_25:31](#) ff., [Luk_21:36](#), [Joh_5:27](#); [Joh_6:62](#) etc.

The title Son of Man expresses the *humanity* of our Lord. It is His own testimony to His perfect Brotherhood with men. It marks His sympathy with human infirmity, and is used impressively in connexion with His mission of salvation (e.g. [Mat_20:28](#), [Luk_19:10](#)). It presents Him as the *Ideal Man*. This has been questioned as not in accordance with the thought of the time, but the OT had its ideal figures. Abraham, Moses, David, Elijah came to be regarded as typical representatives of whole peoples or classes. In the latter Isaiah this mode of thought reaches its most perfect development. The ideal Israel is depicted as the 'Servant of Jehovah,' and, as the prophet proceeds, the conception grows, until in Is 53 there rises into view the wonderful form of the Suffering Servant who is contrasted with, yet is one with, the people of God. There is therefore no anachronism in supposing that when our Lord styled Himself the Son of Man He intended to set Himself forth as the representative of the human race, the Ideal Man. See, further, art. Son of Man.

The title **Son of God** was not often used by Jesus Himself (see [Mat_27:43](#), [Joh_5:25](#); [Joh_9:35](#)), yet in many ways He implied His right to it. His constant and peculiar use of the expression 'My Father' (see above), and the frequent occurrence of the title 'Son of God,' as attributed to Him by others and not disclaimed by Himself, show what was His position in regard to this question ([Mat_4:3](#); [Mat_8:29](#); [Mat_14:33](#); [Mat_27:40](#); [Mat_27:54](#), [Mar_3:11](#), [Luk_4:41](#); [Luk_22:70](#), [Joh_1:34](#); [Joh_1:49](#); [Joh_3:18](#); [Joh_9:35](#); [Joh_11:27](#) etc.). This title was naturally seized upon by His disciples as the simplest way of expressing the mystery of His person. The essence of that mystery, as manifested in every instance in which He disclosed His inner mind, was the close relationship in which He stood to the Father (see [Mat_11:27](#)). And so it was by means of this title that His *Divinity* was represented to the minds of His first followers. And for the practical purposes of the religious life, as distinguished from the definitions of theology, no mode of expression could have been so useful; the critical faculties were held in suspense while the needs of the soul were satisfied. See also art. Son of God.

The two titles 'Son of God' and 'Son of Man' modify and explain one another. Taken together they constitute our Lord's own most characteristic way of expressing the nature of His person. It was in this way that He chose to teach men His humanity and His Divinity and the miracle of their union. Thus the Incarnation is found to be implied in our Lord's attitude towards His own consciousness of Himself in relation to God and man. For a deeper insight into this profound subject we must turn to those passages in which that consciousness is most fully revealed: [Mat_11:27](#); [Mat_5:31](#) ff., [Mar_8:34](#) ff., [Luk_10:21](#) ff., [Joh_5:17](#) ff; [Joh_8:25-29](#); [Joh_10:30](#); [Joh_17:1-5](#) etc. With this is connected our Lord's consciousness of Himself as the bond of union among His

disciples, uniting them to God and to one another: Joh_14:20; Joh_15:1-11; Joh_17:22-23. Also He presents Himself as the means of communication between God and man: Joh_10:7; Joh_14:6. These truths are aspects of His Incarnation.

Our Lord represented the work of His life as a work of *salvation*: Luk_19:9-10; cf. Mat_15:24, Luk_15:1-10. This idea, though prominent in the Gospels from the first (see Mat_1:21, Luk_2:11, Joh_1:29), and implied in all our Lord's language about Himself and His relation to men, yet remains undeveloped in His teaching until the end of His ministry. As the Gospels proceed, however, and His death approaches, sudden gleams of light are thrown upon the deeper meaning of salvation. In Joh_6:51 ff., the thought of Christ as the Bread of Life passes into that of the Paschal Lamb by whose death and blood-shedding the people of God are delivered. In Joh_10:11 ff., He is the Good Shepherd who lays down His life for the sheep. On the last journey to Jerusalem our Lord's mind was much occupied by the dreadful events which He knew were awaiting Him (Mar_10:33-34, also Mat_20:17 ff., Luk_18:31-33). Before this He had told His disciples of the facts (Mat_16:21, Mar_8:31; Mar_9:31, Luk_9:22), but now He declares something of their meaning and purpose. The occasion of the declaration was the ambitious petition of the sons of Zebedee. In reply to the two brothers, our Lord promises, in veiled language, participation in His sufferings; and to the whole body of the disciples He gives this teaching: 'Whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you, shall be servant of all. For verily the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many.' It is the first clear statement in our Lord's own language of the purpose of His death. With this passage must be connected Joh_12:23-27, in which, contemplating the terror of His cross, He lays down the law of sacrifice. But clearer still is the declaration which He made at the Last Supper. There are four accounts in the NT (Mat_26:26-28, Mar_14:22-24, Luk_22:19-20, 1Co_11:23-25). No two of these correspond exactly. But all agree that our Lord connected the rite with the conception of His death as a sacrifice on behalf of men. He gave His body over to death, His blood to be shed 'for many unto the remission of sins.' And, as St. John tells us (chs. 14-16), that very night our Lord addressed His disciples at length on His love and His relation to the Father and to them, and said, 'Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.'

In the teaching of our Lord, then, the atonement is the redemption of men from sin by the giving of His life. It is the remission of sins through His death and the shedding of His blood. It is the work of love. It is the corn of wheat falling into the ground that it may perish and, through perishing, bear much fruit. The impressiveness of this teaching is greatly increased when it is taken in connexion with certain events and fragmentary utterances which give the testimony of our Lord's own inner consciousness to the fact that in His Passion and Death, He engaged in a great conflict

with evil, a work given Him by His Father, a work which He was bound to accomplish. The following passages are the most important: Mat 16:22 ff., Luk 22:53, Joh 12:27; Joh 14:30, Mat 26:38 ff., Mar 14:34 ff., Luk 22:41 ff., Mat 27:46, Mar 15:34. Most impressive of all is the Agony in the garden. It supplies the key to all the rest.

3. Faith.—But though the fuller explanation of the purpose of our Lord's life and death took place only towards the end, He had from the beginning made a demand which implied all that afterwards became explicit. He insisted on a faith which found its supreme object in Himself. The greatness of His personal claim has been already pointed out (see list of passages given above). We have been able to discern something of the meaning of this claim in relation to the doctrine of our Lord's person. But it is necessary also to observe that there is involved a very clear doctrine of the nature of faith. Jesus taught the supreme necessity of faith in God, the great Father. He also taught the necessity of faith in Himself. By the demands which He made, the promises He gave, the blessings He bestowed, He made it clear that He sought for a faith which should take the form of an absolute trust directed towards Himself. See Mat 8:2-3; Mat 8:10; Mat 9:2; Mat 9:22; Mat 9:29; Mat 15:28, Mar 1:40-41; Mar 2:5; Mar 4:40; Mar 5:34; Mar 5:36; Mar 6:5-6; Mar 7:29; Mar 8:12; Mar 8:17-21; Mar 10:52; Mar 14:6-9, Luk 5:12-13; Luk 5:20; Luk 7:9; Luk 7:50; Luk 8:25; Luk 8:48; Luk 8:50; Luk 10:42; Luk 17:19; Luk 18:42; Luk 19:39-40. In the Gospel of St. John, faith of this kind is presented everywhere as the spiritual condition which enables man to become receptive of the highest blessing. See Joh 1:12; Joh 1:50; Joh 2:11; Joh 2:23; Joh 3:16; Joh 3:18; Joh 3:36; Joh 4:41-42; Joh 4:50; Joh 5:24; Joh 6:29; Joh 6:35; Joh 6:40; Joh 8:12; Joh 9:35-38; Joh 10:9; Joh 10:16; Joh 10:27; Joh 11:25; Joh 11:28; Joh 12:46; Joh 12:48; Joh 14:9; Joh 14:12 etc. In these passages and throughout the Fourth Gospel, Christ Himself, in His relation to God the Father on the one hand, and to those who believe on the other, sums up all spiritual blessing. He is the source of Eternal Life, the giver of the living water, the Bread of Life, the Light of the World, the Good Shepherd, the Resurrection and the Life, the Way, the Truth, and the Life, etc. All these images imply some attitude or act of reception on the part of those who benefit. Therefore we read of the New Birth, the drinking of the Living Water, the eating of the Bread of Life, the following of the Light, etc. And whatever else may be involved, there is, in all these, the teaching that faith on the part of the human recipient corresponds to the gifts which are bestowed in Christ. See, further, art. Faith.

Our Lord's first teaching as to preparation for the Kingdom was a call to repentance (Mar 1:15). To this we must now add faith, as the subjective means by which the Kingdom is realized, a faith which, when developed, becomes faith in Jesus Christ.

4. The Coming of the Kingdom.—Our Lord came to found a kingdom, a great spiritual and social order of things, based on the principle of love, under the Fatherhood of God, and creating a Brotherhood among men. Its members were to enter into this new life through repentance and faith, and in it to realize a righteousness of heart and life far exceeding the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees. The possibility of such a thing in a world like this would have been incredible, but for the way in which our Lord presented and manifested Himself to men. In Him resided the power which would realize the Kingdom. By His death He overcame the forces which opposed the Kingdom, by His life He established it.

But though the Kingdom was a present fact from the moment that Christ brought human souls into a right relation to God, we are taught by Him to think of the Kingdom as yet to come. In the Lord's Prayer we have the petition, 'Thy kingdom come.' And there are many passages which show that these words refer to a great future realization: Mat 8:11; Mat 13:41; Mat 25:31, Mar 8:38; Mar 14:25, Luk 21:31; Luk 22:16, Act 1:6-7 etc. But clearest of all are the parables of growth: the Tares, the Mustard Seed, the Leaven, the Drawnet, the Seed Growing in Secret. These parables deal with the development of the Kingdom in history and its relation to the world at large. They connect the conception of the Kingdom as a spiritual fact here and now with that conception which is distinctively eschatological and regards the Kingdom as a perfected state of things in the future. It is plain that our Lord never lost sight of the great final realization of the Ideal. He constantly looked at the present in the light of the future, and taught His followers to live and work with the great end in view (Luk 12:37 ff.).

5. The Paraclete.—In the Fourth Gospel we find recorded a very distinct and detailed promise of a special gift by which the disciples of our Lord were to be fitted to do their Master's work after His departure. It occurs in the solemn address of the night before the Passion (John 14-16). 'I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter (Paraclete), that he may be with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth' (Joh 14:16-17). Again and again in this great discourse our Lord returns to this promise, and dwells upon various aspects of the Spirit's work (Joh 14:18; Joh 14:28, Joh 15:26, Joh 16:7-15). The presence of the Spirit involves the presence of Christ Himself. The Spirit is to teach the Apostles, to guide them into all truth, to bear witness of Christ. He has also a mission to the world (Joh 16:8). It is good for the disciples that our Lord should leave them, because the Spirit's coming is dependent on His going. It is plain that the meaning is that the Spirit was to be given as a source of illumination and spiritual power for the people of Christ during the development of the Kingdom in the world. Thus the Spirit carries on the work of Christ.

In the Synoptic Gospels there is nothing as clear in regard to the office of the Holy Spirit. Yet there are passages which, though much less definite, agree perfectly with

the teaching in John 14-16. Thus the connexion of the Spirit's work with the future of the Church is implied in Mat 10:20, Luk 12:12. See also Luk 4:18, Mat 12:28 ff., Mar 3:29, Luk 11:13, Mat 28:19. See, further, artt. Holy Spirit and Paraclete.

In Act 1:4 we find an important corroboration by St. Luke of the promise recorded by St. John: Christ charges His disciples 'not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father, which, said he, ye heard from me.' In Luk 24:49 the promise is mentioned but not given.

The work of the Holy Ghost is therefore connected with the extension and development of the Kingdom. He is the inner regenerating power in the individual and the community. He is the Master of the movements of thought, guiding into all truth. The movements of thought are governed by ruling ideas,—ideas which present certain great ends as supremely desirable, and so become, in the true sense, ideals. Chief among all such is the idea of the Kingdom. It is the great ideal which is to be realized in and through the love of the Father, by the submission of human hearts to the Son, and under the superintending influence of the Holy Ghost. Thus the aims of men are to be subordinated to the one supreme end, that at last the Kingdom may come in its fulness.

Literature.—It is not easy to supply a list of books dealing with this subject, as all commentaries on the Gospels and every 'Life of Christ' may be consulted. The most useful perhaps are: Weiss, *Life of Christ*; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*; Dalman. *The Words of Jesus*. The last mentioned is most important. Wendt's *Teaching of Jesus* is not so useful as it should be. Sanday's art. 'Jesus Christ' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible is important. Orr's art. 'Kingdom of God,' *ib.*, should be consulted. The writer's *Ruling Ideas of our Lord* deals with the subject. Among works of a more general kind may be mentioned Seeley's *Ecce Homo*, Harnack's *What is Christianity?* (*Das Wesen des Christentums*), Liddon's *Divinity of our Lord*, and Latham's *Pastor Pastorum*. Archbishop Alexander's *Leading Ideas of the Gospels* deals with the ideas which guided the minds of the Evangelists. It will, however, be found suggestive on the subject of this article.

Charles F. D'Arcy.

Idumaea

IDUMAE (NT *ιδουμαία*, which is also used in the LXX Septuagint for the Heb.

Ēdôm).—This land is mentioned once only in the NT (Mar 3:8), but is also notable as the native land of Herod and his family. The Edom of the OT lay between the Dead

Sea and the Gulf of Akabah. In the early part of the Jewish exile many of the Edomites overran the south of Judaea, and when the Nabataeans, at some time during the Persian period, conquered their own land, many more joined the earlier settlers in South Judaea, and that district became known as Idumaea. Thus Idumaea at the time of Christ was 'practically the Southern Shephelah with the Negeb' (G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [Note: *GHL* Historical Geog. of Holy Land.] p. 239), *i.e.* roughly, all south of a line from Beth-sur to Gaza. Judas Maccabaeus fought against the Idumaeans with much success (1Ma_5:3) in 164. Fifty-five years later, John Hyrcanus conquered the country, and compelled the people to be circumcised (Josephus *Ant.* xiii. ix. 1; *BJ* i. ii. 6). By the law of Deu_23:7-8 they thus became full Jews in the third generation, though Herod himself was sometimes reproached as a 'half-Jew' (Josephus *Ant.* xiv. xv. 2). Although the Idumaeans were 'sons of Esau,' their interests from this time were entirely merged with those of the Jews, and their country was reckoned to Judaea, Idumaea being counted one of the eleven toparchies of Judaea in Roman times (Josephus *BJ* iii. iii. 5).

G. W. Thatcher.

Ignorance

IGNORANCE

1. *Religious ignorance* is uniformly regarded in the Bible as a moral and spiritual, and not merely as an intellectual, defect. Religious ignorance is always culpable, because the true light 'lighteth every man' (Joh_1:9). The light of reason and of conscience shines even in the darkness of heathenism, and the heathen are plainly in fault if they 'apprehend' it not (Joh_1:5). To put the matter in another way, the truths of Natural Religion carry their own evidence with them, and those who worship the creature instead of the Creator, or who deny that there is a God, or who think that there is no essential difference between virtue and vice, wilfully blind themselves to the truth (cf. Rom_1:19-20, Act_14:17). Yet the culpability of the heathen, great as it is, is less than that of those who have received the light of revelation (Mat_10:15; Mat_12:41). Our Lord specially blames the Samaritans because, having received the Law, they nevertheless remained in ignorance of its Author (Joh_4:22 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), and neglected to worship Him in the place which He had chosen. But far more culpable than the half-heathen Samaritans were the Jews, who had behind them a long religious ancestry of patriarchs and prophets (Rom_9:5), who inherited the promises, and to whom were committed the oracles of God (Rom_3:2, Rom_9:4). The chosen race, wilfully blinding themselves to the true meaning of the Scriptures (Joh_5:45) and to the signs of the times (Mat_16:3), especially the testimony of the

Baptist (Joh 3:26; Joh 3:32) and the words and works of Jesus (Mat 11:20, Joh 10:38; Joh 14:11; Joh 15:24), were punished by having the truth hidden from them in parables (Mat 13:13), and by having their spiritual understanding darkened (Mat 13:15, 2Co 3:14). Of the Jews the most culpable were the leaders—the *Sadducees*, because they were ignorant of the resurrection and the future life, truths inculcated by Moses himself (Mat 22:29); and *the Pharisees and scribes*, those blind leaders of the blind, who led their unwary followers into a pit (Mat 15:14). The case of the Pharisees was particularly hopeless, because, being ignorant, they thought themselves wise: ‘If ye were blind [and acknowledged it], ye would have no sin; but now ye say, We see: your sin remaineth’ (Joh 9:41).

Ignorance of Jesus is treated in the Gospels as equivalent to ignorance of God: ‘Ye know neither me nor my Father; if ye knew me, ye would know my Father also’ (Joh 8:19); ‘No man cometh to the Father but by me. If ye had known me, ye would have known my Father also’ (Joh 14:7). If men do not come to a knowledge of Christ in this world, Christ will profess Himself ignorant of them in the next, and this will exclude them from the joys of heaven (Mat 25:12; Mat 7:23). Yet the obligation to know Christ in this world applies only to those to whom the gospel has been actually preached (Mar 16:15-16).

The reason why ignorance of Christ is regarded as a sin is that the truth as it is in Jesus is spiritually discerned (1Co 2:14). Lovers of truth, whose lives are virtuous and holy, perceive intuitively that the teaching of Jesus comes from God: ‘Every one that doeth ill hateth the light, and cometh not to the light.... But he that doeth the truth cometh to the light,’ etc. (Joh 3:20).

Among the ‘Seven Words’ spoken by Jesus from the Cross there is one which bears upon this sin of ignorance: ‘Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do’ (Luk 23:34). In saying this He renewed that condemnation which He had often passed upon religious ignorance, for He implied that those who slew Him had need of the Father’s forgiveness—His own forgiveness the words themselves express. But what the saying immediately proclaims is that the sin of ignorance is not beyond forgiveness, even when it has led to the darkest of crimes; nay, that ignorance itself may be pleaded in extenuation (ἄρα) before Him who knoweth all. (On the genuineness of the saying see Meyer, Alford, WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort’s text.] [Appendix]).

2. *Christ’s ignorance, or limitation of knowledge*—See Consciousness, Kenosis.

Literature.—Müller, *Chr. Doct. of Sin*, i. 209; Paget, *Stud. in Chr. Character*, p. 154.

C. Harris.

Illustrations

ILLUSTRATIONS.—The use of illustrations is a noticeable mark of Jesus' teaching. He spoke in similes and metaphors and parables; general rules He illustrated by examples or stated in concrete instances. His aim may be gathered from observing what uses the method actually served.

Stories and similes, concrete facts and instances, catch the ear of the people. He who would win their attention must trick out his message in pictorial garb; he must weave in his truth with earthly fact and incident on the loom of fancy. Such teaching also remains in the memory. Truth pictured makes vivid appeal to the eye, and what the eye sees the memory retains, store for mind and heart to brood over. Jesus knew what was in man, and, desiring His message to be current coin for all, treasure of life for the simplest, He spoke in pictures and similitudes.

Illustrative examples serve also to make abstract truth more easily understood. A tale may enter in at lowly doors, bearing its load of truth and suggestion, when a truth stated abstractly would remain without. The concreteness of the poet, his vision of truth and symbol wedded together, of principle incarnated in fact, is closely akin to the ordinary man's ways of thinking and speaking. It is primary; the abstractness of thought, the language of reflexion and analysis, is secondary. Jesus spoke to the people after their own fashion.

These uses are obvious; but they are only surface explanations; they hardly touch the main purpose. When Jesus said (Mat_7:9-11), 'What man is there of you, who, if his son ask a loaf, will give him a stone? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?', He was aiming at something more than a clear and striking presentation of His truth. He was speaking from the heart to the heart, appealing to their feeling for what is highest and best, for what is reasonable to faith in goodness. His illustration was an argument addressed to the heart. 'In theology,' it is said to be an axiom that 'parables do not act as arguments' (Trench¹⁵ [Note: 5 designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 40 n. [Note: note.]); but they may in the sphere of faith. The parable of the Unmerciful Servant (Mat_18:21 ff.) was an answer to Peter's question, 'How often shall we forgive?' It gives no direct answer to that question. It is spoken not to the discursive intelligence busy about problems, but straight to the indignations of the generous spirit. The better nature is enlisted against the man forgiven who was not made thereby tender-hearted and pitiful. When the lawyer put the searching question, 'But who is my neighbour?' (Luk_10:29), Jesus told the story of the Good Samaritan. That parable also does not

answer the question directly. It rather sets before the heart the beauty of kindness, and its power to break down barriers between men which the neighbourhoods of race and religion may leave standing. An idea, such as that all men are potentially brothers, is apt to be barren, without conviction, without power of intellectual or spiritual inspiration; a story such as this appeals to the human heart by which we live, that tenderness in us which leaps up in admiration of a good man's deed.

The aim of our Lord's teaching was not enlightenment, the bringing of clear ideas to the mind: it was to create faith and sustain it. And the form of His teaching—His parables, similes, metaphors, concrete instances—was a means to serve that end. 'After all,' says Newman (*Gram. of Assent*, 94), 'man is not a reasoning animal; he is a seeing, feeling, contemplating, acting animal.' It is by the heart that man believes unto salvation. There is the seat of the emotions, the joy we have in things, the intuitions of faith, the admirations which rule conduct and fashion character and shape our beliefs. The heart has its own reasons: visions of what is noble and fair, spells mighty there. And Jesus' illustrations are mostly pictures painted for that inward eye, music played that the ear of faith there may hear.

Many of Jesus' parables and pictures are more than mere illustrations; they have in them the imagination's power of interpretation, the revealing vision of the poet. The parable of the Pharisee and the Publican (Luk_18:9 ff.) is more than an illustrative example, it is as Jülicher classes it, 'an example of the spiritual worth of humility before God.' It reveals, as in a transparency, the essential and hidden evil of a religious class. Our Lord's controversy with the Pharisees sums itself up in this revealing picture where the inner spirit and tendency of Pharisaism is brought to a luminous point. The parable has the force of a revelation, suddenly illumining a whole spiritual world. The same quality is in the illustrations of hypocrisy in Matthew 6. These kindle a light in the spiritual imagination. Jesus takes the cases of almsgiving, prayer, fasting. These are not chosen as representing the three spiritual worlds, or spheres of duty—neighbour, God, self (Gore). That activity of the schematizing intellect is foreign to the whole method of Jesus. These were the fashionable religious virtues of the day, and therefore the chosen theatre of hypocrisy: self-seeking in religion leaves the humble sequestered virtues alone; and Christ's pictures of ostentatious service there, have that direct illumination of the religious and ethical imagination which sets it free from the bondage of all externalism. Many of the parables have this quality, such as the Seed Growing in Secret, the Good Samaritan, the Unmerciful Servant, the Prodigal Son, the Two Debtors.

In the Synoptic Gospels there is an explanation of Jesus' use of parables which is a startling paradox. It is that He spake to those without in parables, and that He did so to hide His meaning (Mat_13:10-15, Mar_4:11-12, Luk_8:10). It is easy to show that these words are not universally true, and that the aim of Jesus generally was to make

Himself understood. So Jülicher (*Encyc. Bibl.* art. 'Parables') rejects this conception, placed on the lips of Jesus, as quite unhistorical. But we find that in all these Gospels this explanation occurs at one place, namely, between the parable of the Sower as spoken to those without and its interpretation to the disciples. And there the words have a real significance. The parable did not convey its meaning on the face of it. In the circumstances in which it was spoken, it was largely an utterance of the ironic spirit. Jesus was looking on the multitudes, drawn together by curiosity and various motives, caring so little, most of them, for the truths He had to tell them; and He gave utterance to the pathetic thoughts of His spirit. He spoke this parable which tells the disappointments of a prophet and the hope that sustains him, the faith that some, his sheep, will know his voice. It is a simple enough parable; and yet a veil does rest upon it for the careless unspiritual many who are listening, though not any veil of subtle allegory. Jesus is speaking of hopes and fears they comprehend not; and, looking on them in their ignorance, it was natural that the words of old prophecy, with their kindred pathos and irony, should come to His lips, and He should speak about those who hearing understood not and whose hearts were darkened. That explanation has in it a hint of wider suggestiveness. Clearness and directness of speech are not the only sources of enlightenment. 'Art may tell a truth obliquely, do the thing shall breed the thought.' A truth stated objectively, indirectly, in the form of a story, may not compel the understanding; careless ones may hear it as though they heard it not; but it has greater effectiveness with those who receive it. That is exemplified in Jesus' latest parables. These are parables of judgment; the shadow of the Cross rests on them. In them, by their very form, the meaning is veiled somewhat. The intention and the value of that stand out strongly in this contrast. When Stephen stood before the Sanhedrin, he said: 'Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye' ... (Act 7:51 ff.). There is no mistaking that accusation, or evading it; but there is no persuasion there. No wonder the bold truth-speaker was stoned. Jesus says to His enemies, 'Hear another parable'; and after the parable of the Two Sons, He tells the parable of the Householder and his Vineyard. It is the same charge, but spoken indirectly; the reference is left to their own thoughts. That is a way of persuasion; sympathy and love, which are the sources of persuasiveness, have woven a vesture for the truth that, through the imagination, it may reach the heart. See art. Parables.

One great, though indirect, value of Jesus' illustrations must not be missed, *i.e.* their witness to the man He was, their revealing of His mind and heart. (1) His figurative method of teaching reveals the fashion of His mind. Farrar speaks of 'that kind metaphorical method of expression which our Blessed Lord adopted.' The thought there is of a stress put upon His mind through a sympathetic accommodation to His simple unlearned hearers, as though He first had a thought, and then searched for some simple familiar picture to express it. But a man's customary method of speech shows his manner of thinking. Our Lord 'reasoned in figures, because He had an eye

for nature' Thought and image were born together in His seeing; His was the poet's mind, with its concreteness and beauty, its outlook of the whole personality, its individual vision of things flushed with emotion; and the pictures He set in the light give joy to the generations as they pass, because they first of all gave joy to Himself as they arose in His imagination. (2) The illustrations He uses reveal also the simplicity and fulness of His interest in life. It is amazing how the common life of His day passes in procession through His words! The sower in the fields, the merchant on his travels, the fisherman on the beach looking over his catch, the labourers waiting to be hired in the market-place, the beggar at the rich man's gate and the dogs licking his sores, the clamorous woman with her wrongs at the unjust judge's door, the poor woman turning her house upside down for her lost coin, the play of the little children in the streets; and even the faults and follies of men, the Pharisee with his broad phylacteries and wide fringes praying ostentatiously at the street corners, the craft of the dishonest steward, the son who says 'I go, sir,' and goes not, the anxious host begging for a loaf at midnight, and the grumbling friend in bed with his children—all speak of the interest with which Jesus looked on life. 'The learned eye is still the loving one.' He was no thinker whose mind ranged among ideas, no dreamer living in a world of ideals. His heart was amid the pell-mell of ordinary life, ordinary men, and ordinary duties; His thoughts of religion found their sphere there.

(3) Jesus' outlook on Nature was full of joy. That is shown, not so much by the abundance of His references, as by the light in which He places them, the thoughts they brought to Him. He speaks of the hen gathering her chickens under her wings, symbol of His own protecting love for Jerusalem; the sparrows, objects of God's care; the grass in its beauty and the lilies outvying the splendour of Solomon, symbols of the Creator's joy in the work of His hands, seeing He thus clothes these casual flowers of a day with such loveliness and grace. He touches also the common things of our life with the sudden glory of poetry—the growing of the corn, symbol of the upspringing of life in human souls; the care of parents in the home, symbol of the sleepless providence of the Heavenly Father over all His children; servants waiting for their lord, symbol of our duty to an unseen Master. When Jesus looked on Nature and the universal order of man's life, something great shone through—a Divine and beautiful mystery. It all spake of the Father in heaven who made and loves it all; it was all instinct with the presence of God's Spirit. The beauty of religion, its tenderness and grace, is there: and the spiritual glory of life. That is an outlook of the fullest joy:

Literature.—Books on the Parables, by Trench, Arnot, Dods, Bruce; Steinmeyer, *Die Parabeln des Herrn*; Julicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*; Fiebig, *Altjüdische Gleichnisse und die Gleichnisse Jesu*; Wendt, *The Teaching of Jesus*, English translation vol. i. § 2; Plummer, art. 'Parables' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible; Sanday, *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, or art 'Jesus Christ' in *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.]; the various Lives of Christ.

Image

IMAGE.—This is the translation in Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 of εἰκών. In the Gospels it occurs only in [Mat_22:20](#) || [Mar_12:16](#) || [Luk_20:24](#), where, in Christ's answer as to the legality of the Roman tribute, it refers to the likeness of the emperor Tiberius.

Imagination

IMAGINATION

Imagination is the faculty by which we are able to reproduce mentally the images or 'copies' of past elements of sense-experience. This may be done in three ways: (1) passively, as when we reproduce our mental pictures in the form or order in which we experienced them as sensations; or (2) actively, as when we combine the images of past sensations into fresh groups for purposes of our own, as in the telling of an imaginary story; or (3) creatively, as when these images are used to symbolize abstract ideas, or to illustrate the teaching of moral and spiritual truth. There are great differences in the endowments of individual men and women in these respects. Many have but a faint power of mentally reproducing past events and objects, and among those in whom the power is well developed, some are able best to reproduce visual images (artists), others auditory impressions (musicians), others the images of movement (those possessing the dramatic gift). The poetic or creative temperament is richly endowed with all these aptitudes, and makes a free use of its resources in the presentation of ideal scenes and events as a medium for inculcating its message.

Students of our Lord's personality will at once recognize that He possessed the creative temperament in its noblest development. He was psychically endowed with a rich and varied imagination, which was disciplined, like all His human gifts, to the finest pitch of efficiency, and consecrated to the highest uses. His discourses are crowded with bright and vivid pictures, symbolic of the great truths which He had come to reveal. They are expressed in language that is rich, musical, and full of verbal colour and rhythmic phrases. In the narrative portions and the parables there is also a striking dramatic element, which gives them wonderful life and movement.

1. *Characteristics of the imagination of Jesus.*—It is the last feature—the *dramatic*—which is the most prominent quality in the imagination of our Lord. If the form of His teaching can be relied on as an indication of His mental endowments, it is clear that truth naturally clothed itself for Him in the form of concrete pictures and symbolic events. This is probably the key to the Temptation scenes so vividly described in Mat 4:1-11. The temptations of His public life became visualized in these typical scenes, and in fighting them thus prophetically, He rehearsed the long drama of His future spiritual conflicts, and overcame them beforehand. The same dramatic way of dealing with the critical facts of His life and work may be seen in such incidents as are detailed in Mat 9:36-38; Mat 21:31; Mat 26:39; Mat 26:53, Luk 10:18, and many others. This instinctive love of a dramatic situation as the vehicle of imparting spiritual truth, is illustrated also in the frequent use of object-lessons full of incident and movement. Sometimes He made a sudden and skilful use of opportunities offered to Him in the course of social intercourse, as in Mar 5:30; Mar 10:15; Mar 12:41, Luk 5:24; Luk 7:44; Luk 14:1-6; Luk 17:17 etc. In other cases He deliberately created the situation, and then drew the lesson with which He desired to impress the spectators, as in Mar 9:33-37, Mat 18:2-5, Luk 22:17-20, and Joh 13:2-12. (The incident of the Blasted Fig-tree, if understood as a simple but vivid action-parable, loses all the ethical difficulties which have hidden its meaning from so many commentators).

The *pictorial* side of our Lord's imagination is scarcely less obvious than the *dramatic*. He was temperamentally as well as spiritually in the deepest sympathy with Nature in all her varying moods, her wealth of life, her process of growth; and He was a keen and accurate observer of her ways, showing a vivid interest in the life of plants and animals (Mat 6:28; Mat 7:16; Mat 6:26; Mat 8:20) and in the common experiences of human life. These impressions were all stored up, as He watched them, in the treasure-house of a faultless memory, to be afterwards used as drapery for the everlasting truths of the Kingdom in a way which makes many of His discourses a perfect arabesque of beautiful imagery. His predominating love, however, was for images drawn from the incidents of human life and experience. He seldom used imagery of a purely natural kind, *i.e.* drawn from the impersonal action of physical or vital forces: there is nearly always some human agent or sufferer in view whose action or suffering invests the simile with its sympathetic as well as an intellectual aspect. Thus He was fond of drawing His word-pictures from the occupations of such familiar folk as shepherds, husbandmen, fishermen; from social customs in the home,—marriage ceremonies, feasts, salutations, journeyings; and even from bodily life and sensations,—the eye, ear, bones, feet, hunger and thirst, laughing, mourning, sickness, sleep, etc. Our Lord's use of natural imagery may be put into words written elsewhere by the present writer:

‘Nature is interesting to Him only as the handiwork of God, and the mirror of His perfections or providential care for His creatures, or of Him as the Creator of human joys and sorrows. The cold impersonal attitude of the modern scientist towards the creation was impossible to the Lover of Souls. Nature with Him is the vehicle of truth as applied to conduct: she is a bundle of analogies in the sense of the poet:

“Two worlds are ours; ’tis sin alone

Forbids us to descry

The mystic earth and heaven within

Plain as the earth and sky.”

In this way our view of Nature is beautifully enriched and impregnated with higher meanings: and her operations resolve themselves into a series of delightful reminders of human duty and of Divine love’ (*The Master and His Method*, p. 67).

The imaginative side of our Lord’s mind is seen, finally, in the *artistic use of language*. Whether He spoke in the dialect of the common people, or (occasionally at least) in that form of Greek which was commonly known in Palestine, in which the Gospels have come down to us, it is unquestionable that even if we have His discourses only in translation, they are full of characteristic qualities of vividness, terseness, and colour. His use of popular proverbs in fresh applications (Mat 9:12-13; Mat 7:16; Mat 5:14; Mat 6:21; Mat 11:15; Mat 12:37; Mat 16:25, Mar 10:23; Mar 10:27 etc.); His love of paradox (see Mat 5:38-42 for four striking instances of this; also Mar 10:23 and Joh 6:53); the exquisite grace of some of His descriptions of natural processes (Mat 6:28 ff; Mat 7:24 ff.), and of social functions (Mat 25:1-12), together with the symmetrical build of many of His sentences and discourses (esp. Mat 25:31-46), show a mastery over the resources of language to which only a poet whose natural gift had been carefully disciplined to high uses could attain. The more the form of our Lord’s teaching is studied, the more does this verbal skill impress the reader as complete and minute.

2. Practical uses of this imaginative element in our Lord’s discourses.—The method of Jesus being exclusively *oral*, it is easy to see how valuable is this pictorial, dramatic, vividly expressed quality that runs through them all. In order that this method should be effective under the circumstances of the time, it was essential that it should have the marks of *simplicity*, *concreteness*, *vividness*, and *brevity*. It must be *simple*, as it was meant to become current not amongst scholars, disciplined in the use of complicated trains of thought, well used to abstract lines of reasoning, and capable of retaining these in their memory for a long time, but amongst the common crowd of

listeners who had had only an elementary education, and were incapable of giving a close and sustained attention to any train of thought. It must be *concrete*, because such people always thought and spoke in such terms as were closely allied to their daily experience. It must be *vivid*, because otherwise no deep or lasting impression could be made on such occasional and unstudied opportunities as our Lord habitually used to disseminate His teaching. And it must be *brief* and *portable*, for it was meant not merely for those who listened to Him at the time, but also for those who should afterwards 'believe in his name' through the 'preaching and teaching' of the eye-witnesses and auditors of His earthly ministry. All these ends were perfectly served by the imaginative method of presenting truth chosen by the Great Teacher, and consistently followed by Him throughout His public life. His wisdom is shown by the event. It was probably many years before any large portion of His discourses and life-story was committed to writing. But there are clear indications that great care was taken to give the general outlines of the teaching accurately and without admixture, and that the utmost reverence was felt for the *ipsissima verba* of their Lord's utterances by the Apostles and their first pupils. Converts were carefully taught from the earliest times in *catechumen* classes in the 'doctrine of Christ' (cf. 1Co 15:11, Col 2:6, Luk 1:1-2), and they were counselled to be specially careful to retain and transmit the exact form in which the teaching (the 'fair deposit' of truth) had been delivered to them (cf. 2Ti 1:13, a very significant passage). It was only as these first witnesses were one by one removed by death, or so scattered as to be beyond the reach of appeal, that any need for a written version of the Gospel began to be felt. Then the immediate disciples of the Apostles would endeavour to perpetuate their record of the words and deeds of Christ by committing it to writing. In this way the first two Synoptic Gospels may have taken shape, using the common basis of the oral Gospel as a foundation on which to build. In time various versions would arise, which were collated and welded together into a more accurate whole by scholarly men such as St. Luke (Luk 1:1-3). Finally, as the last survivor of the original group passed away, his followers would have a strong desire to rescue his personal reminiscences from oblivion ere it was too late, and thus the Fourth Gospel arose as a supplement to the others.

If the Gospels and the Epistles are compared as to their form, further light is shed on the wisdom of our Lord in using the imaginative style of speech as a vehicle for His oral teaching. St. Paul's involved literary style, full as it is of technical terms, long sentences, and abstract trains of reasoning, could not possibly have served as the vehicle of a spoken Gospel, though, as a supplementary commentary and exposition of the truths enshrined in that Gospel, it is admirably adapted for its purpose; and the same is true, with qualifications, of the other NT writers.

3. A lesson for preachers.—The example of the Great Teacher still applies to those whose business it is to carry on the Christian function of preaching. In more illiterate

periods, preachers naturally followed this method of putting their discourses into a concrete, illustrative, and vivid style; but as books have spread, and the habit of reading has become general, there has been a growing tendency to throw sermons into a more literary form. While this has been partly inevitable and is so far justifiable, it is certain that the pulpit has lost much of its influence because of this unconscious change of method. All *spoken* discourse should aim at the qualities of simplicity, concreteness, vividness, and brevity of expression, which are so remarkable a feature in the discourses and parables of Christ. The very plethora of books makes this specially needful in an age when the human mind is overburdened with the rushing details of daily experience, and the evanescent appeal of ephemeral literature. Unique as are many of the qualities that belong to Christ as a preacher, and making due allowance for the contrast between the Oriental environment in which He lived and that of our own day, there is nothing that more needs to be built into our training of young preachers than a close study of the method of the Master with a view to adapt it to our own day and circumstances.

Literature.—Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, i. 106-151: Stalker, *Imago Christi*, ch. xiii.

E. Griffith-Jones.

⚠️ Imitation

IMITATION

1. Christian Ethics was roughly constituted in the early centuries by the recognition of two moralities—common morality, requiring a minimum of obedience to law from those living in the world, and first-class morality, the super-legal or supererogatory goodness of those who practised asceticism. Into the service of the latter, with its ‘counsels of perfection’ (1Co 7:25 with Mat 19:21—these texts are very early applied in this fashion), all Christian enthusiasm tended to pour itself. This more exacting life is praised as *making men resemble the angels*. Christ had described the angels as unwedded (Mat 22:30 ||); an age, preoccupied with problems of sex, fastened upon this as the leading truth in regard to those exalted beings. But it is in point of fact a mere external—and therefore, of course, it is imitable! The essential thing is, that angels ‘fulfil God’s word’ (Psa 103:20). To our Lord Himself this was the essential about them: ‘Thy will be done, *as in heaven*, so on earth’ (Mat 6:10). And, when we think of that truth, we see that our proper pattern is not the angels, but the Son. About angels we know little, if anything, that is certain. They are supernatural, almost unnatural beings. The Son came into this world that we might know Him, and

has obeyed God's will under our own conditions, in their extremest and most burden some type.

2. This reinterpretation—imitation of Christ rather than of angels—took place within Catholic ethics, with a great gain in the direction of living Christian truth. The most conspicuous leader was St. Francis of Assisi (1182-1226), 'that child of nature and child of God, half angel and half nightingale' (C. Bigg). Long before his time, the pattern of asceticism had been summed up in three virtues, Poverty, Chastity (*i.e.* celibacy), and Obedience. There may have been pre-Christian influences at work in so moulding Christian monasticism. But the pattern of Christ could also be recognized in these virtues. He had 'become poor' (2Co 8:9); He had 'made himself a eunuch for the kingdom of heaven's sake (Mat 19:12); He had been 'obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross' (Php 2:8). Of course, historical knowledge and Christian insight—but the Middle Ages were weak in both—see differences as well as similarities. Above all, Christ, who was persecuted and slain as a revolutionary, can hardly serve in fairness as a pattern of blind obedience to constituted human authorities. But, to St. Francis, the requirements of obedience—a rule for his 'Order,' and unhesitating submission to the Pope—were established conditions, which he never thought of criticising. Much the same may be said in regard to 'chastity.' The really important features of St. Francis' character, and of the movement it gave rise to, were as follows. (1) By the idea of imitating the behaviour of Jesus Christ, St. Francis cut his way direct to the centre of things, unhindered, if unhelped, by the overgrown and often corrupt Church system of his time, and restored new life to personal religion and personal Christianity. (2) His enthusiasm for poverty was a living contribution to religious progress. Poverty to him was no inherited conventional virtue. He joyed in it. And, in this joy, he penetrated beyond externals, and showed that he had drunk from deep and full fountains. Poverty may be acquired by imitation; joy cannot. If there was something of extravagance in St. Francis' love of poverty, there was also a permanent moral idea—the 'simple life.' We cannot here discuss the claims or conditions or limitations of that virtue; but we greet it with reverence in so great a genius as our Saint. Still further, we must recognize in St. Francis' joy the influences of romance. 'Poverty' was his dear 'bride.' It was not for nothing that he lived in the days of chivalry. We recognize, too, the buoyancy of youth; St. Francis 'entered religion' at 25, and died at 44. These are accessories—innocent and touching accessories—at which Christianity may smile, but certainly will not frown. The centre lies deeper. Who can doubt that Christ's own joy dwelt in St. Francis? (3) He was a servant of his fellow-men. Here in part he inherited from the Church. The first ascetics were hermits, living in solitude; but the social instinct, guided by the sagacity of Church rulers, crept after the solitaries, drew them into union, placed them under rule, and in many cases set them to useful work. The two great orders of friars, Dominicans as well as Franciscans, were preachers. But, besides preaching, St. Francis and all his followers who really shared his spirit were

helpers of men in their needs and miseries; a very genuine part of the pattern set by Christ. (4) The order of *Tertiaries*—semi-Franciscans, men or women, living in the world; *not even pledged to celibacy*—was a gallant attempt to minimize the distinction between the two moralities, and to make personal Christianity, as St. Francis had discovered it, available for non-ascetics. Here then we see the Christianity of imitation at its very best (but, as we have noted, it is more than imitation). St. Francis' Christianity is an all-round thing—living, attractive, strong, serviceable, joyous. Why could he not reform the Church by his indirect influence? Perhaps he was too sweet. Perhaps the lingering taint of the theory of two castes and two moralities frustrated him. Again, external poverty might not be in others what it was in St. Francis, the vehicle of simplicity and spiritual joy. Most obviously, external poverty broke down—even Franciscans evaded the full sacrifice. It is little shame to have failed in a region where no one wholly succeeds. Yet we must note that where St. Francis failed, Luther triumphed.

3. Monasticism has left us a literary monument of a kindred type of Christianity; one of the Church's and one of the world's classics; à Kempis' work known by the [historically doubtful] name, *The Imitation of Christ*. As long as human sorrow endures, and faith is not dead among men, this book will be treasured and held in reverence. Christ died on the cross; we must accept a crucifying, a denying, an abnegation of self and self-will. There the message of the book stops. Our fellow-men, even our Christian brethren, are only thought of as hindrances to Divine communion, tempters who threaten to impede our sanctification. À Kempis falls far below St. Francis, who served men for Christ's sake with eager loyalty. The dangerous one-sidedness of this glorious book is not due to externalizing Christ's example. Externally even, the Gospels rebuke it with a loud voice. And the book is not external. It has mystical depth and inwardness. Mysticism touched with the Christian spirit is its strength. But the defects which mar it lie no less deep.

4. The Reformation abolished the 'higher' morality of asceticism, with its imitation of such outward circumstances in the life of our Lord as His poverty or His celibacy. Ordinary lay Christianity was seen to involve a 'more perfect' obedience than the will-worship of the monk. (Recent study of Luther has called in question his insight on such points: but there can be no doubt that he grasped the principle, however his remarks in detail may show the distorting influence of the mediaeval tradition). It is also to be recognized that Protestant Christianity, with its emphasis on the Pauline Gospel of the cross—*Christ died for us* had less receptiveness for the thought of Christ's example, in several of its forms. Ritschl and some other modern Protestants even assert that Christ's example amounts to no more than *faultless fulfilment of vocation*—a vocation very different from ours. This paradox belongs to the art. 'Example' rather than to the present article. What we have to insist upon is this—Christ cannot be truly followed by *imitating* Him in *externals*. But has the NT

erred? He who was greatest humbled Himself; the Master of all served; the one perfectly innocent sufferer in all history forgave ungrudgingly; He laid down His life for us, that we might lay down our lives for others (Php 2:5-8, Joh 13:14, Mat 20:28; 1Pe 2:21, Luk 23:24, 1Jn 3:16). Can this wonderful many-sided example be exchanged for a dry scholastic formula like 'fidelity to a vocation'? We have to be on our guard lest Protestantism, with its rediscovery of the gospel of God's love, and with its repudiation of false (monastic) conceptions of the higher life, should blur at some points that moral claim which is, in truth, high as heaven—high as Christ Himself.

5. Asceticism is an obsolete danger in modern Protestant circles; yet it is possible that the tendency to 'imitation' may take other forms. The socialistic reading of Christ's words—socialism crossed with crazy altruism; anarchistic socialism or socialistic anarchism; extremes meet!—is primarily a wooden way of conceiving Christ's teaching, just as imitation is a wooden way of following Christ's example. If we rise into the region of Christian principle, both dangers vanish. But there is a more subtle connexion between ideas of imitation and a false programme for the Christian life. Many schemes of the Atonement (e.g. the late Dr. Moberly's) tell us in substance that Christ initiated a process—to Dr. Moberly, a penitential process of self-mortification; to others, a process of world-redeeming love—which Christians must prolong. This is substantially imitation over again. We are to be saved by 'being such men as He was, too.' The Pauline and Protestant gospel tells us that Christ offered and finished the great sacrifice. We may well recoil from the old vulgar train of thought described by M'Leod Campbell: 'He suffered—I shall not suffer'; but God forbid we should dream that we share, in all respects and for every purpose, the lot of Christ. We fill up remaining suffering—if we are found worthy—but we do not fill out an uncompleted Atonement; that was 'finished,' once and for all, in mysterious anguish, in agony out of which springs our new life. We have not fully unlearned the dreary external programme of imitation till we confess Christ unambiguously as our life and our only hope. We are to resemble Him, partly as the younger born resemble the elder brother, partly as the saved resemble the Saviour. Confessing this, we are prepared to learn those further things He has to teach us about the ways of conformity to His image. Protestantism is to be developed: or supplemented, but must not be abolished. Christian ethics presuppose the Christian gospel. They can never take its place.

Literature.—The best recent book on the general subject is Stalker's *Imago Christi*, with its thoughtful criticism of the *Imitatio*. Early Christian literature is well summarized in Luthardt's *Hist. of Christian Ethics* (English translation). For St. Francis, see P. Sabatier's *Life* and other writings. For the Reformers, see Charles Beard's *Martin Luther*, also his *Hibbert Lecture*. (Luther, that great religious genius, is the Reformer to study).

Immanence

IMMANENCE (Lat. *in*, 'in,' and *manere*, 'to remain') means *abiding* or *dwelling in*. In general it denotes the existence and operation of one thing within another. In *Philosophy* it expresses the identity of the originating and causal principle, involved in the genesis of the universe, with the universe itself in its progressive history. In *Theology* it denotes the indwelling and operation of God within the entire universe. of which He is the first cause and the abiding ground. It stands in contrast with 'transcendence,' which implies that God is prior to, and not limited by, the universe, which depends upon Him for its origin and continued existence. But immanence and transcendence are not exclusive of each other. A correct theistic philosophy gives a place to each of these principles in its exposition of the relations of God to the universe.

The history of the principle of immanence is interesting. It is perhaps first suggested by the νοῦς of Anaxagoras, as the principle of operative intelligence in the universe. In the idealistic system of Plato, according to which the *ideas* that are supposed to be archetypal in God become ectypal in the universe, and constitute its real essence, order, and intelligibility, the immanence of Deity is involved. The same suggestion is also implied in the *eternal forms* of Aristotle, according to which the framer of the world moulded it, into a harmonious whole. The Aristotelian distinction between the immanent acts of the soul in forming a purpose and its transient acts in making the purpose effective, illustrates the principle of immanence in a general way.

In the later Platonic philosophy of the School of Alexandria the principle of the λόγος, especially in the hands of Philo the Jew, also suggests the idea of immanence. Philo perhaps borrowed the term from the Wisdom literature, where it was used in the sense of σοφία or *ratio*, and applied to denote what Plato had called ιδέαι. This usage of the term λόγος is interesting in itself and on account of its bearing upon the usage of the same term in the Fourth Gospel.

In modern philosophy the dictum of Malebranche, that we know things truly only when we see them in relation to God, and the monadology of Leibnitz, according to which a vital principle is supposed to lie at the heart of all things, both involve the idea of immanence. Spinoza's pantheism, as, indeed, all pantheism, so emphasizes immanence that transcendence has no place. The absolute idealism of the Hegelian

type of philosophy and the Hindu theosophy both make so much of the immanence of the Deity that His transcendence is quite obscured. In the philosophy of our own time there is a tendency towards a fuller recognition of the immanence of God, and this tendency is affecting theology in a wholesome way. The result is a sound theistic philosophy, as the basis for a more vital theology.

This article has to do mainly with the idea of immanence as it appears in the Gospel narratives, and specially as it is exhibited in the teachings of Jesus Christ. The Synoptics do not give as much prominence to the Divine immanence as does the Fourth Gospel. It might be too much to say that transcendence prevails in the former and immanence in the latter; yet it is true that one of the points of difference between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel is the way in which the relations between God and the universe are construed.

1. In the *Synoptics* there are hints of the Divine immanence in *nature* which resemble the OT utterances upon this point, e.g. Mat 5:45; Mat 6:30, Mar 6:51, Luk 21:29. Transcendence is not excluded in these passages. God's immanence in *man* is also suggested by Mat 6:8; Mat 10:20, Mar 13:11, Luk 1:67; Luk 2:26; Luk 11:17. The fact of the immanence of God in *Christ* is alluded to in Mat 3:16; Mat 4:1; Mat 12:18; Mat 27:46, Mar 1:12; Mar 9:2, Luk 4:1. That God is immanent in some sense in the *subjects* of His Kingdom is implied in Mat 10:40; Mat 13:33; Mat 18:2; Mat 28:20, Mar 1:15, Luk 13:21. It may be added that demoniacal immanence in men is often expressed in the Synoptics, e.g. Mat 8:28; Mat 12:45, Mar 3:22; Mar 9:17, Luk 8:30.

We can scarcely conclude from these and similar passages that special stress is laid upon the idea of immanence in the Synoptics. The fact that God is constantly in vital and operative contact with the entire universe of being is very evident; but God's being and activity are not necessarily limited by the universe. He is the First Cause of all things, yet second causes have their place and dependent efficiency in the universe. Hence it is that God's transcendence is clearly recognized.

2. In the *Fourth Gospel* immanence has a larger place. Some interpreters suppose that St. John borrowed many of his ideas, especially that of the *λόγος*, from the Platonic philosophy, as represented by Philo of Alexandria, who combined some OT ideas with the philosophy of Plato. But there are differences between the *λόγος* doctrine of St. John and that of Philo which entirely exclude the supposition that St. John was a mere borrower. The fact that he makes no allusion to Philo or to Alexandria, but rather assumes that he gathered his ideas from the teaching of Jesus, fully justifies this view.

The immanence of God in *nature* is implied in Joh 3:8; Joh 4:24; Joh 11:24. His immanence in *man* is suggested in Joh 1:1-14, Joh 8:12, Joh 14:6. Here God, in some active way, is operative in nature and in the soul of man as its Divine light.

But it is in *Jesus Christ* that the Fourth Gospel finds the immanence of God in a special manner. For this see Joh 1:1-14, Joh 5:26, Joh 7:33, Joh 8:38; Joh 8:43, Joh 10:30, Joh 12:24; Joh 12:45; Joh 12:50, Joh 13:32, Joh 14:11; Joh 14:16; Joh 14:26, Joh 15:23, Joh 16:27-28, Joh 17:5; Joh 17:21; Joh 17:23. In several of these passages the term *λόγος* is used concerning Jesus Christ. In this term the idea of immanence is involved; but as this topic is fully treated in art. Logos it need not be discussed at length here. Suffice it to say that Jesus Christ, as the eternal Logos, is regarded by many as the Divine principle by whose agency the operative intelligence of God is manifested and made effective in the entire universe. Care is needed here not to give too much of the colour of the Alexandrian philosophy to the teaching of the Fourth Gospel upon this point.

This Gospel also lays stress upon the fact that God is immanent in *believers*, as the subjects of His spiritual Kingdom. See Joh 3:27, Joh 4:14, Joh 6:53, Joh 7:37-38, Joh 11:25, Joh 15:1-10, Joh 17:8; Joh 17:23-24. In passages like these the fact is presented that there is such a union with, and participation in, Christ on the part of believers, that He is said to be the source of a spiritual life which is Divine. In a deep mystical sense God may be regarded as immanent in believers by virtue of this union, and their partaking of the Divine nature thereby.

As against Deism, the Gospels very plainly teach that God is in constant and vital contact with the universe. As against Pantheism, they also teach that God is vaster than the universe, and is in no way conditioned by it. Hence they present a sound Theism, which gives a proper place alike to the immanence and transcendence of God in the relations which He sustains to the universe. It may be added that the fact of this immanent and transcendent relation, rather than the mode of it, is set forth in the Gospels. The Epistles expand some of these things (cf. Rom 1:20; Rom 5:5; Rom 8:11, 1Co 1:30; 1Co 2:10; 1Co 6:19; 1Co 8:6, Gal 1:16; Gal 4:19, Eph 6:10, Php 2:13, Col 1:19, Heb 1:3; Heb 2:16, 1Jn 3:24; 1Jn 4:15; see also St. Paul in Act 17:25; Act 17:28).

Literature.—Plato, *Phaedrus*; Philo, *de Opif. Mundi*; Spinoza, *Ethica*; Hegel, *Logic*; Caird, *The Evolution of Religion*; Royce, *God and the Individual*; Illingworth, *Divine Immanence*; Thomas à Kempis, *Imitatio Christi*; Eckhart, *Writings*; Allan, *Continuity of Christian Thought*; Flint, *Anti-Theistic Theories*, p. 339; *Agnosticism*, p. 592; Martensen, *Chr. Dogmatics*, pp. 103-106; Orr, *Chr. View of God and the World*, p. 318.

Immanuel

IMMANUEL (Ἐμμανουήλ) occurs once only in the NT (Mat_1:23, in the quotation from Isa_7:14 where the name is given in the form לְאִמְּוָן). It is necessary, first of all, to examine the original prophecy before discussing the Evangelist's application of it to Jesus.

1. The circumstances which led to the prediction were as follows. Probably under the influence of a wish to force Judah into a coalition against Assyria, an attack was made on the southern kingdom by Syria and Ephraim about 735-734 (Isa_7:1 ff.). The attack was specially directed against the Davidic dynasty, and it was the object of the allies to dethrone Ahaz and set the son of Tabeel in his place (Isa_7:6). The invasion filled Ahaz with panic, and he resolved to call in the aid of Tiglath-pileser, the king of Assyria (2Ki_16:7 ff.). Between the great Empire of Assyria and the petty State of Judah there could be no talk of equal alliance, Judah must forfeit its independence and become a vassal of Assyria. This involved heavy taxation and the loss of all power of independent action. Taxation would only aggravate the social misery and ruthless oppression from which the poor were suffering, and make it more difficult than ever to carry through those social reforms which the prophets regarded as most necessary. Accordingly, Isaiah vehemently opposed the king's project. He made light of the danger from Syria and Ephraim, and stigmatized the allies as fag-ends of smoking firebrands, which might cause considerable annoyance, but had lost all power for serious mischief. He bade Ahaz be quiet and fearless, assuring him that God would frustrate the designs of his foes (Isa_7:4 ff.), but warning him that his stability depended on his faith (Isa_7:9). Possibly our present text is somewhat abbreviated, but at any rate Isaiah, either on that or possibly another occasion, offered him a sign in confirmation of his assurance, placing the universe from Sheol to Heaven at his disposal. Ahaz refused, since he had already made up his mind, but pretended that his unwillingness was prompted by reluctance to tempt God. The prophet passionately cries out against the conduct which, not content with wearying men, goes on to weary God. Then he proceeds to give the king a sign from God Himself, namely, the sign of Immanuel (Isa_7:10 ff.).

The translation of the Hebrew is itself somewhat uncertain. It may now be taken for granted that the word עַלְמָה translated 'virgin' in the Authorized and Revised Versions should be more correctly rendered 'young woman.' The proper Heb. term for 'virgin'

is בְּתוּלָה, though even this is used in [Joe 1:8](#) for ‘young widow.’ All that can with certainty be said of the word used by Isaiah is that it indicates a young woman of marriageable age, but says nothing as to whether she is married or not. Accordingly the terms of the prophecy do not warrant us in interpreting the sign as the prodigy of a virgin conception. The natural interpretation to put on the prophecy is that a young woman, either married at the time or soon to be married, would give birth to a son and call him by this name. It is also uncertain whether we should translate with Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘shall conceive’ or with (Revised Version margin) ‘is with child.’ The former is, however, perhaps the more probable. The third question is whether we should translate ‘a virgin’ or ‘the virgin.’ The Hebrew has the article, which is correctly rendered ‘the virgin,’ in which case some definite person is in the prophet’s mind. But Hebrew idiom often uses the definite article where in English we should translate indefinitely, so that ‘a virgin’ is equally correct as a rendering of the Hebrew.

These uncertainties as to the precise meaning of the words themselves naturally leave much room for difference of opinion, and this is largely increased by other uncertainties. It is therefore desirable to narrow the range of possible interpretation as much as possible. It is clear, in the first place, that the prophet is referring to something in the near future, otherwise the sign could have conveyed no message to the king, all the more that his difficulty was urgent. In the next place, we must beware of supposing that anything extraordinary is necessarily intended by the sign. Isaiah walked in captive’s dress for a sign and a wonder upon Egypt and Ethiopia ([Isa 20:3](#)), certainly not because of any miraculous character attached to his conduct (cf. also [Isa 8:18](#)). With these considerations in mind we may approach the question, What message was the sign intended to convey? When Ahaz had been bidden ask a sign, the object was to convince him that his enemies would be overthrown and their alliance against him come to nought. We naturally expect that the sign volunteered by the prophet will have the same significance. Yet there are objections to this view. It may be argued that Ahaz’ refusal to ask a sign introduced a new element into the situation, especially after the warning in [Isa 7:9](#); and if he rejected a sign assuring him of deliverance, it would not be strange if he received one that was ominous of disaster. And such a sign, according to our present text, we seem to possess. For the prediction in [Isa 7:15](#), that Immanuel should eat curdled milk and honey, implies that Judah would have reverted from the agricultural to the pastoral state, in other words, would have suffered a devastation at the hands of an enemy. And this is confirmed by [Isa 7:17](#), wherein a terrible invasion bringing a disaster unprecedented since the days of Rehoboam is predicted. On the other hand, this is difficult to harmonize with [Isa 7:16](#), at any rate in its present form, for that gives as the meaning of the sign that before the child knows to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land whose two kings Ahaz abhors will be forsaken. In other words, [Isa 7:16](#) interprets the sign as the

desolation of Syria and Ephraim. It is therefore a sign, not of disaster to Judah, but of deliverance. We are accordingly confronted with the problem whether the original text is here preserved. It would suffice to bring [Isa_7:16](#) into harmony with [Isa_7:15](#); [Isa_7:17](#) if the former were to read simply 'for before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, thy land shall be forsaken'; and several scholars have adopted this expedient. In that case the sign is simply one of disaster for Judah. Nevertheless there are serious difficulties in the way of accepting this solution, and the question is forced upon us whether more radical measures are not necessary. Even with the suggested abbreviation of [Isa_7:16](#) it does not connect so well with [Isa_7:15](#) as with [Isa_7:14](#). But apart from that, there are other arguments for treating the sign as favourable. The name *Immanuel* itself, expressing the conviction that God was with His people, might, of course, be harmonized with either verse, it gains significance only on account of the distress in which the name was given, the mother's faith is a sign only when experience seems to contradict it. The name might therefore be given in the midst of the trouble caused by the Syrian invasion or in the greater distress that was to follow from Assyria. But Isaiah certainly anticipated the overthrow of Syria and Ephraim. Not only so, but a little later, in the public exhibition on a tablet of the word *Maher-shalal-hash-baz*, and nearly a year later in the giving of this name to his newborn son, he expressed his faith in the overthrow of the coalition. It is indeed urged that the sign of Immanuel would thus be only a duplication of the sign of Maher-shalal-hash-baz, but there seems to be no reason why such a duplication should be objectionable. Moreover, there is a significant parallelism between the two which points to such an identification of meaning. The time limit in both cases is very similar. In the one case it is before the child shall know to say 'my father and my mother'; in other words, the events described are to happen before the infant who has just been born has learnt to utter the first things that a child says. The other time limit is precisely similar, 'before the child knows to refuse the evil and choose the good.' By this the prophet need not mean before he comes to years of moral discretion, but before he learns to distinguish between good and harmful food. And the very fact that a year later Isaiah was still concerned mainly with the invasion of the allies and in asserting his conviction of their overthrow, surely makes it probable that the same question preoccupies his attention here. Nor is there any reason to suppose that the obstinacy of Ahaz would make any difference to the character of the sign. Unless we are explicitly warned to the contrary, it is natural to assume that the sign given possessed the same significance as the sign offered. The present writer accordingly takes the view that the sign is of a favourable character. This involves, it is true, the elimination of [Isa_7:15](#) (and perhaps of [Isa_7:17](#), though this may belong to another prophecy), but in any case something has to be struck out of the passage to secure consistency. It might, of course, seem easier to eliminate a few words in [Isa_7:16](#) than to strike out a whole verse. Nevertheless, when we look at [Isa_7:16](#) we see that it is practically compounded of part of [Isa_7:22](#) and part of [Isa_7:16](#), whereas

the words 'whose two kings thou abhorrest' make a much greater impression of originality.

The question accordingly arises, in what precisely did the sign consist? The stress may lie either on the *עלמה*, or the son, or the name given to him, or a combination of these. The traditional interpretation has, of course, thrown the stress on the first of these; for it the sign lay in the virgin-conception. But when the true sense of *עלמה* is understood, this interpretation becomes impossible. If she were one of the king's wives, then the child would be the king's son, and the possibility of an identification with the Messiah would have to be considered, it would be possible to accept, with McCurdy, the identification of Immanuel with Hezekiah, the chronological difficulties not being altogether insuperable. A third possible alternative would be to accept the view taken by several scholars, most recently by Whitehouse in the Bible, and identify the *עלמה* with the community in Zion. We have no evidence, however, that this term was used at that time for the Jewish community, and the identification with one of the king's wives must also be pronounced improbable, in spite of the fact that the trouble was dynastic even more than national, directed against the Davidic house rather than against Judah as a whole. Nor is there any reason for identifying Immanuel with the Messianic king mentioned in [Isa 9:1-7](#) and [Isa 11:1-9](#). It is true that, according to the present text of [Isa 8:8](#), the land of Judah is represented as Immanuel's land, but it is probable that the text should be corrected in harmony with [Isa 8:10](#).* [Note: Probably instead of 'thy land, O Immanuel,' we should read 'the land, for God is with us,' thus getting a refrain at the end of v. 8 to match that at the end of v. 10. In that case the figure of the bird with wings spread over the land is a symbol of God's protecting care of Judah, shielding her from the combination of all earthly foes. The extreme abruptness of the transition from threat to promise makes it highly probable that [Isa 8:8](#) b-10 is a fragment not connected with the preceding verses. It must even be granted that Marti may be right in regarding it as a later addition; for although the prophecy may be explained as Isaiah's, on the supposition that he is addressing the forces of Assyria as composed of various nationalities, yet taken by itself the reference to the coalition of the far nations against Judah recurs as a standing feature of the later apocalyptic.] We may then set aside the Messianic identification. With the correction of [Isa 8:8](#) no reason remains for considering that the personality of Immanuel is an important element in the sign; it is in harmony with similar cases that it is the name and not the person who bears it that is important. This is true, for example, of Hosea's children, and, what is still more to the point, of Isaiah's children. The prophetic significance both of *Shear-jashub* and *Maher-shalal-hash-baz* lies not in the children themselves, but exclusively in their names. We expect the same to be true in this case. Just as the names of Isaiah's two children express, the one his doctrine of the remnant, the other his certainty that

Syria and Ephraim would be overthrown, so the name *Immanuel* expresses the mother's conviction that God is with His people. The sign is no prodigy in this case. For against the king's unbelief and his obstinate refusal to accept a sign there arises the mother's impressive faith, which confronted danger without dismay, and uttered her conviction of God's presence with His people in the name she gave her son. The personality of the mother is equally with that of the son of no importance for the sign; that consists in the mother's faith and the son's name. Accordingly it is better to translate 'a young woman' instead of 'the young woman.' Isaiah, however, does not mean precisely that any young woman, who is shortly about to conceive and give birth to a son, may call his name Immanuel. While he has no definite young woman in his mind, he predicts that some young woman will, in the future, conceive and bear a son, to whom she will give the name Immanuel. His language is not that of hypothesis but of prediction.* [Note: The connexion of v. 16 with v. 14 is as follows. A young woman will bear a son and call his name Immanuel. This will be a sign, for it will express a faith which triumphs over the appearance of imminent disaster. And it is truly God-inspired faith, for it will be splendidly vindicated. Ere the child thus born in days of darkness knows how to distinguish between hurtful and proper food, the hostile power will be crushed, and thus God's presence with His people will be clearly manifested. Immanuel will be a standing rebuke to the king's scepticism.]

2. The way is now clear to discuss St. Matthew's use of the passage. This is not the place to examine the subject either of the Virgin-conception of Christ or of the early Christian interpretation of prophecy. It is quite plain that this interpretation was in general very little controlled by the original sense of the OT passage quoted. It was of a largely polemical character, since it was necessary, against the cavilling of the Jews, to prove the Messiahship of Jesus from the OT. Accordingly the Hebrew Scriptures were ransacked to find parallels with the life of Christ; and it is not unlikely that, at a quite early period, collections of these passages were drawn up for controversial use. The First Gospel is peculiarly rich in Messianic proof-texts, and it is therefore not surprising that for two facts so important to the author as the Virgin-conception and the Incarnation the writer should allege an OT prophecy. But the fact that he has done so creates a very interesting problem, which, however, will be approached differently by those who accept the Virgin-conception as a fact and by those who dispute it. For the former, the fact itself is the starting-point, and the author had to find in the OT a text appropriate to it. The only question that would really arise would be as to the part played by the LXX Septuagint in suggesting Isa 7:14. In this passage the LXX Septuagint renders עַלְמָה by παρθένος , which suggests virginity much more strongly than the Hebrew word. At the same time, the fact that the LXX Septuagint so translated shows that the author of the First Gospel may independently have taken the word in the same sense. That he did so is rendered not improbable by the fact that his translation differs in some points from that of the

LXX Septuagint .† [Note: The LXX of is 7:14 reads in B: διὰ τοῦτο δώσει Κύριος αὐτός ὑμῖν σημεῖον ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ λήμψεται καὶ τεξεται υἱόν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ. For λήμψεται, however, ⲛAQ read ἕξει, which is the same rendering as that in Matthew. For καλέσεις we have in ⲛ καλέσει; neither B nor ⲛ here coincide with Matthew. The text in Mat_1:23 reads ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει καὶ τεξεται υἱόν, καὶ καλέσουσιν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ.] The significance for the doctrine of the Incarnation of the name *Immanuel*, which might be translated ‘God with us’ as well as ‘God is with us,’ probably first drew his attention to the passage, and then the translation of פָּרְוּ by παρθένος would readily be suggested by his belief in the Virgin-conception.

Among those, however, who regard the belief in the Virgin-birth as a piece of primitive Christian mythology, there has been a controversy as to what led the author to quote this passage, and the relation between that belief and the passage in Isaiah. Many think that the former was created by the latter,* [Note: Harnack: ‘Even the belief that Jesus was born of a virgin sprang from Isa 7:14 ... The conjecture of Usener, that the idea of the birth from a virgin is a heathen myth which was received by the Christians, contradicts the entire earliest development of Christian tradition, which is free from heathen myths, so far as these had not already been received by wide circles of Jews (above all, certain Babylonian and Persian myths), which in the case of that idea is not demonstrable. Besides, it is in point of method not permissible to stray so far when we have near at hand such a complete explanation as Isa 7:14, (History of Dogma, i. p. 100, n. 1). Harnack, it is true, does not assert that it was the LXX rendering which created the belief, though it may be presumed that this is his view. He is not divided in principle from Gunkel and Cheyne, since he admits that heathen myths had come into Christianity through Judaism, but he considers that the Virgin-birth does not as a matter of fact belong to these, and that an extra-Jewish source should not be sought when a Jewish source is at hand. Lobstein characterizes the method applied to the documents of the Bible by Usener as ‘supremely defective,’ and, after admitting the ‘remarkable likenesses to our Gospel tradition’ in the pagan parallels he has accumulated, says: ‘Yet the conclusions which he draws from them go singularly beyond his premisses: the Jewish and Christian factors suffice to explain the genesis of the myth of the Nativity’ (The Virgin Birth of Christ, pp. 128, 129, cf. pp. 75, 76). He thinks the LXX translation responsible for ‘the religious construction adopted by the Evangelist’ (pp. 74, 75).] and probably in the form given to it by the LXX Septuagint translation. The Hebrew, it is thought, would not naturally have lent itself to this purpose apart from the definite use of παρθένος in

the LXX Septuagint . Several recent scholars, on the other hand, consider that the use of παρθένος is quite insufficient to account for St. Matthew's quotation. They consider that even, before the birth of Jesus there had been formed a doctrine of the Messiah, which included among other things His supernatural birth. This was ultimately derived from the pagan stories of children of the gods, but was not taken over directly from paganism by Jewish Christianity. It had arisen on the soil of Judaism itself, and it is in the Judaeo-pagan syncretism, with its doctrine that the Messiah must be born of a virgin, that the origin of the belief is to be sought. What was said of Christ was subsequently transferred to Jesus, when Jesus and the Christ were identified. A quotation from Gunkel will make this position clear. After saying that the mythological representations did not make their first appearance in the later Gentile Christianity, he proceeds: 'But this would have been impossible if Judaism itself had not previously possessed this or similar representations. The birth of Christ from the Virgin through the Divine Spirit had, we may assume, already belonged to the Christological dogma before Jesus, just as His birth in Bethlehem and from David's race, and has been transferred to Jesus only at a later time. What we have to learn then, and what will subsequently be shown again, is that this Judaism which found its way into primitive Christianity must have been strongly inclined to syncretism' (*Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verstandnis des NT*, p. 69). Similarly, Cheyne, in his *Bible Problems*, considers that the historical explanation of the statement of the Virgin-birth is that it arose 'in the story of non-Jewish origin current in Jewish circles and borrowed from them by certain Jewish Christians.' He interprets 'virgin' in a peculiar sense. In its original meaning 'it expresses the fact that the great mythic mother-goddess was independent of the marriage tie' (p. 75). For him the passage in Mt. 'is a Jewish-Christian transformation of a primitive story, derived ultimately, in all probability, from Babylonia, and analogous to the Jewish transformation of the Babylonian cosmogony in the opening section of Genesis'* [Note: also the important remarks on pp. 193-195. He thinks the translation παρθενος is so far from accounting for the belief in the Virgin-birth that it needs to be explained itself. 'In Isa 7:14 the translator must have had some special motive, and that motive must have been not philological, but, if I may say so, ideological.' 'As for the quotation in Mat 1:22 f. it is perfectly well accounted for as one of the subsidiary Biblical proofs which were habitually sought for by the evangelists. The real supports of their statements were traditions of one kind or another, but their belief in the written word of prophecy led them to look for a justification of these traditions in the prophetic scriptures and the prophecies had a common origin.' The same view is taken by the scholars who regard the doctrine as purely pagan in origin. See, e.g., Pfeleiderer, *Das Urchristentum*2, i. pp. 551, 694, where he affirms that Mt.'s use of Isa 7:14 was possible only for one who had already quite other grounds for ascribing that origin to Jesus.] (p. 93). On the other hand, a good many scholars take the view that the story was created, not

simply out of pagan materials, but on pagan soil and among Gentile Christians. This is the view of Usener, Schmiedel, Soltau, Pfeleiderer, and others (see references below). It does not fall within the scope of this article to discuss this question further, since it is concerned simply with the bearing of the LXX Septuagint translation of מלמ by παρθένος on the development of the belief in the Virgin-conception of Christ. To rebut the Christian use of Isa 7:14 as a prediction of the supernatural birth of Christ, later Jewish translators substituted νεάνις for παρθένος. See Virgin Birth.

Literature.—In addition to commentaries on Isaiah and Matthew, and articles on ‘Immanuel’ in Dictionaries of the Bible, reference may be made to the articles ‘Mary’ and ‘Nativity’ in the *Encyc. Bibl.*; Giesebrecht, *SK* [Note: K Studien und Kritiken.] , 1888; Porter, *JBL* [Note: BL Journal of Biblical Literature.] , 1895; McCurdy, *II PM*, vol. i. pp. 368-371, 417-420; Soltau, *The Birth of Jesus Christ*, pp. 50-52; Lobstein, *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, pp. 73-75, 128-130; Cheyne, *Bible Problems*, pp. 67-100, 191-195; Pfeleiderer, *Das Urchristentum*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , i. pp. 551, 694; Harnack, *History of Dogma*, i. p. 100, n. [Note: note.] 1; Box, ‘The Gospel Narratives of the Nativity and the alleged Influence of Heathen Ideas’ in *ZNTW* [Note: NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissen. schaft.] , 1905, p. 80 ff.

A. S. Peake.

☪Immortality

IMMORTALITY.—In the ordinary acceptation of the term ‘immortality’ connotes ‘endlessness.’ It has ceased to express merely or solely a denial of physical death, in its incidence or its consequences, and has been extended to include the possibility or actuality of death, considered as putting an end to conscious existence either now or in the limitless future. Whether these two alternatives really mean the same thing, whether to be capable of dying is always and ultimately to die, and so that only is immortal which by its very nature and constitution is not liable to death, while all else perishes,—as is probably the case,—is a question that hardly comes within the scope of the present article. It will, however, be just, and will conduce to clearness, to separate these two considerations; to seek to determine, in the first instance, the teaching of Christ with regard to immortality in the limited sense of a denial of cessation of existence at death; and, secondly, to review the much wider and more perplexed question of the permanence of this ‘immortal’ state. ‘Does death end all?’, according to the mind and teaching of the Founder of Christianity, is an inquiry that

needs to be twice raised,—once as it concerns the terminus of the present life upon earth, and again as it refers or may refer to a future to which human thought can set no limit. It is obvious that the first question is comparatively simple and uninvolved; and that upon its answer in the affirmative depends the possibility of opening the second, which is highly complicated, and involves the most far-reaching and important problems that can present themselves for human consideration.

By some writers the terms used in the NT, and especially by Christ Himself, with reference to a life after death have been further understood to imply blessedness. Life immortal would thus be not only life in the ordinary acceptance of conscious existence, but it would be life *plus* felicity. It is perhaps hardly right or wise to saddle the doctrine with this additional connotation. It will, however, be necessary to examine how far the words of Christ suggest or imply that He regarded happiness as an essential and inseparable part of the life to come, or a future existence of misery more or less prolonged as inconceivable unless it were terminated by restoration to bliss or annihilation of consciousness.

There is, however, a further preliminary consideration which must be taken into account. An examination of the whole teaching of Christ upon so momentous a theme, as it is transmitted by the Evangelists, may be expected to yield results not only positive but negative. Positive, inasmuch as upon a subject that concerns the deepest interests of men no great religious teacher can do other than afford some guidance to those who seek knowledge and truth at his lips; and negative, since the revelation which he may venture or see fit to make of his own thoughts will obviously be determined and limited by the character and capacity of his contemporaries. In a sense neither derogatory nor contemptuous towards his hearers, he will refuse to cast his pearls before swine. Environment naturally and inevitably plays a large part in moulding the form into which doctrine shall be cast, and in assigning the bounds beyond which it shall not move. Teaching appropriate and welcome to the keen-witted and philosophic circles of Athens will fall on dull and inappreciative ears by the waterside or in the fields of Galilee. And of the confessedly greatest Teacher that the world has ever known this may be expected to be preeminently true; He will make His sayings accord both as to form and substance with the receptive ability of those to whom they are delivered. There will be many things within the compass of His own knowledge which they cannot now bear ([Joh_16:12](#)). And though He will at times give utterance to sayings hard to be understood ([Joh_6:50](#) ff., [Joh_6:60](#)), of a depth and significance beyond their comprehension, foreshadowing truths into the full understanding of which only after-generations will be able to grow, the major part of His instruction will not be concerned with these; else would that instruction be barren and profitless to the hearers, no fruitful seed germinating to new spiritual and intellectual life. Moreover, it is precisely these sayings, dealing with the higher, more abstract and supra-sensible side of things, that would be most likely to be lost upon

ordinary disciples, to fail to find a place in their memory, and in their subsequent reproductions, whether written or oral, of the Master's teaching. Only by the choicer natures, the more refined and contemplative spirits among His followers, such as we conceive the Apostle John to have been, would this aspect of His discourse and doctrine be caught up and treasured, to be afterwards faithfully delivered as words φωνᾶντα συνετοῖσιν, although for the moment they may have soared far above the care or comprehension of those who first heard them with their outward ears.

Upon *a priori* grounds, therefore, bearing in mind the character of the people among whom Christ lived and with whom He had to deal, we should expect to find the speculative and philosophic side of doctrine but slightly represented, while stress is laid more upon ethics and the practical conduct of life. The supernatural will be stated, as it were, in terms of the natural, the heavenly of the earthly, and with a constant recognition of the actual needs and circumstances and possibilities of His hearers. Whether and how far this is so in fact only an examination of the texts can show. Such an examination of the more or less direct references in the Gospels to a future life will be most conveniently conducted under the three divisions suggested, viz.—(1) a renewed life after death, (2) the permanence of this life, (3) its comprehensiveness, whether it is to be conceived as embracing the entire race of mankind or limited to a part thereof. It will be necessary to take separately the evidence of the Synoptic Gospels and of St. John.

A. The Synoptists

(1) With regard to the first point little need be said, for indeed there is nothing in dispute. That the teaching of Christ assumes from first to last *a conscious life beyond the grave* for Himself and His hearers lies upon the surface of His words and permeates His entire rule of life. The whole tone of His speech, the implications of His parables, the sanctions with which He surrounds His encouragements and warnings, the comparative value which He teaches men to set upon heavenly and earthly things, the gravity and seriousness of His outlook into the future, all show that here at least to Him and to His hearers there was common ground; that He did not need to begin by proving to them that death was not the end of all, but that the universal postulate of religious thought of His day anticipated a renewal of personal and conscious existence after death. In this respect He was but adopting, assuming, and making the basis of impressive exhortation and warning what the majority at least of His contemporaries believed.

The repeated references to the coming of the Kingdom of God or of the heavens (Mat 3:2; Mat 4:17; Mat 10:7; Mat 12:28, Mar 1:15, Luk 9:27; Luk 10:9 *al.*), into which not everyone who professes loyalty will enter (Mat 7:21); to the Day of

Judgment or 'that day' (Mat 10:15; Mat 11:22; Mat 11:24, Luk 10:14, Mat 7:22 al.); to His own Resurrection (Mat 17:9; Matthew 28; Mat 26:32, Mar 9:31; Mar 10:34, Luk 18:33 al.) and the Coming of the Son of Man (Mat 10:23; Mat 16:27 f., Mar 13:26; Mar 14:62 al.), when those who have confessed or denied Him upon earth will reap as they have sown, in a public confession or denial of them before His Father and the holy angels (Mat 10:32 f., Luk 9:26; Luk 12:8 f.),—all presuppose and rest upon the foundation of a belief in another life after this. The disciples are to lay up treasure in heaven (Mat 6:20, Luk 12:33), the enjoyment of which is clearly not designed for the present. 'In the regeneration' these disciples shall sit upon thrones in the capacity of judges (Mat 19:28, Luk 22:30). Even His enemies, who bound Him to death, shall 'see' the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power (Mat 26:64, Mar 14:62; cf. Mat 24:30, Mar 13:26, Luk 21:27). The robber, after death, shall be with Christ in Paradise (Luk 23:43). More than one parable bears emphatic witness to the same belief, for example that of the King and the Wedding Feast (Mat 22:1 ff.), of the Talents (Mat 25:14 ff.), of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Luk 16:19 ff.). These and other expressions which might be cited, figurative as some of them undoubtedly are, sufficiently emphasize the form and substance of a teaching which is not limited to the present, but always and consistently presupposes a life of active consciousness beyond the grave.

It is doubtful whether even the reputed scepticism of the Sadducees (Mat 22:23-33, Mar 12:18-27, Luk 20:27-40) is any real exception to this. The scope and articles of the creed that they professed remain very uncertain. And their famous apologue is perhaps rather directed against the conception of a joint and common resurrection at one time and place, at which the relationships of this life would be resumed, than implies disbelief in any sequel after death to the life lived upon earth. The incident gives occasion at least to a most emphatic assertion on the part of Christ of the reality of the life that succeeds the present, and an equally emphatic repudiation of the idea that those who have died have ceased to be—'God is not the God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto him.'

(2) The question of *the duration of this new life*, the permanence or impermanence of the state after death, presents greater difficulties. Once again it may be said in anticipation that the probabilities of the case are strongly in favour of the former hypothesis. A teacher of the elevation and spirituality of Christ would hardly be likely to suggest to His hearers as a reward for following Him a prolonged existence indeed, but one which closed in the thick darkness of oblivion; and if He wished to convey the thought that in this respect a sharp distinction prevailed between those who loved and obeyed Him and those who did not,—the former are to be immortal, the latter entirely cease to be,—He would do so very clearly and emphatically, as presenting a further powerful and almost overwhelming incentive to hearken to His words. Moreover, it is to be noted also that the conception of 'endlessness' in the abstract is

not one easily formulated or grasped, and that a doctrine of this character, assuming it to be present in His teaching, may very well prove to have been set forth in the simplest terms, rather by way of suggestion and illustration that would appeal to His hearers, than in the rigorous language of a scheme of metaphysics. The more important terms that bear upon this point are collected and will be conveniently examined together at a later stage. A few expressions only from the Synoptic Gospels call here for notice.

One of the most important passages, rather, perhaps, on the ground of what it implies than of what it directly states, is the declaration recorded in St. Matthew's Gospel (Mat 16:18) of the permanence and inviolability of Christ's Church, founded and built up as it is upon Himself. * [Note: It is strange that ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ is still sometimes referred to Peter. The Speaker, or the Evangelist who reports Him, is playing upon the name in a characteristically Oriental manner. The similarity of the sound forms to Oriental thought a real bond of connexion between the persons. The whole point of the play is lost, and the expression reduced to meaninglessness and absurdity, if Πέτρος and πέτρα are identified (cf. 1Co 10:4, and in the OT, Gen 2:23, Exo 2:10 etc.).] The Speaker can hardly be conceived as thinking of a mere temporary duration of that Church, united as it is with Him in the closest of all bonds; the destruction or annihilation of the one would involve a like fate for the other: 'the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it' now or henceforth. And if the Church is to remain, then necessarily its members collectively: for the Church *is* the members.

It may be said also that the abiding nature of Christ's words (Mat 24:35, Mar 13:31, Luk 21:33), under the circumstances of their utterance, presupposes the continued existence of intelligent receptive hearers and doers. The permanence of His words is contrasted with that which in the universe appears most permanent and unchanged, 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away' (Mar 13:31, cf. Mat 5:18, Luk 16:17); in no part or degree shall their accomplishment fail to be achieved. But this complete fulfilment does not imply the cessation of their effect upon and in those for whom they are spoken. Rather is it the beginning of a new life, which is only then perfected.

The literal demands of these passages would be satisfied by what has sometimes been termed 'racial' or 'collective' immortality; in which the race might be supposed to persist, while the individuals, each and all in turn, perished. Such an interpretation could not be ruled out of court on the ground that it is not suggested elsewhere in Christ's teaching. But a conception so remote and unusual would seem to require much more clear and definite exposition, and is hardly consistent with the numerous references to a personal and individual survival.

In a negative sense also phrases like τὸ τέλος (Mat 24:6, Mar 13:7, Luk 21:9), εἰς τέλος (Mat 10:22; Mat 24:13, Mar 13:13), ἡ συντέλεια τ. αἰῶνος (Mat 13:40; Mat 13:49; Mat 24:3) clearly do not imply an absolute end, involving annihilation or the like. They do not, of course, assert survival in any universalistic sense; but they are not altogether neutral in the matter (cf. Matthew 13 *ll. cc.*, and the interpretation that is given by Christ Himself of the parable of the Sower). The end of one era is the beginning of another, and for some at least ushers in a period of supreme blessedness (Mat 10:22; Mat 24:13, Mar 13:13).

The indications which the Synoptic Gospels afford on the subject of the comparative duration of the existence of the righteous and the wicked after death are almost wholly concerned with the significance of words like αἰώνιος (κόλασις αἰ. Mat 25:46, πῦρ αἰώνιον Mat 18:8, Mat 25:41, αἰώνιον ἁμάρτημα Mar 3:29, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα *ib.*), and will be more conveniently examined together (see below). Here it need only be said that parables such as those of the Rich Man and Lazarus, the Wise and Foolish Virgins, or the Wedding Feast, do not in themselves suggest or demand any inequality of treatment as regards the mere duration of the allotted punishment or reward; and that references to the Judgment, the Day of Judgment, or the Last Day are equally neutral, as far as direct statement is concerned. While the burning of the tares in the parable of the Wheat and the Tares (Mat 13:30), if the detail is to be pressed as anything more than the natural and appropriate setting of the story,—the legitimate and necessary end of weeds,—rather points in the direction of permanence and indestructibility. Burning is not annihilation of matter, but transformation of form. And this particular feature of the parable might admit of interpretation as implying renovation through suffering, but is hardly satisfied by any theory of absolute cessation of being. Similarly, it might be urged that the πῦρ ἄσβεστον of Mar 9:43 (cf. v. 48) implies the permanence of the fuel on which it feeds. It is clear, however, that no secure or decisive argument can be based on what are obviously allusive and metaphorical expressions.

B. St. John.—Within the Fourth Gospel, where, if anywhere in the record of our Lord's teaching, we might expect to find a reasoned and philosophical doctrine of a future life, that teaching is so entirely, or almost entirely, conveyed in connexion with a special phraseology, the leading terms of which are ζωὴ, ζωὴ αἰώνιος, and εἰς τ. αἰῶνα, that little need be said by way of anticipation of the special investigation of these terms. It is worth noting, however, at once, in view of the interpretation of these expressions which will be urged below, that every reference in St. John to a definite termination or close of a world-period is, as we saw was the case in the Synoptists, such as to presuppose and assume a continuation beyond. The conception

of an absolute end, beyond which there is nothing, is as foreign to the thought of this Gospel as to that of the others. There is a ‘last day’ (ἡ ἐσχάτη ἡμέρα, John Joh 6:39 f.; Joh 6:44; Joh 6:54; Joh 11:24; Joh 12:48, a phrase not found in the Synoptists); but it terminates one age only to usher in another more glorious. Judgment (κρίσις) again in St. John does not ordinarily await the setting up of a future tribunal; it is immediate conviction, wrought by the presence of the light. And in the one passage where it is definitely relegated to the future (Joh 5:29) the parallelism of the phraseology (ἀνάστασις κρίσεως—ἀνάστασις ζωῆς) shows that whatever threatening of suffering or retribution may lie behind the word, there is no thought of extinction, or of a final end, in the mind of the Speaker,—they that have practised ill ((Revised Version margin)) come to the resurrection equally with those that have done good. He cannot be conceived to mean that they are raised merely that forthwith, or after a longer or shorter period, they may be destroyed.

It is in St. John also that the most emphatic assertions are found—apart from the special phraseology to which reference has been made—of the abiding blessedness and freedom from ill of those who believe in Christ. ‘He that believeth in me οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ’ (Joh 11:26); he that drinks of the Christ-given water ‘οὐ μὴ διψήσῃ’ (Joh 4:14); ‘he that cometh unto me οὐ μὴ πεινάσῃ, and he that believeth on me οὐ μὴ διψήσῃ πώποτε’ (Joh 6:35). The ‘many mansions’ and the prepared place of Joh 14:2 are clearly intended to convey the assurance of more than merely temporary resting-places. Finally, the prayer that all His followers may be one, as He is one with the Father (Joh 17:11; Joh 17:21), and may be with Him where He is (Joh 17:24), implies for those who are thus united a coequal duration of existence with Himself.

For the believer, therefore, the future, thus conditioned and defined, is a life of blessedness. But there is nothing to suggest, much less to show, that the continuance of the life is dependent upon its felicity; or that these two features are other than completely independent, no necessary connexion subsisting between them which would make an eternal but unblessed life a contradiction in terms.

αἰών, αἰώνιος, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα or τοὺς αἰῶνας.—The primary significance of the term αἰών is not seriously in question. ‘Age’ or ‘period’ suggests a limited stretch of time marked by a definite close. In this sense the word is found in the Gospels, with reference to the present era under which the speaker is living, either simply or as ethically characterized by degeneracy and corruption. The cares τοῦ αἰῶνος choke

the word (Mat 13:22 || Mar 4:19); the sons of this αἰών are wiser than the sons of light (Luk 16:8); οὗτος ὁ αἰών is contrasted with the αἰών that is to follow it as ὁ μέλλωνος (Mat 12:32), or ἐκεῖνος (Luk 20:34 f.); and the latter appears again as ὁ ἐρχόμενος αἰών in Mar 10:30 || Luk 18:30, where the present is οὗτος ὁ καιρὸς. It is worthy of notice that in one of the above passages (Luk 20:35) the future αἰών is something to be gained (τυχεῖν); its nature or characteristic, therefore, was more prominent to the writer's mind than any mere question of duration. In one context, the parable of the Tares in St. Matthew, the end of the present age is definitely indicated (ἡ) συντέλεια (τοῦ) αἰῶνος (Mat 13:39 f., Mat 13:49), and the same phrase is twice employed later in the Gospel, once by the disciples with reference to the Parousia, which they assume to be synchronous with the end of the αἰών (Mat 24:3), and again by Christ Himself, when He asserts His presence with His disciples ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος (Mat 28:20).

In the last two passages especially it is clear that in no shape or form is there attached by the Speaker or His hearers to the phrase 'end of the age' the thought of a termination of personality or conscious life. The close of the one epoch marks the opening of another, into which pass without interruption the actors and participators in the present. The pledge given to the disciples of personal association with Himself, or rather of His personal association with them—an association which is already subsisting (ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι, Mat 28:20), could hardly have been couched in more emphatic or significant terms, or in words less suggestive of a possible severance, however clearly they may admit or even require the thought of a change of the conditions under which it is maintained.

αἰών is also twice used in the Gospels with reference to the past, ἀπ' αἰῶνος Luk 1:70, ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος Joh 9:32. In neither case are the words those of Christ Himself. And all, perhaps, that need be said is that the speakers, Zacharias and the man born blind respectively, employ the phrase to denote in an indefinite kind of way the whole antecedent period of human history during which the conditions of life upon the earth have been such as they now know them to be, or believe them to have been in former times.

Elsewhere in the Gospels, the word under consideration is found only in the phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, or εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. The latter occurs in Luk 1:33 and in the inserted doxology of Mat 6:13 (retained in the margin of the Revised Version). It may fairly be regarded as merely a strengthened form of the other, intermediate between that and the yet more emphatic expression εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων employed especially in the Apocalypse, and by St. Paul in doxologies. Εἰς τὸς αἰῶνα occurs once in St. Matthew and St. Luke (Mat 21:19, Luk 1:55), twice in St. Mark (Mar 3:29; Mar 11:14), and twelve times in St. John (Joh 4:14; Joh 6:51; Joh 6:58; Joh 8:35 bis. Joh 8:51 f., Joh 10:28; Joh 11:26; Joh 12:34; Joh 13:8; Joh 14:15), constituting indeed this Evangelist's sole use of the word αἰών, with the exception of the phrase above noted (Joh 9:32). Setting aside Mat 21:19 || Mar 11:14, which condemns the fig-tree to perpetual barrenness, and where μηκέτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα is a strong negation of any possible or prospective fruitfulness at any time; and the passages from St. Luke, of which the first is Messianic and expressly asserts the endlessness of the Messiah's kingdom, and the second has reference to the Divine attitude or action towards men, which also can hardly be thought of as subject to termination or change; the remainder may be classified as positive or negative. In the former, the phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα qualifies some verb expressive of continuance or life (ζῆν Joh 6:51; Joh 6:58, μένειν Joh 8:35, Joh 12:34, εἶναι Joh 14:15); in the latter it is joined with a more or less emphatic negative, and denies the possibility of the contingency to which the passage refers (οὐκ Mar 3:29, Joh 8:35; οὐ μὴ Joh 4:14; Joh 8:51 f., Joh 10:28, Joh 11:26, Joh 13:8).

Of all these passages it may be said at once that the Speaker clearly has in mind a state of things of which no reversal is by Him conceived as possible, either now or at any future time. In presence of natural death, the solemn declaration that he who believes οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (Joh 11:26) does not merely defer the date, but repudiates the possibility of anything that deserves to be called death for the believer. The bond-servant, again, whose sojourn in the house of his master comes to an end, is expressly contrasted with the son who μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (Joh 8:35); and the same expression is used of the Christ (Joh 12:34), with the same associated ideas of permanence and perpetuity. Peter rejects his Master's offer of service in washing his feet (Joh 13:8)—a rejection which lie immediately after gladly retracts—not certainly with the idea that he may accept the offer on some or any future occasion, but sincerely, and as far as his present thought is concerned, finally. And life εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (Joh 6:51; Joh 6:58) is not limited, terminable life, merely lengthened out as

compared with the present, but is a life that needs no artificial and bodily sustenance to enable it uninterruptedly to endure. The connotation of the phrase, whether on the lips of Christ Himself or employed by another, evidently implies an outlook into a future to which the thought of the writer or speaker neither assigns nor conceives it possible to assign a limit.

The same considerations will apply to the adjective *αἰώνιος*, and especially as it is used to qualify *ζωή* in a phrase which becomes a distinctive feature of St. John's Gospel and First Epistle. For the word itself the somewhat question-begging rendering 'age-long' has been offered. In such a rendering it is evident that all depends on the conception the writers had formed of the 'age,' and the associations it bore to their minds. If they thought of it as definitely terminated or terminable, then 'age-long' is equivalent to 'temporary.' If they regarded it and wrote of it without any associated idea of a limit or end, or if the context clearly intimates that no such idea would have been admitted, then so far 'age-long' is synonymous with 'immortal,' 'everlasting,' or 'eternal.' And it appears undesirable to introduce a new and ambiguous term. Apart, however, from the phrase *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*, the adjective is of rare occurrence in the Synoptic Gospels, and is not used by St. John. It is found three times in St. Matthew in association with terms expressive of suffering or retribution to be endured in the future (*τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον*, Mat 18:8; Mat 25:41; *κόλασις αἰώνιος*, Mat 26:46). St. Luke has a reference (Luk 16:9) to *τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς*, 'the eternal tabernacles,' open to those who have been far-sighted enough to secure to themselves friends while it was in their power, from whom in their own day of need they may claim favours and return in kind. And a significant and unique phrase in Mar 3:29 *ὃς δ' ἂν βλασφημήσῃ ... ἔνοχος ἐστὶν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος*, suggests far-reaching conclusions, with regard to which all that perhaps need be said in this place is that it stands here as an explanatory addition to an emphatic affirmation that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit hath not forgiveness *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*. The context, therefore, precludes an interpretation in a sense contrary to the implications of the preceding words, as though the writer might be thinking of an act of sin committed once for all, and then with all that it entailed definitely and finally set aside.

The reading *ἁμαρτήματος* is sufficiently decisively attested by the witness of \aleph^L [Note: L Bampton Lecture.] Δ 28. 33, the Latin and other versions, and is adopted by all editors. It is supported also by the Sinaitic Syriac, mutilated, however, in this verse, if the transcript (1894) may be trusted. The TR [Note: R Textus Receptus.] $\kappa\theta\iota$

σεως is found in \aleph^2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] Γ and the cursives, with one or two Latin manuscripts, and the Peshitta Syriac. The various reading $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$, C-D 13. 69. 346, would seem to be a correction of $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\eta\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ designed to introduce into the text the meaning of 'sinfulness' as distinguished from 'a sin.' Cf. H. B. Swete, *in loc.*, a not wholly satisfactory note. The true exposition seems to be given by E. P. Gould in his commentary:* [Note: Critical Commentary, 'St. Mark,' T. & T. Clark, 1896.] 'An eternal sin may be one subjecting the person to an eternal punishment, eternal in its consequences, that is. But certainly it is equally allowable to suppose that it describes the sin itself as eternal, accounting for the impossibility of the forgiveness by the permanence of the sin,—endless consequences attached to endless sin. This is the philosophy of endless punishment. Sin reacts on the nature, an act passes into a state, and the state continues. That is, eternal punishment is not a measure of God's resentment against a single sin.... It is the result of the effect of any sin, or course of sin, in fixing the sinful state beyond recovery.'

With regard to the phrase $\zeta\omega\eta\ \alpha\iota\omega\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$, there is a striking difference in its associations in the few passages in which it is found in the Synoptists, and in the more frequent use of St. John; a difference which seems to reflect the varying attitude of the writers towards the teaching of Christ. In the Synoptists the sphere of $\zeta\omega\eta\ \alpha\iota\omega\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is in the future. It is to be inherited (Mat 19:29), and to be received in the coming $\alpha\iota\omega\nu$ (Mar 10:30, Luk 18:30) in recompense for that which the disciples of Christ forego in this; which the ruler ($\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omega\nu$, Luk 18:18, Mat 19:16, Mar 10:17), or lawyer ($\nu\omicron\mu\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$, Luk 10:25) conceives that he may inherit or attain ($\sigma\chi\omega$, Mt. *l.c.*) by virtue of good deeds in the present. In St. John, on the contrary, $\zeta\omega\eta\ \alpha\iota\omega\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is a present possession. The believer has or may have it (Joh 3:36; Joh 5:24; Joh 6:47; Joh 3:15-16; Joh 6:40); and the bestowal of this gift is described as the express aim and purpose of the coming of the Son into the world and of His death, the fruit of the Father's love (Joh 3:16) and will (Joh 6:40), but conferred by the Son Himself (Joh 10:28, Joh 17:2). In one passage also where the same phrase is used, the closeness of the fellowship with Himself implied in the possession of $\zeta\omega\eta\ \alpha\iota\omega\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is mystically described as an eating of His flesh and drinking of His blood, and is associated with the resurrection at the last day (Joh 6:54). This last passage would by itself prove, what the others assume, that $\zeta\omega\eta\ \alpha\iota\omega\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$, though present, is not limited by the present. Elsewhere there is an approach to the Synoptic standpoint of a future life over against or following on that now lived, although sight seems never to be

entirely lost of the conception of ζωὴ αἰώνιος as subsisting already and now attainable. He that hateth his soul (ψυχὴ) in this world will keep it εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον (Joh 12:25); the meat (βρωσις), the gift of the Son of Man, abideth unto eternal life (Joh 6:27). The same thought recurs in Christ's words to the woman of Samaria; there it is the water, His gift, which becomes a well of water springing up unto eternal life (Joh 4:14). And, finally, in connexion with the same incident, the harvest, the ripeness of which the disciples are bidden to recognize, is laid up unto a future which is undefined in time and place; the reaper gathereth together fruit εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, and shares with the sower in a common joy (Joh 4:36).

Once also Christ appeals to the knowledge or belief of His hearers in the present reality of this eternal life; they think that they have it in the OT Scriptures, missing the spirit there, and the testimony of these Scriptures to Himself, and ascribing life to the letter (Joh 5:39). A somewhat similar thought underlies the answer of Simon Peter to Christ's question whether he and the Twelve intend to follow the example of others, and be repelled by 'hard sayings'; 'Thou hast the words of eternal life' (Joh 6:68),—words, that is to say, which in their spirit and teaching bring ζωὴν αἰώνιον to the hearers. Finally, lest, as it were, any lingering possibility or suggestion should remain of a time-limit to be understood in the phrase, or of its being confined under a merely temporal category, it is twice expressly defined in terms which are ethical and spiritual, and transcend all limitations of time or change; the Divine ἐντολή, committed by the Father to the Son and by Him transmitted to the world, is eternal life (Joh 12:50); and in similar pregnant words (Joh 17:3) ζωὴ αἰώνιον is the learning to know the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom He has sent.

All the passages in which this phrase is found in the Gospels have now been passed in review. An extension of the examination to the remaining books of the New Testament would not modify the conclusions reached, or throw fresh light upon its meaning. It is used twice by St. Luke in the Acts (Act 13:46; Act 13:48); by St. Paul in the Romans (Rom 2:7; Rom 5:21; Rom 6:22 f.), Galatians (Gal 6:8), and Pastoral Epistles (1Ti 1:16; 1Ti 6:12, Tit 1:2; Tit 3:7); by St. John himself in his First Epistle (Joh 1:2; Joh 2:25; Joh 3:15; Joh 5:11; Joh 13:20; the adjective not elsewhere), and by St. Jude (Jud 1:21). These conclusions are entirely in harmony with the results obtained from a consideration of the term αἰών, or of the adjective αἰώνιος standing by itself, ζωὴ αἰώνιος is in its significance *independent of time-limits, and may be described indifferently as either present or future*. When, moreover, the occasion offers to indicate its characteristics and meaning by definition, that definition is

framed not on the lines of time and space, as here, there, or elsewhere, now or then, but is wholly ethical, *supranatural*, belonging to the realm of the mind and spirit, and lifting up ζωὴ αἰώνιος beyond the touch of change or end, into the region of the changeless, the immortal.

At the risk, therefore, of repetition, it must again be pointed out that words and phrases which are crucial for any doctrine of immortality as taught by Christ in the Gospels, so far from implying or suggesting an absolute termination, whether nearer or more distant, to that future which the speakers or writers have in mind, seem to indicate that no such idea was ever present to them; and in some passages, which are neither isolated nor unimportant, a fair interpretation of the writer's thought in the light of the context appears to exclude the possibility of any such limit being found at any definite point or place in the 'age' towards which his gaze is directed.

ζωὴ, εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν, σώζεσθαι, σωτηρία.

There remains a group of words and phrases to be referred to, which with more or less distinctness characterize the future, or contrast it with the conditions of the present. All of them, when used in their fullest sense, imply *non-mortality*, but they do not bear directly upon the question of the duration of existence after death, which, as we have seen, has come to be the chief element in the connotation of the term 'immortality.' The chief of these is ζωὴ with its derivatives, including the phrases of which it forms a part, ζωὴ in the Gospels is not mere physical life, but is an expression for the higher life, the life which is life indeed, life in its fullest, richest aspects. Such life was in the Word (Joh 1:4); it is Christ's gift to His disciples (Joh 10:28, cf. Joh 6:33); nay, He is Himself 'the life' (Joh 11:25, Joh 14:6). It is so good a possession that to 'enter into life' is worth the sacrifice of an eye or a limb (Mat 18:8 f. || Mar 9:43; Mar 9:45). It begins after death (Joh 5:24)—not in a temporal sense, but when θάνατος as a state ceases to be; and it is a 'resurrection of life' to which the well-doers will come forth from the tomb (Joh 5:29). 'To have life in himself' is an attribute of the Father, and is His gift to the Son (Joh 5:26); and this 'life' or 'eternal life' is repeatedly stated to be the present possession of the believer (Joh 3:15 f, Joh 3:36, Joh 6:47; Joh 6:54), the gift of Christ which some of them wilfully refuse (Joh 5:40), and which the unbelieving will not see (Joh 3:36), but which is emphatically declared to be the final end of His coming into the world (Joh 10:10, cf. Joh 20:31). The words which He has spoken are ζωὴ (Joh 6:63), and His commandment is ζωὴ αἰώνιος (Joh 12:50). None of these passages suggests that the thought of a termination of the 'life' was present to the mind of the Speaker;

some are hardly compatible with such a thought, and others absolutely forbid it (e.g. Joh 1:4; Joh 5:26). This ζωή, therefore, is fittingly represented as αἰώνιος.

A similar absence of limitation will be found to characterize expressions such as σώξασθαι, σωτηρία, etc., which describe the future from the point of view of deliverance from the present, its calamities and its evils. These terms, however, are not in themselves suggestive of duration, except so far as their results are involved; and, as doctrinal terms, belong in the New Testament rather to the Epistles than to the Gospels. In the eschatological discourses, however, of the Synoptic Gospels, ‘salvation’ is described as a state to be attained by those who endure εἰς τέλος (Mat 10:22; Mat 24:13 || Mar 13:13); the saving of the life or soul (ψυχή, cf. Luk 6:9) is strikingly said to be the result of willingness to lose it for Christ’s sake (Mar 8:35 || Luk 9:24, cf. εὐρήσει αὐτήν, Mat 16:25); and in St. John the salvation of the κόσμος is the purpose of the Divine mission of the Son (Joh 3:17), the salvation of His hearers, the end of the words and teaching which He imparts (Joh 5:34). Hence ‘salvation’ is contemplated as beyond an ‘end’; τέλος is rather a crisis than a final close, the entrance into new conditions and a more gracious environment. Both thought and phraseology become meaningless if the subjects of the change are conceived as either annihilated or reduced to unconsciousness.

Agrapha. Of the ‘unwritten’ Sayings, few have interest or importance for the present subject. The most noteworthy and authentic is that which is embodied in St. Paul’s argument of 1Th 4:15-17. Whether all or any of this is intended to be a direct citation of Christ’s words must remain uncertain. The teaching of the passage is, however, founded upon a λόγος Κυρίου. And though it has in view only ‘the dead in Christ,’ and their position of privilege and priority as compared with those alive at the time of the Lord’s descent from heaven, it distinctly asserts of these that they will be ‘for ever’ (πάντοτε) with the Lord. The writer therefore contemplates for them an eternal co-existence with the Lord; and he claims that for this doctrine he has the authority of Christ Himself.

Of the Logia from Oxyrhynchus the mystical Saying, ‘Except ye fast to the world, ye shall in no wise find the kingdom of God; and except ye keep the Sabbath, ye shall not see the Father’ (*Log. 2*; Grenfell and Hunt, p. 10), may be said to imply that those who do so fast and truly keep the Sabbath will see the Father, and therefore live with Him. Of the later Logia also, which were discovered in 1903 (*Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, iv. p. 1 ff.), the Introduction, as it is named by the editors, apparently quotes

Joh 8:52—the hearer of these words ‘shall not taste of death.’ And the first and second Sayings both make reference to the Kingdom which shall be a place of rest to him who seeks and finds. These indications are all of them slight, and do not add anything to the teaching of the Gospels. But as far as they go they are in harmony with what we have found to be the constant implications in Scripture of the words of Christ and His disciples.

The most striking and suggestive feature, therefore, of all these references in the Gospels to the future, and of the doctrine which they may be understood to imply, is the absence of any indication of a termination of the new conditions which they introduce. In some instances, indeed, the writer’s statement might be regarded as colourless in this respect, and the thought and context of his words would not be directly contradicted by an assumption that these conditions were themselves temporary, and at some indefinite period superseded by others. Elsewhere the tone and context strongly support, if they do not compel, the view that the state of things contemplated was contemplated, as far as the forecast of the speaker was concerned, as permanent. In a third and most important series of passages, the same expressions phrases are directly applied to the Divine Being and to His Kingdom in such a manner as to show that no thought of a cessation or close could by any possibility have entered into the mind of the Speaker, or have been regarded by Him as conceivable.

Moreover, the change of circumstances thus introduced involves no interference with the conscious life, not, at least, to the extent of reducing it to unconsciousness. The subjects of the change are represented as speaking, feeling, and willing, with all their faculties under control and in action. Nor is there any suggestion that this condition is occasional or temporary; it is, on the other hand, tacitly assumed to be usual and a matter of course.

Further, also, most prominent and characteristic examples of this manner of regarding the future were found to be associated with the terms *αἰών* and its derivatives. This word, originally apparently denoting a definite age, marked off by beginning and end, had come to be regularly employed to denote an ‘age,’ the beginning of which was, indeed, sometimes more or less obscurely indicated, but to which the Speaker did not assign a further limit, and, in some instances, would clearly have rejected the idea of a limit as contradictory and impossible. The thought underlying these expressions is not that of a terminable period, but of a limitless progression.

The only adequate rendering of such a thought in English is by the words ‘eternal,’ ‘immortal,’ or the like. For there lies implicit in these words precisely what we have found to be the implication of *αἰώνιος*, etc., in the Gospels; viz. that the speaker

rejects the idea of a bound or limit beyond which there is nothing, or nothing for the subject of whom he is speaking; that however far off the boundary fence is in thought set up, he immediately insists that it shall be taken down, and removed farther away,—only to repeat the process as often as an attempt is made to assign a limit or define an end. This is, indeed, the only real conception which we seem able to frame of the meaning and content of such terms as immortality, eternity, etc., as they are ordinarily employed. They connote not a positive and comprehensive idea, which the mind distinctly outlines to itself as a whole, but rather the negative and indefinite one of the absence of an end; looking forth into the future, we find ourselves unable to discern a point beyond which there is an absolute blank as far as the conditions under consideration are concerned. The association of the thought of a final end with the conditions or state supposed would involve a self-contradiction, or, if we prefer to use the phrase, would be impossible. Such a conception is entirely logical and consistent, and amounts practically to defining immortality as the summation of an infinite number of intervals or spaces of time, succeeding one another without break, and receding into dim, fathomless distance.

The precise words ‘endless,’ ‘immortal,’ or ‘immortality’ do not occur in the Gospels; cf., however, Luk 1:33 ‘Of his kingdom there shall be no end,’ οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. The omission, if omission it be, is partly supplied by St. Paul, who describes the after-state of the Christian as ἀφθαρσία and ἀθανασία, ‘incorruption’ and ‘deathlessness’ (1Co 15:53 f). The latter term is shown by its use in 1Ti 6:16 (the blessed and only Potentate ... ὁ μόνος ἔχων ἀθανασίαν) to have moved far in the direction of a positive connotation.

Similar considerations apply generally to the references to this doctrine in the remaining books of the New Testament, a detailed examination of which lies outside the range of the present article. Such an examination would strengthen in detail, but would not change the character of the argument. In no instance is there a suggestion of absolute finality. The conclusion of every αἰών, for example, marks the commencement of another, accompanied by changed conditions, indeed, but not, as far as the statements and apparent train of thought carry us, by annihilation in any sense, or a destruction which involves loss of personal consciousness or life. And while the writers do not in so many words define that future into which their thought projects itself as ‘immortal’ or ‘endless,’ their attitude towards it and the phrases and descriptions which they employ are such as to negative the idea that they would or could have admitted of the drawing of a line here, there, or anywhere, beyond which absolute oblivion and death should reign. Compare Rom 1:25 ad fin., Rom 6:22 ad fin. Rom 9:5; Rom 16:26 τοῦ αἰωνίου θεοῦ, 2Co 4:18 b, 2Co 11:31, Phm 1:15, Heb 1:8; Heb 7:3; Heb 13:8; 1Pe 5:10, Rev 1:18.

(3) In passing to the third part of our inquiry, which relates to *the comprehensiveness of the life beyond the grave*, whether it is contemplated as equally endless for all, or whether a distinction is drawn as regards duration between the after-existence of the evil-doer and that of the righteous man, we are conscious of a certain reserve in description and expression on the part of the Evangelists, of a delicacy which certainly reflects the mind and teaching of the Master. The passages which refer to the future of the wicked are comparatively few in number: and the outline, as it were, of the picture presented is drawn, not, indeed, waveringly or hesitatingly, but with a light hand, as though the subject were one to which detail or elaboration were inappropriate. Reticence and brevity characterize all the utterances of Christ that bear upon the share which the evil-doers have in the life after death. Thus, while the righteous man and believer enters beyond the grave upon a renewed life, to the duration of which no limit is set, and which the hearers of Christ's words understood in this sense to be eternal, the question is justly raised whether the same statement may be made, and the same inference drawn, with regard to the future existence of those who are not righteous and do not believe. Do those who—to adopt the language of the parable—go away into the outer darkness, pass into oblivion, suffer extinction, or experience any other of the conjectural fates which have from time to time been assumed to be the lot of the wicked? or, as an alternative, may 'outer darkness' be paraphrased into 'purgatory,' on the further side of which there is light?

It may be said *in limine* that the presumption is against any such limitation of the duration of life beyond the grave in the case of one class or section only of humanity. It would require very strong evidence to enforce the acceptance of the view that terms or expressions which disown the idea of a boundary, an end, when used of the future state of the righteous, actually and of set purpose connote such an idea when they describe the lot of the wicked: or that the Speaker would confuse His audience with antitheses which were merely verbal, and possessed no underlying significance or reality. Upon this issue, again, only an examination and fair interpretation of the passages which bear upon the subject can decide. It will be found that such passages in the Gospels are few in number, though not wanting in suggestiveness.

The most significant and important passage is perhaps Mar 3:29, to which reference has already been made; and its significance does not altogether depend upon the closing words, in which the variation of text occurs. Assuming that the reading $\alpha\iota\omega\nu\iota\omicron\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\eta\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ is correct, as we are justified in doing (see above, p. 788^a), it is difficult to see what other meaning can be attached to the phrase than that of a sin the results of which are permanent. An 'act of sin' cannot be permanent or endless in execution, though it may be ceaselessly repeated; it is only in its fruits that it endures. And if $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\eta\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ can be supposed to describe 'sinfulness' in any sense,

the meaning is practically the same; for endless sinfulness necessarily involves endless retribution. The earlier part of the verse has its parallels in the two other Synoptists—

Mat 12:32 ὃς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.

Mar 3:29 ὃς δ' ἂν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀλλὰ ἔνοχος ἐστὶν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος.

Luk 12:10 τῷ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα βλαφημήσαντι οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται.

The simplest form is that of St. Luke; but it is hardly less pregnant or decisive than those of the other Evangelists. The blasphemy is *personal*, the conscious and wilful act of a conscious and responsible being; and therefore—unless the words are to be emptied of their force, and reduced to meaninglessness—the consequences are personal also, falling not on someone else, but on the blasphemer himself, for whom there is no place for forgiveness either in this ‘age’ or in that which is to come. The reason is supplied by St. Mark, and by St. Mark only,—he ‘is guilty of an eternal sin,’ is liable to its penalty, and subject to its consequences. The permanence of sin implies and necessitates the permanent impossibility of forgiveness. On the central and essential point the three reports are at one.

The significance for the doctrine of immortality of the parable or apocalypse of Mat 25:31-46, with the sentences pronounced on the ‘sheep’ and ‘goats’ and the penalties incurred, lies in the application of identical words and phrases to describe the duration of that future into which both pass from the judgment-seat. If the ζωὴ of the righteous is αἰώνιος, so is the κόλασις of the wicked (Mat 25:46); the fire into which the latter depart is αἰώνιον also (Mat 25:41), although this word is not applied to the Kingdom prepared for the righteous (Mat 25:34). It is surely an abuse of language to maintain that the Speaker designed to convey a different meaning in the two instances. If, as we have seen reason to believe, the term αἰώνιος carried with it the thought of the absence of an assigned or assignable end to that vista of the future contemplated by the Speaker, or, in other words, was practically identical in significance with our ‘immortal,’ ‘eternal,’ it cannot justly be shorn of this connotation when it is applied to the ‘punishment’ which overtakes those on the left hand of the Judge.

An expression is found in Joh 5:29 which has some bearing upon this subject. Its importance for a doctrine of universal immortality must not be overestimated; for the stress lies again upon the parallelism; but by implication, though not directly, it appears to assert the same equality of lot for all as regards the duration of the revived existence. It would not be difficult, indeed, to draw out at length a similar proof for the words ἀναστῆναι and ἀνάστασις to that which has been attempted above for αἰών and αἰώνιος; and to show that these expressions never, on the lips of Christ and in the Gospels, denote a resurrection which is the prelude to a new life leading only to a new death. On the contrary, ἀνάστασις ushers in another period and fresh conditions of existence, of which no termination is contemplated or conceivable. 'All that are in the tombs ... shall come forth.' And as the 'resurrection of life,' the portion of those who have done good, can hardly be understood to indicate a merely temporary restoration or perpetuation of existence, so no interpretation of the difficult phrase 'resurrection of judgment' will be satisfactory which postulates a distinction in this respect between the righteous and those upon whom the judgment falls.

A similar argument might not unfairly be based upon the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Luk 16:19 ff.), or the King and the Wedding Guests (Mat 22:2-14), viz. that the conditions, the data of the parable, do not in either case suggest, but rather by their tone deprecate the idea of absolute annihilation awaiting those who, on the one hand, find no place in Abraham's bosom, or, on the other, have failed to fitly provide themselves with raiment meet for the wedding feast. It would, however, be at the best no more than an *argumentum e silentio*, to which no great value could be attached. The declaration of Christ also to the Sadducees, as reported in St. Luke's Gospel, that 'all live to him' (Luk 20:38), though from one point of view susceptible of a universalistic interpretation, does seem on any construction to exclude the idea that there are some who finally cease to live in any real or intelligible sense of the word.

Ἀπολλύναι, ἀποθνήσκειν, etc. It remains to consider briefly the significance and implication of the terms employed in the Gospels to denote 'death,' 'perishing,' or 'destruction.' The principal of these are the verbs ἀπολλύναι and ἀποθνήσκειν, with the cognate nouns ἀπώλεια and θάνατος.

The uncompounded verb θνήσκειν occurs but rarely in the Gospels (Mat 2:20, Mar 15:44, Luk 7:12; Luk 8:49, Joh 11:44; Joh 19:33), and is always employed of mere physical death regarded as the termination of the activities, good or evil, of the present life. There is no thought of a future, either affirmed or denied, in the minds

of the speakers; and in none of the passages is the word on the lips of Christ or reported as used by one of His disciples. Neither is the simple verb *ἀλλύναι* found in NT Greek. And the adjective *θνητός* is used only by St. Paul (twice as an epithet of *σωμα*, Rom 6:12; Rom 8:11, once of *σάρξ*, 2Co 4:11, and in antithesis to *ἀθανασία*, 1Co 15:53 f., or to *ζωκ*, 2Co 5:4).

Ἀπώλεια is found only four times in the Gospels. In Mat 26:8 || Mar 14:4 it is the 'waste' of the ointment. For its real purpose, as conceived by the Speaker, the ointment 'perishes,' is lost; but it is clearly not annihilated, only diverted from its proper use. In Mat 7:13 the way that leads *εἰς τὴν ἀπώλειαν*, 'to destruction,' is described as broad; no indication, however, is given as to the fate of those who traverse this way when they reach *ἀπώλεια*, and it is fair, therefore, to interpret the phrase in the light of the other passages where the word occurs (in the parallel passage Luk 13:24 no mention is made of the broad way). Joh 17:12 'not one of them is lost but the son of perdition,' employs a Hebraistic mode of expression. *ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας* is one who shares the qualities, is like in character to *ἀπώλεια*, cf. *νιδν γεννις*, Mat 23:15; but though he *ἀπώλετο*, and nothing is directly stated as to his present condition or future destiny, the son of perdition is certainly not conceived as either unconscious or extinct, nor is there any suggestion that this is to be his ultimate fate.

In the Synoptic Gospels *ἀποθνήσκειν*, like *θνήσκειν*, uniformly expresses merely physical death as the cessation of physical activities. Two passages in St. Luke, however, call for special notice. In the parable referred to above, both Lazarus and the rich man 'die' (*ἀποθανεῖν*, luke Luk 16:22); but their conscious activity does not terminate, it is merely transferred to other spheres. And of the sons of God, the sons of the resurrection, it is emphatically said (Luk 20:36) that recurrence of death is for them impossible. Death, therefore, passes upon them once, but leaves them *ισάγγελοι*, 'equal to angels,' in an exalted and privileged state, no more subject to its power. The word is more common in St. John (28 times), and in accordance with the more contemplative and spiritual character of his Gospel is employed also metaphorically, though its predominant use is literal and physical. Thus the grain of wheat falls into the ground and dies (*ἀποθάνη*, Joh 12:24), but by and through death rises to a newer and richer life, and 'bears much fruit.' And for the believer death is but the beginning

of life (Joh_11:25), a life that is permanent and exposed to no return of death (πᾶς ὁ ζῶν ... οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, Joh_11:26).

Of the word θάνατος, 'death,' a similar account must be given. It is usually physical death, with no reference to or thought of that which is beyond. By the Synoptists it is employed more or less metaphorically in Mat_4:16, Luk_1:79 (quotations from Isaiah), Mat_26:38 || Mar_14:34. In Mat_20:18 || Mar_10:33 θάνατος is for Christ Himself the prelude to life. So in Joh_5:24 he that believeth ... 'hath passed out of death into life'; and later in the same Gospel Christ declares that he who keeps His word shall not see (Joh_8:51). or taste of (Joh_8:52) death εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (cf. Joh_11:26).

Finally, there is the term ἀπολλύναι, perhaps the most significant of all the expressions that describe dissolution and the cessation of a worldly estate. It is apparently employed by the Sacred Writers with a weaker as well as a stronger association. The former meaning, to 'lose,' to 'find to be missing,' is illustrated by Mat_15:24, Luk_15:4; Luk_15:8 f., Joh_6:12; Joh_18:9 and other passages. The predominant sense of the word, however, is that of 'ruin,' the precise nature or degree of which will be indicated by the context; but which consists essentially in the loss or withdrawal of capacity for the due discharge of function or duty. Thus the wine-skins 'perish' in St. Matthew (Mat_9:17), both the wine and the skins in St. Mark (Mar_2:22); but the substance of both survives, though they have become wasted and useless. So also in Joh_6:27, where the βρῶσις that 'perishes' loses its nutritive power, and ceases to be able to perform the part of food. Applied to persons the word is equivalent to 'ruined,' 'undone,' succumbing to present or prospective emergency or pressure, e.g. Mat_8:25 || Mar_4:38, Luk_8:24; Luk_15:17, Joh_11:50. In the passages most pertinent to the present inquiry a definitely spiritual 'ruin' is contemplated, the object of which is usually the ψυχή, Mat_10:28; Mat_10:39; Mat_16:25 || Mar_8:35, Luk_9:24; Luk_17:33; Luk_6:9, Joh_12:25; but the loss or ruin of the soul here is distinctly said to be preliminary to finding, saving, or (Luk_17:33) quickening it (ζωογονεῖν). The idea conveyed is again, therefore, not annihilation or destruction of being, but change of state. Here, also, the highest form of teaching is found in St. John. Every believer in Christ, or the sheep who hear His voice, are expressly declared to be permanently exempt from ruin (Joh_3:16; Joh_10:28); and while the man who 'loveth his life' (ὁ φιλῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ) is the active cause of its ruin (ἀπολλύει αὐτήν), he who hates it in this world will keep it 'unto life eternal' (Joh_12:25). Passages in which the word is used of mere physical destruction, in which usually no thought of the future is involved, must be interpreted in accordance

with this general conception (Mat_2:13; Mat_12:14; Mat_26:52, Mar_9:22, Luk_17:29 *al.*).

In the passages referred to above, Mat_10:39 and parallels, the antithesis $\delta\tau$ $\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\lambda\epsilon\sigma\eta$, $\text{or } \acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\lambda\epsilon\sigma\alpha$; $\tau\eta\nu$ $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\nu$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ is hardly to be weakened or explained away as mere *willingness* to lose. There is an actual loss incurred and completed. And the ‘ruin’ consists in the stripping off from the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ of all those qualities and connexions which have bound it to the present, and have made it what it is, material and sensual. The essential $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$, the soul transformed, is ‘saved’ by the process, and enters upon a new life. Thus the phrase is practically equivalent to St. Johns ‘loving’ and ‘hating’ (Joh_12:25).

In attempting to estimate the value of these indications with regard to the future life of the wicked, few and slight as they seem to be compared with the fulness and frequency of the references to the blessed lot of the righteous, two preliminary conditions which are essential to their right interpretation need to be borne in mind. In the first place, it was clearly far from the intention of the Teacher to lay down or elaborate any metaphysical doctrine of a future existence, such as we might reasonably expect from formal systems of philosophy. Written across His words and actions is their immediate and practical aim; and to have mystified His plain and unlettered hearers with definitions and metaphysics would have been to repel them, and defeat His own purpose. That task He must leave to successors, who in other times, and with other surroundings, will enter into His labours. To expect to find, for example, in the Gospels a well-ordered and articulated defence of natural immortality, so called, is unreasonable. Any such expectation is by the conditions of the case doomed to disappointment. Hints, pre-intimations, there will naturally be, the elucidation and development of which will be the care of after ages; but completeness, finality, from a logical or philosophic point of view, will not be found; nor a series of statements which, however fitted they might be to meet the requirements of some one or other of the later centuries, were out of touch with the thought of His own day and generation.

Again, the reticence observed as to the fate of the wicked, and the comparative infrequency of mention thereof, are entirely in harmony with what is found to be the case in the early literatures of the other great religions of the world. To expatiate on a destiny of woe and pain, or upon the duration of the sufferings of the lost, is, judging from all analogy, evidence not of an early but of a late position in the history of religious thought; and were this a marked feature of the Gospels, it would justly have laid them open to the suspicion of having at least undergone modification in the interests of later and more developed forms of belief. The hymns of the Rig-Veda, for

example, dwell much upon the blessed estate of the good who do that which is acceptable to the gods, and accordingly go hereafter to dwell with them; but they contain only slight and passing references to the lot of the evil-doers, who are hurled by Indra into darkness. The Egyptian Book of the Dead relates the varying trials and fortunes of the deceased in the nether world, through which he passes successfully by the aid of talismanic formulae and the favour of the gods; but complete silence is observed with regard to the man who at the bar of Osiris fails to pass the prescribed tests. And it is characteristic also not of primitive but of mature, if not decadent, Buddhism to set forth in vivid description and with luxuriant art the series of hells in which carefully graduated torments on an ascending scale of horror are apportioned with precision to the heinousness of the sinner's crimes. It was not otherwise in early Christianity. There, too, it was left to later ages to elaborate descriptions and to revel in details of a future life, the real circumstances of which neither human language is capable of defining nor human thought, tied down as it is to categories belonging essentially to present conditions, able to conceive. The comparative silence of the earliest authoritative documents, and of the earliest teaching so far as it has come down to us, is more eloquent and convincing than the most exhaustive and graphic statement of doctrine could ever have been.

Mohammedanism, it may be said, is an exception to this rule, and from the very beginning lavishes its descriptive powers on the torments that await the unbeliever. Islâm, however, sprang adult and full-armed from the mind of its founder, and was stereotyped in the Korân. Its doctrines have already a long history of development behind them, and, if we could trace them back to the starting-point, would probably be found in all instances to conform to the prevailing type of historic growth.

The results to which we have been led may be briefly summarized as follows:—

(1) The reality of a conscious life beyond the grave is uniformly assumed and taught by Christ Himself and by the writers of the Gospels.

(2) To this future life there is assigned no terminus or end. Rather do the phrases used suggest that the thought of a final end never presented itself to Speaker or writer as either actual or possible. And where words like τέλος, ἐσχάτη ἡμέρα, etc., are employed, the 'end' or 'last day' is obviously and patently not absolute, but marks and introduces a new beginning. No philosophical theory of immortality is formulated; such a theory is not to be expected, and was, indeed, under the circumstances hardly possible. The doctrine of the Gospels, however, of a renewed life after death to which no limit is set, and for which by virtue of the very terms employed no limit appears to be conceivable, is in the last analysis all that we mean, or can mean, by 'eternity,' 'immortality.'

(3) The writers give no countenance whatever to any theory which in respect of its duration separates the lot of the righteous from that of the wicked. Slight and indefinite, overlaid with metaphor and parable, as are the indications of the conditions under which the future life of the latter will be lived, the guarded statements made and the hints allowed to fall consistently imply that in this respect equality of treatment is meted out to all. If the ζωή of the one is αἰώνιος, and he is not to die εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, the κόλασις of the other is αἰώνιος likewise, and he is or may be guilty of a ἁμάρτημα, the fruits of which are gathered in no less a period of time than is described by the same phrase. Theories of universal restoration, of final extinction, or of any modification or combination of these find no support in the words of Christ or of His disciples as recorded in the Gospels.

The present writer shares the convictions which have been very widely felt and expressed, that the final demonstration of immortality, if and when it is given, will have to be based on broader than any merely literal or narrowly expository grounds. Christ spoke to His own age; and necessarily spoke such truths and in such a form as that age could receive and assimilate. That He exhausted, the whole range of truth in His statement, or formulated both in shape and substance all doctrine that the mind of man could ever appreciate, is as impossible to believe as it is contrary to His own express words (Joh 16:12). Nor can we doubt that if He had lived in our day, He would have delivered truths expanded and recast to meet the needs and tendencies and capacities with which He found Himself brought into touch.

That the Christian Church has been on the whole on right lines, and has been justified generally in her interpretation of the teaching of her Founder and His immediate disciples with respect to this particular doctrine, the foregoing exposition has attempted to show. The end, however, is not yet. And the ferment of thought, not less, perhaps more, characteristic of our age than of any that have preceded it, is not destined to be stilled into unconcern, or to have its efforts paralyzed, by any dogmatic creed or pronouncement of whatever authority. It claims the right to work out its own doctrinal freedom not only in the light of the Sacred Records, but under the guidance of that reason which it holds no less certainly than revelation to be an element and gift of the Divine.

Literature.—The treatises on NT Theology, or Theology in general, and the History of Doctrine contain little that is relevant. See the article on 'Eschatology' by S. D. F. Salmond in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, vol. i. p. 749 ff., and the literature there cited. Add W. N. Clarke, *Outline of Christian Theology*, Edinburgh, 1898, p. 192 ff.; William James, *Human Immortality*⁵ [Note: designates the particular edition of

the work referred] , London, 1903; J. Royce, *Conception of Immortality*, London, 1904.

A. S. Geden.

⚠️ Impediment

IMPEDIMENT.—See Disease.

⚠️ Importunity

IMPORTUNITY.—The only passage in the Authorized and Revised Versions where this word is found is Luk_11:9 ‘Because of his importunity he will arise and give him as many as he needeth.’ This rendering dates from Tindale (1526). Wyclif (1380) has ‘his contynuel axynge.’ Good modern translations are ‘persistency’ (Weymouth), ‘persistence’ [*Twentieth Century NT*]. Murray’s *New English Dict.* gives the definition ‘troublesome pertinacity in solicitation’; as early as 1460 the word has this meaning, ‘Through ymportunite off thair suyttes.’ In the companion parable, Coverdale (1535) uses the cognate adjective, Luk_18:5 ‘yet seyng this weddowe is so importune vpon me, I will delyner her.’ The original meaning of ‘importune’ was ‘inopportune,’ ‘untimely’; in Sir_32:4 ‘display not thy wisdom out of season,’ Coverdale has ‘at an importunyte.’ Intermediate stages in the growth of the later signification of the word from this root idea are marked by the now obsolete meanings ‘troublesome’ and ‘urgent.’

‘Importunity’ (Luk_11:8) is the translation of the Gr. ἀναιδεια, which signifies ‘the absence of αἰδώς’ ‘shamelessness.’ In Biblical Greek it occurs only in Sir_25:22, and is rendered ‘impudence.’ The Lat. *importunitas*, ‘unfitness,’ is found with the stronger meaning ‘insolence’ (Cic. *de Sen.* iii. 7), and is therefore a more accurate translation of ἀναιδεια than its English equivalent. But persistent asking soon becomes insolent asking. The word contains, as Trapp says, ‘a metaphor from beggars, that will not be said Nay, but are impudently importunate’ (*Com. in loc.*). Cowper uses the word (*Task*, iv. 414) in an instructive context:

‘Knaves ... liberal of their aid

To clam’rous importunity in rags.’

To bring out the striking contrast which our Lord's parable suggests, it is necessary to show that persistence in asking becomes those who know that prayer is never troublesome to God, and never out of season. He who 'will not he said Nay,' and he alone, has learnt the secret of prevailing prayer. Wright notes (*Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek*, p. 243) that St. Luke 'three times uses bad men to represent God, or to be examples to us: (1) here, (2) the unjust steward, (3) the unjust judge.'

J. G. Tasker.

⚡Impossibility

IMPOSSIBILITY.—The modern mind flatters itself upon its frank recognition of impossibility in the world of nature. There is also an impotence of faith which is content to allow impossibility in the sphere of grace. Both these tendencies to a lazy acquiescence in a fancied inevitable are out of touch with the gospel of Christ. There is, of course, such essential impossibility as that of a good tree bearing bad fruit (Mat 7:18). And there is the practical impossibility of a house divided against itself escaping ruin (Mar 3:25). But the range of impossibility in the world of nature and in the sphere of grace is narrowed to evanescence by the faith of the Christian disciple. A mustard-seed of faith will remove a mountain (Mat 17:20). God is able to save to the uttermost (Luk 18:27), though it seems like the passage of a camel through a needle's eye for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of heaven (Mat 19:24, Mar 10:25). It is through Christ, the Son of God become the Son of Man, that all is possible and nothing impossible (Joh 15:5, Mar 9:23). He Himself showed it in the supreme triumph of the Resurrection, when the tomb had been sealed so that escape might be impossible (Mat 27:66). The command over nature displayed in the stilling of the storm (Mar 4:39) and in the healing of the woman with the issue of blood (Mat 9:21, Mar 5:28) is at the service of faith and prayer. The poor leper lost his despair in faith, and was rewarded (Luk 5:12). The blind received sight, because through their faith human impossibility was swallowed up by Divine omnipotence (Mat 9:28). Infinite resources, acknowledging no bounds of impossibility, are within reach of the earnest childlike faith the Lord approves (Mar 11:23, Luk 17:6). Such bright and uplifting lessons are remote from the gloomy and depressing problem of evil. There is, indeed, an undercurrent of impossibility in the stream of this world's development. 'It is impossible but that occasions of stumbling should come' (Luk 17:1). But this species of impossibility we are not to dwell upon too long. 'The redemption draws nigh' (Luk 21:28).

Literature.—Trench, *Miracles*¹⁰ [Note: 0 designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 9 ff.; *Expos. Times*, iv. [1892] p. 1ff.; *Expositor*, i. ix. [1879] p. 307ff.,

ii. viii. [1884] p. 207ff.; Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 220ff.; Clarke, *Outline of Christian Theology*, p. 85 ff.

W. B. Frankland.

⚠️ Impotence

IMPOTENCE.—The single instance of our Lord's miracles specifically classified under this head is recorded in Joh 5:2-9, where the sufferer is described as ὁ ἀσθενῶν (Authorized Version 'the impotent man,' Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'the sick man'). The features of the case are its long continuance (for thirty-eight years); and the association of the man with the multitude of infirm and diseased people gathered round the Pool of Bethesda (wh. see). Of the nature of the ailment we have no evidence. It has been thought to be palsy, but Bennett (*Diseases of the Bible*) considers this doubtful. The long duration of the disease is against its being identified with *locomotor ataxia*. It may have been some chronic wasting disease having its origin in an enfeebled or disorganized nervous system.

The chief feature of the healing is the fact that Jesus begins the process of restoration by dealing with the hopeless condition induced and established by thirty-eight years of suffering, and by the repeated dashing to the ground of slowly-rising hopes. 'Wouldest thou be made whole?' our Lord asked, appealing to the last flicker of expectation evinced by his remaining still at the healing pool, and calling it out into new vigour and consciousness.

Another significant feature is the apparent association in the mind of Jesus of this infirmity with sin, either the sin of the sufferer or the sinfulness of the race (Joh 5:14). A similar association is found in the case recorded in Mat 9:1-8, Mar 2:1-12, Luk 5:17-26 (see art. Paralysis). It cannot be definitely asserted that Jesus marked personal sin as the root-cause of disease in these cases, though the inference is not altogether unwarranted from the narratives. But it is at least evident that our Lord did habitually recognize the close connexion between personal and racial sinfulness and all manner of disease and sickness. While carefully guarding Himself from attributing all sickness and weakness to sin (Joh 9:1-3), He yet declared the essential alliance of sin with all kinds of bodily disorder. 'Sins of the flesh,' as commonly understood, are notoriously responsible for many of mankind's worst diseases and infirmities; and the Apostolic catalogue of these sins includes not only adultery, uncleanness, murder, drunkenness, and revellings, but also hatred, variance, wrath, strife, envyings, and covetousness (Gal 5:19-21, Col 3:5, Eph 5:3).

Our Lord's list of sins that defile and destroy the body begins with 'evil thoughts' and ends with moral stupidity or foolishness (Mar_7:22, ἀφροσύνη).

Another case which must probably be included here is that of the woman with a spirit of infirmity (Luk_13:11-27). The features here are the Evangelist's description of the ailment as πνεῦμα ἔχουσα ἀσθενείας, the lengthened prevalence of the trouble (for eighteen years), and the completeness of the inability to raise herself. The description is evidently from a competent hand. The woman was bowed and crouched together (ἢ συγκύπτουσα), and was in no wise able to lift herself up. The inability was εἰς τὸ παντελές (cf. Heb_7:25, where the ability of the ever-living Christ to save mankind is also εἰς τὸ παντελές). The infirmity, however, did not debar the sufferer from attending the synagogue. The ailment may have been surgical—a gradual distortion and permanent bending, increased by old age, of the spinal column, such as in many cases is due to continual bending in field labour or in the bearing of heavy burdens. Bennett suggests 'the gradual wasting and relaxation of muscles and ligaments of the back by which the trunk is held erect, so that the body falls forward without any disease of brain or cord or mental impairment.' But it may not improperly be rather classified as due at least in part to some morbid mental condition such as hysteria. This seems to be indicated not obscurely by the description given, as a *spirit of infirmity*.

The reference of our Lord to Satan as binding the woman is not to be understood as pointing to possession, although it may have been a reflexion of the current idea that all bodily deformity was due to demonic agency—in which case the description is due to the Evangelist rather than to Jesus. But most probably it indicates our Lord's view of the infirmity as being part of that widespread calamity and curse that lies upon the whole race, of which complex coil *Satan* is the summary and representative.

The features of the healing are: (1) The Divine compassion expressed in our Lord's laying His hand upon the woman as He spoke the word of hope and deliverance; (2) His profound sense that this suffering and weakness, this crouching spirit, were completely foreign to the will of God (Heb_7:16); and (3) His steadfast refusal to allow any pedantic Sabbath rules to stand in the way of His relief of suffering humanity. The last fact is dominant in the whole narrative, and consequently the other features and the healing are only casually reported.

T. H. Wright.

IN (ἐν, εἰς, κατὰ, ἐπί, πρόχ, διά, ἔσω).—The word is prevailingly used in its primary meaning of position in place, but it frequently follows the Greek ἐν in its more or less figurative ramifications of meaning. It is also employed more or less accurately to translate various other prepositions which convey a slightly different *nuance* of significance. In the present article we shall follow the rendering of the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, where the use of the prepositions is more consistent and precise, as well as more conformed to the modern usage, than in the Authorized Version. (For illustration of the wider use of ‘in’ common in the Elizabethan period, cf. Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible, art. ‘In’).

I. As translation of ἐν, the word indicates:

1. *Local* relations: (a) ‘in,’ ‘at,’ or ‘on,’ of simple locality (Mat 2:1 ‘in Bethlehem,’ Mat 24:40 ‘in the field,’ Joh 4:20 ‘in this mountain’); (b) that with which one is covered or clothed (Mar 12:38 ‘walk in long robes,’ Mat 7:15 ‘in sheep’s clothing,’ Mat 11:21 ‘repented in sackcloth and ashes,’ Joh 20:12 ‘two angels in white’); (c) direct cohesion (Joh 15:4 ‘except it abide in the vine’); (d) position in a writing or book (Mat 21:42 ‘in the scriptures,’ Mar 1:2 ‘in Isaiah,’ Luk 20:42 ‘in the book of Psalms’).

2. *Temporal* relations—the point or space of time when, or within which, anything occurs (Mat 22:18 ‘in the resurrection,’ Mat 10:15 etc. ‘in the day of judgment’—the Authorized Version has also ‘at the day of judgment,’ Luk 9:36 ‘in those days,’ Joh 2:19 ‘in three days I will raise it up’).

3. *Figurative and personal* relations:

(a) Indicating a *person*: (α) conceived as the sphere where a certain quality or state of mind is found (Mat 6:23 ‘the light that is in thee,’ Mar 9:50 ‘have salt in yourselves,’ and similarly Mat 21:42 ‘marvellous in our eyes,’ Mat 5:28 ‘committed adultery in his heart,’ Mar 11:23 ‘doubt in his heart’); or (β) in reference to whom another stands in a certain attitude (Mat 3:17 ‘in whom I am well pleased,’ Mat 11:6 ‘whosoever shall not be offended in me’).

(b) *Of the state or condition, manner or circumstance, range or sphere in which a person is or acts*: (α) state or condition (Mat 4:16 ‘the people which sat in darkness,’ Luk 1:75 ‘serve him in holiness and righteousness,’ Joh 4:23 ‘worship in spirit and truth,’ Mat 21:22 ‘ask in prayer’); (β) manner (Mat 13:3 ‘in parables’); (γ) occasion (Mat 22:15 ‘ensnare him in talk,’ Luk 23:31 ‘if they do this in the green tree,’

Luk 24:35 ‘in the breaking of bread’); (δ) surrounding accompaniment (Mat 6:29 ‘Solomon in all his glory,’ Mat 16:28 ‘coming in his kingdom,’ Mat 16:27 ‘in the glory of his Father’); (ε) range or sphere (Joh 8:21 ‘die in your sins,’ Mar 1:15 ‘believe in the gospel’ will also belong to this head, unless we admit that this is an exceptional use of πιστεύω with ἐν. The LXX Septuagint almost invariably construes the verb with the dative, the NT writers with εἰς or ἐπί. Probably therefore the verb is used here absolutely, and ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ marks the sphere within which faith is to be exercised. The only other instance of πιστεύω followed by ἐν in the NT is Joh 3:15, which the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 translates ‘that whosoever believeth may in him have eternal life’). For ἐν with ὄνομα see below.

(c) Of the *means or instrument, or personal agency* employed, where a simple dative might have been used instead of ἐν (Mat 3:11 ‘I baptize you with [(Revised Version margin) ‘in’] water’; cf. Luk 3:16, where the simple dative is used; Mar 9:34 ‘By [(Revised Version margin) ‘In’] the prince of the devils casteth he out devils’; in other cases ‘with’ is used as translation, as Luk 22:49 ‘shall we smite with (ἐν) the sword?’).

(d) Of *persons inherently joined and connected*, where the completest intimacy conceivable is expressed; employed with noticeable frequency in the writings of St. Paul and the Fourth Gospel, to mark the close fellowship between the Christian and Christ (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἐν Κυρίῳ, ἐν Χριστῷ, Rom 8:1; Rom 16:11; Rom 12:5; Rom 16:7; μένειν ἐν ἐμοί, Joh 6:56; Joh 15:4-5; cf. 1Jn 2:5-6; 1Jn 2:24; 1Jn 2:27-28 ἐν αὐτῷ εἶναι, ἐν τῷ νίῳ, ἐν αὐτῷ μένειν), between the Christian or Christ and God (ἐν θεῷ, ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, 1Th 1:1, Col 3:3, Joh 3:21; Joh 10:38; Joh 14:20), or between the Christian and the Spirit (ἐν πνεύματι εἶναι, Rom 8:9, 1Co 12:13; cf. Mat 22:43, Luk 2:27). The very repetition of such unusual expressions indicates that the thought was a favourite one in Pauline and Johannine theology. For the determination of the meaning, special weight should be attached to the fact that complementary expressions are used repeatedly—Χριστὸς ἐν τινι, πνεῦμα ἐν τινι, πατὴρ ἐν τινι (Rom 8:9-10, 2Co 13:5, Gal 2:20, Joh 10:38; Joh 14:20; Joh 15:4-5; Joh 17:21-23). The employment of these parallel expressions points to a relation of the most intimate communion; and the only question is how this spiritual communion is to be conceived. Deissmann, who has carefully sifted the material relating to the

phrase ἐν Χριστῷ, insists that the translation ‘in fellowship with Christ’ does not quite adequately convey the concrete thought of St. Paul. He favours the view that the ἐν here retains its literal and local significance; the Christian lives in the element Christ, somewhat in the same way as animals live in the air, or fishes in the water, or the roots of plants in the earth. He notices the parallel use of ἐν Χριστῷ and Χριστός ἐν τινι, with ἐν πνεύματι and πνεῦμα ἐν τινι, and argues that as the last phrase would be naturally understood in the most literal local sense, of one within whom the invisible powers of the Spirit resided, so in the phrases relative to Christ, the living pneumatic Christ of faith, the same local reference is implied. Or, again, the phrase ἐν θεῷ (1Th 1:1, Col 3:3; Act 17:28 ‘In him we live and move and have our being’) expresses the thought that God is the element in which we live, implying the local conception of a Divine περιχώρησις. From such analogies Deissmann is inclined to accept the most literal and local interpretation of St. Paul’s favourite phrase; and he believes that if we keep in mind the equation Χριστός = πνεῦμα, Christ the everliving Divine Spirit, the conception of real locality will not appear improbable. This interpretation certainly presses the literal meaning of ἐν too far; it tends to dissolve St. Paul’s mystic idea of union into a semi-physical relation, and so to destroy the moral and spiritual basis of faith. The spiritual presence of Christ is indeed *pictured* as a local nearness of relation; yet St. Paul elsewhere clearly distinguishes between the spiritual nearness of present fellowship with Christ and the future local fellowship with (σύν or πρὸς) Christ in the life to come (1Th 4:17, Php 1:23, 2Co 5:8). Even while ‘absent from the Lord,’ St. Paul is ἐν Χριστῷ, *i.e.* in spiritual but not local union. The implied ἐν θεῷ in Act 17:28 ‘In him we live and move and have our being,’ is scarcely adducible as an analogy, since it refers rather to the natural basis of existence than to the spiritual ground, The Johannine phrases already cited (μένειν ἐν ἐμοί; ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ μου, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν ἐμοί, κἀγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν) contain substantially the same thought as the Pauline ἐν Χριστῷ; and in these, in spite of the local figure employed, the idea is clearly not that of local inherence, but of spiritual inherence or communion. The mystic realism of the Pauline and Johannine phrases is rather to be found in the fact that they approach the thought of a *real identification* with the Logos or the pneumatic Christ. The life Divine incorporates itself in the Christian; the Spirit of Christ or of God takes the place of the human spirit, and is *individualized* in the life of believers. This idea of essential spiritual (*mystica, hypostatica*) union alone does justice to those passages where the union of believers with Christ, and even with one another, finds sublimest expression (Joh 17:21-23, 1Co 6:17; 1Co 12:13). But

while this thought of vital union is the central and original conception of the phrase used by St. Paul, the context often indicates some variety in the shades of meaning. Thus Rom_14:14 'I am persuaded in the Lord Jesus,' i.e. *in virtue of that fellowship*; Php_2:29 'Receive him in the Lord,' i.e. *in the spirit* of such fellowship; it is often used as a favourite expression for 'Christian'—Rom_16:9-11; while in other cases the relationship referred to is that between Christ and the Father; 1Th_5:18 'this is the will of God in Christ Jesus'; 2Co_5:19 'God was in Christ reconciling the world.'

II. The word is also used to translate other prepositions in the following senses:

διὰ, 'within' a space of time (Mat_26:61 'build it in three days').

κατά, 'throughout,' 'according to' (Luk_15:14 'a famine in that land,' Mat_1:20 'in a dream').

πρός, 'towards,' *direction* (Luk_12:3 'spoken in the ear').

ἔσω, adverb, *within* (Mat_26:58 'entered in').

ἐπί, 'on,' 'upon,' 'over.' The Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 has followed the more restricted use of 'in' in many cases, and substituted 'on,' 'upon,' 'at,' 'over,' 'by,' 'unto,' 'to' (Mat_6:10 'thy will be done in earth' [Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'on earth'], 18:16 'in [Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'at'] the mouth of two or three witnesses,' 2:22 'reigning in [Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'over'] Judaea,' 21:19 'in [Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'by'] the way,' 13:14 'in [Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'unto'] them is fulfilled the prophecy,' Mar_5:33 'knowing what was done in [Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'to'] her'); but in some cases 'in' is retained, where English idiom requires it, and where the sense is not liable to be mistaken (with the genitive, Mar_8:4 'in the wilderness' [Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'in a desert place'], 11:4 'in a place where two ways met' [Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'in the open street'], and, with the dative, Mat_14:8 'in a charger,' Mar_10:24 'trust in riches,' Luk_18:9 'trusted in themselves that they were righteous,' i.e. rested their confidence of being righteous upon themselves). For ἐπί with ὄνομα see below.

εἰς, 'into,' 'with reference to,' 'with a view to': (a) = 'into,' locally or figuratively, often after verbs of rest, where previous motion and direction are implied (Mat_2:23 'came and dwelt in a city,' Joh_9:7 'go wash in the pool,' Mat_10:27 'what ye hear in the ear,' Mat_13:33 'hid in three measures of meal,' Mar_1:9 'baptized in the

Jordan,' Mar 5:34 'go in peace,' Joh 1:18 'which is in the bosom of the Father'—εἰς τὸν κόλπον—*i.e.* placed in the Father's bosom and there abiding); (b) = 'with respect to,' 'with a view to' (Luk 22:19 'in remembrance of me,' Luk 16:8 'wiser in their generation' [Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'for their generation']). After πιστεῦω, 'believe,' εἰς is largely used (Mat 18:6, Joh 1:12; Joh 2:23; Joh 3:18 etc.) = 'in' or 'on' in Authorized Version, in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 invariably 'on'; it implies the direction in which the believing soul turns, the fellowship into which it enters. Specially noteworthy is the use of εἰς ἐπί, and ἐν with ὄνομα. While the Synoptists commonly employ ἐπί or εἰς or the simple dative, I and rarely use ἐν except in the phrase, 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord' (Mat 21:9; Mat 23:39, Mar 11:9, Luk 13:35; Luk 19:38), St. Paul and the Fourth Gospel prevalingly employ ἐν, and use εἰς only after πιστεῦω, or βαπτίζω. The prepositions have their own *nuance* of meaning; the Synoptic ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι μου (Mat 18:5; Mat 24:5, Mar 9:37; Mar 9:39 etc.) indicates *dependence* of some one on another, the authority on which one leans; εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, *in reference to*, or *in view of*, what the name imports (Mat 10:41 'receive a prophet in the name of a prophet'=in view of his prophetic character or function, Mat 18:20 'two or three gathered together in my name'=not, *by My authority*, but, *in view of My name*, with the viewer honouring Me; and ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, *by authority*, clothed with the commission, of some one (Mat 21:9 'cometh in the name of the Lord'), or even *by the use of the name*, as contrasted with the authority (Mar 9:38 'we saw one casting out devils in thy name,' *i.e.* using the name of Jesus as a Jewish exorcist might). The very obvious preference which St. Paul and the Fourth Gospel show for ἐν and the corresponding εἰς may well be connected with the idea of *intimate mystic communion* which influences all their religious thought. In the great majority of cases ἐν ὀνόματι indicates not so much the authority, as the *union and fellowship* on which the authority is founded (Joh 17:12 'I kept them in thy name,' Joh 20:31 'that believing ye may have life in his name,' 1Co 6:11 'justified in the name of the Lord Jesus,' where ἐν has the same pregnant meaning as in the phrase ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ); and εἰς τὸ ὄνομα after πιστεῦω and βαπτίζω likewise indicates the communion into which the baptized believer enters (Joh 2:23 'many believed εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ,' Rom 6:3, Gal 3:27 'baptized into Christ'; so probably Mat 28:19 'baptizing them into the name of the Father,' etc.).

In one or two cases 'in' is used to translate ἐκ and μετά, but the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 renders these more precisely 'from' and 'with.' It is also used as part-translation where a single Greek word is rendered by a phrase (Joh_8:4; Joh_2:20, Luk_10:34; Luk_16:19 etc.).

Literature.—Besides commentaries on the Gospels, see Moulton, *Grammar of NT Greek*; Grimm-Thayer, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*; H. Cremer, *Bibl.-Theol. Lex. of the NT*, s.vv. ὄνομα, βαπτίζω, πιστεύω; Abbot, *Shakespearian Grammar*; A. Deissmann, *Die NT Formel 'in Christo Jesu.'*

J. Dick Fleming.

✠ Incarnation

INCARNATION

Introduction.—The idea of union with God: (1) in the ethnic faiths; (2) in Greek philosophy—(a) the Stoics, (b) Philo; (3) in the religion of Israel.

The message of Christianity—Union with God in the Person of Christ.

A. The Character of Christ.—

1. Perfect goodness.

(1) Relation to God: (a) perfect knowledge, (b) perfect love.

(2) Relation to men: perfect knowledge and love.

2. Absolute sinlessness: evidence of contemporaries; His own consciousness; inference as to His Person.

B. The self-witness of Jesus: the method of His self-disclosure.

i. His claims:

1. Teacher: (1) the solitariness of the office, (2) the note of authority, (3) the originality of the teaching, (4) the future of the teaching.

2. Legislator.
3. Messiah: His conception of Messiahship. Illustrative passages: (1) the Baptism, (2) the sermon at Nazareth, (3) the reply to John the Baptist, (4) the estimate of John the Baptist, (5) the threefold call of the disciples, (6) the answer to Peter, (7) later or more explicit announcements.
4. Saviour: (1) the function, bestowal of forgiveness and of life; (2) the response, personal trust.
5. Lord.
6. Worker of Miracles.
7. Creator of the New Israel.
8. Judge.

ii. His self-designations.

1. Son of Man: (1) Whence did Jesus derive the title? (2) How did He use it? (3) What does He reveal as to His own Person in it?
2. Son of God: (1) use by demoniacs, (2) use by high priest, (3) ascription by Peter, (4) our Lord's use, (5) Divine attestation.

Inference as to the constitution of our Lord's Person.

C. The witness of the Apostles.

The primary fact, a living experience. Then, the Christologies.

i. The earlier chapters in the Acts of the Apostles.

ii. The minor Christologies:

1. James.
2. First Epistle of Peter.
3. Jude and 2 Peter.

4. Apocalypse.
- iii. The Christology of St. Paul: (a) its origin in his experience, (b) its relation to the common belief of the Church, (c) its development.
 1. Christ in His relation to God.
 2. Christ in His relation to men.
 3. Christ in His relation to the Cosmos.
- iv. Hebrews.
- v. Fourth Gospel: Prologue, use of the term Logos.

Conclusion and Outlook: Christ known in history and experience as God and Man.

1. The Person of Christ, the solution of the problem of union with God.
2. The Person of Christ, a problem for faith. The knowableness of Christ.
 - (1) Christ known as God
 - (2) Christ known as Man.
 - (a) The origin of His earthly life.
 - (b) The relation of the human and Divine aspects of His personality.
Theories under control of dualism. Psychological theories.

Literature.

Introduction.—Christian theology has employed many ruling ideas in order that, by means of them, it might harmonize and systematize the mass of material presented in Scripture and in experience. Each of these, e.g. ‘the Fatherhood of God,’ or ‘the Kingdom of God,’ has meaning and value; but they all lie within the supreme and commanding truth, which is the declaration of Christianity, viz. union with God. This truth has both a *personal* and a *cosmic* aspect. God is *the life of man*. Only as man thinks the Divine thoughts, wills the Divine will, and acts in the Divine strength, does he reach the truth of his own nature, or realize his ideal self. When man is most truly himself, he finds himself to be a partaker of the Divine nature; and what he is most profoundly conscious of is not himself, but the God in whom he lives, who is the

source of all that is most truly human in his personal activities. The end, in attaining which life and satisfaction for the individual and for the race are to be found, is God. God is also *the life of the universe*. Christian theology has thrown off the blight of the old Deism, listens with delight to the expositions of Science, and names the thought, reason, law, life, force, whose operations science can trace, but whose essence she can never define, God, the same God who is the life of man. Between the power manifest in the physical universe and the power operative in the spiritual sphere there is no opposition. Both are expressions of the same Divine energy.

(1) What is thus stated as a Christian doctrine is found to be present either implicitly or explicitly in all the great productions of the human spirit, which are also, most surely, productions of the Divine Spirit, as it impels and quickens the mind of man. Union with God is at once the presupposition and the promise of the great religions, which have awakened the emotions and determined the aspirations of men.

Therianthropic polytheism, as in the religion of Egypt, however gross and repulsive it may seem to be, finds its strength in the demand for vital union with the Divine source of life. Anthropomorphic polytheism, as in the religion of Greece, even though its religious aspect may be overlaid by its aesthetic beauty, has yet its roots in the elemental demand for union with the Divine principle of being. In those religions which for good or evil have recoiled from all contact with space and time, as in the pantheism which is the substratum even to-day of the Hindu consciousness, the demand has become clear and passionste. For this purpose shrines are multiplied and austerities practised, that the soul of the worshipper may be united with the God, and so he carried on the tide of a lesser Divine life to the Diviner ocean of absolute Being. The whole field of Comparative Religion, from polydemonism up to the highest ethical and universal religions, might be laid under contribution to illustrate and confirm the conclusion that the deepest passion of the human heart has ever been union with God.

(2) The idea of union with God is, further, the presupposition and the ruling category of philosophic thought. To think at all, implies that there is present to the mind the ideal of a unity *in* and *to* which the manifold details of the universe exist. Philosophy is simply the verification and application of this ideal. Philosophy, accordingly, however great its quarrel may be with any existing religion, is itself fundamentally religious. It seeks to accomplish, in thought and for thinkers, the harmonizing of all reality in and with God.

This is the effort of early Greek thought, though as yet the distinction of spiritual and material had scarcely emerged. From Xenophanes, with his assertion that nothing is save Being, and Heraclitus, with his counter assertion that all is flux, the problem of the higher synthesis is handed on to thinkers who, philosophizing imperially, seek to

exhibit the ultimate unity of the universe as 'the Good,' or 'Thought of Thought.' From them, again, it has descended, in ever deepening complexity, to the days when the absolute idealism of Hegel is met by the demand to do justice to the reality and independence of the Self. And, in general, union with God is the need and aspiration of the human spirit. The deepest fact regarding human personality is that it is imperfect even in the broadest-minded, largest-hearted specimens of our race, and that consequently, in spite of its intense consciousness of itself, the human self is ill at ease till it enters into the life of the universal Self, and becomes its organ and its reproduction. This fact forces its way to intense conviction and impassioned utterance in every human family which has reached a certain stage of spiritual culture. In India the date may be picturesquely fixed in Buddha's 'great renunciation.' For the Western world the hour had come in the 1st cent. of our era. Two systems, the one born on Greek soil, the other on Jewish, occupied the minds of educated men, and supplied them with the instruments of thought.

(a) One was Stoicism. The systems of Plato and Aristotle had been pierced by dualism, which these masters had sought in vain to overcome. Their supreme merit is, that they did not disguise the intensity of the opposition between the rational and the irrational, between form and matter. To Stoicism, speculation is growing weary of the effort to heal this schism of the universe, and is hoping to make things easy for itself by seizing one of the opposing elements, and making that supreme. The Universal, the Rational, is the ultimate principle. Differences, the obstinate facts of a world which contains so much that is evil and irrational, are not so much resolved or harmonized with the supreme good, as resolutely denied or ignored. Stoicism begins at the furthest extreme from the universal, in an intense individualism. It directs the individual to turn away from a political sphere which has no longer a true, satisfying life to offer him, and to turn inward on himself. It promises, however, that there, in the inner world of his spirit, he will find a rational universal element which is identical with the life and being of the universe. Thus, as the Master of Balliol has pointed out (*Theol. in Gr. Philos.*, Lect. xvii.), Stoicism passed by one step from individualism to pantheism. It laid passionate hold on the conception of one all-embracing principle, one all-comprehensive, ever victorious good. High above the world, with its evil and its irrationality, is the realm of truth and goodness. To it the good belong. The message of Stoicism accordingly is, 'Live in accordance with this Reason, or Logos, which is immanent in the universe and germinally present in every man.' Such a faith as this was bound to have great issues, both in lives made sublime by cherishing it, and in wider achievements. The benefits conferred by Stoicism on civilization are patent and imperishable. At the same time, simply because it was no more than faith in an idea, it was bound to fail. Its most strenuous exponents toiled at what they knew was a hopeless task, and though they carried their burden nobly, their hearts were pierced with the sorrow of their failure. Belief in a purpose which links all the discords of the world into one plan, conquers all things evil, and makes

them subservient to good, requires some surer basis than the meditations of a philosopher, however true or noble these may be. The failure of Stoicism is obvious now; but in the Hellenic world, in the early years of the Roman Empire, it permeated educated society like an atmosphere, and supplied thinking men with a point of view whence they might look out on life not wholly dismayed or despairing.

(b) The other system, which expresses the demand of the age for union with God, and which helps us to understand the attitude of the Greek mind toward Christianity, when it came forth with its great message of reconciliation accomplished, was that which originated with Philo, and which at a later stage, as elaborated by Plotinus, presented itself as a rival to Christianity. Philo's idea of God is Jewish only in name. It is essentially Greek; and yet it is Greek with a difference. The 'idea' of Plato and the 'pure form' of Aristotle have alike proved incapable of gathering into one the diverse elements of the universe. Philo rises not only above the anthropomorphism of the OT, but even above the intellectualism of Greek philosophy. God is indescribable by any forms of thought. Everything which could determine His being must be laid aside, for to determine is to limit. God is thus the indeterminable. To Him no predicates apply. Philo's dualism is thus wider and deeper than that of the Greek thinkers. It is a dualism, not between God conceived as pure thought and the world condemned as material, but between the transcendent God who is too high to be expressed in the loftiest category of thought and the realm of the finite as such. His problem, accordingly, is to find a medium of transition from this remote transcendent God to the time and space world. This bridge, if we may so describe it, Philo built of elements borrowed both from Judaism and from Greek philosophy. In Jewish theology, as the ethical qualities of God are subordinated to the supposed majesty of His transcendence, Divine acts are attributed to personified metaphysical properties. In particular, there is a tendency to hypostatize the Word of God and to ascribe to it almost as to a person the functions of creation and of judgment. At the same time Philo, as a student of Greek philosophy, found in Stoicism the conception of the Logos or immanent reason of the universe. From this twofold attitude of mind, Jewish and Greek, Philo reached the conception of a principle which is Divine and yet distinct from God, which serves as mediator between the transcendent God and the material world. To this principle he gave the name Logos, which thus gathered to itself the import of the double lineage of thought from which it is descended, and thus to Jew and Greek alike came laden with not entirely dissimilar associations. This famous designation stands as the symbol of the highest effort the mind of man has ever made to reach a synthesis of the seemingly discordant elements of the universe, and to discover a medium whereby the spirit of man can ascend into union with the distant incomprehensible Deity. The situation in the 1st cent. is not adequately described by saying that a great many individuals were adherents of the Stoic philosophy, or of the Alexandrian theology; rather must we imagine an intellectual atmosphere full of the speculations which find a shorthand expression in the term Logos. This phrase is

continually on the lips of men. It tells at once of what they sought and of what they thought they had found. Any new message coming to such a world must reckon with this phrase and all it stood for. That the Logos doctrine, whether in its Stoic or Philonic aspect, failed to solve the problem which awakened self-consciousness was stating so fully, and failed to regenerate either the individual or society, is the obvious fact. The reason of its failure is that the reconciliation which it offers is in idea merely, not in historic fact; in thought, and not in life. The opposition between God and the world is so stated as to make the conquest of it not merely difficult, but impossible. On the one side is God, conceived as pure thought, or as something still more remote, ethereal, indescribable. On the other is the universe of matter, in which man is immersed, finding in his body and its relations with the material world his sepulchre and his shame. How shall these two ever meet? The Logos bridge which God throws across the gulf cannot reach to the other, the lower side. The Logos is too ethereal, too Divine, to take to itself any particle of the material world, or to redeem any life which is bound up with matter. Man, for his part, cannot reach, stretch or leap as he will, even the extremity of that gleaming bridge. Matter will not be so easily got rid of. In the semi-physical ecstasy, which was man's last effort to reach the confines of the spiritual world, the flesh found itself still the victor. God and man belong to too disparate universes. They cannot be at one.

(3) In order to complete even so hasty a sketch of the spiritual situation in the Hellenic-Roman world at the advent of Christianity, it is necessary to note the fresh and more hopeful point of view presented by the religion of Israel. (a) Its presupposition is not the contrast, but the affinity of God and man. On the one hand, God is like man. Anthropomorphism is not false, for human nature is the reflex of the Divine, and the attributes of man do therefore, inadequately but not falsely, represent the attributes of God. On the other hand, man is like God, capable of communion with Him, as one person is with another, finding in that fellowship his true life. The Greek dualism of God and the universe, of form and matter, is unknown to the OT. Whatever mediation is wanted is found in man himself, who is creation's crown, to whom nature is bound by community of substance, in whose destiny, for weal or woe, nature is profoundly implicated. (b) Its analysis is wholly different from, and far deeper than, the Greek. It lays bare, not distance between God and man, as between two disparate natures, but a breach, as between two persons who ought to have been at one, but are now, through the action of the dependent personality, woefully opposed. The gulf to be bridged, therefore, is not that between form and matter, but between will and will. To overcome this no one of the Divine attributes, but God Himself alone, will suffice. (c) The goal of the religion of Israel, accordingly, is the indwelling of God in man. The coming of Jehovah in His fulness is the end to which the prophets of Israel look. When He comes, Israel will be restored, and the universe, sharing the blessing, will itself be renovated. They conceived this coming of the Lord without perspective, and in the forms belonging to the world of their own

day. In this way alone could the hope of the coming of the Lord have sustained and comforted their own spirits; only in such forms could they have proclaimed it to others who, like themselves, waited for the consolation of Israel. The spiritual history of the devout in Israel, accordingly, is one of continual disillusionment. Form after form broke like mist; and still the perfect form in which the presence of Jehovah would be fully realized did not come. It is little wonder, therefore, that the hope of Israel did not retain its purity and spirituality, save in the hearts of an inner circle of whom the theologians and politicians of the time took no account,—the poor in spirit, the mourners, the meek, the pure in heart. Comparison between the two lines of development, that of Greek philosophy and that of the religion of Israel, shows that the ruling idea of both was union with God, and, through this, the unifying of all the elements of the life of man and of nature. On neither line had the goal been reached. In the one there was at best an occasional and intermittent experience of ecstasy. In the other there was, in the deepest natures, a hoping against hope, that God would yet visit His people.

Into such a world, Jewish and Hellenic, Christianity entered, with the declaration that what men had been seeking had come to pass, that union with God was no longer a mere dream or a wistful hope, but an accomplished fact. God, so the announcement runs, has united Himself with one Man, so that all men may, in this Man, who is both Christ and Logos, become one with God. The reconciliation of God and man is effected not merely in idea, but in a historic Person. He is both God and man, through Him men have access to God, in Him man and the universe are gathered into unity, and are perfected in their being. He is, with respect to the Divine purpose, at once ἀρχή and τέλος, the active cause of its fulfilment, and the goal of its accomplishment. It is plain that the heart of this announcement is the Person of Christ. Do the facts regarding Him warrant the transcendent claim made on His behalf? Is this man Divine as well as human? Does He indeed meet the demand for union with God? These questions must not be approached with any dogmatic presuppositions. The answer to them must be sought in the portraiture of the historic Christ, and in the impression which His personality made on those who came under its influence.

A. *The character of Christ.*—It is remarkable that all study of Christ necessarily begins with His character. It is not so with other great men, even the founders of religions. What primarily drew adherents to them was not the goodness of their characters, but some gift or power which they possessed. Believers in the greatness of these heroes have been able to retain their faith, even while admitting the moral defects of those to whom they prostrated both intellect and will. It is not so with Jesus Christ. He rules the minds of men by the impression of His personality, and in this impression His character forms an integral part. Prove Him guilty of sin, and at once the spell is broken. He has achieved nothing, if He can be classed among other frail, failing,

sinful mortals. All Christology, therefore, must begin with a character study of Jesus. An attempt at such a study has been made in the article Character of Christ, the details of which need not be repeated here. We may, however, restate the results of that article—the results, as we believe, to which the study of His character must necessarily lead. Contemplating Him as He is presented to us in the Gospels, two features of His character stand out supreme and unmistakable.

1. The first is positive, His *perfect goodness*. This quality is to be sought, and is found, in all the relations in which Jesus stood to His fellowmen and to God. (1) Between Him and God the relations were such as never existed in the case of any other man. They include: (a) perfect knowledge, (b) perfect love. Jesus knew God directly and fully, with the complete intimacy of a Son, nay, of one who, in comparison with all other men, is *the Son* (Mat 11:27). He beheld Divine realities with immediate vision, and reported what He had seen and heard (Joh 1:18; Joh 6:46; Joh 8:38; Joh 15:15). We see in Jesus one whose vision of God was absolutely undimmed, whose intercourse with God was unhindered by any incapacity on His part to receive, or to respond to, the communications of God to Him. Jesus, moreover, loved God with the strength of a nature which had never been injured by any breach with God. In His love for God there is no trace of the compunctions, the heart-breaking memories, which make the love of the redeemed a thing compounded of tears and pain, as well as of adoration and gladness. It shows itself in serene and unbroken trust, which continually depends on the Father's gifts (Joh 5:20; Joh 5:30; Joh 7:16; Joh 14:10; Joh 14:24), and in perfect and comprehensive obedience, which owned no other will than the Father's (Luk 2:49, Joh 4:34; Joh 6:38). Thus loving God, He was aware that God loved Him, and did continually pour upon Him the fulness of a Divine love which found no limitations in the spiritual receptivity of its object. The Divine love, which returns from every other object restrained by incapacity or wounded by misunderstanding, is concentrated upon Christ, abides and has free course in Him, and returns to its source in God completely satisfied and rejoicing with eternal joy. Nothing less than complete mutual indwelling and perfect mutual joy of fellowship are unveiled to us in the communings between Jesus and God, to which the narratives reverently admit us.

(2) Between Jesus and His fellow-men the relations are no less perfect. It is true, He could not realize in His own case all possible circumstances in which a man might be placed. But He could, and did, hold such an attitude to men as would enable Him to enter with perfect sympathy and entire appropriateness into any situation into which Divine Providence might conduct a man. In a word, He loved men. It is abundantly evident that He knew them, both in the broad qualities of humanity and in the individual features of the lives which came before Him. The amazing fact, accordingly is, that, in spite of such knowledge, He loved men, believed in their high destiny,

yearned to save them, and was ready to give the supreme proof of His love by dying for them.

We conclude, then, that Jesus was good, not merely as being one of a class of men upon whom we may pass this verdict without setting them thereby apart from their fellows, but as standing alone in the completeness of His ethical achievement. His character bears the mark of attainment and finality. All other goodness is to be estimated by the measure in which it approximates to His. This is not matter of dogma but of observation. It is a clear inference from the moral history of the race subsequent to His appearing. It is a fact that He is the ethical head of humanity. To say this, however is to define Him as more than man. However we may construe His person, it will be impossible to confine ourselves to a merely humanitarian interpretation of it. 'He who alone stands in this universal relation to humanity cannot be merely a member of it' (Forrest, *Christ of History*, etc. p. 66).

2. The second is negative, His *absolute sinlessness*. The evidence of the portrait constrains us to conclude, not merely that Jesus was a very good man, in whom there was 'the *minimum* of sinfulness' and 'the *maximum* of holiness,' but that in Him was no sin. The testimony of His contemporaries might not suffice to establish this result, though it is, indeed, most impressive to note how those who knew Him intimately bear unanimous and most solemn testimony to His sinlessness, and ascribe to Him an office which could be held only by an absolutely holy person (1Pe 1:19; 1Pe 2:22; 1Pe 3:18, 1Jn 2:1; 1Jn 3:5, Act 3:14; Act 7:52; Act 22:14). The weight of proof lies in His own consciousness. It is beyond question that in that consciousness there was no sense of personal unworthiness, of shortcomings or failures, even the slightest. He who taught others to pray for forgiveness, and never besought it of the Divine mercy for Himself; He who proclaimed the necessity of regeneration for all men, and Himself never passed through any such phase of experience; He who in tenderest sympathy drew close to the sinner's side, and yet always manifested a singular aloofness of spirit, and never included Himself among the objects of the Divine compassion; He who made it His vocation to die for the remission of sins, must have been, in actual fact, sinless:—either that, or He must have been sunk in a moral darkness more profound than sin ordinarily produces, even in the worst of men. The sinlessness of Jesus is a fact whose possibility ought not to be questioned through mere unwillingness to admit the inferences which follow from it. If Jesus is sinless, He stands alone in the moral history of the race. He cannot be classed along with other men, however good and great. They are approximations to an ideal. He is the Ideal. This uniqueness, moreover, cannot be interpreted as that of a *lusus naturae*, or a special product of creative power. The difference between Jesus and other good men is this, that while He has produced a conviction of sin immeasurably more profound than they have evoked among their admirers, He has also awakened a confidence and a peace which they have never wrought in their closest imitators. Unnumbered

multitudes of human souls have come under regenerative and sanctifying influences, which, without doubt, have emanated from His personality, and which have wrought in them a type of character which is the reflex of His. There is only one place in which a reverent and open-minded study of the character of Christ can set Him, and that is beside God, as essentially Divine. He is certainly human. The closer we draw to Him, the more clearly do we discern His humanity. There is nothing, sin excepted, to divide us from Him. Pain and sorrow, temptation and conflict, discipline and growth,—He knows them all. In His universality all the endless variety of human experiences is comprehended; so that He is kinsman of every family on earth, contemporary of every generation, neighbour and friend of every soul that breathes and suffers. Yet this very humanity is the unveiling of Divinity. If, because of His humanity, we have been inclined to draw Him into our ranks, we soon find that He will not be thus classified. He is man, yet more than man—the Holy One of God. He was born a man, yet His birth was not the inevitable product of physiological and racial conditions; it was the entrance into humanity of one whose home and native air were elsewhere. They were within the circle of Divinity. See, further, art. Sin, § 7.

A study of the character of Christ does not provide us with a ready-made dogma of the constitution of His person. Two things, however, it does effect: (a) it sets the person of Christ in the centre of Christianity as its main declaration and its most cogent proof; (b) it makes a merely humanitarian construction of His personality for ever impossible. We are constrained to conceive of the sinless Christ, not as the bloom and efflorescence of humanity, but rather as One who has entered into humanity on an errand of profound significance for the moral history of the race. We turn, therefore, once more to the portrait in the Gospels, to see if the consciousness of Jesus reveals any traces of a uniqueness of personal constitution corresponding to the uniqueness of His character. If such there be, they will both sustain the impression of His sinlessness, and derive from it their true interpretation. Supernatural functions and gifts would mean nothing for mankind apart from ethical perfection.

B. *The self-witness of Jesus.*—It is noteworthy that Jesus does not discuss the constitution of His Person, and gives none of the definitions with which theology has been rife. This is an indication of the truthfulness of the narrative, and shows that it has been to a wonderful degree untouched by the doctrinal development which we know had preceded its earliest written form. It suggests, moreover, that the very highest construction that can be put on the words of Christ is no more than the truth. If, in truth, Jesus *be* the highest that is said of Him, this is precisely the method which He would adopt in order to disclose the transcendent aspect of His being. He would make no categorical statements regarding it, but would leave it to be apprehended through the total impression of His personality.

i. His claims.—As soon as we return to the portrait, we are impressed by the extraordinary claims which Jesus makes on His own behalf. He is perfect in humility; and yet, combined with the utmost gentleness, the most winning loveliness, there is an assertion of His own supreme importance, which is at once profound and sublime. These claims are sometimes stated explicitly; more frequently they are implied in what He says and does. In any case, they are inseparable from what He believes Himself to be. They enter into the very texture of the narrative. They are wrought of the very fibre of the personality of Him who makes them. Whatever quality of being is required to make them valid, we must impute to Him who deliberately advances them. Without presuming to make a complete enumeration, we note the following among the offices and functions which Jesus avowedly claims to hold and fulfil.

1. Teacher.—In Jesus' discharge of this office, certain features at once attract attention.

(1) *The solitariness of the office.* There were in Jesus' day many teachers of religion, and the title of Rabbi, commonly given to them, He accepted (Mar 14:14, Joh 13:13-14). These others, however, were prepared to be followed by successors who might wear their title and inherit their honours. But Jesus claimed to be a teacher in a sense in which He could not be followed by any of His disciples, however learned and pious (Mat 23:8). He did not aim at raising up men who should succeed Him in this office. His office of teacher is His alone. No doubt there came to be in the Church certain men upon whom the Spirit of God conferred a special gift of knowledge, who were accordingly recognized as 'teachers' (1Co 12:28). But teachers after the pattern of Christ were not to be instituted, and were not needed in the new Society (1Th 4:9, 1Jn 2:27). This solitariness of His office is a remarkable fact. He was, then, the bearer of a message which could not be pronounced by other lips than His, which originated in the depths of His consciousness, and owed all its significance and value to the personality of Him who declared it.

(2) *The note of authority.*—This could not be missed, and, in one who had not received the special training of a school Rabbi, it was profoundly impressive. When the people heard His first sermon in Capernaum, 'they were astonished at his teaching: for he taught them as having authority, and not as the scribes' (Mar 1:22). The source of this authority lies in the quality of His mind, which directly sees things Divine. His teaching is not the issue of a dialectic process; it is of the nature of a report, and implies that the Teacher lives in a habitual intercourse with God, such as no other man ever enjoyed (Joh 3:11). His authority, therefore, is His own absolutely. He quotes no other Rabbi, leans on no human opinion, however sound and wise. Move amazing still, He does not use the formula which marks the supernatural authority of a prophet, 'Thus saith the Lord.' For this He substitutes the simpler, more astounding phrase, 'I say unto you.' 'He speaks at all times with the same absolute conviction

and consciousness of His Divine right. There is majesty in His least utterance, and it is nowhere more easily recognized than in the unvarnished record of the Gospel according to St. Mark' (Swete, *Studies in the Teaching of our Lord*, p. 64). Many men have been intoxicated by their own conceit; but the swelling vanity of their tone has easily been detected. When Jesus employs the note of authority, He is simply being true to His own inner consciousness, which, to its inmost core, is clear, genuine, and reliable.

(3) *The originality of the teaching.*—It would be a mistake to attribute to Jesus the independence of a mind which excluded all possible sources of information or instruction, and operated only in a medium of its own imaginations or conceptions. Relations may be traced between the teaching of Jesus and ideas which found lodgment in other minds than His; yet His originality is not thereby infringed. Thus, for instance, His teaching was couched in the terminology and in the forms of thought common to the religious teaching of His day. A parallel might easily be drawn to illustrate this (cf. Shailer Mathews, *The Messianic Hope in the NT*, p. 71 ff.). This, however, in no way lowers the value of the teaching of Jesus. Ideas are not necessarily valueless, because found in Rabbinical theology. By taking them up into His larger and loftier thought, Jesus has placed upon them the stamp of His authority. The central idea of the teaching, moreover, is not borrowed from contemporary thought. The spirituality of the Kingdom of God is Jesus' special contribution to the religious life of His day. This conception is all His own, and is the organizing power of all His teaching. Attempts to set aside certain parts of His teaching as derived from external sources, and as being, therefore, of no permanent value, wreck themselves upon the fact that He was certainly no eclectic, and that His teaching has none of the features of a patchwork. His originality consists in the synthetic, transforming power of His mind. Again, His teaching is not independent of, rather is it rooted in, the OT. He Himself repudiated the idea that He was breaking with the religion of Israel. He does claim, however, to 'fulfil' the Law and the Prophets (Mat 5:17).

Law and Prophets, which are thus conjoined in Jesus' speech (Mat 7:12; Mat 11:13; Mat 22:35-40), are equivalent to the OT taken as a whole, and viewed, in its ethical and spiritual significance, as the utterance of the Divine mind regarding the relations of God and man. *This*, therefore, *i.e.* the inspired record of God's revelation, Jesus claims to fulfil, to preserve and perfect, to retain and develop. We are not to water down the implicit claim. Who can undertake to give the true inwardness of the Divine thought, and carry to completion the eternal purpose? Through the prophets God speaks 'by divers portions.' When He speaks finally and fully, His spokesman can be none other than His Son (Heb 1:1).

Once more, the originality of Jesus appears most strikingly in the fact that He traces all His teaching to His Father (Joh 7:16). The very refusal of the claim to be

independent of God is itself a claim of the most stupendous kind. He whose words and deeds are entirely the speaking and acting of God in Him, between whom and God there is complete intimacy and uninterrupted reciprocity of thought and purpose, stands apart from all human teachers, even the most brilliant and the most original. His teaching is not His own. It is the message of Another, even of Him who sent Him to carry it to the human race.

(4) *The future of the teaching.*—Teachers die: their great thoughts perish not. Socrates passed from the market-place; but Plato and Aristotle, those real Socratics, took up the threads of thought, and wove them into systems which have dominated the intellectual world ever since. It is noticeable, however, that this has not been the history of the ideas of Jesus. He uttered them, and then passed from the scene of His labours. But no disciple took them and expanded them into a system. No philosophical or theological system to-day can claim to be His. He Himself predicted a much more remarkable future for His teaching. He would have a successor, indeed, but not St. Peter with his vigour, or St. John with his speculative gift. The successor of Jesus in the teaching office is none other than the Spirit of God ([Joh 16:12-15](#)). He will take the thoughts of Jesus and unfold their meaning, and apply their vitalizing power to the questionings of all successive generations of men, till, finally, all uncertainties are resolved in the light of the eternal day. It is certain that He who ‘sat thus by the well’ and talked with a woman, who preached in synagogues, and taught in the Temple, had this consciousness of Himself as initiating a teaching which was destined to continue, through the power of the Spirit of God, unfailing, imperishable, and indefeasible. In respect of this also, Jesus stands apart from and superior to all other teachers of men.

2. Legislator.—Jesus is more than a teacher, whether of the type of a Jewish Rabbi or of that of a Greek philosopher. The disciple band is more than a group of docile souls, who may be expected to assimilate and propagate the ideas of their Master. The analogy of the Schools fails to give us Jesus’ point of view. He has before Him the Kingdom of God, which has existed throughout the past ages of Israel’s history, and is now about to pass into a new stage of realization. He speaks, accordingly, not so much in the character of a communicator of new ideas, as in that of a legislator laying down principles upon which the community of God shall be built or rebuilt, delivering laws which shall guide it in its future history. The tone of Jesus is not that of a prophet who, standing within the Kingdom, a member of it, like those whom he addresses, speaks out of the circumstances of his age, and addresses to his fellow-citizens words of warning, of counsel, of rebuke, and of hope. Jesus stands consciously on a far higher platform, and does not class Himself with those whom He addresses, as though He and they bore the same relation to the Law. They are not His fellow-citizens. They are His subjects, citizens of the community of which He is head and lawgiver. The laws of the Kingdom He promulgates by His own personal authority.

Six times in the Sermon on the Mount He sets aside 'that which was spoken to them of old time,' and substitutes a rule of His own. In doing so, however, He is no mere revolutionary, He is taking the inner spiritual principle of the old Law, and liberating it from the restrictions which had protected it in the time of man's pupilage. After the same manner He interprets and applies the Sabbath law (Mar_2:27-28). In dealing with perversions of the Law He is still more peremptory and drastic; e.g. as to fasting (Mar_2:18 ff.) and ceremonial purification (Mar_7:5 ff.). The consciousness of One who thus legislates for the Kingdom is not that of a prophet, not even of the greatest of the prophets, who was God's instrument in the first founding of the community, and received the law at His hands. It is rather that of One in whom God comes to His people, who is the Divinely appointed King in Israel, whose relation to God is closer than any mere man's can be, who speaks, therefore, with the very authority of God Himself.

3. Messiah.—The sense in which Jesus claimed the title of Messiah is certainly not to be gathered from any views regarding the Messiah entertained by His contemporaries. The clue is to be sought in Jesus' attitude towards the OT. (a) He regards the OT as a unity. Critical questions are not before His mind, and upon them He pronounces no judgment. 'David, 'Moses,' 'Isaiah' are simply terms of reference. What He does lay hold of is the unity of the revelation. One mind is revealed. One self-consistent purpose moves amid these varied scenes and ages. (b) He conceives the Divine purpose in the OT to be redemptive. The heart of the OT is union with God, the formation of a spiritual fellowship in which God is fully known and men enter upon the position and privilege of sons. In this connexion He preaches the Kingdom not merely as at hand (Mar_1:15), but as present in commanding power (Mat_12:28). Thus He appropriates to Himself as descriptive of His own work the picture language of Isa_61:1-4. So also in the most solemn hour of His life, when He was on the verge of laying it down, He claimed redemptive efficacy for His death in accordance with the oracle of the new covenant (Mat_26:28, Jer_31:31). This was central in the consciousness of Jesus. An eschatology, no doubt, He had; but it was subordinate to the spiritual conception of redemption, and represented in terms of current thought the consummation of redemption in the world to come. Messiahship, accordingly, meant for Jesus the vocation in which the redemptive purpose of God, which had been growing to completion through the history of Israel, would be fulfilled. We can understand, therefore, how unwilling He would be to receive such a title, when its meaning in the minds of those who used it differed widely from His own conception of it; how glad He would be to accept it when it was applied to Him, not because of His supposed fulfilment of popular requirements, but in spite of His obvious non-fulfilment of these demands; and how careful He would be to train those who clung to Him as Messiah in the apprehension of His own transformed idea of it.

The passages which may be adduced as proof of the Messianic consciousness of Jesus all exhibit His own interpretation of Messiahship, as the calling of the agent of a Divine work of redemption.

(1) *The Baptism*.—(For discussion of Baptism and Temptation, see art. Character of Christ, p. 285f.) This is evidently much more than installation into a prophetic office. It was the solemn acceptance by Jesus of the vocation of Messiah interpreted with reference to the taking away of sin. For such an office, a personal rank superior to that of all other men, and a personal endowment of the Spirit in a measure which no other man could receive, were essential.

(2) *The sermon at Nazareth*. Here the Messianic era is described in terms of intense spirituality; and the Speaker claims to be the Messiah in a sense which identifies Him with the Servant of the Lord (Luk_4:16-30).

(3) *The reply to John the Baptist*. To the question ‘Art thou he that cometh?’ He makes a reply which is at once an affirmation and an interpretation. He is the Messiah, not after a political sort, employing external or catastrophic instrumentality, but of a far higher order, employing means which reach to the depth of man’s necessity (Mat_11:2-6, cf. Isa_35:5-6).

(4) *The estimate of John the Baptist*. In Mat_11:10 John is the messenger of Mal_3:1 who prepares the way for Jehovah, or for the Angel of the Covenant, who is identified with Jehovah. In Mar_9:12-13 John is Elijah, the precursor of the Messiah; while in Mar_1:2-3 he is identified with the ‘voice’ of Isa_40:3-5. The implied claim on the part of Jesus, which the Evangelist repeats, is to a personal dignity not less than that of One whose coming is, at the same time, the coming of Jehovah to His people.

(5) *The threefold call of the disciples*. The call mentioned in the Fourth Gospel (Joh_1:35-41) is necessary to render intelligible that which is mentioned first by the Synoptists (Mar_1:16-20, Mat_4:18-22, Luk_5:10-11). The third call in the ordination to Apostleship (Mar_3:13-14) is the culmination of the series. Messiahship and Apostleship thus receive progressive interpretation. The Kingdom, the King, and high rank even like that of prince in a tribe of Israel, are all to be interpreted in a manner that confounds and contradicts popular theory.

(6) *The answer to Peter*. Into one moment of intense emotional strain and profound spiritual instruction are compressed (a) joyous recognition of faith’s insight and grasp (Mat_16:17); (b) solemn illumination of the truth which faith had thus, with little intelligent apprehension, made its own (Mar_8:27-31). The Messianic calling has an aim which is reached through death and resurrection. He who is competent to carry out such a scheme does not stand in the same rank of being with other men. Jesus’

doctrine of His person is never dogmatically announced. It is none the less, rather all the more, impressively taught, because He allows it to grow upon the minds of believers as an irresistible inference.

(7) It is significant that Jesus' claims to Messiahship become more explicit toward the close of His career. No doubt the explanation is that misapprehension was scarcely now possible. If He be—as He is—a King, it is through humiliation He passes to His glory (Mar 11:1-11; Mar 11:15-19; Mar 13:5-6; Mar 14:61-62; Mar 15:2).

4. Saviour.—(1) Jesus' view of sin, in respect of its guilt, and power, and pollution, was the very gravest. Yet He did not hesitate to announce Himself as able to save men from an evil for which the OT provided no institute of deliverance. He forgave sin (Mat 9:6). He restored the outcast (Luk 7:48-50; Luk 19:10). He died to make good His claims as Redeemer (Mat 26:28). This negative form of salvation, however, is not that upon which alone, or even usually, He dwells. He dwells rather on the positive aspect of salvation, and claims to be able to bestow upon men the highest blessing of which the OT revelation can conceive, viz. life. Not merely does He promise it in the future, but He bestows it in the present. He possesses life (Joh 5:26). He bestows life (Joh 6:57). His words convey life (Joh 6:63). Those who believe in Him are media of life to others (Joh 7:38). Life consists fundamentally in knowledge of God, and of Himself as the Christ (Joh 17:3). If we admit that the Fourth Gospel has reproduced the teaching of Jesus with substantial accuracy, it is impossible not to recognize the superhuman nature of Jesus' self-consciousness. The Jews might well strive with one another (Joh 6:52) as to what His words meant. They certainly conveyed a claim which no mere man could offer in his own behalf.

(2) There is only one possible response on the part of men to the Divine saving act, viz. faith, as personal trust. There can be no doubt that Jesus did require faith in Himself, and, in so doing, consciously stood toward men in a place that can be filled by God only. It is true that the words 'believe in me' occur but rarely in the Synoptics (Mar 9:42, Mat 18:6). But if they have not the phrase, they have the fact. In Beyschlag's well-known words, 'the conduct of those who sought His help, to whom He says so often "thy faith hath saved thee," is, at bottom, a faith in Christ.' So also, confessing Him (Mat 10:32), praying in His name (Mat 18:20), coming to Him and learning of Him (Mat 11:28-30), are, in essence, religious acts. What is implicit in the Synoptics becomes explicit in the Fourth Gospel (Joh 11:25; Joh 12:46; Joh 14:1; Joh 16:9, in which cases the use of $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ implies trustful giving up of self to the personal object of faith). Surely there is only one justification for the man who speaks in such phrases and adopts such an attitude toward His fellows, viz. that, human though He be, He consciously occupies a relation to God radically distinct from that which can be held by any mere man. Jesus accepted a worship that can be rendered

to God only. Yet He never by a breath suggested that He was a rival to Jehovah in the faith and love of men. Whom, then, did He conceive Himself to be? Whom must they, who thus worship Him, believe Him to be, if they are to be free from the error of man-worship?

5. Lord.—He who is Saviour has the right of absolute lordship. Such sovereignty Jesus claims, unhesitatingly, unceasingly. (1) He commands rather than invites discipleship (*e.g.* Mat 4:19; Mat 8:22; Mat 9:9; Mat 19:21). (2) He enjoins on His representatives a similar usage (Mat 10:12-15). (3) He demands entire surrender, placing Himself first in the regard of the human heart (*e.g.* Mat 10:37-38, Luk 9:59-62). (4) He decides infallibly on the spiritual cases set before Him, and deals with them in a manner which would be an invasion of elemental human rights, if it were not warranted by a unique function, which, in turn, is rooted in a unique personality. (5) He appoints the whole future of His disciple's, both here and hereafter (Mat 10:16-20, Joh 14:2-3). In all this there is implied a sovereignty over man which cannot be wielded by one who is no more than man.

6. Worker of Miracles.—If we take the standpoint of monism, that there is only one substance, and only one set of laws appropriate to it, or that of dualism or parallelism, that spiritual and material facts belong to two distinct and incommunicable orders of being, we shall find it impossible to believe in miracle; and we shall condemn, as mistaken, Jesus' evident belief that He was able to seal His redemptive activities by works of superhuman power in the realm of physical nature. If, however, we hold the theistic position, which Jesus Himself held, that between God and the universe there is neither pantheistic identification nor dualistic separation, but that God maintains constant contact with the world which He has made, and directs the activities of which He is the source, towards ends in harmony with His own nature, then we shall find it possible to believe in those interventions of spiritual power in the domain of physical nature, which we call miracle. The only question we shall ask—apart from that of evidence—is that of need. In a perfect universe there might be no need for miracle. In the universe as we know it there is abundant need. Redemption is needed, at once ethical and cosmical. The Kingdom of God is miraculous in its very nature. Miracles, therefore, naturally will attend its advent into the realm of time and space. They are altogether congruous with the mission of Jesus. They are 'signs' of the Kingdom, the characteristic 'works' of Him in whom the Kingdom comes. Such, in any case, was the conviction of Jesus. Before the forces of nature, and of the obscure spirit-world that borders on the physical, in presence of disease and death, He did not own Himself conquered. He bore Himself as Master, as One to whom God's universe lay open, so that its powers were at His disposal for the furtherance of the cause committed to Him. This commanding authority of His was an element in that impression of supernatural greatness which He made on those who came under His influence (Mar 1:27, Luk 5:8).

7. Creator of the New Israel.—The word ἐκκλησία is but once heard on the lips of Jesus in its special significance; but the occasion is one of solemn import (Mat 16:18). Peter has made his inspired confession, and Jesus makes reply, ‘Thou art Petros, and on this Petra I will build my Ecclesia; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it.’ Those who heard could not fail to identify Ecclesia with Israel, as though Jesus had said, ‘on this Rock will I build my Israel’ (Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 11). This claim has reference to the *past*. That community, which originated at the first Passover, which endured through the vicissitudes of Israel’s history, which cannot be identified with the nation which has rejected Christ, is now rebuilt, or built, by Jesus in His capacity as Messiah. It has reference to the *future*. To the Ecclesia, or community of believers in Jesus, He gives the seals of the Supper and Baptism; to it He gives the commission to carry on His work; in it He promises to dwell by His Spirit. Regarding it He predicts that it will prove invincible in face of the powers of Hades. He, Jesus of Nazareth, undertakes to erect on the bed-rock of that group of loyal disciples a new Israel, a spiritual dominion which shall not pass away while time endures. It is vain to characterize a consciousness such as this as merely human. Jesus, in His own belief, stands above humanity, Revealer and Representative of the everlasting God, superior to the lapse of time.

8. Judge.—Our view of eschatology will depend on our conception of history. If we believe in the progressive accomplishment of a Divine purpose we shall anticipate a climax, in which the whole movement will be complete. In that case we shall not be able to set aside ‘Messianism’ as irrelevant to the essence of religion. Our Lord certainly regarded redemption as a process to be continued through a lapse of time, whose culmination would form the completion of the world’s history; and, at the highest point of that culmination, He placed Himself. Amid the many difficulties, textual and other, which surround the eschatology of Jesus, it seems clear that He keeps close to the OT representations, without committing Himself to the details elaborated in later literature. In one all-important point, however, He modifies the OT representation; where the OT placed Jehovah, Jesus places Himself as Judge (Mat 7:21-23; Mat 13:30; Mat 13:41; Mat 16:27; Mat 25:11-12; Mat 25:31 ff., Luk 13:25-27).

In the Fourth Gospel there is another judgment, one which belongs to the present time, and is carried out through the presence or the word of Christ (Joh 3:17-21; Joh 12:47-48). This, however, is not inconsistent with a final judgment, but is rather its precursor; while the final judgment itself is not absent from the representations of the Fourth Gospel (Joh 12:48; Joh 5:27-28; cf. 1Jn 2:28; 1Jn 4:17).

Here, then, is the climax of our Lord’s self-assertion. There is manifest in this claim a consciousness which we should pronounce insane were it not that of the humblest and

sanest man the world ever saw. Nothing can warrant such a claim, nothing justify such a consciousness, save the hypothesis that Jesus had a higher being than appertains to men, and that, as arising from this constitution of His person, He had universal functions which none other than Himself could exercise.

ii. His self-designations.—The claims of Jesus, accordingly, direct us to conclude that He believed Himself to be human indeed, yet at the same time One who was related to God, in the ground and origin of His being, as no other man could be. From this consciousness the functions He claimed relative to humanity must have been derived. It must have been on the ground of what He was, and knew Himself to be, in the inherent quality of His being, that He set Himself forth as tailed and enabled to do certain acts in and for mankind.

It was impossible for men to listen to His claims without inquiring as to His person. Nay, He Himself stimulated the inquiry, and displayed, if one may so say, an anxiety to know what men were thinking of Him. What help, if any, does He give us in seeking for an answer? It is certain that He will not give us definitions after the style of the creeds, or analytic descriptions in the manner of a modern handbook of psychology. The most, and the best, He can do for us, is to grant such unveilings of what was and must remain His secret, as shall enable us, under the requisite spiritual conditions, to know Him and to trust Him. Christ is not a proposition to be proved, or an object to be dissected. He is a Person to be known. By what names, then, does He will to be known? Among the titles or descriptive phrases by which He designates Himself, two are of supreme importance. The discussions regarding their meaning form a kind of register of the history of modern Christology. If the Person of Christ be the centre of the Church's faith, and the apprehension of it be the note of the Church's growth, these discussions cannot be expected to reach scientific finality. The titles stand for all that Christ means in the experience of His disciples, and their wealth of meaning is, therefore, too rich for our exegetical skill to tabulate.

1. The Son of Man.—Three questions are pertinent to our present purpose.

(1) *Whence did Jesus derive the title?*—It would not have been necessary to ask this question—the title might have been at once accepted as invented by Jesus Himself—were it not that a phrase, suggestive of it, occurs both in the later apocalyptic literature and in the OT, in unmistakably Messianic connexions. It is inconceivable that Jesus should have adopted this title, and *not* have meant it to designate Himself, as the personal realization of what was but vaguely suggested in the indefinite phrase of Dan 7:13. We infer, therefore, that the title 'Son of Man' stood on Jesus' lips as equivalent to the title 'Messiah,' which He would not use unless and until His use of it could not be misapprehended.

The title, moreover, is not arbitrary or empty. It suggests the type of Messiah which Jesus believed Himself to be, and the kind of actions through which He intended to fulfil His Messianic vocation. The passage in Daniel, taken as a whole, turns on the contrast between two kinds of sovereignty—that which is won by brute force, and that which belongs to a being not brutal but human. But this is precisely Jesus' conception of His Messiahship, viz. a sovereignty to be won through service. There is another passage which ought not to be forgotten when we ask for the sources of Jesus' idea of the Son of Man, viz. Isaiah 53. It may be too much to say that Jesus intended 'Son of Man' to be a synonym for 'Servant of the Lord,' though His use of the title in Mar_9:12 is significant. But it is certain that He filled the phrase 'Son of Man' with the contents of that other conception, and meant by 'Son of Man' to identify 'Messiah' with the Servant who, in the prophetic vision, passed through suffering to glory.

(2) *How did He use it?*—Let the relative passages be placed before us, as is done in Driver's great art., 'Son of Man' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, and at once a twofold use reveals itself. One class of passages describes the work which Messiahship entails upon Him, His manner of effecting it, and His relation to those for whom it is done. It is a redemptive work; it is performed in lowliest service and profoundest suffering; its motive is deep, true sympathy with men in their needy condition. The other class contains references to the sovereignty which is now hidden by the lowliness, though in no sense inconsistent with it (Mar_10:42 ff.), which, when the ends of humiliation are achieved, will be demonstrated in the face of the universe. Together these passages set forth a Messiah whose work is the redemption of men, through a life of service and suffering, and a death which has in it the quality of an atonement, a Messiah whose faithfulness to His vocation will be crowned with royal honours.

(3) *What does He reveal as to His own Person in it?*—The interpretation of the title as 'representative' or 'ideal' man is surely too modern to be an accurate reflexion of Jesus' own mode of thinking. We shall not be in error, however, if we read in the title Jesus' identification of Himself with men, His profound insight into their condition and His acceptance of it as His own, His taking upon Himself the griefs from which they suffer, and His achieving, in the depths of His suffering, their deliverance. The title, accordingly, sums up the relations in which Jesus stands to men. He touches human nature at every point. It is true He is sinless; but this fact, so far from hindering His perfect sympathy with men, is its necessary pre-condition. Just because He is sinless, His identification with men can be complete, and He can be to men what no other can be. He can do for men what not one of themselves can do. The fulness of His humanity distinguishes Him from all individual members of the race. He is not 'a man'; He is 'the Son of Man,' the kinsman of every man, the Head and King of redeemed and reconstituted humanity.

Here is a gracious fact, verifiable in the experience of every man who will yield his heart to this Saviour and Lord. This very fact, however, opens depths of mystery within itself. Who is He who is perfect man? What is the basis of this human sonship? It cannot be a Personality, limited as ours is, needing, as ours does, some bond beyond itself to connect it with God. He who can stand in this unique relation to men must stand also in a unique relation to God. See also art. Son of Man.

2. The Son of God.—This title, as Jesus used it or accepted it, is plainly derived from the OT, where it is applied to the theocratic people (Exo 4:22, Hos 11:1), to the theocratic King (2Sa 7:14, Psa 89:26-27), and to the Messiah (Psa 2:7). The OT usage evidently is not barely official, but shows a growth in spirituality of connotation and in definiteness of application. It would be too much to suppose that any OT prophet clearly discerned the Divinity of the Messiah; but at least the prophetic vision catches sight of One who should stand in a spiritual relation to God closer than that which can possibly be occupied by any member of the theocracy. The title, accordingly, as it applies to the Messiah, does not express barely His office, but rather some quality of His person which is superhuman, and is the source of reverent awe in the minds of those who contemplate the thought of Him. There is a vagueness in it which excludes either a dogmatic definition of His Divinity, or a merely humanitarian view of His person. When it occurs in the NT, we cannot get rid of it by pointing out that it simply means ‘the Messiah.’ No doubt it means the Messiah; but it connotes that in the man who claims to be the Messiah which lifts Him above the level of mankind.

(1) We cannot draw any definite inference from *the use of it by demoniacs*, or by Satan in the Temptation narrative. Probably, however, as the idea of the ‘subliminal’ sphere which engirdles our conscious life makes its way into psychology, men will be more likely to give weight to narratives which imply that between such unhappy beings and Jesus there existed mutual knowledge, and that He exerted over them a peculiar and direct authority, in that case the title on their lips would certainly be a description of the superhuman dignity and power which He possessed.

(2) Neither can we base a doctrinal proposition on the expression *used by the high priest* (Mar 14:61, Mat 26:63), for the charge of claiming to be ‘the Christ’ did not carry with it the verdict of capital punishment. The addition ‘Son of God’ or ‘Son of the Blessed’ looks like a climax, in St. Luke’s narrative (Luk 22:66-71) the question, ‘if thou art the Christ’ (Luk 22:67), is separated from the second, ‘Art thou then the Son of God?’ (Luk 22:70), by Jesus’ claim to Divine honours (Luk 22:69). The impression made by the scene is that our Lord’s judges understood Him to be claiming superhuman dignity. This claim they regarded as blasphemous, and it formed *ipso facto* the warrant of the death sentence.

(3) *Peter's ascription* in Mat_16:16 has some doubt thrown on it by the absence of the clause 'the Son of the living God' from the parallel passages in Mark and Luke. Yet an argument based on omissions is precarious. St. Matthew had access to special sources. His version has the ring of genuineness; and it is to be noted that the benediction upon Peter is not found in Mark and Luke, where the ascription of Sonship is also wanting. If, then, we may accept the genuineness of the saying, we cannot, indeed, attribute to Peter a doctrine of his Master's person which he could reach only through experience of the risen Christ; but, certainly, we note that he is far in advance of the momentary impression of Mat_14:33. He cannot mean less than that He to whom he speaks is the Son of Jehovah, having an intimacy with Him possessed by no other man, revealing Him as no other can, not even the greatest of the prophets. Peter knows nothing of dogma, but he has flung the plummet of his faith far into the depths of his Master's being. In that moment of supreme spiritual uplift a revelation has been made to him which will carry him far in after days, of which the opening verses in Hebrews and the prologue to the Fourth Gospel will be no more than the adequate expression.

(4) When we turn to *our Lord's own testimony* as to His Sonship toward God, we are at once lifted high above the merely official aspect of the designation. In the Synoptic Gospels He never uses the title 'Son of God'; but His filial relation toward God is not for a moment in question. A son's devotion to his father, a son's utter trust in his father, a son's joyful intercourse with his father—all these, raised to an immeasurable degree, are the characteristics of Jesus' bearing toward God, If the phrase had never occurred in the OT, or fallen from any human lips regarding Him, none the less would any sympathetic view of the Figure portrayed have yielded the inference; Here is a man who in very deed is Son of God, in a sense to which no other man ever attained or could attain. The unique Sonship which Jesus knew Himself to possess gains express utterance in three great sayings (Mar_13:32; Mar_14:36 [cf. Luk_23:34; Luk_23:46] and Mat_11:27). The first of these sets the rank of the Son in a move conspicuous light, because Jesus is disclaiming a knowledge which, on the supposition that He was God's Son, it might have been expected that He would possess. The second unveils the mystery of the Passion, the profound acceptance of the Father's purpose in the midst of a suffering which the Father Himself appoints. The third, with its strongly Johannine phrasing, brings Jesus and the Father together in unique mutual knowledge. The loftiest Christology lies implicit in these words; and, in the consciousness which they express, the invitation which follows, addressed to all the weary and heavy laden, promising them rest, can alone find its warrant. In the Fourth Gospel Jesus is represented as using the exact phrase, 'Son of God' (Joh_5:25; Joh_9:35; Joh_10:36; Joh_11:4). In one of these passages, however, there is uncertainty as to the correct reading, and in the others the possibility that the author may have imported into the narrative phraseology of later date, may be admitted. But the correlative terms 'the Father' and 'the Son' abound; and no reader of the Fourth Gospel, whatever his critical views or theological prejudices may be, doubts

that the deep consciousness of Jesus, revealed in such utterances (e.g. Joh 5:18, Joh 10:30; Joh 10:38, Joh 14:11, Joh 17:21) is that of a Sonship toward God which belongs to Himself alone of all the human race. Few, also, will be found to deny that the representations of the Fourth Gospel are not in excess of the portraiture of the Synoptic Gospels.

(5) *The Divine attestation.*—At the Baptism and the Transfiguration God solemnly attested the Divine Sonship of Jesus in words which reproduce the language of the OT (Psa 2:7, Isa 42:1). It is needless to discuss the ‘objective’ aspect of the communication. In any case, the attestation was, made direct to the consciousness of Jesus. The language is that of Messianic prophecy; but as it fell on Jesus’ inward ear, it was not a mere certification of His Messiahship, but rather a gracious assurance of that which interpreted for Him Messiahship, and made its achievement possible, viz. a relation toward God which lay deep in His being, and was the primary element in His self-knowledge.

How, then, are we to conceive the Sonship of Jesus toward God? Let us avoid modern abstractions, which were certainly not present to the mind of our Lord, or to any of those who came under His influence and have recorded their convictions. In particular, let us not be coerced by the supposed contrast between ‘ethical’ and ‘metaphysical,’ and by the alternative, which some writers would force upon us, of regarding the Divine Sonship of Jesus as being ethical merely, or of imputing to Him a metaphysical Sonship which is an importation from Greek philosophy. Ethical the Sonship of Jesus undoubtedly was. It manifested itself in knowledge of God and love to God, together with trust and obedience and other lovely qualities and experiences. The Sonship to which believers in Him are introduced is of this type, and is marked by the same characteristics. He Himself claims them as His brethren (Mar 3:35). But does this mean that He and they are of one class? Does His Sonship differ from theirs merely in degree? Is He unique only in the measure in which He realized the privileges of a filial standing, which, however, belongs to men simply as men? Is this the utmost impression that the whole portrait makes upon us? It certainly was not all that His Jewish auditors inferred from His self-witness. They declared that He was making Himself equal to God, and they would have killed Him for His blasphemy (Joh 5:18; Joh 8:59; Joh 10:31-33). Were they mistaken? He does not say so. His retort (Joh 10:34 ff.) is no earnest disclaimer; rather is it a reassertion of His essential unity with God. Surely this is the impression we gain from the record, that along with His intense nearness to men, there is a note of aloofness from them as of a Being of another order. Surely there are qualities in His Sonship that are incommunicable to men, aspects of it which can never be found in theirs. Could any of them ever say, ‘I and the Father are one?’ Could it be said of any one of them, that ‘to see him was to see the Father’? It is noteworthy, and ought to be final on this subject, that Jesus never classes Himself along with His disciples as if He and they were alike children of

the Heavenly Father. He distinguishes Himself as *the* Son from all other sons of God (cf. Mat 6:32; Mat 10:29 with Mat 18:35, Mat 20:23). They *become* sons, He *is* the Son. The correlation between 'the Father' and 'the Son' is absolute, and excludes any other son of God from that unique and perfect; fellowship. When we weigh these things, the distinction between ethical and metaphysical becomes meaningless. The Sonship of Jesus has an ethical uniqueness which carries with it essential relations to God. His self-witness carries us to equality of being with God. As 'Son of Man' means humanity in the broadest, truest sense, so 'Son of God' means Divinity in the deepest signification of the term, which will require for its statement and defence the utmost range of reverent thought, while yet it cannot be comprehended or set forth in any formula.

This is the self-witness of Jesus. He is a Divine Being. His life in time under the conditions of humanity is not His whole life. He has come from a sphere wherein He dwelt with God, a conscious Person in equality with God. He entered into this world to execute a purpose which involved His complete oneness with humanity, and a sympathetic appropriation of a complete human experience; He had before Him, throughout His experience as a man, His return to the abode which He had left. His regaining the glory which, for purposes of infinite love, He had laid aside. He knew 'that he came forth from God, and goeth unto God' (Joh 13:3). These were facts which, in the nature of the case, could not be proved by any external evidence. Sympathetic hearts and open minds would be prepared for them. Narrow-minded, unspiritual, and prejudiced persons would reject them. The truth regarding His Personality stands or falls by His own self-witness: 'Even if I bear witness of myself, my witness is true; for I know whence I came, and whither I go.' Or, if another witness is wanted, there is Another who witnesses along with Him, even the Father in whom He abides (Joh 8:12-19). Of a mode of being which He had with God antecedent to His earthly life He could not speak freely. Necessarily, He could not but observe the utmost reticence regarding it. Nevertheless, His recollection of it was continually with Him, and occasionally, in great moments, for example in conflict with His critics, or in communion with His Father (Joh 6:62; Joh 8:58; Joh 17:5; Joh 17:24).

It will be said that this highest reach of the self-witness of Jesus opens out into sheer mystery; and attempts are continually being made to bring down the teaching of Jesus regarding Himself to the terms of mere humanity, with the view of making the record more intelligible, and making Jesus Himself more accessible to our imaginations. Such attempts wreck themselves through over-strenuousness of criticism and over-ingenuity of exegesis. Moreover, they defeat their own end. If Jesus is no more than man, the Gospel narrative is for ever unintelligible; and Jesus Himself remains behind in the past, at best a pathetic memory, at worst a mere enigma. The faith which regards Jesus as 'the only-begotten Son,' or 'God

only-begotten' (Joh 1:18), is a just deduction from the narrative of His life and from His own self-witness. It supplies, moreover, the explanation which is wanted for the whole representation as it is given not merely in the Fourth Gospel, but in the Synoptic Gospels as well. The humanity of Jesus, with its completeness and universality, could belong only to One who was Son of God as well as Son of Man. The Messianic redemptive work of Jesus, in its efficacy, as sealing the new covenant, could be undertaken and discharged only by One who was, and knew Himself to be, the Son of God.

C. *The witness of the Apostles.*—The disciples of Jesus, even when He was with them as their Master and Teacher, were not a mere school. They were a community, enjoying the unexampled privilege of fellowship with the most wonderful Personality which ever impressed itself on human souls. For a brief space, which must have seemed an eternity of pain, they thought He had left them. Then He astounded, rebuked, and blessed them by His risen presence. Thus the disciples were reconstituted as a community, the secret of whose unity and vitality was fellowship with the unseen yet living Lord. This is their experience: Christ is risen; no hallucination, dream, or vision, but the Lord Himself as they had begun to know Him, and now know Him as they could never have known Him had He tarried through lapse of years in flesh among them. Now that He is risen they are less than ever a school; they are an Ecclesia, His Ecclesia, as He had said Himself (Mat 16:18), a fellowship of human beings, the hidden source of whose privileges and gifts is fellowship with the ever present Saviour and Head. To Him they owed that 'loosing' from sin which the elaborate institutes of the OT had failed to accomplish (Rev 1:5). From Him they derived that life which was the choicest privilege of the OT, but which could not be perfectly possessed till God was fully known (Joh 17:3). Christianity as it is presented in the NT is life in fellowship with Jesus Christ. Such an experience cannot be stationary. It must be a growth in the grace and the knowledge of Jesus Christ. The NT throbs and thrills with life, exultant, buoyant, hopeful; expanding, deepening, increasing in energy; not without weaknesses, relapses, defects; but ever correcting its faults, cleansing its stains, renewing its vitality through fellowship with Christ, who is its unfailing source. It is important to remind ourselves that the primary fact in the NT is an experience living and increasing; lest we be tempted to go to it as to a volume of philosophy, or a systematic statement of theology, demanding from it intellectual completeness, and feel proportionately disappointed if it provide not an answer to every question which may rise in our minds. Such a *doctrinaire* view, whether held by the destructive critic or the constructive theologian, is erroneous and misleading. The NT is experimental to its core, and is fundamentally a witness borne to Him with whom believers are united in an ever-increasing fellowship. 'That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you also, that ye also may have fellowship with us: yea, and our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ' (1Jn 1:3). When, accordingly, we approach the records of this testimony, we

anticipate that the notes of experience will be found in it, viz. (a) variety, created by differences in the spiritual history of the individual writers, as well as by differences in the occasion and circumstances of their writing; (b) development throughout the whole period covered by the NT literature, the earlier stages being marked by attention mainly to the conspicuous activities of the risen Saviour, the later being characterized by a deeper insight into the personal relations of Christ to God and to man and to the world; (c) unity, fundamentally the same view of Christ being present in all the writings, earlier and later, inasmuch as all Christian experience, in its origin as well as in its progress, is rooted and grounded in the same almighty Saviour, the same exalted Lord. The witness may be briefly summarized as follows.

i. The earlier chapters in the Acts of the Apostles.—In the midst of much critical discussion of these chapters, it can scarcely be questioned that they reproduce, with substantial truth, the type of life and teaching in the primitive Church; and give us ‘a Christology which must have come from a primitive source’ (Knowling, *Testimony of St. Paul to Christ*, p. 171). How, then, did Peter and his associates preach Christ?

Three points seem plain. (1) They lay the basis of the gospel in the humanity of Christ. They do not grudgingly admit His humanity, as though it presented an intellectual difficulty, nor do they dogmatically insist on it, as though it had been denied by some Docetic scheme. They use His human name. They dwell on His human life and character. He whom they preach as the Christ is the Jesus of that historic past which is so fresh in their memories, so lovely in their hearts. Upon what He had been and done as a man, all that He now is and accomplishes is founded (Act 2:22; Act 3:6; Act 4:10; Act 10:38).—(2) They set the fact of the Resurrection in the forefront of their preaching. That event carries the weight of the greatest doctrines of the faith. This is the message which conveys the glory of God’s accomplished purpose of mercy: ‘He is risen; we are witnesses’ (Act 2:25; Act 2:32). The Resurrection is not merely the miracle of a dead man raised. It is a great historic act on the part of God, who hereby authenticates the mission and vindicates the claims of Jesus. It is not merely that Jesus survives a tragedy. Through death He passes to a higher seat than that of His father David, even the throne of the Divine Majesty (Act 2:34, Act 5:31, Act 7:55). In doing this for Jesus, God did not take a mere man and make Him what a man cannot be, or set Him where a man could not breathe. Jesus is placed in the position which is His by right, to which His person perfectly corresponds. The earliest preaching is in complete harmony with Rom 1:4. The idea of pre-existence, though not explicitly stated, is one of the implications of this teaching, even as it is of the Synoptic portraiture.—(3) They apply to Him titles which describe Him as the fulfilment of the highest reach of OT prophecy, and carry with them, in some instances, a distinctly Divine rank of being: *Messiah*, in Jesus’ own interpretation of Messiah and His mission (Act 3:16-20; Act 4:25-28); *Lord* (Act 1:2, Act 2:34; Act 2:36, Act 10:36), *i.e.* the OT name of Jehovah, which could be borne

only by a Divine being, though, it may well be, the theological bearings of such ascription were not fully present to their minds; *Prophet* (Act 3:22), *Saviour* (Act 5:31, Act 4:12), *Prince* (ἀρχηγός, Act 5:31, Act 3:15), *Servant* (Act 3:13; Act 3:26, Act 4:27; Act 4:30, cf. Act 8:32-33), with evident reference to the Servant of the Lord in Deutero-Isaiah; *Holy or Righteous One* (Act 2:27, Act 4:27; Act 4:30, Act 3:14, Act 7:52), *Son of God* (Act 9:20), a title used in this place only, yet significantly, as a current description of preaching the gospel.—(4) They dwell on certain present functions and activities, exercised by the exalted Saviour. He bestows the Spirit (Act 2:33; Act 2:38). He grants the forgiveness of sins (Act 2:38, Act 3:19, Act 5:31), He operates in miracles of healing (Act 3:16, Act 4:10), the condition on the human side being faith in His name. He is the Source of Salvation (Act 4:12). To Him, therefore, the preachers invite their hearers to come. They insist, however, on repentance, not merely of sin in general, but of the specific guilt of His death (Act 3:13-15), and they require faith as an act of personal trust in Him (Act 10:43).—(5) They announce His return, at the completion of the Messianic period, for judgment (Act 3:21, Act 10:42). This announcement gave a distinctive character to the preaching; and rendered it not so much ‘an argument as to certain truths,’ as ‘the proclamation of a message’ (S. Mathews, *The Messianic Hope in the NT*, p. 145). None the less it bore, as its heart and centre, the truth of the Lord’s superhuman personal dignity.

The Divinity of Christ is not discussed by these missionary preachers. They are concerned with the facts regarding Christ, His power, His promises, His benefits. They do not unfold the doctrine of His person which is implied in their statements: their own conceptions of it were, probably, at a very early stage of development. They held and taught such things regarding Him as implied that conception of Christ which was set forth by later teachers. Those brethren who wrote at a later date, and more explicitly, were not moving away from the historic Christ. They were, rather, getting nearer to Him, and seeing Him more clearly, than had been possible to those who bore their witness at an earlier period.

ii. The minor Christologies.—Some NT writings have scarcely advanced beyond the point of view of the Acts. They are mainly occupied with the saving functions of the Messiah, and do not enter deeply into the consideration of His Person. With respect to the simplest of them, however, it remains true that the place of Jesus in religious experience is central and supreme. He is the object of faith, the source of every spiritual blessing.

1. James.—His Epistle has sometimes been animadverted on as though it were little better than Jewish-Christian. We may content ourselves with Hort’s more generous estimate: ‘Unlike as it is to the other books of the NT, it chiefly illustrates Judaistic

Christianity by total freedom from it' (*Judaistic Christianity*, p. 151). We may refer also to Dr. Patrick's recent volume, *James, the Lord's Brother*, p. 98 ff.

The doctrinal scheme of the Epistle is very simple, and deeply religious. God is the absolutely good One (Jam 1:5; Jam 1:13; Jam 1:17). Man is made in His image (Jam 3:9), and is meant to be separate from the world (Jam 1:27), and wholly given up to God (Jam 1:8). Sin is the forswearing of this allegiance, and the choice of the world instead of God, and leads to death (Jam 1:14-15). For men, under the power of sin, deliverance lies in the act of God, who quickens them into a new life. This He effects by His word (Jam 1:18; Jam 1:21); and this word comes through the mediation of Christ, by whom the old law is transformed into a new law, a royal law, a law of liberty (Jam 2:8; Jam 2:12). Christ, accordingly, is the Saviour to whom we owe our salvation. He is the object of saving faith, which we must not belie by any inconsistent life (Jam 2:1).

To St. James, as to all Christians, Jesus is also Lord, ranked along with Jehovah in honour and dignity (Jam 1:1, Jam 2:1). To Him belongs 'the honourable name' (Jam 2:7). He will shortly come for judgment (Jam 5:8-9). Dorner's summary is borne out by the whole Epistle: 'Both in soteriological and in Christological form, James acknowledges the absoluteness of the Christian religion' (*System*, vol. iii. p. 159).

2. The First Epistle of Peter.—There is distinct advance in this Epistle beyond the statements in St. Peter's speeches reported in the Acts, though even yet the Christology is not so rich and full as in St. Paul or St. John. The sinlessness of Jesus is clearly stated (1Pe 1:19; 1Pe 2:22); and this gives an impression of the Personality of Christ which is inconsistent with a merely humanitarian view of His person. The death of Christ, which had once offended Peter, but which in his preaching he had declared to be part of Messiah's redemptive work, he now glories in as the ground of salvation, and he describes it in its atoning efficacy with rich variety of phrase—covenant blood (1Pe 1:2), ransom (1Pe 1:18 f.), sin-bearing (1Pe 2:20 ff.), substitution (1Pe 3:18). One who ascribed such efficacy to the death of Christ must have taken an exalted view of His Person. Lordship in the usual Christian sense is ascribed to Him (1Pe 1:3, 1Pe 2:13, 1Pe 3:15). Sonship toward God is implied in 1Pe 1:3. Resurrection, exaltation, supremacy have their wonted place in St. Peter's thoughts, as in all Christian faith (1Pe 1:21, 1Pe 3:22). The wording of 1Pe 1:11 and 1Pe 1:20 scarcely allows us to regard these passages as distinctly teaching a *personal* pre-existence of Christ, although such an interpretation of them is certainly legitimate, and is, besides, much more characteristic of St. Peter's non-speculative cast of mind than the *ideal* pre-existence which is held by some interpreters to be the meaning. In any case, Christ is to St. Peter a Being far more than man or angel; and this means, since the thought of a demi-god is impossible to a Jewish monotheist, that St. Peter placed his Lord side by side with Jehovah, sharer with God in Divine rank and worship. This

he did with the memory full and clear within him of his Master's human life. That St. Peter, who so often spoke frankly and plainly to Jesus, and once rebuked Him and once denied Him, should have come to adore Him as Divine, is a fact most wonderful, and fraught with far-reaching consequences.

3. Jude and 2 Peter.—In these brief and, from many points of view, difficult writings, there is no Christological discussion. Both Epistles, however, assume the Lordship of Christ, and look forward to His coming as Judge. In 2Pe 1:2, He is conjoined with the Father as the object of religious knowledge; and in the previous verse He is described as 'our God and Saviour Jesus Christ.'

4. Apocalypse.—Whatever view we take of the composition of this book, the key to which has so long been mislaid, there is no doubt that its pages glow with the glory of Jesus. It contains abundant recollections of the human life of Jesus [e.g. Rev 5:5; Rev 22:16; Rev 21:14; Rev 11:8]. It is the exalted, glorified, victorious Lord, however, who chiefly fills the seer's gaze. To Him the writer desires the eyes of the persecuted Church to turn, that she may be certified of her vindication and reward at the hand of Him whom she adores.

He is included in the sacred Threefold source of blessing (Rev 1:4; Rev 1:6). The radiant Figure of the vision in Rev 1:12-20, whose self-designations are 'the first and the last' and 'the Living one,' to whom belong 'the keys of death and of Hades,' is no mere earthly Being who has undergone apotheosis. He is a Divine being, who came out of eternity, entered into time, and on earth suffered and died, and now, within the unseen world, lives and reigns as God; who, also, will one day return for judgment (Rev 14:14-16, Rev 22:20). He is on the Throne (Rev 3:21, Rev 7:17, Rev 12:5, Rev 22:1; Rev 22:3). Worship is paid to Him as God (Rev 7:10, Rev 5:12; Rev 5:8). He is the Son of God, as none other can be (Rev 1:6, Rev 2:27, Rev 3:21). He is a pre-existent and eternal Being (Rev 1:17-18, Rev 3:14, Rev 21:6, Rev 22:13); such is the interpretation which is required by these passages in view of the Christology of the book as a whole. See discussion in Stevens, pp. 538-540. To Him belongs the incommunicable Name (Rev 3:12, Rev 19:12). It is impossible to exaggerate the significance of the adoration of Jesus which pervades all the NT literature, and is so intense and sincere in this book. 'Although the writer is plainly a Jew of Jews, his mind saturated with Hebrew literature and Hebrew modes of thought, a true son of the race with which monotheism had become a passion, and the ascription of Divine honour to any other than the supreme God a horror and a blasphemy, he nevertheless sets Jesus, the man whom he had known in the flesh, side by side with God' (C. A. Scott, *The Book of the Revelation*, p. 27).

The NT books are not efforts of solitary thinkers evolving schemes out of their inner consciousness. The Christian Ecclesia, the fellowship of Christ, the communion of

saints lived by such thoughts and spiritual activities as these. Its members knew nothing of the subtleties of post-Nicene Christology; but they knew Jesus, the Lamb of God, who died for them, the Living Lord in whose right hand were seven stars, who walked amid the candlesticks.

iii. The Christology of St. Paul

Amid the manifold discussions of this topic, three positions seem to be attracting to themselves an increasing volume of consentient opinion.

(a) St. Paul's Christology in the outcome of his experience. He had seen the Risen Christ. The simplest, most obvious, interpretation of 1Co_9:1; 1Co_15:5-9 is surely the truest. Attempts to assimilate St. Paul's sight of Christ on the road to Damascus with ecstatic experiences, which he also records, betray, by their very ingenuity, the *a priori* assumption that a fully objective revelation of the kind alleged is impossible. St. Paul's sight of Christ was of the same nature as that by which the faith of the Eleven was first established. If the 'vision hypothesis' does not do justice to the facts in their case, neither will it account for the sudden and complete revolution which took place in the life of St. Paul. That he had seen the Risen Christ, in the same sense, with the same convincing 'objectivity,' as St. Peter had seen Him, is the source of Paul's authority as an Apostle. It is the source, also, of his Christian faith. It warrants the utmost and the greatest which Paul can ever say regarding the wonderful being of his Lord. From that date, the hour when he heard the words 'I am Jesus,' he had been 'in Christ.' Christ had been a present reality to him, and out of his fellowship with Christ had come every grace of his character, every privilege of his soul, every activity of his career. 'That I may know him' (Php_3:10) is the passion of his life, and his so-called 'Christology' is not a philosophy of the 'logos,' or 'avatar,' or any other type. It is the testimony he bears, incidentally, as the needs of his converts demand, to the Christ whom he knows.

(b) St. Paul's conception of Christ does not stand wholly apart from the views entertained by the primitive Church. His experience, remarkable as it was, did not differ in kind from that of other believers. The Church was from the beginning a fellowship with Christ. Every member of it is united to Christ by faith. There were others who had been 'in Christ' before St. Paul had gained that blessed privilege (Rom_16:7). The knowledge which he possessed of Christ was common to the fellowship of believers, and had been theirs while Paul was raging against the Church in persecuting fury. In fact, it was precisely the lofty claims advanced by the disciples of the Nazarene on behalf of their Master, which called the young zealot to destroy a movement which he saw clearly was an invasion of the supremacy, not of Caesar, but of Jehovah. When, in later days, he himself is glorying in the lofty attributes and Divine dignity of Christ, he is well aware that he is setting forth no novelties, but is

speaking out of the fulness of a personal knowledge possessed by his readers as well as by himself. Dr. Sanday's words, commenting on 1Th 1:1, are most memorable: 'An elaborate process of reflexion, almost a system of theology, lies behind those familiar terms.' Dr. Knowling's weighty and balanced statement ought to be borne in mind by every student of St. Paul's thought: 'The evidence to be gathered from the Apostle's own writings is not to be judged as if it was only of a reflective character upon the events of the life of Jesus seen through a long retrospect of years: in some particulars it carries us up to the earliest period of the existence of the Christian Church; in other particulars it is plainly incidental, it is used as occasion demands, and it justifies the inference that it has behind it a large reserve of early teaching and tradition' (*Testimony*, etc., p. 211).

(c) To say that St. Paul's Christology is more developed in his later Epistles than in his earlier, is only to note the fact that his personal acquaintance with Christ grew richer as the years of his inner life and of his missionary activity passed over him. But this advance was not determined by accretions from without. He had not to wait till theosophical speculation suggested it to him before he ascribed the loftiest, most comprehensive position and dignity to Christ. Such ascription belongs to his earlier as well as to his later writings. Prof. Bacon has strongly emphasized the presence of Paul's later thoughts 'in a partly developed form in the earlier Epistles' (*Story of St. Paul*, p. 208); and Dr. Knowling's great work, already referred to, is largely devoted to an illustration of this fact (*e.g.* pp. 48, 90 f., 206, 211 f., 502).

1. Christ in His relation to God

(1) *He is a Divine Being.*—St. Paul is an OT believer, utterly removed from polytheism, and wholly incapable of believing in demi-gods. He is not a Greek philosopher; impersonal abstractions or principles have no meaning for him. He of whom he speaks is 'Christ,' which with St. Paul is a proper name, the official designation being lost in the personal appellation. If, then, he ascribes to Christ the qualities which a Jewish monotheist, a member of the Old Covenant, attributed to Jehovah, he can mean nothing else than that this same person, Jesus Christ, is a Divine Being, equal with God and one with God.

(a) He attributes Lordship to Christ (2Co 4:5); and uses the title 'Lord' habitually in connexion with the historic and personal names 'Jesus' and 'Christ.' It is no courtesy title; it is used in the sense in which the LXX Septuagint uses it of God, and it has the 'connotation of Godhead.' Passages of the OT, accordingly, which belong to Jehovah are applied to Christ (Rom 10:13, 1Co 10:22). To the Lord, therefore, as to God, worship is offered, and prayers are addressed by St. Paul and by all Christians (2Co 12:8, 1Co 1:2, Rom 10:13). (b) He designates Christ as 'the Son of God.' The teaching of St. Paul on this subject is in harmony with the other NT representations.

Believers in Christ enter upon the status of sons of God, and St. Paul even calls them υἱοί, while St. John uses only the term τέκνα. But among such sons of God Christ is not one. He stands alone. They *become* sons. He *is* the Son (Rom_8:3; Rom_8:32, Gal_4:4). This Sonship is the very essence of Christ's being. It means Divinity in the fullest sense, in most complete reality. St. Paul testifies to the Divinity of Christ while fully recognizing His humanity. On one side of His being He is linked to humanity; and St. Paul has ample knowledge of the facts of Christ's human life, and shows no want of interest, and still less any reluctance, in referring to them. How should he, when it was his main business as a missionary to prove that this very Jesus was the Son of God? On the other side of His being, Christ possesses Godhead as the only Son of the Father. Of this Divine Sonship the Resurrection is declaration and proof (Rom_1:1-4). St. Paul's Christianity centres in this Divine Sonship of Christ (Gal_2:20, Eph_4:13). It was no invention of his brain, no borrowing from pagan adulation of the Emperor. It was the centre of Christianity as such, and belongs to the very earliest period of which we have literary record, being implied in 1Th_1:1. The faith in Christ as Son of God is the *differentia* of Christianity. They are Christians who think of Jesus Christ 'as of God' (ὡς τερὶ θεοῦ), and so thinking they name Him, as St. Paul did, 'God' (Rom_9:5).

(2) *He is one with the Father.*—The relation of the Divine Christ to the Godhead became an insoluble problem for subsequent thought. Let the presupposed conception of God be abstract simplicity and unity. Let Him be conceived as Pure Being, Pure Form, Pure Thought, the Idea, or Substance. Then let the claim be advanced on behalf of a historic person that he is God. The result will be a problem which, in the nature of the case, must be insoluble. With such a Deity, the Divinity of the historic Christ is utterly incompatible. Christ must be lowered to the rank of a demi-god, or He must be etherialized into an impersonal principle.

Suppose, however, that God be differently conceived; in that case the claim of Divinity advanced on behalf of one who lived a human life may not lead to intellectual impossibilities. It is certain, however, that neither St. Paul nor any other NT writer held any such speculative idea of God as was prevalent in Greek Philosophy. To the men of the NT, God was the God of the OT, the living God, a Person, loving, energizing, seeking the accomplishment of an everlasting purpose of mercy, the satisfaction of His own loving nature. When, accordingly, the facts of the character and claims and resurrection of an historic person compelled them to recognize Him as Divine, they were constrained greatly to enlarge their thought of God; but they were saved the labour of stretching a logical formula to cover facts wholly irreconcilable with it, for the simple reason that no such formula had any place in their thoughts. They set the Divine Christ side by side with the Divine Father, and thus found a manifoldness in the being of God which did not destroy its unity. St. Paul, therefore,

includes Christ in the Divine circle (1Th 3:11-13, 2Th 2:16-17, 1Co 8:6, 2Co 13:14). ‘Abstract monotheism’ has ceased, and has been ‘replaced by a Theism which finds within the one Godhead room for both Father and Son’ (Fairbairn, *Place of Christ*, p. 309). Perhaps it would be more correct to say that the monotheism of the OT was never abstract, because the God of the OT was never a conception, or a substance, but always a Person. Personality, indeed, has never the bare unity of a monad. It always makes room for distinctions; and reaches its greatest wealth of meaning in the fellowship of person with person. Between an abstraction and a historic person there can be no unity. Between two historic persons there may be unity of the profoundest kind. St. Paul, moreover, is not thinking of a mere quantitative equivalence between the Divine Christ and God. He is true to the conception of Sonship. The relation of Christ to the Father is that of a real son, including dependence and subordination (1Co 3:23; 1Co 11:3; 1Co 15:24-28). To the Son, as reward of obedience, is given a glory and a fulness which enable Him to fulfil His mediatorial function (Php 2:9-11, Rom 14:9, Col 1:19). This, however, in no sense lowers the Divine being of the Son, or shuts Him out of the Godhead. The glory He had with the Father from eternity, and the glory gained as He returns to the Father, are not inconsistent. Without the former, indeed, the latter would be impossible.

2. Christ in His relation to mankind

(1) *Pre-incarnate*.—The Being who thus existed from eternity as God has affinities in His very nature with men. Had He been a demi-god, a *tertium quid*, the passage from Him to us and from us to Him would have been impossible. It may seem an ingenious plan to effect the union of God and man by inserting between them a being who is neither God nor man. Really, it makes the problem insoluble. St. Paul knows nothing of the supposed differences between the Divine and the human natures which make a *tertium quid* appear necessary to bring them together. God and man resemble one another in their constitution as personal beings. The problem at once of religion and of philosophy is to bring *two persons* together, not to force two disparate natures into an unreal unity. This problem, the problem of the human spirit, is solved in the Person of Christ. The heart of His eternal being is Sonship. He lives in a filial relation toward God, and upon the model of that relationship ours is formed (Gal 4:4-6, Rom 8:29). Our very existence depends on Him (1Co 8:6). What we are to be is determined by what He is (Eph 1:4; Eph 2:10). The deepest relations of man to man find their guarantee in the relations in which He stands to God and to man (1Co 11:3, Eph 5:22-31). Even before the fulness of time He was not utterly unconnected with the problem of redemption. So, at least, we may interpret the mystic utterance of 1Co 10:4 ἡ πέτρα δὲ ἦν ὁ Χριστός. This Rock, the fountain of life for the Church of the wilderness, was the Christ, not as an idea but as a person. Thus St. Paul conceives

of Christ as existing in these past centuries, fulfilling the functions for the Church which then was, which He now fulfils for the new Ecclesia (cf. Joh_7:37).

(2) *Incarnate*.—The Son is a real person, who conceives, purposes, acts. ‘Before the foundation of the world’ He had assumed the vocation of Redeemer, constrained thereto by the love which is the essence of the Divine nature. When the time comes, in God’s discipline of the race, He takes up His task, which requires for its fulfilment incarnation, the complete identification of Himself with men in life and in death. In two pregnant passages St. Paul sets forth this deed of wonder, in whose depths thought and feeling lose themselves, Php_2:5-11, 2Co_8:9. Three stages of the history of Christ are indicated, so far as human imagination can frame to itself a record so amazing:—(i.) A person, Divine in His being, enjoying the form and circumstance of Godhead, rich in the glory which is the manifestation of the Divine nature; cf. Joh_17:5, Heb_1:3. (ii.) This Divine Being surrendering that form and that wealth, assuming a form the most opposite conceivable, that of a servant, revealing Himself to men in their likeness, so that His humanity is no phantom, while yet it is not His by mere accident of birth, but is acquired in an act of will which extends to the assumption of man’s condition as a sinner, exposed to sin’s sign and seal, even death. (iii.) This same person raised from the dead, and receiving as a gift from the Father what He had not grasped at, namely, equality with God in form and circumstance, and the name which corresponds to that rank and honour, so that to this Being, known now through His humanity as Jesus, there should be rendered the worship of all intelligent creatures throughout the universe of God.

It is in connexion with the incarnate stage of Christ’s career that the problem of the constitution of His Person presses most acutely. Questions press as to the relation of His Divinity to His humanity, of His knowledge as God to His knowledge as man, of His personality as a Divine Being to His personality as a human being, of His activities in the flesh to His contemporaneous activities in the Cosmos and in the circle of the Godhead. It is noteworthy that St. Paul does not discuss these questions, seems, indeed, to be scarcely conscious of them. He wonders and adores as he thinks of the love which led Christ to that stupendous sacrifice. He contemplates with delight and worship the Person of his glorified Lord, and throws his being open to the gracious influences of His Spirit. He has no other ambition on earth save to know Christ; but when he speaks of knowing, he means such spiritual intimacy as person has with person, and in particular a growing appreciation of, and entrance into, the power of Christ’s resurrection, the fellowship of His sufferings, and conformity to His death (Php_3:10). But to dissect the Person of Christ, to lay out the Divinity on one side and the humanity on the other, and to discuss a *communicatio idiomatum*, does not lie within the four corners of Pauline thought. This fact may suggest the doubt whether questions such as the above are rightly conceived. They evidently proceed from the point of view of dualism, according to which one nature is contrasted with another;

whereas Paul's views of God and of man and of the God-man, are all synthetic. Personal unity, and not logical dualism, is the key to the thought of St. Paul. Between God and man, there is the unity of moral likeness; between the Father and the Son, the unity of being and fellowship; between the pre-incarnate and the incarnate periods of Christ's experience and action, the unity of one continuous life; between Christ and those whom He saves, the unity of reciprocal indwelling.

(3) *Post-incarnate*.—Having become man, Christ remains human. In the Kingdom whose Lord He is, He is Jesus who was so named in His earthly life. Mediator between God and man, He is Himself man (1Ti 2:5). From Him, as the Head, life streams down to all members of the body (Col 1:18, 1Co 12:27, Eph 4:12-13). In Him the members are 'complete,' receive fulness of satisfaction (Col 2:10). In Him human nature finds itself raised to its highest perfection, hence in Him there can be none of the barriers that divide man from man (Col 3:11, Gal 3:28). This is the point of the comparison in Rom 5:12-21 and 1Co 15:45-47 between the first Adam and the Second. In one sense Adam is the head of the race, in another the Risen and Exalted Christ is the Head, and from Him all life comes. This is the very heart of St. Paul's experience, and therefore also of His Christology. Christ is living. St. Paul presupposes the pre-existent Christ; his Christ could not begin to be in time. He is acquainted with the historic life through which Christ gained His glory. But that which St. Paul gazes upon with endless adoration is the Person of the Risen and Glorified Lord. Between the living Christ and him there is such union as surpasses power of language to express. Christ dwells in the believer in His complete human-Divine personality, and imparts Himself in growing fulness to the believer; and there is thus developed identity of experience and identity of character, which will ultimately be crowned by identity of outward condition (Gal 2:20, 2Co 3:18, Php 3:21).

3. Christ in His relation to the Cosmos.—The intellect of the time was much occupied with speculations regarding the relation of God to the world. To Greek dualism this was really an insoluble problem. The gulf between God and the universe yawned impassable. The place of a solution was taken by a mythology of 'powers,' 'principalities,' and the like supposititious beings, who existed only in the jargon of the philosophical sects. On Jewish soil this mythology was changed into a hierarchy of angels. Wild as these dreams are, they represent a real need of thought and of religious experience. The problems of creation and redemption cannot be held apart. The creative purpose must include redemption, and redemption must have cosmic bearings. We cannot rest in a harmony with God which leaves the universe outside, unreconciled, possibly the abode of forces against which the redeeming agency would be powerless to defend us. St. Paul's view is that the universe has a part in the history of man. Injured by human sin, it will come to its completion when the children of God enter on their heritage (Rom 8:21). Christ, the Redeemer of men, accordingly, is Lord of the universe. Nothing lies outside His gracious sway. The clumsy machinery

of angels, or powers, or whatever these needless creations are named, is replaced by the one Person, who is the Agent of God alike in creation and in redemption (Col_1:15-17). Christ, who is the manifestation of God, is of infinitely higher rank than all the creatures. All things, whatever their place and dignity, owe to Him their existence, and find in Him their goal. This exalted Person is also Head of the Church, and Agent in reconciliation (Col_1:18-20). That is to say, the work of redemption can be accomplished only by One who is also the Creator. The Redeemer must be God absolutely, else there will be needed a Mediator for Him also. The Redeemer cannot have, in our apprehension, the value of God, unless He is God in His own proper being.

The testimony of St. Paul to Christ contains great heights and depths, but it exhibits no inconsistency with Jesus' self-witness. It is not a mosaic of Jewish and Hellenic elements. It is the product of experience, developed under the conditions of that Divine assistance which Jesus Himself described, Joh_16:12-15.

iv. Hebrews.—In this Epistle the Christian faith is defended against any attempt to belittle the person and office of the Redeemer. However glorious other agents of the Divine purpose might have been, 'this man' is more glorious by far in the dignity of His person and in the vastness and finality of His redemptive work. To Him, therefore, is applied the familiar Christian designation of Lord (Heb_2:3; Heb_7:14; Heb_13:20). The characteristic name applied to Him, however, is *Son* (Heb_1:1-2, Heb_7:28, Heb_5:8, Heb_1:8, Heb_6:6, Heb_7:3, Heb_10:29, Heb_4:14). This title expresses His Divine and eternal being. The author of this Epistle follows the example of the Apostle Paul in describing the Christian salvation under the aspect of a history of the Son of God. This history moves in three stages.

(1) *The pre-existent state*.—Not much is said on this mysterious topic. The NT writers are concerned to allude to it only in order that, in the light of it, the earthly life of Jesus may be discerned in its marvellous condescension as an act of self-sacrifice, and in order that His present position of equality with God may be intellectually credible.

In this pre-existent state the Son is the effulgence of God's glory, the very image of His substance (Heb_1:3). Without formally discussing the question of the being of God, the writer has already surpassed any mere monadism. God is not bare abstract unity. With God there is One who exactly corresponds to Himself, who gives back to Him the glory which is His. Between Him and God there is perfect oneness. Between these two there is no room for a mediator. The functions of the Son in this state are not described further than to indicate that no department of the universe is outside the scope of His power (Heb_1:3). There is no room, accordingly, for any being, other than the Son of God, to whom worship or gratitude is due.

(2) *The incarnate life.*—This writer, like the Apostle Paul, passes by all the questions, so abundantly discussed in later theology, as to ‘two natures,’ etc. His whole interest is concerned with the heart-subduing fact that the birth of Christ is the descent of a Divine Being from heaven to earth, the definite assumption by Him of a complete and true humanity (Heb 2:9, Heb 10:5, Heb 2:14). To this writer the humanity of Jesus is wonderful and glorious. A Being truly Divine has become man, and has entered fully into human experience. There is nothing human that is not His, sin excepted. Temptation, suffering, death—He passed through them all. All this He endured in pursuance of the vocation with which He entered humanity. Before Him lay His task. Beyond shone the glory. Not once, for so great a glory, would He evade one human sorrow. It was all wanted to perfect Him in His vocation (Heb 2:10, Heb 5:8-9). The resemblance to St. Paul’s line of thought in Php 2:5-11 is obvious.

(3) *The exaltation.*—The position of majesty which the Son now occupies is described in two aspects. (a) Its *possibility* is due to what He was in Himself, antecedently to His human experiences. He has been appointed heir of all things, both because He is the Son of God and because, through Him, God made the worlds (Php 1:2). He has sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high, because He is, in His very nature, the effulgence of God’s glory and the very image of His substance. No being less than God, in His own person, could occupy such a place. (b) Its *attainment* is due to His discharge of His redemptive mission, and is of the nature of a reward for His fidelity. His present position presupposes His pre-existent place and function, and yet is distinct from them. It is that of King in God’s realm of redemption.

Here, just as in connexion with the incarnate condition, questions arise which this writer does not discuss. ‘The relation of this rule to the primary rule of God, or to His own primary upholding of all things by the word of His power, is not indicated’ (A. B. Davidson’s *Com.* p. 78). It is enough for faith that, in the universe of being, there is no other power than that of the exalted Redeemer.

v. The Fourth Gospel.—St. John’s Christology, like that of St. Paul, is the transcript of his experience. He makes plain his object in telling the story of the life of Christ (Joh 20:30 f.). Out of all the mass of material which his memory provides, he selects those incidents which may be most useful in proving to generations which had not the privilege of direct vision, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. The principles of selection, and the insight into the meaning of words and deeds which are reproduced, are due to a lifetime of thought and communion, as well as to the continual illumination of the Spirit of Christ. St. John’s conception of Christ is summarily set forth in the Prologue to the narrative (Joh 1:1-18). No doubt these much-debated verses are meant to provide the point of view which the reader of the narrative is to occupy; but equally without doubt they do not present an idea, formed in speculation, and then employed to determine the narrative, to invent the incidents,

and to create the discourses. The narrative, with the words and signs, logically precedes the Prologue, which presents us with the extracted meaning of the history. The Person portrayed in the narrative is One of whose history, in the wider sense, the earthly career is but a part. He had a being with God before He was seen on earth. He had a Divine mode of existence and exercised Divine functions, before He appeared as a man and wrought His deeds through human organs of action. At the set time He entered into humanity, and, through living intercourse with men, revealed to them the glory of His person, and interpreted for them the character of the invisible God. The remarkable feature of the Prologue is its use of the term Logos to designate Him whom the narrative leads us to know as the Son. It is certainly not the key to the narrative, which is to be read from the point of view of the Divine Sonship, which it reveals. It is not used in the narrative, though it reappears in the First Epistle of John. It is certainly not taken over from Philo, and intended to create a new religious philosophy. Probably its presence is to be explained, as are the references in St. Paul's letters, by the technicalities of prevalent philosophy or theosophy. Christianity appeared when the problem of the relation of God to the world had reached its fullest statement; when, also, the utmost that human thought could do had been done in the way of a solution. The last and most strenuous effort of human thought to meet the demand of the human spirit had found expression in Philo's Logos speculation, which owed its origin partly to developments of Hebrew thought as to the word and wisdom of God, and partly to ideas which had been the motive power of the whole history of Greek philosophy. It was not possible for Christianity to ignore the problem. Christianity is more immediately concerned with the problem of the redemption of man; but this cannot be dissociated from the wider problem of the relation of God to the world. The key to the one must unlock the other also. St. Paul and St. John, accordingly, take up the technical terms most in vogue, with whatever they stand for, and say in effect: What human thought has endeavoured to achieve by its machinery of angels or powers, or by its hypostatization of the Logos, has been accomplished in the Person of the Son of God. He is the life of the redeemed. He is the life also of the whole universe of God. There is but one purpose in creation and redemption, and that is summed up in Christ. He is the Logos.

The term Logos, accordingly, is used by St. John to express the identity of Him whom we know as Jesus Christ, with the personal Wisdom and Power of God, who is God's agent in creation, who alone could redeem men, and who achieved this in the only way possible, by Himself assuming human nature, and dwelling for a space with men. The term, having served the purpose of presenting Christ as the goal of the immemorial quest of the human spirit for union with God, is not again employed in the Gospel.

It is not necessary to attempt here a detailed analysis of the Prologue (see Westcott's *Com.*; Dods in *Expos. Gr. Test.*; and a valuable paper by Principal Falconer in

Expositor, v. v. [1897] 222). The leading ideas are plain—(1) *The eternity of the Logos* (Joh 1:1-2, cf. Joh 17:5, Joh 8:58, 1Jn 1:1). The Logos had a being coeval with God, and did not come into existence at a point in time, and therefore is not a creature. (2) *The fellowship of the Logos with God*. The Logos is personal, has a life of His own, which yet is directed toward God, so that He finds His life in God, and is ‘in the bosom of the Father’ (Joh 1:18). (3) *The Divine nature of the Logos*, as identical in being with God, while yet distinct as a person. (4) *The creative function of the Logos* (Joh 1:3; Joh 1:10, cf. Col 1:16, Heb 1:2-3). (5) *The revealing function of the Logos* (Joh 1:4 f.). (6) *The historical manifestation of the Logos* (Joh 1:6-13). (7) *The incarnation of the Logos* (Joh 1:14; Joh 1:18). This is the climax to which the Prologue has led up. This is the event of which the whole Gospel narrative is the record and description. The Logos, the same Being who had dwelt in the circle of the Godhead, left the glory which He had with God (Joh 17:5), and, retaining His personal identity, became ‘flesh,’ *i.e.* became man, assumed human nature in its fulness, and dwelt among men as a man.

The problems with regard to the life of the incarnate Logos, which press so heavily on our minds, are not discussed by St. John any more than by St. Paul. He is wholly occupied with the glorious fact. It is amazing, but it has happened; and in that great event the whole purpose of God, creative as well as redemptive, has reached its consummation. Revelation is complete. No one can declare God save One who is God, and this is He, Jesus Christ, ‘God only-begotten’ (Joh 17:18).

From the simple missionary preaching of the Acts to the high intense thinking of the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel is a long movement. It is a movement, however, not away from the facts, but toward their inward, spiritual, universal, and eternal meaning. This movement, moreover, has not been dependent on unaided human reflexion, nor are its results mere guesses or inferences. It has been conducted under the guidance of Christ’s own self-witness and the illumination of Christ’s own Spirit; and its conclusions express the wealth of Christian experience, and in experience find their ultimate demonstration.

Conclusion and Outlook.—A study of the character of Christ, and a close and reverent attention to His self-witness, compel the inference that His Person, completely and really human though He is, is not constituted like that of other men. It is to be admitted, however, or rather it is to be urged, that what the facts suggest and demand cannot be fully apprehended by any merely intellectual process whatever. What Christ is, in His own Person, can be known only by those who know Him; and personal knowledge has conditions which are not satisfied in any exercise of the mere understanding, however careful and exact. Such conditions are an attitude or direction of the human spirit, and an immediate operation, at once illuminating and quickening, of the Divine Spirit. When these conditions meet and interact, in that

profound region where the Spirit of God and the spirit of man touch and interpenetrate one another, there is produced that knowledge of God and of Christ which our Lord describes as life. There is *no other* knowledge of Christ; and if Christology is supposed to be an intellectual process, governed by forms of discursive thought, and issuing in propositions for which is claimed the cogency of a logical demonstration, it stands condemned as being out of all relation to Christian experience. But this personal experience *is* knowledge of Christ. He is as really known in this spiritual fellowship as one human person is known by another, and is known more closely and fully than one man can be known by another. Christianity, accordingly, presents to the world the solution of its problem, the answer to its need; while, at the same time, it has before itself a constant problem, the answer to which it seeks, not with ever-growing weariness and sense of defeat, but with ever-renewed energy of faith and love.

1. The problem of the world, the more or less conscious and articulate demand of the human spirit, is, as we noted at the outset, union with God. This union is, primarily, *personal*—an ethical fellowship, in which God shall fully disclose His character, and impart Himself, to man; in which man shall freely open his being to the communications of God, and find in God his life and development. Such personal union, however, carries with it *cosmical union* also, or the harmonizing of all those differences from God which are implied in the existence of the created universe, and find their most acute expression in the self-assertion of man against God. The reconciling of man is the reconciling of all things. The solution of a problem, thus fundamentally personal, must be itself personal. Christianity, accordingly, met the problem of the early centuries, as it meets the same problem in the twentieth century, by the preaching of the personal Christ. He is the Son of God; and therefore, also, He is the Son of Man. In Christ, God is fully present; through Him, God is perfectly known; with Him, God is one. In Christ, human nature is fully realized in all that it was meant to be, both in respect of its complete dependence upon God and of its complete fulfilment of spiritual function. In Christ, accordingly, the history of creation is complete. He stands at the head of a universe reconciled to God. He *is* its reconciliation. Wherever the problem of union with God takes expression in concrete facts—in the sense of guilt in the individual conscience; in death, which closes human life with a pall of impenetrable darkness; in the antagonism of man to man, manifested in personal animosities, or the war of nation with nation and class with class—in facts whose gloom no pessimism can exaggerate: there, the knowledge of Christ supplies the solution. To know Christ is to be at one with God and with man. Christianity is thus both religion and ethic. It is an intense individual experience, which is the impulse of boundless social service.

And when the same problem finds the precision and articulateness of philosophical expression—as it did, for instance, in that Neo-Platonism which had such strange

affinities to Christianity while it was also its bitterest opponent; or as it does to-day, in that Absolute Idealism which, in some aspects, is the noblest ally of the Christian faith, and, in others, its proudest and least sympathetic rival—the key to its solution will still be found in the conception of a Personality at once Divine and human, a life lived under historic conditions, which was at once the life of God in man and the life of man in and through God. The words of the Master of Balliol apply to the present as well as to the primitive position of Christianity:

‘It contained implicitly the key to all the antagonisms of thought that had been developed in Greek philosophy—the antagonism of the material and the spiritual, the antagonism of the phenomenal and the ideal or intelligible world, the antagonism of the finite and the infinite, the antagonism of the temporal and the eternal. In a word, it contained in itself the principle of an optimism which faces and overcomes the deepest pessimism, of an idealism which has room in itself for the most realistic consciousness of all the distinctions and relations of the finite’ (*Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers*, vol. ii. p. 351).

2. The Incarnation of the Son of God is therefore the article of a standing Church. It is, at the same time, the abiding problem of a living Church. It is not, however, a problem which is suggested by one faculty to be handed over to another for solution. Faith does not receive Christ, and then appeal to intellect to tell us who He is, and how His Person is constituted. It has been the profound error of Scholasticism, both before and since the Reformation, to suppose that faith supplies a mass of crude amorphous facts and experiences, upon which the intellect exercises its analytic, systematizing genius, distinguishing, defining, separating, and then tying into bundles by means of formulae. The result of such a method, applied to the problem of the Person of Christ, is a Christology in whose dogmatic construction the living Christ of history and experience is wholly unrecognizable. The Reformation was the protest of Christian faith against this attempt to rob it of the personal Saviour, whom it appropriates, whom the believer knows directly and truly. Ritschlianism, however incomplete its constructive work may be, is nevertheless, as a protest against formalism, in harmony with the spirit of the Reformation.

The value of such a protest, however, will be greatly lessened if it lend colour to the supposition that our knowledge of Christ is confined to His benefits, while He Himself, in the secret of His being, belongs to some supposed noumenal sphere, inaccessible to human knowledge, so that it is impossible either to affirm or deny His Divinity. ‘Hoc est Christum cognoscere, beneficia ejus cognoscere’ is a proposition true if it mean that no one can know Christ who is not vitally one with Him, and therefore a partaker of His benefits; but certainly false if it mean that, beyond His benefits, there is a supposed substratum of being, about which nothing can be known, which may or may not be Divine (cf. Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 63). Thus does the misapplied

category of substance take revenge upon the critical method, which, while denying its validity, retains it as a kind of metaphysical phantom. To know the benefits of Christ, to live in fellowship with Him, to carry out His commission, is to know Himself. No shadow of unreality lies upon that knowledge, any more than it lies upon the knowledge we have of the friend whom we know better than we know ourselves. This does not mean, of course, that any believer, or the whole community of believers, now knows, or ever will know, all about Christ. Personality, even human personality, is a great deep; and the joy of friendship is the progressiveness which is the mark of personal knowledge. Much more is this true of the personality of Christ. Knowledge of Christ is boundlessly progressive; what more is to be known of Him than the Church at present apprehends, depends on those conditions belonging to the whole personal life which make any knowledge of Him possible. In short, the problem of the Person of Christ is presented by that faith, which is already knowledge, to that knowing power, which is simply faith itself, as it grows in apprehension of Christ. Christ is not divided; and there is no division in the faculty which apprehends Him, though the stages of its exercise and its acquisition advance endlessly from less to more. It follows that Christology, which is simply the reflective expression of the knowledge of Christ gained in actual experience, must not subject the fulness of its material to any form of thought borrowed from an alien sphere; or if, in the exigencies of a defensive statement, it uses loan-words derived from philosophy, it must never for a moment imagine that these explain or exhaust the living reality with which it is dealing. These words float, like derelicts, on the ocean of the Church's thought, and many a promising speculation has struck thereon and foundered. Especially ought modern Christology to be on its guard against that dualistic mode of thought, with the terminology which it employs, which is the *damnosa haereditas* bequeathed to theology by Greek Philosophy, the shadow of which fell upon Kant, and has not departed from the new Kantians of recent times. The task of Christology at the present day is to restate and to defend two certainties of Christian experience.

(1) To Christian experience, educated and informed by Scripture and by the Spirit of truth, *Christ is known as God*. The problem of the relation of the Divine Christ to the Divine Father is thus necessarily raised, and will not be evaded. If, however, the conception of absolute Godhead be modelled upon the forms of Greek dualism, the mystery becomes an insoluble problem, confounding thought and troubling faith. Within a Godhead conceived as abstract unity there is no room for the Divine Christ. The best that thought can do is to place the Son outside God, though as near to Him as possible. But this is straightway to deprive faith of its object, and to imperil the fact of reconciliation. The Church, accordingly, would have none of the Arian honorific titles applied to Christ on the presupposition that He was less than God, and would be content with nothing less than the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father. The term ὁμοούσιος, borrowed not without reluctance from philosophy, was

probably inevitable, and served sufficiently to utter the Church's faith-knowledge of the true Divinity of its Lord. The danger lay in supposing that οὐσία, or the category of substance, is adequate to express the infinite wealth of the Divine Personality, or, worse still, in directing men's minds to conceive of God as Substance rather than as Personality. From the baleful effects of this point of view, theology has not yet shaken itself free. The only category which can apply to the mystery of the relation of the Father to the Son is that of organic union, whose highest illustration is in the domain of personal life. There are deep and living relations which subsist between persons even within the human family. If one person not only *may*, but *must* live in another person in order to be a person, and if between these two there is such community of life that each finds his life in the other, and these two are not so much two as one, we may find ourselves on the verge of a greater mystery and a far deeper unity: the abiding of the Father in the Son and the Son in the Father, and these two, along with the Spirit of both, forming the One God of redemption and of creation. By such a path as this must Christology move to a fuller grasp of the truth, which the Nicene Creed asserted, but did not adequately or finally set forth.

(2) To Christian experience, maintained in fellowship with the living Christ, *He is known as man*. Faith apprehends Him as incarnate, *i.e.* as a Divine Being, who became man, entered into the sphere and conditions of human life, and passed through a complete human experience. Humanity, therefore, reaches its consummation in His Person; and human beings, divided though they may be from one another, find no impassable barriers between themselves and Christ. Christian experience, accordingly, is vitally concerned with the earthly life of Christ, as recorded in the Gospels. Docetism and Ebionism are both false to the conviction of faith. Between the Divinity and the humanity of Jesus Christ, faith finds no abstract opposition. Christ is known as at once Divine and human.

As soon, however, as faith seeks to make clear to itself its convictions, and to state and defend them in view of inquiry or attack, certain questions regarding the human-Divine life of the Lord inevitably arise.

(a) The problem of the origin of this life presented itself very early to the minds of those who had learned to see in Jesus Christ the Son of God. He is man, yet He is related to God as no other man can be. Is it possible that He could have come into the world, as other men do, as a child of a human father and mother? The answer to be found in two of the Gospels is that He did not; that the Holy Ghost came upon His mother, and the power of the Most High overshadowed her; that her Son had no human father. The truth of the narrative of the supernatural birth is challenged, in many quarters, on critical and on metaphysical grounds. In view of these objections, it ought to be freely admitted that the Incarnation *might* have taken place under

normal human conditions. We are not in a position to determine *a priori* what course Infinite Power and Love shall take. It is impossible, therefore, to place the *mode* of the Incarnation, through a virgin-birth, on the same footing of religious or theological importance as the great *fact* of the Incarnation itself. If, however, from a study of the data presented in the NT, *i.e.* from a consideration of the character of Christ, of His claims and self-witness, as well as of the testimony of His disciples, *apart from* the narratives of His infancy, we have arrived at the conviction of His unequalled and supreme greatness; and if we *then* return to a study of these narratives, we cannot fail to find in them an ethical purity and a spiritual fitness which command our glad acceptance. Their value for Christian thought lies in their providing a physical fact, correspondent to the conviction which a study of the person of Christ has wrought in us, *viz.* that He is not the product of a natural evolution from humanity, but is a Divine Being who has entered into the conditions and experiences of human nature.

The supernatural birth of Jesus is not our warrant for belief in His Divinity and His sinlessness. But belief in His Divinity and His sinlessness is our warrant for regarding the supernatural birth as being not merely possible or credible, but as being wholly congruous with the uniqueness of His personality, and, therefore, as serving as a welcome illustration and confirmation of the contents of Christian experience.

(b) In studying the record of the life of Christ, many questions arise in connexion with the relation of the Divine to the human aspects of His personality. Are not the notes of Godhead absoluteness, finality, completeness, independence of all the means by which human character is developed? How, then, are we to understand the evident facts of our Lord's life on earth, that He inquired, and learned, and was ignorant; that He passed through the stages of a temporal development, moving toward His goal through conflict and suffering; and that, in His communion with His Father, He employed the means of grace which are ordained for men—reading the Sacred Scriptures, and being much in prayer?

In considering such problems, Christian thought has been much hindered by the domination of metaphysical conceptions such as 'nature,' and by the controlling influence of a dualism which has opposed the Divine and human natures, regarding them as possessed of contrary attributes. The history of Christology consists, mainly, in a series of attempts to bring into harmony with one another, in the unity of the person, 'natures' which, it is presupposed, are fundamentally opposed in their characteristics and activities. *Eutychianism* brings them so close together as to confound them in a result which is a compound of Divine and human. *Nestorianism* holds them so far apart as to make them almost the seats of independent personalities. *The formula of Chalcedon* can scarcely be called a theory; it is rather an enumeration of the contrasted elements and a mere assertion of the unity which comprehends them. The *Lutheran Christology* seeks to reduce the dualism of Divine

and human to the lowest possible degree by the deification of Christ's human nature. The *Kenotic theories* of more recent times have sought to reach the same result by the idea of a depotentiation of His Divine nature. However remarkable these schemes may be as intellectual efforts, and whatever value they may have in directing attention to one or another element in the complex fact, it is certain that they all fall under a threefold condemnation. (i.) They are dominated by metaphysical conceptions which are profoundly opposed to the ideas which prevail throughout Scripture; being dualistic to the core, whereas the ruling ideas of Scripture are synthetic, and are far removed from the distinctions which mark the achievements of the Greek mind. (ii.) They do not correspond with, or do justice to, the knowledge which faith has of the personal Christ; separating, as they do, what faith grasps as a unity, while their attempted harmonies are artificial, and not vital. (iii.) They fail to reproduce the portrait of Christ presented in the Gospels; they utterly fail to give adequate utterance to the impression which the Christ of the Gospels makes upon the minds which contemplate Him. This is true even of the Chalcedonian scheme, which, in substance, is repeated in many modern creeds and confessions.

'A Being who combines in an inscrutable fashion Divine with human properties, and of whom, consequently, contradictory assertions may be made, while His dual natures hold an undefined relation to one another. This is not a scheme to satisfy either head or heart' (Principal Dykes, papers on 'The Person of our Lord' in *Expos. Times*, Oct. 1905-Jan. 1906).

Christian thought, accordingly, must abandon the dualism which has so long impeded its efforts. It can never, indeed, emphasize too strongly the lowliness of man, both as creature and as sinful creature, and must never, even in its most spiritual exercises, forget the reverence that is due from man to God. But it must reject as misleading all theories which presuppose a generic difference between the Divine and the human natures. It must, therefore, reject the 'two-natures' doctrine of the Person of Christ, in the form in which it has hitherto prevailed; and must start in its study of Christ from the Biblical point of view of the essential affinity of the Divine and the human natures.

In recent literature the influence of Psychology upon Christological study is deeply marked. Instead of two natures, two consciousnesses are suggested as giving the adequate conception of our Lord's life on earth. The Son of God became the Son of Man; and had a true human experience in respect of knowledge, will, and every other aspect of normal human life; while at the same time He remained the Logos, retaining the attributes of Deity, such as omniscience. He lived, so to speak, in two universes at once, the macrocosm of creation at large and the microcosm of human life. This double life and double consciousness, it is suggested, are to be interpreted in the light of recent psychological experiments, which seem to establish the

conclusion that there is a vast subliminal sphere, where the larger part of our life is lived, that which emerges in consciousness being but a section of the greater whole.

It may well be that such psychological hints are not to be thrown away. Yet it may be doubted whether success on this line is surer than under the old metaphysical control. There are curiosities of Psychology as well as of Metaphysics; and the idea of a subliminal sphere may prove as inadequate to explain the mystery of the Incarnation as the old 'bloodless' categories of 'substance' or 'nature.' The soul of Jesus is not on the dissecting table, and a psychology of it is impossible. In particular, it must be asked whether the representation of Jesus as being ordinarily absorbed in His human experiences, while having occasional visitations of His own Logos consciousness, is true to the portrait of Christ in the Gospels. Is there any suggestion in the narrative of a movement on the part of Jesus, to and fro, between the sub-conscious and the conscious spheres? Is not the deepest note in His character the continuousness of His conscious fellowship with God as of the Son with the Father? Is there a hint anywhere of a shutting off of His Divine consciousness during the greater part of His human experience? There is certainly no indication of the shock which a *merely* human consciousness would receive if it were suddenly invaded by a Divine consciousness. Is not the dualism of two consciousnesses as fatal to the harmony of the life and character of Christ as that of the 'two natures' ever was? Or, at least, are not the two consciousnesses really coincident, the Divine being the root of the human, the human being penetrated, formed, and inspired by the Divine?

In any case, whatever value we may attach to theories of the Person of Christ, whether metaphysical or psychological, and whatever may be our forecast of the issues of fixture Christological study, certain conclusions have established themselves as of permanent importance for Christian thought and experience. (i.) It is possible for a Divine Being to have a truly human experience. There is nothing in the nature of God or of man to forbid this. Scripture knows nothing of such disparity between the Divine and human natures as to make the idea of Incarnation an intellectual impossibility. Without doubt, the fact of Incarnation must be a theme of unending wonder and praise: but our view of it ought not to be confounded by the intrusion of speculative difficulties which do not belong to the actual situation. The Son of God became man. He was born, grew, thought, willed, prayed, rejoiced, suffered, died; and in and through all these perfectly human experiences He was, and was conscious of being, the Son of the Father. This Divine consciousness would, no doubt, profoundly modify, in His case, these experiences. The effect, for instance, of His sinlessness and of His filial relation to God upon the exercise of His intellectual faculties must have been such as to raise His knowledge high above that of other men, and would give to it what has been called 'intensive infinitude.' But the Divine consciousness would not make the human experiences other or less than human. Surely it ought to be admitted, once for all, that humanity, as we know it, is not

complete, and that it gains completeness only as it approximates to the Divine nature. It is not so correct to say that Jesus Christ was Divine and yet human, as to say He was Divine and *therefore* human.

(ii.) It follows that the human experiences of such a Being constitute at once a veiling and a manifestation of the Divine glory. In the thinking, feeling, acting, suffering of the Son, the Father is drawing near to His creatures, and achieving for them the purpose both of creation and of redemption. We are to look for the Divinity of Christ, not apart from His humanity, but within it, in the facts of His character, and in those actions which He performs and those sufferings which He endures in closest fellowship with men. His human experiences, so far from casting doubt on His Divinity, or seeming to be inconsistent with it, will be its chief demonstration, and will constitute God's mightiest work for us, His most moving appeal to us. This Man is the Word of God incarnate.

(iii.) Knowledge of Christ, accordingly, is personal, and, like all personal knowledge, is ethically conditioned. All constructive statements regarding the Person of Christ, accordingly, must be, to a degree not attained in the older formularies of the Church, synthetic and concrete. We rise from a study of the life and character of Jesus, and of the experience of those who have come under His saving influence, with the conviction of His essential Godhead. We confess Him to be the Son of God. But His Godhead is not to be regarded in abstract separation from His humanity. It is the Godhead of One who is profoundly and truly human.

It is Godhead, as it discloses itself in humanity, which presents itself for our reverent study, and our no less reverent doctrinal statement.

From this point of view alone can the facts of the life of Christ be apprehended. In this light alone can Christ be presented to this generation as the answer to its need, the age-long need of the human spirit, for personal union with God.

Literature.—(a) Greek Philosophy: Caird, *Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers* (1894); Zeller, *Stoics and Epicureans*; Lightfoot, *Dissertations on the Apostolic Age*, 'St. Paul and Seneca'; Drummond, *Philo Judaeus*, and art. 'Philo' by same author in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, Extra Vol.

(b) Religion of Israel: *Theol. of the OT*, by Schultz, Davidson, Oehler; Drummond, *Jewish Messiah*; Stanton, *Jewish and Christian Messiah*; Kautzsch's art. in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, Extra Vol.

(c) Character and self-witness of Jesus: *NT Theol.* of Weiss, Beyschlag, Reuss, Stevens; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*; Dalman, *Words of Jesus*; Forrest, *Christ of History*

and of Experience, and Authority of Christ; Shailer Mathews, *Messianic Hope in the NT* (1905); Adamson, *Mind in Christ*; Bruce, *Training of the Twelve, Kingdom of God, Galilean Gospel*; Swete, *Studies in the Teaching of our Lord* (1904); Zockler's art. 'Jesus Christus' in *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; Sanday's art. 'Jesus Christ' in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible* ; Driver's art. 'Son of Man,' and Sanday's 'Son of God,' *ib.*; Westcott, *Revelation of the Father, Christus Consummator*.

(d) Testimony of the Apostles: *NT Theol.* as above; also Shailer Mathews as above; Bacon, *Story of St. Paul: a Comparison of Acts and Epistles* (1904); Knowling, *Testimony of St. Paul to Christ* (1905), note copious literature of recent date referred to in Lecture xxiv.; Patrick, *James, the Lord's Brother* (1906).

(e) Development of Doctrine: Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*; Loofs, *Leitfaden*⁴ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (1906); Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*; Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*; Ottley, *Doctrine of the Incarnation*; Réville, *Hist. du dogme de la divinité de Jésus Christ*; Schultz, *Die Lehre von der Gottheit Christi* (1881); Herm. Schmidt, *Zur Christologie*; Loofs' art. 'Christologie' in *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; Kunze, *Die ewige Gottheit Jesu Christi* (1904); Orr, *Christian View of God and the World, Progress of Dogma, God's Image in Man* (1905); Bruce, *Humiliation of Christ*; T. C. Edwards, *The God-Man*; Liddon, *Divinity of our Lord*; Gore, *Bampton Lecture, and Dissertations*; Walker, *The Spirit and the Incarnation*; Dods, *Incarnation of the Eternal Word* (1849); Illingworth, *Personality Human and Divine, Divine Immanence*; D'Arcy, *Idealism and Theology*; Sturt and others, *Personal Idealism*; Fairbairn, *Christ in Modern Theology, Philosophy of Christian Religion*.

T. B. Kilpatrick.

Incense

INCENSE.—The English word comes from the Lat. *incensus*, 'burnt' (*incendere*, 'to burn'), and is applied to the materials used for making a perfume which was emitted by the materials being burned. These materials consist of fragrant gums, spices, and scents.

‘Incense’ is the usual translation of *θυμιανα*, which occurs in the NT 6 times only: Luk 1:10-11, Rev 5:8; Rev 8:3-4; Rev 18:13. In the passages in Rev. it is always in the plural, and in Rev 18:13 is rendered in Authorized Version by ‘odours.’ *θυμιαμα* is the LXX Septuagint equivalent of Heb. *תַּבְּרָק*, which comes from *קָטַר* ‘to raise an odour by burning,’ and so ‘to burn incense.’ Cognate Gr. words are *θυμιάω*, ‘to burn incense,’ Luk 1:9 (ἅτ. λεγ. in NT); and *θυμιατήριον*, Heb 9:4 ‘censer,’ or ‘altar of incense.’ The root of these words is *θύω* = (1) ‘to be in heat,’ (2) ‘to burn,’ (3) ‘to sacrifice (by burning)’; see Grimm-Thayer, s.v., and cf. *θυμῖς* and *θυμόω*. The word *θυμιαμα* is to be carefully distinguished from *λίβανος*, ‘frankincense’ (Heb. *לְבֹנֵן*). The latter was an ingredient of the former. *λίβανος* is found twice in NT (Mat 2:11 and Rev 18:13, in the latter together with *θυμιάματα*).

Incense came to be used in connexion with the Levitical worship in the Temple. Special care was to be taken in the making of it (Exo 30:34 f. P [Note: Priestly Narrative.]). Several passages in the OT indicate that the Israelites came to regard it (as they did other ceremonies) *per se*, apart from its spiritual meaning. Hence the denunciations of the prophets (Isa 1:13 etc.). In the NT it is referred to only in connexion with the daily service of the Temple (Luke 1), and also as part of the symbolical heavenly worship in the Apocalypse. In Rev 5:8; Rev 8:3-4 it is associated with the prayers of the saints; in Rev 5:8 apparently being identified with the prayers, and in Rev 8:3-4 added to the prayers (cf. *ταῖς προσευχαῖς* in both verses), as though to render them acceptable. Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘with’ in Rev 8:4 seems impossible.

The symbolism seems to be generally that of worship, which, like incense, *ascends* from earth to heaven. In Psa 141:2 prayer is thus likened to incense. Godet (on Luk 1:10) thinks there was a close connexion between the two acts of burning incense and offering prayer.

‘The one was the typical, ideal, and therefore perfectly pure prayer; the other the real prayer, which was inevitably imperfect and defiled. The former covered the latter with its sanctity, the latter communicated to the former its reality and life. Thus they were the complement of each other.’

Incense is used in worship in the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches, and by some congregations in the Anglican Church. Its earliest use in the Christian Church seems to

have been as a fumigant (so Tertullian). No liturgical use is known for at least 4 if not 5 centuries. Up till then it was regarded as a relic of heathenism. As the Holy Communion came to be regarded as a sacrifice, and in some respects analogous to the Jewish sacrifices, incense became gradually associated with Christian worship. It is at least noteworthy that there is an entire absence of any reference to incense in the Christian Church of the NT in Acts and the Epistles, the only allusions being those in the symbolism of the Apocalypse. May not this be rightly regarded as an *argumentum e silentio*? Having the substance, what need is there of the shadow? (Joh_4:23-24).

Literature.—Artt. ‘Incense,’ ‘Frankincense’ in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ; ‘Incense’ in Smith's *DCA* [Note: *CA* Dictionary of Christian Antiquities.] ; Godet and Plummer on Luk_1:9-11; *Speaker's Com.* on Rev_5:8; Rev_8:3; Rev_18:13.

W. H. Griffith Thomas.

☒ Independence

INDEPENDENCE.—See Originality.

☒ Indignation

INDIGNATION.—See Anger, and Fierceness.

☒ Individual

INDIVIDUAL.—It has almost become a commonplace of Apologetics that the significance of the individual is first recognized in Christianity. In Antiquity the idea that the individual might stand over against the State, either through the sense of duty or the sense of truth, was not entertained. Most ancient civilizations were based on slavery, which at once refused to recognize a large section of the members of the State as individuals, and placed the individuality of the others not on an equal moral basis, but on a basis of social inequality.

Yet the Christian conception of the individual did not descend upon the earth without any indication of its coming. Socrates had instructed men to know themselves, and, though his greatest disciple did not consider this teaching inconsistent with a Republic

in which the family and the most sacred rights of the individual are sacrificed to the interests of the State, the real significance of the Greek Philosophy was the growing clearness with which it went on to bring out the importance of man to himself. Stoicism insisted that a man's dignity should not be at the mercy of events, and even Epicureanism taught that man's surest ground of happiness is within. Baur's contention, that the chief preparation for Christianity was a growing need for a universal, a moral religion, is only another way of saying that the individual, not as a free man, or a cultured man, or a member of a Greek State, but as an individual, was slowly coming to his rights.

This progress in the Gentile world, however, was not in any strict sense a preparation for our Lord's teaching, but, at most, of the world for receiving it. His true foundations are in the OT, and more particularly in the prophets. Here again it is a commonplace of theological thinking that the religion of the OT does not concern itself about the individual at all in the same sense as the religion of the NT. Worship is a social and even a civil act. The God men worship is the God of their fathers, *i.e.* the God of their race. The great body of the ritual exalts not the covenant person, but the covenant people. Even the prophets have very little to say about individual piety, but concern themselves with the rulers and the conduct of society and the destiny of the nation. We cannot be sure, even in what seem the most personal Psalms, that it is not the voice of a nation rather than of an individual that confesses sin and implores help. This uncertainty regarding the place of the individual is made greater by the indistinctness, at least in the earlier books, of the hope of individual immortality, which, however we may try to get round it, is essential to any high estimate of the worth of the individual.

No book, nevertheless, compares with the OT for the boldness with which the individual stands out in contrast and, if need be, in opposition to, the community, and that on spiritual, not social considerations. The standard of its teaching is personal responsibility, and that ultimately sets a man alone as an individual with his God. If it is a national and not an individual hope the prophets contend for, they place it on an individual not a communistic foundation. They are not concerned to reform institutions or demand new laws. The reform they seek is of personal action and manners, and the law they wish to see obeyed is God's. For this law it is the individual that signifies—the pressure of his personal call being so great that his duty to follow it is never questioned, even though it should bring him into conflict with both the State and the people. Ezekiel may have been the first to recognize the full significance of this attitude, but he was by no means the first to take it up. Of every prophet it could be said, 'Behold, I have made thy face hard against their faces, and thy forehead against their foreheads' (Eze 3:8). To each of them the Spirit of God was a power to help him to be true to himself. It set each of them on his feet before speaking to him (Eze 2:2). The very mark of a true prophet was to hear God's voice

only, and not man's, and to be true to the individuality God had given him, and not to be an echo of the party cries around. To have that most selfish kind of individualism which consists in agreeing with the majority of the powers that be, was the mark of the false prophet (Jeremiah 20).

Such an attitude of independence could not be taken up without a very strong sense of the significance of the individual for God. The significance of the solitary figure of Jeremiah could not be less because he lived for the welfare of his people, and their ingratitude left him in isolation. Ezekiel naturally followed with the application. Were Noah, Daniel, and Job in a wicked land, they could but deliver their own souls by their righteousness (Eze 14:14). God deals equally with all, and every act is weighed, without prejudice either from a man's own past or from the doings of his fathers (Eze 18:2; Eze 18:23-30). The soul that sinneth, it shall die Eze 14:4).

Of other OT writings the two most important are the Psalms and Job. The eye of the writers may at times be on the nation, but even that is part of their personal piety, and to our day the unfailing interest of the Psalms is in the experience of the individual walking with his God. The Book of Job is wholly occupied with the problem of the individual, even if this individual be supposed to stand for the nation; and no one has ever stated with greater splendour of imagination or intellectual daring his right to fair dealing, not only from his fellow-men but from his God.

The OT conception of the relation of the moral individual to God, moreover, necessarily reached out toward the hope of immortality,—and that not merely as an extension of man's desires beyond time, but as the just requirement of an individuality that defied time and lived by the eternal.

That our Lord entered upon this heritage and accepted the estimate of each individual which we indicate by calling him an immortal soul, and that on the ground of the OT conception of the blessedness of the man whom God hears, appears from His argument with the Sadducees (Mat 22:32, Mar 12:27, Luk 20:38), and is a postulate of His whole teaching. The saying, 'What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?' (Mar 8:36), may only indicate a man's value to himself, and the other, 'How much then is a man better than a sheep!' (Mat 12:12), may not seem to go very far. Christ's true conception of the individual rather appears in the *belief* He offers for man's acceptance and the *duty* He requires that man should perform.

Of this *belief* the centre of everything is the manifestation of the Father. As revealed through the Son, He is a Father, which means that He does not, as a mere Ruler, deal with men in groups, but that each man has to Him the distinctiveness, the importance, the whole significance he can have to himself. The side of God's infinity

which our Lord insists on, is the infinity of His care for the individual. In God's sight also, nothing can be given in exchange for a soul. By His care and guidance, that frail thing, an individual spirit, can walk without anxiety amid all the forces which might threaten his destruction, not only sure of protection, but sure that everything will be used to serve his true welfare. This attitude toward earthly cares is not sustained by hardness or indifference, but by a belief that God regards these things as the servants of His children, whose individual well-being He sets far above material things. It is not a low view of the world, but a high view of the spiritual individual, which our Lord teaches.

Speaking, as He always does, with this thought of God towards man in the foreground, Jesus is led to dwell rather on the worth of the insignificant and imperfect individual in the concrete than on the general worth of the individual in the abstract. Hard-hearted religious people spoke lightly of 'this multitude' being 'accursed' (Joh 7:49). He called none accursed, and warned His followers against calling any one *Raca* (Mat 5:22); and when He used the word 'lost,' it became in His mouth tender and compassionate and full of the heart of God. The parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Piece of Money, and above all of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15), speak of God's unwillingness to let anything so precious as an individual be lost. The little child is the type of what is greatest (Mat 18:1-2), and the little one in moral stature, whom to offend is worse than death, is guarded by the very angels of the Presence (Mat 18:10).

The same estimate of the worth of the individual appears in the ideal of human *duty*. There is no one, however poor or humble, who should not set before him the goal of being perfect as our Father in heaven (Mat 5:48). It is better to cut off the right hand than use another individual for our lusts, or to put out an eye than purpose such a thing (Mat 5:27-30). Most distinctive is the duty of forgiveness. Our Lord takes for granted that it will be difficult. We shall have so much respect for our own individuality that we must be hurt, and for the individuality of others that we cannot pass over their faults easily. Only by rising to the height of God's thought can we hope to attain to God's way of dealing with the unthankful and evil. We are to understand that God also does not pardon lightly. He does not regard the whole mass of good and bad indifferently. On the contrary, He sets each individual before Him as something of great significance to Him, something whereby He can be deeply hurt and grieved, and then, out of the same love that can be hurt, He pardons him. It is the significance of the individual that gives its whole importance to the doctrine of pardon, whether on God's part or on man's.

But the very greatness of this relation to God might seem to withdraw something from the distinctiveness of man as an individual. The worth of the individual is not ultimately from himself but from God. 'If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a

branch, and is withered' (Joh_15:6). This might almost seem to be a denial that there is such a thing as an individual. The individual would then be a mere manifestation of God. Spinoza's formula, *omnis determinatio est negatio*, would obtain, and the assertion of one's own individuality would only be as cutting off a certain portion of the air with a knife. But the inalienable secret of the gospel is that it enables a man to find God and himself at the same time. It does not deal with the endless substance, but with a Father. That He is an individual is not His limitation, but the condition of all His greatness; for it is the condition of His working by love, and love is greater than power. Conversion is thus not only a turning to God, but a finding of oneself (Luk_15:17), and a coming to one's true home and to one's right possession. While no succour of God fails a man who will have it, it remains a necessity of God's love to set a man by himself in the task of working out his own destiny. He is allowed to go into the far country and waste his substance. In all the descriptions which glance out into the future there is a strange aloneness of the individual who has gone his own way, into which God Himself cannot intrude. Just because every human personality is so definitely an individual, we cannot be sure that, in the end, there may not be a lost individual. A relation of love in Christ's sense necessarily means a relation of individuals, and that means such a marking off of a man from God that even God cannot enter that personality again, except the door is opened to Him, as it were, from the inside. This high gift of being an individual with the possibility of being a child of God, carries with it also the possibility of such exclusion of good as can make him a child of the wicked one (Mat_13:38). Nor does the closest relation to God absorb the individual. Whatever ordinances there may be for public worship, the distinctive position is to enter into our closet and shut to the door, and be with our Father who sees in secret (Mat_6:6). There is an individual hearing and an individual answering, which, however little our minds may compass it, are essential both in God's giving and in man's receiving. Just as there is a strange pitiful isolation of the individual who rejects God, so there is a strange saving of his own individuality in losing it, in the soul that finds God. That we remain individuals is as essential to the relationship as that we find our joy in another individual. The revelation of the Father in the Son must preclude all idea of absorption in God.

This is the ground of Ritschl's contention not only against a Catholicism which bears down the individual by the weight of the institution, but also against a mysticism which reduces all individuals to mere personality, upon which a Spirit, Himself mere personality, operates not as individual with individual, but as abstract spiritual force upon abstract spiritual substance. The influences of grace we must, on the contrary, interpret through Christ, the Spirit having come in His place to bring His words to our remembrance (Joh_14:26). Ritschl argues that God only uses His revelation in the Scriptures on the one hand, and His dealings with us by the experiences and duties of life on the other. The tendency with him is, not only to limit God, but also to ignore possibilities in man; yet his main contention is of great value, and it helps us to

understand the patient humanness of God's revelation, if we take it to be a dialogue in which God could not speak the next word till man had responded to the last.

The only influences our Lord used were the appeals of wisdom and love. In every case He respected the individuality of another, and sought to make men realize how much they were to themselves as well as to God. When any influence appeared as a substitute for personal choice, He sternly repressed it. He trusted no general movement, and appealed to nothing occult. He was always willing to leave a crowd for an individual (Mar 1:37, Luk 4:42, Joh 6:15). The only miracle He ever wrought for the multitude He used for sifting them and for gathering individuals from among them (Joh 6:27). And when a crowd did gather to hear Him preach, He gave them most individual teaching. He never departed from the method of being an individual dealing with individuals, and from requiring of them the most individual of actions—repentance and obedience to one's own call.

Nor is the individual overborne by the society (see artt. Church, Kingdom of God, Individualism). Here it suffices to say that it is just the distinctive place Christ assigned to the individual that marks His Church off from the world, and His kingdom as a Kingdom of Heaven, a Kingdom of God. A kingdom which treats its subjects as mere pawns in a great game, is, in that very act, marked as temporal. Other-worldliness, indeed, is not the mind of Christ, and the attempt to derive everything from the far-sighted selfishness which does 'good according to the will of God and for the sake of everlasting happiness,' leaves no room for the highest things of Christianity. But it is not true, as is argued, that we reach a higher stage when we are able calmly to recognize that the individual passes and the society remains, that everyone should be content to live on in the lives of others, and that the Kingdom of God is everything and the individual nothing. The Kingdom of God is not thereby exalted. Nay, there can be no Kingdom of God, but a mere fleeting earthly Utopia. If the individual is obliterated, then, in view of the endless ages, but a moment more, and the society is obliterated as well. It becomes the Kingdom of God only when it deals with the eternal, and that must always be the individual. It is of God and not of mere human regulation just because it respects the individual—his choice, his peace, his freedom; because it is a society of persons not constrained by force to a common purpose, but attuned to it by love and wisdom. All our Lord says of His society speaks of an association in which its members will realize what the Apostle calls the glorious liberty of the children of God, and, so long as the Church is content to stand over against men as an institution claiming external authority, Christ's great problem of how men were at once to live wholly for the Kingdom of God, and not surrender their Christian freedom, their rights as individuals, remains unsolved. (For the general philosophical questions regarding the individual, see art. Personality).

One question yet remains. Can a person whose isolation has been thus dented to himself, ever again pass into the great undistinguishable mass? According to the orthodox conception, individuality, though a mere containing wall, is so adamant, that, whatever it may contain, it must abide. Ritschl, for one, argues that an alienation from God which the highest love cannot overcome, must mean annihilation. The very idea of a reality so important as to be inextinguishable, while all its manifestations demand its extinction, he would ascribe to the pernicious influence of the abstract Platonic idea of the soul. Nor can it be said that in the Gospels, or anywhere else in Scripture, there is any metaphysical basis of a Platonic kind for a necessary individual immortality. The Scripture hope is not in man, but in the character of God, and we cannot suppose Him under any necessity to continue evil for its own sake. On the other hand, if, as Ritschl maintains, the personality of God and man is individual, and pantheism is wholly an abandonment of the religious problem, which is how to maintain the spiritual personality against the whole material universe, through belief in the exalted Power that rules above it, it remains a problem whether evil can ever attain such power as to be able to blot out for God an individual.

Literature.—The whole of modern philosophy is concerned with the problem of the individual, but special mention may be made of: Spinoza, *Ethics*; Hume, *Human Nature*; Leibnitz, *de Principio Individui*; Kant, *Anthropologie*; J. H. Fichte, *Die Idee der Personlichkeit und der individuellen Fortdauer*; Nathaniel Southgate Shaler, *The Individual: A Study of Life and Death*, 1902; Doud, *Evolution of the Individual*, 1901; Beyschlag, *NT Theol.*, esp. vol. i. 125-187 (English translation); Lemme, *Christliche Ethik*, esp. § 10; Kretschmar, *Das Christliche Personlichkeits Ideal*, 1898; J. R. Illingworth, *Personality*.

John Oman.

Individualism

INDIVIDUALISM.—The word individualism is used in two senses, and the difference of meaning is constantly employed in order to discredit one set of ideas by arguing against the other. In a general way the uses may be distinguished by calling the one philosophical and the other political. Individualism, in the philosophical sense, attempts to derive everything from the intellect and the interests of the individual. However much a man derives from others, he ultimately depends, it argues, on his own judgment and his five senses; and, however benevolent he may be, all his motives have their source in self-love. Descartes started to reconstruct our whole knowledge from the individual's knowledge of himself, and his successors naturally

sought to construct our whole activity from the individual's love to himself. Shaftesbury and Butler had to affirm almost as a discovery that benevolence is as true and real a part of human nature as self-love. Only after Hume had reduced this kind of individualism to sensationalism, leaving the individual himself a mere series of sensations, and after Spinozism began to be poured into the waters of speculation, was it seen that man could not be understood alone, but only in his whole context.

It is needless to prove that this kind of individualism is not maintained by the Scriptures. And still less is it necessary to show that it is not our Lord's reading of human nature. The creature that is made in the image of God is not made for himself. The creed that says, 'If any man will come after me, let him deny himself' (Mat 16:24), believes that it finds something more in man than even the wisest self-love to which it can appeal. The individual does not, it is true, lose in Christ's service. On the contrary, he will receive an hundredfold, and, over and above, life everlasting (Mat 19:29). But that is only after he has learned the secret of forsaking all, after he has been taught, not of his own self-interest, but after he has been drawn by the Father from all self-regard (Joh 6:44). This possibility in man, our Lord recognizes, was also taught by the prophets, who wrote, 'And they shall all be taught of God' (Joh 6:45). To be taught of God means to be saved from this kind of individualism, to discover that it is not our right position and not our true selves, but is alienation from our true life and our true home; it is to learn that not only is love part of our nature, but that we have never found ourselves at all till it takes us out of ourselves (Luk 17:33, Mat 10:39).

Philosophical Individualism, however, is not only perfectly consistent with the appeal to authority which the other kind of individualism rejects, but it is almost entirely dependent upon such an authority for any explanation of the social order. On the other hand, what we have called Political Individualism is frequently maintained precisely on the ground that man is not, in the sense of belonging only to himself, individualistic, but has his true social quality within himself. 'Individualism' in this other sense means the rights of the individual over against authority, a position which does not, as is usually assumed, involve logically the other individualism, the individualism of every man for himself. It is not a denial of the necessity of a corporate existence or of the value of society. Its real opposite is Communism, and the real point at issue is whether society depends on the individual or the individual on society. Both Individualism and Communism, of course, would admit a mutual inter-relation, but the question is which is first, the individual or the social institution, and which is to be our chief reliance, the goodwill of the individual or the control of the social machinery. So far is this kind of individualism from involving individualism in the other sense, that it rather assumes that all the elements for the highest social state exist in each man, and would come to fruition, if only the

external hindrances could be removed. On this latter question, it must be admitted, our Lord's attitude is much more difficult to determine.

Of this practical individualism there are several types. First, there is the individualism of Nietzsche, to whom every altruistic feeling is the mere unreasoning instinct of the herd. That kind of individualism stood at the foot of the Cross, and said, 'He saved others, himself he cannot save,' and saw in the position the height of absurdity. Then there is the vigorous Philistine individualism of Herbert Spencer. It conceives man as a creature with five senses and ten fingers, who needs nothing on earth but a free field and no favour, whose chief duty to the human race is to secure its progress by making the weakest go to the wall. The text it most firmly believes in, in the whole Bible, is, 'He becometh poor that dealeth with a slack hand'; and what it cannot away with in Jesus is that He told people to give to everyone who asked, and to sell all, and give to the poor,—a frightful encouragement to laziness and mendicancy, and a most hurtful interference with the law of the survival of the fittest. Again, there is the individualism of Mr. Auberon Herbert and the *Free Life*. In its eyes men are quite free to part with everything they have, and it is believed they would part with it for the best purposes, if it were not that they are robbed and also debased by being blackmailed under the name of taxes. 'Bumble' is the true name and nature of all authorities, it having been their way in all time to muddle everything, doing it wastefully and doing it badly. Freedom, on the other hand, is man's highest privilege, and would, if it could get a chance, be his surest guidance. Force, which is the sole instrument of the State, has only one right application. It has a right to resist force, to suppress violence. The State is, when it keeps to its own sphere, simply the big policeman, 'a terror to evil-doers,' and also, in so far as it kindly lets them alone, 'a praise to them that do well.' With less hesitation regarding consequences, this individualism reasserts J. S. Mill's principle, 'that the sole end for which mankind are warranted, individually or collectively, in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number, is self-protection.' Finally, there is the individualism of Count Tolstoi, the basis of which he flods in the Gospels themselves. 'Judge not, that ye be not judged,' applies as much to a man in his official capacity as in his private, and 'Resist not evil' is required from the community as much as from the individual. No man is ever so much wiser and better than his fellows that he can have the right in any capacity to take over the regulation of their lives, and the very goal of history is to teach the folly and wickedness of any body of men trying to bear rule over others,—a philosophy of history somewhat akin to St. Paul's conception of the dispensation of the Law as meant to shut all up unto disobedience (Rom_11:32).

The kindness of the Socialists towards Tolstoi seems at first sight inexplicable, for nothing could be more opposed to their method than this rejection of all visible authorities. The Socialist, moreover, has the same sympathy with Christ's teaching. Take, e.g., Headlam's *Fabian Tract*, No. 42. The teaching of Jesus, he affirms, had

hardly anything to do with a life after death, but a great deal to do with a Kingdom of God, which is a righteous society to be established upon earth. Christ's works were secular, socialistic works. Whatever may be said of His miracles of raising the dead, they show that the death of a young person was a monstrous, disorderly thing to Him. If men would live in a rational, organized, orderly brotherhood, they would be clothed as beautifully as the lily. His denunciations were for those who oppressed the poor; and the man whom He spoke of as in hell, was the man who calmly accepted the difference between the rich and the poor; while the persons who were on the right hand at the Judgment, were those who had taken pains to know that people were properly clothed and fed. The Christian society was meant to do on a large scale the social work which Jesus had done on a small. Jesus ordained Baptism to receive every human child as equal into His Church, and the Eucharist to be a sacrament of equal brotherhood; and He made the first word in His prayer the recognition of a common Father, which must involve the equality of brethren. The Song of Mary describes Him as putting down the mighty from their seats and sending the rich empty away, and His Apostles insist on every man labouring, and on the labourer, not the capitalist, being first partaker of the fruits. If, therefore, 'you want to be a good Christian; you must be something very much like a good Socialist.' The Church, we are told, is fettered, and ineffective for carrying out this task, but much 'may be done by those Churchmen who remember that the State is a sacred organization as well as the Church,' and who are willing to help to seize it for the good of the people. Their first task, strangely, will be to free the Church from the fetters of the State, for one would rather have imagined that the logical conclusion should have been Rothe's position, that it is the business of the Church so to labour that ultimately it may be absorbed in the Christian State.

This exposition clearly shows the reason for sympathy with Tolstoi. It is a case of extremes meeting. Extreme individualism and extreme Socialism are both alike conscious of the present distress. Individualism is as little satisfied as Socialism with twelve millionaires dining at one end of London and finding the cultivated globe too small to please their palates, and at the other a million and a half of their fellow-creatures not knowing whether they will have any dinner at all. Than this, both are a great deal nearer the position of Him who said, 'Sell that ye have, and give alms' ([Luk 12:33](#)), 'woe unto you who are rich' ([Luk 6:24](#)), who denounced the robbery of the widow and the orphan, and no doubt included every form of ruthless competition whereby the strong get advantage of the weak. Competition has become a sacred word in these days, but it never has been a Christian word, and if some higher law does not rule above it, the fittest that will survive by it will not be the best but only the most rapacious.

Extreme Socialism and extreme Individualism, moreover, have this in common, that both carry on their propaganda in the interests of the individual and in the hope of

arriving at a better state of society. The Individualist thinks a better society can be formed only out of better individuals, and regards force as the great obstacle; whereas the Socialist thinks the individual will never have a chance in the present kind of social conditions. That Christ aimed both at creating a better individual and a better society needs no proof, and it must further be recognized that the society He Himself created, considered a voluntary community of goods at least in agreement with the spirit of His teaching (see art. Wealth). The emphasis which the leaders put on this voluntary aspect of communism distinguishes Christianity clearly from Socialism, but still the experiment indicates that, in a more Christian society, the Socialist ideal might be accomplished in another way. With our present concentration on material well-being, the end of competition would be almost the end of individuality; but if our real life were less lived by bread alone, if our true individuality were dependent on higher concerns, we might come to cultivate together the soil of the earth and enjoy together all it produces as much in common as we use the air that moves on its surface and the water that comes down its hills, and we should then be enabled to accept many of Christ's commands as literal which we can only now live with as figures of speech.

One feels in reading the Gospels that what is more alien to them than either Individualism or Socialism, is the current amalgam of both, which defends all the Individualism that means personal profit and all the Socialism that means personal security and dignity, which finds all our Lord's concessions literal and all His demands figurative. The typical attitude, though not usually expressed so bluntly, is Loisy's. Christ, he says, conceived the Kingdom of God, which He thought was at hand, as the great social panacea. Though He enforced it with the enthusiasm and excess which are necessary to implant any great ideal, it was quite unworkable in this rough world. There rose up in place of it, therefore, the Church with its authorities for belief and for conduct, that useful, practical, enduring compromise between the individual and the religious society. It is this combination which most of our countrymen who love compromise as the oil, if not the water, of life, are concerned to maintain; and when they welcome the passing of Individualism, they mean to hail the revival of the power of the visible authorities; and when they object to Socialism, they only mean that they do not approve of the purposes for which the power is to be used.

The method of Socialism, nevertheless, is not the method of the gospel, and the usual course of the Socialist is that which Mr. Headlam follows,—to prove that the aims of Socialism are Christ's, and then take for granted that He would approve of the means proposed for attaining them. Even supposing we make the large concession of granting the exegesis, we still do not find the slightest attempt to show that our Lord ever in any way trusted to the State as the instrument for accomplishing His design. The usual way of avoiding this difficulty is to say that He could not be expected to look to a Pagan State as we are justified in looking to the Christian State. To this there are two

very evident replies. First, Is the State ever Christian in our Lord's sense? Second, It was not the Pagan but the Theocratic State our Lord dealt with nearly all His days. It was there waiting to be adopted; yet He lived chiefly in conflict with it, and He never attempted to reform it or work through it. He certainly expected His followers to have a good deal to do with States and kings and governors, but it would be in an extremely individualistic position (Mat 10:18), and all that was expected of them was not to fear them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul (Mat 10:28). Our Lord's action was not revolutionary in the sense of actually overthrowing existing institutions, but He cannot be said to have cherished them. A certain regard was to be paid to the Scribes and Pharisees who sat in Moses' seat (Mat 23:2), but He also subjected them to such criticism as must have sapped their power. He Himself so far honoured the religious institutions as not to oppose them; but the only evil He ever put His hand to the task of reforming, was that which disturbed the private worshipper (Mat 21:12-16, Joh 2:13-17), and His entire indifference to ceremonial purity rejected a great deal of the institution to the advantage of the individual. All this might seem to refer rather to the Church than the State; but if He distrusted the leadership of the former, He would not be likely any more to trust the leadership of the latter, if it took over the guidance of life. It also would be the blind leading the blind. What our Lord manifestly expects to see, is what He calls the seed of the Kingdom (Mat 13:38), those who in every place are worthy, who are prepared to be as lights shining in a dark place. Why should He speak of the result as a Kingdom of God at all, if, in the final issue, it is only of man's regulation? The meaning certainly lies very near, that it was a kingdom of souls regulated only by love, a kingdom of souls bent on a direct service and obedience to God, and requiring no other rule. This fundamental distinction between it and all other earthly kingdoms would seem to be the very reason for calling it *of God*.

This view is confirmed by what seems the most convincing explanation of our Lord's temptations. To suppose that He was tempted merely by His own hunger and love of success and love of praise, is to ascribe to Him motives which had no power over Him at other times. But if they are temptations of His work, the temptation to provide a kingdom with fulness of bread and to rule by accepting the methods of force in the State and of display in the Church, we see how He could be touched in His deepest interests. When He turned from that way to the road that led by a solitary path to Calvary, to call many, but to choose only the few who also would be prepared to walk in it, He surely decided to look to the individual to save the institution, and not to the institution to save the individual. In view of all this, it cannot be questioned that the aristocrat in his peasant's dress, digging his bread out of the earth, and living as if the social revolution had come, in the high conviction that the Divine way is personal surrender and not social supervision, represents Christ's attitude better than the respectable persons who meantime take all the present system of competition will give, while they wait for salvation from the action of the State.

But Socialism only makes a pretence of being workable through the State, by ignoring the bearing which its action would have on the whole life of the individual, and it is with this larger question that our Lord is concerned. His Kingdom is not of this world, and its treasures are not upon earth, and it only concerns itself with the things upon earth as they have to do with the great treasure in heaven, which is character, and the great rule of the Kingdom, which is love. That He expected this idea to be embodied in an earthly society is plain, for the beginnings of it arose in His own lifetime. But it was to be a very singular society, in which none was to exercise authority on one hand, and none to call any man master on the other. The only dignity was to be service; and the higher the position, the lowlier one should serve. Nothing can reconcile this with the ecclesiastical embodiment of it in all ages, wherein the true succession has been placed in the officials, who determined not only action but belief, and who have penetrated further into the inner sanctuary of the individual life than any earthly government that ever existed. But no one recognized more fully than Christ Himself that the channels by which His influence would go down would intermingle their clay with the pure waters; and to assume that any organization is more than a dim human attempt at reaching out towards His ideal, is to neglect His own warnings. As the believer must be in the world, so he must be in the institution—in it but not of it, always retaining his right to consider whether Christ is there or not when men say, ‘Lo, here, or Lo, there. In so far as the institution serves this Kingdom of God, this kingdom of souls, whose only authority is God the Father as revealed in the Son, and whose only rule is love, it is to be honoured; but it must ever be prepared to be judged by that standard.

The great end of all progress, therefore, is not to subject the individual, but to call him to the realization of his own heritage of freedom. It is in the crowd that men have done all the great iniquities. The multitude come to take Christ; the disciples all in a body forsake Him; the rulers come together to judge Him; the whole band of soldiers is called together to buffet Him; the crowd cry, ‘Crucify Him’; the chief priests mock Him among themselves. Even those that were crucified with Him stilled their pain by falling in with the cry of the multitude. Whatever institution, therefore, we may submit to, we can only belong to the true Church by first of all having ‘salt in ourselves’ (Mar 9:50), by being of the truth and hearing Christ’s voice (Joh 18:37).

It is argued that the full meaning and claim of Christianity can never be explicable on the basis of Individualism, because ‘from first to last it deals with minds which are in relation with actual truth in regard to the soul, the world, and God, and which have not fully attained even the limits of their own nature till they are united in the Spirit-bearing Body, through Christ to the Father’ (Strong). Possibly Hume contends for the Individualism here refuted. Nobody else does. Why Christianity is so individualistic is precisely that the soul is so directly, or, at all events, can, through God’s revelation and grace, be so directly in contact with actual truth, the world and

God, as to make it only a distraction for another man, on merely official grounds, to come in between as a necessary channel; that the possession of such a personal relation to truth is a common bond of more power than any external tie; and that the visible organization is only vital and useful as it expresses this union. The usual way is to say the Kingdom of God is a purely spiritual condition on the one hand, and has a place and effect in the world on the other; to seek no common basis; to avoid deriving one from the other; to ascribe methods of worldly rule to the visible society, and then to transfer to it the attributes of love and truth and holiness that belong to the invisible, and so to claim for it, in subjection, the obedience which belongs to the other, in freedom. It is quite true that a person in a state of salvation is one called and admitted into a society; but, just because it is a society of saved persons, it is different in its relation to its members from all visible societies. Instead of more submission to their teachers and more obedience to their rulers, the Scripture hope of progress is still what it was of old, 'Would that the Lord's people were all prophets,'—would that each man were less concerned about his neighbour and more about his own message and his own call! Men are always ready to organize others; the fruitful and difficult task is to organize one's own soul.

Literature.—Butler's *Sermons*, and, in contrast, Paley's *Moral Philosophy*. For the extensive literature for and against Socialism, see *Fabian Tract*, No. 29, 'What to Read: A List of Books for Social Reformers.' For individual freedom, J. S. Mill, *On Liberty*; Herbert Spencer, *Man versus the State*, and *Sociology*; Tolstoi, *Essays*, and many smaller works. On the relation of the individual to the Church, reference may be made to Loisy, *L'Évangile et l'Église* [translation *The Gospel and the Church*, 1903]; Newman, *The Development of Christian Doctrine*, 1878; and T. B. Strong, *God and the Individual*, 1903.

John Oman.

☞ Individuality

INDIVIDUALITY.—The word 'individuality' may be used merely for the quality of being an individual, but its common use is to indicate the special characteristics which distinguish one individual from another, that which, as it has been expressed, marks each one as a particular thought of God. Only in this latter sense is the word considered here.

Both in morals and in religion it has always been a difficult matter to determine the due place of individual differences. The great weakness of Deism, e.g., was that, while it abundantly exalted the individual, it had no place for individuality. Its natural

religion and utilitarian ethic had, as its very standard of excellence, that it excluded everything whereby one man was different from another. Even Kant, the highest product of Rationalism, with his view of religion as an appendage to a moral law, and his supreme test of a moral law by its fitness to be a law universal, only accentuated this limitation. The Romantic reaction had as its characteristic note the glory of individuality. The marvel of the universe was just its variety, and the glory of man that he was the most varied thing in the universe. The whole duty of man was to be himself and admit no law except the law of his own nature. Then unfortunately it too frequently appeared that what man took to be his nature was only self-pleasing, and what he thought was religion was only satisfaction of the artistic sense. There was also another very strange result. This excessive insistence upon individuality came to obliterate the individual. So much stress was laid upon what was changing and varied, that nothing was thought of what is one and unchanging. Hence everything was reduced to the great World-Spirit whose artistic pleasure in unfolding His variety constituted the history of the world.

This insistence on the importance of individuality by Romanticism, nevertheless, bore large fruit in both ethics and religion. Indeed, all modern study at least of the historical religions may be dated from Schleiermacher's insistence on the marked individuality of all the great founders of religion. Nor is it possible to question his right to point in particular to Jesus. The supreme human interest in all the Scriptures is their immense gallery of persons who gave scope to their individuality. For the most part they are very far from being perfect, but none of them is fashioned on the common worldly type, none of them is rolled like smooth stones on the beach, in the continual social attrition. Yet, even in this great gallery of the children of nature and of God, Jesus stands out pre-eminent. Whatever may be said of the stories of His birth, they mark the profoundest impression made on His contemporaries by a great, a striking, an unforgettable individuality. Though the many attempts at painting His human individuality, from the Apocryphal Gospels downwards, cannot be regarded as nearer a true likeness than the attempts at portraying His human features, every reader of the Gospels feels that, amid all the things He surrendered, He never surrendered His own marked human individuality. On the contrary, it continued to be a prominent thing that forced itself on everyone. He went His own way, thought His own thoughts, lived His own life, and never accorded anything to that tyranny of fashion to which, in our weak regard for others, we continually sacrifice what is greatest and best in our natures.

Our Lord's regard for the individuality of the persons He dealt with might be used as a key for understanding large portions of the Gospels. He took special care to bring out the individuality of each one's faith. He brings the modesty of the woman with the issue of blood into prominence, to give her the assurance she needed for her comfort (Mat 9:20 ff.). He rejects roughly the prayer of the Canaanitish woman, to show more

clearly her right to be heard (Mat 15:21-28). He sits at meat in the publican's house, to create self-respect in the social outcast (Mar 2:15). He meets the centurion, the man of command, by working through a command (Luk 7:1-10); and He answers John, the man who had required action, by action (Luk 7:22). He justified wisdom both in John the ascetic and in Himself who came eating and drinking, and only blamed the narrow censoriousness which could appreciate neither (Mat 11:19).

In the Fourth Gospel, in particular, the key to almost everything Jesus says or does is that He knew what was in man (Joh 2:25). Nicodemus, the man dried to parchment and swathed in conventional considerations, needs to be born again into a new and fresh life (Joh 3:1-15). The woman of Samaria, no longer able to command the protection of even the poorest marriage tie, and too disreputable to appear at the well except when the midday sun kept the other women at home, is offered living water to refresh her soul parched for sympathy, and is so interpreted to herself that she said, 'He told me all that ever I did' (Joh 4:1-26). Because the nobleman has the aristocratic spirit of his class, he is simply told to go his way, his son lives (Joh 4:50); because his bed has for thirty-eight years been the centre of all his interest, the cripple at Bethesda is told to take it up (Joh 5:8). All the Gospels are full of persons of vivid individuality. A striking feature of our Lord's whole ministry is the way in which, in His presence, a man's true qualities inevitably come to light. The respectable convention behind which men hide inevitably falls away, and men appear in all their real characteristics, often with the unhonoured to their honour, and with the highly esteemed to their shame. Even the Pharisee, the type in all ages in which individuality is most suppressed by creed and custom, cannot keep the curtain drawn in His presence. At first sight this definiteness seems to be lost in the strange, vague atmosphere of the Fourth Gospel, which is so strongly irradiated by one individuality—that of the writer. But in life it is not the persons who are themselves colourless who do most justice to the individuality of others. So it is that in John we see, more than in any other Gospel, the vivid individuality, in particular, of the disciples, and how Jesus recognized it and dealt with it. Andrew and Nathanael, Philip and Thomas are mere names and shadows in the other Gospels, while in John they have each one his own characteristic note. Even Peter, in the other Gospels, is little more than an inexplicable mixture of insight and error; but in John he is drawn in a phrase by the Master Himself, 'When thou wast young thou girdedst thyself and walkedst whither thou wouldest' (Joh 21:18). This enterprising but impetuous character appears in the whole presentation of him in John, till, in the days of heaviness, he flung off the slackness which had fallen upon all the disciples, and said with his old grip at his girdle, 'I go a fishing' (Joh 21:3). In considering the question of the authenticity of John, this, at all events, deserves consideration, that it leaves us with such a sense of the strong individuality of the Apostles, both as children of nature and as children of grace, as to make it not incredible that a handful of poor men should start to conquer the world. In this Gospel, moreover, faith is not only an

individual act, which it must always be, but also an attitude which brings out a man's deepest individuality. Men do not believe, because they trust only what they see (Joh_4:48). They cannot believe in Christ, because already they have not believed in the highest they knew (Joh_5:47). It is a certain preparedness for Christ which makes men believe in Him (Joh_6:35; Joh_6:37). Belief is a special word to oneself, a hearing from the Father (Joh_6:45). Unbelief arises from being from beneath (Joh_8:23), from being of one's father the devil (Joh_8:44). There is, throughout, a family likeness in unbelief; while belief, in the consciousness of its own special needs, finds its own call. It does not lean on Abraham, or fashion itself on the accepted model, but, like Nathanael, it seeks God under the fig-tree, like Philip it is ready to say to conventional questions, 'Come and see.' This faith, moreover, issues in an eternal life, the present effect of which is to give us possession of our own souls, to know God in such a way as not to be greatly concerned about men, to be in the world yet not of it (Joh_17:1, Joh_17:5).

Though less prominent in the Synoptics, our Lord's regard to individuality is not less significant. To enter the Kingdom, so pronounced an individuality is required that it can take by itself the narrow way, while the common course is the broad road (Mat_7:13); it is to be one in so characteristic a fashion as to cause more joy in heaven than the ninety and nine who, satisfied with the received standard, need no repentance (Mat_18:13, Luk_15:7). This strong insistence that many are called and only few chosen, indicates not arbitrariness in dealing with individuals, but the rarity of the individuality God requires (Mat_22:14). His true disciples must be of so pronounced a type that, while they shun the poor glory of self-display (Mat_6:2), they must yet be the salt of the earth, and not even fear the prominence of being as a city set on a hill. They must shun the all-pervasive, all-assimilative creed of the time, the leaven of the Pharisees; nor will the accepted Christian formula, the saying of 'Lord, Lord,' be any more approved (Mat_7:21).

Our Lord does not really differ from the pagan view that the worth of the individual depends upon his individuality. The difference is in the estimate of that wherein this individuality consists, and of the possibilities in each man of attaining it. Even to Aristotle individuality meant something aristocratic. The qualities in a person worth considering are liberality (*ἐλευθεριότης*), magnificence (*μεγαλοπρέπεια*), and magnanimity (*μεγαλοψυχία*). These all require a certain social station, a certain aloofness from the petty concerns of life, which could be possible for all men only when the great mechanical slave whom Aristotle dreamt of could be made to do the drudgery. With Christ, on the other hand, a man could have true individuality in the lowest seats and at the lowliest services.

Nor is Christ's conception that of modern culture, which, indeed, is much nearer Aristotle than Jesus. He does not seek, with Goethe, to build up as high as possible the pyramid of his nature. A man does not fail of that individuality which the Kingdom of God requires, even though he have to cut off an offending hand or pluck out an offending eye, and enter blind and maimed (Mat_5:29).

The classical presentation of the type of individuality permitted and required in the Kingdom of God is in the Beatitudes. Too often they are read as a suppression of individuality, which they are if a man's chief characteristics are possessions, popularity, self-assertion, self-indulgence. But in Christ's eyes this should not be the way of showing a man's true nature. The description, taken as a whole, presents an energetic type which, just because of its superiority both to society and to nature, is bound to be of marked individuality. To be poor in spirit is not to be poor-spirited, not to bend and break under every trial, but is to be rich in a faith which accepts poverty or anything else in the assurance of never being broken or bent. The mourner is not one given to tears, but one in energetic opposition to wrong and in energetic sympathy with suffering. The meek is not the meek and mild, not the soft, timid person, but one who has too high a faith in a wiser power than his own to strive and cry. To hunger and thirst after righteousness is necessarily to take an independent and difficult course in the world; while to be merciful requires decided strength of character, most of the cruel things on earth being done not in self-will and malice, but in thoughtlessness and weakness. Purity of heart never could survive in this world as mere innocence and ignorance of evil; the soft people who seek to shun everything disagreeable are the chief makers of dispeace; and only persons of determined character and decided principles ever run any risk of being persecuted for righteousness' sake. Were there no other condition but this last, it would mark the contrast with the accepted type, with the person whose first motive is prudence, whose guiding star is agreement with the authorities, who feels an obtrusive individuality to be in bad taste, and who regards a somewhat colourless membership of the Church and of Society as the hall-mark of the Divine approval. Instead we see one who is the old man in the hundred, one who will not walk with the crowd in the broad way, one who has something of the singularity of the prophet which will ensure for him the singularity of the prophet's reward.

This large scope for individuality is maintained chiefly by resting the guidance of life not on a rule, but on a relation to God, revealed not in a code, but in a Person. This was the basis of a rule of love to God and to man to which all the Law and the Prophets could be reduced. Love is the way of at once giving scope to our own individuality and cherishing the individuality of others. Not that love can be without law. As it has been well said, What is love at the centre is always law at the circumference. But love at the centre will always keep law mindful of human differences. It will be a law in accordance with the Apostle's interpretation of his

Master's meaning when he enjoins us to be true to our own highest individuality, *i.e.* the special demands of our own conscience, to do nothing that is not of faith (Rom_14:23); to attend so far to the weakness of our own individuality as not to be enslaved to anything; and to regard the individuality of our neighbour so far as to take heed to what edifies (1Co_10:23). Nevertheless it is no true development of Christian faith or morals, as Newman (in his *Development*) and countless others have argued, that the faith has been elaborated into a creed that omits no detail of doctrine, and the morality into a code that lays down every detail of duty. Nor can it ever be true humility to surrender our individuality to any other man made like to ourselves.

Yet a free Protestant code and a smaller creed do not necessarily give us a true and characteristic faith, or save us from a mainly negative standard of duty, and perhaps there is no kind of consideration for others more needed at the present day than to have courage to be ourselves.

To leave room for this individuality is one of the most difficult and most neglected tasks of theology, and to leave scope for it in the Church is a task that has never been very anxiously pursued by the ecclesiastic. Yet if the true manifestation of faith is power to become sons of God in spite of society and circumstances, a very important element of it should be the maintenance of our true individuality; and though truth can only be one, there should be something characteristic in each man's faith. The preservation of this difference among the Scripture writers is the real task of Biblical Theology, which should not aim at evaporating truth into what each man thinks, but at showing how important every man is for his faith.

Literature.—Goethe, *Wilhelm Meister*; Schleiermacher, *Reden* [translation *On Religion: Speeches to its Cultured Despisers*, 1893] and *Monologen* [translation *Monologues*]; Hegel, *Philosophie der Geschichte* [translation *Philosophy of History*, 1857]; Carlyle, *Heroes*; Emerson, *Essays*: J. S. Mill, *On Liberty*; Lüdemann, *Personlichkeit und Individualität*, 1900; Lemme, *Christliche Ethik*, § 56, 1905; Schian, 'Glaube und Individualität' (*Zeitschr. für Theol. u. Kirche*, 1898); A. Breithaupt, *Rechte und Pflichten der Individualität im Christlich-sittlichen Leben*, 1901.

John Oman.

▣ Individuality

INDIVIDUALITY (of Christ).—Regarded simply as a historical character, or as a subject of a visible career among men, Christ undoubtedly presents as distinct an aspect of individuality, or concrete reality, as can be affirmed of any historical personage. On

the other hand, when we pass from the historical point of view to that of Christological construction, we can hardly fail to raise the question whether it is possible to escape from qualifying the category of individuality as applied to Christ on the side of His humanity. Proceeding from the latter point of view, and deferring to the Catholic postulates respecting the union of our Lord's manhood with the pre-existent Logos or Son of God, we are confronted with the task of explaining how a real concrete manhood can be taken into veritable union with the Logos without effecting a heterogeneous and double personality. The task is a very difficult one, and in wrestling with it a temptation easily arises to strip the manhood of concreteness or individuality, and thus to accommodate it more fully to the demands of personal unity. But a resort to this alternative has its own difficulty, and that by no means a slight one, since the thought of an Incarnation which means the union of the Son of God with a mutilated manhood, or with a mere semblance of manhood, is far from being satisfactory. Indeed, there is little hazard in affirming that the mind and heart of Christendom would sooner tolerate an element of unresolved dualism in the person of Christ, than sacrifice in any appreciable degree the reality and perfection of His manhood.

1. Among the prominent theories involving a sacrifice of this kind the *Apollinarian* is the most explicit and intelligible. By its supposition that the Logos took the place of the rational soul in the Redeemer, so that the Incarnation involved only the assumption of a human body with its principle of animal life, it evidently simplifies very much the problem of Christ's person. But the simplification takes place at too great a cost. The immutable Logos clothed in a fleshly garment is obviously no proper subject for temptation or for a real implication in human experiences generally. He cannot be brought into accord with the Gospel representations, except by resort to an artificial, Docetic interpretation. As lacking the most essential factor of manhood, He is destitute of the most apprehensible bond of brotherhood and ground of companionship. In short, the advantage which pertains to the Apollinarian theory, on the score of simplicity and intelligibility, is overmatched by the disadvantage which it incurs by its incompatibility with Gospel facts and by its abridgment of Christ's competency to enter into the life of men, and thus to fulfil the complete office of mediation. In effect it abolishes the Son of Man; for the archetypal manhood, which Apollinaris supposed to be resident in the eternal Logos, is a far off thing in comparison with the concrete reality which naturally is present to our thought when we use the term 'manhood.'

2. A second historic theory which has a distinct bearing upon our theme is that of *Monophysitism*. This differs from Apollinarism in its formal acknowledgment that by the incarnation of the Son of God is to be understood the assumption of a complete human nature. This acknowledgment, however, turns out to be rather verbal than substantial. The Monophysite assertion of a single nature in the incarnated Christ

involved the compounding of the human nature in Him with the Divine; and this, in connexion with the vast preponderance assigned to the Divine in post-Nicene thinking, meant virtually the reduction of the human to the rank of an accident, a secondary and contingent property or group of properties, superinduced upon a Divine subject. Such an outcome, it is needless to say, runs very close to the submergence of the human side of Christ. It leaves no place for the thought of a real ethical manhood; for a proper ethical character is not predicable of a selfless accident. And with this deficit is conjoined a serious metaphysical difficulty, since fundamental thinking insists upon a relation of commensurability between attributes and their subject, and does not approve the notion that attributes appropriate to a finite personality can be made properly to inhere in an infinite subject.

3. A theory favoured with more orthodox associations than the Monophysite, but having a somewhat questionable bearing on the Christological problem, is the theory of *the impersonality of Christ's manhood*, or more specifically, the theory that His manhood, being devoid of a personality of its own, obtained from the first moment of subsistence its personal subject in the Ego of the pre-existent Logos (the so-called doctrine of *enhypostasis*). This theory was broached by Leontius in the 6th cent., was advocated by John of Damascus in the 8th cent., and has had in later times considerable currency among theologians of reputed orthodoxy, though never receiving any distinct œcumenical sanction. As handled by John of Damascus, the notion of the impersonality of Christ's manhood cannot be said to have been suitably reconciled with the full reality of that manhood. While formally he assigned to the Redeemer the full complement of human faculties, he felt obliged in one connexion or another to deny to them their characteristic forms of activity. It would not do, as he conceived, to admit progress in knowledge on the part of Christ, as this would contravene the truth that the hypostatic union of the human with the Divine in Him was complete from the start. For a like reason it was considered inadmissible to impute real prayer to Him. Divinity needs nothing, and a humanity that is perfectly united with Divinity shares in its sufficiency. In relation to the will also the Damascene considered it necessary to retrench from the proper human mode. The logical issue of his representations is to deny to the human will in Christ all power of initiative, and to reduce it entirely to the office of a 'medium through which the Logos moved the man Jesus.' Quite possibly John of Damascus does not afford the best specimen of what can be done in Christological construction with the notion that the human nature of Christ, being without personality of its own, derived such personal character as pertained to it from its relation to the person of the Logos. But certainly it is difficult in the light of his exposition to discover the real Son of Man. The image of a genuine and living manhood does not stand forth in his representation of the Redeemer.

It has sometimes been concluded that a special advantage belongs to the doctrine of the impersonality of the human nature of Christ, as helping to explain the atoning efficacy of His work. The inference is made that human nature in this character is not a concrete, limited entity, such as is the human nature of the individual man, but rather generic or universal. It is then argued that Christ in perfecting His own human nature sanctified human nature in general. Again, it is claimed that, in virtue of His literal community with men, His doing was in the proper sense a transaction within, as well as for, the whole body of humanity. As an eminently spiritual writer has expressed the thought, 'every man was a part of Him, and He felt the sins of every man, not in sympathy, but in sorrow and abhorrence' (Thomas Erskine). To such representations it is legitimate to reply, that what needs to be sanctified is not human nature in itself, but myriads of human beings; that the sanctification of human nature in Christ cannot rationally be conceived to have any immediate effect upon its sanctification elsewhere, inasmuch as human nature in Christ cannot be regarded as a stuff out of which men universally are fashioned; and that a generic or universal human nature belongs purely to the realm of the conceptual, and cannot possibly have any place in the sphere of real being. In short, the line of representation in question rests upon a fiction which modern philosophy for the most part has discountenanced—the fiction of the real existence of universal.

4. While it is impossible to be satisfied with any one of these historic theories, as respects its bearing on the integrity or concrete reality of Christ's manhood, it is far from easy to offer a definite substitute which is not open to exception. Indeed, an attempt at strict construction is certain to miscarry. The extraordinary as such rebels against complete elucidation, and by supposition the union of the Divine and the human in Christ is an extraordinary fact. Any one who accepts the Incarnation must admit that the individuality of Christ's manhood was specially conditioned; but equally, any one who admits the extraordinary character of the Incarnation must grant the impossibility of giving a full explanation of the mode and measure of this special conditioning. We cannot fully construe our own relation to the Divine; how then should we expect to gain clear insight into the relation of the human to the Divine in the person of our Lord? Probably the best that can be done is to form an ideal picture of the normal relation of perfected manhood to the Divine, and then beyond this to postulate *the mystery of a special bond* between Christ's manhood and His Divinity. The forming of the ideal picture will be distinctly helpful. For, having clearly apprehended the great truth that manhood loses nothing of its proper character by intimate union with the Divine, that the human spirit is never more itself than when it is possessed by and insphered in the Divine Spirit, that freedom is never so complete as when the human will by its own consent passes under the absolute direction of the Divine will, we shall be prepared to believe that manhood in Christ suffered no retrenchment by its extraordinary union with the Divine, but rather is to

be accounted the full-orbed specimen of manhood as respects ethical worth and all tender and beautiful traits.

Taken in a popular sense, rather than in relation to Christological theory, the subject of individuality suggests a discussion of those characteristics which may be regarded as specially distinctive of Christ as a historic personage. This discussion, however, is reserved for the art. Uniqueness.

Literature.—J. A. Dorner, *History of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*; Adolf Harnack, *History of Dogma*; R. L. Ottley, *The Doctrine of the Incarnation*; John Caird, *The Fundamental Ideas of Christianity*, Lectures xiii.-xv.; *Contentio Veritatis*, ch. ii.; Illingworth, *Personality Human and Divine*.

Henry C. Sheldon.

Indolence

INDOLENCE.—The spirit of Christ's religion is inimical to indolence in the sphere of business (Luk 16:11, Mat 24:48; Mat 23:26), but more especially indolent Christianity is *salt without savour* (Mat 5:13). Not only is a state of salvation hard to maintain (Mat 7:14), but perfection is to be aimed at (Mat 5:48). An enemy sows tares while we sleep (Mat 13:25). The oil in our lamps consumes as we rest (Mat 25:5). Watchfulness is the very opposite of indolence (Mat 26:41). The hid talent will reproach the indolent in the day of reckoning (Mat 25:18). Most deadly is the spiritual indolence which is satisfied to have Abraham for father (Luk 3:8, Joh 8:39), or Christ for Saviour, without response to the impulses of the Holy Spirit, the source of life and motion and progress.

A signal judgment may be executed upon the indolent soul, either after a period of further probation (Luk 13:6-9), or suddenly and unexpectedly when that day comes as a snare (Luk 21:34), and the Judge pronounces the sentence (Mar 11:14). The conscience must be kept awake and intelligent (Mat 5:23-24). The beginnings of evil must be checked (v. 18f.). The ears must be open to learn, and the heart ready to believe (Mat 11:15). The rock foundation to build the house upon may need much toil to reach it (Mat 7:24). And continually the servant of Christ must be ready for his Master's coming, with loins girded and lights burning (Luk 12:35).—Love is not indolent in seeking the lost sheep (Mat 18:12). Hope is not indolent in running to the sepulchre (Joh 20:4), or hastening to the manger (Luk 2:16). Faith is not indolent in pressing through the crowd to be healed (Mar 5:27). 'The zeal of thine house shall eat me up' (Joh 2:17). See also art. Slothfulness.

Infancy

INFANCY

1. The period of infancy, properly speaking, may be taken as lying between the birth of a child and its being weaned; and Hebrew children were usually weaned at two years of age or thereabouts. Quite a number of terms are used in Heb. to describe childhood and youth at various stages; and in this earliest period before a child has become a *gâmûl* (נָמוּל 'weaned'), there are three different terms that may be applied to him. The infant is יָלֵךְ (f. יִלְדָה), the (new) (cf. 'bairn,' 'barn'), יוֹנֵק (the suckling), and עוֹלֵל (or עוֹל), also indicating dependence for nourishment. In NT, apart from the general use of ταῖς or παιδίον, the terms used are (1) βρεφος (applying to the unborn child as well [Luk_1:41]), and (2) νήπιος. The aspect of infancy connoted by νήπιος, as contrasted with the Heb. terms, is inability to speak (= Lat.). In Mat_21:16, in the quotation from Psa_8:3, LXX Septuagint, the Greek translators use νήπιος as = עוֹלֵל, and the ptcp. θηλάζων as = יוֹנֵק. With the exception of Luk_18:15, βρεφος occurs in the Gospels only in Lk.'s account of the birth of Christ; and νήπιος, in addition to Mat_21:16, only in a figurative use in Mat_11:25 = Luk_10:21.

2. All that the Gospels have to tell concerning the infancy of Jesus is found in Luke 2 and Matthew 2. Excluding the story of the Birth, we have the following series of events:—the Circumcision, the Presentation, the Visit of the Magi, the Flight into Egypt, the Slaughter of the Innocents, the Return and Settlement at Nazareth. The insuperable difficulties in the way of weaving these narratives into a coherent and harmonious whole are now generally recognized. Harmonists have not been able to agree even as to the time-order in which the events should be placed. (Andrews, in his *Life of Our Lord*, p. 91 f., conveniently shows the diversity that has obtained). If it were a matter of supreme importance to settle such order, Wieseler's view (*Chron. Synopsis*, i. ch. iii.) seems the most reasonable, arranging as follows:—Circumcision, Presentation (or Purification of Mary), Visit of the Magi, Flight into Egypt and Slaughter of the Innocents, Return to Nazareth. So far, however, as the narrative in Matthew 2 is concerned, it is evidently unrelated to Lk.'s account of the infancy of Jesus; it stands as a story by itself, detached from its own context; the opening (τοῦ δ

ἘἸησοῦ γεννηθέντος, κ.τ.λ.) is quite indefinite as a time-expression, and anything like chronological interest is at a minimum.

The accounts of the Infancy comprise: (a) normal features—the Circumcision, the Presentation (= Purification of Mary and Redemption of the Firstborn); and (b) peculiar features—the Visit of the Magi and connected incidents.

As for (a), it is noticeable that we have these particulars given in Lk. alone. The rites appointed to be performed on the birth of a Hebrew boy, a firstborn, were duly carried out. The Circumcision took place, on the eighth day (Luk 2:21), *i.e.* at the time prescribed by ancient law and usage (Lev 12:3). Again, after the proper interval (Lev 12:4) the Purification of Mary with all due rites took place at the Temple (Luk 2:22).

The ἀντῶν ('*their* purification') cannot without strain be made to refer to any but both Joseph and Mary who brought the child to Jerusalem (see also Luk 2:33). This, as well as the interpretation making ἀντῶν refer to mother and child (see, *e.g.*, rendering of the *Twentieth Cent. NT*), is in conflict with the ritual law (Leviticus 12); and the reading followed by Authorized Version ('*her* purification'), which has practically no MS authority, is an evident correction to remove the discrepancy.

The offering brought was that prescribed for persons in humble circumstances (Lev 12:8), though the regulation is so quoted in Luk 2:24 that this does not explicitly appear. The Presentation of the infant Jesus involved at the same time the ancient ceremony of the Redemption of the firstborn son, as the reference to Exo 13:2; Exo 13:15 shows. In our Lord's day a rabbinical regulation had added to the Mosaic rule the condition that the child thus presented and redeemed should be free from physical defect and blemish.

In the Pentateuch this devotion of the male firstborn of both man and beast to Jahweh, carrying with it the necessity of redemption in the case of sons, is traced as to its institution to the smiting of the firstborn in Egypt at the Exodus (Exo 13:15, Num 3:13). There can be little doubt, however, that there is an affinity between this Hebrew custom and the sacrifice of firstlings amongst the Arabs, and that they have a common source in ideas of taboo as associated with the firstborn—ideas belonging to a remote Semitic antiquity (see W. R. Smith, *RS* [Note: *S Religion of the Semites.*] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 462 ff.).

Yet in connexion with these ordinary incidents of infancy among the Jews we have touches of the unusual, though the forecast of a great destiny thus indicated is not

per se an incredible feature of the dawn of such a life. At the Circumcision the name Jesus was given, we are told (Luk 2:21), in accordance with an angelic intimation to Mary prior to conception (Luk 1:31), a matter in which, it may be noted, a marked contrast with the representation in Mat 1:18-25 appears. At the Presentation the part played by Simeon and Anna (Luk 2:25-38) forms an unwonted accompaniment of the ceremonies of the occasion, and wonderfully breaks in upon the even recital of customary proceedings (cf. vv. 24, 39). The close parallel, however, which exists here with the story of John the Baptist's birth cannot be overlooked. Cf. Luk 1:13; Luk 1:59-63; Luk 1:31; Luk 2:21; also Luk 1:65-79 and Luk 2:27-38. The character of the narratives as a whole, and especially as regards such elements as these, suggests that we have thus conveyed to us 'the traditional Jewish-Christian views of Jesus,' and argues a special Jewish-Christian (Palestinian) source (see Moffatt, *Historical NT*, p. 651 ff.).

(b) The more peculiar features are furnished by the narrative in Matthew 2. It is quite unnecessary to give an outline of the stories themselves; but some notice must be taken of the considerable problems to which they give rise. Did they form from the very first an integral part of Mt.'s Gospel? Considerations of style and general structure favour the probability of their being from another hand than that which furnished the main body of the Gospel. The stories are not therefore to be rejected as without historic basis; nor are we to cast them aside on the arbitrary ground of intrinsic incredibility. But we cannot ignore the striking features of the narrative that raise the question as to what the nature of the narrative precisely is. Consider, e.g., the use made of dream-warnings (Mat 2:12-13; Mat 2:19; Mat 2:22); the peculiarities in the leading of the 'star' (seen first in the East, then lost sight of—else they had not gone to Jerusalem instead of Bethlehem—only to reappear and go before them to Bethlehem, moving in the heavens, and at last stopping 'over where the young child was'); the symbolic character of the threefold offering (Mat 2:11); and, lastly, the dominant interest in the element of prophetic fulfilment, making each turn in the story answer to some passage from the prophets (Mat 2:6; Mat 2:15; Mat 2:17; Mat 2:23), the correspondence in some cases being but remote and obscure. We at once characterize as legendary such embroidery of the story of the Magi as makes them 'three kings of Orient,' gives them names, and elaborates their after history, and such features as the ox and the ass incessantly adoring the Child (*Gosp. of pseudo-Mt.*); but is the story as it stands in Mt. absolutely free from elements of the same order? The narrative is so naïve, e.g., that it seems superfluous and beside the mark to venture seriously on calculations to prove that some astronomical phenomenon, such as a conjunction of planets, really explains what is said of the star.

The story of the Massacre of the Innocents cannot be said to be inherently improbable. Herod was not the man to hesitate at such a measure if occasion arose for it. Absence of confirmatory references in history also goes for little when all the

circumstances are considered. Macrobius (*Saturn.* ii. 4), writing in the 5th cent., states that Augustus, hearing that some baby boys of less than two years of age had been put to death at Herod's command, and that the king's own child was amongst those killed, said 'Melius est Herodis porcum esse quam filium.' This looks like a reference; but how strange, if it were so, that the Mt. narrative should fail to notice such a notable circumstance! It is a curious passage, but evidently all its interest is in the Emperor's *bon mot*, playing on the Gr. terms for 'pig' (ὑῖς) and 'son' (υιός). It has often been pointed out that the number of little ones slain must have been comparatively small (Edersheim says 'probably 20 at most,' i. 214), in correction of later exaggerations (perhaps helped by the vivid language of Mat 2:18); but this does not destroy the pathetic element in such an association with the infancy of our Lord in Christian tradition. But, all things considered, though it is plausible to suggest that we have here a designed Messianic parallel to the deliverance of the infant Moses, the parallel is not so close as to suggest pure invention, and it is difficult to imagine all substratum of fact to be wanting.

Suggestions, also, which see in the 'Repose in Egypt,' as it used to be called, only a typical indication of Jesus as the vine of Israel 'brought out of Egypt' (art. 'Gospels' in *Encyc. Bibl.* ii. 1780), are not wholly convincing and satisfactory. At the same time, as regards the whole narrative in Matthew 2, we must be content to say that the state of our knowledge affords no solution of the difficulties to which it gives rise when compared with the representations of Lk., especially, e.g., in the implication that Joseph and Mary were continuously resident at Bethlehem probably until Jesus was nearly two years old, and that they went to Nazareth to live only after their return from Egypt.

3. The sources of the Infancy narratives remain a subject of debate. Speaking of the Mt. document in particular, Sanday says 'we are in the dark' (art. 'Jesus Christ' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. 644). Resch's well-known attempt to establish an original Hebrew 'Childhood-Gospel,' having as parts of its contents both the Lk. and Mt. stories, has failed to carry conviction. An important problem, however, is presented by a comparison of these narratives with the conspicuous features of certain of the Apocryphal Gospels, particularly the *Protevangelium of James*, the *Gospel according to Thomas*, and the *Arabic Gospel of the Childhood*. It may be said that it is just at such a point as this that the apocryphal writings come most noticeably into contact with our Canonical Gospels, as also it is in the ministry and teaching of Jesus that they depart most widely from them. A superabundance of fantastic elements in these Christian Apocrypha is at once revealed on the most superficial comparison: still there are elements in common, and here and there points of close contact. In the *Gospel of the Childhood*, e.g., we have the story of the Magi woven into the narrative, and Mat 2:1 is almost literally paralleled, as also the

adoration and offering of the threefold gift (see H. Sike's edition of 1697, with Lat. translation p. 17), though at the same time the most curious divergences appear. It is most improbable that our narratives were directly borrowed from any of these apocryphal works and finally incorporated in the Canonical Gospels. It seems also unlikely that our Gospels were used specifically in the production of any of the Apocrypha, and that out of our Gospels the narratives in Mat 1:2 and Luk 1:2 were simply taken for expansion into the extraordinary congeries of marvels of which these extra-canonical writings mostly consist. Why may not canonical and apocryphal accounts have alike originated in a common early tradition, though they have flowed so far apart? It is well to remember that those who promulgated and those who received most of the Apocryphal Gospels sincerely believed themselves to be Christians. Pseudo-Matthew indeed openly professes to be actuated by the love of Christ in writing his wonder-crowded account of the infancy and boyhood of our Lord. Our narratives, however, are characterized by a wonderful simplicity and restraint when compared with such accounts as his; they proclaim themselves so much nearer what the facts must have been. But one source of apocryphal developments appears to have been the deep-seated fondness of Jews for *haggâdôth* (see Donehoo, *The Apocryphal and Legendary Life of Christ*, p. xix); and one great feature of such *haggâdôth* was the interest shown in connecting OT prophecies with fulfilments. The question suggests itself whether haggadic elements may not even have found their way into our brief canonical narratives. If it be so, it cannot detract from the supreme value of the portraiture of Christ in the Gospels. G. H. Box (in *ZNTW* [Note: NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissen. schaft.] , 1905, p. 80 ff.) suggests that Mat 1:2 are to be regarded as a *midrâsh*, which means much the same thing, though otherwise expressed. The historical basis, that is to say, is treated in subservience to edification and the expression of a Messianic faith. See also artt. Babe, Childhood.

Literature.—Lives of Christ; Supplemental section of Sanday's art. 'Jesus Christ' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ; Ramsay, *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?*; Resch, 'Das Kindheits-evangelium' (*TU* [Note: U Texte und Untersuehungen.] iv. Heft 3, 1897); Gore, *Dissertations*, p. 12 ff.

J. S. Clemens.

Influence

INFLUENCE

1. The influence of Christ during His life

(a) *On His disciples.*—This from the very first was remarkable. The short interview that John and Andrew had with Jesus after He had been pointed out by their old master as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, seems to have carried them away at once. Andrew has no misgivings, but goes off to his brother with the great news that they have found the Messiah (Joh 1:37 ff.). The disciples, spiritually minded though they were, must have felt all the prejudices that widely existed against the appearance of the Messiah as a poor and undistinguished person from a northern village of no reputation, and yet they were at once conquered. One evening's conversation convinced them that He was their Prince. A like instantaneous recognition is recorded of Bartholomew, if he be, as seems likely, the same as Nathanael. He has difficulties to overcome which he had frankly stated to Philip when he ran in with the same great news that Andrew had told Peter. But they vanish before the presence and words of his Lord. The encouraging description of his own character set Nathanael wondering, and when this was followed by news which showed that He knew of some secret passage in his life, he confesses His greatness in the fullest terms, 'Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel' (Joh 1:49). In all these cases it is to be noted that the impression is made not by any miracle or sign, but by what Christ was and what He said. A little later there follows the first sign,—the changing of water into wine,—and with it the natural deepening of the hold Christ had on His disciples (Joh 2:1 ff.). All their previous hopes were confirmed ('crediderunt amplius,' Bengel). Up to this time there are no hostile influences at work. As simple-minded men they probably supposed that all the world would share their sanguine hopes. The cleansing of the Temple, followed as it was by public questioning as to His right to take that bold step (Joh 2:13 ff.), was probably the first indication that He would not be able to influence all men alike.

From that time onward the attempt to break down our Lord's influence becomes much more definite and decided. His supposed birthplace,—Nazareth,—His humble parentage, His lack of a really good education, all these and many other objections were constantly urged (Joh 7:15), and must have caused some difficulty in the disciples' minds. His great assertions that He was the Bread of Life and the Light of the world (Joh 6:35; Joh 6:48; Joh 8:12; Joh 9:5), aroused great opposition and lost Him many friends. But when after eighteen months of criticism, obloquy, and insult, He asked His disciples definitely as to their opinion about Him, they replied through Peter without hesitation: 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God' (Mat 16:16). It is true that this was the conviction they had had at the outset, but it had not been tested, it had not been held against the whole world. The disciples were not fanatics, they were not indifferent to the opinion of their own Church and nation; they felt keenly the opposition and hatred which their view everywhere encountered, and yet they held it. It is a striking proof of our Lord's personal influence. That He knew their difficulties is plain from the fact that He prayed for them before He asked the question (Luk 9:18). That He rejoiced in their loyalty is also plain from the great

words spoken to Peter (Mat_16:17-19). The Transfiguration followed quickly (Mat_17:1 ff. ||), in order that the three disciples who knew Him best might have something to fall back upon in the greater difficulties that lay before them. Soon our Lord became a proscribed person, not only excommunicated from all the synagogues of the land, but bringing under that ban all His friends (Joh_9:22). Their loyalty, however, remained unbroken except in one case, that of Judas. This man must have felt our Lord's influence at one time, and indeed been always more or less under it. He could not tear himself away from it, though he was feeling more and more uncomfortable in the barren prospects that Christ's language and the hostility of the world seemed to suggest. Only little by little he stifled it, and we may well believe that it was not till the very last, even after he had promised to betray Him, that it failed. Then St. John (Joh_13:27) adds the significant words, 'After the sop, then entered Satan into him,' and the disciple was lost.

The severest test was felt after the arrest. That the Prince and Messiah should be betrayed by His own people into the hands of the heathen, and that they should clamour for His death, was the greatest trial that a faithful friendship has ever had to bear. It is true the disciples ought to have known their Scriptures; but, like good people to-day, they followed current interpretations instead of searching the Holy Writings for themselves. That our Lord's influence would have remained with them had He not risen again is, of course, certain; but it would have been the influence of a holy life and a great example, not of an abiding Presence and a magnificent hope. This was given them by the Resurrection, which at once illuminated all the perplexities of the past and made His Messiahship a felt reality. And after Pentecost they found their minds and imaginations extraordinarily stimulated by the presence of the Holy Ghost who witnessed to every word and act of the Crucified and Risen Christ.

(b) *On the people.*—This was as surprising in its own way as His influence on the disciples. 'They heard Him gladly' (Mar_12:37). They would have taken Him 'by force and made him king' (Joh_6:15). They prevented any open act of hostility against Him on the part of the rulers, who were afraid of them (Luk_20:19; Luk_22:2). They never could make up their minds who He was, but yet were convinced He was no ordinary person. He was either Elijah, or the great expected Prophet, or Jeremiah, or even the Baptist risen again (Mat_16:14 ||). That they turned completely round at the last was no doubt due to the malign influence of the Pharisees joined to the great disappointment experienced when nothing followed the events of Palm Sunday. Like the people of Lystra, they were enraged at having openly declared themselves on the side of a movement which seemed to have no result. Our Lord's influence on the people was just what we should expect, as we shall see when we consider its particular character.

(c) *On His enemies.*—At first it strikes us strangely that One who not only did no harm, but always went about doing good, One who refused to be entrapped into any political movement, One who observed fasts and festivals, attended synagogue and temple, should have excited such bitter hostility. He had none of the marks of a great social reformer, disliked crowds and great cities, refused to take advantage of any excitement caused by His words or deeds, chose for His intimate friends plain middle-class men who had no particular mark about them except their religiousness. All His teaching was constructive rather than destructive. He did not speak of the Gentiles as His servant Paul did, nor of the Temple as Stephen did. He was indignant at the abuses of the time, and was unsparing in His condemnation of Pharisees and scribes, but the hostility had set in before that, and its only explanation is the hatred of bad men to a holy life.

(d) *On individuals.*—(α) The visit of *Nicodemus* shows something of the power Jesus exercised in public. Although Nicodemus was a person of some importance, he treats our Lord, in spite of His humble circumstances, as not only a great but a Divine teacher from whom he would gladly learn (Joh_3:2). And the conversation with Him on that occasion bore fruit. (β) *Pilate*, too, was evidently greatly impressed by Jesus. With his inborn contempt for the Jews he would have decided the matter the Sanhedrin brought before him very quickly, had it not been for the majesty of Jesus' presence and the brief but striking words He spoke. That he should have been afraid when the Jews told him that the prisoner had claimed to be the Son of God and at once sought another interview, shows that there was a mysterious influence about our Lord which made the governor feel uncomfortable; and this fear was only increased when his question, 'Whence art thou?' received no answer (Joh_19:8 f.). (γ) Even *Caiaphas* treats Christ with a respect which he would have gladly dispensed with. His continued silence led the high priest to take the very unusual step of forcing some statement out of Him by solemn adjuration (Mat_26:63). (δ) The most touching illustrations of Christ's influence are found amongst *the sinful*. They were drawn to Him as steel to the magnet. He was their friend (Mat_11:19), to whom they could give their confidences. Tired of life they turned instinctively to Him, and gladly gave Him their all. Matthew, Zacchaeus, Mary Magdalene, the woman that was a sinner, are only typical of hundreds of men and women who came to Him because they were sure of His love, and recognized that He had power to forgive.

2. Secret of Christ's influence

(a) *Not the influence of His position as Son of God.*—When we remember who He was, the Word made flesh, the eternal Son of God, we are perhaps surprised that our Lord never used the influence of His unique position. Had He chosen, He could have done

what He was tempted to do, forced men to believe by some plain unmistakable wonder like that of throwing Himself from the pinnacle of the Temple (Mat 4:5). He could have appeared as the great I AM attended by legions of angels (Mat 26:53). He could have declared authoritatively that He was the great God, and proved it by the destruction of the towns and villages which denied it (Luk 9:52 ff.). He could have used His position and forced men to recognize it. And again and again, as the above references show, He was tempted to do it. But He rejected the temptation. It is a method, as we know, freely employed in the world, and widely popular. People prefer the influence of the direct to the indirect. They like to have some sign from heaven which will save them the trouble of thinking, and be a short cut to a difficult conclusion. And the Jews were always seeking this (Mat 12:38); always hoping that He would either show that His claims were invalid and that He was unable to give a sign, or satisfy their curiosity by some miracle. Our Lord tells them that, even if He gave them a sign, the sign of a man risen from the dead, it would have no effect in changing their lives (Luk 16:31). It may be asked—But what about His miracles? In the first place, they were never done as a proof of His claims. He never proclaimed a great truth and then worked a miracle to show it was true. They were all in obedience to an earnest call for help; and faith, where it could be had, was a condition essential to His working (Mar 6:5). When done, they were evidences, but only secondary to the evidence of His own personality. If men were too dull to believe in Him for what He was, then there was still the sign of His works. ‘Though ye believe not me, believe the works’ (Joh 10:38); ‘Believe me that I am in the Father and the Father, in me; or else believe me for the very works’ sake’ (Joh 14:11).

(b) Not the influence of popularity.—In the next place, Jesus did not seek influence through flattering people or rulers. Satan recognized in Christ extraordinary attractive powers. His love and manners were such that He could, had He chosen, have won over the whole world to His side. Never in anyone had there been such rich human gifts, such wide sympathies, such intimate knowledge of men’s ways and hearts. Satan’s attempt to persuade Christ to do him homage (Mat 4:9 || Luk 4:7) was more subtle than is often supposed. It was the temptation to win, through flattery of the world-power,—a path that has again and again been pursued by great men. It is needless to point out that Christ never sought influence that way. The Pharisees and Herodians only expressed the general feeling in saying, ‘Master, we know that thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth, and carest not for anyone: for thou regardest not the person of men’ (Mat 22:16).

(c) The influence of personality.—Christ influenced men not by the majesty of His position nor by His marvellous works, but by His personality. It was what He was more than what He said or did. Men felt about Him that He was always infinitely greater than anything He said. And it was because of the tremendous force that sprang forth from His personality that He could say the most amazing things without amazing. It

must be remembered that the disciples were, during His lifetime, feeling their way towards the mystery of His Person. They did not know at first what they knew afterwards. And yet they could feel thankful for teaching which placed Him before wife and child, before brother or sister (Mat 10:37). They welcomed Him as the Way, the Truth, and the Life. He did not point it out, for He was it. He did not give it as something apart from Himself. All this, which would have been intolerable from anyone else, was a relief from Him, as it expressed in words their own feelings (Mat 7:29). So, too, the weight of His authority was not that of the scribes, dependent on others, but that derived from His own personality. It was this that astonished the people, who were accustomed in their teachers to quotations from others and to second-hand information. With Him it was always personal: 'We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen' (Joh 3:11). Now and again it flashed forth in a way that dazzled and overpowered, as when the men of Nazareth wished to fling Him over the cliff, as when those of Jerusalem would have stoned Him, as when those sent to arrest Him fell back when He declared who He was (Luk 4:29, Joh 8:59; Joh 18:6).

(d) *Power of the Holy Ghost.*—Beyond all this there is something far more difficult to explain, viz. the effect of the descent of the Holy Ghost at His Baptism. When the Baptist was asked to account for the influence of Christ, he replied, 'A man can receive nothing except it be given him from heaven,' and went on to say that not only was the Christ above all as coming from above, but that He was endowed with the Spirit beyond all measure (Joh 3:27; Joh 3:34). It would seem, though the passage is not clear, that part of His influence was due to the co-operation of the Holy Ghost with His own spirit. The Holy Ghost given to man in such measure as man's limitations allow, was given to the infinite heart and mind of Christ fully, infinitely, without bound. And in the power of that Divine Spirit He began His ministry (Luk 4:18-21), not only teaching men's minds, but by the 'finger of God' (Luk 11:20)—an expression interpreted by some of the Holy Ghost—casting out devils. But whatever may be the mystery of the union of the Holy Spirit with Christ, it is certain that He laid stress on this Power as being that which would be the source of the influence His disciples should exercise.

3. Influence of the disciples.—All Christ's disciples, without exception, were to be influential. The words, 'Ye shall receive power, when the Holy Ghost is come upon you' (Act 1:8), were probably spoken to the 120 disciples, numbering some women amongst them. They were to rely upon Him. He had told them previously that in the difficult situations which persecutions would create, they were not to be anxious as to how best to answer the accusations of their adversaries: He Himself would give them 'a mouth and wisdom,' and then further explained by saying, 'for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Spirit' (Luk 21:14 f.). They were then to influence the world not primarily by intellectual power or by wonderful signs, but by that which is deeper

than thought or gifts, namely, their own personality. It would be what they *were*, not what they had, the power of their own inner spirit, not that of cleverness; and this through the power of the Eternal Spirit. Spirit can be touched only by spirit, personality can be developed only by personality. When, then, the Holy Spirit came down upon them on the Day of Pentecost, it was the depths, not the surface of their lives, that were stirred. It was not the development of mere intellectual gifts which enabled them to communicate with others, but such an enlargement of their own spirits that they felt in touch with the whole world, and in their struggle to express this rush of sympathy, found a language suitable for each person with whom they came in contact. So afterwards we do not find the gift of tongues a new language, but rather an endeavour to express the new enlargement of their own spirit. They felt more than they could express, more sometimes than their minds could recognize (1Co 14:13). And this growth of personality is what we see even in the brief records of the NT: Simon becomes Peter; Levi, Matthew; Bartholomew, Nathanael; Joseph, Barnabas; and Saul, Paul. Their characters are not only stronger, but fuller and larger, and through them they built up churches, and changed the face of the world in which they lived. Our Lord never supposes they will be effective through education or culture or the presence of gifts. ‘Apart from me ye can do nothing’ (Joh 15:4). But the co-operation which He promises as the secret of their success is not that of a master who gets over his pupil’s difficulty by solving it for him, but that of one who by his sympathy, power, and skill enables him to meet it for himself. Christ dwelt in them through faith by the power of the Holy Spirit, and worked in them and through them in every painful task they had to accomplish.

Literature.—Phillips Brooks, *Influence of Jesus*; Dale, *The Living Christ*, ch. iii.; Stalker, *Imago Christi*, ch. xvii.; Newman, *Gram. of Assent*⁵ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 463 ff.

G. H. S. Walpole.

⚡Inheritance

INHERITANCE (Mat 21:38, Mar 12:7, Luk 20:14; Luk 12:13 : κληρονομία, derived from κληρος, ‘lot,’ ‘portion,’ ‘possession,’ and νέμειν, ‘to own *or* administer’).—The ordinary Biblical idea of inheritance is ‘the enjoyment by a rightful title of that which is not the fruit of personal exertion. The heir being what he is in relation to others, enters upon a possession which corresponds with his position; but there is no necessary thought of succession to one who has passed away’ (Westcott, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 168). In the Gospels, however, the idea of succession to a deceased

person is the prominent one, as with ourselves. The chief difference between the ordinary ancient and the ordinary modern conception of inheritance is this: We have more regard to the mere change in the ownership of certain property which takes place: the ancient civilized races looked rather to the position of the heir as executor and administrator of the deceased's property, and as the person who, being clothed, so to speak, with the personality of the deceased, took upon himself all the obligations of the testator, as well as the continuance of his race and the perpetuation of his family religion. The last considerations were the most prominent, and account for the prevalence of adoption in ancient society. An adopted son, or a relative compelled to marry the deceased's daughter, could carry on the family and its rites as well as a real son. (See *Maine's Ancient Law*, ch. vi., and artt. 'Heir' and 'Inheritance' in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible*). See also art. Heir.

Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] Souter.

⚑ Inn

INN.—Inns in the time of Christ were neither so infrequent nor so ill-equipped as many writers have represented.

Thus Stapfer (*Palestine in the Time of Christ*, 1866, p. 232), quoting from the Talmud a story of some Levites, who, travelling from Zoar, left at an inn one of their number who had fallen ill upon the road (*Yeb.* xvi. 7), adds the comment, 'Such hostelries were rare, and were found only in very remote places.' Other writers convey the impression that the only inns existing in Palestine were a few *khans*, as bare and comfortless as those now found in many parts of the East, and often described by modern travellers (see, *e.g.*, Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria*, 1822, p. 36; Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* 1853, p. 498; Kinglake, *Eothen*, ch. xvii.; also Kitto's *Cyc.*, art. 'Caravanserais'; and Vigouroux's *Dict.*, art. 'Caravansérail').

This seems to the present writer a mistaken inference, arising partly from exaggerated notions of Oriental hospitality, and partly from attributing to the 1st cent. a.d. social conditions which prevailed, it is true, in patriarchal times, and are found even now on the great trade and pilgrim routes across the desert, but did not obtain to anything like the same degree in the busy, populated, and prosperous country of the Herods. The customary hospitality of the East (see *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible*, s.v., and art. 'Gast' in *Hamburger's RE*) may, of course, be a reason why inns in the modern sense of the word should be less needed than in Western countries; but the statement that 'the warm commendations of hospitality in the NT show that even in the Roman period the buildings set apart for strangers to lodge in

were of a simple character in Palestine' (*Encyc. Bibl.* art. 'Inn'), requires considerable modification.

Some of these commendations obviously refer to the interchange of courtesies among members of the Christian community only (e.g. Rom 12:13 a, 1Pe 4:9, 3Jn 1:5), while others which definitely mention 'strangers' and 'enemies' are not necessarily any indication of the rarity and poverty of existing places of entertainment, but a sign of the new Christian spirit (Rom 12:20, Heb 13:2). Ramsay argues (*Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible*, Ext. Vol. p. 394^a) that the motive of this urging of hospitality was the desire to preserve Christian converts from the corrupting influences among which they would be thrown at the public inns.

Numerous passages are cited from the Talmud to prove the extent to which hospitality prevailed among the Jews; but this traditional virtue was probably more praised than practised in the 1st century. The conditions peculiar to a nomad life came to be very materially modified when the countryside was covered with populous villages and towns. It is true that, at the Passover, if a Jew came up to Jerusalem from any part of the empire, he would find entertainment at a private house. It was the boast of the Rabbis that, notwithstanding the crowds, no man could say, 'I have not found a bed in Jerusalem to lie in' (Light-foot, *Works*, 1823, ix. p. 128); but what if the Jew came at some other time than at one of the great national feasts? What if a Samaritan came? Moreover, there was a large population of heathen; and even if Jewish habits of hospitality to Jews were equal in practice to the theory, no provision was made for the Gentile. Even to a Jew a Jew would shut his door. When Jesus is sending out His disciples to preach, He does not take it for granted that they will always find a ready welcome or free entertainment (Mat 10:11-14, Mar 6:10-11, Luk 10:10-11).

Nor is it safe to argue from the comparative silence of contemporary records that inns were rare. It would not be guessed by a reader of the Gospels that in Jerusalem there were many synagogues.* [Note: See Talm. Bah. Kethub. 105a; Jerus. Megilla, 73d (although, of course, the 400 is a characteristic exaggeration).] It is quite possible that there were almost as many inns in Jerusalem. At any rate, it is misleading to make the general statement, as though it applied to all periods of Jewish history, that 'inns in our sense of the term were, as they still are, unknown in the East' (M'Clintock and Strong, *Cyc.* s.v.). A truer view is given in the *Jewish Encyc.* (art. 'Caravanserai'): 'By NT times the Holy Land had been sufficiently developed to afford opportunity for real inns.'

The influx of Greeks into Palestine, the constant presence of a large Roman element, civil and military, the mixed retinue attached to the Herodian court, the increase of

trade, the importation of foreign workmen, the presence in several towns of companies of gladiators, actors, and the like,—would necessitate not only inns, but various kinds and grades of inns.

There were inns built on a large scale, comfortable and elegant, suited for high officials (see *CI/L* [Note: *IL Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.*] iii. 6123, where Mommsen explains *praetoria* as ‘diversoria nobiliora magistratibus iter facientibus reliquisque honestioribus destinata’). Epictetus draws a picture of a traveller lingering at a fine hotel because he finds everything agreeable there (*Diss.* ii. xxiii. 36). Josephus (*Ant.* xv. v. 1) relates that when Herod the Great was celebrating games at Caesarea, he entertained a number of ambassadors and other visitors at the public inns (καταγωγῶν). On the other hand, there were inns of the lowest description. At the same port of Caesarea there would doubtless be a number of taverns for sailors (cf. Josephus *BJ* i. xxi. 7). The numerous Talmudic references to inns (which, of course, must be used with some degree of caution) indicate that they were a distinct feature of social life, e.g. ‘a public inn in which Israelites come and go’ (*Aboda Zara*, v. 3); ‘An Israelite and a heathen were once at an inn drinking wine’ (*ib.*); ‘R. Papa used to stand outside the store of the heathen and drink his beer’ (ii. 4). R. Ishmael bar Jose declared that his father used to pray in an inn (*Ber.* iv. 7); ‘Cattle must not be placed in the inns of heathen’ (*Aboda Zara*, ii. 1).

There can be little doubt that there were numerous taverns where food as well as drink could be obtained (cf. Franz Delitzsch, *Jewish Artizan Life in the Time of Christ*, p. 47). Not only heathen were innkeepers, but Jews; not only men, but women. ‘A Jewish woman dealing in wine once left her keys in charge of a heathen, and the question came up whether her wine she has in the tavern is allowed’ (*Aboda Zara*, v. 3).

Jülicher (*Gleichnisreden*, ii. p. 590; cf. Bertholet, *Die Stellung der Israeliten und der Juden zu den Fremden*, p. 24) rightly maintains that the inn of Luk 10:34, to which the good Samaritan took his patient, was a hostelry (‘nicht blos Caravanserai sondern Gasthaus’). The word used in this passage (πανδοχεῖον) is significant. It was taken over into Rabbinic Hebrew, and is the usual word (פּוּרְקָא) for ‘inn’ in the Talmud. The Greek name shows that inns were largely a product of the Hellenistic period (see Schürer, *P* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. i. 33). Other Rabbinic terms, אֲשֵׁפּוּיָא and אֲכַסְנִיָּא, are equivalents of *hospitium* and ξενία; and as these replace the OT terms מִלְוֶה and נְרוּת, they seem to indicate that something is intended quite different from the *khan* of the lonely road or the ‘lodging-place of wayfaring men in the wilderness’ (Jer 9:2).

It is difficult to fix the exact significance of *κατάλυμα*, the other word used in the Gospels for 'inn.' Etymologically, it means 'the place where burdens were loosed for the night.' In Luk 2:7 it is generally taken to mean an inn of the *khan* type. Polybius uses it in the plural form (ii. xxxvi. 1). Diodorus (xiv. 93) relates that the Romans, in gratitude for the services of one Timasitheus, granted him δημόσιον κατάλυμα.* [Note: In inscriptions in the Hauran we find δημόσιον πανδοχεῖον (Le Bas and Waddington, vol. iii. n. 2462).] The *κατάλυμα* of Mar 14:14 and Luk 22:11, where the Last Supper was eaten, is generally supposed to have been a private house (Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Inn'); and the use of the verb *καταλύω*, as in Luk 19:7, is quite in keeping with this. Nothing very definite, however, can be deduced from these names as to the precise character of the place of lodging.

Did Jesus Himself ever enter or stay at inns? It is usually assumed that His disciples always provided hospitality for Him. Yet the only recorded cases in which He accepted it are those of Peter's house at Capernaum and the house at Bethany. The words, 'the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head' (Mat 8:20, Luk 9:58), suggest that hospitality was not always forthcoming. We know that it was not in Samaria (Luk 9:52) and among the Gerasenes (8:37). During a considerable part of the year it would be no hardship to spend the night in the open air, and apparently Jesus often preferred this, that He might have opportunity for quiet prayer, and more privacy than would be possible in a house or an inn. (Cf. J. L. Porter, *Giant Cities of Bashan*, 1866, pp. 157-159; also, for the habits of St. Francis and his followers, P. Sabatier, *Vic*, 1894, p. 88 f.). There is, however, no reason against His having resorted upon occasion to places of public entertainment. These were sometimes kept by Jews; but, if kept by a Gentile, this would not necessarily deter Him from going in. Strict Jews objected to entering the house of a Gentile, lest they should incur defilement (Joh 18:28, cf. Hausrath, *Hist. NT Times*, ii. 85); but Jesus, while recognizing that His mission was to Jews primarily, never allowed His action to be limited by ceremonial considerations. For instance, He did not hesitate, in spite of protest, to visit the house of Zacchaeus, and the freedom of His intercourse with all kinds of people brought on Him the charge of being a 'wine-bibber,' and of consorting with the lowest classes (Mat 11:19, Luk 7:34). His desire to seek 'the lost' suggests that He would not avoid the places where these were most likely to be found.

In this connexion it is interesting to note that the Talmud has the following passage: 'In the time of the Messiah the people will be impudent, and be given to drinking; public-houses will flourish, and the vine will be dear' (*Sota*, quoted in M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyc.*, art. 'Inn').

The reputation of inns seems to have been generally bad; they were very often houses of ill-fame, and hostesses were looked upon with suspicion. Yet some of the larger inns would bear a better character and be centres of influence, and there is no reason why Jesus should not have visited them. In most countries and periods the itinerant preacher has found the public inn to be a soil where the word might readily take root. (Cf. Fox, *Journal*, 1901, vol. i. pp. 118, 261, 258; Wesley, *Journal*, under March 1738; Borrow, *Bible in Spain*, *passim*).

Literature.—Ramsay, art. 'Roads and Travel (in NT)' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, Ext. Vol., under *Inns and Entertainment*.

J. Ross Murray.

Innocence

INNOCENCE.—Innocence, strictly speaking, denotes the entire absence of sin in a human soul. As such, in its primary meaning, we have no personal experience of it in ourselves or in others. 'For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God' (Rom 3:23). We can, therefore, have no actual knowledge of what would be the effect of this quality upon a human character. In this sense it is an attribute of Jesus Christ alone among men, who 'was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin' (Heb 4:15); 'who knew no sin' (2Co 5:21); who could address to His watchful foes the challenge, 'Which of you convicteth me of sin?' (Joh 8:46). The gulf between innocence and the state of the soul that has once committed sin can be realized only as we comprehend the nature of sin and its immeasurable depravity and consequences. See art. Sinlessness. (For the subject of our Lord's innocence of the charges which led to His crucifixion, see art. Trial of Jesus Christ).

Innocence in a comparative sense may be attributed to men who, though fallen, are yet, in respect of particular sins, innocent, or who from circumstances of upbringing, or by the special grace of God, are shielded from that knowledge of sin by personal experience which is the common lot of men. Such a man was John the Baptist, who 'was in the deserts until the day of his showing unto Israel' (Luk 1:80). It has been said that there are only two states of life open to the man who wishes to serve God. The one is the state of innocence, the other of penitence. John the Baptist may be taken as a type of the one, St. Peter of the other. It must not be supposed that innocence implies ignorance or weakness. If John the Baptist, in whose life no fall is recorded, the essence of whose career is one unbroken record of devotion to the service of God, be taken as a type of innocence, he is pre-eminently the stern

masculine type of character, and he displays great knowledge of men and power of dealing with the varied temptations of soldiers, publicans, and professors of religion.

The temptation specially addressed to innocence is the knowledge of evil as well as good (Gen 3:5), but the experience of evil which entails the irrecoverable loss of innocence is not wisdom in the true sense of the word. 'The knowledge of wickedness is not wisdom' (Sir 19:22). Innocence possesses an intuitive perception of right and wrong, observable in the child, which becomes blunted by the indulgence of sin; it also implies a strength which is lost by a fall. Each successive lapse from innocence makes the soul weaker in that particular direction in which the fall has taken place.

For further treatment of this subject the reader may be referred to a sermon on the subject in Illingworth's *University and Cathedral Sermons*, p. 99 ff.

M. R. Newbolt.

⚠️ Innocents

INNOCENTS.—In Mat 2:16-18 we find the narrative of what is called the Massacre of the Innocents. Adopting the language of Jer 31:15, the Evangelist represents Rachel, the ancestral mother of the people of Israel, as weeping over the cruel death of her children. Herod the Great, hearing from the Magi about the birth of a king of the Jews, foreshadowed by the star in the East which they had followed, inquired of the chief priests and scribes where this promised prince should be born. They quoted to him the words of Micah (Mic 5:2), who speaks of the governor ruling Israel, who is to come out of Bethlehem in Judah, the city of David. When the Magi, having offered their gifts before the young child at Bethlehem, refused to inform Herod, but returned to their own country another way, the enraged king gave orders that all the children from two years old and under should be slain. This was done with much cruelty, so that in Bethlehem and the surrounding country there was great lamentation.

The truth of this story has been questioned. The chief ground is the silence of Josephus on the subject. While he speaks of many cruel deeds of Herod, he passes this one by. But it is plainly quite of a piece with Herod's well-known character, and, indeed, compared with his other deeds of monstrous cruelty, it would easily escape notice. The whole number of victims, probably not more than twenty or thirty, would not make a very great sensation at that time. Besides, the whole of Josephus' statements in regard to the Messianic expectations and doings of his time are to be

looked upon with some suspicion, for he seems to have been afraid to make many clear and direct allusions to those matters. See *Infancy*.

The deed illustrates well Herod's general character for bloodthirsty cruelty and short-sighted folly. But all his efforts to defeat the purposes of God with His people turn out to be vain. Joseph, warned in a dream by the angel, took Mary and the young child hastily down to Egypt, where they could calmly await the death of the tyrant. Heaven's vengeance soon fell on the blood-stained usurper, dyed with so many inhuman crimes, and he passed away from earth under the maledictions of his down-trodden people.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , art. 'Herod'; Schaff-Herzog, *Encyc. of Rel. Knowl.*, art. 'Innocents' Day'; Farrar, *Christ in Art*, p. 268 ff.; C. Rossetti, *Verses*, p. 57.

D. M. W. Laird.

☞ Inscrption

INSCRIPTION.—See Title on Cross.

☞ Insects

INSECTS.—See Animals, p. 67^a.

☞ Insight

INSIGHT.—In ordinary literary usage the word 'insight' is employed to signify the intellectual apprehension of the cause or processes to which an object or event owes its origin, as distinguished from the mere perception of the object or event itself. We get an insight into the working of a steam-engine, *e.g.*, when we have mastered the principles of engineering; or into some great political crisis, when the various motives that acted upon the minds of the statesmen who took part in it are revealed to us. Insight is also used to designate the faculty that penetrates into the causes that lie behind appearances. A man of practical insight is a man of quick discernment of the principles that determine the appearance of the objects or events that are recurrent

in the business or intercourse of life. A man of political insight is a man who instinctively understands what the community will think, desire, or do at any particular period or special conjunction of circumstances.

In the spiritual or metaphysical sphere, 'insight' has the same double meaning. It is the immediate apprehension of the spiritual significance of truths that can be stated as objective facts. It is also the faculty of the higher reason which intuitively grasps this spiritual significance. Goethe says: 'There are men who put their knowledge in the place of insight.' Here the word is used in the first sense of intuitive apprehension of spiritual truth. 'Jealousy to resist metaphor,' says Francis Newman, 'does not testify to depth of insight.' Here it is the faculty that is referred to. The limits or even the precise nature of this faculty of insight have never been adequately defined. It is used of those subtle processes of thought that elude the syllogistic reason, but with which all are more or less familiar in experience. It is used also to designate that higher faculty of the soul through which the mystic claims to attain to the immediate cognition of the Absolute in its pure being.

Generally it may be said that, in the religious meaning of the word, insight is direct perception of, or the faculty of the soul that perceives, the spiritual order that lies behind phenomena. Sight sees the visible, the phenomenal; insight grasps the invisible, the noumenal. The very definition involves a theory. It implies that there is in the universe a spiritual order, of which man is a constituent element, to perceive; that the noumenal is real, and that what is called immediate cognition of it conveys genuine knowledge, knowledge that can be relied upon as a safe guide to action. It is clear that this theory cannot be proved by any of the ordinary processes of reasoning, seeing it is the result of an immediate cognition which is valid only for the individual. Sight carries its own evidence; and insight, which is the higher sight, must do the same. Truths which come to us through insight, and which press themselves home to the soul with irresistible conviction, must prove themselves in experience by their power of explaining the facts and solving the problems of life. Experience must be the ultimate test of reality. Truths of insight are the postulates of experience. The soul recognizes its immediate cognitions as corresponding with reality, because they are necessary to make its experience rational.

It is a characteristic of Jesus that with Him sight is insight. The spiritual vision is to Him so clear that it is unnecessary to designate the faculty or its object by another term. Jesus is the only-begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father (Joh 1:18)—the Logos which was with God and which was God (Joh 1:1). Jesus sees God as no man can see Him, for human vision of God can only be through the light with which He illumines the soul (Joh 1:18). Because of this unique relation with the ultimate spiritual Reality, His insight into the nature of God is a clear and open vision. The claims He makes, therefore, as to His intimate union with God are the outcome of

a personal consciousness which is part of His essential being. It is similar to our own assurance of selfhood. When Jesus says, 'I and the Father are one' ([Joh 10:30](#)), He is as certain of the fact as when we say, 'I am I.' For Jesus is living in a realm where the object of consciousness is not deflected and refracted by the illusions of sense or the distortions of passion, but where the spirit sees things as they are. It is the realm of pure Reality. There the soul sees what is, not what seems to be. And, further, Jesus thus living in the Absolute and Eternal, sees the lives of men and the processes of history purely in the light of their spiritual issues. What touches His consciousness in the great human drama is the hidden movement that is working out human destiny. With Him the fact is merely the symbol, and the symbol has become so luminous that His vision is always of the spiritual processes of which it is an indication. Browning in the *Epistle of Karshish, the Arab Physician*, has made a daring attempt to get into a consciousness similar to that of Jesus, by trying to imagine how a man whose soul had assimilated the pure spiritual environment of heaven, would feel and act were he permitted to come back to earth and to envisage life from the standpoint of the new experience. It would be—

'Heaven opened to a soul while yet on earth,

Earth forced on a soul's use while seeing heaven.'

The attempt is strikingly suggestive, but Lazarus remains a man with a finite soul, who cannot find his true function in what is now an alien environment. With Jesus this spiritual consciousness was so perfect that it mastered its alien environment and moved through it calmly and serenely, indicating its true place in the Divine purpose, and giving the right interpretation to all its manifestations. The teaching of Jesus is thus a key to the meaning of life, because He sees life in its essence, and has a sure insight into those hidden processes that are evolving the visible order of existence.

And again, from His very nature, the insight of Jesus into the individual souls of men is no less sure and unerring. He reads the human soul like an open book. He needed not that any should testify of man, for He knew what was in man ([Joh 2:25](#)). He could trace accurately the working of the ideas He was instilling into the minds of His disciples, as they mingled with their own crude religious conceptions ([Joh 6:61](#)). He understood perfectly the feeling of instinctive resistance that arose within the minds of the Pharisees at the impact of spiritual truth upon the hard crust of an artificial religionism which had become part of their very nature ([Luk 6:8](#), [Mat 12:25](#)). And He recognized the uprising of a pure spiritual emotion in the hearts even of the most degraded when it was spontaneous and genuine ([Luk 7:47](#)), while He could repress and discourage the most fervent offer of devotion when He detected in it a vein of insincerity ([Luk 9:57-58](#)). It was this insight into human nature which was the secret of His amazing power over men in the days of His flesh. It is a faculty possessed by

men in very varying degrees. Its accuracy and intensity depend upon the richness of a man's nature—upon his knowledge of and sympathy with the gamut of human emotion. There have been many men of wonderful insight, and therefore of strong personal magnetism. But man's insight is always obscured by individual bias and by the obstruction of the medium of sense which conceals the soul's working. Men are always more or less deceived, and even men of the keenest insight often break down in their reading of character at the point where it is most essential for them to be right. Jesus was perfect man, and therefore His sympathy with men was full and entire, and touched human nature at every point. For Jesus, who viewed human life in the light of eternity, the sense-medium did not exist. It was the spirit that was always before His vision, and therefore His knowledge of the human heart was instinctive and unerring. Hence it was that the method of Jesus in dealing with diverse types of character is so full of suggestiveness and instruction.

This conception of the consciousness of Jesus must be kept clearly in mind when we study His sayings. His is a consciousness that moves freely in the realm of pure Reality, and visualizes God, human destiny, and the individual soul in the light of their eternal relations. Hence those marvellous revelations of the essence of the Divine Nature in its correspondence to human needs and human aspirations. Hence, too, it results that it is the spiritual meaning of human actions alone that gives them value to Him, and the measure of their value is the degree of spiritual vitality they indicate. Thus Jesus continually reverses the valuations of the world, which are based on the theory of the reality of the objects of sense-perception. He that is greatest among men is he that is the servant of all (Mar 9:35). The two mites thrown by the widow into the Temple treasury are a more munificent offering than the costly gifts of the Pharisees, because they represent a greater degree of sacrifice (Mar 12:43-44). The action of Mary in breaking over the head of Jesus the alabaster box of very precious ointment, is one of the memorable events of history, because it indicates a fine perception of what is due to the Lord of life at the supremely critical moment of world-development (Mar 14:3, Joh 12:3). Jesus gives to the penitent thief the assurance of immediate entry into Paradise, because full and adequate penitence for sin is itself the crossing of the threshold of the spiritual realm (Luk 23:43). If this clue be rigorously applied, it solves many of the difficulties that beset a literal exegesis of the words of Jesus. It is especially significant when we study His apocalyptic utterances. Here the difficulty of interpretation frequently lies in the fact that the commentator often attempts to force upon them a materialistic meaning that was never intended. Language is material, and has been constructed primarily to indicate the phenomena of sense-perception. When it is used to describe spiritual processes, the ideas conveyed must be detached from the medium of conveyance, if they are to be rightly understood. Jesus lived in the noumenal world. What He saw there He could convey to the souls of His hearers only by the use of words that had been coined to connote totally different conceptions. When Nathanael, struck by Jesus' recognition

of him under the figtree, hails Him as the Son of God, Jesus says: 'Because I said unto thee, I saw thee under the figtree, believest thou?... Verily, verily, I say unto you, *Henceforth* ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man' (Joh 1:50, Joh 1:51). It is significant that the Authorized Version translates ἀπ' ἄρτι 'hereafter.' The translators were evidently dominated by the idea that Jesus is describing a physical marvel which Nathanael will witness in the distant future. But Jesus clearly means that the intercourse of Nathanael with Himself will bring heaven to his soul, and enable him to realize that a living link of communication has been established between God and man.

The words of Jesus regarding death, judgment, His second coming, and the life to come, can be interpreted with rigorous precision, even although they clothe spiritual conceptions with a material garb. They are not mere metaphors, for a metaphor is rarely, if ever, the exact counterpart of the idea it illustrates. Jesus is dwelling in eternity and contemplating the processes of the spiritual world, and He conveys to the receptive soul by the only medium at His command the impression He Himself receives from His direct vision of the truth He is envisaging. The medium is of value only in so far as it serves its purpose. To the irresponsive soul it has no meaning or value at all. To the soul that has the faculty of vision the words are luminous, and reveal God's secrets. There is no question here of metaphor except in so far as nine-tenths of spoken words are metaphorical. There is nothing overstrained or untrue.

The bearing of this on the doctrine of Revelation cannot here be overlooked. Revelation is insight in its intensest form. The revelation granted to the prophets in OT times was their insight into the meaning of God's ways, their vision of the spiritual processes through which the higher life of humanity is evolved. The revelation granted to the Apostles was their response to the brilliancy of the light that streamed from the Eternal Word during the brief period of His Incarnation. Jesus reveals because He is the Light of the world. He never argues. He knows nothing of the dialectic process in pressing home the higher truths to the soul. He sees and He would have others to see, and only in so far as they see is He capable of blessing them (Joh 12:44; Joh 12:46). It follows that all revelation is personal, and incommunicable from one man to another. Only the Triune God is the Revealer of the spiritual mystery. A written revelation is thus, in the strict meaning of the words, a contradiction in terms. The Bible is not a revelation, but a record of a series of revelations that were given to men of insight, men who possessed the faculty of vision. Its purpose is not to reveal, but to put the soul in an attitude of expectancy by telling what other men have seen. It is the Holy Spirit that quickens the soul and conveys the gift of vision to which alone Divine Truth can be revealed. This is

everywhere the doctrine of Scripture, and has never been more clearly or beautifully stated than in the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (ch. i. par. 5).

Jesus invariably attaches a knowledge of the Divine mysteries to a certain spiritual attitude apart from which nothing can be known. It is the pure in heart who see God (Mat 5:8). It is the doer of God's will who alone can judge of the truth of His doctrine (Joh 7:16-17). The sin of the Pharisees is that they are blind while they think they see (Joh 9:41). No matter with what brilliancy the light may shine, so long as the spiritual orb is darkened it can reveal nothing of the wonders of the spirit-land (Joh 1:12). And St. Paul says that no man knoweth the things of God; it is the Spirit of God alone who knoweth them; and only in so far as the spirit of man is illumined by the Spirit of God can they be revealed to him (1Co 2:11). Only when the Divine in man meets and mingles with the Divine that is without and around him can there result that spiritual certainty which is revelation.

Insight, then, in the spiritual sense of the term (which is the sense in which it is generally used), links itself on to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit (wh. see). It is the Light that lighteth every man coming into the world; for we must assume that the capacity, in germ at least, is universal as humanity, otherwise there would be some to whom religion is impossible. But it is given in varying degrees, and is conditioned by varying environments. The visions it sees are not always of reality, for the medium through which it looks is often obscured by earthly passions and prejudices. But when it does see right into the heart of things, it enunciates truths to which the soul clings as essential to its very life.

Literature.—Knight, *Aspects of Theism; Maxims and Reflections of Goethe* (translation by Bailey Saunders); Gilchrist, *Life of William Blake*; F. W. Newman, *The Soul*; Hibbert Lectures on *Basis of Religious Belief*, by C. B. Upton; James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*; Ewald, *Revelation, its Nature and its Record*; Oman, *Vision and Authority*; W. P. dn Bose, *The Ecumenical Councils*; Herrmann, *Verkehr des Christen mit Gott*; Meister Eckhart, *Schriften und Predigten*, Leipzig, 1903.

A. Miller.

☪ Inspiration

INSPIRATION.—The term employed to denote the action of the Divine Spirit upon the writers of Scripture. Literally signifying *a breathing into*, it has the secondary meaning of breathing a certain spirit into the mind or soul, and is therefore naturally employed to express the influence of God upon the sacred writers. 'Inspiration in

general is the influence of one person upon another; Divine inspiration is the influence of the Divine Person upon the human' (Wood, *A Tenable Theory of Insp.* p. 10). In Scripture itself we find the idea in Hos 9:7 (LXX Septuagint) expressed by the word πνευματοφόρος—though in this case the inspiration was not Divine. In the NT (2Pe 1:21) similarly ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι. In non-Christian literature inspired men are spoken of as θεοδίδακτοι, θεόφοροι, θεοφορούμενοι, θεόδοχοι, θεόπνευστοι, ἔνθεοι, ἐπίπνοοι, βακχεύομενοι, μαινόμενοι, *divino numine afflati, inspirati, furentes*. The use of the word 'inspiration' to express the Divine factor in Scripture is probably derived from the fact that the words of 2Ti 3:16 πᾶσα γραφή θεόπνευστος are rendered in the Vulgate 'omnis Scriptura divinitus inspirata.' The definition given by Lee (*Insp.* p. 27 f.) is sufficient as conveying the general idea attached to the word. 'By inspiration I understand that actuating energy of the Holy Spirit, in whatever degree or manner it may have been exercised, guided by which the human agents chosen by God have *officially* proclaimed His will by word of mouth, or have committed to writing the several portions of the Bible.' Sanday's explanation of the word is excellent: 'Just as one particular branch of one particular stock was chosen to be in a general sense the recipient of a clearer revelation than was vouchsafed to others, so within that branch certain individuals were chosen to have their hearts and minds moved in a manner more penetrating and more effective than their fellows, with the result that their written words convey to us truths about the nature of God and His dealings with man which other writings do not convey with equal fulness, power, and purity. We say that this special moving is due to the action upon those hearts and minds of the Holy Spirit. And we call that action Inspiration' (*Bampton Lect.* p. 127). Or we may say that as God revealed Himself in creation, in the history of His people, and especially, in Jesus Christ, He also enabled certain persons to perceive and express the significance of that revelation; and this ability is what we mean by inspiration.

Inspiration is claimed not only for our Scriptures, but for the other sacred books of the world. The Vedas, the books of Zoroaster and of the Buddhists, the Koran, all rest their claim to be received on the belief that they proceed from a Divine source. Even where tribes are too uncivilized to possess sacred writings, there exists a belief that God makes known His mind through dreams, oracles, or inspired individuals; and the presence and influence of God is frequently spoken of as an afflatus, the blowing of a breath or wind upon the inspired person. To the idea that knowledge is supernaturally conveyed to persons who are not in the historic line of Scriptural revelation, sanction is given in the OT by the instances of Abimelech, Pharaoh, and Balaam. And while in the sacred books of the world there is a great deal that is superstitious, contemptible, and degrading, there is also much that illustrates man's thirst for God, and much also to show that God responds to that thirst. We naturally expect to find a fuller

inspiration in those who were in touch with, and were called to record, the great progressive historical revelation which culminated in Christ; but we need not therefore deny all Divine response and assistance to those who on other lines were setting their faces Godwards.

1. The claim of Scripture to be inspired.—The OT was accepted as inspired both by the NT writers and by all their Jewish contemporaries. At that date certain of the books eventually included in the OT had not been definitely admitted to canonical authority; but, speaking generally, the writings of the OT were universally held to be Divine, sacred, in some true sense the word of God. Of this there is abundant evidence.

(a) Our Lord Himself appeals to the OT as a final authority (Mat 19:4, Joh 5:46). He refers to it as the prophetic index to, and justification of, the providential dealings of God (Luk 24:44, Joh 10:35). Expressly, in citing Psalms 110, He introduces the quotation with the words, ‘David himself by the Holy Spirit said’ (αὐτὸς Δαυεὶδ εἶπεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ), Mar 12:36. And significantly in adducing the Law in contrast to the traditions of the elders, the highest human authority, He altogether neglects the human mediation of the writer, and simply says, ‘For God said’ (Mat 15:4). His personal reliance upon Scripture is visible in His use of it as His defence in the stress of temptation (Mat 4:4; Mat 4:7; Mat 4:10) and as the authentication of His ministry (Luk 4:17-21). It was the OT which preserved the knowledge of the marvellous history of which He recognized Himself to be the culmination. In it He met all that was Divine in the past, and acknowledged the regulating Divine Spirit throughout.

(b) As with the Master, so with the disciples. In the First Gospel the writer has ever in his eye τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου (Joh 1:22). In their first independent action the disciples were determined by their belief that they must fulfil the Scripture ἣν προεἶπεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον διὰ στόματος Δαυεὶδ (Act 1:16; cf.

Act 28:25). For St. Paul as for St. Peter the utterances of the OT are the λόγια θεοῦ (Rom 3:2; 1Pe 4:11). ‘It is written’ is the ultimate authority. The Scripture is identified with God, so that St. Paul can say (Rom 9:17) ‘the scripture saith unto Pharaoh’; and it is God who speaks in the prophets (Rom 9:25). In the Epistle to the Hebrews the same conception of Scripture prevails. Quotations are introduced with the formula, ‘the Holy Spirit saith’; and the revelation of Christ is but the completion of the revelation of the OT. It was God who spoke in the prophets (Heb 1:1). The very titles under which the OT Scriptures are designated sufficiently manifest the belief that they were written under the inspiration of God. (For these titles, see Ryle, *Canon of OT*, p. 302).

(c) As representative of contemporary Jewish thought it is enough to cite Philo and Josephus. The former explicitly affirms the inspiration of Moses, speaking of him as ‘that purest mind which received at once the gift of legislation and of prophecy with Divinely inspired wisdom’ (θεοφορητῶ σοφία, *de Congr. Erud.* c. 24, ed. Mangey, i. 538) and as καταπνευσθεῖς ὑπ’ ἔρωτος οὐρανόθεν (dc *Vita Mos.*, Mangey, ii. 145). To Isaiah and Jeremiah ‘as members of the prophetic choir,’ he expressly ascribes inspiration (τοῦ προφητικοῦ θιασώτης χοροῦ, ὃς καταπνευσθεῖς ἐνθουσιῶν ἀνεφθέγγαστο, *de Conf. Ling.* c. 12, Mangey, i. 411). Josephus is equally explicit. Vying with Philo in reverential esteem for the OT, he bases this esteem on the belief that the authors of the various books wrote under the influence of the Divine Spirit (*Ant.* iv. viii. 49, iii. v. 4, x. ii. 2; cf. c. *Apion.* i. 7).

No belief of later Judaism was more universal or constant than this acceptance of the OT Scriptures as inspired. ‘Die heilige Schrift ist entstanden durch Inspiration des heiligen Geistes, stammt also von Gott selbst ab, der in ihr redet.’ This statement of Weber’s (*Lehren d. Talmud*, p. 78) is amply justified by the passages he cites, as, e.g., ‘He who affirms that the Thora is not from heaven, has no part in the future world’ (*Sanhed.* x. 1). Bousset (*Die Religion d. Judentums*, p. 125) reaches the same conclusion: ‘Die heiligen Schriften sind nach spätjüdischem Dogma inspiriert.’

This belief in the inspiration of the OT was the natural and inevitable result of the phenomena it presented; and was not, as has sometimes been suggested, the mere reflexion of the vague idea that all ancient writings, especially if poetical, were inspired.* [Note: Hatch, Hibbert Lect. p. 51.] Moses is represented as speaking face to face with God and as receiving the Law from Him. The prophets demand attention to their words by prefacing them with the announcement, ‘Thus saith the Lord.’ In Exo 4:10-12, Isa 59:21, Jer 1:7-9 the equipment of the prophet is described by the expression, ‘I have put my words in thy mouth.’ From these two phenomena it was a necessary inference that at any rate the Law and the Prophets were inspired. Prof. Sanday (*Insp.* p. 128) justly remarks that ‘the prophetic inspiration seems to be a type of all inspiration. It is perhaps the one mode in which the most distinctive features of Biblical inspiration can be most clearly recognized.’ It must, however, also be borne in mind that among the Jews themselves it was the Law, rather than the Prophets, which satisfied, and perhaps suggested, their idea of inspiration. Latterly they went so far as to say that, had the Law found in Israel recipients worthy of it, nothing beyond would have been required. The Law itself was a perfect and complete revelation, and neither Prophets nor Hagiographa were indispensable (see passages in Weber, *Lehren d. Talm.* p. 79). The response of conscience to the Law confirmed the traditional accounts of its origin, and the belief in its inspiration was inevitable. Possibly it was the belief that the whole OT was normative that prompted the usage

by which even the Prophets and the Psalms were cited in the NT as 'the Law' (see Joh 15:25; Joh 10:34, 1Co 14:21, Rom 3:19).

The inspiration of the NT stands on a somewhat different footing. The supreme instance of inspiration is our Lord Himself (Luk 4:17-21); and He is also its source to His followers. At His Baptism, Jesus was formally called to, and equipped for, His ministry; and His equipment consisted in His receiving the fulness of the Holy Spirit. Under the influence of this Spirit all His works were done and all His words spoken. 'He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God, for he giveth not the Spirit by measure' (Joh 3:34); 'My teaching is not mine, but his that sent me' (Joh 7:16); 'as the Father hath taught me, I speak these things' (Joh 8:28). And it is His words, spoken under the influence of the Divine Spirit, that form the nucleus of the NT Canon. They were the first portion of that Canon to be recognized as authoritative, and however difficult certain writings found it to gain access to the Canon, the words of our Lord were from the first, and universally, regarded as Divine by all Christians.

But those whom He appointed to be His witnesses and to explain to the world the significance of His manifestation, required above all else the inspiration of the Author of salvation. This was emphatically and reiteratedly promised to them. The presence of the Divine Spirit was promised not only to prompt and support them on critical occasions, as when they were summoned before magistrates (Mar 13:11, Mat 10:20, Luk 12:11), but as the Spirit of truth He was promised as the very substitute of Christ Himself: 'He shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you' (Joh 14:26; Joh 16:13). This promise cannot be understood as meant to assure the disciples that they would be able to recall every word their Lord had said; as little as this assurance is conveyed to all Christians by the words of St. John (1Jn 2:27), 'His anointing teacheth you concerning all things.' At the same time it was meant to encourage them to believe that their sympathy with their Lord and their acceptance of His Spirit would give them a sufficient remembrance and understanding of His teaching.

That this promise was fulfilled is certain. The relation of the risen Lord to His Church, His presence with those who represented Him, and the aid He afforded them in accomplishing His purposes, compel the conclusion that His Spirit dwelt in those who taught and built up the Church by word and letter. Those who preached the gospel discharged their function 'with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven' (1Pe 1:12). Of this the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost was the earnest. In guiding the Church the aid of this Spirit was experienced (Act 13:2; Act 15:28 etc.). In writing to the Galatians, St. Paul claims to have been instructed by the Lord in the gospel he preached. In 2Co 13:3 he is prepared to give 'a proof of Christ that speaketh in me.' And even in less essential matters regarding which he can claim no definite instructions or revelation, he yet in the exercise of his own judgment believes himself

to be guided by the Spirit of God (1Co 7:40). In his enumeration of the various manifestations of the Spirit, the writing of sacred books, it is true, finds no place, neither do the writers of the Gospels claim to be inspired. But 'the word of wisdom,' 'the word of knowledge,' the charism of the prophet and the teacher, may quite reasonably, if not even necessarily, be supposed to include written as well as spoken discourse.

2. The significance of the claim to be inspired, or the meaning and effects of inspiration.—Several opinions or theories present themselves. And in determining which of these is correct, we must be guided not by *a priori* ideas of the results which must flow from inspiration, but only by the phenomena presented in the Bible; in other words, by the actual effects of inspiration as these are seen in the writings of inspired men. 'What inspiration is must be learned from what it does.... We must not determine the character of the books from the inspiration, but must rather determine the nature of the inspiration from the books' (Bowne's *Christian Revelation*, p. 45).

(1) *The 'mechanical' or 'dictation' theory, or theory of verbal inspiration.*—This is the theory that in writing the books of Scripture the human author was merely the mouthpiece of the Divine, and that therefore every word in the Bible as truly represents the mind of God as if He had dictated it. 'Facts, doctrines, precepts, references to history or chronology, quotations from writers sacred or profane, allusions to scientific truth, visions or prophetic declarations, mere references to the most ordinary actions of life, according to this view, are not the work of man but of Omniscience. The only use which has been made of human agency in the book has been to copy down with pen, ink, and paper what has been dictated by the Divine Spirit.' Absolute inerrancy is on this theory presumed to be the accompaniment of inspiration. As one of its defenders says: 'God employed men in writing. But these men were so controlled by Him, that He is the Author of the writing and to the Author, that any charge of inaccuracy against the record, or Scripture, as originally given, must be preferred against Him' (Kennedy, *The Doctrine of Insp.* 1878, p. 6). To use the common way of putting it, the writers were 'the pens, not the penmen' of God. They were possessed by God, so that it was not so much their own mind and their own experience, but the mind of God that was represented in their writings.* [Note: 'Omnes et singulae res quae in S. Scriptura continentur, sive illae fuerint S. Scriptoribus naturaliter incognitae, sive naturaliter quidem cognoscibiles, actu tamen incognitae, sive denique non tantum naturaliter cognoscibiles, sed etiam actu ipso notae, vel aliunde, vel per experientiam, et sensuum ministerium, non solum per assistentiam et directionem divinam infallibilem literis consignatae sunt, sed singulari Spiritus S. suggestioni, inspirationi, et dictamini acceptae ferendae sunt' (Quenstedt, cited with other similar dicta, in Hutterus Redivivus, s.v. 'Inspiration').]

This theory has all the prestige which antiquity can give it, for it runs back to those primitive stages of civilization in which possession by a deity was produced by inhaling fumes, or by violent dancings and contortions. This frenzied state being induced, the words spoken were believed to be Divine. The theory has also the prestige which is conferred by the advocacy of great names. Plato countenanced the idea that the inspired man is so possessed by the Divine that his words and thoughts are not his own. In the *Timæus* (p. 71) and in the *Phaedrus* (p. 244) he maintains that when a man receives the inspired word, either his intelligence is enthralled in sleep, or he is demented by some distemper or possession. The relation of the Divine to the human is viewed quantitatively. As the Divine comes in, the human must go out and make room for it. It was probably through Philo that this view gained currency in the Church. Philo's account of Inspiration is quite explicit. 'A prophet,' he says, 'gives forth nothing of his own, but acts as interpreter at the prompting of another in all his utterances; and as long as he is under inspiration he is in ignorance, his reason departing from its place and yielding up the citadel of his soul, when the Divine Spirit enters into it and dwells in it, and strikes at the mechanism of his voice, sounding through it to the clear declaration of that which he prophesieth' (*de Sp. Legg.* ii. 343, quoted in Sanday's *Insp.* p. 74). Again (in the tract *Quis rer. div.* i. 511) Philo explains that 'so long as we are masters of ourselves we are not possessed; but when our own mind ceases to shine, inspiration and madness lay hold on us. For the understanding that dwells in us is ousted on the arrival of the Divine Spirit, but is restored to its own dwelling when that Spirit departs; for it is unlawful that mortal dwell with immortal.' A theory identical with or similar to this of Philo's has been largely held in the Church.

There are also expressions in the NT which seem, at first sight, to countenance such a theory. In Mat 5:18 our Lord is reported as saying: 'Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in nowise pass from the law, till all things be accomplished.' But, as the context shows, that which our Lord intimates in these words is that it was in Himself the Law and the Prophets were to find their fulfilment. Immediately upon giving utterance to this saying He Himself proceeds to repeal commandments of the Law, substituting for them His own better principles, and thus showing that what He had in view was not Scripture as Scripture. Another passage which to the superficial reader might seem to countenance this theory is that in which St. Paul contrasts the wisdom of God with the wisdom of men (1Co 2:1-16). After speaking of the things revealed by the Spirit of God, he says, 'which things we also speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth' (1Co 2:13). But a consideration of the passage makes it apparent that what he means is that he had arrived at the conclusion that his style of address should be in keeping with his subject, and that 'the mystery of God' did not require the garnishing of meretricious ornament or anything which the world might esteem as 'excellency of wisdom,' but such simplicity and directness as the Holy Spirit prompted. He is contrasting two

methods, two styles, the worldly and the spiritual, and he is justifying the style he himself adopted. To conclude from this that St. Paul considered that every word he spoke was dictated by infallible wisdom is quite illegitimate.

This mechanical theory is beset by grave difficulties. (a) Inspiration and dictation are, as has more than once been pointed out, two different, even mutually exclusive, operations. Dictation precludes inspiration, leaving no room for any spiritual influence. Inspiration precludes dictation, making the prompting of words unnecessary by the communication of the right spirit.

(b) It is irreconcilable with the phenomena presented in Scripture. The authors, instead of being passive recipients of information and ideas and feelings, represent themselves as active, deliberating, laborious, intensely interested. The material used by the historical writers has been derived from written sources, or, as in the case of the Third Gospel, from careful critical inquiry at the most reliable witnesses. They do not tell us that their knowledge of events had been supernaturally imparted, but either that they themselves had seen what they relate, or that they had it from trustworthy sources. The Apostles were inspired witnesses of Christ, and proclaimed what they had seen and heard. But if supernatural information was even more trustworthy, why should they have been chosen only from those who had been with our Lord during His ministry? 'If they did not really remember those facts or discourses when they asserted their reality, they are found false witnesses of God. If they were the mere dictation of the Spirit to their minds, St. Peter's declaration which he made to the Jewish Council, "We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard," would have to be corrected into, "We cannot but speak the things which the Spirit has introduced into our minds" ' (Row, *Insp.* p. 154). Similarly, if the intense emotions expressed in the Psalms or in the Epp. of St. Paul are not the outpouring of human sorrow and human experience, they at once become artificial and false. When St. Paul in 2Co 11:17 says, 'That which I speak, I speak not after the Lord, but as in foolishness, in this confidence of boasting,' it is intelligible to say that an inspired man is speaking, it is not intelligible to say that this is God speaking. The mind of God is discernible through the words, but it is not the mind of God we are directly in contact with.

(c) Another class of phenomena presented by Scripture is inconsistent with this theory. For if God be the sole Author, then it is impossible to account for errors in grammar, imperfections of style, discrepancies between one part and another. But such errors, imperfections, and discrepancies exist. The sayings of our Lord are variously reported in the several Gospels. Even in reporting the Lord's Prayer the Evangelists differ. It is impossible to remove from the Book of Acts all disagreement with the Pauline Epistles. And in the disagreement between Peter and Paul at Antioch, we see how possible it was that men equally inspired should hold divergent

and even antagonistic opinions upon matters essential to the well-being of the Church. In the face of these discrepancies, it is impossible to suppose that inspiration carries with it literal accuracy of expression.

(d) The manner in which the NT writers quote the OT books proves that while they believed these books to be authoritative and their writers inspired, they did not consider that their inspiration rendered every word they uttered infallible. Taking 275 quotations from the OT in the NT, it has been found that there are only 53 in which the Hebrew, the LXX Septuagint, and the NT writer agree: while there are 99 passages in which the NT quotation differs both from the Hebrew and from the LXX Septuagint, which also differ from one another, and 76 in which the correct rendering of the LXX Septuagint has been erroneously altered.* [Note: These statistics are taken from D. M'Calman Turpie's OT in the NT, 1868. There are many more quotations than those here given, but these give a fair sample of the whole. A full list of quotations is given in the 2nd vol. of Westcott and Hort's Greek Testament. And Dittmar in his Vetus T. in Novo gives the NT text, the LXX, and the Hebrew.] No doubt when the correct citation of a single word serves the writer's purpose, as in the insistence by St. Paul on the singular instead of the plural (Gal 3:16), there stress is laid upon the very word; but in the face of the general style of quotation above indicated, it is impossible to believe that inspiration was supposed to make each word infallible.

(2) To escape the psychological and other difficulties of a mechanical, verbal inspiration, other theories have been devised. Observing the different values of the various books of Scripture, the Jews themselves supposed that there were *three degrees of inspiration* corresponding to the tripartite division of the OT. Attempts were made by the Rabbis, by the schoolmen, and by some modern writers to differentiate between suggestion, direction, superintendence, and elevation. Thus Bishop Daniel Wilson (*Evidences of Christianity*, i. 506, quoted by Lee) defines as follows: 'By the inspiration of *suggestion* is meant such communication of the Holy Spirit as suggested and dictated minutely every part of the truths delivered. The inspiration of *direction* is meant of such assistance as left the writers to describe the matter revealed in their own way, directing only the mind in the exercise of its powers. The inspiration of *elevation* added a greater strength and vigour to the efforts of the mind than the writers could otherwise have attained. The inspiration of *superintendency* was that watchful care which preserved generally from anything being put down derogatory to the Revelation with which it was connected.' Obviously this theory is very open to criticism. That there are different degrees of inspiration is true, but it is very questionable whether any such classification is complete. In this theory there are hints of truth, but not the whole truth.

(3) The so-called *dynamical theory* brings us somewhat nearer the truth, though it too falls short. This theory is a reaction against the mechanical, and affirms that the human qualities of the writers are not superseded, but are cleansed, strengthened, and employed by the Divine Author. 'The Divine influence acted upon man's faculties in accordance with their natural laws'; classical expression is given to this theory in the words of Augustine (*in Joan.* i. i. 1), 'inspiratus a Deo, sed tamen homo.' The Divine Agent selects suitable media for His communications, and does not try 'to play lyre-music on flutes, and harp-music on trumpets.' The imperfections and weaknesses found in Scripture are human, the truths uttered are Divine. The theory in its most acceptable form, and as held by Erasmus, Grotius, Baxter, Paley, and many modern writers, suggests that the Biblical writers were so inspired as to secure accuracy in all matters of conduct and doctrine, while it declines to pledge itself to their perfect accuracy in non-essentials or subsidiary particulars. Hence it is sometimes called the 'essential' theory.

This theory, while it endeavours to recognize the facts of Scripture and to account for them, yet fails to give us an understanding of inspiration. It does not explain, or even attempt to explain, how writers should be possessed of supernatural knowledge while inditing one sentence, and in the next be dropped to a lower level. It fails to give us the psychology of that state of mind which can infallibly pronounce on matters of doctrine while it is astray on the often simpler facts of history. It makes no attempt to analyze the relation subsisting between the Divine mind and the human which produces such results. Nor does it explain how we are to distinguish essentials from non essentials, or disentangle the one from the other.

(4) Constructively we may make the following affirmations regarding Inspiration, derived from the facts presented in the Bible:

(a) It is the *men*, not directly the writings, that were inspired. 'Men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost' (2Pe 1:21). Inspiration does not mean that one inspired thought is magically communicated to a man in the form in which he is to declare it to his fellows, and in no connexion with the previous contents and normal action of his mind. As he sits down to write, he continues in that state of mind and spirit in which he has been living and to which the Spirit of God has brought him. The book he produces is not the abnormal, exceptional product of a unique condition of mind and spirit, but is the natural and spontaneous outflow from the previous experience and thought of the writer. All his past training and knowledge, all his past strivings to yield himself wholly to the Spirit of Christ, enter into what he now produces.

(b) When we say that a writer of Scripture is Divinely inspired, we mean that *as he writes he is under the influence of the Holy Spirit*. All Christians possess this same

Spirit, and are by Him being led into a full knowledge of the truth that is in Christ, to a full perception of that whole revelation of God which is made in Christ; and when some of their number are *characterized* as inspired, this means that such persons are distinguished above their fellow-Christians by a special readiness and capacity to perceive the meaning of Christ as the revelation of God and to make known what they see.

(c) Inspiration is primarily a *spiritual* gift, and only secondarily a mental one. The Spirit of God may dwell richly in a man and yet not render him infallible even in matters of religion. In 1Th 4:9 St. Paul speaks of his converts as θεοδιδάκτοι, but to one end, and that a spiritual not a mental end. Our Lord (Joh 6:45) applies to all those who come to Him in Spirit the prophetic words, 'They shall be all taught of God,' but no one can suppose that this involves infallible knowledge. It cannot be summarily argued that because God dwells in a man, all that the man speaks partakes of the Divine omniscience. Inspiration operates as any newborn passion, such as maternal love, operates. It does not lift the person out of all limitations, but it seizes upon and uses all the faculties, elevating, refining, and directing to one purpose. It illuminates the mind as enthusiasm does, by stimulating and elevating it; it enriches the memory as love does, by intensifying the interest in a certain object, and by making the mind sensitive to its impressions and retentive of them. It brings light to the understanding and wisdom to the spirit, as purity of intention or a high aim in life does. It brings a man into sympathy with the nature and purposes of God, enables him to see God where others do not see Him, and to interpret His revelations in the same Spirit in which they are given.

Literature.—The history of opinion may partly be traced in Westcott's *Introd. to Study of Gospels*, Appendix on 'Primitive Doctrine of Insp. '; in Hagenbach's *Hist. of Doctrine*; and in Sanday's *Bampton Lectures*. Lutheran teaching is represented and traced in *Hutterus Redivivus*, and Anglican in Fitzjames Stephens' *Defence of the Rev. Rowland Williams* (1862).—From the mass of literature one or two representative books may be named: *The Insp. of Holy Scrip.*, by William Lee, 1854; *The Nature and Extent of Divine Insp.*, by Rev. C. A. Row, M.A., 1864; *Plenary Insp. of Holy Scrip.*, by Gausson; *Insp. and the Bible*, by R. F. Horton; *A Tenable Theory of Insp.*, by Professor Wood; cf. also the present writer's *The Bible: its Origin and Nature*. Schleiermacher's interesting statement of his views occurs in *Der christliche Glaube*, iv. §§ 128-132. Weiss gives an excellent specimen of moderate opinion in *Die Religion d. NT*, p.3 ff.

Marcus Dods.

INSURRECTION (στάσις, Mar 15:7, and Luk 23:19; Luk 23:25 where Authorized Version gives ‘sedition’) is defined by Plato (*Rep.* v. 470 B) thus: ἐπὶ γὰρ τῆ τοῦ οἴκου εἰου ἔχθρα στάσις κέκληται, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆ τῶν ἀλλοτριῶν πόλεμος. Its use in these passages is important as showing that Barabbas was not merely a robber (ληστής, Joh 18:40), but also a leader in one of those fierce fanatical outbursts which were so common in the last years of the Jewish nation, especially from the accession of Herod. Josephus tells of notable leaders such as Ezekias, his son Judas, and his four grandsons, all of whom were put to death (*Ant.* xiv. ix. 2, xvii. x. 5, xviii. i. 1; *BJ* ii. iv. 1, viii. 1, xiii. 5, etc.; cf. Act 5:36 f., Act 21:38). Josephus in his account of the final troubles uses ζηλωτής and ληστής almost as convertible terms. Nothing further is known of this particular στάσις, unless, as Ewald (*Hl* [Note: I History of Israel.] vi. 67 f.) suggests, it may have arisen on account of the aqueduct which Pilate had built with money taken from the Temple treasury (Josephus, *BJ* ii. ix. 4; cf. Luk 13:4). Barabbas may have been moved by patriotic ideas at the first, becoming an outlaw and notorious robber when his rising was suppressed; or he may have used aspirations after freedom merely as a cloak for brigandage (see Westcott, *Some Lessons of the Revised Version of the NT*, p. 74 f.).* [Note: There is no reference to the insurrection in the Sin. Syr. Gospels: see Mrs. Lewis in *Exp. Times*, xii. (1901), pp. 118, 271.] He was ‘lying bound with them that had made insurrection’ (στασιαστῶν, *v.l.* συστασιαστῶν, Mar 15:7), including probably the two robbers who were crucified; for him the third cross may have been intended. Such men had a deep hold on the popular sympathy, which goes to explain the strong demand of the people for the release of their hero, and the interest which the priests showed on behalf of Barabbas, notwithstanding their pretence to holiness. But the hollowness of their newfound zeal for Caesar was thereby exposed, seeing that Barabbas was admittedly guilty of the crime which they alleged against Jesus. See, further, Barabbas.

Literature.—Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 576 ff.; Trench, *Studies in the Gospels* (No. 15).

W. H. Dundas.

Intercession

INTERCESSION (the act of one who goes between) is generally taken to mean that part of prayer in which we approach God on behalf of others. The corresponding word

in NT, ἐντετυξίς, which occurs only at 1Ti 2:1; 1Ti 4:5, does not necessarily mean what we now understand by intercession, but rather, as its connexion with ἐντυγχάνω implies, drawing close to God in free and familiar prayer (see Trench, *Syn.* p. 190, where, however, it is added, ‘In justice to our translators it must be observed that intercession had not in their time that limited meaning of prayer for others which we now ascribe to it’).

Intercession has always been regarded as a characteristic duty and privilege of believers in Christ. There is no fact or aspect of prayer more distinctive of the Christian religion than this, in which the Christian heart, rising above all consideration of self, expands with a Christ-like benevolent desire for the welfare of every living soul, and prays for all mankind. Accordingly, we find that from the beginning intercession has been looked upon as a specific and characteristic part of the vocation of the Christian Church as a whole as well as of its individual members. The practice was enjoined by Christ, He Himself setting the example to His disciples. As prayer, in the general sense of the word, is essential to the Christian life, so intercessory prayer has always been looked upon as an essential part of Christian prayer.

Christ, when on earth, prayed for His followers, and still continues to plead for them beyond the veil, though in thinking of this aspect of His intercession it is a mistake to confine it merely to prayer. This has been admirably and convincingly pointed out by Milligan in *The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord* (pp. 149-153), and though this aspect of Christ’s intercession belongs to a subsequent heading (§ 2 below), yet, because the intercession of Christians must always be based upon the Lord’s intercession, it may be premised here that in the intercessions we offer to God the idea is wider than mere petition on behalf of others. ‘Intercession and giving of thanks’ are to be made for all men (1Ti 2:1). It is a commonplace that prayer is more than mere petition; and so even in prayer on behalf of others mere asking of benefits for them cannot be the whole of prayer. Intercession, then, would appear to embrace thanksgiving for benefits bestowed on others as well as imploring favours for them. Further, intercession also seems to imply that in praying for others, if we pray sincerely, we place ourselves with our means and our energies at God’s disposal for His purposes of grace towards those for whom we pray. Intercession thus leads up to and necessitates self-dedication. In proceeding now to examine our Lord’s teaching, we note:

1. The duty of intercession.—The duty of intercession is explicitly and frequently taught by Christ in the Gospels. It has often been remarked about His teaching as to prayer that He seldom, if ever, gives a direct command to His followers to pray, but, taking it for granted that they do pray and do not need to be told to pray, He simply gives them directions how to pray, and shows them what are the essential elements,

characteristics, and conditions of prayer (cf. e.g. [Mat 6:5](#); [Mat 6:9](#), [Mar 11:24-25](#), [Luk 18:1](#)).

It hardly needs to be remarked that the Christian religion, being a social religion, implies that prayer on behalf of others is an essential and distinguishing element in its devotions. It would have been surprising if Christ had not taught the duty of intercession. This, of course, must not be taken as meaning that He taught it for the first time. Under the OT dispensation God's people were admitted to the privilege of intercession, and their prayers for others were availing. In particular, 'the prophets were intercessors in virtue of their calling. The ground of this was twofold. The prophet was an acceptable person; but, further, he had the Spirit, and the possession of it enabled him not only to interpret the mind of God to man, but also the mind of man to God' (Bernard in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, vol. iv. p. 40^b). But in the Gospels we might have expected to find, as we do find, that the duty and privilege of intercession is advanced and developed. In Christ's teaching, intercession takes a wider range and a higher view than under the OT dispensation, for no section of mankind is excluded from the scope of His redemption. Jewish prayers, even of intercession, had been offered to 'the Lord God of Israel' or 'the God of our Fathers,' but in our Lord's pattern prayer, as well as throughout His teaching, every human being is invited to call upon God as his Father, and in so doing to regard all mankind as his brethren. 'When His disciples ask to be taught to pray, He gives them a prayer very unlike what John would have given, for it contains not a word of that petition for blessing upon Israel which, in any prayer that an Israelite offered, contained, to his mind, the gist of the whole' (Latham, *Pastor Pastorum*, p. 416).

The Incarnation has furnished a new motive and a new power for intercession. The man who is in Christ is no longer an isolated unit: he is a member of the Body of Christ, and therefore prays for all mankind as Christ did; for, knowing that God has loved him in Christ, he loves others for whom as for himself Christ came, and in the power of that love he prays for all men living.

When we come to our Lord's express teaching as to intercession, we are at once arrested by the fact that in the Lord's Prayer—given to the disciples in response to their request to be taught how to pray—intercession not only holds the first place, but the spirit of intercession pervades it all. This prayer, which is the peculiar prayer of the Christian believer, the use of which marks him out from all others (witness the fact that in the early Church it was not taught to the catechumens till they were *competentes* and on the eve of their baptism), is a prayer of intercession. 'Our Father, which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.' Here the disciples are taught to pray that all mankind may be brought into the Kingdom of God, that they may reverence His name, that they may learn to do His will and submit themselves to His rule. Here all limits of

space and time are transcended, and he who prays the Lord's Prayer prays for all mankind, even for the generations yet unborn. It would hardly, therefore, be an exaggeration to say that in Christ's teaching upon prayer, intercession holds the first place. This is in keeping with the whole tenor of His teaching and with the genius of His religion, who all His life took thought for others, and whose first utterance on the cross was a prayer for His murderers (Luk 23:34). Following upon this, it is noteworthy that, according to Luk 11:5-13, it was in direct sequence to and by way of commentary upon the Lord's Prayer that Christ spoke the parable of the Friend at Midnight, in which He teaches the necessity of importunate prayer, the importunity inculcated being the importunity of one for his friend. Intercession, therefore, according to Christ's teaching, is not only to be offered, but it is to be offered with importunity.

2. Christ's personal example.—Besides His great prayer of intercession recorded in John 17, the Gospels afford several instances of our Lord's personal example in intercession. His prayer on the eve of the ordination of the Twelve, when He continued all night in prayer (Luk 16:12 f.), was, it is highly probable, largely occupied with intercession for them. He prayed for St. Peter (Luk 22:32). His first word from the cross was a prayer for His enemies. There is also the prayer recorded in Mat 11:25-27, and His prayer at the grave of Lazarus (Joh 11:41 f.), both of which are intercessory.

Christ teaches that, as He is the Mediator between God and man, intercession must be offered through Him. He is the Intercessor, and our intercessions can avail only because He intercedes, presenting our prayers to the Father. He prayed for His disciples and for all who through their word might believe, and now He prays within the veil, carrying forward the intercession begun on earth. This comes out clearly in His 'Intercessory Prayer' (John 17), or, as it has perhaps been more fittingly designated, His 'High Priestly Prayer.' Reading it in the light of the happily correct rendering of Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, we see that He is speaking as if He had already entered into the glory, and were looking back upon His earthly course. In the joy of His anticipated triumph He presents Himself before the Father and pleads for the fulfilment of the Father's will. Christ's intercession for mankind which was begun on earth is continued in heaven, and our prayers for others are presented by Him in virtue of His mediation. At the same time, this prayer affords an unfailing guide to our prayers of intercession, teaching us that prayer is to be offered for the ingathering of men into the Kingdom, for the unity of the Church of God, for the perseverance of believers, and for the sanctification, for all these ends, of those who are engaged in the Church's work.

3. The scope of intercession.—Our Lord is careful to tell His disciples to pray for their enemies (Mat 5:44), and in so doing He bids them remember in prayer those whom

they might not have thought of including, assuming that they would, without being specially directed, pray for all others. He thus teaches both by direct precept and by implication that intercession is to be full and universal. The only other special direction He gives in this connexion is that they are to pray for labourers to be sent into the Lord's harvest (Mat_9:38, Luk_10:2). Christ gives these few general directions as to the scope of intercession, leaving it to time and growing experience to suggest their amplification. The scope of Christian intercession must always be widening.

'It grows with the growth of the Church and her needs; it grows with the growing complexity of human society as new classes and new objects rise up to claim its help.... Intercession is also an ever widening element in each individual life; as a man's interest and experiences widen, so must his prayers' (Frere, *Sursum Corda*, p. 1).

4. *The conditions of intercession.*—Two distinct, though sometimes confused, conditions of acceptable intercession are laid down by Christ. (1) In Mar_11:25 He shows that effectual intercession presupposes a forgiving spirit. Those who pray for others through Christ must have the spirit of Christ. (2) In Mat_5:23-24 the disciples are taught that a condition of acceptable prayer is that they must seek reconciliation with any one who regards them (rightly or wrongly) as having done him a wrong (see Zahn, *ad loc.*). There must be a removal of the sense of injury from his mind as well as forgiveness to those who have wronged themselves. He who prays for others must be in peace and charity with all men.

Literature.—Most of the modern popular books on Prayer are astonishingly silent as to Intercession. In many of the so-called 'divisions of prayer' Intercession does not even find a place. But in Matthew Henry's *Method of Prayer*, a book little used now, Intercession is prominent. Of the few modern books in which the subject is dealt with, mention may be made of Worlledge on 'Prayer' in the *Oxford Library of Practical Theology*; Frere and Illingworth's *Sursum Corda*; Reid's *Christian Prayer*; Rendel Harris' *Union with God*, pp. 41-64.

J. Cromarty Smith.

☞ Interest

INTEREST.—'Interest,' found twice in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 of the Gospels (Mat_25:27, Luk_19:23) instead of 'usury' of Authorized Version, represents the Greek τόκος which in the LXX Septuagint is the equivalent of the Heb. *neshekh* in the whole of the eleven passages in which the latter occurs (Exo_22:25, Lev_25:36

etc.). Now *neshekh* is rightly rendered 'usury,' the reference being to the interest, often exorbitant, charged by money-lenders in the ancient East. In the NT τὸκος, though often used in contemporary Greek in the sense just defined, clearly signifies 'interest on deposit paid by a banker.' There were many banks in the Roman period scattered over the Graeco-Roman world, some called 'public banks' and others private firms (e.g. 'Theon & Co.,' 'Herodes & Co.,' at Oxyrhynchus). These, however, seem, from a lately discovered text, to have farmed from the government, in Egypt at any rate, the right of administering business; the Roman authorities, it would appear, following in some degree Ptolemaic precedent (*Papyri of Oxyrhynchus*, No. 513, vol. iii.: cf. the note on p. 248 f.). Not much seems to be known about the deposit department of ancient banking. The technical term for a deposit on which interest was paid was *creditum*. The amounts lodged in Roman banks towards the end of the Republic and under the Empire must have been, in some instances, very large. About the rate of interest paid to depositors there seems to be little or no information. The statement of Suetonius, that Augustus branded some people with infamy (*notavit*) because they borrowed at low interest and invested at high (*Octavius*, 39), may hint how the bankers made money out of the funds entrusted to their care. The usual rate of interest on loans under the Empire seems to have been one per cent, per month, or twelve per cent. per annum. This rate is repeatedly mentioned in the *Papyri of Oxyrhynchus* (No. 243 of a.d. 79, and No. 270 of a.d. 94, etc.). The rate paid to depositors will have been much lower. A considerable banking business was also done in ancient temples. So in ancient Babylonia (Johns, *Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, Contracts, and Letters*, 211), and in the Greek world, at the temple of the Ephesian Artemis, for instance (*Anabasis*, v. iii. 6 f.). That the temple of Jerusalem was used in this way is expressly stated by Josephus (*BJ* vi. v. 2), and in the legend about Heliodorus ([2Ma_3:10-12](#); [2Ma_3:15](#)). About the management of this temple bank nothing seems to be known. Our Lord's references are probably to local τραπεζίται, the Eastern representatives of the Roman *argentarii*. See also Bank.

Literature.—Besides the authorities mentioned above, see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Usury'; *Encyc. Bibl.*, art. 'Trade and Commerce,' § 78; Smith, *Dict. of Ant.*, artt. 'Fenus' and 'Argentarii; Winer, *RWB* [Note: WB Realwörterbuch.] , art. 'Hinterlage'; Schurer, *GJV* [Note: JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ii. 268.

W. Taylor Smith.

INTERMEDIATE STATE.—See Dead, p. 426^a.

☩ Invitation

INVITATION.—The method of public teaching adopted by our Lord being exclusively oral, it was necessary that two features difficult to combine should be prominent in the form of His instruction,—an immediate impression, and a firm grip on the memory. This He secured by mingling freely in the social life of the time, and by an abundant use of similes and illustrations drawn from facts in the daily life and social customs of the people whom He addressed. This is one of the reasons why He clothed so many of His doctrines in parables and figures centred in the idea of hospitality.

The Hebrews were an eminently sociable people. In the earliest times, the laws of hospitality were specially sacred; strangers were made heartily welcome at the door of the patriarch's tent (Gen 18:3, cf. Heb 13:2); and in later times a surly attitude towards travellers needing refreshment was considered a serious offence against good manners (1Sa 25:4-10). Many strict injunctions were laid down in the Mosaic Law (Lev 19:33-34, Deu 14:29 etc.) as to the duty of kindness to strangers. At a still later period, when the community was settled in towns and cities, an elaborate code of manners grew up, both as to giving and receiving hospitality. There was much entertainment of friends, relations, and strangers among the Jews in the time of our Lord; social meetings were frequent, and religious gatherings frequently took on a festive character.

Jesus freely accepted such opportunities of social intercourse as were offered to Him; He was fond of being entertained by His friends (Luk 10:38 etc.), and distinguished Himself from the outset of His public career as an eminently sociable man (Mat 9:10), often accepting invitations from quarters that gave offence to those who considered themselves leaders of society (Mat 9:11, cf. Luk 19:7). This, however, He did, not merely because He delighted in the fellowship of men and women, but mainly because of the unexampled opportunity it afforded Him of spiritual instruction (Mat 9:12-13, Luk 7:41-50), and of bringing His influence to bear on those around Him, whether they were His personal friends (Luk 10:41-42), or secret enemies (Luk 7:36), or the general public (Joh 12:9), or individuals who were denied entrance into recognized society (Luk 18:10). It was a sign of His insight and wisdom as well as of His broad sympathies, that in a community so eminently sociable as that in which He moved, He should make such free use of the machinery of hospitality for His Messianic purpose, and devise many parables and illustrations drawn from the customs of the day, and from the etiquette that ruled the relations of hosts and guests, from the highest circles of life to the lowest.

It is partly from this point of view that we are to understand His frequent habit of representing the gospel of grace as God's invitation to the soul to partake of the blessings of salvation. It made an instant appeal to the sympathies of His audience; it brought spiritual realities within reach of the intelligence of the humblest and most ordinary people, and it predisposed them to receive His message willingly; and, as the similes and illustrations in which He clothed His teaching represented recurrent facts and exigencies in their lives, it helped to drive home deep into their memory the lessons which He taught, and to bring them back frequently to their recollection. In this way the method of His teaching helped to perpetuate its substance till the time when it took a written form. But the parables of invitation have a wider appeal, for the relationships from which they were drawn are universal, and belong to all nations and communities where the customs of social life are honoured. These customs vary in detail in different ages and lands, but the root-relations of hosts and guests are permanent. These parables are a kind of *Esperanto* of the spiritual life, and appeal to the universal intelligence and sympathies of mankind. Thus the human side of Christ's teaching forms an ideal channel for its Divine contents.

When we pass from the form to the substance of the teaching, which represents the gospel as an invitation, the simile is further justified by its appropriateness and its beauty.

1. It emphasizes the bright and genial aspects of religion, which shine with so clear a lustre in the teaching of Jesus. It has been a recurrent and baneful feature of theological learning that it has tended to envelop religion in an atmosphere of gloom, by making so much of the horror and mischief of sin, and dwelling so exclusively on the need of repentance, atonement, and justification. Religious ritual introduced another baneful element into the spiritual life by representing its duties too much as a series of sacerdotal observances, which by frequent recurrence became mechanical and wearisome. Ethical writers have likewise been prone to dwell exclusively on the responsibilities of religion, to the obscuration of its privileges. In the teaching of Jesus there is nothing of this mischievous tendency. His parables are full of the sound of wedding-bells, of the voice of laughter, of the joy of a great deliverance, of the discovery of a precious and unsuspected happiness. There are clouds on the horizon, and the echo of distant thunders; but the foreground is full of happy figures intent on celebrating the marriage of the soul to its Divine Lover and Friend, and on enjoying the new-found fellowship of God as the Giver of life and salvation. Without in any way obscuring the evils from which the soul is delivered by the gracious ministries of the gospel, preachers should follow their great Model in placing greater emphasis on the sunny joys and holy privileges brought within our reach in Jesus Christ. One reason why the common people heard Him so gladly was, that He took them away from the word-splitting and elaborate discussions of the Rabbis, and transported them into that

circle of happy human relationships from which He mainly drew His illustrations. What was true then is just as true to-day.

2. The presentation of the gospel as a Divine invitation throws emphasis on another of its essential features,—that it embodies a free gift of grace from God to man. The central idea of hospitality is that one gives freely what the many receive and enjoy ‘without money and without price.’ Jesus in the ‘parables of grace’ teaches us that the gospel contains something infinitely precious which is given to us, but which we could never deserve or buy. Religion is not a bargain between man and God; it is a boon, a largess bestowed by God on man. It is not commerce, it is reconciliation and friendship. It is thus represented not as an exchange of commodities in a market-place, but as a feast where the one side gives all and receives nothing back, save in realizing the happiness and loyal gratitude of the invited guests. Jesus justifies this idea of a one-sided benefit by nearly always making use of a simile of feasting in which a superior invites his inferior to a banquet. It is a king inviting his subjects to the wedding-feast of his son (Mat 22:2-14); it is a great man entertaining a miscellaneous assemblage of guests from all quarters (Luk 14:15-24); it is a father welcoming home a renegade son with the best of the flock. In all these cases there could be no question of a return in kind. The conditions were satisfied by the coming of the guests, and their happy enjoyment of the good things provided. ‘The gospel is ever a gospel of grace.

3. A third significant aspect suggested by the simile of an invitation is its voluntariness on both sides. There can be no compulsion in the invitation to a feast of rejoicing. Unwilling guests have no place at a banquet. Religion has no room for the idea of spiritual compulsion. The invitation is free to all: acceptance must be as free. Thus is the sacred function of spiritual liberty, of the freedom of the will, safeguarded by the gospel. Those who refuse or neglect a social invitation may be incurring a grave responsibility; but they can do so if they choose. The spiritual appeal of religion may also be refused; it lies with the soul whether it will respond to the call of God or reject it.

The word translated ‘compel’ in Luk 14:23 (*ἀνάγκασον*) must be read in its secondary meaning of ‘constrain by persuasion.’ It ‘reflects in the first place the urgent desire of the master to have an absolutely full house, in the second the feeling that, pressure will be needed to overcome the incredulity of country people as to such an invitation to them being meant seriously. They would be apt to laugh in the servant’s face’ (Bruce in *Expositor’s Gr. Test., in loco*).

4. The idea of an invitation thus merges into that of response; and it is important to notice that great stress is laid on this side of the question in the parables. In not a

few it is clearly the pivot on which the teaching turns. There is one way in which an invitation may be worthily accepted; there are several in which it may be rejected: e.g. it may be (1) openly scorned, (2) accepted and then rejected or ignored, (3) accepted in a wrong spirit, or with an imperfect realization of its privileges and value. Each of these situations is dealt with by Christ to typify the attitude of men to His gospel. In the parable of the Marriage of the King's Son, the first guests invited treat the offer with scorn (Mat_22:3), and 'make light' of it, preferring to find their satisfaction in their own way, and even maltreating the king's messengers. By this Jesus exposed the attitude of the Pharisees and scribes towards His gospel, and in a wider sense that of all those who in a thoroughly worldly spirit have since treated His offer of salvation with derision or disrespect. In the parable of the Great Supper, the guests first accepted the invitation, and then, finding other more absorbing interests, sent various excuses for not attending. These represent the fickle multitude, who at first thronged to hear the 'gracious words that proceeded out of his mouth,' and afterwards left Him, having exhausted the sensational aspect of His ministry and wonderful works, and having no love for His higher message. Returning to the parable of the Marriage, we find a final episode in which the man without a 'wedding-garment' is dealt with. Clearly he stands for those who, having heard and accepted the invitation of the gospel, show that they have failed to realize the lofty and decorous spirit in which the soul should respond to it, and who treat it as a common thing, with no sense of its high privilege. The care with which Jesus developed these situations in His parables, and proclaimed the doom that followed, shows how deeply He felt the importance of a right attitude towards spiritual realities. It is as though He were repeating in many tones and accents the fact that God offers man His best in the invitations of the gospel, and expects man to be at his best in responding to them, otherwise he perils his soul (cf. Mat_22:7, Mat_22:13, Luk_14:24).

When we turn from the teaching to the practice of Christ, the same attitude of appeal and invitation is manifested, and the same spirit of loyal and worthy acceptance is expected in turn. Everywhere in His dealings with men we find Him acting as God's messenger of goodwill, and urging them to respond to heavenly grace with grateful hearts and willing service. Where men do so He promises them a great reward (Mat_19:27-30); where they fail to do so He shows a Divine and touching sorrow (Mat_23:37-38); and though He is clear in revealing His own disappointment at such a result, He lays the chief stress on the loss and misery which rejection must bring on those who are guilty of spurning or ignoring His ever-renewed appeal.

The heart of the gospel is found in the central invitation given by Christ to all men in the words, 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest' (Mat_11:28).

Literature.—Wendt, *Teach. of Jesus*, i. 148 ff.; Stalker, *Imago Christi*, ch. vii.; Bruce, *Galilean Gospel*, ch. xii.; *Expositor*, i. xi. [1880] 101 ff. See, further, art. Coming to Christ.

E. Griffith-Jones.

☩ Irony

IRONY.—See Humour, and Laughter.

☩ Isaac

ISAAC.—Named (1) in our Lord's genealogy, Mat 1:2, Luk 3:34; (2) in such collocations as 'sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob' (Mat 8:11), 'see Abraham and Isaac and Jacob' (Luk 13:28), 'the God of Abraham and of Isaac and of Jacob' (Mat 22:32, Mar 12:26, Luk 20:37). See Abraham, and Fathers. The sacrifice of Isaac came at an early date to be used by Christian writers as a type of the sacrifice on the cross (cf. e.g. Ep. of Barn. ch. 7). It is just possible that some such thought underlies Rom 8:32 'He that spared not his own Son.'

☩ Isaiah

ISAIAH.—There are seven instances recorded in the Gospels in which Jesus quotes from the prophecies of Isaiah, besides numerous other cases in which His language is more or less manifestly reminiscent of expressions in the book. The most notable passages are two in which our Lord applies to Himself the terms used by the prophet of the Exile with regard to the Servant of Jehovah, viz. Luk 4:16-22, where Jesus reads and expounds the words of Isa 61:1-2; and Luk 22:37, where He adopts as a prediction of His own experience a clause of Isa 53:12. Our Lord thus plainly taught that, alike in the mission and in the vicarious suffering of the ideal Servant of Deutero-Isaiah, His own person and work were typified and foreshadowed. More general is the application of Isa 6:9-10 to the people of His own time (Mat 13:14-15, Mar 4:12, Luk 8:10); and also His use of Isa 29:13 of the Pharisees and scribes (Mat 15:7-9, Mar 7:6-7). All three Synoptists record the quotation from Isa 56:7 with which He rebuked the temple-traders (Mat 21:13 ||). St. John alone gives the quotation of a general character from Isa 54:13 (Joh 6:45), while St. Mark records an expression which manifestly comes from Isa 66:24 (Mar 9:48). In only three of the

above seven cases is Isaiah mentioned by name, and in no case is there any indication that bears in the slightest degree upon the question as to the authorship of the various parts of the book.

In addition to these more direct references, there are many expressions in the discourses of Jesus in which we have echoes of Isaiah's language. Our Lord's mind was filled with the OT, and it was to be expected that His utterances should be cast in the mould, and often expressed in the very words, of psalm and prophecy. In Mat 5:34-35 we perceive a reminiscence of Isa 66:1; Mat 21:33 ff., || at once suggests Isa 5:1-2. Other less obvious instances are probably to be found in Mat 11:23 (cf. Isa 14:13; Isa 14:15) Mat 16:19 (Isa 22:22) Mat 6:6 (Isa 26:20); and various expressions in the eschatological discourses of Matthew 24 and Luke 21. To these others might possibly be added; but it is not warrantable to find in every case of verbal similarity a reference to, or even a reminiscence of, the words of the OT. But apart from doubtful cases, it will be seen that the Book of Isaiah, both in its earlier and in its later portions, is fully acknowledged and used in the teaching of Jesus.

It is not less so with the Evangelists themselves. All four quote Isa 40:3 with regard to the mission of John the Baptist (Mat 3:3 and ||); while Mt., who uses the OT so largely in connexion with the ministry of Jesus, applies to His coming and mission the passages Isa 7:14 (Mat 1:23) Isa 9:1-2 (Mat 4:14-16) Isa 53:4 (Mat 8:17) Isa 42:1-4 (Mat 12:18-21). St. John (Joh 12:38-41) quotes Isa 53:1; Isa 6:10 in reference to the rejection of Christ by the people; and the Synoptists all record the voice heard at the Baptism and the Transfiguration as using the language of Isa 42:1.

As with the words of Jesus Himself, so, in the case of the Evangelists, no theory with regard to the actual authorship of any part of the book can claim to be supported by the manner of the references. 'Isaiah,' even when named, stands manifestly for the reputed author, and (as in Joh 12:38) the mode of expression is naturally and rightly that popularly used and understood. No critical conclusions can be drawn from any of the references.

With regard to the original Messianic import of the passages applied in the Gospels to Jesus Christ and His work, there is no difficulty in those cases where the 'Servant of Jehovah' is identified with the Messiah. And even in such passages as Isa 7:14; Isa 9:1-2 quoted by Mt., we must recognize, beneath and beyond the immediate prophetic reference, an *ideal* element which permitted and justified the specific application by the Evangelist. Especially is this so with the prophetic conception of 'Immanuel,' an ideal figure in whom we find the earliest portraiture of the Messianic King (Isa 7:14; Isa 8:8; Isa 8:10; Isa 9:6-7). Though it might in some cases be without historical or critical exactitude (as in Mat 4:15-16 from Isa 9:1-2), it was quite legitimate to find unexpected correspondences between the earlier and the later

stages of Providence and Revelation, based on the deep underlying unity and consistency of the Divine purpose and methods.

J. E. M'Ouat.

✠ Iscariot

ISCARIOT.—See Judas Iscariot.

✠ Israel, Israelite

ISRAEL, ISRAELITE.—1. The former name occurs 30 times in the Gospels, and the latter once (Joh 1:47). The following expressions are found: 'Israel,' with or without the article (Mat 8:10; Mat 9:33, Luk 1:54; Luk 1:80; Luk 2:25; Luk 2:34; Luk 4:25; Luk 4:27; Luk 7:9; Luk 24:21, Joh 1:31; Joh 3:10; also Mar 12:29 vocative); 'people (λαός) Israel' (Mat 2:6, Luk 2:32); 'house of Israel' (Mat 10:6; Mat 15:24); 'sons of Israel' (Mat 27:9, Luk 1:16); 'tribes of Israel' (Mat 19:28, Luk 22:30); 'land of Israel' (Mat 2:20 f.); 'God of Israel' (Mat 15:31, Luk 1:68); 'King of Israel' (Mat 27:42, Mar 15:32, Joh 1:49; Joh 12:13). The force of the name is best understood by comparing it with two others used in the NT. 'Hebrew' (Ἑβραῖος) is one who speaks the Hebrew language—*i.e.* the vernacular Aramaic dialect (Act 6:1; cf. Luk 23:38, Joh 19:13; Joh 19:17; Joh 19:20). 'Jew' (Ἰουδαῖος) implies national descent; originally used for those who were members of the tribe of Judah, and lived in the country of Judah, it became a wider term, after the return from Babylon, for all who were members of the Hebrew race. 'Israel' differed from both of these as being the name of privilege given by God to Jacob, the ancestor of the race (Gen 32:28; Gen 35:10), and the thought of the theocratic privileges of the chosen people and of God's covenant with them always underlies the term. See esp. Mat 2:6, Luk 1:54; Luk 1:68; Luk 2:25; Luk 2:32; Luk 24:21, Act 1:6, all of which reveal the national conviction that the Messiah would come for the benefit of Israel, and that to Israel were God's attention and love especially given. But in marked contrast to such passages are those which imply that the theocratic nation has failed to fulfil the Divine purposes for it:—a Roman centurion exhibits greater faith than was to be found in the holy nation (Mat 8:10 || Luk 7:9); the house of Israel are as a whole 'lost sheep' (Mat 10:6; Mat 15:24); they need someone to turn them to the Lord their God (Luk 1:16); an honoured and official teacher of Israel is shown to be ignorant of the fundamental principles of the spiritual life (Joh 3:10); incidents in the OT prove that

some Gentiles received God's care and blessing, and were preferred to Israelites (Luk 4:25-27); and a mysterious intimation is given of the supremacy of the Church of Christ hereafter (Mat 19:28 || Luk 22:30); it is character, and not theocratic privileges, that makes a man 'truly an Israelite' (Joh 1:47). See Nathanael. Thus the Gospels teach incidentally what St. Paul lays down categorically: (a) that Israel does not comprise all who are of Israel (Rom 9:6); (b) that the privileged position of Israel is to be taken by Christians, for the latter are 'the Israel of God' (Gal 6:16, cf. Eph 2:11-19); (c) that this is for the purpose of ultimately restoring Israel to spiritual communion and salvation (Romans 9-11).

2. The status of the chosen people before God is to be taken by Christians. But that does not mean that Christianity is merely to be substituted for Judaism. Christianity is not a completely new creation fallen from heaven, but rather a growth from the religion of Israel—a growth far surpassing the germ from which it sprang, as an oak surpasses an acorn, but yet composed of elements which are discernible in the earlier dispensation in a rudimentary form. In order, therefore, to estimate the relation in which the Gospels, and particularly our Lord's teaching, stood towards Israel, it is necessary to estimate broadly how much the New was indebted to the Old, and how much it discarded in rising out of it with its Divine and potent growth.

(a) *Monotheism* was the chiefest glory of Judaism. Part of the inspiration of the people of Israel is seen in its 'genius for religion,' the capacity for realizing the supreme and only existence of God. A step towards this had been monolatry, the national adhesion to one Deity only, which was compatible with the recognition that other nations and lands were under the protection of other deities (Jdg 11:24, 1Sa 26:19). But it was not long before the Hebrew prophets taught that Jehovah was the God of all the nations of the earth, a spiritual Being whose service was incumbent upon all mankind, that service consisting not primarily in ritual but in morality. And this truth is the very fibre of Christianity; a Christian is in the truest sense a Unitarian. 'Jesus answered, "The chief [commandment] is—Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God" ' (Mar 12:29). But even in the OT there are not wanting intimations that the God-head is not a 'monotonous unity,' but that there are distinctions within It; e.g. 'the Angel of Jahweh or of God,' *i.e.* His presence manifesting itself in outward act (Exo 3:2; Exo 14:19; Exo 22:23); 'the Captain of Jahweh's host,' who is also called Jahweh (Jos 5:14 f., Jos 6:2); 'His Holy Spirit' (Isa 63:10 f.); see also the thrice repeated name (Num 6:24-26), and the *Tersanctus* (Isa 6:3).* [Note: On the use of the indefinite plural 'they', see Taylor on Pirke Aboth, ii. 2.] According to the reports of His teaching as contained in the Gospel records, our Lord expressly formulated the truth of the unity of God, but never that of the Holy Trinity; and yet the latter pervades the whole record. 'In the gradual process of intercourse with Him, His disciples came to recognize Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as included in their deepening and enlarging thought of God.' But the truth is

definitely implied in the discourses in the Upper Room (John 14-17), and in the baptismal formula (Mat 28:19). See Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 134 ff.; Illingworth's *do.* pp. 67 ff.; Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, vol. i. pp. 93-101.

(b) *Covenant*.—The idolatry which preceded monotheism was calculated to give birth to the idea that between Jahweh and His people there was a close and mutual agreement. If He was exclusively their God and Protector, they were bound to do Him service. It is not easy to say at what period the conception arose. But the earlier prophets, though they do not expressly mention a covenant—except Hosea (Hos 6:7 doubtful, Hos 8:1)—all teach the truth that Jahweh requires moral, ethical service from His people. And in the JE compilations of the national traditions the covenant relationship with God is firmly established in the religious thought of Israel. The covenant with Abraham (Genesis 15) is the starting-point. The covenant at Sinai (Exo 24:1-11; Exo 34:10-28) opens the second stage of the history. D [Note: Deuteronomist.] has yet another covenant, based on the contents of the Deut. law, and made on the borders of Moab (Deu 29:1; Deu 29:9; Deu 29:12; Deu 29:14; Deu 29:21; cf. Deu 26:16-19, 2Ki 23:2; 2Ki 23:21). But when Israel was carried into Babylon, the Old Covenant was in reality at an end; they had broken it by their sins. Jeremiah, therefore, speaks of a New Covenant (Jer 31:31 ff.), forgiveness of sins, righteousness, peace and joy. It had been foreshadowed in the life story of Hosea, and was to be the fulfilment of the dreams and longings of all the prophets. 'In the visions of the new covenant the OT becomes Christian.' And the thought is the inspiration of Ezekiel and of Deutero-Isaiah. But there were two other crises in Israel's history where the idea of a covenant is prominent. God gave a covenant, *i.e.* a promise, to Levi of a perpetual priesthood in the tribe (Deu 33:8, Jer 33:18; Jer 33:21 f., Mal 2:4-8), and to David of a perpetual lineage on the throne (2 Samuel 7; 2Sa 23:5, Psa 89:3; Psa 89:34 f., Jer 33:17; Jer 33:21 f.). Thus there were several factors which went to make up the fulness of the Christian covenant. In the Gospels, with the exception of Luk 1:72, where the Abrahamic covenant is referred to, the only occurrence of the word is at the Last Supper (Mat 26:28 || Mar 14:24, Luk 22:20); our Lord uses Jeremiah's term, 'the new covenant,' but at the same time the words 'This is my blood' refer to the covenant at Sinai (Exo 24:4-8). This application of the word to the results of His own Person and work served as a starting-point for the fuller working out of the thought by the Apostolic writers. The analogy of the Abrahamic covenant is drawn out chiefly by St. Paul (Romans 4, Galatians 3), while the Ep. to the Hebrews deals with the kingship (ch. 1; cf. Mat 22:44), the priesthood (7-10), and, closely connected with the latter, the spiritual covenant of the forgiveness of sins (Heb 10:15-18).

(c) *Law*.—A study of the passages in the Gospels which speak of the Mosaic Law shows in a striking manner the relation of Christ's teaching to the religion of Israel. On the one hand, He recognized the Divine authority of the Law, *in its true meaning and*

spirit, and not as interpreted and embodied in the ‘deformed righteousness’ of the scribes and Pharisees (Mat 5:17-20; Mat 12:5; Mat 19:17; Mat 23:3, Luk 16:17). But, on the other hand, in order to ‘fulfil’ (πληρῶσαι) the Law He was obliged to take a negative or critical attitude. ‘The Law and the Prophets,’ as a dispensation, have had their day, and have given place to ‘the kingdom of heaven’ (Mat 11:12 f., || Luk 16:16), and to ‘grace and truth’ (Joh 1:17; and see Mat 9:17 || Mar 2:21 f., Luk 5:37). Even the Law and the Prophets meant something deeper than they had hitherto been understood to mean (Mat 7:12; Mat 22:34-40); and this deeper meaning is contained in a ‘new commandment’ which Jesus gives to the disciples (Joh 13:34). The Law had generally been considered as a compendium of positive commands bearing on the details of life; but the only parts of it that mattered were ‘the weightier things,’ judgment, mercy and faith (Mat 23:23 || Luk 11:42). Other criticisms of the Law are found in Mat 5:21-48; Mat 19:8 (divorce) Mat 12:1-12, Luk 13:10-17; Luk 14:1-6, Joh 5:9-17; Joh 5:9 (Sabbath). Our Lord took care to avoid causing offence (Mat 18:6 f.), though showing at the same time that He was raised above bondage to purely ritual and non-ethical enactments: e.g. in the payment of the Temple tax (Mat 17:24-27); in *touching* the leper, but at the same time telling him to offer the requisite sacrifices (Mat 8:1-4). The one decisive breach that He made with Jewish legalism was in dealing with the distinction between clean and unclean foods, and with ceremonial washings (Mat 15:1-20, Mar 7:1-23 [note Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 of Mar 7:19], Luk 10:7; Luk 11:38-41).

(d) *Sacrifice*.—The Jewish ordinances of sacrifice formed part of the ‘Law,’ and were also in intimate connexion with the covenant idea; this section, therefore, must to some extent overlap the two preceding. Our Lord accorded to sacrifices the same recognition that He accorded to the Law as a whole; He accepted them as of Divine authority, and binding upon the Jews. He told the recovered leper to offer the prescribed gift (Mat 8:4); He assumed that His hearers offered them as an ordinary practice (Mat 5:23 f.). But the latter passage also shows that He relegated them to a subordinate place as compared with the higher moral duties. He twice quoted the saying of Hosea that God desires ‘mercy and not sacrifice’ (Mat 9:13; Mat 12:7). And by the inauguration of the New Covenant in His own blood, the whole Jewish system was by implication abrogated by being transcended. The thought of sacrifice seems also to underlie the words in Mat 20:28 || Mar 10:45. Christ gave His life as a ‘ransom’ (λύτρον)—a means of redemption or release. The word is used in the LXX Septuagint as a rendering of כַּפַּר a ‘covering’ or ‘atonement.’ But such a passage as Num 35:31 shows that it does not necessarily imply the death of an animal; and it is precarious to press our Lord’s words to support any *theory* of the Atonement, as has been done with disastrous results by widely differing schools of thought. Further, Joh 19:36 refers to the Passover lamb; and possibly also Joh 1:29; Joh 1:36, but it is

safer to regard the Baptist's words as an allusion to Isa 53:6-7, where the sufferings and death of the Servant of Jahweh are described as being in some sense vicarious, and availing to 'take away the sin of the world'; this truth was depicted symbolically by the 'scapegoat' on the Day of Atonement. The words of our Lord at the institution of the Eucharist were, as has been said above, the starting-point for the fuller teaching of the Apostolic writers. Of the debts which Christianity owes to Israel, none is more fundamental than the conception of sacrifice. The references to the subject in St. Paul's writings, though not numerous, are quite enough to show that he had a deep and firm belief in the sacrificial and propitiatory character of Christ's death (Sanday-Headlam, *Romans*, pp. 91 f.). See also 1Pe 1:2 (an allusion to the covenant sacrifice at Horeb), 1Pe 1:19 (the Passover lamb), 1Pe 2:24 (a general description of an atoning sacrifice). And it is the paramount thought in Hebrews, which shows how Christ's sacrifice and priesthood were analogous to, but infinitely surpassed, the Jewish sacrifices and the Levitical priesthood (see art. Day of Atonement).

(e) *Messianic expectations.*—(i.) The universal expectation in Israel in our Lord's time that One was to come who should be a national deliverer, had its roots as far back as the Divine promises to Abraham; but the focussing of all hopes on a *King* was due to the promise made to David that his line should have perpetual possession of the throne. The hopes of national peace and glory under a king reach a climax in Isaiah and Micah. But they received a terrible reverse at the Captivity, and in subsequent OT writings the idea largely disappeared. It was revived, however, to a certain extent in apocryphal and especially in apocalyptic literature. In two of the earlier portions of the Sibylline Oracles, in parts of the Ethiopic Enoch and in the Psalms of Solomon, there are indications of the hope, though the title 'Messiah' is not used. The Christian belief that Jesus was the Messiah (though the truth was guessed by the first disciples, Joh 1:41; Joh 1:49) was due to His own claims, which were not, however, put forward even to the Twelve till near the close of His ministry. He pronounced Simon Peter blessed because the truth had been Divinely revealed to him (Mat 16:16 f.); and He acknowledged to Pilate that He was a king (Mat 27:11 || Mar 15:2, Luk 23:3, Joh 18:36 f.). But while He declared the fact, He raised it into a new sphere of thought—'My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight ... but now is my kingdom not from hence.' And in conversing with the Twelve He linked with it the clear announcement of His approaching sufferings (Mar 8:27-31 and parallels; cf. Mat 20:20-28).

(ii.) The kingship of the Messiah was the only conception which had been entertained by the Jews themselves. But 'in the minds of the first members of the Christian Church the experiences of the Cross, the Resurrection and Pentecost, together with the impression which the character and work, the life and teaching of Jesus had made upon them, led to a rapid transformation, pregnant with important consequences, of the idea of the Messiah which they held as Jews' (Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible

iii. 356^a). As they studied the OT Scriptures in the light of these experiences, ‘they found scattered there the elements of a relatively complete ideal, which had been perfectly fulfilled in Jesus’ (*ib.* 356^b). The very mode of life and teaching which He had adopted drew their attention to the promise of a ‘true prophet’ (Deu 18:15, Act 3:22 f., 7:37). And in the miracles which He performed He appeared to be a counterpart of OT prophets. This working of miracles formed part of the current Messianic conception, as is implied by John the Baptist (Mat 11:2 f.), and in the questionings of the Jews (Joh 7:31). Another trait in the prophetic office of the Messiah—that of the revealer of unknown truths—is implied by the Samaritan woman (Joh 4:25). This had formed no definite part of the earlier Messianic expectations, though the nation had looked forward to a true prophet (1Ma 14:41). In our Lord’s time men hoped for the return of one of the old prophets (Mar 6:15; Mar 8:27 f.), or the coming of one who was called ‘the prophet’ (Joh 1:21; Joh 1:25; Joh 6:14); but there is no indication that ‘the prophet’ was identified with the Messiah.

(iii.) The more clearly the atoning value of Christ’s death was realized, the more completely was He seen to be the ideal Priest foreshadowed by the Levitical priesthood. His own words would form the starting-point for this conception; He ‘laid down’ His life, He ‘gave’ His life as a ransom (see above). The double thought of Christ as Victim and Priest is fully worked out in Hebrews on the basis of Psa 110:4.

(iv.) The OT contains many passages which teach that Divine purposes are accomplished through the sufferings of the righteous; and in the later chapters of the Book of Isaiah the righteous portion of the nation merges into the vision of one representative *Servant* of Jahweh, whose preaching was to bring the whole nation, and even Gentiles, to the light, and whose sufferings were to have a vicarious value. This representation does not appear to have exercised any influence on the later Jewish expectations of the Messiah. The inspired utterance of John the Baptist (Joh 1:29; Joh 1:36) pointed towards the truth, though his hearers do not seem to have understood his words. The Twelve could not realize the necessity for Christ’s sufferings until He had suffered, when the great truth dawned upon them (Mat 12:18-21, Act 3:13; Act 3:26; Act 4:27; Act 4:30). It has been suggested that the servant (*δοῦλος*) of Luk 14:16 f. may be an allusion to the same figure of prophecy.

(f) *Eschatology*.—The Jewish and Christian Messianic beliefs were closely bound up with eschatological teaching as a whole. In the OT the expectations with regard to a hereafter consisted mainly of the aspirations of saints who felt certain that righteousness is eternal, and that God’s power and dominion are infinite. This intuitive assurance that the present life with its inequalities and anomalies cannot be the whole of life, maintained itself in some minds side by side with the popular

notions held by the Hebrews in common with the Babylonian and other Semitic peoples, that Sheol was a state in which man would continue to exist, but only in a shadowy, nerveless, purposeless reproduction of his present personality. In apocalyptic literature an advance was made to some extent. The 'last things' began to be detailed in a great variety of forms—some of them, indeed, sensuous, and marred by narrow Jewish exclusiveness, but others more spiritual and universal; in some the Messianic kingdom is to be on this earth, in others in a transformed heaven and earth; in some the enemies of Israel are punished at death in Sheol or Hades, which thus becomes equivalent to Hell, while the righteous (*i.e.* Israel) attain to a resurrection; in others the resurrection is universal, and a prelude to a final spiritual judgment. And Christian teaching borrowed much, both from the OT and from later Jewish writings; but it rose to a spiritual height and certainty far beyond the former, while at the same time it discarded the gross, exaggerated, and unspiritual elements which marred the latter. Christ's own eschatological teaching centres round the *Kingdom of God*. He, like the OT writers, does not discuss theoretical or speculative questions, but deals with broad moral issues. His teaching 'unfolds the course of the Divine kingdom which had been the object of OT faith and the centre of OT hope. It presents that kingdom as a thing of the actual present, brought to men in and by the Teacher Himself, but also as a thing of the future which looks through all historical fulfilments to a completer realization—a thing, too, of gradual, unobtrusive growth, yet destined to be finally established by a great conclusive event' (Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible i. 750^b). Our Lord, as reported by the Synoptists, gave a large place to the promise of His own *Return*, an objective event, the time of which was not yet revealed even to the Son. In some passages this is closely connected with a quite distinct occurrence—the destruction of Jerusalem (Matthew 24, Mark 13; cf. Mat 10:23; Mat 16:27 f., Mar 8:38; Mar 9:1, Luk 9:26 f., Luk 21:32). Connected with the Parousia, and the cause of it, is the *Final Judgment*, which will occur at the end of the world, a judgment of individuals, and of universal scope, in which Christ the Son of Man will be Himself the Judge. The Fourth Gospel, while not without indications (cf. Joh 12:48) of this final judgment, lays stress rather on a present judgment, 'fulfilling itself in a probation of character and a self-verdict which proceed now' (Joh 3:17 f., Joh 12:47 f.). With the teaching of Jesus on the Parousia and Judgment is connected the doctrine of a *Resurrection*. In the OT this was not a doctrine, but a vague longing of a few great minds for a deliverance from Sheol, a life superior to death. It was only gradually and at a late date that the conception became more distinct. At first it was a re-animation of Israel as a whole, but Isa 26:19 seems to breathe the more individual hope; and the clearest statement is reached in Dan 12:2 f., the latest OT utterance on the subject. Nowhere in the OT is a resurrection thought of as extending beyond the case of Israel; but the doctrine of a resurrection of all men was gradually evolved, and had been accepted before the Christian era by the Pharisees and the mass of the people, though rejected by the Sadducees, in accordance with their principle of rejecting all traditions and

accretions later than the OT. Our Lord's teaching holds a course between the two; it is based on the great principles of the OT, but is coloured, as to some details, by the eschatology of later writings, being at the same time free from the crudeness and extravagances of the popular beliefs. See Mat 22:23-33 || Mar 12:18-27, Luk 20:27-40; Mat 8:11, Luk 13:28 f.; Mat 10:28, Luk 14:14, Joh 5:25 f., Joh 5:28 f., Joh 11:21-26.

(g) *Angelology*.—The NT belief with regard to angels is taken over almost entire from the later phases of Judaism. Angels are innumerable (Mat 26:53, Luk 2:13), and glorious in appearance (Mat 28:3, Luk 2:9; cf. δόξα 2Pe 2:10); they minister to God's people (Mat 2:13; Mat 4:11, Luk 22:43), and carry the saints to Paradise (Luk 16:22). As Jahweh, in the OT, was surrounded by them, so the Son of Man will be accompanied by them at His Parousia (Mat 16:27; Mat 25:31); and they are charged with duties connected with the Last Day (Mat 13:41; Mat 13:40; Mat 24:31). In OT and NT alike only two angelic names are recorded, Michael and Gabriel (Dan 10:13; Dan 10:21; Dan 8:16; Dan 9:21, Jud 1:9, Rev 12:7, Luk 1:19; Luk 1:26). Satan is an individual being (Mar 1:13, Luk 10:18). In a few points Christian conceptions show an advance upon the Jewish. In the Book of Daniel angels are guardians or patrons of particular countries (Dan 10:13; Dan 10:20-21; Dan 12:1); in Mat 18:10 they appear to be guardians of individual human beings, especially of children. Satan is attended by a company of angels (Mat 25:41, Rev 12:7), an idea not found in earlier writings. Angels are spirits (Heb 1:14). Christ, and men in union with Him, are better than angels (Heb 2:5, 1Co 6:3).

(h) *Scripture*.—This has been placed at the end, and not at the beginning, of the series, because the growth of Christianity out of the religion of Israel would remain a fact even if all the Jewish records had been destroyed. But it is true that the possession of, and devotion to, the OT Scriptures had an enormous effect on the formation of Christian thought and teaching and phraseology. The direct quotations from the OT in the NT are very many; and there are, besides, a mass of more or less distinct allusions and reminiscences which must be studied in their OT context if their meaning in the NT is to be understood. See artt. Old Testament, and Quotations.

Literature.—In addition to the works on OT Theology and on the Life of Christ, the following are among the more useful English works which are easily obtainable. They are arranged according to the sections in the article—

1. Sanday-Headlam, *Romans*, on chs. 9-11.

2. (a) Gore, *Bampton Lectures*; Illingworth, *do.*; Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, vol. i. 91-118; E. Caird, *The Evolution of Religion*. The doctrine of God from the Jewish side is treated in Montefiore's *Hibbert Lectures*.

(b) Westcott, *Hebrews*, 298-302; Candlish, *Expos. Times*, 1892 (Oct.-Nov.).

(c) Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*; M'Giffert, *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*; Bruce, *The Kingdom of God*, and *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*; Sand.-Headl., *Romans*, 187 ff.

(d) Cave, *The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice*; Maurice, *The Doctrine of Sacrifice*; Milligan, *The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord*; Westcott, *Hebrews*; Sand.-Headl., *Romans*, 91 f.; Driver, *Deuteronomy*, note on פִּכָּר, 425 f.

(e) (f) Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*; Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*; Stanton, *The Jewish and the Christian Messiah*; Dalman, *The Words of Jesus* (English translation); Driver-Neubauer, *The Jewish Interpreters of Is. liii.*; Charles, *Eschatology Hebrew Jewish and Christian*; Salmond, *The Christian Doctrine of Immortality*; Thackeray, *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*; Enoch (ed. Charles); Psalms of Solomon (ed. Ryle-James).

(g) Fuller, Excursus on 'Angelology and Demonology,' in *Speaker's Apocrypha*, vol. i.; Comm. on Dan., Zech., and Revelation.

(h) See art. Septuagint with the literature there.

Besides the above, a mass of useful information is contained in the following articles in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible :—'Israel,' 'God,' 'Jesus Christ,' 'Covenant,' 'Law (in N.T.),' 'Sacrifice,' 'Atonement,' 'Messiah,' 'Eschatology,' 'Resurrection,' 'Angel,' 'Satan,' 'Development of Doctrine' (Extra Vol.)

A. H. M'Neile.

Issue Of Blood

ISSUE OF BLOOD.—One peculiarly distressing case of this ailment is mentioned in the Gospels (Mat 9:20 αἰμορροοῦσα, Mar 5:25, and Luk 8:43 οὔσα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος). The description indicates a very severe and obstinate form of uterine haemorrhage possibly arising from internal growth, for the patient had suffered many things of many physicians and only grew worse for the treatment; and she had endured the complaint for twelve years. The malady was in general regarded as incurable by medical treatment, and was handed over to be dealt with by magic charms and amulets. Its painful character, apart from its enfeebling and prostrating effects, was

increased by the fact that it involved a rigorous isolation from society, and was looked upon with particular horror. All female discharges, even the normal monthly occurrences, were peculiarly repugnant to the Semitic mind, and came under the cycle of custom and legislation to which the Polynesian term *taboo* has been applied. The terror arose from the dread of supernatural penalties and of malignant agencies which were supposed to emanate from women at such times. Supernatural powers were believed to reside in the blood of the *menses*, on account of which it was itself held to be efficacious as a charm. The idea may have been modified before NT times, and yet would remain at least as a vague undefined repugnance and fear (see W. R. Smith, *RS* [Note: S Religion of the Semites.] , Note on 'Holiness, Uncleaness, and Taboo'). The sufferer would further be compelled to perpetual celibacy.

Among Talmudic cures of this malady we find the following: 'Let the patient sit at the parting of the ways with a cup of wine in her hand, and let some one coming up behind startle her by calling out, Be healed of thine issue of blood.' And, 'Take three measures of onions, boil in wine and give the patient to drink, at the same time calling out suddenly. Be healed of thine issue.'—An interesting anticipation of certain familiar features of modern therapeutics.

That our Lord's healing of the sufferer was regarded as memorable and attained to a considerable vogue apart from the NT record, is evidenced by the legend that the votive figure at Baniâs, supposed to be that of Christ, was erected by this woman out of gratitude to her Deliverer, and other kindred legends.

The chief feature of the miracle was the fact that the healing was gained surreptitiously, apart from the will and initiative of Jesus. Our Lord was pressing through the crowd on His way to the house of Jairus, when the woman, moved by a great expectation of healing, drew near to touch at least the fringe of His garment (in which special sanctity resided), assured that even this slight contact would remove her trouble. Having accomplished her object, 'immediately she felt in her body that she was healed of the plague,' and our Lord became conscious that 'virtue' had gone out of Him. The idea that healing power was resident in the body of Jesus, comparable to a charge of electric energy, is not to be entertained. The casual touching of His body by any sick person would have had no such result. We must emphasize (1) *the touch of faith*. The whole nature of the woman had been roused to activity and hopefulness. No labour of Jesus to create and evoke this essential condition of being healed was necessary or possible. The expectation existed at full tension, and she was prepared mentally and therefore physically to receive the healing power. And (2) corresponding to this exercise of faith is a *Divinely great capacity for sympathy resident in the spirit and life of Jesus*. While this capacity infinitely transcends the forces of human sympathy which exist in humanity, it still may be believed to operate on the same plane and to be not alien but kindred. The

possibility of sympathetic relations being in existence between ‘mind and mind,’ quite irrespective of consciousness or will on the part of both or of either, is an ascertained fact, however it may be explainable. Various theories are put forward to account for the phenomena, but meanwhile the fact must be recognized—the power of mind to affect mind by other than the channels of sense. Moreover, (3), our Lord’s own teaching must be duly weighed, that His works were due to *the indwelling Divine power*. The nature of Jesus was strung to sympathy with the whole complex coil of human suffering and need. At the very moment of this occurrence His heart was full of intensest sympathy with the sorrowing ruler. Such a nature then would present, quite apart from the immediate exercise of will, a fitting instrument for the Divine healing energy. The Divine power utilized and made more efficacious these already powerful sympathies and expectations; but while this is to be freely recognized, the chief emphasis is to be laid on the holy will of the unseen Father, with whom our Lord was morally and essentially one.

Literature.—The Comm., and standard works on the *Miracles*; Ker, *Serm.* 1st ser. p. 186 ff.; Maclaren, *Serm. pr. in Manchester*, 2nd ser. p. 294 ff. On the telepathic powers of the subliminal consciousness see the relevant sections of F. W. Myers’ *Human Personality*.

T. H. Wright.

Ituraea

ITURAEAE.—This term is used in [Luk 3:1](#) among other designations of political and geographical districts, the identification of whose rulers is intended to give a fixed chronological starting-point for the ministry of John the Baptist. It does not occur as a substantive in any pre-Christian writer. Neither does it occur again in post-Christian literature until the days of Eusebius, and doubtfully then. The term ‘Ituraeans,’ however, as the name of a people, is frequently mentioned. The first mention among Greek writers of the Ituraeans is that of Eupolemus (b.c. 150) as quoted by Eusebius (*Præp. Evan.* ix. 30). Cicero (*Philip.* ii. 112) speaks of them as a predatory people, and Caesar (*Bell. Afr.* 20) calls them skilful archers (cf. Josephus *Ant.* xiii. xi. 3 [Dindorf reads Ἰτουραῖαν; but it is commonly agreed that this is incorrect, and Naber’s and Niese’s reading, Ἰτουραίων, is preferred]; Strabo xvi. ii. 10, 18, 20; Dio Cass. xlix. 32. 5; Appian, *Civ.* v. 7; also Virgil, *Georg.* ii. 448; Lucan, *Pharsal.* vii. 230, 514).

The most important fact brought into view by the history of the Ituraeans, so far as the understanding of [Luk 3:1](#) is concerned, is their migratory character. They first

appear as the sons of Jetur (Gen 25:15, 1Ch 1:31), a branch of the race of Ishmael (cf. artt. 'Jetur' and 'Ishmael' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible). Their original home was the territory to the S.E. of Palestine. In the course of their wanderings they drifted northward, and some time before the Exile reached the country adjacent to Israel, east of the Jordan. Late in the 2nd cent. b.c., Aristobulus I. conquered certain bands of non-Israelites who had settled in Galilee, and compelled them either to submit to circumcision or leave the country. It has been conjectured that among these there were some Ituraeans, who moved still farther north. At any rate, in the next generation the Ituraeans are definitely located in the region of Lebanon. Strabo (xvi. ii. 10) speaks of them as inhabiting the 'mountain country' which with Chalcis and Marsyas was ruled by Ptolemy the son of Mennaueus (b.c. 85-40). He further describes them in association with the Arabs as 'all lawless men dwelling in the mountain region of the Libanus and anti-Libanus territory,' and harassing the agricultural population of the adjacent plain. D. aemilius Secundus, a military commander under Quirinius, reports that in a campaign against the Ituraeans in the Lebanon range, he had stormed a fortress of theirs (Mommsen, *Ephemeris Epigr.* iv. 1881, p. 538). With the death of Ptolemy, the government of this entire region passed into the hands of his son Lysanias, whom accordingly Dio Cassius calls 'king of the Ituraeans' (xlix. 32). Lysanias was put to death by Mark Antony in b.c. 34, and a little over ten years later (b.c. 23) this territory came, by way of a lease, under the control of a chief named Zenodorus (Josephus *Ant.* xv. x. 1; *BJ* i. xx. 4); but in b.c. 20, upon the death of Zenodorus, Augustus gave a portion of it to Herod the Great; and when Herod's kingdom was broken up among his heirs into tetrarchies, it fell to the lot of Philip to possess it (Josephus *Ant.* xv. x. 3; *BJ* ii. vi. 3). Subsequently to the mention of Ituraea by St. Luke, the emperor Caligula bestowed it upon a certain Soemus (a.d. 38), entitled by Tacitus (*Ann.* xii. 23) and Dio Cassius (lix. 12) 'king of the Ituraeans.' From a.d. 49, the date of the death of Soemus, and onwards, the country appears as a part of the province of Syria, furnishing a quota of soldiers for the Roman army (*Ephem. Epigr.* 1884, p. 194).

The mention of Ituraea by St. Luke raises the following questions: (1) Did he use the term as a noun or as an adjective? This is partly a question of correct Greek usage. A noun 'Ituraea' would be a linguistic anachronism at the time of St. Luke. It is unknown until the 4th cent.; but that the Evangelist fell into the error of using it as such is maintained by Schürer and H. Holtzmann, while Ramsay (*Expos.*, Feb. 1894, p. 144 ff., Apr. p. 288 ff.), contends against this position.* [Note: The importance of this conclusion by Professor Ramsay, apart from the purely academic vindication of St. Luke as a master of good Greek, is that it establishes an analogy for the South-Galatian theory so strenuously advocated by himself.]

(2) Out of this linguistic question grows the historical one: Did St. Luke speak accurately when he enumerated the Ituraean country as a part of the tetrarchy of

Philip? For even if the Evangelist did use the word 'Ituraea' as an adjective, it does not follow that he has correctly located the country. H. Holtzmann (*Hand-Com. 'Syn. Gosp.'* p. 58) calls it an error that Ituraea should be included with Trachonitis in Philip's tetrarchy, and explains that St. Luke probably had in mind a later arrangement of the territory under Agrippa. As a matter of fact, Josephus describes the tetrarchy of Philip as consisting of 'Batanea, Trachonitis, Auranitis, and certain parts of the house of Zeno (Zenodorus) about Paneas yielding a revenue of one hundred talents' (*Ant.* xvii. xi. 4; *BJ* ii. vi. 3). Ituraea is not given in this description. But it does not seem probable that St. Luke, who is writing with so much regard for historical details, should have failed at this point. Hence efforts have been made to account for his statement as it stands. Of these it is easy to set aside as futile (a) the identification of Ituraea with *Jedur* (a region S.W. of Damascus), as etymologically unsound, and as not corresponding geographically to the descriptions given by Strabo. According to these, the Ituraeans lived in a mountainous region. (b) Cheyne (art. 'Ituraea' in *Encyc. Bibl.*) proposes an interesting emendation of the text of Luke. Instead of Ἰτουραίας he would read Αὐρανιτιδος. But in order to get this substitution he assumes that by a transcriptional error ἰδ was dropped from Αὐρανιτιδος, and the remainder of the word, thus left in confusion, was by another transcriptional manipulation converted into Ἰτουραίας. Evidently this is too elaborate and too purely conjectural a proceeding to be accepted. (c) Statements of Eusebius (*OS*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 268, Ἰτουραία ἢ καὶ Τραχωνίτις, and p. 298, Τραχωνίτις χώρα ἢ καὶ Ἰτουραία; cf. also Jerome's translation of the same, 'Trachonitis regio sive Ituraea,' *Lib. de Situ*, etc., p. 238) definitely identify Ituraea and Trachonitis, and have been accepted as satisfactorily removing the difficulty. The terms 'Trachonitis' and 'Ituraea' do not, however, seem to be used by the Evangelist with the exact equivalency that the phraseology of Eusebius suggests. Hence (d) it is best not to identify Ituraea with Trachonitis as a whole, but to assume a certain overlapping of the two, giving a fairly painstaking writer good ground for connecting them together in the attempt to present the situation broadly. This conclusion is supported by the constantly changing character of the territory occupied by the Ituraeans, as exhibited in the sketch of their history above given, as well as the repeated shifting of the boundary lines in this general region during the centuries before and after Christ.

Literature.—Münter, *de Rebus Ituraeorum*, 1824; Schurer, *GJV* [Note: *JV* Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] i. 707ff. [*HJP* [Note: *JP* History of the Jewish People.] i. ii. App. i.]; Krenkel, *Josephus u. Lukas*, 1894, pp. 90-95; G. A. Smith, art. 'Ituraea' in *Hasting's Dictionary*

of the Bible , and *Expos.* March 1894, pp. 231-238; Ramsay, *Expos.* Jan. 1894, p. 43 ff., Feb. p. 144 ff., Apr. p. 288ff.

A. C. Zenos.

☞ Jacob

JACOB.—1. According to the genealogical list in Matthew, Jacob (Ἰακώβ) is the father of Joseph the husband of Mary (Mat 1:15-16).

2. One of the reputed progenitors of the Jewish nation. Apart from the reference to Jacob's well (πηγή τοῦ Ἰακώβ, see next art.), in Joh 4:6, and his place in the genealogies of Matthew and Luke (Mat 1:2, Luk 3:34), Jacob is mentioned in the Gospels only as one of the three patriarchs (Mat 8:11 'Many shall come from the east and the west; and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob ...' cf. Luk 13:28 f., Mat 22:32 || Mar 12:26, Luk 20:37 'I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'). These three were grouped from early times (Exo 2:24; Exo 3:6; Exo 3:15-16, Lev 26:42, 1Ki 18:36, 2Ki 13:23, Jer 33:26, 1Ch 29:18, 2Ch 30:6), and occupied a place apart in Jewish thought. According to the Rabbis, they alone were entitled to be called אבות 'fathers.' To them was traced not only the origin of the nation, but also the beginning of true worship. As a descendant of these three, a Jew might claim nobility and a special relationship to God. This claim was recognized as אבות וברית 'righteousness of the fathers,' and was based on Exo 32:13. It was denounced by John the Baptist (see Abraham, and cf. Mat 3:9, Luk 3:8), and it figured prominently in the conflicts between Jesus and the Pharisees (cf. Joh 8:33; Joh 8:37). Apparently in the time of Jesus it was liable to be abused, and on this account later Rabbis refused to lay stress upon it, declaring it no longer valid. In Rabbinic literature, Jacob is recognized as the most important of the three patriarchs (cf. Lev 26:42). He prevails with God (Gen 32:28). He names the sanctuary the house of God (Gen 28:22), and, in contrast to Abraham the father of Ishmael, and Isaac the father of Esau, Jacob inherits the promise in his children (49).

Literature.—A most suggestive analysis of the character of Jacob, and a full discussion of the problems of the narrative in Genesis, including the names 'Jacob' and 'Israel,' is given by Driver in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. 526-535; cf. also Stanley, *Jewish Church*, i. pp. 46-66; Gore, *Studia Biblica*, iii. 37 f.; Ph. Berger, 'La

Signification Historique des Noms des Patriarches Hébreux' in *Mémoires de la Société Linguistique*, vi. 150.

G. Gordon Stott.

☩ Jacob's Well

JACOB'S WELL.—On the arrest of John the Baptist by Herod Antipas, Jesus left Judaea and returned with His loosely-attached followers to Galilee (Mar_1:14). He travelled by 'the great north road' through Samaria. This road, after skirting the W. edge of the plain of Mukhneh, and passing under the slopes of Gerizim, enters the wide bay forming the approach to the Vale of Nâblus. Here it divides, one branch striking west, the other going north across the bay, past the ruins and spring of 'Askar. In the fork of these roads is Jacob's Well (*Bir Yâkûb*), where Jesus, being wearied with His journey,—it was about the hour of noon,—sat down and rested (Joh_4:6).

The well is described (Joh_4:5) as in the neighbourhood of 'a city of Samaria called Sychar, near to the parcel of ground that Jacob gave to his son Joseph.' This parcel of ground (χωριον) is evidently the plot referred to in Gen_33:18-19 as lying 'before' (or 'to the east of') Shechem, which Jacob purchased from the native Shechemites for 100 *kesîtahs*. Somewhere within its borders the bones of Joseph were afterwards buried (Jos_24:32, cf. Act_7:16): and the plot came to have for the N. Kingdom the kind of sanctity that Machpelah had for the Kingdom of Judah. It is nowhere recorded that Jacob dug a well here; but the fact had become a matter of common and well-established belief by the time of Jesus, and no serious doubt has since been raised as to the origin or locality of the well. The traditional sites of Jacob's Well and Joseph's Tomb (a little to the N.) are acknowledged by Jews, Samaritans, Christians, and Moslems alike. The tradition for the well goes back to Eusebius (*OS*, s.v. 'Sychar'). See also art. Sychar.

In Joh_4:6 the well is called πηγῆ ('fountain') τοῦ Ἰακώβ: in Joh_4:11 the woman refers to it as τὸ φρέαρ ('the cistern or pit') which Jacob gave. The latter is the more exact description, inasmuch as it 'is not an *ain*, a well of living water, but a *ber*, a cistern to hold water' (*PEFSt* [Note: *EFSt* Quarterly Statement of the same.] , 1897, p. 197). Rainwater probably formed the greater part of its supply, though another smaller portion may have been due to infiltration from the surrounding strata. This would partly account for the 'great local reputation' of the water 'for purity and flavour among the natives of El 'Askar and Nablus.' The neighbouring springs were 'heavy' (or hard), being strongly impregnated with lime, while Jacob's Well contained

'lighter' (or softer) water, 'cool, palatable, and refreshing' (G. A. Smith, *HGH^L* [Note: *GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*] p. 676). The woman's presence at the well *at noon* may have been due to the fact that she was seeking water for workmen on the adjacent cornlands, rather than for domestic use (*PEFst* [Note: *EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.*] , 1897, p. 149). The sacred associations of the spot, together with the 'real excellence' of the water, probably drew visitors regularly both from 'Askar ($\frac{3}{4}$ mile away) and from Nâblus ($1\frac{3}{4}$ miles distant), in spite of nearer and more copious supplies.

The true mouth of the well is several feet below the surface, and beneath a ruined vault, which once formed part of the ancient cruciform church mentioned by Arculph (a.d. 700), and referred to by Jerome (*OS*, s.v. 'Sychar'). This narrow opening, 4 ft. long and just wide enough to admit the body of a man, broadens out into the cylindrical tank or well itself, which is about $7\frac{1}{2}$ ft. in diameter and over 100 feet deep (G. A. Smith, *l.c.* p. 373). The interior appears to have been lined throughout with masonry, and thick layers of débris cover the bottom.* [Note: Robinson (in 1838) gives the depth as 105 feet; Anderson (in 1866) and Conder (in 1875) measured 75 feet. Evidently debris from the surface accumulated rather quickly.]

If the uniform tradition as to the well's origin be correct, probably the incomer Jacob sank this 'deep' pit to avoid collision with the natives among whom he settled. A well of his own, on his own ground, would make him secure and independent.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. 535 f.; *Encyc. Bibl.* iv. 4829; Robinson, *BRP* [Note: *RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.*] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ii. 283 f.; Thomson, *LB* [Note: *The Land and the Book.*] ii. 146 f.; Baedeker-Socin, *Pal.* [Note: *Palestine, Palestinian.*] 215 f.; Stanley, *SP* [Note: *P Sinai and Palestine.*] 241; G. A. Smith, *HGH^L* [Note: *GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*] 367 f., 676; Sanday, *Sacred Sites*, 31ff., 91; *PEFMem.* ii. 172 f.; *PEFst* [Note: *EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.*] , 1897, pp. 96, 149, 196; *Expos. Times*, v. [1893] 97 f.

A. W. Cooke.

JAIRUS.—1. The name Ἰάειρος occurs in Mar 5:22 and in the Lukan parallel (Luk 8:41), but not in Mt. (Mat 9:18). Such variants as Ἰάηρος, Ἰάρος, Ἰάρος (as Cod. Ⓢ) are also to be met with in the MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] . It cannot be positively identified with the Heb. name יְאִיר (as in Jdg 10:3, = prob. ‘Jahweh enlightens’), the LXX Septuagint equivalent of which is variously Ἰαειρ, Ἰαῆρ, Ἰαῖρ by simple transcription. In favour of regarding Ἰάειρος as the Grecized form of the Heb. name is the fact that this form occurs in LXX Septuagint in Est 2:5 for יְאִיר, the father of Mordecai (Cod. A, by a curious slip, has ἰατρούς), as also in the Apocrypha (Est 11:2), where the Authorized and Revised Versions has ‘Jairus’ as the name of the same person. In any case, however, analogy permits the adoption of ‘Jair’ as the English equivalent of Ἰάειρος; and were the name in familiar vogue, like such names as ‘Paul,’ this would naturally be its form. The Authorized Version ‘Jairus’ follows the Vulgate (Wyclif, ‘Jayrus’). Note the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘Jairus,’ fixing it as a trisyllable; and cf. other modes of transcription, as e.g. ‘Jaeirus’ (*Twentieth Cent. NT*, ed. 1904).

Cheyne (*Ency. Bibl.* ii. s.v.) regards the name as unauthentic, ‘the spontaneous invention of a pious and poetic imagination.’ He rejects its identification with OT יְאִיר, and yet he does not hesitate to explain it by reference to יְצִיר, simply because the meaning of the latter term, as he gives it (‘he will awaken’), suits his theory of a fanciful creation to fit the drift of the story. This is quite arbitrary and precarious. (Note, the name יְצִיר occurs in 1Ch 20:5 as the K^é; Authorized and Revised Versions ‘Jair’).

2. Jairus is described in Mk. as εἷς τῶν ἀρχισυναγωγῶν (Mar 5:22) and similarly afterwards as ἀρχισυναγωγός. Lk.’s ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς (Luk 8:41) is perhaps simply explanatory of this term which he himself uses later (Luk 8:49). Mt. has ἄρχων alone (Mat 9:18); but there is no need to suppose that this is intended to represent Jairus as a member of the Sanhedrin, or in any other capacity than that indicated in the other Gospels. The brevity and conciseness of the form in which Mt. gives the story probably explain this loose use of ἄρχων. Wyclif’s ‘prince’ here is due to the Vulgate *princeps*, and elsewhere he invariably uses ‘prince of the synagoge’ as = ἀρχισυναγωγός. The Vulgate, however, uses *archisynagogus* in the Markan passage, whilst in

Luk 8:49 it has *principem synagogae*, perhaps through the influence of the phrase in Luk 8:41. The Gr. term exactly = the Heb. title אָרָם קַבָּנֵי, and the office held by Jairus had well-defined functions. Pre-eminently the ‘ruler’ (*al.* ‘president’ or ‘leader’) was the director of public worship. Schürer holds that generally there was ‘but one archisynagogus for each synagogue’ (*HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. ii. 65). The expression used in Mar 5:22 quite agrees with this, as it describes the *class* to which Jairus belonged (one of the ‘synagogue-rulers’ or ‘synagogue-presidents’) rather than a particular body of ‘rulers’ of which he was a member. The locality of the synagogue in which he held office is not definitely indicated. See artt. Ruler and Synagogue.

3. In the triple narrative in which Jairus figures, Mar 5:21-43 = Mat 9:18-26 = Luk 8:40-56, the condensed form of Mt.’s account is most noticeable. In addition to the omission of the ruler’s name and the loose use of ἀρχων (see above), there is no mention of the servant who met our Lord and Jairus on the way with the news that the child was dead (Mar 5:35 = Luk 8:49). In harmony with this, whilst Mk. says she was *in extremis* (ἐσχάτως ἔχει), and Lk. that she ‘was dying’ (ἀπέθνησκεν), when her father came to Jesus, Mt. represents her as already dead (ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν). Perhaps, as a matter of structure, the prefatory link in Mat 9:18 may be compared with the phrase in Mar 5:35 (= Luk 8:49) ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, with a bearing on this point.

Cheyne thinks the Mt. form of the story the most original, and explains the representation in Mk. on this point as due to the feeling of a later time that no one would have had a sufficiently bold faith to ask Jesus to restore one who was already dead. So far as that goes, however, the Markan account is parallel with the situation in the story of Lazarus (John 11); and we have no other instance in the Gospels besides this in Mt. of a request that one dead should be restored to life. Compression still best accounts for the form in Matthew. The account of the actual restoration to life is also given with the greatest brevity.

The effort to explain this incident as a case of restoration from trance is not quite successful. Mk.’s narrative would admit of such an interpretation, but Lk.’s definite phrases in vv. 53, 55 distinctly fix the sense otherwise. In the primitive tradition the daughter of Jairus was believed to have been brought back from death to life. The story as a whole is full of grace and beauty, and ‘belongs to the earliest stratum of the Gospel tradition’ (Cheyne, *Ency. Bibl. ut supra*).

J. S. Clemens.

James

JAMES (Heb. יַעֲקֹב, Gr. Ἰακώβ, Ἰάκωβος. The English name is analogous to the Portuguese and Gaelic).—The name does not occur in the OT except in the case of the patriarch, but had become common in NT times, and is borne by several persons mentioned in the Gospels. Passing over the father of Joseph the husband of the Virgin Mary, according to St. Matthew's genealogy (Mat 1:16 where the form is Ἰακώβ), we have—1. James the father (Authorized Version 'brother') of Judas, Luk 6:16 ('not Iscariot,' Joh 14:22, the Thaddaeus of Mt. and Mk.). The Authorized Version translation is derived from the Latin of Beza, and is due to a confusion of this Judas with a quite different person, Judas (Jude) the 'brother of James' (Jud 1:1, Mat 13:55). The older English versions have either 'Judas of James' (Wyclif = Vulgate *Iudam Iacobi*) or 'Judas James' sonne' (Tindale, etc.). Further, St. Luke's practice is to insert ἀδελφός when he means 'brother' (Luk 3:1; Luk 3:6; Luk 3:14, Act 12:2). Nothing more is known of this James.

2. James the brother of John (Mat 10:2, Mar 3:17, Luk 6:14, Act 1:13), elder* [Note: The usual order is 'James and John.' St. Luke sometimes inverts it (8:51, 9:28, Act 1:13), probably because of the early death of James and the subsequent prominence of John.] son of Zebedee, a well-to-do† [Note: He had 'Hired servants' (Mar 1:20). his Wife Was one of those who ministered to Christ 'of their substance' (Mar 15:41, Luk 8:3).] Galilaean fisherman, most probably a native of Capernaum. The call of James to Apostleship is related in Mat 4:21-22, Mar 1:19-20 and (perhaps) Luk 5:10.‡ [Note: The question whether the Lukan narrative refers to the same incident as that related by Mt. is not easy to decide. Hammond, Trench, Wordsworth, and other commentators answer it in the affirmative; Alford, Greswell, etc., in the negative. Plummer ('St. Luke' in Internat. Crit. Com.) is doubtful. A. Wright regards it as a conflation of the Markan narrative with that found in Joh 21:1-6. The characteristic features of the Lukan account are: (1) there is no mention of Andrew or Zebedee; (2) St. Peter is the prominent figure; (3) there is no command to follow Christ; (4) the fishermen are washing (not casting or mending) their nets; (5) there is a miraculous draught of fishes.] The two sons of Zebedee appear to have been partners (κοινωνοί, μέτοχοι) with Peter in the fishing industry. Their mother's name was Salome, who was probably a sister of the Virgin Mary (see art. Salome). The two brothers received from our Lord the name *Boanerges* ('sons of thunder'), perhaps because of their impetuous zeal for their Master's honour, shown by incidents like the wish to call down fire to consume certain Samaritans who refused Him a passage

through their country (Luk 9:54; cf. Mar 9:38, Luk 9:49-50). James is specially mentioned as present at the healing of Peter's wife's mother (Mar 1:29), at the raising of Jairus' daughter (Mar 5:37), at the Transfiguration (Mar 9:2), at the Mount of Olives during the great 'eschatological' discourse (Mar 13:3), and at the agony in the Garden of Gethsemane (Mar 14:33). On two of these occasions, the first and the fourth, Andrew is associated with the three; but on all the others, Peter, James, and John are alone with Christ. The special favour accorded to the two brothers (and perhaps their kinship to Jesus) probably prompted the ambitious request of Salome that they might sit as assessors to Him in His kingdom (Mar 10:35-40, Mat 20:20-23). James was called upon to 'drink the cup' of suffering (Mar 10:38-39) first of all the Apostolic band, being beheaded by Herod Agrippa i. in a.d. 44 (Act 12:2). An untrustworthy tradition represents him as preaching the gospel in Spain, of which country he is patron saint. Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* ii. 9) relates, on the authority of Clement of Alexandria, that, when he was tried for his life, his accuser was so greatly affected by his constancy that he declared himself a Christian, and died with him after obtaining his forgiveness and blessing. See, further, Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. 541.

3. James the son of Alphaeus, one of the Twelve (Mat 10:3, Mar 3:18, Luk 6:15, Act 1:13). In each list he stands at the head of the third group along with Simon Zelotes (with whom he is coupled by St. Luke), Judas of James (= Thaddaeus, with whom he is coupled by Mt. and Mk.), and Judas Iscariot. The Gospels tell us nothing more about him, but he was most likely a brother of Matthew, who also was a 'son of Alphaeus' (cf. Mat 9:9 with Mar 2:14). He has been identified with (4) and (5); but the probabilities seem to the present writer to be against the former identification, while the latter is almost certainly wrong.

4. James ὁ μικρός[§] [Note: Jerome's rendering minor (Vulg. Maria Jacobi minoris), on which he founds an argument for the identification of this James with (3) and (5), takes no account of the fact that the Greek is positive, not comparative.] (Mar 15:40; cf. Mat 27:58, Joh 19:25). He is mentioned as the son of a Mary, probably the wife of Clopas, one of the four women, of whom the other three were Mary the Lord's mother, Mary Magdalene, and Salome, present at the crucifixion. This Mary, with Mary Magdalene, remained to see where Jesus was buried. She had another son Joseph. Those who identify this James with (3) argue that Alphaeus (Ἀλφαιός, אֱלִפָּא) and Clopas (Κλωπᾶς) are two forms of the same name (Meyer, Alford). Philologically this is improbable. The extant Syriac Versions render 'Alphaeus' by *Chalpai*, while 'Clopas' is rendered by *Kleopha*. Nor can it be said to be absolutely certain that ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ of Joh 19:25 means the wife of Clopas. It may mean 'daughter of Clopas.' And it is unlikely that St. Mark would describe James *the son of*

Alphaeus by a new designation, James ‘*the Little*’ (in stature).* [Note: μικρός may also mean ‘young’ (Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, Eng. tr. 144).] Moreover, it is hard to see why St. John, writing for readers acquainted with the Synoptic Gospels, should introduce into his Gospel the name Clopas if he meant Alphaeus. On the whole, therefore, we must conclude with Ewald (*Hist. of Israel*, vi. 305, note 4) that the identification is unlikely.† [Note: Ewald, however, identifies Clopas with Cleopas (a Greek name), Luk 24:18.] Of this James we know nothing further.

5. James the Lord’s brother. He is mentioned by name twice in the Gospels (Mat 13:55, Mar 6:3). He is the eldest of four brothers, James, Joseph, Judas, and Simon (Simon and Judas, Mat 13:55). Other references to the Brethren of the Lord are found in Mat 12:46-50, Mar 3:31-35, Luk 8:19-21, Joh 7:3-5. From these passages we learn that they thought Him mad, and opposed His work. St. John tells us plainly that His brethren did not believe in Him.

The following passages outside the Gospels have to do with this James: 1Co 15:7, Act 1:13; Act 12:17; Act 12:15 (*passim*) Act 21:18-25, Gal 1:18-19; Gal 2:1-10; Josephus *Ant.* xx. ix. 1; Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* ii. 1 (quotation from Clement of Alexandria), ii. 23 (quotation from Hegesippus), vii. 19; Jerome, *de Vir. Illus.* (quotation from the Gospel according to the Hebrews); *Clementine Homilies* (*ad init.*); *Apostolic Constitutions*, viii. 35. From these passages we learn that he was converted to a full acknowledgment of Christ (probably by the Resurrection), that the Lord appeared to him specially, that he became head of the Church of Jerusalem, and that he was put to death by the Jews either just before the siege (Hegesippus) or some ten years earlier (Josephus). He was surnamed the Just by his fellow-countrymen, and was greatly respected by all classes in Jerusalem.

The Epistle bearing his name, which is almost universally attributed to the brother of the Lord, is of the greatest interest to students of the Gospels. There is no Epistle which contains in a small compass so many allusions to the teaching of Christ subsequently contained in the Gospels as we have them. The following list includes all the more striking parallels: Mat 5:3; Mat 5:7; Mat 5:9; Mat 5:11; Mat 5:22; Mat 5:34-37 = Jam 2:5; Jam 2:13; Jam 3:18; Jam 1:2; Jam 1:19; Jam 5:12; Mat 6:19; Mat 6:24 = Jam 5:2; Jam 4:4; Mat 7:1; Mat 7:7-8; Mat 7:12; Mat 7:16; Mat 7:24 = Jam 4:11-12; Jam 1:5; Jam 2:8; Jam 3:11-12; Jam 1:22 (all these are from the Sermon on the Mount). Cf. also Mat 12:38 with Jam 3:1-2, Mat 18:4 with Jam 4:6; Luk 6:24 = Jam 5:1; Luk 12:16-21 = Jam 4:14; Luk 8:15; Luk 21:19 (ὑπομονή, used by Lk. only in the Gospels) = Jam 1:3-4; Jam 5:11; Joh 3:3 = Jam 1:17; Joh 8:31-33 = Jam 1:25; Joh 13:17 = Jam 4:17.‡ [Note: Fuller lists will be found in Mayor, *Epistle of St. James* (2nd ed.), lxxxv-lxxxviii; Salmon, *Introduction to NT*, 455

(5th ed.); Zahn, *Einleitung*, i. p. 87; Knowling, *St. James*, xxi-xxiii.] On these passages it may be remarked (1) that, while some of the parallels may be explained as coincidences, there remain others which even Renan (*l'Antéchrist*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 54) admits to be reminiscences of the words of Jesus; (2) that the evidence is cumulative, and includes correspondence in teaching (e.g. on riches, formalism, prayer) as well as in language; (3) that the most striking parallels are with the Gospel according to St. Matthew, and with the earlier parts of that, suggesting the possibility that James may at first have been a hearer of our Lord, and making it fairly certain that he was acquainted with the special Matthaean 'source.'

A second point to be noticed is that the Epistle of James is clearly the work of one trained in the strict observance of the Law, while at the same time his obedience to it is the obedience of zealous love, as far removed as possible from the Pharisaic formalism denounced by our Lord (Jam 1:22-27; Jam 2:8-12; Jam 4:5-7; Jam 5:10-11). Both in his case and in that of St. Paul, although they developed on somewhat different lines, the Law was a παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστόν. This view of the training of James, and consequently of our Lord his Brother, is confirmed by the Gospels. The names of the four brothers, James, Joseph, Simon (= Simeon), and Jude (= Judah), are those of patriarchs. The parents are careful to observe the Law in our Lord's case (Luk 2:22-24; Luk 2:39; Luk 2:41-42).

The Western Church, in regarding James the Lord's brother as identical with James the son of Alphaeus, seems to have been influenced by the authority of Jerome, who, in replying to Helvidius (*circa* 383 a.d.), urges that, as James the Lord's brother is called an Apostle by St. Paul (Gal 1:18-19), he must be identified with James the son of Alphaeus, since James the son of Zebedee was dead; and, further, that he was our Lord's first cousin. (Jerome does not identify Alphaeus with Clopas). But it may be observed (1) that Jerome himself seems to have abandoned this view (*Ep. cxx. ad Hedibiam*); (2) that ἀδελφός never = ἀνεψιός in the NT; (3) that James the brother of the Lord is always distinguished from the Twelve (Joh 2:12, Act 1:14; cf. Mat 12:47-50); (4) that 'His brethren did not believe in him' (Joh 7:3; Joh 7:5); (5) that the word ἀπόστολος, on which Jerome relies, is not confined to the Twelve (Act 14:4; Act 14:14, 1Co 15:4-7). * [Note: In favour of their identification of (3), (4), and (5) it is sometimes urged that it is unlikely there would be four persons, all named James, closely connected with our Lord. But it must be remembered (1) that the name was certain to be popular among patriotic Jews; (2) that 'Jewish names in ordinary use at that time were very few' (Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 268). Twelve persons are mentioned in the NT as bearing the name Siunon (Simeon), and nine that

of Joseph (Joses).] [For a fuller discussion of the question see the article Brethren of the Lord].

Literature.—Besides the authorities quoted above, see articles in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible (by J. B. Mayor), *Encyc. Bibl.* (by Orello Cone), Smith's *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (by Meyrick, with full list of the views of British theologians); Herzog, *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (by Sieffert, with Bibliography); Commentaries of Swete (on Mk.), Alford, Meyer (English translation, Edin. 1882), Plumptre (*Cambridge Bible*), von Soden (*Hand-Commentar*, Freiburg, 1890), Plummer (in *Expositor's Bible*, 1891); W. Patrick, *James the Lord's Brother*, 1906.

H. W. Fulford.

⚠ Jannai

JANNAI.—One of the links in the Lukan genealogy of our Lord (Luk_3:24).

⚠ Jared

JARED.—Father of Enoch, named in our Lord's genealogy (Luk_3:37).

⚠ Jealousy

JEALOUSY.—This word is not used in the Gospels, though Joh_2:17 has ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου = בִּיתְךָ קִנְיָהּ (Psa_69:10) = 'jealousy for thy house'; and one of Jesus' disciples was Simon ὁ ζηλωτής (Luk_6:15, Act_1:13) = Simon ὁ Καναναῖος (Mar_3:18), a man who had belonged to that party in the Jewish State which was so jealous for the sole sovereignty of God in Israel that it regarded the recognition of any other (.g. by paying tribute to Caesar) as a form of treason. But the thing which the OT means by קִנְיָהּ, in all its aspects, is everywhere present in the NT, and especially in the Gospels.

1. The jealousy of God in the OT is connected with the truth that He is God alone, and it is expressed mainly in two ways. First, *in the exclusive claims which He makes for Himself*: ‘Thou shalt have no other gods before me’ (Exo 20:3); ‘Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart,’ etc. (Deu 6:5); ‘I am the Lord, that is my name; and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise unto graven images’ (Isa 42:8). This exclusiveness or intolerance of God—His jealousy *for Himself*, as it may be called—pervades the OT. It is the source of that compulsion which He puts upon the human race to learn the most important lesson which the mind is capable of receiving, that there is one only, the living and true God. This is the presupposition not only of all uplifting religion, but of all science, and of all morality which rises above caste and convention; and what we see in the OT is the jealousy of God working monotheism into the constitution of a race who should impart it to the world. In this sense the jealousy of God is represented in the mind of Christ by the exclusive claims which He makes for Himself, and in the rest of the NT by the reiteration of these claims through the lips of His disciples. Sometimes the expression of it is informal: e.g. ‘He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me’ (Mat 10:37); or, ‘Blessed is he whosoever shall find none occasion of stumbling in me’ (Mat 11:6). Sometimes, again, it is quite explicit: ‘No one knoweth the Son save the Father; neither doth any know the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him’ (Mat 11:27). In the Fourth Gospel this tone predominates, and there could not be more precise and formal expressions of the jealousy of God, as God is revealed in Christ, than are found, e.g., in Joh 1:18; Joh 8:24; Joh 14:6 (see art. Preaching Christ). This jealousy of God for Himself is echoed in passages like Act 4:12 (‘There is none other name,’ etc.), 1Co 3:11 (‘Other foundation can no man lay,’ etc.), Gal 1:8 f. (‘Though we or an angel from heaven should preach unto you any other gospel,’ etc.: the peculiarity of the Pauline as opposed to the Judaizing gospel being that it ascribed the whole of salvation to Christ *alone*, and did not share His glory with the Law), and 2Jn 1:9 f.

The second way in which the jealousy of God expresses itself in the OT is in *God’s unreserved identification of Himself with His people*. It is a jealousy *for them*, in which their cause is His, in which His honour (if such a word can be used in such a connexion) is touched if they are wronged, in which His love rises into passion, and takes on itself responsibilities for them of which they would not have dared to think. Sometimes this, too, is informally expressed: e.g. ‘He that toucheth you toucheth the apple of his eye’ (Zec 2:8). Sometimes it is quite explicit: e.g. the great Messianic promises of Isa 9:1 ff. are sealed in Isa 9:7 by ‘The jealousy of Jahweh of hosts shall do this.’ Cf. also the striking passage Zec 8:2 ff. All this is reproduced in the mind and words of Jesus. He is jealous for His people, especially for ‘the little ones’ (who, however, are not so much a class of Christians, as Christians generally—a weak and inconsiderable folk in ordinary eyes), and nothing that concerns them is alien to Him. The very slightest service done them has a reward solemnly assured to it (Mat 10:42);

the sin of causing one of them to stumble is denounced with a passion which startles us still as we read (Mat_18:6); cf. art. Anger, 2 (a). The most thrilling illustration of this jealousy of Jesus for His 'little ones' is given in the Final Judgment: 'Inasmuch as ye did it (*or*, did it not) to one of these least, my brethren, ye did it (*or*, did it not) unto me' (Mat_25:40; Mat_25:45). Jealous love can go no further than this.

2. Since God, especially God revealed in Christ, is in this twofold sense a jealous God, it is clear that there must be in the Christian religion and character a corresponding intensity and passion. Christians ought to be jealous for Christ, sensitive to all that dishonours Him, and especially to all that degrades Him from the place which He claims, and which belongs to Him alone. The NT gives Him what He demands, the name which is above every name; and it is inconsistent with jealousy for Him to give Him only a name alongside of other names—to classify Him, as is often done, with prophets or religious heroes or founders of religions. Jealousy, no doubt, is apt to be a turbid virtue; the OT examples of it—Phinehas, Elijah, and Jehu—all illustrate this; and even in Christian history jealousy for Jesus as sole Lord and Saviour has often been confounded with zeal for a definition of one's own making, or for the predominance of one's own ecclesiastical or political faction. Of all virtues, it is the one which most readily calls the old man into the field to reinforce the new, a process which always ends in disaster. Nevertheless, it is the primary virtue of a Christian, just as the keeping of the first commandment was the primary virtue of a Jew.

3. Apart from their use in the sense of an ardent and exclusive devotion to God in Christ, and to the cause of Christ in His people (2Co_11:2), the associations of the words ζήλος, ζηλοῦν in the NT are rather repellent. Sometimes ζήλος is *anger* (Act_5:17), the Heb. נָפֶת being at least once rendered θυμός in LXX Septuagint ; often it is *envy* (Act_13:45 : so the verb Act_7:9, Act_17:5); in this sense, too, it is frequently combined with ἔρις (Rom_13:13, 1Co_3:3, 2Co_12:20, Gal_5:20); only rarely does it denote a keen and affectionate interest (2Co_7:7; 2Co_7:11). But this last sense is the one which is really congruous with the fundamental import of jealousy as the sense of self-respect and of honour in the God who is revealed in Christ as Love.

James Denney.

JECHONIAH.—Also called in OT *Jehoiachin* and *Coniah*; mentioned in Mat_1:11 f. as a link in our Lord's genealogy.

⚠️ **Jehoshaphat**

JEHOSHAPHAT.—A king of Judah, named in our Lord's genealogy (Mat_1:8).

⚠️ **Jericho**

JERICHO was situated in the valley of the Jordan, about 5 miles west of the river and about 6 north of the Dead Sea. The distance between Jerusalem and Jericho was about 17 miles. The immediate vicinity enjoyed the advantage of abundant springs (2Ki_2:19-22), and showed great fertility. It was the 'city of palms' (Deu_34:3, 2Ch_28:15), and Josephus gives an enthusiastic account of the abundance and variety of its products (*BJ* iv. viii. 2, 3).

The Jericho which was destroyed by Joshua was a considerable town, characterized by the wealth of its inhabitants and the strength of its fortifications (Joshua 6, 7). The rebuilding of the city is described in 1Ki_16:34, but the place is referred to at earlier dates (Jos_18:21, 2Sa_10:5, 1Ch_19:5). A school of prophets was established at Jericho (2Ki_2:5), and it was from Jericho that Elijah and Elisha went down to Jordan. Other references are found in 2Ch_28:15, 2Ki_25:5, Jer_39:5, Ezr_2:34, Neh_3:2; Neh_7:36.

In the time of our Lord, Jericho was a large and important town. Antony granted the revenues of Jericho and the surrounding district to Cleopatra, and these were farmed from her by Herod the Great. Afterwards Herod received Jericho by gift from Augustus, and erected a citadel, which he called *Cypros*, above the town. He also built within the city a palace, in which he died. This palace was rebuilt by Herod Archelaus after it had been burned down by Simon during the troubles which followed upon the death of Herod the Great (Josephus *Ant.* xvii. x. 6 and xiii. 1). After the deposition of Herod Archelaus as tetrarch of Judaea, Jericho was held directly by the Roman procurator, who farmed out its revenues.

Modern Jericho (*er-Riha*) is a miserable village of 300 inhabitants; the forest of palms has entirely disappeared, and only here and there can traces of the former fertility of the district be seen. The exact site of the Canaanite Jericho does not correspond with that of the modern village, and probably there were two towns, a little apart from

one another, which, during the prosperity of the Roman occupation, may have been united by continuous building.

By tradition, Jericho has been closely associated with the Baptism of Jesus and the Temptation. The site of Bethany or Bethabara (wh. see), however, cannot be fixed with certainty, and some (e.g. Conder) maintain that the ford east from Jericho cannot be the place, but rather a ford farther north, lying east from Cana of Galilee. The traditional scene of the Temptation is a mountain called from this association *Quarantania*, lying to the west of Jericho. But the uncertainty of the scene of the Baptism and the vagueness of the phrase 'the wilderness' (Mat_4:1 ||) make this a matter of tradition only.

From Jericho to Jerusalem there are three roads. The central one of these is the most direct, and was that used by pilgrims going from Galilee to Jerusalem, who took the circuitous route in order to avoid entering Samaria. It is an extremely arduous path, and wayfarers were much exposed to the attacks of robbers, who easily found secure concealment among the bare and rugged hills which it traversed: a fact which gives vividness to the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luk_10:30). This road was that which Jesus took on His last journey to Jerusalem. After the raising of Lazarus, Jesus and His disciples withdrew 'into a city called Ephraim' (Joh_11:54). (On its site see art. Ephraim). From this place Jesus could see the pilgrim bands from Galilee going down to Jericho on their way to Jerusalem. And in all probability, when 'the Passover was nigh at hand,' He joined one of these bands, and so paid that visit to Jericho with which the names of Bartimaeus and Zacchaeus are associated. See artt. Bartimaeus and Zacchaeus.* [Note: The statement is frequently met with, in connexion with our Lord's treatment of Zacchaeus and also in connexion with the parable of the Good Samaritan, that Jericho was a sacerdotal city. In regard to this, it is certain that the priests and throughout the towns and villages, but were scattered throughout the towns and villages of Judaea. Jericho, as within easy reach of Jerusalem and an important place, may have been a favourite residence for the priests (see Schurer, HJP ii. i. 229).]

Literature.—Stanley, *SP* [Note: P Sinai and Palestine.] ch. vii. pp. 305, 316; G. A. Smith, *HGH* [Note: GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.] 264, 268, 493, 496; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, artt. 'Jericho, 'Ephraim,' 'Bethabara'; Farrar, *Life of Christ*, ii. 178-186.

Andrew N. Bogle.

Jerusalem

JERUSALEM

1. Name.
2. Natural site.
3. Climate and Diseases.
4. Water supply.
5. Topography.
6. History of the city during period of the Gospels.
7. Jerusalem in the Gospels.

Literature.

1. Name.—This appears in the Gospels as Ἱεροσόλυμα and Ἱερουσαλήμ. The former of these names, and the more used, appears to have come into common vogue a century or so before the commencement of the Christian era. It occurs in 2 Maccabees (2Ma 3:9), in the *Letter of Aristeas*, and in Strabo, and it is the form always employed by Josephus. In Latin Pagan writers, e.g. Cicero, Pliny, Tacitus, it is employed transliterated as *Hierosolyma*. Ἱερουσαλήμ unquestionably is much nearer to the Hebrew ירושלים, however this was vocalized, and is therefore the more primitive. St. Luke specially employs this both in his Gospel and in the Acts. It is noticeable that it is the form put into the mouth of Jesus when His words are professedly reported verbatim (Mat 23:37, Luk 13:34; Luk 23:8). The name, as used throughout the Western world, and the Arabic form used in Palestine to-day, are both derived from this Greek form. In Mat 4:5; Mat 27:53 we have the expression, used previously too in the OT, ‘the holy city.’ This is familiar to us in Western lands, but it is also, for other reasons, the name for Jerusalem throughout the Moslem world. Kuds, or, more classically, Mukaddas, ‘the sanctuary’ or ‘holy place,’ is the common name for this city in the East.

2. Natural site.—Modern Jerusalem occupies a situation which is defined geographically as 31° 46' 45" N. lat. by 35° 13' 25" long. E. of Greenwich, and lies at levels between 2300 and 2500 feet above the Mediterranean. It is overlooked by somewhat higher ground to the N., to the E., and the South. On the West the outlook

is somewhat more open, but even here the view is not very extensive; only along a narrow line to the S.E. a gap in the mountains exposes to view a long strip of the beautiful mountains of Moab across the Dead Sea, itself invisible in its deep basin. Although the exact situation of the city has varied considerably during historical times, yet the main natural features which gave Jerusalem its strength—and its weakness—both as a fortress and as a sanctuary, may be easily recognized to-day. Built, as it has been, in a peculiarly bare and ill-watered region, off the natural lines of communication, it could never have enjoyed its long and famous history but for certain compensating advantages.

The city's site lies slightly to the east of the great mountainous backbone of Palestine, upon a tongue-shaped ridge running from N.W. to S.E. This 'tongue' is the central of three branches given off at this point. The N.E. one terminates opposite the city as the Mount of Olives, while a southern branch, given off near the highest point before the modern Jaffa road commences to descend to the city, runs almost due south, and terminates near the commencement of the *Wady el-Wurd*, at a point on which is situated to-day the summer residence of the Greek Patriarch, known as *Katamûn*. The whole mountain group is isolated from its neighbours on the N.W. and W. by the deep *Wady beit Hanîna*, to the S.W. by the roots of the *Wady es-Surâr*, and to the E. and S.E. by the *Wady en-Nâr* and other steep valleys running down towards the Jordan and the Dead Sea. To the north and south, where the ancient caravan road from Hebron and the Negeb runs towards Samaria and Galilee, it is separated from the main backbone by only shallow and open valleys. The special ridge of land on which Jerusalem stands is roughly quadrilateral in shape, but merges itself into higher ground towards the N. and N.W. The surface direction is generally downwards from N. to S., with a slight tilt towards the E.; this is due to the dip of the strata, which run E.S.E. Like all this part of the country, the rocky formation is grey chalky limestone, deposited in beds of varying hardness. The least durable, which still lies on the surface of the Mount of Olives, having been denuded here, the top layer over the city's site, is a hard limestone with flinty bands, known locally as the *Mezzeh*. This is the formation most suitable for building-stone, though the hardest to work upon. Under this are thick strata of a soft white stone of uniform consistence, known locally as *Meleki*. These softer layers have been of the greatest importance in the history of the city, as in them have been excavated the countless caves, cisterns, and tombs which cover the whole district, and from them in ancient times most of the building-stones were taken. In many places this *Meleki* rock when first excavated is quite soft and easily worked with the most primitive tools, but on exposure to the air it rapidly hardens. The stones from this soft layer, however, never have the durability of those from the *Mezzeh*; and doubtless it is because of the poor material used that so few relics of real antiquity have survived till to-day. Under the *Meleki* is a layer of dolomite limestone which comes to the surface in the valley to the south of the city, and is of importance, because along its non-porous surface the water, which

percolates through the other layers, is conducted upwards to the one spring—the Virgin’s Fountain.

The enormous accumulation of débris over the ancient site renders it difficult to picture to-day its primitive condition. The extensive investigations made here during the past fifty years, as well as the examination of many kindred sites in other parts of Palestine, lead to the conclusion that the whole area before human habitation consisted of an irregular, rocky surface, broken up by a number of small shallow valleys in which alone there was sufficient soil for vegetation. To-day the rock is everywhere covered with debris of a depth varying from 40 to 70 or more feet. Only those who understand how much this vast accumulation has blotted out the ancient natural landmarks can realize how very difficult are even the essential and elementary questions of Jerusalem topography.

Of the broad natural features that survive, most manifest are the two great valleys which demark the before mentioned tongue of land. The Eastern Valley commences a mile north of the city wall in a shallow depression near the watershed, a little to the N. of the highest point on the Jaffa road. It at first runs S.E., and is shallow and open: it is here known as the *Wady el-Jôz*. It then turns due south, and soon becomes a ravine with steep sides, called by the Moslems the *Wady Sitti Miriam*, and by Christians since the 4th cent. the Valley of Jehoshaphat* [Note: Eusebius, *onomasticon*2, 193, 20] (a name very probably connected originally with the neighbouring village of *Sh’afat*, and corrupted to Jehoshaphat because of [Joe_3:2](#); [Joe_3:12](#)). This ravine, on reaching the northern extremity of the village of Silwan, turns S.W. and joins the Western Valley near the well now called *Bir Eyyûb*. In ancient times this part of the valley with its steep and, in places, precipitous sides, must have formed a most efficient protection to the whole E. and S.E. sides of the city. It is mentioned in the NT as the ‘brook’ (χεῖμαρρος) Kidron ([Joh_18:1](#)). The valley is almost all the year quite dry, but after a sudden heavy storm quite a considerable torrent may pour down its centre. The present writer has traversed the road along the lower parts of the valley immediately after such rain, with the water half-way to his knees.

The Western Valley—known to-day as the *Wady er-Rabâbi*—is shorter and more crooked than that on the East. It commences to the S. of the modern Jaffa road close to the *Birket Mamilla*, its head being now occupied by a large Moslem burying-ground. After running E. towards the Jaffa Gate—near which it has been extensively filled up with rubbish during recent years—it curves south, and some 300 yards down is crossed by the arched, though now half-buried, ‘low-level aqueduct.’ A little further on it is transformed by the erection of a barrier across its breadth into a great pool—the *Birket es-Sultân*. Below the barrier it rapidly deepens and curves S.E., until at *Bir Eyyûb* it joins the Kidron Valley; the new valley formed by their union runs, under the

name of the *Wady en-Nâr* (the Valley of Fire), down to the Dead Sea. The *Wady er-Rabâbi* is very generally considered to be the Valley of Hinnom. Several good authorities are against this identification, but for the present purpose there is no need to enter into this discussion, and here it may be provisionally accepted. Although not so steep a valley as the Eastern one, the *Wady er-Rabâbi* presented a much more effective protection to the walls in ancient days than present conditions suggest. In NT times it must have made attack along the whole W. and S.W. sides almost impracticable. Only to the N. and N.W. was the city without natural defence, and it was from these points that she always proved vulnerable.

The quadrilateral plateau enclosed by these valleys, about half a mile in breadth and some 1000 acres in extent, was subdivided by several shallow natural valleys. Of these the most important, and the only one which to-day is clearly seen, is a valley known as *el-Wad*. This, commencing near the present Damascus Gate, runs S. in a somewhat curved direction, dividing the modern city into two unequal halves, and after passing out near the Dung Gate joins the Kidron Valley at the Pool of Siloam. Although extensively filled up in places, the outline of the valley may still be clearly seen from any high point in the city near the Damascus Gate, and its bed is to-day traversed by one of the two carriage roads in the city. Though crossed near the *Bab es-Silsileh* by an artificial causeway in which was discovered 'Wilson's Arch,' it again appears near the Jews' Wailing-place, much of its bed being even to-day waste ground. At this point the W. hill still preserves something of its precipitous face, * [Note: Robinson, BRP i. 390.] but on its E. side it is largely encroached upon by the S.W. corner of the Haram. This valley is evidently that described as the Tyropœon or Cheesemongers' Valley, and by it the whole natural site of Jerusalem is divided into Western and Eastern hills.

The broader and loftier Western hill is without doubt that called by Josephus the Upper Market-place and the Upper City, and it is the one which since the 4th cent. has been known as **Zion**. Josephus (*BJ* v. iv. 1) mentions that in his day it was called the Citadel of David, and this tradition survives in the name the 'Tower of David,' given to the fortress at the Jaffa Gate. This is not the place to discuss the position of Zion, but it is now fairly generally admitted that the tradition which placed the Citadel of David and Zion on this Western spur was wrong, and that these sites lay on the Eastern hill south of the Temple. Josephus (*BJ* v. iv. 1) describes the Western hill as 'much higher' and 'in length more direct' than the other hill opposite to it. The buildings on it extended southward to the Valley of Hinnom, but to the north it is bounded by a valley which runs eastward from near the modern Jaffa Gate to join the Tyropœon Valley opposite the Western wall of the Temple area. It is to-day largely filled up, but its direction is preserved by David Street. The first wall ran along the S. edge of this valley, and the suburbs which grew up to its north were enclosed by the second wall.

Regarding the Eastern hill, or, rather, regarding the name for part of this Eastern hill, there is much more dispute. Josephus (*BJ* v. iv. 1) wrote of the 'other hill, which was called Akra, and sustains the lower city': it 'is the shape of a moon when she is horned; over against this there was a third hill'—evidently, from the description, that covered by the Temple—'but naturally lower than Akra, and parted formerly from the other by a deep valley.' He narrates how Simon Maccabaeus, after capturing the fortress which stood there, set his followers to work night and day for three years levelling the mountain, so that it should no longer be able to support a fortress which could overlook the Temple. As a result of this work, the valley between this hill and the Temple was filled up. The conclusion is therefore that this hill, which we learn was the 'City of David' at the time of the Maccabees, formed in the days of Josephus one hill with the Temple hill, and further that it was separated from the Western hill, whereon was the Upper City, by the valley which 'extended as far as Siloam.' All this points to the Eastern hill south of the Temple as the site of Akra* [Note: This view was apparently first put forward by Olshausen, and has been recently revived by Benzinger, G. A. Smith, and Sanday.] and of the Lower City. Akra cannot have lain north of the Temple, for here lay the Antonia (*Ant.* xv. xi. 4; *BJ* v. v. 8), the ancient Baris or tower, a fortress distinct from the Akra, indeed largely its successor; and north of this again was Bezetha, the New City.

There is much to confirm this view of the position of the Akra. The Akra was built on the 'City of David,' and this is identical with the Jebusite Zion. On quite other grounds Zion has been placed on this hill by many modern authorities. Then Akra is associated, in the description of the taking of Jerusalem, with 'the fountain,' *i.e.* the Virgin's Fountain, and Siloam (*BJ* v. vi. 1).† [Note: *BJ* v. iv. 1, vi. vi.3, and v. vii. 2.] The appropriateness of the name 'Lower City' for the part of Jerusalem which sloped down south from the Temple is as evident as 'Upper City' is for that which actually overlooked the Temple on the west. If this, the most ancient part of Jerusalem, is not that described by Josephus as Akra and Lower City, what name did it have? It must have contained a very large share of the ordinary dwellings of the people. *Ophlas* (the Ophel of the OT) seems in Josephus' (*BJ* v. iv. 2) time, at any rate, to have been only a particular knoll near the S.E. corner of the Temple.

The topographical difficulties are not insurmountable if the history is borne in mind. It is highly probable that a valley does exist either south of the present Temple area or even on a line between the present Temple platform and the *el-Aksa* mosque. The name may have remained associated with the highest parts of the hill, even though the wall of the Temple at the time of Josephus may have encroached on the hill, and even have covered part of the site of the ancient fortress. The Lower City seems to have extended up the Tyropœon Valley at least to the first wall, and hence the

descent by steps from one of the W. gates of the Temple described by Josephus presents no real difficulty to the view of the position of Akra here maintained.

The older view of Robinson, Warren, Conder, and others, that Akra was the hill now sustaining the *Muristan* and the Church of the Sepulchre, north of the W. branch of the Tyropæon Valley, presents many difficulties. This was the area enclosed by the second wall, and Josephus calls it not the Lower City, but 'the northern quarter of the city.' Then the condition of neither the hill nor the valley tallies with the description of Josephus, and in his day the valley between this and the Temple must have been very much deeper than it is to-day. Josephus is more likely to be wrong in stating that the hill had once been higher than the Temple and was separated from it by a deep valley—a statement which depended on tradition—than in describing the hill as lower in his time and the valley as filled up—facts which he must have seen with his own eyes.

3. Climate and Diseases.—The climate of Jerusalem, while bearing the broad characteristics common to the land, presents in some respects marked features of contrast to that of the Jordan Valley and other low-lying places which were the scenes of the ministry of Jesus. There is every reason for believing that the general climatic features are the same to-day as then. On the whole, Jerusalem must be considered healthy, and what disease there is, is largely due to preventable causes. The marked changes of season, the clear pure atmosphere, with frequent winds, and the cool nights even in midsummer, combine to give Jerusalem a climate superior to the lower parts of Palestine. In winter the cold is considerable but never extreme, the lowest temperature recorded in 20 years being only 25° F. As a rule, a frost occurs on some half a dozen nights in each year. January, February, and December are, in this order, the three coldest and wettest months, though the minimum temperature has occurred several times in March, and a night temperature as low as 40° at the end of May (cf. Joh. 18:18). Snow falls heavily at times, but only in exceptionally severe winters. The average rainfall is about 26 inches, a lower mean than at Hebron, but higher than in the plains and the Jordan Valley. The maximum fall recorded (1847) was 41.62 inches, the minimum (1870) was 13.39. So low a fall as this, especially if preceded by a scanty fall, means considerable distress in the succeeding dry season. During the summer no rain falls, and the mean temperature steadily rises till August, when it reaches 73.6, though the days of maximum heat (near or even over 100°) are often in September. It is not, however, the seasons of extreme heat or cold that are most trying to the health, but the intermediate spring and autumn, especially the months of May and October. This is largely due to the winds. Of all the winds the most characteristic is the S.E.—the sirocco—which in midwinter blows piercingly cold, and in the spring and autumn (but not at all in the summer) hot, stifling, and often laden with fine dust from the deserts whence it comes. On such days all Nature suffers, the vegetation droops, and man not only feels debilitated and depressed, but is actually

more liable to illness, especially 'fever' and ophthalmia. The N.W. is the cold refreshing wind which, almost every summer afternoon and evening, mitigates the heat. The S.W. wind blows moist off the sea, and in the later summer brings the welcome copious clouds and, in consequence, the refreshing 'dews.' In the early mornings of September and October thick mists often fill the valleys till dispersed by the rising sun. The onset of the rains, in late October, is not uncommonly signaled by heavy thunderstorms and sudden downpours of rain, which fill with raging and destructive floods the valleys still parched by seven months' drought. As much as 4 inches of rain has fallen in one day.

The diseases of Jerusalem are preventable to a large extent under proper sanitary conditions. Malarial fevers, ophthalmia, and smallpox (in epidemics) are the greatest scourges. Enteric fever, typhus, measles, scarlet fever, and cholera (rarely) occur in epidemics. Tubercular diseases, rheumatism, erysipelas, intestinal worms, and various skin diseases are all common.

4. Water supply.—The water supply of Jerusalem has in all its history been of such importance and, on account of the altitude of the city, has involved so many elaborate works, which remain to-day as archaeological problems, that it will be well to consider it separately. The city never appears to have seriously suffered from want of water in sieges, but probably at no period was Jerusalem more lavishly supplied with water than it was during the Roman predominance, and most of the arrangements were complete before the time of Christ.

Of springs we know of only one to-day, and there is no reason to believe there were ever any more. This spring is that known to the Christians as '*Ain Sitti Miriam*—the spring of the Lady Mary—or the Virgin's Fountain (from a tradition that the Virgin washed the clothes of the infant Jesus there), to the Moslem fellahin as '*Ain umm ed-deraj*—'the spring of the mother of the steps,' and to the eastern Jews as 'Aaron's (or "the priests") bath.' The water arises in a small cave reached by 30 steps, some 25 feet underground, in the Kidron Valley, due south of the Temple area. Though to-day lying so deep, there are ample evidences that originally the mouth of the cave opened out on the side of the valley, and that the water flowed out thence. It has become buried through the accumulated debris in the valley bed. At the back of the cave—some 30 feet from the entrance—is a tunnel mouth, the beginning of the famous Siloam aqueduct (see Siloam). The flow is intermittent, about two or three times a day on an average. This fact is recorded by Jerome, and is by many authorities considered a reason for locating here the Pool of Bethesda (see Bethesda). The water is brackish to the taste, and chemical examination shows that, to-day at any rate, it is contaminated with sewage. It is undoubtedly unfit for drinking purposes: it is used chiefly by the people of the village of *Silwan*, especially at the Siloam-pool end of the aqueduct, for watering their gardens.

Further down the valley, at its junction with the Valley of Hinnom, there is a well, 125 feet deep, known as *Bir Eyyûb*, or Job's Well. This, though rediscovered by the Crusaders, is almost certainly ancient and may have been the En-rogel of the OT. From here great quantities of water are drawn all the year round, much of which is carried in skins and sold in Jerusalem, but it is in no way of better quality than that from the Virgin's Fountain. After a spell of heavy rain the water rises up like a genuine spring, and overflowing underground a little below the actual well mouth, it bursts forth in a little stream and runs down the *Wady en-Nâr*. Such an outflow may last several days, and is a great source of attraction to the people of Jerusalem, who, on the cessation of the rain, hasten out to sit by the 'flowing Kidron' and refresh themselves beside its running waters. During the unusually heavy rains of the winter 1904-5 the 'Kidron' ran thus four times. A little farther down the valley there occurs, at the same time and under the same circumstances, another apparent 'spring'—the '*Ain el-Lôz*'—due to the water of *Bir Eyyûb* finding its way along an ancient rock-cut aqueduct and bursting up through the ground where the conduit is blocked.

The *Hammâm esh-Shefa* (bath of healing) under the W. wall of the *Haram* area has by many been considered an ancient spring. To-day the water collects in an extensive underground rocky chamber at the bottom of a well 86 feet deep. Quite possibly before the area to the north was so thickly inhabited, when, for example, this well was outside the walls, a certain amount of good water may have been obtainable here, but now what collects is a foul and smelling liquid which percolates to the valley bottom from the neighbouring inhabited area, and it is unfit for even its present use—in a Turkish bath.

More important than springs or wells are the innumerable cisterns with which, from the earliest times, the hill of Jerusalem has been honeycombed. It has already been pointed out that the rainfall of this region is considerable, and rain-water collected on a clean roof and stored in a well-kept cistern is good for all domestic purposes. There are private cisterns under practically every house, but there are in addition a number of larger reservoirs for public use. In the *Haram*—the ancient Temple area—there are 37 known excavations, of which one, the 'great sea,' it is calculated, can hold about 2,000,000 gallons.

In other parts the more important cisterns are—the *Birket Mamilla*, *Hammâm el-Batrak*, *Birket Israël*, *Birket es-Sultân*, 'The Twin Pools,' the so-called 'Pool of Bethesda,' and the two Siloam pools—*Birket Silwan* and *Birket el-Hamra*. The last three are dealt with in the special articles Bethesda and Siloam respectively. The *Birket es-Sultân*, the misnamed 'Lower Pool of Gihon' in the Valley of Hinnom, was probably first constructed by German knights in the 12th cent., and was repaired by the Sultan Suleiman ibn Selîm in the 16th cent., while the Twin Pools near the 'Sisters of Zion' were made in the moat of the Antonia fortress after the destruction of the

city in a.d. 70; so neither of these needs description here. The other three require longer notice. The *Birket Mamilla*, incorrectly called the 'Upper Pool of Gihon,' lies at the head of the Valley of Hinnom, about 700 yards W. N. W. of the Jaffa Gate, and used to collect all the surface water from the higher ground around; in recent years the Moslem cemetery in which it lies has been surrounded by a wall, which has largely cut off the supplies. After a spell of heavy rain it often used to fill to overflowing. It is 97 yards long, 64 yards wide, and 19 feet deep. It appears to be 'the Serpents' Pool' of Josephus (*BJ* v. iii. 2). The outlet on the E. side leads to a conduit which enters the city near the Jaffa Gate and empties itself into the great rock-cut pool—*Birket Hammâm el-Batrak* (the pool or bath of the Patriarch), commonly known as the Pool of Hezekiah. The pool, 80 yards long by 48 yards wide, is largely rock-cut, and lies across the W. arm of the Tyropœon Valley; there are indications that it extended at one time further north than it does at present. Josephus apparently refers to this as the Pool Amygdalon (κολυμβήθρα Ἀμύγδαλον), a name perhaps derived from *Berekat ha-migdalim* (Pool of the Towers) on account of the near proximity of some of the great fortresses on the neighbouring walls. As the pool is not mentioned in Josephus until after the second wall had been captured, it may be presumed that it was within that wall (*BJ* v. xi. 4).

The *Birket Israël* is built across the width of a natural valley which runs from N.W. to S.E., and passes under the N.E. course of the Haram at this point. It is supposed by some authorities that the pool itself did not exist at the period of Christ's ministry, but as a defence to the Temple enclosure and to the neighbouring Castle of Antonia (wh. see) it may well have been the Pool Struthius mentioned by Josephus (*ib.*). He says the fifth legion raised a bank at the tower of Antonia 'over against the middle of the pool that is called Struthius.' It must, however, be stated that M. Ganneau and others propose to identify the 'Twin Pools' with Struthius.

Constructed for Jerusalem, though seven miles from the city, are the three great reservoirs known as 'Solomon's Pools,' or *el-Buruk*. They lie one below the other down a valley; their floors are made of the valley bed, deepened in places, and they are naturally deepest at their lower or eastern ends; they increase in size from above downward. The largest and lowest is nearly 200 yards long, 60 yards wide, and 50 feet deep. To-day they are useless, but when kept in repair and clean were no doubt valuable as storeplaces of surplus supplies of surface water from the surrounding hills and of water from the springs. Regarding the question when these pools were made there are most contrary opinions. It is highly improbable that they go back anything like as far as Solomon's time, and the association of his name with any great and wise work is so common in the East that the name 'Solomon's Pools' means nothing. On the whole, it is likely the work was not later than Roman times.

The system of aqueducts which centre round these pools has a special interest. Two were constructed to carry water from the four springs in the Valley of the pools to Jerusalem, and two others to supplement this supply. The first two are the well-known high- and low-level aqueducts. The former appears to have reached the city somewhere about the level of the Jaffa Gate, and may also have supplied the *Birket Mamilla*. It is specially remarkable for the way it crossed a valley on the Bethlehem road by means of an inverted syphon. Large fragments of this great stone tube have been found, and from inscriptions carved on the limestone blocks the date of its construction or repair must have been in Roman times and, according to some authorities, as late as about a.d. 195. Unless, however, the account given of the royal palace gardens of Herod is greatly exaggerated, the aqueduct must have been in use in Herod's days, as it is the only conduit by which *running* water could have reached the city at a level high enough to have supplied these gardens. The low-level aqueduct, still in use along a good part of its course, may easily be followed to-day along its whole length of 11½ miles. It brought water from the springs into the Temple area. It is very probably the source of the 'spring' which is said by Tacitus (*Hist.* v. 2) to have run perpetually in the Temple. Of the two supplementary aqueducts, one, of exactly the same construction as the last mentioned, brought water from the copious springs at *Wady Arrûb*—two-thirds of the way from Jerusalem to Hebron—along an extraordinarily winding conduit 28 miles long. The other, built on an altogether different principle, is a four-mile channel which gathers water from a long chain of wells in the *Wady Biâr* on the plan of a Persian *kharîz*, such as is extensively used in Northern Syria. This, pronounced by Sir C. Wilson 'one of the most remarkable works in Palestine,' is probably comparatively late. It seems to have been used to supplement the water of the springs in the Valley of the Pools.

The special interest of the great 'low-level aqueduct' described above, with its total length of 40 miles, lies in the historical fact that it, or some part of it, was one of the causes of the recall of Pontius Pilate. 'Pilate (*Ant.* xviii. iii. 2) undertook to bring a current of water to Jerusalem, and did it with the sacred money, and derived the origin of the stream from the distance of two hundred furlongs.' A riot took place, and a 'great number' of people were slain. This may be the incident referred to in Luk 13:1 f. Josephus is correct in saying that Pilate was bringing water a distance of 200 stadia (= 26 miles), then this must apply to the extension of the aqueduct to *Wady Arrûb*. In any case, it is highly improbable that his was the initiation of the whole work. The very absence of inscriptions and of contemporary references makes it probable that the conduit was at least older than Roman times. If we allow that the high-level aqueduct goes back to the days of Herod the Great, then the low-level aqueduct may well go back some centuries earlier.

5. Topography of the City in the time of Christ

The city walls.—At the time of Christ, Jerusalem had two walls which had been restored by order of Julius Caesar (*Ant.* xiv. x. 5). In a.d. 43, Agrippa i. commenced a third one of great magnificence, which, however, seems never to have been properly finished.

(a) The *first wall* had 60 towers; it encompassed the ancient and most important secular buildings of the city. Though some minor details are yet unknown, its general course is perfectly clear. The tower Hippicus, at which it arose—one of those magnificent towers built by Herod—was situated close to the present so-called ‘Tower of David,’ in which indeed its remains may even be incorporated. From here it ran along the S. edge of the W. arm of the Tyropœon Valley. It then passed the Xystus, joined on to the Council House near the present *Mehkemeh* or Town Hall, and ended at the Western Cloister. It probably crossed the Tyropœon Valley, where to-day there is the causeway leading to the *Bab es-Silsileh* of the *Haram*. The western wall commenced at the tower Hippicus, and probably followed the line of the present western wall to the great corner tower, the rocky foundations of which are now included in the C.M.S. Boys’ School. Somewhere near this part of its course it passed ‘a place called Bethso’—unidentified; it then bent S.E. ‘to the gate of the Essenes, and went thence southward along the steep edge of the Valley of Hinnom down to the Pool of Siloam.’ It had ‘its bending above the fountain Siloam,’ which probably implies that it surrounded the pool on the W., N., and E., but did not enclose it, as a wall at another period undoubtedly did. It then ran on the edge of the steep rocks above the Virgin’s Fountain—called, apparently, by Josephus ‘Solomon’s Pool’—and thence to ‘a certain place which they called Ophlas, where it joined to the eastern cloister of the Temple’ (*BJ* v. iv. 2).

Extensive remains of this wall have been traced. Those of the great tower at the S.W. corner were examined by Maudslay in 1874. He found the base of a tower 20 feet high hewn out of the native rock. It was nearly square, and projected 45 feet from the scarp to which it was attached—altogether a great work, and at a point which must have always been specially well fortified.* [Note: PEFSt, 1875, p. 83.] A little to the east is another great scarp, and here Bliss† [Note: Sec ‘Excavations at Jerusalem, 1894-97,’ Bliss and Dickie, PEFSt.] began to trace out the buried remains of the south wall. He found near the commencement of his excavations a gate which may very probably be the Gate of the Essenes. In tracing the wall towards Siloam, foundations belonging to two distinct periods were excavated. Bliss considered that the higher of these belonged to the wall of the period between Herod and Titus. A little to the W. of Siloam he found the remains of a fine gateway showing three periods of use—the sill lying at different heights in each period—and a fine rock-cut

underground drain, almost certainly Roman work, which he traced for a great distance up the W. side of the Tyropœon Valley, where it came to lie under a paved street ascending the valley in the direction of the Temple. After leaving the before-mentioned gate, there were indications—not, it must be admitted, decisive—that the wall at one period surrounded the pool on three sides, as Josephus apparently describes, while at another period it crossed the mouth of the Tyropœon Valley on an elaborate dam. To the east of the pool the rock scarp is exposed, and almost every trace of the wall has been removed. As regards the E. section of this southern wall, Sir Charles Warren in 1875 traced the buried remains of a wall 14½ feet thick and, in places, 70 feet high from the S.E. corner of the Temple southwards for 90 feet, and then S.W. for 700 feet. Two hundred feet from the end he unearthed the remains of a massive tower standing to the height of 66 feet and founded upon rock. The wall itself had been built, not on rock, but on virgin soil. The course of the wall, as described by Josephus, thus appears to be very fully verified by modern discoveries.

(b) With regard to the *second wall* a great deal of uncertainty prevails. There are few more hotly disputed problems in Jerusalem topography. This second wall appears to have been on the line of that made by the later kings of Judah, to have been repaired by Nehemiah, and used by the Hasmonæans. It is dismissed by Josephus (*BJ* v. iv. 2) in a very few words; it ‘took its beginning from that gate which they call Gennath, which belonged to the first wall; it only encompassed the northern quarter of the city and reached as far as the tower of Antonia.’ It had 40 towers on it. No remains of the gate Gennath have been found, but the configuration of the ground makes it improbable that the wall could have taken its rise very far to the E. of the present Jaffa Gate, as here there exists a narrow neck of high ground, but a little to the E. the level abruptly descends into the W. arm of the Tyropœon. In 1886 some 30 yards of the remains of what seemed a city wall were discovered 15 feet below the street, where the foundations of the Grand New Hotel were dug. They were supposed by Messrs. Merrill and Schick to be part of the second wall at its W. end, but too short a piece was examined to allow of positive conclusions. The other supposed traces of the second wall are even more ambiguous. In the N. part of the *Muristan*, where to-day stands the German church, Schick found remains of which he said, ‘I am convinced that these are traces of the second wall’: these would fall in line with a wall 10 or 12 feet thick, which, according to Robinson (*BRP* [Note: *RP* Biblical Researches in Palestine.] i. 408), was found N. of the Pool of Hezekiah, when the foundations of the Coptic Convent were laid. Again, just to the N. of the German church and E. of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre were found extensive ruined walls, which are to-day treasured by the Russian ecclesiastical authorities as sure evidences that the site of the traditional Holy Sepulchre was outside the ancient walls. It is, however, much

more probable that these remains, which are quite unlike city walls, are really fragments of Constantine's Great Basilica.

The question is thus quite an open one, but the argument that the second wall *cannot*, on military grounds, have followed a course S. of the site of the Sepulchre is an unsafe one. As Sir C. Wilson* [Note: PEFSt 16903, p. 247 footnote.] points out: 'There are several Greek towns in Asia Minor where the city walls or parts of them are quite as badly traced according to modern ideas. In ancient towns the Acropolis was the principal defence, the city wall was often weak.' It may indeed be suggested that this very weakness made Agrippa undertake his new wall along a better line for defence.

(c) The whole question of the second wall depends largely on what view is taken of the course of the *third wall* constructed by Agrippa i. The most widely accepted opinion to-day is that this followed much the same course as the present N. wall. It was begun upon the most elaborate plan, but was never apparently finished on the scale designed, because Agrippa feared Claudius Caesar, 'lest he should suspect that so strong a wall was built in order to make some innovation in public affairs' (*BJ* v. iv. 2). It was, however, at the time of the siege, over 18 feet wide and 40 feet high, with 90 massive towers. It began at the tower Hippicus, and had its N.W. corner at a great octagonal tower, called Psephinus, 135 feet high and overlooking the whole city.† [Note: It does not appear whether this tower was one of Herod's constructions or of later date, but the latter now seems the more probable.] From here was an extensive view of Arabia, *i.e.* the Land of Moab, at sunrise, 'as well as of the utmost limits of the Hebrew possessions at the sea westwards' (*BJ* v. iv. 3). The foundations of this tower are supposed to survive to-day just inside the N.W. angle of the modern city, under the name *Kalât el-Jalud*, or Goliath's Castle. From this corner the wall 'extended till it came over against the monuments of Helena, queen of Adiabene, the daughter of Izates' (*BJ* v. iv. 2). This, however, must be read in the light of the statement of Josephus in another place (*Ant.* xx. iv. 3) that this tomb is 'distant no more than three furlongs from the city of Jerusalem.' The so-called 'Tombs of the Kings' are now very generally identified as the very notable tomb of Queen Helena, and, that being so, the distance given, 3 stadia or furlongs (700 yards), is a fair description of the distance of this monument from the present north wall near the Damascus Gate. He next states that 'it extended further to a great length, and passed by the sepulchral caverns of the kings'—these last may very well be the extensive caves known as 'Solomon's Quarries.' The wall 'bent again at the tower of the corner,' which then may have been where the present Stork Tower at the N.E. corner of the city is, 'at the monument which is called the monument of the fuller'—probably destroyed—'and joined the old wall at the valley called the Valley of the Kidron.' This was probably near the present St. Stephen's Gate. The exact course

at the N.E. corner is very doubtful; it is quite possible that it turned S.E. near 'Herod's Gate.' It will be observed that the description fits in very well with the course followed by the existing N. wall. At the Damascus Gate there are unmistakable evidences that a gate at least as ancient as Roman times stood there. The supporters of the view that the second wall ran here lay stress on certain supposed remains of the third wall further north. A candid examination of such of these as survive, and of the accounts, both verbally and in publications, of those that have been removed, does not seem very convincing. One of the best marked pieces, forming the side of a cistern near Helena's Tomb, proved on recent examination to be but a piece of smooth scarp facing towards the city, and not remains of a building at all.

As is clear from the history of the taking of the city, there was another wall, no doubt greatly inferior in strength to those before mentioned, which ran along the western side of the Tyropœon, bounding in that direction the 'Upper City' (Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 11), and it is probable that some kind of wall, though doubtless only a temporary one, ran along the opposite or eastern side of the valley.

Towers.—Of the great towers the three erected by Herod the Great yet remain to be described. Josephus, in his usual exaggerated manner, says they 'were for largeness, beauty, and strength beyond all that were in the habitable earth' (*BJ* v. iv. 3). They were dedicated to Herod's friend Hippius, his brother Phasaël, and his wife Mariamne, whom he had murdered. Each of these towers was of solid masonry at the base. The base of Hippius was about 44 feet square and 50 high, over which was a reservoir and several rooms, and, surmounting all, battlements with turrets: the total height was 140 feet. The second tower, Phasaël, was 70 feet square at the base and nearly 160 feet high, and, it is said, 'wanted nothing that might make it appear to be a royal palace.' The Mariamne tower was smaller and less lofty, but 'its upper buildings were more magnificent.' As to the position of these towers, the present 'Tower of David' is generally considered to contain the remains of Phasaël, with various Crusading and Saracenic additions. Hippius must have been near this spot, perhaps where the Jaffa Gate now stands, and Mariamne probably a little more to the east on higher ground. The three are all described as being 'on the north side of the wall,' and from a distance they all appeared to be of the same height. The N.W. corner of the city, where they stood, was one without much natural defence, and they bore the same important relation to the King's Palace as the other fortress, the Antonia, did to the Temple.

Of the other great architectural works of the period we have but scanty description and still scantier remains, with the exception, of course, of the Temple, for which see art. Temple.

Herod's great *palace*, built on the site of the palace of the Hasmonaeans (*Ant.* xx. viii. 11), evidently adjoined the before-mentioned towers on the south, and occupied an area of land now covered by the English church and schools and the Armenian quarter, probably extending also to the Patriarch's house and gardens—the greater part, indeed, of the area between the present David Street (along the line of which the first wall ran) to the N. and the modern city walls as far east as the Zion Gate to the south, it is quite possible that the present course of the southern wall was determined by the remains of the S. wall of this palace. From the walls an extensive view could be seen, and at a later time Agrippa II. gave great offence when he added a lofty dining-room from which he could watch all the doings in the Temple. To frustrate this, the Jews raised a wall upon the 'uppermost building which belonged to the inner court of the Temple towards the west.' This gave annoyance not only to Agrippa but also to Festus, who ordered it to be removed. On appeal, however, Nero gave his verdict in favour of the Jews. The palace had walls, in parts over 50 feet high, with many towers, and was internally fitted with great luxury. Around it were numerous porticos, with 'curious pillars' buried among groves of trees, and gardens well irrigated and 'filled with brazen statues through which the water ran out.'

Between the palace grounds and the Temple lay the *Xystus*, a gymnasium surrounded with columns, for Greek games. Connecting the W. wall of the Temple with the W. hill and the 'Upper City,' was a *bridge* which had been broken down when Pompey (*Ant.* xiv. iv. 4; *BJ* i. vii. 2) besieged the Temple in b.c. 65, but had been repaired. The projecting arch of this bridge was first recognized by Robinson, and the *PEF* [Note: EF Palestine Exploration Fund.] excavations not only uncovered the central pier, but beneath the early Roman pavement found an old voussoir of the earlier bridge of Pompey's time, which had fallen through into an ancient drain below the street. No remains of this bridge have, however, so far been recovered further to the west.

The *hippodrome* apparently lay somewhat to the south, on the borders, perhaps, of the Tyropœon Valley near the present Dung Gate; this was very probably the 'place of exercise' of 2Ma_4:12 (cf. 1Ma_1:15), and the description 'under the very castle' would well suit this place if Akra was where it is here proposed to locate it. Of the position of Herod's *theatre* nothing at all is known.

Next to the Temple, perhaps the most famous building in Jerusalem was **Antonia**, the great fortress of the Temple, and the acropolis of the city, which from its lofty height is described by Tacitus (*Hist.* v. 11) as pre-eminently conspicuous. It had received the name *Antonia* from Herod after Mark Antony, but it had in Hasmonaeon times been known as *Baris*. Nehemiah (Neh_2:8 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) mentions a castle (*birah*) as being here—to the north of the Temple: this the high priest Hyrcanus (*BJ* i. vi. 1) made his headquarters. It is interesting that at least a portion of the site

with so great a reputation as a military stronghold should even to-day be occupied by troops—the Turkish garrison. A great rock scarp on which part of the ancient fortress stood is still clearly visible from the Haram, and in the moat cut to protect its northern aspect lie the ‘Twin Pools.’ The fortress lay at the N.W. corner of the Temple enclosure, and is described by Josephus as being built on a rock over 87 feet high, ‘on a great precipice’; the rock was covered with smooth stones, and upon the rocky platform was a building 70 feet high fitted up with great magnificence. At the four corners were towers 87 feet high, except that at the S.E. corner, which was over 120 feet high; from it the whole Temple was overlooked, but a considerable space separated it from the Temple itself (*BJ* vi. ii. 5-7). At the W. corner there were passages into the W. and the N. cloisters by which the Temple guards could obtain access to the Temple. The Western boundary was probably on the line of the present W. wall of the Haram, and the moat (*BJ* v. iv. 2) to the N. appears to have been demonstrated, but the S. and E. boundaries are unknown. The total area must have been large, as it held a whole Roman legion, and it is clear from history that it was a powerful fortress. Even before its extension by Herod, Antigonus could not capture it until after the city and the Temple had been taken by storm, and in a.d. 70 the capture of Antonia is recorded as one of the fiercest of the fights of the siege (*BJ* vi. i. and ii.). It is commonly believed that the *Prætorium* ([Mar_15:16](#) ff.) was in part of Antonia, for there undoubtedly was the Roman garrison ([Act_21:34](#)). See *Praetorium*.

Near the W. wall of the Temple where is now the Turkish Town Hall (*el-Mehkemeh*) was the *Town Council House*. Possibly it was here the high priest held his court.

The palaces of Monobazus, king of Adiabene, and of his mother Queen Helena appear to have been on the southern slopes of the Eastern hill, the former probably due east of the Pool of Siloam.

Of the great number of tombs around Jerusalem the majority of the most conspicuous and notable belong to a later period than Christ’s life. The monuments of Queen Helena, known as the ‘Tombs of the Kings,’ and probably almost all the tombs in the valley in which the ‘Tombs of the Judges’ are situated, are of a date very soon after Christ’s death. The same is probably true of the famous group of tombs near the S.E. corner of the Temple, the so-called ‘Pillar of Absalom,’ the ‘Tomb of Jehoshaphat,’ the ‘Grotto of St. James,’ and the ‘Pyramid of Zacharias.’ It is very tempting to connect these highly ornamented tomb structures with the words of Jesus ([Mat_23:27](#); [Mat_23:35](#)), spoken as they probably were almost within sight of this spot. If so, the indications of work of a later period may be additions to earlier constructions of the Herodian era. The so-called Tombs of Joseph of Arimathaea and of Nicodemus, to the W. of the shrine of the Holy Sepulchre, though only by a late tradition associated with these NT characters, are undoubtedly old tombs, probably much before Christ’s time. The traditional tomb of Christ has been treated in a separate article. See *Golgotha*.

A general view of the city in the time of Christ from such a height as Olivet must have been an impressive sight. In the foreground lay the great Temple in a grandeur and beauty greater than it had ever had in all its long history, its courts all day crowded with throngs of worshippers from every corner of the known world. To the north of this, Antonia, with its four massive towers, stood sentinel over the city and the Temple. Behind these lay the Upper City crowned by the magnificent palace-fortress of Herod, with its great groves of trees and well-watered gardens. To the right of this lay the great towers Hippicus, Phasael, and Mariamne. Then between these buildings and the Temple lay the central valley with the Xystus and its many columns, the lofty bridge, and, a little to the south, the great Hippodrome. Then somewhere among the houses, which rose tier above tier from the valley, very probably in that part of the city which is described by Josephus (*Ant.* xv. viii. 1) as like an amphitheatre itself, lay the theatre of Herod, doubtless facing the distant mountains of Moab. Then southward, covering both the hills as they descended into the deep valleys towards Siloam, were the thick built houses of the common folk, with other palaces such as those of Monobazus and Helena rising like islands from among them. Enclosing all were the mighty walls of the Temple and of the city—these latter alone with a hundred towers—rising up, in many places precipitously, from deep valleys, suggestive at once of strength and security. To the north lay the New City, yet unwalled, where, doubtless, countless villas rose amid the fresh greenness of gardens and trees.

‘The devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them’ (Mat_4:8). Did they not all lie beneath the gaze of the Man of Galilee if He were brought from the neighbouring wilderness into the blaze of material glory—Greek, Roman, and Hebrew—spread out beneath Him in the Holy City?

The city over which the Son of Man wept (Luk_19:41) must have been a city representing, in small area, more extravagant display, more intense contrasts of materialism and religious zeal, of Rome’s iron discipline and seething rebellion, of the East and the West, and more seeds of that fanatic hatred that spells murder than the world has ever seen. Elements were here gathered that made the city a miniature of the whole world, of a world, too, hastening to destruction.

The total *population* of the city cannot have been large, and the numbers given by Josephus (*BJ* ii. xiv. 2, v. vi. 1, vi. ix. 3) and Tacitus (*Hist.* v. 13) are manifestly exaggerated. The present permanent population of modern Jerusalem, which covers a considerably larger area than the city in the time of Christ, is about 65,000. However closely the people were packed in the ancient city, it is hardly possible that there could have been so many as this, and many put the estimate at one-half this number. At the time of the Passover, when numbers were camped on the Mount of Olives and

at other spots around, it is possible to believe that the population may have been considerably higher than that of to-day.

6. History of Jerusalem during the period of the Gospels.—For a few short years before the birth of Jesus, Jerusalem enjoyed a time of extraordinary material prosperity, during which the great architectural works of Herod the Great were completed. It is evident, as has often been the case in the East, that this work was carried out only by means of great oppression, so that the king, while he left behind him vast monuments in stone, left also a memory execrated in the hearts of the common people. Some twenty years before the birth of Jesus the magnificent palace of Herod was finished;* [Note: Palace built b.c. 24; Temple restored b.c. 19-11.] the three great towers, the theatre, the Xystus, and the Hippodrome (these last two adorned, if not initiated, by Herod) were completed early in his reign. Several years (b.c. 19-11) were also spent in adorning and extending the Temple, a work which was being continued during the life of Christ (Joh 2:20). At this time the Temple must have attained a grandeur and beauty exceeding all previous eras. Yet the declining days of Herod the Great found the city seething with rebellion, which, just before his death, found vent in the public destruction of the golden eagle (*BJ* i. xxxiii.) which he had erected over the gate of the Temple. In revenge for this forty persons were burnt alive, and others were executed in less terrible ways. When the king considered that his last hour was imminent, he shut into the Hippodrome the most illustrious of the Jews, with orders that they should be executed when he died, so that the city might on his death be filled with mourning, even if not for him.

Herod's death in b.c. 4, the year of the Nativity, let loose on all sides the disorderly elements. Archelaus, the heir by Herod's will, advertised his accession by ascending a golden throne in the Temple on a 'high elevation made for him,' and hastened to ingratiate himself by promising all kinds of good things to the expectant and worshipping crowds. He was, however, unable to satisfy the excessive and exacting demands of the unruly crowds, who had been deeply stirred by the heavy punishment meted out by Herod in the affair of the golden eagle, and at the approach of the Passover a riot followed which ended in the massacre of three thousand Jews—mainly visitors to the feast, who were encamped in tents outside the Temple. Archelaus forthwith hastened to Rome to have his appointment confirmed, leaving the city in utter confusion. As soon as he had taken ship, Sabinus, the Roman procurator, hastened to the city, seized and garrisoned the king's palace and all the fortified posts of which he could get possession, and laid hands on all the treasures he could find. He endeavoured to assert his authority with a view to opposing the absent Archelaus, for he at the same time sent to Rome a letter accusing him to Caesar. At the succeeding feast of Pentecost the crowds of Galilaeans, Idumaeans, and trans-Jordan Jews, with recruits from the more unrestrained elements from Jerusalem, rose in open rebellion, and commenced to besiege Sabinus in the palace.

One party assembled along the whole Wt wall of the Temple to attack from the east, another towards the south at the Hippodrome, and a third to the west—apparently outside the W. walls of the city. Sabinus, who seems to have been an arrant coward, sent an appeal for help to Varus, the governor of Syria, who was then in Antioch, and shut himself up in the tower Phasaël. From there he signalled to the troops to fall upon the people. A terrible fight ensued, at first in the city itself and then in the Tyropœon Valley, from which the Roman soldiers shot up at the rioters assembled in the Temple cloisters. Finding themselves at great disadvantage from their position in the valley, the soldiers in desperation set lire to the cloisters, and their Jewish opponents, crowded within and upon the roof, were either burnt to death or were slaughtered in attempting to escape. Some of the soldiers pursuing their victims through the flames burst into the Temple precincts and seized the sacred treasures; of these Sabinus is stated to have received 400 talents for himself. Upon this, other parties of Jews, exasperated by these affairs, made a counter attack upon the palace and threatened to set it on fire. They first offered a free pass to all who would come out peaceably, whereupon many of Herod's soldiers came out and joined the Jews; but Rufus and Gratus with a band of horsemen went over to the Romans with three thousand soldiers. Sabinus continued to be besieged in the palace, the walls of which the Jews commenced to undermine, until Varus arrived, after which he slunk away to the seacoast. The Jerusalem Jews excused themselves to the governor by laying all the blame on their fellow-countrymen from other parts. Varus suppressed the rebellion with ruthless firmness, crucifying two thousand Jews; and then, leaving a legion in the city to maintain order, he returned to Antioch. Archelaus returned some months later as ethnarch, and ruled for ten years, until, being accused to Caesar of oppression, he was banished to Vienne.

During the rule of Coponius (6-10), the procurator who succeeded, another Passover disturbance occurred. This was due to the extraordinary and defiant conduct of a party of Samaritans, who threw some dead bodies into the cloisters of the Temple just after midnight,—a step which must, without doubt, have deepened the smouldering hatred between Jews and Samaritans (Joh 4:9). Marcus Ambivius (11-12) and Annius Rufus (13) after short and uneventful terms of office were succeeded by Valerius Gratus (14-25), whose eleven years were marked only by the many changes he made in the high priesthood. His successor, Pontius Pilate (26-37), left the stamp of his character on secular history by making a great show of authority, in constituting Jerusalem the military headquarters, and introducing Caesar's effigies into the city, but entirely reversing this policy when it was vigorously opposed by the more fanatic elements of the Jews. On this occasion a great gathering of Jews assembled in, apparently, the Xystus (ἐν τῷ μεγάλῳ σταδίῳ), and preferred to bare their necks to Pilate's soldiers to withdrawing their demands (*Ant.* xviii. iii. 1). Mention has already been made of the 'current of water' Pilate brought to Jerusalem, and the riot which

followed because he used for the work 'sacred money' of the Temple. When persuasions had failed to quell the tumult, Pilate gave a signal to the soldiers, whom he had distributed in disguise through the crowd, and many were killed and wounded (*Ant.* xviii. iii. 2).

The whole secular history as given by Josephus shows in what an excitable and unstable condition the Jews were, specially at the time of the feasts, when the city was filled by outsiders. In such a city it is not wonderful that twice (Joh 8:59; Joh 10:31) Jesus was threatened with stoning: The histories of past Passovers in the Holy City may have made Pilate acutely anxious as to whether the commotion connected with the arrest of Jesus was tending; the leaders of the Jews, on the other hand, had doubtless learnt by their victory in the matter of Caesar's effigies to anticipate that, if they blustered and threatened enough, Pilate was unlikely finally to withstand their demands.

7. Jerusalem in the Gospels.—The earliest Gospel incident connected with the city is the foretelling to Zacharias in the Temple of the birth of John the Baptist (Luk 1:5-23); the second, the arrival of the Magi to inquire in the city where the 'king of the Jews' was born (Mat 2:1-10). Shortly after this occur the purification of the Virgin Mary and the presentation of Jesus in the Temple (Luk 2:22-39); and some twelve years later the first (?) Passover of Jesus in the Holy City and the incident of His staying behind to discuss with the doctors in the Temple (Luk 2:41-49). After this, with the exception of one brief scene in the Temptation (Mat 4:5), the Synoptics are silent regarding any events in the city until the last week of His life. It is clear that Jesus rather avoided the city, and that the city was hostile to Him. It was Jerusalem as the centre of Jewish religious life which alone drew Jesus there; almost exclusively His being there was connected with attendance at a feast; and, with the single exception of the incident at the Pool of Bethesda, all His doings were, till the last week, in the courts of the Temple. In the Fourth Gospel there is mention of a Passover at which Jesus cleansed the Temple, and later had His discourse with Nicodemus (Joh 2:13; Joh 3:1-21). Then a year and a half after, while He was attending the Feast of Tabernacles, occurred the incidents of the adulteress and the blind man (Joh 7:2; Joh 8:3 ff; Joh 9:1 ff.), ending in an attempt to arrest Him and a threatened stoning. A little later in the year, at the Feast of Dedication, He appeared in the Temple and was again threatened with stoning (Joh 10:22-39). After the raising of Lazarus at Bethany, Jesus deliberately avoided entering the city, but shortly afterwards He determinately turned His face towards it, with the consciousness that suffering and death inevitably awaited Him there (Mar 10:32-34).

When at last the step of return to the metropolis had been taken and the triumphal entry into the city (Mat 21:1-11, Mar 11:1-10, Luk 19:29-44, Joh 12:12-19) and the second cleansing of the Temple (Mat 21:12-16, Mar 11:11, Luk 19:45-46) had

occurred, Jesus seems to have gladly withdrawn Himself night after night from the turmoil of the city to the quiet of the village life of Bethany, out of sight of the sad and tragic city over which He could but weep (Luk 19:41-44). The night of His arrest seems to have been the first in that fateful week He spent in the immediate environs of the city. Then during the closing days came teaching by the miracle of the fig-tree (Mat 21:20-22, Mar 11:20-25) and by parable (the Wicked Husbandmen, the Ten Virgins, the Sheep and the Goats), as well as by direct prediction, to enforce the lesson that judgment on the city and the nation was nigh at hand. The wickedness and hypocrisy of the city led to the sterner denunciations of the scribes and Pharisees by One who considered that their doom was practically sealed (Matthew 23). Only in the incidents of the widow's mite (Mar 12:41-44, Luk 21:1-4) and in the coming of the Greek strangers to Jesus (Joh 12:20-33) is there any sign of this lifting of the heavy clouds of approaching tragedy. The efforts of Pharisees, Sadducees, and lawyers to catch Him in some political indiscretion or unorthodoxy in His teaching were alike foiled, and at length the leaders of the Jews made their unholy compact with the traitor Judas.

As the first day of Unleavened Bread drew nigh, the disciples were sent into the city to prepare the Passover. The scene of this incident is to-day pointed out as an upper room (50 feet by 30 feet) near the modern Zion gate of the city; tradition, according to Epiphanius, records that this was one of the few buildings which escaped destruction by Titus. It is certainly on the *site*, even if it is not the actual room, referred to by Bishop Cyril of Jerusalem in the middle of the 4th cent, as the place where the disciples were assembled on the day of Pentecost. Arculf is the first (about a.d. 685) to point it out as the *Cœnaculum*. Since 1561 the buildings, with the traditional tomb of David adjoining, have been in the hands of the Moslems.

After the Supper, Jesus withdrew with His disciples to the Garden of Gethsemane. The fact that He crossed the Kidron points to some spot on the lower slopes of' the Mount of Olives, and tradition since the 4th cent, has fixed on one which is now preserved as a garden by the Franciscans. If the site of the *Cœnaculum* is correct, it is probable that Jesus reached Gethsemane along the line of the paths now running outside the S. wall of the city, leaving the city south of the Temple.

After arrest, Jesus was taken by the soldiers to the palace of the high priest in the Temple precincts. Probably the procession followed the general direction of the road which to-day runs from Gethsemane to St. Stephen's gate, though there are indications that in ancient times this road was more direct than it now is. In the early morning He was brought before Pilate in the Praetorium, and he in turn sent Him (Luk 23:7-11) to Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee, who happened to be in Jerusalem at the time. The natural place where Herod would have his quarters would be in some part of his father's palace on the W. hill, and it may well be argued by those who

think it more likely that the Praetorium was in the same enclosure, that it is hardly probable that Pilate would have lightly risked sending Jesus twice through the streets when so many Galilaeans were about the city.

After the condemnation came the procession to Golgotha. The traditional route of this, known as the *Via Dolorosa*, has been selected on very slender grounds; indeed, all the 'stations of the cross' on the way have varied greatly from time to time. Even the first station, the site of the Praetorium, has been placed in many parts of the city. In the 4th cent, it was near the present *Bab el-Kattanîn*, two centuries later it was marked by the basilica of St. Sophia. During the Crusading period it was placed first on the W. hill, under the idea that Pilate's house must have been near the Royal Palace, as several good modern authorities think it was; but at a later period it was transferred to the present Turkish barracks, indisputably on some part of the site of Antonia, as the more probable. The starting-point of the *Via Dolorosa* being so arbitrarily fixed, it necessarily follows that the various 'stations of the cross' are the flimsiest traditions. The *second* station—where the cross was laid on Jesus—is below the steps descending from the barracks. Near this is the well-known *Ecce Homo* arch—a construction of the 2nd cent.; and inside the adjoining institution of the Sisters of Zion is shown a large sheet of pavement belonging to the Roman period (and identified by the Latin authorities as the *Gabbatha* of [Joh 19:13](#)), which may quite possibly have been in position at the time of the Crucifixion: part of its surface belongs to a street. The *third* station is shown where the street from the barracks—*Tarîk bâb Sitti Miriam*—joins the carriage road from the Damascus Gate, running along the ancient Tyropœon Valley; the spot is marked by a broken, prostrate column. Here Jesus sank under the weight of the cross. A few yards farther down the carriage road, the *fourth* station—where Jesus met His mother—lies on the right. At the next turning to the right is the *fifth* station, where Simon of Cyrene took the cross from Jesus; and if we ascend this street by a series of steps, the *sixth* station—the scene of the incident of St. Veronica's handkerchief—is found, near where the road becomes arched over. When the *Via Dolorosa* crosses the central street of the city, *Suk es-Semany*, the procession is supposed to have left the city walls. This is the *seventh* station. The *eighth* station, where Jesus admonished the women not to weep for Him but for themselves ([Luk 23:27-28](#)), lies up the ascent towards the Church of the Sepulchre; and the *ninth* station, where Jesus is said to have fallen a second time under the weight of the cross, is in front of the Coptic monastery. The remaining five stations are included in the Church of the Sepulchre, for which see art. Golgotha.

The last mention of Jerusalem in the Gospels is in the injunction to the disciples to begin preaching the gospel there ([Luk 24:47](#)). The full force of this, and the necessity for their being specially commanded, is fully realized only when it is seen what a unique position Jerusalem held in the mind of Jesus, as was recognized by His regular attendance at the Temple services and the periodical feasts; how deep was His pity

for its close approaching doom; how bitter had been the hostility to His teaching and His claims; and, lastly, how extraordinarily important was Jerusalem at that time as a meeting-place of many intensely held religious ideals.

Literature.—This is enormous, and to attempt an exhaustive analysis would here be out of place. The authorities mentioned below are only some of those of which the writer has himself made use, and in the great majority of instances the references are only to modern writers.—

The Bible, the Apocrypha, the works of Josephus, and the *History* of Tacitus; the volume 'Jerusalem' in the Memoirs of the *PEF* [Note: EF Palestine Exploration Fund.] (1884); Rev. W. F. Birch in *PEFSt* [Note: EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.] ; Bliss and Dickie, *Excavations in Jerusalem* (1894-1897); Dr. T. Chaplin on the Climate of Jerusalem in *PEFSt* [Note: EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.] , 1883; Conder, art. 'Jerusalem' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , and many other works and papers; Glaisher, 'Meteorological observations in Jerusalem 'in *PEF* [Note: EF Palestine Exploration Fund.] special pamphlet; Richard Gottheil, art. 'Jerusalem' in *Jewish Encyclopedia* (1904); Rev. E. Hanauer and Dr. Merrill of Jerusalem, various papers in the *PEFSt* [Note: EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.] ; Lewin, *Siege of Jerusalem by Titus* (1863); Prof. Mitchell, art. on the Walls of Jerusalem in *JBL* [Note: BL Journal of Biblical Literature.] (1903); Porter in Murray's *Guide Book*¹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; Robinson's *BRP* [Note: RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.] (1858); Sanday, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels* (1903); Schick, 'Die Wasserversorgung der Stadt Jerusalem' in the *ZDPV* [Note: DPV Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.] (1878), and many papers in the *PEFSt* [Note: EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.] and elsewhere; Geo. Adam Smith, artt. 'Jerusalem' in *Encyc. Bibl. and Expositor*, 1903 and 1905; W. R. Smith, part of art. 'Jerusalem' in *Encyc. Bibl.*; Socin and Benzinger in Baedeker's *Handbook to Palestine*; Sir Charles Warren, *Underground Jerusalem* (1876); Andrew Watt on Climate in *Jour. of Scot. Meteor. Society*, 1900-1901; Williams, *Holy City*, 1849; Sir Charles Wilson, art. 'Jerusalem' in Smith's *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] ² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (1893), also on 'Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre' in *PEFSt* [Note: EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.] , 1902-3-4-5, and many other articles.

E. W. G. Masterman.

⚡ Jesse

JESSE.—The father of king David, named in our Lord's genealogy (Mat_1:5 f., Luk_3:32).

⚡ Jesus

JESUS (the name).—It is strange that even this name has not yet been explained with certainty. Ἰησοῦς (gen., dat., voc. Ἰησοῦ; acc. Mat_1:1; Mat_8:34, Mar_1:24, Mat_1:21 [on Ἰησοῦ as gen. and dat. see Winer-Schmiedel, § 10, note 6]) is the Greek form of the Hebrew יֵשׁוּעַ or יְהוֹשֻׁעַ. Aquila has for the latter (Deu_1:38) Ἰησοῦά; in some passages Ἰησοῦε is found (1Ch_7:27, 2Es_2:6; 2Es_2:40); see Redpath's .

No satisfactory explanation has yet been offered of the varying forms יְהוֹשֻׁעַ and יֵשׁוּעַ. The high priest, for instance, who led the Jews back from Babylon with Zerubbabel, is constantly called יְהוֹשֻׁעַ in the prophetic books of Haggai and Zechariah (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 Joshua,' not 'Jehoshua, as in the name of his father 'Jehozadak'), and with equal constancy יֵשׁוּעַ in the historical books of Ezra and Nehemiah (where also the name of his father is written in the abbreviated form 'Jozadak'). Were, then, both forms used at the same time? Or is this a hint that the difference is due to later recensions, and that the form 'Jeshua' is later than the time of the Exile? Again, how did 'Jehoshua' become 'Jeshua'? The question is the more difficult as *nowhere* is the intermediate form 'Joshua' found, as in the other names formed with 'Jeho-', e.g. יְהוֹאָחָז side by side with יְהוֹאָחָז, etc. The nearest parallel seems to be the name of the king of Moab, who is called 'Mesha' (מִישַׁע) in the Massoretic Text of 2Ki_3:4, but Μωσα in the LXX Septuagint ; or the name 'Moah,' which is explained as if = *mç'ab* in Gen_19:37. The reason for the vowel change has been sought in the analogy of names beginning with *el.* or merely on phonetical principles (differentiation, as *rishôn* from *rōsh*, etc.) (For quite a different explanation, which will hardly stand examination, see Fr. Pratorius in *ZDMG* [Note: *DMG Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.*] lix. 342) The difficulty is increased by the fact that the name is spelt יְהוֹשֻׁעַ (with י) but twice (Deu_3:21, Jdg_2:7); and יְהוֹשֻׁעַ may therefore have been originally 'Jehosha', like אֶלְיָשָׁע alongside of אֶלְיָשׁוּעַ.

Hitherto it has generally been presupposed that the name was formed from the root *ישׁ* 'to save' (or rather 'to be safe'), like *יְהוֹשֻׁעַ*, which, according to Num_13:8; Num_13:16 and Deu_32:44, was the earlier name of 'Joshua'; cf. the name *יְהוֹשֻׁעַ* on a Palestinian jarhandle combined by Macalister with the name *יְשׁוּעָה* 1Ch_4:20 (*PEFSt*, 1905, p. 330). But the dropping of the first letter is not easily explained on this theory. And the analogy of the names *יְהוֹשֻׁעַ*, *יְהוֹשֻׁעַ*, *יְשׁוּעָה* side by side with *יְהוֹשֻׁעַ*, *יְהוֹשֻׁעַ*, *יְשׁוּעָה*, points to the possibility that *יְהוֹשֻׁעַ* is related to *יְהוֹשֻׁעַ*, as *יְשׁוּעָה* is to *יְשׁוּעָה*. As to the meaning of these names nothing is certain. That to popular sentiment the name recalled the idea of *salvation* is proved for the OT by Num_13:8; Num_13:16, and for the NT by Mat_1:21 'Thou shalt call his name *Jesus*; for he shall *save* his people from their sins.' Perhaps also in 1Th_1:10 Ἰησοῦν τὸν ὀνομαζόμενον ἡμᾶς, we have an allusion to this etymology. Greek Christians were reminded by the name of the root *ιάομαι*, 'to heal'; cf. *Sib. Or.* i. 351 καὶ τότε δὴ νοσεροὺς ἰήσεται; *Clem. Al. Paedag.* i. 7. 61 τοιοῦτον ἡμῖν ὄνομα σωτηρίου προφητεύει παιδαγωγοῦ ... ἴν' οὗς ὁ λόγος ὁ πειθήνιος οὐκ ἰᾶται, ἀπειλὴ ἰάσεται, κ.τ.λ., *ib.* iii. 12. 98 ὁ ἰώμενος ἡμῶν καὶ σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν, τὸν αἰθεριῶν ἀνθρώπων, Ἰησοῦς; Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cateches.* x. p. 88 Ἰησοῦς τοίνυν ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν ὁ ἰώμενος. Ἐπειδὴν ἰατρός ἐστι ψυχῶν καὶ σωμάτων, καὶ θεραπευτὴς πνευμάτων, τυφλῶν μὲν αἰσθητῶν θεραπευτὴς ... χωλῶν φαινομένων ἰατρός; Epiphanius, *Haer.* 29, *Nazar.* § 4 Ἰησοῦς γὰρ κατὰ τὴν Ἑβραϊκὴν διάλεκτον θεραπευτὴς καλεῖται, ἥτοι ἰατρός καὶ σωτήρ. Epiphanius betrays in these last words also a knowledge of the Hebrew root; and the same is the case with Chrysostom, who expressly states (*Hom. 2 in Matth.* p. 23), τὸ γὰρ Ἰησοῦς τοῦτο ὄνομα οὐκ ἔστιν Ἑλληνικόν, ἀλλὰ τῆ Ἑβραίων φωνῇ οὕτω λέγεται ἰησοῦς· ὃ ἐστὶν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλῶτταν ἐρμηνευόμενον, σωτήρ· σωτήρ δέ, ἀπὸ τοῦ σῶσαι τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ. To the same effect is the statement of Eusebius (*Dem. Ev.* iv. 17, p. 199), who compares Christ with the high priest of the Return, and writes on their names, § 23, Εἰκότως οὖν τῆς εἰκόνης ἕνεκα καὶ οὗτος τῆς τοῦ σωτήρος προσηγορίας ἤξιοῦτο ... ἐπειδὴ σωτήριον θεοῦ εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα φωνὴν τὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μεταληφθὲν ὄνομα σημαίνει· Ἰησοῦ μὲν γὰρ Ἑβραίοις σωτηρία, νιός δὲ Ναυῆ παρὰ τοῖς αὐτοῖς Ἰωσοῦ ὀνομάζεται· Ἰωσοῦ δὲ ἐστὶν Ἰάω σωτηρία, τοῦτ' ἐστὶ θεοῦ σωτήριον. εἰκότως εἴ ποῦ θεοῦ σωτήριον ἐν τοῖς Ἑλληνικοῖς ἀντιγράφοις ὀνομάσται, οὐδ' ἄλλο τι ἢ τὸν Ἰησοῦν κατὰ τὴν Ἑβραίων φωνὴν πέπεισο δη

λουσθαι; cf. also Theodoret, ii. 385, on Is 61:10, ἐν τῇ Ἑβραίων φωνῇ τὸ ἱμάτιον σωτηρίου ἱμάτιον ἰεσσωὰ κεῖται, τοῦτ' ἔστι Χριστοῦ. Lagarde (*Übersicht*, p. 97) concludes from this that ܘܥܚ, the Syriac form of the name, had a double š.

Already in the oldest MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] of the Gr. Test. the name is written with abbreviations ~~ΙΣ, ΙΥ, ΙΝ; but occasionally in some MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.], and regularly in the Codex Bezae, ΙΗΥ is found (in the Codex Sinaiticus ΙΗΥ and ΙΥ in consecutive lines in Rev 22:20-21). The Epistle of Barnabas seems to have known the abbreviation ΙΗ, because the number 318 (= ΤΙΗ) in Gen 14:14 is explained there of the cross of Jesus; and the same inference may be drawn for Irenaeus from a comparison of the texts of Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and Epiphanius on the Marcosians (see *Exp^T* [Note: xp^T Expository Times.] xvii. [1905] pp. 44, 139).~~

H. Leclereq, in art. 'Abréviations' in Cabrol's *Dict. d'Archéol. Chrétienne*, has a special paragraph 'de l'abréviation ΙΗΥ, ΙΗΣ' (col. 177-180). The earliest coins exhibiting the symbol IHS are of Justinian ii. (685-695, and 705-711). In the legend IHSVS XPISTVS NICA found on coins of Constantine ii. (780-791), the second letter is pronounced to be the Greek η, despite the C in NICA. On the story that the monogram of Christ was found written on the heart of Ignatius (περοφορος), when at his martyrdom it was laid bare by the claws of the lions, see A. Bell, *The Saints in Christian Art*, i. [1901] p. 205.

On the power of the name Ἰησοῦς, which cannot be translated, see Origen, *c. Cels.* i. 25: like the names Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, καὶ ὁ ἡμέτερος ἰησοῦς, οὗ τὸ ὄνομα μυστηρίους ἤδη ἐναργῶς ἐώραται δαιμονίας ἐξέλασαν ψυχᾶν καὶ σωμάτων, ἐνεθρησάν εἰς ἕνεους ἀφ' ἐν ἀτηλαθησαν.

We have as yet no explanation of the statement of Irenaeus: 'Jesus autem nomen secundum propriam Hebraeorum linguam litterarum est duarum ac dimidiae, sicut periti eorum dicunt, significans dominum eum, qui continet caelum et terram, quia Jesus secundum antiquam Hebraicam linguam caelum est: terra autem iterum sura ussea dicitur' (= sma uers? 'heaven and earth'). In another passage Irenaeus writes: 'Nihilominus autem et unigenitus et maxime autem super omnia nomen, quod dicitur Deus, quod et ipsum hebraice *Baruch* dicitur, et duas et dimidium habet literas.'

The Jews now write יֵשׁוּ, which is explained by Handler (*Lexicon der Abbreviaturen*, 1897) שְׁמוֹ יָמָת מְבָרָנוּ, by Lagarde (*Mittcilungen*, ii. 290) שְׁוִיתָאֲבָר י'. 'may his name (and memory) be wiped out (and perish)'; Jastrow's *Dictionary* explains it as an abbreviation of יֵשׁוּעַ; Renchlin and other Christian Hebraists wrote the name יְהֵשׁוּה, as a combination of the tetragrammaton יְהוָה, with ש. wherein they found deep mysteries.

The first letter of the Greek Ἰησοῦς seems to be treated as a consonant in the hexameter

Ἰσαακ ἢ δ' Ἰακωβ Ἰησοῦς Δανιήλ τ' Ἡλίας, *Sib. Or.* ii. 247; also in the verse of Theodorus Prodrumus: τοῦ δ' Ἰούδας θανόντος Ἰούδας μένει. On its numerical value (10) and its straight form see speculations in Clement's *Paedag.* i. 9. 25 ἢ εὐθεῖα καὶ κατὰ φύσιν, ἣν αἰνιττεται τὸ Ἰῶτα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἢ ἀγαθωσύνη αὐτοῦ, and ii. 43. 3, the psalter of ten strings; in Epiphanius, *Haer.* l. 3 = the 10th of Nisan, on which the Paschal lamb was chosen; the tithes (δεκάται σωτηρίου ἀρχὴ ὀνόματος Ἰησοῦ) in *Apost. Const.* ii. 25; in the *Opus imperf. in Mt.* (Migne, lvi. 618).

On the spelling of the name in the Latin MSS [Note: SS Manuscripts.] of the Bible, Iesus, Ihesus, Hiesus, see Wordsworth-White on *Mat. 1:1* and p. 776; H. J. Lawlor, *Chapters on the Book of Mulling*, p. 76; the letter of Amalarius to Bp. Jonas of Orleans and to Abp. Jeremias of Sens 'de nomine dni Iesu,' whether mo or ihs is the correct spelling, whether the middle letter is the Greek η or the Latin h, whether the last letter is Greek or Latin. In the Russian Church there was at one time a violent dispute about this orthographical question. In mediaeval poetry, for instance in Ekkehart iv. of St. Gall, *Iesus* is made to rhyme with *visus*, etc.:

'Virgo prior visum cunctis agnoverat Isum ...

Sed nec ab his volumus nudetur laudibus Iesus.'

Damasus formed the lines:

'In rebus tantis Trina conjunctio mundi

Erigit humanum sensum laudare venustE,

~~Sola salus nobis et mundi summa potestas~~

~~Venit peccati nodum dissolvere fructu~~

~~Summa salus cunctis nituit per secula terris.'~~

~~The Mohammedan form 'Isâ was certainly adapted to get an assonance with Mûsa (like Ibrahim with Ismail, Kabil with Habil), and not to identify the name with Esau. This was the more easy because the Nestorians pronounced the name 'Isho', not 'Jeshu' like the Jacobites. On the proposal to introduce the Mohammedan form 'Isâ instead of 'Gisû' into the Urdu NT, see Bible House Papers, No. iii. p. 28.~~

~~That the name contains 4 vowels and one consonant doubled, and has the numerical value 888 (10+8+200+70+400+200), is shown by Sib. Or. i. 326ff. and by the speculations of the Marcosians (Iren. xv. 2; Hippol. vi. 50).~~

~~On the monograms for the name of Jesus see *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologic und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] xii. esp. p. 371 f.; Jerome, 'de monogramma XPI' in *Anecdota Maredsolana*, iii. 3 (1903), pp. 195-198; P. Cafaro, *l'ebreo nome Gesu*, Napoli, 1890, p. 390.~~

~~In the Ethiopian Church the name Jesus is avoided as a proper name (*ZDMG* [Note: *DMG Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.*] xxviii. 309); in the Syriac Church it is 'still very commonly used as a man's name' (Maclean, *Dict. of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac*, 1901). It would be an interesting task to collect the proper names formed with Jesus as first or second part; they seem especially frequent in the Syriac and Persian Churches.~~

~~Eb. Nestle.~~

Jews

JEWS.—This term, originally perhaps applied only to men of the tribe of Judah, 'men of Judaea,' is employed in the Gospels (1) in opposition to Gentiles, proselytes, or Samaritans: Mar 7:3, Joh 2:6; Joh 2:13; Joh 4:9; Joh 4:22; Joh 5:1; Joh 6:4; Joh 7:2; Joh 19:40; Joh 19:42; (2) specially of Jews as antagonistic to our Lord, a usage which is characteristic of Jn. as distinguished from the Synoptics: Mat 28:15, Joh 6:41; Joh 6:52; Joh 8:48-57; Joh 9:18; Joh 10:19; Joh 11:19; Joh 11:31;

Joh 11:33; Joh 11:36; Joh 12:9; Joh 12:11. On the inferences that have been drawn from this usage as to the authorship and date of the Fourth Gospel, see art. John (Gospel of). 'The Jews' in this sense were blind followers of the Pharisees, and bitter opponents of Christ. Scrupulous about all the practices sanctioned by the elders,—washing of hands, of cups and pots and brazen vessels, Sabbath observance, etc. (Mar 7:3-4, Joh 5:10 etc.),—they had forsaken the 'old paths' trodden by their fathers, and the things commanded by God. 'For fear of the Jews' men hesitated to confess Christ (Joh 7:13; Joh 9:22).

For customs of the Jews see art. Social Life. See also artt. Israel and Jerusalem.

Literature.—Westcott, *Gospel of St. John*, Introd. p. viii ff.; Andrews, *Life of our Lord* [ed. 1893], p. 470; Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, ch. x.

J. Soutar.

ⲓJoanan

JOANAN.—A link in our Lord's genealogy (Luk 3:27).

ⲓJoanna

JOANNA (Ἰωάννα, Tisch. and Revisers' Text; but Ἰωάννα, WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] and Nestle; from Aram. [Note: Aramaic.] יוחנָּה, Heb. יוחנָּה).—The wife of Chuza, the 'steward' of Herod Antipas. In Luk 8:1-3 she appears as one of certain women who had been healed, and in gratitude ministered to Jesus and His disciples. The passage reads as though she had herself derived physical benefit from Jesus; but it is possible, as Godet suggests *in loc.*, that the 'nobleman' or king's officer of Joh 4:46-53 was Chuza. If so, Joanna may have been led to attach herself to Christ through the restoration of her son's health, or even of his life if the Johannine narrative is to be identified with Mat 8:5-13 and Luk 7:1-10. The latter identification, as early as Irenaeus (*adv. Haer.* ii. 33), and not without distinguished support (Wetstein, Ewald, de Wette, Baur), is attractive but precarious. Joanna is mentioned again in Luk 24:10 as one of the women who went to the sepulchre to embalm the body of Jesus. She is almost certainly the same person as in Luk 8:3, though her husband's name does not occur in the later passage. There is no need to explain the omission by a suggestion that he was dead, or had become obscure

through dismissal from his office by Antipas because of the relations of his household with Jesus. The Evangelist had already sufficiently marked the identity of Joanna, who through her own devotion would be well known to the disciples. See also Chuza.

R. W. Moss.

☩ Joda

JODĀ.—A link in our Lord's genealogy (Luk_3:26).

☩ John

JOHN.—The father of Simon Peter (Joh_1:42; Joh_21:15-17, Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ; Authorized Version *Jonas*). See Peter.

☩ John (The Apostle)

JOHN (THE APOSTLE).—As the Gospels are but memorabilia of Jesus, giving relatively but meagre accounts of His life and works, it is to be expected that they can afford us only glimpses of the Apostles. Such is the case; and, while a few more references are made to Peter, James, and John than to the others, we have no such material as allows any more than a fragmentary account of any one. Tradition has, in the case of each Apostle, added to the Scripture narrative a story of subsequent activity and fate. For convenience of reference, therefore, to all that is known of John we may group the materials under the following heads: (1) those found in the Scriptures; (2) those given us by tradition. To the account thus obtained we shall add a brief delineation of his character.

i. The Testimony of Scripture.—Preliminary to giving the facts in their chronological order, it is well to call attention to the almost universal identification of the unnamed disciple of the Fourth Gospel with John.* [Note: Delff ha with considerable force advanced and defended the theory that 'the disciple whom Jesus loved' was not the Apostle John, but a younger disciple, who shared all the privileges of the Twelve, but who was a native of Jerusalem and a member of the higher aristocracy. While this theory explains satisfactorily some of the facts given in the Gospels, it is beset with grave difficulties.]

John is first introduced to us as a disciple of John the Baptist (Joh 1:35). How long he had been with this stern preacher of the desert we do not know, but the time was one of preparation for the higher discipleship soon to follow. After the Temptation Jesus returned to the Jordan. Then and there John first met Jesus, and, with Andrew, showed such deep interest in Him that He invited them to go with Him to His abode. So critical was the hour when they went—four o'clock in the afternoon—that it was remembered long years after (Joh 1:36-40). John's home was in Galilee (probably at Bethsaida), where his father, Zebedee, a man apparently of means (Mar 1:20), was busy as a fisherman on the Lake. His mother was Salome (cf. Mat 27:56 with Mar 15:40). On the next day after his first meeting with Jesus, John accompanied Him to Galilee, and was present at the marriage feast at Cana (Joh 2:1-11). From Cana they went to Capernaum, in order, perhaps, to make ready for going up to Jerusalem to the Passover. At this first Passover Jesus cleansed the Temple, and also 'did signs' which awakened popular interest. Here also He conversed with Nicodemus (Joh 2:13 to Joh 3:21). The capital had not shown itself ready for the work He wished to do, so Jesus withdrew into the country of Judaea and summoned the people to the baptism of repentance, just as the Baptist himself was doing. John was with Him all through this sojourn of over seven months in Judaea, and doubtless assisted in the administering of the baptismal rite, for Jesus did not Himself baptize (Joh 4:2). At the end of this period Jesus returned by way of Samaria to Galilee. On the way occurred the incident of the Samaritan woman, so fully depicted for us in the Fourth Gospel (Joh 4:1-42). Once more the Master came to Cana, and while there cured the nobleman's son (Joh 4:46-54). For a brief time John seems now to have been at home, and to have engaged in his customary business of fishing; but the Baptist's imprisonment was the signal to Jesus for more vigorous work, and He appeared at the Lake-side to call to be His permanent escort the men who had already acknowledged Him and given Him some service (Mar 1:16-20, Mat 4:18-22, Luk 5:1-11). John now entered upon that second stage of discipleship which was to prepare him for his life-work. The record of events which shows Jesus performing miracles and preaching in the towns and villages of Galilee is the record of John's training (see Mar 1:21 to Mar 2:22). When, some time afterwards, John was chosen to the Apostolate (Mar 3:13-19 a, Mat 10:2-4, Luk 6:12-19), it was but to confirm him in the position he had already occupied, and to make more definite his mission. At this time Jesus called him and his brother Boanerges, that is, 'sons of thunder' (Mar 3:17). See Boanerges.

As from this time onwards the most of John's experiences were common to all the Apostles, it is necessary to mark only those which were in any way exceptional for him. They are sufficient to show that he was among the most prominent of the little band, and that he was especially close in friendship to the Master. With Peter and James he saw the raising of Jairus' daughter (Mar 5:37, Luk 8:51). These three were with Jesus upon the Mount of Transfiguration (Mar 9:2, Mat 17:1, Luk 9:28). It was

John who 'answered and said, Master we saw one casting out devils in thy name: and we forbade him, because he followeth not with us' (Mar 9:38, Luk 9:49). It was he and James who wished to call down fire upon an inhospitable Samaritan village (Luk 9:54). His mistaken ambition for high place at the side of his Master is recorded in Mar 10:37, Mat 20:21. He took part in the questioning about the time for the fulfilment of the solemn prophecies concerning Jerusalem (Mar 13:3). He and Peter were sent to make ready the Passover (Luk 22:8). At the supper itself he reclined 'in Jesus' bosom' (see art. Bosom), and asked Him who it was that was to be the betrayer (Joh 13:23-25). In the garden of Gethsemane he was, with Peter and James, near his Master (Mar 14:33, Mat 26:37). Panic-stricken, he fled with all the other disciples at the time of the arrest (Mat 26:56), but soon recovered himself, and followed the procession to the palace of the high priest (Joh 18:15). Being known to the high priest, he was admitted to the court of the palace, and secured entrance for Peter (v. 16). Faithful now to the last, he stood near the cross, and there received the commission to care for the mother of Jesus (Joh 19:26-27). On the morning of the resurrection Mary Magdalene tells him and Peter of the empty grave, and they hasten together to the spot (Joh 20:2-3). In the account of the appearance of the risen Lord in Galilee (Joh 21:2-7) the 'sons of Zebedee' have special mention, and again in the closing scene and words of the Fourth Gospel the impression that he should not die before the Lord's coming is corrected, and the truthfulness of his witness as given in this Gospel confirmed (Joh 21:20-24).

Outside of the Gospels there are but few references to him in the NT. In the Acts he appears twice in the company of Peter. As they were going together, at the hour of prayer, to the Temple, they met a man, lame from birth, at the Beautiful Gate, and cured him. The deed caused great excitement, and a large crowd gathered around them in Solomon's porch. While they were speaking to the people the authorities came, and 'being sore troubled because they taught the people,' arrested them, and on the following day brought them before the Sanhedrin (Act 4:3). Later, he and Peter were sent to Samaria to those who had received the word of God under Philip's ministry, and 'they prayed for these that they might receive the Holy Ghost' (Act 8:14; Act 8:16). About a.d. 50 we find John in Jerusalem, for at that time Paul meets him there and consults with him regarding his work among the Gentiles (Gal 2:1-9). He was at this time one of the pillars of the Church. The only other mention of him in the NT is in Rev 1:4; Rev 1:9

ii. The testimony of tradition

1. *Regarding John's residence in Ephesus.*—From the time of his meeting with Paul in Jerusalem until his activity in later life at Ephesus, we have no certain knowledge of the Apostle. Nicephorus (*Historia Ecclesiastica* ii. 2) tells us that Mary lived with John in Jerusalem for eleven years after the death of the Lord. There is nothing

unlikely in this story, unless it be, as Godet suggests, that 'his own home' (Joh_19:27) was in Galilee rather than in the capital, in which case there would be an explanation of the Apostle's absence at the time of Paul's first visit to the city (Gal_1:18-19). It is but conjecture, however, which fixes the date of his final departure from Jerusalem, though we know that he was not there when Paul came for the last time (Act_21:18 ff.), and that the signs of the impending destruction of the city caused all the Christians to retire to Pella, *e.* 68 a.d. (Eus. *Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 5. 3). It is of more moment to inquire why he should go to Ephesus, and in answer two reasons may be given: (a) the importance of this city as a centre for missionary activity; and (b) the necessity of carrying on and developing the work of Paul. In the latter part of the 1st cent. 'the Church's centre of gravity was *no longer* at Jerusalem; it was *not yet* at Rome; it was at Ephesus' (Thiersch, quoted by Godet, *Com. on John*, vol. i. p. 45). Not only within the borders of this city had Christianity made a marked impression, but all about were cities in which the Church had been established. The seven letters in the Apocalypse enable us to see what ceaseless vigilance and intelligent care were needed to protect these Churches from error in doctrine, and to keep them faithful in life. No louder call for Apostolic service could be given than this part of the world was then giving, and, as far as tradition is concerned, there can be little doubt that John responded to this call. Just at this point, however, criticism, in the interest of its discussions regarding the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, has taken its stand, and tried to make it appear that tradition is untrustworthy. The Ephesian residence of John is therefore a critical matter, and as such must be given somewhat extended attention. The main witnesses for the common tradition are Irenaeus, Polycrates (Bishop of Ephesus), and Clement of Alexandria.

(a) *Irenaeus* bears repeated testimony to the Apostle's presence in Asia, and says explicitly:

'Afterwards' (*i.e.* after the first three) 'John the disciple of the Lord, who also lay on His breast, likewise published a Gospel while dwelling at Ephesus' (*adv. Haer.* iii. 1). Polycarp was not only instructed by the Apostles, and had intercourse with many who had seen Christ, but he was also installed by the Apostles as Bishop in Asia in the Church at Smyrna. 'We also saw him (Polycarp) in our earliest youth, for he lived very long, and left this life at a great age, having suffered a glorious and brilliant martyrdom, and having always taught what he had learned from the Apostles.' Also the Church at Ephesus, founded by Paul, and with which John lived till Trajan's time (98-117), 'is a truthful witness to the tradition of the Apostles' (*ib.* iii. 3, 4). In a letter to Florinus, a part of which has been preserved by Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* v. 20), Irenaeus tells of his vivid recollections of Polycarp. The way of the venerable martyr's life, his bodily form, the discourses he gave to the people, and the account which he gave of his intercourse with John and with the rest who had seen the Lord, were clearer to him (Irenaeus) in memory than many recent

experiences. Again, when Victor the Bishop of Rome excommunicated the Quartodeciman Churches, Irenaeus wrote admonishing the Bishop, and, in the course of what he had to say, referred to the difference between Anicetus and Polycarp over the Paschal question, in these words: 'Anicetus could not persuade Polycarp not to observe what he had always observed with John the disciple of our Lord and the other Apostles with whom he had associated' (Eus. *Historia Ecclesiastica* v. 24).

The value of all this testimony is enhanced when one marks the overlapping of lives which is here evident. Polycarp suffered martyrdom in the year a.d. 155 at the age of 86. He was born, therefore, in the year 69. If John lived until Trajan's time, it were easily possible for the two to have associated with each other. Irenaeus while a boy (12-18 years of age) listened with peculiar and observant attentiveness to Polycarp. These three names cover over a century. They link together in such a manner the experiences of personal associations and reverent memories that the evidence for John's presence in Ephesus seems well-nigh conclusive. Its cogency, however, is supposed to be greatly weakened by two important considerations: (a) the silence among older writers regarding the Ephesian residence, and (b) the possible confusion, on the part of Irenaeus, of John the Apostle with John the Presbyter. At first sight the silence of Polycarp and Ignatius is surprising, but it is not beyond explanation. Polycarp's letter is to the Philippian Church, and calls for no reference to John. The absence of all mention of the Apostle in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians is not so easy to account for, but an argument from silence is precarious when one considers how sparingly he brings in even the name of Paul. It is apparently the similarity of their fortunes which leads him to speak of this Apostle at all, for just as Paul had sent for the elders of the Ephesian Church to meet him at Miletus on his way to imprisonment in Rome, so Ignatius at Smyrna received a delegation from Ephesus (*Ephes.* 12). This would exclude any reference to John; and in view of all other evidence, it can be as certainly affirmed, as it can be denied, that the general reference in the previous section covers the name of John. This reference is, 'May I be found in the lot of the Christians of Ephesus, who have always been of the same mind with the Apostles through the power of Jesus Christ' (*Ephes.* 11). When, moreover, one takes into account the scantiness of the remains of this early period, the probable growth of John's reputation during the 2nd century, and the prevalence in the Ignatian Epistles themselves of a Johannine type of teaching (see von der Goltz's 'Ignatius von Antiochien als Christ und Theolog' in *TU* [Note: U Texte und Untersuchungen.] , Bd. xii. [1894]), the argument from silence loses much of its force. The other consideration urged against the testimony of Irenaeus is really a seconding of the correction made by Eusebius of the declaration of Irenaeus that 'Papias was a hearer of John and a companion of Polycarp' (*adv. Haer.* v. 33. 4).* [Note: This objection is urged by Keim, Harnack, Holtzmanu, and other modern critics in their discussion of the authorship of John's Gospel.] The words of Eusebius are

found in his *History*, iii. 39. After quoting the above words from Irenaeus, he says, 'But Papias himself by no means declares that he was himself a hearer and eye-witness of the holy Apostles'; and then he goes on to infer that it was the Presbyter John who was meant in the statement of Irenaeus. This brings us to the examination of the witness of Papias in its bearing upon the whole question. In his preface to his *Expositions of the Oracles of the Lord* he says:

'But I shall not hesitate also to put down for you along with my interpretations whatsoever things I have at any time learned carefully from the elders and carefully remembered, guaranteeing their truth. For I did not, like the multitude, take pleasure in those that speak much, but in those that speak the truth; not in those that relate strange commandments, but in those that deliver the commandments given by the Lord to faith and springing from the truth itself. If, then, anyone came who had been a follower of the elders, I questioned him in regard to the words of the elders—what Andrew or what Peter said, or what was said by Philip, or by Thomas, or by James, or by John, or by Matthew, or by any other of the disciples of the Lord, and what things Aristion and the presbyter John, the disciples of the Lord, say. For I did not think that what was to be gotten from the books would profit me as much as what came from the living and abiding voice' (Eus. *Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 39).

A just interpretation of these words must allow for a distinction between the Apostle John and the Presbyter John, but the inference based on the tense of the verb in the sentence, 'What things Aristion and the Presbyter John, the disciples of the Lord, say,'—that Papias was actually a hearer of the Presbyter,—is very questionable. Much discussion has been given to the import of this latter part of Papias' preface. A thoroughly satisfactory understanding is, however, that which makes these words we have just quoted refer not to the spoken witness, but to the *written* testimony of Aristion and the Presbyter John.* [Note: See Drummond, *The Character and authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 199-204.] In his search for enlightenment Papias inquired after the unwritten sayings of all referred to except Aristion and John the Presbyter. In their case his inquiry was concerning their written sayings about which there might be some doubt. 'The books,' bearing possibly such titles as 'Narratives of Aristion,' or 'Traditions of the Presbyter John,' needed confirmation by competent witnesses. Papias had not the same confidence in them as in oral reports. Points which confirm this understanding are (1) the hesitation of Eusebius about his own inference that Papias was an actual hearer of John the Presbyter ['at least he mentions them frequently by name, and gives their traditions in writing' (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 39)]; (2) the suggested antitheses in the phrases 'his own writing' and 'unwritten tradition,' which are found in the accounts of the sources of Papias later on in the same section (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 39: 'The same author has communicated also other things that came to him as from unwritten tradition'; 'but he also commits to his own writing other narratives of the sayings of the Lord of the

aforesaid Aristion and traditions of the Presbyter John'). 'His own writing' suggests somebody else's writing; the 'unwritten tradition' suggests written tradition. If this interpretation of the words of Papias be true, then it affords no evidence that Papias was a hearer of the Presbyter John. Indeed, it does not require us to think that he was living at the time the words of Papias were written, or that he was even ever in Ephesus at all. The only support we have for this last supposition is Dionysius of Alexandria, who in the interests of the authorship of the Apocalypse by some other John than the Apostle cites the tradition that 'there are two monuments in Ephesus, each bearing the name of John.'

We come back now to Irenaeus. The statement which he makes regarding the relationship of Papias to the Apostle John and to Polycarp is not derived from the preface of Papias (see above), and if there is no possible confusion in the two Johns, we need only ask what value the positive statement of Irenaeus really has. Recall for a moment his reference to Polycarp. If these words are true, and there is no reason to doubt them, then it was no mere passing acquaintance which Irenaeus had with Polycarp. He had carefully observed him, and attentively listened to his discourses. Can it be possible that he understood him, whenever he spoke of John, to be referring to John the Presbyter, and was Polycarp himself talking of his intercourse with John the Presbyter? Such confusion as this on the part of men so intimately related is quite improbable. Certainly it is equally improbable that, at the early time of Polycarp, John the Presbyter should have become such a figure in Ephesus that Polycarp could speak of him exactly as if he were John the Apostle. There is therefore no sufficient reason for doubting the testimony of Irenaeus.

(b) In turning to the witness of *Polycrates*, it is well to note that he was Bishop of Ephesus, had seven relatives who were bishops, and was at the time of his letter to Victor, Bishop of Rome, an old enough man to have been living at the time of Polycarp. He was therefore in a position to know fully whereof he wrote. This fact of the continuity of experiences as lying behind these several testimonies needs repeated emphasis. In his letter to Victor (see Eus. *Historia Ecclesiastica* v. 24) he is writing upon the Quartodeciman question, and citing his authorities for the observance of the 'fourteenth day of the Passover according to the Gospel.' Among these he places 'John, who was both a witness and a teacher who reclined upon the bosom of the Lord, and being a priest wore the sacerdotal plate. He fell asleep at Ephesus.'

The reference to one 'who reclined upon the bosom of the Lord' seems to point unmistakably to the Apostle, but two statements of Polycrates seem to come to run counter to this: (1) That he was a priest and wore the sacerdotal plate (τὸ πετάλον). From the fact that Epiphanius (*Haer.*, xxvii. 14) says the same of James the brother of

the Lord, it is probably a purely figurative statement, indicating the exalted and revered position of these men among their Christian brethren. (2) The other counter-statement is derived from the notice given of Philip in this same letter. It is claimed that Polycrates has clearly confused the Apostles and Evangelists, hence he may have in the same way confused John the Apostle with John the Presbyter. The whole question turns upon the allusion to the daughters of Philip. Briefly stated, the disputed evidence is this. Papias, the earliest witness, places Philip among the Apostles (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 39). Then he goes on to relate a wonderful tale which he heard from the daughters of Philip. There is no indication whatever that this is not the same Philip just referred to. Polycrates now follows with his testimony that among those who had died in Asia was 'Philip, one of the Twelve Apostles, who sleeps in Hierapolis, and his two virgin daughters and another daughter who lived in the Holy Spirit and now rests at Ephesus' (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 31). Again the reference to the Apostle is clear. Clement of Alexandria declares that the Apostles Peter and Philip had children, and that Philip gave his daughters to husbands (*Strom.* iii. 6). From all this it is clear that the Apostle Philip had daughters. So far there seems to be no confusion. If this comes in at all, it appears in a statement of Proclus, who, speaking of the death of Philip and his daughters, says: 'After this arose four prophetesses, the daughters of Philip, at Hierapolis in Asia. Their tomb is there, and the tomb of their father' (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 31). The close resemblance of this record to the statement in [Act 21:9](#) makes it appear that the Evangelist is referred to; but even if the identification of the two Philips be here allowed, it is made comparatively late, and need not involve Polycrates. 'The report of Polycrates deserves our credence rather than that of Proclus, because, in the first place, Polycrates was earlier than Proclus; in the second place, because his report is more exact, and it is hard to imagine how, if all four were buried in one place, the more detailed report of Polycrates could have arisen, while on the other hand it is quite easy to explain the rise of the more general but inexact account of Proclus' (McGiffert on Eusebius, *in loco.*). It should be noted also that we have in Polycrates, as a contemporary of Irenaeus, an independent witness.

(c) It is in connexion with the story of the young convert who subsequently became a robber that *Clement of Alexandria* speaks of John's residence in Asia. The value of this testimony lies in the fact that Clement, in gathering memoranda to be 'stored up against old age as a remedy against forgetfulness,' had collected traditions handed down 'from the holy Apostles Peter, James, John, and Paul, the sons receiving it from the father.' As Drummond says of this witness, 'It seems probable that we have here a distinct line of tradition which affords independent confirmation of the statements of Irenaeus and Polycrates.' The clearness, positiveness, and fulness of the witness of these three, taken together with the personal relations involved, affords adequate basis for the general belief of the Church that in the latter part of his life John made his home in Ephesus.

2. *Regarding John's banishment to Patmos.*—The discussion of the deliverances of tradition in regard to John's exile in Patmos is vitally connected with the authorship of the Apocalypse (see art. 'John, Gospel of,' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. 707 ff.). The references to this fact are quite numerous in the Fathers, and begin with Clement of Alexandria (a.d. 190). Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Jerome all speak of it, but do not agree as to the time of it. Epiphanius (*Haer.* 12) assigns it to the reign of Claudius, while Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, and Jerome place it in the reign of Domitian. Internal evidence from the Apocalypse itself favours an early time, while tradition is explicit about the later date. All testimonies to the exile are probably based upon the statement found in Rev_1:9, and this gives no real foundation for any banishment at all. If John was in Patmos, it may be that he went thither, as Weiss supposes, to find a religious retreat, or, as others think, to avoid persecution.

3. *Regarding John's death.*—In accord with the statement of Irenaeus that 'John remained among them (the disciples) in Asia up to the time of Trajan' (*adv. Haer.* ii. 22), it has been generally believed that the Apostle lived to a ripe old age, and died quietly at Ephesus. Of late this opinion has been earnestly disputed, on the basis of a statement found in the *Chronicle* of Georgius Hamartolos (9th cent.), which reads, 'Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, declares in the second book of the Oracles of the Lord that John was put to death by the Jews.' This testimony has been confirmed by the de Boor Fragment, which expressly says that Papias tells in his second book of the death of James and John at the hands of the Jews. Of course, if John the Apostle died in this way, there is nothing left but to take some other John as the John of Ephesus; and all the testimony of Irenaeus, Polycrates, and Clement of Alexandria has a confusion of names underlying it; also the John of the Apostolic council (Gal_2:9) was not the son of Zebedee. All this is by no means likely. Various attempts have been made to account for the record of Georgius—such as Lightfoot's supposition of a lacuna, which was later filled in as we now have it (see *Essay on Supernatural Religion*, p. 211 ff.); or Zahn's (*Forsch.* vi. 147-151) of an interpolation, and that Papias was really referring to the Baptist; but the more probable explanation is that the statement arose from a desire to find a fulfilment of Mar_10:38-39, and a mistaken interpretation of the word μαρτυρῶν, which in its earlier sense did not necessarily involve death. It is certainly not easy to understand why Eusebius and others ignored the fact, if such it was.

Thus far we have sought to get at the real facts of tradition. It will surprise no one to know that the life of one so eminent as John was embellished with all manner of legends, such as his meeting with Cerinthus in the bath-house at Ephesus (*adv. Haer.* iii. 3, 4); his being carried in extreme old age to the church, and saying, 'Little children, love one another' (Jerome, *Com. ad Gal.* vi. 11); his recovery of the young

robber from his life of shame (Eus. *Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 23); his immersion in a caldron of boiling oil (Tert. *Praescript. Haer.* ch. xxvi.); and a number of others. Some of them may have germs of truth in them. They all seek in some way to illustrate the noble character of the man, or to interpret the prophecy of the Gospels regarding his earthly destiny.

iii. The character of John.—It is commonly thought that John was of a gentle, contemplative nature, and almost effeminate in character. Contemplative he was, and the Gospel is but an expression of his profound meditation upon the character and work of his Master; but a moment's reflexion upon some of the scenes of the Gospels (see Mat 20:20-24, Luk 9:49; Luk 9:54), in correspondence with which are some of the legends regarding his later life, will show that this Apostle was, at least in earlier life, impetuous, intolerant, and ambitious. Doubtless he was effectively moulded by the Spirit of Christ during his long discipleship, but he was always stern and uncompromising in his hatred of evil and in his defence of truth. He loved with a strong, passionate devotion, and he hated all wrong and untruth as only one can who understands as profoundly as he did the significance of his Lord and His teaching. Because of his profound understanding, he writes as one who has an immediate perception of truth. He does not reason as does Paul. He saw 'the King in his beauty,' or, to use his own words, 'the glory of the only-begotten of the Father' (Joh 1:14). His strength and devotion made him courageous; his affection and sympathy made him tender and abundantly helpful. His was the finest type of strong manhood made beautiful by spiritual purity.

Literature.—Among the more recent works which discuss the Ephesian residence of John, we would call attention to the following: James Drummond, *The Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*; V. H. Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*; W. Sanday, *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*; A. C. McGiffert, *The Apostolic Age*; *Encyc. Bibl.* art. 'John, Son of Zebedee'; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'John, the Apostle'; Harnack, *Chronol. der Altehrhist. Lit. bis Eusebius*, pp. 320-340, 656-680; Keim, *Gesch. Jesu von Nazara*, English translation i. pp. 211-232.

James S. Riggs.

⚠ John The Baptist

JOHN THE BAPTIST

- i. John's Importance, and Sources for his History.

- ii. Birth, Youth, and Pre-Prophetic Life.
- iii. The Public Ministry.
- iv. John's Baptism of Jesus and Witness regarding Him.
- v. Imprisonment and Death.
- vi. John and his Disciples.
- vii. Our Lord's Estimate of John.

i. John's Importance, and Sources for his History.—The significance of John the Baptist for the history of Christianity is shown by the place given him in the Gospel records by every one of the four Evangelists. St. Mark describes John's mission in the very first words of his narrative as 'the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God' mark (Mar_1:1). St. Luke makes the story of John's birth the prelude to his wonderful narrative of the greater birth at Bethlehem (Luk_1:5 ff.). The three Synoptists are agreed in representing his mission as the necessary preparation, in accordance with OT prophecy, for the manifestation of the Christ (Mar_1:2-3, Mat_3:3, Luk_3:4 ff.), while in all the Gospels his baptism of Jesus becomes the moment of the Lord's equipment with the Spirit for His Messianic office (Mar_1:9 ff., Mat_3:16 f., Luk_3:21 f.; cf. Joh_1:32 ff.). In the Prologue to his Gospel the Fourth Evangelist describes John as 'a man sent from God,' who 'came for a witness, to bear witness of the light, that all men through him (*i.e.* Jesus) might believe' (Joh_1:6-7). In accordance with this general sense of John's great importance for Christ and Christianity is the space devoted to him in the Gospel narratives as a whole. It is true that Lk. alone furnishes any information about him previous to the moment when he suddenly issued from his retirement in the wilderness and began to preach the baptism of repentance in the Jordan Valley, and true also that in the case of the Fourth Gospel it is difficult often to distinguish between the Evangelist's statements as a historian and his own subjective exposition. But when we put together all the references to John's ministry and history and character which we find either in the form of historical narrative, or testimony from the lips of Jesus, or reflexion on the part of an Evangelist, and when we make use besides of one or two sidelights which fall from the book of Acts and the pages of Josephus, we find that for knowledge regarding the Baptist's mission, his character, his relation to Jesus Christ, and his place in the history of both the old and the new dispensations, we are in no lack of plentiful and trustworthy sources of information.

ii. Birth, Youth, and Pre-Prophetic Life

The fact that Lk. alone of the Gospels gives an account of John's earlier life, together with the artistic nature of the narrative and its presumed discrepancy with the representation of the Fourth Gospel in respect of a connexion between John and Jesus previous to the baptism of the latter (cf. Luk 1:36; Luk 1:56 with Joh 1:31; Joh 1:33), has frequently been supposed to reduce this exquisite story to the level of pure legend. In view, however, of St. Luke's claims to historical accuracy (Luk 1:1; Luk 1:4), and of the vindication of these claims at so many points by modern research (cf. W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, ch. i., *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?*; Chase, *The Credibility of Acts*), it is impossible to set his narrative aside as if it rested on no basis of historical fact. It is full of poetry, no doubt, but it is the kind of poetry which bursts like a flower from the living stem of actual truth. Any attempt to dissolve the narrative into fictions of a later growth must reckon with the fact that the Evangelist is evidently making use at this point of an early Aramaic source steeped in the colours of the OT—'the earliest documentary evidence respecting the origins of Christianity which has come down to us, evidence which may justly be called contemporary' (Plummer, 'St. Luke' in *Internat. Crit. Com.*, p. 7). This document, which, if it is historical, must have rested in large part upon the authority of the Virgin Mary, St. Luke, 'as a faithful collector of evangelic *memorabilia*, allows to speak for itself, with here and there an editorial touch' (Bruce, *Expositor's Gr. Test.*, *ad loc.*). To appreciate the historical sobriety and manifestly primary character of this early Jewish-Christian source, we have only to compare the first chapter of Lk. with the relative sections of the *Protevangelium Jacobi*, and especially with those chapters (22-24) which Harnack calls the *Apocryphum Zachariae* (see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, Extra Vol. p. 431).

According to Lk., John was the son of Zacharias, a priest of the course of Abijah (see art. Zacharias), and his wife Elisabeth who belonged to the family of Aaron (Luk 1:5 ff.). Elisabeth was a kinswoman (not 'cousin,' see Plummer, *op. cit.* p. 25) of the Virgin Mary (Joh 1:36), who paid her a three months' visit immediately before the birth of John (Luk 1:56, cf. Luk 1:36; Luk 1:39-40). John was the senior of Jesus by six months (Luk 1:36; Luk 1:57, cf. Joh 2:6). The name John, properly Johanan (Ἰωάννης = יוחנן, cf. Heb. text and LXX Septuagint of 1Ch 3:24, 2Ch 28:12), was given to the child by his parents in obedience to a Divine direction (Luk 1:13), and in spite of the opposition of neighbours and kinsfolk (Luk 1:58-63).

Regarding the place of John's birth there has been much discussion. Lk. describes the house of Zacharias as in 'a city of Judah' which lay in 'the hill country' (Luk 1:39-40). A number of commentators have assumed, without any warrant, that this must have been Hebron, as being a priestly town in that region. Others have suggested that τολις Ἰούδα is a corruption for τολις Ἰούτα (Reland, *Pal.* [Note: Palestine, Palestinian.] p.

870; Robinson, *BRP* [Note: RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ii. 206), so that the Baptist's birthplace would be Judah or Juttah, to the south of Hebron (Robinson, *op. cit.*, *ib.*, and i. 495), which is mentioned in Joshua as having been allotted to the priests (21:16). A tradition as early as the Crusades assigns the honour to *Ain Karim*, a village which lay between Jerusalem and Bethlehem. All this, however, is purely conjectural, and it is best to be content to say that John was born in a town unknown, in the hill country of Judah. See, further, art. Judah.

Of the external incidents of John's childhood and youth Lk. gives no information. All that is told us bears upon his spiritual growth. According to an announcement of the angel Gabriel, he was to be 'filled with the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb' (Luk 1:15). That a peculiar Divine blessing did rest upon him from the first is implied in the words, 'the hand of the Lord was upon him' (Luk 1:66); that this Divine presence made itself manifest in the development of his character is evident when the Evangelist adds, 'and the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit' (Luk 1:80).

But whatever the outward tenor of John's way in that priestly house in the hill country of Judah, a great crisis must have come at last, followed by a sudden break in his manner of life. A priest's son, he would naturally, according to all Jewish traditions, have stepped into the priestly office, and enjoyed the honours, abundance, and comparative ease that were parts of his birthright. But spiritual instincts and powers which had long been unknown in Israel began to make themselves felt in the young man's heart, and this son of a priest went forth into the deserts to be shaped in solitude into a prophet mightier than Elijah or Isaiah. Of the precise nature of the impulse which first led him to withdraw himself from his fellows, the duration of his stay in the wilderness, and the fashion of his life while there, no Evangelist has anything to tell us. But it is certainly a grotesque mistake to suppose that he left his home and the haunts of men in order to become an Essene (see the excellent remarks of Godet on this point, *Com. On Lk.* i. p. 117 f.).* [Note: This theory, put forth by Grätz (*Gesch. der Juden*, iii. p. 100) and adopted by many since, has been repeated once more in the art. 'Essence' in *Jewish Encyc.*, where it is added that the silence of the NT about the Essense 'is perhaps the best proof that they furnish the new sect [i.e. Christianity] with its main elements as regards personnel and views'—as striking an illustration as could well be discovered of a fallacious use of the argumentum e silentio. On John's relations to the Essenes see Lightfoot, *Colossians*, Dissert. iii.]

There was absolutely no resemblance between John, the desert solitary, as he is described to us in the pages of the Gospels (Mat 3:4 || 11:7ff. || 11:18 ||), and the Essenes with their white garments and their cenobitic establishments, as we come

across them in the pages of Josephus (*BJ* ii. viii. 2-13, *Ant.* xviii. i. 5). All that can be said is that John was an ascetic as the Essenes were, and that in both cases the revolt against prevailing luxury and corruption sprang out of the deep seriousness which marked the more earnest spirits of the time (see Rüegg, art. 'Johannes der Täufer' in *RR*E [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred]). John's withdrawal into the wilderness indicated his disapproval of society as he found it, it signified more especially an absolute break with the prevalent Pharisaic type of piety. But in his case it meant much more than this, much more even than the adoption of severely ascetic habits in the interests of his own spiritual life. It was as one who was conscious that he was set apart for the office of a prophet (cf. Luk 1:14-17; Luk 1:76 ff.), and who felt himself called in particular to take up in Israel a work of reformation similar to that of Elijah (Luk 1:17; cf. Mat 11:14; Mat 17:12, Joh 1:21), that John betook himself to the deserts (Luk 1:80) and there lived the life of one who hides himself from men that he may the better see the face of God. Locusts and wild honey were his food, while his clothing was a loose cloak (*ἔνδυμα*) of woven camel's hair and a leathern girdle about his loins (Mat 3:4, Mar 1:6; cf. 2Ki 1:8).† [Note: That he ate locusts, as the Bedawin still do, not carob-beans, is now the prevalent opinion of scholars (cf. art. Locust, and in Hastings DB, s.v.). Cheyne, however, holds out for carob-beans (Encyc. Bibl., artt. 'Husks' and 'John the Baptist'). See also Expos. Times, xv. [1904] pp. 285, 335, 429, xvi. [1905] p. 382.]

How long John remained in 'the deserts,' by which is doubtless meant the awful solitudes of the Wilderness of Judaea, and how he grew into the full sense of the precise nature of his prophetic vocation as the forerunner and herald of the Messiah, we cannot tell. But the Holy Ghost who had been working in him, and the hand of the Lord which had been laid upon him from the first, his own constant brooding over words of ancient prophecy (Joh 1:23, cf. Mat 3:3 ||), and a deep intuitive reading of the signs of the times, would gradually bring him to a clear knowledge both of his function as a prophet and of the time when he must begin to exercise it. And so came at last the day of his 'shewing' (*ἀνάδειξις*) unto Israel (Luk 1:80).

iii. The Public Ministry.—It was in the 15th year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar that the word of God came to John in the wilderness summoning him to enter upon his work as a prophet (Luk 3:1-2). Immediately he obeyed the summons (Luk 3:3). The scene of his ministry, according to Mk., was 'the wilderness' (Mar 1:4), according to Mt. 'the wilderness of Judaea' (Mat 3:1), according to Lk. 'all the country about Jordan' (Luk 3:3). Probably, as hitherto, the Wilderness of Judaea continued to be his home—that wild region which stretches westwards from the Dead Sea and the Jordan to the edge of the central plateau of Palestine; but when he preached he must have

done so in some place not too far removed from the haunts of men, while, owing to his practice of baptism (almost certainly by immersion), the Jordan necessarily marked the central line of his activity (Mat 3:6; Mat 13:16, Mar 1:5; Mar 1:9). To Jn. we owe the information that he baptized on both sides of the river (Joh 1:28; Joh 3:28; Joh 10:40). John's work may be considered under two aspects, (1) his preaching, (2) his baptism.

1. John's Preaching.—According to Mt. the essence of John's preaching, the text as we might say of all his sermons, was this: 'Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand' (Mat 3:2). The second part of this text was the fundamental part. It shows that John was fully conscious that the long-expected Messianic age was now about to dawn, and that it was his mission to proclaim the fact. By his trumpet-voiced proclamation of this fact he thrilled the nation to its heart and drew forth the multitude into the wilderness to hear him (Mat 3:5, Luk 3:7; cf. Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. v. 2)—men from Jerusalem and men from Galilee (Joh 1:19; Joh 1:35 ff.) (civilians and soldiers (Luk 3:10; Luk 3:14), Pharisees and publicans side by side (Mat 3:7, Luk 3:12).

But while the preacher's fundamental message was the announcement of the near approach of the Messianic Kingdom, he combined with these glad tidings of good a stern summons to repentance. Repentance, he said, *μετάνοια*, a change of mind and heart, were indispensable as a preparatory condition for all who would share in the privileges of the new order about to be set up. To the Jewish mind this was an unexpected and unwelcome note in a herald of the Messiah; and John's utterance of it and strenuous emphasis upon it form one of the marks of his profound originality as a prophet. According to the popular conviction, all Israel would have a lot and a part in the blessings of the Messianic age, and that specifically because of their descent from Abraham. It was recognized that judgments would accompany the appearance of the Christ, but these judgments were to fall upon the Gentiles, while Abraham's children would be secure and happy in that day of the Lord. The Talmud explains the cry of the prophetic watchman, 'The morning cometh, and also the night' (Isa 21:12), by saying, 'The night is only to the nations of the world, but the morning to Israel' (Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] *Taan.* 64a, quoted by Edersheim, *Life and Times*, i. 271). Not so, said John. Repentance is the prime requisite for all who would enter the Kingdom of heaven. Descent from Abraham counts for nothing (Mat 3:9). Every fruitless or worthless tree must be hewn down and cast into the fire (Mat 3:10). The very leaders of the nation themselves, the Pharisees and Sadducees, must bring forth fruit worthy of repentance if they are to escape from the wrath to come (Mat 3:7-8).

2. John's Baptism.—Alongside of the spoken word John set that great distinctive symbol of his ministry from which his title 'the Baptist' (ὁ Βαπτιστής) was derived. He

came not only preaching but baptizing, or rather, so closely was the symbol interwoven with the word, he came 'preaching the baptism of repentance' (Mar 1:4, Luk 3:3). To understand John's baptismal doctrine it is necessary to think of the historical roots out of which it sprang. For though he gave to the rite a depth of meaning it had never had in Israel before, he evidently appealed to ideas on the subject which were already familiar to the Jewish people. In particular, three moments in the preceding history of the religion of Israel appear to be gathered up in the baptism of John as it meets us in the Gospels.

(a) *The theocratic washings of the Jews* (Leviticus 11-15, Numbers 19). That a religious intention underlay those 'divers washings' of the ceremonial law is evident (cf. Lev 14:32; Lev 15:13, Mar 1:44, Luk 2:22; Luk 5:14, Joh 2:6), while the historical connexion of John's baptism with them is proved by the fact that in NT times βαπτίζειν had come to be the regular term alike for those ceremonial washings and for the Messianic baptism of the Forerunner (for detailed proof and reff. on these points see the present writer's *Sacraments in the NT*, p. 56 f.). And yet, though John's baptism finds its earliest historical roots in the Levitical washings, it is far from finding its complete explanation there. It was essentially an ethical rite, and thus very different from an outward ceremony to which some value could be attached apart from the moral and spiritual condition of the recipient. In the case of all who came to him John insisted upon repentance; and they 'were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins' (Mat 3:2; Mat 3:6).

(b) *The Messianic lustration foretold by the prophets.*—Long before the time of John, prophetic souls in Israel had seen that for a true cleansing the nation must look to those Messianic days when God should open a fountain for sin and for uncleanness, sprinkling His people with clean water, and putting a new heart and a new spirit within them (Jer 33:8, Eze 36:25-26, Zee 13:1). It was John's function to declare that those great Messianic promises were now going to receive their fulfilment at the hands of the Messiah Himself. His baptism, we have said, was a baptism of preparation for the Kingdom, preparation which took the form of repentance and confession. But even more than a baptism of preparation it was a baptism of promise, promise both of the Kingdom and the King, being a promissory symbol of a perfect spiritual cleansing which the Messiah in person should bestow—'I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me ... shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire' (Mat 3:11 ||).

(c) Another historical moment which should not be lost sight of is *the proselyte baptism of the Jewish Church*. It may now be regarded as certain that the baptism of proselytes had been the rule in Israel long before NT times (see especially Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. i. 319; Edersheim, *Life and Times*, ii.

745 ff.); and proselyte baptism helps us to understand the baptism of John in certain of its aspects. When a Gentile 'sought shelter under the wings of the Shekinah,' it was understood that he was utterly renouncing his past. And John insisted on a like renunciation in the case of candidates for his baptism. The danger of the proclamation that the Kingdom of heaven was at hand lay in the fact that multitudes would claim to enter that Kingdom as a matter of course, without being prepared to submit to the necessary conditions. Not so, said John. God does not depend upon Israel alone for the peopling of His Kingdom. He 'is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham' (Mat 3:9). Even a Jew, if he is to be received, must come as a humble penitent who casts himself upon the Divine grace He must come like a stranger and a proselyte renouncing the past, not as one who claims an inalienable right, but as one who seeks by fruits of repentance to flee from the wrath to come (Mat 3:7-8, Luk 3:7-8). For the baptism of the Coming One is a baptism of judgment. His winnowing-fan is in His hand; and while He will gather His wheat into the garner, He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire (Mat 3:12, Luk 3:17). On the baptism of John see, further, art. Baptism.

iv. John's Baptism of Jesus and Witness regarding Him.—1. The baptism of Jesus by John is recorded in all the Synoptics (Mat 3:13 ff., Mar 1:9 f., Luk 3:21), but is not mentioned in the Fourth Gospel. The author, however, makes the Baptist refer to the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus in the form of a dove (Joh 1:32 ff.) as an authenticating sign which he received that He was the Messiah; and this incident is represented by the other three as following immediately upon the baptism, though the first two, and probably the third also, describe the visible sign as bestowed upon Jesus Himself along with the approving voice from heaven (Mat 3:16, Mar 1:10 f., Luk 3:22). If the scene of the baptism was the same as that of John's subsequent witness to Jesus recorded in the Fourth Gospel, it took place at 'Bethany beyond Jordan' (Joh 1:28), a site which has been much discussed, but cannot be said to have been certainly identified (see art. Bethabara).

It was here, then, in all likelihood, that Jesus met John when He came from Galilee to be baptized of him (Mat 3:13). At first John was unwilling to perform the rite upon such an applicant, but Jesus insisted. 'Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness' (Mat 3:15). He recognized John's baptism as an appointment of the Divine righteousness which it was proper that He should accept. If the fitness of that baptism in the case of Jesus is called in question, we must remember that it had an initiatory aspect which would commend it to Him as He saw in it an opportunity of consecrating Himself definitely and openly to the Messianic kingdom and its tasks. But if John's words of protest (Mat 3:14) imply that even in the baptism of Christ the cleansing aspect of the rite was in view, was it not proper that the 'Lamb of God' (Joh 1:29; Joh 1:36), who had no sense of personal guilt, nothing to repent of or confess, should

even now begin to bear upon His heart the burden of the sins of others, even as on a coming day He was to bear them 'in his own body on the tree' (1Pe 2:24)?

2. Of the intercourse of John with Jesus, the Fourth Gospel gives an account which differs widely from that presented in the Synoptics; but apart from the Johannine colouring of the later narrative, the difference is sufficiently explained on the ordinary view that the Synoptists describe the meeting between the two at the time of our Lord's baptism, while the Fourth Evangelist concerns himself only with John's subsequent testimony to the now recognized Messiah (cf. Joh 1:7 f.). There is no real discrepancy between John's 'I knew him not,' reported in the Fourth Gospel (Joh 1:31), and the representation of Mt. (Mat 3:13 ff.), that when the Man from Nazareth presented Himself at the Jordan, John declined at first to baptize Him, on the ground of his own unworthiness in comparison. Even if we suppose that in spite of their kinship and the friendship between their mothers the two had not met before, the fact that John's baptism was a baptism of repentance and confession seems to imply a personal interview with applicants previous to the performance of the rite—an interview which in the case of Jesus must have revealed to one with the Baptist's insight the beauty and glory of His character. On the other hand, the 'I knew him not' of the last Gospel, as the context shows, only means that John did not know that Jesus was indeed the Messiah until he received the promised sign (Joh 1:32 f.).

It is true that in the Fourth Gospel John is made to bear a witness to Jesus by the banks of the Jordan (Joh 1:15-36) which finds no parallel in the earlier narratives; but if we follow the ordinary view of students of the chronology of our Lord's life—that the narrative of the Fourth Evangelist comes in after the forty days of the Temptation have intervened, and that John now sees Jesus in the light not only of the authenticating sign given at the baptism, but of his own reflexion ever since upon the subject of the character of Jesus and the fulfilment of the Messianic promise—the fulness and explicitness of his testimony upon this later occasion appear perfectly natural. The twice-repeated $\xi\mu\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\nu\epsilon\nu$ (Joh 1:15; Joh 1:30), it is true, cannot be understood, so far as the Baptist himself is concerned, as referring to pre-existence, though this was probably involved in the thought of the Evangelist. But the designation of Jesus as 'the Lamb of God' (Joh 1:29; Joh 1:36), and especially the phrase 'which taketh away the sin of the world' (Joh 1:29), reveals a conception of the Saviour's Messianic functions which is certainly profound, but which, in spite of the objections which have been taken to it, cannot surprise us in the case of one who had brooded like John over the utterances of OT prophecy (cf. especially Isaiah 53).

The Fourth Evangelist records a further witness regarding Jesus which John bore to his own disciples on a later occasion, when he was baptizing in aenon (wh. see), near to Salim (Joh 3:23 ff.). In this passage the difficulty of discriminating between the

original words and facts of history and the Johannine setting and atmosphere is even greater than usual, but the figure of the Bridegroom 'that hath the bride' and the Bridegroom's friend who rejoices in the other's joy (Joh_3:29), and the saying, 'He must increase, but I must decrease' (Joh_3:30), are so thoroughly in keeping with other utterances of the Baptist recorded in the Synoptics as well as in the Fourth Gospel regarding the relations between the Messiah and himself (Mat_3:3; Mat_3:11, Joh_1:15; Joh_1:27), that it is difficult to resist the impression of historical reality which they make upon the reader.

v. John's Imprisonment and Death (Mat_14:3-12, Mar_6:17-29, Luk_3:19-20; cf. Josephus *Ant.* xviii. v. 1, 2).—According to the Synoptists, the arrest and execution of John were due to the spiteful hatred of Herodias (wh. see), because he had rebuked Herod for making her his wife in flagrant defiance of the law of Israel (Lev_18:16; Lev_20:21). Josephus, on the other hand, says that Herod put the prophet to death because he 'feared lest the great influence John had over the people might put it in his power and inclination to raise a rebellion; for they seemed ready to do anything he should advise.' The two statements, however, are not irreconcilable; and certainly the evidence of Josephus, whose interests as a historian lay altogether in the political direction, is not such as to cast any suspicion on the trustworthiness of the more detailed and more intimate Gospel narrative. It may very well have been the case that, while John's death was really due to the implacable hate of Herodias, Herod felt that this was hardly an adequate ground, or one that he would care to allege, for the execution of the Baptist, and so made political reasons his excuse. Assuredly there was nothing of the political revolutionary about John; yet his extraordinary influence over the people and the wild hopes raised among certain classes by his preaching might make it easy for Herod to present a plausible justification of his base deed by representing John as a politically dangerous person.

There may seem to be a contradiction within the Evangelic narratives themselves, when we find Mt. saying that Herod would have put John to death but that he feared the multitude (Mat_14:5), while Mk. alleges that Herod 'feared John, knowing that he was a righteous man and a holy, and kept him safe ... and heard him gladly' (Mar_6:20). But the contradiction lies in Herod's character rather than in the testimonies of the two writers, and the words *πολλὰ ἠπόρει*, 'he was much perplexed' (Mar_6:20 WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), explain adequately enough a moral situation of which we have the final revelation in Herod's weakly vacillating behaviour, 'letting I dare not wait upon I would,' when Herodias through her daughter Salome (Mat_14:6, Mar_6:22; cf. Josephus *Ant.* xviii. v. 4) presented her horrible request. That Herod did not really regard John as a political fanatic is suggested by all that the Gospels tell us as to the way in which he treated him while he lay in prison; by the personal audiences he

granted him (Mar_6:20), and by the fact that he allowed him to have intercourse with his disciples (Mat_11:2, Luk_7:18-19), and through them to exchange messages with Jesus (Mat_11:2-6, Luk_7:19-23).

The message which John sent to Jesus has often been regarded as exceedingly strange on the part of one who had previously borne so signal a witness that Jesus was the Christ, and it has even been suggested that he sent his messengers not because there was any wavering of his own faith, but for the sake of his disciples, to whom he wished some confirmation of the Messiahship of Jesus to be given (see Bebb in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. 680^a). But the more simple explanation is also the one which is truer to human nature. The depression wrought by imprisonment on one accustomed to the freedom of the wilderness, together with his disappointment at the seeming delay of Jesus to assert His power and authority as the Christ of Israel, had resulted in an hour of the power of darkness in the soul of the great prophet, when he began to wonder whether after all he had not made a great mistake. That in spite of his doubts he had not lost his faith in Jesus is shown by the very fact that it was to Jesus Himself that he applied to have these doubts removed, as well as by that message of encouragement and 'strong consolation' which the Bridegroom sent back to His sorely tried friend: 'Blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me' (Mat_11:6, Luk_7:23).

From Josephus we learn that the Castle of Machaerus (wh. see) was the scene of the Baptist's imprisonment (*Ant.* xviii. v. 1, 2). Machaerus was a powerful stronghold, at once a fortress and a palace (*BJ* vii. vi. 1-3; cf. Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* v. xvi. 72), situated on the eastern shores of the Dead Sea (G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [Note: Historical Geog. of Holy Land.] p. 569 f.). Within these gloomy walls, then, the death of John took place, one of 'those awful tragedies for which nature has provided here so sympathetic a theatre' (*op. cit. in loc.*). Of this tragedy St. Mark has furnished us with the fullest account (Mar_6:21-29) in a narrative which is not more thrilling in its dramatic vividness than it is instinct with the elements of what might almost be described as self-evidencing moral and historical truth.

vi. John and his Disciples.—Besides the crowds that came to him to be baptized, John appears to have drawn around him a circle of closer followers, who are referred to in all the Gospels as his 'disciples' (Mat_9:14 [|| Mar_2:18, Luk_5:33] Luk_11:2 [|| Luk_7:18-19], Mar_6:29, Luk_11:1, Joh_1:35; Joh_1:37; Joh_3:25; Joh_4:1; cf. Act_18:25; Act_19:1 ff.). It appears that, unlike Jesus, he enjoined regular fasts upon his disciples (Mat_9:14 ||), and that he also gave them forms of prayer (Luk_11:1) which they were in the habit of employing frequently (Luk_5:33). Possibly he utilized them as assistants in the work of baptizing, for which he could hardly have sufficed personally when his movement was at its height.

It was from the circle of these disciples of the Baptist that the disciples of Jesus were immediately drawn (Joh 1:28-51), and that not only with John's full consent, but through his own express witness both in public (Joh 1:19 ff., Joh 1:29 ff.) and in private (Joh 1:35 f.) to the superior worth of Jesus and to his own function as the mere herald and forerunner of the latter. And yet he did not, as we might have expected, decline, after Christ's baptism, to stand any longer to others in the relation of a master to his disciples. Perfectly loyal as he was to Him whom he recognized as the Messiah, he evidently felt, as Jesus also did previous to John's imprisonment (Joh 3:22; Joh 3:24; Joh 4:1-2), that there was still need for a work of preparation, and room therefore for a discipleship to the Forerunner. But when his disciples grew jealous of the rapidly growing popularity of Jesus, and came to him with their complaint, he proclaimed to them once more the true relation between that Other and himself,—‘He must increase, but I must decrease,’—and reminded them how he had said from the first that he was not the Christ, but was sent before Him (Joh 3:28; cf. Mat 3:11 ||).

The fidelity of John's disciples to their master is shown by their holding together and continuing to observe his prescriptions after he was cast into prison (cf. Mat 4:12 || with Mat 9:14 ||), by their attendance upon him during his captivity (Mat 11:2 ff., Luk 7:18-19 ff.), and by their loving and reverent treatment of his corpse (Mar 6:29). The vital impression he made upon them, and the self-propagating power of the baptism of repentance in the absence of a higher teaching, is proved by the fact that more than 20 years afterwards, and in the far-off city of Ephesus, St. Paul found certain disciples, including no less a personage than Apollos, the Alexandrian Jew, who knew no other baptism than that of John (Act 19:1 ff; cf. Act 18:24 ff.). Before the growing light of Christianity John's baptism as a baptism of preparation for the Messiah soon vanished away, but the traces of his memory and influence are found lingering long afterwards in the name, doctrines, and practices of the Hemerobaptists, who claimed John as one of themselves (*Clem. Hom.* ii. 23; cf. Hegesippus in Euseb. *Historia Ecclesiastica* iv. 22; Justin Martyr, *Dial. c. Tryph.* On the relation of the Hemerobaptists to John, see Lightfoot, *Colossians*, p. 402 ff.).

vii. Our Lord's estimate of John.—The task of appreciating the character and activity of John the Baptist is rendered easy for us by the frequent utterances of Jesus Himself. If the worth of praise is to be measured by the lips from which it falls, no mortal man was ever praised so greatly as he whom Jesus described as ‘a burning and a shining light’ (Joh 5:35), as one who was ‘much more than a prophet’ (Mat 11:9 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, Luk 7:26), as the Elijah who by his coming was to ‘restore all things’ (Mat 11:14; Mat 17:10 ff., Mar 9:11 ff.); and of whom He said: ‘Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist’ (Mat 11:11; see the whole passage, and cf. Luk 7:24 ff.). That John had his limitations Jesus made clear (Mar 2:18 ff.), but He attributed these not to any

personal shortcomings, but to the fact that he belonged to the time of preparation, and so stood by a dispensational necessity outside of the realized Kingdom of God (Mat 11:11 b, Luk 7:28 b).

Again and again Jesus revealed His sense of the Divine value that attached to the baptism of John. He showed it when He insisted on submitting to that baptism Himself, and by the words He used on the occasion (Mat 3:15). He showed it when He asked the question, ‘The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven, or of men?’ (Mat 21:25 ||), a question to which His own answer was self-evident, and which St. Luke answers for us when he says that ‘all the people when they heard, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John. But the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected for themselves the counsel of God, being not baptized of him, Luk 7:29 f.). And may we not say that in His words to a certain Pharisee (Joh 3:1) about the necessity of a birth ‘of water and the Spirit’ (Joh 3:5), He was indicating once more the deep religious value of John’s water-baptism, while insisting at the same time on the indispensableness of that spiritual birth which comes only from above (Joh 3:3)? Time after time, too, even to the closing days of His ministry, words which Jesus let fall reveal to us that He carried about with Him continually the thought of His predecessor’s career, and perceived the bearing of its lessons upon His own ministry and earthly lot and fate (see Mat 9:15 ff. Mat 11:12 ff., Mat 11:18 f., Mat 17:9 ff., Mat 21:32, Luk 16:16). And, finally, after His resurrection, we find that as He had justified John at the first by taking up his baptism of preparation, so now He crowns the work of the Forerunner by instituting the baptism of the Kingdom itself (Mat 28:19). John had adopted the rite as the distinctive symbol of his reforming activity and the gateway into the sphere of Messianic preparation. Jesus transformed it into a sacrament of the Christian Church—at once the token of the gospel of forgiveness and the sign and seal of discipleship to Himself.

Literature.—Relative sections in works on Life of Christ by Neander, Keim, Renan, Weiss, Beyschlag, and Edersheim; Ewald, *H¹* [Note: I History of Israel.] vi. 160-200; Reynolds, *John the Baptist*; Feather, *John the Baptist*; Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible, artt. ‘John the Baptist,’ ‘Baptism,’ and vol. ii. 610f.; *PRE* [Note: RE Real-Encyclopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred], art. ‘Johannes der Tauffer’; Haupt, *Johannes der Täufer*; Bornemann, *Die Taufe Christi church Johannes*; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*, ch. i.; *Expos. Times*, xiii. [1902] 483f. XV. [1903] 5ff.: *Expositor*, i. v. [1877] 11ff., 98 ff., viii. [1878] 23 ff., iii. i. [1885] 267 ff., v. i. [1895] 201 ff., vi. [1897] 139 ff., vii. [1898] 187ff.; Wilkinson, *A Johannine Document in the First Chapter of St. Luke’s Gospel*; the earlier sections of Althaus, *Die Heilsbedeutung der Taufe*.

J. C. Lambert.

John, Gospel Of (Critical)

JOHN, GOSPEL OF (I. Critical article)

Introduction.

- i. External evidence for the authorship of the Fourth Gospel.
 1. Writers of the last quarter of the 2nd century.
 2. Justin Martyr.
 3. Tatian.
 4. The Apostolic Fathers.
 5. Evidence derived from Opponents of the Church doctrine.
 6. Evidence afforded by the Quartodeciman controversy.
 7. The Alogi.
- ii. Internal evidence of authorship.
 1. The author is a Jew.
 2. The author is a Jew of Palestine.
 3. A contemporary of the events and persons.
 4. Relationship to Jesus and the Apostolic circle.
 5. Is John the Apostle the author?
- iii. The divergences from the Synoptic narrative.
- iv. The problem of the historicity of the Gospel.

Literature.

Introduction.—It is important to remember that the Kingdom of Christ was in being before the Gospel records were written. They did not originate the institution, but are themselves the expression of it. Previous to the publication of the Johannine Gospel, which is the latest of the four, St. Paul had completed his mission to the Gentiles; and in Ephesus, where the Gospel was written, his doctrine had already an assured place in the Christian Church. It is therefore historically untrue to say that faith in the Divine Person and work of Jesus is destroyed if the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel cannot be proved. For the basis of our faith we must dig deeper than the results of critical investigation.

The question, however, of the authorship of this Gospel is more than a merely academic one. It occupies a unique position. None of the other three claims to be written by the man whose name it bears, but the Fourth Gospel is issued with an explicit statement to that effect (Joh 21:24). Moreover, its contents are vitally connected with the individuality of the author. The very way in which his identity is studiously concealed shows that the writer is himself conscious that the Gospel contains a personal testimony, which he does not hesitate to present as objective and impersonal. We desire to know who it is that claims to be an eye-witness; who it is that narrates events and discourses of Jesus so distinct in character from the Synoptics, and yet meant to occupy a place alongside these without contradiction; who it is that has so boldly mingled historic fact and ideal conceptions, that has given to the Person of Christ a timeless cosmic significance, and has represented our Lord in His acts and in His words as Himself justifying that impression and those claims. If, as is certain, the work is influenced by developed theological conceptions, and reflects the contemporary historical situation of the Christian Church, we desire to be certain that the writer was in a position not seriously to misrepresent the actual facts. This is no merely antiquarian question. There can be no doubt that the Gospel is intended to be read as the work of the Apostle, and it would seriously detract from its value, if, as extreme critics are more and more inclined to allow, that claim means only that it contains a nucleus of Johannine tradition. The same objection applies to all partition theories of the Gospel (*e.g.* Wendt's), and it is assumed in this article that their authors have failed to prove their case. If, on the other hand, the writer was the beloved disciple, an eye-witness possessing a specially intimate knowledge of the mind and character of Jesus, we have an assurance that when, for example, he wrote the opening sentences of the Gospel, he felt himself in touch not merely with current theological thought, but with the historic fact of the consciousness of Jesus of Nazareth. So far from being a stumbling-block to the Johannine authorship, the Prologue even gains in value and significance with the acceptance of the traditional view. The striking juxtaposition in the Prologue of the timeless Logos idea and the historical witness of the Baptist, to whom the conception was unfamiliar, and the frequent mention of the Baptist throughout the Gospel, I even at times when the situation scarcely demands it (*e.g.* Joh 10:40-42) are saved from abruptness only if

the writer is developing an impression made on him by his earliest teacher, who led him to Christ. His experience stretches in one continuous whole from that time to this when he begins to write.

I. *External Evidence for the authorship of the Fourth Gospel.*—The face of the Johannine problem has greatly changed since the days of Baur and his school. The prophecy of Lightfoot, that ‘we may look forward to the time when it will be held discreditable to the reputation of any critic for sobriety and judgment to assign to, this Gospel any later date than the end of the first century or the very beginning of the second,’ has been amply fulfilled. 80-110 a.d. may be regarded as the *termini a quo* and *ad quem* for the date of the writing, and the trend of modern opinion is towards the end of the 1st century. This result makes it desirable to throw the emphasis in a less degree on the external evidence for an early date, and in a, greater degree on the evidence for the Apostolic authorship. If, however, the problem of external evidence be presented in this form, we must guard ourselves against a certain feeling of disappointment at the meagre results. In the first place, there is no evidence that the Apostolic authorship was contested in the 2nd cent. except by the Alogi; and none that it was ever debated. The questions that agitated the mind of the Church in this period seem to have been entirely doctrinal (Gnosticism and Montanism). Again, it is not until the latter part of the century that there are indications of a distinct value attached to each separate Gospel. *Εὐαγγέλιον* was the term employed to denote the general contents of those books that embodied the facts concerning the life and teaching of our Lord, and we first find the term *εὐαγγέλιον* in Justin (*Apol.* i. lxvi.). The contrast between the Synoptics and John in this period arose entirely from the differences in subject-matter, and there is no indication that the Fourth Gospel was set on a lower plane of authority.

One remarkable fact in connexion with the external evidence is that none of the writers in question ever actually calls St. John an Apostle. This fact is never lost sight of by opponents of the Apostolic authorship, it is true that Irenaeus speaks of ‘John and the other Apostles’; but in referring to St. John alone he always calls him ‘the disciple.’ This is in accordance with the usage of the Fourth Gospel itself, where the title *ἀπόστολος* is only once used (Joh_13:16), and there in a sense that seems to deprecate any presumptuous or mercenary claim to official position. If such claims were rife in Ephesus, perhaps St. John himself preferred to be known as ‘disciple.’ (Cf. H. T. Purchas, *Johann. Problems and Modern Needs*, ch. 3.).

We shall now proceed to examine in detail, working backwards from the end of the 2nd cent., the evidence of those Ecclesiastical writers who have made direct or indirect reference to the Fourth Gospel.

1. A group of writers in the last quarter of the 2nd cent. whose geographical distribution over the Christian Church gives evidence of a widespread tradition.

(1) **Irenaeus** was bishop of Lyons in Gaul. His work entitled *Against Heresies* has come down to us, and in the writings of Eusebius we possess other fragments. An important letter to Florinus has also been preserved. The date of his literary activity may be put within the limits 173-190. He explicitly attributes the Fourth Gospel to the Apostle, and gives it a place alongside Matthew, Mark, and Luke. He says that 'John, the disciple of the Lord, who leaned upon His breast,' wrote it 'while dwelling in Ephesus, the city of Asia' (*adv. Haer.* in. i. 1). Stress is also to be laid on the fact that Irenaeus speaks of the Gospels not merely as Apostolic, but also as inspired by the Holy Spirit. For him the tradition of the fourfold Gospel, which he supports strongly, has passed into a deep spiritual fact, which he seeks to establish, not by bringing forward proofs of authorship, but in his well-known mystic fashion. 'The gospel is the Divine breath or word of life for men; there are four chief winds therefore four Gospels.' He brings forward other analogies, all of which are equally fanciful, but serve to show that this firm belief in the fourfold Gospel as a Divine arrangement could not have been a creation of his own mind, but represents a tradition of considerable antiquity. The opinion of Irenaeus is corroborated by a contemporary letter written by the members of the Churches at Vienne and Lyons to the brethren in Asia Minor during the time of persecution in 177. Thus Irenaeus is in touch with the living Church around him.

(2) **Clement of Alexandria** is the author of a statement preserved by Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* vi. 14), which professes to represent 'the tradition of the Presbyters from the first (παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνεκασθεν πρεσβυτέρων) that John, last, having observed that the bodily things [σωματικά, *i.e.* the simple facts relating to the life and teaching of Christ] had been set forth in the Gospels, on the exhortation of his friends (γνώριμοι), inspired by the Spirit, produced a spiritual Gospel.' From about 189, Clement was head of the celebrated catechetical school at Alexandria. His great reverence for his teacher Pantaenus, who also preceded him in office, may fairly be regarded as indicating that he represents the ecclesiastical tradition at Alexandria. He was also in living touch with opinion at other centres. He travelled in Greece, Magna Graecia, Syria, and the East, expressly for the purpose of collecting information about the Apostolic tradition. In his extant writings he quotes words from all the four Gospels, regards them as possessing Divine authority, and lays great emphasis on the differences between them and other writings professing to be Gospels.

(3) **Tertullian** was a famous theologian of the Western Church, and was born at Carthage about 160. The style of his writing suggests that he was trained as an advocate. He was reputed a man of great learning. Jerome speaks of his 'eager and

vehement disposition,' and his habit of mind is in striking contrast to the philosophic temper of Clement. It is needless to quote passages from his writings, as he undoubtedly assumes without question the genuineness of the Gospel, and lays under contribution every chapter. Little is known of his personal life, but he was certainly in touch with theological opinion, not only at Carthage, but also at Rome. In the line of argument that he adopts in his reply to Marcion he is concerned above all else to show that the doctrine of the Church is in line with Apostolic tradition. He makes appeal in another writing, *de Praescriptione Haereticorum*, to the testimony of those Churches that were founded by Apostles, or to whom Apostles declared their mind in letters. Among these he mentions Ephesus, evidently in connexion with the name of St. John. His term for the fourfold Gospel is a legal term, *Evangelieum Instrumentum*, i.e. a valid document finally declaring the mind of the Church with regard to spiritual truth. He became a distinguished leader of the Montanists, and would on that account be predisposed to combat any objection, if it had been urged, against the authenticity of the Gospel. At the same time, he is not indifferent to questions of literary criticism, applied to the Gospels. In his reply to Marcion he makes careful and scholarly investigation into the text of St. Luke, and is able to prove that Marcion's Gospel is a mutilated copy.

(4) **The Muratorian Fragment on the Canon.**—This fragment contains the earliest known list of the books that were regarded at the date at which it was written as canonical. It was published in the year 1740 by an Italian scholar, Muratori.

Lightfoot, Westcott, and others argue for a date 150-175; but Salmon, Zahn, and Harnack agree in placing its date, from internal evidence, not earlier than a.d. 200. Sanday, in his *Gospels in the Second Century* (pp. 264-266), suggests 170-180, and perhaps within ten years later. Stanton, in *The Gospels as Historical Documents* (p. 247, n. [Note: note.] 1), inclines to the later date.

The writer gives an account of the origin of the Fourth Gospel which is plainly legendary. The important statement in it is that the Gospel is the work of St. John (*Johannes ex discipulis*), who is also the author of at least two of the Epistles (*in suis epistolis*). The further statement is made that he resolved to write it after a fast had been held, and at the request of contemporary Christians (*cohortantibus condiscipulis et episcopis suis*), and the concurrence is also claimed of the rest of the Apostles (*recognoscentibus cunctis*). The second statement seems, like the γνώριμοι of Clement, to be founded on Joh 1:14; Joh 21:24, and possesses no independent value, except as an interpretation of internal evidence.

The object of the author was clearly controversial, 'to draw a broad line of separation between the inspired writings of the Apostolic age and modern additions' (Salmon,

Introduction, p. 46). He strongly protests, for example, against the inclusion of *Hermas* in the Canon, though he has no objection to its being 'read.' Bacon (*Hibbert Journal*, April 1903) has interpreted the Muratorian Fragment as indicating the existence of controversy in the Church at that date as to the Apostolic authorship; but the emphasis on that question might easily be explained by the fact that the historicity—the *varia principia* of the Gospels—was alone in question. There is no attempt to *harmonize* the statements in the various Gospels; but it is sought to secure for the contents of the Fourth Gospel a place of equal authority with the other three. Throughout the whole history of the NT Canon the admission of a book was not decided solely on the question of authorship, but far more on the general consideration whether its teaching was congruent with the received doctrine of the Church. Salmon thinks that the writer of the Muratorian Fragment is arguing against the Montanists, and Zahn and Drummond that he is opposing the Alogi (see below). The legendary account of the origin of the Gospel would seem to indicate that the fact of the Apostolic authorship was already well established and well known. An additional confirmation of the view that the historicity alone is within the purview of the writer is that the words of the First Epistle (it is true in a somewhat inaccurate rendering), 'What we have seen with our eyes, and heard with our ears, and our hands have handled, these things we have written' (*haec scripsimus*), are quoted as a reference by the author to his Gospel.

(5) **Theophilus**, bishop of Antioch (e. a.d. 180), wrote, among other works, a defence of Christianity, addressed to Autolycus, 'a real or imaginary heathen friend of wide learning and high culture' (Watkins). He is the earliest writer of the 2nd cent., who, while quoting a passage from the Gospel (1:13), also refers to St. John by name. His words are, 'We are taught by the Holy Scriptures and all Spirit-bearing men, among whom John says'; and then follow *verbatim* quotations from the Prologue to the Gospel. There are also other sentences in his work that recall the Fourth Gospel. It is significant also, as belying any appearance of controversy as to the authorship of the Gospel, that he introduces the name of St. John in this quite incidental fashion. Commentaries on the Gospels are also attributed to him, but their genuineness, upheld by Zahn, is assailed by Harnack. This part of his evidence must at present be set aside.

2. Justin Martyr.—The works of Justin that are relevant in this connexion are the two *Apologies* and the *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*. They may be set within the limits a.d. 140-161. Palestine was his birthplace, and he was brought up in the religion of his father, who was a heathen. He was an ardent student of philosophy, and after an unsatisfying experience of various teachers he ultimately became a Platonist. After his conversion to Christianity, of which he gives a full account in *Trypho*, ii-viii., he was 'kindled with love to Christ,' and consecrated his philosophic attainments to the defence of the Christian religion.

Among the authorities to which Justin refers in the course of his writings, he gives an important place to ‘The Memoirs of Christ, composed by the Apostles and those who followed them.’ The battle of criticism still rages around the question whether Justin includes in these Memoirs only the four Gospels. It may now, at least, be regarded as settled amongst all classes of critics that Justin makes use of the Gospel (cf. Schmiedel, *Encyc. Bibl.*, art. ‘John, Son of Zebedee,’ ii. 2546). It is not so generally admitted that he includes it among his Memoirs of the Apostles. Those, however, who deny that Justin regarded the Gospel as the work of the Apostle are laid under the necessity of explaining how his contemporary Irenaeus could be so assured that the Gospel is a genuine Apostolic work.

(1) *Quotations.*—The *locus classicus* in Justin is the passage on Baptism (*Apol.* I. lxi.). He describes how those who are about to make a Christian profession—

‘are brought by us where there is water, and are born again in the same manner in which we ourselves are born again. For in the name of God the Father and Lord of the universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, they then receive the washing with water. For Christ also said, “Except ye be born again, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven” (ὅν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ ἐσιλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλειαν τῶν οὐρανῶν). Now that it is impossible for those who have once been born to enter into their mother’s wombs, is manifest to all.’

This passage immediately recalls Joh 3:3-5. The language, however, reveals some striking variations from the text of the Gospel. No one would now endorse the verdict of the author of *Supernatural Religion*, that ‘there does not exist a single linguistic trace by which the passage in Justin can be connected with the Fourth Gospel.’ It may be conceded that some of his expressions have more than an accidental relationship with Mat 18:3. Justin certainly uses ἀναγεννηθῆτε (‘born again’) instead of γεννηθῆ ἄνωθεν (‘born from above’) of the Fourth Gospel, but this variation is at least a possible rendering of the Johannine expression. There are, however, other linguistic differences. The difficulty is increased by the discovery that in the *Clementine Homilies* (xi. 26) there is a passage containing similar linguistic deviations from the Gospel. Has their author copied Justin, or does the similarity point to the use by both of a common source other than the Gospel? The fact that the context in each is quite different excludes the first hypothesis, and the second may well be viewed as improbable, until the alleged common source—that ‘ghost-like’ Gospel of which Volkmar speaks—has emerged from the place of shades, and embodied itself in a MS (cf. Drummond, *Character and Authorship*, pp. 88-96).

It ought to be sufficient to establish the high probability, amounting to certainty, that Justin quotes Joh 3:3-5, that, giving due weight to linguistic differences, the Fourth Gospel is the only source known to us from which he could have derived such ideas. The idea of birth as applied to spiritual change is found in none of the Gospels but St. John; and it is significant that both Justin and St. John expressly connected this thought with the rite of Baptism. As regards the impossibility of a second physical birth, it is to be noted that this somewhat wistful, and, at the same time, wilfully absurd, objection of Nicodemus—which in the Gospel is the symptom of a heart profoundly moved, and has a living place in the context—is prosaically reproduced by Justin. This is evidently the result of a familiar association of ideas derived from the passage in John 3. The words, ‘for Christ also said,’ introduce the quotation, and the document from which it is taken is clearly looked upon as an authoritative source for the words of Christ.

Justin has other correspondences with the peculiar thought of the Fourth Gospel. He uses the title *μονογενής* of Christ, and in the next sentence speaks of the Virgin-Birth (*Dialogue* 105), adding the words, ‘as we have learned from the Memoirs.’ This seems to point to a combination of St. John and the Synoptics. Justin has also made much use of the thought of the Logos Gospel in his doctrine of the Logos, and his teaching on that subject is influenced by the theology of the Gospel. It is sometimes urged as an objection that Justin does not make more use of the authority of the Gospel in his teaching about the Logos, but this is to presuppose that the thought was first suggested to him by that source. Justin’s philosophy is filled with Alexandrine ideas, but the thought of the Incarnation of the Logos of which Justin makes use is found only in St. John (*Apol.* i. 32). The Johannine expressions *φῶς*, *σὰρξ* are also found in Justin.

On the question of the relationship between Justin and the fragment of the *Gospel of Peter*, discovered in 1892, see Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible iii. 535^b; Drummond, *Character and Authorship*, pp. 151-155. The evidence is insufficient to prove that this Gospel is one of Justin’s Memoirs. Loisy and Harnack hold that the *Gospel of Peter* is dependent on the Fourth Gospel, to whose existence it would therefore be the most ancient witness. The date of the *Gospel of Peter* is put *circa (about)* 110-130 by Loisy (*Le Quatrième Évangile*, p. 16) and Harnack (*Chron.* i. 623).

(2) *His use of the Gospel.*—Another consideration is adduced to prove that Justin did not regard the Gospel as an authority on the same level as the Synoptics, and therefore viewed it as non-Apostolic. Schmiedel (*Encyc. Bibl.*, art. ‘John, Son of Zebedee,’ ii. 2546) states that ‘his employment of it is not only more sparing but also more circumspect’ than his use of the Synoptics. There are occasions on which it would be open to him to use it in proof of his doctrine of the Logos and of the

pre-existence of Christ. Why has Justin not used the Fourth Gospel more? It is perfectly relevant to reply that we do not know, and perhaps never shall know, with complete certainty. At the same time, there are certain considerations that ought to be borne in mind. Justin is certainly the first writer who displays the tendency to attach a separate value to the four Gospels; he is the first to speak of εὐαγγέλια instead of εὐαγγέλιον; but he can scarcely be expected to have completely emancipated himself, at this transition stage, from the older conception of the gospel as embracing equally the contents of the four. Justin's purpose and his audience must be borne in mind, and these would insensibly lead him to rely mostly on the Synoptic Gospels. It is specially noticeable that the witness of Christ to Himself, so prominent in the Fourth Gospel, is nowhere used by Justin as an argument, and in one place in the *Dialogue with Trypho* (ch. 18) he even apologizes for citing the words of Christ alongside the words of the prophets. His *Apologies* are addressed to the Emperor, Senate, and People of Rome, and to quote to them the Christian writings in proof of Christian doctrine would have been to reason in a circle. Moreover, it may be suggested that not even at that date was the Gospel regarded as, strictly speaking, historical, and its spiritual or reflective character rendered it hardly so suitable for Justin's purpose as the Synoptics.

(3) *Evidence as to Apostolic authorship.*—Is there any evidence in Justin that he attributed the authorship to St. John the Apostle? In the first place, if the *Memoirs* are composed of our four Gospels, we may answer the question with certainty in the affirmative. Justin describes them as composed by 'the Apostles and those that followed them,' a description which tallies completely with the four Evangelists. The plural 'Apostles' could be used only if he believed in the Apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel. Again, the strongest argument adduced against Justin's evidence is still the argument from his silence as to the name of the author. It seems, however, to have been the custom among apologists not to mention the Evangelists by their names, which would carry no weight with unbelievers. Moreover, it has been pointed out that Justin never mentions the name of St. Paul, although it is certain that at least four of his Epistles from which he quotes are of undoubted authenticity. Justin once names St. John as the author of Revelation (*Dialogue* 81), but 'he nowhere quotes this work, which he regarded as inspired, apostolic, prophetic, though it contains so much which might seem to favour his view of the person of Christ' (Ezra Abbot, p. 61). In the passage he speaks of the author as one whose name is not likely to carry weight ('a certain man with us, whose name was John'), but it is essential to his argument, in thus making use of a Revelation or Vision, that he should mention the recipient. (Cf. Stanton, *Gospels as Historical Documents*, i. p. 89).

3. Tatian was a native of Syria, and, like Justin, travelled as a wandering philosopher. His conversion to Christianity took place at Rome about a.d. 150. He became a

disciple of Justin, during whose lifetime he wrote the *Oratio ad Graecos*. After Justin's death in 166, Tatian taught in Rome, and ultimately adopted a heretical position. He died about a.d. 180.

Tatian clearly quotes the Gospel in his *Oratio*, which was written perhaps as early as 153 (so Zahn and Harnack), although he does not refer to the author by name. The important work, however, for our purpose is the *Diatessaron*. It is a compendium of the Life and Teaching of our Lord, founded on our four Gospels, and containing also some material taken from the Apocryphal Gospels. The book had apparently an ancient place in the worship of the Syrian Churches. Theodoret, bishop of Cyrrhus, near the Euphrates, in 453, tells how he found more than 200 copies of the work in the churches of his district. These lie collected and, with considerable difficulty, put away, substituting for them the *four* Gospels.

The *Diatessaron* includes the whole of the Fourth Gospel, except 1:6, the first half of 2:23, the *Pericope Adulterae*, and some other passages that are common to the Synoptics.

The significance of Tatian's work lies in the fact that an authoritative value is attached to the contents of our four Gospels, and that the Fourth Gospel is placed on a level with the Synoptics. Moreover, Tatian's use of the Fourth Gospel renders it very difficult to doubt that it was also one of the Memoirs of his contemporary, Justin.

4. The Apostolic Fathers

(1) **Papias** was bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia. Unfortunately his testimony has given rise to more questions about the Gospel than it solves. Only one or two fragments of his work preserved by Eusebius have come down to us. We know that in the time of Eusebius the only writing of Papias to which he had access was a work in five books, entitled 'Exposition(s) of the Oracles of the Lord' (Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις [ορ -εις]). Cf. Drummond, *op. cit.* note 4, p. 195.

The 'Oracles' were probably a collection of sayings of our Lord, together with some kind of historical setting.

There is a tendency among modern critics to fix a later date than formerly for the writings of Papias. His written work seems not to have been produced till about the age of sixty. The change in the date is owing to the discovery of a fragment, purporting to contain statements by Papias, that was published by De Boor in 1888. It dates from the 7th or 8th cent., and is in turn probably based on the *Chronicle* of Philip of Sidé (*circa (about)* a.d. 430). Among other matters it relates that those individuals who had been raised from the dead by Christ survived 'till the time of

Hadrian.’ Hadrian reigned 117-138, which compels us to fix a date for Papias’ work not earlier than 140-160 (so Harnack, Drummond, and Schmiedel. Sanday in his most recent work, *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, includes the date of Papias among the ‘unsolved problems’). The date of his martyrdom is also very uncertain.

Eusebius says that Papias ‘evidently was a man of very mean capacity, as one may say, judging from his statements’ (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 39). This judgment must be considered strictly in connexion with the context. Eusebius is speaking of his millenarian notions, and of the unimaginative way in which he interpreted the figurative language of the Apostolic writings. These defects do not reflect on his accuracy in matters of fact, but rather indicate a literalness and exactness which may at times be painful, but are yet a source of strength in the present discussion.

(i.) Papias is best known by the famous extract from the Preface to his work which is preserved by Eusebius:

‘I will not hesitate to place before you, along with my interpretations (of the Oracles of the Lord), everything that carefully learned, and carefully remembered in time past from the elders, and I can guarantee its truth. For I take no pleasure, as do the many, in those who have so very much to say, but in those who teach the truth: nor in those who relate commandments foreign (to the mind of the Lord), but in those (who record) such as were given to the faith by the Lord, and found on the truth itself. Moreover, if met with anyone on any occasion who had attended the elders, I used to inquire about the words of the elders; what Andrew or what Peter said, or what Philip, or what Thomas, or James or John or Matthew, or any other of the disciples of the Lord said, and what Aristion and the elder John, disciples of the Lord, say. For I was not inclined to suppose that statements made by the books would help me, so much as the utterances of a living and abiding voice’ (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 39).

Several questions of moment are raised by these words of Papias.

(a) *Who are the elders or presbyters of whom he speaks?*—They clearly include the Apostles themselves, and Papias derives his information from their friends, *i.e.* those who not merely ‘had followed them’ in the literal sense, but had ‘attended to’ (παρηκολουθηκώς) their words. He is in search of direct oral tradition about the ‘Oracles.’ At the same time he mentions two, Aristion and John, who are not Apostles, and whom he regards as ‘presbyters’ or elders. He also designates the whole group as ‘disciples of the Lord.’ In the case of Aristion and the Presbyter John, *οι μαθηται* is found only in one MS, and the preferable reading is to omit the article. In the first case, the use of the article with *μαθητων* means ‘*the* disciples’ specially known as such, and the key

to the use of the term 'disciple' in the second case, is found in the statement of Act 6:7, where all those who were members of the first Christian community are called 'disciples.' The 'Elders,' then, signify all those men who were members of the primitive Christian Church who may or may not have followed the Lord Himself.

Irenaeus has said that Papias was 'a hearer of John,' by whom he evidently means the Apostle. This would place him in immediate contact with the Apostolic circle. If, however, we are to rely only on the statements in the Preface, it is plain that Eusebius must be right when, in opposition to Irenaeus, he says that 'Papias certainly does not declare that he himself was a hearer and eye-witness to the holy Apostles.' Yet even with the later date assigned to Papias, there is no chronological impossibility in his having known the Apostle; and it must not be forgotten that Irenaeus was not necessarily dependent solely on the words of the Preface, but may have had other statements of Papias, or the living tradition of the Church, on which to found his assertion. If the position has to be surrendered that Papias was a 'hearer of John,' it is at least certain that he put himself in the most favourable position to hear clearly 'the living and abiding voice' of Apostolic times, conveyed to him through the 'friends' of the Elders.

(b) What can we determine regarding the nature and purpose of the work of Papias?—He contrasts his sources with 'those who have so very much to say' (τοῖς τὰ πολλὰ λέγουσιν), with 'those who relate commandments foreign to the mind of the Lord' (τοῖς τὰς ἀλλοτριᾶς ἐντολὰς μνημονεύουσιν) and with 'the contents of the books' (τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων). 'The books' which he mentions have been interpreted as meaning some form of 'the Gospels' (Jülicher, *Introd.*, English translation p. 487), and also as 'writings of Aristion and the Elder John' (Drummond and Bacon). In regard to the former interpretation, it seems out of the question that Papias should oppose 'the living and abiding voice' to the sources of his Logia. On the other hand, it is hardly likely that Papias would minimize the value of the oral evidence of Aristion and the Presbyter John by disparaging their written work. The simplest explanation is that given by Lightfoot (followed by Schwarz, *Ueber den Tod der Sohne Zebedaei*, p. 11), that the exegetical commentaries on the Gospels written by Gnostics like Basilides are meant. It is to these also that he refers when he speaks of 'foreign commandments' and of 'those who have so very much to say.' Papias himself seems to have been a commentator on the 'Oracles of the Lord,' and seeks to support his own explanations (ἐξηγήσεις) by direct oral tradition from those who were in touch with the first Christian community.

(c) *What position does the Presbyter John hold in Papias' view?*—It is noticeable that while the past tense 'said' (εἶπεν) is used of the first group of Apostles, as though they were dead at the time of writing, the present tense 'say' (λέγουσιν) is used of Aristion and the Presbyter John. The entirely unconvincing explanation of Lightfoot, that the tense should probably be regarded as an historic present, introduced 'for the sake of variety,' must be rejected. On the other hand, the present tense seems rather meagre evidence on which to rear the hypothesis that *books* written by these two men were before Papias (so Drummond, *Character and Authorship*, p. 200), especially as he distinctly tells us that it is oral evidence of which he is in search. There is evidence in the writing of Papias that some literary productions of these men were extant, but the intention of Papias in his Preface seems to be to convey the impression that they were alive at the time he wrote. Papias had begun, at a much earlier time ('in time past'), to collect information from the elders, and had gone on doing so up to the time of writing. He means that Aristion and John are still available for anyone who wishes to check the authority of the explanations he gives.

The foregoing establishes the reality of the second John. It is no longer possible to regard the existence of the Presbyter 'as due to a confusion of Eusebius,' or to accuse Papias of 'slovenliness of composition,' which would lead us to suppose that two Johns are mentioned, while all the time he is only referring to the same man a second time. The question is debated by modern critics whether this Presbyter John has any connexion with the authorship of the Gospel. It is necessary only to indicate the grounds on which the suggestion is based. Eusebius, in the passage from which we have quoted (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 39), suggests that he is the author of Revelation. He controverts the statement of Irenaeus that Papias means to be looked upon as a hearer of the Apostle John, and gathers from the use of the present tense (ΛΕΓΟΥΣΙΝ) that he is really a hearer of Aristion and the Elder John. We have seen that in the time of Papias these two men were still alive, but the evidence as to his relationship with them rather suggests that he had not himself met them. Papias seems to have had to collect information about what they 'say,' and Eusebius himself puts forward his statement about an oral relationship merely as a suggestion. It does not follow that Eusebius, in attributing the authorship of Revelation to the Presbyter, even hints at the idea that he is also the author of the Gospel. He may have regarded it as an advantage to assign another authorship to the book, that the Apostle John might not be held responsible for the millenarian ideas of Papias. Papias accords the Presbyter no special place of honour in his list, and indeed places him last, after Aristion. If Papias had recorded anything of importance about him, no doubt Eusebius would have noted it, in order to support his view of the authorship of Revelation. See also artt. Aristion and Papias.

(ii.) We have next to inquire *whether there is any evidence in the writing of Papias that he used the Fourth Gospel.* (a) A passage occurs in the writings of Irenaeus which contains a quotation of Joh_14:2 'Our Lord has said, that in the abode of my Father are many mansions.' The passage is introduced, like many others in Irenaeus, as a quotation from the words of 'the Elders.' Is Irenaeus here quoting from the sayings of 'the Elders' as reported by Papias? By the way in which the Johannine quotation is prefaced, it is fair to suppose that 'the Elders' are here referring to a written record, and not reproducing merely oral tradition, and that some well-known and accepted source for the words of our Lord is meant.

An additional confirmation of the position that Irenaeus quotes *verbatim* from the Elders of Papias is found in another portion of his work. He is speaking of the fruitfulness of the earth at the millennium, and inserts a fanciful passage about vines with ten thousand shoots. He says that he received it from 'the Elders who saw John, the disciple of the Lord.' After quoting the passage, he adds: 'Papias also, a hearer of John and companion of Polycarp, an ancient man, confirms these things in writing.' Harnack contends that the words 'also' and 'confirms in writing' 'certainly ought not to be pressed' to mean that Irenaeus is giving a confirmation from Papias of the words of the Elders, but that he only means to indicate the written source from which he takes them. (This position is stoutly opposed by Schmiedel, *op. cit.* ii. 2549, where see a statement of the whole controversy and its issues).

If Papias quotes 14:2 we have here an important clue to an early date for the Gospel. The Elders of Papias belonged to the early Christian community.

(b) There are indications in the Preface of Papias that the Gospel permeates his thought, and that the references would be apparent to his readers. He speaks of 'those who teach the truth' (τοῖς ἀληθῆ διδάσκουσιν), and he also applies the term 'the Truth' to Christ. It is also not without significance that St. Andrew and St. Peter and St. Philip are named in the exact order in which the names occur in the first chapter of St. John, while St. Philip and St. Thomas are prominent only in the Fourth Gospel.

(c) Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 39) says that 'Papias has used testimonies from the former Epistle of John and from that of Peter similarly.' If 1 John and the Gospel are by the same author, we have here additional confirmation that Papias knew and used the Fourth Gospel. This item of evidence, however, can have weight only in connexion with the rest of the evidence. Formerly the fact that Eusebius, while mentioning his use of the Epistle, is silent as to any use of the Gospel by Papias, was relied upon as a strong argument for the nonexistence of the Gospel before 160-170 (*e.g.* in *Supernatural Religion*). After Lightfoot's complete answer to this

position (*Essays on Supernatural Religion*, ii.), it is not now possible to deny a much earlier date for the Gospel. Modern opponents of the traditional view now rely on the argument from the silence of Eusebius, as proving that Papias nowhere appeals to the Gospel as of Apostolic authority (e.g. Bacon). It is therefore necessary to examine anything in Papias which seems to indicate that he regarded the Gospel as the work of St. John the Apostle.

(iii.) *The evidence of Papias as to the authorship of the Gospel.*—(a) Eusebius, in the often quoted passage, says that Papias distinguishes the Presbyter John from John the Apostle, 'evidently meaning the Evangelist.' The words in inverted commas would seem to point to some indication that Eusebius found in Papias' writing that he spoke of St. John the Apostle as the Evangelist. To this may be added the naming of St. John immediately after the Evangelist St. Matthew in the Preface.

(b) A Vatican MS of the 9th cent. contains the statement: 'Evangelium Johannis manifestatum et datum est ecclesiis ab Johanne adhuc in corpore constituto: sicut Papias nomine Hierapolitanus, discipulus Johannis carus, in exotericis—id est in extremis—quinque libris retulit. Descripsit vero evangelium dictante Johanne recte.' The words are part of a translation of an early Greek *argumentum* or proof that the Gospel was written by John the Apostle. As the passage stands, the words *exotericis* and *extremis* are unintelligible, and the conjecture of Lightfoot may be accepted that the former should read *exegeticis* and *extremis* should read *externis*, which was an explanation of the false reading *exoterieis*. Again, it is nonsense to say that the Gospel was published 'by John while he was yet alive'; and Harnack suggests (*Chron.* i. 665) that the preposition *ab* should be deleted. With these changes it is possible to make sense of the words. The statement 'Johanne adhuc in corpore constituto' would then imply that there was an interval between the writing and the publication of the Gospel and has reference to Joh 21:25. This would explain why Papias had found it necessary to say that the Gospel was published 'in the lifetime of the Apostle.' The statement at the end, that Papias wrote the Gospel at the dictation of St. John, may safely be set aside. At the same time, apart from the fact that it is necessary so to edit the fragment, there are serious difficulties in the way of accepting it as reliable evidence. For one thing, it is strange that Eusebius does not mention such a statement in Papias, although he mentions similar statements of his with regard to St. Matthew and St. Mark. Moreover, in view of the modern question of the Presbyter authorship, there is nothing to indicate which John is meant. (For discussion of the alleged statement of Papias recorded by Philip of Side, that John died a martyr in Jerusalem, see art. John [the Apostle]).

If the direct testimony of Papias must be regarded as inconclusive, it may fairly be asked whether we have a right to expect more. There is a very high probability that the Gospel was one of the sources of the 'Oracles' which he expounded, and his

silence as to the author, so far from displaying any uncertainty on the question, may quite as easily be interpreted as meaning that the personality of St. John was eclipsed in the mind of Papias by the desire to hear the living voice of the Lord Himself in the Gospel. It is probable that in Papias we are in the presence of a certain conservatism which marked with some regret the dying out of those who were in possession of the oral tradition about the life and teaching of Jesus, and the gradual substitution of the written word as the authority for the Christian life which, of necessity, was taking place. It was his aim from an early period in his activity to collect the oral tradition. One thing at least is practically certain, that if Papias knew and quoted the Gospel, it must have been for him an authentic record. If the Gospel emerged at the close of the 1st cent. or the very beginning of the 2nd, as it undoubtedly did, and did not bring with it the strongest credentials and most unmistakable indications that it was in complete accord with the accredited oral teaching so much valued by Papias, it is difficult to think that in a mind of such simplicity as his it could have raised, as it appears to have done, only the merest ripple on the surface.

(2) **Ignatius** was bishop of Antioch in Syria. A number of letters have come down to us under his name, of which only seven are genuine. The writer was at the time on his way from Antioch to Rome under sentence of death. The date 110-117, the closing years of Trajan's reign, may be assigned to them.

In Rom 7:2, Ignatius says, 'There is not in me a fire fed by fleshly motive, but water living and speaking in me, saying within me, Come to the Father.' These words 'inevitably recall Joh 4:10; Joh 4:14 (cf. also Joh 4:23 'the Father seeketh such to worship him'). Not only the ideas, but the coincidence of ideas, seem to point to the story of the woman of Samaria as to a passage in the Gospel which is affording him comfort in his trial. Again, in *Philad.* vii. 1, he says, 'The Spirit is not deceived, being from God; for it knoweth whence it cometh and whither it goeth, and searcheth out the hidden things' (cf. Joh 3:8; Joh 8:14, 1Jn 2:11). There are some striking differences in the thought of the parallel passages; but it is difficult to resist the conclusion that the words of Ignatius are due to the influence of these Johannine passages 'floating in his mind' (*New Test. in Apost. Fathers*, Oxford Society of Historical Theology, 1905, p. 82, where see other parallelisms). Both in expression and in doctrine there is an undoubted affinity between Ignatius and the Evangelist. Loisy admits that Ignatius, in his Christology, is dependent on the Gospel (*Le Quatrième Evangile*, p. 7). Von der Goltz holds that the affinity of thought is so deep that it cannot be explained by the influence of a book, and that the writer of the letters must have been imbued with the tradition and thought of a school (quoted by Sanday, *Crit. of Fourth Gospel*, p. 243). Sanday himself 'doubts whether there is any other instance of resemblance between a Biblical and patristic book that is really so close' (*ib.*).

Two arguments, taken from the writings of Ignatius, are relied upon by opponents of the Apostolic authorship, (a) It is urged that he nowhere quotes the Gospel as of Apostolic authority, although there are occasions (notably *Smyrn.* iii. 2) where it would have been exceedingly apposite to do so. It may be pointed out as having a bearing on this objection, that, although it is quite evident that Ignatius knew 1 Cor. 'almost by heart,' he has 'no quotations (in the strictest sense, with mention of the source) from that Epistle' (*NT in Apost. Fathers*, p. 67). This is only another instance of the precariousness of the argument from silence, considered apart from the idiosyncrasies of a writer, (b) Again, it is also objected that in writing to the Ephesian community in which St. John is said to have laboured, Ignatius mentions St. Paul as a hero of the faith, whom he sets before himself and them for imitation, but makes no mention of St. John (*Ephes.* xii.). To this argument it must be admitted that no very satisfactory answer has yet been given. Ignatius is, indeed, predisposed to mention St. Paul's name, through his evident desire to compare his own experience and the Apostle's in calling together the elders of Ephesus. Again, the writings of St. Paul, which have more clearly in view the various heresies of the time, would perhaps suit his purpose better.

It cannot be regarded as certain that Ignatius used the Gospel. His evidence is on the borderline between evidence for the existence of the Gospel and proof of the influence of a *milieu* of Johannine teaching and thought. It is probable that Ignatius had access to some document containing Johannine teaching (cf. e.g. his reference to the narrative of the woman of Samaria); on the other hand, that might easily have been a story told orally by the Apostle in the course of his preaching and teaching, and embedded in the hearts and minds of those who heard him.

(3) **Polycarp** was bishop of Smyrna. His writing has come down to us in the form of an *Epistle to the Philippians*. The date of his martyrdom was long uncertain, but the investigations of Light-foot and Harnack have led to the almost certain conclusion that he died in 155 at the age of 86.

As regards the Gospel, we have two sources from which we may derive evidence as to his opinions, viz. the *Epistle* and some reminiscences of Irenaeus.

(a) In the *Epistle*, Polycarp makes no reference to any document, except that he refers to St. Paul's Ep. to the Philippians immediately after mentioning his name, and in another passage again quotes the Epistle without remark. There is also a sentence which, though not verbally accurate, bears every trace of having been taken from the First Epistle of St. John: 'Everyone who shall not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is Antichrist' (cf. 1Jn 4:2-3). He has also a passage that recalls at once words of Christ in the Gospel and the thought of the Epistle: 'He that raised Him from the dead will raise us also, if we do His will and walk in His commandments, and love

the things which He loved' (cf. Joh 7:17; Joh 14:15, 1Jn 2:6; 1Jn 2:17; 1Jn 5:1-2). We also find in Polycarp, v. 2, 'As He hath promised to raise us from the dead.' This promise is found only in Joh 6:44. These parallelisms at least show that he was familiar with a circle of Johannine thought. He does not once mention the name of St. John; but the Church at Philippi had not been directly in contact with that Apostle. Moreover, his habits of quotation hardly lead us to expect any other result (cf. *NT in Apost. Fathers*, p. 84).

(b) Irenaeus gives Polycarp a foremost place among the elders whom he quotes. He says that he 'had not only been instructed by Apostles, and associated with many who had seen the Christ, but had also been placed by Apostles in Asia in the Church at Smyrna as a bishop, whom we also saw in our early life' (ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡλικίᾳ) (*Haer.* III. iii. 4). Eusebius has preserved for us a letter of his to Florinus, in which he gives an account of his listening with peculiar attention to Polycarp, and vividly recalls the very place where he sat when he discoursed, his manner of life, and his personal appearance, 'and how he would describe his intercourse with John, and with the rest who had seen the Lord, and how he would relate their words. And whatsoever things he had heard from them about the Lord, and about His miracles, and about His teaching, Polycarp, as having received them from eye-witnesses of the life of the Word, would relate them in accordance with the Scriptures' (*ap. Euseb. Historia Ecclesiastica* v. xx. 6). Again, Irenaeus also, in a letter to Victor, bishop of Rome, on the Paschal controversy, uses as an argument the fact that Polycarp followed the example of 'John the disciple of the Lord, and the rest of the Apostles with whom he consorted.' Irenaeus is undoubtedly referring to the Apostle John; and if that be so, there can be little doubt that 'the Scriptures' to which Polycarp referred contained the Fourth Gospel in some form. Thus the silence of Polycarp, in the solitary writing that has come down to us, is balanced by the explicit statement of Irenaeus that Polycarp knew St. John, and referred to him in his discourse.

Opponents of the Johannine authorship of the Gospel have cast doubt on the trustworthiness of Irenaeus in this matter. They allege that he made a mistake in regarding Papias as a hearer of John, and that he has possibly done the same in the case of Polycarp. The John to whom Polycarp referred may have been the Presbyter. Irenaeus was still a boy (ἐκ ταιδων) when he heard his teacher. At the same time, it is hardly likely that the vivid personal impression he has of Polycarp contains a mistake of this kind. Polycarp evidently mentioned the name of John with some frequency, and there is no evidence that the Presbyter John was a man of such note in Asia as to be thus referred to in Polycarp's lectures. It is inconceivable that, if there had been any prospect of confusion in the mind of a youth who was listening to him, Polycarp would not have guarded against it (see Stanton, *Gospels as Hist. Doct.* pp. 214-218).

(4) We have still to deal with a group of writings classed among the Apostolic Fathers, whose evidence on the subject is rendered vague and inconclusive, inasmuch as they contain no definite quotations from the Gospel, and there is also uncertainty as to their dates. (a) **The Epistle of Barnabas** reflects the condition of thought in Egypt, and the date may lie anywhere between 79 and 132. The theory that Barnabas used the Fourth Gospel found strangely a strong champion in Keim, who assigned the date 120-130 (*Jesus of Naz.* i. 192-195). Loisy, on the other hand, accepting the date *circa (about)* 130, urges complete ignorance of the Gospel on the part of Barnabas, and uses the argument to prove that the Johannine writings had not yet taken complete possession of ecclesiastical usage (*Le Quatrième Év.* p. 5). In *Barnabas*, use is made of the idea of the Brazen Serpent; and the conceptions of 'eternal life,' which often occurs, and of 'feeding upon the words of life,' seem to point to the influence of a Johannine current of thought. (b) Only one of the epistles known under the name of **Clement of Rome** is genuine. It was written from the Roman community to the Corinthian, *circa (about)* 100. Here, again, the writer seems to be influenced by Johannine teaching (cf. Clem. xlix. and Joh 14:15; Joh 14:23, 1Jn 5:1-3). (c) **The Didache, or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles**, is a composite document, and is the earliest manual of Church procedure extant. The elements of which it is composed may have been in use at the end of the 1st cent., but the work in its present form was published much later. It contains a specimen of a prayer of thanksgiving for use after the Eucharist, in which there is a very remarkable parallel to the anti-sacramentarian treatment of the ideas of the Supper in the Fourth Gospel (ch. 6); 'Thou, Almighty Master, didst create all things for thy name's sake, and didst give food and drink unto men for enjoyment, that they might render thanks unto thee; but didst bestow upon us spiritual food and drink and eternal life through thy Son' (*Did.* x. 3). (d) **The Shepherd of Hermas** (*circa (about)* 100 Zahn, 135-145 Harnack) displays a Johannine colouring of thought.

5. Evidence derived from Opponents of Church doctrine in the 2nd century

(1) **The Clementine Homilies.**—These are the work of a Jewish Christian, and were published at Rome not earlier than a.d. 160-170. In one of the *Homilies* (discovered by Dressel in 1837) there is an undoubted quotation (xix. 22) from Joh 9:2-3. There are also in the *Homilies* other apparent references to the Gospel.

(2) **The Gnostics.**—There were two great schools of Gnostics—the Valentinians and the Basilidians. The date of the literary activity of *Valentinus* is uncertain, but we know that there existed a school of his followers before a.d. 150. *Heracleon* was a pupil of Valentinus; and it is exceptionally strong evidence, not only for the early existence but also for the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel, that he composed a Commentary on it which is quoted by Origen. Tertullian contrasts Valentinus and Marcion as to the way in which they use Scripture. He says that Marcion used the 'knife,' while

Valentinus 'accepted the whole instrument' (*i.e.* the four Gospels), but with an ability not less than Marcion's 'laid hands upon the truth.' We hear of a school of *Basilides c.* 133, and his own period of activity was a.d. 117-138. Hippolytus in his *Refutatio* quotes Basilides, and in the quotations there are undoubted extracts from the Gospel. The question discussed by modern criticism is whether these are quotations from Basilides or from the representative of a school (*cf.* Drummond, *op. cit.* 296-301). There is a strong preponderance of evidence in favour of Basilides himself as the source.

So far as the earlier Gnostics are concerned—the Naasseni, Peratae, Ophites, and Docetae—it is generally admitted that the Gospel is earlier than these controversies; and Hippolytus tells us that they made abundant use of the Gospel.

(3) **Marcion** was a contemporary of Valentinus.—The principle of his work is to secure a Gospel that shall represent the pure doctrine of Christ, unmixed with Jewish prejudices, which he regarded as inherent in the minds of the primitive Apostles. We find him rejecting all others in favour of St. Luke, which was written under Pauline influence; and he mutilated even that Gospel to suit his purpose. We cannot expect to find in his writing any reference to the Gospel of John, but, from his action in rejecting the writings of the early Apostles, we may draw the negative conclusion that if the Gospel was regarded as written by St. John it would be sufficient reason for its rejection. He made use of the passage in Galatians where St. Paul rebukes 'Apostles themselves' 'who walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel' (2:14). His silence as to the Fourth Gospel is all the more striking because of its anti-Judaic tendency, which would have predisposed him in its favour had it not been written by a primitive Apostle.

6. The Quartodeciman controversy.—In the latter part of the 2nd cent. a controversy was rife between certain Asiatic Christians and the Church with regard to their Paschal observance on the 14th Nisan. They appealed to the example of the Apostle John in defence of their practice. In the Gospel the Paschal meal falls on the 13th, and it was contended by Bretschneider, followed by the Tübingen School, that therefore the Apostle could not be the author of the Gospel. A fuller investigation, however, into the rationale of the Quartodeciman controversy goes far to remove the difficulty. In opposition to the Tübingen School, it was held that the 14th was kept not in commemoration of the Passover, but in commemoration of the death of Christ, which would be in accord with the Fourth Gospel. This still leaves the difficulty unsolved, that in the Synoptics the death of Christ falls on the 15th. Accordingly, Bleek (followed by Schürer) and Stanton maintain that the observance in question was neither of the institution of the Supper, nor of the death of Christ alone, but that the Christian Jews gave to the Passover day a new meaning which made it a commemoration of the entire fact of redemption, including the Supper, the Death,

and the Resurrection of Christ. This interpretation seems to be the correct one. At the same time, while it surmounts the difficulty caused by the chronology of the Fourth Gospel, there still remains the fact that the Quartodecimans of the latter half of the century appealed to the example of Christ as eating the Passover on the 14th. If such an appeal was made in the earlier part of the controversy, and at the same time the example of St. John was quoted in support, we should be face to face with a strong argument against the Apostolic authorship of the Gospel. There is no proof, however, that the argument from the example of Christ was used before the time of Apollinaris. Apollinaris distinctly assumes that the Synoptics and St. John must not be made to contradict one another; and Polycrates as distinctly holds the Apostolic authorship, although he is a Quartodeciman (cf. Schmiedel, *op. cit.* ii. 2552-2553, who regards the Quartodeciman argument as still valid against the Apostolic authorship. The question is fully discussed by Stanton, *op. cit.* i. pp. 173-197, with a result favourable to the traditional view).

7. The Alogi.—These were a party in Asia Minor (*circa (about)* a.d. 180) who rejected the Johannine authorship of the Gospel and the Apocalypse. They are first mentioned by Epiphanius and Philaster (4th cent.), but it may now be safely admitted that Irenaeus opposes their views in *Haer.* iii. xi. 12 (Zahn and Harnack). They attributed the authorship to Cerinthus, and founded their argument chiefly on the chronological disparity with the Synoptics. The main interest in the Alogi centres round the question whether they betoken uncertainty in the ecclesiastical tradition. Epiphanius ranks them among heretics, but it is certain that they were a party in the Church (Schürer and Harnack). The name ‘Alogi’ is a jest of Epiphanius, and indicates merely that they rejected the Logos Gospel, with more than a hint at their stupidity (*ἄλογος* = ‘unreasonable’). It gives no clue to their doctrinal position. Epiphanius, himself very orthodox, says ‘that they seem to believe as we do.’ Probably they were opposed to some form of the Montanist heresy, and in their zeal sought to get rid of the teaching of the Gospel on the Holy Spirit by rejecting the whole. This step they strove to justify by the chronological disparities with the Synoptics and other internal discrepancies. Irenaeus says of them that ‘they frustrate the gift of the Spirit.’ The millenarian views of the Montanists may have directed their first attack on the Apocalypse, which they extended to the Gospel ‘by a piece of sheer bravado’ (Sanday, *Crit. of Fourth Gospel*, p. 65). Their influence seems to have been small. Irenaeus and Epiphanius refer to them slightly, and Schwarz (*op. cit.* p. 33), in common with Salmon, although from a different motive, narrows them down to a single individual with perhaps a coterie behind him. We may admit that the presence of the Alogi in the Church indicates that the belief in the Johannine authorship had not reached that stage of clear definition and regular acceptance which only controversy and time could give. They ‘came upon the tradition unawares’ (Loisy). The Church was not yet in a position either to challenge with critical weapons, or to

expel as heretics those who differed from her traditional beliefs about authorship (Irenaeus could only defend the fourfold Gospel mystically), especially when they were fighting, as in this case, a common foe in Montanism. Indeed, the Alogi can really be pressed into the service of tradition. 'Its ascription to Cerintbus, an impossible author, betrays the recklessness of the judgment pronounced; while the naming of a contemporary and fellow-townsmen of the Apostle may be accepted as an indication of the true date of the Gospel' (Dods, *Expos. Gr. Test.* i. p. 659).

II. *The Internal Evidence.*—No text of the Gospel that we possess is without the categorical statement of 21:24 that the book contains the witness of the Apostle John and is written by him. It seems the more probable view that this whole chapter was composed by friends of the Evangelist, either towards the end of his life, or after his death, in order to remove a misinterpretation of a saying of Jesus about him. The position assigned to St. Peter in the chapter might be explained by the desire to show that, although the Gospel leaves him weighted with the guilt of his denial, he was restored to his place in the Apostolic circle, and that no disparagement or supersession is intended of the Petrine Gospel that lies at the basis of the Synoptics. We have no moral right to regard the statement of 21:24 as anything but a *bona fide* statement of the earliest view of the authorship, and in the internal evidence we have to consider how far the book itself corresponds with this suggested view.

1. The author is a Jew.—

(1) *His attitude towards the OT* shows unmistakably that it was for him a valuable aid to faith and a deep source of religious experience. The opening words of the Gospel are reminiscent of Gen 1:1; Gen 3:13 recalls Deu 30:12. 'His own' in Joh 1:11 can betray only the tragic consciousness of a Jew that the chosen nation rejected the Christ. The words in Joh 10:35 'the Scripture cannot be broken,' may be taken as expressing the Evangelist's own conviction. He sees in certain incidents in the life of Jesus that would otherwise cause perplexity, especially some connected with the Passion, the fulfilment of the OT. Twice the conduct of Judas is explained by Scripture (Joh 13:18, Joh 17:12). The mournful sight of the garments of Jesus distributed among the rough soldiers brings to mind a prophecy (Joh 19:24). The thirst of Jesus, who Himself had the gift of the living water, is a fulfilment of Scripture (Joh 19:28). It is in Scripture that he finds a solution for the problem of the failure of Christ's ministry and teaching (Joh 12:37). The very spear-thrust has a place in the counsels of God (Joh 19:36-37) and becomes an aid to faith (Joh 19:35). While the Evangelist rarely cites incidents from the OT, and the great majority of the OT references are contained in the discourses of Christ, it has to be borne in mind that the Gospel was written for Gentile readers, to whom only the outlines of the history would be familiar.

(2) The writer is familiar *not only with the Messianic expectation, but also with the limitations that it suffered in the popular mind*. The hope is current in Galilee (Joh 1:41; Joh 1:46; Joh 1:49, Joh 6:15; Joh 6:28; Joh 6:30 f.), in Samaria (Joh 4:25; Joh 4:29; Joh 4:42), in Judaea (Joh 5:39; Joh 5:45 f., Joh 7:26 f., Joh 7:40-43, Joh 8:30 f., Joh 10:24). ‘Among friends, among foes, among neutrals alike, it is discussed.’ The purpose of the Gospel is to induce belief that Jesus is the Christ (Joh 20:31). Not only so, but the limitations and misconceptions of the idea of the Christ in the popular mind are familiar to him. Elijah and the Prophet are not yet come (Joh 1:21); the outlook is unspiritual (Joh 6:14-15); the Messiah will never die (Joh 6:60, Joh 12:34); Jesus does not satisfy their conventional ideas (Joh 7:27; Joh 7:42).

(3) The writer is familiar with *the ideas and customs of the Jews*. We have a picture of a Jewish marriage feast (Joh 2:1-10), of pastoral life (Joh 10:1-14), of burial customs (Joh 11:38; Joh 11:44, Joh 19:40), the estimate of women (Joh 4:27), the disparagement of the Dispersion (Joh 7:35), the heredity of sin (Joh 9:2). The religious observances of the people are known to him, and he displays great familiarity with the Temple and its services. The Synagogue and the Temple are places of resort (Joh 18:20); he knows the side of the Temple where shelter is to be had in inclement weather (Joh 10:22-23); it was forty-six years in building (Joh 2:20); he speaks of the treasury (Joh 8:20). The two feasts of Tabernacles and of Dedication are familiar to him, even to the implied ritualistic details (Westcott, vi.). He speaks of the ‘great day’ of the feast of Tabernacles. He is familiar with the narrow Sabbatarian views of the Jews (Joh 5:10, Joh 9:14, Joh 7:21-23). In the last passage a subtle argument is founded on the knowledge that circumcision is allowable on the Sabbath.

Does the statement that Caiaphas was ‘high priest that same year’ (Joh 11:49, repeated Joh 11:51, Joh 18:13) imply that the writer imagined that the office was tenable only for a year? The repetition after the manner of the Evangelist is meant to impress more than a chronological fact. Either the words may have an ironical significance, arising from the fact that the three predecessors of Caiaphas had been deposed after a year’s tenure, and would be an allusion to the present uncertainty of the office (Delff, *Gesch. des Rabbi Jesus von Nazareth*, pp. 85, 86); or the Evangelist seeks to connect emphatically the office of the high priest with the part that he took in accomplishing the death of Christ. The high priest entered alone once a year into the Holy of Holies, where he offered atonement for the sins of the people (Heb 9:7), and in ‘that memorable year’ Caiaphas is but an unconscious instrument in bringing about the great and final sacrifice (Westcott, vi.; cf. also B. Weiss, *Com. ad loc.*).

(4) It has been contended against these indications that *when the writer mentions the Jews he seems to speak of them as a foreigner would speak*. They are throughout

represented as the bitter enemies of Christ (Joh 2:18; Joh 5:10 ff; Joh 6:41; Joh 7:11 f., Joh 8:22 ff., Joh 10:24 ff., Joh 11:36, Joh 13:33, Joh 20:18). The term οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι is sometimes used to denote the Jews as a nation, in distinction from other nations: sometimes as Judaeans distinguished from Galilaeans or Peraeans: and sometimes the leaders of the Jewish people alone are meant. This somewhat indefinite mode of speech has a sufficient explanation if the Evangelist wrote as he used to speak (Drummond, *op. cit.* 416, note). There is no indication in his tone of national antagonism. Rather his attitude is like that of St. Paul to his countrymen. The Jews are ‘His own’ (Joh 1:11); Jesus Himself is a Jew (Joh 4:9); salvation is of the Jews (Joh 4:22); Nathanael is an ‘Israelite indeed’ (Joh 1:47); there are believing Jews (Joh 8:31 etc.).

This Gospel also preserves words of Christ that trace the subsequent persecution by the Jews to its roots in their ignorance of the Father and the Son (Joh 16:2-3). In this Gospel Jesus never denounces the leaders of the people in as strong terms as He uses in the Synoptics. That He expressly distinguishes His disciples from the Jews (Joh 13:33), and also speaks of ‘your law’ (Joh 8:17, Joh 10:34), ‘their law’ (Joh 13:25), implies that this external attitude adopted by the writer was not unknown during the ministry on earth (cf. Dods, *Expos. Gr. Test.* i. 666).

2. The author is a Jew of Palestine.—Many of the preceding characteristics are already indications that the writer is a native of Palestine.

(1) He is also familiar with *sites and places*. Jacob’s well is deep (Joh 4:11); the mountain and the ripening cornfields are suggested in the most natural fashion (Joh 4:20-21; Joh 4:35); it is a *descent* from the high ground where Cana stood to the shores of Gennesaret at Capernaum (Joh 4:47). Ch. 6 contains some minute information as to the district. Bethsaida (Joh 1:44, Joh 12:21) and Bethany (Joh 11:1) are not merely localities, but connected with the names of friends. He carefully distinguishes Bethany ‘nigh unto Jerusalem about fifteen furlongs’ (Joh 11:18) from ‘Bethany beyond Jordan’ (Joh 1:28). Nazareth is mentioned not only as the home of Jesus, but as a place so well known to Nathanael that he considered it unlikely that ‘any good thing’ could spring from such commonplace surroundings (Joh 1:46); cf. the details as to Sychar (Joh 4:5), aenon (Joh 3:23), Ephraim (Joh 11:54). A very striking feature is the accurate knowledge displayed of the topography of Jerusalem and its environs (cf. Joh 5:2, Joh 18:1): the Kidron; which is a ravine on the way from the city to the Mount of Olives, and a torrent only in winter (χειμάρου, Joh 18:1); the Pavement (Gabbatha) in the Praetorium (Joh 19:13); Golgotha (Joh 19:17). The acclaiming multitude carried in their hands ‘*the branches of the palm trees*’ which grew on the Mount of Olives (Joh 12:13).

(2) It has been customary to regard the *so-called Hebraisms* of the Fourth Gospel, which it was supposed to share with the other NT writings, as an indication that the writer was a Palestinian. The study of the papyri has revolutionized this idea. It is now no longer permissible to speak of Hebraistic Greek. The papyri are written in the vernacular Greek, and range in date from the 3rd cent. b.c. to the 7th cent. a.d. The earlier specimens furnish a convincing parallel in language to the Greek of the NT. Where there are Hebraic modes of expression, these must be traced to direct translation from the Aramaic, or to those causes that operate in the introduction of foreign elements into the vernacular of any language (Moulton, *Grammar of NT Greek*, Prolegomena, vol. i. pp. 18, 19). At the same time, while we must attribute the simple structure of this Evangelist's sentences and the absence of connecting particles to his use of the vernacular, we are not left without evidence that he knew Hebrew. In his quotations from the OT he made use of the LXX Septuagint (Joh 2:17, Joh 12:38, Joh 19:24, Joh 10:34); but he is also independent of it (Joh 19:36, Joh 7:38, Joh 1:23, Joh 6:31); and there is an interesting group of cases where the LXX Septuagint seems to be corrected by reference to the Hebrew (Joh 6:45, Joh 13:18., Joh 19:37; cf. Westcott, *Gospel of John*, xiii-xiv; Drummond, *op. cit.* p. 364).

(3) Can *the Logos conception* of the Gospel be shown to have greater affinity with Alexandrian than with Hebrew thought? It is noteworthy that the term *λόγος* is not used throughout the Gospel, either in the discourses or in the narrative parts, except in the ordinary sense of 'word': but we must not neglect other passages where the Logos idea is in the background. The lofty and undefined sense of the plural subject in such passages as Joh 3:11-13, the well-known pre-existence passages, the assertion by Christ of what He had seen with the Father (Joh 6:46, Joh 8:38, cf. Joh 1:18), His teaching which is not of Himself (Joh 7:14-17), His complete unity of existence with the Father (Joh 14:7-11), are all expressions of the Logos consciousness (cf. Grill, *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums*, I. pp. 32, 33). On the other hand, in order to prove that the Evangelist had either a literary acquaintance with the works of Philo, or was deeply influenced by his thought, it would be necessary to discover a much closer correspondence between them than is actually to be found. In the Stoic philosophy with which Philo closely identifies himself, the term 'Logos' has the double significance of 'reason' (*λόγος ἐνδιάθετος*) and 'word' (*λόγος προφορικός*), and in the Fourth Gospel there is not a trace of the former sense. Jesus is the manifestation of God, the uttered Word. Again, in the Gospel the Logos is identified with the Messiah, and in Philo there is no such identification. It is doubtful whether Philo attributes personality to the Logos; but there can be no doubt of the personal existence of the Logos in the Gospel. At the same time, the author of the Fourth Gospel, like every Hebrew thinker, is no metaphysician, and he simply projects

the conception of personality, which he derived from the knowledge of the Incarnate One, into the Word in its pre-incarnate existence. The Angel of the Lord and the personified Wisdom in the OT are not so much independent existences as immanent determinations of the Divine Being. Moreover, the Incarnation of the Logos is an idea quite foreign to the mind of Philo, not because with him matter is essentially corrupt, but because it is 'regarded as a principle purely negative, arresting, limiting, restraining the penetration of the Divine action, in proportion to its thickness and opacity' (Réville, *Le Quatrième Evangile*, p. 87). For Alexandrian thought an Incarnation of the Logos could only be Docetic; and this may have given rise to the heresy of 1Jn 2:22.

There are, however, *some very striking affinities of expression between Philo and the Fourth Gospel*. Philo speaks of 'a second God' (δεύτερος θεός); the Word Himself is God and the Son of God (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ); the Word is the agent or instrument in creation (δι' οὗ ὁ κόσμος κατεσκευάθη); Light and Life are conceptions of Philo as applied to the Logos; he uses the term 'Paraclete,' but applies it to the 'cosmos' and not to the 'Logos.' The Logos exists in heaven; reveals the name of God; possesses supernatural knowledge and power; is continually at work; is eternal; is free from sin; instructs and convinces; dwells in the souls of men; is high priest towards God; is the source of unity, joy, and peace; imparts eternal life; is bridegroom, father, guide, steersman, shepherd, physician: imparts manna: is the food of the soul (Grill, pp. 115-128). For a discussion of the whole question see Sanday, *l.c.* pp. 185-200. These coincidences cannot be overlooked in deciding the question of authorship. We must bear in mind that 'Logos' is the word by which the Hebrew idea of the Word of God is translated in the LXX Septuagint, and that there are passages in the OT, the Apocrypha, and in the Jewish Targums that afford equally important coincidences of thought (Psa 33:6; Psa 107:20; Psa 147:15, Isa 40:8; Isa 55:10-11, Wis 9:1; Wis 16:12; Wis 18:15; Wis 18:18. For the *Memra* of the Targums, see Edersheim, *Life and Times*, i. pp. 46-48). The Evangelist would meet with these ideas nowhere more readily than in Ephesus, which was also the home of the Logos philosophy of Heraclitus. He would be disposed to keep in view his Greek readers, among whom these expressions were current. Again, we find similar coincidences of thought with Philo in the writings of St. Paul and in the Epistle to the Hebrews. If, indeed, we were to isolate the Prologue to the Gospel, which may be regarded as containing all that was in the author's mind essential to the Logos idea, and to rid ourselves of all associations of the word 'Logos' derived from Greek philosophy, we should find that the thought remains within the limits of the OT, except in the case of Wis 18:1; Wis 18:14.

3. The writer is a contemporary of the events and persons in his narrative

(1) *His knowledge of the ecclesiastical situation and feeling of the time.*—A deputation is sent to the Baptist from the ecclesiastical authorities in Jerusalem consisting of priests and their attendant Levites (Joh_1:19 ff.), and the writer breaks the narrative of the deputation to insert the remark, evidently meant to explain the question that follows, that the deputation included some Pharisees (Joh_1:24). Their inquiry betrays an interest in ritual and in the orderly observance of the Law which is characteristic of that party, as distinct from the Sadducees. The Sadducees seem to have applied rationalist principles to the old religion, and were distinguished by dogmatic differences not only regarding the rule of faith, but in connexion with such questions as the life after death, and the question of free-will and predestination (Edersheim, *Life and Times*, i. pp. 310-324). The writer does not speak of Pharisees and Sadducees, but of Chief Priests and Pharisees, showing that he is acquainted with the fact that the Sadducees held the offices in the time of Christ. The passage Joh_11:47-53 is full of ecclesiastical knowledge. The discussion in the Sanhedrin is occasioned by the influence on the people of the raising of Lazarus, and we can clearly distinguish the attitude of the two parties. The Pharisees are represented as in touch with the people (Joh_11:46, cf. Josephus *Ant.* xiii. x. 6), and they are afraid lest a tumult should arise, and thereby the ecclesiastical influence (τόπος) and the national existence be destroyed by Rome. The reply of Caiaphas is characteristic. He scornfully sets aside the question of the miracle, and urges an opportunist policy to deal with the actual situation (Joh_11:49-50). It can scarcely be without meaning that the Evangelist, who knew the Sadduceean disbelief in predestination, should represent Caiaphas as the unconscious prophet and instrument of the death of Christ (Joh_11:51-52). In Joh_7:45-52 there is displayed a similar knowledge of ecclesiastical circles. After the triumphal entry the Pharisees seem to have been filled with dismay at their loss of influence with the people, and at the popularity of Christ (Joh_12:19), and it is the ruling Sadduceean party who plot the death of Lazarus (Joh_12:10). Again, it is the Fourth Evangelist who tells us of the informal trial before Annas, who, though still wielding much power, had been deposed in favour of his son-in-law (Joh_18:12-24).

These indications of an acquaintance with opinion in ecclesiastical circles are in complete correspondence with the statement in Joh_18:15 about the disciple 'who was known to the high priest.' In this Gospel alone are we told the name (Malchus) of the servant of the high priest whose ear was cut off by Peter. It is noteworthy, also, that the Evangelist is acquainted with Nicodemus, and with Joseph of Arimathaea, who belonged to the Pharisaic party. In this connexion may be mentioned the tradition of Polycrates that 'John, who leaned on Jesus' breast,' also wore 'the frontlet' (πέταλον) of the high priest (Eus. *Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. xxxi. 3).

Delff has propounded the theory that the author of the Fourth Gospel was an unnamed native of Jerusalem, not of the number of the Twelve, but a man of high-priestly family, and a member of the higher aristocracy. He finds on Joh 18:15, on the statement of Polycrates, and on the other indications in the Gospel. He identifies the author with 'the disciple whom Jesus loved,' and describes him as a kind of 'supernumerary disciple.' Sanday (*Crit. of Fourth Gospel*, 99-108) has discussed this theory with great generosity, but it necessitates a further theory of interpolations, and itself presents some insuperable difficulties. This disciple and Peter are close friends (Joh 20:2), and in the other Gospels, Peter and John are often named together (cf. Act 3:1; Act 3:11; Act 4:13; Act 8:14, Gal 2:9). We cannot suppose that within the Apostolic circle there were two pairs of friends, one identical in each. Again, if Delff is right, the Apostle John is not once referred to in the Gospel, and, on the other hand, this unknown disciple has completely vanished from history, unless he be the timorous man who fled at the arrest, leaving his linen cloth behind him, or the shadowy Presbyter John of Papias. It will be admitted that Delff's conclusion goes considerably beyond the evidence, but we must be prepared, in assigning the authorship, to recognize the undoubted insight of the Evangelist into the ecclesiastical situation.

(2) *His knowledge of the opinions of the populace* (ὄχλος).—He knows their varying verdicts about Christ (Joh 7:11-13); the wonder of the 'Jerusalemites' at the immunity Jesus enjoys from injury, notwithstanding His fearless speaking (Joh 7:25-27); the belief of some of the crowd (Joh 7:31, cf. Joh 7:40); the fickleness of the *popularis aura* is graphically described (Joh 7:40-44); the excitement among the people in view of the request of the Sanhedrin for information as to the whereabouts of Jesus, and the possibility of His appearance at the feast, is vividly portrayed (Joh 11:56-57). The climax of popular acclamation is reached in Joh 12:12-19.

(3) *The writer speaks as one to whom the men and women of his narrative are personally familiar*.—Nicodemus is introduced somewhat suddenly into the narrative, but that is in the manner of the Evangelist, and presupposes that his readers are aware, either from the other Gospels, or from the oral tradition, or from personal acquaintance, of his historical existence. Nicodemus is introduced almost in the same words as John the Baptist (cf. Joh 1:6 and Joh 3:1), a fact which must not be forgotten in view of the tendency to find allegorical meanings in the characters (cf. Joh 1:29 and Joh 4:7). It would be strange if the Evangelist should take so little pains to distinguish between characters known to be historical, and those that are allegorical. The reality of the characters is witnessed by the words they utter. It is not stupidity, but a profound emotion that makes Nicodemus speak as he does in Joh 3:4, when he discovers that all that he has learned must be unlearned, and that

he must begin the process of human experience anew. He is on the threshold of a world of facts as yet unrealized by him (Joh 3:9). The woman of Samaria is introduced upon the scene, amid real surroundings, at Jacob's well, on the road from Judaea to Johilee. Her character is revealed in her nonchalant air and bantering mood, behind which she conceals an aching and guilty heart, and is much too true to life for allegory. How *can* the woman of Samaria be an allegory of the Samaritan Church, and her five husbands symbolize her idolatrous worship? (so, *e.g.*, Keim, *Jesus of Naz.* i. 159, note 1; Loisy, *Le Quat. Évangile*, p. 354). It is not necessary to suppose that the Evangelist was present at these interviews. It is enough to remember that Christ was present, and that the Evangelist is the 'disciple whom Jesus loved,' with whom confidences of that kind would be exchanged. Leaving for the moment the lifelike characters of the Apostolic circle, we are confronted in the closing scenes with a group of men that could have been painted only by a contemporary hand. The writer knows Caiaphas so well that he is able to reveal the man in a single sentence that fell from his lips (Joh 11:49). Pilate is depicted, irresolute, and fettered by a guilty past of oppressive and cruel government. At the critical moment, the Evangelist places in the hands of the people the powerful weapon of a covert threat to denounce him to the Emperor (Joh 19:12).

4. Relationship of the Evangelist to Jesus and the Apostolic circle.—It is evident that the author was able in a peculiar degree to interpret the mind of our Lord. He tells us of His emotions, thoughts, and motives (Joh 11:33, Joh 13:21, Joh 2:24, Joh 4:1-3, Joh 6:15, Joh 13:1, Joh 18:4). Is the writer identical with 'the disciple whom Jesus loved'? Joh 21:20; Joh 21:24 leaves us in no doubt. It is an entirely inadequate interpretation to say that the phrase is meant to stand for 'the type of the perfect Gnostic, the spiritual witness of Jesus' (so Loisy, *Le Quat. Év.* p. 125). It is a strong argument against the view that a purely ideal figure is meant, when we note the variety of the references. His existence is implied in Joh 1:40 : in Joh 13:23 he is described as leaning on Jesus' breast; in Joh 18:15 he is mentioned as 'another disciple who was known to the high priest.' It would also be necessary to interpret the scene in Joh 19:26 as allegorical, if the disciple is not a historical figure. The variety of the situations shows that the author had a real person in his mind.

We have, however, to explain the difficulty that when the personality of the Evangelist is obtruded, he describes himself as 'the disciple whom Jesus loved.' If there is an apparent lack of modesty in the use of the phrase, it may be questioned whether this charge would not be equally relevant in those passages where the Evangelist confidently interprets the inmost thoughts of our Lord. The fact that he should describe himself in this indirect fashion at all will be matter for discussion under the question of the historicity of the Gospel. In the meantime it is sufficient to point out that in every case where the phrase is used, the writer is laid under the necessity of referring to himself individually. In Joh 13:23 he explains the fact that he

is lying on Jesus' breast. And in Joh 19:28 Jesus addresses him directly. Perhaps in Joh 20:2 there is the suggestion of a thought in Mary's mind that the disciple would tell the mother of Jesus. The only alternative in these cases is to use the personal pronoun or to mention his own name, a course which the Evangelist systematically avoids. If ch. 21 is an appendix by another hand, there is no difficulty about the use of the phrase in Joh 20:7; Joh 20:20.

It is also apparent that the author of the Gospel stood in a very intimate relationship to the Apostolic circle. We have miniature portraits of several of the Apostles, conveyed often through questions they put. Philip throughout appears as a man of somewhat practical and business-like turn of mind (Joh 1:46, Joh 6:5, Joh 14:8). Andrew is wise, helpful, and unobtrusive (Joh 1:41, Joh 6:8-9, Joh 12:22). Thomas is despondent: his moods colour his outlook, and he experiences violent reaction (Joh 11:6, Joh 14:5, Joh 20:24 ff., Joh 20:27 ff.). Peter is over-confident and impulsive, and at a time cowardly (Joh 13:6 ff., Joh 13:36 ff., Joh 18:10 ff., Joh 18:16 ff.). The scandal of Judas' presence among the Twelve is referred to as if by one who felt the shame of it and was eager to clear the situation (Joh 12:4-6, Joh 13:2; Joh 13:26-30, Joh 18:2). He knows also their places of resort (Joh 11:54, Joh 18:2, Joh 20:19), and the thoughts of the disciples at critical moments (Joh 2:11; Joh 2:17; Joh 2:22, Joh 4:27, Joh 6:19; Joh 6:60, Joh 12:15, Joh 13:22; Joh 13:28, Joh 20:9).

5. Is St. John the Apostle the author of the Gospel?—Is he the unnamed disciple who is identified with the writer? This unnamed disciple is called among the earliest disciples, and remembers even the hour of the day (Joh 1:39). He is closely associated with St. Peter in the closing scenes. We know from the Synoptics that St. Peter and the two sons of Zebedee were in specially close relationship with Jesus. St. Peter is out of the question; St. James died early; only St. John is left. Unless John be the beloved disciple, one of the 'pillar' Apostles (Gal 2:9) is never once mentioned in the Gospel, except indirectly in Joh 21:2. A very strong argument for supposing that St. John is meant may also be founded on the fact that nowhere does the author refer to 'the Baptist,' but always to 'John.' Elsewhere he is very careful to distinguish names (e.g. Joh 14:22), but in this case he seems to have thought that no confusion was possible.

If St. John is the writer of the Gospel, why does he so studiously conceal his identity? The Fourth Gospel is distinguished from the Synoptics by the fact that, while in them we have a purely impersonal narrative except in the preface to St. Luke, in St. John we have a narrative where individual experience ('testimony') is prominent. Is it solely because St. John is himself the author and writer of the Gospel, that he sedulously veils his own name? Why was it not possible for him to incorporate his own testimony in the Gospel without keeping himself in the background in such a way as

really to attract attention? There must be some reason for this conduct other than a modesty which thus defeats its own end. It is quite evident that the authority of the Gospel for the Church is regarded as depending on the fact that St. John the Apostle wrote it. It is permissible to see in Joh 21:24 an indication that it was felt necessary, even at that early date, to authenticate the position that the Apostle John made himself responsible for the statements contained in this Gospel. This is not because there was doubt as to the Johannine authorship, but because the Gospel differs so much in character, subject, and content from the Synoptics, which already held the ground as authorities for the life and teaching of the Lord.

We shall be able to find an answer to these questions if we consider the two passages in the Gospel itself that have been most relied on as direct statements of Johannine authorship (a) Joh 1:14. In what sense is 'we beheld' to be taken? It has been contended that a seeing with the bodily eye is not meant, but spiritual vision. If we compare the parallel passage in 1Jn 1:1, there can be little doubt that the 'hearing' and the 'handling' there mentioned demand the sense that the 'seeing' is also literal. The presumption is in favour of applying the same interpretation to the passage in the Gospel. By 'we' is meant a group of eyewitnesses who are associated with St. John in the statement. Who these were it is impossible actually to determine, but perhaps it is unnecessary to limit the range of 'we' to the circle of the Twelve. The Gospel shows that the writer is interested in the testimony, however imperfect it may sometimes be, of many others besides his fellow-Apostles. Clement of Alexandria says that 'last of all, John, perceiving that the bodily facts had been set forth in the other Gospels, at the instance of his disciples and with the inspiration of the Spirit composed a spiritual Gospel.' With this may be compared the statement in the Muratorian Canon: 'It was revealed to Andrew, one of the Apostles, that John should narrate everything in his own name, subject to the revision of the rest' (*ut recognoseentibus cunctis Johannes suo nomine cuncta describeret*). While these statements may not have independent historical value, and may themselves be based on the internal evidence of the Gospel, and especially on Joh 21:24, surely they must be regarded as the simplest and most direct interpretation of the facts. A group of eye-witnesses was concerned in the origin of the Gospel. We may therefore utter the hypothesis that, while St. John wrote the Gospel and impressed upon it his own personality, the form in which he expresses himself, the philosophical mould in which the writing is cast, the Philonic phraseology, and the extraordinary power of analyzing situations and characters, would owe much to the intellectual environment of Ephesus, and in some cases to direct suggestion on the part of some fellow-disciple, not necessarily one of the Twelve. The value of the Gospel and its authenticity are confirmed by the fact that it is the expression of St. John's own experience, attested by that of his fellow-disciples who had seen the Lord. The purpose of the Gospel is to treat the facts of the life and teaching of Jesus in such a way as to advance faith in the hearts of those who had *not* been eye-witnesses, and were therefore all the more

inclined to regard their position in relation to the 'bodily facts' as a loss and a hindrance to faith. So far from this, the climax of faith is not to have seen and yet to believe (Joh 20:29). There would, no doubt, be men like Thomas in the early Church, easily cast down, and satisfied only by the bodily presence of Christ, to whom all else was unreal. No personal assurance was sufficient to convince them. St. John, therefore, veiled his identity, and emphasized the joint-testimony of the group of eye-witnesses to which he also belonged. This is also the origin of the impersonal reference in Joh 20:31 'These things are written,' etc.

(b) Joh 19:35-37. Here is an instance where the Evangelist is compelled to distinguish his own personality from the circle in whose name he speaks. St. John alone of that group was present at the Cross (Joh 19:26). In this case he has to find, in accordance with his principle, some means of authenticating his testimony. It is interesting to notice how this is done, and the character of the Gospel as not dependent on the evidence of a single testimony alone vindicated. A threefold corroboration is adduced (α) 'His witness is true' (ἀληθινός), *i.e.* confirmed by the 'Spirit of truth' (Joh 14:17; Joh 14:26). (β) Reference is made to One who 'knoweth that he saith true.' It is possible, but awkward, to refer ἐκεῖνος to the Evangelist. Rather it is meant to denote Christ Himself (cf. Joh 1:18, 1Jn 3:16; 1Jn 4:17). It is so taken by Sanday (*op. cit.* p. 78) and Schmiedel (*Encyc. Bibl.* ii. 1809). This interpretation is as old as Erasmus. (γ) The Scriptures are adduced as a witness, *i.e.* the witness of God Himself (Joh 4:36-37). The fact of the flow of blood and water from the pierced side can be explained medically, and the emphasis is laid not on the fact, but on the interpretation to be put upon it. It is a 'sign,' and the writer must have regarded it as of peculiar value to his readers. Perhaps some form of the Docetic heresy is aimed at (cf. Haussleiter, *Zwei Apost. Zeugen*, p. 29).

In conclusion, the Gospel is a genuine Johannine work from the pen of the Apostle, who wrote from Ephesus.* [Note: for arguments against the Ephesian residence, see Drummond, Sanday, Stanton, and art. John the Apostle.] We cannot, however, overlook the undoubted fact that the writer is concerned to hide his own identity, and thereby to impress the fact that the Gospel is not the work of a single individual, but the testimony of a group of eye-witnesses. With John's as the guiding mind, they conjointly made themselves responsible for the statements contained in the book. This is at once the oldest and simplest solution of the problem of authorship.

Two objections, on general grounds, to the traditional authorship may here be mentioned.

1. *Can a Galilaeen fisherman have written this Gospel?*—There is no question of NT criticism where the need is more imperative to rid ourselves of prejudice than this question of the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel. It is possible to have a completely mistaken conception of the connexion between letters and handicraft in the days of the Apostles. St. Peter and St. John are described in Act_4:13 as ‘unlearned and ignorant men’ (ἀγρόαμματοι καὶ ἰδιῶται). ἰδιώτης marks a caste distinction, in opposition to the learned or academic classes. The use of the vernacular tongue by the Apostles would be sufficient to suggest the expression. The Pharisaic objection is, as Delitzsch reminds us, a decline from the traditional honourable connexion between the Rabbi and the handworker (*Jewish Artisan Life*, p. 54). Zebedee owned his own fishing vessel, and the presumptuous request of the mother of Zebedee’s sons betrays a somewhat overweening sense of social position. St. John was ‘known to the high priest.’ Moreover, we too must take knowledge that he ‘had been with Jesus,’ and it would not be easy to estimate, in addition to the spiritual training, the purely educative influence of companionship with Jesus of Nazareth. The over-ardent spirit that sought to call down fire on a hostile Samaritan village, finds a nobler expression in the withering exposure of Judas (Joh_12:6) and of Caiaphas (Joh_11:49-52). He who with such insight lets us into the spiritual incapacity of Nicodemus, must have been himself born again into a new world, and have gained a new outlook.

2. *Is it impossible that John, a ‘pillar’ Apostle (Gal_2:9), who so favoured the claims of the circumcision, should also have written such an anti-Judaic Gospel?*—Yet even then he cordially recognized, by the giving of the right hand of fellowship, St. Paul’s mission to the Gentiles. Does the love for his own nation not breathe in the emphasis he lays in the Fourth Gospel on the tragedy of their rejection of Christ? The effect of the destruction of Jerusalem must have been very great on a mind like John’s, and the Gospel was written forty years after that event. None of the other Evangelists lays such stress on the teaching of events as the Fourth. In Ephesus also he would breathe the atmosphere of the Pauline gospel, full of thoughts of the sovereignty of God, the condescension of the Divine grace, and the universality of the gospel message. He who beheld the awe-inspiring vision of the Risen Christ in Patmos, might well, in the calm of later years, write the majestic words of the Prologue.

III. *Relation to the Synoptic Gospels.*—It is impossible to doubt that the Fourth Evangelist presupposes that his readers are acquainted with the contents of the first three Gospels, or that he himself is acquainted with them. We shall confine ourselves in this discussion to *certain points of divergence* between John and the Synoptics.

1. **The scene of the ministry of Christ** is for the most part confined to Jerusalem. The Galilaeen ministry is referred to in Joh_2:12, Joh_6:1; Joh_6:59, Joh_7:1,

Joh 21:1. We are not now concerned with the demand for chronological correspondence with the Synoptic account. It will be sufficient to show that there is no inconsistency in the prominence given in this Gospel to the events in Jerusalem. The Judaeen ministry is presupposed in Luk 4:44, but the reading is doubtful. Scribes and Pharisees from Jerusalem came to attend on the Galilaeen ministry (Luk 5:17, Mar 3:22; Mar 7:1). Judas was a native of Kerieth, in Judaea. The friendship of Joseph of Arimathaea, who in all probability resided in Jerusalem, has to be explained. The relations with Martha and Mary point to frequent visits to Bethany. We have also the 'How often'! of Mat 23:37 and Luk 13:22; Luk 13:33-34, which indicates not merely unfulfilled desire, but baffled effort. After the Ascension the disciples make their headquarters in Jerusalem. It is well-nigh impossible to explain the attitude of the authorities, and many incidents of the closing days (e.g. the friend at whose house the Supper was eaten), unless by the Johannine accounts of the visits to Jerusalem. The Synoptics tell us of only one Passover, but events could hardly have ripened there as they did unless Jesus had been previously known in Jerusalem.

2. Certain incidents are omitted in St. John which in the Synoptics are crises in the life of Christ.—The omission of the *Temptation* narrative is perhaps not strange in one who knew the mind of Jesus so intimately. The beloved disciple would be well qualified to understand the parabolic nature of the story. The essence of the Temptation narrative is the possession of Divine power and the refusal to use it for selfish ends. Similarly, Christ's freedom of action, especially in regard to His death, is frequently emphasized in the Fourth Gospel (cf. Joh 10:17-18). The outward glory of the *Transfiguration* is merged in a higher glory, which is seen in the communicating of Life and Light to men (Joh 1:4). As regards the omission of the narrative of the institution of the *Lord's Supper*, it was no doubt unnecessary, at the time at which the Gospel was written, to repeat words that were in common use in the Church. The inner meaning of the sacrament is perhaps displayed in ch. 6, and throughout chs. 13-17, as an abiding union with Christ, and the redemptive death is emphasized elsewhere in the Gospel. It is possible that there had been creeping into the Church superstitious views of the ordinance, and the author is concerned both to bring out the spiritual meaning and to show that the ideas usually connected solely with the institution, of eating and drinking the flesh and blood of Christ, were already familiar to His disciples. It is the washing of the disciples' feet in the Fourth Gospel to which a symbolic meaning is attached (Joh 13:6-10). The Fourth Evangelist omits the *Agony in the Garden*. It is suggested that he would regard it as incompatible with the dignity of the Logos, and damaging to his conception of the Person of Christ. Certainly the Christ of the Fourth Gospel retains no trace of the Agony when at His word the Roman soldiers fall back on the ground. The Intercessory Prayer also preserves 'an imperial calm.' Yet we must take into account such statements as Joh 12:27-28, and the recalling of the very words of the Agony in Joh 18:11. Moreover, it is untrue to say that the Fourth Evangelist regards bodily weakness as incompatible with the Logos.

Jesus sits at Jacob's well tired and weary (Joh 4:6), He weeps at the grave of Lazarus, and thirsts on the cross (Joh 19:28). The last passage gives us a key to the author's attitude in reference to the person of Christ. Jesus spoke the words in full consciousness ('knowing,' etc., *i.e.* they were not *wrung* from Him), and in speaking them fulfils a great Divine purpose ('that the scripture might be fulfilled'). In his picture of Jesus upon earth, the Evangelist brings out in strong relief attributes of His Person which presented themselves to him in their full significance only through his experience of the Risen Christ. The two conceptions of Christ's humanity and Divinity are naively set side by side (cf. Joh 6:6, Joh 12:30, Joh 11:5-6; Joh 11:41-42).

The reverse side of the question is presented in the miracle of the *Raising of Lazarus*. Here the Fourth Evangelist inserts an occurrence which is also a crisis in the last days, and yet the Synoptics do not mention it. The contradiction is partly resolved if we remember that the Synoptic account may really be reduced to one original document closely corresponding to our Gospel of St. Mark, and containing recollections of the preaching of St. Peter. Again, the mere fact that a miracle of raising from the dead has been omitted need excite no surprise. Jairus' daughter also was dead. The difficulty is that the miracle should be one of such central importance in the working out of the end. It may be that in the preaching of the early Apostles, which is the basis for the oral tradition of the Synoptics, the incident would not be dwelt on, considering the hatred provoked against Lazarus himself (Joh 12:10). At all events, the extraordinary knowledge displayed by the Fourth Evangelist of the situation, in the closing days at Jerusalem, leads to the presumption that he is right in the place he gives to the miracle.

3. The date of the Last Supper.—All the Synoptics agree in putting the Last Supper on the evening of 'the first day of unleavened bread,' *i.e.* on the evening which began Passover day, according to Jewish reckoning (Mat 26:17; Mat 26:20, Mar 14:12; Mar 14:17, Luk 22:7; Luk 22:14). Thus the day of the Crucifixion is the Passover day, or 15th Nisan. On the other hand, the Fourth Gospel regards the day of the Crucifixion as identical with the day of Preparation for the Passover (Joh 19:14; Joh 19:31; Joh 19:42). The rulers would not enter the Praetorium lest they be prevented by defilement from eating the Passover (Joh 18:28). Joh 13:1 puts the Supper 'before the feast of the Passover.' Elaborate and ingenious attempts have been made to bring either the Synoptics into harmony with the Fourth Gospel or *vice versa*. No successful attempt has yet been made to reconcile the two accounts chronologically, and it does not appear probable that any solution can be found in that direction. The only points on which all four are agreed are that our Lord suffered on a Friday (but see Westcott, *Introd. to Study of Gospels*, p. 322), and rose again on the following Sunday. We must choose between the Crucifixion on the 14th Nisan (John) or on 15th Nisan (Synoptics).

There are two questions that call for answer. (1) Is this Friday Passover day (*i.e.* 15th Nisan according to Jewish reckoning from sunset to sunset)? (2) Is the Supper held on the evening of (Friday the regular Paschal meal?

(1) There are various internal contradictions in the Synoptic account. Chwolson has challenged the accuracy of the expression 'the first day of unleavened bread' as applied to the day of preparation. He holds that the words can strictly be used only of the first day of the Passover week, *i.e.* of Passover day itself. It was the case, however, that the leaven began to be removed from Jewish houses in the daytime of the 14th Nisan, and this would be sufficient to account for the phrase. Again, we are told that the Sanhedrin determined to avoid putting Jesus to death during the feast (Mar_14:2). Did they change their plans? (Mar_14:12; Mar_14:17; Mar_14:43-46). Peter is armed, and the servants of the high priest are accompanied by an armed band. This was, strictly speaking, contrary to Jewish law on the Passover days; but the situation might well be regarded as exceptional. It is not so easy to believe that a hurried meeting of the Sanhedrin would be held immediately after partaking of the Paschal meal. Simon of Cyrene is coming up out of the country (Mar_15:21)—not necessarily from his work, which would, of course, indicate that it was not yet Passover, but more probably to purify himself for the Passover (Joh_11:55). Again, it is not easy to account for the haste with which it was sought to take down the body of Christ (Mar_15:42), unless the Passover was imminent. Joseph buys fine linen, and lays the body in the tomb, which could scarcely be done on Passover day. These considerations serve to show that the Synoptic account is at least uncertain. Thus there are also indications in the Synoptic story that go to confirm the clear statement of the Fourth Gospel that Jesus ate the Supper and was crucified on the day of Preparation for the Passover. The only argument against the Johannine position is that urged by Baur and his school, that an attempt is made, in a theological interest, to show that Jesus died on the day on which the Passover lamb was slain.

(2) If we accept the Johannine view, it follows that the Last Supper was not the regular Paschal meal. It is remarkable that in none of the Gospels is there mention of the lamb. John expressly distinguishes the Supper from the Passover (Joh_13:1 f.). At the same time it must not be forgotten that in Lk. Christ speaks of the meal as a Passover (Luk_22:15), and in such a way as to imply that there was some foreboding in His mind that they would not celebrate the Passover together on the legal day. The *Chronicon Paschale*, quoting Clement of Alexandria, says that the disciples learned that Jesus was Himself the Lamb, the food and the wine of the feast. St. Paul seems to imply that he identified in his mind the Crucifixion with the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb (1Co_5:7). If the Supper is meant by Jesus to anticipate the Passover meal, the shifting of the day would have as its secondary cause the haste with which the final preparations for arrest were made. At the same time it is hardly correct to say that the Fourth Evangelist is himself conscious of discrepancy with the Synoptics.

Otherwise the phrase in Joh 13:1 would have been more exact. His references (Joh 13:1, Joh 19:14; Joh 19:31; Joh 19:42) rather imply that a definite tradition is before him.

(An exhaustive discussion of the question will be found in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. p. 711; Drummond, *op. cit.* pp. 47-59. See also artt. Dates, Last Supper, Lord's Supper).

4. The conception of miracles.—In the Fourth Gospel the miracles are interpreted as manifestations of Christ's glory, with the view of calling attention to His Person. In the Synoptics they are performed as the outcome of His compassion. St. John certainly lays stress on the evidential aspect of the miracles, but he cannot be said to overlook the motive of compassion. Jesus created wine to add to the happiness of a perplexed marriage party (Joh 2:1; Joh 2:11). 'Whence shall we buy bread, that these may eat?' is a question full of tender feeling (Joh 6:5). After their discouraging and chilling interviews with the Jews, Jesus 'found' both the sick man of Bethesda and the man born blind (Joh 5:14, Joh 9:35), and spoke further words of spiritual healing. The allegory of the Good Shepherd is spoken for the sake of the excommunicated man, and breathes compassion (Joh 10:1-18). The Evangelist guards against the delay of two days being interpreted as a want of compassionate love for the sisters of Lazarus (11:5). There is nothing in the high claims of Jesus inconsistent with the Synoptic account. Compare the lofty claim that is implied in the sending forth of the Apostles in Matthew 10, and the impression produced by His calming of the storm (Mar 4:41). Note the tenderness and solicitude for the troubled and sorrowful disciples in the valedictory discourses (cf., further, Joh 5:40; Joh 6:27; Joh 10:9 and Mat 11:25-30, Luk 10:21-22). We may admit that there is 'a certain heightening of the effect,' as, for example, when we are told that the man at Bethesda had been a cripple for thirty-eight years, and that Lazarus was four days in the tomb. On the other hand, this Gospel is alone in declaring that the miraculous is an inferior kind of evidence (Joh 14:10-14, cf. Joh 2:23-25).

5. The picture of the Baptist has been regarded as inconsistent with the Synoptics. Sometimes, indeed, the Baptist speaks in the manner of the Evangelist, but it has to be remembered that only one aspect of the Baptist, viz. his witness to the Person of Christ, is emphasized. Baldensperger has contended (*Prolog des vierten Evangelium*) that the Gospel is written with the purpose of combating a sect in Asia Minor who were inclined to exalt the claims of the Baptist above those of Jesus. If we modify his statement so far as to admit that this is *one* of the aims of the Gospel, and that it has in view such a sect as we are told of in Act 18:24 to Act 19:7, we are provided with the means of explaining the striking introduction of the Baptist as 'a man' sent from God (Joh 1:6); his being contrasted with the Logos in the Prologue; why he is represented in the Fourth Gospel solely as directing his disciples to Jesus (Joh 1:36);

why it is stated that the Baptist's work and Christ's went on simultaneously, and that Jesus did not merely take up John's work where he left it (Joh 3:22-30); why the baptism of Jesus is mentioned in such a way as to exclude the conferring of any charism on Him by the Baptist (Joh 1:31-33).

6. It is urged as an objection to the Fourth Gospel that there is a **lack of development in connexion with the claims of Jesus**. At the very beginning He is hailed as the Messiah (Joh 1:41; Joh 1:45), and as Son of God (Joh 1:34; Joh 1:49). He reveals Himself as Messiah to the Samaritan woman (Joh 4:26). A process of development, however, is represented (e.g. Joh 2:22) as going on in the minds of the disciples, and the transition is easy, from remembering what Jesus had said, to unconsciously mingling with the actual narrative the expansion of the meaning of words and events through time. Moreover, the narrative moves in growing cycles of belief and disbelief. His reply to His mother (Joh 2:4), His brethren's insinuation (Joh 7:3-4), His own words in Joh 7:17, the reproof of Philip (Joh 14:9), and the speculations of the crowd (Joh 7:12; Joh 7:26-27), all indicate that the understanding of men did not keep pace with His own declarations. In this Gospel we still find the echo of the *Messiasgeheimniss* (Joh 10:24; cf. Sanday, *op. cit.* pp. 162-165). Again, is it not to be expected that if a Fourth Gospel was thought necessary, it would present a somewhat different aspect of Christ's claims and teaching? The Synoptics tell us how Jesus taught the audiences of Galilaean peasants. The Fourth Gospel deals largely with the experience of individuals, and of the inner group of disciples, and the way in which Christ's claims were met by the authorities at Jerusalem (cf. Dods, *Expos. Gr. Test.* Introduction, pp. 671-676).

IV. *Historicity of the Gospel*.—Clement of Alexandria described the Gospel as 'spiritual,' in contrast to the Synoptics, which relate the 'bodily facts' concerning Christ. In the Prologue itself we have an example of the way in which statements of spiritual truth and historical fact are characteristically interwoven, and the Evangelist tells us that he aims at presenting, out of the fulness of his knowledge, such an impression of Christ and of His teaching 'that ye may believe' (Joh 20:30-31). Can we understand more clearly from the character of the Gospel itself the impulses that actuated his mind? Can we in any measure detach the ideal element from the historical in the Gospel?

1. The narrative of events.

(1) *There are many signs in the Gospel that the author is narrating facts in which he himself had a personal interest*. He claims to be an eye-witness (Joh 1:14). He gives us exact notes of time (Joh 1:29, Joh 2:1, Joh 4:40, Joh 6:22, Joh 7:14, Joh 11:6, Joh 12:1, Joh 19:31, Joh 20:1). The hour of the day is mentioned (Joh 1:39, Joh 4:6, Joh 19:14). Similarly, exact numbers are given (Joh 1:35, Joh 2:6, Joh 6:9;

Joh 6:19; Joh 6:19, Joh 4:18, Joh 19:23-39). The significance of these marks of real recollection is increased by the fact that they occur chiefly in connexion with incidents of critical importance in the life of Jesus or in the experience of His followers. Note the accurate chronology dealing with the rise of faith in the Apostolic circle (Joh 1:1 to Joh 2:11), and with the Passion week (Joh 2:18-20). This Evangelist alone tells us of 'the *barley* loaves' (Joh 6:9; Joh 6:13), that Mary 'fell down at his feet' (Joh 11:32), of 'the house filled with the fragrance of the ointment' (Joh 12:3). Note also such personal impressions as Joh 13:24, Joh 18:6, Joh 19:5. These touches are introduced spontaneously, forming an integral part of the consciousness of the writer.

Again, it is evident that a selection has been made out of a number of incidents that were available (Joh 20:30-31). Incidents related in detail in the Synoptics are implied (Joh 7:42, Joh 3:24, Joh 1:32-33). Barabbas is mentioned without introduction, and the single comment, 'Now Barabbas was a robber,' is full of suppressed meaning (Joh 18:40). The trial before Caiaphas is not described. Two great miracles are related substantially as in the Synoptics (Joh 6:1-21). Compare also the Anointing (12) and the Triumphal Entry (Joh 12:12-15). The Trial scenes and the Crucifixion correspond in the main with the Synoptics. The Denial of Peter gains in verisimilitude by being broken up into separate incidents. The Baptist's words in Joh 3:29 are confirmed by Mat 9:15. The Baptist's ministry is implied in Joh 10:40-41.

(2) *The Evangelist describes himself not as a biographer, but as a 'witness.'* He brings forward others as witnessing. In Joh 21:24, if the order is significant, 'witnessing' is looked upon as of prior importance to 'writing.' A governing idea in the writer's mind is 'the truth,' which consists not in historical fact, but in having the mind brought into tune with the Divine facts of love and self-sacrifice. The miracles are not only actualities (ἔργα), they are also signs (σημεῖα). The Evangelist's mind is specially open to any suggestion of spiritual truth conveyed by the actual facts (e.g. Joh 2:11; Joh 2:17). Siloam is 'sent,' the sending forth of the waters being typical, perhaps, of the Christ sent of God (Joh 9:7). Judas goes out of the light of the upper room 'into the night' (Joh 13:30). 'It was winter' at the Feast of the Dedication (Joh 10:22), symbolizing the storm of hatred and the chill of indifference that met the warmth of Jesus' love. The use made of the sign in Joh 19:35 ff., is also typical of the Evangelist's mind. The reflective character of the writing is seen in the frequent use of ἵνα and οὕτως as connective particles. He emphasizes on various occasions the doctrine of a higher purpose running through the history (e.g. Joh 11:51; cf. 'the hour.' Joh 2:4 etc. Joh 3:27, Joh 19:28). This idea of the sovereignty of God in events is found also in St. Paul, and is not represented in the Christian tradition solely by the Fourth Evangelist. There is also the frank confession that the disciples failed to understand some sayings and incidents at the time, and that only the Spirit, mediated

through the teaching of events, revealed the hidden meaning (e.g. Joh 2:22, Joh 12:16). This is in accordance with the abstract expression of the same idea in Joh 14:26.

It is impossible fully to understand the author's conception of history without taking into account his clear consciousness that the gift of the Spirit of Truth must be part of the equipment for writing such a narrative as this Gospel (Joh 14:17, cf. Joh 19:35 and the use of ἀληθινός). The theory of history that is exemplified in the Gospel is summed up in Joh 15:24-27. Even the situation of distress in the Church at the time he wrote finds its interpretation only in the prophetic words of Christ (Joh 14:29, Joh 16:4).

With a conception of history so far removed from that of the mere chronicler, it is not surprising that the perspective of certain incidents (e.g. the Cleansing of the Temple) has been disturbed. There was a careful selection of those events in the life of Christ that were best fitted to illustrate in all their varying phases the belief and unbelief called forth by the Person and teaching of Jesus, but the Evangelist always starts with what he has seen (Joh 1:14). There are some difficulties of sequence that would be removed by giving a different order to the narrative; e.g. 'Arise, let us go hence' (Joh 14:31), where the discourse is resumed in ch. 15. Again, the discourse in Joh 7:15-24 would be eminently in place at the end of ch. 5. These transpositions might have taken place through various causes after the document had left the writer's hands (see Bacon, *Introduction*, pp. 271-274).

2. The discourses.—There are differences in style and in length between the discourses of Christ in the Fourth Gospel and those in the Synoptics. At first sight they seem far removed in character. Yet nothing could be farther from the truth than to say that the personal contribution of the Evangelist in the discourses is more apparent than his desire to reproduce the exact words of Jesus, or that he makes use of the Synoptics in mechanical fashion. He has preserved one or two isolated sayings (Joh 1:43, Joh 5:8, Joh 6:20, Joh 13:21; Joh 13:38, Joh 20:19) which are also found in the Synoptics, and the discourse in Joh 5:19-47 contains many coincidences of word and thought with Mat 11:2-19. (For other coincidences see Westcott, lxxxi.). Yet there is no sufficient evidence to warrant the hypothesis that even in these cases the Evangelist was entirely dependent on the Synoptic narratives, although it is probable that he had them before him. Even the discourses of the Fourth Gospel, when reduced to their elements, are full of short and pregnant sayings, such as we are accustomed to connect with Christ (see a most suggestive collection in Drummond, *op. cit.* p. 16ff.). Discourses much longer than any that are found in John are to be found in the Synoptics. It is true that the style of the discourses and the style of the Evangelist are practically identical, but that may be partly due to the fact

that the words of Jesus have been translated from the Aramaic. The dialogue form is more fully represented in the Fourth Gospel than in the others, which would rather make for authenticity.

There are indications in the Gospel that the Evangelist is concerned to keep his own ideas separate from those of Christ. The actual Logos idea outlined in the Prologue is never put into the mouth of Christ except as underlying His words in certain cases. He keeps separate his own explanations of words of Christ (Joh 2:19-21; Joh 12:33; Joh 7:39). What can only be an actual saying of Christ is represented as haunting the minds of the disciples in Joh 16:14-19. Again, in Joh 12:44-50, in the midst of a passage containing his own reflexions, there is a summary containing a free rendering of words of Christ that are repeated elsewhere in the Gospel; Joh 14:2 would seem to indicate that the same ideas had been expressed before, and would be familiar to the disciples.

On the other hand, it is clear that it is not the concern of this Evangelist to record the precise phrase that 'once for a moment ruffled the air of Palestine.' 'The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life' (Joh 6:63). At one point the disciples think they understand clearly the words they hear, but Jesus shows them their ignorance still (Joh 16:29 ff.). The teaching by parables appears only as transformed into allegory. In Joh 10:1-18 the image and the interpretation are inextricably intermingled. In some of the discourses the meaning is carried up to a certain point, and is then repeated like a *motif*, as though the Evangelist sought to express himself more clearly (e.g. the valedictory discourses). There are some cases where there is doubt as to where the words of Jesus end and the words of the Evangelist begin. It is conceivable that a more exact study of his language would afford us critical appliances more capable of detaching the two elements than those we now possess. Abbott, in his *Johannine Grammar* (2066b), has suggested that where γὰρ is used as a connective it is an indication that the Evangelist is entering on his own words. This would certainly suit such cases as Joh 3:15, Joh 4:9, Joh 5:21-23; Joh 5:26-27. At the same time, whatever further grammatical study may reveal, we must be prepared to regard the Johannine tradition of the words of Christ as differing in many aspects from that of the Synoptics. On the other hand, affinities are found in earlier NT writings with the words of Christ as reported in the Fourth Gospel (cf. 1Pe 5:2-4 and Joh 10:1; 1Pe 2:25 and Joh 10:16; also 1Pe 1:8; 1Pe 1:23, Rom 6:16 and Joh 8:34; Gal 5:17; Gal 5:26, Eph 2:13 ff. and Joh 10:16; Php 2:5 and Joh 10:17), and in all probability the question of the historicity of the words of Christ is not a problem peculiar to the Fourth Gospel (see P. Ewald, *Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage*). The dialogues with the Jews in this Gospel have taken on the abstract form that we should expect if they had often been orally repeated by the Evangelist in his preaching, before they were written down. The discourses

themselves are definitely connected with historical situations, and may, in some cases, be the expansion of fragmentary reminiscences. On the other hand, the gaps in the thought seem sometimes to point to abridgement. The problem is the same as in the case of the Sermon on the Mount. The valedictory discourses have no doubt taken their continuous form through the welding together of recollections of the closing days, suggested by the desire to make plain to the early Church that her present condition of anxiety and distress was anticipated with solicitous forethought in the prophetic words of the Saviour. The prayer in ch 17 is the prayer of One who has become the Great High Priest of His Church and of humanity. There is no reason for denying that the mind of the writer had a place in the composition of these. The spiritual equipment of the Evangelist is the guarantee for the fidelity of his psychological attitude as a 'witness,' and we must be prepared to trust not only the man himself, but above all his peculiar and intimate knowledge of the mind of Christ. We may thus reverently examine the material of which his unique spiritual experience is composed, but may well refrain from dividing a seamless robe.

Literature.—Full bibliographies will be found in Luthardt, *St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel* (by C. P. Gregory); Reynolds in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. pp. 721-722; a survey of modern literature in Loisy, *Le Quatrième Évangile*, p. 36 ff.; a critical account of recent literature in Sanday, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 1-32.

1. The most important works hostile to the traditional view of the authorship are: Bretschneider, *Probabilia*, 1820; Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, 1835-1840 [mythical view]; Baur, *Die Kanonischen Evangelien*, 1847 [date a.d. 170, tendency criticism]; Keim, *Jesu von Nazara*, 1867 [written by a Jewish Christian, 110-115, under name of Apostle John]; J. J. Tayler, *An Attempt to ascertain the Character of the Fourth Gospel*, 1867; *Supernatural Religion*, 1874 [replied to by Lightfoot, *Cont. Rev.*, Dec. 1874, Jan. 1875; Sanday, *Gospels in Second Century*; Luthardt, *St. John the author of Fourth Gospel*, 1875]; Albrecht Thoma, *Die Genesis der Johann. Evang.* 1882 [Gospel an Alexandrian allegory of Philonic character]; Oscar Holtzmann, 1887 [specially valuable for Jewish element in Gospel]; H. J. Holtzmann, *Handcom. zum NT*, 1893; Jean Réville, *Le Quatrième Évangile*, 1901 [unknown author; 'beloved disciple' not an individual but an ideal type]; Moffatt, *Historical NT*, 1901; Schmiedel in *Encyc. Bibl.* ii. art. 'John, son of Zebedee,' and 'Die Johann. Schriften' in *Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher*; Wrede, *Charakter und Tendenz*, 1903; Loisy, *Le Quatrième Évangile*, 1903.

2. A mediating position is represented by: Weisse, *Ev. Geschichte*, 1838, *Die Evangelische Frage*. 1856 [discourses and prologue Apostolic]; C. Weizsacker, *Untersuchungen*, 1864, reprinted 1901 [written by disciple of John; narratives and discourses in substance historical, but contains a large ideal element]; Renan, *Vie de*

Jésus, 1863 [practically abandons the historicity of discourses, but retains narrative as fundamentally Johannine]; Hugo Delff, *Grundzüge der Entwicklungsgeschichte d. Religion*, 1883, *Das vierte Evangelium*, and *Neue Beiträge*, 1890; Jülicher, *Einleitung*, 1901 (translation 1904); B. W. Bacon, *Introduction*, 1902; Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, 1886, i. 215-342, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 1909 (translated) [a development of the partition theory of Weisse; criticised by Wanchope Stewart in *Expositor*, Jan., Feb. 1903, and Drummond, *Character and Authorship*, pp. 399-404]; Harnack, *Chronologie d. altchrist. Litteratur*, vol. i.

3. The Apostolic authorship is maintained by: Neander, *Life of Christ*; Luthardt, *op. cit.*; Andrews Norton, *Genuineness of the Four Gospels* [all three in answer to Strauss]; Bleek, *Einleitung*, 1862, translation [in answer to Baur]; Pressensé, *Jésus Christ: son Temps, sa Vie*, etc.; Sabatier, *Essai sur les sources de la Vie de Jesus*; Godet, *Introd. and Com.* (1864, translation 1896, posthumous edition, 1901) [still most valuable in every direction]; R. H. Hutton in *Essays Theological and Literary*, 1871 [defending historical, credibility against Baur]; Sanday, *Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel*, 1872; M. Arnold, *God and the Bible* (from *Contemp. Review*, 1875); Willibald Beyschlag, *Zur johann. Frage*, 1876, *NT Theol.* (English translation i. 216-221); Salmon, *Historical Introduction*, 1885; Westcott, *Introd. and Com.* 1881 [classical]; Reynolds, *Pulpit Commentary*, and art. in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible*; Watkins, *Bampton Lectures*, 1899 [specially valuable for external evidence]; P. Ewald, *Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage*, 1890 [seeks to show that the Johannine element has a fundamental place in the entire Evangelic tradition of four Gospels]; Gloag, *Introd. to the Johann. Writings*, 1891 [containing valuable summary of positions]; Volume of Essays by Ezra Abbot, A. P. Peabody, J. B. Lightfoot, 1892; B. Weiss, *Einleitung* (translation 1888), *Das Johann. Evang.* 1897; Marcus Dods, *Expos. Gr. Test.* vol. i. 1897; Zahn, *Einleitung*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1899; Drummond, *Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, 1903 [very significant owing to the theological position of the writer; especially suggestive in treatment of external evidence; displays tendency towards allegorical interpretation]; Stanton, *Gospels as Historical Documents*, i. 1903 [external evidence]; Sanday, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, 1905 [containing surveys and estimates of recent theories, and valuable criticism of critical methods]; Barth, *Biblischen Zeitund Streitfragen*, 'Das Johann. evang. und die Synopt. Evang.' 1903.

The series of volumes by Edwin Abbott, entitled 'Diatessarica' (esp. *From Letter to Spirit*, 1903; *Johannine Vocabulary*, 1905; *Johannine Grammar*, 1906), contains much fresh matter, suggested by an elaborate study of the language of the Fourth Gospel.

Among articles in magazines may be mentioned W. Milligan in *Contemp. Review* (Sept. 1867, Aug. and Nov. 1868), and *British and Foreign Evangelical Review* (Oct. 1871) [directed against Baur and his school]; Schürer, *Contemp. Review*, 1891 [a review of

the position of the problem; replied to by Sanday, Oct. 1891]; Bacon, *Hibbert Journal*, April 1903, Jan. 1904, 1995 [has developed theory of editorship by author of 1-3 Jn. and ch. 21]; three important articles on conservative side by an anonymous writer in the *Church Quarterly Review*, 1905-1906. The monograph by Schwarz, *Ueber den Tod der Sohne Zebedaei*, 1904, while completely hostile to the traditional view, is valuable for certain portions of the external evidence.

R. H. Strachan.

☛ John, Gospel Of (II. Contents)

JOHN, GOSPEL OF (II.: Contents).—

1. Character of the Gospel.—The interesting fragment of Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* vi. 14), quoted from the lost ‘Outlines’ of Clement of Alexandria, gives us the earliest view which was taken of the Fourth Gospel. ‘John, last, having observed that the bodily things had been set forth in the [earlier] Gospels, and exhorted thereto by his friends, and inspired by the Spirit, produced a *spiritual* Gospel.’ The word ‘spiritual,’ or ‘pneumatic,’ is here, as usually with the Alexandrians, opposed to ‘bodily,’ or ‘somatic.’ And what the difference was, as regards the records of the past, is shown admirably by Origen’s comment on Joh 2:12. He says that if all the four Gospels are to be believed, the truth of them cannot be in their ‘bodily characters,’ but in their spiritual meaning. The Gospels, he says elsewhere (*de Prine.* 4), contain many things which are said to have happened, but which did not happen literally; and in one place of his Commentary on St. John he says that when the writers of Holy Scripture were unable to speak the truth ‘at once spiritually and bodily’ (*i.e.* at once literally and with a deeper symbolical or allegorical meaning), it was their practice to prefer the spiritual to the corporeal, ‘the true spiritual meaning being often preserved in the corporeal falsehood’ (σωζομένον πολλάκις τοῦ ἀληθοῦς πνευματικοῦ ἐν τῷ σωματικῷ ψευδεῖ). So Epiphanius says of St. John’s Gospel: ‘most of the things spoken by him were spiritual, the fleshly things having been already attested’ (*Haer.* li. 19).

These passages are very important for the study of the Fourth Gospel. They are evidence, not, of course, for the author’s method of composition, but for what was thought of the Gospel in the latter part of the 2nd cent. and the first half of the 3rd, that is to say, as soon as it was widely known. It was accepted as ‘a spiritual Gospel,’ and by spiritual was meant, not devotional, ethical, and philosophical, but allegorical as opposed to barely historical.

The distinction between the two modes of treatment was familiar at Alexandria, and had been familiar long before the Fourth Gospel was written. Philo compares the literal meaning to the body, and the spiritual to the soul. He applies this exegetical principle to the OT narratives with great thoroughness. To the literal truth of ancient sacred history he is very indifferent. Particular events are important only in proportion to their universal significance. To grasp the truth of a narrative is to see its relation to universal spiritual law or fact. He would have considered the laborious investigation of historical detail to be merely learned trifling, worthy only of a grammarian or a pedant. Moral edification and gnosis were the only objects for which it was at all worth while to trouble about the records of the past.

We have, of course, no right to assume that the 2nd cent. was right in classing the Fourth Gospel as a 'spiritual' work. We shall have to consider its allegorism in detail before we can pronounce on its relation to history. But it should be perfectly obvious that its author did not mean it to be studied as a plain historical narrative. He would probably have said that he had a higher aim than to record trivial details, some of which had no spiritual meaning. The Gospel is, and claims to be, an *interpretation* of our Lord's Person and ministry, an ideal construction which aims at producing a certain impression about the Person of Christ. This impression is to be the *true* interpretation of the historical Jesus—the author is infinitely anxious about this. He is writing no mere historical romance, like the Life of Apollonius of Tyana, which was afterwards concocted as a rival to the Gospels. He is no Docetist, as is shown by several passages in the Gospel, and more categorically in 1 John, which, if not by the same author, is in closest connexion with the Gospel. But a very slight critical investigation is enough to show that he allows himself a free hand in manipulating the facts on which he is working. It is perfectly honest history, as history was understood by the ancients. But even the most scientific of ancient historians did not scruple to put his own views of the political situation into the mouths of the chief characters in his period; and among the Jews the composer of a *haggadah* had no fear of being branded as a romancer or a forger.

The plan of the Gospel is clearly stated in [Joh 20:30-31](#), an impressive passage which was intended to be the conclusion of the book, and was so until the appendix was added. The object here avowed is strictly adhered to throughout. No other book of the NT is so entirely dominated by one conception. The theology of the Incarnation, taught in the form of a historical narrative, with an underlying framework of symbolism and allegory, which, though never obtruded, determines the whole arrangement and selection of incidents—this is the topic of the Fourth Gospel. And unless it is read in the light of this purpose, and with a due recognition of the peculiar method, the seven seals of the Apocalypse will remain set upon the 'spiritual Gospel.'

Different opinions have been held as to the readers whom the writer has mainly in view. Réville thinks that 'the author has wished to prove to his contemporaries who had remained in the liberal and philosophical Judaism of the Diaspora, that, in Jesus Christ, the revelation of the Logos, admitted by them in the OT, has its full and definitive fulfilment.' But the Gospel is not an *apologia* written for the Jews. The extremely unconciliatory tone, used throughout in speaking of them, is enough to disprove this hypothesis. There is a subordinate element of apologetic, but the main object is clearly to edify and teach the faithful, not to convert the unbeliever. The author never descends to his opponents' ground, but remains throughout on his own. His aim is didactic, but not exactly dogmatic. He wishes, not to prove a theological thesis, but to confirm and perfect the believer in his adhesion to Christ as the Incarnate Word, the principle of spiritual regeneration, and the nourishment of 'eternal' life. This is the foundation of his own faith, and the characteristic Johannine ideas are the intellectual form of this faith, which is centred in the *unio mystica*. There is no sign of a polemic against Docetism, Ebionism, or against Cerinthus. Still less is he writing against liberalized Judaism, as Réville seems to suggest. Whatever was his attitude towards Philo (and the question is not an easy one to answer), it was not one of conscious antagonism.

The author, then, is writing for Christians. But for what Christians? It has often been maintained or assumed that his object is to teach a philosophy of religion—that he is, in fact, the author of the formula 'Jesus Christ, the promised Messiah of the Jews, is the Incarnate Logos of God.' But this view is untenable. There is no systematic philosophy in the Gospel—not even in the Prologue. And besides, the Logos theology was not new. It is not propounded as new in the Gospel; and it exists in substance in St. Paul's Epistles, as well as in the Hebrews. There can be little doubt that Apollos, the learned Jew of Alexandria, made this identification in his preaching, which was so mightily convincing. For at this time 'Logos' was as familiar a term to all educated persons as 'Evolution' is to our own generation.

The Gospel is not a philosophical treatise. Is it, then, an attempt to *mediate* between two parties in the Church, between the advocates of 'Faith' and 'Knowledge,' of Gnosis and Pistis? The conflict between these two parties was acute at the end of the 2nd cent., as we see from the caution imposed upon Clement of Alexandria by conservative prejudice, and on the other side by the diatribes of the obscurantist Tertullian against philosophy? At that period Gnosticism had gained a footing within the Church, and orthodoxy had become alive to the dangers which threatened the Christian religion from this side. The intellectualists were even strong enough to drive Montanism out of the Church. During the first quarter of the 2nd cent. the great Gnostics were outside the Church, and the chief danger was that the party of ψιλή πίστις, ignorant and superstitious, with materialistic notions of religion and hopes of a

coming reign of the saints, might make the position of the Christian philosopher impossible, and drive him into the arms of the Gnostics. Moreover, at the time when the Gospel was written, the inadequacy of *both* presentations of Christianity was becoming apparent. The primitive revivalism was decaying; the hopes of a Parousia were growing faint; while, on the other hand, Docetism and the fantastic schemes of the Gnostic party were visibly tending to discard the Gospel in favour of a barbarized Platonism. The author of this Gospel interposed his powerful influence to save Christianity from being either swamped in a mythology or sublimated into a theosophy. 'The Jews' demanded miracles, 'the Greeks' a philosophy; this Gospel, like St. Paul, presents both with 'Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God' (1Co 1:22-24). The author addresses himself chiefly to the Faith-party, who most needed teaching. He tries to recall them to real history, by subtly spiritualizing the miraculous narratives, to which they attributed too much importance, and bringing out their ethical and spiritual significance. He never makes the slightest attempt to rationalize a miracle.—on the contrary, the miracles which he records are more startling than anything in the Synoptics,—but no stress is laid on any physical portent as momentous in and for itself, or as evidence, apart from its symbolical value as a type of the Person, work, and office of Christ. This design of spiritualizing the tradition is kept in view throughout; but it is carried out so subtly and quietly that it has often been overlooked.

A glance at one of the old-fashioned 'Harmonies' of the four Evangelists makes us realize how few of the events of our Lord's life, before the last few days, are recorded by the Synoptists and also by St. John. And even the few common elements are employed differently, and in different settings. There are notable and irreconcilable differences in the chronology, including, as is well known, a discrepancy as to the date of the Crucifixion. The development of Christ's mission is differently conceived, the Johannine Christ making the most exalted claims to equality with the Father near the beginning of His career, and in the presence of His enemies (2:19, 6:40, 8:58 etc.), whereas in the Synoptics the question and answer at Caesarea Philippi are clearly intended to be of crucial importance (Mat 16:13 ff. ||). The form and substance of the discourses are also very different, the Christ of the Synoptics speaking as a man to men, as a Jew to Jews; conveying His message in pithy aphorisms, easily understood and remembered, and in homely parables, adapted to the comprehension of country folk. These discourses are directed rather to bringing men to the Father, and to righteousness and consistency of life, than to inculcating any doctrines about His own Person; sometimes He expresses His attachment to the Law, and repudiates any intention of abrogating it. Our Evangelist, on the other hand, represents Jesus as taking part in long polemical disputations with 'the Jews,' who are as much His enemies as they were the enemies of the Christian Church 80 years later; the parables have disappeared, and their place is taken by 'proverbs' or symbolic language; and, above all, His whole teaching is centred upon faith in and

devotion to Himself. The emphatic ἐγὼ occurs 15 times in St. Matthew, 117 times in St. John. Many facts to which our Evangelist attaches great importance are completely strange to the Synoptic tradition. Such are: the marriage in Cana of Galilee, with which the public ministry opens; the conversation with the Samaritan woman; the healing of the paralytic at the pool of Bethesda; the incident of the man born blind; the raising of Lazarus, which in St. John's Gospel appears to have been the immediate cause of the plot against the life of Jesus; the washing of the disciples' feet at the Last Supper; the conversation with Pilate at the trial; the presence of the beloved disciple and Mary at the Cross; the appearance to Thomas after the Resurrection. On the other hand, the writer of the Fourth Gospel omits the genealogy and the birth from a virgin, because it could be of no interest to him to prove that Jesus (or rather Joseph) was descended from king David, and the Incarnation of the Logos is a far grander conception than a miraculous birth by the operation of the Holy Ghost; he omits the Baptism of Jesus, of which notwithstanding he shows knowledge, because, again, the true Baptism is the Incarnation of the Logos in Jesus, and also partly, perhaps, because he is anxious to discountenance the Adoptionist views of the Person of Christ which were prevalent at the time when he wrote; he omits the Temptation, because it is no part of his plan to exhibit Jesus as experiencing any temptation or weakness; he omits the Transfiguration, because in his view the whole life of Christ on earth is a manifestation of His glory, not by visible light but to the spiritual eye; he omits the institution of the Eucharist, because he has already given his sacramental doctrine in his discourse about the Bread of Life ([Joh_6:26](#) ff.), following the miracle of the 5000, and does not wish the truth of the mystical union to be bound up too closely with the participation in an ecclesiastical rite; he omits the Agony in the Garden of Gethsemane, and the cry, 'Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani,' because the impression which he wishes to convey of the complete voluntariness of Christ's sufferings and death, and of the 'glory' which was manifested by His humiliation as well as by His triumph over death, might be impaired by incidents which seem to indicate human weakness and hesitation; and, lastly, he omits the Ascension and the descent of the Paraclete, because he does not wish the withdrawal of Christ's bodily presence, and the continuation of the Incarnation in another more spiritual form, to be associated with physical portents, or to be assigned to particular days.

There can be no question that these omissions are deliberate, and not the result of ignorance. Those who wish to discredit any of the narratives which appear in the Synoptics, cannot rightly draw any inferences from St. John's silence. Such features of the Christian tradition as the Birth at Bethlehem and the Ascension must have been well known by any well-instructed Christian at the beginning of the 2nd cent., and there are no signs that our Evangelist wishes to correct his predecessors from the standpoint of one who has had access to better information. Not only are incidents

like the Baptism referred to incidentally (Joh_1:32), but an attempt is made to provide substitutes for several of the omitted narratives. Instead of the Davidic ancestry of Joseph, we have the eternal generation of the *μονογενής*; instead of the Lord's Prayer, taught to the disciples, we have the High-Priestly prayer of ch. 17, in which almost every clause of the Lord's Prayer is represented, though in each case, except the last ('Deliver us from the evil one'), the petition is changed into a statement that the work has been done, the boon conferred. The institution of Baptism is represented by the discourses with Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman; that of the Eucharist by the miracle in ch. 6 and the discourse on the Bread of Life which follows it. The Transfiguration is represented by the voice from heaven in Joh_12:7; Joh_12:28; while the preceding verse (which should be printed as a question, 'Shall I say, Father, save me from this hour?') is intended to compensate us for the loss of the Agony in the Garden. Lastly, the words to Thomas in Joh_20:29—the last beatitude—more than reconcile us to the loss of any description of the Ascension.

The number of miracles is much reduced; but those which are given are representative, and in some cases are more tremendous than those of the Synoptics. The healing of the son of Herod's official (Joh_4:46 ff.) is the only miracle which has the true Synoptic ring; in the others no 'faith' is required in those who are to benefit by the sign, and the object seems to be to manifest some aspect of Christ's Person and work. In the marriage at Cana, the feeding of the multitude, the healing of the blind man, and the raising of Lazarus, the Evangelist himself tells us the spiritual meaning of the miracle, in words spoken either by the Lord Himself or by some one else.

There is, however, a great deal of symbolism in the Gospel which is unexplained by the author, and unnoticed by the large majority of his readers. The method is strange to us, and we do not look out for allegories which would be at once understood by Alexandrians in the 2nd century. A few examples are necessary, to justify the view here taken that symbolism or allegorism pervades the whole Gospel. In Joh_1:29 John the Baptist designates Christ 'the Lamb of God,' with clear reference to the Paschal sacrifice. The prophetic type of the Paschal lamb dominates the whole of the Passion narrative in St. John. Even the date, it would appear, is altered, in order that Christ may die on the day when the Paschal lambs were killed. The change of the 'reed' of the Synoptics to 'hyssop' seems to have been made with the same object, when we remember the ritual use of hyssop at the Passover. The Gospel abounds in enigmatic utterances, such as 'Thou hast kept the good wine until now' (Joh_2:10); 'It is expedient that one man should die for the people' (Joh_11:50); 'Judas went immediately out, and it was night' (Joh_13:30); in which the reader is plainly meant to see a double meaning. The symbolism is often in three stages. The text presents an apparent sense, which is in figure a second, which in turn points to a third and still

deeper signification. Especially in the narrative, a prophetic utterance quoted from the OT is sometimes the intermediate stage in this allegorical construction. The type of the Paschal lamb comes as it were between the literal feeding of the 5000 and the idea that Christ gives His life to take away the sin of the world, and that He may be our spiritual food and sustenance. The words quoted from the Psalms, 'the zeal of thy house shall eat me up,' come in like manner between the cleansing of the Temple at Jerusalem and the idea of the glorification of Jesus as the building of the true Temple, the body of Christ, the Church. There are, we might venture to say, three temples in the mind of the Evangelist—the material temple built by Herod, the temple of Christ's natural body, which was to be destroyed and raised up 'in three days,' and the temple which is the spiritual body of Christ—namely, the Church. Similarly, in Joh 7:38, the quotation, 'out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water,' comes, as it were, between the thrust of the lance and the effusion of the Holy Spirit on the disciples and the Church.

But the most remarkable part of the allegoric method is that connected with *numbers*. There can be no doubt, in the opinion of the present writer, that the Philonic method of playing with numbers had a strong fascination for our Evangelist. The examples are far too numerous to be accidental. The number 7 recurs in the number of the miracles (omitting ch. 21 from our calculations), in the number of solemn declarations beginning 'I am'; in the number of 'witnesses' borne to Christ, and perhaps in other places. The officer's son is healed at the seventh hour; the paralytic on the seventh day. It is thoroughly in accordance with the method of the Evangelist, that he avoids the word *ἑπτὰ*, just as he avoids the two crucial words *γνώσις* and *πίστις*, which had become watchwords of parties. As for the number 3, perhaps too much ingenuity has been shown in cutting up the whole Gospel into arrangements of 3; but unquestionably the book does lend itself very readily to such classification, and the fact that it is concealed rather than obtruded is in accordance with what seems to have been the method and design of the writer. With regard to higher numbers, the extreme precision of the Evangelist must excite suspicion of an allegorical motive; and when we find that 38, 46, and 153 can be plausibly explained on Philonic principles, the suspicion becomes almost a certainty. For example, the 153 fish may be the 'fulfilment' of $10+7$; $1 + 2 + 3 + \dots + 17 = 153$; or, as Bishop Wordsworth suggests, it may be the square of 12 + the square of 3. It is said that 200 (Peter is 200 cubits from the land) signifies, in the Philonian lore, repentance. The 'forty-six years' since the beginning of the building of the Temple may possibly be connected with the age assigned to Jesus ('not yet fifty years old'); it has been suggested that the Evangelist wishes to make Him seven times seven years old at the Crucifixion; but this is very doubtful. The frequent use of number-symbolism in the Gospel is more certain than the correctness of particular interpretations. These

interpretations would occur readily to the 'Gnostic' of the 2nd cent.; to us they must be guesswork.

Some critics, such as Renan, have objected to this discovery of allegorism in the Fourth Gospel, that the allegorist always tries to attract attention to his symbols, whereas St. John clearly does not, but conceals them so carefully that the large majority of his readers do not even suspect their existence. This sounds plausible. But the question really is whether the Evangelist has not done all that he need have done in order to be understood by those among his first readers who knew his method. It is not suggested that the Johannine symbolism was meant for all to understand. There is abundant evidence that those who valued the 'Gnosis' were agreed that it must not be profaned by being explained to all. We find this conviction in Philo, and very strongly in Clement of Alexandria, who, as a Christian, is important evidence. He says that to put the spiritual exegesis before the common people is like giving a sword to a child to play with. He will not write all that he knows, because of the danger that it may get into wrong hands. There are some religious truths which can only be safely imparted orally. There is reason to think that he abandoned his project of putting the coping-stone on his theological works by a book of an esoteric character, because a published treatise cannot be confined to those who ought to read it. Since, then, the existence of the symbolic method, and the obligation of concealing it from the ordinary reader, are both proved, there is nothing strange in the veiled symbolism which we have found to characterize this Gospel.

The Evangelist writes throughout for two classes of readers—for the *simpliciores*, who would be satisfied by the narrative in its plain sense, and for the 'Gnostic,' who could read between the lines without difficulty. And yet he *wishes* all his readers to rise towards a spiritual understanding. Again and again he puts the key in the lock—in such solemn utterances as 'I am the Bread of Life—the Light of the World—the Resurrection and the Life.' His own word for the allegoric method is 'proverb' (παροιμία). Up to the end of the last discourse, Jesus has spoken to His disciples in proverbs; but the time was coming (after the withdrawal of His bodily presence) in which, through the medium of the Paraclete, He should no more speak to them in proverbs, but should show them plainly of the Father. The proverb is different from the Synoptic παραβολή, which is a story with a religious and moral application—a story which has a complete sense in itself, apart from the lesson, which is generally conveyed by the story as a whole, and not by the details. St. John, however, tries to keep the historical parabolic form in which Jesus actually taught. Yet, in spite of himself, he half substitutes the Alexandrian and Philonic allegory for the Synoptic parable. The double sense runs all through the narrative. Whenever the Johannine Christ begins to teach—whether His words are addressed to Nicodemus, the Samaritan woman, 'the Jews,' or His own disciples—He nearly always begins by enunciating a proposition

which contains, under a sensible and symbolic image, a religious truth. The auditor regularly misunderstands Him, interpreting literally what should have been easily perceived to be a metaphor. This gives Jesus an opportunity to develop His allegory, and, in so doing, to instruct the reader, if not the original hearer of the discourse, whom once or twice (as in ch. 3) the Evangelist seems to have quite forgotten. The Johannine Christ loves words which, at any rate in Greek, have a double sense, such as ἄνωθεν, πνεῦμα, λόγος (cf. esp. Joh 10:31-38). Whether the very numerous cases where a verb may be indicative or imperative are intentionally ambiguous, it is not easy to say. The symbolism reaches its height in some of the discourses to the Jews; the last discourses to the disciples are more plain, and in ch. 17, which is the climax of the teaching of the Gospel, the mystical union is expounded with much directness.

One of the most difficult problems in connexion with the classes of readers for whom the Gospel was intended is presented by certain explanations introduced by the Evangelist. The chief of these are Joh 2:21, Joh 6:64-65, Joh 7:38, Joh 8:27, Joh 12:33, Joh 18:9. These explanations seem to us at times superficial and unworthy of their context. We cannot be surprised that they have given force to partition-theories like that of Wendt, who maintains that the discourses are on a higher intellectual and spiritual level than could be within the compass of the author of parts of the narrative. The difficulties in the way of partition-theories seem to be insuperable. A more plausible hypothesis is that the Evangelist deliberately introduced these childlike observations for the benefit of the *simpliciores*, trusting to the educated reader being able to divine his purpose. But this theory is not very satisfactory. We have seen that St. John is able to see as many as three meanings in a simple occurrence. And so he may have felt that 'the Temple' might mean Christ's natural body as well as the stone building and the Church of Christ, which last must have been mainly in his mind when he foresaw the downfall of the Jewish sanctuary and all which it represented.

The *style* of the Fourth Gospel is as different from that of the Synoptics as the matter. Instead of the variety which we find in them, we have a small number of essential thoughts repeated again and again under a small number of images. From this results a strange impressiveness, common in mystical writings, which often share this peculiarity, though to some readers the monotony appears tedious and inartistic. The discourses of Christ have a sweet and melancholy charm, with an indescribable dignity and grandeur; over them all hangs the luminous haze of mysticism, in which mystery seems clear, and clearness itself is mysterious. The phraseology is Hebraic, not Greek; in the Prologue we have a species of rhythm which recalls the old prophets, and in many places we find the parallelism of Hebrew poetry. The arrangement is that of the writer's own thought, not chronological. The appearance of detailed accuracy is not, as has often been seriously argued, a proof of first-hand

knowledge, but is due to the vividness of the Evangelist's mental images. The numbers, as has been said, seem often to have a symbolic meaning; the figures, such as Nicodemus and the Greeks who asked for an introduction to Jesus, disappear from the writer's mind as soon as the point is made. No difference can be detected between the style of the various speakers, or between the discourses of Christ and the Evangelist's own comments.

2. Theology of the Gospel.—The first question which meets us is the relation of the Prologue to the rest of the Gospel. Harnack, whose antipathy to the Logos theology apparently influences his judgment, suggests that the Prologue was merely prefixed to the narrative in order to predispose the Greeks in favour of the views which the author was about to propound, views which do not really at all correspond with the Logos philosophy as they understood it.

'The Prologue brings in conceptions which were familiar to the Greeks, and enters into these more deeply than is justified by the presentation which follows; for the notion of the incarnate Logos is by no means the dominant one in the Gospel. Though faint echoes of this idea may possibly be met with here and there in the Gospel,—I confess I do not notice them,—the predominating thought is essentially that of Christ as the Son of God, who obediently executes what the Father has shown and appointed Him' (*ZThK* [Note: *ThK Zeitschrift f. Theologie u. Kirche.*] ii. 189 ff.).

This strangely perverse judgment has evoked protests from several critics who understand the Gospel better than Harnack, among others from Réville, who has certainly no bias in favour of traditional views. It would be easy to show that every one of the dogmatic statements in the Prologue is reasserted in the body of the Gospel. For the pre-existence of the Logos, beyond time, in personal relation to, and in essential union with, God, cf. [Joh 6:62](#), [Joh 8:58](#), [Joh 14:10](#), [Joh 17:5](#); [Joh 17:24](#). For the Logos as the Agent in creation, and its life-giving and sustaining principle, cf. [Joh 5:26](#), [Joh 8:12](#), [Joh 9:5](#). (From the nature of the subject-matter, there is not *much* cosmological teaching in the Gospel; but what there is, is in full accordance with the Prologue). For manifestations of the Logos before the Incarnation, by revelations and by His immanent presence, cf. [Joh 8:56](#) and [Joh 9:5](#), 'whenever I am in the world,' etc. There is thus chapter and verse in the Gospel, and in Christ's own words, for every statement in the Prologue; and though Jesus never calls Himself the Logos, this sublime conception of His personality pervades the whole narrative. The stumbling-block to Harnack and others has been what some critics (*e.g.* Beyschlag and Réville) have called the 'contradictory double theology' of the Gospel. By the side of a conception of Christ's Person which seems to class the Evangelist as a speculative mystic or Gnostic, we have statements which seem to belong to the school of Christianity which was dominated by Jewish positivism. Such doctrines are the actual 'becoming flesh' of the Logos, as opposed to a theophany under human form; and the

repeated mention of 'the Last Day,' a conception with which, as Reuss says, 'mystical theology has no concern.' But the Evangelist does not write or think as a philosopher. The supreme merit of his book as a Gospel is that he does not write the life of Christ as a Christian Platonist might have been tempted to write it, but keeps a firm hold on the historical Jesus, and on the concrete facts in His teaching. There is, undoubtedly, a double thread of the kind indicated. In some parts of the narrative we feel that 'tabernacled among us' is a truer description of the character of the Johannine Christ than 'became flesh.' There is an aloofness, a solitary grandeur, about the central figure which prevents Him from seeming fully human; while in other places there is an approximation to the Synoptic portrait. But it is only to the minute critic that these difficulties become apparent. To the religious consciousness of Christendom there has never been any hesitation in recognizing the profound agreement between the Synoptic and the Johannine presentations of Jesus Christ. See, further, art. Logos.

The intense ethical dualism of the Fourth Gospel is another perplexing phenomenon to those who look for philosophical consistency in a religious treatise. Christian Platonism, into which the Logos theology passed as its most important ingredient, seems to leave no room for a personal devil, or for human beings who are children of the devil. It seems rather to favour the conception of evil as mere *privatio boni*. St. John, however, is quite unconscious of any such difficulty. Although the Logos is the immanent cause of all life, so that 'without him nothing whatever came into being,' the 'darkness' in which the light shines is no mere absence of colour, but a positive malignant thing, a rival kingdom which has its own subjects and its own sphere. Some critics have even been reminded of the metaphysical dualism of Manichaeism speculation. This last, however, is in too flagrant contradiction with the Logos theology to effect a lodgment in the Evangelist's mind. The Logos is the true light which lighteth every man as it comes into the world. But since the philosophical problem is not present to the mind of the writer, he is not careful to draw the line between the ethical dualism which was part of his religious experience, and the metaphysical dualism which would have subverted the foundations of his intellectual system. The sources of this ethical dualism may be found partly in the spiritual struggles of an intensely devout nature, but to a greater extent, probably, in the furious antagonism of Judaism to nascent Christianity, a hostility which, to a Christian, must have seemed really diabolical. The temper of his own age was unconsciously transferred to the ministry of Jesus, who certainly could not have adopted the attitude of uncompromising antagonism to 'the Jews' which we find in this Gospel. But it is worthy of note that some of the devotional literature of later times, which shows the closest affinity with Johannine ideas,—the *Theologia Germanica* is a particularly good example,—displays the same extreme ethical dualism as the Gospel. Stöckl, in criticising the *Theologia Germanica* from the standpoint of modern Romanism, finds in it the 'Gnostic dualism' which, with equal justice, he might have detected in parts of the Fourth Gospel. In neither the one nor the other

does the distinction correspond with the Gnostic division of mankind into pneumatic and psychic, with an impassable gulf between them. Compare, e.g., the Evangelist's use of 'the world' in Joh 15:19.

(1) *Doctrine of God the Father.*—According to the logic of the system, it has often been said, God should always manifest Himself through the Logos. No man hath seen or heard God at any time (Joh 1:18, Joh 5:37, Joh 6:46). So Philo holds that there can be no immediate communication between God, who is transcendent and unknowable, and the world. Nevertheless, it is impossible to impose this philosophical idea upon St. John. His God is not the unknowable 'One' of the later Platonism. He is Spirit (Joh 4:24), that is, on the negative side, He is non-material, not appreciable by sense, spaceless and timeless. Yet He is not darkness, but Light; and light includes the ideas of radiation and illumination. Further yet, He is Love. He loves the world. As loving the world, He is the principle of *action*, the principle of the activity of the Logos. He is the *Father*, who 'draws' men to Himself. Several other passages (e.g. Joh 5:7; Joh 5:21, Joh 9:29) imply independent direct action by the Father. Still, we must not over-emphasize this as a proof of the Evangelist's disagreement with Philo. Philo, no doubt, could not acknowledge an Incarnation; but the idea of theophanies was naturally very familiar to him from his OT studies. There is nothing un-Philonic in the 'voice from heaven' (Joh 12:38). Philo, too, speaks of 'a voice formed in the air, not coming from any animate body.'

(2) *Doctrine of the Holy Spirit.*—The dualism of Flesh and Spirit in St. John is one expression of the ethical dualism of which we have spoken above. It is very clearly set forth in the conversation with Nicodemus, when Christ says that no one can see the Kingdom of God unless he be born from above (*or afresh*). This He explains by repeating that unless a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot see the Kingdom of God. 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.' This regeneration by water and the Spirit is the birth from above, not a simple moral renovation, but a real communication of the Divine Spirit. Natural generation is only a feeble image of this supernatural generation, which, says Loisy (perhaps too boldly, in the absence of any expression of this thought in the Gospel), 'is attached to the same order as the Incarnation of the Word.' St. John does not draw this comparison; but he says of the elect that they 'were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God' (Joh 1:13). The sphere of the Spirit forms a world absolutely opposed to the world of the flesh. What, then, is the content of this world of the Spirit? Since God is Spirit, the world of Spirit is the world of God, and partakes of the Divine attributes. It is absolute and indestructible; the Father 'hath life in himself,' and has given this absolute life to the Son also. Even so the Son can transmit it, 'quickeneth whom he will.' The Spirit quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing: it was to communicate to men a life which they have not naturally, that the Word became incarnate. This gift of spiritual life is figured as 'the bread

from heaven' and 'the living water,' symbols which, as the Evangelist was far from forgetting, are the outward and visible signs in the two great Sacraments. The Divine gift is also typified as Light and Truth, words which imply an illumination of the intellect. So in Joh 17:3 life eternal is defined as the knowledge of (or rather, the process of knowing) the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom He sent. This advancing knowledge is the highest form of life. Those who 'are of the truth' listen to the words of Christ; but the contemptuous or careless question of Pilate, 'What is truth?' receives no answer. The truth also 'makes us free'; it breaks the yoke of sin. In opposition to this higher world, St. John develops the idea of the *cosmos*, which is the direct opposite of the Spirit. It has only the appearance of life; he who has been redeemed from it 'has passed from death into life' (Joh 5:24). It is therefore possible to call the devil the prince of this world; although the passage from the kingdom of the world to that of the Spirit is open (Joh 3:17; Joh 3:17). Jesus Christ, who has full possession of the Spirit, is come to raise men from the sphere of the world into that of the Spirit. Thus, the Johannine soteriology contemplates an enrichment, not a restoration, of human nature. The Evangelist regards sin as essentially a failure to recognize the Divine in the world. Those to whom the light has not been brought are blind, but not guilty: those to whom it has appeared, and who turn their backs upon it, are the typical sinners. From henceforth, these lovers of darkness are doomed to destruction (*ἀπώλεια*), when Jesus shall 'overcome the world' as a triumphant conqueror.

The relations of the Spirit to the Logos are difficult to define. What, for example, was the office of the Spirit in the world before the Incarnation? Life, as we know, was immanent in the Logos: there seems to be no room for another *πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν*. The descent of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus at His baptism is referred to in St. John, but not described. To him, the Baptism could have no such importance as it appears to have in the Synoptic record. The Spirit was given to Christ 'without measure' from the first.

During the ministry we do not hear much of the Spirit. St. John tells us bluntly (Joh 7:39) that 'There was as yet no Spirit, because Jesus was not yet glorified.' Instead of the Spirit, we have a *quasi*-independent power ascribed to the *words* of the Lord Jesus, which are spoken of in the same sort of way in which Philo speaks of the *λόγοι* and *δυνάμεις*. Jesus insists that the words are not His own, but come from God (Joh 3:34 and several other places). The words are, of course, inoperative, unless they are received and taken into the heart: but if they are so received, they will abide in the heart as a living and spiritual principle (Joh 15:7, Joh 6:63). 'He that keepeth my words shall never see death,' says Jesus (Joh 8:51); and St. Peter exclaims, 'Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life' (Joh 6:68):

that is to say, not words about eternal life, but words which confer eternal life, as in Joh 8:51. Of the disobedient, He says, 'The word which I have spoken will judge him at the last day' (Joh 12:48): and to His disciples, 'He that heareth my words hath passed from death unto life' (Joh 5:24); 'Now ye are clean through the word that I have spoken unto you' (Joh 15:3). The word or words would thus seem to exercise all the functions of the Paraclete. But they must not be identified; for the words were addressed to all who heard them; the Paraclete was given only to the faithful disciples. Moreover, the ministry of the Spirit, properly speaking, begins only after the glorification of Jesus Christ. Remembering that the Johannine theology implies a Trinitarian doctrine of equality and oneness between the three Persons of the Trinity, we may still say that the office of the Son, during the period of His sojourn on earth, was to reveal the Father, while the office of the Holy Spirit was, and is, to reveal the Son.

St. John takes no interest in purely speculative or dogmatic questions, and therefore he does not trouble himself about such questions as the office of the Holy Spirit, as distinguished from that of the Logos, before the Incarnation. From the practical point of view it is possible to say, as he does, that 'there was as yet no Spirit' before Jesus was glorified. After this glorification, although the action of the Holy Spirit is often represented as that of Christ Himself returning to His own, there is a difference between the mode of action of the Incarnate Christ and that of the Holy Spirit. Not only is the former external, the latter internal; but the Incarnate Christ addressed Himself to all who came into contact with Him, and was obliged to adapt His teaching to the limited intelligence of His auditors. The Paraclete is a principle of spiritual life in the hearts of believers, on whom He acts directly and without intermediary. His work consists in glorifying Christ, bearing witness to Him and continuing His work of revelation. It is quite useless to ask whether, for St. John, the Paraclete is a distinct hypostasis in the Godhead. The category of personality is quite foreign to the Evangelist, as to his whole school, and no answer to such a question can be drawn from his words. The Evangelist does not speculate about the relation of the Spirit to the Father, who 'sends' Him. The expression 'God is Spirit' (not '*the* Spirit') expresses, so to speak, the *quality* of the Divine nature; it does not assert the identity of the Father and the Holy Ghost, any more than θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος in the Prologue asserts such an identity between the First and Second Persons. The Evangelist is much more concerned with the relation of the Paraclete to Christ. This indeed is one of the dominating thoughts of the Fourth Gospel. Jesus 'baptizes with the Holy Ghost' (Joh 1:33); that is to say, the gift of the Holy Ghost is an end of the ministry of Jesus. A very important passage is Joh 14:17, in which Jesus says that the world cannot receive the Paraclete 'because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; because he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.' The words 'dwelleth with you' must refer to the presence of Jesus Himself, who has received the Spirit in

absolutely full measure, in the midst of His disciples: after His departure the Spirit 'shall be in you,' a condition which did not yet exist at the time when the words were spoken. This gift was, in a manner, communicated when, after the Resurrection, Jesus breathed on the disciples and said, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost.' But it would be quite foreign to the thought of the Gospel to attach importance to the physical 'insufflation' as the vehicle of the gift of the Holy Ghost. The gift would follow in response to the prayer of Christ (Joh 14:16). He would be sent in Christ's name (Joh 14:26). Jesus Himself will send Him (Joh 15:26). After the gift has come, when the disciples have entered into the sphere of the Spirit, they will still look to Christ as the principle of their life. He will still be the true Vine, of which they are the branches. It is even possible for Him to promise, 'I will see you again'—certainly not with reference to the appearances after the Resurrection, but to the spiritual vision which has nothing to do with bodily presence (Joh 16:16-23). So when He says, 'I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it' (Joh 17:26), the intention does not refer to any future discourses with the disciples on earth, before or after His Passion, but to the relations which will exist between Him and them under the dispensation of the Spirit. The expressions 'we will come unto him, and make our abode with him' (Joh 14:23); and 'I will come again and receive you unto myself' (Joh 14:3), have the same meaning, though in the latter passage there may be a special reference to the 'coming' of Christ at the death of each believer. There is no reference in St. John to such a picture as that drawn by St. Paul in 1 Corinthians 15. In Joh 16:13 f. there is a remarkable statement about the Paraclete, that 'he shall not speak of himself ... he shall take of mine and shall show it unto you.' The relation of the Paraclete to Christ is thus exactly the same as that between Christ and the Father (cf. Joh 5:30, Joh 6:38 etc.).

But the special office of the Spirit in the world begins with Christ's departure from earth. The death of Christ, in St. John, has not the same significance as in the Pauline theology. St. John even shrinks from the idea of death in connexion with the incarnate Logos. 'The death of Christ,' says Reuss, 'in the Johannine theology, is an exaltation, not an abasement.' 'The end of the ministry of Christ,' says Réville, 'is not, properly speaking, His death. His death is in reality a deliverance.' The redemptive element in the death of Christ is not His suffering, but His glorification. And yet we must not forget that the idea of sacrifice, and of Christ as the true Paschal Lamb, is frequently in the mind of the Evangelist. It appears not only in the 'testimony' of John the Baptist (Joh 1:29; Joh 1:36), but in the High-Priestly prayer, where the words 'for their sakes I consecrate myself' (Joh 17:19), have a definitely sacrificial meaning. This doctrine was part of the Christian tradition, which St. John accepts heartily without attempting to bring it into line with his own dominant ideas. It is, however, true to say that it is by His life, and not by His death, that the Johannine Christ gives life to the world. 'Because I live, ye shall live also' (Joh 14:19). The principle of life within them will be the Holy Spirit. As Paraclete, He

will be their defender and helper against all adversaries, ghostly and bodily. He will also be their Comforter (we cannot wonder that some have defended this meaning of Paraclete); He will change their sorrow into joy, as a grain of wheat dies only to live again, or as a woman, when she is in travail, exchanges her pain for joy that a man is born into the world; He will guide them into all truth—a word which in St. John has a predominantly moral significance. His action on the unbelieving ‘world’ is one of ‘conviction’ (ἐλέγχειν, Joh_16:8), a Philonic expression, of somewhat obscure meaning. St. John does not seem to contemplate any direct action of the Holy Spirit, except in the hearts of the faithful: the office assigned to Him in the Anglican Catechism, as the ‘sanctifier of all the elect people of God,’ is quite Johannine; but indirectly He will show in their true colours, and condemn, those who are the enemies of Jesus Christ. See, further, art. Holy Spirit, 14 (b).

3. Scheme of the Fourth Gospel.—After the Prologue begins a section of the Gospel which may be called ‘The Testimony.’ We have first the testimony of John the Baptist, then of the disciples, then of ‘signs’—the miracle at Cana. The Evangelist next describes how Jesus manifests Himself, first in Judaea, then in Samaria, and thirdly in Galilee. But another thread seems to run through these chapters, which also lends itself to the arrangement in triplets. We might call these first chapters the doctrine of *Water*. First we have the water of the Law superseded by the wine of the Gospel, typified by the changing of the water into wine at the marriage-feast; next we have the water of purification mentioned in the discourse with Nicodemus; and thirdly, the water of life, the nature of which is expounded in the dialogue with the woman of Samaria. In ch. 5 begins the second of the three great divisions of the book, which should be called the *Conflict* or κρίσις. After two more ‘signs’ a prolonged controversy with the Jews is described, in which the divergence between Christ and the hierarchy becomes more and more acute, till the final catastrophe is seen to be inevitable. The tension comes to breaking point after the final ‘sign,’ and the end of Christ’s public ministry. It is at this point that the unstable ‘multitude’ quits the scene with the significant question, unanswered like that of Pilate, ‘Who is this Son of Man?’ (Joh_12:34). In these chapters also a subordinate thread may be discovered in the doctrine of *Bread* (ch. 6), the doctrine of *Light* (ch. 8), and the doctrine of *Life*, (the transit through death into life a spiritual law). The third part of the Gospel may be called the *Glorification* (δόξα). Jesus reveals Himself to His disciples in a series of esoteric discourses, addressed to them only, in view of His approaching departure from them. This section culminates in the High-Priestly prayer (ch. 17). Then follows the narrative of the Passion, conceived throughout as the glorification of Christ through self-chosen suffering. The humiliation and sacrifice, no less than the triumph of death, are part of the δόξα. This part of the Gospel ends with the appearance to Thomas, and the ‘last beatitude.’ Ch. 21 is an epilogue.

4. Characteristic Words in the Fourth Gospel.

(1) *Life* (ζωή).—In the Prologue an interesting and rather important question of punctuation arises in connexion with this word. Ought we to read with Authorized Version *ΧΩΡΙ* χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν. ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν, or, with ACD and nearly all the Ante-Nicene Fathers who comment on it, should we put the full stop at ἓν? The former view, which is supported by Chrysostom, has prevailed in modern times, though several authorities, such as WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.], put the stop at ἓν. The latter theory seems to give a richer and deeper meaning, and one more completely in accordance with the religious philosophy of the Gospel. 'All things were made by Him (as the Instrument), and without Him nothing came into being. That which has come into being was, in Him, life.' The Logos is the vital principle from whom all that lives derives its life. Whatever life exists in the world was, eternally, timelessly, in Him. To have 'life in Himself' is an eternal attribute of God the Son; all that appears on this fleeting scene exists, so far as it exists, by participation in His life. In short, the Logos, as life, is a cosmic principle. The idea that all things preexisted eternally in the mind of God, and are, as it were, unrolled as the ages go on, was familiar to Jewish thought. But St. John's doctrine is more *Greek*—that the things of time derive whatever reality they possess from a sphere of higher reality beyond time and place. With this accord the other passages in the Gospel where Life is mentioned. In Joh 6:33-56 Christ is declared to be the Bread of God which cometh down from heaven to give life to the world. Whoso eateth His flesh and drinketh His blood hath eternal life. He who is closely united to Christ—who makes the life of Christ his own—has the principle of life within him. In Joh 17:3 the knowledge of the Father and of the Son is said to constitute eternal life. This knowledge can be possessed only through the indwelling of Him who is the principle of life. The same idea recurs in Joh 11:25, and in Joh 14:6 Christ, 'in whom all things consist,' as St. Paul says (Col 1:17), is Himself the Resurrection and the Life, and the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Accordingly, the Life is a present possession rather than a future hope. He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life (Joh 3:36, Joh 5:24). Christ came that we might have life, and have it abundantly (Joh 10:10). See Life.

(2) *Truth* (ἀλήθεια).—St. John's use of this word cannot be paralleled in the Synoptics, but it occurs in the Epistles of St. James, St. Peter, and St. Paul. Typical examples of the use of the word in this Gospel are Joh 1:17 'grace and truth came by Jesus Christ'; Joh 8:32 'the truth shall make you free'; Joh 14:6 'I am the truth'; Joh 16:13 'the Spirit of truth shall guide you into all truth'; Joh 17:17 'thy word is truth.' Christ, however, came 'to bear witness to the truth' (Joh 18:37), so that it

must have been in the world before the Incarnation. Those that 'are of the truth' heard and accepted Him. From these passages we gather that 'the truth' is all that *really exists* in every sphere, and this is why Jesus Christ, as the Logos, calls Himself the Truth (cf. Scotus Erigena: 'certius cognoscas Verbum naturam omnium esse'). Recognition of this brings freedom, because truth corresponds with the law of our being. For those who have eyes to see, all experience is a commentary on, and witness to, Christ's religion. But the children of the evil one, who was a liar from the beginning, cannot hear the words of truth (Joh 8:44 f.).

(3) Closely akin to Truth is *Witness* (μαρτυρία). This idea is never absent from St. John's mind, particularly in the earlier part of his Gospel. Every event in history, every experience, is valuable as a witness to the truth. Christ is the centre, to whose Person and claims everything testifies. The Father bears witness concerning Christ. Christ bears, and yet does not bear, witness concerning Himself (Joh 5:31 contrasted with Joh 8:14); the Spirit will bear witness concerning Him (Joh 15:26; cf. 1Jn 5:6 'it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth'); John the Baptist and the disciples bear witness (Joh 1:7, Joh 15:27); especially the Evangelist himself (Joh 19:35, Joh 21:24); the Scriptures bear witness (Joh 5:39-40); and lastly, the 'works' of Christ bear witness (Joh 10:25, Joh 14:11). The 'witness,' therefore, is found in every avenue through which the truth can reach us. Converging from all sides upon the Person of Christ, it is the means of progressive initiation (ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ γινώσκητε, Joh 10:38) into the whole truth—that is to say, into the knowledge and love of Christ. The contradiction in Joh 5:31 and Joh 8:14 is only partially explained. Christ makes a unique claim for Himself (in Joh 8:14), as having full knowledge of past, present, and future.

(4) *Light* (φῶς).—When the First Epistle, putting into terse and definite phrases the teaching of the Gospel, says that 'God is light' (1Jn 1:5), it means, in modern language, that it is the nature of God to communicate Himself. This self-communication is effected through the Logos as the principle of life. 'The life was the light of men' (Joh 1:4). Christ is 'the true light which lighteth every man as it comes into the world.' There is not much room for doubt that this is the right translation of Joh 1:9. The 'coming' is repeated or continues; cf. Joh 9:5 'whenever (ὅταν) I am in the world, I am the light of the world.' The Evangelist certainly asserts that there were earlier partial Christophanies, as there will be later and even greater Christophanies through the Spirit. And yet there is a sense in which Jesus could say, 'Yet a little while is the light with you' (Joh 12:35).

(5) The Light converges upon one point, where it shines forth as *Glory* (δόξα), another very characteristic word. Christ was in glory with the Father before the world was (Joh 17:5); an important passage as negating the pantheistic conception that the Word is *only* the life and light of the world—that the world is the complete and only expression of His being. He was incarnate to ‘glorify’ the Father on the earth (Joh 17:5), and thereby was also glorified Himself (Joh 13:31, Joh 14:13). The Spirit, too, will glorify Christ by making Him more fully known (Joh 16:14). It has been said that in St. John the universe is the poem of the Word to the glory of the Father.

(6) *Judgment* (κρίσις).—As at the creation God divided the light from the darkness, so the Incarnation necessarily and naturally divided mankind, condemning those who would not receive the light. This is ‘the judgment’ (Joh 3:19). With regard to Christ’s own function as Judge, we have another formal contradiction (cf. Joh 12:48, Joh 3:17, Joh 12:47 with Joh 5:22; Joh 5:27, Joh 9:39, Joh 5:30). The contrast is striking, but the Evangelist’s meaning is clear. The coming of Christ disclosed an actual relation; He made no new, more severe laws; He only revealed, in all its unfathomable depth, the gulf that yawns between God and the devil, and between their respective servants. The ‘one that seeketh and judgeth’ (Joh 8:50) is the eternal power of righteousness which is symbolized in the Law (Joh 5:45), and expressed in the Gospel (Joh 12:48 f.). At the same time, the judgment is a *personal* one, and is committed to Christ as *a son of man* (Joh 5:27). Mankind is judged by a human standard, though by the standard of humanity at its best.

(7) *World* (κόσμος).—It is remarkable that St. John uses κόσμος, while the Synoptics use αἰών. The former is the Greek, the latter the Jewish way of envisaging reality; for the Greeks pictured it more readily under the form of space, the Jews under that of time. The ‘world’ is the sum-total of existence viewed (by abstraction) without the spiritual world. It is ‘the things below’ (Joh 8:23), as I opposed to ‘the things above.’ The concept is therefore an abstraction for certain purposes, and has no real existence, for the world is upheld in being only by the Logos, who is ‘not of the world.’ It comprises all that belongs to the categories of time and place. Christ ‘came into the world’ at His incarnation, and He is ‘in the world’ till His death and glorification. He prays not that His disciples may be taken out of the world, but that they may be kept from the evil. From this idea comes that of the world as human society as it organizes itself apart from God, hence the severe judgments passed upon the world; e.g. 1Jn 5:19 ‘the whole world lieth in the wicked one,’ and similar phrases in the Gospel. Thus the world is that which is external, transitory, and corrupt. The Evangelist, it need hardly be said, does not follow up the thought of the unreality of the world apart from God, into acosmistic speculations. Thinkers who have done so have been driven into a purely negative conception of evil, and have

often drifted into a dreamy pantheism. But St. John, as we have seen, presents us with an intense ethical dualism, including a belief in a personal or *quasi*-personal devil, who is the *de facto* prince of this world.

(8) *To believe* (πιστεῖν).—This, and not the substantive πίστις, is St. John's chosen expression. The verb has two constructions: (1) with the dative (Joh 5:24, Joh 8:31, both mistranslated in Authorized Version), to believe a person or statement—accept the veracity of the former, or the truth of the latter; and (2) π. εἰς τινα—a construction characteristically Johannine, which occurs only once in the Synoptics (Mat 18:6 = Mar 9:42). In the Synoptics generally faith is relative to a particular object—the condition of obtaining some special miraculous benefit. But in St. John faith is allegiance to Jesus Christ, and, as such, a condition of eternal life (Joh 1:12, Joh 6:40), which is also a progressive state, depending on knowledge (Joh 17:3) as well as faith. The Evangelist studiously avoids γινῶσις as well as πίστις, using in both cases the verbs only.

(9) *Love* (ἀγάπη).—This is the new commandment (Joh 13:34). Love is the bond which unites the Son to the Father, the disciples to the Son, and the disciples to each other. 'As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you' (Joh 15:9). 'That the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them.' The virtue of love is no vague sentiment, but shows itself necessarily in action. 'He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me' (Joh 14:21; Joh 14:23). Love is not to be sharply distinguished from faith, though the former is a state mainly of the affections, the latter of the will and the intellect. Theologians who developed the Johannine ideas further, like Clement of Alexandria, agree that faith is the beginning, love the crown, of the spiritual life. Faith and love are both *simple* states, and, as Clement says, 'are not taught.' The soul passes out of the simplicity of faith, through the multiplicity of strenuous interests in the life of duty, into a second and more Divine simplicity, and immediacy of intercourse with God. St. John's teaching about love culminates in ch. 17, in which our Lord seems to imply that the 'name' of the Father, which He has declared to His disciples, is Love.

5. The miracles of the Fourth Gospel.—The miracles in St. John are either 'signs' (σημεῖα), in which case their abnormal and also their symbolic character is emphasized, or 'works' (ἔργα), in which case no distinction between natural and supernatural is thought of, and the 'works' are only component parts of the one 'work,' to do which Jesus came into the world. The Johannine Christ does not wish faith in His person to rest on the signs, though He allows them a legitimate weight in fortifying a weak faith. It is better to believe for the sake of the words than of the works, He implies in

Joh 14:11; and the last beatitude (Joh 20:29) is a reproof of Thomas, who believed only when he had ocular testimony to the Resurrection. The seven miracles selected by the Evangelist have the value of acted parables, and in some cases the symbolical significance is clearly indicated.

(1) *The miracle at Cana in Galilee* (Joh 2:1 ff.).—Christ is represented as beginning His public ministry at a wedding. Unlike the Essenes, and unlike John the Baptist, Jesus was not personally an ascetic. He drank wine, and ate what was put before Him. There was, indeed, a special appropriateness in this festivity at the beginning of His ministry, when He had just called together His family of Apostles, whom He loved to compare to a bridal party (cf. Mat 9:15 ||). The miracle may have taken place on the last of the seven days usually given up to bridal festivities. The occasion gives Christ an opportunity to assert the superior sacredness of His mission to any family ties (His words to His mother convey an unmistakable rebuke), and also (through the mouth of the master of the ceremonies) to indicate symbolically the supersession of the water of the Law by the good wine of the Gospel.

(2) *The healing of the official's son* (Joh 4:46 ff.).—The miracle of healing, performed for the benefit of a court official (βασιλικός) of Herod Antipas, is the only 'sign' of the Synoptic type recorded in St. John. The miracle is conditioned by the faith of the father; it is a work of mercy, pure and simple, and no symbolic meaning can easily be detected in it.

(3) *The paralytic at Bethesda* (Joh 5:1 ff.).—This work of healing at first sight resembles the last, and it introduces the situation, familiar in the Synoptics, of a quarrel with the strict legalists about Sabbath observance. But the Evangelist has a deeper lesson to convey by this work of healing on the Sabbath, one which profoundly modifies the whole conception of the way in which that day should be kept. 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work' (Joh 5:17). That is to say, the Sabbath rest of God is unimpeded activity, and that is the true notion of rest, as opposed to inertia. It follows that a mere negative abstinence from exertion of every kind is not an intelligent or acceptable mode of honouring God. The verse is also theologically important, as separating the Christian idea of God the Father from the Neo-Platonic Absolute, and from the God of such speculative mystics as Eckhart and Silesius. Lastly, by co-ordinating His own activity with that of the Father, Jesus claims to be Himself Divine.

(4) *The feeding of the five thousand* (Joh 6:5 ff.).—This miracle is also recorded by the Synoptists, but St. John tells it with a very different purpose. In no other miracle is the didactic purpose, referred to by St. Augustine, more apparent. 'Interrogemus ipsa miracula quid nobis loquantur de Christo; habent enim, si intellegantur, linguam

suam. Nam quia ipse Christus Verbum Dei est, etiam factum Verbi verbum nobis est.’ How much this miracle is an acted parable is shown by Joh 6:30, where, in answer to the challenge of the Jews, Christ does not make any appeal to the miracle as a ‘sign.’ His answer is, ‘My Father *giveth* you the true bread from heaven’—not only in one miraculous act, but always. In Joh 6:34 the metaphor is misunderstood by the hearers (a favourite literary device of the Evangelist), and then comes the great saying in Joh 6:35. The device recurs in Joh 6:52-54. The discourse on the Bread of Life does not refer directly to the Eucharist, which had not yet been instituted; but the Evangelist undoubtedly wishes, by narrating it, to spiritualize and generalize the Eucharistic doctrine current when he wrote, and to check the tendency to formality and materialism (cf. esp. Joh 6:63). In Joh 6:51 ff. there is clearly an allusion to the Paschal lamb, the blood of which was sprinkled on the lintels and doorposts; and therefore the thought of *sacrifice* was already in the mind of Jesus. But the leading idea is that of identifying ourselves with the life of Christ, being reborn into His spirit: this union constitutes eternal life. Christ is Himself the gift which He brings; even through apparent failure He fulfils His work (Joh 6:34-38). A *spiritual* preparation is needed to understand how a *man* can thus unite earth and heaven (Joh 6:43-44); but in part the question is answered in the OT (Joh 6:45-46), and in part the believer must co-operate (Joh 6:47-50). Man lives only by participation in the virtues of Christ’s life and death, which brings with it a personal union between the believer and Christ (Joh 6:53-56). The whole discourse (λόγος, not ‘saying,’ Joh 6:60) seemed ‘harsh’ (σκληρός) to those who heard it: it pointed to self-devotion, and surrender even to death. Accordingly, many even of His *disciples* left Him. Christ thereupon said (Joh 6:61), ‘Does this offend you? What if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend where he was before?’ When the bodily presence is withdrawn, and the flesh entirely disappears, the meaning of the ‘harsh discourse’ will be made manifest—viz. that the union with Christ is spiritual, and therefore a truth for all times and places. Unlike the eating of manna by ‘the fathers,’ which only nourished their bodily frames for a few hours, the bread from heaven confers eternal life. The flesh profiteth nothing; the *words* which He spoke to them were spirit and life. This language would bring great comfort to the disciples of the Evangelist’s own day, when the ‘hope deferred’ of the Second Coming was making many hearts sick. It can hardly be an accident that the designation of the traitor, which in the Synoptics occurs at the same hour as the institution of the Eucharist, in this Gospel follows immediately the discourse on the bread of life. The whole passage *represents*, under another form, the narrative of the Last Supper.

(5) *The walking on the sea* (Joh 6:16 f.) is closely connected with the more important miracle, and merely illustrates the power of Christ over another element.

(6) *The man born blind* (ch. 9).—The disciples are confronted by one of the most perplexing problems of life—that of a *vie manquée*. A beggar lies before them, who has been blind from his birth. Was this crippling infirmity a punishment for his own sins, either in a previous state of existence or in anticipation of those which he was going to commit, or for the sins of his parents? Jesus says that neither explanation is the right one; the reason is ‘that the works of God might be made manifest in him.’ He adds that for all alike ‘the night cometh, when no man can work.’ The moral difficulty about the justice of human suffering receives no direct answer. The most significant verses in the discourse about the Light of the world are 25, 39, 41. Jesus has come into the world for judgment, not only for a *discernment* of good and bad people, but (as a necessary result) to procure for the first eternal life, and to pardon the last. The blind man typifies humanity converted to Christianity, coming out of darkness and made to see by Christ; while the representatives of Judaism, proud of their enlightenment, are struck with blindness—‘blind leaders of the blind.’

(7) *The raising of Lazarus* (ch. 11).—The narrative of this, the last and greatest of the seven ‘signs,’ contains several characteristic features. The suggestion implied in Joh 11:3 does not induce Jesus to hurry His action at all. He deliberately waits two days before starting for Judaea. Similarly in Joh 11:3 f. the Evangelist is anxious to show that He did not act upon His mother’s suggestion. Still more instructive is the misunderstanding of Christ’s words in Joh 11:12, and the conversation of Martha (Joh 1:21 ff.). She makes a half request, which she does not dare to put directly (Joh 11:22), to which Christ answers: ‘Thy brother shall rise again.’ Martha *misunderstands* this to refer to the resurrection at the last day. But Christ did not mean either this or that He intended to bring Lazarus to life again. Just as in ch. 6 He refuses to mention the miracle, in reply to the question ‘What sign showest thou?’ (Joh 6:30), but gives as the sign the declaration, ‘I am the bread of life’; so here He does not invite attention to what He is about to do, but to His own Person. ‘I am the resurrection and the life.’ The deep significance of this is often missed. If the words referred only to the approaching miracle, they would convey but hollow comfort to the Christian mourner, for whom no miracles are wrought; if we take them to refer to the future resurrection at the last day, we are forgetting that the words were spoken as a *correction* of that thought. The words bid us concentrate our thoughts upon the Person of Christ. ‘He that believeth on me, though he die, yet shall he live; and he that liveth and believeth on me shall never die.’ This is not a promise of resurrection; it is a denial of death. The resurrection is a personal communication of the Lord Himself, not a gift to be obtained from another. Martha had spoken of a gift to be obtained from God and dispensed by Christ. Jesus answers that He Himself *is* (not ‘will give or procure’) the Resurrection and the Life. By taking humanity upon Himself He has revealed the permanence of man’s individuality and its indestructibility. The Incarnation brought life and immortality to *light*. Death is abolished; the grave has been robbed of its victory by the fact that Christ lives, and is the life of the individual

believer. In Him all that belongs to the completeness of personal being finds its permanence and consummation. Because He is the Life, He must also be the Resurrection; in other words, our true life is hid with Him in God. The dead in Christ are alive, in virtue of their union with Him who is the Resurrection and the Life. After this sublime lesson, the physical miracle seems almost an anti-climax, a thing to be half regretted, like the restitution of Job's large fortune and his flourishing family by his second marriage. But not only is the miracle a parallel in act to the verbal revelation which precedes it, but it emphasizes the very deep lesson that though life in its highest sense is indestructible, we must pass through the gate of death in order to reach it. This is one of the profoundest and most characteristic doctrines of Christianity. Those who have found in the maxim 'Die to live' the kernel of Christ's religion, have penetrated a large part at least of His 'secret.' This, and the lesson that it is the Person of Christ Himself, revealed as the Resurrection and the Life, rather than the hopes of a gift to be one day conferred by Him, that should be the truest consolation for mourners, are the two main points in the narrative of the raising of Lazarus.

Conclusion.—The Fourth Gospel gives us an answer to the question, 'What think ye of Christ?' Moreover, it maintains that the answer to this question is the dividing-line between light and darkness. To know Christ is to know the Father; and no man cometh to the Father except by Him. The Christ 'whom to know is to live' is not, of course, merely the human Jesus, but the eternal Word who tabernacled among us in human form. The Evangelist would have accepted Bengel's dictum, that '*conversio fit ad Dominum ut Spiritum.*' But he regards the identification of this spiritual power with Jesus of Nazareth as essential. The vigorous words of 1 John (1Jn 1:1-3; 1Jn 4:1-3) unquestionably express the Christological position of the author of the Gospel, even if some doubts exist as to the common authorship of the two books. It is the peculiarity of the Johannine theology that we pass backwards and forwards between the universal and the particular, between time and eternity, present and future, outward and inward. To the philosopher this oscillation is most perplexing; but it is the true normal pulsation of the spiritual and moral life, in which we may always trace a double movement of expansion and concentration. On the one hand, we must lose our souls in order to find them, we must die daily in order to live. We must continually pass out of ourselves, forget ourselves, and identify ourselves with interests of which we are not the centre. We must enlarge our life till there is nothing selfish, personal, or limited about it. And, on the other hand, exactly in proportion as we succeed in doing this, we shall enrich our lives and become more keenly conscious of the worth and value of our own souls in God's sight. There will be no blurring of individual distinctions, no Buddhist absorption in the Infinite, but a growing sense that the soul of man is the throne of the Godhead, and his body the temple of the Holy Ghost.

Literature.—See at end of preceding article.

W. R. Inge.

☩ Jonah

JONAH (Ἰωνᾶς, Heb. יוֹנָתַן ‘dove,’ Authorized Version of NT *Jonas*).—A prophet, the story of whose mission to Nineveh is related in the Book of Jonah, and who is probably to be identified with the Jonah of [2Ki_14:25](#); referred to by our Lord twice at least (see below) in the Gospels ([Mat_12:39-41](#) || [Luk_11:29-32](#) and [Mat_16:4](#)).

Certain of the scribes and Pharisees, not content with our Lord’s many miracles or signs (cf. [Joh_12:37](#)), some of which were, after all, like those performed by their ‘sons’ ([Mat_12:27](#), [Luk_11:19](#)), demanded of Him a special sign, most probably, as in [Mat_16:1](#) || [Mar_8:11](#), from heaven, since such a sign would at once attest His Divine mission (cf. [Joh_6:30-32](#)). He replied: ‘An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it [and we must naturally understand such a sign as they demanded] but the sign of Jonah the prophet: for as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold, a greater than Jonah is here.’ The parallel account in Lk. has the appearance of being a summary report of that in Mt., and there are some notable differences. In place of the reference to the three days, Lk. has, ‘For even as Jonah became a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of Man be to this generation,’—words which many think refer only to Jonah’s preaching. Again, the verse concerning the rising up of the men of Nineveh in the judgment follows that referring to the queen of the south instead of preceding it as in Mt. The reference to Jonah in [Mat_16:4](#) was obviously made on another occasion; it contains only the words, ‘An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign [here plainly from heaven, cf. [Mat_16:1](#)]; and there shall no sign be given unto it, but the sign of Jonah.’

Although it is not the purpose of this article to discuss the difficulties connected with the story of Jonah as told in the OT, or to consider the arguments advanced for and against the historicity of the book, it will yet be necessary to allude to some of them in connexion with the problems arising out of our Lord’s references to the prophet. Those who maintain the historicity of the Book of Jonah, and who hold that it contains a record of facts, find no special difficulties in our Lord’s allusions to it,—He referred to Jonah and to facts in his history, just as He referred to other historical personages and to facts in their history, as to Abraham, for instance, to Moses, or to

the queen of Sheba; for such persons the only difficulties are the subordinate ones belonging to the exegesis and application of the passages in question. On the other hand, those who deny the historicity of the book, and who hold, with whatever modifications, that the story is a fictitious symbolic narrative with a didactic purpose, like some others in the OT and in the Apocrypha, find many grave difficulties in our Lord's use of the book—difficulties which perhaps do not admit of an absolutely certain solution. Before, however, adverting to them there is a preliminary point to be considered.

It has been maintained by some that Mat_12:40 is no part of our Lord's original utterance, but is either an amplification by the Evangelist of Mat_12:39 (and cf. Luk_11:30, Mat_16:4), or at least a very early interpolation. Against the verse it is said: (1) It runs counter to the Gospel history, for according to that history Jesus had wrought many signs, and could not therefore say, 'No sign shall be given.' (2) The resurrection was not a sign to the men of that generation, *i.e.* such as they demanded (cf. Act_10:41). (3) The clause is unnecessary, and interferes with the balance which without it exists in Mat_12:41-42 || Luk_11:31-32, for it was Jonah's preaching and the consequent repentance of the Ninevites, in contrast with His own preaching and the indifference of the men of His generation, to which Jesus especially alluded; His words without Luk_11:40 are a complete answer to their demand for a sign: the repentance-preaching Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites of God's mercy; the repentance-preaching Jesus of Nazareth was a sign, though a greater one, to the Jews. (4) Add that (3) harmonizes well with Luk_11:30, which was perhaps the original out of which Mat_12:40 was evolved. (5) There is the difficulty about the reckoning of the three days and three nights in the case of our Lord's resurrection.

To these objections it may be replied: (1) There is no contradiction of the Gospel story, for the scribes and Pharisees plainly demanded a sign of a different character from those which they had so far witnessed (see above). (2) The resurrection *was* a sign, since the Apostles proclaimed it (Acts and Epistles *passim*), and made it the corner-stone of their teaching about the Christ. (3) Mat_12:40 is unnecessary only on the gratuitous assumption that Jonah's preaching was the only way in which he was to be a sign to the men of Christ's generation; the introduction in Mat_12:40 of another particular in which Jonah was to be a sign does not weaken or interfere with what our Lord says about the prophet's preaching. (4) Luk_11:30, instead of being the original, may well be a summary report of Mat_12:40 as suggested above,—an explanation rendered not improbable by the whole form and tenor of the passage in Lk. referring to Jonah. (5) This difficulty, such as it is, makes rather for than against the authenticity of the verse (see below). To these replies it may be added: (6) There is some ground for the conjecture that allusion was made on another occasion by our Lord, and also by St. Paul, to Jonah's deliverance after three days from the 'whale' as typifying the resurrection (Luk_24:46, 1Co_15:4), it being much more unlikely that

the reference in these places is to Hos 6:2 or Gen 22:4; and this may be thought to add some strength to the probability that our Lord did utter the words recorded in v. 40 (cf. also Mat 27:63, Mar 8:31, Joh 2:19). (7) There is no textual authority for the rejection of the verse. On the whole, the conclusion that this verse is really part of our Lord's original utterance can be fully justified.

We have now to consider briefly the difficulties connected with our Lord's use of the story of Jonah on the supposition that the book is not historical, but a fictitious narrative with a didactic purpose. (1) Did our Lord cite details from the story of Jonah as facts, He Himself thinking them to be facts? If we reply in the affirmative, we must admit that our Lord was not completely omniscient, and that on a point of literary knowledge He was and could be in error. Into a discussion of the great question of the limitation of our Lord's human knowledge we cannot, of course, enter here; it must suffice to point out that the most earnest maintainers of our Lord's Divinity have in all ages recognized, in view of such passages as Mat 24:36 (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) || Mar 13:32, Luk 2:40; Luk 2:52, Php 2:7, not only a gradual growth of His human knowledge, but even a mysterious limitation of His knowledge of Divine things; and however difficult it may be to understand the union of the Divine and the human in one Person, we must not, in maintaining His Divinity, forget that He was 'perfect man.' 'Is it,' asks Dr. Sanday, 'inconsistent with our Christian belief to suppose that He who called Himself the Son of Man, along with the assumption of human flesh and a human mind, should also have assumed the natural workings of such a mind, even in its limitations?' (*Bamp. Lect.* viii. p. 415). (2) But did our Lord know in Himself that the story of Jonah was fiction and yet cite details from it as though they were facts, His hearers thinking them to be such? Here, again, we might reply in the affirmative, and that without detracting from our Lord's honesty as a moral and religious teacher, for He would have been but speaking according to the beliefs of His hearers, as many other teachers in all ages have done. Speaking to children in knowledge, He spoke to them as such. In this way, it is nearly universally agreed, we are to explain His words about Hades and Abraham's bosom in the graphic parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus; *i. e.* in warning and in inculcating truth He spoke according to the beliefs of His hearers and of His age, without necessarily endorsing those beliefs as true. (3) Or did both our Lord and His hearers, the scribes and Pharisees, regard the story of Jonah as a parable or fictitious narrative, like others in the OT and in the Apocrypha, and did He thus refer to it? Although in view of Tob 14:4; Tob 14:8, 3Ma 6:8, Josephus *Ant.* ix. x. it is not very probable that our Lord's hearers regarded the book as fictitious, we might yet admit without hesitation that part of our Lord's reference could be thus explained. Even so firm a maintainer of the historicity of Jonah as Huxtable writes in the *Speaker's Commentary*: 'The reference to Jonah's experiences, as yielding an illustrative parallel to what would be seen in His own case, or even as predictive of it, seems as cogent on the supposition of the book being an inspired parable, as on that of its being authentic narrative.' And

in fact a teacher might, without doing any violence to right teaching, cite well-known fiction (*The Pilgrim's Progress*, *Rasselas*, Shakespeare's characters) to enforce warnings or moral truth, and so could our Saviour have done. There is, however, an objection to this explanation, besides that referred to above, which, if it be not a fatal one, is at least of considerable force, viz. that our Lord would not naturally have said of persons whom a *fiction* represented as repentant, that they would rise up in the Judgment; nor would He have put as a parallel case to a fiction the facts of the queen of Sheba's visit to Solomon.

It does not seem possible to pronounce a decided verdict in favour of any one of these hypotheses to the exclusion of the others, though it may be allowed that (3) contains more of difficulty than (1) or (2); and whilst of these latter (2) is perhaps the more attractive, (1) can certainly be held without belittling our Lord's Divinity or detracting from His authority as a moral and religious Teacher, and without weakening the force of the lessons for all generations derivable from the use He made of the story of Jonah for the edification and warning of the men of His own day.

It remains to notice the difficulty connected with the reckoning of the *three days and three nights*. It is certain that this length of time did not literally elapse between the burial and the resurrection of Christ, and the commentaries in explanation usually follow the lead of St. Jerome and of St. Augustine, who point out that we must understand the passage on the principle that the part is taken for the whole; and accordingly it is usually said that our Lord was in the 'heart of the earth' on three day-night periods or *νυχθημερα* (reference is made to Gen 1:5; Gen 1:8 etc., Lev 23:32, 1Sa 30:12-13, 2Ch 10:5; 2Ch 10:12, Dan 8:14 margin). It must be confessed, however, that this explanation seems somewhat forced, in view of the peculiar form of the sentence in Luk 2:40, and there is not a little to be said against it; and it is perhaps more satisfactory to suppose that our Lord was speaking only in general terms. At any rate the difficulty, such as it is, lends support to the arguments for the authenticity of the verse, since if it were an amplification by the Evangelist, or an interpolation, the Evangelist or the interpolator would hardly have made our Lord utter a prediction expressed in a form not in literal and precise accord with the facts of the resurrection as related in the Gospels.

It is worth noticing that the story of Jonah had a peculiar interest for the early Christians; his deliverance from a strange sea-monster is depicted many times in the Roman catacombs as typifying the resurrection.

Literature.—Jerome. *Com. in Jonam*, ii. 405, also in *Evang. Matth.* 2:12, 83; Augustine, *de Consensu Evang.* iii. 24, 66; 'The Book of Jonah, How far is it Historical?' by M. P. in *JSL* [Note: *SL Journal of Sacred Literature.*] , Oct. 1865;

Liddon, *Bampton Lectures*, on 'Our Lord's Divinity,' Lect. viii.; Introduction to 'Jonah' in *Speaker's Commentary*; C. H. H. Wright, *Biblical Essays*, 1886, pp. 34-98; Farrar, *The Minor Prophets*, 1890; *Lux Mundi*, pref. to the 10th edition; J. Kennedy, *A Monograph on the Book of Jonah*, 1895; Gore, *Bampton Lectures*, on 'The Incarnation,' Lects. vi., vii.; Sanday, *Bampton Lectures*, on 'Inspiration,' Lect. viii.; G. A. Smith, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*, vol. ii., 1898; Driver, *LOT* [Note: OT Introd. to the Literature of the Old Test.] 6 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , pp. 321-325; art. 'Jonah' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , in the *Encyc. Bibl.* 1901, and in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, 1904.

Albert Bonus.

⚠Jonam

JONAM.—A link in our Lord's genealogy ([Luk_3:30](#)).

⚠Joram

JORAM.—Son of Jehoshaphat, named in our Lord's genealogy ([Mat_1:6](#)).

JORDAN

1. *Name.*—The name of this river is in the OT יַרְדֵּן; LXX Septuagint Ἰορδάνης, Ἰορδανος, Ἰορδάννης; NT always Ἰορδάνης; Josephus. Ἰορδάνης, Ἰορδανος.

The form of the word *Yardçn* is difficult to explain. To say, with Ewald (*Ausf. Lehrbuch der heb. Sprache*⁸ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 426), or with Olshausen (*Lehrbuch der heb. Sprache*, p. 405), that the primitive form is *Yardân* or *Yardän*, does not help us much; and we can hardly suppose, like Stade (*Lehrbuch der heb. Grammatik*, p. 176) or Winckler (*Altorient. Forsch.* i. p. 422 f.), that it is a word borrowed from another language, seeing that it is accompanied by the article. It might be better to hold, with Seybold (*MNDP^V* [Note: NDPV Mittheilungen n. Nachrichten d. deutschen Pal. Vereins.] , 1896, p. 10 f.), that the LXX Septuagint has preserved the real vocalization, *Yordan*, formed on the analogy of *korban*, *shuthan*. The name of the Jordan has not yet been found in the

cuneiform inscriptions; but it figures in an Egyptian text (Anast. i. xxiii. 1) in the form of *Y-ira-du-na* (W. M. Müller, *As. u. Eur.* pp. 97f., 196).

The word יִרְדָּן is a common noun, and is therefore always accompanied by the article (הַיִרְדָּן), with a few exceptions, which will be pointed out below. Yet it is worthy of note that we have not a single passage in which יִרְדָּן is treated with certainty as a common noun.

From the point of view of etymology, it is most natural to connect this word with the verb יָרַד 'to descend,' and this is how it is treated by the prevalent opinion, found, however, more frequently among geographers than among philologists, according to which the Jordan is 'the descending,' 'the flowing,' a name which might, of course, be applicable to any stream of water, and which, in a single particular case, would have become a proper name, just as the Hebrews called the Euphrates הַיַּרְדֵּן, 'river.' But it is more probable that, while retaining the root יָרַד as our starting-point, we should interpret יִרְדָּן as the place to which one goes down, .e. 'the watering-place.' Two authors, Seybold (V [Note: NDPV Mittheilungen n. Nachrichten d. deutschen Pal. Vereins.] , 1896, *l.e.*) and Cheyne (*Encyc. Bibl.* ii. col. 2575), have, independently of each other, suggested this explanation. If this derivation is correct, the modern Arabic name of the Jordan would be a literal translation of the old name, for they call it *esh-Sherî'a*, 'the watering-place,' and more fully *esh-Sherî'a el-Kebireh*, 'the great watering-place, to distinguish it from another stream, its tributary, the *Sherî'at el-Manaḍireh* (Yarmuk). However, there is found also among the Arabs the name *el-Urdunn*, an approximate transcription of the Hebrew name (cf. Kampffmeyer, in *ZDPV* [Note: DPV Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.] xv. [1892] p. 27; Ed. König, *Lehrgebäude der heb. Sprache*, 1f. i. p. 461).

We must mention one other way of explaining the name of the Jordan, which used to be in great favour with the Fathers of the Church as well as the Jewish teachers. According to this interpretation, the name Jordan may be divided into *Jor* and *Dan*, and these two monosyllables denote the two sources of the river. *Dan*, that is to say, is the name of the city of Dan, formerly Laish or Leshem (Joshua 18; Joshua 19:47), and consequently that of the branch of the river issuing from it; *Jor* is the name of the other stream, and Jordan is the final name of the river from the point where the two branches unite. This explanation was given by St. Jerome, and accepted by many writers after him. An attempt has been made to support it by interpreting *Jor* as a contraction of *Yě'ôr* (יְאֵר), a Heb. word meaning 'watercourse,' and used especially in reference to the Nile. This strange etymology has now no interest except that of curiosity, and is not upheld by anybody, any more than

another found in the Talmud (, 55), which takes çn to be a contraction of dan or dan, and thus brings in both the verb ‘to descend’ and the name of the city of Dan.

The only passages in which *Yardçn* is used without the article are: (a) Job 40:23, where it may be equally well translated by ‘the Jordan’ or ‘a river’; but several commentators doubt whether the text is reliable; Budde suggests deleting this word as a gloss; Gunkel and Winckler change it into *Yě’ôr* (יְאֹר) because in the same passage reference is made to the Nile; Cheyne into *îhôn* (יְחֹן) for the same reason. ()

Psa 42:7, where ‘hay-Yardçn (הַיַּרְדֵּן אֶרֶץ) seems to denote ‘the country of the Jordan,’ .e. probably the region round about the sources of the river, which is confirmed by the mention of Hermon or rather the Hermons (in the plural) in the same verse. It must be observed, however, that, according to the Talmud, the river bore the name of Jordan only between the Lake of Tiberias and the Dead Sea, a statement which is neither confirmed nor contradicted by the Bible, and cannot be proved in any way; we may add that, according to some writers, the present custom is exactly the opposite, for it is alleged—has the claim any foundation?—that at the present day only the part of the river above the lake is called , and the part below, îa.

The word *Jordan* in the rôle of common noun is further proved by the expression ‘Jordan of Jericho’ (יְרֵחוֹ יַרְדֵּן), in the construct state. The meaning of this will be examined below, in connexion with the lower course of the river near where it falls into the Dead Sea.

2. General geography and geology.—The total length of the valley of the Jordan, from its source to its mouth at the Dead Sea, is about 120 miles. It stretches from north to south in a practically straight line. It begins as a continuation of the *Beka’a* (Cœle-Syria), that valley which stretches between the Lebanon on the west and the Anti-Lebanon on the east, but whose waters run towards the north. Almost immediately after leaving Lake Huleh, which is 7 feet above the level of the Mediterranean, the Jordan begins to fall below the level of the sea; the Lake of Tiberias is 682 feet, the Dead Sea 1292 feet, below it. There is not another example of such a marked depression on the surface of our globe, except with tracts covered by the seas; the other cases which may be cited attain much less depths; the greatest is about 300 feet in the Sahara, while, taking into account the depth of the Dead Sea (1300 feet), we get a total of almost 2600 feet. G. A. Smith has well said (*HGHL* [Note: *GHL* Historical Geog. of Holy Land.] p. 407): ‘Among the rivers of the world the Jordan is unique by a twofold distinction of Nature and History.... The Nile and the Jordan, otherwise so different, are alike in this, that the historical singularity of each has behind it as remarkable a singularity of physical formation.... Every one knows the incomparableness of the Nile.... In its own way the Jordan is as solitary and extreme

an effect of natural forces. There may be something on the surface of another planet to match the Jordan Valley; there is nothing in this.'

As regards the geological explanation of this remarkable phenomenon, we may say that it was supplied in the 19th cent, in a very satisfactory manner by the experts who made a study of Palestine, and the valley of the Jordan and the Dead Sea in particular: Fraas, Hull, Lartet, and Blanckenhorn. The following is briefly the result of their labours. When, during the Eocene period, and even before it, during the Cretaceous period, successive strata of limestone had been deposited, there was produced towards the end of the Eocene epoch, by the action of lateral (east and west) pressure, a falling away, *i.e.* a 'fault' or fracture was formed in the earth's crust. This movement, however, was not of a convulsive nature, it was not a sudden cataclysm, but a slow and gradual process, extending over a long period of time. The result of it was the formation of the parallel chains of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon, and further south that of the two ranges of hills which skirt the Jordan valley. The southern end of this depression is, from the point of view of the flow of water, a transverse ridge reaching 650 feet above the Red Sea and the Mediterranean, and situated about 46 miles from Akabah and more than 73 miles from the Dead Sea.

At the end of the Miocene and the beginning of the Pliocene period, the waters in the Jordan valley must have been just about at their present level. But the pluvial period (Pliocene) brought about a considerable raising of the aqueous surface enclosed; the Jordan valley became a lake which must have been about 200 miles long and more than 2000 feet deep. The glacial period (post-Pliocene), during which the temperature sank considerably and the rainfall increased, only served to accentuate this state of affairs still more. Then, at the close of this period, the streams of water diminished, and also the lake, until things once more arrived at their present state. On the lateral slopes of the valley traces of the heights to which the waters rose are still distinguishable; some of the most notable of these traces are 1180, others 347, feet above the present level of the Dead Sea.

Alongside of this theory, held in common by those who have studied this question, we must mention, as worthy of attention, the one which W. Libbey, Professor of Physical Geography in the University of Princeton, has recently published (Libbey and Hoskins, *The Jordan Valley and Petra*, ii. pp. 251-260).

The ancients were completely ignorant of the fact that the bottom of the Jordan valley lay below the level of the Mediterranean Sea. Nor were they aware at that time that the depression between the Dead Sea and the Gulf of Akabah was intersected by a sort of natural barrier, forming two anticlinal slopes and making a dividing line for the waters. And even in the first part of the 19th cent, it was held by Carl Ritter, W. M. Leake, de Hoff, Léon de Laborde, etc., that formerly—perhaps even in historical

times before the catastrophe of Sodom and Gomorrah—the Jordan passed through the Dead Sea, continued its southward course, and flowed into the Red Sea. Those are ideas which have had to be given up. It was in 1836-37 that two German scholars, von Schubert and Roth, and at the same time two Englishmen, G. H. Moore and W. G. Beke, discovered that the Jordan valley sank far down below the level of the sea. The Austrian Russegger, the Frenchman Jules de Berton, and the Englishman Symonds soon confirmed this sensational discovery, as a consequence of explorations carried on in quite an independent way. Before them, famous travellers, such as Seetzen (1806-07), Burckhardt (1810-12), Irby and Mangles (1817-18), had visited those same parts without any suspicion of the strange phenomenon regarding the altitude.

The course of the Jordan is interrupted twice—first by the Lake of Huleh, a description of which occurs later in the course of the present article, then by the Lake of Tiberias or Sea of Galilee (which see); we have not to examine this here. These interruptions quite naturally cause us to divide the next part of this article into three sections: (a) the sources of the Jordan, (b) the Upper Jordan as far as Lake Tiberias, (c) the Lower Jordan from the Lake of Tiberias to the Dead Sea.

3. *The sources of the Jordan.*—Just as in the Alps the traditional opinion of mountaineers does not always show as the principal source of a river the one which tourists or even geographers would denote as such, so is it with the Jordan. The most northerly of its sources, the one which gives rise to the stream which covers the longest distance, is found near Hasbeya, at 1846 feet above the sea, at the foot of the Great Hermon. The name *Hasbani* is given to the river which starts there and flows towards the south, following a course parallel at first to that of the Litani; between these twin valleys there is only a short distance and a ridge of mountains of moderate height; so that one might quite well imagine the Hasbani rejoining the Litani, and falling along with it into the Mediterranean. But, on the contrary, it remains faithful to its course from north to south, and is joined by a tributary, which some modern scholars would include among the sources of the Jordan—the *Nahr-Bareighit* (Flea River), ‘the smallest of the four sources of the Jordan’ (Libbey and Hoskins, i. p. 89), but which is usually left aside, so that attention may be given only to the three other more important ones. These are, besides the Hasbani, the one which springs forth at Tell el-Kadi, and the one which emerges from the grotto of Banias. The Tell el-Kadi source is called the *Leddán*. This unexplained name is interpreted by some as containing an allusion to the city of Dan, situated in this region, and generally (G. A. Smith, however, is an exception, *HGHL* [Note: *GHL* Historical Geog. of Holy Land.] pp. 480, 678) identified with Tell el-Kadi, *Kadi*, ‘judge,’ being considered the exact equivalent of the Heb. *Dan*. The source of Tell el-Kadi is double, in the sense that it streams forth, at 500 feet above the sea, in two places close together under a hillock which is about 300 feet broad and covered with tall trees, and rises in a very striking manner from the plain, over which it towers

about 60 feet. The stream which flows from it is the shortest but most copious of the sources of the Jordan; it is not, therefore, on account of its abundance, but because of its short length, that Josephus calls it 'the little Jordan' (*BJ* iv. i. 1; *Ant.* viii. viii. 4), or 'the lesser Jordan' (*Ant.* v. iii. 1). Lastly, we find the 'river of Banias,' *Nahr-Banias*, which starts at 1200 feet above the sea from a grotto, the ancient shrine of the Semitic, and then of the Graeco-Roman, gods, well known under the name of *Paneion*, and round which arose the city known under the names of Caesarea Philippi and Paneas, and now called Banias, a corruption of the latter name. Josephus mentions, under the name of Paneas, both the town and the district of which it was the centre; he also mentions the Paneion, and speaks of 'the famous fountain' (cf. *BJ* i. xxi. 3, iii. x. 7; *Ant.* xv. x. 3, xviii. ii. 1). He adds that the water of the source comes from Lake Phiala, situated 120 stades from Caesarea; this is, undoubtedly, the small lake nowadays called *Birket-Ram* (cf. Schumacher in *ZDPV* [Note: DPV Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.] ix. [1886] p. 256f.), but it is only 60 stades distant. There is, however, no subterranean communication between this lake, an ancient volcanic crater, and the Paneion source.

The Leddan and the river of Banias meet at an altitude of 148 feet, after the Leddan has flowed 5 miles. A little farther down, the Hasbani, in its turn, becomes united with them: whence the Jordan is formed.

4. *The Upper Jordan.*—From the confluence, which we have just mentioned, to the Lake of Tiberias the course of the Jordan is unimportant from a historical point of view. The books of the Bible do not speak of it, and later writers very seldom. Nor, from a specifically geographical point of view, has this part of the river any great importance. Its chief interest lies in the fact that at 10 miles distance from the confluence it forms a lake or lagoon, the *Bahr* or *Buheirat* (lake or small lake) Huleh, triangular in shape, the level of which is 7 feet above the Mediterranean, and which is rich in papyrus plants. The size of this sheet of water varies very much according to the seasons: at one time it is a considerable limpid stretch, at another it is simply a kind of huge morass. Its traditional identification with 'the waters of Merom' (Jos 11:5; Jos 11:7) must be regarded with caution (cf. *ZDPV* [Note: DPV Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.] ix. [1886] p. 252); the evidence of Josephus is not favourable. He gives this lake another name, that of 'the lake of the Semechonites' (*BJ* iv. i. 1; cf. *ZDPV* [Note: DPV Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.] l.e. and p. 348 f.). As regards the modern name *Huleh*, it is perhaps derived from the word *Ulatha*, by which Josephus denotes a district near Banias. For the description of the whole upper course of the Jordan from its sources to the Lake of Tiberias, including Lake Huleh, see Macgregor, *The Rob Roy on the Jordan*, 1869, 5th ed. 1880.

As soon as it leaves Lake Huleh, the Jordan begins to flow below the level of the sea, and falls almost 700 feet in a distance of 10 miles. We must here notice a bridge, the *Jisr Benât-Ya'kub*, 'bridge of Jacob's Daughters,' sometimes wrongly called 'bridge of Jacob' or 'bridge of Jacob's Sons'; the name itself is really difficult to explain; see on this subject an ingenious solution suggested in *PEFSt* [Note: EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.] , 1898, p. 29f., by B. Z. Friedmann.

5. *The Lower Jordan.*—The Jordan issues from the Lake of Tiberias at a place called *Bab et-Tum*, leaving on the east the little modern village of Semakh, which has no bridge connecting it with the right bank, and as the river is not fordable at this place, the passage, naturally of frequent occurrence, is accomplished by means of boats. A little farther down there are the remains of an ancient bridge called at the present day *Umm el-Kanatir*, and again at a short distance below, the ruins of another bridge, *Umm es-Sidd*. There the Jordan begins to assume a very sinuous course, describing endless meanders; Pliny spoke of it as an *amnis ambitiosus*, *i.e.* a winding river. The distance in a straight line from the Lake of Tiberias to the Dead Sea is about 65 miles, but if we take into account all the sinuosities of the river it reaches a total of 200 miles.

The Jordan valley at this part is now called the *Ghôr*, *i.e.* 'depression,' 'valley.' Even in the OT it was designated (Jos 13:19; Jos 13:27) by the name *ha-'çmek*, 'the valley,' in opposition to the neighbouring heights. But a name much more frequent in the OT is '*Arabah*, which was applied to the valley to the north as well as that to the south of the Dead Sea; nowadays the name '*Arabah*, which has been preserved, is applied only to the valley to the south of the Dead Sea. In Greek, not in the LXX Septuagint , but in Josephus , Eusebius, etc., 'Arabah is rendered *Αἰλῶν*. Josephus also uses the expressions 'wide wilderness' and 'the great plain' (*BJ* iii. x. 7, iv. viii. 2; *Ant.* iv. vi. 1).

The *Ghôr* is hemmed in on either side by chains of mountains, or at least hills, of variable height, but sometimes rising 1500 or even 1800 feet above the bed of the river. The slopes are generally somewhat steep, but not to such an extent as to prevent their being scaled. Especially at the spots where the wadis come down from one of the side mountains, means of access are opened up. The soil of the valley is fertile, especially in the northern and middle parts. As to the river itself, it flows in a bed which it has hollowed out for itself, called the *Zôr*. This bed is somewhat variable in breadth, and it may be easily seen that the river has frequently changed its course. Thus at Damieh, of which we shall speak below, and where we find the half-ruined arches of a bridge of the Middle Ages, the Jordan actually no longer passes under the bridge, but at some distance from it. The ground bordering either side of the river is covered with very thick brushwood; this is undoubtedly what is called in Jer 12:5;

Jer 49:19; Jer 50:44, Zec 11:3 the תַּיִתּוֹן נֶאֱזָן, *i.e.* ‘the majesty (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘pride’) of Jordan’ (Authorized Version ‘the swelling of Jordan’ [in the Jer. passages] arises from a wrong interpretation, as if the reference here was to the floods of Jordan; these do exist; they are sometimes sudden and very violent, rendering the fords impassable; cf. Jos 3:15, Sir 24:26 (36)).

The vegetation, especially as we go further south, becomes very nearly tropical, and the fauna resembles that of Africa. The lion, which abounded in ancient times, and continued to be encountered even in the Middle Ages, has completely disappeared. But other carnivorous animals are found here, leopards and hyaenas, as well as wild boars, porcupines, etc. In Palestine 58 species of birds are met with, which are also N. African: nearly all of them belong to the *Ghôr*. The flora has the same character, it recalls that of Nubia, Abyssinia, the Sahara, and the region of the great African lakes. Great heat prevails throughout this whole region, a fact which is quite naturally explained when we remember that it is a valley shut in between high walls, at its highest point 682 and at its lowest 1292 feet below the sea-level. The temperature varies from 77° to 130° Fahr. This circumstance undoubtedly accounts largely for the fact that there are not and never have been any towns on the banks of the Jordan. But another reason for the latter important fact may be found in the danger to which the inhabitants would be exposed, owing to the impossibility of effectually fortifying themselves against attacks. The few towns of the *Ghôr* at one time populated, *e.g.* Phasaël and Jericho, are on the height at some distance from the river, near protecting mountains. The other inhabited places are only wretched villages.

The Jordan forms a very large number of rapids; about thirty may be counted, apart from the whirlpools, which are numerous. There is also a considerable number of fords; the majority of them—22—are in the northern part, to the north of *Karn Sartabeh*; there are 5 more in the south. A little to the north of Beisan there is a bridge, which dates from the Middle Ages, the *Jisr el-Mujamieh*, on the way—an ancient Roman road—leading from the plain of Jezreel to Gadara and Damascus. Further south is the ruined bridge of Damieh; and lastly, near Jericho, a modern bridge, the *Jisr el-Ghoranich*, at the place where the mosaic map of Madaba indicates a ferry-boat. For information regarding the fords of the Jordan, see G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [Note: *GHL* Historical Geog. of Holy Land.] p. 336 f.

The configuration of the Jordan valley is remarkable for its formation into terraces (in Arabic *tabakât*), the river flowing between the lowermost of these. There is no comparatively equal and continuous incline from the mountain to the river, but a succession of horizontal platforms, with sudden and very steep slopes, which form what are called the steep banks or cliffs of Jordan. They are marly, and have a tendency to become worn, and even to give way. The *Zôr* itself is bordered by them,

and the Jordan often flows, at least at one side, along the foot of a declivity impossible of ascent. This is the case, *e.g.*, in front of the so-called place of the Baptism at the latitude of Jericho. These terraces correspond to the different levels attained by the waters of the great lake which at one time filled the whole valley, and which first increased and then sank down again.

The Jordan is fed by numerous tributaries. The most important of these are on the left bank. One of them, the *Hieromax* of the Greeks, the *Yarmuk* of the Rabbis, the *Sherî'at el-Manaḍireh* of the Arabs, already mentioned above, flows down from the high plateau on the east of Lake Tiberias, and passes between the warm springs of el-Hammah and the ancient Gadara (modern *Umm Keis*). Further south, also on the eastern bank, the Jordan receives the *Zerka* (blue river), the *Yabbok* of ancient times, which, after passing 'Amman (Rabbath-Ammon, Philadelphia), describes an immense semi-circle towards the east, resumes its westward course, passes to the south of *Jerash* (Gerasa), and at last empties itself into the Jordan; the position of its mouth has considerably changed in the course of the centuries. On the right bank, we must mention the *Nahr-Jalud*, which springs from the fountain of Harod at the foot of Mt. Gilboa and passes to Beisan; then, close to Jericho, the *Wadi el-Kelt*, which tradition, probably wrongly, identifies with the Cherith of the Bible.

It is scarcely necessary to say that the Jordan is not navigable. Yet on three occasions the attempt has been made to sail down its course from the Lake of Tiberias to the Dead Sea. The first time it was an Irishman, Costigan, who, in 1835, accomplished this daring feat alone in a boat for one oarsman; the second time it was Lieutenant Molyneux, of the British Navy, in 1847. Both succeeded in reaching the Dead Sea, but both died soon after from the strain which they had undergone. Lastly, in 1848, an American expedition, under Lieutenant Lynch, sailed all the way down in two boats specially built for the purpose, reached the Dead Sea, and were able to record a whole series of very useful observations. Other travellers have also made a careful study of the Jordan valley, but from the land; besides those whom we have already mentioned, we may recall the names of Robinson, Guérin, and Conder. Long before there was any question of scientific explorations, pilgrims had followed the course of the Jordan through the whole of the *Ghôr*, *e.g.* Antonius Martyr in the 6th cent., Willibald in the 8th; we may add to these the name of King Baldwin i., who passed up from Jericho to the Lake of Tiberias.

While the northern part of the *Ghôr* is fertile, and more especially the environs of Beisan, it is very different in the south, near Jericho. This town, it is true, and its immediate neighbourhood, form a kind of oasis; but the rest of this region is not nearly so rich, the soil being impregnated with salt substances; one is reminded of the nearness of the Dead Sea.

It is this district that is referred to in the passages of the OT where the ‘Jordan of Jericho’ is spoken of. This does not mean a particular branch of the river, far less another stream of the same name (as, e.g., they say in Valais, ‘the Visp of Saas’ and ‘the Visp of Zermatt’). It is simply ‘the Jordan in the district of Jericho.’ See Num 22:1; Num 26:3; Num 26:63; Num 31:12; Num 33:48; Num 33:50; Num 34:15; Num 35:1; Num 36:13, Jos 13:32; Jos 16:1; Jos 20:8, 1Ch 6:63 (78). We must correct the Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 in this respect, and remember that Jordan is originally a common noun.

Another Biblical expression referring to this particular region is *Kikkar hay-Yardçn* (תִּיקָרַיִן כִּכָּר), Gen 13:10 f., or hak-Kikkâr (Gen 13:12; Gen 19:17; Gen 19:25; Gen 19:28 f., Neh 3:22; Neh 12:28), lit. ‘the circle’ (.e. the basin) of the Jordan, or, more briefly, ‘the circle’; in Greek ἡ περιχώρις τοῦ Ἰορδάνου (LXX Septuagint , Mat 3:5, Luk 3:3). It may seem at first sight that this expression should apply to the whole valley, but it is more probable, considering the passages in which it is used, that it is only a designation of the broader part lying to the north of the Dead Sea, with Jericho as centre (cf. Deu 34:3), and stretching northwards until near Sartabeh (cf. 2Sa 18:23, 1Ki 7:46, 2Ch 4:17), and perhaps also including the basin of the Dead Sea. This latter point depends on the position assigned to the cities of the *Kikkâr* (Cities of the Plain), and to Zoar in particular; the present writer thinks their site ought to be sought to the north of the Dead Sea, and this frees him from the necessity of extending the term *Kikkâr* to embrace the region of the Dead Sea.

We also find as a designation of the region of Jericho, the phrase ‘*arboth Yericho*’ (Jos 5:10, 2Ki 25:5), and for the district facing it, to the east of the Jordan, ‘*arboth Moab*’ (Num 22:1; Num 26:3; Num 26:63; Num 31:12; Num 33:48-50; Num 35:1; Num 36:13, Deu 34:1; Deu 34:8, Jos 13:32). The Hebrew word used here is the plural of *Arabah*.

6. Historical and political rôle.—It is a commonplace to say that the Jordan separates E. Palestine from W. Palestine. But one often yields to the temptation to over-estimate the importance of this separation. The Jordan has been called ‘the great Divider.’ We should not exaggerate. The separation does exist, but it is not so great as people think. And if separation there is, it is not the river itself, with its narrow breadth—45 to 90 feet on an average, at places perhaps as broad as 180 (?) feet—and its numerous fords, that constitute it; it is rather the valley as a whole, the *Ghôr* enclosed between its lateral ramparts, with its intolerable heat, and its want of security. The stream itself is so little of an obstacle that it is constantly being crossed, easily, too easily.

In ancient times it kept back neither armies nor raids. The pilgrims of Galilee, who in the times of Judaism made their way to Jerusalem, had so little dread of passing the river that they chose to cross it twice and make their journey by way of Peraea rather than pass through the territory of the Samaritans. John the Baptist baptized beyond the Jordan, and that did not prevent crowds from going to him. Later on, the river was again crossed at all times and with great ease, and down to the most recent epochs the incursions of trans-Jordan Bedawîn have not been prevented by the river, any more than the expeditions sent forth in pursuit of them. And this was as little the case when the Midianites invaded the territory of the Israelites, and Gideon put them to rout and pursued them, while the Ephraimites held the fords. The mountain-slopes are here and there quite accessible; it is easy to descend and ascend the lateral wadis. The valley which stretches down from Jezreel to Beisan is the most convenient of the great routes, and there are many others. G. A. Smith has admirably shown the close connexion between Samaria and the country of Gilead (*HGH* [Note: *GHL* Historical Geog. of Holy Land.] p. 335 ff.).

The Jordan valley is so ineffectual a barrier, that at all times the possessors of the western district have felt the necessity of establishing themselves on the eastern bank for the sake of safety. The 2½ tribes of Israel quartered on the left bank were a rampart guarding their western brethren from the invaders and pillagers of the east. The Romans realized the need of occupying the country across the Jordan in a strong and unassailable manner. And in our day security was not really re-established on the west of the Jordan until the Turkish Government imposed its authority in a firm and permanent fashion in the provinces east of the river.

7. OT references.—It has been well said (*Jewish Encyc.* vii. p. 239), ‘There is no regular description of the Jordan in the Bible; only scattered and indefinite references to it are given.’ There are 176 references to the Jordan in the OT, the majority of which are found in the narrative books of Josephus (67), Deut. (26), Nu. (20), Sam. (17:2+15), Kings (12:3+9), Jg. (12), Ch. (7:1+6), Gn. (5). But by far the greater number of those have to do with topographical expressions such as ‘on this side Jordan,’ ‘beyond Jordan,’ ‘to go over Jordan,’ ‘by Jordan.’ If those cases are deducted, all that remain are very few. Besides, as the present Dictionary is devoted to the Gospels, we have not to enter into details as we should have to do if it treated of the OT. We shall confine ourselves therefore to noting the following. (a) The crossing of the Jordan by the Israelites (Joshua 3-4 : cf. [Psa_114:3](#); [Psa_114:5](#)). This narrative must be compared with what happened on the 8th of December 1267 at the bridge of Damieh, in the reign of the Sultan Beibars I. (1260-77), according to the Arabic historian Nowairi (*PEFSt* [Note: *EFSt* Quarterly Statement of the same.] , 1895, pp. 253-261, 334-338), and the mention of a similar fact in the Val Blenio, in Tessin, when in 1512 a landslip stopped the flow of a stream for 14 months, after which a

clearance was effected by the bursting of the barrier which had been formed. (b) The seizing of the fords of the Jordan by Ehud after the murder of Eglon (Jdg 3:28). (c) The campaign of Gideon (Judges 7-8) against Midian. (d) That of Jephthah against the Ephraimites (Judges 12). (e) The flight of David before Absalom, the battle which followed it and the return of David to Jerusalem (2Sa 17:22; 2Sa 17:24; 2Sa 19:6-43) [on this point the Hebrew text speaks (19:18 (19)) of a פֶּרֶיָה for enabling the king to cross from the other side of the river; Josephus [*Ant.* vii. xi. 2) renders this word by γέφυρα, 'bridge,' but it more probably refers to a ferry-boat]. (f) The crossing of Elijah with Elisha, and the return of the latter alone (2 Kings 2). (g) Two other narratives referring to Elisha: Naaman (2Ki 5:10 ff.), and the adventure of the lost axe (2Ki 6:5). (h) The reference in 1Ma 5:24; 1Ma 5:52; 1Ma 9:35-49 to certain incidents of war, relating to the struggles of the Jews with the Syrians. In the poetical and prophetic books, the Jordan is scarcely mentioned; we have already had occasion to quote the few texts where it occurs.

8. NT references.—Here again, several times, the Jordan is mentioned in the phrase 'beyond Jordan.' See Mat 4:15 (which quotes Isa 9:1) 4:25, 19:1, Mar 3:8; Mar 10:1. All the other passages of the Gospels which mention the Jordan are connected with the ministry of John the Baptist, and the baptism of Jesus, or make a retrospective allusion to them. Thus Mat 3:5, Mar 1:5, Luk 3:3 describe John at work, preaching and baptizing; and on this point Mt. and Lk. mention the περιχώρος of the Jordan, a word which we explained when speaking of the *Kikkâr* of the OT (see above, § 5). Others (Mat 3:13, Mar 1:9) show us Jesus baptized 'in the Jordan,' and then leaving the banks of the river (Luk 4:1) in order to go away to the desert. The Gospel of John is the only one which defines more precisely the place where John baptized and where Jesus was baptized. Joh 1:28 tells us that 'these things were done in Bethany beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing,' and two later passages in the same Gospel recall the same fact; 3:26 'He that was with thee beyond Jordan,' and 10:40 'He went away again beyond Jordan to the place where John at first baptized.' See art. Bethabara. Without entering here into the discussion of the problem which is raised by the substitution (by Origen) of *Bethabara* for *Bethany*, we may say that the latter is infinitely better attested, and ought to be preferred (this does away with the topographical hypotheses based on *Bethabara*). As regards Bethany, the knowledge at our disposal does not enable us to determine its site. It must be (a) beyond Jordan, which excludes the traditional so-called 'place of the Baptism' near Jericho; and (b) near Jordan, which renders improbable the suggestions of Grove, Wilson, and Cheyne, who would combine Bethany and Bethabara into Bethanabra, and the view of Furrer ('Das Geog. im Ev. nach Joh.' in *ZNTW* [Note: *NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissen. schaft.*], 1902, p. 257 f.), put forward also by Zahn (*Einl. NT* ii. p. 561), and noted by Sanday (*Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, p. 94), which identifies Bethany with

Betaneh = Betonim (Jos 13:26). See on this special question Lagrange, 'Béthanie et Béthabara' in *RB* [Note: *Revue Biblique*.] iv. [1895] pp. 502-522; G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [Note: *GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land*.] p. 496; C. Mommert, *Aenon und Bethania*, 1903, pp. 1-19, 30-56.

Literature.—*SWP* [Note: *WP Memoirs of the Survey of W. Palestine*.] i. pp. 85, 97, 109-113, 139-142, ii. pp. 76-79, 380-388, iii. 169 ff., 232; Saunders, *Introduction to the Survey of W. P.*, 1881, pp. 62-97, 143-170; *PEFst* [Note: *EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same*.], almost every volume [see Indexes]; Reland, *Palästina*, pp. 261-266, 270-279; Seetzen, *Reisen*, i. pp. 323-343, ii. 259-271, 296-323; Burckhardt, *Travels*, pp. 342-347; Irhy and Mangles, *Travels*, p. 91 ff.; Buckingham, *Travels in Palestine*, ii. p. 92 ff., *Travels among the Arab Tribes*, pp. 6-15; von Schubert, *Reise in das Morgenland*, iii. pp. 67-94; de Berton, 'Voyage depuis les sources du Jourdain jusqu' à la Mer Rouge' in *Bulletin de la Société de Géographie*, 1839, pp. 114-168; Molyneux, 'Expedition to the Jordan and the Dead Sea' in *Jour. R. Geog. Soc.* xviii. [1848] pp. 104-130, cf. p. xxxvi; Lynch, *Narrative of the United States Expedition to the River Jordan and the Dead Sea*, 1849, the same author's *Official Report*, 1852; Robinson, 'Depression of the Dead Sea and of the Jordan Valley' in *Jour. R. Geog. Soc.* xviii. [1848] pp. 77-88, the same author's *Physical Geography of the Holy Land*, pp. 66-95, 116-139, and his *BRP* [Note: *RP Biblical Researches in Palestine*.] i. 537-568, iii. 390-418; Petermann, 'On the Fall of the Jordan' in *Jour. R. Geog. Soc.* xviii. [1848] pp. 89-104; Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xv. pp. 152-238, 266-281, 358-556, 698-723, the same author's *Der Jordan und die Beschiffung des Todten Meeres*, 1850; Tobler, *Topographie*, ii. pp. 669-719; Lartet, *Exploration géologique, de la Mer Morte*, 1878; Reclus, *Géographie universelle*, ix. pp. 727-736; Lortet, *La Syrie d'aujourd'hui*, pp. 443-470, 543-553; Guérin, *Samarie*, i. pp. 97-109, 239-240, *Galilée*, i. 133, 282-285, 342, ii. 297, 308-310, 338, 450 f.; G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [Note: *GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land*.] pp. 465-496; Buhl, *GAP* [Note: *AP Geographic des alten Palästina*.] pp. 35-39, 111-113, 115f.; Thomson, *LB* [Note: *The Land and the Book*.] i. pp. 359-370, ii. pp. 447-459, 468-473; Hull, 'Memoir on the Geology and Geography of Arabia Petraea, Palestine,' etc., in *SWP* [Note: *WP Memoirs of the Survey of W. Palestine*.], 1889, pp. 3-20, 29 ff., 103-120, the same author's *Mount Seir, Sinai, and Western Palestine*, 1889, pp. 75-143, 159-169; Conder, *Tent Work*⁶ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred], pp. 214-235; MacCoun, *The Holy Land in Geography and History*, 1897, i. pp. 1-3, 47-50, ii. p. 30; Newbold, 'The Lake Phiala, the Jordan and its Sources' in *JRAS* [Note: *RAS Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*.] xvi. [1856] pp. 8-31; J. L. Porter, *Through Samaria to Galilee and the Jordan*, 1889, pp. 114-142, 200-298; Dawson, *Modern Science in Bible Lands*, pp. 313-319, 338-354; Libbey and Hoskins, *The Jordan Valley and Petra*, 1905; Fraas, *Aus dem Orient*, 1867,

pp. 72-78, 204-206; Blanckenhorn, 'Entstehung und Geschichte des Todten Meeres' in *ZDPV* [Note: *DPV Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.*] xix. [1896] pp. 1-59.

Lucien Gautier.

⚠ Jorim

JORIM.—Named in our Lord's genealogy (Luk_3:29).

⚠ Josech

JOSECH (Authorized Version *Joseph*).—Named in our Lord's genealogy (Luk_3:26).

⚠ Joseph

JOSEPH (Ἰωσήφ).—**1.** The patriarch, mentioned only in the description of the visit of Jesus to Sychar (Joh_4:5).—**2. 3.** Joseph son of Mattathias and Joseph son of Jonam are both named in the genealogy of Jesus given in Lk. (Luk_3:24; Luk_3:30). * [Note: Joseph the son of Juda in v. 26 (AV) becomes Josech the son of Joda in RV.] —**4.** One of the brethren of the Lord, Mat_13:55 (Authorized Version *Joses*, the form adopted in both Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 in Mat_27:56, Mar_6:3; Mar_15:40; Mar_15:47. See *Joses*).

5. Joseph, the husband of Mary and the reputed father of Jesus (Luk_3:23), is not mentioned in Mk., and only indirectly in Jn. (Joh_1:45; Joh_6:42). He was of Davidic descent; and, though Mt. and Lk. differ in the genealogical details, they connect Jesus with Joseph and through him with David (Mat_1:1 ff., Luk_3:23 ff.). Joseph, who was a carpenter (Mat_13:55) and a poor man, as his offering in the temple showed (Luk_2:24), lived in Nazareth (Luk_2:4) and was espoused to Mary, also of Nazareth (Luk_1:26). By their betrothal they entered into a relationship which, though not the completion of marriage, could be dissolved only by death or divorce. Before the marriage ceremony Mary was 'found with child of the Holy Ghost,' but the angelic annunciation to her was not made known to Joseph. He is described as a just man (Mat_1:19), a strict observer of the Law. The law was stern (Deu_22:23-24), but its severity had been mitigated and divorce had taken the place of death. Divorce could be effected publicly, so that the shame of the woman might be seen by all; or it

could be done privately, by the method of handing the bill of separation to the woman in presence of two witnesses.† [Note: Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i. 154. Dalman asserts that Edersheim is incorrect in stating that public divorce was possible (see Hastings' DB, art. 'Joseph').] Joseph, not willing to make Mary a public example, 'was minded to put her away privily' (Mat_1:18). An angel, however, appeared to him in a dream, telling him not to fear to marry Mary, as the conception was of the Holy Ghost, and also that she would bring forth a son, whom he was to name Jesus (Mat_1:20 f.). The dream was accepted as a revelation,‡ [Note: cit. i. 155.] as a token of Divine favour, and Joseph took Mary as his wife, but did not live with her as her husband till she had brought forth her firstborn son (Mat_1:24 f.).

Before the birth of Christ there was an Imperial decree that all the world should be taxed, and Joseph, being of the house and lineage of David, had to leave Nazareth and go to Bethlehem, to be taxed with Mary.§ [Note: On the question of the visit to Bethlehem see Ramsay's *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?*] In Bethlehem Jesus was born; and there the shepherds, to whom the angel had announced the birth of the Saviour, found Mary and Joseph and 'the babe lying in a manger' (Luk_2:16). At the circumcision, on the eighth day after the birth, the child received the name 'Jesus' which Joseph had been commanded to give Him; and on a later day, when Mary's purification was accomplished (cf. Lev_12:2-4), she and Joseph took Jesus to the temple in Jerusalem (Luk_2:22), to 'present him to the Lord'* [Note: 'The earliest period of presentation was thirty-one days after birth, so as to make the legal month quite complete' (Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i. 193).] and to offer a sacrifice, according to the requirements of the law (Exo_13:2, Lev_12:8). Joseph fulfilled the law as if he were the father of Jesus; and after the ceremonies in the temple he must have returned with Mary and her son to Bethlehem, which was 6 miles distant from Jerusalem. In Bethlehem the Wise Men who had come from the East saw Mary and 'the young child' and worshipped Him; and after their departure the angel of the Lord appeared again to Joseph, bidding him take Mary and the child and flee into Egypt on account of Herod, who would seek to destroy Him (Mat_2:13). Joseph was quick to obey, and rising in the night he took the young child and His mother and departed for Egypt, where Herod had no authority (Mat_2:14). In Egypt they were to remain till the angel brought word to Joseph (Mat_2:13); and there they dwelt, possibly two or even three years, till the death of Herod, when the angel again appeared in a dream to Joseph. The angel commanded him to take the young child and His mother and go into the land of Israel. Obedience was at once given by Joseph, but he became afraid when he learned that Archelaus was reigning in Judaea. Again the angel appeared in a dream, and after a warning Joseph proceeded to Nazareth,

which was not under the rule of Archelaus, who had an evil reputation, but under that of the milder Antipas (Mat 2:14-23).

It is recorded of Joseph that he and Mary went every year, at the Passover, to Jerusalem, and that when Jesus was twelve years of age He accompanied them. On that occasion Jesus tarried in Jerusalem, after Joseph and Mary, thinking He was with them in the company, had left the city. When they had gone a day's journey they found He was not with them, and they turned back to Jerusalem. After three days they found Him in the temple among the doctors, and they were amazed. Mary's words, 'Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing.' called forth an answer which Joseph and Mary did not understand. But after the incident in Jerusalem, Jesus went with them to Nazareth and 'was subject unto them' (Luk 2:41-51). Mary's words and the record of the subjection of Jesus to her and Joseph indicate that Joseph stood to Jesus in the place of an earthly father. How long that relationship continued is unknown, since the time of the death of Joseph is not stated in the Gospels. It may be accepted as a certainty that he was not alive throughout the period of the public ministry of Jesus, seeing that he is not directly or indirectly mentioned along with His mother and brothers and sisters (Mar 3:31; Mar 6:3).

6. Joseph of Arimathaea (Ἰωσήφ ὁ ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας, see Arimathaea).—A rich and pious Israelite (Mat 27:57), a member of the Sanhedrin (Mar 15:43), who, secretly for fear of the Jews, was Jesus' disciple (Joh 19:38). He had not consented to the death of Jesus (Luk 23:51), and could not therefore have been present at the Council, where they all condemned Him to be guilty of death (Mar 14:64). The timidity which prevented him from openly avowing his discipleship, and perhaps from defending Jesus in the Sanhedrin, fled when he beheld the death of the Lord. Jewish law required that the body of a person who had been executed should not remain all night upon the tree, but should 'in any wise' be buried (Deu 21:22-23). This law would not bind the Roman authorities, and the custom in the Empire was to leave the body to decay upon the cross (cf. Hor. *Ep.* i. xvi. 48; Plautus, *Mil. Glor.* II. iv. 19). But at the crucifixion of Jesus and of the two malefactors, the Jews, anxious that the bodies should not remain upon the cross during the Sabbath, besought Pilate that the legs of the crucified might be broken and death hastened, and that then the bodies might be taken away (Joh 19:31). According to Roman law, the relatives could claim the body of a person executed (*Digest*, xlviii. 24, 'De cadav. punit.'). But which of the relatives of Jesus had a sepulchre in Jerusalem where His body might be placed? Joseph, wishing the burial not to be 'in any wise' (cf. Jos 8:29), but to be according to the most pious custom of his race, went to Pilate and craved the body. The petition required boldness (Mar 15:43), since Joseph, with no kinship in the flesh with Jesus, would be forced to make a confession of discipleship, which the Jews would note.

Pilate, too, neither loved nor was loved by Israel, and his anger might be kindled at the coming of a Jew, and the member of the Sanhedrin be assailed with insults. Pilate, however, making sure that Jesus was dead, gave the body. Perhaps he had pity for the memory of Him he had condemned, or perhaps the rich man's gold, since Pilate, according to Philo (*Op.* ii. 590), took money from suppliants, secured what was craved. Joseph, now with no fear of the Jews, acted openly, and had to act with speed, as the day of preparation for the Sabbath was nearly spent. Taking down the body of Jesus from the cross (and other hands must have aided his), he wrapped it in linen which he himself had bought (Mar 15:46). In the Fourth Gospel it is told how Nicodemus, bringing a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pound weight, joined Joseph, and how they took the body and wound it in linen clothes with the spices (Joh 19:40). Near the place of crucifixion was a garden, and in the garden a new sepulchre, which Joseph had hewn out in the rock, doubtless for his own last resting-place; and in that sepulchre, wherein was never man yet laid, was placed the body of Jesus prepared for its burial (Mat 27:60, Joh 19:41). In the court at the entrance to the tomb, the preparation would be made. All was done which the time before the Sabbath allowed reverent hands to do; and then Joseph, perhaps thinking of the pious offices that could yet be done to the dead, rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre and departed (Mat 27:60). On late legends regarding Joseph of Arimathaea see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , vol. ii. p. 778.

J. Herkless.

⚭ Josep

JOSES (Ἰωσῆς, יוֹסֵי, a shortened form of יוֹסֵף, 'he adds'; cf. Gen 30:24. The identity of the two names is doubted by Lightfoot [.3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 261, note 1], chiefly on the ground of the use of different forms in the Peshitta; but Dalman [*Gram. Aram.* 75] rightly views יוֹסֵי as a dialectical, and probably Galilaeian, abbreviation of יוֹסֵף. The names are apparently interchangeable [cf. Mat 13:55 with Mar 6:3]; in Mat 27:56 WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] and Nestle with Tisch. read Ἰωσῆφ, and in all the passages there is textual evidence, sufficiently strong not to be overlooked, for the name rejected).—1. A brother of Jesus (Mar 6:3). This brother is not mentioned anywhere else except in the above passage of Matthew (Mat 27:56). For views as to his real relationship see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible i. 320 ff., and art. Brethren of the Lord in present work. 2. The brother of James the Little (Mat 27:56, Mar 15:40; Mar 15:47). The name of Josep stands alone in the last passage, but that of his better known brother is

substituted by the 'Western' text. The father was Clopas ([Joh_19:25](#)); but of him, as of his son Joses, nothing certain is known. Both must have been familiar to the members of the early Christian community; but the Syriac versions are against the identification of Clopas with Alphaeus, and Hegesippus does not say enough (*Eus. Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 11) to warrant the conclusion that Joses was a nephew of Joseph of Nazareth.

R. W. Moss.

ⲓ Josiah

JOSIAH.—The well-known king of Judah, named in our Lord's genealogy ([Mat_1:10](#) f.).

ⲓ Jot

JOT.—This modern spelling of the Authorized Version, followed by Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, which has discarded the 16th cent. 'iote' (in Tindale, Coverdale, Cranmer 'iott') of Rhemish, Bishops', Authorized Version (1611), somewhat obscures the etymology of the word, which is simply a transliteration of the Greek term (*ἰωτα* = 'i'). Wyclif's translation and paraphrase ('oon i, *that is lest lettre*') was not adopted by any of the subsequent English versions. The Greek trisyllable being pronounced 'jota' (cf. Spanish 'jota,' German 'jota,' 'jodt,' 'jott,' 'jot'), the reduction to the monosyllable 'iote' (pronounced 'jote') with its variants 'ioyt,' 'ioit' (Scots form: see J. Knox, *Hist. Ref.* 1572, Wks. 1846, i. 107; and Davidson, *Commend. Vprichtnes*, 152 (1573), in *Satir. P. Ref.* xl.) and 'iott,' was natural and normal. The German authorized version is still Luther's paraphrase: 'der kleinste Buchstabe' for which Weizsäcker prefers the transliteration: 'ein Jota,' while the French versions also transliterate: 'un (seul) iota.'

The proverbial phrase *ἰωτα ἐν ἡ μίᾳ κεραία* ([Mat_5:18](#) only) derives its point from the fact that *ἰωτα* in the Greek alphabet, like its equivalent letter and original *yod* in the Hebrew, is the smallest character. In fact, as Dr. Hastings notes (s.v. in *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.]), the *yod* being more distinctively the smallest, provides an argument in favour of those who regard Aramaic as the language of Jesus.

After Tindale's introduction of the word (1526), its meaning, derived from the passage above cited, was not so much 'the least letter or written part of any writing,'

as in a more general application ‘the very least,’ ‘a whit,’ and was usually preceded by a negative expressed or implied. Thus: Bale (1538), *God’s Promises*, iii. in Dodsley O. Pl. i. 1: ‘I wyll not one iote, Lord, from thy wyll dyssent’; Shakspeare (1596), *Merch. of Ven.*: ‘This bond doth giue thee here no iot of bloud’; Spenser (1595), *Sonnets*, lvii.: ‘That wonder is how I should liue a iot.’

P. Henderson Aitken.

☩ Jotham

JOTHAM.—A king of Judah, named in our Lord’s genealogy ([Mat_1:9](#)).

☩ Journey

JOURNEY.—See Travel.

☩ Joy

JOY.—In the Greek of the NT there are two verbs, with their corresponding nouns, used to express the idea of joy. These are ἀγαλλιᾶν, ἀγαλλίασις, and χαίρειν, χαρά.

The word ἀγαλλιᾶν conveys rather the idea of exultation or exuberant gladness, and is a favourite with St. Luke, who has been called the ‘most profound psychologist among the Evangelists.’ It is in the pages of his Gospel also that we find the most frequent mention of circumstances of joy attending the proclamation and reception of the gospel message, and the whole character of his writing reveals our Lord in the most joyous relation to His own disciples and to the world at large. The Gr. word for ‘gospel’ (εὐαγγέλιον) means ‘good tidings,’ or, as it is described in [Luk_2:10](#), in the message of the angel to the shepherds, ‘good tidings of great joy’ (εὐαγγελίζομαι ὑμῖν χαρὰν μεγάλην). In the case of the angel messenger to Zacharias, the two words are combined in his greeting. Thus at the very outset the idea of joy attends the prophecy of even the harsher ministry of John the Baptist. ‘Thou shalt,’ says the angel, ‘have joy and gladness (χαρὰ καὶ ἀγαλλίασις), and many shall rejoice (χαρήσονται) at his birth’ ([Luk_1:14](#)). Another strange attendant circumstance of the joy of these days

that preceded our Lord's incarnation is the utterance of Elisabeth, who, when Mary, the predestined mother of the Messiah, comes to visit her, cries out in an ecstasy of wonder and joy, 'Behold, when the voice of thy salutation came into mine ears, the babe leapt in my womb for joy' ([Luk_1:44](#)). In the same scene there immediately follows the song of thanksgiving known in the Church as the *Magnificat* (wh. see), which is pervaded by the spirit of joy, and in which the word 'rejoiced' occurs at the very outset ([Luk_1:47](#)).

When we turn to the historical account of the beginnings of the proclamation of the gospel, we find that, according to Jn.'s narrative, when John the Baptist declared the coming of the Greater than himself, he heralded His advent in the words, 'He that hath the bride is the bridegroom: but the friend of the bridegroom, which standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegroom's voice: this my joy therefore is fulfilled' ([Joh_3:29](#)).

This statement is rather remarkable in the light of the accounts of the Baptist's ministry given in the Synoptics. There the ascetic note is much more prominent, and it is our Lord who says that, because John came 'neither eating nor drinking,' the people supposed he had a devil ([Mat_11:18](#) || [Luk_7:33](#)). Whether we are to think that the Fourth Evangelist had carried back the conception of his Lord's ministry into the prophetic description of it given by His forerunner or not, it is difficult to decide. In any case, the statement here attributed to John the Baptist stands alone, and is not characteristic of his general attitude or of the question which, according to Mt. and Lk., he addressed at a later time to our Lord Himself.

In the parables in which the secret of the Kingdom is itself set forth by our Lord, we meet the word 'joy' several times. In the interpretation of the parable of the Sower we are told: 'He that was sown upon the rocky places, this is he that heareth the word, and straightway with joy receiveth it' ([Mat_13:20](#)), a striking characterization of the temper of those who eagerly adopt a new idea, but are just as ready to exchange it for some more recent fashion. It is a temper that our Lord describes in another place, when, discussing the ministry of His forerunner, He says: 'He was the lamp that burneth and shineth, and ye were willing to rejoice for a season in his light' ([Joh_5:35](#)). Joy of a deeper and more permanent character is that of the man who found a treasure hidden in his field, and 'in his joy he goeth and selleth all that he hath and buyeth that field' ([Mat_13:44](#)). This is the true and evangelical temper of a proper reception of the gospel message. In Luke 15 joy is given a higher place and a yet more spiritual significance. In the three famous parables that fill that chapter, the joy of God's own heart is set forth under the images of the shepherd with his sheep, the woman with her precious coin, and the father with his restored son. Joy, says our Lord, in the two former cases, fills all heaven, even increasing the gladness of the angels in sympathy with their King; while the exuberant picture of the joy of

the household at the prodigal's return gives a still more tender and touching picture of the Divine Fatherhood. The reward promised to the faithful servant in the parable of the Talents is to enter into 'the joy of his Lord' (Mat_25:21). The meaning of this is obviously that the servant should be partaker in the richer and fuller joy that is his Lord's portion, which may probably be the joy that comes from the exercise of higher responsibilities, and the opportunities of fuller usefulness (see the Comm. *in loc*).

In the narrative in Lk. descriptive of the return of the seventy disciples from their mission in Galilee, we read (Luk_10:17) that they 'returned with joy, saying, Lord, even the devils are subject unto us in thy name.' It may be that our Lord regarded this as too much akin to the shallow joy which He had exposed in the parable of the Sower, or, at any rate, as detrimental to the more serious thought with which He wished their minds to be filled; for He replied (Luk_10:20): 'Howbeit in this rejoice not that the spirits are subject unto you, but rejoice that your names are written in heaven.' The keynote thus given to the real joy of the disciple is the assurance of his belonging to the Kingdom of God, a joy, therefore, that is 'with trembling.' According to Lk.'s account, it is at the same moment that we read of Christ's rejoicing, but the parallel in Mt. does not bear out the same historical connexion (cf. Luk_10:21 and Mat_11:25).

In Lk.'s narrative also there is the unique expression, 'He rejoiced in the Holy Spirit.' What exactly is meant by this phrase it is most difficult to say, and some have even supposed it to be a forestalling of the strange experiences of the Christian Church after Pentecost. This does not seem very probable, and it may be that Lk. is only expressing with greater fulness and exactitude the truth that it was through the inspiration of the Spirit that our Lord was able clearly to thank His Father for the manner in which His mighty works were done, as well as to perform these works themselves.

In the passage in which Lk. gives his setting of the Beatitudes, he puts very strongly the blessing of suffering for righteousness' sake, the words being, 'Rejoice in that day, and leap: for, behold, your reward is great in heaven' (Luk_6:23).

In Jn. there is a very striking use of the verb 'rejoice' in a passage of great difficulty (Joh_8:56). It occurs in the reported controversy of our Lord with the Jews, where He tells them, 'Your father Abraham rejoiced ($\eta\gamma\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron$) to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad' ($\epsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\eta$). The force of the Greek implies that Abraham 'exulted that he should see,' that is, presumably, in the promises that were made to him, while the actual seeing of it, of which the Lord speaks, is possibly an assertion of Abraham's living with God, as in Christ's similar use of the text, 'I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob,' to prove the reality of the doctrine of the resurrection.

We must next turn to a class of passages contained in the closing addresses of our Lord to His disciples, as recorded in the Fourth Gospel, where much stress is laid upon our Lord's own joy and the disciples' share in it. The clear declaration of His commandments is to effect the purpose of their partaking in His own joy of obedience, and to secure the permanence and completeness of their own glad following of the Divine will (Joh 15:11). Again, the natural sorrow at His approaching departure is to be a sorrow like that of a woman in her birth-pangs,—a sorrow, that is, which is not only full of purpose, but is a necessary element in a great deliverance; and the joy that will succeed not only causes forgetfulness of the previous suffering, but abides, while the pain is only a passing and comparatively unimportant experience (Joh 16:20-24).

And, finally, in the great prayer of intercession contained in John 17, our Lord requests that the joy which was His own peculiar possession should find its full accomplishment in the hearts of His disciples (Joh 17:13). The joy thus foretold and interceded for is noted by the Evangelist as a possession of the disciples immediately after the resurrection. In Mat 28:8 we are told that the women departed from the tomb 'with fear and great joy,' while the effect of the gladness is noted by Lk., with a truthfulness to human experience that is most remarkable, as being itself a ground of scepticism (see Luk 24:41). This joy was not only the possession, but the abiding possession of the early Church, as frequent notes in the Book of Acts prove; and many passages in St. Paul's Epistles speak of joy as one of the true fruits of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit (see Act 13:52 and Gal 5:22).

While the passages above examined contain most of the instances in which the words 'joy' or 'rejoice' are used in the Gospels, there remain very many passages in which the idea is prominent. Our Lord's own description of Himself, for instance, as the Bridegroom when He is vindicating the liberty of His disciples to abstain from the ascetic practices of the Pharisees, shows how He conceived His mission and ministry (see Mar 2:18-22). Many of the parables, other than those already named, set forth the inherent joy of the Kingdom, as, for example, those of the Wedding Supper and the Ten Virgins. The Lord's Supper itself was a feast of joy, for, according to Lk.'s account (Luk 22:15), our Lord said, 'With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer,' thus indicating that He had eagerly and gladly anticipated it; and in the further words that He speaks on that occasion He indicates that there is only to be a pause in the joy which will be resumed and heightened in other surroundings. 'I will not,' He continues, 'drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come,' or, as Mt. phrases it (Mat 26:29), 'until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.'

There must have been much in our Lord's intercourse with the people that led them to see in Him a helper of their joys rather than a restraint upon their merriment. He

was, for example, an honoured guest at a wedding feast (Joh 2:1), and at many a social meal (cf. Luk 14:1 and Joh 12:2); and when He decided to abide at the house of Zacchaeus, we are told that the latter ‘received him joyfully.’ In His triumphal entry into Jerusalem the people gladly welcomed Him (Luk 19:37), and the children cried joyfully in the Temple, ‘Hosanna to the Son of David’ (Mat 21:15). All these more or less exuberant outbursts of spontaneous joy greatly offended the Pharisees and other formal religionists; and while it would not be correct to say that our Lord designedly arranged circumstances in which the contrasts would be clearly manifested, still the conditions in which they were so displayed were admirable parables in action of some of the deepest truths of His kingdom.

There is much beauty, as well as truth, in the imaginary description of Renan: ‘He thus traversed Galilee in the midst of a continual feast. When He entered a house it was considered a joy and a blessing. He halted in the villages and at the large farms, where He received open hospitality. In the East when a stranger enters a house it becomes at once a public place. All the village assembles there, the children invade it, they are put out by the servants, but always return. Jesus could not suffer these innocent auditors to be treated harshly. He caused them to be brought to Him and embraced them.... He protected those who wished to honour Him. In this way children and women came to adore Him’ (*Life of Jesus*, ch. xi.).

The joy that emanated from our Lord’s person and presence during His earthly ministry was without question a great part of its power. His attitude stood in such clear contrast to the general character of the religious people round about Him, that the consciousness of it must have been felt by all the onlookers; but in addition to this fact was the whole teaching about His kingdom, which, as set forth in parable and precept, was to be a kingdom of gladness. In this latter respect it came into line with what the prophets had described as the marked characteristic of the Kingdom of God, and also with what the Jewish apocalypses pictured as the outcome of the Messiah’s advent. That a more earthly conception of joy filled the hearts of many of the disciples there is little reason to question, but a great deal of our Lord’s teaching was directed to spiritualize their hopes and to deepen their insight into the true character of spiritual joy.

Literature.—The Comm. on the passages referred to, esp. the Introductions to Lk. by Plummer and Adeney; art. ‘Joy’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible ; Bruce, *Galilean Gospel*, chs. 7. 12.; Farrar, *Life of Christ*, new ed. 1894, 225 ff.; J. W. Diggle, *Short Studies in Holiness*, 1900, 111 ff.; G. Matheson, *Studies in the Portrait of Christ*, 1st series, 272 ff.; J. Moffatt in *Expos, Times*, ix. (1898) 334.

G. Currie Martin.

Judaea

JUDAEA.—1. In its earlier signification the term ‘Judaea’ (Ἰουδαία) was applied to a limited district, of which Jerusalem was the centre, occupied by the captives who returned from Babylon after the decree of Cyrus. The scattered remnants of the Israelites who availed themselves of this opportunity, representing most, if not all, of the several tribes, joined forces with the men of Judah in rebuilding the Temple and its defences; and from this date, except on the lists of the genealogical and tribal records, they were not distinguished from them. Hence the tribe of Judah, which, according to Josephus, arrived first in those parts, gave name both to the inhabitants and the territory, the former being designated as Jews and the latter as ‘Judaea’ or ‘Jewry’ (*Ant.* xi. v. 7). At a later date both names were used in a wider sense, including all the Israelites who returned, and also their settlements or possessions in other sections of the land. Under Persian rule the land of Judah was designated as a province of the Empire, and was administered by a governor, who resided at Jerusalem (Ezr 5:8; Ezr 5:14, Neh 11:3, Hag 1:1; Hag 1:14). During the period of the Roman occupation the term was sometimes used as a general expression for Palestine as a whole (*BJ* i. viii. 2; Strabo, xvi. 2. 21; Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 6; Luk 1:5, Act 28:21), also to include a portion, apparently, of the trans-Jordanic country (*Ant.* xii. iv. 11; Mat 19:1, Mar 10:1; Ptol. v. 16. 9). Apart from this exceptional usage, the name ordinarily—as we find it in the NT and the writings of Josephus—is applied to the southernmost of the three districts—Galilee, Samaria, Judaea—into which Western Palestine was divided in the time of Christ. With some variations on the north and west borders at different periods, Judaea covered all of the territory south of the *Wady Ishar* and the village of *Akrabbeh* (*PEFSt* [Note: *EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.*] , 1881, p. 48), from the Mediterranean to the Jordan Valley and the Dead Sea. According to Josephus, its limits extended from a village on the north called Annath, or Borkeos, identified with *Aina Berkit*, to Iardas (possibly *Tell Arad*), on the edge of the desert, to the south. Its breadth he defines, in general terms, as extending from the river Jordan to Joppa (*BJ* iii. iii. 5). In other words, its area practically corresponded with the area of the kingdom of Judah in the period of its greatest enlargement. As thus defined it included the tribal possessions of Simeon, Judah, Benjamin, Dan, and, to some extent at least, of Ephraim.

A distinction should be noted here between the use of the word Judaea to designate *strictly Jewish* territory, from which the outlying Hellenistic or Gentile towns were excluded, and the Roman usage of the word to designate a political division, which for administrative purposes included all the coast towns south of Mt. Carmel, the chief of which in the time of Christ was Caesarea, the residence of its Procurator. In

the one case its northern limit was Antipatris, on the plain of Sharon; in the other it extended to Acre (Ptolemais) beyond Mt. Carmel. The S.E. portion of Judaea has sometimes been designated as a separate district under the name *Idumaea*, but this term properly describes a settlement of the Edomites in Judaea, and not a separate division of the country. Idumaea, according to Josephus, was one of the eleven toparchies into which Judaea proper was divided for administrative purposes under Roman rule (*BJ* iii. iii. 5). See Idumaea.

2. When our Lord was born, Judaea constituted a part of the dominion of Herod the Great, who accordingly is called by the Evangelists 'king of Judaea' (Luk 1:5, cf. Mat 2:1). After the death of Herod, the Roman emperor assumed the right to settle the dispute which had arisen among his sons concerning the division of the kingdom, and by his decree Judaea and Samaria were in the partition assigned to Archelaus. The sovereignty of Rome was more fully asserted also at this time in refusing to any of Herod's sons the title 'king.' When by the same authority Archelaus was deposed (a.d. 6), the territory over which he held rule was attached to the province of Syria, and thus for the first time came under immediate Roman rule. From this date it was administered by a governor or procurator, who was chosen from the equestrian order. Following Archelaus the province was administered by five procurators during the life and ministry of Jesus, viz. Coponius (*circa (about)* a.d. 6-9), Marcus Ambivius (*circa (about)* 9-12), Annius Rufus (*circa (about)* 12-15), Valerius Gratus (15-25), Pontius Pilate (26-36). It was during Pilate's rule that the word of God came to John the Baptist in the wilderness, and some years later this Roman procurator made his name for ever infamous by giving sentence that the Christ, whom he had openly declared to be innocent of crime, should be led away to be crucified.

3. The *physical features of Judaea* are sharply outlined and singularly diversified. Its distinctive characteristics fall naturally into five subdivisions, originally suggested by the OT writers, viz. the 'Plain of the Coast,' the 'Shephelah' or region of the low hills, the 'Hill country,' the 'Negeb' or dry country, and the 'Wilderness.'

The Maritime Plain varies in width from 10 to 16 miles. It is for the most part flat or rolling, and rises gradually toward the base of the mountains. The upper portion (Sharon) is noted for its rich pasturage; the lower (Philistia) for its vast grain-fields, which have yielded enormous crops without the use of fertilizers, except such as nature has distributed over its surface from the wash and waste of the mountains, for forty centuries. The international highway which follows the line of the coast inside the region of the sand-dunes is one of the oldest caravan and military roads in the world. Most of the noted towns of the Plain are on or near this ancient highway. This section of Judaea has no associations with the life or ministry of Jesus, but in the Acts there are several references to visits which were made, or events which took place, in

its towns, in connexion with the work of the Apostles or their associates (chs. 8-10 and 18-21).

The 'Shephelah' belongs to the plain rather than to the central ridge of the mountains, from which it is distinctly separated by a series of almost continuous breaks or depressions. It has been aptly described as 'a loose gathering of chalk and limestone hills, round, bare, and featureless, but with an occasional bastion flung well out in front of them.' There are several noted valleys, which begin their courses as wadis in the central range, and cut their way through the Shephelah to the plain. Each of these affords a passage-way into the heart of the mountain stronghold of Judaea, and each has its distinct characteristics and historical associations. Apostles and evangelists entered this region soon after the dispersion of the believers at Jerusalem, and in its limestone grottoes, in the days of the persecutions, multitudes of hunted and outlawed Christians found refuges and hiding-places (*HGHL* [Note: *GHL* Historical Geog. of Holy Land.] , ch. 11.).

The 'Hill country' or highland region fills most of the space between the Jordan Valley and the sea, and gives character to the district as a whole. In its present condition it is the most rugged and desolate section of the Lebanon range. In former times its hillsides were terraced, and every available break in its table-lands was carefully cultivated; and yet in every period of its history it has been regarded as a rough, stony land, more suitable for pastoral than for agricultural pursuits. Its watershed is an irregular, undulating plateau, which varies in width from 12 to 18 miles. The general direction of the numerous ravines or torrent-beds which diversify, and in some sections deeply corrugate, its sides, is east and west. On the east side they are short, direct, and deeply cleft; on the west, comparatively long and shallow, reaching the coast often by circuitous routes. The highest elevation (3564 ft.) is *er-Ramah*, a short distance north of Hebron. The general average of the plateau on which Jerusalem is located is about 2500 ft. South of Hebron there is a gradual descent by steps or terraced slopes to the region which for many centuries has borne the distinctive name 'Negeb' or dry country.

The 'Wilderness' includes the whole of the eastern slope or declivity of the Judaeian mountains. It is a barren, uncultivated region, unique in its setting, and notable above all other sections of the land for its desolation, its loneliness, and its scenes of wild and savage grandeur. The variation in levels from the edge of the plateau to the surface of the Dead Sea is but little short of 4000 ft., nearly one half of which is a precipitous descent from sea-level to the margin of the deeply depressed basin amid the silent hills. In this 'land not inhabited' John the Baptist sought seclusion while preparing for his ministry as the forerunner of the Messiah; and here the Holy One, concerning whom he bore record, abode 'forty days tempted of Satan; and was with

the wild beasts; and the angels ministered unto him' (Mat_3:1-6 || Luk_3:2, Mat_4:1-11 || Mar_1:12-13).

4. The sacred memories and thronging events which have been, and for ever shall be, associated with these holy hills cannot be fittingly expressed by voice or pen. In the long ages past the highways of this Judaeian plateau have been trodden by the feet of patriarchs, prophets, priests, and kings, and for centuries its sanctuary on Mt. Zion was the dwelling-place of Jehovah; but, more than all else in its wonderful history, it was the place of the incarnation, the self-denying ministry, the agony, the death, the resurrection, and the ascension of the Son of God, the Saviour of the world.

Literature.—Stanley, *SP* [Note: P Sinai and Palestine.] pp. 227-233; Conder, *Pal.* [Note: Palestine, Palestinian.] ch. 1. p. 221; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] , index; G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [Note: GH Historical Geog. of Holy Land.] , chs. 12.-15.; Neubauer, *Géog. du Talm.* p. 52 ff.; *PEF* [Note: EF Palestine Exploration Fund.] *Memoirs*, vol. iii.; C. W. Wilson in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , vol. ii. p. 791; Smith, *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , vol. ii. p. 1488; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , art. 'Palestine'; Baedeker, *Pal.* [Note: Palestine, Palestinian.] *and Syria*, lvi.

Robert L. Stewart.

⚠Judah

JUDAH.—The eponymous ancestor of the tribe to which our Lord belonged (Mat_1:2 f., Luk_3:33, Heb_7:14; cf. art. Genealogies).

⚠Judah

JUDAH (Ἰουδα).—Two passages in the Gospels mention 'Judah' (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), or 'Juda' (Authorized Version), which is orthographically distinct from 'Judaea' (Ἰουδαία) as well as geographically smaller. The one is Mat_2:6 'And thou Bethlehem, land of Judah, art in no wise least among the princes of Judah,' etc., alluding to Bethlehem, the birthplace of Christ, in the heart of the hill country. The other is Luk_1:39 'And Mary arose in these days and went into the hill country

with haste, into a city of Judah'; which also probably alludes to some town in the centre of the hill country, the birthplace of John the Baptist. In the latter passage, however, instead of εἰς πόλιν Ἰουδα, Reland in 1714 (*Pal.* [Note: Palestine, Palestinian.] p. 870), endorsed by Robinson in 1841 (*BRP* [Note: RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ii. 206) and others of more recent date, emend to read εἰς πόλιν Ἰούτα, *i.e.* 'Juttah' in lieu of 'Judah.' But there is no good philological reason for thinking that the latter is a corruption or softer pronunciation of the former; and, as the context would indicate, the word 'Judah' in [Luk_1:39](#) seems to be parallel to the 'hill country' of [Luk_1:65](#) (cf. Cheyne, art. 'Juttah' in *Encyc. Bibl.*, also Plummer, *Int. Crit. Com. ad Luk_1:39*). It is, therefore, probably better to treat the passage as a reference to that portion of the hill country of Judah round about Hebron, or to the south of it. Tradition has fixed upon 'Ain Kârim, a little west of Jerusalem, as the birthplace of John the Baptist. See, further, artt. Judaea, Hill, etc.

George L. Robinson.

⚠ Judas

JUDAS

1. Judas the son of James. The eleventh name in two lists of the Apostles ([Luk_6:16](#), [Act_1:13](#)) is Ἰούδος Ἰακώβου. Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'Judas *the son of James*' is a better rendering than Authorized Version 'Judas *the brother of James*.' The note in (Revised Version margin) is 'Or *brother*. See [Jud_1:1](#)'; but in [Jud_1:1](#) there is no ambiguity; the Gr. text is ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου. The Authorized Version rendering is grammatically possible; but it is improbable that the genitive has two different meanings in one short list of names (cf. Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'James *the son of Alphaeus*'), and it is noteworthy that in [Luk_3:1](#); [Luk_6:14](#) ἀδελφός is expressed. The Authorized Version rendering may have been caused by [Jud_1:1](#); certainly it has led to the erroneous identification of these two Judases. The evidence of Versions is in favour of Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885. Syr^{Pesh} and Theb. have 'son of'; 'none suggests the exceptional rendering "the brother of"' (Plummer in Smith's *DB* [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] , vol. i. pt. 2). Syr^{Sin} has 'Judas son of James' instead of Thaddaeus or Lebbaeus in [Mat_10:4](#).

2. Judas the brother of James.—In two Gospels (Mat 13:55, Mar 6:3) ‘James and Joseph and Simon and Judas’ are named as brothers of Jesus. In Jud 1:1 the author of that Epistle is described as ‘Judas ... the brother of James’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). The Authorized Version has ‘Jude’; and in Mar 6:3 ‘Juda.’ ‘Judas the brother of James’ is, therefore, a designation both Scriptural and simple, yet sufficient to distinguish the person so named from ‘Judas the son of James,’ who was an Apostle. The use of the full expression ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου in the Epistle of Jude, and the statement (Mat 13:55) that Judas and James were οἱ ἀδελφοὶ [Ἰησοῦ], justifies the limiting of the title ‘the brother of James’ to the Judas who was also a ‘brother of Jesus.’ Much confusion has been caused by the erroneous Authorized Version rendering of Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου (cf. No. 1 above).

Of ‘Judas the brother of James’ as an individual we know nothing; but account should be taken of what is said collectively of our Lord’s brothers. He was probably a son of Joseph and Mary, and a younger brother of Jesus (cf. ‘Brethren of the Lord’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible); he misunderstood the popularity of Jesus (Mat 12:46 ff.), who was, in his estimation, a foolish enthusiast (Mar 3:21); before the resurrection of Jesus he did not acknowledge his Brother as the Messiah (Joh 7:3 ff.), but after the resurrection he is found ‘in prayer’ in the upper room (Act 1:14); his doubts, like those of his brother James (1Co 15:7), may have vanished in the presence of the risen Lord. The distinct mention of the brothers of Jesus (Act 1:14) after the Eleven have been named, is another reason for rejecting the tradition which identifies ‘Judas the brother of James’ with Judas Thaddaeus the Apostle.

The authorship of the Epistle of Jude is much disputed. Harnack regards the words ‘brother of James’ as an interpolation added towards the end of the 2nd cent. to enhance the value of the Epistle ‘as a weapon against Gnosticism.’ But ‘the simplest interpretation of the salutation, which identifies the writer ... with the brother of the Lord, is the best’ (Chase, Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible ii. 804^a).

Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 19, 20:1-8, 32) quotes from Hegesippus the account of an accusation brought against the grandchildren of Judas; they are described as ‘descended from one of the so-called brothers of the Saviour, whose name was Judas’; it is further said that ‘after they had borne testimony before Domitian in behalf of faith in Christ ... they took the lead of every church as witnesses and as relatives of the Lord.’ If ‘Judas the brother of James’ presided over the Church in the city where he lived, he may well have been the author of an Epistle. Mrs. Lewis conjectures that ‘Thomas, the doubting disciple, is identical with Jude, the youngest brother of our Lord’; but this theory involves his exclusion from the statement in Joh 7:5 that our Lord’s brothers did not believe that He was the Messiah (cf. *Exp^T*

[Note: xpT Expository Times.] xiv. 398; also Rendel Harris, *The Dioscuri in the Christian Legends*).

3. Judas Iscariot.—See following article.

J. G. Tasker.

⚠ Judas Iscariot

JUDAS ISCARIOT

- i. The NT sources.
- ii. Name and Designations:
 - (a) Judas.
 - (b) Iscariot.
 - (c) One of the Twelve.
 - (d) A thief.
 - (e) Betrayer or traitor.
 - (f) A devil.
 - (g) Son of perdition.
- iii. Other NT references to Judas:
 - (a) Before the Betrayal;
 - (b) Describing the Betrayal;
 - (c) After the Betrayal.
- iv. The character of Judas:
 - (a) The good motives theory;

(b) The Satan incarnate theory;

(c) The mingled motives theory; he was (α) covetous, (β) ambitious, (γ) jealous.

v. References to Judas in post-Biblical literature:

(a) Apocryphal works;

(b) Early Christian writings.

(c) Folk-lore.

Literature.

i. The NT sources.—The basis of any satisfactory solution of the fascinating and perplexing problem of the personality of Judas must be a comprehensive and careful study of the words of Jesus and the records of the Evangelists. Interest in his life and character may have been unduly sacrificed to dogmatic discussions of ‘fix’d fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute,’ but the reaction in favour of psychological methods of study may be carried to excess. Conclusions arrived at by the use of these methods are not always consistent with the historical data furnished by the Gospels. In psychological as well as theological investigations, speculation may prove an unsafe guide; at least it should always move in a path made by prolonging the lines laid down in the documents which are the main sources of our information. Theories framed by induction from a critical comparison of the narratives may claim to be attempts to untie the knot, but theories involving excisions from, and conjectural emendations of, the text of the Gospels and Acts are mere cuttings of the knot. A frank acknowledgment that there are difficulties at present inexplicable is preferable to the adoption of such violent methods of removing them. The NT material available for the investigation of the subject in its manifold aspects is found in the following passages:

1. The lists of the Apostles: Mar 3:16 ff., Mat 10:2 ff., Luk 6:13 ff.

2. Early allusions to Judas: Joh 6:64 ff; Joh 12:4 ff; Joh 17:12, Luk 22:3 (cf. Mar 14:4 f., Mat 26:8 f.).

3. The narratives of the Betrayal: Mar 14:10 f., Mat 26:14 ff., Luk 22:4 ff.; Joh 13:2 ff.; Mar 14:18 ff., Mat 26:21 ff., Luk 22:21 ff., Joh 13:21 ff.; Mar 14:43 ff., Mat 26:47 ff., Luk 22:47 f., Joh 18:2 ff.

4. The two accounts of the death of Judas: Mat 27:3 ff., Act 1:16 ff.

From this classification it will be seen that, with the exception of Luk 22:3, the Synoptists say nothing about Judas before the Betrayal; their account of the Betrayal also differs in many details from that given in the Fourth Gospel. Some divergent traditions it is difficult, and perhaps impossible, to harmonize; assumptions that the one is an intentional modification of the other, or that they are contradictory, must be carefully examined; suggestions that they are supplementary, or mutually explanatory, must be fairly considered. Statements in the Fourth Gospel which are said to show John's bias against Judas will be investigated in due course.

ii. Name and Designations

(a) *Judas*.—In all the lists of the Twelve this is the name of the Apostle mentioned last. Another Apostle (see preced. art. No. 1) bore this common Jewish name, but 'Judas' now means the Betrayer of Jesus. His sin has stamped the word with such evil significance that it has become the class-name of perfidious friends, who are 'no better than Judases' (cf. 'Judas-hole,' 'Judas-trap,' etc.).

Ἰουδᾶς is the Gr. form of the Heb. *Judah* (יְהוּדָה), which in Gen 29:35 is derived from the verb 'to praise' (יָדָה), and is taken as meaning 'one who is the subject of praise' (cf. Gen 49:8). The etymology is disputed, but in its popular sense it suggests a striking paradox, when used of one whose name became a synonym for shame.

(b) *Iscariot*: the usual surname of Judas. Ἰσκαριώθ, a transliteration from Heb., is the best attested reading in Mar 3:19; Mar 14:10, Luk 6:16; Ἰσκαριώτης, the Graecized form in Mat 26:14, Luk 22:3, Joh 6:71; Joh 13:2; Joh 13:26; ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης in Mat 10:4, Joh 12:4; Joh 14:22. Eight of these passages refer to Judas; in two (Joh 6:71; Joh 13:26) his father Simon is called Iscariot; once (Joh 14:22) his fellow-Apostle is distinguished from his more famous namesake as 'not the Iscariot.' Only in Joh 13:2 does the full phrase occur—'Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon.' Nestle thinks that ἀπὸ Καριώτου, a reading of Codex Bezae, found four times in Jn instead of Ἰσκαριώτης, is a paraphrastic rendering of Iscariot by the author of the Fourth Gospel. Chase furnishes other evidence for this reading (*The Syro-Latin Text of the Gospels*, p. 102f.), but argues that it cannot be part of the original text. His conclusion is that an early Syriac translator represented Ἰσκαριώτης by this paraphrase (cf. *Exp^T* [Note: xpT Expository Times.] ix. pp. 189, 240, 283)

Two facts already mentioned have an important bearing on the interpretation of Ἰσκαριώτης: (1) the true reading, ‘Simon Iscariot,’ shows that the epithet was equally applicable to the father and the son, and this twofold use of the word suggests that it is a local name; (2) the paraphrase ἀπὸ Καριώτου confirms the view that Judas is named after his place of abode (cf. Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus*, p. 393). Cheyne says ‘we should have expected ἀπο κεριωθ,’ yet admits that ‘it is a plausible view’ that Ἰσκαριώτης is derived from Ish-Kerioth (שִׁיחַ קְרִיּוֹת), ‘a man of Kerioth’ (*Ency. Bibl.* ii. 2624). Dalman (*The Words of Jesus*, p. 51 f.) thinks that Ἰσκαριώθ was the original reading, and points back to the Hebrew, whilst ὁ ἀπὸ Καριώτου corresponds to the equivalent Aramaic קְרִיּוֹת הַבֵּן or קְרִיּוֹת הַבֵּן. Hence the surname *Iseariot* probably means ‘a Kariothite.’

It is impossible to say with certainty where the **Kerioth** was situated of which Judas was a native. (1) On account of this difficulty, Cheyne conjectures that Ἰεριχωτῆς, ‘a man of Jericho,’ is the true reading. (2) The majority of scholars incline to the view that Kerioth is the Kerioth-Hezron or Hazor of Jos 15:25 (Vulgate *Carioth*); Buhl identifies the place with the modern *Karjaten* in South Judah (*GAP* [Note: AP Geographic des alten Palästina.] p. 182). (3) Others suggest the Kerioth mentioned in Amo 2:2, Jer 48:24 (LXX Septuagint Καριώθ),—an important city, either Kir-Moab, or Ar, the capital of Moab. Harper (‘Am. and Hos.,’ *Int. Crit. Com.* p. 42) says that ‘the reference in the Moabite stone (l. 13) favours Ewald’s view that it is another name for Ar.’ A less probable opinion is that the town referred to is Κορέαι or Kurawa (Josephus *BJ* i. vi. 5, iv. viii. 1; *Ant.* xiv. iii. 4) in North Judaea (Buhl, *GAP* [Note: AP Geographic des alten Palästina.] p. 181). If any one of these towns was the birthplace of Judas, he was not a Galilean.

(c) ‘*One of the Twelve.*’—In the Synoptic Gospels this phrase is found only in the narrative of the Betrayal, and it is applied only to Judas. It marks the mingled sorrow and indignation of the Evangelists, that within that select circle there could be a single treacherous heart. The simple formula is once changed by St. Luke (22:3), who adds to his statement that ‘Satan entered into Judas’ these significant words: ‘being of the number of the twelve’—*i.e.* counted among those whom Jesus called His friends, but about to become an ally of His foes, because in spirit he was ‘none of his’ (cf. Mat 26:14; Mat 26:47, Mar 14:10; Mar 14:20; Mar 14:43, Luk 22:3; Luk 22:47). In the Fourth Gospel the phrase is used once of another than Judas; like a note of exclamation, it expresses surprise that Thomas, a member of the Apostolic band, was

absent when the risen Saviour appeared to His disciples (Joh_20:24). But St. John also applies the phrase to Judas, giving it a position in which its tragic and pathetic emphasis cannot be mistaken: ‘You—the twelve, did not I choose? and of you one is a devil. Now he spake of Judas, the son of Simon Iscariot; for it was he that was about to betray him—one of the twelve’ (Joh_6:70-71). St. John’s phrase (εἷς ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα α) differs slightly from that used by the Synoptists (εἷς τῶν δώδεκα); Westcott suggests that it marks ‘the unity of the body to which the unfaithful member belonged’ (*Com. in loc.*).

That Judas was ‘one of the twelve’ is an important factor in the problem presented by his history. It implies that Jesus saw in him the material out of which an Apostle might have been made,—the clay out of which a vessel unto honour might have been shaped; it implies that Judas, of free-will, chose to follow Jesus and to continue with Him; and it implies that Judas heard from the Master’s lips words of gracious warning against the peril of his besetting sin. On the other hand, the fact that Judas was ‘one of the twelve’ does not imply that Jesus had the betrayal in view when He chose this Apostle and entrusted him with the common purse; it does not imply that even in that most holy environment Judas was exempted from the working of the spiritual law that such ‘evil things’ as ‘thefts ... covetings, ... deceit ... proceed from within, and defile the man’ (Mar_7:22 f.); and it does not imply that there were no good impulses in the heart of Judas when he became a disciple of Jesus. Of Judas in his darkest hour the words of Lavater are true: he ‘acted like Satan, but like a Satan who had it in him to be an Apostle.’

In Mar_14:10 the best supported reading (⌘BCLM) is ὁ εἷς τῶν δώδεκα, with a note in (Revised Version margin) —‘Gr. the one of the twelve.’ Wright (*Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek*, p. 31, cf. p. 147) is of opinion that Mk. distinctly calls Judas ‘the chief of the twelve.’ He takes ὁ εἷς as equal to ὁ πρῶτος, as in τῆ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων (Mar_16:2). But the definite article is not found with this phrase in any other passage in the Gospels; moreover, it is almost impossible to believe that when the Gospels were written the assertion that Judas was ‘the chief’ or even *primus inter pares* had a place in the original text. On the other hand, Field (*Notes on the Translation of the NT, in loc.*) is scarcely justified in saying ‘ὁ εἷς τῶν δ. can mean nothing but “the first (No. 1) of the twelve,” which is absurd.’* [Note: Swete (*Com. in loc.*) explains the phrase as a contrast with οἱ λοιποὶ, ‘the rest’; Judas was ‘the only one of the twelve’ who turned traitor.] The unique reading may, however, preserve a genuine reminiscence of a time in the earlier ministry of Jesus when Judas, the treasurer of the Apostolic company, had a kind of priority. If this were so, there would come a time when, as Wright suggests, the supporters of Judas would become ‘jealous of the

honour bestowed on Peter.’† [Note: There is force in Edersheim’s remark (*Life and Times*, ii. 536), that ‘viewed in its primary elements (not in its development) Peter’s character was, among the disciples, the likeliest to that of Judas.’] Jealousy would account not only for the dispute about rival claims to be the greatest, but also for the respective positions of Judas and Peter at the supper-table. The most probable explanation of the details given (Mat 26:23, Joh 13:23; Joh 13:26) is that John was reclining on the right of Jesus; but Judas ‘claimed and obtained the chief seat at the table’ next Jesus, and was reclining on His left, whilst ‘the lowest place was voluntarily taken by Peter, who felt keenly the Lord’s rebuke of this strife for precedence’ (cf. Andrews, *The Life of our Lord*, p. 485; Edersheim, *Life and Times*, ii. 493).

(d) ‘A thief.’—The meaning of the statement that ‘Judas was a thief’ (Joh 12:6) is quite plain, if the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 correctly renders the following sentence: ‘and having the bag, *took away* (ἐβάσταξεν) what was put therein.’ βασιτάξω means (1) to bear, (2) to bear away, as in Joh 20:15 (cf. ‘cattle-lifting’). Its use in the sense of bearing away secretly or pilfering is established (cf. Field, *op. cit. in loc.*). In this context the statement that Judas carried the money put into the bag which was in his possession seems singularly tame, if it is not mere repetition. On the other hand, to say that Judas had formed the habit of pilfering is a natural explanation of the assertion that he had been guilty of theft. Weiss (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 443) thinks that ‘John had found out thefts committed by the greedy Judas’; this does not necessarily imply that the thefts were known to John at the time of Mary’s anointing, for they may have come to light after that act, but before the narrative was shaped in this form.

The rendering of ἐβάσταξεν by the neutral word ‘hare’ is adopted by some, who hold that John’s words do not imply more than that Judas had a thievish disposition. Ainger adopts this interpretation in a finely-wrought study of the character of Judas (*The Gospel and Human Life*, p. 231). It is true in a sense that ‘he may have been a thief long before he began to steal,’ but this exposition involves the unlikely assumption that the betrayal of Jesus was the ‘first act by which he converted his spirit of greed into actual money profit.’ If Judas had not formed the habit of pilfering, it is more difficult to understand how the thirty pieces of silver could be a real temptation to him.

Cheyne gets rid of the difficulty by assuming that the text is corrupt. In his conjectural emendation the word ‘thief’ has no place; he reads ‘because he was a harsh man, and used to carry the common purse’ (ὅτι χαλετὸς ἦν καὶ τὸ κοινὸν βαλλάντιον ἐβάσταξε). ‘The statement about Judas’ in this hypothetical text is then

naïvely said to be ‘worthy of more credit than it has sometimes received from advanced critics’ (*Ency. Bibl.* ii. 2625).

(e) ‘*Betrayer*’ or ‘*traitor*.’—In the list of the Apostles given in Luk 6:16 there is a variation from the phrase by which Judas is usually described. Instead of *δς καὶ παρὲς δωκεν αὐτόν* (‘who also betrayed him,’ *lit.* ‘delivered him up’) St. Luke has *δς ἐγένετο ὁ προδότης*, well rendered by Field—‘who turned traitor’ (cf. Amer. Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘became a traitor’; Weymouth, ‘proved to be a traitor’). The translation in the Authorized and Revised Versions—‘which was the traitor’—neither brings out the force of *γίνομαι*, nor the significance of the omission of the article.

The statement that Judas ‘turned traitor’ should be remembered in framing or estimating theories to account for his history; it confirms what has been said on this subject under (c). From this point of view the various phrases used in the Gospels will repay careful discrimination: most frequent is the simple statement of the tragic deed as a historic fact—‘who betrayed him’ (Mar 3:19 *παρέδωκεν*); but there is also the prophecy, ‘The Son of Man is about to be betrayed’ (Mat 17:22 *μέλλει παραδίδοσθαι*), and the statement, when the time was drawing nigh, that the process had already begun, ‘The Son of Man is being betrayed’ (Mat 26:2 *παραδίδεται*). Similarly, Judas is described as ‘he who would betray him’ (Joh 6:64 *ὁ παραδώσων*), ‘he who is betraying me’ (Mat 26:46 *ὁ παραδιδούς*), and as ‘he who had betrayed him’ (Mat 27:3 *ὁ παραδούς*). In this connexion Joh 6:64 deserves special attention: ‘Jesus knew from the beginning ... who it was that should betray him.’ Needless difficulties are occasioned when ‘from the beginning’ is regarded as referring to any period before the call of Judas; the thought seems to be that Jesus perceived ‘from the beginning’ of His intercourse with Judas the spirit that was in him. Hence the statement is wrongly interpreted in a fatalistic sense. The rendering, ‘Jesus knew who it was that would betray him’ has the advantage of suggesting that Jesus discerned the thoughts and intents of His unfaithful Apostle, and knew that ‘the germ of the traitor-spirit was already in the heart of Judas’ (cf. W. F. Moulton in Schaff’s *Popular Commentary*, *in loc.*)* [Note: Our Lord’s words to Pilate, ‘He that delivered me unto thee hath greater sin’ (Joh 19:11), are sometimes applied to Judas; but the reference is almost certainly to Caiaphas.]

(f) ‘*A devil*.’—In Joh 6:70 there is a contrast between the hopes of Jesus when He chose (*ἐξελεξάμην*) the Twelve, and His present grief over the moral deterioration of

one whose nature is now devilish (διάβολός ἐστιν). Our Lord's spiritual discourse to the multitude brought all who heard it to the parting of the ways; it shattered the hopes of those who were eager to share in the glories of an earthly kingdom. On the inner circle of the Apostles that teaching also cast its searching light; to Jesus, though not to Peter (v. 69), it was plain that Judas was at heart a deserter,—in sympathy with those who 'went back and walked no more with him.' What Jesus detected in Judas was 'a sudden crystallization of evil, diabolic purpose, which made him a very adversary of the one whom he called friend' (Wright, *op. cit. in loc.*). But an adversary is not an irreconcilable foe; the assertion taken in its full strength of meaning is a message of conciliation as well as of warning. It involved no lowering of the position of Judas among the Twelve, for his name is not mentioned; and it assuredly involved no relaxing of our Lord's efforts to scatter with the light of love the gloom which was creeping into the heart of one whom He had chosen 'to be with him.' A strained interpretation of the saying underlies the statement that it 'appears to be inconsistent with the equal confidence in all the disciples shown by Jesus according to the Synoptic tradition' (*Ency. Bibl.* ii. 2624). 'No man,' says Pressensé, 'could be more akin to a devil than a perverted apostle' (*Jesus Christ*, p. 324).

(g) '*Son of perdition.*'—The Gr. word rendered 'perdition' in this phrase (Joh 17:12) is ἀπώλεια, which signifies *the state of being lost*. It is the substantive derived from the same root as the main verb of the sentence (ἀπώλετο). The connexion of thought is not easy to reproduce in English. Ainger (*op. cit.* p. 227) brings out the sense of the passage in a paraphrase: 'None of them is lost, but he whose very nature it was to be lost—he (that is to say) whose insensibility to the Divine touch, whose irresponsiveness to the heavenly discipline, made it a certainty that he should fall away.' The apostasy of Judas is traced to the 'natural gravitation' of his character. By a well-known Hebraism Judas is described as the 'son of' that which stamps his nature; he is of such a character that his proper state is one of loss (cf. 2Th 2:3). The same word (ἀπώλεια) is rendered 'waste' in the Synoptic accounts of Mary's anointing (Mat 26:9, Mar 14:4). 'To what purpose is this waste?' was the expression of indignation of 'some' (Mk.) of the disciples; perhaps it was originally the question of Judas, though St. John does not say so. It may well be, however, that he whose audible murmur, 'Why this loss or waste?' was echoed by the other disciples is himself described by Jesus as 'the son of loss'—'the waster.'

This verse (Joh 17:12) is often appealed to by rival champions of Calvinism and Arminianism. In Bishop Sanderson's *Works* (v. 324 f.) there is a letter to him from H. Hammond, who affirms that 'here it is expressly said that Judas, though by his apostasy now become the son of perdition, was by God given to Christ.' But the true reading is, 'I kept them in thy name which thou hast given me' (Revised Version NT

1881, OT 1885), and the thought (cf. Joh 17:9 ‘those whom thou hast given me’) is rather that ‘they in whom the Father’s object is attained’ are those ‘given’ to the Son; Judas, therefore, was not so given. ‘To suppose that Judas is now brought before us as one originally doomed to perdition, and that his character was but the evolving of his doom, would contradict not only the meaning of the Hebraic expression “son of” (which always takes for granted moral choice), but the whole teaching of this Gospel. In no book of the NT is the idea of will, of choice on the part of man, brought forward so repeatedly and with so great an emphasis’ (W. F. Moulton, *op. cit. in loc.*).

iii. Other NT References to Judas

(a) *Before the Betrayal.*—The obscurity which rests upon the early history of Judas accounts to a large extent for the difficulty of estimating his character. But for occasional allusions in the Fourth Gospel, all that is related of him before the Betrayal is that he was one of the chosen Twelve, and that he turned traitor. There is, however, a statement peculiar to St. Luke among the Synoptists, which is obviously intended to furnish an explanation of the act of Betrayal—‘Satan entered into Judas’ (John 22:3). It finds a fitting place in the introduction to the narrative of the Betrayal in the psychological Gospel which so often gives internal reasons; ‘the Gospel of the physician is also the Gospel of the psychologist’ (Alexander, *Leading Ideas of the Gospels*, p. 107). The same phrase, ‘Satan entered into him’ (εἰσῆλθεν εἰς ἐκεῖνον ὁ Σατανᾶς), is also found in Joh 13:27, and it is preceded by the statement (Joh 13:2) that the devil had ‘already put into the heart (ἤδη βεβληκότος εἰς τὴν καρδίαν) of Judas’ the thought of betrayal. It is true, as Cheyne says (*Ency. Bibl.* ii. 2625), that in Jn. we have ‘a modification of the Synoptic tradition,’ but that is not equivalent to ‘quite a different account.’ So far from asserting that ‘it was at the Last Supper that the hateful idea occurred to Judas,’ St. John prefaces his description of the proceedings at the Supper (δείπνου γινομένου) by the emphatic assertion that ‘already’ (ἤδη), *i.e.* at some time other than the Supper, the suggestion of the devil had been entertained by Judas. In St. Luke’s brief account it is said, once for all, that ‘Satan entered into Judas.’ In the Fourth Gospel the genesis of the foul purpose is distinguished from its consummation; the Satanic influences were not irresistible; the devil had not full possession of the heart of Judas until, ‘after the sop,’ he acted on the suggestion which had then become his own resolve.

The Fourth Gospel also makes the Anointing at Bethany (Joh 12:4 f.) a definite stage in the process which is sometimes called the ‘demonizing’ of Judas, but is better described as his ‘giving place to the devil’ (Eph 4:27). St. Luke does not mention Mary’s anointing. St. Matthew and St. Mark have full accounts of it, but Judas is not named; yet immediately after the narrative of the Anointing both Mt. and Mk. place

Judas' offer to the chief priests to betray Jesus for money, thus clearly recognizing an intimate connexion between the two events. St. John explains this sequence by adding the significant detail that the murmuring against Mary's waste of ointment had its origin in the heart of Judas. Our Lord's defence of Mary's beautiful deed implied a rebuke to Judas, and unmasked his hypocrisy; moreover, our Lord's plain references to His coming death involved the disillusionment of His ambitious Apostle. The reproof would rankle; the disappointment would be acute. The angry spirit engendered by such emotions is closely akin to the spirit of treachery and revenge. On insufficient grounds, therefore, Gould speaks of 'John's evident attempt to belittle Judas' (*Int. Crit. Com.*, note on Mar 14:4). No more likely origin of the murmuring, which was not confined to Judas (Mar 14:6, Mat 26:8), is suggested. On the other hand, there seems to be no reason for belittling St. John; his addition to the Synoptic Gospels justifies their association of Mary's anointing with Judas' desertion of Christ; it also furnishes a link between the Anointing of which St. Luke gives no account and his statement 'Satan entered into Judas,'—that statement is the psychological explanation of the actions of Judas recorded in the narratives of the Anointing and the Last Supper.

(b) *Describing the Betrayal.*—In the Passion narratives all the Gospels refer to our Lord's consciousness of His approaching Betrayal; all record His announcement, at the beginning of the Supper, of the presence of the Betrayer; and all mention the consternation and self-questioning of the Apostles to which that statement gave rise (Mar 14:18 ff., Mat 26:21 ff., Luk 22:21 ff., Joh 13:21 ff.). There is no reason to suppose (Weiss) that Judas was definitely indicated by our Lord's words, 'He that dipped his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me' (Mat 26:23). Before the lamb was placed on the table, each guest dipped his own bread into the bitter sauce and ate the sop. The aorist participle (ὁ ἐμβάψας) refers to this act, but does not necessarily fix its time; as thus interpreted, the phrase is in harmony with the vague expression 'that man,' used twice in Mat 26:24, with the passage quoted (Joh 13:18) from Psa 41:9 ('He that eateth my bread'; cf. 'messmate'), and with the parallel passage in Mar 14:20 where the present participle is used (ὁ ἐμβαπτόμενος). An addition to the Synoptic tradition is found in the Fourth Gospel, which describes Jesus as giving a sop to Judas (Mar 13:26). At Eastern meals this was a mark of special attention (cf. Macmillan, 'A Mock Sacrament,' in *ExpT* [Note: xpT Expository Times.] iii. 107 f.); our Lord's action would indicate the traitor to the disciple who was 'leaning back' on His breast, though it left John, like the rest, in ignorance of the meaning of the words with which Jesus urged Judas to hasten the work he was already doing (Mar 14:27). To the traitor himself the words of Jesus, gradually narrowing in their range and therefore increasing in intensity, were at once a tender appeal and a final warning. St. Matthew alone records the question of Judas, 'Is it I, Rabbi?' and our Lord's answer, 'Thou hast said' (Mat 26:25). If Judas had the chief seat at the table next to Jesus (cf. above, ii. (c)), the assent conveyed, perhaps in a whisper and

certainly not in the ordinary form (cf. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, 308 f.), must have had for him a tragic significance. As Zahn points out (*op. cit. in loc.*), the prefixed pronoun in σὺ εἶπας heightens the contrast between the questioner and the speaker, and conveys the meaning, 'What *thou* hast said, there is no need for *me* to say.' St. Matthew does not state that at this juncture Judas left the Supper-table, but the next allusion to Judas (Mat 26:47) implies an absence of some duration. The probable solution of the much-discussed problem, 'Did Judas eat the Passover?' is that, although he ate the sop given to him by Jesus at the beginning of the Supper, he had gone out into the darkness (Joh 13:30) before Jesus gave the bread and the wine to His disciples. It is true that in Luke 22 the narrative of the Supper precedes our Lord's announcement of the Betrayer's presence, but the 'order' (Luk 1:3) characteristic of this Gospel does not imply chronological sequence in every detail; Wright (*op. cit.* p. 132) accounts for the variation from the parallel passages by the suggestion that St. Luke was influenced by the language of St. Paul in 1Co 11:29.

In their accounts of the actual Betrayal of our Lord the Synoptists state that the kiss of Judas was the prearranged signal for His arrest (Mar 14:45, Mat 26:49; cf. Luk 22:47). In the Fourth Gospel nothing is said of the kiss, but a graphic account is given of our Lord's unexpected declaration to His foes that He was the Nazarene for whom they were seeking (Joh 18:4 f.). The silence of St. John is no proof that the kiss was not given; nor is the fact which he records any evidence that the kiss was superfluous. A sufficient motive for the self-manifestation of Jesus is mentioned: 'let these go their way' (Joh 18:8); such a request is appropriate whether the kiss of Judas be placed before or after the question of Jesus, 'Whom seek ye?' If *before*, our Lord supplemented the Betrayer's signal owing to the hesitancy of the awestruck soldiers, who shrank from arresting Him. If *after*, Judas must have been disconcerted by our Lord's action; the kiss would not be given until later, when, as his courage returned, he did not scruple to kiss his Master with the unnecessary demonstration of a feigned affection (κατεφίλησεν, Mar 14:45, Mat 26:49). Our Lord's discernment of the evil purpose underlying this emotional display is indicated by His question, 'Judas, betrayest thou the Son of Man with a kiss?' (Luk 22:48). In Mat 26:50 Jesus is reported to have also said (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), 'Friend, *do* that for which thou art come' (cf. Authorized Version 'Friend, wherefore art thou come?').

Bruce (*Expos. Gr. Test. in loc.*) takes the laconic phrase ἐφ' ὃ πάρει as a 'question in effect, though not in form; its probable meaning is 'Comrade, and as a comrade here?' (cf. Bengel, *in loc.* '*Hoccine illud est cujus causa ades?*'). Blass unnecessarily (cf. Mat 22:12) changes ἐταῖρε into αἶρε, which yields the meaning 'take away that for which thou art come,' or 'art here,' according as παρει is taken from παριέναι or τ

αρεῖναι. Cheyne (*Ency. Bibl.* ii. 2626) conjectures that the true reading is ὑποκρίνεται, 'thou actest a part,' or 'thou art no friend of mine'; ἐταῖρος is got rid of as a dittograph.

(c) *After the Betrayal.*—In three of the Gospels (Mk., Lk., Jn.) there is no mention of the Betrayer after the arrest of Jesus; but Mat 27:3 ff. relates the after-history and fate of Judas as the fulfilment of prophecy. The ascription to Jeremiah of Zec 11:13 is probably due to a failure of memory; the passage is freely quoted, and may include reminiscences of the language of Jeremiah (cf. Jer 18:2ff; Jer 19:1ff; Jer 32:6 ff.). The absence of Ἰερεμίου from some of the Old Lat. and ancient Syriac VSS [Note: SS Versions.] shows that the name was a stumbling-block to early translators of the NT. Zahn (*Gesch. des NT Kanons*, ii. 696) says that the Nazarenes had a Hebrew MS ascribed to Jeremiah, in which the passage is found *verbatim*,—'manifestly an Apocryphon invented to save the honour of Matthew.' The variations from the Heb. and LXX Septuagint are not consistent with the theory that the Evangelist's narrative is a legend evolved from the passage in Zechariah; they are explicable on the supposition that the facts suggested the prophecy. J. H. Bernard (*Expositor*, 6th series, ix. 422 ff.) shows that St. Matthew's account must be based upon 'a tradition independent of the prophecy cited.' The 'salient features' of this tradition are thus summarized—(a) Judas, stricken by remorse, returned the money paid him; (b) he hanged himself in despair; (c) the priests with the money bought a field called the "Potter's Field," which was henceforth called Ἄγρος Αἵματος; (d) the field was used as a cemetery for foreigners.' The point of connexion between the fact and the prophecy is the exact correspondence between the amount paid for the prophet's hire and for the prophet of Nazareth's betrayal. In both cases the paltry sum was the expression of the nation's ingratitude; the thirty pieces of silver was the price of a slave (Exo 21:32). Meditating on the details of the Betrayal, the Evangelist called to mind the experience of Zechariah, and saw in it the foreshadowing of the treatment of Jesus in which the sin of a thankless people reached its climax.

In Act 1:18-19 a different account of the death of Judas is given. Plummer regards the tradition preserved in the Gospel as 'nearer in time to the event, and probably nearer to the truth' (Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. 798^a). Bartlet holds that the Lukan tradition 'represents the actual facts most nearly' ('Acts' in *Cent. Bible*, Note A). The chief argument for the latter view is a saying of Papias which resembles the statement in Acts, though it adds repulsive details (Cramer, *Catena on Mt.*). Dr. Rendel Harris, *AJTh* [Note: JTh American Journal of Theology.] iv. 490 ff., thinks that the Papias tradition is 'the fountainhead of the Judas legends, to which fountainhead Luke lies nearer than Matthew.' The difficulties involved in this

supposition are, (1) that it treats the account in Matthew as ‘a mere substitution’; (2) that it involves the conjecture of an original reading in Acts, ‘he swelled up and burst asunder.’ It is more probable that the Papias story contains later additions from folk-lore than that the present text of Acts omits essential details. Dr. Harris points out striking coincidences between the Judas narratives and the accounts of the death of Nadan, the traitorous nephew of Ahikar, Sennacherib’s grand vizier; but the parallel does not prove that the Ahikar stories are ‘the literary parent’ of the Judas stories. Knowling (*Expos. Gr. Test. in loc.*) rightly says: ‘Whatever may be alleged as to the growth of popular fancy and tradition in the later account in Acts of the death of Judas, it cannot be said to contrast unfavourably with the details given by Papias, *Fragment 18*, which Blass describes as “insulsissima et foedissima.” ’ See, further, Akeldama.

iv. The Character of Judas

(a) *The good motives theory.*—Many have attempted to explain the action of Judas as arising not from treachery and avarice, but from an honest endeavour to arouse Jesus to action and to hasten His Messianic triumph. Modern writers reproduce, with slight modifications, the theory to which the charm of De Quincey’s literary style has imparted a fascination out of all proportion to its probability (*Works*, vi. 21 ff.; cf. Whately, *Essays on Dangers to the Christian Faith*, Discourse iii.). The theory assumes (1) that Jesus, like Hamlet, was ‘sublimely over-gifted for purposes of speculation, ... but not correspondingly endowed for the business of action’; (2) that Judas was alive to the danger resulting from this morbid feature in the temperament of Jesus, and acted not from perfidy, but with a genuine conviction that if Christ’s kingdom was to be set up on earth, He ‘must be compromised before doubts could have time to form.’ This theory implies that the judgment of Judas was at fault, but that he had no evil intent; it finds no support in the Gospel history, and it is inconsistent with our Lord’s stern words of condemnation.

(b) *The Satan incarnate theory.*—Dante (*Inferno*, xxxiv. 62) places Judas in the Giudecca, the lowest circle of the frozen deep of Hell, accounting him a sharer in the sin of Satan, inasmuch as his treachery was aggravated by ingratitude towards his benefactor. A similar tendency to set Judas apart as the arch-villain is manifest in works which reflect the popular imagination. Critics of the Ober-Ammergau Passion-play complain that the Betrayer is represented as a low, cunning rascal, and is often made to look ridiculous. But the comic personifications of Judas, as of Satan himself, in folk-lore are really tokens of popular abhorrence (cf. Büttner, *Judas Ischarioth*, p. 11 f.); they are the result of regarding him as an incarnation of Satanic wickedness. Daub, in the Introduction to a speculative work on the relation of good to evil (*Judas Ischarioth, oder Betrachtungen über das Böse im Verhältniss zum Guten*), conceives Judas as the Satanic kingdom personified in contrast with Jesus who is the

Divine kingdom personified; Judas is 'an incarnation of the devil.' Dr. Fairbairn, who gives (*Studies in the Life of Christ*, p. 264 f.) a succinct summary of Daub's 'gruesome book,' truly says that he is 'unjust to Judas, sacrificing his historical and moral significance to a speculative theory.' The practical effect of such exaggerations of the innate vice of Judas is to place him outside the pale of humanity; but they are as untrue to the Evangelists' delineation of his character as are the attempts to explain away his sin. The same objection may be urged against theories which portray Judas as a mere compound of malice and greed, uninfluenced by any high impulse or noble ambition. In the Gospels he appears as a man 'of like nature with ourselves'; he was both tempted of the devil and 'drawn away by his own lust'; Satan approached his soul along avenues by which he draws near to us; he was not 'twofold more a son of hell' than ourselves (Mat 23:15); he went to 'his own place' in the 'outer darkness,' because he turned away from the 'light of life'; the darkness 'blinded his eyes' because he would not abide in the light, though 'the true light' was shining upon him (cf. 1Jn 2:8 ff.).

(c) *The mingled motives theory.*—The key to the complex problem of the character of Judas is not to be found in a single word. The desire to simplify his motives has led, on the one hand, to an attempt to exonerate him from guilt; and, on the other hand, to a description of him as the devil incarnate. The truth lies between the two extremes; in Judas, possibilities of good were unrealized because he 'gave place to the devil.' It is a mistake to set one motive over against another, as though a man of *covetous* disposition may not also be *ambitious*, and as though an ambitious man may not also be *jealous*. The references to Judas in the Gospels, to which attention has already been called in this article, furnish reasons, it is believed, for saying that Judas was swayed by all three motives, one being sometimes more prominent than another, and the one reacting upon the other. It may well be that ambition would, for a time, restrain covetousness, and yet revive it in the hour of disappointment; whilst, in turn, jealousy would embitter, and covetousness would degrade ambition.

(α) Violence is done to the statements of the Evangelists when *covetousness* is eliminated from the motives which influenced Judas. His covetous disposition is not incompatible either with the fact that he was a disciple of Jesus of his own free will, or with his position of trust, or with his remorse at the consequences of his perfidy. (1) The call of Jesus would arouse 'a new affection,' powerful enough to expel for a time all selfish greed, even though Judas, like the rest of the disciples, cherished the hope of attaining to honour in the Messianic kingdom. (2) His appointment by Jesus to a position of trust scarcely 'proves that he was no lover of money' (Fairbairn, *op. cit.* p. 266); to entrust a man possessing more than ordinary business gifts with the common cash-box is to provide him with an opportunity of honourable service which may become the occasion of his downfall; it was along the line of his capacity to

handle moneys that the temptation came to Judas to handle them to his own gain. (3) The objection that the remorse of Judas discredits the idea of his being actuated by greed of money has force only when covetousness is regarded as the sole motive of the betrayal. What we know of the conduct of Judas towards the close of his career suggests that covetousness—the sin against which Jesus had so earnestly warned His disciples—was once more gaining the upper hand.

(β) To say that Judas was *ambitious* is not to differentiate him from his fellow-Apostles. The contrast between him and them was gradually brought to light as together they listened to the spiritual teaching of Jesus; that contrast is definitely marked by St. John when he first mentions Judas (6:71). It was a time of crisis; the Apostles had been severely tested (1) by the refusal of Jesus to accept the homage of the Galilaean crowd, who had been impressed by His recent miracles and desired perforce to make Him king; (2) by the searching question, ‘Would ye also go away?’ (v. 67) put by Jesus to the Twelve, when Master and disciples were alike saddened by the desertion of the many. St. Peter thought he was speaking for all the Twelve when he made his confession of faith; but within that select circle there was one who had not found in Christ all that he was seeking. Jesus saw that already in spirit Judas was a deserter, and, as Westcott points out, a man who regards Christ ‘in the light of his own selfish views’ is ‘turning good into evil’ (διαβάλλειν), and is, therefore, a partaker of ‘that which is essential to the devil’s nature’ (*Speaker’s Com. in loc.*). It was in the light of the Betrayal that St. John came not only to recognize in Judas the disloyal Apostle to whom Christ referred without mentioning his name, but also to perceive the significance of the words of Jesus, ‘One of you is a devil’ (6:70). The whole incident shows that the words and actions of Jesus had proved a disillusionment to Judas; when he joined the disciples of Christ, he hoped for more than ‘words of eternal life’; baffled ambition was one of the motives which prompted him to do the devil’s work of betrayal.

(γ) Reasons for believing that *jealousy* was one of the motives which led Judas to turn traitor have been given above (cf. ii. (e)). An ambitious man is peculiarly susceptible to this temptation. It would embitter Judas to realize that he was in a false position owing to his misconception of the aims of Christ, that his chances of advancement in the coming kingdom were dwindling, and that some of the least of his brethren would be greater than he. In proportion as others gained a higher place than himself in the esteem of Christ, the expectations he had been cherishing would fade. ‘Trifles light as air are to the jealous confirmation’ of their fears. Fuller knowledge of the life of Judas would probably enable us to see this sin in germ. It may also be, as Ainger suggests (*op. cit.* p. 234), that the Evangelists are silent because ‘there was so little to tell.’ Judas is described as ‘a sullen and silent person ... dwelling ever on

himself—how *he* should profit if the cause were victorious, how *he* might suffer if the cause should fail.’ Such a man would be prone to jealousy and ‘fit for treasons.’

Whether covetousness, ambition, or jealousy was the basal motive of Judas when he betrayed Jesus, it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to say. It is probable that the flame of resentment, kindled by baffled ambition, was fanned by malign jealousy and base desire to snatch at paltry gain when all seemed lost. That the thirty pieces of silver tormented Judas does not prove that they had never attracted him; that he keenly suffered from the pangs of remorse makes neither his evil deed nor his evil motives good. All that we are warranted in saying is well expressed by Bruce (*The Training of the Twelve*, p. 367): ‘He was bad enough to do the deed of infamy, and good enough to be unable to bear the burden of its guilt. Woe to such a man! Better for him, indeed, that he had never been born!’

v. References to Judas in post-Biblical Literature

(a) *Apocryphal works.*—In the *Gospel of the Twelve Apostles* Judas Iscariot is mentioned (§ 2). In the *Arabic Gospel of the Childhood* (§ 35) Judas is represented as possessed by Satan at the birth of Jesus; he tried to bite Jesus, but could not; he did, however, strike Jesus, and immediately Satan went forth from him in the shape of a mad dog. In the *Gospel of Judas* (Iren. *adv. Haer.* i. 31; cf. Epiph. xxxviii. 1. 3) the Cainites—an important Gnostic sect—are said to have declared ‘that Judas the traitor ... knowing the truth as no others did, alone accomplished the mystery of the betrayal.’ In the *Acts of Peter* (§ 8), Peter speaks of Judas as his ‘fellow-disciple and fellow-apostle’; he also refers to his ‘godless act of betrayal.’ In the *Acts of Thomas* (§ 32) the dragon or serpent says, ‘I am he who inflamed and bribed Judas to deliver the Messiah to death.’ Later (§ 84), there is a warning against ‘theft, which enticed Judas Iscariot and caused him to hang himself.’ The account of the death of the serpent (§ 32) probably contains reminiscences of the story of the death of Judas; after sucking the poison the serpent ‘began to swell,’ and ultimately ‘burst.’ Dr. Rendel Harris (*op. cit.* p. 508) quotes from Solomon of Bassora, *The Book of the Bce*, the interesting comparison: ‘Judas Iscariot, the betrayer, ... was like unto the serpent, because he dealt craftily with the Lord.’

(b) *Early Christian writings.*—Clement of Rome (1 *Ep. ad Cor.* xlvi. 8) combines ‘the words spoken by our Lord with regard to Judas’ (Mat 26:24 = Mar 14:21) with ‘a saying recorded in another connexion in the three Synoptic Gospels’ (cf. Mat 18:6 f. etc.). Hermas (*Vis.* iv. ii. 6) probably borrows the same saying from the Synoptists, ‘the change being no greater than we may expect when there is no express quotation’ (cf. *The NT in the Apostolic Fathers*, pp. 61, 121).

Papias refers to the horrible end of Judas (cf. above, iii. (e)) in the fourth book of his 'Expositions of the Oracles of the Lord' (Cramer, *Catena in Matthew* 27). From the same book Irenaeus (*adv. Haer.* v. 33. 3f.) quotes an 'unwritten' saying of Jesus, foretelling days when the earth shall be marvellously fruitful, and the animals shall be at peace. Papias further says that 'when the traitor Judas did not give credit to these things, and put the question, "How then can things about to bring forth so abundantly be wrought by the Lord?" the Lord declared, "They who shall come to these [times] shall see."'

Tertullian, like Irenaeus (cf. above, v. (a)), condemns the Cainites because they held the conduct of Judas to be meritorious; he represents them as saying (*adv. omnes Haereses*, ii.): 'Judas, observing that Christ wished to subvert the truth, betrayed Him.' Tertullian also (*adv. Marcionem*, iv. 40) refers to the treachery of Judas as predetermined by prophecy.

Origen (*contra Celsum*, ii. 11f.) replies to the 'childish objection that no good general was ever betrayed'; Celsus is reminded that he had learnt of the betrayal from the Gospels, and that he had called 'the one Judas many disciples,' thus unfairly stating his accusation (cf. also *Tract. in Mat.* 35).

(c) *Folk-lore.*—Some of the wild fables about Judas may be traced to the legend of the Wandering Jew (cf. Moncure D. Conway, art. 'Jew' in *Ency. Brit.*⁹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] xiii. 674). Another source of popular tradition is a 17th cent. work by Ulrich Megerle, a Vienna priest, generally known as Abraham a Santa Clara. His *Judas der Erzscheml, oder eigentlicher Entwurf und Lebensbeschreibung des Ischariotischen Bosewichts* was translated into several European languages; the English edition bears the title, *The Arch-Knave, or the History of Judas from the cradle to the gallows*. From the *Polychronicon* (14th cent.) and the *Golden Legend* (13th cent.) many stories of Judas, current as folk-lore, are supposed to be derived. Many curious allusions to Judas and quaint customs connected with his name are mentioned in *Notes and Queries*, ii. 5, 6, 7, iii. 7, iv. 1, v. 6. Cholevius, *Geschichte der deutschen Poesie nach ihren antiken Elementen*, compares the Judas legend with the Ædipus story.

Literature.—It is superfluous to name Lives of Christ, Commentaries on the Gospels, and articles in Encyclopedias. Mention has already been made of the most important works which deal with the NT narratives of the life of Judas, to which may now be added *Expositor*, III. x. [1889] 161 ff.; Ker, *Sermons*, i. 282 ff.; Stalker, *Trial and Death of Jesus Christ*, 110 ff. Interesting studies of or references to Judas will be found in the following poems: Story, *A Roman Lawyer in Jerusalem*; Matthew Arnold, *St. Brandan*; Robert Buchanan, *The Ballad of Judas Iscariot*; Keble, *Judas's Infancy* ('Cradle Songs' 13 in *Lyra Innocentium*). Dr. A. B. Grosart mentions Gianni, *Sonnet on*

Judas; a few German poems may be added: Klopstock, *Messias*, 3rd Aufzug; Geibel, *Judas Ischarioth*; Max Crone, *Judasrätsel* and *Der Sohn des Verderbens*.

J. G. Tasker.

⚠ Judging (by men)

JUDGING (by men)

In the NT 'to judge' is always a translation of κρίνειν or its compounds, although κρίνω, is frequently rendered by other words than 'judge.' The primary meaning of κρίνω is *to separate, put asunder*. Through the derivative signification *to search into, to investigate*, it came to mean *to choose, prefer, determine, to decide moral questions or disputes after examination, to judge*. In this last sense it is used of the authoritative decisions Christ will declare as to conduct and destiny at the general judgment of the last day. When κρίνω is not rendered by 'judge' in the NT, it always involves the kindred meaning of reaching a decision, or of action consequent upon a decision. In a number of instances it means *to determine to pursue the course decided upon as best*. St. Paul had determined (κεκρίκει) to sail past Ephesus (Act 20:16); he determined (ἐκρίνα) not to know anything among the Corinthians save Jesus Christ and Him crucified (1Co 2:2); not to come to them in sorrow (2Co 2:1). The Jews denied Jesus before Pilate when he was determined (κρίναντος) to let Him go (Act 3:13, See also Act 24:21, Act 25:25, 1Co 7:37). In Mat 5:40 κριθῆναι is rendered 'go to law' in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, and other forms are rendered 'condemn' (Act 13:27), 'called in question' (Act 24:21), 'ordained' (Act 16:4), 'esteemeth' (Rom 14:5).

1. *Judging by men permitted and commended.*—The right to pass judgment upon both the actions of men and their characters as manifested in their conduct is implied in the power of rational and moral discrimination which all possess. Its exercise is also made imperative by the very nature of things. Men must form an opinion not only of the quality of deeds, but also of those who do them, if there is to be the prudent and wise action in our necessary relations to others, which shall be best for us and for them. St. Paul recognizes this power of moral judgment in even the heathen (Rom 2:14-16). To this, truth and right conduct may confidently appeal (2Co 4:2). He commends those who exercise it upon all moral questions, and bold fast the good it approves, and abstain from the evil it condemns (1Th 5:21-22). It is to this moral

judgment that all true teaching and preaching appeal. Our Lord assumes that all have the power to know the quality of outward deeds of men, and lays down the principle that the quality of the man corresponds with that of his deeds (Mat 7:15-19), and, therefore, that we can form a right judgment of men, when the fruitage of their lives matures, however much they may seek to hide under false pretences. To this great principle of judging our Lord made frequent appeal in His controversies with the Pharisees. The Satanic conduct of these leaders proved them the children of the devil,—as having his nature (Joh 8:38-44),—while His own works made it plain He was from God (Joh 5:36; Joh 10:25 etc.). Even in Mat 7:1-5, in connexion with our Lord's strongest condemnation of judging, it is implied (Mat 7:2; Mat 7:5) that men may judge others guilty of faults and help to cure them of the failings discovered, if they but be free enough from faults themselves to have the clearest discernment. He also censures the Jews (Luk 12:57) because they do not judge what is right as to the Messianic time of His preaching, as they do the signs of the sky, and are therefore in danger of arraignment and condemnation at the highest tribunal.

2. *The judging which is condemned*

(a) That prompted by a wrong spirit. Of this kind is that forbidden by our Lord in Mat 7:1-4. It is prompted by a *critical and censorious spirit*. The man possessed by this disposition subjects others to searching scrutiny to find out faults. Where even the smallest defects are discovered, he becomes so absorbed in them that he is oblivious alike of his own greater faults and the greater virtues which may be associated with the minor faults of others. Those who are critical of others in order to find something to blame, instead of being critical of themselves in order to become fitted to help them, will but bring upon themselves from God as well as from men the condemnation they are so ready to mete out to others (see also Luk 6:37).

(b) Judging according to false or inadequate principles or standards. In Joh 7:23-24; cf. Joh 5:8, our Lord condemns *judging upon superficial principles*—mere literal conformity to outward rules. Had the Jews seen the deeper intent of the Sabbath law, they would not have condemned Him for apparently breaking it by healing a man on that day. It was this superficial standard of judging—on literal and mere legal grounds rather than upon the deeper underlying principles—which constituted judging after the flesh rather than after the spirit. It is only the judging after the spirit that is righteous and to be commended (Joh 8:15). It is for this reason that the natural (ψυχικός) man receiveth not the things of the Spirit, but he that is spiritual (πνευματικός) judgeth (ἀνακρίνει) all things (1Co 2:14). The one has in his nature only that to which the mere outward and superficial appeals—the other has in him that in which the deepest inner principles of life and action find a response. The latter, through this

sensitive response of his nature to the deepest truths, can give strict judgment as to their character.

Literature.—Dale, *Laws of Christ*, p. 93, *Week Day Sermons*, p. 32; Dykes, *Manifesto of the King*, p. 621; Mozley, *Univ. Sermons*, p. 72; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, i. 274.

C. Goodspeed.

⚖ Judgment

JUDGMENT.—The Synoptic Gospels differ from the Gospel of John in their view of a judgment. The former set forth a multitude of external tests which furnish ground for continuous judgment in this life. The ‘deeds’ or ‘works’ of a man are a measure of his attitude toward Jesus Christ. The Gospel of John is more especially concerned with the inner and hidden judgment which is being pronounced continually in man’s soul. The sensuous and external aspects are little emphasized. All the Gospels hint unmistakably at a final crisis or judgment.

Mt. is pre-eminently the Gospel of judgment, for, throughout, Jesus appears as the Judge of men, and is always discriminating and separating the good from the bad, the sheep from the goats, the wheat from the tares, the grain from the chaff, the sincere man from the hypocrite (Mat 13:38; Mat 25:33; Mat 13:25-30; Mat 3:12; Mat 6:5-6). The predominance of this special aspect of Jesus’ teaching, selected from among His varied utterances, in this Gospel, may arise from Matthew’s Hebrew predisposition to consider Israel as a people separated from the Gentile world. Almost every utterance carries within it an unmistakable voice of judgment which separates men into two classes. The judgment which eventuates in blessedness, as in the Beatitudes (Mat 5:3-10), or as ‘Come, ye blessed of my Father’ (Mat 25:34), is as notable as that which leads to separation from Christ and to eternal wretchedness (Mat 25:46).

1. *Jesus is the Judge.*—This is the view of all the Gospels. The Father gives all judgment to the Son (Joh 5:22-27). Jesus came into the world for judgment (Joh 9:39). He separates men under moral tests (Mat 25:31-46; cf. Mat 7:23). He pronounces judgment on the Pharisees (Mat 22:15-46). He judges Satan (Mat 16:23). He imparts the authority for judgment to men (Mat 16:19). (Cf. Act 10:42, Rom 14:10, 2Co 5:10, 2Ti 4:1). His judgment-seat is at the same time the throne of His glory (Mat 25:31), as it marks the culmination of the work which He has mediated in creation and in redemption. The judgment will be glorious, because then will be the final enthronement of holiness among men, and the deposition of evil. It is to be noted that He associates with Himself the twelve disciples (like the Roman assessors

of judgment) who are to judge the twelve tribes of Israel (Mat 19:28, Luk 22:30; cf. 1Co 6:2-3). This exhibits the vital union of righteous souls with Christ, for the new life which His disciples obtain through Him would dispose them to pronounce judgment upon the same principles of justice as does their Lord. It is fitting that He who has mediated creation, maintenance, and redemption, should pronounce judgment upon man with regard to his attitude and responsibility toward each of these sovereign acts and relations. All judgment is determined by the attitude which men hold towards Christ. He is set forth as a perpetual challenge to men to live a right thinking and right acting life.

2. *The Judgment.*—Jesus in the Gospels presents an almost numberless series of tests by which men may judge themselves in this present age. Their ‘works’ or ‘deeds’ are reviewed (Mat 16:27; Mat 25:31; cf. Rom 2:6, Rev 20:12). Every kindness to a disciple will be rewarded (Mar 9:41, Mat 10:42). Every cause of stumbling to one of these little ones (Luk 17:2) will be punished. Jesus presents Himself as the supreme and personal test. What is man’s attitude towards Him as proved by ‘his deeds and works’? This kind of judgment is continuous and cumulative here, and comes to a conclusion at the final crisis or judgment. These are some of the tests:

Following Him (Mat 4:18-22; Mat 10:38; Mat 19:28, Mar 8:34); confessing Him (Mat 10:32, Luk 12:8); failure to appreciate His presence and work (Mat 11:21); failure to come to Him (Joh 5:40); failure to believe Him (Joh 3:18); failure to obey Him (Joh 3:36); failure to honour Him (Joh 5:23); failure to stand with Him (Mat 12:30); failure of right fruitage (Mat 21:31-42; Mat 7:16, Luk 6:44); failure in outward conduct (Mat 22:11-13); failure to help men (Mat 25:31-46); failure to repent (Joh 5:40); failure to use the gifts of God (Mat 25:14-30); making light of His personal invitations (Mat 22:1-7); unwillingness to hear His words (Mat 12:41-42); unwillingness to forgive an injury (Mat 6:15; Mat 18:28-30); being ashamed of Him (Mar 8:38); breaking a commandment (Mat 5:19); the spirit of our judgment on others (Mat 7:2); faith or lack of it (Mat 8:10; Mat 9:22; Mat 9:29; Mat 15:28, Mar 5:34); heart unreceptive to His words (Mat 10:14-15); hypocrisy (Mat 23:13-36); idle words (Mat 12:36); lip service without the heart (Mat 15:7); selfish conceit (Mat 6:2); wicked pride (Mar 12:38); love of darkness (Joh 3:19); rejection of His disciples (Luk 10:10); adultery (Mat 19:9); commercialism in worship (Mat 21:13); blasphemy against the Spirit (Mat 12:31-32); loving others more than God (Mat 10:37); hearing, seeing the Son, with belief or with failure to believe (Mat 7:24; Mat 13:23, Joh 5:24; Joh 6:40); the cup of cold water given to a disciple (Mat 10:42); mercifulness (Luk 6:36); love to Christ (Luk 7:47, Joh 21:16); love to enemies (Luk 6:27); humble-mindedness as a child (Mat 18:4); fidelity of service (Mat 20:14; Mat 24:45-51); endurance in well-doing (Mat 24:13); doing will of God (Mat 12:50); deeds in general (Mat 16:27); inward thoughts and motives (Mar 7:21, Luk 5:22-23).

These are clear, varied, and concrete tests which men may apply daily to conduct and character, and which bring them into continual judgment. They cover almost every phase of human life, both inward and outward. The great first and second commandments in the law which our Lord enunciated to the lawyer (Mat 22:37-39) are in the nature of a judgment, for men know whether or not they have been kept. Judgments are continuous in the sphere of moral life, as conscience persistently affirms. They are continuous in the religious life, and the principles upon which they are based are found in these teachings and in the character of Jesus. No man can plead ignorance of the grounds on which judgment is pronounced on him, because these varied tests cover clearly and openly so much of his life. Jesus always holds Himself forth ('I am the way and the truth and the life,' Joh 14:6) as the supreme standard of life; and the invitation to come to Him leads to a comparison and judgment of likeness or unlikeness. The work of the Holy Spirit (whom Jesus sends, Joh 16:7) is to convict men of sin, righteousness, and judgment (Joh 16:9), and He accomplishes this by showing men their unlikeness to Christ. The character of Jesus is thus continually a challenge to men, and the measure of the judgment which they must pass on themselves. In all the Gospels, judgment is determined by the relation which a man holds to Jesus Christ. But the Gospels also teach that this continuous judgment will culminate in a crisis or Final Judgment. The inadequacy and inequalities of punishment here seem to demand a final adjusting of the accounts of all men on principles of eternal equity. The parable of Dives and Lazarus (Luk 16:20-25) exhibits this final accounting and the equitable readjustment of their respective conditions. Lazarus had wretchedness. Dives had luxury. The continuous judgment in this life did not result in the proper rewards and penalties, hence the balances are struck after death. Final judgment and penalty are then reached.

3. *The time of this Final Judgment* is set forth in the Synoptics as at 'the end of the world' (Mat 13:39). Some have held that this means at the end of each man's life, but the more obvious meaning is the end of this time-order of race, life, and things (cf. Heb 9:27). The words 'the time' (Mat 8:29), and 'then' (Mat 16:27, Mat 25:1), point to a time which follows the Lord's appearing in glory with His angels after the resurrection from the dead. 'That day and hour' (Mat 24:36), 'the resurrection of life' and 'the resurrection of judgment' (Joh 5:29), are the antithetical statements of what takes place after the resurrection, which to one class of men is entrance into life, and to the other entrance into judgment followed by spiritual death. The Gospels do not give information as to whether or not the Final Judgment follows immediately on the general resurrection. The weight of impression is that judgment does follow immediately, but it would be by no means an entire misinterpretation of the sayings of Jesus if one held that there was a considerable period of intervening time.

4. *All mankind and all evil spirits are to be judged.*—'All nations' (Mat 25:32) and all men (Mat 12:36, Joh 5:29) shall be judged (cf. Rom 14:10, 2Co 5:10, Rev 20:12-15).

It is implied in Mat 8:29 that evil spirits also are to stand in the judgment. But it is clear that the holy angels do not come into judgment, for they accompany and serve the holy Judge (Mat 16:27; Mat 25:31). Judgment would not be necessary for men if it were not for their sin. Wherever there has been need of a redemption, there will be need of a Final Judgment.

5. *Some characteristics.*—Jesus Christ the Judge in His glory (Mat 16:27; Mat 19:28, Mar 8:38, Luk 9:26) [the glory of Jesus will be as manifest in His judgments as in His forgiveness]; ‘the throne of his glory’ (Mat 25:31); the surrounding holy angels as His servitors (cf. Mat 13:41); mankind gathered before Him; evil spirits awaiting their final doom; the sharp separations; the openness of the facts upon which judgment proceeds; the uncovered moral life of every man; the irrevocableness of the decision (Mat 25:46),—all these, together with the manifestly diverse feelings of the righteous and the wicked, present a scene of surpassing grandeur, extent, and interest. Judgment stands in the Gospels as the natural terminus of an aeon in the life of the race which began with Creation, was continued under a purpose and revelation of Redemption, and demands a Judgment as its proper culmination.

Nathan E. Wood.

⚡ Just

JUST and ‘righteous’ in Authorized Version represent the same word, *δικαιος*, which, however, has usually the wider meaning of ‘righteous, observing Divine and human laws, one who is such as he ought to be, prop. the Heb. צַדִּיק’ (Grimm-Thayer), and comprehends duty both to God and to man. The Vulgate had no word available except *justus*, which strictly, means ‘what is according to *jus*, the rights of man,’ hence ‘just’ in many places in Authorized Version. In the Gospels it is used of Joseph (Mat 1:19), Simeon (Luk 2:25), John the Baptist (Mar 6:20), Joseph of Arimathaea (Luk 23:50), and Christ (Mat 27:19; Mat 27:24). In Act 3:14; Act 7:52; Act 22:14 (cf. 1Pe 3:18, and possibly Jam 5:6) ‘the Just One’ is a Messianic name corresponding to the prophecies of the Righteous Servant of Jehovah (Isa 53:11; cf. Isa 11:3 f., Jer 23:5); its use ‘affords in itself a marvellous proof of the impression made by the human life of Jesus upon those who knew Him best, or who, at all events, like St. Stephen, had ample opportunities of learning’ (*Expos. Gr. Test.*). In nearly every case Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 uniformly gives ‘righteous,’ exceptions being Mat 5:45 (‘rain on the just and the unjust’), Luk 1:17 (‘wisdom of the just’) Luk 14:14 (‘resurrection of the just’). In Luk 2:25 ‘just’ might perhaps have been retained with advantage to bring out the difference in the same verse between *δικαιος*

ς and, εὐλαβῆς, which latter means ‘reverencing God, devout’ (‘δικαιος, *justus*, in officiiis; εὐλαβῆς, Vulgate *timoratus*, in habitu animae erga Deum’—Bengel).

For full discussion of δικαιος see art. Righteous.

W. H. Dundas.

Justice

JUSTICE

In the Authorized Version of NT the word ‘justice’ does not occur, δικαιοσύνη being always translated ‘righteousness.’ For the adj. δικαιος we have ‘just’ and ‘righteous’ used interchangeably. God is *just* (1Jn 1:9, Rev 15:3), *righteous* (Joh 17:25, 2Ti 4:8); Christ is the *Just One* (Act 3:14; Act 7:52), and *righteous* (1Jn 2:1). Men, both as individuals and collectively, are *just or righteous* (Mat 1:9; Mat 5:45; Mat 10:41; Mat 13:43, Act 10:22; Act 24:15). In Joh 5:30 we have *just*, and in Rev 16:7 *righteous* judgment. In Col 4:1 τὸ δίκαιον refers to what is due by masters to their slaves; and in Mat 20:4 to a money payment for work done. This haphazard rendering of δικαιος is partially rectified in the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 . In classical Greek the noun and the adj. are sometimes used in the wider sense of moral rectitude in general; but under the influence of the Platonic and Aristotelian philosophy its later usage inclines to the narrower sense of political and social justice. Aristotle (*Nic. Ethiopic* v. 1. 15) qualifies the general idea by making it refer to what is due to one’s neighbour; and Plato (*Republic*, Bks. i. ii. iv.) deals with δικαιοσύνη at great length but almost exclusively in the sense of political and individual justice, though he does attempt to give the idea a wider scope by connecting it with that of the Absolute Good. In Biblical Greek, both in the LXX Septuagint and the NT, the wider meaning is restored, and is the common one. In Luk 1:6 Zacharias and Elisabeth are said to be δίκαιοι; and this is explained, if not defined, by the words τορευόμενοι ἐν τασκίς ταις ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαίωμασι τοῦ Κυρίου ἀμεμπτοι. This is the general idea of righteousness; but our word ‘justice’ must be taken as signifying the recognition and fulfilment of what is due from one to another, righteous dealing between persons, each rendering to others what is their right and due. See also art. Righteous.

1. The justice of God.—The justice of God is an aspect of His righteousness, and belongs, therefore, to His essential nature. It may be shown to have significance for the Divine life, even apart from His relation to others. God's attributes are not all of co-ordinate worth. His omnipotence, *e.g.*, is subordinate to His ethical attributes; it does not use them as a means to accomplish its ends, but they use it. Omnipotence is not a power to do what *it* wills, but to do what God wills; and as His will is holy, it can be only ethically determined. If in God's nature mere power were supreme, and holiness and love subordinate, this would be as contrary to justice as when, in a kingdom, the rule of right has been overturned by irresponsible violence. As in the State, justice is the controlling principle which preserves the body politic for the discharge of its several functions, so, in the Divine justice, we have the regulative principle of order in the Divine nature and life.

(1) *God's justice in His relations with men.*—He shows favour to the righteous. He could not withhold His approval of that in them which is the object of complacency and delight in Himself. This does not mean that they have a claim on God for a happy earthly lot, and exemption from earthly troubles. This doctrine of recompense was the prevalent one during the early and non-reflective stage of Israel's religious progress; but it did not bear the strain put on it by the national calamities. In the teaching of Christ it is repudiated: Mat 5:45; Mat 13:28-29, Luk 16:25; Luk 18:1-5, Joh 9:2-3; and in Rom 8:18; Rom 8:39 and Heb 12:11 an explanation of the sufferings of the righteous is given which goes far to remove their seeming variance with the justice of God. They are part of His fatherly discipline by which His children are prepared for their heavenly inheritance (2Co 4:16-17, Heb 5:8). Even here they have their great reward in the favour and friendship of God (Mat 5:10-12; 1Pe 2:19-20; 1Pe 3:12; 1Pe 3:14).

(2) *God's justice in relation to sin.*—God is just, and will therefore punish sin. This is one of the Christian certainties (Gal 6:7). Different views, however, have been held as to the nature of the punishment and its object. Some think (and this is Ritschl's opinion) that the true punishment of sin consists in the sense of guilt and alienation from God which a persuasion of the Divine displeasure awakens; and that the outward evils which are regarded as punishments are really due to natural causes that have no relation to human guilt (Ritschl, *Justification and Reconciliation*, 47 ff., 257 ff.). Now, the sense of God's displeasure must always be a most important part of punishment, and might almost stand for the whole of it, if we could suppose the sinner as responsive to it as he ought to be, as, *e.g.*, a saint made perfect in holiness would be. To such a saint the sense of alienation from God would be harder to bear than the most untoward outward calamity. But sin increasingly blunts the sinner's susceptibility to suffering from this source; and if no effective provision has been made to bring God's displeasure home to him, he would at last work out his term of punishment. There may be no link of causation between our sin and most of the

outward evils of life. Maeterlinck may be right in saying that nature knows nothing of justice; but in that case we should have to believe with him that neither can nature be regarded as the creation of a Being in whom ethical attributes are supreme (Maeterlinck, *Buried Temple*, Essay on the 'Mystery of Justice').

God's justice in relation to sin is at once retributive, educative, and protective. It is *retributive* because it punishes sin simply as sin; it is *educative* or reformatory because the punishment is also intended for the moral improvement of the transgressor; it is *protective* because by the punishment others are restrained from wrong-doing, and are themselves guarded against the evils which would result from the prevalence of unpunished sin. That the Scripture view of God's justice implies retribution may be shown from many passages: Mat 16:27; Mat 16:24-25, Luk 12:45-48, Rom 2:6; Rom 2:16; Rom 6:23, 2Co 5:10, Col 3:25, 2Th 1:9, Heb 2:2; Heb 10:27. One could scarcely gather from these passages that God's sole aim in punishment is the reformation of the offender. Yet this is the popular view with many modern theologians. As a protest against the once prevalent opinion that God, in punishing, desires merely to exact vengeance without any regard to the sinner's repentance, it has its justification. But, like other reactionary views, it carries us too far in the opposite direction. The whole drift of Biblical teaching is that God punishes sinners because they deserve it. Punishment is the reaction of His holy nature against wrong-doing, and without it the moral order of the world could not be maintained. If sin did not arouse His displeasure, He would not be holy; and if He did not manifest His displeasure objectively by punishment, men could not know that He is holy. But it is said that God is love, and that what love inflicts is chastisement, not punishment in the retributive sense. Holy love, however, cannot accomplish its end unless the sinner is brought to feel that he deserves punishment. How could punishment benefit him if, while undergoing it, he believed that it had not been merited? Retribution does tend to the offender's improvement, and this is part of God's purpose in it; but its reformatory influence never takes effect until the sinner acknowledges its justice. His improvement begins only when he is brought into this state of mind and feeling. If, indeed, God's sole aim were reformation, it would follow that, if rewards carried with them the same benefits as punishments, as in many cases they do, then the offender would deserve them, and this because of his sin. In like manner it would be very difficult to persuade people that it is right that they should be protected from the spread of violence by the punishment of those to whom punishment was not justly due.

God's justice is also shown in the forgiveness of sins on condition of repentance. Repentance is a sign that the disciplinary purpose which accompanies retribution has not missed its mark; and if now God withheld forgiveness, it would imply a failure of justice. According to 1Jn 1:9, 'God is faithful and just (δικαιος) to forgive.'

Forgiveness and punishment are alike connected with the justice of God. The justice of forgiveness further appears from this, that the man who repents is a different moral person from the man who had sinned. His relation to his sin has been reversed; for whereas formerly his will was identified with sin, it is now identified with the mind and will of God regarding it. In proportion to the depth and sincerity of his repentance, we feel that he is a changed man, and should no longer be treated as if sin still formed part of the texture of his being. He has separated from, and now unsparingly condemns, his past sinful self; and, having thus come over to the side of righteousness, he is no longer a fit object of the Divine displeasure. Theologians, who first make logical distinctions between the Divine attributes and then reason from these as if they were real distinctions, say that justice cannot, but love alone can, forgive; as if love and justice were two contending powers in God's nature. In reality, it is holy love that forgives; and this means that love and justice are joined hand in hand in forgiveness as they are in punishment. From a non-moral love gifts would come, but they might not be blessings; and justice without love never could be perfectly just, for love is part of the tribute which justice demands. The OT and NT writers never attempt to reconcile love and justice, because they were not conscious of any contrariety between them (see Mat 6:12; Mat 6:14-15; Mat 12:31-32; Mat 18:15-17; Mat 18:21-35, Luk 6:37; Luk 7:37-50; Luk 13:3; Luk 13:5; Luk 15:11-32; Luk 17:3-4; Luk 18:10-14; Luk 22:61-62; cf. Joh 21:15-17, Act 2:39; Act 3:19; Act 5:31; 2Pe 3:9, 1Jn 1:9). Of course, imperfection clings to all human repentance, because past sin disqualifies even the sincerest penitent for that godly sorrow for sin 'which worketh repentance not to be repented of' (2Co 7:10). Hence the need for the work of Christ and the regenerating influence of the Spirit, by which imperfect repentance is atoned for and made perfect.

2. Justice in man.—If man has been created in the image of God, we should expect to find reflected in him the same supremacy of the ethical attributes as exists in God. Thus for him also justice or righteousness will be the supreme law of his being, obligatory, not through any human convention, but in virtue of man's Godlikeness. As supreme, it will be regulative of his whole life, determining his use of his freedom, the outflow of his emotions and thoughts, his activity in all human relations. Justice will regulate his life Godward, for God has definite claims on man for devotion and service; and as in Christ He has made Himself known as a Father and Saviour, these claims are, for the Christian, raised to a higher sphere of obligation. These are duties which man owes to God, and, when they are withheld, justice is violated. God is robbed when that which is His due is not rendered (Mal 3:8). Hence the just or righteous (δικαιος) man is represented as walking 'in all the commandments of the Lord blameless' (Luk 1:6), and of these the first and greatest is, 'Thou shalt love the Lord with all thy heart' (Mat 22:37). Not until we give God this wholehearted love do we give Him His due. We are *then* 'just before God'; and from 1Jn 3:10; 1Jn 3:17;

1Jn 4:20-21; 1Jn 5:1 we learn that only when man responds to God's claim can he fulfil the obligations of love and justice to his fellow-men. That man can be just or unjust in relation to God appears also from passages in which sin is spoken of as a state of indebtedness—God being the creditor and man the debtor (Mat 5:26; Mat 6:12; Mat 18:23-35, Luk 7:41-43); and from those parables in which God and man are related as Master and servant, or King and subject (Mat 20:1-16; Mat 21:33-41; Mat 25:14-30; Mar 12:1-12).

One characteristic of the NT doctrine of justice, as compared with the views current in the Jewish and classical worlds, is a noteworthy enlargement of its sphere. Justice to man as man was a subject of speculation among the Stoics, but in the popular morality its obligation was ignored and even repudiated. The Jew hated the Samaritan (Luk 9:54) and despised the Gentile, with whom he would not share his privileges (Act 21:27-30). Why should they show favour to those whom God had not honoured? The Greek was bound by moralities to his fellow-citizens, but between him and the barbarians there was no moral reciprocity; if he was conscious of any obligation, it was an obligation to do them all the injury he could. Then again there was the slave class, who were regarded as incapable of virtue, and, therefore, like the lower animals, outside the ethical sphere. Thus Jew and Gentile alike acknowledged no moral relationship between themselves and the vast majority of the race. It was, therefore, a great step in advance when Christ proclaimed a universal Kingdom of justice and love, and taught that, since God was the Father of all, they were due to all men, on the ground not of citizenship or nationality, but of humanity and of their common relationship to God (Mat 5:43-48; Mat 28:19, Luk 10:30-37, Joh 3:16; Joh 12:32).

There was also a subjective enlargement of its sphere. Under the influence of Pharisaic teaching and example, the moral law had come to be regarded as merely an external rule of conduct; the inner world of thought and motive and feeling being overlooked or regarded as of only secondary importance. All the virtues had thus suffered deterioration, and justice among them. But in the Sermon on the Mount, Christ claimed this neglected sphere for the moral law. Its authority was extended so as to cover the entire life of men, for in the spiritual realm of being, thoughts and feelings are accounted as deeds, as acts of the moral self. And this was an infinite extension of the sway of justice. 'Out of the heart proceed adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts' (Mar 7:21). Sin is not confined to outward acts; it begins the moment evil thoughts and desires arise in the heart; and a régime of justice is necessary there. To be angry with our brother without cause is to do him wrong (Mat 5:22); and the man is accounted guilty who, while refraining from actual murder, yet thinks in his heart, 'I would, if I dared.' Our neighbour has a claim on us, that we should think and feel justly regarding him; and when this is withheld, we fail to give him his due. Again, the sin of adultery may be begun and completed by simply

looking on a woman to lust after her (Mat 5:28). Before the tribunal of the Kingdom, the man is adjudged to have wronged the woman. The Christian law of justice is embodied in the Golden Rule, 'All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them' (Mat 7:12); and also in the second of the great commandments, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself' (Mar 12:31). According to the Golden Rule, we are to regard our fellow-man as an *alter ego*, to put ourselves in his place, and judge his claims or needs and our duties from his point of view (Php 2:4-8). Then the commandment tells us positively what our obligation is. 'Thou shalt love him as thyself,' not with a non-moral love, which seeks nothing higher than the happiness of its objects. We are to care for him with that holy love which attaches itself to that in him which in ourselves is the legitimate object of our self-love,—the moral self or soul which was created in, and can be restored to, the image of God. It is for His moral perfections that we love God; and the claims of Christian justice are met, only when our love for others has as its aim their restoration to Godlikeness (Mat 16:26, Jam 5:20, Heb 13:17). The Christian law requires us not merely to refrain from doing our neighbour wrong, but to promote, even at the cost of self-sacrifice, his highest well-being as we would our own. For a Christian man to say, 'I have done my neighbour justice, and he has no claim on me for more,' is to prove false to the Christian ideal; for, in the Kingdom of righteousness, benevolence is not something that may be withheld, but is simply justice made perfect.

Literature.—For meaning of *δικαιος* and *δικαιοσύνη* see Grimm-Thayer, *Lex.*; Cremer, *Bib.-Th. Lex.*; Westcott, *Ep. of Jn.* 24 f.; Sanday-Headlam, *Rom.* [Note: Roman.] 28 ff. See also T. Aquinas, *Sum.* i., Qu. xxi. ii. 2, Qu. lviii.-lxxxi.; Hodge, *Syst. Theol.* vol. i.; the *Dogmatics* of Martensen and Dorner; Ritschl, *Justification and Reconciliation*; Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*, esp. i.-iv.; Clarke, *Outline of Theol.*; Stevens, *Chr. Doct. of Salvation*; the *Christian Ethics* of Martensen (Social), Dorner, Newman Smyth; Luthardt. *Hist. of Chr. Ethics*; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, vol. i.; C. Wagner, *Justice*; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*. In the following works on General Ethics, 'Justice' is, in the main, treated from the Christian standpoint: Hegel. *Phil.* [Note: Philistine.] *of Right*; Bradley, *Ethiopic Studies*; Green, *Proleg. to Ethics*, also *Principles of Polit. Obligation*; M'Kenzie, *Introd. to Social Phil.* [Note: Philistine.] ; Seth, *Ethical Principles*; Maeterlinck, Essay on the 'Mystery of Justice' in his *Buried Temple* [contains some fine thoughts, but Agnostic in tone and tendency].

A. Bisset.

I. Biblical doctrine.

1. The OT and Pharisaic doctrines.
2. The Pauline doctrine.

II. Historical.

1. The Catholic doctrine.
2. The Protestant doctrine.
3. Modern theories.

III. Constructive treatment.

I. Biblical doctrine

1. *The OT and Pharisaic doctrines.*—The doctrine of justification through faith in Christ owes its origin to St. Paul, and is the outcome of two factors, his Jewish training on the one hand, and his Christian experience on the other. The idea of justification itself was derived by the Apostle from the Rabbinic theology, whose doctrine of justification by the works of the Law is at once the antithesis and the necessary background of his own. The Rabbinic doctrine again rested upon an OT basis. We can trace the development of the idea of righteousness before God in the prophets, who from the first judge Israel by the standard of the absolutely righteous demands of Jahweh. In the time of Jeremiah and Ezekiel the idea is brought into connexion with the individual (Jer 20:12, Hab 1:4; Hab 1:13; Hab 2:4, Eze 3:20-21; Eze 18:19 ff; Eze 33:12 ff.). Further, this age being also that of the development of the Law, whose authors aimed at embodying the demands of Jahweh in a practical form, we find the idea connected with the fulfilment either of the Law as a whole (Deu 6:25), or of a single commandment contained in it (Deu 24:13). Finally, in the post-exilic period the idea receives a great development. God is characterized as the righteous Judge (Psa 9:7-8; Psa 50:6; Psa 94:2; Psa 96:10; Psa 96:13 etc.), whose righteousness results in the punishment of sinners (Psa 1:5-6, Psa 9:16, Psa 11:5-6 etc.). The actual positive recognition of the righteousness of the righteous is said in Psa 62:12 to depend on the Divine grace; the latter term, however, is practically synonymous with righteousness in its beneficent aspect (Psa 33:5, Psa 36:6-7, Psa 48:9-10, Psa 145:17). Sinners God can justify so far as they are at bottom righteous (Job 33:26). But the godless He may not justify (Psa 69:27). The general idea is, further, that the recognition of righteousness by God is manifested by outward good fortune; just as His displeasure is shown by outward calamity

(Isa 65:13-14, Mal 4:2-3, Psa 37:19-20 etc.; cf. Wellhausen, *IJG* [Note: JG Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte.] 5 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 220, n. [Note: note.] 1). In the later post-exilic literature, however, the idea that the righteous is always rewarded and the wicked always punished in this life, is abandoned, and there appears the conception that the final justification or condemnation takes place after death (Job 19:25-26, Dan 12:2-3). This conception is henceforth predominant, as in the Pharisaic theology, to which we now turn.

The Pharisaic conception of the relation of man to God was purely legal, and based upon the idea of the Law as a contract between God and man. The idea of grace which qualifies the legalism of the OT sinks altogether into the background. The Pharisaic doctrine implies that the Divine demands expressed in the Law can be satisfied, and that the fulfilment of them gives a claim to reward. It is the recognition of this claim that is now meant by 'justification.' The conception is further carried out into detail in that the Law is regarded atomically as the sum of the commandments it contains (cf., however, Deu 6:25). Every act of obedience is entered by God in the heavenly books, as is also every act of transgression. The decision is according to the preponderance. If this is on the side of the good, the Divine sentence of justification follows, which consists in the declaration that the man is righteous. The account is finally made up at death (Weber, *Jud. Theol.*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 1897, p. 277 ff.).

It will be apparent that the whole idea, both in the OT and still more distinctly in the Pharisaic theology, is forensic. With this, again, agrees the derivation of the group of technical terms used in the OT in connexion with the idea of justification (צדק קדש 'righteousness,' צדיק 'righteous,' הצדיק 'justify'). This group has almost universally a forensic sense. The words are so used secularly, and are therefore naturally applied with this meaning in religion (Smend, *Alttest. Religionsgeschichte*², 1899, p. 388 f.). In the LXX the equivalents are δικαιοσύνη, δίκαιος, δικαιώω. On the constant forensic use of δικαιώω in the LXX (OT and Apocr.), also in the pseudepigraphic books, see Sanday-Headlam, 'Romans' in *Internat. Crit. Com.* p. 31. In Talmudic theology צדק is replaced by זכות 'innocence,' and הצדיק by זכות; זבה also appears for צדיק, but the latter is maintained in use along with it (Weber, p. 277 f.).

It is finally to be observed that, both in the OT and in the Rabbinic theology, righteousness before God and justification, whether looked for from the Divine grace or on the ground of human merit, are *religious* ideas. Righteousness is not sought for

its own sake, as a moralist might seek it, but always as the condition of acceptance with God, and the blessings which flow from this, in this world or the next. It is at this point that the Pauline conception of justification by faith links itself on to the older theologies. What St. Paul has in view is always the question of acceptance with God, and his doctrine is the answer of his Christian experience to a problem set in the terms of the Pharisaic theology.

2. The Pauline doctrine.—There is no doubt that St. Paul's idea of justification is essentially the same as the Pharisaic, and, like it, forensic. In the fundamental passage Rom 3:19 ff. the whole setting is forensic. Note the words ἵνα πᾶν στόμα φοραγῆ, ὑπόδικος (Rom 3:19); ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ. (Rom 3:20). Mankind is arraigned before the judgment-bar of God, and the justification which follows must be forensic. So in Rom 4:5 justification is connected with imputation, a distinctly legal conception: λογίζεται = 'is reckoned,' *i.e.* in the heavenly account-books. See, further, Sanday-Headlam, *i.e.* p. 30, who decide on general philological grounds that δικαιῶν means *to pronounce righteous*: 'It has relation to a verdict pronounced by a judge.... It cannot mean to make righteous.' So far, then, St. Paul is in agreement with the Pharisees. But the deeper insight of his conscience will not allow him to suppose that God can be satisfied with a mere preponderance of performance over transgression. For him to attain righteousness by the works of the Law would involve the complete fulfilment of it. But this is impossible; for all are sinners (Rom 3:23). Hence St. Paul concludes that 'by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in God's sight' (Rom 3:20).

Here is the point where St. Paul introduces his doctrine, based on his own personal experience, of a new method of justification (Rom 3:21 ff.), of which the principle on God's side is grace (χάρις). *i.e.* the free unmerited love of God (Rom 3:24), and on man's side faith (Rom 1:17, Rom 4:5). As proceeding from the Divine grace, justification by faith is totally opposed to justification by works, which depends on merit (Rom 4:4). Instead of attaining a righteousness by his own efforts, the believer submissively receives a righteousness which is wholly of God, and His gift (Rom 5:17, Rom 10:3, Php 3:9). This casts light upon the Pauline conception of faith. It is the method by which the grace of God is subjectively appropriated. In so far as the believer, instead of acting on his own initiative, allows himself to be determined by God (Rom 10:3), faith is a species of obedience; thus St. Paul speaks of the obedience of faith (Rom 1:5). But as correlative to grace, or the free love of God, faith is psychologically trust, a believing 'on God' (Rom 4:24).

The revelation of the Divine grace which awakens faith takes place, according to St. Paul, in the Person of Christ (2Co 5:19) and in His work, more especially in His death, but also in His resurrection. Christ's death was the work of the Divine grace in that God ordained it as an expiatory sacrifice for sin, Christ dying instead of sinners, that in the act of justification He might not appear indulgent of sin (Rom 3:25; cf. 2Co 5:21, Rom 5:8). Christ's resurrection is also included in the revelation by which God's grace to sinners is made known (Rom 4:25; Rom 8:34; Rom 10:9, 1Co 15:17), but St. Paul does not define its exact place in it. In fact, Christ's resurrection, as the object of faith, is hardly separable from the Risen Christ. It is God's act by which He presents Christ alive, in spite of His death (Rom 4:24; Rom 10:9), as the object of faith.

It is to be observed, finally, that justification requires for its complete explanation both sides of the correlation, grace and faith, which in St. Paul's mind are associated in the closest possible manner. Thus he speaks of the revelation of the righteousness of God through faith (Rom 1:17, Rom 3:22): the whole is really one idea. Only thus can we explain the remarkable interchange of language which the Apostle uses with respect to the two sides of the correlation. Justification is generally associated more closely with faith, or the subjective side (Rom 3:26, Rom 5:1). But in 2Co 5:19 St. Paul says that God was in Christ, not imputing to men their trespasses, which last phrase is synonymous with 'justifying men'; so that here justification is associated with the *objective* side, or the revelation of grace (cf. Rom 3:24). So also in Rom 5:16, if δικαιῶμα be rightly translated 'sentence of justification' (so Sanday-Headlam, *l.c.* p. 141), then St. Paul here represents this sentence as falling once for all at the death of Christ. On the other hand, the sacrifice of Jesus Christ belongs to the objective side of the correlation; yet St. Paul speaks of Christ in Rom 3:25 as propitiatory through faith in His blood. Evidently, then, grace and faith are so organically related that the one implies the other, and is properly understood only through its correlative.

We must now return to the form in which St. Paul has expressed his doctrine of justification. It is, as we have seen, determined by his Pharisaic training, and is that of a forensic judgment. But the *form* is all that the Apostle has in common with the Pharisaic idea. The judgment of justification in his conception is extra-judicial, *i.e.* God has regard in it to considerations outside the Law. The righteousness of faith is 'apart from law' (χωρὶς νόμου, Rom 3:21). The Law as such takes account only of merit, as St. Paul himself testifies: 'He that doeth them shall live in them' (Gal 3:12). But the Divine sentence of justification takes account of faith, which is a consideration beyond the purview of the Law: 'The law is not of faith' (*ib.*). In fact, in justification the Law is transcended by grace, which reckons faith for righteousness (Rom 4:4-5). St. Paul does not mean that faith is a work, and that grace simply

reckons the work of faith instead of the works of the Law. This would be, after all, half legalism. With the Apostle, as we have seen, faith is not a work, but a receiving; not a second principle of justification over against grace, but simply the reflex of Divine grace in man. Grace therefore sees in faith simply this reflex of itself, and in justifying the sinner by faith in reality justifies on the ground of itself (cf. Isa 43:25).

What, then, is the essential point in the Pauline presentation of justification as forensic? It is, to use philosophic language, that justification is a synthetic, not an analytic judgment. It is not based on anything in the believer—not even on his faith, which comes into view only so far as the Divine grace is reflected in it. In justification God ‘justifies the ungodly’ (Rom 4:5): the words are evidently chosen by St. Paul with a clear sense of the paradox involved, as the deliberate opposition of language to the OT shows (cf. Exo 23:7, Deu 25:1, Pro 17:15, Isa 5:23). God does not, in justification, recognize the presence of any attribute in the sinner; on the contrary, He adds to him an attribute while he is still a sinner, viz. that of righteousness. It is evident that the paradoxical character of this doctrine created misunderstanding even in St. Paul’s time (Rom 3:8; cf. Rom 6:1); and it has done so ever since. The paradox, however, resolves itself at once as soon as we remember that it is ‘righteousness,’ not in the ethical, but in the religious sense, as the condition of acceptance with God, which is meant. The OT taught that righteousness was the condition of acceptance with God; the Pharisees sharpened this into the doctrine that the performance of the Law was the condition. St. Paul’s language is determined by this form in which he found the problem of acceptance with God stated; his meaning simply is that God accepts the sinner on the ground of His mere grace, apart from all question of merit. It is consequently ‘only another, though less difficult, expression for the same act of the Divine judgment’ when St. Paul speaks of adoption (*υιοθεσια*, Gal 4:5), or the reception of the sinner into the position of a child of God (Holtzmann, *Neutest. Theol.* ii. p. 134). Adoption is also formally a judicial act, and really a synthetic act of the Divine judgment. The possible objection to this identification of justification and adoption, viz. that justification is the act of God as Judge, but adoption His act as Father, falls to the ground as soon as it is remembered that justification is really an extra-judicial judgment, proceeding from the Divine grace (Ritschl, *Justification and Reconciliation*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred]’, iii., English translation p. 86 ff.).

Finally, we get still further light on St. Paul’s meaning as to justification from the fact that in Rom 4:7 he introduces, as synonymous with the imputation of righteousness or justification, the OT idea of the forgiveness of sins (cf. also Eph 1:7), which links his teaching on at once to that of Christ Himself; and it appears that the Pauline conceptions of justification and adoption are simply the equivalent of the Fatherly forgiveness taught by Jesus (Kaftan, *Dogmatik* 3, 4, p. 523). The idea that forgiveness

is something merely negative, while justification conveys a positive status, turns on an inadequate conception of the Biblical idea of forgiveness.

So far we have considered justification as a Divine operation; it now remains to consider its practical issues, when it takes effect in the admission of the sinner to fellowship with God. Faith now comes into view, not simply as the reflexion of grace, but in its psychological nature as trust, including the submission of the will to God; and the practical effects of justification appear as the unfolding of this trust in its various aspects. The first of these is the sense of present peace with God (Rom 5:1), or the consciousness of acceptance with Him. Here appears a strong contrast with the Pharisaic theology, which, teaching not the justification of the sinner, but only of him who has kept the precepts, defers justification till the hour of death, and consequently demands in the present a condition of anxious fear lest in the end justification should not be attained (Weber, *l.c.* pp. 284, 334 ff.; cf. Rom 8:15). Along with present peace goes patience in all present suffering (Rom 5:2-3; Rom 5:5), in the belief that it is Divinely ordered for the best ends (Rom 8:28), while there is at the same time a consciousness of the Divine love (Rom 5:5, Rom 8:35-39). Here appears a contrast to the OT point of view, from which temporal sufferings appeared as signs of the Divine displeasure. This contrast is strikingly brought out by comparing St. Paul's triumphant use of the quotation in Rom 8:36 with its original despondent meaning in Psa 44:22. While St. Paul finds it impossible that persecution should separate the believer from the love of God, the Psalmist sees in it a proof that God has cast off His people (cf. Psa 44:9). Finally, there is no fear of final punishment (Rom 5:9), but rather a joyful hope, nay certainty, of ultimate salvation (Rom 5:2; Rom 5:10, Rom 6:23, Rom 8:30; Rom 8:38-39). The sum of all these things, in fact the whole consequence of justification, St. Paul expresses by saying that, for the believer, 'There is now no condemnation' (Rom 8:1), or that he is not under law, but under grace (Rom 6:15). From this point of view the work of Christ appears as a redemption from the curse of the Law. Christ, in His death, bore its curse, and its power is therefore at an end (Gal 3:13). St. Paul refers in this passage to the Jewish Law, as the antithesis with Gal 3:14 shows: 'Christ redeemed us [Jews] from the curse of the law ... that upon the Gentiles might come the blessing of Abraham in Christ Jesus.' But his idea of freedom from the Law is not to be limited to freedom from the Jewish Law. Though, historically, this special case was of the greatest importance, St. Paul means that the Christian religion is a religion not of law, but of grace. He also expresses the same idea in terms of the parallel conception of adoption, by saying that the believer has received, in place of the spirit of bondage, leading to fear, the spirit of adoption, 'whereby we cry, Abba, Father' (Rom 8:15).

The doctrine of the Epistle of James on justification, whether the author has the Pauline doctrine or abuses of it in view or not [on the critical question connected with

the Epistle see Moffatt, *Historical NT²* [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 576, for a good statement of the alternatives; also Sanday-Headlam, 'Romans,' p. 104; and W. Patrick, *James the Lord's Brother*], raises an important problem in connexion with it. It is to be noted, first, that the idea of faith in the Epistle is quite different from St. Paul's. When the author teaches that justification is not by faith only, but by works also, the faith he has in view is a mere intellectual assent to Christian truth, especially to the doctrine of the Divine unity (Jam 2:19). Further, his idea of works is not that of meritorious performance deserving reward, but of practical morality. He solves the problem of justification in reality by going back behind the legalism of the Pharisees, and behind the Law altogether, to the position of the OT prophets, in so far as they demanded practical righteousness as the condition of acceptance with God. His doctrine and St. Paul's, therefore, touch nowhere except in language; in thought they are altogether apart. At the same time, the Epistle of James serves forcibly to raise the question, which St. Paul's doctrine is always liable to provoke, viz. what safeguard it offers, while satisfying the religious needs of man, for his moral interests. Reference has already been made to the passage in which St. Paul speaks of opposition to his teaching; it was its apparent antinomianism that provoked this opposition (Rom 3:8; cf. Rom 6:1).

We have thus to return to St. Paul, and ask how he met this difficulty. He does it by opening a new line of argument, in which he presents a fresh view of the death and resurrection of Christ, where these acts appear in the ethical sense of a death to sin and a resurrection to a new life unto God (Rom 6:10), and where, further, Christ in His death and resurrection appears as inclusive of all for whom He died (2Co 5:14). In correspondence with this view, faith also takes on a new significance. It is still a receptivity and an obedience; but as that which it receives is different, it appears with new powers, as establishing a mystic union with Christ in His death and resurrection, the outward symbol of which is baptism (Gal 2:20, Rom 6:1-6, Col 2:11), from which union St. Paul draws the ethical consequence, that the believer being dead with Christ to sin, and alive with Him to God, should live accordingly (Rom 6:4; Rom 6:11-13, Col 3:1; Col 3:5). A parallel line of argument presents the view of the Risen Christ as the Spirit (2Co 3:17), and faith correspondingly as involving the endowment of the Spirit (Gal 3:2, cf. Rom 8:1-11), by which the believer is transformed into the likeness of Christ (2Co 3:18). But again, the possession of the Spirit demands a life according to the Spirit (Gal 5:25, Rom 8:12-13). Along these lines, then, St. Paul makes provision for Christian morality. He presents, as we see, his total thought on the salvation of the individual through the work of Christ in two hemispheres—the former doctrine of justification and this further doctrine which corresponds to the ecclesiastical doctrines of regeneration and sanctification. St. Paul passes continually from the one hemisphere

to the other in a way that shows that he feels them to be vitally related; and there are not wanting points of contact between them, amongst which we may note especially the fact that the idea of faith is common to both hemispheres, as is also that of the Spirit, who appears in connexion with justification and adoption as diffusing the consciousness of the love of God (Rom_5:5) and as witnessing to our adoption (8:16), as well as in connexion with regeneration and sanctification as the potency of the new life. Further, there is a cycle of passages in which there appears a tendency to the unification of the two hemispheres of thought, by making justification conditional on regeneration and sanctification, and thus still future and the object of effort (Rom_8:17, Gal_2:17, 1Co_4:4; 1Co_9:24; 1Co_9:27, Php_3:10; Php_3:14). See on the whole subject Holtzmann, *Neutest. Theol.* ii. p. 137 ff. In the main, however, St. Paul keeps the two hemispheres apart. Holtzmann (p. 137, n. [Note: note.] 1) quotes Pfleiderer, who, using another figure, speaks of ‘the two streams which unite in Paulinism in one bed, without, however, inwardly blending.’

II. Historical

1. *The Catholic doctrine.*—St. Paul’s doctrine of justification remained after his death in practical abeyance, until it was revived at the Reformation. There is little trace of it in the NT outside of his own Epistles (*i.e.* of the specific Pauline form of the doctrine of forgiveness). Only uncertain echoes of it are found in the post-Apostolic age, and under the régime of Catholicism, both ancient and mediaeval, it remained practically a dead letter. Common Catholicism, in fact, returned substantially to the Pharisaic doctrine of salvation by merit, against which St. Paul had fought, with its accompanying atmosphere of fear of coming short at last. According to Gregory the Great, who is here typical, assurance is the mother of indolence, and the fear of Divine judgment is the only fit attitude for the Christian till his last day on earth (Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , iii. p. 250, n. [Note: note.] 1). In such an atmosphere the words of the Pauline vocabulary necessarily lost their original meaning, and took on a new significance. Faith came to mean, not trust, but intellectual assent to revealed truth; grace, not the unmerited love of God, but the Holy Spirit, as sacramentally communicated or infused (so Tertullian; see Loofs, *Leitfaden*, p. 104). It was the work of Augustine to create a new doctrine of justification by the combination of these ideas. First he interpreted the word ‘justification’ itself to mean not ‘a declaring righteous,’ but ‘a making righteous’; what else is *justificati* than *justi facti*? (*de Sp. ct Litt.* 26, 45). Then, further, he combined the idea of justification in this sense with that of ‘infused’ grace. Augustine teaches that it is this infused grace which justifies or makes righteous by renewing the nature. He is able thus, with St. Paul, to conceive righteousness as a gift; the gift, however, is not of forensic, but of inherent righteousness. This idea of justification by infused grace, it is to be noted, lacks that

immediate and necessary connexion with the work of Christ which lies at the base of the Pauline doctrine. Augustine, indeed, regards the forgiveness of sins as an effect of grace, parallel with the renewal of the nature; but faith is not brought into the connexion. The idea of faith remains with Augustine simply the common Catholic idea of assent to revealed truth; so that faith is no more than a presupposition of salvation. Only as it is completed by hope and love through the infusion of grace, is it Christian and saving faith (Seeberg, *Dogmengeschichte*, i. 276). It is obvious how far Augustine is here from St. Paul, though he constantly uses the Apostle's formula 'justification by faith' (Seeberg, p. 277). The climax of his departure from Pauline doctrine, however, is reached when the idea of merit is drawn into the scheme. The combination is thus effected. Grace alone renders merit possible. God in His condescension accepts as meritorious the works which are really His own gifts: 'what are called our merits are His gifts' (*de Trinitate*, xiii. 10, 14).

In Western Catholicism the doctrine of justification remains substantially that of Augustine. The Roman Catholic doctrine was finally formulated in opposition to Protestantism at the Council of Trent. It is necessary to refer to two points only. The first is that, in the Middle Ages, Duns Scotus taught a modification of the Augustinian doctrine, which makes still wider room for the idea of merit. He avails himself of a distinction already found in Thomas Aquinas between merit of congruity (*meritum de congruo*) and condign merit (*meritum de condigno*). The former is based upon the idea of the Divine equity, to which it is congruous to reward every one who works according to his power after the excellency of the Divine power. The latter is based on the idea of strict justice, which rewards according to desert (Seeberg, *l.e.* ii. 105). According to Duns, the first grace itself can be merited *de congruo* by attrition, *i.e.* such repentance as is possible without grace. The second point to be observed is that the Council of Trent draws a natural consequence from the Augustinian idea of justification, by teaching that justification is progressive, and can and ought to receive continual increment (Sess. vi. cap. x.).

The great contrast between the Catholic doctrine and that of St. Paul is obvious at the first glance. A second look, however, might suggest that perhaps the contrast was not so great after all. For the Catholic doctrine of justification corresponds, though by no means exactly, to St. Paul's doctrine of regeneration and sanctification. It might, therefore, appear as if the difference were really one of language. Nevertheless, in the end the contrast remains unmitigated by this seeming possibility of reconciliation; as Ritschl has acutely observed (*op. cit.*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] iii. 36). Catholicism still remains in opposition to St. Paul's idea of justification. What the Apostle calls 'justification,' viz. acceptance with God, including the assurance of eternal life (Rom 5:10; Rom 6:23; Rom 8:30; Rom 8:33; Rom 8:39), Catholic doctrine includes under the conception of hope. So Conc. Trid. Sess. vi. cap. xiii.: Christians 'ought to fear, knowing that they are regenerated unto

the hope of glory, and not yet unto glory....' No one, indeed, can be absolutely certain even of present grace (cap. ix.). It is true that within Catholicism the practical attitude of trust for salvation to the Divine mercy alone, apart from all merits, and the consequent sense of assurance, are to be found, as to some extent in Augustine (Harnack, *op. cit.* iii. p. 85 f.), but preeminently in Bernard of Clairvaux. In this attitude is the true harbinger of the return to St. Paul at the Reformation (Ritschl, *op. cit.*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] i. 109 ff.). But we are now concerned with the Catholic doctrine, not with an attitude maintained in spite of it.

2. The Protestant doctrine.—With the Reformation we have a return to the Pauline idea of justification. The absolutely fundamental character for the Christian religion of the Pauline conception is firmly seized. As is well known, Luther called justification by faith 'the article of a standing and falling Church.' The Protestant doctrine, however, assumes a special form, in antithesis to the interim Catholic development, and St. Paul's formula is sharpened into the still more definite shape 'justification by faith alone.'

We have to note, first of all, a reversion to the original Pauline ideas of grace, faith, and justification. Luther, indeed, especially in his earlier period, remained somewhat entangled with the Catholic conception of the last, making the term include both a forensic and a real justification. This, however, was merely a matter of terminology, and has only a historical significance. Practically Luther held the Pauline view: the emphasis with him falls on the forensic aspect of justification. Moreover, the somewhat confused terminology of Luther was corrected by Melancthon, who says decidedly that justification with the Hebrews was a forensic word, and opposes the idea of a real justification (*Loci Theologici*: 'De gratia et justificatione').

The Protestant theology, further, like St. Paul, found the revelation of the Divine grace in Christ, and His work for sinners. Here, however, a considerable development takes place, based upon the mediaeval development of the doctrine of the Atonement due to Anselm. The latter had viewed the death of Christ in the first place as a satisfaction to God's honour, which liberated Him from the necessity of punishing sinners, and in the second place as a merit or work of supererogatory obedience, which could be made available for His followers. The Protestant theology accepted both these ideas, but with such modifications as made it possible to combine them with the forensic idea of justification. The death of Christ was viewed not as a satisfaction to God's honour, but to the penal sanctions of His Law. To this was added His active obedience to the Law in His life as a satisfaction to its positive requirements. The whole was summed up as Christ's active and passive obedience or merit, and regarded as a provision of the Divine grace with a view to the justification of sinners. Justification consists in the gracious imputation of this twofold merit or

obedience to the sinner on the sole condition of faith, so that he becomes not only guiltless before the Law, but also totally free from its claims. This conception is common to both the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches. It did not grow up all at once; but the roots of it can be traced in the earlier Reformers, and it finally established itself firmly in both Churches. It is completely stated in the *Formula of Concord* (pars ii. Solida Declaratio, iii. 14, 15).

The change from the Pauline doctrine is marked by the alteration of his formula, the imputation of faith for righteousness, into that of the imputation of Christ's righteousness. It is not merely one of language. The conception of Christ's death as a satisfaction to the penal sanctions of the Divine law, on the ground of which God forgives sinners, may, indeed, be accepted as a natural interpretation of the Pauline conception of Christ's death as an expiatory sacrifice for sin, if this conception is to be translated into terms of law. Whether, however, such translation is desirable, is questionable; as we saw that the forensic point of view is only formally and not materially regulative for the Pauline conception of justification. Thus, instead of seeking to translate related conceptions into legal terminology, we ought rather to seek such an explanation (or, if need be, modification) of them as accords with the material element in St. Paul's idea of justification, viz. that it is entirely the work of grace, 'apart from law.' The Protestant theology, in fact, misinterprets Paul by taking his legal phraseology as essential, and seeking to systematize his whole view of justification and its presuppositions under legal ideas. The attempt of the Protestant doctors to conceive the whole process of salvation in legal forms, made them introduce into theology a number of axioms which are in no way part of the Christian view of the world. Such an axiom is that all sin must be punished; whereas the Christian religion teaches that it can be forgiven, and forgiveness and punishment are mutually exclusive (cf. W. N. Clarke, *Christian Theology*, p. 330). Another axiom is that the punishment of sin may be transferred from one person to another; whereas the very essence of the idea of punishment is its connexion with guilt. The vicarious suffering of the innocent for the guilty is not punishment. A third axiom is that merit may similarly be transferred from one person to another; whereas the moral result of a life, which is what is meant, is personal, and while it may result in the good of others, cannot possibly be separated from the person of its author, and treated as a commercial asset. That the Protestant doctors had to base their theology on axioms like these, plainly shows that they were on the wrong line in attempting to translate the doctrine of salvation into legal terms. We may no doubt recognize behind the forms of the Protestant theology the intention to show that the Divine grace itself is the grace of a Holy and a Righteous God. But the immediate identification of the Divine Righteousness with its expression in law is fatal to a full and complete view of grace. St. Paul might have taught a better conception of law as a temporary and preparatory manifestation of the Divine righteousness, whose end is fulfilled in a higher way by grace (Gal 3:24).

This defect in the view of the revelation of the Divine grace in Christ does not, however, prevent the Protestant theology from being true in the main to the Pauline conception of justification. Over against Catholicism, Protestant theology teaches justification by God's grace appropriated by faith alone, and apart from all question of human merit. Moreover, in the total view the emphasis, at any rate with the earlier Reformers, does not fall on the supposed legal forms of the Divine revelation in Christ, but on the idea of grace itself. A remarkable proof of this is to be found in the fact that in Melancthon's *Loci Theologici* there is no *locus* devoted to the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction. Even so late as Gerhard in the early part of the 17th cent., the doctrine is treated by him simply as a part of the *locus de justificatione*.

After this critical excursus we return to the Protestant theology itself, in order next to describe the positions by which it further defined its conception of justification as over against Catholicism. As regards what the Catholics call 'justification,' but the Protestants 'regeneration,' it is taught that the latter is the necessary accompaniment and logical (the later Lutheran theology says, temporal) consequence of justification. Its objective principle is the gift of the Holy Spirit, its subjective manifestation the activity of faith in good works.

On some further points the two Evangelical Churches diverge not only from Catholicism, but from one another. The first of these has to do with the question of assurance. The Lutherans teach that the believer's consciousness of justification is in itself an immediate certainty of the reality of justification, operated by the Holy Ghost (*fides divina*). Where, however, doubt enters, recourse must be had to the Word and the Sacraments, that the Holy Ghost, who works through the Word, may rekindle faith. The Reformed theologians teach that the guarantee of the reality of justification is God's eternal predestination to salvation, which manifests itself subjectively in perseverance in the state of grace. Hence the assurance of justification cannot be gathered directly from faith itself, but by a reference to its evidence in its fruits (*sylogismus practicus*). [See Lipsius, *Dogmatik*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 675 f.].

The second difference between the Protestant Churches is that the Lutherans make the moment of justification, alike in earth and heaven, the moment when saving faith comes into being. The Reformed, on the other hand, regard justification as accomplished in the resurrection of Christ for the whole Church as His mystical body (*justificatio activa*), but as regards individual believers based on the decree of justification, which accompanies their eternal election, and realized when saving faith arises (*justificatio passiva*). It is to be noted that the objective justification, which is accomplished for believers in Christ's resurrection, depends only upon their *ideal* incorporation in His mystical body. The Reformed doctrine does not therefore, as has sometimes been said, make justification dependent on regeneration. Christ's

resurrection is regarded as the acceptance of His satisfaction, made for believers, and thus as ideally their justification in Him (cf. Lipsius, *Dogmatik*, p. 677 f.; Ritschl, *op. cit.*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] i. 293 ff.).

The third difference is as to the doctrine of perseverance. The Lutherans teach that a man may fall from faith, and thus from grace, but that he may regain his position by renewed repentance and faith. On the contrary, the Reformed teach that the members of Christ's body cannot fall, but must persevere in faith to the end. A faith that does not endure, is not real faith; and the consciousness of justification it may bring is only self-deception (Lipsius, p. 679).

Reference must now be made to certain views within Protestantism which deviate from the orthodox conception. The first of these is that of Osiander, who, attaching himself to many expressions in the teaching of Luther, attempted once more to teach a real justification, and yet avoid introducing the Catholic conception of salvation by merit. In opposition to the idea of justification by the mere external imputation of Christ's righteousness, he taught that the essential ground of justification is Christ's righteousness as really communicated to us; though at the same time he regards this indwelling righteousness of Christ not as our own, but as an alien righteousness, and in so far as an imputed righteousness (Lipsius, p. 668).

Another line of thought is opened by the Socinian theology. A criticism of the legal forms of the ecclesiastical doctrine of reconciliation leads to the complete rejection of it. Socinus, however, retains a doctrine of justification by faith, regarded as including not only trust in God as revealed by Christ, but consequent obedience to His will. There is no justification by works without faith; but, on the other hand, works are not merely the fruit of faith, but its execution and perfection, and in so far the works which follow faith justify (Socinus, *de Fide et Operibus*, Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum, 1656, tom. i. p. 623). But as works done in faith are not perfect, justification is also said to be by faith in opposition to works, because the mercy of God imputes righteousness to the believer (*de Jesu Christo Salvatore*, p. iv, c. 11). In other words, faith is here considered as the principle of active righteousness, and the doctrine of justification comes to mean that God judges not by the outward work, but by the inward disposition. This conclusion is distinctly drawn by the Rationalism of the German Illumination (Lipsius, p. 684).

3. Modern theories.—The most important forms in which the doctrine of justification has been stated in modern theology, so far as that does not simply repeat older points of view, owe their origin chiefly to Kant and Schleiermacher, particularly the latter. Kant took up the subject where it had been left by the Illumination, but in view of his deeper ethics stated it as an ethico-religious problem, viz. how a man conscious of guilt could obtain power to live a new life. The solution is to be found in the

conception of faith in the ideal. On the one hand, this appears as the principle of a good life; on the other, it affords the principle of acceptance with God, in so far as God judges men by the ideal they follow, though their realization of it may be imperfect. The Kantian theologian Tieftrunk further pointed out that from a psychological point of view the operation of the Divine grace is absolutely necessary, if a man, in spite of his consciousness of guilt, is to be able joyfully to fulfil the moral law; so that it is required from the point of view of the law itself, in so far as it looks for fulfilment (Lipsius, p. 685; Ritschl³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , i. p. 429 ff.).

The defect of the Kantian conception, from the point of view of the Christian religion, is its lack of organic connexion with the historical revelation of God in Jesus Christ. In the system of Schleiermacher, however, the fundamental character for Christianity of this revelation is fully recognized, while at the same time, instead of a return to the standpoint of the older Protestant dogmatics, there is introduced a new and fruitful theological principle. Schleiermacher demands that all conceptions concerning Divine operations shall be verified by their correspondence with Christian experience, not indeed the experience of an individual, but of the Christian community as a whole (*Der christliche Glaube*⁵ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , i. § 30. p. 162).

From this point of view Schleiermacher treats justification. He begins with the Christian consciousness of redemption and reconciliation through Christ. 'The Redeemer receives believers into the power of His God-consciousness, and this is His redeeming activity' (ii. § 100. p. 94). 'The Redeemer receives believers into the fellowship of His undisturbed happiness, and this is His reconciling activity' (ii. § 101. p. 102). Schleiermacher thus views the work of Christ through the total impression of His character and life. Only as a part of the latter do His sufferings come into question (ii. § 101. 4, p. 108). In accordance with this groundwork follow a the doctrine of justification. Justification and conversion are the two inseparable parts of regeneration or assumption into union with Christ. 'Assumption into union with Christ is, viewed as an altered relation of man to God, his justification; viewed as an altered form of life, his conversion' (ii. § 107. p. 165). Justification is by faith, and includes the forgiveness of sins and adoption into Divine sonship (ii. § 109. p. 190). All these things flow naturally and inseparably from union with Christ, which alters alike the will and the contemplative consciousness. In particular, the consciousness of forgiveness follows from the fact that the new man in Christ has no relation to the sins of the old man or their penalties. Present suffering he regards simply as evil, not as punishment, and of future suffering he has no fear (ii. § 109. 2, p. 193). Finally, when passing over from our own consciousness we view justification as a Divine act, it is not to be separated from the effective working of Christ in conversion. The Divine

act of justification, moreover, is one with the sending of Christ into the world. There is no 'declaratory act' apart from this: only figuratively can such be spoken of. As regards the justification of the individual, the case is simply that the one Divine decree of justification in Christ is realized in successive points of time. Finally, faith is not to be described as the instrumental cause, or the ὄργανον ληπτικόν of justification. We bring nothing to the Divine grace in Christ but our mere receptivity (ii. § 109. 3, p. 195 f.). Faith is awakened wholly by the operation of Christ (ii. § 108. 6, p. 186).

The influence of the Reformed theology is plainly visible in the position of Schleiermacher, that justification is, as a Divine act, to be viewed as realized first of all in Christ, and then successively in believers. Compare what is said above, also Turretin (*Inst. Theol. Elenccticae*, Loc. xvi. Qu. ix. 12), who says that justification is one from the point of view of God, though from our point of view it appears in successive acts, viz. God's eternal decree of justification, the realization of it in Christ's work, the application of it in experience, and the declaration of it at the last day. But, further, the correspondence of this point of view with the tendency previously noted in St. Paul to bring the objective and subjective sides of justification into close and indeed inseparable relation, may also be remarked. Schleiermacher, however, brings the principle which underlies this tendency to clear consciousness, and bases on it his theological method, for which, as we saw, the continuity of Divine operation and human experience is fundamental.

Schleiermacher's doctrine of justification has been differently understood. Most theologians have considered that he means to make justification conditional on a real union with Christ (cf. Lipsius, p. 686 ff.). Ritschl, however, thinks that only an ideal union is referred to (iii.³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 559). Two different developments, therefore, have taken place, starting from either view of Schleiermacher's position.

In the first place, one of the commonest views in modern theology makes justification dependent on a real union with Christ, breaking down the sharp distinction between justification and regeneration, and treating them simply as aspects of the same process. Faith, on this view, is to be regarded in justification not simply as the reflex of Divine grace, but as comprehending the spiritual content of union with Christ, and of the gift of the Spirit, which is the basis of the ethical life of the Christian. Hence this view of justification is claimed to be 'ethical'; justification according to it being a recognition of what really is in the believer his new life, as well pleasing to God. A reconciliation with the forensic view is found in the Kantian thought that God judges by the ideal; so that justification appears as a prophetic judgment, which sees in the first germ of the new life its whole fruit.

This view is closely akin to Osiander's. It has undoubtedly points of contact with the broader use of the word 'faith' in St. Paul, who, as Pfleiderer points out, often uses it as practically equivalent to the whole of Christianity (*Urchristenthum*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , i. p. 250; cf. 1Co 12:9 f., 1Co 16:13). It is further along the line developed in the cycle of passages like Rom 8:17, Gal 2:17, 1Co 4:4; 1Co 9:24; 1Co 9:27, Php 3:10-14, as previously explained. But it does not represent St. Paul's main line of thought with respect to justification, and the objection to it further is that in the end it bases justification either upon the imperfect realization of Christ in us, or, in so far as the imperfection is counterbalanced by a reference to the ideal, upon what is still future, thus resembling the Catholic view. This view does not, therefore, meet the *religious* need of a firm and unshakable ground of trust as to acceptance with God.

In opposition to it, therefore, Ritschl develops the doctrine of Schleiermacher along the other line, which he takes to be its real meaning, giving in his theology also prominence to a conception which with Schleiermacher is in the background—that of revelation. The idea of justification is consequently construed directly through the idea of the Divine grace as revealed in Christ, and faith is thought of as of a piece with this revelation and the realization of it in human lives. Justification is thus in the first instance through grace, but by faith. Ritschl's way of expressing this is by saying that justification is the act of God as Father, and further that the sentence of justification falls in the first instance on the religious community founded by Christ as a whole, to which God imputes the position towards Him of Christ its Founder, and on individuals as by faith in the Gospel they attach themselves to this community; justification thus becoming effective for them. Faith is simply obedience to God and trust in the revelation of His grace in Christ. Its functions are religious, not moral (iii.³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 139; cf. also p. 70). As regards the effects of justification, the comprehensive description of them is that it is 'the acceptance of sinners into fellowship with God, in which their salvation is to be realized and carried out into eternal life.' In particular, the consciousness of guilt is removed, in so far as the element of mistrust of God, which is the essence of it, is removed (p. 85). Assurance of justification can be obtained only by the exercise of faith in patience or 'lordship over the world.' Finally, the course of moral action is conditioned by justification; but the direct aim of the latter is not the product of moral action, but the bestowal of eternal life, which is realized here and now in lordship over the world (pp. 192, 534 f., 670).

III. Constructive treatment.—It appears to the present writer that a correct modern interpretation of the Pauline conception of justification must move generally along the lines suggested by Ritschl. Perhaps it may be necessary to observe that such an interpretation is required, and that it is not sufficient simply to rest in the Pauline

statement as it stands. In the first place, we have seen that St. Paul suggests more than one point of view, and we have to settle which is to be regarded as determinative. Then, again, there are gaps in the Pauline presentation which require to be filled up, especially in view of the points raised by later theological controversies. Finally, the Pauline theology is only one among the early Christian presentations of the Christian salvation, and it is necessary in some points to modify his conceptions in order to do justice to other NT points of view, especially those presented in the Gospels. We proceed, then, to present the doctrine of justification along the general lines of Ritschl, but with regard also to the treatment of other theologians, who have, as it seems to the writer, dealt more satisfactorily than Ritschl with particular points. Reference is made particularly to Ritschl's own followers, Kaftan and Häring, but also to Lipsius and Kähler, and finally to W. N. Clarke.

Instead of beginning with St. Paul's technical term 'justification,' we shall first make use of its material equivalent, the idea of *forgiveness*, having already established our right to do this. We thus, as Kaftan says (*Dogmatik*^{3, 4} [Note: , 4 designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 523), present the issue in a simpler and less equivocal form, with the advantage also of keeping before the mind the connexions of the subject in the teaching of Jesus. What Paul calls grace is to Jesus the Fatherly forgiving love of God.

We begin, then, with the analysis of forgiveness as a Divine act, and consider, after Paul, first the objective side of this act—revelation,—and then the subjective side—faith, by which the revelation is appropriated and forgiveness fully realized. The revelation of forgiveness is in Jesus Christ, His Person and Work; not merely, however, as St. Paul teaches, in His death and resurrection, but as the Gospels clearly show, and as Schleiermacher, after them recognized, in His whole life, including these culminating acts. Forgiveness is revealed by the whole of Christ's activity as well as by His sufferings. In fact, His sufferings reveal forgiveness because of the activity expressed in the endurance of them. Jesus further makes this revelation as the unique and perfect representative of God in the world, absolutely one with the Father in thought and feeling; so that by every word and deed and by His whole attitude He incarnates God in the world, to do which is His earthly mission and vocation.

The Fatherly forgiveness of God, which Jesus reveals, is no mere good-natured indulgence; on the contrary, the Father is the Holy Father, the Righteous Father (Joh 17:11; Joh 17:25), and His forgiveness is holy and righteous forgiveness. Jesus guarantees this by His revelation not only of the Divine forgiveness, but also of the Divine holiness in its stern condemnation of sin. A holy hatred of sin is evident in His whole attitude.

But, finally, Jesus reveals the holy forgiving love of God not only in these two separate moments, but in its entirety, by His bearing in love the sins of men upon His soul. We can explain His sorrow over Jerusalem only as the pain of One who, full of love to men, felt their sin as the heaviest burden. We can explain the agony in Gethsemane and the cry of desolation on the cross only along the same lines, as caused by the pressure of the sin of the world upon the loving heart of the Saviour. In this bearing of sin, however, Jesus was still revealing the attitude of God towards sinners. The fact that the burden of sin upon His soul broke in upon the peace and bliss of His personal communion with the Father, makes no difference as to this point. Christ's actual communion with the Father had to be maintained, indeed, by an act of supreme self-surrender (Mar_14:36), or of faith, unaided by any evidence of the Divine presence (Mar_15:34). It was necessary that the holy love of God should come to complete self-expression in the world, which could only be by the revelation of the depth of suffering caused to sinless love by sin; and this revelation could not be made except by the Revealer proceeding along a path which brought upon His human spirit the sense of separation from God. This path was, however, not a new one; it was I but the continuation, to the end of the path, of Christ's vocation as Revealer of God. To reveal the holy love of God in a world of sin could have but one issue, that which it historically had, viz. to rouse up the opposition of sin, as much to the love as to the holiness (Luk_15:2), to the uttermost. The final act of self-surrender and faith, therefore, by which Jesus gave Himself to the death at the hands of sinners, which was inevitable, if He persevered in His vocation, was simply the climax of the self-surrender and faith by which as man He gave Himself at every moment to the work of His vocation. The whole revelation of God made by Jesus being a revelation within humanity, was made at every point by the offering up of the human will of Jesus to the Father. His whole life and death together constituted a sacrifice, which He offered up to God as the necessary means of the revelation in the world of His holy love. And this He did for the sake of men, that they might come to know the holy forgiveness of the Father.

Such, then, would seem to be the necessary restatement of the Pauline doctrine of the revelation of the grace of God in Christ in view of the historical statements of the Gospels. To complete it, however, it is necessary to add that the function of the resurrection is to make the historical revelation permanent and abiding, by presenting Christ as the perpetual object of faith. This leads to the next point, which is that of the doctrine of faith, or the subjective appropriation of the revelation. There St. Paul's conception of faith as in the first place, on the side of the will, a species of obedience or submission to God, remains fundamental. It is in essential agreement, it may be observed, with the teaching of Jesus Himself, in which *μετάνοια*, or turning to God, is made the subjective principle of forgiveness. But in order that the subjective appropriation may correspond in all points with the objective revelation, faith must

not be limited psychologically to trust, but must include penitence also, in this way appearing as the proper correlative of both the love and the holiness of forgiveness. When the revelation of forgiveness in Christ awakens this faith in the heart, then the Divine act of forgiveness is completed, and forgiveness is fully realized.

We turn next to forgiveness as an experience, where St. Paul gives ample guidance, and all that is necessary is to explain some points in reference to the problems raised by later theologians. The first practical effect of justification is peace with God, or the removal of the consciousness of guilt which separated the sinner from God. This is removed by the appropriation of the Divine forgiveness, which is realized as the removal of guilt. Nor does conscience offer any obstacle to the realization of the removal of guilt in the consciousness of the believer; since the holiness of the Divine forgiveness is assured by the very revelation which brings the knowledge of it. In fact, the penitence which accompanies trust in the Divine forgiveness as the result of the revelation in Christ, is an inward appropriation of the Divine condemnation of sin. Thus there is peace with God as the result of faith, and that upon the sure and certain basis of the knowledge of God's holy love, in which both the conscience and the heart find rest.

Forgiveness is also realized as the remission of the penalties of sin. The chief penalty of sin is eternal death, or separation from God. But further, of physical evils some are clearly the effects of sin; and the rest, to the sinner conscious of separation from God, also tend to appear as the tokens of His displeasure. Forgiveness removes the fear of eternal death by the establishment of communion with God; while, so far as physical evils are concerned, though the consequences of former sins may continue to abound, yet all these appear no longer as tokens of God's displeasure, but as fatherly chastisements, so that the believer's communion with God remains unbroken by them. Finally, the positive expression of the whole experience is that the believer enjoys the privilege of Divine sonship, and has, in his communion with God, here and now, the gift of eternal life; while his trust in God enables him confidently to leave to Him the maintenance of this privilege in the future. The negative statement of this experience is that the standing of the believer with God is not on terms of law or merit. In other words, to sum up the whole matter, the Christian religion is not a religion of law but a religion of grace. This is the real meaning of the article of justification by faith, which shows at once why it is so fundamental for Christianity, and why it is so necessary to maintain that justification is by faith alone.

We have now reached the end of the exposition of the subject-matter of the doctrine; some necessary questions, however, remain to be discussed. The first is formal. *With what point in time is the Divine act of justification to be connected?* If the exposition above has been followed, it will be seen that the question is one of definition. Forgiveness is revealed in Christ, and realized in faith. We may, therefore, connect

the Divine act more particularly with the death of Christ as the climax of the revelation, as Kaftan does (*Dogmatik*^{3. 4} [Note: 4 designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 523), which is, perhaps, most logical; or we may, with Lipsius (*Dogmatik*, p. 696), connect it with the awakening of faith in the sense that then God by His Spirit speaks pardon to the soul. The one is the *justificatio activa*, the other the *justificatio passiva* of Reformed theology; each is simply an aspect of one process.

The next question is that of *assurance*. The new of Lipsius here seems most in accordance with the spirit of Paul, viz. that ‘when faith becomes uncertain, there remains to us nothing but ever to return anew in believing trust to the objective message of grace, which meets us in the gospel or in the historical revelation in Christ, till the lost consciousness of salvation revives again.’

There remains the most difficult question of all, as Lipsius calls it, ‘the master question of theology’ (*Dogmatik*, p. 699), viz. the question of *the relation of justification to regeneration and the Christian life*. The Pauline answer to this question is, as we have seen, that the same Divine revelation in Christ by which forgiveness is revealed, is also the revelation of an ethical ideal as an energizing spirit; and that, as faith receives the revelation of grace in forgiveness, so it receives also at the same time the revelation of the ideal as a quickening influence upon the life. It is still an act of obedience or submission to God, but, in this latter aspect, the act of obedience or submission to the Christian ideal, or the reception of the Spirit of Christ as the principle of life. It is one and the same revelation in both cases, and one and the same faith or receptivity in both cases. Justification and regeneration are therefore vitally connected, and it is impossible to experience one without the other. Nevertheless Christian theology is compelled to treat them as separate articles, in order to do justice to each. In spite of the oneness of the revelation in Christ, and of the faith of the Christian, it remains true that justification has its ground simply in the Divine grace, and that faith comes into view in the matter, not in its general reference to the Christian life as a whole, but as it reflects the Divine revelation of God’s holy forgiveness.

Literature.—Only a representative selection can be given. It falls into three divisions, corresponding to those of the article. First, however, must be named a work covering all three divisions, viz. Ritschl’s great work, *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 3 vols. 1889 [English translation (*Justification and Reconciliation*) of 1st vol. from 1st ed. 1872, of 3rd vol. from 3rd ed. 1902].

I. *Biblical Theology*.—(a) Art. ‘Justification’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible , vol. ii.: R. Smend, *Alttest. Religionsgeschichte*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1899; Weber, *Jüd. Theol.*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 1897; Bousset, *Religion des Judenthums im Neutest. Zeitalter*, 1903.—(b) The various NT Theologies, especially that of Holtzmann, 1897; the general works on Paulinism; further, Ménégos, *Le péché et la rédemption d’après St. Paul*, 1882; Riggenbach, *Die Rechtfertigungslehre des Apostels Paulus*, 1897; H. Cremer, *Die paulin. Rechtfertigungslehre*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1900; the Comm. on St. Paul’s Epistles, esp. Sanday-Headlam, *Romans*, 1895.

II. *History of the Doctrine*.—(a) The general works on the History of Doctrine, esp. Seeberg, *Dogmengesch.* 1895-1898; Baur, *Lehre von der Versöhnung*, 1838.—(b) The Catholic doctrine: Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* [many editions]; *Canones et Decreta Concilii Tridentini*, ed. Tauchnitz, 1846; Mohler, *Symbolik*⁸ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1872 [also in English translation]; Newman, *Lectures on Justification*⁶ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1892.—(c) The Protestant doctrine: the various Symbols of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, esp. *Formula Concordiae*, 1589, and Berlin, 1857. (α) Lutheran: Köstlin, *Luthers Theologie*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1901; Th. Harnack, *Luthers Theologie*, 1862-1886; Melancthon, *Loci Theologici*, 1561, Erlangen, 1828; Gerhard, *Loci Theologici*, 1610-1625, also ed. by Frank, 1885; Frank, *System der Christlichen Wahrheit*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1894. (β) Reformed: Calvin, *Inst. Relig. Christ.* 1559, and Edin. 1874; Turretin, *Inst. Theol. Elencticæ*, 1688, and Edin. 1847; Owen, *On Justification*, 1677, and Edin. 1851; Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 1872.—(d) The Socinian criticism: Faustus Socinus, *de Jesu Christo Servatore*, in *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*, 1656.

III. *Modern Theories*.—Kant, *Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft*, 1793; Schleiermacher, *Der Christliche Glaube*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1830; Rothe, *Theol. Ethik*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1867-1871; Dorner, *System der Christlichen Glaubenslehre*, 1879-1881 [also English translation *System of Christian Doctrine*, 1880-1883]; Lipsius, *Dogmatik*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1893; Kähler, *Die Wissenschaft der Christlichen Lehre*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1905; Kaftan, *Dogmatik*³. 4 [Note: 4

designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1901; W. N. Clarke, *Outline of Christian Theology*, 1903; Stevens, *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, 1905.

Robert S. Franks.

✚ Justifying One's Self

JUSTIFYING ONE'S SELF.—When our Lord told the lawyer that loving God with all the heart and one's neighbour as one's self was the way to inherit eternal life, the man, 'willing to justify himself, said unto Jesus, And who is my neighbour?' (Luk_10:29). And on a later occasion, in opposition to the Pharisees who derided Him, our Lord said to them, 'Ye are they which justify yourselves before men' (Luk_16:15). The English word 'justify' always means 'to show to be just,' and in the different passages the idea of the Greek also is that of showing one's self to be just or righteous. In the first case the lawyer wished to justify either his past neglect of the command to love his neighbour, or else his having asked the question, by seeking to be told to whom the term 'neighbour' was to be applied. He would thereby suggest the impossibility of fulfilling the command until he knew for certain to whom the term was rightly applicable. In the case of the Pharisees in the latter passage, the emphasis is clearly laid upon the fact that they were endeavouring (with apparent success) to show themselves to be righteous persons in the judgment of men, though God's idea of them was entirely different. With reference to the lawyer's question, 'Who is my neighbour?' the precise form of the inquiry is noteworthy. Just as if a man could pick and choose after being told who and what constitutes a neighbour. The question really comes from a self-centred man who meant, 'Who is neighbour to me?' Bishop Lightfoot once preached a sermon on this subject, in which he pointed out that the true question is, 'Who my neighbour is,' that is, 'What is he like? what are his characteristics?' It does not call attention to this or that person as a possible neighbour, but concentrates thought on my getting to know all about the man who is 'nigh' me, my neighbour in every sense. Thus by his very question the man, so far from justifying himself, that is, showing himself to be just, really condemned himself. The character of the question reveals a selfish man whose one thought was about some one being neighbour to him instead of inquiring as to whom he could be a neighbour. Our Lord's parable of the Good Samaritan and its application, 'Which of these was *neighbour unto him*?' revealed the true aspect and attitude. This is but one instance of the great law that no man can justify himself before God. 'By the deeds of the law shall no flesh living be justified' (Rom_3:20).

W. H. Griffith Thomas.

Keeping

KEEPING.—The English verb ‘keep,’ with its equivalents ‘watch,’ ‘beware of,’ ‘preserve,’ ‘observe,’ is a translation of several Gr. words: τηρέω (and its compounds διατηρέω. συντηρέω), φυλάσσω (and its compound διαφυλάσσω), ποιέω, ἔχω (and its compounds κατέχω, συνέχω), κρατέω, ἄγω.

The most important of these words are τηρέω and φυλάσσω with their respective compounds, and for a discussion of the difference in meaning between them the reader is referred to Grimm-Thayer’s *Gr. Lex.*, and Westcott’s *St. John* (note on Joh 8:51).

1. Two common usages of the word have to be noticed first. (a) It is=*exercise watchful care*. The participle translation in Authorized Version ‘the keepers’ (Mat 28:4) is a part of the same verb (τηρέω) as is rendered ‘watch’ in Mat 27:36 ‘and they sat and watched him there’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), and in Mat 27:54 ‘The centurion and they that were with him watching ... feared exceedingly’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). It is a compound of that verb, too (συντηρέω), which is used to describe the action of putting ‘new wine into new bottles’—‘both are preserved,’ *i.e.* properly cared for (Mat 9:17). And the same compound occurs again in the passage in Mk. (Mar 6:20), where it is said that Herod ‘observed’ (Authorized Version) John, or ‘kept’ him ‘safe’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). (b) It is=*guard*, the direct implication being that this action is necessary in view of possible assaults. For instance, ‘There were shepherds in the same country abiding in the field, and keeping watch (φυλάσσοντες φυλακάς) by night over their flocks’ (Luk 2:8); ‘It is written, He shall give his angels charge over thee to keep (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 guard) thee’ (Luk 4:10, where the verb used is διαφυλάσσω). Other instances of the same usage of the word are to be found in Luk 8:29; Luk 11:21; Luk 12:15.

2. *Retain* may be taken as another general synonym for ‘keep’ as it is used in the Gospels. For example, at the marriage in Cana the ruler of the feast is reported as having said to the bridegroom, ‘Thou hast kept (τηρέω) the good wine until now’ (Joh 2:10).

Retention (κατέχω) is described as a stage in the process whereby ‘an honest and good heart’ brings to the fulfilment of fruitfulness the experience of ‘hearing the word’ (Luk 8:15). It is opposed to ‘hearing with joy, but having no root,’ and to ‘hearing and going on one’s way, and being choked with cares and riches and pleasures of this life.’

But, apart from Mar 9:10, where the disciples are said to have ‘kept (κράτέω) the saying’ which Jesus spoke to them on their way down from the Mount of Transfiguration [Luke says, Luk 9:36, they ‘held their peace’ (ἔσιγησαν) about the things they had seen on the Mount], the two most striking contexts in which the word is used with this meaning are found in Luke’s Gospel. When the shepherds made known concerning the saying which had been spoken to them about the child in Bethlehem, ‘all that heard it wondered.... But Mary kept (συνετήρει) all these sayings (or things), pondering them in her heart’ (Luk 2:18 f.). She kept them to herself, and did not allow the impression of them to dissipate in mere astonishment. ‘The wonder of the many was a transient emotion; this recollecting and brooding of Mary was an abiding habit’ (Bruce, *Expos. Gr. Test.*). Again, referring to what took place on the occasion of the visit to Jerusalem, the narrative goes on to say that Jesus went down with His parents ‘and came to Nazareth; and he was subject unto them; and his mother kept (διετήρει) all these sayings (or things) in her heart’ (Luk 2:51). She kept them continually and carefully. They were never absent from her consciousness. They were always the subject of her thought. Motherhood, in all its pathos and beauty, in all its self-forgetfulness, and devoted intentness, and jealous vigilance, is revealed in these simple words—‘*His mother kept all these sayings in her heart.*’

3. Two further usages of the word may be grouped together here. (a) In certain contexts it means to *celebrate*. For example, we read that Herod ‘exercised a watchful care’ over the Baptist, ‘*but* when his birthday was kept’ (ἄγω, Authorized Version), he was found off his guard (Mat 14:6). Again, the verb used to describe the celebration of the Passover (Mat 26:18) is ‘keep’ (ποιέω—a most appropriate term to use in connexion with an ordinance which largely consisted in representing ancient events by means of symbolic actions). Once more, in the report given in John’s Gospel of the anointing by Mary in Bethany, we read that Jesus said of Mary’s action, ‘Suffer

her to keep (τηρέω) it against the day of my burying' (Joh_12:7 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885)—the meaning of 'keep it' evidently being to 'celebrate this as a rite.' (b) In several contexts it means generally to *observe* or *conform to*. For instance, we read that when the Pharisees and scribes asked Jesus why His disciples walked not according to the tradition of the elders, but ate their bread with defiled hands, He replied, 'Full well do ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep (τηρέω) your tradition' (Mar_7:9). Again, the conclusion to which some of the Pharisees are reported to have come with regard to our Lord's action in healing a man blind from his birth on the Sabbath, was, 'This man is not from God, because he keepeth (τηρέω) not the Sabbath' (Joh_9:16).

4. But 'keep' has the more precise meanings of: (a) *believe*, in such passages as 'Blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep (φυλάσσω) it' (Luk_11:28), and 'If any man hear my sayings, and keep (φυλάσσω) them not. I judge him not' (Joh_12:47); and (b) *obey*, in such passages as that in which the rich young ruler is reported as having said with reference to the commandments cited by Jesus, 'All these things have I kept (φυλάσσω) from my youth up' (Mat_19:20 Authorized Version , cf. Mar_10:20, Luk_18:21), and that in which Jesus is reported as having taxed the Jews with failure to 'keep' (Authorized Version) or 'do' (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ; ποιέω) the Law of Moses (Joh_7:19).

But the significant passages in this connexion are those which (with the exception of Mat_19:17; Mat_28:20) occur in the Fourth Gospel, and in which the verb to 'keep' (τηρέω in every instance) is associated with the terms λόγος (sing, or plur. 'word' or 'words') and ἐντολαί (plur. 'commandments'). (i.) Westcott points out (note to Joh_8:51) that the phrase 'keeping Christ's word' (or 'words') refers to 'the observance of the whole revelation in its organic completeness.' The opposite of 'to keep' in this connexion is 'to *disregard* or *disbelieve*.' He who 'keeps' Christ's 'word' (or 'words') is he who first attends to it, and lets the wonder and significance of the message it conveys sink into his mind, and who then appropriates and makes his own by faith the revelation it brings. To pay no heed to Christ's 'word' (or 'words'), to be at no pains to think out the purport of His appearance in history, and of the tidings of salvation He proclaimed; or, the meaning and worth of the gospel having in some measure been realized, to set it aside, to neglect it, to occupy one's self seriously with other things only—that is the attitude to Himself which Christ describes when He speaks of a man *not* 'keeping His word.' To 'keep' Christ's word, in short, is to take Christ at His word—to believe in Him (cf. Joh_8:51-52; Joh_14:23-24; Joh_15:20;

Joh_17:6). The word of Christ is the word of the Father (Joh_14:24, Joh_17:6), and it is the word which the disciples are to proclaim (Joh_15:20). (ii.) The phrase ‘keeping Christ’s commandments’ refers to ‘the observance of definite precepts’ (Westcott, *ib.*). The opposite of ‘to keep’ in this connexion is clearly ‘to disobey.’ He that ‘keeps Christ’s commandments’ is he who recognizes their supremacy over his will, and seeks to regulate his inward and his outward life by them. To slight the obligations which Christ imposes, to look upon the principles of conduct which He enjoins on men as subject to qualification and as mere alternatives to other possible and perhaps more congenial maxims, or, their authority being acknowledged, to limit one’s conformity to them to an external and superficial obedience, an obedience that is only a travesty of active Christian discipleship—that is the attitude to Christ which is described when it has to be said of a man that he ‘*keeps not*’ His commandments. ‘To keep Christ’s commandments’ is to own Him as the sole sovereign of one’s life, and to bring one’s whole self—mind and will and heart—into captivity to the obedience of Christ (cf. Joh_14:15; Joh_14:21, Joh_15:10).

Love for Christ is described by Him as being the condition that ensures both *belief* in His word or words (Joh_14:23-24), and *obedience* to His commandments (Joh_14:15); and *obedience* to His commandments, on the other hand (Joh_14:21), is described by Him as being the evidence that bears witness to the reality of that love. Further, to *believing* in His word He attaches two promises. ‘If a man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him’ (Joh_14:23), and ‘If a man keep my word, he shall never see death’ (Joh_8:51)—a combination of passages which shows what ‘death’ involves. Similarly with *obedience* to His commandments Christ connects this promise, ‘If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I ... abide in my Father’s love’ (Joh_15:10); and with the love to Him that is borne witness to by *obedience* to His commandments, this other: ‘He that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him’ (Joh_14:21).

Finally, Christ describes Himself as standing in this twofold relation to the Father, viz. of ‘keeping his word,’ and ‘keeping his commandments’; ‘I know him, and keep his word’ (Joh_8:55); ‘I have kept my Father’s commandments, and abide in his love’ (Joh_15:10).

5. The last usage of the word ‘keep’ refers to the *Divine care of men*, and occurs in our Lord’s Intercessory Prayer (17). (a) Joh_15:11 lets us see one aspect of the meaning of this ‘keeping’: ‘Holy Father, keep (τηροέω) them [*i.e.* ‘those whom thou hast given me’ (Joh_15:9)] in thy name which thou hast given me, that they may be one, even as we are.’ This was the work which Christ had wrought for the disciples while He was with them. He had kept (τηροέω) them in the Father’s name, and guarded

(φυλάσσω) them (Joh 15:12). In these two phrases—the former of which suggests positive communication of truth and solicitude that the recipients might not be dispossessed of it, and the latter protection against the assaults of temptation—the ‘educative care’ which Christ spent on the disciples is summed up (see *Expos. Gr. Test. ad loc.*). And now that He is to be ‘no more in the world,’ He prays the Father to keep them in the name of Himself as Father. ‘To be kept in the name’ means not only ‘to be kept in the knowledge,’ but ‘to be kept in the experience’—there being other modes or relation and sensibility to God on man’s part besides that of knowledge. That the disciples’ faith in God as Father might be characterized by assurance, is the burden of Christ’s prayer (see Westcott, *ad loc.*, on the title ‘Holy Father’). (b) Joh 15:15 shows us another aspect of the meaning of the Divine ‘keeping’: ‘I pray not that thou shouldst take them out of the world, but that thou shouldst keep them from (Gr. ‘out of’) the evil’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘evil one’). Whether ‘evil’ should be interpreted as masculine or neuter need not be discussed here. The point to notice is that the experience, and the only experience, of Divine ‘keeping’ which Christ by His example encourages men to pray for and anticipate, consists not in immunity from adversity, injuries, suffering, sorrow, and death, but in maintenance in a condition of certitude with regard to the Father’s love and of perseverance in the path and practice of goodness—freedom from evil. The man who does not lend himself and the man who does lend himself to this keeping are described in Joh 12:25 : ‘He that loveth his life loseth it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep (φυλάσσω) it unto life eternal’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885).

Literature.—Moulton-Geden, *Concord. to Gr. Test.*; Grimm-Thayer, *Gr. Lex.*; Westcott, *Com. on John; Expos. Gr. Test.* and works referred to there.

A. B. Macaulay.

Kenosis

KENOSIS.—The word κένωσις is not itself found in the NT, but the verb κενόω *to empty, to make empty*, occurs in Php 2:7, where Authorized Version renders ‘made himself of no reputation,’ but the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 correctly ‘emptied himself’ (see Lightfoot’s *Com. in loc.*, and Grimm-Thayer’s *Greek-English Lexicon*). It is disputed among theologians as to the extent to which the Son of God stripped Himself of His Divine prerogatives, but it is not necessary here to discuss these differences, as the purpose of this article is only to collect the evidences the

Gospels afford of the actual conditions of the Incarnation. But two questions may here be very briefly touched on before we pass to this subject.

(1) We may glance at the description of this *Kenosis* of the Son of God found in the Apostolic writings. The passage in Philippians (Php 2:6-8) lays stress on the surrender, on the one hand, of the form of God ('the glories, the prerogatives of deity,' Lightfoot), of equality with God; and the assumption, on the other hand, of the form of a servant, the likeness of man, self-humiliation and obedience 'even unto death, yea, the death of the cross.' In 2Co 8:9 St. Paul describes the *Kenosis* as the abandonment of wealth for poverty (the Divine for the human mode of existence). In four pregnant statements, in which the Christian salvation is brought into most intimate relation with the humiliation of the Son of God, this *Kenosis* is more fully defined: 'God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh [He shared the flesh, but not the sin], condemned sin in the flesh' (Rom 8:3); 'God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law' (Gal 4:4); 'Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf' [the penalty of sin was endured by the sinless for the sinful (2Co 5:21)]; 'Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us' [Christ as the sacrificial victim 'became in a certain sense the impersonation of the sin and of the curse,' Lightfoot on Gal 3:13]. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews lays emphasis on the participation of the Son of God in *flesh* and *blood*, in order that He might be capable of dying (Heb 2:14); on His experience of temptation as enabling Him to sympathize with and succour the tempted (Heb 2:16, Heb 4:15); on the obedience He learned by suffering (Heb 5:8). The prologue to John's Gospel may be regarded as Apostolic interpretation; and there the *Kenosis* is described in the words 'and the Word became flesh' (Joh 1:14, see Westcott *in loco*). It is the intention of all these statements to affirm the complete reality of the manhood of Jesus.

(2) We may glance at the attempts to define theologically the process of the Incarnation in the Kenotic theory, 'which seeks to make the manhood of Christ real by representing the Logos as contracting Himself within human dimensions and literally becoming man' (Brace's *The Humiliation of Christ*, p. 136. This lecture contains the best account in English of the modern Kenotic theories. Bruce distinguishes four types, the *absolute dualistic*, the *absolute metamorphic*, the *absolute semi-metamorphic*, the *real but relative*. The differences in these theories concern two points, the degree in which the Logos laid aside the Divine attributes of omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience in order to become man, and the relation between the Logos and the human soul of Christ, as retaining distinctness, or as becoming identical. As regards the first point, the theories are absolute or relative; as regards the second, dualistic, metamorphic, semi-metamorphic). Of the speculative attempts to formulate the doctrine of the Incarnation, Ritschl says that 'what is taught under the head of the *Kenosis* of the Divine Logos is pure mythology'

(*Justification and Reconciliation*, pp. 409-411). Without endorsing the terms of this condemnation, the present writer may repeat what he has elsewhere written on this matter. 'The Kenotic theories are commendable as attempts to do justice to the historical personality of Jesus, while assuming the ecclesiastical dogma; but are unsatisfactory in putting an undue strain on the passages in the New Testament which are supposed to teach the doctrine, and in venturing on bold assertions about the constitution of deity, which go far beyond the compass of our intelligence in these high matters' (*The Ritschlian Theology*, p. 271 note). The study of the facts of the life of Jesus proves undoubtedly the *Kenosis*, of which none of these theories offers a satisfactory explanation, as partly the *data*—the inner life of the Godhead—lie beyond our reach. We now confine ourselves to the *data* offered in the Gospels. (A useful summary of the data, although by no means exhaustive, will be found in Gore's *Dissertations*, 'The Consciousness of our Lord in His Mortal Life.' Adamson in *The Mind in Christ* deals very thoroughly with all the data bearing on the knowledge of Christ).

The Kenotic theories concern themselves specially with the three metaphysical attributes of God, manifest in His transcendent, yet immanent, relation to the world—omnipresence, omnipotence, omniscience. The Gospels show that Jesus possessed none of these. He was localized in a body (Joh 1:14 '*tabernacled* among us'), and moved from place to place as His mission required. The cure of the nobleman's son (Joh 4:50) does not prove *omnipresence*, but is explicable as an act of faith in God. In the absence of their Master the disciples become faithless (Mar 9:19), and He has to return to them to restore their confidence. In His farewell discourse He promises His constant presence as a future gift (Joh 14:18-19), and fulfils His promise after the Resurrection (Mat 28:20). His miracles do not prove *omnipotence*, as they were wrought in dependence on, with prayer to, God (Mar 9:29, Joh 11:41-42), were restrained by unbelief (Mat 13:58), seemingly involved physical strain (Mar 5:30), and sometimes were accompanied by means of cure (Mar 7:33-34; see *The Expositor*, 6th series, vol. vi., 'The Function of the Miracles'). Jesus never claimed *omniscience*. He claimed to know the Father as no other knew Him (Mat 11:27), but, on the other hand, He confessed that His knowledge as Son was limited in so important a matter as the time of His Return (Mat 24:36 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, Mar 13:32). The express distinction between the knowledge of the Son and of the Father made in this utterance disproves the view sometimes advanced, that the Son's perfect knowledge of the Father must include a knowledge of all the Father knows. It is the character, purpose, and activity of God as Father that the Son knows and reveals. When Jesus Himself thus confesses ignorance in a matter affecting Himself so closely, it is not reverence to claim for Him universal knowledge regarding such matters as the date and authorship of Old Testament writings, the causes of disease, the course of events in the remote future; nor is it any lack of homage and devotion to acknowledge the other evidences of limitation of knowledge the Gospels offer. He made a mistake regarding the barren

fig-tree (Mar 11:13); He was sometimes surprised and disappointed [see art. Surprise] (Mat 8:10; Mat 26:40, Mar 1:45; Mar 2:1-2; Mar 6:6; Mar 7:24-25; Mar 7:36; Mar 8:12, Luk 2:49); information came to Him by the ordinary channels of hearing and seeing (Mat 4:12; Mat 4:17; Mat 14:12-13, Mar 1:37-38; Mar 2:17, Joh 4:1-3), and He sought it in this way (Joh 1:38; Joh 9:35, Mar 5:30-32, Luk 4:17). He asked questions not rhetorically, but because He desired an answer (Mat 16:13; Mat 16:15, Luk 8:30, Joh 11:34). He developed mentally (Luk 2:52), and during His ministry learned by experience (Joh 2:24; the verb used is *γινώσκειν*, see Westcott *in loco*). He sought guidance from God in prayer (Luk 5:16; Luk 6:12; Luk 9:18; Luk 9:28; Luk 10:21). The necessity of the cup offered by His Father's will was not at first evident to Him (Mat 26:39), and, when convinced that His Father's will required it, He was not sure that His strength to drink it would endure (Mat 26:42; cf. Heb 5:7-8). His cry of desolation (Mat 27:46) on the cross was not only the culmination of His Passion, but in being this it was also the temporary obscuration of His knowledge of the Father, who in that moment had not forsaken Him. Instances of supernatural knowledge are found in the Gospels. Some of these: the getting of the ass (Mat 21:2), and of the upper room (Mat 26:17-19), the finding of the money in the fish's mouth (Mat 17:27), are only apparent, and allow another explanation. The statement to the woman of Samaria about the number of her husbands (Joh 4:17-18) is very perplexing; and possibly, as the conversation was probably reported by the woman, may have been made more definite by her guilty conscience than it actually was, even as she exaggerates in her account of what Christ had told her (Joh 4:29). The command to the disciples about casting their net (Luk 5:5) was probably an act of faith in God, even as the command to the storm (Mar 4:39). The other cases fall into two classes: prophetic anticipations (His own death and resurrection, the doom of Jerusalem), or exercises of an exceptional moral insight and spiritual discernment. We may admit occasionally, for the fulfilment of His vocation, miraculous knowledge as well as power, without the constant possession of omniscience or omnipotence.

We cannot dis sever the intellectual from the moral life; and the development of the latter involves necessarily some limitations in the former. Omniscience cannot be 'tempted in all points even as we are,' nor can it exercise a childlike faith in God such as Jesus calls us to exercise along with Him. Moral and religious reality is excluded from the history of Jesus by the denial of the limitation of His knowledge. He was tempted (see articles on Temptation and Struggles of Soul). In the Wilderness the temptation was possible, because He had to learn by experience the uses to which His miraculous powers might legitimately be put, and the proper means for the fulfilment of His vocation. Without taint or flaw in His own nature, the expectations of the people regarding the Messiah, and the desires they pressed upon Him, afforded the occasions of temptation to Him. The necessity of His own sacrifice was not so certain to Him as to exclude the possibility of the temptation to escape it. That Jesus

was Himself conscious of being still the subject of a moral discipline is suggested by His refusal of the epithet 'good' (Mar 10:18). Although morally tempted and developing, Jesus betrays no sign of penitence for sin or failure, and we are warranted in affirming that He was tempted without sin, and in His development knew no sin. But that perfection would have been only a moral semblance had there been no liability to temptation and no limitation of knowledge. As Son of God, He lived in dependence on God (Mat 11:27 a) and submission to Him (Mat 11:25, Mat 26:39). It is the Fourth Gospel that throws into special prominence this feature (Joh 3:34; Joh 5:19-20; Joh 8:28; Joh 15:15; Joh 17:1; Joh 17:8). The Son delivers the words and performs the deeds given by the Father. There are a few utterances given in this Gospel which express a sense of loss for Himself and His disciples in the separation from the Father that His earthly life involves (Joh 14:28), a desire for the recovery of the former conditions of communion (Joh 17:5), and an expectation of gain in His return to the Father (Joh 14:19-20). Jesus was subject to human emotion: He groaned (Joh 11:33; Joh 11:38), sighed (Mar 7:34; Mar 8:12), wept at the grave of Lazarus (Joh 11:35) and over Jerusalem (Luk 13:34; Luk 19:41, Mat 23:37). He endured poverty (Mat 8:20, Luk 9:58), labour (Mar 6:3), weariness (Joh 4:6, Mat 21:7), weakness (Mat 27:32), hunger (Mat 4:2; Mat 21:18), thirst (Joh 4:7; Joh 19:28), pain (Mat 27:34-35), and death (Mat 27:50, Joh 19:30). Some have conjectured from the evidence of Joh 19:34 that He died literally of a broken heart (see Farrar's *Life of Christ*, note at the end of chap. lxi.). This *Kenosis* did not obscure His moral insight and spiritual discernment; did not involve any moral defect or failure, any religious distrust; did not weaken or narrow His love, mercy, or grace; did not lower His authority, or lessen His efficiency as Revealer of God and Redeemer of men; but, on the contrary, it was necessary, for only under such human conditions and limitations could He fulfil His mission, deliver His message, present His sacrifice, and effect His salvation. That He might receive the name of Saviour and Lord, which is above every other name, He must empty Himself.

Literature.—Works referred to in the art.; Liddon, *BL [Note: L Bampton Lecture.]*; Gore, *BL [Note: L Bampton Lecture.]*; Gifford, *The Incarnation*; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, on the various passages quoted; Stalker, *Christology of Jesus*.

Alfred E. Garvie.

 KeriOTH

KERIOTH.—See Judas Iscariot.

Keys

KEYS.—The word (κλεις) occurs 6 times in the New Testament, twice in the Synoptic Gospels, and 4 times in Revelation. In Luk_11:52 Jesus upbraids the lawyers on the ground that they have ‘taken away the key of knowledge,’ the instrument by which entrance into knowledge could be obtained, and thereby hindered the people from the privilege which should have been theirs. This they had done by substituting a false confidence in the wrong kind of knowledge, with the result that the right kind was ignored and forgotten. The knowledge from which the people are thus excluded is ‘that of the way of salvation’ (Plummer), or, more profoundly, that knowledge of the Lord, for lack of which the ‘people perish’ (Hos_4:6), to seek which they had been urged by the prophets (cf. Joh_17:3).

In Mat_16:19 the word is used again metaphorically, in the address to Peter: ‘I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven.’ The apparent limitation of the promise to one Apostle is to be controlled by the repetition of the following and interpretive clause addressed to the Apostles in general in Mat_18:18. The keys are to be intrusted to Peter as to a steward of the house (and in like manner to the Apostles in general), to whom might be given the power of locking and unlocking, but not of deciding who did or did not belong to the household (Weiss). The significance of this promise would be fully met if it announced the effectual proclamation, through the Apostles, of the gospel by means of which the believer obtains entrance into the kingdom. On the passage as a whole see artt. Caesarea Philippi, p. 249, and Peter.

In Rev_1:18 the Son of Man in John’s vision says: ‘I have the keys of death and of Hades,’ *i.e.* control over the entrance to the realm of the dead. The figure of death as a realm with portals comes down from Psa_9:13, and was freely developed in the Rabbinic writings. The ‘key of death’ was one of the three (four) keys which were said to be in the hand of God alone. Thus in *Sanhedrin*, 113, ‘Elijah desired that there should be given to him the key of rain; he desired that there should be given to him the key of resurrection of the dead: they said to him, “Three keys are not given into the hand of a representative, the key of birth, the key of rain, and the key of resurrection of the dead.’ ” There is therefore strong significance in the claim here made by the Risen Messiah.

In like manner a claim to at least Messianic dignity is involved in the phrase in Rev_3:7 ‘he that hath the key of David.’ The allusion is clearly to the promise in Isa_22:22 ‘I will give to him (Eliakim) the key of the house of David upon his shoulder,’ a passage which, according to Zulich, was commonly referred by Jewish commentators to the Messiah.

In the two remaining passages (Rev 9:1; Rev 20:1) the use of the word ('the key of the pit of the abyss,' 'the key of the abyss') depends on the idea familiar in Jewish cosmogony, viz. that there was a communication between the upper world and the under world or abyss by means of a pit or shaft, the opening to which might be conceived as covered and locked. According to Rabbinic tradition, this opening was placed beneath the foundations of the Temple, as the Moslems hold to this day that it is to be found beneath the Dome of the Rock, or Mosque of Omar (see Gunkel, *Schopfung und Chaos*, pp. 91-98).

C. Anderson Scott.

☞Khan

KHAN.—See Inn.

KID.—See Animals, p. 64^a.

☞Kidron

KIDRON.—See Brook.

☞Kin, Kindred, Kinship

KIN, KINDRED, KINSHIP.—'The antique conception of kinship is participation in one blood, which passes from parent to child, and circulates in the veins of every member of the family. The unity of family or clan is viewed as a physical unity; for the blood is the life,—an idea familiar to us from the OT,—and it is the same blood, and therefore the same life, that is shared by every descendant of the common ancestor. The idea that the race has a life of its own, of which individual lives are only parts, is expressed even more clearly by picturing the race as a tree, of which the ancestor is the root or stem and the descendants the branches' (W. R. Smith, *RS [Note: S Religion of the Semites.]*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 40f.). This conception underlies the words 'kin' (συγγενής, Mar 6:4) and 'kindred' (συγγένεια, Luk 1:61). But it was Christ's purpose to organize society according to another conception of the basis of unity. He made kinship depend not upon physical but

spiritual affinities (Mat_12:48 etc.). ‘Already, in the spiritual religion of the Hebrews, the idea of Divine fatherhood is entirely dissociated from the basis of natural fatherhood. Man was created in the image of God, but he was not begotten; God-sonship is not a thing of nature, but of grace’ (*RS [Note: S Religion of the Semites.]*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 41). There, however, the sonship of the *nation* is emphasized: in Christ’s teaching the *personal* relationship is brought into prominence. Sonship depends on personal faith (Joh_1:12), and its evidence is individual submission to the will of God (Mat_12:48 ff.). In His allegory of the Vine (Joh_15:1), Jesus practically adopts the old figure. He Himself takes the place of stem or root, but the branches share the common life only on condition of an abiding faith (cf. St. Paul’s figure of the olive-tree, Rom_11:17 etc.). The ancient kindred of blood, with its narrow physical limits, gives place in the NT to a fellowship of faith which is open to all mankind. See also art. Family.

W. Ewing.

Kindness

KINDNESS.—The NT term *χρηστότης*, which is rendered in the Authorized and Revised Versions both by ‘kindness’ and by ‘goodness’ (once in Rom_3:12 as ‘good,’ following the LXX Septuagint of Psalms 13(14):1, 3, there quoted, in which *χρηστότητα* = כִּיב), nowhere occurs in the Gospels. The quality it denotes, however, is an evangelical virtue. Like its OT counterpart *רַחֲמִים*, it is attributable both to God (as in Rom_2:4 *et al.*) and to man (as in 2Co_6:6 *et al.*). The adj. *χρηστός*, Authorized and Revised Versions ‘kind,’ is found once in the Gospels as referring to God (Luk_6:35). The other instances of its use in very different connexions, as applied to a yoke (Mat_11:30) and to wine (Luk_5:39), though such use is a natural outgrowth of its root-meaning, need only be mentioned.

1. *The Kindness of God in the Teaching of Jesus.*—The passage in which God is explicitly represented as ‘kind’ occurs in Lk.’s version of the *logion* of Jesus concerning love of friends and hatred of foes (Luk_6:27-36 || Mat_5:43-48). The highest reward attendant upon a love that extends to both friends and foes and is ready to show kindness to all men without distinction, is that thereby men become ‘sons of the Most High.’ ‘Sons of your Father which is in heaven,’ as it runs in Mat_5:45, would appear to be the primitive phrase, but ‘the Most High’ (*ὑψιστος*) is quite a favourite name for God with Lk., and its substitution here is probably due to this preference (see Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, English translation p. 199). God

is kind to the ungrateful and wicked. In the Mt. parallel this benign goodness is expressed in the concrete picture of sunshine and rain bestowed equally upon the evil and the good, the just and the unjust. Clearly the expression of an all-embracing benignity can go no further so far as extent is concerned. The only enhancing possible is in connexion with the gift which betokens that benignity, and this we have in the great saying of Joh 3:16, along with the same sweep of reference, 'God so loved *the world*, that he gave *his only-begotten Son*.' That fontal love is manifested in the kindness (cf. Tit 3:4) on which Jesus lays so much stress in His presentment of God as our Father, a kindness going far beyond the providential bounties and mercies of this life, and concerning itself with the profoundest needs of sinful men.

If explicit statements of the character of that now considered are not multiplied in our Lord's teaching, it is to be pointed out that the same conception of God is necessarily implied in a considerable group of the parables—those, in particular, that illustrate the Divine grace. The great trilogy of Luke 15, exhibiting the Divine concern for man as τὸ ἀπολλωλός; the parables which show how royally and wonderfully God pities and forgives, whether that forgiveness is gratefully realized (the Two Debtors, Luk 7:36-50) or is strangely disregarded (the Unmerciful Servant, Mat 18:23-35); the parable of the Great Supper (Luk 14:16-24), with its comprehensive 'welcome for the sinner'—these and other such are full of the wide-reaching kindness of God.

An OT basis for this conspicuous feature in Jesus' representation of God undoubtedly exists. Whilst God was supremely known in Israel as King, His fatherly relation to Israel is not obscurely dwelt upon in OT writings, particularly in the prophets (e.g. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea). God's goodness and graciousness are gratefully celebrated in the Psalms; witness the refrain of Psalms 107, 'Oh that men would praise the Lord for his goodness (יְהוָה)! Stress on this Divine quality is the great characteristic of Hosea. *Hesed* is the bond uniting Jahweh and Israel in one covenant relation: the *hesed* of J" [Note: " Jehovah.] to Israel being His grace, of Israel to J" [Note: " Jehovah.] , piety or dutiful love, and of Israelite to Israelite, love and mutual consideration. Love to J" [Note: " Jehovah.] and love to one's brethren are identical (cf. Hos 4:1; Hos 6:4; Hos 6:6), and both are made imperative by a right sense of J" [Note: " Jehovah.] 's fatherly affection and kindness towards His people (see W. R. Smith, *The Prophets of Israel*, p. 160 ff.). This line of thought, however, regarding God was arrested in later Judaism; God's transcendent kingly greatness was emphasized in Jewish thought in our Lord's time, and His grace and loving-kindness had fallen into the background. Jesus deliberately chose this conception of fatherly kindness as the one predominant characteristic in His revelation of God, and, what is more, proclaimed this gracious God as the Father of all mankind.

No difficulty need be raised as to the reconciliation of such a conception of God with His character as 'Rex tremendae majestatis,' or as the holy God who cannot regard wickedness with indifference. That God is gracious does not mean that He is an easy-going God. Moral distinctions cannot be obliterated. Though in Christ's simple language God sends sunshine and rain upon the unjust, though He is kind to the ungrateful and wicked and they enjoy great prosperity, it cannot be other than an evil thing to be unjust, ungrateful, and wicked. And even though such blessings should appear to be withheld from the just and good, it still must be an altogether good thing to be just and good. Is it not significant that Jesus declares God's kindness without any qualification whatever, and shows Himself all unconscious that any difficulties are thereby occasioned, that there is anything requiring to be explained and adjusted? The parable of the Unmerciful Servant displays God's benignity; but the truculence which shows itself unaffected by an amazing experience of forgiving mercy must needs lose the boon which that benignity bestowed. The conclusion of the parable ([Mat 18:35](#)) expresses what must needs be; and Jesus presents the doom of the 'wicked servant' as a picture of God's dealings with men just as directly and simply as He sets forth the kindness of our Father in heaven. The one presentation is perfectly consistent with the other.

Similarly, the problem of suffering and misery, which times without number has evoked the cry 'Is God good?', is not allowed by Jesus to qualify in any way His declaration of the kindness of God. It is not because He ignored the problem; He is Himself conspicuous as the Sufferer. And with our Lord the Divine kindness is not involved in doubt, because, as we say, God permits so much suffering amongst men, but rather that kindness is represented by Him as specially called forth by human misery. God is particularly set forth as viewing the sufferings and sorrows of men with compassion and pity; and pity is simply kindness brought into relation to suffering and distress. God declares Himself 'most chiefly in shewing mercy and pity' (Collect for 11th Sunday after Trinity). So also it is significant that in enforcing the lesson of [Luk 6:35](#), Christ does not say, 'Be ye kind, as your Father is kind,' but (V. 36), 'Be ye compassionate, as your Father is compassionate' (οἰκτιρῶν). And what a vast deduction from the sum of human misery would result, and how the problem would be simplified, if everywhere 'man's inhumanity to man' gave place to such a spirit!

2. Kindness as the Law of Human Life.—'Love one another' is the new commandment of Jesus ([Joh 13:34](#)); and kindness is love in its practical manifestation. From what has been said above, we see that this great law of life is directly enforced by the exhibition of the loving-kindness of God our Father. This is the case notably in the comment of our Lord on the dictum, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy' ([Mat 5:43-48](#)).

The ideal of a relation of kindness between man and man is, however, not altogether an original and peculiar feature in our Lord's teaching. In the OT (as, e.g., in Hosea) *hesed* is presented as the right characteristic of human relationships, even as it denotes God's graciousness to men; and as a term belonging to common life it indicates that 'those who are linked together by the bonds of personal affection, or of social unity, owe to one another more than can be expressed in the forms of legal obligation' (W. R. Smith, *op. cit.* p. 161). And Jesus quotes Hos_6:6 with approval, 'I desire mercy (*hesed*) and not sacrifice' (Mat_12:7)—a passage which makes that quality of kindness of greater importance than worship, and worship vain without it. In heathen religions and philosophies, too, ideas are found corresponding more or less to such a conception of the social bond.

Further, it is true that our Lord very emphatically insisted on the application of the principle of kindness as a law of life to relations of men with men in general, and not merely those of co-religionists and people of the same tribe or country. What can equal the parable of the Good Samaritan as helping to a definition of the 'neighbour' to whom the service of kindness is due?

Yet the OT and other forms of teaching are not without traces of a wider view than the scribes of Christ's day would allow. The duty of kindness to the stranger in the land (as in Lev_19:9 f., Deu_10:18 f. *et al.*), and of kindness to enemies, with readiness in forgiving injuries (as in Exo_23:4 f., Pro_24:29; Pro_25:21 f. *et al.*), is explicitly set forth in the OT. We get one glimpse (among many) of this wider humane feeling, from a very different quarter, in the Indian saying, 'I met a hundred men going to Delhi, and every one of them was my brother.'

Our Lord's exposition of this law of kindness is pre-eminent and *sui generis*. And the newness of His teaching in this respect appears in His having established this duty on a firm religious basis and given it 'an essential place in the moral consciousness of men' (Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, i. p. 332). It is significant that the judgment of men in Mat_25:31 ff. is made to turn on the performance or neglect of the acts of mercy or kindness. The kindness inculcated, also, extends to all creatures: and it is to express itself in the little courtesies of life (Mat_5:47; Mat_10:12).

A view of Christ's ethical teaching as a whole makes it clear that the stress thus laid on the duty of kindness favours no loosening of obligation to justice and fidelity in the manifold relationships of men, nor does it do away with the duty and need of punishment when that obligation is violated. The maintenance of just and faithful dealing does not necessarily involve severity and harshness; rather it is itself part of the law of kindness rightly considered. Love of neighbour and of enemy is as truly reconcilable with the claims of justice on the human plane as is God's benignity with His righteous government. And Christ makes us see once for all that love is the only

satisfactory basis for human relationships, and indeed the only possible bond in the perfected social state. See also artt. Love, Neighbour.

3. *The Kindness of Jesus.*—The perfect embodiment of this kindness in human life is seen in Jesus Himself. ‘As I have loved you’ is the Johannine counterpart (Joh 13:34; Joh 15:12) of the Synoptic ‘as your Father is compassionate’ in the enforcement of the Law of Love. The whole Gospel portraiture shows us that in Jesus the kindness and pity of God fully dwelt. His dealing with sickness and suffering in all forms, His attitude towards sin, His sense of social disorder, His regard for men as men and indifference to class distinctions, His whole demeanour, His gracious speech (Luk 4:22)—all proclaimed the Divine kindness. His fiery denunciation of scribes and Pharisees (see Matthew 23) presents no exception; for His wrath is the wrath of love, and the denunciation must be read in the light of the yearning lament over Jerusalem (Mat 23:37 ff.)—Jerusalem in which Pharisaim and scribism were specially entrenched. The key to this perfect life of kindness and love is found in His own words—‘The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many’ (Mar 10:45). The declaration of vivid and loving remembrance is that He ‘went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil’ (Act 10:38).

J. S. Clemens.

King

KING.—The primitive Christian Church regarded herself as the vassal of Jesus Christ, her exalted Lord and King, under whose regal sway she had been brought by Divine grace (Col 1:13). The current belief was that Jesus had been installed in His royal office by the Resurrection; in that event God had made Him both Lord and Christ (Act 2:36), and in it had been fulfilled the prophecy regarding the Messianic King, ‘Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee’ (Psa 2:7, cf. Act 13:33), as also another prophetic utterance, ‘Sit thou at my right hand’ (Psa 110:1; cf. Act 2:34, Rev 3:21). This sovereignty is indeed temporary; it will come to an end with the final overthrow of the enemies of God: ‘Then shall he deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father’ (1Co 15:24; 1Co 15:28). It was the conviction of the primitive community that the idea of a Messianic kingdom upon earth—whether eternal (Luk 1:33) or of limited duration (Rev 20:4 ff.)—as it gleams through the Jewish Apocalyptic and in the earlier Messianic hope, had at last been realized in the Kingdom of Christ, *i. e.*, the Church as subject to her exalted King.

Now the question which we seek to answer in the present article is this:—*Did Jesus Himself in His lifetime put forward a claim to be the Messianic King?* Here we light upon a problem which is vigorously canvassed among theologians, particularly at the present day. While there are scholars of high repute, such as Wellhausen and Wrede, * [Note: Wellhausen, IJG3, Comm. zu den Synopt. Evangelien, Einleit. in die drei ersten Evangelien (1905), 89 ff.; Wrede, Das Messiasgeheimniss in der Evangelien, 1901.] who deny that Jesus thought of Himself as the Messiah at all, there are others who are convinced that He was in possession of some kind of ‘Messianic consciousness’; and among the latter the controversy turns upon the peculiar significance and the specific colouring of the implied claims and expectations. It is impossible in the space at our disposal to discuss the problem in all its bearings; for the details reference must be made to other works of the present writer.† [Note: Die Schriften des NT, i. i. 135 f., 198 ff., 476 ff.] The task of determining the sense in which Jesus assumed the title of King is all that meanwhile concerns us.

The prophecy regarding Jesus uttered by the angel Gabriel: ‘The Lord shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end’ (Luk 1:32 f.), was not brought to fulfilment in the lifetime of Jesus. But the writer of the Gospel of the Infancy in Lk. would hardly have recorded the prediction, had he not entertained the hope that its fulfilment was but a matter of time. It is beyond question that the earliest Jewish Christian communities believed that Jesus would come again in kingly glory, as is acknowledged by the repentant thief upon the cross (Luk 23:42, reading ὅταν ἔλθῃς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου as preferable to εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν σου). This belief appears also in the emphasis which the early churches laid upon the descent of Jesus from David (Rom 1:3), and in the endeavours which were made to substantiate it by the construction of genealogical tables (Mat 1:1-16, Luk 3:23-36). These tables were not constructed for merely academic or theological purposes; they were designed to support the contention with which the Jewish Christians confronted their unbelieving compatriots, viz. that Jesus was the King of Israel. It is true, indeed, that in the primitive tradition of the life of Jesus, His Kingship is not explicitly asserted. The acclamations of the multitude on the occasion of the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem, ‘Hosanna to the son of David’ (Mat 21:9), ‘Blessed is the kingdom that cometh, the kingdom of our father David’ (Mar 11:10), cannot have been more than a bold anticipation of the future. The crown of thorns (15:17) was an act of derision, to the true significance of which the soldiers were blind; while the inscription on the cross (15:26) was a prediction which Pilate, in opposition to the wishes of the Jews and in ignorance of what he was doing (Joh 19:19 f.), was constrained to set forth in all the great languages of the world. In point of fact the primitive tradition makes it perfectly clear that Jesus deprecated and even disclaimed the ascription of royalty,

or at all events that He thought of the dignity as something to become His only in the future.

To the question of Pilate, 'Art thou the King of the Jews?' Jesus answers, according to Mar_15:2, neither *yea* nor *nay*, but replies only in the words 'Thou sayest it.' Is this an affirmative? St. Mark certainly regarded it as such (cf. 14:62), but St. Luke shows unmistakably that the words were not so understood by Pilate, since, if he had regarded them as equivalent to *yea*, he could not have said, 'I find no fault in this man' (23:4): a claimant to the throne must necessarily have been convicted of sedition. St. John also indicates that Jesus at first replied evasively to the question (18:33f.), but that afterwards He frankly avowed His claim to the title of King, though with the reservation that His Kingdom was 'not of this world' (18:36). Even more clearly than in the Synoptists we see in St. John's account a definite purpose: he aims at showing that Jesus was no political usurper, no pretender to the crown, who designed by force of arms to deliver His people from the thralldom of Rome, and to reinstall the dynasty of David. Notwithstanding the obvious tendency of the writer of the Fourth Gospel, we must grant that in this instance his narrative, equally with those of the earlier Evangelists, is essentially faithful to fact.

That Jesus harboured no design of restoring the Davidic monarchy may be asserted without misgiving. To the policy of the violent, who would take the Kingdom by force (Mat_11:12), He lent no countenance, and when, after the feeding of the multitude, they wanted to make Him a King, he betook Himself elsewhere (Joh_6:15). We shall be asked, however, if He did not, on the occasion of His Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem, carefully organize and carry through a demonstration designed to further His royal claims. In answer to this it is to be said that St. Mark's account of the episode (11:1f.) cannot be taken as historical; and we must either accept the narrative of Jn. (12:12ff.), according to which the demonstration emanated from His supporters among the people and was only *permitted* by Him, and which weakens the impression of the incident by its quotation from Zec_9:9;* [Note: cit. i. i. 163.] or else we must abandon the hope of winning from the event any light for our theme at all. Had the Triumphal Entry been of such capital importance and of such a striking character as St. Mark represents, the authorities would certainly have intervened, and the matter would have figured in the trial of Jesus as a count in the indictment [but see Entry into Jerusalem].

In the discourses of Jesus we find telling arguments, both positive and negative, in favour of the view that He either made no claim whatever to the title of Messianic King, or that He did so in a most unobtrusive way. To His descent from David, if He gave it credence at all, He did not attach the slightest importance; indeed, He even sought to convince the scribes that in regarding the coming Messiah as the Son of David they fell far short of the truth. To all appearance He desired to eradicate from

the minds of His hearers the prevailing idea of a Davidic ruler, and to substitute for it another Messianic figure, viz. the 'Son of Man,' the 'Man' who, as Daniel (7:13f.) had prophesied, was to come in the clouds of heaven at the end of the age. This 'Son of Man' is no earthly monarch, but a Being of Divine and heavenly nature; not one who by means of a revolution rises from his native obscurity to a throne, but one who descends from heaven to earth. With such a figure dominating the outlook of Jesus, there is no place for a Messianic King. It is thus quite in keeping with these facts that He announces, not that God is about to send forth the Messiah, the Son of David, not that the kingdom of David is at hand, but that 'the kingdom of God is at hand.' The purport of this message has been dealt with elsewhere:† [Note: Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes* (1900).] suffice it to say here, that the announcement of a cosmical catastrophe, of a new aeon, in which the existing sway of Satan shall be destroyed, and God shall be all in all, is intrinsically incompatible with the idea of a Messianic King standing side by side with the Most High. Nor do the prophecies of Daniel, when rightly interpreted, present us with the figure of a Messiah. Hence it is by no mere accident that in the utterances of Jesus the title 'King' is applied to God alone: cf. Jerusalem 'the city of the great king' ([Mat 5:35](#)), the parable of the Unmerciful Servant (18:23); and in particular, the parable of the Marriage Feast (22:1ff.), where the Messiah appeals as the King's son. It is only in the description of the Last Judgment (25:31) that the 'Son of Man' appears as King—note the abrupt change vv. 34, 40; probably, however, we have in this passage reminiscences of some older parable, which had to do with a king and not with the Messiah at all. Only on one recorded occasion ([Luk 22:29](#)) does Jesus invest Himself with the βασιλεία, but that is *for the future*. This occurred, according to Lk., during the Last Supper,—a circumstance which leads us to infer that Jesus did not in any sense regard Himself as being a king in the days of His flesh. What He has in prospect here is simply a participation in the Divine Sovereignty, a prerogative guaranteed also to those who accept Him. He believes, indeed, that He will occupy the chief place among them that are His; that He will take the seat of honour at table, having them on His right hand and on His left ([Mat 20:21](#)); but of a Messianic Kingship in the ordinary sense of the word there is no suggestion at all. If Jesus deemed Himself to be the predestined Messiah in any sense whatsoever, He certainly thought of the Messianic office as being different from that of a king. See, further, art. Messiah.

Johannes Weiss.

KING OF THE JEWS.—See preceding art., Divinity of Christ (p. 477^b), Names and Titles of Christ.

☩ Kingdom Of God (or Heaven)

KINGDOM OF GOD (or HEAVEN).—To learn what Jesus meant by the term ‘kingdom of heaven,’ or ‘kingdom of God,’ we must go first and chiefly to His own words. The simple fact that He employed a term which was in common use, and which had parallels also in the Jewish Scriptures (e.g. 1Ch 28:5, Dan 2:44; Dan 4:3), does not justify one in assuming that His conception can be defined by the current view of His day, or by a study of the OT. It is plain that He might make use of the familiar term, but might put into it a new and higher meaning. Indeed, it is quite certain that Jesus, as a wise teacher, started from the beliefs and longings of those whom He sought to help, and that He aimed at fulfilling rather than destroying. We should expect, then, to find Him using old terms, but pouring into them new meanings. Moreover, the thought of Jesus in regard to the kingdom of heaven is presented to us more fully and clearly than is that of His Jewish contemporaries. Hence there is no occasion for approaching our topic indirectly, either by the way of the OT or that of the Rabbinic usage. It will be best to go at once to the main source of information, and seek the thought of Jesus from His own words, though availing ourselves of any light that can be found in other quarters.

1. *Survey of the data.*—According to Mk. and Mt., the memorable word in the first preaching of Jesus in Galilee was the announcement of the nearness of the kingdom of God [or of heaven] (ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ [or τῶν οὐρανῶν], Mar 1:15, Mat 4:17); and in the last interview with His disciples, on the evening before His death, He still spoke of the kingdom, anticipating a union with them there (Mar 14:25). In all the interval between these events the term was frequently on His lips both in public and in private. St. Mark records 13 instances of its use by Jesus, St. Luke 34, and St. Matthew 48. Its central importance in the teaching of Jesus is frequently apparent. Thus the gospel itself is spoken of as the gospel of the kingdom (Mat 9:35); the Twelve and the Seventy are sent out to announce that the kingdom is at hand (Mat 10:7, Luk 10:9): more than a third of the parables are explicitly said to be an unfolding of the truth of the kingdom;* [Note: The use of the formula ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, or ὡμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, cannot be at once attributed to Jesus. In some instances it has no manifest connexion with the thought of the parable (e.g. Mat 20:1; Mat 22:2).] the disciples are taught to pray for the coming of the kingdom (Mat 6:10); it is the preaching of the kingdom of heaven that

terminates the period of the Law and the Prophets (Mat 11:12, Luk 16:16); the kingdom is presented as the *summum bonum* (Mat 13:44-45); and the kingdom is the great fact of the future (e.g. Mat 25:34).

But while the kingdom is thus seen to be of great significance in the teaching of Jesus, it is equally obvious that its meaning varies widely in different passages. Thus Jesus says that the kingdom is to be entered at once by those to whom He is speaking (7:13, 14), and again, that the righteous are to enter it when the Son of Man shall have come in His glory (25:34). At one time Jesus says to the Pharisees, 'The kingdom of heaven is among you' (ἐντὸς ὑμῶν),* [Note: See below, § 3.] and at another He teaches that it is the place where Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, with all the prophets, rest and are blessed (Luk 17:21; Luk 13:28). Now the kingdom is thought of as something that can be taken away from the Jews and be given to the Gentiles (Mat 21:43), and again, it is that for whose coming the disciples are instructed to pray (6:10). The kingdom is thought of at one time as a good that can be obtained by seeking (6:33), and as something to be slowly developed from within the soul (Mar 4:26); at another time, as an event of the future, realized suddenly and by Divine power (8:38, 9:1).

From this survey it is readily seen that the term 'kingdom of God (or heaven)' in the usage of Jesus is not easy to be defined; that it appears to be an elastic, poetic symbol rather than the vehicle of a single sharply-bounded conception.

2. *The original form of the expression.*—With the exception of two passages in Mt. which speak of the kingdom without any qualifying word (Mat 8:12; Mat 13:38), and three passages in which the kingdom (always thought of as future) is spoken of by Jesus as 'His' [or 'My'] kingdom (Mat 13:41; Mat 16:28, Luk 22:30), His usage fluctuates between 'kingdom of heaven' and 'kingdom of God,' the former greatly predominating in Matthew, and the latter being the exclusive term in Mark and Luke. It seems probable that the term ordinarily used by Jesus was 'kingdom of heaven,' and that for the following reasons. (1) It is the prevailing term in the *Logia* of Matthew, and the *Logia*, unlike the Gospels of Mark and Luke, are regarded as directly Apostolic. (2) The presumption is that Jesus used a current Jewish term, and 'kingdom of heaven' has a distinctly Jewish colouring, which does not belong to the term 'kingdom of God.' For the Greek word for 'heaven' in this phrase is a plural (τῶν οὐρανῶν) in accordance with the Hebrew usage (שָׁמַיִם מְלֻכּוּתָהּ), but contrary to the Greek. And, further, the expression 'kingdom of heaven' accords better with the popular Jewish belief that the kingdom of the Messiah was to come *from above*. (3) The originality of the term 'kingdom of heaven' is favoured by the consideration that the Second and Third Evangelists, since they wrote for Gentile readers, may more readily be thought to have modified a Jewish expression than that the author of the

Logia, who wrote for Jews, modified the term used by Jesus.† [Note: Note the bearing of the words ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, which frequently modify ‘Father.’]

But, while there is therefore every reason to conclude that Jesus ordinarily used the term ‘kingdom of heaven,’ we certainly are not justified in saying that He did this to avoid speaking the Divine name (cf. O. Holtzmann, *The Life of Jesus*, pp. 163, 164; Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 92, English translation). It is impossible to suppose that the man who called God His Father, and who felt that God was always with Him, the man who brought God near to His disciples and convinced them that He numbered the hairs of their heads, that they could approach Him at any time without priest or outward sacrifice,—that such a man shared the superstitious regard for the Holy Name. If Jesus habitually used the term ‘kingdom of heaven,’ which we believe to have been the case, He probably did so because that was the name in common use among His hearers.

3. Fundamental thought of the term.—To ascertain the central idea of the term ‘kingdom of heaven,’ as used by Jesus, we may well begin with a passage in which He seems to give a general interpretation of it, viz. the second and third petitions of the Lord’s Prayer, ‘Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth’ (Mat 6:10). The second of these petitions appears to explain the first. It seems to imply that, where the will of God is done, there the kingdom of God has come. That will is thought of as being done perfectly in heaven; and when it is done thus on earth, then the kingdom of heaven is realized. Accordingly this passage suggests that the fundamental idea of ‘kingdom of heaven’ is the *rule of God*.

Another passage which, though not using the word ‘kingdom,’ seems to throw light on the conception of Jesus, is that which records His answer to those who, while He was teaching on a certain occasion, told Him that His mother and brothers desired to see Him (Mar 3:31-35). He said, ‘Whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.’ But if these people who sat around Him, listening to His word, were owned as His *kindred*, it is reasonable to think that what made them His kindred made them also members of His kingdom. And that which brought them near to Him was the doing of God’s will—the very thing which in the Lord’s Prayer seems to explain the term ‘kingdom.’

In line with the thought of these two passages which have been considered, is the conception of a considerable number of important sayings of Jesus concerning the kingdom. Thus, in the Sermon on the Mount, He told His hearers to seek the kingdom and the righteousness of their heavenly Father (Mat 6:33). Here, as in the Lord’s Prayer, the kingdom is something to be desired and sought. It is contrasted with food and drink and clothing,—things that the Gentiles seek,—and is thus characterized as

an inward and spiritual good. We may then regard the word 'righteousness' as giving here the dominant thought of that kingdom which is to be sought. Not otherwise are we to understand the word in that passage which deals with the young scribe who answered Jesus discreetly (Mar 12:34). The Master told him that he was not far from the kingdom of God. Now, in these words He was obviously characterizing the moral and spiritual state of the young man; and thus the content of the term 'kingdom' is here moral and spiritual. So in the parable of the Automatic Earth. As it is the function of the earth to carry forward the development of the seed lodged in it, so by analogy it is the function of the heart to develop the kingdom of heaven (4:26, 29). Manifestly, then, the kingdom is here thought of as a spiritual principle to be received into the heart.

Another passage in which the content of the term is virtually indicated by Jesus is the reply which He gave to the question of certain Pharisees. They asked Him when the kingdom of God should come, and He replied: 'The kingdom of God is in the midst of you' (Luk 17:21). That is to say, the kingdom is already present, already an accomplished fact. It had not come with outward show and noise, but quietly and naturally. There seems to be only one way of understanding this remarkable utterance, for the view that it refers to the future, and means that the kingdom will come as a surprise, rests on the identification of the coming of the kingdom with the Parousia of the Son of Man (see Wernle, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, i. 62). But this identification cannot be made, for the Parousia will have the very characteristic which Jesus here denies to the coming of the kingdom. It will be 'with observation' ($\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\tau\eta\rho\eta\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$; see, e.g., Mar 13:24-26; Mar 13:29). We must hold, then, that the utterance of Jesus had a present force, and must find the justification of it in His own experience. He was conscious that the kingdom was realized in His own heart, and was beginning to be realized in His disciples. Thus this passage falls into line with those in which Jesus suggests that He meant by the terra 'kingdom of heaven' an inner spiritual fact, viz. the rule of God in the heart.* [Note: The AV and RV rendering of $\epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\varsigma\ \upsilon\mu\omicron\upsilon\upsilon$, viz. 'within you,' is sanctioned by general usage and by the context (see Godet, Com. in loc.) equally with the marginal 'among you,' 'in the midst of you,' and possibly receives some confirmation from the 2nd of Grenfell and Hunt's 'New Sayings of Jesus' (see art. Ideas (Leading), p. 770b). But, if adopted, it falls even more readily than the other into line with Christ's teaching as to the spirituality of the kingdom.]

Now these passages which have been considered present a conception of the kingdom of heaven which Jesus unquestionably entertained. That this conception was central in His usage, and must be called the fundamental content of the term 'kingdom of heaven,' is seen from the following considerations. (a) It is the only explanation of a

number of most important passages which is suggested by Jesus Himself. (b) It is an explanation in perfect harmony with the other teaching of Jesus. For that teaching, as seen, for instance, in the Sermon on the Mount, is inward and spiritual; and such is the thought of the 'kingdom of heaven' as the rule of God in the heart of man. (c) The Fourth Gospel, with the exception of two passages (3:3-5, 18:36), does not employ the term 'kingdom of heaven'; but the term which it does employ, where the Synoptics have 'kingdom of heaven,' is the equivalent of 'kingdom' in the sense of God's rule. This term is 'eternal life.' That is the *summum bonum* in John, as the kingdom of heaven is in the early Gospels (Joh 4:14; Joh 5:24; Joh 6:40; Joh 10:23). This eternal life, like the kingdom of heaven, is bound up with the personality and mission of Jesus (4:14, 6:27). Again, like the rule of God in the Synoptics, the gift of eternal life in John is both for the present and for the future (4:36, 12:25). Therefore we say that this early interpretation of the Gospel which we have in John helps to confirm the view that the fundamental conception of the term 'kingdom of heaven' in the mind of Jesus was the rule of God. (d) And, finally, the correctness of this view is established by the fact that, while the Synoptics use the term 'kingdom of heaven' in various other senses, these are all secondary to the thought of God's rule, and are derived from it. This will be shown in the next section.

4. *Special uses of the term*—(a) There is a group of passages in which the term 'kingdom of heaven' evidently denotes *a company of men*. This is the prominent thought of the expression when Jesus says that he who is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than John the Baptist (Mat 11:11); also in the parables of the Tares and the Drag-net (13:24-30, 47-50), The tares are the evil, one, and at the end of the present age they are to be gathered *out* of the kingdom. They are therefore *in* the kingdom up to that time. To be gathered out of the kingdom means to be separated from the sons of the kingdom. The interest of the parable centres in the teaching that these two classes—the sons of the kingdom and the sons of the evil one—must remain intermingled until the end of the age. Hence it is obvious that the kingdom out of which the 'stumbling-blocks' are to be taken is the company of those who inwardly belong to God.

Now, while the foremost thought in these passages is that of a certain company of persons, these persons cannot, be defined without the aid of the thought of God's rule. They are the persons who are under that rule, or at least claim to be under it.

(b) A second special use of the term 'kingdom of heaven' is presented in the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard (21:43). Jesus said to the Jews at the close of the parable, 'The kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.' In this case 'kingdom' cannot mean the *rule* of God, for these Jews were hostile to this, and obviously it cannot mean those who are under the Divine rule. We take it in the sense of *the high privilege and blessing*

which the Jews had enjoyed as God's peculiar people. It was these things which were actually taken from the Jews when the gospel of Jesus was freely proclaimed to the Gentiles. Another passage which may well be assigned to the same category is the first Beatitude (5:3). The poor in spirit are blessed because 'theirs is the kingdom of heaven.' It is now theirs. They experience its blessing by virtue of the fact that they *are* poor in spirit. They will doubtless experience it in much larger measure in the future, but they have a foretaste of the experience now. In like manner they who hungered after righteousness began to be 'filled' by Jesus at once: the satisfaction of their longing was not deferred to a distant future. Again, as purity of heart brought a vision of God to Jesus, even in His earthly life, we cannot doubt that the promise of His beatitude for the pure in heart was a promise not merely of a future good, but of a good to be enjoyed in some measure here and now.

(c) Another special use of the term 'kingdom of heaven,' and yet one that is easily derived from its fundamental idea, is found in a considerable number of passages. Thus Jesus said, 'It is better to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into Gehenna' (Mar_9:47). Since Gehenna stands here in contrast to the kingdom of God, it is obvious that the latter term denotes the place to which the righteous go at death. Again we read, 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven' (Mat_7:21). It is plain from the following verse that Jesus is thinking of the end of the present age, and therefore the kingdom of heaven is here a synonym for heaven as the abode of the blessed. It is used in the same sense when Jesus says that many shall come from the east and the west, and sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven (8:11); and again, in the parable of the Tares, when it is said that the righteous, *after* the judgment of the wicked, shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father (13:43).

The prominent thought in these passages is the place to be occupied by those who are under the rule of God, rather than that rule itself. The kingdom of heaven in this sense alone is wholly eschatological. It belongs entirely to the future. Yet it is by no means the Jewish apocalyptic kingdom even in these passages. It is open to Gentiles as well as Jews (8:11, 12), and it is not a kingdom for this earth. It is where the spirits of the patriarchs are now.

Such are the special uses of the term 'kingdom of heaven' in the words of Jesus. No one of them furnishes a conception that binds the various uses together as does the idea of the rule of God.

5. The ideal of Jesus and that of the scribes.—Jesus' conception of the kingdom of heaven was not developed out of that of the scribes. It was the antithesis of that. The story of the Temptation marks the definite rejection of the popular idea. For there

would have been no ground for the temptation of Jesus, in regard to the Messianic office, if that ideal which He put away as fundamentally evil had not been the ideal of His people. His ideal was born out of His own inner experience of the rule of God. Hence for Him the kingdom in its fundamental idea was something to be realized from within, quietly and gradually, by spiritual means. The scribes, on the contrary, looked for a kingdom to be realized from without, in a spectacular and supernatural manner. This is plain from certain references in the Gospel itself. Thus, when Jesus entered Jerusalem riding on an ass, and all the crowds shouted Hosanna, His disciples thought that He was now at last to set up a visible Messianic banner, and they hailed the *coming* kingdom of their father David (Mar_11:10). Thus the establishment of the kingdom was associated in their minds with outward pomp. The disciples of Jesus, even after the resurrection, seem to have thought that the kingdom was to be set up in some miraculous manner, at any rate it was not to come *through them* (Act_1:6).

This idea of the kingdom is common also in other Jewish writings. Thus, *e.g.*, in the *Psalms of Solomon* we read that the Messiah will destroy the ungodly nations by the breath of His mouth, and He alone will establish the kingdom (17:23-25). Of the same purport is the teaching of the Talmud. Deliverance by the Messiah, like the deliverance of Israel by Moses, is to come from without, miraculously, and not at all from within. The Jews who are alive at the coming of the Messiah seem to have no more to do with the establishment of the kingdom than the Jews who are dead, and who at the beginning of the Messianic age are raised up to enjoy the kingdom (see Weber, *Jud. Theol.*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] pp. 347-354; Hilgenfeld, *Die jud. Apokalyptik*, p. 86).

Again, the popular conception of the kingdom of heaven in the time of Jesus was thoroughly *political* and *national*. This is made plain by the Gospel. Thus, *e.g.*, the third temptation of Jesus presupposes that people thought of the kingdom as a political organism. For the suggestion that Jesus might secure all the kingdoms of the world and their glory—He a carpenter from the little town of Nazareth, poor and as yet without a follower—would have been psychologically impossible, had not the popular view associated world-wide political dominion with Messiahship; and it would not have been a temptation of any power to the mind of Jesus, had it not been deeply rooted in the Jewish heart, and had it not seemed to have strong support in the OT itself.

The Fourth Evangelist tells us that after the miracle of feeding the five thousand, Jesus perceived that the people were about to make Him *king* (Joh_6:15). This word is capable only of a political meaning in this place, and therefore shows that the Galilaean idea of the kingdom was political. The character and strength of the popular view are seen in the request of Salome, seconded by James and John

(Mar_10:37), and in the question of the disciples who, after the resurrection, asked the Lord if He would now *restore* the kingdom to Israel (Act_1:6).

In utter contrast to this view, the fundamental conception of Jesus was, from the first, non-political and universal. The rule which He contemplated was, primarily, the rule of God in the heart, a rule which He doubtless thought of as transforming the entire outward life, social and political, and as bringing it into harmony with the Divine rule, though on this consequence of the inner rule of God He gave no explicit teaching. He dwelt on the fundamental spiritual fact of God's rule in the heart. If at times He used the word 'kingdom' in the sense of the company of men who were under the rule of God, He did so without a suggestion of any political organization. And when by the 'kingdom of heaven' Jesus meant the full realization of His ideal in the future age, it is manifest that His conception is wholly religious in character and universal in its scope. Men enter the kingdom from the east and the west—all who have shown the spirit of Jesus; and what they inherit is eternal life (Mat_8:11-12; Mat_25:34).

We conclude, then, that just as Jesus derived His conception of God from His own experience, so it was from His experience of the rule of God that He developed His teaching about the kingdom of heaven. This teaching was akin to the spiritual views of the great prophets, but was wholly unlike that of the scribes of His day. See also art. Eschatology, p. 528 ff.

Literature.—Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu* [*Teaching of Jesus*], 1886; V. H. Stanton, *The Jewish and the Christian Messiah*, 1886; J. Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*, 1892; W. Baldeusperger, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1892; C. H. Toy, *Judaism and Christianity*, 1892; J. Drummond, *Hibbert Lectures*, 1894; Beyschlag, *NT Theol.*, English translation 1895; L. Paul, *Die Vorstellungen vom Messias und vom Gottesreich bei den Synoptikern*, 1895; W. Lütgert, *Das Reich Gottes nach den syn. Evangelien*, 1895; A. Titius, *Jesu Lehre vom Reiche Gottes*, 1895; H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der NT Theol.* 1897; Stevens, *Theol. of NT*, 1899; Gould, *Bibl. Theol. of NT*, 1900; G. Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, English translation 1902; W. Bousset, *Rel. des Judenthums*, 1903; Wernle, *Beginnings of Christianity*, English translation 1903; Candlish, *Kingdom of God*; Bruce, *Kingdom of God*; Orr, *Chr. View of God and the World*, p. 401 ff., and his art. in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible* ii. 844; Denney, *Stud. in Theol.*, ch. viii.; *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times.*] iv. [1893] pp. 245, 464.

George Holley Gilbert.

☩ Kiss

KISS.—Originally a token of affection belonging to the intimate conditions of family life, but extended to more general relationships.

1. To *kiss the hands* is the expression of respect towards seniority and higher rank. Children in Oriental homes are taught to rise at the entrance of visitors and salute in this way. It is also their first form of greeting to parents and adult relatives before being kissed on the lips and cheek by them. When two sheikhs meet they kiss each other's hands in recognition of the rank held by each. Kissing the hand, or making an attempt to do so, often occurs when one person receives a commission from another or undertakes to do some work for him. The feeling of respect originating in the relationship of child to parent is extended to that of employed and employer.

With regard to the salutation of Judas Iscariot (Luk_22:47-48), to have kissed the hand of Christ after the interval of absence caused by his conference with the chief priests would have been but an ordinary tribute of respect, and as such would have escaped the notice of the disciples, while giving the required information to those who had come with him. If, on the other hand, the kiss was on the face, it was an act of presumption for an Oriental disciple to take the initiative in offering to his master the salutation of equal friendship. The prodigal son, in meeting his father, would be described as kissing his hands before being embraced and kissed by the latter (Luk_15:20).

2. Among those of the same age, and where the relationships of life permitted it, the salutation is given sometimes on the *lips*, but more frequently on the *check* or *neck*. For intimate relatives or acquaintances of the same sex to part for a time, or to meet after a period of separation without such salutation, would seem strained and unnatural (Luk_15:20). In this form of greeting all thought of superior and inferior is lost in the equality of affection and identity of interest (Act_20:37). Such was the kiss of peace or salutation of goodwill that prevailed for a time in the congregations of the early Church. It testified to the new bond of fellowship in the family of the firstborn, and was called a *holy kiss* (Rom_16:16) as a reminder of Christian sainthood, and also a kiss of *love* (1Pe_5:14) made possible by the love that had given them such discipleship and communion.

G. M. Mackie.

☩ Kneeling

KNEELING.—A comparison of the passages that refer to bodily posture seems to prove that kneeling is nowhere intended unless the word ‘knee’ (γόνα) forms part of the expression. The word προσκυνέω, usually translation ‘worship,’ always denotes prostration, not kneeling. Kneeling is referred to as—(a) A posture of *homage*. In this sense it was rendered to Christ in awe of His person (Mar 10:17, Luk 5:8), and in mockery of His claims (Mat 27:29). There is no instance of Christ Himself paying this homage to any man. (b) The posture of a *suppliant* (Mat 17:14, Mar 1:40). In classical literature the suppliant kneels and touches the knees, or beard, of the person applied to. (c) A posture of *prayer*. Luk 22:41 is the only instance of this in the Gospels. Among the Jews the usual custom (and in the Temple and synagogues at ordinary times the invariable custom) was to stand at prayer (Mat 6:5, Mar 11:25, Luk 9:28-32; Luk 18:11 ff; Luk 22:46 etc.). The prayers of Solomon (1Ki 8:54 = 2Ch 6:13) and Ezra (Ezr 9:5), both offered kneeling in the Temple, are altogether exceptional. Beyond general (and ambiguous) expressions, e.g. Psa 95:6, Isa 45:23, any references to particular cases of kneeling are very rare in the OT (cf. Dan 6:10). In the Jewish Church, Solomon’s prayer is the only instance prior to the Captivity. In the Christian Church, instances multiply after Pentecost (Act 7:60; Act 9:40; Act 20:36; Act 21:5). This may have been due in some measure to Hellenistic and Gentile influences. In 1Ch 29:20 LXX Septuagint there is an alteration of ‘heads’ to ‘knees’ bowed. The description given in Luk 22:41 (not supported by ||) occurs in a Gospel of Gentile authorship; and Gentile connexions are found in all except one (Act 9:40) of the NT passages already quoted. If this supposition is correct, the spread of kneeling as a posture of prayer has an interesting association with the change from a national to a universal religion.

F. S. Ranken.

Knocking

KNOCKING.—The guarding of the Oriental house-door led to the more elaborate precautions with regard to entrance by the city gate.

1. During the daytime any unannounced approach is felt to be unneighbourly, and open to suspicion. It is regarded as an act of thoughtlessness or implied contempt to ride up to a Bedawî tent from behind. The privacy or domestic life forbids a visitor from entering even the walled enclosure round the house, without first knocking and asking permission. He must wait until his call is heard, and the bar of the door or gate, if closed, has been removed by a member or servant who can conduct him into the house.

2. It is, however, at night that the difficulty is greatest. The family have retired together into a room with closed doors, and on account of the habit of sleeping with the coverlet drawn over the head they usually are unable for a time to hear the sound of knocking at the door. In the still, elastic air it is also difficult to localize the sound. In this way one is often disturbed by the loud persistent knocking and summoning by name resorted to by a neighbour who has returned late at night to his house (Luk 12:36). The large wooden key of ancient times was too cumbersome to carry about, so that even one who had the right to enter, or was sure of being welcome, had to wait outside until the door was opened (Act 12:16). It was to those already familiar with such obstacles and the way of overcoming them that Christ said with regard to a higher entrance, 'Knock, and it shall be opened unto you' (Mat 7:7-8); cf. Rev 3:20 'Behold, I stand at the door, and knock.'

G. M. Mackie.

⚡ Knowledge

KNOWLEDGE.—See Consciousness, Ignorance, Kenosis, Teaching of Jesus.

⚡ Labour

LABOUR.—The verb *κοπιᾶν* in NT Greek signifies not only the weariness produced by constant toil (see Joh 4:6 *κεκοπιακῶς*), which is the idea attaching to the word in classical writings (cf. Liddell and Scott's *Lex. s.v.*); it also has reference to the toil itself (cf. Mat 6:28; Mat 11:28, Luk 5:5; Luk 12:27, Joh 4:38), and sometimes to its result in the field of operations (*ὁ οὐχ ὑμεῖς κεκοπιάκατε = τὸν κόπον* in Joh 4:38). This extension in the use of the word is not confined, however, to the NT, and it is probable that it is borrowed from the LXX Septuagint. We find it employed, for instance, in Joshua (Jos 24:13). Nor is it unlikely that Jesus had in His mind this passage and was even conscious of a parallel between Himself and the warlike leader of Israel's armies, who brought the nation into a land on the development of which they spent no wearisome toil (*ἐφ' ἣν οὐκ ἐκοπιάσατε, κ.τ.λ.*). The perfection of Christ's human nature is emphasized by the use of this word in the Johannine narrative of the woman of Samaria (Joh 4:6), and it is worthy of note that the record of this incident is peculiar to that writing (see Westcott's *Gospel of St. John, ad loc.*).

Closely allied to this word is ἐργάζεσθαι and its cognates, ἐργάτης which occurs frequently in the Gospels, and ἐργασία almost peculiar to the Lukan writings. The last mentioned word not only implies the business or trade by which men gain their livelihood (Act 19:24), but includes in its meaning the resultant gain or profit accruing (see Act 16:16-19), and sometimes the trouble or toil involved in the pursuit of an object (Luk 12:58). An ethical content is imported into the word by St. Paul (Eph 4:19), just as is done in St. Luke's Gospel where a Latinism (δὸς ἐργασίαν) is employed to emphasize the warning of Jesus with respect to the conciliation of an adversary. 'In medical language it was used for the making of some mixture, the mixture itself—the work of digestion and that of the lungs,' etc. (Hobart, *The Medical Language of St. Luke*, p. 243). At the same time it must not be forgotten that this word is found in the LXX Septuagint (cf. e.g. Wis 13:19), where St. Luke may have become familiar with its uses. A similar spiritual significance frequently attaches to the words κοπιᾶν, κόπος, and ἐργάτης in the Gospel narratives (cf. Joh 4:38, Mat 9:37 f. = Luk 10:2, Mat 10:10 = Luk 10:7; Luk 13:27).

Considerations like these show us clearly in what spirit Jesus claimed the active support of His followers. Theirs was to be no half-hearted allegiance. They were expected to work in His cause ceaselessly and in spite of weariness, for the field of operations was large and the toilers few (οἱ ἐργάται ὀλίγοι, ὁ θερισμὸς πολὺς, Mat 9:37 = Luk 10:2). The conditions as to remuneration which obtained in the case of the ordinary field-labourer held good in the case of those who preached the Gospel (ἄξιός γάρ ὁ ἐργάτης τῆς τροφῆς αὐτοῦ, Mat 10:10, cf. Luk 10:7). His disciples were reminded that they were the successors of a long line of toilers who sowed the seed, of which they were about to reap the fruit (ἄλλοι κεκοπιᾶσιν, καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς τὸν κόπον αὐτῶν εἰσεληλύθατε, Joh 4:38).

This is a thought which has a large place in the Pauline conception of Christian work, and the Christology of St. Paul enhances the dignity of, as it supplies the motive power which guides and strengthens, the toiler (cf. τολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν ἐν Κυρίῳ, Rom 16:12; see also 1Co 15:10, Gal 4:11, Php 2:16, Col 1:29, 1Th 5:12). With this conception of laborious effort as the norm of Christian life we may compare what is told of Rabbi Judah in the Midrash on Genesis, who sat labouring 'in the law' before the Babylonish synagogue in Zippor (*Bereshith Rabba*, § 33). We are reminded of the exhortation respecting those 'who labour (οἱ κοπιῶντες) in the word and in teaching' (1Ti 5:17). It may not be out of place to call attention here to those incidental statements which picture for us the Apostle of the Gentiles and his companions

working day by day to supply their physical necessities (1Co 4:12 κοιῶμεν, *ct.* [*Note: contrast.*] 1Co 9:6, 1Th 2:9, 2Th 3:8).

Not only does the life of Jesus exhibit the great example of self-sacrificing labour for the sake of the souls of men; it furnishes, moreover, the principle that human life in all its phases is, at its best, a life of service. In its earliest stages obedience to parental authority (καὶ ἡ ὑποτασσόμενος αὐτοῖς, Luk 2:51) leads the way to willing obedience to a primal and fundamental law which conditions man's living to the full his present life (see Gen 3:19, ἐν ἰδρωτί τοῦ προσώπου σου φάγη τὸν ἄρτον σου, κ.τ.λ.).

The question of His Galilaeen neighbours who were familiar with the circumstances of Jesus' early life, 'Is not this the worker in wood?' (ὁ τέκτων, Mar 6:3), shows clearly how fully He adopted this principle as regulating the preparatory discipline of His young manhood. Nor must we forget that it was amongst that class which is dependent for its livelihood upon its capacity for physical labour and endurance that Jesus gained His most thoughtful, whole-hearted adherents (cf. Mar 1:16-20 = Mat 4:18-22, Luk 5:5 ff.), while many of His most beautiful and effective similes are taken from the surroundings of the busy life (cf. Joh 4:35 ff., Luk 10:2 f., Mat 9:37 f., Mat 20:1-15 etc.). On the other hand, He reserved His profoundest commiseration for those upon whom superfluous wealth had imposed a selfish idleness (see Mat 19:23 ff. = Mar 10:23 ff., Luk 16:19 ff.), and perhaps the most caustic remark in connexion with the life led by the unjust steward was that in which he confessed his inability for honest physical work (σκάπτειν οὐκ ἰσχύω, Luk 16:3).

The remarkable apocryphal addition to Luk 6:4 found in Codex Bezae (D), while primarily having reference to the Sabbath controversy, may not be without its bearing on this question. This passage relates that Jesus 'seeing a certain man working on the Sabbath day said to him, "O, man, if thou indeed knowest what thou art doing, thou art blessed; but if thou knowest not, thou art cursed, and art a transgressor of the law." ' Westcott believes that this saying 'rests on some real incident' (see his *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, App. C); and, indeed, the spirit underlying these words is not out of harmony with the general tenor of Christ's known attitude towards the active life of busy service. Whether any man's labour is a blessing or not to himself depends, of course, on whether he knows what he does and recognizes its bearing upon his whole life and character (cf. εἰ εἶδας in the passage just quoted, where there is evidently a reference to the relation between the work done and the doer of that work [see Cremer's *Biblico-Theol. Lexicon of NT Greek*, p. 229]).

A charge, which has been brought again and again against the Christian religion, is that it is too exclusive in its other-worldliness to be of practical value in the midst of life's stern realities. Enough has been already said to show that such an accusation misinterprets completely the moving spirit of Christianity. At the same time, we must not forget that at a very early period of the Church's history there was a grave danger of professing Christians degenerating into idle dreamers and useless busybodies (περιεργοί, 1Ti_5:13, cf. 2Th_3:11). Against this abuse St. Paul felt compelled repeatedly to contend (cf. Eph_4:28, 1Th_4:11), while he set the example in his own life of unflagging industry (see Act_18:3 etc.). There can be no doubt that in his restatement of the law of social economics ('if any will not work, neither let him eat,' 2Th_3:10) St. Paul was profoundly influenced by the life as well as by the teaching of Jesus.

No thoughtful student of modern problems can fail to note how completely the future of the Christian Church is bound up with her attitude towards the labour question. Year by year that question assumes graver proportions as the danger of a complete breach between employer and employed becomes more formidable. Nor can there be any serious doubt in the mind of a loyal subject of 'the Kingdom of the Incarnation,' that in the true interests of Christian development and progress a real active harmony of aims and aspirations between capital and labour must be established. Representatives of both must be taught that the only solution of problems which seem to baffle them lies in the recognition of the truth that at bottom all human life is true and sacred according as it may be measured in terms of service. Jesus, who employed labourers in fields of activity selected by Himself (cf. Mat_10:5), points out distinctly the complete identification of employer and employed as being the root idea underlying all vital progress (ὁς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος ἔσται ὑμῶν δοῦλος, Mat_20:27, cf. Mar_10:43). Nor is the Incarnation above the sphere of this universal law. The Son of Man Himself (ὥσπερ) came not to be served but to serve (διακονῆσαι), yielding up even His life for the sake of His fellow-men (λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, Mar_10:45 = Mat_20:28; cf. Luk_22:26 f.).

'The labourer is worthy of his hire' (Luk_10:7) is a basal principle both broad and deep. It does not mean either that the employer's liability to his servant is discharged when he has paid him his stipulated wage, or that the latter's duty to his master ends with the outward fulfilment of a set task. Personal relationship involving mutual responsibility forms an essential part in the Christian solution of this economic problem. For the labourer is no longer in the position of a bond-servant but of a friend, and is to be recognized as such (οὐκέτι λέγω ὑμᾶς δούλους ... ὑμᾶς δὲ εἰρηκα φίλους, Joh_15:15).

Literature.—See three remarkable addresses on social service by Westcott in his *Christian Aspects of Life*, especially that on ‘The Christian Law,’ in which he quotes from Bishop Tucker of Uganda the salutation ordinarily addressed in that country to a man engaged in manual labour, ‘Many thanks; well done.’ Consult also Westcott, *Social Aspects of Christianity*; W. H. M. H. Aitken, *Temptation and Toil*, p. 209; E. Griffith-Jones, *Economics of Jesus* (1905); and *The Citizen of To-morrow* (ed. S. E. Keeble), esp. ch. vi. with the bibliography on p. 123.

J. R. Willis.

☞ Lake Of Gennesaret

LAKE OF GENNESARET.—See Sea of Galilee.

☞ Lamb

LAMB.—See Animals (vol. i. p. 64^a), Names and Titles of Christ, and Sheep.

☞ Lame

LAME.—This word, perhaps originally meaning *bruised*, signifies a crippled or disabled condition caused by injury to or defect of a limb or limbs; specifically walking with difficulty, inefficient from injury or defect, unsound or impaired in strength. It is applied metaphorically to all kinds of inefficiency, such as inadequate excuses, or verses which offend against the laws of versification. The term embraces all varieties of defect in walking arising from various causes, and includes *halting* and *maimed* (see artt.), which are separate and distinct species of lameness.

The Greek word is *χολός*, from obsolete *χάω* or *χαλάω* (*to loosen, slacken*), which is translation ‘lame’ in [Mat_11:5](#); [Mat_15:30-31](#); [Mat_21:14](#), [Luk_7:22](#); [Luk_14:13](#); but in other passages for no apparent reason the same word is translated ‘halt’ In [Joh_5:3](#) *χολῶν* is rendered ‘halt.’ without any indication that a special species of lameness is intended, where the description is quite general as in the above passages. In [Mar_9:43-45](#) it is used synonymously with *κυλλός*, where *ἀνάτηρος* might have been expected in both cases, seeing that the injury referred to is the definite cutting off of

the hand or foot. κυλλός is, however, most commonly associated with the hand, while χωλός more specifically has to do with lameness in the foot or feet. In Mat_18:8 we have χωλὸν ἢ κυλλόν—transposed in the authorities followed by Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, making the correspondence between χεῖρ and κυλλέν, and τοῦς and χωλόν.

Healing of the lame was a characteristic work of Christ. Among the multitudes that gathered round Him seeking restoration for various ailments were probably sufferers from many different kinds of lameness (as Mat_15:30, Luk_7:22). Joh_5:3 gives a comprehensive list of such sick persons, including the feeble, the blind, the lame, and the withered (πλήθος τῶν ἀσθενούντων, τυφλῶν, χωλῶν, ξηρῶν). Probably these miscellaneous cases would include those suffering from chronic rheumatism and from infirmities having a nervous origin, many of which resulted in a withering of the limbs and of the bodily frame. It is significant that Jesus is never said to have restored the ἀνάπηροι, the badly mutilated—deprived of their limbs (see Maimed).

T. H. Wright.

☩ Lamech

LAMECH.—Father of Noah, mentioned in our Lord's genealogy, Luk_3:36.

☩ Lamentation

LAMENTATION (θρήνος, θρηνεῖν).—An expression of sorrow accompanied by wailing and other demonstrations of grief. It is associated in Joh_16:20 with weeping, and also in Luk_23:27, in the case of the women accompanying the Saviour to the Crucifixion. It is applied equally to sorrow for the dead and to grief for approaching disaster (Mat_2:18, Joh_16:20, Luk_23:27), and it is referred to by the Lord as one of the common games of children.

When a death occurred, it was intimated at once by a loud wail which is described (Mar_5:38) as accompanied by a 'tumult,' and this lamentation was renewed at the grave of the deceased. Oriental demonstrations of grief are very vivid. Mourners hang

over the lifeless form and beg for a response from its lips. When a young person dies unmarried, part of the ceremony of mourning is a form of marriage (see art. Mourning). Lamentation for the dead was also accompanied by beating the breast and tearing the hair, as well as by rending the garments (see Rending of Garments) and fasting.

W. H. Rankine.

☩Lamp

LAMP.—There are two words in the Gospels translated ‘lamp,’ *λύχνος* and *λαμπάς*. The former (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘lamp,’ Authorized Version ‘candle’) is used Mat 5:15, Mar 4:21, Luk 8:16 of the usual means of lighting a house. In Mat 6:22 the eye, as the source of light, the organ by which light is appreciated, is called the lamp (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ; Authorized Version ‘light’) of the body. In Joh 5:35 the same word is applied to John the Baptist, who is not the eternal light (*φῶς*, Joh 1:8), but the burning and shining lamp kindled by it and bearing witness to it.

The word *λαμπάς* occurs in Joh 18:3, where it is rendered ‘torch.’ It is also used in the parable of the Ten Virgins, Matthew 25, where it would be better translated ‘torch.’ In Eastern countries the torch, like the lamp, is fed with oil, which is carried in small vessels constructed for the purpose (*ἀγγεῖον*, Mat 25:4). See Candle, Light, Torch.

Literature.—Trench, *Synonyms*, xlvi.; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , artt. ‘Lamp’ and ‘Lantern’; Edersheim, *Life and Times*, ii. 455 ff.; H. J. van Lennep, *Bible Lands and Customs*, p. 132; W. M. Thomson, *Land and Book*, iii. 472.

C. H. Prichard.

☩Lane

LANE.—See Street.

Language Of Christ

LANGUAGE OF CHRIST.—Recent historical and critical research has narrowed the ground which it is necessary to cover in the discussion of the question as to the language spoken by Christ. It has ruled Hebrew out of court. The practically unanimous verdict of recent scholars is that, considerably before the time of Christ, though when is uncertain, Hebrew had ceased to be spoken in Palestine, and its place as the vernacular had been taken by Aramaic, the language represented in OT by Ezr_4:8-16; Ezr_7:12-26, Jer_10:11, and Dan_2:4 to Dan_7:28, and mistakenly named ‘Chaldee.’

The transition from Hebrew to Aramaic involved no great linguistic revolution, as it was simply a transition from one Semitic language to another, and that a closely cognate one. It was, however, only very gradually effected, and was chiefly due to the predominance to which Aramaic attained in Western Asia during the Persian period, coming, as it did, to be, with dialectical differences, the *lingua communis* from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean. While, however, Aramaic thus gradually superseded Hebrew as the living tongue of Palestine, and by the time of Alexander the Great had probably reached a position of ascendancy, if it had not gained entire possession of the field, yet Hebrew remained, though with some loss of its ancient purity, the language of sacred literature, the language in which Prophet and Psalmist wrote, and as the language of the books ultimately embraced in the OT Canon, continued to be read, with an accompanying translation into Aramaic, in the synagogues, and to be diligently studied by the professional interpreters of the Scriptures. It is, therefore, quite possible that Christ possessed a knowledge of Hebrew, and had thus access to the Scriptures in the original.

With Alexander the Great, however, there came a fresh disturbance of the linguistic situation. Thenceforward Greek entered into competition with Aramaic. And though, as a non-Semitic language, the adoption of Greek could not come so readily to the Jews as Aramaic, yet the circumstances were such as to tend in no small degree to counterbalance the disadvantage under which Greek thus lay. For not only was it the official language alike of the Lagid, Seleucid, and, after the Maccabaeen interregnum, of the Idumaeen Roman rulers to whom the Jews were successively subject; but its cause was furthered by the Hellenizing policy which these rulers generally followed, and by the existence, more or less, all through of a party among the Jews themselves favourable to that policy. The result on the linguistic situation of the political conditions thus obtaining cannot be certainly determined from the historical data bearing directly thereon. It is, however, clear that whatever headway Greek may have made before the Maccabaeen revolt,—which was a revolt against the Hellenizing policy referred to, as pushed to extremes by Antiochus Epiphanes,—it suffered a decided set-back, and was practically expelled the country during the Maccabaeen

régime. And though it had again made considerable progress by the time of Christ, and especially through the influence of Herod the Great, who particularly affected Greek culture, there is nothing to show that the political conditions were such as to secure for it the ascendancy claimed by some scholars, and notably by Dr. Roberts in his book, *Greek the Language of Christ and His Apostles*.

At the time of Christ, then, Palestine was bilingual, Greek as well as Aramaic being, to some extent at least, spoken. The question, therefore, to be answered is, Which of these languages did Christ speak, or, if He knew and spoke both, which of them did He mainly, if not exclusively, employ as the vehicle of His teaching? Consideration need be given to the question only in its latter form. For, as undoubtedly spoken by some of the Palestinian Jews, as the language of perhaps the great majority of His countrymen scattered throughout the Roman world, as the predominant language of the representatives of the Gentile world in Palestine and of that Gentile world itself, which, though wide, was not yet wider than He conceived the scope of His mission to be, and as, besides, the language of the Septuagint Version of the OT, which had no doubt acquired considerable popularity, it may reasonably be assumed that Christ would acquire some knowledge of Greek, and be able, in some measure at least, to speak it. Was it, then, Aramaic or Greek that Christ habitually employed in His public ministry? The question resolves itself into that of the relative prevalence of the two languages in the country at the time, so far as that can be determined by such evidence, direct and indirect, as is available. And this evidence, though somewhat meagre, is decisive for Aramaic. That furnished by the reported words of Christ Himself does not go very far, but yet goes some length towards that conclusion. All that it certainly establishes is that Christ knew Aramaic, and, apart from His employment of Aramaic terms and proper names, on which perhaps little stress is to be laid, as these terms and proper names may have formed part of the ordinary vocabulary of Greek-speaking Jews, expressed Himself in Aramaic on three different occasions. The *three expressions* are: (1) *ταλειθα κούμ*, the Gr. transliteration of the Aram. Aramaic אַטְלִיתָּ or קוּם טְלִידָא Mar 5:41; (2) *ἐφφαθά*, euphonic for the Aram. Aramaic אַתְפַּתָּ Mar 7:34; and (3) *ἤλει ἤλει λαμὰ σαβαχθανεὶ* (Mat 27:46), or according to Mar 15:34 *ἐλωί, ἐλωί, λεμὰ σαβαχθανεὶ*, the Aram. Aramaic אֱלֵי אֱלֵי, אֱלֵי לֵיָּ or שְׁבַקְחֵי לְמָא. How these three Aramaic expressions alone came to be preserved is matter of conjecture. An obvious explanation is that they alone were preserved because they were exceptional, Greek being the language for the most part used by Christ. That, however, is not the only possible explanation. More probable is it that they alone were preserved because associated with moments of exceptional emotion on Christ's part, and therefore felt to be exceptionally precious. The cry upon the cross was peculiarly a cry *de profundis*. In the case of the deaf and dumb man, Christ, for some reason or other, was unwontedly moved, for it is said that 'he

looked up to heaven and sighed.’ And, though it is not stated, the spectacle of Jairus’ child-daughter lying cold yet beautiful in death, was calculated to touch profoundly the heart of the great Child-Lover.

The two main sources of direct evidence conclusively proving the predominance of Aramaic as the popular language, are the *Book of Acts* and the *Works of Josephus*.

1. In Act 1:19 it is said with reference to the suicide of Judas in the field which he had purchased ‘with the reward of iniquity,’ ‘And it was known unto all the dwellers at Jerusalem; insomuch as that field is called *in their own tongue* (τῇ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν) Akeldama.’ Now *Akeldama* is the Aram. Aramaic אַקֵּלְדָמָא, and points not only to the fact that Aramaic had superseded Hebrew as the vernacular, but that at the time of Christ it was the popular language, even of the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Equally conclusive on the latter point are two other passages in the Acts. In describing his conversion to Agrippa, St. Paul said, ‘And when we were all fallen to the earth, I heard a voice speaking unto me, and saying, *in the Hebrew tongue*’ (τῇ Ἑβραϊκῇ διαλέκτῳ), Act 26:14. By ‘Hebrew’ St. Paul undoubtedly meant Aramaic. The terms Ἑβραϊκῇ and Ἑβραϊστί, as is generally admitted, are used both in the NT and by Josephus when not Hebrew but Aramaic is meant. Thus in Joh 19:13 it is said that ‘Pilate sat down in the judgment-seat in a place that is called the Pavement, but in the Hebrew Gabbatha’ (Ἑβραϊστί δὲ Γαββαθᾶ); and Γαββαθᾶ is not Hebrew, but Aramaic. That the ascended Christ should have spoken to Saul in Aramaic is unintelligible except on the supposition that that had been the language which He had spoken when on earth, and that it was the prevailing language of Palestine.

Quite as significant is the circumstance mentioned in Act 22:2 that Paul addressed the infuriated Jerusalemites in Aramaic, and that when they ascertained from his opening words that he was to speak to them in that language, ‘they kept the more silence’ (μᾶλλον παρέσχον ἡσυχίαν), the reference being to the fact that Paul had not attempted to speak until by a gesture indicative of his desire to be heard he had stilled the uproar, and, as it is said, ‘there was made a great silence.’ It does not necessarily follow, as has been maintained, that the people expected Paul to address them in Greek, and that the fact that they were prepared to give him a hearing when they expected him to speak in that language, proves that they were familiar with it. The simple fact that, as his gesture indicated, Paul was going to address them was in itself sufficient to secure their quiet attention. And in any case, even though they had expected to be addressed in Greek, the deeper silence into which they settled when they found that they were to be addressed in Aramaic, proves that they were more

familiar with the latter language than the former, and that the latter was the language generally spoken by them.

2. The evidence of *Josephus* is as direct and conclusive as that furnished by the Acts of the predominance of Aramaic. In *BJ* v. vi. 3, Josephus records how during the siege of Jerusalem the Jewish watchmen warned their compatriots of the discharge of the Roman missiles by crying out *in their native tongue* (τῆ πατριῶ γλώσση), ὁ ἰδὸς ἔρχεται. In the same work, vi. ii. 1, he tells how in his capacity of intermediary during the same siege he communicated the proposals of Titus to the besieged *in their native tongue* (τῆ πατριῶ γλώσση). In the preface to *BJ* he records how that work was at first written in Aramaic and afterwards translated into Greek.

The passage runs: ‘I have proposed to myself, for the sake of such as live under the government of the Romans, to translate these books into the Greek tongue, which I formerly composed in *the language of our own country*, and sent to the Upper Barbarians,’ *i.e.* to the Aramaic-speaking peoples, whom he describes in the following paragraph as ‘the Parthians, Babylonians, the remotest Arabians, and those of our nation beyond Euphrates, with the Adiabeni.’

That a Palestinian Jew such as Josephus, who was of a distinguished priestly family, who received a careful rabbinic education and studied in the various schools of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes, should not only characterize Aramaic as ‘the language of our own country,’ but should write his first book in that language, is in itself conclusive proof that Aramaic had not then been materially driven from its position as the vernacular of Palestine. Suggestive also in this connexion, and giving added weight to the case for Aramaic, is Josephus’ own confession of the difficulty he experienced in acquiring such mastery of Greek as that which he ultimately attained. In the preface to his *Antiquities* he tells how he found the writing of that work a hard and wearisome task, ‘it being,’ as he says, ‘a large subject, and a difficult thing to translate our history into a foreign and to us unaccustomed language’ (εἰς ἄλλοδαπὴν ἡμῶν καὶ ξένην διαλέκτου συνήθειαν), and how he was able to continue and accomplish the task only by the encouragement and help of a friend, Epaphroditus. To the same difficulty he refers in the closing paragraphs of the *Antiquities*:

‘I am so bold as to say, now that I have completed the task set before me, that no other person, either Jew or Greek, with whatever good intentions, would have been able to set forth this history to the Greeks as accurately as I have done; for I am acknowledged by my countrymen to excel them far in our national learning. I also did my best to obtain a knowledge of Greek by practising myself in the grammar, though native habit prevented me from attaining accuracy in its use.’

Josephus' difficulty with Greek is very significant. For if that difficulty obtained with him, what of his countrymen generally? Stress has been laid, as, e.g., by Dr. Roberts, upon the attainments in Greek of such men as Peter and James and John, as shown in the speeches or writings attributed to them, and it has been argued therefrom that a knowledge of Greek must have been common among the rank and file. But even though Peter and James and John were the authors of the speeches and writings referred to and did speak or write such Greek as is found therein, which is open to question, they cannot fairly be regarded as representative of the people generally in this respect. The very fact of their not only being of the number of the Twelve, but forming the inner group of that favoured circle, differentiates them from the crowd. 'Unlearned and ignorant men,' the Council at Jerusalem dubbed them (Act 4:13); but the contemptuous epithets were but the expression of a twofold prejudice, the prejudice of antagonism and the prejudice of the Schools. In virtue of their discipleship, Peter and James and John have to be placed in a different category from the mass of the people of their social rank, who, as compared with them, must have been 'unlearned and ignorant' in the broader sense of the terms.

3. The case for Aramaic as the prevailing language of Palestine in the time of Christ, and the language, therefore, which Christ must necessarily have employed generally in His teaching, is thus incontestably established by the direct evidence of the Acts and of Josephus. And though less direct and certain, there is other evidence to the same effect to which reference may be made, and specially that furnished by the *Targums* and what is known as *The Aramaic Gospel*.

(a) The Targums are Aramaic translations or paraphrases of the OT books, and cover the whole of those books with the exception of Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah. The two principal Targums are (1) that on the Pentateuch, known as the Targum of Onkelos, which is characterized by its almost slavish literalism; and (2) that of Jonathan ben-Uzziel on the Prophets, *i.e.* the Historical books and the Prophets properly so called, which is largely paraphrastic. The dates of these Targums are uncertain, and by scholars they have been made to range from the end of the 1st to that of the 4th cent. a.d. The important point, however, is that they undoubtedly embody material from a much earlier time, and were the outcome of the practice, originating in the gradual disuse of Hebrew as the vernacular, of translating the synagogue readings of the OT into Aramaic for the benefit of the people generally. Written Targums were at first forbidden. The translation was required to be oral, the translator (**מְדַבֵּר**) giving his translation after each verse of the Pentateuch and every three verses of the Prophets. Whether the rule which forbade written Targums had fallen into desuetude by the time of Christ cannot be definitely determined. Probably it had. But even though it had not, and there were no written Targums till a later date, yet the existence of written Targums at that later date points conclusively to the prevalence

of the practice of the oral translation of the synagogue lessons into Aramaic, and therefore to the prevalence of that language as the vernacular.

As against this, the supporters of Greek hold that the Septuagint version was in such general use that it may be described as the 'People's Bible.' The special arguments in favour of this theory are: (1) that copies of the Septuagint could be had at a much smaller cost than Hebrew or Aramaic Manuscripts, that indeed the price of the latter was prohibitive so far as the people generally were concerned; and (2) that the OT quotations in the NT point to a very general familiarity with the Septuagint, inasmuch as the majority of them are verbatim or practically verbatim, or show unmistakable traces of the Septuagint, and particularly as in some cases the Septuagint is followed when it differs from the Hebrew. The *price* argument scarcely deserves notice, and very little weight is to be attached to the *quotation* argument. For while it must be admitted that those who were responsible for the quotations were familiar with the Septuagint, it by no means follows that such familiarity obtained with the people generally. And while it was to be expected that the writers of the NT books would not only be familiar with the Septuagint, but in quoting from the OT would take advantage of a translation ready to hand, it is yet a significant fact that that translation was not always taken advantage of, not a few of the quotations showing an entire independence of the Septuagint.

(b) The question of an Aramaic Gospel (*Ur-Evangelium*), while important chiefly in connexion with the Synoptic problem, bears closely upon that of the language spoken by Christ. If Christ spoke Aramaic, such a Gospel was to be expected, and at the same time its existence would furnish weighty proof at once of the prevalence of Aramaic and of the use of that language by our Lord. And the labours of recent critical scholars, if they have not conclusively established the existence of an Aramaic *Ur-Evangelium*, have at least made it much less open to question. Of special interest in this connexion is the series of articles in the *Expositor* (Ser. iv.), by Professor Marshall, on 'The Aramaic Gospel.' The theory which Professor Marshall in these articles works out with great ability and skill is that the variant Greek words in parallel passages of the Synoptic Gospels can be traced to one original Aramaic word; and the result of the application of his theory is that the Aramaic Gospel contained, speaking generally, the ministry of Christ in Galilee. That Professor Marshall's theory will ever find anything like general acceptance is perhaps unlikely. But whether or not it may be possible by his or any other method to recover with certainty and to any extent the precise Aramaic words used by our Lord, there can be no doubt that Aramaic had the supreme honour of being the language in which He gave expression to His imperishable thoughts.

Literature.—Pfannkuche, *Language of Palestine*, Clark's Cabinet Library, vol. ii.; Roberts, *Greek the Language of Christ and His Apostles*, 1888; W. H. Simcox,

Language of the NT, 1889; T. K. Abbott, *Essays chiefly on the Original Texts of OT and NT*, 1891, p. 129; A. Meyer, *Jesu Mutter-sprache*, 1896; Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, English translation 1902; Schultze, *Gram, der Aram. Aramaic Muttersprache Jesu*, 1899; Marshall, *Expositor*, Ser. iv. ii. 69 ff., iii. 1 ff., 109 ff., 205 ff., 275 ff., 375 ff., 452 ff., iv. 208 ff., 373 ff., 435 ff., vi. 81 ff., viii. 176 ff.; *Exp. Times*, iv. 260; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] i. i., ii. ii.

James Young.

☩Lantern

LANTERN (φανάριον) occurs in Joh 18:3, where the band of soldiers accompanying Judas is described as provided with lanterns and torches (see Lamp).

☩Last Day

LAST DAY.—See Day of Judgment.

☩Last Supper

LAST SUPPER.—Although the relation of the Last Supper to the Jewish Passover is treated with more or less fulness elsewhere (see Dates, vol. i. p. 413 ff., and Lord's Supper (I.)), it appears advisable to handle the whole subject in a special article.

The Paschal controversy, which agitated the first ages of Christianity (see Calendar), has only a general connexion with the inquiry on which we are entering. We note* [Note: See art. 'Chronology' (Turner) in Hastings' DB i. 411 f.] that the trend of opinion at first was towards the view that Christ was crucified on the 14th day of the Jewish month Nisan, and therefore on the day on which the Paschal lamb was killed; from which it follows that the Last Supper (whatever was its nature) preceded the Jewish Passover by several hours. In the 3rd cent. the view that our Lord kept the Passover with the Jews on the 14th, and was crucified on the 15th, began to come into favour. When we approach the sacred records, we find that the first three Evangelists so express themselves, that, in the opinion of some, they represent our Lord as eating the Paschal Supper with His disciples on the night of His betrayal. It is certain that St. John (18:28) represents some of the Jews as not having eaten the

Passover several hours later. On these premises, there appears to be a discrepancy between the accounts in the sacred narratives. When an honest attempt is made to arrive at a conclusion, a great authority on the history of Christ's ministry is compelled to confess his inability to solve the enigma.† [Note: See Sanday, art. 'Jesus Christ' in DB ii. 634b.] By some it has been thought that Christ anticipated the day of the Paschal Supper, in order to eat it with His disciples;‡ [Note: This seems to be the view which Dr. Sanday, on the whole, favours; see art. quoted in preceding note. For the view that the Last Supper was an anticipated Passover meal, resembling the ordinary Passover in form and order, and held before the statutory date, see artt. 'Jesus Christus' (Zöckler) in PRE3, ix. p. 32; 'Eucharist' (J. Armitage Robinson) in EBi, col. 1419. A good summary of arguments and opinions is given by Ellicott in Lectures on the Life of our Lord, pp. 322, 323, nn.] by others, that the heads of the Jewish people deferred their Passover in order to have time to apprehend and condemn Jesus.§ [Note: The Passover might be deferred for a month for those who were legally debarred from observing it on the proper day (Num 9:9-12), but there is no provision in the Law for postponing it for one day: this explanation of the action of the rulers is improbable in itself, and contrary to their expressed intention (Mat 26:5); further notice of it is superfluous.] The object of this article is to show that the first three Gospels preclude the notion that the Last Supper was a Passover, and therefore, as St. John certainly seems to represent the Passover as still to come while the Supper was proceeding,* [Note: Joh 13:29. Edersheim (Life and Times, ii. 566 ff.) explains the φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα of Joh 18:28 as referring to sacrifices of the Paschal season. The opinion of such a writer demands respectful consideration, and a similar explanation is adopted by many. From 2 Chronicles 35 we learn that other sacrifices were offered at the Paschal season besides the lambs; see 2Ch 35:7-8; 2Ch 35:13.] that there is no discrepancy in the accounts.† [Note: The position maintained in this article is identical with the explanation given by the late G. Wildon Peiritz in The Gospels from the Rabbinical point of view, 1873. By birth a Jew, of German nationality, a Cambridge graduate, and an Anglican priest, of wide reading and profound learning, Peiritz had, to an exceptional extent, the ability to form a correct opinion on the problem before us.]

1. In examining the evidence afforded by the four accounts, we find, with satisfaction, that they have been handed down to us intact, and that no attempt was made to harmonize the records, as by the omission of the words τὸ πάσχα from Luk 22:15, which seem at variance with the statements in St. John. There is one critical problem in St. Luke—the retention, or omission, of the mention of a second cup, and the order of the Bread and the Cup in the Institution;‡ [Note: The Received Text of Luk 22:19-20 is read in 'codd. Graec. et verss. fere omn.' (Nov. Test., Lloyd-Sanday, Append. p. 121)—i.e. it has the very highest diplomatic attestation, including the old uncials. It can be rejected only on a priori grounds. The case

illustrates the difference between two schools of criticism—those who follow the testimony of ancient MSS, and those who are influenced by subjective considerations. Dr. Sanday (l.c. 636b) says: ‘We cannot doubt that both these types of text existed early in the 2nd cent. Either may be original. And this is just one of those cases where internal evidence is strongly in favour of the text which we call Western. The temptation to expand was much stronger than to contract; and the double mention of the Cup raises real difficulties of the kind which suggest interpolation.’ See also a full discussion of the Lukan account of the Institution by Mr. Blakiston, in *JThSt*, July 1903, p. 548 f. Dr. Lambert (ib. Jan. 1903) well sums up the arguments and authorities for adhering to the Received Text.] but the solution of this problem will not affect the chief thesis in our position. Herein is another proof, if proof be needed, of the honesty and faithfulness of the ancient scribes, who, in the midst of one of the greatest controversies of the early Church, resisted the temptation to accommodate the records to particular views of the event.

2. The five following indications of time may be collected from the several accounts:

(1) When Jesus had finished His great eschatological discourse, and the rulers were forming a plan for His apprehension and condemnation, it wanted two days to the commencement of the Paschal Feast—*μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας τὸ πάσχα γίνεται* (Mat 26:2, Mar 14:1, Luk 22:1). ‘After two days’ must be interpreted according to the reckoning which makes ‘after three days’ equivalent to ‘on the third day.’ This Jewish usage is well known, and is found, e.g., in Mat 20:19 parallel with Mar 10:34 and Luk 18:33, where *τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ* in the First and Third corresponds to *μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας* in the Second Evangelist. § [Note: As there is a v.l. harmonizing the text of Mk. with that of Mt. and Lk., we may compare Mat 27:63, where the text is certain.] Now the Passover was slain late in the afternoon of the 14th Nisan, and some hours earlier leaven was put out of the houses, in preparation for the ‘days of unleavened bread,’ which, strictly speaking, began with the eating of the lamb in the early hours of 15th Nisan. || [Note: | So Chwolson in *Das letzte Passainahl Christi und der Tag seines Todes*, quoted by Mr. Box and Dr. Lambert; see note*, p. 8b below. Cf. Turner, l.c.] The *terminus ad quem* of the ‘two days’ must be the last hours of 14th Nisan. The *terminus a quo* may be any hour after 12th Nisan had been succeeded by the 13th.

(2) In arranging for the apprehension of Jesus, the rulers decided that it should not be attempted on the Feast Day (Mat 26:5, Mar 14:2). If they carried out their intention, it follows that the night of the apprehension and trial was before the slaying of the Passover; and that the Last Supper, whatever it was, did not coincide with the Paschal Feast. The hurried proceedings of the night suggest an attempt to secure a condemnation within a limited time. This is intelligible if the Feast had not begun; otherwise it is hard to see why men who were, in that case, willing to try a prisoner

on the first day should have scrupled about extending the proceedings to any necessary length.

(3) The third indication of time presents some difficulty. On a day called ‘the first day of *Azuma*’ preparations were made for the Feast, according to Mt. (Mat_26:17) and Mk. (Mar_14:12), at the suggestion of the Twelve; according to all three (Mat_26:18-19, Mar_14:13-16, Luk_22:7-13), with the consent and at the command of the Master. Strictly speaking, the *πρώτη τῶν ἄζύμων* would indicate the 15th Nisan, for the period during which leaven was prohibited commenced with the Paschal meal, following the slaying of the Paschal lamb in the closing hours of 14th Nisan. So late a date for the *πρώτη* is precluded by the circumstances of the narrative; but it is incredible that Mt. could make an erroneous statement in a matter connected with the greatest solemnity of the whole of the Jewish sacred year. The reasonable conclusion is, that, in a popular way of speaking, a day before the legal day had acquired the name of ‘First day of *Azuma*,’ and not unfitly, if on that day early arrangements were commenced for the complete exclusion of leaven from the houses.* [Note: Wieseler, quoting from the Talmudical tract Pesachim, that the search for leaven in houses must be made in the night preceding 14th Nisan, in order that it might be put away by midday, and nothing leavened eaten afterwards, argues that the day before the Passover was made ready was reckoned as belonging to the Feast of Unleavened Bread. See Chronological Synopsis of the Four Gospels, tr. Venables, pp. 334, 335, and art. Passover in Hastings’ DB (W. J. Moulton), vol. iii. p. 690. Peiritz (op. cit. pp. 28, 29, 33, 34) describes the arrangements made by Jews on the day before the legal Preparation day, and adds: ‘There is a very intelligible reason why that Thursday should, in a subordinate sense,—loosely, we may allow,—be called the first day of unleavened bread.’] Mk., bearing in mind, as often, the needs of non-Jewish readers, adds, *ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθουον*. The point of time need not be pressed too strictly; the gloss is no more than an explanation that the season of *Azuma* was the time of the offering of the Passover. The expression in Lk. is more difficult. In Luk_22:7 we read, *ἦλθεν δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἄζύμων, ἐντ* [Note: *ἐν* is omitted by some authorities; but the attestation is insufficient, nor would the omission affect the translation—‘when it behoved,’ or ‘in which’; see Winer’s Grammar, iii. § xxxi. 9, a.] *ἢ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα*. But there was more than one day of *Azuma*. In Luk_22:1 he had written *ἠγγιζεν δὲ ἡ ἑορτὴ τ. ἄζ.* It looks as if *ἡμέρα* below was equivalent to *ἑορτὴ* above—not 24 hours, but a period;‡ [Note: Many examples occur of the use of *ἡμέρα* for a period of long duration; but it is then regarded in contrast to conditions which may be described as ‘night,’—e.g. Rom_13:12; or as the time when certain conditions are realized,—e.g. 2Co_6:2, to which latter sense belongs the oft-recurring expression ‘day of the Lord,’ or ‘my day’ (Joh_8:56); but there seems no exact parallel to the

use we have supposed of ἡμέρα as equivalent to ἡμέραι. Yet, if we limit the term to the ‘first day,’ the remainder of the sentence is inexact, the lamb being slain before the legal ‘first day’ began. It seems impossible to treat the sentence as rigidly and historically accurate, in the terms in which the text has come to us.] or else there is some little inexactitude in a mere reference to an observance which it was unnecessary for the purpose of the narrative to describe precisely.

(4) The fourth note of time is given by the ὀψίας γενομένης of Mat 26:20 and Mar 14:17.§ [Note: Of the ‘two evenings,’ it is better to take this as the second, rather than the first, which would be our ‘late afternoon.’] These verses immediately follow the statement that the disciples ‘made ready the Passover.’ The natural interpretation is to take them as indicative of the evening of the day when the Upper Room was engaged. We have therefore another date, from which we may argue backwards to the limitations of the πρώτη τ. ἄζ. It ended with sunset on the night of the Betrayal. It began with the preceding sunset. At any time during those 24 hours. it is permissible to place the commencement by the disciples of preparations for a Passover which would be kept in circumstances they never anticipated. According to our present argument, the Master had passed into Paradise before the Passover was eaten. That would not prevent the disciples complying with the requirements of the Law, except in so far as some might have contracted ceremonial defilement during the events of Good Friday. But this would not apply to all; and here may be found the explanation of the preparations. The Master permitted the disciples to make ready for what was legally requisite; but He made this the occasion of suitable provision for the new Passover which He designed to provide, but of which they, as yet, knew nothing.

Parallel with the ὀψία of the first two Evangelists is an interesting expression in Luk 22:14 ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα. While in itself absolutely vague, in connexion with the preceding words, ‘they made ready the Passover,’ it would naturally indicate the commencement of 15th Nisan, when the lamb was eaten; but in view of considerations already stated, we must reject such interpretation, and read the term in connexion with what follows, and is peculiar to Lk., ‘with desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer.’ The ὥρα was the Master’s time for one of the great acts of His incarnate life, not a particular division of a particular day in the Jewish calendar. So it is used in Luk 22:53 below—αὕτη ὑμῶν ἐστὶν ἡ ὥρα, ‘your time,’ ‘opportunity.’* [Note: the same use of ὥρα by Christ at Cana (Joh 2:4), and a similar sense in 1Jn 2:18.]

(5) The appellation *paraskeuç* affords yet another mark of time. There were *paraskeuai* before various days. In connexion with our present inquiry we note the Preparation of the Sabbath (Mar_15:42, Luk_23:54), and the Preparation of the Passover (Joh_19:14). On this latter *paraskeuç* our Lord stood before Pilate, and was condemned (Jn. *l.c.*). Therefore the Passover had not yet been eaten; much less could the day before have been the Day of the Passover. But the day of the condemnation and crucifixion was also the *prosabbaton* (Luk_23:54; Luk_23:56, cf. Mar_15:42). In that year the two *paraskeuai* coincided, and the *first day of unleavened bread* was also the Sabbath; hence St. John calls that Sabbath ‘an high day’ (19:31). The *paraskeuç* was our Friday,† [Note: *Paraskeuç* is rendered in the Pesh. by ‘arubhta, which is from a root meaning to set (of the sun). It became the name of Friday in the use of the Syrians, ‘because on that day the sun set and darkness reigned’ (see Payne-Smith, *Thes. Syr.* col. 2984). Herein is preserved a tradition of the day of the Crucifixion, accepted with such confidence that from it the sixth day derived its name, as the first day has been known from earliest times as the Lord’s day, because it was the day of the Resurrection. Cf. Mr. Turner’s remarks, *l.c.* p. 411 f.] Nisan 14, and the day of the crucifixion.

3. (i.) St. John was one of the two disciples who were specially charged with the Paschal preparations. It is recognized that the evidence afforded by his narrative is absolutely plain and consistent. It has been said that he silently corrects the others.‡ [Note: So Mr. Turner in art. quoted above.] From our point of view, as we hold that they preclude the notion that the Last Supper was a Passover, St. John adds the emphatic testimony of an eye-witness to our conclusion. The Supper was *before the feast of the Passover* (Joh_13:1); it was supposed that it might be necessary to buy what there was *need of against the feast* (Joh_13:29); several hours later some of the rulers had not yet eaten the Passover (Joh_18:28);§ [Note: The Passover, which was slain ‘between the evenings’ of Nisan 14, was usually eaten in the early hours of the night following, for time must be allowed for taking the lamb to the house and roasting it. This would be the commencement of Nisan 15 (see Exo_12:8). But Exo_12:10, Num_9:12, and Deu_16:4 suggest the possibility of extending the time of eating, provided all was consumed before morning light. But it was already morning (Mat_27:1-2) when the Jews objected to enter the Judgment Hall (Joh_19:28) lest they should be debarred from eating the Passover. Therefore they could not have contemplated eating of a lamb slain the afternoon before. They must have anticipated a Passover in the hours to follow. Every scrap of evidence tends to confirm the view for which we contend.] the following day, when Jesus was crucified, was *the preparation of the Passover* (Joh_19:14). Language could hardly be more distinct; and some evidence, which seems to support a different view, can be explained. Taking St. John’s words in their natural sense, and reading them without prejudice, no one would gather from them that the Supper described by him was the

Passover. It seems reasonable to demand that the less distinct and somewhat inexact language of the other three should be interpreted in the light of the last account.

(ii.) It has been claimed by some that the account of the meal in the three Evangelists agrees with the ritual of a Passover; by others, that no trace of a Passover can be found in it. To us, we confess, it seems that the details of a Paschal celebration have been discovered after the importation of ideas which are not on the surface of the narrative. The initial statement that Jesus *sat down* with the Twelve (ἀνέκειτο, Mat 26:20; ἀνέπεσεν, Luk 22:14) is against the usual interpretation of the directions given in Exo 12:11 : it is supposed that a change of posture had been admitted in later times. The two cups of wine are regarded as two of the four or five which were handed round at the feast; but in view of the serious difference of opinion amongst critics as to the genuineness of the reading in Lk., which gives the notice of a second cup, it seems unfair to press this identification. The dish in which the sop was dipped is identified with the dish of *haroseth*, a kind of sauce,* [Note: Its nature is described in Buxtorf, Lex. Talmud. col. 831.] which was an adjunct of the Paschal meal; but this is an assumption, rather than a deduction from evidence. The *hymn* sung on leaving the upper chamber is identified with the *Hallel* (Psalms 115-118) sung at the conclusion of the Passover ritual; but ὕμνεῖν (Mat 26:30, Mar 14:26) does not necessarily denote the use of a particular composition, and in Eph 5:19, Col 3:16, ὕμνοι are distinguished from ψαλμοί.

(iii.) Those who fail to discover traces of a Passover meal in the accounts of the Last Supper, who point to the absence of allusion to a lamb, and generally to the weakness of the evidence adduced, may reasonably claim an argument *e silentio* for what that is worth. It may be added that the supposition of the disciples, that the preparations for the feast were not complete (Joh 13:29), seems strange indeed if they were already keeping the feast. Preparation for the Passover was so important in the eyes of the Jews, that the day preceding had derived its appellation of *paraskeuē* from their scrupulous care; see Mat 27:62.

4. We can now tabulate the order of the sacred days in accordance with the conclusions at which we have arrived. It will be convenient to use the modern names for the days. In the early morning of Sunday our Lord rose. This tradition is universally accepted, and further discussion would be superfluous. The Saturday was the 'first day of unleavened bread' (for the eating of unleavened bread began legally with the Paschal meal),† [Note: Exo 12:18; but in later practice, for greater strictness, leaven was excluded earlier See note *, p. 6b above.] and was Nisan 15. Friday, Nisan 14, was the official Preparation Day. Between it and the commencement of Nisan 15 the lamb was slain and eaten. Thursday evening was the beginning of the *paraskeuē*, and

some hours before that the exclusion of leaven commenced, from which custom, as we have suggested, the day had acquired the popular appellation of ‘first day of *Azuma*.’ This was the 13th of Nisan, and began with sunset on Wednesday evening. During the 24 hours which followed Wednesday afternoon, the disciples began to make ready for the Passover. On Thursday evening (Mat_26:20, Mar_14:17) Jesus sat down with them for the Last Supper; and this, according to St. John (13:1), was *before* the Passover.

5. But our Lord called that Thursday evening meal a ‘passover’—τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα, Luk_22:15. As we have shown that the meal preceded the legal Passover by some 24 hours, there are but two explanations of the words recorded by St. Luke—(i.) an anticipatory celebration was held, or (ii.) *πάσχα* is used in a mystical sense.

(i.) An anticipation of the Passover might have been either (a) from a desire to keep with the disciples a rite which, on the legal and customary day, would be precluded by the crucifixion; or (b) with the intention of reverting to a more exact date, and correcting an error in time which had crept into the Jewish calculations.* [Note: The Rev. Matthew Power, S.J., in his learned and elaborate essay, *Anglo-Jewish Calendar for every day in the Gospels*, says, ‘Our Lord, keeping to the lunar-legal computation, partook of His last supper on Thursday evening, Nisan 14.... The Jews, in obedience to the popular reckoning, had their Paschal Supper on Friday evening.... The Synoptists adopt, like our Lord, the strict lunar-legal mode of reckoning; the Fourth Gospel elects to follow the popular style.’ Even if the rule of Badhu was already in force, as Father Matthew supposes, there remains the difficulty, which writers shirk, of any one obtaining the sacrifice of the lamb before the hour appointed by the priests. Stapfer is one of the few who recognize the difficulty; but he overcomes it by rejecting the Johannine account and accepting the others. See *Palestine in the time of Christ*, p. 323f. Cf. JE ix. 553.] The impossibility of procuring the sacrifice of a lamb except on the day commonly observed, would have been fatal to any such plan. (1) Our Lord was not a householder, but a guest. It would be usual, perhaps, in such a case, to share in the lamb offered by the householder. This would require the assent of the householder to an abnormal, and apparently illegal, arrangement. Or if (2) we suppose that the thirteen were to constitute a family, and have their lamb to themselves, there would still be, as there would be in the former case also, the insuperable difficulty of getting the lamb killed by the priests before the legal day. (3) It has been supposed that there was a difference of opinion between Jewish schools as to the date of the Passover; but this argument, if it has, which is doubtful, any foundation, is of no value in the present inquiry. One party only was paramount at a time: there is no proof that there was a choice of dates for the celebration.† [Note: Mat_26:2 and parallels compared with Joh_13:1-2 do not suggest any difference of practice as to the date of observing the anniversary.] If, however, by an

‘anticipatory Passover’ is meant an imitative meal, with herbs and unleavened bread and wine, but without a lamb,‡ [Note: Caspari (Chron. Geogr. Einleit.), referring to Pesachim x., supposes the Supper to have been a Mazzoth meal, of which the essential element was unleavened cakes (mazzoth), with or without a lamb, eaten everywhere, and by all—for all were required to eat unleavened bread, though only the ceremonially clean were permitted to partake of the lamb—such meals being still observed in the present age.] this is not forbidden by the second explanation of our Lord’s words; yet we doubt whether such an imitation of the reality would have been contemplated. It seems so utterly alien to Jewish sentiment,§ [Note: ‘Jews ... would consider it a shocking piece of profanation to enact anything resembling the great Paschal meal the evening before its time.’ Peiritz (himself a Jew), op. cit. p. 30.] as to be inconceivable for the deliberate act of One who held the Law in honour. Moreover, the act could hardly have been kept secret, even if the ‘good-man of the house’ had respectfully submitted to what would have greatly shocked his religious sentiments. Some rumour must have reached the ears of those who were willing to bear witness against Jesus. On such evidence a most damaging charge could have been founded; yet not a word of such charge is found in the records of the trial.* [Note: The Rev. G. H. Box has contended with much ability in an article in JThSt, April 1902, that not the Passover, but the weekly Kiddush, which preceded the meal on the eve of the Sabbath, is the antecedent of the Eucharist. In this case our Lord must have celebrated it 24 hours earlier: but Mr. Box supposes that He often celebrated Kiddush; there was Kiddush of Passover and of Pentecost, and other occasions, besides the weekly Sanctification. In the January number of JThSt the Rev. Dr. Lambert, replying to Mr. Box’s argument, that the evidence of the first three Evangelists is self-contradictory, follows Chwolson by supposing an error in the text. We make no supposition, but offer an explanation of the traditional evidence.]

Dr. J. Armitage Robinson expresses himself in harmony with our view: ‘The Eucharist had, in its earliest form, an element in common with the ordinary Jewish meal, which was sanctified by thanksgivings uttered over the bread and over the cup.... Our conception of the original institution must not be dominated by the consideration of the elaborate ceremonial of the Passover celebration. Such a consideration belongs rather to the subsequent development of the Eucharist as a Christian rite’ (art. ‘Eucharist’ in Encyc. Bibl. coll. 1419, 1420).]

(ii.) Seeing then that a literal interpretation of *πάσχα* in our Lord’s words to the Twelve is precluded by the conditions of the occasion, we adopt the alternative, and understand ‘passover’ to be here used in a mystical sense.† [Note: Our Lord was pleased to veil the meaning of His words in many ways. Besides prophecies of His death, which were misunderstood (Mar_9:32), and parables, which were not explained to all (Mat_13:11), and figures, as sleep for death (Joh_11:11), He spoke in mystery of

His body as a temple (Joh 2:19), of birth by water and the Spirit (Joh 3:5), of eating His flesh and drinking His blood (Joh 6:53). So, we believe, He called the Supper ‘this Passover,’ not in the literal, but in a mystical sense.] In such sense undoubtedly He spoke when He called the bread His body, and the wine His blood. Whatever opinion may be held of the nature of the presence in the Eucharist, the bread and the wine were then before His sacrifice, as they are now after His resurrection, His body and His blood in a mystical and spiritual sense. His promise to drink wine with them in the Kingdom of God (Mat 26:29, Mar 14:25, Luk 22:18) was conveyed in the same terms of mystery; for in the kingdom of redemption there is no place for the Jewish Passover,—that has waxed old and vanished,—and still less can a literal fulfilment be conceived as having hereafter a place in the kingdom of glory. Yet in that kingdom there will be a feast, the mystical and spiritual supper of the Lamb, where the host will be the real Passover, of which the annual victims were the figures; He who is therefore called by St. Paul, ‘Christ our passover.’ ‡ [Note: This title of the Saviour, although of such frequent occurrence in ecclesiastical and theological language, occurs in the NT only at 1Co 5:7, the writer being St. Paul, who was intimately associated with the only Evangelist who records (Luk 22:15) that our Lord spoke of His Last Supper as τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα.]

6. It has been thought that the Last Supper, while not an imitation, was celebrated with some outward features which connected it with the annual Passover, although the chief characteristic, the lamb, was absent. § [Note: See note ‡ on preced. column.] It may have been so. Perhaps there was unleavened bread, and the dish of bitter herbs; but the narratives contain not a word to favour such a supposition. They seem to describe an ordinary Eastern meal, || [Note: | See the account, from personal experience, of an Eastern supper, given by Peiritz, op. cit. pp. 13-15 and note, and the similar account by Thomson in *The Land and the Book*, pp. 126-128.] with the one dish in the centre, into which all the guests put their hands. The usual custom of giving the complimentary sop was observed, and wine was passed round. We believe that the Last Supper was in form only an ordinary repast, but that it was attended by the exceptional circumstances of the washing of the feet by the host, the mystic acts with bread and wine, and the strange, prophetic, and spiritual utterances of a long discourse. As we attempt to portray the scene, the outlines are simple, homely, ordinary; but the whole is pervaded by an air of mystery. It was not the Passover of Moses, but it was the initiation of the Passover of Christ.* [Note: Compare the remarks of Isaac Williams in *The Holy Week*, pt. iv. § ii. It is interesting to note that two writers so widely separated by antecedents and education, and to some extent by sympathies, as were he and Peiritz, arrive from different points at the same conclusion. In one case it is the opinion of a mind steeped in Patristic lore, in the other of a very learned Rabbinical scholar.] But see Passover (II.).

7. When we pass from the sacred narratives to Patristic tradition, we encounter controversy about the date of Easter which lasted for several generations, but produced no decision as to the nature of the Last Supper. The early separation of the Church from the Synagogue, although inevitable, was a loss to the former. Gentile converts found themselves the inheritors of rites and Scriptures derived from Jewish believers whose language and ideas they understood but imperfectly; hence the opinion obtained some credence, that Christ celebrated an anticipatory Passover; for they overlooked the insuperable hindrances to such an act which the Jewish customs would present. But one tradition has an important bearing on our inquiry. The Primitive Church had no scruple about the use of leavened bread in the Eucharist. Such has been the immemorial custom of the unchanging East; while in the West (as few would now deny), the use of unleavened wafers was brought in during the Middle Ages. If our Lord instituted the Sacrament at a Paschal Supper, He used, of necessity, unleavened bread. The desire to imitate His acts would, surely, if He had consecrated in unleavened, have found expression in an opinion that ordinary bread was inadmissible. There is no ancient tradition, of universal acceptance, that the sacramental bread must be unleavened. The use of ordinary bread is an unconscious admission that the Last Supper was not a Passover.† [Note: See full account of the Eucharistic bread in art. 'Elements' in Dict. of Christ. Antiq. (Smith and Cheetham), i. p. 601 f.; cf. Bingham's Antiquities, bk. xv. ch. ii. § 5. Some heretics of early days, the Aquarians, Encratites, and Hydroparastatae, who were teetotallers, consecrated in water; see Bingham, ib. § 7.]

8. The discussion of this question is not merely academical. The practice of some Christians has been affected by the views entertained of the nature of the Last Supper. On the supposition that it was a Passover, it has been contended that the use of unleavened bread is obligatory in the Eucharist. The teetotaller extends the exclusion of leaven to the chalice, and demands the use of unfermented wine. Many love to think that they can find the words sung after the Supper in the Psalms of the Paschal *Hallel*. But the conclusions at which we have arrived lend no authority to the exclusion of leaven from the Lord's Table, and are inconsistent with many expressions in well-known Communion Hymns, and in books of Sacramental devotion.‡ [Note: The Anglican Liturgy in the Proper Preface for Easter recognizes Christ as 'the very Paschal Lamb,' but throughout the Service there is not an expression or allusion which implies a particular view of the nature of the Last Supper.] There may be practical reasons for the use of wafers in preference to cubes of ordinary bread. As to what is called 'unfermented wine,' a previous question arises, whether mere grape juice is true wine. But whatever may be deemed most suitable for the sacramental elements in present-day use, our contention is that the Holy Mysteries were first administered at an ordinary meal, and with ordinary bread and wine for their outward and visible form.

Literature.—See under Dates and Lord's Supper.

G. H. Gwilliam.

☩ Latchet

LATCHET (ἰμάς, Luk 3:16, Mar 1:7, Joh 1:27).—The leathern strap attached to the sandal, which, passing several times across the foot, was secured round the ankle, thus fixing the sandal securely. See artt. Sandal and Shoe. The most menial service which can be exacted from an Oriental is to remove or carry his master's shoes. Hence, too, the greatest honour a host can show to his guest is to stoop down and remove his shoes. John the Baptist counted himself unworthy to perform this service for Christ.

J. Soutar.

☩ Latin

LATIN.—See Title on Cross.

☩ Laughter

LAUGHTER

The two words found in NT for 'laughter' correspond almost exactly in significance with the two commonly occurring in OT. καταγελάω (Mat 9:24 || Mar 5:40 and Luk 8:53) = לַעֲד, which always means *scornful, derisive laughter* (e.g. Pro 17:5, Isa 37:22, Psa 2:4). On the other hand, γελάω (Luk 6:21) = רָפִיץ, which is the more general term, and while sometimes implying derision (as in Job 30:1, Pro 1:26), is more usually found in the sense of *merry laughter*, as opposed to the gloom of sadness (e.g. Pro 29:9, Ecc 3:4; Ecc 2:2; Ecc 10:19, Pro 14:13). But, while in OT these words and others denoting mirth and gleefulness are often found, their parallels are very rare in NT. Beyond the two passages already mentioned, there is only one (Jam 4:9) in which laughter is referred to,—and this is obviously a reminiscence of

Christ's sayings as reported in Luk 6:21; Luk 6:25,—and one other in which jesting (εὐτραπελία)* [Note: See Trench, Synonyms, s.v.; and cf. 'the pleasantries of fools' (χάρουτ ες μωεῶν), Sir 20:13.] is forbidden to the Christian by St. Paul (Eph 5:4). The word which does occur in NT, and which is characteristic of it, is χαρά (53 times), χαίρω (6 times); but this is almost always a restrained and chastened joy rather than one which breaks out into laughter—describing the condition of the mind rather than the expression of the emotions. A stronger word, implying more emotional demonstration, is ἀγαλλιαῶ; see esp. Luk 10:21, where it seems to be implied that Jesus manifested His joy by outward signs; the word in Luk 1:41; Luk 1:44, Luk 6:23 (σκιτῶ) is stronger still, and can hardly be used except where almost extravagant demonstrations of pleasure are intended.

It has been too readily inferred from the comparative absence in NT of allusions to mirth, that Jesus was characterized by a certain sobriety of demeanour which precludes us from thinking of Him as ever laughing or even smiling, and that Christianity from the first discouraged anything in the form of laughter-provoking mirth. Thus the statements—'We are never told that (Jesus) laughed, while we are once told that He wept' (Farrar, *Life of Christ*, p. 242); 'we never read that Jesus laughed, and but once that He rejoiced in spirit' (Jer. Taylor), and similar statements are based on nothing more than a dim and untrustworthy tradition,† [Note: The alleged Ep. of P. Lentulus, Procons. of Judaea, to the Roman Senate.] and convey an impression which is far from being warranted by the general tenor of the Gospel narrative. The common use of the title 'Man of Sorrows,' dictated no doubt by the deepest motives, and the conventional portraits of Christ, showing Him always pensive and often sorrowful, have been responsible for fostering the thought of a Christ who was constantly grave, if not sad. A writer like Renan goes to the opposite extreme; but there is at least as much support for his representation of a teacher whose 'sweet gaiety constantly found expression in lively reflexions and kindly pleasantries.'‡ [Note: *Vie de Jésus*, 1879, p. 196.] What evidence there is, indeed, is on the whole against the traditional view. Jesus definitely dissociated Himself from the austerer school of His time (Luk 5:33 ff., Mat 9:14, Mar 2:18); He made it a habit to enter convivial assemblies, and was a guest at feasts where laughter, jest, and song were a part of the order of the day;§ [Note: Edersheim, describing marriage-feasts, says, 'Not a few instances of riotous merriment and even dubious jokes on the part of the greatest Rabbis are mentioned' (*Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i. p. 355).] He watched, if He did not join in, the merry games of children (Luk 7:32), and loved their company. He chose, as an analogy for the joy of God over a redeemed soul, the exuberant merry-making (Luk 15:23; Luk 15:25) of a father to

whom his son was restored,* [Note: εὐφραίνεσθαι in Lk. is specially used of convivial mirth (see [Luk 12:19](#); [Luk 15:23](#)).] and in bidding His disciples rejoice in their very tribulations, uses a word which suggests vehement demonstrations of joy ([Luk 6:23](#)). There is nothing in the Gospels to encourage the supposition that He frowned upon innocent mirth or checked its exhibition in His followers. On the contrary, on one occasion at least, He declined to interfere with a spontaneous outburst of exhilaration on their part ([Luk 19:37](#)). He bade them, even when they fasted, not be of a sad countenance ([Mat 6:16](#)), and His chief concern was not so much to regulate the manner of their joy as to purify its motive ([Luk 10:30](#)).

Against the *a priori* view that Jesus never laughed, a view which is based upon a misdirected reverence and a one-sided conception of His nature, has to be set the consideration that such a view tends to dehumanize the 'Son of Man.' The faculty for laughter, as recent psychologists have shown, is eminently human, and its absence is a defect.† [Note: See James Sully. *Essay on Laughter*.] There may be saintly men to whom anything like boisterous hilarity is impossible, but he whose face is never lit with a smile, and whose voice never has the infectious ring of joy, is lacking in fullorbed humanity (cf. Carlyle, *Sartor, ad init.*). If Jesus showed the natural emotions of sorrow, there is every reason to suppose that He showed those of joy.

There is as little support for the view that the NT encourages a religion in which laughter finds no legitimate place. The first disciples of Jesus, like those of St. Francis, who became known as *joculatores Domini*, appear to have shown a vivacity and cheerfulness in complete contrast to the rigid and frigid demeanour engendered by Pharisaism; and this attitude was encouraged by their Master, who did not expect 'the sons of the bride-chamber' to mourn so long as the 'bridegroom' was with them ([Mat 9:15](#); cf. [Mat 15:1-2](#)).

But there is more to be said. Nearly all the world's greatest teachers have employed laughter, in one or other of its subtler forms, as a means of gaining a hearing for the truth they had to deliver. Was Jesus an exception to this rule? Is there any real reason for refusing to apply to His case the saying, *Ridentem dicere verum quid vetat?* Can it be said that He never used the Socratic method of proving the reasonableness of His teaching by showing the incongruous and even ridiculous position in which those who rejected it involved themselves? It has been very generally assumed that such a method was beneath the dignity, or foreign to the nature of the Son of God. Thus it is said, 'He brought peace wherever He came, but He never awakened mirth ... The inquiry whether Jesus had the sense of humour is not simply trivial and irreverent; it betrays a fundamental misconception of that holy life of redeeming love.'‡ [Note: See art. 'Our Lord's Use of Common Proverbs,' *Expositor*, Dec. 1902.] The question, however, cannot be so easily disposed of. In the Gospels there are sayings of Jesus

which a rational exegesis finds it almost impossible to explain apart from the assumption that they show a vein of humour. Indeed, the writer just quoted admits that Jesus 'deigned to make use of the quaint and often humorous maxims so dear to the common folk.' It is allowed by writers of the most orthodox school that irony and satire were used by Jesus upon occasion; if He saw fit to employ these sterner weapons, the gentler one of humour would not be beneath Him. When Jesus says to the Jews, 'Many good works have I showed you from my Father; for which of these works do ye stone me?' the touch of irony is unmistakable (Joh_10:32),* [Note: Westcott, in loc.] as it is also in the expression 'everlasting tents' (Luk_16:9). When He says to His disciples, 'Sleep on now' (Mar_14:41), it is in a tone of gentle raillery;† [Note: F. W. Robertson, Serm. (2nd ser.) xx. 'The Irreparable Past.'] and His conversation with the Syrophœnician woman is in the same tone (Mar_7:25 ff.). His answer to the lawyer, 'This do and thou shalt live,' seems to be most naturally interpreted as ironical (Luk_10:28). The reply to His critics, 'I came not to call the righteous, but sinners' (Mar_2:17), is in the same vein, as is the passage, 'Full well (καλῶς) do ye reject the commandment of God' (Mar_7:9). In Mat_6:2, literalists have sought in vain to prove that it was a practice among Pharisaic almsgivers to 'sound a trumpet'; obviously the passage is satirical. The element of satire runs through the scathing denunciations of the Pharisees and scribes (23, etc.). But the crucial instance is the parable of the Unjust Steward (Luk_16:1-9). Commentators have exhausted their ingenuity in devising all possible and impossible explanations of Christ's commendation of the steward, through failing to see that the whole passage is sarcastic, pouring laughter upon the futile trust that men put in the power of mammon; Luk_16:9 in particular is 'a sudden turn of the sublimest and most crushing irony.'‡ [Note: See Expositor, Dec. 1895; Good Words, Oct. 1867.]

But if it was in keeping with the mission of Jesus that He should use irony, still more natural was it that humour (wh. see) should enter into His speech. Humour is in its nature both human and humane. The greatest humorists have been the best lovers of men and the most endowed with sympathy (e.g. 'gentle' Shakspeare and Charles Lamb). The foremost religious teachers have almost invariably been possessed of humour, and have proved the truth of Milton's dictum (Preface to *Animadversions upon the Remonstrant*) that 'the vein of laughing hath oftentimes a strong and sinewy force in teaching and confuting.' It is probable that the reluctance, which has existed from early times, to admit any tone of raillery or playfulness in Christ's teaching, has been responsible for the loss of the original force of some of His sayings. Jesus has suffered from His reporters. Yet enough passages remain to show that this element was often present. The pictures of a man endeavouring to serve two masters at once (Mat_6:24), of another who feeds swine with pearls (Mat_7:6), of a camel trying to get through a needle's eye (Mat_19:24), of a light being put under a bushel (Mat_5:15), of him who sees a splinter in his brother's eye, but fails to notice the

beam in his own (Mat 7:8), of Beelzebub at variance with Beelzebub (Mat 12:24 ff.), of men who have eyes but do not see (Mar 8:18), of one blind man guiding another (Mat 15:14), of a father who should give his son a stone instead of a loaf (Mat 7:9)—these are all instances of that perception of the incongruous which is the soul of humour.§ [Note: the Logion of Grenfell and Hunt: ‘Thou hearest with one ear (but the other thou hast closed).’] We know that Jesus sometimes used words with a play upon their meaning (Luk 5:10, Mat 4:19, Luk 9:60). The ready way in which He answers a question by propounding another which at first seems irrelevant (Mat 20:22; Mat 21:24), His unexpected manner of turning the tables upon a critic (Luk 7:36 ff.), His use of illustrations which would cause, by their homely aptness, an involuntary smile (Mar 2:21, Luk 11:6), His epigrammatic way of putting a truth so as to give a sudden satisfaction (Mar 2:27), and His use of daring hyperbole (Luk 19:40),|| [Note: | Cf. the obscure saying, reported by Papias and quoted by Irenaeus (adv. Hæer. v. 33. 3), of the vine with ten thousand stems. In its exuberant playfulness of fancy it exceeds anything in the Gospels; it is probably based on an actual saying of Christ (see Westcott, *Introd.* p. 433).] are indications that Jesus thought it not beneath Him to laugh with those that laugh.

On this whole subject nothing can be more just than the words of A. B. Bruce (*Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, p. 149):

‘With pathos often goes humour, and so it is in the parables.... The spirit of Jesus was too earnest to indulge in idle mirth; but just because He was so earnest and so sympathetic, He expressed Himself at times in a manner which provokes a smile; laughter and tears, as it were, mingling in His eyes as He spake. It were a false propriety which took for granted that an expositor was necessarily off the track, because in his interpretation of these parables an element of holy playfulness appears blended with the deep seriousness which pervades them throughout.’

Literature.—Martensen, *Chr. Ethics*, i. 186 ff.; D. Smith in *Exp. Times*, xii. [1901] 546; *Expositor*, ii. viii. [1884] 92 ff.; Welldon, *Fire Upon the Altar*, 105; G. H. Morrison, *Sun-rise*, p. 43.

J. Ross Murray.

⚡ Law

LAW.—The question of Christ’s relation to the Jewish law is one of fundamental importance for the origin of Christianity, but at the same time one of peculiar difficulty. The difficulty arises, to some extent, from the fact that His own teaching

marks a period of transition, when the old was already antiquated, while the new was still unborn. A further difficulty is created by the relation in which the actual conduct of Jesus stood to the principles which He laid down. Moreover, the question arises whether His attitude remained the same through the whole course of His ministry, or whether He came to realize that His fundamental principles carried Him further than He had at first anticipated. Lastly, when we remember how bitter was the strife which this very question aroused in the primitive Church, the misgiving is certainly not unreasonable, that this may have been reflected back into the life of the Founder, and sayings placed in His mouth endorsing one of the later partisan views. Our present subject is that of the **Ceremonial Law**.

It must be clearly recognized that the distinction between *moral* and *ceremonial* law is not one sanctioned in the Law itself. All its parts alike were the command of God. The distinction has maintained its vitality in virtue of a praiseworthy ethical interest. The antinomianism of St. Paul seemed to endanger morality, and those who could not rise to his point of view, that it was precisely in this way that morality was secured, turned Christianity into a new legalism, and explained his doctrine that the Law was abolished to mean that Christians were no longer compelled to practise Jewish ceremonies. This was, of course, to reduce much that he said to the unmeaning. It is precisely the moral law that St. Paul had chiefly in mind. The Decalogue is described as 'the ministration of death written and engraven on stones' (2Co_3:7 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885); and, to illustrate the sin-producing effects of the Law, St. Paul quotes one of the Ten Commandments (Rom_7:7). His doctrine was unquestionably that the Law as a whole was done away for all who were in Christ, inasmuch as they had crucified the flesh, which was the home of sin, and thus had lost everything to which the Law could appeal as provocation to sin, while they had escaped into the freedom of the Spirit, and could therefore no longer be under the constraint of the Law. But even St. Paul was forced to recognize that his magnificent idealism was not milk for babes, hence moral exhortation found a large place in his Epistles, side by side with the loftiest assertions of a Christian's freedom from sin, flesh, and the Law. But St. Paul is quite explicit that this freedom is to be strenuously maintained in the sphere of Jewish ceremonies, especially circumcision, and sacred days and seasons. On the other hand, a party in the Early Church insisted passionately on the permanent validity of the Law, and especially of circumcision, as essential to salvation. It lies beyond our limits to trace the history of this controversy, but a reference to it is necessary for the reason already indicated.

Jesus was Himself born into a Jewish home, and the rites prescribed by the Jewish law were scrupulously fulfilled in His case. His parents did not belong to the ranks of the Pharisees, hence His early training was healthier than that of St. Paul; but He, like His great Apostle, was born under the Law (Gal_4:4), and initiated by circumcision into the Covenant on the eighth day (Luk_2:21). His mother presented

Him as her firstborn male child to the Lord in the Temple, and offered the sacrifice of purification prescribed in the Law (Luk 2:22-24), and thus 'accomplished all things that were according to the law of the Lord' (Luk 2:39). Joseph and Mary went up each year to the feast of the Passover at Jerusalem (Luk 2:41). So far as we can see, Jesus Himself was a strict observer of the Law. Whatever His attitude towards it during His ministry, we may assume without question that, till He was conscious of His Messianic vocation, His obedience to the Law was scrupulously and heartily rendered. It lay in the nature of the case, however, that the old bottles of Judaism should be unfit to receive the new wine of the Kingdom with which He knew Himself to be intrusted. The question whether this was clear to Him from the first, or whether it became clear only in the course of His controversy with the scribes, cannot be answered with certainty, in view of the doubt which hangs over the chronology of the ministry. And His conduct here was regulated by much the same need for reserve as He practised in reference to His self-revelation as Messiah. A premature declaration would have created an extremely difficult situation. All He could do was to utter His principles and leave the practical inferences to be drawn, when the time was ripe, by those who shared His spirit.

On one great branch of this question, however, Jesus expressed Himself clearly and without compromise. The morbid anxiety of the scribes to make a hedge about the Law so that all possible approaches to its violation might be blocked, added to the hair-splitting casuistry in which moralists of their type delighted, and the lawyer's instinct for precise and exhaustive definition, had led to the elaboration of the precepts in the Law into a vast system of tradition. Moreover, the heavier the burden grew, the greater grew the temptation to find a literal fulfilment which should be an escape from the spirit. All this apparatus of piety demanded leisure to master and perform, such leisure as no man with his daily bread to earn could command; hence arose a morality unfitted for the normal human life. Against all this tradition Jesus entered an emphatic protest. His attitude towards it was wholly different from that which He assumed towards the written Law. The scribes made void by their tradition the word of God, and every plant which His heavenly Father had not planted He said should be rooted up. Nevertheless, in vindicating the Law against the tradition, He enunciated principles which pointed forward to the abolition of both. The points on which He came into conflict with Jewish ceremonialism were Fasting, the law of Uncleanness, the Temple service, and the cancelling of primary human duties by feigned respect for duties to God.

1. If the order of incidents in the Gospel of St. Mark could be accepted as chronological, the first collision of Jesus with the representatives of the tradition was occasioned by His eating with publicans and sinners at the house of Levi (Mar 2:15 ff.). Although stress cannot be laid on the order in which the incidents are narrated, this furnishes us with an excellent illustration of the way in which the fundamental

ideas of Jesus brought Him into conflict with the religious prejudices of His time. His doctrine of the Fatherhood of God and of the incomparable value of the human soul were fundamental convictions. To this was added the consciousness of His own mission to restore the lost children to their Father. Hence He met the criticism of His conduct in associating with the degraded by the explanation that He was a physician, and where was the physician's place but in the midst of the sick? There is indeed a terrible irony in the words, for there were none whose moral and religious health was, to the eyes of Jesus, in a more desperate condition than that of His critics. But scandalized as they might be by conduct so unprofessional on the part of a teacher, there was an obvious conclusiveness in the reply of Jesus which could have been evaded only by the assertion that the salvation of such people was not desirable. The two types of holiness emerge in clear contradiction—the type which seeks to avoid all contact with the contaminating in order that personal purity may not be compromised, and the type that is entirely forgetful of self in its zeal for the regeneration of others. It is in connexion with a similar accusation that St. Luke relates the parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Drachma, and the Lost Son (Luke 15). Similarly Christ's lodging with Zacheaeus the publican gave rise to criticism; and here again Jesus explained His action by His mission: 'The Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost' (Luk 19:10).

2. The second point in which the new type displayed a contrast with the old was in the matter of **Fasting**. Wonder was excited that, while the Pharisees and the disciples of the Baptist fasted, the disciples of Jesus neglected this religious exercise. The Pharisees fasted twice in the week, on Monday and Thursday. What fasts were observed by the disciples of John we do not know. But the distinction was not one simply between disciples, it went back to the leaders. The Baptist was an ascetic, clothed in camel's hair and a leathern girdle, with locusts and wild honey for his food; his congenial home was the desert, his message one of judgment to come, the axe already lying at the root of the tree. He came neither eating nor drinking, and this unsociable disposition called forth the charge that he had a devil. Jesus, on the other hand, was no ascetic; so little of an ascetic, in fact, that His enemies taxed Him with over-indulgence: 'The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a gluttonous man and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners' (Mat 11:19). Jesus defends His disciples against the criticism implied in the question, 'Why do John's disciples and the disciples of the Pharisees fast, but thy disciples fast not?' (Mar 2:18) by the answer, 'Can the sons of the bride-chamber fast while the bridegroom is with them? as long as they have the bridegroom with them they cannot fast.' The principle underlying this is that the external practice must be a spontaneous expression of the inward feeling. Fasting is out of place in their present circumstances, they have the bridegroom with them, therefore all is joy and festivity. It would be a piece of unreality to introduce into their present religious life an element so incongruous. But He proceeds: 'The days will come, when the bridegroom

shall be taken away from them, and then will they fast in that day.' The reference is to His own death; and possibly the foreboding expressed should lead us to assign this incident to His later ministry, after the declaration of Messiahship had been made and the prediction of death had been uttered. On the other hand, the veiled allusion makes it possible that those who heard it would not catch His meaning, and we can, in that case, assign it to a late date only if we are clear that Jesus Himself became conscious at a comparatively late period in His ministry of the death that awaited Him. The incident itself rather makes the impression that it belongs to the earlier period of Christ's activity. This was one of the respects in which failure to conform to conventional piety would early attract attention.

Wellhausen regards the incident as unauthentic. He points to the curious fact that the question is one between the disciples of the Baptist and of Jesus, and draws the inference that it is a justification for the deviation of the later practice of Christ's followers from that of Jesus Himself, who in practice conformed strictly to the Judaism of His time. He confirms this by pointing out that as a matter of fact the bridegroom is not taken away from wedding festivities, and here therefore the choice of expression has been determined by the actual fact of Christ's removal by death. However plausible this suggestion may be, the sayings bear rather the stamp of Jesus than of the early Apostolic Church. The criticism of the disciples rather than of Jesus has its parallel in the incident of the plucking of the ears of corn on the Sabbath and the disciples eating with unwashed hands, and the temper of the Master was much freer than that of the timidly legalistic disciples.

In the Sermon on the Mount fasting is recognized as a fitting religious exercise; but, as in the case of prayer and almsgiving, it is essential, for its true religious quality to be preserved, that it should be practised without ostentation. The religious self-advertisement which characterized the Pharisees eviscerated these exercises of all their value. They were to be a secret between a man and his God. In the most rigorous fasts washing and anointing were forbidden (*Taanith*, i. 6), while they were allowed in the less severe (*ib.* i. 4 f.). Jesus bids His followers anoint the head and wash the face when they fast, that no one may be able to detect that they are fasting (Mat 6:16-18). See Fasting.

Immediately following the defence of the disciples for not fasting, we have in all the Synoptics (Mat 9:16 f., Mar 2:21 f., Luk 5:36 f.) the sayings about the undressed cloth and the new wine in the old wineskins. The parables are difficult; the lesson taught is clearly the incompatibility of the new with the old, and the disaster that will inevitably follow any attempt to combine them. But it is by no means clear with what 'old' and 'new' should be identified, nor again can we assume that both parables express the same truth. It is possible, though improbable, that Jesus may intend by 'the old' the ancient piety of the Old Testament, and by 'the new' the new-fangled

regulations of the scribes, His sense being that the old Divinely-given mode of life is being ruined by the tradition of men. But it is more likely that the usual view is right, according to which 'the old' is Judaism and 'the new' is the gospel. Even so, however, various interpretations are possible. Usually it has been thought that in both sayings Jesus is defending the attitude of His disciples: you cannot expect the new spirit of the gospel to be cast in the old moulds or Judaism; the new spirit must create new forms for itself. Weiss, however, considers that both parables constitute a defence of the attitude of John's disciples, they cannot be expected to combine the spirit of the Gospel with their legalist and ascetic habit of life (*Bibl. Theol. of NT*, i. 112). It is possible, however, that Beysehlag is correct in thinking that the parable of the undressed cloth on the old garment is a justification of John's disciples in fasting, while the parable of the new wine in the old bottles is a justification of the disciples of Jesus for refusing to follow their example (*NT Theol.* i. 114). The two sayings are connected by 'and,' it is true, but this conjunction has in the Synoptics a wider range of meaning than in English. Wellhausen finds the sayings difficult. He is not disposed to question their authenticity, though, as already mentioned, he strikes out the sayings immediately preceding.

3. Another point in which Jesus came into conflict with the tradition was that of Ablutions (Mar_7:1 ff. ||). To secure that nothing ceremonially unclean should be eaten, the Jews were very scrupulous in washing the hands before meals. The laws of cleanness and uncleanness touch life so much more closely than any others, that the casuistry of the scribes naturally finds in this matter a large field of exercise. The largest of the six books of the Mishna is given up to this topic. The purification of vessels alone occupies thirty chapters of this book. The Pentateuch itself exhibits more than the usual tendency to casuistry in this matter, but the tradition left the Law out of sight in the elaborateness of its regulations. In the time of Jesus tradition had become very strict with reference to the washing of the hands. The practice originated with the Pharisees, but was adopted by almost all the Jews. Even when the hands were ceremonially clean it was necessary to wash them, no doubt to guard against the possibility of unconscious defilement. If they were known to be unclean, they had to be washed twice before a meal; they were also washed after food; and some Pharisees washed even between the courses. The hands were held with the fingers up, so that the uncleanness might be washed down from them; and for the ceremony to be effectual it was necessary that the water should run down to the wrist (though we should probably not translate *πυγμῆ*, Mar_7:3, 'to the wrist'; see Swete, *ad loc.*). In Joh_2:6 we read of the six stone water-pots for the water of purification at the marriage in Cana; and the same Gospel tells us how the Jews purified themselves for the Passover (Joh_11:55), or took precautions against defilement which would disqualify them from eating it (Joh_18:28).

It was therefore natural that the neglect of some of the disciples should evoke criticism; and this criticism was uttered by officials from Jerusalem who had come down to watch the new movement (Mar_7:1). No mention is made here of any violation of the tradition on the part of Jesus Himself; though in Luk_11:38 we are told that the Pharisee, at whose house Jesus was eating, was surprised that He neglected this ceremony. Jesus defended His disciples by a complete repudiation of the tradition. He pointed out that its effect was to nullify the Law rather than to establish it; and He illustrated this from the practice of dedicating to God that which ought to have been used by a man for the support of his parents. To this point it will be necessary to return. But in connexion with the question of hand-washing Jesus enunciated a principle of far-reaching importance which not only set aside the tradition, but even abrogated a large section of the Law. He asserted that not that which is without a man can, by going into him, defile him, but the things which proceed out of the man. The heart is the essential thing, food cannot come into contact with that; but it is in it that evil thoughts, words, or actions have their rise, and it is these that make a man unclean. Not what a man eats, but what he is, determines the question of his purity. Thus Jesus lifted the whole conception of cleanness and uncleanness out of the ceremonial into the ethical domain. But it is plain that this carried with it revolutionary conclusions, not only as to the tradition, but as to the Law; for much of the Law was occupied precisely with the uncleanness created by external things, and it is not improbable that St. Mark has definitely drawn this inference in his Gospel.

It is possible that the usual view taken of the passage, according to which the words 'making all meats clean' (Mar_7:19) are the concluding words of Jesus, should be accepted. This involves, however, a grammatical irregularity, and we ought perhaps to adopt the view taken by Origen, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Chrysostom, ably defended by Field (*Notes on the Translation of the NT*, pp. 31, 32) and adopted by Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, Weizsäcker, Swete, Gould, Salmond, that they are the comment of the Evangelist, and that we should translate '*this he said*, making all meats clean.' On the other hand, the notes of Menzies and Wellhausen on the passage may be consulted.

The evasion of the Law by the Tradition here asserted by Jesus has been affirmed by some Jewish scholars not to have existed. (The reader may consult an appendix on 'Legal Evasions of the Law,' by Dr. Schechter in Montefiore's *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 557-563; an article by Montefiore on 'Jewish Scholarship and Christian Silence' in the *Hibbert Journal* for Jan. 1903; the rejoinder to this by Menzies in July 1903, with a further rejoinder by Montefiore in Oct. 1903.) It is urged that the reference in the Jewish treatise *Nedarim* does not confirm the statement in St. Mark about Corban. Dr. Menzies accepts this; but when that is said, the matter is by no means ended. To the present writer it seems that the evidence of St. Mark is quite good evidence for the

contemporary Judaism. If the assertion about Corban is untrue, of course it cannot be ascribed to Jesus, who could not have quoted, as a conclusive proof that the Jews cancelled the Law by their tradition, an example which His hearers would know to have no existence. Accordingly, if the statement is mistaken, it would have to be put down to the account of the Evangelist, though how he should have hit upon it unless such a custom was actually in vogue would be difficult to understand. In forming our judgment on a question of this kind certain leading principles must be kept in mind. The contemporary Judaism is most imperfectly known to us, and the documents which we have to use as our sources of information are, in many instances, centuries later than the rise of Christianity. Further, the stereotyping of Judaism must not be blindly accepted as if it guaranteed that doctrines or practices for which we have only late literary attestation were already developed in the time of Christ. We must remember that Judaism did not live in an intellectual vacuum, but in an atmosphere saturated with Christian germs. Especially, we cannot forget that controversy went on between Jews and Christians; and under its pressure it is by no means unreasonable to believe that Judaism may have undergone a considerable modification, above all, in the elimination of matter which proved susceptible to criticism. In the light of these principles the present writer has no hesitation in regarding the statement in St. Mark as good evidence for the existence of the practice of Corban in the time of Christ.

4. The next question touches Christ's relation to the **Temple**. His personal attitude towards it was that of a loyal Jew. Not only did He as a boy of twelve years recognize it as His Father's house (Luk 2:49), but, after He had entered on His ministry, He cleansed it by driving out the money-changers, and overturning the stalls of the traders (Mat 21:12 ff. ||). According to the Fourth Gospel, His visits to Jerusalem were largely connected with the feasts. In His Sermon on the Mount He assumes that His disciples will offer sacrifice, and only requires that, before he offers, a man shall be reconciled to his brother (Mat 5:23 f.). In His great indictment of the scribes and Pharisees He rebukes them for their ruling that an oath by the temple or by the altar counts for nothing, while an oath by the gold of the temple, or a gift at the altar, is binding. The temple is greater than its gold, and makes it holy; and similarly it is by the altar that the gift is sanctified. To swear by the altar is to swear not only by it, but by the offering placed upon it; while to swear by the temple is to swear not only by it and all that it contains, but by Him who dwells therein (Mat 23:16 ff. ||). But all this loyal recognition of the place filled by the temple and the honour due to it was combined with an inward detachment from it, which was a presage of the ultimate deliverance of Christianity from its connexion with it. This comes out very clearly in the story of the stater in the fish's mouth (Mat 17:24 ff.). The very doubt which was implied in the question whether Jesus paid the half-shekel which was levied as a temple-tax is most significant as to the drift towards freedom, which was already detected in His teaching. That He had not repudiated the toll, Peter is aware; but the reason for His obedience comes out plainly in the conversation He has with Peter on

the subject. Taxes are taken by monarchs not from their sons, but from strangers. Therefore, since Jesus knows that He and His disciples are not aliens to God, but His children, the inference is that no payment of the tax can be legitimately expected from the children of the Kingdom. Jesus, however, bids Peter pay the tax for both, to avoid giving offence. In other words, Jesus regarded Himself and members of His Kingdom as released from every obligation to pay the half-shekel for the service of the temple, even if, in tender concession to the feelings of others, they did not avail themselves of their liberty. The temple-duty in question was not definitely commanded in the Law, though it was a not unnatural deduction from Exo 30:13, which was itself a development of the rule of Nehemiah that there should be an annual payment of a third of a shekel for the temple service (Neh 10:32-33). The temple itself, Christ predicted, would be destroyed. However we may explain the saying, 'Destroy this temple, and I will build it up in three days' (Joh 2:19), He certainly foretold in His eschatological discourse (Mat 24:2) the overthrow of the literal temple, and therewith naturally the cessation of the Jewish cultus.

It is not improbable that the saying, 'Destroy this temple,' should be similarly interpreted. The authenticity of the utterance is guaranteed by the use made of it in the trial of Jesus (Mar 14:58), and the similar accusation at the trial of Stephen (Act 6:14), as well as the taunt addressed to Jesus on the cross (Mar 15:29). It is true that the author of the Fourth Gospel interprets the saying as a reference to the body of Christ, fulfilled in the death and the resurrection. But this interpretation did not at the time occur either to the Jews or to the disciples. The retort of the former showed that they understood the reference to be to the literal temple, while the Evangelist expressly says that the interpretation he adopts occurred to the disciples only after the resurrection. It is, in fact, very difficult to believe that the saying referred to the death and resurrection of Jesus. In its connexion with the desecration and cleansing of the actual temple the allusion could naturally be nothing less than to its destruction, unless Jesus made His meaning clear by pointing to His body. But in that case the misunderstanding on the part of the Jews and the disciples would have been impossible, even if we leave aside the objection that so unveiled an allusion to His death and resurrection at this early period is most unlikely. Moreover, the contrast with the temple made with hands (Mar 14:58) does not at all suit the human body. A difficulty, however, is raised by the Johannine version of the saying. We may, perhaps, assume that the latter is to be preferred to the version of the witnesses at the trial, in that it refers the work of destruction not to Jesus Himself, but to the Jews. Their present course of desecration, if they persist in it, will lead to the destruction of the temple. But it is not easy to believe that Jesus can have said that He would rebuild the temple that had been destroyed. Here the version of the witnesses is intrinsically the more credible, that He would build another temple in its place. And the contrast between the temple made with hands and the temple made without hands bears also the stamp of authenticity; the new is not simply to be a

reproduction of the old, it is to be not a material, but a spiritual, structure. We may therefore conclude with some confidence that Jesus definitely anticipated the destruction of the centre of Jewish worship and the substitution of a spiritual temple in its place.

In the conversation with the woman of Samaria (John 4), Jesus is represented as dealing specifically with the question of the legitimate sanctuary as against the Samaritan temple (Joh 4:20-24). He gives His verdict in favour of the temple at Jerusalem, but He asserts that the hour has already come for both sanctuaries to lose whatever exclusive legitimacy they may possess. The true worship of God transcends all local limitations; for God is spirit, and as such cannot be localized; and the worship He desires is a worship in spirit and in truth. There is no reason whatever for supposing that here the Evangelist is putting his own doctrine into the mouth of Jesus. The pregnant aphoristic form and penetrating insight of the saying stamp it as authentic. Moreover, it is quite in the line of the other teachings of Jesus with reference to the temple. He recognizes that the temple is His Father's house, and yet looks forward to its destruction; and similarly here He asserts the legitimacy of the Jewish as against the Samaritan temple, and yet looks forward to the speedy termination of worship in it.

5. It is certainly a very striking fact, in view of the immense importance attached in Judaism to the rite, that Jesus nowhere raises the question of the permanence of **Circumcision**. Had He pronounced upon it, the bitter controversy excited by the question in the primitive Church could hardly have arisen. But, naturally, occasion for discussing it did not so readily arise, and it was part of the method of Jesus to leave questions of practice to be settled by His disciples under the guidance of the Spirit and in the light of principles with which He had imbued them. There can be no reasonable doubt that St. Paul drew the true Christian inference. The great principle, that the external was unimportant in comparison with the inward, expressed in the abolition by Jesus of the Levitical laws as to unclean food, and in His doctrine that for worship in the material temple there was to be substituted worship in spirit and in truth, carried with it the conclusion that as a purely external rite circumcision could have no place in the religion of the spirit. Moreover, it was the sign of the Old Covenant; but Jesus knew that His blood consecrated a New Covenant. This implied the abolition of the Old Covenant, and naturally the abolition of circumcision, which was its sign. Indeed, the Old Testament itself was on the way to this, not simply in Jeremiah's prediction (Jer 31:31 ff.) of the New Covenant, but in the prophetic demand for a circumcision of the heart (Jer 4:4; Jer 9:26; cf. Eze 44:7, Lev 26:41). Here, as elsewhere, the attitude of Jesus linked itself closely to that previously taken by the prophets. Nor must we forget that Jesus contemplated that His religion would become universal. This in itself suggested the abolition of a rite which possessed no spiritual value, and was at the same time an almost insuperable barrier to the wide

acceptance among the cultured of a religion that required it for full membership. See, further, art. Circumcision.

6. We have left till the last the much-debated passage Mat 5:17-20, since it is helpful in our interpretation of it to have before us the application of the principle in detail. The opening words of the passage, 'Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets,' show clearly that Jesus was conscious that His teaching might not unjustifiably seem to carry this implication with it. There was an element which suggested a revolutionary attitude, but it was a mistaken inference that He meant to destroy the Law or the Prophets; it was His intention to fulfil them. It is important to observe here and elsewhere the way in which Jesus combines the Prophets with the Law. Unlike the current theology of His time, His teaching brought the Prophets into equal prominence with the Law; and it is of the OT system as a whole that He is thinking, and not simply of the legal enactments which constituted for the Rabbis almost the whole of religion. Yet it would be a mistake to infer that the Levitical requirements are here left out of sight. It is true that both the Rabbis and Jesus recognized degrees of importance among the laws, though their emphasis was very differently placed. Yet the Levitical laws were equally with others regarded by Jesus as laws of God, so that, in a comprehensive statement of the relation of His teaching to the religion of the OT, He could not leave them out of account. Now, we have already seen that the teaching of Jesus came into conflict not simply with the Tradition of the Elders, but with the Levitical laws of purity; that He explicitly abolished the laws of clean and unclean food, and looked forward to the cessation of the temple worship. Accordingly, we must give such a sense to His words as will harmonize the explanation of His intention not to destroy the Law with the fact that He did abolish some of its precepts, and contemplate the impossibility, through the destruction of the temple, of a large part of its injunctions. The unifying conception is contained in the word 'fulfil' (πληρῶσαι). Jesus does not mean that He came to render a perfect obedience to the Law and the Prophets in His own life. The fulfilment forms an antithesis to the destruction. The destruction was such as would be accomplished by His teaching, not by His action, and similarly the fulfilment is something effected by His teaching. Besides, it is very difficult to believe that with the freedom of His principles, Jesus should have attached any importance to the perfect carrying out in action of the Law and the Prophets. What is meant is that, to use a familiar illustration, the gospel fulfils the Law as the flower fulfils the bud. Jesus sees in the Law a Divinely ordained system, but He is conscious that it is stamped with immaturity and defect. His function is to bring out its intrinsic significance by disengaging and carrying to perfection the principles entangled in it. Thus He does not abrogate the Law, but He transcends it, and, in doing so, antiquates it. In Beyschlag's words, it is 'confirmed and transformed in one breath.' What this means is admirably explained by Stevens in the following words: 'Jesus fulfils the OT system by rounding

out into entire completeness what is incomplete in that system. In this process of fulfilment all that is imperfect, provisional, temporary, or, for any reason, needless to the perfect religion, falls away of its own accord, and all that is essential and permanent is conserved and embodied in Christianity' (*The Theology of the New Testament*, p. 19).

The two following verses (Mat_5:18-19) create much difficulty. They seem to assert a permanence of the Law and its minutest details, and to affirm the insignificant place assigned in the Kingdom to any who should set aside one of the minor commandments. In view of the attitude adopted by Jesus towards the law of uncleanness, the Sabbath, and divorce, it is not surprising that doubts have been expressed as to the genuineness of the saying. It is out of the question to argue with Wendt that 'the law' is not a written law but an ideal law, for the reference to the jot and tittle implies a written law, and there is nothing to indicate that 'the law' is used here in two different senses. Beyschlag argues for the genuineness of the saying, which is also attested by Luk_16:17 'It is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one tittle of the law to fail.' If it is genuine, the best explanation is that given by Beyschlag, that we must explain here of spiritual fulfilments. No commandment, even the most trifling, is a mere empty husk; each has a Divine thought which must come to its rights before the husk of the letter is allowed to perish (*NT Theol.* i. 110 f.). It is, however, very difficult to believe that this interpretation is correct, inasmuch as it would be hard to understand what Divine idea Jesus could think was latent in innumerable trifling details of the Law. The immediate impression made by the words is surely that the Law, to its minutest details, was to be regarded as permanent. When we remember how bitter was the controversy created by the question of the Law in the Early Church, it is not easy to avoid the conclusion that here we have an expression from a Jewish-Christian point of view, according to which Jesus is made explicitly to disavow the movement led by St. Paul, not indeed that St. Paul is regarded as outside the Kingdom, but as one of the least in it. It would, however, be perhaps too far-fetched to connect the words 'least in the kingdom of heaven' with St. Paul's designation of himself as the 'least of the apostles.'

Literature.—The subject is discussed in the *New Testament Theologies*, the treatises on the Teaching of Jesus, and in the *Lives of Christ* and the commentaries. A very able monograph by R. Mackintosh, *Christ and the Jewish Law*, is devoted to the subject. Other works that may be mentioned are: Schürer, *Die Predigt Jesu in ihrem Verhältniss zum alten Testament und zum Judenthum* (1882); Bousset, *Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judenthum* (1892); Jacob, *Jesu Stellung zum mosaischen Gesetz* (1893); also the section 'Christus und das mosaische Gesetz' in Ritschl's *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the

work referred] (1857); cf. also Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. 73-76, and Extra Vol. p. 22 ff.

See also following article (Law of God).

A. S. Peake.

⚠️ Law Of God

LAW OF GOD.—We are not entitled to gather from the teaching of Jesus in the Gospels that He made any formal distinction between the Law of Moses and the Law of God. His mission being not to destroy but to fulfil the Law and the Prophets (Mat 5:17), so far from saying anything in disparagement of the Law of Moses or from encouraging His disciples to assume an attitude of independence with regard to it, He expressly recognized the authority of the Law of Moses as such, and of the Pharisees as its official interpreters (Mat 23:1-3).

One great aim of His teaching being, however, to counteract the influence of the Pharisaism of the time, under which zeal for the Law had degenerated into a pedantic legalism, which made outward conformity to the letter all-important and caused the true interests of religion and morality to be lost sight of amid the Shibboleths of national ritualism, He sought to concentrate the attention of His hearers upon the true meaning of the Law. In doing this He practically ignored the distinctions of the scribes between greater and lesser commandments of the Law, and between the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms (or 'the Writings'), and insisted upon the authority of Scripture as the word of God. What God says in Scripture, the inspired record of Revelation, is for Jesus the final court of appeal. 'The Scripture cannot be broken' (Joh 10:35) is a principle never once lost sight of in any controversy.

At the same time, as Jesus Himself taught as One who had authority (Mat 7:29 || Mar 1:22), quietly but none the less emphatically asserting His right to explain the spirit and meaning of the Divine word, He did distinguish and teach His disciples to distinguish between letter and spirit, that which was permanent and universal in the Law and that which was partial and temporary. It is therefore possible, and even almost necessary, with a view to a clear understanding of Christ's attitude towards the Law, to distinguish between the Law of God, meaning by the term that which is of universal validity, and those elements in the Law of Moses which are merely associated with a particular dispensation, a temporary manifestation of God's will.

1. A typical illustration of the propriety of such a distinction is found in that passage in which Jesus, dealing with the question of marriage and divorce, treats the Mosaic law on the subject as an instance of accommodation to an imperfect state of society (Mat 19:3-8 || Mar 10:2-9). 'For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept. But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female, etc. (Mar 10:5-6 ff.). Here we see at once a distinction made between the Mosaic precept and the Divine law. The former allowed divorce upon certain well-understood grounds. The Pharisees put their own lax interpretation upon this precept, and multiplied the causes of divorce to an extent far beyond what the precept actually justified. Christ's reply to the question of His adversaries on this point was simply to remind them of the original Divine ordinance, according to which the marriage bond was made indissoluble. The Law of Moses permitted divorce, but the Law of God maintained the sanctity of the marriage bond, and this represented the point of view from which the whole question ought to be regarded. 'They twain shall be one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together let not man put asunder.' In this connexion the Law of God and the Law of Moses are to one another in the relation of the spirit to the letter. This typical instance illustrates the principle upon which Jesus proceeded in His interpretation of the Divine law. His aim throughout was to call attention to the true spirit and purpose of the Law, to that in it which was of essential and permanent value. That the spirit of the Law, of which the letter is but the necessarily inadequate expression, is the Law of God, the manifestation of the Father's will for the moral and spiritual good of His children.

2. The attitude which Jesus adopted towards the whole question of the Law, considered as the Law of God, is well exemplified in the Sermon on the Mount, and in particular in those words which may be fitly taken as the motto of His teaching: 'Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil' (Mat 5:17; see preced. art.). In the contrast between what 'was said by them of old time' and His own emphatic 'But I say unto you,' we find the distinction between the Law of Moses and the Law of God. In the latter case He clearly speaks as God's representative, and we are reminded of John the Baptist's illustration of the difference between Christ and himself, the last of the Prophets: 'He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God; for God giveth not the Spirit by measure [unto him]' (Joh 3:34). In the one case, the statute which Jesus *quotes*, we have to do with the letter of the Law, that with which alone the scribes occupied themselves and upon which they founded their casuistical refinements. In the other case, the words 'But I say unto you' bid us go behind the letter and get at the root of the matter, 'for the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life' (2Co 3:6). Thus, in proceeding to apply the principle which He has just laid down (Mat 5:17), Jesus starts with the comprehensive statement of Mat 5:20 'For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.'

From this point He goes on to deal with typical instances of the difference between letter and spirit in the Law. He begins with a commandment of the Decalogue, the Sixth, coupled with a corresponding passage from the Mosaic legislation, 'and whosoever shall kill, shall be in danger of the judgment' (Mat 5:21). He says in effect, 'The spirit of the commandment is this: Anger is murder. I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother ... shall be in danger of the Judgment' (Mat 5:22). And then, as if still further to emphasize the point that the Law is not satisfied by negative or formal obedience, Jesus shows that brethren at variance must give effect to the positive law of love before they can render acceptable worship at God's altar (Mat 5:23-26). Nor is this enough. At a later point in His discourse, in connexion with the law of retaliation, He returns to the subject and insists upon the Divine principle of love, showing that the aim of God's Law is to make man resemble God Himself. The law of love leaves no room for enemies. A Christian has no enemies; for by loving and praying for them he makes them friends (Mat 5:38-45).

So again, in another place, Jesus shows that the neighbour to whom the Law of God refers is any one in need whom one can help (Luk 10:29-37). Again Jesus takes up the Seventh Commandment. According to the letter it forbids the sin of unchastity, unchaste actions, unlawful intercourse between the sexes. The spirit of the commandment has a far higher aim. It is only one aspect of the grand law of purity. It demands purity of heart. Every impure thought, every unchaste look, are transgressions of this law of God (Mat 5:27-32). Jesus deals with the Ninth Commandment upon the same principle. According to the letter, it forbids false swearing. According to the spirit, it is just a form of the law of sincerity and truthfulness. Its real meaning is that God desireth truth in the inward parts (Mat 5:33-37).

Proceeding (Mat 6:1 ff.) to the subject of religious exercises, Jesus shows that questions of ritual and outward form, upon which the Pharisees founded their ideas of 'righteousness' (δικαιοσύνην ... ποιεῖν, Mat 6:1) and meritorious service, are of trifling importance in comparison with the question of the heart's approach to God. Religion is not a performance, to be judged by what men can see and pronounce their opinions upon, and involving such trivial points as ritual, excellency of speech, propriety of form, reverence and decorum of posture. It is a matter of communion of spirit with spirit, needy souls, humbly conscious of their needs, confessing their wants and desires to One who seeth in secret, the poor in spirit hungering and thirsting after righteousness, and so convinced of their entire dependence upon the forgiveness and compassion of the All-Merciful as to feel that for them to claim the mercy and grace of God is to bind themselves by the law of love to the duty of forgiving as they would themselves be forgiven. From this point of view the essence of worship is prayer,—not sacrifice and offering—the humble, fervent outpouring of contrite hearts (cf.

Luk 18:10-14), and cordial surrender to the will of God—not questions of posture or of such material things as rich gifts (Luk 21:3-4, Joh 4:23-24). Prayer is the kernel; all external ordinances, whole burnt-offerings, sacrifices and the like, are but the husk (Mat 6:1-18). So the prayers even of the Gentiles are of infinitely more consequence than the temple offerings, and God's house is a house of prayer for all people (Mat 21:12 ff. || Mar 11:17 || Luk 19:45-46, cf. Joh 2:14-16).

In connexion with Christ's teaching on the subject of heart religion and morality, and the true meaning of the Law considered as the Law of God, an interesting case suggests itself, in which Jesus seems to anticipate the abrogation of the Old Covenant with its laws and ordinances. It is that of His controversy with the Pharisees with reference to the ceremonial ablutions which the disciples were accused of neglecting (Mat 15:1-20 || Mar 7:1-23). Jesus defends His disciples by turning the tables upon the Pharisees, whom He taxes with setting their traditions above the express commandments of God Himself, and with neglecting in the interest of mere technicalities the weightier matters of the Law (cf. His denunciation of Pharisaic scrupulosity in Mat 23:4-30 || Luk 11:37-47), and cites as an instance their treatment of the Fifth Commandment and the law of filial affection. But what calls for notice is, in particular, the circumstance that what specially offended the Pharisees, and startled even Christ's own disciples, was His pronouncement upon the point immediately in dispute, the question of ceremonial ablutions, and the whole Levitical legislation on the subject of the clean and the unclean. In view of the fact that a large portion of the Mosaic law is taken up with and deals minutely with these very points, in view also of the fact that the controversies in the Early Church itself between Jewish and Gentile Christians turned upon these things, our Lord's treatment of the question is very remarkable, and illustrates clearly the nature of the distinction which, in His revision of the Law, He emphasized between letter and spirit. He practically teaches that the principle of those Levitical precepts is simply the Divine law of holiness. Rightly understood, they only restate in another form the command, 'Be holy, as the Lord your God is holy'; and they are truly obeyed only by those whose hearts are renewed in every thought by the Spirit of God. The scribes who, forgetting the teaching of the prophets (for here Jesus made no essential addition to Jeremiah's doctrine of the New Covenant or Ezekiel's doctrine of the renewed heart and the washing of regeneration, Jer 31:31 ff., Eze 36:25-27), made the external ritual everything, and took no account of heart-religion, were on that account compared to those who should cleanse the outside of the cup and the platter, and be utterly careless as to the condition of the inside. If, on the other hand, the heart were purged from evil thoughts and wicked inclinations, then the life would correspond, as the tree is known by its fruit, and God's law would be fulfilled in the spirit of it. The Law of God appeared thus as the perfect law of liberty, the worship of God in spirit and in truth. In a word, true religion and true morality, the teaching of which in all their particulars is the grand purpose of the Law of God, are from first to last a

matter of the heart. Let the heart be pure. Let it be truly turned to God, in simple faith casting aside every care and anxious thought of the world and things of time, and trusting that God will deny His children no good thing, temporal or spiritual, of which, as their Father, He knows them to stand in need, and there is the secret of the fulfilling of the Law. All else follows from that. The pure in heart see God, the poor in spirit are already inheritors of the Kingdom of heaven (Mat 6:19-34; Mat 7:15-27).

Jesus taught essentially the same truth when, in controversy with the Pharisees, He summarized the teaching of the Law and the Prophets. So far from repudiating as a mere matter of Pharisaic casuistry the question often agitated among the scribes as to whether there were any commandments which in themselves summed up the teaching of the whole Law, He was ready to discuss such questions with them; and when, in response to His definition of love to God and one's neighbour as the essential commandment of the Law, a scribe commended His answer, and said that such love was 'more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices,' He declared that he was not far from the Kingdom of God (Mar 12:28-34).

On the same principle, Jesus at once defended His disciples against the charge of Sabbath-breaking, and vindicated His right to perform works of beneficence on the Sabbath day, by appealing to the spirit of the ordinance. Like other parts of the Law, He showed that this was only an expression of God's beneficent will for the good of man, a provision for his temporal and spiritual welfare. Therefore in the case of the cripple at Bethesda, He declared that, as God's providential government of the world recognized no distinction between the Sabbath and other days, so Christ Himself, as Son of God, must, like the Father, seek man's benefit even on the Sabbath. Again, as Son of Man, He no less emphatically asserted His right to interpret the Sabbath law in the interest of man, for whose benefit it was framed (Joh 5:17 ff., Mat 12:1-8 || Mar 2:23-28 || Luk 6:1-5). See also artt. Accommodation, Authority of Christ, Law, etc.

Literature.—Cremer, *Bib.-Theol. Lex.* s.v. νόμος; Grimm, *Lex. Novi Testamenti*, s.v. νόμος; *Comm.* of Meyer and Alford; Wendt, *The Teaching of Jesus*, i. 261-313, ii. 3-26; H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der NT Theol.* 1. 29-45, 116-146; Beyschlag, *NT Theology*, i. 37-40, 97-129; Weiss, *Ribl. Theol. of NT*, i. 107-120; Briggs, *Ethical Teaching of Christ*, 143; Gore, *Sermon on Mount*; Bruce, *Kingdom of God*, 63-84; Dykes, *Manifesto of the King* [ed. 1887], 203-329; cf. also Literature at end of preceding article.

Hugh H. Currie.

⚠️ Lawlessness

LAWLESSNESS.—The service of God becomes perfect freedom through the work of the Holy Spirit restoring the Divine image more and more in the heart of man. This liberty cannot therefore be a licence for lawlessness. St. Augustine's maxim, 'Love, and do as you like,' derives its truth from the principle that love is not the abolition but the recapitulation of all the Divine law for mankind. The love of God and the love of man constitute the essence of the Law's demands and the Prophets' promises (Mat 22:40). It is not the Law which Christ denounces, but traditional excrescences and empty forms (Mar 7:13). These traditional excrescences gave opportunities for hypocrisy, a condition detested by the Lord (Mat 15:7-9). The empty forms distracted attention from vital concerns (Mar 7:4). The scribes and Pharisees were losing all sense of proportion in the duties of the religious life (Mat 23:24, Luk 11:42). The exponents of the Law were erring, yet the Law itself stood as a Divine ordinance (Mat 23:3, Luk 16:17). The commandments are necessary to eternal life (Luk 18:20). Nay, not one tittle can pass away from the Law (Mat 5:18). Perfect and complete obedience will be demanded of men (Mat 5:19). Not less but more will be expected of the disciples of Christ (Matthew 5). And yet Christ's yoke is to be easy (Mat 11:30). So there is a paradox, the solution of which lies in the recapitulation of the entire Law as consisting in the love of God and the love of one's fellow-man. The revelation of the guiding principle summing up the Law renders light a burden which the Pharisees made heavy (Luk 11:46). Mechanical conformity to a legal code is thus avoided. The conscience of man finds exercise and discipline. This point is emphasized in the Western addition to Luk 6:4 'O man, blessed art thou if thou knowest what thou doest.' In His technical breaches of the Sabbath the Lord knew what He did (Luk 14:5). Yet the legalists took advantage of these to charge Him with lawlessness (Joh 9:16). Nevertheless, He came fulfilling all righteousness (Mat 3:15), and appealing to the Law in the face of temptation (Mat 4:4-10). When He cleansed the Temple, He vindicated His action from Scripture (Luk 19:46). There was no lawlessness in His pattern life of perfect obedience to God (Joh 15:10). Lawless efforts at good, however strenuous, are not acceptable (Joh 10:1). Indeed, St. John sums up the matter in the words, 'Sin is lawlessness' (1Jn 3:4).

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Law (in NT)'; Bruce, *Training of the Twelve*, pp. 67-95; *Kingdom of God*, pp. 63-84; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, ii. 1-48; Dykes, *Manifesto of the King*, pp. 203-220; Dale, *Christian Doctrine*, 198; Hobhouse, *Spiritual Standard*, iii.

W. B. Frankland.

⚠️ Lawyer

LAWYER (νομικός) or ‘teacher (doctor) of the law’ (νομοδιδάσκαλος) is found occasionally, almost exclusively in Lk., for the more usual ‘scribe’ (γραμματεὺς). The identity of these terms is shown by the following passages. 1. Luk_5:17, Pharisees and *doctors of the law* are sitting by; but (Luk_5:21) the *scribes* and Pharisees begin to reason (so || Mt., Mk.). 2. Luk_11:37 ff. is a denunciation first of Pharisees, then of *lawyers*; this is parallel to Matthew 23 against *scribes* and Pharisees; and at its close (Luk_11:53) ‘the *scribes* and Pharisees began to urge him vehemently.’ The Textus Receptus reading (Luk_11:44) ‘scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites,’ which, when compared with the next verse, might imply a difference between ‘scribes’ and ‘lawyers,’ is omitted by critical editors on the authority of ⚠️ BCL Vulgate etc.; and is obviously an assimilation to Luk_11:27. 3. Mat_22:35, a *lawyer* questions Jesus as to the greatest commandment; in Mar_12:28 it is ‘one of the *scribes*’; cf. also Luk_10:25 ‘a certain *lawyer*.’ 4. The martyr Eleazar is called in 2Ma_6:18 ‘one of the principal *scribes*,’ in 4Ma_5:4 he is a *lawyer*. Thus these titles are equivalent. γραμματεὺς (‘scribe’) is a literal translation of the Heb. סֹפֵר (a literary man or a student of Scripture), while νομικός (‘lawyer,’ ‘jurist,’ a regular term for Roman lawyers, Vulgate *legis peritus*), and, still better, νομοδιδάσκαλος, are more distinct descriptions of this class, explaining to Gentile readers their character and office. Hence their comparative frequency in Luke. ‘Rabbi,’ the title by which they were addressed, is perhaps for us their best designation.

Mt. has γραμματεὺς 23 times, νομικός once only (Mat_22:35, where Syr-Sin omits). Mk. has γραμματεὺς only, 21 times. Lk. has γραμματεὺς 14 times, besides (of Jewish scribes) twice in Acts; νομικός 6 times (Luk_7:30; Luk_10:25; Luk_11:45-46; Luk_11:52; Luk_14:3), νομοδιδάσκαλος once (Luk_5:17, and in Act_5:34 of Gamaliel). Josephus also, while once using ιερογραμματεὺς (*BJ* vi. v. 3), commonly uses phrases with more definite meaning for Gentile readers: σοφιστῆς (*BJ* 1. xxxiii. 2, ii. xvii. 8) or ἐξηγητῆς τῶν πατριῶν νόμων (*Ant.* xvii. vi. 2).

These titles show that the great sphere of their activity was the Law, whether contained in Scripture or handed down traditionally. They studied, of course, the other books of Scripture besides the Pentateuch, but these were regarded as merely supplementary to the Law of Moses, and as themselves presenting a revealed rule of

life and conduct; so that the term 'Law' is applied sometimes in the NT to the whole of the OT (Joh 10:34; Joh 15:25, 1Co 14:21). So also in the Mishna (see Buhl, *Canon*, § 3).

Their work, in all its departments, is sketched in the saying ascribed to the 'Men of the Great Synagogue,' their traditional predecessors: 'Be careful in judgment, raise up many disciples, and set a hedge about the Law' (*Prike Aboth*, i. i.). They acted as judges; they gave instruction in the Law, and trained disciples; and they interpreted and developed the Law. Though anyone might be a judge, the office was naturally most commonly held by those learned in the Law; and we find the leaders of the Scribes an integral part of the Sanhedrin (Mar 15:1 etc.). Their leaders gathered disciples round them, and taught them the traditional law, instructing them by discussing real or imagined legal cases; and they developed the Law, applying it to all actual and possible cases, and laying down rules to secure against its being broken. See Scribes.

Literature.—Schürer, *HJP* [*Note: JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. i. p. 312 ff., and literature there mentioned; Edersheim, *Life and Times*, etc., i. 93; artt. 'Lawyer' and 'Scribe' (by Eaton) in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, and literature there.

Harold Smith.

☩ Lazarus

LAZARUS.—A common Jewish name, meaning 'God hath helped'; a colloquial abbreviation of *Eleazar* (cf. *Liezer* for *Eliezer*).* [*Note: Juchasin, 81. 1: 'In Talmude Hierosolymitano unusquisque R. Eleazar scribitur, absque Aleph, R. Lazar.'*]

1. Lazarus the beggar, who, in our Lord's parable (Luk 16:19-31), lay, a mass of loathsome sores, at the gateway of the rich man, named traditionally Nineuis (Euth. Zig.) or Phinees (Clem. *Recogn.*). The notion that he was a leper (whence *lazar-house*, *lazzaretto*) is impossible, since he must then have kept afar off, and durst not have lain at the rich man's gateway.

This has been pronounced no authentic parable of Jesus, but an 'evangelic discourse upon His words—"that which is exalted among men is an abomination in the sight of God" ' (Luk 16:15),† [*Note: A. Abbott in Encycl. Bibl. art. 'Lazarus,' § 2.*] on the following grounds: (1) *Its introduction of a proper name*. Nowhere else in the Gospels is a parabolic personage named, and the idea prevailed in early times that this is not a parable but a story from real life (cf. Tert. *de Anim.* § 7; Iren. *adv. Hær.* iv. 3. 2).

(2) *Its alleged Ebionism.* The contrast between the two men on earth is not moral or religious. It is not said that the rich man got his wealth unrighteously, or that he treated Lazarus cruelly. The difference was merely that the one was rich and the other poor, and their dooms are a reversal of their earthly conditions. 'In this parable,' says Strauss, 'the measure of future recompense is not the amount of good done or wickedness perpetrated, but of evil endured and fortune enjoyed.'

(3) *Its Jewish imagery.* (a) 'The beggar died, and he was carried away by the angels.' It was a Jewish idea that the souls of the righteous were carried by angels to paradise (cf. Targ. [Note: Targum.] on Son_4:2 'Non possunt ingredi Paradisum nisi justi, quorum animae eo feruntur per angelos.') (b) The Jews called the unseen world Sheol; and so closely identical was their conception thereof with that of the Greeks, that Sheol is rendered by the LXX Septuagint Hades.* [Note: Schultz, OT Theol. ii. p. 321 ff.] It was the common abode of all souls, good and bad alike, where they received the due reward of their deeds; and it was an aggravation of the misery of the wicked that they continually beheld the felicity of the righteous, knowing all the while that they were excluded from it. See Lightfoot and Wetstein on Luk_16:23; cf. Rev_14:10. So in the parable 'the rich man in Hades lifts up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham from afar, and Lazarus in his bosom.' (c) There were three Jewish phrases descriptive of the state of the righteous after death: 'in the Garden of Eden' or 'Paradise'; 'under the throne of glory' (cf. Rev_6:9; Rev_7:9; Rev_7:15); 'in Abraham's bosom.' The last appears in the parable (Luk_16:22-23). The meaning is that Lazarus was a guest at the heavenly feast. Cf. Luk_14:15 and the saying of R. Jacob: 'This world is like a vestibule before the world to come: prepare thyself at the vestibule, that thou mayest be admitted into the festal-chamber.' Lazarus occupied the place of honour, reclining on Abraham's breast, even as the beloved disciple at the Last Supper reclined on the Master's (Joh_13:23).

These objections, however, are by no means insurmountable. The name *Lazarus* is perhaps introduced significantly, defining the beggar's character. He was one who had found his help in God. It was not because he was poor, but because God had helped him, that the beggar was carried away into Abraham's bosom; and the rich man was doomed not simply because he had been rich, but because he had made a selfish use of his riches. The parable is an illustration and enforcement of the moral which Jesus deduces from the preceding parable of the Shrewd Factor: 'Make to yourselves friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness (*i.e.* earthly riches, unsatisfying and unenduring† [Note: Psa_23:3 רַקְמֵי־לֶחֶם, τριβους ὀικαιοσύνης, in contrast to 'delusive tracks which lead nowhere' (Cheyne).]), that, when it faileth, they may receive you into the eternal tents' (Luk_16:9). Had the rich man befriended the beggar, he would have laid up for himself treasure in heaven. He would have

bound Lazarus to himself, and would have been welcomed by him on the threshold of the unseen world.

As for the Jewish imagery, it constitutes no argument against the authenticity of the parable. Jesus was accustomed to speak the language of His hearers in order to reach their understandings and hearts. He often spoke of the heavenly feast: cf. Mat 8:11-12 (Luk 13:28-29), Luk 13:25-27 (Mat 7:22-23), Mat 22:1-14 (Luk 14:16-24), Mat 25:1-13, Luk 22:18 = Mat 26:29 = Mar 14:25. And it is noteworthy how, when He employed Jewish imagery, He was wont to invest it with new significance. Thus, the Rabbis taught that the abodes of the righteous and the wicked in Hades were nigh to each other; according to one, there was only a span between them; according to another, the boundary was a wall (*Midr. Kohel. 103. 2: 'Deus statuit hoc juxta illud (Ecc 7:14), id est, Gehennam et Paradisum. Quantum distant? Palmo. R. Jochanan dicit: Paries interponitur.'*) But what says Jesus? 'In all this region betwixt us and you a great chasm has been fixed, that they that wish to pass over from this side unto you may not be able, nor those on that side cross over unto us.' The sentence, He would indicate, is final, the separation eternal. See Gulf.

2. Lazarus of Bethany, brother of Martha and Mary. There was a close and tender intimacy between Jesus and this household (cf. Joh 11:3; Joh 11:11; Joh 11:36). From the Feast of Tabernacles (October) until the Feast of Dedication (December) Jesus sojourned in Jerusalem, making His appeal to her rulers and people. The former proved obdurate, and finally proceeded to violence (Joh 10:31; Joh 10:39). It was unsafe for Him to remain among them, and He retired to Bethany beyond Jordan (Joh 10:40, cf. Joh 1:28 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). A crowd followed Him thither, and, undisturbed by His adversaries, He exercised a ministry which recalled, while it surpassed, the work of John the Baptist on the same spot three years earlier. All the while He was thinking of Jerusalem. He would fain win her even yet, and He prayed that God would bring about some crisis which might persuade her of His Messiahship or at least leave her without excuse (cf. Joh 11:41-42). He saw not the way, but He was waiting for God to open it up; and suddenly a message reached Him from the other Bethany that Lazarus was sick (Joh 11:3). He recognized in this turn of events God's answer to His prayer. It afforded Him just such an opportunity as He had craved. 'This sickness,' He said, 'is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God (*i.e.* the Messiah) may be glorified thereby.' He did not hasten to Bethany and lay His hand upon the sick man, nor did He, abiding where He was, 'send forth His word and heal him,' as He had done to the courtier's son (Joh 4:46-54) and the Syrophœnician woman's daughter (Mat 15:21-28 = Mar 7:24-30). He deliberately remained where He was for two days, and then set out for Judaea. On His arrival at Bethany, Lazarus was dead and buried, and a large company, including many of the rulers from the adjacent capital (Mar 7:19), had gathered, in accordance with Jewish custom, to testify their esteem for the good Lazarus and condole with his sisters. The

situation favoured the Lord's design. He repaired to the sepulchre, which lay at least 2000 cubits outside the town,* [Note: Lightfoot, ii. p. 424.] and in presence of the assemblage recalled the dead man to life and summoned him forth in his cerements.

It was an indubitable miracle. In the sultry East it was necessary that the dead should be buried immediately (cf. Act_5:5-6), and it sometimes happened that a swoon was mistaken for death, and the man awoke. The Jewish fancy was that for three days after death the soul hovered about the sepulchre, fain to re-enter and reanimate its tenement of clay; and the bereaved were wont to visit the sepulchre to see if haply their dead had come to life. After three days decomposition set in, and when they saw its ghastly disfigurement on the face, they abandoned hope.† [Note: Lightfoot on Joh_11:39.] Had Jesus arrived within three days after Lazarus' death, it might have been pronounced no miracle; but He arrived on the fourth day, when decomposition would have already set in (Joh_11:39).

If anything could have conquered the unbelief of the rulers, this miracle must have done it; but they hardened their hearts, and all the more that the people were profoundly impressed. The Sanhedrin met under the presidency of Caiaphas the high priest, and resolved to put Jesus to death, at the same time publishing an order that, if any knew where He was, they should give information for His arrest. He did not venture into the city, but retired northward to Ephraim, near the Samaritan frontier. There He remained until the Passover was nigh, and then He went up to keep the Feast and to die. Six days before the Feast began, He reached Bethany, and in defiance of the Sanhedrin's order received an ovation from the townsfolk. They honoured Him with a banquet in the house of Simon, one of their leading men, who had been a leper, and had perhaps been healed by Jesus (see art. Anointing, i. 2.). Lazarus of course was present. The news that Jesus was at Bethany reached Jerusalem, and next day a great multitude thronged out to meet Him and escorted Him with Messianic honours into the city. It was the raising of Lazarus that had convinced them of the claims of Jesus (Joh_12:17-18). The Triumphal Entry is a powerful evidence of the miracle. Without it such an outburst of enthusiasm is unaccountable.

It might be expected that Lazarus of all men should have stood by Jesus during the last dread ordeal; but he never appears after the banquet in Simon's house. His name is nowhere mentioned in the story of the Lord's Passion. What is the explanation? Enraged by the impression which the miracle made and the support which it brought to Jesus, the high priests plotted the death of Lazarus (Joh_12:10-11); and it is probable that, ere the final crisis, he had been compelled to withdraw from the vicinity of Jerusalem.

It was a stupendous miracle, the greatest which Jesus ever wrought; yet it is not the supreme miracle of the Gospel-story. The Lord's own Resurrection holds that place, and one who is persuaded of His claims will hardly hesitate to believe in the raising of Lazarus. 'He raised the man,' says St. Augustine,* [Note: In Joan. Ev. Tract. xlix. § 1.] 'who made the man; for He is Himself the Father's only Son, through whom, as ye know, all things were made. If, therefore, all things were made through Him, what wonder if one rose from the dead through Him, when so many are daily born through Him? It is a greater thing to create men than to raise them.'

Naturalistic criticism, however, has assailed the miracle. Much has been made of the silence of the Synoptists, who must, it is alleged, have recorded it had they known of it, and must have known of it had it occurred. Their silence in this instance, however, is merely part of a larger problem—their silence regarding the Lord's Judaeian ministry generally, and their peculiar reticence regarding the family of Bethany.

It is no exaggeration to affirm that the desperateness of the assaults which have been directed against it constitute a powerful apologetic for the miracle. (1) The earlier rationalists (Paulus, Venturini), in spite of the Evangelist's specific testimony to the contrary, supposed that Lazarus had not really died but only fallen into a trance. He had been buried alive, and he awoke to consciousness through the combined influences of the coolness of the cave, the pungent odour of the burial spices (cf. Joh 19:40), and the stream of warm air which rushed in when the stone was removed. Jesus, looking in, perceived that he was alive, and bade him come forth.

(2) According to Strauss, the story, like the two earlier stories of resuscitation (Mat 9:18-19; Mat 9:23-26 = Mar 5:21-24; Mar 5:35-43 = Luk 8:40-42; Luk 8:49-56; Luk 7:11-17), is a myth, originating in the desire of the primitive Church that the Messiah should not only rival but surpass His great prototypes in the OT. Elijah and Elisha had wrought miracles of resuscitation (1Ki 17:17 ff., 2Ki 4:8 ff.), and Jesus must do the like in a more wonderful manner.

(3) Renan regarded the miracle as an imposture. 'Tired of the cold reception which the Kingdom of God found in the capital, the friends of Jesus, wished for a great miracle which should strike powerfully the incredulity of the Jerusalemites.' And the sick Lazarus lent himself to their design. Pallid with disease, he let himself be wrapped in grave-clothes and shut up in the sepulchre; and when Jesus, believing that he was dead, came to take a last look at his friend's remains, Lazarus came forth in his bandages, his head covered with a winding-sheet. Jesus acquiesced in the fraud. 'Not by any fault of his own, but by that of others, his conscience had lost something of its original purity. Desperate and driven to extremity, he was no longer his own master. His mission over-whelmed him, and he yielded to the torrent.... He was no

more able than St. Bernard or St. Francis to moderate the avidity for the marvellous displayed by the multitude, and even by his own disciples.’

(4) Later criticism is still more destructive. Not only was the miracle never wrought, but there was never such a man as Lazarus. The story is ‘non-historical, like the History of the Creation in Genesis, and like the records of the other miracles in the Fourth Gospel; all of which are poetic developments.’* [Note: A. Abbott, art. ‘Lazarus,’ § 4, in *Encyc. Biblica.*] Keim finds the germ of the story in the Ebionite parable of the Rich Man and the Beggar (Luk_16:19-31). ‘If,’ says Abraham in the parable, ‘to Moses and the prophets they do not hearken, not even if one rise from the dead will they be persuaded’; and the Johannine narrative is this saying converted into a history: a man rose from the dead, and the Jews did not believe. Lazarus full of corruption corresponds to the beggar full of sores. The story is thus doubly divorced from reality, being an unhistorical development of an unauthentic parable.

Literature.—1. Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , art. ‘Lazarus and Dives’; Trench, Bruce, Orelli, and Dods on the *Parables*; Plummer, ‘St. Luke’ (*ICC [Note: CC International Critical Commentary.]*), in *loc.*; Bersier, *Gospel in Paris*, p. 448 f.

2. Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , art. ‘Lazarus of Bethany’; the standard *Lives of Christ*; Elmslie, *Expository Lectures and Sermons*, p. 92 ff.; Maclaren, *Unchanging Christ*, p. 282 ff. On the rationalistic objections to the miracle see the chapter on ‘The Later Miracles’ in Fairbairn’s *Studies in the Life of Christ* (or in *Expositor*, 1st Ser. ix. [1879] p. 178 ff.), where the theories of Paulus, Strauss, Baur, and Renan are fully dealt with.

D. Smith.

☞Leading

LEADING.—‘Lead’ is used in the Gospels in its ordinary senses: intransitively in the description of the ways that lead to life or destruction (Mat_7:13-14), and transitively often. The OT metaphor of Jehovah as a Shepherd leading His people like a flock (Psa_23:1; Psa_80:1) is repeated in the parables representing Christ as a Shepherd whose sheep recognize and obey Him (Joh_10:3-4; Joh_10:27). The general conception of God’s leading His people, so frequent in the Psalms and in Deutero-Isaiah and elsewhere, is assumed in the petition ‘Lead us not into temptation’ (Mat_6:13, Luk_11:4); for the true life is along a right path wherein God leads His children.

The leadership of religious authorities is referred to in the description of scribes and Pharisees as ‘blind guides’ or ‘blind leaders of the blind’ (Mat 23:16; Mat 15:14); the metaphor being based on the sight, familiar in Eastern cities, of rows or files of blind persons each holding by the one in front. But, as this saying is placed by St. Luke (Luk 6:39) in immediate connexion with the appointment of the Twelve, it may be presumed that Jesus pressed on His disciples the necessity of their recognizing and qualifying for the duties of true leadership. They are required to have light and to let it shine, to be, in short, ‘men of light and leading.’

The position of Jesus as a Leader is most frequently expressed in terms of following. The imperative ‘Follow me’ is addressed to individuals, as Peter and Andrew, James and John (Mat 4:19; Mat 4:21), Matthew (Mat 9:9), and Philip (Joh 1:43); and to unnamed disciples or listeners (Mat 8:22; Mat 19:21). It is repeated in the fundamental law of the Kingdom, where self-denial or cross-bearing is enjoined (Mat 16:24, Mar 8:34, Luk 9:23, Joh 12:25); but here the reference is to Jesus as a supreme example rather than a present guide, and the instruction is primarily spiritual. It may be said that during His whole public ministry Jesus was leading and training disciples to carry on His work; while the risen Christ is the Head of the Church and the Leader of the Christian army (Mat 28:18-20).

Four times the term ‘Leader’ (ἀρχηγός) is applied to Christ: in the Authorized and Revised Versions phrases ‘Prince of life,’ ‘Prince,’ ‘Captain (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘Author’) of salvation,’ ‘Author of faith’ (Act 3:15; Act 5:31, Heb 2:10; Heb 12:2); and a similar meaning is expressed by προδρομος, ‘Forerunner’ (Heb 6:20). In these passages the leadership is through death from life on earth to life in heaven.

Literature.—II. Bushnell, *The New Life*, p. 74; Phillips Brooks, *Mystery of Iniquity*, p. 171; B. B. Warfield, *Power of God unto Salvation*, p. 151.

R. Scott.

📖 Learning

LEARNING.—To what extent did learning prevail in Palestine in the time of Christ? and is it correct to say that He Himself and His Apostles and disciples were illiterate?

Higher education existed at least in the collegiate institutions of the capital. From the restoration following the epoch of the Exile there was a class of men who are known

to us as 'scribes' (*sôphêrîm*). Their point of union was their knowledge of the Law, and Scriptures, and Traditions. So far they are parallel to the *shastris*, who are the authorities on Hindu literature. Ezra, the second founder of the theocracy and a man of priestly birth, is designated a scribe (Ezr 7:6). From his date measures were taken, directed to the establishment and maintenance of the sacred authority of the Law. The scribe was an interpreter to the people. The period of higher inspiration was giving place to an age of didactic literature. And a succession of able scribes arose who expounded the sacred books, cherished and enlarged tradition, determined the details of religious observance, and wrote the Law in its exclusiveness on the minds of the people. They were at their best in the 4th or 3rd cent. b.c.; but they continued for many centuries. Pharisaism was a development of them, and they are also connected with the later books of Wisdom, while in the post-Christian period their chief men are the Rabbis. Part of their work consisted in the training of young scribes, and for this end schools or colleges were formed. In these the Scriptures formed a literary and theological basis, the Law, traditions, and national history were expounded, and judgment was given on the problems and practical questions of the time. This education was professional, and contained no secular culture; and it was intensely national or Jewish. Yet here as elsewhere there were varieties of opinion and diverging tendencies. The schools of Hillel and Shammai were rival institutions in the years preceding the birth of our Lord. A generation later Hillel was succeeded by his perhaps more liberal grandson, Gamaliel, to whose classroom St. Paul came from Asia Minor to be trained in the Law.

Other schools less exclusively religious, more akin to Greek institutions, are known to have existed in Jerusalem and other towns, where especially the sons of men not opposed to the Roman occupation might be trained for public life. Jews of the Dispersion were at home in the Greek language, and had more immediate access to Greek literature. About the time of Christ several of the later apocryphal books were written. Culture was widespread, and at least two Jews belong to general literature: Philo the philosopher of Alexandria, who endeavoured to reconcile Hellenism and Judaism; and Josephus the historian, who was brought up in Jerusalem.

But the work of the scribes was not confined to 'higher education.' In every village they had planted a synagogue, and in connexion with every synagogue an elementary school was ultimately opened. For many centuries the training of the young was a duty enjoined upon parents. About b.c. 75, Simon ben Shetach, a scribe and Pharisee, is said to have carried a law requiring boys to attend 'the elementary school.' Probably before that date a lower school system (such as was known to exist in the Greek world) was tentatively tried in all leading centres. Now education was made compulsory. The schoolroom, known as the 'house of the book,' was either part of the synagogue or of the teacher's house. The teacher, or *hazzan*, belonged to a humble rank of the fraternity of scribes. Lk (Luk 5:7) refers to a gathering of teachers of the

law (νομοδιδάσκαλοι) from every city and village of the land. Whether or not school-masters are included, the reference implies a wide diffusion of education.

The instruction given in these schools is considered by Ramsay (*Education of Christ*) superior to that of Greece or any other ancient land. The subjects of study and methods of teaching were calculated to call forth and develop the best mental faculties of the boys. In the choice of subjects the theoretical and practical were successfully combined; and pupils were taught both to think and to act, while maxims of duty were graven on their memories. The standard of average intelligence was therefore high. And while in most cases no regular secondary education followed, it is to be remembered that the synagogue remained a place of instruction rather than of formal worship, and also that talented young men could carry reading and study farther than public provision was made for. Whether any of the leading disciples were educated in Jerusalem cannot be definitely known. But they were not ignorant. On the contrary, they were men of keen intelligence and ardent spirit, who had been cherishing the Messianic hope and found in Jesus the realization of their dreams.

Ancient literature was mainly religious; and learning is founded on literature. But though the circle of learning had religion as its centre, it included some study of all the obvious phenomena of nature. Modern discovery is proving that not only famous countries such as Egypt or Babylonia, but also peoples whose very names were formerly unknown, had a developed civilization and system of thought. Amongst the Israelites Moses and Solomon are credited (Act 7:22, 1Ki 4:29-34) with all the knowledge the world then possessed; and to the latter are attributed not only poetry and philosophy, but also an exhaustive knowledge of Natural History. The people were skilled in music and in works of architecture. But while Israel was producing its prophets, the imaginative genius of Greece was creating a secular literature and founding sciences. Gradually Greek influence extended to all lands. It was felt in Jerusalem even in the days of greatest exclusiveness. Greek was the language of the Hellenistic Jews, and the Septuagint was their Bible. Greek ideas were thus diffused over the surface of Hebraic religion, and helped to enrich the thought and life of the planters of Christianity. Of the NT writings it may confidently be said that they are not the work of unlearned men. St. Paul was probably much more learned than his letters show (Act 26:3; Act 26:24). The Johannine writings are artistically conceived, and studded with gems of thought and expression. The Epistles to the Hebrews and Ephesians show an imaginative scope and a rhetorical power scarcely surpassed. St. Luke had a literary faculty rare amongst physicians. It is true that Peter and John are styled 'unlearned' (Act 4:13); yet this is but the technical description (ἀγράμματοι καὶ ἰδιῶται) of men who had not graduated in the colleges of the scribes. If not many noble were called (1Co 1:26), there were at least some who combined spiritual

insight with literary culture, and who were able to express the new ideas in forms whose beauty is partially hidden by their Divineness.

Of Jesus Himself His enemies asked (Joh_7:15), ‘How knoweth this man letters (γράμμα ατα), having never learned?’ No doubt it was true that He had never studied Jewish theology at any of the great Rabbinical schools. But not only did He have a thorough knowledge of the letter of the OT, as He repeatedly showed (see, e.g., Mat_5:21-43; Mat_12:3 ff., Mat_12:40 ff., Mat_13:14 f., Mat_15:4; Mat_15:7 f., Mat_19:4 ff., Mat_19:17 ff., Mat_21:13; Mat_21:16; Mat_21:42; Mat_22:32; Mat_22:37 ff., Mat_22:43 ff., Mat_24:15; Mat_24:37 ff., Mat_26:54; Mat_27:46), but He revealed an insight into Scripture and an expository skill (and this was what the Jews specially meant by His ‘knowing letters’) at which they were compelled to marvel (Joh_7:15 a). This ‘learning’ of Jesus, for γράμμαα in Gr. (like Lat. *literae*, English ‘letters’) is synonymous with ‘learning,’ had its human side without doubt. His education in Scripture would begin in the family circle, and most probably be continued in a synagogue school. In early youth He showed His interest in the synagogal instruction (Luk_2:46), and ever afterwards it was His ‘custom’ to frequent those services of the synagogue at which Moses and the Prophets were read and explained (Luk_4:15). But His ‘learning’ and consequent ‘teaching,’ on the spiritual side, as He Himself declared, came from an inward and Divine spring (Joh_7:16-17), a saying which helps to explain the statement of two of the Synoptists (Mat_7:29 || Mar_1:22), ‘He taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes’ (γραμματεῖς). See also art. Education.

Literature.—Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible , art. ‘Education’; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. i. 323-350, ii. 47-52; Edershelm, *Life and Times*, i. 228-234; Stalker, *Imago Christi*, pp. 147-164.

R. Scott.

Leaven

LEAVEN.—The effect of leaven upon dough to which it is added is due to minute living organisms disseminated through it in great numbers. These organisms are one or more species of yeast-fungi. They are the most important agents of the alcoholic fermentation, which they produce in dough as well as in solutions of sugar. Whether lodged in sour dough (leaven) or collected free out of fermenting vats (compressed yeast), they cause the same effect when introduced into bread sponge. At the present

time leaven is not so much used for the lightening of bread as yeast, because it is apt to impart to bread a sour taste and a disagreeable odour.

Yeast-fungi were first recognized (1680) by the Dutch naturalist Leuwenhök in the scum floating on the surface of fermenting beer. With his imperfect lenses he was able to observe little of their structure beyond the fact that they were very small globules. They are now known to be single-celled plants, having for the most part an oval or ellipsoidal shape. The individual yeast-cell consists of a mass of protoplasm enclosed in a delicate wall of cellulose. The protoplasm, as in the case of all the fungi, contains no chlorophyll, and is, accordingly, dependent upon organic matter for its nourishment. It is granular, and usually shows one large non-contractile vacuole or several small vacuoles containing water. It has also a nucleus, which, however, can be brought into view only after special treatment. The size of the yeast-cell varies from 1.5 microns to 15 microns in diameter. (The micron equals $1/25000$ inch). During the inactive stage the cells are isolated, but in an actively fermenting medium they occur in groups or families, organically united and consisting of from two to six or eight members in varying stages of development. When the members reach maturity, they separate from one another, each one having the capacity to produce a new group. This is the method by which the plant propagates itself. An isolated cell sends out a little pimple or bud on the surface. The bud is destined to become an independent cell of the same size as the cell which produced it; but, before it is mature, it may itself form a bud which in turn may form another bud of its own, the mother-cell in the meantime forming a second bud at a different point. A sort of chain of sprouts, usually curved, is formed as the result of this process of *budding* or *gemination*. The successive buds round up and finally separate themselves as independent individuals. Pasteur, to whose elaborate investigations we are deeply indebted for our knowledge of the agents and the process of fermentation, found that two cells produced eight in two hours at a temperature of 13 degrees C. The multiplication is more rapid at a higher temperature.

Yeast-fungi secure their food for the most part from weak solutions of grape-sugar. They convert grape-sugar into alcohol and carbon dioxide. This conversion is known as the alcoholic fermentation. The same action takes place in moistened wheat-flour when yeast is mixed with it. The wheat grain contains a ferment, *diastase*, whose function is the conversion of the insoluble starch of the grain into soluble grape-sugar for the nourishment of the embryo when the grain germinates. Diastase is present, of course, in wheat-flour, and when the conditions of moisture and temperature are supplied, as in a gently heated bread sponge, it effects the same conversion as under natural conditions in the germinating grain. Some of the flour starch is changed into grape-sugar, in which the yeast-cells excite the alcoholic fermentation. The bubbles of the gas carbon dioxide produced in the fermentation are entangled in the glutinous sponge, and, expanded by heat, puff it up or lighten it. If, now, more flour is

thoroughly mixed with this sponge so as to scatter the yeast-cells of the sponge throughout the mass, the whole will shortly be leavened by the gas which continues to be given off by the agency of the rapidly multiplying cells. A practically indefinite quantity of flour so treated can be leavened by ‘a little leaven.’

The week which began with the Passover is called ‘the days of unleavened bread’ (Mat_26:17, Mar_14:1; Mar_14:12, Luk_22:1; Luk_22:7), from the practice enjoined in Exo_23:15, Lev_23:6, Deu_16:3-4; Deu_16:8.

The effect of leaven in raising a mass of dough (see above) is the basis of our Lord’s parable of the Leaven (Mat_13:33, Luk_13:20-21), which sets forth the gradual and pervasive influence of the Kingdom of God upon the whole of human society.

The fermentation produced by leaven was regarded as a species of putrefaction, and this, together with the tendency of leaven to spread, explains the figure in which ‘the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees’ stands for their corrupt teaching (Mat_16:6; Mat_16:11, Mar_8:15), or, as St. Luke puts it more specifically in the case of the Pharisees, their hypocrisy (Luk_12:1). ‘The leaven of Herod’ (Mar_8:15) similarly denotes the policy of the Herodian party.

Literature.—Trench, Dods, Bruce, Orelli on the Parables; Winterbotham, *Kingdom of Heaven*, 70; Drummond, *Stones Rolled Away*, 144; Scott-Holland, *God’s City*, 143; Macmillan, *Two Worlds are Ours*, 153; R. Flint, *Christ’s Kingdom*, 170.

W. L. Poteat and James Patrick.

Leaves

LEAVES.—The tree is often used in NT as a symbol of the life of a man. Leaves are the indication of the existence of life in the tree. The barren fig-tree was cursed by our Lord because it had leaves only (Mat_21:19, Mar_11:13) and no fruit. See Fig-tree. We have here a type of religious profession unaccompanied by practice, a spiritual condition which always drew from our Lord the strongest condemnation.

The putting forth of leaves by the fig-tree is referred to by our Lord as one of the indications that summer is nigh (Mat_24:32, Mar_13:28). See Robertson Nicoll, *Ten Minute Sermons*, 59.

C. H. Prichard.

Lebbaeus

LEBBAEUS.—The name ‘Lebbaeus’ has completely disappeared from the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ; in the Authorized Version it occurs (Mat_10:3) in the list of the Apostles: ‘Lebbeus, whose surname was Thaddeus.’ [On this spelling see *Scrivener’s Paragraph Bible*, p. lxxxii, note 3]. This is the reading of the Received Text, which is still maintained in the Patriarchal Edition of the Greek Testament (Constantinople, 1904), and supported by most of the Greek Manuscripts, to which was added lately the Palimpsest of Cairo. The modern critical editions are unanimous in the omission of ‘whose surname was,’ but are divided about the name itself, reading either ‘Thaddaeus,’ as Lachmann, Tregelles, WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort’s text.], Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, or ‘Lebbaeus,’ as Alford, Tischendorf, and WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort’s text.] in the margin. The question of reading is here of singular importance; for the name is one of the test passages of textual criticism in the NT. WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort’s text.] (§ 304) adduce the reading ‘Thaddaeus’ found only in $\aleph B$ as proof of the unique excellence of these Manuscripts, and are inclined to attribute the name ‘Lebbaeus’ to an attempt to bring Levi (Mar_2:14) within the number of the Twelve. But if so, why was this attempt not made in Mar_3:18? There ‘Lebbaeus’ is attested only by D [Note: Deuteronomist.] and the Old Latin Manuscripts *a b d f f i q r*, whereas in Mt. D [Note: Deuteronomist.] has the support of at least one Greek minuscule (122), of *k*—the oldest Latin witness, spelt *iebbæus* [the others, *a b g h gat*, read in Mt. ‘Judas Zelotes’]—and of all witnesses for the Textus Receptus. The reading of the latter is apparently a conflation of the name Lebbaeus (Mt.) with the name Thaddaeus (Mk.); while D [Note: Deuteronomist.], as is its custom, assimilated Mk. to Mt. Allen (*Ebi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*] 5032) sees in ‘Lebbaeus’ the ‘Western’ gloss of a copyist, who connected the name Thaddaeus with *thēdâ* = *mamma*, and wished to substitute a not dissimilar name, which should be more appropriate to an Apostle and less undignified.

A trace of the name ‘Lebbaeus’ is also found in the list of the Apostles as given in Tatian’s *Diatessaron* according to Ishodad; but here ‘Lebbaeus’ is inserted between ‘James’ and ‘son of Alphaï,’ and Judas Jacobi is added afterwards (see Zahn’s *Com. on Mt.*, and Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, ii. 270). The Syriac lexicographer Bar Bahlul explained that Judas Thomas was called *Lebbaeus* and *Thaddaeus* on account of his wisdom. Very curious is the testimony of the Manuscripts of the *Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum*. The Manuscripts AB give תאדי דאתקרי הרין וליביום C has ק’ סימן Here וליודם seems to be a combination of ‘Lebbaeus’

and 'Judas,' and יְהוּדָא a confusion of 'Thaddaeus' with 'was surnamed.' In the *ap. Const.* vi. 14, cod. *h* spells Λευαῖος, viii. 25, cod. *d* Λεβαιοῖς; it is a pity that the new edition of Funk does not contain the lists of the Apostles given by de Lagarde, p. 282 f. In *ap. Const.* vii. 46, Judas Jacobi is mentioned as third bishop of Jerusalem. The list of Lag. p. 283, distinguishes Judas Jacobi as the tenth Apostle from Θαδδαῖος ὁ Λεβαιοῖς καὶ Ἰουδᾶς as the eleventh. In the Synaxaries of the Greek Church (1) Judas (in Lk.), 'who is called by Mt. and Mk. Thaddaeus and Lebbaeus,' the brother of Jesus after the flesh, is celebrated on the 19th June, and, together with the other Apostles, on 30th June, as the last of them. From him is distinguished (2) the Apostle Thaddaeus, who is also Lebbaeus, one of the Seventy, celebrated on the 21st August; and (3) Judas Zelotes on the 22nd May.

As supplement to the art. Judas (i. 906), it may be stated that this strange combination 'Judas Zelotes,' mentioned above as the reading of the Old Latin Manuscripts in Mat 10:3, is attested for Rome by the chronographer of the year 334, by the list of the canonical books of the year 382; and for Ravenna by the mosaics of the great Baptistery (5th cent.). From the oldest Manuscripts of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* it would appear that also in the name of the 28th Oct. 'SS. Simon and Jude App. M M. the latter name is not an abbreviation of *Judas Jacobi*, but of *Judas Zelotes*.

The meaning of the name 'Lebbaeus' is equally doubtful. The explanation *corculum* by Jerome (after the surname of Scipio Nasica) is not proved. For relationship with *Levi* the spelling Λευαῖος and Λαβιδ might be adduced, against it the double *bb*. A *l* at the beginning of a name may have the same origin as the *L* in Lulianus = Julianus, Lestus = Justus, etc. J. Lightfoot (*Hor. Heb.* 325) derived 'Lebbaeus' from the home of the man, and so already Ishodad. Josephus (*Ant.* xiii. § 97) mentions a town *Lemba* in Moab, which he calls *Libba* (xiv. 17 [v.l. *Libias*]). Dalman (*Words of Jesus*, 50, *Grammatik*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 178) compares Phoen. [Note: Phœnician.] לבא (CIS [Note: IS *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*.] i. 147), and Sinaitic לבא (Euting, *Sin.* [Note: *Sinaitic*.] *Inschriften*, 421) and denies affinity with *Levi*. Finally, the name Labbu (= Nebo) may be compared in the Syriac *Doctrine of Addai*.

That there was another Judas besides the traitor among the Twelve is attested by Joh 14:22, and it is possible that later his name was less used to avoid remembrance of the traitor and confusion with him, and that his original name 'Judas' was replaced by 'Thaddaeus' in Mk. and by 'Lebbaeus' in Mt. (if this be the true reading for Mt.). In

Act 1:13 we have three names—Joseph, Barsabbas, Justus; in a similar way we should get here three or even four—Judas, son of James, Lebbaeus, Thaddaeus. The testimony of Origen (c. *Cels.* i. 62 [Berlin ed. i. 113]) is rather confused. Against Celsus, who mentioned ‘publicans and sailors’ in the plural among the ten or eleven followers of Jesus, Origen says that by the sailors Celsus may mean the sons of Zebedee; but of publicans there was only Matthew among the Twelve. Even if the publican Λευῆς (so cod. A, Λευῆς P) followed Jesus, yet he was not of the number of the Twelve, εἰ μὴ κατὰ τινα τῶν ἀντιγράφων τοῦ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίου. Did Origen know the reading of D [Note: Deuteronomist.] and its Latin allies in Mk., and identify Lebbaeus with Levi?* [Note: On the reading Θαδδαῖος ὁ ἰκικληθεὶς Δεββαῖος for Mt. see v. Soden, 1. p. 1074, and ib. p. 1313 for the reading of D in Mk. What, according to v. Soden, the true reading in Mt. is we have not been able to discover. The MSS ⲛB represent, according to him (and others), the recension of Hesychius.]

Literature.—See vol. i. pp. 103, 457, 906; and below at end of art. Thaddaeus.

Eb. Nestle.

ⲓ Legion

LEGION (λεγιῶν [λεγεῶν], a loan-word from the Latin *legio*, which meant originally a ‘gathering’ of the citizen army of Rome).—The word ‘legion’ occurs in two contexts in the Gospels. One is in the scene at Gethsemane, when Peter cut off the ear of the high priest’s slave (Mat 26:53); the other occurs in the narrative about the man with the unclean spirit in the country of the Gerasenes (Mar 5:9; Mar 5:15, Luk 8:30; but not in Matthew’s account, which gives two men). In both cases the reference is to the large number of persons who compose a legion: in the one case the legions of angels are at the disposal of Jesus, if He asks for them; in the other the great number of evil spirits can be described only by the name ‘legion.’ The present writer cannot recall any such use of the word ‘legion’ in non-Christian authors. It seems certain also that in the NT the word is not a translation of any Aramaic word. The conclusion is that, if Aramaic is behind the passages where the word occurs, the expression was imported into that language from Greek, and reveals the great impression made on the minds of Orientals by the vast organized unity of the Roman army, with which they had become acquainted since the Roman occupation of Syria by Pompey (b.c. 64-63). At least three and often more (see Hardy’s *Studies in Roman History*, 181 ff.) legions were quartered in that province during the whole of the 1st cent. a.d., and the sight of these magnificent troops, as they marched in column along the great roads of the

country, must have powerfully impressed the natives with the numbers and power of the Roman people. An innumerable number of persons came to be spoken of as a *legion*.

The full strength of a Roman legion was about 6000 men, or about that of a modern infantry division, but the subdivision was different. Instead of brigades, battalions, companies, and sections, there were 10 *cohortes*, each commanded by a *tribunus militum*, 3 *manipuli* in each *cohors*, and 2 *centuriæ* in each *manipulus*. The uniform of all ordinary legionaries was the same. The legion was commanded by a *legatus legionis* (lieutenant-general). See also Band.

Literature.—W. Ramsay, *A Manual of Roman Antiquities*, revised and partly rewritten by R. Lanciani, 15th ed. (London, 1894) ch. xii. (on p. 459 f. there are references to other literature).

Alex. Souter.

⚔️ Legs

LEGS (Joh 19:31 f.).—The breaking of the legs with a heavy club or bar (*σκελοκοπία*, *crurifragium*) was inflicted as a capital punishment on slaves and others who incurred the anger of irresponsible masters (for reff. see Westcott's note). The victim, with legs broken, hands cut off, and otherwise mutilated, was thrown still alive into a pit; often the deathblow was given in some other way ('fractis cruribus occiduntur,' Ammian Marcell. *Hist.* xiv. 9). *Crurifragium* formed no part of crucifixion itself, but was perhaps usually added in Judaea to secure a speedy death, as otherwise those crucified might linger for several days (cf. Lactantius, iv. 26, 'His executioners did not think it necessary to break His bones, *as was their prevailing custom*'). Death would then ensue in one of the following ways—(1) From *shock*; in which case it would be immediate. (2) From *haemorrhage*; such blows given by a heavy bar might cause complete tearing of the skin, producing what is known as 'a compound fracture,' which would speedily result in bleeding to death owing to the tearing of the blood-vessels. This would be especially likely to occur from the upright position in which the victim was suspended. (3) From *gangrene*, which would ensue if neither shock nor haemorrhage were fatal, and would make recovery impossible. Thus the bodies might be removed. Edersheim says (*Life and Times*, ii. 613): 'The breaking of the bones was always followed by a *coup de grâce* by sword, lance, or stroke (the *Perforatio* or *percussio sub alas*), which immediately put an end to what remained of life. Thus the "breaking of the bones" was a sort of increase of punishment by way of compensation for its shortening by the final stroke that followed.' Cf. Quintilian,

‘cruces succiduntur: percussos sepeliri carnifex non vetat.’ But Meyer is of opinion that the addition of a finishing blow by which (and therefore not by *crurifragium* in itself) death was brought about, cannot be shown, and least of all from Joh 19:34. *Crurifragium*, as well as crucifixion, was abolished by Constantine, the first Christian emperor. The Jews did not make their request to Pilate with the desire to intensify the sufferings of Jesus and the robbers, but because only in this way could they have the bodies taken down. They had in view Deu 21:23 (though this law did not refer to crucifixion, a punishment unknown to the Israelites), more especially as they feared the pollution of the coming Sabbath, which was a high day (Joh 19:31).

Jesus being crucified ‘in the midst,’ the soldiers would naturally begin with the robbers who were on either side, and so come last to Him. This is better than Bengel’s explanation (‘cui destinatum crurifragium distulerant, diuturnioris doloris causa’). His legs were not broken as He was already dead, but a soldier gave the spear-thrust to make sure. Thus the type of the Paschal lamb (Exo 12:46, Num 9:12), and the declaration of God’s protection of the righteous (Psa 34:20), were remarkably fulfilled (Joh 19:36); and the sacred body of Christ, which had previously been subjected to insult and abuse, was preserved from the last indignity when once His work was finished. The omission of the *crurifragium* is very important, showing that the executioners were convinced of the reality of the death of Jesus. The Synoptists make no mention of the incident, probably (as Godet) because Jesus Himself was not affected by it and His Person alone was of consequence to them, not those of the two male-factors. Neither would St. John have mentioned it but for the relation of the fact to the prophecy which struck him so forcibly. ‘To understand what John felt at the moment which he here recalls, we must suppose a believing, Jew, familiar with the OT, seeing the soldiers approach who are to break the legs of the three victims. He asks himself anxiously what is to be done to the body of the Messiah, which is still more sacred than the Paschal lamb. And lo, simultaneously and in the most unexpected manner, this body is rescued from the brutal operation which threatened it, and receives the spear-thrust, thereby realizing the spectacle which repentant Israel is one day to behold.’

The so-called *Gospel according to Peter* has a curious perversion of the account, representing the *crurifragium* as omitted not in the case of Jesus, but in that of the penitent robber. ‘One of the malefactors reproached them, saying, We have suffered this for the evils that we have done, but this man having become the Saviour of men, what wrong hath He done to you? And they, being angered at him, commanded that his legs should not be broken, that he might die in torment’ (see Robinson and James, *Gospel and Revelation of Peter*; also the edd. [Note: editions or editors.] by Swete (p. 7) and by the author of *Supern. Rel.* (p. 63)).

Literature.—Neander, *Life of Christ*; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*; Godet, *St. John*; Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, vi. 253; Lipsius, *de Cruce*, ii. 14, iii. 14; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. 94^a.

W. H. Dundas.

☪ Leprosy

LEPROSY (λέπρα, Mar_1:42, Luk_5:12; and λεπρός, [leper] Mat_8:2; Mat_10:8; Mat_11:5; Mat_26:6, Mar_1:40; Mar_14:3, Luk_4:27; Luk_7:22; Luk_17:12).—The name of a disease common in Palestine in the time of Christ, for the cleansing of which many mighty works were performed. The great difficulty in knowing the exact nature of the disease from which the leper suffered lies in the fact that the word ‘leprosy’ is used as the English equivalent of three different foreign words—the Heb. צַרַעַת (*zāráath*), the Gr. λέπρα, and the Gr. ἐλέφας and ἐλεφαντίασις. And the subject is further complicated by the fact that the term last mentioned, *elephantiasis*, is used to-day for a disease of quite another nature from that described under that name by the early Greek medical writers.

(1) צַרַעַת (*zāra'ath*) is the word translation in Authorized and Revised Versions ‘leprosy’; the root meaning is *to smite*. The symptoms of *zāra'ath* are fully described in Leviticus 13, and we have other scattered references to the disease in the OT. To enter into a full examination of OT leprosy would be out of place here, but it may be said that neither true leprosy (in the modern sense) nor any other known disease answers to all the signs described. We must either suppose, as is conceivable but not highly probable, that the disease described in Leviticus 13 has disappeared or greatly changed its character from new environment, or that the term *zāra'ath* included a great variety of skin diseases, some infectious in the modern sense, but all of them regarded in ancient times as rendering their victims ceremonially impure. Of these diseases, to take a few examples, we seem to be able to recognize *psoriasis* in the expression ‘a leper white as snow’; *favus* (a common disease among Eastern Jews to-day) and perhaps ‘ringworm’ in the description of the ‘plague of the head and the beard’ (Lev_13:29-30); and the disease *vitiligo* in the symptom termed ‘freckled spot’ (בִּזְרֵק, Lev_13:39), the exactly equivalent word بَهَق (*bohak*) being used for this condition in Palestine and Arabia to-day. On the other hand, there are in the references to *zāra'ath* an extraordinary absence of the symptoms of true leprosy which will be mentioned lower down; the extremely slow process of this latter disease, and its practically hopeless outlook, ill tallies with either the frequent

examinations—at intervals of seven days—or the elaborate directions, evidently meant for use, for restoration of a cured person to the community.

The history of medicine shows that in the undeveloped state of medical science many diseases which a later age learns to differentiate are classed as one disease; of no department has this been truer than of diseases affecting the skin. In the Middle Ages many persons affected with syphilis were put in the lazar hospitals of Northern Europe through the mistaken idea that they were lepers.

(2) λέπρα (meaning ‘rough’ or ‘scaly’) was the name given by the Greek physicians to a disease known to-day as *psoriasis*. It is a non-contagious, irritating, but by no means fatal disease, in which white scales form on various parts of, and occasionally all over, the body. In such cases the expression ‘a leper white as snow’ might be not inappropriate. The disease is not hereditary nor in any marked degree repulsive, unless, as is unusual, the face is attacked; in this respect it is the very opposite of true leprosy, with which, moreover, it cannot be confused.

In the LXX Septuagint λέπρα is used as the equivalent of *zâra’ath*; and as the former was well known, the translators apparently regarded this disease as the nearest equivalent to that described in the OT. In the same way the Synoptists, and among them Luke, the ‘beloved physician,’ in using λέπρα and λεπρός, were using words which had a definite meaning to the outside world.

(3) True leprosy—the *ἐλεφαντίασις* of the Greeks—is certainly no new disease, and references to it are found in Egyptian inscriptions many centuries before the Israelites left Egypt. It is also said that it was known in India at an equally primitive period. Hippocrates appears to refer to it under the name of the ‘Phœnician disease,’ and Galen under the name ‘elephantiasis.’ It is stated by Pliny that it was brought to Europe from Syria by the army of Ptolemy (61 b.c.). From this time references to it are common, but always under the name *elephantiasis*.

It is evident, therefore, that at the time of the Gospels, λέπρα—in the classical medical sense—was primarily the well-known skin disease *psoriasis*. At the same time it is highly probable that the disease *elephantiasis*—true leprosy—together with other skin affections, *e.g. vitiligo, favus*, etc., were, from the point of view of ceremonial uncleanness, included in the term *lepra*, the word having, as is usual with medical terms, a much wider signification among the lay public than among the medical authors. The fact that tradition has from the earliest period pointed to true leprosy as the disease of the Bible, certainly makes it probable that it at least was one of the

diseases recognized by the Rabbis as *zâra'ath*; and doubtless its specially horrible and fatal character has caused it to gradually displace all others in the popular mind.

It might be thought that Rabbinical commentaries or existing Jewish custom might help to throw a light on the subject, but neither of these is any real help. The Talmud teaches that *zâra'ath* refers to any disease with cutaneous eruptions or sores, and indeed some references appear to demonstrate that the writers considered the disease non-contagious; as, for example, the rule that a bridegroom, suspecting himself affected, might wait till seven days after his marriage before reporting his condition. The Rabbinical comments, instead of correlating the Levitical description with known medical facts, are rather engaged in impressing the importance of a literal adherence to the text of the Mosaic law.

Modern custom among the Jews in the East does not seem to view true leprosy with the aversion of even Moslems and Christians. Of six cases of well-marked leprosy among the Jews of Jerusalem which the present writer can recall, only one of them, a stranger from India, was in any way isolated, and he only after he had been in the English Hospital for some days among all the other patients; when he could no longer be kept he was sent to the Leper Hospital, where he died. The other cases, a Russian Jewess, three Spanish Jewesses, and a Spanish Jewish boy, all lived at home and mixed freely with their friends; the boy, indeed, long after he had marked symptoms of anaesthetic leprosy, continued to attend a large Jewish boys' school without any sign of opposition or trouble. The Eastern Jews, on the other hand, manifest at times great fear of the contagiousness of tuberculous, or as they would popularly be called, 'scrofulous' affections of the skin and of the lymphatic glands. These seem by tradition to be recognized as contagious.

When it is remembered that it is only in very recent years, in the life of the present generation of medical men, that the true nature both of leprosy (*elephantiasis*) and of 'scrofula' has been discovered, it is difficult to believe that the Jews of Palestine, even in NT times, recognized the sharply-defined varieties of disease we do to-day. It is therefore probable that, while the leprosy of the NT certainly included some developments of the disease we now know as *psoriasis* and allied affections with a scaly eruption, and almost certainly a proportion of cases of 'true leprosy,' it may also have included cases of 'lupus,' 'scrofulous' (*i.e.* tuberculous) glands, and varieties of parasitic skin affections, such as 'ringworm' and *favus*, both of which are very common among the Jews of the East to-day.

True leprosy (*elephantiasis*) has for so many centuries been identified with the disease now called by that name, and, indeed, is likely to be for so many generations, that some description of this disease, especially as it occurs to-day in the Holy Land, is here not out of place. It is a disease of world-wide distribution, though apparently

dying out of most European lands, where, as in England and France, it was once rampant. India, China, South Africa, and the Sandwich Islands are to-day the great habitats of leprosy. Climate appears to have no real effect on it. It is not hereditary; the children of lepers, if removed to healthy surroundings at an early age, seldom take the disease, while advance of the disease usually produces sterility. There is no doubt that it is contagious, but only by close personal contact; attendants on lepers run very little risk if they are careful; and they cannot, as was once supposed, carry the contagion to others. Although the almost world-wide custom of isolating lepers is founded upon the doubtful tradition of this being the special and peculiar disease described in the Mosaic law, yet from every point of view this is desirable both for the poor victims themselves, who are always to some degree incapacitated and suffering, and for the sake of their healthy neighbours. Although a leper in the street is no danger to the passer-by, he must in his home be a danger to his family, and no other disease reduces a human being for so many years to such a hideous wreck.

With respect to the ultimate cause of leprosy, Hansen has demonstrated (1871) that it is due to a special micro-organism, the *bacillus lepræ*, similar in appearance, and to some extent in the action on the human tissues, to the tubercle *bacillus*. How the poison enters the body is not known. The disease occurs so sporadically that there must be some cause other than contagion; but what this may be has never been proved. The theory recently revived by Mr. Jonathan Hutchinson, F.R.C.S., that the disease is due to a diet of fish, is not borne out by the facts. In Palestine, in particular, the great majority of the lepers have never eaten fish at all, as they come from inland villages: fish is very seldom eaten by the Moslems in Palestine, and the only people who eat it—the Jews regularly, and the Christians at their fasts when living in the cities—suffer least from this disease.

Leprosy manifests itself in three forms: (1) the tubercular or nodular, (2) the anaesthetic, and (3) the mixed. Chronic cases, however they begin, tend to assume in the later stages the third or mixed type.

(1) In the *tubercular* form, after a prodromal period of indefinite duration during which there is a gradual loss of power and vivacity, obscure pains in the limbs and joints, feverish attacks and loss of appetite, the first definite signs to appear are symmetrical discoloured blotches, especially over the back. These blotches are at the first most marked during feverish attacks. Soon afterwards, definite tubercles, at first pink but later brownish, arise; the skin in these places is thickened and found to be infiltrated. The tubercles have a special tendency to form on the folds of the cheek, the nose, the lips, and the forehead. At this time some amount of ulceration about the soft palate often assists the diagnosis. The nodules enlarge and from time to time ulcerate and become encrusted with discharge. In cases where the face is particularly attacked the expression is entirely altered, and a most characteristic 'lion-like' or

'satyr-like' expression is developed. The *leontiasis* of Aretaeus and the *satyriasis* (= *satyriasis*) of Aristotle (*de Gen. [Note: Geneva NT 1557, Bible 1560.] Animal. iv. iii. 22*) are both supposed on these grounds to have been true leprosy. As a rule the eyebrows fall out, and the eyes, in addition to suffering from *keratitis*, become staring in appearance through scarring about the eyelids. The voice is often hoarse, and the breathing loud and wheezing through ulceration of the vocal chords. The hands and feet, sometimes the first to suffer, always in time become ulcerated, though the most severe changes in them are probably secondary to nerve lesions. The disease from first to last has an average duration of nine years; if it runs its full course and is not terminated, as is usual, by the onset of tuberculosis, it leads to gradual mental decay, coma, and death.

(2) The *anaesthetic* variety, if not complicated, is not nearly so horrible nor so fatal. Here the incidence of the disease falls on the nerve trunks, which may quite early in the disease be felt thickened from inflammation due to bacterial infection. The prodromal symptoms are similar to those described, but the onset of the disease is often not remarked until the patient finds that certain parts of the body are without sensation. Thus it is narrated of Father Damien that, although he had vague symptoms which made him suspicious, he was not convinced that he was a leper until he found he had placed his feet in scalding water without feeling the heat. As the disease progresses, the nerve lesions cause various discoloured patches and blisters on the skin, wasting of muscles and contraction of the tendons, a peculiar claw-like appearance of the hands,—the result of partial paralysis,—disfigurement of the nails, deep chronic ulceration of the foot, and finally progressive loss of various fingers and toes, and even of the feet and occasionally of the hands. Many of these later changes also occur in the tubercular form as the nerves become affected. An anaesthetic case which keeps to this type may last 20, 30, or even more years, and some such cases become 'cured,' that is, the disease actually ceases to progress, though the results of its work can never be remedied.

(3) In Palestine, as has been already suggested, the great majority of cases are of the *mixed* form; cases of pure anaesthetic type are exceptional.

Leprosy in modern Palestine is not a common disease, but is prominently to the front from three causes: firstly, because of the interest excited in Christians of all Churches, and the special appeal made to their charitable feelings from the traditional view that these sufferers are the veritable lepers of the OT and NT; secondly, because its results are so manifest and repulsive, and its progress so slow, that a comparatively small number of cases are very much in evidence; and, lastly, because practically all the lepers in the land are segregated together by order of the Government in a few chief towns, all resorted to by travellers. There the lepers, being unable to work for a living, sit in groups in prominent places, and endeavour by

an exhibition of the miseries of their condition to touch the sympathy of the passer-by. In Jerusalem, at any rate, they collect in this way large sums for their community. They live in huts provided by the Government at Silwân (near Jerusalem), Ramleh, and Nâblus. At Damascus also there is a community, some members of which are also drawn from Palestine, but the majority from Syria and around Damascus; the traditional 'House of Naaman' is their home. In addition to these, there is the voluntary community—now numbering nearly 60—at the excellent Moravian Hospital in Jerusalem; the patients there are not allowed to go begging, and are employed in various ways on the premises. Including these last, there must be between 100 and 120 lepers in Jerusalem, some 25 at Ramleh, about 40 at Nâblus; altogether, allowing for some Palestine lepers in the Damascus community, there are not more than 200 known victims of this disease in the country. It is quite possible that sometimes cases may be hidden away, as with the Jewish cases above mentioned, by their relatives; but this cannot often happen in the villages, as the village sheikhs are very prompt in detecting early signs of the disease, and a suspected case is soon expelled from the community. Sometimes the heads of the village make mistakes; cases of this sort have come to the medical officer of the Leper Hospital in Jerusalem, and their friends learning that they have been mistaken, they have been restored to their rights.

It has been mentioned that one of the striking things about leprosy is that it occurs so sporadically. It is not the rule in Palestine, at any rate, that whole villages or families become leprosy, but a case arises here and there. To illustrate this, we give a list of villages from which came some 60 cases that were in the Moravian Hospital during 1903. They are as follows:—From Ramallah and 'Ain Arîk, 3 cases each; from Zeta, Bait Ammar, Nahalîn, Saidna Ali, ed-Dîr, Deir Diwân, and Nazareth, 2 cases each; from Abu Dîs, 'Ain Kairem, Bîr Zait, Bait Ummar, Bait Jebrîn, Bettîr, Beita, Biddu, Bait Hanîna, Bait Jala, Bait Safafa, 'Asîreh, Dûra, Jerusalem, Feddar, Yasîneh, 'Allâr, Mesar'a, Fara'un, Marassa, Kefrenji, Kefr Akâb, Kefr Hâris, Shafât, es-Salt, and Jummain, 1 each. In addition there were 3 Bedawîn from scattered tribes, one gipsy, one case from Mosul, and two from Greece. Any one who will consult a map of modern Palestine will appreciate from how wide an area, both W. and E. of the Jordan, these cases come. Probably there is no district that does not furnish cases at some time.

The only kind of treatment that can alleviate the disease is a well-managed Leper Home. In the Jerusalem Leper Hospital (founded in 1867 and formally taken over by the Moravian Brethren in 1881) all that medical science and Christian kindness can accomplish is done.

Leprosy in the Gospels.—It has been often pointed out that, whereas the cure of disease in general is called 'healing', (*ἰᾶσθαι*), that of the lepers is called 'cleansing' (

καθαρίζειν). This was, no doubt, appropriate on account of the very evident restoration of cleanness of skin, but primarily because the miracle enabled the leper to become ceremonially clean. Doubtless the lepers drifting about the land had intractable skin diseases, and as they were shut out from the temple, the synagogues, certainly in all the towns, and to a large extent from the social life of their fellow-beings, their lot was truly pitiable. Their 'cleansing' meant much more than getting rid of a disagreeable and often, doubtless, painful disease, repulsive to all their fellow-men; it meant restoration to the worship and service of God.

Of lepers mentioned in the NT we have but one named, Simon of Bethany (Mat_26:6, Mar_14:3), probably a grateful recipient of the Saviour's mercy. Tradition has made the Lazarus of the parable a leper, and the terms *lazzaro* for leper and *lazar-house* for leper hospital were a result of this. Also the order of the Knights of Lazarus, founded during the Crusades, made the care of lepers one of their special duties, and they had always a leper as their Grand Master. But though Lazarus was 'full of sores,' the very account in the parable that he lay in such intimate contact with passers-by would, apart from the express omission of the statement in the parable, make his being a leper highly improbable.

In spite of the great prominence given to the cleansing of lepers both in Jesus' account of His own works (Mat_11:5, Luk_7:22) and in His directions to His disciples (Mat_10:8), we have only two actual incidents described. (1) The incident of the man whom Jesus touched, with the words, 'I will, be thou clean,' and whose grateful excess of zeal prevented Jesus from entering that 'certain city,' and drove Him to seek seclusion in the wilderness (Mat_8:2 || Mar_1:42 || Luk_5:12). (2) The story of the nine thankless lepers and the grateful tenth, who was a Samaritan (Luk_17:11 ff.). It is noticeable that he turned back because he was healed (ἰᾶσθαι); but he was not yet finally cleansed (καθαρίζειν), because he had not yet been to the priest; unless, indeed, it is because he was a Samaritan that he is spoken of as healed rather than cleansed.

Literature.—This is enormous. Here only a selection of modern articles in English is given, which will furnish all necessary information and references for following up the subject:—P. S. Abraham, art. 'Leprosy' in Allbutt's *System of Medicine*, ii. 41; J. R. Bennett, *Diseases of the Bible*, R.T.S. 1887; T. Chaplin, 'Diseases of the Bible,' *Proceedings of Victoria Institute*, vol. xxxiv.; C. V. Carter, *Leprosy and Elephantiasis*, 1874; Hansen and Looft, *Leprosy in its Clinical and Pathological Aspects*, 1895; A. Macalister, art. 'Leprosy' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible; do. by C. Creighton in *EBi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*]; Report of the Leprosy Commission to India, 1893; A. S. Waldstein, art. 'Leprosy' in *Jewish Encyclopedia*. On the moral aspects of

leprosy in NT, see Edersheim, *Life and Times*, i. 491 ff.; *Expositor*, iv. vi. [1892] 443 ff.

E. W. G. Masterman.

⚠️ Letters

LETTERS.—The word γράμματα (Joh 7:15) may be intended to indicate literature in general, as it might do in Act 26:24. But to the ordinary Jew γρ. were practically constituted exclusively by the Sacred Scriptures, certain esteemed Apocryphal books, and the Rabbinical commentaries upon them. The surprise of the question recorded in the reference suggests consideration of the amount of human learning Jesus possessed.

With the rudiments of the Law every Jew was made thoroughly and intimately conversant from his earliest intelligent years (see Education). The education of the Jewish child had the primary purpose of enabling him to read the passages which it was essential for him to know for the proper discharge of his religious duties. Beyond this elementary knowledge comparatively few carried their studies. It was, indeed, the ideal of Judaism that every Israelite should have a professional acquaintance with the Law in its details. But only a small fraction attended the schools of the scribes at which advanced instruction was given in its more recondite matters and the commentaries upon them contained in the Midrash and other Rabbinic books. It would seem from the surprise-expressed in this question that Jesus had not prosecuted such studies, at least in the recognized schools, whether from disinclination or from poverty which prevented Him from paying the fees exacted in spite of the understanding that such instruction should be gratuitous. There are convincing indications, however, that Jesus was to some extent familiar with the literature studied in the schools, both from His direct reference to passages contained in it, and from striking parallelisms in language and thought between various sayings of His and maxims of uncanonical books such as Sirach and the Wisdom of Solomon.* [Note: With Mat 6:7, cf. Sir 7:14; Mat 6:14 (Mar 11:26), cf. Sir 28:2-4; Mat 6:20, cf. Sir 29:11; Mat 7:1-2, cf. Sir 31:15; Mat 19:12, cf. Wis 3:14; Mat 27:43; Mat 27:55, cf. Wis 2:16 to Wis 18:20; Mar 9:44, cf. Sir 7:17; Luk 11:41, cf. Sir 3:30; Luk 12:16-20, cf. Sir 5:1; Sir 11:18-19; Joh 17:19, cf. Sir 36:4.] He is also evidently acquainted with the kind of teaching supplied by the scribes. In the apocryphal Gospel of the Infancy, Jesus is credited with an intimate and astounding acquaintance with 'learning,' partly derived from the reading of books. The bestowal of the title 'Rabbi' upon Him implies that, though not having studied after the usual manner, He was

recognized to possess learning. But He Himself in His reply accepts the implication of the question that His teaching was not derived from any human source, but was the immediate communication from His heavenly Father. See also Learning.

A. Mitchell Hunter.

Levelling

LEVELLING.—1. In mountainous countries like Palestine landslips are not uncommon, and in this way roads are blocked, or obstructed by falling *débris*. The drenching rains loosen the stones on the hillsides and send them rolling down to the plains, and the swollen burns and torrents cut new channels for themselves, and dam up old ones, so that familiar paths not infrequently become obliterated. Besides that, the farmers in some places are in the habit of gathering the stones from the fields and throwing them out on the highway, thus making the roads both dangerous and uncomfortable for travellers. It was needful, therefore, to have the roads restored by removing the obstacles and filling up the inequalities. When a sovereign rode forth, a company always went before him to clear the way: hence, ‘Prepare ye the way of the people: cast up, cast up the highway: gather out the stones’ ([Isa 62:10](#)), and, ‘A voice crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight’ ([Mat 3:3](#), adapted from [Isa 40:3](#)). When Ibrahim Pasha proposed to visit certain places in Lebanon, the emirs and sheikhs sent out a general proclamation commanding the people to prepare the way. The same took place in 1845 when the Sultan visited Brusa.

2. Of the Temple, Jesus said, ‘There shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down’ ([Mat 24:2](#), [Mar 13:2](#), [Luk 21:6](#)). This prophecy was fulfilled when the Temple was destroyed in 70 a.d. With the levelling of the sacred building to the ground there came an end to the Ceremonial Law so long cherished by the Jews, and this paved the way for a wider acceptance of the gospel of Christ ([Rom 5:12](#), [1Co 3:23](#)).

R. Leggat.

Levi

LEVI.—1. The name occurs twice in our Lord’s genealogy ([Luk 3:24](#); [Luk 3:29](#)). 2. See Levites and Priest. 3. See Matthew.

Levirate Law

LEVIRATE LAW (Lat. *levir*, 'a husband's brother') regulated the marriage of a man with his dead brother's widow. In the story of Tamar and Judah (Genesis 38) there is record of a marriage of this type, and at certain stages of civilization the Levirate marriage was a widespread custom.† [Note: Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, London, 1891, pp. 510-514.] Among the Jews the law was laid down that 'if brethren dwell together, and one of them die, and have no child (son), the wife of the dead shall not marry without unto a stranger: her husband's brother ... shall take her to him to wife' (Deu_25:5). It almost seems, however, that the Levirate custom was not permitted by later legislation (Lev_18:16; Lev_20:21); but it has been suggested (1) that the forbidden marriage of that legislation was one between a man and the wife of his living brother;* [Note: Note to Deu_25:5 ff. in Steuernagel, 'Deuteronomium und Josua' (Nowack's Hdkom. zum AT, Göttingen, 1900).] and (2) that the custom consecrated in Dt. was the exception to the general law set forth in Leviticus.† [Note: Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. 285; note to Lev_18:16 in Dillmann, *Exodus und Leviticus*, Leipzig, 1897.] The object of the Levirate marriage (Deu_25:6) was to secure that the firstborn of the new union should succeed in the name of the dead brother, whose name thereby might not be blotted out from Israel. In the earlier ages of Judaism there was no clear conception of personal immortality; and the Levirate law was doubtless framed so that there might be the survival through posterity of the name of the representative of a family.

For the statement of a problem regarding the resurrection, propounded to Jesus (Mat_22:23-33, Mar_12:18-27, Luk_20:27-38), the Levirate law was used by the Sadducees, who are described by the Synoptists as saying that there is no resurrection, and by Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. i. 4) as holding 'that souls die with the bodies.' Regarding as obligatory only those observances which are found in the written word, they rejected those derived from the traditions of their forefathers. The Pharisees, on the other hand, accepted such traditions, and with them a belief in the doctrine of the resurrection (cf. Josephus *Ant.* xiii. x. 6). This doctrine, taught clearly in Daniel 12, was made popular in Jewish theological discussions by the Book of Enoch,‡ [Note: Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, p. 52 (Oxford, 1893).] and suggested the problem set forth by the Sadducees, who evidently sought by the authority of Moses to discredit a doctrine held by the Pharisees and taught by Jesus. In stating their problem they brought forward a case of seven brothers who one after the other married the same woman. It is not necessary to take the case as one of actual fact, since the phrase $\pi\alpha\theta\omicron\ \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ in Mt. may have been used merely for literary effect.

In each of the Synoptics the setting forth of the problem is prefaced by a statement of the Levirate law as spoken or written by Moses (Mt. has Μωϋσῆς εἶπε, but in Mk. and Lk. it is Μωϋσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν). In none of the three statements are the *ipsissima verba* of Deu_25:5 used, and Mt. borrows the words ἐπιγαμβρεύσει καὶ ἀναστήσει σπέρμα from the LXX Septuagint version of Gen_38:8.

The problem propounded by the Sadducees may be thus stated:—The Levirate law was enacted by Moses, and there was a case of seven brothers who in obedience to it married, one after the other, the same woman, who herself died after the death of the last of the seven. In the resurrection, since they all had her, whose wife shall she be of the seven? Jesus in His answer to the Sadducees did not discuss the justice or injustice of the Levirate law, or examine the purpose of Moses in decreeing it; but, asserting that they had erred, not knowing the Scriptures or the power of God, He showed them that in the resurrection men neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven; and then He proceeded to declare that belief in immortality is involved in our consciousness of the being of God.

J. Herkless.

Levites

LEVITES.—According to one line of tradition, the Levites were appointed to assist the priests (Num_3:9; Num_8:19; Num_18:1-6), but were not themselves, like Aaron and his sons, to approach unto the most holy things (Num_4:19); yet according to another representation the priesthood belonged to them as an inheritance (Deu_33:8-11, Jos_18:7). Whatever may have been the origin and date of the distinction between priest and Levite, it existed in the post-exilic period, since it was recognized in NT times. The Levites are to be classed among the Temple officials, and to their office with its specific duties (Num_1:50-51; Num_3:8) they were formally set apart (Num_8:6-7). Among their duties was the instruction of the people* [Note: Schürer, HJP ii. i. 306 ff.] (Neh_8:9, 2Ch_30:22; 2Ch_35:3) and ‘the killing of the passovers for every one that was not clean,’ as also the handing of the blood to the priests to be sprinkled by them according to the Law† [Note: Keim, Jesus of Nazara, v. 276.] (2Ch_30:16-17).

The relation of assistantship which associated the Levites with the priests was similar to that which connected deacons with bishops in the Christian Church; and it is not improbable that that connexion was suggested by the arrangement of the functions of

the Temple officers with which the Jewish converts to Christianity were familiar.‡
[Note: Hatch, *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches*, 52.]

In the Gospels there are only two places where the word 'Levite' is found. In the first of these, the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luk_10:30-35), a priest and a Levite, representatives of the religion of Israel and at the same time examples of Jewish traditionalism, are unfavourably contrasted with a Samaritan, one of a people with whom the Jews had no dealings. The parable is the answer of Jesus to the lawyer who asked, 'Who is my neighbour?' and it seems evident that the Levite, described by Jesus, when he looked on the wounded man and passed by on the other side, recognized that he was not a Jew, and therefore not a neighbour to be humanely treated according to the commandment, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself' (Lev_19:18). The Levite, it may be concluded, accepted a Jewish traditional conception of 'neighbour' which excluded all those who were not of Israel. Clement of Alexandria wrote that Jesus, 'on His interlocutor inquiring, "Who is my neighbour?" did not, in the same way with the Jews, specify the blood-relation, or the fellow-citizen, or the proselyte, or him that had been similarly circumcised, or the man who uses one and the same law.'§ [Note: *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, xxii. 205.]

In the Fourth Gospel (Joh_1:19) the distinction between priest and Levite is made by naming together the representatives of these classes, who were sent from Jerusalem to ask John the question, 'Who art thou?' The Levites, as teachers of the people, would be deemed qualified to judge of claims of Messiahship (so Hengstenberg and Godet, but see B. Weiss, *ad loc.*); but it is significant that the mission to John of priests and Levites, who were officially connected with the Passover ceremonies, is recorded, and in it alone, in the Gospel which, according to the theory held by many critics, identifies Christ with the Paschal lamb. They were told by John that he was not the Christ; and immediately after the account of their interview with him there is the statement that he, seeing Jesus, said, 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world' (Joh_1:29).

Literature.—Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. i. 223 ff., 265 ff.; Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, ii. 408; Kautzsch, *Lit. of the OT*, 90, 117; Schultz, *OT Theology*, i. 337; K. Budde, *Rel. of Israel to the Exile*, 80; and the art. 'Priests and Levites' by Baudissin in *Hastings' DB*. [Note: *Dictionary of the Bible.*]

J. Herkless.

LIBERALITY.—1. This may be considered to begin when the requirements of the Law have been fulfilled. Thus the payment of tithe, which in our Lord's time was evidently regarded as an ideal (cf. Luk 18:12), cannot be described as liberality, though it seems certain that many of the wealthier among the 'dispersed' regarded it as a duty to send, by way of Temple tribute, generous and even munificent contributions, far in excess of the legal requirement. These were collected at different centres abroad, and then sent by certain specially appointed 'ambassadors' to Jerusalem, where they were placed in three large chests within the Temple, which were opened with great solemnity at certain seasons of the year. Apart from the Temple tribute, the treasury was enriched by voluntary offerings of different kinds; and out of this grew the abuse which our Lord denounces in Mat 15:5-6. It seems probable that the faithful rarely visited the Temple, at least on Sabbaths and feasts, without making some contribution to its revenues. Though votive offerings cannot be regarded, strictly speaking, as instances of liberality, and led to abuses against which the more devout Rabbis protested, the motives which prompted them may not infrequently have been generous and sincere.

In the Court of the Women, within the Temple, were the *shopharoth*, or 'trumpets,' vessels whose shape is indicated by their name, in which contributions for religious purposes and for charitable objects might be placed. The contents of these were at fixed times placed in the treasury; and in addition to these there was a chamber where donations to be applied to the maintenance and education of poor children might be given. There is reason to believe that, whatever the motives in individual cases might be, there was a constant flow of liberality through these channels (cf. Mar 12:41, Luk 21:1). On the wealth of the Temple treasury and the pious purposes for which it was partly intended, cf. 2Ma 3:6; 2Ma 3:10. Whatever may have been the greedy and grasping spirit of the Pharisees, whose extortions our Lord denounces (Mat 23:14), it is probable that the Deuteronomic precept (Deu 15:7-11) received a generous fulfilment among all classes.

2. Christ's teaching as to liberality.—(a) Of mind. The whole life and teaching of Christ may be regarded as a protest against prejudice and narrow-mindedness, and therefore as an appeal for liberality. His injunctions to love enemies (Mat 5:44-46, Luk 6:27-28), to refrain from passing judgment on others (Mat 7:1-5, Luk 6:37), and indirectly, the parable of the Good Samaritan, afford instances in which He condemns the spirit of prejudice and inculcates an open mind and generous bearing towards others.

(b) In the use of wealth, etc. The claim to which no follower of Christ is to turn a deaf ear is that of *need*. Need, as evidenced by asking, is a sufficient ground for giving (Mat 5:42). The *measure* of our giving is to be in proportion to the extent of our own blessing (Luk 11:41; Luk 12:33), and although the command 'Freely ye have received,

freely give' (Mat_10:8) was spoken with reference to the use of the miraculous powers given to the disciples, we cannot doubt that it extends also to all endowments of wealth or talents wherewith God has blessed us. Liberality in the form of almsgiving is to be *without ostentation* (Mat_6:1-2; Mat_6:4); its *reward* is the heavenly treasure 'that faileth not' (Luk_12:33), and a generous return, here or hereafter, for the right use of wealth (Luk_6:38; Luk_16:9). The complete bestowal of earthly possessions on the poor, accompanied by 'taking up the cross' and following Christ, which is required of the rich young ruler in addition to the observance of the commandments (Mat_19:21, Mar_10:21, Luk_18:22), is not necessarily a rule of universal obligation, but evidently intended to meet this special case; underlying it is the idea, never absent from our Lord's teaching as to the use of wealth, that wealth is a trust from God, and to be renounced when it becomes a hindrance to spiritual life. While liberality is assured of a reward, the reward, or even return, is not to be the object of the giver (Luk_6:35, where μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες may be 'hoping for nothing again,' as in Authorized Version ; or 'never despairing,' as in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ; or, if read μηδένα, 'driving no one to despair,' or 'despairing of no man,' as in (Revised Version margin)).* [Note: One of the few sayings of our Lord quoted outside the Gospels commends liberality (Act_20:35).]

There are three utterances of our Lord with reference to liberality to the Temple and the purposes connected therewith. The gift is to be brought to the altar only after reconciliation to an offended brother (Mat_5:23-24); outward liberality being thus shown to be unacceptable to God unless the heart be filled with the spirit of love. Natural duties are not to be set aside by a liberality which becomes sinful (Mat_15:5) in devoting to the Temple what ought to be given to the support of parents. The teaching of the incident of the widow's two mites is best summed up in the words of Ambrose: 'It is not considered how much is given, but how much remains behind.' The answer of John the Baptist (Luk_3:11) may be quoted as in accordance with the teaching of our Lord: liberality is here shown to be an evidence of repentance, and a practical testimony to a change of heart. See also artt. Almsgiving, Giving.

Literature.—J. O. Dykes, *Manifesto of the King*, 351; J. LI. Davies, *Spiritual Apprehension*, 244; S. Cox, *Biblical Expositions*, 195; W. M. Sinclair, *Christ and our Times*, 279; W. Dickie, *Culture of the Spiritual Life*, 183; Edersheim, *The Temple: Its Ministry and Services*; works on Jewish Antiquq.; the Comm. *in loc*.

S. J. Ramsay Sibbald.

LIBERTY.—Christ and His first disciples clearly regarded liberty as an essential of the highest religious life. He begins His mission at Nazareth with the words of Isaiah that His work was ‘to set at liberty them that are bruised’ (Luk 4:18). By His contrast of the Mosaic law with His own ‘I say unto you’ of Mat 5:22; Mat 5:28; Mat 5:39, He declares His disciples to be free of the ancient law; their worship no longer fettered by place (Joh 4:21); their very Sabbath, which had held them together in the Captivity, an institution to be sanely used for any kind of good work and any sinless pleasure (Mar 2:27, Mat 12:8, Luk 5:1-5). New wine-skins must be made for the new wine (Mar 2:22, Luk 6:38). The disciple must hold himself entirely at liberty from the things of the world for the world’s sake; he must stand ‘with loins girded about and lamp burning’ (Luk 12:35), unhindered by multitudinous possessions (Luk 12:15), not anxious as to the lesser matters of clothing, food, and shelter (Mat 6:25, Luk 12:22), taking ‘no bread, no wallet, no money,’ whereon he may come to depend too much (Luk 9:3; Luk 10:4, Mat 10:9, Mar 6:8). If the rich young man would be perfect, he must learn to be the free master of his riches, not their slave, even though he may have entirely to disperse them in order to assure himself of his spiritual liberty (Mat 19:21, Luk 18:22). In all things the disciple must be absolutely free for his mission, and ‘leave the dead to bury their own dead’ (Mat 8:22, Luk 9:60). His utterance itself must partake of the same liberty, not crippled by the slow movement of the intellectual faculties, but made vivid by immediate contact with the Holy Spirit: ‘Settle it therefore in your hearts not to meditate beforehand how to answer’ (Luk 21:14, Mar 13:11, Mat 10:19). Christ promises that the disciple who prizes His word shall come to know the greater fulness of truth, and that revelation shall liberate him; he shall no longer be a bond-servant of sin (it would be impossible, having once seen the light); he shall be free with all the liberties of sonship (Joh 8:32; Joh 8:34-36).

Jesus Himself exhibits the surprises which the ‘law of liberty’ (Jam 1:25) has within it. He tells of the master who, finding his servants alert and faithful, flings conventionality to the winds, ‘girds himself, makes them sit down to meat, and himself serves them’ (Luk 12:37). He tells His host that it were a higher thing to dare to invite, not his relatives and wealthy friends, but the poor, the lame, the blind, who could never recompense him (Luk 14:12). In dealing with the woman taken in sin,* [Note: Although no part of the correct text of John 8, the Pericope Adulteræ probably embodies a true reminiscence of an incident in our Lord’s ministry.] He takes the course of the moment, as novel as it is searching in its free way (Joh 8:1-11). The cruse of precious ointment is looked at as the symbol of an affectionate impulse, more to be valued than a calculated act of philanthropy—selling and giving to the poor (Mar 14:5, Mat 26:6-12, Joh 12:5). Pharisees are startled at His frank intercourse with publicans and sinners (Mar 2:16, Luk 5:30; Luk 15:2). In vain He likens the liberty of the Spirit to the wind ‘that bloweth where it listeth’ (Joh 3:8); few can understand the variety of the workings of the Divine Spirit in man, Wisdom

only being justified by 'all her children' (Mar 11:19, Luk 7:35), to the confusion often of those who cannot comprehend a John the Baptist abstaining and the Son of man 'eating and drinking.' There are times when Christ seems deliberately to lead His hearers, and especially the formalists among them, into problems that find no solution in 'the Law,' but that compel an exercise of liberty of judgment, as in the 'Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's' (Luk 20:25, Mat 22:21), 'the baptism of John, was it from heaven, or of men?' (Luk 20:4), and the question, 'Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath day, or not?' (Mar 3:4, Luk 6:9; Luk 14:3). The principle of true liberty, as our Lord taught and lived it, would go far in encouraging the believers in 'the reunion of Christendom,' especially such a command as 'Forbid him not: for he that is not against you is for you' (Luk 9:50).

That the Apostles so understood Christ can hardly be questioned. Throughout the NT liberty (*ἐλευθερία*, and its even more confident form *ἐξουσία*) runs as a golden thread, distinguishing the New Dispensation from the Old. There is the same joyous exercise of the power of a new life that Christ foretold. The writers have met one of the deepest problems of philosophy (man's freedom of will), and have boldly pronounced upon it. St. Paul has no hesitation in asserting man's natural liberty in the light of the spiritual liberty now made known through Jesus Christ. He claims the right (*ἐξουσία*) of free action in the common affairs of life, in food, in marriage, in the pastor not necessarily labouring manually, but sharing in material provision in return for his spiritual toiling (1Co 9:4-6; 1Co 9:12 bis), just as St. John will claim for the purified soul the same liberty (*ἐξουσία*) of approach to the tree of life and entry by the portals of the eternal city (Rev 22:14). Perhaps this particular word is most suggestively used in 1Co 8:9 'Take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling-block to the weak,' *i.e.* lest the very strength and assurance of the new-found liberty may lead you to flourish it boastfully, thus courting temptation yourself, and perhaps ruining the weaker brethren, who, seeing you able to join in certain practices unharmed, will be tempted to copy you, to their own hurt. It is clear that in the first days liberty was fundamental with the Christian. Each man has to 'work out his own salvation' (Php 2:12), to be 'fully assured in his own mind,' to 'give account of himself to God' (Rom 14:5; Rom 14:12). Christians are the free citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem, children of liberty (Gal 4:26). For abiding freedom did Christ set them free (Gal 5:1), calling them into liberty (Gal 5:13). Henceforth no Mosaic veil of past traditions, laws, rites, can bind them. When Moses is read, it shall be with no hindering timidities (2Co 3:15 ff.) of the letter, but in the reverent freedom of the spirit (2Co 3:6-8). The disciple feels himself freed from that yoke 'which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear' (Act 15:10). The Law has but led into a larger world, in which is prized 'the liberty which we have in Christ Jesus' (Gal 3:24; Gal 2:4). The escape has been from the bondage of a religion of fear into the liberty

of a faith that discerns in God the Eternal Fatherhood (Rom_8:15). So St. Paul prays that the word may have ‘free course,’ may run (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) (τρεχῆν), spreading the gospel abroad with a free unhindered spirit (2Th_3:1), and leaving each worker to develop his own methods (1Co_9:1) and rules of conduct—‘Why is my liberty judged by another man’s conscience?’ (10:29). But this does not imply licence. That his liberty is Christian implies a limitation. He is to be ‘as free, yet not using his liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the bond-servant of God’ (1Pe_2:16), having no part with those worldly ones so ready in ‘promising liberty while they themselves are bond-servants of corruption’ (2Pe_2:19). He knows that he will be judged in his speech and conduct by the law of liberty which has taken the place of the ancient law (Jam_2:12). Being made free from sin he is still a servant, but of righteousness, a ‘servant to God’ (Rom_6:18; Rom_6:20; Rom_6:22), and from the ‘bondage of corruption’ has entered into the ‘liberty of the glory of the children of God’ (Rom_8:21). This liberty has been the exchange of a hateful for a precious bondage. If you were actually a slave, you are now ‘the Lord’s freedman,’ if you were free, you are now ‘Christ’s bond-servant’ (1Co_7:21-22), and that service is the ministry of the brethren, a bondage into which St. Paul boasts and glories that he had brought himself (1Co_9:19). He has found a new law in place of the ancient prohibitory ‘law of sin and of death,’ and this ‘law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus’ has made him free (Rom_8:2). The practical comment of the Apostles upon this doctrine of the Gospels indicates also the immeasurable indebtedness of Christianity to that principle of liberty with which Christ inspired His disciples.* [Note: The various terms used, and the many English equivalents, will be found fully treated in Hastings’ DB, artt. ‘Free,’ ‘Freedom,’ etc.]

See also artt. Free Will and Necessity.

Edgar Daplyn.

☩ Lie, Lying

LIE, LYING.—See Deceit.

☩ Life

LIFE (ζωή).—The term applied by Jesus, alike in the Synoptic and the Johannine records of His teaching, to the supreme blessing mediated by Him to men. Certain

elements in the conception are common to the two records, but their differences are so marked that it will be necessary to consider them separately.

1. *The idea of Life in the Synoptic teaching* is substantially that of the OT, unfolded in all its potential wealth of meaning. Hebrew thought, averse to metaphysical speculation, conceived of life as the sum of energies which make up man's actual existence. The soul separated from the body did not cease to be, but it forfeited its portion in the true life. It either departed to the shadowy world of Sheol, or, according to the later view of Ecclesiastes, was reabsorbed (?) into the Divine Being,—'returned to God who gave it' (Ecc_12:7). Thus the highest good was simply 'length of days,'—the continuance of the bodily existence right on to its natural term. Two factors, however, were latent in the OT conception from the beginning, and became more and more prominent in the course of the after-development. (1) The radical element in life is activity. Mere physical being is distinguished from that essential 'life' which consists in the unrestricted play of all the energies, especially of the higher and more characteristic. In the loftier passages of the Psalms, more particularly, the idea of 'life' has almost always a pregnant sense. It is associated with joy, peace, prosperity, wisdom, righteousness; man 'lives' according as he has free scope for the activities which are distinctive of his spiritual nature. God Himself is emphatically the 'living One,' as contrasted with men in their limitation and helplessness. (2) Since God alone possesses life in the highest sense, fellowship with Him is the one condition on which men can obtain it. 'By every word of God doth man live' (Deu_8:3). 'With thee is the fountain of life' (Psa_36:9). In the higher regions of OT thought, life and communion with God are interchangeable ideas. The belief in immortality is never expressly stated, but, as Jesus Himself indicates, it was implicit in this conception of a God who was not the God of the dead but of the living. See art. Living.

Jesus accepted the idea of life as it had come to Him through the OT. To Him also life is primarily the physical existence (cf. Mat_6:25 'Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat and drink,' etc.), and He advances on this conception along ethical and religious lines, in the same manner as the Psalmists and Prophets. (1) He distinguishes between the essential 'life' and the outward subsidiary things with which it is so easily confused. 'The life is more than meat' (Luk_12:23). 'A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth' (v. 15). 'What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his life?' (Mar_8:36). (2) Thus He arrives at the idea of something central and inalienable which constitutes the reality of life. This He discovers in the moral activity. The body with its manifold faculties is only the organ by which man accomplishes his true task of obedience to God. Meat, raiment, and all the rest are necessary, 'but seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness.' (3) In this way He is led to the conception of a higher, spiritual life, gained through the sacrifice of the lower. 'If a man hate not his own life, he cannot

be my disciple' (Luk 14:26). 'He that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it' (Mat 10:39; Mat 16:25).

Here, however, we become aware of the difficulty which meets us under different forms throughout our Lord's teaching. In His account of the supreme blessing for which lower things must be sacrificed, He seems to pass abruptly from ethical to eschatological ideas. 'Life' is a reward laid up for the righteous in the world to come. It is regarded sometimes as a new state of being (Mat 25:46), sometimes as a sort of prize that can be bestowed in the same manner as houses and goods and lands (Mar 10:30). The precise meaning to be attached to 'the world to come' in which this 'life' will be imparted, depends on our interpretation of the general conception of the Kingdom of God. Our Lord would appear to waver between the idea of a world beyond death and that of a Messianic **age** or **aeon**, apocalyptically revealed on earth. In either case, however, He thinks of 'life' as of something still in the future, the peculiar blessing of the realized Kingdom of God.

This future possession is defined more particularly in several passages as 'eternal life,' and the epithet might appear at first sight to imply a distinction. We find, however, on closer examination that the term 'life' itself usually involves the emphatic meaning. 'This do and thou shalt live' (Luk 10:28) is our Lord's reply to the inquiry concerning 'eternal life.' So when He says, 'It is better to enter into life halt or maimed' (Mat 18:8, Mar 9:43), or 'Narrow is the way that leadeth unto life' (Mat 7:14), it is evidently the future blessing that is in His mind. There is good ground for the conjecture that Jesus Himself never used the expression 'eternal life.'

Since the ethical and eschatological ideas are denoted by the same word, we are justified in assuming that in the mind of Jesus they were bound up with one another. The 'life' which is projected into the future and described figuratively as a gift bestowed from without, is in the last resort the life of moral activity. This becomes more apparent when we take account of certain further elements in our Lord's teaching.

(a) The condition on which the future reward is given is faithful performance of the moral task in the present. Those shall 'live' who keep the commandments. The narrow way that leads to life is the way of obedience and sacrifice. By voluntary loss of earthly things in the cause of Christ, the disciples will gain 'life' (Mar 10:30). The apocalyptic imagery does not conceal from us the essential thought of Jesus, that the promised 'life' is nothing but the outcome and fulfilment of a moral obedience begun on earth.

(b) Life is not only a future fulfilment, but has a real beginning in the present. Thus in the saying, 'Follow me, and let the dead bury their dead' (Mat 8:22 = Luk 9:60),

Jesus implies that the disciples even now enter into possession of a new and higher life. They are the 'living' as opposed to the children of this world, who are spiritually dead. The same thought appears in the parable of the Prodigal Son: 'he was dead and is alive again' ([Luk_15:32](#)). Life in its full reality is the blessing of the world to come, but it will be different in degree, not in kind, from the present life of true discipleship.

(c) One element is common to the two types of 'life,' and marks their ultimate identity. The future consummation, described by Jesus in vivid pictorial language, is in its substance a closer fellowship with God. In the Kingdom which He anticipated, the pure in heart were to see God ([Mat_5:8](#)); those who hungered and thirsted after righteousness were to be satisfied with God's presence (v. 6). This perfect communion with God is the supreme reward laid up for the believer. It constitutes the inner meaning and content of the future Life. In like manner the present life of moral obedience is in its essence a life of fellowship with God. The aim of Jesus is to bring His disciples even now into such a harmony with the Divine will that they may be children of their Father who is in heaven, resembling Him and holding real communion with Him. The eschatological idea of life thus resolves itself at its centre into the purely ethical and religious. The Kingdom is already come when God's will is done on earth as it is in heaven.

Jesus is Himself the Mediator of the new life. He imparts to His disciples His own consciousness of God's presence and Fatherhood. He inspires in them a faith and obedience which without Him would have been for ever impossible. Through knowledge of Him and participation in His spirit, they enter into that fellowship with God which is eternal life. See Mediator.

2. *In the Fourth Gospel* the idea of Life is much more prominent than in the Synoptics. The Evangelist expressly states ([Joh_20:31](#)) that he has 'written these things that believing ye may have life,' and this statement of his main intention is fully borne out by the detailed study of the Gospel. The teaching of Jesus, as he records it, centres wholly on the subject of Life.

This in itself need not be regarded as a breach with the authentic tradition. We have seen that in the Synoptics also the idea of Life lies at the heart of our Lord's teaching, since life is the peculiar blessing of the Kingdom of God. St. John, after his manner, detaches the essential thought from the eschatological framework. The future 'kingdom' becomes simply 'life.'

The idea of Life as a present possession (already implicit in the Synoptic teaching) becomes in the Fourth Gospel central and determinative. 'He that believeth on the Son hath (even now) everlasting life' ([Joh_3:36](#)). 'He that heareth my word ... is

passed out of death into life' (Joh_5:24). The whole purpose of the work of Christ, as conceived by the Evangelist, was to communicate to His disciples, here and now, the eternal life. To those who have received His gift the death of the body is only a physical incident, a 'falling asleep' (Joh_11:11). The true death is the state of sin and privation, out of which they have been delivered, once and for all, in the act of surrender to Christ.

Isolated passages in the Gospel might seem to conflict with this, the characteristic and prevailing view. In the 6th chapter more especially, the conception of Life as a spiritual possession in the present appears side by side with repeated allusions to a resurrection 'at the last day' (Joh_6:39; Joh_6:44; Joh_6:54). These allusions are partly to be explained as reminiscences of an earlier type of doctrine, not completely in harmony with the writer's own; such 'concessions' to a traditional belief meet us continually in this Gospel. At the same time, they serve to emphasize a real, though secondary, aspect of John's own teaching. He anticipates in the future world a full manifestation of the Life which under earthly conditions is necessarily hidden. For the believer, as for Christ Himself, the escape from this world and its limitations marks the entrance into a larger activity and 'glory' (cf. Joh_14:2-3).

The Evangelist nowhere attempts to define his conception of Life. The great saying, 'This is life eternal,' etc. (Joh_17:3), cannot be construed as a definition. It only declares that the knowledge of God through Jesus Christ carries with it the assurance of life (cf. 'His commandment is life everlasting' [Joh_12:50]). The nature of the life is indicated only in vague and half-figurative terms. It is indestructible (Joh_6:58, Joh_11:26), satisfies all spiritual thirst and hunger (Joh_6:35, Joh_4:14), is the source of light (Joh_1:4, Joh_8:12). But, while little is said by way of express definition, the general import of the Johannine conception is sufficiently clear. The Life which Christ communicates is the absolute, Divine Life. 'As the Father has life in himself, so he hath given the Son to have life in himself' (Joh_5:26., cf. Joh_1:4). It is assumed that in God and in the Logos, who is one with Him, a life resides which is different in kind from that of men, and is the real, the 'eternal' Life.

The conception arises from the blending in the Fourth Gospel of Hebrew and early Christian with Greek-philosophical influences. Hebrew thought did not concern itself with questions regarding the ultimate nature of God. He was the 'living' God, who could be known only through His activity in the creation and moral government of the world. The Greek thinkers, on the other hand, tried to get behind His activity to His essential Being. He was the absolute and self-existent, over against the world of phenomena. His Life, so far as Life could be predicated of Him, was an energy of pure thought, abstracted from every form of sensible manifestation (cf. Arist. *Metaph.* xii. 7). The Fourth Evangelist, carrying out more fully the suggestion of Philo, combines the Hebrew and Greek ideas. He thinks of God as the 'only true' (Joh_17:3), the

absolute Being who is eternally separate from the world which He has created. Nevertheless He is a living and personal God. The Life which He possesses is analogous to the life in man, but of a higher order, spiritual instead of earthly.

It follows from this attempt to combine Hebrew with Greek ideas, that the ethical moment falls largely out of sight. The difference between the human and the Divine Life is one of essence. Till man has undergone a radical change, not in heart merely but in the very constitution of his being, there can be no thought of his participating in the life of God. St. John thus involves himself in a conception which may be described as semi-physical. The Divine life is regarded as a sort of higher substance inherent in the nature of God. How can man, who is 'born of flesh' (Joh 3:6), become partaker in this substance, and so experience a new birth as a child of God? This is the religious problem as it presents itself to St. John.

The solution is afforded by the doctrine of the Incarnate Word. Jesus Christ, as the eternal Logos, possessed 'life in himself,' and yet assumed humanity and entered into our lower world. He therefore became the vehicle through which the life of God is imparted to men, or at least to those elect natures who are predisposed to receive it. He not only possesses, but is Himself the Life. To impart His gift He must also impart Himself, since life is inalienable from the living Person. This idea, which lies at the very centre of St. John's thinking, determines his theory of the communication of Life through Christ.

The subjective condition, apart from which the gift cannot be bestowed, is belief in Jesus as the Son of God. This belief is primarily an act of intellectual assent to the claim of Christ; but such an act implies a religious experience which has led up to it and gives it value. It runs back in the last resort to the 'drawing by the Father' (Joh 6:44), the work of God's Spirit in the heart. Through the act of belief a man is brought into such a relation to Christ that His power as Life-giver becomes operative.

Three means are indicated by which Christ imparts the gift to those who have believed. (1) It is conveyed through His word, regarded not simply as the medium of His message, but in the Hebrew sense as active and creative. The words spoken by Jesus are of the same nature as the quickening word of God. They are 'spirit and life,' carrying with them some portion of His own being. He can say indifferently, 'My word shall abide in you' and 'I shall abide in you' (Joh 15:7). It is this imparting of Himself through His words that renders them 'words of eternal life.' (2) The gift is conveyed likewise in the Sacraments, more especially in the Lord's Supper. The Eucharistic reference in the 6th chapter appears to the present writer unmistakable, and, while the Supper is interpreted in a spiritual sense, its real validity is also emphasized.

Ignatius, writing in the same age, describes the Eucharist as the *φάρμακον ἀθανασίας*

(*Ephes.* 20), and St. John accepts this current belief, and harmonizes it with his own doctrine of Life: 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you' (Joh_6:53). Since Jesus in His own Person is the Life, it can be given only through an actual incorporation of His 'flesh and blood,' and this is offered in the mystery of the Eucharist. The idea of Life as a semi-physical essence here comes to its sharpest expression. (3) In this same chapter, however, we have the indication of another and still more mysterious means by which the Life is imparted. The Eucharist, while it possesses in itself a real validity, is typical of an abiding union of the believer with Christ. He is like the vine (Joh_15:1 ff.), out of which the several branches draw their nourishment. He is united with His disciples in a relation so profound and intimate that they feel themselves to be one with Him. They abide in Him and He in them, and the life which He possesses becomes their life, springing up within them like a perennial well (Joh_4:14). This doctrine of a mystical union with Christ in which He imparts His Divine life to the believer, contains the central and characteristic thought of the Fourth Gospel.

Thus far we have considered the Johannine idea of Life as it is determined by the Logos theory. It becomes apparent, however, the more we study the Gospel, that the writer is working throughout with two conceptions, essentially different from each other and never completely reconciled. The incarnate Logos is at the same time the historical Jesus, who revealed God and drew all men to Himself by the moral grandeur of His personality and life. Doctrines which are presented theologically on the lines of the Logos hypothesis are also capable of a purely religious interpretation. They require to be so interpreted if we are not to miss their underlying and vital import.

Life regarded from this other side bears a meaning substantially the same as in the Synoptic Gospels. Jesus was the Living One, inasmuch as He realized in His own Person the love and goodness and holiness which constitute the inmost nature of God. The life He sought to communicate was nothing else than His own Spirit, as it was revealed in the scene of the feet-washing (John 13), and in the subsequent discourse with His disciples. Even in the Eucharistic chapter in which the theological view of Life is expressed most forcibly, we can discern this other view in the background. To partake of Christ's flesh and blood is to become wholly conformed to Him, absorbing into oneself the very spirit by which He lived. We cannot read the chapter attentively without feeling that St. John is always passing from the metaphysical conception to this moral and religious one. Both are present in his mind, and he endeavours to fuse them, though such a fusion is in the nature of things impossible.

The cardinal doctrine of union with Christ assumes a new meaning in the light of this other aspect of St. John's thought. What is elsewhere described as a mystical indwelling becomes a moral fellowship. 'Henceforth I call you not servants, but friends; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth; but I have called you

friends' (Joh_15:15). The disciples are to enter into a perfect harmony of mind and will with their Master. His spirit is not to act on them from the outside, through set commandments, but inwardly and spontaneously. The relation of discipleship thus passes into one of 'friendship,'—a friendship so close that they lose all sense of separateness between themselves and Christ. He 'abides in them,' and replaces their will with His own.

To the Synoptic teaching St. John adds one element of priceless value. He perceives that the new Life proclaimed by Jesus was bound up indissolubly with His living Person. 'In him was life' (Joh_1:4), and it is not enough to render some vague obedience to His teaching. There must be a real and personal communion with Christ, so that He may impart His very self to His disciple. In his presentation of this truth, John avails himself of metaphysical modes of thinking which are not wholly adequate to the Christian message. The conception of Christ as Logos obscures the true significance of His Person and of the higher life imparted through Him. But the essential thought of the Gospel is independent of the form, borrowed from an alien philosophy, in which it is expressed. Jesus Christ is not only the Life-giver, but is Himself the Life. He imparts His gift to those who know Him by an inward fellowship, and become one with Him in heart and will. See also Living.

Literature.—H. Holtzmann, *NT Theol.* i. 293 ff. (1897); Schrenck, *Die johan. Anschauung vom 'Leben'* (1898); Titius, *Die NT Lehre von der Seligkeit* (esp. the Johannine section, 1900); Grill, *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evang.* 206-327 (1902); G. Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, 156; G. B. Stevens, *Johannine Theology*, 241, 312; P. Brooks, *More Abundant Life*; B. F. Westcott, *Historic Faith*, 142; F. J. A. Hort, *The Way, the Truth, the Life* (1893); E. Hatch, *Memorials*, 181; J. G. Hoare, *Life in St. John's Gospel*, (1901).

E. F. Scott.

Light

LIGHT.—Apart from the ordinary use of this word to denote outward light (as in Luk_11:36, Mat_17:2, Mat_24:29 etc.), there are three applications of the metaphor of light in the Synoptic Gospels which demand attention.

1. The first occurs in the figurative and somewhat enigmatic saying preserved in Mat_6:22-23 = Luk_11:34-35, where the eye is called the lamp of the body, the symbolism pointing to *sincerity of soul* as the decisive feature of life. Each Evangelist gives the saying a different setting. In Mt.'s version of the Sermon on the Mount it

occurs in a context laying stress upon the supreme need of the heavenly mind in religion; and as the main rival to God in man's affections is the world, in the shape of material wealth, the pursuit of the single mind is naturally correlated with the avoidance of covetousness. This shade of meaning is reflected from Mat 6:19-21; Mat 6:24-25 (see Mammon) upon the intervening *logion*. The soul is to human life what the eye is to the body (so Philo, *de Opif. Mundi*, 17, 'reason [νοῦς] is to the soul what the eye is to the body'); it is a lamp, by means of which the way and work of life are illuminated. As the functions of the physical life depend largely upon the soundness of the organs of vision, by means of which men move safely and freely in the outside world, so the mental and moral health of man is bound up with the condition of his inner life. The inward disposition (cf. Joh 11:10) is the key to all (cf. Ruskin's *Queen of the Air*, § 93; *Eagle's Nest*, §§ 106-110). The employment of 'light' in this connexion is thus one illustration of the inwardness of the teaching of Jesus. He brought men from the circumference to the centre, laid supreme stress on motive, and sought to emphasize—as in this saying—the vital importance of the inner spirit for conduct. The symbolism turns on the ethical meaning implied in 'single' (ἀπλοῦς) and 'evil' (πονηρός), the former suggesting 'liberality,' the latter 'niggardliness' in the moral sphere. Hence 'light' means that condition of life which is void of covetousness and the grasping spirit. Such a spirit confuses life by diverting it from the supreme inward and heavenly aim which is its true pursuit. The hoarding temper, which absorbs men in outward possessions, is pronounced by Jesus to be a flaw in the moral vision, a speck that blurs 'the light that is in thee,' i.e. the inner light of conscience, the heart, or the soul. When the latter is darkened by the intrusion of a divided affection, especially in the form of some appetite such as covetousness or worldliness, then 'how great is the darkness!' For religion, as Christ taught it, is not admitting God into life. It is putting Him first in life. Faith is not thinking Him good, but hailing Him as best. And nothing can be more ominous than when the soul, which is man's delicate faculty for seeing and choosing God, is diverted to double-mindedness or to an attempt to reconcile the competing interests of God and of the world. The outcome is compromise and its inevitable product, hypocrisy—that sin which a Frenchman once called the firstfruits of English society—ripening under the very breath of conventional religion.—The *logion* may be, as Brandt suggests, a Jewish aphorism based on Pro 20:27, which Jesus here quotes and applies.

The introduction of the saying in Luk 11:33-36 is due to the key-word λυχνος. Here, as often, Lk. groups sayings together less from their internal correspondence than from some verbal common element. He sharpens the point of the saying by introducing Luk 11:35. As eyes may become injured by the blinding glare and dust which make ophthalmia a prevalent complaint in the East, so, it is implied, the inner disposition lies exposed to risk and disease, against which it is a man's duty to guard. For if the

heart rules the life, the life, on the other hand, can stain and spoil the heart. Yet the stress of the saying falls on attention to the inward life as determining the course and value of the outer. ‘ “Take care of the little things of life, and the great things will take care of themselves,” is the maxim of the trader, which is sometimes, and with a certain degree of truth, applied to the service of God. But much more true is it in religion, that we should take care of the great things, and the trifles of life will take care of themselves. “If thine eye be single, thy whole body will be full of light.” Christianity is not acquired, as an art, by long practice; it does not carve and polish human nature with a graving tool; it makes the whole man; first pouring out his soul before God, and then casting him in a mould’ (Jowett’s *Paul*, ii. 117).—The point of Luk 11:36 is not easy to grasp. It seems a somewhat tautological expansion of Luk 11:34 b (so Blass). D [Note: Deuteronomist.] , Syr [Note: yr Syriac.] ^{cur} etc., omit it, while Syr [Note: yr Syriac.] ^{sin} has a different form of it; yet, as Wellhausen observes, it does not read like an interpolation, and probably we must be content to suspect, with Westcott and Hort, e.g., and J. Weiss (in Meyer⁸ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , pp. 476-477), some primitive corruption of the text.

2. The connexion of Luk 11:33 with the saying is not immediate. Luk 11:33 is simply an equivalent of Mar 5:14-16, which is incorporated here under the rubric of ‘light,’ and Luke has already more appropriately used it in Luk 8:16 (= Mar 4:21) in the second phase of the light-symbolism in the Gospels, viz. that of *influence*. The disciples are cautioned against the tendency, whether due to modesty or to cowardice, to refrain from letting their faith tell upon the world. In Luk 11:33 it is impossible to trace any very obvious connexion between this and what precedes, any more than between it and what follows, unless the idea of the editor is that Solomon’s wisdom and Jonah’s preaching were frank and open to the world (hence Luk 11:33), while no sign (Luk 11:29) is needed if the inner heart be pure and true (Luk 11:34-38). The context in Matthew 5 is much more congenial. Jesus is warning His disciples that while their relation to the outside world is often full of annoyance and suffering, yet this bitter experience (Mat 5:10 f.) must not drive them into a parochial and secluded attitude of negative protest. ‘You are the light of the world,’ He urges. You owe it a duty. Your faith lays you under an obligation to let your life tell upon your environment (cf. *EBi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*] , 4377, 4384-4385), instead of weakly relapsing into some esoteric or Essene-like seclusion. The allusion to *good works* is peculiar to Matthew. It emphasizes that frankness of spirit and necessity of good conduct which the saying upon light advocates as the sole reasonable position for Christian disciples to assume. The vocation of a Christian is to be visible. And visibility means influence. The reference is not to Apostles but to Christians in general, nor is preaching in view. What Jesus inculcates is an attitude of consistent goodness, void of monasticism and ostentation alike, as corresponding to

the nature of His Kingdom, whose property and destiny it is to become manifest to the world (cf. Mozley's *Parochial and Occasional Sermons*, p. 212 f.).

This latter idea, without the moral counsel, is reproduced by Mar 4:21 (= Luk 8:16) as a sequel to the interpretation of the parable of the Seeds, as if to suggest that such knowledge as had just been imparted to the disciples was not to be kept to themselves but to be diffused like light (cf. Menzies, *Earliest Gospel*, pp. 112-114), the placing of the lamp in its proper position perhaps corresponding (so Jülicher) to the fruitful and useful qualities of the good seed in the good soil (Mar 4:20). Others, like Wrede (*das Messiasgeheimnis*, p. 68 f.), prefer to read the saying in the light of the Apostolic age, as if it meant that after the Resurrection all reserve upon the Christian mysteries was to be thrown aside (Mar 4:11). This, however, cannot be the original sense of the saying, and there is no reason why one should give up the interpretation which makes the lamp here equivalent to the teaching of Jesus or the knowledge of the gospel (see *Expos. Nov.* 1900, on 'The Peril and the Comfort of Exposure'). The point is less general than in Mat 5:14-16. But the essential bearing of the saying is the same, viz. that as the function of light is to radiate, so Christian privileges imply the duty of propaganda. Similarly, Mat 10:27 = Luk 12:3 (cf. Jülicher's *Gleichnisreden*, ii. 86 f.). In the fourth of the New Oxyrhynchus Logia, we have the words: 'for there is nothing hidden which shall not be made manifest, nor buried which shall not be raised.'

3. If Christians, however, are to arise and shine, it must be because their light has come. Consequently *revelation* is also embraced under the light-symbolism of the Gospels, in Mat 4:16, Luk 1:79 [Isa 9:2] Luk 2:32, where the reference, based on OT quotations, is to the redeeming life of Christ. This semi-mystical application, which associates light with the Divine effluence, runs far back into human history. 'Heaven means both the world of light above us and the world of hope within us, and the earliest name of the Divine beings is simply "the bright ones." Such names are more than metaphors. But if they were simply metaphors, they would show how closely the world without is adapted to express and render definite the yearnings and the fears of the world within' (J. Wedgwood, *The Moral Ideal*, pp. 6, 7). It is needless to illustrate from ancient thought how light was almost invariably, if variously, allied to the conception of heaven and the Divine nature, the latter being conceived as radiant and glorious. The gradual evolution of the religious idea slowly purified the symbolism, especially in the deeper reaches of faith within the later Judaism (notably in the Book of Enoch). The semi-physical element, though not entirely excluded even from the NT idea of glory and spiritual phenomena, came to be subordinated to the moral and mystical. The purity, the noiseless energy, the streaming rays of light, all suggested religious qualities to the mind, until the light of God came to be an expression for the healing influence and vitalizing power exercised by Him over human life. The light of Christ, the Messiah, was thus His ministry (see Bruce's *Galilean Gospel*, p. 13 f.). His

person formed the creative power in the life of the human soul. Through work and word alike, His being operated with quickening effect upon the responsive hearts of His own people.

This application of the metaphor of light to the Divine revelation in Jesus is developed especially in the Fourth Gospel, where 'light' is reserved almost exclusively for this purpose. John the Baptist is indeed described once as 'the burning and shining lamp,' in whose light (cf. Joh 1:7-8) the Jews were 'willing to rejoice for a season' (Joh 5:35, cf. Sir 48:1), with all a shallow nature's delight in transient impressions (see Martensen's *Individual Ethics*, p. 385). And Christians are incidentally called 'sons of light' (Joh 12:36, cf. Luk 16:8). But, if John the Baptist is *the lamp*, Jesus is *the Light*; if Christians become *sons of light*, it is by *believing on the Light*. It is not Christians but Christ, the incarnate Logos, who is *the Light of the world* (Joh 1:4; Joh 8:12; Joh 9:5; Joh 12:46). Already in the ancient mind the supreme God had been frequently defined as the God of light, and the later Judaism had expressed its profounder consciousness of this truth in the collocation of life and light (e.g. Psa 36:9, En 58:3) and in the employment of 'light' as a summary expression not only for cosmic vitality, but for the bliss of mankind, chiefly, though not solely, in the future (cf. Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie*, 328 f.). In the Fourth Gospel, however, this idea is developed with singular precision and breadth. The Logos-Christ is defined in the Prologue not only as Logos but as Life and Light, the former category being confined to Christ's being as a Divine factor in the creation and in the essence of God (Joh 1:1-3), as well as to His incarnation (Joh 1:14-18), after which it is dropped. The intervening paragraph (Joh 1:4-13), dealing with the Logos-Christ as a historical phenomenon, is subsumed under the category of Light and Life, which afterwards dominates the entire Gospel, except (curiously enough) the closing speeches (Joh 1:14-17), where the symbolism of Light is entirely absent. 'In him was life, and the life was the light of men.' This profound sentence really gives the keynote to the Gospel, in which Christ as the Light represents the essential Truth of God as revealed to human knowledge. The Messiah (e.g. En 48:4) and the Logos (as in Philo) had already been hailed as Light. But here the metaphor of light denotes much more than the self-revelation of God in the person of Jesus (Weiss); it describes the transcendent life streaming out on men, the absolute nature of God as truth, as the supreme reality for man to believe in, and by his belief to share. In sharp antithesis to this Light is the Darkness, by which the writer symbolizes all that is contrary to God in human life, whether unbelief or disobedience, all that resists the true Life which it is the function of the Light to produce in humanity, all the ignorance and wilful rejection of Christ which issue in practical consequences of confusion and rebellion. Historically, this opposition emerged during Christ's lifetime in the Jews' rejection of His mission. But, as the present tense φαίνει seems to imply, the truth is general; the same enmity pervades every age—a conception to which there is a remarkable parallel

in the Logos-teaching of Heraclitus (cf. Pflleiderer's *Urchrist.* 2 ii. 339). This antithesis means more, however, than a metaphysical dualism running through the world. The hostility of men to the Light is described as their own choice and fault (Joh 3:19-20), and this conception naturally permeates the entire Gospel. The determinism is apparent rather than real. Whether positive or negative, the attitude of men to God in Christ is run back to their own wills, although the writer makes no attempt to correlate this strictly with Divine prescience. Nor, again, is the conception purely intellectual, though the terminology would seem occasionally to suggest this view. Light and darkness represent moral good and evil as these are presented in the spiritual order introduced by Christ. To love the light (Joh 3:19-21) is not a theoretical attitude, but a practical, equivalent to *doing the truth*. The light has to be followed (Joh 8:12, cf. Joh 12:35 f.); Christ's revelation is an appeal to the reason and conscience of mankind as the controlling principle of conduct; 'the light of life' is the light which brings life, and life is more than mere intellectualism (Joh 17:3). To walk in or by the light is to have one's character and conduct determined by the influence of Christ, the latter being as indispensable to vitality in the moral and religious sphere as light is to physical growth (cf. 2Sa 23:4, Psa 49:19; Psa 56:13 etc.). See, further, art. Truth.

These and other applications of this metaphor throughout the Fourth Gospel are all suggested in the somewhat abstract language of the Prologue. Three further points may be selected as typical of this mode of thought.

(a) The function of Christ as the Light is described as bearing not only upon the creation of the Universe, but on the spiritual and moral life of men (Joh 1:3-4). In this sphere it encounters an obstacle in the error and evil of man's nature, but encounters it successfully. This is proleptically described in Joh 1:5 (cf. 1Jn 2:8), where *οὐ κατέλαβεν* probably means 'failed to overpower, or extinguish' (cf. Joh 12:35, Sir 15:7); despite the opposition of man's ignorance and corruption, the true Light makes its way. The climax of this triumph in history is then described. It was heralded by the prophetic mission of John the Baptist, the allusion to whom is, like Joh 5:35, carefully phrased in order to bring out the transient and subordinate character of his ministry (cf. Lightfoot's *Colossians*, p. 401); whereupon the historic functions of the real Light are resumed in Joh 5:9 f. 'The true light, which lightens every man, was coming into the world'; *i.e.* had arrived, even when the Baptist was preaching (cf. Joh 5:26). Later on, this is frankly stated by Jesus Himself at the feast of Tabernacles, when brilliant illuminations were held every night—a symbolism which may have suggested the cry, 'I am the light of the world' (Joh 8:12; cf. Isa 60:1). The description in Joh 1:9 is probably an echo of Testament of Levi 13:4 ('the light of the Lord was given to lighten every man').

(b) While the Light is the Christian revelation, it is implied that already (Joh 3:21), not merely in Judaism but throughout humanity (cf. Joh 11:52, Joh 12:21 f.), there were individuals whose honesty and sincerity had prepared them to receive the truth of God (Joh 1:11-12) mentally and morally. When the light fell on those who sat in darkness, some were content to sit still. But others rose to welcome the fuller knowledge of God in the perfect revelation of Christ's person, men like Nathanael and the Greeks. For it is characteristic of the Fourth Gospel that good people, rather than sinners (as in the Synoptic narratives), flock to Christ. The Logos, as Hausrath puts it, draws God's children to the light as a magnet attracts metals, while mere stones are left unmoved by its presence. And God's children are those who respond to Christ by the exercise of their moral instincts and religious affections. Unlike Philo, the author refuses to trace back this lack of susceptibility towards God to any source in the material constitution of mankind (cf. Joh 8:44); but the semi-Gnostic idea of a special class remains.

(c) Upon the other hand, Christ, the Light, came to His own people; and there are repeated allusions to the brief opportunity of the Jews (Joh 9:4, Joh 11:9-10, Joh 12:35-36), in sayings which warn the nation against trilling with its privilege,—a privilege soon to be taken from its unworthy keeping. Here the author is reflecting the period in which he writes, when the Jews' day of grace had passed, with tragic consequences to themselves. 'Light, accept the blessed light, if you will have it when Heaven vouchsafes. You refuse? Very well: the "light" is more and more withdrawn, ... and furthermore, by due sequence, infallible as the foundations of the universe and Nature's oldest law, the light *returns* on you, this time, with *lightning*' (Carlyle's *Latter-Day Pamphlets*, iii. *ad fin.*).

Literature.—In addition to the references already given, see Norris, the Cambridge Platonist, *Reason and Religion*, p. 222 f.; Berkeley, *Siris*, § 210; and, for the use of the idea in morals and religion, Fiske, *Myths and Myth-Making*, p. 104 f., and D. G. Brinton, *Religion of Primitive Peoples*, p. 73 f. The use of the symbol in the Gospels is analyzed by Titius, *die Johan. Ansehauung d. Seligkeit* (1900), p. 119 f.; Holtzmann, *Neutest. Theologie*, ii. 304 f., 399 f.; and especially Grill, *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evang.* (1902), pp. 1-31, 217-225, 259-271, 308 f. See also Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, 1. (English translation) iv. § 3; and Drummond, *Philo Judæus*, i. 217 f. For the moral uses of the word see Phillips Brooks, *Candle of the Lord*, 305, *Light of the World*, 1; R. W. Church, *Village Sermons*, i. 296, iii. 46; B. F. Westcott, *Revelation of the Father*, 45; F. Temple, *Rugby Sermons*, 3rd series, 149; G. Macdonald, *Unspoken Sermons*, iii. 163; G. A. Smith, *Forgiveness of Sins*, 89; R. Rainy, *Sojourning with God*, 64.

J. Moffatt.

⚡ Lightning

LIGHTNING (ἀστραπή).—There are 3 references to lightning in the Gospels, one of these being duplicated (in Mt. and Lk.).

1. Luk_10:18 ‘I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven.’ The word ‘beheld’ (ἐθεώρουν), being in the impf., indicates a continuous contemplation. Taken in conjunction with the aorist participle ‘fallen’ (so Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, not ‘fall’ as in Authorized Version, the Gr. being πεσόντα), this cannot mean that in a pre-existent state Jesus beheld the fall of Satan taking place, *i.e.* when the devil was cast out of heaven, as described in *Paradise Lost*. The meaning of the expression should be arrived at through the context, where we read of the Seventy returning to Jesus with joy, and exclaiming, ‘Lord, even the demons are subject unto us in thy name’ (Luk_10:17), in reference to their successful exorcism. This meaning seems to be that the news brought to Jesus by His disciples did not take Him by surprise, because at the very time when they were carrying on their successful work He was looking at the prince of the demons lying fallen (so Holtzmann, Plummer, etc.),—a highly figurative expression which need not point to an actual vision. Jesus had the intuitive assurance that His arch-enemy was defeated already. Therefore the disciples were able to cast out the demons. The situation may be illustrated by the parable of the strong man bound by a stronger so that his house can be robbed (Mar_3:27), Satan being the strong man, Christ the stronger, the demons the vessels that are taken from the house, which may be either the world or the possessed victims. There is no indication when Satan fell (as perhaps at the Temptation of Jesus). He is contemplated as fallen. Still the aorist points to a definite action, and the comparison with lightning emphasizes this point. Possibly our Lord was alluding to Isa_14:12. A similar idea appears in Rev_12:9. Wellhausen regards the verse in Lk. as apocryphal; but Jesus frequently used apocalyptic imagery. In the *Koran* (Sura 72) the demons are cast out of heaven at the coming of Mohammed, the angels bombarding them with stars.

2. Mat_24:27 ‘For as the lightning cometh forth from the east, and is seen even unto the west; so shall be the coming of the Son of Man’ (cf. Luk_17:24). The idea seems to be that of widespread and unmistakable evidence. The coming of the Son of Man will be seen everywhere, and that very manifestly (so Plummer, Wellhausen, etc.). A second thought, the suddenness of the flash (Plummer), is not so apparent, if it is even present at all, in this application of the idea of lightning to the Parousia. For the apparent contradiction between this thought and that in Luk_17:20 see Observation.

3. The one other Gospel reference to lightning is in the description of the angel of the Resurrection (Mat 28:3), whose appearance is 'as lightning,' the idea being dazzling brightness.

W. F. Adeney.

☩ Lily

LILY.—The lily (לילך, לילך, κρίνον) is mentioned by various OT writers (1Ki 7:19, 2Ch 4:5, Son 2:1 etc., Hos 14:5). In the NT there is but one reference (Mat 6:28 and || Luk 12:27). From the expression 'lilies of the field,' we gather that they were wild flowers, while the comparison of them with the regal robes of Solomon (Mat 6:29) implies that they were not white, but coloured (cf. Son 5:13). The plant that best accords with these conditions is the scarlet anemone (*A. coronaria*), with which, in the spring of the year, the Galilaeen hillsides are clothed. (See Tristram, *Fauna and Flora of Palestine*, p. 208; *Nat. Hist. of Bible*, p. 462). The nature of the reference might, however, favour the supposition that our Lord used the term 'lilies' in a very general way, and that it should be taken as comprising a variety of flowers, such as anemones, poppies, and tulips.

Hugh Duncan.

☩ Linen

LINEN (βύσσος, σινδών).—Cloth of various kinds prepared from the fibre of flax was largely used in Egypt and Palestine for under-garments. It was preferred to cotton or wool, as being cleaner and cooler in the hot climate. It formed an important element in priestly dress, and in the Temple hangings. Worn together with purple it constituted the characteristic clothing of the wealthy (Est 8:15, Luk 16:19), and probably of royalty (Gen 41:42). Linen was used in Egypt to prepare the bodies of both men and animals for burial, and in Palestine it was the common wrapping of the dead. Wool was avoided, the belief being that it tended to breed worms. To this day linen is used for these purposes in Palestine by all who can afford it. Coarser cloth was made in the country, but the finer sorts were imported, the products of Egypt being held in high esteem. As an article of merchandise, linen ranked with gold, silver, precious stones, silk, etc. (Rev 18:12).

σινδών (Mar_14:51-52) probably corresponds to the Rabbinic *sadin* or *sedina*, a linen cloth, or loose linen wrapper; although possibly it may also mean a night-dress (Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus*, 1900, ii. 545). In this garment the body of Jesus was wrapped when taken from the cross (Mat_27:59). It may have been torn into strips to form the ὀθόνια in which, with the spices, the body was bound (Joh_19:40; Joh_20:5 ff.). Probably, however, these were the bandages fastening the σινδών.

W. Ewing.

⦿ Lip

LIP.—This word, in the plural, is found in the Gospels only in Mat_15:8 || Mar_7:6, where it stands for χεῖλεσιν in a free quotation from the LXX Septuagint . It is rendered by Authorized Version , ‘This people honoureth me *with their lips*, but their heart is far from me’ (cf. Isa_29:13). St. Matthew, who quotes oftenest from the LXX Septuagint , does so here (Mat_15:8 f.), even though it departs considerably from the Hebrew. But he modifies its phraseology so as to improve it, and to bring out the prophet’s thought more clearly than would be done by a literal translation of the Hebrew. (See Toy, *NT Quotations from the OT*). The expression ‘honoureth me with their lips’ is explained by some as an allusion to the Jewish custom of putting the tassel of the *tallith* to the lips during worship, as a sign that the Law was accepted, not as of duty only, but as the enthusiastic preference of the heart (cf. Job_31:27, where putting the hand to the lips is an act of astral worship; and the Oriental salutations in which putting the hand to the lips is supposed to have been originally a sign and assurance of sincerity; see *Jewish Eneye*. art. ‘Lip’). Others explain this clause, in relation to the entire passage, as intended to put in sharp contrast a worship of God, or a form of religion, that is taught of men (cf. ‘teaching teachings which are precepts of men,’ Mat_15:9), and a worship that is really according to the teachings of God’s word, *i.e.* which springs from a devout and trusting heart (cf. ‘But *their heart is far from me*, Mat_15:8, with the suggestion of emptiness in Mat_15:9 ‘*In vain* do they worship me,’ etc.).

It would seem from the OT that the lips had come to be regarded as a sort of originating centre of life and morals. We read of ‘lying lips’ (Psa_31:18), of ‘the lip of truth’ (Pro_12:19), of ‘unclean lips’ (Isa_6:5), and of ‘the poison of asps’ as ‘under the lips’ (quoted in Rom_3:13); and in the NT also, of ‘the fruit of the lips’ (Heb_13:15), and of ‘lips that speak no guile’ (1Pe_3:10), etc.

But whatever be the implied allusion or exact meaning of the words here, this much is certain, that our Lord in speaking to His own contemporaries said, ‘This prophecy of Isaiah was *concerning you*’—language that would seem to require us to interpret the passage so as to make it include and describe the unbelieving Jews of His day, and, probably, all people of all times who were, or are, or will yet be, guilty of offering to God a worship in which they do not draw near to Him in heart.

Geo. B. Eager.

☛ Little Ones

LITTLE ONES.—The phrase ‘one of these little ones’ occurs in the records of our Lord’s discourses in the Synoptic Gospels six times (Mat 10:42; Mat 18:6; Mat 18:10; Mat 18:14, Mar 9:42, Luk 17:2), although, to satisfy these references, it need not have been employed by our Lord on more than two or three different occasions. It seems to have been used with marked solemnity and to be charged with high emotion. To understand its implications, we shall need to inquire whom our Lord designates as ‘little ones,’ whence the designation was derived, and what its significance is.

1. It seems to be quite generally assumed that at least in some of the instances of its occurrence the phrase designates, quite simply, actual *children*. Thus, multitudes of Christians appear to be accustomed to read Mat 18:10 as a declaration that the ‘angels of children’ (whatever these ‘angels’ may be) hold a particularly exalted place in heaven. The connexion of this whole passage with the opening verses of the chapter, where a ‘little child’ is presented as a type of the children of the Kingdom, seems to many to require this interpretation, and the parallel passages, Mar 9:37; Mar 9:42, Luk 9:48; Luk 17:2 to add their support to it. A careful scrutiny of the passages in which the phrase occurs, however, will show that its reference is never to actual children, but in every case to *our Lord’s disciples*.

The earliest recorded employment of the phrase is reported in Mat 10:40-42. Our Lord is here bringing to a close His instructions to His Apostles as He sent them forth on their first, their trial, evangelistic tour. His words are words of highest encouragement. ‘He that receiveth you,’ He says, ‘receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me.’ Our Lord makes common cause with His messengers: that is the general declaration. Then comes the enforcement by illustration. It was a matter of common understanding that ‘he that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet’—that is, not in the name of another prophet, but on this sole ground, that he is a prophet, or, as we should say in our English idiom, as

a prophet—‘shall receive a prophet’s reward; and he that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man’—that is, again, merely because he is a righteous man—‘shall receive a righteous man’s reward.’ The broad principle, then, is that the receiver shall be put, in the matter of reward, on the level of the received; by his reception of the prophet or righteous man, he takes his place by his side and becomes sharer in his reward. Now comes the application, marked as such (and not the continuation of the examples) by a change of construction. ‘And whosoever’—perhaps we might paraphrase ‘Likewise whosoever’—‘shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward.’ The parallelism of the clauses here with those in the preceding sentences compels us to read ‘one of these little ones’ as a synonym of ‘a disciple.’ The sense is, as the receiver of the prophet shall share the prophet’s reward, and the receiver of the righteous man the righteous man’s reward, so the receiver of the disciple shall share the disciple’s reward. The general purport of the declaration, moreover, demands this sense. Its object was to hearten and encourage the Apostles on their mission. For that, they needed assurance, not that goodness to children would be marked and rewarded, but that they, the Apostles, were under Divine care. The very variations from the phraseology of the earlier sentences which are introduced into the application have their part to play in emphasizing this needed lesson. These variations are five in number. In the first place, instead of the simple ‘he that’ receiveth, we have here the emphasized universal ‘whosoever’; there is no danger of failure here. Next, instead of the simple, comprehensive ‘receiveth,’ the least conceivable benefit is here specified—‘shall give to drink a cup of cold water only’: the slightest goodness to the disciples shall be noted and rewarded. Next, instead of the simple statement that the benefiter shall share the reward of the benefited, we have a solemn asseveration that in no case will a due reward be missed: the nature of the reward is left in large vagueness, and it is hinted only that it shall be appropriate, treated as of obligation, and surely given. Lastly, instead of the cold ‘disciple,’ we have the tender ‘one of these little ones.’ The disciples our Lord has in mind are *His own* disciples: His own disciples He cherishes with a devoted love; and this love is pledged to their protection. The effect of these variations from the formally exact parallel is to raise the saying to its emotional climax. The lesson conveyed is that Christ’s disciples are under the watchful care of His jealous love.

The case is similar with that in the paragraph [Mat_18:5-14](#). It is important that the relation of this paragraph to the preceding one ([Mat_18:1-4](#)), and the nature of the transition made at [Mat_18:5](#) be correctly apprehended. The Apostles had been disputing about their relative claims to greatness in the Kingdom of heaven; and the Lord teaches them a much needed lesson in humility by the example of a little child. Setting a little child in their midst, He exhorts them to see in it a type of the children of the Kingdom, and to seek to become like it if they would be greatest in that Kingdom (cf. art. Children, vol. i. p. 304). With [Mat_18:4](#), however, this incident

closes, and the lesson from it is concluded. The discussion that follows in the succeeding verses is no longer an inculcation of humility. It is an exhilarating pledge of the whole Divine power to the sustaining, protection, and glorification of Christ's disciples. The connexion between the two paragraphs seems to turn on the idea that, though men enter the Kingdom like helpless infants, they are not therefore abandoned to the adverse forces of the world: the power of God is outstretched for their salvation. 'Such little children' (Mat_18:5) God takes under His own protection, rewarding those who do them benefits, and visiting with the severest punishment those who evil-entreat them; their angels ever behold the Father's face in heaven; if they go astray everything is left that they may be recovered; the Father's will is pledged that no one of them shall perish. The force of these great assurances is indefinitely enhanced by the individual note that is thrown into them. Throughout, the stress is laid upon the individual, as distinguished from the class, as the object of the Divine love (Mat_18:5-6; Mat_18:10; Mat_18:12; Mat_18:14): not a single one of them shall be without the Father's care, no single one of them shall perish. The passage is in effect just the Synoptic parallel of the seventeenth chapter of John, or the Evangelic parallel of the eighth chapter of Romans. Christ's 'little ones' in it are, in short, just 'those that believe on him,' of whom 'it is not the will of the Father that one should perish,' whose 'angels in heaven do always behold the face of the Father which is in heaven.'

The declaration of Mar_9:42 is parallel with that of Mat_18:6, and is immediately preceded by a verse the thought of which is parallel with that of Mat_10:42. This passage gives us thus afresh in a single context the two primary statements we have met with in Matthew. The variations of the phraseology in Mat_10:41 from what we have seen in Mat_10:42 supply commentaries on the meaning of the phrases in the latter. 'Little ones' in the one becomes 'you,' that is, Christ's disciples, in the other: 'in the name of a disciple' in the one, 'in the name that ye are Christ's' in the other. Thus the interpretation suggested of the passage in Matthew is confirmed by the very language of the passage in Mark. But this language in Mat_10:41 settles the meaning also of the phrases in the succeeding verse. The 'you,' *i.e.* the disciples, of Mat_10:41 is replaced in Mat_10:42 by 'these little ones that believe,' which must, therefore, mean the same thing. This indeed would be independently true, since these 'little ones' are specifically defined here not as 'little ones' simply, but as those 'little ones' 'that have faith.' It is quite clear, therefore, that 'these little ones' in this passage means not children, but believers.

The only other passage in which the phrase occurs, Luk_17:2, is parallel in its assertion with Mat_18:6 and Mar_9:42, and repeats in effect their language. There is no allusion to children in the entire context, in which our Lord simply warns His 'disciples' against sins against their brethren. In this and the parallel passage in Mk., in other words, we have merely renewed manifestations of the Saviour's concern for

those He calls 'these little ones.' He pronounces the sin of causing those for whom His love was thus pledged to stumble, almost too great to be expressed in words.

On every occasion of its occurrence, therefore, the phrase 'these little ones' evinces itself independently a designation, not of children, but of the disciples of Christ. In these circumstances, we cannot permit doubt to be thrown on its meaning in the palmary passage, Mat 18:5 f., by the circumstance that certain passages in Mark (Mar 9:33-37) and Luke (Luk 9:46-48) which are parallel to Mat 18:1-5 might easily be so read as to make literal children the subject of their declarations (Mar 9:37, Luk 9:48) parallel to Mat 18:5. The account in Matthew is the fuller, and permits the connexion of the clauses to be more exactly estimated. It seems as if it were merely the compression of Mark's and Luke's reports which tempts to the identification of the 'little child' of the earlier verses with the 'one of such little children' (Mk.), or 'this little child' (Lk.) of the closing verse: and the pressing of this language literally is not free from difficulties of its own. In any event, we cannot permit any difficulties that we may feel in explaining Mar 9:37, Luk 9:48 to affect the determination of the meaning of a phrase which does not occur in them, when we meet it in other passages where its sense seems clearly indicated.

We may take it as established, then, that the phrase 'these little ones' on the Master's lips means not 'children,' but distinctly and always 'my disciples.' The question still remains open, however, whether our Lord means by it all His disciples, or only a specially designated class of them. The latter has been quite commonly supposed, and interpreters have busied themselves defining the characteristic qualities of the particularly designated class. Hahn, for example, argues strenuously that the disciples at large cannot be meant; but that the designation presupposes gradations among the disciples (cf. Luk 7:28), and the essence of the exhortation in Luk 17:2 at least is that the greater must not despise the lesser. Godet similarly supposes that the 'little ones' are 'beginners in the faith,' 'those yet weak in the faith.' Surely, however, such distinctions are foreign to the contexts in which these phrases occur, and even inconsistent with them. In Mat 10:42, for example, the broad identification of 'one of these little ones' with 'a disciple' excludes from thought all divisions within the body of disciples; and the definition of 'these' as the disciples to whom our Lord was speaking, as He spoke of them as '*these* little ones,' looks in the same direction. In Mar 9:42, again, the phrase 'these little ones' takes up broadly the 'you' of the preceding verse, and therefore designates just the disciples at large. 'These little ones' are, moreover, defined here as 'these that believe,' that is to say, as 'believers,' in their essential characteristics as such. Much the same may be said of Luk 17:2, in the context of which there is a distinction between brother and brother but no discrimination between greater and lesser, while the whole drift of Mat 18:5-14 is to exalt the 'little ones' and to identify them with that body of chosen ones to whose salvation the will of the Father is pledged. It may be taken as

exegetically certain, then, that by ‘these little ones’ our Lord does not intend to single out a certain section of His disciples,—whether the weakest in faith or the more advanced in that humility of spirit which is the fruit of a great faith,—but means the whole body of His disciples. This is therefore just one of the somewhat numerous general designations which He gives to His disciples by which to express His conception of their character and estate, and the nature of His feelings towards them.

2. Whence this particular designation of His disciples was derived by our Lord remains indeed somewhat obscure. It used to be quite generally supposed that in it He had simply adopted and applied to His own disciples an ordinary designation for their pupils current in the Rabbinical schools. This idea seems traceable to J. J. Wetstein, who illustrates the phrase on its first occurrence (Mat_10:42) by the following quotation from the *Bereshith Rabba* (xlii. 4):

‘Where there are no little ones, there are no disciples; where there are no disciples, there are no sages; where there are no sages, there are no elders; where there are no elders, there are no prophets; where there is no prophet, there is no God.’

Following this suggestion, commentators like Bolten, Kuinoel, Bloomfield, Fritzsche have accordingly explained the phrase as simply a Hebraism for ‘disciples.’

It was early pointed out, however (*e.g.* by Meyer, ed. 2, p. 215 note; Bruno Bauer, ii. 241), that the currency in the Rabbinical schools of such an employment of ‘little ones’ as a designation for ‘disciples’ is neither shown by the citation from the *Bereshith Rabba* nor supported by any other evidence. Accordingly this notion has quite generally died out (*cf.* Meyer-Weiss, ed. 8, 1890). Its place has been largely taken by the very natural supposition that our Lord has done for Himself what the Rabbis had been supposed to have done for Him,—applied affectionately to His disciples a designation appropriate literally only to children. The difficulty of this supposition, otherwise most satisfactory, is that the particular designation in question—‘little ones’—is not a Biblical designation of children, and not one which would readily suggest itself as a term of affection. Neither the Hebrew (קַמֵּץ) nor the Greek (μακρός) lent itself readily to adoption as a term of tenderness; and accordingly neither in the Hebrew nor in the Greek Bible does the term ‘little ones’ (הַקְּמִיץִים, οἱ μακροί) ever occur as a periphrasis for children. Where we read of ‘little ones’ in the English Bible in the sense of children, this is an imposition of an English idea upon a totally divergent Hebrew conception (מֵץ Gen_34:29; Gen_43:8; Gen_46:5 etc.). It is quite true that in Rabbinical Hebrew קַמֵּץ has become a standing term for children;

but not as a term of affectionate feeling so much as with the simple implication of immaturity. The *katan* and *kētanna* were to the Rabbis merely the ‘boy’ and ‘girl’ as undeveloped and unripe, in opposition to the mature man and woman. And although this term was occasionally transferred by them metaphorically to their pupils, it was not, if we can trust the lexicographers, in a very pleasant sense. The ‘little one’ among the disciples was just an ‘abortion’—one who disregarded his teacher and set his immaturity against his master’s ripe learning; or one who, while yet fit only to be a learner, wished to set himself up prematurely as a teacher (ef. Levy or Jastrow, *sub voce* קטן, quoting the tract *Sota 22a*; but consult *Sota 24b*, where we are told that Samuel was surnamed הקטן ‘the Little,’—cf. ‘James the Little’ in the NT, and ‘Kleigenes the Little’ in Xenophon,—because he made himself little, that is, bore himself humbly; here a good sense seems to be attached to the metaphorical use of the word). It was assuredly not from this circle of ideas that our Lord derived His use of the phrase, even if we may suppose that this Rabbinical use of it was already developed in His day.

Only two OT passages suggest themselves as offering natural points of departure for the framing of such a phrase as our Lord employs. The one of these is [Isa 60:22](#) and the other [Zec 13:7](#). In the former, the terms employed, from which our Lord’s phrase may have been derived, are הקטן in the first clause and הצעיר in the second. In the latter the Hebrew term employed is הצעירים, translated in the LXX Septuagint οἱ μικροὶ οἱ. Both passages are Messianic, though only [Zec 13:7](#) is adduced in the NT and given explicit application to Christ ([Mat 26:31](#), [Mar 14:27](#)). In neither is there any allusion to children; but in both the reference of the diminutive term is to the smallness of the beginnings out of which the Lord in the days of the coming blessing shall recreate His Church. If we may believe that the Master had these passages in mind when He called His disciples ‘these little ones,’ then the application of the term to them obviously meant to point them out as those ‘little ones’ who, Zechariah had promised, should be refined as silver and tried as gold, only that they might for ever become the Lord’s people; who, Isaiah had promised, should be the unassuming nucleus out of which by gracious expansion should be developed the newly created city of God which should be to Him an everlasting possession. The consonance of this implication of the term with all the allusions of the contexts in which it occurs, and with all the declarations concerning His ‘little ones’ which our Lord makes, lies on the face of things. And on its assumption all the peculiarities of the form and use of the phrase at once find an adequate explanation.

3. If, now, we ask why and with what meaning our Lord designated His disciples ‘these little ones,’ a twofold answer seems indicated. It is on the one side His chief Messianic designation of His followers: it is on the other side the chief of His

hypocoristic designations of them. Other designations of each order exist. When Jesus speaks of His followers as ‘children of the kingdom,’ for example, He is applying to them a Messianic designation; or, to confine ourselves to the circle of ideas most closely related to the passages of the Old Testament supposed to be in His mind in the instance holding our attention, when He calls them His ‘sheep’ (Mat 26:31) or more pointedly His ‘little flock’ (Luk 12:32), these are Messianic designations which He is applying to them. Similarly His language with reference to them was full of hypocoristics. They were not merely His ‘children’ (Mar 10:24, Joh 21:5), but His ‘little children’ (Joh 13:33). They were not merely His ‘flock’ (Mat 26:31, Joh 10:16), but His ‘little flock’ (Luk 12:32). They were not merely His ‘sheep’ (Mat 10:6), but His ‘little sheep’ (Joh 10:7; Joh 10:16); not merely His ‘lambs’ (Luk 10:3), but His ‘little lambs’ (Joh 21:15). In the designation ‘little ones’ both these lines of expression reach their height. In calling His disciples the ‘little ones’ of Isa 60:22, Zec 13:7, He points to them as the true seed of the Kingdom, the branch of God’s planting, the work of His hands in which He shall be glorified (cf. Schwartzkopff, *The Prophecies of Jesus Christ*, pp. 199-202). In calling them ‘little ones’ (οἱ μικροί) He applies to them the hypocoristic by way of eminence,—so pure a hypocoristic that the very substantive is lacking, and nothing persists but the bare endearing diminutive. There is combined, therefore, in this designation the expression of our Lord’s deep-reaching tenderness for His disciples and the declaration of His protecting care over them as ‘the remnant of Jacob.’ The ordinary suggestions of the meaning of the phrase as applied to the disciples may doubtless be neglected as artificial. Reuss, for example, thinks they were called ‘little ones’ because they were drawn from the most humble, the least distinguished section of society; de Wette, because they were despised and meanly esteemed for Christ’s sake; Dr. Riddle, in recognition of their weakness in themselves in the midst of the persecution of the world. These are all secondary ideas. Primarily our Lord’s disciples were called by Him ‘little ones’ because this was the natural utterance of the tenderness of Jesus’ love for them, and the strongest mode of expressing the glorious destiny that was in store for them. The passages in which the epithet occurs are full of the note of pledged protection, and they run up into that marvellous declaration that no man and no thing can snatch them out of the Father’s hand. We shall not go far wrong, then, if we say simply that our Saviour calls His disciples ‘these little ones’ because He thinks of them as the peculiar objects of His protecting care, and sees in them already of the travail of His soul that He may be satisfied. The greatness of His love for them, the greatness of their significance as the seed of the Kingdom,—these are the two ideas that combine in this designation.

Benjamin B. Warfield.

Living

LIVING.—1. Βίος = ‘livelihood,’ ‘means of living.’ It is often used in this sense in class. Gr., e.g. τὸν βίον κᾶσθαι, ποιεῖσθαι, etc.; Plato, *Gorg.* 486 D [Note: Deuteronomist.], (men) οἷς ἔστι καὶ βίος καὶ δόξα καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ ἀγαθὰ; Phocylides, *Frag.* 10, ed. Bergk, δίζησθαι βιοτήν, ἀρετὴν δ’ ὅταν ἦ βίος ἤδη (like Hor. *Ep.* i. i. 53, ‘quaerenda pecunia primum est, virtus post nummos’). It is rendered ‘living’ in four passages in the Gospels. (1) Mar_12:44 (|| Luk_21:4) ἔβαλεν ὄλον τὸν βίον αὐτῆς, Vulgate *totum victum suum* = ‘all that she had to live upon until more should be earned’ (Swete). Jesus knew that this was the case, and that she might have retained one of the λεπτά when she cast in both (Nestle, *Expos. Times*, xiii. 562, who adds that 2Co_8:12 looks like the moral drawn from this passage; cf. Holtzmann, *Hand-Commentar*, 256). Compare the praise of the virtuous woman, Pro_31:14 (LXX Septuagint συνάγει δὲ αὕτη τὸν βίον). (2) Luk_8:43 ἰατροῖς προσαναλώσασα ὄλον τὸν βίον, Vulgate *omnem substantiam suam*: the πρὸς implying that besides what she had suffered, she had expended all her means of subsistence (cf. Plummer, 234; Holtzmann, 157; Hasting’s *Dictionary of the Bible* iii. 322^a). Son_8:7 LXX Septuagint, ἐὰν δῶ ἀνήρ πάντα τὸν βίον αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ, ἐξουδενώσει ἐξουδενώσουσιν αὐτόν, forms a suggestive parallel. (3) Luk_15:12 διεῖλεν αὐτοῖς τὸν βίον, Vulgate *divisit illis substantiam*: ὁ βίος being equivalent to ἡ οὐσία (‘his estate’). Such a division of property in the father’s lifetime was perhaps not uncommon. What precise rights the father retained after the division is not clear. The words πάντα τὰ ἐμὰ σὰ ἐστίν (Luk_15:31) are not spoken in a legal sense, but are an expression of fatherly affection (cf. Plummer, 372; Simcox, *Expositor*, 1889, ii. 124, 127). τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος was a technical formula, as appears from the papyri (Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 230). The share of the younger son would be a third (Deu_21:17, cf. Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden*, 338). (4) Luk_15:30 ὁ καταφαγὼν σου τὸν βίον. Plummer thinks there may be bitterness in the σου, when αὐτοῦ might have been more fairly used. But the σου τὸν βίον may have been due to correct feeling; the elder son not regarding the share which he himself had received as being absolutely his own as long as his father lived (cf. Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden*, 337). Βίος is used in the same sense: 1Jn_3:17 ὃς δ’ ἂν ἔχη τὸν βίον τοῦ κόσμου, where it is rendered ‘this world’s good’ (Authorized

Version), ‘goods’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), and includes ‘all the endowments which make up our earthly riches, wealth, station, intellect’ (Westcott, *in loc.*). For the distinction between ζωή and βίος, in NT and in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers (ζωή the principle of life, *vita qua vivimus*; βίος the process, the circumstances, the accidents of life, in its social relations, *vita quam vivimus*; cf. Luk 8:14), see the valuable note of Lightfoot, *Ignat. ad Rom. [Note: Roman.]* vii. 3 (*Apostolic Fathers*, second part, ii. 1, 225-226); and cf. Haupt on 1Jn 2:16, and Trench, *Synon.* xxvii.

2. Ζῶν.—(1) *as applied to God*: by St. Peter, Mat 16:16 ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος; by the high priest, Mat 26:63 ἐξορκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ θ. τ. ζ.; by Christ Himself, Joh 6:57 ὁ ζῶν πατήρ.

The title ‘the living God’ occurs in OT in the following passages: אֱלֹהִים חַיִּים Deu 5:23 (Deu 5:26), 1Sa 17:26-36, Jer 10:10; Jer 23:36; אֱלֹהִים חַיִּים 2Ki 19:4; 2Ki 19:16 (|| Isa 37:4; Isa 37:17); אֱלֹהֵינוּ Jos 3:10, Hos 2:1 (Hos 1:10), Psa 42:3 (2) Psa 84:3 (2); אֱלֹהֵינוּ Dan 6:21 (20) Dan 6:27 (26). It is found besides (in LXX Septuagint) Deu 4:33, Tob 13:1, Est 6:13, Dan 4:19; Dan 5:23; Dan 12:7, Bel 5, 3Ma 6:28. A study of the OT passages shows that God is called ‘the living God,’ not only as contrasted with the dead idols of the heathen, but also as the God of active Providence, as Israel’s Protector and Helper, as He who is Life, and the never-failing Source of spiritual life to men. It is perhaps the title of God that comes nearest in significance to Jahweh, and it seems to have been used at times of great emotion as a substitute for it, particularly when the name Jahweh had disappeared from popular use (cf. Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, 195). Sanday (*BL [Note: L Bampton Lecture.]*, 1893, p. 153, cf. 124) justly calls attention to the richness and depth of this prophetic title as compared with modern terminology: ‘the Absolute, the Infinite, the Unconditioned, the First Cause, the Moral Governor,’ and so on (cf. Flint, *Sermons and Addresses*, 170).* [Note: ‘O Thou Infinite, Amen,’ was the form of prayer Tennyson used in times of trouble and sorrow (Memoir by his Son, i. 324). The language of the founder of the Gifford Lectureship may also be recalled.]

‘The living God’ occurs often in NT, and the writer of Hebrews uses it with special force and emphasis (see A. B. Davidson, note on Heb 3:12). On the lips of St. Peter (Mat 16:16) it amounts to a confession that the living God is now revealed in Christ, who thus becomes the Source of eternal life to His followers (Joh 6:68; cf. Hasting’s *Dictionary of the Bible* iv. 574^b). The high priest’s use of the title adds a certain dignity to his adjuration; and Jesus answered on being thus solemnly appealed to.

‘The living Father’ (Joh 6:57) is a remarkable expression, combining as it does all that was signified by ‘the living God’ in the OT with Christ’s revelation of God as the Father who sent His Son (or, of God as the Source of life on the side of love). The meaning of this verse may be briefly stated as follows: our Lord’s words, ‘I live by (διὰ , Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘because of’) the Father’ are to be referred to the personal life of human weakness and suffering now in progress. In living this life Jesus is dependent upon the support and sustenance which He is receiving at every moment from the Father who sent Him. A like dependence exists in our case upon Jesus Himself. Being Himself strengthened, He becomes the source of strength to us. It is the very fact of His coming and living this life of human weakness and suffering on earth that puts it within our power to take Him for our spiritual support and sustenance. When we take home the truth of His self-humbling love for our sake, and assimilate it to ourselves as the bread we eat, we receive into our souls the true life that cannot die (cf. Beyschlag, *NT Theol.* i. 272; and for a similar profound saying as to the relation between the Father and the Son and believers, see Joh 10:14-15).

(2) *As applied to the Risen Lord:* Luk 24:5 τί ζητεῖτε τὸν ζῶντα μετὰ τῶν νεκρῶν; the angels’ question conveyed a reproof to the women who were come to the place where the dead was laid, bringing the spices which they had prepared: it was like asking them, ‘Where is your faith?’ They had heard the announcement Christ made to the circle of His followers before leaving Galilee, that He would rise again the third day (Luk 24:6-7). At the same time, the question was spoken sympathetically, and conveyed to them the first intimation of the astonishing truth, οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἀλλὰ ἡγέρθη. Here ὁ ζῶν simply implies that Jesus lives, and is not now to be sought in the place where the dead are, *i.e.* continues no longer under the power of death (cf. Luk 24:23 ἀγγέλων ... οἱ λέγουσιν αὐτὸν ζῆν). But as spoken at the empty sepulchre, it undoubtedly has something of the exaltation of meaning with which it was afterwards used by our Lord in His glorified state (Rev 1:18 ἐγὼ εἰμι ... ὁ ζῶν ‘the Living one,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). There is comprehended in it the completeness of that triumph over death which was afterwards so richly unfolded to the mind of the Church by the Holy Spirit, as, for example, when St. Paul used the exultant language of Rom 6:9-10, or spoke of Christ as a πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν (1Co 15:45).

(3) *As applied to Water and Bread in the Fourth Gospel:* Joh 4:10-11 ὕδωρ ζῶν; Joh 7:38 ποταμοὶ ὕδατος ζῶντος; Joh 6:51 ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν.—a. Joh 4:10-11. ‘Living water’ is spring water, as contrasted with that collected in a well or cistern. It

is the מַיִם חַיִּים of the OT (Gen 26:19 [see Driver's note], Lev 14:5-6; Lev 14:50-52, Son 4:15, Jer 2:13; Jer 17:13, Zec 14:8 : also LXX Septuagint Gen 21:19, Num 5:17). The woman of Samaria was familiar with the expression, and her question was quite natural and appropriate, 'Art thou greater than our father Jacob?' 'Here is an ordinary man offering to supply better water, spring water, in the place where the patriarch Jacob had been obliged to content himself with building a cistern and drinking cistern water' (Wendt, *St. John's Gospel*, 124). The water in Jacob's Well (wh. see) is believed to be due to 'percolation and rainfall' (cf. Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. 536, *Encyc. Bibl.* iv. 4829, Smith's *DB* [Note: *Dictionary of the Bible.*] ² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ii. 1503). Jer 2:13 especially illustrates the difference between the spring or fountain, gushing forth with its unstinted and unfailing supply, 'overflowing, ever-flowing,' and the cistern, so liable to be destroyed by cracking (*Land and Book*, 287), which at the best cannot afford a refreshing draught like that of the bubbling spring, and which cannot permanently retain the water collected in it. Christ does not call Himself 'the Living water,' as He calls Himself 'the Living bread.' What He means by 'the living water' is the word of salvation which He preaches (cf. Joh 4:41-42). This word, He says (Joh 4:14), enters into the inner personal life, and becomes there a gushing spring, a perennial fountain (πηγή ὕδατος), 'springing up into eternal life,' *i.e.* persisting to flow upwards till we reach our end of full communion with God. C. Wesley's 'Spring Thou up within my heart, Rise to all eternity,' is quite in harmony with Israel's water-drawing song, in which the spring is addressed as a living being (Num 21:17, cf. *Encyc. Bibl.* i. 515, iv. 4778).

b. Joh 7:38.—'Pouring out water before the Lord' was a primitive ritual practice, of which the origin is uncertain. It was 'in all probability a survival from a time when water (in the desert) was considered an article of value' (Kantzsck in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , Ext. Vol. 620^a). It is mentioned as a prayer-offering, 1Sa 7:6; as a thank-offering, 2Sa 23:16. There are no traces of it beyond the time of David (a reference to it in 1Ki 18:33 is not probable); but the practice of pouring out water as a drink-offering continued to be observed, or was revived, in connexion with the Feast of Tabernacles. Every morning during the seven days of the feast water was drawn from the spring of Siloam in a golden pitcher, and was poured into a basin at the top of the altar (*Encyc. Bibl.* iv. 4213). The libation of water was probably a prayer-offering for abundant rain for the new seed-time (*ib.* iv. 4880, cf. iii. 3354). Rain was an emblem of Messianic blessings (2Sa 23:4, Psa 72:6, cf. Hos 6:3); and we may well believe that the symbolical act of pouring out water gave occasion to our Lord's looking forward to the abundant showers with which He was soon to water the earth.—Further, this joyous festival brought to our Lord's mind the Rock at Horeb (Exo 17:6, Num 20:11, cf. 1Co 10:4), and perhaps more especially those OT sayings

in which it had been predicted that living water should flow out from Jerusalem, or from the House of the Lord (Eze 47:1; Eze 47:12, Zec 14:8, Joe 3:18, cf. Psa 87:7). What was the precise connecting link of thought between these predictions and the phrase ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ, it is difficult to say. But may it not be the case that, in our Lord's view, what had been spoken concerning Jerusalem and the Temple was now to be applied to the inner personal life of the believer, enriched by the entrance of His word, and renewed by His Holy Spirit? This sanctified personal life was what now answered to the sanctuary from which it had been foretold that living waters should flow out. Our Lord's application of the term κοιλία to it was in keeping with the use of קִּיבּוּץ in certain passages of the OT, where it denotes the whole of man's emotional nature and sympathetic affections (Pro 20:27; Pro 20:30, Hab 3:16, cf. Sir 19:12; Sir 51:21; cf. also the expression 'his bowels yearned,' Gen 43:30, 1Ki 3:26). The words καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή, κ.τ.λ., are thus a terse and eloquent paraphrase of the scope of the passages above referred to. It need hardly be said that the clause καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή cannot possibly be connected with the preceding ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ ('there are not different ways of believing,' Principal Campbell, *The Four Gospels, in loc.*). This saying of our Lord supplements and extends that of Joh 4:14. The word of salvation which becomes a gushing spring when received into the inner personal life of the believer, and rises up there unto eternal life, Jesus now announces, is to become a rushing stream, and is to flow out from the believer in rivers of blessing to others (ποταμοὺς ἐκάλεσεν, οὐχ ἓνα ποταμὸν, ἀλλὰ ἀφάρτους, Chrys. *in loc.*). The limitations to its diffusion that at present exist will be removed when Christ shall have entered into His glory. His sending His Holy Spirit upon the company of believers will enable them to proclaim His word with full power, and will make their holy lives a means of spiritual replenishment to all mankind. The saying was fulfilled after Pentecost, when 'rivers of living water' flowed out from the Lord's witnesses 'unto the uttermost part of the earth,' 'beginning at Jerusalem'* [Note: The Patristic expositors applied the saying mainly to the effusion of the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit (Hare, *Mission of the Comforter*, Note H, where a passage is quoted from a sermon preached by Luther in 1531, in which he states the right sense with his usual vigour).] (cf. Dykes, *Expositor*, 1890 (i.) p. 127 ff.). When the water from Siloam was brought to the Temple, priests and people sang the words, 'Therefore with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation' (Isa 12:3). But in the verses following (Isa 12:4-6), it was implied that the water so drawn was not to be Israel's exclusive possession, but that the salvation which it symbolized was to be communicated to other nations (Isa 12:5 'let this be known in all the earth,' Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). With the leading thought of Joh 7:38 may be compared what St. Paul says about Christians first receiving and then giving forth 'the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ' (2Co 4:6).

c. Joh 6:51.—Two things—the manna and the bread of the miracle which He had just wrought—were present to our Lord’s mind when He preached at Capernaum, and also to the minds of His hearers. They had said, after His feeding the five thousand, ‘This is of a truth the Prophet that cometh into the world’ (Joh 6:14). But the earthly and material good which they expected to follow not being immediately forthcoming, and the first favourable impression produced by the miracle having worn off, they began to criticise and find fault. ‘After all, His multiplying the loaves is not anything so very wonderful. Can He “rain down manna upon us to eat, and give us of the corn of heaven” (Psa 78:24), that we may see and believe Him (Joh 6:30)? The manna,’ said they, ‘supplied the wants of all the hosts of Israel for forty years, but He has furnished us with no more than one meal.’ This led Jesus to set forth the difference between the manna and ‘the true bread from heaven’ (Joh 6:32). Inasmuch as the manna was sent down from above, and was continually renewed, it was a type of the true bread. But *that* bread it was not, being simply a provision which was made for a special purpose, and which lasted only until that purpose had been fulfilled (cf. Jos 5:12); nor had their fathers’ having eaten it eventually delivered them from the power of death (Joh 6:49). Jesus also showed that His hearers had failed to perceive the true purpose of the miracle He had wrought. The bread of the miracle was intended for ‘a sign’ (Joh 6:26), which they had not had faith to discern (Joh 6:36), that He could supply them with the true bread of the soul. Inasmuch as the multiplying of the loaves was due to His love, and involved the repeated action of that love in the gift of a satisfying meal to each of them severally (cf. Swete, *St. Mark*, 127^b), it was ‘a sign’ that should have led them to believe that He could give them the true bread. But they had sought Him at Capernaum, not hungering for this bread, but hankering after more earthly good, like that which they had already received. Accordingly, Jesus spoke of the bread of the miracle as ‘the meat which perisheth,’ and contrasted it with ‘the meat which endureth unto eternal life’ (Joh 6:27). These distinctions of the bread of the miracle as well as the manna from the true bread of the soul are important and vital, and they assist us to lay hold of our Lord’s meaning when He said, ‘I am the living bread.’ This expression has no parallel in the OT, but it is in close affinity with the ‘living water’ in ch. 4. As ‘living water’ is water that never ceases to gush forth, so ‘living bread’ is bread that Jesus never ceases to multiply for the supply of our spiritual wants,—bread, therefore, by which our spiritual sustenance is perpetually renewed (cf. Dods, *Expositor’s Bible*, *in loc.*). It is bread in ever-multiplying, unmeasured store, that can never be exhausted by the famishing. As Jesus speaks of ‘giving’ this bread (Joh 6:27), it must mean, in the first instance, the same thing as the better water which He also spoke of ‘giving,’ namely, His word. This view is in agreement with the teaching of Joh 6:63; Joh 6:68, and is also supported by our Lord’s use of Deu 8:3 (Mat 4:4, Luk 4:4). But He not only speaks of ‘giving’ bread, He also says, ‘I am the living bread.’ The key to His meaning is found in the Prologue. Jesus not only utters the word of God, but is ‘from eternity the very *Word of God*, by which God manifests Himself. He is not one who leads to

the way, but Himself the Way; not one who preaches truth, but Himself the Truth' (Joh 1:1; Joh 14:6; *Hibbert Journal*, Oct. 1905, p. 6). So here Jesus not only gives the bread, but is Himself 'the living bread,' – 'the actual source of nutrition.' He 'speaks of Himself not as resembling, but as being the veritable vine, the veritable bread, the veritable light of the world; implying that He is the absolute truth of all these things; the supreme reality which they partially manifest in their several spheres' (Illingworth, *Divine Immanence*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 135, cf. 137). Jesus adds, 'which came down from heaven.' As in the physical realm, so, too, in the spiritual, the food that sustains us comes down from heaven, and to procure it is beyond the reach of our own powers (Isa 55:10-11). As the heaven-given bread which feeds our bodies ultimately assumes the humble form of the baked loaf, which, inasmuch as it nourishes life, retains the life of the living wheat, and can impart it, so Jesus, in order to feed our souls, must humble Himself and 'be found in fashion as a man,' be born, and that in a low condition (v. 42), undergo the miseries of this life, and at the end of His earthly course even 'give his flesh for the life of the world.' The power of this truth of His self-humbling love for our sake enters into our inner personal life, and we are enabled to assimilate it to ourselves as the food we eat, by means of His word. His word is the 'bread which strengtheneth man's heart' (Psa 104:15), because it is the embodiment of Him who, having humbled Himself to death, now for ever lives. Through it the repeated action of His love still ministers the gift to each hungering soul. The Bread of heaven, in heaven itself, will be the word which Jesus speaks to His people.—It is the same truth respecting Christ as our Living Food and Strength that is 'represented, sealed, and applied' to us in the Lord's Supper.

(4) *As applied to the Patriarchs: Mar 12:27 (|| Mat 22:32, Luk 20:38) οὐκ ἔστιν θεὸς νεκρῶν, ἀλλὰ ζώντων.*—In expounding this cardinal saying, we have first to inquire what doctrine our Lord is here vindicating. Religious minds among the Jews had already arrived at the clearly defined hope of a future life (Driver, *Sermons on OT*, 92), which life they conceived of as comprehending 'the deliverance of an existent personality from Sheol, and its re-endowment with life in all its powers and activities' (Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iv. 232^a). Sadduceeism, which represented the old Jewish standpoint, rejected these doctrines. The Sadducees were hostile to our Lord's whole teaching respecting 'the kingdom of God,' which carried the consummation of the Kingdom into a future life, and accordingly implied that there would be a resurrection of the dead. It was with reference to the resurrection that they chose their line of attack on His teaching. In His discussion with them, it was our Lord's object not only to maintain that there is a life after death, but also to reveal what deliverance from death really implied. Had He made use of Exodus 3 simply to prove the continued existence of men after death, He would not have met the objections of

His opponents. It was their attack on the resurrection that He successfully repelled (cf. Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, i. 222). The Sadducees, although not actually rejecting the other books of the OT, considered them as being very inferior in value to the five books of Moses (cf. *Encyc. Bibl.* iv. 4240). It was from the latter, accordingly, that they drew their objection to the resurrection. Founding on the law of the Levirate marriage (see Levirate Law), they thought to put our Lord in an embarrassing position by propounding the case of seven brethren, who, after having married the same wife in succession, had all died childless, and then asking, 'In the resurrection, when they shall rise, whose wife shall she be of the seven?' The story of Glaphyra (Josephus *Ant.* xvii. xiii. 4; cf. Addison, *Spectator*, No. 110) was probably much canvassed about that time (Holtzmann, *Hand-Commentar*, 245); and in it the marriage-relation was conceived of as still standing in the world beyond death. Our Lord took the opportunity afforded Him by the disputation which had arisen to set free the doctrine of the resurrection from such grossly materialistic notions as these, and to show that the resurrection life is not a continuation of the present life of the body, or of human relations as they now exist (Joh 6:25). As to the main point at issue, He met the Sadducees on their own ground. He directed their attention to a passage which they had overlooked in one of their revered books, and prefacing the quotation with the words, 'As touching the dead that they rise,'—thus showing that it was the resurrection He was vindicating,—He asked them, 'Have you considered the bearing of this passage upon the doctrine in question?' As to our Lord's use of this passage of the OT, all that need be said here is that the revelation given to Moses at Horeb, and made by him the ground of his appeal to the Hebrew tribes,—the revelation, namely, of Jahweh as the God of their fathers,—lies at the very root of Israel's religion (cf. W. R. Smith, *Proph.* 1 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 32, *OTJC* [Note: *TJC The Old Test, in the Jewish Church*] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 303; Kautzsch in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, Ext. Vol. 624, 625^a). Our Lord's argument, based on the passage quoted, may be stated as follows:—The words of Exo 3:6; Exo 3:13; Exo 3:15-16 spoke of the relation of the patriarchs to God as a still existing relation, and set forth a fellowship with God in which they, being dead, yet lived. But their fellowship with God contained in itself the promise and the pledge of a more complete life and more perfect fellowship which should hereafter be granted them by God. It followed, by an inner principle of necessity, from their being united to Him who is 'the God of the living,' that He would not leave any part of their being for ever under the destructive power of death, but would in the end awaken them to a heavenly life with Himself (Wendt, *l.c.* i. 223; cf. Bengel, note on Mat 22:32; Salmond, *Chr. Doctr. of Immortality*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 366; Swete, *St. Mark*, 266). Or, to state the argument in a more compact form:—God is Life. The patriarchs are in God, therefore they partake of life. But life cannot die, therefore they must continue living for ever. But a purely incorporeal existence does

not give the full conception of life in man's case. Each patriarch is soul plus body. Therefore the body, as well as the soul, is secured in an everlasting life. Compare the remarkable treatise on the Resurrection by the apologist Athenagoras (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 177), especially chs. 14-17 (Donaldson, *A Critical History of Chr. Lit. and Doctr.* iii. 116, 136 ff.). The ground of the resurrection-hope which our Lord found in this passage was beyond question contained in it, seeing that *He* found it there and set it forth. He could see all that God meant when He called Himself 'the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.' He could discern the full witness borne by this title to the certainty of the hope which He defended. 'He who spoke in the OT was God, and from the first that which He spoke about was the consummation which filled His thought' (A. B. Davidson, *Expositor*, 1900 (i.), 15; cf. *OT Prophecy*, 14). Further, in the Resurrection of Christ Himself we have the conclusive proof that communion with God involves the restitution of the whole of our personal being. What the proper view of the resurrection body is we find later on from St. Paul, whose doctrine of a σῶμα πνευματικόν as contrasted with a σῶμα ψυχικόν (1Co 15:44), and of a σῶμα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ as contrasted with a σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν (Php 3:21), was no doubt evolved from our Lord's saying.

(5) *As applied to the manner or course of life:* Luk 15:13 ζῶν ἀσώτως, 'with riotous living' (cf. Josephus *Ant.* xii. iv. 8, ἀσώτως ζῆν). Contrast 'holy living.' From this phrase is derived the title ὁ ἄσωτος υἱός, *filius prodigus*, by which this parable is generally known (Trench, *Par.* 8 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 393; Jülicher, *Gleichnissr.* 337, 341).* [Note: (de Pœnitentia, Hom. i. 4) calls the younger son ὁ ἄσωτος, but the sermon εἰς τοῦ ἄσωτον υἱόν referred to by Jülicher is omitted as spurious, ed. Montfauçon (Paris, 1839).] See also art. Life.

Literature.—In addition to the reff. in this art., see Dale, *The Living Christ and the Four Gospels*; Forsyth, *The Holy Father and the Living Christ*; van Dyke, *The Reality of Religion*, p. 121; Liddon, *Passiontide Sermons*, p. 244.

James Donald.

☞ Loaf

LOAF (ἄρτος).—The Eastern loaf is not at all like the bread in use among ourselves. The Passover loaf—a large round thin cake—probably preserves the shape of the loaf

in use among the Jews of our Lord's time. The same shape of loaf is found to-day among the Bedawîn and *fellahîn* as well as in many villages and towns. The loaves are of considerable size,—18 in. or more in diameter,—and are of an extreme tenuity and of a peculiar but not unpleasant toughness. They are baked usually on a convex girdle, very often on the implement which is used for roasting coffee—hence the name 'girdle bread.' They may also be baked on heated stones or on the outside of a jar within which a fire has been kindled. Such without doubt would be the kind of bread baked by the children of Israel in their desert wanderings. And at the present time one may see this loaf in almost every part of Palestine. Even where other kinds of bread are used, this is still highly relished. If there is a guest in a native house, the loaves are often folded up in quarter size and laid beside his plate, and more than one European traveller has mistaken them, when so placed, for table napkins!

In all probability the loaves in [Mar_6:38](#); [Mar_8:6](#), etc., were of this kind, inasmuch as such bread is almost always carried on a journey, and by workmen, because of its keeping properties. The loaf is never cut; it is broken or torn asunder. Small scoops are made of the portions, with which the meat, rice, or *leben* (curdled milk) is scooped up—spoon and contents being eaten together. A man will eat three or four of these loaves at a meal ([Luk_11:5](#)).

Another loaf in common use at the present day is smaller in circumference and considerably thicker, and very much resembles in appearance the 'scones,' baked on a girdle, so common in some parts of Scotland. Bread of this kind is found only in towns where there are public ovens. See also art. Bread.

J. Soutar.

Loans

LOANS.—There are frequent references to money, and many illustrations suggested by financial obligations, in the teaching of Jesus. These have been gathered together as indications of 'the economic background of the Evangelical history' (Hausrath, *NT Times*, i. p. 188 f., quoted also in full by Bruce in *Parabolic Teaching*, p. 243 f.). We learn from Tacitus that the year 17 was marked by great discontent in Judaea and throughout Syria, on account of the burdensome taxation, and that the year 33 was one of financial crisis throughout the Empire. There is thus full justification for the numerous Gospel intimations of hardship and debt, and impoverishment generally. See Debt.

But the relation of debtor and creditor is so obviously adaptable to moral obligations, that under any social condition the use of this figure is to be expected. The very terms for financial obligations are freely used to express the obligations of moral life. Thus the same Gr. verb (ὀφείλω) is variously rendered in the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'owed,' 'owest,' 'that was due' (Mat 18:28; Mat 18:30; Mat 18:34, Luk 7:41; Luk 16:5; Luk 16:7 of financial obligation); 'debtor' (Mat 23:16; Mat 23:18 [Authorized Version 'guilty']), 'duty' (Luk 17:10), 'ought' (Joh 13:14; Joh 19:7), 'indebted' (Luk 11:4; all of moral obligation); and the noun (ὀφειλέτης) is translated 'owed' (Mat 18:24 of money debt), 'debtors' (Mat 6:12 of moral debts), 'offenders' (Luk 13:4 [Authorized Version 'sinners'] of guilt before God). Financial obligations afford also a ready measure of moral indebtedness; our sins against one another are as debts of £50 or £5 (Luk 7:41), but our sin against God runs into 'millions sterling' (Mat 18:24).

The very naturalness of these illustrative uses of money values and financial relations makes it obviously wrong to press them into the support of economic theories, e.g. the justification of commercial loans from 'Thou oughtest therefore to have put my money to the bankers, and then at my coming I should have received back mine own with interest' (Mat 25:27 = Luk 19:23). In parables any relations may hold which the story demands. In Christian economics only moral relations are to be tolerated. Because then, in the Gospel narratives, debtors and creditors, borrowers and lenders figure largely, we are not able to say that the teaching of Jesus either supports or condemns modern commercial arrangements. The true basis of Christian economics must be found in the ethical teaching of the Gospels as a whole.

Apart from incidental references in parables, there is one saying of Jesus which calls for fuller notice. 'If ye lend (δανείζω, *lend upon interest*; contrast *κίχρημι*, of a *friendly loan*, Luk 11:5 only) to them of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye? even sinners lend to sinners, to receive again as much. But love your enemies, and do them good, and lend, never despairing; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be sons of the Most High: for he is kind toward the unthankful and evil' (Luk 6:34 f., cf. Mat 5:42). The difficulty, in part one of textual reading, but mainly of interpretation, finds adequate representation in 'hoping for nothing again' (Authorized Version), 'never despairing' (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), 'despairing of no man' ((Revised Version margin)). This uncertainty cannot, however, affect the meaning, which is determined by the preceding verses, and though the rendering of the Authorized Version must be rejected on critical grounds, it may well stand as an adequate gloss. On the authority of this saying the unlawfulness for Christians of receiving interest on loans has been based; and, rightly understood and applied, the inference is just. The commandment is one of benevolence. Christian charity is not to be by way of loans at interest. It is the duty of giving Jesus teaches,

as if He said, 'Let *your* lending be giving'—a rule of charity which experience justifies, and which, from the would-be borrower's side, receives support in St. Paul's saying, 'Owe no man anything, save to love one another' ([Rom_13:8](#)).

W. H. Dyson.

Locust

LOCUST

1. *Zoological description.*—Locusts belong to the natural order Orthoptera. The members of this order are insects which undergo only a partial metamorphosis; the larva is scarcely distinguishable from the adult, unless by its smaller form and by the atrophy of its wings, which develop only gradually in proportion to its growth. Excepting this difference, it has the same form and the same habits as the adult. In its perfect state, the first pair of wings, though remaining supple, have a certain consistency. They cover the hind wings, which are membranous and transparent, and folded under the upper wings in the form of a fan. The mouth is of shape suitable for mastication, and the jaws act like a pair of scissors. Formerly the Orthoptera were divided into *runners* and *leapers*, but this division has been abandoned. Locusts were classed among the leapers. According to the present nomenclature, we must class them among the *Orthoptera genuina*. Among these appear among others (*a*) the family of *Locustodeæ*, to which the European grasshoppers (the subfamily of the *Locustidæ*) belong; and also (*b*) the family of *Acridiodeæ*, which includes in its various sub-families the principal locusts of Palestine. It is of the highest importance to avoid the confusion which may arise from this misleading terminology, according to which the 'locusts' of the Bible do not belong to the scientific family *Locustodeæ*.

We are, then, to treat of the family *Aeridiodeæ*. Their antennae are relatively short, scarcely exceeding the length of the head, whereas the antennae of the *Locustodeæ* are very long, as long as their bodies. Their hind legs, adapted for leaping, have very strong thighs furnished with indentations, which are easily seen if slightly magnified. The head is vertical. The first pair of wings are more leathery than the second, but both present the same reticulated appearance. The rapid brushing of the thighs of the hind legs, furnished with indentations, against the nervures of the front wings produces, when the insect is at rest, a stridulation, the tone and height of which vary according to the species. The *Acridiodeæ* are generally diurnal, and their food is essentially herbaceous. In the females the abdomen ends in a pair of short pincers, whereas in the *Locustodeæ* this appendage is greatly prolonged like the blade of a

sabre. These pincers serve to bury in the earth, one by one, the eggs, which are disposed in cylindrical masses and held together by a frothy secretion.

The insect moults six times, but the principal stages of its development are only two—*larva* and *imago* (perfect state). The intermediate state (*pupa*) which we find in other orders of insects is imperceptible in the Orthoptera. In their state of larvae, locusts, having no wings, or more correctly, merely the rudiments of wings, *hop* on the ground; even at this stage they are extremely destructive. Later, with the succeeding moultings, the wings develop, but remain enclosed in a membranous case; the insects now advance *walking*. At last, at their sixth moulting, which takes place from six to seven weeks after their coming out of the egg, locusts attain to their perfect state, and, unfolding their wings, *fly* through the air, producing what travellers describe as ‘a hissing or a buzzing noise.’

In Palestine as many as forty different species of *Acridiodeæ* have been noted. The most important of these belong to the sub-families of the *Tryxalidæ*, the *Ædipodidæ*, and the *Acridiidæ* properly so called. The commonest species, those which are rightly associated with the locusts mentioned in the Bible, are the *Pachytylus migratorius* (formerly called *Ædipoda migratoria*) and the *Sehisticerea peregrina* (formerly called *Acridium peregrinum*). The colour of these insects is generally brown bordering on green, but with a bluish tint round the mouth, and with black spots on the body and green spots on the wings. The males are coloured differently from the females. In regard to their dimensions, locusts are as much as three or even four inches long when they are full grown.

Locusts are migratory insects, as the qualifying words, *migratoria*, *peregrina*, applied to them denote. They are produced chiefly in desert regions on the lofty plateaux of the East, and, carried by their wings and driven on by the east wind, they invade western Palestine in compact bodies.

2. Biblical names.—The OT mentions locusts under at least nine different names. These are (1) אַרְבֵּכָה *'arbch*, Exo 10:4; Exo 10:12-14; Exo 10:19, Lev 11:22, Deu 28:38, Jdg 6:5; Jdg 7:12, 1Ki 8:37, 2Ch 6:28, Job 39:20, Psa 78:46; Psa 105:34; Psa 109:23, Pro 30:27, Jer 46:23, Joe 1:4; Joe 2:25, Nah 3:15; Nah 3:17. (2) חֲגָבָה *hâgâb*, Lev 11:22, Num 13:33, 2Ch 7:13, Ecc 12:5, Isa 40:22. (3) סִלְעָם *sol'âm*, Lev 11:22. (4) חֲרָגֹל *hargôl*, Lev 11:22. (5) יֵלֶק *yelek*, Psa 105:34, Jer 51:14; Jer 51:27, Joe 1:4; Joe 2:25, Nah 3:15 f. (6) חֲסִיל *hâsîl*, 1Ki 8:37, 2Ch 6:28, Psa 78:46, Isa 33:4, Joe 1:4; Joe 2:25. (7) גֻזָּאם *gûzâm*, Joe 1:4; Joe 2:25, Amo 4:9.

(8) נִבְּ, נִבְּ, נִבְּי, *gçb, gôb, gôbai*, Isa 33:4, Amo 7:1, Nah 3:17. (9) זְלַזַל *zêlâzal*, Deu 28:42.

It would naturally be a matter of the greatest interest to know if these various names correspond with as many different species. But before replying to this question, (a) we should have to be certain that the ancients, the Easterns, the Hebrews in particular, were capable of making a distinction similar to that of genus and species used by modern scholars; (b) we should have to be equally certain that Biblical writers employed the terms in their language in a strict and rigorous fashion (a thing which even modern writers do not always do); and (c) we should require sufficient data to enable us to assign such and such a Hebrew name to such and such a particular species. Now these three conditions cannot be fulfilled, and in such a case it may well seem chimerical to demand a systematic classification, in accordance with present zoological principles, of the various locusts mentioned in the Bible. We must remember that Oriental languages, such as Hebrew and Arabic, possess a considerable choice of synonyms to denote one and the same animal. We note that the LXX Septuagint proceeds on no regular system. It translates the Hebrew by using the terms ἀκρίς, βροῦχος, κάμπη, ἀπτέλαβος (ἀπτέλεβος), ἐρυσίβν (ἐρυσύβη), ἀττάκης, ὄφιομάχης, etc., in a purely arbitrary and, it would appear, conjectural manner, without taking the least care always to translate the same Hebrew by the same Greek word. The same is true of the version of Jerome and of translations into modern languages. The Authorized and Revised Versions has had no better success with its varying use of 'locust,' 'grasshopper,' 'canker-worm,' 'palmer-worm,' 'caterpillar,' and even 'beetle' (for *hâgâb*, manifestly a false translation).

We must also avoid the error of thinking that the various terms employed, for example, by Joel and Nahum refer to locusts at various stages in their development. The fact that the order of the four terms *gâzâm, 'arbeh, yelek, hâsîl* in Joe 1:4 is followed in Joe 2:25 by the order *'arbch, yelek, hâsîl, gâzâm*, in itself disproves this theory. Besides, it would be difficult to perceive in the development of the Orthopterous insect four stages easily distinguishable by every observer, since, as we have seen, the insect changes very little from moulting to moulting.* [Note: Perhaps one might instance, to prove that the Hebrews had noticed the successive stages of development in the locust, the fact that in Jer 51:27 yelek is qualified by סָמָר *sâmâr* (EV 'rough'): this might be understood to apply to the state of the insect before it has the use of its wings (?).] We must add to the passages of the canonical OT cited above Jdt 2:20, Wis 16:9, Sir 43:17. The term used in these three texts is ἀκρίς; the Hebrew Sirach has *'arbch*.

The names that the Hebrew language gives to locusts prove that these insects were peculiarly feared (*a*) on account of their great numbers, and (*b*) on account of their voracity and their power of destruction. In fact, 'arbch probably goes back to a root meaning *to be numerous, to multiply*. On the other hand, gâzâm, hâsîl, yelek, and sol'âm all have the sense of *destruction* (literally to clip, to cut, to devour, to swallow).† [Note: It is striking to note, in view of these names of serious and even terrible import, that similar insects in Europe (the Locustidœ) are tricked out with such innocent names as 'grasshopper' (German, Heuschrecke, from Heu, 'hay,' and the old word scricchan, 'to leap'; in French sauterelle); note also the German Heupferd and the Italian cavaletta, due to the resemblance of the grasshopper's head to a horse's.] The sense of gçb (gôb, gôbai) and of hâgâb is a problem. Hargôl appears to signify *one who gallops*, and zêlâzal is a more harmless term, referring to the humming of the locust's wings, or rather to the stridulation it makes when it is at rest (a word akin to this is used to denote cymbals).

3. Locusts in the OT.—In the books of the OT the locust is sometimes used figuratively to denote smallness (Num 13:33, Isa 40:22), lightness (Ecc 12:5, but the passage is obscure and in dispute), and great numbers (Jdg 6:5; Jdg 7:12, Jer 46:23). But, as a rule, when locusts are mentioned, it is usually as an instrument of destruction or as food.

The former of these last two usages is much the more frequent in the OT. Particularly forcible, vivid, and picturesque descriptions of the *destructive power* of the locust are given in the passages quoted above from Exodus, Joel, Amos, and Nahum. The fear-inspiring character of these insect invaders, as they advance in regular companies (Pro 30:27), is in no way exaggerated. Locusts are a veritable plague. We find graphic descriptions in the writings of travellers or residents in the Holy Land, such as Wilson, Tristram, Thomson, Van-Lennep, as well as of other writers in various countries. Their accounts have, among others, been collected by Driver (*loc. cit. inf.*). Van-Lennep even says of locusts (p. 314) that 'their voracity is such that in the neighbourhood of Broosa, in the year 1856, an infant having been left asleep in its cradle under some shady trees, was found not long after partly devoured by the locusts.' See also the singularly graphic passage in which Thomson relates his personal experiences (*LB [Note: The Land and the Book.] ii. p. 296 f.*). On a sculptured stone found at Babylon is an exact representation (reproduced in Van-Lennep, *l.e.*) of two locusts devouring a bush. The present writer has seen on both sides of the Dead Sea, and also in the neighbourhood of Jericho and Gadara, locusts at the various stages of development devastating the country and making all verdure disappear in an instant. He has also been a witness of the efforts of the *fellahîn*, under the direction of the officials of the Turkish Government, to check the advance of the insects by lighting along their track fires fed with petroleum. Another device is to compel the Bedawîn, proportionally to the number of members of each family, to bring in a fixed weight of

the eggs or larvae of locusts. The wind, which brings the swarms of locusts, also drives them hither and thither (cf. Psa_109:23), and sometimes carries them into the sea (Exo_10:19, Joe_2:20). One who has read, for example, Joel 1-2, or has seen with his own eyes the ravages of the locusts, is not surprised to find in Rev_9:3-11 this insect playing an apocalyptic part and accomplishing a mission of destruction.

4. *Locusts in the Gospels.*—But in the Gospels—with which this Dictionary is principally concerned—locusts are never mentioned as devastating insects. In Mat_3:4 and in the parallel passage Mar_1:6 they appear only as an article of *food*. It is in this character, then, that we have chiefly to study them here. The word used is ἀκρίς; it is said that John the Baptist fed on ‘locusts and wild honey’ (see art. Honey). An ancient tradition of the Christian Church held that the locusts eaten by the Baptist were not insects, but the pods or husks of a tree, the carob or locust tree (*Ceratonia siliqua*, Arab. [Note: Arabic.] *kharrúb*). Curiously enough, this old interpretation has been resuscitated in our own times by Cheyne (*Encyc. Bibl.* ii. cols. 2136, 2499), who sees in the locusts of John the Baptist ‘carobbeans,’ but for reasons which do not seem to us convincing. In fact, locusts are a well-known food in Eastern countries. Herodotus mentions this (iv. 172); Thomson says (*LB [Note: The Land and the Book.]* ii. p. 301): ‘Locusts are not eaten in Syria by any but the Bedawîn on the extreme frontier. By the natives, locusts are always spoken of as a very inferior article of food, and regarded by most with disgust—to be eaten only by the very poorest people. John the Baptist, however, was of that class ... he also dwelt in “the wilderness” or desert, where such food was and is still used.’ There are, according to travellers, several ways of preparing locusts for food. ‘The Bedouins eat locusts,’ says Burckhardt (p. 239), ‘which are collected in great quantities in the beginning of April. After having been roasted a little upon the iron plate on which bread is baked, they are dried in the sun, and then put into large sacks, with the mixture of a little salt. They are never served up as a dish, but everyone takes a handful of them when hungry. The peasants of Syria do not eat locusts.... There are a few poor fellahs in the Haouran, however, who sometimes, pressed by hunger, make a meal of them; but they break off the head and take out the entrails before they dry them in the sun. The Bedouins swallow them entire.’ ‘The wings and legs are lopped off the body,’ says Wilson (p. 330), ‘and fried with salt and pepper.’ ‘They are roasted and eaten as butter upon loaves of bread,’ says Van-Lennep (p. 319), ‘resembling shrimps in taste, or they are boiled in water with a little salt, dried in the sun, and, being deprived of their wings and legs, are packed in bags for use. They are beaten to a powder, which is mixed with flour and water, made into little cakes, and used as a substitute for bread when flour is scarce. Dried locusts are generally exposed for sale in the markets of Medina, Bagdad, and even Damascus. Palgrave goes so far as to say (p. 346), ‘Locusts are here an article of food, nay, a dainty, and a good swarm of them is begged of Heaven in Arabia no less fervently than it would be deprecated in India or in Syria.... When

boiled or fried they are said to be delicious, and boiled and fried accordingly they are to an incredible extent.’ It would appear likewise, to judge from Thomson (*l.c.*), that occasionally dried, boiled, or fried locusts are eaten with honey. Even horses (Blunt, ii. p. 79) and camels (Daumas, p. 258) are fed on locusts.

The Law of Israel, which strictly forbade the eating of creeping things, insects, etc., made an exception in the case of locusts, which are mentioned under four different names, two of which (*sol’âm* and *hargôl*) are found only in this one passage (Lev 11:22). The Law characterizes them in this sentence: ‘Yet these may ye eat of all winged creeping things that go upon all four, which have legs above their feet, to leap withal upon the earth.’

Literature.—Bochart, *Hieroicoicon*, i. pp. 34-36, ii. pp. 441-496; Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria*, 1822, p. 238 f., *Notes on the Bedouins*, 1830, p. 269; William Rae Wilson, *Travels in Egypt and the Holy Land*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1824, pp. 329-331; Berggrèn, *Guide français-arabe*, 1844, p. 702 f.; Général E. Daumas, *Le Grand Desert*, 1856, pp. 257-265; Robinson, *BRP* [Note: *RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1867, ii. pp. 205, 340; Wood, *Bible Animals*, 1869, pp. 596-604; Van-Lennep, *Bible Lands*, 1875, pp. 313-319; Franz Delitzsch, *Hoheslied und Koheleth*, 1875, Excursus by Wetzstein, pp. 445-455; Lady Anne Blunt, *A Pilgrimage to Nejd*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1881, i. p. 94, ii. pp. 57 f., 79; Palgrave, *Central and Eastern Arabia*, 1883, pp. 345-347; Tristram, *Natural History of the Bible*, 1885, pp. 306-318; Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, ii. [1883] pp. 295-302, iii. [1886] p. 130 f.; Morris, *Bible Natural History*, 1896, pp. 211 f., 269 f.; Driver, *Joel and Amos* (Cambr. Bible for Schools), 1897, Excursus on Locusts, pp. 82-91; Tümpel, *Die Geradflügler Mitteleuropas*, 1901; F. H. Fabre, *Souvenirs entomologiques*, vi. pp. 196-212, 248-297.

Lucien Gautier.

Logia

LOGIA

1. Ancient use of the term.
2. Modern use of the term; (a) of Jesus’ Sayings; (b) of compilations.

3. Tradition on transmission of the Sayings.
4. Criticism of the tradition; (a) Internal evidence of the tradition; (b) Internal evidence of the Gospels.
5. Conjectural reconstructions of the source.
6. Conclusions.

Literature.

1. *Ancient use of the term.*—The Gr. λόγια is the plural of λόγιον ‘a brief utterance,’ ‘apothegm,’ ‘saying’ (so Schol. *ad* Aristoph. *Ran.* 969. 973). According to Liddell-Scott (*Lex.*) and Meyer (on Rom 3:2), λόγιον is the neuter of λόγιος = ‘learned,’ ‘rational,’ and hence means ‘a wise saying.’ More correctly, according to Grimm-Thayer and others, it is a diminutive of λόγος ‘word,’ like βιβλίον from βιβλος ‘book,’ plur. τὰ βιβλία ‘the (sacred) books,’ English ‘Bible.’ In secular writers (Herodotus, Thucyd., Aristoph., *et al.*) it is applied to the Divine oracles (because brief utterances), as those of the Sibyl of Dodona, of Delphi, etc. The same connotation of *sacred* utterances attaches to the use of the word as applied to the Hebrew Scriptures, as by Philo and Josephus. Thus the contents of the OT, as *Divine* utterances, are called τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ. In particular the Ten Words (English ‘Ten Commandments’) are called by Philo τὰ δέκα λόγια (ed. Mangey ii. p. 180ff). By NT writers the term is applied to the Scriptures generally, as ‘oracles’ of God, or to individual inspired utterances of prophets, pre-Christian or Christian (Act 7:38, Rom 3:2, Heb 5:12, 1Pe 4:11). In Ecclesiastical writers of the sub-Apostolic age πᾶ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ is used of the admonitions of God in Scripture (Clem. Rom. [Note: Roman.] *ad Cor.* liii. 1, in parallel with αἱ ἱερᾶι γραφαί), and τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου, or simply τὰ λόγια, of the precepts of Jesus, *not including* embodying narrative. So especially Polycarp *ad Phil.* vii. 1, denouncing heretics, who ‘pervert the precepts of the Lord (τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου) to their own lusts, denying that there is either (bodily) resurrection or (day of) judgment’ (cf. Hegesippus *ap.* Eus. *Historia Ecclesiastica* ii. xxiii. 9); and Papias (*ap.* Euseb. *Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 39), who interpreted ‘the oracles of the Lord’ (λόγια κυριακά) in accordance with the tradition of elders who had been followers of the Apostles. In Papias the λόγια are made equivalent to ‘the commandments (ἐντολαί)

delivered by the Lord to the faith,' and stand in contrast with 'alien commandments' (ἀλλότριαι ἐντολαί) of heretical teachers, and the 'loquacity sought by the multitude' (οὐχ ὥσπερ οἱ πολλοὶ τοῖς τὰ πολλὰ λέγουσιν ἔχαιρον). The true interpretation of these *logia* is matter of tradition transmitted through (1) the Apostles, (2) the Elders 'the disciples of these' (*lege* οἱ τούτων—8c. τῶν τοῦ κυρίου μαθητῶν—μαθηταί [see Aristion-Aristo], Iren. *Hæer.* v. v. 1; οἱ πρεσβύτεροι [οἱ] τῶν ἀποστόλων μαθηταί, Origen ap. Eus.: οἱ διάδοχοι τῶν ἀποστόλων). Compare Polycarp (*I.e.*), 'Wherefore leaving the vain talk (ματαιότητα) of the multitude and the false teachings (ψευδοδιδασκαλίας), let us turn to *the word handed down by tradition* from the beginning (τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἢ μὲν παραδοθεντα λόγον).

At a much later time the term τὰ λόγια is applied to NT Scripture generally in the same sense as to the OT (Ignatius, *ad Smyrn.* iii. [longer form in the interpolated matter]). See in general Grimm-Thayer, *Lexicon*, s.v. λόγιον, and Lightfoot, *Contemp. Rev.* for Aug. 1875, p. 399 ff. On Papias' use see Hall, *Papias*, 1899, p. 242.

2. The *modern use* of the term 'logia' is partly (a) conformed to the Patristic application to the precepts of Jesus conceived as 'brief and pithy apothegms' (Justin M. *Apol.* xiv.) of sacred authority; partly (b) designates a compilation, or compilations, antecedent to or parallel with the canonical Gospels, supposed to have been entitled or called τὰ λόγια; cf. the use of 'Bible' (Lat. *Biblia* = τὰ βιβλία), to mean 'the (sacred) books' of the Canon.

(a) Of the former (correct) use it is enough to say that science has no better designation for the apothegms of Jesus in the form wherein tradition has transmitted them, whether in the Synoptic Gospels or as uncanonical *agrapha*. The connotation of sacredness in the designation *logion*, if we have regard to the later period of transmission, is not inappropriate. The cherished utterances of Jesus soon obtained such currency independently of our Gospels (Act 20:35, Clem. Rom. [Note: Roman.] *ad Cor.* xiii. 1, xlvii. 7, Polyc. *ad Phil.* [Note: *Philistine.*] vii. 2) as rightly to deserve it. The term is appropriate therefore to the sacred apothegms of Jesus as preserved in the Synoptic Gospels or independently. As against the simple λόγοι, it is probably a later form involving tacit comparison with the (sacred) precepts of the OT. It is less common than λόγοι, and certainly much less applicable to the discourses of the Fourth Gospel, where, even if traditional *logia* are embodied, dialogue, the favourite

form for philosophic and religious exposition, predominates, and the traditional interest is subordinated to that of expounding the Evangelist's Christology.

(b) The use of 'Logia' or 'the Logia' to designate a certain type of Gospel-composition is open to serious objection. The discovery by Grenfell and Hunt of papyri of the 2nd or 3rd century, in which Sayings attributed to Jesus are agglutinated with no more of narrative framework than the bare words, 'Jesus saith' (λέγει Ἰησοῦς), proves that such compilations actually circulated, fulfilling a function similar to the *Pirke Aboth*, or 'Sayings of the Fathers' in the contemporary and earlier Synagogue. But the later discovered superscription of the Oxyrhynchus collection itself (published 1904) condemns the editors' hasty application of the title Λόγια Ἰησοῦ to the fragment of 1897, by using the simple λόγοι (οἱ τοῖοι οἱ λόγοι, κ.τ.λ).* [Note: This of course is ungrammatical. The editors propose to delete the first οἱ. Professor Swete prefers to read οὔτοι for οἱ τοῖοι (see ExpT xv. [1904] p. 490).] There is, in fact, absolutely no evidence that any book ever received the title λόγια, though there is a certain significance in the use of the word by Papias and Polycarp interchangeably with λόγοι to designate the precepts of Jesus, whether in literary embodiment or otherwise. For Papias these precepts are 'commandments delivered by the Lord to the faith' (ἐντολαὶ τῇ πίστει δεδομένα), and hence comparable with 'the oracles of God committed to Israel' (ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ, Rom 3:2); but he refers to just the same precepts as λόγοι, when in a connected clause he declares that Peter had no design of making a *syntagma* of the 'sayings' (οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγων). Indeed, in all the earlier evidence we possess of the formation of such *syntagmata*, the expression used is always λόγοι, and never λόγια. Thus, besides the references already given to Acts, Clem. Rom. [Note: Roman.] *ad Cor.*, and Polycarp *ad Phil.* [Note: *Philistine.*], the Pastoral Epistles have two references to 'wholesome words' (ὑγιαίνοντες λόγοι) which are more closely defined as 'sayings of the faith' (λόγοι τῆς πίστεως, cf. Papias, ἐντολαὶ τῇ πίστει δεδομένα) 'of the excellent teaching,' and even explicitly as 'the sayings of our Lord Jesus Christ' (οἱ λόγοι τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς καλῆς διδασκαλίας, οἱ ὑγιαίνοντες λόγοι οἱ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἡ κατ' εὐσέβειαν διδασκαλία, κ.τ.λ., 1Ti 4:6; 1Ti 6:3).

More important for its bearing on the question of the name to be applied to the Matthaean *syntagma* are the structural phenomena of the canonical Mt., to be discussed later. At present we note only that, apart from the Markan narrative outline, the main framework of this Gospel consists of five great agglutinated discourses, each marked off by the resumption of the narrative in a stereotyped formula, 'And it came to pass when Jesus had finished these words.' In this formula the expression *λόγοι* is varied only by the expressions 'parables' and 'directions to the Twelve,' where the context requires (Mat 11:1; Mat 13:53), while the final group concludes: 'And it came to pass when Jesus had finished all these words' (*πάντας τοὺς λόγους τούτους*, Mat 26:1), in spite of the fact that the narrative continues: 'he *said* to his disciples.'

In view of this earlier evidence it is manifestly unwarrantable to infer from the use by Papias of the term *λόγια* alongside of *λόγοι*, that 'he refers to three documents, (1) St. Mark's version of St. Peter's teaching, (2) an anonymous collection of *Sayings of the Lord*, (3) *the Logia* of St. Matthew' (K. Lake, *Hibbert Journ.* iii. 2 [Jan. 1905], p. 337). Papias is defining his authority for 'the commandments given by the Lord to the faith.' If he refers to these now, with 1Ti 4:6; 1Ti 6:3, as 'sayings,' of which Peter might have made a *syntagma* but did not, and now, with Polycarp *ad Phil.* [*Note: Philistine.*] vii., as 'oracles,' of which Matthew did make a *syntagma*, the difference is only that in the latter embodiment they seemed to him comparable with the 'oracles of God' given to Israel (Act 7:38, Rom 3:2, Heb 5:12, 1Pe 4:11).

The relatively late date of Papias (145-160 a.d.) makes it certain that for him, if not already for Polycarp, τὰ *λόγια* meant the precepts of Jesus *as embodied* in narrative Gospels, pre-eminently in canonical Matthew. In later authorities, who take over the tradition, the term is gradually extended to cover the embodying narrative as well, until with Irenaeus and Tertullian the Divine utterance is coextensive with the canonical Gospel ('ait Spiritus Sanctus per Matthaenum,' applied by Irenaeus to utterances of the Evangelist). Whether at a stage anterior to its adoption by Papias the tradition regarding the *λόγια* had a narrower application, must be settled by a consideration of the expression in its context.

3. *Tradition on transmission of the Sayings.*—The fragments from the preface (*προοίμιον*) of Papias' work in five books, entitled *Exposition (s?) of the Oracles of the Lord*, as given by Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. xxxix. 2, 16), are closely related to one another, and to the passage already referred to in the Epistle of Polycarp, Papias' earlier contemporary and friend. As regards the 'commandments' which Papias sought

to hear and to expound as ‘oracles,’ the fragment states as a tradition (probably from the same authority, ‘John the Elder, who gave that regarding Mark) that ‘Matthew made a compend (συνετάξατο v.l. συνεγράψατο) of the *logia* in the Hebrew (Aramaic?) tongue, and every man translated them as he was able.’ For Papias, and *a fortiori* for the later authorities who repeat the tradition in partly independent forms, it was a testimony to our canonical Matthew. This to them *represented* the *syntagma* of which the tradition spoke, though it was admitted not to be identical with it. That was in ‘Hebrew,’ this in Greek. Possibly a difference of contents as regards the narrative framework was also recognized, since Papias has no scruple in contradicting Mat 27:3-10 (cf. Lightfoot-Harmer, *Apost. Fathers*, Frgt. xviii.), and Jerome recognizes the independence of what he regarded as the *ipsum Hebraicum*, and which was in his day ‘called by most the authentic Gospel of Matthew,’ by translating it anew into both Greek and Latin. Surviving fragments, however, prove this work, the so-called *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, to have been another and much later product. In Papias’ time the Hebrew *syntagma* had disappeared from use (ἠρμήνευσεν), if ever known in his region; his idea of its relation to canonical Mt. was probably as vague as his successors’. He valued the tradition because it gave him Apostolic authority for the Gospel on which he relies in all known instances for his *logia* of the Lord (Frgt. xi. *ibid.* is *not* related, as Lightfoot supposed, to Luk 10:18, but to Mat 12:22-29; see *Heads against Caius*, Frgt. v., and cf. Apollinaris, Frgt. ii. in *Chron. Paseh.*). It also gave him a convenient explanation for their variation of form in the Greek Gospels current in his own day (Mt., Lk.); both went back to a common Apostolic original, but were more or less perfectly translated.

4. *Criticism of the tradition.*—Modern critics attribute great value to the tradition reported by Papias, partly because of its inapplicability to canonical Mt., which shows it to be in his hands an heirloom, not a manufacture; partly because it is independently attested; partly because it seems to be connected internally with the tradition concerning Mark explicitly ascribed to ‘the Elder’ (John of Jerusalem [d. a.d. 117]), and *in that relation* becomes both intelligible and historically probable in view of known conditions in the Palestinian Church.

Its inapplicability to canonical Mt. appears in that our Mt. is not a translation, whether from Hebrew or Aramaic; not (strictly) a *syntagma of the Oracles*; and, as concerns derivation from immediate ‘followers of the Lord,’ *less* authentic in its ‘order’ than Mk., since practically its entire historical outline is borrowed from our Second Gospel with arbitrary alteration (in chs. 1-14) of the order (see the *Introductions to NT*). The tradition is also attested, however, by Pantaenus (*ap. Eus. Historia Ecclesiastica* v. x. 3), Irenaeus, Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Jerome, Augustine, and Euthymius Zigabenus. Not all of these can have derived all their data from Papias, so that the tradition cannot be his

invention, although he clearly adapts it to his own use (cf. ὡς ἔφη in the Mk. fragment, referring probably to an inference of his own from 1Pe 5:13 [Eus. *Historia Ecclesiastica* ii. xv. 2, iii. xxxix. 16]. Finally, the internal evidence of the tradition itself indicates a close relation to the testimony of 'the Elder' as to Mk., and agrees with known conditions in the Palestinian Church.

(a) Holsten has pointed out (*Drei urspr. Evang., ad init.*) that the original motive of the Mark fragment is apologetic and harmonistic. It accounts for the incompleteness and lack of system in Mk. by contrast with some other writing which could be regarded as a complete σύνταξις τῶν κυριακῶν λόγων. No such compendium did Mark make, but only a transcript of certain discourses of Peter, accurate and complete so far as secondary testimony could go, but suffering from the inevitable limitations of one who had been a follower, not of the Lord (like Matthew), but, 'as I (Papias) said, of Peter, afterward.' The result was a mingled account of narratives about Christ, now a saying, now something done (ἢ λεχθέντα, ἢ πραχθέντα), incomplete (ἔνια, ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν) and without system (οὐ μέντοι τάξει), because Peter's preaching, Mark's only source of knowledge, had brought out the material in such irregular order as the occasion demanded (πρὸς τὴν χρεῖαν).

Our first concern must be with the motive of this conception of Mk., reserving the question of its historicity. Clearly, while unwilling to reject the narrative Gospel, it contends for the superiority of some other, whose characteristics may easily be inferred from what is denied to its rival. This authority of superior standing in the region whence Papias obtained his traditions (Palestine) emanated from one who had been a follower of the Lord Himself, not (like Mark) of an Apostle. It was more complete, and afforded a systematic, *not necessarily chronological*, arrangement of the Lord's words (σύνταξιν τῶν τοῦ κυρίου λόγων, συνέταξεν τὰ λόγια, οὐ μέντοι τάξει) serviceable to those in search of the 'commandments given by the Lord to the faith.' For, as soon as the general point of view is considered, the real significance of the complaint against Mk., so puzzling to modern critics, and perhaps not clear to Papias himself, becomes intelligible. The deficient τάξις of Mk. is explained by the contrasting statements regarding Peter and Matthew respectively, the former of whom did not aim at a σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν λόγων [*v.l.* λογίων], whereas the latter actually made such a compend (συνετάξατο [*v.l.* συνεγράψατο] τὰ λόγια). The two fragments are parts of a single tradition, and the general point of view is that of a church to which the Gospel was primarily a new Torah, wherein the object of system (τάξις) is completeness in presenting 'the commandments given to the faith.' The

historian-evangelist's idea of 'order' as chronological sequence in the biography (καθεξῆς Luk_1:3) is not that in consideration. In short, the tradition of Papias reflects the attitude of the Palestinian Church towards the rival claims of its own autochthonous Matthaean tradition, and the Petrine or Roman. It aims to adjust the two with recognition of the merits of the latter, while holding to the superiority of the former, just as the appendix to the Fourth Gospel (John 21) adjusts the secondary Petrine to its own primary authority, the Johannine (Asiatic).

Looked at thus, from the point of view suggested by its own internal relations, the tradition of Papias becomes not only intelligible but probable. It defines (no doubt correctly) the primary authority for the *λόγια κυριακά* which Papias proposed to expound in the light of the traditional authorities. If the Gospel of Lk. does not come into Papias' consideration, and Mk. is treated as quite subordinate, it is because the object in view is the *ἐντολαί* delivered by the Lord, and tradition and Church usage were at one in pointing to Matthew as the fountain-head for such purposes.

Nor does the tradition stand alone in its distinction of *syntagmata* of the Logia of the Lord from Gospels of the Markan type. Act_1:1 refers to its author's 'former treatise' as relating what 'Jesus began both to do and to teach' (*ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν*), thereby properly classing Lk. with Mk. and similar Gospels made up of 'both works and teachings' (*ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα*). Moreover, the implied distinction from *syntagmata* of the Sayings is precisely what we should expect in a church whose institutions and traditions were almost invariably based on the practice of the Synagogue. The teaching of the Synagogue was divided into (1) *Halacha*, i.e. 'the Way,' authoritative applications of the Mosaic law, precepts of life, and (2) *Haggada*, i.e. 'tales,' unauthoritative preaching, based mainly on OT narrative. Just so in the primitive Palestinian Church we soon find two types of Gospel composition—(1) the catechetical, for the converted, generally connected with the name of Matthew. Then (2) the evangelistic, for the unconverted, similarly associated with the name of Peter. To the latter type would belong the 'testimony of the cross' (*τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ σταυροῦ*) rejected by the opponents of Polycarp (*l.c.*); to the former not only the 'Sayings of the faith' or 'of the Lord Jesus' (1Ti_4:6; 1Ti_6:3) compiled by Matthew and others, but examples of Christian catechesis, such as the little manuals of ethics or 'teachings of baptisms' which survive to us under such titles as 'the Two Ways,' or the 'Teaching' (*Διδαχή, Διδασκαλία*) of the Apostles. These were primarily of Jewish origin, and were intended for the instruction of neophytes and catechumens. Such writings, on the other hand, as the *Preaching of Peter*, of the apologetic or evangelistic type, are clearly addressed to the unconverted, and if we go back to the

examples furnished in Acts of this evangelistic preaching, still attributed to 'Peter,' we may identify the already stereotyped outline of Synoptic story in Act 10:38-41, the so-called 'lesser Gospel of Mark.' Long ago the resemblance of this Synoptic outline to the *haggadic* type was observed by Jewish scholars such as Wünsche and Hirsch. Both types accordingly were current in the Palestinian Church. We might, in fact, presuppose it from the nature of the situation. But both would not there be equally esteemed. The indigenous product, adapted to the requirements of a church more given to the perpetuation than to the propagation of the gospel, a church where Jesus was pre-eminently the 'Prophet like unto Moses,' giver of 'the perfect law of liberty,' would be the authoritative *syntagma* of the Lord's Sayings, *halachic* in the fundamental sense of the term. The Greek version of the *Preaching of Peter*, imported probably from Rome, would be received; but it would stand upon the lower footing of *haggadic* narrative. The lateness of the combination is attested not only by the reluctance manifest in the tradition, but by the fact that when Mk. was added to the Matthaean *syntagma*, the editor had so little else to add.

The correspondence of Papias' tradition of the Matthaean *syntagma* with known Palestinian conditions is strongly confirmatory both of the tradition itself and of that interpretation of it which emphasizes the distinction between catechetic works and Gospels of the evangelistic type. It is characteristic of the Gospels which continued to circulate in Palestine independently of the canonical four so late as the time of Jerome and Epiphanius, that, while they conflate material drawn from the Greek Gospels with their own, they continue to represent their tradition in all cases as delivered by the Apostle Matthew (Preuschen, *Antilegomena*, Frgs. 2. 3. 12 of *Ev. Hebrews*, 6 of *Ev. Naz.*).

(b) The internal evidence of our Synoptic Gospels is the decisive factor in the question of the historicity and meaning of the tradition. Here we have only to subtract the material coincident with Mk. from Mt. and Lk. respectively, to see that what is left is in Lk. to a great extent, in Mt. almost exclusively, a mass of discourse-material, much of it reproduced in common by the two. So convincing is this general result of an application of the representations of early tradition to the actual structure of our Synoptic Gospels, that since the time of Schleiermacher the so-called 'two-document' theory of the Synoptic Gospels, which rests upon it, has won wider and wider assent, and is to-day in its general outline an almost universally accepted canon of criticism (see art. Gospels). Synoptic tradition consists in the main of the Markan story, filled out and expanded by masses of discourse-material which are otherwise almost devoid of historical setting.

But there is a great and significant difference in result when the subtraction is made from Mt. and when it is made from Luke. Subtract Mk. from Mt. and the *narrative* material which remains is exceedingly meagre in amount, somewhat apocryphal in

character, and unconnected with any other source. It includes the Genealogy and Birth-stories (chs. 1, 2), Peter's walking on the sea (Mat 14:28-31), the stater in the fish's mouth (Mat 17:24-27), and a few traits in the story of the Passion and Resurrection—the suicide of Judas (Mat 27:3-10), Pilate's wife's dream, and his washing of his hands (Mat 27:19-24), the earthquake (Mat 27:51-53), watch at the tomb (Mat 27:62-66, Mat 28:11-15), and appearance to the women and to the Eleven in Galilee (Mat 28:9-10; Mat 28:16-20). A few other apparent Matthaean additions to the narrative of Mk. are illusive. The story of the centurion's son (Mat 8:5-10; Mat 8:13) is the one great exception in character and attestation, being shared not only by Lk. (Luk 7:2-10), but even by Jn. (Joh 4:46-54). The real surplus of Mt. over Mk. consists pre-eminently in great aggregations of *discourse*-material, grouped in the live principal masses already referred to. These groups of agglutinated λόγοι consist of (1) the Sermon on the Mount (chs. 5-7), showing the new Way of Righteousness; (2) the Mission of the Disciples (ch. 10), showing the duty of Witness-bearing; (3) the Parables (ch. 13), treated as fulfilling the Scripture Is 6:9 ff. against a generation which had rejected both the Baptist and Christ; (4) Rules of conduct towards brethren in 'the church' (ch. 18); (5) Warnings of the Judgment (ch. 25) attached to the eschatological chapter (24) parallel to Mark 13. Each of the five groups is marked off by the formula καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, κ.τ.λ., where the narrative is resumed; but groups (3) and (5) are enlarged by prefixing the two denunciatory sections (chs. 11-12 and 23), which are unaccompanied by the formula, and expand the total number of discourses to seven (cf. the seven parables of ch. 13, seven woes of ch. 23, seven petitions of the Lord's Prayer expanded from five of Lk.). Thus our First Gospel, minus the Markan biographic outline and the few late narrative accretions, really consists of a systematic compendium of the teachings of the Lord, once framed in the favourite pentad structure of Torah, Psalm-book, and the Christian Διδαχή, but later expanded to a sevenfold form.

The same process applied to Lk. yields a very different but equally enlightening result. The subtraction of Mk. leaves a much more considerable narrative element, including, besides the Centurion's Son, a whole series of incidents elsewhere unknown, of kindred animus. Such are the Penitent Harlot and Penitent Thief, Zacchaeus, the Ministering Women, the Samaritan Leper, the Crooked Woman, the Widow of Nain. But more important than the new incidents is a series of parables and teachings in the same vein, of which the Prodigal Son, Good Samaritan, Rich Man and Lazarus, Pharisee and Publican, are examples. The so-called Infancy chapters of Luke show the same favour towards the lowly, and partake otherwise to so high a degree of the linguistic and stylistic peculiarities of this material, that we must either suppose Luke to have had at command a 'special source' equally abundant in narrative-and discourse-material, and characterized by the humanitarian interest so manifest here,

or else ascribe to him an extremely one-sided selection from a much more copious stream of tradition than would seem probable from Matthew and Mark. Thus the great outstanding difference in structure between the non-Markan element in Mt. and in Lk. is that in the former it is almost exclusively the *λόγοι*, arranged in groups as such; whereas in Lk. the *logian* material does not stand apart from narrative, but is connected with and framed into a narrative independent of Mk. and found in no other Gospel. Moreover, the combination of discourse with narrative in Lk. is not, as sometimes stated, a mere adaptation by the Evangelist of *logian* material to narrative settings of his own composition. There are examples (Luk 14:1-7) of such fictitious settings, but who would dream of so describing the incident of the Repentant Harlot (Luk 7:36-50), which-forms the setting of the parable of the Two Debtors? No explanation will here suffice but an admission that narrative and discourse have come down together from the earliest and most authentic sources. The same conclusion must be reached when the relation of this 'pre-canonical Luke' to Mk. and to the added sections of Mt. (Matthew 11 f. and Matthew 23) is studied (see art. Wisdom). Priority will be found to belong in both cases to the Lukan source.

Luke's distribution of his discourse-material under various heads of narrative description, and his disposition of the non-Markan material at various points of a shorter and longer journey (Luk 6:12 to Luk 8:3, Luk 9:51 to Luk 18:14), indicate in what sense we should take his proposal to write 'in order' (*καθεξῆς*, Luk 1:3). He aims, like the historian that he is, at chronological sequence; but certainly not without some better authority than his own conjecture. For while his discourse-material is sometimes without true connexion, it has a basis of order which indicates that, in the region whence this Gospel is derived, narrative and teaching had been combined at a much earlier time and with better resources than in our Matthew.

Critics who have attempted to reconstruct the *Logia* from Mt. and Lk. have unfortunately neglected this fundamental distinction, reconstructing their ultimate source, without regard for the difference in type (with Mat 28:20 cf. Luk 1:4, Act 1:1), from the mere coincidence of Mt. and Lk. in a certain part of the discourse-material. This ultimate source, however, cannot be reached from the side of Lk. without first taking account of the so-called 'special source' from which some elements seem to have passed into Mt. (e.g. Mat 3:7-12; Mat 4:1-11; Mat 6:19-34; Mat 8:5-10; Mat 11:1-27), and can even be shown with great probability to have affected canonical Mk. (With Mar 1:2; Mar 1:5 f., cf. Luk 7:24-27; Luk 7:33 f.; with Mar 1:13, Luk 4:2-12; with Mar 2:1-22, Luk 7:33 f.; with Mar 3:22-30, Luk 11:14-22; with Mar 7:1-23, Luk 11:37-54. Comparison with Mt. will in all these cases prove dependence by Mk. upon the source more fully recoverable from Mt. and Lk.). But the elements most naturally to be sought in a purely *logian* common source, such as the

Sermon on the Mount and the Parables, display a very different degree of resemblance in Mt. and Lk. respectively. Instead of the exact verbal identity of long sentences in the sections outside the Matthaean pentad, there is within it for the most part an extreme divergence from the Lukan parallels. In general it would be difficult, if not impossible, to prove from this material any *direct* acquaintance with the *Logia* on the part of our Third Evangelist.

5. *Conjectural reconstructions of the source.*—Lost works have nevertheless been so frequently reconstructed in modern times by process of extraction from later documents into which they had been independently incorporated, as to offer a standing challenge in this supreme instance of the Matthaean *Logia*. If Krawutzky (to cite a single example) could reconstruct the *Teaching of the Twelve* from the *Apostolic Constitutions* and *Apostolic Epitome*, in advance of its discovery by Bryennios, why should not our First and Third Gospels yield up out of their common discourse-material the substance of the lost *Logia*? There have been thus far but two notable attempts to meet this challenge. Wendt's *Lehre Jesu* (1886) presents in the first (untranslated) volume the author's attempted reconstruction from Mt. and Lk. of the (Greek) *Logia* of Matthew. Unfortunately no account is taken of the third factor, Luke's 'special source,' which certainly afforded much discourse-material not likely to have been connected with the Matthaean *Logia*, and may even have contained all that Luke shares with Matthew. Equally unfortunate was the failure to distinguish the difference in point of view between a 'syntagma of the Lord's commandments' in which 'order' must be topical, and a διήγησις καθεξῆς such as Luke's, where the λόγοι are λόγοι τῆς χάριτος (Luk 4:22) illustrative of the message of the Divine wisdom. The problem must not be treated as if a mere question of arithmetic: Elements common to Mt. and Lk., *minus* Mk. = the *Logia*. As a pioneer in the field, Wendt deserves credit for his work, but a process so simple could not be expected to solve so complicated a problem. Wendt himself could find no place for a non-Markan διήγησις such as the Centurion's Son, Luk 7:2-10 = Mat 8:5-13 = Joh 4:46-54, which could not naturally be connected with the Matthaean *Logia*, but falls into place at once when account is taken of its relation to the Lukan context. Wendt's results were not unjustly pronounced 'a heap of interesting ruins, without beginning, without conclusion, without connexion' (Resch).

A much more elaborate and detailed analysis is that of Alfred Resch, *Dic Logia Jesu nach dem griechischen und hebräischen Text wiederhergestellt*, Leipzig, 1898 (Hebrew text separately ספר היסודות של ישוע דבריו: ישוע דבריו: ישוע דבריו, τὰ λόγια Ἰησοῦ). Here the attempt is made to restore the original Apostolic source not only in the Greek form assumed to be utilized in common by Mt. and Lk., but to retranslate into the Hebrew (*sic*) assumed to have been employed by the Apostle as the classical religious

language in preference to the colloquial Aramaic spoken by Jesus Himself. Resch brings to his task an immense amount of learning and patience, especially in the accumulation of all possible (and many impossible) traces of extra-canonical *logia*. Unfortunately the process is again vitiated, not only by an extremely indiscriminate use of unsifted material, but by highly uncritical assumptions. Of these one of the most fatal is that the order of Lk. must be nearest that of the *Logia* because, in Resch's judgment, nearest the historical; while another, wherein may be traced the influence of B. Weiss, attributes to the *Logia* the features of a narrative-Gospel. As will be apparent from our criticism of the tradition, and criticism of canonical Mt., all the evidence we possess should commend precisely the reverse principle. The Apostolic *syntagma* of Matthew was not a narrative, and cannot have had a historian's order, and the structure of Mt. and Lk. respectively shows that in the one case the *halachic*, in the other the *haggadic*, principle was predominant from the first. On the other hand, Resch's gathering of the material was indispensable. His renewed consideration of the careful and scrupulous work of B. Weiss (*Matthäusevangelium*, 1876; *Markusevangelium*, 1872) looking toward an Apostolic (?) source utilized in common by these Gospels, did better justice to another factor not to be neglected, namely, use of the *Logia* (?) in Mk.; and his tracing of the tradition of Matthaean authorship to a direct claim embodied in at least one of the early Palestinian Gospels (*Ev. Naz. Frg. 6* [*Preusch.*] σὲ τὸν Ματθαῖον), are contributions of permanent service. The experience of both Wendt and Resch, however, should warn against indiscriminate combination of Mt. and Lk., without regard for the structural evidence of the Gospels as we have them, or even for the avowed purpose of the Third Evangelist himself.

Besides Wendt and Resch, mention should be made of the disposition of material in the Greek *Synopticon* of A. Wright, who devotes Division 2 of his presentation to material supposedly derived from the *Logia* of Matthew. The arbitrariness of the dealing with the Lukan material is amply demonstrated by the two supplementary divisions which follow. The work is unfortunately affected by inadmissible presuppositions regarding oral tradition.

6. *Conclusions.*—These may be briefly summarized in the following outline:—

(1) The term *logia* was applied to the Sayings of Jesus early in the 2nd century by those who held them as Divine utterances, but not as displacing the earlier λόγοι.

(2) The same individuals report a tradition of Palestinian derivation which contrasts the Markan type of Gospel with another, of Matthaean origin, consisting of *syntagmata* of the Sayings.

(3) Our present representative of the Matthaean tradition, disembarassed of its Markan framework, displays this type-form, combining the teaching of Jesus in five agglutinations of Christian precepts corresponding to the five books of the Torah.

(4) Our Third Evangelist presents the discourse-material which he holds in common with Mt. from the historical point of view, and seems to have received it in a collection wherein narrative and discourse were intermingled from the first, the agglutination being effected with an eye to illustrate Jesus' mission of grace rather than to form a new Torah (see art. Wisdom).

(5) If the actual work of the Apostle Matthew (Matthias?) be not too remote for recovery, it should be sought primarily in, or rather under, the accumulated aggregations of *logian* material in the five discourse groups of our First Gospel, with secondary comparison of the added groups (chs. 3 f., 11 f., 23) which have special aflinity by language and content with Lk., together with the rest of the Lukan material. It is not probable that the Matthaean *syntagma* can have been lost in any other way than through superimposition of new material. To extricate it from the mass of superimposed accretion is a task which still challenges the utmost skill of the critic.

Literature.—Besides the works of Wendt, Resch, and B. Weiss, above referred to, the reader should consult the excellent discussions of Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, and in *Expos. Times* xii. (1900-1901) pp. 72 ff. and 471 ff., also *ib.* xiii. (1902) p. 20, on 'Some Internal Evidence for the use of the Logia in our First and Third Gospels,' and 'Use of Materials in Matthew 8-9'; also four articles by C. A. Briggs, *ib.* vols. vl. ix. (1897-1898) on 'The Wisdom of Jesus the Messiah.' Many excellent observations are made by A. Wright in his *Synopsis 2*, 1903. A valuable discussion of the history of the *logia* embodied in the Sermon on the Mount will be found in the Extra Vol. of Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, s.v. 'Sermon on the Mount' (C. W. Votaw). For an analysis of this conglomerate, and discussion of the process of transmission of this and related principal discourses of Jesus, see the present writer's *The Sermon on the Mount—its Literary Structure and Didactic Purpose*, Macmillan, 1902. On the *logian* material of Lk. see art. Wisdom.

B. W. Bacon.

☩ Logos

LOGOS.—The conception of Christ as the Logos, or eternal Word, is peculiar to the Fourth Gospel. In the Epp. to Colossians and Hebrews (writings which are likewise

touched with the Alexandrian influence) the Logos theory of Christ's Person is in some points implied (cf. Col 1:15-18, Heb 1:2-4). In Revelation (Rev 19:13) the 'Word of God' is announced as the new and mysterious name which Christ bears when He comes forth to execute judgment. But only in the Fourth Gospel is the conception deliberately adopted and worked out in its full significance.

The idea of a Logos, an immanent Divine reason in the world, is one that meets us under various modifications in many ancient systems of thought, Indian, Egyptian, Persian. In view of the religious syncretism which prevailed in the 1st and 2nd centuries, it is barely possible that these extraneous theologies may have indirectly influenced the Evangelist; but there can be no doubt in regard to the main source from which his Logos doctrine was derived. It had come to him through Philo after its final elaboration in Greek philosophy.

In the 6th cent. b.c. Heraclitus first broke away from the purely physical conceptions of early Greek speculation, by discovering a λόγος, a principle of reason, at work in the cosmic process. From the obscure fragments of this philosopher that have come down to us we gather that he was chiefly interested in accounting for the aesthetic order of the visible universe. In the arrangement of natural phenomena, in the adaptation of means to ends, he discerned the working of a power analogous to the reasoning power in man. His speculation was still entangled with the physical hypotheses of earlier times, and on this account dropped out of sight, and had little influence on the greater systems of Greek thought. Plato and Aristotle were engaged in the development of the theory of ideas, with its absolute separation of the material world from the world of higher reality. Their work was of profound significance for the after history of Logos speculation, but belongs itself to a different philosophical movement. It was in the reaction from Platonic dualism that the Logos idea again asserted itself, and was worked out through all its implications in Stoicism.

The Stoics, animated chiefly by a practical interest, sought to connect the world of true being, as conceived by Plato, with the actual world of man's existence. They abandoned the theory of supersensible archetypes and fell back on the simpler hypothesis of Heraclitus, that the universe is pervaded in all its parts by an eternal Reason. Man in his individual life may raise himself above all that limits him, and realize his identity with this Logos, which resides in his own soul, and is also the governing principle of the world. The Stoic philosophy not only furnished the general conception of the Logos to later thinkers, but also emphasized the distinction which became of prime importance in the later development. The faculty of reason as it exists in man reveals itself in speech, which is denoted by the same Greek word, λόγος. To the universal λογος Stoicism ascribed the two attributes that mark the reasoning

power in man. On the one hand it is λόγος ἐνδιάθετος,—reason in its inner movement and potentiality,—and on the other hand λόγος τροφορικός,—reason projected and made concrete in the endless variety of the visible world.

1. Philo appropriates the main Stoic conception, but combines it with other elements borrowed eclectically from previous systems of thought. The Logos idea is loosened from its connexion with Stoic materialism and harmonized with a thoroughgoing Platonism, which regards the visible things as only the types and shadows of realities laid up in the higher world. It becomes identical in great measure with Plato's idea of the Good, except that it is further regarded as creatively active. Philo's grand innovation, however, is to press the Logos theory into the service of a theology derived from the OT. The same problem which Stoicism had tried to solve had in a different manner become urgent in Jewish thought. Here also all progress, alike in the moral and intellectual life, was like to be arrested by an overstrained dualism. The effort to conceive of God as absolutely transcendent had resulted in separating Him entirely from the world, of which He had yet to be regarded as the Creator and Governor. Already in the later books of the OT, much more in Rabbinical speculation, we can trace the idea of an intermediary between God and the world. 'Wisdom' is described in Job and Proverbs, with something more than a poetical personification, as God's agent and co-worker. Peculiar significance was attached by the later expositors to the various OT allusions to the 'word' of God. By His 'word' He had created heaven and earth and revealed Himself to the prophets. The actual hypostatizing of the Word in the doctrine of the Memra was subsequent to the time of Philo, but it was the outcome of a mode of thinking already prevalent in Jewish theology. God who was Himself the High and Holy One, of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, mediated His action through the Divine Word. It was natural for Philo, with his Hellenic and philosophical culture, to advance a step further and identify the Word of the OT with the Stoic λόγος.

The Logos of Philo requires to be understood in the light of this double descent from Greek and OT thought. The Stoic conception, as we have seen, took account of the two meanings of λόγος as reason and uttered speech, but the distinction was of little practical importance. What the Greek thinkers sought to affirm was the rationality of the world. The Logos under all its aspects was simply the principle of reason, informing the endless variety of things, and so maintaining the world-order. To Philo, on the other hand, the idea of reason is combined with that of the outgoing of Divine power. While describing his Logos in terms directly borrowed from Plato and the Stoics, he regards it as in the last resort dynamic, like the creative word in Genesis. This difference between Philo and the Greek thinkers is connected with another and still more vital one. To the Stoics the eternal Reason was itself an ultimate principle,

and the necessity was not felt of explaining it as the reason of God. The doctrine of the Logos may, indeed, be regarded as an attempt, more or less conscious, to escape from the belief in a Divine Creator. Philo could not content himself with this notion of an absolute Logos. He started from the Hebrew belief in a supreme, self-existing God, to whom the immanent reason of the world must be related and subordinated. To this clashing of the primary Greek conception with the demands of Hebrew monotheism, we may largely attribute one of the most perplexing peculiarities of the Philonic doctrine. The Logos appears, sometimes as only an aspect of the activity of God, at other times as a 'second God,' an independent and, it might seem, a personal being. There can be little doubt that Philo, who never ceased to be an orthodox Jew, had no intention of maintaining the existence of two Divine agents; and the passages in which he appears to detach and personify the Logos must be explained mainly in a figurative sense. The Word which is described as speaking, acting, creating of itself, is the word of God, vividly realized by an imaginative thinker. But this separate existence assigned to the Logos may also be set down in some measure to the composite origin of the idea. The Stoical doctrine of an independent Reason could not be wholly reconciled with the Jewish belief in one supreme God.

2. The Fourth Gospel sets out from a conception of the Logos which to all appearance is closely similar to that of Philo. In the Prologue the main features of the Philonic doctrine are reproduced one by one;—the eternal existence of the Word, its Divine character (ἦν θεός), its relation to God as towards Him, and yet distinct (πρὸς τὸν θεόν), its creative activity, its function in the illumination and deliverance of men. The Evangelist assumes that the idea of the Logos is already a familiar one in Christian theology. It is introduced abruptly, as requiring no explanation, and its different aspects are lightly indicated, by way of reminding the reader of truths sufficiently known to him. We can thus infer that the conception of Philo had already naturalized itself in Christian thought, but there is reason to believe that the author of the Gospel was acquainted more or less directly with the Philonic writings and consciously derived from them.* [Note: the list of parallel passages collected by Grill (pp. 111-138).]

To what extent does the Logos idea of Philo change its character as it assimilates itself to the theology of the Gospel? Before an answer can be offered to this question, it is necessary to consider a preliminary difficulty with which Johannine criticism has been largely occupied since the appearance of Harnack's famous pamphlet.* [Note: Über das Verhältniss des Prologs des vierten Evgl. zum ganzen Werk (1892).] Is the Prologue to be regarded as an integral portion of the Gospel, or is it, as Harnack contends, a mere preface written to conciliate the interest of a philosophical public? The idea of Christ as the Divine Logos is nowhere resumed in the body of the Gospel. Although the term Logos is constantly used, it always bears its ordinary sense of

spoken discourse, while the categories of Light, Life, Love are substituted for the Logos of the Prologue. The work, as we have it, is no metaphysical treatise, such as we might expect from the opening verses, if they truly set forth its programme, but a historical document, the narrative of the earthly life of Christ. In spite, however, of Harnack's powerful argument, the almost unanimous voice of Johannine criticism has declared against him. The statement of his view has led to a closer examination of the Prologue in its connexion with the Gospel, resulting in multiplied proof that the ideas presented at the outset are woven in with the whole tissue of the work. The Prologue supplies the background, the atmosphere, which are necessary to a right contemplation of the history. Nevertheless, while Harnack's main argument cannot be accepted, it serves to remind us of one fact which cannot be emphasized too much. St. John is not concerned merely with the Word, but with the Word made flesh. After the first few verses, in which he treats of the pre-existent Logos, he passes to the historical Person of Jesus, who is more than the abstract Word. In Him it had become visible, and acted on men through a human Personality.

St. John therefore accepts the Philonic conception in order to assimilate it to his account of a historical Person, through whom the Word declared itself under the conditions of human life. It is evident that the conception could not be so adapted without submitting to profound modifications. (1) The Logos, which was to clothe itself in flesh and act on men with the force of a personality, must in its deepest ground be a personal Being. We have seen that Philo, partly in imaginative fashion, partly because of the composite origin of his thought, attributes a semi-independence to the Logos. This prepared the way for a complete personification; but Philo himself thinks only of a Divine principle, the creative reason of God. St. John, however, makes it an essential moment in his conception that the Logos has a ground of independent being within God ($\pi\rho\delta\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\nu$, standing over against Him as a distinct Being). His view even of the pre-existent Logos is coloured by his knowledge of the ultimate Incarnation. (2) The creative activity of the Logos, which in Philo is central and all-determining, falls into the background. Only in Joh_1:3 ('All things were made by him') do we have any clear trace of this aspect of Logos doctrine, and the sequence of thought would still be complete if the brief allusion were omitted. It is thrown out, apparently, by way of acknowledgment of the recognized theory. Some reference to the cosmic significance of the Logos was necessary if any link with previous speculation was to be preserved. The Gospel, in point of fact, knows nothing of the absolute transcendence of God, which Philo's whole theory is designed to mitigate. It assumes that 'the world' is the direct object of God's love and providence (Joh_3:16). It maintains that God acts immediately on the human soul and so makes possible the redeeming work of the Logos (Joh_6:44, Joh_17:6). (3) In the Gospel, much more emphatically than in Philo, the term $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ denotes Word as well as Reason. The Greek philosophical meaning is, indeed, discarded, or retained only as a

faintly colouring element. The Word is regarded throughout as the expression of God's will and power, the self-revelation of His inward nature. It does not represent the Divine reason but the Divine energy. Its sovereign attribute is Life, the life which it derives from God and transmits to men. Under the form of Alexandrian speculation St. John preserves the essential Hebrew conception of the living, quickening Word.

Thus, in accepting the Philonic idea, St. John does not commit himself to the precise interpretation that Philo placed on it; on the contrary, whether consciously or not, he departs from the characteristic lines of Philo's thinking. The differences, however, do not alter the main fact that he rested his account of the Christian revelation on a hypothesis which was metaphysical rather than religious. The Jesus who had appeared in history was identified with the Logos of philosophy, and this identification involved an entirely new reading of His Person and life. St. John does not, indeed, press to its full extent his theory that the Logos became manifest in Christ. Behind his speculation there is always the remembrance of the actual life, which had arrested him as it had done the first disciples, and been to him the true revelation of God. His worship is directed in the last resort not to the Logos whom he discovers in Jesus, but to Jesus Himself. Nevertheless the acceptance of the Logos idea imposes on him a mode of thought which is often alien to his deeper religious instinct. On the one hand, he conceives of Jesus as revealing God to men and lifting them to a higher life by His ethical personality. On the other hand, he is compelled to interpret the work of Jesus in terms of metaphysic. God was manifest in Him because He was Himself the Logos, and the life He imparted was the Divine life, different in essence from that of man. The Gospel wavers throughout between these two parallel interpretations of the life of Christ,—that suggested by the history and that required by the Logos hypothesis. Superficially the two conceptions are drawn together, but they are disparate by their very nature and will not admit of a true reconciliation.

St. John does not concern himself with the questions that arose in later theology regarding the nature of the union between the Logos and the human Jesus. He assumes the union as a fact incapable of further definition. 'The Word became flesh,' appeared in Jesus as a human personality. How and when this Incarnation was effected, to what extent the Divine nature in Christ could be distinguished from the human,—these are questions which he does not try to answer, and which he probably never asked himself. His silence is mainly to be explained by the practical intention with which he wrote his Gospel. It was not his purpose to discuss the Divinity of Christ as a theological idea, but to impress it on his readers as a fact, by the knowledge of which 'they might have life' (Joh 20:31). At the same time, the problems which came to light in the course of later controversy are all legitimately suggested by the simple thesis 'the Word became flesh.' From St. John's silence in regard to them we are compelled to infer that he did not reason out his doctrine with any fulness or

clearness. He had set himself to combine ideas which in themselves were radically incompatible, and succeeded in doing so only by a certain confusion of thought.

3. The Evangelist, then, sets out from the fact that the historical Jesus was also the Divine Logos. In the body of the Gospel this hypothesis is never directly alluded to, but it is assumed throughout and modifies profoundly the whole picture of the earthly life of Jesus. (1) Peculiar stress is laid on His miracles as the 'signs' by which He 'manifested forth his glory.' The motive of compassion, to which the miracles are for the most part ascribed by the Synoptic writers, falls into the background. They are regarded as sheer exhibitions of power, intended by Jesus to inspire belief in His Divine claims. The marvellous element is uniformly heightened, in such a manner as to preclude all natural explanations. (2) Apart from direct works of miracle, certain attributes are assigned to Jesus which witness to His possession of the Logos nature. He partakes even on earth of the Divine omniscience (Joh 1:48, Joh 2:25, Joh 4:17, Joh 11:14). He appears where He will, with something of a Divine omnipresence (Joh 6:19, Joh 8:59, Joh 9:35). There is a majesty about His Person which quells and overawes (Joh 7:46, Joh 12:21, Joh 18:6). An impression is borne home on us in every episode of the history that, while He dwelt with men, He was a heavenly being, who could exercise at will the prerogatives of God. (3) The aloofness of Jesus, as of one who belonged to a different world, is everywhere brought into strong relief. In the Synoptic narratives, what separates Him from other men is His matchless wisdom and moral purity. St. John ascribes to Him a radical difference of nature. He does not participate in human weaknesses and distresses (even His sorrow over Lazarus is that of a Divine being who stands apart and contemplates the tragedy of our mortal lot). In His intercourse with the disciples He is conscious all the time that He has come from God and returns to God (Joh 13:3-4). (4) A still more striking emphasis is laid on the absolute freedom, the self-determination of Jesus. While submitting for a time to earthly limitations, He vindicates His higher nature by acting in everything on His own sovereign will, without compulsion from without (Joh 2:4, Joh 6:5-6, Joh 7:6, Joh 11:33). From the beginning He has fixed His 'hour,' and Himself ordains all the conditions that will lead up to it. His enemies are impotent until the hour willed by Himself has come (Joh 7:30, Joh 8:20), and meanwhile He goes about His work in perfect security (Joh 11:9). In this well-marked strain of Johannine thought we have little difficulty in discerning the influence of the Logos idea, penetrating the actual reminiscence of the life of Christ. (5) The Logos character of Jesus, which is thus illustrated on various sides by His actions, comes to clear expression in His spoken words. These are concerned almost wholly with the assertion, under many different types and forms, of the Divine significance of the Speaker Himself. Hence the peculiar value which is ascribed to them (Joh 6:63; Joh 6:68, Joh 15:3). They convey more clearly and emphatically than actions could do the inner secret of our Lord's personality. Being Himself the Logos, one in essence with God, He had power to impart the higher life (see Word).

In all these directions, therefore, St. John gives effect to the idea of the Prologue that the nature of Christ was a Logos nature. His acceptance of this doctrine involves him in a new reading of the Gospel history—a reading which in some respects is artificial and inadequate. The life of Jesus becomes that of a heavenly being, and all traces of moral struggle (as in the Temptation and the Agony) disappear from it. The attributes of faith in God and infinite sympathy with men are replaced by metaphysical attributes, which are supposed to belong more essentially to the Divine nature. Jesus is the revelation of God because He is the eternal Logos, who manifests in an earthly life the absolute being and self-dependence of God. This, however, is to divest the revelation of its real worth and meaning. What we desire to know and what was actually revealed to us in the life of Jesus, is the moral character of God, and of this the Logos doctrine can render no account. In so far as the Fourth Evangelist has subordinated his conception of Christ to a philosophical speculation, we cannot but feel that he defeats his own purpose. He desires so to assert the majesty of Christ that men may be drawn to believe in Him as the Son of God, and enter into life-giving fellowship with Him. But in the endeavour to exalt the Lord's Person by means of the Logos hypothesis, he obscures those very elements in the Divine life which constitute its true glory.

4. It is necessary at the same time to recognize that much was gained for Christian theology by the adoption of this hypothesis. (1) A middle term was discovered between Christianity and the forms of Hellenic thought, and a wider development was thus rendered possible. The new religion could now interpret itself to the Graeco-Roman world, and assimilate whatever was congenial to its spirit in the intellectual life of the time. With the help of the categories which it henceforth borrowed from Greek philosophy, it was enabled in many ways to convey its message more clearly and adequately. (2) The claim of Christianity to be the absolute religion was definitely formulated in the Logos doctrine. Jesus was identified not merely with the Jewish Messiah, but with the eternal Word who had been with God from the beginning. His revelation was not one out of many, but the supreme and final revelation. This idea is prominent throughout the Prologue, in which the 'true Light' is contrasted with the manifestations of God through John the Baptist and Moses. These, although burning and shining lights, were only 'for a season' (Joh 5:35). (3) By identifying Him with the Logos, St. John declared, in a manner that could not be mistaken, the uniqueness of Jesus, and assigned Him His central place as the object of Christian faith. The Logos category was in itself insufficient, and tended to confuse Christianity with metaphysical issues which were alien to its real import. But it provided a form within which the innermost truth of the religion could maintain itself for ages following. Jesus Christ in His own Person is the revelation of God, and believing on Him we have life through His name.

5. The vital and permanent message of the Fourth Gospel is little affected by any estimate we may form of the value of the Logos hypothesis. It is evident that, while the Evangelist ostensibly sets out from a philosophical theory, he derives in reality from a religious experience. From the impression created in him by the earthly life of Jesus, still more from the knowledge he had received of Him in inward fellowship, he has arrived at the conviction that this is the Christ, the Son of God. He avails himself of the doctrine of the Logos, the highest that the thought of his time afforded him, in order to express this conviction, and in some measure explain it. But the speculative idea belongs to the form, not to the essence of St. John's teaching. It represents the attempt to interpret, in terms of an inadequate philosophy, a truth which has been grasped by faith. See also art. Divinity of Christ, vol. i. p. 478^b.

Literature,—Aall, *Geschichte der Logosidee* (2 vols., 1896, 1899); Heinze, *Die Lehre vom Logos in der griech. Philosophie* (1872); Drummond, *Philo Judæus*; J. Réville, *Le Quatrième Evangile* (1901), and *La doctrine du Logos dans le Lème Évang. et dans les œuvres de Philon* (1881); Grill, *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evang.* (1902); Bousset, *Die Relig. des Judenthums* (pp. 405-431); Simon, *Der Logos* (1902); Meyer, *Der Prolog des Johannesevang.* (1902); Baldensperger, *Der Prolog des vierten Evang.* (1898); Harnack, *Über das Verhältniss*, etc. (1892); Kaftan, *Das Verhältniss des evangelischen Glaubens zur Logoslehre* (1896); art 'Logos' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible .

E. F. Scott.

☩ Loneliness

LONELINESS.—To speak of the isolation of Christ would give a wrong impression as far as the everyday circumstances of His life are concerned. He was most often either in crowds, teaching and healing, or else seeking loneliness without success; He was lonely in the same sense as that in which Nazareth and Syria were lonely—placed close to the world's highways, yet living a life of their own (cf. G. A. Smith, *HGHL [Note: GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.]*, p. 432; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Messiah*, i. 147). We may notice four aspects of what may be called the loneliness of Christ.

1. *Solitude for the purposes of prayer, meditation, and rest.* The outstanding instances are—the Temptation in the Wilderness (Mat 4:1, Mar 1:12, Luk 4:2), the retirement after the excitement consequent on the feeding of the five thousand (Mat 14:22, Mar 6:45; cf. Joh 6:15), and the retirement for prayer, soon interrupted (Mar 1:35; cf. also Luk 6:12; Luk 9:18 where Mar 8:27 has 'in the way he asked his

disciples'). It should be noted that at times of peculiar spiritual intensity Jesus withdrew from the other disciples, but kept by Him Peter and the sons of Zebedee, as at the Transfiguration (Mat 17:1, Mar 9:2, Luk 9:28), at the raising of Jairus' daughter (Mar 5:37), and at Gethsemane (Mat 26:37—'watch with me,'—Mar 14:35, Luk 22:43).

2. *Retirement from possible persecution, or from unwished for notoriety: e.g.* after the death of John the Baptist (Mat 14:13; in Mar 6:11 this retirement immediately follows the return of the Twelve); from the opposition of the Pharisees (Mat 16:13, Mar 8:27, Luk 9:18; also Mat 15:21, Mar 7:24). Similarly, He was extremely anxious that His miracles should not become known (Luk 5:13, Mat 8:4, Mar 8:26; Mar 9:9; the chief exception, where there were special reasons, is in Mar 5:19). The opposite reason for solitude and concealment is given in Joh 6:15 ('perceiving that they were about to come and take him by force, to make him king'). On the other hand, it must be remembered that (a) Jesus was constantly accompanied, at least in Galilee and at the end in Jerusalem, by twelve friends and disciples specially appointed (Mat 10:2, Mar 3:16, Luk 10:1 imply a larger circle from which to draw); to these we must add a number of women (Luk 8:3; cf. Mat 27:55, Mar 15:40, Luk 23:49). In connexion with the visits to Jerusalem recounted in the Fourth Gospel, the disciples are hardly mentioned; Joh 7:10, coupled with the absence of reference to the disciples in chs. 7 to 10, seems to make it certain that Jesus was alone; we find the disciples with Him again in Joh 11:16. (b) In the earlier part of His ministry Jesus was constantly inconvenienced by the thronging of the vast crowds drawn to His side (cf. Mat 4:23; Mat 8:18; Mat 9:35, Mar 1:37, Luk 4:42, Luk 12:1; see Swete, *St. Mark*, p. lxxx); in the last visit to Jerusalem He sought retirement at night by leaving the city either for Bethany or the Mount of Olives (Mat 21:17, Mar 11:19, Luk 21:37). (c) His conduct was social enough—as distinct from that of John and of the Essenes—to give rise to the slanders about 'a gluttonous man and a winebibber' (Mat 11:19, Luk 7:34); He went to the marriage at Cana (Joh 2:1); He was found at the feast in Simon's house (Mat 26:6, Mar 14:3, also Luk 7:36); with Matthew (Mat 9:10, Luk 5:29), and Zacehaeus (Luk 19:6); and contrasted Himself with John as one who 'comes eating and drinking' (Mat 11:19, Luk 7:34).

3. *The inevitable result of His own attitude.* The question in Mat 12:48 seems to be that of one who wilfully cuts himself off from human ties; as He faced death more nearly, isolation could not but grow on Him (Mat 17:12, Mar 9:30, Luk 9:22; Luk 9:44, cf. also Mar 10:32); as early as the feeding of the five thousand, 'many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him' (Joh 6:66). The disciples remained with Him till the end, when the arrest proved too much for their loyalty, although we find John, with the women, at the foot of the cross (Joh 19:25-26, Mat 27:55, Mar 15:40).

4. *The uniqueness of Christ's Person.* This is emphasized chiefly in the Fourth Gospel; though that it was soon felt is shown in Luk 5:8 ('Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord'; compare the timidity of the disciples in Joh 21:12); and easily gathered from the manner in which the disciples misunderstood Him and His purposes for themselves (Mat 20:21, Mar 10:37; cf. Luk 9:54-55, and Mar 9:32, Luk 9:46; Luk 22:24). When Christ speaks of His own nearness to the Father, distance from mankind must naturally follow; see Joh 5:18 ff; Joh 8:16; Joh 8:27; Joh 8:29; Joh 10:30; Joh 20:17. On the other hand, this special relation of Christ to the Father is one which is, through Christ, to be shared by His disciples (see Joh 10:4, ch. 17 *passim*, and Joh 20:17). The extreme of loneliness, as it is heard in the cry upon the cross (Mat 27:46, Mar 15:34, cf. Luk 23:46, Joh 19:30), lasted, it would seem, but for a moment. See Dereliction.

Literature.—In addition to the Commentaries and Lives of Christ, see F. W. Robertson, *Sermons*, 1st Series, p. 220; J. Caird, *Aspects of Life*, p. 111; H. P. Liddon, *Passiontide Sermons*, p. 138; J. Martineau, *Endeavours after the Christian Life*, p. 159; E. B. Pusey, *Sermons from Advent to Whitsuntide*, p. 188.

W. F. Lofthouse.

☩ Long-Suffering

LONG-SUFFERING (*μακροθυμία*), like another fruit of the Spirit, love (*ἀγάπη*), has almost entirely non-pagan connexions. The Gr. word occurs 14 times in the NT, while its cognate verb is found 10 times, and the adverb only once (Act 26:3). Only the verb occurs in the Gospels: Mat 18:26; Mat 18:29 (Authorized and Revised Versions 'have patience'), Luk 18:7 (Authorized Version 'bear long,' Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'is long-suffering'). It is both a Divine attribute and a Christian virtue. The word 'long-tempered' as opposed to 'short-tempered' is not in ordinary English use, but it expresses with fair accuracy the central thought in *μακροθυμία*. The Latin equivalent is *longanimitas* (Vulgate), and Jeremy Taylor amongst others tried to transplant the word into English soil under the form of 'longanimity,' but without success.

OT use.—Long-suffering is one of God's noblest attributes, and is made the subject of a special revelation in Exo 34:6. The Heb. phrase 'erek 'aph (עֵרֶךְ אָפִי) is found frequently in the books that follow, and Joel (Joe 2:13), Jonah (Jon 4:2), and Nahum (Nah 1:3) specially dwell upon this element in God's character.

NT use.—It is significant that the word μακροθυμία is rare in pre-Christian Greek. In the NT it occurs several times in context with ὑπομονή (patience, endurance), from which it must be carefully distinguished (2Co 6:4; 2Co 6:6, Col 1:11, 2Ti 3:10, Jam 5:10-11). Trench (*Synonyms*) says μακροθυμία is used of persons, and ὑπομονή of things. As regards NT usage alone, this is near the truth (but see Jam 5:7, and cf. in OT Isa 57:15 [LXX Septuagint] and in Apocr. [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] 1Ma 8:4). Perhaps we may more truly say that patience keeps a man from breaking *down* in despair, while long-suffering keeps him from breaking *out* in word or action because of some unsatisfied desire. This latter distinction is probably the key to several passages where μακροθυμία has been said to approximate to the meaning of ὑπομονή. In Heb 6:12; Heb 6:15, for instance, Abraham not only waited patiently for the promise; he did not in heart or word break out into murmurs against God's delay, and this right attitude won him his reward. So in Jam 5:7 the husband-man without patience would break down with despair, but if his long-suffering gave out he would probably break out into pulling up his tardy plants. Long-suffering, then, is a passive virtue, and waits God's time. It is the exact opposite of hasty action or hurried speech. Nevertheless, it is not carelessness. If God is long-suffering, He waits to give further opportunity for repentance, and this may not be presumed upon without risk (Rom 2:4; Rom 9:22, 1Pe 3:20, 2Pe 3:9).

1. *Christ's long-suffering character.*—The word itself is not often used of, or by, Christ Himself, but the virtue which it expresses is frequently exemplified in the Gospels. It was His long toleration of manifest injustice that puzzled John the Baptist (Mat 11:3), and there is long-suffering too in His quiet reception of John's complaint (Mat 11:4). In long-suffering He refused to call down fire from heaven on inhospitable Samaritans (Luk 9:54). It was long-suffering too that made Him yield to arrest without resistance (Mat 26:52-53, Jam 5:6-7), and refrain from returning scorn for scorn or threat for threat at His trial (Mat 27:12). And after His ascension we see Him exhibiting the same long-suffering spirit towards those who persecuted the disciples as they had persecuted the Master (1Ti 1:16, Act 9:4; cf. 2Pe 3:15).

In His teaching He bids His people be partakers of His own long-suffering character. The tares are not rooted up, but grow together with the wheat until the harvest (Mat 13:30). In the parable of the Unmerciful Servant the prayer of that unworthy man was for long-suffering (Mat 18:26), but a full pardon was given instead, until his subsequent conduct caused the withdrawal of the boon (Mat 18:29). In the parable of the Unjust Judge the word μακροθυμεῖ (Luk 18:7) occurs in connexion with a difficult piece of interpretation, for the full discussion of which we have scarcely space here. Christ possibly had in mind a verse in Sir 35:18 [Gr. 32:22]. If ἐπ' αὐτοῖς refers to the

elect, we may say that μακροθυμεῖ here means the vindication of the cause rather than the punishment of the foe. But if we may refer the words to the enemies of the elect, the phrase will be parallel in thought to Rom_2:4.

2. *Long-suffering a Christian duty.*—In Mat_18:26; Mat_18:29 we noted the obligation resting on those who enjoy Christ's long-suffering to exhibit it to others. This habit we find enforced in the Epistles (1Co_13:4, 2Co_6:6, Gal_5:22, 1Th_5:14, 2Ti_3:10). It is not a natural characteristic: it has to be acquired (Col_3:12). In Eph_4:2 it is explained as forbearance, or cessation of hostilities (ἀνοχή). This implies that there may be wrong on *both* sides. But there is a power from without (Col_1:11, Gal_5:22), the Spirit of God, who will enable Christ's people to reproduce His long-suffering in face, for instance, of opposition to the truth they teach (2Ti_4:2). In Jam_5:7-10 the word occurs four times. The Christian who is persecuted is to be as long-suffering towards his foe as the farmer who waits till the unproductive field bears a crop after fertilizing showers. There is, perhaps, in addition, a thought of man's attitude towards God in times of trial. Christ's long-suffering man refuses both to rail at his enemies and to question the dealings of his God.

Literature.—Trench, *Synonyms*; Cremer, *Lex. s.v.*; art. 'Long-suffering' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ; Paget, *Studies in the Christian Character*, 177; Morrison, *Unlighted Lustre*, 188.

H. C. Lees.

☞ Look

LOOK (CHRIST'S).—The Gospels give no direct information as to the look of our Lord, if the word 'look' be regarded as a synonym for His outward appearance. The first natural request of a child—'You are going to tell me about Jesus, then tell me what He was like'—puts a question the Evangelists do not even begin to answer; and in a tale generally so frank and childlike this fact is not without significance. No description of Jesus' 'face' is ever given in the Gospels, except when, in the story of the Transfiguration, it is said that the fashion of His face was altered (ἐγένετο τὸ εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἕτερον, Luk_9:29). Even then, it is stated to have become like the sun (Mat_17:2); and, as it happens, the figure is of something which, though it lights the world, is not in itself directly to be gazed upon (cf. Rev_1:16). While it may be possible, therefore, to deduce from the Epistles a message figuratively termed 'the Gospel of the Face' (see Bushnell, *Sermons on Living Subjects*, 73 ff.), the

Evangelists afford no opportunity of making this study of Christ ‘after the flesh.’ See art. Christ in Art.

It is further to be observed, in the same connexion, that even the more vivid words for looking, as a synonym for ‘seeing,’ ‘beholding,’ are never used of Christ so as to draw attention to the *manner* of His look. Such a word, e.g., as ἀτενίζω, ‘to gaze fixedly’ (employed to describe a congregation gazing *at* Jesus, Luk 4:20; the maid staring at St. Peter, Luk 22:56; St. Paul flashing an indignant look at Elymas the sorcerer, Act 13:9), is never associated with our Lord. Even διαβλέπω, a milder though still pietorial word, is not connected with Him. It is as though every mental image of Christ’s outward appearance were designedly excluded. We must be content, therefore, to study Christ’s look in the more objective sense in which it expresses simply the act of vision. Here we may roughly divide the references into four classes.

1. The look of Christ is sometimes disclosed as an *upward* look, expressing dependence on the Father. This uplifted glance is recorded on four occasions—during the miracle of the feeding of the 5000, while giving thanks and blessing the loaves (Mat 14:19); in the healing of a man deaf and dumb, when Christ looked up to heaven and sighed (Mar 7:34 [in both passages ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν]); in the raising of Lazarus (Joh 11:41 ἤρεν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἄνω); and during the great High-Priestly prayer (Joh 17:1 ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν). In all these instances the action and gesture must have imprinted themselves very deeply on the memory of the disciples. They were an outward sign of a lifelong inward attitude. They evidenced the direction of the appeal which Christ made in His human nature to God. Of Him the words are preeminently true, ‘Mine eyes are ever toward the Lord’ (Psa 25:15).

2. The look of Christ is often disclosed as an *outward* look of calm clear-eyed discernment on the world around Him. ‘He beheld (ἐθεώρει) how the people cast money into the treasury’ (Mar 12:41)—appreciating not only the matter of their gift, but the manner of it. He ‘entered into the temple, and looked round about upon all things’ (Mar 11:11 περιβλεψάμενος πάντα); and it appeared on the following day how piercing and comprehensive His glance had been (Mar 11:15 ff.). ‘He looked up’ (ἀναβλέψας) and saw Zacchaeus in his post in the tree (Luk 19:5). When the scribes brought Him a crafty question, ‘He perceived (κατανοήσας) their craftiness’ (Luk 20:23)—‘saw at a glance,’ the word might be rendered. If there were space to offer a complete list

of those things which Jesus is said in the Gospels to have beheld or seen, the impression would at least be strong that those calm eyes *missed* nothing. Retaining God continually in the field of vision, Jesus' sight was not thereby dimmed, but only purged and purified for all other exercise. On one occasion His disciples were permitted to share a deeper gaze into the world behind the veil—'And He said unto them, I beheld (ἐθεώρουν) Satan as lightning fall from heaven' (Luk_10:18).

3. A special look of Christ is recorded as directed to a man or an audience during the utterance of some *statement* or *address*. The simplest record of this is when it is said that He 'looked round' before speaking (Mar_3:34; Mar_10:23 περιβλεψάμενος); or that 'he beheld (ἐμβλέψας) them and said' (Mat_19:26); or when more fully St. Luke states in reporting the Sermon on the Mount, 'And he lifted up his eyes (ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς) on his disciples, and said' (Luk_6:20). This is the look of the sower scrutinizing the field. It is a look adding personality to the word spoken. It is a silent 'Verily, verily, I say unto you.' More individual instances of this look are when Jesus 'beheld' (ἐμβλέψας) Peter, and said, 'Thou art Simon ... thou shalt be called Cephas' (Joh_1:42)—a look sealing the new name upon Peter's heart; or when He 'beheld' (ἐμβλέψας) the chief priests and scribes, 'and said, What is this then that is written?' (Luk_20:17)—a grave look of reproach, 'to add solemnity to His reference to their own Scriptures.' Christ and His words can never be separated. He is Himself the Word made flesh—the greatest utterance in the greatest Person; and the language of the Apostles is 'what we have *seen* and heard declare we unto you' (1Jn_1:3).

4. A few passages form a group by themselves, wherein strong *feeling* is expressed or implied as accompanying some look of Christ. The most notable instance of this is when 'the Lord turned and looked upon (ἐνέβλεψεν) Peter' (Luk_22:61), 'No word, no gesture of reproach'; but

'Oh to render plain,

By help of having loved a little and mourned,

That look of sovran love and sovran pain'

(Mrs. Browning, *Sonnets*).

Akin to this is the look directed by Jesus upon the young ruler, ‘And Jesus beholding (ἐμβλέψας) him loved him’ (Mar_10:21); or the look of the King upon Jerusalem, on ‘what should have been the City’s bridal day,’ ‘He beheld (ιδών) the city, and wept over it’ (Luk_19:41). As a last instance, though expressing a very different emotion, we may adduce Mar_3:5 ‘He looked round about on them (περιβλεψάμενος αὐτούς) with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts.’ Of Christ, too, might the words have been written, He

‘loved well because he hated,

Hated wickedness that hinders loving’ (Browning).

R. Stevenson.

⚡ Lord

LORD.—This title is used as the translation of three different words in the Gr. Gospels: (1) ὁ δεσπότης. This word occurs only once in the Gospels, in the prayer of Simeon, ‘Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word’ (Luk_2:29). It is the proper correlative of δοῦλος. In thus addressing God, Simeon thinks of himself as His slave. (2) οἱ μεγιστᾶνες. This word also occurs but once in the Gospels, in Mar_6:21 ‘Herod ... made a supper to his lords.’ It describes the chief men or nobles of a city or kingdom. (3) κύριος, ὁ κύριος. Except in the above instances, this is the word which stands for ‘Lord’ and ‘lord’ in the Gospels. It occurs with great frequency. With or without the article, it is found at least 244 times. The frequency of its use is concealed from readers of the English versions. It is sometimes translated ‘master’ (‘Yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their master’s table,’ Mat_15:27), or ‘sir’ (‘I go, sir, and went not,’ Mat_21:30), or ‘owner’ (‘the owners therefore said, Why loose ye the colt?’ Luk_19:33). Fundamentally the title describes one who has power or authority (ὁ ἔχων κύριος) over persons or things. Strictly speaking, it implies ownership, but it is also used as a title of reverence or courtesy. In the Gospels it is applied in a wide variety of relationship.

1. It is frequently used as *a name for God*.—(1) In most cases as a name for God, it is used without the article. It occurs in all 59 times (17 in Matthew , 8 in Mk., 30 in Luke , 4 in Jn.). It is found in quotations from the OT, as ‘Thou shalt not tempt (the) Lord

thy God' (Mat_4:7); and in phrases of OT origin, as 'the angel of (the) Lord' (Mat_1:20 || Luk_1:11); 'the law of (the) Lord' (Luk_2:23); 'the power of (the) Lord' (Luk_5:17). It is noteworthy that the only instances in the Gospels where the title is used in direct address to God, are found in the prayers of Jesus: 'I thank thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth' (Mat_11:25 || Luk_10:21). In both cases the title is found in exactly the same phrase. (2) The use of the name with the article is infrequent, occurring in all 11 times (twice in Mt., once in Mark, 8 times in Lk.): e.g. 'Perform unto the Lord thine oaths' (Mat_5:33); 'Tell how great things the Lord hath done for thee' (Mar_5:19); 'Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest' (Luk_10:2). In the application of this name to God, with and without the article, the Gospels follow the usage of the LXX Septuagint .

2. It is also used with great frequency as a *general title of courtesy*, or as a *name for a master or owner*. (1) Without the article, it is employed in direct address, as the salutation of a son to a father, 'I go, sir' (Mat_21:30); of servants to their master, 'Sir, didst not thou sow good seed in thy field?' (Mat_13:27); 'Lord, let it alone this year also' (Luk_13:8); of the Greeks to Philip, 'Sir, we would see Jesus' (Joh_12:21); of the Pharisees and priests to Pilate, 'Sir, we remember that this deceiver said' (Mat_27:63). This use of the title, as a general term of courtesy in direct address, is not found in Mk., but it occurs 9 times in Matthew, 8 times in Lk., and twice in John. As the name for a master, without the article it is found only in Mat_6:24 'No man can serve two masters,' and in Luk_16:13, the parallel passage. (2) With the article, it is a frequent name for a master or owner, as 'the lord of the vineyard' (Mat_20:8), 'the lord of that servant' (Luk_12:46), 'the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth' (Joh_15:15). In Luk_16:8 it is the 'lord' of the unjust steward who commended his dishonest method of providing for himself.

3. It is most frequently of all employed as a *title of courtesy in direct address to*, or as a *name for Jesus*.

(1) Without the article, it is used (a) by His disciples, as 'Lord, if it be thou, bid me come unto thee on the water' (Mat_14:28). This title in direct address to Jesus by disciples is never found in Mark. It is most frequent in Jn., as is to be expected, since he records most of the private intercourse between Jesus and His disciples. (b) By others than disciples, as 'Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean' (Mat_8:2). In Mk. it is employed only once in this relation, by the Syrophenician woman, 'Yes, Lord' (Mar_7:28). In most cases, the title as used by others than disciples is found in narratives of miracle. (c) By Jesus Himself, as 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven' (Mat_7:21). (d) It is also found in the words of the angel to the shepherds, 'Unto you is born this day ... a Saviour, who is Christ (the) Lord' (Luk_2:11). This phrase (χριστὸς κύριος) is found in Ps-Sol 17:36.

Briggs (*Messiah of the Gospels*, pp. 34, 35, notes) says it is probably to be interpreted on the basis of אֲדַבֵּר Psa_110:1 ('The Lord said unto my *Lord*'), but adds that Schürer, Ewald, Wellhausen, and W. R. Smith regard the phrase in Ps-Sol as a mistranslation of יְהוָה שָׁחַח ('Anointed of (the) Lord,'—a phrase which is found in Luk_2:26 (the) Lord's Christ'). Dalman, on the other hand (*Words of Jesus*, T. & T. Clark, p. 303 f.), thinks it incredible that a translator should have made such a mistake. We agree with him in regarding κύριος (Lord) as a word added by the Evangelist to interpret the Jewish title Messiah (χριστός) to his Gentile readers. (The same necessity of interpretation accounts for the phrase 'Christ, a king' (Luk_23:2), in the accusation made before Pilate. The claim that Jesus was 'the Christ' had no political significance to the Gentile governor. It had to be interpreted to him as 'king' before he could receive the charge as an accusation). In Act_2:36 the phrase 'God hath made that same Jesus ... both Lord and Christ' (κύριον καὶ χριστόν), is to be explained in the same way. 'Lord' is an addition by the Evangelist, to interpret 'Christ' to Gentile Christians. We may add that the same necessity of interpreting 'Christ' to Gentiles accounts for the curious phrase in the address of Peter to Cornelius, which has been found so difficult—'Jesus Christ (he is Lord of all, πάντων κύριος),' Act_10:36. The clause in brackets is added to interpret the confessional title 'Christ.' It may be due to Lk., but it is more likely that it was added at the time by Peter. He was speaking to a Gentile, who, though he was 'a devout man and one that feared God,' may not have understood the confessional significance of the term 'Christ.' Without the addition of the interpretation, Cornelius might have regarded it as part of the name of Jesus. The title 'Christ' did become a proper name, but that use of the term did not arise till a later date. If the interpretation was given by Peter when speaking to Cornelius, it provides an interesting illustration of the way in which the first preachers of Christianity adapted themselves to the new conditions in which they found themselves, when they began to preach to Gentiles. The Saviour of the world must not have a local or national confessional title, (cf. the words of Paul and Silas to the Philippian jailer as they are given in \aleph AB, and accepted by Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf, and other critical editors, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus (*i.e.* believe on Jesus as Lord), and thou shalt be saved,' Act_16:31. Also, 'No man can say that Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Ghost' (1Co_12:3), and 'every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father,' Php_2:11). To the Jewish Christian, Jesus was the 'Messiah,' to the Hellenistic Christian Jew He was 'the Christ,' and to the Gentile Christian He was 'the Lord.' The Hellenistic and Gentile terms are combined in our familiar name 'the Lord Jesus Christ.' The interpretation of 'Christ' as 'Lord' enables us to understand that the essential idea of the first term is that of Sovereignty or Lordship. The Saviour is the Lord, the Possessor and Ruler of the Kingdom of God.

This title readily acquired its highest significance as one of Divine honour among the Gentile Christians, especially in the East. 'Oriental religions are fond of expressing the relationship between the divinity and the devotee, as that of the "Lord" or "Lady" to a slave' (Deissmann). The higher significance of the title was most likely assisted also by the fact that among Hellenistic Jewish Christians κύριος was in use as a Divine title applied to God.

(2) With the article, the title is applied to Jesus (a) by Himself, directly, as 'Ye call me Master and Lord' (more literally, 'the Teacher and the Lord') (Joh 13:13), and indirectly, as '(The) Lord said unto my Lord (τῷ κυρίῳ μου), Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool' (Mat 22:44). (b) The historical application of the title, with the article, to Jesus is specially significant. Tischendorf and Westcott-Hort omit the title in this form, in the only place where it is found in Mt. (Mat 28:6). It occurs twice in Mk. (Mar 16:19-20), *i.e.* in that part of the Gospel which is regarded by critical editors as not belonging to the original Manuscripts. Therefore it is only in the Gospels of Lk. and Jn. that the title in this form is applied historically to Jesus. This is a strong argument for the earlier composition of Mt. and Mk., for the title became so common in the Apostolic Church that its absence from these Gospels can be explained only by their early date. The title occurs 18 times in Luke, 12 times in John. Twelve of the instances in Lk. are found in passages which are peculiar to that Gospel, as 'the Lord appointed other seventy' (Luk 10:1). The other instances may be regarded as editorial additions (Luk 7:13; Luk 11:39; Luk 12:42; Luk 17:5-6; Luk 24:3). Three of the instances in Jn., which are found in the early part of the Gospel, are plainly editorial additions (Joh 4:1; Joh 6:23; Joh 11:2). The remaining instances are found in the last two chapters of the Gospel, and in passages which are peculiar to it. They deal with the risen life of Jesus, and were written at a time when the higher conceptions of His personality gave a deeper significance to the title, and when its confessional meaning was universally known. The adoring cry of Thomas, 'My Lord and my God' (ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου) Joh 20:28, is an illustration of how among Jewish Christians the title of respect addressed to a teacher became one of Divine honour. Yet, as Dalman says, 'it must ... be remembered that the Aramaic-speaking Jews did not, save exceptionally, designate God as "Lord," so that in the Hebraic section of the Jewish Christians the expression "our Lord" was used in reference to Jesus only, and would be quite free from ambiguity' (p. 329).

4. In comparing parallel passages in which the title occurs, it is to be noticed that other titles are sometimes employed as equivalent terms in addressing Jesus. —

i. Mat 8:25 (κύριε) 'Lord, save us: we perish.'

Mar 4:38 (διδάσκαλος) ‘Teacher, earest thou not that we perish?’

Luk 8:24 (ἐπιστάτα) ‘Master (teacher), we perish.’

ii. Mat 17:4 (κύριε) ‘Lord, it is good for us to be here.’

Mar 9:5 (Ραββει) ‘Rabbi, it is good for us to be here.’

Luk 9:33 (ἐπιστάτα) ‘Master (teacher), it is good for us to be here.’

iii. Mat 26:22 (κύριε) ‘Is it I, Lord?’

Mat 26:25 (Ραββει) ‘Is it I, Rabbi?’

Joh 13:25 (κύριε) ‘Lord, who is it?’

The variety in the title used in addressing Jesus is not confined to the parallel passages. It is to be seen throughout each of the Gospels. Arranging the titles in the order of preference, Mt. uses κύριος, διδάσκαλος, and Ῥαββει; Mk. διδάσκαλος Ῥαββει, Ῥαββουνει, and κύριος Lk. κύριος, διδάσκαλος, and ἐπιστάτης; Jn. κύριος, Ῥαββει, Ῥαββουνει, and διδάσκαλος. Sometimes the variety of the title is seen even in the same passage. It cannot be without intention or meaning that in (iii.) Mt. represents the eleven disciples as asking, ‘Is it I, Lord?’ while Judas, the traitor, says, ‘Is it I, Rabbi?’ (Mat 26:22; Mat 26:25). Possibly Judas indicated his position of detachment or opposition by using ‘Rabbi’ instead of the title employed by the rest of the disciples. It is only by Judas that Jesus is addressed as ‘Rabbi’ in Mt. (Mat 26:25; Mat 26:49). There must also be some difference of feeling in the use of different titles in Luk 5:5 ‘Master (teacher, ἐπιστάτα), we have toiled all night’; and Luk 5:8, where Peter, after the miraculous draught of fishes, falls at the feet of Jesus with the cry, ‘Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord’ (κύριε). But it is possible that the variation of title in the parallel passages may have taken place in the process of oral transmission, or in translation from the Aramaic.

5. The variation of title in addressing Jesus suggests that in the original language of the Gospels at least two titles were employed. Of these Ῥαββει was one, cf. ‘ye call

me Master (teacher) and Lord,' Joh 13:13, and the frequent use of 'Rabbi' in the Gospels. Evidently 'teacher' (διδάσκαλος) is a translation of 'Rabbi' in some of its forms (רב, רבי, רבן). In 7 places Lk. uses ἐπιστάτης as a synonym for διδάσκαλος (Luk 5:5; Luk 8:24 bis. Luk 8:45; Luk 9:33; Luk 9:49; Luk 17:13), and, without doubt, some form of רב lies behind this also. As to the title κύριος (Lord), which is used so frequently in addressing Jesus, it is most probably a translation of מַרְיָא or מַרְיָא. It was a common name for a master, and was used as a title of courtesy. It was used by a servant to a master, by a debtor to a creditor, and by a layman to a learned man. It is possible, however, since many of the people of Palestine were bilingual, that κύριος was used by itself when one who knew Greek spoke to Jesus.

6. We thus suggest a twofold origin of the title as applied to Jesus. First, as the translation of the Aramaic titles in use among the disciples; and second, as the substitute for χριστός with confessional meaning among Gentiles. These distinctions of origin and meaning were soon lost in the gradual but rapid adoption of the title as one expressive of Divine honour. It is possible that this use of the title first became common among Eastern Christians.

7. In regard to the application of κύριος to God, it may be said that this was entirely due to the influence of Hellenistic Judaism. It is very unlikely that it was in use among Aramaic-speaking Jews at the time of our Lord. In reading the Scriptures in the synagogue in Hebrew, the name אֲרִנִי (Lord) was read wherever the sacred name יהוה was found in the text. When it became necessary to translate the Scriptures into Aramaic in public reading, אֲרִנִי still took the place of the sacred name. In quoting from the Scriptures אֲרִנִי was not employed for the name of God, but הַשֵּׁם ('the Name') in Hebrew, and שְׁמַיָא in Aramaic. In phrases of OT origin like 'the angel of (the) Lord,' the name of God was entirely omitted or merely hinted at.

Literature.—Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, 324; Bruce, *Apologetics*, 398; Naville, *The Christ*, 144; Somerville, *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, 295; Spurgeon, *The Messiah*, 649; *Expository Times*, vol. xii. [1901] p. 425 ff., vol. xiii. p. 236 ff., vol. xv. p. 296 ff.; Deissmann, *ibid.* vol. xviii. p. 195 ff.; *Lexicons* of Cremer and Grimin-Thayer, s.v. κύριος.

John Reid.

☩ Lord's Day

LORD'S DAY.—See Calendar (the Christian).

☩ Lord's Prayer (I)

LORD'S PRAYER (I)

1. Place in NT.—Mat 6:9-13, Luk 11:1-4. The former passage has been more influential in the later history of the Lord's Prayer, but the latter seems to give it in a more historical setting. In the Sermon on the Mount, the Prayer is, to all appearance, a later insertion; Lk. leads into the neighbourhood of Bethany (Luk 10:38-42) or Gethsemane; see J. A. Robinson, 'On the Locality in which the Lord's Prayer was given,' in F. H. Chase, 'The Lord's Prayer in Early Church' (*TS [Note: 5 Texts and Studies.]* iii. [1891] pp. 123-125). Not far from the traditional site of Gethsemane, on the slope of the Mount of Olives, stands to-day the Church of the Paternoster, showing in the quadrangle the Lord's Prayer engraved in thirty-two languages.

The Lord's Prayer has been frequently published in Polyglot editions; the oldest at Rome, 1591, in 26 languages; then by Il. Megiser, Frankfort, 1593, in 40 [2nd ed., 1603, in 50; 3rd ed., Linz, 1616, in 52]; by Andr. Müller, 1660, in 100; Chamberlayne, 1715, in 150 languages. J. Adelung (*Mithridates*, 1804-1817) made the Lord's Prayer the basis of a scientific classification of languages. Further Polyglot editions by Bodoni (Parma), J. J. Marcel (Paris), Auer (Vienna), Dalton (St. Petersburg, 1870, in 108 languages of Russia), S. Apostolides (London, no date, in 100 languages, published for the benefit of the poor Cretan refugees now in Greece); *The Lord's Prayer in Three Hundred Languages ...* with a Preface by Heinrich Rost, 1891; in 300 dialects of Africa, 1900. But most of these compilations lack scholarly supervision. A pleasant task would be for a united band of scholars to trace the historic development of those languages for which this is possible, on the basis of the Lord's Prayer, and to show the character of the rest on the same basis. The Lord's Prayer has also been frequently turned into *metre* and *rhyme*. Whether there exists a collection of this kind in English, is unknown to the present writer; in German, cf. *Das Gebet des Herrn: Eine Sammlung metrischer Umschreibungen des Vaterunsers*, Reutlingen, 1821; E. W. Scripture, 'A Record of the Melody of the Lord's Prayer,' in *Die neueren Sprachen*, ed. by W. Vietor, x. 9.

For early English translations of the Lord's Prayer, see Albert S. Cook, 'Study of the Lord's Prayer in English' (*Amer. Journ. Philol.* vol. xii. pp. 59-66), and *Biblical*

Quotations of Old English Prose Writers (London, 1898, pp. xxv, liii, lix, lxiv, 147 ff.). Cook refers to Wanley's *Catalogus*, where separate versions of the Lord's Prayer are either given or their existence noted, pp. 51, 160, 169, 197, 202, 221, 224, 239 (?), 240, 248. Cook gives the first from MS. Bodl. Jun. 121. Three poetical paraphrases of the Lord's Prayer of uncertain date are given by Greiss in his *Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Poesie*, ii. 285-290 (new ed. ii. 227-238), the last two published by Wanley, *Catalogus*, pp. 48 and 147 f., and by Etmüller, *Scopas and Boceras*, pp. 230-237; the first by Thorpe, *Codex Exoniensis*, p. 468 f. On p. 147, Cook gives the Lord's Prayer from aelfric's *Homilies*, and an isolated quotation in Cnut's *Laws* (Schmid, *Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, p. 270). We may quote: 'urne daeghwamlican hlâf,' 'ure gyltas,' 'on costnunge'; 'fram yfele,' 'hlâf userne oferwistlic,' 'instondenlice,' 'scylða' (Cook, pp. liii, lix). For the expression 'costnunge,' it is interesting to note that the corresponding German word 'Bekörung,' was declared by Luther better than the received 'Versuchung.'

In the new and enlarged edition of *The Lord's Prayer in Five Hundred Languages, comprising the Leading Languages and their Principal Dialects throughout the World, with the Places where Spoken*; with a Preface by Reinhold Rost (London, Gilbert & Rivington, 1905), the Lord's Prayer is given in English in sixteen forms, namely: Charles 11. Prayer-Book, 1662; Edward VI. Prayer-Book, 1549; as sent from Rome by Pope Adrian, an Englishman, about 1160; from two Manuscripts of the 13th cent.; from Wyclif, about 1380; Tindale, 1534; Cranmer, 1575; Rheims Version, 1582; Authorized Version, 1611; Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, 1881; *The Twentieth Century NT*; further, in Anglo-Saxon.

A disciple—it is not said whether one of the Twelve—asked Jesus, as He was praying in a certain place, when He ceased, 'Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples.' That the disciples of John were wont to make prayers or supplications, besides their fasting, is told by St. Luke only (5:33). On a form of prayer ascribed to John, see 'Lord's Prayer' (by present writer) in *Ebi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*] 2817, n. [Note: note.] 6, and the Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge (p. 529). There it begins: 'Bright Morning, Jesus Christ, Who was sent by God the Father.' Where fixed forms of prayer are in use, as was the case, it seems, with the Jews in the time of Christ, it is but natural that petitions on particular subjects should be added to them; such additions are mentioned as made, for example, by R. Eliezer and by R. Johanan (see Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* on Matthew 6, and art. 'Schemone Esre' in Hamburger, *RE* ii. [1883] 1098).

2. Sources.—The sources whence our Mt. and Lk. took the Lord's Prayer are quite unknown. The Gospel of Mk., which, according to the common view, was used by our Mt. and Lk., does not give it. On Mar 11:24 f., where Mk. speaks about prayer, see A. Wright, *Synopsis*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ,

1903, p. 115, and Wellhausen, who thinks that Mk. may have known the Lord's Prayer as a prayer of the Church, but did not dare to refer it in its wording to Jesus; the expression (ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν) ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, occurring there, is not found elsewhere in Mk. If the first Gospel was originally written in (Hebrew or) Aramaic, its author may have had the Lord's Prayer before him, written or oral, in (Hebrew or) Aramaic, and given it in one of these dialects; then the translator may have formed the Greek under the influence of Lk. (cf. the *hapaxlegomenon* ἐπιούσιος). This is the view especially of Th. Zahn. The opposite view, that ἐπιούσιος was first coined by Mt. or one of his fellow-workers, is maintained, for instance, by A. Wright, *The Gospel according to Luke*, 1900, p. 102.

3. Text of the Lord's Prayer.—As there are two traditions about the place of origin of the Lord's Prayer, so even its wording is given in two different forms. In the Received Text, it is true, they differ very little; in the Authorized Version, for instance, the variations are but four:

| Matthew. | Luke. |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| (1) in earth as it is in heaven. | as in heaven, so in earth. |
| (2) this day. | day by day. |
| (3) debts, as we forgive our debtors. | sins, for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. |
| (4) For thine ... Amen. | <i>omits.</i> |

In the Greek Textus Receptus they differ even less, the first of the above variations has nothing to correspond in Greek. (In Mt. the Authorized Version preserved the order of the Pr. Bk. [Note: Bk. Prayer Book.] version, which differs both from Mt. and Lk. in the fifth petition, 'trespasses' against 'debts' and 'sins').

There can be no doubt that in the Textus Receptus the form of Lk. has been assimilated to that of Mt. The modern critical editions agree almost to the letter; see the editions of Scrivener, Weymouth, Nestle. Weiss retained in Mt. the form ἐλθέτω instead of ἐλθάτω, and the article τῆς before γῆς. The critical apparatus of Tischendorf and WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] [the 2nd ed. of 1896 is enriched by some additional notes] may be supplemented by the following notes:

(1) The *Didache* (8:2) has the singular τῷ οὐρανῷ; the *Apost. Const.* in both places, 3:18 and 7:24 (here reproducing the *Didache*), the plural.

(2) On the form ‘veni ad regnum tuum’ in the oldest Latin MS (Cod. Bobbiensis), see F. C. Burkitt (*Cambr. Univ. Reporter*, 5th March 1900).

(3) Syr [Note: yr Syriac.] ^{CUF} and the Syr. [Note: Syriac.] *Acts of Thomas* have the plural for ‘thy will’ as the first hand of Cod. \aleph in Mat 7:21 (τὰ θελήματα).

(4) On the article for ‘on earth,’ see *Ebi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*] 2818; on the new punctuation of the third petition, see below.

(5) With τὴν ὀφειλὴν of the *Didache* cf. Mat 18:32, and the difference of the singular and plural in German and Dutch: *Schuld* and *Schulden*. Two Manuscripts of the *Apost. Const.* give *καραπτώματα* = ‘trespasses,’ *καθώς* for *ὡς*, and omit the verb. Syriac forms combine ‘debts’ and ‘sins’; see, besides *Ebi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*] 2818, Burkitt in his ed. of the *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, Mrs. Gibson’s ed. of the *Didascalia*, and Mrs. Lewis’ MS of the *Acts of Thomas*.

(6) In some Oriental translations ‘deliver’ is rendered by different roots in Mt. and Lk., and then both are combined in liturgical use of the Lord’s Prayer.

(7) Of the Doxology the *Didache* omits ‘the kingdom and’; in the *Apost. Const.* (7:24) one MS, on the contrary, omits ‘and the power and the glory’; and the same two clauses are omitted by another MS at 3:18, which with its ally ends ‘of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, for ever and ever.’ In this connexion it is worth while to remark, that Funk, in his new edition of the *Didascalia* and *Apost. Const.*, puts at 3:18 and 7:24 the final quotation marks after *τονηροῦ*, implying by this that he does not regard the Doxology as part of the quotation from the NT. Compare with this the above statement about the Manuscripts of the *Constitutions*, and Brightman’s *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, p. 353 f.

In Lk. the modern editions differ even less than in Mt.—only in a single letter, Weiss retaining here also the spelling *ἐλθέτω*. With this unity contrast the judgment of Dean Burgon (*The Revision Revised*, pp. 34-36; *The Traditional Text*, p. 84):

‘ “The five Old Uncials” (\aleph ABCD) falsify the Lord’s Prayer as given by St. Luke in no less than forty-five words. But so little do they agree among themselves, that they throw themselves into six different combinations in their departures from the

Traditional Text; and yet they are never able to agree among themselves as to one single various reading: while only once are more than two of them observed to stand together, and their grand point of union is no less than an omission of the article. Such is their eccentric tendency, that in respect of thirty-two out of the whole forty-five words they bear in turn solitary evidence.'

Any one who is unwilling to believe that the Textus Receptus of Lk. is due to assimilation with Mt. may compare the critical apparatus of the *Latin Testament* of Wordsworth-White, or of the pre-Lutheran *German Bible* as edited by Kurrelmeyer. There he can watch the same process for the German and the Latin texts. Even the Vulgate of Sixtus V. (1590) has the addition in Lk., *Fiat voluntas tua sicut in caelo ct in terra*; but not the rest.

The chief question about the Lord's Prayer in Lk. is, What about the petition ἐλθέτω τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμά σου ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ καθαρῶσαι ἡμᾶς, which is witnessed for Marcion and found since in one MS (604, or Scrivener's *b*, Gregory's 700, von Soden's ε 133, pub. by Hoskier, 1890). Perhaps a trace of it is found in D [Note: Deuteronomist.], which has ἀγιασθήτω ὄνομά σου ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, ἐλθέτω σου ἡ βασιλεία, etc. Another reading of Marcion is 'thy bread' for 'our'; whether he read the second clause of the fifth petition we do not know, the sixth (and last with him) had the form καὶ μὴ ἄφες ἡμᾶς εἰσενεχθῆναι εἰς πειρασμόν. The same or similar forms are found independently from Marcion down to the present day. Harnack (*Sitzungsber. Acad. Berl.* 21st Jan. 1904) was inclined to see in the petition, 'Thy holy spirit come (upon us) and cleanse us,' the original for Lk., comparing Luk 11:13 with Mat 7:11.

4. Arrangement of the Lord's Prayer.—Augustine tells us (*Enchir.* 116): 'Lucas in oratione dominica petitiones non septem sed quinque complexus est'; thus it became the custom in the West to count seven petitions; but Origen, Chrysostom, and the Reformed Churches count six, connecting 'but deliver us from evil' closely with what precedes. WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] print in Mt. the Lord's Prayer in 2 × 3 *stichi*, in Lk. without strophical arrangement, seeing in 'as in heaven, so on earth' the common burden for the first triplet of single clauses; see § 421. This has been adopted now for the Pr. Bk. [Note: Bk. Prayer Book.] version by Parliamentary Papers, 1903, No. 53, removing the comma from behind 'on earth' to behind 'done.' For the Authorized Version, the editions of the *Parallel NT* give a comma after 'done' as well as after 'on earth'; but Scrivener's *Paragraph Bible* (1873), the *Two Version Edition* (1900), and the *Interlinear Bible* (1906) omit the first comma. Whether the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 agrees with WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] is not quite clear from its comma (in this case we should have expected a

colon). This arrangement was already put forward by the *Opus imperfectum in Mt.* (Migne, lvi. 712): ‘Communiter autem accipi debet quod ait, Sicut in caelo et in terra,’ *i.e.*—

‘Sanctificetur nomen tuum, sicut in caelo et in terra.

Adveniat regnum tuum, sicut in caelo et in terra.

Fiat voluntas tua, sicut in caelo et in terra.’

On the fact that in mediaeval explanations the beginning was construed ‘Pater noster qui es. In caelis sanctificetur nomen tuum,’ see below.

5. Contents.—(a) *The exordium.*—The short *πάτερ* in Lk., the fuller *πάτερ ἡμῶν* in Mt., would both correspond to an Aram. Aramaic אבא, which is connected with *ὁ πατήρ* in Rom 8:15, Gal 4:6, Mar 14:36. Cf. J. H. Moulton’s *Prolegomena*, pp. 10, 233, and art. Abba in vol. i. That *πάτερ ἡμῶν* may also correspond to אבא and does not necessarily presuppose the form with suffix (אביו in Heb., אביו in Aram. Aramaic, אביו in Galilaean), is shown by Dahman, *Worte Jesu*, 157, though for the beginning of a prayer the more solemn form appears to him more probable. Among Jews it is customary to add שבשמים in Hebrew (שבשמיא in Aramaic) to אב where it is used of God, but the isolated אבא is not unusual. In the NT *ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* is almost exclusively used in Matthew. On the question whether from Rom 8:15, Gal 4:6 an acquaintance of St. Paul and his churches with the Lord’s Prayer may be concluded, see Gerh. Bindemann, *Das Gebet um tägliche Vergebung der Sünden in der Heilsverkündigung Jesu und in den Briefen der Apostel*, Gütersloh, 1902.

(b) On the imperatives *ἀγιασθήτω*, *γενηθήτω*, see Origen, *de Orat.* 24. 5; Blass, *Grammar*, § 20. 1; Moulton, *Proleg.* p. 172, who quotes from Gildersleeve on Justin Martyr, p. 137: ‘As in the Lord’s Prayer, so in the ancient Greek Liturgies the aor. imper. is almost exclusively used. It is the true tense for “instant” prayer.’ Moulton adds: ‘To God we are bidden, by our Lord’s precept and example, to present the claim of faith in the simplest, directest, most urgent form with which language supplies us.’

(c) With the first petition cf. *SE** [Note: *SE*, used hereafter as abbreviation for Shemone Esre, the daily Prayer of the Synagogue; see the edition in Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, p. 299 ff.; and cf. on it, e.g., Hirsch in *JE* x. 270-282.] 3, and the beginning of

the *Kaddish* רבא שמייה ויתקדש תפילת; afterwards eight more such verbs are placed together about ‘the name of holiness (Blessed be it).’ A benediction without mentioning השם (= יהוה) is no benediction at all (*Ber.* 40b).

(d) Likewise a benediction with no מלכות is no benediction at all (*ib.*; cf. *SE* 11, in opposition to 12, 14, 17, *Kaddish*).

(e) γεννηθήτω is translation יעשה by Shemtob, Delitzsch, Salkinson-Ginsburg, Resch; יתי by Alexander (McCaul-Hoga), Margoliouth, by the old Syriac versions except the Syro-Palestinian; from *SE* cf. 13, רצוק עשי; in the *Kaddish*: ‘May your prayers be accepted, and may *your* petition be done.’ To רצון of Biblical Hebrew would correspond צביון in post-Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic.

(f) For ἐπιούσιος the remark of Origen, *de Orat.* 27, still holds good, that the word is found nowhere else in the whole range of Greek literature. Jerome compares it with the LXX Septuagint περιούσιος; but this stands almost everywhere for סגולה (*ap.* Aquila, Gen 14:21 for רבש, LXX Ps 16:14 for יתך). On περιούσιος, see Jerome’s remark (*Anecd. Mareds.* iii. 1, p. 92): ‘Verbo περιούσιος, i.e. *substantialis*, exceptis sanctis scripturis nullus foris disertorum usus est.’ The *Gospel according to the Hebrews* had for ἐπ., as Jerome states, *mâhâr* (מחר=). His most explicit statement has been published by Morin, *Anecd-Mareds.* iii. 2, p. 262: ‘In Hebraico evangelio secundum Matthaeum ita habet: Panem nostrum *crastinum* da nobis hodie.’ This lends a strong support to the view that ἐπιούσιος is formed from ἡ ἐπιούσα, ‘the coming day,’ even if this *mâhâr* were nothing but a retranslation of the Greek. But another view is that it is the original word used by Jesus and preserved by the Jewish-Christian communities. This is the view of Zahn, *Gesch. Kan.* ii. 193, 703, *Eind.* ii. 312; Ambrose: ‘Latinus hunc panem *quotidianum* dixit, quem Graeci dicunt *advenientem*, quia Graeci dicunt τὴν ἐπιούσαν ἡμέραν *advenientem diem*’; Athanasius: τὸν ἐ. ἄρτ. τουτέστι τὸν μέλλοντα; Cyril Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.]: οἱ μὲν εἶναι φασὶ τὸν ἕξοντά τε καὶ δοθησόμενον κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τὸν μέλλοντα; the Sahidic Version, on which see Lagarde, *Mitt.* ii. 374.

But the Oriental versions took another view: Syr [Note: yr Syriac.] *cur* אמינא לחמן, i.e. ‘our continual bread,’ in Luke Syr [Note: yr Syriac.] *cur* sin and *Acts of Thomas* ‘the

continual bread' (אמינא אלחמ); the same tradition seems to be followed by the *cotidianus* of the Latin, the *sinteinan* of the Gothic, especially by חמירי לחמנו of Shemtob ben Shafrut, with which cf. Num_4:7 תַּמְיִר לֶחֶם 'the continual bread.' [The Armenian version of 2Ma_1:8 used for the shewbread the same expression as in the Lord's Prayer, wherefore Holmes-Parsons remarked: '*tres codices Sergii* ἄρτους ἐπιουσίους,' which remark led Deissmann (*Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 41) and Hilgenfeld (in his *Ztschr.*, 1899, p. 157) to the belief that ἐπιουσίους was actually found in some Greek Manuscripts . This was corrected by the present writer in *ZNTW* [Note: *NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissen. schaft.*] i. 250, *EBi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*] 2820, n. [Note: note.] 1; but it is repeated by Wellhausen in his Com. on Mt. and not recalled in that on Lk.]. The Vulgate (Jerome?) has *supersubstantialis* in Mt. and *cotidianus* in Lk. How the Peshitta (Rabula?) came to translate 'the bread of our need,' דסונקמ לחמא, is not quite clear, while the translation 'our bread of richness' in the Syro-Palestinian version rests on confusion with περιουσίους.

The following is a conspectus of the different renderings that have been tried:

(1) Shemtob: חמירי לחמנו. (2) J. B. Jona, Rome, 1668: להמנו הקיום על, a literal rendering of the *supersubstantialis* of the Vulgate, as *überstantlich* in three editions of the pre-Lutheran German Bible. (3) Delitzsch, Salkinson, Resch: תקני לֶחֶם, after Pro_30:8. (4) Taylor: תמיד לֶחֶם or תהירא המאל. (5) Schultze: *lahma di çorkána* (= Pesh.). (6) Rönsch: סגלתנו לֶחֶם, like the Syro-Palestinian version. (7) Arn. Meyer: מססח (sufficient). (8) Chase: 'our (or the) bread of the day.' The *Variorum Bible* quotes the readings: 'our bread in sufficiency,' 'the bread proper for our sustenance,' 'the bread for the coming day,' 'needful bread,' or 'bread for the life to come.' Others translation 'bread of second quality,' 'the bread that we shall need' (*Twentieth Cent. NT*); see on the word, *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times.*] ii. [1891] 184, 242, 254, iii. [1891-92] 24, 31, 77.

The meaning of the word is certainly not far from the ἐφήμερος τροφή of Jam_2:15.

The change of σήμερον into καθ' ἡμέραν (and of δός into δίδου) has been explained by the daily use of the prayer; but the *Didache*, which already enjoins the use of it three times a day, does use δός and σήμερον.

(g) In the fifth petition ὀφειλήματα is rather = חֲבוּתֵינוּ (Shemtob, Delitzsch, Margoliouth), not אֲשַׁמְדֵינוּ (Salkinson, Resch). On the variant ὀφειλήν and the dogmatic changes of εἰσενέγκης, see above. In the Latin Church it became customary in the time of Jerome and Hilary to say ‘in tentationem quam ferre (or, sufferre) non possumus.’

(h) The last ambiguity is πονηροῦ, *malo*, which also in Heb., Aram. Aramaic and Syr. [Note: Syriac.] may be masculine or neuter. The translation of Shemtob, לְמִכָּל רָע ‘from all evil,’ finds its parallel in Ethiopic (see Brightman’s *Liturgies*, p. 234), ‘Deliver us and rescue us from all evil,’ while the Nestorian Liturgy equally combines the two verbs by which the Pesh. (not Sin^{cur}) renders ῥῦσαι in Mt. and Lk., ‘Save and deliver us,’ but continues, ‘from the Evil and his host.’ The neuter is found (in a different connexion, 10:5) already in the *Didache*: μνήσθητι, Κύριε, τῆς ἐκκλησίας σου, ῥύσασθαι αὐτήν ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ. Nevertheless, it seems to the present writer, on the whole, more probable that it should be taken as masculine. For the Greek NT see the exhaustive investigation of Chase, and cf. Act 10:38 where διαβόλου (Cod. E [Note: Elohist.] σατανᾶ) is rendered (by Shemtob) אֲשַׁמְדֵנוּ ‘the Evil One.’ The most decided view that the word is masculine is in the *Clem. Hom.*, where Peter uses the passage as one of his proofs for the fact that his Master frequently spoke to them of the existence of an Evil One (Act 19:2 ἐν ἧ παρεδωκεν ἡμῖν εὐχῆ ἔχομεν εἰρημένον· ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ, along with Mar 1:13, Mat 12:26, Luk 10:18, Mat 13:39; Mat 5:37, as proof for the statement: πολλάκις οἶδα τὸν διδάσκαλόν μοι εἰπόντα εἶναί τὸν πονηρόν = τινὰ κακίας ἡγεμόνα). Zahn and Wellhausen take it as neuter, as in Mat 5:37.

(i) That the Doxology formed no original part of the Lord’s Prayer needs no longer to be proved, in spite of Dean Burgon. The very discovery of the oldest witness outside of the NT, the *Didache*, where it occurs, corroborates the view that it originated in liturgical use. Its peculiar form there does not agree with any of the forms known to occur in the authorities for the text of Matthew (see *The NT in the Apostolic Fathers*, by a Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology, 1905, p. 28 f.). The statement of WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort’s text.] on the Doxology in the *Apost. Const.* must be supplemented as above from the new edition of Funk. See also art. Doxology in vol. i. p. 492.

6. The Lord's Prayer as a whole.—True prayer, says Wellhausen, is a creation of the Jews, and so the Lord's Prayer follows Jewish examples, though it is not a mere composition 'ex formulis Hebraeorum.' On the latter exaggeration, put forward by Grotius, Wetstein, and others, and strongly maintained by modern Jewish writers, see *The Lord's Prayer no Adaptation of existing Jewish Petitions*, by the Rev. M. Margoliouth (London, Bagster, 1876). The *Kaddish*, which is justly quoted for comparison, does not begin with 'Abba,' but it, too, has as first petition, 'Hallowed be thy name,' with the addition, however, 'in the world to come.' The national, eschatological, or Messianic element which goes through the *Kaddish* and the *SE* from beginning to end is remarkably thrown into the background in the Lord's Prayer. A petition like 'Give us this day our daily bread' would be impossible in the *Kaddish*, though a similar petition is not wanting in *SE*.

It is, however, wrong to deny completely the eschatological character of the Lord's Prayer; see esp. the Com. of Th. Zahn, who insists on the force of the aorists ἀγιασθήτω, ἐλθάτω, γεννηθήτω. Even the first petition looks forward to the time when the name of God, which in this world is so much blasphemed, especially among the heathen, through the sins of Israel (Rom 2:24), shall be glorified, when He brings about the inward purification and outward restoration of His people, separating the godless out of their midst. Zahn declares it erroneous to believe that the Lord's Prayer had a specifically Christian character. A Jew knowing nothing of Christ, and having no wish to have anything to do with Him, was able and is still able to-day to pray it. The saying of Mat 5:17, that He 'came to fulfil,' is true also of the Lord's Prayer.

That the first three petitions touch God and the rest refer to man is too clear a point to be missed.* [Note: It is, however, wrong to accentuate the word 'thy'; only codex D has in Lk. the emphatic order of words, σου ἡ βασιλεία.] The second half may perhaps be arranged under the heads of *present* (daily bread), *past* (debts of the past), *future* (temptation and deliverance); but a reference to the last trial (Mat 24:22), the hour of temptation (Rev 3:10) and deliverance from it, does not seem to be implied in the words.

'Thy kingdom come' is again the second petition in the *Kaddish*.

Instead of the third petition, which Wellhausen calls hard to understand, we have in the *Kaddish*, 'Your petition be done.' Whether it was under the influence of the fact that it is missing in the true text of Luke or not, at all events it is remarkable that Luther, in his *Catechism*, gave to the third petition no contents of its own, but treated it as a mere combination of the first and second ('Wenn Gott allen bösen Rat und Willen bricht und hindert, so uns den *Namen* Gottes nicht heiligen und sein *Reich* nicht kommen lassen wollen,' etc.).

Dogmatics and Ethics seem to be combined in every one of these three petitions: That we do not dishonour the name of the Heavenly Father (1) by mistrust, (2) by disobedience; that His Kingdom may come (1) with its blessings, (2) with its tasks and duties; that we (1) gladly accept all that is God's will concerning us, and (2) willingly do what He demands of us. To take the fourth petition as merely spiritual, like Marcion and afterwards Luther in his monkish days, is certainly wrong.

The sixth petition reminds us much more of the temptation of Jesus Himself at the beginning and end of His work, in the wilderness and in Gethsemane. The Jewish morning prayer contains the petition *גסיון לירי ... תביאנו אל* 'Bring us not ... into temptation'; but the age of this part is unknown. Jesus speaks, however, throughout in the second person, advising His disciples, not including Himself; on the other hand, He could not have taught them such a prayer if He had not Himself lived in that atmosphere which the prayer breathes. When He bids them pray after this manner (*οὕτως*), He gives them an example from which they might learn with few words to say to God what the pious soul has to say to Him, and He did not prescribe the use which was made very early of this prayer, so that it became, to use Luther's expression, the greatest martyr.

7. Later history of the Lord's Prayer.—Only a few hints can be given here. It is very sad to observe how early a mechanical use of the Lord's Prayer set in. The same *Didache* which turned the warning of Mat_6:16 into the precept, 'Your fastings shall not be with the hypocrites, for they fast on Monday and Thursday, but you fast on Wednesday and Friday,' goes on to write: 'Nor do ye pray as the hypocrites, but as the Lord commanded in His Gospel, Our Father, etc. Thrice in the day do ye pray so.'

This was enforced by the *Apost. Const.* (iii. 18): *προκατασκευάζοντες ἑαυτοὺς ἀξιους τῆς υἰοθεσίας τοῦ πατρὸς*, lest Mal_1:6 and Isa_52:5 find application to the Christians. Tertullian styled the Lord's Prayer *breuiarium totius evangelii*, and pronounced the judgment: 'Oratio haec quantum substringitur verbis, tantum diffunditur sensibus.' Cyprian called it *caelestis doctrinae compendium*; Origen wrote on it the treatise *de Oratione* (vol. ii. in the Berlin edition). On its use in the Liturgy, Brightman (p. 58) says: 'It occurs in all liturgies except *Apost. Const.* as the conclusion of the central action and summing up of the great prayer (533-534), and the transition to the communion, with a proem and a conclusion (*Embolismos*); it is also otherwise used.' For instance, in the liturgy of the Nestorians it is three times repeated.

Of mediaeval explanations, the *Glossa ordinaria* draws a rather artificial parallel between the seven petitions of the Lord's Prayer and the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost (Isa_11:12) and the seven Beatitudes. The Com. of St. Thomas Aquinas has been

translated from the Latin by Edw. Male (1893). Of special interest is the block-book of Henricus ex Pomerio (Henri van den Bøegaarde, 1382-1441), *Explanatio figuralis super Pater noster*.

See on it Alvin in *Bulletin de l'Académie R. de Belgique*, 2 Ser. vol. xvii. 674-94; *Monuments iconogr. et typogr. de la Bibliothèque R. de Belgique*; and P. Weizsäcker in *Christliches Kunstblatt*, 42 (1900), Nos. 4, 5. It is characterized by joining *in caelis* with the first petition,* [Note: Dibelius, *Das Vaterunser* (1903, p. 165 ff.), knows, for this construction, only Theodoricus of Paderborn, *Com. in Or. Dom. M.* 147, 333 f.] and a thoroughgoing tripartition ('in *caelo tres* sanctorum afflictiones; in *purgatorio tres* animarum afflictiones; in *saeculo tres* virorum defectiones; *tres* panes in via necessarios (naturae, gratiae, gloriae); *triplex* debitum (commissionis, omissionis, remissionis); *triplex* tentatio; damnandorum *triplex* malum; salvandorum *triplex* bonum. The illustrations remind one of the task which has yet to be executed, of writing a monograph on the artistic illustrations to the Lord's Prayer.

Literature.—The literature on the Lord's Prayer is immense. Strangely enough, an art. 'Lord's Day' is found in Smith, but not one on 'Lord's Prayer.' Under 'Paternoster,' Murray mentions that the first example of this term in English is one from about 1000. Of Queen Mary the saying is quoted that she 'got the crown by Our Father and held it by Pater noster.' The Latin designation was so frequently used, esp. in connexion with the rosary, that it was taken over into the language of architects, engineers, and anglers (see Murray). In German both its components in the form 'Patter' and 'Nuster' became expressions for collar-chains. As a measure of time, cf. a 'Paternoster cricket.'

Out of the literature on the Lord's Prayer, Th. Zahn in his *Com. on Matth.* (1903) selects: Tertull. *de Orat.* cc. 1-10; Cypr. *de Oratione Dominica* (Vienna ed. i. 267); Origen, *περὶ εὐχῆς* (Berlin ed. ii. 346); Gregory of Nyssa, *Or.* 2-5, *de Oratione* (Opp. ed. Paris, 1638, i. 723-761); Kamphausen, *Das Gebet des Herrn*, 1866; Chase (see above); E. v. d. Goltz, *Das Gebet in der ältesten Christenheit*, 1905, pp. 35-53; *Ebi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*] 2816 ff. We may add Plummer in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible* iii., and the following list of writers which is arranged chronologically as far as possible: 1626, Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] Huish; 1798, N. B. Cadogan; 1814, Isaac Mann; 1826, Samuel Saunders; 1832, J. Knight; 1835, W. Howells; 1846, Henry Alford; 1849, H. Caunter; 1852, Dan. Moore; 1854, Thomas Hugo; 1855, Charles Parsons Reichel; 1858, Hope Robertson; 1861, Navison Lorain, Rob. Hemley, W. H. Karlslake, F. D. Maurice; 1863, Geo. Wagner; 1864, W. Denton; 1865, Josephus T. Parker; 1866, Octavins Winslow; 1869, Claude Bosanquet; 1870, Ad. Saphir; 1872, J. W. Lance, Edw. J. Robinson; 1876, C. J. Vaughan (Dean of Llandaff); 1883, Newman Hall; 1884, Charles Stanford; 1885, Marcus Dods, W. S.

Carter; 1886, A. M. W. Christopher, Wash. Gladden; 1889, Gilb. Karney; 1890, H. N. Grimley, A. Hastings Ross; 1892, Rob. Eyton; 1893, Alh. Stolz; 1894, Arth. C. A. Hall, F. W. Farrar; 1895, G. Milligan; 1898, Dean E. M. Goulburn, Eliz. Wordsworth; 1900, J. E. Roberts; 1902, John Wakeford; 1903, J. D. Jones.—Without date (alphabetically): F. C. Blyth, J. J. Busfield, Rich. Glover, Thom. Griffith, Aug. W. Hare, J. Knight, B. Lambert, J. W. Lance, Rob. Leighton, Thom. Manton, Marcus Rainsford, Rigaut, Dean Stubbs, Caleb Webb, Will. R. Williams.

In *ExpT.* [*Note: Expository Times.*], besides the passages already quoted, may be compared: vi. [1894-95] 50, 140, 146, 190, xiii. [1902] 378, 431, xvi. [1905] 5, 10.

See also O. Dibelius, *Das Vaterunser: Umrisse zu einer Gesch. des Gebets in der alten und mittleren Kirche*, Giessen, 1903 (chiefly pp. 59-72—'Die Auffassung des Vaterunsers bei griechischen Schriftstellern'; cf. Ed. v. d. Goltz in *Theol. Litztg.* 1904, No. 2); C. F. Georg Heinrici, *Beiträge zur Gesch. und Erklärung des NT*, iii. (Leipzig, 1905, pp. 65-68 [Heinrici is inclined to agree with Harnack as to the petition, 'Thy holy spirit come upon us,' collects parallels from the OT, questions direct relation to *SE*, and republishes (p. 109 ff.) the explanation of the Lord's Prayer ascribed to Petrus of Laodicea (published by Mai, *Bibl. Patrum*, vi. 543, Migne, *Patr. Gr.* 86:2, p. 3321)]; together with Fed. Morelli, *Interpretis reg., Notæ ad orationem dominicam*. Petrus explains: ἐτιούσιον ἢ τὸν συνιστῶντα τὸ σῶμα ἡμῶν, τουτέστι τὸν ἐφήμερον, εἴτε τὸν ἔτοντα, τὸν μέλλοντα. τονηροῦ Petrus understands of the διάβολος κατ' ἐξοχὴν δὲ οὗτος καλεῖται δια τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς κακίας.

On the Lord's Prayer on a papyrus of the 6th cent., as amulet, brought to Europe by Willken, but destroyed by fire in Hamburg, see *Egypt. [Note: Egyptian.] Explor. Rep.* 1902, p. 42, 1903, p. 12; *aeg. Urkunden aus Berlin*, iii. No. 954; on the clay tablet, from Megara, containing the Lord's Prayer, see *ZNTW [Note: NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissen. schaft.]* ii. 228, 357,

Eb. Nestle.

☩ Lord's Prayer (II)

LORD'S PRAYER (II.)—This name for the prayer which Jesus taught His disciples (Mat 6:9-13, Luk 11:2-4), though used so generally by Christians, does not occur in the NT, and objection to it has sometimes been offered. It might suggest that the prayer was one which Jesus Himself employed, while not only is there no evidence of His having done so, but the petition for forgiveness is a sufficient assurance that He

cannot have made it His own. ‘When ye pray,’ He said to His disciples, ‘pray thus’; but His own manner of praying would be different—how different we may judge from the recollections preserved in the Fourth Gospel of one of His prayers (John 17). And so it has sometimes been suggested that we should speak not of ‘The Lord’s Prayer,’ but of ‘The Disciples’ Prayer,’ or that we should content ourselves with designating it by its first two words, calling it the ‘Our Father,’ just as German Protestants call it the ‘Vaterunser’ and Roman Catholics the ‘Paternoster.’ But apart from the consecration of long and hallowed use, the name is appropriate as giving expression to the fact that the prayer comes to us from the very lips of our Lord. In this sense it is the Lord’s Prayer. When we use it, we are approaching God with no words of our own, but in the very words which our Master has taught us.

1. Occasion.—Of the two accounts, in Mt. and Lk. respectively, of the occasion when Christ gave the prayer, it is generally agreed that if we must choose between them, Lk.’s is to be preferred as the more historical. It may be that the author of the First Gospel, after recording the Lord’s injunctions with regard to the spirit and manner of prayer (Mat 6:5-8), thought this a suitable opportunity to set down the prayer-form which was really given at a different time. And yet there seems no positive reason why we should set aside Mt.’s statement as to the connexion at least in which the prayer was spoken. If Jesus gave a form of prayer at all, and meant it to be used as He gave it, it seems likely that He would repeat it, more especially when dealing with different sets of hearers. And if it was natural that He should impart it when one of His disciples, not necessarily one of the Twelve, asked to be taught to pray, it was also natural that, when He had just been warning His disciples against hypocrisy in prayer and the vain repetitions of the Gentiles, He should instruct them to pray after the brief, simple, and filial manner of this model of approach to God.

2. Structure.—This is exceedingly simple. A part from the Doxology, which occurs only in Mt., and even there forms no part of the original, but is a later insertion due to liturgical usage, we have only an invocation and a series of six petitions. Since Augustine, the number of the petitions has commonly been reckoned at seven, the last clause in Mt.’s version being regarded as two separate requests. But the view that now commends itself to most scholars is that the two members of the sentence are to be taken as one and the same petition negatively and positively expressed. This view is confirmed by the fact that in the critical text of Lk. (see Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) the petition runs simply, ‘Bring us not into temptation,’ and it is further borne out by the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 rendering (almost certainly correct) of Mt.’s τοῦ πονηροῦ by ‘the evil one’ instead of ‘evil.’ The petition is that we may not be brought into temptation, but may be delivered from the Tempter; and these are two aspects of the selfsame request.

Looking now at the six petitions, we observe at once that the first three have a Godward, the second three a manward reference. Because of this the prayer has often been compared to the Decalogue with its summation of human duty first to God and then to man (cf. Mat 22:40, Mar 12:31). But beneath this resemblance there lies a great difference between the Ten Words and the Lord's Prayer, the familiar difference between law and grace, between the Old Testament and the New. For while in the one case our debt to God and to man is laid upon us from above as a commandment that must be obeyed, in the other we look up to God, crying like Augustine, 'Da quod jubes, et jube quod vis' (*Conf.* x. 60).

When we examine the prayer more closely, a beautiful continuity and symmetry of thought becomes apparent. In the invocation God is addressed by His new name of 'Father'; and it is with a petition for the hallowing of this name that the prayer proper begins. If we take the three petitions of the first group, God appears to be addressed: (1) as the Father whose name must be hallowed, (2) as the King whose Kingdom is to come, (3) as the Lord of heaven and earth whose will must be fulfilled. And when we pass to the three petitions of the second group, the same threefold view of God may be traced, coming, too, in the same order, so that the successive clauses of this group correspond respectively to those of the first. For the prayer for bread naturally suggests the request of the child to the Father, the prayer for forgiveness the petition of the subject to the King, and the prayer for deliverance from the Tempter the cry of one who feels in the presence of the world's evil his utter dependence upon the strong and holy will of his Master and Lord.

3. Contents.—Without entering here into the questions raised by the twofold text (see preceding art.), we shall for convenience follow Mt.'s version as the one which has passed into general use in the Christian Church.

(a) *The Invocation:* 'Our Father which art in heaven.' These words mark a new epoch not only in the history of prayer, but in the history of revelation. In the OT, God is occasionally spoken of as the Father of the Jewish people (Deu 32:6, Isa 63:16 etc.), but individuals do not venture to address Him by this name (Psa 103:13 is only a comparison). And though in some of the extra-canonical writings there appears a dawning consciousness of a personal relation to God as a Father (Wis 2:16, Sir 23:1; Sir 23:4 etc.), it was Jesus Christ who first turned the dim hope of pious hearts into the assured certainty of faith. 'Father' is the distinctive Christian name of God, the name which Christ taught us, and which, apart from Him, we have no proper right to use (cf. Joh 1:12, Gal 4:6). The Fatherhood here appealed to is not the general Fatherhood of Creatorship, but the special Fatherhood of grace. It is for those who are the children of God by Christian faith that this prayer is meant, those who turn to Him with filial hearts, prepared to say: 'Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done.'

But God is called not 'Father' only, but 'Our Father,' and thus the invocation acknowledges the brotherhood of man as well as the Fatherhood of God. There is a human brotherhood which rests on the Divine Creatorship (cf. Mal 2:10). But just as there is a special sonship, the sonship of believers, so there is a distinctive brotherhood, the brotherhood of saints; and it is this brotherhood that finds immediate expression in the invocation of the Lord's Prayer.

Our Father is 'in heaven.' The phrase speaks to us of His greatness and holiness, of the reverence we owe Him, of His power to bless. But it also reminds us that if we are the children of the heavenly Father, His home is the true home of our souls, and that, as always, so especially when we bow before His throne with our requests, we must set our mind on the things that are above.

(b) *First Petition:* 'Hallowed be thy name.' In the OT the 'name' of God is a constant expression for His revealed character (cf. Psa 9:10; Psa 20:7, Pro 18:10). Without doubt it is in this sense that the word is used by Jesus. But His immediate reference here must be to that character of Fatherhood under which He had just presented God to His disciples. It is our Father in heaven whose name is to be hallowed. To hallow that name is to set great store by it, to exalt it and revere it and glory in it. To pray that it may be hallowed is to pray that God as revealed to us by Christ may be accepted and honoured by ourselves and others—that we may turn to Him as our Father with loving, trustful hearts, and give Him the honour that is due.

(c) *Second Petition:* 'Thy kingdom come.' The Kingdom of God was the hope of Israel before Christ's advent, and when He came it formed the constant and central theme of His teaching. When we examine the Synoptic Gospels to learn what His teaching upon the subject was, we find Him speaking of the Kingdom of God in two ways. (1) It was a present reality set up on earth (Mat 12:28, Mar 1:15, Luk 17:21), gathering round His own person (Mat 13:41; Mat 16:28; Mat 25:31; Mat 25:34 etc.), the coming of which meant its entrance (which is really His own entrance, Mat 8:10 ff; Mat 11:28-30 etc.) into the individual heart (Luk 17:20-21, Mat 18:3 ||, Joh 3:3), its steady growth (Mar 4:26-32), and its gradual spread like leaven through society (Mat 13:33 = Luk 13:20 f.). (2) But again it was a hope of the future, a Kingdom not realized as yet, but one day to be revealed in power by the Parousia of the Son of Man Himself (Mat 13:41 f., Mat 13:49 f., Mat 22:13; Mat 25:30). And so, when we pray for the coming of God's Kingdom, we are praying that Christ the King may enter into our hearts, that He may take full possession of them, that the gospel of the Kingdom may spread throughout the world, and that its principles may work in human society with subduing power. But we are praying also for the hour of the final consummation when the Lord Himself shall appear in His glory, when the kingdom of this world shall become the Kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ, when out of that Kingdom there shall be cast all things that offend, and God shall be all in all.

(d) *Third Petition*: ‘Thy will be done.’ This may be described as the dominant note of the Lord’s Prayer. The petitions that precede lead up to this, and those that follow must be brought into harmony with it. We frequently use these words as if they were nothing more than a prayer of submission and resignation in the day of sorrow, an echo of the Saviour’s cry in the Garden of Gethsemane (Mat 26:39 | |). And no doubt this is part of their meaning, and one of the uses to which they may be applied. They are a cry to God to enable us to bear what He sees fit to send, and to make us meek and patient under His chastening hand. But while this is implied in the petition, it is not its first intention. The added words, ‘as in heaven, so on earth,’ should keep us right here, since from heaven all sorrow and sighing have fled away. This is the prayer of active rather than of passive obedience, an obedience like that of God’s angels who excel in strength and do His commandments. Before we think of Jesus in the garden of shadows, we should think of Him as He sat by the well of Sychar and said to His disciples, ‘My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to accomplish his work’ (Joh 4:34). When we pray this prayer we are asking that we and all men, being delivered from the spirit of wilfulness, may attain to a joyful alacrity like that of angels in doing the will of God.

(e) *Fourth Petition*.—‘Give us this day our daily (ἐπιούσιον) bread.’ We pass now from the God ward to the manward aspects of the prayer. The first petition of this second group shows that it is right and proper to pray for material as well as for spiritual blessings. The prayer is not to be spiritualized, with most of the Fathers, into a request for the Bread of Life; it is literal bread, bread for bodily sustenance, that Jesus means us to ask for.

The one expository difficulty of this petition lies in the word ἐπιούσιος, which has been called ‘the most untranslatable word in the NT.’ It appears here (in both Mt. and Lk.) for the first time in Gr. literature, and within the NT occurs nowhere else. Of the three principal renderings—‘daily’ (Authorized and Revised Versions text), ‘for the coming day’ ((Revised Version margin)), and ‘needful’ (Amer. (Revised Version margin) , alternat.)—there is least to be said for the first, familiar as it is. It reproduces the Old Lat. *quotidianum*, but finds no support in etymology, and may be regarded perhaps as nothing more than a guess suggested by what the sense of the passage appeared to require. ‘For the coming day’ is more likely from the etymological point of view (ἐσιούσιος fr. ἡ ἐπιούσα [sc. ἡμέρα] = ‘the coming day,’ fr. ἐπιών, pres. part. of ἔπειμι [εἶμι, ‘to go or come’]), but seems out of keeping with Christ’s teaching elsewhere in the Sermon on the Mount (Mat 6:34). If this rendering is accepted, Chase’s view (‘Lord’s Prayer in Early Church,’ *Texts and Studies*, Cambridge [1891], *in loc.*) is plausible, that the word was a liturgical insertion intended to adapt the prayer for use at evening service. In the morning the petition

would run, according to its original form, 'Give us this day our bread,' while in the evening there would be substituted, 'Give us our bread for the coming day.' Cf. Lk.'s 'day by day,' which obviates any inappropriateness in asking at night for the bread of the day.

Perhaps, however, there is most to be said for the view that *ἐπιούσιος* is a word specially coined, after the analogy of the LXX Septuagint *περιούσιος* (Exo 19:5, Deu 7:6; Deu 14:2; Deu 26:18, for Heb. *לֶחֶם* Authorized and Revised Versions 'peculiar.' It is evidently derived from *περιουσία* = wealth, abundance [*περί* and *οὔσια*]). *ἐπιούσιος* in contrast to *περιούσιος* would thus denote what is needful or sufficient as distinguished from what is abundant or superfluous. If this is the proper rendering of the word, the petition would correspond almost exactly with the prayer of Agur, 'Feed me with the food that is needful for me' (Pro 30:8 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885).* [Note: In support of this interpretation see A. N. Jannaris in *Contemp. Rev.*, Oct. 1894; *ExpT* vi. [1894] p. 61. Cf. also the preceding article.]

(f) *Fifth Petition*.—'Forgive us our debts (*ὀφειλήματα*), as we forgive our debtors.' Lk. has 'sins' (*ἁμαρτίας*), while in the explanatory addition given by Mt. (Mat 6:14-15) 'trespasses' (*παροπτώματα*) is used—the word which in the *Bk. of Com. Prayer* is substituted for 'debts' in the Lord's Prayer itself. 'Debts' is particularly suggestive. In the first place, it reminds us of the personal accountability to God into which we are brought by every act of sin. We may look at sin in many aspects—as the transgression of an ideal law, as a wrong done to our neighbour, as a harm inflicted upon ourselves. But most solemn of all is the thought that sin makes us debtors before God, debtors who have wasted our Lord's money and are called to render account. But further, 'debts' reminds us of a class of sins we are most apt to forget—our sins of omission. It is when we ask ourselves, 'How much owest thou unto thy Lord?' that the full extent of our shortcoming begins to appear. Perhaps we have striven hard against wrongdoing, but what of the things we have left undone? In Christ's great vision of the Judgment, 'Inasmuch as ye did it not' is the preface to the sentence of condemnation (Mat 25:45).

By teaching us to offer this petition our Lord teaches that God is ready to forgive all our debts. But a condition is laid down. Those who pray for forgiveness must be ready to forgive. On this Jesus placed great emphasis, so great that He does for the fifth petition what He does for no other, adding at the end of the prayer (Mat 25:14-15) a sentence of explanation and enforcement, in which He makes it perfectly clear that if we will not forgive those who have trespassed against us, neither will our Father in

heaven forgive our trespasses.† [Note: If the view is taken that Mat_25:14-15 have been imported here by the Evangelist from another connexion such as I835 (so Meyer-Weiss and Bruce; cf. Holtzmann in Hand-Com.), the words testify at all events to the fact that Jesus was accustomed to lay stress on the relation between human and Divine forgiveness; see Mar_11:25-26, Luk_6:37, and esp. the parable of the Unmerciful Servant, Mat_18:23-35.]

(g) *Sixth Petition*.—‘Bring us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one.’ This petition follows naturally after the fifth, for the recollection of past falls makes us conscious of weakness and fearful of future possibilities. But is it not an impracticable petition? How can we hope to escape from being tempted? The world and the flesh and the devil are ever with us, and still ‘in the midst of the garden’; just where all life’s daily cross-paths meet, the tree of temptation grows and the Tempter himself lies waiting. And is it not also a mistaken petition? Is not temptation a means of grace, an opportunity of ‘winning our souls’? Does not St. James write, ‘My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations’? (Jam_1:2). Yes, but there is another side to the question. Temptation is a means of grace, but it may prove to be an occasion of stumbling and even of utter destruction. Blessed is the man that endureth it (Jam_1:12); but what of him who is drawn away by his own lusts and enticed, and so falls into the snare of the devil? By putting this petition into our lips Jesus reminds us that the hour of temptation is always a dangerous hour. He hangs out a red lamp of warning on the dark and crooked road along which we have to pass, and summons us to ‘watch and pray’ (cf. Mat_26:41 = Mar_14:38).

And yet temptations must come, we cannot hope to escape meeting them, and this petition, like every other in the Lord’s Prayer, is subject to the rule of the guiding petition of all, ‘Thy will be done.’ But ‘Deliver us from the evil one’ is a prayer that Satan may not gain the victory over our souls. That ‘the evil one’ is the right rendering of τοῦ πονηροῦ is now commonly accepted by scholars on grounds of exegesis. It is in keeping, too, with our Lord’s teaching about the presence and influence in the world of a hostile and malevolent will, an ‘enemy’ of God’s Kingdom and its King (cf. Mat_13:25; Mat_13:39). From him we may well pray to be delivered. Jesus Himself prayed for Simon that in the hour of Satan’s sifting his faith might not fail (Luk_22:31 f.). And we know that faith need never fail. God will not suffer us to be tempted above that we are able (1Co_10:13), and this petition is an appeal to Him for strength to endure and to overcome in the evil day.

4. Uses.—(1) This is a *breviary* of Christian prayer, in which all Christian petitions are summarily comprehended. As the commandments of the moral law are all gathered up in the two tables of duty to God and to man, so the petitions of the gospel are all represented in the two divisions of this little prayer. Apart from requests of a

personal and particular kind, everything that the universal Christian heart need ask for is explicitly stated or implicitly enfolded here, whether things on earth or things in heaven, things human or Divine, things of the body or the spirit, things of the life that now is or of that which is to come.

(2) It is a *model* or *directory* of prayer. According to Mt.'s account, Jesus, when He gave it, had just been warning His disciples against the formalisms of hypocrites and the vain repetitions which the Gentiles use (Mat 6:5-8), and it was in contrast with these that He said, '*After this manner pray ye.*' Looking at the manner of the prayer we are struck by its direct sincerity, its brevity, its simplicity, its calmness and quietness of spirit, its entire submission to the will of God. It teaches us that we are not heard for our much speaking, that long and elaborate prayers are unnecessary, that a simple request like that of a child to a father is enough. It teaches also the right relation and proportion in prayer between what belongs to God and what concerns ourselves. The earthly has its claims, but the heavenly comes before it; and all requests must be made in subordination to the Divine will.

(3) It is a *form* of prayer. The prayers which John the Baptist taught his disciples (Luk 11:1) must have been forms; and when a disciple of Jesus, reminding Him of John's custom, said, 'Lord teach us to pray,' it was doubtless a prayer-form for which he asked. And Jesus justified the request by replying, 'When ye pray, say, Our Father,' etc. Not that He wished His disciples to restrict themselves to this form or to repeat it incessantly. It is significant that, apart from these two passages in Mt. and Lk., we do not hear of the Lord's Prayer in the NT again. The recorded prayers of the Apostolic Church bear no resemblance to it. When God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into men's hearts, they prayed with freedom as the Spirit gave them utterance. And yet from the first this must have been, and must ever continue to be, a specially consecrated form of prayer, which no one can sincerely use without being conscious that, in presenting his petitions in the very words that Christ has given, he is asking according to the will of God (cf. 1Jn 5:14).

(4) It is a prayer especially for *social* use. There are prayers which can be offered only in secret, and Jesus had already spoken of these. '*Thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet,*' He said (Mat 6:6). But this was a prayer for the whole Christian society: '*After this manner pray ye,*' '*When ye pray, say.*' The invocation is addressed to '*our Father,*' the requests are on behalf of others as well as ourselves: '*give us,*' '*forgive us,*' '*bring us not,*' '*deliver us.*' And so this prayer, which is an appeal to the Fatherhood of God, is also a constant reminder of our human and especially of our Christian brotherhood. It teaches us to join our desires with those of the universal Church as we pray for the coming of the Kingdom. It teaches us when we ask for bread, or forgiveness, or guidance and deliverance, to bear the needs of others along

with our own on our hearts before God, and to remember that the unspeakable privilege of intercession is of the very essence of Christian prayer.

Literature.—See preceding article.

J. C. Lambert.

☩ Lord's Supper (II)

LORD'S SUPPER'S SUPPER (II).—The NT passages bearing on this subject may conveniently be divided into the following groups:—

1. Preparation for Institution

(1) *Feeding of Five thousand* (Mar_6:41-42 = Mat_14:19-20, Luk_9:16-17, Joh_6:11-12). In connexion with this miracle it is important to observe that (a) it is recorded in all four Gospels; (b) the record contains the following significant phrases, which it is well to compare with the phraseology in the accounts of the institution: λαβών (Mk., Mt., Lk.; ἔλαβεν, Jn.), εὐλόγησεν (Mk., Mt., Lk.; εὐχαριστήσας, Jn.; cf. Joh_6:23 εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ Κυρίου), κατέκλασεν (Mk., Lk.; κλάσας, Mt.; Jn. omits), ἐδίδου, (Mk., Lk.; ἔδωκεν, Mt.; διέδωκεν, Jn.); (α) the event carried on and emphasized the idea of a sacred meal, which, as a means of communion with God, had been profoundly impressed on the minds of the Jews by the sacrificial system.

(2) *Feeding of Four thousand* (Mar_8:6-8 = Mat_15:36-37). In connexion with this must be observed: (a) the same type of phrases as in the Feeding of the Five thousand: λαβών (Mk.; ἔλαβεν, Mt.), εὐχαριστήσας (Mk., Mt.), ἔκλασεν (Mk., Mt.), ἐδίδου (Mk., Mt.), εὐλογήσας (Mk. only); (b) the same idea of a sacred meal as in the Feeding of the Five thousand. With the Feeding of the Five thousand and the Four thousand should be compared the meals after the Resurrection in Luk_24:30-31; Luk_24:35 and Joh_21:13, where, though neither appears to have been the Eucharist, the idea of a sacred meal is maintained, and the phraseology should be noticed (λαβών τὸν ἄρτον εὐλόγησεν καὶ κλάσας ἐπέδιδου αὐτοῖς and ἐν τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου in Luk_24:30; Luk_24:35, and λαμβάνει τὸν ἄρτον καὶ δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τὸ ὄψάριον ὁμοίως in Joh_21:13).

(3) *Discourse in the Fourth Gospel in connexion with Feeding of Five thousand.* This miracle, like others, is called σημεῖον in the Fourth Gospel (Joh 6:14; Joh 6:26), i.e. it has a place in the group of 'signs' which are so called because 'they make men feel the mysteries which underlie the visible order' (Westcott). The peculiar significance of this 'sign' in particular was drawn out by our Lord in the discourse at Capernaum which followed it. That it was an acted parable of Divine truth He asserted to the multitude which sought Him at Capernaum, in the words: 'Ye seek me, not because ye saw signs, but because ye ate of the loaves, and were filled. Work not for the meat which perisheth, but for the meat which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you: for him the Father, even God, hath sealed' (Joh 6:26-27). Thus it supplied the starting-point for the conversation with the multitude, in which our Lord identified 'the bread out of heaven that is genuine,' which 'the Father giveth,' with Himself as 'the bread of God which cometh down out of heaven, and giveth life unto the world,' 'the bread of life,' 'the bread which cometh down out of heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die,' 'the living bread which came down out of heaven' and further declared, 'the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world' (Joh 6:32-51). As the conversation proceeded, our Lord spoke, in still clearer terms, of the reception of His flesh and blood as the means whereby there was to be participation in Himself, and as requisite to the possession of life; 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life'; 'My flesh is true food, and my blood is true drink. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him'; 'He that eateth me, he also shall live because of me. This is the bread which came down out of heaven'; 'He that eateth this bread shall live for ever' (Joh 6:52-58). Recognizing the difficulty caused to His hearers by this teaching, our Lord laid stress on the deep spiritual significance of what He had said: 'The Spirit is the life-giver; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life' (Joh 6:61-63). By this conversation, the idea of a sacred meal is carried further than it had been in the miracle itself. An act of eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ is anticipated as the way in which His disciples will participate in the life which is in Him.

To dissociate this teaching from the Eucharist is to take away the key to its meaning which is supplied by the comparison of the phraseology used in it with that employed by our Lord at the Institution. This fact may be illustrated by the view of Arthur Wright (*Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 140, *NT Problems*, pp. 134-146) that the Eucharist had been observed by our Lord from the first as 'a covenant of service' or 'union,' since the language of John 6 would not have been intelligible unless the Eucharist had been already in common use. Wright's view must be rejected as (a) lacking positive support; (b) not really affording a parallel to the existence of a rite of baptism

(Joh 3:22; Joh 4:1-2) before the institution of Christian Baptism (Mat 28:19); (c) being contrary to the tenor of John 6, which implies that, to the disciples as well as to the multitude, the teaching had the element of difficulty which shows that the Eucharist was not yet instituted; and (d) as contrary to the parallels by which the discourse about Baptism in John 3 is prior to the institution in Mat 28:19, and the teaching about forgiveness in Mar 2:5-11 (= Mat 9:2-8, Luk 5:20-24) is prior to Joh 20:21-23; but its plausibility at first sight is a significant indication of the truth that the discourse in John 6 was destined to find its explanation in the Institution of the Eucharist. Thus the teaching may be taken as anticipatory of the Eucharist. As such it suggests (α) a real spiritual participation on the part of the communicant in the human nature of Christ by the power of the Holy Ghost, and a consequent union with His Divine Person; (β) connexion with His death, indicated in the words ‘the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world,’ and with His resurrection, indicated by the references to ‘the bread of life’ and ‘the living bread.’ Consequently the communicant feeds on the living risen body and blood of the Lord which have passed through death.

The interpretations of the discourse which need be mentioned are the following: (1) that there is no connexion with the Holy Communion, but the feeding on Christ referred to is simply acceptance of His teaching or faith in His work, a view which obviously fails to allow for the distinctive character of the phraseology; (2) that the primary and special reference is to the Holy Communion, the interpretation which best satisfies all the conditions; (3) that the teaching, while not excluding the Holy Communion, is rather to the general verity of spiritual communion with our Lord than specifically to the Holy Communion, a view which, though it may be expressed so as to come very near the interpretation here accepted, does not account for the peculiar phrases used in the discourse and their remarkable likeness to, and explanation by, the words used in the Institution of the Eucharist. The objection that, if the primary reference were to the Eucharist, Joh 6:54; Joh 6:58 would require that mere reception of Communion, even by one who should receive unworthily, would confer the gift of life, is not weighty, since any reasonable treatment of the passage regards it as referring to those who communicate with such dispositions as may preserve them from receiving unworthily.

2. Accounts of the Institution.—(1) 1Co 11:23-25. The earliest history of the Institution which we possess is that here given by St. Paul. It records our Lord’s words with reference to the bread: ‘This is my body, which is for you: this do as my memorial’; and with reference to the cup: ‘This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as oft as ye drink it, as my memorial.’ The interpretation of these words is concerned with two subjects:—

(a) The meaning of 'This is my body.' The word 'this' is the subject of the sentence. Viewed in connexion with the introductory words 'took bread,' 'He brake it and said,' it cannot reasonably be understood to denote bread in general or anything else except the actual pieces of bread which our Lord gave as He spoke. The word 'is' is the logical copula between the subject 'this' and the predicate 'my body.' In the Aramaic sentence which our Lord spoke, the predication was probably expressed simply by the juxtaposition of the subject and the predicate without any copula. Either the Greek copula, as used in the record which we possess, or the juxtaposition in the Aramaic sentence which it probably represents, denotes that the subject ('this,' *i.e.* the bread which our Lord gave to His disciples) and the predicate ('my body') are viewed as identical. The interpretation of the sentence then depends on the sense in which the word 'body' is to be understood. It must be remembered that (α) the idea of communion with God by means of a sacred meal was familiar, as in many religious rites outside Judaism, so also in the literature and the religion which were well known to the disciples, as shown in the Levitical peace-offerings with the threefold division into the portion for God, the portion for the priest, and the portion for the worshipper (Leviticus 3; Lev 7:29-34); the bread and wine brought forth by Melchizedek, the 'priest of God Most High' (Gen 14:18); the eating of the lamb in the Passover (Exodus 12); the meal of Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders in the presence of God (Exo 24:1-11); the prophecy by Isaiah of the feast to be made by the Lord of hosts (Isa 25:6); and the invitations to a meal evidently of profound spiritual significance given by the personified 'Wisdom' of the Sapiential books (Pro 9:1-5, Sir 24:19-21). (β) This idea had been emphasized in our Lord's ministry in the Feeding of the Five thousand and the subsequent discourse, and the disciples had been taught that in eating His flesh and drinking His blood they would have participation in Divine life (Joh 6:53-57). (γ) There is nothing to indicate that the word 'body' is used in any unreal or metaphorical sense, and the added words, 'which is for you,' alluding to the sacrificial efficacy of our Lord's body, appear to identify that which is spoken of with His actual body. (δ) The close connexion of the words 'The Spirit is the life-giver; the flesh profiteth nothing' (Joh 6:63) with the teaching about eating the flesh of the Son of Man and drinking His blood, suggests that in the rite which our Lord was instituting there would be the operation of the Holy Ghost and a work of spiritual efficacy. (ε) However accomplished at the Institution, as in the parallel instances of anticipation in the walking of our Lord on the water and His Transfiguration during the days of His humiliation, the gift contemplated in the rite instituted must be viewed in the light of the spiritual nature and powers of the risen body of Christ. (ζ) The assertion of this spiritual aspect of the body denoted is confirmed when the language in which St. Paul describes Christians as 'the body of Christ' (1Co 12:27) is compared; but this comparison would be pushed

beyond its proper force if it were held to imply that the meaning in the two passages is the same, since in St. Paul's teaching the gift in Baptism, which makes men 'the body of Christ' (1Co_12:13), is not identified with the gift in the Holy Communion. The exegesis of this part of our Lord's words at the Institution, then, as recorded by St. Paul, indicates that the gift in the Eucharist is the spiritual food of the risen and ascended body of our Lord. The same method of exegesis involves a similar interpretation of the words 'In my blood,' though, in view of the spiritual nature of the risen body, it is impossible to make a sharp severance between the body and the blood.

That this line of exegesis, which is that which is naturally deduced from the study of the Holy Scripture by itself, is right is strongly confirmed by the traditional interpretation in the Church from St. Ignatius onwards.

Other interpretations are (1) that the words 'this is my body' mean, 'This conveys the efficacy of my body but is not my body'; (2) that they mean, 'This represents my body but is not my body.' Both of these interpretations are vitally distinguished from that which has here been adopted, namely, 'This not only represents my body and conveys its efficacy, but also is my body.' To adopt either of them involves putting aside the cumulative argument which has already been briefly detailed; the main argument by which they have been supported is the supposed merely metaphorical character of certain phrases, alleged to be parallel, in which our Lord described Himself as 'the bread of life' (Joh_6:35; Joh_6:41; Joh_6:48), 'the living bread' (Joh_6:51), 'the light of the world' (Joh_8:12, Joh_9:5), 'the door of the sheep' (Joh_10:7-8), 'the good shepherd' (Joh_10:11; Joh_10:14), 'the way' (Joh_14:6), 'the true vine' (Joh_15:1; Joh_15:5). In regard to these phrases it must be observed that (1) neither the phrases themselves nor the circumstances in which they were used were really parallel to the words and circumstances at the Institution; and (2) the phrases in question are as a matter of fact very far from being simply metaphorical. In each of them an actual fact about Christ is set forth. Christ in spiritual reality feeds Christians, and gives them light, and admits them into the Church, and tends them, and affords them access to the Father, and unites them in Himself. Similarly, in spiritual reality the bread which He gives in the Holy Communion is His body.

(b) The meaning of 'This cup is the new covenant'; 'this do, as oft as ye drink it, as my memorial.' The interpretation of these sentences turns on three words: (i.) 'covenant,' (ii.) 'do,' (iii.) 'memorial.'

(i.) The sentence 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood,' while recalling the phraseology and promise of Jer_31:31-34, inevitably suggests a comparison with Exo_24:1-11. The making of a covenant between the Lord and Israel is there described. A sacrifice was offered by the slaughter of oxen and the sprinkling of part

of the blood of the victims on the altar. After the reading of the book of the covenant in the audience of the people by Moses, and their promise to be obedient to all that the Lord had thus spoken, the rest of the blood was sprinkled by Moses on the people with the words, 'Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words.' The sacrifice was consummated, and the covenant completed, by the sacred meal wherein 'the nobles of the children of Israel' 'beheld God, and did eat and drink.' The analogy between this series of actions and the Eucharist which the words 'This is the new covenant in my blood' suggest, is worked out with some detail in Heb_9:11-28. The death of Christ and His entrance into heaven with His own blood are there represented as the high-priestly actions of which the slaughter of the beasts and the sprinkling of their blood in the Mosaic sacrifices, alike in the covenant of Exo_24:1-11 and in the ceremonies of the Day of Atonement in Exo_30:10, Leviticus 16, were an anticipation. The words 'This is the new covenant in my blood' thus bring the Eucharist into close connexion with the high-priestly work wherein Christ offered Himself a sacrifice in His death on the cross, and His entrance into heaven at the Ascension. They denote that the gift by Christ of His body and blood, and the reception of these by Christians, are the means of a covenant relation in the sacrificial action; and that Christians by participating in this rite are in contact with the death of Christ and His high-priestly acts in heaven.

(ii.) The command 'this do' conveys the injunction for the perpetuation of the rite instituted by our Lord in the Church. It has been much discussed whether the word 'do' (ποιεῖτε) suggests sacrificial associations. The truth appears to be that in itself ποιεῖω is simply negative as to this point. Apart from other indications of sacrifice, it would not suggest any such thing, since in the very large number of instances in which it is used in LXX Septuagint and NT it is in a merely general sense. In a sacrificial context, however, like the Heb. עשה, it acquires the idea of 'sacrifice' or 'offer,' as, e.g. in Exo_29:39, Lev_9:7, Psa_66:15, where עשה (LXX Septuagint ποιεῖω) is rightly translated 'offer' in Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885. In NT cf. Luk_2:27. In this possibility of a special use, side by side with the ordinary use, ποιεῖω is not greatly dissimilar from the Shakespearian use of 'do,' by which 'do' constantly has its ordinary general sense, but in a sacrificial context in *Jul. Caes.* II. ii. 5 acquires the sense 'offer' ('Bid the priests do present sacrifice,' i.e. 'offer sacrifice immediately'). Consequently, the word 'do,' as used by our Lord at the Institution, is in itself wholly negative, and does not suggest or deny the idea of sacrifice. In relation to the context, however, it will be held to be appropriate or inappropriate to the idea of sacrifice according as the suggestion of sacrifice is recognized or ignored in the general surroundings of the Last Supper and in the words 'covenant' and 'memorial.'

(iii.) The primary thought suggested in the word ‘memorial’ (ἀνάμνησις) is that of a memorial before God, though without excluding the idea of a memento to man. It occurs five times in the LXX Septuagint, namely in Lev 24:7, Num 10:10, Psa 37:1 (= Heb. 38:1), Psa 69:1 (= Heb. 70:1), Wis 16:6. In Wis 16:6 it denotes a reminder to man; in the other four passages it denotes a memorial before God. The only place in NT where it occurs besides 1Co 11:24-25, and the same phrase in Luk 22:19, is Heb 10:3, where it refers to the remembrance of sins in the Jewish sacrifices. When all the circumstances are taken into account, the thought most naturally suggested is that of a memorial of Christ presented by Christians before the Father, which is at the same time a memento to themselves. If so, the idea differs little from that way of regarding the Eucharist in much Greek theology, whereby it is viewed as the act in which the Church remembers Christ and in remembering Him makes the memorial of Him before the Father. In the sentences ‘This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as oft as ye drink it, as my memorial,’ then, our Lord associated with the command for the observance of the rite which He instituted, indications that by means of it Christians would have access to His high-priestly work on the cross and in heaven, and would possess a memorial before God and a memento to themselves.

(2) Mar 14:22-25. As here recorded, our Lord’s words at the Institution were: ‘Take ye: this is my body’; ‘this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many. Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.’ The words in connexion with the species of bread are the same as those in 1Co 11:24, already discussed, and do not need further comment, except to notice that Mark does not add ‘which is for you: this do as my memorial.’ In connexion with the cup Mark differs from 1 Cor. in that (1) he has ‘this is my blood of the covenant’ instead of ‘this is the new covenant in my blood’; (2) he omits ‘this do, as oft as ye drink it, as my memorial’; (3) he adds ‘which is poured out for many’; (4) he adds ‘Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.’ As to these differences, it may be noticed: (α) The blood in Mark’s phrase is described as being Christ’s and as being ‘of the covenant,’ *i.e.* it is Christ’s because it is the blood which He personally took in the Incarnation, and it is ‘of the covenant’ because by means of it the covenant between God and man which Christ makes is ratified and sealed. Consequently the meaning of the expression is not substantially different from that used by St. Paul in 1Co 11:25; (β) the consideration of the omission of ‘which is for you: this do as my memorial,’ ‘this do, as oft as ye drink it, as my memorial,’ does not belong to this section of the article; (γ) the words ‘for many,’ *i.e.* ‘on behalf of many’ (ὕπερ πολλῶν), indicate the sacrificial and expiatory power of Christ’s blood. Similarly the words ‘which is poured out’ (τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον) are connected with the

sacrifice of His blood. In the LXX Septuagint ἐκχέω is often used both of the shedding of blood in slaughter and of the pouring out of the blood of slain victims at the altar. Instances of the latter use are Exo 29:12, Lev 4:7; Lev 4:18; Lev 4:25; Lev 4:30; Lev 4:34; Lev 8:15; Lev 9:9; cf. 1 K (= 1 S) 1Ki 7:6. The close connexion with the word 'covenant' in Mar 14:24, and the general sacrificial surroundings, give strong probability that the meaning here is 'poured out' rather than 'shed,' and that the sense is 'this is my blood,' 'which is sacrificially poured out,' as in the Jewish sacrifices the blood of the slain victim was poured out as the culmination of the sacrifice; (δ) like much else in the Gospels, the words 'when I drink it new in the kingdom of God' appear to have a twofold reference. They refer in part to Christian Eucharists; the 'kingdom of God' is the Christian Church; the drinking 'new' is in the 'new covenant' of 1Co 11:25; thus is denoted the fellowship between Christ and His people in the Eucharistic feast. In a further sense they refer to the 'marriage supper of the Lamb, (Rev 19:9); the 'kingdom of God' is the consummated Kingdom of glory; the drinking 'new' is in that state in which 'all things' are made 'new' (Rev 21:5), newness being a characteristic feature of the future as well as of the present Christian life. See art. Covenant.

(3) Mat 26:26; Mat 26:29. As here recorded, our Lord's words were: 'Take, eat, this is my body'; 'Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many unto remission of sins. But I say unto you, I will not drink hence-forth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.' There is little here different from Mark's account which calls for comment: (α) 'unto remission of sins' is added to 'poured out,' specifying distinctly the object of the sacrificial offering of our Lord's blood; (β) the words 'with you' are added in the description of the future 'new' drinking of 'this fruit of the vine'; (γ) the phrase 'my Father's kingdom' is used instead of 'the kingdom of God,' both phrases alike being descriptive of both the Christian Church and the future perfected Kingdom.

(4) Luk 22:14-20. The account here given is as follows: 'When the hour was come, he sat down, and the apostles with him. And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I will not eat it, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And he received a cup, and when he had given thanks, he said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves; for I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come. And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave to them, saying, This is my body which is given for you; this do for my memorial. And the cup in like manner after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you.' From the point of view of exegesis, this account of the Institution does not need further comment than what has already been

said in connexion with the accounts in 1 Cor., Mk., Mt. From other points of view it would be necessary to discuss (1) the cup which our Lord 'received' (δεξιόμενος) before He 'took bread' (λαβὼν ἄρτον); and (2) the shorter reading of the text according to which some authorities omit from 'which is given for you' to 'which is poured out for you.'

3. Pauline teaching.—(1) 1Co 10:16-21. 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ? seeing that we, who are many, are one bread, one body: for we all partake of the one bread. Behold Israel after the flesh: have not they which eat the sacrifices communion with the altar? What say I then? that a thing sacrificed to idols is anything, or that an idol is anything? But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons, and not to God; and I would not that ye should have communion with demons. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of demons; ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord, and of the table of demons.' The following points here call for comment: (α) St. Paul describes the 'bread' and the 'cup' as being the means by which Christians participate in the 'body of Christ' and the 'blood of Christ'; (β) there is nothing to suggest that the phrases 'body of Christ' and 'blood of Christ' are used in any other sense than that in which they would ordinarily be understood; (γ) the phrases 'which we break,' 'of blessing which we bless,' seem to connect the efficacy of the elements as means of conveying the body and blood of Christ with the consecration of them, not simply with their reception; (δ) this participation by Christians in 'the one bread' is a means of their unity, so that they are 'one bread, one body'; (ε) this description of the 'bread' and the 'cup' as the 'body of Christ' and the 'blood of Christ' must be compared with St. Paul's description elsewhere of Christians being made by means of baptism the body of Christ (see 1Co 12:12-13; 1Co 12:27, Eph 5:30); (ζ) the communion of Christians is analogous to the Jewish sacrifices and to the sacrifices of the Gentiles. As the object of the Jewish sacrifices was to hold communion with God, and as the object of the Gentile sacrifices was to hold communion with the false gods who are more properly regarded as demons, so also the Christian feast aims at communion with Christ.

(2) 1Co 11:26-29. 'As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord. But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of the bread, and drink of the cup. For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, if he discern not the body.' (α) Christian communion is here declared to be a proclamation of the death of

the Lord, a setting forth of it so that it may not be forgotten between the time of His visible departure from the earth and the time of His return. So far as the indications of a sacrificial aspect which have already been noticed are held to be of weight, this proclamation may be regarded in a double manner as a memory among Christians and as a memorial before God. (β) The reception of communion unworthily is said to be an offence of so great gravity as to make the offender 'guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord,' so that his communion is an act of judgment upon himself in his failure to discern or appreciate or estimate the significance of the Lord's body.

(3) 1Co_12:13. 'We were all made to drink of one Spirit.' This probably refers to the gift of the Holy Ghost in Baptism, though the use of the word 'drink' has led some to refer it to such a gift in Communion.

4. Heb_13:8-16.—The starting-point in this passage is the assertion in Heb_13:8 of the unchangeableness of Christ: 'Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, and to-day, yea and for ever.' From this is derived the thought of Heb_13:9, that since Christ, the centre of Christian life, is unchangeable, Christian belief must have stability and consistency. Hence 'divers and strange teachings,' such as those in Judaistic forms of Christianity, and the externalities to which Judaizing teachers would have led Christians, are to be avoided; and the power that stabilises the heart is to be sought in Divine grace. This contrast leads on to Heb_13:10, the point of which is to emphasize the sharp line which divides Christianity from Judaism; since Christians 'have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle.' Heb_13:11-12 pass on to the likeness between the Jewish sacrifices and the sacrifice of Christ, in that in the former bodies were 'burned without the camp,' and in the latter Christ 'suffered without the gate.' Heb_13:13 notes the conclusion from the sacrifice of Christ that it is right for Christians to abandon what is distinctively Jewish. Heb_13:14 takes up the frequently-implied thought of this Epistle, that the old covenant is earthly, and that the new covenant, both now on earth and in its future perfection, is heavenly. The Christian gets beyond the old earthly covenant. He reaches the new heavenly covenant in the city of the living God, which on earth he does not realize as an abiding possession, though even now he has the life of Christ which makes his citizenship, and through which he is eventually to reach perfect holiness and fruition of God. Heb_13:15-16 point out that through Christ Christians can offer up to God a 'sacrifice of praise,' and that with this are to be associated the 'sacrifices' of doing good and communicating, with which 'God is well pleased.' These two verses, then, describe the worship and life of Christians as being a sacrificial offering to God. The Epistle as a whole regards the heavenly centre of this earthly worship and life as being the high-priestly work of our Lord in heaven. If the 'altar' mentioned in Heb_13:10 is the altar of the Eucharist, this implies that the earthly centre of the sacrificial worship and life of Christians is in the Eucharist. This would be in harmony

with the traditional Christian view of the Eucharist as the means whereby Christians enter into and partake of the heavenly offering of Christ. The interpretations of the word 'altar' which need be mentioned are that it denotes (1) Christ Himself, (2) the cross of Christ, (3) the altar of the Christian Church. Any one of these three interpretations would give a good meaning to the verse. It might be truly said that the Jews have no participation in Christ, or in His cross, or in the Christian altar. But the use of the word 'eat' makes it difficult to suppose that a reference to the Eucharist was not at any rate included by the writer. Thus there is the idea of the priesthood of Christ as an abiding priesthood, and the sacrifice of Christ as an abiding and continually pleaded sacrifice in heaven, and of the Eucharist as the means of entering into and pleading that heavenly sacrifice on earth, and as the earthly centre of the sacrificial worship and life of Christians.

5. Rev_5:6.—'A lamb standing as slain.' The offering of our Lord's living ('standing') created human nature ('lamb'), which had passed through death ('as slain'), is here represented as the centre of the heavenly worship. This passage, therefore, has an indirect relation to the Eucharist as the corresponding earthly centre (see above on Heb_13:8-16).

6. **Summary.**—The results of the exegesis of the NT passages relating to the Eucharist may be summed up as follows: (1) In the reception of Holy Communion there is a gift of Christ's body and blood to sustain and increase His life in those who receive it. (2) The consecrated elements are the spiritual body and blood of the risen and ascended Christ. (3) Those who receive the communion grow thereby in that living union with Christ which their baptism conferred. (4) The feast of communion is also a sacrificial presentation of Christ. (5) It is important to observe that the tradition found in the teaching of the writers of the Church corroborates what is thus seen to be taught in the NT.

Literature.—Frankland, *The Early Eucharist*; Gore, *The Body of Christ*; Strong, *The Doctrine of the Real Presence*; Stone, *The Holy Communion*; Thomas, *A Sacrament of our Redemption*; Adamson, *The Christian Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*; Lambert, *The Sacraments in the NT*; Franzelin, *Tract. de SS. Eucharistiæ Sacramento et Sacrificio*, pp. 12-74, 356-363; Lobstein, *La doctrine de la sainte cène*; Schultzen, *Das Abendmahl im NT*; Batiffol, *Etudes d'histoire et de théologie positive*, Tième série; Abbott, *Essays chiefly on the Original Texts of the OT and NT*, pp. 110-128, also *A Reply to Mr. Supple's and Other Criticisms*; Alford on Mat_26:26, 1Co_10:16-17, and Heb_13:10; Cornely on 1Co_10:15-22; 1Co_11:23-32; Ellicott on 1Co_10:16-18; 1Co_11:23-32; Evans on 1Co_10:16-18; 1Co_11:24; 1Co_11:31; Plummer on Luk_22:19-20 (*ICC [Note: CC International Critical Commentary.]*), and in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. 148-150; Sanday, *ib.* ii. 636-638 (= *Outlines of the Life of*

Christ, pp. 157-169); Swete on Mar_14:22-24; Westcott on John 6 and Heb_13:10; Wordsworth on Mat_26:26-28 and Joh_6:51-56.

Darwell Stone.

☩ Lord's Supper. (I.)

LORD'S SUPPER. (I.)

Introductory.

1. The Sacramental in Hebrew worship.
2. The Method and Teaching of Jesus.
3. Passover Eve.
 - (a) The Synoptic Gospels.
 - (b) The Fourth Gospel.
 - (c) The Apostle Paul.
4. The Institution.
 - (a) The common underlying Tradition.
 - (b) Differences in detail.
 - (i.) Mark-Matt.; (ii.) Luk_22:15-20; (iii.) Paul; (iv.) The Fourth Gospel.

Results.

5. The Apostolic Church.
 - (a) The Jewish-Christian Community.
 - (b) The Pauline Churches.

- (c) The Agape and the Lord's Supper.
6. The sub-Apostolic Church.
- (a) Clement of Rome.
 - (b) Pliny's Letter to Trajan.
 - (c) *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*.
 - (d) Ignatius.
 - (e) Justin Martyr.
7. The Lord's Supper and the Pagan Mysteries.

Literature.

Introductory.—The Lord's Supper has been for centuries, and is to-day, a theological storm-centre; though the blasts have shifted, recent critical scholarship having occasioned a new incidence of forces. Former controversies raged round the meaning of the institution. At present the discussion is even more vital, for it is a matter not of interpretation only, but of the trustworthiness of the sources. The Gospels as they now stand are said to owe so much to the thought and practice of the growing Church, that it is necessary to read between the lines in order to detect the simple form of the Eucharist on the day of its first celebration, when 'it signified rather the abrogation of the old worship and the near approach of the Kingdom than the institution of a new worship.' It is denied that Jesus, with His views as to the speedy consummation of His Kingdom, could have instituted the Supper as a perpetual memorial of His death; and the connexion in the Gospels between the Last Supper and the Passover is regarded as a later overlying deposit, which can be easily detached from the primitive stratum. To take an example, Jesus is supposed to have uttered the words of the Supper recorded in the Gospels on the impulse of the moment. Feeling Himself already victor over death and the world, He wishes to inspire His disciples with His own conviction, and by an act of vivid imagination conceives Himself as already dispensing the blessings of the completed Kingdom, their simple farewell meal having been transformed into the great Messianic banquet of the future, which commonly served as a figure for the joys of Messiah's sovereignty. Professor Gardner is even more drastic in his treatment of the Gospel tradition, eliminating all evidence except that of St. Paul, who, he thinks, was the real originator of the rite, having 'turned a pagan ceremony to Christian use' in a moment of ecstasy under the influence of what he had seen of the Greek mysteries in Corinth.

But the great majority of impartial scholars who have discussed the question do not adopt such a highly critical attitude towards the narratives of the institution of the Supper, or reverse so completely the ordinarily accepted views as to its origin and purpose. No sufficient treatment of the Lord's Supper can pass in silence these problems which have been raised with great learning and acuteness, but they must be discussed in relation to the method of Jesus the Messiah, who brings Israel to its fulfilment.

1. The Sacramental in Hebrew worship.—The term 'sacrament' denotes an outward and visible sign of an invisible spiritual reality. By means of symbol, which is metaphor transformed into action or concreteness, truth is conveyed to the participants in a sacrament much more readily than by the bare word. Language conveys truth, but symbol does what language cannot compass. The worship of the OT was full of the symbolic, for it is almost certain that the cultus was in its essence no arbitrary prescription of meaningless forms. The sacrificial system was held to be a means of grace, of Divine appointment, whereby the worshipper could approach Jehovah. It must have been educative, so that the obedient and lealhearted Israelite became in the actual observance more receptive of moral and spiritual truth. In that sense the sacrificial system of Israel was truly sacramental. But whether the average Hebrew recognized the sacramental character is doubtful, for the great prophets constantly warn the people that the mere ritual performance of sacrifice is inefficacious. Some, especially the earlier prophets, often seem to disparage offerings entirely, as though the only worship with which Jehovah is well pleased is the spiritual service of moral character and a contrite heart. And yet the prophets employ symbolic action again and again in the service of an ideal spirituality, so that in itself symbol has been a widespread and perfectly legitimate means of grace. The transcendental element in worship, however brightly or faintly the contemporary life of Israel may have been illumined by the spiritual truth of the prophets, had all but vanished from the official Judaism of our Lord's day. There was no open vision. No prophet or seer was abroad in the dull day of rationalism. Heroic faith had been displaced by a shrewd but commonplace conduct. The Law had come in alongside Temple service, and ritual was observed as an ordinance. The average Jew, having become a deist, could not feel sky, earth, and sea palpitate with the Divine Spirit, and so was impervious to sacramental conceptions (W. P. Paterson, art. 'Sacrifice' in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible* iv. 341; Bousset, *Rel. des Judenthums*, pp. 182-184). It was to the 'poor of the land' who cherished the prophetic ideal that the parabolic, the sacramental, the symbolical in the teaching of Jesus would appeal.

2. The Method and Teaching of Jesus.—The Gospel narratives represent the Supper as a solemn final act in the life of the Messiah. But the Messiah of their delineation is a Person of startling originality. He penetrates through the crust of unimaginative moralism to the living prophetic stream which in His day found its way to the surface

only in tiny rivulets. On His own authority He claims, while purifying and enlarging the hopes of prophecy, to fulfil all that was truest in the religion of Israel, having accepted in His Temptation the Divine ideal of a Kingdom unalloyed by any earthly aspirations. He discovers and applies to Himself the title 'Son of Man,' and in virtue of His position inaugurates changes in religion which constitute a breach with the past, for His doctrine concerning worship, foreshadowed by the prophets, antiquates bloody sacrifices and opaque ritual. To say that Jesus could not have instituted the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, because He looked for a speedy realization of the Kingdom, is to deny that He had the complete vision of the destiny of the Servant of the Lord whose function is assumed by the Son of Man, whereas it seems certain that He foretold a spiritual inheritance among the Gentiles in return for His faithful service even unto death (Isa 42:1 ff., Isa 52:13 ff., Isa 62:1 ff., Mar 1:11, Luk 4:16-21, Mat 12:18, Mar 10:45). Another unique prophetic ideal was the consummation of the Kingdom in the Day of the Lord. With respect to this also we must assume that Jesus was a creator of spiritual truth, for the consistency of the Synoptic portraiture of Jesus, and the purity of His own views as to His mission, demand that our interpretation of His outlook into the future of the Kingdom should not be limited by the current ideas of Jewish apocalypses, or by the literal symbolism of OT prophecy.

We infer from the Gospels, (1) that before the close of His ministry in Galilee Jesus had looked forward to His death as the goal of His service (Mar 8:31); (2) that this death was to result in the redemption of the new Israel to which the prerogatives of the old would be transferred (Mar 10:45; Mar 12:1-12); (3) that He expected an earthly future for His Kingdom outlasting the earthly Jerusalem, and involving its establishment among the Gentiles (Mar 4:30-32; Mar 12:1-12; Mar 13:10; Mar 13:14 ff., Luk 13:32-35; Luk 21:20-24). No less evident, however, was the inability of the disciples to understand that the road of service even unto death was the road to the crowning glory of the Kingdom. For Him thus steadily to set His face towards Jerusalem, was, they thought, a sheer and fatal fascination (Mar 10:32-34, Luk 18:31 ff.).

Nor is the institution of the sacrament of the Supper inconsistent with the method of Jesus. The day for symbolism was not past, provided the symbolism was adequate; and this Supreme Teacher surpasses all others in the use of parable and symbol. Every meal with His disciples becomes sacramental through its prayer of thanksgiving, a symbol of the spiritual truth that in Him God was giving to the world the food that was real indeed (Joh 6:51-58). Nor would such a procedure be altogether strange to men who would remember that in the OT the common meal was the symbol of a completed covenant (Gen 26:30; Gen 31:54, Exo 24:11, 2Sa 3:20; see König, 'Symbols, Symbolical Actions' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , Ext. Vol., 171^b). In order to understand the significance of this institution, it must be borne in mind that

the disciples had committed all their fortunes to Jesus. Their faith had been for them a heroic venture, and the death of the Messiah meant little less than His desertion of them. That night, death like a dark shadow hovering over them was forcing their loved one within its portal. They could not see that a glorious light was shining on His back, that He was in reality an angel of blessing. They needed a pledge of love significant of the future and yet full of tender memories. This the Lord's Supper becomes to them. That it was a mark of supreme wisdom thus to perpetuate the significance of His death for the completion of His Kingdom in concrete symbolism, is evident from their misinterpretation of their Lord's promise as to the future of His Kingdom on earth and His own return; but we are led to expect only such words and symbolic action as would illuminate the spiritual idea of the Kingdom; not precepts and ritual ordinance for its external organization.

3. Passover Eve.—Jesus came into Jerusalem on the morning of the first day of the week, and for several days escaped the plots of His enemies. But Judas entered into a conspiracy with the chief priests apparently two days before 'the Passover and the feast of unleavened bread' (Mar 14:1; Mar 14:10-11). Ignorant of this accomplished treachery, the other disciples, observing that Jesus has as yet made no arrangement for the celebration of the feast, say unto Him 'on the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the Passover, Where wilt thou that we go and make ready that thou mayest eat the Passover?' (Mar 14:12). Now we are embarked upon a sea of difficulties. The Gospels separate very distinctly—the Synoptics on the one side, the Fourth on the other. Did Jesus eat the regular Passover with His disciples, or did He not? At first sight the Synoptic Gospels seem to say that He did. But, according to John, Jesus died on the afternoon when the Passover lamb was slain (Joh 13:1; Joh 13:29; Joh 18:28).

(a) *The Synoptic Gospels.*—(α) Evidence that the last meal was eaten at the conclusion of the regular Passover meal is offered by Mar 14:12; Mar 14:14, Mat 26:17-19, Luk 22:7-8; Luk 22:11; Luk 22:15-16, the last verses laying especial stress upon the desire of Jesus to eat this Passover with His disciples. Many features of the meal also suggest the Passover,—the family group with Jesus presiding, the prayers of thanksgiving, the cups (Luk 22:17; Luk 22:20), the breaking of the bread, the solemn demeanour, the exposition, the conclusion with a hymn.

(β) But the Synoptics contain hints that the Supper was not a regular Passover meal. It is stated in Mar 14:1-2, that two days before the feast the priests resolved to capture Jesus, and to execute Him before any sympathizers among the populace could interfere; and, since nothing is said to the contrary, it is reasonable to conclude that the purpose was carried out. It would appear that, according to contemporary Jewish practice, Passover, the 14th Nisan, was spoken of as the beginning of the feast

Mazzoth, though originally Unleavened Bread began on 15th Nisan (Wellhausen, *Evangelium Marci*, 115; Schürer, *ThLZ [Note: hLZ Theol. Literaturzeitung.]*, 1st April 1893, col. 182; as against Chwolson in *Das letzte Passamahl*). But only work necessary for preparing food was permitted from sunset on the 14th to sunset on the 21st, and it would have been illegal or contrary to custom to arrest Jesus that night with swords and staves, to hold a meeting of the Sanhedrin, to release a prisoner, to purchase grave-clothes, and to take the dead body down from the cross, if He ate the regular Passover meal on Thursday evening Nisan 14. Further, there is no mention in the Synoptic narrative of their eating the lamb (*Jewish Encyc.* x. art. 'Passover'). Jesus died on a Friday, so that we may probably assume from Mar_14:1-2 that Passover (Nisan 14) fell on the Sabbath, which began on Friday at sunset. Nevertheless the preponderating impression of the Synoptic Gospels is certainly in favour of this meal having been related in some way to the Passover feast. It is distinctly so stated, and it is difficult to suppose that there were not good grounds in the primary sources for such united testimony.

(b) *The Fourth Gospel*.—From Joh_18:28 we must infer that Jesus died on the afternoon before Passover—'between the two evenings' (Deu_16:6). This inference is so strongly reinforced by Joh_13:1; Joh_13:29, that Dr. Hort, with whom Dr. Sanday and Mr. C. H. Turner agree, believes that the Fourth Evangelist is silently correcting a false impression left by the Synoptists (*Expos.* iv. v. [1892] p. 182; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible i. 411^a). On the other side see Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, Bk. v. ch. x.). St. John neither here nor elsewhere refers directly to the institution of the Supper, but in Joh_6:53-59 his conception of the truth that underlies the Sacrament is set forth in the conversation of Jesus. He states that the miracle of the feeding of the 5000 took place at Passover time (Joh_6:4, so true reading), probably seeing in it a figure of the Christian Passover. Notwithstanding, therefore, his fixing of the day of our Lord's death before the regular Passover, there is good ground for holding that he implicitly relates the Last Supper to the Passover (Westcott, *St. John*, pp. 96, 113; Holtzmann, *NT Theol.* ii. 503; Wendt, *St. John's Gospel*, 137-139). See, further, artt. Dates, vol. i. p. 413 ff., Last Supper, Passover (II.).

(c) *The Apostle Paul*.—Though 1Co_5:7-8 is often interpreted so as to make St. Paul agree with the Fourth Evangelist, that Jesus died when the lambs for the feast were slain, it is very doubtful whether this idea was in his mind. He is comparing the Christian life with the old Passover upon which the Feast of Unleavened Bread followed (Exo_12:19; Exo_13:7). So now, since the Christian Passover has begun through the sacrifice of Christ, all impurity must be removed from their lives. Perhaps 1Co_10:1-2; 1Co_10:6; 1Co_10:15-16 have the imagery of the Passover; 'the cup of blessing' (1Co_10:16) was one of the most sacred elements of the Paschal meal

(Edersheim, *op. cit.* ii. 510 f.; but for opposite view, see Holtzmann, *op. cit.* ii. 184 f.).

The figure of 1Co 5:7-8 may refer to an actual celebration of the Christian Passover in the Corinthian Church, for we know that in the middle of the 2nd cent. Easter was the most important annual festival of the Catholic Church, and there is no evidence of its having been introduced after the Apostolic age. The great Quartodeciman controversy (c. 165 a.d.) was not concerned with doctrinal differences, but with the date on which the universal Christian feast was to be held—whether the Jewish date, Nisan 14, or the Sunday of Easter week. No inference can be drawn from it as to the connexion between the Eucharist and the Passover, inasmuch as the Christian Passover was not a memorial of the Passover only, but of redemption in which Christ's death and resurrection both were the essential factors. The Supper would be at most one element in the celebration, and possibly had little direct Paschal significance. The Church of the last half of the 2nd cent. assumed that there was agreement among the four Evangelists with regard to the time of Christ's death, and apparently accepted the Synoptic chronology, Origen and Eusebius making definite attempts to bring Jn. into conformity with the other Gospels. Zahn, however, holds that the Quartodecimans interpreted the latter in accordance with the former (*Gesch. NT Kan.* i. 1. 191). For a fuller discussion, with older literature, see Zahn, *op. cit.* i. 1. 180-192; J. Drummond, *Character and Authorship of Fourth Gospel*, 444-513; Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, 173-197; Preuschen in *PRE [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.]* ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] xiv. 725-734 takes a different view.

The easiest explanation of this conflicting evidence is that Jesus did not eat the regular Passover feast with His disciples, but that He did eat a meal by anticipation on Nisan 13, the night before the regular Jewish celebration, which was in some sort a keeping of the Passover by this little group (but see Robinson, art. 'Eucharist' in *Encyc. Bibl.* i. § 3). The words of Jesus in Luk 22:15-16 become intelligible when we remember what the Passover meant, and also His method in promulgating His Kingdom. Passover was the greatest national feast, gathering into itself whatever was most sacred in the religious life of Israel. It was the memorial of national redemption. Through its families—each a part of the larger whole—Israel entered annually into renewed covenant relationship with Jehovah, who had graciously preserved and ransomed the people. It was a sacrificial feast allied with the *shelamim* or peace-offerings. The sprinkled blood denoted atoning efficacy (v. Orelli, 'Passah,' in *PRE [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.]* ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] xiv.; art. 'Passover' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. and in *Jewish Encyc.*). Now Israel is on the point of being transformed. A new redemption is to be completed. Jerusalem and the

Temple, with its bloody sacrifices and ritual worship, are soon to disappear. But while the Messiah is abrogating the letter of the old, He fulfils its spirit. He is supplying new wine-skins for the new wine. Just as He has provided the new Israel with a new conception of worship (Mat 6:1-18, Joh 4:21-24), a new standard of righteousness (Mat 5:17-48), and a reinterpretation of the Sabbath (Mar 2:23-26; Mar 3:1-5), so now He transfigures, while yet He preserves the identity of, the central institution of Israel's national life. By 'a masterpiece of practical skill as a teacher' Jesus enshrines, in this symbolic action, for the spiritual representatives of the new Israel, the memory of its ransom through the death of Messiah, whereby a new covenant relationship with Jehovah is possible.

4. The Institution.—Mar 14:22-26, Mat 26:26-30, Luk 22:15-20, 1Co 11:23-26 :

| | |
|------|---|
| Mk | And as they were eating |
| Mt | And as they were eating blessed |
| Lk | And given thanks |
| 1 Co | In the night in which He was betrayed the Lord Jesus |
| Mk | He brake it and gave to them and said |
| Mt | And brake it and He gave to the disciples and said, Take |
| Lk | He brake it and gave to them saying you |
| 1 Co | He brake it for you |
| Lk | This do in remembrance of me. |
| 1 Co | This do in remembrance of me. And He said [unto them] |
| Mk | And He took a cup and when He had given thanks He gave to |
| Mt | And He took a cup and gave thanks and g |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Lk | And the cup supper saying |
| 1 Co | And the cup supper |
| Mk | This (covenant) my blood of the covenant |
| Mt | For this (covenant) my blood of the covenant |
| Lk | This cup is the new covenant in my blood |
| 1 Co | This cup is the new covenant in my blood |
| Mk | which is shed for many |
| Mt | which is shed for many unto remission of sins |
| Lk | which is shed for you |
| 1 Co | remembrance of me |
| Mk | Verily I say unto you I will no more |
| Mt | But I say unto you I will not henceforth drink |
| Lk (<u>Luk_22:18</u>) | For I say unto you I will not from henceforth drink |
| Mk | Until that day when I drink it new in |
| Mt | Until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom |
| Lk | Until |
| 1 Co adds: | For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye proclaim |

We read in Matthew and Mark that, during a meal, Jesus took bread and brake it. Possibly it was one of the unleavened cakes used at the Feast, though the foregoing discussion renders unnecessary any attempt to fix this action into the order of the regular Passover. The procedure was peculiarly solemn, with an added gravity,

because for the first time, a few moments before, Jesus had announced that one of the little group was a traitor (Luk 22:21-23, which puts this after the narrative of the Supper, is probably a displacement). Ruin without, treachery within, the disintegration of the brotherhood may well have seemed to have already begun, and collapse was staring them in the face. Nothing but the serene assurance of Jesus could brace them against such disaster. Like a father presiding at a family meal, He rallies them, in full view of His own death, by such a thanksgiving as they had often heard from Him before (Mat 14:19; Mat 15:36, Joh 6:11). There is no suggestion here of exaltation or ecstasy. His demeanour is that of confidence, subdued by sorrow for His betrayal and the hatred of His enemies. The presumption from the order of Mar 14:18-21 and Joh 13:21-30 is against the traitor having remained throughout the Supper.

(a) *The common underlying Tradition.*—The action of Jesus in solemnly breaking bread and handing it to His disciples must mean that His body is likewise to be broken, destroyed by men; but, when assimilated by His disciples, He in His complete Person will become their spiritual food. It is parabolic, or rather, it may be illustrated by the allegories of the Fourth Gospel, as e.g. Joh 15:1, where Jesus claims to be ‘most really and yet not materially the true vine’ (Westcott). Quite apart from the question of its historical value, the discourse of Jesus in Joh 6:47-59 may be used to illuminate this procedure, because the same truth is expressed in Jn. in words as in the Lord’s Supper by words and symbol.

The second part of the Supper is another solemnly acted allegory. Old is passing over into new. At Sinai sprinkled blood had ratified a covenant (Exo 24:4-8). Jeremiah, all but submerged in the flood which was carrying on its surface the fragments of the old system, sees like a rainbow of hope the new covenant which, with its promise of forgiveness of sins, was to be established on a perfect knowledge of God; and later came the profound truth that this new covenant between God and man could be inaugurated only by the death of the Servant of the Lord, whose sufferings would bring salvation to the whole world (Isa 42:6; Isa 49:8; Isa 52:13-15; Isa 53:11-12; see Kautzsch, ‘Religion of Israel,’ in *Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible*, Extra Vol. 708).

The new covenant is about to be ratified by Messiah’s blood. The many are to be ransomed (Mar 10:45), these representatives of the true Israel being but the first to appropriate the benefits of the new covenant. Parabolic or symbolic this meal was, but both parts do not convey the same truth. The first action is a vehicle for the truth that Jesus Himself will continue to be for His disciples their heavenly food unto eternal life; the second that, in virtue of Messiah’s death, salvation from sin is possible through the covenant grace of God. To attribute the conception of the second half of the institution, as it is recorded in Mk., to the influence of Pauline thought, is to do injustice to the fact that its roots are deeply imbedded in OT

prophecy, although, like many other ideas, its flower first appears in the teaching of Jesus.

His closing words have a future outlook. Death will end in victory, and when the Day of the Lord shall usher in the Kingdom, He will again hold fellowship with His disciples at the eternal Messianic banquet. That Day began to come with power as the Spirit-filled Church received the Gentiles for her inheritance, and the eagles gathered upon the carcass of official Judaism.

(b) *Differences in detail.*—The records, as preserved in the Textus Receptus, divide into two types—Mark-Matthew and Luke-Paul. In the shorter recension of Luke, to be referred to later, there is an independent narrative. We begin with the Markan tradition, reproduced mainly in Matthew, as the earliest source.

(i.) *Mark-Matthew.*—The words ‘take (eat)’ may perhaps be intended to emphasize the representative action of the disciples. As those who are to sit on twelve thrones, they are not eating a common meal but accepting this blessing for Israel. Some justification of this view may be found in the fact that in Luke and Paul the addition ‘which is (given or shed) on your behalf’ is qualified by the words ‘do this in remembrance of me,’ whereas in Mk.-Mt., which omit this injunction altogether, the words run ‘which is shed for many,’ as though the meal had a wider reach than an ordinary supper. The omission from Mk.-Mt. of the command to repeat the meal as a memorial is the most remarkable difference between the two sources for the Supper. Mt. differs from Mk. in minor points, the most important being the addition of the words ‘unto remission of sins,’ which may have been a current or ritual interpretation, but in any case merely render explicit the idea of the new covenant (Jer 31:34).

(ii.) Luk 22:15-20.—The difficulties of the text are such that so far no final decision has been reached with regard to them, some scholars indeed thinking that the textual problem is involved in the Synoptic problem. The evidence is as follows: (1) The Textus Receptus is supported by \aleph ABCL. (2) Old Latin be (k defective) have the order Luk 22:16; Luk 22:19 a, (καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτο ... τὸ σῶμά μου) Luk 22:17-18, and omit Luk 22:19 b, Luk 22:20. Old Syriac (Syr [Note: yr Syriac.] ^{sin} and Syr [Note: yr Syriac.] ^{cur}) agree in the main with old Latt., though with interpolations. Their order is Luk 22:16; Luk 22:19; Luk 22:17-18; Luk 22:21. ‘And he took bread and gave thanks for it and brake it and gave and said: This is my body which is for you (Syr [Note: yr Syriac.] ^{sin} + ‘is given’): do this in remembrance of me. And (Syr [Note: yr Syriac.] ^{sin} ‘after they had supped’) he took a cup and gave thanks over it and said: Take this and share it among yourselves (Syr [Note: yr Syriac.] ^{sin} + ‘this is my blood

of the new covenant'). I say to you that from this time on I shall not drink of this growth of the vine (Syr [Note: yr Syriac.] *sin* 'fruit') until the kingdom of God comes.' The Pesh. omits Luk 22:17-18; Egyp. [Note: Egyptian.] omits Luk 22:16-18; Marcion omits Luk 22:16; Luk 22:18-19 b, and after Luk 22:19 a comes the cup, but there is only one. (3) D [Note: Deuteronomist.] a ff2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] i l omit Luk 22:19 b and Luk 22:20. Hort, with whom Nestle agrees, is strongly of opinion that Luk 22:19 b, Luk 22:20 were not part of the original text of Luke. Weiss, Schürer, Zahn, and others also believe in a shorter text, but Zahn looks to the oldest versions rather than to D [Note: Deuteronomist.] a, etc., for the proper order. Their testimony is uniform for the order of Mk.-Mt.-Paul (for 1Co 10:16 even with the *Didache* can hardly, in the face of 1Co 11:24, be cited for primitive practice) and for only one cup. However, Mark and Paul seem to have influenced the oldest Syriac directly, in its additions 'this is my blood,' etc., and the command for repetition. If the longer text be accepted, as it is by many scholars, the mention of the two cups may be due to the recapitulatory propensity of Luke (Thayer), or the first cup may signify the close of the Old Covenant in the last Passover (Luk 22:16-18), while the second cup belongs to the New Covenant (Luk 22:19 a, 20). In favour of the latter view it may be observed that 'a cup' occurs in Luk 22:17, but in Luk 22:20 'the cup,' as though well known in the Church (Holtzmann). There is, however, other evidence in this chapter of unsuitable order if not disarrangement, as e.g. Luk 22:18; Luk 22:21-23, where a change of position would fit the narrative better: and if Joh 13:1-30 may be taken as a guide, it would seem that Luk 22:24-27 should come before the institution of the Supper. Hence Hort's excision of Luk 22:19 b, Luk 22:20 is as yet the simplest solution of the difficulty. In that case Luke did not intend to give the detailed account of the institution of the Supper, but rather its meaning. Whatever the original order may have been, there can be no doubt that he desires to lay stress on the Paschal character of the meal. The old dispensation is closing. For the last time Jesus hands His disciples the Passover cup: in the coming Kingdom He will provide for them a heavenly vintage (cf. Joh 15:1). (See Hort, 'Notes on Select Readings,' p. 63 f.; Nestle, *Textual Crit. of Gr. Test.* p. 276 f.; Zahn, *Einl. in d. NT*, ii. 357 ff.; Sanday, *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible* ii. 636; Plummer, *St. Luke*, 496).

(iii.) *Paul.*—1Co 11:23-26 is evidently drawn upon by the author of the longer account of the Supper in Luke. The Apostle gives unimpeachable authority for his view of the Supper, claiming that he had a revelation from the Lord, though it is highly probable that he derived it indirectly through the Apostles (*ἀπό* seems to involve a remote source; see Schmiedel, *Hand-Com.* ii. 162). Of the variations from Mk.-Mt. the most important are the repetition of 'Do this in remembrance of me,' and the change of 'This is my blood of the covenant' into 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood': while the common Synoptic prophecy of Jesus that He will drink the new fruit of the

vine in the Kingdom with His disciples, gives way to a Pauline interpretation of the forward aspect of the Supper—‘ye proclaim the Lord’s death till he come.’

In 1 Cor. the subject is introduced incidentally. There is no formal description of the first Supper, with full historical detail. The narrative is intended to correct abuses among light-hearted Greeks, who seem to have degraded the Supper to the level of their former heathen club-banquets (συσσίτια, ἕρῳνοι). They had few such sacred associations as the Jews, whose annual Passover was a valuable discipline in reverence for Jehovah their Redeemer. These Corinthians had poor ideas of the awful cost of their redemption, when they failed to recognize the meaning of this memorial of Christ’s redeeming death, and by their selfish party-spirit profaned the Lord’s Supper, instituted as it was at such a time as the night on which preparations for His betrayal were being matured (παρεδίδετο). The rite as described here is essentially the same as in the Gospels; but in the Gospels we have the historical account of its creation; while 1 Cor. describes an ideal celebration for the Christian brotherhood.

According to 1Co 11:23-26, the ruling idea of the Supper is the symbolical display of redemption through the death of our Lord, and the same conception, under the figure of the Christian Passover, is involved in 1Co 5:7. Another truth also underlying 1Co 11:23-26, but especially taught in 1Co 10:16-22, is that all those who partake of the spiritual food and drink in this Sacrament are brought into fellowship with Christ Himself, and are thus united into one body (1Co 10:3-4; 1Co 10:16-17).

(iv.) *The Fourth Gospel*.—Though the institution of the Supper is not found in Jn., the final discourses of Jesus (13-17) are coloured with the thought of it and of the love-feast, like brilliant clouds irradiated by the sun which they hide. It is in a measure true to say that, while the Synoptists are concerned with the Supper, St. John lingers upon the memory of the love-feast, for the conversations have the one great theme fittingly introduced by the deed of humility on the part of Him who having loved His own, loved them unto the end. He had exhibited the new law of love of which His death would be the crowning expression, and He becomes at once their example and their Sanctifier (see esp. ch. 17). The Evangelist, as we have seen, seems to correct the Synoptists as to the day of Christ’s death, but he relates the discourse of ch. 6 to the Passover, and in the theme he agrees substantially with them, for the words ‘this is my body ... this is my blood,’ with their symbolic accompaniments, find an excellent interpretation in Joh 6:41-58, which can hardly be dissociated from the later institution of the Supper (see Westcott, *St. John*, 113; Holtzmann, *NT Theol.* ii. 501-503; Loisy, *Quatrième Evangile*, 702-722, 760, 811).

Results.—(a) The Lord’s Supper was instituted by Jesus as a perpetual memorial of His death. It is true that the words ‘Do this in remembrance of me’ do not occur in the

oldest tradition, and may, perhaps, in their present form be traceable to St. Paul; but it is incredible that he should have originated this sacrament, and that it should have been adopted from him by the Jewish Christians. The ordinance was in existence among the Jerusalem Churches before his conversion, and the symbolism and narrative which he received must have been invested with a peculiar sacredness, for, as preserved in the written Petrine source (Mark) at least twenty years later, while different and distinctly more original, they are essentially the same. It is difficult to see how the early Christians would have turned every meal into a commemoration of their Lord's death without His command, for even after the death they failed for a while to understand its full significance. After Pentecost they might have found their meals to be symbols of His perpetual presence to nourish them, but that they should have combined with this the necessity of His death, which remained a solemn mystery, would be inexplicable except under the example and instruction of their Lord.

(b) The Evangelical records relate the Supper to the Passover either directly or indirectly, but no such transformation of the original feast as we find in the Supper would have been made by the primitive Church, which remained thoroughly Jewish, except under the guidance of Jesus.

(c) Like all other teaching of Jesus, this does not prescribe new ritual dependent for its validity upon a set of fixed terms. Possibly freedom was allowed even with regard to the order of the action (see shorter text of Luke, 1Co_10:16 and *Didache*): certainly the spirit was not to be enslaved by an inerrant repetition of sacred words. Complete verbal accord is not to be found in the records, nor even in St. Paul is there a fixed liturgical formula such as might be repeated by a presiding officer; but the import of the Supper was preserved and conveyed mainly by a generally uniform Christian practice.

(d) The Lord's Supper was a 'visible word' conveying the truth of the awful mystery of Redemption. Until He came, however long or short might be the interval, His followers, Jew and Gentile, would in this acted parable read their Master's mind in regard to His death, the culmination of His service of love on their behalf. 'The Passion of Christ was itself a sacrament or mystery of an eternal truth: it was the supreme sacrament of human history: the outward and visible sign of a great supra-temporal fact' (W. R. Inge, *Contentio Veritatis*, p. 298; see also art. Fellowship, § ii.).

5. The Apostolic Church

(a) *The Jewish-Christian Community.*—‘To break (or ‘the breaking of’) bread’ (κλᾶν—ἡ κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου) is almost a formula in the NT (Mar 8:6 ||, Mat 26:26, Luk 24:35, Act 2:42; Act 2:46; Act 20:7; Act 20:11, 1Co 10:16; 1Co 11:24). The term does not seem to have been employed for the ordinary meals of the Jews or their sects in any formal way (see Jer 16:7-8, Lam 4:4). Undoubtedly sacrificial feasts shared in by fellow-worshippers were common not only in heathen circles but among the Jews; they were consecrated by thanksgivings and other religious ritual (Schürer, *ThLZ* [*Note: hLZ Theol. Literaturzeitung.*] , 1891, 32), and it would have been quite natural for the Christians thus to associate themselves together; but a widespread religious custom is not sufficient to account for the usage, and its nomenclature among the early disciples. Why was it distinguished from the ‘fellowship’ (κοινωνία) and singled out by a different terminology? Partly because of the memory of their Lord’s constant table-fellowship, to which His thanksgivings, with their intense reality, had given religious significance, but much more because of the Last Supper carrying His command. That Supper made every common meal more sacred. Enshrining the love of their Master in the symbolism of its closing scene, it gave new meaning to the communion of brethren at their common board. It became the source of a renewed joy, and the daily inspiration of a richer hope. So the term ‘breaking of bread’ covers more than the observance of the Eucharist. It designates the meals of which this ordinance formed an integral part, the action of breaking bread, which was the largest factor of their meal, being used to denote the whole feast. We may assume that the disciples followed their Lord’s example, celebrating a love-feast, which would be enriched with memories of their Master and teaching from His nearest disciples, and closing with the more solemn thanksgiving for the broken body and the cup of blessing which Jesus had consecrated.

(b) *The Pauline Churches.*—There are signs in the letters of St. Paul that there was a widespread doctrine and practice to which his own churches would conform (Rom 6:17), so that his influence over any churches but those of his foundation must not be exaggerated, especially in matters so vital as the sacred observances on which the personal disciples of Jesus would be regarded as primary authorities (cf. 1Co 1:12). Nevertheless the Church underwent a profound change when it passed from Jerusalem and the village churches of Judaea to the large cities of Syria, Asia Minor, and Greece. All ranks now contributed their share to the brotherhood. Thus of necessity the disciples could no longer meet daily, and their regular gatherings were held on the first day of the week (Act 20:7, 1Co 16:2, Rev 1:10). Probably the conduct of the service at Troas (Act 20:7-11) was that of the average Gentile congregation, but little can be gathered from it except that there was a weekly meeting of the church on Sunday night, followed by a common meal, at which, in this

case, St. Paul presided, and protracted the discourse till daybreak. The Lord's Supper may have been observed at some time during the common meal.

Thanksgiving was such an outstanding feature of the meal that already in 1Co 10:16 there is mention of 'the cup of blessing which we bless' (some think it is so called in distinction from the cups at heathen banquets), and afterwards the meal is called 'the Eucharist' (Ignat. *Philad.* 4, *Smyr.* 6; Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 64-66, *Trypho*, 116, 117). This Supper, originated and presided over by the Lord (τὸ κυριακὸν δεῖπνον), did not owe its validity to any official president or to any Apostolic blessing. It was a celebration of the brotherhood as a whole; indeed, the sacrilege of the Corinthians consisted partly in destroying the bond of love which united into one body the brethren who ate one bread (1Co 10:16 f., 1Co 11:20 ff.). Only brethren seem to have been admitted to the Supper, though unbelievers and strangers attended other gatherings of a hortatory or didactic nature (1Co 14:23). It is noteworthy that the direct references to the Lord's Supper in the epistolary writings of the NT are confined to 1 Cor., so that we may possibly attach a larger importance to the function of the Lord's Supper in the Christian life than the Apostle Paul (see 1Co 1:14-17), though he did undoubtedly regard it as a powerful means of grace (1Co 10:16-21).

(c) *The Agape and the Lord's Supper.*—While the word 'Agape' occurs only once in the NT (Jud 1:12, for the reading of 2Pe 2:13 is almost certainly ἀγάπαις), there can be no doubt that the common meals of the primitive Christians, and the table-fellowship which the Corinthians abused, answer to the later Agape. A new name was given to what was really a new thing, for there is nothing elsewhere like the spirit of love which called into existence and pervaded the common intercourse of the brotherhood. The occasion for the origin of the name may be found in John 13-16, though the technical term probably did not come into use till long after the brethren had been enjoying the reality.

What did 'the Lord's Supper' (τὸ κυριακὸν δεῖπνον, 1Co 11:20) precisely mean? Was it the concluding part of the Agape, later called the Eucharist, or did it include both the Agape and the Eucharist? Or was the Lord's Supper a distinct Eucharistic meal separate from the Agape? The decision turns partly on the interpretation of 1Co 11:20. Jülicher is of the opinion that 'the Lord's Supper' was quite unlike all other congregational gatherings, and holds that St. Paul found fault with the Corinthians because by their greed they turned a meal, which was meant to serve the brotherly unity of the Church, into a means of satisfying their appetites (see Stewart, *Expos.* July 1898, and also Drews, *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologic und Kirche.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] v. 562 f.). But there are two decisive objections to this view. (α) The Apostle says

that the ordinance was instituted ‘after supper’ (μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, 1Co 11:25). (β) Bread and wine would not occasion the gluttony which he rebukes. It is much more difficult to decide between the other views. Those who hold that the Agape culminated in the Eucharist, and that the whole was called ‘the Lord’s Supper,’ explain that the selfish conduct of the Corinthian cliques rendered impossible any table-fellowship like that of the first Lord’s Supper, when the feast of love culminated in the Eucharist. (Keating, *Agape and Eucharist*, Appendix B; Robertson in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible i. 490^b). Perhaps this agrees with the term ‘breaking of bread,’ and the practice as outlined in Acts, but the words of St. Paul seem to separate this part of the feast from the rest. It is a ‘Lord’s meal’ because of the institution by the Lord which he proceeds to relate. ‘It is impossible for you to eat a real Lord’s Supper when you have acted so disgracefully in the Agape.’ Further, the institution ‘after supper,’ and the subsequent history of the ordinance, seem to be most easily explained on this view. (Weizsäcker, *Apost. Age*, English translation vol. ii. 283 ff.; Zahn, ‘Agapen,’ in *PRE [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.]*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] i. 236 f.). The abuses which led eventually to a separation of the Agape from the Eucharist were abundant in Corinth, though the process of dissociation proved to be slow, and varied in different localities.

6. The sub-Âpostolic Church

(a) *Clement of Rome*.—To counteract the disturbances resulting from the Corinthian rivalries, Clement urges the necessity of order and reverence in the service, which will be effected by every one abiding in his own part (41). The bishops must offer ‘the gifts blamelessly and holily’ (44), *i.e.* ‘the prayers and thanksgivings, the alms, the Eucharistic elements, the contributions to the Agape, and so forth’ (Lightfoot). His stately prayers and insistence upon orderliness may point to a developing liturgical service, but the epistle sheds no real light upon the place or meaning of the Eucharist in the worship of the Church.

(b) *Pliny’s Letter to Trajan (a.d. 112)*.—This letter is of importance, but raises vexed questions. How far the practice described extended beyond the Church of Bithynia, and the trustworthiness and interpretation of evidence which he drew from apostate Christians, are doubtful. He says: ‘Essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere secum invicem, seque sacramento non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent: quibus peractis morem sibi discedendi fuisse, rursusque coeundi ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen et innoxium’ (*Ep.* 96. 7).

Just what is involved in the word *sacramentum* has divided scholars. Lightfoot (*Ign.* i. 50 ff.) and Ramsay (*Ch. in Rom. [Note: Roman.] Empire*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 219 f.) believe that the Eucharist and the Agape were separated at this time, and that the social meal, which was held in the evening, had been repressed in accordance with the Roman Imperial policy against associations (Keating, 54 ff.). Weizsäcker is not very clear (*op. cit.* ii. 249, 285), but Zahn (*PRE [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.]*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] i. 236, art. 'Agapen') and J. A. Robinson (*Encyc. Bibl.*, 'Eucharist,' § 17) are unwilling to draw such a conclusion. Possibly the abolition of the Agape was local and temporary (Mayor, *Clem. of Alexandria, Strom.* vii. 376 ff.). In any case, undue emphasis should not be placed upon the Imperial policy as a uniform influence, for there were other contributory local forces at work, introducing changes into worship; and when Ignatius wrote, the Eucharist and the Agape were still united 'in some parts of Asia Minor, and probably at Antioch' (Light-foot).

(c) *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.*—The uncertainty of the date and local origin of the *Didache* renders its witness doubtful. Quite different in tone from Paul, and not influenced directly, it would appear, by John, it may be taken as a type of widespread Jewish Christian life within the limits of Palestine, and possibly Egypt, about the end of the 1st century. The Supper, called 'the Eucharist,' and associated with 'the breaking of bread,' is mentioned in chapters 9, 10, and 14. The Eucharist is not yet separated from the Agape, if, indeed, they are not identical, for the latter is not mentioned, though some take ch. 9 to contain the closing prayers of the Agape, and ch. 10 those of the Eucharist (Zahn, Weizsäcker, Weiss, Loofs). It is held on the Lord's Day, and is preceded by confession, for only pure hearts make praise and thanksgiving possible. The order, as in the shorter form of Luke, is cup and bread; but nothing is said as to the method of celebration, except that, while a set form of prayers is given for ordinary use, prophets are allowed freedom. There is no sign of a priest, and the celebration is the common act of the whole Church. Only the baptized are to partake of the Eucharist, which is that holy thing that cannot be given to the dogs, though not because the Eucharistic elements are regarded as conveying some mysterious power, or are, in any sense, sacrificial; for there is not much advance on Rom. 12:1.* [Note: 'εὐχαριστία in Christian usage has two concrete senses besides the abstract sense: (1) a thanksgiving in words, and (2) a thanksgiving in offerings; and in early times it appears to denote always the offering or thing offered itself, not the ceremony or service, or the institution' (Hort, *JThSt*, vol. iii. 595).]

The *Didache* is mystical, like the Fourth Gospel. Life and knowledge come through the appropriation of Jesus Christ as Messiah, but no reference is made to redemption through His blood. A unique figure—that of the grains of wheat being brought together

to form one loaf—is applied to the sanctification of the Church in a unity. Thanks are given for knowledge of God, for faith and immortality brought through Jesus the Servant, and for daily food, but especially for the spiritual food through Jesus. After the stress of the present evil age, which may soon close with the advent of the Lord, will come the peace of perfect mystical union in the Church of the completed Kingdom (Bartlet, ‘Didache,’ Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible , Extra Vol. 439 ff.; Drews in *Neutest. Apokryphen*, 182-188).

(d) *Ignatius*.—The Lord’s Supper assumes large importance. By a transference of the name for the prayer of thanksgiving to the whole meal it is called ‘the Eucharist’ (*Eph.* 13, *Phil.* [Note: *Philistine.*] 4, *Smyr.* 6, 8). It is still associated with the Agape (*Smyr.* 8. 1, 2), and the term ‘breaking of bread’ seems to include both (*Eph.* 20). His utterances often stand out untuned in the atmosphere of controversy with the Docetists, against whom he is never wearied of insisting upon the reality of the human nature of Jesus Christ which is essential to salvation. Only in the one Church is this full truth preserved, and the Eucharist is the symbol of unity, for there the gifts of salvation which are the full fellowship of life with Christ find fleshly expression. So, to be valid, it must be celebrated by the bishop, who, as opposed to all heretics, performs the sacrament as an act of the Church as a whole. For Ignatius the spiritual supersensible world is intensely real, but it becomes illusory without an earthly or material form, and only through the appropriation of the flesh and blood of Christ do believers enter into mystical union with God. This is most fully realized in the breaking of bread, an action efficacious as an antidote to spiritual death—‘a medicine for immortality’ (φάρμακον ἀθανασίας, *Eph.* 20). Some hold that Ignatius regards the elements of the Supper as purely symbolic, for in *Phil.* [Note: *Philistine.*] 5. 1, the gospel is called ‘the flesh of Jesus’; in *Trall.* 8. 1, faith is ‘the flesh of the Lord,’ and love is ‘the blood of Jesus Christ’; and in *Rom.* [Note: *Roman.*] 7, *Ephesians* 5, ‘the bread of God’ is an image of the blessings of salvation without any reference to the Lord’s Supper (v. d. Goltz, *Ignatius von Antiochien*, pp. 72, 73; Lightfoot, *Ign. ad Rom.* [Note: *Roman.*] 7; Loofs, *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologic und Kirche.*] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] i. 40). Harnack’s most recent view is that in Ignatius, sixty years after St. Paul, the whilom clear theology has become fouled by the Mysteries and their lore (*Expansion of Christianity*, i. 289). Apparently Ignatius does not think of magical powers as being inherent in material elements, but, influenced by Johannine mysticism, holds that the material forms must be interpreted by a spirit of faith, love, and thanksgiving in order to convey spiritual gifts. Yet he is ambiguous, and his realistic language, partly due to a mind more imaginative than penetrating, opens the door for the cruder conceptions which follow. Perhaps we may go further, and see in his use of the term ‘medicine for immortality’ the first evidence of the later view of Greek theology, which laid the chief stress of redemption rather on the annihilation of physical corruption by the

infusion of the Divine Nature of the Son of God, than on spiritual regeneration through the eternal Divine Person. (Lightfoot, *Ign.* ii. 45, 171, 258; Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, 257, and Appendix C; Swete in *JThSt* [Note: *ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.*] , iii. 168; Sanday, *The Fourth Gospel*, 241-245).

(e) *Justin Martyr*.—The ecclesiastical term for the Supper is henceforth ‘the Eucharist.’ Justin makes no mention of the Agape. The Eucharist ceases to be a meal of the congregation and becomes a regular part of the Sunday service, and seems to require the presence of a bishop or some other official for its valid celebration (*Apol.* i. 65-67). Under the growing tendency towards ritual it began to gather to itself some of the Jewish, or perhaps heathen, sacrificial ideas centring in a special priesthood. Indeed Justin sees in the mysteries of Mithras a demonic imitation of Christian symbolism (*Apol.* i. 54, 62, 65-67; *Dial. c. Trypho*, 70, 78). The ideas of Ignatius are in Justin losing their purity. He continues to speak of the Supper as a spiritual life-giving food, but holds that a material change passes upon the elements of the sacrament, so that they nourish our bodies and make them incorruptible, the Logos becoming united by the Eucharistic prayer with the bread, as He took flesh and blood when He became incarnate in Jesus (*Apol.* i. 66; Loofs, *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologic und Kirche.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] i. 40, 41, 45, 46; Swete, *JThSt* [Note: *ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.*] , iii. 169 f.). Harnack put forward a theory that bread and water were the usual elements in the Eucharist at the time of Justin, but it has received little approval, for the most that can be said is that the practice existed among some small sects in Africa (*TU* [Note: *U Texte und Untersuchungen.*] vii. 2, 117-144, outlined by Stewart, *Expos.* July 1898, 43 ff.).

A variety of causes led to the discontinuance of the celebration of the Agape along with the Lord’s Supper. (a) The increase of abuses as they are found already in 1 Cor. and Jude. (b) The growth of the Church in large cities, where it became impossible for the Christians to meet together in house-celebrations. (c) The increasing power of the bishop and clergy, who found in house-gatherings a menace to the unity of the Church, together with the development of the dogma that the presence of a bishop was necessary to make a Supper valid. (d) Charges of child-murder and cannibalism (θ υέστεια δεῖπνα, οἰδιποδείους μίξεις). (e) The enforcement of the Imperial law against associations (see Drews, *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologic und Kirche.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] v. ‘Eucharistie’). The change, already widespread in the time of Justin Martyr, whereby the Supper is definitely called ‘the Eucharist’ and becomes the central part of public service, was of vast consequence, and gradually spread over the whole Church, transforming the conception of worship. In Tertullian’s circle the Eucharist is celebrated in the early morning and the Agape is held in the evening (*Apol.* 39, *de*

Corona, 3). But authorities differ as to the completeness of the separation at Alexandria in Clement's day, Bigg, e.g., saying that 'the Eucharist was not distinguished in time, ritual, or motive from the primitive Supper of the Lord' (*Christian Platonists*, 102, 103), while Mayor is doubtful (Clem. Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] *Strom.* vii. 382), and Zahn is strongly of the contrary opinion (*PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyclopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 'Agapen,' 234).

7. The Lord's Supper and the pagan Mysteries.—Dr. Percy Gardner may be taken as a representative of a few scholars who trace the influence of the pagan Mysteries on St. Paul.

'The great difference between the teaching of the Synoptic Jesus on the one hand, and the teaching of Paul, of the Fourth Evangelist, and of the author of Hebrews on the other, is just that the latter is permeated, as the former is not, by the ideas of spiritual communion, of salvation, of justification, and mediation—ideas which had found an utterance, however imperfect, in the teaching of the *thiasi*.... Christians are, like the Pagan Mystae, called upon to be *δσιοι* and *ἀγιοι*. The language of the Pauline and Johannine writings shows the translation of Christianity on to a new level by the reception and baptism into Christ of a set of ideas which at the time, coming from a Divine source, were making their way into the various religions of the human race' (*Explor. Evangel.* p. 340 ff.). H. J. Holtzmann also holds that in separating the sacrament as a specifically religious act unrelated to the kernel of his gospel, Paul opened the gates to 'mystery' conceptions (*NT Theol.* ii. 186, 187).

But the sacrament of the Supper was in existence before St. Paul, and its import well established in the Jewish section of the Church before the gospel went to the Gentiles, who for many decades were not sufficiently influential to stamp the sacrament with 'mystery' conceptions even if they had so desired. All this type of thought was alien to the Jewish mind, the only section of the nation that was in sympathy with these ideas being the Essenes, who derived their sacramental meals—in some sort 'mystery' associations—from foreign sources, and they cannot be regarded as a factor in the shaping of the Christian rite (Bousset, *Rel. des Judenthums*, 431-443). It is quite gratuitous to say that the ideas of spiritual communion, salvation, justification, and mediation are especially Pauline or Johannine. They had, in fact, a long history in Hebrew thought, and while they are frequent in 'mystery' ritual, their import is different. The pagan Mysteries, even in their purest expression, were tainted with the religious conceptions of old nature-worships. Fellowship through sacraments with the Divine was thought to bring an infusion of the subtle material essence of the god, who thus held present communion with the initiated, and vouchsafed immortality to him. This was the result not so much of a moral act of faith

as of an impression produced upon the character by the vision of the Divine drams. Contemplation and ecstasy crown the course of the initiated. A rigorous ethical discipline was also required by way of preparation for the vision of the Divine, but inasmuch as the purpose was to free the soul from its prison-house in the flesh, the purification was chiefly of a ceremonial character. The soul cleansed of earthly impurities would ascend after death into final union with the Supreme (see Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, Bk. iv. chs. v. vi.). Of sin in the Christian sense there is little trace in pagan thought. Such sin as the worshipper was freed from in the heathen Mysteries was inherent in him by reason of human frailty, or was an outward taint of the body (Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen*, 38). When in the 2nd cent. these subtle shades began to colour Christian thought, it was a sign that the full summer was passing.

St. Paul is ruled by the Hebrew idea of sin as it became heightened by the life and death of Jesus. God is for him the supremely moral Person, and sin is treason against His Sovereignty. On His Son, the Redeemer from sin, he lavishes all his loyalty and worship. Indeed, Christ becomes his intimate personal friend and Lord. For him it is Christ to live, which is only another way of saying that Christ is his spiritual food as it is symbolized in the Supper (1Co 10:4; 1Co 10:17). He does not, it is true, lay inordinate emphasis on the celebration of Baptism or the Supper (1Co 1:14-17), but he finds in the common meal of love the most perfect earthly expression of the fellowship of the saints with the Head of the body. The living Christ draws the believers, who have abandoned their former pagan fellowship, into a new communion with Himself. He is the most real of all persons, dwelling in the hearts of a loving company as their thought is focussed upon Him by the symbols of His redemption, and pledged by this memorial of His death to return (see Dobschütz, *Probleme d. apost. Zeitalters*, 72, 73; Ramsay, *Expos.*, Dec. 1900, Jan. 1901). Even the use by St. Paul of such words as 'mystery' and 'to initiate' (τελειοῦν), 1Co 2:6-7, 2Co 1:22, Php 3:12, hardly justifies the assumption of conscious influence (Heinrici, *Com. [1887] zu 2 Kor.* 121; Anrich, 112). Nor is there any more reason for discerning 'mystery-doctrine' in John, for the conception of God and of true worship which rules this Gospel is unsurpassed (Joh 4:20-24), while in Joh 6:63 words which might be thought to have a materialistic sense are expressly said to be spirit and life. In the final discourses of Jesus the conditions for receiving the Spirit of Christ are ethical. Those abide in Christ who show their love to Him by obeying His command to love one another. In the First Epistle the final vision of God is promised for the world to come, but only those can know God now who love, and who have had their sins taken away through the Lamb of God who is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world (1Jn 2:2, cf. Joh 1:29). 'Faith' in Paul. 'love' and 'knowledge,' almost convertible terms in John, are the subjective conditions for communion with God, who dwells in the individual heart attuned to the loving fellowship of the brotherhood.

It may be partially true to say that without the sacraments Christianity would not have conquered Europe, and yet such a judgment should be qualified by the fact that non-sacramental Judaism was the most effective proselytizer of all the religions of the old world. Widespread as the 'mystery' cults were, the Jews became a church within the Roman Empire, exceeding other foreign worships in numbers, the attention it attracted, and the privileges it extorted from a hostile power. Philo, the only 'mystery' philosopher of the Jews, was an isolated phenomenon (Bousset, *op. cit.* 78, 79).

Unquestionably, the heathen Mysteries satisfied many deep religious longings. The contemplation of impressive ceremonial and a Divine drama concealed from all but the initiated, the litany, the rhythmic music, appealed to the feeling of the worshipper, and swept him into an attitude of mind in which he enjoyed Divine communion and received a pledge of his immortality. By means of a common meal he entered into mystical union with the god, and began the process of deification through the infusion of the imperishable Divine nature. Degraded though these Mysteries often were by magic and superstition, they were felt by their purest votaries to be the guarantee of salvation here in fellowship with God and of a blessed future life (Anrich, pp. 39, 46, 47; Dill, 609-614). And yet Judaism was the most powerful factor in that religious world, because it satisfied more perfectly than any 'mystery' cult the more insistent ethical and spiritual needs of human nature. But Christianity brought to the world a richer boon than either Judaism or the heathen Mysteries. It offered all that was best both in the Mysteries and in Judaism. By its sacraments it disclosed its 'open secret' to Jew and Gentile; and in these sacraments the believer, as one of a brotherhood of saints, was brought into perfect communion with the eternal God who had redeemed him.

The most sacred symbol of this redemption, 'the core of religious worship,' was the Lord's Supper, and it remained truly symbolic until, after the first decade of the 2nd cent., the stream of Christian life, making its way through pagan soil that was saturated with ideas drained off from mystery practice and thought, began to grow discoloured. How far in the succeeding years there was direct imitation between Christianity and the mystery religions, or how far resemblances were due to ideas that had by a long process of religious development become almost essential to the thought of the early centuries, is a problem that still awaits solution. But it was the Gnostic sects that were first invaded and overcome by distinctly heathen influences. The Christian Church, with its immense reserve of spiritual power, performed a masterly and slow retreat from the more exalted positions of the Apostolic age (Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*, i. 285-299; Hatch, *Hibbert Lectures*, 283-309; Mayor, *Clement of Alexandria*, ch. iii.; Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, Lect. ii. and Appendix B; and esp. Dill and Anrich, *ut supra*).

Literature.—Schultzen, *Das Abendmahl im NT*, 1895; J. H. Thayer, ‘Recent Discussions respecting the Lord’s Supper’ in *JBL* [Note: *BL Journal of Biblical Literature.*] xviii. [1899] 110-131; Cremer and Loofs, ‘Abendmahl,’ i. and ii., in *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyclopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] i.; Drews, ‘Eucharistie,’ *ib.* v.; Zahn, ‘Agapen,’ *ib.* i.; Plummer, ‘The Lord’s Supper’ in Hastings’s Dictionary of the Bible iii.; J. A. Robinson, ‘Eucharist’ in *Encyc. Bibl.* ii. The views of Harnack, Jülicher, and Spitta are clearly outlined by G. Wauchope Stewart in *Expos.* 5th ser. viii. [1898] 43-61, 86-102, and by Grafe in *Ztschr. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1895, pt. 2. See also Percy Gardner, *Origin of the Lord’s Supper*, 1893; J. F. Keating, *The Agape and the Eucharist*, 1901; J. C. Lambert, *The Sacraments in the NT*, 1903 [excellent]; G. H. Box, *Jewish Antecedents of the Eucharist*, and reply by J. C. Lambert in *JThSt* [Note: *ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.*], vols. iii. iv.; H. B. Swete, ‘Eucharistic Belief in the Second and Third Centuries,’ *ib.* vol. iii.; W. B. Frankland, *The Early Eucharist*, 1902 [useful for textual material]; Bishop A. J. Maclean, art. ‘Agape’ in Hastings’ forthcoming *Encyc. of Religion and Ethics*.

R. A. Falconer.

☛ Lost

LOST.—The word ‘lost’ has come to be invested with a sinister theological significance. A moral sense hopelessly degraded, a sullen abandonment to evil, a persistent closing of the heart, and a future determined beyond the possibility of alteration—are some of the ideas which it compels in the mind. As it fell from Christ’s lips, however, the word did not, as a rule, convey any such harsh suggestions. It was rather a word of infinite pathos and of Divine pity. Used in its Middle voice, the verb ἄπολλυμι denotes irretrievable ruin, as in the great text, [Joh_3:16](#) (cf. also [Joh_17:12](#) ‘None of them is lost, but the son of perdition’; see Judas Iscariot); but as a participle used passively, the form in which we find it in [Luk_19:10](#), and in the group of parables in Luke 15, which bear especially on this subject, it signifies simply a condition of peril, grave, yet with the glad prospect of recovery.

What moral condition of humanity is meant by the word ‘lost’ appears from the character of those to whom Jesus directed His message. Broadly speaking, the society of His day was split up into two classes. There were those who, with the advantage of wealth, or, if wealth were denied them, with praiseworthy self-denial, contrived to satisfy the demands of the Law; and, on a platform infinitely lower, stood those who had neither the will nor the means to bear so heavy and so doleful a burden. These

latter comprised the sinners, the lapsed, and those recreant Jews who so far forgot themselves as to take service under the conquering Power. They had no share in Israel's hopes; they had ceased to cherish the ideals of the race. It was precisely to this class, called by the Pharisees in a bitter hour 'an accursed multitude which knoweth not the law' (Joh_7:49), that Christ mainly appealed. He ate and drank with them: He made the conditions of entrance to His Kingdom such as were possible for them all. With a profound sense of what they had missed in life, He summed up their imperfections under this term, 'the lost.' Reviving a beautiful OT figure, He compared them with sheep that had gone astray. If the reality of the case demanded sterner language, His supreme pity covered that fact from His eyes. They were simply 'lost'; and the word, sorrowful as it was, yet with a ring of hope in it, expressed, while at the same time it concealed, the heinousness of their sin. It was a moral condition full of danger, because they acquiesced in it, and were in some measure content to abide under the shadow of the contempt of their fellow-men. It was a condition full of hope, because it was due partly to circumstances that were invincibly against them, and partly to a merely thoughtless divergence from the true way of human life.

But the delicate shades of meaning which Christ imparted to the word may best be appreciated from its use in the trilogy of parables in Luke 15. From there we learn that, however sinister may be the suggestions which the word carries to our minds, it did not, as employed by Christ, indicate any supreme or singular degree of vice. To be lost was to wander, aimlessly and thoughtlessly, or in wantonness and self-will. It was to live in vain, as a coin that lies hidden among the dust; to turn aside from life's true way, and therefore miss life's true end. There is a suggestion in the term of the lost ideals that one used to hold, and of the forlornness of the mind from which those ideals have fled. There is a hint of the entanglement of the wandering soul in influences that hold it back from safety. There is the generous implication that sin is always in a greater or less degree the result of ignorance, of a thoughtless and wild pursuit after unknown pleasures into unknown paths, until the true path is lost to view, and the unhappy wanderer does not know where it lies. The term leaves also upon the mind the impression that to be lost one does not need to wander far. A man need step but a little way aside to find himself among circumstances that stand up about him and shut out the light, and then, equally with him whose 'feet stumble on the dark mountains,' he is lost. But the singular and appropriate beauty of the idea lies in the prospect of recovery which it implies. Whatever is lost may be found, if in its ignorance it cannot find itself. It may be found by him who has lost it, and whose heart, tortured by anxiety and thrilled with exquisite devotion, will carry him in his search over difficult and perilous roads.

Literature.—Cremer, *Bib.-Theol. Lex.* s.v. ἀπολλυμι; Bruce, *Parab. Teach. of Christ*, 261, 293, *Gal. Gospel*, ch. vii.; H. E. Manning, *Teaching of Christ*, 105; A. Maclaren,

Beatitudes, 243; Stopford A. Brooke, *Unity of God and Man*, 34; C. H. Spurgeon, *Parables of our Lord*, Nos. 57, 58, 59; F. W. Robertson, *Sermons*, ii. 190; G. S. Barrett, *Intermediate State*, 187.

A. G. Campbell.

☛ Lot

LOT.—The suddenness of the Divine Parousia and the unpreparedness and want of expectation on the part of the world, find illustration from ‘the days of Lot’ (Luk_17:28), when the people of Sodom continued their social and commercial activity until ‘the day that Lot went out’ (Luk_17:29).

Lot’s Wife—to whom in Jewish tradition the name עֲרִיַת Edith is given—is recorded in Genesis 19 to have been turned into a pillar of salt as a result of her looking back upon Sodom while escaping to the mountain. Her fate, as one failing to escape imminent and foretold destruction, is referred to in Luk_17:32, though without specific mention of the form in which destruction overtook her.

Our Lord’s word ‘Remember’ neither confirms nor rejects the tradition. It is with the spiritual fact and its lesson, not with the memorial, that He is concerned. The folly of unreadiness, of the longing for things left behind, of the desire to retain a transient little in the face of impending judgment and at the cost of a greater and eternal loss, is the lesson He would teach in connexion with His Parousia, from the remembrance of Lot’s wife.

Literature.—Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible , Smith’s *DB* [*Note: Dictionary of the Bible.*] , *Encyc. Bibl.*, Kitto’s *Encyc.*, *Jewish Encyc. s.v.*; G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [*Note: GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*] p. 505; Josephus *Ant.* i. xi. 4; Jon. Edwards, *Works* [ed. 1840], ii. 64; *Comm.*, esp. Driver on *Genesis*; and the following expository sermons, J. A. Alexander, *Gospel of Jesus Christ*, 38; H. E. Manning, *Teaching of Christ*, 38; F. Temple, *Rugby Sermons*, ii. 312; S. Cox, *Expositions*, iv. 280; B. Herford, *Courage and Cheer*, 79; G. Matheson, *Representative Men of the Bible*, ii. 22; A. Whyte, *Bible Characters*, i. 129.

J. T. L. Maggs.

☛ Lots

LOTS (Casting of) (λαγχάνω, κλήρον βάλλειν).—Among the Jews the lot was in frequent use (see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , art. 'Lots'). It was the recognized method by which the order of service and most of the individual duties of the priesthood were determined. The order of the 24 'courses' or priestly families was arranged by lot. The 'course' to which Zacharias (Luk 1:5-9) belonged was that of Abijah, which stood eighth on the list (1Ch 24:1-19). Each family or 'course' was on duty for a week, from one Sabbath to another, twice a year (2Ki 11:9). The priests from whom the officiating ministers for the service of the day (ἐφημερία) were to be chosen, had to present themselves 'washed' (Exo 40:12-15) before the officer who had special charge of the lots. The lots were cast in the 'Hall of Hewn Polished Stones' in the Temple. The distribution of duties for a day among the priests required that the lot should be cast four times. The priest who had to offer incense was chosen by the third lot. This duty was regarded as one of special honour, and the lot by which it was assigned was cast after prayer and confession. The decision was accepted as indicating the man whom God had chosen to offer the prayers of the people. The third of April or the first week of October is by some reckoned as the time when Zacharias was appointed to offer incense (Luk 1:9). It may have been at the morning or the evening service.

At the Crucifixion the soldiers cast lots for the clothes of Jesus. As they were divided into 'four parts, to every soldier a part' (Joh 19:23), it was evidently a quaternion of soldiers that was on duty. The Synoptists simply record the parting of the garments by lot (Mat 27:35, Mar 15:24, Luk 23:34). In Jn. special reference is made to His 'coat.' It is impossible to say whether the 'coat' was added to one of the four parts, or if a separate lot was cast for it. The precision and detail of the narrative in Jn. have been regarded as proofs that the Fourth Evangelist was an eye-witness of the things which he records. In the casting of the lot for the 'coat' he saw the fulfilment of one of the predicted woes of the Messiah (Psa 22:18). The quotation is in the exact words of the LXX Septuagint . Critical editions of the NT omit the quotation in Matthew.

There is no indication as to the particular method by which the lot was cast in the two incidents in which it is employed in the Gospels.

It may be noted under this heading that the idea of the lot as giving expression to the Divine will runs through all the words which relate to inheritance (κληρονόμω, -ομία, -ονόμος). With this fundamental significance all such words become part of the language of grace. The right of inheritance in the Kingdom of God, or to eternal life, does not spring from legal enactment or personal merit, but from the will of God.

Literature.—Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i. 133-187, ii. 592 f.; Josephus *Ant.* vii. xiv. 7; Godet on *Luke*, vol. i. 71; Muirhead, *Times of Christ*, p. 79; Godet on *John*, vol. iii. 266. See also art. Chance.

John Reid.

Love

LOVE.—In the word ‘love’ is concentrated, we may say, the essence of the Christian religion. It is love that is the outstanding feature in the revelation Christ has given us of the nature of God, love that is the controlling power in the life of the Son who claimed that he that had seen Him had seen the Father (Joh 14:9). On the two commandments to love God and to love our neighbour, Christ declares that all the Law and the Prophets hang (Mat 22:40). In the commandment to love one another as He has loved them, He sums up the new law which He lays upon His disciples, declaring that by their fulfilment of it the faithfulness of their discipleship shall be known (Joh 13:34 f.). We propose to exhibit from different points of view the place which love holds in the doctrine of Christ.

1. The love of God for man.—It is certainly true, as has been pointed out, that Christ does not, in the Synoptic Gospels, speak directly of the love (*ἀγάπη*) of God. But if He does not thus expressly *predicate* love of God, it is because He has already endowed Him, as *subject*, with this love in the highest degree. The doctrine of the Fatherhood of God, which is the foundation of the whole gospel of Christ, contains within it the fullest recognition of the love of God. If the Apostolic writers of the NT expand with greater fulness the doctrine of the Divine love, they are only making explicit the truth involved in the assurance of the Fatherhood of God set forth on every page of the Synoptic Gospels. The God whose love is the constant theme of St. Paul’s preaching is the Father-God of Jesus Christ (so H. Holtzmann interprets the Pauline formula *ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, *Neutest. Theol.* i. 171). In the one word ‘Abba,’ which Christian lips have learned to repeat after the Master, there lies to St. Paul the assurance of the Divine love which can banish the old feeling of bondage and inspire the spirit of adoption (Rom 8:15). The Johannine doctrine that God is love (1Jn 4:8) is but the statement in abstract terms of the truth to which Christ has given concrete expression in the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God. For it is the love of God that Christ will express by this name which is so constantly on His lips. He speaks of God not only as His own Father (‘My Father’), or as the Father of those who are members of the Kingdom of God (‘your Father’), but as ‘the Father’ absolutely (Mat 11:27, Mar 13:32, Luk 11:13). The title suggests more than the relation in which

God stands to mankind as their Creator. In Mat 5:44-48 Christ urges His hearers to become God's sons by showing a love like to that of their Father in heaven, 'for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.' Did Fatherhood mean merely Creatorship, there could be no question of *becoming* the sons of God. All men are God's creatures. The fact that Christ speaks of our becoming God's sons, proves that He is using the terms 'Father' and 'sons' in an ethical sense. By Fatherhood He indicates the love which God cherishes for men, by sonship the love by which they may prove themselves like in character to this Father whose nature is love. This love suggested by the name 'Father' is the very essence of the Divine nature. It is not merely one among the various attributes of God. It is the supreme and dominating element in the Divine character. It is in it that the Divine perfection lies; and when Christ urges us to be perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect (Mat 5:48), it is evident from the context that it is of the love of God that He is thinking, a fact recognized by Lk., who substitutes 'merciful' for the 'perfect' of Mt.'s version (Luk 6:36).

This love of the Father in heaven is the foundation upon which the gospel of Christ rests. It is all-embracing. God is the Father not only of those who are members of the Kingdom of God, *i.e.* of those who by the love which animates them prove themselves to be His sons (Mat 5:45), but of all men. The evil as well as the good, the unjust as well as the just, are the objects of His love (*ib.*); and if the facts to which Christ refers, in this connexion, in proof of the universality of the Father's love, do not go beyond such natural blessings as the sunshine and the rain, that is explained on the ground that these blessings require for their appreciation no special receptivity on the part of those who enjoy them (Beyschlag, *Neutest. Theol.* i. 81). The Father cares for all. Each individual is precious in His sight. 'It is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish' (Mat 18:14). The very hairs of our head are all numbered (Mat 10:30). There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth (Luk 15:7; Luk 15:10). In the fact of God's Fatherhood there lies the assurance that He will certainly give good things to them that ask (Mat 7:11; Mat 18:19), and that He will welcome the penitent sinner who turns to Him (Luk 15:11-32). It is the Father's good pleasure, Christ assures us, to give us the Kingdom (Luk 12:32), that greatest of all blessings, to obtain which a man might well be willing to sacrifice everything else (Mat 13:44-46); and with it He gives us all such material blessings as He sees to be necessary for us (Luk 12:31, Mat 6:33). When we thus gather together the various utterances of Christ with regard to the God whom He reveals to us as Father, when we think of the assurance that name breathes of bountiful providence, of watchful care, of forgiving love, when we remember, above all, how Christ points to the Father's unfailing goodness towards the undeserving as an instance of the Divine perfection, we must confess that though the Synoptic Gospels contain no direct mention of the love of God, the Being whose character the Saviour seeks to reveal to us by that name 'Father' is one whose very nature is love.

In the Fourth Gospel it is the same representation of the nature of God that meets us. Here, too, 'Father' is the favourite designation. It has been questioned, indeed, whether the title 'Father' has the same significance in the Fourth Gospel as in the Synoptics. H. Holtzmann (*Neutest. Theol.* ii. 433 f.) maintains that in the constantly recurring designation of God as 'the Father' there is always either an express or a tacit reference to the Son. [For a full discussion of the use of the word 'Father' in St. John, see Westcott, *The Epistles of St. John*, pp. 29-34]. But there are occasions on which we feel that the title is used in a manner which suggests a reflexion on the love of God quite in the manner of the Synoptics, as when Christ says to the disciples that whatever they shall ask the Father in His name He will give (Joh 15:16; Joh 16:23), or when He tells them that He does not say that He will pray the Father for them, for the Father Himself loveth them (Joh 16:26 f.). And in any case the question of the significance attaching to the title 'Father' in the Fourth Gospel is of minor interest in our present inquiry, since that Gospel contains many express declarations of the love of God, the absence of which makes the question of the significance of that title in the Synoptics matter of importance. These express references to the love of God in the Fourth Gospel occur specially in connexion with that aspect of the Divine love which we proceed to consider under the following head.

2. The love of God for man as manifested in Christ.—The highest proof of the Father's love is given in the mission and Person of the Son. This aspect of the Divine love, which is emphasized in the Fourth Gospel, is not unknown in the Synoptics, though it is rather implied than expressed. If the love of the Father is manifested in the bestowal of the Messianic Kingdom (Luk 12:32), that Kingdom which has been prepared for His children from the foundation of the world (Mat 25:34), and which is now about to come with power (Mar 9:1), then the sending of the Son (Mat 10:40; Mat 21:37) to inaugurate the Kingdom must in itself be an evidence of the love of God. All things are delivered unto the Son of the Father, and He alone can reveal the Father to man (Mat 11:27, Luk 10:22). And this revelation is not confined to His preaching. It embraces the whole of His Messianic work. That work was from beginning to end animated by the spirit of love. He pointed to His works of healing as proof that the Messianic era had arrived (Mat 11:5; Mat 12:28). He described His daily work on one occasion as 'casting out devils and doing cures' (Luk 13:32). He called to all who laboured and were heavy laden to come to Him and He would give them rest (Mat 11:28). As He had assured men of the forgiving love of God, so He declared that He came not to call the righteous but sinners (Mar 2:17), and on occasion announced the forgiveness of their sins to those who approached Him (Mar 2:5, Luk 7:47 f.). His whole ministry was one continual mission of love, culminating in the willing sacrifice of His own life as a ransom for many (Mar 10:45). If we look for the revelation which the Son gives of the Father, not only to His preaching but to His Person and work, then we must admit that that revelation is one

which confirms at every point the assurance of God's boundless love for man conveyed by the gracious title by which Christ designates Him.

But this aspect of the matter is not emphasized in the Synoptics as it is in the Fourth Gospel. Here the mission of the only-begotten Son for the salvation of man is expressly cited as a proof of the vastness of the love of God (Joh 3:16 f.); and whatever question there may be as to the metaphysical relation suggested by that word 'only-begotten,' there can be none as to the depth of the love involved in the sacrifice of the Son so designated. We may note not only the depth but the wideness of the love here proclaimed. God gives His Son for the salvation of the *world*. This wider outlook in connexion with the work of Christ is characteristic of the Fourth Gospel (O. Holtzmann, *Johannesevangelium*, 49 f., 80 ff.). Christ is the Saviour of the world (Joh 4:42), the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world (Joh 1:29). He speaks to the world (Joh 8:26), gives His flesh for the life of the world (Joh 6:51), is the light of the world (Joh 9:5, Joh 12:46). Into this world burdened with sin (Joh 1:29) and animated by a spirit of hostility to Himself (Joh 12:31, Joh 17:14), God in His infinite love has sent His Son for its deliverance (Joh 3:17). Throughout the whole Gospel there is far more prominence given than in the Synoptics to the fact that Christ has been sent by the Father (Joh 5:37, Joh 7:16, Joh 8:16; Joh 8:28 etc.). He repeatedly refers to Himself as Him whom the Father hath sent (Joh 5:38, Joh 6:29, Joh 10:36, Joh 17:3). He is not come of Himself (Joh 7:28), but is come in the name of His Father (Joh 5:43) from whom He has come forth (Joh 8:42, Joh 16:27, Joh 17:8). Not only does the Son, as in the Synoptics, claim to reveal the Father as none other, He asserts that He is in the Father and the Father in Him (Joh 10:38, Joh 14:10; Joh 14:20, Joh 17:21; Joh 17:23). He and the Father are one (Joh 10:30, Joh 17:22). The words that He speaks have been given Him by His Father (Joh 7:16 f., Joh 12:49 f., Joh 14:10; Joh 14:24, Joh 17:8). The works that He does are the works of His Father who dwelleth in Him (Joh 14:10). He that hath seen Him hath seen the Father (Joh 14:9). As it is love that has inspired the Father in the mission of His Son, so it is love that is the animating principle in the life of the Son who is one with the Father—love to the Father on the one hand (Joh 14:31), and love to His own in the world on the other (Joh 13:1, Joh 15:13). As the Father has loved Him, so He has loved His disciples (Joh 15:9). He sets His love before them as an example, and bids them love one another as He has loved them (Joh 13:34, Joh 15:12). The highest proof of His love is given in His death (Joh 10:15, Joh 15:13). The Son lays down His life willingly in obedience to the commandment of the Father (Joh 10:17 f.). For this the Father has given the Son (Joh 3:16 ἔδωκε, if not to be restricted to the giving to the death, may be taken, in view of Joh 3:14, cf. Joh 12:32, to include this reference); and the result will be the consummation of the gracious purpose which animated the Father in the giving of the Son. The cross will become the centre of attraction. Through it Christ will draw all men unto Him

(Joh 12:32, Joh 8:28, Joh 11:52, cf. Joh 10:15 f.), and gain the victory over the prince of this world (Joh 12:31). Thus will the love which impelled the Father to the sacrifice of the Son gain the end it seeks to attain, man's deliverance from the destruction which threatens him, and participation in the blessing of everlasting life (Joh 3:15 f., Joh 6:40).

Such is the aspect under which the love of God is presented in the Fourth Gospel. It is in the Person of Christ that we have the full and complete revelation of that love. He is God's love incarnate. The Prologue gives the keynote to the whole Gospel. Christ is the Word become flesh, the perfect revelation in human personality of the Divine nature. He is the only-begotten Son (or only-begotten God, if we adopt the reading $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ instead of $\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$), who has declared the Father to us (Joh 1:18). With God in the beginning (Joh 1:2), He was made flesh, and dwelt among us (v. 14). The glory that we behold in Him is a full revelation of the Divine glory, for His relation to the Father is that of an only son who receives the whole of his father's inheritance (*ib.*). And that glory is the glory of one who reflected in His own person the Divine love, who was full of *grace* and truth (*ib.*), and of whose fulness we have received, in ever increasing measure, participating in the grace which flowed from Him.

3. The mutual love of God and Christ.—The words 'Father' and 'Son' as applied by Christ to God and man in their relations to one another have, as we have seen, an ethical significance. It is by His love that God proves Himself the Father. It is by exhibiting a love like to that which God displays that man becomes the son of God (Mat 5:45). The terms do not lose their ethical content when used to describe the relation in which God and Christ stand to one another. The God whom Christ revealed to men as 'the Father' He had known first of all as His own Father. Such He had felt Him to be from His childhood (Luk 2:49). So He addressed Him in prayer (Mat 11:25 f., Mar 14:36, Luk 23:46); so He spoke of Him to others (Mat 10:32 f., Mat 11:27; Mat 18:19; Mat 18:35, Luk 22:29). He knew Himself to be in a special sense the object of the Divine love. He had been anointed of the Spirit for the performance of the work for which He was sent (Mar 1:10, Luk 4:18-21), and endowed with a power whereby He might triumph over every hostile influence (Luk 10:19; Luk 11:20). In a remarkable utterance (Luk 10:22, Mat 11:27) Christ describes the intimate relationship in which the Father and He stand to one another, 'All things are delivered to me of my Father; and no man knoweth who the Son is but the Father; and who the Father is but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him.' The mutual knowledge which Father and Son have of one another is based upon that mutual love indicated by the terms Father and Son. Christ claims to be able to reveal God in His character of Father ($\tau\iota\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu \acute{\omicron} \pi\alpha\tau\eta\rho$) as no one else, for none can have such knowledge of the Father's love as the Son, who knows Himself to be in the supreme degree the object of that love (Mar 1:10), and can say of Himself that all things are

delivered unto Him of His Father, *i.e.* all things necessary for the fulfilment of the Father's gracious purpose. And the Father can reveal Himself thus to the Son because of the love with which that Son responds to His love, and the meekness and submission with which He surrenders Himself to the Father's will (Mat 11:29, Mar 14:36). It is evident that in this striking word of Christ's regarding the mutual knowledge of the Father and the Son, the words 'Father' and 'Son' are not mere names to denote the persons concerned, but are used to suggest that mutual love upon which the knowledge is based. And indeed all through the Synoptic Gospels there is always a suggestion of this relationship of mutual love in the manner in which God and Christ are spoken of as Father and Son. Whether, when Christ is spoken of in the Synoptics as the Son of God, there is more than this ethical relationship implied, is a question upon which there is difference of opinion. But it is admitted, even by those who attach a deeper significance to the designation, that, in the first instance at any rate, it has an ethical content, and that, when Christ is called the Son of God, whatever more may be implied, so much in any case is suggested, that on the one hand He is the supreme object of the Father's love, and that on the other He exhibits in His Person in its perfection that loving obedience whereby man may become the son of God.

In the Fourth Gospel the references to the love of the Father and the Son to one another are more frequent and more express. Christ is the only begotten Son (Joh 3:16), loved by the Father before the foundation of the world (Joh 17:24), and now returned to the bosom of the Father (Joh 1:18). He and the Father know one another intimately (Joh 10:15). The Father loves Him, and has given all things into His hand (Joh 3:35). As in the Synoptic account of the announcement at the Baptism, Christ is called the beloved Son in whom God is well pleased (Mar 1:11), so in Jn. the love of the Father is occasionally represented as being based upon the Son's obedience to the Father's commandment (Joh 15:10) and willing sacrifice of Himself (Joh 10:17). The Father never leaves Him alone (Joh 16:32), for He does always those things that please Him (Joh 8:29). Because He keeps His Father's commandments He abides in His love (Joh 15:10). No higher estimate can be given of the Saviour's love for His disciples than to say that He has loved them as His Father has loved Him (Joh 15:9), nor of the love of God for believers than to compare it to that of the Father for the Son (Joh 17:23). Sometimes the love of God for believers is represented as based upon that of the Father for the Son (Joh 14:21; Joh 14:23, Joh 16:27).

And as the Father loves the Son, so the Son loves the Father. He alone has seen and known the Father (Joh 3:11; Joh 3:32, Joh 6:46, Joh 7:29, Joh 8:55, Joh 10:15). He does nothing of Himself, but only what He seeth the Father do (Joh 5:19). He speaks only as His Father hath taught Him (Joh 8:28, Joh 12:50). His meat is to do the will of Him that sent Him (Joh 4:34). It is love to the Father (Joh 14:31) no less than love

to His brethren (Joh 13:1, Joh 15:13) that is the motive that animates Him in the fulfilment of His vocation. In virtue of the love which unites them one to the other, each may be said to be in the other, the Son in the Father and the Father in the Son (Joh 10:38, Joh 14:10; Joh 14:20, Joh 17:21; Joh 17:23). They have no separate interests. Whatever belongs to the one belongs to the other (Joh 17:10). The Father and the Son are one (Joh 10:30, Joh 17:22).

4. The love of man for God.—There is comparatively little under this heading to be found in the Gospels. It is true that Christ has Himself given as the first commandment of all, that which enjoins the love of God with the whole heart and soul and mind and strength (Mar 12:28 ff.), and in the same spirit in the Fourth Gospel He finds the final explanation of the unbelief of the Jews in their lack of this love of God (Joh 5:42). But so far as the former of these passages is concerned, it is evident that Christ's answer to the scribe is purposely couched in language borrowed from the Old Testament; and it is a noteworthy fact that at other times, when He has no occasion to conform to OT modes of expression, Christ does not give prominence to the duty of love towards God.

Ritschl has drawn attention to the fact of how small a part the love of man towards God plays throughout the NT as a whole. 'Love is reserved as the characteristic of God and God's Son in the foundation and guidance of the congregation, while of its members faith or trust in God and His Son is demanded' (*Rechtf. u. Vers.* ii. 100 f.). B. Weiss thinks that Christ keeps the commandment of love to God in the background, because where the love of God does not awaken such love in return it would be of no avail to demand it (*Bib. Theol. of NT*, § 25b). Wendt, while recognizing that the idea of love corresponds well, on the whole, to the filial relationship, believes that it is too general, and does not give sufficient prominence to the relation of subordination and complete dependence in which man stands to God. To express the feeling of whole-hearted devotion to God suggested by the idea of love, while at the same time giving full recognition to His infinite love and power, Christ selected the term 'trust' ($\tau\rho\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$) as the one most suitable to describe the disposition man should display (*Lehre Jesu*, ii. 227).

Whatever the reason, we must recognize the fact that neither in the Synoptics nor in the Fourth Gospel, with the exception of the passages referred to, do we find Christ dwelling on the love which man should cherish towards God. But though He speaks of man's trust in God rather than of his love towards Him, we must not overlook the fact that this trust which Christ seeks to inspire is but love under a slightly different form. It is the response of the human heart to the infinite love of God,—love on the part of man awakened by the love of God, yet humbling itself in the presence of One who, though the Father, is yet Lord of heaven and earth. Without love there can be no such

trust as Christ seeks to inspire. The prayer in which this trust finds expression must be the outpouring of a heart full of love to God and of zeal for the establishment of His Kingdom. The righteousness which becomes the members of the Kingdom must be righteousness not of outward conduct alone, but of a heart which takes delight in the performance of the Divine will. The believer is to seek first the Kingdom and the righteousness of God (Mat 6:33), to have his heart fixed on the heavenly treasure (Mat 6:21), to be filled with whole-hearted devotion to the service of God (Mat 6:24), and to renounce, no matter at what cost, whatever may hinder him in the attainment of the great end set before him (Mar 9:43-48, cf. Mat 13:44 ff.). Though there may be little explicit reference in the teaching of Christ to the love for God which man is required to cherish, we feel that in the case of the believer no less than in that of Christ Himself, it is the source from which springs all the strength for the performance of duty and the endurance of suffering, and that, just as Christ accounted for the unbelief of the Jews by the utter lack in them of this love of God (Joh 5:42), so, if we trace back to its beginnings the faith which the gospel inspires, it will be found to issue from the love to the Father who has revealed Himself in Christ.

5. The love of man for Christ.—Of love for Christ there is almost no mention in the Synoptics. In one utterance, indeed, Christ requires His followers to love Him more than their closest earthly relatives (Mat 10:37). But the purpose of that saying, as is proved by the parallel passage, Luk 14:26, is not so much to insist on a personal affection for Himself as the condition of discipleship, as to emphasize the supreme worth of the good represented by His own Person, compared with which the joys of family life are to be esteemed as nothing. The nearest approach to any reference to love of Himself as a motive for conduct is to be found in those passages in which He puts His own Person in the foreground, requiring of His disciples a readiness to sacrifice themselves for His sake (Mar 8:35; Mar 10:29), and attaching high importance to the most trivial acts done in His name (Mar 9:37; Mar 9:41). On these occasions He identifies Himself with His cause. When He requires devotion to Himself, it is only another way of requiring devotion to the truth revealed in His Person. Thus He speaks of sufferings borne for His sake and the gospel's (Mar 8:35; Mar 10:29, cf. Luk 18:29), and of being ashamed of Him and of His words (Mar 8:38, Luk 9:26). In this spirit He welcomed the love displayed by the woman who anointed His feet in the Pharisee's house, as a proof of the sincerity of the repentance which filled her heart, and of the vastness of the blessings she was conscious of having received (Luk 7:47).

In the Fourth Gospel, where the personal relation to Christ is so strongly emphasized, there is more direct reference to love as the disposition the believer may be expected to display towards Christ. Jesus tells the Jews that if God were their Father they would love Him, for He proceeded forth and is come from God (Joh 8:42). Of the disciples He says, on the other hand, that the Father loveth them because they have

loved Him, and have believed that He came from God (Joh 16:27). Something is, indeed, still lacking in their love. He tells them in His farewell address that if they loved Him they would rejoice because He said that He went unto the Father (Joh 14:28). But though their love be not perfect, He can confidently reckon upon it. He would only remind them, as He does more than once in the course of that address, that a true love for Him will manifest itself in the keeping of His commandments (Joh 14:21; Joh 14:23 f.). So it had been with His own love for the Father (Joh 14:31). So let it be with the disciples. Let them prove the sincerity of their love to Him by the loyalty of their obedience. Such a relationship to Himself, love manifesting itself in faithful fulfilment of His commandments, is the condition upon which the giving of the Paraclete is promised (Joh 14:15 ff.). Where it exists, Christ promises the enjoyment of the closest communion with the Father and Himself (Joh 14:21; Joh 14:23). It is quite in keeping with the emphasis that has been laid upon love throughout the Gospel as the relation which must exist between the disciple and Christ, that in the final scene with Peter in the Epilogue He should thrice address to him the question, 'Lovest thou me?' (Joh 21:15-17), as if to suggest that such love is the indispensable qualification on the part of one who would be a true shepherd of Christ's flock.

In view of these quotations, it is difficult to understand Ritschl's statement (*Rechtf. u. Vers.* iii. 560), that, apart from Joh 21:15-16, there is no reference in the NT to love towards Christ. Certainly it is the case that, for the most part, faith is the usual formula to indicate the relation of the believer to Him. But it is quite in accordance with the general character of this Gospel, with its conception of a mystical union between the believer and Christ (Joh 15:1 ff.), to use warmer colours to paint the devotion of the believer, and to describe that complete self-surrender to Christ, which is the true relation to Him, as the work of love.

6. The love of man to man.—Alongside of the first great commandment to love the Lord our God, Christ places a second, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself' (Mar 12:31). The high importance He assigned to this duty is evident from the place He gives it alongside of the commandment to love God. 'There is none other commandment greater than these' (*ib.*). Both are ethical in their nature. The ceremonial observances in which Christ's contemporaries thought to find the fulfilment of this first commandment are never to be allowed to stand in the way of the performance of the offices of love towards our fellow-men. These latter, because they are ethical, are the weightier matters of the Law which are on no account to be omitted (Mat 23:23). To refuse to support one's parents, on the plea that one desires to make an offering of the money that might be used for this purpose, is to make a travesty of religion (Mar 7:9-13). The ethical stands above the ceremonial. God desires mercy, not sacrifice (Mat 12:7). The first commandment may be to love the Lord our God, but when it is a question of showing love towards our brother man or

performing some act of worship towards God, there can be no doubt which is to come first, 'Leave there thy gift before the altar, and first go thy way; be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift' (Mat_5:23 f.).

In the enunciation of this second great commandment, Christ specifies the love which men are required to show for one another as the love of one's *neighbour*. Doubtless the word was suggested by the precept from Leviticus which He quoted, just as the form of the first commandment is based, as we have seen, upon the language of Deuteronomy. When we inquire as to the wideness of the circle denoted by the term 'neighbour,' we seem to find an answer in the parable of the Good Samaritan, which was told, according to Lk., in response to the question that had been put, 'Who is my neighbour?' (Luk_10:29-37). But in its present form that parable gives no satisfactory answer to the question. After telling the story of what befell the traveller, how he was maltreated by the thieves and passed by in his miserable plight by the priest and the Levite, and how at last the Samaritan took compassion on him, Christ asks, 'Which now of those three, thinkest thou, was neighbour unto him that fell among the thieves?' The answer is, the Samaritan; and the conclusion of the parable seems to be that it was the traveller's duty to love the Samaritan, *i.e.* that the term 'neighbour' is wider than the lawyer who had put the question seemed to imagine, and must be held to embrace any who by their conduct prove themselves worthy of the name, whether they be Jews or not (so Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, ii. 268). This is certainly the logical conclusion from the parable as it at present stands, but it is questionable whether this can have been the lesson Christ desired to enforce by it. It starts with the object of proving who is one's neighbour in the sense of *diligendus* (Luk_10:29), and ends by proving who is the traveller's neighbour in the sense of *diligens*, Luk_10:36 (Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, ii. 596). The nearest approach that it reaches to a definition of the term 'neighbour' in the sense required is contained in the 'Go and do thou likewise' with which it concludes. The usual method of interpreting the parable is to find the answer to the question in the practical lesson enforced by that exhortation, and to conclude that our neighbour is anyone who requires our help. But in view of the immediately preceding statement that the neighbour of the traveller was the Samaritan who had compassion on him, it seems utterly incongruous to conclude that the design of the parable is to teach that one's neighbour is not one's benefactor, but anyone that one can benefit, *i.e.* in this case that the traveller was the neighbour of the Samaritan. So we can only conclude that Lk. is responsible for the introduction of the parable in connexion with this question of the lawyer's, and that whatever the original purpose for which it was related, it was certainly not designed to give an answer to the question, 'Who is my neighbour?' in the sense of 'Who is the person I am required to love?'

But the precise scope of the term 'neighbour' in the mouth of Christ is of the less importance, as it is only on the occasion of His interview with the scribe

(Mar 12:28-34, Mat 22:35-40) that He thus defines the limits within which one is to show love towards one's fellow-men, and there, as we have seen, He is evidently formulating His answer in the language of the OT commandment. In opposition to the narrow sense in which the term 'neighbour' was interpreted by His contemporaries, who could add to the injunction to love their neighbour a corollary to the effect that they were to hate their enemy (Mat 5:43), Christ enjoined a love which was to embrace both friend and enemy (Mat 5:44 f.). The Golden Rule which Christ has given men to guide them in their offices of love takes us far beyond the circle of neighbours in the narrow Jewish sense. The command runs, 'All things whatsoever ye would that men (not your neighbours) should do unto you, do ye even so to them' (Mat 7:12). We are to show love to all. 'Whosoever shall smite thee,' 'if any man will sue thee,' 'whosoever shall compel thee,' 'he that asketh thee,' 'he that would borrow of thee,'—these are the phrases with which Christ introduces those to whom He commands His disciples to show love (Mat 5:39-42). Sometimes He describes them as 'brothers' (Mat 5:22; Mat 5:24, Mat 7:3-5, Mat 18:15; Mat 18:21 f., Mat 18:35), not in the sense of those who are bound to us by natural ties, in which sense brotherly love is practised by the Gentiles as well (Mat 5:47), nor in the sense of fellow-citizens of the Kingdom of God (so B. Weiss; Westcott, *The Epistles of St. John*, note on 1Jn 2:9), in which sense the word would reproduce in a new form the limitation that attached to the Jewish interpretation of the term 'neighbour,' but in the same wide sense as He applies the term 'Father' to God. He is the Father not only of the members of the Kingdom, but of all mankind (Mat 5:45), and by using the term 'brother' to denote the objects of our love, Christ will suggest that it is to be a love as wide and all-embracing as that of the Father in heaven, who bestows His bounties on good and evil,—a love not only of those who are members of the Kingdom of God, but of all who have the right to look up and claim God as their Father in heaven (Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, ii. 270 f.). The command to forgive our brother his trespasses (Mat 18:35) is interpreted in the widest sense in Mat 6:14 f., when, in place of forgiving our *brother*, Christ speaks of forgiving *men* their trespasses.

From various occasional utterances of Christ we can form a general idea of the nature of the love which He expects men to display in their relations to one another. Its unselfishness on the one side, and its interest in the welfare of others on the other, are features which continually appear in the exhortations in which He seeks to inculcate it. In illustration of the unselfish spirit which He commends, He urges His hearers to invite to their banquets not their friends and kinsmen who may invite them in return, but the poor, the maimed, the lame and the blind, who cannot recompense them (Luk 14:12 ff.). In the same spirit He bids men lend, hoping for nothing (Luk 6:35, according to the translation of μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες best suited to the context). Another aspect of the unselfishness which is characteristic of the spirit of love Christ would instil, is the suppression of those vindictive feelings which are prone

to rise when we experience ill-treatment from others. We are required to forgive those who have wronged us, not seven times, but seventy times seven (Mat 18:21 f.): to be so far from resenting injury we receive from another that we turn the other cheek to the smiter, allow him who would take away our coat to have our cloak also, and go two miles with him who would compel us to go one (Mat 5:38-42); to love our enemies, and to pray for them that persecute us (Mat 5:44). Again, this unselfishness will exhibit itself in the absence of all self-assertion or desire to attain pre-eminence among our fellows. Such self-exaltation is characteristic of the scribes and Pharisees (Mar 12:38 f., Mat 23:5 ff.), and of the Gentiles (Mar 10:42, Luk 22:25). But the follower of Christ, who came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and who was among His disciples as he that serveth, will be ready to stoop to the lowliest service (Mar 10:43-45, Luk 22:26 f.), and will seek for self-exaltation only through self-abasement (Luk 14:11).

But while love is thus regardless of self, it will ever seek to advance the good of others. It will give readily to supply their demands (Mat 5:42, Luk 6:30). Nay, it will be quick to anticipate them. It will teach us to put ourselves in their place and realize what they stand in need of. 'All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them' (Mat 7:12, Luk 6:31). We shall not hesitate to share with them our earthly goods. 'It is more blessed to give than to receive' is a saying of Christ's preserved by St. Paul (Act 20:35) which is not recorded in the Gospels. In the picture which Christ has painted of the Judgment, He claims as offices of love performed towards Himself acts of kindness done to our unfortunate fellow-creatures (Mat 25:34-40). That is the wise use of our riches whereby we make to ourselves friends of those whom we benefit (Luk 16:9). But we shall care not only for our brother's worldly interests, but also for his spiritual welfare. We are solemnly warned to give heed lest we cause him to stumble (Mar 9:42, Luk 17:1 f.). It is not the will of our Father which is in heaven that one of these little ones, *i.e.* the humblest member of the Kingdom of God, should perish (Mat 18:14). And while we are careful to avoid the censorious spirit which takes delight in uncharitable judgment of the faults of others (Mat 7:1 f.), we shall still feel it our duty to rebuke our brother when he trespasses, and to endeavour to reclaim him from his sin (Mat 18:15 f.).

One other point worthy of notice in connexion with the duty of brotherly love which Christ inculcates, is the light in which this duty is presented in view of the love which we experience at the hands of God. At the root of all that Christ says regarding the love which we should display to one another lies the great truth of the Fatherhood of God. That word of St. John's, 'We love because he first loved us' (1Jn 4:19), expresses the position which Christ takes up. To forgive another his trespasses and to recompense an injury with kindness, to love one's enemies and to pray for them that persecute one, appears the height of magnanimity from the standpoint of the natural man. But Christ puts the matter in a new light. He reminds us of the love with which

God treats man, undeserving as he is, and of the readiness with which He forgives us our offences. In the parable of the Unforgiving Servant (Mat 18:23-35) He exhibits in its true light the conduct of the man who, freely forgiven at the hands of God, yet refuses to forgive his brother who has offended him. And as our indignation burns at the behaviour of the unforgiving servant in the parable, we realize that so far from the forgiveness of those who have offended us being the magnanimous conduct we had imagined, it is a simple duty, the non-fulfilment of which calls for severest condemnation.

In the Fourth Gospel the duty of love to our brother is laid down with the utmost distinctness, though the references are comparatively few. As in the Synoptics Christ had summed up the Law and the Prophets in the Golden Rule to do unto others whatsoever we would that they should do to us, so here He concentrates His ethical teaching to His disciples in the new commandment to love one another as He has loved them (Joh 13:34; Joh 15:12). It was a new commandment in the new emphasis with which it was enjoined, in the new place assigned to it as the one principle in which the Law and the Prophets find fulfilment (Mat 7:12; Mat 5:17 ff., cf. Rom 13:9, Gal 5:14), in the new sanction it received through the appeal to Christ's own example. He declares that the keeping of this commandment is the sure test whereby His disciples may be recognized by others (Joh 13:35). It is by their fulfilment of it alone that they may enjoy such close communion with Him as He enjoys with His Father (Joh 15:10; Joh 15:12). He has given them an example in His own Person of the love they are to practise. At the last meal with His disciples, at which this new commandment was given, He had Himself washed their feet, to enforce the injunction to lowly service which He laid upon them (Joh 13:14 ff.). But this act of condescension on the part of the Master was typical of the self-denying love which He had displayed throughout His whole intercourse with them, that love which reached its culminating point in the willing sacrifice of His life. It is to this that He points when He urges them to love one another as He has loved them. 'Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends' (Joh 15:13).

It has been urged that the brotherly love which is thus commended in the Fourth Gospel falls short of that enjoined in the Synoptics, in respect that it is limited to the circle of the Christian brotherhood. While Christ in the Synoptics commands us to love our neighbour, and insists that the love which He enjoins must embrace not only our friends but our enemies, we read in the Fourth Gospel of a love *for one another* (Joh 13:34-35; Joh 15:12; Joh 15:17). The reciprocal pronoun points to a limitation of the love to the Christian brotherhood. The Christians are known not by their love for others, but by their mutual love amongst themselves (H. Holtzmann, *Handcom.* on Joh 13:13, *Neutest. Theol.* ii. 388 f.; O. Holtzmann, *Johannesevang.* 76, 266). And as the love which the believer is exhorted to practise is limited to the Christian brotherhood, so also, it is maintained, is that of Christ Himself, which is held up as an

example. The Fourth Gospel and St. Paul both cite the death of Christ as the highest proof that can be given of His love; but St. Paul finds in it a proof of His love for His enemies (Rom_5:6 ff.), whereas the Evangelist adduces it as a proof of His love for His friends (Joh_15:13). Such love of friends, it is maintained, is the highest love the Gospel recognizes. Of love for one's enemies it knows nothing (O. Holtzmann, *ib.* 87, 276; H. Holtzmann, *Handcom. on Joh_15:13, Neutest. Theol.* ii. 477).

We must admit that there is so much truth in the contention that, as a matter of fact, the love referred to in Joh_13:34 f., Joh_15:12; Joh_15:17 is a love of Christian brethren for one another. It would be quite unwarrantable to find the novelty of the commandment Joh_13:34 in the wideness of its scope, to which there is no reference at all in the context. But it is equally unwarrantable to explain that novelty as consisting in the narrowness of the circle within which Christ, in the context, insisted on its fulfilment, as if this commandment to practise brotherly love were an advance upon the old injunction to love one's neighbour. (So Grotius: 'Novum autem dicit, quia non agit de dilectione communi omnium, sed de speciali Christianorum inter se, qua tales sunt'; cf. Kölbinger, *SK [Note: K Studien und Kritiken.]*, 1845, pp. 685-694). It is a mistake to take the commandment in any exclusive sense, as if there were any contrast implied to the wider commandment of the Synoptics. Christ speaks of the love of Christian brethren for one another, either because He had had occasion immediately before to give His disciples a lesson on the manner in which they should be ready to render loving service to one another (Joh_13:4-17), or because it was natural to look for the display of this spirit of love He would inculcate first of all within the smaller circle of those who stood in close relation to Him and to one another. It is not a question of confining their love to their Christian brethren, but of displaying it towards those with whom they come into closest contact.

In the same way as Christ urges them to show their love to those who stand nearest to them, He represents His own love as issuing in the sacrifice He made for them, His friends. He does not mean that it was because of the love they had shown Him as friends that He responded with this culminating proof of love in return. On the contrary, He calls them friends because they are the objects of His love (Joh_15:15 f.). His sacrifice has not been evoked by the friendship they have displayed. It is rather their friendship that is the response to the love He has cherished for them, of which that sacrifice was the culminating proof.

While we recognize, then, that in this farewell conversation with His disciples, the love which Christ urges them to display is in the first instance a love of one toward another, we cannot admit that there is any intention on the part either of the Evangelist or of Christ Himself to limit the practice of it to the Christian brotherhood. The circumstances in which the address was spoken sufficiently explain the form in which the commandment is given, and the manner in which Christ's example is

appealed to. The Teacher who had inculcated a love which was to embrace friend and enemy alike might well feel constrained to give His own disciples the commandment to love one another. And He who had given His life as a ransom for many might well remind those who stood nearest to Him that they were among the many for whom the sacrifice was made, and appeal to them to love one another as He had loved them.

Literature.—Sartorius, *The Doctrine of Divine Love*; Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*, ii.; *NT Theol.* of B. Weiss, Beyschlag, H. Holtzmann, Stevens; Ritschl, *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*; Rothe, *Theol. Ethik*; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*, chs. xiii. xiv.; F. W. Robertson, *Serm.* iv. 222; Law, *Serious Call*, ch. xx.; Butler, *Serm.* xi.-xiv.; C. A. Briggs, *Ethical Teaching of Jesus*, 97, 114.

G. Wauchope Stewart.

☩ Lowliness

LOWLINESS.—The modest attitude of mind and demeanour which characterized our Lord as a man. It is in contrast with, though not in contradiction to, the greatness both of His station and of His claims. He describes Himself (Mat 11:29) as ‘lowly in heart,’ and the word employed (ταπεινός) is accurately translated by the English ‘lowly’ and the Lat. *humilis* as denoting that which is near the earth, low as opposed to lofty, bowed down as opposed to erect. Though sometimes used in a bad sense, as indicating meanness of spirit, this is not at all its necessary or common signification. In the moral sense it is opposed to proud, haughty, self-assertive. The adjective occurs elsewhere in the NT (Luk 1:52, 2Co 10:1, Jam 1:9; Jam 4:6, 1Pe 5:5); and the noun ταπεινοφροσύνη and the verb ταπεινῶω are even of more frequent occurrence. Both noun and verb are used by St. Paul (Php 2:3; Php 2:8) in describing the κένωσις of Christ, where a twofold lowliness is declared of Him: (1) in *becoming* man, (2) *as* a man. In the prophecy of Zechariah (Zec 9:9) the Messianic King is foretold as being ‘lowly and riding upon an ass’; but in the passages where the prophecy is quoted (Mat 21:5, Joh 12:15), the action is given in both cases. The adjective is altogether omitted by St. John, and is rendered ‘meek’ (πραύς) by St. Matthew. See also artt. Meekness and Humility.

E. C. Dargan.

☩ Luke

LUKE.—The only reliable sources for the life of Luke are his Acts of the Apostles, and, in a very slight degree, his Gospel, and the Epistles of St. Paul. The biography found in many Manuscripts of the Gospel in Latin, and printed, for example, in Wordsworth and White's *Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine*, Pars i. (Oxonii, 1889-1898), pp. 269-272, can hardly be considered reliable, by whomsoever composed. Some of its statements will be quoted below.

1. *Name.*—The name Λουκᾶς appears to be unexampled elsewhere. The modern accentuation is no doubt correct, and this at once proclaims it as a contraction or shorter form of some other name. It belongs in fact to the class of pet names (*Lallnamen, Kosenamen* in German), as a glance at the long list of such in Jannaris' *Historical Gr. Gram.* (London, 1897), § 287, will show. The NT itself is not without examples of such names; Σίλας (Σιλῆας) for Σιλουανός, Ἀμπλιᾶς ([Rom_16:8](#)) for Ἀμπλιᾶτος, Ὀυμπᾶς ([Rom_16:15](#)) for Ὀλυμπιόδωρος, Δημᾶς ([Col_4:14](#)) for Δημήτριος, Ἐπαφρᾶς ([Col_4:12](#)) for Ἐπαφρόδιτος, Ἀπολλῶς for Ἀπολλώνιος, Ζηνᾶς ([Tit_3:13](#)) for Ζηνόδωρος, Ἀντιπᾶς ([Rev_2:13](#)) for Ἀντίπατρος, Στεφανᾶς ([1Co_16:15](#)) for Στεφανηφόρος. The shorter names are less technical and more friendly than the others. There can be little doubt that Λουκᾶς is short for Λουκανός, and indeed this latter form is very frequent in the oldest forms of the Latin Bible, in the title of the Gospel. There appears to be no example of the nominative in Manuscripts, but the accusative *lucanum* is regular (see C. H. Turner in *JThSt [Note: ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.]*, vi. (1904-1905), pp. 256-258). Monsignor Mercati, of the Vatican Library, has found an instance even of the nominative, on the sarcophagus of Concordius at Arles, *matteus marcus lucanus iohannes* (*ib.* p. 435).* [Note: The present writer has recently seen it on the mould of this sarcophagus at the Museum of St. Germain near Paris.] The name *Lucanus* suggests 'Lucanian,' a native of the district of Southern Italy; it also suggests the Latin poet, a member of the *gens Annaea*, nephew of Seneca the philosopher. But neither of these suggestions seems to lead us further in the attempt to trace the ancestry or family of the Third Evangelist.

2. *Origin.*—The Latin biography above referred to calls Luke a Syrian of Antioch. This is almost certainly due to a mistaken interpretation of [Act_13:1](#), where a different person, with a different name, Lucius, is mentioned. If that be not the explanation, the selection of Antioch may be due to a guess, which sought to connect him with an important city. Some have thought that 'Antiochensis' is right, but that 'Syrus' is wrong, and would claim him for Pisidian Antioch, a place of much less importance. In the absence of other evidence, this second theory would be possible, as Pisidian

Antioch is much nearer the historical scene on which he first appears and figures prominently in the missionary journeys of St. Paul. The Book of Acts itself, however, seems to yield up the secret. If we concentrate our attention on that part of the narrative which tells of St. Paul's visit to Philippi, we observe certain peculiarities about it which distinguish it from the other parts. In the first place, we observe that in Act 16:9 'a certain man of Macedonia' (τις implies that the author could name him if he chose) is mentioned as appearing to St. Paul in a dream at Troas, and inviting him to cross over into Macedonia. In the following verse, the first 'We' passage begins:—'we sought immediately.' The Macedonians did not differ from other Greeks in their appearance or dress, and why should the author conceal the name of the Macedonian, if not from modesty? The present writer can feel no doubt that Luke and Paul met in Troas, and conversed together, expectant of a sign of the Spirit's will; that, as the result of their impressive talk, St. Paul saw a vision of his companion of the previous day, who appeared to be addressing him in the words of Act 16:9; and, in accordance with the belief of the time, considered—who shall say wrongly?—that the Spirit had spoken through this dream. Act 16:12 of ch. 16 is even more important in this connexion for the information it supplies:—'Philippi, which is a city of Macedonia, the first of its district, a *Roman* colony.' The characterization of Philippi might almost be styled gratuitous. Since the battle of b.c. 42 this place was well known to all persons of any education. Further, one might judge from this passage that it was the only Roman colony mentioned in Acts. This is far from being the case. Corinth, Lystra, Ptolemais, and Pisidian Antioch, to mention no others, were also Roman colonies; yet the author affixes the title to Philippi only. Again, we know that Philippi was not regarded by all as the chief town of its district. The author is clearly taking a side as against those who regarded Thessalonica or Amphipolis as the chief town of that district. The rivalry between cities was a characteristically Greek quality, which finds a parallel in the more modern rivalry between Dôle and Besançon. An instance in Asia Minor was that between Smyrna, Ephesus, and Pergamum. We shall not be wrong in regarding the author as a native of Philippi. His fondness for the sea and all matters nautical, as well as his choice of a profession almost entirely confined to Greeks, already proclaim him a Greek. There are other indications that point to Philippi as his native place. Act 16:13 of ch. 16, 'where we *thought* there was a place of prayer,' is quite natural, if the author, being a Gentile, had only a rough idea where the Jewish place of prayer in his native town was. Again, when Paul and Silas go to Thessalonica (Act 17:1), Luke is left behind in Philippi, and reappears in that neighbourhood afterwards (Act 20:4-5).

3. Notes on his Life.—Of Luke's early life little can be said, and that little is inference derived from his two books. If he were the son of a Greek freedman of a Roman master, this would account both for his name and his history. From the character of the language of his writings it is evident that he had a good education, both rhetorical

and medical. It is impossible to say where he was educated, as higher education was widespread in the Greek world. About his disposition something can be said. From the frequent references to the poor in his Gospel and his loving attachment to Paul, as well as his self-effacement, it seems not too fanciful to picture him as a man of modest, tender, sympathetic, and constant nature. His circumstances appear to have been good; otherwise he could hardly have followed Paul as he did, ministering to his ailing body. The present writer has little doubt that the reason why Titus, though a valued coadjutor of St. Paul, is not mentioned in Acts, is that he was Luke's brother, especially as the only natural way to take the words τὸν ἀδελφόν in 2Co_12:18 is as 'his brother,' *i.e.* the brother of the man previously mentioned, that is, of Titus. Luke as a teacher was not so prominent as Titus, and hence is not named there. The true meaning of the passage would have been understood long ago, had it not been for the obscuration produced by the ecclesiastical sense of the term 'brother.'

The only part of Luke's life of which we know much is the part he spent travelling in St. Paul's company. They met first at Troas, and journeyed together from there by Samothrace and Neapolis to Philippi (Act_16:10-12). In Philippi Luke remained after Paul had gone, and they appear to have been separated for a little over five years (according to Ramsay's chronology). After meeting again, almost certainly at Philippi (Act_20:3-5), they appear to have remained together till the death of St. Paul. Certainly they were together on St. Paul's last journey along the coast of Asia Minor and Syria, up to Jerusalem (Act_21:15), and on the eventful voyage to Puteoli and Rome (ch. 27). In Rome he appears with St. Paul (Col_4:14, Phm_1:24). It is probable that he devoted himself mainly to medical and literary work, and not so much to evangelization. The Latin biography states that he never married, and that he died at the age of 74 in Bœotia (some Manuscripts, Bithynia). Another tradition has it that he died at Constantinople, and his sarcophagus, said to have been brought from there, is now pointed out in the Church of Santa Giustina, at Padua.

Literature.—The above art. is largely indebted to Sir W. M. Ramsay's *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*⁸ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , the most sympathetic study of Luke in existence. See also his *Was Christ Born at Bethlehem? A Study in the Credibility of St. Luke* 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; cf. R. J. Knowling's Introduction to the Acts of the Apostles in *The Expositor's Gr. Test.*, vol. ii. (Lond. 1900); Hobart, *The Medical Language of St. Luke* (Lond. 1882); Harnack, *Lukas der Arzt* (Leipzig, 1906).

A. Souter.

☛ Luke, Gospel According To

LUKE, GOSPEL ACCORDING TO

- i. The Synoptic Problem.
 1. Solutions offered in the past.
 2. Priority of St. Mark.
 3. The doctrine of a proto-Mark, of a deutero-Mark, and of a trito-Mark.
- ii. Analysis of St. Luke's Gospel according to the sources used.
 1. First Source—St. Mark.
 2. Second Source—St. Matthew's *Logia*.
 3. Third Source—a Pauline Collection.
 4. Fourth Source—Anonymous Fragments.
 5. Fifth Source—a Private Collection (from the Holy Family?).
 6. Editorial Notes.
- iii. Points of contact with St. John.
- iv. St. Luke's characteristics.
- v. Date of writing.

Literature.

i. The Synoptic Problem.—To a student of the Synoptic Problem St. Luke's Gospel is the most interesting of the three. Indeed, we may confidently affirm that, but for St. Luke, the Synoptic Problem would never have existed. For the connexions between St. Matthew and St. Mark are comparatively simple and are easily explained. It is only when we read St. Luke that the perplexing questions which constitute the Problem arise. We have first to explain the fact of his omissions (*a*) of Markan matter, (*b*) of Matthaean; next, his additions (*a*) of narrative, (*b*) of discourse; thirdly, his variations

from the other Gospels in arrangement (*a*) of Markan matter, (*b*) of Matthaean; then we must examine his editorial work, which consists (*a*) of prefaces to introduce a section, (*b*) of conclusions to wind it up, (*c*) of explanatory notes, (*d*) of corrections, alike in fact, in style, and in grammar; lastly, we must consider cases where he agrees with St. Matthew against St. Mark, and cases where he alone of the Synoptists has some contact with St. John. Anyone who attempts to solve the Problem by neglecting one or more of these factors, may fascinate the reader by the simplicity of his proposals, but he does so at the expense of success. He has not really grappled with the Problem, and therefore has not solved it. If, on the other hand, the reader thinks the proposals which are here offered too intricate; if he accuses the writer of vacillation, because two or more solutions are frequently offered of the same difficulty, let him reflect that in mathematics—the most exact of sciences—a similar fact may be observed. For every quadratic equation has two solutions, and when the Radeliffe Observer published his calculation of the distance of the sun from the earth, the answer came out as a double quadratic with four variations. Similar complications should be expected in an intricate literary problem like this. Let the beginner cultivate patience and suspense of judgment. He will have made good progress, if he learns to suspect the man who is too simple or too confident.

1. Solutions offered in the past.—Augustine, bishop of Hippo, at the close of the 4th cent., was the first writer who made a serious attempt to solve the Synoptic Problem. He was guided partly by tradition, but chiefly by a careful examination of the internal evidence which the Gospels offer. In that age it was perhaps inevitable that he should assume, what modern critics are almost united in denying, that the Apostle Matthew was the author of the First Gospel in its present form. From this fundamental error it inevitably followed that he assumed the priority of St. Matthew, and spoke of St. Mark as the ‘abbreviator and humble follower of St. Matthew.’ St. Luke he held to have copied from the other two. Augustine’s influence in the Western Church was so transcendent, that his opinion on these intricate questions was accepted without examination until quite modern times. Strange to say, the founders of the famous Tübingen school in theology, though they reversed most of the traditional beliefs, adhered to this. They upheld the priority of St. Matthew, not for any literary reason, but for a dogmatic one. The miraeulous element is somewhat less prominent in St. Matthew than it is in St. Mark; therefore, they argued, he must be the earlier writer.

2. Priority of St. Mark.—The notion of the priority of St. Matthew has, however, been so completely beaten off the field, that we need not spend time in refuting it. Suffice it to say that even so conservative a writer as Dr. Salmon, the late Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, admitted that St. Mark’s is the arehaic Gospel. And no wonder, for it is simple where the others are complex; it is meagre where they are rich; it is a chronicle while they are histories; it contains Latin and Aramaic words which they

have translated or removed. For example, in Mar 15:39 we find the Latin word κεντυρίων, but in the parallel passages St. Matthew writes ἐκατόνταρχος and St. Luke ἑκατοντάρχη. Both Evangelists felt that they must not disfigure their pages with St. Mark's 'barbarism,' and the different forms which they used indicate independent action. Who, on the other hand, could suppose that St. Mark found ἐκατόνταρχος in St. Matthew, and deliberately altered it into κεντυρίων, or that St. Luke found ἑκατόνταρχος, and deliberately altered it into ἑκατοντάρχη? For these and other reasons it is maintained in all orthodox schools of criticism that St. Matthew and St. Luke made use of St. Mark. Indeed, St. Mark's Gospel furnishes the historical framework for the others. Equally certain is it that St. Matthew and St. Luke were unacquainted with each other's writings. Whatever agreement exists between them in non-Markan sections comes from their use of a common source. Augustine therefore is wrong in every particular.

3. The doctrine of a proto-Mark, of a deutero-Mark, and of a trito-Mark.—It has, however, long been debated whether St. Mark's Gospel in its complete form lay before St. Matthew and St. Luke. Many critics have held that St. Luke, at any rate, had only an *Urmarkus*—a term which has been used in Germany to signify a document shorter than our St. Mark, earlier in date, and free from those 'picturesque' additions which strike the reader of St. Mark's Gospel. Of late years there has been a growing tendency, both in Germany and in England, to repudiate the doctrine of an *Urmarkus*. Dr. Swete, without arguing the question at length, expresses the opinion that we can dispense with it. The Dean of Westminster is more positive in setting it aside. Nor is this surprising. Those who reject the oral hypothesis are beginning to feel that they cannot multiply documents at pleasure. *Litera scripta manet*. If St. Mark's Gospel circulated in the Apostolic age in three widely different editions, it is impossible to believe that the first and second editions perished without being noticed by such scholars as Origen and Jerome. Nor is it conceivable, as some maintain, that St. Mark entrusted his first edition to St. Luke, who incorporated it into his Gospel, but allowed no one else to make use of it. No wonder that with men who have an historical sense such hypotheses are unpalatable. But the oral hypothesis readily admits of, nay requires, these gradual growths in St. Mark. Under it there is no difficulty whatever in believing that St. Luke's (oral) St. Mark was much shorter than St. Matthew's, and that St. Matthew's had not received the final touches. In fact, the oral hypothesis solves the Synoptic Problem. The documentary hypothesis fails to do so. Both are equally hypothetical. And those who declare the oral hypothesis to be incredible have never, as yet, fairly tackled the arguments on which it rests, or sufficiently taken into account the habits of the East and of that age. This, however, is not the place to plead for the oral hypothesis, nor has the present writer any wish

to do more than demand for it a dispassionate consideration. In the examination which follows he will not assume its truth.

ii. Analysis of St. Luke's Gospel according to the sources used

1. First Source—St. Mark.—St. Mark's Gospel (oral or written) was not merely used by St. Luke, it forms the backbone of his Gospel. It is hardly too much to say that without St. Mark there would have been neither a St. Luke nor a St. Matthew. But, as we have already intimated, there is strong reason for concluding that St. Luke used a much shorter work, not merely than our St. Mark, but than the St. Mark which lay before the redactor of St. Matthew. In short, he used an *Urmakus* or an (oral) proto-Mark. By adopting this view we account at once (a) for his omissions, (b) for his variations from St. Mark's order. He omitted nothing which his St. Mark contained: he adhered to St. Mark's order in every section which he took directly from St. Mark. The marvellous simplification of the Synoptic Problem which this view offers can be appreciated only by those who have seriously endeavoured to explain to themselves and justify to others St. Luke's omissions and his order.

But St. Luke's omissions are so important that we must consider them at some length. In the *Synopsis* St. Mark's Gospel is divided into 223 sections, of which St. Luke omits 54. A group of sections is omitted between Mar 3:22; Mar 4:1. A much larger group—amounting to more than two out of St. Mark's 16 chapters—is omitted between Mar 6:17; Mar 8:26. The remaining omissions consist of single sections scattered over the rest of St. Mark's Gospel. Only from Mark 2, 5 are no sections omitted. It is manifestly the duty of the critic to account for these omissions, and attempts have been made by harmonists to do so. Thus they have suggested (1) that St. Luke omitted what his readers would not value: being a Gentile himself, and writing for Gentiles, he naturally omitted sections which dealt with questions of Jewish interest; (2) that he objected to repetition, and left out what he regarded as dittographies; e.g. having given the feeding of 5000, he thought it unnecessary to narrate the feeding of 4000; having described the anointing of our Lord's feet, he deemed it superfluous to record the anointing of His head. These reasons, however, are quite inadequate. St. Luke is particularly fond of alluding to Jewish customs, and Gentile Christians have always taken a deep interest in them. Furthermore, the great majority of his omissions cannot be accounted for under either of the above heads. Thus he omits 25 out of St. Mark's 86 proper names. He does so in defiance of his instincts as an historian (Wright, *NT Problems*, 56-90). Again, he omits the healing of the Syrophœnician's daughter (Mar 7:24-30)—the only case in which our Lord is recorded to have healed a Gentile. He omits the only journey which our Lord is said to have taken through Gentile lands (Mar 7:31 to Mar 8:10). He omits our Lord's teaching about the inferiority of the moral precepts of the Old Testament to those of the New (Mat 5:27; Mat 5:31; Mat 5:33; Mat 5:38; Mat 5:43). All these topics were

of overwhelming interest to Gentile readers, and we find it impossible to believe that St. Luke deliberately rejected them. The only satisfactory hypothesis is that he was not acquainted with them, as he would not be if he used a shorter recension of St. Mark and of the *Logia*.

(a) Now, if St. Luke used an earlier recension of St. Mark, whether oral or written, it is reasonable to suspect that in several places he has preserved for us the primitive Petrine wording. He will occasionally be nearer to St. Peter's teaching than is either St. Matthew or St. Mark. For, if the trito-Mark has made many additions to the primitive records, so also has he sometimes altered the tradition. In the index to the *Synopsis* nine passages are pointed out in which St. Luke's account is held to be the oldest, but there are probably many more. At any rate it is of the greatest advantage to the critic to feel that he is not always bound to vindicate the priority of St. Mark in details, however highly he may value it on the whole. And although subjective reasoning must always be received with caution, it ought not to be altogether discarded.

(b) Although St. Luke omits, as we have seen, 54 out of St. Mark's 223 sections, he does not always omit them entirely, but has preserved short fragments or 'scraps' of 24 out of the 54. These 'scraps' are always misplaced in his Gospel. In fact, the departure from St. Mark's order is our chief means of detecting them. (They may be seen in the *Synopsis*, Table I. a). No one is likely now to maintain that these 'scraps' were copied directly from a written St. Mark. It is surely incredible that they should have been torn from their context and misplaced. But if these 'scraps' came to St. Luke orally, is it conceivable that he was so careless as never to have discovered that he had a full account of them in writing before him? To the present writer's mind the very existence in St. Luke's Gospel of these 'scraps' is conclusive proof that he used an abbreviated St. Mark. When, therefore, these 'scraps' reached him, he was not aware that they were Markan. For, if we mistake not, there were in the Apostolic age two kinds of oral tradition, both of which contributed much to the composition of St. Luke's Gospel. First there was a vast body of uncodified fact, *rudis indigestaque moles*. Striking sayings were remembered apart from their surroundings, striking deeds were recorded without mention of place or person. These passed from mouth to mouth informally. Secondly, there was the regular course of catechetical teaching preserved by those catechists to whose ill-requited toil St. Paul bears testimony in Gal 6:6. From these men St. Luke derived the sections of the proto-Mark in their invariable order: from the former source he derived the 'scraps' of the deutero-Mark together with much other matter.

(c) St. Matthew's redactor frequently introduces non-Markan material into a Markan section, mixing the two together to the reader's confusion. St. Luke avoids doing this,

as a rule, rightly feeling that his sources ought to be treated with respect. But, of course, all the 'scraps' are amalgamated with and lost in other matter.

(d) There are cases in which St. Luke corrects the proto-Mark or forsakes it in favour of other sources. Not only does he polish St. Mark's style in a multitude of instances, but in his third chapter he gives (with some additions) the account of the Baptist which he found in the second Source, preferring it to the much shorter account which is found in St. Mark. The same thing is done in Mar 3:22-26. He differs from the proto-Mark in holding that only one of the malefactors who were hanged reviled our Lord, the other turned to Him for help (Luk 23:39). In the account of the Eucharist (according to the true text) he puts the administration of the Cup before that of the Bread (Luk 22:17-19), following in all probability a local liturgical usage of which several traces remain. These changes must have been made deliberately. And in all cases in which St. Luke or St. John corrects St. Mark, it is reasonable to believe that they had good warrant for doing so.

(e) It used to be argued that the testimony of four men is true, and those passages which are found in more than one Gospel were held to be doubly or trebly attested. Criticism has considerably altered our view of this matter. No doubt the 'Triple tradition' deserves special respect. When three Gospels agree *verbatim* (as they seldom do for more than a few words at a time), they are reproducing a source which must be as old as, and may be considerably older than, any of them. Tradition assigns St. Mark's Gospel to St. Peter's teaching, and we are entitled to claim that at least the proto-Mark may in large measure be regarded as his work. In this there is scope for apologetics. But it is evident that, if three Evangelists are reproducing the same Source, they may be reproducing its defects as well as its excellences. Their agreement proves the antiquity, but not the infallibility, of the original. Now Papias expressly asserts that St. Mark's Gospel is defective in order. And when we examine it critically we find that it is arranged topographically. It takes us first to the Jordan valley for our Lord's Baptism, then to Galilee for His ministry; after that comes a journey to Jerusalem, followed by the Passion. Finally, the lost verses must have contained a journey into Galilee, for such a journey is expressly enjoined on the disciples. All three Synoptics adopt this arrangement, except that the final journey into Galilee is omitted by St. Luke, belonging, as it does, to the deutero-Mark. Can we accept St. Mark's arrangement, supported, as it is, by St. Matthew and St. Luke? Is the testimony of three men true? No one until quite modern times has ever thought so. The traditional account is that it is partly true. The Galilaean ministry was broken by visits to Jerusalem, which St. John alone records. In ignoring them the Synoptists were wrong. But the ministry in Jerusalem which the Synoptists give is assumed to have been unbroken by visits to Galilee, and must therefore merely be adjusted with John 12-20. This is improbable. St. Mark assigns 360 verses to the ministry in Galilee, which is commonly supposed to have lasted three years, 251 to the ministry in

Jerusalem, which lasted about a week. Events in real history seldom move so rapidly. Our contention is that St. Mark is, as Papias says, and as his contemporaries probably well knew, defective in arrangement. Not only ought the ministry in the North to be broken by several visits to Jerusalem, but St. Mark's account of the ministry in Jerusalem ought to be broken by several visits to Galilee. Both ministries must be split up and dovetailed together, if we would attain to the true sequence of events. St. John corrects St. Mark by putting the Cleansing of the Temple into the first year's ministry (Joh 2:13-22) instead of the last. The traditional view that there were two cleansings is discredited in every other case, and is particularly incredible here. But if St. Mark has misplaced it, he has misplaced also some other sections which adhere to it. And although we cannot with any confidence decide at which particular visit to Jerusalem each of the recorded events happened, it is an enormous gain to the historian to be at liberty to distribute them.

2. Second Source—St. Matthew's Logia.—When Papias wrote that 'St. Matthew compiled the *Logia* (or Utterances of our Lord) in the Hebrew dialect, and each man interpreted them as he was able,' he cannot, as the traditionalists suppose, be alluding to our First Gospel, which was written (at Alexandria?) in Greek. Critical opinion is fast coming round to the view that St. Matthew compiled, not a formal Gospel, but a collection of our Lord's Utterances, which was incorporated into our First Gospel, and formed so distinctive a feature of it, that the whole book was with some justice called 'the Gospel according to St. Matthew.' And if this collection was originally oral, as many who deny an oral Mark are ready to admit, there is nothing strange in our contention that St. Luke used it, when it was much shorter: in fact, he used a proto-Matthew. In that way we explain his omissions, which are more glaring even than his omissions from St. Mark.

The question of order, which was complex in the case of the first Source, is simple here. For St. Luke's order is entirely different from St. Matthew's. Except on the rare occasions when St. Mark furnishes a clue, as he does in the account of the Baptist and of the Temptation, St. Luke arranges the *Logia* in one way, St. Matthew in another. Which, then, of these arrangements is to be preferred? Which Evangelist reproduced St. Matthew's order? Not the redactor of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, for he has massed most of the *Logia* into five huge Discourses, which are impressive for Church reading, but can hardly correspond to any actual Sermons. Many critics, however, incline to believe that St. Luke has preserved the original order, because he has so scrupulously followed the order of the proto-Mark. Even if he has done so, we must not assume that he is any nearer the truth, for we have no right to suppose that St. Matthew, any more than St. Mark, had regard to anything else in arrangement than convenience in Church teaching. It seems to us, however, that there is considerable evidence to show that originally the *Logia* were piled one upon another in confused disorder, as they are in the Oxyrhynchus fragment, with no other prefaces

than 'Jesus said' or 'John said.' Their arrangement into speeches was the work of later hands (*Synopsis*, xxv). If so, this was done by the art of conflation, which consists in picking out all the Utterances which dealt with one subject and arranging them into an artificial speech on that subject. Such speeches, of which the Sermon on the Mount is a typical example, do not correspond to any Sermon that was ever preached, but are compiled for the simplification of teaching, and for the preservation of important Utterances which were in danger of being lost. St. Matthew prefers long confluations. One of these covers three chapters (Matthew 5-7), another two (24, 25), and three more one each (10, 13, 23). St. Luke's confluations are shorter, never filling one chapter. They are therefore more numerous (we reckon nineteen of them) and more compact; for, whereas it is difficult to say what is the subject of the Sermon on the Mount or of the Charge to the Twelve, there is no such difficulty with St. Luke. In St. Matthew's Eschatological Discourses (24, 25) the prophecies respecting the destruction of Jerusalem and those respecting the Second Coming of the Son of Man are inextricably blended together, as though the redactor regarded the two events as synchronous, whereas St. Luke separates them (Luk 17:20-37; Luk 21:5-38), and it may well be that our Lord habitually did so.

The hypothesis of confluations may come as a shock to those who have been brought up in the belief that the Sermon on the Mount is a single discourse. We credit the Evangelists with some audacity. Their literary morality must not be judged by the standard of this century. They were composing Gospels and not formal histories. They were providing for the need of an age which lived in daily expectation of the return of their Lord. The work was done wisely and well, for it has stood the test of time; but we must understand its limitations if we really care to attain to the truth.

That the art of conflation was a real thing, actually practised by the Evangelists, can be fully proved only by a detailed examination into all the confluations; and for that we have no space now; but it may help to remove prejudice if we compare St. Matthew's Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5-7) with St. Luke's Sermon on the Plain (Luk 6:20-49). Both begin with Beatitudes, and both end with the same Warning. We conclude, therefore, that the source contained the nucleus of a sermon. But the proto-Matthaeus had only three short and one long Beatitude, for St. Luke gives no more. In St. Matthew five others have been added by the deutero-Matthaeus. St. Luke's Beatitudes, short and long, are all expressed in the second person, owing to an editorial change made by him for the purpose of securing literary uniformity. In St. Luke, Woes follow the Blessings. St. Matthew contains Woes, but not here. Either, therefore, St. Luke borrowed these Woes from another source unknown to us, or they are mere editorial work to enhance the Blessings. Their close uniformity to the Blessings favours the latter view. The wording of the Warning, with which the Sermons end, has been slightly altered in St. Luke to suit the comprehension of readers who did not live in Palestine, and would not know the action of winter

torrents on a wady. Between the Beatitudes and the Warning the Source must have contained some Utterances setting forth the Law of Love. Besides these, St. Matthew has collected much material, St. Luke comparatively little; for St. Matthew's Sermon contains 107 verses, St. Luke's only 30. Yet we cannot regard St. Luke's Sermon as an abbreviation of St. Matthew's. True, he reproduces 26 out of St. Matthew's 107 verses; but he reproduces 32 more of them in other parts of his Gospel, spreading them over no fewer than seven chapters. Again, he gives in his Sermon four passages (Luk 6:24-27; Luk 6:34-35; Luk 6:37-38) which are not found in St. Matthew at all, and therefore do not come from the *Logia*. He adds two (Luk 6:39-40) which are given by St. Matthew in a different context. We are justified, therefore, in regarding the Sermons as in large part independent confluations. St. Luke's subject, as usual, is precise, being simply the statement of the Law of Love; but the most that we can say for St. Matthew is that he seems here to be setting forth the duty of Christian laymen, while in the charge to the Twelve he gives our Lord's teaching about the duty of the clergy.

It is a further proof of the fact of conflation that in some cases, where the subject-matter is so clearly marked that two Evangelists have collected the utterances respecting it, which may have been widely separated in the Source, into one conflation, they have nevertheless arranged the sections in different order. Thus in the Temptation, St. Matthew gives the second and third Temptations in one order, St. Luke in another. In the passage about the Ninevites, and Solomon and the Queen of the South (Mat 12:38-45, Luk 11:24-32), two such differences of arrangement occur. In the Woes on the Pharisees, St. Luke's order (Luk 11:37-54) differs repeatedly from St. Matthew's (Mat 23:13 ff.), and the deuterio-Matthaeus supplies fresh Woes. It is, of course, possible that St. Luke was dissatisfied with St. Matthew's order, and thought to improve upon it; it is more probable that he was not acquainted with it.

In cases where the subject is less clearly marked, the Evangelists collect the utterances into independent confluations. But there is one very instructive example. Both Evangelists have gathered together our Lord's teaching on the subject of prayer. St. Matthew has put it into the Sermon on the Mount (Mat 6:5-13), St. Luke into an independent conflation (Luk 11:1-13). St. Luke, however, has very properly included in his conflation the utterance, 'Ask, and it shall be given you,' etc. St. Matthew has put this also into the Sermon on the Mount, but in a different department (Mat 7:7-11). Why is this? The words 'pray' or 'prayer' do not occur in it, and the redactor of St. Matthew, acting, as we are all liable to do, mechanically, did not perceive that this *Logion* dealt with prayer. St. Luke was more observant.

That the original *Logia* had no prefaces beyond 'Jesus said,' etc., is shown by four remarkable cases in which St. Matthew (Mat 3:7; Mat 12:24; Mat 12:38; Mat 16:1)

applies to the scribes and Pharisees, *i.e.* to the ruling class, denunciations which in St. Luke (Luk 3:7; Luk 11:15-29; Luk 11:16) are addressed to the lower orders. Plainly the Evangelists were left to gather from the contents of the *Logion* the persons to whom it was addressed. St. Luke's pronounced dislike of the rabble made him incline to them, while St. Matthew's indictment of the upper class led him into the opposite direction. It may well be that both Evangelists were mistaken. At any rate the limitations under which they worked must be acknowledged by all seekers after truth.

The contents of the second Source may be seen in the *Synopsis*, 187-239. St. Luke's parable of the Pounds is identified with St. Matthew's parable of the Talents, and St. Luke's parable of the Great Dinner with St. Matthew's of the Marriage Feast.

3. Third Source—a Pauline Collection.—If the first Source contained a good deal of triple tradition, and the second Source a good deal of double tradition, the remaining sources consist almost entirely of single tradition. Again, St. Mark contains a small quantity of single tradition, added (we believe) by the trito-Mark. St. Matthew gives a considerable amount; but St. Luke surpasses them both in respect of quantity and interest. And first we must recognize in his Gospel a collection of nineteen discourses, parables, and stories which stand by themselves, and may be called Pauline from their character (*Synopsis*, 241-250). We do not mean that St. Paul had much, if anything, to do with their wording; but some one in sympathy with Pauline teaching must have edited them. Our Lord spoke the words, but credit must be given to the collector who preserved them from oblivion. And if in St. John's Gospel it is more and more recognized that the mind of the Evangelist cast the utterances of our Lord into the peculiar form which they there hold, the same process of redaction may be observed in St. Luke, who comes nearest of the Synoptists to the methods of St. John. The story of the Prodigal Son is the crown of this division, but the stories of the Good Samaritan, of the Pharisee and the Publican, of the woman who washed our Lord's feet with her tears, are scarcely of inferior interest, while the parable of the Unjust Steward, when properly interpreted, is full of interest, and that of the Rich Man and Lazarus of difficulty. The more we consider this collection, the more entranced we are with it. It is the very cream of the Gospel, and yet (strange to say) it is peculiar to St. Luke.

In all cases, but especially in those of the single tradition, the question arises, How near do our records come to the actual words of Christ? The traditionalists, although they are forced to admit that in the triple and the double tradition some doubt may exist through the divergences in three, or two, Gospels, quietly assume that in the single tradition we have a *verbatim* report. To this assumption the critic is unable to assent. If the triple tradition was first taught by St. Peter, and confirmed by the general consent of the Churches; if the double tradition was taught by St. Matthew

and diffused extensively, the single tradition was later in formation, lays no claim to Apostolic origination, and must have been known to few, or else by its intrinsic interest it would often have found its way into more Gospels than one. It is possible that St. Philip the Evangelist was the worker to whom we are indebted for the third Source; but it is mere guesswork to say so; there are no solid grounds for argument. We do not therefore claim for the single tradition the same authority that we claim for the others. The work of an editor is often conspicuous in it, and always to be suspected. And yet it would be mere scepticism to throw much doubt on these utterances, many of which vindicate their claim to have been given by Him who spake as never man spake. When a witness recollected only one or two sayings of our Lord, his memory would be specially trustworthy. The apologist has no cause to fear, but he must recognize the human element which plays its part in all Scripture. In this division the human element, if we are not mistaken, may be most clearly seen in the narrative of the washing of our Lord's feet by the woman who had been a sinner (Luk 7:36-50). Our view of this most perplexing section is that its groundwork belongs to the deutero-Markan, being identical with the Markan account of the anointing of our Lord's head. It has been misplaced by St. Luke, but he misplaces all the deutero-Markan sections which he gives. St. Luke agrees with St. John in saying that the feet, not the head, were anointed. In this, according to our contention, St. Luke and St. John are simply following St. Mark's original narrative. In the Gospels according to St. Matthew and St. Mark the feet have been changed into the head, because the Psalmist wrote, 'Thou anointest my head with oil' (Psa 23:5). The early Christians were always searching for fulfilments of Scripture, and in some cases the primitive records have been changed to secure a more complete fulfilment. Such changes appeared legitimate to the literary morality of that age, and we have no right to object (*Synopsis*, 269).

4. Fourth Source—Anonymous Fragments.—To this Source we assign 80 fragments of St. Luke, of which nine are found also in St. Matthew, but, of course, in a different context. If the sections in the third Division lack Apostolic authority, still more probable is it that these do so. Nay, to some of us it may appear their chief glory, as it is of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that their authors are unknown. Hundreds of Christians in Palestine had seen our Lord in the days of His flesh, and every one of them would treasure up some personal reminiscence. The great majority of these have inevitably been lost, but a few were so widely known and so much valued that they forced their way into local Church tradition and so passed into one—seldom into two—Gospels. All this is quite certain to the historian. But, of course, difficulties about chronology arise. Probably most of these fragments are widely misplaced. Thus St. Luke (Luk 5:1-11) by a conflation blends the Draught of fishes with the deutero-Markan account of St. Peter's Call. St. John places it (in what we believe to be its true position) after the Resurrection (Joh 21:1-14). Now, as St. Luke leaves no room either in his Gospel or in the Acts for a visit to Galilee after the Resurrection, it

is at last being confessed that he was not aware of such a visit, and therefore it was quite natural for him to infer that the Draught of fishes belonged to St. Peter's Call, and indeed explains his readiness to rise and follow Christ without question. But, if this had been the true connexion of events, it is incredible that St. Mark, if he gives St. Peter's account of the call, did not mention it (*Synopsis*, 13).

If in the deutero-Mark and in the *Logia* St. Luke was content to find a literary connexion for many of our Lord's Utterances, it is no wonder if he did so in the fourth Source. He certainly endeavoured to write, as he says, 'in (chronological) order,' but in many cases he had not the detailed information which was necessary for doing so. St. Luke's Gospel is probably the least chronological of the three (as we shall show hereafter more fully), but in all the Gospels criticism teaches us to value the picture more than the frame; to treasure the Utterance, but esteem at a much lower value the setting which the Evangelist has given it.

5. Fifth Source—a Private Collection (from the Holy Family?).—St. Luke's first two chapters, together with the Genealogy, the Sermon at Nazareth, and the Raising of the widow's son at Nain, form our fifth and last Division. Marcion rejected the first two chapters and many other sections from his canon. Wellhausen omits them from his edition of St. Luke. The Bishop of Ely infers from Act 1:1; Act 1:22 that they were no part of the first edition of the Gospel. The present writer has long taught that they are among the latest additions to the Gospel, and that they never were part of the oral teaching: beyond that we can hardly go. The idea that St. Luke issued two editions of his Gospel has gained few converts, and Dr. Blass, its chief advocate, assigns these chapters to both supposed editions. That they proceed from St. Luke is shown by the literary connexions which Sir John Hawkins has traced.

This Division bears testimony to the fact, which Irenaeus records, that there was difference of opinion in the early Church on the question of the Virgin Birth. St. Paul is silent on that subject, showing, perhaps, that it had not been raised in his day. St. John alludes to it in his own peculiar way (Joh 1:45). Both Genealogies seem to have issued from Ebionite circles, in which our Lord's descent from Joseph was affirmed. They have been altered with some rather clumsy editorial changes, to make them square with orthodox belief. But the trito-Mark has altered the wording of a passage (Joh 6:3) with a view to support the Virgin Birth (*Synopsis*, xli), while St. Matthew's first chapter and St. Luke's second strenuously assert it. There can be no doubt that, when once the question was raised, it was answered in widely different Churches in no hesitating way. East and West, at Rome and in the provinces, belief in the Virgin Birth became a test of orthodoxy.

In St. Matthew, Joseph is the hero, and all action is taken by him. Mary is kept in the background, in accordance with Eastern feeling. But in St. Luke, Elisabeth and Mary

are brought forward. Honour is claimed for women, as it is throughout the Third Gospel.

It is obvious that the story told in these chapters, unless it be regarded as a free invention, must have been derived, directly or indirectly, from the Virgin Mary herself. The style is strangely Semitic, in striking contrast to the four verses of preface. Not only was the original narrative told in Aramaic, but the translator has closely imitated the language and manner of the LXX Septuagint, feeling that he could thus best convey the meaning. Few parts of the Gospel have been more popular than this. The Sermon at Nazareth (Luk 4:16-29) is conflated, much of a (misplaced) deutero-Markan section having been worked into it. But it shows additional information; and long ago the observation was made, that St. Luke's knowledge of events at Nazareth is unique. If he had intercourse with some member of the Holy Family, the mystery is explained.

6. Editorial Notes.—The editorial element in all the Gospels is very great, for ancient authors took immense pains to reduce the crude chronicles which they used into literary form. In Herodotus, Thucydides, Livy, and Tacitus the charm of style is all their own, and it must have been gained by unsparing labour. Nor did inspired authors deem it unnecessary to take pains. Nay, the Divine treasure which they held in earthen vessels demanded and received all the skill which they possessed. Both St. Luke and the redactor of St. Matthew are artists of a high order.

Editorial changes, however, though they often improve upon the original, do so at some sacrifice. The substitution of a more elegant word alters the precise meaning of the original. The critic's endeavour must always be to recover the primitive wording. And in the triple tradition he can generally feel sure of his ground; in the double tradition there is more room for subjective preferences; while in the single tradition he has little else to guide him. Just where the records are most likely to be obscured, the means of verifying them disappear. We cannot attain to greater certainty than God has given.

St. Luke's editorial contributions are manifold and important. He had sources of information which are closed to us. Even his own opinion is of high value. But, nevertheless, he worked under limitations, and an exact scrutiny throws some doubt upon many of his assertions.

Let us first consider the general arrangement of his Gospel, which, as we have said, depends almost entirely on St. Mark. The first thing which strikes us is the extraordinary fact, that whereas St. Mark describes our Lord's last journey to Jerusalem in 52 verses, which St. Matthew expands to 64, St. Luke devotes to it no fewer than 408: more than one-third part of his whole Gospel. How are we to

understand this amazing disproportion? First, let us look at the 'Travel Narrative' in itself. It contains a very few and slight Markan 'scraps': so few, that we are entitled to call the whole of it non-Markan. There is a good deal of matter which has been taken from the second Source; this, of course, is arranged by St. Matthew in an entirely different way. But much of the material is peculiar to St. Luke. For example, sixteen out of the nineteen sections of the third Source are embedded here.

Harmonists say that St. Luke is giving us a Peraean ministry, in which our Lord repeated much of what He had taught in Galilee. But who were these Peraeans, that the wealth of the third Source should have been reserved for them? St. Luke gives us no help in answering that necessary question. Not a single town or village is named until we reach the Markan Jericho. If there was a door open to our Lord at all in Peraea, it would seem to have been among those Galilaeen pilgrims who passed through Peraea on their way to keep the Feast. But there are other difficulties. We are distinctly taught that our Lord gradually withdrew from public teaching, first speaking only in parables, and finally confining Himself to the training of the Twelve. But here within a fortnight of His death (though harmonists try to lengthen the journey, and, indeed, change it into several journeys, with visits to Jerusalem and retirements into Galilee of which St. Luke says nothing) some of the simplest and plainest of His teaching is set forth. Again, why does St. Matthew put so many of these sayings into the Sermon on the Mount or the Charge to the Twelve? The theory of repetition is entirely unsatisfactory (*NT Problems*, 30-39).

We have little doubt that a different explanation must be found. If St. Luke's sole guide to chronology was St. Mark, what was he to do with non-Markan matter? The difficulty confronted him continually. New materials reached him, while he taught at Philippi, by every ship which arrived. Seldom did the new fragments contain any clue to their date or occasion. If they were not worked into his oral teaching they would soon be forgotten. Some niche must be found for them. And he began, it would seem, by placing them into this last journey. Slowly they accumulated until they reached their present proportions. The famous 'Travel Narrative' is therefore really a collection of undated material. The extraordinary vagueness which characterizes this Division favours that view. It is discourse matter, but quite indeterminate. Some of the most striking parables have no further preface than 'He said,' and there are no indications of locality except that He was still on the journey. St. Luke's idea was that our Lord brought forth the best of His treasures as the time of His departure drew nigh: it is a noble conception, but not in agreement with what we learn from the other Gospels. The matter (we believe) is scarcely arranged at all, and always wrongly.

If this be so, it is no wonder that we attach low historical value to those editorial prefaces with which St. Luke introduces so many sections in this 'Travel Narrative,'

and, indeed, outside it also. Such prefaces appear usually to be inferences from the contents of the passage or transferences from other occasions. Thus the parable of the Marriage Feast according to St. Matthew (Mat_22:1-14) was spoken in the courts of the Temple. But the parable of the Great Dinner, which we identify with it, was, according to St. Luke (Luk_14:15-24), part of a long discourse at a Pharisee's dinner table: the machinery of the dinner table is made much of by St. Luke in binding the conflation together. St. Luke stands alone in telling us that our Lord on three occasions (Luk_7:36; Luk_11:37; Luk_14:1) accepted hospitality from Pharisees. There is reason to think that the last two of these occasions are due to transference or assimilation.

St. Luke, like the other Synoptists, seems to have thought that our Lord's ministry lasted one year only—'the acceptable year of the Lord' (*NT Problems*, 182-194). He appears to have placed our Lord's Birth after Herod's death, though St. Matthew distinctly places it before that event. For a discussion of this difficult question the present writer may be allowed to refer the reader to his edition of St. Luke's Gospel. Suffice it here to record the conviction that, though St. Luke has done much for us in connecting our Lord's life upon earth with secular history, his Gospel is very far from being arranged with the chronological accuracy at which he aimed. He was working in a place and amid surroundings which precluded historical research, and, when he visited Palestine, it was too late to recast the whole work of his life.

Philosophy was sedulously cultivated among the Gentiles for whom St. Luke wrote. All the more earnest thinkers, who were attracted by Christianity, had been brought up as neo-Platonists or Stoics. They would, of course, bring their philosophy with them into their new religion. Christianity became to a considerable extent leavened by Hellenistic thought. This is what our Lord foretold in the parable of the Leaven, rightly interpreted. Now Plato taught the indestructibility of the soul. But in Mat_10:28 God is declared to be 'able to destroy both soul and body in hell,' which is the usual Biblical doctrine. St. Luke (Luk_12:5) has altered this into 'him who has power to cast into hell.' It would seem that he, or his informant, did this to avoid giving offence to the Platonists. In the Markan account of the Agony in Gethsemane (Mar_14:32-42) there is much to perplex a Stoic, who believed that a good man is never perturbed. All trace of agony is absent from St. Luke's account (cf. (Revised Version margin) at Luk_22:43 f.); perhaps because the proto-Mark did not contain it; more probably because St. Luke has deliberately struck it out.

St. Luke has long been accused of Ebionism, because the rich are severely handled in his pages, and because he expressly commands us to part with all our property (Luk_12:32-34); whereas St. Matthew (according to the Greek) bids us only think more highly of the heavenly than of the earthly treasure (Luk_6:19-21). St. Luke was certainly not an Ebionite, or he would not have defended the Virgin Birth or praised

Joseph of Arimathaea. In speaking words of severity against the rich he is probably faithfully reproducing our Lord's words, which were wont to be incisive. The strongest of all these sayings against the wealthy is preserved in the proto-Mark (Mar_10:25), and it is followed by a declaration in which our Lord Himself cautions us against interpreting His utterances with prosaic literality. Nor have Christians generally supposed that He intended us to pluck out our right eye or cut off our right hand and foot.

The most striking example of editorial addition in St. Luke is that in which he attributes the three hours' darkness to a solar eclipse (Luk_23:45). In saying so he cannot be right for many reasons (*Comp. of the Gospels*, 119).

iii. Points of contact with St. John.—If St. John's teaching was esoteric, intended for advanced disciples only, we shall better understand the rarity of the occasions on which allusions to it are found in the sub-Apostolic age. But that it existed orally for many years before it was committed to writing, is indicated not only by its own characteristics, but by several cases in which it is simpler to assume that one of the Synoptists learned a fact from St. John than that St. John learned it from him. Many passages are pointed out in the index to the *Synopsis* in which the trito-Mark is held to have drawn from St. John's oral teaching. There is one case where St. Matthew does so. And we have now to consider cases where St. Luke appears to have followed their example. We have already seen that St. Luke agrees with St. John that our Lord's feet were anointed and not His head. But in that matter we held that St. Luke is reproducing the original deutero-Markan statement which has been corrupted in St. Matthew and in the trito-Mark. The trito-Mark tells us that the day of the Crucifixion was Friday (Mar_15:42). This statement St. Luke repeats (Luk_23:54), but in a different context and in different language. The simplest explanation of these peculiarities and of the absence of the words from St. Matthew is that both Evangelists, directly or indirectly, derived their information from St. John. Finally, St. Luke and St. John tell us that the sepulchre in which our Lord's body lay was a new one, 'where no one had yet lain' (Luk_23:53).

iv. St. Luke's characteristics.—St. Luke the Gentile was cosmopolitan in his sentiments. St. Luke the beloved physician had sympathy for the sorrows of mankind. The words of pity which he records were drawn from the all-compassionate heart of the Saviour, but to St. Luke is due the credit of preserving them from oblivion. To his literary skill we are probably right in attributing some of the beauty of their form. St. Luke the disciple of St. Paul tells of the publican, who durst not so much as lift up his eyes to heaven, but kept smiting his breast and saying, 'God be merciful to me the sinner' (Luk_18:13). He tells of the traveller by the wayside, stripped, wounded, and half-dead, and how the good Samaritan had pity upon him (Luk_10:30-37). He tells of the Prodigal, wandering in thoughtless levity from home, spending his substance in

riot and revelry, and then eating the husks which were thrown to the swine; and how the father had compassion upon him and welcomed him home (Luk 15:11-32). He tells of the poor woman who had been a sinner in the city, coming behind and washing the Saviour's feet with her tears (Luk 7:36-50); of the robber's appeal on the cross, 'Lord, remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom' (Luk 23:39-43). These and other passages which set forth the freeness and fulness of pardoning love have been preserved to us only in the writings of St. Luke, who had more pity for the weak and for the suffering, for widows and for the poor, than any other NT writer.

St. Luke was no idealist. He had a literal, matter-of-fact mind, which blurted out facts without glossing them. We have seen how he records without reservation the command to part with our possessions, as St. Barnabas and others in their first love did (Act 4:36-37). Being a physician, he nevertheless had the strongest belief in the truth of demoniacal possession, understanding literally what was originally given as a burst of insanity (Mar 5:9 with parallels). He stands alone in affirming that our Lord, after His resurrection, ate a piece of broiled fish before His disciples (Luk 24:41-43). To this he refers, probably in Act 1:4, certainly in Act 10:41. Many persons in modern times have felt some difficulty in reconciling this with the general Scripture account of the nature of our Lord's resurrection body. It may be one side of the truth which is apt in these days to be ignored; in a coarser age it was the only side that was accepted. Ignatius supports it in the saying which he preserves: 'I am not an incorporeal demon' (*Smyr.* iii. 1).

v. Date of Writing.—St. Luke's Gospel is not, like St. Mark's, a bare record of our Lord's deeds and words, but, to a considerable extent, a theological exposition of their meaning. St. Luke, like his master St. Paul, has reflected on them, and is anxious to impress on the reader his own ideas about them. Such action demands time. In spite of 1Ti 5:18, we cannot admit that St. Luke wrote before St. Paul's death.

Again, if we observe the treatment in his pages of the destruction of Jerusalem, contrasting his precise language (Luk 21:20) with the vague predictions in St. Mark (Mar 13:14), we can hardly doubt that he wrote after the event, and edited the wording accordingly. The end of the world was not with him, as it was with the redactor of St. Matthew, synchronous with the burning of the Temple. He carefully puts our Lord's teaching about the last days into a separate conflation, which he prefaces with a remarkable saying which warns us against a literal interpretation: 'The kingdom of God is within you' (Luk 17:21).

But there are no 2nd cent. ideas in the Gospel, nor anything to throw doubt upon the unanimous and early tradition of St. Luke's authorship. Nor would so obscure a

member of the Church have been selected as author if there had not been good ground for the belief. Probably his name stood on the original title-page.

We are, therefore, probably right in assigning the date to about 80 a.d.

Literature.—Plummer's Commentary (T. & T. Clark) is good on the linguistic side. The Commentaries of Meyer (German) and of Godet (French) have been published in English by T. & T. Clark, but the later German editions of Meyer, edited by B. and J. Weiss, are preferable. In the *Expositor's Greek Testament* the Synoptic Gospels are treated from the side of the higher criticism by A. B. Bruce, but unfortunately the Textus Receptus is used. Wellhausen has translated the Gospel into German with a few critical notes. For comparative study Wright's *St. Luke* and his *Synopsis* may be used. In *Horæ Synopticæ* Sir J. C. Hawkins has collected statistics of great value. Hobart's *Medical Language of St. Luke* needs some weeding out, but has never been refuted. A. Resch, in *Das Kindheits-Evangelium*, as in his other writings, collects an immense quantity of illustrative matter, but the critical standpoint which he adopts is not generally acceptable. Ramsay (*Was Christ born at Bethlehem?*) successfully defends St. Luke as an historian of high rank, but insists too much on his accuracy in editorial details. Blass, in his edition of St. Luke's Gospel and of the Acts, follows Lightfoot in suggesting that St. Luke published two editions of his works—one for Theophilus and another for use by the Church. In this way he accounts for the Western readings, which, however, are found in other books of the NT.

A. Wright.

⚠ Lunatic

LUNATIC

Introduction.

- i. Difficulty of classifying NT cases.
 1. From the medical side.
 2. From the Biblical side.
- ii. Leading cases reported in Gospels.
 1. Capernaum lunatic.

2. Case at foot of Mt. of Transfiguration.
 3. Gerasene victim.
 4. Other cases.
- iii. Question as to possession by evil spirits. Prevalent mis-conceptions. Truer conception.
- iv. Our Lord's method of restoration. Kinship with modern medical treatment.

Literature.

The word 'lunatic' in the Authorized Version of NT is the translation of σεληνιαζεσθαι (from σελήνη, 'the moon') which occurs in Mat_4:24; Mat_17:15, and nowhere else in the NT or in classical or Biblical Greek. Literally its meaning is 'to be moonstruck.' The Vulgate translates it *lunaticus*, and in Mat_17:15 *lunaticus est*, where Tindale gives 'is frantick,' and other versions practically follow the Vulgate. Sir John Cheke (1550) has the expression 'is moond' as the equivalent of 'lunatic,' putting into plain English the ancient thought expressed by the word. The influence of the moon on persons was believed to be injurious, and to be able to cause them to become moonstruck (Psa_121:6), an idea which has been widely prevalent and still persists. The fact that certain forms of insanity are periodical, no doubt gave rise in part to the idea. Dr. Menzies Alexander says: 'The popular idea that there is some connexion between the moon and epilepsy is partly due to the confusion of epilepsy with epileptic insanity. The bright moonlight of the Orient has a curious stimulating effect on such creatures as crows and dogs, making them restless and noisy. It has an exciting effect also on those afflicted with epileptic insanity. In both cases darkness acts as a sedative.'

The Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 of the two passages in Mt. above cited prefers 'epileptic' and 'is epileptic' as translation for σεληνιαζεσθαι, but without substantial warrant. The ground for the preference according to *Eneye. Bibl.* is that a Greek medical writer of the 7th cent. gives ἐπιλητιχός as the correct scientific term for the disorder referred to, and that δαιμόνιζόμενος and σεληνιαζόμενος were the popular terms for the same disease.

But the word ‘lunatic’ covers more than the cases in which Mt. uses σεληνιαζέσθαι.

The mentally deranged also are described by the Evangelists as δαιμονιζόμενοι, and no kind of doubt is possible that the latter term included many sufferers who are now called lunatic, as well as simple epileptics and epileptic idiots. The uncontrollable explosions of nervous energy which characterize these cases were not unnaturally attributed solely to demonic agency. The explanation is so simple and direct and apparently so adequate, that none other was sought for. But the term ‘lunatic’ must be restricted in its use to those who were mentally deranged, and ought not to be applied to those who were simply epileptic, or suffering from mental feebleness or imbecility.

The attempt to trace a differentiation between mental diseases on the part of the Evangelists cannot be pronounced successful, being based upon far too slender ground in a simple NT passage, Mat_4:24, where δαιμονιζόμενοι and σεληνιαζόμενοι are placed side by side. (1) We have no grounds for expecting such precision in writers like the Evangelists. (2) The same writer uses (Mat_17:15) the word σεληνιαζεσθαι of a case which is not simple epilepsy (see below). (3) He does not use the word for the Gerasene demoniacs of Mat_8:28, where we have undoubted cases of lunacy. (4) Luke the physician knows nothing of the distinction so far as his own usage is concerned. (5) It is not to be thought that Mt. alone of the Evangelists traced a distinction between the epileptic and the possessed, or that he would not attribute an attack of simple epilepsy to the domination by evil spirits.

The Evangelists class all the cases together, and use both words to cover the same trouble of mental derangement, while the latter word δαιμονιζόμενοι is also employed with a wider signification. The fact that the description given in the Gospels enables us to classify the instances under the broad types of mental disease is evidence of the faithful unsophisticated narration of what the Evangelists had seen or heard, not of their having any scientific understanding of the phenomena in question.

i. Difficulty of classifying NT cases.—The Gospels record and describe three clear cases which may be included under the general head of lunacy. Others are probably indicated with no kind of description; or only the very vaguest is given. But the task of determining to which particular class of lunacy the cases described are to be assigned is not without difficulty, and perhaps cannot at present be accomplished without some degree of uncertainty. The difficulty is twofold.

1. The current classifications, in vogue amongst alienists, of the various insanities are very numerous, and by common consent far from being final. Certain of these systems, some adopted by International Congresses and others determined by

representative associations, and generally in use among the leading mental physicians of Great Britain, are valuable chiefly as giving facilities, the one for international conference, the other for national comparison and correspondence. Clouston in his *Clinical Lectures* provides a good working classification. Following the example of many illustrious predecessors, he divides mental diseases: (1) according to the mental symptoms manifested, and (2) according to the causes of the disorder and to the relationships of the disease to the great physical periods of life and to the activities other than mental. But the researches of the present day, and especially in respect of the causes of mental derangement, with their suggestions of toxic and bacteriological origin, are profoundly modifying the generalizations which only a few years ago were accepted as satisfactory. Brilliant and enthusiastic investigators in Italy, France, Germany, America, and in our own country are 'settling much and unsettling more' (Clouston), and while this condition of science is full of promise for the ultimate goal of all such research in the alleviation and recovery of the malady and the removal of its causes, the prevalent uncertainty does not lessen the difficulty of classifying the NT cases. The difficulty arises largely from the facts that (a) the symptoms from one class are combined in ever-varying proportions with symptoms of other classes, rendering the task of deciding which is the predominant symptom according to which the malady must be classified well-nigh impossible; and (b) a similar combination is discovered among the causes producing the disorder. Accordingly some have scoffed at the attempt to classify mental diseases with all the divisions and technology of a botanical or zoological system. And perhaps it is more important to mark carefully all the symptoms in each case and study the predisposing and actual causes so far as they can be ascertained.

2. The difficulty from the Biblical side lies in the following facts. (a) The descriptions of the cases mentioned in the Gospels are non-scientific. They do not profess to give a complete methodized account of the ailments with which the power of Jesus dealt. The Evangelists give no sign that they themselves understood what they describe. (b) They deal only with symptoms. Causes of the disorder were not sought for, the prevalent theory of demonic possession being to them adequate to account for the trouble, and this possession the only possible cause. Our Lord Himself speaks and acts as though upon the whole He shared the conceptions of the time. Possibly because in this realm, as in others, He in His incarnate condition shared the limitations of the race, or because He could not take upon Himself the task of correcting and remoulding the deep-lying misconceptions of that generation with respect to these matters, without withdrawing His strength from far more vital concerns on which in the short time at His disposal He must concentrate all His attention. (c) The Evangelists' descriptions probably do not give all the symptoms which a modern alienist would have noted, but only those which for one reason or another were pressed particularly upon their observation.

ii. Leading cases of lunacy reported in NT.

1. *The case in the synagogue at Capernaum* (Mar_1:21-28, Luk_4:31-37). The symptoms indicated by the Evangelists are—

(1) The predominance of unclean habits and instincts. Mk. speaks of the man as being under the influence of an unclean spirit; Lk. of the spirit of an unclean demon. This might possibly mean no more than that the victims of this malady habitually haunted unclean places, as tombs, and desert regions believed to be the habitation of demons. But the greater probability is that it points to ‘moral alienation,’ which Esquirol (*Maladies Mentales*) declared was the proper characteristic of mental derangement. ‘The subtle influence of epilepsy, or rather of that condition of the nervous system which gives rise alike to epileptic seizures and certain mental symptoms, is most strikingly manifested in the change which takes place in the moral character’ (Bucknill and Tuke).

(2) Convulsive seizures. This feature is not made prominent in the case before us, but is indicated by the words of Mar_1:26, ‘And the unclean spirit tearing ((Revised Version margin) ‘convulsing,’ *σπαράξεν*) him and crying with a loud voice.’

(3) Uncontrolled impulse, leading the victim in defiance of all that was fitting and customary to burst into the assembly at the hour of worship.

(4) The patient’s belief in and identification of himself with an alleged evil spirit. He speaks of himself and the evil power as one—‘What have we to do with thee?’ This may be explained as an example of a well-known delusion classed as demonomania, but the question must not be fore-closed (see below). At least, however, an element of delusion may be traced in the feeling of entire and inevitable subjection to the monstrous control.

(5) The acknowledgment of Messiah. This has been claimed as the classical criterion of demonic possession, all cases where it is not found being regarded as not due to this cause even although the Scripture so attributes them (Menzies Alexander). But argument from silence is always perilous, and especially so in dealing with the Gospel narratives. And other cases might yet be genuinely demonic where the confession is apparently or really absent. And, on the other hand, the acknowledgment might reasonably be regarded as the last vestige of rationality in the otherwise deranged nature.

Attempting to classify the above, it may be ranged symptomatically under Clouston’s head—‘States of Defective Inhibition, or Impulsive Insanity,’ the chief characteristic of which is uncontrollable impulse, and which includes general impulsiveness,

epileptiform impulse (indicated by the convulsions), animal, sexual and organic impulse (pointed to by the term 'unclean' applied to this and other instances). Clinically considered (according to the causes) it most nearly approaches epileptic insanity. This 'means insanity with epilepsy, whether the convulsive affection has preceded the insanity and has seemed to be the cause, or whether it has appeared during the course of the mental disease only as a symptom or complication' (Bucknill and Tuke). The presence of epileptic insanity is not always indicated by epileptic fits but by the character of the mental disturbance, the paroxysmal gust of passion, the blind fury. And therefore Defective Inhibition is difficult to distinguish from Mania. Out of 385 epileptic women observed by Esquirol (*Maladies Mentales*, vol. i.), only 60 were free from mental derangement, and nearly all were unstable, peculiar, easily enraged.

2. *The case at the foot of the Mt. of Transfiguration* (Mat 17:14-20, Mar 9:17-29, Luk 9:37-43).—Two sides are plainly marked in this disorder: (1) The physical. Uncontrollable paroxysms accompanied by foaming at the mouth and gnashing of teeth, succeeded by utter prostration. The affliction had been from infancy, pointing to some congenital disease involving the other physical features—deafness and dumbness. (2) The mental. At least idiocy, but more probably lunacy, a feature of which was the suicidal mania manifested. The indication is that during the time while he was free from convulsions and their effects the patient was not mentally disturbed. The suicidal impulse was apparently spasmodic and periodical, but no very solid ground is given to theorize upon.

The epilepsy is more pronounced than in the previous case, and the suicidal tendency is added. But possibly, if the previous instance had been fully described, it might more nearly approximate to the one under consideration. The classification must be under the same general head—Defective Inhibition or Epileptic Insanity (rather than Epileptic Idiocy—as Alexander).

3. *The Gerasene victim* (Mat 8:28-34, Mar 5:1-20, Luk 8:26-39).—The physical symptoms, the convulsions, that characterize 1 and 2, are here absent, and the features of mental derangement become all-prominent. The victim is possessed by an ungoverned violence, having the command of a morbid muscular energy. This uncontrollable power was one that increased, for the description implies that in the earlier stages they had been able to control him in some measure by binding, but that the binding had increased the violence of the power so that he could no longer be bound (Mar 5:3-4). 'The tenses used (δεδέσθαι, διεσπᾶσθαι, συντετριφθαι) denote the relation of these past acts to the present inability' (Gould, *Internat. Crit. Com.* on 'St. Mark'). The malignant power controlling the life drove him into the tombs and mountains, causing him to utter frenzied cries and leading to impulses of

self-mutilation, apparently also to homicidal tendencies (Mat 8:28). Loss of personality is the dominant feature of the case, evidenced by the absence of the sense of all fitness, causing him to destroy his clothing and rush about in nakedness, and by his positive feeling of being possessed by a legion of devils which tore his life asunder. At times he thoroughly identifies himself with the power that controlled his life ('we are many'), and is terrified by the fear lest he and they should be driven from their hiding-place. A conspicuous feature also was the homage paid by the evil power, or by the man in spite of the evil power, to the authority of Jesus (Mar 5:7, Luk 8:28).

The case belongs to those described by Clouston as 'states of mental exaltation or mania,' which includes the varieties simple, acute, delusional, chronic, ephemeral, homicidal; and the indications all point to acute mania with delusions. The fixed idea of plural possession would lead to the medical classification 'Demonomania,' a variety of 'religious mania.'

4. *Other cases.*—(1) The daughter of the Syro-phœnician woman, Mat 15:21-28, Mar 7:24-30. (2) The dumb demoniac, Mat 9:32-34, Luk 11:14-15. (3) The blind and dumb demoniac, Mat 12:22-24. These cases are not described except in most obscure terms. In (2) and (3) the interest of the narrator was fixed upon other elements of the occasion. And they would all be doubtfully classified as cases of lunacy. (4) Mary of Magdala (Mar 16:9, Luk 8:2), with whom are classed other women healed of evil spirits and infirmities. Mary Magdalene is said to have been delivered from seven demons. The expression may be due (*a*) to the Evangelist's sense of the violence of the derangement to which she had been subject, or (*b*) to the current idea of manifold possession among the disciples, to which Jesus gave no sanction, or (*c*) to mania and delusion of manifold possession. But nothing can be determined beyond the fact that Jesus had delivered her from grievous bodily or mental distress, or a combination of these.

The Evangelists give full prominence to the physical side of these distressing afflictions, not because they understand the symptoms they describe, but because they testify simply and artlessly to what they had themselves witnessed, or what had become part of the common tradition from the testimony of eye-witnesses. But the physical is not the only side. Even in bodily disorders it is being more fully recognized that there is the mental or psychical factor in the problem as it faces the physician (see art. Cures). And the NT plainly sets forth this psychical element in the cases now before us. They ascribe the trouble directly to an intangible spiritual influence which possesses the being of the sufferer, takes the use of the bodily organs, and controls the will. And thus emerges—

iii. The question as to possession by evil spirits.—How far does the NT in attributing these disorders to demonic possession give a true account of the phenomenon? The question is not to be determined by invoking authority, either that of the NT or of our Lord Jesus Christ. The authority of the Gospels is of a totally different order, and moves in a higher sphere than that of writers who were ‘supernaturally’ lifted above the current conceptions of their generation. We have no warrant for believing the Evangelists to have been granted knowledge of mental disease in advance of the scientific attainments of their own day. Nor can inquiry be silenced by the appeal to the fact that our Lord Himself habitually spoke and acted as if He recognized the presence of evil spirits in mental disease. The Christian apologist takes unnecessarily perilous ground when he declares that for our Lord to have been limited in knowledge invalidates His authority as Prophet and Saviour. In His condition as incarnate our Lord did share the limitations that belong to our human lot, and advanced in knowledge of human affairs and scientific problems by normal human processes.

But it is equally important that the matter should not be dogmatized off the roll of discussion by those who claim to speak in the name of science and declare that the NT explanation is ‘impossible’ on the ground that *spiritual agencies do not exist*. The question, if left open, must be open on both sides; and there are certain considerations which must be borne in mind while we examine the possibility of spiritual agencies being concerned, as concomitants of the physical disease or nervous instability, in cases of mental derangement, whether in NT times or in the present day.

(1) We must guard ourselves from the conception of these evil spiritual agencies as semi-sensuous beings, possessed of bodily form, appetites and passions. The conception has vitiated human thought from early Semitic times, in the NT age, through the Middle Ages down to the present, when it is even yet strangely persistent. The popular thought of Satan is grotesquely dominated by that idea, and much of the prevalent disbelief in the existence of a spiritual adversary can be traced to that gross misconception.

(2) Kindred to this is the thought of a multiplicity of demons being concerned in the possession of a human life. This idea has been responsible for much false conception in the case of the Gerasene sufferer. And it cannot be too strongly emphasized that nowhere does our Lord give the least sanction to any such notion. He never speaks of more than one evil or unclean spirit (see Alexander, *Demonic Possession*, ch. vii.).

(3) In place of misconceptions, a right conception needs to be grasped of the malignant powers that can make a prey of an otherwise disordered human life. So far from the idea of semi-sensuous beings representing the truth, it would be far truer to think of possession as akin to the condition seen in intense anger, or extreme fear.

‘Anything is a possession that dispossesses the man of himself, from whatever world it comes’ (Bushnell). We are yet far from being able to define the nature of mind or spirit. We believe in mind on the ground of its manifest action in the directing of our human activities, because of the things it creates and destroys. But what mind is, passes our power to conceive and define. And the same is true of spirit. But we can make no progress in understanding the Universe and our human life within it, except on the assumption of a Supreme and Holy Intelligence and Will behind all physical and mental phenomena. We believe in a living Personal God, and the faith illumines all life and being. Moreover, we are ourselves personalities constantly acting upon, and being acted upon by, other personalities. A moral world is inconceivable on any other terms. And is it unreasonable if we decline to admit the impossibility of other superhuman personalities, some of them centres of benignant and others of malignant moral energy, being present and active in and upon our life here? Who can reasonably deny that such evil agencies may conceivably take advantage of an unstable nervous system or a disordered physical constitution, and possess and control the whole being?

(4) It must also be made clear that the physical disease may be the effect of a potent psychical disorder. The whole mischief may come from the side of the mental or psychical. A long-continued yielding of the mind or spirit to evil agencies may result in physical deterioration, just as truly as physical deterioration may give the opportunity for an evil spiritual possession. ‘Prolonged mental enfeeblement is followed by brain atrophy, and prolonged mental disturbances by structural brain changes’ (Clouston). A consideration of our Lord’s method in dealing with this disaster in humanity will increase our unwillingness to bar out the ‘demonic’ element in lunacy. See also artt. Accommodation, vol. i. 20 f., and Demon, *ib.* 441 ff.

iv. Our Lord’s restoration of the ‘lunatic.’—The Synoptic Gospels all ascribe to Jesus a unique command over these afflicted persons and over the alien power that possessed them. He was able to restore the lost self-control and also to deal with the disease which was commonly the physical basis of the mental derangement. The latter portion of the process is akin to our Lord’s healing of bodily diseases (see Cures); but the action of Jesus is upon the body through the mind, and upon the mental or psychical directly. Mental physicians who treat lunacy from the physical side yet fully recognize the existence of the psychical, and the possibility and actuality of alleviation being brought by action upon that side of the ailment. ‘The action of “mind on mind” in healthy brains is direct, intense, and most subtle. The same is the case when the brain is disordered, and hence in psychiatry mental therapeutics are a most important means of treatment’ (Clouston). Such facts are truly illuminative of the action of Jesus, and we may not unreasonably attribute His restoring power to a master-influence which, while it transcends all that is known of the human, yet is not on a totally different plane. In Jesus the power of mind was at its fullest and finest by reason of: (1) His intense and penetrating sympathy with mankind; (2) His vigorous

will to bring help and deliverance to all human sufferers; (3) His continual and perfect alliance and moral union with the Divine Power in which He lived and moved and had His being. The Divine Will can and does manifest itself in every human unselfishness and sympathy and generous helpful impulse, and through a human personality healing forces of God Himself are at work amidst all human distress and oppression. And in our Lord that Divine healing might find full scope and unhindered freedom of activity, so that the Name of Jesus was a healing, restoring, life-giving Name, even empowering feeble disciples to cast out devils (see art. Miracles, c.).

The method of Jesus clearly suggests the exercise of a Holy Divinely-informed Will and Personality upon other wills and personalities. The features which most impressed those who witnessed His action were the rebuke, the command, the authority which claimed and obtained unhesitating homage and obedience (Mar 1:21-27, Luk 9:37-43), inevitably reminding them of 'the majesty of God.' Especially does His dealing with the Gerasene lunatic indicate His secret. He goes direct to the lost self-control, seeks to recover the submerged personality, and to remove that self-identification with the evil power. He endeavours to awaken the man to the true sense of his own individuality and to set it free from an alien domination. 'What is thy name?' He asks. By the efficient co-operation of the man He would break up that terrible sympathy and alliance which caused the victim to say, 'We are many.' (The suggestion of Schmiedel that in asking this question Jesus was, like a modern alienist, seeking to discover the delusions of the patient, amounts to an anachronism). And the unique Personality of Jesus had the power to evoke, and give once again its commanding controlling place to, this essential energy of the man.

Modern treatment of the insane bears a most suggestive likeness to the method of Jesus. By cheerful surroundings, by healthful labour, by the encouragement of all existing faculty in the patient, by amusement and music and religious exercises, and not least by human sympathy, the endeavour is made to conserve every vestige of self-possession, to keep alive and to develop all available capacity. The constant effort is to penetrate through all physical and psychical disabilities to the real and effective personality. It may fairly be said that medical skill and investigation into causes and remedies of this distressing malady are yet in their preliminary stages, and the progress of the years may be followed with the utmost hopefulness because in all such investigation the Divine Spirit energizes.

Literature.—Griesinger, *Mental Pathology and Therapeutics* (translation), 1867; D. Hack Tuke, *Dictionary of Psychological Medicine*, 2 vols. 1892; Bucknill-Tuke, *Manual of Psychological Medicine*, 1874; Maudsley, *Physiology and Pathology of Mind*, 2 vols. 1879; Clouston, *Clinical Lectures on Mental Disease*⁶ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred], 1904; Macpherson, *Mental Affections*, 1899; *Traite de Pathologie Mentale*, by various writers, ed. Ballet, Paris, 1903; Kraepelin, *Clinical*

Psychiatry (translation), 1904. On Biblical aspects of the question, consult artt. on 'Medicine,' 'Satan,' 'Demonology,' 'Exorcism,' etc., in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ; also kindred artt. in *Encyc. Bibl.*; R. Bennett, *Diseases of the Bible*, 1887; Menzies Alexander, *Demonic Possession*, 1902 [brings together most valuable data for the discussion of the whole question]. See also Literature at end of artt. Miracles and Cures, and chapter on 'Demoniacs' in *The Finger of God*, by the present writer.

T. H. Wright.

☞ Lust

LUST.—The noun 'lust' (ἐπιθυμία) occurs only twice in Authorized and Revised Versions of Gospels (Mar_4:19, Joh_8:44), and the verb 'to lust' (ἐπιθυμέω) only once (Mat_5:28). Both noun and verb, however, are of common occurrence in the rest of the NT. In modern usage, 'lust' is confined to sexual desire; but, when the Authorized Version was made, the word had a much greater elasticity of meaning, corresponding in this respect to ἐπιθυμία and ἐπιθυμέω. In NT, as in classical Gr., these words properly denote strong desire whether good or bad, then evil desire in particular, and finally sexual desire specifically. Even in the Gospels we find illustrations of these varying connotations of both the Gr. and the English terms. When our Lord says of His desire to eat of His last Passover ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα (Luk_22:15), He simply expresses a deep longing. When He speaks of the seed of the word being choked by the lusts (ἐπιθυμῖαι) of other things (Mar_4:19), these lusts are desires not necessarily evil, though the taint of evil is beginning to enter, because, while in themselves they may be harmless, these desires are allowed to hinder the operation of the word. When He says to the Jewish leaders, 'Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts (ἐπιθυμίας) of your father it is your will to do,' both 'lust' and ἐπιθυμία have passed into a distinctly bad meaning. And in Mat_5:28 the Gr. and the English word are alike equivalent to lascivious desire. See also art. Desire, vol. i. p. 453.

Very little is said explicitly about lust in the Gospels, because little is needed. Lust is not to be dallied with or compromised with; it is to be totally and continually shunned and avoided. Inward lust is as heinous as outward adultery to the eye of God, which views alike the inside and the outside of man (Mat_5:28).* [Note: See discussion of this passage in art. Adultery.] The lustful eye will make the whole body full of darkness (Mat_6:23). The single eye and mind are free from lustful fancies and

thoughts (Luk_11:34). The honest and good heart brings forth only good fruit (Luk_8:15). Either the heart must be pure, and its fruit pure; or else impure, and its fruit impure (Mat_12:33). Adulteries, covetings, lasciviousness,—these delile a man (Mar_7:22). And lust, in its very nature, is unholy. Hence Christ's Holy Spirit is opposite to, and inconsistent with, the lustful *demon* which makes its foul abode in the neglected heart of the careless or heedless or wanton. There is no limit to the iniquity and abandonment to which such evil possession or corruption may drag the blinded, besotted soul intent upon brutish delights never realized. Herod's course was impeded only a little by the rebuke of a John Baptist (Mar_6:18). No man can serve two masters (Luk_16:13); and he that committeth sin is the bondservant of sin (Joh_8:34).

W. B. Frankland and J. C. Lambert.

☞ Lysanias

LYSANIAS.—This name is given by St. Luke (Luk_3:1) among those who ruled in the various parts of Syria and Palestine at the time when John the Baptist entered upon his public work. The name does not again occur in the NT. A Lysanias is mentioned by Dio Cassius (xlix. 32) as having been made king of Ituraea by Mark Antony and afterwards put to death by him. This same Lysanias is also spoken of by Josephus (*Ant.* xv. iv. 1), who adds that Antony was moved to the step of putting Lysanias to death by Cleopatra, on the ground that he had conspired against her with the Parthians. The same Lysanias and his connexion with the Parthians are alluded to also elsewhere by Josephus (*BJ* i. xiii. 1; *Ant.* xiv. xiii. 3). The data agree in making him the son of Ptolemy, and locating his reign between b.c. 40 and 36. A Lysanias is mentioned again by Josephus in *Ant.* xviii. vi. 10 and XX. vii. 1. In both of these passages the territory over which he ruled is designated a tetrarchy (cf. *BJ* ii. xi. 5, xii. 8; *Ant.* xix. v. 1).

The question raised by these data is, Does Josephus know two men of the name or one? If he knows two, the Lysanias of St. Luke is evidently the second, and no further difficulty exists. If, however, he has the same man in mind throughout, the question next emerging is as to whether St. Luke knew and alluded to another and younger Lysanias, or erroneously identified the only ruler of that name with the times of the public appearance of John the Baptist and Jesus. In favour of the latter view, it is alleged that Josephus never gives any intimation of a difference between the two men of the name, and in fact does not at first reading seem to know two. His readers were bound, it is argued, to suppose that the Lysanias who was executed in b.c. 36 is meant wherever the name is used. St. Luke was acquainted with the writings of

Josephus, but did not use them with accuracy, and an error is quite probable. He makes an error in defining the limits of the realm of Philip, Ituraea. It is not held that an error can be demonstrated in his statement regarding Lysanias, but the probability is said to be for such an error, and the grounds for believing in a second Lysanias are regarded as unsatisfying. This view was propounded by Strauss, and has been supported by Keim, Krenkel, and Sehmiedel.

Per contra, that there were two men of the name is argued from various considerations. (1) Though Josephus does not explicitly say that he is speaking of two distinct persons, his descriptions imply such a distinction. Lysanias the son of Ptolemy was not a tetrarch, but bore the title of king (so he is also called by Dio Cassius). (2) The limits of the territories over which the Lysaniases of Josephus ruled are different. The elder Lysanias inherited from his father a kingdom including Chalkis on the Lebanon. This was not, however, included in the realm of the tetrarch Lysanias. (3) Abila was associated with the name of the tetrarch, but not with that of the son of Ptolemy. (4) During the reign of Tiberius, or at least 50 years after the death of the first Lysanias, a certain Nymphaeus built a road and erected a temple, and left an account of these acts in an extant inscription (*CIG [Note: IG Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum.] 4521*). In this inscription he calls himself 'a freedman of Lysanias.' It is impossible that he should have been the freedman of the son of Ptolemy. He must be regarded as living under the tetrarch. (5) Another inscription at Heliopolis, whose *lacunæ* have been filled out by Renan, renders it exceedingly probable that there were more than one ruler bearing the name in question. (6) A coin discovered by Poeocke at Nebhi-Abel (Abila) bears the superscription Λυσσανίου τετράρχ. καὶ ἀρχιερέως. But as Dio calls the first Lysanias a king, it is at least doubtful that the lower title of tetrarch should appear on his own coin. In that case the coin must have been struck by the second Lysanias. (7) Finally, an inscription (*CIG [Note: IG Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum.] 4523*) informs us that Lysanias the son of Ptolemy left children behind him. It is probable that the names Lysanias and Zenodorus were dynastic names, and that the second Lysanias was given the name of him who was put to death in 36. This is the view supported by S. Davidson, Wieseler, Renan, Schürer, Plummer, and others.

An earlier effort to establish the historical accuracy of St. Luke's statement regarding Lysanias was made by Paulus (*Com. i. 1*) through the suggestion that the word τετράρχου should be erased from St. Luke's text, or that it should be connected with Φίλιππου, making Philip the 'tetrarch of Ituraea, Trachonitis, and the Abilene of Lysanias,' *i.e.* of that province of which Lysanias had been tetrarch in his day. But this has always been considered an arbitrary way of dealing with the text, resorted to solely for the purpose of saving the historical precision of the Evangelist, and has not found much favour in any quarter.

Literature.—Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, 1835, pp. 310-313; S. Davidson, *Intr. to NT*, i. pp. 214-221; Wieseler, *Chron. Synop. d. vier Evang.* 1843, pp. 174-183, *Beitr. z. Würdigung der Evang.* 1869, pp. 194-204; Herzog-Plitt, *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.*] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1877, art. 'Abilene'; Renan, *Mém. de l' Acad. d'Inser.* 26. 6, 1870, pp. 49-84; Keim, *Gesch. Jesu von Nazara*, i. 618, ii. 384; Krenkel, *Josephus u. Lucas*, 1894, pp. 95-98; Schürer, *GJV* [Note: *JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.*] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1901, i. pp. 716-720 [HJP [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] i. ii. 335]; Plummer, *Com. on St. Luke*, 1900, p. 84; Schmiedel, *Ency. Bibl.* art. 'Lysanias.'

A. C. Zenos.

☞Maath

MAATH.—An ancestor of Jesus (Luk 3:26).

☞Machaerus

MACHAERUS.—A fortress on the east of the Dead Sea, in which, according to Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. v. 2), John the Baptist was imprisoned and put to death by Herod Antipas (Mat 14:3-12, Mar 6:17-29, Luk 3:19). It had been originally fortified by Alexander Jannaeus (Josephus *BJ* vii. vi. 2), and afterwards destroyed by Gabinius (*ib.* i. viii. 5; *Ant.* xiv. v. 4). It was restored by Herod the Great, who used it as a residence (*BJ* vii. vi. 1, 2.). On his death it passed into the hands of Antipas, as it lay in the Peraean portion of his tetrarchy. At the time of the Jewish revolt it was occupied by a Roman garrison, which was constrained to abandon it in a.d. 66 (*ib.* ii. xviii. 6). After the fall of Jerusalem it was recaptured, and finally destroyed by the Roman general Lucilius Bassus (*ib.* vii. vi. 4). The ruins, called *Mkawr*, on a projecting height near the Dead Sea on its eastern side, are supposed to mark the site of the fortress.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , art. 'Machaerus,' and the Lit. there cited; to wh. add *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.*] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ix. 326 f.

James Patrick.

Madness

MADNESS.—It is somewhat remarkable that the OT ideas about madness should differ so much from those of the Gospels. In the OT madness is due to the influence of a spirit from God (1Sa 16:14; 1Sa 18:10), in the Gospels to a demon; in the OT it is conceived of as being closely connected with the ‘spirit of prophecy’ (which likewise came from God); this is clear from such passages as 1Sa 10:6; 1Sa 10:10-13; 1Sa 19:23-24, Hos 9:7, 2Ki 9:11, Jer 29:26; there is no sign of this in the Gospels.* [Note: See, however, Act 16:16 ff.] It was, no doubt, owing to the belief that madness was a sign of the indwelling of a spirit from God that a madman was looked upon (in the OT) as, in some sense, sacred;† [Note: This is still the case in the East.] in the Gospels the reverse of this seems to be the case, if one regards the demoniac described in Luk 8:26-39 as a madman [see Demon].

There are very few references to madness in the Gospels; in Luk 6:11 the word *ἄνοια* is used (the (Revised Version margin) renders it ‘foolishness’), its meaning is certainly nearer to ‘foolishness’ than to the modern notion of madness; perhaps its meaning is best expressed by the German *ausser sich*, lit. ‘outside of oneself,’ resulting in a temporary loss of mental balance; in 2Ti 3:9 the same word is translated ‘folly,’ which, taken with the words ‘corrupted in mind’ in the preceding verse, brings out the sense more fully. Another expression, used in Mat 4:24; Mat 17:15, is *σεληνιαῖσθαι* ‘to be lunatic,’ or ‘moonstruck,’* [Note: Macalister (in Hastings’ DB iii. 328a) quotes Vicary, who says of the brain that ‘it moueth and followeth the mouing of the Moone: for in the waxing of the Moone, the Brayne followeth upwardes: and in the wane of the Moone the Brayne discendeth downwardes, and vanishes in substance of vertue ...’; according to the Jewish conception, which connects epilepsy with demoniacal possession (Mat 17:18), the light of the moon drove demons away. [See Demon].] but from the context in the second passage there can be no doubt that this was epilepsy. Neither of these expressions answers to modern ideas of madness. There is, however, one other word (*μαίνεσθαι*, Joh 10:20) which seems to correspond with what would be understood by madness nowadays, viz. to be bereft of reason; in the passage in question it is certainly used in this sense; at the same time it must be remembered that *μαίνεσθαι* is connected with *μαντεύεσθαι*, which implies possession by some supernatural being.† [Note: See Trench, *Synonyms of the NT*11, pp. 21, 22, cf. Act 16:16-18.] The same word, as well as *μανία*, is used in Act 26:24-25, where *ἀλήθεια* and *σωφροσύνη* are placed in opposition to it, which confirms the meaning implied in Joh 10:20.‡ [Note:

A somewhat similar meaning belongs to παραφρονῶν in 2Co_11:23 and παραφρονα in 2Pe_2:16.] [See, further, Demon, Lunatic].

On two occasions in the Gospels we find madness or insanity definitely attributed to our Lord Himself. Once by His own friends, among whom, apparently, His mother and brethren were included (Mar_3:21, cf. Mar_3:31). We read that ‘they went out to lay hold on him: for they said, He is beside himself’ (ἐξέστη). Commentators are for the most part agreed that in this passage ἐξέστη denotes insanity, or at least a mental excitement bordering upon it (cf. a similar use of the word by St. Paul, 2Co_5:13). The other occasion is that already referred to, when, according to St. John, certain of ‘the Jews’ said of Jesus, ‘He hath a devil, and is mad’ (δαιμόνιον ἔχει καὶ μαίνεται, Joh_10:20). In this case the madness is evidently ascribed to Satanic possession, and is not regarded merely as a derangement due to overwork and excitement. It is worth noting, however, that μαινομαι is applied to St. Paul in a less offensive way (μαίνη, Act_26:24) by Festus. Authorized Version renders, ‘Thou art beside thyself,’ which Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 consistently changes into, ‘Thou art mad,’ to correspond with ‘I am not mad (οὐ μαινομαι), most excellent Festus,’ in the next verse. The charge of madness brought against Jesus is characteristic and significant, and has many parallels in the history of Christ’s followers in the early (cf. Act_2:13 as well as Act_26:24-25, 2Co_5:13) and in the later Church. It is an illustration of the inability of the natural man to receive the things of the Spirit of God (2Co_2:14; cf. Joh_15:18; Joh_17:16).

W. O. E. Oesterley and J. C. Lambert.

☩ Magdala

MAGDALA.—The word ‘Magdala’ occurs once only in the Textus Receptus of the NT (Mat_15:39). In B and x̄ the reading is ‘Magadan.’ This reading is followed by Tisch., Alford, WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort’s text.], and is adopted in the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885. In the parallel narrative in St. Mark’s Gospel (Mar_8:10) the place to which Christ came is designated as ‘the parts of *Dalmanutha*’ (wh. see). These names evidently refer to the same district, but not necessarily to the same place. They seem to have been in such proximity, however, that the adjacent district might be named from either. With respect to their location, various sites on the south and south-east border of the Lake of Galilee have been suggested, but none of them can be regarded as satisfactory. There is no site in this locality whose name bears any

resemblance to Magadan; and the only place which suggests a resemblance to Dalmanutha is a village known as *ed-Delhemiyeh*, near the mouth of the Jarmuk river. Apart from the name there is nothing else in or about the place to justify its identification with the town to which St. Mark refers in the passage above cited. Caspari and Edersheim would place Magadan within the limits of the Decapolis, but do not assign it to any definite location. The suggestion of Ewald that its site is identical with Megiddo, on the southern border of the Esdraelon plain, does not harmonize with the facts of the narrative, and apparently rests upon a very slender foundation.

In the light of all the information attainable at the present time, the probabilities strongly favour the view, which has long been held by eminent writers and explorers, that the district in which these places were located was on the *western* shore of the Lake of Galilee, and that Magadan represents the village now known as *el-Mejdel*, the traditional site of the town of Mary Magdalene. While the words in their present form are not identical, they may be regarded as variations of the same name. Stanley's suggestion is worthy of note in this connexion: 'It may be observed that, as Herodotus (ii. 159) turns Megiddo into Magdalum, so some Manuscripts in Mat 15:39 turn Magdala into Magadan' (*SP [Note: P Sinai and Palestine.]* 451, note 1). It has been suggested also by another writer, as a possible explanation of the substitution of one name for the other, 'that owing to the familiar recurrence of the word Magdalene, the less known name was absorbed in the better, and Magdala usurped the name and possibly also the position of Magadan' (art. 'Magdala' in Smith's *DB [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.]* ii. p. 1734). On the supposition that Magadan was on or adjacent to the site of *el-Mejdel*, the probable location of Dalmanutha is at or near '*Ain el-Barideh*, where the ruins of an ancient village have been traced and described by Porter, Tristram, and other explorers. This site is about a mile south of *el-Mejdel*. An incidental testimony in support of this identification is given by Rabbi Schwarz, who asserts that the cave of Teliman or Talmanutha was in the cliffs which overlooked the sea behind the site of *el-Mejdel*. In the same connexion he identifies Migdal (*Mejdel*) with Magdala (p. 189). To this may be added the testimony of the Rabbins, that Magdala was adjacent to the city of Tiberias (Otho, *Lex Rabb.* 353). In the travels of Willibald (a.d. 722), 'Magdalum' is located between Tiberias and Capernaum; and in the time of Quaresmius (17th cent.), *Mejdel* is mentioned as identical with the Magdala of Scripture (ii. 866).

The generally accepted view that the descriptive surname of Mary—'Magdalene'—used several times in the NT, and by all the Evangelists, was derived from her home or birthplace, is confirmed by the testimony of Edersheim, who asserts that several Rabbis are spoken of in the Talmud as 'Magdalene' or residents of Magdala. From the same source he gathers the statements that Magdala, which was a Sabbath-day's journey from Tiberias, was celebrated for its dye-works and its manufactories of fine woollen textures, of which eighty are mentioned. It was also noted for its wealth, its

moral corruption, and for its traffic in turtle-doves and pigeons for purifications. The suggestion made by Lightfoot, that the name meant 'curler of hair,' is rejected by Edersheim, who regards it as founded upon a misapprehension (*Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. i. p. 571).

Magdala is favourably situated at the S.E. corner of the plain of Gennesaret. It is three miles north of Tiberias, and almost the same distance south of *Khan Minyeh*. Before it lies the northward expanse of the Plain and the Lake; behind it rises a dark background of beetling cliffs, broken in one section by the deeply-cleft gorge of the *Wady Hamam* (Valley of Doves). Its precipitous sides are honeycombed with caves, which for centuries have been the refuge of robbers and outlaws. Mt. Hattin, the traditional mountain of the Beatitudes, is a conspicuous landmark on the plateau at the upper end of the wady. Through this natural passage-way the caravan route from the Mediterranean coast follows the line of the old Roman road to Khan Minyeh, and thence northward over the hills of Naphtali. A perennial stream, which waters the southern portion of the Plain, finds its way to the Lake a short distance north of the outskirts of the town.

Mejdel, which has little in itself to commend or distinguish it, is the only place of permanent habitation in the once densely populated 'land of Gennesaret.' It consists of twenty or more low, flat-roofed, grass-covered hovels, built of a conglomeration of dried mud, shells, and pebbles. Its degenerate inhabitants are the only resident farmers of the Plain, and go out from the town to cultivate a few patches of cleared ground in favourable locations. Near the centre of the village a palm-tree rises conspicuously above the objects around it, and a few thickly set thorn-trees on the outskirts afford a grateful shade to the loungers of the place in the heat of the day. A watch-tower on the north border of the town is a present suggestion of the derivation of the name *Mejdel* or its Greek form *Migdol*. It is possible also that *Migdal-el* ([Jos 19:38](#)) stands for the same place. The tower gives evidence of a date of construction comparatively modern, but it is doubtless the successor of an older outlook or watch-tower, which commanded the gateway to the southern section of the Gennesaret plain. The remains of substructions of a substantial character, hidden beneath the earth and its dense covering of undergrowth, afford satisfactory evidence of the antiquity of the site.

Literature.—Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. i. pp. 571-572; Andrews, *Life of our Lord*, pp. 337-338; Tristram, *Holy Land*, p. 253; Thomson, *Land and Book*, 'Central Pal. [Note: Palestine, Palestinian.]' p. 394; Smith's *DB* [Note: *Dictionary of the Bible.*] vol. ii. p. 1734; Robinson, *BRP* [Note: *RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.*] ii. 397; Ewing, art. 'Magadan,' in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible*; also art. 'Dalmanutha'; Baedeker, *Pal.* [Note: *Palestine, Palestinian.*] and *Syria*, p. 255.

☩Magdalene

MAGDALENE.—See preceding art., and Mary, No. 2.

☩Magi

MAGI (μάγοι, Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘wise men’).—The only reference to Magi in the Gospels occurs in Matthew 2, where we have the well-known story of the visit of the Oriental Magi to the infant Jesus. The following article will deal with (1) certain difficulties in the narrative, (2) the historical value of the narrative, (3) the legendary additions to the narrative.

1. The *difficulties* are occasioned chiefly by the vague and indefinite character of the record. The first question that suggests itself is, What class of people had the Evangelist in his mind when he used the term μάγοι? Now, according to Herodotus (i. 101), the Magi were a Median tribe which in the time of Gaumata, the pseudo-Smerdis, made a determined attempt to substitute Median for Persian rule (*ib.* iii. 61 ff.; Ctesias, *Pers.* [Note: *Persian.*] 41 (10) ff.; Justin, i. 9, 10; Agathias, ii. 26). Through the failure of this revolt the Magi lost all political importance, but they were influential as the priestly caste (Herod. i. 132; Amm. Marc. xxiii. 6; cf. the Levites among the Hebrews, *SBE* [Note: *BE Sacred Books of the East.*] iv. pp. lxii, lxiii), and as religious instructors of the Persian kings (Cic. *de Divin.* i. 41; Philo, *de Special. Leg.* 18; Pliny, *HN* xxx. 1). The introduction of this Magian priesthood is ascribed to Cyrns (Xen. *Cyr.* viii. 1. 23); and classical writers conversant with Persian affairs use the word *magus* as synonymous with ‘priest’ (Apul. *Apol.* i. 25, 26; cf. Strabo, pp. 732, 733; Philo, *Quod omn. prob. lib.* 11; Dio Chrysost. *Or.* 36, p. 449, 49, p. 538; Diog. Laert. *proæm.* 6; Porphyry. *de Abstinens.* iv. 16; and the lexicons of Hesych. and Suidas). Darius Hystaspis made Mazdaism the religion of the Empire (Behistun inser., and Sayce, *Ancient Empires of the East*), and from his time, at any rate,—for how long before, if at all, is disputed,—the Magi are identified with the Zoroastrian worship, and are represented as the disciples of Zoroaster (Plato, *Alcib.* i. 122; Plutarch, *de Is. et Os.* 46, 47; Pliny, *HN* xxx. 1; Apul. *Apol.* 26; Diog. Laert. *proæm.* 2; Amm. Marc. 23:6; Agathias, ii. 24; Aug. *de Civ. Dei*, xxi. 14). In the Avesta, however, the priests are called, not *magi*, but *âthravans*; though even in the sacred texts the word ‘magi’ is found in a few instances. Finally, it may be noted that these

Median magi are credited with skill in philosophy (Strabo, pp. 23, 24; Nicol. Damasc. *fr.* 66; Diog. Laert. *proœm.* 1), natural science (Philo, *Quod omn. prob. lib.* 11; Dio Chrysost. *Or.* 49, p. 538), and medicine (Pliny, *HN* xxx. 1, cf. xxiv. 17). They are also described as interpreters of dreams (Herod. i. 107, 120, vii. 19), astrologers (*ib.* vii. 37; Pliny, *HN* xxxvii. 9; Amm. Marc. xxiii. 6), soothsayers and diviners (Cic. *de Divin.* i. 41; Strabo, p. 762; Pliny, *HN* xxx. 2; Diog. Laert. *proœm.* 7; Aelian, *Var. Hist.* ii. 17; Amm. Marc. xxiii. 6).

In a technical sense, then, *magi* denoted the members of the sacerdotal class in the Persian Empire. But in the LXX Septuagint Daniel the word is used to render the Heb. *‘ashshâphim* Authorized Version ‘astrologers,’ of Babylonia (Dan 1:20; Dan 2:2; Dan 2:10; Dan 2:27; Dan 4:7; Dan 5:7; Dan 5:11; Dan 5:15. Some would explain the title Rab-mag in Jer 39:3; Jer 39:13 as = ‘chief magician,’ but without probability). Moreover, classical writers sometimes confuse the words *magi* and *Chaldæi* (Ctes. *Pers.* [Note: *Persian.*] 46 (15); Justin, xii. 13). The latter term, however, is properly used in Daniel (Dan 1:4; Dan 2:2; Dan 2:4-5; Dan 2:10; Dan 4:7; Dan 5:7; Dan 5:11) and by classical authorities (Herod. i. 181, 183; Diod. Sic. ii. 29-31) to represent a class, or the class, of Babylonian priests or learned men (Driver, *Daniel*, pp. 12-16), renowned for their skill in astronomy, astrology, and sorcery (Cic. *de Divin.* i. 41, *de Fato*, 8, 9; Diod. Sic. ii. 29-31; Strabo, p. 762; Curtius, v. 1; Apul. *Flor.* 15; Porph. *Vit. Pyth.* 6; Diog. Laert. *proœm.* 6; cf. Lenormant, *La magie chez les Chaldéens*; R. C. Thompson, *Reports of the Magicians and Astrologers of Nineveh and Babylon*; W. L. King, *Babylonian Magic and Sorcery*; Chantepie de la Saussaye, *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*; Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*).

Lastly, the words *magi* and *Chaldæi* came to be applied not only to the members of a sacerdotal caste, but in a secondary sense to all those who cultivated magic arts (Soph. *Œd. Tyr.* 387; Tac. *Ann.* ii. 27, xii. 22, 59; Juv. *Sat.* x. 94, with Mayor’s note; Dio Chrysost. *Or.* 36, p. 449). In Rabbinical writers this bad sense is predominant (Edersheim, *Life and Times*, i. p. 210), and the same may be said of the passages in the NT (other than Matthew 2) in which magi are referred to (Act 8:9; Act 8:11 Simon Magus, Act 13:6; Act 13:8 Elymas). In the LXX Septuagint the Egyptian conjuring is described as μαγική τέχνη (Wis 17:7). And Jerome says: ‘Consuetudo et sermo communis magos pro maleficis accepit’ (Hieron. *Com. in Daniel 2*, cf. Isid. *Ety.* viii. 9).

In what sense, then, did the author of Matthew 2 understand the term? The majority of the Fathers affix the worst interpretation, and lay stress on the idea that magic was overthrown by the advent of Christ (Ign. *Ephes.* 19; Justin M. *Dial.* 78; Tertull. *de Idol.* 9; Origen, c. *Ccls.* i. 60; Max. Taur. *Hom.* 21; Hilar. *de Trin.* iv. 38, *Com. in Matthew 1*; Aug. *Serm.* 200, § 3; Theophylact, *in loc.*); and this was the common

opinion even in the Middle Ages (Abelard, *in Epiph. serm.* 4; Aquinas, *Summa*, III. xxxvi. 3). But the consensus of later commentators rejects this view. There is no hint or suggestion of reprobation in the Gospel narrative. On the other hand, there is no indication that the Evangelist is alluding to any particular class of magi. He appears, on the contrary, to use the term in the general sense of sages from the East, who busied themselves with astronomy (Mat 2:2; Mat 2:7; Mat 2:9-10) and perhaps with the interpretation of dreams (Mat 2:12). There is certainly no attempt in the narrative to contrast Christianity with Zoroastrian or Babylonian worship.

Closely connected with the above is the further question of the region whence the Magi are supposed to have come. Mt. calls them simply μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν, *i.e.* ‘Oriental magi.’ The expression is quite indefinite (cf. Mat 8:11; Mat 24:27, Luk 13:29, Rev 21:13). Various attempts have been made, however, to identify the particular part of the East whence the Magi may have come (Patritius, *de Evang.* iii. p. 315 ff.; Spanheim, *Dub. Evang.* ii. p. 291 ff.). The oldest opinion inclines to Arabia (Justin M. *Dial.* 77, 78; Tertull. Jud 1:9; Epiph. *Exp Fid.* 8, and most Roman commentators, *e.g.* Corn. a Lapide, *in loc.*), partly on account of references such as Psa 72:10, Isa 60:5, partly on account of the character of the gifts, partly by reason of the close intercourse that subsisted between Arabia and Palestine (Edersheim, i. p. 203). On the other hand, Arabia is to the south rather than the east of Judaea (cf. Mat 12:42 βασιλίσσα νότου), and in the NT it is usually specified by its geographical name. Other places suggested are Persia (Clem. Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] *Strom.* i. 15; Chrysost. *in Mt. Hom.* 6. § 1, 2, 3, 4; 7. § 5; *Op. Imp. in Matthew 2 ap.* Chrysost. vi.; Diodorus Tars. *ap.* Phot. cod. 223; Theophylact, *in loc.*; Juvenius, *Evang. Hist.* i. 276), Chaldaea (Max. Taur. *Hom.* 21; Origen, *C.* [Note: circa, about.] *Cels.* i. 58), Parthia (Wetstein, *in loc.*; Hyde, *Rel. Vet. Pers.* [Note: Persian.] c. 31), and Egypt (Möller, *Neue Ansichten*). But the language of the Evangelist is ‘too indefinite, and perhaps intentionally too indefinite, to justify any decision’ (Trench, *Star of the Wise Men*, p. 4), and it is unsafe to draw any inference from the nature of the presents (Weiss, *Life of Christ*, i. p. 266). One thing alone seems clear—the Magi were heathen and not Jews (see references in Meyer, *Com. in loc.*). The form of their question (Mat 2:2) would be sufficient to establish this, apart from the ecclesiastical tradition which represents their homage as the first-fruits of the Gentile world (Aquinas, *Summa*, III. xxxvi. 8).

The cause of the coming of the Magi is roughly indicated in the words, ‘we have seen his star in the rising’ (ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ). It seems clear that they were induced to make the journey by some sidereal appearance; but what exactly this appearance was is not conclusively determined (see art. Star). From this phenomenon, however, whatever it may have been, the Magi inferred the birth of a Messiah-king of the Jews. We cannot say precisely by what means they arrived at this inference. It is unlikely, for

chronological and other reasons, that their expectations had been excited by the Zoroastrian prediction of the coming of Soshyos (*SBE [Note: BE Sacred Books of the East.]* iv. p. xxxvii); nor is it probable that an independent tradition of Balaam's prophecy (*Num. 24:17*) had been preserved by their ancestors and handed down to them (Origen, *c. [Note: circa, about.] Cels.* i. 60, *Hom. in Num. 13:7; Op. Imp. in Matthew 2 ap.* Chrysost. vi.); nor is there any historical evidence that there was at this time among the nations any widespread expectation of the advent of a Messiah in Palestine (Tac. *Hist.* v. 13 and Suet. *Vesp.* 4 are derived from Josephus *BJ* VI. v. 4, and refer to the Flavian dynasty). On the other hand, the Jews themselves were undoubtedly expecting the Messiah (Charles, *Eschatology*, p. 304; Toy, *Judaism and Christianity*, p. 330), and a Rabbinical tradition, which may be previous to Christ's birth, declared that a star in the East was to appear two years before the Messiah's advent (Edersheim, i. pp. 211, 212; Strauss, *Life of Jesus*, English translation p. 174 and references; cf. the name Bar-Cochba). Hence the source whence the Magi derived their inference that a king of the Jews was born may well have been the Jews of the Diaspora, whose tenets would doubtless be known to the wise men of the lands in which they sojourned.

The time of the visit of the Magi is quite uncertain. By ancient writers it was usually supposed that they arrived at Bethlehem on the 13th day inclusive after the birth of Christ, *i.e.* Jan. 6 (Aug. *Serm.* 203. 1). Most commentators, however, place their coming after Christ's presentation in the Temple; and some, as an inference from *Mat. 2:16*, delay it till Jesus had reached or nearly reached His second year (see Patritius, iii. 326 ff.; Spanheim, ii. p. 299 ff.; Trench, p. 109 ff.; Ramsay, *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* pp. 215-220). Here also the evidence is insufficient to warrant a definite conclusion.

2. The *historical value* of the narrative has been frequently impugned, the principal objections being as follows. The account of the Magi is found in the First Gospel only, and is not corroborated by either Lk. or Josephus or any pagan historian. (The references in Macrobius, *Sat.* ii. 4. 11, and Chalcidius, *Tim.* 7. 126, cannot be regarded as independent evidence). Moreover, it is not easy to see how Mt.'s narrative can be harmonized with that of Luke. Many of the details, again, are suspicious; the conduct of Herod, as here represented, seems inexplicable (Meyer, *in loc.*). Finally, the story in general is vague, and on *a priori* grounds may even be held to be improbable. These objections are not without force. Doubtless too much stress has been laid on the absence of confirmatory evidence, and the argument from the silence of Josephus can scarcely be sustained (Edersheim, i. pp. 214, 215; Trench, p. 102 ff.). The difficulties in connexion with Herod's attitude have also been overestimated (Weiss, i. p. 269). Yet the divergence between Mt. and Lk., though certainly not incapable of explanation (Ellicott, *Huls. Lect.* p. 70), is sufficiently serious; and the positive evidence for the truth of the narrative is slender. It may be

urged, however, that there is no reason for denying the existence in the narrative of at least a substratum of historical fact, though possibly the facts have been treated with a certain amount of freedom. Such a view, at any rate, appears to account for the story better than any rationalistic explanation hitherto put forward.

Of these attempted explanations the most important may briefly be summarized. (a) The older school of critics sought for the basis of the history mainly in the prophecies of the OT. Thus Strauss laid great stress on Num 24:17, while Keim emphasized Is 60. From these and other prophetic passages (e.g. Isa 9:2; Isa 42:6; Isa 49:6-7, Psa 68:29; Psa 68:31; Psa 72:10), supplemented possibly by Jewish or pagan tradition, the Evangelist is supposed to have built up his story. But it is incredible that the history could have been constructed from such material, or that such a fulfilment could have been deliberately devised for prophecies which at the time were understood to have so different a significance (Edersheim, i. p. 209). Moreover, it should be noted that 'the Evangelist who at other times searches zealously for the fulfilment of OT predictions, nowhere refers in this narrative to one of these prophetic passages, from which it is said to have arisen (Weiss, i. p. 267). (b) A different, and very fanciful explanation has been offered by W. Soltau, Usener, and others (Soltau, *Birth of Jesus Christ*; Usener in *Encyc. Bibl.* art. 'Nativity,' cf. his *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, i. 'Das Weihnachtsfest'). According to this, Mt.'s account is the outcome partly of the operation of heathen superstitious ideas, partly of the transformation of a story recorded by Dio Cassius and Pliny. Thus, for the incident of the star, Soltau appeals to the widespread belief that such portents were manifested in connexion with the birth and death of kings and heroes (for instances see Wetstein, *in loc.*; Winer, *Biblisches Realwörterbuch*, vol. ii. p. 613); and, for the Massacre of the innocents, Usener refers to the story of Marathus concerning the birth of Augustus (Suet. *Aug.* 94). The visit of the Magi is represented as a Christian transformation of the story related by Dio and Pliny about the visit of Tiridates and his Magians to Nero (see the passages quoted by Soltau, *op. cit.* pp. 73, 74). In the year a.d. 66 the Parthian king Tiridates, the Magus, bringing other Magi with him, journeyed to Rome, worshipped Nero as the sun-god Mithra, and afterwards travelled home by another way through the cities of Asia. Now to the Christians of the East Nero was Antichrist: hence it is argued that just as, in the early legends, the miraculous events of Christ's life were transferred to Antichrist, so the story of being worshipped by Magi may have been transferred from the Antichrist Nero to the Christ. The whole narration of the Magi, then, Soltau dismisses as an insertion 'of Hellenistic origin' (*op. cit.* p. 49). But he does not explain how this insertion received so characteristic a Jewish form, or why such alien elements should have 'crystallized themselves in just the most markedly Jewish part of the New Testament, while they are passed over in silence elsewhere' (*Interpreter*, Jan. 1906, pp. 195-207). On the whole it is easier to suppose that the events recorded actually took place, than to believe the far-fetched explanations of them offered by Soltau and Usener. (c) Other

critics, again, resort to a mythological solution, and regard the adoration of the Magi and the attendant events as 'not history, but pious transformations of current mythic stories.' Réville believes that it was suggested by the Mithraic legend, though he admits that the supposition is incapable of proof (*Études publiées en hommage à la faculté de théologie de Montauban*, 1901, p. 339 ff.). Pfleiderer and Cheyne maintain that the star, the worship of the wise men, and the persecution of the Holy Child have many prototypes in tales concerning heroes of old, and belong to a pre-Christian international myth of the Redeemer (Pfleiderer, *Early Christian Conception of Christ*; Cheyne, *Bible Problems*); on which it may be remarked that although striking parallels can undoubtedly be produced, yet resemblances do not necessarily presuppose an imitation. (d) Another suggestion is that the narrative exhibits the characteristic features of Jewish Midrash or Haggâdâ, and is governed by an apologetic purpose. The writer's object is to show that the prophecy of Deu 18:15 was fulfilled in Jesus, and he endeavours to do this by drawing a parallel between the early career of Moses and that of the Christian Messiah (see the *Midrash Rabbâ* to Exodus in the section which deals with the birth of Moses, and cf. Josephus *Ant.* ii. ix. 2). Jesus is throughout represented as the antitype of Moses. This is the underlying motive of the narrative, to which may be added another influential idea, viz. the desire to suggest the homage of the Gentile world (G. H. Box in *Interpreter*, *loc. cit.*). The simplicity of the Gospel story, however, seems to be at variance with this hypothesis.

Allusion may here be made to the theory that the history of the Magi was added to the Gospel as late as the year a.d. 119. The evidence for this is a Syriac document, ascribed to Eusebius of Caesarea, which was published with an English translation by W. Wright in the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, vols. ix., x., 1866, from a 6th cent. British Museum codex, Add. 17, 142. The title is, 'Concerning the star; showing how and through what the Magi recognized the star, and that Joseph did not take Mary as his wife.' This tractate relates that the prophecy of Balaam about the star was recorded in a letter written by Balak to the king of Assyria, and preserved in the Assyrian archives. At last, in the reign of king Pir Shabour, the star appeared, and the Magi were sent with great pomp to do homage to the Messiah. The colophon at the end states: 'And in the year 430 (= a.d. 119), in the reign of Hadrianus Caesar.... this concern arose in (the minds of) men acquainted with the Holy Books; and through the pains of the great men in various places this history was sought for and found and written in the tongue of those who took this care.' As to the meaning of this statement, however, critics are not agreed (see F. C. Conybeare, *Guardian*, April 29, 1903; and, on the other side, *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1904, p. 389). The more probable explanation seems to be that 'the Holy Books' refers, not to the OT but to the narrative in Matthew 2, already, therefore, incorporated in the Gospel in a.d. 119; and that the 'history' is not Matthew 2, but the legend about the preservation of Balak's letter and the coming of the Magi in the reign of Pir Shabour.

To conclude this part of the subject, it may be pointed out that the story of the Magi must stand or fall with the other Matthaean narratives of the Infancy. All were probably drawn from some written source, Jewish-Christian in character, and perhaps originally Aramaic in language. The value of this source cannot here be determined (see artt. Birth of Christ, Matthew). It is sufficient to point out that if a Palestinian or semi-Palestinian origin of the narratives can be sustained, the hypothesis of direct pagan influence in their formation must be rejected.

3. Of the *legendary accretions* to the story of the Magi, the following deserve notice. From the 6th cent., if not before (Tert. *Marc.* iii. 13, Jud 1:9 are not decisive), the opinion prevailed that the Magi were kings. This belief is first unambiguously stated in a sermon ascribed to Caesarius of Arles (Aug. *Opp.* v. Append. *Serm.* 139. 3); and it prevailed universally during the Middle Ages (cf. Paschasius, *Exp. in Mt.* ii. 2). Hence the festival of Epiphany received the name *Festum Trium Regum*. The idea would, of course, find support in such passages as Psa 68:29; Psa 68:31; Psa 72:10, Isa 49:7; Isa 49:23; Isa 60:3; Isa 60:10; Isa 60:16; but there is no suggestion of it in the Evangelic narrative. (For discussions see Patritius, iii. p. 320 ff.; Spanheim, ii. p. 273 ff.; Barradius, *Com.* ix. c. 8).

The number of the Magi is not specified in the Gospel. Eastern tradition fixed it at twelve (*Op. Imp. in Matthew 2 ap.* Chrysost. vi.; cf. the curious MS fragment quoted in *Classical studies in honour of Henry Drisler*, p. 31—'Twelve kings set out from Persia to go to Jerusalem,' etc.), or thirteen (Bar Bahlul in Hyde, *Rcl. Vet. Pers. [Note: Persian.]* c. 31). But in the West the number of the Magi was reckoned at three (Max. Taur. *Hom.* 17, 20; Leo M. *Serm.* 31. § 1, 2; 34. § 2), probably on account of their threefold gift (Abelard, *Serm.* 4: 'Quot vero isti magi fuerint, ex numero trinae oblationis tres eos fuisse multi suspicantur'), though allegorical reasons were also found (Patritius, iii. 318 ff.).

The familiar names of the Magi—Melchior, Gaspar, and Balthasar—first occur in Bede, where also is given a remarkable description of their persons, derived most probably from some early work of art. 'Primus fuisse dicitur Melchior, senex et canus, barba prolixa et capillis... aurum obtulit regi Domino. Secundus nomine Gaspar, iuvenis imberbis, rubicundus... thure, quasi Deo oblatione digna, Deum honorabat. Tertius fuscus, integre barbatus, Balthasar nomine... per myrrham filium hominis moriturum professus est' (*Collect.* v. 541. For the association of the gifts with the several Magi, contrast the familiar verse, 'Gaspar fert myrrham, thus Melchior, Balthasar aurum'). Other names are found, e.g. Appellius, Amerius, Damascus: Magalath, Pangalath, Saracen: Ator, Sator, Peratoras, etc. (Patritius, iii. p. 326; Spanheim, ii. pp. 288, 289; Hebenstreit, *de Magorum nomine, patria et statu dissert.*, Jenae, 1709). Hyde quotes thirteen names, among which the three familiar to Western tradition do not occur (*Rel. Vet. Pers. [Note: Persian.]* c. 31).

Symbolical meanings were early attached to the gifts. Thus Irenaeus says: 'Matthaeus autem Magos ab Oriente venientes ait.... per ea quae obtulerunt munera ostendisse quis erat qui adorabatur: myrrham quidem quod ipse erat qui pro mortali humano genere moreretur et sepeliretur: aurum vero quoniam rex, cuius regni finis non est: thus vero, quoniam Deus, qui et notus in Judaea factus est, et manifestus eis qui non quaerebant eum' (*Hær.* iii. 9. 2, cf. *Max. Taur. Hom.* 21; *Leo, Serm.* 34. 3; *Origen, c. Cels.* i. 60; *Ambros. in Lk.* ii. 44; [*Aug.*] *Serm.* 139. 2; *Hilar. Com. in Matthew 1*; and Christian poets, *Juvencus, Ev. Hist.* i. 285; *Prudent. Cath.* xii. 69 ff.; *Sedulius, Carm. Pasch.* ii. 96; [*Claudian*] *Carm. Append.* 21). Mediaeval tradition invented histories for these gifts. The gold consisted of thirty pennies, which had once been paid by Abraham for the cave of Machpelah, and which were afterwards given to Judas. Some of the myrrh is said to have been administered to Jesus on the cross (*Quarterly Review*, vol. lxxviii. p. 433 ff.).

Miraculous elements were increasingly introduced into the narrative, and the whole history was gradually amplified. Thus the star is alleged to have shone with surpassing brilliance (*Ignat. Ephes.* 19; *Leo, Serm.* 31. 1; *Protevang. Jacob.* 21; and pass. quoted in *Barradius, Com.* ix. 9), having the sun, moon, and other stars as 'chorus' to it (*Ignat. loc. cit.*). According to Eastern tradition, there was in the star an appearance of the Virgin and Child (*Lightfoot, ap. Fath.* ii. 81), or of a young child bearing a cross (*Op. Imp. in Matthew 2 ap. Chrysost.* vi.). The star was alleged to be an angel (*Suicer, Thes. s.v. ἀστήρ*); and according to *Greg. of Tours* it was still, in his time, to be seen in a well at Bethlehem (*Mirac.* i. 1). Similarly a mass of details were invented about the Magi themselves, their journey, and their later life and death. Here it need only be noticed that they are reported to have been baptized by St. Thomas. (A full account of the Magi-legends will be found in *Crombach's* monumental monograph, *Primitiæ gentium sive historia et encomium SS. Trium Magorum*. See also the epitome in the *Quarterly Review*, vol. lxxviii. p. 433 ff., of the mediaeval stories collected by *John of Hildesheim*; and the *Boll. AA. SS. Jan. d. i. vi*, and xi.).

The bodies of the Magi are said to have been discovered in the East in the 4th cent. (according to one tradition, by St. Helena herself), and to have been brought to Constantinople and deposited in the Church of St. Sofia. When *Eustorgius* became bishop of Milan, they were transferred to that city, whence, in the year 1162, they were again removed by *Frederic Barbarossa* to Cologne (*Boll. AA. SS. Jan. d. vi.*). The festival of Epiphany (the celebration of which in the West is mentioned first by *Amm. Marc.* xxi. 2) commemorated originally Christ's manifestation to the Magi, together with His baptism, His miracle at Cana (*Max. Taur. Hom.* 29; *Isid. de Off. Eccl.* i. 27; *Abelard, Serm.* 4), and the miracle of feeding the 5000 ([*Aug.*] *Append. Serm.* 36. 1). But soon the manifestation to the Magi became in the West, if not exclusively, yet principally, dwelt upon (see, e.g., *Leo's Epiphany Sermons*); and the common Western

synonym for Epiphany was *Festum Trium Regum* (Bingham, *Ant.* xx. 4; *DCA* [Note: *CA Dictionary of Christian Antiquities.*] i. p. 617 ff.; *Boll. AA. SS.* Jan. d. vi.). In the Middle Ages the Magi were considered the patron saints of travellers, and inns were called after them. Their names were also used as charms to cure epilepsy and snake-bite (Spanheim, ii. pp. 289, 290). See also art. Star.

Literature.—Besides the books referred to above, see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Magi'; *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , vol. viii. art. 'Magier'; *Encyc. Bibl.* art. 'Nativity'; Kraus, *RE*, vol. ii. art. 'Magier'; Moroni's *Dizionario*, vol. xli. art. 'Magi'; Hamburger's *RE*, art. 'Zauberei'; Smith's *DB* [Note: *Dictionary of the Bible.*] , artt. 'Magi,' 'Star'; Suicer, *Thesaurus*, artt. λιβανος, μάγος; Winer, *Biblisches Realwörterbuch*, vol. ii. artt. 'Magier,' 'Stem der Weisen'; Hone, *Everyday Book*, Jan. 6; and the various Comm. on Matthew. An English monograph by F. W. Upham, *The Wise Men*, is of little value. The discussions of Spanheim and Patritius should be consulted, while Crombach's elaborate study is a treasury of curious information.

F. Homes Dudden.

☞Magistrate

MAGISTRATE.—This English word occurs only twice in the Gospels (Authorized Version), viz. in [Luk 12:11](#); [Luk 12:58](#), where the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 gives the same translation. By our use of the word we usually mean one entrusted with the duty and power of putting laws into force, but the Greek ἄρχων (of which 'magistrate' is the translation in the passages before us) has a wider meaning, and may denote *ruler, captain, chief, king*. In the Gospels, ἄρχων (as well as the similar word ἡγεμών) occurs frequently, and will be referred to in the articles Rule and Ruler.

In the first of the instances to be noticed here our Lord prepares His disciples for the persecutions that await them. One form of persecution will be arrest and accusation before magistrates. In such an event, however, Christ's followers are not to concern themselves unduly about their defence, for the Holy Ghost shall teach them in the same hour what they ought to say. Their presence before the magistrates and their utterance in such a situation will constitute a twofold testimony—a testimony against the unbelief and injustice of their accusers, and perhaps also of the magistrates ([Mar 13:11](#))—and a testimony to the truth of the gospel and to their own fidelity ([Luk 21:13](#)). The Lord's prediction and promise were alike fulfilled. Persecutions did

ensue, and nothing is more remarkable than the dignity and wisdom of the words spoken by disciples thus accused before magistrates, the Holy Ghost being a mouth and wisdom unto them (Luk_21:15; cf. Act_4:13 *et al.*).

This policy of submissively trusting to the Holy ‘Ghost for defence is not to be taken as justifying Tolstoi’s theory of non-resistance. But our Lord’s counsel indicates that He looked upon existent magistracies as a part of the providential order, not to be overturned in any revolutionary way by His first disciples. Similarly, Christ taught that, the political circumstances being what they were, tribute should be paid to Caesar, the supreme magistrate (Mat_22:21). The capital instance of submission to the magistrate is Christ’s own demeanour before Pilate (styled ἡγεμόν in Mat_27:2, Luk_3:1). The subject of the relation between Christ and the magistrate runs into questions of Church and State, the spiritual and the civil power, individual conscience and public law.

In the second instance (Luk_12:58) Christ seems to warn against a litigious spirit, and to commend that ‘sweet reasonableness’ which is one of the gifts of His own Spirit, and which may obviate the necessity of going before a magistrate. This does not condemn as un-Christian all reference to a magistrate, but Christ hints that to agree with an adversary quickly may prove to be the highest prudence as well as the most Christian-like conduct. The advice is sometimes spiritualized to mean that the sinner ought to settle accounts with God quickly.

R. M. Adamson.

☛Magnificat

MAGNIFICAT.—Our primary interest in the hymn *Magnificat* (Luk_1:46-55) is centred in the question of (1) its authorship, upon which must largely depend the scope of (2) its interpretation. Then (3) the history of its liturgical use may be briefly summarized.

1. *Authorship.*—Opinions are divided as to the source from which St. Luke derived the materials of his first chapter. Völter suggests that it is based on an *Apocalypse of Zacharias*, a Jewish document which has been edited by a Christian, who found the *Magnificat* attributed to Elisabeth, and transferred it to Mary. Weizsäcker thinks that St. Luke simply inserted an early Christian hymn. A more satisfactory view is that of Sanday (*Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible* ii. 639, 644), who suggests that St. Luke was supplied with a special (written) source, through one of the women mentioned in Luk_8:3; Luk_24:10, possibly Joanna, who, being the wife of Herod’s steward, may also have supplied information about the court of Herod. We know from Joh_19:25

(cf. Act 1:14) that the Virgin Mary was brought into contact with this group. Ramsay (*Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* p. 88) calls attention to ‘a womanly spirit in the whole narrative, which seems inconsistent with the transmission from man to man, and which, moreover, is an indication of Luke’s character; he had a marked sympathy with women.’ On the supposition that St. Luke used an Aramaic tradition or document, it is possible to account for all the characteristics of style by which Harnack (see below) seeks to prove that he was the author both of the *Magnificat* and of the *Benedictus*.

Having described the visit of the Virgin Mary to Elisabeth, and Elisabeth’s salutation, the Textus Receptus has καὶ εἶπεν [Μαριάμ] with the variant reading Ἐλισάβετ. Then follows the hymn, the text of which has been excellently preserved, the only other doubtful reading being μεγάλα, for which we should probably read μεγαλεῖα.

Μαριάμ is the reading of all Greek Manuscripts, of the great majority of Latin Manuscripts, and of innumerable Patristic testimonies, back to the 2nd cent., when Tertullian wrote (*de Anima*, 26): ‘Exsultat Elisabet, Johannes intus impulerat, glorificat dominum Maria, Christus intus instinxerat.’

Ἐλισάβετ is the reading of three Old Latin Manuscripts. *a* (Vercellensis, saec. iv.), *b* (Veronensis, saec. v.), *rhe* (Rhedigeranus-Vratislaviensis, saec. fere vii.), in Burkitt’s phrase ‘a typical European group,’ to which may be added the testimony of Niceta of Remesiana, *de Psalmodiae Bono*, c. 9: ‘Nec Elisabeth, diu sterilis, edito de repromissione filio, Deum de ipsa anima magnificare cessat; c. 11: Cum Elisabeth Dominum anima nostra magnificat.’

So also Origen, or his translator Jerome, in the 5th *Homily* on Luke 5 (Lommatzsch, *t. v.* p. 108 f.): ‘Inuenitur beata Maria, sicut in aliquantis exemplaribus reperimus, prophetare; non enim ignoramus, quod secundum alios codices et haec uerba Elisabet uaticinetur Spiritu itaque sancto tunc repleta est Maria,’ etc. Harnack thinks that Jerome, if he had been responsible for this reference, would have mentioned whether the reading was in Latin or Greek Manuscripts. But as Jerome was writing in Latin, and the evidence of Niceta shows that the reading *Elisabeth* was more persistent and widespread in the very district from which Jerome came,—having been born in Pannonia, not a great distance from Remesiana,—it must be considered still possible that he interpolated the reference.

Lastly we come to Irenaeus, iv. 7. 1 (*Cod. Clarom. et Voss.*): ‘sed et Elisabet ait: Magnificat anima mea dominum,’ etc. *Cod. Arund.* ‘Maria.’ In iii. 10. 1: ‘Propter quod exultans Maria clamabat pro ecclesia prophetans: Magnificat anima mea dominum,’

etc. Here the context proves that Irenaeus intended to write 'Maria.*' [Note: In iii. 14. 3, Irenaeus refers to Luk_1:42-45 as exclamatio Elisabet.] Thus it seems probable that it was the translator of Irenaeus, or a copyist, who introduced the reading *Elisabet* from his Old Latin Bible, and we may safely carry it back to the 3rd century.* [Note: Burkitt still adheres to his view, that 'Irenaeus regarded Elisabeth as a type of 'the ancient Jewish Ecclesia prophesying by a Divine Spirit about the Christ.']

How then are we to account for the reading? Bardenhewer thinks that, Μαριάμ having dropped out, Ἐλισάβετ was supplied by a copyist. But most critics (Burkitt, Harnack, Wordsworth) agree that the original text must have been καὶ εἶπεν without either name. Burkitt puts it concisely: ' "Mary" was read by Tertullian as well as by all Greek and Syriac texts. This is fatal to "Elisabeth"; yet, if "Mary" were genuine, the actual occurrence of "Elisabeth" in the European branch of the Old Latin would be inexplicable. But if the original text of the Gospel had καὶ εἶπεν Μεγαλύνει, κ.τ.λ., without either name, all the evidence falls into line.'

On the question, which is the right gloss, critics are divided. Harnack and Burkitt argue for 'Elisabeth,' Wordsworth and Spitta for 'Mary.' (1) Harnack does not think that the exclamation of Luk_1:42-45 covers all that is implied in Luk_1:41 καὶ ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἁγίου ἢ Ἐλισάβετ. In Luk_1:67 similar words are used about Zacharias, and are followed by the *Benedictus*. Nothing is said about Mary being filled with the prophetic spirit. It does not seem necessary, on the other hand, to resort to the extreme remedy of Spitta, who refuses to consider that the *Benedictus* supplies a parallel case, because he thinks that it has been interpolated at this point. The 'glowing words' of Elisabeth's address need some reply. 'Could St. Mary, who answered so freely and so bravely, yet so humbly, to the angel, have been silent at such a moment when addressed by one whom she knew so well?' (Wordsworth). Though undoubtedly she is kept, or more probably keeps herself, in the background of this history, and is not spoken of as 'filled with the Holy Ghost,' there is no question of deepest communing with God (*Gottinnigkeit*, Spitta), and this suffices to explain the outpouring in devotion and faith of a mind stored with OT phrases.

In the OT 'when any question is addressed to a person or persons whom the reader knows to be present, the formula of reply is frequently and perhaps generally without proper name and without pronoun'; cf. Luk_2:49. Later in his Gospel Lk. generally uses ὁ δὲ εἶπεν; but the first chapters have 'a special OT colouring' (Wordsworth), in view of which Harnack's argument, that 'if in Luk_2:46 the subject was to be changed, Lk. would have written εἶπεν δὲ Μαριάμ,' falls to the ground. Further, the

words μακαριοῦσί με πᾶσαι αἱ γενεαί of Luk 2:48 seem to be a reply to Elisabeth's μακαρία ἡ πιστεύουσα. On the other hand, it is only fair to point out that Prof. Burkitt seeks to prove that St. Luke was 'remarkably fond of inserting καὶ εἶπεν or εἶπεν δὲ between the speeches of his characters without a change of speaker.'† [Note: JThSt vii. p. 223.] (2) Another argument has been based on the words ἔμεινεν δὲ Μαριάμ σὺν αὐτῇ, which are said to make it probable that Elisabeth has been the speaker, otherwise Lk. would have written ἔμεινεν δὲ Μ. σὺν τῇ Ἐ. or ἔμεινεν δὲ σὺν τῇ Ἐ. 'The Peshitta as well as the Sinai Palimpsest renders, "Now Mary remained *with Elisabeth.*" But the Greek has retained "the tell-tale αὐτῇ" ' (Burkitt).

In the OT the personality of the singer is, as a rule, sunk in the song, and the name is mentioned at the end as if to pick up the thread (cf. Balaam, Num 24:25; Moses, Deu 32:44; Deu 34:1 etc.). It is true that Hannah's name is not mentioned in 1Sa 2:11, but it has been mentioned at the beginning. The name marks 'the whole section Luk 1:39-56 as what we may call a "Mary section," ' the Syriac reading being an attempt to clear up ambiguity (Wordsworth).

On the whole, then, so far as external evidence goes, the balance of probability is in favour of the reading or gloss 'Mary.' But the more difficult question of internal evidence remains for discussion. Does the *Magnificat* seem more suitable on the lips of Elisabeth?

Harnack thinks that it was modelled on the lines of Hannah's song, that it expresses the feeling of a mother from whom has been removed what Jewish women felt as 'the reproach of childlessness.' Burkitt suggests that 'the Λόγος ἀπὸ Σιγῆς προελθῶν more corresponds to the fitness of things than a burst of premature song.'

Apart from the question raised by Wellhausen whether Hannah's song has been interpolated in 1 Samuel 2, Spitta thinks that it is the song of a warrior rather than a woman, and looks elsewhere for parallels to the *Magnificat*. Any way, either Mary or Elisabeth would regard it as the song of Hannah, which is the main point before us. We cannot do better than quote the text at this point, with Harnack's parallels, to introduce his argument that St. Luke is thereby proved to be the actual author of the hymn which he puts into the mouth of Elisabeth.

Luk 1:46-47 Μεγαλύνεις ἡ ψυχὴ μου (1) 1Sa 2:1 Ἐστερεώθη ἡ καρδία μου
τὸν κύριον, καὶ ἠγαλλίασεν τὸ πνεῦμα υ' ἐν κυρίῳ, ὑψώθη κέρας μου ἐν θ

α μου ἐτὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτῆρί μου ἄ

εῷ μου.

ν. 48 ὅτι ἐτέβλεψεν ἐπὶ τὴν ταπειν
ωσιν τῆς δούλης αὐτοῦ. ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἀπ
ὸ τοῦ νῦν μακαριοῦσιν με πᾶσαι αἰ
γενεαί,

(2) 1Sa 1:11 ἐὰν ἐπιβλέπων ἐπεβλέψ
ης ἐπὶ τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῆς δούλης σ
ου; Gen 30:13 μακαρία ἐγώ, ὅτι μα
καρίζουσιν με πᾶσαι αἰ γυναῖκες.

Luk 1:49 ὅτις ἐτοίησέν μοι μεγάλα ὀ
δυνατός, καὶ ἅγιον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ,

(3) Deu 10:21 ὅστις ἐπάησεν ἐν σοὶ
τὰ μεγάλα. Psa 111:9 ἅγιον καὶ φο
βερὸν τὸ ἔνομα αὐτοῦ.

Luk 1:50 καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ εἰς γεν
εὰς καὶ γενεὰς τοῖς φοβουμένοις α
ὐτόν,

(4) Psa 103:17 τὸ δὲ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρι
ου ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ ἰως τοῦ αἰῶ
νος ἐπὶ τοὺς φοβουμένους αὐτόν

Luk 1:51 ἐτοίησιν κράτος ἐν βραχίῳ
νε αὐτοῦ, διεσκόρπησεν ὑπερηφάνου
ς διανοία καρδίας αὐτῶν ἄ

(5) Psa 89:11 σὺ ἐταπείνωσας ὡς τρ
αυματίαν ὑπερήφανον, καὶ ἐν τῷ βρ
αχίῳ τῆς δυνάμεώς σου διεσκόρπισ
ας τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου.

Luk 1:52 καθεῖλεν δυνάστας ἀπὸ θρ
όνων καὶ ἕψωσεν ταπεινοὺς,

(6) Job 12:19 δυνάστας δὲ γῆς κατέ
στρεψεν, Job 5:11 τὸν ποιοῦντα ταπ
εινοὺς εἰς ὕψος.

Luk 1:53 πενῶντας ἐνέπλησεν ἀγαθῶ
ν καὶ πλουτοῦντας ἐζήκτεστείλεν κενο
ύς.

(7) 1Sa 2:7 κύριος πτωχίζει καὶ πλο
υτίζει, ταπεινεῖ καὶ ἀνυψεῖ Psa 107:9
ψυχὴν πεινῶσαν ἐνέπλησεν ἀγαθῶν.
Job 12:19 ἐξαποστέλλων ἱερεῖς αἰχμ
αλώτους.

Luk 1:54 ἀντελάβετο Ἰσραὴλ παιδὸς

(8) Isa 41:8 σὺ δὲ, Ἰσραὴλ, παῖς μο

αὐτοῦ, μνησθῆναι ἐλέους

υ, οὐ̄ ἀντελαβόμεν. Psa 98:3 ἐμνήσθη τοῦ ἐλέους αὐτοῦ τῷ Ἰακώβ.

Luk 1:55—κατέρας ἡμῶν—τῷ Ἀβραάμ καὶ τῷ στέρματι αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

(9) Mic 7:20 δώσει ... ἔλεον τῷ Ἀβραάμ, καθότι ὤμοσας τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν; 2Sa 22:51 καὶ ποεῶν ἔλεος ... τῷ Δαυεὶδ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ ἕως κίωνος.

In regard to these parallels Spitta argues with some force that there are nearer parallels in the Psalms; e.g. Psa 33:3-4 ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ ἐπαινεθήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ μου ... μεγαλύνετε τὸν κύριον σὺν ἐμοί; Psa 34:9 ζ μου ἀγαλλιάσεται ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ, τερφθήσεται ἐπὶ τῷ σωτηρίῳ αὐτοῦ; LXX Psalm 34:27 =Psa 39:17 = Psa 69:5 ἀγαλλιάσαιντο καὶ εὐφρανθήσων ἐπὶ σοὶ πάντες οἱ ζητοῦντές σε κύριε, καὶ εἰπάτωσαν διὰ παντός, Μεγαλυνθήτω ὁ κύριος, οἱ ἀγαπῶντες τὸ σωτήριόν σου.* [Note: He quotes Psa 9:14 f. Psa 12:4-6; Psa 30:8 as parallels to Luk 1:53.] This is true; but at the same time we cannot doubt that a Jewish woman would turn to Hannah's song as, so to speak, a model, even though the phrases of the psalms which she used often in devotion would come more readily to her lips while working out her idea.

Harnack picks out certain words as having no place in his parallels, and suggests that they are not found in the LXX Septuagint, and being characteristic of Lk.'s style, prove that he was really the author of the hymn. Spitta, however, proves that the phrases in question are not only found in the LXX Septuagint, but are not so characteristic of Lk.'s style; e.g. (1) ἰδοὺ γάρ is found not only in Luk 1:44; Luk 2:10; Luk 6:23; Luk 17:21, Act 9:11, but also in 2Co 7:11;* [Note: Psa 50:7-8; Psa 53:6, Isa 32:7; Isa 38:17; Isa 44:22; Isa 62:11; Isa 66:15.] (2) ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, said to be found in Luk 5:10; Luk 12:52; Luk 22:18; Luk 22:69, Act 18:6 only, is also found 2Co 5:16.† [Note: Gen 46:30, 2Ch 16:9, Tob 10:13, 11:9, Isa 48:6, Dan 10:17.] These instances alone will suffice to prove how unsafe the foundations are upon which Harnack's argument is based.

There is one other possible source for some of the phrases which has not been mentioned, i.e. the 18 Benedictions of the Synagogue (quoted by Warren, *Liturgy of Ante-Nicene Church*, p. 243).

Luk 1:49

Ben. 2: 'Thou art mighty, O Lord, world without end.'

Luk 1:51

Ben. 12: 'Let the proud speedily be uprooted, broken, crushed, and humbled speedily in our days. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who breakest down the enemy and humblest the proud.'

Luk 1:54-55

Ben. 1: 'Blessed art Thou who rememberest the pious deeds of our fathers, and sendest the Redeemer to their children's children. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the shield of Abraham.'

On the whole, then, in spite of Harnack's arguments, there is still room to believe that St. Luke translated, or perhaps to some extent worked up into a Greek hymn, the materials supplied to him in an Aramaic tradition or document. There was no unnatural seeking after effect. In reply to Elisabeth's address no conventional answer would seem in place. On the other hand, Prof. Burkitt regards the whole of Elisabeth's words as the acknowledgment of Mary's salutation, and finds 'a striking parallel in Luk 2:25-35, *i.e.* the conversation of Mary and Simeon. In both cases Mary's interlocutor is said to have a holy Spirit, in both cases the whole of the words recorded is assigned to the interlocutor, and the words themselves consist partly of pious meditation, partly of words addressed exclusively to Mary' (*JThSt [Note: ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.]* vii. p. 225). This is a question perhaps of sentiment. But few devout believers in the Incarnation would hesitate to express their profound gratitude for the words of simple faith and hope, grounded, as Spitta has certainly shown, as much on the Psalms as on Hannah's song, a spontaneous offering of praise from a lowly spirit continually in communion with the Divine, and therefore never lacking words of praise. We may regard these words as spoken in substance by the Virgin Mary, and yet maintain the truth of the phrase of Ignatius about 'the Word proceeding from silence.' The silence remains unbroken. No personal dread of the possible reproach not of childlessness but of shame, no personal exultation in this transcendent blessedness among women, find expression.

2. Interpretation.—The scope of interpretation varies in accordance with the view held concerning the authorship. Harnack's description is correct so far as it goes: 'The artistic arrangement of the pronouns, which governs the hymn, expresses exactly the

progress of thought, advancing from the subjective to the objective in order to return again to the subjective, though in a higher form.’ But he fails to express the situation so clearly described by Liddon (p. 13) from the internal evidence.

‘Like the songs of Zacharias and Simeon, it is something more than a psalm, and something less than a complete Christian hymn. A Christian poet, living after the Resurrection of Christ, would surely have said more; a Hebrew psalmist would have said less than Mary. In this Hymn of hers we observe a consciousness of nearness to the fulfilment of the great promises, to which there is no parallel even in the latest of the psalms; and yet even Mary does not speak of the Promised One, as an Evangelist or an Apostle would have spoken of Him, by His Human Name, and with distinct reference to the mysteries of His Life and Death and Resurrection. Her Hymn was a native product of one particular moment of transition in sacred religious history, and of no other; when the twilight of the ancient dispensation was melting, but had not yet melted, into the full daylight of the new.’

In Strophe i. (Luk_1:46-47) she offers praise to God as His due, with all powers of the soul, that is, of imagination and impulse; and of the spirit, with the faculties of reason and memory and will.

In Strophe ii. (Luk_1:48-49) she dwells on the distinction vouchsafed to her in becoming the Mother of the Incarnate Son. She is to live in the memory of mankind not because she deserves it, but because He whose Name is holy so wills.

In Strophe iii. (Luk_1:51; Luk_1:53), turning away from self, she rises, as in moments of spiritual enlightenment any one may rise, to larger views of God’s purposes in the shaping of human history. His presence and power are vindicated in the humbling of the proudest dynasties and the triumph of the meek. This thought is characteristic of a group of psalms (9, 10, 22, 25, 35, 40, 69, 109; cf. 4 Ezr (2 Es) 11:42, Ps-Son_5:13 f.) which must often have been in the minds of the little group—Joseph, Mary, Zacharias, Elisabeth, Simeon, Anna—who were looking for the redemption of Israel.

In Strophe iv. (Luk_1:54-55) she comes back to the thought of the Messianic time now beginning: the assurances given to the fathers should be fulfilled. The source of the Incarnation is found in God’s attributes of loving-kindness and truth.

3. Liturgical use.—In the Eastern Church the *Magnificat* is sung as a morning canticle. This also was its use in the West at one time. In the directions at the end of the Rule of Aurelian, bp. of Arles, c. [Note: circa, about.] 540, it is mentioned as used in the Office of Lands ‘with antiphon or with alleluia, following OT psalms and canticles, and followed by *Gloria in excelsis*.’* [Note: Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxviii. 393.]

In the treatise of Niceta, *de Psalmodiae Bono*, to which we have already alluded, the primary reference is to Vigils, to the use, therefore, of the *Magnificat* in the evening. The list of canticles mentioned corresponds to that in use in the Church of Constantinople at that time. When the later-hour offices were developed in the West, it was, in accordance with such usage, attached to Vespers, with varying antiphon. Thus it passed into the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI., and has since been used in Evensong after the first Lesson.

In Julian's *Dict. of Hymnology* there are references to several metrical versions which found favour from the 16th century. But these are of no importance.

Literature.—O. Bardenhewer, *Biblische Studien*, vi. (1901) p. 187; F. C. Burkitt in A. E. Burn's *Niceta of Remesiana*, 1905, and *JThSt* [Note: *ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.*] vii. 220; A. Harnack, *Sitzungsberichte der k. preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften*, 1900, xxvii. p. 537; F. Jacobé, *Revue d'hist. et de litt. religieuses*, ii. p. 424; H. P. Liddon, *The Magnificat*, 1889; W. Sanday, art. 'Jesus Christ' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible; F. Spitta, 'Das Magnifikat ein Psalm der Maria und nicht der Elisabeth,' *Theol. Abhandlungen*, 1902; Völter, *ThT* [Note: *hT Theol. Tijdschrift.*] xxx. (1896) p. 224; Bp. Wordsworth in A. E. Burn's *Niceta of Remesiana*; T. D. Bernard, *Songs of the Holy Nativity*, 1895, pp. 56, 65.

A. E. Burn.

☩ Mahalaleel

MAHALALEEL.—An ancestor of Jesus, Luk_3:37.

☩ Maid

MAID.—The English words 'maid,' 'maiden' represent three Greek words: κοράσιον (Mat_9:24 f. Authorized Version 'maid,' Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'damsel'); ἡ παῖς (Luk_8:51 Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'maiden'; Luk_8:54 Authorized Version 'maid,' Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'maiden'); and παιδίσκη (Mat_26:69, Joh_18:17 Authorized Version 'damsel,' Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'maid'; Mar_14:66; Mar_14:69, Luk_22:56 Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'maid'; Luk_12:45 Authorized Version 'maidens,' Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'maidservants').

The first two clearly signify ‘young girl,’ answering to the Aramaic *talîtha* (cf. Mar 5:41 and Luk 8:54 : for a discussion of the Aramaic form see art. Talitha cumi). *Talîtha* seems to have been frequently employed in the sense of ‘young woman.’ In the Targums it is used of Dinah, Miriam, and Esther. It and its Greek equivalents have almost that meaning as applied to the daughter of Jairus. κοράσιον seems to have lost its diminutive force in later Greek and to have been no longer employed as a familiar term, but to have been virtually equivalent to κόρη, παιδίσκη, the feminine of παιδίσκος, originally a diminutive of παῖς, meant in the first instance ‘girl’ and then ‘domestic female servant’ or ‘slave.’ It has the latter meaning in the Gospels. In some passages in the LXX Septuagint (Exo 20:10, Lev 25:44 etc.) it represents ’*âmâh* (cf. art. Handmaid). It seems to have been used especially of a doorkeeper (Gospels, Act 12:13, Lysias cited by Wetstein). That it often referred to a slave, not a hired servant, is evident from the passages quoted by Wetstein from the grammarians, and seems to be implied in the contrast between παιδίσκης and ἐλευθέρως in Gal 4:22.

Literature.—Wetstein on Mat 26:69; Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, i. 303b; Swete on Mar 14:66,

W. Taylor Smith.

☞ Maimed

MAIMED.—This term signifies disabled by wounding or mutilation; deprived of the use of a necessary constitutive part of the body; mutilated; rendered unable to defend oneself or to discharge necessary functions. In Mat 15:30 and Mar 9:43 κυλλός is the word employed and is translation ‘maimed’ in both Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 . It is kindred with κοῖλος, ‘hollow,’ and signifies originally ‘crooked,’ ‘bent,’ and so crippled and halt. κυλλῆ χεῖρ is the hand with its fingers bent so as to make a hollow palm. ἔμβαλε κυλλῆ (sc. χεῖρι) = ‘put it into the hollow of the hand.’ In Luk 14:13; Luk 14:21 the word used is ἀνάπηρος, *i.e.* πηρός = ‘deprived of some member of the body’ (Lat. *mancus*), preceded by ἀνά intensive. The composite word indicates an extreme form of bodily mutilation, and Jesus is never said to have restored one so suffering. The word is not employed in connexion with our Lord’s miracles, but only in His invitation to the blessings of the Kingdom, to which all outcast sufferers were with Divine compassion called.

☒ Majesty

MAJESTY

1. The term.—In the NT the word ‘majesty’ is associated with Christ in three different connexions. (1) In Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 of Luk 9:43 we read that the people ‘were all astonished at the majesty (μεγαλειότης, Authorized Version ‘mighty power’) of God.’ The immediate occasion of their astonishment was the healing of the lunatic boy, but v. 43b, and esp. the ἐποίηι which critical editors substitute for ἐποίησεν of Textus Receptus, seems to show that the miracles of Christ generally are to be thought of as producing this impression that the Divine μεγαλειότης was manifesting itself through Him.

(2) In 2Pe 1:16 the writer, who claims to have been present with Jesus on the Mount of Transfiguration, says of that experience, ‘We were eyewitnesses of his majesty’ (Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885; Gr. μεγαλειότης). The word μεγαλειότης is found in only one other passage of the NT, viz. Act 19:27, where it is used to describe the ‘magnificence’ (Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) of the great goddess Diana. It is thus an interesting coincidence that the two instances of its use in connexion with Christ belong to the episode of the Transfiguration and the incident of the healing of the lunatic boy which followed immediately after. On the ‘holy mount’ the favoured three received a revelation of Christ’s inherent μεγαλειότης (the word ἐπόπται, ‘eyewitnesses,’ is a technical term denoting those who had been admitted to the highest grade of initiation into the Eleusinian mysteries). And when He came down from the mountain, the μεγαλειότης of God shone forth through His works in the eyes of all the multitude.

A comparison of the uses of μεγαλειότης in Luk 9:43, Act 19:27, and 2Pe 1:16 raises a doubt whether ‘majesty’ is the most adequate rendering of the word in the first and third passages, and whether ‘magnificence’ (as in Act 19:27 Authorized and Revised Versions) or ‘splendour’ would not more correctly reproduce the original idea. This is suggested by the ordinary use of the adj. μεγαλειος in class. Greek, and even by the two instances of its employment in the NT (Luk 1:49, Act 2:11). The evidence of the

LXX Septuagint also points in the same direction; for while μεγαλειότης is used in Jer_33:9 to translation ἰστησῶν (Authorized Version ‘honour,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘glory’)—a word which is usually rendered by δόξα—the terms ordinarily taken to express the idea of greatness or majesty are μεγαλωσύνη and μεγαλοπρέπεια (e.g. 2Sa_7:23, Psa_145:3; Psa_145:5-6; Psa_145:12).

With this idea of Christ’s miracles, or of His miraculous being, as an effulgence of the Divine splendour or magnificence, compare the statement of Joh_2:11 that by the miracle of Cana Jesus ‘manifested his glory’ (ἐφανερώσε τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ). Cf. also the ἐπόπται τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος of 2Pe_1:16 with what is said in 2Pe_1:17 of the ‘glory’ (δόξα) which Jesus received upon the mount from God the Father.

(3) In Heb_1:3; Heb_8:1 we see Jesus seated ‘on the right hand of the Majesty on high.’ The word for ‘Majesty’ in these two cases is μεγαλωσύνη, a term that does not occur again in the NT except in the doxology at the end of Jude (Jud_1:25). The idea of Christ as seated at God’s right hand, which is so frequent in the NT (Mat_26:64 ||, Act_2:33; Act_7:55 f., Rom_8:34, Eph_1:20, Col_3:1 etc.), was no doubt taken in the first case from Psa_110:1 (cf. Heb_1:3 with Heb_1:13). It seems always to be used with reference not to His pre-existent dignity, but to the exaltation that followed His incarnation and suffering. Moreover, in the two passages in Hebrews there is no direct ascription of the Divine majesty to Jesus. The idea is that of His exercise of a supremely exalted office as the Great High Priest who is the Mediator between God and men.

2. The quality of majesty in Christ.—Apart from its infrequent use of the word, the NT affords abundant material for a consideration of the majesty of Christ, whether in His estate of humiliation or of exaltation.

(1) With regard to His *life on earth*, (a) it is evident that there was nothing of the majestic in His *outward circumstances*. From His birth in a stable to His death on a cross, it was a life of ‘no reputation,’ His form being that of a servant and not of a king (cf. Php_2:8). And on the one occasion when He assumed a kind of royal state, and suffered the multitudes in the streets and the children in the Temple to hail Him with Hosannas (Mat_21:9; Mat_21:15 f.), His majesty, after all, as the Evangelists subsequently perceived, was but the majesty of meekness, for Zion’s King came to her gates, as the prophet had said, ‘lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass’ (Mat_21:1 ff., Joh_12:14 ff.; cf. Zec_9:9).

(b) Was there no majesty, then, in His *personal appearance*? The Gospels are completely silent on this point, and in the lack of any trustworthy tradition the Fathers seem to have fallen back chiefly on the prophetic pictures of the Messiah, with the result that a wide diversity of view came to exist, according as one passage or another was taken as the norm. The earlier tendency, inspired without doubt by prevailing ascetic ideals, was to fasten upon the words of Deutero-Isaiah with reference to the Suffering Servant (Isa_53:2-3), and to represent Jesus as utterly devoid of all beauty and dignity of face or form. ‘Base of aspect’ (αἰσχρὸς τὴν ὄψιν) is the verdict of Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* iii. 1), who was preceded in his estimate by Justin Martyr, and followed by Tertullian. There came a reaction by and by, represented in the East by Origen and in the West by Jerome, when men bethought themselves of such a prophetic Psalm as the 45th, with its vision of One ‘fairer than the children of men’ (Isa_53:2) and girded with glory and majesty (Isaiah 53 :). Jerome in particular maintained this high view of the majesty of Christ’s outward aspect. There was ‘something starry’ (*sidereum quiddam*), he affirmed, in the Saviour’s face and eyes (*Ep. ad Principiam*); ‘the brightness and majesty of His Divinity ... shed their rays over His human countenance’ (*in Mat_1:8*). This was the view that ultimately prevailed in the Church, and finds expression in the so-called ‘Letter of Lentulus’ (see vol. i. p. 315). It gave rise to a type of presentment that has dominated Christian art ever since; but it is right to remember that this conventional conception of a Christ who was tall in stature, beautiful in countenance, dignified and even majestic in figure and bearing, rests upon no real basis of authentic tradition, as it is supported by no single word of the NT; and that Augustine has stated the simple truth when he says, ‘Qua fuerit ille facie penitus ignoramus’ (*de Trin.* viii. 5).

(c) But there is a *moral majesty*, a majesty of purity and truth and goodness, that is independent of all outward seeming; and the Gospels give abundant illustration of Christ’s endowment with this majesty of soul. Milton tells us how, face to face with the cherub:

‘abash’d the devil stood,

And felt how awful goodness is’ (*Par. Lost*, iv. 846).

And no one can read the Gospel narratives without perceiving how good men and bad alike were smitten at times with a sense of subduing awe as they stood in the presence of Jesus Christ. This was the experience of the Baptist when he exclaimed, ‘I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?’ (Mat_3:14). It was the feeling of Simon Peter when he cried, ‘Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord’ (Luk_5:8). This majesty of Christ’s character forces itself upon us at every point, rising higher and higher until it reaches a culmination in the awful scenes of the

judgment-hall and the cross. Was it not this majesty of a pure soul that arrested and troubled Pilate himself in the midst of his keen concern for his own selfish interests and his lofty Roman contempt for a mere Jew? And was it not this same majesty of holiness that smote upon the heart of the very centurion who carried out the sentence of crucifixion, so that he exclaimed, 'Certainly this was a righteous man' (Luk_23:47)? Sometimes we see Christ's moral majesty flashing out so overwhelmingly that it works with a kind of physical effect, as when the profane traffickers in the Temple cringe and flee before Him; or when, in the Garden, as He steps out of the shadows, saying, 'I am he,' His enemies go backward, and fall to the ground (Joh_18:5 f.).

(d) But besides the unconscious majesty of goodness, we see in Jesus Christ throughout His public ministry a *conscious majesty* of the most positive kind. This man, so meek and lowly in heart, does not hesitate to make the most astounding claims. He claims a personal authority that sweeps aside in a moment all the traditional learning of the nation's religious teachers (Mat_7:28-29). Never, surely, in the world's history has there been another series of utterances so clothed in the majesty of spiritual power as the Sermon on the Mount. And this poor Carpenter of Nazareth further assumes without the least hesitation the name and dignity of the promised Messiah of Israel; He affirms, in a sense altogether unique, that He is the Son of God, unto whom all things have been delivered of the Father (Mat_11:27, Luk_10:22; cf. John 14-17); He invites every burdened and weary soul to come unto Him for rest (Mat_11:28). And what could be more majestic than the language in which Christ assumes the office of the universal Judge of men, and describes the events and issues of that solemn day when the Son of Man shall come in His glory, and all the nations shall be gathered before Him? (Mat_25:31 ff.).

(2) It is unnecessary to dwell in any detail upon the majesty of *the exalted Christ*. From St. Peter's first sermon on the Day of Pentecost (Act_2:33 ff.) down to the last utterance of the Apostolic Church, the Christ of the NT is the Christ enthroned in glory, dignity, and power. His followers do not think of Him 'according to the flesh' (2Co_5:16)—as the Prophet of Galilee or the Man of Sorrows. The Christ of whom they do habitually think is risen, ascended, glorified, and set down on the right hand of the Majesty on high (cf. Rom_8:34, 1Co_15:14 ff., Gal_2:20, Php_2:9 ff., 1Th_4:13 ff., Heb_1:2 ff. and *passim*). Apart from the evidence of their own writings, no better proof of this can be found than the fact that for more than a century after the death of Jesus the Church appears never to have concerned itself in any way as to His earthly appearance, or to have had any desire for pictorial representations of His human face and form. And is it not highly significant that, on the one solitary occasion on which a NT writer has set himself to describe the Lord's personal appearance, the attempt is based upon no recollections or traditions regarding Jesus of Nazareth, but upon a splendid conception of the majesty of the exalted Christ—His

eyes as a flame of fire, His voice as the sound of many waters, in His right hand seven stars, and His countenance as the sun shineth in his strength (Rev. 1:13 ff.)?

Literature.—The Lexx. and Comm.; Farrar, *Christ in Art*, bk. ii.; P. Dearmer's art. 'Christ in Art' in vol. i.; Dora Greenwell, *Patience of Hope*, pt. i.; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*, ch. iv.; Denney, *Stud. in Theol.* 169.

J. C. Lambert.

Malchus

MALCHUS (Μάλχος).—The name of the man whom Peter wounded in the right ear at the arrest of Jesus (Joh 18:10).

Malchus was a common Semitic name, though not certainly met with among the Jews proper. By both Delitzsch and Salkinson it is vocalized מַלְכוּ, which is no more than a transliteration. Josephus (see Niese's index) mentions five persons who bore it under the form of Μάλχος or Μάλιχος, whence an original מַלְכוּ has been inferred (Dalman, *Gram. Aram. Aramaic* 104). But the true Greek form seems to have been Μαλιχας (*Periplus maris Erythraei*, cf. Müll. *Geogr. Gr. Min.* i. 272); and מַלְכוּ, pronounced מַלְכוּ, appears in three inscriptions (*CIS [Note: IS Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum.]* ii. 158, 174, 218) that may be dated with some confidence between b.c. 40 and a.d. 40. In these inscriptions the name is Nabataean; but the root מַלְכוּ is common to all the Semitic languages, and appears to belong to the unhistorical period prior to the separation of the various peoples. In Assyrian it is a designation of a subordinate ruler (Schrader, *COT [Note: OT Cuneiform Inscriptions and the OT.]* i. 23), a prince rather than a king. While there are instances of its use in relation to a god (cf. Boehmer in *Expos. Times*, xvi. [1905] 473 ff.), there is no need to see in it anything more than an allusion, serious or playful, to superiority in rank or in pretence.

The bearer of the name in the Gospel narrative held a position of trust in the household of the high priest, probably Caiaphas (Joh 18:13). It has been assumed that the other Evangelists suppressed the name (Mat 26:51, Mar 14:47, Luk 22:50) with a view to protect Peter from revenge or an action at law on the part of the Jews. It is at least as likely that they were ignorant of the name, or of opinion that no purpose was to be served by its mention. There is no evidence that Malchus was exceptionally active in the arrest, or anything more than an onlooker. Peter's forward rush, when

his indignation could be restrained no longer, towards the group of which Jesus was becoming the centre (Joh 18:4), suggests rather that Malchus was on the skirt of the group, and not immediately engaged in binding Jesus. He happened to be in Peter's way in his attempt to rescue his Master, and may well have been personally unknown to the majority of the disciples. If John was the unnamed disciple who was 'known unto the high priest' (Joh 18:15), possibly because he supplied the family of Annas with fish (according to an old tradition; cf. David Smith, *Days of His Flesh*, 465), he would be acquainted with both Malchus and his kinsman (Joh 18:26); and the mention of the name in the Fourth Gospel may be taken as one of the undesigned indications of Johannine authorship. The healing of the ear of Malchus is recorded by Lk. alone, but is an essential part of the story (cf. *Expos. Times*, x. [1898-99] 139, 188), and exactly such an incident as would be likely to attract the notice of a physician, and so to calm the soldiers as to make the subsequent remonstrance preserved by each of the Synoptics possible. The natural order of events was first the healing of the wound, followed, while Malchus' friends were crowding around him, by the rebuke of Peter, and then, as soon as the people were ready to listen, by the taunting protest in regard to the manner of the arrest. Thereupon Jesus consented to be seized, and in perfect self-possession passed on to His trial and death.

R. W. Moss.

⚡ Malefactor

MALEFACTOR.—Two Gr. words, whose shades of meaning are indistinguishable, are thus translated in NT: (1) *κακοποιός* or *κακὸν ποιῶν* (lit. 'evil-doer'), Joh 18:30, 1Pe 2:12; 1Pe 2:14; 1Pe 4:15; (2) *κακοῦργος* (lit. 'evil-worker'), Luk 23:32-33; Luk 23:39, 2Ti 2:9. Authorized Version renders *κακοποιός* 'malefactor' in Joh 18:30, 'evil-doer' elsewhere; but Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 gives 'evil-doer' throughout. Again Authorized Version renders *κακοῦργος* 'malefactor' in Luk 23:32-33; Luk 23:39, 'evil-doer' in 2Ti 2:9, while Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 makes it always 'malefactor.' This illustrates the NT Revisers' uniformity in the translation of words.

In Luk 23:32 the best attested text is *ἕτεροι κακοῦργοι δύο*, not *ἕτεροι δύο κακοῦργοι* (Textus Receptus). Hence it is maintained by Alford and others that we ought to read 'two other malefactors' (without a comma after 'other') instead of 'two others, malefactors' (Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). There is really no difficulty about adopting this rendering, which does not imply that St. Luke

assents to the judgment that Jesus was a malefactor, but merely states the fact that He was led to execution as such.

D. A. Mackinnon.

☒ Mammon

MAMMON, or more accurately 'Mamon,' is the transliteration of the Gr. equivalent for a late Aram. Aramaic or Syro-Chald. term denoting 'wealth' or 'riches' or 'treasure,' whose etymology is still a matter of dispute (cf. the articles s.v. in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible and *Encyc. Bib.*). In the Gospels it means worldliness in the form of wealth, and occurs twice—(a) in Mat 6:24 = Luk 16:13 ('ye cannot serve God and mammon'); and (b) in Luk 16:9; Luk 16:11, where it is defined, or rather described, as *unrighteous*, the latter epithet being applied to it not only in the Targums, but as early as 1Enoch 63:10 ('our souls are satisfied with the mammon of unrighteousness, yet for all that we descend into the flame of Sheol's pain').

The genuineness of the logion (a) there is no need to question, although its present position is probably due to editorial arrangement. Of the two settings, Matthew's seems preferable. Mammon here represents a sort of personified worldliness, a Plutus of the age, and Christ exposes the impossibility of combining devotion to this end with devotion to the true God. The spiritual life, He explains in Mat 6:19-24, must have the two notes of inwardness and unity. Compromise here is out of the question. The object of a man's confidence determines ultimately his character; and single-mindedness is the supreme condition of health and effectiveness in religion. Jesus 'warns them that it is impossible to be at once high-minded and just and wise, and to comply with the accustomed forms of human society, seek power, wealth, or empire, either from the idolatry of habit, or as the direct instruments of sensual gratification' (Shelley). Objection is sometimes taken to this counsel as inapplicable to a group of good disciples. But Jesus had rich people among His adherents, and besides it is not the rich alone who are tempted to make a god of their money. Poor people are just as prone in some ways to attach an exaggerated importance to wealth, to overestimate its power, and thus to let it exercise a control over their desires. No written comment on the verse, however, can equal the impression made by Mr. G. F. Watts' picture of 'Mammon,' with its coarse, gross limbs crushing human life; to which one pendant is the same painter's picture entitled, 'For he had great possessions.'

The Lukan setting is as apt in its own way, placing the same logion amid a cluster of characteristic (see Theophilus) sayings and parables on the dangers and abuse of

money (cf. Luk 16:14). Luk 16:13 forms one of several rather heterogeneous fringes to the parable of the Unjust Steward (Luk 16:1-8 or Luk 16:1-7), arranged with almost as little connexion as the logia in Luk 16:16 f. So far as it stands, however, it has the same meaning as in Mat 6:24. The main difficulty is to correlate it with what immediately precedes, and this opens up the unpersonified use of mammon in the second class of passages (*b*). The point of Luk 16:1-8, which is certainly a genuine parable of Jesus, is to inculcate the wisdom of making provision in the present life for the life which is to come. The temper commended by Jesus is that of a man who has wit enough to see that his future prospects depend on his present exertions, and who inferentially has no illusions whatever about himself. He is open-eyed to the present situation. He does not flatter himself into a rosy view of his case, or look to some happy chance to bear him through. A prudent regard to self-interest is the saving feature of his character and conduct. So much is clear. The trouble is to adjust Luk 16:9-13 to this standpoint. If, with critics like J. Weiss, Wernle, and Jülicher, all five verses are regarded as editorial glosses, the solution becomes fairly simple, the original parable having nothing to do with the use of money at all, as Christ meant it. But Luk 16:9 may well be the original sequel to Luk 16:8 (so Wellhausen recently), in which case 'the mammon of unrighteousness' there and in Luk 16:11 is explained by 'what belongs to another' in Mat 16:12. Wealth, Jesus teaches, does not really belong to a Christian. It is something alien to him. Yet, as the steward used wealth that was not his own for his own ends, so the Christian can and must employ his wealth in order to promote his eternal interests. Money given in alms makes friends for him in heaven, just as it lays up a treasure for him there (Luk 11:41, Mat 12:23 etc.). Instead of serving God and mammon alike, he is to use mammon wisely in the interests of his relation to God and the heavenly Kingdom, the wisdom consisting in the practice of charity (cf. Mat 12:19 f.). If not, the prospect held out is ominous. 'God,' as Kingsley once said, 'will yet take account of the selfishness of wealth; and His quarrel has yet to be fought out.' This is true to the spirit of the Lukan sayings, except that they threaten an eschatological ruin rather than one wrought out on this side of the grave.

In any case Luk 16:10-13 (Luk 16:10 coming from Luk 19:17) form a conglomerate appendix, added to prevent misconceptions, 'another instance of editorial solicitude on the part of an Evangelist ever careful to guard the character and teaching of Jesus against misunderstanding' (Bruce). Luk 16:11, especially, indicates the right use of money (as in the parable of the Talents): Use it faithfully, *i.e.* for the good of the needy, instead of hoarding it up selfishly. Honesty in money matters (Luk 16:10) is vital to the Christian. And honesty, in this particular application, is viewed under the light of liberality (Luk 16:11), in accordance with the tenor of Luke's social sympathies throughout his Gospel. Thus the use of mammon brings out two elements in the teaching of Jesus upon money—(*a*) the need of administering it wisely, and (*b*) the essentially inferior and even irrelevant position of money in the religious life. The

latter is brought out by the epithet *unrighteous* (almost equal to 'secular' here); money is *less* by far than a Christian's other interests (Luk 16:10), *alien* (Luk 16:12), and *unreal* (Luk 16:11), even when it is not allowed to be a positive rival to God (Luk 16:13). By its nature it belongs to *the present* (i.e. this evil) *generation*, not to the real order of things which forms the sphere of *the children of light*, i.e. Christians. Yet even so it is a test; it furnishes opportunities for the exercise of certain virtues (cf. Morley's *Voltaire*, p. 107). Christians are trusted with money, as the steward was. But what in his case was fraud, in their case is both honest and shrewd. Forethought is the quality commended by our Lord, as opposed to a selfish and shortsighted policy. Faithfulness in dealing with money means giving it away. And the two, faithfulness and forethought, are different sides of the same habit—pretty much as in the proverb, 'What I gave, I have' (cf. Pro 11:24). The steward dispensed his goods; no doubt, for selfish ends. Still he dispensed them, and so proved his wisdom at least.

On this interpretation 'the mammon of unrighteousness' does not mean money or worldly advantages wrongfully gained, as though the point of the parable were that wealth, dishonestly come by, should be disbursed in charity (so Strauss, and O. Holtzmann in Stade's *Geschichte Israels*, ii. 584-585). The steward is not commended because he atoned by beneficence for ill-gotten gains, as if he represented a sinner who insured forgiveness and welcome in heaven by means of charity to his fellows on earth, finding it impossible to restore, as Zacchaeus did, his fraudulent profits (so even Bruce, *Parabolic Teaching of Jesus*, pp. 373-374). 'The mammon of unrighteousness' means money as essentially secular and unchristian (cf. Weinel's *Wirkungen des Geistes*, 1899, p. 15), pertaining to the order of the Evil One. Jesus does not deal here with any question of reparation. The object of the parable is to point out how one may best use this tainted possession in view of the future, and the teaching is on the lines of the later Jewish Rabbis, who attached high religious significance to alms (cf. Luk 12:15-21; Luk 18:22 etc.), though it must be borne in mind that some allowance has to be made for St. Luke's 'ascetic' bias in estimating some of Christ's sayings on wealth in the Third Gospel, where logia, perhaps originally genuine, have been sharpened (e.g. in Luk 6:24 f.) into exaggerated emphasis. In calling mammon 'unrighteous,' Jesus means that great wealth is seldom gained or employed without injustice. The stain of abuse is upon it. The mark of the evil world is stamped on it. At best, then, it is a means, not an end, for the Christian, and a means which demands care and conscience for its wise employment, lest life degenerate into the mercenary and narrowing spirit which devotes itself to what Bacon called 'a Sabbathless pursuit of fortune,' a culpable love of acquisition and material goods, and an insidious appetite for self-gratification which deadens the higher faculties of the soul and stunts the instinct of self-sacrifice.

Literature.—See the commentators on *Matthew* and *Luke*, the various Lives of Jesus, and the current works upon the Parables, in all of which the mammon passages are handled; also Zahn's *Einleitung*, i. 11-12. On the parable of the Unjust Steward, cf. the critical discussions of Feine (*Eine vorkanon. Ueberlieferung d. Lukas*, p. 80 f.), J. Weiss (in Meyer's *Luke* 8, 528-535), Schmiedel (*Encyc. Bibl.* 1863-1864), and incidentally Rodenbusch (*ZNTW [Note: NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissenschaft.]*, 1903, 243 f.). For Christ's attitude to wealth, consult H. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Theologie*, i. p. 448 f.; Titius, *Jesu Lehre vom Reiche Gottes*, 72-79; Pfeleiderer, *Urchristenthum*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , i. p. 649 f.; Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, iv. p. 80 f. (extreme); and Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*, p. 244 f. Further discussions on the significance of the parable may be found in *Expos.* 4th ser. vii. 21 f.; *Expos. Times*, 1903-1905, *passim*; Latham's *Pastor Pastorum*, p. 386 f.; *Expos.* 1903, 273-283 (Oesterley); and *Christliche Welt* (xvii. 218-227); besides F. W. Robertson's *Sermons*, iv. (No. 22); J. Martineau, *Endeavours after the Chr. Life*, p. 76; R. F. Horton, *Commandments of Jesus*, p. 249. On mammon-worship, see Carlyle, *French Revolution* (iii. bk. 3, ch. vii.) and *Past and Present* (bk. 4, ch. iv.); Ruskin, *Mornings in Florence*, § 50; also Morley, *Gladstone*, iii. p. 548, for modern war as the most remarkable 'incentive to mammon-worship'; Coleridge in his *Friend* (Essay xvi. written during 1818) said that Luk 16:8 would form a suitable motto for a collection of Machiavelli's most weighty aphorisms, by some vigorous mind, in order to illustrate thereby the 'present triumph of lawless violence' as due to the imprudent neglect of such worldly-wise maxims.—In *Academy* (1888), pp. 416-417, C. Bezold criticises unfavourably Mr. Pinches' derivation of the term from an Assyr. [Note: Assyrian.] *mimmu* or *memmu* = 'anything,' 'everything,' 'property,' etc.

J. Moffatt.

☞ Man

MAN* [Note: ἄνθρωπος and ἀνὴρ are used by Jesus with the ordinary classic distinctions. Generally ἄνθρωπος = a human being, male or female (e.g. Mat 4:4; Mat 5:16); ἀνὴρ, a man as distinguished from a woman (Mat 7:24; Mat 7:26, Luk 14:24). In keeping with this distinction, and by a Hebrew idiom (cf. the use of שׂוֹאֵל), He employs ἄνθρωπος in the sense of the Gr. τις, Lat. quidam, to denote 'someone,' 'a certain one' (Mat 21:28; Mat 22:11 etc.). As the converse of this, it

may be noted that not infrequently (esp. in Jn.) where $\tau\iota\varsigma$ occurs in the teaching of Jesus, EV renders it 'a man.']

1. Christ's relation to men.—(1) The first aspect of Jesus in His relation to men, is the relation of a *Master* to His disciples, and of a *Brother*, who is also Leader and Teacher, to His brethren. This relationship is unmistakable. 'Ye did not choose me, but I chose you' (Joh 15:16). The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord' (Mat 10:24). They were not to accept the title 'Rabbi'; they were brethren; they had but one teacher, even Christ (Mat 23:8-10). The relationship was no external one. The disciples were not simply the servants of Jesus; they were His friends (Joh 15:14-15), and knew His thoughts and purposes. To them He was about to show the very height and greatness of His love by laying down His life. The best way for them to show that they were His friends was by keeping His commandments (Joh 15:14). They were also under His Father's care; they were the Father's flock, and no one should snatch them out of His hand (Luk 12:28; Luk 12:32, Joh 10:29). They were called to a vocation in some respects similar to His own: they were to be 'fishers of men' (Mat 4:19); they, too, would know persecution and trial and death; but these, in their essence, were but temporal things, and could not really injure or destroy (Mat 10:17-18; Mat 10:28, Luk 10:19). As contrasted with others who were 'wise and prudent,' the disciples were but 'babes'; but it was to them that God had made the revelation of Himself in Jesus Christ (Mat 11:25-26). The disciples responded to this attachment. When they found the teaching of Jesus difficult and obscure, and were almost tempted, like many others, to go no more with Him, He asks them plainly, 'Will ye also go away?' and the answer rises within them with all the strength of passionate loyalty and conviction: 'Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life' (Joh 6:66-68). It is significant also that one of the strongest utterances of devotion is recorded of Thomas. Other references to this disciple show him as a practical man, who lives on the earth and not in the clouds, and who withholds his faith and support until plain proof be shown (Joh 20:24-25). But when Jesus expressed His determination to go up to Bethany and wake His friend Lazarus out of his sleep, it was Thomas who first saw his Master's danger, and that death was near at hand, and who exclaimed with vehemence, 'Let us go up also with him, that we may die with him' (Joh 11:16). Peter is called blessed when, at Caesarea Philippi, he answers Christ's question and confesses, 'Thou art the Christ of God' (Luk 9:20); and John is the disciple whom Jesus loved (Joh 19:26), the man who at the Last Supper sat next to His Master and leaned upon His breast (Joh 21:20), and the one to whom Mary the mother of Jesus was entrusted by Jesus as He hung on the cross (Joh 19:26-27). When His disciples are weary, Jesus bids them go with Him to a desert place and rest a while (Mar 6:31); and after their last meal together, He kneels down and washes their feet, thus teaching them the duty of service (Joh 13:3-5). The discourses recorded in John 14-16 are doubtless in some measure

ideal; but they are true to the main lines of Christian tradition. The relationship between Jesus and His disciples was very intimate and sacred, and the disciples were filled with sorrow at the prospect of that relationship being snapped.

(2) But Jesus was also a *Jew* and a *citizen*. His mission was, first and foremost, to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Mat 15:24); and it was only when they repeatedly rejected Him and His doctrine that He turned and went elsewhere. Jesus found that His own people were spiritually dead. They had now no prophets, and scarcely any teacher who might quicken their interest in things beyond the present hour and day. They had made the Temple (which was to Jesus His Father's house) a den of robbers (Mat 21:13), and they had forgotten that mercy was better than sacrifice (Mat 9:13); and Jesus, in the strength of His moral indignation, upset the tables of the money-changers, and drove those who sat there out of the Temple. His people honoured the prophets, but in their lifetime they stoned them; and now the greatest of the prophets had come, and they knew it not (Mat 23:29-39, Luk 11:29; Luk 11:32). He had come to His own, and they that were His own received Him not (Joh 1:11). There was woe to come upon Chorazin and Bethsaida. Had Tyre and Sidon seen the things which they had seen, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes (Mat 11:21). Jesus looked upon Jerusalem and its people with a citizen's and a patriot's love, and was moved even to tears (Mat 23:37, Luk 19:41). Let them weep for their city, themselves and their fate, and not for Him! (Luk 23:28-31). How often would He have gathered her children together as a hen gathereth her brood under her wings!

(3) It seems certain that the Jews, as a body, could never have accepted Jesus as their Messiah. It was the Pharisee who, with all his faults, had remained true in some measure to his national tradition; and it was in him that the teaching of Jesus found its strongest opponent. It was, above all, the *universalism* of Jesus that the Pharisee could not bear. He despised the Greek and Roman, and especially his kin and neighbour the Samaritan, as 'Gentile' folk—outsiders. If the God of the Jews should show Himself favourable unto such, it would have to be by some special act of grace. But Jesus followed out the prophetic ideal. He submitted to be baptized by John, and He expressed in no stinted way His feeling about the Baptist and his work. In His first public utterance Jesus reminded His hearers of the nature of Israel's God. He was the God of *men*, no matter what their race and no matter what their moral character. It was this God who despatched Elijah to Zarephath on an errand of mercy, when there were many widows in Israel. Elisha also was sent to heal Naaman the Syrian, although there were many lepers nearer home (Luk 4:25-27). It was by utterances such as these that Jesus gained at the outset the opposition of the national party. Men felt—and felt rightly—that if Jesus triumphed Judaism was undone. The Pharisees were also deeply troubled by Jesus' manner of life. He received 'sinners,' and ate with them; He dined with tax-gatherers, and spoke kindly and compassionately to a

woman of ill fame (Luk 5:27-39; Luk 19:1-10, Joh 8:1-11). The official class—the Sadducees and priests—also felt that new wine like this would burst the old skins, and that a new society might arise, in which they themselves might be anywhere save at the top. And from the moment Jesus set foot in Jerusalem, the priests and Sadducees, as the ruling official party, set themselves to work, not to confute Him, but to compass His death (Mat 21:23; Mat 26:3-4, Luk 19:47-48; Luk 19:20; Luk 19:22).

It follows from this that Jesus was a lover of man, irrespective of his race or condition. He began His ministry with teaching and healing. He was often moved to compassion by the multitudes which followed Him; they were as sheep without a shepherd; they heard Him gladly, and even tarried with Him a whole day, and that in a desert place (Mar 1:41; Mar 6:30-36). On one occasion they would have made Him their king (Joh 6:1-15). And to Jesus, though He refuses their proffered sovereignty, they were as ‘fields white unto the harvest’ (Joh 4:35). Many of the most striking sayings of Jesus, however, occur in utterances addressed to individuals. It was while sitting and talking with a Samaritan—a Samaritan *woman*—that He said: ‘God is Spirit’ (Joh 4:24); it was in the house of Zacchaeus that men first heard that ‘the Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost’ (Luk 19:10); while it was in answer to ‘a certain lawyer’ that Jesus related the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luk 10:25-37). Men were amazed at and charmed by Jesus’ power of speech; they ‘wondered at the words of grace which proceeded out of his mouth’ (Luk 4:22). Police officers on one occasion were disarmed by it. ‘He taught,’ says the Evangelist, ‘as one having authority, and not as the scribes’ (Joh 7:45-47, Mat 7:28-29).

What was it that led Jesus to teach and to associate Himself, not simply with Jews, but with men as men? What was it that carried Him willingly and of set purpose into all classes of society, and especially among the outcast and unfavoured folk? What led Him to seek, not the righteous, but sinners, and not the whole, but the sick? To answer this question we must pass to—

2. Christ’s teaching on man.—With Jesus the doctrines of God and man are closely akin. They pass into each other, and are deeply interfused; so much so, that at times we seem but to have been looking at different sides of the same fundamental truth. Central, basal, a pole around which everything else centres and revolves, is His conception of God. To know Him is to share His life, and to seek His Kingdom and His righteousness is alike the highest duty and the highest joy of man (Joh 17:3, Mat 6:33). He is Spirit (Joh 4:24). Without Him nature would cease to be; its beauty, its order, and the creatures which have within it their home, derive all their life and sustenance and joy from Him. The hairs of a man’s head are all numbered; not even a sparrow falls to the ground without His notice. The common flowers and grass owe their life to Him (Mat 6:25-34; Mat 10:29-30).

What, then, does Jesus, with this high doctrine of God, say about man? He tells us that man is distinct from the natural world and natural creatures; he is God's child; God is his Father; he is God's son (Mat 5:43-48; Mat 6:25-34). Such words may not define man's present condition; they look at him in the light of the ideal; they describe his duty, his highest destiny and ambition. The loftiest hope and purpose that any man may cherish is to become a son of his Father who is in heaven, and to become perfect as his heavenly Father is perfect (Mat 5:45-48). It is noteworthy that Jesus never mentions the fall of man, nor is there any very conclusive passage in which He speaks of man as a sinner. But He implies that man is such in that He makes 'Repent' the keynote of His opening ministry (Mat 4:17). There is but one who is good, even God (Luk 18:18-19); yet men, who are evil, can render good gifts to their children (Mat 7:11). It is possible for a man's eye to be evil, and for his whole body to be filled with darkness rather than with light (Mat 6:23). Men cannot serve two masters, mammon and God (Mat 6:24). A rich man can with difficulty enter into the Kingdom of God (Mat 19:24). Ultimately, too, men are sifted out and their destiny is determined by their attitude to Himself and His brethren; some will sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the Kingdom of God; others will be cast into the outer darkness, where there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth (Mat 25:31-46).

But, generally, it is the ideal which is present with Jesus; He prefers to look at the possibilities; He does not see capacity for evil; He tries rather to discover the latent powers and potencies of good. An incident such as that recorded in Joh 8:1-11 is striking proof of this. Jesus there sees not simply the sinner, but the possibility of good in the sinner. His final word to her, therefore, is not one of condemnation: 'Neither do I condemn thee; go thy way; from henceforth sin no more.' Man, therefore, is crowned with high dignity and solemn grandeur because he is akin to the Divine. If Jesus had not believed in the capacity for good even in the most unlikely and unexpected people, what we read recorded of Him and His work would never have happened. Of set purpose He turned from folk who were reputable, respectable, and, in the conventional sense, righteous and holy. He came not to the whole, but to the sick; not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance (Luk 5:31-32). He turned to those without repute, to the so-called 'sinners,' in the faith that goodness lived within their hearts; and history tells us that He was not disappointed. He sought for the common man, unsophisticated, unconventional; and we read that He was often surprised and astonished at what the common man revealed to Him (Mat 8:5-13); Jesus may thus be said to have been the first to discover the true significance of common men and common things. They were significant because they led up to and implied more than themselves; at the base and heart of each there was God.

But to Jesus man was not one object or thing among other objects or things in the natural world. He was not simply a part of Nature. 'How much then is a man of more value than a sheep!' (Mat 12:12). If the recovery of one sheep brought joy to the

shepherd in charge of the flock, a man, by his choice and pursuit of the good, could bring joy to the heart of God (Luk 15:3-7). He was *of value*, as a lost coin is of value, for which a woman sweeps the house and searches diligently until she finds it (Luk 15:8-10); or as a son is of value, who, even if he has left home for a far country and there wasted his substance in riotous living, is still dear to his father's heart (Luk 15:11-32).

To Jesus, man, as a spiritual being, made in the image of God, who is Spirit, took precedence of all material things. The death of the body was merely a temporal event; but to think and believe and act as if the material world was all, was the death of the soul (Luk 12:13-21). It was to deny God by forgetting Him, and at bottom meant the surrender of one's life as a *person* and the endeavour to become a *thing*. Such was the act of a fool. To Jesus the spiritual side was all; or, in relation to other things it was the central, controlling principle, the *fons et origo* of all besides. The life is 'more than the meat, and the body than the raiment' (Mat 6:25). 'A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth' (Luk 12:15). 'What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world, and forfeit his life?' (Mat 16:26).

From a strictly moral standpoint the same truth held good of man; he alone of all natural creatures was capable of good and ill; *things* could not defile; they were unmoral, and knew neither good nor bad; defilement could come only from spirit, from man, and it proceeded from the thoughts and purposes of his heart (Mat 15:10-11; Mat 15:18-20). If the inner life was watched, and its waters and streams kept pure, all was well; from without there was no danger, because things had no power. It was similar in regard to the nature of the true good. It was an inward possession; moth and rust consumed material things, but they could not touch spiritual treasure, which made up the wealth of the soul; this was treasure in heaven, and as such would abide (Mat 6:20). It was the good incorporated, as it were, into the very life and spirit of man. Such also was the Kingdom of heaven. Men could not see it; it did not come by observation; it was within (Luk 17:20-21).

There is a revelation of God in Nature; there is a revelation of God in man; above all, in the moral consciousness of man. People often asked Jesus for a sign or miracle to show them that His teaching was true. But Jesus gave no sign. The teaching itself was its own sign and witness (Luk 11:29-32); its presence was also an argument; it 'doth both shine and give us sight to see.' The rich man in the torments of hell-fire might ask that a messenger be sent to his brethren—that some one should rise from the dead to warn them from his fate;—surely at a miracle they would repent? But the appeal of Jesus ever addressed itself to the moral consciousness of man. 'They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them.... If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rise from the dead' (Luk 16:19-31). In this aspect

John also, in the Prologue to his Gospel, defines for us the nature of man. There was a light which lighted every man as he came into the world. The source of this light was God. Its supreme manifestation was in Jesus; in Him was life, and the life was the light of men (Joh_1:1-9).

Man, then, as spiritual, takes precedence of everything else that is. He is not a means or a thing; he is an end in himself. In the time of Jesus, however, as has also happened in other periods of history, the customs and institutions which man had made had become his master, were obscuring his vision and keeping him from his true good. One of these institutions was that of the Sabbath. A man might not heal another man on the Sabbath; yet if a sheep had fallen into a well he might get it out, or if his ox or his ass were thirsty he might lead them to the pool. Jesus enforces the true order; the Sabbath was made for man; it was a means for his good; it was a custom, an institution, a thing, and, as compared with spirit, occupied a strictly subordinate place. It was similar with every custom and institution man had made (Mat_12:1-21, Mar_2:23-28).

In saying this, Jesus stood emphatically for progress; He practically said also that there was something in the life of man which neither institutions nor the social order nor civic legislation could ever fully express; man bore the infinite within him; deep and ineradicable, within his life, there was the life of God. Man was therefore immortal. If we admit the premises, no other conclusion is possible. The fact, said Jesus in effect, that we can stand in relation to God, that we can speak with Him and commune with Him, is itself the promise and pledge of immortality. Because He lives, we live also (Joh_14:19). God 'is not the God of the dead, but of the living, for all live unto him' (Luk_20:38). And thus the chief end of man was to know God and Jesus Christ whom He had sent (Joh_17:3); his true vocation was to seek the kingdom of God and His righteousness (Mat_6:33). Because he was made in God's image, and was able, in some measure, to represent Him and reveal Him, man was endowed with a peculiar dignity. But here again Jesus spoke in the language of the ideal. Immortality was a possibility for man; it was in some sense an achievement; it was also something that could be lost. But it was something of which every man was capable.

In conclusion, the strongest argument for the dignity and worth of man is to be found in Jesus Himself. He called Himself the Son of Man; whatever touched man and his well-being was His concern. His teaching and His life were such that men find it impossible to regard Him from the ordinary human standpoint. They have conceived of Him as Divine; they say that His entry into human life to share the common pain and toil and death was a purely voluntary act. Such is not only a view held by theologians, but one which is entertained to-day by men of science. Sir Oliver Lodge speaks of Jesus as being willing to share the life of a peasant, and as being the best race-asset that men possess (*Hibbert Journal*, Oct. 1904). From whatever standpoint,

however, He is viewed, the presence of Jesus in humanity can only add incalculably to its worth and dignity. In set doctrine Jesus taught very little as to the nature of man. To really see what He thought about man and the value He set on him, we must look at Jesus' life. He came to do the will of His Father and to accomplish His work (Joh_6:38; Joh_9:4); He came to give life, and to give it abundantly (Joh_10:10); He came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many (Mat_20:28). That He loved men is a commonplace. He, beyond all other teachers and leaders whom we know, 'stood stoutly for the human,' and made the cause of man—the true well-being of man—take precedence of every other thing and cause. It was not that men were better in His than in any other age; it was that He ever saw men in the light of the ideal, and ever found at the root of man's life the life of God. To say this is to say also that among all the benefactors of humanity, Jesus of Nazareth is, *par excellence*, the Friend of Man. He thought that the common weal—man and man's true cause and good—was worth living for with absolute devotion; should things so require, it was also worth dying for. And, as Jesus Himself has said, greater love hath no man than this (Joh_15:13).

Psychologically, man, in the thought of Jesus, is made up of two parts, soul and body, or spirit and flesh. But He speaks, as a moral teacher, of man in his broad general aspect, and is not concerned with minute psychological distinctions (cf. Mat_10:28-29; Mat_16:26; Mat_26:41, Mar_8:36, Luk_16:22).

Literature.—Grimm-Thayer, *Lex. s.vv. ἀνὴρ, ἄνθρωπος*; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Man'; A. B. Bruce, *The Kingdom of God*, and other works; John Caird, *Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion*; A. M. Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*; Laidlaw, *Bibl. Doct. of Man*; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*; N. T. Theol. of Weiss, Beyschlag, etc.; H. E. Manning, *Sermons* (1844), p. 47; H. Bushnell, *The New Life* (1860), p. 16; J. Martineau, *Hours of Thought* (1879), ii. p. 286; F. Paget, *Faculties and Difficulties*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (1889), p. 132; W. Gladden, *Burning Questions* (1890), p. 67; J. B. Lightfoot, *Cambridge Sermons* (1800), p. 229; R. W. Dale, *Christian Doctrine* (1894), p. 170; H. van Dyke, *Manhood, Faith and Courage* (1906), p. 1.

E. Wheeler.

☞ Manaen

MANAEN (Μανναήν, Act_13:1 = Menahem, מנחם, 'comforter,' 2Ki_15:14 etc.).—Two facts only are recorded in Scripture concerning Manaen. In his old age he was a

Christian minister; in youth he was foster-brother of Herod the tetrarch, *i.e.* Antipas (Act 13:1). But this must be read side by side with a statement of Josephus, who tells us (*Ant.* xv. x. 5) that, some few years before, another Manaen (or Manaem) had come into touch with another Herod,—the Great. The double parallel appears too striking to be mere coincidence. It seems more reasonable to assume a connexion between the two stories, and from them we may inferentially derive much light.

1. *The connexion between the Manaen of Josephus and Herod the Great.*—When Herod was yet a schoolboy, he was one day greeted in the street by this Manaen, who patted him on the back, and saluted him as future king of the Jews. As Antipater, Herod's father, was only a military governor, the prediction seemed absurd. But Manaen was an Essene, one of the stalwart Puritans of that day, who had a reputation not only for austerity but for predictive powers (*Josephus BJ* ii. viii. 12); and the words induced the lad to make further inquiry. Manaen persisted, adding that the coming dignity would not be accompanied by righteous living, and that God's punishment would visit his later life. About fifteen years later (b.c. 37), when the first part of the prophecy was fulfilled, Herod sent for the old Essene, and ever after honoured him and his sect. If, as Lightfoot conjectures, he was the same Manaen who, being vice-president of the Sanhedrin under Hillel, led away eighty others to the service of Herod, and inaugurated a system of laxer living, then the connexion did not issue in the moral profit of the older man, and he may have been alluded to (as Plumptre thinks) by our Lord under the figure of the shaken reed (Mat 11:7), and as a soft-clad dweller in royal households. Perhaps, too, this defection was the origin of the sect of the Herodians (Mar 3:6, etc.).

2. *Connexion between the later Manaen and Herod Antipas.*—The facts related above seem to constitute an intelligible foundation for the circumstances of Manaen's life noted in Act 13:1. Antipas was a son of Herod the Great, and if the old king had an elder Manaen living in his household, nothing would be more natural than that a young Herod and a young Manaen (perhaps a grandson, since Manaen the elder was a man of standing when Herod the Great was a boy) should be brought up together. What this implied it is difficult to determine, since 'foster-brother' (σύντροφος) has both a narrower and a wider meaning. It may only indicate that the children were much together. Manaen may well have shared both the home-life and the subsequent education, under a private tutor at Rome, which Antipas and Archelaus enjoyed (*Ant.* xvii. i. 3). On the other hand, Archelaus is not mentioned here, so perhaps the narrower sense of σύντροφος may be pressed, that Manaen's mother was also nurse to Antipas. In either case it is suggestive to contemplate the murderer of John the Baptist and paramour of Herodias, side by side with the man of ascetic Essene stock, subsequently a teacher in the Church of Christ.

3. *Manaen's religious development and influence.*—One wonders how the companion of Herod became the servant of Christ. His name ('consoler') may indicate that his parents were of that spiritually watchful circle who waited for the consolation of Israel (Luk 2:25). According to the Talmud (Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] *Ber.* ii. 4), *Menahem* was to be one of the titles of the Messiah, and indeed it became so (see 1Jn 2:1 *παράκλητος*, used in Job 16:2 [Aq. [Note: Aquila.] Theod. [Note: Theodotion.]] as translation of מנחם). The name was sometimes given to children at this period, with Messianic thoughts and hopes. Manaen is like a ferry-chain whose ends are visible and whose centre is submerged. We know of his childhood and old age: his mature manhood we can only conjecture. But we know at least that he passed through the Gospel period of John the Baptist's preaching and Jesus Christ's ministry. He may have been amongst the number of those who listened on the Jordan's banks, and brought tidings to Antipas. At any rate, in Herod's household he must have heard the stirring words of the rugged prophet of the old Essene type, and if Herod 'heard gladly,' how much more Manaen! The twin-texts, 'Repent ye' and 'Behold the Lamb,' may well have become the head-lights of his course, and the forerunner's words have led to Christ one more fruitful servant. There is much to indicate that the lonely ministry in the castle of Machaerus was not barren of results. Besides Manaen, we know of spiritual interests kindled in Joanna, wife of Herod's major-domo (Luk 8:3), in the king's courtiers (*βασιλικός*, Joh 4:46), perhaps in Herodion (Rom 16:11), whose name indicates court connexions; we know, further, that there were servants to whom Herod talked on religious topics (Mat 14:1 f.). And among these Manaen may well have been one of those unseen influences for good which alone can account for some of the better impulses of Herod's inconsistent life. What passed between the foster-brothers after John's murder? Was Manaen a silent or a protesting spectator when Jesus was mocked? Did the death of Christ complete a work of grace already begun at the death of John? Did the Resurrection of Christ (no rumour this time, Mat 14:2, but a well attested fact) seal for ever the allegiance of a halting disciple? Did he remain in the train of his foster-brother till the latter left for Rome in a.d. 39? If so, he may have gone to Antioch at that date, and been one of the founders of the Church in that city, which comes into view about a.d. 41 (Act 11:19). He would then rank amongst that honoured company whose consistent practice of the faith they professed first won them the name 'Christian,' Christ's man,—honoured since with world-wide acceptance wherever the gospel message has spread. At Antioch, in any case, we find him four years later occupying a position of authority (Act 13:1). If he was a prophet, we have an interesting link with the old Essene foreteller of Herod the Great's reign. But perhaps the copulative particles, strictly pressed, rank him as teacher and not as prophet. He must by this time have become somewhat advanced in years. If St. Luke also came from Antioch (Euseb. *Historia Ecclesiastica* 3, 4), it may have been from Manaen that he learned certain details

concerning Herod and John which are peculiar to his Gospel. We last catch sight of Manaen in that hallowed gathering when he and his fellows in the ministry willingly surrendered their two ablest men, Barnabas and Saul, for the evangelization of the world. He who was called by his parents 'the comforter' cheerfully yielded to the higher voice of the heavenly 'Comforter' (Act 13:2), and tarried by the staff, while others went forth to the fight.

Literature.—Lightfoot, Pitman's ed. iii. 211; Josephus *Ant.* xv. x. 5, *BJ* ii. viii.; Plumptre, *Bib. Educ.* ii. 29, 82; art. in Smith's, 'Hastings', and Fairbairn's *DB [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.]* (by Hackett, Cowan, and Dickson respectively), and in *Eneyc. Bibl.* (by Cheyne).

H. C. Lees.

☩ Manasseh

MANASSEH.—The well-known king of Judah, mentioned as a link in our Lord's genealogy, Mat 1:10.

☩ Manger

MANGER.—The Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 translation of φάτνη in Luk 2:7; Luk 2:12; Luk 2:16. In Luk 13:15, the only other place where φάτνη occurs in NT, Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 both render it 'stall,' though (Revised Version margin) gives 'manger.' The precise meaning of φάτνη is somewhat uncertain, opinions differing as to whether it denotes a *stall* or a *manger* within a stall.

Tristram (*Land of Israel*, p. 73) supposes that Mary and Joseph, who could not find room in the κατάλυμα, were obliged to go to some poor house hard by, where there was 'an upper platform' for people and 'a lower platform' for cattle, and that 'in the lower portion allotted to the cattle the Infant when born was naturally laid at once in the long earthen trough which serves for a manger, and into which the fodder is pushed from the floor.' If the κατάλυμα was like a modern Eastern *khan*, and if the φάτνη belonged to it (see below), Mary and Joseph went to one of the stalls for cattle and beasts of burden within the outside wall, and there the babe was born. Meyer (on

Luk 2:7) favours the view that φάτνη means a feeding-trough placed in a stable. In any case, φάτνη, as its derivation implies, designates a feeding-place for animals.

Opinions further differ as to whether the φάτνη in question was a *cave* or grotto in the limestone rock of the neighbourhood used as a stable, or an *enclosure* fenced in.

The former view, which has the weight of persistent tradition, is due to Justin Martyr, who tells us that Christ was born 'in a certain cave near the village,' which cave, he says, had been pointed out by Isaiah as 'a sign.' For this latter circumstance he founds upon Isa 33:16 LXX Septuagint, 'He shall dwell in the lofty cave of the strong rock' (*Trypho*, 70 and 78). A similar statement is made by Origen, who affirms that in his day there was shown at Bethlehem 'the cave where Jesus was born, and the manger in the cave where He was wrapped in swaddling bands' (c. *Cels.* i. 51).

There is, of course, nothing improbable in this traditional view that the place where Mary sought shelter was a cave, for throughout Palestine such caves or grottoes were and are commonly used as stables. The other view, that the φάτνη was an enclosure, is favoured by many. According to Schleusner, it was the open courtyard attached to the inn and enclosed by a rough fence, into which the cattle would be shut at night, and where poorer travellers might lodge, when from want of room in the inn, or want of means to pay for room, they could find no other place. This view is supported by the Vulgate (*præsepium*) and the Peshitta. It is, moreover, significant that the earliest Christian artists represent the Nativity as in an open courtyard.

Stanley, who opposes the view that the φάτνη was a cave, does so partly on the ground of Mat 2:11 and partly on the ground of the superstitious tendency to associate sacred events with caves. He says (*SP [Note: P Sinai and Palestine.]* p. 440): 'As soon as the religion of Palestine fell into the hands of Europeans, it is hardly too much to say that it became "a religion of caves." ' He further notes that when the Convent of the Nativity was dismantled during the invasion of Ibrahim Pasha, it was found that the traditional cave had been, in pre-Christian times, a place of sepulture, and was therefore not at all likely ever to have been used by Jews as a manger.

It has been commonly but too readily assumed that the precise meaning of φάτνη in St. Luke's account must be determined by our interpretation of κατάλυμα. This appears to be a groundless assumption. It is not said by St. Luke that the φάτνη was connected with the inn. In Luk 2:7; Luk 2:12 the definite article is not used; for,

though it appears in the Textus Receptus and a few Manuscripts of minor importance, in which it was probably inserted to designate the well-known φάτνη, preponderating evidence is altogether against it. It occurs, as the best Manuscripts show, in Luk 2:16, but there it clearly refers to the φάτνη spoken of in Luk 2:7; Luk 2:12. It is at least possible that the φάτνη did not belong to the κατάλυμα at all, and it is worth noting as subordinate evidence for this that the *Protevangel of James* and the *Arabic Gospel of the Infancy* do not connect 'the cave' of which they both speak with the inn.

Our conclusion, then, seems clear that, whether the φάτνη was a cave or an enclosure, it was certainly a place where cattle were housed or fed. It cannot be maintained that there is anything improbable or unreasonable in the continuous Christian tradition which goes back to the first decade of the second century. Nor is the pious sentiment groundless which has pictured the birth of the world's Redeemer in circumstances so humble, and has lingered in loving and grateful meditation over His manger cradle. See also artt. Bethlehem and Cave.

Literature.—Schleusner, *Lex. s.v. φάτνη*; Meyer-Weiss on Luk 2:7; Keim, *Jesus of Nazara* (English translation ii. 80); Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus*, i. 185; Stanley, *SP [Note: P Sinai and Palestine.]*, and Tristram, *Land of Israel*, as quoted; Hepworth Dixon, *Holy Land*, i. ch. 13.

J. Cromarty Smith.

☩ Manifestation

MANIFESTATION

1. *The historic manifestation.*—We shall not attempt in this article to say anything about such manifestations of Christ as those alluded to in Joh 1:9, where He is spoken of as the Light which lighteth every man coming into the world. Our first point must obviously be that manifestation in the flesh of which St. Paul speaks in his letter to Timothy (1Ti 3:16). We are so accustomed to its outward form that to some extent we have lost its significance. Not in the court as a king's son, not in the Temple as the member of a priestly family, not in the wilderness as the son of some aged solitary who had given up the world, but in the familiar commonplace surroundings of a peasant family, as the Son of Mary, the wife of a village carpenter. This was the presentation of God to the world. Any of the other forms would have been more in

accord with human expectations. But we are learning more and more every day that God loves the natural, not the out-of-the-way, as a means for manifestation. And this manifestation, first in the manger at Bethlehem, then in the home at Nazareth, was the outward setting of the Divine Life, both simple and natural. There were no miracles, no strange exhibitions of unseen powers, no external signs that led the men of Nazareth to mark out that home as being specially remarkable. Mary and Joseph, who alone knew the secret, read the wonder of it in the spotless life which from infancy to manhood unfolded new beauties every day. Nothing like it had they ever seen or heard.

2. *Manifestation by signs.*—But this manifestation of God in human character, though the only one seen during thirty out of thirty-three years, was not the only one. His mother evidently expected something further. When He left His home to begin His ministry, she felt sure that this reserve and silence would be broken. It might come at any place, and at any time. And it was in accord with the humility and kindness of her character that she should believe it might come at a small village feast to meet a temporary social need. It is plain from our Lord's reply (Joh_2:4) that she was looking for some manifestation, for He told her that the hour for such had not come. It is equally plain that she read in His words only a correction of her eagerness and supposition that she best knew the occasion. She had no doubt that He would help, and gave directions accordingly. And in that secret miracle, apparently unperceived at the time, and discovered only when there was an opportunity to ask the servants, He manifested forth His glory.

This is typical of the many manifestations that followed during the three years. They were not wonders wrought to force men's belief, but signs of Divine character. They were bits of teaching by illustration, object-lessons as we should call them. He never would work a miracle for the sake of astonishing men, though He was often asked to do so (Mat_12:38 ff; Mat_16:1 ff.). They were all signs of God's sympathy with the needs of men, and the desire He had to relieve them. (See Wace, *Some Central Points of Our Lord's Ministry*, p. 133).

3. *Manifestation of the Transfiguration.*—For some eighteen months there had been wonderful manifestations of Divine character and power, but no personal manifestation. Like any one else, Christ was seen tired, hungry, asleep, and in pain through the infirmities and sicknesses of others that He carried. He did not strive nor cry, neither was His voice heard in the streets (Mat_12:19). All was singularly quiet and unassuming, and men might well wonder what there was at the back of this astonishing teaching and these wonderful works. But once the disclosure was made (Mat_17:1 f. || Mar_9:2 f., Luk_9:28 f.). See art. Transfiguration.

4. Manifestations after the Resurrection.—It is very difficult to realize the character of these revelations of the Risen Lord. In one He is like a gardener (Joh 20:15), in another, a traveller walking to a country village (Luk 24:15), in another, a stranger standing on the beach of the Lake (Joh 21:4). Mk. speaks of the appearance to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus as being in ‘another form’ (Mar 16:12). They were manifestations marked by sudden appearances and disappearances. His home was elsewhere, but He came and went according to the disciples’ needs. The body was real—could be touched as well as seen. Indeed, He was anxious that they should not suppose Him to be mere spirit, and actually ate a piece of broiled fish before them in order to show them the reality of His bodily existence (Luk 24:42). But these manifestations are characterized by two features: (1) they were made only to His friends; (2) they were not apparently surrounded with glory and majesty.

With regard to (1), we may believe that only His friends could have perceived them. They might have seen *something*, as St. Paul’s companions did on the road to Damascus (Act 9:7), but not the face of Christ. Faith and love were necessary to interpret the manifestations. (2) They were not apparently surrounded with glory and majesty. They disturbed and frightened, not because they were expressions of His eternal majesty, as that of the Transfiguration was, but because they were unexpected and sudden. This, we think, is singular, and certainly one of the marks of the truthfulness of the narrative. We expect it to be so different, as is shown by the shining figures that represent the Risen Lord in picture and stained-glass window. But just as the graciousness of a king leads him to adopt the dress of his guest so as to make him more completely at home, so our King, when He comes to those poor labouring folk whom He had chosen for His Apostles, comes as one of them.

5. Manifestations to disciples since the Ascension.—There is a striking promise in the words our Lord spoke after the Last Supper, in which He declares that He will manifest Himself to the man that loves Him. That this does not refer to the manifestations of the Resurrection, which were so soon to follow, is clear from His reply to Jude’s very natural question as to how He would manifest Himself to the disciples and yet not to the world (Joh 14:22). It is interesting, to note that St. John does not use the ordinary Greek word (φανερόω) for manifestation, but takes another word (ἐμφανίζω), which is employed in this sense in only one other passage (Mat 27:53), where the dead bodies of the saints are said to have appeared to many in the holy city. That passage would seem to indicate a bodily appearance; but our Lord’s explanation contradicts such an interpretation. When asked how He could appear to the men who loved Him and yet not to the world, He replies that in the first place the man who loves Him will keep His word, *i.e.* will give his mind to Him, and observe His teaching, and then in his fixed contemplation and obedience will realize not only His own presence, but the presence of the Father. Such manifestations as

these, then, are secret, personal realizations of Christ's presence, according more nearly with the revelations of a friend's character that we have in his letters, or in his pictures if he is an artist, in his music if he is a musician. Not, however, that we are to think of them as entirely, subjective. The words 'We will come unto him' teach an actual spiritual movement on our Lord's part towards those who love Him, which they will feel and enjoy.

To St. Paul, who did enjoy some actual appearances of Christ, the spiritual revelations were everything; and in one difficult passage he declares that though he had known Christ after the flesh, *i.e.* in bodily form, henceforth he knew Him no longer in that way (2Co 5:16), evidently finding more in the indwelling manifestation of Christ than he had known in the joy of Christ's visible form.

6. *Manifestation of the Second Advent.*—In 2Th 2:8, where Authorized Version gives 'with the brightness of his coming,' Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 renders 'by the manifestation of his coming,' the Gr. word being ἐπιφάνεια. Similarly Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 substitutes 'shall be manifested' for Authorized Version 'shall appear' in Col 3:4, 1Pe 5:4, 1Jn 2:28; 1Jn 3:2, the Gr. word in each case being φανερώω. See artt. Parousia, Second Coming.

G. H. S. Walpole.

☞ Manliness

MANLINESS.—To the Christian, Jesus is the perfect man, and therefore in His character is to be found the perfect type of manliness. At the same time, when we speak of the manliness of Jesus, there is an element of challenge in the phrase, and we make an assertion that is felt to require justification. This is due partly to the fact that the conventional idea of manliness seems too poor a standard to apply to Jesus, and partly to the fact that the courage of Jesus is not often emphasized. Gentleness, meekness, and forgiveness are the qualities by which His character was pre-eminently distinguished, and it is too often assumed that these preclude the possession of courage. A somewhat complex problem is thus raised by the discussion of manliness in relation to Jesus, which involves two questions: (1) What is the conventional or worldly conception of manliness? (2) How far do the character and teaching of Jesus agree with this, and how far do they modify it?

1. *The conventional or worldly conception of manliness* cannot be described in a word, for a number of qualities go to make up what the world accepts as a manly

man. (1) There must be a basis of *adequate physical strength*. Men have always admired the athlete, and they reject the claim to manliness of those who are puny and feeble in body. The vigour and energy of a strong, well-disciplined body form the substratum of the world's idea of manliness. A proof of this is to be found in the many efforts made by Christian people to remove the prejudice that there is an opposition between Christian faith and bodily strength. The combination of Christian faith with athletic vigour has seemed and does seem to many extremely desirable (cf. 'muscular Christianity'). (2) There must be a sufficient degree of *intelligence*. As, however, the standard of intelligence demanded for manliness is not very high, this element is not greatly emphasized. (3) There must be the *moral qualities* of courage, temperance or self-control, perseverance, and love of personal honour. Of these courage is fundamental, and it may be defined as the assertion of self against opposing influences. It is recognized by the world in many forms, from the animal quality of bold disregard of physical danger up to steadfast adherence to conscientious conviction. At the same time, however courageous a man may be, the world holds him to come short of true manliness if he is not able to control his impulses, whether of mind or body, to persevere patiently in any course of action he has adopted, and to be scrupulous in guarding his personal honour with life itself if necessary.

There are three points which may be noticed in connexion with this analysis of the conventional idea of manliness. (a) All the virtues involved are compatible with pride, and indeed are conceived as ministering to and supporting pride. This is obvious in regard to courage and love of honour. Self-control, again, is desirable largely because its opposite brings ridicule; and perseverance, because to give in is intolerable to the proud man. (b) This idea of manliness corresponds very closely to the ideal of the perfect man of the Greek and Roman moralists. The starting-point of pagan ethics is the analysis of the term 'happiness' (εὐδαιμονία), regarded not as a subjective state of feeling, but as an objective form of being. Happiness is held to be found in the harmony of character and experience. Hence the qualities which give a man rule over his circumstances are to be desired as good. By Plato and Aristotle an optimistic view of the world's capacity to satisfy the requirements of a good man is assumed. With the Stoics, and still more with the Cynics, pessimism about the world leads to strong emphasis being laid on the power of the individual to be sufficient to himself. With the Epicureans the optimistic assumption that the world will not fail to give the gratification necessary to happiness, leads to the emphasis being laid on the regulation rather than the suppression of desire. The ethics of Greek and Roman writers may be generically described as the science of the relation of man to his environment. The variations in theory are determined by the view taken of the responsiveness of the environment to man's needs. Thus, from the practical point of view, all the various theories aim at self-development. Self is the beginning, centre, and aim of pagan ethical thought. Harmonies with Christian teaching are largely

accidental. The essence and root are different. The virtues of the pagan are ‘inflated and arrogant’ (Augustine), even where they inculcate the same conduct as the Christian virtues (cf. Luthardt, *Hist. of Christian Ethics*, i. 25). (c) This idea or manliness corresponds very closely to the ideal of manhood to be found in the Ethics of Evolution. Phrases such as the ‘survival of the fittest’ and the ‘struggle for existence,’ which suggest that men are engaged in a constant war from which only the conquerors emerge, indicate at once an ideal of manliness of which self-assertion is the fundamental quality.

2. How far do the character and teaching of Jesus agree with the worldly conception of manliness, and how far do they modify it?—Was Jesus a manly man according to the world’s idea? To this the answer must be that His manliness can be vindicated in relation to all the qualities which go to make a manly man, but that allowance must be made for the very different ideal in relation to which these qualities were exercised. About physical strength and intellectual ability it is not necessary to say anything. There is a degree of human excellence which makes even the latter inconsiderable, and we have passed that degree when we discuss the character of Jesus. Courage, however, is on quite a different plane, and the courage of Jesus can be triumphantly vindicated. The cleansing of the Temple (Mat 21:12-13, Mar 11:15-18, Joh 2:13-16), the attitude of Jesus towards the throng who would have made Him king (Joh 6:15 f.), His denunciations of the Pharisees (Matthew 23), His woes against the cities of Galilee (Mat 11:20-24), His acts of healing upon the Sabbath, His rebuke to the people of Nazareth (Luk 4:16-30), His statement about the Temple (Joh 2:18-22), His refusal of a sign to the scribes (Mat 12:38-42; Mat 16:1-4, Mar 8:11-12, Luk 11:16 f.), His last journey and entrance into Jerusalem (Luk 9:51), His demeanour before the high priest and before Pilate (Mat 26:57 f., Mar 14:53 f., Luk 22:66 f.)—all show courage of the very first quality. He is undismayed before an unparalleled combination of adverse forces. And the overwhelming forces opposed to Him give an added lustre to His courage in dealing faithfully with those who took or were ready to take His part. His disciples are fearlessly rebuked when they are in the wrong (Luk 9:54-56, Mat 16:23, Mar 8:33, Mat 18:1 ff., Mar 9:33, Luk 9:46; Luk 24:24 f., Mat 19:14, Mar 10:13-15, Luk 18:15-19). He never modifies His demands in order thereby to secure influential supporters (Joh 3:1 ff., Mat 19:16 f., Mar 10:17 f., Luk 18:18 f., Mat 8:19-22, Luk 9:57-62). Moreover, the inevitable result of His faithfulness was clear to Him from an early point in His public career. So there was not lacking in His courage that element which arises from the vision of the cruel and shameful death awaiting Him. The self-control of Jesus, again, is very apparent in His life. We see it in the fact that He remained subject to His parents (Luk 2:51), and was 30 years of age before He began His ministry. It is displayed in a different relation in the temptation in the wilderness (Mat 4:1-11, Luk 4:1-13), when neither the pangs of hunger nor the splendid prospect of worldwide dominion could overcome His resolution. And once more, before the high priest, before Pilate, and in

the brutal hands of the soldiers, He never spoke one bitter or unworthy word, even though Peter denied Him and the other disciples had forsaken Him. Of His perseverance it is only necessary to say that He was 'obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross' (Php 2:8).

It is in regard to love of personal honour that the transcendent difference between the world's idea of manliness and the manliness of Jesus becomes apparent, just as also very varying views are to be found even among worldly men as to what honour really is. However, an integral element in honour in the worldly sense is the good opinion of a man held by his fellows. To be an inconsiderable person was regarded by Aristotle as incompatible with happiness. High-mindedness is one of the virtues which go to make the perfect man, and 'by a high-minded man we seem to mean one who claims much and deserves much' (*Nic. Ethiopic* iv. 3, § 3; cf. Mat 23:12). Even the proud indifference of the Cynic to the opinion of his neighbours by its vehemence betrayed its hollowness. It is the last refuge of pride to despise all who do not acknowledge the superiority on which it is based. In the life and teaching of Jesus the centre of morality is changed from self to God. Right conduct consists in obedience to the law of God. The essential nature of the Law is to love God and one's neighbour (Mat 22:37-40, Mar 12:30-31, Luk 10:27). The approval of God is thus the supreme practical consideration for the Christian, while his relations to others are to be governed by love and a desire for their good. There is no exception to this rule. It is to guide the conduct of Christians towards those who have injured them. Now the right and duty of avenging an affront or an injury have always seemed to men bound up with the love of honour, and the division of others into friends and enemies has seemed inevitable. But Jesus teaches that His followers are to forgive injuries, and to love their enemies (Mat 5:39 f., Mat 18:21-22, Luk 6:27 f., Luk 17:3-4). Moreover, they are not to meet violence with violence. And of these precepts He has given a perfect illustration (Luk 4:24-30, Mat 26:52-56, Mar 14:65, Mat 27:30, Joh 8:59; Joh 10:39; Joh 19:17).

It is in regard to this duty of forgiveness that the world has found the greatest difficulty in assimilating the views of Jesus, and has been inclined to treat them as counsels of perfection which cannot be put in practice. Three degrees of opinion on this question may be distinguished: (1) that of those who altogether ignore the teaching of Jesus as impracticable; (2) that of those who find in His teaching the condemnation of all resistance to evil, whether private or public, and so condemn alike war between States and private quarrels, whether settled by physical force or by an appeal to courts of law, the decisions of which ultimately rest on force; (3) that of those who find in the teaching of Jesus primarily the inculcation of a spirit of love the manifestation of which is determined in every case by the circumstances, and which accordingly condemns neither war nor an appeal to force, nor an appeal to courts of law, apart from the occasion which gives rise to them.

With the first of these opinions we are not concerned. The second has always been held by many Christians. It is based especially on Mat 5:18-48; Mat 26:52, Luk 6:27; Luk 17:3. In the early Church it led to a strong feeling against the propriety of Christians serving as soldiers (cf. Tertullian, *de Idol.* ch. 19—‘the Lord in disarming Peter unbelted every soldier’). In later times the Society of Friends have been the most prominent adherents of similar ideas. And Tolstoi, among modern writers of distinction, holds such views in their most extreme form. It has to be remembered, however, (a) that the illustrative sayings of Jesus cannot wisely be generalized into universal precepts. To do this is to ignore the clearly marked feature of His teaching, in which He aimed ‘at the greatest clearness in the briefest compass.’ (b) If Jesus said, ‘To him that smiteth thee on one cheek offer also the other’ (cf. Mat 26:52, Joh 18:11), He also told His disciples to sell their garments and ‘buy a sword’ (Luk 22:36, cf. Mat 10:34-35). (c) Jesus laid down a method of dealing with one who has trespassed against another which cannot be brought within the boundary of strict non-resistance, though, indeed, the motive of this dealing is undoubtedly to be a desire for the good of the offender (Mat 18:15-17). The third opinion is that which has generally prevailed among Christians. According to it, the ruling principle of a Christian’s conduct is love towards all. This involves at once and without question or limit the forgiveness of all injuries and the crucifying of the spirit of emulation and self-esteem which so often leads to strife. But the manifestation of heart-forgiveness is to be regulated by a wise conception of the injurer’s welfare and the welfare of others. These principles, in their mutual interaction, condemn all personal vindictiveness and malice, such an appeal to violence as duelling, that litigious spirit which aims at getting the better of another in a law-court, and all wars of aggression, as well as those which spring from national or personal pride. They do not condemn, however, the establishment of just government by force of arms, nor an appeal to justice and a desire for its vindication by force, nor the use of arms in the protection of the weak.* [Note: Tolstoi, with remorseless logic, declares that a Christian should not interfere with force to prevent murder—a precept which ignores the moral nature of the murderer no less than the claim of the person attacked for protection.]

There is thus open to the Christian a sphere for the exercise of aggressive courage consecrated to the furtherance of noble ends. To right wrong and to protect the weak are the natural aims of Christian manliness. At the same time it remains true that the Christian is called upon to exercise the courage of endurance much more frequently than that of aggression. And the endurance of the martyr shows a quality of manliness which transcends all others, inasmuch as his courage is made sublime by self-sacrifice.

Literature.—Sidgwick, *Hist. of Ethics*; Paulsen, *A System of Ethics*; Knight, *The Christian Ethic*; Martensen, *Christian Ethics*; Luthardt, *Hist. of Christian Ethics*; Benjamin Kidd, *Social Evolution*; *Ecce Homo*, chs. 20, 21, 22; Wendt, *Teaching of*

Jesus; Speer, The Principles of Jesus; Tolstoi, The Christianity of Christ; Hughes, The Manliness of Christ; Phillips Brooks, The Candle of the Lord, p. 253.

Andrew N. Bogle.

☩ Manna

MANNA.—The miracle of the loaves and fishes, by which Jesus fed five thousand men, stirred the multitudes to fanaticism (Joh_6:1-15). Their first impulse was to make Jesus king by force. On the morrow they followed Him across the sea to Capernaum, hoping that He would feed them again in some supernatural way, and suggesting the giving of bread from heaven as a suitable sign in confirmation of His high claims. Would not the prophet of Nazareth imitate the great lawgiver, who gave their fathers bread from heaven? Jesus turns their thoughts away from Moses to God: ‘It was not Moses that gave you the bread out of heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread out of heaven.’ As God gave the fathers literal bread from heaven, so now He is giving to their children spiritual food that nourishes the soul eternally. ‘I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me shall not hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.’ ‘Your fathers did eat the manna in the wilderness, and they died.’ God has a far better gift than the manna that was gathered day by day in the wilderness. ‘I am the living bread that cometh down out of heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; yea, and the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world’ (Joh_6:51).

In Rev_2:17 the spiritual blessing promised by the glorified Christ to the victor in life’s battle is called ‘hidden manna.’

John R. Sampey.

☩ Mansion

MANSION (μονή, Joh_14:2; Joh_14:23).—1. ‘Mansion,’ like μονή, is properly an abstract noun, meaning ‘a staying,’ ‘an abiding.’ In English literature it is first found in Hampole’s *Psalter*, 5. 8 (c. [Note: circa, about.] 1340 a.d.), ‘pai entire in til God is house of heuen and takis þaire joy and þaire mansyon in þaire perfeccioun.’ So in the B text of *Piers Plowman*, Langland says of Pride (B xiv. 26): ‘Arst in the maister than in the man some mansioun he hath’ (he dwelleth in the master rather than in the man). The C text (c. [Note: circa, about.] 1393) keeps the word while it extends the

limits of Pride's abode (xvii. 59): 'Other in the maister, other in the man, some mancion he shewith.' But Hampole and Lydgate (1420) also use 'mansion' of a dwelling-place. A charter of Henry vi. (1444) uses it of a hostel, and Fabyan (1512) of the chief residence of a lord, whence it gains its modern meaning of 'an imposing abode,' which is seen even in Shakspeare (2 *Henry IV.* iii. ii. 351). Bacon, however, still uses the word in its abstract sense in the *Advancement of Learning* (1605), and both Shakspeare and Milton use it of 'an abiding-place' without the suggestion of a building (*Timon of Athens*, v. i. 218; *Paradise Lost*, i. 268, viii. 296). From the Vulgate *mansiones* it is used by Wyclif for 'halting-places' in Exo_17:1, but in translations from the Greek (as Whiston's *Josephus*, 1737) this meaning represents σταθμός, not μονή, and so has no bearing upon the sense of Joh_14:2. The Vulgate also uses *mansiones* in Joh_14:2, and is responsible for Hampole's use of the English form of the word in the sense of 'dwelling-places.' That sense was confirmed in the language, partly by Chaucer (*Knight's Tale*, 1116), but mainly by the influence of Tindale's Version of the NT (1526), 'In my fathers housse are many mansions,' and (2Co_5:1) 'Our erthy mancoun wherein we now dwell,' copied by Milton in *Il Penseroso*, 92.

2. But while the English 'mansion' and the identical French word *maison* have retained from their common original only the developed meaning of 'dwelling-place,' the Greek μονή is nowhere in extant literature found with this meaning, save only in Joh_14:2. Westcott (with Liddell and Scott) explains its use in this verse by the supposed occurrence of the word in Pausanias (x. 31:7) in the sense of 'a halting-place for the night.' But the ordinary reading in that passage seems impossible Greek, and is certainly corrupt (see J. G. Frazer's note): τέτμηται δὲ διὰ τῶν μονῶν ἡ ὁδός is not an intelligible expression for the traditional meaning, 'there are halting-places at intervals upon the road.' One MS reads μηνῶν, from which W. M. Ramsay conjectures διὰ τῶν Μηρινῶν, 'the road has been carried through the country of the M. (beside Minos' tomb).'

Apart, then, from Joh_14:2, μονή remains a purely abstract noun, meaning (1) *abiding*, (2) *continuance*, (3) *rest*. The ease with which it passes from the first to the last of these meanings can be seen from Plato, *Crat.* 437 B, where μνήμη is defined as a μονή, and not a φορά; Ar. *Phys.* v. 6. 8 (ὥστε κινήσει μονὴ ἐναντία); Polybius, iv. 41, 4, 5, where it is twice coupled with στάσις; and most of all in Plutarch, whose writings (a.d. 80-120) are contemporary with St. John's Gospel.

Like the classical authors, Plutarch still uses *μονή*, in the literal sense of ‘a stay’ or ‘a continuance’: οὔτε μονήν ἐν τῷ βίῳ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς οὔτε ἐξαγωγὴν τοῖς κακοῖς (1042 D), ἀλλὰ καὶ τούτοις μονήν οἶονται καθήκουσαν εἶναι κάκεινοις ἐξαγωγὴν, 1063 D. But in 1024 F, though *μονή* answers to τὸ μένου, Plutarch opposes it, like Aristotle, to κίνησις: ἔστι γὰρ ἡ μὲν νόησις τοῦ νοοῦτος κίνησις περὶ τὸ μένον, ἡ δὲ δόξα μονὴ τῶ οὐ αισθανομένου περὶ τὸ κινούμενον. So in 927 A the material elements as conceived by Empedocles are reduced to order by the introduction of the principle of love (φιλότιμος ἐγγενομένης), ἵνα ... τὰ μὲν κινήσεως τὰ δὲ μονῆς ἀνάγκαις ἐνδεθέντα ... ἀρουονία ν καὶ κοινωνίαν ἀπεργάσῃται τοῦ παντός, where *μονή* has the complete meaning of *rest* as opposed to motion. And in 747 C he uses the plural of ‘rests’ in dancing; ἐνταῦθα δὲ αἰ μοναὶ πέρατα τῶν κινήσεων εἰσίν.

In Joh 14:2, however, the immediate mention of ‘a place’ seems to demand a concrete meaning for *μοναί*, though it has no parallel elsewhere. If so, the senses of ‘abode’ in vv. 2 and 23, concrete and abstract respectively, will be derived from the idea of *rest* that has become attached to the word, as well as from the original idea of *remaining*. The difference is seen at once when the *μονήν ποιεῖσθαι* of Joh 14:23 is compared with the same phrase in Thuc. i. 131: Pausanias the victor of Plataea, intriguing with the Persians in Asia Minor, was ‘prolonging his stay to no good purpose’ (οὐκ ἐπ’ ἀγαθῶ τὴν μονήν ποιούμενος), *μονήν*, as the Scholiast remarks, being practically equivalent to *ἀργίαν*, ‘idleness.’ In Joh 14:23 the phrase combines, like *μοναί* in Joh 14:2, the meanings of ‘abiding’ and ‘rest’ with that of the ‘home’ in which the rest is found. All the same suggestions are found in 1Ma 7:38, the only passage in the LXX Septuagint where *μονή* occurs: μνήσθητι τῶν δυσφημιῶν αὐτῶν, καὶ μὴ δὸς αὐτοῖς μονήν (‘and suffer them not to live any longer,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885).

3. The *μονή* of the Christian in the spiritual world (Joh 14:2) and the *μονή* of God in the Christian (Joh 14:23) are evidently intended to be correlative: ‘Abide in me, and I in you’ (Joh 15:4). Their consummation realizes the ideal of Joh 17:21; Joh 17:23; meanwhile they are the NT fulfilment of the two OT ideals of rest: ‘Rest in the Lord and wait patiently for him’ (Psa 37:7), and ‘Arise, O Lord, into thy resting-place; thou, and the ark of thy strength’ (Psa 132:8). Joh 14:2, that is, refers not only to

the perpetual 'rest' or 'home' in the life hereafter, but, like v. 23, to the 'abiding' fellowship with the Divine in this life (Mat 28:20, Rev 21:8). See artt. Abiding, and Father's House.

Literature.—For the English word see *Oxford English Dict.*, where its history is fully illustrated; Aldis Wright's *Bible Word-Book*, 387, 388; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. 238. The Greek word is very insufficiently treated both in Stephanus and in Liddell and Scott; for Plutarch's uses see Wytttenbach's Index, where, however, some references are misprinted. Reference may further be made to *Expos. Times*, viii. [1897] 496, x. [1899] 303; *Expositor*, ii. ii. [1881] 281, iii. [1882] 397, iv. vi. [1892] 209; A. Maclaren, *The Holy of Holies* (1890), p. 12; R. W. Dale, *Christ and the Future Life* (1895), pp. 33-84; J. Parker, *City Temple Pulpit*, i. (1899), p. 259.

Frank Richards.

☞ Manuscripts

MANUSCRIPTS.—The aim of the present article is to give a select list of the more ancient or interesting Manuscripts of the Gospels, with a description of the most important or interesting of these. The simplest course will be to divide them into the languages in which they are written, premising that the Gospels were originally written in Greek, and that the versions in other languages are translations, generally direct, from the Greek. The symbols employed to indicate these manuscripts, whether letters or numbers, were invented for the sake of brevity, when they are referred to in an apparatus of variant readings. The standard collection of variants contained in Gospel manuscripts is that of C. Tischendorf (*Novum Testamentum Graece: Editio Octava Critica Maior*, vol. i., Lipsiae, 1869), and the standard lists of Manuscripts are those contained in the *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1900, 1902) of C. R. Gregory, an American scholar domiciled in Germany. The new numbers which von Soden (*Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, Band i., Berlin, 1902) has given to the Greek Manuscripts are added for the sake of completeness, but it is very doubtful whether they will gain wide currency. Capital letters are used to indicate Manuscripts with uncial writing, which is never later than the 10th cent.; numbers, for those in minuscule writing (9th to 15th centuries and later).

I. Greek Manuscripts :

(a) *Uncials*:—

⌘ (= δ 2, von Soden), Codex Sinaiticus (of the 4th or 5th cent.), now in the Imperial Library, St. Petersburg, with the exception of a small portion, which is in the University Library, Leipzig, contains OT (with considerable losses), NT (complete), followed by Ep. Barnab. and the *Shepherd*. The MS, found by Tischendorf in the Convent of St. Catharine, Mt. Sinai, in 1844, consists of 346½ (NT 147½) leaves of fine parchment, measuring 48 × 37.8 cm., with four columns to the page and 48 lines to the column. The ink is now brownish; the letters are not very large, and are painfully regular, without breathings or accents, the use of which is only sporadic till the 9th century. The hands of seven revisers, dating from the 4th (5th) to the 12th centuries, can be observed in the MS. This MS shares with B the honour of being considered the purest MS of the Gospels. Tischendorf has been charged more than once with having stolen this MS, but the charges are successfully refuted by Gregory.

A (= δ 4, von S.), Codex Alexandrinus, in London, British Museum, Reg. I. D. v.-viii. (the NT is in showcases). This MS is of the 5th cent., and consists of 773 leaves (NT 143 leaves) of parchment, measuring 32 × 26.3 cm., with 2 columns to the page and 49-51 lines to the column. It contains, with some losses, the whole Greek Bible. It was probably written in Egypt, and came in 1098 into the possession of the patriarch of Alexandria, from which place it gets its name. Cyril Lucar, patriarch of Constantinople, and former patriarch of Alexandria, sent it as a gift to Charles I. of England in 1628. About a century afterwards it was presented to the nation. A few lines at the beginning of each book are written in red. The following portions of the Gospels are lost: Mat 1:1 to Mat 25:6, Joh 6:50 to Joh 8:52. It is quite clear that Joh 7:53 to Joh 8:11 never formed a part of the manuscript. A complete facsimile was published in 1878-1880.

B (= δ 1, von S.), Codex Vaticanus, Vat. Lib. MS Gr. 1209 (in showcases). The MS is of the 4th cent., and consists of 759 (NT 142) leaves of parchment, measuring 27 cm. square, with 3 columns to the page and 42 lines to the column. The parchment is very soft and fine. The uncial letters are small, simple, and written, without breaks between the individual words; the first hand wrote no breathings or accents, and punctuation is very rare. The MS is of uncertain origin, and, when complete, contained the whole of the Greek Bible with perhaps the exception of the Books of Maccabees and the Prayer of Manasses. No gaps occur in the Gospels. It has been twice revised, once by a corrector contemporary with the original scribe (called B² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred]), and again by another of the 10th or 11th cent., who worked over the letters and often added accents and breathings. WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] consider it our very best MS, and regard the combination BN as practically infallible. A splendid facsimile of the NT part was published by Hœpli of Milan in 1904 (see the notice of it by Nestle in the *Theol.*

Literaturblatt for 6th Jan. 1905), superseding the inferior photograph issued by Cozza-Luzi at Rome in 1889.

C (= δ 3, von S.), Codex Ephraemi rescriptus, Paris Bibl. Nat., gr. 9, a palimpsest of the 5th century. Contains, in present form, 209 leaves, written in single columns. The NT portion consists of 145 leaves, and contains parts of every book except 2 John and 2 Thessalonians. Edited by Tisch. (Leipzig, 1843 and 1845).

D *evv. act.* (= δ 5, von S.), Codex Bezae, in Cambridge University Library, Nn. 2, 41 (in a showcase in Cockerell's Building). This MS is of the 6th cent. (according to Burkitt, of the 4th), and is bilingual (Greek and Latin). It is on parchment, 26 cm. in height and 21.5 in breadth, and contains now 415 (406 + 9 added later) leaves, with one column to the page. When the book is open, the left side is Greek, the right side Latin. Originally it contained probably Mt., Jn., Lk., Mk. (the regular Western order of the Gospels), Apocalypse, Apocalyptic, 1, 2, 3 Jn., Acts (Dom Chapman in *Expositor*, 1905, ii. p. 46 ff.). Now the Gospels and Acts are almost complete, the Apocalypse and 1 James, 2 nd. Jn. have disappeared, and of 3 Jn. there remain only a few verses in Latin. Many hands have been engaged in correcting the MS. It was probably written in Italy, or South France, where it was when Beza acquired it and gave it to the University of Cambridge in 1581. The MS is the only representative of the Western text in Greek, a form of text which was widespread already in the 2nd century. It contains, therefore, many original elements, which have been worked over at a very early date. In spite of this revision, it often agrees with the neutral Manuscripts, ⚭ B. Scrivener published an accurate and handy edition of the MS at Cambridge (1864), which retains its use side by side with the gorgeous facsimile published by the Cambridge University Press in 1899.

N (= ε 19, von S.), Codex Purpureus Petropolitanus, incomplete and mutilated, the parts being distributed between St. Petersburg, Rome, Patmos, London, and Vienna. It is an uncial, probably of the 6th cent., measuring 32 by 26.5 cm.; has 2 columns to the page, 16 lines to the column, and 227 leaves. The leaves are stained with purple, and the writing is silver, the Divine names being in gold. The MS is very like Σ both in text and external character. The only complete edition is that of H. S. Cronin in *TS [Note: 5 Texts and Studies.]*, vol. v. No. 4 (Cambridge, 1899). He considers N and Σ to be copies of the same lost original. The text is of a mixed character, representing a sort of transition stage between the purity of the older uncials and the corruption of the majority of cursives. While it sometimes supports the former, it also at times provides the earliest known authority for readings which are subsequently almost universal. For particulars see Cronin's valuable introduction.

Σ (= ε 18, von S.), Codex Purpureus Rossanensis, in the charge of the Archbp. of Rossano, S. Italy. An uncial of the 6th cent., probably later than its brother MS N, it is, like it, purple with silver writing. It measures 30.7 by 26 cm., has 2 columns, to the page, 20 lines to the column, and comprises 188 leaves. It contains Matthew and Mark (the latter without Mar 16:14-end). Edited by von Gebhardt (*Die Evangelien des Matthäus und des Marcus aus dem cod. purp. Rossan.*, Leipzig, 1883). See under N. The credit of the discovery of this MS belongs to von Gebhardt and Harnack (1879), It contains eight pictures of Gospel scenes, the oldest known.

Ψ (= δ 6, von S.), Athos, Laura 172 (β 52), an uncial of the 8th or 9th cent., measuring 20.8 by 15 cm., has 31 lines to the page, and comprises 262 leaves. It contains the greater part of the NT, but lacks Mt., and Mk. down to Mar 9:3. The ending of Mk. is like that in L and T¹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] . After Mar 16:8 ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ, it proceeds as follows: πάντα δὲ τὰ παραγγελλόμενα τοῖς περὶ τὸν Πέτρον συντόμως ἔξηγ γειλαν: Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἰησοῦς ἐφάνη ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς καὶ μέχρι δύσεως ἐξαπέστειλεν δι' αὐτῶν τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἄφθαρτον κήρυγμα τῆς αἰωνίου σωτηρίας ἀμὴν: ἔστιν καὶ ταῦτα φερόμενα μετὰ τὸ ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ:—Ἀναστὰς δὲ, κ.τ.λ., up to Mar 16:20, and at the end Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μᾶρκον. It is only in this Gospel that the text is of interest. The character of its readings, is set forth in Lake's edition (*Studies Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, vol. v. (Oxford, 1903) pp. 94-122), [pp. 89-186 can be obtained separately].

T^X (= ε 02, von S.), Oxyrhynchus Papyri, vol. ii. No. 208. We mention this papyrus uncial fragment of the 3rd cent. (Joh 1:23-31; Joh 1:33-41; Joh 20:11-17; Joh 20:19-25), because it is probably the oldest fragment of Gospel MS in existence.

(b) *Minuscules*:—

1 (= δ 50, von S.), Basel University Library, A.N. iv. 2 (formerly B vi. 27), of the 12th (others say 10th) century. This MS was used for Erasmus' Gr. Test., the first published edition. It gives a good text, which is often in agreement with 118 (= ε 346, von S.), 131 (= δ 467, von S.), and 209 (= δ 457, von S.). Lake has edited the four, taking 1 as the basis, and showing the variants in the others ('Codex 1 of the Gospels and its Allies' in *TS [Note: 5 Texts and Studies.]*, vol. vii. No. 3, Cambridge, 1902). He has also discussed with thoroughness the relations between them. The reader will find his Introduction a valuable lesson in textual criticism. It is sufficient here to quote his

conclusion with regard to the text in Mark, which escaped a good deal of the assimilating process which affected the texts of Matthew and Luke: ‘(1) *fam*¹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] in St. Mark seems to form part of a larger family of which the most certain members are *fam*¹³ [Note: 3 designates the particular edition of the work referred] 22, 28, 565, 700; (2) this larger family seems to represent a local text or local texts which were current in a comparatively limited region in the East; (3) the only definite localities which there is any reason to suggest are Jerusalem and Sinai, and even for these the evidence is insufficient to justify confident assertion’ (p. liv). The most noticeable features in the other Gospels are an element akin to \aleph B and a Western element (cf. p. lv).

13 (= ϵ 368, von S.), Paris, Bibl. Nat., gr. 50, of the 13th century. This MS is one of the group 13-69-124-346-543-788-826-828-983- ϵ 1053 (von S.)— ϵ 1054 (von S.), conveniently named by Lake *fam*¹³ [Note: 3 designates the particular edition of the work referred] . The group is also called the Ferrar group, because the relation between 13, 69, 124, and 346 was discovered by Ferrar of Dublin (*A Collation of Four Important Manuscripts of the Gospels*, by W. H. Ferrar and T. K. Abbott, Dublin, 1877). The studies of Rendel Harris (*On the Origin of the Ferrar Group*, Cambridge, 1893; *Further Researches into the History of the Ferrar Group*, London, 1900), Lake (*JThSt* [Note: *ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.*] , vol. i. [1899-1900] pp. 117-120), and von Soden have shed further light upon this group. The archetype appears to have been in Calabria or Sicily in the Middle Ages. Its most remarkable characteristics are the transposition of Joh 7:53 to Joh 8:11 to Luk 21:38, and Luk 24:43 f. to Mat 26:39 (on the first transposition see von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, i. (Berlin, 1902) p. 486 ff.). The importance of the group lies in the great support which it gives to the Western text.

II. Syriac Manuscripts :—

(a) *of the Old Syriae translation (Evangelion da-Mepharreshe, ‘Gospel of the Separated Ones’)*:—

1. London, British Museum, Additional Manuscripts , No. 14,451 (No. 119 in Wright’s catalogue), and Berlin, Royal Library, Orient. Quart. No. 528. This MS, Codex Nitriensis Curetonianus (Burkitt’s C), consists of 82½ leaves in the British Museum and 3 leaves in Berlin; and came from the great Library of the Convent of St. Mary Deipara in the Nitrian Valley, west of Cairo. The greater portion of the MS reached England in 1842. In its original state it contained Mt., Mk., Jn., Lk. (in this unusual order). The portions still extant are Mat 1:1 to Mat 8:22; Mat 10:32 to Mat 23:25, Mar 16:17-20,

Joh 1:1-42; Joh 3:5 to Joh 8:19; Joh 14:10-12; Joh 14:15-19; Joh 14:21-24; Joh 14:26-29, Luk 2:48 to Luk 3:16, Luk 7:33 to Luk 16:12; Luk 17:1 to Luk 24:44.
The early part of the 5th cent. is the latest possible date for it. Each page has two columns, each with lines varying from 22 to 26. Each leaf measures 30 by 24 cm. The first edition of this MS is that of Cureton (London, 1858) supplemented by Rödiger (Berlin, 1872), but the definitive edition is that of F. C. Burkitt, who has edited this MS and the following together, the only representatives of the Old Syriac version, with an English translation, copious Introduction and Notes (*Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, etc., 2 vols., Cambridge, 1904). From this work the details here are taken. A photograph of a page of C is in vol. ii. opposite p. 7, also p. 38 two pages; also in Kenyon's *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*, facing p. 155.

2. Sinai, Monastery of St. Catharine; Syr. [Note: Syriac.] 30, Codex Palimpsestus Sinaiticus (Burkitt's S). The MS was discovered by Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson, of Cambridge, in 1892, and has been since studied repeatedly by Mrs. Lewis and other scholars. The MS consists of 182 leaves of vellum (one leaf was stolen in 1902, but afterwards restored; see *Exp. Times*, xiii. 405; xvii. 396). The upper writing is of the 8th cent., and consists of Lives of Saints. In its original form the MS had 166 leaves, containing the four Gospels in the usual order. Its date is early 5th, perhaps 4th century. Each page contains 2 columns, with from 29 to 21 lines each, and measures 21.9 by 15.8 cm. The Gospels are nearly complete. Of the two Manuscripts this must be regarded as the better representative of the original translation. Complete photographs of it are in Cambridge University Library; Westminster College, Cambridge; Rylands' Library, Manchester: photos of separate pages in Burkitt, vol. ii. pp. 28, 257, and elsewhere.

The *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe* was so called to distinguish it from Tatian's *Diatessaron* or Harmony, in which form the Gospels were regularly read in the Syrian Church at first. This Church had its centre at Edessa near the Euphrates, and its language must not be identified with the Aramaic our Lord spoke. The value of the Old Syriac Version consists in the fact that it reproduces the Greek text current in Antioch at the end of the 2nd cent., with a certain amount of contamination from the use of the *Diatessaron*, which is in origin Italian. It is of the first authority for the constitution of the text of the Greek Gospels. For all problems connected with it the reader is referred to Burkitt's second volume.

(b) of the *Peshitta* ('simple') translation:

2. Earl of Crawford's MS 1, now Rylands' Library, Manchester, of the 6th cent. (Gwilliam, No. 11).

13. London, British Museum, Addit. Manuscripts 14,470, of the 5th or 6th cent. (Gwilliam, No. 17).

15. London, British Museum, Addit. Manuscripts 14,453, of the 5th or 6th cent. (Gwilliam, No. 14).

22. London, British Museum, Addit. Manuscripts 12,140, of the 6th cent. (Gwilliam, 31).

There are many other codices, complete or incomplete, of equal antiquity, in other libraries. See Gwilliam's list of 42 Manuscripts in the *Tetraeuangelium Sanctum* by Pusey and Gwilliam (Oxonii, 1901), which is the best edition of the Peshitta, and is provided with a literal Latin translation. As to the date of the Peshitta itself, Burkitt's view that it was prepared by Rabbula, bp. of Edessa from 411 to 435 a.d., has gained wide acceptance. He regards it as 'a revision of the *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, undertaken mainly with the object of conforming the translation more closely to the Greek text as read at Antioch early in the 5th century' (*Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, vol. ii. p. 5).

(c) of the *Palestinian or Jerusalem translation*:

1. Rome, Vaticanus Syr. [Note: Syriac.] 19 (formerly 11), of the year 1030 (Codex A, Lewis-Gibson).

6. Sinai, Monastery of St. Catharine, of the year 1104 (Codex B, Lewis-Gibson).

7. Sinai, Monastery of St. Catharine, of the year 1118 (Codex C, Lewis-Gibson).

Edited by Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson in the *Palestinian Syriac Lectionary of the Gospels* (London, 1899). This version is perhaps more closely related to the Old Syriac than to the Peshitta, and may be a revision of the former.

(d) of the *Philoxenian-Harklean translation*:

1. Belonging to the Syrian Protestant College in Beirut, but lent to the Union Theological Seminary of New York. Of the 9th cent., and somewhat defective.

22. Florence, Laur. i. 40 (Assem. 3). Of date 757.

25. Rome, Vat. Syr. [Note: Syriac.] 266. Of the 7th century.

26. Rome, Vat. Syr. [Note: Syriac.] 267. Of the 8th century.

This, the youngest of the Syrian versions, is a revision by Thomas of Harkel (Heraclea) in the first half of the 7th cent. of an earlier version made at the instance of Philoxenus, Monophysite bp. of Hierapolis (Mabog) in the early 6th century. The earlier translation was perhaps made from the Peshitta by reference to the 'corrected' form of the Greek text, and Thomas found in Egypt older Greek Manuscripts, which had escaped the enthusiasm of the destroyers, who favoured the 'corrected' text, and inserted some readings from them, adding others in the margin.

III. Egyptian (Coptic) Manuscripts :

(a) of the Bohairic translation:

Complete manuscripts are all of late date, none being earlier apparently than the 12th century. On all questions connected with this translation and its Manuscripts, see *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect* [ed. G. Horner]; 4 vols. (Oxford, 1898-1905).

1. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Huntington, 17,* [Note: Gregory wrongly 'Huntingdon, 11.'] Horner's A, printed entire by him as the basis of his edition. This MS was written in 1174, and contains the Gospels complete, both in Bohairic and Arabic. It is on paper, contains 457 (+ 5) leaves, and 2 columns to the page, with 20 lines each. It measures 34.5 by 26 cm. The MS has a number of omissions: see the valuable tables of omissions in the chief Bohairic Manuscripts in Horner's edition, vol. i. p. cxxvi ff.

21. Paris, Bibl. Nat., copt. 16, Horner's C. The MS was written in 1196, and contains the Gospels almost complete, both in Bohairic and Arabic. It is on paper, contains 369 (+2) leaves, and 2 columns to the page, with 26 lines each. It measures 28.5 by 21 cm. The text is perfect, with the exception of a small lacuna, Joh_16:6-18.

33. Paris, Institut Catholique, Horner's H. This MS was written in 1250, and contains the Gospels complete, both in Bohairic and Arabic. It is on paper, contains 235 (+2) leaves, and 2 columns to the page, with 33 lines each. It measures 25 by 17.5 cm., and contains some beautiful pictures.

(b) of the Sahidic translation:

Of this there exists only a considerable quantity of short fragments (Gregory gives 91). Some are as old as the 5th century. One is still older (No. 48 Rome, Propag. 65).

(c) of the Fayyum translation:

Gregory gives fragments of 5 Gospel Manuscripts only, one (No. 2), in the possession of Flinders Petrie, of the 4th century. Of (b) and (c) there is as yet neither a comprehensive edition nor a complete study. Further fragments of both are certain to be discovered.

The Ethiopic, Armenian, Georgian, Persian, and Arabic translations may be here passed over.

IV. Latin Manuscripts :—

(a) of the *pre-Vulgate* (otherwise called ‘Old Latin,’ or ‘Itala’) translation(s):—

a: Vercelli, Cathedral. This MS is of the 4th cent., measures 25.5 by 16 cm., has 2 columns to the page, and 24 lines to the column. The order of the Gospels is Mt., Jn., Lk., Mk., the regular Old Latin order. Much is wanting in Matthew 20-27; Jn. is slightly defective; in Lk. much of chs. 1, 11 and 12 has disappeared; in Mk. chs. 1, 4, 5, 15, 16 have suffered greatly; a second but ancient hand has supplied Mar 16:7-20. The text is good, and was, according to tradition, copied by the famous bishop Eusebius of Vercelli, martyred in 371. The book has suffered greatly from neglect and bad treatment. Editions by G. A. Irico (*Sacrosanctus Evangeliorum Codex S. Eusebii Magni*, Milan, 1748), J. Bianchini (*Evangeliarium Quadruplex*, Rome, 1749; very accurately reprinted in Migne’s *Patrologia Latina*, vol. xii.), and J. Belsheim (*Codex Vercellensis*, Christiania, 1894).

b: Verona, Cathedral Library (Biblioteca Capitolare). The MS is of the early part of the 5th cent. (or of the end of the 4th), and is written in silver. The following parts are wanting: Mat 1:1-11; Mat 15:12-23; Mat 23:18-27, Joh 7:44 to Joh 8:12, Luk 19:26 to Luk 21:29, Mar 13:9-19; Mar 13:24 to Mar 16:20. Edited by Bianchini (see under a) and by J. Belsheim (*Codex Veronensis Quattuor Euangelia*, Prag, 1904). It was probably a MS like this which was the chief basis of Jerome’s revision known as the Vulgate. It is perhaps the best representative of the European Latin versions of the 4th century. There is a photograph of one page in *Monumenta Palæographica Sacra* (Turin, 1899).

c: Paris, Bibl. Nat. 254 (Colb. 4051), of the 12th century. Edited by P. Sabatier (*Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinæ Versiones Antiquæ*, vol. iii., Paris, 1751; there is also an edition with ‘Reims’ on the title-page), and by J. Belsheim (*Codex Colbrcrtinus Parisiensis*, Christiania, 1888). The work of P. Sabatier is still un superseded as the most complete repertory of the readings of the Old Latin Bible.

d: This symbol indicates the Latin side of Codex Bezae (D).

e: Palatinus; all that is left is in Vienna (Kais. Lat. 1185) except one leaf, which is in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin (N. 4, 18). The MS is of the 5th cent., and is, with k (see below), representative of a form of text used in the Roman province of Africa (corresponding to modern Tunis). It is very defective, containing about half of Mt., nearly the whole of Jn. and Lk., and about half of Mark. A copy of the MS made before its present mutilation exists in the Vallicellian Library, Rome, as U. 66. The Vienna part was edited by Tischendorf (*Evangelium Palatinum*, Leipzig, 1847), the Dublin leaf by T. K. Abbott (*Par Palimpsestorum Dublinensium*, etc., London, 1880); reports on the copy in the Vallicellian Library were published by H. Linke (*Sitzungsberichte der Königl. bayer. Akad. der Wissenschaften* [Phil-Philolog. und Hist. Classe], Munich, 1893, Heft 2, pp. 281-287). See also Belsheim (*Evangelium Palatinum*, Christiania, 1896), and *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, vol. ii. (Oxford, 1886), pp. lxxvii-lxxxv, by W. Sanday.

f: Brixianus; in the Capitular Library of Brescia. It is of the 6th cent., and is written in silver. It lacks the last quarter or so of Mark. It was edited by Bianchini (see under a), and is also printed under the Vulgate in Wordsworth and White's edition (Oxford, 1889-1898), as in the opinion of these editors and Hort the type of text which Jerome used as the basis of his revision. The other view with regard to it, namely, that of Burkitt, is that it is an Old Latin text deeply contaminated with the Vulgate (see *JThSt* [Note: *ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.*] , i. [1899] pp. 129-134). With Burkitt's view the present writer agrees. If it be correct (see under q), the result is the disappearance of Hort's 'Italian' class altogether.

ff1 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] : St. Petersburg, Imperial Library, formerly Corbeiensis 21 (10th cent.): Matthew.

ff2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] : Paris, Bibl. Nat. 17225, formerly Corbeiensis 195. It is of the 5th cent. (C. H. Turner in *JThSt* [Note: *ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.*] , vol. vi. [1904-1905] p. 257), not the 7th (Tischendorf, Gregory, and the Paris authorities). The following parts of the four Gospels are wanting: Mat 1:1 to Mat 11:16, Luk 9:48-62; Luk 11:45 to Luk 12:7; Joh 17:15 to Joh 18:9; Joh 20:22 to Joh 21:8. Published reports of this MS are incomplete and inexact. An exact edition is expected from Rev. E. S. Buchanan, who has made a very careful study of the MS, and has already published a translation of its text of some Gospels (e.g. *The Latin Gospels in the Second Century*, Part I. 'S. John,' Sevenoaks [1904]), and prolegomena (*JThSt* [Note: *ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.*] vii. 99 ff.).

g¹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] : Paris, Bibl. Nat. 11553, formerly Sangermanensis 15, of the 8th cent., edited by the Bishop of Salisbury (Dr. John Wordsworth) in *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, No. I. (Oxford, 1883).

k: Turin, Nat. G. vii. 15 (formerly of the Irish monastery of Bobbio). This, perhaps the most precious of all Old Latin Manuscripts, is of the 4th (Burkitt) or 5th cent., and represents the text habitually used by St. Cyprian in the early 3rd century. The MS measures 18.7 by 16.7 cm., and consists now of 96 leaves. It contains Mar 8:8-11, Mar 8:14-16; Mar 8:19 to Mar 16:8; Mat 1:1 to Mat 3:10; Mat 4:2 to Mat 14:17; Mat 15:20-36. The only reliable edition is that of Wordsworth, Sanday, and White (*Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, No. II., Oxford, 1886), which is enriched by discussions of the greatest value for the study of all Biblical texts. Side by side with this edition should be consulted the article of Turner and Burkitt, 'A Re-Collation of Codex *k* of the Old-Latin Gospels' (*JThSt* [Note: *ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.*], vol. v. [1903-1904] pp. 88-107).

m: Rome, Sessorianus lviii. This MS, of the 8th or 9th cent., contains the so-called *Speculum*, falsely attributed to St. Augustine, a series of extracts from nearly all the books of the NT. The compilation appears to be of Spanish origin, as the text closely resembles that used by the Spanish heretic Priscillian. Edited by F. Wehrich in the *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. xii. (Vienna, 1887).

q: Munich, Lat. 6224, formerly of Freising. It is of the 6th cent., and contains the Gospels, except Mat 3:15 to Mat 4:2; Mat 5:25 to Mat 6:4; Mat 6:28 to Mat 7:8, Joh 10:11 to Joh 12:39, Luk 23:22-36; Luk 24:11-39, Mar 1:7-22; Mar 15:5-36. This, like *f*, belongs to Hort's 'Italian' class, and stands or falls with *f* (see above). Edited by H. J. White as *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, No. III. (Oxford, 1888).

(*b*) of the *Vulgate revision* (made by St. Jerome in 383), the two best Manuscripts out of thousands which exist are:—

am: in the Laurentian Library, at Florence, formerly in the monastery of Monte Amiata, No. 1. This MS was written about the year 700 in the North of England, probably by an Italian scribe, and was taken by Ceolfrid, the abbot of Jarrow, to the Continent as a present to the Pope in the year 716. It measures 50 by 34 by 20 cm. (without the cover), and comprises 1029 leaves, with 2 columns to the leaf, and 43 or 44 lines to the column. It contains the whole Bible. The NT was published by Tischendorf (Leipzig, 1850, and again 1854), but not with perfect exactness. (See *Nouum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine*, rec. Wordsworth and White, Pars Prior, Oxonii, 1889-1898, p. xi; and *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, vol. ii., Oxford, 1890, pp. 273-324). Wordsworth and White's A.

fuld: in the library of Fulda, Prussia. The MS was written about the year 540 at the wish of Victor, bishop of Capua. The Gospels are written in the form of a harmony. Edited by E. Ranke (*Codex Fuldensis*, Marburg and Leipzig, 1868), with specimens of the handwriting. (See *Nov. Test. etc. Latine*, rec. Wordsworth and White, Pars Prior, p. xii). Wordsworth and White's F.

V. Gothic Manuscripts :—

1. Upsala University, the 'Codex Argenteus.' The MS is of the 6th cent., and now consists of 187 leaves, which are stained with purple and bear silver writing. The contents are fragments of Mt., Jn., Lk., Mark. (The translation was made by Ulfilas (Wulfila) in the 4th cent., and all surviving fragments are collected in Gabelentz and Loebe's *Ulfilas* (Altenburg and Leipzig, 1836-1843).

Literature.—Most of the important literature has already been indicated in the course of the article. Reference should also be made to *The NT in the Original Greek: The Text* revised by Westcott and Hort, vol. ii. Introduction and Appendix (London, 1881 and 1896); Kenyon, *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the NT* (London, 1901); Nestle, *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek NT* (London, 1901); Hammond, *Outlines of Textual Criticism applied to the NT* (Oxford, 1902).

Alex. Souter.

 Mark

MARK

1. **Name and identity.**—One, two, and even three Marks have been discovered in the NT. But the identity of the 'John Mark' of Acts with the 'Mark' of St. Paul's Epistles is clearly proved by Col 4:10, where he is called the cousin of Barnabas, and his identity with the 'Mark' of 1 Peter is clearly proved by Act 12:12. These two passages show that in all the nine places where the name occurs (Act 12:12; Act 12:25; Act 13:5; Act 13:13; Act 15:36 ff., Col 4:10, 2Ti 4:11, Phm 1:24, 1Pe 5:13) the same person is referred to. The curious notion has widely prevailed that the 'young man' of Mar 14:51-52 was the Evangelist himself, but there is no evidence whatever in its support. Indeed, the words of Papias, 'he neither heard the Lord, nor accompanied Him,' would seem to exclude this and other similar suggestions. In accordance with a well-known custom (cf. 'Jesus Justus,' Col 4:11), Mark had both a Hebrew and a Latin name, and the Roman *prænomen* Marcus is of frequent occurrence. From Act 12:11 ff. we gather that Mark occupied a position of some prominence socially in the Church

at Jerusalem. His mother's house was evidently a well-known rendezvous for believers. When St. Peter is released from prison, he turns naturally to this place, and on his arrival finds a company of Christians at worship. Several slight indications in the description suggest the house of a person of means (the porch, the slave-girl, the large upper room). The only other information we possess as to Mark's family history is his connexion with Barnabas, who seems to have been a man of standing in the Christian community.

2. Relations with Paul and Barnabas.—When Paul and Barnabas returned to Antioch from Jerusalem, whither they had gone with the offering for the poor, they took Mark with them as assistant, perhaps owing to his kinship with Barnabas (Act 12:25). A little later, he again accompanies them on their first missionary journey as their 'attendant' (Act 13:5). This word (*ὑπηρέτης*) emphasizes his secondary position and function. Probably his work was of the nature of business management. He had to look after such matters as lodging, routes, conveyance, and the like. At Perga, Mark withdrew from the mission, for what reason is not stated. That Paul deeply resented his conduct is shown by the refusal to employ his services on a later occasion. It has been assumed that he shirked the dangers of the enterprise, or that he tired of the work. But Ramsay (*Ch. in Rom. [Note: Roman.] Emp. p. 61 f.*) has taken a more favourable view of his conduct. He holds that there was a change of plan at this point, that the journey into the interior was not in the original arrangement, and that Mark might consider this a good ground for refusing to go on. He had not the same necessity laid upon him as those who had been solemnly designated by the Spirit for this service. He was an 'extra hand,' taken on for casual labour. Barnabas, at any rate, judged Mark's conduct more leniently than Paul, and later on Paul himself modified his attitude. At the outset of the second missionary journey, however, his objection to Mark's co-operation was so strong that it led to a separation between himself and Barnabas (Act 15:36 ff.). The latter took Mark with him on a mission to Cyprus, and we hear no more of him in the Book of Acts. When Mark next appears (Col. and Philem.), it is as the 'fellow-labourer' of Paul, who had by this time become completely reconciled to him, and had found him a comfort (*παρηγορία*, Col 4:11) in his imprisonment. Paul speaks in Col 4:10 of a projected visit of Mark to the Colossian Church, and urges his friends there to receive him kindly, 'if he comes' to them. If it is probable, therefore, that Mark's previous desertion had created an unfavourable impression over a wide area. Harnack thinks the visit was paid, and that, when St. Paul wrote to Timothy to bring Mark with him (2Ti 4:11), Timothy was to pick him up at Colossae on his way from Ephesus. Paul had evidently missed the attentions which Mark had been able to give.

3. Relations with Peter.—St. Peter refers to Mark in his First Epistle (1Pe 5:13) as 'my son.' This may imply only a peculiarly close intimacy, but more probably it means

that Mark had been converted through Peter's influence. Peter was evidently a frequent visitor at Mark's home (Acts 12), and the friendship had begun there which afterwards became so deep and fruitful. St. Peter's reference in his letter shows also that at this date Mark was with him at 'Babylon,' which most writers now consider to mean Rome. From the familiar words of Papias (see Mark [Gospel acc. to], Mar 2:1) we learn that Mark had become the 'interpreter' of Peter, and that Mark 'accompanied' or 'attended' him. Swete thinks he acted as Peter's dragoman, and translated the Apostle's words for his audiences. Peter, it is supposed, would not be fluent in Greek. It is not easy to fit in this ministry to Peter in Rome with the ministry to Paul. Swete thinks it occurred after Paul's death; but it is at least doubtful whether Peter survived Paul. Harnack and Lightfoot may be quoted to the contrary. It is by no means impossible, of course, that Mark may have 'attended' Peter in Rome, and transferred his services to Paul. It would be much simpler, however, to suppose that the ministry was exercised much earlier, and in the real, not the spiritual, Babylon. In any case, Mark's association with Peter was a fruitful one, as it resulted in the composition of the Second Gospel. In this matter Mark seems to have been little more than an amanuensis. According to Papias, the Gospel is really Peter's, and Mark was simply his 'interpreter' on this as on other occasions.

4. Character and position in the Apostolic history.—Mark was thus associated with three notable men in turn, and always in the same subordinate capacity. Jülicher calls him 'Apostelschüler.' Swete thinks this humble position decidedly implied in the terms used of him in Acts and the Epistles. The *συνπαραλαβόντες* of Act 12:25 suggests an assistant 'of inferior rank.' The *ὑπηρέτης* of Act 13:5 indicates personal and not spiritual service. Ramsay (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 71) holds that Mark's subordinate character is displayed by the 'haphazard reference' to him in Act 13:5. The same conclusion may be drawn from St. Paul's language in 2Ti 4:11 ('he is useful to me *εἰς διακονίαν*'). His services to the Apostle in prison probably concerned his comfort and convenience. If, again, Mark was Peter's dragoman, he exercised very much the same 'ministry' for Paul also. We gather, then, from these references, that Mark was a person with a large capacity for being useful in practical matters, but without any special spiritual gifts, and probably without any very great force of character. This opinion may be regarded as receiving confirmation from his conduct at Perga, on the most charitable view of that incident. He does not appear to have been fitted for heroic enterprise, or for a separate responsibility, or for spiritual functions. It is only fair to say, however, that a more favourable opinion has been expressed by writers like Westcott (*Introd. to Study of Gospels*) and Jülicher (in *PRE [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.]*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred]). Jülicher points out that St. Paul ultimately came round to the lenient judgment of Barnabas, that Mark never lost his missionary

zeal, and also that he remained unaffected by the prevalent party spirit, serving both St. Paul and St. Peter with equal loyalty.

5. Traditions.—Tradition has been busy with Mark's name. The most widely spread is that which assigns to him a mission in Egypt, and the evangelization of Alexandria. This mission is regarded as occupying the gap between the history in Acts and the later ministry to the Apostles. It was also widely believed that he died at Alexandria, receiving (according to some versions) the crown of martyrdom. These traditions cannot be traced back further than a hundred years after the supposed events. One curious fact is preserved in some of the Western traditions. Mark is said to have been κολοβοδάκτυλος, which means either mutilated or stunted in one or more of his fingers. Explanations of this deformity have been offered which possess no probability. But the reminiscence itself may quite possibly preserve a genuine fact; and it is not impossible that this defect may have had some influence in determining the possibilities of Mark's career.

Literature.—The best accounts of Mark are given by Swete (*Gospel acc. to St. Mark*, 1898) and Lindsay ('St. Mark' in T. & T. Clark's *Handbook* series) in their introductions. The following may also be consulted: Harnack, art. 'Mark' in *EBr* [*Note: Br Encyclopaedia Britannica.*] (esp. for its good account of the traditions concerning the Evangelist); Jülicher, art. 'Marcus' in *PRE* [*Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologic und Kirche.*] ³ [*Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred*]; Morison and Salmond in introd. to their Comm. on this Gospel.

Frederick J. Rae.

 Mark, Gospel According To

MARK, GOSPEL ACCORDING TO

- i. The problems to be discussed.
- ii. The Second Gospel in the Early Church.
 1. Statements as to its composition.
 2. Early quotations, references, and use.

iii. Character of the Gospel as shown by internal evidence, and by comparison with the other Synoptics:

1. The presentation of Christ's Person and work.
2. Autoptic characteristics.
3. Description of the inner feelings of our Lord and the Apostles.
4. Comparison with the other Synoptics:
 - (a) As to Scope.
 - (b) Diffuseness and redundancies of Mark.
 - (c) Correction of Mark's matter by Matthew and Luke.
 - (d) Correction of Mark's phraseology—Diminutives.
 - (e) Colloquialisms.
 - (f) Latinisms.
 - (g) Aramaisms.
 - (h) Grammar and awkward or difficult phrases.
 - (i) Corrections for precision.
 - (j) Doubtful cases.
 - (k) Conclusion from the evidence on this head.
5. Mark's other characteristics of diction.
6. Matter peculiar to Mark.

iv. Authorship, Date, and Place of Writing.

v. Aramaic or Greek original.

vi. The last twelve verses.

vii. Is our Second Gospel the original Mark?

Literature.

i. The problems to be discussed.—No book of the NT has experienced such a change in public estimation as the Second Gospel. Formerly regarded as comparatively unimportant and receiving little attention from commentators, who in effect re-echoed Augustine's opinion that it was but an abbreviation of the First Gospel, it has of late years been more carefully studied, and has received a juster appreciation. It has now been recognized as a book of supreme importance, as giving us the narrative of the life of Christ in a most primitive form, and as being not improbably the foundation, if not directly at least indirectly, of all the Gospels. It will be necessary, then, in this article first to investigate the statements about its composition in the earlier Fathers and their use of it, and then to examine the Gospel itself, to see what picture it gives of our Lord's Person and work, and what relation it bears to the other Synoptic Gospels. We shall then be able to come to a conclusion about questions of date, authorship, and place of writing, of the original language, and of the integrity of the Gospel. Finally, we will consider the question of an 'Ur-Marcus,' that is, if the Gospel in our hands is the original work of St. Mark.

It will be convenient here to state the results arrived at in this article with regard to some points. The present writer thinks it most probable that the Second Gospel as we have it, or at any rate with the very slightest differences, was in the hands of all the other Evangelists when they wrote; and that the latter freely used the material before them, altering it, or adding to it, or omitting parts of it, as they thought right when following other guides. The theory put forward by Alford (*Prolegomena* to his *Greek Testament*, i. 2) and other holders of the 'oral hypothesis,' that the later writers would not have so treated a book which they regarded as inspired or even as authoritative, does not greatly commend itself, as it appears to interpret the feeling of the Christians of the 1st cent. by those of a later age.—The very style of Mk., with its roughness and inelegances, is of great value, and still more is its description of the Saviour in words which were often in after times misunderstood, of the utmost importance as showing a very early record. For these and other reasons a date at least before the Fall of Jerusalem seems to be probable. Further, it is considered likely that the Gospel was written in Greek, and primarily for Roman readers, the last twelve verses being an appendix, not composed as an ending to the Gospel, but having once had an independent existence, and being added later to the Gospel to supply a lost leaf.

ii. The Second Gospel in the Early Church

1. Statements as to its composition.—We will first consider those passages of early writers which may be thought to throw light on the composition of Mk., before discussing those which only quote or refer to it; later (§ vii.) we will consider whether the Gospel known to these writers is the same as our Mark.

The first passage which *may* refer to Mk. is St. Luke's prologue. This shows that some who were not from the beginning eye-witnesses and ministers of the word had already written narratives of the Gospel history, and by implication avers (Luk 1:3) that these narratives were incomplete in not beginning 'from the first' (ἀνωθεν); also we perhaps gather that they were not in St. Luke's judgment in good chronological order (καθεξῆς, cf. ἀκριβῶς just before). Internal evidence leads us to think that not improbably St. Luke knew Mk. (see below, § iii.), and, if so, we may have here the first criticism on the Second Gospel; it has some striking resemblances to Papias' account, for which we are indebted to Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 39). Eusebius says:

Ἀναγκαιῶς νῦν τροσθήσομιν ταῖς προεκτεθείσαις αὐτοῦ [σχ. τοῦ Πατία] φωναῖς ταράδουσιν, ἢ τιρὶ Μάρχου τοῦ ὑαγγίλιον γιγραφότος ἰχτεθίεται διὰ τούτων. Καὶ τοῦτα ὁ τρισβύτιρος ἔλεγε μάρχας μὲν ἐρμηνευτῆς Πέτρου γενόμενος, ὅσα ἐμνημονευσιν, ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει, τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ τραχθέντα, εὔτε γὰρ ἤχουσι τοῦ κυρίου, οὔτε ταρηχολούθυσεν αὐτῷ ἴσιραν δε, ὡς ἴφην, Πέτρω, ὅς τορὸς τὰς χρεῖας ἰσοιετε τὰς διδασχααλίας, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥσσερ σύνταξιν τῶν χυριαχῶν ταιούμενος λογῖων [ς. λ. λογων], ὥστε οὐδὲς ἡμαρτε Μάρχος, οὔτως ἴνια γράψας ὡς ἀπεμνημονυσιν. ἰνὸς γὰρ ἐτοιήσατο πρόνοιας, τοῦ μηδὲν ὧν ἤχουσε ταραλετεῖν ἢ ψεύσασθαί τε ἐν αὐτοῖς.' Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἰστόρηται τῷ Πατία τεριτοῦ Μάρχου. Lightfoot's translation (*Apost. Fathers*, compend. ed. p. 529) is here appended, and some points where Schmiedel (*Encyc. Bibl.* s.v. 'Gospels') differs from him are noted: 'For our present purpose we will merely add to his [Papias'] words which have been quoted above, a tradition which has been set forth through these sources concerning Mark who wrote the Gospel: "And the Elder said this also: Mark, having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately everything that he remembered [Schmiedel: 'mentioned'], without, however, recording in order what was either said or done by Christ. For neither did he hear the Lord, nor did he follow Him; but afterwards, as I said, (attended) Peter, who adapted his instructions to the needs (of his hearers), but had no design of giving a connected account of the Lord's oracles [*v.l.* 'words']. So then Mark made no mistake [Schm. 'committed no fault'; but see Lightfoot's *Essays on Sup. Rel.* pp. 8, 163], while he thus wrote down some things as he remembered

them [Schm. ‘repeated them exactly from memory’], for he made it his one care not to omit anything that he heard, or to set down any false statement therein.” Such, then, is the account given by Papias concerning Mark.’

Here Papias vindicates Mark from inaccuracy, and from errors of omission, as far as his knowledge went, but finds fault with his chronological order, which was due to his being dependent only on Peter’s oral teaching. If this is a correct interpretation of Papias, which account of the Gospel story did he prefer? Lightfoot (*Essays on Supernatural Religion*, pp. 165, 205 f.) thinks John, Salmon (*Introd. Lect. vii.*) thinks Luke; while Schmiedel, in a not very convincing argument, thinks that Papias did not recognize Jn. and Lk. as being of equal authority with Mt. and Mk. (*Encyc. Bibl.* ii. 1813; see, further, § vii. below). Schmiedel takes no account of Lightfoot’s essay ‘On the Silence of Eusebius’ (*Sup. Rel.* ii.). However this may be, Papias describes the Second Gospel as being limited to Peter’s reminiscences, the writer being the ‘interpreter’ of that Apostle. This phrase may mean (Zahn, *Einleit.* ii. 209, 218) that Mark, being Peter’s scholar, made Peter’s teaching widely known through his written Gospel, or (Swete, *St. Mark*, p. xxiv) that he was the secretary or dragoman who translated Peter’s words into a foreign tongue during the Apostle’s lifetime. Papias does not call the work of Mark a ‘gospel,’ and the word εὐαγγέλιον is not undoubtedly found in the sense of the record of good tidings before Justin (*Apol.* i. 66, see below), though some find this sense in Ignatius, *Philad.* 5, 8, and in the *Didache* 8, 11, 15. In these places, however, it is probably not the written word that is referred to. [For a complete discussion of the Papias fragment see Lightfoot, *Ess. on Sup. Rel.* v., vi., and Sanday, *Gosp. in Second Cent.* v. 2].

Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 106) says that Christ changed Simon’s name to Peter, and that this is written ‘in his memoirs’ (ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν αὐτοῦ), and also that He changed the name of the sons of Zebedee to ‘Boanerges, which is Sons of Thunder.’ But these last words actually occur only in [Mar 3:17](#), where we read of both names, Peter and Boanerges, together, and in no other Gospel. We may probably dismiss the idea that αὐτοῦ refers to Christ, as if Justin meant ‘Christ’s memoirs,’ and conclude that Justin is speaking of a Petrine Gospel. Harnack (*Bruchstücke d. Ev.... d. Petrus*, p. 37) proposes to find this in the apocryphal Akhmîm Fragment which goes by St. Peter’s name, and Sanday (*Inspiration*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] [Bampton Lectures], p. 310) agrees that Justin used pseudo-Peter. But as there is no other reason to suppose that this apocryphal Gospel ever contained the passage in question,—the fragment lately discovered beginning in the middle of the story of the Passion,—and as Justin elsewhere probably refers to our Second Gospel (see below), it is more reasonable to suppose with Swete (*Gospel of St. Peter*, p. xxxiii), Salmond (Hastings, *DB* [Note: *Dictionary of the Bible.*] iii. 256), and

Stanton (*JThSt* [*Note: ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.*] ii. 6, and *Gospels as Hist. Doc.* p. 93 ff.) that he refers to it here. If so, we have another authority for regarding St. Peter as a chief source of Mark. In considering the question whether Justin refers to Mk. or to the apocryphal Gospel, we must note that while some points of contact are found between pseudo-Peter and Justin, there are also some considerable differences (see esp. Stanton, *loc. cit.*), and that if one borrowed from the other, it is as likely that pseudo-Peter is the borrower as Justin.—The Evangelic narratives are in Justin commonly called ‘memoirs’—*e.g.* *Apol.* i. 66, ‘the memoirs composed by them [the Apostles] which are called Gospels.’ From *Dial.* 103 it appears that he included in the term some not composed by the Apostles themselves but by their followers. He speaks of ‘the memoirs drawn up by the Apostles and by those who followed them,’ and in this context recalls the (Lukan?) account of the Agony and the drops of blood.

Tatian, Justin’s pupil, affords evidence that Mk. was received in his time (*c.* [*Note: circa, about.*] 170 a.d.) as one of the four Gospel narratives pre-eminently above, and on a different platform from, all others. His *Diatessaron* is now known to be a harmony of our four Gospels, and probably it was not the first of its kind.

Irenaeus is the first explicitly to expound the doctrine of the necessity of a fourfold Gospel (ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τετράμορφον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, iii. 11. 8). As the world has four quarters, and as the Church is spread over the whole world, and as the pillar and ground of the Church is the Gospel and the Spirit of life, so it is right that there should be four Gospels. Irenaeus finds other equally fanciful reasons for a fourfold Gospel, and identifies our Evangelists with the fourfold appearance of the cherubim, St. Mark being the eagle (see § iii. 1 below). This reasoning, however erroneous, shows that our four Gospels had a position entirely by themselves in Irenaeus’ estimation; and Dr. Taylor conjectures that he borrowed the idea from Hermas (*Witness of Hermas*, § 1). In an earlier passage (iii. 1. 1) Irenaeus says that Mark was Peter’s disciple and interpreter (ἑρμηνευτής, as Papias), and that he handed on to us in writing the things preached by Peter, after the departure of Peter and Paul. In iii. 10. 6 (where the Greek is wanting), Irenaeus calls Mark ‘*interpres et sectator Petri.*’

Tertullian (*adv. Mare.* iv. 5, Migne, *P. L.* ii. 396) gives similar witness (‘... licet et Marcus quod edidit, Petri affirmetur, cujus interpres Marcus’).

The Muratorian fragment (*c.* [*Note: circa, about.*] a.d. 170? or perhaps a little later) begins in the middle of a sentence thus: ‘... quibus tamen interfuit, et ita posuit. Tertium Evangelii librum secundum Lucan.... Quarti evangeliorum Johannes ex discipulis....’ Thus the writer had been speaking of *two* Gospels, which were neither Luke nor John. It is generally recognized that the opening words of the fragment refer

to Mk. rather than to Mt., and that the latter had come first, as in Irenaeus; but there is some difference of opinion as to their meaning. Swete, Lightfoot, and Chase interpret them to mean that Mark was present at *some* discourses of Peter; he reported Peter's teaching as far as he had the opportunity. The first word 'quibus' may be the second half of 'aliquibus' *some*; Chase (Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. 24) takes 'quibus tamen' as the equivalent of an original οἷς δὲ—for the fragment is a Latin translation from Greek. Zahn (*Einleit.* ii. 200 f.) thinks that the author of the fragment had quoted Papias as saying that Mark was not a hearer of our Lord, and then qualified Papias' assertion by saying that Mark had been present at *some* of our Lord's discourses. Compare this with the idea of some later writers (e.g. Epiphanius, *Hær.* xx. 4, li. 6) that Mark was one of the Seventy (Seventy-two) Disciples; and with the modern opinion that the young man of Mar_14:51 was the Evangelist. But, as Swete shows (*St. Mark*, p. xxxiii), this is against the words that follow about Luke: 'Neither did he [Luke] himself see the Lord in the flesh.'

Clement of Alexandria (*Hypotyp.*, ap. Euseb. *Historia Ecclesiastica* vi. 14) says that while Peter was preaching the gospel at Rome, many of those present begged Mark to write down what was said. Peter neither forbade nor urged it. There is a story similar to this told in the Muratorian fragment about John. In *Historia Ecclesiastica* ii. 15, Eusebius says, on the authority of Clement and Papias, that Peter confirmed the writing; but the passage afterwards quoted by Eusebius from Papias does not bear out this detail. Origen (quoted by Euseb. *Historia Ecclesiastica* vi. 25) says that Mark composed the Gospel at Peter's instruction (ὡς Πέτρος ὑφηγήσατο), being acknowledged as his son (1Pe_5:13).

It is unnecessary to quote later writers, who could scarcely have other means of information than we have; but we may notice that Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* ii. 16) makes Mark go to Egypt and found the Church at Alexandria after he had written his Gospel, and says (*ib.* 24) that Annianus succeeded him as bishop there in the eighth year of Nero, a statement which Jerome improves upon by saying that St. Mark died then (*de Vir. Illustr.* § 8). It is also desirable to quote Augustine, as his opinion has had such weight in the Church. He says (*de Consensu Evangelistarum*, i. 3, *aliter* i. 6) that of the four Evangelists, Matthew wrote first, then Mark, and that Mark was, as it were, Matthew's follower and abbreviator ('Marcus eum subsequutus tanquam pedisequus et breviator ejus videtur'). Seldom has one short sentence had such an unfortunate effect in distorting a judgment on a literary work; and largely in consequence of it Mk. has been generally neglected. The Second Gospel seems hardly to have engaged the attention of commentators; and the writer known as Victor of Antioch (quoted by Swete, *St. Mark*, p. xxxiv) in the 5th cent. (or later), says that he had not been able to find a single author who had expounded it.

2. Early quotations, references, and use.—The use of Mk. by the Apostolic Fathers is not certain, though in some cases quite probable. The quotation in Clement of Rome (*Cor.* 23) and pseudo-Clement (*Ancient Homily*, 11), which in the latter is introduced by λέγει γὰρ καὶ ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος, is more likely to be from some lost Christian writing than to be a fusion of Mar 4:26 ff. and other NT passages; but Polycarp, *Phil.* [Note: *Philistine.*] 5, διάκονος πάντων, seems to come from Mar 9:35. In other cases it is probable that one of our Gospels is referred to, but we cannot be sure that it is Mk. in particular that is before the writer. As an example we may take Polycarp, *Phil.* [Note: *Philistine.*] 7, which quotes Mat 26:41 and Mar 14:38 exactly, and both in Polycarp and in the Gospels the context is about not going into temptation. Pseudo-Clement (§ 2), after quoting Is 54:1 LXX Septuagint, continues: ‘Another Scripture saith, I came not to call the righteous, but sinners,’ exactly as Mat 9:13, Mar 2:17, where ‘to repentance’ is not in the best manuscripts, but comes from || Luk 5:32. But Mt. and not Mk. might have been before Polycarp and pseudo-Clement, though in the latter case the omission of the γὰρ of Mt. makes Mk. more likely. And so with Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and others. The *Didache* apparently refers to Mt. and Lk., and the name itself seems to be derived from Act 2:42; but though a probable reference (x. 5) to 1Jn 4:18 makes the writer’s knowledge of Jn. likely, there is no trace of his knowing Mark. For the possible references to the last twelve verses in Barnabas, etc., see below, § vi. The use of Mk. by Hermas is very probable. He apparently refers to Mar 3:29; Mar 10:24 where they differ from Mt. and Lk., in *Mand.* ii. 2 (οὕτως οὖν ἔνοχος ἔσῃ ἁμαρτίας τοῦ καταλαλοῦντος), and *Sim.* ix. 20. 3 (τοῖς τοιούτοις δύσκολόν ἐστιν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν). Indirectly the *Shepherd* of Hermas supplies a great argument for the antiquity of the Gospels, because it shows the uniqueness of our Lord’s parables as there narrated. Hermas essays the same method of teaching, but his attempt is utterly feeble. If the Gospels were 2nd cent. productions, and the words of our Lord had been handed on only by oral tradition, the parables could never have been kept so pure. They would in the course of time, before the narratives reached us in their present form, have assimilated features such as we find in Hermas. [For further references in the *Shepherd* see Zahn, *Hirt d. Hermas*, p. 456 ff.; Stanton, *Gosp. as Hist. Doc.* p. 45].

To Justin’s probable reference to the Boanerges passage (see above) must be added *Dial.* 88, where he speaks of Jesus as ‘supposed to be the carpenter’ (τέκτονος νομιζομένου; but Otto’s text has νομ. Ἰωσήφ τοῦ τέκτ. υἱοῦ ὑπάρχειν). Only Mark (Mar 6:3) calls Jesus a carpenter (see § iii. 4 (j) below). Justin also probably quotes from the last twelve verses (below, § vi.).

The use of Mk. by heretics is presumed from references to it in Heracleon, the Valentinians, pseudo-Peter, and the *Clementine Homilies* (the first two as reported by Clement of Alexandria and Irenaeus), for which reference may be made to Swete's *St. Mark*, p. xxxi; and Sanday's *Gospels in the Second Century*, ch. vi. p. 177 ff.

The Gospel is found in all the old Versions—Curetonian and Sinaitic Syriac (of the former only 16:17-20 is extant), Old Latin, Bohairic, Sahidic; and in all catalogues and Greek manuscripts of the Gospels.

Putting together the statements, references, and quotations, and deferring the question of an editor later than the original writer of the Gospel (see § vii.), we may conclude, (a) that there is valid evidence that Mk. was *in circulation* before the middle of the 2nd cent.; (b) that ecclesiastical tradition almost uniformly connects the Second Evangelist with St. Peter—the *Apostolic Constitutions* (ii. 57, Lagarde, p. 85, c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 375) being the only writing which undoubtedly connects him with St. Paul (οἱ συνεργοὶ Παύλου ... Λουκᾶς καὶ Μάρκος, cf. Phm_1:24, Col_4:11); (c) that there was a difference of tradition as to whether he wrote while St. Peter was alive or after his death (see § iv. below). Further, (d) the Alexandrian Fathers Clement and Origen do not mention Mark's preaching at Alexandria—a strange silence; and (e) there is no hint till Hippolytus that there was more than one Mark; apparently the other writers identified the cousin of Barnabas and the disciple of Peter.

iii. The Character of the Gospel as shown by itself and by comparison with the other Gospels.—If we had no information from ecclesiastical writers, we could have made no conjecture as to the authorship of the Second Gospel, as we can in the case of Lk. (by comparing it with Acts) and Jn. (by comparing it with the Synoptics). But from internal evidence we should gather that the author was either an eye-witness of the events described or at least that he had first-hand information. Further, a close examination of the Gospel makes it exceedingly probable that the writer's informant was St. Peter. So that, while we should never from the NT itself have arrived at the name Mark, yet the internal evidence fully corroborates the external, that the author was the 'interpreter of Peter.' The impression left from a study of Mk. is that we have here in effect, though not in form, and not without some additions due to the Evangelist himself, that Apostle's Gospel. It begins the narrative at the point when Peter could give his own recollections—at the preaching of the Baptist and the baptism of Jesus. This, not the Birth-narratives, as in the case of Mt. and Lk., nor yet the account of our Lord's pre-existence, as in the case of Jn., was to Mark 'the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God' (1:1), whether these words are part of the record or are the title prefixed by an early scribe.

1. Presentation of Christ's Person and work.—Beginning with the preaching of John and our Lord's entering on His ministry, St. Mark describes at length the Galilaean ministry and the slow unfolding of Jesus' claims. Our Lord, for example, does not at once proclaim His Messiahship, nor does He allow evil spirits to proclaim it in-opportunely (Mar 1:25; Mar 3:12; cf. Mar 1:44 etc.). Even after Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi, when the Galilaean ministry was nearly ended, the disciples were charged to tell no man (Mar 8:30). At first Jesus begins by calling Himself the Son of Man (Mar 2:10). Then the crowds begin to see in Him a prophet; His own people and the learned scribes from Jerusalem think Him mad. We might even think, at first sight, especially if we have the Matthaean account (Mar 16:16) of Peter's confession chiefly in mind and not the Markan, that the disciples then and then only found out that Jesus was Messiah. But this deduction would be precarious. The account in Jn., which makes the Baptist begin by calling Jesus the Lamb of God and the Son of God, and makes Andrew, Philip, and Nathanael at once recognize Him as Messiah (Joh 1:29; Joh 1:34; Joh 1:41; Joh 1:45; Joh 1:49), bears all the marks of probability. A Judaeae ministry, as to which the Synoptists are almost silent, must have been carried on simultaneously with the Galilaean preaching. We should expect Jesus, as a religious Jew, to visit Jerusalem frequently; and indeed, if the last Passover were His first visit during the ministry, we could not explain the sudden enmity of the Jerusalem Jews, or the fact of there being Judaeae disciples—Judas Iscariot (probably from Kerioth in Judaeae), Joseph of Arimathaea, the owners of the colt at Bethphage and of the room where the Last Supper was celebrated (these evidently knew Jesus), the household at Bethany, and Simon 'the leper.' Also non-Markan portions of Mt. and Lk. imply visits to Jerusalem or a wider ministry than that in Galilee (Mat 23:37, Luk 4:44, BC \times , Luk 13:21; Luk 13:33 f.); and in Acts the Apostles at once make their headquarters at Jerusalem, which would have been unlikely if they had only just arrived there for the first time. On that occasion they were perfectly familiar with places and people. But if this be so, we should expect two methods of proclaiming the Person of Christ to have been adopted for these two quite distinct people, of such different characteristics, and separated by hostile Samaria. In Jerusalem, where religious controversy was rife, the question of Jesus' Personality and office could not be postponed; this is shown by the way in which the Pharisees questioned the Baptist. But in Galilee this was not the case, and the revelation consequently was much more gradual. The Apostles, doubtless, had heard the questions asked in Judaeae, and did know the claim of Jesus to be the Christ, though perhaps they did not fully realize all that it meant until the incident at Caesarea Philippi. Thenceforward Jesus speaks to them of His future glory (Mar 8:38; cf. Mar 9:7) and of His Passion (Mar 8:31, Mar 9:12; Mar 9:31 etc.). After the Galilaean ministry (which ends at Mar 9:50) Mark gives some short account (ch. 10) of journeys in Judaeae and Peraea, and it is only on the final approach to Jerusalem that

all reserve passes away. In common with all the Evangelists, Mark gives a detailed account of the last days at Jerusalem.

In describing our Lord's Person, Mark emphatically brings out His *Divinity*. Jesus claims super human authority—e.g. Mar 2:28 (lord of the Sabbath), Mar 8:38 and Mar 14:62 (coming in glory, the latter in answer to Caiaphas' question, 'Art thou the Christ?'), Mar 12:6 ff. (the beloved Son and Heir); and especially authority to forgive sins, Mar 2:5; Mar 2:10 (the paralytic). He is a supernatural Person: Mar 1:11, Mar 9:7 ('my beloved Son'), Mar 1:24 ('the Holy One of God'), Mar 3:11 ('the Son of God'), Mar 5:7 ('Son of the Most High God'), Mar 15:39 ('the Son of God' or 'a son of God'). He knows the thoughts of man, Mar 2:8; Mar 8:17; Mar 12:15, and what is to happen in the future, Mar 2:20 (fasting), Mar 8:31 and Mar 9:31 etc. (the Passion), Mar 8:38 (the Second Advent), Mar 10:39 (the sufferings of the Apostles), Mar 13:2 (destruction of the Temple), Mar 13:10 (the universal gospel), Mar 14:27 (scattering of the sheep). His death has an atoning efficacy, Mar 10:45 (λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν), Mar 14:24 ('my blood of the covenant which is shed for many').

But still more striking is the emphasis laid on the true *humanity* of our Lord. The reality of His human body is referred to much as in the other Evangelists—e.g. He is wearied and sleeps (Mar 4:38; sleep is perhaps implied also in Mar 1:35); He eats (Mar 14:3) and drinks (Mar 15:36); His 'touch' is frequently spoken of (Mar 1:41 etc.) (see Gestures); the burial of His body is dwelt on in Mar 15:43 ff. But Mark pre-eminently describes the human soul and spirit of our Lord. Note especially His human compassion (Mar 1:41) and love (Mar 10:21), and the more painful emotions (Mar 1:43, Mar 3:5, Mar 6:6, Mar 10:14 Mar 14:33 f., Mar 15:34), for which see below, § iii. 3. Note also the reference to our Lord's human soul and spirit in Mar 2:8, Mar 14:34, and to His human will in Mar 14:36. Mark also refers to the sinless limitations of Jesus' human nature. Questions are asked apparently for information (Mar 5:30, Mar 8:5, Mar 9:16)—for in these cases an 'economical' questioning seems scarcely worthy. The Evangelist also records the one perfectly certain instance of Jesus' ignorance *qua* man, Mar 13:32 (the Day of Judgment—so Mt.). It is because so much stress is laid in Mk. on our Lord's true human nature that St. Augustine assigns to the Second Evangelist the symbol of the man. Other Fathers vary much in assigning the four symbols, but it is remarkable that each one of the four is assigned to St. Mark in some one or other of the Fathers, Irenaeus making him the eagle, Victorinus the lion, Augustine the man, pseudo-Athanasius the calf (see Swete, *St. Mark*, p. xxxviii).

2. Autoptic character.—In many passages Mk. shows, equally with Jn. and much more than Mt. and Lk., clear signs of first-hand knowledge. In these places Mk. often gives a lifelike touch, though Mt. and Lk. in their parallels have lost it. Such are the stooping down of the Baptist to loose the shoe-latchet (Mar 1:7), the heavens in the

act of opening (σχιζομένους [present], Mar 1:10), the ‘incoherent and excited remarks of the crowd’ at the healing of the Capernaum demoniac (Mar 1:27 best text, see Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ; they are softened down by later scribes of Mk. and by Lk.), the ‘house of Simon and Andrew’ (Mar 1:29, where || Mt. and Lk. omit Andrew; in the East it is common for several brothers, even when married, to live in one house, but it required first-hand knowledge to know that Andrew and Peter lived together), Simon starting in pursuit of Jesus (Mar 1:36), the breaking up of the mud roof to let the paralytic down through it, with other details (Mar 2:4, where Mt. tells none of the small points, and Lk., writing for a Roman nobleman, as has been conjectured, translates these, to him, unintelligible details into the language of Western Europe, and says that the man was let down through the *tiles*; see Ramsay, *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* p. 63), the *single* pillow, τὸ προσκεφάλαιον, probably a wooden headrest, in the boat in the storm (Mar 4:38, Mk. only), Jesus turning round in the crowd to see who touched Him (so Mt., not Lk.), and His glance at the woman (Mar 5:30 ff., Mk. only), His not allowing the crowd who were with Him to come near Jairus’ house, a very probable and lifelike detail (Mar 5:37, Mk. only; Lk. makes Jesus dismiss the crowd on His entering). The scene at Jairus’ house is especially vivid in Mk., and is instructive as showing who the Evangelist’s authority was. It must have been one of the inner circle of Apostles, *i.e.* Peter, James, or John (Andrew was not here present). As James died early, and another Gospel was written by (or, at least, depends on) John, we are led to think of Peter as the source. Further instances of lifelike touches are: the five thousand arranged ‘like garden beds’ πρασιοὶ πρασιαί (Mk. only) on the green grass (Mar 6:40), the details in the account of the Transfiguration (Mar 9:2 ff., where Mt. and Lk. also are vivid), but especially of the healing which followed, where the story is told from the point of view of the three Apostles, not of those who remained behind (Mar 9:14 ἐλθόντες ... εἶδον ὄχλον, Mk. only), and where Mk. only has the delicate touch (Mar 9:17) that the man brought the cataleptic boy to *Jesus* and applied to the disciples only when he found that Jesus was absent, and other autoptic details; Mt. and Lk. greatly abbreviate this narrative. So Mark alone relates that in the dispute about precedence and in the blessing of the little ones Jesus took the children into His arms (ἐναγκαλισάμενος, Mar 9:36, Mar 10:16), and in the latter case that He blessed them *fervently* (κατηυλόγει). Notice also how Mk. alone tells us of the searching glance of love cast by Jesus on the rich young man and the clouding over of the young man’s brow (Mar 10:21 f.), and of the colt tied at the door without in the open street (Mar 11:4; probably Peter was one of the two disciples sent), of Jesus refusing to permit vessels to be carried through the Temple (Mar 11:16), of the command to *bring* a denarius, the Roman coin, into the Temple (where only Jewish coins were current) at the question of paying tribute (Mar 12:15). For the Agony in the Garden, see below, 3; but here again we note that

the source must have been Peter, James, or John. The account of Peter's denials is indecisive, as he must have been the ultimate authority for all the narratives; but the ἐπιβαλὼν of Mar 14:72 (see below, 4 (h)) argues the priority of our Evangelist.

Exceptional knowledge is evidenced by the mention of the names of Levi's father (Alphaeus, Mar 2:14), of the father of the blind man at Jericho (Timaeus, Mar 10:46), and of the sons of Simon of Cyrene (Alexander and Rufus, Mar 15:21). These and other instances lead us to see in the Second Gospel a graphic account of one who had first-hand knowledge at his command, and, to a large extent, confirm Papias' description of Mark as Peter's interpreter. Mk. consists almost entirely of things of which Peter had personal knowledge. As Eusebius noticed long ago (*Demonstr. Evangel.* iii. 5, Cologne ed. p. 120 f.), it is silent on matters which reflect credit on Peter. It alone records several Petrine touches. We have, in fact, here in all particulars the Petrine tradition in a far more exact form than in the other Synoptics.

3. Description of the inner feelings of our Lord and of the Apostles.—This is found in Mk. to an extent which argues an early narrative based on intimate personal knowledge of Jesus and of the Twelve. In Mt. and Lk. the painful emotions of our Lord are not mentioned, except in the case of the Agony, and even that disappears in the Westcott-Hort text of Lk. (Luk 22:43 f.); a fact probably to be accounted for by a feeling of reverence due to a slightly later age. In Mk. we find a more childlike boldness in describing Jesus' feelings. See the following instances, which are found in Mk. only: Mar 1:43 ἐμβρομησάμενος (denoting sternness: not necessarily anger, but deep feeling); Mar 3:5 righteous anger and grief; Mar 6:6 wondering at the people's unbelief (here Mt. retains διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν, but omits ἐθαύμασεν; on the other hand, Mat 8:10, Luk 7:9 have the wonder of Jesus' human mind at the centurion's faith—an incident which was not part of the Petrine tradition and is not in Mk.); Luk 10:14, indignation when the disciples kept back the little children; and especially Luk 14:33 f., the Agony in the Garden, where Mk. alone speaks of the surprise (ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι) added to the distraction from grief (ἀδημονεῖν) of Jesus' human soul. Mt. changes the former to λυπεῖσθαι while retaining the latter, and Lk. omits the whole passage. If, as seems probable, the passage Luk 22:43 f. is not an original part of the Third Gospel, it is perhaps a fragment older than Lk. and reflects the same stage of thought as Mark. It is referred to in Justin, *Dial.* 103.—It is not unlikely that the difference between Mar 10:18 (the rich young man) and Mat 19:16 f. in the best text (BD \times , Origen, etc.; see Westcott-Hort, *Notes*) is due to the same feeling. Possibly when the First Evangelist wrote, the Markan phrase, 'Why callest thou me good? none is good save one, even God,' may have been misunderstood to imply a merely human Christ. Or perhaps the Westcott-Hort text of Mt. is not original, but is due to an early scribe or editor who disliked the Markan form of the incident. Another example is the

πτῶμα of Mar 15:43 (so \times BDL; Westcott-Hort with AC, etc., read σῶμα). This was a word used of the carcase of a dead animal or of a human being, with a touch of contempt. Mt. and Lk. have therefore altered πτῶμα to σῶμα, as also have some scribes in Mk., from feelings of reverence.

The same thing is true of another matter almost peculiar to Mk., the account of the inner feelings of the Apostles. See mark Mar 4:38, showing the Apostles' resentment against the Lord ('Carest thou not?'), and similarly Mar 4:41, showing their awe or holy fear at the revelation of Jesus' power and Divinity (cf., however, St. Peter at the miraculous draught of fishes in Luk 5:8); Mar 10:32, showing their amazement and fear, apparently arising from our Lord's manner as He went before them; and Mar 14:5 ἐνεβριμῶντο, here (unlike Mar 1:43) of anger.

A similar result follows from the passages where Mk. tells us that Jesus 'could not' do a thing. The inability is, doubtless, relative and conditional. Jesus 'could not' do that which was inconsistent with His plan of salvation. Yet here the other Synoptists, feeling that the phrases might be misunderstood as taking from the Master's glory, have altered or omitted them. See Mar 1:45, Mar 7:24, and the specially significant Mar 6:5 f., where οὐκ ἐδύνατο ἐκεῖ ποιῆσαι οὐδεμίαν δύναμιν εἰ μὴ, κ.τ.λ., καὶ ἔθαύμασεν διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν = Mat 13:58 οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἐκεῖ δυνάμεις πολλὰς διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν, the two possible causes of offence being removed in Mt.

4. Comparison with the other Synoptics.—The indications given in the last two subsections will lead us to believe that the Second Gospel, either in the form in which we have it now, or at least in a form very like that which we have, is chronologically the first of the Synoptics, and that it lay before the writers of the First and Third Gospels. This impression is greatly strengthened by the considerations which follow. We still postpone the question whether the Markan Gospel known to Matthew and Luke is the same as our Mark.

(a) *Scope of Mark.*—Except about thirty verses, all the narrative that we find in Mk. we find also (and in the same order) in either Mt. or Lk., or in both. This might tell both ways. If Mark were only an abbreviator, borrowing from Mt. and Lk., without much independent information, it would stand to reason that he would have little to tell us that was not found in them. But, then, his Gospel would not be the fresh and vivid, first-hand and autoptic, composition that it is. Therefore we are led to the conclusion that Matthew and Luke borrowed from Mark, and that one or other of them took almost everything that was found in his Gospel.

That Luke borrowed from Mark is seen from another fact. In the Third Gospel there is a long section which is not in the Second (Luk 9:51 to Luk 18:14). For this, Luke is dependent on some other source. But, having followed the Markan order somewhat closely up to the point where the section begins, he goes back, when the section ends, to within a few verses of the place in Mk. where he dropped it. Thus, Luk 9:50 = Mar 9:39 f.; Luk 18:15 = Mar 10:13. This looks as if Mk. (or something very like it) was lying open before the Third Evangelist as he wrote.

(b) *Diffuseness and redundancy of Mk. as compared with parallel passages of Mt. and Luke.*—The idea that Mark is an abbreviator of Matthew is at once shown to be wrong when we compare parallels. When we do so, we shall find, in almost every case, that Mk. is much fuller than either Mt. or Lk. taken singly. The greater bulk of the two latter is due to their relating many incidents and speeches which are not in Mark. The style of Mk. is somewhat diffuse, and it was necessary for the other Synoptists, if they were to make room for the new matter which they desired to introduce, to prune it considerably. This they did. Instances are: Mar 1:32 (Mt. omits ‘when the sun did set,’ Lk. omits ‘at even’); Mar 1:35 *πρωτὶ ἔννυχα λίαν* (= Lk. *γενομένης ἡμέρας*); Mar 2:15 f., Mar 4:1 ff., where the shorter form in Mt. and Lk. really omits nothing from the sense; Mar 5:22 f., Mar 5:35 (Mt., abbreviating, puts together the arrival of Jairus who said that the child was dying, and of the messenger who said that she was dead); Mar 5:25 (Mt. omits all the Markan details about the woman with the issue of blood, Lk. omits some of them); Mar 6:17 ff. (the parenthetical explanation about the Baptist’s death interrupts the course of the narrative in Mt. and Mk., but is greatly abbreviated in the former; in Lk. the story is put in its proper place, but abbreviated to one or two sentences; note Mk.’s redundant *εὐθὺς μετὰ σπουδῆς*, Mar 6:25); Mar 8:1 (the feeding of the four thousand, shortened in Mt., left out in Lk.); Mar 8:14 (the omission to take bread, abbreviated in Mr., whence we should have gathered, if we had not had Mk., that they discovered the omission only after landing, instead of when in the boat, as Mk., which is much more likely); Mar 9:38 ff. (the stranger exorcist, omitted in Mt., shortened in Lk.); Mar 13:19 *ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἦν ἔκτισεν ὁ θεός* (= Mt. *ἀπ’ ἀρχόσμου*, Lk. different). Many other examples might be given, e.g. Mar 7:13, Mar 8:15; Mar 8:37 (cf. Lk.) Mar 12:14; Mar 12:44, Mar 14:68, Mar 15:1, Mar 16:8. See also Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, pp. 100 ff., 110.

A similar instance of redundancy is the use of pleonastic forms in Mk., e.g. *ἐκ παιδιόθ* *εν* Mar 9:21 (A omits *ἐκ*, D [Note: Deuteronomist.] has *ἐκ παιδός*), *ἀπὸ μακρόθεν* Mar 5:6, Mar 8:3, Mar 11:13, Mar 14:54, Mar 15:40. These are very seldom found in Mt. and Luke.

(c) *Correction of Markan details in Mt. or Luke.*—In two or three instances we find a small slip of the pen corrected, as when Mark (Mar_1:2 f.) cites as from Isaiah a passage which is really partly from Mal_3:1 and partly from Isa_40:3, perhaps through using a book of quotations in which these passages followed each other, with ‘Isaiah’ at the top of the page; here the other Synoptists omit the Malachi passage (though they give it elsewhere, Mat_11:10 = Luk_7:27), thus silently correcting Mark. So Mar_2:26 has ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθαρ ἀρχιερέως, which can only mean ‘during the high priesthood of Abiathar’ (AC, etc., insert τοῦ, which *might* give the meaning ‘in the time of A., who was afterwards high priest’; D [Note: Deuteronomist.] , syr [Note: yr Syriac.] ^{sin}, and some Old Latin Manuscripts omit the whole phrase; these are scribes’ corrections). The || Mt. Lk. have the Markan sentence almost exactly, with the exception of these three words which they omit, no doubt because it is not correct to say that the events happened when Abiathar was actually high priest. In the account of the women at the tomb (Mar_16:2) there is some confusion of time (λίαν πρὸς ... ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου), probably due to compression, different events being put together, unless, indeed, we accept Wright’s suggestion (*Synopsis of the Gospels*², in loc.) that μήπω has dropped out before ἀνατείλαντος. In || Mat_28:1 there is a similar obscurity: ‘late on the Sabbath day, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene.’ But this is corrected in || Luk_24:1. The women came on the first day of the week ὄρθρου βαθέως (so John 20 :1 πρῶτι, σκοτίας ἔτι οὔσης).

Cases of explanations, or corrections of matter, as opposed to corrections of phraseology, may be seen in Mar_12:8, where the killing of the heir precedes the casting out of the vineyard, the order being inverted in Mt. and Lk. to make the parable fit the heavenly counterpart; in Mar_13:14 (‘abomination of desolation’) where || Mat_24:15 adds ‘spoken of by Daniel the prophet,’ and || Luk_21:20 explains by altering to ‘Jerusalem compassed with armies’; and Mar_15:39 where the words ‘Son of God’ (so Mt.) are explained by Lk. as ‘a righteous man.’ In this last case the Markan phrase is probably original, though the centurion would have borrowed it from the Jews without understanding it; Luke gives what the centurion meant in his own mind.

In several cases additions in Mt. or Lk. imply the priority of Mk., the added words probably coming from a non-Markan source, as in the confession of St. Peter, where the account in Mk. (Mar_8:29) could hardly have been derived from Mt. by abbreviation; and in the warning (Mar_13:18) to pray that the flight be not in the winter (χειμῶνος), where Mt. (Mat_24:20) adds μηδὲ σαββάτω, changing the case. Or, in some instances, the added words are a gloss; e.g. Mar_8:34 (taking up the

cross—Lk. adds ‘daily’), Mar_10:40 (to sit on Jesus’ right hand or left hand is for those for whom it has been prepared—Mt. adds ‘by my Father’), Mar_12:1 (the owner of the vineyard goes away—Lk. adds χρόνους ικανούς, showing special knowledge of viticulture, as it would be several years before the grapes were allowed to ripen).

In some cases, by a turn of phrase, Mk.’s accuracy in minute points is lost in Mt. and Luke. Thus in Mar_4:36 our Lord was already in the boat (Mar_4:1); the other Synoptists, by an oversight, make Him embark here. In the Charge to the Twelve Mar_6:8 has ‘take nothin ... save a staff only’; || Mt. and Lk. show an early exaggeration of the command (see Swete, *St. Mark, in loc.*). In Mar_10:1 Jesus comes ‘into the borders of Judaea and beyond (καὶ πέραν) Jordan’; Mt. (Mat_19:1) omits καὶ, as do some lesser Manuscripts. in Mk. (A, etc., have διὰ τοῦ πέραν); but doubtless Mk. is right here,—Jesus went both into Judaea and into Peraea. The passage is not in Luke. On the general question of the alterations and omissions of Markan matter in Mt. and Lk. see Hawkins, *Hor. Synopt.* p. 96 ff. He suggests that several Markan passages might be misunderstood as derogatory to Jesus or to the Apostles, or might otherwise cause offence; and therefore were altered by Mt. or by Lk. or by both.

(d) *Correction of Markan phraseology in Mt. or Luke.*—The Second Gospel is distinguished by a rough and unpolished style, reflecting the Greek commonly spoken by the Jews in the 1st century. In the parallels of the other Synoptics there are numerous instances of toning down and pruning Mark’s unliterary forms of speech.

As an example, take Mk.’s frequent use of *diminutives*, often altered in Mt., almost always in Luke. Such are θυγάτριον Mar_5:23; Mar_7:25 (not elsewhere in NT) = θυγάτηρ Mt. Lk. (no Lukan parallel to Mar_7:25); παιδίον, κοράσιον (the latter a late colloquial word condemned by the Atticists) Mar_5:39 ff. = κοράσιον Mt. *bis* = παῖς Lk.; παιδία Mar_10:13 (so Mt.) = βρέφη Lk.; ιχθύδια Mar_8:7—Mt. has it once, but soon corrects to ιχθύας (not in Lk.); πλοιάριον Mar_3:9 (so Jn.), not in Mt. and Lk. (all the best Manuscripts in Mar_4:36 have πλοῖα as in Mt. and Lk., not πλοιάρια as Textus Receptus); ὠτάριον *⊗*BD Mar_14:47 (also in Jn.) = ὠτίον Mt. = οὖς Lk.; παιδισκη Mar_14:66; Mar_14:69 (so Mt. Lk. once, but Mt. soon changes it to ἄλλη, Lk. to ἕτερος); κυνάρια Mar_7:27 f. (so Mt., no Lukan parallel); ψυχία Mar_7:28 (so Mt., no Lukan parallel); ψυχίων in Luk_16:21 is not in the best Manuscripts).

(e) Other *colloquialisms* are frequent in Mark. These are often corrected in Mt., oftener still in Luke. [Those here marked with an asterisk are expressly condemned by the Atticists]. Such are κράββατος* or κράβαττος* Mar 2:4; Mar 2:9; Mar 2:11 (Mt. and Lk. κλίνη, Lk. also κλινίδιον) and Mar 6:55 (Mt. omits, Lk. has no parallel, Jn. also has the word); συμβούλιον ἐδίδουν [νν. ll. ἐποίησαν, ἐποίουν] Mar 3:6, ζ. ποιήσαντες Mar 15:1, neither elsewhere in NT (Mt. has ζ. λαμβάνειν five times, Lk. different); ὄρκιζω* Mar 5:7, avoided by Mt. and Lk. (Mat 26:63 has ἐξορκίζω); ἐσχάτως ἔχει* Mar 5:23, corrected by Mt. and Lk. (Josephus has ἐν ἐσχάτοις εἶναι, *Ant.* ix. viii. 6); σφυρίς* [best reading] Mar 8:8; Mar 8:20 (so Mt.), colloquial for σπυρίς (see Deissmann, *Bibl. Stud.* p. 158, English translation); βλέπετε ἀπό Mar 8:15, Mar 12:38. probably colloquial or coined by Mark, corrected or avoided in Mt. and Lk.; μονόφθαλμος* Mar 9:47 (so Mt., Lk. has no parallel); τρυμαλιὰ ῥαφίδος Mar 10:25 = Mt. τρῆμα ῥ. = Lk. τρῆμα βελόνης best text (τρυμ. is a late rare word, doubtless colloquial; ῥαφίς* is colloquial); κολλυβιστής* Mar 11:15 (so Mt. and Jn.; Lk. omits; Joh 2:14 f. has κερματιστής in addition); ἐκεφαλίωσαν Mar 12:4, ἄπ. λεγ. in Greek, altered in Mt. and Lk. (see § iii. 5 and § vii. below); ἀγρεύσωσιν Mar 12:13 (= Mt. παγιδεύσωσιν, both ἄπ. λεγ. in NT; Lk. has ἐπιλάβωνται); κατάλυμα Mar 14:14 (so Lk., but Mt. omits), a colloquialism, though the verb καταλύω is classical in the sense of ‘halting to rest’; εἷς καθ’ (κατὰ) εἷς Mar 14:19 (altered in Mt., no parallel in Lk., a colloquialism, εἷς being made an indeclinable numeral, or else κατὰ an adverb, see Deissmann, *Bibl. Stud.* p. 138); σύσσημον* Mar 14:44 (= Mt. σημεῖον); ῥάπισμα* Mar 14:65 (so Jn., but altered in Mt. and Lk.); εὐσχήμων* Mar 15:43 in the sense ‘rich’ or ‘of honourable estate’ (altered in Mt. and Lk.). It is noteworthy, however, that Luke is more particular when correcting Mark than when composing his later treatise, for we find κράβαττος in Act 5:15; Act 9:33, ὄρκιζω in Act 19:13 (cf. 1Th 5:27 ἐνορκίζω best text), and εὐσχήμων in the above sense in Act 13:50; Act 17:12.

(f) Mark’s so-called *Latinisms* must probably be reckoned as being in reality colloquialisms; see § iv. below. Such are κεντυρίων *centurio* Mar 15:39; Mar 15:44 (= ἑκατόνταρχος, ἑκατοντάρχης Mt. Lk.); ξέστης *sextarius* Mar 7:4, not in the best text of

Mar 7:8 (Mt. omits, abbreviating; no parallel in Lk.); σπεκουλάτωρ *speculator*
Mar 6:27 ἄπ. λεγ. in Greek (omitted in Mt., no parallel in Lk.); κοδράντης *quadrans*
Mar 12:42 (omitted in Lk., no parallel in Mt., but the word is found in Mat 5:26); λεγι
ών or λεγεών *legio* Mar 5:9; Mar 5:15, i.e. ‘a large number,’ which seems to have
been its meaning in colloquial Greek (the || Luk 8:30 has it, but || Mat 8:29;
Mat 8:34 omits it; Mat 26:53 has the word in its literal, military sense); κῆνσος
census Mar 12:14 (so Mt., but Lk. φόρος); τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιεῖν *satisfacere* Mar 15:15
(omitted in Mt. and Lk., cf. Act 17:9 λαβόντες τὸ ἱκανὸν *satis accipientes*). To these
must be added δηνάριον *denarius* Mar 6:37, Mar 12:15, Mar 14:5 and μόδιος *modius*
Mar 4:21, which both the other Synoptics have retained.

(g) *The Aramaic transliterations* in Mk. are a source of some perplexity when we ask the cause of their presence (see below, § v.). But in this connexion they are significant, because almost all of them have been removed by the other Synoptists. Even in Mk. they are nearly always accompanied by an interpretation; the other Evangelists, writing later, probably thought it useless to retain them. They are marks of an early hand, desirous of retaining the *ipsissima verba* spoken.

(h) *Corrections of grammar, awkward and difficult phrases, etc.*—Under this head we note many instances of smoothing an unpolished style. Thus in Mar 3:15 ff. Mark writes καὶ Ἰάκωβον, κ.τ.λ., forgetting that he had added a clause about Peter after (⊗BC*, etc.) καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς δώδεκα (Westcott-Hort insert a bracket in endeavouring to make Mk. grammatical—surely a desperate expedient)—the difficulty disappears in Mt. and Lk.; in Mar 4:11 ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται is awkward—in Mt. and Lk. γυῶναι is inserted and makes the phrase easy—this probably is not a correction proper, but a case of taking a smoother phrase from the non-Markan source of Mt. and Lk. rather than the rough phrase in Mk. (see § vii. 2 below). Note also Mar 4:15 οὗτοι δὲ εἰσιν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ... καὶ ὅταν, κ.τ.λ., for οἱ ὅταν—simplified in Mt. and Luk 4:21 where ἔρχεται is very awkward—Luke removes it, as also Matthew, who narrates the passage in a different connexion; Mar 4:24 βλέπετε τί ἀκοῦετε—Luke’s gloss is πῶς (for τί), doubtless a true one (no parallel in Mt.); Mar 4:31, anacolouthon, removed in Mt. and Lk., which both insert δν λαβῶν ἄνθρωπος, here probably following in preference their non-Markan source (as in Mar 4:11); Mar 7:11 f. ἐὰν εἴπη ἄνθρωπος ... Κορβάν ... οὐκέτι ἀφίετε αὐτόν, κ.τ.λ., which is grammatical

enough though the sense is rather strained—this is smoothed in Mt. (no parallel in Lk.); Mar_9:1 εἰσὶν τινες ὧδε τῶν ἐστηκότων more awkward than the || Mt. τῶν ὧ. ἐ. or the || Lk. τῶν αὐτοῦ ἐ. Mar_9:11; Mar_9:28 ὅτι in the sense ‘why?’ (*i.e.* ‘how is it that ...’) = Mt. τί or διὰ τί, not in Lk. (so ὅτι in Mar_2:16 = Mk. Lk. διὰ τί); Mar_9:12, no δέ corresponding to μέν, καὶ πῶς being used instead—in Mt. the order is inverted and the λέγω δέ provides the requisite antithesis; Mar_9:41 ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι an awkward phrase for ‘because’ = Mt. εἰς ὄνομα, μαθητοῦ (the converse change would be impossible; Swete finds a classical parallel to Mk. in Thuc. iv. 60; there is no parallel in Lk.); Mar_11:3 the words in the best text: ‘And straightway he will send (ἀποστέλλει, historic present) him back (πάλιν) hither,’ are part of the message, but (perhaps as being ambiguous) have been omitted in Lk., and altered in Mt. to a prediction that the owner of the colt would comply with the request; Mar_13:14 βδέλυγμα is made ungrammatically masculine (ἐστηκότα), because it is taken to be a man (the participle corrected in Mt. to ἐστός—Lk. completely different); Mar_13:19, the harsh phrase ‘those days shall be tribulation’ (softened in Authorized Version to ‘in those days,’ etc.) is altered and smoothed in Mt. and Lk. to ‘there shall be,’ etc.; Mar_14:65, the difficult phrase ῥαπίσμασιν ἔλαβον is omitted in Mt. and Lk. (the reading of Textus Receptus ἔβαλλον in Mk. arises partly from confusion of βαλ- and βάλ-, partly from the harshness of the original); Mar_14:72, the difficult ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιεν altered both in Mat_26:75 and Luk_22:62 to καὶ ἐξεληθὼν ἔξω ἔκλαυσεν πικρῶς, but Westcott-Hort bracket the clause in Lk. as doubtful (it is wanting in some Old Latin Manuscripts)—if it is genuine in Lk. (and it has almost overwhelming attestation) we probably have here a case not of correction proper, but (as before) of both Matthew and Luke preferring their non-Markan source to the ambiguous Mk., which was perhaps misunderstood in early times as much as now; whether it means ‘when he thought thereon he wept,’ or ‘covering his head he wept,’ or as D [Note: Deuteronomist.] and the Latin, Syrian, Armenian, and other versions have it, ‘he began to weep.’

The corrections under this head are most significant, and appear to be conclusive as to the early date of Mk. as compared with the other Synoptics. For no writer, having before him a smooth text, would gratuitously introduce harsh or difficult phraseology, whereas the converse change is natural and common.

(i) We may notice some changes made for *greater precision*, especially by Luke, who, as one would expect, uses more correct medical language. Cf. Mar 2:3 ff., Mat 9:2 ff. παραλυτικός = Luk 5:18 ff. παραλελυμένος; Mar 2:17, Mat 9:12 ισχύοντες = Luk 5:31 ὑγιαίνοντες. [In Mar 5:42 = Mat 9:25 = Luk 8:55, Lk. Mk. (not Mt.) add the command to give the maiden something to eat,—cf. Luk 7:15 where Jesus gives the widow’s son back to his mother: ‘in each case He intimates that nature is to resume its usual course’ (Plummer, *St. Luke*, on Luk 8:55)].

Similar corrections for precision are: Mar 6:14 ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης (cf. Mar 6:22; Mar 6:26 f.) = Mt. Lk. ‘Ὁ τετραάρχης (though Mt. has retained ὁ βασιλ. in Mar 14:9); perhaps also Mar 6:22 τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἡρωδιάδος if the reading of \aleph BD (so Westcott-Hort) be right, in which case either the girl was not Salome but her half-sister, or perhaps more probably αὐτοῦ is used in a loose way to denote that she was Herod’s step-daughter—Mat 14:6 has ἡ θυγάτηρ τῆς Ἡρωδιάδος, which is more likely to be the truth (the Markan reading is, however, very doubtful); Mar 1:16 etc., where Mark calls the Lake of Gennesaret ‘the sea (θάλασσα) of Galilee’ (so Mt.), but Luke always, with his superior nautical knowledge, changes the word to λίμνη; and Mar 15:32 which says that ‘they that were crucified (pl.) with him reproached him’ (so Mt.)—the plural is perhaps used only impersonally, or possibly both robbers began to revile and one repented; but Luke, who had independent knowledge of this incident (for he alone relates the penitence of the robber), emphatically corrects the phrase to εἷς δὲ τῶν κρεμασθέντων κακούργων (Luk 23:39).

(j) *Doubtful cases.*—We must finally consider some passages in which it is doubtful whether we must attribute to Mk. priority or posteriority. In Mar 6:3 we find οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τέκτων; where Mat 13:55 has ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός and Luk 4:22 υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ. Here the correction might be on the part of the First and Third Evangelists, who disliked the name ‘the carpenter’ being given to Jesus, and the fact that they use different phrases points to the probability that they are not here borrowing from their common source or sources; while the correction might be on the part of Mark, who thought that the phrase ‘son of Joseph’ might be misunderstood by his readers, inasmuch as they had not the birth-narrative before them to explain it. Origen asserts that ‘in none of the Gospels current in the Churches is Jesus Himself ever described as being “the carpenter” ’ (*adv. Cels.* vi. 36), and perhaps this reading was not in his copy of Mark—a few authorities now extant have a different phrase (but see Westcott-Hort, *Notes on Select Readings*, p. 24). If the correction is on the part of the

Second Gospel, it is probable that our Markan reading is the work of an editor later than Mt. Lk. (but see § vii. below).—In Mar 14:30; Mar 14:68; Mar 14:72 the cock is said to crow twice, according to the usually received readings; in Mt. Lk. Jn. only one cock-crowing is recorded. Some Manuscripts omit δις in Mar 14:30, many (ⲛBC syr [Note: yr Syriac.] ^{sin} etc.) omit καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν in Mar 14:68, some omit ἐκ δευτέρου in Mar 14:72, others omit δις in Mar 14:72. If a second cock-crowing was in the Petrine tradition, it is difficult to understand why the other Evangelists should have so completely omitted all trace of it; but it is equally difficult to understand why, if it belongs to the original Mk., and if that Gospel was later than Mt. and Lk., the Second Evangelist should have introduced it; or again why, if it is an editorial addition to Mk., the editor should have introduced it. Perhaps Dr. Salmon's solution is the right one (*Textual Criticism*, ch. v.)—that originally Mk. had only one cock-crowing, that of Mar 14:72 (*i.e.*, not in the same place as in Mt. and Lk.); that the omission of ⲛB, etc., in Mar 14:68 is right; and that some early scribe having by error put in these words, without intending to introduce two cock-crowings, other scribes added δις and ἐκ δευτέρου in the other places to produce consistency. On the other hand, it must be remembered that the omissions in some Manuscripts of Mk. are easily explicable on the supposition that a harmonizing scribe, not finding two cock-crowings in the other Gospels, omitted these words in Mk.; if this be so, the enigma is inexplicable.—In Mar 14:58 the words χειροποίητον, ἀχειροποίητον may be a comment of the Evangelist's, the simpler words of Mat 26:61 being what the false witnesses really said (Lk. has no parallel). If so, the Markan form would probably be later than the Matthaean (see Schmiedel in *Encyc. Bibl.* ii. 1851). But the introduction of comments such as these, however much in the style of Mt., is not in that of Mk., and there is no reason why Jesus should not actually have used the words, and, if so, why the false witnesses should not have quoted them; their false testimony lay in giving a wrong sense to our Lord's words, rather than in quoting Him wrongly.

A case of possible correction of Mk. may be briefly noticed here, though it does not concern Mt. or Luke. In Mar 15:25 we read that the Crucifixion took place at the third hour; Joh 19:14 says that the trial was hardly over by the sixth hour (ὥρα ἦν ὡς ἕκτη), and this looks like a correction of Mk. as to time. But probably this is no correction, whether we take Westcott's solution that John's 'sixth hour' is our 6 a.m., or that of Ramsay (*Expositor*, 4th ser. vii. 216, 5th ser. iii. 457) and others that the word 'hour' is used in a loose and ill-defined way, or the more probable and ancient view (Euseb. *ad Marin.*) that there is an error of the digamma, Ϝ (= 6) for Γ (= 3) or *vice versa*, in the text of the Gospels. If so, our copies of Jn. are probably wrong, since Mk. has three separate notes of time which hang all together, Mar 15:1; Mar 15:25;

Mar 15:33 (see Wright, *Synopsis*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , *in loc.*, and *New Test. Prob.* p. 147).

(k) *Conclusion from the evidence.*—The detailed comparison of Mk. with Mt. and Lk. leads us to the conclusion that either Mk. as we have it now, or at least a Gospel which differs from our Mk. in unessential particulars only, lay before the First and Third Evangelists when they wrote. If the doubtful cases mentioned above, and the instances given below in § vii., be held to argue the priority of Mt. or Lk. over Mk., that would apply only to editorial additions, and the main conclusion would not be affected. Some of the deductions made above may be questioned, yet the cumulative force of the whole is very great. And a careful study of them will at once dissipate the idea that Mark is an abbreviator of Matthew, and will lead us to the conclusion that here we come much closer to the bed-rock of the Gospel story than in either Mt. or Luke. This is the great value of Mk., and it has been left for modern scholars to discover it.

5. Other characteristics of diction in Mark.—The style of the Second Gospel may be gathered to a large extent from what has preceded. For its Aramaic tinge see below, § v. A few favourite modes of speech remain to be noticed. The use of the historic present is especially common, and this contributes largely to the vividness of the narrative. Yet there is great freedom of tenses; we find changes in the same sentence from a past tense to a historic present, and *vice versa*. Of a few particles Mark is very fond—*e.g.* εὐθύς 41 times; πολλά as adverb, Mar 1:45; Mar 3:12; Mar 5:10; Mar 5:23; Mar 5:38; Mar 5:43; Mar 6:20 ἄBL Mar 9:26, Mar 15:3; πάλιν Mar 2:1; Mar 2:13, Mar 3:1; Mar 3:20 etc.; πᾶς is used in exaggeration, *e.g.* Mar 1:5, Mar 2:13; accumulated negatives are common, *e.g.* Mar 1:44, Mar 2:3, Mar 3:20; Mar 3:27. In ch. 4 καὶ ἔλεγεν or καὶ λέγει is so frequent (8 times) that Swete has raised the question (on Mar 4:21) whether Mark had before him a number of detached sayings of Jesus which he here introduces.

Our Gospel has about ten somewhat striking words which are, as far as we know, ἄπαξ λεγόμενα in all Greek literature. Such are: ἔννουχα Mar 1:35 (cf. πάννουχα—A, etc., have ἔννουχον); ἐπιράπτει Mar 2:21 (D [Note: Deuteronomist.] has ἐπισυνράπτει); σπεκουλάτορα Mar 6:27 (see above, § iii. 4 (b)); πυγμῆ as adv. Mar 7:3, *i.e.* ‘with arm and elbow’ (a late Greek meaning—in classical Greek ‘with the list’), so ‘completely’ or ‘diligently’ (D [Note: Deuteronomist.] has πυγμῆ, ἄ πυκνά ‘frequently,’ and so several VSS [Note: SS Versions.] , obviously a correction); ὑπερπερισσῶς Mar 7:37 (D

[Note: Deuteronomist.] has ὑπερεκπ.) and ἐκπερισσῶς Mar 14:31 (A, etc., have ἐκ περισσοῦ); τηλαυγῶς Mar 8:25, *i.e.* ‘clearly, though at a distance’ (ⲥ*CLΔ have δηλ-); ἐπι συντρέχει Mar 9:25; ἐκεφαλίωσαν Mar 12:4 (*v.l.* -λαίωσαν), see below, § vii.; προμεριμνᾷτε Mar 13:11. There are also about 70 other words which occur nowhere else in NT, though many are found in the LXX Septuagint. This, as compared with the other Gospels, is a small number; Lk. has some 250 words not found elsewhere in NT (see Swete, *l.c.* p. xliv, for careful lists of words peculiar to Mk., or used by him in common with one or more of the other NT writers).

6. Matter peculiar to Mark.—The Second Gospel relates very few incidents not given, or at least referred to, in Mt. or Luke. We have only one parable peculiar to Mk., that of the seed growing secretly (Mar 4:26 ff.), and only two miracles, the healing of the deaf stammerer (μογιλάλος—the *v.l.* μογγιλάλος, from μόγγος ‘thick-voiced,’ is not well supported) (Mar 7:31 ff.), and of the blind man at Bethsaida (Mar 8:22 ff.). Other paragraphs peculiar to Mk. are: the questions about the dulness of the disciples when they forgot to take bread (Mar 8:17 f.), and about the disciples disputing (Mar 9:33); and the incidents of the young man with the linen cloth (Mar 14:51 f.), of the smiting of Jesus by the servants (ὑπηρέται) of the chief priests (Mar 14:65), and of Pilate’s wonder, and his question put to the centurion (Mar 15:44). See also § vii. below.

iv. Authorship, Date, and Place of writing.—There is no reason to dispute the Patristic statements (§ ii. above) that Mark, the ὑπηρέτης of Paul and Barnabas (Act 13:5) and the disciple of Peter, was the author of the Second Gospel. And there is much probability that the statement of Clement of Alexandria, that Mark wrote in Rome, is correct. We cannot, indeed, argue from the Latinisms (see § iii. 4 (f)) that he wrote for the Romans, for these words are probably mere colloquialisms in common use in the whole Empire, and, moreover, the Christian Romans undoubtedly spoke, at least in the ordinary way, Greek and not Latin (see § v. 2). But that it was written for Gentiles appears from the general absence of OT quotations, except when our Lord’s words are cited (Mar 1:2 f. is an exception; Mar 15:28 must almost certainly be expunged from the text, being omitted by ⲠABC*D k syr [Note: yr Syriac.] ^{sin} etc.); also from the interpretation of Aramaic transliterations and the explanation of Jewish customs: *e.g.* Mar 7:2 ff. (washing of hands, etc.) Mar 12:42 (two mites making a farthing; the λεπτόν or half quadrans, being a Jewish coin, has to be explained), Mar 15:42 (‘the Preparation, that is, the day before the sabbath’); from the absence of mention of the Jewish law; and from the geographical description of Mar 13:3 (‘the

Mount of Olives* [Note: uses τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν here and in Mar 14:26; but in Mar 11:1 we must probably accentuate the last word as oxytone—τὸς τὸ ὄρος τὸ Ἐλαιῶν (B k r)—i.e. the substantive is Ἐλαιῶν, ‘an olive grove’ (as in Act 1:12 ἀπο ὄρους τῶν καλουμένου Ἐλαιῶνος). See Deissmann, *Bibl. Stud.* p. 208 f., and Swete, *St. Mark on Mar 11:1.*] over against the temple’). Chrysostom’s statement (*Proœm. in Matt.*), that Egypt was the place of writing, is negated by the silence of the Alexandrian Fathers Clement and Origen, and is probably a mistaken inference from Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* ii. 16, which says that Mark was sent to Egypt and preached there the gospel which he had composed. Some moderns have supposed a double publication, one in Rome and one in Alexandria.

The question of *date* is more difficult. From internal considerations we should certainly assign an early date to Mk., at any rate before the Fall of Jerusalem. The Discourse on the End (esp. Mar 13:13 f., Mar 13:24; Mar 13:30; Mar 13:33) is reported as if the fulfilment were only in prospect, and in a manner that would be hardly possible if the siege of Titus had already taken place. This conclusion becomes still more likely when we compare Mk. with Mt. and Luke. The discourse seems to join together two separate things, the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world. All the Synoptics begin with the destruction of the Temple. In Mk. and Lk. follows a discourse which apparently speaks of the destruction of Jerusalem, and then the passage Mar 13:24-27 seems to refer to the end of the world. But Matthew in his accustomed manner weaves together Jesus’ sayings which in the other Evangelists are distinct, and mingles together the two events spoken of. Thus the compiler of the Matthaean discourse (we need beg no question as to authorship) evidently thought that the two events would be synchronous, and therefore must have written his account of the prophecy (not necessarily the whole Gospel) before the Fall of Jerusalem. If so, the Markan discourse is earlier still.

So the reference to the shewbread (Mar 2:26 οὐκ ἔστι, present) seems to imply that the Temple was at the time of writing still standing, and that the presentation of the shewbread still went on. Also the considerations mentioned above in § iii. 3, 4, as to the description of Jesus’ inner feelings, the style and details of the Gospel, point strongly in the same direction. If, again, we were to hold the theory of an Aramaic original (but see § v.), we could hardly avoid supposing a still earlier date.

We have then to consider if the external evidence contradicts the internal. The date of two other NT books affects our judgment. (a) If we adopt the early date for Acts (c. a.d. 62), i.e. if we suppose that St. Luke tells us no more of St. Paul’s history after the two years at Rome simply because nothing more at the time of writing had happened, we must assign a still earlier date to Lk., and *a fortiori* to Mark. There is

much to be said for this early date of Acts, though many hold that Luk 21:20 ('Jerusalem compassed with armies'), when we compare it with Mar 13:14, Mat 24:15 ('abomination of desolation'), betokens a writing *after* the event described. (b) Papias by implication, and Irenaeus (iii. 1. 1) explicitly, say that Mark wrote after Peter's death (see § ii. above)—Irenaeus also asserts that Matthew wrote first—while Clement of Alexandria and Origen say that he wrote in Peter's lifetime. Now, if we take the former statement as true, the date of 1 Peter is a difficulty in the way of accepting the internal evidence for the date of Mark. For we can hardly assign a very early date to it (e.g. 1Pe 4:16 '[suffer] as a Christian'). There is no great reason for believing that St. Peter died *in the same year* as St. Paul, and it is quite possible that he survived him for some considerable time, during which St. Mark acted as his interpreter. The indications of a later date in 1 Peter do not then militate against the Petrine authorship of that Epistle. But if Mark wrote his Gospel after Peter's death, the early date to which the internal evidence leads us becomes difficult. While, therefore, we might have agreed with Swete (*St. Mark*, p. xl) that the witness of Irenaeus and Papias is more probable than that of Clement and Origen, if we had nothing else to go by, in view of the strong internal indications of an early date, we are perhaps led to prefer the Alexandrian view that Mark wrote in the lifetime of Peter. Nevertheless Sweet's date, just before a.d. 70, is chronologically possible (the order would then be 1 Peter; death of St. Peter; Mk.), but it allows very little time for the Mt. Discourse on the End to be written. Possibly the theory of a double publication might reconcile the Patristic testimony; but, if so, the second edition probably differed hardly at all from the first (see §§ vi. vii. below).

§ v. The Aramaic characteristics and original language of Mark.—The external evidence would not lead us to any other conclusion than that the Greek St. Mark as we have it is an original composition, and not a translation from any Aramaic document. We have, however, to consider a noteworthy phenomenon which the Gospel itself brings out—the strong Aramaic tinge which goes all through it. This tinge has led some to postulate an Aramaic original, and to suppose that the Gospel which we possess is a translation. We may first collect together and comment on instances of this characteristic, and then consider how they bear on the question of the original language.

1. Aramaisms.—A characteristic of Mk. is the retention of several Aramaic words transliterated into Greek. Such are:— $\beta\omicron\alpha\nu\eta\rho\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ Mar 3:17 (= רִנְיָ בְנֵי?, the \omicron or the α being probably an intrusion in the text, or $\beta\alpha\nu\eta\rho\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ being perhaps the original reading, see Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 49, *Gramm. d. Jüd.-Pal.* [Note: *Palestine, Palestinian.*] *Aramäisch*, p. 112; the syr [Note: yr Syriac.] ܒܢܝ ܪܝܢܝ is ܒܢܝ ܪܝܢܝ , which the Nestorians pronounce *bhé raysh*, the Jacobites *bné* [or *bnai?*] *ryesh*, both with mute *yudh*—for a possible origin of these forms see Burkitt, *Evang. da-Mephar.* ii.

p. 280; the Armenian is ‘Banereges’); *ταλειθα* *κούμ* Mar 5:41 (= *ܩܘܡܝ ܡܠܝܬܗ*, syr [Note: yr Syriac.] psh *ܩܘܡܝ ܡܠܝܬܗ*, with *yudh* quiescent, syr [Note: yr Syriac.] sin wanting: some Greek Manuscripts read *κούμι*; see also below); *κορβάν* Mar 7:11 (= *ܩܘܪܒܐܢ*, syr [Note: yr Syriac.] sin *ܩܘܪܒܐܢ*, syr [Note: yr Syriac.] psh *ܩܘܪܒܐܢ*, *ܩܘܪܒܐܢ* being the usual Syriac name for the Eucharist); *ἐφραθά* Mar 7:34 (= *ܦܫܬܐ*); *ἄββᾶ* Mar 14:36 (= *ܐܒܒܐ*, again in Rom 8:15, Gal 4:6, see *Abba*). These occur in Mk. only of the Gospels, as does the redundant *Βαρτιμαίος* (ὁ υἱὸς Τιμαίου Βαρ.) Mar 10:46 (Mt. Lk. give no name; Bartimaeus could not be the blind man’s own real name, though he may have been known by it; cf. *Barjona*, *Barabbas*). Two others are found also in Mt. and Jn., ὁ *αββεί* Mar 9:5; Mar 11:21; Mar 14:45 (= *ܒܒܝ*, syr [Note: yr Syriac.] sin cu puh *ܒܒܝ*), ὡς *αννά* Mar 11:9 (= *ܐܢܢܐ*, Syr [Note: yr Syriac.] sin cu puh *ܐܢܢܐ*); a third in Jn., ὁ *αββουνεί* Mar 10:51 (= *ܒܒܝܢܝ*, syr^{sin} *ܒܒܝܢܝ*, syr^{cu} waiting in Jn. also, syr^{psh} *ܒܒܝܢܝ* syr hkl *ܒܒܝܢܝ*, perhaps a diminutive); these three are not found in Luke. The Heb. Aram. Aramaic *ἀμήν* (*ܐܡܝܢ*, syr *ܐܡܝܢ*) is retained by all the Evangelists, but much less often by Luke than by the others; note also that Mar 3:28 *ἀμήν* λέγω becomes in Mat 12:31 *διὰ τοῦτο* λέγω, and so sometimes elsewhere. The Aramaic Word from the Cross is remarkable, Ἐλωί, Ἐλωί, λαμὰ σαβαχθανεί Mar 15:34 (*ܐܠܘܝ ܐܠܘܝ ܠܡܢܐ ܫܒܚܩܝܢܝ ܠܡܢܐ* syr [Note: yr Syriac.] sin puh *ܐܠܘܝ ܐܠܘܝ ܠܡܢܐ ܫܒܚܩܝܢܝ* with both *yudhs* quiescent; vv.ll. are ἡλεί D [Note: Deuteronomist.] and some old latt., *λεμὰ* and *ζαφθανεί* D [Note: Deuteronomist.] , *zaphtani d*, *zaphani k*). The Divine name here is a Hebraized form of the pure Aramaic *ܐܠܘܝ* (syr. *ܐܠܘܝ*). Ἐλωί recurs in the *ⲛB* text of Mat 27:46 (so Westcott-Hort), but the Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 text, following other Manuscripts, have ἡλεί or ἡλί (so syr [Note: yr Syriac.] sin *ܐܠܘܝ*; syr [Note: yr Syriac.] psh *ܐܠܘܝ* syr [Note: yr Syriac.] cu wanting), and this would be a correction by Matthew, or (as Westcott Hort, *Notes*, p. 21) by a Matthaean scribe or editor, to suit the Hebrew form *יְהוָה*, which was no doubt familiar from liturgical worship. This reading is probably confirmed by pseudo-Peter, for it apparently underlies his strange phrase ἡ δύναμις μου, ἡ δ., κατέλειπός με, being mistaken for *ܕܝܢܐ* (syr. *ܕܝܢܐ*) ‘strength.’ The object of the Matthaean correction would be to make it more obvious why the people thought that Elijah was being invoked, the form Ἐλωί

α, Mar 9:7 ἐγ. ἐπισκιάζουσα, both altered in Mt. and Lk.; and so whichever way we read Mar 1:4 (ἐγένετο Ἰωάνης ὁ βαπτίζων ... κηρύσσων, v.l. ἐγ. Ἰτβαπτ ... καὶ κηρ., altered in Mt. and Lk.).

The use of some prepositions after verbs, etc., is thought to be due to the same cause (Allen, *loc. cit.*), as ἔρχεται ὀπίσω Mar 1:7, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα Mar 1:11, πιστεύετε ἐν Mar 1:15, λέγουσι περὶ Mar 1:30, ἐσθίει μετὰ Mar 2:16, ἵαται ἀπὸ Mar 5:29, ὑπαγε εἰς εἰρήνην Mar 5:34, ὑγιῆς ἀπὸ Mar 5:34, διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ Mar 6:2 (but the Aramaic would have the singular), ἐλάλησε μετὰ Mar 6:50, λάβη ἀπὸ Mar 12:2.

Similarly also prepositions repeated after compound verbs, as ἔξελθε ἐξ Mar 1:25, and so Mar 1:26; Mar 1:42; Mar 1:45; Mar 2:1; Mar 5:2; Mar 5:8; Mar 5:13; Mar 5:17; Mar 6:54; Mar 7:17; Mar 7:26; Mar 7:29; Mar 7:31; Mar 9:25; Mar 9:28; Mar 9:45; Mar 9:47; Mar 10:15 etc.; the suggestion apparently being that these represent Aramaic forms like קָמַן, לָע לָ.

Phrases like δύο δύο Mar 6:7, συμπόσια συμπόσια Mar 6:39, πρασιαὶ πρασιαὶ Mar 6:40 are Aramaic or Hebrew idioms. Also several other Aramaic phrases have been noted, as ‘sons of the bridechamber’ Mar 2:19 (so Mt. Lk.), ‘sons of men’ Mar 3:28 (see § vii. 2 below), εἶπε δοθῆναι Mar 5:43, μία τῶν σαββάτων Mar 16:2 (positive for superlative), γίνεται καὶ Mar 2:15 (so Mt., not Lk.), ἐγένετο ἦλθεν Mar 1:9 (Mk. only); and the indefinite use of εἷς ἓν (for τις) Mar 9:17, Mar 10:17, Mar 12:28, Mar 13:1, Mar 14:18; Mar 14:66 (Allen, *loc. cit.*). Dalman also has made a collection of Hebraisms and Aramaisms in the Gospels (*Words of Jesus*, p. 20 ff.), though he considers that they do not constitute a proof of a Hebrew or Aramaic original. Of these the following are found in Mk.:—ἐλθοῦσα redundantly used with a finite verb Mar 7:25 (ἐ. προσέπεσε); ἀφείς with a term signifying departure where the idea of ‘leaving’ is not emphasized Mar 4:36, Mar 8:13, Mar 12:12; καθήμενον and στήκετε where they are superfluous Mar 2:14, Mar 11:25; ἀναστάς used redundantly Mar 2:14, Mar 7:24, Mar 10:1; Mar 10:50 (AC); ‘answer and say’ Mar 3:33, Mar 7:28, Mar 9:5, Mar 10:51, Mar 11:14, Mar 12:35, Mar 15:9, often when no question has been asked; ἐλάλησεν ... καὶ λέγει Mar 6:50 (?); ἤρξατο (-αντο) with infinitive when nothing follows developing the action, 26 times; εὐθέως or εὐθύς, a favourite form in Mk. (45 times) = Aram. Aramaic ἔμε; the use of πρόσωπον, not only in a quotation

like Mar 1:2, but in the phrase βλέπεις εἰς πο. ἀνθρώπων Mar 12:14, and some others.

2. Original language of Mark.—The Aramaic tinge in our Gospel is thought by some, e.g. Blass (*Philology of the Gospels*, ch. xi.) and Allen (*loc. cit.*), to show that it was originally written in Aramaic. A large number of the real or alleged Aramaisms given above are found in Mt. and Lk.; but it is argued that as they had *ex hypothesi* Mk. before them, they merely retained a certain number of the Aramaisms of their source. Moreover, the Aramaisms are found not only in the words of our Lord, in which case they might be explained as being due to the faithful reporting of His *ipsissima verba*, but also in the framework of the Gospel. On the theory of an Aramaic original, Allen explains the frequent use in Mk. of καὶ as a connecting link (cf. Aram. Aramaic 1), and of five particles constantly used, εὐθύς (see above), πάλιν, δέ, γάρ, ἀλλά, other particles being rare. He also explains the favourite historic present in Mk. as coming from the use of an Aramaic present participle for this purpose. In Syriac it is so found only in the verb ܘܫܝܪܘܢ ‘to say’ (Nöldeke, *Syr. [Note: Syriac.] Gramm.* § 274, p. 190), except in syr [Note: yr Syriac.] hkl, where it is a literal translation. But in the other Aramaic dialects this usage is not so limited; the idiom is found with other verbs, e.g. in Daniel and Tobit, and its presence in an original Aramaic Mk. would bring us to the frequent historic presents in the Greek Mk. The irregularity noticed above (§ iii. 5) of their being mixed up with past tenses occurs also in Aramaic. It is also thought that the difficult εἰς τριάκοντα καὶ εἰς (v.l. ἐν Westcott-Hort) ἐξήκοντα καὶ εἰς (v.l. ἐν WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort’s text.]) ἐκατόν in Mar 4:8 (cf. Mar 4:20) is explained by the εἷς (i.e. εἷς) representing ܐܝܢ, cf. Dan 3:19 (but equally well εἷς might represent an Aramaic ܐܝܢ ‘at the rate of’); and that the ἔρχεται of Mar 4:21 and ἐν ὀνόματι ὄτι of Mar 9:41 and ἐπιβαλὼν of Mar 14:72 (see above, § iii. 4 (h)) come from a mistranslation of some (unknown) Aramaic original. In the *JThSt* [Note: *ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.*] ii. 298, Allen suggests that the word ἐκεφαλῶσαν (Mar 12:4) is due to a confusion of ܘܫܝܪܘܢ ‘they injured’ with ܘܫܝܪܘܢ, which would be a puzzle to the translator, who rendered it by this coined word, taking it from Aram. Aramaic ܘܫܝܪܘܢ ‘a head.’ Similarly, Prof. Marshall (*Expositor*, 4th series, iv. 377) thinks that Mar 5:10 ἔξω τῆς χώρας and || Luk 8:31 εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον (Mt. different) are the result of translations of one Aramaic original, ܘܫܝܪܘܢ meaning both ‘earth’ or ‘land’ and ‘below.’

Blass brings different arguments on the same side. They run in two lines. (a) He suggests that St. Luke in Acts 1-12 used an Aramaic source, while the rest of the book was his own independent work. In these twelve chapters Aramaisms abound, while in the rest of the book they are comparatively scarce; and the style of the twelve chapters is rough as compared with St. Luke's own. Blass conjectures that Mark, who, as son of a prominent Christian lady in Jerusalem, was well fitted for the task, wrote the Aramaic source. [With this we may compare Weiss's idea that Mark ended his Gospel at Mar 16:8 because he went on to write a second work, which began with the Resurrection appearances]. If so, the first work, *i.e.* the Gospel, would be in Aramaic. (b) Blass thinks that the various readings in the present Manuscripts of Mk., and those shown by Patristic quotations, are relics of different translations of an original Aramaic.

In reviewing these considerations, we must remark that Dr. Blass's first argument rests on pure conjecture. Why should Mark be the writer of the supposed Aramaic source of Acts 1-12? And if so, why must he have written two books in the same language? He was confessedly bilingual, able to write in both Greek and Aramaic. This argument, then, is a halting one. And the second seems scarcely less precarious. The suggestions of Mr. Allen are more substantial. But these also appear to be inconclusive. They certainly show that the Aramaic tinge, strong in all the Synoptics, is strongest in Mark. But this need mean no more than that Aramaic was St. Mark's native language, that in which he thought, as most of the Palestinian Jews would do. The Greek spoken in Palestine was doubtless saturated with Aramaic forms and idioms, and Mark, whose style is comparatively unpolished, discarded them less than the other Synoptists. The theory of an Aramaic original has some formidable difficulties to overcome. Papias had evidently never heard of any but a Greek Mk., and no ecclesiastical writer suggests that the latter is a translation. The external evidence is all against the hypothesis which we have been examining. But so, also, when we look closely, is the internal evidence. It is true that there are many Aramaisms in Mark. Of these, however, we may dismiss, for our present purpose, the proper names, which would be used in Palestine equally whether an author wrote in Aramaic or in Greek. The influence of Aramaic grammar and diction may also probably be dismissed, seeing that the writer doubtless thought in Aramaic. There remain, then, the suggestions of mistranslation, which, however, are too ingenious for verisimilitude, and the transliterations like *Talitha Cumi*. But the fact that practically in each case of transliteration a Greek interpretation is added, is fatal to the idea that we have here traces of a conservative translator who incorporated bodily the words which he found in the book before him. As Swete remarks (*St. Mark*, p. xlii), a translator might have either translated the Aramaic or transliterated it; but transliteration followed by interpretation savours of an original writer. A still more fatal objection is the freshness of the style of our Gospel. Even the best translation loses the individuality of the author. But here we have a book in which the

individuality is most strongly marked. It can hardly be a second-hand reproduction of any one's work.

If the Aramaic-original theory be true, we must put back the date considerably, as Mr. Allen (*loc. cit.*) sees, probably to a date before a.d. 60; and then the Gospel is not likely to have been written in Rome. In this last detail the ecclesiastical testimony is again contradicted by the theory.

There is a line of argument which, though interesting, does not really bear on this question. In Mar_5:41, for *ταλειθά* or *ταλιθά*, D [Note: Deuteronomist.] has *θαβιτά*, supported by Old Latin *tabitha*, or *thabitha*, or *thabitha* as if the girl's name were Tabitha (cf. Act_9:20). In a Syriac text the transition from *ܬܒܝܬܗ* to *ܬܒܝܬܗ* would be easy. The Old Latin MS *e* has the curious reading 'tabea acultha quod est interpretatum puella puella tibi dico exsurge.' But these variations show nothing as to the original language of Mk.; they show only that D [Note: Deuteronomist.] and the Old Latin Manuscripts were directly or indirectly influenced by the Syriac versions (see Chase, *Syro-Latin Text of the Gospels*, p. 109 f.).

Finally, we must consider the statement of some cursive Greek Manuscripts, that the Gospel was written in Latin (*Ῥωμαϊστί*). They add that it was written in Rome, and this is no doubt the explanation of the other statement. It was supposed that if Rome was the place of writing, the Gospel must have been written in Latin. But this deduction is known to be without warrant. Those in Rome for whom the Gospel was written would speak Greek. St. Paul wrote to the Christian community in Rome in Greek, and St. Clement wrote from Rome in the same language. Further, even a cursory examination of Mk. shows that, whatever it is, it is not a translation into Greek from Latin. Thus this idea may be very briefly dismissed.

vi. The last twelve verses.—The question of the end of the Gospel is one of great difficulty, whatever view we take of the paragraph which now brings it to a close. An endeavour will be made in this section to state and weigh all the principal arguments; it would seem that neither the supporters nor the impugners of the present ending have quite done justice to the strength of the arguments on the other side. The facts to be considered are as follows. There are three ways of ending the Gospel. The first, here called the 'Short Ending,' stops at Mar_16:8 *ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ*. The second, here cited as the 'Long Ending,' is that of our ordinary Bibles (Mar_16:9-20), the last twelve verses. But there is also a third, here called the 'Intermediate Ending,' which runs as follows: *πάντα δὲ τὰ παρηγγελμένα τοῖς περὶ τὸν Πέτρον συντόμως ἐξηγγεῖλα*
ν. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς [ἐφάνη αὐτοῖς καὶ] ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς καὶ ἄχρη δύσεω

ς ἔξαπέστειλεν δι' αὐτῶν τὸ ἱερόν καὶ ἄφθαρτον κήρυγμα τῆς αἰωνίου σωτηρίας. 'And they immediately (or briefly) made known all things that had been commanded (them) to those about Peter. And after this Jesus himself [appeared to them and] sent out by means of them from the East even to the West the holy and incorruptible preaching of the eternal salvation.' This ending is found in four minor uncials, L (Codex Regius, 8th cent.), 12 [Note: 2 designates the particular edition of the work referred] (Fragmentum Sinaiticum, 7th cent.), ρ (Fragm. Parisiense, 8th cent.), and ψ (Codex Athous Laurae, 8th or 9th cent.), in all of them as an alternative to the Long Ending, though it would appear that the archetype of the first three, at any rate, ended at Mar 16:8. The Intermediate Ending is also found in the Old Latin k, standing alone, in several Manuscripts of the Ethiopic prefixed to the Long Ending, and in the margin of syr [Note: yr Syriac.] hkl, of two Bohairic Manuscripts, and of a cursive Greek MS. No one maintains its genuineness; it is clearly written as an end to the Gospel, and is not an independent fragment. It is probably due to an early scribe, who wrote it either because he had before him the Long Ending and objected to it, or because he had before him the Short Ending and thought it abrupt. Swete (*St. Mark*, p. cviii) conjectures that he was a Western, because of the emphasis laid on the West. Nestle makes him an Egyptian, without giving reasons (*Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible* iii. 13). Dobschütz (*TU [Note: U Texte und Untersuchungen.]* xi. 1, p. 73 f., quoted by Swete) thinks that the ending is part of the 'Preaching of Peter'; but the internal evidence is against this (see above). It is not found in any of the Fathers. Its presence, however, bears materially on the whole question. The only variation in the readings that need be mentioned is that ἐφάνη αὐτοῖς καί, which the sense clearly demands, is omitted by L7, αὐτοῖς καί is omitted by Ψ, and καί by all the Greek codices,—it has to be supplied from the versions.

The Short Ending is found in 8B, syr [Note: yr Syriac.] sin, and also in the oldest Manuscripts of the Armenian and Ethiopic versions. Eusebius says (*ad Marin. Quae* James 1, vol. 4) that the Long Ending was not in the 'accurate copies' of his day; later writers copy Eusebius, and do not add to our knowledge. Tertullian, Cyprian, Athanasius, and Cyril of Jerusalem are silent about the Long Ending; and this would be very significant if it were not that Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret are also silent, though they must have known verses which were in wide circulation in their time. Here we must note, further, that the fact that the Short Ending could scarcely have been the original close of the Gospel (see below), is no argument for the genuineness of the other two extant endings.

The Long Ending is found in practically all the authorities except those mentioned above—in almost all the uncials and cursives, the lectionaries, in the great majority of versions. It is explicitly quoted by Irenaeus as a genuine part of Mk. (Mar_3:10; Mar_3:6 : ‘in fine autem evangelii ait Marcus, Et quidem Dominus Jesus,’ etc. = Mar_16:19). It is also probably referred to by Justin (*Apol.* i. 45: ἐξελθόντες πανταχοῦ ἐκήρυξαν = Mar_16:20); possibly by ‘Barnabas’ (xv. 9, φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανοῦς; cf. Mar_16:14 ἐφανερώθη) and Hermas (*Sim.* ix. xxv. 1, 2; cf. Mar_16:15). But these last two cases are quite uncertain, and there is no evidence at all that any Father before Irenaeus knew these verses *as part of the Gospel*; they may have known them from some other writer. Dr. Salmon argues with some force (*Introd.*, appendix to Lect. ix.) that though \aleph B have not got these verses, yet in this part they are copied from one archetype which probably did contain them. The scribes seem to have purposely omitted something which was in the archetype, leaving a blank or distending the writing, and that something must have been of about the same length as the Long Ending. Salmon conjectures that the scribes of \aleph and B were of the school of Eusebius, and that they left out these verses, though they had them in their original, because Eusebius disapproved of them. No writer before Eusebius is known to have rejected them, and their presence in all later Manuscripts shows that the successors of Eusebius, in spite of his great authority, did not follow his judgment in the matter. If, however, Salmon’s argument on this part of the subject is sound, and if \aleph B when cross-examined give evidence, as he says, *for* the disputed ending and not against it, yet the absence of the ending in syr [Note: yr Syriac.] ^{sin} and in Eusebius’ ‘more accurate copies’ remains a stumbling-block to accepting the further inference that the Long Ending is genuine. Mr. F. C. Conybeare has suggested (*Expositor*, 4th series, viii. 241) that these verses are the work of the Aristion mentioned by Papias as one of our Lord’s disciples. In an Armenian MS. of the Gospels written a.d. 986 (only discovered in 1891), the Long Ending is said to be ‘of the presbyter Ariston,’ and it is not unreasonable to understand Aristion to be meant, the iota having fallen in transcription into Armenian. But the evidence is too late to be of much worth.

The internal evidence is important. It is freely admitted by the supporters of the Long Ending that its style and vocabulary are entirely different from those of the main part of the Gospel; and this consideration is decisive against the authorship being the same. But this does not at once bring us to a solution of all our difficulties. As far as style goes, it does not necessarily follow that the Long Ending is not by St. Mark. Salmon (*loc. cit.*) suggests that our Second Gospel is, in its present form, the latest of the Synoptics, St. Mark having, indeed, followed the written Petrine tradition more faithfully than the others, and having incorporated it in his Gospel almost in its own words, prefixing Mar_1:1-15 and adding Mar_16:9 ff., inserting also various editorial

touches (for which see § vii. 2 below). Certainly both the first fifteen and the last twelve verses of our Gospel show the same system of summarizing events,—Salmon suggests that it was these two passages which led Augustine to call Mark an abbreviator of Matthew,—and so far they might be by the same author. Yet the style of the ‘preface’ and that of the ‘appendix’ are not similar. A greater objection to this view is that it supposes in reality a Peter-Gospel not written by St. Mark; but ecclesiastical writers never represent St. Peter as writing a Gospel, either by himself or by any scribe or ‘interpreter’ except St. Mark. For we notice that this theory will not bear the weight of the additional hypothesis (not Salmon’s), that St. Mark wrote a first edition, perhaps at Rome, and afterwards a later one, *with added matter*, perhaps at Alexandria. The style-argument is decisively against this; moreover, some traces of the original ending would have survived, and the Church to which he gave his first edition would have preserved the words with which that edition closed.

There is one consideration which seems to the present writer decisive against Dr. Salmon’s view. The Long Ending could not, like the Intermediate one, have been written—whether by Mark or by another—expressly to finish the Gospel left unfinished at Mar_16:8. For the beginning of Mar_16:9 is not continuous with Mar_16:8. The subject of ἐφάνη had evidently been indicated in the sentence which had preceded; yet the necessary ‘Jesus’ cannot be understood from anything in Mar_16:8. Further, Mary Magdalene is introduced in Mar_16:9 as a new person,—she is indicated as one π α ρ ᾽ ἧς ἐκβεβλήκει ἑπτὰ δαιμόνια,—though she had just been mentioned by name in Mar_15:40; Mar_15:47, Mar_16:1, and though she was one of the women spoken of throughout the eight verses preceding the Long Ending. This paragraph, then, must be a fragment of a larger work, and could not have been composed on purpose to end the Gospel. It is, indeed, too much to say that it is a summary of events of the Forty Days, complete in itself, but at least it fits very badly on to the rest of the Gospel.

The presence of the Intermediate Ending also militates against the last twelve verses being the work of St. Mark. It shows that in very early times, how early we cannot say, these verses were not unanimously received. The evidence of Irenaeus, however, shows that they were adopted as an ending to the Gospel not later than the middle of the 2nd century.

We must probably, then, dismiss the idea that either the Long or the Intermediate Ending was the work of the Second Evangelist. We have, however, still to consider the problem suggested by the Short Ending.

It is inconceivable that Mar_16:8, with its abrupt and inauspicious ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ, could possibly be the end of a Gospel; indeed, it seems to stop in the middle of a

sentence. Against this it is said that abrupt terminations are not unknown in Greek literature (see Salmond in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. 253). Yet in this case such an idea is hardly tenable. It is very unlikely that the Gospel should deliberately end without any incident of the risen life of our Lord and with a note of terror. We have therefore to suppose a *lost ending*; and the difficulty of accounting for its total disappearance is the strongest argument of the supporters of the last twelve verses. It is not sufficient to pass it by, as is often done by those who impugn them, as a matter of little importance.

It is suggested that the last leaf of the original was early lost, and that the other extant endings were supplied to take its place. The last leaf of a MS is undoubtedly the very one which is most likely, after much use, to disappear. Dr. Salmon points out (*loc. cit.*) that this idea is based on the supposition that the original *completely* disappeared. The hypothesis of a lost leaf would account for a partial circulation of shorter copies, but for the complete disappearance of the old ending only if it was Mark's own autograph that lost its leaf before any copy was made from it. But it is difficult to suppose that only one MS of the Gospel existed in Mark's lifetime, and that his autograph was not copied till he died; and if the leaf fell in Mark's lifetime before the autograph was copied, why did not Mark write another?

There is an equal difficulty in the kindred supposition that the Gospel was left accidentally unfinished at Mar 16:8. Salmon asks why, if Mark died before completing his work, the disciple who gave the work to the world did not add a suitable ending, as Tertius added something to Romans (Rom 16:22), and the presbyters (probably) to the Fourth Gospel (Joh 21:24)? If suitable endings were added afterwards, why not at the time when the Gospel was first published? And this supposition is against the ecclesiastical testimony, which makes Mark finish his Gospel, and in some cases makes him take it to Egypt.

It cannot be said that these difficulties have been very satisfactorily met. Perhaps in our present state of knowledge the best solution of them is that of Dean Armitage Robinson, who suggests (*Study of the Gospels*, p. 5) that the Second Gospel was not highly esteemed in the 2nd cent., and that all copies perished but one, which lost its leaf. We know that the Gospel was neglected later on (see above, § ii.), chiefly on account of its shortness, and because it apparently adds little to our information. This may well have been the case early in the 2nd cent.; and if that be so, the circulation of it would not have been nearly so large as that of the other Gospels. It is not, however, necessary to put the loss of the leaf so late. The same state of things might well have existed immediately after St. Mark's death.

The difficulties on neither side can be neglected. But our verdict must be given after weighing probabilities, and to the present writer they seem overwhelmingly to

preponderate against the Markan authorship of the last twelve verses, or even against their being a real ending of the Gospel at all. But they are, nevertheless, like the *Pericope Adulteræ*, an exceedingly ancient and authoritative record of the words and deeds narrated in them.

vii. Is our Second Gospel the original which lay before the First and Third Evangelists?—Those who in the present day answer this question in the negative usually take a different line from that taken by Baur and his school. They regard our present canonical Gospel as an edited and augmented form of the original, yet as retaining almost all the characteristic features of that original. This hypothesis is much more tenable than the Tübingen theory, which made all our Synoptic Gospels 2nd cent. productions, and held that the Mk. known to Papias was not our Mk., but something entirely different. These two hypotheses are, in reality, inconsistent, and must be considered separately. [For an attempt partially to combine them see Sanday's *Gosp. in Sec. Cent. v. 2*, written in 1876, and not since reprinted. It is not known if Dr. Sanday would still maintain the opinions which he then held].

1. Baur, Schleiermacher, Wendt, Davidson, Renan, and others substantially agree in holding the latter hypothesis. Papias says that St. Mark wrote Christ's words and deeds 'accurately' but 'not in order' (see above, § ii.). From this it is concluded that the Mk. of Papias ('Ur-Marcus') was not written 'in order,' but was a disjointed collection of speeches and anecdotes; and, further, was not a Gospel in our later sense of the word, but something of the nature of the *Clementine Homilies*, a record of the sayings and teachings of *Peter*. Again, Papias says that Matthew composed the 'oracles' (λόγια) in the Hebrew language, and each one interpreted them (ἠρμήνευσε, aorist—the interpreting did not go on in Papias' own day) as he could. We need not here discuss the question of the original language of Mt., but the argument which we are now considering is that, whereas our present Gospels resemble one another in general plan, and to a great extent in detail, the Mt. of Papias was very different from his Mk., the former being a collection of discourses, the latter a narrative of the words and deeds of Christ. Renan (*Vie de Jésus*, p. xxii) supposes that Matthew wrote the discourses and Mark the anecdotes about Christ, and that by assimilation our present Mt. and Mk. took their shape, the former assimilating the anecdotes and adding them to the discourses, the latter adopting the reverse process. A further argument on the same side has been drawn from the evidence of Justin Martyr (see above, § ii.), who constantly quotes the Evangelic narrative, but in words that in many cases differ from our canonical Synoptics, so that if he had the latter before him, we cannot always be sure which he is quoting; we need not here consider whether he used the Fourth Gospel. The conclusion which at one time used to be drawn from Justin's quotations, and from his mentioning one or two things not found in the canonical texts, e.g. that Christ was born in a cave, and that the Magi came

from Arabia, was that he used Gospels different from those which we now have. Perhaps also we should insert under this head the fact that a comparatively long section in Mk. (Mar_6:45 to Mar_8:26) is omitted by Luke, from which it is argued by some that Luke's Mk. was not the same as our own. It is also argued that the records of the Two Feedings show that our Mk. is a compilation from two separate originals, one of which narrated the feeding of the 5000, the other of the 4000, and that it cannot be the work, directly or indirectly, of an eye-witness.

When we consider these arguments, we are struck by the fact that they assume several disputable points. It is not at all clear that Papias meant that his Mk. was an unconnected collection of anecdotes; it is quite as probable that he meant that he did not approve of the chronological order of Mk.; and, as we have seen (§ ii.), St. Luke was perhaps of the same opinion. It is also assumed as obvious that Papias meant only 'discourses' by λόγια. Certainly that is the primary meaning of the word. But its use in the sense of 'oracles,' *i.e.* the inspired Scriptures, is quite common in early Christian times. In Rom_3:2 τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ may, indeed, refer only to God's sayings (as Sanday-Headlam, *in loc.*; see also Sanday, *Gosp. in Second Cent.* p. 155), but it is more natural to refer it to the whole of OT. Sanday-Headlam remark that from the time of Philo onwards the word was used of any sacred writing, whether discourse or narrative. Thus, then, we cannot assume without argument that Papias meant only discourses by λόγια. Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 39) tells us that Papias' own work was called Λογιῶν κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις (*v.l.* ἐξηγήσεις), and Papias clearly did not deal only with our Lord's sayings. It is at least quite possible that Papias uses the word λόγια as equivalent to our 'Gospel' (so Westcott, *Canon*, p. 80 n. [Note: note.] ; Lightfoot, *Ess. on Sup. Rel.* pp. 155 n. [Note: note.] , 171 f.). If so, the argument from the dissimilarity of Papias' Mt. and Mk. breaks down. But even supposing (as living scholars are more willing to grant than were Lightfoot and Westcott) that λόγια in Papias means 'discourses,' his words do not necessarily mean that Matthew wrote sayings *only*; and we shall be led to the contrary opinion by a great difficulty that meets the hypothesis in question at the outset. There was no time for the process imagined by Renan to take place. Such a process would take a very much longer time in its development than can by any possibility be allowed. And a fatal objection to the hypothesis is that the result would not be that which as a matter of fact has taken place. We should have had a great number of variant Gospels, and the earlier the copies the greater would have been the variations. We should have had no certainty as to which Gospel could rightly claim any given incident, and there would have been in an aggravated form the textual conditions that we find in the case of the *Pericope Adulteræ*, which appears sometimes in one Gospel and sometimes in another. In reality the four Gospels are perfectly distinct, and have been so as far back as we

have any copies of them, the earliest Manuscripts showing as distinct a division between them as the later ones (see Salmon, *Introd. Lect. vii.*; Lightfoot, *op. cit.* p. 172 ff.). Justin Martyr tells us that the 'memoirs of the Apostles' (*i.e.* the Gospels) were read at Christian worship in his time (*Apol.* i. 67). If the Gospels then read were our canonical Gospels, there is not sufficient time between Papias and Justin for such a revolution to have taken place as is supposed. If, on the other hand, Justin used the supposed 'original Matthew' and 'original Mark,' there is not time between him and Irenaeus for the same thing to have happened. As a matter of fact, it is now generally held that Justin knew at least our Synoptic Gospels. This does not mean that he had no other sources of information, such as oral tradition, or even that he did not borrow from an 'apocryphal' Gospel; the 'cave' at Bethlehem, for example, may well have come from some one or other of such sources. But a careful analysis of his quotations from OT shows that he varies from the true text in these quite as much as in his Gospel quotations; and most of the variations probably arise from his trusting to memory. The difficulty of turning to a manuscript without divisions, even for words, is so great, that the memory would be trusted in a far greater degree than with us who have printed Bibles. And, as we should have conjectured, Justin is much more accurate in his longer quotations, where he would be obliged to refer to his manuscript, than in his shorter ones, where it would be less necessary to do so (see, further, Sanday, *Gospels in Second Cent.* ch. ii; Salmon, *Introd. Lect. vi.*). Moreover, we may remark that an 'original Mark' could not have disappeared without leaving any trace; we should have found some quotations from it, or some reference to its being dispossessed by a more modern successor. And the autoptic argument (above, § iii. 2) comes in here with overwhelming force. Our Mk. could not have had its fresh, lifelike character, its evidence of first-hand knowledge, if Renan's idea were true.

The argument from the omission by Luke of a Markan section is inconclusive. He had a long section to introduce (§ iii. 4 (a) above), and it was natural for him to omit something, to make room for his new matter. The section of Mk. is found, in the same order, in Mt., and therefore, if this argument held good, it would be necessary to suppose that, while Luke used an 'original Mark,' the First Evangelist used our present one. Also, two incidents in this section are referred to shortly in Lk., the seeking of a sign and the leaven of the Pharisees (Luk 11:16; Luk 11:29; Luk 12:1). The conclusion from 'doublets' is very insecure. There is no reason why there should not have been two Feedings.

2. The hypothesis that our present Mk. is an 'edited' form of the Gospel which was used by Matthew and Luke, is in reality quite different from that which has just been considered. For it supposes that our Second Gospel is very like the original, differing from it only by the insertion of a few editorial touches, at the most by the addition of a few paragraphs; whereas the other hypothesis supposes our Mk. to be entirely different from the original Gospel. Dr. Salmon proposes one form of the hypothesis

which we have now reached (*Introd. Lect. ix. s.f.*). He suggests that our Second Gospel is at once the oldest and the youngest of the three Synoptics; the oldest as giving most nearly the very words in which the Apostolic traditions were delivered, the youngest as respects the date when the independent traditions were set in their present framework. This opinion is largely influenced by his view that the Long Ending is really Markan (see above, § vi.). He supposes that Mark added, besides the first fifteen and the last twelve verses, some other slight portions; and that the remarks about unbelief Mar 3:5, Mar 6:6; Mar 6:52, which are not found in the other Synoptics, are by the writer of the Long Ending (cf. Mar 16:11; Mar 16:13 f.), *i.e.* by St. Mark, as the editor of the Petrine Tradition. From an opposite standpoint, Schmiedel (*Encyc. Bibl. ii. 1844, 1848, 1850 f.*) thinks that the canonical Mk. is a later edition, and that several things in it are ‘secondary’ to Mt. and Luke. One leading consideration urged by him (also by Sanday, *Gosp. in Second Cent. v. § 2, p. 149*) is that Mt. and Lk. often agree against Mk.; therefore, unless the First Evangelist knew the Third Gospel, or the Third Evangelist the First (both of which suppositions are confessedly improbable), they must have had a form of Mk. which is not ours. But this assumes too much; it supposes that the First and Third Evangelists had no other source (besides Mk.) than a collection of discourses, *i.e.* that the ‘non-Markan document’ could not have been a history parallel to Mark. As Schmiedel himself rightly says, this assumption is not necessarily true. But if so, his argument, given above, has little weight. There is no reason why Mt. and Lk. should not have got their agreements as against Mk. from the non-Markan source. There is no reason to believe that the latter carefully avoided everything contained in the Petrine tradition; and if it included some things which were in that tradition, there is no reason why Matthew and Luke should not sometimes have followed it in preference.

As this question of agreement of Mt. and Lk. against Mk. is of great importance in forming a judgment about the Second Gospel, it is necessary to consider some details. As examples, it will suffice to give instances from the first few chapters: Mar 1:8 πνεύματι ἁγίῳ = Mt. Lk. πν. ἁγ. καὶ πυρί; Mar 1:31, Mt. inserts ἠγέρθη καὶ, Lk. ἀναστᾶσα; Mar 1:40 and Mar 2:3, Mt. Lk. insert (but in different ways) ἰδοῦ; Mar 2:3 φέροντες, Mt. Lk. insert (but in different ways) ἐπὶ κλίνης; Mar 2:12 ἐξῆλθεν ἔμπροσθεν πάντων = Mt. Lk. ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ; *ib.* ἐξίστασθαι = Mt. ἐφοβήθησαν = Lk. ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου; Mar 2:22 ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται, κ.τ.λ., Mt. inserts ἐκχεῖται, Lk. ἐκχυθήσεται, and both transpose ἀπόλλ.; *ib.* ἀλλ’ οἶνον νέον, κ.τ.λ., Mt. inserts βάλλουσι, Lk. βλητέον, but both come from the βάλλει (Mt. βάλλουσι) which had just preceded; Mar 3:18 a, Mt. Lk. insert ‘his brother’ (Mt. nominative, Lk. accusative), and both transfer Andrew to a place just after Peter; Mar 3:23, Mt. inserts εἰδὼς δὲ τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις αὐτ

ων, Lk. αὐτὸς δὲ εἰδὼς αὐτῶν τὰ διανοήματα; Mar 4:11, Mt. Lk. insert γνῶναι (see above, § iii. 4 (h)); Mar 4:31, Mt. Lk. insert δν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος; Mar 5:27 ἤψατο τοῦ ἰματίου αὐτοῦ, Mt. Lk. insert τοῦ κρασπέδου. The other chapters give similar results; e.g. Mar 14:65, Mt. Lk. insert τίς ἐστὶν ὁ παῖσας σε; Mar 14:72, Mt. and (?) Lk. insert καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἔκλαυσεν πικρῶς (but see § iii. 4 (h) above). These changes, or most of them, could not, as Sanday (*loc. cit.*) points out, have been accidental. The same cannot be said of the great majority of the instances often quoted of supposed agreement of Mt.-Lk. against Mk.; most of them are so minute and unimportant that they do not argue any common bond between the First and Third Evangelists except common sense.

Now, the argument which we are considering suggests that these inserted phrases were originally in Mk., but were omitted or altered by a later editor. Is this in the least probable? There is no reason that we can conceive why they should have been omitted or altered. In some cases it is most improbable that anything of the kind should have happened, for it would mean the introduction by a later editor of harsh or difficult phrases not found in Mt. or Lk. (see § iii. 4 (h) above). On the other hand, the theory that the non-Markan source or sources used by Matthew and Luke contained narrative as well as discourses has all the marks of probability, to put the matter at the lowest. See, for example, the non-Markan paragraphs collected in the second division of Wright's *Synopsis*, which contains the narratives of the Temptation and of the Baptist's preaching; and there are many others. If this be the case, the result is exactly what we should expect. Matthew and Luke sometimes follow Mark rather than the non-Markan source; sometimes one follows the one and the other the other; and sometimes both follow the non-Markan source. Probably no one would have thought otherwise but for presuppositions founded on the *λόγια* sentence of Papias.

But Schmiedel (*loc. cit.*) finds in certain passages indications of our Mk. being 'secondary to Mt. and Luke. Such are Mar 3:28 πάντα ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, where || Mat 12:31 f. has ἀνθρώποις, but goes on to say: 'Whosoever shall speak a word against *the Son of Man*, it shall be forgiven him.' The supposition is that the editor of our Mk. did not like this latter phrase, which had been common to Mt. and the original Mk., and omitted it, but kept the words 'Son of Man' by altering the ἀνθρώποις of Mt. to τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. It seems much more probable that Matthew got the additional sentence from the non-Markan source; and Mark's 'sons of men' as equivalent to 'men,' a common Semitic idiom, is on a par with his other Aramaisms (see § vi. above). In Mar 7:27 occurs a phrase, 'Let the children first be

filled,' which is not in Mt., and is thought by Schmiedel to be an insertion in our Mk., showing 'some aversion to Jewish particularism,' as toning down our Lord's answer. Yet Mat_8:11 shows much more 'aversion.' In Mar_9:1 the phrase 'the kingdom of God come (ἐληλυθυῖαν) in (with) power' is thought to be a correction of 'the Son of man coming (ἐρχόμενον) in his kingdom,' Mat_16:28, as postponing the Parousia, which the result showed to be not so near as was at first believed. Here Luke (Mar_9:27) has 'the kingdom of God' simply, which at least shows no priority to Mark. It is much more likely that 'the kingdom of God,' with or without the addition 'come in (with) power,' was our Lord's own phrase, and that Matthew, as is his wont, gives the explanation, no doubt prompted by the belief of the first age that Jesus would return in the lifetime of those 'standing here' (see Sanday in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. 635). The awkward turn of the wording in Mar_9:12, used above (§ iii. 4 (h)) as an indication of Mk.'s priority, Matthew smoothing down an awkward phrase, is held by Schmiedel to show our Mk.'s 'secondary' character; he thinks that our Mk. has introduced a 'sense-destroying parenthesis'—surely a very strange thing for an *editor* to do, whatever an original author might have done. In Mar_11:25 we find ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (where || Mt. has ὁ π. ὑ. ὁ οὐράνιος), the only Markan instance (perhaps Mar_11:26 of Textus Receptus is an interpolation) of an express characteristic of Mt., and it is thought to be an editorial addition. This argument, however, would necessitate the supposition that the first clause of the Lord's Prayer, as given in Mt., was an invention of the First Evangelist, which is very unlikely. It is true that the shorter or Lukan form shows much of Luke's style, and some of the differences between it and the Matthaean form seem to be due to Luke himself (see Plummer on Luk_11:1), the Matthaean form being probably nearer the original; and Dr. Chase supposes that the first Christians adapted the prayer for liturgical use (*TS [Note: 5 Texts and Studies.]*, Camb., i. 3). But it is quite unnecessary to suppose that the phrase 'Our Father which art in heaven' was first found in Matthew. From Mark's account of the Wicked Husbandmen (Mar_12:2 ff.), where one messenger is mentioned on each occasion, and then, 'in a quite unnecessary and even disturbing manner,' many others, Schmiedel argues the priority of Mt., where several servants are sent on each occasion. It is hard to see any force in this. Matthew is as likely to have corrected Mark (if it be a correction) as our Mk. to have introduced a gratuitous inconsistency (if it be an inconsistency) under the influence of Matthew. In the discourse on the Coming of the Son of Man, after the account of the afflictions, Mar_13:24 has: 'In those days, after that tribulation, the sun shall be darkened,' while || Mt. has 'immediately after,' etc. This is said to show the posteriority of a supposed Markan editor who desires to postpone the Parousia, as in the case of Mar_9:1 (above); but as there, so here, it is more probable that Matthew's εὐθέως is

an explanation, and Mark's ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις is our Lord's own phrase, or nearly so.

Thus, although there is nothing in the nature of things why our Second Gospel should not be an edited form of the original document that lay before Matthew and Luke, the reasons alleged by Schmiedel will hardly convince us that this is the case. Salmon's argument really depends on the view taken of the last twelve verses (see above, § vi.). If on other grounds we believe them to be by the writer who put our Second Gospel into its present shape, then we may accept his theory; but if otherwise, the theory falls.

If, however, we were to accept the hypothesis of a later editor, it would be of interest to trace the portions due to him. We may put aside Dr. Salmon's suggestion (see above) of Mar_1:1-15, Mar_3:5, Mar_6:6; Mar_6:52, Mar_16:9 ff. unless we accept the appendix as a real ending to the Gospel. But we might hold that several paragraphs peculiar to Mk. are due to this supposed editor; such as Mar_3:19 b, Mar_3:20-21 (accusation of madness by Jesus' friends: though here we might equally hold that the omission in Mt. and Lk. is due to the same feeling as in § iii. 3 above), Mar_4:26-29 (the seed growing secretly), Mar_7:3 f. (explanation about washings), Mar_7:32-37 (the healing of the deaf *μογιλάλος*), Mar_8:22-26 (the blind man of Bethsaida), Mar_14:51 f. (the young man who fled naked), Mar_15:21 (the names Alexander and Rufus). It might also be thought that the Aramaisms and Latinisms were due to such an editor (but see above, §§ iii. 4 (f), (g), v.). These are points which are peculiar to our Gospel.

But a consideration which militates against such a large amount of editing is that our Mk. retains at once the original roughness and the original freshness of style. If the canonical Mk. is later than and influenced by Mt. and Lk., why did not its editor correct the mistakes and prune the vulgarisms and roughnesses as did Matthew and Luke? While, however, this seems to forbid the idea of any large amount of editing, it is certainly possible that a later editor has introduced a few phrases. Sir J. Hawkins (*Hor. Synopt.* p. 110) suggests the following as additions: Mar_1:1 Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [also υἱοῦ Θεοῦ?], Mar_5:13 ὡς δισχίλιοι, Mar_6:37 δηναρίων διακοσίων, Mar_8:35 καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, Mar_9:41 ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστέ (but see above, § iii. 4 (h)), Mar_10:29 καὶ ἔνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, Mar_10:30 μετὰ διωγμῶν, Mar_14:5 ἐπάνω δηναρίων τριακοσίων, Mar_14:56 καὶ ἴσαι αἱ μαρτυρίαι οὐκ ἦσαν, and so in Mar_14:59. But even this hypothesis is not necessary; and on the whole the more probable solution seems to be that our Second Gospel is that which was used by the First and Third Evangelists; in fact, that Mark wrote first of all the Four, and that his work was known to the others.

Literature.—*Commentaries*: (1) On St. Mark specially: those by Swete, 1902 (the fullest Commentary in English, with text, apparatus criticus, introduction, and notes); A. Menzies, (*The Earliest Gospel*), 1901; A. B. Bruce, 1897; Could, 1896 (in the *International Critical Commentary* series); J. Knabenbauer, 1894; P. Schanz, 1881; J. Morison, 1873; B. Weiss, 1872; A. Klostermann, 1867; J. A. Alexander, 1858; K. Fritzsche, 1830; and several smaller ones on a popular scale. (2) As part of general Commentaries on the NT, those by Alford (1st ed. 1849); Chr. Wordsworth, Davidson, Cook (in *Speaker's Commentary*), 1878; Lange (1st ed. 1858). (3) Old Commentaries, by 'Victor of Antioch' (in Cramer's *Catenæ*, 1840); Bede (Migne, P. L.), Theophylact (Migne, P. G.), Euthymius Zigabenus (Migne, P. G.), Bruno Astensis (Migne, P. L.), Rupertus Tuitiensis (Migne, P. L.), Thomas Aquinas (*Catena Aurea*, authorship not certain), Albertus Magnus, Dionysius Carthusianus, Faber Stapulensis, Erasmus, Maldonatus, Cornelius a Lapide. [For information about these, see Swete's *St. Mark*, p. cxiv ff.]

Relation of Mk. to the Synoptic problem: Wright's *Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek* (1st ed. 1896, 2nd, 1903; supports the Oral Theory; the first edition for mere purposes of comparison is the more useful as being simpler); Huck's *Synopse*; Rushbrooke's *Synopticon*, 1880; Wright's *Some NT Problems*; Campbell's *First Three Gospels in Greek*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1899 (supports priority of Mt. and Lk. over Mk.); F. H. Woods in *Studia Biblica*, vol. ii. ('Mk. the groundwork of Mt. and Lk. '); Sir J. Hawkins' *Horæ Synopticæ*, 1899 (esp. part iii.); Salmond, art. 'Mark (Gospel of)' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ; Schiniedel, art. 'Gospels' in *Encyc. Biblica*; Salmon's *Historical Introduction to the NT*; Westcott, *Canon of the NT and Introduction to the Study of the Four Gospels*; J. A. Robinson's *Study of the Gospels*, 1903; A. B. Bruce's *The Synoptic Gospels*; Vincent Rose, O. P., *Studies on the Gospels* (English translation 1903, by Dr. Rob. Fraser); Zahn, *Einleit. in das NT and Geschichte des NT Kanons*; Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, 1906.

The Second Gospel in the Early Church: J. B. Lightfoot's *Essays on the Work entitled Supernatural Religion* (collected in one volume, 1889); Sanday's *The Gospels in the Second Century*, 1876; Stanton's *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, part i. 1903 (the rest not yet published); and most of the above works on 'Introduction.'

The endings of the Gospel: The modern Commentaries, as above; Burgon's *The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel according to St. Mark*; Salmon's *Introd. Lect. ix.*; Zahn's *Einleit. ii. 227*, and *Geschichte, ii. 910 ff.*; Harnack's *Bruch-stücke des Evangeliums und der Apokalypse des Petrus*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 33 (*Text. u. Unt. ix. 2*); Westcott-Hort, *New Testament in Greek*, Notes on Select Passages; Scrivener's *Introduction to the Criticism of the NT*.

On special points: Blass's *Philology of the Gospels* (original language, and the text); Deissmann's *Bible Studies*, English translation 1901 (the language); Dalman's *Words of Jesus*, English translation 1902 (esp. on the Aramaisms); Westcott-Hort's *New Testament in Greek*, as above, and Salmon's *Textual Criticism* (the Greek text); Burkitt's *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, 2 vols. 1904 (the Sinaitic Syriac text); Pusey-Gwilliam's *Tetracuangelium Sanctum*, 1901 (the Peshitta Syriac text); also many articles in the *Expositor* and the *JThSt.* [*Note: Journal of Theological Studies.*] Of the latter may be mentioned: i. 278, Burkitt on Mar_15:34; i. 290, Lake on the text of Codex ψ ; ii. 1, Stanton on pseudo-Peter and its bearing on Justin and Mk.; ii. 111, Burkitt on Mar_8:32; ii. 298, Allen on Aramaic Gospels; v. 321, Sanday on our Lord's 'silence,' esp. in Mk.; v. 330 and vi. 121, Burkitt and Bartlet on Mk. in the Early Church; v. 451, Burkitt on Mar_14:61; v. 628, Burkitt on 'St. Mark and Divorce' (cf. v. 621, Lyttelton on 'Divorce'); vi. 237, Jackson on Mar_10:40; vi. 563, Chapman on Irenaeus and the date of Mt. and Mark.

A. J. Maclean.

☞ Market, Market-Place

MARKET, MARKET-PLACE (ἀγορά)

1. Locality and appearance.—The landscape of Palestine was characterized by the number of its villages and the absence of isolated dwelling-houses on the cultivated lands. This was due to the joint ownership and tillage of the village fields and to the importance of living together for common safety. The Oriental always lived in the midst of neighbours (Luk_15:6; Luk_15:9), and sought his home in 'a city of habitation' (Psa_107:36). The Palestine village had a path of communication leading through it to other villages, and this thoroughfare, or the widest and most central part of it, became the market-place. A few small shops opened upon the roadway representing the simple village traffic in food and clothing, and the manual skill of the carpenter and the blacksmith. In the larger towns the single shop of a kind became a street, row, or enclosed square devoted to the manufacture and sale of particular articles, each being thus known as the fruit-market, the shoe-makers' street, or the *khan* of the silver-smiths (Jer_37:21, Joh_5:2).

2. Uses and associations.—Beside the fountain or large tree of the market-place to which the village often owed its name and choice of locality, muleteers and other travellers rested their baggage animals, and told of what had happened by the way. There the elders of the village could be met with (Act_16:19-20), and the children

naturally collected and played where there was most to be seen and heard (Luk 7:32). In the market-place, day-labourers gathered at dawn from different quarters and waited to be engaged (Mat 20:3). There men met and greetings were exchanged, a scale of distinction being carefully observed, from the recognition accorded to equals and neighbours up to the salutation offered to those whom it was prudent or becoming to hold in honour on account of seniority, family connexion, worldly prosperity, or religious position (Mat 23:7, Luk 11:43). On account of the coming and going of strangers and the importation of foreign wares, the Pharisee washed his hands on returning from the market, as he might have unavoidably or inadvertently touched something that was classified as defiling, or that had itself previously come into contact with what imparted such ceremonial defilement (Mar 7:4).

3. In Gentile towns.—Under the Graeco-Roman influences the market-place of an Oriental city became a broad paved way, with a colonnade on each side marking off two side-walks for foot-passengers. Such was the agora of Ephesus (Act 16:19; Act 17:17), leading in a direct line, with branching side streets of the ordinary kind, from the canal quay to the amphitheatre at the other end. The street called ‘Straight’ (Act 9:11) in Damascus was thus laid out. In Rome, the Forum was a similar localizing of trade and municipal business.

G. M. Mackie.

☩ Marks Of Jesus

MARKS OF JESUS.—See Stigmata.

☩ Marriage (I.)

MARRIAGE (I.)

1. Oriental estimate of marriage.—Of the three great events in family life—birth, marriage and death—that of marriage was rendered important by the amount of consideration devoted to the choice of son-in-law or daughter-in-law, to the settlement of the customary financial conditions, and to the arrangements connected with the wedding festivities. It was recognized as a step leading to grave consequences, for, in the case of a daughter, if the marriage should prove unsatisfactory, she would likely return to her former home discredited and unhappy,

and there would be a feeling of irritation and injustice between the families concerned. An almost equal anxiety attended the arrival of the young wife to live with her husband's parents, and to perform her duties under the often exacting superintendence of her mother-in-law. In a decision thus affecting the whole circle of relatives, it was considered natural and inevitable that both the selection of the individual and the settlement of all financial matters should be decided by the parents and guardians of those about to be married. The impulsive self-will of Esau which showed itself in the contempt of his birthright, led him to set aside the above tradition by marrying two of the daughters of Heth (Gen 26:34; Gen 26:33; Gen 27:46). Woman was not thought of as having a personal existence at her own disposal, but as a unit in the family, and under the protection and authority of her male relatives. In marriage she was practically the purchased possession of her husband, becoming *bèûlah* to him as her *ba'al*, or owner and master.

2. Betrothal.—This was a binding transaction declaring the fact of prospective marriage, and specifying the terms agreed upon by the contracting parties, that is, by those acting on their behalf. Although in both families the intention of marriage might have been decided upon by the parents from the infancy of their children, yet the formality of betrothal was not proceeded with until marriage could be regarded as a possibility in the near future. On the one hand, it was undesirable to make gifts or pay an instalment in a compact that might never be implemented by marriage, and, on the other hand, it was equally undesirable to dedicate a daughter to one who might not live to undertake her support, and thus cause her to be regarded as a widow. During a prolonged interval the man might move to another part of the land or fail to carry out the betrothal stipulations, and then the intended bride would require to get a writing of divorce or separation before she could be betrothed or married to another. While the act of betrothal by the presence of witnesses and the assemblage of friends had the importance of a ceremonial function, yet the spirit of bargaining was generally so keenly aroused, and the process of compromise so protracted and complex, that the situation scarcely admitted of immediate marriage rejoicings. Besides, it frequently happened that an interval of time was needed in order that the bridegroom might render the stipulated service, or acquire the sum of money agreed upon as the present to be given to the father and brothers of the bride. Thus there was usually an interval of a year or two, or it might be of several years, between the betrothal and the celebration of marriage.

3. Ceremony of marriage.—As a welcome sequel following in due time upon the discussion and settlement of the marriage portion and similar matters, the wedding itself was always an occasion of joyful festivity and congratulation.

(a) *Place.*—While in ancient times the marriage doubtless took place occasionally in the home of the bride, yet the fact that the bridegroom came to claim one who had

become his by the fulfilment of assigned conditions, and further, the widespread tradition of forcible opposition to her removal from her people, point to the greater frequency of marriage in the house of the bridegroom's parents. Thither the bride was conducted by a company of friends, carrying also her personal outfit and household belongings. If her people were of the peasant class, and she was merely passing to a neighbouring village, she would be already in her bridal dress and seated upon a led horse or mule, while in front of the procession young men and maidens individually engaged in sword-play and dancing. In the larger villages, such as Bethlehem and Nazareth, the robing of the bride was more elaborate, and was carried out by the help of women after her arrival at the new home. On that day, the bridegroom, instead of following the primitive custom of going to claim his bride or to meet her procession on the way, remained absent from the house with his relatives or friends until all preparations had been fully made.

(b) *Time.*—The marriage generally took place in the evening, so that those coming from a distance might not fail to arrive, and those who were occupied during the day might have liberty to attend. During the evening, as he sat among his friends, the bridegroom, in the exercise of his prerogative as the chief person concerned, signified his desire to move homewards. Upon this the wedding procession was formed. Lanterns and torches were lit to guide him and his companions through the dark, silent streets. Those who were waiting to see the procession pass raised the peculiar Oriental cry of marriage festivity, and thus, as the cry was taken up, the fact of his approach was known along the path in front of him up to the house in which the bride and her attendants were waiting. Owing to the stillness of the air and the slow pace of the illuminated procession, the cry might be heard half an hour before the arrival of the bridegroom. Then those who had merely come to do honour by joining in the procession returned to their houses, and the relatives and invited guests passed in to the wedding ceremony and festivity. These rejoicings were maintained for several days or even a week, according to the worldly circumstances of the family.

Many of these marriage customs are alluded to by Christ in His teaching, as the subject was familiar to His hearers, and any parabolic lessons deduced from it would be easily understood. Thus the bridegroom could excuse himself for not attending the wedding of another, seeing that his own invited guests were returning to pay visits of congratulation and good-will, and would feel offended if they found him absent (Luk 14:20). It was a privilege and honour to the guest to be invited to the wedding feast, and an affront to those who invited him if he failed to attend (Mat 22:3; Mat 22:9). It was late when the wedding guest returned to his own house (Luk 12:36). It was for the bridegroom to tarry until he was pleased to appoint the hour of his coming (Mat 24:42; Mat 25:6; Mat 25:13). The reference to marrying and giving in marriage, with the Flood at the door, exemplified that pre-occupation of the mind with worldly interests and ambitions by which men forget the transitoriness of life

and the precariousness of its possessions. One of the marks of the new Kingdom was to be its power of carrying disruption into the closest and strongest family relationships at the call of loyalty to its larger and higher citizenship (Mat 10:35-37; Mat 12:46-49). With such a background of tradition and custom Christ gave to marriage the support of His own presence, and spoke of its Divine origin and temporary nature (Joh 2:2, Mat 19:4-6; Mat 22:30). In the Epistles it is evident that the higher conception of marriage prevalent among the Jews was gravely endangered by the inherited views still familiar to the mind, though condemned by the conscience, in the Gentile membership of the Church (1 Corinthians 7). The marriage relationship was used to typify the intimate vital affinity between Christ and the Church (Eph 5:22-33). In Rev 21:2 the comparison of the New Jerusalem to an Oriental bride adorned for her husband, appropriately sets forth the protracted development and perfected beauty of the Kingdom of God.

The bridegroom's friend (Joh 3:29) must be distinguished from 'the children of the bride-chamber' (Mat 9:15), who were simply the invited guests. In Judaea there were two such 'friends,' one acting for the bridegroom, the other for the bride. They conducted all the preliminary inquiries, made the bargains as to dowry, etc., arranged the betrothal, and finally led the betrothed couple to the bride-chamber. They were responsible for the legality of the whole proceedings, and were guarantors of the bride's virgin chastity. The bridegroom's voice, in converse with the bride, assured them pleasantly that their work had been successful. The discharge of the 'friend's' functions was liable to gross abuses (see Mishnic tractate *Middoth*). There was no corresponding functionary in Galilee, and so there is no allusion to him in the account of the marriage at Cana. Similar offices are discharged by the friends of would-be bridegrooms in Palestine to-day. An ardent suitor once sent to the present writer a sum of £40, with the request that it be given to a friend, on condition that he should secure the goodwill of a certain maiden, and the consent of her parents to his suit.

The bride-chamber is probably = Heb. *heder*, 'the nuptial chamber' (Jdg 15:1), in which stood the *huppah*, the bridal 'bed with a canopy' (Joe 2:16; Gesenius, s.v.). In all the lands of their dispersion the Jews still apply this name, *huppah*, to the richly embroidered canopy under which the contracting parties stand during the marriage ceremony.

G. M. Mackie and W. Ewing.

MARRIAGE (II.).—Jesus does not treat of the family from the point of view of the sociologist, but from that of the teacher of religion and morals. The high estimate which He places upon it is to be seen, not alone in His regard for His mother, but more particularly from His use of the institution as His most characteristic analogy for the Kingdom of God. As far as the condition of its future members in the present evil age is concerned, He describes the Kingdom as a social order in which the relationship of men to God is analogous to that of sons to a father; and their relation to each other, therefore, is like that existing between brothers. Jesus also frequently uses figures drawn from marriage customs to illustrate His teaching concerning the coming of the Kingdom. It would be a mistake to see in this use of the paternal and filial relations a survival of that primitive religious concept which made members of a clan the sons of its gods. The usage of Jesus contains no reflexion of such a primitive thought, but rather springs from His high appreciation of marriage as it existed in the conventionalized civilization of the Jews of His day.

1. As an institution Jesus regards marriage as *essentially physical, and intended only for the present age*. Those who were to share in the blessings of the eschatological Kingdom would neither marry nor be given in marriage, but would be possessed of the non-physical body in the resurrection (Mat 22:23-30, Mar 12:18-25, Luk 20:27-36). His teaching at this point is not an endorsement of the view that immortality is to be without personal relations, but is rather a relegation of physical relations to physical conditions.

The Sadducees, in their query which gave rise to this teaching of Jesus, raised the question of the levirate marriage. Jesus' answer does not touch upon that peculiar institution, but deals rather with the nature of marriage itself. He was no social reformer. In all the records of His teaching there is nothing to indicate that He gave to marriage any new social content or custom. Like His Apostles after Him, Jesus accepted marriage as an existing institution which gave rise to practical moral questions. His use of the customs of the time (cf. Mat 22:2 ff., Joh 2:1 ff.) was for the purpose of illustration rather than in the way of either approval or disapproval. It follows that Jesus did not look upon marriage as psychical or spiritual. Such transcendental teaching is foreign to the practical temper of Christianity. In its place is the assumption that the family, like all other members of social life, comes within the region of the great commandment of love. Jesus assumes that the father loves the child, and that brothers love each other. Farther than this His discussions do not go, but the inference is imperative that the relations between husband and wife fall within the great teaching of Mat 5:44-48 quite as truly as other social relations of individuals. If quarrelsome brothers are to be reconciled, most assuredly should there be reconciliation between husband and wife.

2. Marriage as a social institution Jesus regards as *of Divine origin*. It is one of the primal facts of humanity, established by God before the giving of the Law (Mat 19:5-6, Mar 10:6-8). Jesus grants that because of the exigencies of social development Moses modified the institution to the extent of permitting and regulating divorce; but such modification Jesus evidently regarded as out of harmony with the institution. According to the original Divine purpose, man and wife were no longer two persons but one flesh. That is, marriage was to be monogamous. Any form of polygamy is thus excluded from His ideal.

It is noteworthy that Jesus in His quotation of Gen 2:24 does not follow the Heb. reading, in which *οἱ δύο* of the LXX Septuagint has no equivalent. Polygamy is not excluded by the Hebrew, but is obviously inconsistent with the LXX Septuagint statement, and even more so with the inference drawn from the passage by Jesus. It is from this point of view that one must approach the subject of divorce. (See Divorce).

3. Jesus, however, *does not make marriage a supreme good*. Rather is it one of those great goods of an imperfect age which are to be subordinated to the supreme good of sharing in the Kingdom of God, *i.e.* eternal life. Yet at no point is the sanity of His teaching more in evidence than here. He Himself was unmarried, but He never counsels celibacy. He does not even take the mediating position of St. Paul (1Co 7:7; 1Co 7:29; 1Co 7:32-40). In this particular, as in so many others, He is in such opposition to the Essenes of His day as quite to overbalance any of those superficial resemblances which have been discovered between His teaching and the ascetic doctrines of that sect. At the same time, just because marriage, though a good, is one which must pass with the present age, He teaches that in some cases it must be avoided. Mat 19:12 speaks of those who have made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the Kingdom of heaven, *i.e.* who, because of exceptional circumstances, have become celibates. In certain other expressions He distinctly recognizes the necessity for some among His followers to leave their families in the interests of a devotion to His cause (Mat 18:25, Luk 14:26). These sayings, however, are not to be interpreted as in any way a prohibition of marriage, or as an elevation of the unmarried state to a plane superior to that of marriage. To draw such an inference is to misinterpret the entire tendency of His teaching, and to elevate into a controlling position His recognition of exceptional and particularly difficult situations in which one is compelled to practise a supreme self-sacrifice in order to remain loyal to a supreme ideal. The sayings are to be interpreted in accordance with those others in which Jesus concedes the fact that the family circle is not proof against evil influences—sayings which aroused hostility against His followers (Mat 10:34 ff., Luk 12:49-53).

The Early Church under the influence of extra-Christian ideals moved along the line suggested by St. Paul towards the approval of the highest state of celibacy. Rev_14:4 gives the highest honours to those men who have not been married. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iii. 9. 63) refers to the unauthentic saying of Jesus preserved in the Gospel of the Egyptians, 'I came to destroy the works of the female.' Similarly Clement (*ib.* 16) reports Jesus as having said, 'Eat every herb, but that which hath bitterness (*i.e.* maternity) eat not.'

A consideration of this teaching of Jesus leads naturally, therefore, to the genuinely Christian conception of marriage as a relationship which, though in the very nature of the case limited to the physical mode of existence, is yet sacred. The ascetic ideal is thus utterly lacking here as in all the teaching of Jesus, and in its place is to be found all that is normal in the so-called Greek ideal of life, together with the ennobling Christian ideal of love. See, further, Adultery, Celibacy, Divorce.

Literature.—Westcott, *Social Aspects of Christianity*; Mathews, *Social Teaching of Jesus*, ch. iv.; Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*, ch. iii.; M. J. Savage, *Jesus and Mod. Life*, p. 162; W. Cunningham, *The Path towards Knowledge*, p. 1; cf. also the standard treatises on the teaching of Jesus.

Shailer Mathews.

☞ Martha

MARTHA (of Bethany, sister of Lazarus and Mary).—The name (מרת) 'mistress' or 'lady'), though unique in the Scriptures, is common in the Talmud.* [Note: See Lightfoot on Joh_11:1.] She appears in the Gospel-story on three occasions: (1) when she entertained Jesus on His way to Jerusalem at the season of the Feast of Tabernacles (Luk_10:38-42); (2) when Lazarus died and was revived by Jesus (Joh_11:1-46); and (3) when Jesus, on His way to the Passover from His retreat at Ephraim (Joh_11:54), was honoured with a public entertainment at Bethany in the house of a leading man named Simon the Leper (Joh_12:1-11 = Mat_26:6-13 = Mar_14:3-9). Being a notable housewife, Martha was entrusted with the management of the banquet. See Anointing, I. 2.

The idea that the scene of this entertainment was Martha's house has given rise to the unfortunate surmise that Martha was a widow, Simon the Leper being her deceased husband. On the supposition that *Κυρία* in 2Jn_1:1; 2Jn_1:5 is a proper name, the Greek equivalent of *Martha*, 'lady' (Volmar), it has been surmised that St.

John's 2nd Epistle is addressed to our Martha. This is ingenious but untenable, since (1) 'the elect Kyria' would be, not ἐκλεκτῆ Κυρία (v. 1), but Κυρία τῆ ἐκλεκτῆ (cf. 3Jn 1:1); (2) the Epistle is probably addressed metaphorically to a church and not to an individual.

Martha and Mary exhibit a peculiarity frequently observable in families. They were, like the brothers Jacob and Esau, utterly diverse in disposition and temperament. While Mary was impassioned and imaginative, Martha was unemotional and practical.† [Note: Zig. on Luk 10:42 δύο μερίδες πολιτείας ἐπαινεταί, ἡ μὲν προακτικὴ ἡ δὲ θεωρητικὴ.] When Jesus visited her house at the season of the Feast of Tabernacles, He found her busy preparing the festal cheer (see Mary, No. 3). His arrival redoubled her housewifely solicitude, and it angered her when she saw her sister seated at His feet and listening to His discourse, leaving to her unaided hands the offices of hospitality. And when Jesus came to Bethany in tardy response to the sisters' appeal, 'Lord, behold, he whom thou lovest is sick,' Mary was in the darkened home overwhelmed with grief, but Martha had repressed her emotion, and, when word was brought her that Jesus had been sighted making His toilsome approach by the Ascent of Blood, the steep and robber-haunted road up the eastern slope of Olivet, she went out and met Him ere He entered the village. She greeted Him calmly, not without upbraiding for His delay; and when He assured her that her brother would rise again, she took His words in her matter-of-fact way as a reference to the current doctrine of the resurrection of the righteous at the last day, seeing in them merely a commonplace of pious consolation. Very different was her sister's behaviour. When Martha returned home and told her that the Master had arrived and was calling for her, she sprang up and ran to Him, and, in a passion of love and sorrow, flung herself at His feet.

It were, however, unjust to disparage Martha. She was of a practical turn, but she was very far from stupid. She was mistress of the house, and she was as a mother to her unworldly sister. There was evidently a close sympathy between them. During the dark days which succeeded their brother's death, they had been each other's comforters and had unbosomed their grief one to the other. Their constant plaint had been, 'Had the Lord been here, our brother had not died'; and this was the cry of each in turn when they met Jesus (Joh 11:21; Joh 11:32). Martha was calm and self-possessed, but a great tenderness was concealed beneath her unemotional exterior. She wept less than Mary, but she mourned as deeply. Nor was she lacking in love and reverence for Jesus. Her impatience of Mary's inactivity amid the bustle of preparing the meal was due less to resentment at being left alone to serve, than to anxiety that nothing should be wanting for the comfort of the dear Master. And she believed in His power to help even when Lazarus had been dead four days (Joh 11:22). She lacked some qualities which Mary possessed, but she had others of

her own, and Jesus appreciated the excellence of her character. He loved Martha no less than her sister and Lazarus (Joh_11:5).

It is no slight attestation of the historicity of the Lukan and Johannine narratives of the family of Bethany that they faithfully accord in their delineations of the two sisters. On the pages of St. John each sustains the character which she exhibits in the little scene so exquisitely depicted by St. Luke. Here are no imaginary pictures, but portraiture of real personages.

St. John says that the village where Martha and her sister dwelt was Bethany; but St. Luke does not name it, and he has been charged with placing the incident of the meal in Martha's house in Galilee. This idea, however, arises from a misconception of his literary method. Like the other Synoptists, St. Luke was not an original author but an editor of the Evangelic Tradition, and his aim was not chronological accuracy but the exhibition of Jesus. He sifted the ample material at his disposal, and arranged his selections topically rather than historically. Thus at Luk_9:49-50, recounting what befell in Galilee, he records the Lord's rebuke of His disciples' mistaken zeal; then, finding another incident which teaches a like lesson (Luk_9:51-56), he inserts it in this connexion, though it belongs to the last journey to Jerusalem (cf. Luk_9:51). Having begun this section of the Tradition, he continues it, giving various other incidents of the journey, down to the close of ch. 12. Then he returns to what befell in Galilee, resuming the narrative of the journey to Jerusalem at Luk_17:11.

David Smith.

☩ Mary

MARY

1. Mary the mother of James the Little and Joses, one of the women who followed Jesus from Galilee, stood beside the cross, watched the burial, and visited the sepulchre on the Resurrection morning (Mat_27:55-56 = Mar_15:40-41, Mat_27:61 = Mar_15:47, Mar_16:1 = Mat_28:1 = Luk_24:10). From Joh_19:25 it appears that she was wife to Clopas. This name is distinct from Cleopas (Luk_24:18), and is perhaps identical with Alphaens, both representing תלפאי. Cf. J. B. Lightfoot, *Gal.* p. 256. WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] write Ἀλφαῖος (see *NT*, vol. ii. § 408). If this identification be allowed, then (1) James the Little was probably one of the Twelve (Mat_10:3 = Mar_3:18 = Luk_16:15); (2) he was perhaps brother to Levi (Matthew), the son of Alphaeus. The latter inference is favoured by (a) the *v.l.* Ἰάκωβον for Δευεῖν in

Mar_2:14; (b) the tradition that James, like Matthew, had been a tax-gatherer (Chrysost. *in Matth.* xxxiii.: δύο τελῶναι, Ματθαῖος καὶ Ἰάκωβος; Euth. Zig.: Ματθαῖος δὲ καὶ Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφραίου, τελῶναι). See artt. Alphaeus and Clopas.

Hegesippus (in Eus. *Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 11. 32, iv. 22) mentions a Clopas who was brother to Joseph, our Lord's foster-father; but there is no evidence that he was identical with this Clopas. Jerome, in support of his theory of 'the Brethren of Jesus,' construes Μαριάμ ἡ τοῦ Κλωτᾶ in Joh_19:25 as in opposition to ἡ ἀδελφὴ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ, thus reducing the number of the women by the Cross to three, and making 'Mary the [wife] of Clopas' the Virgin's sister. See J. B. Lightfoot, *Gal.* p. 255 ff. But (1) it is improbable that two sisters bore the same name, and (2) 'the sister of his mother' was apparently Salome, the mother of the sons of Zebedee (cf. Mar_15:40 = Mat_27:56).

2. Mary Magdalene.—She is first mentioned (Luk_8:2) as one of a company of women who attended Jesus on His second mission through Galilee in the course of the second year of His ministry. She is distinguished by two significant epithets: (1) 'the Magdalene,' *i.e.* the woman of Magdala (*Mejdel*), a town on the Lake of Galilee, some 3 miles from Capernaum, at the southern end of the Plain of Gennesaret. The modern Mejdel is a miserable village, but the ancient Magdala was a wealthy place, one of three cities, according to the Talmud, whose tribute had to be conveyed in waggons to Jerusalem (cf. Lightfoot on Joh_12:3). It had, however, an evil reputation, and was destroyed, according to the same authority, for harlotry, so that 'Mary the Magdalene' might be equivalent to 'Mary the harlot' (cf. 'Corinthian Lais'). It is only fair, however, to add that many regard this as very precarious.

(2) 'From whom seven demons had gone forth.' In Jewish parlance, immorality was a form of demonic possession,* [Note: Lightfoot on Luk_8:2. Cf. Jer. Vit. Hil. Erem.: a virgo Dei at Majumas possessed by amoris dæmon.] and, just as the grace of the Holy Spirit is called 'sevenfold,'† [Note: Od. Clun. Hymn. de S. Mar. Magdal.:

'Qui septem purgat vitia

Per septiformem gratiam.'] so sevenfold possession might signify complete abandonment to the dominion of unclean passion. Cf. Mat_12:45 = Luk_11:26. It is possible that Mary had been a harlot, that Jesus had rescued her from her life of shame, and that she followed Him out of gratitude. She was one of the devoted women who stood by the cross (Joh_19:25, Mat_27:56 = Mar_15:40), watched His burial (Mat_27:61 = Mar_15:47), and came on the Resurrection morning to the sepulchre (Joh_20:1 = Mat_28:1 = Mar_16:1 = Luk_24:10). Finding it empty, she

waited beside it weeping, and was rewarded with the first vision of the risen Lord (Joh 20:11-18, cf. Mat 28:9-10).

3. Mary of Bethany.—She is first introduced by St. Luke (Luk 10:38-42), who tells how Jesus, probably on His way to the Feast of Tabernacles (Joh 7:2; Joh 7:10) in the third year of His ministry, reached ‘a certain village,’ and was hospitably received by ‘a certain woman by name Martha,’ who had a sister called Mary. The Feast of Tabernacles was a season of feasting and friendship. ‘They ate the fat and drank the sweet, and sent portions unto them for whom nothing was prepared, and made great mirth’ (Exo 23:16, Lev 23:33-44, Num 29:12-38, Neh 8:9-18). Martha, a good housewife, was busy making ready the festal cheer; but Mary, oblivious of all save the Lord’s presence, seated herself, in the posture of a disciple (cf. Act 22:3), at His feet and listened to His discourse. Martha, ‘distracted about much service,’ interposed: ‘Lord, dost thou not care that my sister left me alone to serve? Tell her then to lend me a helping hand.’ ‘Martha, Martha,’ He answered, gently protesting against the sumptuousness of His hostess’s preparations, ‘thou art anxious and troubled about many things, but a few are all we need; or rather,’ He added, ‘only one thing;‡ [Note: ⋈BL, WH ὀλίγων δὲ ἐστὶν χρεῖα ἢ ἑνός.] for it is the good “portion” that Mary chose, one which shall not be taken away from her.’ At that season, when they were all feasting and sending ‘portions,’ Mary was thinking not of the meat that perisheth, but of that which endureth unto eternal life.

St. Luke does not name the village where Martha and Mary dwelt. St. John tells us that it was Bethany, and that they had a brother named Lazarus (Joh 11:1-46). Some months later, when Jesus was at the other Bethany beyond Jordan, whither He had retired from Jerusalem to escape the fury of the rulers (Joh 10:40; cf. Joh 1:28 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), Lazarus fell sick, and his sisters sent Jesus word. For two days after He heard the news He remained where He was, and only when Lazarus died did He set out. His approach was reported to Martha, apparently the elder sister and mistress of the house; and she went to meet Him and sorrowfully upbraided Him: ‘Lord, hadst thou been here, my brother had not died.’ Assured of His sympathy and help, she returned home and, finding her sister among the mourners, whispered to her that the Teacher had come. Mary arose, and, hurrying to Him, fell at His feet, crying in the very words which Martha had used, the words which had been on their lips all those sorrowful days: ‘Lord, hadst thou been here, my brother had not died.’ Cf. art. Martha.

Mary appears a third time six days before the Passover, when Jesus was entertained in the house of Simon the Leper at Bethany, and she came in during the feast and anointed His feet (Joh 12:1-11; cf. Mat 26:6-13 = Mar 14:3-9). See Anointing, I. 2.

Literature.—Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* ii. pp. 23, 388, 652; Hengstenb. on Joh 11:1-46; Andrews, *Life of our Lord*, pp. 281-286; artt. 'Mary' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible and in *Encyc. Bibl.*

David Smith.

☩ Mary, The Virgin

MARY, THE VIRGIN.—Historical data for the life of the mother of our Lord are astonishingly meagre. Legendary matter there is in abundance, with regard to her life both before the Annunciation and after the Ascension, but this art. will not touch on this except incidentally.

1. The Virgin Mary was born, we may suppose, at Nazareth. Tradition names Jerusalem (Cuinet, *Syrie, Liban, et Palestine*, p. 523), but this is quite untrustworthy. Her parents, according to a not improbable tradition, were Joachim and Anna (*Protev. Jacob.*). There is no reason to doubt that the Virgin, as well as Joseph, belonged to the tribe of Judah and to the family of David (Luk 1:32; Luk 1:69, Rom 1:3, 2Ti 2:8, Heb 7:14), although it is almost certain, on the other hand, that both Mt. and Lk. give, not her genealogy, but Joseph's.

The statement of the *Test. XII. Patr.* (Simeon vii.), which makes Mary a woman of the tribe of Levi, is clearly an erroneous inference from the relationship between her and Elisabeth (cf. Plummer on Luk 1:27; Luk 1:36). Syr [Note: yr Syriac.] ^{sin} reads, Luk 2:5, 'because they were both of the house of David.'

Only one member of her immediate family is alluded to in the NT, viz. her sister (Joh 19:25). This sister of the Virgin was most probably Salome, wife of Zebedee, and mother of James and John. We know from the other Gospels (Mat 27:56, Mar 15:40) that Salome was present at the Crucifixion, and it is quite in accordance with St. John's manner to allude thus to his own mother without mentioning her name. The other opinion, that this sister was Mary 'of Clopas,' would (cf. Westcott, *in loc.*, also Mayor, *St. James*, pp. xix-xx) 'involve the most unlikely supposition that two sisters bore the same name.' The family of the Virgin was connected in some way with Elisabeth (ἡ συγγενίς σου, Luk 1:36), but what the degree of relationship was cannot be known. According to a theory brought forward in connexion with the harmonizing of the two genealogies of our Lord, Mary was a cousin of Joseph her husband (art. 'Genealogy of Jesus Christ' in Smith's *DB* [Note: *Dictionary of the Bible.*]), but such a theory has little to recommend it. That her family was but a humble one may be

inferred from her betrothal to Joseph 'the carpenter,' especially if there be any truth in the tradition as to the disparity of their ages.

2. Some time after their betrothal, which came generally among the Jews a year before the marriage, the angel Gabriel was sent from God to Nazareth to tell her of One who was to be born of her, and who should 'be called holy, the Son of God' (Luk_1:35). The simplicity of the narrative bears on it the stamp of truth. Mary was troubled (*διεταράχθη*), we are told, at the saying, yet she believed at once. Her words, 'How shall this be?' ought not to be taken as an expression of doubt, like the words of Zacharias, 'Whereby shall I know this?' They are rather to be regarded as an 'involuntary expression of amazement' (Grot. 'non dubitantis sed admirantis'). Equally impossible is it to suppose that she believed that the child promised would be the fruit of a future union with Joseph. The words of the angel forbid any such idea. Yet, on the other hand, we need not suppose that the full meaning of the angel's words was at once grasped. There are evident signs in the narrative that this was not so, but nothing that we read mars the exquisite simplicity of her words of humble submission, 'Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word.' Soon after ('in these days,' Luk_1:39) the departure of the angel, Mary set out to pay the visit to her kinswoman, which his words would naturally suggest to her. The supposition that her journey was due to the intention of Joseph to put her away is a baseless one. Rather, as it has been said, 'the first but the ever-deepening desire in the heart of Mary, when the angel left her, must have been to be away from Nazareth, and for the relief of opening her heart to a woman, in all things like-minded, who perhaps might speak blessed words to her' (Edersheim, *Life and Times*, i. p. 152). She arose with haste and set out to seek that relief in the house of her kinswoman in the far-off hills of Judah.

What the city of her destination was we cannot know for certain. Whatever it was, it was distant from Nazareth by almost the whole length of the land. According to a tradition which may be correct (cf. *ExpT [Note: xpT Expository Times.]* xv. [1905] 245 f.), it was 'Ain Karim, a village an hour and a half west of Jerusalem.

The opinion held for so long that this city was Juttah is, according to Buhl (*GAP [Note: AP Geographic des alten Palästina.]* p. 163), quite worthless, having originated with Reland in the beginning of the 18th century.

When Mary reached her kinswoman's house, a fresh surprise awaited her in the greeting of Elisabeth: 'Blessed art thou among women.' No longer is Mary to Elisabeth simply 'kinswoman,' she is 'the mother of my Lord.' Doubtless what she had heard from Zacharias of the promises made in regard to their son would fill Elisabeth with hopes of a speedy appearance of the Messiah, and now, by inspiration (Luk_1:41), she

knows that the mother of her Lord is before her. Her greeting is in reality a psalm, brief though it is and overshadowed by the still more wonderful hymn which it called forth in response. The 'Song of Mary' is 'modelled on the OT psalms, especially the Song of Hannah (1Sa 2:1-10), but its superiority to the latter in moral and spiritual elevation is very manifest.' That Mary should 'fall back on the familiar expressions of Jewish Scripture in this moment of intense exultation' is very natural (cf. Plummer, *St. Luke*, p. 30).

Niceta, bp. of Remesia, in his treatise *de Psalmodiae Bono*, names Elisabeth as the author of the *Magnificat*. This is supported by the Old Latin Manuscripts Vercellensis, Veronensis, Rhedigeranus, and by Irenaeus. Origen also knew of the reading, though he did not accept it. The evidence adduced, however, does not seem sufficient to override the verdict of all the rest of antiquity, that the Hymn is Mary's and not Elisabeth's. See, further, art. *Magnificat*.

3. Mary remained with her kinswoman in Judah 'about three months,' probably waiting (cf. Luk 1:56 with v. 36) till after the birth of John the Baptist, and then returned to Nazareth. It is probably at this point that we ought to put the commencement of the narrative in Mt., which records Joseph's intention to put Mary away privily when her condition became known to him, and speaks of his subsequent marriage with her in obedience to the angelic messages. The marriage would afford 'not only outward but moral protection' both to the mother and to the unborn Babe. That the Virgin is still spoken of as ἐμνηστευμένη in Luk 2:5 is not to be taken as necessarily indicating that the marriage had not yet taken place. Had she not been Joseph's wife, Jewish custom would have forbidden her making the journey along with him. When Joseph went up to Bethlehem to get himself enrolled, Mary went also, not because it was necessary, but because 'she would be anxious at all risks not to be separated from Joseph' (Plummer, *in loc.*). At Bethlehem, perhaps in the cave where now is the Church of the Nativity, she brought forth her firstborn Son, and there, too, she received the visit of the shepherds, whose words as to the sign given them from heaven she 'kept, pondering them in her heart.'

4. There is no need to linger on the next events,—the Circumcision, the Presentation and Purification in the Temple, the visit of the Magi, the Flight into and Return from Egypt,—for these all belong rather to the life of Christ than to that of Mary. Before leaving this part of her history, it may be well to emphasize how much of what we know of the Birth, Infancy, and Childhood of our Lord we owe to accounts given by His mother. That St. Luke's source in the first two chapters of his Gospel was one connected with the Virgin is generally admitted. Whether he received his information directly from her, as Ramsay supposes (*Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* p. 85 ff.), or whether the information came to him indirectly through another (perhaps, as Sanday

conjectures, Joanna), may not be determinable. At least we can say that St. Luke believed that he wrote what he wrote on her authority.

‘He does not,’ writes Ramsay (*ib.* p. 74), ‘leave it doubtful whose authority he believed himself to have. “His mother kept all these sayings hid in her heart”; “Mary kept all these sayings, pondering them in her heart”; those two sentences would be sufficient.’

5. The Return from Egypt was followed by a life in retirement at Nazareth. Very little do we know of those years. Two verses in Lk. ([Luk 2:40-41](#)), which tell us of the growth of the Child and the custom of His ‘parents’ to go every year to Jerusalem at the Feast of the Passover, are all we have in the way of direct statement. Here in Nazareth it was that those brothers and sisters of the Lord, of whom we read in the course of the Gospel narrative, were born to Mary and Joseph (for other views see art. Brethren of the Lord). Four brothers are named ([Mat 13:55](#), [Mar 6:3](#)), but the sisters are mentioned only once ([Mar 6:3](#)), without any mention of their names.

The silence of the life at Nazareth is broken but once before the commencement of the Ministry. The scene in the Temple ([Luk 2:42-50](#)) would claim a fuller consideration in the Life of Jesus Christ. As regards its relation to His mother, we have to notice only two points which emerge from St. Luke’s narrative. Mary did not yet understand all the meaning of the angel’s words to her regarding the Child that was to be born. The Child’s own words would be a reminder to her of His true nature. He must be ‘about his Father’s business’ (or ‘in his Father’s house’). Then again we see from the passage the lasting impression which the scene left on Mary’s mind. ‘His mother kept (*συνετήρει*) all these sayings in her heart.’ The tense of the verb covers a long period, up to, and even during, the Ministry. Yet of the Virgin’s life during the interval between our Lord’s twelfth year and His Baptism we know nothing but what is contained in these words and those which immediately precede, as to her Son’s subjection to her and Joseph. It is, however, an easily drawn inference from the absence of any mention of Joseph in the later Gospel narrative, that he died during this interval. Beyond this it is useless to conjecture. ‘The Arabic *Historia Josephi* (cc. 14, 15) places his death in our Lord’s eighteenth year, when Joseph had reached the age of 111’ (Swete on [Mar 6:3](#)).

6. The remaining allusions to the Virgin in the Gospels may be briefly recorded. She was present at the marriage feast at Cana ([Joh 2:1](#)), after which she went down to Capernaum ([Joh 2:12](#)) with Jesus and His brethren and His disciples. She would seem to have been among ‘his friends’ (*οἱ παρ’ αὐτοῦ*) at Capernaum, who ‘went out to lay hold on him’ ([Mar 3:21](#)), for the next paragraph tells us of the coming of His mother and His brethren ([Mar 3:31](#)). She is mentioned by the unknown woman out of the

multitude (Luk_11:27), 'Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the breasts that thou didst suck.' She was present at the Crucifixion, whence the loved disciple, into whose care she had been committed, took her to his own home (Joh_19:25 ff.). It is not a little remarkable, in view of later developments, that no fewer than three of these allusions seem to guard against an undue feeling of veneration for the mother of our Lord, In the story of the feast at Cana, His words, though not wanting in respect, 'show that the actions of the Son of God, now that He has entered on His Divine work, are no longer dependent in any way on the suggestion of a woman, even though that woman be His mother.... The time of silent discipline and obedience is over' (Westcott, *in loc.*). In the scene at Capernaum the lesson is much the same, though the interference of Mary and our Lord's brethren on this occasion seems to have arisen from a different motive. They are seeking to oppose His work. Before they reach Him He understands their purpose, and declares that the true kinship to the Son of God consists in obedience to the will of God, and not in mere earthly ties. It is, of course, as Swete observes (*St. Mark*, p. 70), 'a relative attitude only, and is perfectly consistent with tender care for kinsmen, as the saying on the cross shows.' These two scenes at Cana and Capernaum belong to the beginning of the Ministry, and similarly, almost at its close, we have Christ's words, during the last journey from Galilee to Jerusalem, in answer to the saying of the woman above mentioned, 'Yea, rather ($\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\upsilon$), blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it (Luk_11:28).' This adds to and corrects the woman's words. There is no denial of the Virgin's blessedness, only a declaration of that wherein her blessedness consists, a blessedness which may be shared by all who, like her, hear the word of God and keep it.

Why it was that the Virgin was committed by our Lord on the cross to John can be only a matter of conjecture. It may be, as Mayor suggests (*St. James*, p. xxvii), that her sons, as married men (1Co_9:5), were already dispersed in their several homes, while John her nephew was unmarried, and so could more readily accept such a charge. All we know is that 'from that hour that disciple took her unto his own home (Joh_19:27).

7. After this the only glimpse we get of Mary is in Act_1:14, where she is mentioned as continuing steadfastly in prayer with the other women and the brethren and Apostles of the Lord, after the Ascension. Whether she lived the rest of her life in Palestine, or accompanied St. John to Ephesus, cannot be known. Traditions there are, but they vary. According to one, found in Nicephorus Callistus (*Historia Ecclesiastica* ii. 3), she continued to live with St. John in Jerusalem, and died there in her fifty-ninth year. Another tradition, found in the Synodical Letter of the Council of Ephesus (a.d. 431), makes her accompany St. John to Ephesus, and speaks of her as having been buried in that city.

☞ Master

MASTER (Lat. *magister* from root of *magnus* = ‘great.’ Hence ‘master’ corresponds to **rabbi**, which is from רב ‘great’; and in Authorized Version ῥαββει is frequently translation ‘master,’ e.g. Mat 26:25, Mar 9:5, Joh 4:31, though in all such cases Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 retains ‘rabbi’).—The word most generally rendered ‘master’ is διδάσκαλος, which strictly means **teacher**; and this meaning is given in every case as an alternative reading in (Revised Version margin) , e.g. Mat 8:19; Mat 22:16, Mar 5:35; Mar 10:17, Luk 3:12; Luk 8:49, Joh 11:28; Joh 13:13-14. In Luk 8:24; Luk 9:33 the Gr. word for ‘master’ is ἐπιστάτης, a word generally used in the sense not of ‘teacher’ but of ‘chief’ or ‘overseer.’ In Mat 23:10 καθηγητής, rendered ‘master,’ is more correctly translation ‘leader’ or ‘guide.’ ‘Master’ was the ordinary title of courtesy and respect paid to a religious teacher. See art. Rabbi.

Dugald Clark.

☞ Mattatha

MATTATHA.—A grandson of David, named in our Lord’s genealogy, Luk 3:31.

☞ Mattathias

MATTATHIAS.—Occurs twice in our Lord’s genealogy, Luk 3:25-26.

☞ Matthan

MATTHAN.—Grandfather of Joseph the husband of Mary, Mat 1:15.

⚡Matthat

MATTHAT.—1. The form of the name (Mt. *Matthan*) of Joseph's grandfather given in Luk_3:24. 2. Another link in our Lord's genealogy, Luk_3:29.

⚡Matthew

MATTHEW (Ματθαῖος, Lachm., Tisch., WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] ; Ματθ αῖος, Textus Receptus) is to be identified with **Levi**, son of Alphaeus, since the Synoptists agree in their description of the feast associated with the publican who is named Levi in Mk. (Mar_2:14) and Lk. (Luk_5:29), and Matthew in Mt. (Mat_9:9).^{*} [Note: Levi's father was not the father of James the Little (cf. Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii. 263).] *Levi*, according to the analogy of *Simon* and *Peter*, may have been the original name and *Matthew* the acquired; though, according to Edersheim (*Life and Times*, i. 514), it was common in Galilee for a man to have two names, one strictly Jewish and the other Galilaeen. Matthew was chosen one of the Twelve, and is placed seventh in the lists in Mk. and Lk., and eighth in those in Mt. and Acts. When called to be a disciple, he was sitting at a toll-house, his place of business. Along the north end of the Sea of Galilee there was a road leading from Damascus to Acre on the Mediterranean, and on that road a customs-office marked the boundary between the territories of Philip the tetrarch and Herod Antipas. Matthew's occupation was the examination of goods which passed along the road, and the levying of the toll (cf. Hausrath, *NT Times*, ii. 179). The work of a publican excited the scorn so often shown beyond the limits of Israel to fiscal officers; and when he was a Jew, as was Matthew, he was condemned for impurity by the Pharisees. A Jew serving on a great highway was prevented from fulfilling requirements of the Law, and was compelled to violate the Sabbath law, which the Gentiles, who conveyed their goods, did not observe. Schürer makes the statement that the customs raised in Capernaum in the time of Christ went into the treasury of Herod Antipas, while in Judaea they were taken for the Imperial *fiscus* (HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.] i. ii. 68). Matthew was thus not a collector under one of the companies that farmed the taxes in the Empire, but was in the service of Herod. Yet the fact that he belonged to the publican class, among whom were Jews who outraged patriotism by gathering tribute for Caesar, subjected him to the scorn of the Pharisees and their party (cf. Edersheim, *Life and Times*, i. 515); and his occupation itself associated him with men who, everywhere in the Empire, were despised for extortion and fraud, and were execrated (cf. Cic. *de Offic.* i. 42; Lucian, *Menipp.* 11). Even Jesus Himself named the publicans with harlots (Mat_21:31). See Publican, and Sea of Galilee, § vi.

Before the call of Matthew, Jesus had resided at Capernaum, had left it, and had gone back to it (Mar 1:21; Mar 1:38; Mar 2:1); and it is safe to conclude that Matthew, a dweller in or near the city, had heard the fame of Jesus, and perhaps he may have been among those who sought Him (Mar 1:37). Jesus, too, may have noticed the publican, and the fact may have led to the call. According to the narrative of that call, which is almost identical in the Synoptics, Jesus said to him, 'Follow me,' and he arose and followed Him (Mat 9:9). After the call and the answer there was a feast, probably to celebrate the new departure in the life of the publican, at which Jesus met him and his friends.

Certain critics (cf. Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, iii. 268 n. [Note: note.]) take the words καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῦ ἀνακειμένου ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ (Mat 9:10) as indicating that the house was that of Jesus; but they can bear this interpretation only if taken in connexion with the preceding words, καὶ ἀναστὰς ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ. It is, however, not necessary to establish this connexion, as the writer may simply have made a sudden transition to a paragraph beginning καὶ ἐγένετο. If, on the other hand, the connexion must be made, then it is possible to take the narrative as recording that Matthew rose and followed Jesus to the house which belonged to Jesus. Mk. does not indicate the ownership of the house, while Lk. says distinctly that it was Levi's. If we accept the description of Mk. or Lk., we need not conclude that the feast followed immediately after the call, since it may have taken place just before the assembling of the Twelve (Mar 3:14, Luk 6:13), in the period between that event and the calling of the individual disciples.

At the feast were Jesus and His disciples, and at the table with them were many publicans and sinners. These disciples were also many in number (Mar 2:15), and they must therefore have included others beyond the individuals who had been specially called. The sinners mentioned along with the publicans at the feast were those who violated the Law, or did not try to keep its innumerable commands as set forth by the scribes or interpreted by the Pharisees. Certain scribes and Pharisees had been spectators of the feast, and they asked the disciples concerning Jesus' eating and drinking with sinners; and Jesus Himself, answering them, declared that He had not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance. The call of Matthew and the feast with publicans and sinners were the comment of Jesus on Pharisaic separatism; but the action itself did not prevent the separatism which showed itself in the primitive Church, and which involved the rebuke of Peter by Paul.

Beyond the call and the inclusion of the name in the list of the Twelve, there is no mention of Matthew in the NT. On the question of the authorship of the First Gospel, see following article.

Literature.—*Expos. Times*, viii. [1897] 529; *Expos.* i. i. [1875] 36, iii. ix. [1889] 445, v. viii. [1898] 37; Keble, *Chr. Year*, 'S. Matthew the Apostle'; W. B. Carpenter, *The Son of Man*, p. 141; J. D. Jones, *The Glorious Company of the Apostles*, p. 150.

John Herkless.

Matthew, Gospel According To

MATTHEW, GOSPEL ACCORDING TO.—*'The power of God unto salvation—to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.'*—The Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke may be characterized respectively as the Gospel of the Jew and the Gospel of the Greek. St. Luke gives us the conception of the Christ as His Person presented itself to the Greek Churches of the West. To them Christ was the Saviour of the world, the Divine Redeemer, whose Good News was equally available for all the children of men, regardless of distinctions of race, or class, or sex. St. Matthew, on the other hand, presents to us the Christ as He was conceived by the Jewish Christians of Palestine. To them Christ was the King of Israel; and the glad tidings of His coming Kingdom were intended first for the Chosen People. It was true that He had foretold the coming of many from the east and the west to sit down in the Kingdom of God (Mat 8:11), and had bidden His Apostles baptize all nations (Mat 28:19); but then it had always been a part of the Divine plan to suffer aliens to enter as proselytes into the fold of Israel, and to partake of the blessings promised to the Chosen People. So it was to be with the new Israel. In the period of preparation for the Kingdom, the gospel was to be preached to all nations for a testimony (Mat 24:14), and those who entered by baptism into the Christian Church would become members of that new Israel, which in the days of the Kingdom should be judged and governed by the twelve Apostles as viceroys of the King Messiah (Mat 19:28).

Of course the distinction here drawn makes itself felt in two respects. First, in the selection of material by the two writers. Each Evangelist has a certain amount of matter peculiar to himself; and it will be found that whilst in the First Gospel this is very largely matter which lends itself to the Christianity of one who was glad to emphasize the prior claim of the Jew to the blessings of the Kingdom, that in St. Luke is predominantly material capable of a more universalistic interpretation. Secondly, in the treatment of the large amount of material which is common to the two Gospels. A good example is to be found in the discourse on the Last Things. Whilst St. Matthew emphasizes the close connexion between the fall of Jerusalem and the Coming of the Son of Man (Mat 24:29), thus limiting the period during which the gospel could be preached to the Gentiles, St. Luke expands this period to an indefinite length, during

which Jerusalem was to be trodden under foot (Luk 21:24), thus making space for a long and protracted preaching to the Gentiles.

In the present article we propose to discuss the chief features in the picture of the Person of Christ drawn for us by the First Evangelist, and to consider the bearing of this upon the questions of the author, the sources, the date, and the historical value of the Gospel.

1. Theology of the Gospel.

(1) *The Messiah*.—Jesus the Messiah was legally descended from David, and through him from Abraham, the father of the Israelite people (Mat 1:1). He was the culminating point in the history of His family. In David it had risen to monarchical power (Mat 1:6), but at the period of the Captivity it had lost this dignity. But now again in Jesus the anointed King it had regained it (Mat 1:16). He was therefore born 'king of the Jews' (Mat 2:2). As King He entered Jerusalem (Mat 21:5). As King He suffered the death of crucifixion (Mat 27:38; Mat 27:42), and as King He would sit to judge all nations at the Last Day (Mat 25:31 ff.). But He was no mere scion of the Davidic stock. Though legally descended from David through Joseph ben-Jacob, He was also in a unique sense Son of God. As such He was born of the Holy Spirit from a virgin (Mat 1:18-25). Hence He was 'God with us' (Mat 1:23), and this Divine Sonship placed Him in a unique relationship to God. He could speak of God and of Himself as 'the Father' and 'the Son,' as though these terms could only be applied to this relationship (Mat 11:27); and David himself had recognized by the Divine inspiration this Divine Sonship of his promised descendant, when he applied to Him the Divine name 'Lord' (Mat 22:44). The history of the supernatural birth was, of course, an easy mark for Jewish calumny, but nevertheless it was a fact which had been Divinely foreordained (Mat 1:22); and in the history of the Davidic family there had been women of old time (Rahab, Bathsheba, Tamar, Ruth) whose lives should have taught the calumniators of the Virgin that God overrules and uses circumstances for His own Divine ends. Moreover, if in Jesus the prophecies of a Coming Davidic king, supernaturally born, had found at last their fulfilment, so also in Him were summed up all the many strands in the web of Jewish anticipation. He was 'the Beloved' (Mat 3:17, Mat 17:5) whom God had eternally chosen (Mat 3:16, Mat 12:18), and to whom God had eternally given all things (Mat 11:27) and all power (Mat 28:18). He was the supernatural Son of Man, who was to come upon the clouds of heaven (Mat 16:28, Mat 26:64, Mat 24:30), and to sit upon the throne of His glory to judge all men (Mat 16:28, Mat 19:28, Mat 25:31). And the events of His life down to the minutest details had been foretold in the OT. Thus Isaiah had foretold the circumstances (Mat 1:22), and Micah the place, of His birth (Mat 2:5). Hosea had foreseen the flight into Egypt, Jeremiah the massacre of the infants at Bethlehem (Mat 2:17); and the settlement of His parents at the ill-famed village of Nazareth had

been the subject of prophecy (Mat 2:23). His herald John had been fore-announced by Isaiah (Mat 3:3), and the same prophet had foreseen the Christ's ministry in Galilee, with Capernaum as His headquarters (Mat 4:14). That He healed the sick was in accordance with a prophecy of Isaiah, and the contrast between His gracious and gentle work and the noisy clamour of His opponents, found anticipation in another passage of the same prophet (Mat 12:17-21). Zechariah had foreseen His entry as King into Jerusalem (Mat 21:5), His betrayal (Mat 26:24), and the desertion of His disciples (Mat 26:31); and the whole course of His tragic end had been Divinely fore-ordained, and foretold in Scripture (Mat 16:23 [τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ] Mat 26:54; Mat 26:56).

Such was the Person of Jesus. He was the Divinely foreordained Messiah, the supernaturally-born King of Israel, the unique Son of God. What then had been His work? It is clear that the editor of the Gospel is much more concerned with Christ's doctrine than with His work, with what He had said than with what He had done. He is interested in the events of the life chiefly in so far as they proved Jesus to be the Messiah of the OT, and with His actions either as proofs of His supernatural power over all the known forces of life, or as illustrative of His attitude towards the orthodox Pharisaism of the day. He could, e.g., heal disease, even leprosy, without use of drugs or medical appliances, by the simple exercise of His will (Mat 8:8 'Speak the word only,' Mat 8:16 'with a word'), the cure being immediate and complete (Mat 8:13, Mat 9:22, Mat 15:28, Mat 17:18). He could control the forces of nature (Mat 8:26-27), and could drive out demons from the unhappy beings of whom they had taken possession (Mat 8:28-34). He exercised upon earth the Divine prerogative of forgiving sin (Mat 9:1-8), and raised the dead to life (Mat 9:25). He could feed multitudes with a few loaves and fishes (Mat 14:13-21, Mat 15:32-39). On the other hand, He associated with people who were regarded by the leaders of religion as ill friends for a devout man (Mat 9:11), and seemed negligent of the rules which the Pharisees had framed as the guides of a pious life. His disciples did not fast (Mat 9:14), and broke Sabbath regulations (Mat 12:2). He Himself performed acts of healing on the Sabbath day (Mat 12:10), and His disciples neglected the regulations about purification of the hands before meals (Mat 15:2). After a ministry marked by acts like these, He had been put to death by the Romans at the instigation of the Pharisees and Sadducees. He had expected this fate, and had foretold it to His disciples as being ordained of God and prophesied in Scripture (Mat 16:21 δεῖ, Mat 16:23 τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, Mat 17:12; Mat 17:22-23, Mat 20:18-19). He had promised that on the third day He should be raised again, and this was fulfilled; and He had ascended into heaven.

Now it is clear that the details thus sketched furnish a very small part of the significance of the Gospel to the editor. The miracles proved Christ's power, or

illustrated His attitude towards Pharisaism, or showed Him to be the Messiah of the OT. But to what end was He powerful, and, if the Messiah, where was His Kingdom? We might have expected to find a good deal more emphasis laid on the significance of Christ's death, but such emphasis is strikingly absent. The death is rather regarded as without significance in itself, but as a necessary stage in the revelation of the Messiah. He had come to found a Kingdom, but in accordance with the Divine plan had been put to death. Clearly then the Kingdom remained yet to come, and the death was a necessary prelude to glorification. The insistence on the fact that the death *had* to take place, because it had been foretold in the Scriptures, suggests the inference that to the editor it was a fact which required explanation, a difficult phase in the history of the Messiah rather than the central fact which itself explained everything else in His life. In two passages only is the death referred to as having any purpose or effect, rather than as being simply a thing which had happened as a necessary transition stage from the earthly life to the heavenly monarchy of the Messiah. In one of these Christ is represented as saying that He came to give His life as a ransom for many (λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, Mat_20:28); in the other He speaks of His blood as shed for many for the remission of sins (Mat_26:28). It is easy to see how sayings like these could be made the foundation of a theology which would explain the whole of Christ's life from the significance of His death. But it is equally clear that the editor of the First Gospel has recorded them because they formed part of the tradition which had come to him, without seeing in them an explanation of the entire earthly life of the Messiah. They are incidental rather than fundamental to his Gospel.

Thus the facts of Christ's life as here recorded would have been meaningless to the editor without the teaching which he records. It is in that that he finds the explanation of Christ's life. The facts alone were obscure and difficult. Jesus was the Davidic Messiah and also the Son of God. He had entered into human history through the Virgin's womb. He had evinced His supernatural power in all that He did. But then He had allowed Himself to be put to death, because, as He said, the Scriptures had foretold it; and rising from the dead, He had gone into heaven again. But how then was He the Messiah, and where was the Kingdom? The main object of the Gospel is to explain this, and the explanation is given in the great discourses which the editor has formed by massing sayings or groups of sayings.

(2) *The Kingdom*.—The central subject of Christ's doctrine had been the near approach of the 'kingdom of the heavens.' With this He began His ministry (Mat_4:17), and wherever He went He taught this as a good news (Mat_4:23). The Kingdom, He taught, was coming, but not in His lifetime. After His ascension He would come as Son of Man upon the clouds of heaven (Mat_16:27-28, Mat_19:28, Mat_24:30), would send His angels to gather together the elect (Mat_24:31, Mat_13:41), and would sit on the throne of His glory (Mat_16:28, Mat_19:28,

Mat 25:31). This would happen in the lifetime of the generation to whom He spoke (Mat 16:28, Mat 24:34, Mat 10:23), immediately after the great tribulation accompanying the destruction of Jerusalem (Mat 24:29); but God alone knew the exact day and hour (Mat 24:30). Then the twelve Apostles should sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Mat 19:28). In the meantime He Himself must suffer and die, and be raised from the dead. How else could He come upon the clouds of heaven? And His disciples were to preach the good news of the coming Kingdom (Mat 10:7, Mat 24:14) among all nations, making disciples by baptism (Mat 28:19). The body of disciples thus gained would naturally form a society bound by common aims (Mat 16:18, Mat 18:17). They would be distinct from the existing Jewish polity, because the Jews as a people, the 'sons of the kingdom,' *i.e.* those who should have inherited it (Mat 8:12), would definitely reject the good news (Mat 21:32; Mat 21:42-43, Mat 22:7). Hence the disciples of the Kingdom would form a new spiritual Israel (Mat 21:43 'a nation') which would include many who came from east and west (Mat 8:12).

In view of the needs of this new Israel of Christ's disciples, *i.e.* of the true sons of the Kingdom (Mat 13:38), who were to await His coming on the clouds of heaven, it is natural that a large part of the teaching recorded in the Gospel should concern the qualifications required in those who hoped to enter the Kingdom when it came. They were still to live in allegiance to the revelation of God made in the OT, which was permanently valid. Not a letter was to pass away from it (Mat 5:18). Its permission of divorce still held good (Mat 5:32, Mat 19:3 ff.). Christ had not abolished the Mosaic distinctions between clean and unclean meats (see notes on Mat 15:20). His disciples were still to take two or three witnesses (Mat 18:16); and the Sabbath was still to be held sacred (Mat 24:20). But they were to search beneath the letter of the OT for its spiritual meaning. Their 'righteousness' was to exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees, because they were to interpret the Law of Moses in a sense which would make it more far-reaching in its effect upon conduct than ever before (Mat 5:21-48). In particular, their 'righteousness' was to be less a matter of something done that men might see it, and more a right relation to God, taking effect in action known only to God Himself (Mat 6:1-34). In relation to their fellow-men they were to cultivate humility, and to suppress self-assertiveness (Mat 18:1-14); to exercise forgiveness (Mat 18:15; Mat 18:21-35); to be slow to judge their fellows (Mat 7:1-5); to do to others what they would have done to themselves (Mat 7:12). In relation to wealth, they were not to hoard up treasure upon earth, but to trust in God's care for them (Mat 6:19-34, Mat 19:28), seeking first His righteousness and Kingdom. In relation to sexual morality, they were to be chaste in thought (Mat 5:28); marriage was an indissoluble bond, broken only by adultery (Mat 19:9). But some were called to live single lives for the Kingdom of the heavens (Mat 19:12). In relation to God, they were to pray to Him for their daily needs, for His forgiveness, and for deliverance from the evil that is in the world (Mat 6:9-13, Mat 7:7-11).

In the above sketch of the picture drawn for us in the First Gospel of the Person and teaching of the Messiah, we have purposely omitted the parables. Most of the parables in this Gospel are parables of the Kingdom. With the exception of Mat 18:21-35, they do not, as in the case of many of St. Luke's parables, inculcate some Christian virtue or practice, such as love of one's neighbour, or earnestness in prayer, but convey some lesson about the nature of the Kingdom and the period of preparation for it. Their interpretation will often depend largely upon the conception of the Kingdom with which the reader approaches them. We are not now concerned with the meaning which they were intended to convey when they were originally spoken. But it should be sufficiently obvious that if we ask what meaning they had for the editor of the First Gospel, and why he selected them for insertion in his Gospel, the answer must be that he chose them because he believed that they taught lessons about the Kingdom of the heavens in the sense in which that phrase is used everywhere else in his Gospel, of the Kingdom which was to come when the Son of Man came upon the clouds of heaven. Thus the parable of the Sower illustrates the varying reception met with by the good news of the Kingdom as it is preached amongst men. That of the Tares also deals not with the Kingdom itself, but with the period of preparation for it. At the end of the age the Son of Man will come to inaugurate His Kingdom. A phrase here, 'shall gather out of his kingdom,' has been pressed to support the interpretation that the Kingdom is thought of as present now. But it need convey no such meaning. The 'good seed' is interpreted as equivalent to the 'sons of the kingdom,' i.e. according to Jewish usage, not they who already live in or possess the Kingdom, but those who are destined to inherit it when it comes. It is not inaugurated until the 'end of the age.' Then when the 'Son of Man' comes, the 'Kingdom' comes; and the method of its foundation is not a gathering of the elect out of the mass of mankind, but a gathering of the wicked from amongst the elect, a gathering of them out of the Kingdom that the righteous may inherit it and shine forth in it. There is nothing here or elsewhere in this Gospel to suggest that the scene of the Kingdom is other than the present world renewed, restored, and purified (cf. *παλιγγενεσία*, Mat 19:28).

The parables of the Mustard Seed and of the Leaven describe the way in which the good news of the Kingdom spreads rapidly and penetrates deeply into human society. Those of the Hid Treasure and of the Goodly Pearl emphasize its value, and teach the lesson that a man must give up all else to enter into it. That of the Drag-Net has much the same application as the parable of the Tares. The doctrine of the Kingdom attracts good and bad alike. But at the end of the age, when the Kingdom is inaugurated, there will be a separation.

In Mat 20:1-16 occurs the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard. In its *present context* this seems to be intended to teach the lesson that in discipleship of the

Kingdom priority, whether in date of entrance upon discipleship or of position *now*, will not carry with it special privilege within the Kingdom when it comes. All shall receive the same reward—eternal life.

Of the other parables in the Gospel, Mat 18:21-35 does not bear directly upon the doctrine of the Kingdom, but emphasizes forgiveness as a qualification in all who wish to enter it. Mat 21:28-32 illustrates the perverse attitude of the Pharisees towards the Baptist's preaching. Mat 21:33-46 and Mat 22:1-10 are historical forecasts of the fate of the Jewish nation. Mat 22:11-14 emphasizes the necessity for all who hope to enter the Kingdom of possessing the necessary qualifications. Mat 25:1-13 and Mat 25:14-30 teach the suddenness of its appearance and the necessity of watching for its coming. Mat 25:31-46 describes the test by which the King when He comes will admit the righteous into His Kingdom.

Of several of these parables it will rightly be felt that, as originally spoken, they had a wider meaning and scope than that here given, and one which is inconsistent with the narrow limits of the Kingdom to be inaugurated immediately after the fall of Jerusalem. That is quite true. But the question is not, What did these parables mean when they were originally spoken? but, What interpretation did the editor put upon them when he incorporated them into his Gospel? He everywhere seems to use the phrase 'kingdom of the heavens' in its eschatological sense. In four or five passages he has, instead, the 'kingdom of God.' In Mat 6:33 τοῦ θεοῦ is probably not genuine (omit $\aleph B g^1$ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] k). As regards Mat 19:24, a passage borrowed from Mk., the fact that Mt. in 13 other places where 'kingdom of God' occurs in Mk., substitutes 'kingdom of the heavens,' or omits or paraphrases the passage, makes it very probable that 'kingdom of the heavens' should be read here also. In Mat 12:28, Mat 21:31; Mat 21:43 the editor has retained 'kingdom of God,' not because he regarded it as equivalent to 'kingdom of the heavens,' but because he felt that in these passages the idea conveyed was different from that which his phrase 'kingdom of the heavens' everywhere carries with it; and he therefore retained 'kingdom of God' to mark the difference.

Thus the conception of Christianity as expressed in this Gospel may be summarized as follows. Jesus was the King-Messiah of the OT. He was also the Son of Man of apocalyptic anticipation. But how could the functions ascribed to these two ideals be combined? Only if the King passed through death that He might come again on the clouds to inaugurate His Kingdom. And to those who could read the OT aright, all this had been foretold. Hence the Crucifixion. When Jerusalem fell, the end of the age would come, and the Son of Man would appear. In the meantime the good news was to be preached, and men were to be gathered into the society of disciples of the Messiah.

2. Date and place of composition.—If the dominant conception of the book has been rightly sketched, very important conclusions can be drawn as to its *provenance* and date. It must have been written by a Jewish-Christian, probably by a Jewish-Christian of Palestine, and it cannot date from long after the fall of Jerusalem. For it is inconceivable that any one should so arrange the words of Christ as to convey the impression that He had taught that He would return as Son of Man immediately after the fall of Jerusalem, if many years had elapsed since that event. And this conclusion as to the early date and Palestinian origin of the Gospel is supported by other features of the book. It is markedly anti-Pharisaic, and strongly Jewish-Christian in outlook.

(1) *Its anti-Pharisaism.*—This already underlies the stories of the first two chapters, which are most easily explained as a narrative of facts written to rebut Pharisaic calumnies. Christ was born of a virgin, but He was legally of Davidic descent, and the Virgin Mary's marvellous history already found prototypes by contrast in the history of women connected with the ancestors of the Christ. If He went into Egypt, it was in the days of His infancy, and He brought no magical arts thence. If His parents settled at Nazareth, it was that the tenor of prophecy might be fulfilled.

So far the anti-Pharisaic polemic of the writer has been defensive and implicit. In the third chapter it becomes manifest and open. The sayings of the Baptist are so arranged as to form a sermon of denunciation of the Pharisees and Sadducees. They are a 'brood of vipers,' who pride themselves on their descent from Abraham. But right action based on repentance is the only ground for hope of God's favour. The Messiah is at hand, and will sweep away all such false claims with the fire of judgment. In the Sermon on the Mount the same anti-Pharisaic polemic is found. Their 'righteousness' will not admit them into the Kingdom (Mat 5:20). They are 'hypocrites' whose religious observances are based on desire for personal credit (Mat 6:1-17). In Mat 8:12 they are 'the sons of the kingdom,' but nevertheless they will be cast into the outer darkness. It was the Pharisees who complained that Christ ate with tax-gatherers and sinners (Mat 9:11), and it was they who ascribed His power to cast out demons to Beelzebul (Mat 9:34, Mat 12:24). They accused His disciples (Mat 12:2), and Christ Himself (Mat 12:10), of doing illegal actions on the Sabbath. They plotted to destroy Him (Mat 12:14), and asked a sign from Him (Mat 12:38). They condemned His disciples for eating with unwashed hands (Mat 15:2), and were shocked at His teaching about things clean and unclean (Mat 15:12), being themselves blind guides (Mat 15:14). The disciples were to beware of their teaching (Mat 16:12). In the last days of the Messiah's life the Pharisees took a prominent part in the events that led to His death. They plotted with the chief priests to arrest Him (Mat 21:45). They planned to entrap Him in His speech (Mat 22:15). They tried to entangle Him in argument (Mat 22:34; Mat 22:41). All this leads up to the tremendous indictment of the scribes and Pharisees in ch. 23. In the

narrative dealing with the Crucifixion we read naturally rather of the chief priests and elders than of the Pharisees; but it is the latter, with the chief priests, who effect the sealing of the tomb (Mat 27:62 ff.).

(2) *The Jewish-Christian element.*—Of course the whole conception of the Kingdom of the heavens as sketched above is Jewish-Christian in character. But there are other Jewish-Christian features in the Gospel. (a) One is the interest shown in St. Peter. He was one of the earliest of Christ's disciples (Mat 4:18), and Christ had healed his wife's mother (Mat 8:14). He was in some sense 'first' of the Twelve (Mat 10:2.), and it was he who walked on the waters at Christ's command (Mat 14:28 ff.). It was he who first confessed Christ's Messiahship (Mat 16:16), and received the promise of high rank in the Kingdom (Mat 16:19). By inserting this passage the editor blunts the severity of the rebuke (Mat 16:23), which St. Luke altogether omits. It was Peter who was prominent amongst the three who were privileged to be on the Mount of Transfiguration (Mat 17:4), and it was he to whom the tax-gatherers came as to one who was the representative of the other disciples. It was Peter who acted as the spokesman of the rest (Mat 15:15, Mat 18:21, Mat 26:33; Mat 26:35), or who was addressed as representing the others (Mat 26:40). It was he who penetrated into the palace, and there denied that he knew Christ (Mat 26:58-75). If all the Apostles were to sit on thrones in the new age (Mat 19:28), Peter was to have administrative and legislative power in the Kingdom (Mat 16:19).

(b) Another Jewish-Christian feature in the Gospel is the presence in it of sayings which seem to limit Christ's mission and doctrine to the Jewish nation. In His own lifetime He had expressly asserted this of His own activity. 'I was not sent save to the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Mat 15:24). On two occasions He had extended His mercy to pagans (Mat 8:5-13, Mat 15:21-28), but on the latter occasion He made it plain that the grace thus extended to a Gentile woman was only as it were a crumb which had dropped from the table of the Jews, to whom He was sent, and had been devoured by a Gentile dog. He bade His disciples 'go not to the way of the Gentiles, nor to the cities of the Samaritans, but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Mat 10:6); and said they should not have exhausted the cities of Israel before His coming (Mat 10:23). In the new age the Apostles were to rule over a new Israel (Mat 19:28). Of course, side by side with these sayings from his Palestinian sources, the editor has incorporated others from other sources, which prove that he himself was well aware that Christ had on other occasions foreseen and commanded the admission of Gentiles to the discipleship of the Kingdom. 'Many were to come from east and west' (Mat 8:11), and the three parables in Mat 21:28 to Mat 22:14 seem to convey the same truth. Further, the good news was to be preached among all nations for a testimony (Mat 24:14), and the Apostles were to make disciples of all nations (Mat 28:19). But there is nothing in any of these passages to suggest that the editor anticipated the admission of Gentiles to discipleship save on terms similar to those on

which proselytes had been admitted to the old Israel;* [Note: At least the Mosaic Law was to be binding upon them.] and it is clear that he saw no difficulty in the preaching to all nations being accomplished within a generation, for the 'end' (Mat 24:14) which was to close this preaching was the period of great tribulation accompanying the siege of the city, followed immediately by the coming of the Son of Man (Mat 24:30).

(c) A third Jewish-Christian feature is the insistence on the permanent obligations of the Mosaic Law; see above, p. 144^b.

Now all these characteristics of the Gospel point irresistibly to Palestine, and to Palestine in the period before or very soon after the fall of Jerusalem, as the place and date of the composition of the Gospel. The most obvious feature in this connexion is the belief that the coming of the Son of Man would immediately follow the period of tribulation accompanying the siege of the city. But the other features above mentioned point in the same direction. The prominence given to St. Peter is natural enough in traditions which had been collected and preserved in Palestine in the early days of the Church at Jerusalem. The limitation of Christianity to Jews or proselytes, and the insistence on the permanent validity of the Law, reflect the same primitive Christian atmosphere as we breathe in the first few chapters of the Acts, before the pressure of circumstances had compelled the Apostles to recognize that St. Paul must be right, and that under Christianity Jew and Gentile stood on the same plane in the sight of God.

Lastly, the anti-Pharisaic attitude of the editor would be natural in one who knew something of the difficulties of the Jewish-Christian Church in the early days when Pharisaic hatred pursued its members from city to city.

The date thus arrived at affects the whole Gospel and not only portions of it. It is a literary unity, and apart from a few possible later interpolations, e.g. Mat 6:14 (the doxology) Mat 22:43, Mat 23:35 ('son of Barachiah'), belongs to one editor, and to one period of final composition. The attempts made to argue for a late date for the composition of the whole book from isolated phrases, or to mark large sections as late additions, fail to account for the unity of idea and conception that runs through the whole work, and neglect the cumulative evidence of the conceptions that characterize it for an early date.

Mat 1:18-25 has been claimed as late because the idea of virgin-birth is 'quite foreign to Judaism.' As a matter of fact this idea is thoroughly Eastern (as well as Western), and must have been familiar to every Palestinian Jew who had read the Septuagint. And in other respects the narrative is Jewish throughout. The occurrence of the word

ἐκκλησία (Mat 16:19, Mat 18:17) and the Baptismal Formula (Mat 28:19) have been said to betray late date. But there is no possible reason why a Jewish Christian writing about the year a.d. 70 should not have used ἐκκλησία to represent whatever Aramaic word was originally uttered; and if the Triune name in Mat 28:19 is not a later gloss, it may well have been used by a Palestinian Christian who was contemporary with St. Paul (cf. 1Co 12:3, 2Co 13:14, and 1Pe 1:2, 1Jn 3:23-24).

3. The Sources.—If, then, we take the year a.d. 70 as an approximate date for the composition of the Gospel, there remain the questions of its sources, its author, and its historical value. The facts about the sources are these:—

(1) The editor has borrowed the greater part of the Second Gospel, and has made it the framework of his narrative. He has altered the order of Mar 1:1 to Mar 7:24 in order to group the material under subject-heads. He has greatly expanded the discourses. He makes omissions and alterations in phrases relating to the Person of Christ, omitting especially expressions which attribute to Him inability, or desire for information, and terms of human emotion; and makes a series of somewhat similar changes in clauses relating to the Apostles. For the details of his editorial revision of the Second Gospel, see art. Mark (Gospel), and the Com. on 'Matthew' in *ICC [Note: CC International Critical Commentary.]*, pp. xiii-xl.

(2) The Gospel contains, besides this Markan material, a good deal of matter, almost entirely sayings, which is found also in substance in the Third Gospel. It is generally supposed that this was borrowed by the two Evangelists from a common source, viz. a collection of Gospel material compiled by the Apostle Matthew, and referred to by Papias (*Eus. Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. xxxix.).

The present writer has elsewhere attempted to prove that, so far as St. Luke goes, this is not a very probable theory. Besides these sayings which he has in common with St. Luke, the editor of the First Gospel has also a number of sayings found only in his Gospel. The probability is that he borrowed these peculiar sayings, and most of those common to him and to St. Luke, from the Apostolic collection of sayings mentioned by Papias. If so, it is not very likely that St. Luke had also seen this collection. Rather material from it had passed into some of the many sources which he had used (Luk 1:1), and were borrowed by him from them. See 'Matthew,' *l.c.* pp. xli-lxii. Thus Mt.'s second source was the Matthaean *Logia* or collection of discourses.

(3) What remains of the Gospel, when we have put aside the matter borrowed from Mk. and the sayings drawn from the *Logia*, consists of a number of narrative traditions. These deal with Christ's Birth and Infancy (chs. 1, 2), with a few incidents connected with St. Peter (Mat 14:28-31; Mat 17:24-27), and with some details

connected with Christ's trial and Resurrection (Mat 27:3-10; Mat 27:19; Mat 27:24-25; Mat 27:51-53; Mat 27:62-66, Mat 28:11-15). They were all drawn, it may be supposed, from current Palestinian Christian tradition.

(4) Lastly, a number of quotations of a peculiar type, which are introduced by a special formula (Mat 1:22-23, Mat 2:5-6; Mat 2:15; Mat 2:17-18; Mat 2:23, Mat 4:14-16, Mat 8:17, Mat 12:17-21, Mat 13:35, Mat 21:4-5, Mat 27:9), were drawn from a catena or list of OT Messianic passages, which had already been translated into Greek when the editor borrowed them.

4. The Author.—Now, who was the writer who thus welded together the Second Gospel, the Matthaean *Logia*, a number of Palestinian traditions, and a series of OT quotations, into our present Gospel? From the end of the 2nd cent. the work has been ascribed to St. Matthew. But there are the following difficulties in this ascription:

(1) The same writers who attribute our Gospel to St. Matthew state that he wrote it in Hebrew or Aramaic. Now it is clear that our Gospel was composed in Greek, and is based upon Greek sources. This is certain so far as the material drawn from the Second Gospel is concerned, and probable for the sayings drawn from the Matthaean *Logia*.

(2) It does not seem very probable that the Apostle Matthew should have written a Gospel from second-hand materials. The work lacks that freshness of presentation which we should expect from an eye-witness of many of the events.

How then explain the ascription of the Gospel to him? Because the book, in a sense in which the statement is not true of St. Luke's Gospel, is based directly upon the collection of sayings compiled by the Apostle. We must, therefore, suppose that the author was an otherwise unknown Jewish Christian of Palestine, who about the year a.d. 70 compiled his Gospel, using as his framework the Second Gospel, but borrowing largely from the Matthaean *Logia*, and inserting also some Palestinian traditions with which he was familiar. The Gospel, as it left his hand, represents the conception of Christ's Person and work which was dominant in the Palestinian Church in the middle of the 1st cent. a.d. To Christians there Jesus was the Jewish King-Messiah. His life on earth was only the prelude to His sovereignty. For He was to come again as Son of Man at the end of the age, and that was imminent, and would follow immediately upon the final downfall of the Jewish polity.

5. Historical value.—So far as the question of the historical value of the detail given in the Gospel is concerned, we may set aside for our present purpose all that is drawn from St. Mark's Gospel. The value of that is a consideration for a writer on the Second Gospel (see above, p. 133 ff., and cf. the Dean of Westminster's *Study of the*

Gospels, and Burkitt's *The Gospel History and its Transmission*). The sayings drawn from the Matthaean *Logia* have behind them Apostolic authority, and, allowing for some change of emphasis and possible accretion in the process of transmission, may safely be taken as representing actual utterances of Christ.

The Palestinian traditions peculiar to the Gospel are probably not all of equal weight. The narrative of the supernatural birth is best attested, because the main fact of the story is supported by the tradition known to St. Luke. Of the rest it is difficult to say more than that they are early Palestinian traditions, and we must abstain from condemning them upon purely fanciful grounds as legendary.

But the question of historical value can be raised in a different form, and one of much greater importance. Allowing the substantial accuracy of the bulk of the detail in the Gospel, and without discussing the precise value and importance to be attached to each separate tradition, how far do the main conceptions of Christ and of His doctrine which run through the Gospel correspond to the historical Christ? Did He teach what is here ascribed to Him?

Something may be learned in this connexion if we consider the method of the Evangelist. He presents to us selections from Christ's sayings, arranged in what is clearly often an artificial and literary manner. A good example of this is the Charge to the Twelve. The nucleus of this consists of a few sayings, recorded by St. Mark, addressed to the Twelve when Christ sent them forth on a journey of preaching in Palestine. But the editor of the First Gospel is so little concerned with the actual historical facts that he omits altogether the statements descriptive of their going forth and of their return. The local and temporary mission in Palestine merges itself in his mind in the wider and universal mission to all nations. He draws from his sources many other sayings which had reference to this wider mission work, and adds them to St. Mark's short discourse, regardless of the fact that some of them were not spoken on that particular occasion. Now, selection and artificial grouping of this kind, useful as it is, inevitably involves over-emphasis. Teaching, which would have explained and counter-balanced that which is recorded, is left out, and impressions are given which would be qualified, if the selection given had been larger, or the grouping less artificial. And combined with this feature of arbitrary selection and artificial grouping may be linked the local character of the Gospel, and the early date of its material. For it is clear that the Jewish-Christian disciples in the early Church stood too near to the life of the Christ to be able to form any adequate conception of the true meaning of His person or His work. Jesus had, we may be sure, said many things that were obscure at the moment of utterance, had spoken sometimes in parable, sometimes in symbol, sometimes in paradox. And the first Christians of Jerusalem did, it is clear, what, after all, others since them have often done, *i.e.* they interpreted the life of Christ in the light of their own historical surroundings, and

selected from His teaching those elements which enabled them to adapt their ideas of His meaning to their own lives, without making an absolute breach with all that life had hitherto meant for them. The development of history is, as we now see, the truest interpreter of much that Christ said, and not until Jerusalem fell could His teaching about the future of Christianity become clear.

We shall expect, then, to find in the Gospel an over-emphasis upon certain points arising from artificial grouping of sayings, and from omission of other aspects of Christ's teaching. We shall also not be surprised to find interpretations of His sayings which the later developments of history have proved to be mistaken. Let us apply this to the chief conceptions of the Gospel.

(1) *The permanence of the Law.*—If we may judge from the general tenor of the NT evidence, Christ laid down no hard and fast rules for dealing with the difficult problem of the obligations of the Mosaic Law. But on special occasions He seems to have given expression to the idea that particular precepts or sanctions belonged to a bygone age, and had lost their validity. St. Mark (who is here supported by St. Luke and St. Paul) represents Him as teaching that the tacit sanction of divorce by Deu 24:1-4 should be set aside as a concession to weakness, and should, from a Christian point of view, be superseded by an ideal view of marriage as a tie which could not be broken. St. Mark again represents Him as implicitly annulling the Mosaic distinctions between clean and unclean meats, on the ground that defilement was moral and internal, not external and ceremonial. And the fact that He taught views of the Law which were not those of orthodox Judaism, is suggested by the statements that the Pharisees attempted to entrap Him into some statement about the Law, or upon subjects with which the Law dealt, which could be used as an accusation against Him (Mar 10:2 [πειράζοντες], Mat 22:35 [πειράζων]). But the history of the early Church proves that it was difficult for the first Jewish disciples to suppose that the Messiah had ever countenanced the view that any part of the OT Scriptures had lost its original hold upon the consciences of men. This is the stand point of the editor of the First Gospel. Christ had taught that not a letter should pass from the Law until all had been fulfilled, and that anyone who relaxed the authority of the least commandment of the Law should be least in the Kingdom of heaven (Mat 5:17-20). And not only was there this general statement of the permanent validity of the Law in general, but special laws had been sanctioned and reaffirmed by Christ as still valid and obligatory. Divorce must be sanctioned when there had been fornication (πορνεία) (Mat 15:32, Mat 19:9). The saying about clean and unclean had reference not to the Mosaic Law, but to the Pharisaic traditions about eating with unwashed hands (Mat 15:20). The Christian disciple who had a case against his brother was to take two or three witnesses, that the Mosaic Law might be satisfied (Mat 18:16). And in the great tribulation Christians were to pray that their flight might not fall on the

Sabbath, lest the Law should be broken (Mat 24:20). It is clear that the editor regarded the Mosaic Law as still binding in all its details on Christian men. Now it is probable that we must make allowance here for some over-emphasis due to local and national prejudice which interpreted Christ's sayings in the direction which the history of the Jewish people seemed to warrant, and which took effect in the selection, and arrangement, and interpretation of such of His sayings as lent themselves to the impression which it was desired to produce.

The most obvious instance of this process may be found in Mt.'s treatment of Mar 10:1-12. That narrative is perfectly clear, coherent, and decisive. The Pharisees, who knew well that Christ taught a doctrine about the sanctity of marriage which seemed to set aside the sanction of divorce by the Law (Deu 24:1-4), came to test Him, *i.e.* to get from Him a direct statement which would enable them to say that He was attacking the Mosaic ordinance. He met their challenge with the expected answer. The permission of divorce by the Law was a concession to human weakness. From an ideal standpoint, the marriage tie was indissoluble. The man or woman* [Note: For divorce by a woman amongst the Jews, cf. Aramaic Papyri discovered at Assuan, p. 12 (London, G. Moring, 1906).] who put away their partner committed adultery. Nothing can be clearer than this, and it is in accordance with the tradition of Christ's teaching, preserved by St. Luke (Luk 16:18) and by St. Paul (1Co 7:10-11). But the editor of the First Gospel has introduced hopeless confusion into the narrative. He represents the Pharisees as asking for an interpretation of Deu 24:1-4. The Jewish theologians were divided upon the point. Some—the school of Shammai—argued that by דבר ערוה some act of unchastity was intended. Cf. *Gittin, 90a*: 'No one shall divorce his wife unless there be found in her something unchaste' (ערוה דבר). They thus placed the emphasis upon the word ערוה. But others—the school of Hillel—allowed divorce for any idle pretext, emphasizing the word דבר. Accordingly, the Pharisees in Mt. ask, 'Is it lawful to put away a wife for every cause?' Christ answers, as in Mk., that from an ideal standpoint marriage is indissoluble. The Pharisees appeal to Deuteronomy 24. Now clearly Christ should be represented as reaffirming and supporting what He has said by declaring (as in Mk.) that the permission of Deuteronomy 24 was a concession to human weakness, and that a higher principle was to be found in the purpose of God as declared in Gen 1:27. But, instead, He is represented as saying that σοφεια constituted an exception to the ideal principle. Thus He is made to reaffirm the Law of Deuteronomy 24, interpreted in the sense of the school of Shammai, and to acknowledge the permanent obligation of a sanction which He had just criticised.

It seems clear that the editor of Mt. has confused Mk.'s consistent narrative by introducing into it a clause which entirely confuses the point at issue. Now, if we ask

why he has done this, we remember that earlier in his Gospel (Mat 5:32) he has inserted a saying (probably from the Matthaean *Logia*) in which this same exception to the general rule occurs. The words are not identical. In Mat 5:32 they are *παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας*, but in Mat 19:9 (εἰ) μὴ ἐπὶ πορνεία (but BDS² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 33 latt have *παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας* here also). The two clauses look like alternative renderings of the phrase *ערוה דבר*, which the school of Shammai declared to be the ground of divorce. That is to say, in Mat 19:9 the editor has blended with Mk.'s narrative another tradition of the Lord's words, which was furnished to him by his Palestinian source; and we have a clear case of a saying of Christ altered in process of transmission to bring it into accordance with the Mosaic Law. Of course the saying of Mat 5:32 may be as genuine and original as Mar 10:11-12. It is quite possible that Christ should have on one occasion taught as Mk. represents Him, and on another have sanctioned the necessity of divorce for *πορνεία*. But there is a good deal of probability in the supposition that, as a matter of fact, He appealed to the ideal view of marriage as a principle which should guide men, leaving it to the common sense of His disciples to realize that when the sin of men makes a breach in the ideal law, such sin drags with it the necessity of divorce. In this case the clause which allows an exception will be an accretion to His words, added in the early Palestinian Church to His simple statement that no man must divorce his wife and no woman her husband, in order to harmonize it with the supposed teaching of the OT, and then transferred by Mt. into Mk.'s narrative.

Another somewhat similar case may be found in Mar 7:14-23 = Mat 15:10-20. The reading and interpretation of Mar 7:19 are obscure. According to one reading, *καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα* may be a comment of the Evangelist, to the effect that Christ's teaching on this occasion 'purged all meats,' *i.e.* cancelled the Mosaic distinctions between clean and unclean meats. But however this may be, the narrative leaves on the mind of the reader the impression that the inevitable effect of such teaching as is here recorded would be to make null these distinctions of the Mosaic Law. Now the editor of Mt. clearly wished to avoid this inference. He omits the clause *καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα*, and at the end of the discourse turns the mind of the reader from the inevitable inference by adding the clause, 'But to eat with unwashen hands defileth not a man,' as though the whole discourse had been dealing with the Pharisaic regulations about ceremonial hand-washing. Thus he carries the reader back at once to the previous question, and, so far as possible, prevents him from drawing the natural and inevitable conclusion from the discourse as recorded by Mk.

A somewhat similar desire to avoid words which might seem out of harmony with OT regulations has probably caused the omission in Mat 12:8 of the clause, 'The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath,' found in Mar 2:27.

Lastly, an example of over-emphasis due to arrangement of sayings may be found in Mat 5:17-20. It is quite probable that Mat 5:18-19 are genuine sayings of Christ spoken on some occasion when their meaning could not be mistaken, as a paradoxical expression of the permanent value of the moral elements in the OT. But as they now stand they hopelessly confuse the plain tenor of the Sermon. The illustrations given in Mat 5:21-43 make it clear that the 'fulfilling' of Mat 5:17 meant to make clear the true spiritual meaning of the Law. But Mat 5:18-19 interpret πληρῶσαι in another sense; namely, to reaffirm and carry out in detail, which is indeed in harmony with the teaching of Rabbinical Judaism, but is inconsistent with the plain meaning of the rest of the chapter. If Mat 5:18-19 be omitted as extraneous to this context, and due to the practice of the editor of bringing together sayings which in any way bear upon the same subject, the meaning of Mat 5:17; Mat 5:20-43 is quite clear. Christ did not, as His adversaries argued, subvert the Law. He reaffirmed its spiritual principles, and gave to it a deeper meaning than that arrived at by Rabbinical exegesis. The 'righteousness' of His disciples was to exceed that of the Pharisees, because it would be based upon a more spiritual understanding of the principles underlying the OT revelation.

(2) *The near approach of the Kingdom.*—A still more difficult problem is raised by the question, Did Jesus Christ promise that He would come again on the clouds of heaven within the lifetime of the generation to which He spoke? The Palestinian Church, as represented by the First Gospel, certainly believed that this was the case. But did they misunderstand Him? And the question may be raised in an earlier form. Nearly all the terms used in sayings of this nature were familiar technical theological terms in use in the apocalyptic writings, which expressed one side of contemporary Messianic expectation. e.g. 'the Son of Man,' 'the clouds of heaven,' the 'coming' of the Son of Man, 'the throne of glory,' 'the coming age,' 'the day of judgment,' the division between righteous and wicked, the condemnation to Gehenna, the inheritance of the Kingdom by the righteous, the feast in the Kingdom, and 'eternal life'—all these formed part of the ordinary mental equipment of every writer who tried to express the hopes of Israel under apocalyptic imagery. Did the Lord use them of Himself, or did the Palestinian Church try to express her faith and belief in Him as the Divine Messiah by transferring to Him the phrases and the imagery of current Messianic belief? Attempts have been made to show that the second supposition is the more probable,* [Note: E.g. it has been argued on linguistic grounds that Christ could not have spoken of Himself as the 'Son of Man,' and that much of the apocalyptic imagery in Mark 13, Matthew 24, is due to the blending of a Jewish Apocalypse with genuine

sayings of Christ. But the former theory is still unproven, and the second is an unsuccessful exegetical device to solve a difficulty.] but, so far as the present writer can judge, they have failed in their aim. For it is impossible to disentangle all apocalyptic imagery from Christ's teaching, without entirely destroying the credit of the Gospels as historical records. This kind of imagery and metaphor is, of course, more accumulated in the First Gospel than in the others, and one or two phrases, as, e.g., the 'end' or 'consummation of the age,' and 'the throne of glory,' occur only in it, but still all the Gospels contain a good deal. If Christ did not speak of Himself as the 'Son of Man' and of His 'coming' at the Last Day, and of other similar things, then we have no solid ground for believing that any saying recorded of Him is genuine.

But if we assume that Christ did use of Himself this apocalyptic language, what shall we say of the more important question, Are, then, the conceptions which His sayings, as they are arranged in the First Gospel, seem to convey, to be taken as a part of the real teaching? And here we shall necessarily have to take into consideration the following facts amongst others.

(a) It seems clear that Christ must have given utterance to words which left upon the minds of the early disciples the impression that He had promised to come again shortly. For this conception not only pervades the Synoptic Gospels, but is found in almost every part of the NT literature.

(b) It was, however, inevitable that any expressions of time to which He gave utterance should have been interpreted by His Jewish adherents to imply a short time literally. For if we grant for a moment, for the sake of argument, that He had foreknowledge of the future development of history, it is clear to us now that it would have been inconsistent with His methods of teaching to have unveiled to His disciples the historical details of future ages. On the other hand, He may well have wished that His return should be, as it has been, the soul's pole-star of His lovers in every successive age, and have left the period of His Coming veiled in ambiguous language. In that case the early Jewish Church has been influenced by the contemporary Messianic belief which always placed the coming of the Messiah in the near future, and has selected from Christ's sayings those which were most easily interpreted to convey the impression of the nearness of the Kingdom.

This will partly explain the large part which sayings referring to the near approach of the Kingdom play in the First Gospel. Some of these occur only in this Gospel, as, e.g., Mat 10:23; Mat 13:24-30; Mat 13:36-43; Mat 13:47-50; Mat 19:28 a, Mat 25:1-13; Mat 25:31-46. In other cases a saying, the original form of which was found in the Second Gospel, has been modified so as to make it express clearly this idea. For example, in Mar 9:1 occur the words 'until they see the kingdom of God come with power.' Although a reference to the immediately preceding verse would

naturally suggest that this coming of the 'kingdom of God' was identical with the coming of the Son of Man with His angels, the words taken by themselves might be interpreted by the reader to refer to the Transfiguration which follows, or to some later event, such as the Day of Pentecost, or the Fall of Jerusalem. The editor of the First Gospel has been unwilling to leave them in this ambiguity, and by changing them into 'the Son of Man coming in His kingdom,' interprets them unmistakably of the coming in glory with the angels (Mat_16:27), which he then believed to be about to take place during the lifetime of some to whom the words were originally spoken. Again, in Mar_14:62 occur the words 'you shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of the power, and coming with the clouds of heaven.' The editor of the First Gospel (Mat_26:64) inserts before 'you shall see' the words ἀπ' ἄρτι. This phrase is difficult, because the words should mean 'from this present moment' (cf. 'Matthew,' *l.c.*). But since the period between the Crucifixion and the Resurrection must on any interpretation be excluded, it is probable that the words mean 'you shall soon, shortly, see,' etc. That is again an expression of the belief of the editor that the Second Coming was near at hand. A similar case is found in Mat_24:29, where the editor inserts into Mk.'s discourse the word 'immediately,' thus again linking the Second Coming closely with the Fall of Jerusalem.

These facts suggest irresistibly the conclusion that the editor or the tradition which he follows has, by accumulating sayings of one kind, and by modifying others to some slight extent in order to give them the required meaning, given the impression that the Lord taught a nearness of His coming to inaugurate the Kingdom, which goes beyond what He Himself originally intended. He spoke, no doubt, of the coming of the Son of Man in glory, using apocalyptic language, which He may or may not have intended to be taken literally. The early Jewish Church has interpreted it quite literally, and read into it that element of immediacy which is presupposed in all apocalyptic writings. He forecast, no doubt, the catastrophe to which the shortsighted policy of the Jewish authorities was hurrying that ill-starred people. The early Church linked together these two classes of utterance, and believed that both would receive their fulfilment at the same period.

If, then, we must allow for some over-emphasis, some foreshortening in the presentation of this conception in the First Gospel, we shall naturally ask if there is not evidence that Christ's teaching anticipated, in fact, a longer development of history than that here presupposed. Even within the First Gospel itself many of His sayings suggest a different interpretation from that put upon them by the editor (e.g. the parables of the Mustard Seed, the Drag-net, and see below). And when we pass to the writers who have emancipated themselves from Jewish theological conceptions, we see that Christ's words were regarded as presupposing a longer development of historical events than that suggested by the First Gospel. This, of course, is true of

the later Epistles of St. Paul, of the Fourth Gospel, and of St. Luke. And the verdict of the historian must be that the Jewish-Christian interpretation of Christ's words upon this point is not likely to be most accurate, because it is Jewish and because it is early. Rather these two factors would, in the nature of things, concur to impel the first Jewish Christians to an interpretation of His sayings which is one-sided, and in part overemphasized, just because it is local and early. The best interpreter of much that Christ taught has been the later development of history.

(3) *The scope of the Gospel.*—It is known that the later Jewish theologians had no strictly formulated views of the relation of the Gentiles to the future Messianic salvation. In some few passages of their writings, especially in the Sibylline Oracles, it would seem as though they looked forward to the admittance of Gentiles into the Kingdom on equal terms with the Jews, simply on the ground of obedience to God (cf. Sib. Or iii. 740). But the prevailing tendency was very different. When the Kingdom came, the Gentiles would be annihilated; or they would be condemned to everlasting punishment in Gehenna; or they would, if they were righteous, participate in the Messianic salvation, but only as proselytes, or as subjects of the Jewish people.

To the early Jewish Christians, who had been trained in such conceptions as these, it was inevitable that Christ's teaching, if it were universal in ultimate scope and intention, implicitly rather than explicitly should seem to point to a national rather than a universal Kingdom. That this was the belief of the first disciples at Jerusalem, the first half of the Acts bears witness. Only the pressure of circumstances could force the Apostles to go back to Christ's words, and to see that they bore within them the seeds of a belief in a universal, spiritual monarchy, which was quite unlimited in scope. It needed a vision to convince St. Peter of this, and Galatians 3 shows how difficult the lesson was for him. In this respect the First Gospel has a twofold outlook. Underlying the surface there may clearly be seen, in the words of Christ which are recorded, expressions which would naturally convey the implication that Christianity was intended to influence all mankind. The gospel was to be preached to all nations (Mat 24:14). The disciples were to make disciples of all nations (Mat 28:19). Many were to come from east and west, and sit down within the Kingdom (Mat 8:11). The Kingdom was to be given to another nation, and to be taken from the Jews (Mat 21:43). But these sayings have all the appearance of words which were interpreted in a limited sense by the editor of the Gospel. If the Kingdom was to come immediately after the fall of Jerusalem, then the preaching to the Gentiles could be but a superficial process. It was to be 'for a testimony.' Moreover, there is nothing in the Gospel to suggest an unconditioned equality of Jew and Gentile. The supposition is rather probable that the editor assumed that such Gentiles as became Christians would do so as proselytes of the Jewish-Christian Church. They were to be 'made disciples,' that is to say, to be merged in the Jewish-Christian Church. If they had not the fitting wedding garment, they would be excluded from the Kingdom; and the

garment probably symbolizes, in the editor's mind, the 'righteousness' which was to be greater than that of the Pharisees, only as being based upon a deeper insight into the spiritual intention of the Mosaic Law, which by no means permitted any relaxation of its obligations.

Here again we must, as it would seem, make some allowance for over-emphasis, due partly to artificial arrangement of Christ's sayings, partly to a limited insight into their true scope and meaning, which was due to past religious training. Some lapse of time, some clearing of spiritual vision by the actual facts of life when Christianity came into contact with pagan peoples, was needed before it could be realized that if Christianity was intended for the Jew first and also for the Greek, it nevertheless was to include them both in a position of absolute equality, and to appeal to men without respect to differences of race or creed. See also Gospels, Logia, Luke (Gospel), Mark (Gospel), Papias, Sermon on the Mount, etc.

Literature.—Willoughby C. Allen, Com. on 'St. Matthew' in *ICC [Note: CC International Critical Commentary.]*, 1907 (see List of Authorities on p. lxxxix ff.); Th. Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus*, 1903, the same author's *Forschungen f. Gesch. d. NT Kanons*, 1881-1903, *Gesch. d. NT Kanons*, 1888-1890, and his *Einleit. in das NT*, 1897-1899; H. J. Holtzmann, *Handkom. 'Die Synoptiker'*, 1901; Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Matthaevi*, 1904, the same author's *Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten*, 1899, and his *Einleit. in die drei ersten Evangelien*, 1905; A. Merx, *Das Evangelium Matthäus*, 1902; Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, 1906; the Comm. of Broadus (1887), Morison (1875), Alford⁷ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (1874), Schanz (R. C., 1879), Meyer-Weiss (1898), Maclaren (1892), A. B. Bruce (in *EGT [Note: GT Expositor's Greek Testament.]*, vol. i.). See also Scholten, *Das Aelteste Evangelium*, 1869; Renan, *Les Evangiles*, 1877; Roehrich, *La composition des Evangiles*, 1897; Bruce, *With Open Face*, 1896, pp. 1-24; Sir J. C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, 1899; Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu* [English translation 1902]; P. Wernle, *Die Synopt. Frage*, 1899; F. Blass, *Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Matthäus*, 1900; the Introductions of Hilgenfeld, S. Davidson, Bleek-Mangold, Westcott, Salmon, B. Weiss, H. J. Holtzmann, Jülicher, Godet; artt. 'Matthew' (by J. V. Bartlet) in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible* and 'Gospels' (by Schmiedel) in *Ebi [Note: Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.]*. Special points are dealt with in such works as Resch's 'Kindheitsevangelium' in *TU [Note: U Texte und Untersuchungen.]* x. 5; Hoelmann, *Bibelstudien* (on the Eschatological Discourse), 1860; Weifferbach, *Der Wiederkunftsgedanke Jesu*, 1873; Schwartzkopff, *Die Weissagungen Jesu Christi*, 1896 [English translation 1897].

Willoughby C. Allen.

☞ Meals

MEALS.—The prevalent custom amongst the Jews in the time of Jesus was to have two formal meals in the day. Both these are referred to more than once in the Gospels by the terms ἄριστον and δεῖπνον (cf. Luk 14:12, where both words occur in the same context), and we know from these writings that it was to either of these meals that guests were invited to partake of the festive hospitality of their friends (cf. Luk 14:12, Luk 11:37, Luk 14:16 f.). Besides these, it was customary to have an informal meal at an early hour of the day (ἀκράτισμα or ἄριστον πρωϊνόν), which was a very light repast, consisting of a piece of bread, or bread with some accompanying relish, such as oil or melted butter (Robinson, *BRP* [Note: *RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.*] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ii. 18). This meal is only once referred to in the NT (Joh 21:12; Joh 21:15), and there the word used is the same as that which occurs in the Lukan narrative of Jesus ‘dining’ (ἄριστᾶν) in the Pharisee’s house (Luk 11:37 f.).

It is probably this meal which ‘the virtuous woman’ of Proverbs rises so early to provide (Pro 29:23 [LXX Septuagint] = 31:15 [Heb.]), and which at the present time constitutes the breakfast of the populace in Palestine. It is, moreover, probable that it is this meal which is called in the Talmud the ‘early snack’ (שְׁתֵּי פֶתַח), though Edersheim refers this descriptive title to the ἄριστον of the NT (see his *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 205 n. [Note: note.] 3; cf. also Plummer, ‘St. Luke,’ in *Internat. Crit. Com.* on Luk 11:37).

The mid-day meal, corresponding somewhat to the modern luncheon, was partaken of at hours varying, according to rank and occupation, from 10 a.m. till noon (*Shabbath*, 10a). It was partaken of immediately after the business of the forenoon was concluded, whether in the market-place (Mar 7:4), in the synagogue (Edersheim, vol. ii. p. 205; cf. 1Ki 13:7), or during the heat of the middle of the day, when the labourers were compelled to desist from their field work (cf. Rth 2:14). Josephus informs us that the Jews were required by their Law to make their breakfast (ἀριστοποιεῖσθαι) at noon on Sabbath days (*Vita*, 54, cf. also Gen 43:16; Gen 43:25 and 2Sa 24:15, where the LXX Septuagint has ἕως ὥρας ἀριστου, which is rendered by Pesh. ‘till the sixth hour’). This, too, was generally a meal of a simple character, consisting of bread with parched corn, the former being moistened with a little vinegar (Rth 2:14), or of bread broken down into a bowl of pottage, together with

some weak or diluted wine (στάμνον οίνου κεκερασμένου, Bel 33 [LXX Septuagint , Swete's ed.]). Fish grilled by laying it upon the hot charcoal (άνθρακιά) was also a common article of food accompanying the bread (see Joh 21:9).

The principal meal of the whole day was the δεῖπνον, which was eaten after the day's work was finished (see Luk 17:7). This would naturally be about the time of the going down of the sun, which will explain the Lukan narrative of Jesus and the two disciples at Emmaus (πρὸς ἑσπέραν, Luk 24:29 f.). This was the time of the day when Jesus is recorded by the three Synoptists to have miraculously fed the multitudes (ὥρα πολλή, Mar 6:35; ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης ... καὶ ἡ ὥρα ἤδη παρηλθεν, Mat 14:15; ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλίνειν, Luk 9:12). The Passover was also eaten during the evening, and it was at the conclusion of that festal meal (μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι) that Jesus instituted the Feast memorial of His death.

We find numerous references to the δεῖπνον in the writings of Josephus, from whom we learn incidentally that this was usually an elaborate meal and closely connected with sacrificial feasting; that sometimes it was prolonged to a late hour, which may explain the Preacher's reference to the dangerous habit of over-eating before retiring to sleep (Ecc 5:11, cf. Tob 8:1; Josephus *Vita*, 44, 63, *Ant.* vi. iv. 1, xiv. xv. 11, etc.; 3Ma 5:14).

The principal constituent of every meal was bread, which was regarded, indeed, as the meal itself. So much so was this the case, that the word 'bread' (ἄρτος) was used by the ancient Hebrews either for bread in particular or for food in general (see *Encyc. Bibl.* art. 'Bread,' vol. i. col. 604). It was over the bread that the blessing was pronounced which was thus supposed to have been spoken over all the rest of the solid food eaten during the first part of the meal. So strongly was this held by all Jews, that for them bread assumed a *quasi*-sacred character, and elaborate rules were devised for its treatment at table (see Edersheim, *op. cit.* vol. ii. pp. 205-210).

The Hebraistic φαγεῖν ἄρτον occurs again and again as a synonym for an ordinary meal (Mat 15:2, Mar 7:2, Luk 14:1; Luk 14:15, cf. Joh 21:13, Gen 43:16 [LXX Septuagint], Exo 3:20 [LXX Septuagint], etc., see art. Bread above and in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , vol. i. p. 315^b). Keeping this fact in mind, we are enabled to feel the force of Jesus' words in His great sacramental discourse (Joh 6:26-59), and also to understand the true reason for the rejection by the Jews of His reiterated claims. It was not that their interpretation of His words was carnal (cf. Joh 6:52-58).

‘There was no gross misunderstanding on their part, but a clear perception of the claim involved in the Lord’s words’ (Westcott, *Gospel of St. John, ad loc.*). The phrases in which He couched these claims were such as would present no real difficulty to a thinking Jew, as they might easily be paralleled out of his sacred literature (ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς, ὁ ἄρτος τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ ἄρτον ὁ ζῶν, ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς). Bread, which is the representative and symbol of all earthly food, is the type of Him who is the Representative Man, imparting life to all who will partake of His Spirit.

On three different occasions we are told that Jesus was the invited guest of a Pharisee; and, so far as the circumstances in each instance testify, it was at one of their ordinary meals that He was present. It is remarkable that it is St. Luke who records all these occurrences, and at the same time it is noteworthy that he uses three different expressions in his wording of the formal invitations (ἵνα φάγη μετ’ αὐτοῦ, Luk 7:36; ὅπως ἀριστήσῃ παρ’ αὐτῶ, Luk 11:37; σαββάτῳ φαγεῖν ἄρτον, Luk 14:1). Not only are the invitations couched in varying phrases, but St. Luke uses different words when referring to the attitude of the guests at the meals (κατεκλιθη, Luk 7:36; ἀνέπεσεν, Luk 11:37; συνανακειμένων, Luk 14:15). There is every probability that in each case it was the mid-day meal to which Jesus was invited. It became customary amongst the Jews to make three elaborate meals on the Sabbath day (‘*Observa diem Sabbati; non Judaicis deliciis,*’ quoted by Plummer, *op. cit.* p. 354). So much so, indeed, was this the case, that specially devised rules were made for carrying out the observance of the Sabbath feasts, and special spiritual benefits were supposed to be conferred on those who, overcoming the difficulties interposed by poverty, supplied themselves with the choicest procurable food for that day (see *Peah*, viii. 7, and the examples quoted from *Shabbath* by Lightfoot in his *Hor. Heb. et Talm. [Note: Talmud.]* on Luk 14:1; cf. Edersheim, *op. cit.* ii. 52, 437; Farrar, *Life of Christ*, ii. 119 n. [Note: note.] 2). It was on the occasion of one of these Sabbath meals that a fellow-guest of Jesus, on hearing Him speak, answered with the exclamation, ‘Blessed is he that shall eat bread (φάγεται ἄρτον) in the kingdom of God’ (Luk 14:15), referring, of course, to the popular Jewish idea that the Messianic Kingdom was to be ushered in by a banquet, and that feasting was to be the chief occupation of those who shared its glories (cf. Isa 25:6),—an idea which finds a place in the illustrative teaching of Jesus on the universal character of the future Kingdom of God (cf. ἀνακληθήσονται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, Luk 13:29; see Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, English translation vol. i. pp. 217, 221).

At first sight it may seem strange that Jesus should countenance the Jewish custom of Sabbath banqueting, which was carried to such excess that its character for luxury became proverbial. At the same time we must remember that the principle which lay at the root of this method of feasting was the honour of the Sabbath day (cf. three quotations from *Shabbath* illustrative of this in Lightfoot, *op. cit.* iii. 149). Nor was this practice out of harmony with Jesus' views and teaching on the Sabbath rest, so long as it was conducted in a spirit of humility, mutual toleration, and charity (cf. Luk 14:7-14). It is of interest, and in this respect not without significance, to notice that, on the last Sabbath spent by Jesus before His Passion, He was the chief guest at a festive meal (ἐποίησαν οὖν αὐτῷ δεῖπνον ἐκεῖ, Joh 12:2). This was probably on the evening of the Sabbath day as it was drawing to a close and passing away, when festivities were of the most liberal and elaborate character (*epulæ lautiores*); and it is evident from the three narratives (St. Luke's story of the anointing of Jesus by the 'woman who was a sinner' [7:37] can scarcely be a record of the same event [see, however, Hengstenberg, *Com. on St. John*, English translation pp. 1-33, etc.]) that it made a deep impression on the minds of Jesus' followers (cf. Mar 14:3, Mat 26:6 f., Joh 12:2). From the way in which St. John dispenses with the use of the nominative before the verb, it would seem that this meal was of a semi-public character, designed to do honour to Jesus, and that the house of 'Simon the leper' was made the meeting-place for all who wished to meet Him (cf. Westcott, *ad loc.*, and Edersheim, *op. cit.* ii. 357 f.). It is impossible not to be struck with the way in which Jesus makes use of the opportunity afforded by His presence at these meals on the Sabbath, to inculcate lessons of large-hearted charity even when His host is inclined to be the discourteous critic (Luk 7:39; Luk 11:38; Luk 11:45 ff., Luk 14:1 ff. cf. Joh 12:7 f.). There is no appearance of disapproval in His attitude to wards what was tending to, if it had not already become, an abuse, because there were latent possibilities for good in the joyous and festive Sabbath. It was to these possibilities that He directed His attention.

Acting on these principles, we can understand His words and deeds on the evening when He instituted 'the Lord's Supper' (κυριακὸν δεῖπνον, 1Co 11:20). As we have seen, the Jewish custom was to constitute the bread the representative food at their meals. In the same way wine was considered the representative drink. Many and elaborate rules were formulated as to the manner in which blessings were to be said over these, and the discussions arising out of the etiquette to be observed degenerated into meaningless verbalism (see *Berakhoth*, 35a, 36a, 41b, referred to by Edersheim, ii. 206). In spite of this spiritual decadence and barren ritualism, Jesus did what was characteristic of His general teaching. He rescued the primitive act from its debased surroundings, and the wine blessed (τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας) became the means of a participating of 'the blood of Christ' (κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος), and the loaf

blessed and broken (τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, ἄρτον εὐλογήσας) became the joyful (εὐχαιροιστήσας) communion of ‘the body of Christ’ (cf. 1Co 10:16 f., 1Co 11:23-27, Luk 22:19 f., Mar 14:22 f., Mat 26:26 f.). In a spirit somewhat similar He dealt with the elaborate ceremonial washings which His Jewish contemporaries sought to elevate to the rank of a compulsory religious rite (Mat 15:2 = Mar 7:2 ff., Luk 11:38; for a description of this Jewish practice during meals, see Edersheim, ii. 207). Not the least remarkable of the lessons, objective and spiritual, inculcated by Jesus was that in which He transformed what had become a tedious and worse than meaningless series of forms into a beautiful example of social service and personal humility (see Joh 13:4 ff., cf. Luk 22:27). By this single act He gathered up into one the various customs of His day, including the hospitable one of the guests’ feet being washed by their host’s servants before they sat down to eat, and taught His disciples the dignity of labour in the service of humanity (cf. Mat 18:1-14, see Westcott on Mat 13:4, and Plummer, ‘St. John’ in *Camb. Gr. Test. ad loc.*). Nor must we omit to note here that the Church’s Eucharistic meal constitutes the most emphatic object-lesson of the essential oneness of all Christian people in a brotherhood as extensive as her own borders, as intensive and real as any of the claims of Jesus to rule within the sphere of human thought (cf. πάντες δὲ ὑμεῖς ἀδελφοί ἐστε Mat 23:8; and Phm 1:16).

Several different words are employed by the Evangelists to denote the bodily attitude of the Jews at their meals, all of which, however, imply that the custom was to recline with the body stretched out (cf. Edersheim, ii. 207). In this respect it is interesting to note the differences in usage, and the preferences for one or more of these words which characterize each of the writers. St. Luke, for example, uses a word no fewer than 5 times which occurs nowhere else in the NT (κατακλιθῆναι, Luk 7:36; Luk 14:8; Luk 24:30; κατακλίνειν, Luk 9:14-15). Hobart states that in his use of the active voice St. Luke is employing ‘the medical term for laying patients, or causing them to lie in bed, placing them in certain positions during operations—making them recline in a bath, etc.’ (*The Medical Language of St. Luke*, p. 69; cf. however, Luk 2:7; Luk 12:37). As might be expected, this Evangelist exhibits a richer and more flexible vocabulary than the others. On the only occasion of his using the verb κατακεῖσθαι (Luk 5:29 [D [Note: Deuteronomist.] ἄνακ εἰμένων]) for sitting at meals, he seems to employ it because he has already, in the immediately preceding context, made use of the same word to express a different idea (cf. Luk 5:25). The same might, of course, be said of St. Mark, who has this word in the same two senses in the parallel narrative. It is not probable, however, that St. Luke sacrificed his customary literary independence by a verbal copying of St. Mark, who, moreover, uses the same word for Jesus’ reclining at Supper in Bethany (Mar 14:3).

Of the 5 different words employed by the four Evangelists when speaking of sitting down to meals, St. Luke uses all (ἀνακλινειν twice, ἀναπιπτειν 4 times, ἀνακεισθαι with its compound συν- 5 times, κατακεισθαι once, κατακλινειν 5 times); St. Matthew uses three (ἀνακλινειν twice, ἀναπιπτειν once, ἀνακεισθαι and its compound συν- 7 times); St. Mark uses four (ἀνακλινειν once, ἀναπιπτειν twice, ἀνακεισθαι and its compound συν- 5 times, κατακεισθαι twice); St. John is characteristically limited in his use, and employs only two of these words (ἀναπιπτειν 5 times, ἀνακεισθαι 4 times without any employment of its compound).

In the narrative of the conversion and call of Levi (Matthew), which is common to the three Synoptists, St. Luke is the only one who expressly states that Jesus was the guest of the new disciple (Luk_5:29), the latter having made a feast in honour of his recently discovered Master. St. Matthew uses the vague expression ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ (Mat_9:10), which may mean 'inside' as contrasted with 'outside' (ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον, Mat_9:9), where lay the scene of Levi's call (cf. Plummer, *ad loc.*). St. Mark, on the other hand, seems to have understood that Jesus was the host and not the guest (cf. κατακεισθαι αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ, Mar_2:15, where his use of the same pronoun in the same sentence would point to this interpretation; see also συνανέκειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ, Mar_2:15; τῶν συνανακειμένων σοι, Luk_14:10; τοῖς συνανακειμένοις [*sc.* τῷ Ἡρώδῃ], Mar_6:22). On the other hand, it does not seem at all certain that either of these two writers connected the conversion of Levi with the entertainment (cf. καὶ ἐγένετο, Mat_9:10; καὶ γίνεται, Mar_2:15, which marks the commencement of a fresh narrative). It is improbable that St. Luke acted merely the part of interpreter by introducing his categorical assertion as a gloss (καὶ ἐποίησεν δοχὴν μεγάλην Λευεὶς αὐτῷ κ.τ.λ., Luk_5:29), thus doing away with a previous ambiguity. It is more likely that he had sufficient oral, if not documentary, authority to justify his statement (the word δοχὴ is peculiar to St. Luke, and is used by him only once afterwards as a general equivalent for ἄριστον ἢ δεῖπνον, Luk_14:12 f.); and we have St. Mark's authority for connecting the conversion of Simon and Andrew with hospitality to their newly-found Master and His other disciples (Mar_1:16 ff., Mar_1:29 ff.). Whether, however, this partaking by Jesus of a Sabbath-meal in the house of Simon Peter was secondary to the purpose of healing the fever-stricken πενθερὰ τοῦ Σίμωνος, would be difficult to determine. Nor must we forget the possibility that St. Luke's authority

for the statement that Jesus was the guest of His latest convert Levi may have been influenced by the parallel case we are here noticing—the conversion of the brothers Simon and Andrew and the subsequent entertainment in their own house of the newly discovered Messiah (cf. Joh_1:41).

Literature.—See for discussions of the last-mentioned questions, Wright, *Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek*, pp. 16 f., 23, etc.; Plummer, ‘St. Luke’ in *Internat. Crit. Com.* p. 159 f.; Gould, ‘St. Mark,’ *ib.* p. 41; O. Holtzmann, *Leben Jesu*, English translation p. 206; cf. art. ‘Matthew’ in *Encyc. Bibl.* col. 2986 f.; B. Weiss, *The Life of Christ* (T. & T. Clark), vol. ii. p. 125 n. [Note: note.] 2; Bengel, *Gnomon of the NT* on Mat_9:10; and, for the problem as to the identification of Matthew and Levi, which is germane to that we are discussing, see Zahn’s *Einleit. in das NT*, ii. p. 264.

J. R. Willis.

⚡ Measures

MEASURES.—See Weights and Measures.

⚡ Mediator

MEDIATOR

Introductory.—The title ‘Mediator’ is applied to our Lord in the NT only by St. Paul (1Ti_2:5) and the author of Hebrews (Heb_8:6; Heb_9:15; Heb_12:24). In Gal_3:19-20 St. Paul’s argument implies that there is an important sense in which Christ cannot be fitly called a mediator. Here Moses is described by this title, and the *mediator* (generic) is sharply distinguished from *God*. Moses was a person coming between two contracting parties, God and Israel, with the consequence that the law administered by Moses is apparently in opposition to the promises of God which depend upon God only. Obviously Christ is not such a mediator as Moses. He does not come between two contracting parties, for He Himself is the representative human receiver of God’s promise, and the Divine Son through whom we receive that promise. He includes both parties in His own Person, instead of coming between them. He is not the instrument of a contract, but the embodiment of a Divine gift. This passage implies that Christ united God and man, two parties previously at variance, in a wholly unique manner. And the same truth is asserted in the verse which calls Him ‘the one mediator

between God and men' (1Ti 2:5). In what sense St. Paul calls Christ a mediator will be shown more fully in § 3.

1. The Synoptic Gospels.—Although these do not employ the title 'mediator,' they throughout imply that the teaching, life, and death of Jesus were mediatorial. The familiar old division of His mediatorial functions into those of Prophet, Priest, and King is roughly correct, though it may be better to designate them as those of Prophet, King, and Redeemer. By such a division we are able to find a more natural place for those passages in the Synoptic Gospels which speak of His atoning work, than if we use the word 'Priest.' We are also able to do more justice to the truth that He revealed Himself as already the Messiah during 'the days of his flesh,' and did not teach that His Messianic Kingdom was only an affair of the future.

(a) The 'wisdom' of our Lord impressed His hearers at Nazareth, and when they were offended at the difference which they noted between Him and His humble family, Jesus said, 'A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country, and in his own house' (Mat 13:54-58). Here He seems in some way to claim the office of a *prophet*. And there are several passages which show that the ordinary people inclined to regard Him as a *Prophet*. See, fully, under art. Prophet.

(b) He is also *King*. He claimed to fulfil the Jewish expectation of an ideal King, the Messiah. This cannot be reasonably disputed, in spite of the fact that this claim did not represent all that He was and all that He demanded. The confession of His Messiahship by St. Peter, the dispute between His disciples for places of honour, and especially the desire of the sons of Zebedee to sit on His right hand and His left, cannot be thrown aside as legendary inventions. Nor can we fail to see the Messianic meaning of His triumphal entry into Jerusalem, His trial and answer to the high priest (Mar 14:62), and the inscription 'The King of the Jews' upon the cross. Apart from His Messianic claim, His life and His death become unintelligible, although He used the actual title very seldom, and rather avoided it on account of the political associations which clung to it. See, further, artt. King and Kingdom of God.

(c) Jesus, who is Mediator in revealing God, is also Mediator in *redeeming man*. He offered to the Father a sacrifice of perfect human obedience which effected a new relation between God and mankind. It was a reparation to God for the disobedience of man.

In dealing with the redemptive work of Christ, we have to consider as of primary importance the place occupied by His death in the theology as well as in the history of the Synoptics. It is frequently asserted or hinted that He did not foresee His death until an advanced period in His ministry, and that, when He found that it was inevitable, He did not attribute to it any power of obtaining the remission of sins.

These two theories do not elucidate the Gospels, but simply contradict them. All the accounts of our Lord's baptism represent Him as hearing the words which declare that He is the Son in whom the Father is well pleased (Mat_3:17, Mar_1:11, Luk_3:22). He was, therefore, from the first conscious that He fulfilled the Isaianic picture of the Servant of the Lord, who dies as a *guilt-offering* for the people. In submitting to baptism, He identified Himself with a race that has sinned; in submitting to the subsequent temptation, He identified Himself with a race which suffers when Satan lures it to sin. He also predicted His death early in His ministry. He is the bridegroom who will be taken away in the midst of joy, and His disciples will fast at that day (Mar_2:19-20). Later, He tells how He has to submit to the baptism of His Passion, and feels anguish until it is accomplished. He dreads it; but He desires it, because it is the necessary preliminary of His kindling a sacred fire on earth (Luk_12:49). With these words we must compare the question addressed to the ambitious sons of Zebedee, whether they can drink of His cup and be baptized with His baptism (Mar_10:38). The baptism and the cup represent the will of the Father with all the suffering which the doing of that will entailed. What that suffering was the story of Gethsemane tells us. It was there that He, with a final effort of His human will, identified Himself wholly with the Servant 'wounded for our transgressions.' But this identification had been outlined long before in the words, 'Whosoever would be first among you shall be servant of all. For verily the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many' (Mar_10:45). This acceptance of death was not a mere example of perfect resignation. He had taught His disciples not to fear those who kill the body (Mat_10:28), He had assured them that 'he that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it' (Mat_10:39). But the disciple who loses his life for Christ's sake does not necessarily win any life except his own, whereas Christ's death avails 'for many.' With this prediction we must connect the words used at the institution of the Lord's Supper. Assuming that Christ did institute this sacrament, we may also assume that He who taught His own not to fear those who kill the body, did not mean that when His blood was shed 'for many' it was shed to save them from being killed by the Jews or Romans. Whether He did or did not add the words 'for the remission of sins,' He must have meant that a new covenant was being made between God and man. His death had some special value in itself, or else the Church would not have continued to show forth the Lord's death (1Co_11:26). The special value which He attached to His own death is made plain by the account of the Lord's Supper contained in the Petrine Gospel of St. Mark no less than in the Pauline Gospel of St. Luke. The shedding of Christ's blood seals a covenant similar to the initial covenant made by Moses between God and the people (Exo_24:3-8); it consecrates a new people to God. It also fulfils Jeremiah's prophecy of a new covenant, of which the very foundation was the forgiveness of sins (Jer_31:31). And, like the blood of the Paschal lamb, the blood of Jesus saves His people from a destruction that comes from God. With this sacrifice of

Jesus His disciples are to hold communion. They appropriate the atonement, and as they appropriate it, it becomes for them a propitiation.

2. Acts of the Apostles and Epp. of St. Peter, St. Jude, and St. James.—The simple teaching about our Lord conveyed in Acts, more especially in chs. 1-12, and in the First Epistle of St. Peter and that of St. Jude and of St. James, justifies us in placing these books in a class by themselves. They represent a theology which in character, if not in date, is primitive, and in close touch with Judaism.

(a) In *Acts* Jesus is set forth as Prophet, Messiah, Son of God, and Redeemer. From the first He is the *Lord Jesus* (Act 1:6; Act 1:21). And at Pentecost St. Peter proclaims that ‘God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified’ (Act 2:36). He is the *Prophet* whom Moses had foretold, and those who will not hearken to Him will be utterly destroyed (Act 3:22-23). His *Messianic lordship* is repeatedly preached; He is the Holy and Righteous One, the Prince of life, the Saviour, the Stone or foundation of the true temple, the Stone now exalted to be the Head of the corner (Act 3:14-15, Act 5:31, Act 4:11). He is Lord of all (Act 10:36), and there is salvation in none other (Act 4:12). Miracles are regarded as His work, though He is no longer visibly present. He is preparing for the ‘Day of the Lord,’ when the Divine Kingdom will be vindicated, and He has Himself poured out the Holy Ghost to fit the disciples for that day (Act 2:33). Moreover, His unique *Sonship* is implied in the expression ‘the Father’ as used in the beginning of the book (Act 1:4; Act 1:7, Act 2:3). Fitly does St. Stephen direct to Him his dying prayer, and Saul declare that He is the Son of God (Act 9:20). The whole mission and work of Jesus is therefore mediatorial. His death has also an atoning mediatorial worth. Of great importance in Acts is the identification of our Lord with the suffering Servant of the Lord in Isaiah 53. Our Lord had so identified Himself, as is shown not only by the quotation in Luk 22:37 but by the whole tenor of His life from the time of His baptism. In Acts a keynote is struck by St. Peter’s words, ‘the God of our fathers hath glorified his Servant Jesus’ (Act 3:13). When Philip meets the Ethiopian eunuch he finds that he is reading Isaiah 53, and resolves his doubts by explaining that the vicarious sufferer is Jesus. Acts shows plainly that the Christian Church of the most primitive period applied to Jesus this prophecy. ‘Of a truth in this city against thy holy Servant Jesus, whom thou didst anoint, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the peoples of Israel, were gathered together, to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel foreordained to come to pass’ (Act 4:27-28).

These Apostolic words show precisely how the Church regarded the death of Christ. He died, not as any ordinary martyr, but as the Messiah and the atoning Servant. The death was a necessity, not because it was simply inevitable from the surroundings in which Jesus lived and against which He struggled, but because God Himself required it as an indispensable means for the realization of His will for man. It took place by His

foreknowledge (Act 2:23), it was foretold by His prophets (Act 3:18). Further, it would have been impossible for the Apostles to attribute this meaning to the death of Christ, unless they had been able to point to the empty grave, to assert that the Messiah lives, and that a direct relation can be established between Him and His sinful people. The Servant in Isaiah, though he died, lived again to 'prolong his days.' And because they were able to assert positively that Christ had risen, the first Christians were able to make the death of Christ a fundamental thing in their gospel. Repentance, faith, baptism, the gift of the Holy Spirit, are the distinctive gifts which flow from the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. St. Peter exerts himself to deepen a sense of sin in his hearers by pointing to the cross. They tried to destroy the Saviour, but God thwarted their effort by raising Him from the dead. Their act, so far from accomplishing what they desired, fulfilled God's counsel. Let them repent while there is time, before Christ returns to judgment (Act 2:14-21, Act 3:19-20, Act 4:10-11, Act 5:30-31, Act 10:36-43). God offers forgiveness to those who are baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and He offers the bestowal of the Holy Spirit to make a new life possible (Act 2:38).

If we compare this very early doctrine with that of St. Paul, we see that, simple though it is, it is radically the same. And against all modern attempts to represent St. Paul as the first man who inseparably joined together the thought of Christ's death, of sin, and of atonement, St. Paul's own words protest: 'I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures' (1Co 15:3). He affirms that he *received* it, and his testimony is true.

(b) In *First Peter* the mediatorial character of Christ's death is always present to the writer's mind. The doctrine of this Epistle may possibly have been influenced by that of St. Paul, but it is considerably less developed, and is such as we might well expect from St. Peter. The doctrine with regard to our Lord's Person is simple. It is taught that He existed before He was born on earth, for He was not only 'foreknown indeed before the foundation of the world' (1Pe 1:20), which might not necessarily imply a personal pre-existence, but His Spirit was in the prophets before the Incarnation (1Pe 1:11). To Him, as to a Divine Being, glory and dominion are ascribed (1Pe 5:11). In consequence of His resurrection, baptism 'saves' us (1Pe 3:21). It has an inward power to cleanse the soul in response to the interrogation of a good conscience, because Christ rose and lives.

But it is the Passion of Christ, the 'precious blood,' that fills this letter with its peculiar glow. By that blood, 'as of a lamb without blemish and without spot,' we were 'redeemed' (1Pe 1:18-19). It is a moral redemption, changing a former 'manner of life' into a better type of conduct. His action involved a patient endurance which it is the Christian's duty to imitate (1Pe 2:21, 1Pe 4:1, 1Pe 3:17-18). But it is, nevertheless, an objective external fact before it becomes subjective and inward.

Christians are 'elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, in sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ' (1Pe 1:2). The life of obedience involves sprinkling with the blood. As the Israelites were received into a unique relation with God at Sinai by being sprinkled with sacrificial blood, so by the blood shed on Calvary, a new elect race is dedicated to God. It is this blood that has an abiding power to cancel sin. What Christ did in His Passion is clearly stated, 'His own self bore our sins in his own body upon the tree' (1Pe 2:24). The word 'bear' means both 'endure,' and 'carry' a sacrifice to the altar. So Christ both endured the consequences of our sins, and carried them to the cross as if they were His own. He suffered for sins which were not His own, and He did it that we might be 'healed.' Again, St. Peter says that Christ 'suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God' (1Pe 3:18). He is urging his readers to be prepared to suffer for righteousness' sake; he hopes that their conduct may silence opposition, perhaps that it may bring others to God. But all the power to suffer rightly rests on an event now past. It is the solitary death of Christ 'for sins' that enables us to go to God and sets us right with God. Like St. Paul and like the author of Hebrews, St. Peter regards the death of Christ as the supreme event which established for mankind a free communion with the Father.

(c) The *Epistle of St. Jude* and the *Second of St. Peter* do not add to the doctrine of Christ's mediation. The lascivious sect against which the former is directed seems to have denied the reality of the Incarnation and of the Lordship of Christ (Jud 1:4), which the writer regards as essential. He mentions the Holy Spirit, God, and our Lord Jesus Christ together (Jud 1:21), and ascribes glory to 'God our Saviour' through Jesus Christ. 2 Peter also simply assumes the Divinity and mediatorial work of Christ. The writer describes himself as 'the bond-servant and apostle of Jesus Christ' (2Pe 1:1), describes Jesus as 'Lord and Saviour' (2Pe 2:20), speaks of growing 'in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ' (2Pe 3:18), and of entrance into His 'eternal kingdom' (2Pe 1:11).

(d) In the *Epistle of St. James* little is said, yet much is implied, respecting the Person of Christ. He is 'Lord' and 'the Lord of glory' (Jam 2:1). His is the 'honourable name' (Jam 2:7) which was named over Christians in baptism. He is unquestionably regarded as the Mediator of salvation. For the 'word of truth,' 'the implanted word' (Jam 1:18; Jam 1:21), which the Christians have received, has come to them through Christ, and He is called 'the judge' who 'standeth before the doors' (Jam 5:8-9). Moreover, the opposition manifested by St. James towards a misuse of Christian freedom is of a kind which implies that he, like the people whom he desired to refute, believed that faith gains blessings from God through Christ. He illustrates the necessity of good works by instances in which 'works' can hardly be distinguished from faith, but are its necessary expression. He insists that God requires a good life; but, no less truly than St. Paul, he insists that a living faith is requisite for salvation.

There is no developed Christology, but the writer who calls himself a 'bond-servant of God and of Jesus Christ,' and is so faithful both to the letter and to the spirit of Christ's moral teaching, must necessarily have believed that He is the Mediator between God and man.

3. The Pauline Epistles.—(a) St. Paul's doctrine of *the Person of Christ* is fundamentally the same in all his Epistles. And his whole teaching concerning the work of Christ is inseparable from the doctrine of His Person. Jesus is the Son of God, who, as such, possesses a superhuman and Divine nature. God is 'the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ' (2Co_1:3), and the Son shares in the spiritual immaterial nature of the Father. In his earliest Epistles, those to the Thessalonians, Jesus is called 'the Lord Jesus,' and each letter closes with the prayer that His 'grace' or unmerited kindness may be with His people. It is assumed that Jesus is exalted to heaven, is the Lord ruling the Church, and that He will return to judge the world. In the second group of Epistles—1 and 2 Cor., Gal., Rom. [Note: Roman.]—there is much teaching about our Lord's Person. He is God's 'own Son' (Rom_8:3), and to Him alone belongs the privilege of being 'the image of God' (2Co_4:4). St. Paul applies to Christ passages which in the OT refer to Jehovah (Rom_10:13, 1Co_2:16; 1Co_10:22), and in Rom_9:5 says that He is 'over all, God blessed for ever.' The Son of God is more ancient than all creation, and 'through him all things were made' (1Co_8:6). He existed in heaven before He was 'sent forth' on earth, and this coming to earth was for Him the humiliation of exchanging riches for poverty (2Co_8:9). The last two facts are fundamental in the next group of Epistles (Col_1:15-17, Php_2:5-11).

The third group of Epistles—Phil. [Note: Philistine.] , Col., Eph.—illustrates these doctrines more fully. Php_2:5-11 lays special stress upon the self-sacrifice involved in the Son of God taking 'the form of a servant.' In heaven He had 'the form of God,' but He 'emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men.' This likeness is elsewhere called 'the likeness of sinful flesh' (Rom_8:3). In Colossians, St. Paul attacks a superstitious theosophy which taught that worship ought to be paid to some intermediate beings who come between God and the world—a theory which implied that God could not come into direct contact with matter. Against this St. Paul insists upon the mediatorial work of the Son of God in both creation and redemption. He declares that the Son is the 'image' or adequate counterpart of the Father, and the 'firstborn of all creation,' *i.e.*, not the first being created, but, as the context shows, 'born before all creation' (Col_1:15-16). All things were created *in Him*, since their existence was conditioned by His thought; *by Him*, since it was through His power that they came into being; *unto Him*, since all creation finds in Him the summit of its evolution. All things cohere in Him (Col_1:17), and it was God's purpose that all things should be summed up in Him (Eph_1:10). The sum total of God's attributes dwells in Him *bodily* (Col_2:9). And the Church is an organism without which Christ deigns to regard Himself as incomplete, because

without the Church His incarnate life would not continue to be manifested. It is an extension of the Incarnation. It is a body in which Christ Himself lives and works (Eph 1:23), the suffering of its members completes His own (Col 1:24) by making possible a further application to mankind of His saving power.

The Church therefore exists to promote a certain relation between God and man. That relation is one of union and communion. The new confession which is taught to us by the Spirit of God's Son is expressed in the words 'Abba, Father.' The very Aramaic word used by Jesus in His communion with the Father in Gethsemane (Mar 14:36) is used by St. Paul to describe the Christian's attitude towards God. The prominence given by St. Paul to the love of God for man, for all men, for sinners, is unceasing. His certainty of God's love rests on all that Jesus did and does, but the most fundamental proof of it was that Jesus died. By this God commends His love toward us (Rom 5:8). This makes it obvious that God will give us all things (Rom 8:32). And this equally proves the love of Christ (2Co 5:14, Eph 5:2; Eph 5:25). The death of Christ is, therefore, the highest proof of the love of the Father and the love of Jesus for mankind. The mediatorial work of the Son of God is a process involved in the whole relation of His Divine Person to the world. But it was focused in one great event—His death.

(b) St. Paul's teaching about *the death of Christ* is entirely consistent. He teaches that there are two great elements in the process of the individual man's reconciliation with God. The first is his faith in Christ, who died as a sacrifice on our behalf. The second is that inward, vital, and ethical union with Christ, the 'life-giving Spirit' (1Co 15:45), involved in our baptism 'into Christ.'

To suppose that his language about dying as our 'ransom' or 'price' (1Co 6:20; 1Co 7:23, 1Ti 2:6, Tit 2:14) is inconsistent with our need of identification with Christ, or that the moral identification excludes the need of a sacramental identification, is to create an imaginary false antithesis. Sacrifice, rightly understood, implies communion with the object sacrificed. And sacraments convey the power which is taken and used by that moral choice which is called 'faith.' Baptism begins our new supernatural life (Rom 6:4 f.), the Lord's Supper imparts to us sustenance for that life (1Co 10:3 f.). In both we enter into union with a Christ who died, and died 'for us' and 'for sins' (e.g. 2Co 5:14, Gal 1:4, Rom 8:32, Eph 5:25). That death had a special meaning for mankind as a whole, for God the Father, and for Christ Himself.

(i.) *The death of Christ effected a reconciliation.*—By it we were reconciled to God (Rom 5:9-10, Eph 1:7). This is because God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself (2Co 5:19), and those who were 'alienated and enemies' Christ has reconciled in the body of His flesh through death (Col 1:22). The action of Christ is identical with the action of God. In Christ living and Christ dying God was present,

‘not reckoning trespasses.’ He came to pardon when He might have punished. The cross, therefore, manifests the love and pity of God. And the reason why the love of Christ specially ‘constraineth us’ is ‘because we thus judge that one died for all (therefore all died); and he died for all, that they which live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who for their sakes died, and rose again’ (2Co_5:14 f.). We feel the constraint of love when we see that Christ died a death which was a substitute for our death. If the Son had not died, we should have been left to experience the death of a sinner who is alienated from God. The work of reconciliation was done by the Father through the Son,—done outside us before it was done in us.

(ii.) *The death of Christ removes the wrath of God.*—Sinners are exposed to God’s wrath (Rom_1:18; Rom_1:32; Rom_2:3; Rom_5:10; Rom_11:28). This wrath is not vindictiveness, but the attitude of a loving Father towards that which destroys the very life of His children. The wrath of God is removed when, ‘through faith,’ the sinner accepts Jesus as a ‘means of propitiation’ (Rom_3:25). God justifies, acquits as righteous, those who avail themselves of that force which wipes away their sins. In providing this means of propitiation, God did something to counterbalance all His previous forbearance towards sin. He manifested His righteousness, His disposition to treat men according to a perfect moral law. When sin is passed over, righteousness is not manifested. But it was demonstrated when God showed that He could not forgive except at the tremendous cost of sending His Son to be a means of propitiation by His blood. The death of the Son was an oblation and a sacrifice to the Father (Eph_5:2), wholly acceptable to the Father on account of the sinlessness and love of the Sufferer; and it is wholly adequate to the needs of the human soul, because it simultaneously removes the sinner’s sin and his fear of the judgment of God.

(iii.) *Christ is not regarded by St. Paul as literally punished for the sins of all mankind.*—These sins are not transferred to Jesus, for men who do not accept Him as their Saviour have still to answer for their sins. They are still under the wrath of God (Rom_1:18). Nor were the sins of those who God foresaw would repent literally transferred to Jesus. In the Hebrew conception of the sin-offering, the offering was ‘most holy,’ which would have been impossible if sin had been transferred to it in any literal manner. At the same time, Christ is said to have been made ‘sin’ (2Co_5:21) and to have been made ‘curse’ for us (Gal_3:13).

The first passage may mean that Christ was made a sin-offering; the second may mean that Christ in some way fulfilled the type of the scape-goat (Lev_16:21), which symbolized the disappearance of the iniquities of the children of Israel. Both these interpretations are somewhat uncertain. What is certain is that in 2Co_5:21, Gal_3:13 St. Paul means that Christ was treated as a sinner in order that sinners might become righteous; that He chose to die by crucifixion, a death which in Jewish eyes was

symbolical of God's curse; and that in dying He realized God's curse or condemnation on the sins of the race of which He had chosen to be a member. There is no question of a literal personal punishment of Christ. It was a voluntary entrance on His part into a state in which, by a profound sympathy, He felt our calamity as though it were His.

Our Lord Himself had shown the connexion between His death and the forgiveness of our sins. The primitive Church had believed and experienced the reality of this connexion. And St. Paul, in preaching what he calls 'the word of the cross' so fully and vividly, was 'faithful' to 'the much' which was committed to Him by the risen Christ. He preached, as no other man has done, the Name which means that Christ saves His people from their sins.

4. The Epistle to the Hebrews.—(a) The subject of the Epistle to the Hebrews is 'the world to come' (Heb 2:5). This world to come already exists and has existed from the Creation. But it is regarded as still to come, because it has not yet been fully realized in time. It is a heavenly spiritual counterpart of this temporal material world in which we live. The material world, and the Jewish system of worship which belongs to this world, are not, in the strictest sense of the word, real. Christianity is the perfect religion, and is superior to Judaism, because its origin, worship, and priesthood belong to the heavenly world of which Judaism is only a shadow. The Revealer of Christianity belongs to the heavenly world. It is on His mediation that the existence both of the material and of the spiritual world depends. He is the 'effulgence' or 'radiance' of God's glory, *i.e.* of God's nature as shown to things created, and the impress of His essence; 'upholding all things by the word of his power' (Heb 1:3). The Son, through whom the Father made the worlds, was appointed heir of all things prior to creation. By His almighty word (cf. 'God said' in Genesis 1)—a word which is itself an act—He carries the world to its goal. This Son, as essentially Divine, is above the angels, and is the object of their worship (Gen 1:7). He is above Moses, as the son of a house is superior to a servant, and as the founder of a house is superior to one who is only a part of the edifice itself (Gen 3:2-3).

(b) But Jesus is especially our sympathetic High Priest 'who hath passed through the heavens' (Gen 4:14). Great stress is laid upon the fact that He endured all that we endure, sin apart. Having taken flesh and blood, and become in all things like His 'brethren,' He passed through temptations, shed tears, suffered death. His human prayer to God, offered during His agony, was heard on account of His 'godly fear.' He was strengthened to bear His burden, and was made perfect for His saving work by the discipline of His sufferings. He manifests the highest degree both of sympathy and of probation, and is therefore the Representative of man to God. He is able to enter with full sympathy into the lot of ignorant and erring man. He also possesses the other essential qualification of a High Priest, for He was Divinely appointed. He who proclaimed Him to be His Son, declared Him to be a priest for ever after the order of

Melchizedek (Heb 5:5-6). In the reality of His human experience and sympathy, and in the fact of His Divine calling, He resembled the Levitical priests. But He differed from them profoundly. They were sinful: He was sinless. They must offer sacrifices for themselves: His offering was solely for others. They served a temporary sanctuary: He ministers perpetually in heaven. He further differs from them because He is a priest after the order of Melchizedek. The priesthood of Melchizedek had these two great characteristics: it was especially royal, and it was independent of any genealogy; whereas the priesthood of the Levitical priests was not more royal than that of all the Israelites, and their title to it rested on their descent from Levi. Christ is King as well as Priest; and as His Being had no beginning, the silence of Scripture about the ancestry of Melchizedek assimilates him to Christ. And since Abraham the father of Levi paid tithes to Melchizedek, he acknowledged his inferiority, and compromised the Levitical priests by so doing. Their priesthood is lower than that of Melchizedek, which was an archetype of that of the Son of God (Heb 7:1-10).

(c) The sacrifice of Christ had these notes. (i.) It was the expression of *the perfect obedience of His will to the will of the Father*. No animal sacrifices can take away sins. They rather bring sins to remembrance than purge them away. Bulls and goats cannot give to God a conscious, voluntary, moral sacrifice. This the Son gave; He satisfied the will of God by so doing: 'When he cometh into the world he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body didst thou prepare for me.... Lo, I am come to do thy will, O God' (Heb 10:5-7). By the offering of Christ's body, which was prepared by God to make this great sacrifice possible, the will of God was satisfied, and by that will we are 'sanctified.'—(ii.) *It is one, and need not be repeated yearly*. Every day the Levitical priests offer sacrifices which cannot cancel sin. In contrast with the ineffectiveness of those sacrifices, offered by priests still standing day by day, Christ offered one sacrifice on the cross, and then the adequacy of His offering was proved by His sitting down on the right hand of God (Heb 10:12). His offering is valid for both past and future, and delivers men from 'the transgressions that were under the first covenant' (Heb 9:15), in addition to giving a new power to those who live after the Incarnation has taken place.—(iii.) *It is the basis of a 'new covenant' between God and man*.

The best commentators differ somewhat with regard to the meaning of Heb 9:15-16. But the natural explanation is that since the word διαθήκη meant both *covenant* or *alliance* and *testament* or *will*, the word is used in both senses, and the author was conscious of no logical difficulty in so using it. He means that God's people, their sins having been taken away by Christ, are able to enter upon that inheritance, that rest of God, bequeathed to them by Christ, who Himself removed the encumbrance of past sins which barred access to it. But the idea of covenant is more fundamental. The only sacrifice of the Old Covenant which the Jews never repeated was that which

established the original relation between God and the Hebrew people (Exo 24:3-8). This was dedicated with blood. So was the New Covenant, the blood of the Son being 'the blood of the covenant' (Heb 10:29). And by it the whole region of man's approach to God, the system of 'the heavenly things' themselves, was cleansed from the taint of sin. In Heb 10:29 the writer has in mind the words spoken by our Lord in instituting His Supper.

(d) The effect of Christ's death on man is specially described by the ritual words 'purify' (καθαρίζειν), 'sanctify' (ἀγιάζειν), and 'make perfect' (τελειοῦν). These words do not exactly correspond with the terms of later theology. They are primarily ritual words, though they involve a truly ethical conception as used in this Epistle. They mean to remove the sense of guilt (Heb 9:14) or 'evil conscience,' to dedicate to God (Heb 10:10; Heb 10:29, Heb 13:12), to bring to that full enjoyment of spiritual privileges which the Levitical priesthood could not effect (Heb 7:11). The result of this work done by Christ is our sense of forgiveness and free access to God through Christ (Heb 4:16).

(e) The Ascension is the culminating point of the Atonement as offered by Christ to God. As a High Priest after the order of Melchizedek, *i.e.* with an eternal priesthood which belongs to the world to come, Christ offered Himself upon the cross (Heb 7:27, Heb 9:24-28). But as the Aaronic high priest carried the sacrificial blood on the day of Atonement into the Holy of Holies, so Christ entered heaven 'through his blood' having obtained 'eternal redemption' (Heb 9:12). He now exercises a priesthood which is after the order of Melchizedek, but at the same time fulfils the type of the Aaronic high priest's action within the veil. He still remains High Priest and acts as such (Heb 6:20). Because He abideth for ever He hath His priesthood unchangeable (Heb 7:24). He manifests Himself to God for us (Heb 9:24), continuously interceding on our behalf (Heb 7:25). Into all His intercession the value of His offering is put, so that He is 'the minister of the sanctuary' above. His work is still of a sacerdotal nature, 'it is necessary that this high priest also have somewhat to offer' (Heb 8:1-3). The 'somewhat' is His blood or life. His blood retains its sacrificial efficacy, pleads to God for pardon, and speaks peace to man.

'We have an altar' (Heb 13:10). Unlike the Jews, even the Jewish priests, who were unable to partake of the sin-offering offered on the Day of Atonement, Christians may partake of Christ.

The 'altar' of which they eat has been variously interpreted as the cross, the altar in heaven, and the Lord's table. The first seems to be excluded by the fact that according to the writer's argument the cross corresponds with the place outside the camp where the sin-offering was burnt, not with the altar in the tabernacle. Whether

the altar here is the heavenly altar or the Lord's table (cf. Mal 1:7; Mal 1:12, Eze 44:16; Eze 41:22), a reference to the Eucharist is included. And in that rite the pleading of Christ's death by the Church is joined with the present intercession which He makes in heaven.

The special value of the Epistle to the Hebrews is that it presents to us the mediatorial work of Christ as a work of Divine worship. Without worship, Christianity would be merely a philosophy. And the author satisfies one of the deepest needs of the human soul when he teaches us the relation between Christ and His people in the life of intercession, a life which is for the Christian one of faith and confidence by virtue of all that Jesus did and does. The author also teaches us something of the philosophy of religion. St. Paul's view of Judaism is wholly true, but it is not the whole truth. And this Epistle, with its peculiar dignity and calm, and a devotion to Christ not less real than that of the Apostle of the Gentiles, gives us a fresh insight into the Divine wisdom which made Judaism 'a sacred school of the knowledge of God for the world.'

5. The Johannine writings

(a) *The Apocalypse*.—Whether the Apocalypse be the work of John the Presbyter, or, as the present writer believes, the work of John the Apostle, its doctrine of the mediatorial work of Christ is of high importance. The book is full of the exaltation of Jesus. He is the Messiah, the unique Son of God (Rev 1:6; Rev 3:5; Rev 14:1), the Divine Word (Rev 19:13). He is the lion of the tribe of Judah, the root and offspring of David (Rev 5:5, Rev 22:16). He is the Lord's Messiah (Rev 11:15). By His resurrection He has become Ruler of the kings of the earth, many royal diadems are on His head, and He is King of kings and Lord of lords (Rev 1:5, Rev 19:12, Rev 17:14, Rev 19:16). He has all authority, an authority given Him by God (Rev 3:21). His terrible might is suggested by the description of His feet, His voice, His eyes, and the sound from His mouth (Rev 1:14 ff.). With God He shares the throne of heaven (Rev 22:1; Rev 22:3), with Him He receives ascriptions of praise from the angels and the redeemed (Rev 5:13, Rev 7:10). He comes seated on a white cloud, like the figure in Daniel's vision (Rev 14:14). He is the Morning Star who brings in the day of grace (Rev 22:16). The coming of Christ is the coming of God, and when the coming is accomplished God is called He 'who is and who was,' and no longer 'the coming one' (Rev 1:4; Rev 1:8, Rev 4:8, cf. Rev 11:17, Rev 16:5). He holds the keys of death and Hades (Rev 1:18), He is 'the first and the last, and the living One,' 'the Alpha and the Omega' (Rev 1:17-18, Rev 22:13).

From the beginning to the end the book contains deep appreciations of the mediatorial work effected by Christ's death. (i.) *It is a great demonstration of the love of Jesus* (Rev 1:5). (ii.) *It is a death which implies that a redeeming work was*

then accomplished, and that the Christian enjoys a liberty which was won by that death; 'He loosed us from our sins by his blood; and he made us to be a kingdom, to be priests unto his God and Father' (Rev_1:5-6). And in Rev_5:6-14 the Lamb is praised in the words, 'Thou wast slain, and didst purchase unto God with thy blood men of every tribe and tongue.' The Lamb is 'standing, as though it had been slain'; it is not dead, but has the virtue of its death in it. (iii.) The abiding power of the death of Christ is shown in this, that it is *the source of moral purity and of moral victory under persecution*. Even the virgins who follow the Lamb reach heaven only because Christ 'purchased' them (Rev_14:3-4), And the martyrs slain by persecuting pagan Rome overcame the dragon 'because of the blood of the Lamb, and because of the word of their testimony' (Rev_12:11). The blood of the Lamb therefore did something in the past, for it released mankind from sin by the ransom paid to God. And it does something now, for it enables us to live and witness as Christ lived and witnessed. The mediatorial power of the blood of Christ is therefore a power without which the Christian life can be neither begun nor continued.

(b) The *Prologue of St. John's Gospel* contains an assertion which is of essential importance for all subsequent Christian theology. The Divine Λόγος, the Word who 'was God,' became flesh, and was incarnate as Jesus. This Word is both the expression of God and God expressed. The origin of the title is to be sought mainly in the OT and in Palestinian tradition. But St. John's use of it was probably partly determined by its common occurrence in Greek philosophy, and more especially in the writings of the Alexandrian Jewish philosopher Philo. His doctrine of the Λόγος is more moral and less metaphysical than that of Philo, more Jewish and less Greek. Philo's dominant idea is that of the Divine *Reason*, St. John's is that of the Divine *Word*, the manifestation of the Divine will. The Jewish Targums use the phrase *Memra* or Word for God as manifested in His action on the world, and in Wis_18:15 the almighty Word of God is described as leaping down from heaven to smite the Egyptians. The term as used by St. John denotes inherence in God, as a thought or conception inheres in the mind—mediatorship between God and the universe of a kind which implies that God Himself comes into touch with the universe—and it requires as its complement the other title 'only-begotten Son.' In Philo the Λόγος remains a vague cosmic force, in St. John it is a definite Divine Person who becomes Man. See, further, art. Logos.

(c) Although in the *Fourth Gospel* the word Λόγος is applied to the Son of God in the Prologue only, the same doctrine pervades the whole book. 'We beheld his glory' (Joh_1:14) is shown to be true by the record which follows. In the Synoptics, Jesus seems to speak most of His own ministry and of men; here He rather speaks of Himself and His relations to the Father. There He frequently distinguishes Himself from His

disciples in His relations to the Father; here He takes the same attitude more decisively. He declares Himself the Son of God (Joh 5:25, Joh 9:35-37 etc.), the Son in a unique sense (Joh 3:16; Joh 3:35, Joh 5:19-22 etc.). Distinct from all others there exist *the Father* and *the Son* (Joh 3:35-36, Joh 5:19-22). The Father is the Source of the Son's being and action (Joh 5:19; Joh 5:26). He does works in the Son; the Father and the Son know one another (Joh 10:15, Joh 8:55). They love one another (Joh 5:20, Joh 14:31, Joh 15:9); they abide in one another (Joh 8:29, Joh 14:10-11). They are one, *ἐν* (Joh 10:30, Joh 17:11; Joh 17:21-22). As the Father has life in Himself, He has given to the Son life in Himself (Joh 5:26). So to see or to reject the Son is to see or reject the Father (Joh 8:19, Joh 14:9, Joh 15:21-24). Men must render similar honour to the Father and to the Son (Joh 5:23). The Son existed before He came into the world: He was before Abraham (Joh 8:58), He was glorified with the Father before the world existed (Joh 17:5): He came from heaven and returns to heaven (Joh 6:62). The Father sent Him into the world (Joh 3:16) to fulfil a certain mission (Joh 5:36, Joh 14:31 etc.), to speak, judge, and act in His Name (Joh 8:36, Joh 10:32; Joh 10:37).

But the chief object for which the Son came was to save the world (Joh 3:17) and to give it eternal life (Joh 3:16; Joh 3:36, Joh 4:14 etc.). And Jesus is Himself the life (Joh 14:6), and came that men might have it more abundantly (Joh 10:10). He is also the light of the world (Joh 3:19, Joh 8:12, Joh 12:46), because He teaches men to know God and His Son, and this knowledge is eternal life (Joh 17:2-3). Jesus is therefore the Mediator of the life and the light of God for men. How are they to receive it?

We receive eternal life by attaching ourselves to the Person of Jesus Christ. We must believe on Him (Joh 3:16). We must obey the Son if we are to escape from the wrath of the Father (Joh 3:36). We must believe His claim or die in our sins (Joh 8:24). We must abide in Him, as the branches in the vine, and abide in His love as He abides in His Father's love (Joh 15:1-10). Other conditions of salvation remind us of our Lord's teaching in the Synoptics. It is necessary to be born again of water and the Spirit (Joh 3:3-7), and to eat His flesh and drink His blood (Joh 6:52-59).

The last injunction reminds us that the Divine life which is in Jesus becomes available for the Christian by virtue only of His death. It is sometimes held that Jesus is represented in this Gospel as saving men by revealing to them the truth about God, a revelation made in His own Person. But it cannot be said with justice that the mediatorial work of Jesus in this Gospel is only of this prophetic nature. St. John records a great deal about the death of Jesus which implies that the death has a propitiatory character in the Gospel as well as in the First Epistle. In Joh 1:29 the Baptist describes our Lord as the Lamb that taketh away the sin of the world. This

must have a sacrificial meaning, for only by sacrifice could a lamb be conceived as taking away sin. In three passages (Joh 3:14, Joh 8:28, Joh 12:32) our Lord speaks of Himself being 'lifted up.' Men will look to Him for life as the Israelites looked to the brazen serpent which Moses uplifted in the wilderness. Again, after He has been lifted up by the Jews, they will know that He is the Messiah. Lastly, He says, 'I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself'; the Cross, followed by the Ascension, will be the means of attracting Gentile as well as Jew. So He is the Good Shepherd, whose very vocation it is to lay down His life for the sheep (Joh 10:11). His laying it down is wholly voluntary, but it is God's purpose and His own for His earthly life (Joh 10:17 f.). St. John regards Caiaphas as unconsciously prophesying that Christ would die for the well-being and the union of all God's children (Joh 11:52). In Joh 12:27 He dreads the appointed 'hour' or crisis, which He nevertheless knows to be the hour when He will be glorified (Joh 12:23), this glory being the manifestation of His character in the great passage from His trial and death to His Ascension (cf. Joh 17:5). He ascends to heaven by the way of the cross; and this ascent shows, as nothing else can, what He is. He also compares Himself in Joh 12:24 to a grain of wheat which bears fruit only if it dies, otherwise 'it abideth by itself alone.' Here our Lord makes His whole influence depend upon His death; because He is to perish, He will be the source of life to others. 'Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends' (Joh 15:13) His death is therefore the fullest revelation of His love. And in Joh 17:19 He sanctified Himself, deliberately dedicated Himself to the Father in death, that so He might establish for men a dedicated relationship with God.

Ch. 6 throws further light on our Lord's teaching about His Atonement. The great discourse therein contains three sections, the first Christological (Joh 6:26-40), the second more definitely Soteriological (Joh 6:41-51), the third Eucharistic (Joh 6:52-59). In the first, Jesus requires belief in Himself as the living Lord, and *bread* of God. In the second, He asserts that He is the *living bread*, and that He will give His *flesh* for the life of the world. In the third, He speaks of the necessity of eating His *flesh* and drinking His *blood*. The flesh and blood must mean not Himself merely, but Himself as affected by a violent death, and a death endured, as He has declared, for the life of the world. The act of communion is represented as an exalted act of faith by which man appropriates Christ's atoning self. All this implies that the death of Christ is propitiatory; the sacrifice is dedicated to God, and it cleanses man's sin when man appropriates it. If we consult Joh 8:24 and Joh 3:36, we see quite certainly that the result of this sacrifice is that God's wrath is removed. The sin of the world is exposed to His wrath, and this wrath on His part means death on man's part. It is such wrath as can be felt only by perfect love. And the saving effect of Christ's death is this, that it established between God and man that relationship which enables individual men to escape from sin, wrath, and death, and attain a vital union with God.

(d) In St. John's *First Epistle* the doctrine of Christ's mediation is clear. The Apostle insists upon the historical truth of the atoning work of Christ, and upon the existing witness of that work. In Joh 5:6; Joh 5:8 he opposes the Docetic theory concerning Jesus and His work, and declares that the crucifixion was as true an experience of Christ as His baptism. He who by baptism associated Himself with repentant sinners, by crucifixion endured what that baptism foreshadowed. The Holy Spirit makes these two saving events penetrate our hearts, and the water of Christian baptism and the blood of the Eucharistic cup bear testimony to His witness. In Joh 2:1-2, Joh 4:9-10, Joh 1:7 it is shown that the death of Jesus has a direct relation to the sins of the world, for it is their propitiation; to His own righteousness, for only the perfectly Righteous could establish God's law of righteousness; to His present intercession for man, for He is the Advocate of man by virtue of what He has already done for us. The Apostle further implies in Joh 1:7; Joh 1:9 that the Christian needs a continuous purification. He is unforgiven and uncleansed unless he continues to 'walk.' His salvation is ethical. It is made possible by something which he did not do, and could not do, for himself. But it is not something which he can secure eternally by a momentary choice.

Conclusion.—The writers of the NT unite in various ways in teaching that Jesus is the Mediator between God and man in the whole work of reconciliation which the human conscience requires. In the whole of His teaching and His contest with evil He satisfied the Divine law of Righteousness. Further, by His perfect sympathy He entered into the situation and the misery of sinful man; a truth which is unintelligible when regarded as an external legal transference of guilt, but intelligible and moral when regarded as the voluntary act of love. In giving Himself for man, He gave Himself to God, offering in His own Person to God all that devotion which God, who is holiness and love, could desire from His children. In so surrendering Himself to death, He acquiesced in the justice of God's condemnation of the sins of the human race, of which He had chosen to become a member. All sin inevitably tends to death, not by any arbitrary appointment but by its very nature, and Christ accepted death as the symbol of God's judgment on man's sin. Lastly, Christ is our propitiation, because He gives us inwardly that power, that communication of His own life, which cleanses us from sin. He enables us to die to sin, and thus within us, as outside us, does not suspend but establishes the law of Righteousness. All this is possible if Jesus is truly God and perfectly man; having an actual original solidarity with our race previous to the choice of any individual member of it, and that new solidarity which He establishes between Himself and all who consciously come into a moral and sacramental union with Him.

See also artt. Atonement, Death of Christ, Propitiation, Ransom, Reconciliation, Redemption, and the Literature there referred to.

☒ Meekness

MEEKNESS

1. The quality defined.—The Christian virtue of meekness has suffered the misfortune of being seriously misunderstood. In the popular mind it has been so conceived as to forfeit the right to be considered a virtue at all, being regarded as the equivalent of weak compliance—the temper of one devoid of manly vigour, who tamely allows himself to be slighted and injured without protest or resistance. That this conception is a caricature of meekness, is apparent in view of Christ's Beatitude (Mat 5:5); for not only is it incredible that our Lord should have pronounced a blessing on those of feeble character, but the nature of the promise attached to the Beatitude implies that in some sense meekness is a strong and victorious quality. Whatever it be, we must presume it to be a virtue replete with energy, robust and manly, the very opposite of everything that is weak. Otherwise Christ's words are reduced to an absurdity.

In the NT use of the word, meekness (*πραύτης, πραότης*) is commonly interpreted as meaning gentleness of disposition, peaceableness of temper in the face of provocation and wrong. It is the spirit of one who is not easily provoked, but keeps under control the natural instinct to assert oneself and to retaliate. It is the opposite of irascibility and the spirit of revenge. That is to say, it is conceived as a disposition restricted in its exercise to a man's relation with his fellow-men. But in reality meekness has a deeper and wider significance. It is, to begin with, a disposition towards God, the humble submission to the Divine will, the quiet acceptance of the discipline of life as coming from One who in infinite wisdom and love directs the destinies of men. This is made clear by the Biblical history of *πραῦς*. In the LXX Septuagint, *πραῦς* is most frequently employed as the translation of *יָבֹן*—one who bows himself down in lowliness beneath the hand of God. The *πραεῖς* are the class of afflicted ones who accept their sorrows without murmuring, and yield themselves in trust and in hope to the will of God. When Jesus pronounced His blessing on 'the meek,' it was this class of humble, uncomplaining, God-fearing sufferers that He had in view. His appropriation of the words in Psa 37:11 is conclusive proof of that. That 'the meek' of the Beatitude have so often been exclusively conceived as those who are peaceable and unvindictive in their dealings with their fellow-men, is due to the fact that the Greek conception of *πραύτης** [Note: See, for the Greek conception of *πρ*

αὔτης, Aristotle, Nic Eth. iv. 7.] has governed the interpretation, instead of the conception represented by the underlying Hebrew word. At the same time, this common interpretation of πραύτης is not to be rejected as alien to the NT meaning.

The attitude of humble submission to the will of God carries with it of necessity a disposition of gentleness and forbearance towards men who are harsh and provocative in their dealings, not only because they are to be regarded as the instruments of the Divine discipline, but because only through the loving restraint of angry and vindictive feelings can the gracious will of God be done in human relationships. The primary significance of meekness is the calm and trustful acceptance of God's will, when it is adverse, as meaning our good; but this involves in regard to our fellow-men the quiet and patient endurance of scorn, annoyance, and opposition.

2. Meekness in relation to God.—Regarded as the submissive attitude of the soul towards God, meekness has its root in a humble, childlike faith. To use the words of Gregory of Nyssa, humility is 'the mother of meekness.' Humility and meekness are kindred virtues; hence they are often mentioned together (Eph 4:2, Col 3:12, cf. Mat 11:29). Humility is the soul's attitude induced by a proper sense of one's creaturely weakness, ignorance, and unworthiness in presence of the Most High; meekness is the attendant disposition, born of humility, which constrains the soul to bow without complaining before the will of God in the hard and perplexing experiences of life. The soul that thus bows meekly beneath the Divine discipline is not open to the reproach of feebleness or insensibility; it is meek, not because it is too callous to feel the pain of sorrow and misfortune or too spiritless to protest against it, but because it bends in lowly and childlike trust before the unsearchable wisdom and love of God. Where there is faith in the universal operation of the all-wise love of God, meekness shows itself in the uncomplaining surrender to the Divine will and in the patient endurance of that will. And from this attitude towards God there flows the blessing of peace. Meekness is the channel by which the gracious love of God is communicated to the soul as waters of refreshment and rest. This is the truth taught under a different figure in Mat 11:29. Meekness is the easy yoke of Jesus which enables the weary and heavy-laden to bear the discipline laid upon them without chafing and complaining. Amid outward conditions which are hard and oppressive, they who like Jesus are 'meek and lowly of heart,' who bow before God with a profound sense of His infinitely wise and perfect will, find 'rest unto their souls'; they are freed from that inward restiveness and discontent which aggravate the outward burden and wear away the strength. Not only is meekness a strong and heroic quality which curbs the natural impulse to fume and rebel against God's will, but it is the means whereby the soul is reinforced by a Divine power to endure life's discipline with courage.

Meekness before God is, then, the natural ethical outcome of humble faith in the Divine Father who in unerring wisdom and holy love orders the life of men. It is seen in its crowning manifestation in Jesus Christ (cf. 2Co_10:1), for whom alike in the tasks which He undertook and in the sorrows which He bore the Father's will was supreme. When faithfulness to His mission brought upon Him unmerited suffering, He endured it in meekness, assured that it was God's holy will for Him. That His meekness was not merely a passive virtue, but one that was pervaded by a moral vigour and strength of purpose, is made clear by the conflict in Gethsemane. In the prayer of lowly submission, 'Not my will but thine be done,' we see the meekness of Jesus, in respect of God's dealings with Him, in its Divinest light. The agony and the bloody sweat, the prayer, 'If it be possible, let this cup pass away from me,' not only set in vivid relief the moral grandeur of Christ's willing acceptance of His Father's will, but they show with convincing power that true meekness is not the easy outcome of insensibility or tameness of spirit, but the victory of a strong nature over personal desires which conflict with the will of God.

3. Meekness in relation to men.—When we think of meekness in regard to the wrongs and opposition of men, we find that it is characterized by the same heroic qualities and is attended by similar blessed results. It is a virile and noble thing. The outward garb of meekness may, indeed, be worn by men in whom there are none of the robust and gracious qualities which make true meekness so worthy of admiration and honour. There are those who, by natural disposition, are timid and compliant, who have not manliness enough to resent injustice, who do not retaliate when they are wronged simply because they dare not. Similarly, there are those who, when slighted, show no sign of resentment, because they are too dull to feel an affront, or because they are controlled by feelings of scorn or by considerations of self-interest and policy. Of none of these can it be said that he is meek, nor does his conduct deserve our admiration. True meekness, which is worthy of all honour, is seen only in those who, with an acute sense of wrong, control the natural impulse to show anger and to retaliate, not from fear, or pride, or policy, or scorn of others, but because in obedience to the will of God they accept the provocation or wrong as discipline, and as an opportunity for showing the Divine spirit of patience and love. The meek man is not quick-tempered or vindictive, because, swayed by feelings of benevolence and love, he remains master of himself. Where there is no love, there is no meekness. 'Meekness is the power of love to quell the ebullition of anger, to restrain the violent and hasty temper' (Martensen). The irritation may be keenly felt; the temptation to retaliate may be very strong; but love keeps the upper hand and imposes calmness and self-restraint. It follows from all this that true meekness is not open to the contemptuous charge, so often brought against it, of softness and mean-spiritedness. It is a strong quality, for it means victory over the hot desire to retaliate; it is a gracious quality, for it means love triumphing over the selfish and self-assertive

impulses of one's nature, in its anxiety to avoid the embittering of friendly relations and to subdue ill-feeling by gentleness and kindness.

Meekness, then, is an expression of the love which 'is not easily provoked' (1Co 13:5). It is the self-restraint imposed by love when one is irritated or suffers a personal wrong. But this gentle and peaceable disposition is not inconsistent with a burning indignation at the injustice and evil conduct of men, when wider interests are concerned. The meek man is not bound over to keep the peace at any price. Meekness does not mean incapacity for indignation. When the interests of the Divine Kingdom are at stake, in the face of flagrant and defiant wrongdoing, the duty of the meek is not silence and self-repression, but indignant and active opposition to evil. Indignation has a vastly greater moral value and influence when it proceeds from one who in personal matters endures provocation with calmness and self-restraint. It is the meekness of Jesus that makes His anger so terrible. When He was subjected in His own person to insult or wrong, He bore it with patience and with compassion on those who wronged Him (1Pe 2:23). When He was wounded to the heart by the treachery of Judas, and the betrayal was sealed by a hypocritical kiss, His answer to the traitor showed how superior He was to the natural resentment of men: 'Comrade, is it for this that thou art come?' (Mat 26:50). When He hung upon the cross in agony, He was so far master of Himself and so deeply moved by compassion for His enemies, that He found some ground for extenuating their conduct and prayed for their forgiveness. But when the interests of the weak and helpless were involved (Mat 18:6), when the sacred name of religion was profaned (Mat 21:12), and the Kingdom of God was thwarted by those who were so blind as to imagine they were defending it (Mat 23:13 ff.), 'the wrath of the Lamb' flamed on the heads of the wrong-doers. So far from anger being inconsistent with meekness, it is only when meekness is associated with it that anger has a pure moral worth. The wrath of an irascible and violent man is deservedly discounted; that of a meek man scorches where it falls. Even when it is most vehement, the indignation that is associated with meekness is kept within bounds. It is not allowed to degenerate into uncontrollable and self-willed passion. Behind its severity there is the moderating power of love, which even in the act of showing indignation regrets its necessity (cf. Mar 3:5).

In the matter of personal wrongs, meekness is shown in the refusal to retaliate in the spirit of the aggressor. It will not requite evil with evil. Much rather will it endure the wrong and yield no room in the heart to the spirit of revenge. The motive for this meek endurance of wrong is love, which does not suffer us to forget that the wrong doer is a brother-man, whom we should strive to win to penitence and friendly relations by patience and forbearance (Gal 6:1, 2Ti 2:25, Tit 3:2).

Whether there should be any bounds to this acceptance of personal wrong is a question which has been brought into great prominence in our day by the teaching of

Tolstoi. According to the Russian moralist, who has preached with great power the Quaker doctrine of non-resistance to evil, the old right of requital was abolished by Christ; not only should there be no private retaliation against wrong, but there should be no recourse to any legal tribunal when one has suffered injury or injustice. The law of non-resistance in Tolstoi's view is absolute; when we are wronged, we should suffer meekly in the hope that through our meekness evil will be overcome of good. Against this interpretation of the law of Christ in an absolute sense we have to set not only Christ's own example, when in the sacred name of justice He challenged the man who smote Him at the bar of judgment (Joh 18:23), but also the whole tenor of the Christian law. When Jesus, in inculcating meekness and love to our enemies, said, 'Resist not evil' (Mat 5:39), the context shows that He was not laying down a law which should be rigidly interpreted according to the letter, but that He was requiring a new spirit—the spirit of forbearance and love in dealing with those who wrong us. Christ's aim in requiring meekness of His followers was a moral aim—the furtherance of the Divine Kingdom, the lessening of the amount of evil in the world—a result which the meek endurance of wrong often brings with it in the disarming of enmity and in the quenching of the fires of ill-will, whereas retaliation adds to the evil and inflames the bitterness that already exists; but when it has become clear that forbearance and patience with a wrong-doer only confirm him in his evil courses, Christian love not only does not forbid but actually requires, in the interest both of public righteousness and of the wrongdoer himself, recourse to a civil tribunal that requital may be given. So long as there is any reasonable hope that meek endurance of wrong will turn the wrongdoer to a better frame of mind, we should be willing to suffer injustice; but when that hope has proved itself vain, there is nothing inconsistent with the spirit of meekness and Christian love in securing that justice shall be done and evil defeated by the procedure of civil law.

4. The dominion of meekness.—Meekness, though feeble to all outward seeming, is 'a world-conquering principle' (Tholuck). 'Blessed are the meek,' Christ said, 'for *they shall inherit the earth.*' 'To inherit the earth' (or, rather, 'the land') was originally the formula for the Israelitish possession of the Promised Land (Gen 15:7, Deu 4:38). In OT times, however, it had already, as in Psa 37:9; Psa 37:11, become 'a symbolic expression for the totality of Divine blessing and Messianic happiness' (Holtzmann). On the lips of Jesus the phrase has a spiritual significance; it expresses the highest good along with the collateral idea of world-wide influence. The inheritance of the earth by the meek does not come through outward possession, but by spiritual sovereignty. The meek, in accepting God's will in His disciplinary dealing with them, are not in bondage to earthly things, but are their true masters. They derive from life the highest good that it can bestow. They who rebel against the appointments of Providence miss the real gains of life. Only when the conditions of life are seen to be instinct with spiritual significance and intention as the expression of God's will, do they yield up the purest blessings that are hidden in them, and

become the means of inward enrichment (cf. 1Ti 6:6). Further, they who are meek under provocation and wrong have a large spiritual dominion. They are the true rulers of men. Human hearts are won only by gentleness and love. God's Kingdom on earth grows not by requiting evil with evil, but by overcoming evil with good. That is the sovereignty of the Cross. And the future is with the meek. They are destined to have a world-wide dominion. Because God reigns and they accept and do the will of God, they are on the winning side. Meekness will one day claim the whole earth for its own, when men, conquered by the meek endurance of the Cross, bow humbly before God and live together in peace and brotherhood.

Literature.—Trench, *NT Synonyms*, 142 ff.; Comm. on Mat 5:5; works on the Sermon on the Mount (Tholuck, Dykes, Gore, Boyd-Carpenter, etc.); art. 'Sermon on the Mount' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, Ext. Vol. 19 (Votaw); Sermons by MacLaren ('The Beatitudes'), Leckie ('Life and Religion' [excellent]), Channing ('Self-Denial'), etc.; Tholuck, *Hours of Christian Devotion*, 378 ff.; Martensen, *Christliche Ethik*, Spec. Th. i. 307 ff.; Moulton, *Expos. Aug.* 1906; Tolstoi, *My Religion*, and *The Kingdom of God is within you*.

A. F. Findlay.

☩ Melchi

MELCHI.—Occurs twice in our Lord's genealogy, Luk 3:24; Luk 3:28.

☩ Melchizedek

MELCHIZEDEK.—See Priest.

☩ Melea

MELEA.—An ancestor of Jesus, Luk 3:31.

☩ Menna

MENNA.—An ancestor of Jesus, Luk 3:31.

☒ Mental Characteristics

MENTAL CHARACTERISTICS.—There can be no full appreciation without some analysis: the friend who is understood is loved the better. That ‘love is blind’ is singularly false, save when the word is restricted to an unworthy meaning. True love gives insight always; and the power it gives of divining what to others is invisible is a species of analysis. There is no question, however, of analyzing Divinity. Divinity realized in humanity is what we know in Jesus Christ. In God Incarnate there can be nothing which is not human, though nothing which is human only. An attempt to analyze the mental characteristics of the Lord Jesus is therefore an attempt to appreciate the human manifestation which God has made of Himself. The first condition must be reverence, and the study is best undertaken with St. Paul’s teaching (1Co_2:6-16) in mind, for success is to be reached only if ‘we have the mind of Christ.’

1. Perhaps the first characteristic to notice is the way in which the mind of the Lord Jesus was always so thoroughly *alive to everything around Him*. In the single glimpse afforded of His boyhood this appears strikingly; for no one can read Luk_2:41-51 without feeling the eagerness with which He looked on Jerusalem for the first time consciously, and threw Himself into the best life of the festival. He was instantly at home in the Temple, and ready to listen and to inquire of the Rabbis there with a keen grasp which amazed them. Later on, the same ready observancy, which not merely noticed but entered into every phase of life, is again and again to be remarked. Now it was the flowers of the country side that won His attention (Luk_12:27), now the games of the children in the market-place (Luk_7:32), now the habits of the wild creatures (Luk_9:58), or their unconsidered treatment in captivity (Luk_12:6), now the details of the yeoman’s employment (Mat_13:3-8; Mat_12:11, Luk_13:11), now the unnoticed self-denial of a poor woman in a crowd (Mar_12:43). Just as readily He gave keen attention to the life of long ago told in the Scriptures of His race. For Him the characters appearing in the stories of the past were all real and vivid; e.g. Naaman (Luk_4:27), David (Mat_12:3), Zachariah (Mat_23:35). With no less alacrity He noted the current events which made a popular impression (Luk_13:4), and the far more momentous movements of national life which others too often overlooked (Luk_21:20, Mat_16:1-3).

2. In close connexion with the foregoing characteristic stands *the fulness of vital force* in the Lord Jesus. Of most persons it is true that the emotional, or the intellectual, or the volitional faculties dominate and give the general colour to the temperament, but in Him *all* were supremely strong. The vehemence of His feelings was such as would have overbalanced the will or unsteadied the intellect of another;

but He never lost balance or clarity. The lucid understanding which never failed in things great or small would have subordinated feeling, or even sapped its strength, in most; but the calm sweep of His discernment never made Him less warm-hearted towards 'one of the least of these my brethren,' and He condemned at once any use of reason which restrained responsiveness, as when His disciples were inclined to check the children brought to Him and He was 'moved with indignation' (Mar 10:14), or when He promptly defended the woman's 'waste' of the costly ointment which her uncalculating love so gladly spent on Him (Mar 14:6). Yet neither warmth of feeling nor reach of understanding ever warped His will to excuse or palliate in any wise, or made His resolution waver. Nothing could be sterner or more unsparing than the way in which He turned on almost the best-loved and aptest of His disciples, and this, too, directly after His whole heart had gone out to him in welcome and in grateful sympathy for the trust and insight he had just shown (Mat 16:17; Mat 16:23). The narrative of the Temptation in the wilderness, which must have been derived from the Lord Himself, can hardly be paralleled in its dauntless determination, except indeed by the narrative of how He followed out in His work the ideal here resolutely formed, and never faltered in following it still when it led Him through the valley of the shadow of death.

3. What has been said of the poise of these three mental factors, which are found in every living action of every living soul, though hardly ever balanced evenly, must be extended in Jesus' case to a wider range. There is nothing more remarkable than *the perfect proportion of His nature*. Those characteristics which are found singly in others, and which are commonly antithetic and even incompatible, are found alike, and at one in Him. He was passionate: 'He looked round with anger' (Mar 3:5); 'Jesus wept' (Joh 11:35, cf. Luk 19:41); 'Jesus looking on him loved him' (Mar 10:21); 'Ye serpents, ye offspring of vipers!' (Mat 23:33). But who was ever so patient? cf. Mar 4:40, Joh 16:12, and the whole scene of His trial and crucifixion. He was full of reverence for the past; scrupulous in His respect for authority (Mat 23:2), and very sensitive to the sacred associations of ancient institutions (Mar 11:15-17, Luk 19:41-42; Luk 22:15). But He held Himself entirely untrammelled by either precedent or outward enactment (Mat 5:17-18 ff.), and appealed without hesitation to the conscience and instinct of every man, as to a sufficient and trustworthy test (Luk 13:15-16). His was an imaginative and contemplative mind; He loved to withdraw to the desert country by Himself, or with a handful of intimate friends, and to spend long hours in personal devotions. Even when work pressed upon Him, and He 'had no leisure so much as to eat' (Mar 6:31), feeling the harvest waiting to be reaped was far too great for His little band of fellow-labourers to cope with, He still spent what seems to have been an astonishingly large proportion of His time in seclusion. But never was a dreamer of dreams so intensely practical. Hard and prolonged work He undertook with zest, then slept at once and soundly, and woke ready for any effort or emergency at the instant (Mar 4:1-2; Mar 4:33-39). And His

practical ability is strikingly apparent in other ways; e.g. He was so sure in the handling of men (Luk 9:57-62, Joh 3:1-15; Joh 11:6-16), so capable of picking out and dealing with the precise thing needing to be done at any given stage or moment (Mat 17:24-27, Joh 7:3-8; Joh 11:6-16). He was remarkably tolerant, and again and again gave offence to narrower minds by the width of His sympathies and the leniency of His judgments. Particularly is this illustrated by His relations with ‘publicans and sinners,’ which exposed Him to disgraceful calumny (Mat 11:19), of which He recked nothing; but His tolerance was also too great for His own followers to understand it (Mar 9:38-41), and great enough sometimes to shame the bitterest opponents into silence (Joh 8:7-11). Yet no one could be more rigid on occasion, as in His treatment of the Phœnician mother (Mat 15:23-28), or more inexorable in condemnation (Mat 23:13-36, Mar 3:28-29). His humility was profound, and has changed the estimation of this quality in the eyes of mankind. ‘I am in the midst of you as he that serveth’ (Luk 22:27), He would say, or show them even more vividly in deed (Joh 13:15). ‘I am meek and lowly in heart’ (Mat 11:29) was what He felt as He welcomed the weary, and gave thanks that the highest wisdom was ‘revealed unto babes.’ Yet never were such tremendous assertions made by any one about himself, or such unfaltering emphasis laid upon the place he must hold in the eyes of others, and the claims he made upon them: ‘He that loveth father or mother ... son or daughter, more than me, is not worthy of me. And he that doth not take his cross and follow after me is not worthy of me’ (Mat 10:37-38); ‘The Spirit of the truth shall glorify me, for he shall take of mine and shall declare it unto you. All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine’ (Joh 16:13-15). Again, the stern independence which would not bend to make a ‘hard saying’ more easily acceptable, but would let all who would not receive it go their way, even if His closest intimates were to be included (Joh 6:66-68), and which justly called forth F. W. Robertson’s rejoinder, ‘Don’t care was crucified on Calvary,’ was no less characteristic of Him than that craving for sympathy which went with His sensitive and affectionate nature, and led Him to beseech the companionship of those whom He could best trust in such hours of agonized prayer as are recorded on the Mount of Transfiguration and in the Garden of Gethsemane. On the one hand, He always saw things just as they are, undistorted by His own feelings, unconcealed by custom or convention, neither excused nor glorified, if faulty, by their associations, nor hackneyed or degraded by their common abuse. This holds equally of the smallest details of the natural world (Mat 11:7) or of human life (Luk 14:7; Luk 15:8-9), and of the greatest forces at work in the world (Mar 13:2). All this marks Him out as a genuine realist. But, on the other hand, beyond all others He was an idealist. For Him the most real world was that Kingdom of heaven which He always felt to be ‘at hand’—within direct and instant reach. It was His own most positive experience not to ‘live by bread alone,’ but to satisfy the needs of His nature with food and drink that were spiritual (Joh 4:13-14; Joh 4:34). The story of the Temptation is perhaps the purest idealism ever written: but glimpses into His thoughts which are subsequently afforded show how the habitual working of

His mind was on no lower level of idealism (Luk 10:17-24). Again, He was intensely individualistic in His point of view (Mat 6:3; Mat 6:6; Mat 6:17), and, even in the widest sweep of forecast on the fate of the world, did not fail to regard each several individual in and for himself; in fact, His influence has given the world a different and a deeper conception of the worth and meaning of individual lives, and has gone far towards the making of the best modern thoughts of personality. But none the less He was quite free from the segregative and disintegrating individualism which has been the bane of Puritanism and Benthamism and other phases of thought in which the individualist standpoint has been prominent. And the aims He set forward were always communal. e.g. His followers were described as 'a flock,' 'a church,' 'a vine,' in which the severance of a member involved its utter futility. The 'Kingdom of God' was the one great end for which all were to live and work (Mat 6:33), careless of personal needs; and no condition for association with Himself was more imperative than that every one should 'disown himself' completely (Mar 8:34-37). But what is most remarkable of all is not that these and other antithetic characteristics, which are in other cases met with singly, were found in concurrence and in full development in the mind of the Lord Jesus, but that in Him they were in such perfect proportion and such intimate relation that they were not opposing tendencies at all. To say that it is impossible to indicate which way the balance of contrasted impulses inclined, so stable was the equipoise, is not enough. These things, which in other natures are conflicting, were in Him mutually supporting and at one. In nearly all minds one can detect more or less cleavage and internal strain, but that of the Lord Jesus was wholly annealed, showing only the finest temper without any tension.

The fulness, balance, and unity of the Master's nature make it impracticable to use in His case what is the commonest and readiest way of portraying a person. This is to throw into the foreground of the picture those features in which the character is exceptionally strong, or those deficiencies which mark it off from others, and to leave as an unelaborated background the common stuff of human nature. Thus by sketching the idiosyncrasies, and casting a few high-lights, the man is set forth sufficiently. But what traits are there in the Lord Jesus which stand out because more highly developed than other features? Where are His foibles or defects? Nothing truly human was wanting in Him, nothing was exaggerated. The fact which distinguished Him from all others was His completeness at all points, so that in the first and in every succeeding generation of His followers the greatest have declared, 'Of his fulness we all receive' (Joh 1:16). And this surely is what we must expect to be its mode if we try to conceive of a Divine incarnation. Even as Christ's power and presence give to such as trust Him 'perfect wholeness' (τὴν δλοκκριαν ταύτην, Act 3:16), so the power and presence of the Infinite realized in humanity is disclosed in a 'perfect wholeness' which raises every human feature and faculty above itself, and compels the confession, 'In him dwelleth all the plenitude of the Godhead bodily-wise'

(Col 2:9). It is difficult to mention more than four features which can fairly be called personal traits of the Lord Jesus. These are: His keen appreciation of the beauty of the natural world: His fondness for little children, whom again and again He held up for the reverence of His disciples, and whom He Himself looked upon with a feeling akin to awe (Mat 18:10); His love of being on a height (many of the cardinal points in His career were on the hill-tops, just as the crises of temptation were on 'an exceeding high mountain,' and when He was 'set on the pinnacle of the temple,' cf. Mat 5:1; Mat 14:23; Mat 15:29; Mat 17:1; Mat 28:16 || Mar 3:13); and His love of being often alone. On the other hand, if one seeks for personal characteristics due to the marked absence of anything that most men share, there is nothing that can be named, except that, unlike others, He was without 'the defects of His qualities.' Thus exaltation never passed into ecstasy; zeal never into rashness or one-sidedness; sympathy never into sentimentality; determination never into obstinacy; conscience never into scrupulosity; the habit of moral discrimination never into casuistry; standing indignation against the hypocrisies of the day never made Him censorious; a wonderful tenderness of heart left Him stern and uncompromising; and an energy which rejoiced in work, and shrank from nothing, never led Him to become exacting towards others or inconsiderate of their weakness.

In this connexion a word must be said on His relation to the stock of Israel. All His personal habits and customs, all His information, His religious premises, found their starting-points in the national life and customs of Israel, and in the Scriptures and other current ideas of its noblest minds belonging to previous days. And He never hesitated to adopt and use freely the practices and religious language which He found in the Israel of His age. But it is impossible, for all that, to regard Jesus as a typical, or as a perfect Jew. He had indeed all the best characteristics of the greatest sons of Israel, and notably of the prophets of the past; their zeal for righteousness, their fear of God, their tenacity of purpose, their noble scorn of the littleness of the earth and all that is in it in comparison with 'the high and lofty One that inhabiteth Eternity, whose name is Holy' (Isa 57:15). But He was likest them just where they were least representative of the race from which they sprang, just where they towered above their fellow-countrymen and were least appreciated by the latter. He rose above them all; and while nothing truly Jewish was discarded or denied, the Jew was left below. He was fully conscious of this Himself, and so the term by which He continually named Himself was at once the simplest and the greatest that a human being can bear—He was the 'Son of Man.' It is a title all can use, but He alone exhausts. And to this day it continually receives corroboration from many quarters, for His disciples, drawn from many races, never find Him alien to their own needs. To the Oriental believer Jesus is an Oriental, to the Western He has all the Western nature. The ancient Greek philosopher, the modern Hindu, and the Negro slave, no less than the British subject, see indeed different aspects of Him salient, but none

feels in Him a national character which makes Him a foreigner from their several points of view.

4. A few negative observations are required, as they serve to define more clearly some of the characteristics of the Lord Jesus. (a) He was *sinless*. Amidst men whose eyes were sharpened by envy to detect the least fault, and who tried many times to ensnare Him in His words because they despaired of tripping Him in wrong conduct, He threw down the challenge without misgiving: 'Which of you convicteth me of sin?' And none dared take it up, either then or later (Mar_14:55): nor in the sixty generations that have passed since then have any such ethical advances been made that, looking back from our present vantage ground, we can point to anything as sin in Him. But His sinlessness did not consist merely in the fact that no act of full-grown sin could be discovered. There was no *taint* anywhere in Jesus' mind. Everything bore the bloom of perfect spiritual health and maturity. Spiritual disease could find no foothold whence to spread its poison, not even in the hours of spiritual conflict and internal agony. 'One that hath been tempted in all points like as we are, apart from sin' (Heb_4:15), is the only possible description of Him. (b) He made *no use of limiting qualifications in His sayings, or similar reservations in His action*. He did not use 'ifs' and 'buts,' but spoke with simple decisiveness on the most complex questions. At times He would carry this to the length of paradox, and bid a man struck on one cheek turn the other to invite a blow. At other times He would restate a problem to strip it of those adventitious difficulties with which it is enveloped in common minds; as when He met the unuttered question whether He would break the Law by healing on the Sabbath, by putting the inquiry, 'Is it lawful on the Sabbath day to do good, or to do harm? to save a life, or to kill?' (Mar_3:4). But more often He went straight to the centre of the matter in hand with a simple directness which made all qualifications needless: His dealing with the Sadducees' puzzle (Mar_12:18-27) is a striking instance. This can be done only by one whose 'eye is single.' (c) *Jesus was never critical*. More nearly than anywhere else one seems here to discover a deficiency in Him; for the critical faculties are of great value, and in some minds are in admirable vigour. In Him they were in abeyance. And yet it is plain this resulted from no want of faculty. He could on occasion prove Himself matchless in dialectic; and in more than one controversy with skilled opponents He used this dialectic power with crushing effect. What could be finer than His appeal to the image and superscription of the tribute-money when plied with the insidious question, 'Shall we give, or shall we not give?' (Mar_12:14); or than His rejoinder to the challenge of His own authority, 'The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or from men? answer me' (Mar_11:30),—a rejoinder which not only silenced objectors, but went to the root of the question they raised as to the criterion of 'authority'? His dialectic skill sometimes passed into biting sarcasm, as when He pointed out how the scribes and Pharisees witnessed to themselves that they were the sons of them that slew the prophets, by the way they garnished their tombs (Mat_23:29-31). Here are

all the faculties for critical efficiency, but the Lord Jesus was never critical. The fact seems to be that His mind was too creative. In minds of lesser stature, criticism may hold an honourable place, and often serves a very useful purpose; but it is always a second-hand way of winning truth. The truly creative mind does not need it, and does not use it, but reaches truth by direct intuition, or makes it spontaneously. He did so.

5. The last observation leads on to the mention of three mental characteristics which can hardly be separated, and which are all inwoven in the very fabric of Jesus' mind. His thoughts were always *concrete*, not abstract; His intellectual processes were *intuitive*, not argumentative; His views were ever *positive*, not negative. It has been very truly pointed out that 'only the widest generalizations and concrete facts are definite' (Hort); whatever lies between these extremes is more or less indefinite. Most minds are occupied mainly with this intermediate region, adding some degree of generalization to each fact of experience, and qualifying the largest generalizations by some accommodation to groups of facts observed. And to this is due not a little of the indefiniteness of most men's thoughts. But it was otherwise with the Lord Jesus. If He dealt with generalizations at all, He generalized out and out, dropping all half-way descriptions and limitations. He did not, therefore, shrink from inculcating principles which have often since been questioned on the ground that they are not of universal application. e.g. 'Give to him that asketh of thee' (Mat_5:42),—though experience shows too surely how much moral mischief may be done by indiscriminate charity; 'Ask, and it shall be given you' (Mat_7:7),—though prayers by no means always win what has been prayed for; 'It is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God' (Mar_10:25),—though wealth used worthily is no such bar to entry, and must itself be regarded as a 'loan from the Lord.' There is a definiteness in these unrestricted duties which could not have been attained by any carefully qualified rules of conduct. But more often the Lord Jesus adhered to concrete facts, and did not generalize at all. So, when any case came before Him, He dealt with *that*, and did not treat it as a precedent to govern others generally similar. Thus He told the rich young ruler to 'sell all he had and give to the poor, and follow him' (Mar_10:21). He certainly meant this to be done literally and at once; but it would be ruinous to turn this counsel into a command binding upon all rich men. It was never so intended, but was the particular remedy for the 'one thing lacking' in that one young man. No rule is to be directly drawn from the Lord's treatment of the woman in the Temple, or of Zacchaeus, or of Judas Iscariot, which would apply to all adulteresses, or renegades, or traitors: each was dealt with as the particular need required.

This was one leading reason why the use of parables was such a very characteristic feature in Jesus' teaching; they have been said, in fact, and not without reason, to be the most characteristic of the Lord's recorded sayings. They enabled Him to put the lesson He desired in the concrete instead of the abstract. So, when asked, 'Who is my

neighbour?' He gave no general answer, but an actual instance occurring on the road (Luk 10:30 ff.). Probably the scribe to whom this was first spoken never found himself in circumstances that were similar; but if he gained the higher standpoint which this story gave him, and saw into the very heart of truth in that one case, he would be able, like thousands of others who have heard the story since, the better to answer his own question in his own circumstances.

It was a consequence of this love of the concrete, and avoidance of that vagueness which belongs to all that lies short of the widest generalization, that Jesus never gave definitions. Instead, He fixed the *type* in some particular fact or instance. In His teaching there was no theorizing, no abstract discussion, no systematic theology. Nor was there any care to lay down principles for the organization or policy of His Church in times to come. The nearest approach to this last is in such passages as Mat 18:15-17, or the directions given before the first mission (Mat 10:5-23); but in these nothing is more noticeable than the utter absence of all abstractions, and all provisions for distant contingencies, every idea being expressed in concrete form, and in immediate connexion with the conditions of the work in hand. And yet in all this there is no mere particularism. Each single fact on which He looked was seen by Him in its real relations to all else, and in the light of the highest and widest principles. There is true insight into human needs in the saying that 'little thoughts do not suit with little duties. It is in the fulfilment of simple routine that we need more than anywhere the quickening of the highest thoughts' (Westcott). With Jesus that was instinctive. Any fact in His sight was serious, was sacred; for it was not merely an illustration of a wider truth, rather it was an actual embodiment of eternal reality. He looked on the 'flower in the crannied wall'—no more—and saw it with such penetrating insight that to Him it was eloquent of 'what God and man is.' He showed just the same intuitive recognition of truth in His estimate of a man, or His grasp of a religious principle. Whether it were the purpose and use of the Temple, or the religious customs and conventions of the day, or practical problems involving conflicting considerations, like that set to Peter by the question, 'Doth not your Master pay the half-shekel?' (Mat 17:24), or inquiries on the outer confines of human thought, such as those concerning eschatology and the life beyond death, the Lord Jesus always looked into the very heart of the facts before Him, so that all accessories and accidents seemed to drop away and leave the truth in its naked simplicity under His eyes. He completely disregarded the things which for most minds overlies and confuse the essential issues, and fixed His gaze on those positive points round which all the rest was accretion. His mind therefore concerned itself but little with negatives in any case. One most important consequence of this was that He always saw whatever good there was in any man, and paid comparatively little heed to the evil which might be there also. He did not stay to combat or correct the latter, but freed and reinforced the former so that it grew till no place was left for the evil, and it was expelled. In His hands all the old negative commandments were

transformed into positive ideals; and all were summed up in the one great ideal of loving God and one's neighbour (Mar 12:29-31), which was itself set forth in no lower form than the very highest, 'Ye shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect' (Mat 5:48). And in full accordance with this habit of mind, the judgments which from time to time He passed on men about Him were determined rather by what moral worth they had or lacked, than by what faults were in them. The most unsparing condemnation fell upon the Pharisees, whose lives were strict and reputable, and free from the gross and careless vices of the multitude. He denounced their whole moral and religious activity as an 'hypocrisy,' because it was one great negation. They were not 'sinners'; but with all the opportunities for good which more than others they possessed, their hearts and lives were empty. He portrayed them, and showed the futility of their whole religious method, by describing a man out of whom the unclean spirit has been driven, and whose house is then cleaned and left vacant. The cleaning out is not disputed, but all the more surely does the vacancy invite new tenants; and if no good spirit occupies the house forthwith, 'the last state of that man becometh worse than the first' (Luk 11:36). So in His pictures of God's final judgment the condemnation falls not usually on those against whom crimes may be alleged (though these find mention, e.g. Mar 12:9, Mat 22:7), but on the thoughtless maids found without oil; on the servant who took good care of his talent but never used it; on the guest without a wedding garment; on those to whom it is said, 'I was an hungered, and ye gave me no food; I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me not in; naked, and ye clothed me not; sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not' (Mat 25:42 f.). The whole point of view of Jesus in this is in strong contrast with that of the Judaism of His age, which aimed at attaining holiness by an earnest and elaborate endeavour to eliminate unholiness and defend the shrine of the soul from trespass.

One aspect of these last-mentioned characteristics may be summed up in a word, by saying that the make of Jesus' mind was that which is found in the greatest poets. They all combine, as lesser men cannot, the realist and the idealist. Their ideas are concrete, not abstract. Their minds work by intuition, not by argument. Their interests and thoughts are positive; and they are all more or less insistent that—

'The evil is null, is nought, a silence implying sound.'

And much of the Lord's teaching shows that the sense of form and the feeling for language which belong to them were His in a remarkable degree. Perhaps it was not entirely the power of His own personality, nor yet the substance of what He said, but also in part the music of its expression, that enabled Him so often to throw a spell over His hearers: e.g. 'All bare him witness, and wondered at the words of grace which proceeded out of his mouth' (Luk 4:22); 'The people all hung upon him, listening' (Luk 19:48); 'The officers answered, Never man so spake' (Joh 7:46). There

is, of course, the truest poetry in many of His sayings and in His parables; and His teaching teems with flashes of imagery such as only the highest poetry presents. Even in form of language some of His sayings lack little of the rhythm and music of poetical expression. But we have to remember that He wrote nothing that remains, and that nothing has been reported in His original words. The best we can expect to find in the NT is a good and faithful translation; and who can translate poetry? But a doubt must remain whether any literary vehicle could carry the full poetic inspiration of the Lord Jesus. Poems, however truly living, are the reflexions of life. The Life itself was inherent in Him (Joh 5:26), and He came to impart it, not to reflect it (Joh 10:10). So His 'poems' (ποίηματα) are the souls which, generation after generation, He has created anew, the ideals which have transformed, and are transforming, the world: even as St. Paul said of his disciples, 'Ye are an epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God' (2Co 3:3). See, further, art. Poet.

6. There are some things more properly described, perhaps, as features of character than as mental characteristics, but the distinction is such a narrow one, being a difference in the point of view and not in the facts, that they must be mentioned, though as briefly as possible. The *profound reverence* of Jesus' mind is one. Not only does this appear in every relation to His Father in heaven, and in the way He taught His disciples to look up to Him, but also in His delicate respect for all those who sought His help, and the sensitive regard He showed for the spiritual responsibility of each person, on which He never trenched. Another is His *simplicity*. He loved a simple life in outward things, rebuking Martha for her too ample provision when so little was needful (Luk 10:41), and teaching His followers to spend little care on the wealth and comfort which He held so lightly, and to pray only for 'daily bread.' But simplicity is still more strikingly characteristic of the nature and process of His mind. Though more than any other that has ever lived He was 'many-sided,' He never gave the impression of a complicated nature. With the directness of a child He always turned to the point in hand; and no one was ever more free from that hesitancy which is so often found in those who are the best able to see both sides of a question. With sympathy unending and unlimited, He still was simple, and could put the loftiest thoughts into simple terms. That is always a characteristic of a really great—though not of every great—mind: never was an instance of it comparable with this one. Closely akin to this is the fact that *Jesus was never disconcerted* or bewildered, nor did He ever lose presence of mind in the most difficult or dangerous situations. Rather, in times of trial, there was a heightening of His serenity of mind; for trial and sorrow made stronger appeal to His faith, which was always responsive. μή μετεωρίζεσθε was a counsel most characteristic of Him (Luk 12:29); and it was this habitual trust in the Father that enabled Him in the very hour of impending agony to make His followers the bequest of peace—His peace (Joh 14:27; Joh 16:33).

7. Two matters of importance remain to be mentioned, distinct but by no means unconnected—(a) *Jesus' characteristic outlook upon life*, and (b) *His method as the Saviour of the world*.

(a) One cannot escape the feeling that while others look only at the surface of life, the Master looked through its surface and saw its depth: we see life usually in two dimensions, He looked at it in three, and so saw *reality*. Of course, from His standpoint all its proportions were very different from those which appear to us. The most striking expression of what is meant is to be found in Browning's description of Lazarus as given in the *Epistle of Karshish*. But while Browning had learnt the nature of this larger view, converting all proportions, from Him who called back Lazarus to earth, he represents it as a double prospect in Lazarus, with none of that translucent unity which is its essential feature in the Lord Jesus. The Beatitudes are an instance. Their chief effect, and it cannot be doubted their chief purpose, is to set the hearer on a new standpoint, and so enable him to gain a new view of life. It is no paradox that the poor are blest, while all men congratulate the rich; and this is not said to give emphasis to the aspect which is too much over looked. It is simply the truth of life, seen as the eyes of the Lord Jesus saw it when He looked round on His disciples gathered there, all destitute of earth's possessions, but with a light in their eager faces as they 'hung upon him listening' which told of the 'righteousness and peace and joy in holy inspiration' which showed that theirs *was* the Kingdom of God (Rom 14:17). All whose reading of experience goes deep can see, or partly see, why He counted sorrow blest, and gentleness, mercy, purity, and love the treasures of man's real enrichment. Another instance is the prayer He gave to His disciples when they felt the need of being taught how to pray. There is an unearthliness in it, and a grasp on the real depths of life, such as no other prayers disclose. God's glory, and His Kingdom, and the joy of fulfilling His will, fill up all the foreground; and the remainder of the view includes brief mention of bare needs here, and then fuller appeal for the deeper needs of forgiveness, and of the shelter of Him who is our 'shield and our exceeding great reward.' Hardly less striking is the way in which He enforced the duty of simple truthfulness, His words calling up vividly the awful picture of the Evil One leaning over the soul that talks loosely, to ply it with 'suggestions' which then find unsuspecting utterance as readily as those which the hypnotist gives to his unconscious 'subject' (Mat 5:37, with which cf. Luk 22:31). There were times when the Lord expressed strongly this contrast between the view which men took of life and that which He took (Luk 16:15), but more often His reference is a mere allusion. The difference culminated in that most characteristic and central idea on which He so often dwelt, that a man must 'lose his life to find it' (Mar 8:34-37 ||, cf. Mat 10:39, Luk 17:33, Joh 12:25). Death itself was accordingly transfigured in Jesus' eyes: it neither put a limit to life nor made a breach which destroyed its continuity. Death was for Him 'sleep'; a sleep from which He awaked more than one, and from which 'in the last day' He would awake and raise up 'every

one that beholdeth the Son and believeth on him' (Joh_6:40). For Himself, He looked through death to His own resurrection, which He again and again told His disciples to expect as the day of His departure drew nearer; and for the rest, He recognized death with all its miserable and misleading associations as little as might be, and refused even to speak of it if this could be avoided (Joh_11:11-14). With His strong sense of the continuity of life there went, however, a very remarkable reserve about the future. Concerning it He disclosed nothing of detail; nothing that trust in the love of God and the assurance of life's continuity do not themselves imply. He plainly said He did not know the course of the future, and His disciples must not expect to do so (Mar_13:32, Act_1:7). But He never showed Himself averse to adopting the current religions language which rested on the prophecy and apocalypics of the past, to clothe those ideas which He wished to impress about the life to come; though it may well be that the eschatological passages in the Gospels are considerably coloured and confused by the fact that they have come through the medium of disciples who were not equal to following their Master's higher thoughts.

It is in connexion with this far profounder view of life which we find in Him that we are best able to understand the 'powers that worked in' the Lord Jesus (ἐνεργουῦσιν αἱ δυνάμεις ἐν αὐτῷ, Mar_6:14), and His consciousness in regard to them. The term 'miracles' can hardly fail to prove misleading, as it is so closely associated with the 18th cent. point of view, which considered them as exceptions to natural law, and as owing their evidential value to the fact that they were exceptions. That view is quite obsolete and impossible now to a really scientific mind: it was always singularly unappreciative of 'the mind of Christ.' There can be no doubt that Jesus Himself felt complete certainty that He did wield powers of an extraordinary and practically limitless kind (cf. Mat_26:51-53), and that His contemporaries never dreamt of disputing the fact. But to Him they were certainly neither 'unnatural' nor 'supernatural.' The distinction drawn by the latter term is quite alien to His mind, and inconsistent with His point of view; for Him the continuous character and flow of life was a fundamental idea, and the one unbroken reality included equally what we describe as 'natural' and 'supernatural.' The 'powers' of which He was conscious had their proper place and scope in life as He saw it; and if it is not possible for us to assign this, or to explain them, that is due probably to the single fact that, as already said, we try to see the reality of life from the standpoint of two dimensions, and can succeed so little in seeing it from that of three as He did (cf. Mat_16:19; Mat_18:18, Joh_20:23).

(b) The method which the Lord Jesus followed in carrying out His purpose as the world's Saviour was no less unique than His outlook on life, and it was the direct result of the latter. In the ordinary sense of the term He was no reformer; He did not try to make the institutions which He found serve their end better, nor did He seek to

substitute one expedient for another, to attain more successfully the aims before Him. He felt that His Kingdom was 'not of this world,' and all He sought was to open its portal to believers. He did not pit His Kingdom against those of the world to overthrow the latter; rather He refused to let His followers do this or to do it Himself (Mat 26:52-54). Nor did He attempt to withdraw His followers from the world, as other religious leaders often have done, that they might serve God with less distraction. Even His prayers were not for change of the world itself, or the delivery of His disciples from it (Joh 17:9-21). Though His whole life was sacrificed to save the world, He just left the world alone. As in His teaching there was little that was negative, so in His work He tried to *undo* nothing. It is very surprising how content He always seemed to be to accommodate Himself to the use of any means or circumstance that lay ready at hand, while so unbending in aim throughout. Thus He spoke the religious language of Judaism, practised the customs in Israel, and respected its institutions, however much they were degraded and abused. He paid His half-shekel to the Sanhedrin and His tribute-money to the Caesar without protest. Browning again brings out with striking effect this feature of the Master's in his portrait of Lazarus, whose 'especial marking ... is prone submission to the heavenly will,' so that he tries to change nothing; but here again this characteristic, being isolated, lapses into quietism as it never did in Lazarus' Master. For, however willing Jesus was to use and leave unreformed the things around Him, none of these ever bound Him. If there was fault or falsehood mingled with what He borrowed for the moment, He left that on one side and moved on towards His goal unaffected. He saw the truth too clearly to be diverted by aught else, and the truth made Him free. And He led His followers into the freedom that was His own. So, while He abstained from all political intervention, and declined to be mixed up with the ordinary business of life (Luk 12:14), and left religious institutions and traditions where He found them, He nevertheless revolutionized all life. There is no department of human activity in the world to-day—except in some of its backwaters which have not yet felt His influence—which is not profoundly altered in consequence of His life and work and words. His confidence that it would be so never faltered; He saw here the supreme scope of the law of 'life through loss.' So He declared beforehand the result which is yet in progress under our eyes—'I, if I be lifted up out of the earth, will draw all men unto myself' (Joh 12:32). Of what import are the foam flakes which float upon its surface to him who plunges into the mighty stream of life? Jesus' view of life, and His method of saving men, both so original, both so characteristic, are both vindicated in full by the results. They are alike summed up in the joyous conviction which many and many a soul has uttered when lifted to His higher plane, and which even the world itself has been forced to suspect, though not to share: 'If any man be in Christ, there is a new creation!' (2Co 5:17, Gal 6:15).

Literature.—Bernard, *Mental Characteristics of the Lord Jesus Christ*; Adamson, *Studies of the Mind in Christ*; Latham, *Pastor Pastorum*; Du Bose, *Gospel in the Gospels*; art. Character of Christ, and the Literature there cited.

E. P. Boys-Smith.

☞ Merchant

MERCHANT.—See Trade and Commerce.

☞ Mercy

MERCY

1. Mercy of God.—Mercy is ‘that essential perfection in God whereby He pities and relieves the miseries of His creatures’ (Cruden). In the OT the mercy of God (רַחֵם, רַחֲמִים; רַחֵן ‘to show mercy’) is sought and celebrated in (Psa 51:1, Lam 3:22), or more frequently where no connexion with sin is expressed (Psa 89:1; Psa 118:1). Sin and the distress which is the consequence of it are not always separated in thought (Psa 41:4; Psa 79:8-9).

In the NT a clearer division can be made of places where the mercy spoken of is temporal or spiritual. Those who came to Christ for help asked for *mercy*, that is, for pity and relief (Mat 9:27; Mat 15:22; Mat 17:15; Mat 20:30; cf. Mar 5:19). The word used is ἐλεεῖν, while Christ’s twofold response is expressed by σπλαγχνισθεῖς, ‘moved with compassion,’ and by His act of healing (Mat 20:34). Along with these may be placed Luk 1:58, Php 2:27, 1Co 7:25, where particular instances of mercy are mentioned. On the other hand, the words ἔλεος, ἐλεεῖν are used of the whole of God’s saving work in Christ (Luk 1:72; Luk 1:78, Rom 11:30, 2Co 4:1, Eph 2:4, 1Ti 1:13; 1Ti 1:16, Tit 3:3-7, Jud 1:21). In the publican’s prayer, ‘God, be merciful to me the sinner’ (Luk 18:13), the more exact translation is ‘be propitiated’ (ἰλάσθητι), as also in Heb 8:12 (ἰλεως). In these places the obstacle of sin is recognized, and the mercy described is such as overcomes sin.

Generally in the NT sin is described not only as the source of human misery, but as itself the greatest evil from which men need to be delivered; and accordingly the

work of God's mercy is to save from sin (see [Eph 2:4-10](#), [Tit 3:3-7](#)). In [Rom 11:30-32](#) something is said of the Divine purpose in permitting sin, so that we may believe that the severities of God's judgments are not inconsistent with 'that essential perfection of mercy whereby He pities and relieves the miseries of His creatures.' But of this as creatures we have not the final right to judge ([Rom 9:15](#); [Rom 9:23](#)). A deepened sense of the hopelessness of separation from God brings it about that no other deliverance is to be for a moment compared with salvation from sin ([Eph 2:1-4](#); cf. [Gal 1:4](#), [Jud 1:21](#)).

This is also seen to be the meaning of mercy when the *method* of God's mercy in the Gospel is considered, and the *aim* of it.

(1) *Its method.*—Christ's work teaches us that God's mercy seeks a higher good for men than the relief of temporal distress. We must think of Christ as abiding in the constant sense of the mercy of His Father, and communicating the same to men in word and deed. 'Be ye therefore merciful (*οἰκτιρομενες*), as your Father also is merciful' ([Luk 6:36](#)). 'Love one another, as I have loved you. Greater love hath no man than this' ([Joh 15:12-13](#)). That is to say, the mercy of God beginning with compassion went on to action, in the Incarnation and Atonement. 'This is he that came by water and blood' ([1Jn 5:6](#)). 'I lay down my life that I may take it again.... This commandment have I received of my Father' ([Joh 10:17-18](#), cf. [1Pe 1:3](#)).

Following upon the work of Christ, it is said of believers that they have obtained mercy ([2Co 4:1](#), [1Ti 1:13](#); [1Ti 1:16](#), [1Pe 2:10](#)); and that they look for the mercy of the Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life ([Jud 1:21](#)). And mercy is still continuously needed, asked for, and received by believers ([Heb 4:16](#), [Php 2:27](#), [2Ti 1:16](#); [2Ti 1:18](#)). Also the prayers in [1Ti 1:2](#), [2Ti 1:2](#), [Gal 6:16](#), [2Jn 1:3](#), [Jud 1:2](#), indicate that it becomes us to go in prayer to seek the mercy which it remains always with God to bestow. It is noteworthy that mercy is added to the usual 'grace' and 'peace' of the salutations just in those places where some more intimate affection and tender sympathy is naturally to be expected (e.g. [Gal 6:16](#), the Letters to Timothy, and Jude's Epistle). Whatever there is painful in the experience of believers constitutes for them a new need of the Divine mercy, and is to be explained as a part of God's purpose of greater good by saving them more and more completely from sin.

(2) *Its aim.*—The aim of God's mercy is expressed in Christ's words, 'That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven' ([Mat 5:45](#)). The parable of the Unmerciful Servant ([Mat 18:23](#)) sets forth the purpose of God negatively, and in [1Jn 2:5](#); [1Jn 4:12](#); [1Jn 4:17](#) the positive side is given. God's mercy or love to us comes to perfect realization when we have learned to be like Him. Because He loves us He will have us to be merciful, that we may be at our best. In this way also the

progress of the Kingdom of God among men is assured, as we see in a concrete instance in 2 Corinthians 4-7 (cf. [Act 20:18-35](#)).

2. Mercy of man to man.—We have seen that it is the aim of the Divine mercy to reproduce itself in the spirits of men. As mercy has two parts, pity and active beneficence, we are commanded to love not in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth ([1Jn 3:16](#)). This is Christ's teaching in [Mat 9:13](#); [Mat 12:7](#); [Mat 23:23](#), and in the parables of the Good Samaritan ([Luk 10:30](#)) and of the Sheep and the Goats ([Mat 25:31](#)), as well as in that of the Unmerciful Servant ([Mat 18:28](#)). From these we learn that if gratitude to God does not avail to make men merciful to one another, they will be dealt with by penalties (see also [Jam 2:13](#); [Jam 3:17](#), [1Jn 2:9-11](#); [1Jn 3:15](#)). This right disposition of heart is a product not so much of enlightenment of the mind as of such experiences as touch the springs of affection. The passage in 2 Corinthians 4-9, beginning 'as we have obtained mercy' (and, indeed, the whole Epistle), is a treasury of evangelical motives to philanthropic conduct. 'Our mouth is opened unto you, our heart is enlarged' ([2Co 6:11](#)). Similarly, in the case of St. Peter, 'Thou knowest that I love thee.... Feed my sheep' ([Joh 21:17](#); cf. [Rom 12:1](#) 'I beseech you ... by the mercies (*οἰκτιρμοί*) of God that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice').

Selflessness, and the constraint that Christ's love lays upon a believer, are the important features of his behaviour in this matter of mercifulness. 'Though I be nothing'; 'I will very gladly spend and be spent for you' ([2Co 12:12](#); [2Co 12:15](#)). 'I am debtor ... as much as in me is, I am ready' ([Rom 1:14-15](#)). 'The love of Christ constraineth us' ([2Co 5:14](#)). 'We ought to lay down our lives for the brethren' ([1Jn 3:16](#)). When we look at Christ's own life for an example, we do not find in His case the indebtedness of one who has been forgiven, but we do find the readiness of unreserved surrender to His Father's will. 'I came not to do mine own will' ([Joh 6:38](#)). 'My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me' ([Joh 7:16](#)). 'I have not spoken of myself' ([Joh 12:49](#)). Thus the mercy of God does not work *in vacuo*, but in the concrete example of Christ and of men possessed by His spirit, and made vehicles of His mercy ([Rom 11:31](#), [1Jn 4:12](#)).

In the OT the word *חֶסֶד* 'mercy' is used of the duties of piety between kinsmen ([Gen 20:13](#)), or persons who are in covenant with each other ([Gen 21:23](#)). And it might seem in conflict with this that one of the most striking instances in which an appeal for mercy is disallowed in the NT is that of the rich man to his father Abraham ([Luk 16:24](#)). Similarly, Christ subordinated the ties of kindred ([Luk 14:26](#)) even with Himself ([Mar 3:33](#), [Luk 11:28](#)) to the higher bonds of the Kingdom of God. Nevertheless the effect of Christian faith is to strengthen, and not to weaken, all the ties of human affection, raising them into the region of religion. The early motto of

Christ's ministry was, 'I desire mercy and not sacrifice' (Mat_9:13; Mat_12:7); the same thought pervades the later chapters of the Gospel of John (13-17) and his First Epistle, *passim*, while both in Acts (Act_20:38; Act_21:13) and in his Epistles there is evidence of the overflowing, self-forgetting affection of St. Paul for the Christian Churches. The rule of pity and of active helpfulness is the teaching and the practice of Christ and His disciples. Mercy is the note of the Christian temper. See, further, artt. Grace, Kindness.

Literature.—Cremer, *Lexicon*, s.v. ἔλεος; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Mercy'; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*, chs. xix. xx.; Dykes, *Manifesto of the King*, p. 101 ff.; Paget, *Studies in the Christian Character*, p. 221 ff.; Butler, *Serm.* v. vi. ix. xi. xii.; Browning, *Ring and the Book*, x.; C. Watson, *First Ep. of John*; Dean Stanley *Corinthians*, vol. ii.

T. Gregory.

☞ Merit

MERIT.—The idea of merit in general is one which attaches to human conduct on the presupposition of the existence, in the first place, of a moral law; in the second place, of free-will in man, enabling him to obey it; and, in the third place, of some system of rewards and punishments, by which the worth of obedience to the Law is recognized, and equally the unworth of disobedience is demonstrated. That conduct is meritorious, or possesses merit, which corresponds with the moral law, and at the same time is voluntary; and, as meritorious, it claims honour or reward. This is the general ethical conception of merit (cf. Martineau, *Types of Ethical Theory*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , ii. 80 ff.). The theological use, however, of the conception, and still more of the term ('merit,' *meritum*), involves further specifications, which follow, on the one hand, from the connexion of the idea with other theological ideas, e.g. those of God, of His grace, and so on; and, on the other hand, from the different analogies under which, from time to time, the relation of God to men has been conceived. Here we have two special cases of the use of the conception to consider: (1) its use in the Gospels; (2) the use not only of the idea, but also of the theological term 'merit' in reference to the work of Christ.

1. The idea of merit in the Gospels.—We note, first, that the use of the conception is frequent in the Gospels in connexion with a general view of God as the Judge and Rewarder of good and evil deeds. This conception of God was in fact that dominant at

the time of the ministry of our Lord, God's relation to men being commonly viewed under legal analogies. Compare the statement of Schultz (*op. cit. infr.*):—

'When Christianity entered into the world and found its first expression in the dominant Jewish circles, as well as among the spokesmen of the idealistic Hellenic popular culture, the thought of a Divine repayment deciding according to legal standards, and therefore of a merit or demerit of men according to which their fate was to be settled, was a self-evident axiom.... With faith in God as the representative of the moral order of the world, there appeared to be self-evidently given the faith that He rewards and punishes according to the rule of human law.'

This statement of Schultz may be supplemented, with regard, in particular, to the doctrine of the Pharisees, which forms at once the background and the contrast of the teaching of Jesus, by the accounts of H. J. Holtzmann, *NT Theol.* i. p. 62 ff., and of Weber, *Jud. Theol.*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 277 ff. In the Pharisaic theology the legal conception of God takes the sharpest possible form. The Law is thought of as the sum of so many precepts, the performance of each one of which establishes a separate and definite merit or claim to reward (Weber, p. 380 ff.).

'Just like a heavenly book-keeper, God reckons and calculates according to a standard quantitative as well as qualitative—here the sum of performances of the law and meritorious works, there the sum of transgressions and misdeeds' (Holtzmann, p. 63).

The idea of merit, however, does not end with the performance of the Law: it also attaches to 'good works,' *i.e.* voluntary acts beyond the strict requirement of the Law, but which are taken account of in the same way before God's judgment seat, and avail to make up the shortcomings of a man's account. The principal of these good works are almsgiving and works of charity (Weber, p. 284). Finally, the idea of merit is brought specially into connexion with the question of ultimate salvation.

'The judgment on men before the heavenly court of justice takes place with reference to the question whether the man shall live or die—whether he shall be found worthy of the future Kingdom of God or not' (Weber, p. 278).

The teaching of Jesus now proceeds in agreement with the theology of the Pharisees, in so far as He not only continually speaks of the rewarding of our works by God, but also represents the Kingdom of God itself under the point of view of a reward, which is awarded to the performance of 'righteousness.' We have the general idea of work and reward in Mat 6:1-4; Mat 6:6; Mat 6:16; Mat 6:18; Mat 10:41-42; Mat 20:1-7; Mat 24:45-51; Mat 25:14-28, Mar 9:41, Luk 6:35; Luk 10:7, Joh 4:36. For the

Kingdom of God (life, or eternal life) as reward, cf. Mat 6:20; Mat 19:17; Mat 25:31-46, Mar 10:29-30.

The limitations set to the idea of merit in the teaching of Jesus, as compared with its use in the theology of the Pharisees, are, however, very striking. (a) First of all, we have to notice the change involved by the difference in the conception of God. While with the Pharisees the idea of God as Lawgiver and Judge is dominant, with Jesus this idea is subordinated to *the conception of God as Father*. The idea of reward itself, in fact, is connected with that of God's Fatherhood (Mat 6:1; Mat 6:4; Mat 6:6; Mat 6:18). What this implied is thus stated by Schultz:—

‘Since Jesus has taught His disciples to see the true understanding of their relation to God in the figure of child and father, then the thought of merit in the sense of the law is in general completely irreconcilable with the figure’ (p. 15).

Only an *ethical*, not a legal, conception of merit is therefore possible along the lines of the teaching of Jesus.

(b) Jesus criticised the Pharisaic doctrine of reward according to strict legal merit, by teaching that the reward which God gives is *not according to debt, but according to grace*. We have here to remember that when Jesus illustrates, as He frequently does, the relation of God to men by that of a master and his household servants (cf. Mat 24:45-51; Mat 25:14-30, Luk 17:9), this excludes the idea of legal merit.

‘A servant in the sense of antiquity cannot win merit. He is δούλος ἀχρεῖτος, even when he has done all he should (Luk 17:9). The Lord can reward him, but that remains at bottom an act of good-pleasure’ (Schultz, p. 15).

The point is made still clearer by the one parable where Jesus introduces a relation in which merit and reward are possible, speaking not of household servants, but of hired labourers (Mat 20:1-16). Here

‘He emphasizes in intentional paradox that the lord in his goodness will not bind himself to this rule—that he indeed redeems his promise, but reserves to himself the right to transcend the measure of the law in free sovereignty’ (*ib.*).

Cf., on the same point, Holtzmann (i. p. 196):—

‘This remarkable parable annuls the idea of reward in applying it, completely destroys the relation of merit and right, of performance and reward in general.’

We note, finally, to the same effect, the *gracious abundance* of the reward in Mar 10:30, Mat 24:46-47; Mat 25:21-23, Luk 6:38.

(c) Another criticism which Jesus passes on the legal idea of merit is that it is *too external*. God, the Father, looks at the heart. The better righteousness, which admits to the Kingdom, is an inward righteousness (cf. Mat 5:20 to Mat 6:18). But this affects the whole conception of merit and reward.

‘The reward belongs to the personality which reveals itself in the work, not to the performance as such.... Thus, what appears as reward is at bottom the recognition of the worth of the personality.... It is the conduct of life, the $\pi\omicron\tilde{\alpha}\xi\iota\varsigma$, which appears in the single acts, and is rewarded (Mat 16:27) ... as it is the love shown to the brothers of Christ which is recognized in the judgment (Mat 25:34 ff.)’ (Schultz, p. 14).

To sum up, then, we do not in the teaching of Jesus get a completely unified doctrine of merit, but we get clear indications of the lines which such a doctrine must follow. It must be ethical rather than legal; must connect itself with the conception of God’s Fatherhood, and with the idea of His free grace, rather than with that of His strict retribution according to law; and must have regard not to external actions only, but to the inward motive. The conditions are fulfilled if we recognize human merit as the worth to the Heavenly Father of the conduct of His sons when judged by the inward motive of filial obedience, and its reward as the recognition of this worth by His Fatherly love, which gives to His children who seek His Kingdom both this chief good and all things else that they need (Luk 6:31-32). As regards the individual actions of God’s children, the idea of merit is not to be connected with them apart from the general context of filial conduct in which they stand; nor is the idea of reward to be connected with particular Divine gifts apart from the gift of the Kingdom. Only on the background of the general conception of the reward of filial conduct by the gift of the Kingdom can particular gifts appear as the reward of particular actions.

2. The merit of Christ.—The definite theological doctrine, in which the term ‘merit’ is employed as a *terminus technicus* of the subject, lies beyond the NT. But it is anticipated in the latter, in so far as we there have a doctrine of Christ’s work as man, in which ethical standards are applied to the subject. (a) In this doctrine it is above all upon His *death* that attention is concentrated, as the point in which the character of His saving work specially appears. We have first the idea of Christ’s death as an act of *obedience* to God (Rom 5:19, Php 2:8, Heb 10:5-10). Further approximation to the idea of a merit of Christ is contained in the references to the *worth* of His death in procuring the salvation of men. It is a ransom (Mar 10:45), a price (1Co 6:20). In the idea of *sacrifice* once more we have both the idea of the worth to God of Christ’s death as self-surrender, and of its worth for men in procuring

salvation (Eph 5:2, Heb 10:5-10). [The important series of passages further defining the sacrifice of Christ as an expiatory sacrifice is not brought in here; since these passages, so far as they contain this additional idea, belong properly to the Scripture proof of the doctrine of Christ's work, not as *directly* meriting salvation, but as making satisfaction for sin, and so making salvation possible. In virtue of the general idea of sacrifice contained in them, apart from the specification of it as expiatory, they may, however, be added to the proof of the doctrine of merit]. We have, further, references in the NT to the *recognition* of Christ's death by God. On account of it the Father loves Him (Joh 10:17); because of His obedience in it God exalts Him to universal lordship (Php 2:9-11). [Compare the Divine recognition of the worth of the work of the Suffering Servant in Isa 53:10-12]. (b) The conception of the work of Christ is not, however, confined to His death. His *life* is a ministry to men (Mar 10:45). His work (Joh 17:4) includes the manifestation of the Divine name to the disciples (Joh 17:6), the giving to them of the words received from the Father (Joh 17:8), the keeping of them from the evil in the world (Joh 17:12), as well as His final sacrifice (Joh 17:19). Moreover, it is not only the death of Christ, but His work throughout His life, that God recognizes in glorifying in turn the Son who has glorified Him (Joh 17:1-4). And, finally, both Mar 10:45 and John 17 imply that the work of Christ in His life and death is all of a piece; since in both passages, but especially in John 17, there is no break in the way in which the culminating work of the death is added on to the work of the life.

Summing up our results, we have in the NT the basis of a doctrine of Christ's merit as the worth to God (and men) of His human work carried on throughout His life, and culminating in His death. This worth of Christ's work is estimated by God along the lines of Christ's obedience to His will (the work of Christ being that which the Father has given Him to do (Joh 4:24; Joh 17:4)). It is recognized by God in the special love with which He regards Christ in the accomplishment of His work, and outwardly by His exaltation or glorification. It is to be noted, however, that while the position of lordship is viewed as the reward of the work of Christ, the salvation of men is not viewed in the NT as its direct *reward*, but rather as its *fruit* or *effect* (Joh 12:24). Christ saves, according to NT conceptions, by His earthly work, but not by means of it as a *quantum* which can be detached from His Personality, and rewarded by the salvation of men [as in the conception of the ecclesiastical doctrine of Christ's merit, presently to be discussed]. Instead of this, we have the conception that through His work He becomes a saving Personality, or, as Rothe puts it, that through it He 'qualifies Himself to become a Redeemer' (*Theol. Ethik*,² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] iii. p. 104). Our salvation follows from His work; since the Christ, who lived to minister to men, to make known to them the words which the Father had given Him, and to keep them from the evil, and persevered in His work to the death in perfect obedience to the will of His Father,

thus offering up His life as a sacrifice to God, by this very work and the Personality achieved through it, exercises a saving authority and influence over men (Joh 12:32; cf. the similar idea in Isa 53:11, where the righteous Servant justifies many through his *knowledge*, and thus sees of the travail of his soul and is satisfied). But the open recognition of Christ's work by God in the exaltation of Christ, which begins with the Resurrection, also contributes to His saving power over men (cf. Rom 4:25 'raised for our justification'); inasmuch as a human personality influences us not only by its inner worth, but also through the outward manifestation and revelation of that worth. Thus in the NT the Saviourhood of Christ is connected specially with His Lordship (Act 5:31, 2Pe 1:11). The name which is above every name (Php 2:11) is the name of salvation (Act 5:12). Cf. also the use of the name *Christ*, which implies both Saviourhood and Lordship, in special reference to the state of exaltation (Act 2:36; St. Paul also always thinks of the *risen* Lord as the Saviour). It is at this point that the way in which human salvation can be regarded as the 'reward' of the work of Christ becomes clearest, inasmuch as the exaltation which is His direct reward puts Him in the position to reap the full fruit of His travail in the salvation of souls.

Two more points are necessary to complete our outline of the suggestions of the NT towards a doctrine of Christ's merit. In the first place, there is required (c) a closer definition of Christ's *saving power*. What is the work by which He saves? It is, above all, the revelation of the holy love of God in Christ's life and death, which moves men at once to faith in God as revealed in Him, and to repentance (*μετάνοια*, change of mind from love of sin to love of God), and thus brings them into that communion with the Father which is the essential ground of all the blessings of salvation. Christ's love towards men and His holiness, in the absolute unity of His Person, are a manifestation of the love and the holiness of God, as existing in a similar absolute personal unity; and the trust and repentance which Christ inspires are directed through Him to God. For proof of these statements, the following passages, amongst others, may be referred to. According to Joh 1:14-18 the grace and truth of Christ declare the invisible God. In Rom 5:15 the grace of Christ is equivalent to the grace of God. In Rom 8:35-39 the love of Christ reveals the love of God. Further, in Joh 17:11; Joh 17:25 the Father whom Christ reveals is the holy, the righteous Father. Jesus awakes not only trust in the love of God (Rom 5:8; Rom 8:35-39), but also repentance towards God (Act 5:31; cf. the Pauline idea of baptism into Christ's death and resurrection as involving a death to sin and new life unto God, Rom 6:1-11). Finally, to know God as revealed in Christ is eternal life, or the sum of all blessings (Joh 17:3).

(d) In the second place, the above definition of the work of Christ as the revelation of the holy love of God, throws further light upon *the 'reward' of Christ*. We saw that while this meant primarily the recognition of Christ's work by God in His exaltation, it

involved indirectly the fruit or effect of the work of Christ, as realized through this. But now it appears that the whole conception of the reward of Christ by God is subordinate to the idea of the *immanence* of God in His work. The work of Christ is not only the work which God has given Him to do (Joh 4:34; Joh 17:4), but God works through Him; so that the value to God of the work of Christ consists ultimately in His voluntary self-surrender to be the personal instrument in the world of the saving revelation of God, and the recognition of this work by God in the exaltation of Christ, which yields Him the fruit of His work in the salvation of men, is, at the same time, included in the execution of God's own purpose of salvation. Thus the *ethical* doctrine of the work of Christ culminates ultimately in the wholly *religious* view of it (2Co 3:1-9; cf. the subordination of the work of Christ to the grace of God in Rom 3:24-28).

Such is the outline of a doctrine of Christ's merit, as sketched in the NT. The agreement of it with the ethical lines of Christ's own general teaching on merit, as previously stated, is apparent. There is the same stress on the inner motive of obedience, the same domination of the whole subject by the idea of God's Fatherhood; while the exaltation of Christ is the analogue of the gift to His people of the Kingdom, in which they share His Lordship (Luk 22:29, 2Ti 2:12).

Very different is the ecclesiastical doctrine of Christ's merit, which, beginning with Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*, extends throughout both the Catholic and the Protestant scholasticism. Here an idea of merit is applied to the work of Christ, which is essentially the same as that of the Pharisaic theology, rejected by Jesus. This idea exists as a general conception illustrating the relation of man to God from the time of Tertullian onwards, who introduced from the vocabulary of Roman law the term *meritum*, and its cognates *mereri*, *promereri*, *demereri*, to define it (cf. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , iii. p. 16, n. [Note: note.] 1). As employed by Anselm to elucidate the work of Christ, it includes the following points. (1) The work of Christ is regarded as a voluntary work or performance, lying outside of the sphere of Christ's proper obligation to God. Anselm thinks of Christ as bound as man to obedience to God in His life, but as sinless man, free from obligation to die: hence His voluntary death is a work, which He can and does offer to God to procure the salvation of men. (2) The value of this work to God is estimated, not qualitatively by its motive, but quantitatively by the dignity of the Person who performs it. (3) The reward of Christ's work follows from God's justice, and the conception of this is equally external with that of the work itself, the reward being transferable from Christ to His people just like a sum of money. 'Whom could He more justly make the heirs of His debt (*i.e.* the reward which God owes Him), which He does not Himself need, than His relatives and brethren?' (*Cur Deus Homo*, lib. ii. cap. 9).

The Catholic schoolmen after Anselm, and the Protestant schoolmen after them, continue the Anselmic doctrine of merit, not, however, without many changes. Of these the most important are as follows. Peter Lombard, following [Php 2:9-11](#), adds that Christ merited not only salvation for us, but exaltation and glory for Himself (*Sent.* lib. iii. dist. 18). Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus no longer deduce the reward of Christ's merit from God's justice, as does Anselm, but either from a relative justice or equity, such as that implied in Roman law by the relation of father and son, or lord and slave (Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, ii. i. 104. 1), or from God's mere good pleasure (Scotus in *Sent.* lib. iii. dist. 20, qu. 1). By the Protestant schoolmen the material content of Christ's merit is enlarged by the addition of the general obedience of Christ's life, as voluntary, to the special voluntary obedience of His death (which latter they view not as a gift to God, but as an endurance of the penalties of sin). None of these changes, however, *essentially* alters the Anselmic conception of merit. Two points in particular stand fast throughout, viz. the idea of Christ's work as something voluntary and unowed, and the entirely external conception of it as a *quantum*, whose value can be assessed and rewarded by another quantum of corresponding value. Only in the idea, first fully developed, after Bernard and Lombard, by Aquinas, and continued especially in the Reformed theology, that the 'transfer' of Christ's merit to His people is mediated through His mystic unity as Head with them as His members, is the hard, juristic outline of the Anselmic doctrine transcended (cf. *Summa Theol.* iii. 46. 1). By the end of the Protestant scholasticism, however, the disparateness of the traditional idea of merit from anything in the NT had become clear to the theologians within Protestantism of a critical tendency. The Arminian Limborch says of this idea, along with that of satisfaction: 'Since they do not stand in Scripture, but have been invented by men, no one is bound to the meaning of them any further than it can be construed from the phrases of Scripture, to elucidate the sense of which they have been applied' (*Theologia Christiana*, lib. iii. cap. 21. 1). In the period of theological reconstruction since Schleiermacher, the general tendency of theologians, so far as they have not simply repeated older ideas, or dissolved theology into philosophy, has been either to reject the term 'merit' altogether, as being too much associated with the scholastic conception of it, or, if it has been retained, to reinterpret it along more Scriptural lines. Ritschl, above all, has succeeded in transforming into firm dogmatic conceptions the outlines of the NT doctrine, as above stated. See his exhaustive treatment of the whole subject in *Justification and Reconciliation*, vol. iii. [English translation p. 434 ff.].

Literature.—Schultz, 'Der sittliche Begriff des Verdienstes und seine Anwendung auf das Verständniss des Werkes Christi'² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] in *SK* [Note: *K Studien und Kritiken.*], 1894, p. 9; Ritschl, *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred], 3 vols. 1889 [English translation (*Justification and Reconciliation*) of 1st

vol. from 1st ed. 1872, of 3rd vol. from 3rd ed. 1902]; H. J. Holtzmann, *NT Theol.* 1897; Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1901 [English translation from 1st ed. 1893]; Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo* in Migne's *Patr. Lat.* tom. 158, also in separate ed. (Nutt), 1894.

Robert S. Franks.

⚡ Messenger

MESSENGER.—The word is formed from ‘message’ with intrusive nasal. It is used as the equivalent of ἄγγελος in its primary meaning of one sent on a message or to make an announcement. So it occurs frequently in the OT (representing מַלְאָכִי of Heb. and ἄγγελος of LXX Septuagint), and in the Gospels in Luk_7:24; Luk_9:52. It is to be observed, however, that in ‘messenger’ the emphasis is on the sending or mission, while in ἄγγελος it is on the message or proclamation. Philologically a truer equivalent is ἀπόστολος; and accordingly in two instances (2Co_8:23, Php_2:25), where missionary preachers are so described and where some special mission is in view, the latter is the Greek term used.

1. Towards the close of the OT the term seems to have acquired the meaning of a special or inspired teacher. Thus in Hag_1:13 the prophet styles himself ‘messenger’ as the bearer of Jehovah’s message. A similar meaning is at least probable in Job_33:23. And this usage is in some degree paralleled in the modern tendency to seek a definite ‘message’ in the literary works of distinguished poets and thinkers. The most important use of the term is in Malachi, a prophet whose name [if מַלְאָכִי be, indeed, his *name*; cf. Mal_1:1 and the Comm. *ad loc.*] means ‘my messenger.’ He uses the term three times and in three applications. First, it is a designation of the true priest, whose work is to conserve spiritual knowledge and teach the law of God (Mal_2:7). Secondly and thirdly, in Mal_3:1 it is applied to a forerunner, and to the ‘messenger of the covenant,’ who seems to be identical with the Person styled ‘the Lord whom you seek.’ These two applications are in the NT interpreted of the Baptist and the Messiah respectively. The words of the prophet with reference to the forerunner are with a change of pronoun (‘thee’ for ‘me’) repeated in identical form in each of the Synoptics (Mar_1:2, Mat_11:10, Luk_7:27). In these quotations, as in Luk_9:52, the messenger is one sent before to proclaim or to prepare. The direct application of the term to Jesus is not made in the NT, though a kindred idea is frequently expressed: in the saying which occurs in all the Gospels, ‘He that receiveth

me receiveth him that sent me' (Mat 10:40, Mar 9:37, Luk 9:48; Luk 10:15, Joh 13:20; Joh 12:44); in the frequent Johannine phrase 'whom God hath sent,' and in the commission (Joh 20:21); and even in the term 'gospel' (εὐαγγέλιον), which is expressive of what Jesus described Himself as anointed of God and sent to preach (Luk 4:18). The conceptions of Christ as the Revealer of the Father and the incarnate Word are also kindred; and it might be argued that the language of Malachi was in the mind of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews in Heb 1:2; Heb 3:1; Heb 7:22 and throughout.

R. Scott.

2. In Heb 6:20 our Lord is spoken of as our **Forerunner** (πρόδρομος) 'within the veil.'

This is the only place in the NT where the title is used. A πρόδρομος (in the literal sense) was a messenger sent in front of the main army to examine the ground, clear the front of obstacles, or notify the presence of an enemy to the main body advancing behind (*i.e.* a scout, light-armed soldier, or spy). Here it is connected with the priestly work of our Lord. He has entered within the veil 'for us,' as our 'high priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek, *i.e.* in our interest, namely, to obtain pardon for us (Heb 9:12), to represent us in the presence of God (Heb 9:24), and to open up for us an entrance into heaven itself (Heb 10:19)' (Lünemann in Meyer's *Com.*). Probably, however, the military connotation is not to be entirely ignored. Just as an army advances securely under cover of its scouts far in front, so the army of believers moves on through the valley of the shadow of death without fear, knowing that our great Forerunner is in front. He has encountered and conquered death for us, so that we have no need to fear anything. This thought is beautifully elaborated from another point of view in Joh 14:2-3. When Jesus came back for a moment from the silent land, it was not with an air of terror or defeat, but as a conqueror, crying 'All hail!' (Mat 28:9). There is nothing to fear in the Beyond whither Jesus has gone before us 'to prepare a place for us.'

E. Griffith-Jones.

☞Messiah

MESSIAH is the English word based on the Greek representation of the original Hebrew or Aramaic. The Gr. reproduction assumes the varied forms ?es?a?, ?ess?a?, and ?ese?a?, corresponding to the Hebrew ??????? and the Aramaic ????????. The Heb. is the normal kat?l form, meaning ?anointed, which is translation into Greek in the term which has become so familiar, ?st?, the agnomen of our Lord. The Heb. ??????? was a term applied pre-eminently to the king, who was designated to office by the

ceremony of anointing (1Sa_9:16; 1Sa_10:1, 2Ki_9:2-3; 2Ki_9:6). Priests were consecrated to office in like manner (Lev_8:12; cf. Lev_4:3; cf. Lev_4:16).

i. *Anointing of Kings*.—The custom of anointing the king, from which his designation as ‘messiah’ arose, is connected with magical usages of hoary antiquity, based on the conception that the smearing or pouring of the unguent on the body endows the human subject with certain qualities. Thus the Arabs of Eastern Africa believe that an unguent of lion’s fat inspires a man with boldness, and makes the wild beasts flee in terror from him. Other illustrations may be found in Frazer’s *Golden Bough*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , ii. 364 ff. The Tell el-Amarna inscriptions show that this custom of anointing the king with oil prevailed in Western Asia at least as far back as b.c. 1450. The passage to which we refer occurs in a letter from a certain Rammân-nirâri of Nuhašši in Northern Syria addressed to the king of Egypt, in which it is stated that a former king of Egypt [Thothmes iii.] had ‘poured oil on the head’ of Rammân-nirâri’s grandfather and established him as king of Nuhašši.* [Note: Winckler, Thontafeln von Tell el-Amarna (vol. v. in Schrader’s KIB), Letter 37 (p. 98).] Frazer’s great work has rendered us familiar with the supernatural endowments of a king who was regarded as a *quasi*-deity.† [Note: *Golden Bough*², i. 137-156; cf. also his *Lectures on the Early History of the Kingship* (1905).] That ancient Israel also believed that the royal dignity involved supernatural Divine powers, and that the oil poured upon the king conveyed these powers (like the ‘laying on of hands’), can hardly admit of doubt. The oil, like the sprinkled blood in a covenant-rite‡ [Note: According to Westermarck, the blood shed possesses a magical power of conveying a curse (‘Magic and Social Relations’ in *Sociological Papers*, vol. ii. p. 160). In the case of a covenant the curse falls if the covenant be not fulfilled.] (Exo_24:6 ff.), possessed a magical virtue.§ [Note: Thus shields were smeared with oil to render them or their owners immune (2Sa_1:21, cf. Isa_21:5. Saul’s shield was un-anointed, and so its owner perished).]

Like the priest, the king was regarded as a Divine intermediary, and assumed the supreme ritual functions of a priest in his own person. Among the ancient Semites, especially the Babylonians and Assyrians, the earthly ruler or king was considered to be the supreme God’s representative or viceroy. Sometimes he declares himself the ‘son of the deity’ (e.g. in the opening line of Ashurbanipal’s cylinder-inscription he calls himself *binutu Ashûr u Bêlit*, ‘offspring of Ashur and Beltis’; cf. the language of Psa_2:7), or ‘favourite of the deity’ (cf. the name of the Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] monarch *Naram-Sin*, ‘beloved of SIN. [Note: Sinaitic.]’ Sargon calls himself in the opening of his Nimrûd insc. ‘the favourite of Anu and Bel’). Further parallels in the case of Nebuchadrezzar may be found in Schrader, *COT* [Note: *OT Cuneiform Inscriptions and the OT.*] ii. 105 ff. See also Tiele, *Bab.* [Note: *Babylonian.*] —Assyr. [Note: *Assyrian.*] *Gesch.* 491 ff. Tiglath-pileser i. (b.c. 1100) calls himself *iššakku* (PA-TE-SI) of the God Ashur (Prism-Insc. col. vii. 62. 63), i.e. Ashur’s plenipotentiary.

That in this sacred function priestly office was involved may be readily inferred. Thus Ashurbanipal (like Sargon) calls himself not only the *šaknu* or vicegerent of Bêl, but also the *šangu* or priest of Ashur. Similarly the Homeric kings offer sacrifice on behalf of the people. As Robertson Smith remarks ('Priest' in *EBr [Note: Br Encyclopaedia Britannica.]*⁹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred]), the king in both Greece and Rome was the acting head of the State-religion. So also in ancient pre-exilic Israel, David and Solomon offered sacrifices (2Sa_6:17 ff., 1Ki_8:63) in accordance with the tradition of the age.

ii. *Unique position of David in Hebrew thought.*—Among the Hebrew anointed kings or messiahs, *David* came in course of time to have a special significance. His importance was enhanced by the history of the three centuries that followed his reign. No Israelite or Jew living in the year b.c. 730 could have failed to note the striking contrast between the unbroken continuity of monarchs of the seed of David sitting on the throne of Jerusalem and the succession of brief dynasties and usurping kings who followed one another on the throne of Samaria. The swiftly passing series of short reigns terminated by violence which filled the space of 15 years in Northern Israel from the close of the dynasty of Jehu (which lasted nearly a century) to the accession of Hoshea, Assyria's nominee, to the dismembered kingdom, deeply impressed the prophet of Ephraim, who exclaims:—

'They have appointed kings, but not from me (*i.e.* Jahweh);

Have made princes, but I knew them not' (Hos_8:4).

It is not surprising, amid the rapid changes of rulers and the disasters wrought by foreign invasion, that Hosea should have prophesied the discipline of exile for his faithless countrymen, and as its final issue that they should return and seek Jahweh their God and 'David their king.'* [Note: There is not a shred of evidence to show that this clause is not genuine in Hos_3:5. It is difficult to see why, if the idea 'had its roots in Isaiah's time' and not in that out of which Eze_34:23; Eze_37:24 f. Eze_45:8-9 and Jer_30:9 arose (Harper, ad loc.), we should follow Wellhausen in rejecting the clause. Nowack rejects the entire verse.] For amid all the vicissitudes of the last three centuries the seed of David had survived every peril. The 'sure mercies of David' to which the Jews still clung, though with feeble hope, in the dark days of exile (Isa_55:3), began in the age of Isaiah to take root in the national imagination. Though Judah was destined to suffer terrible chastisements, yet as a result of the disciplinary trial 'a remnant would return' (*i.e.* be converted) to Jahweh, and Jerusalem would be preserved from the onslaughts of the Assyrian foe. The Immanuel prophecy, which contained the assurance of God's presence among His people, delivered to the doubting Ahaz and his unbelieving court during the dark days of b.c. 735, became the germ of a great series of Messianic passages which are found

in Isa 9:1-6 [English 2-7], which was probably composed soon after b.c. 701, in Isa 11:1-9, and, lastly, in Isa 32:1-3. In the first the Messiah is portrayed as a military conquering hero, 'breaking in pieces the oppressor's mace'; in the second, the sounds of discord cease, and He, sprung from Jesse's stock, is the ruler of justice and peace in God's 'holy mountain' of Zion, where even the powers of violence and injustice are turned into submission to a Divine authority. In the last He is again the King who shall reign in righteousness, 'a hiding-place from the wind, a covert from the tempest.'

All these passages, as well as Is 2:2-4, are regarded by Duhm as Isaianic. On the other hand, Cheyne, Hackmann, and Marti hold that they are post-exilic,* [Note: Recently Prof. R. 11. Kennett has discussed Is 9:1-7 in *JThSt* (April 1906), and would assign it to the Maccabaeen period. The epithets are referred to Simon the Maccabee.] but on what the present writer considers to be insufficient grounds. The subject is discussed by Cheyne in his *Introd. to Isaiah*, pp. 44 ff., 57 ff., and 173-176; also by Hackmann, *Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaja*, pp. 126-156, and by Marti in his Commentary on the above passages: cf. also his *Gesch. der Isr. [Note: Israelite.] Religion*⁴ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 191 footn., 255 ff. On the other side, see the Commentaries of Duhm and Dillmann-Kittel (1898) on these passages, and the *Century Bible*, Com. on 'Isaiah' by the present writer. Kautzsch, in his elaborate art. 'Religion of Israel' in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible* (Extra Vol. p. 696^a), admits the reasonableness of the view here advocated.

After the gleams of hope awakened by Hezekiah and the deliverance of Jerusalem, and after the glowing anticipations of an ideal Messianic King clothed with Divine powers, to which Isaiah in the early years of the 7th cent. gave expression, there followed a time of reaction when these high hopes suffered temporary eclipse. Men's hearts became sick of waiting. The long reign of Manasseh, followed by the brief reign of Amon, was a period of religious as well as political decline. On the other hand, the reign of Josiah reawakened the hopes of the faithful adherents of Jahweh, and it is significant that Messianic expectation revives in the oracles of Jeremiah. In Jer 23:5-8 (cf. Jer 30:9) he foretells the coming days when a righteous branch or shoot shall be raised unto David, who shall reign prudently and execute judgment and justice. In his days Judah shall be saved and Israel dwell secure, and the name by which he shall be called is 'Jahweh is our righteousness' This fragment probably belongs to the earlier utterances of Jeremiah, and upon it Zechariah in the opening years of the post-exilic period bases his well-known prophecies (Zec 3:8; Zec 6:12), in which Joshua and his comrades are addressed as tokens of the coming of Jahweh's servant 'the branch' (Zec 3:8). In Zec 6:12 it is made clear that Zerubbabel of the seed of David is meant, who is destined to complete the building of the Temple.† [Note: Duhm deals very arbitrarily with these passages. Jer 23:5-8 was not the genuine utterance of Jeremiah, but a post-exilic addition. Zec 3:8; Zec 6:12 are

badly corrupted, and later editors have sought to eliminate the name of Zerubbabel from the original oracle, because Zechariah's prophecies with respect to him were not fulfilled.

Probably Mic 5:1-8, like Jer 23:5-8, may be assigned to the earlier years of the reign of Josiah, when the religious and political outlook of Judah appeared more hopeful, and the overthrow of Assyria seemed as probable as it did to Isaiah after b.c. 701 (Isa 9:3-4 [Heb.]). We may assign Nah 2:2 to Nah 3:19 to the same period.] With the passage in Jer 23:5-8 cf. also Jer 30:9, Jer 33:15 as well as Eze 21:32; Eze 34:23-31; Eze 37:24. In Jeremiah less stress is laid on the personal and material features, more emphasis placed on the ethical. Also it appears from several passages that Jeremiah thought rather of a succession of rulers of Davidic descent than of a single ruler. But in determining this question the utmost critical caution is required. Thus Jer 33:14-24 is regarded by most critics as a later addition to the oracles of Jeremiah (see, e.g., Giesebrecht's Com., and Cornill in *SBOT [Note: BOT Sacred Books of Old Test.]*). Certainly after the time of Jeremiah the personal features in Messianic prophecy became fainter. 'There shall not be cut off from David one that sits upon the throne of the house of Israel' (Jer 33:17), points to a succession of rulers at a time when the hopes of Israel still clung to the 'sure mercies of David.' But this utterance, as we have already seen, belongs to a later time than that of Jeremiah. Zephaniah and Obadiah make no reference to the Messianic King. When we consider their historic environment, this is not surprising. For royalty in Judah was rapidly declining in power and prestige. The last kings of Judah became mere puppets in the hands of foreign princes, who pulled the strings from the banks of the Nile or of the Euphrates. Under these circumstances the ideal of a Davidic ruler ceased to appeal as powerfully as it did a century earlier, and ultimately gave place to another. It is marvellous that it continued to survive after the rude shocks of a hundred years.

Its survival is probably due to *Ezekiel*, the priest-prophet, herald of restoration, of hope and of reconstructive effort. This prophet was an earnest student of Israel's past, and read its records and its oracles. The influence not only of his great elder contemporary Jeremiah, but also of the earlier prophets Hosea and Isaiah, is unmistakable. The influence of the first and the last is clear in Eze 34:23-31 'And I will set over them a shepherd, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; ... and I the Lord will be a God unto them, and my servant David a prince in their midst.' Here, as in the case of Jer 23:5-8, David represents a succession of Davidic descendants sitting on his throne. When we turn to Ezekiel's ideal scheme of the restored Jewish theocracy (chs. 40-48), we find that the secular prince of Davidic lineage falls into the background, and his functions are subordinated to the ecclesiastical routine. The same fate in the early post-exilic period befalls the somewhat shadowy, if stately, figure of Zerubbabel in Zechariah 4, 6 (cf. Hag 2:22), who was soon destined to subside into the background in the presence of Joshua the

high priest, the natural and legitimate head of the newly constituted Church-nation. In truth, the Messianic King rapidly becomes a vanished ideal of prophecy. In the closing verses (14-20) of Zephaniah (obviously an addition belonging to the late-exilic or early post-exilic period) it is Jahweh who is Israel's King in the midst of His people, their mighty Hero who wards off the nation's foes (Hag_2:15-19).

When we turn to the *Deutero-Isaiah* (40-55), we find that an entirely new ideal, to which reference has already been made, had displaced the earlier and older one created by Isaiah. In place of the national-Messianic King we have the national-prophetic ideal of the Suffering Servant of Jahweh, through whose humiliation and sorrow the sinning nation shall find peace. God's anointed king, who is not of Davidic descent at all, but the *Persian* Cyrus, is the chosen instrument for accomplishing the Divine purposes with respect to His servant Jacob (Isa_44:28; Isa_45:1-4). We shall have to note how profoundly the Deutero-Isaianic portraiture of the Suffering Servant came in later times to modify the Hebrew ideal of the Messiah, and to constitute an entirely new conception which the Hebrew race only partially and very slowly assimilated, and whose leaven worked powerfully in the Messianic ideal of the 'Son of Man' in the consciousness of Christ and His immediate followers.

When we pass to the *Trito-Isaiah* (56-66), which probably arose in the years that immediately preceded the advent of Nehemiah, we find that the old ideal of the Davidic Messiah, which Ezekiel and Haggai attempted with poor success to revive, has altogether disappeared. Not even in the lyrical collection (60-62) is the faintest note to be heard of a Messianic Jewish King. The prophecies of Malachi are equally silent. We have to wait for centuries—perhaps as late as the declining days of the Hasmonaeans—before the Davidic Messianic King definitely and clearly reappears.

Before we pass to the Greek period (b.c. 300 and later), it is necessary to refer briefly to a series of OT passages of a Messianic or reputed Messianic character. (1) Gen_3:15 (belonging to the earlier Jahwistic document, J 1) can only by a strained interpretation be regarded as Messianic at all. The seed of the woman and the serpent (representing the power of evil) are to be engaged in prolonged conflict, in which both suffer injury. In this struggle it is not expressly stated which side will triumph (so Dillmann). (2) Gen_49:10 is exceedingly obscure. The rendering, 'as long as one comes to Shiloh' (Hitzig, Tuch), is doubtful in point of Hebrew usage, and difficult to sustain historically. The Greek versions attribute to the phrase an obscure Messianic reference, but interpret לְשֵׁבֶט as a late Hebrew compound form with a relative, which can be accepted only after making violent assumptions.* [Note: LXX τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ, 'that which is reserved for him.' The LXX in some variants has ἕως ἃν ἔλθῃ ὃ ἀπόκειται, 'till there comes he to whom it (? the sceptre) belongs,' which is

the rendering of the Targ. of Onkelos and also of Jerusalem. This most clumsy and almost impossible construction is apparently due to the influence of Eze 21:32, where, however, we have a subject for the relative clause, viz. הַמֶּלֶךְ.] Giesebrecht ingeniously proposed to read in place of שֶׁלֶה the form מִשְׁלֶה 'his ruler.' He rightly argues that to read שֶׁלֶה as the LXX Septuagint presupposes, immediately followed by וְלִי, constitutes a very awkward and intolerable combination.† [Note: Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik, p. 29, footnote. It is difficult to understand the acquiescence of Gunkel in the construction pre-supposed in the alternative rendering of the LXX variant (cited in the previous footnote).] If we accept this emendation, the passage may be regarded as Messianic. But it is most probably an insertion moulded on Eze 21:32, for it stands in no immediate relation to the verses that precede or follow.‡ [Note: See Driver in Expositor, July 1885; EBi, art. 'Shiloh'; and Bennett's 'Genesis' (Century Bible), ad loc.] (3) 2Sa 7:4-17. Here 2Sa 7:15-16 are the expression, placed in the mouth of the prophet Nathan, of the sentiment of reverence to the House of David, which took its rise in the latter part of the 8th century. Budde refers this speech of Nathan and the following prayer of David to a later period than the other more primitive sections of the historical narrative, and we may reasonably follow him in ascribing this passage to the 7th cent.—not improbably the same period as that in which Jer 23:5-8; Jer 30:9 arose.§ [Note: Budde's Com. on the Books of Samuel (J. C. B. Mohr), p. 233; cf. also his Richter u. Samuel, pp. 244, 247.] (4) Num 24:17 'A star hath marched (? gleamed) out of Jacob, and a sceptre hath arisen out of Israel, and hath broken in pieces the sides (temples) of Moab, and hath destroyed all the sons of Seth' (?). The text is here difficult, and many points are uncertain. The entire series of Balaam's oracles are brought together by the redactor of the J [Note: Jahwist.] and E [Note: Elohist.] documents, and the reference of the lyric passage just cited may be either to David (2Sa 8:2) or to Omri (cf. insc. of Mesha, lines 4-8, and art. 'Omri' in Hastings' DB. [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.] || [Note: | The Com. of Dr. Buchanan Gray (ICC) should be consulted.] Its Messianic interpretation by early Christian writers (Justin Martyr, Irenaeus), as well as by Rabbi Akiba, who referred it to Bar Cochba in the days of Hadrian (cf. also the Targums of Onkelos and Jon.), need not detain us. (5) Deu 18:15 'A prophet shall Jahweh thy God raise up unto thee from thy midst from thy brethren, like unto me. To him shall ye hearken.' This passage is quoted in Act 3:22; Act 7:37 as having an individual Messianic reference. But the context (cf. the verses that immediately precede) clearly proves that the reference is general, and not individual. The Israelites are not to pay heed to the magician or soothsayer, but to God's true prophet, like Moses, whom He will raise up in Israel from time to time (see Driver's Com. in ICC [Note: CC International Critical Commentary.]). (6) Lastly, we have a series of Psalm passages. Psalms 2 (esp. Psa 2:5 ff.). 72, 89, 110 may be taken as the most conspicuous examples of the revived Messianic expectation. They all belong to the Greek period. Psalms 2, like

Psalms 1 (both without superscription), was evidently placed by the redactors at the head of the Psalm collection, and belongs to a late period. Psalms 2, like Psalms 110, originates from the Maccabean days, when the old conception of the national deliverer from foreign enemies, which was created by Isaiah after Judah's emergence from a desperate crisis, once more revived.

Before we come to deal with the later phases of Messianic expectation, we would here note the historic evolution of three distinct lines of anticipation respecting the human agency whereby Israel's salvation and the establishment of a Divine and righteous rule would be effected. (1) The *righteous Messianic warrior-king* of Davidic descent. (2) The *prophetic sufferer* portrayed in Isaiah 40-55, and esp. in [Isa 52:13](#) to [Isa 53:12](#)—a conception which may also underlie the obscure passage [Zec 12:10-11](#). (3) The *prophetic ideal*, based mainly on [Deu 18:15](#), which came to be identified with the heraldic prophet of 'the great and terrible day of the Lord,' the Elijah of [Mal 4:4](#) f. [Heb. 3:22 f.], or was identified with the Messiah Himself ([Act 3:22](#) f.). Cf. [Mar 6:15](#); [Mar 8:28](#), [Joh 1:21](#); [Joh 6:14](#); [Joh 7:40](#), and Wendt's *Teaching of Jesus*, i. p. 67 f.

iii. *Transformation of the Messianic ideal through Apocalyptic.*—The kingdom of righteousness and the fear of the Lord, or what is expressed in the Biblical phrase the *Kingdom of God*, was not to be attained without a struggle against opposing forces political and moral, or without the instrumentality of a personal leader, sometimes an anointed king of Davidic descent, through whom the victory was to be won for Israel. For throughout we find that Israel, or a purified remnant, stands at the centre of the whole movement towards righteousness, and becomes more or less identified with it. Accordingly, the closest connexion subsisted between the national Messiah and that future state of blessedness, a restored theocracy, which became the steadfast expectation of the Jewish race since the destruction of Solomon's temple in b.c. 587. At first it was believed that the desired consummation would not long be delayed. The existing generation and the earthly scene in which the prophet lived would behold the great day of the Lord and the advent of the salvation foretold. But ever since the days of Amos, and still more after the discipline of the Exile, the horizons of time and space expanded.

1. After the Exile and the return of the *Gôlah* (exiled Jews), the advent of the fulfilled hopes of a Divine kingdom of righteousness was still delayed, and the Messianic age seemed as far off as ever, even after Nehemiah and Ezra had worked at their task of reform. As time went on, the disappointed expectations of post-exilic Judaism bred among the spiritual leaders a spirit of hopelessness as to the political outlook, and this is echoed in their religious hymns: 'Does Jahweh cast off in abhorrence for ever; will he no more be gracious? Is there an end to his kindness for evermore' ([Psa 77:8-9](#) [Heb.]); cf. Psalms 22, 37, etc. Trust in Jahweh still survived,

and His faithful followers clung to the Tôrah (Psa 19:8-12 [Heb.] and 119 *passim*), but Messianic expectation languished. The outlook of the present time was hopeless. But amid the enlarged horizons of time as well as space to which we have referred, the thoughts of some of the most spiritual minds in Judaism were directed to the transcendental and ultimate. In *that* world God would finally vindicate Himself and His ways to the expectant faith of Israel. A distinction began to be established between the present and the future age or aeon. The former is corrupt, and hopelessly delivered over to Satan and the powers of darkness. Victory will come in the latter. As we approach the time of Christ, the distinction between the present age (הַיָּמִים הַזֵּהוּ or αἰὼν οὗτος) and the age to come (הַיָּמִים הַבָּאִים or αἰὼν μέλλων) becomes sharply contrasted, and the transcendental features and colouring which invest the latter, and the final conflict with the heathen or demonic powers (Gog and Magog in Ezekiel 38, 39, attributed by some recent critics to a later hand than Ezekiel) characterize the new and later phase of Messianic expectation. This final agony or conflict, called in later times the 'Messianic sufferings or pangs' (הַמְשִׁיחִית הַבְּלִי), which was to usher in the new age, was no longer confined to earth. It was universal and cosmic. These apocalyptic features (which first meet us clearly in that latest addendum to the Isaianic oracles, Isaiah 24-27) now impress themselves on Messianic expectation, though by no means always; cf. Mar 13:6-37, Joh 16:11; Joh 16:20-22.

2. Another feature of equal importance, which begins to emerge in apocalyptic literature, left its impress on Messianic expectation, viz. the belief in the *resurrection of the dead*. The first clear intimations of this faith are to be found in Isa 26:19, Dan 12:2. In the older apocrypha (Sirach, Judith, Tobit, 1 Mac.) it is absent. In the later (2Ma 7:9; 2Ma 7:14; 2Ma 7:23; 2Ma 7:29; 2Ma 7:36; 2Ma 12:43-44) it is obviously present. In the Wisdom of Solomon it takes the form of a happy life after death for the just (Wis 3:1-9; Wis 4:7; Wis 5:16; Wis 6:20).* [Note: Schürer, GJV3 ii. 508.] It is hardly necessary to emphasize how profoundly this belief in the resurrection of the righteous (the most primitive form of the doctrine limited the resurrection to them) moulded the Christology of St. Paul. For to St. Paul, Christ is the Second Adam, endowed with the πνεῦμα ζωοποιού (1Co 15:45), in whom all His faithful followers are made alive (v. 22); cf. Rom 6:3-11. See Volz, *Jüd. Eschatologie*, pp. 237-248.

3. The *pre-mundane existence of the Messiah* was another mode of the larger transcendental mould of thought which apocalyptic reveals. Belief in the ante-natal existence of the Messiah was only part of a general tendency of Jewish speculation. The new Jerusalem, the Temple, and Paradise existed before the creation of the world (Apocalypse, Apocalyptic Bar 4:3, 59:4, Assumpt. Mosis 1:14, 17). The Midrash on Pro 8:9 even goes beyond this, and expressly mentions the Messiah among the seven things created before the creation of the world, viz. the Throne of Glory,

Messiah the King, the Tôrah, ideal Israel, Repentance, and Gehenna.* [Note: Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i. p. 175.] The pre-mundane existence of the Messiah is also certified in the Targ. [Note: Targum.] on [Isa 9:6](#) and [Mic 5:2](#). In these metaphysical conceptions, stimulated, as we may with considerable probability believe, through the Platonic doctrine of archetypal ideas which passed in the great stream of Hellenic influence over the Jewish Diaspora, we clearly discern what Charles aptly calls a Semitic philosophy of religion.† [Note: Book of Enoch, *Introd.* 1 p. 23, in his description of Apocalyptic generally. It is quite possible that we have a trace of it in that profoundly speculative *Psalms*, 139 (note vv. 15, 16). With reference to the pre-existence of the Messiah (not His name only, as Volz seems to assume in *Jüd. Eschatologie*, p. 217), see *Enoch* 48:2-6, and cf. Charles' notes (and 62:7). 'Name' here connotes existence as in the *Babyl. Creation tablet* (lines 1, 2). On the other side, as against the Jewish belief in Messianic pre-existence, see Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, p. 245.] By this doctrine of pre-mundane existence the things of God were lifted above the universal lot of change and decay, and brought into the realm of adamantine permanence. As Baldensperger acutely remarks, it became, in the minds of reflective and pious Jews, a guarantee against loss.‡ [Note: *Selbstbewusstsein Jesu* 2, p. 89; Volz, *Jüd. Eschatologie*, p. 218.] We need not labour to set forth how profoundly it affects NT thought, especially Pauline and Johannine ([2Co 8:9](#), [Php 2:7](#); cf. [2Co 4:4](#), [Col 1:5](#), [Heb 1:2](#); [Heb 2:10](#), [Joh 1:1-3](#)).

4. Messianic titles.

(a) Among the most significant for students of the NT is that of 'Restorer,' which is probably involved in the epithet *Ta'eb*, which occurs in the apocalypse of the Samaritan liturgy for the Day of Atonement. In the day of *Ta'eb* it was believed that the sacred vessels of the Temple would reappear which had been concealed on Mount Gerizim,§ [Note: Bousset, *Religion des Judentums* 2, pp. 258, 267, 274.] and it has been conjectured that this same idea of Restorer underlies the epithet *Taxo* (Greek τὰ ξων) in *Assumpt. Mosis* 9:1. In the literature of the time of Christ we frequently meet with this conception of the Messiah. Thus in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (*Test. Levi*, 18), which may have originated about a century before Christ's birth, the Messiah is regarded as the coming restorer of the Paradise lost by Adam's transgression. In [Act 3:21](#) the *καὶροὶ ἀποκαταστάσεως* clearly reflect this tradition. This function of 'restorer' was evidently ascribed to the Messiah and not to God's messenger Elias, referred to in [Mal 3:1-18](#) f. [Heb.]

(b) Other significant epithets, as 'Son of a woman,' prob. in allusion to [Isa 7:14](#), appear, if the text be sound, in the *Book of Enoch (Similitudes)* 62:5, 69:29. || [Note: | Here, however, it should be noted, in both passages Charles adopts the reading 'Son of Man.'] This is of interest when we compare the Pauline 'son of a woman'

(Gal 4:4). On the other hand, the designation ‘horned,’ or ‘two-horned’ (*B^erçshîth Rabbâ*, 99), based apparently on Deu 33:17, belongs to Jewish literature subsequent to the 1st cent. and need not detain us here. Far more significant is the title which plays so large a part in the Synoptic Gospels, viz.:

(c) ‘**Son of Man.**’—The employment of this phrase as a Messianic title dates from the Maccabaeian period, and in this specific sense meets us for the first time in Dan 7:13. Its earlier occurrence in the OT requires no exposition here. At the time when the Book of Daniel was written, Jewish apocalyptic was directed to the conception of a great final Divine judgment at the close of the present age, whereby the coming age was to be ushered in. We no longer see the figure of a Messianic King of Davidic descent. His place is taken by a mysterious symbolic portraiture which, as Volz correctly argues,* [Note: *Eschatologie*, p. 10 f.] is not angelic. It stands contrasted with the four animal symbolical shapes previously described, and especially with the last beast with the ten horns, ‘dreadful and exceedingly strong,’ which had ‘great iron teeth that devoured and brake in pieces.’ In sharp distinction from these monstrous and bestial world-powers which are finally to be destroyed, we have a mysterious figure in human shape.† [Note: On the element of mystery attaching to the use of the preposition כּ (in אֱנוֹשׁ כְּבָר), see Volz, *ib.*] In v. 27 its significance is explained. It represents ‘the people of the saints of the Most High.’ As H. J. Holtzmann correctly observes, it is intended to express ‘a world-empire which is human and not brutal, which is ethical and noble and not immoral, which is like man, stamped with the likeness of God’ (Gen 1:26). That this human and humane world-empire was to be Jewish and not Gentile, is obvious to the reader of Daniel’s apocalypse.

The ‘Son of Man’ has a yet more definite and distinguished rôle in the *Similitudes* of the Book of Enoch (chs. 37-71), written probably after b.c. 100. Here He is obviously a supernatural personality and not a symbolic figure, or indefinitely expressed as ‘like a son of man.’ The Son of Man is not mere man. This is clearly shown in ch. 39, where a cloud and whirlwind carry Enoch away and set him down at the end of the heavens. There he sees the mansions of the holy, and among these latter ‘the Elect One of righteousness and faith,’ which is another name for the ‘Son of Man’ (v. 6). Moreover, He sits on God’s throne (51:3), which is also His own throne (69:27, 29), possesses universal dominion (62:6), and all judgment is committed to Him (69:27). Various alternative titles are given to Him, viz. ‘the Righteous One’ (38:2, 3, 53:6), and ‘the Elect One’ (39:6, 40:5, 45:3f). We note meanwhile that the Son of Man is also *Judge*.

Accordingly, we conclude that while the term in Daniel is symbolical of the human rule of God’s people Israel, in Enoch it is the designation of a supernatural personality, who holds universal empire and wields the office of Judge.

When we pass from this apocalyptic use of the title 'Son of Man' to its employment in the Synoptic Gospels, we observe a great change. It was without question Christ's favourite designation of Himself. It is noteworthy that in the Synoptics the term relatively occurs twice as often as it does in the Fourth Gospel. It occurs 30 times in Matthew, 14 times in Mark, and 25 times in Luke. In John it is found only 12 times.

Christ's employment of the term is by no means uniform. Consequently we are in danger, as Bousset points out, of giving a one-sided interpretation to the expression, either by taking it predominantly in the eschatological sense of Daniel or the Book of Enoch, or as signifying ideal typical man (as Schleiermacher assumes).* [Note: Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judenthum, p. 112 f.] Probably Charles is on the right path when he interprets the Synoptic use of the phrase as involving a combination of two contrasted ideas—the transcendent conception of apocalyptic and the Deutero-Isaianic ideal of Jahweh's Suffering Servant.† [Note: Book of Enoch, Appendix B, p. 315 ff.; cf. also Bartlet, Expositor, Dec. 1892.] It is certainly possible that the latter was the prevailing conception in Christ's personal consciousness rather than the former or eschatological use of the phrase; while the former was the interpretation of the title which dominated the thought of the Synoptic writers, and came to be impressed on the utterances of Jesus. This view seems to be sustained by the fact that in Aramaic the term 'Son of Man' (ܐܢܫܐ ܒܢ ܐܢܫܐ) means simply 'man.' On the other hand, it is difficult to believe that Jesus could have employed so colourless and vague a designation of Himself; and Bousset is probably right in his contention, as against Wellhausen, that such a term, employed in Aramaic, could easily come to acquire a special eschatological significance.‡ [Note: Religion des Judentums², p. 305, footnote.] In all probability, Jesus on certain momentous occasions so used it. How far it was weighted with the significance that the phrase conveys in the Book of Enoch, when the expression was actually employed by Jesus, it is difficult to say. It is hardly necessary to believe that in the personal consciousness of Jesus the superadded notion of pre-mundane existence was attached to the term, though Joh 8:58 ('Before Abraham was, I am') would fairly point in this direction. We certainly have no clear right to infer it from Mar 12:6. Moreover, there is some weight in the suggestion which a few scholars, including Bousset, have put forth, that the term 'Son of Man' has been placed in the mouth of Jesus in many cases when He simply used the first personal pronoun.§ [Note: Bousset's Jesus (Eng. ed.), p. 188. Bousset thinks that it was not till the closing months of His ministry that this title was assumed; 'in face of the threatening doom of final failure ... only briefly and sparingly did He adopt the name' (p. 192f.). Some colour is given to this view, that the Synoptic writers have frequently supplied the phrase in Christ's discourses, by comparing ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ in Mat 5:10 with the parallel ἐνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in Luk 6:22. But in the extremely severe limitation imposed by Bousset on Christ's employment of the term we are unable to concur.] That He did, however, employ

the phrase in an eschatological sense of Himself, and with a full consciousness of the sublime dignity which it conferred, cannot be denied. Thus, in answer to Pilate's question (Mar 14:62; cf. Mat 26:64, Luk 22:69), He quotes the well-known Daniel passage (Dan 7:13), declaring that men would see Him, the Son of Man, sitting at the right hand of power (*i.e.* of God), and coming in the clouds of heaven. This utterance is certified by the three Synoptic Gospels; and all three agree in giving it a decisive influence in the trial of Jesus before the Sanhedrin. This testimony, however, carries us one step further. It is hardly possible to dissociate in the consciousness of Jesus the assumption of this high eschatological dignity without including in it the judicial function. The Oriental king was also judge. As King or Messiah, Jesus had, with full consent from Himself, been already acclaimed (Mar 11:7-11), and, with the title of 'King of the Jews' placed on the cross by the Roman governor, He was crucified (Mar 15:26; cf. Mar 15:12; cf. Mar 15:18; cf. Mar 15:32). Moreover, His preaching of the Kingdom of God was closely bound up with the conception of impending judgment. 'Just as He could not dispense with the ideas of the kingdom and the judgment, if He wished to make Himself intelligible to His countrymen, so He could not dispense with the Messianic idea if He wished to be intelligible to Himself' (Bousset).* [Note: Jesus, p. 178. Bousset, however, refuses to include in Christ's conception of the title 'Son of Man' the idea of His own judgeship (p. 194).] It is easy to draw the necessary corollary. In the designation 'Son of Man' applied by Jesus to Himself in an eschatological sense, there was involved the other conception which meets us in the *Similitudes* of the Book of Enoch, that of universal judge.† [Note: Mar 13:26-27, Mat 25:31-32, 2Co 5:10. See also Friedländer. *Die religiösen Bewegungen innerhalb des Judentums im Zeitalter Jesu*, p. 325.]

But the eschatological side is not the only, nor is it the most important, aspect of the conception of 'Son of Man' in the mind of Jesus and the Synoptic writers. Far greater, viewed from the ethical standpoint, was the human aspect of the lowly Suffering Servant suggested by the Deutero-Isaiah. This certainly could never have been invented by the Synoptic writers. It is of the very essence of Christ's thought respecting Himself. It is nevertheless remarkable that the *locus classicus* of the NT writers who reflected on the mystery of the Messiah's crucifixion, viz. Isaiah 53, was never, so far as we can gather from the Synoptic writers, quoted by Jesus Himself, with the doubtful exception of Luk 22:37. That this prophecy, however, must have been in His mind, seems fairly clear from Mar 10:45; Mar 12:6-10; cf. Joh 13:12-17 and Luk 24:25-26. Accordingly, the title 'Son of Man' had a twofold significance. It is employed when Christ's claims to power and authority are asserted, both now and in His future Kingdom and glory. The 'Son of Man' has power to forgive sins (Mar 2:10). He is Lord over the Sabbath (Mat 12:8). He will appear clothed in power at the last day (Mar 14:62). But the title is also used in immediate connexion with His human nature, lowliness, poverty, suffering, and death. 'The Son of Man came eating and drinking' (Mat 11:19, Luk 7:34); 'the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head'

(Mat 8:20, Luk 9:58); 'is betrayed' (Mar 14:21); 'came not to be ministered unto but to minister' (Mar 10:45); suffers and is condemned (Mar 8:31). The paradox of this twofold antithetic significance is solved by the positive truth which underlies it. The peculiar and special function of dignity and privilege which belongs to the 'Son of Man' rests on an ethical basis. He that has come to serve, suffer, and give His life a ransom for many, will pass through agony and death to His place of exaltation in the clouds of heaven (cf. Act 3:18; Act 8:32; Act 17:3; Act 26:23). Upon this basis St. Paul and his successors have built. We also are to suffer with Him, that we may share in His glory (Rom 8:17). The Kenotic doctrine of Php 2:6-7 is reared on this foundation of the teachings of Jesus respecting Himself as 'Son of Man,' whereby we learn that He was 'made perfect through sufferings,' and became 'the leader of our salvation' (Heb 2:9-10).

(d) 'Son of God' is a designation frequently applied to Jesus in the Gospels, and is applied by Jesus to Himself as the expression of His vivid consciousness of God's presence in His life, and the intimate bond that united Him to the Father (Mat 11:27). In His native Aramaic, *Abbâ* was the mode of address in prayer that came most naturally to His lips, and became a tradition in the worship of the early Christian Church (Rom 8:15). That the relation claimed by Jesus was a special one, is indicated by His use of the expression 'my Father in Mat 11:27; Mat 18:35; Mat 20:23, whereas in Mat 6:32; Mat 10:29 God is spoken of to the audience before Jesus as 'your Father.' More significant still is the designation of Himself as 'beloved Son' in the parable of the Vineyard let out to Husbandmen (Mar 12:6), and also by the voice which spoke to Him from heaven at His baptism (Mat 3:16-17, Mar 1:10-11, Luk 3:21-22). Upon this unquestionable basis of language employed by Jesus respecting Himself, the frequent application of this designation 'Son of God' to Christ in the Pauline Epistles, and of the same phrase with the epithet *μονογενῆς* in the Johannine writings, was obviously founded. In the memorable scene at Caesarea Philippi, when Jesus questioned His disciples as to their belief respecting Himself, Peter, according to the Matthew tradition, replied, 'Thou art the *Messiah, the Son of the living God*' (Mat 16:16). This would seem to imply that the expression 'Son of God' was a Messianic title. But in this connexion two things should be noted: (1) Mar 8:29 gives Peter's reply in the briefer form 'Thou art the Messiah.' (2) There is scarcely any evidence in later Jewish literature to indicate that the phrase 'Son of God' was used as a Messianic title.* [Note: The passages where the term 'Son' occurs in 2 Esdras (7:28, 13:32, 37, 52, 14:9) as well as in Enoch (105:2) are all extremely doubtful. The Aramaic original is lost; and it is held by many scholars, including Drummond, Spitta (*Zur Gesch. und Lit. des Urchristentums*, ii. 9), as well as Charles, that Christian hands have worked over these texts and have inserted the expression 'Son.' See Volz, *Jüd. Eschatologie*, p. 213, who regards Drummond's conjecture as probable, that the phrase 'Son' of God may sometimes have arisen from the Gr.

rendering ταῖς for 'servant' (עַבְדֵּי). See also N. Schmidt's art. 'Son of God' in EBi, col. 4694.] This is the more remarkable when we remember Psa 2:7 'Jahweh hath said unto me, Thou art my son, this day I have begotten thee,' and the old Semitic conceptions of divinity which attached to kingship, reflected in Assyrian inscriptions (see above, p. 171). Probably the stern monotheism of later post-exilic Judaism tended to suppress language which seemed to attribute Divinity to an earthly human personality.

(e) '**Son of David**' is the most characteristic, as it is the most traditional and historic, designation of the Jewish Messiah. It expresses the most representative type of Messianic expectation, if we understand by that term an anointed Jewish king who was to be the national deliverer. This conception, as we have already seen, had its roots in the days of Isaiah of Jerusalem, and revived in the age of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and even survived in attenuated form to the early days of post-exilic Judaism. But in later Jewish literature belonging to the Greek period we notice a remarkable absence of any allusion to a Messianic king of Davidic descent who at the end of the ages will erect his throne. That the expectation still survived, and at times found expression, especially as we approach the period of the Maccabaeen struggle, seems fairly clear from such Psalms as 2, 72, 110. On the other hand, we find no reference to a Messianic deliverer of the seed of David in Joel, Isaiah 24-27, Sirach, Daniel, Enoch (chs. 1-36, the Vision of Weeks and the hortatory discourses), Book of Jubilees, Assumpt. Mosis, Sib. Or. 3:36-91. The figure of the Messiah is absent also from Tobit, Judith, 1 and 2 Maccabees, Wisdom, Baruch. It is true that we do find mention of the Messiah, or allusion to Him, in the visions of animals in Enoch (chs. 85-90), in Sib. Or. 3, in Philo (*de Præm. et Pæn.* 16), and also in Apocalypse, Apocalyptic Bar 29:3, 30:1 and 2Es 7:28 f.; but the figure holds a secondary position, and is far more shadow than substance.

Bousset, in reviewing this literature (both pre-Christian and extending to a.d. 100), endeavours to solve the problem of this absence of Messianic expectation,† [Note: Religion des Judentums² im neust. Zeitalter, p. 255 f.] The causes are twofold. *First* comes the patent fact to which reference has already been made in a previous page. The Jew had entered into a larger world, and his eschatology was therefore framed on these larger dimensions of time and space in which the final catastrophe was to be vast and world-wide. The world of the Jew was no longer Palestinian or even Western-Asiatic. It was the world ruled by the successors of Alexander, and the yet greater world ruled by the Caesars. Moreover, Greek culture had begun to enter deeply into the mind of Judaism. To the cultured Jew the figure of a Davidic-Messianic king seemed incongruous and provincial amid these larger political and intellectual horizons. *Secondly*, the establishment of the line of Maccabaeen rulers left large circles of pious Jews well content. In the latter part of the rule of

Jonathan, and during the days of Simon and Hyrcanus, the Jew might well have believed in the advent of a Messianic age. Now, the Maccabees were of priestly descent, and came, therefore, from the tribe of Levi. It is therefore not surprising that the seed of David of the tribe of Judah faded for awhile into comparative insignificance; cf. Charles' note on Enoch 90:37.

But the old hopes bound up with the Messiah king of David's line were by no means extinct, though they appeared sometimes to be dormant. There were Palestinian Jews as well as Jews of the Diaspora, and there were uncultured Jews both in the countryside and in the towns, influenced by old traditions and the expectations still kept alive by the Law and the Prophets read in the synagogue, as well as the literary Jews who pored over the Book of Wisdom or consoled themselves with the Visions of the Book of Enoch amid their blighted political hopes. Moreover, the spell of the Hasmonaean line of princes did not last for ever. The 1st century b.c. witnessed a great change as compared with the second. Life was no longer under Aristobulus I. and Alexander Jannaeus what it was in the great days of Judas, Simon, and John Hyrcanus. The Hasmonaean princes were regarded as usurpers, and the political aspirations of the race began to turn once more to the seed of David. The ordinary uncultured Jew did not trouble himself with apocalyptic dreams of new heavens and a new earth, and probably there were many cultivated Jews who had little taste for the Book of Enoch. These would read with far greater satisfaction the Psalter of Solomon, especially Psa 17:5 ff., with its references to the familiar words of Prophecy and Psalm:—

'Thou, Lord, didst choose David to be king over Israel, and didst swear unto him concerning his seed for ever, that his kingdom should not fail before thee [2Sa 7:13-16, Psa 89:4-5]. Then, through our sins, sinners* [Note: A reference to the Hasmonaean princes who usurped the high priesthood (so Ryle and James).] arose against us, attacked us, and thrust us out. Those to whom thou didst make no promise took away with violence (our honour† [Note: The Greek ἀφείλοντο has no object, and these words may probably be supplied.]).... They laid waste the throne of David with insolent shouting. But thou, O God, wilt cast them down and remove their seed from the earth, when one that is a foreigner‡ [Note: Pompey is undoubtedly meant. See the interesting and full discussion in Ryle and James' Com. on the Psalms of Solomon, Introd. p. xlii ff.] to our race arises against them. According to their sins wilt thou recompense them, O God ... (v. 23). Behold, O Lord, and raise up for them their king, the son of David, at the time which thou, O God, knowest, that he may reign over Israel thy servant; and gird him with strength that he may break in pieces unjust rulers. Purge Jerusalem with wisdom and righteousness from the heathen that trample her down with destruction. May he thrust out the sinners from the

inheritance, utterly destroy the pride of the sinners, and as potters' vessels with an iron rod break in pieces all their substance' [Psa_2:9].

The Psalter of Solomon, not inaptly called by Ryle and James 'the Psalms of the Pharisees,' clearly reveals by its contents that it belongs to the period b.c. 70-40. Its chief interest for us consists in the strong indications which it gives of the reviving Messianic hopes of Israel at this time under the Roman yoke. Palestine was ready to respond to any bold or able adventurer like Judas, Theudas, or Bar Cochba, the last of whom was supported even by the distinguished Rabbi Akiba. The Synoptic Gospels furnish clear evidence that the national expectations which were directed to a Davidic Messiah in the middle of the last cent. b.c. still prevailed in the days of Jesus. The very form of the Matthew and Luke traditions respecting our Lord's birth exhibits an endeavour to conform to the prevalent expectation that the Messiah would be of Davidic descent. (1) The divergent pedigrees in the two Gospels trace the genealogy of Joseph, the reputed father of Jesus, from David. (2) Both lay stress on Bethlehem as Christ's birthplace, in conformity with the oracle in Mic_5:2.

Quite apart from the form of the Gospel narratives and the predisposition of the writers, the facts of the life of Jesus furnish conclusive evidence of this strong current of Messianic expectation.* [Note: Keim, *Jesu von Nazara*, i. 244, iii. 103.] We know that on repeated occasions, especially towards the close of His career, He was acclaimed as Son of David: Mat_9:27 (cf. Mar_10:47-48) Mar_12:23; Mar_15:22, Mar_11:10 (Mat_21:9; Mat_21:15). A survey of the facts, however, leads to the conclusion that Jerusalem in South Palestine was the centre of this national movement of Messianic anticipation, and that its pulses become weaker as we pass to the Jewish populations farther removed from this centre.

(f) We also find the title 'comforter' (מְנַחֵם *měnahçm*) bestowed on the Messiah of Davidic lineage. In Joh_14:16; Joh_14:26; Joh_15:26; Joh_16:7 παράκλητος is forensic in origin = 'advocate,' hence comes to mean 'helper' (see Weiss, *ad loc.*). It has therefore nothing to do with the above Messianic title. See Wünsche, *Leiden des Messias*, p. 112; Bousset, *Relig. des Jud_1:2* [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 261. We find a Menahem, son of Judas the Galilaeen, appearing in Jerusalem as a messiah, and after a brief interval overthrown (Volz, *Eschat.* p. 210).

iv. *Attitude of Jesus towards the Messiahship.*—This subject involves some delicate problems which do not admit of easy or immediate solution. Several questions present themselves, and the answers to these enable us to define approximately the attitude of Jesus towards the Messiahship. (1) What was the popular impression created by the Personality and ministry of Jesus? (2) In what form did Jesus regard Himself as

Messiah, and how was this related to the popular impression or the current Messianic expectation? (3) At what time did the Messianic consciousness possess Jesus, and when was it proclaimed?

1. In reference to the first question, the following facts may be noted: (a) During the Galilaeen period of His ministry Jesus was designated a *prophet*; and of this He was plainly conscious (Mar_6:4). Yet in popular estimation He was considered to be endowed with powers so remarkable that some supposed Him to be Elijah (Mar_6:15), the precursor of the Messiah (Mal_3:1; Mal_4:5), or one of the great prophets returned to life (Mar_8:28; perhaps Jeremiah or Isaiah, cf. 2Ma_2:5; 2Ma_15:14 f., 2Es_2:18). This seems to have been the general opinion respecting Jesus down to the close of His life (Luk_24:19 'a prophet mighty in deed and word'). (b) On the other hand, when Jesus passes into Judaea, He is confronted by the powerful current of Messianic expectation which looked for a king of David's line (Mar_10:48; Mar_11:9-10). Probably an attempt to draw Him into this path of Messianic claim and revolt against Roman imperial authority underlies the question as to tribute-money (Mar_12:14).

2. As to the form of Christ's own Messianic consciousness and its relation to the popular impression and the South Palestinian expectation, we note: (a) That the narrative of the Temptation (Mat_4:5 ff., Luk_4:5 ff.) points to the conclusion that early in His public ministry the path of a material or worldly Messiah-king was deliberately renounced (cf. Joh_6:15; Joh_18:36). (b) At an early period Jesus promulgated the fundamental principles of the Kingdom of God, and was fully conscious of His plenary authority to declare them even in opposition to the sacred Mosaic *Tôrah* which He announced Himself prepared to fulfil ('Ye have heard how it hath been said ... but *I* say unto you'). Yet though the expression 'kingdom of God (or heaven)' is often on His lips, He does not name Himself as 'king.' (c) He was evidently conscious of a higher vocation and dignity than the designation 'prophet' involved. For (i.) He never called Himself 'prophet,' though popularly acclaimed as such; (ii.) the prevailing designation of Himself which He adopted was, according to the Synoptics, 'Son of Man,' which, we have already shown, implied a high eschatological function and dignity; (iii.) He also regarded Himself as 'Son of God' (cf. Mar_1:10-11), though He restrained the announcement of the title (Mar_3:11-12). (d) He was wholly out of sympathy with the popular national and materialistic conceptions of Messiah-ship with which Southern Palestine at this time was rife. This we can clearly discern in His warning against false prophets and messiahs (Mar_13:22, Mat_24:11-24), who attempted by violent revolutionary means to force on the advent of the 'kingdom of God' (Mat_11:12). From these data the conclusion may be derived, that Jesus from very early times—even as early as the date of His baptism, according to the triple tradition of the Synoptics—was conscious of His unique relation to God as His Father, and of His Messianic dignity and mission, but that He filled it with an ethical as well

as apocalyptic content. It was for this reason that He hesitated to declare Himself as Messiah at the opening of His public ministry, knowing the perils of the material and unspiritual conceptions with which the national expectations of the Jews invested the name. The true representation of His Person and of His mission was to be found in the apocalyptic title 'Son of Man.' He was thinking of the exalted cosmic spiritual dignity which attached to this title when, in answer to Pilate's question, He acquiesced* [Note: The present writer, though with considerable hesitation, differs from Swete's comment upon the words $\sigma\upsilon\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\mu\varsigma$ in Mar 15:2 (Mat 27:11). For Pilate appears to have understood these words as an affirmation of his own suggestion (Mar 15:9); so also the Roman soldiers (Mar 15:18, cf. Mar 15:26). Cf. Luk 22:70 f. with Luk 23:3.] in the ambiguous honour 'King of the Jews' (Mar 15:2). The name connoted to Him the same personal authority as He claimed in the previous reply to the high priest (Mar 14:62). So the Fourth Gospel interprets the enigmatic answer of Jesus to Pilate (Joh 18:36, cf. also Joh 19:21).

3. With reference to the time when the Messianic consciousness possessed Jesus, and when His Messiahship was proclaimed, few will dissent from Bousset's dictum, that it is highly probable that the tradition is right in dating Jesus' awakening to the Messianic consciousness from the moment of His baptism, that is, before the opening of His ministry.† [Note: Jesus (Eng. ed.), p. 174.] As we have already indicated, there were, nevertheless, powerful motives which dictated the withholding of His claims from immediate public announcement. It is evident that the significant declaration which He drew from Simon near to Caesarea Philippi, that He was the Messiah, and more than prophet, marks the decisive point after which His Messianic title was generally proclaimed. Though He still imposed upon His followers great reserve (Mar 8:30), we find that shortly after this He is hailed by the blind Bartimaeus (Mar 10:48) and by His enthusiastic followers (Mar 11:9-10) as 'son of David,'—a title which He probably regarded with mixed feelings.

v. *Varied Features in the Messianic Expectation current in the Time of Christ.*

1. That the Messiah of Jewish traditional expectation *would be endowed with the virtues of justice and understanding through the Spirit of God*, was an obviously fundamental conception derived from the old Isaianic prophecy, Isa 9:7 [Hebrews 6] Isa 11:2 f., cf. Psalms 72. These ethical qualities are reproduced in varied forms in, e.g., Ps-Sol 17, Test. of the XII. Patr., Levi 18. In this last passage the Hasmonaean priest-princes seem to hover before the writer's imagination. In this portraiture the Messiah is king and priest of the whole earth; the nations of the earth and the angels in heaven rejoice over him. All iniquity disappears under his sway. He again opens Paradise, and the devil (Beliar) is bound by him. It is not easy to be quite sure whether Christian elements have been interpolated here as elsewhere in the Test. of

the XII. Patriarchs. Moreover, in the Sibyll. Oracles (3:36-92) the Messiah is called a 'holy king' of universal sway. In the Psalms of Solomon (17:36, 41, 42) the sinlessness of the Messiah is emphasized, and expressly referred to his endowment with the Holy Spirit (cf. Mat 3:16-17, Rom 1:4).

2. *The element of mystery and marvel shrouds the appearance of the Messiah*, cf. Apocalypse, Apocalyptic Bar 29:3 (text, however, somewhat doubtful; see Charles) 32:1, 2Es 7:28, Test. of the XII. Patr., Levi 18, Sib. Or. 3:652. According to Targ. [Note: Targum.] Jon. on Mic 4:8, the Messiah is already in the world, but is concealed owing to the sins of the people; see Schürer, *GJV* [Note: *JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ii. 531 ff. With this tradition cf. Joh 7:27.

3. *The Messiah is to be preceded by a messenger of God who is to purify Israel* (Mal 3:1; Mal 3:3).—This angel of the Covenant is identified by Malachi (or perhaps by an interpolator) with the returning Elijah (Mal 4:5 f. [Heb. 3:23 f.]). This passage, we know, exerted a far-reaching influence over later times; cf. Sir 48:10-11 and Mat 17:10-13 (Mar 9:11 f.).

4. *The scattered tribes of Israel are to be gathered together to Jerusalem, and Jerusalem and its Temple rebuilt*.—Often we find that the *apocalyptic features of a heavenly Jerusalem* usurp the place of the terrestrial lineaments of the older forms of Messianic anticipation; cf. Rev 7:4 ff; Rev 21:10 ff. Here, again, the sources of these traits are found in the OT, *i.e.* in exilic and post-exilic literature: Eze 39:27 ff., Isa 11:11; Isa 11:16 (which tell of the gathering of the Diaspora from Assyria, Babylon, Egypt): cf. Isa 27:12-13; Isa 35:8 ff., Mic 7:12, Isa 60:4; Isa 60:9; Isa 66:20. In many cases these expectations may be called by the general term 'Messianic,' but are without the presence of a Messiah. God brings about the blessed change, not by a gradual evolution of the earthly order, but by a mighty destruction of world-empires, in which Israel's foes (pre-eminently Edom) are overthrown without the instrumentality of any human or superhuman intermediary. Perhaps the most characteristic passage is Isa 27:13 'In that day the great trumpet shall be blown, and all who are being lost in Assyria, and are driven into Egypt, shall come and bow to Jahweh in the holy mount in Jerusalem.' Similarly in the earlier Enoch 90:33 f., Ps-Sol 11, and Bar 4:36 to Bar 5:9, and even in Philo (*de Exsecrationibus*, § 8-9, *de Præm. et Pæn.*; see Schürer³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , ii. p. 515), where the ethical traits are not forgotten.

Moreover, the rebuilding of Jerusalem is the reflex of the Deutero-Isaianic utterances, and also of Ezekiel 40-44, 47, Sir 35:13 ff., Tob 13:15-17; Tob 14:5, Enoch 90:28. According to Ps-Sol 17:33, this restoration of Jerusalem is to be the work of the Messiah.

5. The *Messiah as a martial personality* is based on the portraiture of Isa_9:3-4; Isa_11:4, Psa_2:7-9, and this trait frequently recurs in the literature of the 1st cent. b.c. and later; cf. Sib. Or. 3:652, 2Es_12:31; 2Es_12:33 (where the Messiah is the lion which is to destroy the Roman empire), also Apocalypse, Apocalyptic Bar 70:9,* [Note: Bracketed, however, by Charles as an interpolation; it comes in abruptly and forestalls the reference to the Messiah in ch. 72.] and esp. Ps-Sol 17:22-25. It is significant that this trait is absent from the NT except in Rev_19:11-21, in which the atmosphere is Judaic rather than Christian.

6. The conception of Messiah *ben-Joseph* or *ben-Ephraim* belongs to much later Jewish literature, and need not detain us. See Bousset, *Rel. des Judentums*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 264 f.

7. The *ethical* and *universal* traits of the Jewish Messiah and of Messianic expectation are, however, *meagre* and *even conspicuous by their absence*. The blight of materialism or national exclusiveness rests upon most of the later Jewish literature of Messianic hopes. We scarcely have a hint of the Messiah as the bearer of a new and higher revelation of God's nature or will to mankind, or of His function as a redeemer from sin. The horizons are the horizons of the Jew. With the exception of Philo and the writer of Sib. Or. 3, who were evidently Hellenic in sympathy and culture, we have but little to remind us that the Jew felt any interest in other nationalities and their future. Jewish apocalyptic presents a singularly contracted world, though it be an entire universe. For that universe, when it is not limited to Palestine, is to be governed by Israel only. The visions of the Book of Enoch suffer from these painful limitations. The *Similitudes* in the description of the last struggle with the heathen restrict the scene to the Holy Land (Enoch 56). Similarly in the Psalms of Solomon the eschatology is limited in its scope to Palestine. Seldom do we meet with any hint or suggestion of the conversion of the Gentiles. Isa_49:6, with its glorious ideal of Israel's mission as a light to the Gentiles, is almost wholly forgotten. The might of the Gentiles is to be broken, and world-empires are to be destroyed. The heathen nations are to be tributary vassals to the new Israelite power which Jahweh will erect, and of which the restored Jerusalem will be the centre. The Gentiles may make pilgrimages to the Holy Land, but only Israel may dwell there. See Bousset, *op. cit.* pp. 268-270.

The features of the 'Suffering Servant' portrayed in Isaiah 53 are almost totally absent in the version of the Targum of Jonathan, composed in the first two centuries of the Christian era, when the influence of the Maccabaeian age still affected the Messianic conceptions of Judaism. The traits of Isaiah 53 and Isa_49:6 are quite foreign to the Messianic ideals of Judaism in the 1st cent. a.d. The cross of Jesus was to the Jews a stumbling-block (1Co_1:23); cf. Volz, *op. cit.* p. 237; Dalman, *Der*

leidende und sterbenile Messias, p. 6 f.; Schürer³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , ii. 554 f.

vi. *Jesus the true spiritual fulfilment of prophecy and Israel's real Messiah.*—The volcanic uprising of the Jewish race under Judas Maccabaeus and his brothers against the efforts of Antiochus Epiphanes to suppress the national worship, exercised a profound influence upon the Hebrew nation and its ideals. For the future spiritual progress of Israel the results were permanently injurious. Religious ideas became warped by particularism, and the thoughts of the race diverted from the noble universalist conceptions of prophecy, especially of the Deutero-Isaiah, to the study of the *Tôrah*, as Israel's national heritage, with its ever growing mass of legal requirements and ceremonial punctilios. Piety then became a rule of thumb, and an elaborated endeavour to secure merit took the place of the old prophetic ideals of righteousness. All this is summed up in the single word *Pharisaism*. Pharisaism was born of the strong national movement of which the heroic episodes of the Maccabean struggle were the outward embodiment. Out of this movement emerged, on the one hand, a vehement reaction against Hellenic ideas and usages, and the exaltation of the *Tôrah* as Israel's *palladium*; while, on the other, there emerged the Napoleonic legend of the Jewish race, which became the prolific source of messiahs whose abortive careers were quenched in blood, until the final heroic effort of Bar Cochba, hailed as the fulfilment of Balaam's prophecy by Rabbi Akiba, was extinguished in the reign of Hadrian. But the noble spiritual ideals of Hebrew prophecy—of Jeremiah and the Deutero-Isaiah—could not be entirely suppressed by Pharisaism. As Friedländer in his recent stimulating work has pointed out,* [Note: *Die religiösen Bewegungen innerhalb des Judentums im Zeitalter Jesu*, pp. 237-264.] the liberal movements which prevailed in the Jewish Diaspora which was surrounded and penetrated by Hellenic influence, prepared the way, especially through the writings of Philo, for the advent of Christ; and the same writer enables us to discern more clearly how the highest ethical ideals of the Hebrew Messiah were realized in Jesus. The husk of nationalism, which clung to Jewish apocalyptic and left no place in its Messianic conceptions for the redemption of the Gentile world, was remorselessly cast aside by Jesus: 'I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness' (Mat 8:11-12). What the Messiah-prophet of Nazareth declared in His oracles, St. Paul, His greatest disciple, fulfilled. For Judaism had been diverted by Pharisaism from its true prophetic mission marked out for it in the dark days of its exile, but was enabled at last, by its greatest latter-day Prophet, the Divine 'Son of Man,' and by His great Jewish disciple and Apostle to the Gentiles, to accomplish its real vocation in spite of itself; cf. Isa 42:19, 2Co 3:14.

Literature.—This has been partially indicated in the course of this article. The article on ‘Messiah’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible and in *Ebi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*] and *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] should be consulted. A selection only of the most important works need be given here: Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , i. 160-179, ii. 434 ff., 710-741; Stanton, *The Jewish and the Christian Messiah*, 1886; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, i. pp. 60-84, 176-181, ii. pp. 123-339; Holtzmann, *NT Theol.* i. pp. 81-85, 234-304; Baldensperger, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*; Wellhausen, *IJG* [Note: *JG Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte.*] ² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (1895), pp. 198-204; Charles, *Book of Enoch* (see esp. Introduction). The last named writer’s editions of the *Apocalypse of Baruch* and his art in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible and the *Ebi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*] will also be found useful. Specially important is the section (§ 29) entitled ‘Die Messianische Hoffnung’ in Schürer’s *GJV* [Note: *JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ii. 497-556; cf. also Bousset, *Religion des Judentums im neutest. Zeitalter*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , pp. 245-308; and Paul Volz, *Jüd. Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba*, pp. 213-237, also pp. 55-68; Dalman, *Der leidende und sterbende Messias*; Castelli, *Il Messia secondo gli Ebrei*; Neubauer and Driver, *The Jewish Interpreters of Isaiah liii.* For a more complete list the reader is referred to Schürer, *op. cit.* p. 496 ff.

Owen C. Whitehouse.

☞ Metaphors

METAPHORS.—A *metaphor* is a blossom of one tree on the branch of another; it is a figure of speech by which a word or phrase is lifted to a meaning to which it is not literally entitled. A simple *trope* is a metaphor condensed. *Similes* are metaphors explained. *Parables* and *allegories* are similes or metaphors elaborately extended, and do not come into the scope of this discussion (see Parable). In this article we shall not attempt to catalogue or classify the metaphors used in the Gospels, or to distinguish in any technical way between the metaphors and other closely-related figures of speech, but shall use the word in its broadest sense.

Macbeth (*Might and Mirth of Literature*) restricts the term ‘metaphor’ unduly (cf. Gardiner, Kittredge and Arnold, *Mother Tongue*, 1962). Wendt (*Lehre Jesu*), notwithstanding the classic character of his general treatment of the figurative

language of the NT, does not give specific attention to the metaphors in the speech of Jesus and their relation to the more extended symbolic and parabolic teaching of the Gospels. Votaw, in his valuable art. 'Sermon on the Mount' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, Ext. Vol., classifies NT figures of speech as metaphorical, symbolical, hyperbolic, and figurative. But evidently the last term includes all the classes previously mentioned, while many of the hyperbolic expressions, even in the instances cited by Votaw, contain veiled metaphors. Every one who listened to Jesus mentally supplied the resemblance between the 'gnat' and the ritual peccadilloes which these men, so scrupulous of their meat and drink, 'strained out,' and between the 'camel' and the gross sins against the moral law which they swallowed so complacently. So the 'eye' which was to be plucked out (Mat 5:29) and the 'beam' which was not plucked out (Mat 7:3) evidently were the man's pet sins.

A simple metaphor expresses the resemblance (or identity) between two dissimilar objects or ideas by applying to one a term which can literally designate only the other, as 'This is my body (Mat 26:26). An abbreviated or veiled metaphor is one in which the assertion of resemblance is not expressed but implied. Sometimes a veiled metaphor sparkles in a phrase, as: 'water of life,' 'sons of thunder'; or even in a single word used in a non-literal, ideal, or peculiar sense, to be determined by the context or by current usage, as: 'cross,' 'yoke,' 'grace,' 'flesh,' 'the Day,' 'the Wrath,' 'darkness,' 'to wash,' 'to sleep' (cf. use in Synoptt., John, and Paul, of ποτήριον), 'to drink,' 'to walk' (περιπατέω), and scores of other words constantly used in the NT with an ethical meaning, the force of which is grasped only after the mind has made the connexion between their literal and non-literal meanings. All the Gospels refer to 'death' as a 'sleep.' This was not uncommon among the Jews of that era. But John's Gospel uses a different and more tender word (κοιμάομαι), and adds to the usual metaphorical conception the idea of sleep being an invigorator which brings health to the sick and makes the tired man ready for the work of a new day (Joh 11:12-13). Other expressions, such as 'Get thee behind me, Satan' (Mat 16:23), 'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up' (Joh 2:19), may be taken at random as examples of veiled metaphors, the connexion between the literal and spiritual meanings being mentally supplied. Many of the deepest teachings of the NT are embodied in words or phrases which cannot be fully understood until their metaphorical meaning is grasped.

All Oriental language is pictorial. This is especially true of the words of Jesus, not only as reported in the NT, but in other sayings reported by the early Fathers and in the recently-discovered Logia. To insist upon taking the Sermon on the Mount 'just as it reads,' would often mean to insist upon taking it as no one listening to Jesus would have understood it. This metaphorical method of speech was habitual with Jesus

(Mat 13:34, Mar 4:11, where παραβολή does not mean ‘parable’ in the modern sense, but metaphorical comparison), and was used, so His disciples thought, to hide the meaning of His words from all except the inner circle of believers. It certainly, however, as Wendt has suggested, quickened the attention of His hearers, and enabled His teaching to be carried more easily in the memory.

Notwithstanding the marked difference in vocabulary, style, and thought found in the various Gospels, they all agree, when reporting the speeches of Jesus, in putting a metaphorical spiritual meaning into even the simplest words, such as ‘sheep-fold,’ ‘door,’ ‘key,’ ‘lamp,’ ‘bread,’ ‘water,’ ‘fish,’ ‘life,’ ‘birth,’ ‘travail,’ ‘death,’ ‘love,’ ‘hell’ (γέεννα), ‘paradise,’ etc. This is true even in the case of reporters who themselves lacked poetic and spiritual insight, and who not infrequently misunderstood the inner meaning of Jesus’ words.* [Note: Such misunderstanding does not seem so strange after one examines the contemporaneous literature. In the Talmud (Pesachim) an entire section is given to the discussion whether a man may eat the leaven of a Gentile, and with what kind of water dough must be kneaded.] Sometimes, as in the references to ‘meat’ and ‘leaven’ (Joh 4:32; Joh 4:34; Joh 6:27; Joh 6:55, Mat 16:12, Mar 8:17, Luk 12:1), the deeper meaning of our Lord’s words was understood before the Gospels came into existence. In other cases it is plain that even the Gospel writer did not catch the meaning of the words which he reports.

In all parts of the NT, social, civil, and regal terms are applied, often with a new depth of meaning, to our Lord and His Kingdom. Not only such terms as ‘king,’ ‘Lord,’ ‘Master,’ etc., but υἱὸς θεοῦ and σωτήρ are titles given to the Roman emperors of the 1st and 2nd cents., while ἀδελφός was the common term used for members of various heathen esoteric associations of that period, and ‘birth’ the technical term for the rite of initiation. So the papyri have shown that ‘presbyter,’ ‘scribe,’ ‘prophet,’ etc., were technical terms used for officials in the heathen temples. This means only that the members of the early Christian community were accustomed to use the ordinary language of their times. It is difficult to tell what new ecclesiastical colouring was originally given to the titles of the early Christian officials, or what new ideas were from the very beginning expressed by the old terms ‘faith,’ ‘salvation,’ etc., That the latter terms, though identical in form, expressed ideas radically different from what they did when used in the LXX Septuagint, is acknowledged by all critics—how much more, then, did these ideas differ from those conveyed by the same terms when used in the heathen Mysteries?* [Note: See, e.g., Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 1901, pp. 73, 233; Percy Gardner, *Exploratio Evangelica* (1899); cf. Ramsay, ‘Greek of Early Church and Pagan Ritual’ (*Expos. Times* [1898], p. 9).]

The command to baptize or believe on, in, or into the name of Jesus,—found in all parts of NT,—receives a new force from the papyri, where, in heathen temples, the property bought ‘into the name of God’ emphasizes the Divine ownership.† [Note: See Deissmann, pp. 142, 147, 197; Moulton, Gram. NT Greek, (1906), has shown that the prepositions are practically identical in meaning as used in the papyri.]

The different NT writers are marked by certain striking peculiarities in their use of metaphors. St. Mark, in his peasant’s Gospel, rustic but picturesque, uses many metaphors which all writers following him could but repeat. So his simple metaphors grow into extended metaphors or illustrations in the later Gospels. Yet certain strong expressions, evidently metaphorical, are, either because of their uncouthness or implications, ignored by the later and more reflective writers. That the disciples are to be ‘salted with fire’ (Mar 9:49), and that even in this life they are to be rewarded with a hundred ‘mothers,’ etc. (Mar 10:30) are peculiar to Mark.‡ [Note: Mat 19:29 is doubtful, and at any rate *v̄v* is omitted.] But when the force of these metaphors is caught, each statement strengthens our Lord’s argument.

So the statement that Jesus spat on the blind man’s eyes and on the dumb man’s tongue (Mar 8:23; Mar 7:33), though omitted for obvious reasons from the other Gospels, becomes peculiarly impressive when we remember that spittle, according to all ancient thought, represented the essence of a man’s inner spirit, the quintessence of himself, and therefore played, from the earliest ages, a leading part in magic and witchcraft. By this acted metaphor Jesus proclaimed symbolically that it was His very essence that healed. Cf. also Joh 9:6, where the action of Jesus possibly receives a new meaning when we remember that in the Talmud the dust of certain districts in Jerusalem was clean and of other districts unclean—not because of the district being insanitary, as is suggested in the Talmudic text. If, instead of spitting on the tongue, He ‘spat out,’ this would receive explanation from the custom of the Jews to spit in contempt when idols were mentioned; as also in the early Church, where converts coming to baptism spat out as a sign that they renounced the kingdom of Satan. Cf. *J* [Note: *Jahwist.*] *E* [Note: *Elohist.*], art. ‘Alenu.’

In Mk., believers who have ‘salt’ within them (Mar 9:50) have brotherly love; in Mt., those who love their enemies are salt (Mat 5:10-13).§ [Note: Compare the proverb yet to be heard in Jerusalem, ‘What salt is it that keeps money good?’ Answer: ‘Charity.’] In Mk., the word is a lamp (*λύχνος*) which must not be hid (Mar 4:21, cf. Luk 8:16; Luk 8:18); in Mt., it is the believer (Mat 5:15), or his ‘eye’ (spiritual vision or intent), if clear and healthy (*ἀπλοῦς*, Mat 6:22), which is the lamp shining forth from the inward centre of life (*φῶς*, Mat 5:14)—which Jn. sees to be the eternal Word, Christ Jesus (Joh 1:4). In Mk., disciples are compared to sheep (Mar 6:34; Mar 14:27); in

Mt. they are sheep (Mat 10:6; Mat 15:24; Mat 26:31, cf. Mat 18:12), while in Jn. (Joh 10:2-27) a long, elaborate discourse is based upon this well understood metaphor. || [Note: | Jülicher (Die Gleichnisreden Jesu, p. 120) looks upon the narrative as contradictory and suspicious, because at one time Jesus is represented as the Door and at another as the Shepherd who enters it; but no Oriental would have criticised the use of these varying metaphors.] Both Mk. and Mt. teach that he who 'findeth his life shall lose it,' but Lk. enlarges the meaning of ψυχή until it includes the whole man (Luk 9:25). Mt. alone says, Have no anxiety for your life, 'for each to-morrow will be anxious for itself (Mat 6:25-34), though both Mt. and Lk. remark that even the birds, which have neither farming implements nor granaries, are eared for (Luk 6:26; Luk 8:20, cf. Luk 12:22-24). The metaphorical allusion to new wine in fresh wine-skins, Mar 2:22, is explained in Mat 9:17 and enlarged in Luk 5:37. The patch which in Mk. and Mt. tears out a larger hole from the old garment, is in Lk. condemned for two altogether different reasons (Luk 5:36)—the necessity of tearing a new piece of cloth in order to get the patch, and because it would be a different kind of cloth. Every one who heard this remark in either form would be caught by the unspoken metaphor: Judaism cannot be patched by this new doctrine of Jesus; it must be replaced by it. The gospel is no patch; it must replace the old and worn-out garment. In Mk. there is only a brief allusion to the coming of the Son of Man (Mar 13:24-27), in Mt. an extended description.

'Let the dead bury their dead' (Mat 8:22); 'Cast not your pearls before swine' (Mat 7:6); 'Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?' (Mat 7:16), are some of the striking expressions found in Mt. alone, as also the declaration that no man should be called 'father' (Mat 23:9); cf. the acted metaphor (Mat 17:26), nowhere else recorded, by which Jesus metaphorically claims that the God of the Temple is His Father, when He declares His legal exemption from the Temple tax. There are a number of peculiarly picturesque and humorous metaphors for which we are indebted to Matthew. The Pharisees are 'white-washed tombs' full of putridity (Mat 23:27); 'blind guides of the blind' (Mat 15:14, Mat 23:16; Mat 23:24); 'wolves in sheep's clothing' (Mat 7:15). One who truly exhibits the law of righteousness (which is unselfishness and love) does not let his left hand know what his right hand doeth (Mat 6:3); but these men blow a trumpet before them, not only when they give alms, but when they pray (cf. the remark in the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* [xii. 1], that a teacher of the true doctrine is known to one who 'has understanding of the right hand and the left'). They make long prayers and 'devour windows' houses (Mat 23:14 or 13?). These hair-splitting theologians, so particular in their eating, strain out the gnat but swallow the camel (Mat 23:24).* [Note: All the Synoptists report the saying of Christ that it is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye than, etc. (Mar 10:25, Mat 19:24, Luk 18:25). The Talmud has the same expression, excepting that an elephant takes the place of the camel (quoted by Arthur Wright,

Some NT Problems, p. 127).] Christ's yoke does not gall (Mat 11:30), but these men lay upon the shoulders of others burdens which they will not move even with the finger (Mat 23:4). For such is the 'weeping and the gnashing of teeth' (Mat 8:12, Mat 13:42; Mat 13:50, Mat 22:13, Mat 24:51, Mat 25:30, elsewhere only Luk 13:28). These satiric pictures of the theologians of the day are peculiar to Matthew. Both Mt. and Lk. refer to the same individuals as hyper-critics, who are greatly disturbed by the mote in their brother's eye, although they have a beam in their own. Forgetting their own infirmity and need of immediate surgical assistance, they use the other eye, which must also have been sympathetically afflicted, in spying out and ridiculing the speck of dust in the eye of their neighbour (Mat 7:3-5 = Luk 6:41 f.). Nothing in Hogarth is better than that.

In Lk., several of the Beatitudes concerning the poor and hungry take on a distinctly different meaning from what they had in Mt. (Mat 5:3; Mat 5:6); the words 'poor' and 'hungry' (Mat 6:20; Mat 6:23) having perhaps obtained a settled ecclesiastical, non-literal meaning. The storming of the Kingdom of heaven by those who upset the Law in their anxiety to hurry into the Kingdom of the gospel, while obscured in Mt. (Mat 11:12), is explained in Lk. (Luk 16:16-17). The mixed figures used by Mk. (Mar 4:14-16) and Mt. (Mat 13:19),—sometimes similes and sometimes metaphors,—representing men in one breath as both soil and seed, disappear in Lk.'s beautiful symmetrical narrative (Luk 8:5 ff.). He, too, is responsible for the injunction 'Make for yourselves purses which wax not old' (Luk 12:33), and for the attractive Orientalism 'son of peace' (Luk 10:6) added to Mat 10:13, and for the less commendable addition that the descent of the Spirit at the baptism of Jesus, which Mk. and Mt. had said to be 'like a dove,'—and which Jn. explains to have been 'as a dove,' *i.e.* in a softly, floating manner (Moulton),—was 'in bodily form' (Joh 3:22). Instead of Mt.'s metaphorical reference to the Pharisees as painted sepulchres (Mat 23:27), beautiful to look at but foul within, Lk. makes Jesus speak of them as unsuspected graves (μνημεία) which defile every one who comes near them (Luk 11:44). The 'mountain' of Mt. (Mat 17:20), which can be east into the sea by any disciple who has faith as fully alive as a mustard seed, becomes a 'tree' in Lk. (Luk 17:6). The 'seventy-seven' acts of forgiveness required of Jesus' disciples, according to Mt. (Mat 18:22), are expressed with equal truth and vigour by Lk. when he reduces that number to 'seven' (Luk 17:4). The satirical remark that wealth can build a man an 'eternal tent' (Luk 16:9), and the hyperbole that one must 'hate' (μισῶ) his father and mother in order to be a true disciple of Jesus (Luk 14:26), are original with Lk.; as also the statement that the disciples must 'win their souls' (Luk 21:19), and that the Pharisees take away the 'key of knowledge' (Luk 11:52, cf. Mat 16:19).

Lk., which shows more attention to literary style than any other NT writing except the Hebrews (Moulton), uses far fewer original metaphors. This is because it was not a first-hand work, but a compilation (Luk_1:3). Even the beautiful reference to Jesus as the Sun-rise (Luk_1:78) looks back to the OT; and the terms 'torment' and 'fixed gulf' in the Dives parable, which are peculiar to Lk., are found in the medical works of that period; while the word used for the life immediately after death—Paradise—is the word for the garden of delight in which our first parents dwelt (Gen_2:8 LXX Septuagint). In Lk., as truly as in Jn., the Baptist not only preaches the whole gospel, social, ethical, and sacrificial, but uses the favourite metaphors of Jesus; while Elisabeth and Mary, Zacharias and Simeon, all speak in blank verse, every line being filled with OT imagery. The nautical metaphors of Lk. are few and doubtful (cf. *Expos.* vi. viii. [1903] 130). It does not even use the striking phrase 'fishers of men' common to both Mk. and Mt.

In the Fourth Gospel we have not many new figures of speech, but all the old ones are filled with new contents. Even the old title 'Son of Man' becomes exalted (Joh_1:51; Joh_5:27). In the Synoptt. Jesus points out the way; in Jn. He is 'the Way' (Joh_14:6). In the Synoptt. He gives life; in Jn. He is 'Life,' and 'the Life' (Joh_1:4), and large inferences are drawn from this. He is also called 'the Resurrection' (Joh_11:25). In the Synoptt. Jesus is like a shepherd, but in Jn. He has become both Shepherd and Gate of the fold (Joh_10:7; Joh_10:11). In the Synoptt. Jesus speaks the word; in Jn. He is 'the Word,' and the term has taken into itself a new and mystic meaning: ὁ λόγος has come to mean the eternal thought of Jehovah given visible utterance, the sacred Tetragrammaton manifested in flesh (Joh_1:14), whose word (ὁ λόγος) or words (τὰ ῥήματα) are a part of His own Divine essence, to abide in which is to abide in Him (Joh_5:38, Joh_8:31). Either term expresses the creative, cleansing, protecting power of the Divine Name. The unity of the spoken word with the speaker is metaphorically regarded as an identity equivalent to that between Christ and the Father (Joh_14:10, cf. Joh_10:30). But the unity of the word with the speaker, or of Christ with His Father, is no closer than that between the Christ and His true disciples. He abides in them and they abide in Him (Joh_6:56, Joh_15:4, Joh_17:26; cf. Joh_6:70, where Judas, because of his relationship with Satan, becomes *diabolos*). So all believers may become one 'as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee' (Joh_17:21). The Christ, the 'only begotten' (Joh_1:14; Joh_1:18, Joh_3:16; Joh_3:18), is the Vine (Joh_15:1), His body a sanctuary (Joh_2:19); even while on the earth He is 'in heaven' (Joh_3:13), and holds His disciples and all things in His hand (Joh_10:28, Joh_3:35). Those in whom the Word abides (Joh_15:7) and who abide in the Word (Joh_8:31)—these metaphors being interchangeable—cannot 'taste death' (Joh_8:52), nor even 'look on death' (Joh_8:51).* [Note: For Oriental parallels to the Logos in other Oriental religions, see JRAS, April 1906.]

In Jn., more than in any other Gospel, metaphors become an important factor in doctrinal development. These mystic figures of speech indicate the growth of the Church in theological development, and have also played no little part in shaping the later doctrines of Christendom. A freely translated expression in the Psalms concerning the manna which came from heaven is made the occasion, metaphorically interpreted, of deep and beautiful teachings concerning the heavenly origin of the Christ and His power to give life (Joh_6:33; Joh_6:35; Joh_6:51). To eat Him is the only way to gain life (Joh_6:51; Joh_6:53; Joh_6:58). So Jesus is the well of salvation out of which men may draw water with great joy (cf. Is Joh_12:3); not only satisfying their own thirst thereby, but becoming living fountains which send forth floods of life-giving water such as came from Jesus Himself (Joh_4:10-14, Joh_7:38). In the Acts (Joh_8:32), Jesus goes as a lamb to the slaughter; in Jn. He is the Lamb (Joh_1:29; Joh_1:36) ‘exalted’ upon the cross-altar (Joh_3:14, Joh_12:32; Joh_12:34 [ὑψόω is peculiar to Jn.]).

Camden M. Cobern.

☞Methuselah

METHUSELAH.—Mentioned as a link in our Lord’s genealogy, Luk_3:37.

☞Mile

MILE.—See Weights and Measures.

☞Mill

MILL (μύλων),

☞Mill-Stone

MILL-STONE (μύλος, λίθος μυλικός).—The hand-mill used in Palestine consists of two stone discs, from a foot to a foot and a half in diameter, the upper being about 2 in.,

the lower 3 in. thick. A porous stone of black basalt is preferred, as being sufficiently hard and not so liable as ordinary limestone to become glazed by the friction of the two surfaces against each other (Job_41:24). The stones are usually flat, but not infrequently the concave face of the upper stone rests upon the corresponding convex of the lower one, so as to facilitate the passing out of the flour in the act of rotation. The lower stone is always the heavier of the two, because it is thicker and because it is often a little wider, with a rebate or raised rim; and the upper stone fits into the recess thus formed. The flour then escapes from an opening several inches long where the rim of the lower stone has been cut away. The upper stone has an opening through the centre for the reception of the upright wooden pin projecting from the centre of the lower stone. Into this hole the wheat is poured in the process of grinding. The upper stone has near the circumference a wooden peg a little over two handbreadths in height, and when the stone is being turned by two women (Mat_24:41), sitting on opposite sides of it, each grasps the peg continuously with one hand and alternately draws it to herself and pushes it away. Partly on account of their position in sitting, and partly to keep the edge of the skirt away from the cloth spread for the flour, they usually draw up the dress to the knee (Isa_47:1-2). The sound of the hand-mill grinding the flour for the daily bread was suggestive of home life under conditions of peace and prosperity, and its cessation betokened turmoil and distress (Ecc_12:3-4, Jer_25:10-11). The μύλος ὄνικος, or donkey stone of Luk_17:2, may simply mean the revolving upper stone of the common hand-mill, as having the more active share in the work of grinding. If the reference be to the larger kind of stone driven by animal or water power, the allusion would be a case of emphatic hyperbole, like the passage of a camel through the slit of a needle (Mat_19:24). In Rev_18:21 it is a strong angel that is described as casting such a stone. See, further, art. 'Mill,' with illustration, in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible .

G. M. Mackie.

☞Mina

MINA.—See Money.

☞Mind

MIND.—See Mental Characteristics.

⚡ Minister, Ministration

MINISTER, MINISTRATION

1. ὑπηρέτης: Luk_1:2 ὑπηρετάει τοῦ λόγου, Luk_4:20 ἀποδοὺς τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ.

ὑπηρέτης is originally ‘a rower’ (from ἐρέσσω,—the ὑπό pointing to his being under the direction of the κυβερνήτης or steersman, who was the navigating officer: *Encyc. Brit.*⁹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] xxi. 808). It is commonly used in class. Gr. in the sense of ‘a doer of hard work,’ ‘an assistant’ or ‘apparitor’ or ‘inferior officer,’ but still retains the meaning of ‘one who is under the direction or control of another’ (e.g. ὑπηρετάει is the term employed by Xenophon for the adjutants or orderlies of a general).

In Bibl. Greek ‘the word covers a wide range of offices,’ but still retains this meaning: e.g. Mat_5:25 (the officer of a court of justice = πράκτωρ, Luk_12:58), Mat_26:58, Mar_14:54; Mar_14:65, Joh_7:32; Joh_7:45-46; Joh_18:3; Joh_18:12; Joh_18:18; Joh_18:22; Joh_19:6, Act_5:22; Act_5:26 (the Temple police, or apparitors of the Sanhedrin; cf. Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iv. 715b; *Encyc. Bibl.* iv. 4650; Swete, *St. Mark*, xii. 329, 335). In Joh_18:36 our Lord says, ‘If my kingdom were of this world, then would my ὑπηρετάει (‘officers,’ (Revised Version margin)) fight’; with which cf. (for a similar connexion of ὑπηρετάει) LXX Septuagint Pro_14:35 δεκτὸς βασιλεῖ ὑπηρέτης νοήμων, Wis_6:5 (kings) ὑπηρετάει ὄντες τῆς αὐτοῦ (i.e. God's) βασιλείας. In Act_26:16 ὑπηρετήν points to the service of complete subjection into which St. Paul was called to enter, when Jesus appeared to him as the Risen Lord. He and Apollos and Cephas are ὑπηρετάει Χριστοῦ (1Co_4:1). Lk.'s ὑπηρετάει τοῦ λόγου may be due to his having heard St. Paul use this and similar expressions, and describes the αὐτόπαι τῶν πεπληροφορημένων πραγμάτων in their service of entire subjection to the gospel (here τοῦ λόγου = ‘the gospel’ as in other Lukan passages, Act_6:2; Act_6:4; Act_8:4; Act_10:44; Act_11:19; Act_14:25; Act_16:6; Act_17:11.) ‘ὑπηρέτης and διάκονος are often used interchangeably’ (Hort, *Ecclesia*, 210; cf. Trench, *Synon.* ix, (near end); Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. 378a).

In Luk 4:20 the ὑπηρέτης is the synagogue official called the *hazzân*, who during public worship ‘hands the copy of the Scriptures to the reader, and receives it back from the hands of the man who has read the final lesson.... The *hazzân* rolls up the Torah roll after the reading, and, after holding it up to view, deposits it in the press’ (Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible iv. 640b; cf. Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus*, i. 438). Chase conjectures that John Mark was originally a *hazzân* or synagogue attendant (Act 13:5; Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible iii. 245^b).

2. **λειτουργία:** Luk 1:23 αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ, ‘the days of his ministration,’ *i.e.* the week during which he was on priestly duty in the Temple.

λειτουργία is of common occurrence in LXX Septuagint in the sense of ritual service (= לִיטוּרְיָא Num 8:22; Num 16:9; Num 18:4, 2Ch 31:2; cf. Diod. Sic. i. 21 (of the Egyptian priesthood), τὰς τῶν θεῶν θερατείας τε καὶ λειτουργίας). At Athens the λειτουργία (from obsol. ἔργω = ἐργάζομαι, and λείτος, λήϊτος [fr. λαός]) were State burdens of a peculiar kind laid on the citizens, *e.g.* defraying the cost of public choruses, or of the training of athletes, or of feasting one’s fellow-tribesmen (Xen. *de Rep. Ath.* i. 13; Becker, *Charicles*, sc. iv. n. [Note: note.] 23; *Dict. Antiq.* ii. 27). The use of λειτουργία in a ritual sense is not peculiar to LXX Septuagint, the Papyri having shown that it was common in Egypt, and in particular that the services in the Serapeum were designated by this title (Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 138; cf. Moulton, *Expositor*, vi. vii. [1903] 116).

Lk. speaks of the prophets and teachers at Antioch λειτουργούντων τῷ Κυρίῳ, by which prayers to Christ are probably meant (Act 13:2). λειτουργεῖν and the group of words connected with it are used, as in LXX Septuagint, by the writer of Hebrews of the ministry of the tabernacle (Heb 9:21; Heb 10:11); metaphorically, of the more excellent ministry of Christ as High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary (Heb 8:2; Heb 8:6); they are also applied to the ministry of angels (Heb 1:7; Heb 1:14). St. Paul speaks of civil rulers as λειτουργοὶ θεοῦ, thus ascribing to them a sacred function (Rom 13:6). Evidently the ritual sense of this group of words is always present to the mind of the Apostle when he has occasion to use them (Rom 15:16 ‘Paul the ministering priest, the preaching of the gospel his priestly function, the believing Gentiles his offering’ [Gifford], Rom 15:27, 2Co 9:12, Php 2:17 ‘the Philippians the priests, their faith the sacrifice, the apostle’s life-blood the accompanying libation’ [Lightfoot], Php 2:25; Php 2:30; cf. Westcott on Hebrews 1 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 231). Those passages also show that

Christ's ministers are sacrificing priests only in the same sense as the rest of the members of the Christian brotherhood, who render λειτουργία to God and to men by 'the work of faith, and the labour of love' (cf. Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. 377^a; Lightfoot, *Philip*.² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 182).—The application of λειτουργία to the prayers offered at the dispensation of the Lord's Supper is a comparatively late ecclesiastical usage (Cheetham, *Dict. Chris. Antiq.* ii. 1018; Lightfoot, *l.c.* 261; Trench, *Synon.* xxxv).

3. διάκονος, διακονεῖν, -εἶσθαι (διηκόνουν, διηκόνησα, later impf. and aor. for ἐδιακόνουν, ἐδιακόνησα).—

The derivation of διάκονος is uncertain. If Buttman's conjecture is right (*Lexil.* i. 218), that the root of the word is an obsolete verb διακω = διώκω, it may have originally meant 'a messenger.' Prellwitz (*Etymol. Wörterbuch*, 74) connects it with = ἐγκονέω, 'to be active,' the long α being explained as arising from δια + α = a weak form of the ἐν in ἐγκονεω. The original meaning would then be 'one who is quick and active in service.' The Greek usage of the word is fully dealt with by Hort (*Ecclesia*, 202 ff.), who quotes, amongst other passages which bring out its menial associations, Plato, *Gorg.* i. 518 A, where it is said that, except gymnastics and medicine, 'all other arts which have to do with the body are servile and menial (διακονικάς) and illiberal.' Hort also shows that by later Greek writers it was sometimes used in a lofty figurative sense, e.g. by Epictetus, *Dissertationes*, iv. 7. 20, 'For I think that what God chooses is better than what I choose. I will attach myself as a minister and follower (διάκονος καὶ ἀκόλουθος) to Him; I have the same movements as He has, I have the same desires; in a word, I have the same will (συνθελω).' *Long's translation*, 348.—'The true proper Greek sense' is 'an attendant whose duty it is to wait on his master at table.'

In the Gospels, διάκονος and its derivatives are used in the sense of preparing or serving a meal, Mar 1:13 (|| Mat 4:11), Mar 1:31 (|| Mat 8:15, Luk 4:39), Luk 10:40; Luk 12:37; Luk 17:8, Mat 22:13, Joh 2:5; Joh 2:9; Joh 12:2; in the same sense, figuratively, Mar 9:35 (not exactly || Mat 23:11, Luk 22:26-27), Mar 10:43; Mar 10:45 (|| Mat 20:26; Mat 20:28), Joh 12:26; of ministering service generally, Luk 8:3, Mar 15:41, Mat 27:55; Mat 25:44. διάκονος does not occur in St. Luke, who uses ὁ διακονῶν (Luk 22:26-27).

The passages in which ‘minister,’ ‘to minister,’ are the renderings adopted in Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, are the following: (i.) Of the ministry of angels, Mar 1:13 (|| Mat 4:11) οἱ ἄγγελοι διηκόνουν αὐτῷ, cf. Gen 28:12, 1Ki 19:5, Dan 10:21, Joh 1:51, Luk 22:43, Heb 1:14, 1Pe 1:12. Christ’s nativity. His temptation, His agony, His resurrection, His ascension, were all accompanied by their sympathetic ministrations.—(ii.) Of Peter’s wife’s mother, Mar 1:31 (|| Mat 8:15, Luk 4:39) διηκόνει αὐτοῖς at the Sabbath meal immediately after the fever left her. ‘Et nos ministremus Jesu’ (Jerome, quoted by Swete, *in loc.*).—(iii.) Of the ministering women, Luk 8:3 (Mar 15:41, Mat 27:55) αἵτινες διηκόνουν αὐτῷ [αὐτοῖς] ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐταῖς, and continued doing so till the close of Christ’s life on earth. αἵτινες (= *tales quæ*) may imply that they had the heart as well as the means to minister to Him. Lk. has much to tell us about the women friends of Jesus (e.g. Luk 10:38-42; Luk 11:27; Luk 23:27; Luk 24:22).—(iv.) The great sayings about service being the path to true greatness, Mar 9:35 πάντων διάκονος, ‘minister of all,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 (not exactly || Mat 23:11, Luk 22:26-27), Mar 10:43; Mar 10:45 (Mat 20:26; Mat 20:28, which is followed by an extensive interpolation of a similar tenor in DΦ, Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible, Ext. Vol. 345^a) ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος ... καὶ γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθε διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι.—Promotion to true greatness is not effected by such methods as are adopted by ‘the princes of the Gentiles’ to gain or to retain supreme power; nor does it depend on an act of partiality, such as the sons of Zebedee imagined might be exercised in their favour if they applied for it in time. It is regulated by fixed spiritual laws, or by the general principle that honour comes in the Kingdom of God by disinterested love. As ‘to get pleasure you must forget it’ (Seth, *Ethiopic Principles*, 66; W. L. Davidson, *Theism*, 372), so to be great you must cease to think of greatness and humble yourself to serve others, which includes the being quick to discern and open-hearted to minister to their needs, even to the sacrificing of yourself for their good. They who shall have the highest place in God’s household are they who take the duties of its humblest member, the δοῦλος, upon themselves; and they who shall be qualified to sit down at the feast of salvation are they who fulfil the work of the διάκονος at table, who wait upon those whom God regards as His guests, and minister to their wants (cf. Menzies, *Mark*, 200). Jesus sets forth this principle in the most touching manner as that of His own life (cf. Act 10:38). He is Himself the living embodiment of the truth which He teaches. In saying that He ‘came not to be ministered unto, but to minister,’ He does not mean that the ministrations He is receiving are not welcome, but He defines the main object of His sojourning in this

world, and speaks of Himself not as the Guest whom the whole world will delight to honour, but as the humble attendant upon those who are in want; not as the Benefactor who is to be raised by men to the highest earthly glory, but as One who is come to serve them (seeing that on account of the state they are in there is no other way in which He can effectually and completely serve them) by the surrender of life itself (cf. Mar 15:31). This was Jesus' path to the most exalted greatness. It led to there being given Him by God 'the name which is above every name' (Php 2:9, cf. Heb 2:9), and also to His receiving from man the undying homage of his heart, together with the confession of the tongue that his highest ideal of human goodness and service is now realized in Jesus. So, when we follow His example and are lifted out of ourselves by His Spirit of ministering love, everything that came to Him will come to us, according to the measure in which we, who are infinitely inferior to Him, will be found meet for it,—God's approval of our life, increasing influence for good, that true greatness which consists in our becoming better able to elevate and bless our fellow-men (cf. Caird, *Univ. Sermon*, 260), and to minister to them in the highest way by leading them to righteousness (Dan 12:3), and which may also comprehend the power to minister to them in a higher state of being (cf. Mat 25:21, Luk 19:17).* [Note: 'My idea of heaven is the perpetual ministry of one soul to another' (Tennyson, *Memoir by his Son*, ii. 421).] —(v.) Mat 25:44 πότε ... οὐ διακονήσαμέν σοι; those words supplement in a solemn way the sayings just commented upon. Ministering love is not only the path to true greatness, it is also the indispensable condition of future exaltation with Christ. He who 'for our sakes became poor,' who turned the light of His infinite pity upon the world of hunger, poverty, and misery, still calls the hungry and poor and miserable 'His brethren,' and accounts their cause His own. Not to have ministered to their needs is not to have ministered to His (cf. Lowell, 'The Vision of Sir Launfal'; and 'The Legend of St. Martin's Cloak,' Farrar, *Lives of the Fathers*, i. 630). At His coming in glory, Christ will declare His love to those who have loved, and will admit them as 'joint-heirs with Himself'; but He will reject as unmeet for companionship with Him those who have not taken the position among their fellow-men which He showed them how to take when He said, Ἐγὼ δὲ εἰμι ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν ὡς ὁ διακονῶν (Luk 22:27, cf. Joh 13:5).—These sayings of Jesus virtually create a new standard of social ethics. They give to the prophetic teaching of the OT on considerate and brotherly conduct (תָּוֵב, see W. R. Smith, *Proph.* 1 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 160, 407; Driver, *Sermons on OT*, 221, 232) the breadth and completeness which it yet lacked. 'If we wish to feel the contrast of the Pagan and the Christian ideals of greatness, we have only to compare the Aristotelian picture of the μεγαλόψυχος, the proud aristocrat who lives to prove his independence and superiority, with that other picture of a Life that poured itself out in the service of others' (Seth, *Ethiopic Principles*, 264).

Later Stoicism ‘sometimes expressed with much warmth the recognition of the universal fellowship and natural mutual claims of human beings as such’ (Sidgwick, *Hist. of Ethics*, 120), but this was really inconsistent with the hard isolation of the individual that was the fundamental basis of Stoicism (Lightfoot on Philippians 2, ‘St. Paul and Seneca,’ 296), and the practical results of such teaching were small (Lecky, *Europ. Morals*¹² [Note: 2 designates the particular edition of the work referred] , ii. 78-79). Numerous coincidences are found between the teaching of Jesus and the humane sayings of Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius. But, as Lightfoot observes (*l.c.* 291), ‘an expression or a maxim, which detached from its context offers a striking resemblance to the ethics of the Gospel, is found to have a wholly different bearing when considered in its proper relations.’ Stoicism was wholly wanting in humility, which is the very foundation of ministering love as taught by Jesus (cf. Westcott in Smith’s *DB* [Note: *Dictionary of the Bible.*] ii. 857^b, iii. 1380). With Him, such love is not an occasional precept of benevolence, but, as Harnack says (*What is Christianity?* 98), it is ‘the religious-maxim.’

The following passages will show some of the results produced by our Lord’s teaching in Christian thought and life. There are differences of *διακονία* (1Co 12:5), but the manifold faculties for ‘the work of ministering’ are gifts from the Exalted Lord (Eph 4:12), and each disciple has received a gift of some kind to be laid out in Christian service (1Pe 4:10-11). Some are called to the ministry of the word (Act 6:4, 2Co 3:6; 2Co 6:4, Col 4:17, 1Th 3:2, 2Ti 4:5), to testify the gospel of the grace of God (Act 20:24) and win men to faith (1Co 3:5); God has committed to such ‘the ministry of reconciliation’ (2Co 5:18). Some as attendants and comrades can strengthen the hands of those engaged in this work: St. Paul was thus helped by Timothy and Erastus (Act 19:22), by Tychicus (Eph 6:21, Col 4:7), by Onesiphorus (2Ti 1:18), by Mark (2Ti 4:11), by Onesimus (Phm 1:13). Some can render invaluable help in the local churches, as Stephanas and his household at Corinth (1Co 16:15), and Phœbe at Cenchræe (Rom 16:1). Ministering to the wants of the poor, the sick, the stranger, the prisoner, was constantly called for (Act 6:1-2, Rom 12:7, Heb 6:10; cf. Heb 10:34, Rev 2:19). A collection (two are mentioned) is a *διακονία* (Act 11:29; Act 12:25, Rom 15:31, 2Co 8:4; 2Co 8:19-20; 2Co 9:1; 2Co 9:12-13), and St. Paul speaks of his journey in charge of the latter as itself a part of the ministrations (Rom 15:25 *πορευομαι ... διακονῶν τοῖς ἁγίοις*, see Gifford’s note). The above passages show that ‘a faithful minister of Christ’ (Col 1:7, cf. 1Ti 4:6) is one who combines with the stated ministry of the gospel the service of his fellow-men in things temporal and external.—Thus *διάκονος*, *διακονεῖν*, in showing men the path to greatness, have themselves attained to greatness. It is true of *words* as well as of *persons*, that God as revealed in Christ ‘hath exalted them of low degree’ (Luk 1:52).

Literature.—Stephanus, *Thesaurus* (Hase and Dindorf's ed.); Hastings' and other Dictionaries of the Bible; *Dict. of Antiquities*; *Dict. of Christian Antiquities*; Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*; Lightfoot, *Philippians*; Deissmann, *Bible Studies*; Swete, *St. Mark*; Menzies, *Mark*; Trench, *Synon.* ix, xxxv; F. W. Robertson, *Human Race*, 143; R. W. Dale, *Fellowship with Christ*, 247; P. Brooks, *Mystery of Iniquity*, 327; R. W. Church, *Human Life*, 125; W. Sanday, *Conception of Priesthood*, 35.

James Donald.

☞ Ministry

MINISTRY.—The word 'ministry' as now used in English has two leading senses: (a) service rendered, and (b) an official class, especially ecclesiastical. The latter has no place in this discussion, which has regard to the public service rendered by our Lord during His life on earth. In this connexion it describes both the period of the service and its contents. The word comes from the Latin *minister*, properly an adjective, but in its substantive use signifying an 'attendant' or 'servant' who usually performed services of a personal and more or less menial nature. It was also sometimes used of public or religious functionaries. In Greek there are three words which more or less nearly correspond to the Latin *minister*, namely, διάκονος, λειτουργός, ὑπηρέτης. See preceding article.

i. The Nature of our Lord's Ministry.—In the mind of Jesus Himself there lay the ideas of both sacrifice and service as the essential principles of His mission among men.

1. The first element to be noticed is *service*. This presents a threefold aspect: (a) It was notably and characteristically a ministry of *teaching*. The frequent mention of His teaching, the reports of His discourses and sayings, and the fact that He was often called 'Teacher,' emphasize as all-important this function of His ministry. The varied character, the weighty contents, the marvellous power and the sweet charm of His teaching, are familiar thoughts to students of His life. But we must remember also the arduous nature of this work. The bodily toil, the mental strain, the spiritual intensity, all were great; and these were increased by the constant opposition of critics and foes, and by slowness of comprehension on the part of His friends. (b) But incidental to and accompanying this work of teaching was Christ's great ministry of *help and healing*. All the narratives show how large a place this occupied in His public life. Here, too, His labours were vast in sum, and made extraordinary demands—as many indications show—upon His sympathy and strength. (c) Closely related to His teaching, but not exactly identical with it, was our Lord's ministry of *founding His Church*. The

selection and training of His Apostles and other disciples, involving many details of precept in regard to both the principles and the positive institutions of the Kingdom of God, were elements of the first importance in the earthly work of Jesus.

2. The other element is that of *sacrifice*. This was no less prominent in the ministry of Jesus than service. (a) In the Synoptics there is a progress of thought in regard to the fact and meaning of His sufferings. After Peter's confession near Caesarea Philippi, Jesus began to impress on His disciples the certainty of His approaching death (Mat 16:16; Mat 16:21); at the Transfiguration, Moses and Elijah talked with Him of His 'decease (ἔξοδος) which he was to accomplish at Jerusalem' (Luk 9:31); soon after (Mat 17:22 f.) He again spoke of His coming death. The self-giving character of His sufferings is indicated in the manner in which they are spoken of in Luk 9:22-24, Mat 20:22, as compared with Luk 12:50; and the severity of this experience as being something more than death alone, however painful, is indicated in the passages noted, and powerfully enforced by the Agony in Gethsemane and the events of the Crucifixion. Finally, the atoning value of Christ's sacrifice is pointed out in Mat 20:28—the words 'and give his life a ransom for many,' and in the accounts of the Last Supper (Mat 26:27-28, Mar 14:24, Luk 22:19-20). (b) In the Fourth Gospel the sacrificial note is even more distinct. It appears in the announcement of the Forerunner (Joh 1:29; Joh 1:36), in the great saying to Nicodemus (Joh 3:14-16), in the discourse at Capernaum (Joh 6:32-33; Joh 6:48-51), in the parable of the Good Shepherd (Joh 10:11; Joh 10:15; Joh 10:17-18), in the remarks on the visit of the Greeks (Joh 12:20-33), and in the words of comfort to the disciples (Joh 15:13). (c) How strongly the Lord must have impressed this view of His ministry upon the minds of His disciples, is shown in utterances of Peter and of Paul in their addresses and in their Epistles, in the elaborate argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and in the representations of the Lamb in the Apocalypse.

ii. **The Extent of our Lord's Ministry.**—In regard to the extent of the public ministry of Jesus, three main questions present themselves: How long did it last? How much territory did it cover? How much labour did it include?

1. *Duration.*—On the point of duration the principal things to be considered are the limits, the dates, and the resultant theories of scholars.

(1) The limits of the public ministry of Jesus are properly placed between His baptism and His burial, leaving out at the beginning the thirty years of retirement and preparation at Nazareth, and at the end the forty days of occasional appearances after His resurrection. The determination of the time between is a hard problem.

(2) The principal dates to be determined in our Lord's life are those of His birth, baptism, and crucifixion—the duration of the ministry depending upon the latter two,

but involving the first. If it were possible to fix with certainty any two of these, the problem would practically be solved; or, if even one could be placed beyond doubt, it would be greatly simplified. But as a matter of fact scholars have never been able to decide positively on any one of the dates. A full discussion is not called for here (see art. Dates), but the salient points must be presented.

(a) For the Birth of Jesus, we know that it occurred in the reign of the emperor Augustus (Luk 2:1-6), and not long before the death of Herod the Great (Mat 2:1; Mat 2:19). Herod died probably not later than b.c. 4, as is made out from statements of Josephus (see Dates), and thus it appears that by an early error (of Dionysius Exiguus, an abbot of the 6th cent.) the generally accepted era of Christ's birth has been irrevocably fixed a few years later than the actual time. The probable date of the Nativity is somewhere between b.c. 6 and 4.

(b) For the Baptism, we know that it took place at some time within the 'fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar' (Luk 3:1-2), for this was the time that John began to baptize, and Jesus was among those who received the rite at his hands (Mat 3:13, Mar 1:9, Luk 3:21); but none of the accounts gives any definite note as to the exact point during the ministry of John when the baptism occurred. St. Luke states (Luk 3:23) that 'Jesus when he *began* (presumably His ministry or teaching) was *about* thirty years old.' But neither His exact age nor the exact point of His 'beginning' is indicated. The probability is that He was either just thirty, or from one to three years past that—hardly under thirty. So that here we have no certain number of years to add to the already uncertain year of the Lord's birth. If we take b.c. 4 as the Birth date and add thirty years, it brings us to a.d. 26 as the probable year of the baptism; but if St. Luke's 'about thirty' be extended two years, it would be 28. Now, as to the 'fifteenth year of Tiberius,' that was probably the year 28, but may have been 26. Augustus died in a.d. 14 (Aug. 19), and, if the beginning of the reign of his successor Tiberius be reckoned from that date, the 'fifteenth year' would begin in Aug. 28, and the baptism of Jesus would be at some time in the twelve months following. But it is possible that St. Luke dates the beginning of Tiberius' reign from the time he was associated in the government with Augustus, *i.e.* in a.d. 12; and so the 'fifteenth year' could begin in Aug. 26. On this, however, it is proper to remark that the more common mode of reckoning would be from the actual sole reign, and not from the previous association of an emperor in the government.

(c) For the Crucifixion, we know that it occurred during the governorship of Pontius Pilate in Judaea (all the Evangelists), and this administration covered about ten years, from a.d. 26 to 36. Other data (see Dates) help to fix upon near the central part of this period as the time of the Crucifixion, between 28 and 31, more likely 29 or 30.

(3) These uncertainties have given rise among scholars to a number of different theories of the duration of our Lord's ministry. It will be sufficient to mention three, among which choice, according to what seems to be the greatest probability, should be made.

(a) The *short period* theory. This assigns but a little over a year to the ministry. According to it, the Baptism probably occurred early in the year 29, that is, during the fifteenth year of Tiberius, reckoning that to have begun in Aug. 28, and the Baptism to have taken place early in the year following. The first Passover (Joh 2:13) came soon after, and the last Passover just a year later. Between these two Passovers lay the whole ministry, hence this theory is called the *bipaschal* view. To obtain this result, the feast of Joh 5:1 is held not to be a Passover; the text of Joh 6:4 is regarded as incorrect (on slight documentary evidence), and read as omitting 'of the passover,' and so leaving this also an unnamed feast. After disposing of these two feasts, the order of feasts mentioned in John is fixed as follows: Passover (Joh 2:13), a.d. 29; Pentecost (Joh 5:1), nameless or omitted (Joh 6:4), Tabernacles (Joh 7:2), Dedication (Joh 10:22), and Passover (Joh 11:55), spring of a.d. 30. With this scheme derived from the Fourth Gospel, the data furnished by the Synoptics is made to harmonize by slighting the indications of a time of nearly ripe grain (Mat 12:1, Mar 2:23, Luk 6:1), which it is hard to locate if there were only two Passovers in the whole series of events. But this theory is defended (see von Soden in *Encyc. Bibl.*) on the following grounds: (i.) That the correct interpretation of the 'fifteenth year' of Tiberius is from the date of his sole reign, and therefore is a.d. 28-29. (ii.) The events of the Gospel narrative are too meagre to have extended over more than a year. (iii.) This view was held by many of the Fathers as early as the 2nd century. The only one of these grounds that has any real force is the first, and as to that it may be replied that we are not compelled to put the Crucifixion in 30, and thereby limit the time to one year. The second ground is entirely subjective—to many other scholars it seems far too short a time for all the events (with their implications of others and of intervals) to have taken place. As to the third ground, it may be said that the Fathers were not unanimous, and they had only the same data for forming opinions that modern and more accurate chronologers have. Besides its inadequacy to account for all the facts, this theory deals in an arbitrary way with the text of Joh 6:4 and with the indication furnished by the incident of the grain fields (Mat 12:1 etc.).

(b) The *long period* theory. This holds that there were four Passovers in the ministry, and is hence called the *quadripaschal* theory. It dates from Eusebius in the 4th cent., and is held by many modern scholars. This takes the unnamed feast of Joh 5:1 to be a Passover, holds to the commonly received text of Joh 6:4, puts the Baptism early in 27 and the Crucifixion in 30, thus making the ministry extend over three years. But there is difference of arrangement of details even among those who hold this view, and it is not at all certain that the feast of Joh 5:1 can be fixed as a Passover.

(c) The *medium period* theory. This holds that the feast of Joh_5:1 is not a Passover, and that there were only three Passovers in the ministry—so the *tripaschal* theory. As to what feast it was, and as to the arrangement of all the details, there is much difference among the advocates of the medium period. But from a year and a half to two and a half is the time allowed by those who reject both the other theories. If the Baptism occurred in the autumn of 28 or early spring of 29, then to get in three Passovers it will be necessary to put the Crucifixion in 31—to which there are serious objections. But if the Baptism was in 26-27, then the Crucifixion could be assigned to 29, which is not improbable. It must be said in view of all these difficulties, that no positive convictions in regard to the duration of the ministry are, in the present state of knowledge, tenable, but the probabilities are upon the whole in favour of a ministry of more than one and less than three years' duration.

2. *Localities*.—In regard to the topographical extent of our Lord's ministry we have a much simpler question to deal with. His labours extended throughout Palestine, and on a few occasions to contiguous lands. (a) Judaea, in several different places, and more especially Jerusalem, witnessed some of His most important deeds and teachings. (b) Galilee, however, was the principal scene of His teaching and healing work. The Lake and its cities,—Capernaum with others,—Nazareth, Cana, and other towns and a number of villages, the plains and mountains of populous Galilee shared in the deeds of His busy life. Two certainly, and probably three, separate tours of the whole of Galilee are mentioned: (1) Mat_4:23, Mar_1:39, Luk_4:44; (2) Luk_8:1; (3) Mat_9:35, Mar_6:6,—though it is possible that (2) and (3) are the same. (c) In passing through Samaria several times (Joh_4:4 ff., Luk_9:52 f., Luk_17:11) He paused to perform some work of mercy. (d) Into Phœnicia, 'the region of Tyre and Sidon,' He went at least once (Mat_15:21, Mar_7:24). (e) Several visits to districts contiguous to Galilee, to the east and north, are mentioned, namely, the visit to Gerasa or Gadara during His Galilaean ministry (Mat_8:28, Mar_5:1, Luk_8:26), to Decapolis (Mar_7:31), to the unknown Magadan (Mat_15:39) or Dalmanutha (Mar_8:10), and Caesarea-Philippi (Mat_16:13, Mar_8:27). (f) In regard to the region beyond the Jordan commonly known as Peraea, there are interesting notices, but some uncertainties. The first notice is in the account of John's baptism as taking place at Bethany beyond Jordan (Joh_1:28). Much later there was a ministry of uncertain duration in Peraea (Joh_10:40, Luk_13:22; Luk_13:32), and still later a journey through the same region on His last visit to Jerusalem (Mat_19:1, Mar_10:1).

3. *Labours*.—The extent of our Lord's ministry is also to be regarded from the point of view of the labours He performed during its course. (a) The actual labours recorded by the Evangelists are considerable in sum. (b) That these were only samples and specimens of His work is distinctly and repeatedly implied. (c) Pointed allusions to the magnitude of His work are frequent (Mat_4:23; Mat_4:25, Mar_1:32; Mar_1:34, Luk_4:14-15, and many similar passages). (d) There are many indications of the

insistent demands upon His attention (*e.g.* Mar 1:35-37; Mar 2:1-2; Mar 3:7-9; Mar 3:20 and similar ones), of His weariness and need of rest (Joh 4:6, Mar 4:35 ff; Mar 6:30-32, and others), once of the anxiety of His relatives (Mar 3:21-31). (e) The enormous amount of His unrecorded labours is distinctly asserted (Joh 21:25).

The following conspectus may serve to present in clearer view some of the points already discussed:

| | | | | |
|------|-------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|
| I. | The Thirty Years. | Birth to Baptism. | Bethlehem. Egypt. Nazareth. | b.c. 5 or 4 to a.d. 26 or 28. |
| II. | Opening Scenes. | Baptism to First Miracle. | Beyond Jordan. Wilderness. Judæa. Cana of Galilee. | 26 or 28. |
| III. | Earlier Ministry. | First Miracle to Beginning of Work in Galilee. | Capernaum. Jerusalem. Samaria. | Between 27 and 29. |
| IV. | Central Ministry. | Preceding Events and First Tour in Galilee. | Nazareth. Capernaum. Other Cities of Galilee. | Probably 28, 29. |
| | | Events connected with Second Tour in Galilee. | Cities and Villages of Galilee. Gadara. Nazareth. | ... |
| | | Third Tour, and Departure from Galilee. | Cities and Villages. The Lake. Capernaum. Tyre and Sidon. Decapolis. | ... |

| | | | | |
|------|--------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| | | | Cæsarea Philippi. | |
| V. | Later Ministry. | Close of Galilæan Ministry to Triumphal Entry. | Galilee. Judæa. Peræa. | Probably 29 or 30. |
| VI. | Closing Scenes. | Triumphal Entry to Crucifixion and Burial. | Jerusalem and vicinity. | ... |
| VII. | The Forty Days. | Resurrectio n to Ascension. | Jerusalem. Galilee. Olivet. | ... |

iii. Results of our Lord's Ministry.—When we attempt to sum up the results of our Lord's ministry, we have to distinguish between those which were gathered during His life and those which have been maturing through the centuries following.

1. During His life.—Briefly, we should here have in mind: (*a*) the multitudes who were reached by His personal influence both in His teaching and His healing; (*b*) the number of particular adherents won, including the Twelve and all other disciples mentioned in the Gospels, together with those mentioned or alluded to in the early chapters of Acts; (*c*) the training of the Twelve for their work after His departure; and (*d*) the establishing of the institutions of the Kingdom of God—preaching, the ordinances, the Church.

2. Since His ascension.—The history of Christianity for nineteen centuries only partially describes the outcome of Christ's short ministry upon earth. It is indeed a commonplace, but withal a glorious truth, to say that no other term of service in any man's life, whether longer or shorter, was ever so potent an influence or so formative a force for all that is best in human affairs.

Literature.—The Lives of Christ, esp. Andrews. *The Life of our Lord*; Broadus, *Harmony of the Gospels*, with Notes on dates by A. T. Robertson; art. 'Chronology' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible (Turner) and in *Encyc. Bibl.* (von Soden), and the literature adduced; art. in *The Biblical World* (Chicago) for Dec. 1905, by Professor Votaw.

E. C. Dargan.

☞ Minstrels

MINSTRELS.—See Flute-players.

☞ Mint

MINT (ἡδύοσμον, *mentha*) is mentioned only in Mat_23:23 and the parallel passage Luk_11:42, where it is represented as being subject to tithe. It is a familiar garden herb, belonging to the natural order Labiatae. The species commonly grown in Palestine is horse-mint (*M. sylvestris*), and there can be little doubt that this is the mint of Scripture. It is extensively used for culinary purposes, and is also highly valued as a carminative. Mint was probably one of the ‘bitter herbs’ with which the Paschal lamb was eaten.

Hugh Duncan.

☞ Miracles

MIRACLES.—The process of thought and research, both theological and scientific, has led to a position where belief in the actuality, in the career of Jesus, of those remarkable activities and manifestations summed up under the comprehensive and popular term ‘miracle,’ is made possible if not inevitable. The prevailing negative attitude of science shows signs of being abandoned in view of enlarging understanding of the possibilities both in Matter and in Spirit, and theology is coming to see that the miraculous events recorded of Him who was the Son of God and the Regenerator of the Race must not be conceived of as in any sense or degree a violation of the order of Nature; and that viewed in this way they become, instead of difficulties and stumbling-blocks in the way of faith, some of its most convincing reinforcements. It is scarcely too much to affirm that a belief in these occurrences as vital parts of the Christian revelation is rising, compared with which all previous belief is feeble and superficial. Without being unduly optimistic, we may anticipate that the ‘ages of faith’ in every department of Christian truth, and not least in that of miracle, are yet to come. This consummation is being prepared for in modern conceptions of the Order of Nature, of Human Personality, and of the Divine Being.

1. Modern conceptions of *the Order of Nature*. Christian advocates are becoming thoroughly disposed to accept unreservedly the scientific teaching of the Unity of Nature, carefully guarding the admission from being read as the Uniformity of Nature. They recognize and take account of the inalienable connexion between cause and effect by which the Universe consists. They do not regard the miracles of the Gospels as in the least degree arbitrary interruptions of the Order of Nature, but rather as a revelation of the infinite extent of that order. The ancient antagonism between the Natural and the Supernatural has broken down, and the two spheres are seen to be one, regarded from opposite poles. Grave objections lie against the term 'supernatural,' which is entirely un-Scriptural, and many modern thinkers prefer the term 'spiritual' to express the animating and sustaining Power which pervades all things. Without the spiritual the physical universe has no ground of being, and nothing exists, not the least fraction of the material, still less anything of human affection and sympathy and personal life-force, apart from the Universal Life. If the term 'supernatural' be retained, it must be on the distinct understanding that while all things may be conceived of as super-naturally sustained, it may with equal propriety be asserted that the whole Universe, including not only the physical but the mental, moral, and spiritual in human personality, is a part of the Order of Nature. The powers and sympathies that work in man cannot be separated from that order, and it is most natural, most agreeable to the whole constitution of human nature, that it shall be animated, sustained, and governed by the Divine Power and Life. Men of science, moreover, are increasingly willing to admit the necessity of the spiritual and rational as the ultimate ground of the physical; and recent investigations into the make of the so-called 'atom,' and the vast potentialities of Matter, will further develop the distrust of all dogmatic assertion that nothing in the nature of the events recorded in the Gospels and called 'miracles' is possible or credible. Sir Oliver Lodge (*Hibbert Journal*, October 1902) writes:

'The root question or outstanding controversy between science and faith rests upon two distinct conceptions of the universe: the one, that of a self-contained and self-sufficient universe, with no outlook into or links with anything beyond, uninfluenced by any life or mind except such as is connected with a visible and tangible material body; and the other conception, that of a universe lying open to all manner of spiritual influences, permeated through and through with a Divine spirit, guided and watched by living minds, acting through the medium of law indeed, but with intelligence and love behind the law; a universe by no means self-sufficient or self-contained, but with feelers at every pore groping into another supersensuous order of existence, where reign laws hitherto unimagined by science, but laws as real and as mighty as those by which the material universe is governed.'

2. *The nature of Human Personality*.—Researches, anthropological and psychological, into the nature and possibilities of man have greatly multiplied during the present

generation, and something of the vast region of potentiality lying above and beneath and beyond all that is actually realized has been revealed. The conception of the ideal human personality has been immeasurably enlarged and exalted. Psychological investigation is only in its infancy, and yet enough has been arrived at to make it certain that the powers of humanity remain essentially unfathomed. Beneath or above the ordinary consciousness of man, and beyond the powers which at present his will controls and organizes, are other and larger powers at present uncontrolled and unorganized by the personal force, but manifest in exceptional phases of human life, such as dreams, hypnosis, clairvoyance, clairaudience, somnambulism, or unwonted excitement and spiritual exaltation. We may call man, as we are acquainted with him, a personality, a living centre of original will and action, made in the image of the Deity. But yet it is far truer to regard him as a personality which has not yet arrived, the mere rudiment of a personality whose powers, as he controls them, Teach out beyond his control to regions of potentiality as yet unrecognized, and showing that the true personality is vastly greater and mightier than the present actual. 'Man partly is, and wholly hopes to be.' The powers at present possessed and controlled by man are the veriest suggestion of the powers that are his by right of nature, made as he was for intimate alliance with the Divine Being. But the perfect Personality was realized in the Son of Man who was also Son of God. The perfect Personality cannot be conceived of apart from the Divine Personality, for it is of the very essence of the Ideal Man that his nature shall be possessed and controlled by the Divine. By the Divine power the human nature consists. And the Lord Jesus plainly marked it as the essential condition of His power that He was morally and spiritually one with God.

3. *The Divine Nature.*—A wholesome feature of modern conceptions of the Being of God is their sense of mystery. Holding fast, on the one hand, to the essential knowableness of the Deity and to His self-revelation as the centre of all Divine action, theologians, on the other hand, admit the impossibility of giving dogmatic expression to the mode of the Divine Being. 'In mystery the soul abides,' not only the Divine but even the human soul. But taking the teaching of the Lord Jesus, interpreted as it was by His life before God and man, and as it is by an increasing Christian experience, they conceive of God as the Infinite Will and Intelligence that animates while it transcends the whole creation, visible and invisible, a Divine Presence ever seeking self-realization and self-revelation in His creation, in some true measure expressing Himself in all the works of His hands, even in the non-human creation; but most really of all in human life with its manifold sympathies and powers, actual and potential, conscious and sub-conscious (or super-conscious). The conception is of a Living God present and active in all life, but supremely in the nobler impulses and humanities that glorify mankind. In the life of men as they are, in their poor actual, the Divine Mind finds a real though feeble and fragmentary expression, and as that nature is developed and its latent powers are evoked and made part of the conscious life, is

destined to find a fuller channel for its living action. And the nature which was fitted to be a complete channel, and more than channel—an active co-operator with Himself—the Divine Being, revealing Himself as Father, finds in Him who was perfectly one with man and at the same time morally, spiritually, and essentially one with God.

In this fact, that the Divine Power dwelt in its fulness in the personality of Jesus, we find the unifying principle for all the miracles of the Gospels. The master-principle of them all is contained in our Lord's own declaration, 'If I by the funder of God cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon you' (Luk 11:20). This declaration is in complete harmony with His repeated affirmations that the ultimate power by which He wrought His beneficent and mighty works was the same as that by which He knew and taught the truth—the Divine power dwelling in Him (Joh 5:19; Joh 5:30; Joh 14:10).

The great deeds of healing and of revelation were due to the direct action of the Infinite Life and active Power by which all things consist (1) on the nature of Jesus, and (2) through Him, so empowered, upon the life of man and upon the world. Our Lord makes it perfectly plain that the miraculous deeds were morally conditioned, were therefore a moral achievement, and depended upon His living faith in and union with God. Of Himself He could do nothing (Joh 5:19). But He also has the feeling and knowledge that in His own nature there was a potentiality of superhuman working. And the chief point to emphasize is that the Personality of Jesus cannot be conceived of even momentarily as apart from the Divine Life. He perfectly lived in God. The purpose of all was to accomplish the Divine will by the establishment of His Kingdom among men. Here and elsewhere the miracles are represented, not as an arbitrary putting forth of a supernatural power altogether out of relation to any human capacity or possibility, but as arising spontaneously out of the unique relation He sustained to the Infinite Life; not as something given, while it could have been withheld, for the sake of commending the moral and spiritual and personal claims of Jesus, but as vital and essential parts of the Divine Revelation. The evidential value of the work was secondary, the need of man and the Divine impulse primary.

In order to get an intelligent faith in the Gospel miracles, it is of great consequence at what point we approach the problem. The important matter is to begin with the less obscure, with those works which are most closely and obviously related to what may be called the innate forces of human nature. This gives us as our starting-point the healing works of Jesus. Careful study must be given to the principles and methods employed in these cases of restoration from sickness, infirmity, and distress. A growing disposition is evident to receive these as genuinely historical, on the ground that they are not in themselves inconceivable, related as they are to the forces perceived to be at work in the complex nature of man. Psychical research has brought, and is more fully bringing, to light a vast wealth of resource in the depths

and heights of human personality. And a close study of the method Of Jesus convinces us that He worked upon this complex nature (see art. Cures). His miracles were not simply the output of an alien force, but the living exercise of a Divine force, deeply akin to all human powers, already working in the capacities, sympathies, and life-ties of humanity, utilizing the known in all their unknown ramifications, and also the unknown and unsuspected. These works are no less Divine because they are not emphasized as supernatural, the Divine energy being more truly conceived of as the normal and natural. If these deepest principles which our Lord followed are duly recognized in our faith and conception, then the remaining miracles, most of which are rejected by many who receive the healings, become not only not incredible, but inevitable as the completion of a revelation otherwise essentially incomplete. One who has gained a rational and imaginative faith in the healing of body and mind, by the incarnate pity and power of God in Christ Jesus, will be prepared to believe that it is extremely unlikely that Christ should so freely reveal the power of God in this sphere, and not go beyond to give visible expression to the power that resides in and animates and at the same time controls all Nature. And those miracles which are associated with the life and career of Jesus, being wrought not so much by the power of our Lord, as by the Divine Power acting upon Him, have a strong presumption in their favour, congruous as they are with the whole method of His mighty works and with the one revelation given in Him.

A. Miracles of Jesus.

1. *Our Lord's own description of them.*—A distinction must be made between what Jesus Himself said of the miracles and the description given by the people of the time, who were under the influence of low and vulgar ideas of a Divine revelation, and by the Evangelists, who were not altogether emancipated from current conceptions. (1) It must be borne in mind that the Synoptics give very few specific terms which our Lord applied to His own supernatural action. They are the record of His deeds, not of His speech concerning them. But the Evangelists' description may be taken without much deduction as a faithful reflexion of the Master's usage. Jesus does refer to His works, as in Mat_16:9-10; He speaks of casting out demons by the Spirit of God (Mat_12:28) or by the finger of God (Luk_11:20), and declares that 'this kind' (τοῦτο δὲ τὸ γένος) goeth not out except by prayer (Mat_17:21 Textus Receptus). He refers to the deed itself and its blessed result, without characterizing it by any specific term. (2) His favourite term for them, according to the Fourth Gospel, was ἔργα, 'works' (Joh_5:36; Joh_10:25; Joh_10:32; Joh_10:37-38). He uses the same word also of the good and beautiful acts of others (καλὸν ἔργον, Mar_14:6). He makes no great distinction between His ordinary works of mercy and the extraordinary, regarding them all alike as wrought simply and naturally in the way of His life and

vocation. The miracles were not the highest works; they belong to a lower level of manifestation as compared with His moral and spiritual revelation of God (Joh 14:11). But He also qualifies ἔργα: ‘the works that none other man did’ (Joh 15:24), probably including under that category the healing and other mighty deeds. Utility was the chief element in His view of all His deeds and actions. (3) He also calls them δυνάμεις (‘powers’ or ‘mighty works’), emphasizing the striking manifestation of Divine Power overpassing all human capacity (Mat 11:21). The Evangelists also commonly employ this term (Mat 13:58, Mar 6:5). (4) He also speaks of His works as σημεῖα, ‘signs’ (Joh 6:26), carefully separating Himself from the popular estimate of what constituted a Divinely significant act (see art. Sign). The Fourth Gospel consistently applies this word to the works of Jesus. Probably we must see in the fact a feature due to prolonged reflexion on the events in the light of after-history. But the term is singularly fitting to describe the Divinely significant works of our Lord as signs of another and higher order of things, leading on the thought and imagination to higher spheres of being, fuller powers of soul, Diviner possibilities for humanity. (5) The word τέρατα (‘prodigies’) is never applied by Jesus to His own working. Only once He uses the word, and then to disavow the idea involved in it and to sever His action from it (Joh 4:48). In the Apocalyptic discourse these τέρατα are associated with false Christs and false prophets (Mat 24:24, Mar 13:22). (6) The popular use of σημεῖον was most akin to the τέρας. With this the English word ‘miracle’ has most affinity. It is not the equivalent of any word used by Jesus. The Authorized Version uses it to translate σημεῖον and δύναμις. The Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 practically abandons it. The idea of the word ‘supernatural’ also is not found in the NT or in the whole Bible, and the term should be relegated to the region of the obsolete. The word ‘spiritual’ is an excellent substitute, conserving the idea expressed by it without committing the mind to any untenable and indefensible philosophy.

2. Characteristics of our Lord’s miracles.—Briefly, the features of the miracles which commend them to our judgment and affection may be stated as—(1) Spontaneity. They arise out of the occasion—are never deliberated, unless the raising of Lazarus be an exception (Joh 11:4), but spring from the present practical impulse of compassion and desire to help man, and the prompting of the Divine Spirit (Joh 2:4 ff., Luk 18:40-42 etc.). (2) High moral purpose. The miracles of Jesus ever sought the highest and Divinest ends, and were never ends in themselves. In all His works there were no signs of any ostentatious exercise of power. Sternly He forbade any public advertisement of His healings, etc., which might rouse the popular excitement. (3) Strong restraint in use of supernormal power. The Temptation of the wilderness witnesses to what was characteristic of all His life, His constant refusal to use His

power for personal ease, gratification, or convenience. Nothing was done by extraordinary which could be done by ordinary means. (4) Moral dignity and congruity with the whole spirit and life of Jesus. His miracles spring out of His innermost nature, and reveal the moral harmony and winsomeness of His Person. Herein lies a most fruitful comparison with other alleged miracles, ecclesiastical and mediaeval and modern. The vast majority of these latter fail to commend themselves to us as worthy exercises of a Divine power. The criterion must not, however, be unduly pressed, for natures differ widely in what they regard as morally fitting and suitable for Divine action. But, employed broadly, it may help us to discriminate between alleged miraculous events as to how far they are worthy of credence. (5) Helpfulness to mankind was the abiding characteristic of our Lord's miracles. In most cases they were wrought for the immediate succour of suffering humanity, and for the revelation, in and through this, of the Divine love and pity. In His works on the non-human world also the need of man was continually served, more especially his need for vision of the higher facts of existence. His action never issued in meaningless marvels or needless wonders and in those that seem farthest removed from the requirements of mankind a revelation was given of the kind of power which animated and sustained all nature, and ordered its course.

3. The whole texture of the Gospel narratives is *complicated with the supernormal*. They presuppose a unique relation to God in Jesus, and His possession of a miracle-working power. 'In most of the reports the action of Jesus is so interwoven with unmistakably authentic words, that the two elements cannot be separated' (A. B. Bruce, art. 'Jesus' in *Encyc. Bibl.*). If excision be made from the Evangelic records (1) of all that directly narrates His unique action as a healer and wonderworker, (2) of all that presupposes the possibility and actuality of such unique action, (3) of all that testifies to His authority and power due to a unique relation to God—the Gospels are left bald and bare and mutilated beyond description. The very warp and woof of the fabric is destroyed.

As an example, apply the process to Mark 1-3. As a residue we have—

1. The account of the Baptist's preaching (without the reference to the prophetic witness).
2. The Baptism of John (robbed of the spiritual endowment of Jesus and its accompaniments).
3. The bare mention of a temptation in the wilderness (with angels excluded. The story cannot be filled up by reference to the other Evangelists, for their account presupposes a miracle-working power in Jesus).

4. John's imprisonment, and announcement of the Kingdom by Jesus.
5. Call of Peter, Andrew, James, and John.
6. Teaching of Jesus in the synagogue, and spread of His fame (the latter left like a pyramid on its apex without the restoration of the demoniac).
7. Entrance to house of Peter (healing of wife's mother excluded).
8. Account of solitary prayer (with no action of Jesus to account for such prolonged prayer).
9. Preaching in synagogue (mere repetition apart from healing of leper and casting out devil).
10. Account of sudden popularity (with no adequate reason given for it).
11. Another repetition of the statement that He taught the people (Mar_2:3-12 all being excised as entirely complicated with miracle).
12. Call of Matthew.
13. Conflict with scribes and Pharisees in regard to eating and drinking with publicans and sinners, and fasting, and His teaching consequent thereon.
14. Pharisees and Herodians take counsel to kill Him (but no reason given—the healing of withered hand being removed).
15. Withdrawal of Jesus (following by multitude being omitted because of motive given in Mar_2:8).
16. Call of disciples (commission reduced to preaching and teaching. Teaching in Mar_3:20-30 cut out as entirely dependent on His exorcism of demons).
17. Teaching of true relationship to Himself (strongly savouring of presumption, apart from reasons which have disappeared in process of excision).

The whole narrative is rendered colourless and dislocated, the only section which is left fairly un mutilated being Mar_2:13-28. 'That the healing ministry was not only a fact, but a great outstanding fact, is attested by the popularity of Jesus and by the various theories which were invented to account for the remarkable phenomena' (A. B. Bruce, *l.c.*). The above analysis forcibly illustrates this assertion.

4. Chronological list of miracles of Jesus.

(a) Preliminary Period, from Baptism to call of leading Apostles.

| | found in |
|-----------------------------|----------|
| 1. Water made wine | Jn. |
| 2. Cleansing of the Temple | Jn. |
| 3. Son of nobleman restored | Jn. |

(b) First Period of Galilaean Ministry, to Death of John the Baptist.

| | | found in |
|------------------------------------|---------|----------|
| 4. Escape from hostile crowd | | Lk. |
| 5. Draught of fishes | | Lk. |
| 6. Capernaum demoniac | Mk. | Lk. |
| 7. Peter's wife's mother | Mt. Mk. | Lk. |
| 8. General healings and exorcisms. | Mt. Mk. | Lk. |
| 9. Leper | Mt. Mk. | Lk. |
| 10. Palsied man | Mt. Mk. | Lk. |
| 11. Impotent man of Bethesda | | Jn. |
| 12. Man with withered hand | Mt. Mk. | Lk. |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|--|-----|-----|
| 13. General healings and exorcisms. | Mt. | | Mk. | Lk. |
| 14. Centurion's servant | | | | Lk. |
| 15. Son of widow of Nain raised | | | | Lk. |
| 16. General healings and exorcisms | | | | Lk. |
| 17. Dumb demoniac healed | Mt. | | | |
| 18. Tempest stilled | Mt. | | Mk. | Lk. |
| 19. Gadarene demoniac or demoniacs | Mt. | | Mk. | Lk. |
| 20. Raising of Jairus' daughter | Mt. | | Mk. | Lk. |
| 21. Issue of blood | Mt. | | Mk. | Lk. |
| 22. Two blind men healed | Mt. | | | |

(c) *Second Period of Galilaean ministry, to its close.*

found in

- | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 23. Five thousand fed | Mt. | Mk. | Lk. | |
| 24. Jesus walks on sea | Mt. | Mk. | | Jn. |
| 25. Daughter of Syro-Phoenician woman | Mt. | Mk. | | |
| 26. Deaf and dumb restored | | Mk. | | |
| 27. General healing of infirmities | Mt. | | | |
| 28. Four thousand fed | Mt. | Mk. | | |
| 29. Blind man restored | | Mk. | | |
| 30. Deaf and dumb epileptic | Mt. | Mk. | | Lk. |
| 31. Stater in fish's mouth | Mt. | Mk. | | |

(d) Ministry in Judaea and Peraea.

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|-----|----------|----|
| | | | found in | |
| 32. Man blind from birth restored | | | | Jn |
| 33. Impotent woman restored | | Lk. | | |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----|--|-----|-----|
| 34. Man with dropsy healed | | | Lk. | |
| 35. Ten lepers cleansed. | | | Lk. | |
| 36. Lazarus raised | | | | Jn. |
| 37. Two blind men near Jericho | Mt. | | Mk. | Lk. |

(e) *Closing Days of Life.*

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----|--|----------|-----|
| | | | found in | |
| 38. Withering of fig-tree | Mt. | | Mk. | |
| 39. Cleansing of Temple | Mt. | | Mk. | Lk. |
| 40. Healing of Malchus | Mt. | | Lk. | Jn. |
| 41. Falling to ground of soldiers | | | | Jn. |

Examining the above list, we may remark—

(1) The same event is probably referred to in 2 and 39. Possibly also, but on the whole not probably, 3 and 14 refer to same healing.

(2) Instances which seem to come so near to familiar human experience as to need no assumption of miracle are 2, 4, 41.

(3) In 31 no indication is given that the command of Jesus was meant to be obeyed. It may readily have been understood by the disciple as a parabolic expression of the surety of providential care.

(4) Cases where the reporting of the healing is so casual that nothing as to the method of Jesus can be securely built upon the narrative are 10, 12, 33, 34, 40. The chief interest of the Evangelist lies in the other part of the story. In the case of Malchus, St. John, who reports the injury, makes no mention of any healing, and the interest of St. Luke is evangelical rather than medical, emphasizing the generosity and compassion of Jesus.

(5) 'Nature miracles' are found (a) in each period; (b) in the Fourth Gospel; (c) in the Synoptic tradition, both in the Double and Triple Synopsis. They are therefore as well attested as the works of healing. The walking on the sea is found in the Double Synopsis; the stilling of the storm and the withering of the fig-tree in the Triple Synopsis; the feeding of the multitude in all four Gospels.

(6) The healings of nervous diseases, which many are more willing to accept on the ground of their likeness to well-known medical facts of to-day, are not better attested than those involving physical disorder and disease. The healings of fever, leprosy, issue of blood, and blindness are all recorded in the Triple Synopsis. The raising of the dead is found in all four Gospels; one case, the daughter of Jairus, is attested by the three Synoptics. The NT makes no distinction between these classes of miracles, but the evidence for all the classes is equally strong (see art. Cures, § 11).

5. Classification of miracles of Jesus.—As a typical example of the customary classification of miracles, may be given that of Westcott (*Introd. to the Gospels*)—

I. Miracles on Nature. 1. Miracles of creative power: (α) water made wine, (β) bread multiplied, (γ) walking on the water. 2. Miracles of Providence: (α) miracles of blessing: (1) first draught of fishes, (2) storm stilled, (3) stater in fish's mouth, (4) second draught of fishes; (β) Miracle of judgment: withering of fig-tree.

II. Miracles on Man. (α) Miracles of personal faith: (1) organic defects (blind): (α) faith special (Mat 9:29-31), (b) faith absolute—Bartimaeus restored; (2) chronic impurity: (α) open (leprosy)—faith special, the one leper—faith special and absolute contrasted, the ten lepers; (b) secret—woman with issue. (β) Miracles of intercession: (1) organic defects (simple intercession): (a) the blind (Mar 8:22-26), (b) the deaf and dumb (Mar 7:31-37); (2) mortal sicknesses—intercession based on natural ties: (a) fever (Joh 4:46-54), (b) paralysis—centurion's servant and man borne of four. (γ) Miracles of love: (1) organic defect—blindness (John 9); (2) disease—(a) fever, (b) dropsy, (c)

withered hand, (d) impotent man, (e) woman with spirit of infirmity; (3) death—(a) death chamber, (b) the bier, (c) the tomb.

III. Miracles on Spirit World. (α) Miracles of intercession: (1) simple intercession—(a) dumb man with devil, (b) blind and dumb man; (2) intercession based on natural ties—(α) Syro-Phœnician's daughter, (b) lunatic boy. (β) Miracles of antagonism: (1) in synagogue—unclean spirit cast out, (2) in tombs—the lepers cast out.

The chief defect in the above is its endorsement of the term 'Nature miracles' as applied to the first class. If 'Nature' be rightly measured, the term may legitimately be used to cover the whole ground of our Lord's working, for the complex nature of man cannot be severed from the universal order. Moreover, the distinction is, apart from that consideration, an arbitrary one, for several of these so-called 'Nature miracles' are wrought in the sphere of our Lord's human nature, and are conceivably extensions of human, mental, and psychical faculty; and some of them are wrought in and upon the bodily form of Jesus Himself. The walking upon the water is an example of the latter. The draught of fishes is a miracle of vision, an extension of human perception, as well as an example of Divine control of the animal creation. A similar element must be traced in the instance of the coin in the fish's month, if we are to understand a miracle here.* [Note: The power of the mind over the body may reasonably be conceived as at work in these instances, for it is impossible, with the growing knowledge of the inter-relations of mind and body, to set an arbitrary limit to that influence.] Other defects are: 'Miracles of Providence,' 'Miracles of Blessing' and of 'Love,' are terms that may be applied to other than the classes given.

A truer classification may be suggested as follows:

I. Healings of bodily ailments—as blindness, leprosy, lameness, dropsy, deafness and dumbness, fevers, and manifold ailments and infirmities.

II. Healings of nervous diseases—as paralysis or palsy, simple epilepsy, possibly the woman with the spirit of infirmity (unless her ailment be physical).

III. Healings of nervous and psychical disorders—epilepsy associated with idiocy or insanity, and varieties of mania.

IV. Revelations of power in the nature of Jesus—walking on the sea.

V. Revelation of Jesus in nature and upon the organic world—as draughts of fishes, and stater in fish's mouth.

VI. Power upon the organic world—multiplied loaves and fishes, water made wine, fig-tree withered.

VII. Power upon the inorganic world—stilling of the tempest.

VIII. Raising of the dead—Jairus' daughter, son of widow of Nain, Lazarus.

B. 'Miraculous' events associated with Career of Jesus.

found in

| | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. Annunciation by angels | Mt. | | Lk. | |
| 2. Virgin-birth | Mt. | | Lk. | |
| 3. Angels' song | | | Lk. | |
| 4. Other appearances of angels in protection of the Child | Mt. | | | |
| 5. Star of Magi | Mt. | | | |
| 6. Voice at Baptism of Jesus | Mt. | Mk. | Lk. | |
| 7. Descent of dove | Mt. | Mk. | Lk. | Jn. |
| 8. Transfiguration | Mt. | Mk. | Lk. | |
| 9. Voices at Transfiguration | Mt. | Mk. | Lk. | |
| 10. Opening of graves after death | Mt. | | | |

of Jesus

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 11. Rending of veil of Temple | Mt. | Mk. | Lk. | |
| 12. Darkness over land | | Mk. | Lk. | |
| 13. Earthquakes | Mk. | | | |
| 14. The Resurrection | Mt. | Mk. | Lk. | Jn. |
| 15. The Ascension | | Mk. | Lk. | Jn. |

In the above, noteworthy facts are—

(1) Only one Evangelist in each case records 3, 4, 5, 10, 13. Number 10 stands by itself, and is not found in other Gospels, although these speak of the rending of the veil of the Temple. The latter event (11) is also possibly an accompaniment of the remarkable physical phenomena 12 and 13, which were associated with the time of our Lord's death. 1, 2, 12 are recorded by two Evangelists only.

(2) While the historicity, as objective events, of 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 cannot be reasonably denied with any dogmatism, especially if the principles enunciated above be intelligently accepted, yet we are free to admit that they are such as were not unlikely to be added to the Gospel tradition by disciples and by the first Christian community, who were not entirely freed from Jewish prepossessions (see art. Sign). It would be grossly disproportionate to give the same weight of authority to the details of the Birth, Baptism, and Death of Jesus as to the personal experience which He underwent, and to the significance of the Incarnation, Spiritual Endowment, and Atonement for human salvation.

(3) The Voice at the Baptism is well attested, but it is not clear if we are taught to regard it as more than subjective to Jesus Himself. Mt. and Mark seem to attribute the whole experience—the vision of the opening heaven, the seeing of the dove, the hearing of the voice—to Jesus; and the Baptist's vision of the Descent (Joh 1:32) may express his special insight into the whole event as it affected our Lord at that critical time and experience. It is noteworthy that Luke simply records the facts.

(4) The chief events that demand consideration are the Virgin-birth, the Transfiguration, the Resurrection, and the Ascension, for which we must refer to the separate articles on these subjects.

C. Miracles wrought in the name of Jesus by His followers.—The Evangelists make it plain that the disciples and other followers of Jesus were commissioned by the Master to go forth in His name to combine healing and exorcism with the teaching and preaching of the gospel (Mat 10:1; Mat 10:7-8, Mar 3:14-16; Mar 6:7, Luk 10:9). They also declare that a signal success was achieved by the Seventy, for they return to Jesus rejoicing greatly in the power of His name, extending even to the control of the evil spirits (Luk 10:17). Of this great success our Lord was aware, and it became to Him the occasion of a spiritual exultation, in which He saw, as already accomplished, the downfall of the Satanic power with all its accompanying ills and afflictions of mankind (Luk 10:18).

The evidence favours the idea that Jewish exorcists had a certain measure of success in their arts, even although much charlatanry may be believed to have mingled with their practices. The names they invoked, including the Ineffable Name, together, no doubt, with the drastic physical remedies they applied, were possibly efficacious in some cases (Mat 12:27, Luk 9:49). And we may be confident that the Name of Jesus, which was of vast import and of awful and mysterious significance (especially after the Resurrection), would make for healing and for liberating disordered minds and evil-controlled natures. There is reason, also, to make a distinction between these healings and exorcisms and the other works of Jesus, for nothing is said of these latter supernormal powers being possessed by the disciples and first Christians. It must also be remembered that St. Paul's Epistles are clear witness to somewhat kindred phenomena having been experienced in the *Charismata* of Apostolic circles (1 Corinthians 12, etc.). The closing section of Mark's Gospel, too, is a reflexion of 2nd century belief in the continuance of these miraculous endowments among the Apostles. Coming down to sub-Apostolic times, the evidence is too strong to be discredited that the same powers together with prophecy were familiar to those generations; and the question cannot be entirely avoided, as to whether we have any sufficient reason to draw the line at the close of this age, or, with other apologists, at the time of Constantine, and declare that, beyond it, all assertions of a manifest and direct Divine action through any servant of Christ are due to chicanery, or illusion, ignorance, or superstition.

If this question be left *sub judice*, and the story of the Christian Church of the following centuries be read without prepossession, an impression may well be produced that some of the alleged supernormal phenomena are far too well attested to be scornfully and summarily dismissed. In all generations of the Christian era, certain natures, specially God-sensitive, conspicuously consecrated to God and

sympathetic with man and with all living things, appear to have wielded a real though imperfect control over the physical processes of life. Both through them and in them remarkable forces have been at work which we cannot but believe are God-sustained and God-energized, producing supernormal phenomena. In regard to all these, as well as to kindred manifestations of modern times, the right attitude is that of a watchful but unprejudiced and patient examination. Forces that make for healing undoubtedly lie in human nature, in certain gifted souls, and in others not conspicuously gifted spiritually, but 'sensitives'; and in times of great spiritual awakening, when the sense of the reality of the Unseen and Divine is quickened and God's presence is freshly and acutely realized, startling manifestations of these sub-conscious or super-conscious forces may occur, and need not surprise any who understand how closely the Divine power has access to all forces of human life. Such phenomena, and indeed all things that belong to the human race, must not be met with a *non possumus*, but with careful, scientific, and withal reverent, investigation. The miracles of Jesus are available as a criterion, and basing our judgment upon them we may demand: (1) an adequate and worthy moral purpose to be served [this must be clearly distinguished from personal or ecclesiastical convenience, advantage, or ambition, traces of which, together with offerings at the shrine of the saint, discredit so many mediaeval miracles]; and (2) a proper moral dignity—in which many alleged workings of the thaumaturgist are conspicuously wanting. It is by no means easy to say how far healings and other powers kindred to those wrought by Jesus are meant to be expected in our human life on earth. It seems natural to make a distinction between the healings and other restorations from human infirmity on the one hand, and works of revelation in the non-human sphere. The latter may not be expected in this earthly scene, although they point to large powers of soul in the evolution of our psychical capacities in some further stages of being. But the healings and exorcisms we have good reason to expect among men on earth; for in all investigation and experiment and self-devoted labour, in all spiritual prayer and aspiration for the physical, mental, and eternal welfare of the race, His presence is ever active who said, 'Lo, I am with you always.'

Literature.—For general, dealing with the various themes comprised in above art. see the many Lives of Christ, Commentaries on the Gospels, and artt. in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, *Encyc. Biblica*, and other Dictionaries. For the argument concerning the miracles in general and in particular—

(1) Adverse on whole: E. A. Abbott, *Kernel and the Husk*, *The Spirit on the Waters*, and *Philomythus* (a reply to Newman's *Essays on Ecclesiastical Miracles*); M. Arnold, *Literature and Dogma*; Percy Gardner, *Historic View of NT*, and *Exploratio Evangelica*; Harnack, *What is Christianity?* and *Christianity and History*.

(2) In favour of miraculous: Origen, *contra Celsum*; Pascal, *Pensées*; Row's, Mozley's, and Temple's *Bampton Lectures*, A. B. Bruce, *Miraculous Element in the Gospels*, and *Chief End of Revelation*; Trench, *Miracles*; Lyttelton's *Hulsean Lectures*; Fisher, *Ground of Theistic and Christian Belief*; *The Supernatural in Christianity*, by Drs. Rainy, Orr, and Dods (a reply to Pflleiderer's *Gifford Lectures*); Lias, *Are Miracles Credible?*; Thomson, *Miracles and Modern Science*; Illingworth, *Personality Human and Divine*, and *Divine Immanence*; to which may be added *The Finger of God*, by writer of the present article.

For larger and wider discussions bearing closely on the conception of the miraculous, consult the works of John Fiske, esp. *The Idea of God*; Dr. E. Caird's *Evolution of Religion*, 2 vols. (Gifford Lectures); and *Human Personality* by F. W. H. Myers.

T. H. Wright.

☞ Miraculous Conception

MIRACULOUS CONCEPTION.—See Virgin-Birth.

☞ Mission

MISSION.—The following article deals with the mission of the Lord Jesus Christ only as presented in the Gospel narratives. The Lord Jesus frequently manifested *consciousness of being commissioned by God*. Now the general (πέμπω) and now the specific term (ἀποστέλλω) for sending is used in reference to His work, the latter word signifying an intimate connexion between sender and sent (Cremer, p. 529). As God's trusted messenger He felt that there was a decree (δεῖ) for Him to execute (Luk 2:49; Luk 4:43; Luk 9:22 etc.), that He had His Father's authority (Joh 5:43; Joh 8:42), and that as the Father had sanctified Him and sent Him into the world (Joh 10:36), it was not for Him to do His own pleasure (Joh 6:38). The Fourth Evangelist, deeply impressed with the idea of the commission received by his Lord, mentions the fact repeatedly, and in one place stops to brood over the mere name of a place because it suggests a mission (Joh 9:7). Instead of considering Himself as being merely one among a number of Divine messengers, Jesus knew Himself to be the Messenger-Son (Mar 12:6-7). The Lord's consciousness refers to (1) the *objects* of His mission, (2) the *means* to be adopted to gain His wondrous ends, (3) the *extent*, and (4) the *credentials* of His mission.

1. The objects of the mission.—These are exhibited in various forms. Prophecy has to be fulfilled (Mar 12:10-11; Mar 14:21; Mar 14:27; Mar 14:49, Luk 4:21; Luk 10:24; Luk 24:27, Joh 5:46; Joh 13:18). It is the function of Jesus to be the King (Psalms 2), the Son of Man (Psalms 8, Dan 7:13-14), the Servant of Jehovah (Isaiah 42, 53), the founder a New Covenant (Jer 31:31-34); and thus to glorify God (Joh 12:28; Joh 17:4) and save men (Mat 1:21, Luk 2:11; Luk 19:10, Joh 3:17; Joh 10:10; Joh 12:47; Joh 17:2; Joh 20:31) by attracting men to Himself (Mat 11:28, Joh 5:40; Joh 12:32) and by giving Himself as a sacrifice (Mar 10:45, Joh 1:29; Joh 6:51; Joh 10:15; Joh 12:24).

2. Means to the ends of the mission.—The nature of these aims required that the Heavenly Apostle (Heb 3:1) should manifest the Kingdom and the character of God, together with the greatness of man's calling. The sacrificial death at Calvary sums up all the revelations. The speech, the life, the death of the Lord Jesus are the means whereby He discharges His unique mission to mankind.

(a) To succeed, it was imperative that Jesus should ensure *the recognition of the sovereignty of God*. The Kingdom of God must be established upon the earth (Mat 4:17, Luk 19:11 ff.). Where there are minds that gladly defer to God's will, there the Kingdom is. Submission may be incomplete (Mat 13:24-30; Mat 13:47-48) and transient (Mat 13:20-22). In Jesus alone were the claims of God fully and constantly heeded: therefore the leadership of men is His prerogative (Mat 23:10). He called men to Himself in order to make them loyal to the heavenly throne. God's subjects renounce evil habits (Mat 4:17), enjoy pardon (Luk 24:47), possess sincerity (Mat 7:21-27), are plastic and trustful as children (Mat 18:2-4, Luk 18:16-17, Joh 3:3), are willing to render costly service in meekness (Mat 20:25-28); they transcend national distinctions (Mat 8:11) and set all interests below those of the Kingdom (Mat 6:33; Mat 13:45-46, Luk 9:57-62; Luk 18:29-30). The presence of the Kingdom is known by its conquering power (Luk 11:20). Its growth cannot be accounted for unless the activities of God are adduced; albeit man's cooperation is required (Mar 4:26-29). A river (as the Nile) may not originate in the land that it waters, and yet may be indispensable thereto; similarly Christ's Kingdom is the blessing the world needs most, and its coining must be uppermost in prayerful minds (Mat 6:9-10), yet it takes its rise in the unseen heaven (Joh 18:36). Diseases, defects, excreescences of all kinds—physical, mental, spiritual—are foreign elements (Mat 13:27-28, Luk 13:16). It was the function of the Lord Jesus to reveal verbally and in His life the nature of God's reign. His loving and unswerving devotion to the Father's will is the central orb of the moral world, and all human wills should be planets ruled and lighted by His filial homage. Union with Him, harmony with Him, would bring about union and harmony among the races of mankind, and earth according to the great prayers (Mat 6:9-10, Joh 17:20-21), would be a province of heaven. In all its particulars—its purity, might, obedience, joyful loyalty, friendliness,

prayerfulness, catholicity—the Kingdom of God is the life of Christ expanded. It was His task to give mankind, on the scale of His earthly experience, a clear and distinct conception of subjection to the authority of God. The Kingdom is where He is; it is He working through the wills, intellects, affections of His people. The laws of the Kingdom are those to which Christ conformed His purposes and deeds. The Beatitudes (Mat 5:1-12) are songs that first were sung in His own heart. Hence a description of the Kingdom is a description of the character of Jesus from the point of view belonging to duty and common service. If the precepts of the gospel—which were indeed citations from His own hook of life as child, friend, artizan, preacher, sacrifice—were heeded in home and Church and State, we should see the Kingdom of God an organism with Christ as its soul, devout, righteous, beneficent.

(b) He to whom the human will ought to be surrendered must be known to be supremely worthy of reverence, trust, and love. Inasmuch, then, as *knowledge of God* is essential to eternal life, it was one of the aims of Christ to impart this knowledge (Joh 17:3). God had often been represented as the Father of the Chosen People, and here and there individuals had thought themselves to be sons of God; but in the teachings of Jesus the Divine Fatherhood is asserted and illustrated so copiously, that some chapters of the Gospels consist almost solely of variations to the music of these good tidings (Matthew 5, 6, 7). Jesus made men think of God trustfully as well as reverently, with love as well as with awe. The revelation could be made only by the Son of God (Mat 11:27, Luk 10:22), and it was contained in Himself (Joh 1:18; Joh 14:7-10). The love and obedience of the Son have as their counterparts the Father's love and instructions; and so the paternal and the filial dispositions are mutually illuminating. The purposes of the Father are executed by the Son, and therefore to come to Jesus, to receive and honour Him, are acts that reach to God (Luk 9:48, Joh 5:22-23; Joh 13:20). The message is the Messenger. Not merely does a veil fall from before the Divine character; for Jesus, standing where the veil had stood, manifests the eternal righteousness and pitying love that cannot be content unless men are rescued from unrighteousness and wrath. Salvation is man's progressive advance (Joh 17:3 γινώσκω) to God, his growing communion with the Father, his increasing faith, love, and reverence. The Saviour invites men to come by penitence and trust to Himself, that they may become one with Him and, through Him, with the Father (Mat 11:28, Joh 17:21). whose holiness He discloses.

(c) The fulfilment of Christ's mission required the *revelation of man*. What is the moral condition of men? What is man in God's idea? What can make man's sin to be seen and hated? What can make God's thought and purpose concerning man attractive to sinners? Inasmuch as penitence, faith, hope, love are essential elements of a true life, to create them was included in Christ's gracious task. To produce the consciousness of guilt was an indispensable preliminary. His speech made sin

exceeding sinful, and in His conduct there were presented such contrasts to man's misdoings that the evils were exposed. A sense of sin actually was produced (Luk 5:8; Luk 7:37 ff; Luk 19:7-8), and men learned to trust God's Son and to desire to be taught His life (Luk 11:1). He encouraged men to hope that His experience of pleasing the Father (Joh 8:29) might become theirs, seeing that they could become as intimately related to Him as the branches are related to the vine (Joh 15:1-8). The appearance of the Son of Man was a gospel, because, while it condemned sin, it affirmed moral evil to be an intrusion into man's nature, and it invited the sinful to receive forgiveness and enter into union with that victorious life which from the first had overcome the world (Mat 4:1-11, Joh 8:29; Joh 16:33; Joh 17:4). Corrupted man rejected and killed the Holy One, thereby disclosing human guilt and need; man, as God intended him to be, and as he may become by 'believing in him' (Joh 2:11; Joh 3:16), is revealed in Christ's meekness, devoutness, filial obedience and fraternal service. 'The Son of God' gives men authority to become God's sons (Joh 1:12-13), thereby causing men fully to unfold their manhood.

(d) *The mission of the Saviour involved His death.*—His death was a chief part of His work. The Evangelists record sayings which prove that the great sacrifice was present to our Lord's mind at an early stage of His ministry, so that there is no need to regard the explicit references to the death by violence made near Caesarea Philippi (Mar 8:31 ff.) as indicating a new outlook to the Lord's own mind. The tragic note that is heard early in the Fourth Gospel (Joh 2:19-21; Joh 3:14-15; Joh 6:51) is not left to the last in the Synoptic accounts (Mat 9:15, Mar 2:19-20, Luk 5:34-35). Moreover, the saving purpose of the sacrifice (Mat 26:28, Mar 10:45; Mar 14:24, Joh 10:11; Joh 12:23-24; Joh 12:32-33), its necessity ($\delta\epsilon\iota$ Mar 8:31, Luk 24:26), and its voluntary character (Mat 26:53, Joh 10:18), are affirmed. 'Through death to life' is illustrated in His experience. The enjoyment by Him of a fuller life in countless redeemed ones is conditional upon His uttermost self-renunciation (Joh 12:24). The life of the Saviour passes to men through His surrender, and it enters into them so far as they adopt its principle. The way of sacrifice is thus the way whereby the Saviour gives and the saved receive (Mat 16:24-25). The New Covenant (Jer 31:31-34) is connected with the shedding of the Lord's blood (Luk 22:20), and it is necessary that the saved should participate in this fundamental law of Christ's being (Joh 6:53-57). It was the Son's gracious will to come to earth on an errand which meant exposure to temptation (and therefore exposure to the possibility that He might not return to heaven) in order to destroy sin and to allure mankind to the paths of rectitude and peace. It was not the purpose of the Lord to ascend to God unless He could do so as the head of a new race,—a race healed (Joh 3:14-15), vivified and nourished by His sacrificial offering (Joh 6:51-58). This death, with its victory over death, and its sequel—the return to the Father—were intended to provide, through the gift of the

Holy Spirit, those saving resources whereby the true life is initiated (Joh 16:7-11) and sustained (Joh 14:16; Joh 14:26, Joh 15:26, Joh 16:13-15).

3. The extent of Christ's mission.—While the regeneration of men was His first concern, His numerous miracles evince His care for man's physical needs. As all departments of life were to be purified and enriched by His example and teaching, so all men were to feel that they could be saved by His grace. It has been supposed that Jesus had no outlook beyond the Chosen People, and that the universalism of the Gospels is an interpolation; the catholicity which the Church subsequently manifested being read back into the teachings of the Lord. This conjecture is applied to the Fourth Gospel, to the world-wide commission (Mat 28:18-20, Mar 16:15), and to the universalism of St. Luke. True it is that at first the area of labour was restricted (Mat 15:24), but this was a necessity of the situation, and is no indication that the Gentiles were to be excluded from salvation. Sin is not local or racial, and Jesus hated *it*; and man, as man, was loved by Him. Any devout Jew would think that somehow the Gentiles were to reap advantage from the Messianic reign (Luk 2:30-32), and though it was deemed absurd to suppose that preference could be given by the Messiah to heathen men (Joh 7:35), even the Pharisees were zealous in making proselytes (Mat 23:15). Why should it be thought incredible that Jesus hoped ultimately to win men of all nations? Was not exclusiveness distressing to Him? Was He not ready with a reference to mercies granted to the woman of Zarephath and to Naaman the Syrian (Luk 4:25-27)? The outer court of the Temple was the only part of the sacred structure to which a Gentile had access, and all the Evangelists report that Jesus insisted that this enclosure should be kept clean and quiet 'for all the nations' (Mat 21:12-13, Mar 11:15-17, Luk 19:45-46, Joh 2:14; Joh 2:16). Jesus rejoiced in the centurion's faith—not found by Him in Israel (Luk 7:9), and the Syrophenician woman cheered His heart by her trust and loving ingenuity (Mat 15:28). At first the disciples were forbidden to preach to Samaritans (Mat 10:5), though, when they were fully equipped, the restriction was withdrawn (Act 1:8): He Himself laboured in Samaria (Luk 9:51-56, John 4), and called attention to the beneficence of one Samaritan (Luk 10:33-35), and to the faith and gratitude of another' (Luk 17:15-19). It is quite in harmony with the Saviour's love for the outcast and despised, the publicans and sinners amongst the Jews (Mat 9:9-13, Luk 7:37-50; Luk 15:1-2 ff., Luk 18:9-14; Luk 19:1-10), that He should foresee the approach of all men to Himself (Joh 12:32), and anticipate a time when He should be the Shepherd of one flock consisting of sheep gathered from far and near (Joh 10:16). The interest manifested by the Magi (Matthew 2) and by the Greeks (Joh 12:20-21) is not alien to Christ's mission. Moreover it is clearly declared that strangers will become workers in the vineyard (Mat 21:41), and that before His throne all nations are to be assembled for judgment (Mat 25:31-32). 'The Saviour of the world' (Joh 4:42) has grace and power wherewith to meet the needs which belong to every man in every age and country;

for He is the Light (Joh 1:9, Joh 8:12, Joh 9:5, Joh 12:46), the Water (Joh 4:10, Joh 7:37), the Bread (Joh 6:35; Joh 6:48-51), the Life (Joh 11:25, Joh 14:6).

4. Credentials of the mission.—Jesus entered upon His task with the confidence that He was anointed with the Holy Spirit (Luk 4:18). John the Baptist declared that he saw the Spirit descending upon Jesus, and that he had been prepared for this sign (Joh 1:33-34). The testimony thus borne by the last of the Old Covenant prophets is referred to by the Saviour together with other credentials,—as the witness of His works, that of the Father and that of the Scriptures (Joh 5:32-47). Messengers came from the Machaerus prison, saying, ‘John the Baptist hath sent us unto thee, saying, Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?’ In that hour Jesus wrought miracles which He adduced, together with His habit of announcing good tidings to the poor, as proofs of His Messiahship (Luk 7:18-22). The deeds were signs (σημεῖα) that the Divine messenger could quicken body and soul (Mar 5:41-42, Luk 7:14-15, Joh 11:25; Joh 11:43-44); cure physical and spiritual diseases; render efficient withered powers (Mar 3:1-5, Joh 5:5-9); add faculties, contrary to what might be expected, as in the case of the man born blind (John 9); redress evils caused by circumstances—for instance the fever due to the Capernaum district—(Luk 4:38-39); cleanse all the fountains of life, as in cures wrought for lepers (Mar 1:40-42, Luk 17:12-14); bestow abilities, receptive (Mar 8:22-25) and communicative (Mat 9:32-33). While the miracles were wrought in pure kindness, they afforded evidences to the thoughtful of the validity of Christ’s claims (Joh 3:2; Joh 7:31; Joh 10:37-38; Joh 14:11; Joh 15:24), and they were intended by the Lord to give assurance to men of His redeeming grace (Mar 2:10-11). The very term employed for saving processes (σώζω) will serve equally for temporal and spiritual blessings (Mat 1:21, Mar 10:26, Luk 7:50, Joh 3:17), even as the Worker shows Himself in reference both to the inner and the outer life to be the Great Physician (Mar 2:17). Some persons were allowed to have extraordinary aid to the belief that Jesus came from God, for they were with Him when He was transfigured, and heard a voice saying, ‘This is my Son, my chosen: hear ye him’ (Luk 9:35); nevertheless there was adequate support for the faith of all men in the remarkable interest Jesus took in the neglected (Luk 7:22-23; Luk 15:1 ff.), in His readiness to pray (Joh 17:1) and to serve (Mar 6:34, cf. v. 31), and in the union of qualities of character which are rarely found together. The credentials of Christ’s mission are in Himself. The grandeur and simplicity of His life, the meek and beneficent use of marvellous powers, the sinless One’s friendship with sinners, the strength and gentleness, the zeal and patience, the ardour and purity of His character—prove that He came forth from the Father (Joh 6:68-69; Joh 16:27). Believers in Him discover with more and more clearness, as they trust Him more and more fully, that His gracious promises are fulfilled. He is to their consciences the Goodness,—to their intellects the Truth,—to their hearts the supreme Beauty, the Way, the Truth, the Life.

Literature.—Cremer, *Lex. s.v. ἀποστέλλω*; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, ii. 184 ff.

W. J. Henderson.

⚡ Missions

MISSIONS

1. *The prophetic background.*—The missionary spirit and aims of Christianity have their beginnings in the history, literature, and character of the Jewish people. The OT, especially in the portions which express the ideals and spirit of prophecy, is full of principles and promises which find their fulfilment in the world-wide mission of Christianity (Horton, *The Bible as a Missionary Book*). The proselytizing energy of the Jews in the last cent. b.c. and in the time of our Lord ('Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte,' Mat 23:15) is a partial outcome of ideas and instincts which were long inherent in the race. These wide and lofty prophetic aims had to struggle against particularist tendencies, which made the Jews one of the most narrow and exclusive of the races of mankind. It is one of the paradoxes of history, that the missionary propaganda which aimed at the conversion and blessing of the world, sprang from a people whose predominant characteristics were pride in racial privileges, expectation of national greatness, and contempt for all who were not of the seed of Abraham. But the missionary activities and aims of Christianity cannot be rightly understood apart from the gradual development of missionary ideas which took place in the course of Jewish history. The words applied to John the Baptist in relation to Christ might be applied to the Jewish race, 'Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee' (Mar 1:2). These germinal missionary conceptions and movements found their end and fulfilment in the Person and work of Jesus Christ, and in the work which He originated. He absorbed and enlarged them, giving them such definiteness and fulness that they appear to be derived entirely from Him; for the spirit, aims, and motives of missions are distinctively Christian, and Christianity is essentially a missionary religion.

2. *The missionary character of our Lord.*—He regarded Himself as a missionary. At the beginning of His work in Galilee He applied to Himself the words of Isaiah (Isa 61:1), 'The spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor, he hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted,' etc. (Luk 4:18-19). He frequently describes Himself as one 'who was sent,' as when He says, 'he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me' (τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με, Mat 10:40); 'as the living Father hath sent me' (ἀπέστειλέν με, Joh 6:57); 'the Father which hath sent

me' (ὁ πέμψας με, [Joh_6:44](#)). The references to His being 'sent' are most frequent in John.

It may be remarked that the verb ἀποστελλειν is applied to Jesus 17 times in John , 10 times in the Synoptics, while πέμπειν is applied to Him 25 times in Jn., but only once in the Synoptics. The distinction between the two verbs is slight. In most cases in the Gospels τέμπειν, applies to the sender and ἀποστελλειν to the person sent (cf. 'Neither is he that is sent (ἀπόστολος) greater than he that sent (πέμψαντος) him,' [Joh_13:16](#)); but the distinction is not always followed (cf. 'As thou hast sent (ἀπέστειλας) me into the world, even so have I also sent (ἀπέστειλα) them into the world' ([Joh_17:18](#))).

Wilke and Grimm distinguish τίμπειν as the general term, which may imply accompaniment (as when the sender is God), while ἀποστελλειν includes a reference to equipment, and suggests official or authoritative sending). But the frequency with which both words are applied to Jesus in the Gospels (at least 53 times in all) is an emphatic indication of the missionary character of His work. (Under this heading it is not necessary to discuss the distinctive aims and character of His mission. See artt. Kingdom of God, Eternal Life, Salvation).

3. In the call and training of the disciples the missionary idea is also strongly emphasized. They were to be 'fishers of men' ([Mar_1:7](#) || [Mat_4:19](#)). Jesus ordained them that 'they might be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach' (κηρύσσειν, [Mar_3:14](#)). The training was not only educative but practical. After a period of private intercourse He sent the Twelve forth two by two, as heralds to proclaim (κηρύσσειν) that 'the kingdom of heaven (or of God) was at hand' ([Mar_6:7](#) || [Mat_10:5-7](#) || [Luk_9:3](#)). There is recorded by Lk. ([Luk_10:1-7](#)) another mission of Seventy, also sent forth two and two, who were to go with the same message to every city and place to which He Himself was about to come. From the words 'also others' ([καί] ἑτέροις, [Luk_10:1](#)) it is probably 'to be understood that the Twelve were not included in this mission. In both missions of the disciples, the work they had to do was evangelistic in relation to the people, and educative in relation to themselves. There may have been other missions which have not been recorded, for Mk. uses the suggestive phrase, 'He began to send them forth two by two' ([Mar_6:7](#)); but the influence of such work on the training of the disciples, especially in giving them a firm grasp of the gospel they had to preach, is incalculable. Not a little of the

teaching of Jesus which we have in the Gospels may have taken its present shape from the frequent repetition of their message.

4. *The limits within which the personal work of Jesus was confined were declared by Himself: 'I am not sent but unto the house of Israel' (Mat_15:24).* During the time of His personal ministry the work of the disciples was similarly limited. In sending them forth, He said, 'Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Mat_10:5-6). This restriction, given at such a time, is of great importance, for it is an indication that the idea of a mission outside the bounds of the Jewish people was in the minds of the disciples when they were sent out on their first missionary journey. The restriction would have been needless if the disciples had not thought of such a mission as a possibility. It is an entire misreading of the Gospel history to imagine that the glorious conception of a world-wide mission was an afterthought, which only occurred to the disciples, or was suggested to them, after the resurrection of our Lord. The limitations which were so carefully laid down were temporary, and were evidently regarded as temporary. Even in declaring that He was sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, He had also said, 'Let the children first be filled' (Mar_7:27). The reasons for the limitation were adequate. The disciples had to be fully trained; the Kingdom of God had to be preached to the people who had been disciplined by the providence of God to receive it; the gospel had to be completed by the full disclosure of the redemption of grace, in the death and resurrection of the Saviour.

5. *Indications of a world mission in the teaching of Jesus.*—Apart from the essentially universal character of the gospel, which inevitably involved a universal mission, there are indications that the world-wide view was brought before the minds of the disciples prior to the time when the great commission was given. The disciples were to be 'the salt of the earth' and 'the light of the world' (Mat_5:13-14). When Jesus praised the faith of the centurion of Capernaum, He said, 'Many shall come from the east and from the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of God' (Mat_8:11; cf. also the same passage in Lk. in another connexion, where He adds, as if in reference to the preference which the Jews had received, 'Behold there are last which shall be first, and there are first which shall be last,' Luk_13:29-30). So also, when defending the woman who had anointed Him with the box of ointment, He said, 'Verily I say unto you, Wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, this ... shall be told for a memorial of her' (Mat_26:13). Then He warned the disciples, saying, 'Ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them and the Gentiles' (Mat_10:18). Many of the parables have references to or suggestions of a future extension of work among the Gentiles. In the interpretation of the parable of the Tares (one of the earlier parables) it is said that 'the field is the world' (Mat_13:38). In the later series of

parables, as in that of the Vineyard and the Husbandmen, it is said, 'The kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof' (Mat 21:43); in the Marriage Feast the direction is found, 'Go ye ... into the highways, and as many as ye shall find, bid to the marriage' (Mat 22:9, Luk 14:23); in the Sheep and the Goats there is a picture of the judgment of 'all nations' (Mat 25:32). Direct intimations of a world mission are not wanting, as in the apocalyptic discourses in the Synoptics, which are prefaced with a declaration of the destruction of the Temple ('There shall not be left one stone upon another which shall not be thrown down,' Mat 24:2, Mar 13:2, Luk 21:6), and contain the announcement that 'this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness to all the nations' (Mat 24:14 || Mar 13:10). In the Fourth Gospel the evidence of a world view as part of the instruction given to the disciples is very plain. After saying that He lays down his life for the sheep' (Joh 10:15), Jesus adds, 'Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice' (Joh 10:16). In connexion with the visit of the Greeks, He uttered the pregnant and impressive prophecy, 'I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me' (Joh 12:32); and a little further on in the same chapter we find the words, 'I came not to judge the world, but to save the world' (Joh 12:47). In the private converse of our Lord and His disciples, in the last days of the earthly ministry, the vision of the world is repeatedly brought before the minds of the disciples as the object of the Saviour's thought and the scope of the disciples' mission, as—'That the world may know that I love the Father ... even so I do' (Joh 14:31); 'As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world' (Joh 17:18; also Joh 12:46-48, Joh 16:8-11, Joh 17:2; Joh 17:21). Judas (not Iscariot) is even represented as asking, 'How is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us and not unto the world?' (Joh 14:22), as if the limitation of His work was a source of perplexity to him. Unless we are to regard the Gospels as entirely unhistorical, and all such universal references as due to the mind of the Church (which would then be greater than its Lord) at a later time, it must be admitted that the disciples were aware of the world-wide character of the work they were to undertake. The frequency of the world references in the earthly ministry may to some extent account for the fact that the missionary commission is mentioned only once in each of the Gospels (Mat 28:16-20 || Mar 16:15 || Joh 20:21 || Luk 24:46-48), and in Act 1:8. For it is recognized that it is only in the brief records of the risen life of Jesus that the universal mission of the disciples is explicitly expressed in the form of a command. But that is no reason for imagining that it was an afterthought of Jesus, or an addition put into His mouth by followers of a later time. The universal commission is given then, because that is the time to which it belongs. The work of redemption had been 'finished'; the gospel was completed; the limitations which had restricted its extension were no longer necessary. The intimations of a universal mission, which had been given before, were carried to their inevitable conclusion in the majestic commission: 'All authority is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye into all the

world, make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you all the days, unto the consummation of the age' (πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος, Mat_28:16-20). The universal note predominates the whole passage. There is (i.) the claim of universal authority; (ii.) the direction to a universal field; (iii.) the universality of what is to be taught ('all things whatsoever I have commanded you'); (iv.) the promise of a universal presence, 'Lo, I am with you all the days, unto the consummation of the age.'

6. *The genuineness of the missionary commission* has been gravely questioned. In Mk, it appears in the closing section (Mar_16:9-10), which is now generally regarded as an addition by a later hand, possibly by the presbyter Aristion, who, according to Papias, was 'a disciple of the Lord' (F. C. Conybeare, *Expositor*, iv. viii. [1893] 241 ff.; but see Aristion). All critics admit the antiquity of the passage, and it may be accepted as 'embodying a true Apostolic tradition' (Salmond in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible* iii. p. 253^b).

The passage in Mt. (Mat_28:16-20) is characterized as 'a later appendix' (Moffatt, *Historical NT*, p. 647) entirely on account of its contents. The indications (in a different order) of its lateness are said to be—(i.) its incipient Trinitarianism, (ii.) the Trinitarian formula of baptism, which is found nowhere else in the NT. To these is added, (iii.) that the first disciples could hardly have known of the universal mission, or else they lived in flagrant disobedience to their Master's solemn command, and only reluctantly recognized its fulfilment in the Pauline gospel. But it may be said, on the other hand, as to (i.), that the incipient Trinitarianism of the NT is such a daring conception, especially to men who had been trained in the strict monotheism of Judaism, that its existence can hardly be explained without some word of the Lord Jesus in relation to it, such as that which Mt. records. How are we to account for the 'incipient Trinitarianism' of the Pauline benediction—'The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost' (2Co_13:14)—if there were no words of the Lord Jesus to justify it? As to (ii.), the baptismal formula, as it has been called, may not have been a formula. It may have been the mistake of a later time to regard it as such. If it was not a formula, there was nothing to hinder the Apostles and others from baptizing in the name of the Lord Jesus ('The Baptismal Formula,' by J. H. Bernard in *Expositor*, vi. v. [1902] 43 ff.). (iii.) The apparent inaction of the disciples may not have been due to ignorance or disobedience. The command as given in Lk. and Acts indicates a gradually widening sphere of operations, in Jerusalem and Judaea, in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth. The difficulties and persecution which the Apostles encountered at the beginning of their work may have been to them a proof that the time had not yet come when they could leave the nearer and narrower fields and go forth to the Gentiles. If any reliance is to

be placed on Acts as an historical document, it is abundantly evident that the first disciples did know of the world mission, and that they were moving in the line of their instructions. For in his first recorded utterance St. Peter strikes the universal note repeatedly. He quotes the words of Joel in explanation of what had happened at Pentecost, saying, 'It shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, that I will pour out of my Spirit upon *all flesh*' (Act 2:17), 'And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved' (Act 2:21). He closes his appeal to the people with the assurance that the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call' (Act 2:39). Then in Act 3:25 f. there is the recognition of the coming of Christ as a fulfilment of prophecy, as a carrying out of the covenant made with Abraham ('And in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed'); further, in the words, 'Unto you first God, having raised up his Servant (*παῖς*), sent him to bless you,' there is the recognition of a wider field to be entered in due time. The great declaration, 'Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is no other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved' (Act 4:12), is meaningless, if there was not behind it a consciousness of the universal character of Christianity, and, as a consequence, the consciousness of a universal mission.

The disciples are also seen to be moving in the line of their instructions. They certainly preached the gospel in Jerusalem and in all Judaea. It is also seen that they preached it among the Samaritans, towards whom Jews had as strong an antipathy as they had towards Gentiles ('Philip went down to the city of Samaria and preached Christ unto them.... (Peter and John) preached the gospel in many villages of the Samaritans,' Act 8:5; Act 8:25). In a few years after the Crucifixion (Harnack says 1, Ramsay 3, Lightfoot 4, Turner 6 or 7 [in fixing the date of St. Paul's conversion, see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Chronology of the NT']) the faith of Christ had spread to Damascus, and had gained such hold there, that Saul was sent thither by the Sanhedrin to bring 'any of the Way,' whom he might find, bound to Jerusalem (Act 9:2). Lastly, some of those who were scattered abroad upon the persecution which arose about Stephen went as far as to Antioch, and preached the word to the Greeks ("*Ἑλληνας*, the reading adopted by Tischendorf, Nestle, etc.); and when tidings of these things came to the Church at Jerusalem, they sent forth Barnabas to visit and help them (which he did by finding Saul of Tarsus, Act 11:19-26).

Taking Turner's estimate as above (though we prefer Ramsay's), the gospel was firmly established in Damascus (and in Antioch) 6 or 7 years after the Crucifixion. The trouble which arose about Stephen marked the close of the comparatively peaceful progress of the Church. The hidden cleavage between Judaism and Christianity then became apparent, and an entirely new situation resulted, which affected those within and without the Church. The sympathy of the Jews (Act 2:47) towards the Christians

had become antipathy (Act 12:2-3). The persecution created anxieties which naturally absorbed the attention of the leaders. Coming as it did when the Church had been extended throughout Palestine, the persecution may have arrested the forward movement which, in accordance with the line of progress sketched out in Act 1:8, had then become due. A little consideration of the difficulties which affect the progress of modern missions in different countries might lead to a better understanding of the situation in the Apostolic age, and to a higher appreciation of the results which the first missionaries achieved.

The dispute in the early Church in relation to the Gentiles, regarding which so much has been made, was not about preaching the gospel to them, but about the conditions on which they were to receive salvation and be admitted into the Church. No instructions on these matters had been given by the Lord Jesus, and difference of opinion was inevitable until the truth was made plain. St. Peter's reluctance to go to Cornelius did not arise from any unwillingness to preach to him, but from the natural shrinking of a strict Jew from entering the house of a Gentile. The accusation which was brought against him at Jerusalem by those who were of the circumcision was, not that he had preached the gospel to a Gentile, but that he had gone in to 'men uncircumcised and had eaten with them' (Act 11:3). It was 'they of the circumcision,' and not the first disciples, who glorified God, saying, 'Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life' (Act 11:18). These considerations are sufficient to establish the knowledge of the missionary command by the first disciples, and to account for the apparent delay (if any) in carrying it out.

7. The progress of mission work within the NT record.—The order is admirably given by Turner in his art. 'Chronology of the NT' in Hastings' *DB*. [*Note: Dictionary of the Bible.*] He says that 'the picture in Acts is cut up, as it were, into six panels, each labelled with a general summary of progress'; and his arrangement is adopted here. First stage, the beginning at Jerusalem (Act 1:1 to Act 6:7); second stage, the extension of the Church throughout Palestine (Act 6:8 to Act 9:31); third stage, the extension of the Church to Antioch (Act 9:32 to Act 12:24); fourth stage, the extension of the Church to Asia Minor, as a result of St. Paul's first missionary journey (Act 12:25 to Act 16:5); fifth stage, the extension of the Church to Europe, resulting from St. Paul's second missionary journey (Act 16:6 to Act 19:20); sixth stage, the extension of the Church to Rome (Act 19:21 to Act 28:31). While that is the view of progress which is presented in Acts, it is not to be taken as complete. It exhibits for the most part the movement as connected with the great missionaries, St. Peter and St. Paul. The labours of the majority of the company of the Apostles are not recorded, and their activity might to some extent modify the above order of progression. Missionary enthusiasm also was not confined to the Apostles. Unnamed disciples, as in the case of Antioch (Act 11:20), and certainly also in the case of Rome, may have carried the gospel into many places of which no mention is made.

But for general purposes the sketch as given above represents the line of advance up to the year a.d. 70. Progress after that belongs to the general history of missions.

Literature.—Horton, *Bible as a Missionary Book*; Bruce, *Training of the Twelve*; Latham, *Pastor Pastorum*; Hort, *Judaistic Christianity* Selby, *Ministry of the Lord Jesus*, pp. 86-118; Moffatt, *Historical NT*, pp. 647-650; Lambert, *Sacraments in the NT*, pp. 38 ff., 234 ff.; F. C. Conybeare, *Expositor*, iv. viii. [1893] 241-254; J. H. Bernard, *ib.* vi. v. [1902] 43 ff.; H. B. Swete, *ib.* vi. vi. [1903] 241 ff.; art. 'Baptism' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible .

John Reid.

☞ Mite

MITE.—See Money.

☞ Mockery

MOCKERY.—The Evangelists relate in the Passion history a series of narratives describing the brutal mockery of Jesus by the authorities and by their soldiers and servants. The passages are the following: (a) Mar_14:65 = Mat_26:67-68 = Luk_22:63-64; (b) Luk_23:11; (c) Mar_15:18-20 = Mat_27:27-31 = Joh_19:2-3.

There is no necessity to 'regard these stories as duplicates. A person who was condemned for the claims that Jesus was supposed to put forward was likely to meet with derision and brutality at every turn. Of course, it the story that Jesus was sent to Herod, which is peculiar to Lk., is unhistorical, the second of the stories would have to be struck out. If, however, that narrative is historical, and there is no cogent reason for doubting it, it was perfectly natural that Herod and his guards should mock one who claimed to be king. It is possible, indeed, that the narratives may have exerted an influence upon each other, but nothing compels us to affirm that any of them is unhistorical.

The first narrative records the mockery and ill-treatment inflicted on Jesus immediately after His condemnation by the Sanhedrin. Two stages are mentioned in Mark. The first consisted of spitting, blindfolding, buffeting, and the request that He should prophesy. Then, following this, we have a statement as to the attendants, the meaning of which is not perfectly clear. The better reading in Mar_14:65 is ἑλαβον.

Several Manuscripts , however, read ἔβαλλον or ἔβαλον (see Field). It is not quite clear how we should translate or explain the better reading. Swete renders 'they caught Him with blows,' others 'they took Him in charge with blows.' ῥαπισμασιν, means blows with the open hand, not blows with the rod. Another question touches the authors of this outrage. According to Mt., it is the members of the Sanhedrin. This seems to be Mk.'s meaning also, except that he limits it to 'some.' He mentions the servants at the close. Lk. represents the attendants who had charge of Jesus as alone concerned. Difficulties are also raised by the command to prophesy. Mt. and Lk. both explain it as a challenge to Jesus to prophesy who it was that smote Him. This in itself is perfectly natural, but it implies that Jesus was blindfolded, though there is no reference to this in Mt., and it is omitted by D [Note: Deuteronomist.] and Syr [Note: yr Syriac.] ^{sin} in Mark. Even if original in Mk., it may imply that Jesus was condemned to death (cf. 'they covered Haman's face,' Est 7:8), rather than that He was blindfolded so that He might be asked to prophesy who struck Him. Accordingly, the meaning may be 'foretell the future,' either generally or with a specific reference to His own fate, or to the destruction of the Temple, which He had been accused of predicting.

The second mockery, that before Herod, is free from the element of physical ill-treatment. Jesus is simply arrayed in royal garments, and a mocking homage is paid to Him; then He is sent back to Pilate. Luk 23:10-12 is omitted, it is true, in Syr [Note: yr Syriac.] ^{sin}, and is regarded by Wellhausen as a later addition (see his note on the passage and on Luk 23:15).

The third mockery is that by the Roman soldiers after the condemnation by Pilate. This narrative is omitted by Lk. but recorded by John. The soldiers take Jesus into the Praetorium and summon the whole of their company. Then they clothe Him in purple and put a crown of thorns upon His head; then they do homage to Him, saluting Him as king of the Jews. They keep on striking Him on the head with a reed, spitting upon Him, and bending the knee to Him in mock homage. To this account (of Mk.) Mt. adds, first, that before clothing Him in the robes they divested Him of His garments, and that they put a reed in His right hand, and subsequently took it from Him and struck Him on the head with it. Here Mt.'s account deserves preference, for it is intrinsically probable that the reed should have been given Him as a sceptre before it was used to smite Him. Jn.'s account is brief; he does not mention the reed, but says that they gave Him blows with the hand. It is a mark of historicity in the Gospel narratives that the Sanhedrists are represented as mocking the claims of Jesus to be a prophet, whereas the Roman soldiers, quite uninterested in His prophetic character, mock His claims to be a king, which would not be so ready a subject of jesting with the Jews, though they mocked Him for His pretensions to be a king of Israel as He hung upon the cross.

In recent years quite new significance has been attached to the mockery. Wendland in his art. 'Jesus als Saturnalien-König' (*Hermes*, xxxiii. 175-179) put forward the view that the Roman soldiers ridiculed Christ's royal and Divine claims by attiring Him in the dress of king Saturn. J. G. Frazer urges as an objection to this that, while it is possible that the Saturnalia may have been celebrated in Jerusalem at what seems to have been its original date in March, it is much more likely that it was really held in December, which, of course, does not harmonize with the time of year at which the Crucifixion took place. Frazer himself thinks that it resembled much more closely the treatment of the mock king of the Sacaea. He translates Dio Chrysostom's description as follows: 'They take one of the prisoners condemned to death and seat him upon the king's throne, and give him the king's raiment, and let him lord it and drink and run riot and use the king's concubines during these days, and no man prevents him from doing just what he likes. But afterwards they strip and scourge and crucify him' (Frazer, *Golden Bough*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , iii. 187).

Frazer argues that the Jewish Feast of Purim was a continuation of the Sacaea, and he conjectures that the Jews regularly compelled a condemned criminal to play a tragic part in that festival, and that Jesus perished in the character of Haman. He admits the difficulty caused by the fact that Purim fell a month before Passover, but he puts forward various suggestions to mitigate this difficulty. He thinks that possibly the Christian tradition may have shifted the date of the Crucifixion to coincide with the Passover, though he admits that this is perhaps not possible. He points out that the Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] festival seems to have fallen near the time of the Passover, and that the date of Purim was altered to a month earlier so as not to clash with it. He conjectures that the Jews may have sometimes, for a special reason, celebrated the Feast of Purim, or at least the death of Haman, at or near Passover. A further suggestion is, however, that possibly the licence of thirty days allowed to the mock king of the Saturnalia was allowed to the human representative of Haman. Yet as the mockery in question was not by Jews but by Roman soldiers, the question arises whether they would have been likely to take part in a Jewish celebration. To this Frazer replies that they may have fallen in with the local customs, but, quite apart from this, it was natural that without sharing Jewish beliefs they would be quite ready to join in the sport. He points out, however, that according to Lk.'s account, it was Herod's soldiers who mocked Jesus, and they were presumably Jews. Thus the Crucifixion on this view was not a punishment specially designed for Christ, but merely the fate which annually befell the malefactor who played Haman. It is argued that certain difficulties in the narrative thus gain relief. Pilate was reluctant to give up Jesus and yet acquiesced, though he had the power to release Him. This is due to the fact that someone had to be given up to play the part of Haman. Again, would Pilate have ventured to put over the cross the inscription declaring that Jesus was king of the Jews with a tyrant so gloomy and suspicious as Tiberius, unless it had been

a formula of long standing and regarded as quite innocuous? Since Jesus represented Haman, it is suggested that Barabbas represented Mordecai; and if so, he was probably released in order to play the part of a buffoon king (cf. the story of the mockery of Carabas in Philo, *adv. Flaccum*, ii. 520-523, and the 'Ride of the Beardless One' in Persia, referred to by Lagarde in his *Purim*). The name Barabbas, Frazer suggests, was an official title mistakenly regarded as a personal name. Originally Haman and Mordecai were the same, but one personated the dead and the other the risen deity. The same person probably played both parts, he who was Mordecai one year was Haman the next.

This ingenious theory is open to the most serious objections. Some of these have been stated by Mr. Andrew Lang in the very elaborate investigation he gives in *Magic and Religion*. It is very difficult to make good the identification of Purim with the Sacaea even if Frazer's interpretation of the Sacaea could hold good, which is very doubtful. It is also very improbable that a victim was actually crucified in the character of Haman by the Jews. There is not a shred of evidence to make such a suggestion plausible. And when we come to apply it to the Gospel history, the theory becomes more improbable than ever. The licence allowed to 'the Beardless One' was such that he was permitted, if the shopkeepers did not give him what he wished during his ride through the city, to appropriate everything they had in their shops. It is not easy to see any real parallel between this and the overturning of the money-changers' tables and driving out of their sheep and oxen from the Temple by Jesus. There is all the difference between a raid on the shopkeepers for personal plunder and the cleansing of the Temple from an intolerable abuse. Jesus would not have been asked by the authorities by what right He did these things, if it had been a perfectly legitimate exercise of a power He possessed as the representative of Haman. Moreover, Frazer's theory involves our rejection of the Johannine date for the cleansing of the Temple, although that date has much that can be said in its favour. Apart from this, however, one insuperable difficulty remains. It is quite possible that Jesus should have suffered in any character chosen for Him by those who compassed His death. In that respect He was a passive victim. But it is quite incredible that He should have participated in these ceremonies of His own free will, or have given any colour whatever to superstitions of that kind. It is accordingly out of the question to interpret the cleansing of the Temple as Frazer does, since that would imply that Jesus lent Himself to this festival. Moreover, unless the Gospel narratives are altogether misleading, Jesus was not in the hands of His enemies till the night before His death, and therefore His triumphal entry and His attack on the desecration of the Temple could have been no part of the programme of a Purim festival. There would have been no need for secrecy through the fear of the people, or for the services of the traitor, if the mockery and death were but the last acts in a longer drama. Nor are the difficulties in the Gospel narratives really mitigated by this hypothesis. The ordinary explanation of Pilate's vacillation and surrender is perfectly adequate. The procurator

was so unpopular that he dared not risk the charge of treason that might have been launched against him before Tiberius if he had let a claimant to Messianic dignity go free. However convinced Pilate may have been that Jesus was harmless to Rome, nothing would have been easier than to bring a very damaging charge against him before the emperor. Nor is the title over the cross to be interpreted along Frazer's lines. To have let Jesus go would have constituted a much more valid basis of accusation than to write the title 'This is the king of the Jews' over His cross, for that meant 'This is the king of the Jews, and thus I serve pretenders to the throne.' It mocked Jesus and exasperated the Jews. To imagine that by one course Pilate would have escaped the charge of treason which he would have incurred by the other, is indeed to strain out the gnat and swallow the camel. If, as Frazer says, Pilate was obliged to give up a prisoner, and all he could do was to choose him, he had others whom he might have chosen besides Jesus and Barabbas. It was a choice that was dictated by his position. He was in the grip of his past and of his dread of Tiberius. Another point that deserves mention is that the mockery of Christ's prophetic claims is precisely parallel to the mockery of His royal claims. In the one case they bid Him prophesy, in the other they dress Him up as a mock king and pay Him a ribald homage. The parallelism shows us how unnecessary it is for us to seek for far-fetched reasons to explain the conduct of the Roman soldiers. Nothing was more natural than that the supporters of an alien empire should mock royal claims put forward by one who belonged to the subject people, and no derision was more effective than the dressing up of their victim as king. The sceptre served to beat Him, and the jest of the coronation was all the more piquant that the crown was studded with thorns. As Mr. Lang reminds us, 'Wallace was crowned at his trial with laurel'; and Atholl, who was a pretender to the crown, 'was tortured to death with a red-hot iron crown' (*Magic and Religion*, p. 203).

Lastly, it should be observed that the passage from Dio Chrysostom will not bear too much weight. There is a resemblance in the clothing with royal robes, in the stripping, the scourging, and the death, but there is no resemblance to the royal privileges accorded to the condemned prisoner, and it is also not clear that the victim was crucified. The Greek word used (*ἐκρέμασαν*) may mean simply that he was hanged, though the other view is more probable. No stress can be laid on the scourging in the case of Jesus, for it was the usual preliminary to crucifixion, and crucifixion was unhappily among the Romans no exceptional form of execution.

Literature.—In addition to the Commentaries and Lives of Christ, see Frazer, *Golden Bough*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , iii. 186-198; A. Lang, *Magic and Religion*, 76-204, 295-305; Vollmer, *Jesus und das Sacænopfer*; Reich, *Der König mit der Dornenkrone*.

☒ Money

MONEY.—We propose to treat first of money in general as referred to in the Gospels, and afterwards of the definite sums or coins which are there named.

I. *Money in General.*—In the Authorized Version six Greek words are rendered ‘money,’ ‘tribute money,’ or ‘piece of money.’ In two cases this is a mistranslation, and is rectified by the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885. The words are as follows:

1. ἀργύριον (Mat 25:18; Mat 25:27; Mat 28:12; Mat 28:15, Mar 14:11, Luk 9:3; Luk 19:15; Luk 19:23; Luk 22:5). (In three of the above passages it occurs in the plural without the sense being altered; thus, cf. Mat 25:18 with 25:27). This word originally means silver, hence silver money (also translation ‘pieces of silver,’ Mat 27:3; Mat 27:5-6; Mat 27:9; see below, under ‘Stater’); finally, as silver was the chief medium of exchange in the ancient world, money in general (cf. Fr. *argent*). 2. χαλκός (Mar 6:8; Mar 12:41). This word originally means brass, hence coins of brass (or copper), and, as copper money circulated largely among the common people, money in general. 3. κέρμα (Joh 2:15) comes from a verb meaning *to cut*, and means originally change or small coins. It is appropriately used in this passage for the stock-in-trade of the money-changers, a part of whose business it was to supply change for larger sums. 4. νόμισμα (Mat 22:19) comes from a verb meaning *to acknowledge as customary or lawful*. It means, accordingly, money in the sense of lawful coin. The νόμισμα τοῦ κήνσου, or tribute money, was the currency in which the Roman tribute had to be paid, that is, the *denarius*. 5. τὰ δίδραχμα (Mat 17:24 Authorized Version ‘tribute money,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 the half-shekel’). As is rightly indicated by the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, this word is the name of a definite sum of money which was levied for the maintenance of the Temple (see below, under ‘Didrachm’). 6. στατήρ (Mat 17:27 Authorized Version ‘piece of money,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘shekel’). Here, too, the Authorized Version is at fault, the word meaning a definite coin (see below, under ‘Stater’).

To the above words used for money in general (though under slightly different aspects) may be added the comprehensive description of money in Mat 10:9 in terms of the three metals used as specie—gold, silver, and brass (or copper). This verse may be taken as evidence that gold as well as silver and copper coins circulated in

Palestine in the time of our Lord, although no gold coin is mentioned in the Gospels. The current gold coin was doubtless the Roman *aureus*, frequently referred to in the Mishna as a golden *denarius*. In silver there was more variety. The Roman *denarius* was, of course, largely, in evidence, and was probably the silver coin in most common use. But there were also coins of larger size, bearing Greek names. When Pompey made Syria a Roman province (b.c. 65), he found in circulation tetradrachms of two different kinds. There were those issued chiefly from Antioch by the Seleucid kings on the Attic standard, weighing 262 grains troy. There were also those issued by the semi-autonomous cities of Phœnicia on the Phœnician standard of 224 grains to the tetradrachm. Tetradrachms of both standards were recognized by Pompey as equivalent to four denarii (Mommsen, *Gesch. des Röm. Münzwesens*, 36, 715). Both would still be lawful coin in the time of our Lord, though, as Mommsen surmises (*ib.* 72), the heavier royal tetradrachms would tend to be driven out of circulation by the lighter Phœnician coins, which, besides, as corresponding exactly to the Hebrew shekel, were in special demand in Palestine for religious purposes (see below, under 'Didrachm'). The supply of silver from the mints at Tyre and Sidon, which continued to issue tetradrachms and didrachms under the Emperors,* [Note: According to most numismatologists; e.g., Head (*Hist. Num* 675) says: From b.c. 126 down to the reign of Vespasian, we possess a plentiful series of Tyrian tetradrachms and didrachms.' On the other hand, Mommsen (*op. cit.* 36) holds that from the time of Pompey the Phœnician cities lost the power of issuing silver money, and points out that the extant Phœnician tetradrachms never bear the names of Emperors or any other indication of Roman sway.] was reinforced from the time of Augustus onwards by the tetradrachms coined in large numbers at Antioch for circulation in the province of Syria. These ranged in weight from 220 to 236 grains, and were no doubt reckoned for ordinary purposes as equal to four *denarii*, although, in accordance with the regular practice of the Romans of giving a preference to their own silver, they were tariffed for purposes of taxation as only equal to three *denarii*.

A vexed question, which cannot be held to be yet decided, is whether prior to the time of the first Jewish revolt any silver coins had been produced in Palestine itself. Until lately it has been usual for numismatologists to assign to Simon Meccabæus certain silver shekels and half-shekels struck on the Phœnician standard, and bearing the inscription in Hebrew, 'Jerusalem the Holy' (Madden, *Coins of the Jews*, 65-71; Head, *Hist. Num.* 681, 682). Strong historical reasons, however, have been brought by Schürer (*HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]* i. ii. 379-383) and others for dating these coins rather in the time of the revolt under Nero; and the opinion seems to be making headway that at the time of our Lord, and previously, the Jews were dependent for their silver money upon foreign sources. (For an able statement of the case, see Kennedy in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, vol. iii. s.v. 'Money,' § 5).

On the other hand, the supply of copper money must have been almost, if not quite, exclusively of native production. There were the copper coins of the Hasmonaean princes, those of the various Herods, and those which had been struck since a.d. 6 by successive procurators of Judaea. Unlike the foreign silver money, they have, in deference to Jewish feeling, no Imperial effigy or the likeness of any living thing; even those of the procurators have only the name of the reigning Emperor, and innocent ears of corn, palm-trees, lilies, and the like. As to their denomination we have no sure evidence. Schürer holds that the Romans imposed their monetary standard more rigorously in Palestine than elsewhere, and that even the Herodian coins followed the Roman system (*HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]* ii. i. 38). Other writers consider it to be more probable that the copper coinage of Palestine followed the subdivisions of the drachm common in Greek-speaking countries. The extant coins contain no indication of value, nor can any safe inference be drawn from their weight, seeing that, where a silver standard prevails, the copper coinage must always be very much of the nature of token money. (See, further, under 'Assarion,' 'Kodrantēs,' and 'Lepton,' below).

Before proceeding to speak in detail of the coins named in the Gospels, it will be well to give in tabular form the main elements of the two systems, the Greek and the Roman, which obtained concurrently in Palestine at the time of our Lord. For convenience of reference the average value in sterling money is put opposite the larger sums.

Greek system.

| | | |
|-----------------|---|-------------|
| 1 Talent (£240) | = | 60 Minas. |
| 1 Mina (£4) | = | 100 Drachms |
| 1 Drachm (9½d.) | = | 6 Obols. |
| 1 Obol | = | 8 Chalki. |

(To this system belong also the stater of four, and the didrachm of two, drachms and the lepton, whose relation to the chalkus is uncertain. See below, under 'Lepton').

Roman system.

| | | |
|------------------|---|-------------|
| 1 Aureus (£1) | = | 25 Denarii. |
| 1 Denarius (9½d) | = | 16 Asses. |

1 As.

=

4 Quadrantes.

The point of connexion between the two systems is found in the identification of the Roman *denarius* with the Attic drachm. This identification was rendered easy by the fact that at the time when Rome began her career of conquest in the East the drachm of the Attic standard had fallen to a weight which only slightly exceeded that of the *denarius*; but there can be little doubt that it was made deliberately by the Romans as a matter of policy. Alexander the Great had made the Attic drachm the unit of his Imperial coinage, which he imposed upon all the lands he had conquered; and in adopting the Alexandrine drachm as equal to their own *denarius*, the Romans wished to indicate that they served themselves heirs to his kingdom in the East (Mommsen, *op. cit.* 691). In imperial times the identification was so completely established that Hellenistic writers regularly refer to the *denarius* as 'the Attic drachm.' This identification enables us to assign values to those coins which follow the Greek system. The weight of the gold *aureus* is known, and its value admits of easy calculation (see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. 427), and the other values, as given above, follow at once. This method of ascertaining the value of the silver coins of the Gospels does justice to the fact that, in the Roman Empire then, as in Britain now, the value of silver coins was legally defined in terms of the gold standard.

II. *Definite sums of money and coins mentioned in the gospels.*—These may most conveniently be treated of under three heads: money of account, silver coins, and copper coins.

(i.) *Money of account.*—Two sums of money, to which no actual coin corresponded, receive a special name in the Gospels. These are the *talent* and the *mina*.

1. Talent (τάλαντον, Mat 18:24; Mat 25:15-16; Mat 25:20; Mat 25:22; Mat 25:24-25; Mat 25:28) is originally the name of the highest weight in the various systems of antiquity, hence the sum of money represented by that weight in gold or silver. The talent of the Gospels, which is, of course, a talent of silver, might conceivably be the Phœnician talent, but is far more probably to be identified with the talent on the reduced Attic scale which had been formally recognized by the Romans (see above). It contained 6000 Attic drachms or *denarii*, and was thus worth 240 *aurei* or £240.

The talent is mentioned twice by our Lord. In the parable of the Unmerciful Servant (Mat 18:23-35) the one servant owes the king 10,000 talents, or nearly two-and-a-half millions of our money—an enormous sum, of which the 100 *denarii* (= £4) owed him by his fellow-servant represents but an insignificant fraction (1/6000). It may be remarked that the juxtaposition in this parable of the talent and the *denarius* is a confirmation of the view that it is the *Attic* talent that is meant). In the parable of

the Talents (Mat 25:14-30) the master intrusts his capital of eight talents or £1920 to his three servants in sums of £1200, £480, and £240 respectively. It will be seen that even he who received but one talent had yet quite a respectable capital to trade with, so that the excuse which is sometimes made by commentators on his behalf, viz. that he was discouraged by the smallness of the sum committed to him, is as little valid as that which he offered for himself. The real reason for his conduct was, of course, just his slothfulness.

2. Mina ($\mu\nu\tilde{\alpha}$, Luk 19:13; Luk 19:16; Luk 19:18; Luk 19:20; Luk 19:24-25 Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 **pound**) is the sixtieth part of the talent. Like the latter, it is to be calculated on the Roman-Attic scale. It contains 100 *denarii*, and is thus equal to £4.

The only mention of this sum in the Gospels is in the parable of the Pounds (Luk 19:12-27), where a nobleman, going to a far country to get a kingdom, gives one mina to each of his ten servants, bidding them trade with it till his return. The smallness of the sum in such a connexion is remarkable, especially when compared with the companion parable of the Talents. The explanation (as far as the story is concerned) seems to be that the master is not in this case a trader making provision for the suitable employment of his capital in his absence, but one who, having in prospect the acquisition of a kingdom, desires to test capacity of his servants for high office in that kingdom. Ingenuity and diligence would be more thoroughly tested in multiplying a small sum than a large one.

(ii.) *Silver coins*.—Of these there are mentioned by name, the *denarius*, the *drachm*, the *didrachm*, and the *stater*. The ‘piece of money’ of the Authorized Version in Mat 17:27 is the stater, the ‘pieces of silver’ in Luk 15:8 are drachms, while the ‘pieces of silver’ in Mat 26:15 are probably staters, and are discussed under that heading.

1. Denarius ($\delta\eta\nu\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$, Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 **penny**; American Revisers, more happily, **shilling**).—This is the most frequently mentioned coin in the Gospels (Mat 18:28; Mat 20:2; Mat 20:9-10; Mat 20:13; Mat 22:19, Mar 6:37; Mar 12:15; Mar 14:5, Luk 7:41; Luk 10:35; Luk 20:24, Joh 6:7; Joh 12:5). It is the name of the most important Roman coin, which circulated throughout the Empire, and in terms of which all public accounts were made up. It received its name from being originally the equivalent of ten copper asses, but from b.c. 217 onwards it was equivalent to sixteen asses, and weighed 1/84; of the Roman pound, or 60 grains troy. Under Nero (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 60) it was reduced to 1/96; of the pound, or 52½ grains. At the time of our Lord its value was fixed at 1/23; of the *aureus*, which may be taken under the early

emperors as equal on the average to our sovereign; thus the *denarius* was worth 9-6 pence, or roughly 9½d.

We find the *denarius* used in the Gospels for the reckoning of even fairly large sums. Thus in the parable of the Unmerciful Servant (Mat 18:28, see above under 'Talent') a sum of 100 *denarii* is mentioned, while in the parable of the Two Debtors (Luk 7:41) the two debts are stated at 500 and 50 *denarii* respectively (£20 and £2). In Mar 6:37 = Joh 6:7 the disciples estimate that it would seed bread to the value of at least 200 *denarii* (£8) to provide for the five thousand. (There is no probability in the suggestion that this figure was named as the amount of money then in 'the bag.' It is intended to indicate a sum far beyond the means of the little company). In Mar 14:5 = Joh 12:5 the vase of ointment with which Mary anointed our Lord is valued at 300 *denarii* (£12). The 'exceeding costliness' of this loving tribute is realized when we remember that the sum named represents at least the annual income of a labourer of those days. This appears from the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard (Mat 20:1-15), where a *denarius* is evidently looked upon as liberal pay for a day's work; for we may be quite sure that the employer who dealt so generously with the labourers engaged late in the day had struck no niggardly bargain with those hired in the morning. (A passage which may be quoted in confirmation is To 5:14, where the disguised angel is promised by Tobit a drachm a day—at that time a little less than a *denarius*—for acting as companion to his son. It is true that this was to be exclusive of his necessary expenses; but, on the other hand, the position was one of trust, and would naturally be more highly remunerated than field labour). In the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luk 10:30-37) two *denarii* are given to the innkeeper as a reasonable payment in advance for the keep of the wounded traveller for a day or two, to be supplemented if necessary on the return of the Samaritan. (This is the most natural way to explain the reference; see Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden*, ii. 591. On the other hand, Ramsay in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, Ext. Vol. 394, holds that the two *denarii* were simply payment for the one night that the two had spent in the inn).

Of special interest is the reference to the *denarius* in Mat 22:19 = Mar 12:15 = Luk 20:24 in connexion with the Pharisees' question as to the lawfulness of paying tribute to Caesar. The *denarius* was 'the money of the tribute' (Mat 22:19), all Imperial taxes being payable in terms of it in accordance with a rescript of Germanicus (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 18). It bore upon it the name and title of the reigning Emperor, along with the effigy either of himself or of some member of the Imperial family—the 'image and superscription' to which our Lord alluded. It was issued by the Imperial authority, even the Roman Senate having only the right to mint copper coins, and could thus must appropriately be spoken of as 'that which is Caesar's.'

2. Drachm (δραχμή, Luk 15:8-9 Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 **piece of silver**).—This is the name of the unit of the Greek system of silver coinage, and, as such, might be applied to a great variety of coins from different mints and of different standards. In the Gospels it occurs only in the parable of the Lost Coin, where, of course, it must be understood of some coin current in Palestine. Few coins of this denomination were issued from the Phœnician cities or from Antioch, and the city of Caesarea in Cappadocia had only recently begun to coin drachms on the Phœnician standard (of 55 grains) for use in the provinces of Syria and Cappadocia (Mommsen, *op. cit.* 734, 897; Head, *op. cit.* 634). Thus, while it is not impossible that the coins in question may have been drachms of the Phœnician standard, they are with greater probability to be identified with the ‘Attic drachms’* [Note: It may not be out of place to remind the reader that the word ‘Attic’ in this connexion implies only a remote association with the coinage of Athens. In his Notes on the Parables, Trench assumes that this drachm was Athenian, stamped with ‘an owl, a tortoise, or a head of Minerva,’ and reluctantly surrenders ‘the resemblance to the human soul, originally stamped with the image and superscription of the great King,’ which earlier expositors had delighted to trace. A sound method of parable exposition will indeed dispense with this fanciful suggestion, but not for Trench’s reasons (see Bruce, *Parabolic Teaching*, 279).] of the Hellenistic writers, that is, with Roman *denarii*. In any case, the value for ordinary purposes was the same—about 9½d. of our money. The ‘ten pieces of silver’ possessed by the woman thus amounted to eight shillings.

3. Didrachm (διδραχμον, Mat 17:24 Authorized Version ‘tribute money,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘half-shekel’).—As the name implies, this is a coin of the value of two drachms. τὰ διδραχμα in the passage quoted refers to the tax of half a shekel (Exo 30:13) levied each year in the month of Adar from all Jews above the age of twenty for the maintenance of the Temple. The only coins then current in Palestine which answered exactly to the ‘shekel of the sanctuary’—leaving out of account the shekels commonly but probably erroneously assigned to Simon Maccabaeus (see above)—were those which had for long been coined in the Phœnician cities; and the Temple tax, along with other sacred dues, was paid in this currency.

The well-established correspondence of the didrachm to the half-shekel has been obscured for some writers by the fact that the LXX Septuagint regularly translate שֶׁקֶל by δ·δραχμον. From the narrative in Mt. it is evident that the tax was a voluntary one, although the Mishna declares that the goods of those who had not paid it by the 25th Adar might be distrained (Edersheim, *Life and Times*, ii. 112). After the destruction of Jerusalem, Vespasian made compulsory a poll-tax of the same amount to defray the cost of rebuilding the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus.

4. Stater (στατήρ, Mat 17:27 Authorized Version **piece of money**, Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 **shekel**).—The word στατήρ is derived from the verb ἴστημι in the sense of *to weigh*. It hence means, in the first place, a standard weight, and then derivatively a standard coin. In Athens it was at first applied to the didrachm, which was looked upon as the standard coin of the monetary system, but afterwards to the tetradrachm or piece of four drachms. It is evidently so used in the passage before us, for the stater to be found in the fish's mouth was to pay the Temple tax of a didrachm for two persons, our Lord and Peter. The tetradrachm of the Phœnician standard corresponded to the Hebrew shekel, and is no doubt the coin here indicated. Josephus refers in one passage (*BJ* ii. xxi. 2) to 'the Tyrian coin which is of the value of four Attic drachms,' and in another (*Ant.* iii. viii. 2) he gives the value of the Hebrew shekel as four Attic drachms. The stater would thus be worth 4s. 2d. of our money.

In Mat 26:15 Cod. D [Note: Deuteronomist.] reads σριάκοντα στατήρας; and though this reading is rejected by critical editors, it probably embodies a correct paraphrase of the ἀργύρια (Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'pieces of silver') of the Textus Receptus. That is, the thirty pieces of silver paid to the traitor as the price of blood were staters of the Phœnician standard. This appears from a comparison of the passages in Mt. where they are spoken of with Zec 11:12-13, in which shekels are plainly intended. It has been pointed out (O. Holtzmann, *NT Zeitgesch.* 110) that just as in Zec 11:12 the word שקל does not occur but is suggested by the word וישקלו, so also the word στατήρ is latent in the verb ἴστησεν in Mat 26:15. Reckoning the stater at 4 *denarii*, the sum paid to Judas amounted to £4, 16s. Thirty shekels of silver was the price that had to be paid (Exo 21:32) as blood-money for a male or female slave; and this coincidence has frequently been used as a striking illustration of the truth expressed in Php 2:7 that our Lord took upon Himself the form of a servant.

(iii.) *Copper coins*.—There are three copper coins mentioned in the Gospels: the *assarion*, the *kodrantēs*, and the *lepton*. The last is translation 'mite' in the Authorized and Revised Versions, while the two others are called, without distinction, by the name 'farthing.'

1. Assarion (ἄσσάριον Mat 10:29, Luk 12:6, Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 **farthing**, Amer. Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 **penny**).—The name is derived from the Latin *assarius*, a variant of *as*. It may either be the name given in Greek-speaking countries to the Roman *as*, or else the name of some local

copper coin which in some way corresponded to it. Both views have been taken, by different scholars, of the significance of the word in the above passages. On the one hand, Schürer (*HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]* ii. i. 39) and others hold that it is the Roman *as* that is here mentioned, in value the sixteenth part of the *denarius*. In support of this view, it may be urged that copper coins were issued, by authority of the Senate, from the Imperial mint at Antioch for circulation in the province of Syria, that these coins bear Latin inscriptions, and that of the two sizes in which they are found one has been identified (*e.g.* by Mommsen, *op. cit.* 718, and Madden, *op. cit.* 301) with the *sestertius* or quarter-*denarius*, and the other with the *as*. Moreover, the Vulgate not only renders ἀσσάριον back into *as* in the passage in Mt., but in the corresponding passage in Lk. has *dipondio*, thus identifying the ‘two farthings’ which are named as the price of two sparrows with the Roman *dupondius* or piece of two *asses*. Schürer points out, besides, that the name אִסָּר (‘*issar*, evidently the Heb. form of ἀσσάριον) occurs frequently in the Mishna, and is sometimes expressly called אִסָּר אִיטָּלִי or Italian *assarion*. If this view is correct, the *assarion* of the Gospels will represent 6d.—roughly a halfpenny—in English money, or exactly 5 German pfennigs. On the other hand, this simple solution of the problem is challenged, and chiefly on account of those very references in the Mishna to which Schürer appeals. The qualification of certain *assaria* as ‘Italian’—which is also found in Greek on certain Cretan coins of the time of Claudius (Head, 384) and in a quotation from the Rescript of Germanicus in the Palmyra tariff—seems to imply that there were other coins of the same name, but of different value. And, as a matter of fact, the Mishna speaks of the *dînar* or *denarius* as containing 24 ‘*issârîm*, which cannot therefore be Roman *asses* of 16 to the *denarius*. If this distinction existed already in the time of our Lord, it is to be presumed that He used the word in the more popular sense.* [Note: Kennedy in Hastings’ DB, s.v. ‘Money,’ § 8, draws an interesting and instructive distinction between the ‘tariff’ and the ‘current’ value of the local copper money. Just as the tetradrachmon of Antioch was tarified as only equal to three denarii for purposes of taxation, so he supposes that the local *assarion* (1/24 of the drachm) was rated as equivalent to half of the Italian *assarion* or *as*. But this does not affect the calculation made above, for of course the purchase of sparrows would be one of those ‘ordinary purposes’ for which the coin would retain its current value.] In this case the price of the two sparrows (Mat 10:29) would be 4d., or rather less than a halfpenny—almost exactly 4 centimes.

2. Kodrantes (κοδραντης, Mat 5:26, Mar 12:42, Authorized Version, Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, and Amer. Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 **farthing**).—There can be no question as to the identity of the coin that is intended in these two passages. It is the *quadrans* or quarter-*as*, the smallest coin in the Roman system, equal in value to 3/5 of a farthing, or a little more than the pfennig. It may, however,

reasonably be doubted whether any coin known by this name was in circulation in Palestine in the time of our Lord. The word does not occur in the Mishna, and it has not been found in any of the inscriptions in Greek-speaking provinces (see *ExpT [Note: xpT Expository Times.]* x. [1899] 232, 336. where Sir W. M. Ramsay takes Prof. Blass roundly to task for assuming that the name *κοδρόντης* was familiar in the East, and that the provincial cities coined copper money with Roman designations). Nor are the allusions in the Gospels conclusive. Mk.'s explanatory note (*λεπτὰ δύο, ὃ ἐστὶν κοδρόντης*) is obviously intended for non-Palestinian (possibly Roman) readers. As for the use of the word in Mt., the fact that the parallel passage in Lk. has *τὸ ἔσχατον λεπτόν* instead of *τὸν ἔσχατον κοδρόντην*, suggests that it may have been inserted by the First Evangelist as the name of the smallest coin in the Roman system in place of the *lepton*, the smallest coin in the Palestinian system. It is, however, open to us to suppose that there was a local coin which for some purposes was identified with the *quadrans*, though rarely so named. A coin of Agrippa ii. has been found bearing the name *χαλκοῦς* (Madden, 146). In the ordinary Greek system the *chalkus* is equal to 1/48; of the drachm; but if we suppose that for purposes of taxation local copper was only accepted subject to a discount of 25 per cent., the *chalkus* would be tariffed as equal to the *quadrans*, which is 1/64; of the *denarius*. (Cf. note to last paragraph, and see the already quoted art. by Prof. Kennedy, who works out in detail the relations of the 'tariff' and 'current' values of the various coins).

3. Lepton (*λεπτόν*, Mar 12:42, Luk 12:59; Luk 21:2, Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 mite).—This name is originally an adjective meaning 'thin' or 'small.' It hence denotes a very small coin, but is otherwise indeterminate. 'In the Oriental provinces of the Roman Empire,' says Babelon (*Monnaies Grecques et Romaines*, i. i. 466), 'the word *λεπτόν* regularly denoted local copper money as distinguished from coppers of the Roman mint.' At different times and in various places it was used of coins of very different value. As used in the Gospels, however, there is no ambiguity. It is agreed on all hands that it denotes the smallest coin current among the Jews, known to the Mishna as the *פְּרֻטָּה* (*pěřûtâh*), of which we are expressly told that it was an eighth of the Roman *as* (see reff. in Lightfoot, ii. 453, and Schürer, ii. i. 40),—a statement which exactly agrees with that of Mk. about the value of the *lepton*. If, therefore, *quadrans* is to be identified with the *chalkus*, the *lepton* is a coin of half the value.

Nevertheless, the statement of Mk. (*λεπτὰ δύο, ὃ ἴσιν κοδρόντης*), has given much trouble to numismatologists, who, to quote the words of one of them, 'have serious

difficulty in finding among the small coins of Judaea separate denominations for chalkous and lepton' (G. F. Hill in *Ebi [Note: Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.]*, s.v. 'Penny'). Accordingly, many attempts have been made to identify the *lepton* with the *chalkus-quadrans*. Thus Madden, following Cavedoni, cuts the knot by supposing Mk. to have meant the ὀιστι, to apply to the λεπτον and not to the λεπτα δύο (*Coins of the Jews*, 304), and appeals for corroboration to the correspondence of the *kodrantes* to the *lepton* in Mat 5:26 = Luk 12:59. Hill, on the other hand, following up the suggestion of Prof. Kennedy referred to in the preceding paragraphs, contends that the difference between the *lepton* and the *chalkus-quadrans* was only a matter of accounting. The difficulty, as stated by Mr. Hill, depends upon the assumption that the *chalkus-quadrans* was a current Palestinian coin. This, however, has not been proved. Agrippa's *chalkus* need not have been considered as equal to a *quadrans*.* [Note: Babelon (606) identifies the quadrans with the διχαλκον and the χαλκοῦς; with the lepton of the Gospels.] As stated by Mr. Madden, 'it is impossible to get over the fact that at this period the quadrans of the Empire, which still retained the name of χαλκοῦς, had the same weight as the lepton of the time of the Seleucidae' (*Coins of the Jews*, 304). The difficulty depends, further, upon an inference from weight,—an inference which, in the case of coins which were little more than tokens, is unusually precarious. In any case, the arguments advanced would need to be much stronger in order to upset the positive statement of St. Mark.

The value, then, as men reckon values, of the widow's gift was little more than a farthing. But the fact that it consisted of *two* tiny coins,—a fact which we constantly obscure by talking, in our careless way, of 'the widow's *mite*,'—is full of significance. She might have kept back one.† [Note: 'Quorum unum vidua retinere potuerat' (Bengel).] But of her penury she cast in all that she had; and so of her, too, as of another woman who from her larger resources made an equally lavish gift, it is true that, wherever the gospel is preached throughout the whole world (Mat 26:13), this that she did is told as a memorial of her.

Literature.—Madden's *Coins of the Jews* (vol. ii. of *Numismata Orientalia*) contains an exhaustive account of all the extant Jewish coins, and an appendix (289-310) on the money of the NT. The subject is treated briefly, but clearly, in Schürer, *HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]* ii. i. 38-40, and O. Holtzmann, *NT Zeitgesch.* 110-116. Mommsen's *Gesch. des Röm. Münzwesens* is a mine of information on all that concerns the money of the Empire. Articles on 'Money' in the various Bible Dictionaries can be read with advantage, esp. the admirably comprehensive and lucid art. by Prof. Kennedy in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible .

Norman Fraser.

☒ Money-Changers

MONEY-CHANGERS.—See preced. art. and Bank, No. 1.

☒ Monotheism

MONOTHEISM.—At whatever period in their early history the people of Israel may be supposed to have passed through the obscure and uncertain stages of belief that precede a clear and reasoned theism, that period had been left behind long before the days of Christ and the NT writers. The bitter experiences of exile and suffering on the one hand, and on the other the lofty teachings of prophets and men of God, had eradicated all tendencies to polytheism, and had fixed immovably in the conscience and conviction of the entire nation the faith that Jehovah was the one God of the whole earth. If Israel's early beliefs, as some contend, were henotheistic, and conceded a place and right to other national gods, as Chemosh, Molech, or Rimmon, as equal and paramount lords of their own peoples, such recognition of external divinities had long since ceased to be permissible. There were not really gods many and lords many; there is one God the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ (1Co_8:6).

This monotheistic belief, however, is assumed rather than formulated or defined in the Gospels. The doctrine that God is one, universally supreme and without rival, does not need to be explained or defended, for it runs no risk of being assailed. Like the belief in the existence of God, it is an article of faith accepted on all sides, by Jesus and by His opponents, and is rather implicit in the thought than explicit in the teaching of Christ and of His disciples.

While, however, this is true, and all the more so because His controversy with the Jews turned largely upon the question of His claim to equality with God, and the blasphemy which this claim appeared to them to imply, epithets and phrases may readily be quoted from the Gospels which have no meaning except as presupposing an absolute and pure monotheism. Such phrases, as would naturally be anticipated, are more generally employed by St. John than by the Synoptists. Thus the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel, tracing all things back to God with whom the Word is one (Joh_1:1), asserts nothing less than the uniqueness as well as the eternity and sovereignty of Him from whom they proceed; and the true Light entering into the world enlighteneth not this or that nation only, but every man (Joh_1:9). To the same effect and with the same background of accepted and common belief are the repeated declarations of His oneness with the Father (Joh_10:30; Joh_10:38; Joh_14:10; cf. Joh_17:21; cf.

Joh_17:23). The area and claims of the Divine Kingdom, the Kingdom of God, are explicitly enlarged beyond any mere national limits, and made to embrace the whole world (Luk_16:16, Joh_4:21 ff.), and so the disciples are taught to pray that it may come upon earth, as it is in heaven (Mat_6:10). It is indeed not bodily or material (Luk_17:21), but transcends the world (Joh_18:36). In the Last Judgment, again, all nations are gathered before the throne, and all receive sentence. 'The field' in which the seed is sown is 'the world' (Mat_13:38); and the final injunction to Christ's followers is that they are to go into all the world to make disciples of all the nations (Mat_28:19).

The same teaching is conveyed with more or less directness in the assertion of the subordination and judgment of the prince of this world (Joh_16:11); in the stress laid upon the unique obligation and importance of love to God as constituting the first and greatest commandment (Mat_22:37 || Mar_12:30, Luk_10:27); in the appeal made by Christ Himself to a similar unique obligation of worship and service to the one only God (Mat_4:10 || Luk_4:8); in the emphatic affirmation of a common Fatherhood and Godhead (Joh_20:17; cf. Joh_8:41); and in the solemn declaration of the permanence and inviolability of the words of the Son (Mat_24:35 || Mar_13:31, Luk_21:33), while elsewhere there is ascribed to Him that omniscience which is an attribute of God Himself (Joh_16:30).

There are also passages in which the epithet 'one' or 'only' is directly applied to the Divine Ruler, thus claiming for Him with more or less emphasis the sole dominion and the exclusive right to homage. 'The Lord our God is one Lord' (Mar_12:29 from Deu_6:4, cf. Mar_12:32). The God who forgives sins is εἷς (Mar_2:7), or μόνος (Luk_5:21); He is unique in goodness (Mat_19:17 || Mar_10:18, Luk_18:19); the sole Father (Mat_23:9); and the only God (Joh_5:44).

Some of these expressions might, it is true, be satisfied by a wide conception, such as the ancient prophets had formed, of a God of Israel to whom the sons of Israel were a first interest and charge, or even of a Sovereign the limits of whose sway left room for other sovereigns beside Him. Not all of them, evidently, if read apart and by themselves, will bear the weight of a full monotheistic inference. Taken together, however, and in their context, their joint and several significance is unmistakable. They assume on the part of speaker and hearer alike a belief in the sole supremacy of one God. Nor is this inference as to their meaning seriously contested.

Moreover, in one passage (Joh_17:3) there is found a perfectly distinct and unequivocal assertion of monotheistic doctrine; eternal life is to gain a knowledge of the only true God (τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν). Other phrases, in themselves less definite or comprehensive, must clearly be received and interpreted in the light of

this, if an adequate conception of Christ's teaching concerning the Father is to be reached. The principle is applicable to other elements of His instruction than that under consideration. The whole is to be construed and expounded by means of the loftiest and most comprehensive statements of doctrine, not to be attenuated to those which may be more particular or obscure.

The conclusion, therefore, is that a monotheistic belief is everywhere assumed in the Gospels; and if it is rarely formulated, the reason is to be sought in the universal assent with which it was received. Christ did not need to teach with definiteness and reiteration, as though it were a new truth, that there is one only Lord of heaven and of earth; for this belief was common to Himself and to His hearers, and formed the solid and accepted foundation of their religious faith.

Literature.—Treatises on the Theology of the NT discuss the conception of God, and the general doctrine is treated in works on Theism; cf. Ed. Caird, *Evolution of Religion*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 2 vols., Glasgow, 1894; Orr, *Christian View of God and the World*¹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , pp. 91-96.

A. S. Geden.

☞Month

MONTH.—See Time.

☞Moon

MOON.—In the NT the moon (σελήνη) is part of the established natural order. So when Christ prophesies the end of the world, 'The moon shall not give her light' (Mat_24:29, Mar_13:24). Twice in the Gospel of Matthew (Mat_4:24; Mat_17:15) σεληνιάζεσθαι (literally *to be moonstruck*) is used to describe mental derangement, as in our 'lunacy,' 'lunatic,' from Lat. *luna*, 'the moon.' See above, pp. 91^b, 96^b.

The Passover always took place at full moon, for it was held on the 14th of the month Nisan, and it was the lunar month that was used, as it is still used by the Jews (Josephus *Ant.* iii. x. 5; cf. Col_2:16). Thus there was moonlight in Gethsemane

when Christ went there with His disciples, and when He was betrayed. Also, the darkness which lasted for three hours during the crucifixion could not be due to an ordinary eclipse of the sun by the moon. See also art. Time.

T. Gregory.

☞ Morality, Moral Law

MORALITY, MORAL LAW.—See Ethics, and Law.

☞ Morning

MORNING.—Mat 16:3; Mat 20:1; Mat 27:1, Mar 11:20; Mar 13:35; Mar 16:2; cf. Mat 28:1, Luk 24:1, Joh 20:1. There was no exact division of the day into parts among the Jews until after the Exile. The broad divisions current were ‘evening,’ ‘morning,’ and ‘mid-day,’ which followed this order usually, after the Jewish method of reckoning the day prevailed ‘with the triumph of the Law.’ The Roman division of the night into four ‘watches,’ extending from six o’clock to six o’clock, is brought into striking view in Mar 13:35, where ὄψε (in the evening), μεσονύκτιον, (at midnight), and ἀλεκτοροφωνίας (at cock-crowing), are given in connexion and contrast with πρωτ (in the morning). The passages in the Gospels in which πρωτ (morning) plays the most interesting and puzzling part are those connected with the visit of the women to the sepulchre after the resurrection of Jesus (Mat 28:1, Mar 16:2, Luk 24:1, and Joh 20:1). Here Mt. has ‘late on the sabbath’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), while Mk. says ‘very early on the first day of the week,’ and Jn. while it was yet dark.’ No explanation will prove satisfactory to all. But Mt.’s ‘late on the sabbath’ may be taken as reckoning the following night as a part of the Sabbath—a departure from Jewish usage (Meyer). In short, we may suppose that the Babylonian method of adding diurnally the night to the day, rather than the day to the night (Israelitish), had come at this time, more or less, into common use among the Jews, so that there were two ways of reckoning complete astronomical days; namely, first, by ‘night-days,’ and, secondly, by ‘day-nights.’ Then we need only to suppose Mt. to be thinking of the ‘day-night,’ and the difficulty vanishes; for ‘late’ in that ‘day-night’ would mean about the end of the night which followed the end of the Sabbath. This would accord perfectly with Mk.’s note of time, ‘very early on the first day of the week.’ Another solution of the difficulty is suggested by J. H. Moulton (*Prolegomena*, p. 72), that, according to the usage represented in the papyri, Mt.’s words rendered

in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘late on the sabbath,’ should be rendered ‘late from the sabbath,’ which is equivalent to saying ‘after the sabbath.’ This, too, would bring the words into harmony with those of Mark and John.

Geo. B. Eager.

☞ Moses

MOSES (Heb. מֹשֶׁה in accordance with the derivation from מָשַׁח ‘to draw,’ given in Exo_2:10; LXX Septuagint and NT usually Μωϋσῆς [Vulgate *Moyses*], following the derivation adopted by Philo and Josephus from the Coptic *mo* ‘water’ and *ushe* ‘saved, occasionally, however, Μωσῆς in conformity to the Hebrew. On its declension see Blass, *Grammar of NT*, § 10)—For an estimate of the position occupied by Moses in the Gospels, and his relation to the Person and work of Christ, a good starting-point is afforded by the words of Heb_3:2-6, which may be paraphrased thus: Moses was intrusted by God with an influence which was to affect and permeate not only his own generation but the whole of the Old Dispensation; and he proved himself worthy of the trust. Christ was similarly faithful, but in two ways He far transcended Moses.—(a) Moses, for all the influence which he exercised, was yet a member, a portion, of the ‘house’ throughout which that influence extended; but Christ is God, the Builder and Maker of the house.’ (b) Moses had a delegated authority in the house; he acted under orders as a trusted servant in the early stages of man’s spiritual evolution; but his authority vanished when the Son came into possession. Moses may thus be considered under two aspects, which, however, are not entirely distinct, but blend into one another. (1) He is not so much a person as an instrument. He represented the Old Dispensation because he was the instrument through which the Law was given. (2) He is an historical personality. But, because he represented the Old Dispensation, many of his acts, and of the events of his career, and of the characteristics of his person, prove to be types—inferior and prophetic counterparts—of various factors in the Kingdom and the Person of Christ.

1. (a) It was the opinion universally held among Jews and Christians in Apostolic times, that Moses was the *author* of the Pentateuch. (On our Lord’s acceptance of this opinion, see below).

Mar_12:26. The passage in Exodus relating God’s appearance in the bush is said to occur ‘in the book of Moses.’ And in || Luk_20:37 Moses ‘pointed out’ (ἐμῆνυσεν) the truth of a resurrection of the dead in the passage about the bush, ‘when he calleth

the Lord the God of Abraham ...' It was God Himself who used these words (Exo_3:6), but Moses is spoken of as the author of the passage.

Mar_12:19 || Luk_20:28. The Sadducees, in referring to the Levirate law, claim that 'Moses wrote unto us.' On || Mat_22:24 see below.

Joh_1:45. Philip speaks of 'him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, wrote.'

Luk_16:29; Luk_16:31; Luk_24:27. Moses being the author of the Pentateuch, his name stands as synonymous with that which he wrote.

To these must be added the passages which speak of 'the law of Moses': Luk_2:22 (the offering after childbirth), Luk_24:44 ('the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms'), Joh_7:23 (circumcision; cf. Act_15:1; Act_15:5). See also Act_13:39; Act_26:22; Act_28:23, Rom_5:14; Rom_10:5, 1Co_9:9, 2Co_3:15, Heb_10:28.

(b) Besides this somewhat impersonal use of the name of Moses, there are passages which invest him with a more conscious responsibility and authority in connexion with the Law.

Mat_8:4 || Mar_1:44, Luk_5:14. The healed leper is told to offer the gift which 'Moses enjoined.'

Mat_19:7 || Mar_10:3 f. The Pharisees, 'tempting' Jesus, argue on the assumption that 'Moses commanded' a man to give his wife a writ of divorcement. And our Lord answers them—'Moses allowed you to put away your wives (Mt.), he wrote you this commandment (Mk.), with a view to (προς) your hardness of heart.' Moses is here conceived of as looking out with a prophetic eye over the ages, and seeing that all future generations of Israel would alike harden their hearts against God; and that it would therefore be advisable to permit divorce as a necessary evil under certain circumstances, in order to limit and check man's sinful disposition. The words 'recognize the validity of the husband's act, but do not create the situation' (Swete). In Mk. our Lord anticipates the appeal to Moses by saying, 'What did Moses command you?' Mt. misses this, putting the τι ἐνεταλατο into the mouth of the Pharisees (see Swete on the whole passage, Mar_10:1-6).

Mat_22:24. In citing the Levirate law, the Sadducees claim that 'Moses said'—for which the other Synoptists have the less personal 'Moses wrote.'

Mar_7:10 Our Lord quotes the Fifth Commandment of the Decalogue, together with Exo_21:17, with the words 'Moses said.' || Mat_15:4 has 'God said.'

Mat 23:2. Moses, as the great teacher of the Law, used to sit (cf. Exo 18:1 f.), and deliver *ex cathedra* decisions. And the recognized teachers of the nation, the scribes and Pharisees, took up the same authoritative position (ἐσὶ τῆς Μ. καθίδρας ικάθισαι) when they became the exponents of the traditional rules by which the old Law was 'hedged.' Jesus does not find fault with the position; He says, in effect, 'as interpreters of the Law of God, show them all due reverence; as keepers of the Law of God, beware of following their example' (see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. 74^a).

In the Fourth Gospel this view of Moses' authority appears no less prominently.—

Joh 1:17, 'The Law was given through Moses.' But this very fact places him and it on a lower plane than Christ and the Gospel. Moses was merely a channel, through whom the Law—which was something separate from himself—was given; whereas 'grace and truth came into being (ἐγένετο) through Jesus Christ,' because He Himself was, and is, grace and truth; so that we received the fulness of grace and truth 'because we all received of his fulness' (see Hort, *The Way, the Truth, and the Life*, p. 43 f.).

Joh 5:45. The national adherence to the Law is the resting of the national hopes upon Moses ('Moses on whom ye have placed your hope'). But (Joh 5:46 f.) this adherence on your part ought to mean a loyal acceptance of his words, even though their true meaning is at variance with national expectations. Moses' words accuse you, for belief in his writings really involves belief in My words. 'He wrote of me.'

There are two senses in which it may be said that Moses wrote of Christ. Christ said (Mat 22:36-40, cf. Deu 6:5, Lev 19:18) that on the two commandments—love to God, and love to man—'all the Law is hung, and the prophets.' so that the true underlying meaning and motive of the whole Law was reflected in the spirit of Christ (see 'Christ the Interpreter of Prophecy,' by Kennett, *Interpreter*, Jan. 1906). But the Pentateuch contains more than the laws. A further sense in which Moses wrote of Christ is indicated in the whole of § 2 of the present article. Moses was quite unconscious that he wrote of Christ when he hung' the Law upon love; and he was similarly unconscious of it when he related events which were afterwards to receive a spiritual fulfillment in the religion of Christ.

Joh 7:19; Joh 7:22. Our Lord shows the Jews that a strict observance of the letter of the whole Law is, in practice, impossible; and that He is therefore, from their own standpoint, entitled to heal on the Sabbath. 'Did not Moses give you the law? and yet not one of you carries it out in actual practice (ποιεῖ τὸν νόμον). For instance—Moses has given you circumcision; but in keeping that ordinance, you do not hesitate to

break the letter of another, for you circumcise on the Sabbath. There is irony in the ἵνα μὴ λυθῆι ('that the law of Moses be not broken') of Joh 7:23. But a further thought seems to be implied in the διὰ τοῦτο ('for this cause') with which Joh 7:22 opens. Not only did Moses give you a law which it is impossible to keep with rigid exactness, but he gave it to you on this very account, *i.e.* that you might discover by experience its weakness and unprofitableness. A parenthesis, however, is thrown in to modify the δέδωκεν. Moses 'has given' you circumcision in the sense that he has authoritatively endorsed it as a binding ordinance; but it did not originate from him; it was handed down 'from the fathers,' *i.e.* from the days when Abraham circumcised himself and his sons. (Our Lord uses a similar argument with regard to the Sabbath in Mat 12:5).

Joh 9:28 f. The Pharisees taunted the man who had been healed of his blindness with being a disciple of Jesus, while they were 'Moses' disciples.' In their eyes Moses held a position analogous to that of Mohammed or Buddha, or any great founder of a religion. They were Moses' disciples because they revered his writings and obeyed his commands. But Christ's true followers, while they are His disciples, are at the same time far more, because they are partakers in His Divine life.

See also Rom 10:19 (the expression 'Moses saith' introducing the words of God, Deu 32:21), Heb 7:14.

The thought of this section finds concrete illustration in the narrative of Mat 17:1-8 || Mar 9:2-8, Luk 9:28-36. Moses and Elijah, the two grandest figures of the OT, who both fasted forty days and nights, who were both privileged to behold a theophany on Mt. Horeb, and who were both taken from the earth in a supernatural manner, represented 'the Law and the Prophets.' And they appeared to Him who was the fulfilment to which both pointed, and conversed with Him (Lk.) concerning His impending departure (ἔξοδος). Among other factors in the vision which taught a lesson to the watching disciples was the vanishing of Moses and Elijah when 'Jesus alone' remained. 'It helped them to see that the OT being fulfilled by Christ is done away in Christ' (Plummer in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iv. 808^a).

In all the above passages, both in (a) and (b), Moses does not appear strictly as a personality. He is not a man, possessed of individual character—of moral or spiritual attainments. He is the instrument through whom the Law was given to Israel (Act 7:38)—the hand which wrote and the voice which spoke. And Jesus, together with the Jews of His day, thought of him as such. This fact is held by some to cut away the ground from the critical arguments which go to prove that Moses was not the author of the Pentateuch as it stands, and, indeed, that the greater part of the

Pentateuchal law is in its present form later than the age of Moses. The question has been very fully discussed by many writers, so that only a brief notice is needed here. If, as Hebrew scholars contend, the evidence is overwhelming that the Pentateuch and the Laws contained in it are the result of a long growth, which was not completed until a period after the return of the Jews from exile, it is impossible for us to shut our eyes to this evidence on the assumption (for it is only an assumption) that our Lord's use of the name of Moses precludes further argument. An explanation sometimes given is that Jesus must have known the exact truth about the authorship of the Pentateuch, but that He made a *concession* to the ignorance of the Jews of His day. But a growing body of students rejects this as untenable, because it detracts from the complete humanity of our Lord. If, as man, He had a full knowledge of the results which modern study has reached with regard to the literary problems of time OT, He must also, as man, have known all future results which will be reached by the study of generations to come. In other words, as man He was omniscient. But this conflicts alike with our conception of complete manhood and with the explicit declaration that He 'advanced in wisdom' (Luk 2:52). We know that He could feel hungry and thirsty and weary, that He could be overcome with sleep, that He could manifest surprise; and on one occasion at least He spoke of 'something which 'no one knoweth, not the angels of heaven, *nor the Son*, but the Father only' (Mat 24:36, Mar 13:32). He was subject, therefore, to the ordinary limitations of manhood, and, as man, He acquired His knowledge by the methods which other men follow. The problem is a part of a larger one—the problem of determining to what extent, or in what sense, His Divine powers and prerogatives were in abeyance during His earthly life. Although fully and completely man, He did not cease to be God, and He did not cease to be conscious of His Divinity. 'It is this continuous self-consciousness of the Son of God that gives the true measure of His transcendent humility' (Gifford, *The Incarnation*, p. 90). We can venture the statement with respect to His knowledge, that though, as God, He never ceased to be omniscient, yet *He refused to know*, as man, anything which could not be learnt by human means. But when we have said that, we have only enunciated and not solved the problem. This is not the place to enter into it further. But there can be no doubt that it is along this line of thought that we must move, to justify modern criticism in denying to Moses the authorship of the Pentateuch which our Lord and His Apostles ascribed to him. See also artt. Humanity of Christ and Kenosis.

2. But because Moses was the representative of the Old Dispensation, Jesus and the NT writers thought of him as something more. He was an historical personage of such unique prominence in Israel's history, that his whole career affords parallels to spiritual factors in the New Covenant. The history of the old Israel repeats itself in that of the new. To say this is not to affirm that the OT writers had the slightest idea that the events which they described were one day to receive a spiritual fulfilment. The mind of God alone knew it, when He guided the events and inspired the writings.

The series of Mosaic events which NT writers cite as affording points of comparison with things spiritual, form an extremely interesting study, since they cover so many of the distinctive features of the New Dispensation, and illustrate in a striking manner the essential unity of the 'Divine Library.'

(a) 2Co 3:7-18. The centre of Christianity is the Incarnation—the dwelling of God's glory among men in the Person of Jesus Christ (Joh 1:14). And St. Paul argues that the 'glory' upon Moses' face,* [Note: His use of the narrative is rendered easier by the LXX, which renders ἦν ('shone') by δεδόξασται and δεδοξασμένη (Exo 34:29 f.).] which accompanied his reception of the Law, was so great that the Israelites could not bear to gaze upon it, although that law was merely a ministration of death, and of condemnation: much more will the ministration of the spirit, and of righteousness, be of surpassing glory. Again, Moses realized that the 'glory' on his face was transitory, and so he could not boldly leave his face uncovered. And the veil which he wore still lies, spiritually speaking, on the hearts of the Jewish nation, and will not be removed till they 'turn to the Lord,' as Moses used to remove it when he returned to the Divine presence. But we Christians can speak boldly, and with unveiled face can reflect the glory of the Lord. If we are told that our gospel is obscure and hidden by a veil, it is only so in the case of those who are spiritually perishing. It is they who have been blinded by the 'god of this age,' to prevent the 'glory of God,' which is, in fact, the Incarnate Christ, from dawning upon them.

(b) Joh 3:14. The Incarnation had its issue in the Passion. The connexion of this verse with Joh 3:13 by the opening 'and,' and the repetition of the title 'Son of Man,' express this thought (see Westcott, *in loc*). The difficulties in arriving at the ideas attached to the brazen serpent in the original story (Num 21:7-9), and of our Lord's application of it, are great. Patristic writers deal with it in a variety of ways—some of them deeply suggestive (see Westcott, p. 63 ff.). Two points stand out clearly—the lifting up of the Son of Man upon the Cross, and the spiritual healing of those who look up with faith to Him. But two others suggest themselves, though we cannot estimate the exact part which they played in our Lord's thought. (1) The serpent on the pole symbolized the evil from which the people had suffered; and Christ identified Himself with sinful humanity so completely, that when He was crucified He took sin 'out of the way, nailing it to his cross' (Col 2:14, cf. Gal 3:13, 1Pe 2:24, with (Revised Version margin)). (2) The word 'be lifted up' (ὑψωθῆναι, *exaltari*) is applied elsewhere, not only to the Passion (Joh 8:28; Joh 12:32-34), but also to the Ascension (Act 2:33; Act 5:31, cf. Php 2:9 ὑπερῦψωσεν). Christ 'reigned from the Tree' in the supreme moment of victory, but that was only the first stage in a triumphal progress upwards.

(c) Joh 19:36. Christ's death and the shedding of His blood procured atonement. This, in the minds of all Christians, has its counterpart in the Passover (Heb 11:28). St. John traces a fulfilment of a particular detail in the fact that no bone of our Lord's body was broken. And see 1Co 5:7 f.

(d) Christ's sacrifice is more clearly connected with the covenant sacrifice at Horeb (Exo 24:4-8). Our Lord explicitly refers to it in the words of the institution of the Eucharist (Mat 26:28, Mar 14:21, Luk 22:20, 1Co 11:25; see also Heb 9:18-20, 1Pe 1:2, with Hort's note).

(e) Heb 12:18-24. Though pleading in heaven, Christ is still present among men; He is still incarnate; hence the existence of the Church which is His Body. In these verses the position and condition of the Church under the New Covenant is contrasted with that of the Israelites at Sinai, the characteristics of the two covenants being summed up in the words 'terror' and 'grace' (cf. Keble's *Christian Year*, 'Whitsunday').

(f) 1Co 10:2. Sacramental incorporation into Christ's Divine life had its counterpart in the old Jewish Church; all the Israelites were 'baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea.'

Joh 6:30-35; Joh 6:41-58. By the other great sacrament, the Divine life is fed and nourished in the members of the Church. Our Lord teaches that 'it was not Moses, but God revealing Himself through Moses, who gave the manna; and again the manna—the perishable bread—was not in the highest sense "bread from heaven," but rather the symbol of spiritual food.' [It is not here asserted that our Lord's discourse had reference exclusively to the Sacrament of the Holy Communion, which He was afterwards to institute. But it must have been impossible for St. John—and it is impossible for us—having heard the words spoken at the Last Supper, not to see in the present passage their fullest and deepest application].

1Co 10:3-4. As Christ is the Bread of Life, so He is the Water of Life. The Israelites, in the mind of St. Paul, did not eat and drink mere physical food and water, but spiritual. The two accounts of the striking of the rock by Moses for the production of water (Exo 17:6, Num 20:11) gave rise to the Rabbinic explanation that the rock which was struck followed them through the desert, affording a continual supply. That rock, says St. Paul, is typical of Christ.

(g) Act 3:22; Act 7:37. Besides the spiritual nourishment, which fosters the Divine life in the soul, Christians need a Teacher, who will at all times reveal the will of God. Both St. Peter and St. Stephen see in Christ the fulfilment of the declaration in Deu 18:15-18 that God would raise up a prophet like unto Moses. And John the Baptist, in his truthfulness and self-effacement, declares that he himself is not 'the

Prophet,' but only a voice heralding His coming (Joh 1:21 ff.). And see Joh 6:14; Joh 7:40 [Luk 7:39].

(h) While the Israelites are the counterpart of the Christian Church, their enemies who opposed Moses (cf. 2Ti 3:8) afford a parallel to those who obey not the gospel. In Rev 8:5; Rev 8:7-8; Rev 9:2-4; Rev 15:6 ff; Rev 16:2-4; Rev 16:10; Rev 16:13; Rev 16:18; Rev 16:21 the symbolism of punishment is clearly based on the plagues of Egypt. On the other hand, those who have been redeemed from the slavery of sin can, like the Israelites rescued from Egypt, 'sing the song of Moses the servant of God' (Rev 15:3).

Literature.—Besides the works mentioned in the article, reference should be made throughout to the principal commentaries on the NT. See also, for our Lord's relation to the Law, artt. Accommodation, Authority of Christ, Law, Law of God.

A. H. M'Neile.

Mote

MOTE.—See Beam and Mote.

Moth

MOTH (σῆς).—The Bible frequently makes reference to the destructive action of the moth as a fit symbol of the perishableness of man and his earthly possessions. In Oriental countries, where so large a part of 'treasure' consisted of costly silken and woollen fabrics, the figure was peculiarly appropriate and impressive. Specially referred to is the 'clothes' moth,' one or more (not readily identified as to its particular member of the family) of the genus *Tinea*, which may be said to have an almost cosmopolitan distribution. The larva of this moth feeds on wool, silk, hair, fur, feathers, etc. Out of the material on which it feeds it forms a portable case or house, supposed to be alluded to as an image of instability (though Cheyne [*Ebi* [*Note: Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*] , 'Moth'] denies this) in Job 27:18 a. The moth first finishes its case, which is often motley-coloured on account of the variety of material from which it draws supplies, and afterwards feeds voraciously on the substance from which the tent or house has been produced. For building purposes it selects the long straight fibres, but for food the shortest and thickest, and in order to get the latter it eats down below the surface pile to the fabric itself. The feeding process is therefore

the most destructive to the fabric. The yellowish-brown pupa is either formed in this structure which the larva constructs, or in a slight cocoon. Before the perfect insect appears the mischief is accomplished, for large patches are eaten in the clothes, carpets, or tapestry where the parent moth has laid its eggs. If the action of the insect is undiscovered, or by carelessness allowed to be completed, it makes the fabric into a mere flimsy shell which falls into nothingness on the least touch or breath. 'Crushed before the moth' ([Job_4:19](#)) is a faithful description of this most effective destruction—an apt figure of the insidious, deadly work of evil in the human character.

Our Lord refers to this well-known phenomenon in the Sermon on the Mount ([Mat_6:19-20](#), [Luk_12:33](#)). Along with the corroding work of the rust—due to chemical action on metals left unused and exposed—He classes the ravages of the moth, as illustrations of the inevitable corruption and decay which overtake all earthly things apart from the heavenly and Divine. Men are not to set their affections on things that belong to the earth (things which contain no higher and heavenly element), are not to make these their treasures, for in that case their heart, the centre of their life, set upon these decaying, perishing things, is itself subject to similar destructive forces—'Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.' All earthly things are to be valued, not in themselves as ends, but as means to the higher spiritual life. The affection is to be positively fixed on the enduring things of human virtue, knowledge, and character, formed and obtained by fellowship with the Divine—elements which all lower things are adapted to subserve, and which themselves 'neither moth, nor rust can corrupt.'

T. H. Wright.

☪ Mother

MOTHER.—Concerning the relations of Jesus with His mother, and her influence upon His training, we can but infer that the mother of such a son must herself have been an exceptional personality. See art. Mary (Virgin). Professor W. M. Ramsay, in his *Education of Christ*, shows how thorough was the instruction given to the Jewish youth. With this the mother had much to do. Granted that religious genius is not to be accounted for by environment, there still remains the overwhelming probability that the feminine qualities in the character of Jesus—His graciousness, gentleness, and sympathy—found a congenial setting in the home at Nazareth. Had it been otherwise, some hint of the fact must have been given in the records of His public ministry. It has been contended that such a hint is given in [Mar_3:31](#) ff., an incident which also finds a place in the other Evangelists. Another is [Mat_10:35-37](#) || [Mar_10:29](#),

Luk 12:53; Luk 14:26. But it should not be overlooked that these hyperbolic expressions by no means involve the repudiation of the filial tie. They are rather designed to mark the thoroughness with which the religious life should be embraced, the higher love absorbing and transforming the lower. The emphasis with which, in other connexions, Jesus denounces contemporary sins against the filial relationship is a proof that with Him the ideal life did not consist with holding it in contempt (Mar 7:10-13, Mat 15:4-9). The filial relationship is to be superseded only by the greater sacredness of the conjugal (Mat 19:5, Mar 10:7). In His response to the question of the rich young ruler Jesus emphasizes the command to honour father and mother (Mat 19:19 etc.), but (Mat 19:29 etc.) loyalty to the truth as expressed in Himself is made to take precedence of all other ties. The reason for this insistence is obvious, and has been abundantly illustrated in the history of the world's benefactors.

Concerning our Lord's dealings with other mothers than His own, few details are given in the Gospels. It is noteworthy that the mother of Zebedee's children (Mat 20:20) goes unrebuked, as does the action of the mothers who brought their children to Him (Mar 10:13). His sympathy with motherhood may be inferred from these incidents, as also from the healing of the daughter of the Canaanitish woman (Mat 15:22, Mar 7:26). The same is implied in the pathetic phrase (Luk 23:28) uttered on the way to Calvary. In nothing is the uniqueness of Jesus more clearly seen than in this kind of reverence for womanhood, so unexpected in a religious teacher of His time (Joh 4:27). See Woman.

Literature.—F. W. Robertson, *Serm.* 2nd ser. xviii. xix.; Rendel Harris, *Union with God*, ch. iv.; Stalker, *Imago Christi*, ch. ii.; A. Morris Stewart, *Infancy and Youth, of Jesus*, p. 105.

R. J. Campbell.

☩ Mount Of Olives

MOUNT OF OLIVES (τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν, Mat 21:1; Mat 24:3; Mat 26:30, Mar 13:3; Mar 14:26, Luk 19:37; Luk 22:39, Joh 8:1; and τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον ἐλαιῶν, Luk 19:29; Luk 21:37).—One of the universally accepted holy sites around Jerusalem. It is to-day known as *Jebel et-Tûr* (the mountain of the elevation or tower) by the Moslems, and as *Jebel ez-Zeitûn* (the mount of olives) by native Christians and, indeed, also by Moslems. By the Jews, besides the above mentioned, the name

'mountain of light' has also been given, from the fact that here used to be kindled the first beacon-fire to signalize through the land the appearance of each new moon.

The mount due east of Jerusalem forms the culminating height of a range which, separating itself from the central plateau near the village of *Sha'phat*, runs for two miles, first S. and then S. W., and terminates beyond the village of *Silwân* at the *Wady en-Nâr*. The beginning of the range has very generally been accepted as the Scopus (prospect) of Josephus, and the part running S. W.—*Batn el-Hawa*—considerably lower than the part east of the city and not higher than the Temple area itself, has by many been identified as the Mount of Offence. Although these have been described by some authorities as parts of the Mount of Olives, there seems no real reason for including them in the description, and to do so is confusing.

The natural boundaries of Olivet are to-day well defined by two ancient roads. To the N. a very ancient highway to Jericho, after traversing a deep bay* [Note: This open valley, in which to-day are many olives and also at least one ancient olive press, is an attractive site for Gethsemane (which see), though it must be admitted that tradition is all against it.] in the range, which from the city side seems to separate the range into two, crosses a low neck cutting off the northern part, now crowned by the house of Sir John Grey Hill, from the southern loftier mass—the true Mount of Olives. To the S. the road which runs to Bethany forms a convenient if somewhat arbitrary division, cutting off Olivet from the so-called 'Mount of Offence' and from other spurs to the south. To the W. the boundary is sufficiently plainly marked off by the deep valley of the Kidron, while to the E. [Note: Elohists.] there are indications (see [Luk 19:29](#); [Luk 24:50](#); cf. [Act 1:12](#)) for including within the limits the projecting spur on which Bethany stands. Probably the limits were never defined geographically, but the whole area was distinguished, as it is to some extent to-day, by its thick plantations of olives, figs, and palms,—hence the names Bethphage (house of figs) and Bethany (house of dates). This fertility, though no doubt most constantly observed by the city dwellers, to whom the beautiful slopes, then as they do to-day, would appeal most refreshingly as viewed from the dirty, squalid streets, must also have held out to the tired and thirsty travellers, ascending the dry and dusty wilderness from the Jordan to the city, an enchanting prospect of coolness and refreshment. For this alone it would appear only reasonable to include the sites of the villages on the eastern side, with their abundant gardens, as an essential part of the Mount. There can be little doubt that in the days of Christ the hill was thickly spread with verdure over parts which to-day are given up to churches, hovels, and extensive cemeteries.

Viewing the mountain thus, two principal summits and two subsidiary spurs may be described. The N. summit is that known as *Karem es-Sayuâd* (the vineyard of the hunter), and also as the *Viri Galilæi*; it reaches a height of 2723 feet above the Mediterranean, and is separated from the S. mass by a narrow neck of land traversed

to-day by the new carriage road. As far back as 530 this hill is spoken of as Galilee, and in the *Acts of Pilate* (about 350) a mountain near Jerusalem called 'Galilee' is mentioned, It is said to have first received its name Γαλιλαία because the Galilaeans attending the feasts used to encamp there, or as Saewulf (1102) says, it 'was called Galilee because the Apostles, who were called Galilaeans, frequently visited there.'* [Note: Attempts have been made to harmonize the accounts of the appearances of Jesus after His resurrection by supposing that this was the place where He appointed His disciples to meet Him. A recent discussion of the subject by Lepsius will be found in *Das Reich Christi*, Nos. 7 and 8 (1902).] The S. summit, of practically equal height, is the traditional Mount of the Ascension, and has for some years been distinguished by a lofty tower erected by the Russians. Here, too, Constantine erected his Church of the Ascension in 316 on the site where now stands its successor (erected 1834-5) of the same name. Here also is the Church of the Creed and the Paternoster Church, the latter a modern building on the site of one of that name destroyed long ago. Scattered over the summit is a modern Moslem village—*Kefr et-Tûr*—which combines with the noisy conduct of its rapacious inhabitants in spoiling the quiet beauty and holy associations of this sacred spot.

A small spur running S. is sometimes known as the Hill of the Prophets, on account of the interesting old 'Tomb of the Prophets'—a sepulchre generally believed, until recently,† [Note: According to Father Vincent and M. Clermont-Ganneau, it is not Jewish, but belongs to the 4th or 5th cent. a.d. (see *PEFSt*, 1901, pp. 309-317).] to have been originally Jewish—which is situated there; and the other somewhat isolated spur to the S. E. [Note: *Elohist.*] , on which stands the wretched, half-ruined village of *el-'Azarîyeh*, on the site of Bethany, should, for reasons given, be included in the Mount.

Along the W. slopes facing the city lies the reputed Garden of Gethsemane (part, too, of the Mount, cf. Luk 22:39; see Gethsemane) of the Latins and its Greek rival; and a little higher up the hill to the S. the great Russian Church of St. Magdalene. The greater part of the slopes of the S. W. part of the hill is filled with a vast number of graves, those from the valley bottom till a little above the Bethany road being Jewish, while higher up are some Christian cemeteries. The Jews have a strong sentiment about being buried on this spot, the slopes of the 'Valley of Jehoshaphat' being traditionally, with them and with the Moslems, the scene of the resurrection and final judgment.

Traversing this side of the Mount are three steep paths, all probably ancient. The most evident and important is the N. one, which continues the line of the path from the St. Stephen's Gate and the Tomb of the Virgin. It runs along the depression between the two summits, and is the direct route for travellers crossing the Mount

from or to Bethany. Too steep for riding, it is essentially the short cut for the pedestrian. The second path, still steeper, branches off from this just above the Garden of Gethsemane, and after passing the traditional scene of the lamentation of Jesus over the city, leads to-day to the Russian tower and buildings. It is the path of the modern pilgrim. The third, more gradual in ascent, starts from the Garden of Gethsemane and ascends the hill through Russian property in a S. direction, passing near the 'Tomb of the Prophets.' Whether the first or second of these lies most in the direction of our Lord's frequent passages from the city to the Mount of Olives and to Bethany, it is difficult to say, but it can hardly be supposed that He came by such a path on the morning of His triumphal entry into the city. The only likely course for the highroad of Roman times must have been in the general direction of the present Bethany and Jericho road; and, as Dean Stanley has suggested, the most natural site for the scene of the lamentation over the city is the point where this highroad crosses the S. W. shoulder of the Mount and the first full view of the city is obtained. A viaduct appears to have connected the Mount with the Temple hill, probably on the site of one of the two bridges which to-day span the dry torrent bed of the Kidron.

The Mount of Olives in the days of Christ must have presented rural fertility, verdure, and quiet very grateful to country visitors to the great metropolis; fresh mountain breeziness in contrast to the closeness and foulness of the city atmosphere, and a view of the beloved and sacred city in which all that was sordid was lost, and only the beauty and grandeur remained. This view is, when the historical associations are taken into consideration, probably the most fascinating in the Holy Land. It is seen at its best about the hour of sunset. In its essential details it is one on which the eyes of Christ must frequently have rested.

To the immediate W. is the Holy City, separated from the onlooker by the deep Valley of Jehoshaphat; just within the wall lies the 'Dome of the Rock' and the *al-Aksa* mosque, and in the open space of the great Temple area figures of people may be discerned moving about. Beyond this enclosure lie, pile above pile, the domed houses of the modern city, interspersed with the minarets, the synagogue domes, and the church towers of the followers of the three great Semitic religions: most prominent of all are the two domes and the massive tower which go to make up the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Far to the W. lie the battlements of the so-called Tower of David, and behind that, on the horizon, the W. mountains of Judaea shut off the distant sea. The roar of the city is deadened, but the fresh breeze carries the chiming of many bells, the blast of a military bugle or the roar of a salute from the barracks, reminding the onlooker that it is no dead city of the far past he is looking at. Somewhat to the N. the eye passes from the close-packed streets of the Moslem and Christian quarters, past the long line of the N. wall, to the many buildings of the newer Jerusalem, chiefly mean Jewish houses, but among them many handsome buildings like the great French Hospice, the Russian Cathedral, or the Abyssinian Church. Here lies all that is

progressive and of promise for the days to be. Beyond again, against the sky line to the N., rises the outline of *Nebi Samwîl* crowning the height of Mizpeh.

Turning S. the spectator sees the bare slopes south of the city walls, once thickly covered with the houses of the poor, terminating in the two deep valleys of Kidron and Hinnom, while on the opposite slope some of the houses of *Silwân* may be distinguished. Far to the S. in a gap in the hills lies the convent of *Mar Elias* on the road to Bethlehem; and to its left a crater-shaped hill—the Herodium—the burial-place of Herod the Great.

As the eye passes gradually E. [Note: Elohist.] over the wilderness of Judaea, it is caught by the still beauty of the Dead Sea lying nearly 4000 feet below, but in the clear atmosphere looking very near, while behind lies the long level line of the beautiful hills of Moab. More in the foreground a few houses of Bethany appear, and behind them the village of *Abu Dîs*—inhabited by the hereditary robbers of the Jericho road. Northward of the great lake, beyond a vista of tumbled hills and parched valleys, lies the Jordan Valley, through the centre of which may be traced, by a serpentine line of green, the course of the famous river itself. Eastward of this the line of Moab is continued N. as the mountains of Gilead, with their one distinct summit—*Jebel Ôsha*—almost directly E. [Note: Elohist.] of the onlooker.

Gospel incidents connected with the Mount of Olives.—Although, with the single exception of Joh 8:1, all the incidents expressly connected with the Mount of Olives belong to the Passion week, there can be no doubt (Luk 21:37) that this quiet spot was one beloved and frequented by the Master. Here He withdrew from the city for rest and meditation (Joh 8:1) and for prayer (Mat 26:30 etc). Once we read of His approach to the Mount from the Eastern side ‘unto Bethphage and Bethany, at the Mount of Olives’ (Mar 11:1 || Mat 21:1 || Luk 19:29). Over a part of the Mount He must have made. His triumphal progress to the city (Matthew 21, Mark 11, Luke 19), and on this road He wept over Jerusalem (Luk 19:40-44). During the whole of that week ‘in the daytime he was teaching in the temple; and at night he went out and abode in the Mount that is called of Olives’ (Luk 21:37)—the special locality on the Mount being Bethany (Mat 21:17, Mar 11:11). Crossing over from Bethany, Jesus illustrated His teaching by the sign of the withering of the barren fig-tree (Mat 21:18-19 || Mar 11:12-14; Mar 11:20-22), and on the slopes of this hill, with the doomed city spread out before them, Christ delivered to His disciples His wonderful eschatological discourse (Mat 24:3 f. || Mar 13:3 f.). Then here, in the Garden of Gethsemane, occurred the Agony, the Betrayal, and the Arrest (Mat 26:36-56, Mar 14:26-52, Luk 22:39-53, Joh 18:1-12). Lastly, on the Mount, not on the summit where tradition places it, but near Bethany, occurred the Ascension (Luk 24:50-52, Act 1:12).

To these incidents where the Mount of Olives is expressly mentioned may be added the scene in the house of Martha and Mary (Luk_10:38-42), the raising of Lazarus (John 11), and the feast at the house of Simon (Mat_26:6-13, Mar_14:3-9, Joh_12:1-19); for, as has been shown, Bethany was certainly a part of the Mount of Olives.

Literature.—*PEF* [*Note: EF Palestine Exploration Fund.*] Mem., 'Jerusalem' volume; papers by Schick and others in the Quarterly Statements (*PEFSt* [*Note: EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.*]); Groves, art. 'Mount of Olives' in Smith's *DB* [*Note: Dictionary of the Bible.*]; R. Hofman, *Galilæa auf dem Oelberg*, Leipzig, 1896; Porter in Murray's *Handbook to Palestine*; Robinson, *BRP* [*Note: RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.*] vol. i. (1838); Stanley, *SP* [*Note: P Sinai and Palestine.*]; Socin and Benzinger in Baedeker's *Palestine and Syria*; J. Tobler, *Siloahquelle und Oelberg*, 1852; Vincent (Père), 'The Tombs of the Prophets' in *Revue Biblique*, 1901; C. Warren, art. 'Mount of Olives' in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible*.

E. W. G. Masterman.

☞ Mount, Mountain

MOUNT, MOUNTAIN (ὄρος).—Mountains figure often in the narratives of Christ's life. This is natural, considering the highly mountainous character of the country in which He lived. At no point in His journeyings were the mountains out of sight; and if He was not actually on or among them, they were never a great way off.

The Mount of Olives (wh. see) alone is named in the Gospels—the mountain that rises beyond the kidron valley, east of Jerusalem, from the S. E. slope of which Bethany looks out over the wilderness. In two passages we see from the context which mountains are referred to. In Mat_21:21 'to this mountain' points clearly to Olivet, on which Jesus and His disciples stood, viewing the cursed and withered fig-tree. In Joh_4:20 'this mountain' can be no other than Gerizim, on whose rocky summit, amid the ruins of ancient splendour, the remnant of Samaritans still annually chant their weird service at the feast of the Passover. In other places, such as Mat_24:16, 'mountain' must be taken generally as meaning the wilder and more inaccessible parts, forming natural places of refuge, Judaea itself being almost entirely mountainous (cf. Rev_6:15). So also with the haunts of the demoniac (Mar_5:5). The 'mountain' on (Luk_8:32) or near (Mar_5:11) which the swine were feeding must have been the western edge of the great plateau which stretches from the desert to the lip of the *Ghôr*, and drops a distance of some 2000 feet to the eastern shore of the Sea of

Galilee. The place intended is probably a little north of the old fortress of Gamala, where the foot of the swift slope runs almost to the water.

Perhaps only men familiar with the steep cliffs and beetling crags of Palestinian mountains would think of calling in their terror upon the mountains to fall and cover them (Luk 23:30).

Regarding the position of three mountains there has been much discussion—the mountain of the Temptation (Mat 4:8, Luk 4:5), the Mount of Beatitudes (Mat 5:1), and the Mount of Transfiguration (Mat 17:1 etc.).

The evidence we possess is mainly negative, tending to show that traditional identifications are impossible. As to the first, if any actual height is intended, *Jebel Kuruntul*, with its cave-fretted brows frowning over Jericho, and the district to the south, are bleak and inhospitable enough, and there certainly the sojourner by night would be ‘with the wild beasts’ (Mar 1:13) But there is no height at all suggesting the description ‘an exceeding high mountain.’

The tradition identifying *Karn Hattin* with the scene of the Sermon on the Mount dates only from Crusading times. To the traveller journeying towards Tiberias from Nazareth or Tabor, the double-peaked hill seems easy of approach. But from any part of the seashore the ascent is steep, and from Gennesaret, where our Lord was at work, the way, as the present writer knows from much experience, is both long and toilsome. With so many heights near the plain, quite suitable for the Master’s purpose, the necessity for this difficult journey is not apparent. ‘Further, certain traces of ancient buildings lend colour to the idea that, in our Lord’s time, the hill may have been occupied.

The Roman and Greek Churches still maintain the traditional identification of Mount Tabor with the scene of the Transfiguration, and, in accordance with their separate calendars, that august event is annually commemorated there. It must be remembered, however, that they have much valuable property on the mountain—the great monasteries—which an admission of error would render worthless, while the contributions received from streams of pilgrims would be diverted. Most modern students of the question locate the Transfiguration on Mount Hermon; if not on the summit itself, on one of the lower spurs. This would satisfy the requirements of the narrative; whereas the journey south to Tabor, through Galilee, and back again to Capernaum, within the time specified, while possible, is highly improbable. The present writer spent some weeks in the summer of 1891 on the top of Tabor, and was led to emphatic agreement with the opinion that the presence of a town or fortress on the mountain in the days of Christ makes the traditional identification utterly impossible. See art. Transfiguration.

On a mountain in Galilee the risen Jesus gave His disciples their great commission (Mat 28:16). The circumstances suggest some height familiar to all, not far from the scenes of the Galilaean ministry, commanding a wide prospect. Certain identification is, of course, impossible, but these conditions are well fulfilled by *Jebel Kan'ân*, a bold headland projecting southward from the great bulk of Naphtali. The spacious view ranges from Carmel and the Mediterranean to the eastern ridges of Bashan, and from snowy Hermon to the dim mountains guarding the Dead Sea. In the great hollow below sleep the blue waters of Galilee, the white-sailed fishing boats recalling imperishable memories.

In hours of devotion Jesus seemed to long for the solitude and stillness to be found only on lonely heights by night (Mat 14:23, Mar 6:46, Luk 6:12; Luk 9:28, Joh 6:15). From a mountain at last He passed into the invisible (Luk 24:50, Act 1:9; Act 1:12). See also art. Hill.

Literature.—G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [*Note: GHHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*] , p. 47 ff.; W. M. Ramsay, *Education of Christ*, cf. *ExpT* [*Note: xpT Expository Times.*] xiv. [1903] p. 194.

W. Ewing.

☞ Mourning

MOURNING.—An expression of grief for death or disaster. See also artt. Lamentation and Rending of Garments. Mourning is associated in the Gospels (1) with 'the appearance of the sign of the Son of Man,' Mat 24:30; (2) with the removal of the visible presence of the Saviour, Mat 9:15; (3) with the death of friends. It is also one of the conditions mentioned in the Beatitudes as bearing a special blessing (Mat 5:4, but cf. Luk 6:21). The laws of mourning were very minute. The general time of mourning was seven days, during which the mourner was forbidden to work, wash, anoint himself, or wear his shoes. This last provision might, however, be evaded by putting earth or ashes into his boots. For seven days the mourner might not read in the Law, the Prophets, or the Talmud, because it was a 'joy' to do so; but a teacher could teach others through an interpreter. The mourner was allowed during this period to read only the books of Job, Jeremiah, Lamentations, and the *אבילות הלכות* (Laws of Mourning). He had to sit away from his dead, with his head tied up, and on the first day he might not wear his phylacteries. He was forbidden to shave his head or his neck, or do anything which might be considered to be for his comfort. He could take no part in rejoicings, and the rent in his garments was to be seen for thirty days. Even a poor man, or one who lived on charity, was forbidden to work for three days;

but after that time, he might do work secretly, for his maintenance, or his wife might spin in his house. Travelling with goods was forbidden, and no business even at the risk of loss could be transacted by himself or his family or his servants. It was allowable, however, to have a business carried on, if he assigned it to another before the departure of the soul. The mourner was allowed to eat only in his own house; he might eat no flesh and drink no wine; nor could he ask blessing before or after food. Extra-Talmudical regulations enjoined that the mourner should sit on the floor and take his food from a chair instead of a table, and, as is still the custom, that he should eat eggs dipped in ashes with salt. He might not leave town for thirty days; and in the case of mourning for a parent he might not go out of town for the first year, till his friends told him to do so. After the death of a wife, a widower might not marry for a year (*i.e.* till after three feasts had passed); but if his wife had died childless, or if she had left young children, he might marry after seven days. A mourner being 'free' must attend the synagogue; when he appeared, the congregation faced him as he entered, and said: אבל מינחם ברוך 'Blessed is He that comforteth the mourner.' Immediately on a death, all water in the house and in three houses on either side was emptied out, because of the belief that the Angel of Death procured death by means of a knife which he washed in water close at hand. Between death and burial the mourner was free from all the Law, because he was supposed to be beside himself with grief. The following is the prescribed prayer before meat to be used in the house of the mourner after burial:—

'Blessed art thou, O God our Lord, King of the universe, God of our Fathers, our Creator, our Redeemer, our Sanctifier, the Holy One of Jacob, the King of Life, who art good and doest good; the God of truth, the righteous Judge who judgest in righteousness, who takest the soul in judgment, and rulest alone in the universe, who doest in it according to His will, and all His ways are in Judgment, and we are His people and His servants, and in everything we are bound to praise Him and to bless Him, who shields all the calamities of Israel and will shield us in this calamity, and from this mourning will bring us to life and peace. Comfort, O God our Lord, all the mourners of Jerusalem, and all the mourners that mourn in our sorrow. Comfort them in their mourning, and make them rejoice in their agony as a man is comforted by his mother. Blessed art Thou, O God, the Comforter of Zion, and that buildest again Jerusalem' (Jewish prayer-books from רעה יודה).

The practice of hiring mourners was common with such as could afford it, and, as in the story of Jairus' daughter, these hired mourners used flutes to increase the sounds of woe. The apostasy of a member of the family was the occasion of mourning as for the dead, and a blasphemy spoken in the presence of the high priest was also a reason for a demonstration of mourning. See also Flute-Players, Rending of Garments.

Literature.—See under Rending of Garments.

W. H. Rankine.

☞ Mouth

MOUTH (Mat_4:4; Mat_12:34; Mat_15:11; Mat_18:16; Mat_21:16, and Luk_1:70).—In conformity with Oriental usage, ‘mouth,’ considered as the organ of speech, is used in the NT, as in the OT, in the sense of ‘language,’ ‘utterance,’ etc.—a notable instance of the primitive employment of the concrete for the abstract. Indeed, among the ancient Hebrews ‘mouth’ was even personified, e.g. in such expressions as ‘The mouth of the Lord has spoken it,’ etc.—a usage that helped not a little to prepare the Jewish mind at last to apprehend the meaning of *the Word made flesh*. Most passages of the Gospels where ‘mouth’ is found are quotations from the OT (LXX Septuagint), e.g. ‘Every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God’ (διὰ στόματος θεοῦ, Deu_8:3); ‘in the mouth of two or three witnesses’ (ἐπὶ στόματος, Deu_17:6; Deu_19:15); ‘out of the mouth of babes and sucklings’ (ἐκ στόμ., Psa_8:2 etc.); cf. Zacharias’ words, Luk_1:70 ‘as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets’ (διὰ στόματος); and Jesus’ words to His disciples, ‘I will give you a mouth (στόμα) and wisdom’ (Luk_21:15).

Geo. B. Eager.

☞ Multitude

MULTITUDE.—This word is used in Authorized and Revised Versions to translate ὄχλος and πλῆθος.

(1) ὄχλος is defined by Grimm-Thayer as ‘a casual collection of people, a multitude of men who have flocked together in some place, a throng.’ The plural οἱ ὄχλοι, which often occurs in Mt. and Lk., is found twice in Mk., viz mark. Mar_6:33 (Textus Receptus; all the best Manuscripts omit] and Mar_10:2 without the article; once only in Jn. (Joh_7:12 where ⲛD Vulgate give sing.), meaning probably the various groups or companies (cf. Luk_2:44) which had come up to the feast. In Authorized

Version it is rendered ‘multitude’ and frequently ‘people,’ also ‘press’ (Mar 2:4; Mar 5:27; Mar 5:30, Luk 8:19; Luk 19:3) and ‘company’ (Luk 5:29; Luk 6:17; Luk 9:38 (but ‘people’ in Luk 9:37] Luk 12:13, Joh 6:5). Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 usually gives ‘multitude,’ but in some passages prefers ‘crowd,’ from A.S. *crúdan*, ‘to push,’ ‘throng, apparently in cases where the ὄχλος would cause inconvenient pressure, cf. Mar 3:9 (διὰ τὸν ὄχλον ἵνα μὴ θλίβωσιν αὐτόν), also Mat 9:23, Mar 2:4; Mar 5:27; Mar 5:30, Luk 8:19; Luk 19:3; yet in Mar 5:31 where σὺνθλίβοντα is used of ὄχλον (translation ‘crowd’ in the previous verse), and in Luk 5:1 where the ὄχλος is described as pressing upon Him (ἐπικειῖσθαι), Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 rather inconsistently uses ‘multitude.’ The following phrases may be noted—(a) ὄχλος ἰκανός, which Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 in Mar 10:46 translates ‘great multitude’ (Authorized Version a ‘great number of people’), yet in Luk 7:12 renders, as Authorized Version, ‘much people,’ probably because in the preceding verse ‘great multitude’ is used for a different collection of persons; (b) ὁ πολλὺς ὄχλος or ὁ ὄχλος πολλὺς forming almost a composite term ‘the common people’ (Mar 12:37, Joh 12:9; Joh 12:12 (Revised Version margin)); (c) ὁ σὺν εἰστοὶ ὄχλος, Mat 21:8 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘the most part of the multitude,’ Authorized Version ‘a very great multitude,’ Vulgate *plurima turba*; in Mar 4:1 ὄχλος πλείστος is read by $\aleph B$, al.; (d) τῶν μυριάδων τοῦ ὄχλου, Luk 12:1 ‘the many thousands of the multitude’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), ‘an innumerable multitude of people’ (Authorized Version), *multis turbis* (Vulgate); this ὄχλος appears to be the largest mentioned in the Gospels, and the words ‘in the meantime’ (ἐν οἷς) at the beginning of the verse suggest that it was drawn together by the conflict between Christ and His adversaries which is narrated in the previous chapter.

(2) πλῆθος occurs 12 times in the Gospels, of which 8 are in Lk. (Luk 1:10; Luk 2:13; Luk 5:6; Luk 6:17; Luk 8:37; Luk 19:37; Luk 23:1; Luk 23:27), 2 in Mk. (Mar 3:7-8), and 2 in Jn. (Joh 5:3; Joh 21:6); in only two cases is it used otherwise than of a collection of persons (Luk 5:6, Joh 21:6 a ‘multitude of fishes’). Authorized Version renders the word by ‘multitude’ in all passages except Luk 23:27 where it gives ‘company.’ There is more variety in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 which employs ‘multitude’ in 9 places, but also ‘company’ (Luk 23:1), ‘number of the people’ (Luk 6:17), and ‘people’ in Luk 8:37, where Humphry (*Commentary on the Revised Version*) says it would not be in accordance with English idiom to say ‘the whole multitude of the country’; yet the latter is the translation of Authorized Version, which does not usually err in this respect. ‘People’ is elsewhere almost

invariably reserved by Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 to translation λαός. All three Gr. words occur in Luk 6:17 ὄχλος πολλὸς μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ πλῆθος πολλὸ τοῦ λαοῦ (Authorized Version ‘the company of his disciples and a great multitude of people,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘a great multitude of his disciples and a great number of the people’).

The multitude occupies a distinct position in the Gospels; those of whom it was composed are marked off from the disciples (cf. Mar 8:34, Luk 9:16; Luk 9:18, and Mat 23:1, where the disciples appear round Jesus in the foreground, the multitude farther off, and the Pharisees in the background). They are also distinguished from the ruling classes who despised them and held them in contempt, regarding them as accursed through their ignorance of the Law (Joh 7:49), and a prey to any designing teacher (Joh 7:12; Joh 7:47 f.). Thus the ‘multitude’ answers to *‘am hâ’ârcz*, ‘people of the land,’ ‘common persons,’ which was the name given to those who were not *hăbçrîm*, *i.e.* not strict observers of the Law (see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. 743^a, 826). Hillel used to say, ‘No brutish man is sin-fearing, nor is one of the people of the land pious,’ and Rabbinical writers used such contemptuous expressions as ‘the ignorant is impious; only the learned shall have part in the resurrection’ (Godet on Joh 7:49). Yet it was felt that the multitude would be formidable from its very numbers if it were only united under a leader in one common purpose. Accordingly we read that Herod was restrained from putting John the Baptist to death since he feared the multitude, because they counted him as a prophet (Mat 14:5). For the same reason the chief priests and elders dared not say that John’s baptism was of men (Mat 21:26). This same fear prevented the chief priests and the Pharisees from laying hold on Jesus (Mat 21:46); they decided not to arrest Him on the feast day (Mar 14:2), ‘lest haply there shall be a tumult of the people’ (λαοῦ, note the future ἔσται, which shows their positive expectation of trouble); and they arranged with Judas for His betrayal ‘in the absence of the multitude’ ((Revised Version margin) ‘without tumult,’ ἄτερο ὄχλου, Luk 22:6; cf. Luk 19:47 f.). The multitude, however, at ordinary times was greatly under the influence of their rulers, looking up to them as guides in religious matters, cf. Joh 7:12-13 ‘there was much murmuring among the multitudes concerning him: some said, He is a good man; others said, Not so, but he leadeth the multitude astray. Howbeit no man spake openly of him for fear of the Jews.’ This whole chapter is important as showing the relations between the ruling classes and the multitude, and also the discussions between different sections of the latter as to the claims of Jesus, and the gradual development into belief or disbelief (see especially Joh 7:25-27; Joh 7:31; Joh 7:40-44 and art. Murmuring). Here also perhaps may be noted Luk 12:1. The violent scene of ch. 11 ‘had found its echo outside; a considerable crowd had flocked together. Excited by the animosity of their chiefs, the

multitude showed a disposition hostile to Jesus and His disciples. Jesus feels the need of turning to His own, and giving them, in presence of all, those encouragements which their situation demands' (Godet). The power of the same influence is seen in the account of the Trial, cf. Mat 27:20 'the chief priests and the elders persuaded the multitudes that they should ask for Barabbas and destroy Jesus'—words which suggest that if left to themselves they might have listened to Pilate's proposal, but their leaders turned the scale against Jesus. It must be remembered that this multitude which cried for His blood was mainly, if not entirely, composed of Jews of Jerusalem. It was therefore quite distinct from the multitude which had accompanied Jesus at His triumphal entry, and which largely consisted of pilgrims from Galilee coming to the feast. For the meeting of the two multitudes see Mat 21:10-11, and note how the answer of Mat 21:11 is already greatly modified from the Hosanna cries of Mat 21:9. Accordingly the favourite use of these incidents as illustrations of the proverbial fickleness of a crowd—shouting Hosanna and waving palm branches one day, and crying 'Crucify him' the next—though attractive, is without justification.

Jesus regarded with deep pity the multitudes who came to Him. We read that on one occasion He had compassion on them because they were ἐσκυλμένοι καὶ ἐρριμμένοι, as sheep not having a shepherd. (Mat 9:36).

If these words primarily describe the physical aspect of those who came to Him on this occasion, then ἐσκυλμένοι, which properly means 'flayed,' 'mangled,' will signify here 'distressed and wearied by long traveling'; and ἐρριμμένοι, 'prostrated by fatigue, lying down like tired sheep' (cf. Vulgate *iacentes*). Thus they will express mute misery, and a half unconscious appeal to the Divine compassion, and they are so taken by Meyer, and Bruce in *Expos, Gr. Testament*. But if, as seems more likely, the expressions are mainly figurative, ἐσκυλμένοι will mean 'hunted and distressed by spiritual foes,' harassed by the tyranny of the scribes and Pharisees with their 'heavy burdens' (cf. Mat 23:4); and ἐρριμμένοι, 'scattered,' without true spiritual shepherds, John the Baptist being imprisoned and their regular teachers shamefully neglecting their duties. This agrees better with the Lord's remark in v. 37 that 'the labourers are few,' and with the commission of the Twelve immediately following in ch. 10, as the result of His compassion; so Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'distressed and scattered'; Authorized Version 'they fainted,' following Textus Receptus, which reads ἐκλελυμένοι for ἐσκυλμένοι, with very little MS support.

On other occasions His compassion for the multitude led Him to heal their sick (Mat 14:14), and to feed the 4000 (Mat 15:32, Mar 8:2).

The astonishment and wonder with which the multitude regarded Jesus is a very marked feature in the Gospels, especially in Mk. and Lk. (see art. Attributes of Christ, ii. 9). These feelings were excited by the manner and substance of His teaching (Mat 7:28; Mat 22:33, Mar 1:22, Luk 4:32), by His words of grace (Luk 4:22), and also by His mighty works (Mat 9:8; Mat 9:33; Mat 15:31, Mar 2:12; Mar 5:20; Mar 7:37, Luk 4:36; Luk 5:26; Luk 7:16; Luk 9:43; Luk 11:14). The people never became so familiar with His miracles as to take them as a matter of course. It is noted that they received His words and acts with gladness (cf. Mar 12:37 and Luk 13:17, where there is a contrast to the feeling of His adversaries who 'were ashamed'). They greatly enjoyed the discomfiture of His enemies when He easily replied to their subtle questions and escaped their cleverly laid snares. Jesus was very popular with the ordinary people; it is frequently recorded that great multitudes followed Him (cf. Mat 4:25; Mat 8:1; Mat 12:15; Mat 19:2). At other times we read that, attracted by His teaching and His miracles, 'all the city was gathered together at the door' (Mar 1:33); 'they came from every quarter' (Mar 1:45); their attendance was so persistent that Jesus and the disciples 'could not so much as eat bread' (Mar 3:20); it was necessary to address them from the boat (Mat 13:2); they brought their sick and maimed to Him (Mat 15:31, Mar 1:32); they pressed upon Him and heard the word of God (Luk 5:1); and their rapt attention to His preaching, even during the last days at Jerusalem, is described by St. Luke (Luk 19:48) in emphatic language, 'the people all hung upon him, listening' (ἐξεκρέματο αὐτοῦ ἀκούων). The feeding of the 5000 produced such an effect that they were 'about to come and take him by force to make him king' (Joh 6:15), proclaiming Him the Son of David (cf. Mat 12:23; Mat 21:9; Mat 21:15); and His enemies bore striking testimony to His popularity when they said, 'Lo, the world is gone after him' (Joh 12:19). Even in the region of Caesarea Philippi, whither He had gone for retirement, we are surprised to find mention of a multitude, which may indeed have consisted mainly of Gentiles (Mar 8:34). Edersherm (*LT [Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].]* ii. 45 f.) thinks there is a previous mention of a non-Israelite multitude in Mat 15:31 'the multitude wondered ... and they glorified the God of Israel' (but see Alford's note). 'By the reiteration of this word we are constantly reminded that our Lord, wherever He went, drew about Him eager crowds of the common people, who sometimes thronged and pressed upon Him too closely, sometimes followed Him, far from their own homes, and always heard Him gladly' (Humphry, *Commentary on the Revised Version*, on Mat 7:28).

Christ, however, was not deceived as to the depth of these impressions; He did not court their applause or seek their favour. On the contrary, it is recorded that on several occasions He withdrew Himself from the multitude (cf. Mat 8:18, Joh 6:15), and the expression ἀφείλς τοὺς ὄχλους, used in Mat 13:36, Mar 4:36, means 'leaving the multitude' (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), not 'sending them away'

(Authorized Version). Knowing that such popularity would not further the Kingdom of God, and would lead afterwards to serious disappointment, He sought at times to repress it, and showed the danger and loss and self-sacrifice involved in being His disciples; cf. His teaching as to the necessity of being willing to forsake everything (Luk 14:25 f.). The parables of Matthew 13 give a very sober estimate of the value of the professions of the multitude. Yet His popularity with the simple-hearted people of Galilee continued until the end, as was shown at His triumphal entry into Jerusalem.

Certain sections of Christ's teaching were specially addressed to the multitude, viz. the discourse about defilement (Mat 15:10 f., Mar 7:14 f. where, turning from the Pharisees and the scribes, 'he called to him the multitude, and said unto them, Hear and understand'; ἐκείνους μὲν ἐπιστομίσας καὶ καταισχίνας ἀφήκεν ὡς ἀνιάτους· τρέπει δὲ τὸν λόγον πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον ὡς ἀξιολογώτερον, Euthym.); the first three parables of the Kingdom (Matthew 13); the passage showing the need of renunciation and of counting the cost (Luk 14:25 f. ||); the section dealing with the Bread of Life (Joh 6:24 f.); the questions concerning John the Baptist, and the statement as to his character and mission (Mat 11:7 f.); and the passage dealing with the scribes and Pharisees (Mat 23:1 f.), which was spoken to the multitudes and to His disciples; cf. also Mar 2:13. See also Crowd.

Literature.—In addition to the notes on the various passages in Commentaries, two suggestive sermons may be mentioned: Vaughan, *Earnest Words for Earnest Men*: 'The Christian aspect of a multitude'; A. K. H. B., *The Graver Thoughts of a Country Parson*: 'A great multitude a sad sight.'

W. H. Dundas.

☒ Murder

MURDER.—The observance of the Sixth Commandment, as of the rest, is taken for granted in the Christian system (Mat 19:18, Mar 10:19, Luk 18:20). It concerns those who are outside of the society founded by Jesus. Thus the guilt of murder is predicated of Barabbas (Mar 15:7, Luk 23:19; Luk 23:25, Joh 18:40 'robber'), and of the unwilling guests (Mat 22:7), and Satan is designated the original ἀνθρωποκτόνος (Joh 8:44). In the doctrine of Jesus, the crimes of the Mosaic codes are traced to their source in the heart (Mat 15:19, Mar 7:21), and murder to the passion of anger. He who is angry with his brother, or who says to him 'Raca,' or 'Thou fool,' is accounted guilty of murder (Mat 5:22). With this saying of Jesus may be compared one of Mohammed, 'Whosoever shall say to his brother, Thou unbeliever, one of the

two shall suffer as an unbeliever.’ It is also interesting to note that the Arabic verb *katala* means both to kill and to curse (Koran, lxxx. 16). In the Koran murder is atoned for by retaliation (cf. Mat 5:38), a free man dying for a free, a slave for a slave; or the relatives of the slain may accept a money payment, which in practice does not exceed £500 (Koran, ii. 173; Lane’s *Arabian Nights*, vi. 8). The Jewish Rabbis distinguished between manslaughter and murder (Exo 21:13-14): only in the latter case did capital punishment follow (Edersheim, *History of the Jewish Nation*, p. 375 f.; W. R. Smith, *RS [Note: S Religion of the Semites.]*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 420). Self-murder is rare among Semitic peoples, though cases do occur (Mat 27:5, Act 1:18; Josephus *BJ* iii. viii. 5).

T. H. Weir.

☞Murmur, Murmuring

MURMUR, MURMURING (Lat. *murmur*, a reduplication of an imitative syllable *mur*; cf. Gr. *μορμύρω*).—A low continuous sound, as of a stream or of bees, hence a whispering, something said in a low muttering voice. The verb represents:—

(1) *γογγύζω*, to murmur, say in a low tone; according to Pollux and Phavorinus, it was used of the cooing of doves, like *τονθούζω* and *τονθορούζω* of the more elegant Greek writers. It is found in the Gospels with the accusative of the thing said (Joh 7:32), with *περί τινος* (Joh 6:41; Joh 6:61; Joh 7:32), *κατά τινος* (Mat 20:11), *σρός τινα* (Luk 5:30), and *μετ’ ἀλλήλων* (Joh 6:43). (2) *διαγογγύζω* only in Lk. (Luk 15:2; Luk 19:7), where *διά* seems to give the idea of a general pervasive murmuring through the whole assembly, or perhaps it means alternative murmuring ‘among one another,’ certandi significationem addit’ (Hermann). (3) *ἐμβριμᾶσθαι* is used in one passage (Mar 14:5) of the disciples murmuring against Mary; it implies that they were moved with indignation. The noun *γογγυσμός* occurs only once in the Gospels (Joh 7:12); it as well as *γογγύζω* and *διαγογγύζω* are frequently used in LXX Septuagint of Israel in the wilderness.

The word ‘murmur’ appears in itself to have a neutral meaning, the context deciding whether it expresses favour, doubt, or hostility; hence in several cases ‘muttering’ or ‘whispering’ might be a better rendering. For its use in a friendly sense see Joh 7:31-32, where the murmuring was that of persons who believed on Jesus, and

who said, ‘When the Christ shall come, will he do more signs than those which this man hath done?’—a dangerous omen to the Pharisees. The noun γογγυσμός, as used in Joh 7:12, includes both favour and hostility: ‘There was much murmuring among the multitudes concerning him; some said, He is a good man; others said, Not so, but he leadeth the multitude astray.’ It implies a discussion low and whispered, not free and open; it was hardly safe to speak out plainly, for they feared the Jews (cf. Joh 7:40-41) The development of such differences of opinion is recorded in Joh 6:52 ‘they strove (ἐμάχοντο) one with another’; Joh 7:43 ‘there arose a division (σχίσμα) in the multitude because of him’; cf. also Joh 9:16, Joh 10:19, Joh 11:45-46. The sense of doubt and dissatisfaction predominates in Joh 6:41; Joh 6:43, as also in Joh 6:61 ‘his disciples murmured at this,’ namely, at the ‘hard saying.’ There is some uncertainty as to what precisely is here meant: whether the new teaching of life through death (Westcott); the paradoxical nature of the words just spoken by Jesus, the need of eating His flesh and drinking His blood (Godet); His claim to have come down from heaven (Lampe and others); the apparent pride with which He connected the salvation of the world with His own Person (Tholuck, Hengstenberg); or the bloody death of the Messiah (de Wette, Meyer). Dissatisfaction is seen highly intensified in Luk 5:30; Luk 15:2, where the Pharisees and the scribes murmured because He ate with publicans and sinners. Compare also Luk 19:7, where all, apparently even the Twelve, shared in it with a sense of outrage done to propriety; Edersheim calls it a murmur of disappointment and anger; but perhaps Bengel is more correct, ‘ex haesitatione potius quod ad majoreni partem attinet quam cum indignatione.’ Hostile murmuring is found in the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard (Mat 20:11), and in the story of the Anointing in the house of Simon the leper (Mar 14:5).

W. H. Dundas.

Music

MUSIC.—The Jews cultivated music from the earliest times, perhaps the more because sculpture and painting were practically forbidden (Exo 20:4). It gave expression to all their emotions, and found a place in all the chief events of public and private life (cf. OT, *passim*).

1. References in the Gospels are few and indirect, (a) *Song*: Mat 26:30 ||, Luk 15:25 (?) seem to be the only instances. (b) *Instruments*: Mat 9:23; Mat 11:17 || pipe (wh. see) or flute (see Flute-players); Mat 24:31 trumpet (wh. see), probably the curved trumpet as in Exo 19:16. In Dan 3:5; Dan 3:15 (LXX Septuagint) συμφωνία is usually taken to mean a bagpipe; but such a meaning in Luk 15:25 is unlikely. It is in the OT

that the various national instruments appear, of which the following are the principal types:—(1) *Stringed*: lyre (Authorized and Revised Versions ‘harp’), harp (Authorized and Revised Versions variously ‘psaltery,’ ‘viol,’ ‘lute’); (2) *wind*: pipe, of wood; curved trumpet, of horn or (in later times) of metal; straight trumpet, of silver; (3) *percussion*: hand-drum (Authorized and Revised Versions ‘tabret,’ ‘timbrel’) of skin; cymbals (Authorized and Revised Versions once [Zec 14:20] ‘bells’) of brass, used, especially the precentor as it appears from 1Ch 16:5, no doubt for rhythmical purposes. Several others are mentioned, but some are foreign, and the nature of the rest is unknown.

2. The general character of Jewish music in the time of Christ is wholly a matter of inference. There were no theoretical writers, as among the Greeks; of their instruments sculpture portrays the silver trumpet alone; and, notation not having been invented, specimens of their music contemporaneously committed to writing do not exist. Yet within definable limits inference amounts to certainty, (a) As to rhythmical structure, all ancient music was of the free form, in contrast to the measured form of modern music: ‘time,’ in our sense, was then unknown. (b) The variety and combination of instruments employed, together with the musical arrangements generally (e.g. 1Ch 15:16-22), imply at least some definite system whereby the intervals of melodic progression were regulated. The existence of scales or modes, of some sort, cannot therefore be questioned, (c) They seem to have been in accord with those in use at Babylon (Psa 137:1-3). Moreover, habitual contact with Greek influences in Alexandria and elsewhere probably produced (or at least goes to prove) an affinity with the Greek modes. (d) The ‘traditional melodies’ now used in Jewish synagogues are, in some cases, similar in kind to the music that we may infer to have existed in the time of Christ. Tradition might preserve melodies down to the invention of notation, much as it preserved the vowel-system down to the invention of ‘points.’ But the Jews themselves seem to have discontinued the Temple melodies after its destruction; so that the synagogue melodies, whatever their origin, would not be those of the Temple. It may be supposed that Jewish Christians imported some of their Temple melodies into the Christian Church. Perhaps it was they who introduced antiphonal singing: and even Greek liturgies are held to have been largely ‘affected by Mosaic rites’ (Swainson, *Gr. Liturgies*). It is therefore not impossible that a Jewish element still survives in some of the ancient ecclesiastical plainsong. But no one can say for certain that this is so, or identify any particular instance.

Literature.—Chappell, *History of Music*; Stainer, *The Music of the Bible*; Edersheim, *The Temple*, etc.; art. ‘Music’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible; Helmore, *Plainsong*, etc. The traditional Jewish melodies can be seen in E. [Note: Elohists.] Pauer’s *Hebrew Melodies* (Augener), and in the collection of music for the synagogue edited by Cohen and Davis.

☒ Mustard

MUSTARD.—In a simile the word (σινάπι) occurs in Mat_13:31, Mar_4:31, Luk_13:19; as a bold metaphor, in Mat_17:20, Luk_17:6. It used to be strongly contended that the mustard referred to is not any of the familiar wild species of the Holy Land (such as the *Sinapis nigra*), but an arboreal plant (*Salvadora persica*) found in the extreme south or sub-tropical part of Palestine, and said to be called among the Arabs by the same name (*Khardal*) as mustard. This theory, however, may now be said to be exploded (cf. Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Mustard'). The passages concerned clearly suggest, not a perennial shrub, but an annual sown among and comparable with other garden herbs; and if the expression 'tree' be a difficulty ('great' in Luk_13:19 is of weak authority, cf. Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), it is to be remembered that, when Jesus spoke to the multitude, it was in popular language. He meant that the tiny seed became to all intents a tree. An accurate botanist (Dr. Hooker) found the black mustard on the banks of the Jordan 'ten feet high, drawn up amongst bushes, etc., and not thicker than whipcord.' And Dr. Thomson says that he has seen it 'on the rich plain of Akkâr as tall as the horse and his rider' (*LB [Note: The Land and the Book.]*, p. 414).

Equally prosaic is the criticism that the mustard is not 'the least of all seeds' (Mt.), or 'less than all the seeds that be in the earth,' *i.e.* annuals (Mk.). Enough, as before, that the language is not absolute and scientific. The mustard was probably the smallest a gardener ordinarily sowed. But the fact is, the saying is proverbial (found as such in the Talmud and in the Koran), and in good proverbs there is often the suppressed note of poetic licence (cf. the Semitic form of poetry in the introductory verse of the passage Mar_4:30, Luk_13:18). The broad effect of the image is plain, that out of a speck of seed there was to come in due course marvellously great growth—a plant towering among the pulse and pot-herbs like a Titan, and with branching sprays on which the birds of the air find shelter and rest.

The Arabs are given to special cultivation of mustard as a condiment (Hooker), and there is clearly emphasis on the statement that it was 'a grain, (not a handful) which was taken 'by a man' (Mt. and Lk.) and cast 'into his own garden.' (Luk_13:19 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885)—the garden ('field' in Mat_13:31) being a place where, as observation attests, wild plants attain more than the normal size. Elsewhere this is the thought of Jesus—that God's Kingdom is taken from the world and developed on lines of its own (cf. the fig-tree favoured by being put in the choice and carefully protected place usually devoted to vines, Luk_13:6).

The essential point in the application is not any seeming rapidity of growth; rather it is the striking contrast between the initial insignificance and the amply beneficent result. Jesus, the spokesman of the coming Kingdom, was derided in His teaching, persecuted in His Person, doomed to violence and degradation; but He felt, and knew, and here affirms that the cause was supremely great, and that its greatness should be manifested to the world.

The remaining passages ([Mat 17:20](#) and [Luk 17:6](#)) describe the wonder-working power of faith, which, within its own sphere, produces miraculous results (cf. art. Faith in vol. i. p. 569).

George Murray.

☞ Myrrh

MYRRH (σμύρνα, [Mat 2:11](#), [Joh 19:39](#)).—A gum-resin, the exudation of a shrub (*Balsamodendron myrrha*) and some other allied species of shrubs growing in the dry regions of Arabia, in Somaliland, and in certain districts bordering on the Red Sea. The myrrh shrubs are of a low stature, unattractive, rigid, spiny, with scanty foliage and minute flowers and small oval berries. Myrrh exudes from the bark, or is obtained by incisions made in the bark, and appears in resinous, yellow drops, which gradually thicken and become harder. The smell is balsamic, and the taste bitter and slightly pungent. Myrrh has been known to mankind from the remotest times, and was among the most precious articles of ancient commerce. It is used in medicine as a tonic and stimulant, and was much employed by the ancient Egyptians in embalming. It is collected in great quantities to-day by the Somali tribes and sold to traders. There has been considerable controversy as to the real nature of the ancient myrrh, and particularly as to the regions from which it came; but the σμύρνα of NT appears, on the whole, to have been the substance described above.

Myrrh was one of the gifts brought by the Magi to the Infant Christ ([Mat 2:11](#)), and it was used, along with aloes, by Nicodemus to anoint the body of Christ before burial ([Joh 19:39](#)). All the ancient commentators affirm that each of the three gifts—gold, frankincense, and myrrh—offered by the Magi is replete with spiritual significance. Thus it was widely accepted in early times that the myrrh was emblematic of the death of Christ, inasmuch as myrrh was used for embalming. It was ‘offered to Christ as to one who is about to die for all’ (Aug. *ad loe*). Others regarded it as setting forth His true human nature, and therefore as teaching the mortification of the flesh by abstinence. The well-known ancient hymn, part of which refers to this, says:

‘Gold, a monarch to declare;
Frankincense, that God is there;
Myrrh, to tell the heavier tale
Of His tomb and funeral.’

Though we may admit that in the gifts presented there was an unconscious fulfilment of prophecy ([Isa 60:6](#)), no symbolism of the nature referred to can have been designed by the Magi. So far as their intention was concerned, they simply offered to the new-born King, whom they came to worship, the choicest and most precious products of their country, and thus expressed their homage.

In [Mar 15:23](#) we are told that there was offered to Christ, probably just before He was nailed to the cross, ἐσμυρνισμένον οἶνον, ‘wine mingled with myrrh.’ It was offered, of course, as an anodyne; but as myrrh was often infused into wine to give it a more agreeable flavour and fragrance, it has been held by some that Mt.’s expression οἶνον μετὰ χολῆς, ‘wine mingled with gall,’ is the more correct, because the mingling of gall with wine to render it anaesthetic was a well-known practice. It is, however, possible that the *gall* of Mt. was the same as the *myrrh* of Mk., the corresponding Hebrew words being from the same root, and both signifying ‘bitter.’ The mingling of myrrh with the wine would certainly render it more potent as an anodyne, and we must therefore accept the word given by Mk. as conveying the purpose for which the draught was offered. Such a draught, called by the Romans *sopor*, was regularly offered to criminals just before their crucifixion. It was provided by an association of wealthy women in Jerusalem, who prepared it for the purpose. But, having tasted it and ascertained its object, He would not drink. This action is in contrast with what He did at a later period of the day; for when, in response to His cry ‘I thirst,’ one of the soldiers soaked a sponge in ‘vinegar’ and, holding it up to Him on a reed, gave Him to drink, He received it. This was not to soothe His agony, but only to moisten His parched tongue and lips, perhaps that He might be able to utter ‘with a loud voice’ His triumphant τετέλεσται, perhaps also to sanction and sanctify the friendly office which is often the only one that can be rendered to the dying, and possibly in fulfilment of the prophecy of thirst ([Joh 19:28](#), cf. [Psa 69:21](#)). However this may be, His purpose in refusing the draught offered as an anodyne is clear. He would ‘look death in the face,’ and meet the King of Terrors in full possession of all His faculties. He was dying of His own accord, fulfilling His words, ‘No man taketh my life from me’ ([Joh 10:18](#)). His death was an act of voluntary self-surrender, and He would ‘taste death for every man’ ([Heb 2:9](#)). He ‘endured the cross, despising shame’ ([Heb 12:2](#)).

Literature.—Birdwood in *Bible Educator*, ii. 151; an exhaustive article by Hanbury, ‘The Botanical Origin and Country of Myrrh’ in the *Pharmaceutical Journal*, 19th Apr. 1873.

J. Cromarty Smith.

☞Mystery

MYSTERY (μυστήριον from μύστης ‘one initiated’; stem μύω ‘to close,’ ‘shut’ (cf. Lat. *mutus*, English ‘mum’).—1. In classical Greek μυστήριον means *a hidden thing, a secret*; in Biblical writers primarily *a hidden or secret thing*; in the plural (usually) individual matters of revelation or superhuman knowledge (Mat_13:11, Luk_8:10, Rom_11:25, 1Co_4:1; 1Co_15:51). In the singular with the article τὸ μυστήριον is used, principally by St. Paul, of the hidden counsel of God, especially His redemptive plan culminating in the final judgment (Rom_16:25, 1Co_2:7, Eph_3:3; Eph_3:9, Col_1:26 f.). This counsel of God is further characterized as the ‘mystery of his will’ (Eph_1:9) ‘which he formed’ (Col_2:2 [1Co_2:1, text of WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort’s text.]]) ‘respecting Christ’ (Col_4:3), and constitutes the contents of the gospel (Eph_6:19). It is consummated in the *parousia* (Rev_10:7). In antithesis to ‘the mystery of the faith’ or ‘of godliness’ (1Ti_3:9; 1Ti_3:16) stands that of ‘lawlessness’ (2Th_2:7), the purposed impulse of an antagonistic power operative in the world.

Besides this primary sense, the word μυστήριον is also used like מֵטֵר and חֵט in Rabbinic writers to designate the hidden or mystic sense of a Scripture (Eph_5:32), a name (Rev_17:5), or the image or form seen in a vision (Rev_1:20; Rev_17:5).

It is important to observe that the connotation of *intrinsic* difficulty of comprehension, obscurity, which has become inseparable from the word in modern use, is misleading. In Biblical and in ancient use generally the ‘mystery’ is simply that which is made known only to the initiated, be its content easy or hard to understand, hence *revealed* as against *reasoned* knowledge.

2. In a looser sense the term ‘mysteries’ was transferred from the teaching symbolized to (a) the rites enacted in certain cults or rituals known to classic authors as τελεταί (Wis_14:23), and (b), still more loosely, to the τελεταί themselves. From the former sense (a) the designation of the sacraments, or even the Church service generally, as ‘the mysteries’ becomes common from the 2nd cent. onward. From the

latter is doubtless derived the designation of mediaeval religious dramas or pantomimes as ‘mysteries’ (cf., from the same stem, ‘mummery’).

3. The τελεταί, loosely called ‘mysteries,’ are of importance to our consideration as affecting the application of the term ‘mystery’ to the gospel as a whole in Mar_4:11. They consisted of secret rites in honour of certain divinities especially representative of the drama of life, vegetable and animal, annually failing and renewed. These divinities are always chthonic, as against the Olympian (national) divinities of the upper air; and their worship, maintained by guilds, was commonly associated with the rites of ancestor and hero-worship. Mystery-religion transcended all lines of mere nationality, substituting its own brotherhoods of initiates, and offered the idea of personal deliverance and immortality as the goal; as the means, it offered sacramental (instead of sacrificial) union with a Redeemer-god (θεὸς σωτήρ), who, in contrast with the Olympian divinities, participated in the suffering and death of humanity, and won for men victory over their spiritual foes. Its strong monotheistic tendency, added to these other traits, gave it an obvious resemblance to the gospel as preached to the Gentile world, and made it a much more formidable rival than the various religionized forms of Greek and Oriental philosophy, in bidding for the adherence of popular faith in the Empire, after the dissolution of the national religions. Christianity itself, in the transition from a national to a universal religion, necessarily passed through some of the same phases as the mystery-cults; for these had already connected themselves in a syncretizing spirit with the mythology of every people. Their influence is most apparent, as we should expect, in the development of the Pauline Church, supremely in the ultra-Pauline or Gnostic. The resemblances were in fact so striking alike in dogma, terminology, and ritual, as to lead early apologists to account for them by the theory of diabolic travesty (Justin M. *Apol.* i. 66, *Dial.* lxx.). Some modern students of the history of religion find it impossible to deny a relation of dependence on the side of the Church, especially in the Pauline and post-Pauline period. [For an able presentation of the view that it is impossible to establish any direct relation during the Pauline or early post-Pauline period, see Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen*], This appears not only from terminology, but even from the Pauline doctrine and ritual, in particular as regards the theory of the sacraments. In the Gospels this influence is scarcely traceable outside the Fourth, wherein the type of the δράμα μυστικόν and the sacramental interest are very apparent (Harnack, *Mission und Ausbreitung*, pp. 169-173—John and Origen the profoundest mysteriosophists of the Church); but in the single passage Mar_4:11 = Mat_13:11 = Luk_8:10 even the Synoptic writers must be admitted to have been affected through St. Paul both as to phraseology and as to thought.

4. Mar_4:11 seems to be earlier in form than its parallels; for the context shows that the thing given or withheld is not certain *elements of the gospel*, conceived as μυστήρια and therefore uttered only in parables (understood as enigmas; cf. Mat_13:35, Joh_16:29)—the sense conveyed by the use of the plural in the parallels (τὰ μυστήρια, Mat_13:11 = Luk_8:10)—but is the gospel as a whole conceived as a ‘mystery’ in the Pauline sense, *i.e.* a Divine revelation (cf. Mat_13:16-17). The teaching in parables is regarded by Mk. (and still more by Mt.) as a fulfilment of Isa_6:9 conceived as a sentence of judicial blindness. In answer to the question (Mat_13:10), ‘Why speakest thou to them (the motley Galilaeen multitude) in parables?’ (*i.e.* enigmas), Jesus answers that it is a fulfilment of the prophetic curse of Isaiah upon a disobedient and gainsaying people, of whom such fruitless hearing had been foretold. The inner circle (Mar_4:10; cf. Mar_3:13; cf. Mar_3:34-35) are alone intended to receive more than the husk. The parallels, in altering to τὰ μυστήρια, give a dilution of this sense (cf. the secondary sense above under 1).

5. Not the word alone, but the entire context of Mark 4 and parallels are Pauline in aim. Romans 9-11 attempts a theodicy of the rejection of Israel the covenant people in favour of the Gentiles, based upon the same idea of judicial hardening, and employing the same passage from Isaiah. In Rom_11:6 Paul writes after 30 years of disappointing experience in preaching to the Jews: ‘*It is written, God gave them a spirit of stupor, eyes that they should not see, and cars that they should not hear, unto this very day.*’ To St. Paul, accordingly, must be attributed the first utilization of Isa_6:9, which henceforth becomes the *locus classicus* to account for the rejection of the Messiah by His own people (with Mar_4:11 and parallels, cf. Joh_12:39-41, Act_28:24-28). Manifestly an interpretation of parabolic utterance which supposes it adopted in order to fulfil the prophetic sentence of judicial blindness on Israel cannot be attributed to Jesus, since the end sought in the parables themselves is the reverse of intentional obscurity. Mar_4:11, accordingly, which does not stand alone in this Gospel as regards its Pauline phraseology (cf. Mar_1:15 with Mat_4:17), is equally Pauline in the employment of this theory of the intention of the parabolic teaching.

6. Linguistically the results are at least equally conclusive. The word μυστήριον occurs 21 times in the Pauline Epp., elsewhere in the NT only here, and 4 times in the Apocalypse. The conception of the gospel itself as a ‘mystery’ is found nowhere else save in the Pauline Epistles. With St. Paul it is fundamental (1Co_2:1-16, Eph_1:9; Eph_3:3-11, Col_1:27, Rom_16:25-27), usually involving the contrast of philosophy *versus* revelation, the ‘wisdom of this world’ *versus* the spirit of prophecy. It is noteworthy that the removal of Rom_16:11-12 from the context of Mar_4:10-20 produces a simpler and more intelligible connexion (cf. Mar_4:10 ‘asked of him the parables’).

7. The *agraphon* quoted by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* v. x. 69) from ‘a certain Gospel’: ‘My mystery belongs to me and to the sons of my household’ (μυστήριον ἐμὸν ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ οἴκου μου), and also found in *Clem. Hom.* xix. xx. in the form, ‘Keep the mysteries for me and the sons of my house,’ is manifestly connected with Mar 4:11, but probably not dependent upon it, nor upon St. Paul. This, however, does not counteract the above conclusions. It is quite probable that Mar 4:11 rests upon a traditional *logion* of some such form as this, rather than directly or exclusively on Rom 11:8. The utterance in this form is not indeed attributable to Jesus, to whose doctrine its suggestion of esoteric teaching is abhorrent (cf. Philo, *de Vict. Off.* i. f., on the superiority of the Mosaic to heathen ‘mysteries’ as concealed from none; also Wis 6:22); but proper appreciation of the Pauline use of the word μυστήριον will show a common basis in the real teaching of Jesus. Mat 11:25-27 = Luk 10:21-22 is the canonical equivalent of the *agraphon*, and affords the real point of connexion between the teaching of Jesus and the Pauline and post-Pauline application of the term μυστήριον to the gospel. In respect to the superhuman, Divinely revealed character of the one message, Jesus and St. Paul are both emphatic. The expressions of 1Co 2:1-16 from this point of view are not only in agreement with Jesus’ whole teaching as ‘with authority and not as the scribes,’ but form a striking parallel to Mat 11:25-30. However open to suspicion the *logion* of Mar 4:11 may be in its present canonical or post-canonical form, the words are at bottom nothing more than the translation into Greek equivalents of a claim of Jesus that is unquestionably historical, namely the claim for His teaching to be by *revelation*, a wisdom of God accessible to His ‘little ones’ though ‘hid from the wise and prudent.’

Literature.—On the word μυστήριον see, besides Grimm-Thayer, Hatch, *Essays on NT Greek*, p. 58; Lightfoot, *Com. on Col 1:26*; Stewart, s.v. ‘Mystery’ in Hasting’s *Dictionary of the Bible*; Ramsay, s.v. in *Enc. Brit.*⁹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; and A. Jülicher, s.v. in *Encyc. Biblica*. On the influence of the Greek mysteries on early Christianity, see Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, 1829; Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss a.d. Christenthum*, 1894; and Wobbermin, *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien zur Beeinflussung des Urchristenthums durch d. Mysterien*, 1896; also Cheetham, *The Mysteries Pagan and Christian*, 1897; and Hatch, *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*, ch. x. On NT use of terminology from the mysteries, see Carman in *Bibliotheca Sacra* L (1893). On the mysteries generally as a phenomenon in the history of religion, see Rhode, *Psyche*; Frazer, *Golden Bough*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; Harnack, *Mission und Ausbreitung des Chr.* 1902, Bk. ii. ch. v.

B. W. Bacon.

Myth

MYTH.—Neither the word $\mu\tilde{\upsilon}\theta\omicron\varsigma$ nor the conception of a myth occurs in any of the Gospels. Outside of the Gospels the word appears in the NT several times (in plur. $\mu\tilde{\upsilon}\theta\omicron\iota$.) in the Pastoral Epistles (1Ti 1:4; 1Ti 4:7, 2Ti 4:4, Tit 1:14), and once in 2 Pet. (2Pe 1:16). In all these cases a myth is a story unworthy of credence, a foolish tale without sufficient foundation in fact or significance in principle to make it worth while to give heed to it. This is not, however, the ordinary meaning of the word in the Classic period or in modern usage. A myth in the Classic writers is either (1) akin to parable or legend; *i.e.* a story constructed with a specific design or conveying a moral or philosophical truth—*aesop's Fables*; Plato's *Phaedo*, 61 B, *Prot.* 320 C, 324 D; or (2) a story in which, through a process of growth, has come to be embodied a truth of nature or of conscience. Of this class of myths, illustrations are such as those in Plato, *Legg.* 636 D, *Rep.* 330 D [Note: Deuteronomist.] (cf. Grote, *Hist. Gr.* i. 480). Modern historical terminology would make myth a story whose basis is past verifying. An account is said to be mythical when external evidences for its being a true narration of facts are not forthcoming, and when its internal characteristics render it incredible.

In the Platonic sense of the word no myths can be said to exist in the Gospels unless, contrary to all usage, the parables of Jesus be called myths (against this cf. Trench, *Parables*). In the modern sense it has been alleged that the Gospels are a tissue of mythological material (Strauss, *Leben Jesu*). This was the mythical theory of Gospel history, which for a time disputed the ground with the Tübingen hypothesis of 'tendency' literature, on the one side, and the earlier traditional view that the Gospels should be taken as precise and accurate history, on the other.

With the rise of the critical method all these theories have been compelled to yield the field to the view that the Gospels are the *sources* of history rather than history strictly so called; and that they are to be used as sources precisely upon the same principles as all other first-hand documentary testimony. But this view does not exclude the possibility of some mythical elements in these sources. The question, then, is whether there actually exist mythical accounts in the Gospels, and, if so, whence and how they came there. Whereas, therefore, the mythical theory propounded by Strauss has been entirely set aside, a new one has arisen to take its place.

The grounds on which the Straussian theory had been set aside were that the age of Jesus was not a mythopœic age in the sense assumed by its pro-pounder. No matter

what the truth may be about a mythology in the OT, where a prehistoric period certainly comes into view, the age of Jesus falls within a clearly lighted historic period, and the conditions for mythological growth of the nature assumed do not exist.

Accordingly the new mythical theory does not posit that these Gospel myths are the creation of the period and country in which Jesus lived. It rather undertakes to affiliate the narratives with the mythology of the environing heathen world. They are not creations of, but importations into, the Christian tradition. The age of Jesus was not a myth-making age, but a large stock of myths was already in existence among the peoples to whom the gospel came. These myths were diffused in the atmosphere, and could not but be absorbed into the very texture of the history. The search for the origin of Gospel myths is therefore not to be made in the Gospel story itself, but in the field of Comparative Religion.

The special passages of the Gospel history where, according to the new mythical theory, these myths were drawn in and found ready lodgment, are the account of the birth of Jesus, the accounts of His miracles, and the accounts of His death and resurrection. The accounts of the birth (Mat 1:18-25, Luk 1:34 f.) are to be regarded not as parts of the original story of Jesus, but as 2nd cent, additions to it. They owe their origin to Gentile-Christian imagination. Like all true myths, they embody an idea, that of the Divine sonship of the founder of a great religion. The conception and phrase of Divine sonship are not foreign to the more direct Hebrew and Jewish antecedents of the gospel (Psa 2:6 ff., Enoch 45-51, 2 Esdras 13). Yet it is among the heathen that the idea was more commonly ascribed to great personages, especially rulers and sages. In Egypt, even to the latest days, the Pharaohs were regarded as incarnations of the deity (Wiedemann, *Egypt. [Note: Egyptian.] Rel.* p. 92 ff.). Alexander the Great deemed it wise, upon conquering Egypt, to permit himself to be called the son of the god Ammon-Ra. In Babylon, from the time of Sargon I. onwards, the kings were considered emanations of the godhead (Radau, *Early Hist. of Babylon*, p. 308 ff.). These incarnations are, moreover, often associated with a virgin birth. Pythagoras and Plato were both regarded as born of virgin mothers and the god Apollo (Olympiodorus, *Vit. Plat.* p. 1). The mother of Alexander the Great was believed to have been visited by Zeus in the form of a serpent before king Philip had consummated his marriage with her. In the narratives of the birth of Buddha (which are of pre-Christian origin) there are some marked similarities to the Gospel accounts of the birth of Jesus.

The myths alleged to have grown about the career of Jesus as a wonder-worker are prefaced by parallel accounts of a temptation and a conquest of the power of evil. The prince Siddhartha was tempted by the spirit of evil, who urged him to abandon his foolish and futile purpose of living a simple and abstemious life, and to return to

the comfort, glory, and power of the royal palace; but he resisted. The prophet Zarathustra had been urged by the evil spirit Ahriman to 'renounce the good law of the worshippers of Mazda,' and thereby to win dominion over the nations of the earth. But he had declined to do so. All the subsequent miracles recorded of Jesus are said to be abundantly paralleled in the legendary lore of the Orientals. The miraculous element did, in fact, persist through the Patristic age and down into the mediaeval period.

The last portion of the Gospel story is said to be specially overlaid with myths of this genus. All that is apparently distinctive and remarkable here is represented as the reflexion and counterpart of the myths current among pagans. The idea of the death of Christ as the propitiation for sin is paralleled by the numerous instances of vicarious human sacrifices. The burial and resurrection are the Christian equivalents of the Egyptian myth of Osiris, who was slain by his brother Set, 'the demon of the withering heat of summer,' and who lives again in the person of his son Horus. Likewise the fabled death, resurrection, and translation into heaven of Adonis, the rape of Persephone, and her rescue upon the compromise that she thereafter spend part of the year with her mother upon earth and part in Hades, are expressions of the same thought.

These cases are associated with mystic rites. In fact, it seems to be a peculiarity of mysteries that death and restoration to life again should be symbolically represented in them. In their best form these rites occur in the Dionyso-Orphic festivals. Here the death of the god was enacted in the sacrifice of a bull, whose flesh was then torn and devoured by the worshippers without being drained of its blood. Thus, it was supposed, the immortal life of the god passed into and conferred immortality upon the worshippers (Clem. Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] *Protrept.* i. 12, 17; Frazer, *Golden Bough*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , ii. 165).

If the death of Jesus is pictured as a voluntary descent into the realm of shades that He might there conquer death, the same thought is seen to run through the Babylonian myth of Ishtar (Schrader, *Höllenfahrt d. Istar*), the Mandaean myth of Hibil Ziwa (Brandt, *Mandäische Religion*, p. 213 ff.), and the myths of Orpheus and Herakles, both of whom accomplished descents into Hades, and, according to the Greek classical mythology, achieved conquests there.

The Gospel account of the ascension is paralleled first of all in the OT by the ascensions of Enoch and Elijah, then in the Graeco-Roman legendary lore by the ascensions of Romulus and Herakles. Legends of ascensions were, in fact, common even in the later periods. Some of the Roman emperors were said to have been raised at their death into equality with the gods (Rhode, *Psyche*, p. 663). The case of

Peregrinus Proteus, recited by Lucian, is quite noteworthy. Peregrinus took Herakles as his ensample. As Herakles had made his exit from the world by consigning himself to a funeral pyre, so Peregrinus built a pyre and cast himself into it; but at the moment of his doing so a trustworthy old man reports that he saw an eagle issuing from the flames and flying up into the heavens. Further, the same old man testifies that he beheld Peregrinus clothed in a white garment, and with a garland of victory on his head. Apollonius of Tyana is also reported to have disappeared quite mysteriously, either in the temple of Athene at Lindus or in that of Dictynna at Crete. Philostratus, his biographer, appeals to the fact that nowhere on earth could a grave of him be found, in proof of his ascension and deification.

To the question how these myths filtered into the Gospel story there is no clear answer given. It is simply assumed that they were in the air, and that a new religion must somehow adopt them, and embellish the life and personality of its founder with them. This is a serious difficulty with the new mythical theory. For it is precisely the manner of their infiltration into the Christian tradition that is the crucial point in it. The existence of the myths themselves among the pagans has always been known, and is no new discovery. It is not by simply re-telling these stories that the theory can gain support to itself, but by substantiating the claim that they actually passed from the world of heathen thought into the Christian tradition. This difficulty is enhanced and made practically insuperable when it is further borne in mind that the Hebrew antecedents of the Gospel had resolutely and effectively resisted the incorporation of such myths for a thousand years. Moreover, there is no room in the time interval between the life of Jesus and the writing down of the Gospel accounts of Him for such a process as is assumed, unless we except the birth-narratives of St. Matthew and St. Luke upon purely textual grounds. Criticism has been busy with the origin of the Gospel story as found in the extant narratives, and the more light it throws on the subject the more clearly it appears that the main data come from eye- and ear-witnesses. The old Strauss theory, assuming that the myths were constructed by the disciples of Jesus under the power of an excited and vivid imagination, was at this point stronger than the new one.

Furthermore, when these parallels are closely scrutinized, the first aspect of plausibility given to the mythical theory by them vanishes. The parallels are in most cases far-fetched. In some instances the resemblances are striking indeed. But a relation of derivation of one from the other or from a common source seems to be out of the question. In other instances where a genetic connexion might be possibly established, the parallelisms are forced.

In the case of the birth-narratives (Mat 1:18-25, Luk 1:34 f.), the question is one of evidence. The effort to reduce these to mythology is based upon the *a priori* conception that they are mythical. If it could be proved, apart from the theory itself,

upon purely critical grounds, that these accounts are of later origin, a basis for the theory might be found; but, as a matter of fact, the assumption that they are mythical furnishes the strongest consideration for their critical rejection—a process which can scarcely be called scientific.

Literature.—D. F. Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu*, 1835-1836 (4th ed. 1840), also *Das Leben Jesu, f. d. deutsche Volk bearbeitet*, 1864 (4th ed. 1877); Gfrörer, *Die Heilige Sage*, 1838; Ullmann, *Historisch oder Mythisch?* 1838 (2nd ed. 1864); Schenkel, *Charakterbild Jesu*⁴ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1873; Luthardt, *Die modernen Darstellungen des Lebens Jesu*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1865 (for products of the Strauss controversy, see, further, Grimm, *Glaubwürdigkeit d. Evang. Gesch.* 1845, pp. 128-131); Pfeleiderer, *Early Christian Conception of Christ*, 1905; J. May, *Miracles and Myths of NT*, 1901; Kalthoff, *Entsteh. Christenthums*, 1904. For the influence of the Babylonian Marduk myth and other myths on Jewish thought, and indirectly on the Gospel history, cf. Gunkel, *Schöpfung u. Chaos*, also Bousset, *Antichrist*, and A. Jeremias, *Babylonisches im NT*. For incarnation parallels, R. Seydel, *Das Evang. in sein. Verhältnissen z. d. Buddha-Sage u. Buddha-Lehre*, Leipzig, 1882, *Die Buddha-Legende u. d. Leben Jesu*, 1884; Verus, *Vergleichende Uebersicht d. vier Evang. in unverkürztem Wortlaut*, Leipzig, 1897.

A. C. Zenos.

☩ Naaman

NAAMAN (Luk 4:27 Νεεμάν, Textus Receptus ; Ναιμάν, Tisch., WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] ; Heb. נַעֲמָן = 'pleasantness').—The famous captain of Benhadad ii., whose cure by the instrumentality of Elisha is related in 2 Kings 5, and who was referred to by our Lord as 'Naaman the Syrian' in His discourse in the synagogue at Nazareth.

Whether our Lord's visit to Nazareth took place early in His ministry as here related by St. Luke, or later on as some think (cf. Mat 13:54-58, Mar 6:1-6), or whether there were two distinct visits, does not concern this article, since the purpose of our Lord's reference to Naaman is the same at whatever period of His ministry He may have made it. He suggested to His audience that they were ready to quote the proverb 'Physician, heal thyself,' and to say, 'Whatsoever we have heard done in Capernaum, do also here in thy country.' 'And (better 'But') he said, Verily I say unto you, No prophet is accepted in his own country.' His hearers apparently inferred from these

words that He had determined to work no miracle among them, and were irritated accordingly, although perhaps our Lord intended to imply no more than that He had little hope of being able to do so (cf. Mat_13:58, Mar_6:5). Then, to justify and to illustrate His action in Working miracles outside the limits of His own city, He referred to the cases of the widow of Sarepta and of Naaman, which were instances of blessings bestowed through the instrumentality of two of Israel's greatest prophets on persons who were not of the house of Israel at all. This afforded a complete justification of His own action, and was, further, a very pointed rebuke to them if, as seems the case, they were annoyed that He had neglected them for Capernaum, which, situated in that region known as 'Galilee of the Gentiles,' might be considered as less a Jewish town than their own. And, further, our Lord in these words rebuked Jewish exclusiveness in general, and quite clearly indicated the great truth that the benefits of His gospel, whether bodily or spiritual, were not only for the Jew, but also for the Gentile. It is probable that it was this underlying suggestion, coupled with His application to Himself of the great passage from Isaiah 61, which caused the final outbreak of His hearers' wrath (cf. Act_22:22; Act_28:28-29).

Albert Bonus.

☞ Naggai

NAGGAI.—An ancestor of Jesus, Luk_3:25 (= OT *Nogah*, 1Ch_3:7; 1Ch_14:6).

☞ Nahor

NAHOR.—Grandfather of Abraham, named in our Lord's genealogy, Luk_3:34.

☞ Nahshon

NAHSHON.—An ancestor of Jesus, Mat_1:4, Luk_3:32.

☞ Nahum

NAHUM.—An ancestor of Jesus, Luk_3:25.

☞ Nail

NAIL.—See Crucifixion, and Feet.

☞ Nain

NAIN (Ναΐν ⚭BCD Ti WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] , etc.; Ναεῖν EΓΔ, etc., Ναεῖμ 1 and 209, al pauc) is named only once in Scripture. St. Luke mentions it (Luk_7:11) as the 'city' to which the widow, whose dead son Jesus raised to life, belonged. The miracle was wrought near to the 'gate,' and in the presence of 'much people.' This Nain cannot be the same as the village on the E. [Note: Elohist.] side of the Jordan mentioned by Josephus (*BJ* iv. ix. 4). Robinson (*BMP*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ii. 361) identified Nain with the modern *Nein*, a collection of squalid huts on the N. slope of *Jebel cd-Duhy* (Little Hermon), 2 miles W. of Endor and about a day's journey from Capernaum (cf. Luk_7:1; Luk_7:11 (margin)). Robinson's view has been generally accepted. It agrees roughly with the statements of Eusebius and Jerome, both of whom place it S. of Tabor and not far from Endor. Eusebius reckons it 12 miles to the south (*Onom.* s.v. Ναεῖν), Jerome (*ib.* s.v. 'Naim') says 2 miles. The situation of the present village is bleak and uninviting, though it commands a wide and interesting view. A few hundred paces above the huts, to the S.E. [Note: Elohist.] , are rock-tombs in the hillside. Ramsay (*Education of Jesus*, Preface, p. ix) says he has 'little doubt that the ancient city was on the top' of the hill, somewhere above the modern village. He expresses his belief that this site has more claim to be the 'city set on a hill' (Mat_5:14) than Safed. It should be noted that Cheyne doubts the correctness of the reading Ναΐν here (*Encyc. Bibl.* iii. 3263), and claims Nestle (*Philol. Sacra*, 20) as also recognizing 'the doubtfulness of the locality assigned in Luke.'

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. 477; Stanley, SP [Note: P Sinai and Palestine.] 357; Thomson, *Land and Book*, 445; Tristram, *Land of Israel*, 127; Buhl, *GAP* [Note: *AP Geographic des alten Palästina.*] 217; Guérin, *Galilee*, i. 115 f.; Neubaner, *Géog. du Talm.* [Note: *Talmud.*] 188; Sanday, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, 24, 101; Baedeker-Socin, *Pal.* [Note: *Palestine, Palestinian.*] 346; Murray, *Handbook for S. and P.* 349.

A. W. Cooke.

☞ Nakedness

NAKEDNESS (γυμνότης).—Oriental dress is generally a draping of the figure in one or more continuous gowns or cloaks. The clothing may be drawn to the body by the waist-band or sash, but the tendency is to avoid as far as possible any exact shaping and rigid fastening of the costume, as such close adaptation to the figure is considered both immodest and undecorative, and in a warm climate would cause friction and perspiration (Eze 44:18). With Orientals, to a greater extent than in the West, out-door dress carries a meaning of investiture and embellishment, with a consciousness of self-appreciation and an expectation of comment. This is partly because in the daytime, in the retirement of the family, they undress more than is customary in the West. In the OT, the garments that were continually put on and off, as one went out and returned to the house, were called suits of apparel or exchange (Jdg 17:10, Isa 3:22). The cotton or linen gown worn beneath these is the permanent under-garment, and any one wearing only this is conventionally said to be naked or unclothed. In this loose costume—a long robe reaching to the feet—members of the family, both male and female, attend to their active household duties, or enjoy the passive luxury of the unoccupied hour. It is, however, unbecoming to receive visitors in such undress, and hence the impropriety of entering without due announcement and permission received, or of looking down from the flat roof of the house into a neighbour's enclosure. The linen cloth mentioned in Mar 14:51-52 was a substitute for the ordinary under-garment. The solitary fisherman when diving from the side of the Lake of Galilee after his cast-net usually divests himself of all clothing. The same is frequently done in summer weather when fishermen haul the drag-net into the boat (Joh 21:7), or a loincloth is worn, as in the case of the tanner and potter at their work.

Nakedness thus means: (1) the state of undress permitted in Oriental family life, and preferred as an adaptation to the climate; (2) insufficiency, amounting sometimes to complete want, of clothing, involving discomfort and suffering in the case of the poor and destitute (Mat 25:36, Rom 8:35, 2Co 11:27); (3) the nudity connected with immodest behaviour (Exo 20:26), or inflicted as a humiliation on prisoners of war (Isa 20:4); and (4) in a metaphorical sense, unnatural and shameless disloyalty to God (Eze 23:29, Rev 3:18).

G. M. Mackie.

☞ Name

NAME (ὄνομα).—1. In the Gospels the word is frequently used in the ordinary sense of a distinctive appellation or title, and especially to denote personal proper names (e.g. [Mat_10:2](#), [Mar_5:22](#), [Luk_1:5](#); [Luk_1:27](#), [Joh_1:6](#)). See following article.

2. Rarely it is found in the sense of ‘reputation,’ ‘fame,’ ‘glory’—the result of a person’s name being on every tongue. So it is said of Jesus, ‘His name was spread abroad’ ([Mar_6:14](#); cf. ‘a name which is above every name,’ [Php_2:9](#)).

3. But especially ὄνομα is used, like Heb. [שֵׁם](#), not as a mere external designation, or distinguishing label attached to an individual, but with the suggestion of its significance as characteristic of personality. Hence the importance attached, just as in the OT, to the choosing of a name ([Mat_1:21](#), [Luk_1:13](#); [Luk_1:31](#); [Luk_1:63](#)). hence also (cf. [Gen_17:5](#); [Gen_17:15](#); [Gen_32:28](#)) the alteration of a name, or the addition of another name, when some vital fact of experience has made the character different from what it was before (e.g. [Mat_16:17-18](#), [Act_13:9](#)). It is when we remember that ‘name’ stands for character that we see the force of such an expression as ‘to receive a prophet in the name of a prophet’ ([Mat_10:41](#)). This does not mean to receive him in the name or for the sake of someone else, but to receive him in his character as a prophet—for his work’s sake, and on the ground of what he himself is.

4. This use of ὄνομα as significant of character is of very frequent occurrence with reference to God—corresponding here again to the employment of [שֵׁם](#) in the OT. When Mary sings in the *Magnificat*, ‘Holy is his name’ ([Luk_1:49](#)), it is the revealed character of God that is meant. When Jesus teaches His disciples in the Lord’s Prayer to say, ‘Hallowed be thy name’ ([Mat_6:9](#) = [Luk_11:2](#)), it is that Divine quality of Fatherhood which He has just set in the very forefront of the prayer that He desires them to hallow. When He did works in His Father’s name ([Joh_10:25](#)), He did them by appealing to His Father’s self-revelation, and hence by His Father’s authority. When He exclaims, ‘Father, glorify thy name’ ([Joh_12:28](#)), He is asking the Father to complete in the eyes not only of the Jewish people, but of the great Gentile world represented by those Greek seekers who now stood before Him, the manifestation of His holiness and love given in the Person and ministry of His Son. And when He says in the Intercessory Prayer, ‘I have manifested thy name’ ([17:6](#), cf. v. 26), He is speaking once more of that Fatherhood of God of which His own earthly life had been the revelation and the pledge.

5. Corresponding to the foregoing use of ὄνομα as expressive of the revealed character of God, is the constant employment of the word, not only in the Gospels, but throughout the whole of the NT, to denote the character, dignity, authority, and

even the very Personality of Jesus Christ. This is the use made of it by the First Evangelist (Mat 12:21) when he applies to Jesus the words of Deutero-Isaiah according to the LXX Septuagint reading, ‘And in his name shall the Gentiles hope’ (Isa 42:4). The meaning of the author of Acts is similar when he writes, ‘The name of the Lord Jesus was magnified’ (Isa 19:17). When our Lord speaks of those who ‘receive a little child in my name’ (Mat 18:5 ||), or gives a gracious promise to the two or three who in His name are gathered together (Mat 18:20), or assures us that whatsoever we shall ask in His name the Father will bestow (Joh 16:23 f.), He is certainly not speaking of the use of His name as a species of magical formula—nothing could be further from the mind of Christ (cf. Mat 7:22)—but of a service and worship and prayer undertaken for His sake or inspired by faith in His Person. And when in the Johannine writings the very same blessings are assured to those who ‘believe on his name’ (Joh 1:12; Joh 2:23; Joh 3:18, 1Jn 3:23; 1Jn 5:13) and to those who believe on Himself (Joh 3:16; Joh 6:40, 1Jn 5:10; cf. esp., as occurring in close juxtaposition, Joh 3:15 with Joh 3:18, and 1Jn 5:10 with 1Jn 5:13), it seems plain that by ‘the name of Jesus’ is meant the Personality of Jesus as that has been summed up in ‘the name’—the name, above all, of ‘only-begotten Son of God’ (Joh 3:18, cf. 1Jn 5:13).

6. There are certain phrases in which ‘the name of Christ’ occurs that call for more particular consideration.

(1) *Persecution for the name.*—When our Lord said to His disciples that they should be hated and persecuted ‘for his name’s sake’ (Mat 10:22; Mat 24:9, Mar 13:13, Luk 6:22; Luk 21:12; Luk 21:17); when ‘for his name’s sake’ shame and suffering actually fell upon the Apostles and the early Church (Act 5:41; Act 9:16; Act 15:26). and when St. Paul expresses his readiness not to be bound only, but also to die ‘for the name of the Lord Jesus’ (Act 21:13)—what are we to understand by these expressions? No doubt in several of these cases ‘name’ is practically synonymous with Person; and so to suffer for Christ’s name is equivalent to suffering for His sake—an alternative phrase which is also employed (Joh 13:37-38, 2Co 12:10, Php 1:29). But sometimes it seems more natural to think of the primary meaning of ‘name’ as an external designation. The expression ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος used in Act 5:41 (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘for the Name’) and 3Jn 1:7 (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘for the sake of the Name’) suggests that ‘the Name,’ like ‘the Way’ (Act 9:2; Act 19:9), was a technical term, and that to suffer for ‘the Name’ meant to ‘suffer as a Christian’ (1Pe 4:16), i.e. as one who bore the name of being a disciple of Christ. It is true that the name ‘Christian’ (wh. see) does not appear to have been originally used by Christ’s followers themselves. But at all events it was employed by outsiders (Act 11:26; Act 26:28), and came to be employed especially by enemies (1Pe 4:16). And if the name Χριστιανοί was not current within the Church, there was a party in

Corinth that claimed to be distinctively ‘of Christ’ (Χριστοῦ, 1Co 1:12), while St. Paul not only protests, with reference to this claim, ‘Is Christ divided?’ (1Co 1:13), but says a little further on in the Ep., with regard to the whole Christian body, ‘Ye are of Christ’ (ὕμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ, 1Co 3:23). When, again, St. Peter writes, ‘If ye are reproached for the name of Christ, blessed are ye’ (1Pe 4:14), it is evident that the reproach is brought not so much against the name of Christ itself as against those who bear it (cf. 1Pe 4:16). And this view is confirmed when we find St. James speaking of ‘the honourable name which was called upon you’ (Jam 2:7 (Revised Version margin)), the reference being apparently to Christ’s name as a designation that came to be applied to His people—probably from the fact that His name had been invoked over them at the time of their baptism.

(2) *Working of miracles in the name.*—In the Gospels references to the working of miracles (esp. the casting out of evil spirits) with the use of the name are found in Mat 7:22, Mar 9:38 f. = Luk 9:49 f., Luk 10:17, and in the Appendix to Mk.’s Gospel, where, before His Ascension, Jesus is represented as assuring His disciples that those who believe shall have the power of casting out demons in His name (Mar 16:17). In Act 3:6 ff. (cf. Act 3:16; Act 4:10; Act 4:30) St. Peter cures the lame beggar at the gate of the Temple by commanding him in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth to walk. In Act 16:18 St. Paul, with the invocation of the same name, casts the spirit of divination out of the slave-girl at Philippi. In Act 19:13 ff. certain vagabond Jews, exorcists, take upon themselves to call over those possessed by evil spirits the name of the Lord Jesus, and the sons of Sceva in particular do this to their own confusion; but the implication of the narrative evidently is that the ‘special miracles’ which had just been wrought by St. Paul himself were accomplished with a like invocation (cf. Act 19:11-12 with Act 19:13). In Jam 5:14 the elders of the Church are told to pray over the sick man, ‘anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord.’

The view has been taken that this use of the name of Christ for the working of miracles was nothing more than the employment of a theurgic formula, which finds its analogue in the invocations and incantations of ancient magic (so esp. Conybeare, *JQR* [Note: *QR Jewish Quarterly Review.*] viii, ix). We may be sure that in so far as such a use of His name was commanded or approved by our Lord Himself, this view is quite impossible (cf. Mat 7:22). And as for the Apostolic Church, while it is clear that the name of Jesus was invoked by both Peter and Paul before the performance of a miracle, Peter’s prayer, after the miracle at the Temple gate, that God would accompany the use of the name by stretching forth His hand to heal (Act 4:29-30), points to the conclusion that the name of Jesus was invoked by the Apostles in these cases simply because every appeal to God was made through the Person of the Mediator. The influence of Greek and Oriental superstition soon brought into the Church a magical and theurgic element, which gathered specially round the use of

Christ's name in formulas of exorcism. But within the Apostolic sphere, at all events, it was not a formula, however sacred, that was believed to cast out demons or work cures. St. James, after enjoining the use of the Lord's name at a sick-bed, adds that 'the prayer of faith shall heal the sick' (Jam 5:15). And in the case of the impotent man, St. Peter, when the people came crowding into Solomon's Porch, greatly wondering (Act 3:11), said, 'By faith in his name hath his name made this man strong ... yea, the faith which is through him hath given him this perfect soundness in the presence of you all' (Act 3:16).

(3) *Baptizing in (or into) the name.*—Christian baptism, as we meet with it in the Apostolic Church, is performed in (or into) the name of Christ (Act 2:38; Act 8:16; Act 10:48; Act 19:5, Rom 6:3, Gal 3:27). On the other hand, in our Lord's parting instructions to the Eleven, as given at the end of Mt., He directs them to baptize 'into (or in; but εἰς is the preposition used) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost' (Mat 28:19)—a formula that is found nowhere else in the NT. This is not the place to discuss the genuineness of the logion (in support of it see Resch, *TU [Note: U Texte und Untersuchungen.]* x. 2, summarized by Marshall in *ExpT [Note: xpT Expository Times.]* vi. [1895] p. 395 ff.; Bruce, *Kingdom of God*, p. 258 ff.; against it, Holtzmann, *NT Theol.* i. 378 ff.; Harnack, *Hist. of Dog.* i. 79; Moffatt, *Hist. NT*, p. 647 ff. See, further, art. Baptism, § 5). But if we accept the triple formula as coming from the lips of Jesus, the fact that we have no direct evidence of its use in the Apostolic Church certainly creates a difficulty. The suggestion that the shorter form is simply a designation of the fact that baptism was administered on confession of Jesus as Christ and Lord, and that the Trinitarian formula would invariably be employed in the actual administration of the sacrament, does not meet the case, for we know that in the 3rd cent, a baptism in the name of Christ was still common, and that in the time of Cyprian the controversy about re-baptism gathered round this very point.

The solution of the problem may lie in the fact that at first the efficacy of baptism was not attached to any set form of words. The Trinitarian formula itself occurs in different versions. Justin gives it after a paraphrastic fashion (*Apol.* i. 61); Tertullian associates the name of the Church with the names of the Three Persons of the Trinity (*de Bapt.* vi.), and a like usage is found in the Syrian Church (see Scholten, *Taufformel*, p. 39). Corresponding to this lack of fixity in the longer form is the absence of anything like uniformity in the shorter one. The name used is 'Jesus Christ,' or 'the Lord Jesus,' or perhaps even simply 'Christ' (1Co 1:13 suggests the last); while the relation to the name is variously expressed by εἰς, ἐν ἐπί (ἐπί [or ἐν] τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Act 2:38; εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, Act 8:16; Act 19:5; ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου, Act 10:48; εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, Rom 6:3; εἰς Χρ

ιστόν, Gal 3:27). It is hardly legitimate to simplify this diversity by assuming, with Dean Armitage Robinson, that εἰς and ἐν are really synonymous in every case, and that ‘in the name,’ not ‘into the name,’ is always the proper English rendering (*EBi [Note: Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.]* i. 473). No doubt it is true, as he says, that ‘the interchangeability of the two prepositions in late Greek may be plentifully illustrated from the NT’ (cf. J. H. Moulton, *Gram, of NT Gr.* i. 62, 66, 234 f.). But this is far from deciding the question whether in the case of baptism they are used indifferently, and passages like Rom 6:3, 1Co 12:13, Gal 3:27 strongly suggest that they are not.

All this diversity of usage seems to show that slight importance was attached at first to the question of a formula, provided that it was clearly understood what Christian baptism meant, and what it implied. Relation to Christ was the essential matter. And as Christian baptism in the NT is invariably conditional upon confession of Christ, so it was administered with an appeal to Christ’s authority (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι); it depended for its reality upon a faith that rested on His name (ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι); and it was the outward symbol of an actual union with His Person (εἰς τὸ ὄνομα).

Literature.—The Lexx. of Grimm-Thayer and Cremer, s.v. ὄνομα; Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible, art. ‘Name’; *PRE [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.]* 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred], art. ‘Name’; Böhmer, *Das biblische ‘Im Namen’* (1898); Conybeare, ‘Christian Demonology’ in *JQR [Note: QR Jewish Quarterly Review.]* viii, ix; Scholten, *Das Taufformel*; Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, 181 ff.; *ExpT [Note: xpT Expository Times.]* vi. [1895] 247, 395, xi. [1899] 3, xv. [1904] 294; *Expositor*, Oct. 1902, p. 251 ff.; F. H. Chase and J. A. Robinson in *JThSt [Note: ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.]*, July 1905 (vi. 481), Jan. 1906 (vii. 186), Jan. 1907 (viii. 161).

J. C. Lambert.

Names

NAMES.—Jewish children usually received their names very soon after their birth; in the case of male children, at the time of their circumcision on the eighth day (Luk 1:59; Luk 2:21). The name was selected in honour of a parent or relative (Luk 1:59), or because of some circumstance connected with the birth of the child, as in the case of Thomas (Aram. Aramaic :ܛܘܡܝܢ, Gr. Θῶμας), meaning ‘twin’; in the case of our Lord and of John the Baptist the name had been selected beforehand by

special Divine communication (Mat_1:21, Luk_1:13). Indeed, Jewish names generally were significant, referring to some trait in the child, actual or prophetic; some feeling or hope of the parent at the time of the birth, though this was perhaps not so generally true as in the early OT period. Such old-fashioned names still survived in names like *Nathanael* (Ναθαναήλ, Heb. נְתַנְיָאֵל ‘God gave’); *Zachariah* (Ζαχαρίας, Heb. יְבִרְיָהוּ ‘Jehovah remembered’).

Surnames were quite common in NT times. Frequently one person was distinguished from another of the same name by the adding of the father’s name, joined by the Aramaic word *bar* (בַּר), ‘son of,’ as in *Simon bar-Jona* (Mat_16:17), and also in such names as *Bartholomew*, ‘son of Tolmai,’ and *Barabbas*, ‘son of a father.’ The Greek idiom is frequently followed, however, as in Joh_21:17 ‘Simon of Jonas’; or, written more fully with υἱός, ‘son,’ ‘Simon son of Jonas’ (Joh_1:42).

The presence of two names for the same person in the Gospels is sometimes to be accounted for by the fact that many of the people of Palestine in Christ’s day were bilingual. Hence persons would have an Aramaic and a Greek name, the second translating the first, or being quite similar in sound. The Greek for *Thomas* (‘twin’) was *Didymus* (Joh_11:16); for *Cephas* (כִּפְיָא ‘stone’) it was *Peter* (Πέτρος, Joh_1:42). Many of the Jews mentioned in the Gospels are known to us only by Greek names, so widespread had the influence of that language become; cf. Φίλιππος, *Philip* (Joh_1:45), and Ανδρέας, *Andrew* (Mat_4:18).

A noteworthy feature of personal names in Christ’s day—though the custom existed much earlier and was widespread (cf. Gen_32:28, Dan_1:7)—was that of changing the name or adding a new name at some important crisis in the life, or because of some manifest characteristic of the person so named (Mat_16:18, Mar_3:16; Mar_3:18).

Surnames were sometimes given from the place where one lived or from which one came, as in the case of Judas Iscariot (wh. see), Mar_3:19; or from the party to which one belonged: Simon the Zealot (Ζηλωτής), Luk_6:15.

On names applied to Christ see following article.

Literature.—Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible , art. ‘Names, Proper’; *Ebi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*] , art. ‘Names’; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. i. 47; A. Wright, *Some N.T. Problems*, 56 (in St. Mark), 74 (in St. Luke).

Names And Titles Of Christ

NAMES AND TITLES OF CHRIST.—That special significance is attached in the Gospels to the names which are applied to our Lord, is clearly suggested by the reason assigned by the angel of the Lord for the name which he directed Joseph and Mary to bestow upon the Babe whose birth he foretold. ‘Thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins’ (Mat_1:21). This explanation of the name Jesus suggests that the other titles that are used to distinguish our Saviour have each its own didactic purpose, and are intended to shed light on some special aspect of Christ’s mission and nature.

1. Jesus.—The name Divinely bestowed upon our Lord, ‘Jesus’ (Ἰησοῦς, the Gr. equivalent of the Heb. *Joshua* or *Jeshua* יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, יֵשׁוּעַ), ‘Jehovah is salvation,’ was one of the commonest of male names among the Jews. Its bestowal upon Christ had, as is expressly stated in Mat_1:21, peculiar and special significance. It meant that the bearer of the name should in this unique instance of its application be in the fullest sense all that the word meant, the Divinely sent Saviour of His people, and in particular that the salvation which He should work out should be a moral and spiritual, not a temporal deliverance. The name Jesus, as being that by which He was commonly known among His countrymen, is used by the Evangelists as a proper name, with or without the addition of other names or titles employed by way of distinction. See separate article and also Salvation.

2. Immanuel.—In connexion with the miraculous birth of Jesus and with the assurance that in Him should be fulfilled the promise of the Messiah, St. Matthew applies the prophecy (Is 7:14), ‘Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel, which is, being interpreted, God with us’ (Mat_1:23). The thought present to the Evangelist, in his use of this prophecy of Isaiah, is that which was embodied in the OT types of the Tabernacle and the Temple, and may be compared with the use in the Fourth Gospel of the expression, ‘The Word was made flesh and dwelt (ἐσκήνωσεν, lit. ‘tabernacled’) among us’ (Joh_1:14). The name Immanuel, as applied to Christ in respect of His Incarnation, thus denotes the union of the Divine and the human natures in the person of the God-man. See also separate article.

3. Christ.—This name (Χριστός, ‘anointed,’ the exact equivalent in Greek of the word ‘Messiah’ מָשִׁיחַ) holds a very important place among the titles of our Lord.

The word is variously applied in the OT. It is used of the high priest, who is called ‘the anointed priest’ (ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ χριστός [ἱερεὺς ἁγιασμένος]), or more fully, ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ χριστὸς ὁ τετελειωμένος, ‘the anointed priest who has been consecrated,’ the participle τετελειωμένος, ‘consecrated,’ being added to the translation apparently in order to call attention to the meaning of the anointing (Lev 4:5; cf. Lev 6:22). Its use as a designation of kings is familiar, as in the title ‘the Lord’s anointed’ (ὁ χριστὸς τοῦ Κυρίου [יהוה מָשִׁיחַ]) applied to Saul (2Sa 1:14 etc.), to David (2Sa 19:21, Psa 89:38; Psa 89:51; Psa 132:10-17), to Cyrus, in connexion with his mission as the deliverer of God’s people (Isa 45:1). It is applied even to the people of Israel as a nation consecrated to God (Psa 105:15 || 1Ch 16:22, Hab 3:13). It occurs as a title of the expected Messiah in Psa 2:2 and Dan 9:25. In the latter book it occurs with special reference to royal authority, as a result of which it came to be regularly used as the recognized title of Israel’s promised deliverer; cf. its use in the Book of Enoch (48:10, 52:4), an apocalyptic work which strongly influenced the theology of the Hebrews.

The word is used in the Gospels, but very rarely, as a proper name, in the first chapters of St. Matthew and St. Mark, where the subject of the narrative is mentioned in such expressions as ‘Jesus Christ, son of David, son of Abraham’ (Mat 1:1), ‘Jesus Christ’ (Mar 1:1, where υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ is omitted by the best authorities), or where Jesus of Nazareth is distinguished from others who bore the same name, as in the phrase ‘Jesus who is called Christ’ (Mat 27:17; Mat 27:22, cf. Mat 1:16). It appears as a proper name in the passage in which St. Matthew, commenting ‘upon the genealogy of the family of Abraham, notes that ‘from the carrying away to Babylon *unto the Christ*’ there were fourteen generations (Mat 1:17); and probably also in the one passage in which the word occurs without the article (Mar 9:41), where Jesus uses the words ‘because ye belong to Christ.’ With these exceptions the name has in the Gospels some special reference to our Lord’s offices and claims, or to the Messianic expectations of the Jews. Thus it is said of Simeon (Luk 2:26) that it was revealed to him that he should not see death till he had seen ‘the Lord’s Christ’ (τὸν χριστὸν Κυρίου—the familiar LXX Septuagint translation of יהוה מָשִׁיחַ ‘the Lord’s anointed,’ the title of all Hebrew kings), and the angel announced to the shepherds the birth of a Saviour ‘who is Christ the Lord’ (Luk 2:11). “We learn from St. Matthew (Mat 2:2) that the Magi inquired in Jerusalem, ‘Where is he that is born King of the Jews?’ Herod, who took this as referring to the current form of the Messianic hope,

and regarded the Messiah concerning whom the inquiry was made as a possible rival to himself, called the chief priests and scribes, and put the question of the Magi in another form, demanding 'where *the Christ* should be born.' Herod and the Jewish rulers evidently considered the title 'Christ' as synonymous with that of 'King of the Jews,' in accordance with the general expectation current at the time. To them the Messiah was a king who should derive his royal authority from his Davidic descent and reign as a temporal prince. The Jews, in fact, influenced largely by their apocalyptic literature, had so narrowed their conceptions of the meaning of the title 'Messiah' as to make it signify little more than a king by Divine right, and, leaving out of account all other elements of the Messianic promise, to associate it with thoughts of a kingdom which was of this world. Our Lord, probably for this reason, refrained from claiming the title for Himself, and discouraged its use by others. He forbade the demons whom He cast out of those possessed to confess that He was Christ (Luk 4:41, cf. Mar 1:25; Mar 1:34 etc.). When Peter, in reply to the direct question, 'Who say ye that I am?' confessed His Messiahship, Jesus strictly commanded the disciples to tell no man that He was the Christ (Mat 16:20). On the other hand, He revealed Himself as the Christ to the woman of Samaria (Joh 4:25-26). He answered the doubting message of John, 'Art thou lie that should come, or do we look for another?' by pointing in proof of His Messianic claims to His teaching and His works of beneficence (Mat 11:2-6 || Luk 7:19-23). Even at the beginning of His ministry He accepted the confession of the first disciples when they acknowledged Him to be the Messiah (Joh 1:41 ff.), as He afterwards accepted the confession of Peter (Mat 16:16); and when the high priest adjured Him to declare whether He was the Christ, He answered in the affirmative (Mat 26:63 || Mar 14:61 || Luk 22:67); and before His final rejection, when the Jews challenged Him, 'How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly,' He replied that He had already told them, and that His claim was confirmed by the works which He did in the Father's name (Joh 10:24-25). The murmuring of the people when He spoke of the lifting up of the Son of Man, showed that by that time the impression produced by His ministry was that He did claim to be the Christ. Jesus had just said, 'I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me,' to which the people replied, 'We have heard out of the law that Christ abideth for ever: and how sayest thou, The Son of Man shall be lifted up?' (Joh 12:32 ff.); and again St. John tells us, in connexion with the incident of the cure of the man who had been born blind, that the Jews had agreed that if any man should confess that Jesus was the Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue (Joh 9:22).

From these various instances the conclusion appears to be, that Jesus discouraged the application to Himself of the title 'Christ' in every case in which it was likely to be misunderstood or to lead the people, with their narrow views as to what the Messiah should be, to form inadequate conceptions of the nature and scope of His actual claims and His actual mission.

His aim throughout His ministry was to correct the current conceptions of the expected Messiah by calling attention to the spiritual significance of the national hope, and to the true meaning of that word which was so often upon their lips, thus gradually preparing them to accept Himself as the Deliverer who had been promised and whom they required. This explains, on the one hand, His reticence on most occasions as to His personal claim to be the Christ; and, on the other hand, His frankness at other times, as when He revealed Himself as the Christ to the woman of Samaria, who had learned to look upon the promised Messiah as One who should reveal the Father and the Father's will.

Jesus sought to effect His purpose in various ways. To adduce one conspicuous example, He called the attention of the Pharisees to a well-known Messianic prophecy, evidently in order to correct that popular belief which they shared. He asked them, 'What think ye of Christ? Whose son is he?' (Mat 22:42 f., cf. Mar 12:35 f. || Luk 20:41), clearly treating the matter as a question in Biblical theology or Scripture interpretation: They answered His question in terms of the belief then current, 'The son of David.' Then Jesus, by quoting from the Psalms a passage which they understood to be not only distinctly Messianic, but an utterance of David himself (Psa 110:1), showed some of the practical difficulties involved in the belief that the Messiah of prophecy owed his authority to his Davidic descent. 'How is David's son David's Lord?' Thus our Lord suggested the need there was of carefully revising the whole question of Messianic prophecy, that the people should ask themselves whether they had taken into account not one element or aspect of the problem only, but all that the prophets had spoken concerning the Christ. Until they had done this and were in a position to judge the Person, mission, work, and claims of Jesus by the light shed upon the subject by such a careful study of the whole question, they must necessarily find not merely the teaching and work of Jesus, but the OT revelation itself, a dark problem full of insoluble enigmas.

Thus Jesus sought gradually to lead His countrymen to rise above their narrow views, and, instead of making an unintelligent use of words and names, mere signs of spiritual truths, to apprehend the thing signified by them. Thus He taught them that 'the Christ,' 'the Messiah,' 'the Lord's Anointed,' simply meant 'him whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world' (Joh 10:36) that He might 'do the' Father's 'will and finish his work' (Joh 4:34; cf. Joh 17:4). The anointing which the name denoted, and of which under the old economy priests and kings, as types of the coming Deliverer, were the subjects, was only a symbol of the Holy Spirit by whose effectual working God's will was done. The Christ of God, the Anointed One by way of eminence, the Antitype to which those types more or less clearly pointed, was He upon whom the Spirit of God rested and abode according to the prophecy (Isa 11:2-3), and who was thus equipped for the fulfilment of the Father's will. We may compare with this what we learn from the Fourth Gospel of the manner in which

the Baptist knew that Jesus was the Christ. The appointed sign was the descent upon Him of the Spirit in the form of a dove. 'Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost' (Joh 1:33). That was the anointing which constituted Him the Christ, and by which He was publicly set apart for the perfect accomplishment of the Father's purpose of redemption. This truth was not fully learned, and therefore the name in which the truth was enshrined could not be used, with a correct understanding of its meaning, even by the most intimate disciples of Jesus, until after the Resurrection, when they knew that the doing of the Father's will, for which He had been anointed with the Spirit, involved the sufferings, death, and resurrection of the Christ (Luk 24:46), after which, and as a result of which, Christ should impart to His followers the gift of the Holy Ghost, and so communicate to them all the benefits of His redemptive work. See also art. Messiah.

4. Son of David; King of Israel; King of the Jews.—These titles, closely connected with that of 'Christ,' and, like it, associated in the minds of the people with inadequate conceptions of Messianic prophecy, were little favoured by our Lord. They had, however, their own significance for the Evangelists in respect of their bearing upon the fulfilment of prophecy. Thus St. Matthew in the beginning of his Gospel calls Jesus 'son of David,' and prefaces his narrative with a genealogical table in which he notes Christ's place in history as a descendant of the royal house of David (Mat 1:1 ff.), while in ch. 2 he calls attention to the general expectation prevalent among the nations that the Messiah should appear as a Prince of the house of Judah (Mat 2:2). St. Luke also traces the genealogy of Jesus, and calls attention to His descent from David, in connexion with which he explains how it happened that He was born in Bethlehem, though the home of Mary and Joseph was in Nazareth in Galilee (Luk 2:1 ff; Luk 3:23-38). The Evangelist further emphasizes the point of our Lord's Davidic descent by recording the words of Gabriel at the Annunciation: 'The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David' (Luk 1:32). The aim of these Evangelists in noting these points is to show that in Jesus of Nazareth, OT prophecy, and, in particular, the promise that the Christ should come of the house of David, find their fulfilment. The connexion between the Old Covenant and the New having been thus established, and Jesus proved to be the subject of OT prophecies of the coming Deliverer, the title 'Son of David' ceases to be used or referred to until the Gospel narrative reaches the closing scenes of the life of Christ. Then we learn that Jesus was addressed as 'Son of David' by the two blind men (Mat 9:27), by the Syrophœnician woman (Mat 15:22), by the blind men at Jericho (Mat 20:30 || Mar 10:47-48 || Luk 18:38-39); and that He was saluted as such by the multitude at His triumphal entry into Jerusalem (Mat 21:9 || Mar 11:10). That the popular belief made the Davidic descent of the Messiah an essential element, is illustrated by the exclamation of the multitude on the occasion on which He healed one 'possessed with a devil, blind and dumb,' 'Is not this the son of David?' (Mat 12:23); by the objection

raised at another time by those who maintained that Christ should come not from Galilee, but 'of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was' (Joh 7:42); and by the answer of the Pharisees to our Lord's question, 'What think ye of Christ?' (Mat 22:42, cf. Mar 12:35 || Luk 20:41).

Closely connected with the title 'Son of David' are those of 'King of Israel' and 'King of the Jews.' Jesus is spoken of as 'King of the Jews' by the Magi (Mat 2:2, cf. Luk 1:32-33), and the first recorded instance of His being addressed as 'King of Israel' is the confession of Nathanael, 'Thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel' (Joh 1:49). All other instances of the use of these titles belong to the narrative of the last week of Christ's ministry. He was hailed as 'King of Israel' (Joh 12:13, cf. Luk 19:38) at His triumphal entry, when He seemed to be on the point of acceding to the popular desire, and when He so far countenanced it by literally and in the most public manner fulfilling the prophecy of Zechariah (Zec 9:9), riding into Jerusalem upon a young ass, the use of which He had claimed on the ground that 'the Lord hath need of him' (Mat 21:3 || Mar 11:3 || Luk 19:31). The title appears after this in direct connexion with the sufferings and death of Jesus, whose claim to be 'Christ, a King,' was the pretext used by the chief priests for delivering Him over to Pilate (Luk 23:2). Pilate, hearing this charge brought against his prisoner, asked Jesus, 'Art thou the King of the Jews?' (Mar 15:2 || Luk 23:3). Jesus replied in the affirmative, but explained that the Kingdom which He claimed was spiritual, not temporal (Joh 18:33-37). After this the titles 'King of Israel' and 'King of the Jews' are 'applied to Jesus by Pilate, the Roman soldiers, and the Jews, with associations of mockery and abuse (Mat 27:29; Mat 27:42 || Mar 15:18; Mar 15:32 || Luk 23:37 || Joh 19:3; Joh 19:14-15); and with the same associations the title 'King of the Jews' was affixed to the cross (Mat 27:37 || Mar 15:26 || Luk 23:38 || Joh 19:19). The explanation already suggested of our Lord's avoidance of the name Christ has special force here. Misunderstood as those titles were, Jesus systematically discouraged their use as being calculated to create a false impression of His actual claims. The trial before Pilate and Herod and the scene at the Crucifixion themselves illustrate the reason for Christ's refusal to accept the royal honours which the people would have pressed upon Him. In the opinion of Jew and Gentile the royalty of Jesus and His crucifixion as an impostor and malefactor involved a grotesque contradiction. The cry of derision, 'He is the King of Israel, let him come down from the cross' (Mat 27:42 || Mar 15:30), was but another form of the popular belief that a suffering Saviour was a contradiction in terms, that the Christ could not be subject to death (Joh 12:34). See also art. King.

5. Son of God.—This title, as it was known among the Jews, had in it a very considerable element of ambiguity. We can understand why this was so when we reflect upon the fact that in OT Scripture the expression is more than once used of others besides a Divine Being. It is used of angels (Gen 6:2; Gen 6:4, Job 1:6;

Job 2:1; Job 38:7), of kings, and even of the nation of Israel (2Sa 7:14, Psa 82:6, Exo 4:22). In the New Test., again, it is applied to Adam (Luk 3:38), where the reference is to the relationship in which by his creation he stands to God; and Jesus Himself uses the expression ‘sons of God’ with reference to believers, where He says that in heaven ‘they are equal unto the angels; and are the ‘children (Gr. υιοί, “sons”) of God’ (Luk 20:36).

The use of the name as a title of the Messiah is traceable to OT prophecies like that of Psa 2:7 ‘Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.’ Thus ‘Son of God’ came to be synonymous with ‘Christ.’ It is possible that it was so used even by Peter in his confession at Caesarea Philippi (Mat 16:16, cf. Mar 8:29 ‘Thou art the Christ,’ and Luk 9:20 ‘the Christ of God,’ with Joh 6:69 ‘the Holy One of God,’ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ), and it was certainly understood in that sense, *i.e.* as strictly Messianic, by the Jews generally in the time of our Lord. To them the Messiah as such was Son of God. Thus in Nathanael’s confession the latter name occurs in conjunction with the Messianic title ‘King of Israel’; and John the Baptist, after relating the incident by which the Spirit of God showed him that Jesus was the Christ, concludes with the words, ‘I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God’ (Joh 1:49, cf. Joh 1:34). It is of rare occurrence in the Synoptic Gospels. We find it in the Annunciation: ‘That holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God’ (Luk 1:35). In the Synoptic accounts of the Baptism and the Transfiguration we learn that on both occasions Jesus was hailed as God’s Son by a voice from heaven (Mat 3:17 || Mar 1:11 || Luk 3:22, cf. Mat 17:5 || Mar 9:7 || Luk 9:35). Again, the Synoptists give various instances in which Jesus was called ‘Son of God’ by others, as by Satan (Mat 4:3; Mat 4:6 || Luk 4:3; Luk 4:9), by the demons whom He cast out of those who were possessed (Mar 3:11, Luk 4:41), and by the occupants of Peter’s boat after the second stilling of the storm on the lake (Mat 14:33). Again, as already noted, Peter confessed ‘Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.’ To these may be added the testimony at the cross by the centurion and others (Mat 27:54), ‘Truly this was the (a) son of God.’ Of its use by Jesus Himself the Synoptists record no direct instance, though they record allusions in His parabolic teaching which clearly point to Himself as the Son of the King (Mat 22:2 ff.) or of the Lord of the vineyard. (Mat 21:37-39 || Mar 12:6-8 || Luk 20:13-15), and take note of His acceptance of the title as involved in His answer to the direct questions of the chief priests and scribes, ‘Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?’ (Mar 14:61); ‘Art thou then the Son of God?’ (Mat 26:63, cf. Luk 22:67; Luk 22:70). Further, in the baptismal formula Jesus instructs the disciples to baptize in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost (Mat 28:19).

In addition to the instances already cited in which He was called ‘Son of God’ by others, there are those in which Jesus was challenged to prove Himself Son of God by

coming down from the cross, though in the latter case the title is used in its purely Messianic sense as that was currently understood among the Jews (Mat_27:40).

In the Fourth Gospel, on the other hand, considerable prominence is given to our Lord's claim to be the Son of God. In the discourses of our Lord as recorded by St. John, Jesus clearly conveys the impression that the Divine Sonship there spoken of means very much more than was involved in the popular Messianic use of the name. But even in that Gospel the actual use of the title is confined to a very few passages. Jesus applies it to Himself in the narrative of the man who was born blind (Joh_9:35-37); again (Joh_10:36) where He says, 'I said, I am the Son of God'; justifying His claim to the title in that passage in which He says 'The Father loveth the Son,' etc. (Joh_5:20); in His remarks on the illness of Lazarus: 'This sickness is ... for the glory of God, that the Son of God may be glorified thereby' (Joh_11:4); and in the Intercessory Prayer (Joh_17:1). Elsewhere He is acknowledged as the Son of God by Nathanael (Joh_1:49) and by Martha (Joh_11:27). Among the charges brought against Him by His enemies this is specially emphasized, that 'He made himself the Son of God' (Joh_19:7).

The conclusion to which we are led by a careful consideration of such instances as we find in the Gospels of the use of the name 'Son of God' is, that, as it had come to be employed by the Jews, it was at best a vague and indefinite term. It did not necessarily involve the conception of essential Deity, eternal participation in the attributes of Godhead. The object of the Gospels was to show how Jesus appeared as the Revealer of the Father, and that salvation could come only through One who was Himself equal with God assuming the nature of humanity, dwelling among men, and suffering in their place. Such a revelation so far transcended the current expectations of the people as to the nature and work of the promised Messiah, that the full realization of the significance of Christ's mission could not be attained until His work was completely accomplished and Jesus was revealed as the Son of God with power. This view of the history of the title 'Son of God' is well illustrated by Wendt (*The Teaching of Jesus*, ii. p. 133): 'According to the Jewish idea, the Messianic King was also Son of God; according to Jesus' idea, the Son of God as such was the Messianic King.' Here as elsewhere Jesus sought to enlarge and elevate the current conception of the Messianic hope, and to show that the Redeemer of Israel and the world was none else than the Son of God, by nature and essence equal with God, and not in that secondary sense in which that name had hitherto been understood. Such a revelation could be made only gradually, hence the sparing use by Christ of the title 'Son of God.'

The Fourth Gospel gives special prominence to the doctrine of the essential Divine Sonship of Jesus. That indications of it are found in the Synoptists themselves is evident not only from the cases already cited, the testimony of the voice from heaven

at the Baptism and at the Transfiguration, and our Lord's argument from Psa_110:1 that Christ must be more than Son of David since David himself calls Him Lord, but from such an utterance as this of our Lord Himself recorded by St. Matthew and St. Luke: 'All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whom-soever the Son will reveal him' (Mat_11:27 || Luk_10:22). But our Lord's claim to be Son of God κατ' ἐξοχήν is one of the central features of the Johan-nine discourses no less than of the teaching of St. John himself. St. John identifies Christ with the Eternal Logos, and calls Him 'the only-begotten of the Father' (Joh_1:14); and Jesus applies to Himself the same expression (Joh_3:16; Joh_3:18) in terms which distinctly assert His essential Sonship and His pre-existence, and declares that the unbelieving are 'condemned already' because they have 'not believed in the name of the only-begotten Son of God' (Joh_3:18). Jesus associates His work with that of the Father (Joh_5:17), and that in such a way as at once to expose Himself to the charge of blasphemy. So the Evangelist tells us that the Jews sought the more to kill Him, because 'He said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God' (Joh_5:18), their interpretation of His words being justified by His language on other occasions, as when He said, 'Before Abraham was, I am' (Joh_8:58), an expression at once suggestive of the Tetragrammaton, the sacred name Jehovah itself. And notwithstanding the fact that the Jews put such a construction upon His words, Jesus enlarged upon the theme, and claimed for Himself power and authority to give life to the dead and to execute judgment (Joh_5:19-30). In the same connexion He declares it to be the Father's will 'that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father' (Joh_5:23); and in other places asserts His essential oneness with the Father (Joh_10:30), and claims to have shared His glory 'before the world was' (Joh_17:5). He claims, moreover, to have received from the Father 'power over all flesh,' to 'give eternal life to as many as' the Father has 'given him' (Joh_17:2); while in more than one passage emphasis is laid upon the fact that He came from God and should return to Him (Joh_13:3, Joh_6:38; Joh_6:46; Joh_6:62, Joh_7:28; Joh_7:33; Joh_7:36, Joh_8:14; Joh_8:16; Joh_8:18; Joh_8:26; Joh_8:42, Joh_16:28; Joh_16:30). Again, while He teaches His disciples to regard God as their Father (so Joh_20:17, where He says 'My Father and your Father'), and to pray to Him as such (as He does also in the Synoptic Gospels), 'He never places His filial relationship on a level with theirs (Weiss). On the contrary, He speaks at times of the Fatherhood of God with exclusive reference to Himself, as, e.g., where He says (Joh_6:46), 'Not that any man hath seen the Father, save he which is of God, he hath seen the Father,' a passage which, as Holtzmann points out, 'shows clearly that there the historical appearance of the Son is connected with the supra-historical being of the pre-existent Logos.'

From all this it is evident that while the title 'Son of God,' which had come to be associated with essentially theocratic ideas, as of the election of Israel by the

adoption of grace as sons of God, and of the Messiah as King of Israel, and was therefore open to misunderstanding and misconstruction, was seldom used by Jesus or His disciples as a title of our Lord; the testimony of all the Gospels, and especially of the Fourth, distinctly shows that Jesus claimed to be the Son of God in the strictest sense of the term, as essentially and eternally One with God the Father (cf. St. John's summary of the aim of his Gospel in Joh 20:31 'These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name'). See also sep. article.

6. The Word or The Logos. This name is peculiar to the Fourth Gospel, and there it occurs only in the Prologue (Joh 1:1; Joh 1:14). Much controversy has arisen as to the probable sources from which the Apostle derived his conception of Christ as the Logos—a controversy the more natural that the term 'the Word' as used by St. John represents the meeting point of Hebrew theology, Hellenic philosophy, and the religion of Jesus Christ. To that controversy little reference need here be made. See art. Logos.

The Logos doctrine of St. John may be summarized thus. God's revelation of Himself in the history of mankind is a complete unity. Creation, Providence, and Redemption are parts of the same grand purpose, whose object is the highest well-being of God's creatures, and especially of man, the head and crown of the creation. In each we have God revealing Himself, and that through a Mediator. This Mediator, more or less darkly imagined by mankind from the beginning until these last times, and more or less clearly revealed to God's chosen people in the days of the fathers as the Angel of the Covenant or the Angel of the Presence, is the same in whom He has now manifested Himself, the Christ by whom God has now spoken to those to whom the promise was given, and who had long been expecting their Messiah, and to all the sons of men, as many as will receive Him. Thus is the Christ, the Redeemer of Israel, the very Word of God, the last, the perfect revelation of the Most High, and the Redeemer of the world.

The Prologue of the Gospel is St. John's appeal to the nations, and speaks thus: 'In Christ Jesus, whom we knew, who as a man among men companied with us, God has spoken, has manifested Himself to us who beheld His glory, and to all that have welcomed that Word of the Father. In Christ the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us. In Him was life, and the life was the light of men.' This conception of Christ as the Logos, the same that was in the beginning with God, necessarily involves the doctrine of the essential Deity and eternal pre-existence of Christ. But the point which St. John specially brings out by his use of the term is that in Christ God perfectly reveals Himself to man, and gives to all that receive Christ that adoption by which they may become 'children of God' (τέκνα θεοῦ, not υἱοί, Joh 1:12; cf.

1Jn 3:1). Having in the Prologue established this point, St. John makes no further use of the term Logos in his Gospel, where ‘Son’ or ‘Son of God’ takes its place.

7. Son of Man.—This title seems to have been most favoured by our Lord, and occurs with great frequency, especially in the Synoptic Gospels. Two typical instances may be given of our Lord’s preference for this name. One is found in the Gospel of St. John, where the title least frequently occurs—that of Christ’s answer to Nathanael, who had just acknowledged Him as Son of God. Jesus, accepting Nathanael’s confession, replied thus: ‘Because I said unto thee, I saw thee under the fig-tree, believest thou? thou shalt see greater things than these. And he saith unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man’ (Joh 1:50-51). The other is His reply to the adjuration of the high priest, who asked Him whether He was the Christ the Son of God, in which again, immediately after acknowledging that such was His claim, He spoke of Himself as Son of Man, and that in connexion with a prophecy of His appearing on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven (Mat 26:63-64 || Mar 14:61-62 || Luk 22:67-70). For the origin and history of the title ‘Son of Man,’ see separate article.

With regard to the question as to the sense in which Jesus used the title ‘Son of Man,’ the answer is suggested by the connexion in which at various times He so described Himself. It may be briefly stated in this way: God manifesting Himself to man in a form which man as man can understand. Comparing the passages in which the title is used by Christ, the first thing that strikes us is that He uses it in connexion both with His humiliation and with His exaltation. We find it associated with thoughts of the privations and sufferings of Jesus,—as where He says: ‘Foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head’ (Mat 8:20 || Luk 9:58). It occurs repeatedly in connexion with His sufferings and death, as where He tells His disciples that as John was slain by Herod, so shall it be done to the Son of Man (Mat 17:12 || Mar 9:12). Again, that the Son of Man must ‘be delivered into the hands of men’ (Luk 9:44 || Mat 17:22, cf. Mat 20:18 || Mar 10:33 || Luk 18:31-33, Mat 26:45 || Mar 14:41), ‘and suffer many things’ (Mar 8:31 || Luk 9:22). Thus also Jesus states this as the mission of the Son of Man, that He ‘came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many’ (Mat 20:28 || Mar 10:45). Again, the title is used where the thought expressed is that of the sympathy of Jesus with human joys as with human sorrows, in the contrast drawn between the asceticism of John and the sociable disposition of our Lord (Mat 11:18-19 || Luk 7:33-34); while the same thought appears in another form, where Jesus, justifying His acceptance of the hospitality of Zacchaeus, says: ‘The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost’ (Luk 19:10). In other passages the use of the name suggests the coexistence of Messianic authority with the lowliness of Christ’s human nature, as in the narrative of the healing of the paralytic, in connexion

with which Jesus says that ‘the Son of Man has power on earth to forgive sins’ (Mat 9:6 || Mar 2:10 || Luk 5:24); and St. Matthew notes the impression produced upon the multitude, as that ‘they marvelled, and glorified God which had given such power unto *men*.’ To this class of passages may be referred also our Lord’s saying concerning blasphemy against the Son of Man and that against the Holy Ghost (Mat 12:32). The Son of Man, in His humiliation, veiling His Divine nature, appearing to men like one of themselves, may not be recognized for what He is. Blasphemy against Him, therefore, as resulting only from ignorance and unbelief, admits of forgiveness; whereas blasphemy against the Spirit of God, a presumptuous offence against the Deity, cannot be forgiven. Again, the title is used of Jesus in respect of His representative character, where He asserts His right as Son of Man to interpret the Sabbath law (Mat 12:8 || Mar 2:27-28). ‘Jesus regarded the institution from a philanthropic point of view, and He claimed lordship over it for the Son of Man on the ground of His sympathy with mankind, which He deemed a far more reliable interpreter of the Divine purpose and guide in observance, than the merciless rigour of the Rabbis’ (Brnce, *Kingdom of God*, p. 174). A connecting link between these uses of the title and those which specially refer to Christ’s Exaltation is found in those passages in which Jesus so calls Himself with reference to His mission as Founder of the Kingdom of God. So in the parable of the Tares. ‘He that soweth the good seed is the Son of Man’ (Mat 13:37). ‘The Son of Man shall send forth his angels’ (Mat 13:41). Here Jesus identifies the Founder of the Kingdom of God in the world with the Judge of the world, using the same title in both connexions. He who as Son of Man seeks with all patience and forbearance to establish His Kingdom by manifestation of the grace of God, is He who must judge mankind according as they have accepted or rejected His message of salvation.

But undoubtedly the most remarkable use of the name Son of Man is that which is directly and specially connected with the thought of Jesus in His Exaltation. We see this in all His predictions of His Second Coming. Thus, speaking of the suddenness and unexpectedness of His appearing, He says: ‘At an hour when ye think not the Son of Man cometh’ (Mat 24:44 || Luk 12:40). The Son of Man is to appear with the suddenness of lightning (Mat 24:27 || Luk 17:24), and the circumstances of His appearing are compared to those of the world in the days of Noah and of Lot (Mat 24:37 || Luk 17:26-32). He is to come after the great tribulation (Mat 24:30 || Mar 13:26 || Luk 21:27). His advent is to be announced by ‘the sign of the Son of Man appearing in the heavens’ (Mat 24:30). He is to sit as a King upon the throne of His glory (Mat 25:31), when His Apostles shall be associated with Him, judging the tribes of Israel (Mat 19:28, cf. Luk 22:29-30).

In the Fourth Gospel the name ‘Son of Man’ is used in connexion with the pre-existence of Christ: ‘No man hath ascended up to heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven’ (Joh 3:13; cf. Joh 6:62). As

Son of Man He is Mediator between Heaven and Earth (Joh_1:51). Judgment is committed to the Son of Man as such (Joh_5:27). Special emphasis is laid upon associations of this title with the coming judgment (cf. besides the passages just noted, Mat_26:64 || Mar_14:62 || Luk_22:69). Again, Jesus concludes one of His discourses on 'The Last Things' with an emphatic warning to His own disciples to watch and pray that they 'may be accounted worthy ... to stand before the Son of Man' (Luk_21:36). The meaning of all this is plain. The Son of Man as such is the Judge of man. Man is, as it were, to be 'tried by his peers.' The Son of Man, as bearing the nature of man, capable of understanding and sympathizing with him, is to appear at last as the Judge of the human race.

It is clear that the meaning of the title cannot be limited to any of those conceptions which have been suggested of Christ as the ideal of humanity, still less to the thought of the humanity as distinguished from the Divinity of our Lord. It was rather used, as Wendt puts it, very much 'to raise problems and to incite,' among Christ's hearers, 'reflexion and the use of their own judgment.' 'It contained, *in nuce*, through reference to the testimony of OT Scripture,' 'a solution of the paradox of the coexistence' in Jesus 'of lowly humanity with lofty Messianic dignity' (Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, ii. p. 148).

8. To these characteristic titles of our Lord may be added those of **Lord, Master** (κύριος, ἐπιστάτης, διδάσκαλος), **Rabbi**, which are variously used. The title 'Lord' appears most frequently as the equivalent of 'Master' (ἐπιστάτης), 'Teacher' (διδάσκαλος) simply. So Martha addressed Jesus as 'Lord' (Κύριε) when complaining of Mary's conduct in the household of Bethany (Luk_10:40). The same word is used by the disciples in peril on the Sea of Galilee (Mat_8:25), in which case the parallels 'Teacher' in St. Mark's account (διδάσκαλε) and 'Master' (ἐπιστάτα) in St. Luke's, illustrate the sense in which it occurs (Mar_4:38, cf. Luk_8:24). So again, in the narrative of the Transfiguration, where Peter says, 'Lord, it is good for us to be here,' the word κύριε in St. Matthew corresponds to 'Master' (ἐπιστάτα) in St. Luke and 'Rabbi' (Ραββει) in St. Mark. Peter addressed Jesus as 'Lord' (Κύριε) when he remonstrated with Him at Caesarea Philippi (Mat_16:22); and the same title is used by the disciples when they ask Jesus to teach them to pray 'as John also taught his disciples' (Luk_11:1); again, when they say of Lazarus, 'Lord, if he sleep, he shall do well' (Joh_11:12), and by Martha and Mary in the same narrative (Joh_11:3; Joh_11:21; Joh_11:27); and Jesus Himself uses the title 'Lord' in connexion with that of 'Teacher' (Joh_13:13): 'Ye call me Master (teacher) and Lord.'

The title 'Lord' (κύριος) is also applied to Christ, especially by St. Luke, as an alternative for Jesus or Christ, apparently by anticipation, speaking of Jesus in the manner which became current after the Crucifixion. Thus we read that 'the Lord said' to the widow of Nain: 'Weep not' ([Luk 7:13](#)); that 'the Lord said, Who then is that faithful and wise steward?' etc. ([Luk 12:42](#)); 'the Lord said, Hear what the unjust judge saith' ([Luk 18:6](#)); and again, that 'the Lord appointed' the seventy disciples ([Luk 10:1](#)). Again, in St. John we read, 'When therefore the Lord knew that the Pharisees had heard,' etc. ([Joh 4:1](#)); that 'the Lord gave thanks' ([Joh 6:23](#)); and that Mary of Bethany was she 'who anointed the Lord with ointment' ([Joh 11:2](#)).

Occasionally also the title 'Lord' (κύριος) is applied to Christ where text and context plainly demand that it should be interpreted in the highest sense of the word, as where Elisabeth calls Mary 'the mother of my Lord' ([Luk 1:43](#)); where the angel says, 'a Saviour which is Christ the Lord' ([Luk 2:11](#)); where Thomas addresses Christ, 'my Lord, and my God' ([Joh 20:28](#)); and by Jesus speaking of Himself in connexion with the Last Judgment ([Mat 7:21-22](#); cf. [Mat 25:11](#) etc.). See also separate articles.

9. The various figurative or parabolic names of Christ do not call for any special remark, as their use by Christ in the passages where they occur sufficiently explains their meaning. Such is that of **the Good Shepherd** ([Joh 10:2](#); [Joh 10:11](#) etc., cf. [Luk 15:3](#) ff.), where He shows how, like the Shepherd of Messianic prophecy, He tends and protects the sheep entrusted to His care, and how He must lay down His life for them; and again, that of **the Door of the Sheep**, an expression which means simply that acceptance of Christ by faith is the first condition of entrance into the Kingdom of God ([Joh 10:7](#); [Joh 10:9](#); cf. [Joh 14:6](#)). Again, impressing upon His hearers the dependence of His disciples upon Himself as the source of their spiritual life, He described Himself as **the Bread of Life** ([Joh 6:35](#) ff.). The same truth is taught in the parable in which He calls Himself **the True Vine**, with the added thought of fruit-bearing as the legitimate test of life in all that are joined to Him by faith (John 15). Again, in justification of His work among the outcasts of society, He compares Himself to **the Physician**, of whose aid only the sick stand in need ([Mat 9:12](#) || [Mar 2:17](#) || [Luk 5:31](#)). Speaking of the conflict of good and evil in the heart of man when first he looks to Christ for help, our Lord uses the similitude of a strong man armed, successfully defending his house against all assailants until there comes one stronger than he who overpowers and binds him, where the meaning of the passage is that Christ is that Stronger One, who breaks the power of the strong man—Satan ([Luk 11:21](#), [Mat 12:29](#) || [Mar 3:27](#)). Lastly, Christ's mission to save sinners by His vicarious sufferings and death is shadowed forth by the words of John the Baptist ([Joh 1:29](#)), 'Behold **the Lamb of God** [see Sheep, § 4] which taketh away the sin of the world.' See also artt. Offices of Christ and Prince.

Literature.—Cruden's *Concordance* (sixth ed. unabridged), Preface; Creiner, *Bib.-Theol. Lex. s.vv.* Χριστος, Κύριος, Λογος, μονογενής, υιός; Thayer, *Lex. NT. s.vv.* ἅγιος, Ἐμμανουήλ, Ἰησοῦς, χριστός, Κύριος, Λόγος, μονογενής, υιός; Comm. of Meyer, Alford, etc.; Bengel's *Gnomon*; Wendt, *The Teaching of Jesus*, ii. p. 120 ff.; Beyschlag, *Christologie d. NT*, p. 10 ff. also *NT Theol.* i. pp. 57 ff., 240 ff., ii. pp. 412-424; Reuss, *Hist of Chris. Theol. in the Apostolic Age*, i. pp. 72-201; H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch d. NT Theologie*, i. pp. 73-96, 241-268, ii. 397-434; Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. NT*, i 73-92, ii. 325-347; Schmid, *Bib. Theol. NT*, pp. 63-90; Bruce, *Kingdom of God*, 106-186; E. H. Plumptre, *Christ and Christendom*, 131; A. Maclaren, *God of the Amen*, 19; J. Cairns, *Christ the Morning Star*, 39; D. G. Monrad, *World of Prayer*, 219; A. M. Fairbairn, *Christ in Mod. Theology*, 358.

H. H. Currie.

☞ Naphtali

NAPHTALI (Νεφθαλειμ)

1. Description.—With the Captivities all practical use of the tribal divisions came to an end, and, but for such a reference as that given in [Mat 4:15](#) to the OT prophecy of [Isa 9:1](#), the lands of Zebulun and Naphtali could scarcely appear as geographical names in the NT. The boundaries of these divisions we can know at best only approximately. Many of the towns named in Joshua's description of the tribal territories are unknown to us, and, besides, the tribes are not likely ever to have had the unbroken compactness the maps would lead us to believe. Villages among the mountains of Naphtali have to this day their arable lands near the shores of the Sea of Galilee, and similarly in Zebulun the inhabitants of Nazareth cultivate portions of the plain of Esdraelon. Thus the tribes might in many cases possess detached portions, and difficulties connected with their extent and boundaries may sometimes be explained from this fact. This uncertainty as regards the boundaries of these tribes is of no consequence to our present purpose, as the indefinite statement in [Mat 4:15](#) cannot be used in any argument regarding the site of Capernaum; nor can we fix the boundaries from any supposed relationship to that city, as Reland has sought to do (*Pal. [Note: Palestine, Palestinian.]* p. 161). The lands of Naphtali then, generally speaking, occupied the N.E. portion of Galilee, together with the west and south of the Lake. Josephus (*Ant. v. i. 22*) defines its northern boundary as Mount Lebanon and the Fountains of Jordan. The Rabbis tell us that 'Naphtali rejoiced in his portion, having seas and fish.' They assign the Sea of Galilee to the portion of Naphtali, and give him also 'a full measure' to the south of the Lake (*Bab. [Note: Babylonian.]*

Baba Kama, 81b; *Sifri* on Deu_33:23). In Naphtali were represented the three divisions of Galilee—of varying elevation (*Mishn. Shebiith* ix. 2); (1) Upper Galilee, from Kefr Hananyah (Kefr Anân) northwards, which is described as the portion ‘where the sycamores do not grow’; (2) Lower Galilee, extending downwards till we reach (3) the third division, which is designated מבדיה תהום or העמק—‘the depression of Tiberias’ or ‘the valley.’ For description of the last of these districts, see artt. Sea Of Galilee, and Gennesaret (Land of).

From the north end of the Plain of Gennesaret and the Sea of Galilee (-682.5 ft.) the land rises through a series of steep ascents and small plateaux to Safed (+2750 ft.) and Jebel Jermuk (4000 ft.), the highest peak in Western Palestine. To the north of these points, and until the valley of the Litani is reached, we have an undulating tableland, with vast stretches that are arable and everywhere tilled, with swelling hills in view all round, covered with prickly shrubs and trees and forests of small oak. This district is broken into by two deep valleys, somewhat like but narrower than Wady Hamam. From the N.W. of the Plain of Gennesaret the Wady Leimon, otherwise called Wady Amûd, and in ancient times מרוך מעלת, the ‘ascent of Meiron,’ extends to the neighbourhood of the village of that name. It is a narrow gorge, for the most part enclosed by steep rocky walls and natural pillars. It is now impassable, but in ancient times it was accessible to passengers in single file (*Erubhin*, 22b; *Rosh-hash.*, 16a). About half-way up this ravine a smaller wady branches off eastward, to beyond the great rock of Akbara—a cliff as grand and impressive as anything met with in Wady Hamam. In later days there grew up under its shadow a famous Rabbinical school, and the district was renowned for its coverts of pheasants. Farther north, Upper Galilee is divided by another valley (Wady Fara), almost equally deep, but less rocky. It extends eastward from the neighbourhood of el-Jish, and opens out into the plain beside Lake Huleh and the Jordan.

In the neighbourhood of el-Jish and Taitabeh (said to be the Tishbe of 1Ki_17:1) we meet with three *extinct craters* and quantities of black volcanic rock, and by it the slopes to the Huleh valley and the Jordan as far as the Sea of Galilee are also fringed. Between Kerazeh and Tell Hum great quantities of basaltic boulders cumber the ground, and the stones of Tiberias again are black. Volcanic forces have been active in the past. They have created for us these wild gorges and gigantic cliffs, and their continued existence is proved by the hot springs, as also by the frequent earthquakes in ancient (*Ant.* xv. v. 2; *Joma* v. 2; *Sota* viii. 7) and in modern times. Of these latter the most terrible known is that which occurred on 1st Jan. 1837. Elsewhere the rocks of Naphtali are generally a species of limestone, known in Palestine by the name of *nâri*. On the hills above the Lake there are great stretches of these white rocks, hard as flint, bare, desolate, and painful to the eye, especially under the summer sun. But though the surface is hard and glossy, we have only to get below it to find that the

rock is really soft. It may be cut with a saw with even greater facility than wood. All sorts of trees—olives, figs, and vines—can send their roots through it and draw nourishment thence, while the hard exposed surface is there to conserve the moisture below. With little trouble these rocky desolations may be turned into vineyards, olive groves, and orchards, and we have every reason to believe that they were such in the early Christian centuries (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Megilla*, 6a).

Naphtali will thus be seen to have, in virtue of its lands of varying altitude and deep depression, a greater variety of climate, scenery, and possible variety of production than any other tribe of Israel. To it more than to any other could be applied the words of promise uttered ere the Land was yet entered—‘a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths that spring out of valleys and hills; a land of wheat and barley and vines and fig-trees and pomegranates, a land of oil olives and honey’ (Deu 8:7-8). Apart from the barren stretches mentioned, these words describe most naturally the state of Naphtali to-day. Different parts are renowned for their varied products—Rameh for the excellence of its olives and its oranges, el-Jish for its vineyards, the north and the Huleh valley for their fine crops of wheat and barley. Elsewhere we meet with the lemon, fig, mulberry, apricot, and even tobacco and tomatoes, in great abundance. As the Targum (on Gen 49:21) has it, ‘Naphtali’s lot was cast in a pleasant land.’ From shortly after the commencement of the rainy season it is brilliant with flowers—anemones of many varied tints, cyclamens, and lilies, while all its water-courses may be traced by the red bloom of the oleander. The hills are greener than those of any other tribe, and the grass and the spring flowers continue among its uplands long after the rest of Palestine is burned black and bare. This arises from the fact that Naphtali enjoys first and most of all the much praised ‘dews of Hermon that descend upon the mountains of Zion’ (Psa 133:3). When the N.E. wind has come gently blowing over the great mountain, we have seen the dew-clouds rolling down in great volumes over its fields, supplying all nature with fresh vigour and sensations of pleasantness. Modern products, such as oranges, tobacco, and tomatoes, were absent in our Lord’s time, as was also another feature that attracts the eye in these days, viz., the great hedges of prickly pear or cactus, by which many of the villages are practically fortified. This plant is of modern importation, though, unfortunately, it has often found its way into pictures of Bible scenes. Compared with the present day, the hills of Naphtali were much more wooded in NT times. Just after such another period of unrest and unsettlement as Galilee had passed through before the Advent, Arculphus, a pilgrim (a.d. 670), found that the hills in his time were wooded down to the shores of the Lake. The woods of Naphtali are mentioned in the Palestinian Talmud (*Baba Bathra* v. 1).

Of the productiveness of the soil there is ample testimony. We are told that Gush Halab (Gischala; el-Jish) was famous for the quantity of its oil (*Erakhin* ix. 6; *Menakhoth*, 85b), and as this was considered to be a border town adjoining the tribe

of Asher, the Rabbis saw here a fulfilment of Gen 49:20, Deu 33:24. Josephus, speaking of the same place, tells us that its people were generally husbandmen, and applied themselves to the cultivation of the fruits of the earth (*BJ* iv ii. 1). The quality of the wheat of Chorazin and Capernaum is well spoken of (*Men.* 85a). It is elsewhere stated that Naphtali possessed vines and fruitful fields (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Meg.* 6a), and we meet with incidental reference to the honey of Safed, the indigo of Magdala, and the raw silk of Gush Halab. And, in so far as productiveness is concerned, it must be remembered that whatever may be said of the hills of Naphtali applies with tenfold more force to the Plain of Gennesaret and the southern shore of the Lake (Josephus *BJ* iii. x. 8). If the evidence of Josephus and the Talmuds does not all refer to the time of our Lord's ministry, at least it shows us clearly what the district was becoming during that period.

2. The people.—Zebulun and Naphtali were in the year b.c. 135 practically Gentile (1Ma 5:23), but from that time onward they became gradually reoccupied by a population of Jewish blood, and from the time of this resettlement its people were pre-eminently patriotic (*Ant.* xiv. ix. 2, xv. 10). It was a district of great memories and inspiring scenes, and the new settlers acted up to them. The kind of immigrants—those who sought a freedom unknown at the court of Herod—would guarantee their quality, and, besides, there is something in the free air of the mountains—especially mountains that have a past heroic history—that goes a long way to make heroes and warriors. In b.c. 4, Judas the son of Hezekiah had made an unsuccessful attempt to revolt, and again in a.d. 6, Judas of Galilee and his Zealots (cf. Luk 6:15), declaring 'There is no king but God' (*Ant.* xviii. i. 6). [With this saying we may compare that in the Jewish Morning Prayer, אֲתָהּ אֱלֹהִים מֶלֶךְ לְנוּ אֵי, and its repudiation in the cry of the Jews to Pilate (Joh 19:15), as well as the Galilæan Arabic proverb met with in el-Jish to-day, 'Mâ fish sultân ghçr alla,' 'There is no king but God']. The milder government of Antipas, and his presence, as a 'half-Jew,' between them and their conquerors, kept the Zealots at peace during a long period in the 1st cent. [a.d. 6-a.d. 66), and allowed the population to grow, so that probably all the villages of to-day represent cities of that time (*BJ* iii. iii. 2). The population did not in peaceful days sink into sloth and indulgence. They were essentially sturdy sons of hardy toil; and where commerce, agriculture, and fishing did not afford employment, they engaged in trades, as in dyeing at Magdala, weaving at Arbela, and pottery manufacture at Kefr Hananyah. Though despised by the people of Jerusalem, Naphtali was itself becoming a centre of learning, and, even before the Christian era, had given birth to one in the direct line of succession as transmitters of the oral law or traditions of the elders (Mat 15:2)—Nitai or Mattai of Arbela—who has left us this saying, which is almost characteristic of the people: Remove from a bad neighbour, have no partnership in evil, and despair not of reward' (*Pirkç Aboth* i. 7).

3. Christ's sojourn.—Our Lord's settlement in the lands of Naphtali began probably about January of the year a.d. 27 (Mat 4:13), a short visit of 'not many days' having been made before the previous Passover (Joh 2:12). The time of sojourn would then extend till Sept. [Note: Septuagint.] a.d. 28—a period of about 20 months; but this was broken in upon by circuits in Galilee (Mar 1:34, Luk 8:1-3, Mat 9:35, Mar 6:6), to Tyre and Sidon (Mat 15:21), to Decapolis (Mar 7:31), to Caesarea Philippi (Mat 16:13), and a visit to Jerusalem to the Passover (Joh 5:1). In virtue of Christ's being asked for and paying tribute in Capernaum (Mat 17:24), we may conclude that He was recognized as a citizen there; and the light thrown on this transaction by the Talmud enables us to infer that He had been domiciled in Naphtali one year before the 15th Adar preceding the request for payment (cf. *M. Shekalim* i. 3; *Baba Bathra* i. 6; *Sanhedrin* 112a). As the circuits through Galilee took place for the most part during the hot season, when the inhabitants are in the mountains, we can see, when we consider the smaller Galilee of those days, that the greater part of one year at least would be spent among the people of Naphtali. It was from among them that the Lord chose most of His friends and disciples. It was in Naphtali, too, that He made the selection. It was there that He did most of His mighty works (Mat 11:20). Its towns were the best known in Gospel history—Capernaum, Bethsaida, Chorazin, Magdala, and Tiberias—and it was over three of these that He uttered the sentence of woe because they believed not (Mat 11:21-24). It was in Naphtali that most of His teaching, as recorded in the Synoptics, was given. Its flowers, its fruits, its crops, its birds and beasts, its mountain torrents, its manners and customs, were all used to illumine the Gospel message, and to bring light first to its people, and then, through them, along the world's highways to all that sit in darkness. In this, Matthew (Mat 4:15), and with him the whole Christian world, sees the fulfilment of Isaiah's old prophecy, and, apart from individual opinions that it might be understood of the glory to which Rabbinism attained here in the 2nd and 3rd cents., the older Synagogue teaching is so far at one with them that all the *midrâshîm* declare that the Messiah ben Joseph should appear in Galilee. So also writes Sa'adiah ha-Gaon in his work on *Faith and Knowledge*, § v.; while the Book of Zohar on Exo 1:8 clearly states that the 'Messiah shall arise and be revealed in the land of Galilee.'

Literature.—See the authorities cited under artt. Palestine, Galilee, Capernaum, etc. For homil. use, C. H. Waller, *The Names on the Gates of Pearl*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (1903), p. 129.

W. M. Christie.

NAPKIN.—The Gr. σουδάριον translation ‘napkin’ in the Gospels (cf. Act 19:12 ‘handkerchief’), is Lat. *sudarium*, and became current in the East through the extension of the Roman Empire. The piece of cloth, a yard or so square, of which the σουδάριον consisted, was turned to various purposes. It usually served as a head-dress to protect the head of the living from the sun, and to give a finish to their costume, but it served other purposes as well. Two of these are mentioned in the Gospels. In Luk 19:20 the unfaithful servant confesses that he had wrapped up his master’s pound in a napkin. In Joh 11:44; Joh 20:7 we are told that the head of the dead had been bound about with a napkin.

With regard to Luk 19:20 the words put into the lips of the unfaithful servant are an example of Christ’s irony, and help to show us the true character of the servant. The fact that he admits having put the pound in a *sweat-cloth* is significant. It stamps him not only as a man who was discontented with his pound, but also as a man of indolent character, unwilling to use the opportunities of service which were given him. The misuse of the napkin, revealing as it does the lazy habit of the man, is of importance for the right understanding of the parable.

The reference to the napkin in Joh 20:7 is worthy of special attention in connexion with the Resurrection of Christ. Unfortunately neither the Authorized Version nor the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 gives the exact translation of the Greek text. The literal rendering of the passage makes it clear that the napkin which had been placed about Christ’s head before burial was discovered by the two disciples lying where His head had been, in the undisturbed form of a coiled or twisted head-wrapper. The verb ἐντετυλιγμένον should be rendered ‘coiled’ or ‘twisted up,’ and not ‘wrapped together’ as in Authorized Version, or ‘rolled up’ as in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, and implies that the napkin was found coiled or twisted together in turban-like fashion, just as if His head had somehow slipped out of it, while the words χωρὶς ... εἰς ἓνα τόπον, translated in both Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘in a place by itself,’ would be better translated ‘separately (not touching the linen clothes which had been swathing the body) into one place,’ εἰς ἓνα τόπον being the equivalent of εἰς ταῦτό in classical Greek. This rendering of the passage is confirmed by the impression made upon the two disciples by what they witnessed on entering the tomb. It is said that they ‘saw and believed’—saw something, that is, which persuaded them so completely that their Master was risen from the dead that their doubts were immediately resolved, and they proceeded at once to their own home (Joh 20:10) to await the development of events. For a full discussion of the passage and its bearing on the Resurrection, see H. Latham, *The Risen Master*, p. 40 ff.

Literature.—Geikie, *Holy Land and the Bible*; G. M. Mackie, *Bible Manners and Customs*; Trench, *Notes on the Parables* (Parable of the Pounds).

Morison Bryce.

☞ Nard

NARD (Heb. נָרְדָּ, from Skr. *naladurtha*, probably through Persian; Gr. νάρδος, Arab. [Note: Arabic.] *sumbul-i-kindī* [= Indian spike]).—The chief ingredient in the costly unguents used in the East, and from thence imported to Rome. The word is found in the OT (Son_1:12; Son_4:13-14) and twice in the Gospels (Mar_14:3-5, Joh_12:3-5), occurring in both cases in the account of the anointing of our Lord, in a house at Bethany, by a woman whom St. John identifies as Mary the sister of Lazarus.* [Note: connects this incident closely with the last Passover, but Jn. makes it clear that it happened on the night before the triumphal entry into Jerusalem.] In classical literature there are frequent references to nard. Theophrastus speaks of it as a root (*de Odor.* 28), and says it came from India (*Hist. Plant.* ix. 7. 2). Dioscorides, a physician who flourished about a.d. 100, also tells us that it came from India, being found in the Ganges district, and that it had many shaggy (πολύκομος) spikes growing from one root (i. 6. 77). Athenaeus (xv. 691 B), Horace (*Od.* ii. xi. 16, iv. xii. 16), Ovid (*Ars. Am.* iii. 443), and Tibullus (ii. 2. 7) make references to it. But our chief authority is Pliny the Elder (*Nat. Hist.* xii. 26, 27, xiii. 2). He speaks of its great value,† [Note: and Jn. mention 300 denarii (about £10) as the cost per pound of the unguent. Pliny (xii. 26) says that the ‘spicae’ were worth 100 denarii a pound, and in xiii. 2 mentions the price of a similar unguent as rising to 300 denarii per pound.] its adulteration, and the means by which genuine nard may be distinguished from spurious. Genuine (*sincerum*) nard is known by its lightness, its red colour, its sweet smell, and its peculiar taste (*gustu maxime siccante os, sapore iucundo*). He also speaks of the use of alabaster boxes to preserve it. (See Alabaster).

It was formerly supposed by Linnaeus and other botanists that nard was an Indian grass; but Sir W. Jones and Dr. Royle, director of the Government Botanical Gardens at Saharunpore from 1823 to 1831, have conclusively proved that it is to be identified with *Nardostachys Jatamansi*, a plant of the order Valerianaceae, found at great altitudes in North India. This plant bears small spikes of purple flowers, each with four stamens. The part used for making the perfume was the root and lower portion of the stems, which are shaggy ‘like tufts of ermine,’ and to which the skeletons of former leaves adhere, giving them a bristly appearance. It is probably these stems, rather than the flower heads, which Pliny calls *spicie*. The epithet πιστική applied in

Mk. and Jn. to *νάροδος* may possibly be an attempt to reproduce *spieata*, which, in vulgar Latin, may have become *spicita* (see Swete's *St. Mark*, *ad loc.*, and art. Spikenard in present work).

Literature.—Besides the authorities quoted in the article, see *Asiatic Researches*, ii. 405-417; W. Dymock, *Pharmacographia Indica* (1891), ii. 233-238; Tristram, *Natural History of the Bible*, p. 485; articles 'Spikenard' in *Encyc. Brit.*⁹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , *Smith's DB* [Note: *Dictionary of the Bible.*] (by Houston), *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible* (by Post), *Encyc. Bibl.* (by Thistleto-Dyer and M'Lean).

H. W. Fulford.

☩ Nathan

NATHAN.—A son of king David, named in our Lord's genealogy, [Luk_3:31](#).

☩ Nathanael

NATHANAEL (= Θεόδωρος, 'Gift of God' [Heb. נַחֲמָאֵל, [Num_1:8](#), [1Ch_2:14](#) etc.]; cf. *Adcodatus*, *Deodatus*, *Dcusdedit*).—We know nothing about him except what is told us in [Joh_1:45-51](#); [Joh_21:2](#). On the question of his identity with Bartholomew, see art. Bartholomew, i. p. 173^a. The place at which Nathanael was found by Philip and brought to Jesus is not mentioned; but it is not improbable that Nathanael was returning from listening to the preaching of the Baptist. He may have been baptized by him. The very detailed account of the calling of Nathanael leads one to suppose that it was an important event, such as the calling of one who was afterwards to be an Apostle. In any case, the local knowledge shown in [Joh_1:44](#) f. is very real and, so far as it goes, it tells in favour of Johannine authorship; for St. John would possess this knowledge, and a later writer would not, and would not care to invent such details. Philip, like Nathanael, was a Galilaean, the one of Bethsaida, time other of Cana ([Joh_21:2](#)): they were therefore neighbours, and evidently friends. Like Andrew and John, Philip no sooner finds, or is found by, Christ, than he seeks to make Him known to others. The plural, 'We have found him,' etc., seems to imply that Philip, with Andrew and Peter and John and James, was now a disciple of Jesus. These five formed the beginning of the Christian Church. The order of the words in the Greek is noteworthy: Him of whom wrote Moses in the law' comes first, 'and the prophets'

being added as an afterthought; and the whole of this comes with emphasis before the verb, 'we have found.' It looks as if Nathanael and Philip had at times discussed the OT descriptions of the Messiah. At this time Philip would know nothing of the virgin birth at Bethlehem: he quite naturally describes Jesus as He was commonly known. The Scriptures to which he specially refers would be Gen 17:7; Gen 49:10, Deu 18:15.

Nathanael's question, 'Can any good thing?' etc., does not imply that Nazareth had a bad reputation, but that the insignificant village, so close to his own home, was not a likely birthplace for the Messiah. Was a petty place, so familiar to them both, thus honoured? What prophecy said anything of the kind? The prophecy alluded to in Mat 2:23 is not known to us, and was probably unknown to Nathanael. In any case, Nathanael's question confirms the statement that the miracle at Cana was the first of Christ's signs. If Jesus had worked miracles at Nazareth, Nathanael at Cana must have heard of them.

Philip's 'Come and see' is in harmony with the practical bent of his mind (Joh 12:21; Joh 14:8), and is the best answer to anything like prejudice. 'He that doeth the truth cometh to the light' (Joh 3:21, cf. Joh 1:9); and this is what Nathanael does, with good results. It is part of his guilelessness that he is willing to have any prejudice removed, and he at once accepts Philip's proposal; cf. Joh 4:20; Joh 4:30. Christ praises him as truly an Israelite, *i.e.* as one who has something more than the blood of the patriarch, viz. a character which corresponds to the dignity of the name (Psa 73:1). In him the guile of Jacob the supplanter has given place to the righteousness which wins a victory with God. He is one whose death a prophet may desire (Num 23:10).

Nathanael overhears the praise of himself, and the question with which he replies to it has been criticised as arguing a want of modesty on his part. But his reply does not mean, 'I know that I am all that; but how do you know it?' Rather, he exhibits surprise that a total stranger should express any opinion about him, lie somewhat coldly intimates that he doubts the value of praise which can hardly be based upon experience. But, like Mary's 'How shall this be?' (Luk 1:34), his question does not so much ask for proof as express astonishment. In both cases the proof which was not demanded was granted. Gabriel gave Mary a sign that he could read her future, for he showed that he knew all about Elisabeth's prospects of a son; and Jesus gives Nathanael a sign that He could read his character, for He shows that He knows all about his private conduct (cf. what we read of Elisha in 2Ki 5:26; 2Ki 6:12). Nathanael at once recognizes the significance of this knowledge, and in his reply 'the true Israelite acknowledges his King.'

It is right to allow for the *possibility* that in Nathanael's confession (Joh 1:49), and in that of the Baptist (Joh 1:34), the Evangelist may be putting into the mouths of others language which had become natural to himself, but was not actually used by them. St. John was so full of the doctrine that Jesus as the Messiah was the Son of God, that he may have made those who accepted Him as the Messiah express their belief in a form which was not used until somewhat later. We must admit that thus to antedate the terminology of a fuller appreciation of the truth would be possible. But Psa 2:6-7 will suffice to explain the language which the Evangelist attributes to the Baptist and to Nathanael. This Psalm was generally recognized as Messianic, and seems to have been very familiar (Act 4:25-28; Act 13:33, Heb 1:5; Heb 5:5). In the fulness of his conviction Nathanael quite naturally uses the fullest Scriptural designation of the Messiah with which he was acquainted. Experience of Christ's miraculous knowledge had convinced him, as it convinced the Samaritan woman (Joh 4:29) and Thomas (Joh 20:27-28), that Jesus stood in the closest relation to God. Hence he uses this title of the Messiah (Joh 11:27, Mat 26:63, Mar 3:11 || Mar 5:7 || Mar 15:39 ||, Luk 4:41) rather than the common 'Son of David' (Mat 9:27; Mat 12:23; Mat 15:22; Mat 20:30-31; Mat 21:9-15; Mat 22:42 etc.). Although 'Son of God' and 'King of Israel' both indicate the Messiah, the titles are not quite synonymous, as is shown by the repetition of 'Thou art.' 'Son of God' gives the relation to God—a relation which would be only vaguely understood by Nathanael; 'King of Israel' gives the relation to the Chosen People. Thus the two titles complete one another.

Nothing is gained by suggesting (Cheyne in *Enc. Bibl.* iii. col. 3338) that 'when thou wast under the fig-tree' ought to be 'when thou wast making supplication,' because the Hebrew for the one (מִתְחַנֵּן וְאֵתָא, *wěattâ mithhannçn*) would resemble the Hebrew for the other (תְּתַחֵּן תַּחַת הַאֵילָנָה, *wěattâ tahath hattě'çnâ*). What the Evangelist gives us is intrinsically more probable, as being more definite, and therefore more likely to impress Nathanael. Nathanael seems to have believed that Jesus knew what he was thinking about under the fig-tree, just as the Samaritan woman believed that He knew all about her past life. Fresh from the teaching of the Baptist, Nathanael may have been meditating on the coming of the Messiah as near at hand. It was under a fig-tree that Augustine heard the '*Tolle, lege*' (*Conf.* viii. xii. 1). See OT reff. to 'fig-tree.'

'Believest thou?' implies something of surprise at the rapidity of Nathanael's conviction (contrast Mar 6:6); but 'thou believest' is perhaps right. Christ approves of his faith and of its basis; and He forthwith promises him an ampler basis, and therefore the prospect of a loftier faith. This wider basis of 'greater things' refers to the public signs which are to follow, and which seem to be alluded to in 'the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man.' Angels are instruments of the Divine power in nature (Rev 14:18; Rev 16:5). Nathanael has believed because of a

miracle of knowledge which could be appreciated by himself alone: he is hereafter to witness miracles of power which can be appreciated by all. And here it is to be noted that, while the 'Israelite indeed' enters upon a new life in recognizing his King by the sign granted to him, the Messiah Himself enters upon a new career in granting the sign. This private sign to Nathanael was a prelude to those public miracles in which Christ 'manifested His glory' to the Jewish nation and through it to all the world. The angels, who are to be instruments of the manifestation, are represented as being already on earth, the 'ascending' being placed first. They are ready to carry men's prayers to heaven, and to bring down the blessings which prayer wins. But there is a reference to Jacob's dream ([Gen_28:12](#)), suggested possibly by the place; for Bethel, Mahanaim, and the ford Jabbok all lay close to the route which Christ would take in going from Judaea to Galilee; and in the narrative in Genesis the ascending angels are mentioned first. What Jacob had dreamed was fulfilled in Jesus. Heaven was opened and remained so (perfect participle) to mankind. Heaven came down to earth in the Person of the Son of God, and, by a regular intercourse between His place of sojourn and His home, man became capable of attaining to heaven. It narrows the meaning far too much when the promise to Nathanael is interpreted of the angels who appeared after the Temptation, at the Agony, and after the Resurrection and Ascension.

The change in the designation of the Messiah is significant. Nathanael had called Him 'the Son of God': He calls Himself 'the Son of Man,' and it is the earliest occasion on which He does so. In the Synoptic Gospels the title 'son of Man' occurs 69 times, and Christ is represented as using it (always of Himself) on about 40 different occasions. In John the title is used 11 or 12 times, [Joh_9:35](#) being doubtful; and none of these passages is parallel to anything in the Synoptics. Here the point may be that He is come, not to revive the old theocracy, nor to 'restore the kingdom to Israel' ([Act_1:6](#)), but to redeem the whole human race. It may also be that at this beginning of His ministry Jesus will not definitely accept the title 'Son of God.' Without rejecting it, He substitutes for it a title which seems to have been adopted by Him to veil, rather than to reveal, the fact that He was the Messiah. But here again we must allow for the *possibility* that the Evangelist is wording Christ's reply according to language which he had often heard from His lips, but which was not used quite so early in the ministry as this.

In Nathanael we have an instance of a good man hampered by prejudice, but quite willing to be enlightened. He comes to the Light, and is searched, approved, and illuminated. In Christ's treatment of him we have an instance of His knowledge of what was in man ([Joh_2:25](#)), not only in the case of mankind in general, but with regard to individual character; also of the working of the law that 'whosoever hath, to him shall be given.'

The narrative of the call of Nathanael, like the rest of John 1, strongly confirms the belief that the writer is a Jew of Palestine, well acquainted with the Messianic hopes, and with the traditions and phraseology current in Palestine at the time of Christ's ministry; able also to give a lifelike picture of Christ's first disciples.

Literature.—B. F. Westcott, *Gospel of St. John*, 28 f., 33 ff.; R. C. Trench, *Studies in the Gospels*, 66; H. P. Liddon, *University Sermons*, 2nd ser. 4; Phillips Brooks, *Mystery of Iniquity*, 129; A. Maclaren, *A Year's Ministry*; 2nd ser. 169; W. Boyd Carpenter, *Son of Man*, 163; J. G. Greenhough, *Apostles of our Lord*, 74; H. T. Purchas, *Johannine Problems*, 68; G. Matheson, *Representative Men of the N.T.* 71; *Expos.* 5th ser. viii. (1898) 336.

A. Plummer.

⚠Nation

NATION.—This word has two meanings, according as it distinguishes Israel from other peoples, or as it concerns Israel within itself. In the former sense it signifies a State more or less organized, and its keynote is *independence*; in the latter, a race of common speech and religion, and its keynote is *unity*. There are two pairs of Greek words corresponding to this distinction. Ἰουδαῖοι is used under the former category, and most frequently by John, who wrote when the Jewish and Christian communities were decisively separated from one another;* [Note: Paul, too, puts Ἰουδαῖοι on the same secular footing as Ἕλληνας; cf. the phrase καὶ Ἰουδαίους καὶ Ἕλλησιν καὶ τῆς ἰσραηλῆσιν τοῦ θεοῦ (1Co_10:32).] whereas Ἰσραήλ is used always with a note of affection and pride by those who count themselves as its members, sharers in the Divine choice and covenant. There is a similar contrast between the words ἔθνος and λαός, the former and ἔθνη (in the phrase 'all nations') being used generally of political States. τὰ ἔθνη has the special meaning of 'the Gentiles,' the non-Jewish peoples (Heb. גוֹיִם), and gradually became ethically blackened, so that Authorized Version instinctively translates 'heathen' (Gal_1:16; Gal_2:9, cf. Mat_6:7 ἔθνηκοί). But the common noun which corresponds with Ἰσραήλ is λαός. It conveys the sense of God's possession and purpose, which are creative of the national unity maintained by the sacrifices and observances of the Law. Its analogue in Heb. is אָמָּץ. As ἔθνη sank down into the meaning of heathen, so λαός is at length appropriated by the Christian consciousness.

The few exceptions to the above rules should be noted. In Luk 7:5; Luk 23:2, and throughout the Fourth Gospel, ἔθνος is used in the place of λαός; for, as was just stated, in the later Apostolic circles the old prerogatives of Israel were claimed for the 'Israel of God,' *i.e.* the Christians. In Luk 2:10 λαός is translated in Authorized Version as if it were ἔθνη; but Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 corrects it from 'all people' to 'all *the* people.'

1. Ἰουδαῖοι, ἔθνος, ἔθνη.—In so far as the Jews constituted a body politic, they had lost their *independence* since Pompey's occupation of Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] in b.c. 63, and the Roman hold was tightened by the rule of the Imperial protégé Herod the Great, b.c. 37-4. He obtained from Augustus the title of 'king' in b.c. 30, and large slices of territory, first Samaria, Jericho, and towns in the west, and afterwards the regions between the Lebanon and the Lake of Gennesaret, and eastwards. He greatly enhanced the material glories of the Holy Land, especially by wealth expended on the Temple (Mat 23:16; Mat 24:1, Joh 2:20), by which he hoped to secure the loyalty of the nationalists. But, though he gave lavishly with one hand, he took away cynically with the other. He filled the high priest's office with his own creatures; and by building theatres and pagan temples showed scant respect for the national ideal. 'He founded Καισάρεια (*i.e.* temples of Caesar) in many towns' outside Judaea (Josephus *Ant.* xv. ix. 5). His strength lay in his bodyguard of 3000, who were drawn from the Samaritan population, and in the fortified palaces which he built at Jerusalem and Caesarea. By intrigue and assassination he exterminated the rival Hasmonaean house, including his favourite wife and her popular sons. The frenzied act of massacre of the babes of Bethlehem, for which Mat 2:16 is the only authority, is quite in accord with his temper in the later years of his life.

On the death of this Idumaeen tyrant an even sadder chapter from the standpoint of national independence began. For Herod's kingdom was divided among three sons: Philip having the newly added territories of Trachonitis, Ituraea (Luk 3:1), etc.; Antipas succeeding to Galilee and Peraea; and Archelaus, after a long suit at Rome, obtaining the most important part with an allotted income of 600 talents. In a.d. 6, the last-named was finally summoned for his evil courses to Rome, and the unhappy people sank one stage lower in the scale of national independence, being placed under a procurator. This was an exchange for the worse, even from the tyranny of Herod the Great and the iniquities of his son. For although these were only half Judaeans, and in subtle and sometimes pronounced antagonism to the nationalist party, they did not fail to give it some regard; whereas Pontius Pilate and his four predecessors mostly gave up even the attempt to understand so impracticable a people. No wonder 'the revolutionary current was continually increasing among the Jewish people in the time of Christ' (Schürer).

These procurators (ἡγεμόν in NT, ἐπίτροπος more often in Josephus) were not of senatorial or praetorian, but only of equestrian rank, and not absolutely independent of the Syrian governor, though their dealings were mostly direct with Rome. Their power included (a) *military and police control*. The Jews were themselves free from conscription for military service. But there were plenty of Gentiles in the land to supply the small garrisons required. The centurion (Luk 7:2; Luk 23:47) and his cohort would be required only in a few of the larger towns. The Temple was dominated by the tower of Antonia. The procurator had also (b) *judicial authority*. His confirmation was required for capital sentences (Joh 18:31), and his executive force carried them into effect (Mat 27:27). Ordinary civil and criminal cases, however, affecting Jews were dealt with at the sessions of the Sanhedrin, and when they appeared to have the people behind their verdict, Pilate was loth to deny them (Mat 27:18; Mat 27:24). He also used his powers of release with a view to propitiating the populace (Mat 27:15). But the name of procurator conveys a special reference to the duties respecting (c) *the Roman treasury*. Being an Imperial province, the taxes of Judaea were paid to the account not of the Senate, but of Caesar (Mar 12:14). The country was divided into some ten toparchies for fiscal purposes. Tacitus (*Annals*, ii. 42) speaks of Judaea in a.d. 17 as *fessa oneribus*. The taxes (land and poll) were collected by State officers; but the customs were farmed to *publicani* such as Zacchaeus (ἀρχιτελώνης, Luk 19:2) of Jericho.

The rights of the procurator were also enjoyed by the tetrarchs, as well as the right to issue copper coinage. Herod Antipas built Tiberias, S.W. of the Lake, for his capital. Like his father, he tried to propitiate or rather seduce national sentiment by his outlay on public works; and he was at any time ready to use it for his own ends (Mar 3:6; Mar 12:13). Jesus warned His fellow-countrymen against the leaven of Herod (Mar 8:15); and, in response to a crafty attempt to get rid of Him, described the tetrarch as a fox (Luk 13:32). John the Baptist, whose preaching was in his territory, was his victim (Mar 6:17 ff.). But though his partisans were hand and glove with the Pharisees in their hostility to Jesus (Mar 3:6; Mar 12:13), and though we learn from Luke that he associated himself with the condemnation of Jesus, he was not ready to take that awful responsibility upon himself (Luk 23:7-12). The advent of Jesus apparently raised no political excitement in the regions under Philip, because the bulk of the population was non-Jewish. But there was often danger in Galilee (Luk 4:29); and infinitely more in the furnace of fanaticism at Jerusalem (Mar 10:32 f., Joh 11:8).

When Herod the Great died, his policy of getting material benefit for the nation at the cost of its religious ideals was continued by the priests, who exercised the highest civil as well as religious functions. They constituted the majority of the Sanhedrin, which, as the supreme court of appeal, professedly represented the remnant of

Jewish independence. But it represented no cause so truly as the vested interests of an order dependent first on the favour of Herod, and then on the pleasure of Rome. Thus in the name of a bastard independence, which meant that they had leave to grow rich and their country leisure to grow outwardly splendid, they opposed any national movement which might provoke the Romans to take away not only the nation, but also 'our place' (Joh 11:48). It was, e.g., the high priest Joazar who checked the threatened revolt in a.d. 7 on the taking of the census by Quirinius. There were even some of the Pharisees who, whether because they were satisfied with the measure of religious liberty accorded under the Imperial administration, or because they shut their eyes to the facts (Joh 8:33), or because they saw in the foreign yoke the discipline of God, resented any movement towards national independence; and perhaps it was some of these who associated themselves with the Herodians in Mat 22:16.

2. Ἰσραήλ, λαός.—But while the independence of the Jewish people was irretrievably mutilated, and the State as a geographical or governmental entity about to perish, the other note of national existence, viz. *unity* as focussed in the word λαός, was very completely realized. Indeed, as the outer husk decayed, the inner shell grew the harder and tougher. The succession of Pharisees and scribes proved a far surer defence than the dynasty of David. The soul of Judaism was not devoured even by the omnivorous influences of Greek culture. The first steps in this movement were taken by Ezra and Nehemiah, who put an end to mixed marriages among those who had returned from the Exile. The race was adulterated, however, even so late as b.c. 125, when the Idumaeans, being defeated by Hyrcanus, submitted to circumcision. And in respect to language, the Jews of the Dispersion spoke Greek, and read the Scriptures therein; while 'the people of the land' understood Aramaic only (Act 21:40). Religiously, however, the nation was undivided after the Exile, feeling itself to be the special property and instrument of God (Mat 2:6; Mat 3:9, Luk 1:68, Joh 8:41). This unity was expressed not only by the rite of circumcision (Joh 7:22), but also by the keeping of the Sabbath (Mar 3:4), the abstinence from unclean foods, and the worship, without images, of one only God. And these distinctions were guarded by a multitude of observances, which called into requisition the school of scribes trained in the principles of the Pharisees.

But although the scribes claimed to sit in the seat of Moses (Mat 23:2), their authority was not recognized in what may be called the outer circles of Judaism. The Samaritans declined to follow the national Church in its later developments. Hence they were referred to with contempt (Joh 8:48) as outsiders (Luk 17:18), because of their particular objection to the religious monopoly of Jerusalem (Luk 9:53, cf. Joh 4:30). But for all that, they were counted Jews, though grudgingly, as heretics—'the foolish people who dwell in Sichem' (Sir 50:25 f.), and were proud of

the Israelite strain in their blood (Joh_4:12). More than that, their doctrinal shortcomings received some countenance in high places; for the Sadducees say only what is written is to be esteemed as legal ... the tradition of the fathers needs not to be observed' (Josephus *Ant.* xiii. x. 6).

Taken as a whole, however, in despite of the home-land being penetrated under Herodian and priestly influence with Hellenistic speech and culture, and although, what with Essenes on the one hand, and Samaritans on the other, they did not all keep step, the people preserved such unity that they became, if not politically independent, socially isolated. On the one hand, their exemption from military service, from Sabbath employment, and their refusal of market food, drew out the dislike of the populace and the contempt of the cultured classes, so that they were regarded as 'haters of mankind.' On the other hand, the word ἔθνη, meaning the nations outside the Law of the chosen λαός, gathered more and more of moral connotation, as it passed through the meanings of 'Gentile,' 'heathen,' and finally 'sinners' (Mat_26:45; cf. Gal_2:15). The symbol of this rejuvenated Judaism was still the Temple, whither the tribes went up at the national festivals; but its rallying-point was the synagogue, where men were instructed in the Law and Hope of Israel, and where the Pharisees ruled supreme. Their rivals, the Sadducees, had no influence beyond the aristocratic circles at Jerusalem, in the Hellenized cities, and perhaps in Samaritan villages; and though they had a large place in the Sanhedrin, they had to comply with Pharisaic watchwords.

Thus the national life was knit from within, and ruling functions were exercised through officers of the synagogue, such as προεσβύτεροι (Mat_21:23; Mat_26:47), πρώτοι (Luk_19:47), γραμματεῖς (Mar_9:11), or νομικοί (Luk_10:25). Although Palestine was not politically the mistress of her own territories, she was religiously the mother of a people throughout the Empire. The Jews of the Dispersion could but rarely visit the Temple, and they read the Scriptures in the Greek tongue; but in their separate communities they maintained the precepts as to Sabbath rest and clean food under the protection of Roman governors and the Emperor (cf. Act_18:12-15). The Jews could say with Josephus, 'Even if we were deprived of wealth, of towns and of other possessions, the Law remains to us for ever. And no Jew will be so far from his native land, or so much fear a hostile ruler, as not to fear the Law more than him' (c. [*Note: circa, about.*] *Apion.* ii. 38).

If it was by the hands of the priests, in the name of national independence, that the Lord was betrayed to the 'nations,' so the chief antagonism which He met in His ministry, and which His spirit encountered afterwards in the Apostolic mission, came from this close-knit theory and practice of national unity. The Pharisees pursued Him

from the first because they instinctively saw that the tendency of His teaching (see Nationality) was to break the bonds their traditions had woven, and to act as a solvent on the rigidity of national isolation, which was the only thing left to their pride.

Literature.—Cremer, *Bib.-Theol. Lex.* s.vv. ἔθνος, λαός; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] [indicates all possible sources of information, the fullest of these being the *Antiquities* and *Wars* of Josephus]; Ewald, *Hist. of Israel*, vol. vi.; Hausrath, *Hist. of N.T. Times*; Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, vol. ii; Keim, *Hist. of Jesus of Nazara*, vols. i. and ii.; Stanley, *Lectures on Jewish Church* artt. ‘Gentiles’ and ‘People’ ‘in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible’.

A. Norman Rowland.

☒ Nationality

NATIONALITY.—This term includes the characteristics created by national ideals and facts. The national environment of Jesus and His disciples has been set forth in the preceding article under the two ideals of *independence* and *unity*. Of these ideals the former rested on the Messianic Hope, the latter on the Mosaic Law, which were the key-notes of the most ancient Scriptures of the Jews—the Prophets and the Pentateuch respectively. They provide the clue to all that was distinctive in the nationality which appeared in, around, and against Jesus.

1. *The Messianic Hope, with its meaning for independence.*—The expectations aroused at the birth of Jesus were by no means of a cosmopolitan character (Mat 1:21; Mat 2:6, Luk 2:10—‘all the people,’ not ‘all people’), even as they appear in the perspective of St. John’s transcendental point of view (Joh 1:29; but cf. Joh 1:31). It was with the hope of keen patriots that the disciples remained with Him to the end (Act 1:6, Mar 10:28). St. Matthew especially represents Him throughout with a glow of nationalist pride, as son of Abraham and of David (Mat 1:1; Mat 9:27; Mat 21:15), and the heir of the prophets (Mat 2:15; Mat 2:23; Mat 4:14; Mat 8:17).

As to Jesus Himself, it cannot be denied that He so far shared the patriotic hopes of His fellow-countrymen as to believe they were to be fulfilled in His own person (Luk 4:21; Luk 7:23; Luk 20:13). We may even venture to say that He counted it a temptation to make His ministry succeed on popular lines (Mat 4:5 f.). At any rate He withdrew from advertisement (Mar 1:36 f.), and from the popular desire to make Him king (Joh 6:15), refused to give a ‘sign’ (Mar 8:12), and seemed to repudiate any claim that rested on succession from David (Mat 22:43-45). But He took as the very

keynote of His acceptable and authoritative preaching the phrase which the nationalists used in the name of independence, 'the kingdom of God' or of 'Heaven.' He spoke of His disciples sitting on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes (Mat 19:28). And though He baffled their material hopes over and over again, and left them dumb, He quickened enthusiasm to the highest pitch by His entry into Jerusalem (Mat 21:5 ff.) on lines sketched out by prophecy. And these advances were no accommodation to the popular feeling; they were the expression of His own patriotic consciousness. He declared to the Samaritan woman that salvation is of the Jews (Joh 4:22). He forbade the disciples to address themselves to others than the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Mat 10:5 f.). He was loth to discount the value of nationality by admitting a Syrophœnician woman, an alien both in race and in religion, to an equal claim on His brief ministry with the elect people (Mat 15:24; Mat 15:26). Although He allowed the rights of Caesar (Mat 22:21), and authorized His disciples to pay the tribute-money that was due, He reserved the right to consider it an unrighteous infliction (Mat 17:26). With the love of a patriot He wept over Jerusalem because it knew not the day of its visitation, and was near its final ruin (Luk 19:41-44). Though rejected by those who had formulated their own material notions of the Messianic Hope (Mat 16:20 f., Joh 7:45-52; Joh 9:22), it was after all on the ground of His patriotism that Jesus was betrayed into the hands of the Gentiles. When Caiaphas urged this policy, he was moved more by fear for 'our place' than 'our nation.' It was on the charge of having spoken against Caesar (Luk 23:2) that Pilate was induced to condemn Jesus (Joh 19:12; Joh 19:16). It was in the name of the Messianic Hope that He was mocked by the soldiers, and over His cross were written as accusation the words, 'The King of the Jews' (Mar 15:26).

2. The Mosaic Law in its bearing upon unity.—National pride also centred in the unity which was epitomized in the Mosaic Law. Before the death of Herod the Great, two Pharisees were burnt alive for leading an assault upon the golden eagle he had fixed over the gate of the Temple court. And the passion for the Law was no less exaggerated throughout the period of direct Roman rule, as when there was a riot on the occasion of Pilate's bringing the Roman ensigns within the city walls. Jesus Himself was very conscious of the national unity through the Law. He kept the feasts, being found in Jerusalem at the Passover, the Feast of Tabernacles, and of Dedication (cf. Mat 26:55). He was a regular attendant at the synagogue at Nazareth (Luk 4:16); and His interest in these nurseries of nationality was so far recognized that the liberality of Jairus in providing one was assumed to be a claim on His favour (Luk 7:4-5). His works of healing were kept so far as possible on the lines of the Law (Mar 1:44; Mar 5:12-13). He thought of Israel as the Chosen People, and spoke of them as the children' (Mat 8:12; Mat 15:26). Indeed His reverence for the Scriptures (Luk 4:4; Luk 4:8; Luk 4:12; Luk 16:31; Luk 24:25-27), for the Law (Mat 5:19; Luk 10:26-28, Joh 5:45), and for the Temple (Mat 23:17; Mat 23:21, Joh 2:16-17),

went far deeper than was appreciated by worldly-minded ecclesiastics (Joh 2:18; Joh 7:46-49).

But with all this tenderness for the obligations of Jewish religion as ties, He resented them as bonds. His perfect allegiance to the truth and grace of God (Joh 1:17) made every lesser loyalty stand in subordination. He withdrew Himself more and more from the passion of nationality as embodied in the religious pedantry and exclusiveness of the Pharisees, until at last it was almost wholly arrayed against Him and He against it (Mat 23:15 etc.). The disparagement of Gentiles with which He began (Mat 6:32; cf. Mat 20:25), turned to denunciation of the false children and unfaithful servants (Mat 21:28-44, cf. Mat 8:12; Mat 11:21). And Luke especially records His kindly attitude towards Samaritans (Luk 9:52; Luk 10:33; Luk 17:16). In regard to the terms of the Mosaic Law, He did not hesitate to act as Lord of the Sabbath in the interests of humanity (Mar 3:4). And, further, He taught that a man could not be defiled by the eating of meats (Mar 7:15), or cleansed by the washing of pans (Mar 7:8). He distressed His disciples by sending away sorrowful a young devotee of the Law (Mar 10:17-22), and offended religious sentiment when He kept company with publicans and sinners (Mat 9:11, Luk 15:2; Luk 19:7).

Thus at length the devoted Student of the Scriptures and whole-hearted Champion of the Law was ejected from the national party as a deceiver (Joh 7:12; Joh 9:22-28, Mat 27:63), and delivered up to the priests and the Romans. While He was finally accused to the Romans as a pretender in the cause of independence, He was attacked from the beginning by the legalists as an enemy to the cause of unity. Though He embodied the Hope of Israel and fulfilled the Law of Moses, it was in the name both of the Hope which the priests mistook and of the Law which the scribes misinterpreted, that Jesus was brought to the cross.

But the essential attitude of Jesus in respect to nationality can be better read in the varied witness of His disciples even than in His own. Within the limits of His short career He conformed to the Law, for He was born under it (Gal 4:4); and He spoke out of a Messianic consciousness (Luk 4:21), because He came unto His own (Joh 1:11). But when He was departed, His disciples 'saw greater things than these.' They perceived that the use of current speech and even contemporary ideals was compatible with a more perfect independence of their limitations than the most antagonistic and revolutionary attitude could express. The ideals of Christ moved with such ease in a plane of thought which is as universal as it is inward, that they could be embodied in the contemporary forms as well as in any other. Whereas the most ardent of reformers, ready to deny standing room to everything established, may be quite exclusively the product of his age, and governed by the most pedantic ideas. Thus the gospel of Jesus was released at once and instinctively from its nationalist setting, with this unique result that it lost nothing but gained everything by its

liberation. It is true the company of original Apostles remained Christian Jews; but the leaders came to recognize that they enjoyed no distinctive privilege of the Kingdom which was withheld from the Gentiles. And St. Paul, son of Benjamin and pupil of Gamaliel as he was, drew out to the full logical issue the universal implication of the gospel.

The influence of Jesus upon nationality has been of a composite nature. On the one hand, He has loosened its bonds by enlarging the conception of God and emphasizing the fact of human brotherhood. Nationality was at first constituted under the aegis of the national deity, and provided the practice-ground and range for social ethics. Thus nationality and religion were virtually the same thing, where either meant anything, and where Rome had not obliterated them both by the triumph of material force and the deification by the reigning Emperor. It was to the sacred union of these two ideas of nationality and religion that Jesus was sacrificed. But the sacrifice enabled religion to pass into the higher stage of association with *humanity* (cf. Joh 12:24; Joh 12:32), for which, through the providential advance of Rome, the world was craving, and towards which in the region of philosophy the Stoics had already felt their way (Act 17:26). What nationality had hitherto done for religion, in providing the scope for its practice of social ethics, humanity was to do henceforth. The barriers had been broken down between Jew and Gentile, Greek and barbarian, bond and free; they being brought by the blood of the Cross near to God, and so to one another, in order that henceforth the bonds of brotherhood might be of a purely human character, and that the parables of the Good Samaritan and of the Shepherd-judgment might be the pattern and sanction for next-door philanthropies and world-wide missions.

Literature.—Matheson, *Growth of the Spirit of Christianity*, as well as more formal works; Wilson Harper, *The Christian View of Human Life* (1901), chs. vii.-x.; Forrest, *The Authority of Christ*. (1906), ch. v.; J. Martineau, *National Duties* (1903), 1; B. F. Westcott, *Social Aspects of Christianity* (1887), 35; F. W. Robertson, *Sermons* (1874), iv. 287; D. J. Vaughan, *Questions of the Day* (1894), 12.

A. Norman Rowland.

☞ Naturalness

NATURALNESS.—Few terms are more fruitful of fallacious thought than the group including ‘nature,’ ‘natural,’ ‘naturalness.’ In modern usage they are very frequent, and the range of varied meanings which they cover is wide. Thus we speak of natural instinct, natural conduct, natural religion, natural science, and the natural creation, though the single epithet has a different sense in every case. Two phrases like ‘the

law of nature' and 'natural law' are verbally equivalent, yet they are very different in significance, the one drawing its connotation from Roman jurisprudence, the other from modern science; the one being concerned entirely with human thought and conduct, the other mainly with inanimate phenomena or those regions of Biology which include creatures of lower organization than man. It is always needful to be on one's guard against the fallacies which so easily arise through such changes in the meaning of a term; for they are apt to be unnoticed when the term itself is constant. But the danger becomes greater when these terms are carried back to a period in which they were in far less frequent use, and when they covered a smaller range of meaning. This was the case in the age of the NT. We have now generalized our ideas, and we speak of 'Nature' in the sense of the Cosmos. It is commonly with a reference more or less definite to the observed order of the Cosmos as a whole that we employ the words 'natural,' 'naturalness'; although there are many instances also in which they have a narrower reference. But in antiquity it was either a particular person or thing, or else a particular class of persons or things—a kind—which was in view; and the nature of this group of instances was the standard of naturalness. So 'life according to nature' meant, not what was in harmony with the universe, nor even what corresponded with environment, but what fulfilled the nature of the man himself. What was 'contrary to nature,' on the other hand, was not what put a man into antagonism with his surroundings, but what amounted to violence done to his better self. The later Stoics, indeed, made approach to the modern use in some directions, and in turn influenced legal principles, and later movements of thought which sought a 'return to nature,' such as that with which the name of Rousseau is connected; but they afford no more than an exception to the general truth that in ancient times the use of the terms under consideration was particularist, while to-day it is commonly generalized or even cosmical.

An examination of the passages in the NT in which naturalness is spoken of bears out this difference fully. In Jam 3:7, e.g., the 'nature of beasts' (φύσις θηρίων) is contrasted with human nature (ἡ φύσις ἡ ἀνθρώπινη); and St. Paul opposes the teaching of nature in the case of the Gentiles to the teaching of law in the case of Jews (Rom 2:14; Rom 2:27); while in 2Pe 1:4 we read of 'a Divine nature' (θεία φύσις). But all such instances which develop the idea of naturalness lie outside the Gospels, and most of them occur in the writings of St. Paul. It is not necessary, therefore, to discuss them fully here; it may suffice to refer to an instructive note by Dr. Armitage Robinson in his Com. on the Epistle to the Ephesians (on Eph 2:3), pp. 49-51.

The words which are rendered by 'nature' or the like in the Authorized and Revised Versions are φύσις, φυσικός, ὁμοιοπαθής, and ψυχικός, but the last is only translated

‘natural’ where it stands opposed to πνευματικός, and there the rendering is not satisfactory though none better is easily found. None of these words, however, occurs in the Gospels at all: and the entire absence from the Gospels of terms directly expressive of naturalness is in itself a warning against attempting to bring the facts of Jesus Christ’s life under this category without care and caution.

There is, however, profound truth in Tertullian’s saying, ‘Anima naturaliter Christiana,’ and it is no false extension of this if one speak of the naturalness of Jesus Christ as perfect, since in Him the best and highest nature of man is shown complete and unalloyed for once. Such a mode of expression would only serve to heighten the supplementary aspect of the truth which comes out in the contrast that St. Paul emphasizes between the first Adam as the ‘natural man’ (ψυχικός), and the last Adam as the ‘life-giving spirit’ (1Co_15:45). It is along this line that the explanation must be sought of what some have felt as a serious difficulty, namely, that few principles in Christ’s teaching can be instanced to which parallels of earlier date may not be adduced. Not only the writings of the OT Prophets and Psalmists, but also the religious teachers of other races, such as Gautama, Epictetus, or those collected in the Tao of China, afford numerous anticipations of the Lord’s words. It could not be otherwise if the true nature of man be realized in Him; if God purposed ‘to sum up all things in Christ’ (Eph_1:10); if He was ‘the true light which lighteth every man’ (Joh_1:9). A similar consideration enables one to understand the remarkable fact that Christ’s appeal is to men of all races. ‘One touch of nature makes the whole world kin’: apart from this, the fact, to which ever-widening experience bears witness, that in all races ‘his sheep hear his voice,’ would be most wonderful, not to say inexplicable.

It is quite in keeping with this view of the facts, that the Lord Jesus never hesitated to appeal to the natural instinct of men On questions of conscience. e.g. ‘Doth not each one of you on the Sabbath loose his ox or his ass ...? And ought not this woman to have been loosed from this bond ...? (Luk_13:15 f., cf. Luk_14:5). He also employed expressions in reference to Himself which may be said implicitly to make naturalness the criterion of conduct. e.g. ‘Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness’ (πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν, Mat_3:15); ‘Behoved it not the Christ to suffer?’ (οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστόν, Luk_24:26). This last usage is very characteristic of the Ep. to Heb. (cf. Heb_2:17 ὄφειλεν ... ὁμοιωθῆναι; Heb_2:10 ἔπρεπεν αὐτῷ), and the similar expression in Heb_7:26 ἡμῖν καὶ ἔπρεπεν ἀρχιερεὺς, which bases on the nature God has given us the natural expectation which must be formed of Christ). See Newman Smyth, *Old Faiths in New Light*, 105.

☒ Nature And Natural Phenomena

NATURE AND NATURAL PHENOMENA.—1. The inquiry as to the attitude taken up by Jesus towards the natural, visible, tangible world which is the physical environment of the soul, is affected and limited by the fact that our Lord was not a philosopher or a scientist, but *a spiritual teacher*. His only mission was to preach the doctrine of the Kingdom of God, and to this He rigidly restricted Himself. Thus He nowhere enunciates a cosmology; He gives us no explicit theory of the providential order; He leaves the scientific conceptions of His day where they were, correcting no current mistakes as to the meaning of natural phenomena, and giving no intellectual synthesis of His own of the facts of the physical universe (see Wendt's *Teaching of Jesus*, i. pp. 151-153). This at once both hampers us and frees us in dealing with our special subject. It hampers us because we have to glean such hints as are possible for our purpose from scattered references to natural phenomena and to the order of nature as a whole, which occur incidentally in His teaching. But it also assists us by enabling us to understand that no sinister or misleading suggestions lurk behind the silence of Jesus on the innumerable problems that try the modern mind in its outlook on the natural order. The revelation of Jesus does not contain a complete conspectus of the facts of the world in all their aspects: it is a *spiritual* revelation, which aims at the enlightenment of the soul as to the vital truths of conduct, and as to the ideal relations between it and its Heavenly Father. Every element in the teaching is subordinate to this central consideration. In seeking for such light as is possible on the attitude of our Lord to the physical world, we must, therefore, bear this limitation constantly in mind.

2. We also find here the key to the kind of references which are made by our Lord to the facts of nature. These references are, fortunately for our purpose, very numerous in proportion to the bulk of His teaching as it has come down to us, and this for a reason we shall presently deal with. But they all belong (1) to the class of facts that were quite familiar to His hearers. His aim was always entirely practical, and His illustrations and references to nature are thus extremely simple and obvious. We seek in vain for any recondite, or technical, or unusual allusions; they all lie consistently in the path of common observation; so much so that hardly any of them need interpretation to the simplest modern minds. And (2) they are of that class which lend themselves obviously to the uses of illustration, being vivid, pictorial, and frequently recurrent in the lives of ordinary men and women, so that anyone familiar with His teaching could not fail afterwards to be reminded of the spiritual truths He had taught, because no one could go through a single day of average experience without

coming across one or more of the natural facts used in His matchless collection of illustrations. By this means He turned nature into a whispering gallery of spiritual truths, and filled each common day with perpetual reminders of His central teaching, thus enlisting both the understanding and the memory of His followers in His permanent service as a revealer of religious truth. Any devout and careful student of the Gospels will readily find the justification of these remarks in the pages of the Evangelists.

3. Incidental, however, as are the references to nature and natural phenomena in the words of Jesus, they are full of suggestiveness as to His attitude to the material world. Through the rigid self-limitation which He imposed on Himself we catch the glow of His spirit; through the narrow windows of His imagery rays of light pour out in many directions on the mysteries of life and providence. It is not, perhaps, possible to construct a complete Christian *Weltanschauung*, or 'View of the World,' out of the scattered references of Jesus to nature; but in the light of His teaching it is certainly possible to suggest the lines along which such a theory must run. His doctrine of the Fatherhood necessitated an attitude towards nature as well as man, and this attitude is consistently maintained by Him in all His words and habits of thought as recorded in the Gospels.

4. *Christ's theory of Providence in the natural order.*—(1) The first characteristic in the attitude of Jesus towards the facts and arrangements of the organic world is a certain beautiful *calmness and serenity*. The facts which so deeply disturb us in our view of nature—suffering, the preying of one animal on another, death—were just as familiar to Him, who was an accurate and careful observer, as to ourselves; moreover, He who was so sympathetic with men in their sorrows, must have been equally accessible to the sorrows of dumb creatures. Yet there is no trace of any disturbance of mind in Him as He met these familiar facts. His profound trust in God's goodness to His creatures enabled Him to view their sufferings with an equanimity in which there could have been no trace of hardness or indifference. It is the calmness of a mind so firmly centred in the idea of the Divine love and care that it suffers no shock at the most disturbing and harrowing of natural events. His references to the Providence that looks after the interests of flowers and birds, which are 'clothed' and 'fed' by God Himself, are full of a sense of the Divine benignity and goodwill towards His meanest creatures, and He uses this fact as an argument to quell the needless anxiety of men, who belong to a far higher order of being (Mat_12:12), as to the sources and sureness of the natural provision for their own life and wellbeing. If God so 'clothes the grass of the field,' and 'feeds the fowls of the air,' He will surely much more attend to the temporal wants of His children so that they may consider themselves free to attend to their proper spiritual interests (Mat_6:25-34). That the optimism of Jesus is not the result of careless observation or lack of sympathy is seen also in His acknowledgment of the evanescence and perishableness of vegetable and

animal life (Mat 6:30). Jesus teaches us that ‘God feeds the sparrow and also attends his obsequies’ (Luk 12:24, cf. Mat 10:29). The sufferings peculiar to animal life and the incidence of natural death are clearly normal facts in our Lord’s view of nature, and need contain no problem for faith.

(2) Another feature of our Lord’s view of the providential order is His recognition of the *orderliness and faithfulness of natural law*. There is every indication that in realizing this He found a deep and constant pleasure. The world to Him was the home of order, and, as such, an indication of the will and character of the Creator and Sustainer of all things. He loved to notice and draw attention to this characteristic of the natural world (cf. Mat 5:13; Mat 7:16-18; Mat 7:24-27, Mar 4:4-8; Mar 4:26-28; Mar 9:50, Luk 10:18; Luk 12:24; Luk 13:8; Luk 19:34, Joh 3:8; Joh 10:3-5; Joh 15:1-4 etc.) Specially interesting to Him were all the phenomena of growth, which He so often uses as a symbol of the laws of the spirit (Mar 4:4-8; Mar 4:26-28; Mar 4:31 f., Mar 13:28, Luk 13:8; Luk 13:21, Joh 15:2-4), and of the habits of animals (Mat 6:26; Mat 7:15; Mat 10:16, Luk 13:34; Luk 17:37, Joh 10:3-5; Joh 10:12 etc.).

(3) This leads us to the most important of all the characteristics exhibited in our Lord’s treatment of natural phenomena—His profound sense of the function they fulfil *as suggesting spiritual facts and laws*. His purpose in using natural imagery is not summed up in the fact of its picturesqueness and mnemonic aptness. However handy it may have been as a mould into which to throw His teaching, He evidently believed that there was in addition to this a real correspondence between the laws of organic and of spiritual life. He lived in two worlds, with an intensity of interest that has seldom been approached—the world of sense and the world of spirit. These two worlds to most men are divided by a deep chasm; but to Him there were innumerable bridges of connexion between them, and His thoughts traversed these in a perpetual play of happy insight, finding in both unending correspondences that were real and true, each shedding light into the heart of the other. Or, to vary the simile, we may say that to Him nature was the mirror of the spirit, in which He ever caught glimpses of the profoundest laws and operations of the higher life of the soul and of the character of God as the Lord of both. When He said, ‘The kingdom of God is like—,’ He was exercising no mere ingenuity of fancy, neither was He inventing fictitious similarities between disconnected spheres of existence; rather He was holding up the gold and silver sides of the same bright shield of Truth.

(4) In entire consistence with this view of our Lord’s imagery, we notice the complete *absence, in His view of the world, of any such distinction as has been drawn by modern thinkers between the natural and the supernatural*. Living, as He did, in the perpetual sense of His Father’s presence and power and love, such a distinction would be to Him utterly unreal. In His cosmology there was no third term, such as ‘force,’ or

'energy,' or 'law,' coming in immediately between the Divine will and its result. There was only God—the Creator and Sustainer—and nature was the material expression of His loving care and energy. What we would attribute to a secondary or efficient cause He always attributed to the direct activity of the Father. 'Your heavenly Father feedeth them.... Shall he not much more clothe you ...?' 'Not one of them falleth to the ground without your Father ...' 'My Father worketh hitherto.' In this sense of the immediacy of the Divine activity we find one of the most characteristic traits of the religious attitude of Jesus towards the natural world. The same consideration throws a suggestive light on the way in which He exercised His 'miraculous' gifts. To Him there was nothing 'supernatural' or inexplicable in the wonderful deeds He wrought. They were rather perfectly natural signs of the activity of God in and through Him: 'My Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works' (Joh 14:10). Even in the case of an act of healing which was performed without any overt reference to the Divine power, as when He said, 'I will, be thou clean' (Luk 5:13), the same attitude of dependence on the Father's favour and power must be presupposed (cf. Joh 5:19). To Jesus, therefore, the wonderful works which He wrought were but the expression of the will of God through Him, and were as natural as the forces that eventuate in the 'blowing clover and the falling rain.' If this were borne in mind, perhaps the difficulty of the miraculous would not be what it is to many nowadays. The key would be seen to lie in the region of personality rather than of a 'supernatural' law over-riding a natural law. Jesus being who and what He was, it was as natural for Him to work miracles' and to exercise an exceptional control over the 'forces' of nature, as it was for Napoleon to do extraordinary things through his gift of control over men, or for a great scientist to initiate fresh changes in the forms and conditions of matter. The *differentia* of the soul of Jesus was an unbroken fellowship with God as His Father, which manifested itself in all He did, and, among other ways, ill the power to use natural forces in a unique way in order to fulfil His filial mission.

5. There is another aspect of the attitude of Jesus to nature and natural phenomena which must not be overlooked, and which, however incidental it may be to His mission as such, is replete with suggestion and helpfulness. We have pointed out that His *scientific and philosophic* interest in nature was merged into the *religious* interest which always controlled His soul. What of the *artistic* interest which is so strong in the highest type of mind? Here again we must speak of the subordination of all to the spiritual outlook and temper. None the less is it clear that Jesus was profoundly sensitive to the *beauty* of the world. He loved Nature for her own sake, and because she ministered to His love of what was fair and good to look at. And if it is true that the 'function of art is (1) to teach us to *see*, (2) to teach us *what* to see, and (3) to teach us to see *more than we see*,' then the discourses of Jesus reveal the artistic temperament in all His references to the facts of the natural order. See art. Poet.

(1) His faculty of *observation* was extraordinary. His eye took in the smallest detail of the outward world with loving appreciation. We have references to the march of the seasons (Mat_24:32, Mar_13:28); to the orderly stages of growth (Mar_4:28); to the varying response of various kinds of soil (Mar_4:4-8); to the mystery of development (Mar_4:27; Mar_4:31); to the habits and dispositions of animals (Mat_10:16, Luk_9:58; Luk_13:34; Luk_17:37, Joh_10:3-5; Joh_10:12, cf. Mat_7:15); to the customs of the household (Luk_13:21, cf. the many references to the law of hospitality, and to human intercourse and social life). He was never at a loss, indeed, in drawing upon the resources of His observation for the purpose of illustrating His own teaching, but was like a householder, 'bringing forth from his treasure things new and old' (Mat_13:52).

(2) In the same way He teaches us *what* to see. A wise selection must be made in storing the mind with facts and impressions, so that the multiplicity of Nature may not overwhelm the mind, or cause us to lose our way in the confusion of her wealth. And while, as we have seen, there was nothing too great or too small to arrest His eye or interest His mind, there is one interest which evidently dominated His mind in His watchful observation of natural phenomena. That was the *ordinary human* interest. And this is always true of the highest art. The painter, the poet, the sculptor, are eminently and broadly *human* in their approach to Nature; what has no reference to human experience and action and passion lies outside the scope of her appeal to them. A glance at our Lord's parables and illustrations at once reveals this dominant human interest. He refers only to those aspects of nature that in some more or less definite way intermingle with the daily or occasional experience of human beings. There was a practical as well as artistic purpose in this; for He was thus able to interest His hearers more readily in the higher truths which He was anxious to impress upon their minds and to commend to their sympathies.

(3) He teaches us to see *more than we see*, for the natural became in His hands a translucent veil through which the spiritual poured its light and inspiration into the hearts of men. Here art once more became handmaid to religion: and the beauty of nature became a vehicle for the higher beauty of holiness and truth. The same artistic gift is seen in the beautiful, vivid, and balanced *form* in which He clothed His imagery and parabolic teaching. His language is wonderfully clear and pictorial and apt: the mould into which He runs His illustrations is in keeping with the simplicity and beauty of its content. There is the happiest marriage of word and fact, type and antitype, in His teaching. This reveals the Master both of material and of expression. The earthly forms in which the Incarnate Word enshrined His message have caught something of His own Eternal quality and beauty, and will stand for ever as unique and unforgettable as the truth they embody. 'The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life' (Joh_6:63).

Literature.—Mozley, *Univ. Sermons*, 122; Shairp, *Stud. in Poetry and Philos.* 310; *Expositor*, iii. ii. [1885] 224; F. W. Robertson, *Human Race*, 163; J. Caird, *Univ. Ser.* 300; S. J. Andrews, *Man and the Incarnation*, 105; W. G. Elmslie, *Memoir and Ser.* 240; D. W. Forrest, *Authority of Christ* (1906), 143.

E. Griffith-Jones.

⚡ Natures, Two

NATURES, TWO.—See Divinity of Christ, and Incarnation, vol. i. pp. 481, 812 f.

⚡ Nazarene

NAZARENE

1. *Introductory.*—‘Nazarene’ is a descriptive term applied in the Gospels and Acts to Jesus and His followers. The epithet is also regularly applied in the Talmud to Jesus (צַרְתָּנוּ לְיֵשׁוּעַ *Sanh.* 43a, 107b; *Sota*, 47a) and His disciples (צַרְתָּנוּ *Taan.* 27b). As usually understood, ‘Nazarene’ in the first place meant ‘of [the town of] Nazareth,’ and indeed this explicitly appears in some passages in the Gospels (e.g. Mar_1:9 ‘Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee,’ Luk_2:4 etc.); but, according to Cheyne, the name Nazareth in its original significance was the designation not of a town but of a district, and ‘Nazarene’ is primarily equivalent to ‘Galilaeen’ (see, further, below, and art. Nazareth).

Sometimes a descriptive clause with ἀπό followed by the place-name appears: e.g.

Mat_21:11 ‘This is Jesus the prophet from Nazareth of Galilee’ (ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ τῆς Γαλιλαίας); cf. Act_10:38 (Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ).

2. *The two Gr. equivalents of ‘Nazarene.’*—In the Greek Test. two words correspond to ‘Nazarene,’ viz. Ναζαρηνός and Ναζωραῖος. In WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort’s text.]’s text the former occurs in Mar_1:24; Mar_10:47; Mar_14:67; Mar_16:6, also in Luk_4:34 (where it may be dependent on the Markan source).* [Note: It occurs again only in Luk_24:19, where, however, the reading is doubtful (AD read Ναζωραῖος).] In Mt., Jn., Acts (and perhaps originally in Lk.), Ναζωραῖος is exclusively used. Probably

Ναζαρηνός was employed in the earliest source, and this was given up later for Ναζωοαῖος.

Ναζαρηνός is derived from Ναζαρά, like Μαγδαληνή from Μαγδαλά. The forms Ναζωοαῖος, Ναζαρετ, Ναζαρεθ imply Heb. forms נַצְרַת, נַצְרַת.† [Note: such forms as נַצְרַת (1Ki 17:9) in Bibl. Hebrew.] The Talmudic form נַצְרַתִּי may be derived from נַצְרַת (or its masc.) with change of â to ô (ô). See Dalman, *Gram. d. Jüd.-Pal.* [Note: *Palestine, Palestinian.*] *Aram.*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 152 n. [Note: note.] The same scholar thinks Ναζωοαῖος implies a Heb. form נַצְרַתִּי (connected with a by-form of the place-name נַצְרַת), *op. cit.* p. 178, n. [Note: note.]
2. Does Ναζωοαῖος (= נַצְרַתִּי) represent the dialectical form current in Judaea (cf. esp. Joh 19:19, Act 24:5)? This is possible. For a different view, see below.

The exact relation borne by these two forms to one another, as well as the significance to be attached to this relationship, raise a difficult problem. The points involved come to a head in Mat 2:23, where it is stated that the child Jesus was brought to Nazareth that 'it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, that he should be called a Nazarene' (Ναζωοαῖος). Of the various explanations of this passage that have been proposed the most important are: (1) those that connect it with the Hebrew word *naḥzer* ('branch,' 'sprout') in the Messianic passage, Isa 11:1. (2) The interesting view of Hitzig that Ναζωοαῖος (Act 24:5) was suggested by נַצְרַתִּי in the (unpointed) text of Isa 49:6 regarded as = σωζόμενοι ('those who are being saved') in contradistinction to ἀπολλύμενοι (1Co 1:18; 1Co 1:21 'them that are perishing'). Later the word נַצְרַתִּי was taken to be a singular to correspond with the parallel עַבְד (‘servant’), and applied to Jesus (with a play upon the place-name Nazareth). This is very ingenious, but hardly convincing. It would be better to suppose that the (unpointed) נַצְרַתִּי of the passage was read נַצְרַתִּי, the Heb. form implied, as Dalman thinks, by Ναζωοαῖος, and applied by Jewish-Christian exegesis to Jesus.‡ [Note: The verse so interpreted would run: 'It is too light a thing that thou shouldst be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and (shouldst be) the Nazarene (נַצְרַתִּי) to restore Israel; I will also give thee for a light of the Gentiles,' etc. This is one of the Servant-passages which was undoubtedly applied to Jesus in early Jewish-Christian circles. Cf. Luk 2:32.] (3) Cheyne§ [Note: Developing a theory suggested by Neubauer and Grätz. See EBi, col. 3360, s.v. 'Nazareth.'] doubts

whether Nazareth was ‘originally the name of a town (or village) at all.’ The earlier and more correct form of the word is *Nazara*, implying a Heb. form נָצְרָה (or נְצֻרָה, also desiderated by the Talmudic נְצֻרִינוּ): and this again is a by-form of the same word which enters into the second element of the name *Gennesar* (Gennesaret). This *Nazara* is really a name of Galilee, and Ναζωραῖος = Galilaeen. The word of the ‘prophets’ referred to in Mat 2:23 becomes, on this view, Isa 9:1 f. (‘the land of Zebulun, and the land of Naphtali ... Galilee of the Gentiles’) rather than Isa 11:1.

It seems clear from the NT data that the term ‘Nazarene’ was an early designation applied to Jesus and His disciples generally. It thus was the Jewish (Oriental) equivalent of the specifically Gentile term ‘Christian.’ ‘Nazarene’ was not the title given by the Christians of Palestine to themselves, but by others outside the Christian fellowship. The names for, and used by, themselves were much more probably such as ‘believers,’ || [Note: | See Faith. It is always important to distinguish the names used by a body of itself from those given by outsiders. Another case is probably ‘Pharisees,’ Heb. רִשְׁוֹנִים = (?) ‘separatists.’ Their own name for themselves in the earlier period may have been *hâsîdîm*, ‘pious’: later, such terms as חֲכָמִים ‘wise,’ חֲכָמִים, חֲכָמִים ‘colleague,’ were used. Cf. also remark on Ebionites at end of article.] ‘brethren’ (e.g. Act 9:30), ‘saints’ (Act 9:13, etc.), ‘elect.’ In time ‘Nazarene’ seems to have acquired a somewhat contemptuous or, at any rate, hostile *nuance* (cf. Joh 1:46). The followers of ‘the Nazarene’ had evidently been made to feel the reproach of the alleged Galilaeen origin of their Messiah.* [Note: The Galilaeen population seems to have been by no means strict in carrying out certain legal enactments regarded as important by the Rabbis. A feeling of distrust, if not of contempt, of the Galilaeen population seems to have prevailed in Rabbinical circles. For a full and minute investigation of the relevant data, see the valuable monograph of A. Büchler (*Der galilaische ‘Am-ha-ares des zweiten Jahrhunderts*, Vienna, 1906).] Moved by these influences, the Jewish-Christians seem to have transformed the title Ναζαρηνός –which had now become in the mouths of their opponents an opprobrious one–into the honorific one Ναζωραῖος, and to have substituted the latter for the former. In this way, at any rate, Mt. seems to turn the edge of the reproach levelled at the Christian Messiah in the characteristically Jewish-Palestinian designation of Jesus as ‘the Nazarene’ (נְצֻרִינוּ יֵשׁוּעַ). Assuming, then, that the term Ναζωραῖος is an honorific title educated in this way by the Jewish-Christians themselves, it remains to elucidate the process by which the form was arrived at, and its exact significance.

Ναζωραῖος may be a Greek form of *nâzûrû* (נְצִירָא), † [Note: Or rather the adjectival form of this, נְצִירָא. The Aram. word נְצִירָא is guaranteed by the SYR. ܢܘܨܝܪܐ = surculuc (Heb. נֶצֶר); see Payne-Smith, Thes. col. 2443.] the Aram. Aramaic equivalent of the Heb. Messianic term נֶצֶר ‘Branch’ or ‘shoot.’ The selection of this particular Messianic term was dictated by the necessity of finding a counter-term to Ναζαρηνός. Ναζωραῖος is thus an honorific title given by the disciples themselves to Jesus, and expresses the conviction that He was the *nezer* of Isa 11:1—the ‘Branch’ of Messianic Prophecy. Its application to members of the Christian community naturally followed. See also following article.

3. ‘Nazarene’ as a community-designation.—It is clear not only from Act 24:5 but also from Mat 2:23 that the Christian communities of Palestine, and even outsiders, at first bore the name of ‘Nazarenes.’ The writer of Mat 2:23 evidently belonged to a community so designated. The name is, of course, specifically Jewish, and it remained the characteristic Oriental-Jewish term for Christians generally (e.g. in the Talmud), though primarily it was the Jewish Christians of Palestine who were thought of. An interesting piece of early evidence of this usage has in recent years come to light in the Palestinian recension ‡ [Note: Discovered by Prof. S. Schechter among the Cairo Genîzâh MSS, and published by him in the JQR, vol. x. [1898] pp. 654-659.] of the *Shemoneh Esreh*. As is well known, the 12th of these ‘Benedictions’ contains the famous imprecation on ‘slanderers’ or ‘heretics.’ In the Palestinian version an explicit reference is made to ‘Nazarenes and Sectaries’ (*mîmîm*). § [Note: See, further, an art. by the present writer in *Church and Synagogue*, vol. v. [1903] p. 167 ff. (‘The Jewish Prayer against Heretics’).] Though the clause containing these words may not belong to the earliest form of the prayer (early 2nd cent. a.d.), it is, at any rate, not very much later. Jerome (*Ep.* 112) makes allusion to the use of this ‘cursing’ prayer in the Jewish synagogues throughout the East.

A Jewish-Christian sect of ‘Nazarenes’ is referred to both by Jerome and Epiphanius. They are apparently to be distinguished from the Ebionites, though very little exact information is extant concerning them. || [Note: | Possibly ‘Ebionites’ (Heb. עִבּוֹנִי = ‘poor men’) was a more general term, and may have been given by Jewish-Christians to themselves. See art. Ebionism.]

Literature.—The artt. ‘Nazareth,’ ‘Nazarene’ in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, the *EBi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*], and *J* [Note: *Jahwist.*] *E* [Note: *Elohist.*]; ‘Nazareth’ (by Guthe) in *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.*] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] and in

Hamburger's *RE*; the Comm. on Mat 2:23 (esp. Zahn, 1903); J. Halévy, *Études Évangéliques*, vol. i. p. 231 f. (on Ναζωεαῖος: a most valuable and suggestive essay.

Halévy suggests the derivation of Ναζωεαῖος from the Aram. Aramaic word adopted above); Neubauer, *Géog. du Talmud*, 1868; Biesenthal on Mat 2:23 (*Sacred Lit.* 1859). The bizarre theory as to the existence of pre-Christian 'Nazarenes' set forth by W. B. Smith, *Der vorchristliche Jesus* (1906), does not call for discussion here.

G. H. Box.

☩ Nazareth

NAZARETH (Ναζαρά, Ναζαράτ, Ναζαρέθ, Ναζαρέτ).—The town of Nazareth, the modern *en-Nâsira*, was situated in Lower Galilee, 5½ miles almost due west of Mount Tabor, and nearly as far in a southwesterly direction from Kefr Kennâ, the site that is usually identified with Cana of Galilee. The road that ascends from the latter place winds through the high valley in which Nazareth lies, and divides a short distance south of the town, the south-eastern branch finding its way to Jezreel, and thence down the valley to Beth-shean and the Jordan, the western crossing the low pass of the Samaritan hills, by ancient Megiddo, to join eventually the great trunk road north and south, on the plain by the sea. The town itself, however, lay retired from the great highways of commerce, though within easy reach, almost within sight of them; and its secluded position explains the absence of any mention of Nazareth in the OT or Josephus. The modern village, with a population of seven or eight thousand, clings to the foot of the hill. But the ancient town seems to have spread considerably higher up the slope, and from 'the brow of the hill on which the city was built' (Luk 4:29), 1600 ft. above the level of the sea, one of the finest views in Palestine is said to be obtained, embracing on the one side the valley of the Jordan and the mountains of Gilead, and on the other the blue waters of the Mediterranean.* [Note: For a description of Nazareth and its site see G. A. Smith, HGHL, London, 1894, p. 432 ff.; Baedeker's Palestine; PEF Memoirs, i. pp. 262 f., 275-79, 328 f.; A. P. Stanley, SP, London, 1860, p. 365 ff.; cf. W. Sanday, Sacred Sites of the Gospels, Oxford, 1903, p. 49 f., with plates; Ramsay, Education of Christ, p. 47.]

That in our Lord's time Nazareth was a place of considerable importance is indicated by the fact that it is always referred to in the NT as a city (πόλις, Mat 2:23, Luk 1:26; Luk 2:4; Luk 2:39) not a village (κώμη). It was in touch with, but not harassed by the currents of popular, commercial, or political life. And there appears to be no real justification for the belief that Nazareth or its people were in any sense insignificant

or despised.† [Note: See especially Selah Merrill, *Galilee in the Time of Christ*, London, 1886, chs. xvii, xviii.] The words of Nathanael (Joh 1:46), which have given currency to this view, are perhaps misunderstood. He must himself have shared the universally accepted belief that the Christ could come only from Bethlehem (cf. Mat 2:5, Joh 7:42); and if his language is intended to express disdain, it is no more than that of the polished town-dweller for the uncultivated rural population who know nothing of his artificial rules of propriety and manners. As to the Athenian every native of Bœotia was a dullard, so to the refined *habitué* of Jerusalem the rustic of Galilee may well have appeared uncouth and contemptible. These characteristics might not improbably have become accentuated in the case of Nazareth, owing to its withdrawn position in a self-contained upland valley. Under any circumstances Nathanael's words bear witness only to a personal opinion, and are no evidence of a widespread or general belief.

With the exception of the events of the early ministry recorded in Luk 4:16 ff., the direct references to Nazareth in the Gospels are all associated with the birth and boyhood of Jesus. It was to Nazareth that the angel Gabriel was sent, to Mary His mother (Luk 1:26); and thither His parents came to find a home after the flight into Egypt (Mat 2:23). From Nazareth they journeyed into Judaea for the purpose of the Roman enrolment (Luk 2:4), returning to the same city when the requirements of the Jewish law for the purification of Mary had been satisfied (Luk 2:39). Twelve years later a similar visit to Jerusalem, in accordance with His parents' annual practice (Luk 2:41 f.), and return to Nazareth (Luk 2:51), make it evident that the home during this period had been at the latter town. On the occasion of His baptism, it is from Nazareth that, according to St. Mark (Mar 1:9), Christ came to the Jordan; the other Synoptists merely state that the journey was made from Galilee (Mat 3:13), or name no place (Luk 3:21). His early life, therefore, was spent at Nazareth, and only in consequence of the opposition aroused by His preaching in the synagogue and the murderous attempt upon His life (Luk 4:28 f.) did He abandon Nazareth and take up His abode at Capernaum (Mat 4:13). Thenceforward He does not appear to have visited, or to have had any direct relations with, His former home. Its name, however, continued to cling to Him, and by that designation He is known to the 'multitudes' at Jerusalem at the Passover, the stranger-pilgrims from Galilee His native province (Mat 21:11). Philip uses the name when he calls Nathanael to Jesus (Joh 1:45); and later in the history it is employed by Peter at Caesarea (Act 10:38) as a well-known title with which Gentiles also would be familiar.

The precise form of the word and its signification are alike uncertain. In two passages (Mat 4:13, Luk 4:16) the oldest Manuscripts read *Ναζαρά*, and are followed by all recent editors. Elsewhere in the Synoptic Gospels WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] print *Ναζαρέτ*, with the exception of Mat 21:11 (*Ναζαρέθ*), Tischendorf reads

Ναζαορέθ consistently in all passages of Matthew and Luke (except Ναζαορά, as above), adding with reference to the usage of the latter a note (on Luk 1:26) that on a comparison of all the instances in which the name occurs in St. Luke, including Act 10:38, the decision must be that the Evangelist wrote Ναζαορέθ not Ναζαορέτ, a variable usage between the two forms being inconceivable.* [Note: ναζαορετ, C. ⚭ BKLXII al permn e q. Conlatis omnibus hujus evangclii locis (quibus accedit Act 10:38 - εθ ⚭BCDE) Lucam ναζαορεθ scripsisse statuendum est non ναζαορετ, nisi quod Act 4:16 formam eum ναζαορα adhibuisse suadent testes. Inter -εθ enim et -ετ eundem scriptorem fluctuasse incredibile est.] In Mark and John the form Ναζαορετ and in Acts Ναζαορέθ is accepted by all with the more ancient Manuscripts ; and in Mar 1:9; the form Ναζαοράτ is found in AP. Dr. Hort also states that in eight out of the eleven passages in the Gospels the Codex Sangallensis has Ναζαοράθ, but that the form ‘has little other attestation.’ It would seem probable that the variations in spelling, where they are not merely accidental, are due to local or dialectic peculiarities,† [Note: Compare shibboleth and sibboleth (Jdg 12:6),] and are to be ascribed to the transmitters of the tradition or the copyists of the documents rather than to the original authors.‡ [Note: Hort, however, write:—‘The evidence (for the spelling of the name Nazareth) when tabulated presents little ambiguity, Ναζαορά is used at the outset of the Ministry in Matthew 1/3, (Mat 4:13) and Luke 1/5, (Luk 4:16); Ναζαορέθ in Matthew 1/3, (Mat 21:11), the only later place in the Gospels where the name occurs, and in Acts; and Ναζαορετ certainly or probably in all other places’ (New Testament in Greek, Notes on Orthography, p. 160).]

The adjective also appears in two different forms. The Second Gospel uses only Ναζαορηνός (Mar 1:24; Mar 10:47; Mar 14:67; Mar 16:6); Matthew and John have always Ναζαοραιος (Mat 2:23; Mat 26:71, Joh 18:5; Joh 18:7; Joh 19:19). St. Luke has both in his Gospel (-ορηνός, Luk 4:34; Luk 24:19; -ορηνός, Luk 18:37), but in the Acts only Ναζαοραιος (Act 2:22; Act 3:6; Act 4:10; Act 6:14; Act 22:8; Act 24:5; Act 26:9). In no instance is there any important difference of reading. Neither the noun nor the adjective is found in the Epistles or the Book of Revelation.

There is no agreement, again, with regard to the meaning or derivation of the name. St. Matthew sees in the return to Nazareth a fulfilment of the prophecy of Isa 11:1 (‘a branch (*nçzer*) out of his roots shall bear fruit’), thus connecting Nazareth with the

Hebrew נִצֵּר ‘shoot,’ ‘sprout’; and some have therefore supposed that the name was given to the town in reminiscence of Isaiah’s language, and on account of the circumstances of our Lord’s early life there. Such an origin of the term is perhaps not impossible, although it hardly commends itself as probable; and of course no such thought was in the mind of the writer, or is intended to be suggested by his words. Others have sought a connexion with the root נִצֵּר in the sense of *keeping watch or guard*; e.g. Dr. Swete would follow Delitzsch and Dalman in explaining Nazareth to mean ‘watch-tower.’ § [Note: See his note on Mar_1:9; Aram. נִצְרָה, נִצְרָה. Cf. also Merrill. loc. cit. p. 122.] This would imply either that the town itself was on the top of the hill, or that it took its name from the hill on the slopes or at the foot of which it stood; the former would seem to be contrary to fact, and the latter improbable. It would be preferable to understand the word in a passive sense from נִצֵּר, to *preserve, protect* (Old Aram. Aramaic נִצֵּר, Assy. [Note: Assyrian.] *nasâru*),* [Note: G. A. Cooke, *North Semitic Inscriptions*, pp. 185, 189; *Oxf. Heb. Lex. s.v. נִצֵּר*.] so that Nazareth is the town secluded, protected, and the name describes its position in a valley surrounded by hills. The word might also be explained as a Niphal participle of צִוַּר, צָרַר, with the same meaning of ‘confined,’ ‘shut in’; compare the adjectival form Ναζωραῖος. Heb. or Aram. Aramaic צָ, however, usually becomes σ in Greek, e.g. נִצֵּי = Σειών, Σιών, צְבֹאוֹת = Σαβαώθ, מִצְפָּה = Μασσώχ, Μασσηφά, etc.; or a dental, e.g. צִוַּר = Τύρος. But צַעַר is represented by Ζόγορα in Gen_13:10. A derivation from נוֹר, denom. of נוֹדֵד, has also been suggested; Nazareth would then be ‘the town of the Nazirites.’ נוֹדֵד becomes in the Greek of the Septuagint ναζιρ, ναζιραιος. Compare the modern name of the town *en-Nâsira*. The latter, however, is more likely to be a conscious or unconscious assimilation of the sound and perhaps the spelling to a well-known descriptive title. See also preceding article.

Literature.—In addition to the references given above, the articles in the Bible Dictionaries may be consulted; add Edward Robinson, *BRP [Note: RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.]*, London, 1841, iii. pp. 183-200; A. Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, London, 1883, i. pp. 145-148, 456f.; Cunningham Geikie, *Holy Land and the Bible*, London, 1887, ch. xxxix.; G. le Hardy, *Hist. de Nazareth et de ses sanctuaires*, Paris, 1905.

A. S. Geden.

Nazirite

NAZIRITE (Heb. *nâzîr*), in Authorized Version spelled 'Nazarite,' means etymologically 'one separated,' a religious devotee. The historical references are in Judges (Jdg_13:2 ff. the case of Samson) and Amo_2:11-12; the 'law of the Nazirite' is found in Numbers 6. A comparison of these passages reveals the fact that there was considerable difference between the earlier and the later type of Nazirite. Samson had been 'a Nazirite unto God from his mother's womb' (Jdg_16:17); his Nazirate was lifelong, and due not to any vow, but to the appointment of God (Jdg_13:1; Jdg_13:4-5; Jdg_13:7). In his case the abstinence from wine, which is emphasized in the 'law of the Nazirite,' is not specified, and the avoidance of contact with the dead is apparently excluded. On the other hand, great stress is laid on the hair being left unshorn even from childhood (Jdg_13:4; Jdg_13:7; Jdg_13:14). This, which may be taken to be the most marked feature of a Nazirite in early times, rests upon the belief that the hair is part of a man's vital being, and a symbol of his vitality. Thus to let it grow un-polled or to offer it in sacrifice has an expression of the devotion of the entire manhood to God. From the reference in Amos it may be inferred that the Nazirites formed a numerous class in the 8th cent., and that abstinence from wine was then a marked feature in their outward life. According to W. R. Smith (*Prophets of Isr. [Note: Israelite.]* 84), this prohibition 'was undoubtedly a religious protest against Canaanite civilization in favour of the simple life of ancient times. This appears most clearly in the case of the Rechabites, who had received from their father Jonadab the double precept never to drink wine and never to give up their wandering pastoral life for a residence in cities (Jeremiah 31).'

The 'law of the Nazirite' describes the obligations of the Nazirite, the ceremonies to be observed on the accidental interruption of his vow, and the sacrifices to be offered at its termination. It is clear that the vow is now contemplated as one which might be taken for a specified time only. A passage in Josephus (*BJ* ii. xv. 1) suggests that in his time thirty days was regarded as the minimum duration of the vow. It included three points: abstinence from intoxicating drink of every kind, and from the fruit of the vine in any form, avoidance of all contact with the dead, and the letting the hair grow with a view to offering it on the sacred fire (Num_6:18). Accidental defilement was followed by seven days of uncleanness, after which the period recommenced, and the vow was renewed with elaborate and costly rites. In like manner the termination of the vow is marked by offerings and libations, and specially by the shaving of the hair 'at the door of the tent of meeting,' followed by its being 'put on the fire which is under the sacrifice of peace-offerings' (vv. 13-20). 'After that the Nazirite may drink wine.' 'It appears most probable that the combination of observances in the law is not ancient, that in the regulations for the Nazirite of later times we see a fusion of several originally distinct customs, which, like many others, had lost much, and, in

some cases, all of their original meaning' (G. B. Gray, *ad loc.*). 'Through this change, however, it lost its value; in old times it was Jehovah who raised up the Nazirites as He did the prophets. These were men of God, ensamples of the genuine Israelite God-pleasing life, and therefore of great significance for the whole people. Under the Law the Nazirate had sunk to a private practice of asceticism, through which the individual obtains favour from God' (Benzinger).

Later allusions to the practice of the Nazirite vow are found in 1Ma 3:49, and in Josephus *Ant.* xix. vi. 1, *BJ* ii. xv. 1 (case of Berenice). John the Baptist, in some respects at least, resembled the Nazirites (Luk 1:15; cf. the account of James the Just in Eus. *Historia Ecclesiastica* ii. xxiii. 3). It has been supposed by some that the vow taken by St. Paul at Cenchræe, and discharged by him at the Temple, was Nazirite in its character (Act 18:18; cf. Act 21:23-26); but the information given in the Acts is not sufficient to warrant the conclusion (see Knowling, *ad loc.*, in *Expos. Gr. Test.*).

Literature.—Spencer, *de Leg. Heb.* iii. i. 6; G. B. Gray, 'Numbers' in *Internat. Crit. Com.*; W. R. Smith, *Prophets*, p. 84 f., *RS* [Note: *S Religion of the Semites.*] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 332 f.; W. R. Harper, 'Amos and Hosea' in *Internat. Crit. Com.* p. li ff., 56 f.; Benzinger, *Heb. Arch.* pp. 429 ff.; art. 'Nazirite' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible .

C. A. Scott.

☞ Necessity

NECESSITY.—We exclude from this article all problems not directly raised by the Four Gospels.

1. Necessity and the Divine nature.—Metaphysicians distinguish between (1) *contingent* existence, and (2) *necessary* existence. A thing exists *contingently*, of which the beginning or end or change can be conceived. A thing exists *necessarily*, of which neither the beginning, nor the end, nor the change can be conceived. The Universe exists *contingently*, for we can imagine its annihilation; the laws of Nature also exist contingently, for we can imagine them altered. On the other hand, the laws of Reason, of Mathematics, and of (fundamental) Morality exist *necessarily*, for we can imagine no beginning or end or change in them.

Thus there never was, or will be, or could be, a time when things which are equal to the same thing could be *unequal* to one another. Nor can we imagine a time, or a

world, in which cruelty would be other than odious, and lying other than contemptible. If cruelty and deceit were seated on the throne of the universe, they would still be what they are, odious and contemptible; and benevolence and truth, their opposites, would still be what they are, admirable and praiseworthy. Time and the vicissitudes of things can make no difference to the laws of Reason and the Moral Law. These are eternally and immutably true,—true not only to the human mind, but to every rational mind that does or can exist; valid not only in this universe but in all possible universes.

There exists, therefore, a body of eternal and necessary truth. But this conception of necessary truth carries with it the further conception of *necessary Being*, or *necessary Substance*. A truth cannot exist as it were ‘in the air,’ or in an infinite void: it must be true to *some mind*. And since the truths in question are independent of all created minds, there must exist some *Eternal Uncreated Mind*, to which these truths are eternally true. Moreover, since the truths are partly *moral truths*, this Mind must be *moral*, or, to use the language of religion, *holy*. Now it is obvious that to this Infinite Mind the predicate of necessary existence belongs in a higher degree than it belongs to what is called necessary truth. The laws or truths which are called necessary derive their necessary character from the fact that they are the laws of His Mind; but He, the Ultimate and Absolute Mind itself, exists with a degree of necessity transcending theirs. They inhere in Him, not He in them, and consequently He, the Infinite, Absolute, Ultimate Substance, is not only *necessarily* existent, but also *self-existent*.

The self-existence, or necessary existence, of the One True, Living, Personal God is a fundamental doctrine of Scripture. It was taught, according to the traditional exegesis of Exo 3:14, to Moses at the bush, and our Lord endorsed this view of the meaning of the Mosaic revelation (Joh 8:58). According to the Johannine theology (with which the Pauline is in essential agreement), necessary existence belongs primarily and originally to the Father, who is emphatically ὁ θεός (with the article), and the Living One (ὁ ζῶν πατήρ, Joh 6:57). To Jesus also, as consubstantial Son, belongs eternal and necessary existence (Joh 8:58). He has ‘life *in himself*’ (Joh 5:26), and is to creatures ‘the resurrection and the life’ (Joh 11:26). Yet He has this ‘life in himself’ by derivation from the Father (Joh 5:26, Joh 6:57), and consequently is (in this aspect) an *Effect*, of which the Father is the *Cause*.* [Note: Quite Scriptural, therefore, is the Greek theology which regards the Father as αἴτιος, and the Son and Spirit as αἴτιατα]

2. Necessity and the Divine freedom.—The Divine freedom, though absolute in the sense that God is free to achieve all that is possible, is limited by the laws of necessary truth and necessary substance as defined in § 1. Thus, since the laws of

Reason are eternally valid, He cannot not achieve the essentially irrational, or (what is really the same thing) the essentially impossible. For instance, He cannot annihilate the past, or make the angles of a plane triangle *unequal* to two right angles. Similarly, since He is a *necessary* Substance, He cannot will His own annihilation; and since He is the *supreme necessary, Good* (Mar_10:18), He cannot cease to be good, or will what is evil.

The necessary character of the Divine perfections is fully recognized in Scripture† [Note: The perfections of the Son of God have the same necessary character as those of the Father (see Heb_13:8).] (Psa_102:24-27, Mal_3:6, Num_23:19, Heb_13:8, Jam_1:17), as also is the doctrine that God's freedom is limited by His character. All that is worthy of Him, He can perform, but deceit, cruelty, and injustice are to Him impossible (Gen_18:25, Job_8:3 etc.).

3. Necessity and the laws of Nature.—It is an important corollary of the Divine freedom, that the laws of Nature do not possess immutable and necessary validity. So far from Nature being a self-contained system of blind, inexorable, materialistically determined forces, it is a realm of *Providence*, in which a Being friendly to man guides the course of events providentially, with the object of securing ultimately to each individual his proper good (Mat_10:29 ff.).

In both Testaments the laws and operations of Nature are regarded as expressions of Jehovah's *free, will* (Genesis 1, Psalms 104, Job 26, Mat_5:45; Mat_6:26 ff. etc.), and consequently as capable of being providentially or miraculously interfered with (Exodus 3-15, etc.). The NT lays particular stress upon Christ's control over the forces of Nature (Joh_21:1 ff., Mat_14:22 ff. etc.; see esp. Luk_8:25 'Who then is this that commandeth even the winds and water, and they obey him?').

4. Necessity and human affairs.—The recognition of God as the sole Absolute and Ultimate Being, excludes the heathen conception of an inscrutable Fate or Necessity (*ἀνάγκη*) to which gods and men are subject, but it does not of itself exclude the doctrine of *Theological Determinism* as taught by Calvin. The advocates of this view can appeal plausibly to a considerable number of NT passages.

Thus there are texts which teach that the general course of events is predetermined from eternity (Eph_1:4; Eph_3:11, 2Ti_1:9, Tit_1:2, 1Pe_1:20 etc.), and others which seem to deny human freedom of choice. Most of these are in the Fourth Gospel; see, e.g., Joh_6:37 'All that the Father giveth me shall come unto me' (cf. Joh_6:39); Joh_6:44 'No man can come unto me, except the Father draw him' (*ἐλκύσει αὐτον*); Joh_10:28 'they shall never perish, and no one shall snatch them out of my hand'; Joh_12:39 'for this cause they could not believe, for that Isaiah saith again, He hath

blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart'; Joh 17:9 'I pray for them, I pray not for the world'; Joh 17:12 'not one of them perished, but the son of perdition, that the scripture might be fulfilled' (cf. Joh 13:18, Joh 17:12, Mat 26:24). Even in the Synoptics we have Mat 13:11 ff. 'unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, *but to them it is not given,*' etc.; Mat 18:7 'it must needs be that offences come' (ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἐστὶν ἔλθεῖν τὰ σκάνδαλα); see also Mat 24:6 and Mat 26:24.

But these passages of deterministic tendency are balanced by others of opposite import.

Thus Christ's invitation to be saved is addressed not to selected individuals, but to *all men*: 'Come unto me, *all ye* that labour and are heavy laden' (Mat 11:28); 'it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that *one* of these little ones should perish' (Mat 18:14); 'And I, if I be lifted up, will draw *all men* unto myself' (Joh 12:32); cf, 1Ti 2:4 'God will have *all men* to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.'

Since, however, some reject God's benevolent purpose, and refuse to be saved (Mat 25:41; Mat 26:24, Joh 17:12), it follows that the human will is *free*, and that the apparently deterministic passages of Scripture must be so interpreted as to leave room for human freedom. We are led, therefore, to some such view as this, *that only the main events of human history are absolutely determined beforehand. The persons by whom, and the times when, the Divine purposes are to be realized, are not predetermined absolutely, but only conditionally.* Thus God willed conditionally that the Chosen People should play the leading part in winning the world to the gospel of Christ (Isaiah 60-62, etc.), but, when they proved unfaithful, the Gentiles were called (Mat 21:43; Mat 8:11-12 etc.). Similarly the time of the Last Judgment is not fixed absolutely, but only conditionally (Mar 13:32 compared with 2Pe 3:12 (Revised Version margin)). Applying the same principle to the interpretation of the apparently deterministic passages quoted above, we conclude that Eph 1:4; Eph 3:11 etc. refer mainly to *conditional* predetermination; that 'all that the Father giveth me' (Joh 6:37) are simply those whom the Father foresaw would be genuine believers; that the statement that 'no one (*i.e.* no hostile power) shall snatch them out of my hand' (Joh 10:28) does not preclude the possibility that they may *snatch themselves* out of Christ's hand by unfaithfulness; that the 'drawing' of the Father (Joh 6:44) is the attraction of Divine Love, not the Irresistible Call of Calvinism; that the 'I pray not for the world' of Joh 17:9 is to be read in the light of Joh 17:23, that the 'blinding' and 'hardening' of Joh 12:40 are a penalty for past sin; and that even the case of Judas was not one of individual predestination. The general principle bearing upon the case of Judas is laid down in Mat 18:7 'Woe unto the world because

of occasions of stumbling! for it must needs be that the occasions come; but woe to that man through whom the occasion cometh.’ That is to say, in a wicked world great crimes are morally certain to be committed, but there is no need for any individual to commit them, therefore woe to that individual by whom they are committed. To apply this to the case of Judas—the world being what it was, alienated from God and full of treachery and malice, *some one* was morally certain to betray Jesus to death. *But that some one need not have been Judas.* He freely undertook the evil business, and therefore his condemnation is just (Mat 26:24).

5. The predetermination of the events of Christ’s life.—Much stress is laid by the Fourth Evangelist on the predetermination of the events of Christ’s life, even with regard to such details as their precise dates and incidental circumstances.

See, e.g., Joh 2:4 ‘Mine hour (for changing the water into wine) is not yet come’ [it came a few minutes later]; Joh 7:8; ‘I go not [yet] up unto this feast, because my time is not yet fulfilled’ [it was fulfilled a few days afterwards]; Joh 7:30 ‘no man laid his hand on him, because his hour was not yet come’ (cf. Joh 8:20); Joh 12:23 ‘the hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified’ [by death]; Joh 12:27 ‘for this cause came I unto this hour’ [of my death]; Joh 13:1 ‘knowing that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father’; Joh 17:1 ‘Father, glorify thy Son [by death and resurrection], that thy Son may glorify thee.’ Cf. Mat 26:39; Mat 26:53, Luk 13:33, which imply that the length of Christ’s ministry and the time of His death were predetermined; also the very strong expression in Luk 22:22 ‘the Son of man indeed goeth *as it hath been determined*’ (κατὰ τὸ ὄρισμένον). In all these passages the language is strongly predestinarian, but, for the reasons given in the preceding section, the present writer holds that *conditional* predestination is, for the most part, meant.

6. The necessary fulfilment of prophecy.—According to the ordinary view, it is the nature of the future event that determines the nature of the prophecy. But often in the Gospels it is the nature of the prophecy that is regarded as determining the nature of the future event. This conception is specially characteristic of the First and Fourth Gospels, but it is not peculiar to them.

In St. Matthew, Christ is born of a virgin at Bethlehem, is named Jesus, sojourns in Egypt, resides at Nazareth, migrates to Capernaum, heals the sick, speaks in parables, enters Jerusalem riding an ass, is deserted by the disciples, is betrayed and put to death, ‘that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Lord through the prophet’ (ἵνα πληρωθῆ το ῥηθεν ὑπὸ τον Κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος, κ.τ.λ.: so, with slight variations of phrase, Mat 1:22; Mat 2:15; Mat 2:23; Mat 8:17; Mat 12:17;

Mat 13:35; Mat 21:4; Mat 26:53; cf. Mat 2:5; Mat 13:14-15; Mat 26:31; Mat 27:9). similarly, St. John regards the blindness of Israel as the result of a prophecy of Isaiah (Joh 12:39, referring to Joh 6:9); the betrayal of Jesus as happening ‘that the scripture (*i.e.* Psa 41:9) might be fulfilled’ (ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῆ); the prevalent hatred of Jesus as coming ‘to pass that the word may be fulfilled that is written in their law [viz. in Psa 35:19; Psa 69:4], They hated me without a cause.’ See also Joh 17:12, where ‘the son of perdition’ perishes ‘that the scripture might be fulfilled’; Joh 19:24, where the casting of lots is necessitated by the prophecy, ‘They parted my garments among them’ (Psa 22:18); Joh 19:36, where the piercing of Christ’s side takes place to fulfil Psa 34:20, and the refraining from breaking His legs to fulfil Exo 12:46; cf. also Exo 18:9 and Exo 20:9. For Synoptic parallels see Luk 24:26; Luk 24:44.

Without entering deeply into the philosophy of the question, we may point out that the two views in question do not necessarily exclude one another. We may suppose that God has a plurality of motives for causing or allowing events to happen, and that when events have been predicted by a duly accredited prophet, *one* of His motives in causing or allowing them to happen, is to maintain the credit of the prophet. This, at any rate, seems to be the view of the Evangelists, who esteem prophecy so highly that they regard a prediction once uttered by a prophet as (in a sense) placing God under a moral obligation to fulfil it. Jesus Himself, on several occasions, acknowledged the obligation of fulfilling the ancient prophecies (see Mat 26:53; Mat 16:21; Mat 21:4, Joh 19:28, etc.).

7. The necessity of means to ends.—The ‘musts’ of Christ, of which there are numerous examples in the Gospels, generally refer to the necessity He was under (in order to fulfil the purpose of His Incarnation) to do or to suffer certain things. His original purpose to become incarnate, and to redeem the world, was freely chosen (Php 2:7, 2Co 8:9 etc.); but the choice once made, a whole series of experiences (many of them painful and humiliating) became necessary.

As a child of twelve, He was already conscious, according to one interpretation of Luk 2:49 (see (Revised Version margin)), of the necessity of being about His Father’s business, and the same idea frequently recurs during the ministry. Almost at the beginning of it He declares to Nicodemus that His purpose to give eternal life to believers can be achieved only by His death: ‘As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must (δεῖ) the Son of Man be lifted up’ (Joh 3:14).* [Note: Some critics assign this saying to the Evangelist, not to Jesus.] He frequently declared the necessity He was under of working during the appointed time—‘We must (δεῖ) work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can

work' (Joh_9:4); 'Howbeit I must (δεῖ) go on my way to-day, and to-morrow, and the day following, for it cannot be (οὐκ ἐκδέχεται) that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem' (Luk_13:33); 'My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to accomplish his work' (Joh_4:34; cf. Joh_5:17; cf. Joh_5:19 etc.). His visit to Zacchaeus was determined by a redemptive purpose (Luk_19:5 'to-day I must (δεῖ) abide at thy house.' From the time of Peter's confession at (Caesarea Philippi, intimations of the necessity of the Passion and Resurrection become more frequent; 'From that time began Jesus to show unto his disciples how that he must (δεῖ) go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and the third day be raised up' (Mat_16:21); 'but first must (δεῖ) he suffer many things, and be rejected of this generation' (Luk_17:25); 'Behoved it not (δὲν ἔδει) the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory?' (Luk_24:26).

Corresponding to Christ's obligation of doing and suffering all that is necessary for man's salvation, is man's obligation of appropriating (if he would be saved) the necessary means. Frequent stress is laid upon the latter obligation in the Gospels: see, e.g., Mat_4:17 (the necessity of repentance), Mat_18:3 (of conversion), Mat_22:37 (of love), Joh_3:5 (of baptism), Joh_6:53 (of the Holy Supper), Joh_15:4 (of abiding in Christ), etc.

Literature.—See under Free Will, and add W. James, 'Necessary Truths' in *Principles of Psychology*, ii. 617 ff.; Boutroux, *La contingence des lois de la nature.*; J. Edwards, *Freedom of the Will*; Momerie, *Personality*; Martineau, *Study of Religion*, bk. iii. ch. 2; Lotze, *Microcosmus*, i. 144 ff.; Sturt, *Personal Idealism* (iii.); A. Moore, *Essays* (vii.); J. S. Mill, *Hamilton's Philosophy Examined* (xxvi.), and *Logie*, bk. vi. ch. 2.

C. Harris.

☞ Neck

NECK.—(1) In the embrace of family salutation the smooth part of the neck below the ear is the part that is kissed, first on one side and then on the other (Luk_15:20). This is implied in Hebrew by the use of the dual form (Gen_46:29). (2) Prisoners and those condemned to punishment had the chain attached to a metal ring around the neck (Luk_17:2). (3) It was on the neck of the oxen that the yoke was placed in ploughing. The freedom from all other bondage, which is conferred and naturalized by the grace of Christ, is conditioned by the yoke of service to Him (Mat_11:29-30).

Needle

NEEDLE.—Although the needle is of prehistoric origin, having been made out of fish bones before the discovery of bronze, it is mentioned only in one passage in the Bible: ‘It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle,’ etc. (Mat 19:24 || Mar 10:25, Luk 18:25). The eye of a needle is, in Hebrew and Greek, called simply ‘the hole,’ but in later Arabic it is also called ‘the eye.’ Thus one modern Arab poet (*Mcj. Ad.* ii. 231) asks, ‘What animal has its hoof in its head, and its eye in its tail?’ and another (*ib.* iii. 273) speaks of ‘the eye which never tastes of sleep and is never filled with tears.’ The needle is often used as a symbol of self-neglect, in that it clothes all the world and itself remains naked (Burckhardt, 563).

The phrase cited above from the Gospels was used in the schools, with the substitution of an elephant for a camel, to express something which does not happen. Thus in *Baba Mezia*, 38*b*, in the course of a discussion on dreams and their interpretation, R. Shesheth says to R. Amram, who had tried to convince him of something incredible: ‘Perhaps you are from Pumbeditha [where there flourished a famous academy of the Babylonian Rabbis], where they can drive an elephant through the eye of a needle’—that is, can prove that black is white. Similarly, *Berakhoth*, 55*b*: ‘No one ever saw a golden palm, nor an elephant entering the eye of a needle.’ For other occurrences of the phrase, see Buxtorf’s *Lex.* s.v. אֵינָהּ.† [Note: The proposals that have been made to identify the ‘needle’s eye’ with the small door in a large city gate, or to substitute ‘cable’ (κάμιλος) for ‘camel’ (καμηλος), have nothing in their favour. See Hastings’ *DB* iii. 505*a*, and *Expos. Times*, ix. (1898) 388, 474; A. Wright, *Some N.T. Problems*, 125.]

T. H. Weir.

Neighbour

NEIGHBOUR.—To the people of Israel, God had given the commandment, ‘Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself’ (Lev 19:18); but in their hardness of heart they had put a limit to it. They had deduced from the commandment, ‘Thou shalt love thy neighbour’—its converse—‘and hate thine enemy’ (Mat 5:43); and they had made the latter as binding as the former. To a people who regarded themselves as the sole

recipients of Jehovah's favour, the limitation was not unnatural; but with the revelation of God as the universal Father, who showers His blessings equally upon all the world, just and unjust alike (Mat 5:45), the limitation must of necessity be swept away. To make men like to God was the essential aim of the life and teaching of Jesus Christ; and as the love of God is limitless, the love of man to man must be no less. All His doctrine in reference to man's treatment of his neighbour He summed up in the words, 'Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect' (Mat 5:48). 'Neighbour,' then, upon our Lord's lips becomes a term synonymous with 'humanity.' 'Who is my neighbour?' asked a scribe; and Christ made answer with the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luk 10:25-37), seeking by a picture of pure compassion to shame him of his question. 'Dost thou ask,' He seems to say, 'who thy neighbour is? Set about at once to relieve the misery of every one thou meetest. Make thyself the neighbour of all who need thy help.' It is to be noted that in the application of the parable He does not ask which of the three *was*, but which of the three *became* (γεγονέναι, Luk 10:36) neighbour unto him that fell among thieves. In the Sermon on the Mount He makes the same thing clear by direct statement—that 'neighbour' includes all the world of men, even those who hate and persecute us (Mat 5:43-44).

To the old commandment, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,' Christ gives a new and striking form in the words, 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them' (Mat 7:12); and that the all-importance of this rule may be made plain, He adds, 'for this is the law and the prophets.' He thus makes a man's own longing for love and kindness and compassion the measure of the treatment which he should extend to others. But this love and compassion must not be the outcome of any selfish motive. To do good to others that we may receive the same again, is to miss wholly love's reward (Mat 5:46-47 || Luk 6:32-34); for the joy of love is loving: it is more blessed to give than to receive (Act 20:35). To ask to our feasts only those who can invite us in return is no manifestation of love—is but a bid for earthly recompense. To obtain God's blessing we must invite the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind, who can give nought in return (Luk 14:12-14). The presupposition of our Lord's teaching, then, is this, that love is its own reward, that to lose one's life for love's sake is to find it (Mat 10:39 || Mat 16:25, Mar 8:35, Luk 9:24). The true servant of the Kingdom, therefore, must be ever ready to give unstintingly and ungrudgingly of all that he has and is; and even to those who would take from him by violence he must offer no resistance (Mat 5:39-42).

It follows naturally that the Christian must be as ready to forgive as to give. When a brother seeks forgiveness, it must be granted gladly, even unto seventy times seven (Mat 18:21 || Luk 17:3-4). There can be no refusal of pardon to the penitent, for so the Heavenly Father treats His erring children (cf. the parable of the Prodigal Son,

Luk 15:11 ff.). To refuse to remit the offences of others means to remain unpardoned by God; for the Heavenly Father cannot forgive His children if they will not in turn forgive their brethren, who also are His children: for thus they cut themselves off from the family of God, exclude themselves from His love (Mat 6:12; Mat 18:35). The hatred of a brother becomes a sin which cannot be pardoned except it be repented of, except the hatred be wiped out and love restored. The universal Fatherhood of God is thus once more the basis of the argument (1Jn 4:20-21; 1Jn 5:1). And not only towards those who are fellow-subjects of the Kingdom is love inculcated: it must extend even to those who are our enemies and the enemies of God (Luk 6:37-38); for Christ came to seek and to save the lost, and the Christian must follow in his Master's steps. Yet, on the other hand, forgiveness must in no case flow from mere weak benevolence which foregoes revenge for injury, and leaves the matter there. An entrance must be won for pardon into the heart of the offender before the Christian's work is done; for pardon must be accepted as well as granted. It is not for his own but for his brother's sake that a man must forgive; and forgiveness is spiritually useless to the offender unless he repent of his offence. To win souls for God's Kingdom is the Christian's noblest work, and it is to that end that his whole treatment of his neighbour must be directed (Mat 18:15). Reproof, therefore, must not be wanting. The offence must be pointed out, and the sinner urged to amendment. In Mat 18:15-21 (|| Luk 17:3 ff.) a course of treatment is prescribed for the impenitent. He is to be dealt with privately as a first step; if that fails, in the presence of witnesses; and as a last step the Church is to be called in to aid in effecting a reconciliation. Only when all has proved vain is he to be regarded as a heathen man and a publican. But even then love's offices may not cease. The publican and the heathen still remain the Christian's care, are still sharers in the love of God. Love must still strive with him, by returning good for evil, by heaping coals of fire upon his head, to win him back to God and love (Mat 5:44, Rom 12:20). When all else has failed, there still remains the duty of prayer to God, who in His providence may find a way to penitence.

It follows from the humble self-forgetting attitude which this implies, that all loveless judgment of the weaknesses and sins of others is wholly forbidden. To judge is to usurp the prerogative of God, and to bring upon ourselves His condemnation of our lovelessness (Mat 7:1-2). Yet men are not to close their eyes to the characters of those about them. They must certainly seek to find the best that is in every man, and to draw it to the light even as Christ did; but to treat the notoriously wicked man as if he were good and upright is to make him a cause of offence to others, and at the same time to tempt the man himself to greater wickedness. To act thus is to cast pearls before swine (Mat 7:6). There is no more grievous sin against love than to disregard or to play upon the weaknesses of others. We must know others' weaknesses that we may avoid offending them and causing them to stumble. But that we may be able to do this—to help the weak brother and to save him from his

defects—it is first needful that we should be conscious of our own. If our own eyes are blinded by the beam of self-righteousness and pride, we cannot see clearly to cast out the mote out of our brother's eye (Mat_7:3-5 || Luk_6:41 || Gal_6:1). In the very strongest terms our Lord warns against the giving of offence to others, even to the least. It were better, He says, to suffer the most miserable death than so to endanger the salvation of another, and sin against God's love (Mat_18:6-7; Mat_18:10). In 1 Corinthians 8 St. Paul treats of the matter in reference to a particular instance, pointing out that even Christian liberty must be willingly laid aside if it in any way tends to hurt the conscience of a weaker brother. Love for souls is so absolutely the law of the Christian life that it makes right wrong and wrong right. Charity is the greatest virtue of all, so that the want of it makes every other virtue worthless (1 Corinthians 13).

To summarize the doctrine, the revelation of the new relationship between God and man, and the new law which rests thereon, make of love the highest principle in life, and make the love of God and the love of man one and the same; and since love is the divinest element in human nature, it must be love's object to beget and to increase love in others. Hence towards all who are our brethren in the Lord we must be humble and meek and forgiving, 'in honour preferring one another' (Rom_12:10), seeking greatness not in dominion but in service (Mat_20:26-27 || Luk_22:26); for it is ever the over-estimate of self that takes offence and causes hate (Mar_7:22); and to the sinner and the unbeliever who are ignorant of love, there is but the greater need to make love manifest by unwearying self-sacrifice and unceasing kindness; for so the evil in the other's heart will be overcome, and the Divine germ of love within him will be fanned into a living flame, and he also will become a true son of God (Mat_5:38-48 || Luk_6:28-31 || Rom_12:19-21). It is those whose whole lives make for peace—the peace that springs not from indifference but from love—who shall be called the children of God (Mat_5:9).

Literature.—Works on *NT Theol.* by Beyschlag and by Weiss; the Comm. on the NT, and works on the Parables; J. H. Thom, *Laws of Life after the Mind of Christ*, 330; M. Creighton, *The Mind of St. Peter*, 38.

W. J. S. Miller.

 Neri

NERI.—An ancestor of Jesus, Luk_3:27.

☛ Nest

NEST.—Orientals, while often indifferent to the study and explanation of natural processes, have always been attracted by the provisions of instinct for the preservation of animal life. They observed the home-like motive of rest and safety in the selection and construction of birds' nests (Job 29:18, Psa 84:3; Psa 104:17, Jer 48:28; Jer 49:16). In the Gospels the word translation 'nest' (κατασκήνωσις) means generally the place of night shelter for birds (Mat 8:20), or where they alight in search of food during the day (Mat 13:31-32). By contrasting His own with the more fortunate condition of the birds, Christ intimates that whoever, like the scribe, would follow Him to the uttermost, may for His sake have to endure loneliness, misunderstanding, and rejection. The reference to the mustard seed, which in its wild state produces a shrub reaching to the seat of a horse's saddle, indicates that power of rapid expansion inherent in Christ's Kingdom which has often surprised both its friends and its foes.

G. M. Mackie.

☛ Nets

NETS.—Nets were in ancient times used not only in fishing but in hunting beasts and in bird-catching. In the Gospels they are mentioned only in connexion with fishing, which was an important industry on the very prolific inland waters of Palestine. See Fish. Three terms occur.

1. δίκτυον (perhaps from δικεῖν, 'to cast'), Vulgate *rete*, is the general term, including various kinds of nets. It is found in the parallel accounts of the call of the disciples (Mat 4:20-21, Mar 1:18-19, Luk 5:2-5) always in the plural. In St. John's narrative of the great draught of fishes (Joh 21:6; Joh 21:8; Joh 21:11) it is found in the sing., possibly referring to a net of larger size. See 3 below.
2. ἀμφιβληστρον (which may perhaps be an adjective, δίκτυον being understood), a casting-net (deriv. ἀμφιβάλλω, which verb stands, without a noun, for the action of the fisherman in using the net, Mar 1:16), bell- or pear-shaped, thrown by hand from the shore or from a boat, which was skilfully wielded so as to fall upon the water with its circular mouth fully extended. The edges, being weighted, sank immediately to the bottom, and the fish within the area of the mouth were enclosed. This net is still

much used in Palestine. The individual skill required in its employment is in point if it was with this kind of net in mind that our Lord invited the fishermen to become 'fishers of men.' In the Gospels the word is found only in Mat_4:18 and (in the Textus Receptus) Mar_1:16.

3. σαγήνη (Lat. [so Vulgate] *sagena*; French and English, 'seine'), from *σάπτω*, 'to load, fill': a drag-net (Mat_13:47 (Revised Version margin)) or sweep-net, often of immense size (Manilius, 'vasta sagena'). Such nets have been in use from early times down to the present day, and are extensively employed on our own coasts, as, for instance, in Cornwall. A common way of working the seine is to have one end of it attached to the shore, while the other is taken seawards by a boat in a wide circuit, and at length brought to land again. The upper side of the net is sustained by corks, while the lower, being weighted, sweeps along the sea-bottom. The ends are gradually drawn in till the whole net is brought up on the beach, carrying with it all the fish in the area through which it has passed. The seine may also be worked entirely from a boat or boats. In classical Latin this kind of net is called *everriulum* (*verro*, 'to sweep'); cf. Hom. *Il.* v. 487, *λινον παναγρον*, a take-all net. σαγήνη is found in the Gospels only in Mat_13:47 (translation 'net,' the word 'draw-net, is not in the English text, but only in the Authorized Version chapter-heading), where the choice of this term instead of *δικτυον* or *ἀμφιβληστρον* greatly strengthens the meaning of the parable. See Draw-Net. It occurs in LXX Septuagint Is 19:8, Eze 26:5; and *ἀμφιβληστρον* and σαγήνη are mentioned together in Hab_1:15.

Literature.—R. Flint, *Christ's Kingdom upon Earth*, 245; H. S. Holland, *God's City*, 206; W. C. E. Newbolt, *Counsels of Faith and Practice*, 169.

A. E. Ross.

☩ New Birth

NEW BIRTH.—See Regeneration.

☩ New Commandment

NEW COMMANDMENT.—The definition of the Christian law of love as a 'new commandment' is peculiar to the Johannine writings (Joh_13:34; Joh_15:12, 1Jn_2:7-8, 2Jn_1:5). In the Fourth Gospel the Supper is regarded as the prototype of

the Agape rather than of the Eucharist, and the institution of the 'new covenant' gives place to that of the 'new commandment' of brotherly love. The commandment, like the covenant, is inaugurated by a symbolical act, the washing of the disciples' feet.

In the Synoptic Gospels our Lord repeatedly insists on love for one's neighbour as the paramount ethical duty (cf. Mat_5:43-48, Mar_12:31, Luk_10:30-37); He contrasts this new conception of the Moral Law with the rule that held good 'in old time' (Mat_5:43-44). The words in the Fourth Gospel thus sum up with an exquisite simplicity the authentic substance of the social teaching of Jesus. At the same time there are elements in the Johannine idea which differentiate it from the apparent parallels in the Synoptics.

(1) Jesus in His teaching, as given in the Synoptics, does not impose His ethic under the form of 'commandment.' Accepting the moral code of the Decalogue as Divinely given, He contents Himself with 'fulfilling' it by a deeper and more inward interpretation. The effect of His 'fulfilment' is indeed to replace the ancient Law by a new one, but in this Christian law the idea of commandment is altogether transcended. It is a 'law of liberty,' which the enlightened conscience originates for itself. The Fourth Gospel reverts to the idea of 'commandment'—of a moral law enforced from without. Jesus as the Son of God has power to impose a new law, equally binding with that of the Decalogue; and it is henceforth valid in virtue of His authority.

(2) The divergence from the Synoptics is still more marked in regard to the scope of the 'new commandment.' The love which it requires is the *φιλαδελφία* that found expression in the Agape; not love to one's neighbour in the universal sense, but love of Christians to one another. Here more signally than elsewhere the Fourth Evangelist betrays the influence of the later Church-idea which had narrowed the original intention of the teaching of Christ. A sharp distinction had grown up between the community of believers and the 'world,' and the duty of Christians was primarily, if not exclusively, to their brethren. The passage in the Fourth Gospel already contemplates a time when mutual love within the Church was the *γνώρισμα τῶν Χριστιανῶν* (Joh_13:35, cf. Tert. *Apol.* 39). There is no indication of a wider demand, in the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount and the parable of the Good Samaritan.

The commandment is expressly called a *new* one, although in its Synoptic form it appears as a direct quotation from the ancient Law (Mat_22:39 || Mar_12:31 = Lev_19:18). The newness has been explained in various ways. (a) According to the Greek commentators (Cyril, Theod. [Note: Theodotion.] Mops. etc.) it consists in the

higher degree of love implied in καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς—not ‘as thyself, but ‘more than thyself’ with the self-forgetting love of Christ. This, however, overstrains the meaning of καθὼς, which says nothing of the quality of Christ’s love, but states the simple fact of His example. (b) Several modern commentators (e.g. Meyer, Godet, Bugge) have still sought the explanation in the words ‘as I have loved you.’ The love of Christ experienced by the believer is to be the motive power to a new and higher kind of love. Our love to one another is henceforth to be Christian love—not grounded in a mere natural instinct, but in an inward fellowship with Christ. This idea is certainly present in the Gospel, and in the Epistle it comes to definite expression. ‘Hereby we know love, because he laid down his life for us; and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren’ (1Jn_3:16). The love required in Christians is the greater love which was revealed for the first time in the Cross of Christ. This, however, does not seem to be the idea involved in the ‘new commandment.’ The newness is ascribed to the commandment itself, not to the motive or the quality of the love enjoined in it. (c) An attractive explanation is that suggested by Olshausen. The commandment of love is new in the sense that it is for ever fresh, always renewing itself. Such a meaning seems to be plainly implied in the beautiful antithesis in the Epistle (1Jn_2:7-8), ‘I write no new commandment unto you, but an old commandment. Again, a new commandment I write unto you.’ This passage, however, is a kind of poetical expansion of the idea of a ‘new commandment,’ and cannot be construed as an exegesis. (d) The simplest and most natural explanation is that Christ has in effect established a new morality by His insistence on love as the fulfilment of the Law. In outward form the demand was an old one, and this is acknowledged in the Synoptic parallels by the quotation from Leviticus. But the place assigned to it by Jesus as the sum of the Law, the sovereign principle of the moral life, invests it with a new significance. The ancient morality is superseded by the Christian law of love. The words in the Fourth Gospel thus give expression to the truth which had emerged ever more clearly in the course of later reflexion,—that the teaching of Jesus, based as it was on the religion of the OT, was something radically new. The Law had been not only fulfilled but abrogated. In its place there was a new commandment, a new determining principle for the moral life.

As indicated above, the definition of the Christian ethic as a ‘new commandment’ is in one respect inadequate, and even involves a self-contradiction. The true originality of the moral demand of Jesus consisted in its breaking away from the idea of outward requirement. The Law imposed from without was replaced by the inward spirit of faith and love and obedience. In the Fourth Gospel we have probably the earliest phase of the reaction which ended in the formulation of Christianity as *nova lex*. The development of the Church as an institution was accompanied by a certain externalizing of moral and religious ideas, while at the same time the influence of the OT favoured the relapse into a modified legalism. Thus where St. Paul, in full

accordance with the Synoptics, demanded a new spirit (cf. Rom 12:2, Gal 5:16), the later Church was satisfied with obedience to a 'new law.' The Fourth Gospel appears to mark the transition between these two conceptions of Christian morality. The true character of the 'commandment' is still safeguarded by the profound religious spirit of the Gospel, but the idea of outward ordinance has begun to re-establish itself. In a subsequent age, which had drifted out of sympathy with the original teaching of Jesus, the 'new commandment' became literally the *nova lex*.

Literature.—The Comm. on Joh 13:34 f., 15:12, e.g. Holtzmann, *Hdcom.* (1893); Godet (English translation 1892); Oscar Holtzmann (1887); Bugge (Germ. translation 1894); Loisy, *Le Quatrième. Évangile* (1903); J. Réville, *Le Quatrième Évangile*, 245 f. (1901); cf. also H. J. Holtzmann, *NT Theol.* i. 494 f., ii. 344 f., 389 f. (1897); Stevens, *Johannine Theol.* 266 f. (1900); R. F. Horton, *The Commandments of Jesus*, 319; F. W. Robertson, *Ser.* i. 234; T. T. Carter, *Spirit of Watchfulness*, 206.

E. F. Scott.

☩ New Testament

NEW TESTAMENT.—The expression 'New Testament' (*καινή διαθήκη*) has a double meaning. (1) The New Covenant itself (Luk 22:20, 1Co 11:25, 2Co 3:6 etc.). See artt. Covenant and Testament. No other meaning is possible in the Bible. (2) The books that contain the New Covenant. The latter is the subject of this article.

1. The genesis of a NT literature.—This is to be assigned, humanly speaking, to the slowly developing needs of the Christian society. The Apostles were commissioned not to write but to preach. The OT, interpreted in the light of its fulfilment in Christ, contained both for them and for their earliest converts the whole deposit of Divine truth (2Ti 3:15 etc.). (a) Epistles, as a class, were needed first, in order to settle questions that soon arose on the conversion of Gentiles (Acts 15). Many of the Epistles plainly show their 'occasional' origin (1Co 7:1, 2Co 9:1, Gal 1:6, 2Th 2:1 f. etc.). Formal communications were evidently no new thing in Jewish communities (Act 9:2; Act 28:21). (b) Narratives of Christ's words and works, such as the Gospels, were not at once so necessary. Men were looking for Christ's speedy return (2Th 2:2), and eye-witnesses of His ministry were at first plentiful (Act 1:22, 1Co 15:6). The demand for written and authentic narratives was forcibly realized only when Apostles and eye-witnesses began to pass away (2Pe 1:15 ff., 2Ti 4:6 ff.), and irresponsible persons took in hand to supply the want (Luk 1:1 f.). Yet even in the next generation there lingered a preference for traditional reminiscences, cf. Papias (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 140) ap. Eus. *Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 39. On the shortest reckoning

no Gospel was committed to writing in its present shape within twenty-five years after Christ's Ascension.

2. The canonical reception of NT writings.—This may be said to have passed through three stages, not wholly separable in point of time.

(1) The first stage is that of *collective recognition* (extending roughly to a.d. 170). Christian writers of this period exhibit—(a) Coincidences of language with NT expressions: e.g. Clem. Rom. [Note: Roman.] (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 95); Ign. (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 110); Polyc. (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 116); Barn. (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 70-130); *Didache* (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 90-165); Herm. (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 140-155); Heges. [ap. Eus.] (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 155).—(b) Anonymous references—which seem to have been the set rule for all writers of 'Apologies,' whatever their custom in other works: e.g. Just. M (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 150); *ad Diogn.* (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 170?); also 2 Ep. Clem. (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 140).—(c) Direct references: e.g. Clem., *ad Cor.* xlvi., alludes to 1 Co.; Polyc., *ad Ph.* iii., to Philipians; Papias (before a.d. 150), *ap. Eus. Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 39, mentions a record of Christ's words and deeds by Mark, and 'logia' (originally in Hebrew) by Matthew; Just. M., *Dial.* ciii., speaks of 'Memoirs by Apostles and those that followed them,' and refers to the Apocalypse (*Dial.* lxxxi.) by name.—(d) Dogmatic recensions: Tatian, *Diatessaron* (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 150), harmonized the four Gospels; Marcion (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 140) mutilated Luke and (acknowledging ten Pauline Epistles) rejected the three Pastoral Epistles.—(e) Catalogues: e.g. the Muratorian fragment (composed c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 160), which, according to Westcott, gives 'a summary of the opinion of the Western Church on the Canon shortly after the middle of the 2nd century.'

(2) The second stage is that of *unique authority*.—(a) A succession of contrasts is drawn by Christian writers. (α) Apostles and themselves: cf. all the Apostolic Fathers—Clem. Rom. [Note: Roman.] viii, xlvii.; Polyc. *ad Ph.* iii; Ign. *ad Rom.* [Note: Roman.] iv. ('not as Peter and Paul'); Barn, i, iv ('not as a teacher'). (β) Apostolic records and traditions: Justin M., *ap.* i. 33, says the Memoirs of the Apostles relate 'all things concerning Jesus Christ.' 'These words (Westcott observes) mark the presence of a new age.... Tradition was definitely cast aside as a new source of information.' (γ) Canonical (ἐνδιάθηκοι) and un-canonical (ἀπόκρυφοι) books: generally, e.g. Dionysius of Corinth (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 176), *ap. Eus. Historia Ecclesiastica* iv. 23, says, 'the Scriptures of the Lord ... and those that are not of the same character'; and in detail, e.g. Clem. Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 165-200) *ib.* vi. 14; Origen (a.d. 286-353), *ib.* vi. 25; Dionys. Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 248) *ib.* vii.

25—representing the opinion of Alexandria; Tertullian (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 160-240), *de Pudic.* 20, that of Latin Africa; Caius (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 213), *ap. Eus. Historia Ecclesiastica* vi. 20, that of Rome; Irenaeus (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 135-200), *ib.* v. 8, cf. *Iren. Haer.* iii. 7, that of Asia Minor and Gaul; Serapion (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 190), *ap. Eus. Historia Ecclesiastica* vi. 12, that of Syria. These exhibit substantial agreement, together with variety in detail. From Tertullian's time the general estimate was much as it is to-day.

(b) Illustrations of this developing consciousness are seen in two matters arising from constant use of the books. (i.) *The descriptive titles.* Barnabas, *Ep.* iv., is the first to use the formula 'as it is written' in quoting words taken from the N.T. [= Mat 22:14]. In Justin M., *ap.* i. 66, the term 'Gospels' is first applied to books. Melito of Sardis (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 170), *ap. Eus. Historia Ecclesiastica* iv. 26, refers to 'the books of the Old Testament,' implying undoubtedly by contrast 'the books of the New.' The latter description is expressly used by Irenaeus, *Haer.* ii. 58, and the two Testaments are from that time on a level. Chrysostom is said to have been the first to adopt the expression 'Bible' (τὰ βιβλία) for the two Testaments as one whole. (ii.)

Public reading. For some considerable time (varying much in different places) *profitableness* seems to have been the only absolute test required. Dionys. of Corinth (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 170-175), *ap. Eus. Historia Ecclesiastica* iv. 23, refers to the public reading of a letter from Soter, as well as to the better known instance of the *Ep. of Clem. of Rome*. Eusebius (*ib.* iii. 3) relates that Hermas had formerly been read in public on account of its usefulness for 'elementary instruction.' *Apostolic nature* (*i.e.* practically 'inspiration') was subsequently the regular test: cf. Eus. *l.c.* and Cyril of Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 340), *Catech.* iv. 33-36. Hence δημοσιεύεσθαι under the former conditions refers merely to the fact of public reading; under the latter it is a declaration of canonical authority.

(3) The third stage is that of *formal definition*.—Diocletian's persecution (a.d. 303-311), directed against the Christian Scriptures, proves that their unique position and influence was a matter known to the heathen throughout the Roman Empire. It also made the identification of those Scriptures, as distinct from other Christian books, a vital matter (cf. the history of the Donatist schism on the question of 'traditores'). Eusebius, writing a.d. 313-325, sums up the general consent of that time (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 3, 24, 25), in three classes of books—'acknowledged,' *i.e.* of undisputed authenticity and Apostolic power; 'disputed,' *i.e.* defective in either of those qualities; and 'heretical.' The Emperor Constantine (a.d. 331) caused to be prepared, under the direction of Eusebius, fifty copies of the Divine Scriptures for use in the churches of Constantinople (cf. Eus. *Vit. Const.* iv. 36). These must have become a standard in the Greek Church. It may be added that the evidence of ancient versions, old Latin, Syriac, and Egyptian, is of great importance; but it is of too

complicated a nature to be briefly discussed. Succeeding Councils dealt with the Canon, esp. that of Laodicea (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 363) and the third of Carthage (a.d. 397). The catalogue of canonical books which bears the name of the former is held to be spurious: to the catalogue of Carthage Christendom adheres to-day.

Literature.—The NT (as a whole or its separate portions) forms the subject of well-known ‘Introductions,’ Commentaries, etc. For special information see Sanday, *Inspiration*; Wright, *Synopsis* (oral theory); Westcott, *Canon of NT* and *Bible in the Church*; Moffatt, *The Historical NT*. A work on the ‘Canon and Text of the NT’ (Gregory) is to form part of the *International Theol. Library* series.

F. S. Ranken.

☩ Nicodemus

NICODEMUS.—One of the persons mentioned only in the Fourth Gospel. He is described as a Pharisee and a ruler of the Jews. He had an interview with Jesus by night (Joh_3:1 ff.); and though he did not become an avowed disciple, he protested in the Sanhedrin against the hasty condemnation of Jesus (Joh_7:50 f.); and after the Crucifixion he brought spices to embalm the body of the Lord (Joh_19:39).

The name *Nicodemus* is Greek (from νίκη and δῆμος—‘conqueror of the people’). Josephus (*Ant.* xiv. iii. 2) gives Nicodemus as the name of an ambassador from Aristobulus to Pompey. In the Talmud we have the form נִיְדֵמָא as the name given to a certain Bunai ben Gorion, because, it is said, of a miraculous answer to his prayer. This ben Gorion was a rich man, and is reported to have spent a vast sum on the marriage of his daughter, who afterwards sank into abject poverty. He appears to have had charge of the supply of water to the pilgrims at Jerusalem; and he was accused of being a Christian. Some have identified this man with the Nicodemus of the Gospel; but the positive grounds of identification are insufficient; and there is the negative consideration that ben Gorion is spoken of as living till the siege of Jerusalem, whereas Nicodemus, already in John 3 an elderly man (γέρον, Joh_3:4), could hardly have survived to so late a period. Some writers, who regard the Fourth Gospel as un-historical, suggest that our Nicodemus is simply a typical character, constructed by the Evangelist from the traditions of ben Gorion, with the aid of the Synoptic references to Joseph of Arimathaea. Thus E. [Note: Elohists.] A. Abbott (*Ency. Bib.* art. ‘Nicodemus’) says: ‘Nicodemus ben Gorion passes into the Gospel under the shadow of Joseph of Arimathaea; and speaks of ‘a conflated development of

Joseph into two persons.’ He says that N. ben Gorion was one of three or four who were sometimes called βουλευται, ‘rich men,’ ‘great men of the city,’ and suggests that as an official provider of water he was an appropriate character for a dialogue on regeneration. He concludes that Nicodemus is ‘a Johannine conception representing the liberal, moderate, and well-meaning Pharisee, whose fate it was to be crushed out of existence in the conflict between Judaism and its Roman and Christian adversaries.’ This reconstruction can hardly be persuasive except to those who on other grounds have already judged the Fourth Gospel to be without historic value. The general discussion goes beyond the limit of this article. It is enough to say here that there is nothing in what is related of Nicodemus, or in the circumstances of his connexion with Jesus, which is in itself improbable, or out of harmony with what we are told elsewhere. It is altogether probable that some men of the upper classes and of the Pharisees would be attracted by the personality and teaching of Jesus, and that they would seek with varying degrees of caution to know more of Him. To a certain extent the Synoptics confirm this (cf. [Luk 7:36](#); [Luk 8:3](#); [Luk 19:5](#)). We may add that the personality of Nicodemus stands out clearly in spite of the brevity of the reference to him. The protest in the Sanhedrin shows the same blending of courage with caution as the interview by night. There was a sufficient sense of truth and justice, and of personal interest in Jesus, to enable him to risk the anger of the majority by a protest, but enough of caution or timidity to put the protest into an indirect and tentative form rather than into a bold defence of the Master. The personality of Nicodemus and the conduct ascribed to him do not weaken the case for the historic credibility of the Evangelist.

It has been urged with some measure of plausibility that the conversation in John 3 bears the marks of artificial construction. It is said that it is really a brief sermon by the Evangelist, and follows the regular plan of the Johannine discourses:—a pregnant saying by the Master; a remark by an interlocutor who misunderstands the text by taking it literally and not spiritually; then a further exposition by the speaker: the whole being ‘a thoroughly artificial construction on a set plan’ (Gardner, *A Historic View of the NT*, sec. vi.). There is a very general agreement that the discourses in the Fourth Gospel owe something of their form to the Evangelist. Differences of opinion on that point are almost entirely confined to the question of the extent to which the writer has gone in condensing or re-shaping the Master’s utterances. Without surrendering the conviction that we have a faithful report of the substance of a real conversation, we may readily admit that the Evangelist has put his material into the form which seemed best fitted to make the truth clear to his readers. He is, we may suppose, chiefly interested in Nicodemus ‘as instrumental in eliciting from Jesus’ the sayings which he records. But this does not make Nicodemus a mere lay figure, and his questions mere ‘rhetorical artifice.’

Dr. Gardner says of the question in Joh 3:4 : ‘such crassness is scarcely in human nature.’ Yet when we give due weight to the prejudices of a Pharisee and allow for the deadening effect of respectable religious legalism, it is not hard to understand the sheer bewilderment of Nicodemus at the idea that he—no Gentile, no publican—needed to be born anew. How common it is for men of such a type to be utterly unable to understand even an elementary spiritual truth, if it cuts across their conventions and challenges their privileges. Nicodemus did not at all suppose that a second physical birth was meant. He was simply unable to conceive what kind of new birth could be needed by one who was already a Jew and a keeper of the Law. His questions are simply his bewilderment beating the air.

The last reference to Nicodemus (Joh 19:39) appears to show greater boldness and a more definite discipleship on his part. His gift of spices was certainly an expression of respect and reverence for the Master, and its amount is the lavish gift of a rich man. Whether it expressed faith in the Messiahship of the Crucified, ‘the Saviour typified by the brazen serpent which Jesus had explained to him beforehand (Joh 3:14)’ (Godet), is less certain. Nicodemus may have regarded Jesus simply as a martyred teacher, whose cause had perished, but who deserved to be held in loving memory. He could hardly at that moment have anticipated the Resurrection. He may even have been encouraged to bring his gift by the thought that Jesus dead was no longer feared by the authorities, and that it was no longer a serious risk to show respect to His name.

Christian tradition records many legends of Nicodemus, and his name is associated with one of the Apocryphal Gospels; but nothing further is recorded that has any historical value.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , art. ‘Nicodemus’; Edersheim, *Life and Times*, i. 381; W. Boyd Carpenter, *Son of Man*, 185; W. M. Clow, *In the Day of the Cross*, 279; A. B. Davidson, *The Called of God*, 247; G. Matheson, *Representative Men of the N.T.* 115; *Expos. Times*, iv. (1893) 382, 478, 527, xii. (1901) 210, 307, xiv. (1903) 194; J. Reid, *Jesus and Nicodemus* (1906).

E. H. Titchmarsh.

 Night

NIGHT

1. Associations of the word 'night.'—(a) It was the season for all that demanded *secrecy*. Travellers on a dangerous errand went by night, as Joseph did, after he had received warning in a dream (Mat 2:14). Nicodemus for fear of his colleagues came to Jesus by night at the Passover season; the interview may have been on the roof of some friendly house, or in one of the tents used by the pilgrims (Joh 3:2; Joh 19:39); night was also the time for theft, and drunkenness, and revelling (Luk 12:39, cf. 1Th 5:2; 1Th 5:7, Rom 13:12), and was convenient for plots and stratagems (Mar 14:11). The chief priests bribed the guard to say that the disciples had taken away the body of Jesus *by night* (Mat 28:13).

(b) Night had its peculiar *dangers and annoyances* (cf. Psa 91:5). Travellers might be delayed through stress of circumstances till after nightfall, and even till midnight (Luk 11:5), and such journeys were not without danger; 'if any man walk in the night, he stumbleth' (Joh 11:10, cf. Job 5:14). A modern traveller has spoken of 'the villages by night, without a light, when you stumble on them in the darkness, and all the dogs begin barking' (G. A. Smith, *HGHL [Note: GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.]*, p. 99). Such annoyances would be encountered by the host in the parable, who, coming to beg bread, arrived at midnight after stumbling through the narrow streets of the village (Luk 11:5 etc.).

(c) It was the season when *Divine guidance* might be looked for. Joseph and the Magi were warned in dreams (Mat 2:12-13; Mat 2:19). Pilate's wife suffered many things in a dream because of Jesus (Mat 27:19). To the Israelites the thought of night would always bring the memory of visions and revelations of God, given to their seers, beginning from the nights when Jacob saw the ladder, and wrestled with the angel.

(d) It was the season of *rest* (Joh 11:9; Joh 9:4), but not for all men; shepherds guarded their flocks by night (Luk 2:8); though from November to March the sheep were probably in the fold. The fishermen toiled all night (Luk 5:5, Joh 21:3), when the Lake was often swept by sudden gales (Mar 4:37); the men who could not watch one hour in Gethsemane were accustomed to sleepless nights. In Palestine, as in all Eastern lands, the marriage ceremony was celebrated after nightfall; lamps and torches were always the accompaniment of weddings (cf. Rev 18:23, where the light of the lamp and the voice of the bridegroom are mentioned together). In the parable of the Ten Virgins the guests assembled at nightfall, but they had to tarry till midnight before the bridegroom came, the hour being chosen for the purpose of the parable, because then they would most likely be off their guard (Mat 25:6).

(e) Night was the season of *surprises*. The day of the Lord was to come as a thief in the night (1Th 5:2). In the night the soul of the rich fool was required of him (Luk 12:20). At the coming of the Son of Man 'in that night,' it is said, 'there shall be two in one bed; the one shall be taken, the other shall be left' (Luk 17:34). The

disciples must guard against a surprise: ‘for ye know not when the Lord cometh, whether at even, or at midnight, or at cock-crowing, or in the morning; lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping’ (Mar_13:35). Especial stress is laid upon the mid-watches (Luk_12:38); it would be easy to keep the first watch, and almost impossible to sleep during the watch before the dawn.

(f) The phrases ‘day and night,’ ‘days and nights,’ are used to give a *comprehensive* idea of time (Mat_4:2); or to give an impression of a continuous practice [as when we read that Anna served God night and day (Luk_2:37)], or to indicate the monotonous passage of time: the sower ‘sleeps and rises night and day,’ and nothing happens day after day (Mar_4:27).

2. Divisions of the night.—It is important not to seek the scientific accuracy of modern usage in the NT. Time was divided by natural phenomena. The night varied in length with the seasons of the year; and the length of the four watches into which the night was divided must also have varied (Mat_14:25, Mar_6:48, Luk_12:38). In NT times four watches were recognized, in the OT only three. The division into hours could not be made for the night-season.

‘The division of the day into hours sprang from the use of the sundial, and its peculiar character, the varying length of, the hour, was conditioned by its origin; hours of the night could be measured only by water-glass or some similar means, which would give divisions of equal length during all seasons of the year, and not varying hours like those of the day’ (Ramsay, *Expos*, iv. vii. [1893] p. 219).

The watches of the night are indicated in Mar_13:35 : evening (ὄψια)—midnight—cock-crowing—full morning. It was at eventide, for example, that Jesus sat down with His disciples; before ‘cock-crowing’ Peter denied Him; and in the ‘morning’ Jesus was carried away to Pilate.

3. In the life of Jesus.—Before Jesus called His disciples, He went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer (διανυκτερεύων, Luk_6:12). After the ‘feeding of the five thousand’ also He departed into a mountain to pray (Mar_6:46 || Mat_14:23), and not till the fourth watch did He come to the disciples, spent with their ‘bootless toil.’ From these and other references it is clear that Jesus often made the night His season of prayer. He whose mind was saturated with the OT may have recalled how the prophets had withdrawn to the mountains.

‘So, separate from the world, his breast

Might duly take and strongly keep

The print of Heaven.’—(Keble, *Chr. Year*, 13th Sund. after Trin.).

In the neighbourhood of the Lake, night was the only time of solitude.

‘Save in the recorded hours of our Lord’s praying, the history of Galilee has no intervals of silence and loneliness; the noise of a close and busy life is always audible; and to every crisis in the Gospels and in Josephus we see crowds immediately swarm’ (G. A. Smith, *HGHL [Note: GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.]* p. 421).

It may be urged that Jesus teaches by His example the value of prayer in the silence of night. There are many references to such prayer in the Psalms (cf. Psa_119:62); and it is not without significance that the time is midnight in the parable in which Jesus teaches the lesson of ‘shameless’ prayer (ἀναιδία, Luk_11:8). ‘The thing could never have taken place in the daytime. It is a story of midnight importunity’ (Whyte).

There is no reason to doubt the preference of Jesus for an abode where He would be sure of mountain solitude; we have no record that He entered Tiberias, which was a walled city (*HGHL [Note: GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.]* p. 449). ‘He entered Jericho only to pass through it.’ ‘This freedom Jesus had from childhood’ in Nazareth, Capernaum, Bethany, and other resting-places. When men did not need Him, He must be free to leave them. It is substantially true that ‘Jesus never slept in a walled city’ (see *Expos.* iii. iii. [1886] p. 146). The scenes of rescue on the Lake were in the night-time; then it was He walked upon the sea and stilled the waves (Mar_6:49; cf. Mar_4:39).

The closing incidents of the life of Jesus cannot be pictured except against the background of night. It was dark when they sang a hymn, and went to the Mount of Olives (Mat_26:30). The approach of the soldiers was marked by their lanterns (Joh_18:3). Peter warmed himself in the chilly air before a fire of coals (Joh_18:18). It was possible in the dark to follow undetected afar off (Mat_26:58). The panic of the disciples owed something to the night. It was at cock-crowing that Peter remembered his Master’s warning, and wept bitterly. The air of night is over all these scenes. It was ‘the night in which Jesus was betrayed’ (1Co_11:23).

After the Resurrection, night was falling when Jesus revealed Himself to the two at Emmaus in the breaking of the bread (Luk_24:31). They, on returning to Jerusalem, found the disciples gathered together, and Jesus appeared amongst them. When, for fear of the Jews, the disciples met at eventide, Jesus came to them (Joh_20:19); and it was when the day was breaking that He welcomed His weary disciples to the shore (21:4).

It is impossible to discover with accuracy the character of these Syrian nights, so wide is the variation in the climate between place and place, season and season; it is not clear whether, for example, it is literally true to say, 'For thee I trembled in the nightly frost.' Even when we know the impression made upon the Western traveller, we cannot tell how Jesus and His disciples, hardened by the bracing uplands of Galilee, endured the cold and the mists of night. It is clear that the nights are often as cold as the days are hot (cf. Gen 31:40, Jer 36:30; see Geikie, *The Holy Land and the Bible*, i. 73). At certain seasons in late summer Jesus would be exposed in His nightly vigils to the dense chilly clouds of mist of which the Song of Songs (Son 5:2) speaks: 'For my head is filled with dew, and my locks with the drops of the night.' For modern descriptions of nights spent in the sacred scenes, reference may be made to Warburton's *Crescent and the Cross*, and Kinglake's *Eothen*. But in order to discover the colours, the lights and the half-lights of the Syrian night, those modern painters are the best guides who, like Holman Hunt and William Hole, have studied the Holy Land in the lights and shadows, which are the same as when Jesus watched through the hours of night.

4. Metaphorical applications of 'night.'—The contrast between night and day, darkness and light, belongs to the stock of ideas common to all religions, to the most ancient vocabulary of thought. It is freely used in the OT and NT.

(a) In the opening of the *Synoptic Gospels*, quotations are used to depict as darkness the state of the world before the dawn of Christ (Mat 4:16, Luk 1:79, cf. 2Co 4:6). It is upon such darkness that the gospel shines; and at the consummation of the Kingdom it is the outer darkness that awaits the evil-doers (Mat 8:12; Mat 25:30). Between the two areas of darkness there is the kingdom of light brought in by Jesus, whose disciples were to be the light of the world (Mat 5:14). When Jesus was arrested, He said that the darkness had prevailed (Luk 22:53), for the high priests were the emissaries of darkness. The night was therefore an emblem of all that was set against the Kingdom of God, of the ignorance and corruption of the world which crucified Christ.

(b) *The Fourth Gospel* has a certain framework of contrasts, amongst which is the opposition between the light of Christ and the darkness (Joh 1:5; Joh 8:12; Joh 11:10; Joh 12:35-36; 1Jn 2:8-11). While Christ is revealed as the source of light, His enemies are unmasked as the story proceeds. Though 'darkness' is used in this connexion, it is impossible to escape from the thought of this conflict when we read of 'night' in this Gospel. It is used to denote the close of the divinely appointed day of service (Joh 9:4). The healing of the man born blind was part of the manifestation of God, for which there was a set time. This day being past, neither Jesus nor His disciples could work. 'In the application to Jesus the night is His death, and His retreat into the invisible world' (Loisy). When Jesus persisted, in spite of the warnings

of His disciples, in returning to Judaea, He said that the hours of the day were given for work; so long as it was the appointed time, He would be safe. The one danger was lest the day should be prolonged 'beyond God's appointment.' So prolonged, the day would be as night, in which the traveller stumbles. With both these passages [Luk 22:53](#) should be compared. Night stands also for the close of the day of grace in the life of Judas ([Joh 13:30](#)). Judas went out, 'and it was night.' The darkness is his place. Across the darkness 'less deep than his own soul' he moves from the light of Christ. Night stands for the new environment which he has chosen, 'loving darkness because his deeds were evil.'

(c) *In the Apostolic writings* the night stands for the waning order, which will be ended by the coming of Christ. The day was at hand; the disciples must put off the garments of night, and put on the armour of light ([Rom 13:12](#) etc.). The difference in the metaphorical use of the night may be seen by a comparison of the word of Jesus, 'the night cometh,' with St. Paul's 'the night is far spent.' For those who are of the fellowship of Christ the darkness is already past ([Eph 5:8](#), [1Th 5:4](#), [1Pe 2:9](#)); 'Some daylight it is, and is every moment growing.' The darkness and the light are alternatives, and contemporary.

'But he that hides a dark soul, and foul thoughts,

Benighted walks under the midday sun.'

Night has other associations for the modern mind. It is still the emblem of peril and evil, but it speaks also of quietness and peace; this value it has had for poets from Milton to Whitman.

'Dear night! This world's defeat;

The stop to busie fools; care's check and curb;

The day of spirits; my soul's calm retreat,

Which none disturb!'—(Vaughan).

It is important that the reader should not carry such associations into the study of the NT. There, night has always a sinister suggestion. It speaks of all that is hostile to God, who is light, and in whom there is no darkness at all. The word has changed its value in the commerce of ideas. It is with the night as with the sea. In the OT and NT both are emblems of fear and evil: in the City there will be no night ([Rev 21:25](#)), and the sea is no more ([Rev 21:1](#)). But in the modern mind they awaken other thoughts of attraction and kindness. The writers and teachers of the NT use the coinage of their

age; and though we may conjecture that Jesus had other memories of night than those of fear, yet He did not depart from the customary usage, in which the men of His time took night as significant of terror and evil.

Literature.—W. R. Nicoll, *Ten Minute Sermons*, 103; W. C. E. Newbolt, *Counsels of Faith and Practice*, 62; J. Parker, *Studies in Texts*, vi. 89; W. J. Dawson, *The Evangelistic Note*, 133; W. T. P. Wolston, *Night Scenes of Scripture*.

Edward Shillito.

☞ Nineveh, Ninevites

NINEVEH, NINEVITES.—The great city of Nineveh was on the eastern bank of the Tigris, opposite the modern city of Mosul. (For account of it see art. in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. 553 f.). In Matthew 12 and Luke 11 are grouped several *logia* of our Lord, short pithy passages, each of which appears to be a whole in itself. Two of these contain references to Jonah and the Ninevites.

1. Mat_12:38-40 || Luk_11:29-30. It would seem that on two occasions, the second of which is narrated in these passages, the Pharisees asked for a sign. Christ's preaching and miracles were not enough for them. They wanted Him to prove His Divine mission by some overwhelming marvel that would force them to believe in it, if it were truly Divine. The first occasion is in Mar_8:11 f. || Mat_16:1-4, where they asked for 'a sign from heaven.' This He met with a definite refusal (Mk.). St. Matthew, however, adds to the answer words which really belonged to the second occasion—'except the sign of Jonah.' The answer on the second occasion contains this exception in both Gospels. (In St. Matthew the Pharisees are addressed, in St. Luke the multitudes 'when they were coming crowding up,' ἐπαθροισζομένων). But the meaning of the explanation which our Lord adds is somewhat obscure: 'for as Jonah became to the Ninevites a sign, so shall also the Son of Man be to this generation' (Lk.). It is important to notice that the 'sign' did not consist in the *preaching* of Jonah and of the Son of Man. Jesus had been preaching already, whereas the sign was still future ('shall be'). And the story of Jonah in the OT does not, of itself, throw any light on the difficulty. Jonah started from Joppa to sail westward (Tarshish), and the storm occurred near enough to the shore to make the sailors try to row back for safety. When Jonah, therefore, was vomited up by the fish on to the dry land, it was presumably near Joppa. Then he received the second command to go to Nineveh. According to the story, therefore, Jonah was in no sense a sign *to the Ninevites*. One of two conclusions is inevitable; either that there was a current Haggadic tradition about Jonah and Nineveh which was known to our Lord and His hearers but has been lost to us, or that the word

'Ninevites' has supplanted some other word in the original text of St. Luke, having been introduced by the influence of Luk 11:32. St. Matthew obviates the difficulty by omitting the name altogether; but he (or some later writer, cf. Sanday, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 433) represents our Lord as teaching that 'as "Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale" (= Jon 1:17), so shall the Son of Man be in the heart of the earth three days and three nights.' The 'sign of Jonah' is thus the sign of the resurrection. That, and that only, will be the supreme vindication of Christ's Divine mission. [In St. Luke's passage, after Luk 11:30 D [Note: Deuteronomist.] and some Latin Manuscripts add the harmonistic statement καὶ καθὼς Ἰωνᾶς ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τοῦ κήτους ἐγένετο τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας οὕτως καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ γῆ, 'and as Jonah (was) in the belly of the whale three days and three nights, so also (is, or shall be) the Son of Man in the earth.' It is conceivable that this was the more original form of the words in St. Matthew]. The question whether this passage necessitates the belief that our Lord accepted the story of Jonah as historically true is dealt with in art. Jonah.

2. Mat 12:41 || Luk 11:32. The words in the two Gospels are identical. [D [Note: Deuteronomist.] omits the whole passage in St. Luke]. St. Matthew places side by side the two *logia* relating to Jonah, and then introduces the one that relates to Solomon and 'the queen of the south.' St. Luke transposes the latter two, 'either for chronology, or effect, or both' (Plummer). Our Lord again addresses the 'evil generation.' 'Ninevites (ἄνδρες Νινευεῖται, no article; Authorized and Revised Versions 'the men of Nineveh') shall stand up (as witnesses) in the judgment with this generation and shall condemn it, because they repented in accordance with the message preached by Jonah (εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ),' whereas this generation has not repented though a far greater than Jonah is preaching to it; 'something greater (πλεῖον, cf. Luk 11:31, Mat 12:6) than Jonah is here.'

A. H. M'Neile.

☩ Noah

NOAH.—The hero of the Hebrew version of the Semitic tradition of the Flood; mentioned twice in the Gospels. In the genealogy of Jesus (Luk 3:36) he appears in the ninth generation after Adam, as in the OT narrative. The second mention is in Luk 17:26-27 || Mat 24:37-38, where Jesus uses the Flood in the days of Noah to illustrate the sudden and unexpected coming of the Son of Man; the indifference of

the people in the time of Noah is paralleled by the indifference of men to this approaching event.

The use of the illustration shows the familiarity of the Jews with the story of Noah. In the OT there is but the slightest mention of him outside of the immediate Flood-story in Genesis. The writer of Isa 54:9 describes the present distresses of Israel 'as the waters of Noah,' to be followed by peace, according to the unchangeable covenant of peace, as surely as the promise and the covenant followed the Flood. Ezekiel (Eze 14:14; Eze 14:20) knows of three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job, efficient mediators to deliver the people by their righteousness; but in the present case, even the three shall be able to deliver only themselves (see also Heb 11:7).

O. H. Gates.

☒ Nobleman

NOBLEMAN.—This word is derived from the Lat. *nobilis* (= *gnô-bilis*), 'well-known,' 'notable.' In usage the ennobling which makes a man notable may come (a) from rank inherited or conferred, (b) from office, or (c) from character. With the meaning (c) 'nobleman' does not occur in the NT, nor has it often this significance in English authors. 'A noble man' should be used, when it is desired to convey the thought expressed in Dryden's lines;

'A nobleman is he whose noble mind

Is filled with inborn worth.'

In the Authorized and Revised Versions 'a certain nobleman' is the translation of two different Gr. phrases, viz. (1) ἄνθρωπος τις εὐγενής, Luk 19:12; (2) τις βασιλικός, Joh 4:46; Joh 4:49.

1. In the parable of the Pounds (Luk 19:11 ff.) the literal rendering of the Gr. phrase is 'a certain well-born man,' or, more idiomatically expressed, 'a man of noble family' (Weymouth). The nobility comes from inherited rank. Inadequate translations are those of Wyclif 'a worthi man,' and of most early English versions 'a noble man.' The 'nobleman' of this parable is probably Archelaus, who, on the death of his father, Herod the Great, went to Rome in order to urge his claims to the kingdom. An 'ambassage' of fifty Jews followed Archelaus from Jerusalem to the 'far country' in order to protest against his being made king; in other words, they went to Rome to say, 'We will not that this man reign over us' (Luk 19:14).

2. The Gr. word used in Joh_4:46; Joh_4:49 means ‘belonging to a king’ (cf. Jam_2:8 ‘royal’). Wyclif ‘a litil kyng,’ like the Vulgate *regulus*, follows the false reading βασιλίσκος. More adequate renderings are AVm [Note: Vm Authorized Version margin.] ‘courtier,’ or ‘ruler’; (Revised Version margin) ‘king’s officer.’ The nobility comes from office. Weymouth expresses the meaning well: ‘a certain officer of the king’s court.’ Josephus (*BJ* vii. v. 2, *Ant.* xv. viii. 4) uses the word to distinguish the courtiers and other officers of the king from those, of Rome. The ‘king’ in whose court this officer served was Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee. The title ‘king’ was not his by right, but was given to him in courtesy (Mat_14:9). It is not known who this king’s officer was, nor whether his duties were civil or military. He has wrongly been identified with the ‘centurion’ (ἐκατόνταρχος) referred to in Mat_8:5 and Luk_7:2,—a Gentile officer in the army of Antipas. To identify the healing of the nobleman’s son with the healing of the centurion’s servant is not only to manufacture discrepancies, but also to lose the light which the earlier miracle casts upon the later one. This is well brought out by Chadwick (*Expositor*, 4th series, v. 443 ff.); the strong faith of the centurion (Mat_8:10) ‘becomes intelligible, without ceasing to be admirable, when we reflect that he was evidently aware of the miracle formerly wrought for another inhabitant of the same city, an eminent person, one of the court which his own sword protected.’

J. G. Tasker.

⚠ Non-Resistance

NON-RESISTANCE.—See Retaliation.

⚠ Numbers

NUMBERS.—In this article it is above all things necessary to distinguish carefully between passages in which numbers are used only in the ordinary way and those in which they are connected with some custom or belief, or have for any reason symbolic significance, whether secular or sacred. Three facts must be borne in mind throughout the inquiry: (1) the Oriental preference of round numbers to indefinite statements; (2) the close association in Western Asia from early times of numbers and religion. It seems to be proved that each of the chief Babylonian gods had his number: Anu, for example, 60, Bel 50, Ea 40, Sin 30, Marduk, as identified with Jupiter, 11, etc. (*KAT* [Note: *AT Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Test.*] [ZW] 454). And it is

equally certain that number often played an important part in ritual. (3) The gradual obliteration of the original reference from the popular consciousness. By the time of Christ the process by which certain numbers had acquired special significance would be wholly or partially forgotten by most of the Jews resident in Palestine. They had received their use from their fathers, and found it expressed in literature and ceremonial and daily life, but knew little, if anything, of the way in which it had originated, so that it is very unsafe to credit them with conscious application of ideas current elsewhere. The Jews who lived in Babylonia from about b.c. 600 to the completion of the Babylonian Talmud unquestionably adopted in course of time many Babylonian thoughts and expressions; but this cannot be assumed, at any rate in the same degree, of the Jews of the Holy Land.

Seven.—Of the significant numbers met with in the Gospels the most prominent is that so freely used in the OT and the other literature of the Semitic area—the number seven, represented in the Gr. Test. by *ἐπτά*, *ἐπτάκις*, *ἑπταπλασίων*, *ἕβσομος*. In three contexts it must be understood literally, although perhaps in the first two with an underlying reference to another use: in the statement that Anna's married life lasted 7 years (Luk 2:36), in the accounts of the feeding of the 4000 (7 loaves, 7 baskets, Mat 15:34; Mat 15:36 f., Mar 8:5-6; Mar 8:8; cf. also the references in Mat 16:10 and Mar 8:20), and in a note of time, 'the seventh hour' (Joh 4:52). In all other passages: Mat 12:45; Mat 18:21 f., 28, Mar 12:20; Mar 12:22 f., Mar 12:16 [9] Luk 8:2; Luk 11:26; Luk 17:4; Luk 18:30 (a doubtful reading) Luk 20:29; Luk 20:31; Luk 20:33; in the number of the Beatitudes relating to character (Mat 5:3-9); in the 7 disciples at the Lake (Joh 21:2); and in the grouping together of 7 parables of the Kingdom in Matthew 13—it has some kind of special significance. In the Apocalyptic passages which come within the scope of this study, the literal meaning combined with the symbolic may be recognized in the 7 churches (Rev 1:11; Rev 1:20), the 7 candlesticks (Rev 1:12; Rev 1:20, Rev 2:1), the 7 stars (Rev 1:16; Rev 1:20, Rev 2:1, Rev 3:1), and the 7 angels (Rev 1:20). Elsewhere, in the 7 seals (Rev 5:1; Rev 5:5), the 7 horns, the 7 eyes, and the 7 spirits (Rev 4:5, Rev 5:6), the use is purely symbolic.

This symbolic or, to speak more generally, non-literal use is very frequent in the Jewish literature of the period extending from about b.c. 150 to about a.d. 100, the period which includes the time covered by the Gospels. The following are a few examples out of many. We read of 7 heavens (Slav. Enoch 3 ff.; Test. of Levi, 2 f.; cf. Charles in *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times.*] vii. [1895] 57 ff.), 7 angels (To 12:15, Ethiopic Enoch 81:5), and 7 high mountains, 7 large rivers, and 7 great islands (Ethiopic Enoch 77:4, 5, 8). Man is said to have been made by the Divine Wisdom of 7 substances (Slav. Enoch 30:8), and to have received 7 natures (30:9). Seven great works were made on the first day of creation (Jub 2:3); Adam and Eve lived 7 years in

Paradise (3:15); at the Deluge 7 sluices were opened in heaven, and 7 fountains of the great deep in earth (5:24); and Jacob is said to have kissed his dying grandfather 7 times (22:26).

In this non-literal use of the number, three shades of significance can perhaps be traced, (a) It was a favourite *round number*. Instead of 'many' or 'a considerable number,' an Oriental in many cases preferred to say 'seven.' This is probably the force of the number in Peter's question about forgiveness (Mat 18:21); in our Lord's command of sevenfold forgiveness for sevenfold injury (Luk 17:4); in the promise (Luk 18:30, according to some Manuscripts) of sevenfold reward (*ἑπταπλασίονα* instead of the usual reading *πολλαπλασίονα*); in the references to the 7 evil spirits (Mat 12:45, Mar 16:9, Luk 8:2; Luk 11:26); in the question of the Sadducees about the 7 brothers (Mat 22:25 etc.); and in the passages alluded to in the Book of Jubilees.—(b) Seven often expressed the idea of *completeness*. So in 7 churches, 7 parables of the Kingdom, the 7 Beatitudes above mentioned, perhaps in the 7 loaves and the 7 disciples, and some of the passages referred to in the Books of Enoch. This use of 7 in the ancient East is directly attested by some cuneiform texts which explain a sign consisting of 7 wedges as meaning 'totality,' 'whole' (Zimmern in *Busspsalmen*, p. 73).—(c) Seven was for the Jews and all their neighbours from early times a *sacred number*. In our Lord's day there were many features of Jewish religious life which kept the sacredness of 7 continually before the mind: the observance of the 7th day and the 7th year; the 7 days of unleavened bread and of the Feast of Tabernacles; the 7 sprinklings of the leper (Lev 14:7); the 7 sprinklings of the blood of the bullock in the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:14); the 7 he-lambs prescribed as an offering for several important occasions (Num 28:11; Num 28:19; Num 28:27; Num 29:36); the 7 days of seclusion for uncleanness or suspected uncleanness (Lev 13:4; Lev 13:6; Lev 13:26; Lev 14:9; Lev 15:13; Lev 15:19; Lev 15:24; Lev 15:28, Num 12:14-15 etc.). the sevenfold march round the altar on the 7th day of the Feast of Tabernacles (Mishna, *Sukkah* iv. 4); and the seven-branched candlestick in the Temple (Josephus *Ant.* iii. vi. 7, the Arch of Titus). For all classes of Jewish society in the period of our Lord's ministry the number 7 was inseparably associated with the most solemn seasons and the most important acts of worship. There is no direct illustration of this sacredness of 7 in the Gospels, but it can be confidently traced in Apocalyptic imagery: in the 7 candlesticks (Rev 1:12; Rev 1:20; Rev 2:1) which evidently allude to the seven-branched candlestick in the Temple, and in the 7 horns of the Lamb, and the 7 eyes which are the 7 spirits of God sent out into all the earth (Rev 5:6; cf. Rev 4:5). In non-canonical literature it is found in the 7 heavens and the 7 angels, and in the remarkable description in the so-called Fourth Book of Maccabees of the 7 brothers put to death by Antiochus Epiphanes as a most holy 7 (*παναγία συμφώνων ἀδελφῶν ἑβδομάς*), who circled round piety in choral dance

like the 7 days of creation round the number 7 (4Ma 14:7 f., according to the emended text followed by Deissmann in Kautzseh's *Pseudepigraphen*, p. 169). The rise and development of these shades of meaning, which to some extent melt into one another (for the use of 7 as the number of completeness was probably connected with its sacred use, and its employment as a round number may have been facilitated by the other uses), are questions which hardly come within the range of this article, as the process must have been completed millenniums before the Christian era. Seven is distinctly a sacred number in the inscriptions of Gudea the ruler of Lagash some centuries before the time of Abraham (*RP [Note: P Records of the Past.]*, new series, ii. 83, 94 ff.). Whatever the primary impulse, whether the observation of the phases of the moon, or of the 7 planets, or of the 7 brightest stars of the Pleiades, or of the 7 stars of Arcturus, or of the 7 stars of the Great Bear, which all attracted the attention of early star-gazers, the Jews of our Lord's age (with a few exceptions) will have used the number simply as their fathers had used it for many generations, as they found it in ritual, in proverbial lore (Pro 6:16; Pro 6:31; Pro 9:1; Pro 26:16; Pro 26:25, Sir 7:3; Sir 20:12; Sir 35:11; Sir 37:14; Sir 40:8), in other literature, in history (Jos 6:4, Jdg 6:1; Jdg 16:7; Jdg 16:13, 2Sa 24:13, 2Ki 5:10 etc.), and in common life (7 days of the marriage feast, To 11:18; and 7 days of fasting and mourning, 1Sa 31:13, Job 2:13, *Móed Katon 27^b*). A few highly educated men associated the number with astral phenomena; the pseudo-Enoch, for example (*Slav. Enoch 30:3*), and Josephus, who affirms that the 7 lamps of the candlestick imitated the number of the 7 planets (τῶν πλανητῶν τὸν ἀριθμὸν μεμιμημένοι, *Ant.* iii. vi. 7); but most will have had little or no acquaintance with such speculations.

One use of the number in the Gospels which has been already briefly referred to needs fuller treatment. In three or four passages, which are really but two, mention is made of 7 evil spirits. Our Lord cast 7 devils or demons out of Mary Magdalene (Luk 8:2, Mark 16 :[9]), and He spoke of an evil spirit which had been cast out as returning with 7 other spirits worse than himself (Mat 12:45, Luk 11:26). It has been suggested, cautiously by Zimmern (*KAT [Note: AT Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Test.] [ZW] 462-463*), positively by R. C. Thompson of the British Museum (*Devils and Evil Spirits of Babylonia*, i. xliii.), that these 7 are connected in some way with the evil 7 so often referred to in Babylonian incantations, and identified to some extent with winds and storms. That the Babylonian belief was widely diffused in the regions affected by Babylonian civilization is probable enough, and that it lingered in one district at any rate into Christian times is attested by a curious Syrian charm cited by Thompson; but there seems to be no clear allusion to it in the extant Jewish literature of the period inclusive of the time of Christ. The 7 spirits put by Beliar into man, according to the Test, of Reuben (2 f.), are mere abstractions. The whole passage seems to be a sort of allegory. And it must be remembered that the Test., as we have it, has been manipulated by a Christian, who would be familiar with the

passages in the Gospels under consideration. The use of 7 in the latter can be fully accounted for without any reference to Babylonia.

In the Holy Land and amongst the Arabs there are still many echoes of the ancient use of 7 as shown in the preceding paragraphs. Dalman's *Diwan* contains several examples of it as a round number in popular poetry (pp. 260, 287, 305, 309). Mourning for relatives and marriage rejoicings extend amongst the Arabs over 7 days (Forder's *With the Arabs in Tent and Town*, 216, 218). If the person is stained with blood, the stain is washed 7 times (Robinson Lees, *Village Life in Palestine*, 2nd ed. 218). A festival at Nebi Musa lasts 7 days (Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*, 163). These illustrations show that the modern Oriental not only employs 7 as a round number, but sometimes associates it in some measure with the ideas of completeness and sanctity.

Three and a half.—Of the symbolic use of the half of seven there is one instance in the Gospels, viz. the reference to the famine in the time of Elijah as lasting three years and six months (Luk 4:25, cf. Jam 5:17). This number, the half of the number of completeness, seems to have been often used by the Jews of periods of trial and judgment. According to Josephus (*BJ* i. i. 1, v. ix. 4), the worship of the Temple was discontinued in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes for three years and six months; and, according to the Midrash on Lam 1:5, the siege by Vespasian continued for the same period (cf. Dan 7:25; Dan 9:27; Dan 12:7, Rev 11:2, and Wetstein's note on the last passage).

Fourteen.—The double of 7 in the genealogy at the beginning of Matthew can hardly be accidental. When the Evangelist carefully divides the generations from Abraham to Christ into three groups of 14 each (Mat 1:17), he must intend the number to have some meaning. He does not forget that it is the double of a favourite round number which is at the same time suggestive of completeness. This multiple of 7 seems to have been common in old Canaan, for scores of the Tell el-Amarna Letters from Canaanites to the Pharaoh have some form of the salutation: 'Seven and seven times I fall at the feet of the king my lord.' A striking example of the use of a multiple of 7 in a scheme of history is supplied by a writing composed probably within a hundred years of our Lord's ministry, 'the Book of Jubilees' or 'Little Genesis.' The writer arranges the whole period from Adam to the giving of the Law in about 7 times 7 jubilees, the interval between two jubilees being 7 times 7 years (50:4).

Seventy.—Of another much used multiple of 7, $7 \times 10 = 70$, there is only one instance in the Gospel narrative, the sending out by Jesus of the 70 disciples (Luk 10:1; Luk 10:17). It must be noted, however, that WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] read (with BD, some OL, Vulgate, Syr [Note: yr Syriac.] ^{cur} and Syr [Note: yr Syriac.] ^{sin}) 72, the multiple of 6 by 12. In either case the use of 70, of which there

are so many examples in the OT and elsewhere (Gen 50:3, Exo 1:5; Exo 15:27, Num 11:16, Jdg 1:7; Jdg 8:30, 2Ki 10:1, 2Ch 29:32, Psa 90:10, Jer 25:11, Eze 8:11, Dan 9:24, Ethiopic Enoch 89:59 'the 70 shepherds,' Test. of Levi, c. 8, 2Es 14:46; Josephus *Vita*, 11, *BJ* ii. xx. 5; Bk. of Jub 11:20 clouds of ravens returned 70 times; *Sanhedrin* i. 6 the high court of justice with 70 members and president) as a round number for 'very many,' with perhaps the added idea of comprehensiveness, may be safely recognized as influential.

The Rabbinic idea of 70 languages for the 70 peoples is found in the Mishna (*Sota* vii. 5), and so may be as old as the time of Christ, but can hardly be alluded to in a mission intended only for Jews. Dr. A. Jeremias (*Babylonisches im NT*, 93) regards 70 as used in the Gospel as 'a round number with astral character;' but any reference to the stars is unnecessary and improbable. Babylonian astrologers might be credited with it, but not the Galilaeans of our Lord's time and the Evangelists.

Seventy times seven.—The 70 times 7 of Mat 18:22, the multiple of 10 times 7 by 7, is a very strong way of saying 'very many times,' almost equivalent to 'without limit.' The alternative rendering of (Revised Version margin) 'seventy times and seven,' which yields a much less emphatic meaning, rests on the LXX Septuagint translation of Gen 4:24 where the same Greek ἑβδομηκοντάκις ἑπτὰ represents Hebrew words which clearly mean 77. In Mt. the familiar rendering is distinctly preferable. Wellhausen (*Das Evangelium Matthaei*, 94) notes that D [Note: Deuteronomist.] reads ἑπτάκις for ἑπτὰ, which is strictly correct (but cf. Moulton, *Proleg. Gr. Gram.* 98).

Ten (δέκα, δέκατος, ἀποδεκατεύω ἀποδεκατόω).—The number ten is probably a round number in the parables of the 10 virgins (Mat 25:1), the 10 pieces of silver (Luk 15:8), the talents (Mat 25:28), and the 10 servants who received 10 pounds (Luk 19:13; Luk 19:16 f., Luk 19:24 f.); and in the prediction to the Church of Smyrna of tribulation 10 days (Rev 2:10). In other passages (Mat 20:24, Mar 10:41, Luk 14:31; Luk 17:12; Luk 17:17, and the references to the payment of a tenth to God, Mat 23:23, Luk 11:42; Luk 18:12) it is used literally. As a round number significant of completeness (although without the idea of sacredness associated with 7), its use was facilitated by the decimal system, which may have been suggested in the first instance by the number of fingers on the two hands. Be that as it may, the Jews of our Lord's day found 10 again and again in their sacred books and in history; for example, in the 10 patriarchs from Adam to Noah (Genesis 5); the 10 righteous men whose presence would have saved Sodom (Gen 18:32); the 10 commandments (Exo 34:12-26; Exo 20:2-17, Deu 5:6-21); the 10 temptations with which Israel tempted God in the wilderness (Num 14:22); the 10 curtains of the tabernacle (Exo 26:1); the 10 lavers (2Ch 4:6); the 10 candlesticks (v. 7) and the 10 tables (v. 8)

in Solomon's temple; the 10 servants of Gideon (Jdg 6:27), and the 10 elders of Boaz (Rth 4:2).

The non-canonical literature of later times supplies many additional examples. The Book of Jubilees knows of 10 temptations of Abraham (19:8), a thought found also in the Mishna ('*Abóth* v. 4), and the Test, of Joseph of 10 temptations of Joseph (ch. 2). The fondness of the Rabbis for the number receives striking illustration from the long series of significant tens in '*Abóth* v. 1-9. The number was also applied in daily life. Ten persons constituted the minimum required for a community or congregation (Mishna, *Sanhedrin* i. 6), and for a company at a Paschal supper (Josephus *BJ* vi. ix. 3). Later authorities fix 10 as the number of persons drawn up in a row to comfort mourners (*Sanh.* 19a) and as the number requisite for the utterance of the nuptial benediction (*Kethuboth*, 7b). The 10 virgins of the parable may possibly receive illustration from an Arab custom mentioned by some mediaeval Jewish writers. They affirm that in the land of the Ishmaelites, when the bride was taken from her father's house to her new home on the evening preceding the completion of the marriage festivities, 10 torches or lamps were borne in front of her. The authority is, it is true, very late, but the custom described may have been of ancient origin (given in the gloss to *Kelim* ii. 8, 9b, and in Latin in Wetstein's note on Mat 25:1). The payment of a tithe or tenth to the Deity, referred to twice by our Lord (Luk 18:12, Mat 23:23 || Luk 11:42), must have been connected in the first instance with the symbolic use of 10. The custom has been traced among Hebrews, Babylonians, Phœnicians, Greeks and Romans. The prominence of the subject in later Judaism is attested by the great space devoted to it in the Mishna, three treatises with 150 *hălâkhóth*.

Five.—Five, the half of ten, is met with in a considerable number of passages in the Gospels, in some of which it may have more than mere numerical significance. So perhaps in the 5 loaves (Mat 14:17; Mat 14:19; Mat 16:9, Mar 6:38; Mar 6:41; Mar 8:19, Luk 9:13; Luk 9:16, Joh 6:9; Joh 6:13), a great multitude fed by an amount of food strongly suggestive of smallness and incompleteness; the 5 talents which bring in 5 more (Mat 25:15 f., 20); the fivefold profit of the second servant in the parable of the Pounds contrasted with the tenfold profit of the first (Luk 19:18 f.); perhaps the 5 sparrows worth two farthings (Luk 12:6); and the 5 disciples of Jesus at the beginning of His ministry (Joh 1:35-51; cf. the 5 disciples of R. Jochanan ben Zakai, c. [Note: circa, about.] 80 a.d. [*'Abóth*, ii. 10], and the 5 disciples ascribed to Jesus in a *baraitha* removed from the censored editions of the Talmud [*Sanh.* 43a, see Laible's *Jesus Christus im Talmud*, Anhang 15]). In the other passages (Mat 25:2, Luk 1:24; Luk 12:52; Luk 14:19; Luk 16:28, Joh 4:18; Joh 5:2) it is safest to find only the ordinary meaning. Five, as a small round number, is repeatedly met with in the OT (Gen 43:34; Gen 45:22, Lev 26:8, Isa 30:17 etc.) and in the Tell el-Amarna letters, in one of the latter (ix. 20 in Winckler's edition) it seems to be regarded as a number so small as to need an apology.

Forty.—An important multiple of ten is 40, found in the accounts of the Temptation (Mat 4:2, Mar 1:13, Luk 4:2) and of the period intervening between the Passion and the Ascension (Act 1:3). That it is in both cases more than a mere number is evident. The 40 days of fasting in the wilderness clearly point back to the 40 days spent by Moses on Sinai (Exo 24:18; Exo 34:28) and the 40 days' journey of Elijah in the same region (1Ki 19:8). The 40 days of temptation remind us of the repeated use in the OT of the number 40 of periods of testing or punishment. The rain at the Flood fell 40 days and 40 nights (Gen 7:4; Gen 7:17). The spies were absent 40 days (Num 13:25). The punishment and proving of the people extended over 40 years (Num 14:34). Nineveh was granted 40 days of respite (Jon 3:4). The Philistine oppression lasted 40 years (Jdg 13:1), and Ezekiel predicted that Egypt should be desolate 40 years (Eze 29:11). That this application of the number was not confined to Israel is probable from the statement on the Moabite Stone (lines 7 f.), that the occupation of Mehedeba by Israel lasted 40 years. Even if king Mesha intended the number to be understood literally, which is very doubtful, he may have recorded it with a view to its special significance. In another group of passages, also, 40 seems to be a normal or ideal number. Three periods of rest from foreign invasion, each of 40 years, are mentioned in the Book of Judges (Jdg 3:11; Jdg 5:31; Jdg 8:28). Eli was judge for 40 years (1Sa 4:18); and the reigns of David and Solomon are reckoned at 40 years each (2Sa 5:4, 1Ki 11:42 : add from tradition the reign of Saul, Act 13:21 Josephus *Ant.* vi. xiv. 9).

How did 40 come to be used in this way? The most satisfactory answer is suggested by the following passages in the OT and other Oriental literature and history. Isaac and Esau married at 40 (Gen 25:20; Gen 26:34). Moses came forward as a friend of his people about 40 (tradition recorded in Act 7:23; cf. Exo 2:11 'when Moses was grown up'), and began his work as their divinely appointed leader 40 years later (Act 7:30 and Exo 7:7). Caleb was 40 years old when sent out as one of the spies (Jos 14:7). Hillel is said to have entered on his Rabbinic career at 40 (*Sifre* referred to in *Jewish Encyc.* art. 'Forty'), and Jochanan ben Zakai to have exchanged commerce for study at 40 (*Rosh ha-shanah*, 31*b*: the same is affirmed of 'Akiba in the late writing, the 'Abôth of Rabbi Nathan, c. 6). Mohammed, according to a tradition referred to by König (*Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible* iii. 563^b, *Stilistik*, 55; cf. Muir, *The Coran, its Composition and Teaching*, 11), appeared as a prophet at or about 40. These passages suggest that 40 was regarded in the ancient East as the age of intellectual maturity, and there are not wanting direct declarations of that belief. In the addendum to the fifth chapter of 'Abôth, 40 is described as the age of reason or understanding (לבינה ארבעים נן), and a passage in the Koran cited by König (*ll. cc.*) runs: 'until he reached his full strength and attained the age of 40 years.' Forty years, therefore, represented a generation, and thus the number 40 became a round number for a full period, a complete epoch, and more generally for 'many.'

It is still used in this way to some extent in the modern East. There is a Syrian proverb: 'If you live 40 days with people, you will then either leave them or become like them' (Mackie, *Bible Manners and Customs*, 111; Bauer, *Volksleben im Lande der Bibel*, 236, gives it rather differently, but with the same use of 40). As the ancient star-gazers noted the disappearance of the Pleiades for 40 days, some recent writers (Cheyne, perhaps, *Bible Problems and their Solution*, 114 f., and Winekler cited there; Zimmern, too, in *KAT [Note: AT Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Test.] [ZW]*, 389, thinks the reference possible) connect the interval between the Passion and the Ascension, through a pre-Christian myth, with this astronomical period. This need not be seriously debated. The explanation given above is quite sufficient to account for the 40 days of the Temptation and 'the Great Forty Days.'

A Hundred (ἑκατόν, ἑκατονταπλασίων).—That the product of 10 by 10 should be frequently used in a general way to express a large number, could be expected only in a civilization which was acquainted with the decimal as well as the sexagesimal system. There are instances in the OT, etc.: Lev 26:8, 2Sa 24:3, Pro 17:10, Ecc 6:3; Ecc 8:12, Sir 18:9 (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 : 'The number of man's days at the most are 100 years'), and the Moabite Stone (lines 28 f.: 'I reigned over 100 chiefs'). In the Gospels the number is used mainly in this way: in the parable of the Sower (Mat 13:8; Mat 13:23, Mar 4:8; Mar 4:20, Luk 8:8), in the parable of the Lost Sheep (Mat 18:12, Luk 15:4), and in Mat 18:28; Mat 19:29 (not WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.]), Mar 10:30, Luk 16:6 f. In Mar 6:40, Joh 19:39 it is employed in the ordinary way.

The division of 100 into 99 and 1 (Mat 18:12 f., Luk 15:4; Luk 15:7), with the preference of the 1, is found in the Mishna, *Peah* iv. 1 f. The same division is also met with in a remarkable passage in the Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] Talmud (*Shabbath* xiv. 3), which, however, is not earlier than the 3rd cent. a.d. Perhaps the contrast of 90 and 1 was not unknown to the Rabbinic teaching of our Lord's day.

Ten Thousand.—In the two passages in the Gospels in which the multiple of 10 by 1000 occurs (μυρία, Mat 18:24; μυριάς, Luk 12:1), it is best regarded as hyperbolic. The intention in the one case is to name an amount quite inconceivable in ordinary life, a debt which could not possibly be discharged by a private person; in the other, to impress on the reader the enormous magnitude of the crowds which gathered round Jesus at that period of His ministry. There are many examples of this use in the OT (Lev 26:8, Deu 32:30, 1Sa 18:7 f., Ca 5:10, Eze 16:7 (Revised Version margin), Dan 11:12, Mic 6:7 etc.). In the Tell el-Amarna letters 100,000 is used in this way. Dushratta, king of Mitani, prayed that Ishtar might protect him and his royal brother the Pharaoh for a hundred thousand years (No. xx. in Winckler's edition).

Two.—There seems to be no special significance of the number 2 in the Gospels, unless, with König (*Stilistik*, 51 f.), we regard it as, in some passages, an equivalent for ‘a few.’ This idiom seems to be proved for the OT. ‘Two days,’ in Num 9:22, may well mean ‘a few days’; and ‘the 2 sticks’ of the widow of Zarephath (1Ki 17:12) can hardly be understood literally. It *may* be illustrated in the NT by the 2 fishes (Mat 14:17; Mat 14:19, Mar 6:38; Mar 6:41, Luk 9:13; Luk 9:16, Joh 6:9), and the 2 who agree in prayer concerning anything (Mat 18:19); but the ordinary interpretation seems not inadmissible in both these cases. The custom of sending out representatives in pairs, of which there are several examples in the Gospel story (the 2 disciples sent by the Baptist to Jesus [Luk 7:19], the 12 sent out by two and two [Mar 6:7], the 70 sent out by two and two [Luk 10:1], the 2 sent out near Jerusalem [Mat 21:1, Mar 11:1, Luk 19:29], and the 2 sent out to make preparations for the Paschal supper [Mar 14:13, Luk 22:8; cf. the 2 going to Emmaus, Luk 24:13 ff., Mark 16 :[12]], the 2 angels at the sepulchre [Luk 24:4, Joh 20:12], and the 2 on Olivet [Act 1:10]), was probably known to the Jewish society of our Lord’s time.

A comparatively early tradition enjoined that the collectors of charity should travel in couples (*Baba Bathra*, 8b). When the son of Rabban Gamaliel (the grandson of St. Paul’s Gamaliel) was ill, the distressed father sent two of his disciples to R. Chanina ben Dosa to request his prayers (*Berak.*, 34b). The 5 *zugoth* or couples of eminent teachers, the last of which consisted of Hillel and Shammai, referred to in the Mishna (*Peah* ii. 6, ‘*Abôth* i. 4-16), may also be mentioned. The expression ‘pairs’ was probably used of them in Rabbinic circles in the time of Christ.

The two ways of Mat 7:13 f. probably represent a widely current mode of teaching. They are met with in Jer 21:8 (cf. Deu 30:15, Sir 15:17), Slav. Enoch 30:15 ‘I showed him the two ways, the light and the darkness’ (cf. the note of Charles), in the Jewish manual probably incorporated in the early chapters of the *Didache* (cf. Ep. of Barnabas, 18 ff.), and in a remarkable passage in the Talmud. When R. Jochanan ben Zakai (c. [Note: circa, about.] 80 a.d.) was on his deathbed, he said to his disciples, who wondered at his tears: ‘There are two ways before me: one leading to the Garden of Eden and the other leading to Gehenna, and I do not know in which I am about to be led’ (*Berak.* 28b).

Three.—A number of peculiar interest to the student of the Gospels is three— $\tau\rho\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, $\tau\rho\iota$ $\iota\varsigma$, $\tau\rho\iota\tau\omicron\nu$, $\tau\rho\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma$. It is purely numerical in the following passages: Mat 15:32, Mar 8:2; Peter’s words about the three tabernacles on the Mount of Transfiguration (Mat 17:4, Mar 9:5, Luk 9:33); Mat 18:16-20; Mat 20:3; Mat 22:26, Mar 12:21; Mar 15:25, Luk 1:56; Luk 2:46; Luk 12:38; Luk 12:52; Luk 20:12; Luk 20:31; Luk 23:22, Joh 2:1; Joh 2:6. In a much greater number of passages it obviously or probably means more: in the allusion to Jonah (Mat 12:40), in the parables of the 3 measures

of meal (Mat 13:33, Luk 13:21), the friend asking for 3 loaves (Luk 11:5), the Good Samaritan (Luk 10:36), and the barren fig-tree (Luk 13:7), in the 3 temptations (Matthew 4 | |), and the 3 prayers of Jesus (Mat 26:44, Mar 14:41), in the references to Peter's threefold denial (Mat 26:34; Mat 26:75, Mar 14:30; Mar 14:72, Luk 22:34; Luk 22:61, Joh 13:38), in the allusions to the 3 days' interval between the Passion and the Resurrection (Mat 12:40; Mat 16:21; Mat 17:23; Mat 20:19; Mat 26:61; Mat 27:40; Mat 27:63 f., Mar 8:31; Mar 9:31; Mar 10:34; Mar 14:58; Mar 15:29, Luk 9:22; Luk 13:32; Luk 18:33; Luk 24:7; Luk 24:21; Luk 24:46, Joh 2:19 f.: add Act 10:40, 1Co 15:4), in the 3 manifestations of the risen Lord recorded in the Fourth Gospel (Joh 21:14), and in the threefold question, 'Lovest thou me?' addressed to Peter (Joh 21:15 ff.). In this latter and larger group can be traced a reference to the use of 3 as a significant number, of which there is a multitude of examples in the OT and other Jewish literature: the 3 feasts (Exo 23:14), Job's 3 friends (Job 2:11), the 3 times of prayer (Psa 55:17, Dan 6:10), the threefold shooting of Joash (2Ki 13:18), the 3 sanctuaries—Eden, Mount Sinai, Mount Zion (Bk. of Jub 8:19), the 3 branches of a vine and the 3 baskets representing 3 days (Gen 40:10; Gen 40:12; Gen 40:16; Gen 40:18), 3 days' journey (Exo 3:18, Num 10:33, Jon 3:3), the 3 days' search for the body of Elijah (2Ki 2:17), Esther's 3 days' fast (Est 4:16), the 3 days of rejoicing for the honour done to Enoch (Slav. Enoch 68:7), the perfuming and anointing of the body of Abraham for 3 days (Test. of Abr. text A, ch. 20), the 3 sayings of the men of the Great Synagogue ('*Abôth* i. 1), the 3 things on which the world standeth (Shim'on the Righteous in '*Abôth* i. 2, and Shim'on ben Gamaliel in '*Abôth* i. 19), and the 3 sayings ascribed to each of the 5 disciples of Rabban Jochanan ben Zakai ('*Abôth* ii. 14 ff.).

It is not difficult to see how the number came to be used in this manner. Several wholes which are often met with can be readily divided into 3 parts: the head, trunk, and legs of a body; the source, stream, and mouth of a river; the root, trunk, and corona of a tree (König, *DB [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.]* iii. 562^b); the van, centre, and rear of an army; morning, noon, and evening. Early Eastern speculation grouped all things under three heads; heaven, earth, and the abyss (cf. the Babylonian triad of gods, Anu, Bel, Ea). It will have been noticed in very early times that 3 is the smallest number with beginning, middle, and end. So it naturally came to be used on a small, well-rounded total, especially, as shown above, in reference to time.

The 3 days' interval between the Passion and the Resurrection may perhaps receive additional illustration from the Jewish rule that evidence for the identification of a corpse could not be received after 3 days (*Yebamôth* xvi. 3). A reason for the rule is given in a tradition ascribed to Bar Kappara, who was associated with the compiler of the Mishna (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 200). This Rabbi is reported to have said that for 3 days the soul hovers near the body, waiting for an opportunity of returning

into it, but that at the end of that period, seeing that the features are altered, it goes away (Midrash on Genesis, c. 100; Midrash on Ecc 12:6 : cf. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judeuthums*, 285 note). The resurrection of Jesus evidently took place before the close of the period of identification. Be that as it may, there can hardly be a doubt that the belief expressed by Bar Kappara, or something like it, underlay the words of Martha: ‘Lord, by this time he stinketh: for he hath been dead four days’ (Joh 11:39). The 3 days were ended, and decay, she thought, had advanced so far that the features would be unrecognizable. That the 3 days between the Passion and the Resurrection had even the remotest connexion with the 3 days’ disappearance of the new moon in spring (Zimmern in *KAT [Note: AT Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Test.] [ZW] 389*), is highly improbable.

Two other passages cannot be entirely passed over, although little or nothing can be said in illustration: the reference to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost in the baptismal formula (Mat 28:19), and the words ascribed to the risen Lord in the Apocalypse: ‘I am the first, and the last, and the living one’ (Rev 1:17). There is no parallel to the use of the number in the former in pre-Christian Jewish literature, and connexion with Babylonian and Egyptian triads is out of the question. The triple priestly blessing (Num 6:24-26) and the Thrice Holy in the song of the seraphim (Is 6:3) are remarkable, but cannot be safely regarded as foreshadowings of the doctrine of the Trinity. The number 3 is in both cases strongly emphatic, but it is not advisable to find more than emphasis. ‘Holy, holy, holy’ is a very strong superlative. The passage in the Apocalypse is, no doubt, like the preceding words ‘him which is, and which was, and which is to come’ (Rev 1:4), an expansion or interpretation of the name I AM THAT I AM (Exo 3:14), and has a partial parallel in Plato, *de Legibus*, 716: ὁ μὲν δὴ θεὸς (ὡσπερ καὶ ὁ παλαιὸς λόγος) ἀρχὴν τε καὶ τελευτὴν καὶ μέσα τῶν ὄντων ἀπάντων ἔχων, but must not be connected with it.

Four.—The number 4 (τέσσαρες, τεταρταῖος, τέταρτος, τετράμηνος, τετραπλῶος) is found in the Gospels in the following passages: in the 4 months before harvest (Joh 4:35), the 4 bearers of the paralytic (Mar 2:3), the 4th watch (Mat 14:25, Mar 6:48), the fourfold restitution promised by Zacchaeus (Luk 19:8), the 4 days of Lazarus in the grave (Joh 11:17; Joh 11:39), the division of the garments of Jesus among the 4 soldiers (Joh 19:23), the 4 winds (Mat 24:31, Mar 13:27), and the 4 kinds of soil in the parable of the Sower, with the types of character which they represent (Mat 13:4 ff. and parallels). We may add the 4 Gospels, the number of which was early regarded as significant. The four last references constitute a group. The 4 winds, associated with the 4 points of the compass, are met with in the OT and elsewhere in Oriental literature and symbolism: 1Ch 9:24 (Revised Version margin) , Jer 49:36, Eze 37:9; Eze 42:20 (Revised Version margin) , Dan 8:8; Dan 11:4, Zec 2:6; Zec 6:5, Babylonian Flood Story, eol. iii. line 42, Book of the Dead, c. 161 (in Budge’s smaller

edition, p. 531 f.). This use of 4 suggested world-wide extent and then comprehensiveness. So we find in the OT: 4 heads of the river going out of Eden (Gen 2:10), 4 cherubim each with 4 faces and 4 wings (Eze 1:5 f., cf. Rev 4:6 ff.), 4 horns (Zec 1:18), 4 smiths (Zec 1:20), 4 chariots (Zec 6:1), and 4 empires (Dan 2:40; Dan 7:3 ff., Dan 7:17 ff.). An Assyrian royal title ran 'king of the 4 quarters,' that is, of the world. Some of the divine figures in Assyrian sculptures have 4 wings, for example No. 1 in the Nimroud Gallery of the British Museum. Adam's name is said to have been given from 4 substances, that is, the east, the west, the north, and the south (Sl. Enoch 30:13). Abraham is said to have pitched his tent where 4 roads met (Test. of Ab. text A 1). The 4 kinds of soil in the parable, therefore, and the 4 types of character which they represent, cover the whole area of human life; and the 4 Gospels give a complete outline-portrait of Christ. The use of 4 in the grouping of persons or things seems to have been a favourite method with Jewish teachers. There are several examples of it in Amos (Amo 1:3; Amo 1:6; Amo 1:9; Amo 1:11; Amo 1:13; Amo 2:1; Amo 2:4; Amo 2:6) and in Proverbs (Pro 30:15 f., Pro 30:18 f., Pro 30:21 ff., Pro 30:24 ff., Pro 30:29 ff.). Later instances are Sir 37:18 'good and evil, life and death,' Test. of Judah, ch. 16, '4 spirits in wine,' and the remarkable series of paragraphs in 'Abôth v. Pro 30:16-21, in which people generally, dispositions, scholars, almsgivers, college-goers, and those who sit under the wise, are in each case grouped in 4 classes. May we suppose that our Lord, in accordance with His habit of utilizing current methods, adopted in the parable a familiar mode of classification?

Twelve.—Twelve, as the number of the tribes of Israel according to ancient tradition, became naturally a favourite number among the Jews, especially as it carried with it the suggestion of Divine choice and Divine faithfulness. So it figured in religious ritual, symbolism, and history. There were 12 jewels in the high priest's breastplate (Exo 28:21), and 12 cakes of shewbread (Lev 24:5). Solomon's sea stood on 12 oxen (1Ki 7:25), Elijah's altar on Carmel consisted of 12 stones (1Ki 18:31), and the altar-hearth in Ezekiel's visionary temple was 12 cubits long by 12 cubits broad (Eze 43:16). It is, therefore, not surprising that the number 12 is prominent in the Gospels. The 12 disciples referred to in Mat 10:1 f., Mat 10:5; Mat 11:1; Mat 20:17; Mat 26:14; Mat 26:20; Mat 26:47, Mar 3:14; Mar 4:10; Mar 6:7; Mar 9:35; Mar 10:32; Mar 11:11; Mar 14:10; Mar 14:17; Mar 14:20; Mar 14:43, Luk 6:13; Luk 8:1; Luk 9:1; Luk 9:12; Luk 18:31; Luk 22:3; Luk 22:47, Joh 6:67; Joh 6:70 f., Joh 20:24 (in 22 of these passages simply as οἱ δώδεκα, 'the Twelve'; cf. also Act 6:2, 1Co 15:5, Rev 21:14), the 12 baskets of broken pieces (Mat 14:20, Mar 6:43; Mar 8:19, Luk 9:17, Joh 6:13), the 12 legions of angels (Mat 26:53), are all more or less reminiscent of the 12 tribes. In the promise in Mat 19:28 || Luk 22:30 is a direct reference which puts beyond doubt the association of the number in our Lord's day with the tribes.

This use may have been aided by the constant recurrence of the 12 months of the year, but it is not safe to follow Dr. A. Jeremias (*Babylonisches in NT*, 88) in connecting the number of the Apostles even indirectly with the 12 signs of the zodiac. He does not, indeed, venture to affirm that this lay in the consciousness of Jesus, although he thinks the promise of the 12 thrones (Mat 19:28, Luk 22:30) might point at that; but he is confident that 'the mystical cosmological reference,' as he calls it, lies in the words of the writer of the Apocalypse about the 12 Apostles of the Lamb (Rev 21:14). However it may be with the latter, it is unnecessary to find any allusion of the kind in the Gospels. Men familiar in some degree with Gentile culture and the astrological-astronomical speculations which were in vogue about this time, such as Philo and Josephus, might connect the 12 gems of the high priest's breastplate with the signs of the zodiac, and might therefore regard 12 as a perfect number (Philo, *de Profugis*, § 33, cited by König, *DB [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.]* iii. 563a, τελειος δ' ἀριθμος ὁ δώδεκα; Josephus, *Ant.* iii. vii. 7) without the idea ever entering the minds of the majority.

In several passages a period of 12 years is referred to. The woman healed by touching the fringe of the Lord's garment had been ill for 12 years (Mat 9:20, Mar 5:25, Luk 8:43). The daughter of Jairus was 12 years old (Mar 5:42, Luk 8:42). Jesus was 12 years old when found in the Temple (Luk 2:42). In all these cases the number must be understood literally, but the second and third admit of illustration from Oriental life. At 12 childhood ceased for the Jewish boy. In the addendum to the fifth chapter of 'Abôth two of the rules run: 'At 10 the Mishnah, at 13 the Commandments.' A boy of 12, therefore, was on the threshold of manhood. A tradition recorded by Josephus affirms that Samuel was 12 years old when he received the Divine call (*Ant.* v. x.4). Another tradition, found in a Christian writing, but probably of Jewish origin, represented Solomon as 12 years old when he gave his famous judgment about the child (pseudo-Ignatius, *ad Magnesias*, iii.). At 12 a girl was marriageable. According to the Book of Jubilees (30:2), Dinah was 12 years old at the time referred to in Gen 34:2.

One more passage remains: 'Are there not twelve hours in the day?' (Joh 11:9). Here, no doubt, Babylonian influence can be traced, although in the time of Christ most of the Jews living in Palestine will have been wholly unconscious of the fact. The full day was divided by the Babylonians, who in this matter as in so many points set the rule for all their neighbours, and through the Greeks for the whole Western world, into 12 parts. As this day consisted of two halves, the daylight portion and the night portion, the division into twelve was applied to each, without regard to the season of the year. An hour was one-twelfth of the day or the night (*KAT [Note: AT Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Test.] [ZW] 328, 335 f.*). The old way of speaking still

survives in Syria. The day is regarded, as in the time of Christ, as consisting of 12 hours (Bauer, *Volksleben im Lande der Bibel*, pp. 274 f.).

Sixty.—The use of the number 60 in the parable of the Sower (Mat 13:8; Mat 13:23, Mar 4:8; Mar 4:20, not in Luk 24:13) may possibly have indirect connexion with the sexagesimal system of Babylonia (for this, cf. Bezold, *Ninive und Babylon*, 90, 92), which must have been current throughout western Asia, especially through its use in the subdivision of the talent (talent = 60 manehs; maneh = 60 shekels), and would naturally lead to the employment of the number with more or less significance. There are many passages in the OT and other Jewish literature in which 60 can hardly be accidental: Num 7:88 (60 rams, 60 he-goats, 60 he-lambs of the first year), Deu 3:4 (60 cities, cf. Jos 13:30, 1Ki 4:13, 1Ch 2:23), 1Ki 6:2 (Solomon's temple 60 cubits long, cf. 2Ch 3:3), 1Ki 4:22, 2Ch 11:21, Jer 52:25 (60 men of the people of the land found in Jerusalem by the Babylonians, cf. 2Ki 25:19), Ca 3:7, 6:8, Test, of Judah, ch. 3 (stone weighing 60 lbs.), ch. 9 (60 men slain), Test, of Abraham, text A 10 (cherubic chariot attended by 60 angels). The many examples in the Babylonian Talmud (fire the 60th part of Gehenna, *Berak.* 57b etc.) will be largely due to the Babylonian atmosphere of the compilation.

Thirty.—Thirty, the half of sixty, may be used in the same context (Mat 13:8; Mat 13:23, Mar 4:8; Mar 4:20) in somewhat the same way, through the same association. In Luk 3:23, where it is said that Jesus was about 30 years of age at the beginning of His ministry, there is probably an allusion to the belief that 30 years marked the attainment of manly vigour. Joseph entered on his career as a states-man at 30 (Gen 41:46), and David was 30 when he ascended the throne (2Sa 5:4). In the appendix to the fifth chapter of 'Abôth, 30 is defined as the age of strength (שלשים בן לכה). The 30 pieces of silver paid to Judas (Mat 26:15; Mat 27:3; Mat 27:9, cf. Zec 11:12 f.) would remind every Jew of the average value of a slave as fixed in the Law (Exo 21:32), 30 shekels. The Babylonian average was lower, but the Assyrian coincided with the Hebrew (Johns in *Babylonian und Assyrian Laws, Contracts, and Letters*, p. 182 f.). In the remaining passage, Joh 6:19, the number is purely historical.

Literature.—Art. 'Zahlen' in Winer, *RWB* [Note: *WB Realwörterbuch*.] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; Riehm, *HWB* [Note: *WB Handwörterbuch*.] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , and Guthe, *Bibelwörterbuch*; artt. 'Forty' and 'Number' in the *Jewish Encyc.*; art. 'Number' in *Encyc. Bibl.* and in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible* iii. 560^b ff.; König, *Stilistik*, 51-57.

☩ Nunc Dimittis

NUNC DIMITTIS (Luk 2:29-32), so called from the opening words in the Latin version, is the third and shortest of the hymns of the Incarnation preserved to us by St. Luke. Like the other two, it speaks of Christ; but whereas *Benedictus*, the Song of the priest Zacharias, is naturally of His Priesthood, and *Magnificat*, the Song of the royally-descended Virgin Mary, of His Kingdom, this, the Song of Simeon (wh. see), as befits the utterance of a prophet, is of Messiah fulfilling the prophetic function assigned to Him in the OT (cf. Deu 18:15), and especially by Isaiah.

The feature in Simeon's character which is to the Evangelist the climax of his virtues is that he was 'waiting for the consolation of Israel.' The words are a reminiscence of Jacob's, 'I have waited for thy salvation, O Lord' (Gen 49:18); and they describe what was precisely the attitude of Abraham in regard to God's promise of the land (Act 7:9 and Heb 11:13), and of David in regard to the kingdom (1Sa 26:9-11), both of whom did not 'fret themselves in anywise to do evil' (Psa 37:8), but waited till the Lord would give what He had spoken. So our Lord, speaking of those in danger of being led away by false Christs, bids His followers 'in patience possess their souls' (Luk 21:19). This was part of the faith of Simeon: his waiting for 'the Lord's Christ' (Luke 2) saved him from going after any turbulent pretender, or accepting, with the Herodians, a mere king of this world. The 'consolation of Israel' was a phrase with the Rabbis for the times of Messiah: Lightfoot (*Hor. Heb.*) gives five illustrations of its use.

The repeated mention of the Holy Spirit guiding Simeon at each successive step evinces the fact that prophecy, silent since the days of Malachi, is again about to stir (de Wette, Oosterzee); yet the difference also is to be observed between the repeated comings of the Spirit upon Simeon, and His abiding on Jesus (Joh 1:33) and remaining with the Church (Joh 14:16). By what sign Simeon was taught of the Spirit to recognize the child of Mary as the Christ we are not told: perhaps the Virgin's poverty, evidenced by her offering of doves, was the token to him, as the manger-cradle had been to the shepherds (Luk 2:12). Anyhow the Child was pointed out to him; he went up to Him, received Him in his arms, and, as he held Him, he 'blessed God,' and uttered his *Nunc dimittis*. There are no different readings in the text of it; but the Syriac renders the verb in the first clause, which in Greek, Latin, and English is in the *indicative* mood, by an *optative*, 'My Lord, now release thou thy servant in peace.' The mistake has been followed by several in this country who should have known better: e.g. by Logan, in the *Scottish Paraphrases* (Par. 38):

‘Now, Lord, according to thy word,

Let me in peace depart.

At length my arms embrace my Lord,

Now let their vigour cease,’

and even by John Keble, usually so accurate:

‘Whose prayers are struggling with his tears,

Lord, let me now depart.’

As a matter of fact, Simeon does not pray for death. He thanks God for permitting him to see, what many prophets and kings had desired to see and were not permitted ([Luk 10:24](#)), the salvation He had promised; and having seen it he says that he is ready to go when God wills.

The hymn is in three couplets:

(1) Thanksgiving for permission at last to leave his post, as the sentinel when the hour of his watch is over (Godet). Death will be to him as sleep to a labouring man (Bruce).

‘Now *thou art letting* thy servant depart, O Lord,

According to thy word, in peace.’

The ‘word,’ of course, is the promise of v. 26 that he should not see death before he had seen the Lord’s [own] Christ; and the fulfilment of the promise has brought him peace, because in Christ there is sure *salvation* for him and for all God’s people.

There are two fine Patristic comments—Cyprian’s (*On the Mortality*, 3), ‘He bears witness that the servants of God have peace, are free, and tranquil when, withdrawn from the whirlwinds of this world, they reach the port of the eternal home, and pass through death to immortality’; and Ambrose’s (*Exposition of St. Luke*, Bk. ii. ii. 59), ‘Let him who wishes to depart come into the Temple; let him come to Jerusalem; let him wait for the Lord’s Christ; let him take in his arms the Word of God, embracing Him by the arms of faith.’ Servant (δοῦλον), Lord (δέσποτα)—‘slave,’ ‘master’ are terms appropriate at all times to express the relation between God and men, yet savouring of the Law (Bruce).

(2) The reason of Simeon's peace in the prospect of death:

‘For mine eyes have seen thy salvation,

Which thou preparedst before the face of all peoples.’

What we see with our eyes is sure (cf. [Joh_1:14](#); [Joh_19:35](#) and [1Jn_1:2](#)). And Jesus Christ is salvation ([Isa_49:6](#)), for salvation is in Him and in none other ([Act_4:12](#)). Moreover, He is the salvation which God Himself provided, not which man might have fancied. ‘Preparedst’ is a more correct rendering than Authorized Version ‘hast prepared,’ for the tense refers to a definite historical fact (cf. [Luk_1:47](#)); and this God means *for all peoples* ([Luk_2:10](#)) (plural)—both the sections of mankind of whom, in the next verse, Simeon is to speak, viz. the Gentiles and Israel. The Greek word used (λαός) usually means Israel only, the people [of the Lord]. But now the privilege is extended, and they who were not a people are to be the people of the living God ([Hos_2:1](#), [Rom_9:25-26](#), [1Pe_2:13](#)).

(3) The different prophetic functions Christ is to discharge towards the Gentiles and the Jews respectively:

‘A light to lighten the Gentiles,

And the glory of thy people Israel.’

(a) To the Gentiles who sat in darkness ([Isa_9:2](#)) He is to be a Light ([Isa_49:6](#)); but not only by giving them light. The thought is greater than merely that Christ is to reveal truth to the Gentiles. He is a Light ‘for their revealing’ (εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν)—to show what the Gentiles are, how dear to Almighty God (cf. [Rom_3:29](#)), and how capable they are through His grace of producing saints. The prophecy of Simeon is thus akin to that of John the Baptist ([Mat_3:7](#)), and has its OT roots in such passages as [Isa_25:7](#) and [Hos_2:3](#). How wonderfully has it been fulfilled—that out of Judaism He could bring a Peter, a John, a Paul; out of decadent Rome an Augustine and an Ambrose; out of the wild Irish a Columba; out of the Saxon ‘knife-men’ a Wilfrid and a Bede! We have yet to see what He will make of China and Japan, when they are Christianized, (b) Of Israel, who had produced so many saints, prophets, and teachers, the ‘lights of the world in their several generations,’ Christ is to be the supreme Glory, of more honour than Moses ([Heb_3:3](#)), with a better priesthood than Aaron ([Heb_7:27](#)), Himself the very Brightness of the Father’s glory ([Heb_1:3](#)), which was beheld in Him ([Joh_1:14](#)). St. Paul saw, in the 1st cent., how true is this prophecy of Christ ([Rom_9:4-6](#)), and all subsequent history is its confirmation.

A parallel is given by Carpenter (*The Synoptic Gospels*) from Buddhist legend of one who, discerning in a babe the signs of perfection, predicted, 'Thou wilt be a Buddha, and remove the veils of sin and ignorance from the world.' But the Indian seer could not rejoice with Simeon, he could only weep that he would not be alive to share the light; which reminds us that Simeon's peace is through the Christian hope of a better life to come, when we shall be with Christ.

Simeon's attitude towards the Gentiles, while in full accord with that of the OT (Gen 22:18; Gen 49:10, Psa 98:3; Psa 100:1, Isa 42:6; Isa 49:6; Isa 60:3), is in striking contrast to that of the nearest contemporary Jewish writings, the Psalms of Solomon, in which, though there is the same longing for Messiah and His kingdom, the lot of the heathen is not light or salvation, but only judgment (Ps-Sol 16:4).

The singular sweetness—the calm beauty, as of a perfect pearl—of the Song of Simeon has always been recognized; and for ages it has entered into the evening service of the Church. Both the Roman Catholic and the Anglican Churches have appointed it as a hymn at Vespers, teaching us (as it does) to live each day as if we knew it to be our last; and, embracing Christ by faith, to thank God for Him and be ready in peace to depart in Him. In the Church of Scotland, while Knox's Prayer-Book held its place, and again after the introduction of the Paraphrases (1781), it became customary to use it at the close of the Communion Service; while in a few churches, both Episcopal and Presbyterian, it is sung at funerals when the body is being carried out of the church.

Literature.—T. A. Gurney, *Nunc Dimittis* (1906); A. M. Stewart, *Infancy and Youth of Jesus* (1905), 53; T. D. Bernard, *Songs of the Holy Nativity* (1895), 120, 131; S. Cox, *Expositions* (1888), iv. 1.

James Cooper.

☩ Oaths

OATHS.—Christ's teaching on the subject of oaths is set forth in one of the sections of the Sermon on the Mount, in which He contrasts His doctrine with that of the earlier dispensation (Mat 5:33-37). The position of the Law on the subject is summed up in the statement, 'Thou shalt not forswear thyself,' but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths.' This is a combination of different passages in the Law (Lev 19:12, Num 30:3, Deu 23:22), of which the first deals specially with oaths, the others with vows. But in point of obligation oaths and vows were recognized in the Rabbinical schools as on the same footing (Wünsche, *Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien aus Talmud und Midrasch*, p. 57), and the statement in which Christ here

represents the position of the Law was, no doubt, the current formula in which, in these schools, the doctrine of the Law on the question was summed up. in opposition to this dictum of the Law, Christ lays down an absolute prohibition, 'Swear not at all' (Mat_5:34), and proceeds to draw out the full meaning of the 'at all' (ὅλως) by showing that His prohibition covers every appeal to anything beside us in confirmation of our word, and not merely such as expressly introduce the name of Jehovah. The casuists among the scribes made a distinction between more and less binding oaths. The former class consisted of those which invoked the name of God; the latter used such forms as 'by heaven,' 'by earth,' 'by Jerusalem,' 'by the life of my head.' An oath by heaven and earth, for instance, was not considered to be binding, because one did not require to think of the Creator; whereas if one swore by one of the letters of the Divine name, or by one of the Divine attributes, that was regarded as binding, and he who treated such an oath lightly was punishable (Wünsche, *op. cit.* p. 59; Schürer, *HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]* ii. ii. 122).

Our Lord Himself gives other examples of such casuistical distinctions in the matter of oaths in Mat_5:16-22. He refers to them here because the full import of His prohibition of oaths might not be realized by those who were familiar with such distinctions. It might be thought that He was merely forbidding a direct appeal to the name of Jehovah. And so He proceeds to show how utterly different is His standpoint on the question of oaths from that of the Rabbinical authorities. They endeavoured to empty the oath of reference to God, so as to narrow the scope of the commandment against perjury. Christ sought to make explicit the reference to God virtually contained in every asseveration, so as to widen the scope of His prohibition of swearing. With this object He takes some of the common forms of oaths which were regarded as less binding, and shows how, though the name of God be not expressly mentioned, they are meaningless unless they involve an appeal to Him. Thus to call heaven or earth to witness our statement is an empty form, unless we be thinking not merely of heaven or earth, but of the Power they suggest, who will punish unfaithfulness (Mat_5:34-35 a), *i.e.* God, of whom heaven is the throne and earth the footstool (Isa_66:1). To appeal to Jerusalem (Mat_5:35 b) is meaningless unless we be thinking of the great King, who has made Jerusalem His city (Psa_48:3). And to swear by one's head (Mat_23:36) involves an appeal to Him in whose hands our destiny lies, and who alone can bring upon our heads the punishment of perjury. For ourselves, we cannot make one hair black or white. Black hair is here used as the symbol of youth; white, of old age. The very colour of our hair, Christ would say, reminds us that we are in the hands of a higher Power. It is to that Power we appeal when we swear by the life of our head. Every form of asseveration, then, Christ concludes, every appeal to anything beside us in confirmation of our word, is an oath, for it virtually involves an appeal to God. All such forms come under Christ's prohibition. His command is: 'Swear not at all; but let your speech be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay' (Mat_5:34; Mat_5:37).

These last words have received different interpretations. Beza renders them, ‘Let your affirmation be yea, and your negation nay,’—an attempt to bring the present verse into harmony with [Jam 5:12](#) at the sacrifice of grammar. Equally unjustifiable grammatically is Grotius’ attempt to secure the same object by his translation, ‘Let your yea and nay of speech correspond to a yea and nay of fact,’ with the additional fault that it is questionable whether that is the meaning of the passage in James. The simplest way of taking the words is to regard the *καὶ ναί, οὐ, οὐ*, as a repetition, such as was common in actual speech (cf. [2Ki 10:15](#), [2Co 1:17](#)), to confirm a statement. ‘Let your speech,’ says Christ, ‘be a clear and forcible yes or no. For whatsoever is more than these,’ He continues, ‘cometh ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ.’ Again there is difference of opinion as to these last words. Many take them as equivalent to ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου. But B. Weiss (*Matthäusevangelium, ad loc.*) contends that such a view is incompatible with the fact that the OT requires oaths ([Exo 22:11](#)), and even puts them into the mouth of God ([Gen 22:16](#); [Gen 26:3](#)). It is better to take the *πονηροῦ* as the gen. of the neuter; so that the statement will mean that the oath springs from evil, either in the sense that it is the presence of evil in the world that leads to the oath in confirmation of one’s word, and that in the Kingdom of God, in which truth prevails, the oath must altogether disappear (so Weiss), or that the practice of confirming one’s statement by an oath springs from the tacit assumption that when one does not so confirm it, one is not bound to speak the truth (so Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, ii. 210).

Before proceeding to discuss the conclusion to be drawn from the passage, we must note an interpretation of [Mat 5:34-36](#) which has gained considerable acceptance, but which puts quite a different meaning upon Christ’s prohibition in [Mat 5:34](#) from what we have given above. It is suggested that the prohibition is not meant to embrace all oaths, but merely the thoughtless swearing of everyday life whereby the name of God is profaned (so Calvin, Ewald, Tholuck, and many others). The ὁμόσαι ὅλως of [Mat 5:34](#), it is contended, does not include swearing by God; for, as Ewald (*Die drei ersten Evangelien*, p. 267) says, that was done only in courts of law, and Christ is not referring to this at all. If He had meant to forbid oaths absolutely, He would certainly have mentioned the direct oath in which the name of God is expressly invoked. As He has not done so, we must conclude that His prohibition is not meant to apply to it, *i.e.* that he means to forbid only such thoughtless oaths of common life as He proceeds to exemplify.

This attempt to empty the ὅλως of its meaning does not commend itself. It is evidently inspired by fear of the consequences which seem to ensue from the absolute prohibition Christ lays down, and such a motive does not tend to sound exegesis. It fails to do justice to the original. The only permissible translation of *μη ὁμόσαι ὅλως*

is that which regards it as an absolute prohibition. Only thus does Christ's position present a proper contrast to that of the Law. The Law forbids swearing falsely; Christ forbids swearing at all. Thus we have a sufficient contrast to, and advance beyond, the position of the Law. But on the present interpretation Christ sets over against the commandment against perjury in the name of God a prohibition merely of frivolous swearing, and that of a kind which does not mention the name of God at all, which is somewhat of an anti-climax. It is true, as the supporters of this interpretation point out, that Christ does not expressly mention the oath by the name of God in the instances He adduces. But it is much more reasonable to suppose that He omits it because it is evident that it is included under the swearing He prohibits, while there may be doubt as to these indirect oaths He specifies, than to argue that, when He prohibits swearing ὄλωϛ, He includes under the prohibition only those forms of oath which were hardly regarded as oaths at all by His contemporaries, and omits the one oath that was universally so esteemed.

We conclude, then, that Christ's word in Mat_5:34 is to be understood as an absolute prohibition of swearing, and that it cannot be restricted to the thoughtless, irrelevant oaths of common life. And it remains to consider in what spirit this absolute prohibition is laid down, and what are the conclusions that follow from it. Christ has Himself given the reason for His prohibition of swearing. Whatsoever goes beyond the distinct and forcible affirmation and negation, He says, cometh of evil (Mat_5:37). As we saw above, this saying may be interpreted in different ways. It may be taken to mean that it is the presence of evil among our fellow-men that necessitates oaths, to convince them of the good faith of the speaker. So Augustine (*Sermon on the Mount*): 'Tu autem non malum facis, qui bene uteris juratione, quae, etsi non bona, tamen necessaria est, ut alten persuadeas quod utiliter persuades, sed a malo est illius, cujus infirmitate jurare cogaris.' But, as Tholuck (*Sermon on the Mount*, English translation p. 252 f.) remarks, this is open to a twofold objection—first, that in such a case the evil in question rests with him who *requires* the oath, whereas all the stress of the prohibition is directed against *taking* oaths; and, second, that on this interpretation the fulfilment of our Lord's command would be deferred to the realization of that ideal state in which no evil exists, in which case the present command would stand on a different footing from the others of the Sermon on the Mount, which plainly apply to a world in which evil is prevalent. For this reason we accept the other interpretation of the words given above—that whatever goes beyond the plain affirmation and negation cometh of evil, in the sense that behind it is the tacit assumption that, when our word is not confirmed by an oath, we are not bound to adhere strictly to the truth. This brings the present passage into harmony with the general spirit of the Sermon on the Mount. The theme of that Sermon is righteousness of the heart. When Christ opposes His commands to those of the Law, it is to show that He requires more than the Law demanded, that He insists not only upon

righteousness of outward conduct, but upon righteousness of the heart. The Law required strict truth whenever an oath was taken. The tendency of the Pharisaic formalism of Christ's day was to keep the letter of the Law by strict fulfilment of one's promise and scrupulous adherence to the truth whenever the Divine name was invoked, but to break its spirit by assuming that whenever such an oath was not taken, greater latitude was allowed. Christ insisted upon such a regard for truth that the absence of the oath should make no difference. To feel that one is more bound by an oath than by one's simple word is to have the spirit of falsehood in one's heart. In such a case whatsoever is more than the direct yea and nay cometh of evil.

Once we realize what is the spirit in which Christ's prohibition is given, we are in a position to decide some of the questions raised as to the practicability of the observance of the command in existing social conditions. If the prohibition is absolute, on what ground can the practice of taking oaths in courts of law be defended? The answer is that the spirit in which the oath is taken in such a case is very different from that which our Lord condemns in the present instance. In a court of law we take the oath to convince our fellow-men, who cannot see our heart and judge of our regard for truth, of our good faith. That is a very different thing from thinking that we are not required to speak the truth unless bound by an oath; and it is the latter view that Christ condemns in His dictum upon swearing. We may still keep the spirit of our Lord's command though we break the letter of it by taking an oath in court, just, as we may keep the spirit of many other injunctions of the Sermon on the Mount, e.g. that with regard to praying in private (Mat 6:6), though we break them in the letter. Christ Himself, according to the Gospel in which the present passage occurs, did not refuse to answer when the high priest adjured Him by the living God (Mat 26:63). And though Mark omits the adjuration, so that we cannot with confidence appeal to the conduct of Christ Himself on this occasion, all the Gospels represent Him as frequently strengthening His declarations by the solemn ἀμήν, which in the Fourth Gospel becomes ἀμήν ἀμήν. In a word, while the prohibition of swearing is absolute, and is on no account to be modified in the manner we have referred to above, we must remember that what Christ is aiming at is not the mere outward oath, but the spirit of evil which inspired it, and regard as an infraction of His command only such conduct as cometh of the evil He seeks to destroy. When we regard the commandment in that light, there is no need to defer the fulfilment of it to an ideal state. It does not describe the conditions which should prevail between the members of the Kingdom of God only in their relations to one another, but lays down a principle which should guide the member of the Kingdom in his relation to all with whom he comes in contact. And though, owing to the conditions of the society in which he lives, he may have to depart from the strict letter of the precept by taking a solemn oath on occasion, so long as he does not do so from the unworthy motive

which inspires the oaths against which Christ contends, he may still claim to remain faithful to the command of Christ.

Literature.—The various Commentaries; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , art. 'Oath' and Extra Vol. p. 28; *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie fur protest. Theologic und Kirche.*] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , art. 'Eid'; Tholuck, *Sermon on the Mount*; Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, ii. 210-213; Gore, *Sermon on the Mount*; Rothe, *Theol. Ethik*, § 1067; Dykes, *Manifesto of the King*, p. 265; Martensen, *Christ. Ethics*, ii. 226. A full list of the relative literature will be found in Tholuck and Rothe.

G. Wauchope Stewart.

⚡ Obed

OBED.—Father of Jesse, mentioned in both genealogies of our Lord (Mat_1:5, Luk_3:32).

⚡ Obedience

OBEDIENCE

i. The Obedience of Christ

1. Christ as a man (see Humanity of Christ) *came under the obligations of men*, and principal among these was the obligation of obedience. This He Himself recognized explicitly. His parents had Him circumcised (Luk_2:21), and brought Him to Jerusalem according to the custom, to observe the law of the Passover (possibly every year, Luk_2:41-42), which custom He subsequently continued personally (Joh_2:23; Joh_5:1; cf. Joh_7:2; cf. Joh_7:10, Mat_26:17 ff. etc.). He felt Himself called upon to join in the great religious movements of His day, though not commanded by the Law (Mat_3:15), as well as to observe the political customs (Mat_17:27). It was therefore more than a mere expression as to a definite example when He said: 'It becometh us [me] to fulfil all righteousness' (Mat_3:15).

2. *The fact of His obedience.*—If we test this by the Ten Commandments as substantially embracing the whole moral law, we find His obedience complete. They are mostly prohibitions, and we do not find Him infringing them. It cannot be said

that this silence of the Scriptures as to transgressions does not prove His entire conformity to them, and leaves room for the doubt whether His obedience was perfect; since He was surrounded by watchful enemies who magnified variations that were not disobedience, and would have mentioned any real disobedience with eagerness. The honour which He paid to God was as perfect as His perception of the spiritual nature of His worship was clear (Joh 4:24). He observed the Sabbath, being found regularly in the synagogue on that day (Luk 4:16 'as his custom was'). The fact that He did no work that was contrary to the Sabbath commandment, is shown clearly by the fact that He was repeatedly attacked for immaterial things and for exercising His healing power upon that day, for which He successfully defended Himself (Mat 12:3; Mat 12:7; Mat 12:11-12). To those of another race and time He may seem to have been lacking on one occasion in respect for His mother, viz. at the marriage in Cana of Galilee (Joh 2:4). But the appellation 'Woman' was not disrespectful, for it was used in the tenderest way at the cross (Joh 19:26); nor was it disrespectful to reprove officious interference; nor was Mary left unsatisfied (Joh 19:5), but expected His compliance with her hinted request. So much for the negative side of the moral law. On its positive side, as comprehensively stated by Him in the words, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself' (Mat 22:39), none was ever so zealous of God's honour, or of preserving His own communion with Him (Joh 10:30; Joh 17:11; Joh 17:21-23; Joh 17:25), as Jesus. And love of neighbour, as interpreted first fully by Himself (Luk 10:30 ff.), He exemplified in all His contact with suffering and needy humanity. Nor did He fail in that harder sort of obedience which consists in quick response to the personal will of God manifested in providence (Mat 4:4, Luk 2:49, Joh 12:27-28). His care for the ceremonial law, besides the cases already cited, may be seen by His recommending the lepers whom He cleansed, on two occasions, to observe the law of Moses provided in their case (Luk 5:14; Luk 17:14).

3. His sinlessness.—We thus see in the life of Jesus no offence against the law of right. There is no evidence of sinfulness. But this would not in itself establish His sinlessness. Many a man gives the impression of a perfect life, is, according to the Scripture phrase, 'blameless,' who is not 'sinless,' because he sees sin in himself, and charges himself with it. But Jesus claimed sinlessness for Himself. He challenged the Jews to convict Him of sin (Joh 8:46); and He affirmed of Himself that the 'prince of this world' had nothing in Him (Joh 14:30). True, this sinlessness was first *attained* through conflict (cf. Mat 4:11, Joh 12:27, Mar 15:34), and 'learned' (Heb 5:8), and Jesus Himself shrank from the application to Him of the word 'good' in the absolute sense (Mar 10:18); but it was attained and learned, and this without the experience of failure. Its necessity to the work of redemption gives it its complete dogmatic establishment (cf. Heb 9:7; Heb 9:14; Heb 5:9; Heb 4:15); but the proof of its actuality depends, finally, upon the word or Jesus Himself. Were this the testimony of the Jews, who were self-righteous, and thus incapacitated for judging of their true

spiritual condition, it would have no value; but it is the testimony of a specially sensitive conscience, one which saw deeper into the meaning of the Law than others, which enjoyed perfect communion with God (Joh_14:9; Joh_12:45). As such it stands, and is subject to no diminution from our ability to point out defect in Him. As a challenge, it was not met by His adversaries, evidently because they could not meet it. See, further, art. Sinlessness.

4. His superiority to the Law.—His obedience may be conceived, on the one side, as His perfect subjection to the Law. But, on the other side, He was superior to the Law. In respect to infringements of the law of the Sabbath with which He was charged, He did not simply defend Himself by saying that He alone rightly interpreted the law, but He proclaimed His superiority to it. ‘The Son of Man is Lord even of the sabbath’ (Mar_2:28). He set aside certain of the provisions of the Law (Mat_5:38); but He did a more significant thing in deepening the meaning of others (Mat_5:27 ff.). He revealed the true meaning of the Law when He brought it back to its foundation in the all-embracing law of love. The element of the Law which He modified was, therefore, the external, the scaffolding or clothing of the legal principle, not the fundamental meaning of the Law. He came also to ‘fulfil’ the Law (Mat_5:17); and this meant to *fill out* (*πληρῶω*), and hence to set it aside as completed and its design accomplished. In the later form of the Apostolic doctrine Jesus was called the ‘end of the law’ (Rom_10:4), in the sense that He provided a new way of salvation, which had formerly had to be attained through the observance of the Law. This was particularly through the sacrifice of Himself (Heb_10:8-14) by which He brought the whole OT system to an end, and for ever cancelled the ceremonial law. When the same idea appears in St. John’s Gospel (Joh_3:14; Joh_3:16; Joh_6:51; Joh_10:17), it may be thought to belong to the same stratum of later teaching; but it is reflected in the earliest form of the Gospel (Mar_10:45), it appears in the institution of the Lord’s Supper (Mat_26:28), and is accordingly to be regarded as the primal and unvarying substance of the Gospel. The Law, then, is abrogated because its object has been attained, and its definite and peculiar prescriptions may give way to more general and spiritual forms of precept. The emphasis is hereafter to be laid not upon the letter, but upon the spirit (2Co_3:6). See Law, Law of God.

5. The capital article of His obedience—the Death upon the Cross.—The later strata of the Gospel history lay emphasis upon the fact that the death of Christ was a subject of the Divine command. Thus Jesus says, according to St. John, ‘This commandment [viz. to lay down my life] I received from the Father’ (Joh_10:18). In Joh_12:27, shrinking from the foreseen suffering of the cross, He says, ‘For this cause [viz. to suffer the death of the cross, cf. Joh_12:32] came I unto this hour.’ The same idea, that His death upon the cross was the essential part of His work which He came into the world to do, and which was laid upon Him by the Father, appears in many other

texts in this Gospel, implied where not explicitly stated (cf. Joh 3:14, Joh 6:38; Joh 6:50-51; Joh 6:58, Joh 8:21, Joh 10:11, Joh 14:30-31, Joh 17:13, Joh 19:30). The same conception is fully developed in the other portions of the NT which belong to the same period of development with this Gospel, particularly in Philippians (Php 2:8) and the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb 5:7-8; Heb 10:10). But it is also indicated in the earliest strata. In Mar 10:45 Jesus Himself says that He has come, 'not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.' The whole Gospel story is displayed, as it were, upon the black background of the darkness and sufferings of Calvary. Prophecies by Jesus Himself of His own death begin to appear at an early period by intimation (Mat 10:38; cf. Mat 16:24), and at a period still long before the final Passion in more explicit and frequent utterance (Mat 16:21-28 ||; Mat 17:3 ff. according to || Luk 9:31; Luk 17:22-23 ||; Luk 20:17-19 ||). There is evidence in these passages, taken as a whole, and regarded as containing the concurrent and consistent Evangelical idea of the death of Christ, that to Christ the burden of death consisted partly in its physical pain, from which One shrank who possessed the instinct of life among other human qualities (see Humanity of Christ), but still more as something unbecoming to the pure and holy Son of God, associated, as it was in human history, with the idea of sin and condemnation. Or, as St. Paul expresses it (Gal 3:13), it was a curse which He did not lightly take upon Himself. Two things result from this method of considering the death of Christ: (1) that it measures the highest degree of devotion to the salvation of men; and (2) that it was effective because it lay in the will of God, to which Christ was obedient, not assuming it Himself, as a desperate and uncertain remedy, but accepting it as the God-designed path of propitiation and redemption.

6. *The relation of Christ's obedience to the salvation of men.*—The relation of the sacrifice, which was the main article of His obedience, to the salvation of men is considered elsewhere (see Atonement, Propitiation, Sacrifice, etc.). No text of the Gospels presents the obedience of Christ, strictly considered, as having a connexion with our salvation, except as His moral perfection was among the qualifications for the office of Saviour. The inference which has been made, that the obedience of Christ itself formed a part of His saving work, has been drawn from such texts as Rom 5:19 ('through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous'). But this idea receives no support from the Gospels, and none from the text cited itself, when carefully interpreted. The thought of the Apostle is unfolded here in a series of parallel expressions, in which, on the one side, Adam's 'trespass,' 'sin,' 'disobedience,' and, on the other side, Christ's 'grace,' 'gift by grace,' 'free gift,' 'righteousness,' 'act of righteousness,' 'obedience,' are mentioned as equal to one another, and as contrasted, the one side with the other. The obedience of Christ here considered is, therefore, His *act* of obedience, or His atoning death. The act of obedience saves, not *as* obedience, but as atonement.

7. *The significance of Christ's obedience for religion* arises from the exaltation which it affords of the Person of Christ. As the victorious contestant and the perfect character, He calls out the veneration and enthusiastic loyalty of His followers, incites them to greater efforts, and fills them with loftier courage than any imperfect prophet could do, however excellent otherwise, and thus becomes the true 'exemplar and leader' (ἀρχηγός, Heb_12:2) of our faith.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Obedience'; Ullmann, *Sinlessness of Jesus*; Forrest, *Christ of Hist. and Exper.* 17 ff.; R. Mackintosh, *Christ and the Jewish Law*; Dale, *Atonement*, Lect. ix.

ii. **Our obedience.**—Christ came not only as a Teacher and Redeemer, but also as an Example. It might be said of all His life, as He said when He washed the disciples' feet, 'I have given you an example, that ye also should do as I have done to you' (Joh_13:15). As the object of all His work was to reveal the Father, and he that had 'seen him had seen the Father' (Joh_14:9), so he who did as Jesus did obeyed the will of the Father, which was perfectly exemplified in Him (Joh_8:29). Indeed, this was the necessary consequence of His teaching office, for He always said in fact if not by word, 'Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me' (Mat_11:29). It was His purpose in the world to bear witness to the truth (Joh_18:37), and to do this not merely by word, but by right deed. Hence the obedience of Christ is the standard of our obedience. We are to be 'perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect' (Mat_5:48), and that perfection is the perfection which is manifested in the Son. At the same time, as performance falls far short of ideal in other human things, so here. There is no example given us in the Gospels of the attainment by a disciple of such perfection as was in the Master. Peter who denied Him, Thomas who could not believe His resurrection, John and James who were fired by an unholy ambition, were the chief among the Twelve, and doubtless as successful as the others. Even after Pentecost, Paul and Barnabas had a sharp contention. All had 'the treasure in earthen vessels.'

The obedience which Christ asks of us is an obedience of the spirit rather than of the letter. He says in one place, 'If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love' (Joh_15:10); but when we ask what the commandments of Jesus are, we find few which, in the form in which they are given, have direct application to the conditions of modern life. He refers to the Ten Commandments when the young man asks what he shall do to inherit eternal life (Mat_19:16); but when the young man is not satisfied, He gives him a test which was not in any of the Commandments nor of any general application to men, 'Go, sell, and give to the poor' (Mat_19:21). His own observance of the Sabbath was not according to the customs of the Jews (Mat_12:8). He went beneath the letter of the Law to its spirit, and this was His demand of men, that they should obey the spirit of the Law. Hence He reduces the Law to its essential

and comprehensive element of love (Mat 22:37-39), which, if a man observe, will constitute the fulfilling of the Law (cf. Rom 13:8). And thus the attitude of one who is evangelically obedient is not that of an anxious inquirer as to every specific commandment and consequent duty, but that of one who freely wills to do the will of God, is animated by the spirit of love, and out of its abounding fulness, by the indwelling Spirit (Rom 8:4, cf. Joh 16:13; Joh 17:17), does what is well-pleasing to God. Such a person might conceivably err as to duty in some specific case, because of lack of enlightenment, but if he has the spirit of obedience, he has substantially obeyed. The spirit will bring him into eventual accord with the objective demands of reason and conscience.

At the same time, none of the specific commands of the Decalogue are set aside. Even the Sabbath was observed by Jesus Himself and by His disciples after Him. The ethical results of the Jewish development were, therefore, conserved by Jesus, who added to them the more spiritual interpretation of the facts of history and experience, and to this extent made them richer and more comprehensive. Not merely judicial false witness (Exo 20:16 שקר עֵר), but every form of lying (ψεῦδος, as the absence of all ἀλήθεια, Joh 8:44), come under His disapproval (as already in Pro 26:28).

The great standard and guide of our obedience therefore becomes the will of God as manifested both in His written word and in His providence. It is not so much the general will of God that we are to seek to learn. This is generally easy to understand and recognize. It is His specific will, as manifested in the course of events, in the unfoldings of our personal history, that we are to learn how to understand and fulfil. Thus obedience rests upon the study of history both general and individual to ourselves (Mat 26:39, cf. Joh 4:34; Joh 5:30), and consists fundamentally in submission to the Divine will.

Sin is therefore not to be conceived of as merely disobedience to specific precepts of the Law. It is this; but it has its secret in the failure to adjust oneself to the will of God as such. Obedience is not profession empty of definite good works (Mat 7:21); it is not even always to be found with those who 'prophesy' and perform miracles (Mat 7:22). The emphasis in the Gospels is laid upon 'faith' in Jesus Christ as fully as it is in the Epistles. This granted, as the important and controlling element of the religious life, obedience follows from it as a matter of course. Such obedience, however defective in form, is genuine obedience, acceptable in God's sight. This is because God wants the *man*, not his acts; his heart, and not any material gift. With the heart will naturally be given to God every other desirable service.

Hence the penalty of disobedience, since this is essentially *difference with God*, is first of all separation from Him. It is 'darkness' because men refuse the 'light' (Joh 1:11; Joh 3:18-21). The sinner is in his 'own place' (Act 1:25), the place fit for him because he is what he is. The penalty involves pain (Mat 13:50, cf. Rev 14:11), is judicial (Mat 25:31 etc.), and involves the personal disapproval of God (Mat 25:41); but it is, in a high sense, natural and inevitable. The wicked man, being what he is, cannot meet with any other lot than what he has. Obedience, on the other hand, leads to reward. This is not 'deserved,' and so given as a matter of justice. Sinners will always 'deserve' punishment. But God freely rewards the forgiven sinner whose heart is right with Him, because of His own goodness, that He may express His favour. Thus the lot of the saved man is the reverse of the sinner's, and is a state of blessedness in the presence of God.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , art. 'Obedience'; Martensen, *Christ. Ethics*, i. 293; F. W. Robertson, *Sermons*, ii. 94; W. A. Butler, *Sermons*, ii. 164; Channing, *The Perfect Life*, xi; Dale, *Evangel. Revival*, 104 ff., 125 ff., *Laws of Christ for Common Life*, 273.

Frank Hugh Foster.

☞ Obscurity

OBSCURITY.—Those who are called from darkness to light do not perform the journey instantaneously, and so must be conscious of obscurity, in various ways and to different degrees, in their progressive apprehension of the gospel of Christ. Yet we are assured that nothing is hid, *save that it should be manifested* (Mar 4:22); and the Holy Spirit is promised us for guidance *into all the truth* (Joh 14:26; Joh 16:13). All four Gospels speak of a clouding of the eyes and dulling of the ears of the perverse (Mat 13:13, Mar 4:12, Luk 8:10, Joh 12:40). To the heedful and amenable the teaching will be made plainer and plainer (Luk 8:18; Luk 10:21). To the haughty and cunning nothing clear can be vouchsafed (Luk 13:32). In teaching by parables there was necessarily an element of obscurity; but this stumbling-block Christ frequently removed (Mat 13:11), and promised the clearance of all hindrances to the perfect knowledge of God (Joh 16:13; Joh 16:25). Obscurity was not infrequently felt by the Apostles in their efforts to discern the meaning of the Lord's other utterances. The teaching about the eternal food of His flesh and blood for the life of the world was felt to be 'a hard saying' (Joh 6:60). The foretelling of His cruel death and glorious resurrection was not at first understood (Luk 18:34). Indeed, the Apostles experienced a signal *opening of mind* after the Resurrection in respect of the prophecies implying His Passion (Luk 24:45). Thus in the Last Discourse they are found

exclaiming, 'We know not what he saith' (Joh_16:18); and a little later they gratefully confess, 'Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no proverb' (Joh_16:29). Obscurity there must often be when spiritual realities are expressed by the inadequate vehicle of human vocabulary. Such an instance may be: 'This is your hour, and the power of darkness' (Luk_22:53). The living spirit cannot be expressed by the dead letter except in similitudes and allegories (Joh_3:8). When the Infinite strives to find portrayal in the finite, there must be what we call obscurity. Richness of significance and application attaches to heavenly truths which might at first seem obscure (Joh_3:31). Obscurity must disappear more and more, for the darkness cannot confine the Light of the world within any bounds (Joh_1:5; Joh_8:12; Joh_9:5). The steadfast disciple will learn to understand His speech (Joh_8:43), and release from obscurity will convey increase of freedom (Joh_8:32). The gospel is not meant to remain obscure (Mat_5:15).

Literature.—Butler, *Analogy*, p. 269 ff.; F. W. Robertson, *Sermons*, ii. p. 94 ff.; *Expositor*, 2nd ser. i. [1881] pp. 372-387; Ker, *Sermons*, 1st ser. p. 302 ff.; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, i. 109 f.

W. B. Frankland.

⚡ Observation

OBSERVATION.—This word occurs only once in the NT, viz. Luk_17:20 'The kingdom of God cometh not with observation' (μετὰ παρατηρήσεως). The verbal form (παρατηρέω) is used: (a) for watching carefully, especially in a bad sense, as a spy or with the object of finding fault (e.g. Luk_20:20); (b) for keeping a religious ordinance (Gal_4:10). This second sense is impossible in the place where the substantive occurs; nor can the malignant sense of (a) be here suggested. The meaning seems to be that the Kingdom will come in such a way that even the close watchers may not discover its approach. The reason given for this assertion is that 'the kingdom of God is within [(ἐντός) or "among" (so Syr [Note: yr Syriac.] ^{sin})] you' (Luk_17:21). Whichever meaning we give to the preposition, a spiritual and therefore invisible presence is indicated. This statement appears to be contradicted by Luk_17:24, where 'the Son of Man in his day' is compared to 'lightning when it lighteneth out of the one part under the heaven' and 'shineth unto the other part under the heaven.'

Four explanations of the apparent contradiction have been proposed: (1) that the earlier verse refers to the Pharisees, who are blind to the signs of the new age, and the later to the disciples, who will have their eyes opened to see it (cf. 2Ki_6:17); (2)

that the coming of the Kingdom is a different event from the Parousia of Christ, ‘the Son of Man in his day’; (3) that there is no contradiction between the two passages; because while, on the one hand, there will be nothing for the watcher to discern as indicative of the drawing near of the great event, this being sudden as a flash of lightning, when it has come it will be universally apparent; (4) that the reference to the lightning manifestation is an apocalyptic element from a foreign source that has been inserted, with other similar elements, among the genuine teachings of Jesus. Against (1) is (a) the lack of any discrimination between two classes of hearers, and (b) the breadth of the lightning-like manifestation, which does not indicate a secret revelation for the few, but what all the world can see. Against (2) is the fact that elsewhere the coming of the Kingdom and the coming of Christ are regarded as the same event (e.g. cf. Mat 16:28 with Mar 9:1). Against (3) is the indication of signs, such as, ‘Now learn a parable of the fig-tree,’ etc. (Mat 24:32, Mar 13:28, cf. Luk 21:29). Explanation (4) is to cut the knot, and against it is the fact that not this passage only but many other equally inconvenient passages would have to be removed by an arbitrary process. Thus all four proposed explanations are beset with difficulties.

H. Holtzmann points out that παρατήρησις should be understood in an active sense; it is not to be regarded as a conceivable attribute of the Kingdom, but as associated with the bringing about of the Kingdom. Accordingly, perhaps, we should reconcile the sayings thus: Sharp, critical watching will not bring it. They who busy themselves with this unsympathetic action will neither hasten its coming nor perceive the first signs of its appearance. In its beginning it is already present (ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν). Yet those who practise παρατήρησις do not perceive this. Nevertheless, the complete revelation of the Christ in His Kingdom will be universally manifest.

Literature.—Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, i. 366; *ExpT* [*Note: xpT Expository Times.*] vi. [1895] 358; H. E. Manning, *Sermons* (1844), 172; J. H. Newman, *Plain Ser.* ii. 107; R. C. Trench, *Ser. New and Old*, 196.

W. F. Adeney.

☞ Occupation

OCCUPATION.—This word is not found in the Gospels. It occurs elsewhere twice in the Authorized Version (Act 18:3 [τέχνη] and Act 19:25 [περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα]). ‘Occupy,’ in the sense of ‘do business,’ ‘traffic,’ ‘trade’ (so Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), is

found in Authorized Version of Luk 19:13 as the rendering of *πραγματεύομαι*. Christ, as well as His reputed father, was Himself an artificer in wood, or a carpenter (*τέκτων*). Every Jewish boy, indeed, had to learn a trade (*τέχνη*), that it might stand between him and destitution if, other resources failed. And however far removed our Lord might be in later life from *quondam* fellow-craftsmen, this technical education kept Him in touch with His industrial compatriots.

Our Lord's attitude towards the various occupations in which men are engaged is of more interest than details regarding the occupations themselves. Judaism in Christ's day had lost hold of the masses, because its ministers urged a law viewed by themselves in false perspective. Christ denounced them for tithing mint, anise, and cummin, while omitting the weightier matters, judgment, mercy, and faith (Mat 23:23). Hence work and worship were largely divorced. People indulged in pagan-like worry over the question, What shall we eat, and what shall we drink, and wherewith shall we be clothed? instead of seeking first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness (Mat 6:31 ff.). But Christ's strenuous example proved the possibility of being diligent in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord. 'I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night Cometh, when no man can work' (Joh 9:4). He never allowed danger to interfere with duty—'Are there not twelve hours in the day? If any man walk in the day, he stumbleth not, because he seeth the light of this world. But if a man walk in the night, he stumbleth, because there is no light in him' (Joh 11:9-10). Christ poured contempt on that monastic spirit which creates artificial distinctions and exalts religious officials, devoid of religious motives, at the expense of those who, though engaged in less responsible callings, are more devout. He reprobated the Pharisee who thanked God for his superiority to other men; and justified the Publican who was a butt for his fellow-worshipper's sneers (Luk 18:10 ff.). He rebuked Simon, haughtily hospitable, and commended the kindly woman, whose love exceeded her pride (Luk 7:44 ff.). He held up the priest and Levite to perennial scorn; and crowned with approbation that Samaritan who proved more humane, if he did not profess to be as holy as they (Luk 10:30 ff.). St. Luke relates with professional delight how Jesus defended His own act of healing on the Sabbath day, against the false spirituality that saw in it a breach of the Fourth Commandment (Luk 13:15 f., Luk 14:3 ff.).

A legitimate inference from all this is that our Lord—with His healthy outlook on life—would encourage all the honest occupations which ministered to man's varied needs. The Apostles' teaching surely reflected the mind of their Master on this subject. If eating and drinking could contribute to the glory of God (1Co 10:31), then all the occupations which provided food and drink could be pursued in the same spirit. St. Paul enjoins on bishops and other teachers of the gospel to inculcate upon Christians that they should maintain good works for necessary uses (Tit 3:14). That

means for the support of themselves and families, and relief of the needy. This is a duty as imperative in its own place as the duty of the ministry, and the Apostle lays great stress on it. 'This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works. These things are good and profitable unto men' (Tit_3:8), *i.e.* of general benefit and advantage to mankind. Thus a man's occupation, instead of being a hindrance to religion, is a part of it,—that sphere in which he can prove himself a doer of the word,—and faithfulness is required there as much as anywhere else (Luk_16:10). See also artt. Business, Carpenter, Trades.

Literature.—Besides Lexicons, see articles on 'Craft,' 'Trade,' and 'Trades' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ; Tillotson, Sermon 101 vol. vi.; Delitzsch, *Jewish Artisan Life*.

D. A. Mackinnon.

⚠️ Offence

OFFENCE.—This article deals with the ideas connected with the words *σκάνδαλον* and *σκανδαλίζειν*, and, in so far as they are applied in the same moral sphere, with those suggested by *προσκοπτειν*, *πρόσκομμα*, and *ἀπρόσκοπος*. The literal meaning of *σκάνδαλον*, which is probably the Alexandrian form of *σκανδάληθρον*, may be the part of a trap to which the bait is fastened, and which, when it is touched, springs up and catches the victim; but in Scripture the sense is not so definite. It may be questioned, indeed, whether it is ever used literally; and the figurative or ethical use of it, which is peculiar to Scripture, is what we are now to investigate. The one idea which is constant in every use of the word, literal or figurative, is that of hurt sustained; it may even be of ruin incurred, by the person who encounters the *σκάνδαλον*. It will be convenient to exhibit the Scriptural view of the subject by referring (1) to the experience of Jesus; (2) to the teaching of Jesus; and (3) to the application of this in the Apostolic Church.

1. Experience of Jesus.—When Jesus visited Nazareth, and taught in the synagogue so that all were astonished, astonishment soon passed into a kind of carping criticism. 'Whence hath this man these things, and what is the wisdom that has been given to him? And these mighty works that are being done by him? Is not this the carpenter?' And so on (Mar_6:2 f. ||). The people had been used to Jesus in one aspect or character, and they could not adjust themselves to Him in another. There was

something in His present appearance and claims which they could not get over: as the Evangelists put it, ἐσκανδαλιζοντο ἐν αὐτῷ. Jesus Himself was the σκάνδαλον with which, for the time at least, they collided: it was to their hurt even at the moment (He could do no mighty work there because of their unbelief, [Mar_6:5](#)), and it would be their ruin if it were their final attitude. Probably before Jesus can become a σκάνδαλον, men must have felt the attraction in Him: it is only when closer acquaintance reveals something in Him, or in the consequences of attachment to Him, which is repellent to the natural man, that He becomes a σκάνδαλον, and those who were once attracted fall away. They stumble at something which attachment to Him involves; they cannot get over it, and so they desert Him. This is the connexion in which σκανδαλιζεσθαι occurs in [Mar_14:27](#); [Mar_14:29](#) and ||. Jesus on the last night of His life recalls to the Twelve the prophecy of Zechariah ([Zec_13:7](#)): ‘I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered,’ and applies it by adding, ‘All ye σκανδαλισθήσεσθε ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ.’ They had felt the charm of Jesus, and continued with Him in His temptations so far; but a Messiah who should be seized, tortured, and crucified by sinners would be too much for them. In spite of all they had seen and felt in Him, they would stumble at this, and leave Him in the lurch. It is the same idea, *mutatis mutandis*, which is found in [Mar_4:17](#) and || Mt.; the rocky ground hearers, who have shown a warm appreciation of the word, are taken aback when they find that they have to endure, persecution because of it, and ‘immediately they are offended.’ [Luk_8:13](#) gives the correct interpretation: ‘in time of temptation they fall away.’ The parable of the Sower, standing where it does, is not so much a prophecy, though it is prophetic, as a summary of the disenchanting experiences of Jesus. He had seen many enthusiasms chill, the moment fidelity to Him exacted any sacrifice. In one sense this is ‘the offence of the cross,’ though it is not what St. Paul means by this expression. We are in the same circle of ideas in [Mat_24:1](#) f., [Joh_16:9](#) f. Jesus warns His disciples of coming persecutions; they as well as He have the cross to bear; and while many will stumble at it,—that is, find it too much for them, a thing which they cannot get over, and must simply decline,—He tells the Twelve beforehand, that being forewarned they may be forearmed against the peril of apostasy.

One of the most striking instances of σκάνδαλον in the experience of Jesus is that which is connected with John the Baptist. John was evidently disappointed somehow in Jesus. He had had reason to regard Him as the Messiah, but He was not the Messiah John had expected. Where were the axe and the fan and the consuming fire? Why, if the Messiah had really come, were not all wrongs irresistibly righted? Why was a true servant of God like himself left to suffer for fidelity to his Master? It is to this temper

in John that Jesus says, 'Blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me' (Mat 11:6, Luk 7:23). We must not impose our preconceptions on God, and dictate to Him the terms on which He may have recognition from us. This always implies the risk that we may stumble at what He actually does—refuse to recognize Him in Jesus because the manifestation does not square with our demands. The Baptist here is a perfect illustration of St. Paul's words, written in immediate connexion with his idea of Christ as *σκάνδαλον*: 'Jews claim signs.' They say, Let God signalize His presence; let Him make bare His holy arm, and break in pieces the oppressor, and we will see and believe Him; and when they see nothing of this in Jesus, they stumble at Him. He becomes a *σκάνδαλον* to them. And just as Jesus in His acts may become an offence to those who anticipated something quite different, so may He be by anything disconcerting or too challenging in His teaching. Thus the Pharisees in Mat 15:12 were offended by the word in which He seemed to abolish the distinction between clean and unclean meats: they could not get over the idea that a distinction on which so much of their sanctity depended should be so summarily swept away. It finally repelled them from Jesus. And in Joh 6:61 we find disciples put out, as it were, by the hard sayings about eating the flesh of the Son of Man, and drinking His blood: it is almost more than they can stand, and Jesus asks *τοῦτο ὑμᾶς σκανδαλίζει*; 'Doth this cause you to stumble?' Almost anything in Jesus may become a ground of stumbling—the demands He makes, the sacrifices which fidelity to Him entails, His disappointment of our expectations, the paradoxical and apparently impossible elements of His teaching. And all these become grounds of stumbling to those who have made some acquaintance with Him, been to some degree attracted and held by Him. To be offended in Him is the sin of those who have had the opportunity of being disciples.

Even though the words *σκάνδαλον*, *σκανδαλίζειν*, are not used at every point, the whole of the central division of the Gospel according to Matthew (chs. 11-18) may be read as a series of illustrations of them. In ch. 11 we have the Baptist, the whole generation (Mat 11:16 ff.), the favoured cities (20 ff.), and especially the wise and prudent (Mat 11:25), offended in Jesus. In ch. 12 we have first the Pharisees, and then His mother and brothers. In ch. 13 the parable of the Sower gives the keynote: it is the experience of one who knows what it is to be an offence: cf. Mat 13:21; Mat 13:41. In ch. 14 there is the miraculous feeding with which, the great 'offence' proved in Joh 6:14 f., Joh 6:66 is connected. Then cf. Mat 15:12; Mat 16:23; Mat 17:17; Mat 17:27; Mat 18:6 ff.

There is another side to the experience of Jesus, that in which the *σκάνδαλον* is not found in Him, but presented to Him. In Mat 16:23 He says to Peter *σκάνδαλον εἶ ἐμοῦ*.

He had been telling His disciples for the first time of the necessity of His death, and Peter had made a vivacious remonstrance. He had tried, in short, to put Jesus at fault about the path appointed for Him by the Father. He had the human temper which avoids suffering at all costs, not the Divine love which at any cost is faithful to its calling; and in yielding to his human temper he had made himself a stumbling-block in Jesus' way. It is a signal illustration of 'a man's foes shall be they of his own household.' But Jesus does not stumble: in ὑπαγε ὀπίσω μου, σατανᾶ, He sweeps the σκάνδαλον from His path.

2. Teaching of Jesus.—It is remarkable that almost the only thing approaching to a discourse of Jesus in our earliest Gospel (if we omit the chapter of parables (ch. 4) and the eschatological discourse (ch. 13)) deals with the subject of offences, and this in both the aspects in which we have seen 'offence' appear in the experience of Jesus: Mar 9:42 ff.

(a) There is first *the giving of offence to others*. The others are conceived as disciples—'little ones who believe' (Mat 18:6 says 'who believe in me'). To 'offend' such means to be responsible for leading them into sin; and when we think what and whose they are, it means to be responsible for their separation by sin from Christ. Thus to mislead 'the little ones who believe' is for Jesus the sin of sins: all the Evangelists record the terrific words in which He denounced it (Mar 9:42, Mat 18:6, Luk 17:2). It is singular that side by side with this both Mt. and Lk. preserve a saying in which the inevitableness of offences coming is admitted, while unabated woe is pronounced on him through whom they come. Nothing is said by Jesus about how they come, that is, about the ways in which the little ones who believe are led into sins which put them at fault about Him; but what has been said above about Jesus as a σκάνδαλον has its application here. What is meant is in principle to seduce them to ways of thinking or acting such as led men to stumble at Jesus while He lived. It is only in the Christian society that this sin can be committed, and there is something peculiarly solemn in the picture of the Last Judgment in Mat 13:41 the Son of Man shall send His angels, and they shall gather *out of His kingdom* πάντα τὰ σκάνδαλα. There is in the life of Jesus one very interesting illustration of His own care in avoiding what might cause others to stumble (Mat 17:24-27). Here we see—what will repeatedly come up later—that an inconsiderate use of our spiritual liberty as children of God may prove a stumbling-block to those who do not understand it; and we are taught by the example and word of Jesus that conduct is never to be decided merely by the abstract principle that this or that is in itself legitimate; part of the motive on which a Christian must always act is consideration for others, and the moral significance of his conduct for them. Of course, there is the complementary consideration of what the principle requires, and though it is not to be pressed to the hurt of 'little ones who

believe,' it is not to be sacrificed to obscurantists or hypocrites (see for an illustration of this Mat 15:12-14). All this will reappear in what is sometimes regarded as the characteristically Pauline part of NT teaching.

(b) Equally important with His sayings on causing others to stumble are those in which Jesus warns His disciples against *allowing anything to cause themselves to stumble*. There are three of these in Mar 9:43; Mar 9:45; Mar 9:47 (Mar 9:44; Mar 9:46 are spurious), and they are found twice in Mt. (Mat 5:29 f., Mat 18:8 f.). It is a fair inference from this that, though Lk. does not give them, they were found in the collection of discourses used by him and Mt. as well as in Mk. (Mt. inserting them in his Gospel from both sources), and therefore that they belong to the most surely authenticated words of Jesus. What Jesus contemplates is that one's hand or foot or eye may cause one to stumble—in other words, that something in his nature, something which is in itself legitimate, may mislead one in the spiritual region and alienate him from Christ; and He declares that to prevent such a catastrophe no severity to nature can be too great. The right eye is to be plucked out, the right hand or foot cut off and cast away: it is better to enter into life halt or maimed or with one eye, than to go with two eyes and feet and hands into the everlasting fire. It is easy to argue against this from the point of view of self-realization and the development of all sides of our nature, but the peremptory and vehement tone of Jesus does not suggest arguing. For men whose nature is what ours is, living in the world in which we live, and called to discipleship to Jesus, situations will emerge in which salvation depends simply on whether we have it in us to subject nature to summary and surgical treatment. If a man will do no violence to his nature, but claims liberty for it on every side,—if he will go wherever his feet can carry him, do whatever his hands itch to do, look at whatever his eyes long to see,—the end will not be a complete and rounded character, it will be the forfeiture of all character; it will not be an abundant entrance into life, it will be hell fire. This is the philosophy of Puritanism. It is relative no doubt to human nature as Jesus knew it and as we know it; but as that is the only human nature we have to do with, it is absolute enough. It is as much a matter of life and death in the teaching of Jesus that we should not allow natural impulses to put us at fault about Him, as that we should not become responsible for putting others at fault. The most passionate words that ever fell from His lips deal with *σκανδαλιζειν* and *σκανδαλιζεσθαι* in both these vital aspects.

3. The Apostolic Church.—When we pass from Jesus to the Apostolic writings, we find new illustrations and applications of His teaching, but no new ethical ideas. Thus the conception recurs (a) of Christ Himself as *σκάνδαλον*. In the gospel which presented a crucified man as the power and the wisdom of God, there was something which people could not get over; they stumbled at it and turned away. This was especially true of the Jews (1Co 1:23). They could not accommodate themselves to a

Messiah who had been hanged, especially when they thought of Deu 21:23. As the act of striking against an obstacle is often painful and irritating, it was this offence of the cross which explained the persecution of St. Paul by the Jews, and even by Christians who did not know what Christianity meant (Gal 5:11): it was the reaction of their soreness against what caused it. The early Christians, who had naturally difficulty in understanding how Christ could be a stumbling-block, found relief for their minds in this as in similar perplexities by discovering that the disconcerting fact had been predicted in the OT. It lay not outside of, but within the Divine counsel and plan. In Rom 9:33, 1Pe 2:8, Christ is spoken of as λίθος προσκόμματος (a loose stone on the road against which the traveller strikes his foot = נִיבָה אֶבֶן) and πέτρα σκανδάλου (a rock projecting through the soil, over which he falls = מִכְשׁוֹל צוּר). [On the relation of these two passages to each other and to Isa 8:14; Isa 28:16, see Sanday and Headlam on *Romans*, and Hort on *1 Pet.*]. What it was in Christ over which men stumbled, Peter does not say: but in Paul it is clear that what the Jews could not get over was the demand involved in Christ's atoning death, that they should renounce the pursuit of a righteousness of their own, and humble themselves to receive in faith the gift of a Divine righteousness. It was the cross that was a stumbling-block, and it was a stumbling-block to pride.

(b) In the main, however, σκάνδαλον is discussed in the Apostolic writings in connexion with the possibility that Christians may cause others, especially weaker Christians, to stumble, and so to forfeit their connexion with Christ. The danger of doing this is the more serious that it is possible to do it (so to speak) with a good conscience. It comes up mainly in 1 Corinthians 8-10 and Romans 14. In both these passages the central idea is that of Christian liberty, and the problem is what are the Christian conditions of its exercise. There are minds which are intoxicated by it, and will not hear anything of conditions. They know what the Christian principle is, and to determine their conduct they do not need to think of anything else. They know, for example, that an idol is nothing in the world, and that is enough to answer all questions about their relation to idolatry—about buying and eating meat which had been sacrificed in a pagan temple, about attending a pagan friend's feast in the temple, and so forth. They know that the earth is the Lord's, and all that it contains; and that is enough to answer all questions about eating and drinking. In this region all things are lawful for them. It is at this point that St. Paul interposes in the spirit of Mat 17:24-27 (see above, 2 a). The knowledge of the Christian principle, he insists, is not enough. He accepts the principle, with a half-ironical depreciation of it: 'We know that we all have knowledge'—as if he would say, but *that* does not carry us far (1Co 8:1). In dealing with conduct we must always consider its moral consequences, both to others and to ourselves; we must consider not only an abstract principle, which may in itself be sound enough, but the practical effect of acting upon it in

given conditions. We must consider, in particular, whether it may not cause others or ourselves to stumble. These are distinct questions, yet involved in each other. If we cause another to stumble by what we do, our own ruin is inseparable from his. St. Paul accepts the principle of liberty, but qualifies it in both directions to avoid *σκανδαλιζειν* and *σκανδαλιζεσθαι*. Thus he writes, ‘All things are lawful for me, but all things do not edify,’ sc. the Church (1Co_10:23); and the edifying or building up of the Church is the rule of all Christian action (1Co_14:26, Rom_14:19; Rom_15:2). To be Christian, in other words, conduct has to be guided not merely by knowledge, but by love. It has to include a reference to Christ’s interest in others, especially in the weak; a Christian sins grievously when he asserts his liberty in disregard of that. The extraordinary vehemence of St. Paul’s language in discussing this subject reminds us vividly of our Lord’s words in the same connexion. ‘For meat destroy not the work of God’ (Rom_14:20). ‘Through thy knowledge he that is weak perisheth, the brother for whose sake Christ died’ (1Co_8:11). ‘If meat maketh my brother to stumble, I will eat no flesh for evermore’ (1Co_8:13). ‘Who is made to stumble, and I am not on fire with pain?’ (2Co_11:29). These are flashes of the same fire which glows in Mat_18:6-9. The use of Christian liberty in an environment of paganism no doubt presented many moral problems, all with possibilities of *σκάνδαλον* in them. A false solution, legitimating a free relation to pagan worship and its ordinary festive and sensual accompaniments, which no doubt caused many to stumble, is denounced in Rev_2:14; possibly in the ‘Apostolic decree’ of Act_15:28 f. we have a more considerate and Christian solution for a special set of circumstances. (For the interpretation of the decree, practically in this sense, see Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 306 ff.; Chase, *Credibility of the Acts*, 96 f.). In the whole region in which liberty can be asserted, it is to be exercised only in subordination to love; to violate this rule and so injure others in their conscience and in their relation to Christ is the most un-Christian sin of which a Christian can be guilty. But Paul is aware of the other side of *σκανδαλιζειν* also—that in which a man so acts as to lead to his own stumbling, and the perdition of his own soul. ‘All things are lawful for me,’ but not only do all things not build up the Church, but ‘I will not be tyrannized over by any’ (1Co_6:12). A man may be befooled by his wisdom: if he is puffed up in the consciousness that he comprehends the principles of Christianity, he is quite capable of yielding to his natural appetites under the delusion that he is exercising a Christian liberty. St. Paul dreaded this for himself. 1Co_9:24-27—especially after v. 1 ‘Am I not free?’—is written in the very spirit of Mar_9:43-47, and in 1 Corinthians 10 the Apostle warns his converts of the peril which awaits them, if secure in their Christianity they slip into easy relations with paganism. In the end of this chapter the idea of offence is generalized. ‘Show yourselves. *ἀπόσκοποι*—persons in whom there is no occasion of stumbling—both to Jews and Gentiles and to the Church of God’ (1Co_10:32). This is a final if not the supreme maxim of

Christian ethics; there must be nothing in the Christian's conduct which could mislead, disconcert, or repel any person seeking or enjoying relations with Christ. Put positively, it is the rule of the Apostle's own action: 'I have become all things to all men if by all means I might save some' (1Co 9:22); which again is but one form of the Golden Rule. Hence the teaching of the NT on 'offences' can be summed up in Mat 7:12. The only passage in which *σκάνδαλον* occurs in Jn. (1Jn 2:10) perhaps combines the two references which it has elsewhere. When a Christian loves his brother, there is no *σκάνδαλον* in him; he does not cause others to stumble, and he does not create difficulties in his own path. 'The triumph of love is that it creates no prejudice against the Truth' ('Wescott, *ad loc.*).

Literature.—Cremer, *Bibl.-Theol. Lex. s.vv.*; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. 586; Sanday-Headlam, *Romans*, p. 390; Hort, *First Peter*, p. 121; Garr, *Hor. Bibl.* 58; F. W. Robertson, *Sermons*, 3rd ser. xvi.; Bushnell, *Serm. on Liv. Subjects*, xix.; Dale, *Weekday Serm*, p. 216; Martensen, *Chr. Ethics*, i. 418 ff.; *ExpT [Note: xpT Expository Times.]* v. [1894] 147; *Life of John Cairns*, 438; J. B. Lightfoot, *Cambridge Sermons* (1890), 248; W. G. Rutherford, *The Keg of Knowledge* (1901), 134.

James Denney.

☩ Offerings

OFFERINGS

In the technical sense, implying a formal ceremonial act, three Gr. words are represented by 'offer,' 'offering,' in the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 : (1) *προσφίρω*, *to bring to or near*, the general term for the act of worshipper or priest, Mat 5:23-24; Mat 8:4 (= Mar 1:44, Luk 5:14), Joh 16:2; (2) *ἀνάθημα*, *a votive offering set up in a temple* (Luk 21:5); (3) *δίδωμι*, *to give* (Luk 2:24, cf. Luk 21:4).

The attitude of Jesus to the ceremonial law is, in part, indicated in these references. Speaking to Jews He uses language appropriate to their condition, and illustrates the truth He would teach from their everyday life. He assumes that they will bring their gifts to the altar, and so far 'He respects the practice,' but He adds the all-important truth that the reconciliation of man to man must come before the altar-offering. Forgiveness of injuries (Mat 5:23 f.), filial piety (Mat 15:5 f.), and mercy (Mat 9:13, Mat 12:7) condition all acceptable service of God. In this Jesus takes His stand with

the Hebrew prophets, and fulfils their moral law. The command to the leper, now cleansed, ‘show thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded,’ [Mat_8:4](#) (= [Mar_1:44](#), [Luk_5:14](#)), ought not to be pressed beyond this. The leper was ostracized, and the priest alone could remove the ban, and grant a certificate of health (Leviticus 14). Freewill offerings, over and above the requirements of the Law, were provided for in the Temple treasury ([Mar_12:41](#), [Luk_21:4](#)). Of the 13 trumpet-shaped boxes of the treasury 4 were for voluntary gifts. (See Edersheim, *The Temple*, p. 26; and for the general subject, see Giving; cf., further, artt. Law and Sacrifice).

W. H. Dyson.

⚠️Officer

OFFICER.—The term ‘officer’ is used in the Gospels (and Acts) as a translation of ὑπηρέτης in the ordinary secular applications of that term ([Mat_5:25](#), [Joh_7:32](#); [Joh_7:45](#); [Joh_18:3](#); [Joh_18:12](#); [Joh_18:18](#); [Joh_18:22](#); [Joh_19:6](#), [Act_5:22](#); [Act_5:28](#)). In other two cases ([Mar_14:54](#); [Mar_14:65](#) || [Mat_26:58](#), [Joh_18:36](#)) the Authorized Version translation ‘servants’; the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 in the former adhering to ‘officers’ and in the latter putting it in the margin. In most of these cases the officers are servants of the Jewish Council; in [Mat_5:25](#) and [Joh_18:36](#) they may be regarded more generally as servants of the State. In [Luk_12:58](#) ‘officer’ is the translation of a still humbler term, πράκτωρ, a prison official, described in (Revised Version margin) as ‘exactor’ from his duty of collecting fines. In [Joh_4:46](#) (Revised Version margin) ‘king’s officer’ appears as an alternative to ‘nobleman’ for a term meaning ‘courtier.’

It is evident that in the 16th or 17th century ‘officer’ had a lower meaning than now.* [Note: The most frequent application of the term was not to commissioners in the army or navy, but to petty officers Of justice, as In ‘sheriff’s officer,’ ‘peace officer.’ It is this usage that is reflected in the NT.] These ὑπηρέται belong to the rank and file. They are subordinate officials, with duties purely instrumental, virtually on a level with our policemen. As emphasized in Jn., they are the creatures of the Jews, accompanying the chief priests for the doing of their will; or they may take orders from a captain of the Temple ([Act_5:26](#)), or they carry into execution the sentence of a judge ([Mat_5:25](#)). St. Luke in his narrative of the Arrest and Trial and in [Luk_12:58](#) avoids the term, but he uses it in [Act_5:22](#); [Act_5:26](#) as above (where, possibly, he is following a source), and four times of religious service—in [Luk_4:20](#) of a minister of

the synagogue, in [Luk_1:2](#) and [Act_26:16](#) (Paul) of Christian preachers, and in [Act_13:5](#) of John Mark, who was, in some sense, assistant to Barnabas and Paul. So also St. Paul uses it in [1Co_4:1](#). In all these cases the Authorized Version renders 'minister'; in two ([Luk_4:20](#), [Act_13:5](#)) the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, without much lucidity, substitutes 'attendant.'

ὑπηρέτης, originally 'rower,' was used in Greece of an assistant or inferior agent in any sort of work. In particular, it was used in a military sense of attendants on heavy-armed soldiers, and also of adjutants to officers of rank. A similar indefiniteness, but always involving subordination, belongs to the NT usage. The term 'officer,' owing to the secular and especially the military associations of the name, was manifestly unsuitable for the description of a Christian minister of any rank. Such terms of ancient administration as ἀπόστολος (commissioner) and ἐπίσκοπος (inspector) were received into modern languages, not by translation into an equivalent, but by a process of adoption and adaptation. But the ὑπηρέτης, whose title, like these, was extended from the secular to the sacred sphere, was too inferior in dignity and too indefinite in character for such distinction. We have indeed in ordinary usage a somewhat similar rank expressed by the term 'office-bearer,' and there is a special episcopal use of 'official'; while a still humbler dignity, parallel with the secular use in Scripture, is denoted by the designation 'church officer.' Of such terms, and of the term 'officer' as representing the servants of the Sanhedrin, the interest pertains merely to the study of language. No theological or ecclesiastical idea is involved; and for practical utility or correctness the only duty of new Revisers towards this term is to eliminate it entirely from the sacred page.

R. Scott.

☩ Offices Of Christ

OFFICES OF CHRIST.—As the specific offices of Christ are handled in this work under their several heads, the treatment in the present article will be general.

Etymologically the word 'office' is from *officium*, the shorter form of *opificium*, the root meaning of which is 'a doing of a work' (Gr. πρᾶξις). The meaning of *officium* being wide enough to include any service or kindness, a more precise connotation is supplied by *munus*, the technical term employed by writers like Calvin to describe the capital functions discharged by Christ. In the Bible the word is nowhere used of Christ's work, though it occurs in other connexions in OT (פְּרִיָּה) and in NT (διακονία,

Rom. 11:13 [Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'ministry'], πρᾶξις, Rom. 12:4). The *idea*, however, abounds in connexion with the Jewish Messiah and the Christ of the Gospel. Under the OT dispensation the three principal offices were those of prophet, priest, and king; and 'the innermost pulse, so to speak, of the history of prophecy is to be found in the effort to interweave these three offices together, and to contemplate them in the Messianic image instead of in their distribution among several persons' (Dorner, *System of Christ. Doct.* iii. 388). Jesus, being the Messiah, fulfilled these three offices, as the supreme prophet, arch-priest, and Divine king. So repeatedly does He appear in these capacities in the NT, that it would be superfluous to enumerate *loci*.

Passing to theology, we may find beginnings of the official conception of Christ in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, etc. Thomas Aquinas departs from the triple division of the offices, and makes them coincide with the two states of humiliation and exaltation; the high-priestly office, to which the prophetic is merely introductory, coinciding with the state of humiliation, while the kingly is to be reserved for the state of exaltation (Dorner, *op. cit.* iii. 391). Discussions as to the relations of Christ's two natures (Eutychians and Nestorians) involved different views as to the way in which He performed official functions. But it was the Reformation, magnifying the sufficiency of Christ in every capacity, that was most fruitful in the exposition of His offices.

'The theologians of the Lutheran Church,' writes Hagenbach, 'further developed the *locus de persona Christi* by distinguishing between three different genera of the *communicatio idiomatum*, which were brought into connexion with the two states of Christ's exaltation and humiliation (*status exaltationis et exinanitionis*). To this they added the theory of the three offices of Christ, viz. the prophetic, priestly, and kingly offices. These definitions owed their origin in part to temporary controversies within the Lutheran Church, such as the controversy between the theologians of Giessen and those of Tübingen, at the commencement of the 17th cent., concerning the κένωσις and κατάψις of the Divine attributes, and the controversy carried on by aepinus in a previous century respecting the *descensus Christi ad inferos*' (*Compend, of Hist. of Doctrines*, Buch's translation p. 317). Those of Tübingen said that Christ in His humiliation possessed omnipotence, omnipresence, etc., but that these attributes were concealed; whereas those of Giessen said that Christ laid these prerogatives aside, aepinus said that Christ's soul suffered the punishments of hell while His body lay in the grave, whereas Calvin said that the only hell suffered by Christ was anguish of soul. The Lutherans, again, held that Christ's visit to hell was a part of His exaltation. Such controversies had a reflex influence upon ways of stating how Christ exercised His offices. Our subject is admirably treated by Calvin in the second book of his *Institutes*, Christ's priesthood being magnified as against Romish

usurpations (ch. xv.). Arminius is especially full and interesting in the present connexion. 'Two things,' he writes, 'were necessary on Christ's part: that He should undertake some offices for the sake of men to obtain eternal salvation for them, and that God should bestow upon Him dominion or lordship over all things' (*Private Disputations*, Nichols's translation ii. p. 380). Both these things were comprehended under the title of Saviour and Mediator. In respect of Christ's priesthood, the preparation consisted in imposition of office, sanctification by the Spirit, obedience, sufferings and death, and resurrection; and the discharge of the office consisted in His offering His body and blood. *Re* Christ's prophetic office, Arminius raised the question as to whether He received knowledge from the Logos as well as from the Holy Spirit. The functions of Christ's kingly office were legislation, giving of remission of sins and of grace, and judgment. The results of Christ's official work are the gathering of the Church, the obedience of His people, the actual remission of sins, resurrection from the dead, and life eternal. The means of Christ's rule are His Church, Word, and Holy Spirit. To all this the corollary is that no one is admitted even subordinately to participation in Christ's proper offices; therefore no pope can be tolerated.

The *Westminster Confession of Faith* contains a chapter (viii.) 'Of Christ the Mediator,' from which we give the third Section. 'The Lord Jesus, in His human nature thus united to the Divine, was sanctified and anointed with the Holy Spirit above measure; having in Him all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge; in whom it pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell: to the end that being holy, harmless, undefiled, and full of grace and truth, He might be thoroughly furnished to execute the office of a Mediator and Surety. Which office He took not unto Himself, but was thereunto called by His Father; who put all power and judgment into His hand, and gave Him commandment to execute the same.' Along with this may be taken the answers to questions 43-45 in the *Larger Catechism*. 'Christ executeth the office of a prophet in His revealing to the Church in all ayes, by His Spirit and word, in divers ways of administration, the whole will of God, in all things concerning their edification and salvation.' 'Christ executeth the office of a priest in His once offering Himself a sacrifice without spot to God, to be a reconciliation for the sins of His people; and in making continual intercession for them.' 'Christ executeth the office of a king in calling out of the world a people to Himself, and giving them officers, laws, and censures, by which He visibly governs them; in bestowing saving grace upon His elect, rewarding their obedience, and correcting them for their sin, preserving and supporting them under all their temptations and sufferings, restraining and overcoming all their enemies, and powerfully ordering all things for His own glory and their good; and also in taking vengeance on the rest, who know not God, and obey not the gospel.'

In our day it is less common than formerly to speak of the official character of Christ; and this for several reasons. Definite doctrine as to the Person and work of our Lord is unacceptable in many quarters, and a reaction from the terminology of the schools is common. Questions as to the metaphysical nature of Christ are thought to be too abstract. That Jesus should embody a fulfilment of OT prophecy as to the Messiah is of remote interest to many. The richness of Christ's humanity has been so energetically unfolded, that there is an aversion to contemplate Him in any aspect which might be suspected of dehumanizing Him by representing Him more in the light of a formal functionary than of a loving Son of Man and Elder Brother. Ritschl, *e.g.*, attacks the word 'office' as unsuitable, because office is a special calling with a view to realizing a legal or moral community upon conditions of law (see Corner, *op. cit.* p. 383).

As against such objections we would submit that the theological category in question possesses too much historic and intrinsic worth to be discarded. Historically it has its roots in Scripture, and controversially it has served to clarify doctrine and to safeguard certain aspects of Christ's Person and work. But, above all, Christ in His official character meets the entire needs of sinful man. On account of that moral evil which blinds the soul to the knowledge and perception of God, we need a Mediator to reveal God and to enlighten the conscience; and here Christ, as the Light of the world, appears in His prophetic office. Next, the effect of light is to disclose the fact of sin and awaken the sense of guilt and the fear of judgment; and here Christ, by putting away sin, by affording access to God, and by blessing us from God, discharges the priestly office. Lastly, by creating an eternal society in which we may live as His loving subjects, serving Him willingly according to His laws, He acts as a Divine king. Nor is there any subordinate office performed by Christ which may not be classified under one or other of these constitutive three.

Literature.—Hodge, *Syst. Theol.* ii. 459 ff.; Martensen, *Chr. Dogmat.* 295-329; Maoperson, *Chr. Dogmat.* 328 f.; Litton, *Dogmatic Theology*, 222; Denney, *Stud. in Theol.* 137 ff., 163 ff.; art. 'Jesu Christi dreifaches Ant' in *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] and the Lit. there given.

Robert M. Adamson.

OIL (טָשׁ, ἔλαιον), by which we are to understand olive oil, was from the very earliest times one of the main products of Palestine, for already in days prior to the Hebrew settlement, Canaan was 'a land of oil olives' (Deu 8:8). The importance of this valuable commodity cannot easily be overestimated. It afforded light (Mat 25:3) and nourishment (1Ki 17:12) to the household; it was valued for its healing and medicinal virtues (Is 1:6 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 , Luk 10:34); it had its place in the Hebrew ritual (Exo 29:40, Lev 2:1); and it was an important article of commerce (2Ki 4:7, Luk 16:6).

The oil was obtained by subjecting the berries of the olive-tree to pressure. The earliest method of expression seems to have been that of treading the olives with the feet, to which allusion is made in Mic 6:15, and perhaps also in Deu 33:24 This process is unknown in modern times (Thomson, *LB [Note: The Land and the Book.]* pp. 207, 339). Van-Lennep, however, states that the pulp from the olive-press is still 'trodden with the bare feet of women and girls' (*Bible Lands*, p. 130). At what period this primitive method was abandoned, and made way for more thorough processes, we do not know. The OT has no references that are clear enough to guide us: those that occur (e.g. Job 24:11; Job 29:6) are vague and general, and in none of them is the oil-press specifically mentioned. But from the Mishna (*Menâhōth* viii. 14) we learn that the processes commonly employed were bruising in a mortar, find crushing in the oil-press and the oil-mill, these processes being consecutive, not alternative.

The quality of the oil depended partly on the time at which the olives were gathered, and partly on the mode of crushing. The best quality was that yielded by berries gathered before they became black (as they do when fully ripe), and pounded in a mortar. Of this kind was 'beaten oil' (Exo 27:20; Exo 29:40, Lev 24:2, Num 28:5). This first quality of oil was got by putting the pulp from the mortar into wicker baskets, through which the strained liquid ran into receptacles placed beneath. A second and a third quality were obtained by further crushing of the pulp in the oil-press, and then in the oil-mill.

In the NT allusions to oil are not very frequent; those occurring in the Gospels have reference to its use:—(1) As an *illuminant* (Mat 25:3-4; Mat 25:8). The lamps in common use were of earthenware, and small in size (see *Lamp*). When they had to be kept burning for any considerable period, it was necessary to replenish them with oil from time to time. (2) *Medicinally* (Luk 10:34, Mar 6:13, cf. Jam 5:14). The healing virtues of oil were highly esteemed by the Jews, and it was much employed by them and by other ancient nations. It was applied, e.g., to wounds (Isa 1:6 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) to soothe their pain and to hasten the process of healing. A similar usage is found in the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luk 10:34). In this instance, wine as well as oil was employed, the added wine imparting to the mixture an

antiseptic quality (cf, Pliny, *HN* xxxi. 47; Talm. [Note: Talmud.] *Shabbâth* xiv. 4). Oil-baths were sometimes used, as in the case of Herod the Great (Josephus *Ant.* xvii. vi. 5). The anointing of the sick with oil (Mar_6:13, Jam_5:14) was doubtless based on the current belief in its remedial powers, but may also have been a symbolic act, as was the anointing of lepers (Lev_14:15 ff.). Plumptre suggests that ‘it served as a help to the faith of the person healed; perhaps also, in the case of the Apostles, to that of the healer’ (‘St. James’ in *Camb. Bible for Schools*, p. 103). (3) For *anointing* (Mat_6:17, Luk_7:46). The custom of anointing the head or the body with oil was a very common one in ancient times, and was practised by the Egyptians (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyp.* [Note: *Egyptian.*] ii. 213), the Greeks (Homer, *Il.* x. 577), and others (Pliny, *HN* xiii. 1 ff.). Among the Jews the anointing of the head with oil seems to have accompanied the daily ablutions (Mat_6:17, cf. Rth_3:3, 2Sa_12:20), except in time of mourning (2Sa_14:2, Dan_10:3). It was also a mark of honour paid to guests by their host (Luk_7:46, cf. Psa_23:5). Anointing the feet (Luk_7:38; Luk_7:46, Joh_11:2) was very unusual. The dead were anointed as a tribute of respect (Mar_16:1, Luk_23:56; Luk_24:1, cf. Joh_12:3; Joh_12:7), aromatic spices being added. (4) As an article of *merchandise* (Mat_25:9, Luk_16:6). In common and daily use, and to the Eastern one of the necessaries of life, oil played a large part in the home trade of Palestine (2Ki_4:7), and was, further, a most valuable export. We find special mention made of trading in oil with the Tyrians (Eze_27:17), who probably re-exported it, and with Egypt (Hos_12:1). It formed an important part of the supplies sent by Solomon to Hiram in return for the timber and other materials furnished for the building of the Temple (1Ki_5:11).

Hugh Duncan.

Ointment

OINTMENT (μύρον).—Nard oil, from a plant found especially in Arabia (*nardus*), and highly prized at Rome. St. Luke mentions it in connexion with the anointing of Christ by the unnamed woman in the house of Simon the Pharisee (Luk_7:38; Luk_7:46), and again (Luk_23:56) as one of the things prepared by the women for the intended completion of the burial of the Master. See art. Anointing.

In the account of the anointing of Jesus at Bethany, St. Matthew describes the unguent as μύρου βαρυτίμον, ‘exceeding precious ointment’ (Mat_26:7 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885); St. Mark as μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτελοῦς, ‘ointment of spikenard [marg. pistic nard] very costly’ (Mar_14:3 Revised Version NT 1881, OT

1885); St. John as μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτίμου, ‘ointment of spikenard very precious’ (Joh_12:3 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 , with ref. to Mar_14:3 [marg.]). As this word πιστικῆ is found only in these two places, it is rather difficult to give its true equivalent. It is used by Plato (*Gorg.* 455) and by Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1. 2), where it is synonymous with πειστικός, ‘persuasive’; but that meaning would be irrelevant in this connexion.* [Note: In later Greek, however, πιστικός = trustworthy, and the meaning may thus be ‘genuine,’ ‘unadulterated,’ ‘pure.’] Scaliger would translate ‘pounded nard,’ from πίσσω, ‘to pound,’ which is a possible rendering, but lacks analogy. The Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 has translated it ‘spikenard,’ following, apparently, the Vulgate rendering of Mar_14:3, *spicati*. Some would translate ‘liquid nard,’ deriving πιστικός from πίνω, ‘to drink’; others regard it as a local technical term (see Mar_14:3 (Revised Version margin) ; cf. Westcott, *St. John, Joh_12:3*). The most natural rendering would appear to be ‘pistic nard,’ an Ointment prepared from the oil of the pistachio nut, which is used to this day in Syria for similar purposes. See especially a long note by Morison, *Com. on Mark, Mar_14:3*, and cf. artt. Nard and Spikenard.

Henry E. Dosker.

⚡ Old Testament (I. Christ As Fulfilment Of)

OLD TESTAMENT (I. Christ as fulfilment of).† [Note: On the OT of Jesus see following article.]

1. The ideals of life found in the OT by Jesus.—Jesus’ conception of the life of the OT is that of the life which is proper to the children of God (*Matthew* 5-7). It is the normal relation of fellowship between God and His children, obedience to God and to His messengers (Mat_7:24). The life for which the prophets laboured, that which they represented as the ideal, was adopted by Him as the ideal, and their labours were continued by Him. He claimed no less an authority to carry on the development of the ideal than the greatest of the prophets had exercised. As the prophet taught (Isa_50:10) that those loyal to Jehovah should obey His representative, so did Jesus when He combined such sayings as ‘He that doeth the will of my Father’ (Mat_7:21), and ‘He that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them’ (Mat_7:24, Luk_6:45-49).

The OT ideal of religious life was the earlier stage of a religious development which He came to continue. It needed no essential change to become that which He wished to establish. It was characterized by an imperative demand for a righteousness which consisted in a thoroughgoing obedience to God, and this was just what Jesus demanded and exemplified. Moreover, while Jesus taught that the ideal of life was to be found in the OT, He was far from teaching that all that was in the OT contributed to this ideal. When He had occasion, He expressly taught that even the lawgiver, Moses, permitted practices which belonged to a lower plane of living than that of the principles contained in the OT. There was so much in the human heart that was hostile to these principles, that for a time a standard of life lower than these ideals was permitted (Mat 19:8).

Jesus, like the prophets, was certain that the religious life for which He laboured was to become a universal religion. His claim of permanence for His utterances (Mat 24:35, Mar 13:31, Luk 21:33) was also a claim that His teachings had the changeless quality of the word of God under the Old Covenant (Isa 40:8; Isa 55:10-11; cf. Isa 51:6), and of God's law under the New (Mat 5:18, Luk 16:17). Words uttered by Him when the Greeks sought to see Him (Joh 12:32), were an assumption to Himself personally of the universal significance for human history which the prophets (Isa 11:9, Hab 2:14) had claimed for the religion of Jehovah. This claim to a unique place in human history and identification of Himself with those lofty utterances of the OT, show that in the mind of Jesus the religious life of the OT had a unique place among the religions of the world. This is equally seen in His declaration to the Samaritan woman (Joh 4:22), 'Ye worship that which ye know not: we worship that which we know: for salvation is of the Jews.'

Jesus addressed His hearers constantly as having the true religion, as nominally recognizing the true and living God, and as needing to do no more than live up to their own religion. He saw in the OT a universal ideal of society, and the principles for a programme of its establishment. The ideal society was one in which the lost should have been saved; into which the called and chosen should have been gathered; in which the repentant should have found pardon, the distressed and scattered should have found comfort; the members of which should love God supremely, and each other as themselves, and should be humble, meek, and pure in heart. During the progress of the establishment of this society, those who belonged to it would be called upon to be merciful, to hunger and thirst after righteousness to be peacemakers, to endure persecution for righteousness' sake patiently, to love enemies, to devote themselves to God without pretence and with singleness of mind; and yet to live lives of radiant goodness, to bring forth an abundant fruitage of beneficence for the sake of Jesus and in His name, to observe the duties which grow out of the natural relations of life, to lose their lives for His sake and the gospel's, to seek first this ideal society and God's righteousness, to go to Jesus and take His yoke

upon themselves, and look upon a life of lowliest ministry as the life of highest honour.

In these conceptions Jesus was developing the OT ideal, as will be seen later. An important element in developing the ideal was a maturing of the conception of God. Since Jesus was an 'OT saint' (A. B. Davidson, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 520), the OT God was His God. Moses had been able to add new elements of meaning to Israel's conception of God in connexion with the name 'Jehovah.' Jesus made a further advance by using the OT word 'Father' as applied to God, making it the dominant name in His own thought, and reading into this dominant conception of Fatherhood all the OT elements of the thought of God. Jesus so enlarged the conception of God that He practically gave a new revelation as the basis of the new development of religious life which He was promoting. This enlargement came in part from replacing the name 'Jehovah' by the name 'Father,' partly by the assumption on His part of a unique Sonship into which none of His disciples might enter (Mat 11:27), partly by the new place given to the Spirit which was no more than adumbrated in the OT.

In these views Jesus was at variance with many of the people among whom He lived. The Jews at large were incapable of understanding them. For Pharisees and Sadducees the OT was a finality. It was a full and complete law incapable of further development. It was to be accomplished, fulfilled, simply by obedience to its letter. Prophecy was formal and literal, and their interpretations were often puerile. The Apocryphal literature shows how far short they fell of the ideals of the ancient prophets in spite of their ethical zeal. There was attachment to noble ethical ideals, and desire to attain them, and yet blindness to the real nature of these ideals. There was a lack of insight into the nature of their own religion, and an incapacity to live anywhere except on the surface of things.

2. Jesus and the Law.—Jesus found in the OT not only the ideal of a life, but also commandments, moral and ritual, by which this ideal was to be realized. It is certain that He regarded the OT as supremely authoritative for the conduct of life. He so accepted it and used it. He emphasized it as giving an authoritative revelation of the mind and will of God. He met temptation (Mat 4:4; Mat 4:7; Mat 4:10, Luk 4:4; Luk 4:12; Luk 4:8) with precepts for life (Deu 8:3; Deu 6:16; Deu 6:13), which exactly fitted the emergency. He also referred to the Ten Commandments as specific directions for conduct (Mat 15:4, Mar 7:10 a; Mat 19:18-19 a, Mar 10:19, Luk 18:20). He treated the OT as giving authoritative legislation when (Mat 22:37; Mat 22:39, Mar 12:29-31, Luk 10:28) He quoted or approved other commands found in the Law (Deu 6:4-5, Lev 19:18; Lev 19:34) as chief rules for life. His practice is not the only indication of His mind. He made a definite declaration of principles, and gave abundant illustration of what He meant by it. The Sermon on the Mount is

luminous on this point: Mat 5:17 f. 'Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfil'; cf. Luk 16:17.

His words to John the Baptist (Mat 3:15 'Suffer it now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness') show that His conception of fulfilment included His own personal performance of any and every duty which was incumbent upon Him according to the Law, so that nothing should be wanting to His full performance of every human duty. In other utterances, as Joh 4:34; Joh 5:36; Joh 17:4, His use of $\tau\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ shows that His idea of fulfilment meant the completion of the tasks laid upon Him to accomplish. It should be borne in mind that He considered, and even claimed, that His conduct and will were in perfect harmony with the will of God (Mat 7:21; Mat 12:50, Mar 3:35, Mat 26:39, Mar 14:36, Luk 22:42, Joh 5:30; Joh 6:38; Joh 8:46). This is a real and important mode of His fulfilment of the Law. If He did no more, it would be small help to those who were to preach the gospel. He did it because He was able to do far more, He was able to complete the Law as a law, *i.e.* to bring it to its perfection as a law. See, further, artt. Law and Law of God.

One wishes to find a clear utterance of the mind of Jesus respecting the imprecatory Psalms. Perhaps it is to be found in Mat 5:44. If the basis of the current Jewish morality respecting revenge found support, as some think, in Psa 41:11, (10) ('But thou, O Lord, have mercy upon me, and raise me up, that I may requite them') and the imprecatory Psalms, then we find the mind of Jesus in respect of those Psalms an expression of feelings which belong to the individual relations in life. Hate, divorce, and revenge are contrary to the principles of the society which Jesus came to establish, and they have no place in His ideal Kingdom.

The OT often had an ideal in solution, as it were, which in the mind of Jesus was precipitated into crystals of perfect and imperishable form. An illustration is the inchoate ideal of Job 31:29 'If I rejoiced at the destruction of him that hated me, or lifted up myself when evil found him'; cf. Pro 24:17 'Rejoice not when thine enemy falleth, and let not thy heart be glad when he is overthrown'; Pro 24:29 'Say not, I will do so to him as he has done to me, I will render to the man according to his work'; Pro 20:22 'Say not thou, I will recompense evil; wait on the Lord, and he will save thee'; Pro 25:21 'If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat; and if he be thirsty, give him water to drink'; Exo 23:4-5 'If thou meet thine enemy's ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again. If thou see the ass of him that hateth thee lying under his burden, and wouldest forbear to help him, thou shalt surely help with him'; 1Sa 24:4-8 the example of David in sparing the life of Saul when he had him in his power; also the similar instance of Elisha in sparing the Syrians (2Ki 6:22); Psa 7:5 b (4b) 'Yea, I have delivered him that without cause was mine adversary.' These were expressions of an ideal as yet unformed; passing through the

mind of Jesus, they appear in the form, 'Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you' (Mat 5:44), or more completely in Luk 6:27 b, Luk 6:28 'Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, bless them that curse you, pray for them that despitefully use you.' And they are exemplified in His prayer on the cross, Luk 23:34 'Father, forgive them: for they know not what they do' (on this verse see Westcott-Hort, *Gr. Test.* ii. pp. 67, 68).

The ideal of true life found in the OT was fellowship with God. The necessary condition of such a life was perfect obedience to the law of love. Jesus found these principles in the literature of the OT, and their authority came from the Spirit, who moulded the life of which the OT was a growth.

3. Jesus and prophecy.—The recorded utterances of Jesus seem to indicate that He laid as real stress on the fulfilment of the prophecies of the OT as He did upon the fulfilment of the Law. This was a necessary consequence of the conviction that the ideal was to be realized. In Law and Prophets alike Jesus found declarations of the Divine purposes in human history, and intimations of the programme of the accomplishment of this purpose. In respect to the latter He expressed a firm confidence that the will of God as declared in the Law should be accomplished. In the Law and the Prophets He found intimations of Himself, of His experiences, and of the relation of these experiences to the establishment of the Kingdom. 'Ye search the scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life' (Joh 5:39). Were the intimations which Jesus found in the Prophets detailed and exact predictions which He was to fulfil? How did He look at the OT in relation to His own life? Did the Messianic conceptions of Jesus come chiefly from predictions which He found in the OT? Early in His ministry (Luk 4:21), after reading from Isa 61:1-2 He said, 'To-day hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears.' He continued, and the contents of His speech are described (Lukr 4:22a), 'And all bare him witness, and wondered at the words of grace which proceeded out of his mouth.' What these words of grace may have been is left to our conjecture. They may have been like the answer sent to John the Baptist at another time, which seems to show that Jesus regarded the work He was doing in preaching good news to the poor, healing the sick, restoring sight to the blind, as the fulfilment of the utterance of the prophet in this passage. But also the fact that He Himself was doing this work was seen by Jesus as a fulfilment of that prophecy. It is only reasonable to interpret the words of Jesus as affirming that He regarded Himself 'personally as included within the scope of the passage. Again, 'For I say unto you, that this which is written must be fulfilled in me, And he was reckoned with transgressors: for that which concerneth me hath fulfilment' (Luk 22:37). 'That which concerneth me' probably means that which in the Divine counsel concerned Him, whether written or unwritten. The words quoted by Him from Isa 53:12 were a part of the Divine counsel, according to the thought of Jesus. He says in effect: This utterance includes me within its scope and finds its culmination and perfect

realization in my experience. The same may be said of the following, 'But that the scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth my bread lifted up his heel against me' (Joh_13:18); 'But this Cometh to pass that the word may be fulfilled that is written in their law, They hated me without a cause' (Joh_15:25), *i.e.* 'the words of the OT find their completion in my experience.'

All the most important utterances of Jesus concerning fulfilment of OT prophecy found in His work or experience were attached to no specific Scripture passage, and furthermore we are unable to find a specific OT utterance as the basis. This is a very significant fact, and deserves more careful attention than was needed in the case of the passages just mentioned; cf. Mat_26:54 'How then should the scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?'; Mat_26:56 'But all this is come to pass, that the scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled'; less fully in Mar_14:49 'But *this is done* that the scriptures might be fulfilled'; Luk_18:31 'And he took unto him twelve, and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all the things that are written by the prophets shall be accomplished unto the Son of Man.' Most important of all are Luk_24:26-27; Luk_24:44-47 'Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself.... And he said unto them, These are my words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, how that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their mind, that they might understand the scriptures, and he said unto them, Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem.' In these passages Jesus taught plainly that the OT testified that His death and resurrection were necessary antecedents to the preaching of repentance and the forgiveness of sins. In other words, according to Jesus, the OT clearly showed that His death and resurrection were a necessity in the Divine economy. The exact nature of this necessity has not been preserved in the record of the teachings of Jesus. We may say that in harmony with Scripture we should regard this necessity as not due to any arbitrariness on God's part, or to any necessity of a mechanical conformity to the utterances in the OT. Rather, in the nature of things, it was due to the hardness of the human heart, which necessitated such experiences on the part of a Saviour in order to overcome its hardness.

It is quite significant that no one passage is quoted or mentioned in the reports of the teaching of Jesus given by Him after His resurrection. Yet He taught His disciples explicitly that His sufferings, death, and resurrection were necessary in order to fulfil the OT. Further, the disciples, after they understood the Scriptures, also saw the necessity of the death and resurrection. For the most part, the early utterances of

the Apostles, as recorded in the Book of Acts, show the same reticence respecting specific OT passages which Jesus had shown.

We must believe that in its general tenor the Apostles taught what they had learned of Jesus. Is it not possible that the speech of Stephen before the Sanhedrin gives us very nearly the character of the teaching of Jesus? This is an argument from broad historical analogies and principles rather than a use of particular passages. In support of this suggestion we may turn to the utterances of Jesus, before His crucifixion, respecting His sufferings. See art. Announcements of Death.

The only passages of the OT which Jesus is recorded as having quoted in any relation to His sufferings are Psa_35:19; Psa_41:9 (Hebrew 10) Psa_69:4 (Hebrews 5), Isa_53:12, and Zec_13:7. Did Jesus see specific predictions in these passages?

Before attempting to answer this question, it will be well to note what He said respecting the suffering of others than Himself which was due to their religious activities. He affirmed that in the past the world had been bitterly hostile towards those who worked for the doing of God's will on earth. In Mat_5:11 f., Luk_11:47-49, and similar passages, Jesus called to mind the fact that God's messengers to His people had encountered bitter hostility throughout the past. In passages like Mat_10:17; Mat_10:22; Mat_10:34-36; Mat_23:29-31; Mat_23:34; Mat_23:37, Mar_10:30, Luk_12:49-53; Luk_13:34, Joh_15:18-25; Joh_17:14-15. He showed that such hostility is inevitable in the progress of His Kingdom. The spirit and methods of the world in the midst of which His Kingdom must develop are wholly alien to those of the Kingdom, therefore Jesus must meet hostility, and so must His disciples. The work of Jesus in the establishment of the Kingdom was conditioned by a long historical development which had already been centuries in progress when He came.

A long-continued historical movement, however complex, tending toward one goal has a substantial unity of character in all stages of its development. The various attitudes assumed by men towards the great features of such a movement are substantially the same from generation to generation, from age to age. Human beings persistently manifest their attitude in modes that are practically identical. Hence arise the oft-noted historical parallels. The fact that at one stage of a movement persons may act as persons do at another stage is the essential element of a historical parallel. In a long-continued development of a specific character nearly identical situations will often be repeated, and nearly identical experiences will often occur.

More noteworthy than mere historical parallels is the substantial identity of moral attitude and conduct seen in the persons whose experiences constitute the historical parallels. These facts can be verified from the political life of all peoples which has been recorded and transmitted to us. Nay, even movements separated widely in time

and place, and not in the direct lines of historical development, give striking instances of historical parallels, and substantial identity of human character and conduct. This is notably exemplified in the entire history of the attempt to establish an ideal society, from Moses until the present day. Every attempt of men to establish the coming perfect society had some likeness to the labours which were to follow it. Every person, therefore, who shared in the earlier parts of the work in some respect foreshadowed those who should come later, including Him who should complete it. The earlier is the type of the later. So the persons in the earlier stages were typical of those in the later stages. So also were the Institutions which were auxiliary to the labours of these persons, or instrumental in their hands, typical of elements involved in the final accomplishment of the work to which they contributed. The later experiences are more complex than the earlier ones. For this reason we may say that the earlier ones foreshadowed the later, but we do not say that the earlier ones show with anything like exactness what the later ones were to be. Nevertheless, there is so much of likeness that similar language may often be used respecting them both. The names or descriptions of the earlier may, in a measure, fit the later. It was thus that Jesus properly gave the name Elijah to John the Baptist (Mat 17:10-13), and appropriated for him the utterance in Mal 4:5 (Heb. 3:23), as He had done more explicitly (Mat 11:10-14) in the use of Mal 3:1.

It is a most noteworthy fact that men who would gain power over others to secure their, transformation of character, must gain that power by self-denial and suffering. This was the philosophy of history given by Deutero-Isaiah. It was recognized by Stephen in his address before the Sanhedrin. Is it likely that Jesus had any less insight into the meaning of the history of His race, and the nature of the work which He had to do, than the prophet of the Exile? The teachings of Jesus show that He saw that the ideal state of society could come only by means of a contest with human selfishness and victory over it. The conflict presents essentially the same aspects in all stages of its progress. A successful issue of any long struggle is the consummation of all the previous stages of that struggle. Any complete realization of an ideal sought in the past is the consummation of that ideal. Also any conflict or experience securing the consummation of the ideal is equally the consummation of those seemingly fruitless conflicts and sufferings in the previous stages of the striving after the ideal. The history of redemption is organic. All the earlier stages typify the later ones.

Among other things, two facts have come to clear recognition at some stage in this discussion. One is that Jesus knew that the society which He was labouring to establish, the Kingdom of God, was certain to be established, and that both the chief place in the establishment of it and the supreme place in it after its establishment belonged to Him. The other fact is that Jesus recognized the inevitable and deeply rooted antagonism which He and His society must encounter and overcome, and that the way of suffering was the only path by which He could reach the goal of success.

The conviction of the certainty of the establishment of the Kingdom of God must accordingly carry with it the conviction that all the conflicts and sufferings necessary to the establishment of this Kingdom were equally certain. Without doubt, Jesus saw in the OT Scriptures those experiences narrated and depicted which were necessary as the conditions of accomplishing the work which belonged to the establishment of the Kingdom of God. He claimed that He was establishing the Kingdom, that the foremost place in it belonged to Him, and that the position of men in the Kingdom was determined by relation to Himself. Accordingly He, the pre-eminent agent in the establishment of the Kingdom, in order to accomplish the purpose for which He was labouring, must accept into His experience all the trial and conflict which could befall any person engaged in the same work. OT prophecy, therefore, as a programme of the establishment of the Kingdom, depicted the experiences and labours of God's servants, which were an unavoidable part of their work in achieving the results which they sought. The Synoptics record the sense of Jesus that sufferings prophesied in connexion with the establishment of the Kingdom were necessary (δεῖ, Mat_16:21 *et al.*). He saw that the goal was certain to be reached, and that the OT representation of the toils, sufferings, and experiences necessary for the accomplishment of the labour which He was to perform concerned Him more fully than they concerned any one else, because the chief place in the Kingdom was His. So all the partial successes and the unsuccessful attempts in past generations to establish the ideal society were prophetic of what must come before the goal should be reached.

We must believe that this typical nature of the OT records and prophecy was that which Jesus had in His mind when He applied the OT prophecies to Himself. This is a principle, and the use which Jesus made of the OT in ethical and spiritual matters was so prevalently that of principle, that it is most natural to regard the use of prophecy as that of principle. Like the Semitic mode of presenting principles by concrete examples, so was His use of the OT Scriptures by definite illustrations and allusions to individuals. The instances noted above of the use of Isa_53:12, Zec_13:7, Psa_41:9 (Hebrew 10) Psa_35:19; Psa_69:4 (Hebrews 5), may all without violence be interpreted as concrete illustrations of principles, instead of being regarded as citations of specific predictions of His individual experience. Jesus saw in Himself the fulfilment of all that belonged to the life of conflict which must be met by any of the members of the Kingdom of blessing, and of all that belonged to the work of deliverance of the people from those habits of life which enslaved them, and which might render them liable to re-enslavement after having once experienced some release.

The view thus derived from the broad consideration of the teaching of Jesus is supported by the various words conveying the idea of fulfilment in respect to the OT utterances and their relation to the experiences of Jesus (τεληρῶω, Mat_26:54;

Mat 26:56, Mar 14:49, Luk 4:21; Luk 24:44, Joh 13:18; Joh 15:25; Joh 17:12; ἀναίτη
ριω, Mat 13:14; πίμπληται Luk 21:22; τέλος, Luk 22:37; τελεω, Luk 18:31; Luk 22:37,
Joh 19:30). The study of these passages gives the idea of the completion of the
incomplete, the culmination of a process, as was the case in the use of the first of the
above words when applied to the Law. e.g. Mat 13:14; the generation of Jesus
exemplified in their conduct, more fully than any previous generation could have
done, that wilful blindness, that spiritual insusceptibility described in Isa 6:9-10. Thus
in the experience of Jesus He thought that nothing was to be lacking of the element
of differing which was the indispensable condition of His entering into the fulness of
power needed by the Messiah. Since He was the One who should perfect the work for
which so many before Him had toiled and suffered, He must gain His power by the
same method as they, for the very nature of things made this a necessity, and His
experience must fulfil theirs by taking up into it every variety known by them, and fill
out to complete realization every type of suffering by which one must enter into
power. He needed greater power than others, hence He must suffer much more than
they.

It is to be noted that the large and broad conception of prophecy which is evident in
the words of Jesus is not equally evident in the writings of the Evangelists. Mark and
Luke make little use of prophecy, and present no variation from the method of Jesus.
Matthew and John had much more use for OT prophecy. As Orientals, they also would
naturally follow the example of Jesus in the use of the common method of teaching
by illustration. Those passages which in the mouth of Jesus would be of illustrative
value were often stated by the Evangelists so as to seem the fulfilments of strict
predictions. The following are passages of this sort: Mat 1:22-23; Mat 2:15;
Mat 2:17-18; Mat 2:23; Mat 8:17; Mat 12:17-21; Mat 21:4-5; Mat 27:9-10, Joh 2:17;
Joh 12:14-16; Joh 19:24; Joh 19:36-37. See, further, art. Prophecy.

Literature.—Beyschlag, *NT Theol.*, English translation bk. i. chs. i.-v.; Stevens, *NT
Theol.* 1904, pp. 17-28, Edinburgh; B. Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. of NT*, English translation
1888-1889, vol. i. § 24; Nösgen, *Gesch. der NT offenbarung*, erster Band, 'Gesch. Jesu
Christi,' 1891; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, vol. i. p. 173 to vol. ii. p. 48; Tholuck, *Die
Bergrede Christi* 5, 1872 [English translation from 4th German ed., Edinburgh,
1860, pp. 115-144]; Votaw, art. 'Sermon on the Mount' in Hasting's Dictionary of the
Bible, Ext. Vol. pp. 22-25; see also the Comm. on Mat 5:17-18; Baur, *NT Theol.*
46-60; Kähler, *Jesus und das AT [Note: T Altes Testament.]*, 1896; Lechler, *SK [Note:
K Studien und Kritiken.]*, 1854, p. 787 ff., 'Das Alte Testament in den Reden Jesu';
Macfarland, *Jesus and the Prophets*, 1905; R. Mackintosh, *Christ and the Jewish Law*,
1886; S. Mathews, *The Messianic Hope in the NT*, 1905, pp. 57-133; Meinhold, *Jesus
und das AT [Note: T Altes Testament.]*, 1896; Osiander, 'Die Stellung Jesu zum
Gesetz' in *SK [Note: K Studien und Kritiken.]*, 1890, p. 103 ff.; Peters, 'Christ's

Treatment of the OT' in *JBL* [Note: *BL Journal of Biblical Literature.*] , 1896, vol. xv. pp. 87-105; P. Ewald, 'Zu Mat 5:17-19' in *ZKWL* [Note: *KWL Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft und kirchl Leben.*] , 1886, pp. 499-518; of. also Orelli, *ib.* 1884, pp. 283-291.

F. B. Denio.

☞ Old Testament (II. Christ As Student And Interpreter Of).

OLD TESTAMENT (II. Christ as student and interpreter of).

1. Importance of the subject.—In studying the Gospels, it is hardly possible to exaggerate the importance of the subject of Christ's knowledge of and use of the Scriptures of the OT. These constituted the main part of the literature of His fellow-countrymen, and by all of them were regarded with a reverence second to nothing else.

In our own day it has become possible to study this subject as no previous generation has ever had the opportunity of doing. Careful textual investigation of the NT has enabled us to be much more sure of the actual form of the text than ever before, and the patient comparative study of the Gospels has set forth their inter-relation and dependence upon one another in a clearer fashion for the ordinary reader than at any other time. Much more care has also been expended on the study of the OT, both in Hebrew and in Greek, and, consequently, the influence of the latter version upon the language of the NT has been rendered clearer. Much study has also been given to the language of the NT, so that we are better able to tell when the LXX Septuagint influences it, and when the vocabulary is less that of the OT than it is of the common contemporary speech. The discoveries of recent years among the papyri of Egypt have given us much insight into the ordinary Greek of the period, so that many words formerly supposed to belong exclusively to the LXX Septuagint are now known to belong to the everyday language of the market-place. Investigations of another order have made us better acquainted than before with the vast amount of literature current in the circles of Judaism, only a small portion of which is contained in the Apocrypha of our English Bible. The various Apocalypses in particular exerted an immense influence upon the generation to which our Lord belonged, and much of their language and ideas can be traced in the pages of the Gospels. Again, the mere improvement in the methods of printing has made the study of this subject easier for present-day students. Take such a copy of the Greek text as that of Westcott and Hort. A cursory examination of it shows that not only actual quotations, but even reminiscences, when these consist of not more than a word or two, are printed in

uncial type, and so reveal at a glance the fact that there are traces of the OT in the passage. It is very striking to run through the Gospels in such a form, and to find how large a portion of them, comparatively speaking, is made up of OT phraseology. A similar expedient is carried out in the *Twentieth Century NT*, save that there quotations and reminiscences from the Apocryphal literature are also indicated. In Weymouth's translation, *The NT in Modern Speech*, the actual quotations from the OT are also indicated in special type, and more clearly still these various sources are indicated in Weizsäcker's German translation of the NT. All these are indications of how thoroughly modern scholars realize the importance of setting forth the presence of OT language in the text of the NT. This, however, is not mainly of antiquarian or historical interest, but derives its greatest significance from the bearing that it has upon the personal thought and action of our Lord. It is always of the greatest interest and significance to discover the intellectual forces that have moulded any great personality. 'Books that have influenced me' always constitute an illuminative section of the autobiography of any great thinker or writer; and to discover that the recorded conversations and addresses of our Lord reveal to us as clearly as they do the literature upon which He has nurtured His own soul, is a great help both in the interpretation of His teaching and in the understanding of His message and mission.

2. Difficulties of the subject.—Fascinating as this study is, it is beset with many peculiar difficulties, (a) First among these is the question of *language*. It is now generally recognized that the language our Lord spoke was Aramaic, the then current colloquial speech of Palestine. This is, as is well known, revealed in certain expressions in that language quoted in the Gospels, as, for example, the words upon the Cross and those spoken at the raising of Jairus' daughter. The fact that our Lord commonly spoke Aramaic implies, of course, that all the reports of His speeches and conversations are translations, and this at the outset necessarily complicates the question we wish to investigate, for the references that are clearly obvious to the OT or other writings may be the work of the translator; and, on the other hand, many traces of OT language present in the original address may now be lost sight of. It is a further question whether and how far the existing Gospels depend upon an Aramaic original or originals. The well-known tradition, derived from Papias, that Matthew's Gospel was originally composed in Aramaic, has been taken as a basis for various theories, that seek to account for existing divergences among the Synoptics by the supposition that these consist of different translations of the same original.

(b) The second difficulty that attaches to the preliminary investigation of the subject is as to *whether our Lord Himself quoted from the original Hebrew text of the OT, or from the Septuagint*. A knowledge of Hebrew was not usual among the common people, and in the synagogue services the reading of the Hebrew text was always accompanied by that of an Aramaic paraphrase;* [Note: It has been thought that a trace of this Aramaic paraphrase of Pro_15:27, which uses the expression 'mammon of

unrighteousness,' may be found in our Lord's use of the phrase, Luk_16:9 (see Expos, iii. vii. [1888] p. 112).] but, of course, it is impossible to tell whether in any one individual case a knowledge of the sacred language might not in some way have been acquired. But the evidence goes to show that the Greek version of the OT was that most commonly in use, and the majority of the quotations in the Gospels are made from it. Swete has pointed out that the large number of citations common to the three Synoptics, or to two of them, are directly taken from the LXX Septuagint, while in the case of citations that are peculiar to one Gospel a larger proportion show independence of the LXX Septuagint text. Some of these peculiar instances will be examined in detail later in this article; but a curious discovery has been made, namely, that certain quotations contained in the Gospels reveal a closer agreement with Cod. A than with any other existing text of the Greek OT—a tendency that has also been discovered in the writings of Josephus and of Philo, while Swete also points out that there is an 'occasional tendency in NT quotations to support Theodotion against the LXX Septuagint' (*Introd. to the OT in Greek*, p. 395). It would thus, appear that the NT writers may have employed a form of text different from that of the LXX Septuagint as now known to us in what we reckon its best textual form; but whether, of course, this is only a peculiarity of the writer or was also the form of text familiar to and used by our Lord Himself, is impossible to decide.

An interesting illustration of our Lord's apparent intimate acquaintance with the LXX Septuagint, where that differs from the Hebrew, is given by Dr. Horton in the case of the Book of Proverbs. In Pro_9:12 there is a long addition in the LXX Septuagint text to that of the ordinary Hebrew, the latter part of which runs as follows: 'For he hath forsaken the ways of his vineyard, and gone astray in the paths of his field; for he walketh through a desert without water (διαπορεύεται δι' ἀνύδρου ἐρήμου) and over a land that is set in thirsty places; and with his hands he gathereth that which is without fruit.' The phrase used above for 'through a desert without water' is that employed in the description of the conduct of the unclean spirit in our Lord's parable in Mat_12:43. Again, in Pro_4:21 the LXX Septuagint, instead of 'Let them not depart from thine eyes,' reads 'in order that thy fountains may not fail thee,' using a metaphor which recurs frequently in the pages of the book (see Pro_18:4; Pro_14:27; Pro_16:22), and is frequently employed by our Lord Himself in His language with reference to the 'water of life' (cf. Joh_7:38, and what is said of that passage below).

(c) The third difficulty is that which attaches to the *method of the Evangelists in reporting our Lord's sayings*. For instance, in Luk_11:29-30 our Lord says that no sign shall be given to the men of His own generation save the sign of Jonah; 'for even,' He adds, 'as Jonah became a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of Man be to this generation ... the men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with this generation and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonah, and

behold a greater than Jonah is here.’ It is obvious that in Lk.’s understanding of the saying the parallel between Jonah and Christ is that of the preacher of righteousness, and the result that his preaching had upon his hearers; but when we turn to the parallel in Mat 12:40, we find the sign distinctly given as the fact of Jonah’s being three days and nights in the maw of the sea-monster, and as a parallel with the Son of Man’s being three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. But the close of the passage is the same as that given by Lk., so that it seems pretty certain that this fantastic and allegorical interpretation was not due to our Lord Himself, but to the Evangelist, a fact that is made the more probable by the consideration that He seems never to have hinted at His resurrection except to the immediate circle of His disciples. Another instance is to be found in Mar 7:11-12 and its parallel in Mat 15:5-6, where Mk. in the explanation of the custom of Corban makes our Lord say, ‘Ye no longer suffer him to do aught for his father or his mother,’ while Mt. says, ‘He shall not honour his father (or his mother).’ A further study of these two parallel passages will also reveal the fact that a passage from Isaiah quoted in each of them has a different connexion in each Evangelist, and that either considerable freedom must have been used in reporting our Lord’s words, or the Evangelists have themselves introduced the passage as appropriate to the occasion. The well-known method of Mt., in particular, of introducing OT passages as illustrative of incidents in our Lord’s history or as explicative of His teaching, makes it the more difficult in the case of the First Gospel to feel certain when we have our Lord’s own words and when the sayings are attributable to the writer.

3. How Jesus learned to know the OT.—Jewish boys were from their earliest years made familiar with the contents of the OT, particularly with the books of the Law (see Boyhood, and Education). They were not only taught to commit many passages to memory, but there seems to have been a pretty widespread knowledge of reading. While the primary steps in such education were no doubt carried out in the home, there is pretty clear testimony that everywhere schools for at least elementary education were established. Within the home circle also children were accustomed from a very early age to observe certain practices enjoined by the Law, *e.g.* the keeping of the Sabbath, fasting on the Day of Atonement, the simpler forms of prayer, and grace at meals. Boys at least, as soon as they could walk the requisite distance, were required to be present at the chief festivals in the Temple, and in particular were bound to observe the Feast of Tabernacles. At the earliest manifestation of manhood’s estate being reached, the full observance of the Law was enjoined upon the youth, and, consequently, our Lord’s appearance in the Temple at the age of twelve is quite in accordance with the regular practice of the time. On this occasion the boy Jesus gained His first insight into the Temple worship. Whether He returned at all, or frequently, during His youth and early manhood, to the Holy City, we have no means of ascertaining; but in Nazareth He would seem to have been a constant attender at the synagogue services, for such is noted in the Gospels as being His

practice; and when He returned to the town, after His public ministry had begun, it was not His presence in the synagogue that surprised His fellow-townsmen, but the learning of one whom they had previously regarded as an ordinary comrade. In the services of the synagogue He would be familiar not only with the recognized reading of the Law in accordance with the prescribed practice and order, and may even have been frequently called upon in His youth to read, but in the chief Sabbath service He would also become familiar with passages read from the Prophets. These might be chosen at will by the appointed reader, a practice of which Jesus probably availed Himself (Luk 4:17). The Scriptures were not only read in these services, but were paraphrased into the popular language of the people. It is uncertain whether the interpreter was a fixed official, or whether his function was left open to be undertaken by any competent member of the congregation. It is at least permissible to think that Jesus may Himself have played this part many times in the quiet of the Nazareth synagogue, and by the exquisite appropriateness of His language have already shown Himself capable of making the word of God an attractive message to the common people. This is at least a possible fancy, and if it is true, it would form an excellent training for His subsequent service as a deeper interpreter of the inner meaning of both Law and Prophets.

It is almost certain that our Lord would have another advantage in gaining a familiar knowledge of the OT, and in enabling Him to use that knowledge for the benefit of His countrymen, the advantage, namely, of being familiar with another language that was then the common speech of the civilized world, namely, Greek. The LXX Septuagint was, as we have already seen, the Bible most generally used by the Jewish community, and it is quite possible that Jesus Himself read it. In any case, if He could speak Greek (see art. Language of Christ), He would have the immense advantage that belongs to any one who grows up able to speak and think in two languages almost indifferently. It seems as if the condition of affairs then prevalent in Palestine was similar to that which exists in many parts of the Highlands of Scotland, or in Wales, at the present moment. The people will always read a book like the Bible by preference in their own tongue, and its language will naturally be most familiar to them in that form, but they can at will translate it into English, though that English may not, and very likely will not, agree verbally with the version in use. Some such process as this may account for many variants that are found in the Greek quotations from the OT in the pages of the NT. But the alacrity thus attained in mental processes and in the rapid change, not only from the idiom of one speech to that of another, but also from the mental atmosphere of one to that of another, is a great education, and helps the man with a natural gift as a teacher to develop his inborn genius in directions very valuable for those he has to teach.

4. Jesus as interpreter of the OT.—Having now seen how Jesus acquired His knowledge of the OT Scriptures, the next matter of importance is to discover how He

attained to His position as an interpreter of them. There was a class of official interpreters, and neither by training nor by personal claim did He belong to this section. Yet His methods of interpretation created far more surprise among His hearers than did the teaching of the orthodox and recognized men of learning. It was not only that His methods possessed the charm of novelty, but that they enabled the people to feel that for the first time their Scriptures had become a new and living book, which no longer pressed upon their souls like a heavy burden, but itself enabled them to bear life's greatest loads. He became, therefore, a popular interpreter of the Book to the weary heart of humanity; while He became, on the other hand, a hated teacher to the privileged class, who felt their profession endangered both by His methods and by the reception they met with at the hands of the crowd. He regarded the OT with much more real reverence than did the scribes, and, indeed, He spoke of it in a way that might almost sound extravagant in its praise, but He also treated its message with a freedom that was surprising, and broke through the husk of the letter till He found for men the strength and the sweetness of the kernel they had not before tasted.

(a) The great *ideas that were regulative of the OT revelation* were also those which guided the conduct and practice of our Lord, ideas that were central to His thinking, and loyalty to which He demanded not only from all His followers, but from the people who themselves professed to reverence them. The OT idea of righteousness of conduct as consisting in both outward obedience to the ceremonial observance of the Law and inward obedience to its spiritual precepts, were the two points round which His own teaching and practice appear to have centred. It was this, we are told (Mat_3:15), that led Him to undergo the ceremony of baptism at the hands of John, as it was this also that on more than one occasion made Him quote the great spiritual commandments of the Law as containing within themselves the secret of eternal life.

(b) It is not, of course, possible to judge fully from the scanty references preserved in the Gospels as to how far our Lord employed *the histories of the OT* to illustrate His teaching; but inasmuch as we have no material other than these upon which to form a judgment, we must examine the records that we possess. The difficulty is increased, moreover, by our uncertainty as to when the statements are clearly those of the Master Himself, and when they are due to the editing hand of the Evangelist.

In the passage, for example, in which He refers to Noah's flood (Mat_24:37 ff., Luk_17:26 f.), He has been dealing with the question of the future history of the world. In Mt. the words occur in the middle of the great apocalyptic passage, which is more than likely to have been much influenced by later ideas, and more altered than many sections of the Gospel. As Lk. reports the reference, it is contained in a short section of teaching to the disciples that follows upon a question asked by the Pharisees; but it is a section which also bears upon it the impress of apocalypse, and

may be a passage extracted by the Evangelist from what the present writer regards as most probably the first collection of the sayings of Jesus, *i.e.* His apocalyptic utterances about the future. Apocalypse was so favourite a form of literature in our Lord's day, and exercised so strong an influence upon His contemporaries, that it seems more than likely that the first series of His words to be reduced to writing would be that which in form and substance most readily fell in with current conceptions. Such a collection of sayings also best accounts for the variety of form in which this particular section appears in the first three Gospels, and may also lie behind St. Paul's well-known passages in the Epp. to the Thessalonians. If the theory here suggested is a sound one, that collection of our Lord's sayings would be in the hands not only of St. Paul, but probably also of his correspondents; and consequently his language and imagery would not only be familiar and intelligible, but would have the authority of Christ behind it. In the parallel passage in Lk., above referred to, there is added to the reference to Noah a reference to the history of Lot, and the fate of Sodom and the Cities of the Plain is again referred to by our Lord when He utters His judgment upon the generation that rejected Him, and declares that in the Final Judgment it shall be more tolerable for Sodom than for them (Mat 10:15; Mat 11:24, Luk 10:12). In the same connexion He makes reference to the fate of Tyre and Sidon. According to Mat 12:40, our Lord speaks of Jonah's being swallowed by the sea-monster, but from the parallel in Lk. we should judge that the reference was made only to Jonah's preaching and the subsequent repentance of the Ninevites (Luk 11:29; Luk 11:32).

All the Synoptics (Mat 12:3 f., Mar 2:25 f., Luk 6:3 f. contain a reference to an incident in the life of David, viz. his eating the shew-bread, and, according to Mk. and Lk., his sharing it with his companions. The account of Mk. has a peculiar difficulty, inasmuch as 'Abiathar' is given as the name of the priest, where the OT narrative (1Sa 21:1 ff.) states that it was 'Ahimelech' (see Abiathar). To Elijah the prophet there is more than one reference. In answer to the question asked by the disciples as to what is meant by the statement of the religious authorities that Elijah must be the precursor of the Messiah (a doctrine founded on Mal 4:5), our Lord replies that the advent of Elijah has already taken place—a statement which in one connexion (Mat 11:14) is directly referred by Jesus in its fulfilment to John the Baptist, whereas in another place (Mat 17:13) this interpretation is given by the Evangelist himself. Another reference to the history of the same prophet is that to his visit to the widow of Sidon in the time of the great famine (Luk 4:25 f.), where also an illustration is taken from Elisha's cleansing of Naaman the Syrian. In the former passage there is again a divergence from the OT as to the length of the period of famine. The latter two passages occur in the address in the synagogue of Nazareth, for which, of course, we have only the authority of Lk.; but inherent probability is in favour of our Lord's using such illustrations to show the wider reach of His mission, though it is not perhaps quite probable that He would have done so, as Lk. represents, at the very

outset of His ministry. We may therefore, perhaps, regard the fact of the reference as a correct tradition, but the place and manner of it as due to the Evangelist himself.

The glory of the court of Solomon is twice referred to in the Gospels, and that in words of Christ. The first instance is the unfavourable comparison between the splendour of the great monarch and the beauty of the field flowers (Mat 6:29, Luk 12:27). The second occasion is the reference to the story of the visit of the 'queen of the South' to the court of Solomon, and the argument that inasmuch as a greater than Solomon is here, she will bring into condemnation Christ's contemporaries. A general reference to the ill-treatment of the prophets at the hands of their countrymen is made in the pathetic lament over Jerusalem, attributed to our Lord in Mat 23:37, Luk 13:34, while a more specific reference is contained in the immediately preceding verses in Mt.—a passage, however, that is fraught with peculiar difficulties. The whole section is that which contains the woes uttered against the scribes and Pharisees, and bears considerable trace of later editing, even if it is to be attributed, in very much of its present form, to the writer of the Gospel. The passage referred to is contained in Mat 23:29-36, where the religious teachers are spoken of as those who 'build the sepulchres of the prophets and garnish the tombs of the righteous, and who say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we should not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets.' The passage then proceeds to a prophecy of what is to happen later to further witnesses that will be sent, and of their ill-treatment; they are to be scourged and persecuted from city to city—an obvious reference to the treatment of the early Christian missionaries, and, in all likelihood, with the knowledge of their fate before the writer's mind. The conclusion of the passage speaks of the judgment that is to come upon the men of that generation for all the blood shed on the earth, from that of 'Abel the righteous unto the blood of Zachariah, son of Barachiah, whom ye slew between the sanctuary and the altar.' It is very difficult to decide what is meant by this last reference, the supposed original passage (2Ch 24:21) having a different name for the father of Zachariah (see Barachiah). In John's Gospel there is a reference (2Ch 3:14) to the brazen serpent raised by Moses in the wilderness, and in His controversy with the Sadducees our Lord shows His acquaintance with the passage in the life of Moses that relates the revelation at the burning bush (Mar 12:26).

These historical references may seem very slight, but they are sufficient to show Jesus' intimate acquaintance with the history of His people, seeing that He was able to employ at will illustrations from what one might consider remote and unlikely incidents in the national story. We must remember also that He was not dealing with historical questions in His teaching, and that all references to these are purely casual. He seems to have accepted the history as it stood recorded, and not to have dealt with it in any critical spirit; for what concerned Him most was its spiritual

significance, and this He could best show by accepting the narratives as they stood in the recognized Scripture.

(c) It is of extreme interest to discover, if we can, *what books of the OT Jesus turned to with the greatest interest and affection*. So far as the available evidence is concerned, it would seem, as we might expect, that the writings which were most familiar to Him were those in which the spirit of the prophets reached its highest level, and on which His countrymen and fellow-religionists had most perfectly matured their own spiritual life—such books as Isaiah, the Psalms, and that most spiritual setting forth of the Law, the Book of Deuteronomy. There is another of the prophets—in *all* likelihood a native of Galilee, where our Lord Himself was brought up—who seems to have influenced His thought and teaching not a little, viz. Hosea. Out of the 39 books which compose the OT, 14 are directly quoted by Jesus in the records we possess. These are Gen. [Note: Geneva NT 1557, Bible 1560.] , Ex., Lev., Num., Deut., Sam. [Note: Samaritan.] -Kings, Ps., Is., Jer., Dan., Hos., Zech., Malachi. His particular interest in Deut. is shown in the fact that in the narrative of the Temptation all the quotations with which He meets the assaults of Satan are taken from that book; and when He declares the essence of the Law to inquirers who ask for it, He invariably states it in the Deuteronomic form. Passages from the Psalms were apparently not only frequently upon His lips, but He used their language on various occasions to describe the real significance of His mission, as when He refers (Mat 21:42 | |) to the ‘stone which the builders rejected’ as being significant of Himself, and so consecrated the passage to the later usage of the Church. That He used the Psalms to strengthen His own spiritual life, is pretty clear from various instances in His recorded language of their phraseology underlying His own forms of expression; but most clearly from His words upon the cross, where it seems that one of the Psalms, the 22nd, was the subject of His reflexion in that supreme hour. Of the prophet Isaiah He evidently made frequent use. According to the narrative in Lk. (Luk 4:17 f.), His ministry opened with an appropriation and interpretation of the great passage in Isaiah 61, which is elsewhere (Mat 11:5) employed as part of the proof that He Himself is carrying out the Messianic programme. If the reference to the ‘keys of the kingdom of heaven’ (Mat 16:19) be authentic, the phrase probably comes from another passage in Isaiah (Isa 22:22), which reads, ‘The key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder, and he shall open and none shall shut, and he shall shut and none shall open.’ In the case of Hosea it is not only that the suggestive words from Hos 6:6 are twice quoted (Mat 9:13; Mat 12:7), but that the words in which He is accustomed to speak of His resurrection are also found in Hos 6:2. Hosea is a prophet who is fond of parables, and some of his illustrations from nature are those also employed by Jesus; e.g. husbandry (Hos 10:12), grape culture (Hos 14:7), the flowers of the field (Hos 10:4), the chaff on the threshing-floor (Hos 13:3; see, further, *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times.*] x. [1899] p. 281). It is very remarkable that the Wisdom literature of the OT should not be directly quoted by Jesus, and

that, in particular, there should be no specific quotation from the Book of Proverbs, though it will be shown in a later section of this article that much of its language finds an echo in His teaching. We shall find, too, traces of the later Wisdom literature in the words of Jesus, who came Himself to be regarded as the incarnate Wisdom.

(d) *Jesus' attitude to current modes of interpretation.*—The teaching of Jesus was recognized by His contemporaries as being different in character from that of the scribes; yet He employed, to some extent, the same methods. He based His teaching upon that of the OT, which He interpreted not in their manner, but on authoritative lines of His own. The objections that He urged against the current modes of interpretation were that they hid under an accumulation of worthless tradition the real truths which the Divine word was designed to teach; while His own method, in the first place, made clear the meaning of the original utterance; and, secondly, interpreted it in a clearer and fuller manner to those whom He addressed. His method of dealing with current interpretation can best be studied in the records of His controversies with His opponents. For example, they based their teachings on divorce on the permission given in the Law of Moses; Jesus goes behind it to the narrative of the Creation, and shows how husband and wife were destined to be one higher and distinct unity from the very beginning. This note of idealism and spirituality is manifest in all our Lord's teaching, and marks it out as distinct from the verbal trifling of His contemporaries. He was not afraid to tell some of those who prided themselves on the subtlety of their arguments that they were in error, and unable to understand those very Scriptures which they professed to interpret (Mat 22:29, Mar 12:24; Mar 12:27). In His judgment many of those who were the professional interpreters of Scripture were doing more harm than good by their methods. 'Ye have made void the word (or law) of God because of your tradition' (Mat 15:6, Mar 7:13), He said, meaning that what they considered to be an improvement upon the original commandment was so contrary to its spirit as absolutely to make of none effect its purpose. But in the case of His own teaching, however revolutionary it might at first sight appear, He claimed that it constituted a fulfilment of the Law; and not only so, but He asserted that loyal obedience to the commandments, both in act and precept, would be the ground of advancement in the Kingdom of heaven (Mat 5:17; Mat 5:20). There is even a stronger passage in the same Gospel, where our Lord is represented as enjoining upon His disciples observance of all the precepts taught by the scribes and Pharisees, since they are the legitimate successors of Moses (Mat 23:2); but the whole passage in which the words occur shows considerable traces of the influence of later ideas, and can scarcely be pressed into the service of a definite statement of Christ's own Personal teaching. There may be in it a trace of Jewish prejudice in favour of the letter of the Law; but the immediate context, in which the Pharisees are most severely criticised, proves that the prejudice, if it existed at all in the mind of the writer, cannot have gone very deep, and we may be justified in seeing in the words at least an accurate reflexion of the teaching of Jesus in this matter. If we may so

regard it, it is then clear that He had the very highest estimate of the spiritual and ethical teaching of the OT, and objected only to such interpretation of it as obscured its meaning or altered its emphasis.

(e) We now turn to the very important and somewhat difficult section of our subject which deals with *Christ's discussion or use of special passages in the OT*. The first passage in which we meet this is in the narrative of the Temptation. This is, of course, a pictorial representation of an inward struggle, which must have been related to His disciples in the parabolic form in which we now possess the story. But it is nevertheless extremely important to find Him reverting time and again to that one book in the OT (Deut.) which we have already discovered was one of His favourites. In its highest spiritual teaching He seems to have found the best antidote against the poison of the evil suggestions that reached Him from the current conception as to the Messianic Kingdom prevalent among His contemporaries, and which also affected even the inner circle of His disciples. In following the course of the First Gospel, we next come upon the long series of teachings contained in the so-called 'Sermon on the Mount,' and there (Mat 5:21) the first passage to be considered is that which consists of a condemnation of quotations from Ex. and Deut. where the old Law had spoken of killing. Jesus interprets its meaning as signifying an attitude of the inward temper rather than an outward act, and, according to the form in which the saying has reached us, increases the severity of the judgment in proportion to the contempt shown in the expression of inward hatred used against a brother. Here again, however, the whole nature of the expressions employed seems to point toward a colouring of this original saying under the influence of a later Christian tradition; and it is probably a narrowed and intensified form of some simpler word of Jesus which the early Christian community edited in such a way as to contain a severe and solemn warning against careless speech—a fault which, as is evident both from the Gospels and the Epistle of James (Mat 3:5-12; Mat 4:11-12), was sadly prevalent. In the same passage of Mt. (Mat 5:22) we have the first reference to Gehenna, a word which occurs frequently in the records of our Lord's teaching. This name for the place of punishment of the dead had become familiar in the literature of later Judaism, meeting us frequently, for instance, in the Book of Enoch (see 27:2; 84:2; 90:26). A similar elevation and intensification of the law of purity is found in 90:27-32. In Mat 5:33 we have quotations from Num. and Deut. with reference to false swearing. Here, in interpreting the passage, Jesus goes much further than the precept of the older Law, and inculcates such perfect truthfulness as not to necessitate any form of oath. Again we are reminded of the Epistle of James (Jam 5:12), so that we feel ourselves in the atmosphere of the early Christian assemblies. But there is nothing to prevent the statement, substantially as we find it, being attributed to Jesus. Such teaching had already been given in Judaism, and a close parallel is found in Sir 23:7-11, in the course of which we read: 'Accustom not thy month to an oath, and be not accustomed to the naming of the Holy One. A man of many oaths shall be filled

with iniquity, and the scourge shall not depart from his house.’ In the book of the Slavonic Enoch also (48:1) the sons of Enoch are taught not to swear by heaven, by earth, or by any other creature. The next citation deals with the law of retaliation (v. 38), and here again the interpreter goes even further, and practically reverses the theory of the OT. In place of exacting an equivalent for any injury, He definitely inculcates the principle of rendering voluntary service where unreasonable exaction has already been practised. To the next quotation (v. 43) no direct parallel can be discovered, the nearest equivalent to the sentiment, ‘Hate thine enemy,’ being Deu 23:6 ‘Thou shalt not seek their peace nor their prosperity all thy days for ever’; so that we are compelled to assume that the form of the word here quoted by Jesus either represents some traditional form of the Law which has not been otherwise preserved, or that it embodies in a succinct form an idea that had hardened itself into ordinary practice.

In the eulogy of John the Baptist, reported in Matthew 11, Jesus is represented as quoting the passage in Mal 3:1 with reference to His great predecessor. Inasmuch as this verse is elsewhere used by the Evangelists as descriptive of John, and as we have other traces of the fact that they did not, till a later time, understand our Lord’s reference to him as fulfilling the function of Elijah, and as we remember also Mt.’s fondness for introducing OT quotations on every possible occasion, we cannot feel certain about the attribution of these words to Jesus, but they seem quite probable. Later in the same chapter (Mat 11:23) the form in which the judgment is pronounced on Capernaum is taken from the Greek of Isa 14:13-17, and serves to show not only how, on solemn occasions, Jesus would readily fall into the familiar language of OT prophecy, but how He was always prepared to apply its teaching to the needs and moral issues of His own time.

We pass next to the passage in Mat 15:4, where again our Lord is discussing a definite commandment of the Law, which He cites in a double form contained in Exo 20:12; Exo 21:17, combining the passages without strict verbal accuracy. Starting from this precept, He proceeds to discuss and to condemn the casuistical tradition that had been reared upon it, and reveals perhaps an acquaintance with Pro 28:24, where the writer is in sympathy with Jesus in condemning the man who regards the robbery of father and mother as being no transgression. In the same context our Lord is made to quote Isa 29:13 in a form that diverges even from the LXX Septuagint . The usual difficulty has here, of course, to be faced,—Did Jesus actually use the words, or are they inserted by the Evangelist in order to give a definite completion to his paragraph, and to carry out his theory of finding appropriate illustrative passages from the OT for as many as possible of his events? The rebuke which our Lord gave to the defilers of the Temple (Mat 21:13) consists of a combination of Isa 56:7 and Jer 7:11, but does not call for more than a simple note of the fact that here also we see that intimate knowledge which could seize at once on the phrases most

appropriate for His purpose. In Matthew 22 we find three special discussions of passages recorded. The first (Mat 22:31 f.) is that of Exo 3:6, which Jesus uses as an argument for the reality of the life after death. We cannot tell whether this was His own original interpretation of the passage, or whether He was here giving His assent to some ideas about it that were then current; but in any case it is a striking instance of the high level to which He was able to raise the frequently trivial discussions of the literalists. In vv. 37-39 He shows Himself in sympathy with the most spiritual teachers of His own day, insisting on the primary importance of the inward precepts of the Law, and upon Love as its most perfect and adequate fulfilment. According to another version of the same incident (Mar 12:32), His answer won from His interlocutor the response, 'Of a truth, Master, thou hast well said that he is one, and there is none other but he: and to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbour as himself, is much more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices.' If this, as it appears to do, represents the actual circumstances of the case, it shows how Jesus won the sympathy of the finest spirits of His day, and by His interpretation of the Law was enabled to appeal to their better nature.

The final example in this chapter (Mar 12:42 ff.) is the difficult one of Christ's question about Psa 110:1. An altogether exaggerated importance has been attached to this passage, because of its supposed bearing on questions of criticism. It is, of course, obvious that Jesus speaks under the limitations of the literary knowledge of His time, and that He and His hearers regarded the Psalm as representing David's own personal sentiments. But a matter that is often overlooked is that the point of the argument lies in David's being regarded as under the influence of the Divine Spirit in what he said. He designates the expected Messiah as his Lord, and yet the Messiah is regarded as being, according to the flesh, David's son. This seems to involve a contradiction in terms. All that Jesus does is here to state the dilemma, and enjoy the discredit of His adversaries when they were unable to solve it. He Himself offers no solution. In this case it appears that, as on one or two occasions, He was suggesting to the thoughtful among His auditors that the ordinary literal interpretations of Scripture were perfectly inadequate to meet the needs of the religious soul, and that His main endeavour was to lead them to revise their methods, and to understand that only the spiritually minded could understand the Divine revelation. Cf., for the same purpose, His statement that John the Baptist was the Elijah spoken of by Malachi.

The difficulties that we have encountered in Mt. are even more pronounced when we pass to the discussion of several passages in John's Gospel. There the idealizing process has been carried so far that we cannot be definitely certain, especially when we are dealing with quotations, that we have the words of Jesus at all. In Joh 6:45, where Jesus is speaking of the impossibility of any man's attaining a knowledge of Him without the previous influence of His Father, this statement is supported by a.

quotation from Isa 54:13, wherein the prophet speaks of the people being directly enlightened by God. This is one of the references that would suggest themselves to a writer familiar with the OT, but it has no special bearing on the argument of the passage, and has all the appearance of a gloss. The next passage is a very difficult one, though its very difficulty makes it more probable that it is to be referred in its present form to Jesus Himself, since it is not at all likely that a later writer would have added to his own problems by quoting as Scripture something of which the origin is so obscure. The words referred to are those in Joh 7:38 ‘He that believeth in me, as the scripture has said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.’ Now the passages suggested as the origin of this saying—e.g. Isa 12:3; Isa 43:20; Isa 44:3 to Isa 55:1; Isa 58:11, Eze 47:1-12, Zec 13:1; Zec 14:8, and Joh 4:14—have, it must be confessed, very little resemblance to it. The passage last cited, with its phrase, ‘a well of water ... unto eternal life,’ has the closest resemblance to the form of the words, but we can scarcely suppose it to be the actual source. One seems driven to conclude, with Hühn, that the reference must be to some passage in a writing not now known to us (see, for some interesting suggestions as to the possible origin of the phrase, H. J. Holtzmann, *Hdcom. ad loc.*).* [Note: Albert J. Edmunds (Buddhist and Christian Gospels) contends that the words are quoted from a Buddhist writing, the Patisambhida-magga (‘Way to Supreme Knowledge’). See ExpT xviii. [1906] p. 100. Cf. also Clemen, *Der Gebrauch des AT in den NT Schriften*, pp. 36, 37, who regards the words as referring not to one passage, but to the general teaching of the OT on the gift of the Holy Spirit. A third passage in John’s Gospel should also be noted where (10:34) Jesus quotes Psa 82:6, where the words are applied a fortiori to Himself. In Joh 8:44 we have a reference to the story recorded in Gen 4:8-9. Cf. Wellhausen, *Erweiterungen und Aenderungen im Vierten Evangelium* [1907], pp. 19-24. Cf. also Joh 15:25; Joh 13:18.]

(f) It is not only, or perhaps mainly, in such definite quotations as we have already considered that our impression of Jesus as a student of the OT is most clear, but when we read through the body of His teaching, and see how it is everywhere *permeated by OT ideas and coloured by OT language*. When, for example, we read the Beatitudes in Matthew 5, we can almost parallel them from passages in the OT. For example, Psa 37:11 ‘The meek shall inherit the land’; Pro 2:21 ‘The upright shall dwell in the land, and the perfect shall remain in it.’ Again, as illustration of Pro 2:5-8, we have the words in Psa 24:3 ‘Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? He that hath ... a pure heart’; while the very form in which these great utterances are couched is reminiscent of OT language, where the Beatitude is a favourite form of stating great and precious truths. When, again, we regard the continual teaching of Jesus as to God’s Fatherhood, which many have considered to be the central point of His revelation, we are reminded how widespread a basis He found for this in the OT, in such passages as Deu 32:6, Mal 2:10; Mal 2:16, Isa 63:16, and elsewhere. The idea of the catholicity of the Kingdom of God, which is so often upon His lips—e.g. in

Mat 8:11 'I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and the west,' etc.—finds its prototype in such passages as Isa 43:5 f., and more closely still in Psa 107:3. For the darker as well as for the lighter colours of His picture He seems also to be dependent on the words of His predecessors, since we find that the foreshadowing of trouble within the family circle, owing to obedience to His message as set forth in Mat 10:21, has the closest parallel in Mic 7:6. One is sometimes tempted to think that the actions of Jesus, as well as His words, were prompted by reminiscences of the OT. For instance, the story of Elisha, recorded in 2Ki 4:42-44, may have suggested the providing of a meal for the multitude in the desert place, the words of Psa 69:9 the cleansing of the Temple (see Joh 2:17), and the memory of the prophecy in Zec 9:9 may have been the thought that prompted the triumphal entry into Jerusalem. Sometimes also the OT seems to have afforded a theme for a parable, as in the case of the Vineyard (cf. Isa 5:1 with Mat 21:33), or the Lost Sheep (Luk 15:3); and the allegory of the Shepherd in John 10 may have as its literary origin Eze 34:11. Jesus' great utterance about the future of His Church, as well as about the perils that were about to come upon His fellow-countrymen, has many points of contact with the OT (cf. e.g. Mat 24:21, with Dan 12:1; Mat 24:24, Deu 13:2-4; Mat 24:29 with Isa 13:10, Amo 8:9; Mat 24:31 with Isa 27:13, Zec 12:10). A careful examination of the passage will reveal many more. Very pathetic is the interest of the sayings recorded from the Cross, where Jesus is reported to have quoted, in the language of His childhood, the first verse of the 22nd Psalm. The appropriateness of the whole of this to the circumstances has been frequently pointed out; and, according to Luk 23:46, His last words were an adaptation of Psa 31:5.* [Note: Traces of the Book of Proverbs are to be discovered in several places in the teaching of Jesus, e.g. the metaphors of the way and the light (cf. Pro 6:23; Pro 14:12; Pro 4:18-19 with Mat 7:13, Joh 11:10; Joh 12:35), those of hid treasure and merchandise (cf. Pro 2:4; Pro 3:14-15 with Mat 13:44-46). The germs of certain parables are also to be found there: e.g. Pro 3:28 as that of the parable recorded in Luk 11:5-8; Pro 9:1-5, cf. Luk 14:16, Mat 22:10; and even more clearly Pro 25:6-7, cf. Luk 14:10; and Pro 24:27, cf. Luk 14:28.] These are to be taken only as instances of what a careful examination of the Gospels, by the help of such a guide as Hühn, will reveal to any student in frequently unsuspected places; and the great significance of the study does not, of course, arise from the interest or ingenuity of the parallel that can be drawn, but from the fact that such a study reveals how thoroughly imbued Jesus was with the thought and spirit of the OT.

(g) A subject of wider reach, though also of greater difficulty, is the endeavour to discover to what extent Jesus was familiar with, and employed, *the Jewish literature that lies outside the OT*. It is only in comparatively recent times that much attention has been given to this subject; but the more carefully it is investigated, the more clear does it become that if He does not actually quote from any of that literature, He was either Himself familiar with it at first hand, or its ideas and language had so

influenced Himself and His contemporaries that many of His ideas, and even forms of speech, are practically identical with what we find in that literature.

In the extra-canonical Wisdom literature we are familiar with many personifications of Wisdom, and traces of this are found in two passages given in Mat 11:19 and Luk 7:35. The ordinary text of the former passage reads, 'Wisdom is justified by her works'; but some Manuscripts read 'children' in place of 'works,' thus conforming it to the passage in Lk. where the verse stands, 'Wisdom is justified of all her children,' and a comparison may be made with Wis 7:22 to Wis 8:1 and Sir 1:1-20. Again, the passage at the close of Matthew 11 has several reminiscences of the same literature, e.g. Sir 24:19 reads, 'Come unto me, ye that are desirous of me, and be ye filled with my produce'; Sir 51:23 'Draw near unto me, ye unlearned, and lodge in the house of instruction'; cf. also Sir 17:24. The whole tenor of the passage suggests the manner in which Wisdom speaks in the books referred to. Again, the longer and more elaborate addresses in Jn. have a suggestion of the speeches of Wisdom, and may well be modelled upon them. In some such way the marked difference between the addresses in the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics may be accounted for. Wisdom is always represented as addressing her disciples, and so these words delivered in the hearing of the innermost circle of His chosen friends may have been modelled by the Incarnate Wisdom on the lines of His great forerunners. In this connexion there is one very interesting reference also contained in Lk. (Luk 11:49), 'Therefore also said the wisdom of God, I will send unto them prophets,' etc. No OT parallel can be discovered for these words, and we are driven to the conclusion either that they are quoted from some work now lost, or that our Lord here uses the term 'wisdom of God' in the most general sense as indicative of the Spirit which moved in all the prophets. In Joh 4:37 there is a saying quoted, 'One soweth and another reapeth,' which may, of course, be a popular proverb, though words of somewhat similar character are found in Job 31:8, and they may have occurred in the exact form quoted in Jn. in some writing now lost.

The well-known name whereby our Lord most commonly speaks of Himself, namely, 'Son of Man,' though derivable from Daniel (Dan 7:13), is so common a title in the Apocalyptic literature that there can be little doubt that His use of it is influenced thereby. This is the more certain when we remember how in these writings the glorious manifestations of the Son of Man are paralleled by certain sayings in the Gospels, e.g. His coming in the clouds of heaven, and in the glory of the angels. Such ideas also as those of the imminence of the Redemption, the sitting on the twelve thrones, the authority given to the Son of Man, and the definite doctrine of Gehenna, are all familiar in the Book of Enoch, 'the influence of which on the NT,' according to Professor Charles, 'has been greater than that of all the other Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal books taken together.' To the same book are attributable developments in the doctrine of Hades and of the resurrection,—ideas which appear in

the parable of Dives and Lazarus, and in such sayings as ‘sons of the resurrection,’ and the answer to the Sadducees’ question about marriage. In the same book also are found doctrines about demons, which throw light upon the conceptions of the NT; e.g. that they are disembodied spirits (cf. Mat 12:43-45); that their punishment is to be deferred till the Final Judgment, hence the surprise expressed by the Gadarene demoniac (Mat 8:29), who asks, ‘Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?’ The subjection of all the evil spirits to Satan or Beelzebub (cf. Mat 12:24-27) is also a doctrine found in the Book of Enoch.

Another interesting group of writings is the ‘Psalms of Solomon.’ which at the latest were probably put into circulation about half a century before the birth of Jesus, and seem to have exerted a very powerful influence on His contemporaries. It may not be possible to point to any actual quotations from these writings in the NT, but they show the growth of certain important ideas which have sometimes been regarded as unique in our Lord’s teaching; e.g. the use of the word ‘Christ’ as a title of the expected Deliverer; the definite statement that He is to be a son of David (cf. Ps-Sol 17:23 with Mat 22:42-45). In the third of these Psalms we find a careful description of ‘the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees,’ and the germ of the parable of the ‘strong man’ (Mat 12:29) is found in Ps-Son 5:4.

More important, however, than any reference to special passages is the effect upon the general intellectual atmosphere of the generation in which Christ lived and worked, created and moulded to a certain extent by the literature intermediate between the OT and the NT. We have to read that literature to understand many of the ideas that were then current, and to find the conceptions that underlay much of the phraseology which to us seems new and specifically Christian, but which had been gradually evolved in the preceding centuries. Jesus and His disciples were, of course, children of their time in this matter, and He was bound to speak in terms intelligible to His contemporaries. What is wonderful is the manner in which He cleared these ideas of many foolish interpretations, and delivered them from a merely fanciful exegesis.

5. Traditional sayings of Jesus that reveal dependence upon the OT.—When we turn to a consideration of the sayings that are attributed to Jesus in sources outside the NT, our difficulties are, of course, increased; for here we are on less certain ground of information, and there is a greater likelihood of the writers being influenced by the literature with which they were familiar. Still, it will not serve to allow any theory of imitation to account for all these recorded utterances, and some of the best authenticated of them must now be examined in the light of our present purpose.

There is, to begin with, the famous saying from the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*. In this work Jesus Himself is the speaker, and the saying referred to runs as follows: 'The Saviour himself says, Just now the Holy Spirit my mother took me by one of my hairs, and bore me away to the great mountain Tabor.' This seemingly extravagant figure is not so uniquely grotesque as might be supposed, for in Eze 8:3 we read of the Lord taking the prophet by a lock of his head, and the spirit lifting him between heaven and earth; and in the Apocryphal book of Bel and the Dragon the prophet Habakkuk is described as being lifted by the hair of his head, while the notion of transportation without specification of the method is by no means uncommon in prophetic narratives. There is the ascetic character of the passage quoted from the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*, where, in answer to the question of Salome, as to when the power of death shall end, the Lord says, 'So long as ye women bear children; for I came to destroy the works of womankind.' These words do not seem at all in agreement with the general tenor of our Lord's teaching, though it must be confessed that the paradox is modified in the later part of the section; but the words as they stand have a reference to such sayings as that found in Sir 25:24 and other passages where women are spoken of with great severity. In the saying contained in the first *Oxyrhynchus papyrus*, 'Except ye make the Sabbath a real Sabbath, ye shall not see the Father,' there may be a reference to Isa 58:13-14. There is a class of sayings found in one form or another in several of the early Christian writers, and attributed to our Lord; e.g. 'He that is near me is near the fire' (Or. *Hom. in Jer.* xx. 3), 'He that is near the Lord is full of stripes' (Clem. Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] *Strom*, ii. 7. 35). Both of these have a close parallel to a passage in Jdt 8:27 'For he hath not tried us in the fire as he did them to search out their hearts, neither hath he taken vengeance on us; but the Lord doth scourge them that come near unto him to admonish them.' In the *Clem. Hom.* 19, 20, we find our Lord saying, 'Keep my mystery for me and the sons of my house'; and Westcott has pointed out that Theodotion's version of Isa 24:16 reads, 'My mystery for me, my mystery for me and mine.' The words now found in 1Pe 4:8 and there frequently taken as a quotation of Pro 10:12, viz. 'Love covers a multitude of sins,' is by Clem. Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] (*Paed.* iii. 12. 91) and others attributed to Jesus. It seems probable enough that He might have used the expression, and not less so even if it is a quotation from the OT. Another saying found in Justin (*Dial. Tryph.* xlvii.), and other authorities, is, 'In whatsoever I may find you, in this also will I judge you,' which is, of course, reminiscent of Joh 5:30; and both of these may go back upon Eze 18:30; Eze 24:14. A very remarkable passage is given in Iren. Joh 5:33, on the authority of Papias, descriptive of the days of the final glory, and the extreme fruitfulness of the vines and grain, and also of the universal peace throughout the animal creation. The passage, which is extraordinary in character, has much resemblance to those found in Isa 11:6-9, Amo 9:13, and a very close one to Apocalypse, Apocalyptic Bar 20:9.

6. Christ's methods as suggestive of our attitude towards OT problems.—From the foregoing discussion of our Lord's study and employment of the OT we may be able to discover several principles which seem to have guided Him in His use of that literature.—(a) *He subjected Himself to its spiritual authority*, but in no respect did He forego His intellectual right to judge for Himself about details of its teaching. The mere fact that words were written in the Scriptures did not suffice to render them authoritative for Him; in fact, He selected teaching which seemed in consonance with the spirit of the Kingdom He had come to declare, and in His interpretation of sayings that He did accept He was not afraid to pass by altogether received opinion or current explanation, if He felt these to be at variance with the true spirit of the original declaration of the Divine will. Sometimes, as in the case of the words, 'I am the God of Abraham,' etc., Jesus seems to support fanciful interpretations of the words, and even to give His authority to the allegorists. But on more careful examination we find that His exegesis is really a spiritual one, and that if the actual words can scarcely be taken, in their original use, to bear the meaning He puts upon them, at all events His reading of them is not forced, but penetrates beneath the surface to the spiritual realities underlying them.—(b) As has been already pointed out, the *critical questions* connected with Jonah or the 110th Psalm *did not emerge in His time*, neither does His treatment of either passage depend upon the judgment formed as to the authorship of the original. Whatever the character of the Book of Jonah, and whoever wrote it, the hero of the book remains as significant as a sign to Christ's contemporaries; and in the case of the Psalmist it is the significance of his words as the utterance of the Divine Spirit upon which Jesus lays stress; and this is equally the case whenever the Psalm was written, and whoever was the author of it. The same things apply to our Lord's treatment of narratives in Genesis and other parts of the OT. His treatment of these passages is of immense significance for us, therefore, as showing that it is the truths embodied in the writing which we have to discover and apply, and that the mere outward form of the revelation is of little significance.—(c) Again, it is helpful to find that *Jesus recognizes the process of evolution that took place in OT revelation*. It is not only that He sets aside certain precepts of the Law, but that He sees clearly that those who in the past were deprived of the privileges that a later age possessed would also be judged in accordance with their opportunities. Thus Tyre and Sidon and the queen of Sheba would find more lenient treatment in the Day of Judgment than the cities that had the opportunity of receiving Christ, but rejected Him. This great spiritual principle carries us very far in the treatment not only of OT problems, but in that of the relation of God to heathen 'peoples, and in the manner in which we regard the revelation contained in other religious systems. When He speaks of Abraham 'seeing his day,' it is also an indication of the same mental attitude, and recognizes the reality of the apprehension of great spiritual truths, even when these are veiled under forms of expression that render them difficult of apprehension.—(d) Of great significance also is *the manner in which Jesus used the OT as the source of His own spiritual life*. It is not only, as we have seen, that He was so imbued with its

letter and spirit that He could employ it at all moments of temptation and trial, but also that He based upon it His greatest doctrines, developing and purifying the idea of the Divine Fatherhood, the Kingdom of righteousness, the Messiah, the Final Judgment, the Holy Spirit, and the mission of Israel (see Charles in *Expos.* vi. v. [1902] p. 258). He found also, it would appear, the very forms of His teaching in OT examples. The parable, which has been so often regarded as His most significant invention, is not infrequent in the pages of the prophets. The aphoristic forms in which so many of His utterances are cast seem based upon the language of the Book of Proverbs; while, as we have seen, the longer addresses have a resemblance to sections of the Wisdom literature. He was Himself reckoned by His contemporaries to be a great prophet, so that they saw the resemblance between His words and those of His great predecessors. As a preacher, therefore, He found His models in the religious literature of His own people, and a careful study of the use He made of these, the modifications that He found requisite, and the development that His own religious genius effected, may all be of the greatest value to those who have in the present day to apply not only Christ's teaching, but that which He Himself received and accepted, and which is implied in all that He taught. (See for interesting and valuable discussions of this latter point, Bugge, *Die Haupt-Parabeln Jesu*; and Fiebig, *Altjüd. Gleichnisse und die Gleichnisse Jesu*).

Literature.—The two best books for a careful study of the subject treated in the above article are Hühn, *Die Alttest. Citate und Reminiscenzen im NT*, and Dittmar, *Vetus Test, in Novo*. Both of these works contain most careful references to the OT parallels, and also to the passages in the extra-canonical literature; and, where questions of various readings or other difficulties occur, these also are noted and discussed. Probably the best work in English of a similar nature is C. H. Toy, *Quotations in the NT*. This has the advantage of printing in important passages the Hebrew, LXX Septuagint, and NT texts side by side, and contains fuller discussions of many passages than the German volumes. But, on the other hand, its references are not so full. An older, but useful book, is Turpie's *The Old Test, and the New*, which has much information, not given, however, in very careful fashion; and another work by the same author bears on the question, *The New Test, view of the Old*. A valuable chapter by S. Davidson on Quotations from the OT and the NT is contained in Horne's *Introduction*¹⁰ [Note: 0 designates the particular edition of the work referred] , vol. ii. pt. 1, chs. 28 to 32. Of great value is the discussion of the subject by Clemen in his *Der Gebrauch des AT* [Note: T Altes Testament.] *in den NT Schriften*, pp. 20-26. For a more popular treatment, see Rose Rae, *How Jesus handled Holy Writ*; Peters, 'Christ's Treatment of the OT,' *Journal of Bib. Lit.* vol. xv. pp. 87-105; Leipoldt, *Entstehung des NT Canons* [1907], § 3. Reference may also be made to Grinfield, *Novum Testamentum Græcum*, Editio Hellenistica; Palfrey, *The Relation between Judaism and Christianity*, illustrated in Notes on the Passages in the NT; Swete, *Introd. to the OT in Greek*, pt. 3, ch. 2; Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*; A. Meyer, *Jesu*

Muttersprache; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. ii.; Wendt, *The Teaching of Jesus*; Barth, *Die Hauptprobleme des Lebens Jesu*, pp. 7 to 18, 71 to 103; Meinhold, *Jesus und das AT* [Note: *T Altes Testament.*]; H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der NT Theol.*, vol. i. pp. 110-150; Ross, *The Teaching of Jesus*, ch. 12; Clarke, *The Use of the Scriptures in Theology*, c. [Note: circa, about.] ii. The Commentaries on the various Gospels should also be consulted, and the best editions of the Apocrypha and Apocalypses, as also Griffinhoofe, *The Unwritten Sayings of Christ*; and Preuschen, *Antilegomena* (a convenient edition of the original passages). See individual articles in the following: *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times.*] x. [1898-99] p. 281; *Expositor*, iii. vii. [1888] p. 105 ff., vi. v. [1902] pp. 52 ff. and 135 ff., and xi. [1905] pp. 340 ff. and 440 ff.; cf. Westcott-Hort, *The NT in Greek*, vol. ii. pp. 174-178.

G. Currie Martin.

☞ Olivet

OLIVET.—See Mount of Olives.

☞ Omnipotence

OMNIPOTENCE.—The infinite power that works in and through, or above, all things towards the realizing of Divine ends. It may be viewed either intensively, as the power which makes its way through all finite powers, finding in these no real obstacle to its purpose; or extensively, as the power which gathers within it all finite powers, and so achieves its ends throughout the universe.

1. As attribute of God.—Power is a fundamental attribute of Deity: it has even been called the Divine attribute *par excellence*, because it is found in all religious conceptions from the lowest to the highest, and forms the basal thought, so to speak, upon which all other conceptions are built. In primitive religion, however, the superhuman power is not yet conceived as infinite: it is not even centred in one being, but distributed among many. It is enough for the worshipper to be able to regard the deity he worships as higher than himself and able to give him what he needs. Even the polytheist, however, often sets logic at defiance by ascribing to the god he is worshipping at the moment an unrestrained power within his own domain, and even a universal sovereignty. A true omnipotence is logically attributable only under a monotheistic scheme, where the one Divine being is invested with all the

powers formerly distributed among many deities. Here the conception naturally develops of a Being whose power is universal in space and time, and moulds all things and events irresistibly to its own purposes. So, in the great days of the prophetic period of Israel's history, all limiting conceptions are withdrawn from the notion of God, and Jehovah stands revealed as the One Being who has all creation in the hollow of His hand, maker and controller of all things in heaven and earth, the supreme power working irresistibly to the accomplishment of His great moral ends (Amo 4:13; Amo 5:8, Isa 40:12-26, Psa 33:9-11; Psa 115:3). God is not merely conceived as transcendent, the wonder-working God, intervening when and where He will: the higher conception also prevails that the ordinary as well as the extraordinary events of history are ordered by the Divine hand, and made to effect His purposes. Not only the universal movement of human life, but nature in all its forms, pulsates with the energy derived from God, is a channel of His revelation, and conforms absolutely to His will (Psalms 148). In the NT the teaching of the prophets is accepted in its entirety: the advance made concerns only the higher attributes of God, and His spiritual ends. God is the infinite power working above and within all things: with Him is the power (Mat 6:13), to Him all things are possible (Mar 10:27; Mar 14:36), He is the Lord God Almighty (Rev 4:8; Rev 11:17), with no other limits than are set by His own nature ('He cannot deny himself,' 2Ti 2:13) or by the moral ends He has in view (Mar 14:35-36).

2. As ascribable to Christ.—It is generally admitted that the ascription to Christ of the Divine power has passed through a certain development, which is partly traceable in the Gospels themselves.

(a) In the *Synoptic Gospels* we have to distinguish between the Divine power attributed to Him in His earthly life, and the fuller power belonging to Him as the risen Lord, and the future Judge of the world. In His *earthly life*, while He passes through a truly human development, and is subject to natural human weakness, He is clothed with unique power for the fulfilment of His mission. The powers of heaven are at His command (Mat 26:53); He has power to heal, exerted at will (Mat 8:3), and apparently resident in Himself, though ultimately derived from God by faith and prayer (Mat 17:20, Mar 9:29). Sometimes this power is brought into play unwittingly on Christ's part (Mar 5:27-30, Luk 6:19). His wonder-working power extends over nature: and even the winds and the seas obey Him. The only limits to His power seem to lie in the faith of those who receive blessing (Mat 13:58) and in the conditions set to His Messianic mission (Mat 15:24). It is a further extension of this power of doing miracles that He can bestow it also upon His disciples (Mar 3:15, Luk 9:1, Mat 10:1), to be used within the same limits and under the same inward conditions of faith and prayer—the channels of the Divine omnipotence. *As the risen and exalted Christ*, He enters into a still wider range of Divine power. He is now clothed with a limitless authority in heaven and earth for the triumphant fulfilment of the Messianic work

(Mat 28:18), and shares in the omnipresent government of God the Father (Mat 28:20). When He comes again as Messianic King to judge the world, He will come clothed with the full power and glory of God (Mar 13:26; Mar 14:62, Mat 25:31 ff.)

(b) In the *Fourth Gospel* the sphere of Christ's Divine power is still further enlarged. He is the incarnation of the Logos, by whom the world was made; the source, under God the Father, of all light and life. While the marks of human weakness are still found, the Christ of this Gospel is invested more thoroughly with the basal attributes of Divinity—eternity (Joh 8:58), omniscience (Joh 1:48; Joh 6:64; Joh 11:4), and omnipotence. Thus His miracles are manifestations of Divine glory, and are painted in the most striking colours, as the miracle at Cana and the story of Lazarus. He speaks as if He were already at the right hand of power; for all judgment is already committed to Him, and life, even life eternal, is in His hands (Joh 5:21-22, Joh 10:27 f.). His death on the cross is no longer a matter of untoward circumstance, and human violence prevailing over right; Christ permits His seizure only after proving His power to resist (Joh 18:6); and as He has freely laid down His life, so He freely takes it again (Joh 2:19; Joh 10:18). It seems clear, then, that in the Fourth Gospel the conception of Jesus as a man subject to ordinary human limitations of weakness, ignorance, and moral growth is giving place to the thought of a Christ-Logos, who, even while on earth, is invested with all the metaphysical attributes of Divinity. At the same time it must be recognized that the earthly Christ exercises His Divine powers under certain limitations. His power (ἐξουσία is the word preferred) is a delegated power, given Him of the Father; and it is exercised within the definite limits of His saving mission.

(c) Without following in detail the progress of thought in the Apostolic teaching, and the development in later ages, we may notice one or two points in Christology where the question of Christ's omnipotence comes more prominently into view. The Logos theory developed into the Two-nature conception of Christ's Person, which last remained as the authoritative doctrine of the Church. The problem of Christ's Person was not thereby solved; and ever-recurring attempts were made to harmonize the facts of weakness, ignorance, and growth with a Divine φύσις possessed of all Divine powers. Either the human nature was conceived as exalted to the Divine, or the Divine was conceived as limiting itself, and so placing itself on a level with the finite human nature. The boldest attempt in the first direction was that made by the Lutheran theologians of the 16th and 17th cents., who taught that all Divine powers were personally communicated to the human nature of Christ, but that in His earthly state the use of these powers was ordinarily veiled, if not surrendered. The other direction of thought is seen, e.g., in Thomas Aquinas, who strives to bring the Divine omnipotence of Christ into harmony with His human life, by affirming that He shared in the Divine omnipotence only so far as He needed it in His mission, and, further, that He ordinarily limited His own power voluntarily so as to be able to partake of

human weakness. A more strenuous attempt in the same direction is to be found in the Kenotic doctrine of last century, which affirms that Christ in becoming man emptied Himself of the attributes of omnipotence, etc., and so became subject to the ordinary conditions of a real human life (see Kenosis). All such attempts to unify inconsistent characters end in depleting the Person of Christ either of His Divinity or of some part of His humanity, and so serve only to show the inadequacy of the Two-nature theory from which they start. The problem is to be solved only by (1) a new conception of what constitutes Divinity, and (2) by pressing back to the historical Christ as presented in the Synoptic Gospels. So long as God is characterized mainly by His basal attributes, the doctrine of the God-man is a simple unintelligibility: it is here that the proposition *finitum non capax infiniti* verifies itself to our minds. But as religious faith presses on to a recognition of the inner being of God, it comes upon attributes that are at once more central and at the same time essentially communicable to humanity. Holiness, justice, faithfulness, love, are the innermost attributes of God, and they also represent the goal of human life; and in the measure man attains to these, does he attain to union with God. It is through the possession of these qualities that Christ is one with the Father, and approves Himself as the Son of God. This must be the starting-point for a revision of the thought of Christ's omnipotence. Christ's power is not coextensive with God's; it is the power of omnipotent goodness and faith, the omnipotence of One who makes Himself the channel of the Divine will. Even His miraculous power must be subsumed under the same category; it is a power granted to faith (Mar 11:23, Mat 17:20). If it be said that this spiritual power and sovereignty are not yet omnipotence, we shall not quarrel about words. Christ does not possess absolute omnipotence, any more than He is God *simpliciter*. But He who lives in fullest fellowship with the Father, who is one with God in heart and purpose, and who consciously makes Himself the instrument of the Divine will in carrying out His work of grace among men, may surely claim to share in the Divine omnipotence.

Literature.—Köstlin, art. 'Gott' in *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologic und Kirche.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; Schultz, *Gottheit Christi* and *OT Theol.* [Clark's translation]; Kaftan, *Dogmatik*, 41-47; A. B. Bruce, *Miraculous Element in the Gospels*, ch. vii.; Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, iii. Qu. 13; B. B. Warfield, *The Power of God unto Salvation* (1903), 91.

J. Dick Fleming.

OMNIPRESENCE.—The distinctive conception of omnipresence which meets us in the Gospels may briefly be expressed thus: God is able to exert His activity anywhere. God's children cannot be where He is not. He is spiritually present with all earnest, seeking souls everywhere.

1. If this be so, it is evident that Christ's distinctive teaching on this subject was *not metaphysical*. He does not speak of God in terms of philosophy. Such terms as 'the Absolute,' or 'the Infinite,' or 'the Unconditioned' are never found on Christ's lips, and, what is more, the ideas implied by these terms are absent from His horizon. We do not find in Christ's discourses any disquisition on the nature and attributes of God. With the exception of the solitary phrase 'God is Spirit' (Joh 4:24), which is certainly rich in implications, but, when originally uttered, was meant merely to check material and local conceptions of the Deity, we have no instance in which Jesus expounded the nature or even the attributes of God as such. His method was rather to reveal the character of God by portraying His activities in relation to the lives of men, and especially of Christian men. Not only so, but *Christ's starting-point* was different from that of the metaphysician. To the latter, God is a postulate of the *Reason*. God is a necessary assumption to explain the origination and continuance of the world. Reason claims satisfaction; and therefore insists that God must essentially be that which will subsume mind and nature under the unity of an intelligible notion. The metaphysician seeks for *proofs* of the existence of God—for indications of the real behind the phenomenal, the great First Cause behind the congeries of events which seem to be effects. In the teaching of the Lord Jesus, God is the postulate of the *religious consciousness*. When religious experiences are reduced to terms of thought, and the religious consciousness of the individual and the community is expressed in terms which are intelligible to the intellect, it is at once recognized that the God who is so real to His people, wherever they may be,—who is the source of strength and joy and light to His people everywhere,—must have the attribute of omnipresence predicated concerning Him. Christ's conception of the presence of God is thoroughly religious. It is always a presence to the religious consciousness, trust, prayer, and fellowship.

2. The Lord Jesus *never associated omnipresence with infinitude*. Hebrew philosophy, in the person of its supposed founder, might exclaim: 'Behold, heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee' (1Ki 8:27); but no such thought ever came from the lips of Jesus. To Him the distinctive conception of omnipresence was: The child of God cannot go where his Father is not. He did not associate omnipresence with the infinitely great, but rather with the infinitely little. He was chiefly concerned to show that in the minute events of life God is present and observant; and that there is nothing so trivial as to elude the vigilance of our Father in heaven. The Lord Jesus left it for philosophers to lash their weary imaginations so as to trace the ubiquity of God in the infinite recesses of space, and to prove that everywhere there are indications

of the same law and order as in the world around us, and that the indications of the presence of a supreme Mind are as apparent in the sidereal heavens as here. If we may so say, Christ's conception was microscopic rather than telescopic. To trace the tokens of the presence of God's workmanship in the colours of the lily, or in the provision God has made for feeding the ravens, yielded great joy to the Saviour's heart because it suggested so strikingly that God is 'round about us,' and enabled Him the better to impress on the hearts of His disciples, when their faith was so feeble, that God was very *near* to them, to sympathize, to succour, and to bless, as well as to further the interests of His Kingdom.

3. It is probable that Christ's teaching on this subject was intended to be a *corrective to much of the current Jewish theology* of that period. An outstanding peculiarity of the religious thought of Christ's time was the emphasis placed on the doctrine of God's aloofness. The Jews had imported, probably from Persia, the belief that matter is essentially evil. Hence it was considered to be beneath the dignity of the Divine nature that God should be supposed to have direct contact with inert matter, or immediate intercourse with sinful men; and under the influence of this belief God was gradually pushed further away from His world. This conception was operative in two ways: (a) To the Palestinian Jews God was conceived of as enjoying the otiose majesty of an Oriental monarch, who is kept informed of the deeds of men and the events of the world by the 'angels of the Presence,' who 'at His bidding speed o'er land and sea,' and report what they have seen and heard. (b) The Alexandrian Jews, of whose beliefs Philo was the chief exponent, treated the matter more philosophically, and they pushed the doctrine of God's 'separateness' from all that is material, earthly, and human, to such an extent as to deny that God has any qualities at all. Philo maintained, as some moderns have done, that to assign any quality or attribute to God is to *limit* Him: which is inadmissible, since God is the absolutely unlimited, eternal, unchangeable, simple substance. 'Of God,' said Philo, 'we can only know *that* He is, not *what* He is' (Drummond, *Philo Judæus*, ii. 23-30). Knowing as we do that this was the trend of Jewish thought in Christ's day, it is difficult to believe that Christ's teaching as to the Divine omnipresence and fatherly care, in the Sermon on the Mount and elsewhere, was not meant to be a corrective of the current theology, which in its endeavour to de-humanize God was in danger of un-deifying Him.

And now we are prepared to consider in detail the intimations of omnipresence which meet us in the Gospels; and we may conveniently arrange them in three groups, according as they refer to the Father, Son, or Holy Spirit.

4. Passages which teach or imply *the omnipresence of God the Father*. We know what kind of intimations to expect. We shall not meet with much that will satisfy our

intellectual, philosophical nature, but with much that will appeal deeply to our religious nature.

As Dr. Stevens says: 'He (Jesus) aims to rescue the idea of God from the realm of cold and powerless abstraction, and to make it a practical, living power in the heart. He sought to inspire in men an intense and constant sense of God's presence and care' (*Theol. of NT*, 66). Similarly, Dr. Orr teaches that 'Christ's doctrine of the Father is entirely unmetaphysical.... He takes up into His teaching all the *natural* truth about God. He also takes up all the truth about God's being, character, perfections, and relation to the world and man, already given in the OT.' But 'the attributes of God ... are never made by Christ the subject of formal discourse, are never treated of for their own sake, or in their metaphysical relations. They come into view solely in their religious relations' (*Christian View*, 77 f.)

The distinctive feature as to the omnipresence of God in the Sermon on the Mount is to be found in the words, 'Thy Father who *is* in secret' (Mat 6:18). Others may expatiate on the fact that God transcends the heaven of heavens, our Lord was concerned to bring home to the religious consciousness of His disciples, that God is in the secret place of their lowly dwelling, where no other eye can see them. To use the words of Beyschlag—Christ taught that—

'God is as present and operative in the world as He can be, without denying His absolute goodness, and without interfering with the freedom of the creature, which is the fundamental condition of all development of good in the world. The world is ... His work and workshop. If the Judaism of the time separated God and the world from each other almost deistically, ... Jesus, on the other hand, conceives the relation of His Father to the world as one instinct with life. God has by no means withdrawn Himself from the world He once created' (*NT Theol.* i. 95 f.).

'Presence' and 'activity' are equivalent with God, and therefore He 'who *is* in secret' must also 'see in secret' (Mat 6:18). He is actively present with those who 'give alms' in secret (Mat 6:4), who 'pray' in secret (Mat 6:6), and who 'fast' in secret (Mat 6:18). The omnipresent activity of God is evidenced also in His unceasing care and fatherly solicitude over His creatures. His children are encouraged to rely on His care from the fact that the Heavenly Father feeds the fowls of heaven (Mat 6:26), and clothes the grass of the field and the beautiful lilies (Mat 6:30); notices the fall of every sparrow, and numbers the very hairs of our heads (Mat 10:29 f.). Wherever God's children may be, He knows what things they have need of (Mat 6:8; Mat 6:32), gives good things to them that ask Him (Mat 7:11), and reveals the truth to earnest souls (Mat 16:17). We learn from these passages that wherever God's children are, there God is, without any need of moving from place to place. All the activities of God are available everywhere at the same time. 'Whatever God can do, whether by

way of knowing, loving, creating, or controlling, He can do anywhere, and everywhere at once' (W. N. Clarke, *Outline of Chr. Theol.* 79).

5. We turn now to the profound and really inexhaustible words which Jesus let fall in His conversation with the woman of Samaria: 'God is Spirit' (Joh 4:24), not 'a spirit,' which might mean that God belongs to the class of spiritual beings. Jesus wished simply to describe what the essential nature of God is; it is spiritual. This declaration of Christ, which, as Westcott says, is 'unique in its majestic simplicity,' has many implications. It certainly implies omnipresence. This is the very fact which the words were employed by our Lord to teach—that God's presence is not confined to any temple, Judaeian or Samaritan; and that therefore in the new dispensation His presence is everywhere operative, and equally real and near to men wheresoever they may be.

Taking in our hand this clue that 'God is Spirit,' we shall find it useful to guide us in regions which lie beyond the immediate purview of our Lord in His conversation with the woman of Samaria. For instance, it is a disputed point whether we ought to say that 'God *fills* all space.' Martensen expresses, himself thus: 'All is *filled* with God. The omnipresent God is the inmost fundamental being of everything that exists,—the life of all that lives—the Spirit of all spirits' (*Chr. Dogmatics*, 93). Dr. Strong says: 'By omnipresence we mean that God in, the totality of His essence, without diffusion or expansion, penetrates and *fills* the universe in all its parts. Like birds in the air, like fish in the sea, we are surrounded still with God' (*Man. Theol.* 132). Whereas, on the other hand, W. N. Clarke teaches: 'By omnipresence we do not mean a presence of God that fills all space in the manner in which we think of matter as Ailing certain parts of space. It is not a universal diffusion of the essence of God, like diffusion of the atmosphere' (*Outline*, 79). Following the analogy of 'spirit,' we learn that we must be very careful lest we fall into any statements that are strictly applicable to matter only. Spirit is in every respect the antithesis of matter. Every quality which belongs to matter is, *ipso facto*, to be excluded from spirit. Matter *fills* space, and on that very account we may *not* say that 'spirit *fills* space,' or that 'God *fills* all things.' To introduce the idea of God's filling space is at once inevitably to suggest materialist analogies, as air fills the atmosphere, or the luminiferous ether fills all space; and all such analogies are misleading. The saving clause introduced by Dr. Strong and others, that God fills the universe 'without diffusion or expansion,' does not help us; it merely makes the definition self-contradictory. It is well that we should avoid all metaphors which suggest that which is extended and materialistic, and adhere closely to dynamical analogies. It is not a *substantial*, but an *operative* presence of God in creation which is suggested to us by the word 'spirit.' It is God's almighty *energy* that is present everywhere. If we could penetrate into the realm of ontology, doubtless God is somewhat which infinitely transcends our thought, but *what* that is we lack the capacity even to imagine.

While thus maintaining the Divine omnipresence, we must try to find room for those numerous passages which speak of God as *dwelling in heaven*. In the First Gospel we have the frequently recurring phrase ‘Your Father which is in heaven’ (Mat 5:16; Mat 5:45; Mat 6:1; Mat 6:9; Mat 7:11; Mat 7:21; Mat 10:32; Mat 12:50; Mat 18:14; Mat 18:19). In the prohibition of oaths in the Sermon on the Mount, Christ speaks of heaven as ‘God’s throne’ and the earth as His ‘footstool’ (Mat 5:34). In the Fourth Gospel Jesus says that He ‘came down from heaven’ (Joh 3:13; Joh 6:33), and also that He ‘came forth from God’ (Joh 16:27; Joh 16:32). And in looking forward to His death, He says: ‘I came forth from the Father, and am in the world: again I *leave the world* and go unto the Father’ (Joh 16:28). So also in Joh 16:10 ‘I go to the Father, and ye behold me no more’; and in Joh 20:17 ‘I ascend unto my Father and your Father.’ How in the light of the present article are we to conceive of God’s being thus connected with heaven so much more than with earth? and of other passages which assure us that ‘*in heaven* the angels do always behold the face of our Father who is in heaven’? How are we to reconcile the statement that God’s throne, or God’s face, is in heaven, with the doctrine of Divine omnipresence? The following seems to be the line along which we must seek for light:—While it is true that God’s presence is everywhere, it does not follow that His presence is *manifested* everywhere alike. He is most fully manifested to those who are most like Him; and if we may believe in a home where there are assembled the spirits of just men made perfect, and also the varying gradations of angels—the holiest intelligences whom God has created, vastly superior to man in purity and capacity for knowledge—that will be the home where God is most fully manifested, because those who can best understand Him are there. There are ‘the pure in heart’ who ‘see God.’ But it will be said: ‘Is heaven, then, a *place*?’ Perhaps not; but so long as we are here, and endowed with our present faculties, we are compelled to *think* of it as a *place*; and it must ever seem to us probable that *created* spirits are possessed of some enswathement which enables us, more or less accurately, to assign locality to them. This is our justification for believing that heaven is a region in which, in a manner more glorious than we can conceive, God manifests His natural and moral attributes, and reveals tokens of His loving favour to pure and holy intelligences. ‘In thy presence is fulness of joy; at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore’ (Psa 16:11).

Considerable controversy has been waged around the passage we have quoted from Mat 5:34, which affirms that heaven is ‘God’s throne’ and the earth is ‘his footstool.’ The early Socinians interpreted it to mean that God’s essential or substantial presence is in heaven, and that elsewhere He is present by His efficacy only. To this it has been objected that ‘it includes God in the heavenly space and excludes Him from the earthly space, and thus tends to Deism’ (Macpherson, *Chr. Dogmatics*, 131); and that ‘such limitation in the Divine essence manifestly abrogates the Divine absoluteness’ (Dorner, *System*, i. 241). The Socinian interpretation is a fair illustration of the way in which we become entangled when we introduce terms of

space into our descriptions of God's attributes. God's spiritual nature refuses to be compared with terms of space, and hence it is incongruous to say that God is existent in one part of space and not in another. He does not, being purely spiritual, *occupy* space at all; but for fuller knowledge of Him we must be content to wait till we have emerged from this state of existence, where all our perceptions are conditioned by space and time, and have entered into that state where we shall see our Lord 'as he is,' and 'shall know' in the same manner as now 'we are known' (1Co_13:12).

6. We have now to speak of *those passages in which the Lord Jesus speaks of Himself as ubiquitous*.—In Joh_3:13 our Lord says: 'No man hath ascended into heaven but he that descended out of heaven, even the Son of Man *who is in heaven*.' It must be noted that the words ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ are omitted in A B L T_b 33, Cyril, Origen, and several Fathers. WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] consider them 'a Western gloss, suggested perhaps by Joh_1:18'; but our Revisers retain the words in the text, remarking in the margin that 'many ancient authorities omit them.' If genuine, as is very probable, they are important, but not unique. They do but cause Jesus to say of Himself what the Evangelist says of Him in Joh_1:18 'The only-begotten Son, who *is* in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.' They teach us that Jesus was conscious of a state of glory which from eternity He had with the Father—was conscious of it not as a past memory, but as a continued reality. His earthly life had not severed the intimacy of His fellowship with His Father; and ontologically His presence as Son of Man on earth did not remove the presence of the Son of Man from heaven.

Beyschlag interprets the passage differently: 'Jesus thinks of Himself as pre-existent, not because He knows Himself to be a second God, and remembered a former life in heaven, but because He recognized Himself in Daniel's image as the bearer of the kingdom of heaven, and because this Son of Man, as well as the kingdom which He brings to earth, must spring from heaven. That the *ideal man* existed from eternity in God is the truth which He grasped, and to which He gave concrete intellectual form' (*NT Theol.* i. 253).

Another important passage is Mat_18:20 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.' The genuineness of this passage has been denied, not because it is lacking in any Greek Manuscripts, but for *a priori* reasons. Starting from a humanitarian conception of Christ, some hold it to be improbable, if not impossible, that He should, as is here affirmed, foresee the development of His Church, legislate for its management, and promise His spiritual presence, wherever the members of the Church were assembled, however few in number they might be. Our purpose is not critical, but exegetical. If we assume the genuineness of the words above cited, they seem to show that Christ's Messianic consciousness included the

ability to fulfil such OT predictions as Joe 2:27 'Ye shall know that I am in the midst of Israel'; Zep 3:17 'The Lord thy God in the midst of thee is mighty.' As He was conscious of His identity as Son of Man before His advent, so He is confident that such powers as He has heretofore possessed will be continued to Him in the days which He foresees shall intervene, before the Son of Man shall come in His glory. Whatever the community of disciples shall bind or loose, make binding or leave optional, shall receive Divine ratification, because the presence of the Christ will be with them guiding and controlling them.

If we have followed this interpretation—and surely, unless St. John and St. Paul have misunderstood and misinterpreted Jesus Christ, there is nothing improbable in the interpretation—we are quite prepared to expect that the Lord Jesus after His resurrection should say to His disciples, 'Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world' (Mat 28:20). This passage is also regarded by Wendt and others as a product of the developing Catholicism and Christology of the Church; but it is surely a blunder to ascribe so much to *developing* Christology, unless there were some germinal utterances of Jesus which the Church proceeded to develop. The eagerness of the primitive Christians to disseminate the gospel most probably rests on a command of the Master, and the readiness with which they assume the presence of Christ with them wherever they are, implies as its background some such promise and declaration as that before us. Christ's Messianic consciousness could hardly fail to include the conceptions involved in Isa 42:1; Isa 49:6 as well as Joe 2:27. If Jesus could appropriate to Himself the statements of Isa 61:1-2 (cf. Luk 4:18 f.), it follows most naturally—and this is precisely what the Gospels presuppose—that He applied to Himself all the OT predictions of the Messiah, and was conscious that He possessed the properties and attributes which the OT assigns to Him who was to come—King, Servant, Prophet, and Messiah in one. It is perfectly in accordance with this conception that Jesus, in contemplating the spread of His Kingdom in 'all nations,' 'to the ends of the earth,' should say, 'Lo, I am with you always.'

In the Reformation period there was bitter controversy as to the ubiquity of Christ's *body*. It arose chiefly from Luther's interpretation of the words of Jesus at the Supper, 'This is my body' (Mat 26:26). Luther was persuaded that the word '*is*' denotes real and essential existence. In vain did Zwingli point out to him that Jesus also said, 'I *am* the door'; 'I *am* the true vine.' Luther was immovable in his belief that the consecrated bread *is* in some sense the body of Christ. He had repudiated the Romanist dogma that the particles of the bread are transmuted into substantial particles of the veritable flesh and blood of Christ, and therefore it remained to him to contend that the body and blood of Christ are 'in, with, and under' the bread and the wine. In order to show that this is compatible with Christ's ascension, Luther fell back on the Scholastic distinction as to the three ways in which a body can be *in* a place, *localiter*, *definitivé*, and *repletivé*. Locally, when the contents exactly fill the

vessel. Definitively, when that which fills has the power of occupying a larger or a smaller space. Repletively (or, to use Luther's word, illocally), when a thing is everywhere, and yet measured or contained by no place. Luther maintained the ubiquity of the *body* of Christ illocally. Then, in order to explain how we may without self-contradiction ascribe omnipresence to *body*, he adopted the theory known to theologians as *communicatio idiomatum*. In other words, he maintained that the Deity of Christ imparted all its essential attributes to Christ's humanity. And in this way Christ's body received the attributes of omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience. The body of Christ is present everywhere, especially in the consecrated bread, and thus can be literally manducated by those who partake of the Lord's Supper. (For further extreme and unreasonable positions of Luther's followers, one should consult Bruce, *Humiliation of Christ*, Lecture iii.).

7. We have now merely to adduce the few expressions in the Gospels which imply *the ubiquity of the Holy Spirit*. We do not find any explicit statement in the Gospels of the absolute omnipresence of the Spirit. His attributes are disclosed in connexion with His activities in the spread of the Kingdom. Wherever believers are found, there 'the Comforter, who is the Holy Ghost,' is present with His benign power over human hearts. He will 'teach' the disciples 'all things, and call all things to their remembrance' ([Joh_14:26](#)); and will guide them into all truth, and show them things to come ([Joh_16:13](#)). But the activity of the Spirit is not limited to those who have believed and have become disciples: it is exerted also on those who are still in 'the world.' Our Lord declares, 'He shall convict the *world* in respect of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment' ([Joh_16:8](#)). To those who believe and are thus 'chosen out of the world' the Spirit 'testifies of, Christ ([Joh_15:26](#)); He 'dwells with, them and is 'in them' ([Joh_14:17](#)); and they know Him, 'though the world seeth him not, neither knoweth him' ([Joh_14:17](#)).

Ritschl maintains that our Lord limited the doctrine of God to its relation to the Kingdom of God. This is not quite true with regard to the Divine omnipresence any more than to the other natural attributes of God; for did not Jesus say that God 'causeth his sun to rise,' and 'sendeth rain' ([Mat_5:45](#)), and 'clothes the grass of the field and the lilies' (6:30)? Still it is only a slight exaggeration of an important truth. The distinctive teaching of Jesus on the subject before us is that God is with His people everywhere. They cannot go where He is not present, to succour and to bless.

Literature.—In addition to the references given in the course of the article, various points of view are presented in Charnock, *Existence and Attributes of God*; Fairbairn, *Philos. of the Chr. Religion*, 58 ff.; Martineau, *Scat of Authority*, 30 f.; D'Arcy, *Idealism and Theology*, 157 f., 269 ff.; and all treatises on NT Theology and Dogmatics.

☒ Omniscience

OMNISCIENCE (of Christ).—There are such great differences in the mental grasp of different persons, that no one can prove that all knowledge may not have been open to the human mind of Christ. On the other hand, no one can assert that because of His Divine nature in union with His human nature He must have possessed and exercised such powers. It seems to be left quite open to us, unbiassed in the one direction or in the other, to deal with each department of His knowledge,—as of history before His coming, of nature, and of the future,—and to come to the conclusion that His knowledge included any matter or did not include it, without introducing the dogmatic fallacy that He must, because of His omniscience, have known this or that. Apart from assurance of what God has done, we cannot say what He must do. And this applies to the conditions of the earthly life which it seemed good to the Father that Christ should live.

When we come to the testimony of Scripture, we find Christ growing in knowledge (Luk_2:52), and afterwards limiting Himself to be a teacher not even in matters of civil justice (Luk_12:14), but only in the highest region of religion. In a sense, every prophet who says what God will do, claims a knowledge which dominates all the details of God's providence in every department (1Jn_2:20 'Ye know all things'). And in this sense, and in higher measure, Christ was omniscient. In the words of Luther, 'He was full of grace and wisdom, and able to judge upon and teach all that came before Him' (Dorner, *Person of Christ*, ii. 92). Thus His disciples said of Him, 'Thou knowest all things' (Joh_16:30; Joh_21:17). 'He knew what was in man' (Joh_2:25).

It is usual to refer to Mar_13:32, where Christ disclaims knowledge of the day of His coming, as evidence that there were limitations to our Lord's knowledge. On the other hand, in His discourse with Nathanael and with the woman of Samaria, He showed supernatural knowledge. See, further, artt. Accommodation, Kenosis.

Literature.—Liddon, *Bamp. Lect.*⁸ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 456 ff.; Gore, *Bamp. Lect.*⁵ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 147 ff.; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, ii. 341 ff.; Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 171 ff., *NT Theol.* i. 73 ff.; Orr, *Christian View of God and the World*, p. 287 ff.; Powell, *Principle of the Incarnation*, 125 ff.

☒ Oneness

ONENESS.—The term ‘oneness’ (ἐνότης, translation ‘unity’) occurs only in the Epistle to the Ephesians, where it is twice used (Eph 4:3; Eph 4:13) in what may be called a moral sense, *i.e.* to express not a physical but a mental or spiritual idea. In that Epistle, where the writer has in view the Gentile world, fundamental ideas of unity are set forth more distinctly and emphatically than anywhere else in the Bible. There is one God, one Lord, one Spirit (Eph 4:4-6). Christ’s work is to ‘gather together in one’ (Eph 1:10), or, as it may be rendered, unite under one head, all created beings in earth or heaven. God had made ‘of one’ (Act 17:26) all nations of men, but in the course of history divisions had prevailed and walls of partition (Eph 2:14) had been built. These separations were to cease. In the Kingdom of God, Jew and Gentile were reconciled, these two types being made ‘both one’ (Eph 2:14) in a union based on the deeper reconciliation of both to God (Eph 2:16). Hence the formation of one Body in which the individuals resemble the Head, and the whole is animated by unity of faith and character and life (Eph 4:13; Eph 4:16). These conceptions, so eloquently unfolded, are presuppositions of Christianity, and are implied, if not explicitly taught, in the Gospels. In Luke, in particular, emphasis is laid on the work of the Redeemer in the saving of the outcast, the sinful, and the lost. This is the subject of the three parables in ch. 15 and of the parable of the Banquet in ch. 14. To these may be added the parable of the Good Samaritan (ch. 10), the story of Zacchaeus (ch. 19), and the description of the Kingdom of God as containing men from all parts of the world (Luk 13:29, cf. Mat 8:11). These correspond with the saying of St. Paul (Gal 3:28), that ‘all are one in Christ Jesus.’ In Mt., again, we have the doctrine of the Church (Mat 16:18), of the mystic presence of Christ with His people (Mat 18:20, Mat 28:20), and of the power of union in commanding answer to prayer (Mat 18:19). And in the closing verses (Mat 28:18) the universal Headship of Christ is fully announced.

It is in St. John’s Gospel, however, that conceptions of oneness are most pointedly set forth. We note the following:

1. *The oneness of Christ and God* (Joh 10:30; Joh 14:9; Joh 17:11; Joh 17:22). The declarations, ‘I and the Father are one,’ ‘he that hath seen me hath seen the Father,’ may or may not be designed to teach identity of essence; they at least express a practical identity as far as human relations are concerned. They imply the moral perfection of Jesus so that His life and example become the manifestation of the Divine; and not moral perfection only, for His character and teaching constitute the revelation of the Father. Other passages indicate the mutual knowledge and love of the Father and the Son, and their mutual indwelling (Joh 17:21-25); but the main lesson is that Christ is for us the revealer and representative of God.

2. *The oneness of Christ and His people.*—This thought is embodied in the allegory of the Vine (Joh 15:1-8). The branches are a part of the vine, and when separated are dead. The unity is therefore that of a common life, and it is indicated in the phrases that express mutual indwelling. The idea is substantially the same as in the figure of the Body which is the fulness of Him that filleth all in all (Eph 1:23), and even in the figure of the Temple or spiritual house of which Christ is the foundation and His people are as living stones (1Pe 2:5, Eph 2:21). This oneness is not of equality; for the vine is greater than the branches; the head is the source of the life, and occupies a position of authority. Jesus possessed the Spirit without measure, and His life marks the ideal towards which His followers are to strive (Eph 4:13). But it is a oneness of life, though in the conditions of normal human existence the Divine is often obscured, and at best is only partially exhibited. This oneness of Christ and His people is represented as parallel to the oneness of the Father and the Son; in respect of mutual knowledge (Joh 10:14-15), community of life (Joh 17:21), and the love which issues from the Father and the Son (Joh 15:9). Hence the loving obedience of the disciple to his Lord should correspond to the consecration of the Son to the Father (Joh 15:10).

3. *The oneness of Christ's people as constituting a Body or Church*, is expressed in the metaphor of the one flock (Joh 10:16 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), divided amongst Jewish and Gentile folds. And to the same effect is the assertion that Christ is to 'gather together into one' the children scattered abroad (Joh 11:52). The first of these texts contradicts the claim of a particular organization to be the sole Church of Christ. Both of them belong to a far loftier sphere of thought, which conceives the Church as a great spiritual organism, embracing those of every land and age who are redeemed and sanctified, and who by the power of God live for His Kingdom and glory.

4. But the conception of *a catholic Church one and holy* carries us away from any visible condition of things; and the moral oneness of faith and love which every company of Christians should exhibit presents itself as an unrealized ideal. The first years of Christianity were indeed a period of singular oneness (Act 4:32). But harmony gave place to discord as new questions of thought and practice had to be faced. Consequently we find St. Paul pouring out his heart in pleas and prayers for oneness of mind and heart and soul (Php 2:2). In anticipation of such troublous times, Christ makes oneness a main burden of His last prayer with His disciples (Joh 17:11; Joh 17:21-26), as He makes mutual love the sum of His closing commandments (Joh 15:9-13). Such oneness, resting on the basis of Divine fellowship and the possession of Christlike excellence, becomes a means of the attainment of perfection (Joh 17:23). For, without social relationship and the mutual support of interdependent men, human nature cannot truly realize itself or completely fulfil the end of its creation.

Literature.—A. Maclaren, *Holy of Holies*, 168 ff., 199 ff.; Rendel Harris, *Union with God*, 41 ff., 127 ff.

R. Scott.

☩ Only Begotten

ONLY BEGOTTEN

1. Meaning.—There is no doubt that the term ‘only begotten’ indicates a *nuance* of the Greek μονογενής which is very seldom emphasized. As H. Schmidt proves, the word γίγνεσθαι has in general usage entirely lost the early sexual sense of the root γεν. It means simply ‘to arise,’ ‘to become.’ It signifies ‘that that which previously was not there and had no existence comes into being’; μονογενής is ‘what alone acquires or has existence,’ it is merely a fuller form for μόνος (as πρωτογενής = πρῶτος, ὁμογενής = ὅμοιος, ἀειγενής = αἰώνιος). When we have to do with living beings—men or animals—the meaning ‘born,’ ‘begotten’ is, of course, congruous, but there is no emphasis whatever attached to this side. When Christ is designated μονογενής υἱός, the emphasis is laid not on the fact that He as Son was ‘born’ or ‘begotten’ (in contrast to being ‘created’ or ‘made’), but that He is the ‘only’ Son, that as Son of God He has no equal. The Latin translators were quite right when originally they rendered the expression υἱός μονογενής simply by *filius unicus*, not by *filius unigenitus*. It was the dogmatic disputes as to the inner essential relations between Christ and God, especially those raised by Arius, which first gave occasion for emphasizing the point that Christ as the Son of God was a ‘begotten’ Son, *i.e.* that He did not form part of the creation. After that it became a general custom to render μονογενής by *unigenitus*, ‘only begotten.’ In the original form of the so-called ‘Apostolic Symbol’—the ‘Old Roman Symbol’—we read: καὶ εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν; and in the Latin text, which in all probability belongs to the same date (*i.e.* in any case some time in the 2nd cent.): ‘et in Christum Jesum filium eius unicum dominum nostrum.’ In the Latin, there is nothing to distinguish whether ‘*unicum*’ is to be connected with ‘*filium eius*’ or ‘*dominum nostrum*.’ The present writer, in an exhaustive inquiry into the historical meaning of the original form of the Apostolic Symbol (see Literature cited at end), has defended the

hypothesis that the latter combination is the correct one. Then, of course, the τὸν before μονογενῆ in the traditional Greek form must be an interpolation. Such an interpolation could easily arise in later times, because the title υἱὸς μονογενῆς was well known from the Johannine writings as an honorific designation of Jesus, whereas in the NT the title κύριος μονογενῆς does not occur (only εἷς κύριος occurs, 1Co 8:6). As far as the language is concerned, there is absolutely no reason why Christ should not be designated μονογενῆς κύριος; and the thought, which then finds a place in the Symbol, is a particularly pregnant one. The combination of μονογενῆς with κύριος, not with υἱός, is favoured by two considerations: first, that in the Symbol there is nothing that recalls Johannine ideas (much, on the other hand, suggesting Pauline thought); and, secondly, that there are a number of Latin texts where, undoubtedly, ‘unicum’ is connected with ‘dominum nostrum.’

2. NT usage.—In the NT the expression υἱὸς μονογενῆς is used only of Christ by John (Joh 3:16; Joh 3:18, 1Jn 4:9). The passage Joh 1:14 is a contested reading, and in any case comes only indirectly into comparison. Elsewhere in the New Test, the expression occurs in Luk 7:12 (the young man of Nain), Luk 8:42 (the daughter of Jairus), Luk 9:38 (the demoniac boy), Heb 11:17 (Isaac). In the LXX Septuagint μονογενῆς is frequently the translation of יָחִיד, especially wherever the idea of uniqueness or aloneness seems to be emphasized: Jdg 11:34, Psa 22:20; Psa 25:16; Psa 35:17; (cf. also Tob 3:15; Tob 6:10; Tob 6:14; Tob 8:17). The expression μονογενῆς acquires a qualitative secondary meaning from the fact that what is ‘unique’ is naturally of special value. An ‘only son’ is a specially beloved son. This secondary meaning belongs in all likelihood to the expression υἱὸς μονογενῆς in Jn. also. Cremer compares with it the term used by St. Paul in Rom 8:32—υἱὸς ἴδιος. In the LXX Septuagint, where this secondary meaning is emphasized, the rendering ἀγαπητός is chosen for יָחִיד: Gen 22:2; Gen 22:12; Gen 22:16, Jer 6:26, Amo 8:10, Zec 12:10. In the Synoptics (in the narratives of the Baptism and the Transfiguration), where Christ is called υἱὸς ἀγαπητός, μονογενῆς could hardly be substituted. The expression here corresponds to the יָחִיד of Isa 42:1 [LXX Septuagint ἐκλεκτός] (for ἀγαπητός in Luk 9:35 Cod. \aleph B and other Manuscripts give ἐκλελεγμένος). In all the passages in Jn.,

with the exception of Joh 1:14, it seems we might substitute the expression ἀγαπητός for μονογενής.

Joh 1:14.—This passage is of interest because the question arises whether instead of υἱὸς μονογενής we ought not to read θεὸς μονογενής. Hort strongly supports this view with a brilliant display of learning, and has proved that the latter reading was very widespread in the Ancient Church. It is to be found in a number of good Manuscripts of the Gospel: ⲛ BCL 33 and in the Pesh. and Coptic versions. He also argues, in support of it, that ‘the whole Prologue leads up to it, and, to say the least, suffers in unity if it is taken away.’ Supposing that we have to accept this reading, it appears to the present writer probable that St. John, in applying this predicate to Christ, was influenced by regard to a non-Christian religious employment of the notions of μονογενής and θεὸς μονογενής, and that the expression υἱὸς μονογενής has thus in his writings a special secondary meaning in addition. For the term Μονογενής occurs in the Valentinian (Ptolemaic) system as the name of one of the aeons (Irenaeus, i. 1 ff., ed. Harvey). Wobbermin, however, has shown that the term was of special significance in the Orphic mysteries, seeing that it occurs there as the personal name of a powerful incomparable divinity. Just as St. John took over from the Hellenistic philosophy the title ‘Logos’ for Christ, in order to remove from the minds of Christians the fear that there was beyond Christ a higher mediator between God and man, so he might have taken over from the highly important Orphic cult the title ‘Monogenes,’ in order to show Christians that they knew Him who is in reality the θεὸς μονογενής. We should then have to suppose that St. John has invested the expression with a meaning which was foreign to general and popular usage, but which probably corresponded with the use of the word in Orphic circles. That is to say, it is possible to interpret the term μονογενής as designating Christ as ἐκ μόνου γενόμενος (cf. αὐτογενής—a name of an aeon in the Barbelognosis [Iren. i. xxix. 1], γηγενής—a description of mankind in Clem. Rom. [Note: Roman.] [First Ep. to Cor. xxxix. 2] etc.). Christ would then be the ‘God’ who proceeded from the ‘only,’ i.e. from the ‘true God,’ the Son who sprang from the ‘unique One.’ In that case the idea of ἀγαπητός, noted above as the secondary meaning which *per se* everywhere best suits the context, would recede into the background, But the present writer does not regard it as likely that St. John knew anything of Orphism. In the whole Gospel there is nothing else to suggest this. It might, indeed, be said that the conception of the Logos in the Prologue is the only trace of Hellenism in the Fourth Gospel. But in the first place this is not quite correct, and again in itself it is much more likely that John [the author of the Gospel is unmistakably a Jew] knew the philosophy of Philo than that he was acquainted with

the Orphic system. Thus the present writer believes that it was persons like Clement of Alexandria who were first reminded of the Orphic titles of the aeons by the predicate *μονογενής* applied to Christ as Son of God. He further holds that the Church so far thought she was acting wisely in making out of the *υἱὸς μονογενῆς* of Joh 1:14 a *θεὸς μονογενῆς*, in order to be able with more assurance to meet both Orphism and Gnosticism.

Literature.—F. J. A. Hort, *Two Dissertations*, i. ‘On *μονογενῆς θεός*’; B. F. Westcott, *The use of the term μονογενῆς in the Epistles of St. John*, p. 169 ff.; H. Cremer, *Wörterbuch der neutest. Graecität*; J. H. Heinrich Schmidt, *Synonymik der griech. Sprache*, ii. p. 530 ff.; F. Kattenbusch, *Das apostolische Symbol*, ii. p. 581 ff.; G. Wobbermin, *Religionsgesch. Studien zur Frage der Beeinflussung des Urchristentums durch das antike Mysterienwesen*, p. 114 ff.; Beyschlag, *NT Theology* (English translation), ii. 414 ff.

Ferdinand Kattenbusch.

⚔ Opposition

OPPOSITION—The reason for the opposition offered to Christ in proclaiming His Kingdom on earth was the hostility of the scribes, Pharisees, and others, who represented the religious element in the Jewish nation. The profession of religion was at that time fashionable among the Jews. To make a parade of religious observance was a sure passport to popularity, as the ostentatious display of wealth is in modern times. Christ decried this parade of religion as hypocritical. He inveighed against the Pharisees and scribes in no measured terms (see esp. Matthew 23). He told them that their profession was a sham and their religion worthless. He assured them that their lineal descent from Abraham, on which they prided themselves so much, gave them no special plea for acceptance with God. It was the spiritual descendants of the patriarch, who imitated his faith and listened to the teaching of God, who were the true Israelites, the inheritors of the promise. He insisted upon a religion of the heart, and not the outward and formal rites and observances, on which they laid such stress because they brought them into favour with men.

The Sadducees, with the leading priestly families at their head, had a special grudge against Jesus, on account of His cleansing of the Temple and condemnation of the traffic carried on in its courts,—a traffic in which they had a direct interest.

The opposition to Christ was so bitter as to be satisfied with nothing short of His death. It culminated in the illegal trial before the high priest and the Sanhedrin, and the arraignment before Pontius Pilate. Its strength is shown in the preference for the release of Barabbas to that of Jesus. Though the Roman governor fully realized that this opposition was dictated by envy, and that Christ was innocent of any thought of treason against the Roman government, yet he was afraid, from motives of personal interest, to give a decision in accordance with his convictions.

As far as the people, as distinguished from the ruling classes, were concerned, their final opposition, or at least indifference, to Jesus arose chiefly from the way in which He had disappointed their carnal Messianic expectations. See, artt. Popularity, Popularity of Jesus.

Christ in the Gospels warned His disciples constantly of the opposition with which they would inevitably meet (see esp. [Mat 24:9](#), [Mar 10:30](#), [Luk 21:12-16](#), [Joh 15:20](#)).

C. H. Prichard.

☒ Oppression

OPPRESSION.—The word does not occur in the Gospels or in connexion with the activity of Jesus except in the verbal form in [Act 10:38](#) ('Jesus of Nazareth ... went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed [[καταδυναστευομένων](#)] of the devil'). In 'breaking the rod of the oppressor,' Jesus delivered men not only from sin, but from sorrow and sickness ([Luk 4:18](#), [Mat 11:4](#) f.), from the yoke of legalism ([Luk 11:46](#)), the tyranny of worldly circumstance ([Luk 12:4-7](#)), the fear of death ([Act 2:15](#)), etc. Oppression of guilt weighing upon the sinner's soul was a condition which never failed specially to elicit 'Christ's sympathy and pity ([Mat 11:28-30](#) according to the interpretation that commends itself to the present writer). The sense of this oppression could not exist without an earnest desire to be rid of the burden, and it was this desire that was a sign of a tendency towards a higher life.

It was the oppression of sin that Christ came to take away, and not the yoke of the Roman government which proved so galling to the Jewish nation after their glorious past. It was partly the mistake about the object of His mission that stirred up against Christ the opposition which is so marked a feature in the Gospels. See Opposition.

C. H. Prichard.

Orchard

ORCHARD.—See Garden.

Ordinances

ORDINANCES.—In the English versions of the Gospels this word occurs only once, Luk 1:6, where the parents of John the Baptist are described as ‘walking in all the commandments (ἐντολαῖς) and ordinances (δικαιώμασι) of the Lord blameless.’ From its etymology the word δικαιώμα means (1) a righteous enactment of rightful authority, and (2) a righteous act or deed. Here, of course, the first signification is the one intended, but the strict etymological force is not to be pressed, as the word is simply one of the oft-recurring practical synonyms for the injunctions of the Divine Law, both moral and ceremonial.

E. C. Dargan.

Organization

ORGANIZATION.—In the NT organization is visible, but in a rudimentary and experimental state. It lacks the rigidity of a fully systematized religion, but it is thereby the better evidence of the glorious vigour of primitive Christianity and its impatience of all that might restrain and hinder its mission. Christ imbued His disciples with an ideal; they accepted His declaration of a Kingdom of God unfettered in plan and method and time; they knew it was to come imperceptibly (‘the wind bloweth where it listeth,’ Joh 3:8), and to one the Kingdom will appear with the surprise of a treasure found in a field (Mat 13:44), while to another it will be the pearl gained at the willing cost of all else (Mat 13:45). In its earthly realization it was to be all-inclusive, a net that should gather of every kind (Mat 13:47), a field for tares as well as wheat (Mat 13:30), and this wide vision gave the Apostles zeal to seek sinners as well as saints, Romans as well as Jews, calling none unworthy or unclean (Peter’s dream, Act 10:28). Yet Jesus knew that organization was the inevitable accompaniment, if not the necessity, of this heavenly Kingdom’s appearance on earth. The sea might be full of fish, but fishers were needful (Luk 5:10); the fields were ripe unto harvest, but labourers must be found for the reaping (Mat 9:37, Luk 10:2); the broadest community will need the power of exercising discipline, even to the extent of excommunicating if that will make the wrong-doer feel the distance

between his present and his best self (Mat 18:17); the tree must have visible form if it is to shelter men in its branches (Mat 13:32, Luk 13:19), though its vital force may be a hidden mystery, permeating, as it does, the whole body, as the leaven does the bread (Mat 13:33, Luk 13:21). Jesus accepted the organization of the past, and made use of it. He referred to the rights of the Sanhedrin (Mat 5:22), He honoured the Temple-sanctuary and the altar (Mat 23:16-22), He sent the lepers to the priests to fulfil the Law (Mat 8:4), He attended the synagogue on the Sabbath 'as his custom was' (Luk 4:16). His race had learned in the Captivity and the Dispersion the value of some outward conformity, especially of holy seasons, holy books, and meetings for worship and edification, all aiming at that unity expressed in Act 4:32 'they had one heart and soul.'

His first step was to form a circle of disciples, learners (μαθηται), those who would differ from the crowd of listeners by their whole-hearted obedience, becoming imitators (μιμηται), actually doing the things taught after the Teacher's example ('if ye abide in my word, then are ye truly my disciples, Joh 8:31). Much of His teaching is given directly to them: they are distinguished as 'the' disciples, or 'my' disciples (Mat 5:1; Mat 10:1; Mat 12:1, Mar 8:27, Luk 8:9, Joh 3:22 etc.); and, though they may ultimately almost form a school of tradition, inheriting certain teachings (Act 2:42), still they remain learners in the school of Christ, rejecting the title of 'Rabbi' ('teacher,' 'master'), and keep their name of 'disciples' well into the next generation (Act 6:2; Act 9:36; Act 11:26; Act 21:4; Act 21:16). Jesus may call them 'servants' (Mat 10:24), 'labourers' (Mat 9:37, Luk 9:62), 'the salt of the earth,' 'the light of the world' (Mat 5:13-14), but the two most distinctive titles He bestows are 'disciple' and 'apostle.' They are first to learn of Him (Mat 11:29) the secret of calm inward strength of peace, and then they shall become heralds, messengers, apostles of that peace to the world. The Apostolate has no status except for its missionary purpose, and though the Apostles may have the power to forgive sins (Joh 20:23), or to exorcize evil spirits (Mar 6:7), or to heal the sick (Mat 10:8), these are secondary to the work of preaching (Mar 6:12-13).

In founding this first great order in His Church, a whole night of prayer significantly precedes the all-important choice. Next day the Twelve are chosen, and after them Seventy for special and local service, and sent to preach repentance and the Kingdom of God, and to heal (Mar 3:14-15, Mat 10:1, Luk 9:1, Mat 11:1 ['teach and preach,' as though to indicate the true fervour which will give wings to the doctrine]). They are to lead men to repentance (Mar 6:12), over which the joy of the angels is increased (Luk 15:7; Luk 15:10, ending in the parable of the Prodigal Son). They are to sow the seed of the word of life broadcast, on all soils (Luk 8:4-18); and the thought which will sustain them, even when the seed seems utterly fruitless, is that they are His representatives, and speak with His authority behind them ('He that

heareth you heareth me,' [Mat 10:40](#), [Luk 10:16](#); [Luk 10:19](#), [Joh 13:20](#)), for are they not His 'servants,' and 'of his household'? ([Mat 10:25](#)). He points to one, possibly as indicating all, and says that upon him, upon the living rock of human faith and enthusiasm, and not upon the dead heights of Sinai or rock of Zion, will He build. His Church ([Mat 16:18](#)). That Church was to be distinguished by its component members. It should reveal to the world a type of character new in the combination of its qualities and representative of the Society's ideal. This perfect membership was of the future, and not immediate. Even in the inner circle of His associates Christ had to admit the lapses of the Boanerges or of Peter; they had to learn slowly what it meant to be members of the Church as Christ conceived it. The disciple must bear himself with an unswerving attitude towards the world, being filled with one overmastering idea and service ([Mat 6:24](#), [Luk 16:13](#)), from which he must never look back ([Luk 9:62](#)). So complete is to be his obedience and devotion, that the nearest human ties must be broken if they conflict with this vocation ([Luk 15:26](#), [Mat 10:37](#)), and entire renunciation of 'all that he hath' become his rule ([Luk 14:33](#)), though not with the impulse of a blind fanaticism, but with the calm and measured reasoning of the king going to war, or the builder of a tower ([Luk 14:28-33](#)); for calmness, trust in God, absence of fretful anxiety, is the note of the single-minded disciple ([Mat 6:22-34](#)). Hence he will need to make no elaborate apologies for his faith, for God will inspire him when the time for utterance arrives, prophecy being one of the marks of primitive discipleship ([Mat 10:19](#), [Mar 13:11](#), [Luk 12:11](#)). As a soldier, he must look for hardship as his lot, expect no ready welcome everywhere, not bid the fire of heaven fall on those who heed him not ([Luk 9:53](#) f.), but anticipate the burden of the cross ([Luk 14:27](#)), submit to be 'hated of all men for my sake' ([Mat 10:22](#)), fearlessly enduring persecution even unto death (v. 28). As being on active service, each member must guard against encumbrances, possessions that, accumulating, hinder. If the rich young man would be a 'perfect' disciple, he must part with that which now shares his care and attention ([Mat 19:21](#), [Luk 18:22](#)); the disciple must go forth wasting no thought upon purse, wallet, or clothes, losing no time in mere gossip, 'salutations by the way' ([Luk 10:4](#), [Mar 6:8](#), [Mat 10:10](#)). He renounces for the sake of his high mission, not for the boastful and purposeless contempt of an Essene. His aloofness from possessions is consecrated by the lowly simplicity of his spirit, which, already dwelling in the Kingdom of heaven, proclaims it with the artlessness of a little child ([Mat 18:1](#), [Mar 9:34](#), [Luk 9:48](#)), and with the same generous desire to share all his possessions, spiritual as well as temporal, with others ([Act 2:44](#); [Act 4:32](#) and the Pauline comment [Gal 2:9](#)). He may find himself a lamb among wolves ([Luk 10:3](#)), but he will still show his discipleship by that love of men which first commissioned him ([Joh 13:35](#)). He will learn to see brothers in all workers for good, whatever name they bear, for 'he that is not against us is for us' ([Mar 9:38](#), [Luk 9:50](#)), and the 'false prophets' he will easily discern by their spiritual unfruitfulness, though they call on the Name and work miracles ([Mat 7:22](#)). These signs of the perfect member of the body of Christ will be the gradual outcome of the hidden inward life: no school can

make it; It will spring from the inner sincerity of devotion and character, the ‘prayer, alms, fasting’ ‘in secret’ of Mat_6:1-18.

In founding the Church, whose main purpose should be the reconciliation of man to God, Christ’s chief act of organization was connected with the material that should form the Church,—the primary Apostles, and the larger group of disciples who should foreshadow the ultimate attainment. To perfect them was the chief necessity: to make them the sinning, guiding lights of the world, who in the after-days should do even greater things on earth than He Himself (Joh_14:12). Hence, perhaps, the little He says about the elements of external religion. He certainly accepted from the past the act of baptism as employed by John (Mat_21:25 || Mar_11:30, Luk_20:4), and commanded its practice (Mat_28:19), though not Himself actually baptizing (Joh_4:2), and clearly impressing one Apostle with the minor importance of baptism (1Co_1:17) as compared with preaching—the baptism of the Spirit (Mat_3:11 || Mar_1:8, Luk_3:16, Joh_1:26). He accepted the Sabbath of His people, but only subject to the good and needs of man (Mat_12:8, Mar_2:27, Luk_6:5), so that His followers afterwards felt free to change the day. While He organized prayer to the extent that it should be always in His name (Mat_18:20, Joh_14:13; Joh_15:16; Joh_16:26), and showed the spirit of that command in the prayer taught to His disciples, He would have it liberated from the formalism and ‘vain repetitions’ of the past and of the heathen (Mat_6:7). He adopted no systematized body of teaching, or of technical Rabbinic discipline, and no casuistic expounding of Scripture. The one new institution He delivered into the keeping of His followers was in the consecration of that Last Supper destined to be the first of an ageless series, and to be the perpetual symbol of the vital union of the Church and its Lord in things visible and invisible (Mat_26:26-27, Mar_14:22, Luk_22:19).

If, then, we ask what organization appears to exist on the night of the Crucifixion, we seem to find little that could satisfy the representative ecclesiastical mind. There is throughout Galilee and in Jerusalem a vaguely connected number of believers in Jesus. These know, in more or less detail, the kind of witness that is expected of them before the world, a manifestation that, once realized, would mark them out from the world more plainly than Jew from Roman. They are bound together by this unity of character, which, once attained, will be the presence of the Kingdom of God to each one. Their leaders are eleven of their Lord’s intimates, chosen by Him as teachers and preachers of His word. For outward helps they have the institutions of Judaism, with the baptism of John; the continual remembrance of Christ through praying in His name, and in the prayer He had given; and in the communion of the Lord’s Supper.

But in the Acts and the Epistles we meet with a development of organization arising chiefly out of local necessities. Whilst remaining Jews and attending worship at the

Temple (Act 3:1), the disciples gradually became more conscious of the necessity of something in the nature of a separate community. Meetings of sympathizers, which were also open to any who would come (1Co 14:23), were planned, and since they could not be held in the synagogues (Act 6:9), private houses were used (Act 2:46; Act 5:42; Act 18:7, Rom 16:5, 1Co 16:15, Col 4:15). Here were held gatherings for common prayer, for the breaking of bread, for Apostolic teaching and fellowship (Act 2:42), and for the moral edification of those present. As the first community at Jerusalem increased in numbers, it was found to be necessary to organize a group of helpers for the distribution of charity and the general ministrations (*διακονίαι*, Rom 12:7, 1Co 12:5) of almonry (Act 6:1-6), though for the full ‘work of the ministry’ other gifts and opportunities would enter in (Eph 4:12). The Apostles continued to spend themselves in preaching and in prayer; and as they needed assistance in these, they would naturally turn to their ‘helps’ (1Co 12:28), those ‘men of good report, full of the Spirit and of wisdom’ (Act 6:3), who would thus, by giving occasional instruction and spiritual guidance, become practising ministers of the word, though their almonry would remain the distinctive duty of these ‘deacons,’ and the key to their expected morality (1Ti 3:8 ff.), especially during the brief period of Apostolic communion (Act 2:44-45).

The Church still consisted of those called disciples, but slowly it assumed a more visible membership. Baptism became the recognized entrance; baptism ‘into the name of Christ’ (Act 2:38; Act 8:16; Act 10:48; Act 19:5, Rom 6:3, Gal 3:27)—in St. Paul’s thought a spiritual cleansing (1Co 6:11), a mystical burial before the rising of the new life (Col 2:12). Each member was to offer sacrifices of praise and thanks (Heb 13:15), might teach (Jam 3:1), and pray with immediate access to God (Eph 3:12), and would receive direct illumination (Joh 1:9, 1Jn 2:27). Each was a temple of the Holy Spirit (1Co 6:19), and was to be given up entirely (mentally, physically, and spiritually) to God (Rom 12:1-2), unto a renewed life of righteousness and holiness (Eph 4:24). Their common name steadily underwent changes that marked a more organized body. From ‘disciples,’ the followers and learners of Jesus, they became more conscious of mutual bonds of faith and consecration, so that ἀδελφοί (‘brothers’) better described them (Act 28:14), since in the fellowship of Christ they had abolished the demarcations of nation, wealth, position, and sex (Gal 3:28, Col 3:11), and had attained to that kinship which is as close as that of mother and brethren (Luk 8:21). Afterwards the religious sense of the brotherhood led them to a new name for the members, οἱ ἅγιοι (‘the saints’), those who are striving after holiness (1Co 1:2, Rom 1:7). They are already looked upon as a school, a sect, a party (αἵρεσις) by outsiders (Act 24:5; Act 24:14; Act 28:22), so that these first communities of ‘the holy ones’ were being welded together openly. Their government was not sacerdotal, the name ‘priest’ occurring in the NT only when used of the

whole society (1Pe 2:5; 1Pe 2:9, Rev 1:6; Rev 5:10). At their head were still the Apostles, strong by their commission from Christ (Mat 10:2, Luk 6:13, Mar 3:14, marg. Mar 6:7; Mar 6:30), and increased in numbers through the guidance of the Holy Spirit, Paul, Barnabas, Matthias, and others being added (1Co 9:6, Gal 1:19, Rom 16:7, 1Th 2:6). Their faith and zeal had been renewed by the vision of the risen Lord (Act 1:21-22, 1Co 9:1; 1Co 15:7), and in that faith they had wrought wondrous signs of their Apostolate (2Co 12:12). But with the growth of the membership of the Church, and the formation of many isolated congregations, superintendents or presidents (πρεσβύτεροι) were needed and appointed, whose duties soon included that of teaching as well as governing the general affairs (1Ti 3:2; 1Ti 5:17, Tit 1:9). Their equivalent title in Greek cities would seem to have been ‘overseers,’ ‘bishops’ (ἐπίσκοποι, Php 1:1, Tit 1:7), and their duties the same, namely, attending to the poor and the sick, helping travelling brethren, exercising discipline towards wrong-doers, and the general administration of the community’s business. So that, although St. Paul mentions many offices in the Church (1Co 12:28, Eph 4:11), two orders only stand out clearly in the NT after the Apostles, that of the presbyters or elders, and that of the deacons. The prophetic office is too nearly allied to the Apostolic to be easily distinguished, though Jesus speaks of it as of something known universally (Mat 7:22; Mat 10:41; Mat 23:34); St. John speaks of the Church as ‘the saints, apostles, and prophets’ (Rev 18:20; Rev 18:24); and Acts names some (Act 11:27; Act 21:10; Act 15:32).

In the organization of the Church, doctrine began to be more settled. While Jesus lived, and in His own life could show the blessedness of the Kingdom of God within, men could not go far astray. But afterwards it was necessary to tell of Him, His sayings and doings, His warnings, His ideals, and the purpose of His life. The Apostles would question whether the future would guard these truly, or add to, alter, or take away. So a body of things needful to be taught was collected, and, for the Gentile world, the OT added as an introduction to the comprehension of Christ. To some such collection St. Paul alludes in Rom 6:17, 2Th 2:15; but for the knowledge of this the whole NT is our only source to-day. Thence we gather, besides many conflicting modern readings of great doctrines, a general agreement as to the practices of the early Church. We find them still meeting for a while on the Sabbath, the Lord’s day commemorating the Resurrection and only later becoming the rest-day. At their meetings would be celebrated the Love-Feast, sometimes hardly distinguishable from the Lord’s Supper. Here would be the gathering for common prayer, of the form of which we know nothing, the Epistles quoting no regular prayer, referring to no liturgical order, and not even alluding to the Lord’s Prayer. Afterwards the fund for the poorer brethren would be collected (Act 4:35, Gal 2:10, Rom 15:26).

So that which comes to be known by the Greek pagan title ἐκκλησία, 'the Church,' is gradually organized. She begins in the mind of Christ, free, unlimited, the universal Kingdom of God, with no sacred seasons, sanctuaries, or priesthood. But her Founder knows that her work is among men, and that she must be humanly as well as Divinely developed. So the limitations of organized life are lightly imposed upon her, not to hinder but to increase effectiveness. Still will she cherish the liberty to which the past has brought her (Gal 3:24), and receive both good and evil into her net (Luk 5:6, 2Ti 2:20), for she strives to save all. The outward organization develops, but, while we keep to the pages of the NT, the spirit of the Church is still master of her organization, still looks to the Invisible Church, yet to be, of those made perfect, where the unrighteous have no place (1Co 6:9; 1Co 15:50, Gal 5:21, Eph 5:5), the assembly of those made perfect through love (Jam 2:5), the everlasting Kingdom of our Lord (2Pe 1:11), into which the few have already entered here upon earth—'Theirs is the kingdom of heaven' (Mat 5:3; Mat 5:10, Luk 6:20). See also Church.

Literature.—For detailed treatment of the Church offices and officers, the following may be consulted out of the abundant literature on these subjects: Hatch, *Organiz. of the Early Christian Churches*; Lightfoot, *Philipp.*, Dissert. i. (repub. as *The Christian Ministry*), and *Galatians*, Excursus on 'Apostle'; Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*; Hort, *Ecclesia*; Weizsäcker, *Apost. Age*, English translation vol. ii. bk. 5; McGiffert, *Christianity in the Apost. Age*, 645 ff.; Hausrath, *NT Times*, vol. ii.; Lindsay, *Church and Ministry*; artt. 'Apostle,' 'Bishop,' 'Baptism' (esp. pp. 240-242), 'Church,' 'Church Government,' 'Deacon,' 'Lord's Supper,' and 'Lord's Day' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible .

Edgar Daplyn.

☞Originality

ORIGINALITY.—It is not surprising that attempts should have been made to dispute Christ's claim to originality. Under whichever aspect we regard His Person, whether we consider Him in His historical relations, or contemplate the eternal truth revealed in Him, on either side opportunity presents itself for disputing the originality of His doctrine. Under the former aspect this is manifestly the case. However fully we may be convinced of the novelty of the doctrine of the Saviour, nobody fancies that that doctrine was without historical connexion with what had gone before. As in the Saviour's Person the Divine revealed itself in human form, so in His doctrine the Divine truth which He had to communicate clothed itself in the language and thought of the time in which He lived. Though He was the Son of God, He was also the child of

His own age and people. Though the truth that He revealed was eternal, it was addressed, in the first instance, to the people of the country and time in which He lived, and linked itself at countless points to the religious ideas and hopes of those who listened to His preaching. And under this aspect of the Saviour's doctrine the question presents itself, whether it may not be sufficiently accounted for on the lines of a natural development of the religious tendencies of the age in which He lived, and whether He has indeed contributed anything new and original to the religious history of the world.

But, on the other hand, the tendency to emphasize the eternal truth revealed in the Person of Christ, while it seems to rebut such attempts to reduce His doctrine to the product of the religious developments of the age in which He lived, may lead indirectly to the challenging of His originality from another side. The religion which Christ has founded is recognized as a universal religion—a religion destined not for any particular people, but for all mankind. As such it must appeal to the deepest cravings of the human heart, and satisfy those yearnings which had found expression in the thoughts and aspirations of the teachers who had gone before Him. Christ came in the fulness of time. The course of the world's history before Him had been one long preparation for the revelation given in His Person. The Spirit of God had been at work in the hearts of mankind from the beginning, guiding them gradually to the truth. The very fact that the truth which Christ proclaimed is eternal, may be regarded as a proof that He can lay no claim to originality in the declaration of it. There had been countless anticipations of it in the teachers who had gone before. He did but formulate the truth upon which the mind of man had been brooding from the beginning. 'Nam res ipsa,' says Augustine (*Retract.* i. c. 12), 'quae nunc Christiana religio nuncupatur, erat et apud antiquos, nec defuit ab initio generis humani quousque Christus veniret in carne, unde vera religio, quae jam erat, coepit appellari Christiana.' It is easy to understand how, from this point of view, arguments might be urged against the originality of Christ, in a spirit very different from that which animates Augustine in his remark. Attempts have been made to prove that the truth revealed in Christ had been anticipated by the sages and religious teachers who had gone before Him. The literature of the ancient world has been ransacked to discover parallels to the doctrine of Christ. And on the strength of the occasional points of resemblance, which have been thus collected, between the teaching of the Saviour and that of those who have gone before Him, the originality of Christ has been disputed, and His claim to be the founder of a new religion denied.

We propose to consider some of the attempts which have thus been made from different sides to prove the indebtedness of Christ to those who preceded Him, and to discuss the worth of the charge of want of originality based upon the evidence thus adduced. In some of the cases we have to consider, it is the question of the originality not so much of Christ as of Christianity that is involved, as the Person of Christ is

either left out of account as a pure piece of fiction, or reduced to such mean proportions as rob it of all historical significance. But inasmuch as in such cases the attempt is made to disprove the originality of that religious movement which we, at any rate, associate with the Person of Christ, we may fitly consider them here, so far, at least, as the criticism in question involves the doctrine of the Master as distinguished from the Apostles.

i. Christianity and Graeco-Roman thought.—Occasional attempts have been made to trace the indebtedness of Christianity to Greek and Graeco-Roman thought. We do not refer here to the endeavours of such men as Hatch and Harnack to prove the influence of Greek philosophy on the development of Christian doctrine, but to the much more revolutionary tendency of such writers as Bruno Bauer and Ernest Havet, who have sought to account not only for the development of Christian doctrine, but for the origin of Christianity itself, upon such lines.

In his work, *Christus und die Caesaren: Der Ursprung des Christenthums aus dem römischen Griechenthum* (1877, 2nd ed. 1879), Bauer seriously undertakes to prove that Christianity is not Jewish in its origin, but is really the product of Graeco-Roman thought. Its birthplace was not Palestine, but the two cities in which the blending of East and West took place,—Alexandria and Rome. Judaism in its monotheism did but give the skeleton; it was the West that gave the soul. Philo and Seneca were its real founders. At Alexandria, Judaism was enriched by a combination of the Platonic world of ideas with the Heraclitic Logos. Philo made of this Logos a priestly mediator who brings the extremes of the Divine and the human into relation to one another. Seneca gave to this mediator reality, brought him down to earth into touch with men, and made him approve himself by suffering. In the picture he has painted of the ideal man who would one day arise and fulfil the destiny of mankind, he is the real creator of the Christian Messiah. He introduced to the masses the wisdom of Greece, with its call to self-denial and renunciation of the world, whereby man may attain to God-likeness and eternal peace. It was Seneca who laid the foundation for Christian Rome. In the contrast which he presents between the old law with its formal requirements and the new with its higher, more spiritualistic demands, he has supplied the theme for the Sermon on the Mount. Many of his sayings have been reproduced in the NT, sometimes in a manner which conclusively proves the secondariness of the Scripture version. It is true that he is never mentioned by name in the NT. This Bauer would explain by the fact that the NT literature is so late in date that its compilers were ignorant of the fact that Seneca was the author of the maxims which were current among the society for whom they wrote. Still, in some cases the correspondence between the NT parallels and the original utterances of Seneca is so close, that Bauer is of opinion that the NT authors must have had the writings of the Roman sage before them.

Another factor to which Bauer attaches importance in accounting for the origin of Christianity, is the influence of the political conditions of the time. Despair over the downfall of the Republic, which seemed to portend the end of the world, awakened the yearning for a new spiritual world. The levelling of classes, which followed on the establishment of the Empire, begot a faith in human rights and inspired a feeling of mutual dependence such as the Republic had never awakened. Further, the emperors themselves contributed to the ideal which was gradually taking shape in the mind of the age. The Christian Saviour and the Roman emperors are both products of the same tendency, which sought to sum up the aspirations and immaterial goods of antiquity in one personal, all-powerful form. Augustus was the prince of peace who healed the wounds of the Civil War; Tiberius, the servant of the community; Caligula, the god-man and world-judge; Nero, the philanthropist who dedicated himself to the service of humanity; Vespasian caused the Jewish oracle, which had called him to be ruler of the world, to be carried before his legions; Nerva and his successors gave to the Roman world an example of mildness and tranquillity. The central figure of the new religion is a composite character constructed out of the aspirations and ideals of Greek philosophy and various traits borrowed from the occupants of the imperial throne, in whom the Roman world recognized the mediators between heaven and earth.

Such are the lines on which Bauer seeks to ascribe the origin of Christianity to Graeco-Roman influence. It is evident that his theory involves not only the complete overturn of all but the most extreme theories as to the date of the NT literature, but also a very different reading of the course of profane history from that which has hitherto obtained. Bauer has no hesitation in setting aside the testimony of Tacitus, Suetonius, and the other Roman historians. A theory which represents Nero in the character of philanthropist, and finds in his reign an anticipation of the Messianic blessedness, makes the strongest demands on our credulity-Bauer's views as to the date of the NT writings are wild in the extreme. The Epistles to the Corinthians are a late composition of the 2nd cent.; the *Urevangelium* is ascribed to the first half of Hadrian's reign; the Apocalypse and Fourth Gospel to the time of Marcus Aurelius, the latter being an attempt to carry out systematically the Gnostic opposition to Judaism. The Jewish element in the NT is persistently denied. The author of the *Urevangelium* is 'an Italian by birth, who was at home in Rome and Alexandria'; the author of Matthew, no Jewish Christian, but 'a Roman nourished by Seneca's spirit.' Such theories justify H. Holtzmann's characterization of Bauer as 'a critical Herostratus' (*Einl. in d. NT*, p. 183). If their very wildness calls for no serious refutation, it at any rate serves to demonstrate the impracticability of the attempt to assign a Hellenic origin to Christianity.

Havet's work, *Le Christianisme et ses Origines*, is on somewhat similar lines, but much more moderate in tone.

There are, Havet thinks, three elements to be taken into account in considering the origin of Christianity, the Hellenic, the Jewish, represented by the Prophets and the Psalms, and a third which he calls the Galilaean, by which he means the sentiments and ideas which developed at first among the turbulent population of Galilee under the misery of the Roman dominion, and then raised up Jesus, and determined His action and destiny, and which gradually spread throughout the great cities of the Roman Empire. He admits that Christianity is not to be found '*tout entier*' in Hellenism, but insists, on the other hand, that however large may be the share of Galilaean Judaism in the Christian revolution, far more considerable is that of Hellenism in Christianity once it was established. We must distinguish, he contends, between the essence and the accident, between the Christian spirit and the Christian revolution. The Christian revolution came from Judaea and Galilee. But the Christian spirit is essentially that of Graeco-Roman philosophy and religion. On the appearance of Christianity it was not the faith and wisdom of Hellenism that were absorbed into Judaism, but Judaism that was absorbed into the common beliefs of the human race. In order to establish this contention, Havet gives an exhaustive examination of Hellenic literature from the earliest times, making an anthology of all the passages which seem to breathe anything of the Christian spirit. In summarizing his conclusions, he paints a picture of the heathen world designed to show how nearly it approached to Christianity in its beliefs and hopes. The heathen believed in the immortality of the soul, in the resurrection of the dead, in a future life with punishments and rewards, in the existence of gods who were offended by the faults of men, in the approaching end of this world and the coming of a new one. They had their temples, their altars, their prayers, their sacred songs; while there were not wanting among them loftier spirits who held that the divinity desired no other temple than the heart of man, nor other worship than the practice of virtue. Their moral code breathed the same spirit of self-denial as Christianity inculcated; taught men to despise riches, honours, pleasures, yea, happiness itself; inspired an abhorrence of sin, a consciousness of our moral infirmity, and a passionate longing for salvation; inculcated chastity, alms, charity, a horror of war, submission to authority. How is it possible, asks Havet, with such a picture before us, to speak of Christianity as renewing the face of the earth, or to hail its advent as something entirely new and unexpected? He believes that the heathen world, if left to itself, would not have remained heathen, that its mythology and superstition would gradually have vanished, and that the feeling of human fraternity and the need of equality and justice would have developed more and more and passed into its manners and laws. This natural development it was not permitted to pursue. The Judaizers precipitated the crisis; the reform was carried through with too great haste, with the result that the world, in becoming Christian, remained more pagan than if Hellenism had retained its mastery.

While Havet recognizes that Judaism thus played a considerable part in the origin of Christianity, he assigns but little importance to the Person of Christ Himself in the movement which bore His name. He believes that John the Baptist was the principal personage in the religious revolution of which Jesus has the honour. Of the life of Jesus Himself we know almost nothing. Havet denies that He claimed to be the Christ, and that He was tried before the Sanhedrin and condemned for blasphemy or any religious crime. He did not break with Judaism, nor was He the opponent of the Pharisees in the way He is represented in the Gospels. He was a Jew, ardent to fanaticism, a Galilaeen zealot who had inflamed the people of His country, and, in the end, so agitated Jerusalem itself that the Jewish authorities, whom He had compromised, handed Him over to the Roman police, by whom He was put to death as a disturber of the peace. At the moment of His death, that which we call Christianity had no existence. He was Himself a Christian only in His manner of feeling; otherwise He was a pure Jew, and there is neither word nor act in His life that is not thoroughly Jewish. He introduced no new dogma or practice. He had no conception of the Trinity, or the Incarnation, or other mysteries,—no idea of Church or Sacraments. It was not till after His death that some began to ask, ‘Was He not the Christ?’, and the thought once started gained currency. In order to give the suggestion any plausibility, it was necessary to combine with it the belief that this Jesus who had perished miserably had been raised up from the dead to enter on a life of glory. If Jesus was the Christ, then all was not finished. He must reappear. He must come again as the Christ on the clouds of heaven to destroy this wicked world and restore Israel. The hope thus cherished was converted into actual fact. The step was taken from the thought, ‘He must rise again,’ to the belief, ‘He has risen.’ The news spread among the Jewish communities scattered throughout the Roman Empire, and from them to the Roman world in the midst of which they lived, that the Christ, who was to come to inaugurate the kingdom of the God of the Jews in place of that of the Romans, had actually appeared, that He had been crucified, and had risen from the dead, and was to reappear to destroy the sinners, and to raise up from the dead all the righteous, and reunite them in an eternal life with those who were still alive. With faith in Christ and His resurrection, the Gentile converts to the new faith accepted also the worship of the one God alone, and the denial of idolatry; while in their turn they set aside, in the name of Christ, the more repugnant elements of Judaism, particularly circumcision. This purified Judaism purified itself more and more as it spread among the Gentiles, and became permeated by the spirit of Greek philosophy. The two spirits came in time to be confounded.

Such is Havet’s account of the origin of Christianity. Although his theories are not so extreme as those of Bauer, his attempt to assign Hellenic culture as the main source from which Christianity has sprung serves, equally with Bauer’s, to illustrate to what desperate expedients such a theory is reduced in order to give itself even some measure of plausibility. Both essays result in the attempt to explain Christianity

without the Person of Christ; for though Havet does not, like Bauer, deny the existence of Christ altogether, there are few Christians who will recognize, in the Jewish fanatic whom he presents to us, the Saviour whom they worship. We must allow to both authors—to Havet especially—a certain merit, in so far as they demonstrate how well Greek thought had prepared the soil for the seeds of Christian truth. As contributions to the study of the early history of the Christian Church and the development of Christian doctrine, their works may prove of value; but as accounts of the origin of Christianity itself, we cannot assign to them any worth (Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, English translation i. 52 f.). They virtually recognize the impracticability of any attempt to trace the indebtedness of the historical Jesus to Hellenic culture. Whatever parallels they may bring forward to any of the recorded utterances of Jesus, they make no attempt to show in what way He could have been brought into contact with the literature from which He is supposed to have derived inspiration. Only by critical theories regarding the Gospels which would deprive them of all historical worth, can they find room to introduce that Hellenic influence which they seek to trace.

ii. Christianity and Buddhism.—From the side of Buddhism, also, attacks have been made on the originality of Christianity. It is an undoubted fact, that long before the Christian era Buddhist doctrine had penetrated to distant regions, and the possibility of the indebtedness of the Christian Gospels to the Buddha legend is not so remote as to be dismissed without careful consideration. Various attempts have been made to prove that much of the material in the Gospel narratives may be traced to Buddhist sources—notably by Bunsen, Seydel, Lillie, and more recently by Stix, Pfleiderer, and van den Bergh van Eysinga (for titles of works see below in list of Literature). Among the earlier group of writers, Seydel is generally recognized to be the most scholarly; and we may devote our attention chiefly to him. In his book, *Das Evangelium Jesu in seinen Verhältnissen zu Buddha-sage und Buddha-lehre*, he endeavours to construct a ‘Buddhist-Christian Gospel Harmony’ by drawing up a list of the parallels that may be traced between the two religions.

In all, Seydel collects 51 such parallels, which he proceeds to arrange in 3 groups. In the first he places those resemblances which may be accidental; in the second, those cases in which we are forced to conclude that there has been borrowing on one side or the other. The third group contains parallels in which it is clear not only that there has been borrowing, but on which side the borrowing has taken place. This last group contains only five parallels, and in each case Seydel concludes that the verdict must be given in favour of Buddhism. They are as follows:—(1) the presentation of the infant Jesus in the Temple, compared with that of Buddha; (2) the fast of Jesus and of Buddha; (3) the pre-existence of Jesus and of Buddha; (4) the fig-tree as the place of Buddha’s first conversion, compared with Jesus’ interview with Nathanael (Joh 1:46 ff.); (5) the question of the disciples regarding the man who was born blind

(Joh_9:2), which seems to imply a former state of existence whose sinfulness might account for present affliction. The verdict in favour of Buddhism in this third group of parallels strengthens the probability that in the second group also it is Christianity that is the debtor. In this group the number of parallels runs to 23, 12 of which Seydel regards as of greater cogency than the rest. Among the Gospel facts which he introduces in this first division of his second group may be mentioned the annunciation to Mary, the gifts to the newborn child, the temptation, and the Beatitudes. Lastly, even in the first group of 23 parallels, which Seydel admits may be wholly accidental, he believes that in view of the conclusions reached by an examination of the two other groups, there is a possibility that in at least 15 cases the Gospels may have been subject to Buddhist influence.

To account for the presence of so much material in the Gospels borrowed from Buddhist sources, Seydel formulates the hypothesis that, in addition to the two sources generally recognized as underlying the Synoptic Gospels—the collection of Sayings, and the original Mark—there must also have existed a third source, a poetic-apocalyptic Gospel, in which the Christian material must have been worked up after the pattern of the Buddhist Gospels, with the incorporation of much that was derived from Buddhist sources. This poetic source was used by all the Synoptists and by the Fourth Evangelist as well. That it has been lost is to be explained by the fact that the available material which it afforded had been incorporated in the Gospels, whose more historical form and genuine Christian doctrine caused the early poetical work to be quite forgotten.

Seydel claims a certain apologetic value for his investigations. If he has shaken our faith in much in the Gospel narratives which he has shown to be derived from Buddhism, we may comfort ourselves, he thinks, with the reflexion that those features in the life of Jesus to which he has found no analogy in Buddhist tradition,—such, *e.g.*, as the Passion and certain fundamental doctrines and personal characteristics of Jesus,—are thus indirectly confirmed. In what remains after we have taken away what may be traced to Buddhism, we have a kernel of historical fact which is unassailable.

When we turn to examine the various parallels upon which Seydel bases his contention, we find that the resemblance between the Christian and the Buddhist material is frequently exaggerated; that but little attention is paid to the underlying difference between the two sides, which in many cases is much more striking than the apparent resemblance; and that, even where the resemblance is strongest, Seydel has not made out his case, *viz.*, that the fact which he instances from the Gospels is so unintelligible on Christian premises, that borrowing from an external source is the only feasible explanation. We shall endeavour to justify this contention in the case of the five parallels upon which Seydel lays the greatest stress.

(1) The Presentation in the Temple. Here Seydel's point is that such presentation of the infant Jesus was not required, and that Luke's appeal to the Law (Luk 2:23) is a mere device to introduce an incident borrowed from a foreign source. We admit that it was not necessary that the infant should be presented in person on the occasion of its being ransomed; but we have only to read the account of the presentation of the infant Buddha, which Seydel thinks may have suggested this incident, with its description of how 100,000 gods drew the waggon which bore him, of how the earth trembled as he entered the temple, of how the images of the gods left their places to throw themselves at his feet, to convince ourselves that among the various motives which might be assigned for the departure from the strict letter of the Law in the case of Jesus, a more unlikely one could hardly be conceived than a desire to institute a parallel with this fantastic story, to which the simple Gospel narrative offers the most striking contrast.

(2) Seydel finds the 40 days' fast of Jesus in the wilderness inexplicable in view of the contrast He Himself drew between His own conduct and the asceticism practised by John the Baptist, and suggests that this incident is borrowed from the example of Buddha. But if any parallel at all is required, we do not need to go so far afield. The 40 days' fast of Moses (Exo 34:28, Deu 9:9) and that of Elijah (1Ki 19:8) at once suggest themselves as parallels which do not take us beyond the limits of Jewish history.

(3) Seydel finds a parallel to Christ's words to the Jews, 'Before Abraham was, I am' (Joh 8:58), in Buddha's assertion of his pre-existence. But the resemblance at once disappears when we realize what is the kind of pre-existence Buddha claims for himself,—not like that of the Johannine Logos who has been with God from the beginning (Joh 1:1 f.), but that of a being who has undergone countless different forms of incarnation.

(4) It was while sitting under the Bodhi-tree, which was a kind of fig-tree, that Gautama attained Buddha-hood, and immediately thereafter converted two brothers, who became his first disciples. Seydel finds a parallel to this in the words of Jesus to Nathanael, 'When thou wast under the fig-tree, I saw thee' (Joh 1:48). But beyond the facts that a fig-tree and a disciple are mentioned in both cases, there is no resemblance between them. It was not Jesus, but Nathanael, who was sitting under the fig-tree; there is no suggestion of the 'enlightenment' of Jesus; and the disciple in connexion with whom the fig-tree is mentioned was not, as in Buddha's case, the first who was called.

(5) The question of the disciples with regard to the man who was born blind, 'Master, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?' (Joh 9:2) is brought forward by Seydel as implying belief in the Buddhist doctrine of re-birth, according to

which we are punished here for sins committed in a former state of existence. But the doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul was not unknown to the Jews (cf. Wis 8:20), and it is questionable, further, whether even this doctrine is necessary to explain the question of the disciples. They may have been thinking; of some sin committed in the womb (cf. Gen 25:22), or may have regarded the blindness of the man as punishment in anticipation of the sins he would commit (cf. B. Weiss in Meyer's *Kommentar*, *ad loc.*).

These are the parallels upon which, as has been said, Seydel lays the chief stress. He admits himself that the force of the other analogies depends, in great measure, upon the verdict we pass upon the evidence afforded by these five parallels, which constitute his third group. And if, as we have endeavoured to show, he has not made good his case in these instances, much of the force of his argument is gone. As to his hypothesis of the existence of a poetic-apocalyptic Gospel imbued with Buddhist doctrine, there is absolutely no proof for the existence of such a document. Seydel can bring forward no particle of evidence to support his hypothesis. He merely invents this fictitious Gospel to supply the lack of historical connexion between Buddhism and Christianity, the want of which is one of the strongest objections to his theory.

As remarked above, attempts have been made more recently by Pfeleiderer and van den Bergh van Eysinga to trace Buddhist influence on the Gospel narratives. Among the parallels which the latter finds specially important, may be mentioned Simeon in the Temple, the twelve-year-old Jesus, the baptism of Jesus, the temptation, the blessing of the mother of Jesus (Luk 11:27), the widow's mite, the walking on the sea, the Samaritan woman at the well, and the world conflagration. Pfeleiderer does not descend so much into detail, but groups his parallels together under general heads, such as Christ as Son of God, as miraculous Saviour, as victor over Satan, as King of kings, etc. With regard to these more recent works, the same criticism applies as in the case of Seydel. Many of the suggested parallels, when closely examined, prove much less striking than appeared at first sight; and even where the resemblance is closest, a much more natural explanation can usually be given of the feature in question on the Christian side than the adaptation of Buddhist material. And due consideration should here be given to the fact to which Oldenberg has called attention (*ThLZ [Note: hLZ Theol. Literaturzeitung.]*, 1905, No. 3), that the Buddhist literature which is drawn upon to supply these parallels to Christianity is so extensive, so infinitely rich in legendary lore, that the wonder would rather be if we did not find occasional points of resemblance between the Buddhist narratives and those parts of the NT which deal with a similar sphere of life. Finally, while we must admit in the abstract the possibility of Buddhist influence upon Western culture, the fact remains that we have no historical evidence of the spread of Buddhist ideas to the regions in which Christianity had its origin till a much later time. Clement of Alexandria is the

first who mentions Buddha by name. In this connexion we may quote the words of Max Müller (*India, what it can teach us?* p. 279):

‘That there are startling coincidences between Buddhism and Christianity cannot be denied, and it must likewise be admitted that Buddhism existed at least 400 years before Christianity. I go even further, and should feel extremely grateful if anybody would point out to me the historical channels through which Buddhism had influenced early Christianity. I have been looking for such channels all my life, but hitherto I have found none. What I have found is that for some of the most startling coincidences there are historical antecedents on both sides, and if we once know these antecedents, the coincidences become far less startling. If I do find, in certain Buddhist works, doctrines identically the same as in Christianity, so far from being frightened, I feel delighted, for surely truth is not the less true because it is believed by the majority of the human race.’

iii. Christianity and Judaism.—When we come to consider the relation of Christianity to Judaism, we feel that the case is very different from what it was in the above instances. There the possibility of contact between Christianity and those influences to which its indebtedness was alleged was remote. Here we are in the line of direct historical connexion. The roots of Christianity go deep down into Jewish soil. Christ was a Jew by birth and education. His whole thought and teaching were cast in Jewish moulds. The very title He bears—the Christ—is meaningless apart from the background of Jewish history in which it had its origin. If we claim originality for Him, we recognize that originality does not mean an entirely new start, the severance of all the links which bind the new Teacher to the religious development of the nation to which He belongs. Such originality is an idle figment of the imagination. It never has existed; it never can exist. If the original teacher is to be a teacher at all, if he is to exercise any influence upon the men he addresses, then he must live in close contact with them and link on his doctrine to the beliefs and hopes which they cherish. So it was with Christ. He may be the world’s Teacher, but He spoke first of all to His fellow-countrymen in Galilee and Judaea, and He used the modes of thought and speech familiar to them. He preached in their synagogues and taught in their streets like the Rabbis of His own day. That there was a certain novelty in His manner of preaching is proved by the astonishment with which the people listened to it (Mar 1:22; Mar 6:2). But was the content essentially different from that of the preachers of His own day, or that of the prophets of old? Had He any new doctrine to communicate? Or was He, as has been alleged by modern Jewish scholars, merely a teacher who gave expression to the best Jewish thought of His time?

We proceed to consider more closely some of the different elements in the Jewish religion to which Christ’s indebtedness is alleged to be so great as to detract from His originality.

(1) *The Old Testament*.—There can be no question as to Christ's obligations to the OT. How much He was influenced by it in His personal life is shown by the frequency of His quotations from it. He seems to live in it. Parallels from it suggest themselves at every turn. In critical moments of His life His thoughts find natural expression in OT quotation. So it was at the temptation (Mat 4:4; Mat 4:7; Mat 4:10), at the cleansing of the Temple (Mar 11:17), even when He hung upon the cross (Mar 15:34). He recognized its authority in religious matters. He appealed to it in defence of His own conduct (Mar 2:25 f.). He quoted it in condemnation of the Pharisees (Mar 7:6; Mar 7:13), and in refutation of the Sadducees (Mar 12:24 f.). He claimed that He came not to destroy, but to fulfil the Law and the Prophets (Mat 5:17). And when He was asked by the rich young man what he must do to inherit eternal life, instead of imparting to him any new doctrine, He simply referred him to the commandments (Mar 10:19).

In view of the attitude Christ thus takes up to the OT, and of His avowed intention of fulfilling the Law and the Prophets, we should expect to find great affinity between His doctrine and that of the OT. Is this affinity so great as to detract from our Lord's originality? It is alleged by some that it is. Nay, it has been questioned, indeed, not only whether Jesus has made any new contribution to the religious and moral teaching of the OT, but whether He even desired to do so (so B. Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 274). There is hardly a feature in the teaching of Christ, it is maintained, to which there is not a parallel in the OT. The constant theme of His preaching, the Kingdom of God, is so manifestly not novel, that He assumes familiarity with it on the part of His hearers, and never even explains what He means by it. His work as a Prophet, sent to announce the coming of this Kingdom and to call men to repentance, was evidently nothing novel. The very words by which the preaching of Christ is introduced by Mk. (Mar 1:15) are practically the same as Mt. uses to describe the appearance of John the Baptist (Mat 3:2). The God whom Christ reveals is no new God, but the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob (Mar 12:26), the God of Israel (Mat 15:31, Mar 12:29). The Fatherhood of God, upon which so much emphasis is laid as the most fundamental and distinctively characteristic doctrine of Christianity, is taught in the OT. The trust in this Father which Christ seeks to inspire already finds most beautiful expression in the Psalms. The new commandment of love which Christ inculcates is so far from being new, that He Himself formulates it on occasion in language borrowed from the OT (Mar 12:31). Not even the widening of the circle of those whom we are required to love, so as to make it embrace our enemy as well as our neighbour, goes beyond the teaching of the OT (Exo 23:4 f., Pro 20:22; Pro 24:29; Pro 25:21 f.). How, it is asked, can originality be claimed for the teaching of Christ, when He Himself takes His stand upon the OT and recognizes its authority; when He claims to reveal no other God than the God of the OT, and to continue the work of the Law and the Prophets; when we find that even those which are regarded as the most characteristic doctrines of Christianity have been forestalled in the OT?

To this it may be replied, that while it is true that Christ generally recognizes the authority of the OT, and appeals to it at times quite in the manner of the scribes, still His attitude towards it is one of freedom and independence. He discriminates between the various parts of it, and leaves aside much that does not appeal to Him. In spite of what He says in the Sermon on the Mount about fulfilling the Law and the Prophets, He does not hesitate in that same sermon to set up His own authority in opposition to the teaching of the Law. He freely criticises the Mosaic law of divorce (Mar 10:2 ff.), and on the question of Sabbath observance not only exercises a freedom which scandalized His contemporaries, but claims to be invested with authority on the question (Mar 2:28). By His doctrine that that only could defile a man which affected his heart, He brushes aside the whole Levitical legislation as to cleanness, and raises the question from the region of the physical to that of the ethical.

It is true, indeed, that most of the elements of Christian doctrine may be found scattered throughout the OT. But they are found side by side with much else which Christ has rejected, and which, in juxtaposition with them, prevents them from having the significance they acquire in Christianity. That God is represented at times in the OT as a Father, e.g., is perfectly true. But the distinguishing feature in Christ's designation of Him as such, as compared with that of the OT, is that with Christ Father is *the* characteristic title for God, and He is never represented under any aspect that is inconsistent with His Fatherhood; whereas in the OT Father is only one, and not even the prevailing one, among various other titles for God, and God is represented at times under very different aspects. It is the same with the various other elements of Christian doctrine that have been found in the OT. They receive a new meaning from the place Christ gives them, the importance He assigns to them, and the consistency with which He insists on them. That God looks not upon the outward conduct but upon the heart, was a truth known to the OT writers no less than to Christ; but it is Christ who first consistently follows it out to its logical conclusions. That we should love our enemies is a doctrine that had been taught even in the OT; yet how much there is in the OT that breathes an entirely different spirit! When we put, not isolated utterances of Christ and of the OT, but the doctrine of Christ as a whole and the OT as a whole, side by side, then, in spite of the fact that we can trace the roots of Christianity down into Jewish soil and can find OT forecasts of much that appears in the teaching of Christ, the conviction is forced upon us that this doctrine of Christ as a whole, by the consistently lofty spirituality of its tone, by the inner coherence and harmony of its various parts in spite of the unsystematic form in which it was delivered, by its indifference to much which held a high place in the Jewish religion, is a new creation as compared with the OT upon which it is based. We feel too that only a mind of the highest originality could have evolved out of a religion in which there was much that was imperfect and unspiritual, a system so pure and lofty as that which we have in the Christian religion.

(2) *Later Judaism.*—But it is not to the OT alone that Christ's indebtedness is alleged. There are later developments of Judaism which are said to have exercised marked influence upon Him. It has been the custom to regard Christ's position as one of pure antagonism to the prevailing religious tendencies of His time, and to represent Him as standing in such irreconcilable opposition to the teaching of the Rabbinical schools that there can be no question of His being influenced by them, save in the way of being repelled. But in spite of the attitude of opposition that Christ took up to the religious authorities of His day, there was, it is alleged, much affinity between them. Like the Rabbis, He preached in the synagogues and taught in the market-places. Like them, He gathered a group of disciples round Him who called Him Master, and whom He sought specially to instruct. His manner of teaching is modelled on theirs. He delights in aphorism. He makes frequent use of illustration and example. It is from them that He has derived the parabolic method of instruction which is so characteristic a feature of His teaching. But not merely the form of His teaching, the matter also is in many cases similar to that of the Rabbis.

Many striking parallels to Christ's sayings have been found in Rabbinical literature. Hillel summed up the whole Law in the words, 'What thou wouldst not have done to thee, do not that to others.' He bade men not Judge their neighbour till they came into his place. 'Raise not thyself above others.' 'If thou art where no men are, show thyself a man.' 'Be among the pupils of Aaron, who loved peace and pursued peace, who loved all creatures and guided them to the Law.' 'Be not as servants who minister to their masters upon condition of receiving a reward.' 'Do God's will as if it were thy will, that He may do thy will as if it were His will.' 'Let your neighbour's, honour be as dear to yon as your own,' Such are some of the more striking sayings of the Jewish Rabbis, which seem to breathe as pure a religious spirit as the teaching of Christ. Even the prayer which Christ taught His disciples, we are told, is but a shortened form of some of the older prayers of the Jewish Liturgy. It is true that in a great many cases the Rabbinical literature in which we find these parallels to the sayings of Christ dates from the 2nd cent. a.d.; and Christian apologists have endeavoured to make the most of the fact, suggesting that if there is any borrowing, the indebtedness cannot rest on the side of Christ. But that argument would be valid only if it were shown that there was any possibility of the literature in question having been influenced by Christian thought. But there is no such possibility. The Christian and the Jewish literature, as Renan (*Life of Jesus*, ch. v.) says, had scarcely any influence on one another before the 13th century. Though these parallels are from a literature which was compiled at a date later than the appearance of Christ, they are themselves older than Christ, and represent a purely Jewish development of thought.

One may dismiss this evidence against the originality of Christ in the words of Wellhausen (*IJG* [Note: *JG Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte.*] 2 [Note: designates

the particular edition of the work referred]), ‘Jewish scholars think that all that Jesus said is found in the Talmud. Yes, all, and a good deal more. Πλέον ἡμῶν παντός . The originality of Jesus consists in this, that He had the feeling for what was true and eternal amid a chaotic mass of rubbish, and that He enunciated it with the greatest emphasis.’ No doubt there are occasional parallels to the words of Christ to be found in the Talmud, but there is a vast amount in the Talmud to which no parallel can be found in the preaching of Christ, for it falls lamentably short of the lofty spiritual tone which characterizes every utterance of the Saviour. Even if it be the case that we can find something corresponding to every clause of the Lord’s Prayer in the Jewish Liturgy, it might still be maintained that there was originality in selecting precisely these petitions and bringing them together in such a brief and simple prayer. But indeed we are not much concerned to defend the originality of the Lord’s Prayer. Christ’s object was not to teach His disciples some new form of prayer, but to give expression to the deepest longings of the human heart; and it would be strange if these cravings had not already found utterance in some measure in the prayers of His fellow-countrymen. When we turn to the parallels which have been traced between sayings of Christ and quotations from the Jewish Rabbis, it will be found, on examination, that in many cases they are not so striking as they appear at first sight. For instance, the saying of Hillel which has been often quoted as an anticipation of the Golden Rule of Christ really falls far short of it. Hillel merely warns us against doing to others what we would not that they should do to us. One might conform to that maxim on grounds of selfishness. At best it requires only that we do no evil. But Christ’s maxim is positive. It insists not merely that we do no evil, but that we do good, and can be carried out only by one who has his heart full of love for his brother. And, further, with regard to the parallels that are drawn between the sayings of Christ and the words of the Rabbis, we must ask what place the quotations occupy in the respective writings from which they are taken. Quotations from the Talmud which have a striking resemblance to some words of Christ may prove, when we consider the context in which they occur, to bear a different meaning from what they assume when put into juxtaposition with similar words of Christ, or may lose a great deal of the impressiveness which attaches to them when regarded as isolated utterances. Upon the whole, we conclude that little weight is to be placed upon the occasional parallels which have been found in the words of the Jewish Rabbis to sayings of Christ. The general spirit of the Rabbinical teaching is very different from Christ’s. When sayings are found which seem to approach to the teaching of Christ, they are rather to be regarded as isolated utterances which rise for the moment above the general level of Rabbinical theology.

There is another branch of late Jewish literature which, it is alleged, has had a marked influence upon Christ, and from which He is said to have derived many of His

leading ideas, viz. the series of Messianic-Apocalyptic writings in which the hopes and aspirations of later Judaism found expression.

There are numerous points of contact between the teaching of Christ and the literature in question. His eschatology, *e.g.*, is said to be almost entirely drawn from this source. Certainly the expectation of His second coming was a novel idea, as it presupposed a want of success on His first appearance which had not been anticipated by any of the later Apocalyptic writers. But otherwise, for the most part, He simply accepts the general eschatological programme which they had outlined. The sharp contrast in which the present age (ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος, [Luk 16:8](#); [Luk 20:34](#), [Mat 12:32](#); ὁ καιρὸς οὗτος, [Luk 18:30](#)) and the future (ὁ αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων, [Mat 12:32](#); ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐρχόμενος, [Luk 18:30](#)) are set to one another, the inauguration of the new era by the miraculous intervention of God, who is to bring in the Kingdom of God with power, the belief that the Kingdom thus to be set up is to come down from heaven, whence also is to come the agent to whom is entrusted its establishment, the series of dire calamities which are to herald the approach of the new era, the great judgment scene and resurrection of the dead with which it is to be ushered in,—all these familiar features of Christ's eschatology are to be found in the writings referred to. In painting the blessedness of heaven and the torments of hell, Christ uses the colours which the Apocalyptic writers have prepared,—Abraham's bosom, the great banquet, eating bread and drinking wine in the Kingdom of God, the furnace of fire and the outer darkness. Again, the Messianic hope which Christ cherished was largely influenced by the expectation which had found expression in the Apocalyptic literature. There was much, indeed, that was sensuous in the expectation of those writers which could not appeal to Christ, and which He put aside. But under their hands the Messianic hope of the OT writers had undergone a transformation which prepared the way for the more spiritual conception of Christianity. They had widened its scope so as to make it embrace not only the nation but the world; they had detached it from earthly political ideas, and raised it to the realm of the supermundane; they had deepened and developed that tendency to individualism which had begun to show itself in the later writings of the OT. In these respects they had prepared the way for Christ, and in much of His teaching He was in sympathy with the aims, and did but develop the doctrines, of the Apocalyptic writers of later Judaism.

One might admit the truth of most of what is thus said, without in any way detracting from the originality of Christ. It is no disparagement to that originality, as we have seen, to recognize that Christ stands in close and vital connexion with those who have preceded Him, and uses the modes of thought and speech which they have made familiar. Whether, indeed, the connexion between the Messianic views of Christ and those of later Judaism is as close as has been suggested, is a question upon which

there is a difference of opinion. Baldensperger answers in the affirmative, maintaining that we must no longer regard Judaism as the dark background against which Christianity stands out as something quite different, but rather as a preparatory stage on the way to Christianity. He lays special stress upon the transcendent character of its Messianism as an advance towards the spiritualism of Christianity (*Die messian.-apocalyp. Hoffnungen des Judenthums*, 1903, p. 232). This view of the relation of Christianity to later Judaism has not been accepted by other authorities. Wellhausen finds in Christianity rather a protest against the prevailing tendency of Judaism (*Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, p. 98). So also Bousset (*Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judenthum*, 1892), who has enumerated a number of points in which the teaching of Christ is in direct conflict with the spirit of later Judaism. In view of this difference of opinion, it is evident that no very strong case has been made out to prove Christ's indebtedness to the later Jewish Apocalyptic writings. That He used the eschatological data and many of the modes of thought which are to be found in this literature, may be readily admitted. But beyond that, His general line of thought must have been little in sympathy with its spirit. There is a wide gulf between the transcendence of later Jewish Messianism, which is sometimes coarse and sensuous, and the spirituality of the Messianic hopes of Christ. Many of the most marked characteristics of later Judaism, as Bousset points out, its withdrawal of God from the world, its asceticism, its world-weariness and lack of interest in the present and yearning for the future, are directly opposed to the spirit of the Saviour's teaching. In view of these and other points of difference between the doctrine of Christ and the tendencies of later Judaism, it seems rash to attempt to trace the origin of Christianity to a system of doctrine to which, in spite of certain superficial points of resemblance, it stands in deep and radical opposition.

(3) *Essenism.*—Attempts have frequently been made to connect Christ with the Essenes, and to account for many of the characteristic features of His doctrine by deriving them from the practices of this sect. But no evidence has been brought forward to prove that Christ had any connexion with them. It is true He never refers to them, while He frequently denounces the Pharisees and Sadducees. But that fact may be easily explained by the smallness and retiring character of the sect. Ginsburg (*Essenes*, p. 24) argues that every Jew had to belong to one of the three parties, Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes, into which the Jews were divided at the time of Christ, and that Christ would naturally associate Himself with the Essenes as most congenial to His nature; but as his premises are quite unsupported, his conclusion has no weight whatever. The only valid ground upon which any plausible case may be made out in favour of the view that Christ had some connexion with the Essenes is, that there are several points in which His doctrine bears a considerable resemblance to theirs. Among these points of resemblance the following may be noted: prohibition of oaths, exaltation of poverty, simplicity of life, celibacy (Mat 19:12), feeling of brotherhood issuing in mutual service. But most of these features merely represent

the high moral tone which obtains on both of the sides thus compared, and no direct connexion is required to account for the resemblance. On the other hand, there are very marked features of difference which preclude any direct connexion of Christ with the Essenes. One of the most distinctive features of the sect was its withdrawal from the world and adoption of a monastic life. Contact with strangers was supposed to communicate defilement. The conduct of Christ presented a striking contrast. He mixed freely in the life of the people. He told His disciples not to hide their light under a bushel. And, so far from thinking that mere contact with strangers caused defilement, He did not shrink even from the touch of the woman who was a sinner, or hesitate to lay His hand upon a leper. In their asceticism the Essenes went to an extreme. 'The Son of Man came eating and drinking.' In their Sabbath observance they outdid the Pharisees. There was no point on which Christ gave such offence to the rigorists. The Essenes stood aloof from the Temple, and offered no sacrifice there. Christ repaired to Jerusalem to some of the great festivals, and taught daily in the Temple. The Essenes were scrupulous to a degree on the question of purity. They had washings innumerable. Christ paid no attention to such ceremonial observances, but esteemed only purity of heart. The differences which thus separate Christ from the Essenes are broad and deep. We cannot find any connexion between Him and a sect which, by its monastic tendency, its exaltation of ceremonial observances, its formal and precise rules, could have made little appeal to Him.

iv. The original element in Christianity.—When we turn from these attempts to disparage the originality of Christ, and proceed to consider wherein that originality consists, we find a great variety of opinions upon the subject. Some would place all the emphasis upon the Person of Christ; others lay weight upon His methods as a teacher; others think to find the original element in His doctrine, selecting now its universalism, now its individualism, now its practical moral tendency, now its lofty spirituality, as the characteristic feature of it; while others, again, contend that the specifically novel feature in the teaching of Christ is His announcement that the Kingdom of God is at hand, that God is about to intervene and bring in the Kingdom of God with power. We shall not confine ourselves to any one of these points of view, but proceed to indicate what appear to us some of the more important characteristics which go to make up the originality of Christ.

1. Without doubt the fullest emphasis must be laid upon *Christ's personality*. This is the most strikingly original feature in Christianity. We cannot separate the doctrine from the Person of Christ. He taught by His life no less than by His words, and it is His Person as much as His doctrine that has converted the world. There could be no more unsatisfactory method of attempting to estimate the originality of Christ than to single out various statements scattered throughout the Gospels which we believe to be unparalleled in any teaching that had gone before. 'It is not difficult to set over against every article from the preaching of Jesus an observation which deprives it of

its originality. It is the Person, it is the fact of his life that is new and creates the new' (Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, English translation i. 73). When we approach the portrait of Christ presented in the Gospels, we at once feel that we are in the presence of One who is in the truest sense original. The moral grandeur of His character alone bears witness to the fact. It dwarfs the attainment of the greatest of human heroes, and leaves the ideals even of our noblest thinkers far behind. The very fact of its sinlessness stamps it with an originality that cannot be gainsaid. The perfect harmony that pervades the whole life, the holy peace which no trial or danger can disturb, the sublime faith, the noble optimism, the unquenchable love, the tender sympathy, the meek humility, the genial, kindly spirit which drew men to Him—these are a few of the features which go to make up that portrait which has produced such an impression on the heart of the world. We feel we are standing in the presence of One who has given in His own Person the perfect revelation of the Divine. One trait we may specially note as characteristic of that originality we are considering, viz. the tone of authority with which He ever acts and speaks. Meek and humble as He is, there is a certain majesty about Him that shines forth all the more forcibly because of the lowliness of the service to which He stoops. He sets up His own authority over against that of the Law: 'Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time ... but I say unto you' (Mat_5:21 f. etc.). He speaks of Himself as a greater than Jonah, a greater than Solomon (Mat_12:41 f.). He claims to be able to reveal the Father as no other can (Mat_11:27), for He stands in a relation of such intimacy to the Father that He can speak of the hidden mysteries of the Divine will as things into which He has Himself looked. Hence the ring of absolute certainty about the revelation He gives of God. Hence the tone of authority in which He announces the Divine will. Either He was the victim of the grossest self-delusion, or He stood in such a close relationship to God, and knew Himself, as the appointed Messiah, to be endowed with such authority as justified Him in speaking in a tone which in any other would be nothing short of blasphemy. There is nothing incompatible with this tone of authority, which marks the teaching of Christ, in the fact that much of His teaching, as we have seen, is closely related to the OT. In a sense His teaching may be said to be based upon the OT, in so far, viz., as in the OT He found the food which nourished His spiritual life. But it is out of the fulness of the spiritual life thus nourished that He draws His doctrine, and not directly from the OT. He speaks that He knows, and testifies that He has seen (Joh_3:11); and what of OT teaching is reproduced in His doctrine is so transmuted and ennobled, bears so unmistakably the impress of His own personality, that it may be fitly called original. We may apply to His relation to the OT the words of the poet, and say that He

'made nobly his what he did mould;

What was another's lead, became his gold.'

Closely akin to this tone of authority which Christ assumes in His preaching is another feature which contributes to the originality of His personality, viz. the feeling that with Him a new era has arrived in the history of the world. 'The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand' (Mar 1:15)—that is the new message of which Christ is the bearer. The hope which animated the prophets has become a reality to Him. He told His disciples that they were blessed in that their eyes had seen the things which many prophets and kings had desired to see (Luk 10:23 f.). His whole preaching rings with glad tidings that the long expected time has come. The period of waiting is past, the new era has begun. Already the Kingdom of God is in the midst of men (Luk 17:21). Even the tragic catastrophe to which His life is tending cannot shake His conviction that with Him the Messianic age has come. He longs for the baptism of suffering which He has to undergo, as calculated to give a mighty impetus to the movement He has begun (Luk 12:49 f.). And when the hour came for Him to lay down His life, so far from seeing in His death any frustration of the gracious work to which He had dedicated His life, He taught His disciples to look upon His blood as the seal of the New Covenant which it had been His life's work to establish.

2. The originality which we have noted as characteristic of the Person of Christ, we should expect to find reflected in *His doctrine*. It was in His doctrine that He made His authority felt (Mat 7:29). The impression made upon those who stood in the closest relation to His Person was that He had a wonderful and life-giving doctrine to communicate (Joh 6:68). In place of His anointment to Messianic kingship, He substituted His anointment to the prophetic office (Luk 4:18-21), and addressed Himself to the work of preaching in fulfilment of His vocation as Messiah. Was there anything original, we ask, in His preaching, anything to justify His feeling that with His entrance on His work as a preacher the new era might be said to have begun?

The impression made upon the people who first listened to His doctrine was that it was something new. 'A new doctrine with authority,' they exclaimed (Mar 1:27) as they listened to His preaching for the first time. Certainly there was much that was old in His doctrine, much that did but echo the teaching of the OT. The description He gives in one of His parables of the scribe instructed in the Kingdom of heaven, applies in the first instance to Himself. He was like a householder who bringeth forth from his storeroom things new and old (Mat 13:52). But if there was much that was old, there was much also that was new and original. As compared with the teaching of the OT, to which it stands in such close connexion, Christ's doctrine was original, as we saw above, in the freedom with which He selected only what appealed to Him, leaving aside much which from the standpoint of His contemporaries was equally, if not more important; in the new emphasis with which it restates certain OT doctrines, and the new value it assigns to them. It was original in the simplicity of its requirements, as against the multitudinous demands which Judaism made upon the individual; in the consistency with which it pursued its few leading ideas—such, e.g.,

as the righteousness of the heart as that which alone avails in God's sight—to their logical issues, not hesitating to enforce the conclusions which follow, even when they conflict with the recognized standards, as in the above case with reference to the Levitical law of cleanness (Mar_7:14-23). It was original in the feeling of confidence which it inspired in man in relation to God, banishing that spirit of bondage which the Pharisaic attitude to the Law had produced, and putting in its place the spirit of adoption whereby we cry, 'Abba, Father' (Rom_8:15), assuring man of the love of the Father in heaven, of the preciousness of each individual in His sight, of His willingness to bestow blessings in rich abundance upon him, to forgive his sins and give him the Kingdom. But, indeed, to do justice to the originality of Christ's doctrine, we should have to mention every feature of it. The purity of the ethical tone, the loftiness of the ideal it sets before us, the comfort it breathes to the sinful and the sinning, the depth of the love it inculcates, the zeal for righteousness it seeks to inspire, its indifference to the ceremonial in religion and interest only for the spiritual,—these are among the features which contribute to its originality. If it is true that there is scarcely a single doctrine of Christ of which we cannot find some anticipation in the OT, it is also true that there is no OT doctrine which Christ reiterates but receives a new significance from the setting it obtains in His teaching. This is the strikingly original feature about His doctrine,—how He makes the old new by the new light in which He places it, and the new value He assigns to it. Much that He taught had been taught before. But never had it been proclaimed with such assurance, never had it been brought home to the heart of man with such conviction, as when it was taught by Him who embodied in His own Person the truth He taught, who, when He spoke of the love of God, could point to His own presence among men as the confirmation of the message that He bore, and who sealed with His blood the truth that He had proclaimed in His life.

Literature.—Bruno Bauer, *Christus und die Cäsaren*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1879, *Das Urevangelium und die Gegner der Schrift* 'Christus und die Cäsaren,' 1880; E. Havet, *Le Christianisme et ses origines*; Bunsen, *The Angel Messiah of Buddhists, Essenes, and Christians*, 1880; Seydel, *Das Evangelium von Jesu in seinen Verhältnissen zu Buddha-sage und Buddha-lehre*, 1882, *Die Buddha-legende und das Leben Jesu nach den Evangelien*, 1884; Oldenberg in *ThLZ* [Note: *hLZ Theol. Literaturzeitung.*] , 1882, No. 18, 1884, No. 8, 1905, No. 3; Lillie, *Buddha and Early Buddhism*, 1881, *The Popular Life of Buddha*, 1883, *Buddhism in Christendom, or Jesus the Essene*, 1885, and *The Influence of Buddhism on Primitive Christianity*, 1893; Aiken, *The Dhamma of Gotama the Buddha and the Gospel of Jesus Christ*, 1900; Stix, *Christus oder Buddha*, 1900; Pfeleiderer, *Das Christusbild des urchristlichen Glaubens in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung*, 1903; van den Bergh van Eysinga, *Indische Einflüsse auf evangelische Erzählungen*, 1904; v. Hase, *Neutest. Parallelen zu buddhist. Quellen*, 1905; Kuenen, *Hibbert*

Lectures, 1882, Lects. iv. and v., notes xi. and xiii.; Bousset, *Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judenthum*, 1892, *Jesus*, English translation 1906; Votaw, *The Modern Jewish View of Jesus* (reprinted from the *Biblical World*, vol. xxvi. No. 2, Aug. 1905); Montefiore, 'The Synoptic Gospels and the Jewish Consciousness,' *Hibbert Journal*, July 1905; Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, ch. ii. § 2, *Das Wesen des Christentums*, p. 30 ff.; Drummond, *The Relation of the Apostolic Teaching to the Teaching of Christ*, p. 85 ff.; O. Holtzmann, *Life of Jesus*, ch. xiv.; Bachmann, *Die neue Botschaft in der Lehre Jesu*, 1905; Eschelbacher, *Das Judentum und das Wesen des Christentums*, 1905; Wellhausen, 'Gesch. Israels u. Judas,' c. [Note: circa, about.] 11 (*Skizzen u. I'orarbeiten*, 1884), also *IJG* [Note: *JG Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte.*] , c. [Note: circa, about.] 24 (1904); Baldensperger, *Die messian.-apocalyp. Hoffnungen des Judenthums*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1903, also *Das spätere Judentum als Vorstufe des Christentums*, 1900; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] , also *Die Predigt Jesu Christi in ihrem Verhältniss zum AT* [Note: *T Altes Testament.*] u. zum Judenthum, 1882; Jülicher, 'Jesus' in *Die christliche Religion*, 1906; H. J. Holtzmann, *NT Theol.* 1897 (first two chapters); J. Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1900; Haupt, *Zum Verständnis der eschatol. Aussagen Jesu*, 1894; Wünsche, *Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien aus Talmud und Midrasch*, 1878; Lightfoot, *Colossians and Philemon*, pp. 395-417; Ginsburg, *Essenes*; Conybeare, art. 'Essenes' in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible* ; Nesbit, *Christ, Christians, and Christianity*, bk. i. 'Jesus an Essene,' 1895 (2nd ed. 1899); A. Schweitzer, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, 1906.

G. Wauchope Stewart.

Oven

OVEN (κλιβανος).—In the reference to fuel for the village oven (Mat 6:30, Luk 12:28) the term 'grass' is used generally for any wild produce of the fields, including thorns and thistles.

The Bible references to the baking of bread correspond to the three principal methods now employed in Palestine. (1) The simplest is that in use among the Bedouin or migratory Arabs of the desert. It is to make a slight hollow in the ground at the tent door, and burn upon it dry grass or twigs until sufficient hot ash is made for the baking of the bread cakes (Gen 18:6, 1Ki 17:12; 1Ki 19:6). An improvement upon this is seen in the small villages, where the conditions of life are more stationary. The hollow is deepened a little more, and covered with large pebbles in order to retain

the heat, and the bread is either laid upon these after the ashes have been brushed aside, or, without removal of the ashes, the bread is laid upon a convex metal disc or griddle slightly raised above the fire-place. (2) The next stage of advance is seen in the large, pot-like hole dug in the ground, and lined with a smooth coating of plaster. The same kind of fuel is laid as before on the pebbles at the bottom, and the thin cakes are fired by being placed for a minute on the hot concave surface of the oven. The work of baking is done by a woman who sits beside the oven, and from time to time adds a few handfuls of fuel. She has on one side the tray of dough from which she tears out a small piece, and after rolling it out into a thin cake she distends it still further by slapping it over one arm and then over the other. She then lays it upon a circular cushion-like pad kept for the purpose, and thus applies it to the plaster surface of the pot oven. As each loaf, about a foot and a half in diameter and of wafer-like thinness, is rapidly fired, it is placed upon the pile of bread on her other side. This is the ordinary oven for home-made bread in the villages, the *tannûr* of the OT and the simpler form of the *klibānos* of the NT. In the warning of Lev 26:26, the predicted scarcity of fuel and flour would be such that ten women in one cluster or section of the village houses, instead of using in turn the same oven for their separate households, would have to unite their little stock of flour to make a baking to be done by one of them, and then receive by weight the share of bread belonging to each.

(3) The final form is that of the baker's oven. The ordinary village usually has one of these, in which baking is done on three or more days of the week, and the towns are furnished with a larger number in daily use on account of the increased demand. The oven recess, instead of being a hollow in the ground, is now a vault about twelve feet long, four feet high, and eight feet broad, built in the bake-house. The pebbles of the primitive form are represented by a pavement of squared stone along the length and breadth of the semi-cylindrical vault. Upon it is laid fuel of the same kind as before, with an addition of thicker twigs and pieces of cleft wood, and the fire is kept up until sufficient heat has been produced. The hot ashes are then brushed off and banked up on each side, and the bread is laid on this cleared space of the hot stone pavement (Isa 44:19, Jer 37:21). The heat is considerably greater than what is needed for the more gradual firing of our larger European loaf, and the Oriental oven thus became the emblem of vehement desire (Hos 7:6-7) and the indignant anger of God (Psa 21:9).

G. M. Mackie.

OWNER (κύριος).—The word is found only once in the Authorized Version (Luk 19:33 ‘The owners said (to the disciples), Why loose ye the colt?’). Luke alone indicates that there was any question asked when the disciples prepared to take the colt away. Probably the answer which the disciples were instructed to give (‘The Lord hath need of him,’ Luk 19:31; Luk 19:34) was a prearranged sign between the owners and Jesus. Elsewhere in the Gospels the frequency of the occurrence of the word ‘owner’ is concealed from readers of the English versions by its translation as ‘lord’ (see art. Lord). ‘Lord’ (κύριος) has the sense of ‘owner’ in the phrases ‘the lord of the vineyard’ (Mat 20:8; Mat 21:40 || Mar 12:9 || Luk 20:15). In the phrases, ‘the servant is not above his lord’ (Mat 10:24), ‘the servant showed his lord these things’ (Luk 14:21), ‘the lord of that servant’ (Luk 12:46 f.), the relationship is that of master (owner) and slave (δοῦλος). By translating δοῦλος as ‘servant,’ the fact is concealed from English readers that slavery was an institution in the social life of the Jews. It was not so common among them as among the Greeks and Romans, and the condition of the slave in the Jewish social economy was much happier than in the Gentile world. The terrible punishment mentioned in Luk 12:46 (‘the lord of that servant ... will cut him in sunder [διχοτομεῖν], and appoint him his portion with the unbelievers’) is probably taken from the punishments which were practised in the Gentile world. It is, however, mentioned as a punishment in Heb 11:37. On the different interpretations of Luk 12:46 see Godet, *ad loc.*, and Meyer on Mat 24:51. See also art. Service.

John Reid.

☞ Ox

OX.—See Animals, vol. i. p. 63^b.

☞ Palace

PALACE.—In the Gospels the word is used in the text of Mat 27:27 and Joh 18:28; Joh 18:33; Joh 19:9, and in the margin of Mar 15:16. In all cases it is the representative of *πραιτώριον* (see Praetorium), which was a term wide enough to include what would now be called a guard-room or the barrack-square adjoining (Mat 27:27, Mar 15:16), as well as the actual place (referred to in the Johannine passages) in which a case was tried and the sentence pronounced.

☒ Palestine

PALESTINE.—The tendency, represented by historians like Buckle and his school, to write history in terms of environment, is one of those remarkable exaggerations of a valuable truth in which the 19th cent. was prolific. Every age which produces elemental theories and sweeping changes in the most widely accepted and venerable views, is liable to this kind of exaggeration. New ideas first stagger and then captivate men's minds, and the new names which these theories introduce assume magic powers for a time. The next generation smiles at the omnipotence of the catchwords of the first years of evolutionary doctrine, and remembers that other words—'sympathy' and 'perpetual motion' among the rest—had a similar vogue in their day. Most of all has the power of environment received undue emphasis and been credited with an influence far in excess of the facts, in the case of Jesus Christ. There is nothing which has doomed the work of His purely naturalistic biographers to premature obsolescence so much as this. Nowhere was Carlyle's protest in favour of the effect of great personalities so applicable as here. If anything in history is certain, it is that here we have a case in which a unique personality is seen mastering circumstances, rather than one in which circumstances are seen creating a conspicuous personality.

Yet the influence of Palestine on Jesus is equally unquestionable.

'We must not isolate the story,' says Dr. Dale, 'from the preceding history of the Jewish race ... Many people seem to suppose that they may approach the subject as if the Lord Jesus Christ had appeared in Spain or in China, instead of in Judaea and Galilee' (*Living Christ and the Four Gospels*, 89). 'If, negatively,' says Hausrath, 'it be self-evident that Jesus' mission would have assumed another character had He grown up under the oaks of Germany instead of under the palms of Nazareth, that the subject of Arminius or Maroboduus would have been different from that of Antipas, that the opponent of the Druids would have differed from the opponent of the Rabbis, so, positively, it is indisputable that for Jesus Himself the facts of His consciousness were given Him under those forms of viewing things in which Jewish thought in general was cast. Only by a freak of the imagination can it be supposed that an historical personality becomes conscious of the facts of its own inner life by conceptions other than those in which the thought of the age in general finds expression' (*Hist. of NT Times*, ii. 225).

Thus we may take it that there is no sentence in the Gospels which can be fairly understood if it be regarded *merely* as the remark or question of a member of the human race who might have belonged to any nationality. Every word derives something of its significance from the place and time at which it was spoken. Jesus is the Son of Man, but He is also a Syrian teacher. It is Syrian landscape, Syrian history, and Syrian human nature with which the Incarnation works; and we of the West are confronted at every turn by the need to Orientalize our conceptions as we study these records.

In this article we shall consider the influence on Jesus (1) of Syria as a whole; (2) of the Gentile elements in the land; (3) of the open field and of Nature as seen in Syria; (4) of the town and village life with which He was familiar; (5) of the city of Jerusalem.

1. Syria as a whole.—Syria is an *Eastern* land, and the relations and differences between East and West are the first aspects of this subject which demand attention. No phenomenon of the kind is so remarkable as the combination of Eastern and Western characteristics in the thought and work of Jesus. Such books as Townsend's *Asia and Europe* and Fielding Hall's *The Soul of a People* (to mention two out of many popular accounts of East and West), though their generalizations are not always convincing, are full of suggestive illustrations of this. 'Though Asiatic in origin,' says the former writer, 'Christianity is the least Oriental of the creeds.' To find lives most typically Christian, we have to look chiefly to Western nations, France and Germany, Britain and America. Indeed, the astonishing fact is evident that in certain respects we have in Jesus an Oriental too Western for Asiatics, so that to a certain extent they have to Occidentalize their conceptions in order to become Christian. This strange fact has commonly been brought as a charge against the methods of Christian missionaries in the East. But there can be no doubt that in some measure it is due to the mind of Jesus Himself. His doctrine of personal immortality, *e.g.*, and still more the triumphant and glad spirit in which He proclaimed it, have a far more congenial appeal to the West than to the East. 'Eternal consciousness!' exclaims Townsend: 'that to the majority of Asiatics is not a promise but a threat.' Similarly, the prominence given in Christianity to the command to love our neighbour as ourself, in the West will always find at least a theoretical assent, for it will be backed by the sentiment or at least the conscience of sympathy between man and man as such. The East, whose religion is fundamentally a matter of saving one's own soul, or at widest a matter of tribal loyalties, will find that a hard saying, and indeed has always so found it. Again, everyone must have noticed that in the battles of Jesus against the unintelligent and conventional doctrines of the Pharisees, His constant appeal was to commonsense and the facts of the case obvious to every unprejudiced observer. But that in itself was an instance of the Western type of intellect pitted against the Oriental.

Yet, at the depths, Christianity rests upon distinctively Oriental foundations. The very publicity of Eastern life has had its effect upon the Gospels. The whole ministry of Jesus was performed among crowds, in public places of assembly and on thronged highways. His thoughts were flung at once into the arena of public discussion, and even His protests and His disregard of ritual in such matters as hand-washing, fasts, etc., were made under the scrutiny of innumerable eyes. The whole Gospel shows traces of this lack of privacy, and the emphasis of its teachings is often fixed by the angle at which its detail was seen by the onlookers. Again, the great Christian doctrine of renunciation is essentially an Oriental doctrine, typical of Hebraism as contrasted with Hellenism; so much so, that it is to the surprise with which that doctrine broke upon the West that its conquest was in part due. The Oriental has been kept from perceiving how Divine self-sacrifice is, by his familiarity with it as a commonplace of human life. 'The qualities which seemed to the warriors of Clovis so magnificently Divine, the self-sacrifice, the self-denial, the resignation, the sweet humility, are precisely the qualities the germs of which exist in the Hindu' (*Asia and Europe*, 69). Consequently, 'the character of Christ is not ... as acceptable to Indians as to Northern races,' the former seeking in the Divine a contrast rather than a complement to their human thoughts. Again, that free play of imagination touching even the most everyday subjects, that direct statement of truth, unguarded by qualifications and unbuttressed by proofs, are Eastern rather than Western characteristics. These are but random instances, a few out of very many, and varying in importance from the most casual to the most fundamental, yet they are enough to prove that the thought of Jesus was cast in an essentially Oriental mould.

The geographical features of Palestine are strongly marked; and they include, in a very small field, mountains, rivers, plains, lakes and sea-coast. The story of Jesus brings Him in contact with each of these; but the only ones which can be said to have left very distinct traces are the mountains. The Bible is full of mountain scenery, and it owes much to that. The religious thought of the great plains of the world is one thing, that of sea-girt islands is another, and that of mountain-land is a third. The long ranges of Lebanon throw off their southern spurs in Galilee, and the range ends suddenly in the line of steep mountain-side which runs along the northern edge of the Plain of Esdraelon. Not far from this edge, nestling in hollows or crowning heights, lay the towns and villages among which Jesus spent His early years. Hermon is the one great mountain which Anti-Lebanon rises to, standing off to the south, and detached from the continuous range by the deep-cut gorge of the Abana, but sending on the ridge again unbroken, though rugged in outline, past the Sea of Merom on the eastern side, to the shores of the Sea of Galilee. Samaria lies to the south of Esdraelon, a region of finely sweeping valleys and hills of soft and rounded outline. But these hills grow less distinct as the road strikes southward through Judaea. The general level rises to a bare and lofty table-land, from which, near Bethel, rounded heights rise like huge breasts of grey stone from the upheaved bosom of the land. South of that, sheer

gorges (geological faults, or the work of flooded winter-torrents) slash across the land from east to west, and open grim and sombre through precipices upon the sunken valley of the Jordan, where Jericho lies steaming in the heat, 6 miles west of the Jordan's channel-groove, chiselled deep below the level of the valley. Soon Jerusalem is seen, like a round nest among low mountains—a city thrust up from the summit of the land, and moated by deep valleys on two sides. South of that, through the pasture-lands about Bethlehem and the wilderness of Judaea to the east of them, the land slopes down the rolling 'South Country' to the Arabian desert.

The traveller to-day is often disappointed in the emotions he had expected at sacred sites. The belief in miracle is nowhere so difficult as on the spot, where every detail of the scene seems so uncompromisingly earthly. If, however, he will follow the example of the Psalmist, and 'lift up his eyes unto the hills,' he will find the realization of Christ an easier matter. The great sky-lines are for the most part unchanged, and the same edges and vistas are to be seen which filled the eyes of Jesus. This is not merely the result of the fact that local tradition and foolish ways of honouring sacred places have disfigured and stultified so many spots of Palestine. It recalls the fact that Jesus came from the highlands of Galilee, and that He chose to associate many of the most outstanding events of His life with mountains. From the hill above Nazareth He looked abroad on an endless field of mountain tops. Hermon dominated the landscape on the north-east, and Tabor thrust its irrelevant cone, conspicuous and unique, over the undulating sky-line of the mountains between Nazareth and the Lake—a gigantic intruder which had reared its huge head to look down into Nazareth from over the wall of mountains. It was there, with countless mountain summits of familiar name about Him, that the Youth first encountered those tremendous thoughts which finally led Him to the Jordan. Driven thence by the Spirit into the wilderness, He fought His long fight with rival schemes of greatness, in the tract which Judaea thrusts high into the air from the depth of the Jordan Valley, and holds balanced upon the edge of cliffs. Jericho looks up at that mountain of Quarantania, and sees its angular and tilted platform of a summit as a black space cut out of the brilliance of a living, starry sky. From the edge He looked down on Jericho (Mat 4:1 etc.), and knew the power of worldliness as He saw the palacelife of Herod there, and the glimmer of festive lamps among the palm-groves that had been Cleopatra's. Mountains were the congenial places for His great utterances in which the Old Law changed to the New, and the freshness as well as the exaltation of these words remind us from beginning to end of them that they are a Sermon on the Mount (Mat 5:1). Similarly, by a sure instinct, it was to the heights that He went to find by night the fullest sense of converse with His Father (Mat 14:23 etc.). Probably it was on some of the slopes of Hermon that such a season of communion brightened to the wonder of Transfiguration (Mat 17:1 etc.). Hermon's summit is always white, and many a 'bright cloud overshadows' it, until it shines upon the plain for miles around, in a white glory of frosted silver. It is not without significance that Matthew gives as

the trysting-place between Jesus and His disciples 'a mountain of Galilee' (Mat 28:16). There is a perceptible air of relief in the words, as if after all those stifling days in Judaea—days of judgment-halls and shut doors in upper rooms, of clouded cross and sealed sepulchre—an irresistible longing had seized Him for the sunlight and the wind-swept heights of His happier early days. Nothing fostered the patriotism of Israel so much as her mountains. From time immemorial they had been her defences in war, and the platforms of her worship. In the story of Jesus they are seen in both these uses, and the feel of the heights is upon much that He has said.

Palestine is a little and compressed country, where not only geographical features, but the facts and associations of *national history* are gathered, so close as to force themselves upon the attention at every step. While travelling there, it is a constant source of wonder that so much could have happened in so small a place. These continual reminders of the past history of the nation, which thrust themselves upon Israelites everywhere, and kept patriotism vehemently alive, had their effect also upon Jesus. The heroes of the past were much in His thought, and His journeys from place to place reminded Him of them continually, Elijah and Elisha, Solomon, David, and Isaiah, were figures not merely remembered from reading in the sacred books. They were the unseen inhabitants of the places where once they dwelt in the flesh, peopling for Him tracts over which He led His disciples. His patriotism is evident continually (Luk 19:9; Luk 13:16). It was a great thing in His eyes to be a son or a daughter of Abraham. Jerusalem, for Him as for the Psalmist, is the 'city of the great King' (Mat 5:35). The waysides are hallowed by the footsteps of the dead. The tombs of the prophets are conspicuous monuments to His imagination (Mat 23:29). He lived among the dead, and they lived unto God and unto Him in the land where their bones had long crumbled to decay. He receives and is taunted with the title 'King of Israel' (Joh 1:49, Mat 27:42 etc.). The accusation on the Cross is 'Jesus, the King of the Jews' (Mat 27:37 etc.).

Two aspects of the land, taken as a whole, must be remembered, especially if we would understand what it meant to Jesus—*Palestine as an oasis, and Palestine as a focus*.

Palestine as an oasis.—It is shut off from the rest of the world by a complete ring of natural barriers. Mountains on the north; a vast desert on the east, with the deep and long trench of the Jordan Valley set as a second and inner barrier like a moat; desert again on the south; and the west wholly bounded by the alien sea which so few understood—these are the boundaries of Israel. And there was also a double ring of national barricades. At a distance had stood the great empires of the East, the Parthians having taken in His time the place of ancient Nineveh and Babylon. To the south-west lay Egypt. An inner ring of wild Arabian tribes wandered over the eastern desert, and now and then raided the land. Formerly an unbroken belt of neighbouring

heathen enemies encircled Israel, and even cut her off from the sea by the Philistine wedge driven along her western coast, stretching from the Pillar of Egypt to the Phœnician seaports. All this was modified, and much of it broken up, in the time of Jesus; but the religious meaning of it all was thus being only the better understood.

The whole meaning of the land in OT times had been the isolation of Israel for religious ends. For her, 'to act like men' (*i.e.* to imitate the nations round about her) was denounced by her prophets as a betrayal (Hos 6:7). As a matter of fact, every experiment which she made in such imitation of 'men' was a failure. Under Solomon she had adopted the 'Policy of Orientalism' of the great world-empires. Under Jeroboam she had sought to conform to the secular ideas of ritual then fashionable, and had even attempted something in the way of a democratic system of government. Under many kings she had sought greatness in aggressive wars. Under Omri she had, by her alliance with Phœnicia, tried for the position of a great commercial power. In every one of these attempts she had found herself defeated, and driven back on the one thing she could do as no other nation could. That one thing was religion, and the meaning of Israel's isolation was that worship of Jehovah which grew up with her institutions, and of whose revelations she was the destined recipient and repository.

For Jesus also Palestine was an oasis. It is indeed true that the Palestine of His time was no longer the 'garden enclosed' which the prophets had striven to keep it. All its hedges were by this time broken down and driven through by the resistless march of Rome. In the heart of the invaded country Jerusalem remained bitterly exclusive and hostile to all the world, so far as the Pharisees could keep it so. Galilee was much more open to the wider thought of the time than Judæa, and Jesus was in sympathy rather with the Galilaean than with the Judæan spirit. Yet, so far as His own work went, He retained and utilized the oasis view of His land. His three temptations were an epitome of the nation's temptations—'to act like men' for bread, or for fame, or for power. In resisting them He was thrusting from His Kingdom the ideals of commercial prosperity, military conquest, and political empire, just as the prophets of Israel had fought against these as national ideals. He remained, and set His speech and His works, among those relationships where God had placed Him. He confined His own ministry and the earlier ministry of His disciples to the land of Israel (Mat 10:5); and that land was still sufficiently isolated from the thought and life of the world to provide a true cradle and fostering-place for those thoughts which formed the nucleus of the Kingdom of heaven. Thus, in the earliest years, they were sufficiently aloof to gain intensity.

Palestine as a focus.—If Palestine was no longer an oasis in the full sense in which it had been so in OT times, it was more a focus than it had ever been before. In the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, a little hollow place with a flattened ball in it is still exhibited to the incredulous visitor as the centre of the world. The cosmography of

the Middle Ages took this as serious science, Jerusalem being the antipodes of the island of Purgatory at the other pole. No doubt some such conception was in the minds of many who looked in early Christian times for new heaven and a new earth *and a new Jerusalem*. Such thoughts were true in a wider sense than the thinkers knew. At the time of Jesus, Palestine was the meeting-point of East and West.

For many centuries Israel had been a buffer State between the conflicting powers of Egypt and Mesopotamia. Now instead of Egypt there was Rome, at the height of its military power, and armed also with the spiritual weapons of Greece, whose national power it had destroyed and by the deed had set free its spirit. The eastern empires of Nineveh and Babylon were gone, and instead of them were those changing hosts of Persian and Parthian warriors who were soon to dispute the world with Rome. And behind them, more clearly visible since the campaigns of Alexander the Great, though still dim in the mists of vast distances, lay India and the Far East.

The Roman conquest of Syria had brought into immediate and hostile contact two nationalities whose whole history and thought placed them irreconcilably apart. Rome's ideal of secular empire confronted the Jewish hope of the universal reign of Messiah. Down to the minutest detail of life the two ideals were opposed. To Rome tribute was the obvious consequence of conquest; the theatre was at once a politic and a generous enrichment of the life of the conquered State. To Israel tribute was a sacrilege, and the theatre which rose in Jerusalem a blasphemy. So hateful was the Roman to the Jew, that Jews were a worthless commodity in the Roman slave-market. So unintelligible was the Jew to the Roman, that Tacitus speaks of the nation as 'given over to superstition, disinclined to religion' (Hausrath, i. 173-86). These facts are but illustrations of the wider principle, that when a nation with intense national sentiments encounters a nation with strong imperial sentiment, trouble of the most violent kind always ensues. For confirmation of this, one has only to remember the history of Switzerland, of Ireland, or of the Transvaal. In Israel the struggle was only the more acute and inevitable, because the Romanizing policy of the Herods had lent to it the additional aspect of a civil war. Nothing could be imagined more explosive than this state of affairs—a fact which was very clear to the enemies of Jesus (Joh 11:48).

That Jesus also saw this clearly there can be no question; and this, among other things, must have been in His mind when He spoke of Himself as sending a sword (Mat 10:34), and scattering fire on the earth (Luk 12:49). Towards the Roman power He, in contrast with such revolutionaries as Judas of Galilee, maintained a strictly neutral attitude. It is probable that no words ever uttered showed such consummate diplomatic skill as those in which He answered the question about the tribute money (Mat 22:17 etc.). His prophecies (Mat 24:2 etc.) show how patent to Him was the coming explosion of the forces then at play. His policy was to set the word of the

Kingdom so fully at the explosive centre, that when the crash came it would send Christianity across the whole world.

For that diffusion everything was ready. Great roads had long been open by land and sea for trade and commerce. Even then the Romans were laying down those indestructible causeways by which they united land with land. The Sadducees, who in some respects read skilfully the signs of their times, did all they could to encourage trade in Syria, and to break down the Pharisaic restrictions which hampered it; and in this Jesus was their powerful ally. From the heights of Nazareth He had seen the march of the legions on the Roman road across Esdraelon from Acre to the Jordan, and watched the long lines of laden camels moving slowly from the coast to Damascus and back, along the road that lies like a flung ribbon along the hillsides to the north. When in after years St. Paul utilized the Roman roads for the spread of the gospel, he was but carrying out the work which Jesus initiated when He placed that gospel within the charged mine of Palestine.

In the light of one further consideration we see the extraordinary Providence which watched over the situation then. It is a commonplace of history, that civilization and all higher developments of human life spring forward at a bound at the meeting-point of national currents. 'The great civilizations have always arisen in the meeting-places of ideas' (Martin Conway, *The Dawn of Art*, 76). The Norman Conquest offers one of the most conspicuous illustrations, but it is only one of many. The supremely influential meeting of national forces has always been that between the East and the West. 'The contact between East and West has always been the prolific source of the advancement of humanity' (*op. cit.* 59, 60). It was from this contact, induced by the Pilgrimages and the Crusades, that the Renaissance arose. But Christianity itself had arisen at that earlier point of contact, when the Eastern factor was the Hebrew religion, and the Western was Greece and Rome. At the focus of the world Jesus set the light of the world.

2. The relations of Jesus with Gentiles.—Not only was Palestine in close proximity with Gentile neighbours in the time of Jesus; the land itself was overrun with Gentiles, and no account of the meaning of Palestine for Jesus can ignore that fact.

His home in Galilee must have given from the first a very different outlook on the Gentile world from any that would have been possible in Judaea. Far from the centre of Jewish exclusiveness, crossed by great high roads from the sea to the east, and actually inhabited by multitudes of Gentiles from various lands, Galilee was the most open-minded and tolerant part of the land. Commercial and other interests made the Galilaeans acquainted with foreigners, and established much friendly human intercourse. Thus at the outset it must be borne in mind that Jesus was from His childhood accustomed to a more or less cosmopolitan world, and to the ideas current

in such a society. The temptation of 'the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them' (Mat 4:8), indicates no new discovery of worldly grandeur, but a knowledge which had been gathering during the experience of thirty years.

One fact of great significance in the life of Palestine was that it had to be lived in constant view of the desert tribes to the east of it. Kinglake has described the Jordan as the boundary-line between roofs and tents; and besides the tents of nomad tribes there were also those cities of Edom and the Hauran, where, in a rude kind of civilization, Arab kings ruled their kingdoms. The terror of the desert Bedawîn and the barbaric splendours of these kingdoms both contributed a romantic element, which was enforced by the eternal mystery of the desert, in which all things are seen in a strong light which magnifies their significance and fascinates the imagination. Most of Jesus' parables of kings and their wars (Mat 18:23 etc.), and certainly His picture of a strong man armed guarding his house against a stronger (Luk 14:31; Luk 11:21-22 etc.), tell of just such a condition of unsettled government and expectation of surprise as existed on the borderline between Arabian and Israelite territory.

In this border region stood the cities of the Decapolis, in which a wealthy and strongly defended Greek life held its own, by force of Roman garrisons, against the desert and the south. The marvellous ruins of J, the two theatres and ornate tombs of Gadara, and the débris of carved stones above the dam which retained water for the *naumachiai* at Abila, tell an almost incredible tale of luxurious and ostentatious grandeur. The blend of civilization and savagery which such places produce is a phenomenon of the most startling kind. The fact that Jesus visited the Decapolis (Mar 7:31; cf. Mat 4:25 and Mar 5:20), bearing His high and pure spirituality into that region of the Syrian world, suggests some of the strongest and most dramatic situations which it would be possible to conceive. In this light we see the extraordinary realism of the story of the Gadarenes and their swine and their devils (Mat 8:28 etc.). It was inevitable that they should have besought Him to depart out of their coasts. And the reaction on His own thought was equally inevitable. He saw the ideals for which He lived and was to die, not as spiritual visions remote from the actual world, or as an advance on its honest endeavours after holiness, but against the background of a life whose gilded swinishness threw it up in all the high relief of the holiness of heaven against earth at its most sordid. And yet it was to this region that He often retired for refuge from the Galilaeans of the western shore, and through this region that He chose to travel on His last journey to the Cross. The relief He sought in it was not wholly that of solitude. Even these degenerate races called for His sympathy; and being unprejudiced by religion, they at least let Him be alone.

The sea-coast comes little into the story of the Gospels, Afterwards, in the lives of Peter and Paul, Joppa and Caesarea were to assume an important place. But, so far as we know, Jesus visited it only once, when He retreated to the coasts of Tyre and

Sidon from the Pharisees who had followed Him from Jerusalem. The few references which He made to the sea appear to be all subsequent to that visit. They are in every case characteristic of the inland Israelite's thought of the sea as a place of horror rather than of beauty (Mat_18:6; cf. art. Poet below, p. 375^b). It was natural that the part of the sea-coast to which He went for concealment should have been that of Tyre and Sidon. We are not, indeed, told that He visited those towns, and the word 'coasts' may even refer to the landward district near them. Yet, obviously, no place could offer Him better hiding than a manufacturing: seaport town, where He would be easily lost in the crowds of workmen which came and went about the dye-works and the glass-works and the shipbuilding yards, or in the many-coloured throngs of native and foreign sailors on the quays, It is characteristic of Jesus that the record of that visit ignores the whole splendour of the wealthy life of Phœnicia; its temples with their sun-pillars, its markets, and its ships might have been non-existent for all the notice given to them. The one fact that has been found worthy of commemoration is that story where, in inimitable sprightliness and vivacity, we see for a moment the foreign mother, and hear her tale of human sorrow assuaged.

Samaria (wh. see) divided Galilee from Judaea by the alien race that is supposed to have originated in a cross between Mesopotamians and Israelites after the first captivity. During the centuries that had intervened there had been time for this nation to settle into a fixed and distinct type of its own, but the race still bore all the marks of its bastard origin. Luxurious and soft morally, with the fertility of the land encouraging the effeminacy, they seem to have relaxed their standards of purity in all directions, and the life of the woman of Sychar (Joh_4:18) was probably typical of current views of sexual relations. The palace life of Herod at the central city of Samaria, and his intercourse with Rome at Caesarea, upon which he had spent fabulous sums, must have intensified the Bohemian and foreign elements in the national character. The tragedies of the palace, the wild story of the murder of Mariamne and what happened after it, and the subsequent strangling of her two sons in that same palace, were matters within the memory of living men. These, and the whole effect of Herod upon the place, must have been all on the side of those primitive and half-savage elements which entered largely into the Samaritan character. In religion the Samaritans had adopted a kind of blend of heathen and Israelitish worship, in which the centre of enthusiasm was a rival group of holy places set over against those of Jerusalem, and a passion for relic-hunting which, in Christ's time, took the form of a search for hidden treasure in Gerizim. This, too, reveals the primitive, in its frank blending of the greed of gold with worship, and it took so deep a hold as to draw the vengeance of Pilate upon a Samaritan religious assembly (Keim, ii. 334). The claims of Samaritan religion, and its compromise with relaxed morality, are reflected in the conversation of the woman at the well (Joh_4:16 ff.).

The Jews of the time were always ready for vigorous hatreds, and in their relations with the Samaritans they showed that extreme rancour which religious bigots keep, not for opposition, but for compromise. The attitude of Jesus to Samaritans is one of the most illuminative of all the sidelights thrown upon His mind and character by the Gospels. On more than one occasion He took the unpopular direct route through Samaria while journeying between Jerusalem and Galilee (Joh 4:4). In religion, when it comes to be a question of localities, He holds by Jerusalem, and refuses to admit that any other shrine can rival its claims (Joh 4:22). Yet the error calls for no anger in Him, inasmuch as His thought of worship transcends all place-limitations, and is as wide as the human spirit and truth (Joh 4:23). He allows for the unthinking brutality of inhospitable villages, and sharply rebukes disciples who would meet it in a like spirit (Luk 9:54). There is a most pleasant sense of tolerant and kindly interest in the alien Samaritans and their ways of thinking, which, while it asserts the higher morality (Joh 4:17) and the higher worship, is yet ever friendly and gentle. He even goes out of His way to show how much nobler as a man a Samaritan may be than those Jews who professed superior nobility of faith. The parable of the Good Samaritan (Luk 10:33), and Jesus words about the grateful leper (Luk 17:17 f.), are direct protests in the name of fairness against the common judgment and attitude of His countrymen.

A few words on the attitude which Jesus assumed to Rome and the Romans are necessary to complete the view of Palestine as He knew it. Rome thrust itself then upon the inhabitants of Palestine in two forms. In such governors as Pilate it was seen directly, as the hostile imperial power governing the province of Syria. From Antioch its roads and armies had subdued the land, yet had never broken the spirit of its people, or quenched their fierce hopes of reprisals and of deliverance. At every centre its tax-gatherers had their stations. Its Praetorium in Jerusalem was occupied by the palace of the hated Pilate, whose cruelties were held in check only by his fear of the still more cruel emperor, and whose desire to quell revolutions was hindered by the fear of complaints on the score of his financial crimes. On the other hand, there were the Herods, Idumaeen princes whose policy was that of Romanizing. With them, to a great extent, were the Sadducees, and under them the outward face of the country had rapidly assumed the appearance of a Western land. Architecture, commerce, amusements, and worship all showed the work of Rome through the Herodian house. There was a Roman theatre in Jerusalem, with lavishly appointed games; and a Roman eagle was set up on the Temple gates. Fortresses had risen along all the frontiers and in every part of the land, and it was Herod the Great who had cleared out the robbers from the Valley of Doves in Galilee, and so had opened Gennesaret and created Capernaum, thus unconsciously building the platform for a great part of the ministry of Jesus. At Jericho the palace-life was unrestrained in its luxury and licentiousness; in Jerusalem, Herod's palace overlooked the city from the Jaffa gate. Tiberias rose by the shore of the Galilaeen sea; but as it was built on an

old graveyard it was avoided by religious Israelites, and Jesus never visited it, so far as our records tell. But all round the lake, villas had been built, and the shores of Galilee seem to have been a fashionable watering-place for Romans, a development which every Herod must have found to his own heart. The disciples, who were Galilaean fishermen, must have found a market for their fish in many a Roman household.

The attitude of Jesus towards Rome is very clearly depicted in the Gospels. From first to last every point at which His life touches any of the Herods shows hostility of relations (Mar 8:15, Luk 13:31-32; Luk 23:9, etc.). He appears studiously to have avoided Tiberias, Caesarea, and the city of Samaria. Herodism and its effects He accepted without further protest as the actual state of the world in which He had to live; but for that Herod with whom He had most to do He showed open contempt. To the popular mind, Herod was the murderer of John, who would also kill Jesus unless He sought escape (Luk 13:31). To Jesus he was but 'that fox,' by no means of sufficient importance to make Him change His plans (Luk 13:32). He manifested no admiration for the great stones and buildings of Herod the Great in the Temple which he had erected (Mar 13:1-2). This scorn of Jesus reached its climax in His silence under Herod's examination at Jerusalem, and the contemptible revenge of the purple robe and crown of thorns (Luk 23:9).

Towards the actual Roman Empire Jesus assumed another attitude. Galilee in Jesus' time was full of revolution. Along with its tolerant cosmopolitanism there always were elements of the most violent fanaticism there,—a combination by no means unusual in the history of nations. Judas of Galilee was the popular patriot and hero, and the sons of Judas, who grew up as boys near Jesus, were to perish on crosses after Him, for vain attempts against the Roman sway. Thoughts of such revolution may have been involved in the third temptation; but if so, they were immediately rejected. Pilate's eager question, 'Art thou a king?' (Joh 18:37), met with no response which could be used against Jesus as a serious charge. His payment of tribute, and the words He spoke about it on various occasions, show no sense of resented injury (Mat 22:21). His absence of bitterness towards the tax-gatherers, and His calling of one of them to be a disciple, were among the bitterest sources of the hatred borne to Him by the Pharisees (Mat 9:9-11). He saw the publicans as human beings, and not as renegades and traitors. The absence of prejudice which enabled Him to adopt this attitude has been explained on the ground that He took 'no interest whatever in the burning questions of the times' (Hausrath, ii. 210). It would be more accurate to say that, so far as the political conditions were concerned, He accepted the facts and their inevitable consequences. He saw the coming destruction of Jerusalem with deep emotion (Mat 23:37), and He spoke of it as about to be trodden down by the Gentiles (Luk 21:24), but He put forth no effort politically to change the course of events. The words in which He spoke of Pilate's slaughter of the Galilaeans, who were no doubt a

band of revolutionary patriots, are certainly very remarkable. Not only did He refrain from any comment on the tragedy, or any tribute to their daring or their sacrifice; all He had to say of them was that they were not sinners above other Galilaeans (Luk 13:4).

By gathering these and other considerations together, we may gain a fairly accurate idea of the feeling of Jesus towards the Gentiles, who played so important a part in the Syrian world of His time. Around Him there was the Herodian attitude of Romanizing, and the Pharisaic and patriotic attitude which delighted in branding Gentiles with such names as 'dogs' and 'swine'; while between these two a considerable mass of the general opinion of the time regarded them neither with emulation nor with hatred, but simply accepted them as facts—'uncomfortable, unaccountable works of God,' as the Hindus are said to regard the English (*Asia and Europe*). To none of them all had it ever occurred to say, 'Suppose I were a Gentile?' and to try to look upon the world earnestly from the Gentile point of view—a quite different matter from imitating Gentile ways in the Herodian manner.

Was this the attitude adopted by Jesus? Whatever answer we give to that question, it is quite clear that His attitude was a different one from any of the three above indicated. Unlike the Herodians, He showed no interest in Gentile architecture or commerce, literature or art. He accepted their institutions in so far as these formed part of the ordinary life of the land, but He passed no judgment either of approval or of disapproval on them. He almost exclusively, and evidently with deliberation, confined His ministry, and that of His disciples during His lifetime, to Israel. While not going out of His way to avoid Gentiles, He did not cultivate them. On almost every occasion they came to Him, not He to them. On the other hand, He expressly forbade His disciples to go into 'the way of the Gentiles,' *i.e.* to utilize for the spread of the gospel, as St. Paul afterwards did, those great roads in which the ends of the earth met. He even forbade them to enter any village of the Samaritans (Mat 10:5). In His initial words to the Syrophœnician woman He contrasts the children of the Promise with the Gentile dogs (Mat 15:26), though probably there was that in His manner which encouraged her to her clever repartee. To the woman of Samaria He pointedly asserted that 'salvation is of the Jews' (Joh 4:22). He saw the failings of the Gentiles, and spoke of them as a warning to Christians. His disciples were to avoid their vain repetitions in prayer (Mat 6:7), their greedy search and labour for food and clothes (Mat 6:32), their servility with princes, and their desire of honour (Mat 20:25). There is little doubt that His words (regarding John) about those who are clothed in soft raiment and who live in kings' houses, were meant to be understood in scorn of Herod (Mat 11:8).

On the other hand, it is equally clear that He refused to countenance the virulent spirit of antagonism, either religious or patriotic. Nothing met with more frequent or

more unsparing condemnation than the sanctimonious exclusiveness of the Pharisees, who made a religion of avoiding their fellow-men. Nor did He intermeddle with the revolutionary politics or methods of His day. On the contrary, He paid tribute; and when the servants of the high priest came to seize Him, He strongly condemned the use of weapons even in defence, and with a quiet request permitted Himself to be bound. The general impression which the narratives give is certainly one of kindly feeling for Gentiles. His interest and appreciation were always frank and open. He shielded His Roman judge from 'the greater sin' in His condemnation (Joh 19:11), and pleaded the ignorance of His actual murderers in His dying prayer (Luk 23:34). He evidently liked to point out cases of Gentile superiority to Jews. At the outset of His ministry He offended the Nazarenes by His words about Naaman and the widow of Sarepta (Luk 4:26-27); and on a later occasion He made the men of Nineveh and the queen of Sheba a foil to the unbelief of His generation (Mat 12:41-42). The phrase which He used on several occasions of Gentile believers has become proverbial, 'I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel' (Mat 8:10 etc.). The impression which such conduct must have produced was certainly one of strong Gentile sympathies, and Matthew aptly quotes regarding Him the words of Isaiah, 'in his name shall the Gentiles trust' (Mat 12:21).

From this it is already evident that Jesus cannot be placed in the third class, with those who merely accepted the Gentiles as facts in the situation. Politically, that was His attitude towards them, but as individuals He often delighted in them. He appreciated their broader outlook and want of Pharisaic narrowness. He was frankly relieved by their unconventionality and naturalness, which gave Him air to breathe after the stifling atmosphere of Rabbinism. To Him, in general, they stood for human nature, plain and unsophisticated.

When we inquire into the reasons for that Jewish exclusiveness against which Jesus thus protested, we come upon a fact of far-reaching significance. The Pharisees had much to justify their narrow views and practices in the fear of heathenism. The dearly won victory of the prophets over idolatry seemed to be in danger of being undone by the Graeco-Roman invasion of a new heathenism. The old struggle renewed itself, and in Jesus' time the religious men of Israel were keeping back the encroaching worship of idols with both hands. In Samson's country the new Philistines (for so the followers of Epiphanes seemed to the faithful) had built an altar to Zeus (Hausrath, i. 29). Herod was known to have taken part in the completion of Jupiter's temple at Athens (*ib.* ii. 4). Much of the modern style, with its pictured art, must have savoured of idolatry to men who still took the Second Commandment literally, and the religious men of Israel were filled with the gravest apprehensions as they watched the advancing tide. In the whole speech of Jesus there is no attack upon heathenism to be found, nor any sense of serious danger from it. At Caesarea Philippi He had seen the temple raised by Herod to Augustus, and the rock-cut niches dedicated to Pan and the

nymphs where Jordan issued from its cave, yet no word of His is recorded in protest. True, He might upon occasion use such a current expression as 'Let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican' (Mat 18:17), but His own attitude to publicans would be sufficient commentary upon that for His enemies. Evidently He was not in the slightest degree afraid of heathenism as a real danger, and He set Himself systematically against those maxims and practices as to clean and unclean things in which the Pharisaic spirit saw one of its best safeguards.

The explanation must be found in His further doctrine of the Kingdom of God, and the methods of its coming. There are two ways of opposing heathenism. The Pharisaic way was the negative one of denouncing it and withstanding its encroachment. Jesus chose the positive method of supplanting it by the Kingdom of heaven. That strong leaven He cast into the lump of humanity, well knowing that it must work eventually far beyond the Jewish regions. This is the ultimate point in His relations with the Gentile world. When He spoke to Pilate of His Kingdom, the Roman was relieved to hear that it was 'not of this world,' and at once set Him down as a dreamer. But Jesus was no dreamer. He was deliberately setting an actual Kingdom over against the existing empire, and history was soon to show that this was in the region of the practical and effective forces of the world. The consequences of this Leaven of the Kingdom could not possibly be confined to the sphere of religion. They must eventually take political shape, and indeed affect every department of human life and interest, and spread throughout every nation of the world.

All this was in the mind of Jesus. The Book of Jonah was a favourite with Him, and it is the OT manifesto of the imperial and world-wide power of faith. His parable of the judgment of the nations (Mat 25:32), and His prophecies of the coming of the East and West and North and South to the Kingdom of God (Mat 8:11), showed plainly His ultimate designs upon the Gentile world. He spoke of other sheep beyond those of the Israelite fold (Joh 10:16), and finally commanded His messengers to go out into all the world and teach all nations (Mat 28:19). When He spoke of Himself as the Light of the world (Joh 8:12), and of His life as given for the world (Joh 6:51), it was the world that He was speaking of, and His hearers understood that it was so (cf. also Mat 16:21; Mat 13:38; Mat 5:5; Mat 5:13-14).

At times there may have crossed His mind a thought of making the wider appeal in person before His death. The most striking instance is that of the coming of the Greeks shortly before the end (Joh 12:20). It may be, as has been held by high authorities, that He saw in that event the invitation to address to the Greek world the message which the Hebrew world was rejecting. He refused it, proclaiming, in the wonderful saying about the corn of wheat (Joh 12:24), His knowledge that it was through death that life must come. Yet He rejoiced in it with a sudden glory (Joh 12:23), and recognized in it the fulfilment of His life's far-reaching purpose. He

rejected it only that He might attain it. His own light, like that of His disciples, must be set upon a candlestick if it was to give light to all that were in the house; and He reached the Gentiles most effectually by concentrating His ministry upon Israel.

3. The open field.—In order to estimate the influence of Nature upon the mind of Jesus, it is necessary, first, to distinguish between the various ways in which Nature has been conceived in relation to humanity. At the two extremes stand materialistic realism and the purely spiritual and idealistic views. The former sees in nature mere masses of living or dead matter, arranged in various shapes, quantities, and combinations, and moved by forces variously conceived. The latter sees in it the visual and sensuous revelation of the Divine life. It is ‘the garment of God,’ whose line drapery at once hides and reveals the Spirit of the universe.

Between these extremes there are three main points of view. Art, searching for beauty, has discovered landscape, in which the detailed objects are grouped into larger unities invested with a larger and more composite character of their own. The experience of individuals and the history of nations have added to the facts of landscape or of single objects certain associations which give them their human interest. Thought, emotion, and imagination have discovered (some would say invented) a mysterious spirituality in Nature, variously described or confessed to be indescribable, but perceived or felt as in some way a haunting presence, a ‘something more’ than meets the eye or ear.

Often we find more than one of these ways of regarding Nature combined in the mind of a single thinker. St. Paul, *e.g.*, seems to have had singularly little feeling for Nature in the modern sense. There is no landscape and hardly any reference to detail in his writings, though his travels had showed him much of the finest scenery of the Mediterranean and of Asia Minor. For him the open field apparently represented nothing but a set of distances to be traversed before reaching cities. Yet at times the mystery comes upon him, and he invests Nature with a dim life of her own, groaning and travailing in pain towards some grand event ([Rom 8:22](#)). Dante, amid much of the grandest scenery of Europe, sees only obstacles to the foot of the traveller. But for him every place has historical associations, in whose light it lives in his mind. Gray is the poet who discovered English landscape. Wordsworth reaches the highest point in spiritualizing nature:

‘Great God! I’d rather be

A Pagan, suckled in a creed outworn,

So might I, standing on this pleasant lea,

Have glimpses that would make me less forlorn;

Have sight of Proteus rising from the sea;

Or hear old Triton blow his wreathéd horn.'

Wordsworth, *Miscellaneous Sonnets*.

The age of Jesus was divided between the Greek and the Hebrew view of Nature, and both of these must have been familiar in Syria. The Greek view was devoid of landscape properly so called. It saw brilliant and well-defined masses of detail—the temple white on its hill, reeds in the river-bed, the numberless laughter of waves. Greece not only saw but felt these, as charged with a spiritual significance which could be apprehended only in fragmentary hints and glimpses, with more wistfulness than understanding. She sought to capture and retain that spiritual significance in the exquisite imagery of her mythological creations of nymph and faun, the dryad of the forest and the goddess of the fountain. Yet these delicate incarnations did not suffice for her expression of Nature. Behind them lay those unaccountable moods of delight and misgiving which Nature awoke in her soul. The unsolved mystery of 'the beauty and the terror of the world' emphasized in the main the misgiving, and produced 'the melancholy of the Greeks.' Death and change oppressed her spirit, and seemed to be ever the last word that Nature strove to say. The voice heard by the steersman had been heard by Greece before—'Great Pan is dead.'

How much of this may have directly presented itself to Jesus, we cannot tell. His answer, however, to the Greeks who came to Him in Passion Week, seems to be an answer to the spirit of their nation ([Joh_12:4](#)). It is to Nature that He leads them in His reference to the corn of wheat, and to the element of death in Nature. But He reveals in Nature what they had not strength to find, the promise of resurrection, and the assurance of life enriched and fructified by death.

The Hebrew view of Nature differs from the Greek somewhat as Browning's differs from Wordsworth's. To the Greek, Nature has a spirituality which is no doubt reflected, in part, from the soul of her observer, yet is conceived as residing in herself in one or other of many fashions of personification. To the Hebrew, Nature in herself is dead, and has no soul of her own. She is the tool of Jehovah or His weapon, according as He is working or warring against His enemies; or she is visible as a background over against human life, or at least as accessory to man and his needs or works in some way. In either case the point is that Nature for the Hebrew has no independent life or spirituality of her own. She shines ever in the borrowed light of human or Divine interest.

The Hebrew view of Nature, in its three main aspects, has been admirably described in the three expressions—(1) A stage for God, the ‘place of His feet’; (2) a home for man; (3) the assessor at the controversy between God and man (Isa_1:2, Mic_6:2), a view in which the solemnity and austerity of Nature found a fitting metaphor to express them. Of each of these three aspects many instances might be quoted; but at present it concerns us only to remark that in none of them is Nature seen in herself, but always dependent on an inhabitant, Divine or human, who gives her soul. The third view, indeed, seems to conceive of Nature as independent, her mountains judging between God and man. But the personification does not go deep, nor is the consciousness of its figurativeness lost. The mountains, the heavens and the earth, are witnesses in much the same sense as a pillar set up by one who has made a vow. They are called upon to listen, to rejoice, to break forth into singing, not because they are conceived as living an independent life, but because the human or Divine event is conceived as of such vast import that even dumb Nature must feel its thrill, and for once awake from her inertness to do homage to the higher forms of being.

There is, properly speaking, no landscape in the Bible. Objects are seen in detail, or groups of objects, in connexion with the events or circumstances narrated. Through a cleft fissure in a mountain range a glimpse is caught of a ‘land that is very far off’; but it is as a destination rather than as a picture that it is seen. The language spends its strength on those sharp and clear-cut names for natural phenomena which express so much—*Jordan*, the down-rusher; *Ghór*, the scooped-out; *Gilgal*, the circular, and so on. The Song of Solomon is full of exquisite detail, with the aromatic scents of the East lingering about its voluptuous gardens and glades. But that is pre-Raphaelite art, of the same sort as those descriptions which are so common in the OT of a single tree or plant, a vine, an olive, or a gourd. It is characteristic of the Hebrew view of Nature that the Feast of Tabernacles, with its booths and illuminations, seemed to the Hebrew mind satisfactory as a piece of genuine rural life.

The life of Jesus was much spent in the open air, and His thought was full of the breezy freshness of the hills and fields; but they were Syrian and not European hills and fields, and their effect is that of Eastern nature, not Western. Samaria and Lebanon strike the traveller from England as most familiar. But there is no word of Lebanon in the Gospels, and Samaria was seen but casually in passing through. It was in one of Samaria’s richest and broadest valleys that He told His disciples to lift up their eyes and look upon the fields white already to the harvest (Joh_4:35). The regions with which He was most familiar were the hills and Sea of Galilee, and the rocky heights of Judaea. These are the very regions where the scenery is most typically Oriental. The main difference between a Syrian and an English landscape is that in Syria there is none of that ‘atmosphere’ which softens outlines and tones down a wide stretch of country into a unity of vision. The colouring is faint, in delicate shades of grey and brown and lilac, broken by the most violently brilliant splashes of

high colour, where a water-spring flings a patch of lush green vegetation upon the pale mountain side, or where in springtime a long thin flame of oleander blazes along the winding depth of a washed-out river-bed. The general impression of wide views either in Judaea or Galilee is that of a land sculptured out of tinted stones. In Judaea the hills are bare grey limestone, whose stoniness is intensified rather than softened by sparse and dingy olives. Along the sides of many valleys the strata run in many-coloured parallel bands, giving the effect of a gigantic but faded mural decoration; while the plateau on the heights round Jerusalem and on to the north lies bare in whitish grey. Galilee has more woodland, and some thin remains of what may once have been forests, but it also owes its general effect to rock rather than to vegetation. Allowing for the denudation caused by so many centuries of war and neglect, it is likely that even at its best the prevalent note of the land was that of sharp outline in faint colour, and its general impression that of huge-scale sculpture-work. Arriving from the West upon the edge of the hillside above Tiberias, the traveller catches his first sight of the Sea of Galilee. The writer may be permitted to quote a former description of his impression:

‘This is not scenery; it is tinted sculpture, it is jewel-work on a gigantic scale. The rosy flush of sunset was on it when we caught the first glimpse. At our feet lay a great flesh-coloured cup full of blue liquor; or rather the whole seemed some lapidary’s quaint fancy in pink marble and blue-stone. There was no translucency, but an aggressive opaqueness, in sea and shore alike. The dry atmosphere showed everything in sharpest outline, clear-cut and broken-edged. There was no shading or variety of colour, but a strong and unsoftened contrast. To be quite accurate, there was one break—a splash of white, with the green suggestion of trees and grass, lying on the water’s edge directly beneath us—Tiberias.’

Of course, the colour changes with the seasons, and we know that Jesus sat upon green grass upon the slopes at the north end of the Lake. Wild flowers of all shades cover the land with richest colours in their season. By the shore, close to Capernaum, lies the wonderful garden of Gennesaret, a reserve of shelter and of fountains filling a level fold of the hills, some three miles by one and a half in area, with exuberant fertility.

Such were the fields where the feet of Jesus trod. His speech of Nature has no landscape in it, but much clear vision of detail. There is singularly little mention of colour. He speaks of white sepulchres and a red sky (Mat 16:2). He refers to the purple in which the rich man is clad (Luk 16:19); and those lilies of the field of which He said that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of them (Mat 6:28 etc.), were purple irises. In the East every shadow turns to this colour, and it may perhaps have been a favourite of His. If so, the robe with which Herod’s soldiers mocked Him gains a new and pathetic irony. His references to flowers (cf. art. Poet) are

pre-Raphaelite in their detail and delicacy. No Greek nymph was ever conceived more daintily than Christ's lily. He often refers to single trees, such as the fig-tree, but especially to the vine, from which He draws symbolic lessons in great detail (Joh 15:1). Thus He is true to that characteristic of Palestine which has given to it the true and happy epithet of 'the land of the single tree.'

But it was as a stage for human activities that Jesus chiefly viewed the earth. His delights and His interests were with the sons of men. Sometimes the exigencies of His own life force thoughts of Nature upon Him, as when the stones of the wilderness suggest loaves of bread (Mat 4:3), or the holes of foxes and the nests of birds are contrasted with His own homelessness (Mat 8:20). He speaks much of those trees which grow fruit for the use of man, and acquiesces in their doom when they are barren. Yet there is a note of compassion in the parable of the Barren Fig-tree (Luk 13:8) which reminds us of Jonah's 'pity' for his withered gourd (Jon 4:10), and there is a sudden and striking description of a tree bursting into the full glory of its leafage. These, however, are exceptions. Man is almost always doing something to Nature as Jesus sees it,—ploughing, sowing, reaping; fishing, tending sheep, protecting them against wolves. Hot journeying and refreshing cups of cold water, wayside incidents of all kinds, abound in His parables. He sees the operations of the husbandman and fisher in minute detail, touches of nature everywhere telling of the keen eyes that let nothing escape their observation. Gennesaret (Mar 6:53, Mat 14:34) itself may have furnished Him with many of those vivid pictures of agricultural life and its occupations in which His parables abound.* [Note: For a very full set of examples of this, see Hausrath, i. 9, 10; ii. 134, 135, 136, 138, 139, 140, 191, 223, etc.] He notes the robbers lurking by the highways (Luk 10:30), and the places where He stands are sometimes crowded with sick folk laid there of an evening for His healing (Mar 1:32). His world is always 'a field full of folk.'

The open-air character of His ministry lends a sense of freedom and of roominess to much of His thought. There is a feel of wandering in it, and a clean scent of cornfields and flowery meadows. There are references to the weather (Mat 16:2), and He overhears His disciples remarking that in four months it will be harvest time (Joh 4:35). In such phrases as 'the birds of the air' (Mat 8:20) and 'the lilies of the field' (Mat 6:28), there is the delight in sky-space and field-breadth. Nothing could better express the leisurely and detached mood of the wanderer, in sympathy with wide open spaces, than such words as 'sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof' (Mat 6:34). While His days were spent in crowded thoroughfares of men, He felt the need of retreat and the refreshment of solitary places (Mat 14:13). When no wider space was available, He frequented the Garden of Gethsemane. But that was at a time when the world had closed in upon His life, shutting Him in with men and human tragedy. There, in full view of the lights of Jerusalem, and with its murmur in His ear, He still found among olive trees a certain solitude. Earlier, there must have been

many quiet days of retreat among the mountains or across the lake, when He felt the soothing and healing effect of Nature in all its power.

Yet the message of the open field was not for Himself alone. In contrast with modern views of Nature, the freedom and the beauty of the world filled Him with the most childlike and delightful thoughts. There was no shadow of separation between the Creator and His works, no sense of cruelty or savagery, no philosophizing consciousness of the tormenting questions of scientific doubt. In all simplicity, with the eyes of a child, He saw in Nature the handiwork of the Father. The heaven is God's throne, and the earth His footstool (Mat 5:34 etc.). Across the whole field of the world the Father's care is lavished, on birds (Mat 10:29) and beasts and the children of men. As to the mysteries of Providence, Jesus refused to admit the popular view of God's interference in such accidents as the fall of a tower in Siloam (Luk 13:4). On the contrary, though without pursuing the subject to further consequences, He reminds us that the Father makes His sun to rise upon the evil and the good, and sends rain upon the just and the unjust (Mat 5:45).

There is a mysterious fact of sympathetic response between Nature and Humanity which has been variously explained, and yet never satisfactorily understood. It would seem as if Nature and Humanity had some mysterious understanding with one another, some subtle and occult system of signalling to one another across the gulf which separates the living world from the dead. In all the ancient religions of Asia this was a familiar idea. Baal-worship, in all its varieties, spread it across the Semitic world. The OT is full of references to spiritual presence associated especially with certain places or natural objects, or spiritual agency passing over from the deeds of man to the locality associated with them. The ground is cursed for man's sake in the story of Eden (Gen 3:17); the place on which Moses stands is holy ground (Exo 3:5). A 'hill of Jehovah' may often have been so called in rhetorical religious speech when all that was intended was emphasis on height or greatness; yet there can be no doubt that the words originally were meant of literal and peculiar possession. The whole ritual concerning clean and unclean animals is an instance of the same habit.

It would be enough, to prove that Jesus felt and utilized this strange and intimate connexion between Nature and the supernatural, to point to the miracles which He openly performed and professed. The Jews have a name for Him which is very significant in this connexion. By many of them He has been called 'The Good Magician.' This interesting fact throws light on the taunt of His enemies that He was a Samaritan, and had a devil (Joh 8:48). Samaria was famous for its magicians, who were for the most part addicted to sorcery and necromancy. Such mistaken interfusion of the material and spiritual world was regarded by His enemies as of the same kind as that which they saw and heard in Him. His prophecies of future judgment (Mat 25:31 etc.) mingle the material facts of the world with spiritual forces

and thoughts in very much the same fashion as they are blended in those flame-pictures which so interested Him in the Book of Daniel. His miracles involved the blending of the two spheres in every instance. On the other hand, He cut through the doctrines of 'clean and unclean' with a ruthlessness which stirred up the animosity of His enemies (Mat_15:11 etc.). Regarding the food provisions of the Jewish law, He said nothing, though it is unmistakably His spirit that we recognize in the vision of Peter a few years after His death (Act_10:9-16). But as for the curse of uncleanness which the Pharisees saw everywhere falling like a shadow over the whole life of man, He would have none of it, and (proclaiming eloquently His belief in the fresh wholesomeness of Nature) declared all things clean (Luk_11:41).

Galilee was very superstitious, though in a more naïve and less repulsive form than the necromancy of Samaria. On two occasions we hear of the disciples mistaking Jesus for a spirit (Mat_14:26, Luk_24:37),—in the former, apparently for the angry spirit of the Lake. On both these occasions Jesus reassures them, but says nothing to dispel or ridicule their views. On the other hand, there can be no doubt that He accepted the universal belief in demons, who haunted not men only, but places as well (Mat_12:43 ['dry places'], cf. Mat_8:28, Mar_5:5).

Thus for Jesus Nature was indeed 'haunted.' The worlds of spirit and matter were, in His thought, full of interchange. Yet it is very remarkable how entirely He differs from the spirit of contemporary magic, as we know its development in the Rabbinical doctrines of the time, and in the later Asiatic and Egyptian schools. There is at once a reserve and a freshness about the narratives of the miracles of Jesus. They are not the dark ultimate result of fearsome dealing with the occult. They are the inevitable effect of the Divine love set free on the earth and in full play upon the facts of Nature—that same love which in less startling fashion He has already recognized in sunrise and rainfall (Mat_5:45). Consequently in Him the unwholesomeness of magic and spiritualism is entirely absent. He calls the dead as simply, and they obey as naturally, as we call the living and they come. He heals the sick just as a mother might caress her child.

One more note must suffice for this brief account of His connexion with Nature as Palestine showed it to Him. We have already referred in passing to some of His parables. It is very noteworthy that in so many of them He saw and used the symbolism of Nature. It would seem as if for Him every process of the field, the life of trees, the springs of 'living water,' the softness of sand and the stability of rocks, the saltiness of salt, the shining and the quenching of lights, were constantly suggesting symbols of that spiritual life of which He was at once the creator and the exponent. The earth was interesting to Him in its own right, but it was doubly interesting on account of its analogy with the Kingdom of heaven. Seeds of the earth, birds of the

air, wind and flowing water and burning fire, were all unceasingly rehearsing under His eyes the operations of the Kingdom.

Nor did the analysis stop there. When the busy and thoughtful work of man had touched the natural world, new symbols sprang forth for His use on every hand. We shall understand better such a saying as 'I am the way,' when we remember how through His childhood He had watched the life of the great world passing along a Roman road and a caravan route in the north. We are reminded of more than one of His sayings (Joh 15:1 etc.) when we find that in vine-growing parts of Syria to-day the vine-plants are dug round and exposed to the depth of more than a foot, and all rootlets are cut off from the main root to that depth. If this were not done, the sun would scorch the roots near the surface, or the passing plough would bleed them. It is the deep roots only that are safe. At Hebron, a few years ago, a traveller noticing the fact that the sheepfolds were circles of stone wall broken by a gap in which there was never any door, asked a shepherd for the reason, and was answered, 'I am the door.' The shepherd lies down in the open space, and no wolf can enter nor can any sheep stray except across his body. That was a symbol worthy of the use of Jesus!

4. Towns and Villages.—For the understanding of anything connected with the life and history of a Semitic nation, nothing is of such importance as to study the growth and character of towns, and the changes which they produce upon those who exchange a nomad for a settled existence. To realize the times of Jesus, and still more those of the OT, we have to disabuse our minds of all that the modern world means by a *city* when we meet the word in the ancient writings. It is not without a feeling of amused surprise that one comes to identify those grotesque hamlets with the 'cities' of the Bible, and to recall the fact that their 'kings' must have often occupied a humbler station in the body politic of their times than the chairman of a parish council may occupy in ours. Of course, there have been incalculably great changes in a land which has been under the ploughshares of war for so many centuries, yet the sites remain, and it is often possible to rebuild the past. The very forces that have consigned so many of them to ruins have kept the rest alive through everything. The want of good roads, the uncertainties of government, the ancient feuds and avoidances, have preserved village communities apart and with little alteration.

Of cities in the Western sense, there were none in Syria. Yet Damascus, Beyrout, and Jerusalem stand out from the towns of Syria as places worthy of the name. Jerusalem we shall consider at a later stage. There is no record of any visit of Jesus to Berytus or Damascus, but Tyre and Sidon must have rivalled if not surpassed them in His time. G. A. Smith has suggested that in the story of the Prodigal Son we may have a reference to the fast city life where boys from country homes might be seen then, as in Beyrout they may be seen now, 'wasting their substance with riotous living' (Luk 15:13). It

was in Beyrout, only a year or two ago, that an American, trying to persuade a lad to come to America, received the answer, 'Suffer me first to bury my father'—the father standing by and acquiescing in the filial sentiment.

With several of the towns Jesus was familiar. They have changed more than the villages, and yet there is much in them still which enables us to reconstruct the life He saw. There are about a dozen of them, and they shine from far, white splashes on the hill-tops, like Jaffa, perched with a conscious pose above the rocks of its seashore; or Jenin, gleaming like a white bird from its nest of palm-trees. The streets are usually aggressively irregular, at once ancient and unfinished in their appearance. The wider spaces, where tents are pitched and camels and horses tethered, are full of noise and colour, a patchwork of brilliant and crowded human life. There are narrower streets, which often become tunnels, in which laden asses brush the wares of shopkeepers with their burdens, and the shrill talk of men and women intensifies the disagreeableness of the smells. Closely huddled together from the first, and kept from lateral expansion by their walls and gates, and the dangers of the open country outside, the houses are forced upwards for expansion, and the sky of townsfolk is a narrow strip seen between lofty precipices of stone.

The villages are charming at a distance, but full of disillusion as one approaches. The difference between the distant view and the interior reminds one of the words of Jesus about the outward and inward appearances of whited sepulchres (Mat 23:27). They are usually well set, on picturesque heights or hillsides, and the angular outline of flat roofs and walls lends them a suggestion of military fortification. Cultivated oliveyards or gardens give the promise of quiet prosperity, and groups of trees seem to have arranged themselves for a picture. But, on nearer approach, the trees appear to detach themselves and stand apart, and the houses to decay before the eyes of the spectator into ruinous heaps of débris. This is due partly to poverty, and partly to the pretence of poverty as a device for avoiding the rapacity of the tax-gatherer or of the robber. Even in the time of Jesus ostentation was dangerous. Those towns of which He speaks were walled and guarded. Towns and villages were eagerly watched by the tax-gatherers and sometimes ruined and burned by banditti, especially in outlying or frontier regions. When He spoke of an angry lord coming to avenge the murder of his son and destroy the city of the murderers (Mat 21:41), the words would awaken no surprise.

Jesus was a dweller in towns. His longest homes on earth were Nazareth and Capernaum, both of them among the larger towns of Galilee. The significance of this fact is noteworthy. Most of the Syrian towns are to-day the mingling-places of the land, the crucibles wherein a composite race is molten out of many elements. One or two towns, indeed, like Nablus and Hebron, are fanatically Mohammedan, and the unwelcome alien elements of the population are kept apart, while the life of the

whole community stagnates, immune to the infection of their uncleanness, but unprogressive as cities of the dead. But the other towns are open to the world. It is said that the sanitary conditions are such that if it were not for the freedom of intercourse the population would die off. The inhabitants often emigrate, and there is much intermarriage with people of other towns, so that the life is varied and has other than purely local interests.

From the earliest times the population of these towns was recruited by Canaanites, Arabs, and Israelites from other districts. In the days of Jesus, Graeco-Roman life was pouring into them, and there was always the presence of the imperial military contingent. The great roads and the Eastern campaigns of Rome had opened up and greatly developed foreign commerce, which found markets in all the larger centres. Jesus was a child and a man of the town. It was not, as in the case of John the Baptist, in desert places that He chose to teach, but in the crowded synagogues, clad in ordinary townsman's tasselled dress.

Urban communities arose from three main causes, viz. commerce (especially commerce in connexion with agriculture), war, and worship. In its various phases, town life bears marks of its threefold origin through all time. Christ touched this life on all its sides, and came into relation with each of these three aspects of it.

Commerce Jesus knew from the first in Nazareth. The town lies in the oval hollow of a high mountain valley. The carpenter's shop there led Him doubtless to a knowledge of house building, and He knew the reasons why some houses stood the underwash of rainstorms and some did not (Mat 7:24). Tradition mentions 'yokes and ploughs' as among the chief objects which He manufactured as a carpenter; and there can be little doubt that this is correct. For Nazareth was just the place in which commerce was most sure to be closely connected with agriculture; and He who said, 'Take my yoke upon you' (Mat 11:29), and spoke of the light burden and the easy yoke, had doubtless in His mind much experience of the choice of timber and of accurate fitting of yokes to the necks of oxen. He knew the markets, and may not only have seen children playing in them, but have played there Himself as a child. Capernaum was a place of importance for the collection of revenue, being situated at an important point on a great Roman road. Jericho, famous for its rich trade in balsam, was a still more important tax-collecting centre, where a leading publican could gather many of his friends to a feast (Luk 5:29). Matthew and Zacchaeus are links connecting Jesus with the receipt of custom. Capernaum also had its fishing fleet, and its extensive fish-market, and Peter's family resided there (Mat 8:14). The traveller coming in from the eastern desert towards the Lebanon is astonished by the aspect of the town of Homs (Emesa), whose high square blocks of masonry and many chimney-stalks give it a striking resemblance to a Midland English manufacturing town. No doubt that is a product of modern industry. Yet, as He looked southward from His disciples' boat,

Jesus must have often seen the cloud of smoke rising from Taricheae, at the southern end of the Lake, where in His time a large trade in fish-curing was carried on.

War, also, had left its traces. As one advances farther and farther to the north-east from Damascus, one is struck to find the walls of oasis-towns grow thicker and higher, and to note the pierced loopholes in them, testifying to the nearness of the raiding Bedawin, and the precarious terms on which town life is possible there. Many such fortress-towns Jesus must have visited on His journeys. Ever visible from Nazareth itself, the crest of Tabor, to which some have seen an allusion in the 'city set on a hill' (Mat_5:14), was crowned by a fort and occupied by a Roman garrison. The centurions whom Jesus met, and who impressed Him so favourably, were in command of detachments of Roman soldiers, who formed an important feature in all the town life of Syria, mingling at times in friendly intercourse with their neighbours (Luk_7:4-5), and lending to the life of the place that unmistakable air of distinction which is ever to be found about the army of a great empire.

Worship, too, was an ancient and ineradicable feature of town life. Many towns owed their first origin to some holy place, whose associations were lost in the most remote antiquity, and many were glorified by historical associations of the religious past. Such holy places were scattered up and down the land, but the history of Jesus brings us into contact chiefly with two of them—Jacob's Well, near Shechem, and Bethlehem, the city of David. The concentration of the religious life of the nation in Jerusalem tended to discourage the attention paid to local shrines, and it is striking that to visit the former of the two above mentioned, Jesus had to journey into the heart of Samaria; while, as regards Bethlehem, we never hear of it after the stories of His birth. It was the synagogue which gave its religious aspect to the town life which Jesus knew. The first beginning of His ministry was in the synagogue of Nazareth. It is in connexion with the ruins of a costly synagogue that the controversy about the site of Capernaum still centres (cf. Sanday). While the Temple still gathered round it the national religious sentiment, the actual religious life of the people owed more to the synagogues than to the Temple. In them religion was surrounded by individual memories and family associations. In them the Scriptures grew familiar, and the Law was expounded and applied to the details of actual life. While the Temple revealed to every true Israelite Jehovah as the God of his nation, the synagogue kept about him the thought and presence of Jehovah as God of his home. Thus the idea of the city was more and more a religious idea in Israel, and her God was a city dweller. There is an Eastern proverb which speaks of homeless strangers as 'going to God's gate,' and the idea of the City of God, fostered indeed by Jerusalem, yet hallowed every city of Israel. Not of the capital only, but of all her towns she sang that 'unless the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain' (Psa_127:1).

There can be no question that the city conception entered largely into Jesus' view of His Kingdom. Josephus describes (perhaps in exaggerated terms) the Essene conception of the Kingdom of God as a spot beyond the ocean 'which is oppressed neither with storms of rain nor snow, nor with intense heat, but soft, cooling, zephyr west winds always blow' (cf. Hausrath, i. 164). That was Utopia seen from the wilderness—the Kingdom of God seen from the desert. But for Jesus the desert was but an occasional resort. It was the crowded streets of towns that set His point of view; and the life—not the retreat from life—of men and women, was the ideal of His Kingdom. In every parable and prophecy of His which describe it, we hear the hum of man's activity, and see him busy with human business.

The town life, however, which Jesus knew in Syria was very far from the ideal. Of course, in estimating such matters, a large allowance must always be made for the different tastes of Easterns and Westerns, so that many things which impress us as disadvantages may have been either unnoticed or actually enjoyed by Orientals. Nothing, for instance, strikes the traveller more than the constant *publicity* of life in the East, to which reference has already been made. There seems, at first sight, to be no private life at all. Every one knows everything about everybody. The intimacy of family life appears to be everywhere, but without its affection, and the unceasing sound of speech keeps up an unbroken and unseemly exposure of private affairs. That Jesus felt this oppressive at times is proved by those periodic retreats to desert places and to mountains which are so familiar to readers of the Gospels. The note of intimacy, the personal quality of intercourse even in crowded thoroughfares, appear in countless touches of the narrative. He Himself refers to it when He gives it as a thing to be counted on, that that which is told in the chamber will be proclaimed on the housetop (Mat 10:27, Luk 12:3), (from which at least ten families would hear it). There is, behind the main speech of the Gospels, the sound of an eternal chatter among the 'rustling crowds.' Remarks of disciples and bystanders are often overheard either by Jesus or by the reporter (Mat 13:55-56, Joh 4:35 etc.). Sins of speech are more frequently referred to and rebuked than other sins.

This publicity, however, is but one part of the general sense of *comfortlessness* which depresses the Western visitor in the East. At one time, when Jesus was homeless, He evidently felt this, contrasting His own wandering life with that of foxes and of birds (Mat 8:20). But the homes themselves are often such as to seem very comfortless to the traveller. Of course, comfort is a matter which very largely depends upon custom, and the apparent want of it is often illusory. The streets are filthy and often untidy in detail; but the inhabitants seem to have a singular lack of sensitiveness to smells, and the sordid litter of odds and ends appears not to distract their eye from appreciation of the fine building that rises out of it. In many houses the floor is on two levels, the upper portion being for the human inhabitants, and the lower for cattle, whose mangers are hollowed out of the raised floor along its edge. Even in better houses the

rooms are bare; and jars for olives, oil, or water, along with corn-baskets and agricultural implements, give to the reception-rooms the appearance of outhouses. The main desiderata seem to be heat in winter and coolness in summer, so that the interiors are generally dark—a state of matters which is not conducive to cleanliness. There is no glass, and the strong sunlight penetrates the rooms in shafts which end in brilliant jewel-like flames of colour where they strike upon a garment or a piece of coloured pottery, and throws the rafters and walls into shadows of the richest brown and indigo, while all recesses and much of the floor are in darkness unrelieved. That this was the state of matters with which Jesus was familiar, is strikingly borne out by His parable of the Lost Coin, where the woman lights a candle and searches the house (Luk 15:8). That He is thinking of daylight is proved by the fact that the candle has to be lighted. It is narrated by Conder of a visitor to the cave of the Holy House at Nazareth, the reputed home of Jesus in His boyhood, that he remarked to the monk who showed him it, that it was dark for a dwelling-house. The monk answered that ‘The Lord had no need of much light.’ Yet it is evident from many sayings that Jesus was peculiarly sensitive to the contrasts of light and darkness. The ‘outer dark’ (Mat 22:13) of unlit streets affected Him with a sort of horror; and He gloried in the claim, which He often repeated, that He was the ‘light of the world,’ or the light of men. In the still more striking phrase, ‘the light of life,’ we see something of what light meant to Him. It may have been suggested by the contrast of the dark interior of a tomb with the sunshine that struck upon its whitewashed outer walls. But these words could have been used only by One to whom light meant quickened and exhilarated vitality.

However much custom and race may have mitigated the trials which these matters would impose on Westerns, we know that there were other characteristics of town life which were wholly distasteful to Him, and which He denounced. From His speech we can gather that He was often in conflict with that sophisticated provincialism which was the besetting sin of country towns. Mingling-places of the national varieties, the towns were yet sufficiently complete in themselves, and apart from one another, to foster jealousy and local conceit. In places like Caesarea Philippi, for instance, where to this day any passer-by may pick up large fragments of Roman mosaic floors or panels, the wealthy and luxurious life had given rise to a system of servility. Jesus had noted this, and warned His disciples against the Gentile practice of encouraging sycophants to address them as ‘sweet lords’ (Luk 22:25). Nor are the objectionable ways and manners of the town confined to the Gentiles. There are the local hypocrites among the natives, who love to pray standing at the corners of streets (Mat 6:2). There is that feature of country-town life which appears to be ineradicable,—that excessive love for litigation (Mat 5:24),—the combined result of leisure and petty interests. Nothing is more striking in the narratives of the Evangelists than the frequency with which litigation is referred to, both by Jesus and His hearers. Again, the littleness and personal character of the habitual outlook on

the world are illustrated by the fluency with which the Nazarenes enumerate the relatives of Jesus (Mat 13:55-56)—the speech this of tongues practised in the eloquence of local gossip. And it throws light on the meaning of Jesus when He spoke of Capernaum as ‘exalted to heaven’ (Mat 11:23). Capernaum physically was on the level of the Lake shore, and 682 feet below sea-level. It was the self-importance of the small provincial town of which He spoke. Jerusalem had its own sins, and the villages had theirs; but it probably was especially to the towns that He referred when He warned the forth-going Apostles of supercilious rejection, and instructed them to meet it by a symbol of still more emphatic rejection, shaking the dust of them off their feet (Mat 10:14 etc.).

Still worse, and still more obvious and common in these narratives, are the tokens of the violent contrasts of avarice and misery in the town life. The selfishness of the town is there, in all its heartlessness, portrayed in such parables as those of Lazarus and Dives (Luk 16:20), the rich man and his barns (Luk 12:18), and many others. Prosperity and adversity are in shameless and pitiless sight of one another. Cruelty and oppression have become the recognized convention of the powerful classes. Disease is rampant, and a class of rapacious quack doctors has sprung up to prey upon its victims (Mar 5:26). The moral tone of the town is such as to permit a prostitute to enter the feast of a wealthy Pharisee, and it is only when it appears that she is penitent that any one is shocked by the incident (Luk 7:37). The preference of Jesus for the town is part of His principle that the true physician goes where the sick are thickest, and the true saviour where sin is most unblushing.

The villages of Syria are a class of communities of a quite different order. The sheikh dwells in his ruined tower, overlooking the huddle of brown walls and roofs, and keeping his audience-hall open for the elders to assemble in and discuss the news of the countryside. They are inhabited now, as they have been largely all along, by fellahin, said to be to a considerable extent the descendants of the ancient Canaanites, practically unmixed in blood, owing to the almost unbroken custom of intermarriages. With these Jesus must have talked that Aramaic tongue which some five or six villages in the Kalamun mountain valleys still use as their vernacular, and which is heard to-day among the bakers of Damascus who come down to the city from the Syriac village of Ma'alula. So conservative is village life in Syria, that it is to village communities alone that we look to-day, in the assured confidence that we are seeing the very kind of life which Jesus saw. One result of this conservatism is, that extraordinary combination of ignorance and pride, superstitious fears and contemptuous effrontery, which is often the first impression produced on strangers. They preserve self-government of a kind, a hereditary rule within an imperial; but they appear to be very helpless against both nature and man. Usury and oppression cow the inhabitants, the insecurity of property renders them suspicious. The writer has accidentally roused a man sleeping through the night upon his haystack in an open

field, and seen others sitting upon the top of the grain piled upon a truck on the railway. They are almost exclusively agricultural in their way of life, and their methods are primitive and leisurely. They leave their hardest work to be done by their women, and spend many hours of each day in absolute idleness. Over them hangs the acrid-smelling smoke of fires whose fuel is camel-dung, that has been dried by being plastered over the outside of ovens, which break the monotony of flat roofs by their rounded shape, and appear like blisters in the fierce heat of summer. The dirtiness of the streets and of some houses is incredible. The simple food and habits of life produce healthy bodies, but disease comes upon its victims unprotected by any skill of medicine, and the sick and the whole dwell together and mingle everywhere. The first impression is one of universal gloom, and the faces of the people are sullen and contemptuous. But that is in many cases but the first instinct of self-preservation in those who are accustomed to ill-treatment. A very little tact and kindness soon changes the aspect of things, and threatening looks give place to a smiling childishness.

Such were the villages with which Jesus was familiar, although their life was then more prosperous, and at least some of their homes more habitable. To their inhabitants He spoke His parables of simple life, such as that of the Friend at Midnight (Luk 11:5). In one of them He blessed the children whom village mothers brought to Him (Mar 10:13). In another He brightened the wedding feast with good wine (Joh 2:1). In the gathering dusk, the two villagers at Emmaus recognized Him in the act of breaking bread at their table (Luk 24:28 ff.). From a village gate was heard the sound of swift footsteps, when a rich young ruler, within sight of the squalor which had enriched him, asked the question about eternal life, and was answered that he must sell all that he had and give to the poor (Mar 10:17). Beside another village gate He stopped the funeral procession of an only son of his mother, and gave her back her dead restored to life (Luk 7:11). That was at Nain, one of the villages of that hill of 'Little Hermon,' on whose sides Endor and Shunem also cling—a hill of villages of resurrection. Bethany hardly counts among the villages, being almost a suburb of Jerusalem, and differing from the rest in consequence. But of all the villages of Palestine none brings Jesus so near as the little hamlet of Ephraim, perched far off on its hill in the lonely uplands to the east of Bethel. It was perhaps the remotest of the inland villages of Israel, and its rustic inhabitants dwelt alone. It was to it that He retired for His last retreat before the Passover of Death (Joh 11:54). To Him the sickness and helplessness of the villages of His native land appealed, and drew forth compassion and healing. The sullenness that sometimes rejected Him and would have none of His love awakened no resentment, but only a great and pitying distress (Mat 11:20 ff. etc., Luk 9:52 ff.). The childlikeness of the villagers refreshed Him after the sophisticated life of towns, and found response in His constant speeches in praise of children and the childlike spirit (Mat 18:3).

5. Jerusalem.—For good or evil, no city in the world has exercised so strong and constant an influence on the world as Jerusalem. Some of her visitors have been filled with an unbounded enthusiasm, others have been depressed with a shattering disappointment; but in one way or other the city has influenced all comers. It has been the usual fate of sacred cities to gather to themselves much of the worst along with much of the best of earthly life. Jerusalem is no exception to the rule. It is the most sacred and the most sinister spot on earth.

From the day when David took it, the last stronghold of the Jebusites, and the battle-beaten old fortress-walls of rough stone opened their gates to the God of Israel, it had been the focus of the nation's life (2 Samuel 6, Psalms 24). Solomon glorified it as the secular and religious centre, drafting into it the wealth and nobility of Israel until the land became hydrocephalous—its metropolis magnificent and the rest shrivelled and impoverished. In a far more real sense Josiah made Jerusalem great; and now at length, after countless changes of fortune, Jesus found it a city of such unique importance and significance that it stood over against all the rest of the land, dividing the nation into 'dwellers in Jerusalem' and 'others'—a more effective division than any other of the time.

In the visits paid by Jesus to Jerusalem, from those of His infancy and the memorable first remembered visit—that paid when He was twelve years old—to the triumphal entry and the night journey as a captive from Gethsemane, there is an increasing intensity of interest. His arguments here are more of the nature of pitched battles than in the country (John 6, etc.); His acts of authority more decisive and dangerous (Mat 21:12); even His healing of the sick more of the nature of a challenge (Joh 5:10). Thus the history of Jesus fully confirms our sense of the importance of Jerusalem. The thrill of patriotic enthusiasm in such a word as His reference to 'the city of the Great King' (Mat 5:35) has already been alluded to. But more and more irrevocably that loyal sentiment changed its aspect as the facts thrust themselves upon Him. It was the impossible spirit of the city more than any other thing that changed Jesus' speech from the Sermon on the Mount to the terrible denunciations and warnings of the closing days. The sacred city, which at the first had been for Him, as for every religious man of Israel, the goal of pilgrimage and the embodiment and incarnation of spiritual thought and dream, came to be the arena of His life's supreme conflict, where spirituality would fight out its great battle with 'the world, the flesh, and the devil.' Here love would try the final issue with hate, and life with death. It is by a happy inspiration that Langland, in his *Piers the Plowman*, tells of Jesus 'going to a jousts in Jerusalem.' Nothing could more exactly describe His own view of the case during His later journeys (Mat 16:21, Joh 11:16). His spirit as He journeyed was that of one who, having fought the battle of the Spirit across the whole field, is now going on to the storming of the citadel.

Such was the change in His own feeling as He approached the capital. Not less striking is the expression of His thought of its meaning and its fate. For the pious Jew, Jerusalem was Utopia; and the mediaeval view, expressed in such enraptured poems as 'Pearl' (cf. Gollanez's translation) and the Crusading dreams of *Gerusalemme Liberata*, were the natural continuation of the ideas of which Ezekiel's visions and the Apocalypse are the expression. Jesus accepted this estimate of its importance when He deliberately chose it as the one place on earth where the Messianic claim must be publicly made (Joh 5:19 etc.), but He did this in the full consciousness that when it had served this purpose it would pass away. To Him it was a doomed Utopia, doomed beyond all hope of recovery. Had it known (Luk 19:42), had it understood the day of its visitation, it might have endured; as things were, it was for Him but a city of might-have-been. Yet, in the very hour when it was rushing to its doom, He seized upon it and forced it to fulfil the purpose towards which it had blindly struggled through all its eventful history. It linked on His work and Person with the past, and in crucifying Him sent on to the future the completed drama of redemption.

Subsequent history, with ruthless and terrific irony, has confirmed His view. The efforts of the Crusades to revive Jerusalem have only the more hopelessly marked it as the doomed Utopia. Every traveller is impressed with the same sense of its infinite loneliness and stony desolation. It looks like a gigantic fortress that has stood dismantled for ages, but retains for ever a weird air of petrified gallantry. It is a fossil city, fossilized when far gone in decay. The savage liveliness of the bugles which now shriek across its streets and houses, only adds to the sense of ancient death. Built for eternity, setting the pattern for men's dreams of the New Jerusalem, it stands for the sarcasm of promises unfulfilled, a city with a great future *behind it*. 'What,' we cannot but ask, 'has this relic to do with a blessed future for mankind?' History and religion seem to mourn here together, reiterating the lament of Jesus. One sees in every remembrance of it those two weeping figures, the most significant of all for its secular and religious life,—Titus, who gazed upon Jerusalem from Scopus the day before its destruction, and wept for the sake of the beautiful city so near its doom; and Jesus Christ, who, when things were ripening for Titus, foresaw the coming of the legions as He looked upon Jerusalem from Olivet,—'And when he was come near he beheld the city, and wept over it' (Luk 19:41).

The appearance of the city, as seen from such a lofty vantage ground as that which the approach from Bethany gives from the shoulder of the Mount of Olives, must always have been to a considerable extent the same as it is to-day. It is true that there are now two Jerusalems side by side, the ancient city packed together firmly, and the more loosely scattered masonry of the new Levantine city that has risen to the south and west of the Jaffa Gate. Yet to the north there is still the mound of ashes said to have been carried thither from the Temple sacrifices of old; and ancient tombs fill the valleys and stretch along the northern plain. It is easy for the

imagination to detach the modern buildings, and to regain the ancient impression. It has been pointed out (Hausrath, i, 38, 39) that Athens stands on an unfruitful cliff; Rome between a marsh and a wilderness; Jerusalem on a barren tongue of stone, where 'the mountain land gathers itself as to a natural centre.' The 'mountains stand round about Jerusalem,' but they lift her up to their height, and she stands as a mural crown upon the mountain land. The surrounding peaks are but little elevated above her level, and she is the climax as well as the centre of the land, set up to be 'the mountain throne and the mountain sanctuary of God.' And that tongue of land is so stony that even the denudation of sieges and of centuries cannot very greatly have changed the general aspect of the scene. There is no river in her landscape to redeem the hardness of the outlines. She is 'a city of stone in a land of iron, with a sky of brass' (Disraeli's *Tancred*). She has nothing in common with the villages of Judaea, the variety of her buildings differentiating her from the rectangular sameness of theirs. As if to accentuate the contrast, the village of Siloam still lies on the eastern slope of the Kidron valley, a drift of square hovels seen across a field of artichokes. Jerusalem 'sitteth solitary,' as she has always sat; unique in the land as she is lonely in history. The colours of her walls and buildings change in the changing lights from grey with a touch of orange to grey with a touch of blue. For there is no one colour of Jerusalem. In the changing lights of sunrise, noon, afternoon, and evening, its colour changes. At one time it hangs, airy and dream-like, over the steep bank of the Valley of Jehoshaphat; at another time it seems to sit solid on its rock, every roof and battlement picked out in photographic clearness; again, in the twilight of evening all is sombre, with rich purple shadows.

We have noted in the towns of Syria those moral defects of petty quarrelsomeness and provincial self-importance which appear constantly in the records of Jesus' ministry. The metropolitan pettiness which confronted Him at Jerusalem—the tenfold provincialism of the capital city, whose modern counterpart is so familiar in many lands to-day—was a much more serious matter. All the dreams of Utopia, religious and secular, had run into personal pride and vanity; all those Divine promises and guarantees on which the glorification of Jerusalem rested were interpreted by the citizens as a species of flattering Divine favouritism shown to themselves.

In spite of much disappointment, there were still many things which must have seemed in some sort the fulfilment of the ancient hopes for Jerusalem. 'The dromedaries of Midian and Ephah' had come to her, indeed, and they from Sheba bringing gold and incense. The flocks of Kedar and the glory of Lebanon were swelling her trade. Ships were flying as a cloud and as doves to their windows, making for her seaport with wealth for her ([Isa 60:6](#)). And with that wealth came men also from east and west, from north and south. The Dispersion of the Jews had already made her Passover feasts almost as cosmopolitan as Mecca afterwards became. The Roman road, while it brought humiliation, brought also much else to Jerusalem. Feeling its

way inland from the sea across the mountains of Judaea, it ended in the Jaffa Gate. It was but one of many roads from all points of the compass which, as they approached the city, grew broader and more thronged with passengers. From the account of Pentecost given in the Acts ([Act_2:9-11](#)), we can see that at certain times the polyglot crowds must have been like those which are now seen in the Meidan of Damascus to welcome the return of the Haj.

The wealthy and luxurious inhabitants were obviously spoiled by all this grandeur, and in all the shamelessness of Eastern cities paraded it in the face of the poverty they should have sought to help. Those who favoured the Roman domination, and sought to make capital out of it, like the Herodians, prided themselves openly in Jerusalem as a Roman city, and did all they could to make it so. Those who simply acquiesced, like the Sadducees, in what their superior intelligence convinced them was inevitable, found enough in their wealth and in their pride in their old city and family connexions to keep alive their aristocratic spirit. Those who, like the Pharisees, stood for the ancient religious and national claims, fostered a still more bitter fashion of bigotry and exclusiveness. From Jerusalem they too, in their surreptitious way, tried to manage the world. They spent their strength in making proselytes ([Mat_23:15](#)), and they sent out deputations to interfere in local questions as far off as Capernaum ([Mar_7:1](#), [Joh_1:19](#)). The crowd, who watched and copied the great ones from below, readily caught their tone, and, in an ignorant sense of superiority, were ready at any moment to raise a tumult at their instigation, and to shout for the crucifixion of a selected victim ([Mar_15:13](#) etc.). Altogether, so mighty was the self-importance of this little metropolis, that for its inhabitants the rest of the world was practically non-existent; and, as happens in all poorly equipped moral natures, their consciousness of their own better privileges and good fortune ran neither to interest nor to compassion, but only to scorn.

Of the more vulgar aspects of this metropolitan superciliousness the narratives present abundant examples. The contempt of Jerusalem for Galilee is everywhere apparent. It was not only on the ground of Messianic tradition, asking whether it were likely that Christ should come out of Galilee ([Joh_7:52](#)). The proverb was ready on their lips about no good thing coming out of Nazareth ([Joh_1:46](#), [Joh_7:41](#)). The facility for inventing opprobrious names, and the unsparing use of them, had developed with them into a fine art ([Joh_8:48](#)). A man was an ignoramus, a blasphemer, a lunatic, if he brought any new thing among them from the provinces. The maid in the palace of the high priest did not show any originality in laughing at the accent of country people ([Mat_26:73](#)). If a provincial gathered crowds of a morning to hear his preaching, and men felt in him the advent of the Spirit of God, Jerusalem coarsely explained it all by the supposition that he was intoxicated ([Act_2:13](#)). Any traveller might have retorted that while they were managing the world from a distance, they were neglecting it at their own doors. The fishermen of

Galilee were probably far less rude, either in speech or manner, than the semi-barbarous shepherds of the Judaeian mountains. But that was no concern of theirs. Their world was within their walls, and the curious and shameful result of their extravagant exclusiveness was that every Israelite was a foreigner in the capital city of his own country. Not Jesus of Nazareth alone, but every countryman was in Jerusalem 'despised and rejected of men'; and every son of man felt homeless when he entered the Holy City's gates.

The first impression made upon a stranger visiting the city in those days must have been that of an extraordinarily Roman city. Herod, the greatest of Romanizers, had utterly disregarded the lessons of past history, and repeated the mistaken policy of Solomon, which neglected the land to glorify the city. His architecture must have been as extravagant in costliness as it was poor in art. One of the grandest of all his palaces crowned the hill of Zion; his temple blazed forth its splendours from the grand platform on which it stood along the hillside of Moriah. The famous Tyropœon way spanned the ravine between the two, entirely Roman in its construction and design. Here stood a theatre whose Roman audiences listened to plays on such themes as Susanna and the Elders; there an amphitheatre at whose games rich prizes were offered. There was much barbaric splendour of a kind in the aspect of the city, but it was Roman splendour; and everything that caught the eye as impressive, led it back to the barracks and the courthouse near the tower of Antonia.

It was this aspect of Jerusalem which one might have expected Jesus to be most greatly influenced by. One of the most famous of the many would-be Messiahs, some years after this, went with a multitude of followers to blow his trumpets as the priests had blown their horns at Jericho. Jesus acted on principles directly the opposite of these. He saw the Roman buildings without either admiration or protest. His certainty of the end of all was no less positive than that of Theudas and such rash men, but it only made Him the more calm in His acquiescence until the providential moment should arrive. That was so sure—that day when the Rome which had glorified the city would destroy it—that the thought of hastening the doom, or of preventing it, never occurred to Him. Yet that very fact embittered and terrified His enemies. They did not, indeed, approve of the rebellious patriots; but that was because they regarded them as Galilaean bunglers who undertook work whose gravity they did not understand. Had any of them succeeded, Jerusalem would have welcomed him with shouts. But here was a far more serious offence. Macaulay's *New Zealander on London Bridge* represents to British readers a familiar and a quite legitimate kind of speculation. To Pharisees of Jerusalem such an idea was sheer treason even to think of, far more to discuss in public.

Not less directly did the attitude of Jesus to the Temple draw the nets of death around Him. Like all religious Israelites, He directed His steps to the Temple as to the

natural seat and centre of His religious life. From the first it was in His Father's house that the Son of God found His appropriate home (Luk 2:46). But the pleasantness of that boyish visit yielded in later years to slow and deepening bitterness, as the accepted meaning of the Temple became more and more unmistakable. The Jews have a legend that in the sacred rock now covered by the Mosque of Omar there was inscribed the mystic name of Jehovah, and that Jesus alone of men had been able to discover and to read it. The heart of every Christian understands the unsuspected truth of that legend. Jesus ever went to that Temple as one going to His Father's house.

All the more tragic is the contrast, as it must have come upon Him, between the real and the ideal Temple of the Lord. The priestly families were Sadducees, men in whom the national hope had largely died out, and in whom His acquiescent attitude to Rome would awaken neither anger nor surprise. Indeed, it is probable that they mistook His views, and carelessly classed Him among the other revolutionaries of the time. At least the high priest frankly avowed that it was necessary that He should perish, to avert the Roman anger and revenge. But if it was only by mistake or by pretence that they found this ground of accusation against Jesus, there were other grounds on which they and He stood in plain and deadly opposition. The Sadducaean priestly families were the chief representatives of a spirit of scepticism regarding spiritual things (in reaction from the Pharisaic spirit) which had lapsed into a kind of hard secularism, a lax morality, and an unconcealed worldliness which were indifferent alike to the glory of worship and to the shame of its degradation. The shadow of Herod had fallen across the Temple and its services. Herod, who at one time had thought of himself posing as Messiah, had built the Temple; and while the Roman idolater Agrippa had offered sacrifice there, Herod had sacrificed to Roman gods at Rome. With such a patron at its head, secular life flowed into the Temple unchecked. The courts were made into a market where fraudulent bargains were driven with country-folk in connexion with the very rites of their religion, and we see how Jesus resented this in the strange outburst of holy anger with which He drove these merchants forth (Mat 21:12). A large number of synagogues had arisen within the precincts, but there is no record of His visiting them. By preference He chose the streets for preaching in, or He spoke in the open Temple court. In the East, religion tends ever to degenerate into ritual pure and simple, devoid alike of meaning for the intellect and of emotion for the heart (W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem. [Note: Semitic.]* p. 16). Never had this taken place more completely than in the Sadducaean priesthood at Jerusalem then. From the abode of holiness and the centre of truth, He found His Father's house become a den of thieves, and a patent sham of ritual whose performers never dreamed of treating it even as a symbol of realities. It is this that explains that most strange and ominous of records, where Jesus is described as sitting silently in the Temple during long periods of the latest days of His life (Hausrath, ii. 250). What thoughts were passing in His mind then we cannot know, and we hardly dare try to imagine. But one

thing is clear. Just as He changed the conception of the Messianic Kingdom from the outward to the inner region, so He did that of the Temple. When the priests poured out the water from great jars at the feast, He cried aloud that out of those who believed on Him would come rivers of living water (Joh_7:38). And the words of which He was afterwards to be accused, as to the destruction and rebuilding of 'this temple,' were spoken 'of the temple of his body' (Joh_2:21).

From all these points of view, Jerusalem had become a place of sinister prospects for Jesus. From the populace He had to expect the usual reception given to all provincials, and if more powerful enemies should require their aid, they might be counted on for darker deeds. By the orthodox religionists He would be treated as a heretic, disloyal alike to the traditions of the past and the pressing needs of the hour. By the latitudinarian priests He must be regarded with the double antagonism of worldly men to spiritual aspiration, and of ritual to spiritual reality. So Jerusalem came to be seen by Jesus under a death-cloud. Rome was free in her use of crucifixion for the better ordering of Eastern affairs, and Jesus must have seen many of His countrymen hanging on crosses beside village gates. So the certainty of the end would force itself upon Him, and the shadow of the cross fall ever more deeply. Tombs of prophets were everywhere to be seen, and many of them were martyrs' tombs (Mat_23:29). But it was round the walls of Jerusalem that such tombs were thickest, and for Him also Jerusalem was seen as the place for perishing in. From the far North He saw it so, saying at Caesarea Philippi that He must go to Jerusalem to be killed (Mat_16:21). The final journey, eager and yet deliberate, had death for its goal in the Holy City. The disciples felt a horror in the thought of Jerusalem, as if the City of the Great King had changed to a shambles (Joh_11:8). Thomas, more ready than the others to face the worst, boldly urged them to go on and die with Him (Joh_11:16). When He came near, and seeing the city realized its hopelessness, and felt the flood of old associations sweep over Him, He wept over it (Luk_19:41). But He went on, nevertheless, when for Him Jerusalem meant Calvary.

It is true that, in the memory of the early Church, Jerusalem was the place of rising again as well as the place of death, and of the New Evangel that had the city for its starting-point. Yet as far as the earthly life of Jesus is concerned, the associations of Jerusalem are of almost unrelieved antagonism, sorrow, and shame. The modern aspect of the city seems to the imagination of lovers of Jesus profoundly symbolic. What the first eye-shot gives, as one sees it from Olivet, is this: a sharp angle formed by the two valleys of Jehoshaphat and Hinnom; steep banks rising from their bottoms to the walls, which they overlap in an irregular and wavy line; within the walls, glancing back from the angle which they form above the junction of the valleys, the eye runs up a gradually rising expanse of close-packed building, which is continued more sparsely in the long rolling slope beyond, to the ridge of Scopus in the north, and to the distant sweep of long level mountain-line to the west. It is as if the whole

city had slid down and been caught by that great angle of wall just before it precipitated itself into the gorges.

These gorges themselves are part and parcel of the city, and they stand for the overflow of her sad and desolate spirit. Their sides are banks of rubbish—the wreckage and débris of a score of sieges, the accumulation of three thousand years. One looks from the lower pool of Siloam in the valley of Hinnom up a long dreary slope of dark grey rubbish, down which a horrible black stream of liquid filth trickles, tainting the air with its stench. Far above stands the wall, which in old days enclosed the pool. Here the city seems to have shrunk northwards, as if in some horror of conscience. The Field of Blood and the Hill of Evil Counsel are just across the gorge to the south. The valleys are full of tombs.

The impression of this is overwhelming, and there is one point in the view which appears more than all else to embody and explain it. Right in front, as one looks from Olivet, is the line of the Temple wall, and it is broken by a double gate, built up with closely mortared masonry. That is the ancient ‘Beautiful Gate’ of the Temple, by which the scapegoat, bearing the nation’s sins, was led forth to the wilderness. It was built up because of a Jewish tradition that Messiah would return and enter the city by it. So Jerusalem has indeed built up the exit for her sins and the entrance for her Saviour. The land seems, as one travels over its desolate mountains and valleys, still inhabited by Jesus; but He has forsaken Jerusalem.

Cf. also separate articles, such as Galilee, Judaea, Samaria, Jerusalem, Nazareth, Capernaum, Jordan, etc.

Literature.—Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] , *passim*; Hausrath, *Hist. of NT Times—Times of Jesus*; G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [Note: *GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*] ; Sanday, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels*; Doughty, *Arabia Deserta*; Conder, *Tent-Work in Palestine*; Ramsay, *The Education of Jesus*; cf. also the present writer’s book, *The Holy Land* (illustrated by Mr. Fulleylove).

John Kelman.

☪ Palm

PALM.—The word occurs (Mar_14:65, Joh_18:22; cf. Joh_19:3) in the translation of ὀπίσθημα, a blow with the open hand. It refers to the stroke on the cheek (Mat_5:39, Luk_6:29), one of the affronts and indignities that may have to be borne cheerfully in

representing and serving the Kingdom of heaven. In Mat 26:67, Mar 14:65, a distinction is implied between the rough jest of hitting with the fist (κολαφίζω) by the soldiers standing in front of Christ and the smiting with the palm by the servants of the high priests as they stood behind and challenged Him to tell from whom the blow had come. For all Christ prayed that the sin committed in ignorance might be forgiven (Luk 23:34). It is only by a Christian that affront can really be put upon Christ (Php 3:18).

G. M. Mackie.

☪ Palm Tree

PALM.—Palm trees, though frequently referred to in the OT, are mentioned in connexion with the life of Christ only once: viz. in the account of the triumphal entry into Jerusalem (Joh 12:13). The English name (Lat. *palma*) is due to the similarity of the leaves of some kinds to the open hand. The term in Greek (applied only to a genus) is φοίνιξ, which gave its name to a town in Crete (Act 27:12). The word also means ‘a Phoenician,’ ‘a purple colour,’ and the fabulous *phœnix*. In Rev 7:9 it is used of the leaf (or so-called branch), which is usually called βαίον

The palm tree is amongst the foremost both in beauty and in utility. It grows with uniform trunk, straight like the mast of a ship. The trunk is in some kinds smooth, in others clearly annulated, in others rough with the roots of former fronds. At the top the leaves (or fronds) spring out in a spreading circle or crown, while beneath them the flowers and clusters of fruit are formed. The tree is endogenous, without bark and without branch. The leaves vary in length from three to ‘thirty feet. And along the stalk on either side long leaflets grow close, presenting in many kinds (pinnated) the shape of an enlarged feather, in others, including most of the fan-shaped palms, a rounder, broader form of palmate or webbed configuration, while in the bi-pinnate caryota and the mauritia they have a triangular (or fish-tailed or wedge-shaped) appearance. The fruit is often valuable, and by incision the juice is obtained that makes palm wine. Palm trees are tropical and semi-tropical. Some grow near wells, as the palms of Elim (Exo 15:27), but this may be attributed to culture; others flourish in sandy deserts; some are found in mountainous regions, and many rear themselves erect on wind-swept ridges. Besides yielding food, drink, and oil, they afford house-building material, and many are highly serviceable for the various uses to which fibres are applicable.

Palms have been divided into five tribes, over a hundred genera, over a thousand species: but there is a limited number of main kinds. The palm of Palestine is the date-palm. This tree (*phœnix dactylifera*, date being a contraction of *dactylus*, ‘finger’) rises gracefully to a height of from fifty to ninety feet. It grows in various climates and latitudes, but its fruit fails both in Europe and in India. The female tree (for the phœnix, unlike most others, is not hermaphrodite) bears a cluster which may contain 200 dates, and it may continue to bear for two hundred years. These fruits, which are half sugar, are a chief article of food in Arabia and North Africa. From an incision near the top the fermenting sap flows so as to yield in one month twenty gallons of wine or toddy. The pinnated leaves, which are of a deep green colour and from 9 to 12 feet in length, are used to make mats and baskets, and the fibres of their stalks make cordage. The leaves also make thatch, and the trunk is useful timber. This tree abounded in the valley of the Jordan, but Jericho was specially the city of palm trees (Deu 34:3). A group of palms, with their magnificent crowns, might afford ample shade. Accordingly, we find that early in the history of Israel Deborah dwelt under her palm tree (Jdg 4:5), while in the time of our Lord many of the Essenes were said to live in palm groves. Fructification is artificial or accidental; and forests may be cultivated that in years of famine will support the population of a country.

The palm, being upright, green, fruitful, and imposing, was an emblem of the righteous in their prosperity (Psa 92:12). In appreciation of the beauty of its form it was carved on the walls and doors of the Temple (1Ki 6:29; 1Ki 6:32, cf. Eze 40:16; Eze 41:18). Its leaves were borne as symbols of rejoicing at the Feast of Tabernacles (Lev 23:40) and also at the Maccabæan Feast of Dedication, of which the special feature was the illumination. This tall, firm, unbending tree, with its magnificent crown of fronds, with fruit and leaves that served for sustenance and ornament, was readily reckoned emblematic of moral qualities—rectitude, constancy, gracefulness, usefulness—such as are the constituents of success. The palm came to be regarded specially as the symbol of victory and triumph. It is in that sense that the name has acquired its metaphorical meaning. The winner (we say) carries off the palm. A period of exceptional prosperity is remembered as ‘palmy days’. ‘Another race hath been, and other palms are won’ (Wordsworth).

The carrying of palm leaves (τὰ βᾶτα τῶν φοινίκων) by the people in honour of the Messiah (Joh 12:13) was in accordance with the custom observed at feasts and on great public occasions. Jesus was saluted as a king proceeding to His coronation. The palms symbolized His triumph and the people’s joy. He allowed the homage of the multitude as the spontaneous expression of pure-minded loyalty. On the other hand, the Pharisees and officials regarded it as a challenge of their authority. The incident has been commemorated since the 5th cent. by the Greek and Latin Churches in the

Palm Sunday (*dominica palmarum*, or feast of palm-leaves), immediately preceding Easter, at which palms are consecrated and a procession takes place.

The supreme expression of the palm as the symbol of triumphant homage is in the Apocalyptic vision, where the innumerable multitude who have come through the great tribulation, and who serve God day and night, stand before the throne and before the Lamb, clothed in white robes and with palms in their hands (Rev_7:9; Rev_7:14).

Literature.—Artt. in *Encyc. Brit.*⁹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , *Chambers's Encyc.* , the *EBi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*] , and Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ; *Historiæ Palmarum* by Martius; Griffiths' *Palms of British East India* is a volume of illustrations.

R. Scott.

☒ Palsy

PALSY.—See Paralysis.

☒ Papias

PAPIAS

1. Papias as witness to Gospels.—There is no early evidence as to our Gospels comparable to that of Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, even in the fragmentary and obscure form in which it has reached us through the pages of Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 39). Eusebius' own slighting estimate of Papias' judgment was due largely to distaste for the highly realistic form in which he set forth the common primitive expectation of an imminent reign of Christ on a renewed earth, which Papias held, with the Apocalypse of John (Rev_20:4 ff.), would last a thousand years. But, whatever his mental calibre, Papias' importance lies rather in his endeavour to keep in touch with historical witness, as far as possible first-hand witness, to the true or original meaning of the Lord's own teaching.

For realizing such an aim Papias had exceptional advantages. There is little doubt that after the destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple in a.d. 70, if not before, the Roman province or Asia was the chief centre of Christian tradition outside Palestine. The

foundation for this had been laid by St. Paul, with Ephesus as base of influence; and hither were attracted not a few of the leading personal disciples of Jesus, including, perhaps, several of the original Apostles. Chief of all, we must reckon John, the son of Zebedee, whose presence at Ephesus for a period of years cannot be explained away by any confusion with another John. The latter's title, 'the Elder,' itself implies the need for distinguishing him from a greater namesake residing in the same neighbourhood.

The statement in certain late writers that John, as well as his brother James, had been 'done to death by Jews,' even if correct, would not negative this. But it is very possibly a mistake, since Eusebius, who was on the look out for all facts bearing on the lives of Apostles, says nothing of the kind. It probably arose from the misunderstanding of a passage in which Papias explained the 'cup' of Christ in Mar_10:38 f., Mat_20:22 f., as 'martyrdom'—which in James' case was unto death, but in John's stopped short of that.

Hierapolis, Papias' home in South Phrygia, was well within the province of Asia and near the main road to Ephesus from the East, while it actually lay on another road running N.W. through Asia to Smyrna and Pergamum. A man so situated, and with a passion for first-hand information as to Christ's teaching, had special chances of intercourse with such disciples of the first generation ('elders' he calls them) as visited or worked in Asia, so far as his youth or early manhood overlapped their later years. But how far was this the case? For an answer to this question we have to rely on the chapter of Eusebius already referred to, and particularly on certain of Papias' own words there cited.

2. Papias' book and the situation it presupposes.—Papias wrote a work in five books, entitled 'Exposition of the Lord's Oracles (*Logia*).' Quoting from this, Irenaeus wrote, about a.d. 180: 'These things Papias, too, who was a hearer of John and a companion of Polycarp, a man of the old time (ἀρχαῖος ἀνήρ), further witnesses in writing.' This statement Eusebius, anxious to dissociate John from Papias' millenarian views, challenges, saying that he does not claim to have heard Apostles, but only associates of theirs. In support of this, he quotes a passage from Papias' preface which enables us to judge how far his own reading of it is warranted. In studying it, our chief care must be to read it in the light of what we can learn as to the scope of its author's preface as a whole.

(a) *The Lord's 'Oracles' and their record.*—We gather that Papias felt constrained to write by the needs of the times in the western part of Asia Minor, where much diversity of view existed as to the standard of Christian faith and practice, owing largely to uncertainty both as to the exact wording of Christ's sayings and as to their

real meaning. Some, it is true, took no pains even to ground their practice in all things on Christ's own words as spoken to His personal disciples, but deferred to 'alien precepts' coming through doubtful media of Divine revelation, rather than direct from this supreme source of truth. But, to Papias, the only sure way of reaching the mind of Christ, the Truth itself, is to start from the Apostolic written collection of 'the Oracles,' as he conceived the Gospel according to Matthew to be, the one directly Apostolic document of this character (the Johannine Gospel is in any case of another type). To this method some—probably typical Greek or 'Gnostic' Christians, to whom its markedly Jewish and eschatological colour may have been an offence—might object that the accuracy of this Gospel itself was not above question, pointing to the differences between it and the Petrine Gospel by Mark. To meet some such difficulty,* [Note: Other views as to the exact reason for the comparison of the Gospels of Matthew and Mark are possible; but the above seems best to fit in with the passage in Papias' preface touching his aim and method dealt with below.] which was perhaps meant to lower the authority of both Gospels (since Mark also had Jewish features of the kind in question), Papias cites a tradition derived from a man of the first Christian generation, 'the Elder' (? John, see below), as he styles him—

'And this the Elder used to say: Mark, indeed (μὲν), having been Peter's interpreter, wrote down with accuracy, yet not in order, everything he bore in mind—the things, namely, either said or done by the Christ (or Lord). For neither did he listen to the Lord nor did he follow Him, but later on, as I said, Peter, who adapted his instructions to the requirements, yet without intending to make a connected account of the Lord's sayings (σύνταξις τῶν κυριακῶν τοιοῦμενος λόγων or λογίων). Accordingly Mark was in no way in fault in so writing certain things as he recalled them: for of one thing he took precaution, not to omit anything that he had heard or therein to state anything falsely.'

Here we have a defence of the trustworthiness of Mark's narrative, so far as it goes, save on the score of the arrangement of its material, which, having originally been delivered by Peter in an order determined by the exigencies of Christian instruction (διδασκαλία, as distinct from public preaching, κήρυγμα), was reproduced by Mark with simple fidelity. A Gospel so composed made no claim to comparison, as regards the order of the Lord's sayings (so far as it recorded them), with a Gospel written by one of Peter's fellow-disciples on a different principle, that of collecting the weighty utterances of the Lord (τὰ λόγια), disposed in orderly grouping. Such, however, was the Gospel composed by the Apostle Matthew, as we may infer that Papias went on to quote 'the Elder' as saying in effect.

Probably the sentence beginning ‘But Matthew,’ which the ‘Mark, indeed (μὲν), ...’ of the extract in Eusebius seems to imply, included a statement that Matthew wrote ‘among the Hebrews,’ i.e. in Palestine. At least this is an element common to Irenaeus (iii. i. 1), and the tradition preserved in Euseb. iii. 24, possibly from Clement of Alexandria, whose account of the Gospels as contained in ‘a tradition of the elders of earlier times’ (τῶν ἀνέκαθεν πρεσβυτέρων) he elsewhere cites (vi. 14). Now in ii. 15 Clement is cited by Euseb. for an expanded form of the Papiian tradition as to Mark’s Gospel, with the additional remark that Clement’s account is confirmed by Papias of Hierapolis. Papias, in fact, was the nucleus of that tradition; and so his Matthaean tradition, as given already in iii. 24, is here omitted.

Thus the whole passage was a defence at once of Mark’s Gospel and of Matthew’s, with which Papias from the nature of the case is mainly concerned. Then in the extract which Eusebius immediately subjoins, Papias sums up (οὖν) the net result of his discussion touching the accuracy of ‘the Oracles’ as originally compiled by that Apostle.

‘Matthew, then, for his part, in Hebrew compiled the Oracles; but their interpretation was determined by each man’s ability.’ In this rendering, which keeps as closely as possible to the order of the original,† [Note: Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο (preferable to συνεγράψατο, Cf. σύνταξιν above), ἡρμήνευσε δ’ αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος. The Logia, then, is Papias’ description of the main contents of Matthew’s Gospel in terms of his special interest in it, not the actual title of any writing ever current under that name.] emphasis no doubt falls on the fact that Matthew’s authoritative collection of the Lord’s Oracles was in Hebrew, or rather Aramaic, and not in Greek. Yet Papias does not seem to have said anything about the manner in which the Greek Matthew, as current in the region where he was writing, came into being, else Eusebius would have gone on to cite information so much to his purpose. Hence we may infer that the point of the citation lies in the words actually given, and that Papias is explaining why various versions of the Oracles (in whole or part) were then current side by side with the recognized Greek Matthew. They went back, that is, to the time when Matthew’s collection of the Oracles existed only in a non-Greek form, various imperfect renderings of which passed into currency before the final Greek version was made. In this way he is able to set aside rival forms of certain sayings to those on which, as standing in the Greek Matthew, he bases his own exposition of the Lord’s teaching.

While it is likely that Papias based on the Elder’s testimony his own assertion that Matthew himself wrote his collection of the Lord’s Oracles, it seems precarious to

lean much weight on the statement. Against this there are various objections. Thus the Preface to Luke's Gospel seems to exclude any such Apostolic record, and its disappearance would be hard to explain.

(b) *Papias' relation to 'the Elders,' the prime witnesses to the meaning of the Oracles.*—So much for the true text of such Oracles of the Lord as he chooses for comment. But what guarantee can he offer that his own exegesis of their meaning is preferable to that of other Christian teachers about him, abler perhaps than himself? This is the question to which the chief citation made by Eusebius is a reply. Its substance is as follows. He is far from piquing himself on his own insight or ingenuity in evolving, at no slight length, plausible views as to the meaning of such Oracles as may seem obscure even to a careful reader. His one object being to reach the true meaning of Him who was the Truth incarnate, he has no false shame in supporting his own 'interpretation' by such authoritative traditions as he had collected in years gone by—traditions derived from the men of the first Christian generation, particularly personal disciples of the Master Himself. His zeal in collecting such authentic oral comments, even at second-hand, was due, he explains, to the feeling that the *vivâ voce* method of continuous transmission was more helpful, for reaching the true sense of the Lord's Oracles, than any books bearing on their elucidation. But before proceeding to draw further inferences from 'Papias' preface, so far as cited by Eusebius, we will quote the passage (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 39) to which we owe our knowledge of it—

'But I will not scruple to set down for thee everything, too, that once on a time I learned right well from the Elders and right well bore in mind—in juxtaposition with the (= my own) interpretations, so confirming their truth. For I used not to delight, like the many, in those wont to have so much to say (by way of comment), but in those wont to teach things that are true; nor yet in those accustomed to bear in mind the precepts of other masters (τὰς ἀλλοτριὰς; ἐντολάς), but in those (wont to bear in mind) such as have been given once for all from the Lord to faith and reach (us) from the Truth itself as source (ἀπ' αὐτῆς παραγινομένης [αὐτῆς] τῆς ἀληθείας). But if haply one also who had been a companion of the Elders came (my way), I used to make careful inquiry into the discourses of the Elders—what had been said by Andrew, or what by Peter, or what by Philip, or what by Thomas or by James, or what by John or Matthew, or by any other of the Lord's disciples, and what things Aristion and the Elder John, disciples of the Lord, have to say (λέγουσιν). For I did not conceive that the contents of (the) books [of comment] assisted me as much as *vivâ voce* communications preserved continuously (τὰ παρὰ ζώσης φωνῆς καὶ μενούσης).'

The exact exegesis of this famous passage is still an open question. Much depends on the relation of the clause, 'But if haply one also who had been a companion of the Elders (= the worthies of the first generation, e.g. "disciples of the Lord," as also above) came my way,' to what immediately precedes. If it expresses a less direct contact with the Elders, then Papias virtually claims himself to have heard some Apostles or personal disciples of Christ. But if, as seems preferable, it expresses a more direct relation, Eusebius' reading of the passage will hold, and Papias implicitly resigns all claim to have heard any Apostle, and so John in particular. In favour of the former alternative may be urged Eusebius' obvious desire to dissociate Papias from the Apostles, as also the positive statement of not a few later readers of Papias, who must have known of Eusebius' challenge, and so been the more careful in their own reading of Papias' meaning (with the full context before them). In particular, one might cite the witness of Apollinaris, bishop of Papias' own Hierapolis,* [Note: Thus he, unlike most others, does not need to describe Papias as 'bishop of Hierapolis.'] within half a century of the date of his predecessor's writing, when he calls him 'Papias, the disciple of John.' Besides, was Eusebius entitled to assume that Irenaeus, in calling Papias 'a hearer of John and a comrade of Polycarp,'—whom Irenaeus elsewhere explicitly makes a disciple of Apostles and of John in particular,—was drawing on this passage at all, seeing that it does not itself suggest the second of the two descriptions here given? Nevertheless Eusebius' exegesis of the passage, viz. that Papias had heard 'from the Elders' only indirectly, though in certain cases at only one remove, best suits the extract as a whole. Nor does Papias' date depend very much on acceptance of the one view rather than the other. In either case he may well have been rather older than Polycarp (whose birth was as early as a.d. 69), though, unlike him, he was won to Christ's Gospel only after the death of His last Apostle. Yet even at that date two of His personal disciples, Aristion and the Elder John, were still living, most likely in Ephesus or its neighbourhood, somewhere about a.d. 100.

(c) *Date of Papias' writing.*—Against the above result nothing can be said on the score of the date of Papias' book. Not only does Irenaeus regard it as the work of 'a primitive worthy' (ἀρχαῖος ἀνήρ), but Eusebius himself classes Papias with Polycarp, Ignatius, Clement (in this order), and others of the next generation after the Apostles (iii. 36 *init.*, 37 *init.*, and *ad fin.*), all of whom he regarded as flourishing under Trajan (a.d. 98-117). Accordingly he deals with Papias before going on to describe events at the end of Trajan's reign (iv. 2), and the accession of Hadrian in 117, in connexion with whom he refers to the *Apology* of Quadratus. There is no external evidence, therefore, apart from a confusion long ago cleared up by Light-foot, to lead us to assign to Papias' *Exposition* a date later than about a.d. 115. Many scholars, indeed, point to the sentence, 'Touching those raised from the dead by the Christ, that they lived until Hadrian,' following immediately on some Papias matter in an epitome (Cod. Barocc. 142), as though it also were based on Papias, so that his work

must be at least as late as Hadrian's reign. But the epitome is really based on Eusebius (with a few touches added directly from Papias in this connexion), and here passes on from Papias in Euseb. iii. 39 to Quadratus as cited in iv. 2, as the very form of the sentence, 'Touching ... that they lived ...,' suggests.

With this agrees also the internal evidence, as it seems to emerge from a comparison of the erroneous tendencies implied by his work, on the one hand, and, on the other, the Epistles of Ignatius and Polycarp, which fall about a.d. 115. The affinities with Polycarp, whom Irenaeus makes Papias' comrade at one time, are specially striking—

'Let us therefore so serve Him [Christ] with fear and all due reverence, even as He Himself gave injunctions, and the Apostles who brought us the Gospel, and the prophets who proclaimed beforehand the coming of our Lord.... For every one who shall not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is antichrist [cf. [1Jn_4:2](#) f.]; and whosoever shall not confess the testimony of the Cross, is of the devil; and whosoever shall perversely interpret the Oracles of the Lord (μεθοδεύη τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου) to his own lusts, and say that there is neither resurrection nor judgment, that man is the firstborn of Satan. Wherefore let us leave behind the vanity of the many ["vain and empty talk and the error of the many," ch. 2] and false teachings, and turn unto the message which was delivered unto us from the beginning....' (chs. 6-7). Here we get the idea of safety in close adherence to the injunctions (ἐντολαί) of Christ and His Apostles, or 'the message which was delivered' by them 'from the beginning,' in contrast to 'false teachings' by which 'the many' were apt, in love of empty talk, to be led into error, especially through perverse interpretations of 'the Oracles of the Lord.' The motive of such misinterpretation was Docetic denial of the reality of Christ's human body and of the significance of bodily self-control in the Christian, since 'there is neither resurrection nor judgment.' This comes out more clearly in Ignatius, for instance in the warning, 'Keep your flesh as a temple of God,' in his letter to Philadelphia, which lay less than 50 miles from Hierapolis, on the main road to the coast. This letter affords marked parallels to the situation implied in Papias' preface. Its central idea is that Christ Himself is the Christian's standard, his law of thought and conduct (κατὰ χριστομαθίαν, ch. viii.; cf. 'having Christ as law,' χριστόνομος, *ad Rom.* inscr.), and that all exegesis, even of the Scriptures, is to be tested by this criterion. Only Ignatius and Papias apply the supreme test differently. The former appeals straight to the notorious central facts of Christ's life and of Christian experience: 'His Cross and Death and Resurrection, and the faith that is through Him' (ch. 8). Papias essays the detailed task of supplying a standard exegesis of the Lord's own Great Sayings, in virtue of his special contact with authentic Apostolic tradition in Asia. The difference turns not only on the fact that the two men represent different types of Christian attitude, but also on their respective local traditions and

opportunities; and it does not point to any real difference in date between their writings.

The milder tone used by Papias towards the errors in question (which are largely similar, as we see from Polycarp, who is a link between Ignatius and Papias), as compared with both Ignatius and Polycarp, is against, the notion of a considerably later date for his *Exposition*. Indeed, it is hard, in the absence of any reference by Eusebius to Papias as engaged, like Ignatius, in refuting any deadly heresy, to believe that Papias was writing after Ignatius' polemic had sharpened, as it must have done, the Asian Churches' sense of the gravity of Docetism in Christianity. Its prevalence may, indeed, have led Papias to lay special emphasis on the realistic aspect of the millennium—a feature in which he was followed by Irenaeus and others, to Eusebius' keen regret. But his attitude to *gnosis* seems less severe than we should expect after a.d. 115.* [Note: Papias' very archaic use of οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, for the men of the first generation, particularly Christ's personal disciples, is another indication of early date. In Irenaeus this phrase always describes those of the second generation at least.]

3. Gospels known to Papias.—We have seen that Papias knew our Matthew and Mark. Eusebius tells us that he also used proof texts from 1 John, probably, e.g., the anti-Docetic 1Jn 4:2 f. cited by Polycarp as above; and this certainly suggests knowledge of the Fourth Gospel, of which there seem also to be traces in the fragments of Papias' *Exposition* as known to us (cf. also Westcott, *Canon* (1889), p. 71, n. [Note: note.] 2). Even the order in which he refers to Apostles by name in his preface is that of Joh 1:37 ff., while his reference to Christ as the Truth, and, as such, the Fountainhead of Divine precepts. (ἐντολαί), points the same way. Probably, however, he used the Johannine Gospel only as a secondary source of exegesis for the standard Matthaean collection of 'the Oracles'—as, in fact, a 'book,' and so less 'helpful' than direct oral tradition. In the *Argumentum* to John's Gospel in a 9th cent. MS., we read: 'The Gospel of John was revealed and given to the Churches...., even as Papias of Hierapolis, a dear disciple of John, has related in his five books.' His knowledge of Luke's Gospel is probable both in itself (cf. Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, p. 186) and in relation to a seeming knowledge of Acts, shown by his traditional amplification of the end of Judas as given in Act 1:18 f., which he apparently tried to harmonize with Matthew's account. But no doubt he preferred to cite Mt. where he could, as being to him a work of direct Apostolic authorship, while Luke's Gospel was not even, like Mark's, only one remove from an Apostle's witness.

Some not only see in the phraseology of Papias' apology for Mark's Gospel traces of the influence of Luk 1:1-4, but also infer that Papias is there meeting the criticism of a party in Asia who held to Luke's Gospel, if not exclusively (like Marcion later), yet in so preferential a way as to make it, and not our Matthew, the standard by which to

criticise Mark's work (so Dom Chapman in *Revue Bénédictine*, July 1905). This is more than dubious.

In a word, if our reading of the situation which Papias had in view in writing be correct, his attitude to our Gospels is just what we should expect from other sources that it would be, if he were writing in Asia about a.d. 115-120. At that time, not the form but the substance of Christ's teaching, whether oral or written, was still the prime matter. The Canon, or 'rule' of faith, consisted of the Lord's words, however obtained, if only it were in purity (cf. Polyc. *ad Philippians 2*, 'remembering what things the Lord said when teaching'). These constituted 'the Gospel' that lay behind the Gospels, and secured their general use, particularly in public worship—out of which canonical authority itself gradually grew (see B. Weiss, *Manual of Introd. to the NT* [1887], i. 32 ff.). This must be borne in mind in estimating the use of all New Testament books in early Christian writers, and makes the task of identifying Evangelic quotations so delicate an art (cf. Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century*, and *The NT in the Apostolic Fathers*, Oxford, 1905). But once it is allowed for, Papias becomes a valuable positive witness to our Canonical Gospels, as distinct from other Gospel writings which, no doubt, existed at that time in considerable numbers. Whether he used any apocryphal Gospel is quite doubtful. Eusebius' statement that 'he has set forth another story also about a woman informed against to the Lord on the score of many sins, which the Gospel according to the Hebrews includes,' by no means proves that Papias got his version of the story from the Gospel in question (cf. Baeon in *Expositor*, 1905, pp. 161-177).

4. General reflexions.—Although we are unable to conceive in detail the exact character of Papias' *Exposition of Oracles of the Lord*, even our meagre knowledge of it, especially when taken in connexion with other Christian writings of the period, helps us not a little to realize the way in which our Gospels, and Gospels generally, were viewed and handled early in the 2nd century. Both it and the Oxyrhynchus Gospel—fragments of which have been found by Grenfell and Hunt—teach us not only that Christ's sayings were the most prized part of the Gospel tradition, but also how strong were the tendencies at work making for change in their meaning and even wording. They were heard or read in environments of thought far other than those for which they were first spoken; and just because they were taken so seriously and practically as Divine 'oracles,' as religious laws of life, their historical or original meaning was apt to be lost as soon as they passed beyond Palestine, and the fresh meanings or glosses put upon them tended insensibly to replace the Master's *ipsissima verba*. Here the instances afforded by the Oxyrhynchus Gospel of how in all good faith such a process of transformation took place, are most suggestive. They show how needful something like a standard exegesis, based on knowledge of the original historical sense, was becoming to the genuine transmission of Christ's own teaching, if it was not to be sublimated away in terms of Greek idealism and Oriental

mysticism. Such a consummation was averted only by strenuous insistence on the part of the local Church leaders, that every care was to be taken to keep in touch with the historic meaning of the Lord's earthly teaching, as certified by Gospels historically known to be of Apostolic or *quasi*-Apostolic authorship, and expounded in the first instance by the aid of continuous local tradition going back to similar sources. Thus was the mass of Gospels once current in the 2nd cent.—and varying as between Syria and Rome, Asia Minor and Egypt—gradually sifted out; until by the close of the century, and a good deal earlier in some places, our four authentic Gospels emerged as the Church's standard, or Canon, of the Lord's own teaching and its true significance.

Literature.—The Fragments of Papias, and Patristic references to his book collected in Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers*, in one vol. (Macmillan, 1891), and (with a commentary) in Funk, *Patres Apostolici* (Tubingen, 1901), i. 346 ff.; Discussions by Weiffenbach, *Das Papiasfragment, u.s.w.*; Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, pp. 142-216; Sanday, *Gospels in the Second Century*; Westcott, *Canon of the NT*; Salmon in *Dict. of Christian Biography*; Zahn, *Gesch. d. NT Kanons*, i. 849 ff., *Forschungen*, vi. 109 ff.; Harnack, *Chronologie*, i. 658 ff.; Leimbach in *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] xiv. 642 ff.; Abbott, *Ebi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*] ii. 1809 ff., also *The Oracles ascribed to Matthew by Papias of Hierapolis* (1894), and A. Wright's review in *Some NT Problems* (1898), p. 265; R. W. Dale, *Living Christ and the Four Gospels*¹⁴ [Note: 4 designates the particular edition of the work referred] , ii. 277-306.

Vernon Bartlet.

▣ Parable

PARABLE

1. Definition and Classification.—The word 'parable' is an oft-recurring one in the Synoptic Gospels, appearing altogether 48 times. Otherwise it is found in the NT only in Heb_9:9; Heb_11:19 (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), where it has the meaning of 'type' or 'symbol' (Authorized Version 'figure'). The Evangelists use of it suggests that for them it was a technical term designating a certain form of discourse or method of teaching, and they report Jesus as employing it in like manner. It is always introduced as something well known, and nowhere denned. The readers are assumed to be as familiar with it as are the writers. This occasions no surprise, for we know that the term had long been current in the circle to which the Evangelists belonged,

appearing, as it does, often in the LXX Septuagint . The connexion between the NT usage and that of the LXX Septuagint is expressly pointed out by St. Matthew (Mat_13:35), who sees in Jesus' use of parables the fulfilment of Psa_78:2.

In the LXX Septuagint παραβολή serves frequently, though not uniformly, to translation the Heb. *mâshâl* (משל). The practice is sufficiently constant to warrant the assumption that it had much the same range of meaning. But, accepting this as true, we have made little progress in determining the exact significance of παραβολή, for as yet agreement has not been attained with reference to the definition of the Semitic original (משל, Aram. Aramaic מלתא). By some scholars the root is thought to mean primarily *to represent or stand for something* (so Fleischer; cf. Franz Delitzsch, *Com. zu Prov.*, Leipzig, 1873, p. 43 f.; Gesenius-Buhl, *HWB [Note: WB Handwörterbuch.]*; Bugge, *Die Haupt-Parabeln*, i. 20 f.); while others, following a different line of derivation, make the conception of *likeness or resemblance* to be fundamental (König in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible* iii. p. 661; cf. Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, i. p. 36 f.). An examination of the OT makes it evident that Hebrew writers employed the term in the broadest and most inclusive way. Allegory, similitude, parable, proverb, paradox, type, and even riddle could be so designated. Jülicher concludes (*op. cit.* i. p. 37) that the most that can be done in the way of definition is to say that in the OT *mâshâl* is a discourse expressing or implying comparison. The limitations thus suggested are, that it be a complete statement and not merely a word or phrase, and that it employ or rest on comparison.

The modern understanding of the word 'parable' has not as yet become well defined. One naturally expects this to follow the Greek conception, but in many definitions one finds a considerable infusion of the Semitic point of view. παραβολή (from παρά 'beside,' and βάλλειν 'to throw or cast') signifies literally *a placing beside*, and in ancient rhetoric designates an illustration or comparison. The fundamental idea is thus in agreement with that which is found by some in the Heb. *mâshâl*. Aristotle classes parable and fable together as means of indirect proof, more convenient and easier to use than historical example for one who is able to detect resemblances, but less effective.

That the Synoptists should entertain this narrower and more definite view of Greek and Roman writers is not to be anticipated. One expects to find in them rather the wider and more indefinite application of Semitic authors, and in this one is not disappointed. Proverb (Luk_4:23), paradox (Mar_7:17), similitude (Mar_4:30), allegory (Mar_4:13), and example or illustrative instance (Luk_12:16) are so named. The word appears with sufficient frequency to make evident its wide application. This does not

prove, of course, that in the NT it has a meaning identical with that which it bears in the OT. It is Jülicher's view that a new element entered in during the period of the Jewish-Hellenistic literature. Besides being a complete thought and expressing or implying comparison, the parable is now understood to veil a hidden meaning. The real teaching is not in what the words seem to say, but in their deeper import. We shall have occasion to return to this topic after reviewing the range of the parabolic material.

It is not to be assumed that the Synoptists have prefixed a title to all the sections that they regarded as παραβολαί. On the contrary, they have done so only incidentally as occasion required, since they had no particular interest in rhetorical categories. In Mk. the word παραβολή is found 13 times, with reference to 6 different sections; 17 times in Mt., with reference to 12 sections; and 18 times in Lk., with reference to 13 sections. It is not used in Jn., but παροιμία occurs with much the same meaning. Deducting parallels, there are 20 passages in the Synoptic Gospels that are spoken of as parables. How far short this comes of full enumeration is made evident by noting the number of parables recognized by modern expositors: e.g. van Koetsveld, 79 (including Jn.); Bugge, 71; Weinel, 59; Jülicher, 53; Heinrici, 39; Lisco, 37; Bruce, 33, and 8 parable germs.

This divergence of opinion makes it evident that it is not easy to determine the precise extent of the parabolic material. Nor is it easy to discover a satisfactory principle for classifying it. This has been attempted from various points of view. Some have sought to make the truth taught a standard for grouping. So Bruce distinguishes (1) Theoretic parables, or those embodying a general teaching regarding the Kingdom of God; (2) the parables of Grace; (3) the parables of Judgment. Others have made the realm from which the illustration was taken the criterion of division. More satisfactory results are obtained by paying heed to the form of the parable, that is, to the character of the illustration and the manner of its introduction. From this point of view a large portion of the material falls within one general division. To this belong all the sections in which a spiritual or moral truth is established or enforced by the use of an express or implicit comparison. An appeal is made to common experience, to what is recognized and accepted by all, in support of less evident truths pertaining to a higher realm. The tacit assumption is that the same laws are valid for moral and religious as for daily practical life. If assent is yielded without hesitation in the one case, it cannot be withheld in the other.

At times the comparison is expressly made by some formula, or by some word or particle (e.g. ὅμοιον, ὡσπερ, or ὡς). Attention is in this way directed to the resemblance between two distinct relationships. The writer makes his readers aware

that a concrete experience is being used to teach some moral or spiritual lesson. Parables of this kind have been happily called **Similitudes**. The passage regarding the Fig-tree, found in all the Gospels (Mar_13:28 f., Mat_24:32 f., Luk_21:29 f.), and designated in them all as a parable, is a good example. 'Now from the fig-tree learn her parable: when her branch is now become tender and putteth forth its leaves, ye know that the summer is nigh; even so ye also, when ye see these things coming to pass, know that it is nigh, even at the doors.' All the dwellers in Palestine knew that the bursting buds and tender shoots of the fig-tree gave unmistakable indication that summer was at hand. The application is that the nearness of the Parousia can with equal certainty be inferred from the signs that immediately precede its coming. There is here no thought of the resemblance of details, as, for example, between summer and the Parousia; but in both instances it is pointed out that with equal certainty, from the signs of the coming, the nearness of the coming itself can be inferred. The likeness is one of relationships and not of details. In the pair of parables of the Hidden Treasure and the Pearl of Great Price we have two illustrations of like character to enforce the one truth, that to gain a possession of greatest value no sacrifice is too great. The Synoptic records afford evidence that not infrequently Jesus thus employed a double illustration. The attempt to discover resemblances between the Kingdom of heaven and the treasure or the pearl may be homiletically admissible, but it is exegetically beside the mark. Equally irrelevant are the ethical discussions regarding the conduct of the man who found the treasure. Jesus no more approves the quality of his act than He does that of the younger brother, or that of the unjust steward.

The following inferences regarding the character of a *Similitude* are possible in view of what has been said: (1) Fundamentally it is a comparison. Often this is expressly indicated, as above. (2) It is a comparison of relationships and not of details. There may chance to be some suggestive resemblance in details, but this is immaterial to the real purpose of the illustration. (3) In each Similitude there is one main comparison and one application, one truth that is unfolded. (4) Since there are two parts, the statement needing proof and the illustration supplying this, it is wrong, as is often done, to speak of the illustration alone as the Similitude. (5) The purpose of the Similitude is manifestly to elucidate or to prove, to win assent for what is unfamiliar by an appeal to what is well known.

A group of passages of lesser extent than the one just considered makes a like use of sayings which were apparently proverbial. Luk_4:23 is an instance of this: 'And he said unto them, Doubtless ye will say unto me this parable, Physician, heal thyself: whatsoever we have heard done at Capernaum, do also here in thine own country.' Jesus, conduct is likened to that of the physician in question. The proverb by itself does not constitute the parable, but the proverb used as an illustration. Since such proverbs are the concise and pointed formulations of the truths of common

experience, we need not differentiate these parables from those last discussed—no further, at least, than to make them a subdivision of the Similitudes. Besides the passage quoted, others, such as Mat 5:14 b, Mat 6:24 (Luk 16:13) Luk 15:14 (Luk 6:39) Luk 24:28 (Luk 17:37), Mar 2:17 (Mat 9:12 f., Luk 5:13 f.), would be included.

Often the illustration from experience is not stated as a general inference, recognized always and by all, but is embodied in the form of a specific incident, in what was done by some person or persons, or in what happened to them. Thus Luk 15:11-32 begins, 'A certain man had two sons,' and Mar 4:3-9 'Behold, the sower went forth to sow.' In purpose and in the way the illustration is employed there is close resemblance between this group and the Similitudes. The difference is mainly in the definiteness of the experience. Here it is presented as a single occurrence. It may still be, and no doubt usually is, wholly imaginary. All that is required is a degree of naturalness and probability sufficient to command unhesitating assent. Such a story, formed by the imagination from the material of actual experience, might be classed as a **Fable**, had not this name gained in the course of time a restricted meaning. By many writers it is looked upon as applicable only to the small group of animal fables in which the main actors are animals or inanimate objects. Since such stories often serve merely to entertain or to teach worldly prudence and discretion, the difference between parable and fable is made by some to consist in the kind of truth enforced. The latter is restricted to the lower realm of worldly knowledge, while the former is assigned to the service of the higher truths of morality and religion. We need not further discuss the distinction, because fable has become exclusively associated in most minds with the type of teaching attributed to aesop. To connect it with any of the discourses of Jesus would occasion misunderstanding. Jülicher's proposal is to retain for this group the name *Parable* in its narrower meaning. Until a better designation is found, it will be well to accept this.

The Gospel of Lk. contains at least four sections differing in character from any previously considered. They have the narrative form, but the illustration is taken, not from a different realm, but from that to which the truth under discussion belongs. A specific instance wherein this is exemplified is recited to win the approval or call forth the disapprobation of the hearer. The application is made, not through analogy, not by some word expressing likeness or resemblance, but by simple affirmation: 'So is it' or 'so should it not be.' The Good Samaritan (Luk 10:30-37), the Foolish Rich Man (Luk 12:16-20), the Rich Man and Lazarus (Luk 16:19-31), and the Pharisee and the Publican (Luk 18:9-14) belong to this group. Possibly, as Heinrici suggests (*PRE [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologic und Kirche.]*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , vi. 692), we ought also to add the accounts of the Importunate Friend (Luk 11:5 ff.), and the Unjust Judge (Luk 18:1 ff.), since the lesson is gained in these instances by reasoning *a minori ad majus*. It is

often difficult, as here, to determine to which division a given section may be most properly assigned. Comparison enters into this class only through the demand made upon the listener to test his life and conduct by that depicted in the story. The abstract truth is commended to him in concrete form. We might call such illustrations, which stand apart from the groups previously enumerated, *Narrative Examples*, or perhaps it will be better to term them, with Jülicher, *Illustrative Instances*.

On the basis of the reference in Mar 7:17 (Mat 15:15) it has been proposed (cf. Bugge, *op. cit.* i. pp. 59, 15, and 16) to regard the **Paradox** as a class of parable. That the name might be so applied may, in the light of Semitic usage, be assumed as probable, though there is wide difference of view regarding this particular passage in Mk. and Mt. Expositors have not, however, generally made paradoxes a distinct group in their treatment of the parables.

It now remains to ask whether there is another class of passages that should be brought together under the head of **Allegory**. This question has recently been much discussed, and opinion is still widely divided. It is variously affirmed that, even according to the Synoptists, Jesus never spoke in allegories (Weinel, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu*, p. 30); or that He is mistakenly reported by them as so doing (Jülicher, *op. cit.* i. 61 ff. etc.); or that He did make use of allegories, and is correctly reported in this respect (Bugge, *op. cit.* i. 40 ff. etc.). *Allegory* (ἀλληγορία, ἀλληγορεῖν) comes from ἄλλο, 'other,' 'something else,' and ἄγορεύειν, 'to speak.' The word occurs as a substantive nowhere in the NT or in Biblical Greek, nor does the verb appear except in Gal 4:24, where St. Paul makes use of the participle ἀλληγορούμενος. It is a mode of speech whereby one thing is ostensibly described or narrated, while the primary reference is to something very different. It is thus closely akin to the metaphor (wh. see), differing from it in consisting not of a single word or concept, but of a series of concepts belonging to the same realm, and so related as to form together a continuous and intelligible narrative. Since the several details are introduced, not because they are the component parts of a vivid and artistic picture, but because of their suitability to portray the desired meaning, the best of allegories are marked by some degree of artificiality and incongruity. The attentive listener is made aware that the story is being told to convey some deeper meaning and not for its own sake. Often it will be impossible for him to determine what this is until the allegory has been wholly or in part interpreted. In other instances the setting in which it occurs may afford the needed clue. To understand it fully, he must be able to translate the terms one by one and read their hidden meaning. Naturally no one but the framer of the allegory can be his infallible guide in this. In the similitude and parable we do not feel the need of seeking for any meaning beyond that which the words usually bear, whereas in the allegory the deeper, hidden significance is of first importance. Are

there sections in the Gospels of which this is true? It seems to be, to some degree, in at least five. Three are in the Synoptic Gospels, namely, the accounts of the Sower (Mar 4:3-9; Mar 4:14-20, Mat 13:3-9; Mat 13:18-23, Luk 8:5-8; Luk 8:11-15), of the Wicked Husbandmen (Mar 12:1-12, Mat 21:33-46, Luk 20:9-19), and of the Tares (Mat 13:24-30; Mat 13:36-43): and two are from the Fourth Gospel, the Door of the Sheepfold (Joh 10:1-16), and the Vine and the Branches (Joh 15:1-8). In each of these, except the Wicked Husbandmen, an allegorical interpretation is expressly added, while in this latter the setting, the comments, as well as the character of the narration, suggest an allegory. According to the definition given above, none of the five passages can be regarded as a perfect and fully developed allegory, because each has unimportant details that are not, and clearly were not intended to be, interpreted. They are introduced as natural parts of the picture, without reference to a hidden meaning. For instance, in the Sower no deeper meaning attaches to the way, the thirty, sixty, and hundredfold, as would be the case in a carefully developed allegory. The Wicked Husbandmen and the Tares are better examples of allegory; but even in these there are several features without allegorical significance. The passages in the Fourth Gospel differ quite markedly from those in the Synoptics. The literal and the figurative are blended in such an unusual way that it has not been possible for commentators to agree in their classification. In ch. 10, following the first interpretation (Joh 10:7-10) comes a second (Joh 10:11-16), which seems to presuppose a closely related but really different allegory. Or we can regard these last verses as a new allegory with continuous interpretation. The discourse of ch. 15 is of exactly the same type; parallel to 'I am the good shepherd' we there have 'I am the true vine.' Besides lacking the unity that usually marks the allegory, these Johannine sections contain many terms that have no significance beyond that belonging to them in ordinary speech. It seems, nevertheless, more correct to class them as allegories than to call them parables with an allegorical interpretation, or collections of related metaphors.

In addition to these passages there are numerous others where little doubt can exist that the Evangelists understood some details allegorically, for they suggest, even if they do not give, such an interpretation. By way of illustration the reference to the whole and the sick (Mar 2:17) may be cited, so also the taking away of the bridegroom (Mar 2:20), and the blind who lead the blind (Mat 15:14, Luk 6:39). Jülicher maintains that they looked on all parables as allegories. They have given, it is true, few allegorical interpretations, and have not often indicated that they felt such treatment necessary, but this is only because their practice is not in accord with their theory. Whenever they reflect (as they do in Mar 4:10-12; Mar 4:33-34 || Mat 13:10 to Mat 15:34 ff., Luk 8:9-10), they think of parables as always veiling a hidden meaning, one hard to be understood and intelligible to the disciples themselves only after interpretation. This conception, as was stated above, is not held to be their own creation, but is thought to be one that came to them from the age of the

Jewish-Hellenistic literature. It was the product of scribal activity. Such an explanation is open to serious question. It may be doubted whether existing evidence proves that the notion of mystery belonged so exclusively to this later period. It is true that with the decadence of prophecy men looked for the message of God in what had been said rather than in what was being said, and that the allegorical method of exegesis was assiduously cultivated. It may also be true that the Gospels indicate that, at the time when the Evangelists wrote, the words of Jesus received to some extent like treatment; but that it went to the length that this theory supposes is not attested. Such a claim could be more reasonably made for the Church Fathers and the interpreters of later generations. From post-Apostolic days even down to the present the prevailing method of exegesis has been allegorical. (On its prevalence in Alexandrian and Palestinian circles before and after Christ, see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Allegory,' i. p. 64). Representatives (e.g. Chrysostom, Calvin, Maldonatus) of sounder interpretation have not been altogether wanting, but they have been little heeded. There is no parable or detail of a parable that has not received many and conflicting interpretations. The judge of Luk 18:2, for example, according to some stands for God, and according to others for the devil. Elsewhere results are no less incongruous (e.g. Mat 24:28, Luk 17:37; Mat 24:43 f., Luk 12:39 f.; Luk 11:5-8). So great was the contradiction, that in the 17th cent. the thesis was proposed that parables should not be used as a source of doctrine, but only to illustrate and confirm what was otherwise established ('theologia parabolica non est argumentativa,' cf. Jülicher, *op. cit.* i. p. 277). The form of the disciples' question (Mar 4:10 f., cf. Mar 4:33-34) might at first incline us to agree that the Church Fathers were but following the Synoptists, were it not that so many parables are recorded without even suggestion that they need interpretation. Jülicher finds it *a priori* improbable that a popular teacher, who expressed himself without any considerable deliberation or preparation, should employ such a highly artificial, rhetorical form as the allegory. This tends to veil rather than to reveal, and belongs to the writer rather than to the speaker. He concedes that Jesus may on occasion have made metaphorical or allegorical application of certain suggestive details of some parable, but finds little or no evidence of His having done so. Everything indicates, rather, that all the passages to which we have alluded derive their allegorical features and interpretations from the writers. Originally, as spoken by Jesus, the Synoptic accounts were parables in the narrower meaning of the term.

This extreme position of Professor Jülicher has been opposed by many, and unqualifiedly approved by few. Admitting the proclivity of Jesus' hearers, by reason of their traditions, to give an allegorical interpretation to many details, admitting that this might be increasingly done as men recalled these discourses and reflected on their import and sought to apply them to existing conditions, still to deny to Jesus all allegorical application of details and restrict Him to simple comparison, is unwarranted. If along with comparison (e.g. Mat 23:37 [Luk 13:34] Mat 10:16

[Luk 10:3], Luk 10:18) He made frequent use of metaphor, as the Gospels indicate (e.g. Mar 5:34; Mar 10:21 [Mat 19:21, Luk 18:22] Mat 12:40 [Luk 20:47]), and if He expanded comparison into parable, is it unwarrantable to assume that occasionally metaphor might be so extended as to become virtually an allegory? As long as such an interpretation of suggestive particulars contributes in a natural way to the enforcement of the main lesson, it cannot be considered irrelevant or artificial. Weinel has pointed out (*Die Bildersprache Jesu in ihrer Bedeutung für die Erforschung seines inneren Lebens*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1906) that in its psychological origin the parable is closely akin to the allegory. It springs often from some suggestive analogy of detail which might well be made evident in the progress of the discourse. Such an assumption does not, to be sure, account for all the allegorical features that a sound exegesis will discover in the Gospels, but it enables us to understand how Jesus may, in the case of some parables, have added an application distinctly allegorical, as, for example, in the account of the Sower. And if He wished to address to His enemies such thoughts as are contained in the Wicked Husbandmen, could they have been more suitably presented? The great service of Jülicher and of B. Weiss before him in effectually discrediting false methods of interpretation and establishing true, can hardly receive too great recognition. But past extravagances and present danger of their perpetuation do not furnish adequate reason for denying to Jesus the use of allegory, or of parables so developed as to be hardly distinguishable therefrom. We accordingly admit allegory as a division of our classification.

2. Purpose.—Why did Jesus make use of parables? It would occur to hardly any reader of the Gospels to-day to be in doubt as to their purpose, were it not for the statements of the Synoptists. Parables have been used by teachers of all ages to unfold and enforce their instruction. Was it otherwise with Jesus? Is it otherwise, for example, in His use of the story of the Prodigal Son? The passage which occasions the perplexity is as follows: ‘And when he was alone, they that were about him with the twelve asked of him the parables. And he said unto them, Unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all things are done in parables: that [*ἵνα*] seeing they may see, and not perceive, and hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest haply they should turn again, and it should be forgiven them. And he saith unto them, Know ye not this parable? and how shall ye know all the parables?... And with many such parables spake he the word unto them, as they were able to hear it. And without a parable spake he not unto them: but privately to his own disciples he expounded all things’ (Mar 4:10-12; Mar 4:33-34, cf. Mat 13:10 ff., Mat 13:34 ff., Luk 8:9 ff.). These words are beset with difficulty from any point of view. Taken by themselves they affirm that parables lead to the hardening of men’s hearts, and were intended so to do. Notwithstanding differences in statement, all three accounts are in substantial agreement as to this. It is instinctively felt,

however, that Jesus could not possibly have entertained a purpose so at variance with the spirit of His whole ministry. He went forth to seek and to save that which was lost. To win, not to harden; to enlighten, not to mystify, was ever His endeavour. Otherwise, why should He express surprise at the failure of His hearers to comprehend His parables? Why should He exhort them to hear? Can we think that He would mock at their helplessness? Why should He speak to His own disciples as well as to the multitude in parables which they could not understand without interpretation? Does not the parable of the Sower, to which these words are joined, imply an understanding on the part of all classes, even though all do not alike heed and profit by what is heard? It is evident that the statements cannot be attributed to Jesus in their most obvious meaning. While this is generally conceded, there is disagreement as to how they are to be qualified and the extent to which this should be done. A few have resorted to text emendation for the removal of the difficulties, but most have preferred to keep the form and seek for a new interpretation. Some expositors suppose that the truths needful for salvation were not presented after this manner, but in a way intelligible to all. What is here said refers only to parables dealing with the mysteries of the nature of the Kingdom of heaven, or the one mystery of its gradual development. Or this reference is limited to the parables of this chapter, or to the parables of Judgment. Such teaching, being suited only to those who are already disciples, is so conveyed that they alone receive it, while outsiders hear without understanding. The improbability and unnaturalness of such a supposition are too apparent to need refutation. The harshness of the view is softened by assuming that the unreceptive and unworthy multitude already stood self-condemned because of their rejection of the message of salvation. Teaching in parables is part of their just punishment, and serves also to keep the door open for those who may become receptive. Another way of removing the harshness is to say that the parable, while executing God's judgment, was at the same time a merciful provision, preventing an increase of guilt. Had the unreceptive understood what was taught in these parables regarding Jesus and themselves, or had it been spoken openly, they would have added to existing sins those of hate and blasphemy, and fallen into a passion, making all hearing impossible for themselves and others.

A different explanation is proposed by those who see here the enunciation of a pedagogical purpose. No class of hearers, not even the disciples, can understand the truth so presented, but the receptive will reveal themselves by their questions as to the meaning of the parable, while the unreceptive remain indifferent, and thereby make clear the hopelessness of their condition. Plain speech would have been equally unintelligible to such hearers, whereas the parable was calculated to quicken in them a spirit of inquiry, if anything could. This, again, is a very improbable supposition. Another interpretation sees in these words a reference not to intellectual comprehension, but to the inner spiritual appropriation of the truth set forth. Jesus seeks for this on the part of all, but finds it wanting in those who were dulled and

hardened in their short-sighted self-righteousness and superficial self-satisfaction. Their hearing is as though they heard not. The parables are thus a summons to the conscience of the hearer, and bring about a separation between the receptive and the unreceptive.

Professor Jülicher, together with other recent writers, accepts the verses in their most obvious meaning, but assigns them to the Evangelists. When Jesus' words were collected after His death, the large proportion of parabolic material attracted attention. An explanation was sought, and it was found in the character of those to whom the parables were addressed, and in their attitude toward Jesus. The multitude had not accepted Him as the Messiah. What had happened must have been in accord with the Divine plan. This plan had been fulfilled through the use of parables. Paul's teaching in Romans 9-11 is here applied by the Evangelists to the history of Jesus. J. Weiss, indeed, holds that Mk. was acquainted with Romans, and followed St. Paul (*Die Schriften des NT*, i. p. 101). Whatever may be thought as to the dependence, the likeness of conception is obvious.

This explanation has in its favour a full and frank recognition of the difficulty as well as the avoidance of forced and unnatural interpretation. Many who think that the passage goes back to Jesus admit that the Evangelists in their report have been in some measure influenced by the hostility and opposition of unbelieving Israel, so pronounced at the time when they wrote. The explanation gains added support from the fact that the existing difficulty is not confined to the words of Jesus, but is occasioned in part by the appended comments of the Evangelists. Still, it cannot yet lay just claim to the validity of a demonstration. That the Evangelists should feel the need of accounting for the large proportion of parabolic material in Jesus' teaching is not obvious. The proportion in Mk., with whom we have primarily to do, is not striking. We should need to postulate, what many deny, his acquaintance with the Logia. Again, if the Evangelists evolved this whole conception, it is certainly strange that they should make so little use of it. Writers are not wont thus to forget or neglect their own pet hypotheses, as Mk. apparently did, even in the course of ch. 4. Could he fail to notice, too, how his theory was contradicted by the readiness with which Jesus' hearers understood the account of the Wicked Husbandmen? With all their freedom in transmitting Jesus' words, is it probable that the writers would venture upon an entirely new creation of this kind at so late a date?

There is greater likelihood that we have to do in this passage with a saying of Jesus that, in the course of time, has been modified, or received a false emphasis. At what stage of the development of the Gospels the change took place we cannot be certain. The lack of responsiveness on the part of His hearers and the growing opposition of which we learn in the Gospels, may have caused Jesus to apply to His ministry the words of the prophet Isaiah ([Isa 6:9](#) f.). The outcome of His mission might appear, on

first thought, to be a repetition of this experience; but a deeper insight revealed as true what the parables of this chapter (Mark 4) teach. The despair of the prophet's words receives its answer. That it was the Evangelists who first brought this OT quotation into such connexion can be doubted, though we can no longer be certain of its exact application, and though the text does not seem here to be in order. If Jesus used the words ironically, they might be cherished by the Christians of the later days of conflict as a statement of the Divine purpose. There is, in any case, too much contradictory evidence to admit of our receiving them as the deliberate statement of Jesus' intention.

3. Interpretation.—In what sense is it permissible to speak of the interpretation of a parable? If we mean thereby an allegory, the need of translating its terms into their equivalents is evident. This will be required by the hearer in more or less fulness, according to circumstances. The statements of the Synoptists (Mar 4:10-13; Mar 4:33-34 ||) are then comprehensible so far as they may refer to allegories, but can the same be claimed if the remaining parabolic material is likewise included? By some it is said that it can be for the narrative parables, or parables in the restricted meaning of the term. Similitude and Illustrative Instance are excepted, as necessarily clear from the way in which they are introduced, but narrative parables, being complete and independent accounts, require interpretation. The hearer is as little aware of their real significance as was David when listening to Nathan's story of the poor man and his lamb (2Sa 12:1 ff.). This view evidently represents Jesus as wont to relate incidents that had no apparent connexion with what was being said or done, and then to add an application, as the moral is appended to the fable. One, for instance, who heard about the Treasure in the field (Mat 13:44), or the Two Debtors (Luk 7:36-50), would have no reason to think of the Kingdom of heaven, or the duties of the sons of the Kingdom, until it was demanded by the application. The Gospels are not responsible for this theory, for they do not give the impression that Jesus kept His hearers in suspense. Either an explicit statement, as in the first example, or the occasion, as in the second, left commonly no doubt as to the topic under discussion. Furthermore, there seems to be no good reason for making such a distinction between this group of parables and the Similitudes and Illustrative Examples. Two parts are here essential to constitute a parable, the illustration and the truth illustrated. That the illustration appears in a slightly modified form does not involve a change in the parable's essential character. And can we suppose that Jesus ever told the people one story, or a series of stories, and withheld all indication of His purpose? What could be expected to result therefrom beyond a little entertainment? And even this would be of short duration, unless the stories were longer than most of our parables. How can we harmonize the fact that the parables, as they now stand, set forth in unparalleled clearness and beauty the deepest truths of the gospel, with the assumption that they were used by Jesus as a means of punishing the unrepentant by hiding the truth?

It is not improbable that oftentimes the illustrative half of a parable alone was preserved by tradition. In such cases we can speak of interpretation if we mean thereby the discovery of the original setting and application, whether this service is performed by the Evangelists or undertaken by their interpreters. Such an understanding of the term is, however, misleading, as it obviously does not represent the thought of Mark 4 and parallels. The demand of these passages is satisfied only when we assume that interpretation means an unfolding of details such as is provided for the story of the Sower. This would not be required for all parabolic material, but only for those parables that were considered to be allegories. We have found above that it is not easy to decide how many were included by the Synoptists in such a point of view. *A priori* considerations or ingenious conjecture cannot decide the question, but only the internal evidence discovered by detailed exegetical study.

4. Transmission and Value.—Have the Evangelists rightly understood and faithfully reported Jesus' parables? Had the tradition, upon which they were dependent, preserved an exact recollection of His words and their application? The parables were quite certainly spoken originally in Aramaic, and many of them, after being preserved for a time by oral tradition, may have first been written down in this same language. But even if the bulk of them were first written in Greek, we should, of course, still possess them only in translation. The possibility of modification accordingly exists, even if an earnest endeavour at historical accuracy, as we conceive of it, could be postulated. A comparison of the records of even the shortest parable appearing in all the Gospels, or in two of them, reveals many variations. While the major part are trifling, others may affect materially the meaning and structure of the parable. In the description of patching the old garment, for instance (Mar 2:21, Mat 9:16, Luk 5:36), the casual reader of the English notes the striking variation in Luke. The defenders of the validity of the several accounts in all their details have been wont to explain the divergences by advancing the hypothesis of the use of the same parable on different occasions. In some parables common to Mt. and Lk. such a view may be advocated with a show of reason, but when these two Gospels are following Mk. it has little support. There are parables, furthermore, like the one just noted and the Sower and the Wicked Husbandmen, that are spoken under conditions and with applications so much alike and at the same time so peculiar as to exclude any thought of repetition. The differences in the accounts of the Evangelists are unquestionable, and they leave the interpreter no choice. He must seek to ascertain the original form of the parable. If we say that these differences existed in the sources, we simply carry the problem back to an earlier stage and contribute nothing to its solution; and even then the personal equation of the Evangelist enters in, through the choice and arrangement of the details of his narrative. When we observe Mt.'s tendency to group material, revealed in so many connexions, we can but conclude that this purpose, rather than special knowledge of the occasion, has often determined the setting of his parables. A comparative study shows that each of the Synoptists has peculiarities which reveal

themselves in his report. Lk.'s interest in the individual and his love of the beautiful are as noticeable as Mt.'s regard for the OT and discovery of allegorical meanings.

If the existing evidence proves that Jesus' words were not at first treated as unalterably holy, it does not, on the other hand, show that there was such freedom as to cast doubt on all His reported sayings, or justify giving them a value secondary to that of the narrative portions of the Gospels. Notwithstanding differences, the Synoptists show such essential agreement that we feel little doubt regarding most parables. The wonder is that there should be so little divergence, even though so short a period separated our records and their Aramaic sources from the original utterances. It can be urged in explanation that Jesus' teaching was too well remembered to admit of the incorporation of new creations. What He had said became early a precious heritage for all believers, and, besides, the parables are of a character to make them especially well remembered. Their freshness, beauty, and earnestness attest their originality and faithful transmission, as does also, in a special degree, their suitability to explain and enforce the teaching in whose service they are employed. That they can be so varied and at the same time so simple, excites wonder. One turns from Rabbinical literature to the parables of Jesus with an increased appreciation of their literary excellence, to say nothing of the marked contrast in dignity and grandeur of theme. Nor is there any writer of early Christian literature worthy of a place in this field beside the Master. An observation of the details and relationships of common life and an appreciation of their significance is revealed that is unparalleled. We gain an insight into the inner life of Jesus Himself, as well as into His teaching, that is afforded by hardly any other portions of the Gospels. The parables are rightly regarded as a most valuable part of the Evangelical tradition, and they will so continue when their right to be heard in their simplicity is generally recognized.

Literature.—The most important work of recent date on the Parables and their exposition is A. Jülicher's *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, Freiburg, 1899. See also C. A. Bugge, *Die Haupt-Parabeln Jesu*, Giessen, 1903; Heinrich Weinel, *Die Bildersprache Jesu in ihrer Bedeutung für die Erforschung seines inneren Lebens*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , Giessen, 1906; 'Die Gleichnisse Jesu, zugleich eine Anleitung zu einem quellenmässigen Verständnis der Evangelien,' Leipzig, 1904 [a volume of the series *Aus Natur und Geisteswelt*]; Paul Fiebig, *Alt-jüdische Gleichnisse und die Gleichnisse Jesu*, Tübingen u. Leipzig, 1904; S. Goebel, *Die Parabeln Jesu methodisch ausgelegt*, Gotha, 1879-80 [English translation (Edin. 1883) *The Parables of Jesus*]; A. B. Bruce, *The Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, London, 1882; F. L. Steinmeyer, *Die Parabeln des Herrn*, Berlin, 1884; R. Winterbotham, *The Kingdom of Heaven* (1898); A. L. Lilley, *Adventus Regni* (1907); artt. in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , the *Ebi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*] ,

and the *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologic und Kirche.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , vol. vi. pp. 688-703 (Heinrici); *Commentaries on the Gospels, and Lives of Christ.* For further literature, see Jülicher, *op. cit.* i. pp. 203-322.

W. J. Moulton.

☩ Paraclete

PARACLETE (παράκλητος).—The term is used only in (Revised Version margin) ; and is applied to Christ in 1Jn_2:1, and to the Holy Spirit in Joh_14:16; Joh_14:26; Joh_15:26; Joh_16:7. For an examination of the Greek word and its cognates, see 'Paraclete' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. 665 ff., also art. Advocate in present work. A passive meaning, 'called to one's help,' is required by both the form and the classical usage, in which generally the word is technical, and denotes the adviser of a defendant, or his representative and counsel in a court of law. Gradually the two ideas of previous engagement by a client and of action only in the court or presence of a judge fall away, and the word comes to denote one who, in something of a representative character, carries on the cause and promotes the interest of another.

In Philo the process of the widening of the meaning of the word, used by him sometimes in a technical and sometimes in a more general sense, may almost be traced (cf. Hatch, *Essays in Bibl. Greek*, 1889, 82 f.), without the assumption of any Johannine dependence upon Philo. In the Talm. [Note: Talmud.] and Targ. [Note: Targum.] the word is transliterated פִּרְקֵלִיט or פִּרְקֵלִיטָא. In the Targ. [Note: Targum.] at Job_33:23 מִלִּיץ is rendered 'paraclete,' the idea being apparently that a special agency from God is needed 'to show unto man what is right,' and so produce repentance. *Pirke Aboth*, iv. 15, represents obedience to a single precept of the Law as a man's paraclete, averting punishment from him. In *Shabb.* 32a, the technical use of the word occurs, and the passage proceeds to assert that repentance and good works act in a similar way as paracletes for a man, ensuring his salvation. Similarly *Baba Bathra*, 10a, makes all acts of charity and benevolence paracletes between Israel and the Father in heaven. The two daily offerings and the sin-offering (*Zebahim*, 7b) are paracletes, interceding for man and securing the favour of the King. In Talmudic times, consequently, the process of change had been carried so far that the word was capable of an impersonal use, and even the plants of Succoth might be spoken of as paracletes, praying in man's behalf for rain (*Ta'anith*, i. 63c). An

earlier stage is occupied by the Johannine writings, where the word is still personal, though the strictly passive sense had already gone, and the judicial suggestiveness was disappearing.

A Babylonian origin has been claimed for the doctrine of the Paraclete on such grounds as that Nusku is persuaded by Ea and Marduk to join in the intervention against the revolted evil genii. But Nusku was only a messenger of Bel (Jensen, *ZA [Note: A Zeitschrift für Assyriologie.]* xi. 29; Jastrow, *Rel. of Bab. [Note: Babylonian.]* 220 f.); and though he continued for some time to be known to the northern Semites (cf. the Nêrab inscr. in Cooke, *North-Semitic Inscr.* 186 ff.), his assumed functions differed generally from those of a paraclete, and entirely from those referred to in the Fourth Gospel. The term is certainly not Babylonian in its origin; and preparations for its NT use may be found not only in Philo and the Targums, but even in Psa_34:7 and Job_33:23, though neither Jesus nor the author of the Johannine literature needed such preparations. Both had sufficient literary faculty to be able to pass without guidance from the literal to a metonymous sense of a word, and to place it appropriately amid new connexions.

The term is applied both to Christ Himself and to the Holy Spirit in meanings that may be classified. Christ is referred to as a Paraclete in two passages. 1. During His historic manifestation (cf. 'another' in Joh_14:16) He acted in two ways concurrently upon men, promoting the interests of God. Immanently He was in them 'the light which lighteth every man' (Joh_1:9); and objectively He brought to bear upon them from without the influence of His example and teaching. It is in the latter sphere that His provisional work as Paraclete, agent for God amongst men, is to be found. Evidently He regarded it as less permanently valuable for man than the indwelling life, which the coming of the Spirit would enrich, securing thus the control and the development of the regenerate heart from within; and hence He could say, 'It is expedient for you that I go away' (Joh_16:7). 2. Since Pentecost, Christ acts as Paraclete for man with God (1Jn_2:1). In His immanence He represents all, as His propitiation avails for all; but specifically His immanental union with believers is made more effective by their attitude of consent and devotion, and He carries on their cause with the Father, covering their sins and acting personally in their behalf (cf. Heb_7:25, Rom_8:34, Luk_22:32; Luk_23:34, Joh_17:24).

On the other hand, the Spirit is the Paraclete of God with and in man, sent to carry on His cause and to make perfect the surrender to Him and the service of His people. The term 'sent' is used officially of the Spirit, as of the Incarnate in regard to His historical manifestation. The distinction must not be unduly pressed; but the Paraclete's work in the hearts of the disciples themselves is the prominent assurance of Joh_14:16; Joh_14:26, His work through them on the world that of Joh_16:7 ff.,

whilst Joh 15:26 f. is intermediate, and combines the qualifying grace with the incitement to witness.

The Paraclete is not mentioned by that name elsewhere in the Gospels; but His functions as such are referred to not only in the intimate conversation on the evening of the betrayal, but in such preparatory words as Joh 1:33; Joh 7:38 f. And though the word is Johannine, the teaching has its parallels in the Synoptics (Mat 10:20, Mar 13:11, Luk 11:13; Luk 12:12; Luk 24:49); and the general idea which our Lord, according to the testimony of all the Evangelists, sought to communicate and to expand, seems to have been that since He could no longer remain in the flesh to promote the cause of God in His disciples, He would act in heaven as their representative with the Father, and the Holy Spirit would come to dwell in them and to further whatever tended to their perfection and to God's glory.

Literature.—To the works cited in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. 668, add Wellton, *Revelation of the Holy Spirit*, 107 ff.; G. G. Findlay in *Exp. Times*, xii. (1901) 445; and Jastrow, *Dict. of Targ. [Note: Targum.]* etc., s.v. פְּרוּקִיט.

R. W. Moss.

☞ Paradise

PARADISE.—The word is a Persian one, and was adopted by the Hebrews from the mildest and most benevolent of their conquerors. Like most words with sufficient impetus to find their way into another language, it brings with it something of the character of the race from which it comes. It means something that the NT receives 'Legion' and 'Praetorium' from Rome, and 'Paradise' from Persia. It seems in its first home to have denoted a park-like garden,—an enclosure fenced in from evil influences outside, and yet not so artificial as to be solely the work of man and devoid of natural landscape beauties. Herds of deer and other wild animals found a happy home in the old Persian paradises (*Xen. Cyr.* i. 3. 14, *Anab.* i. 2. 7). But a word entering the speech of a strong nation does not remain unaltered. The strength of Israel was religious, and the word 'Paradise' became on her lips restricted to the great garden where God at the first had talked with man. Paradise became to her the lost Eden, the garden of the four rivers and the two mystic trees. It was impossible, however, to the Hebrew that anything religious should remain a mere memory. In process of time it became a heavenly and an inspiring hope. A cool and fragrant Paradise awaits the faithful Hebrew after death. The Golden Age creates the future home of the people of God.

It was to little purpose that the Alexandrian Jewish school combated this conception as too materialistic and earthy. The popular mind saw nothing attractive in the allegorizing which taught that Paradise meant 'virtue,' and the trees of the garden the thoughts of spiritual men. The strangely mingled life man lives, half in, half out of the spiritual world, will not suffer a system which ignores so large a portion of his consciousness.

This was its meaning to the mass of men in Gospel times. It appears thrice in the NT,—in Luk 23:43, in 2Co 12:4, and in Rev 2:7,—and its history on the sacred page seems that of a spiral curve upwards. St. Paul's reference is so mystic as to remain somewhat indefinite, yet it is *up* to Paradise he is caught. But in Revelation the spiritual meaning shines through the thin veil of the pictorial promise to the Ephesian 'angel.'

It is not without interest to observe that in later times and outside Scripture the word seems in two directions to take a downward slant; first, among Mohammedans as applied to their carnal heaven, and afterwards in the Mediaeval Church as indicating a place (the *Limbus Patrum*) reserved for departed souls who are only in partial and imperfect communion with the faithful.

Our Lord's solitary use of the word constitutes by far its greatest interest to Christians. He who spoke of 'the kingdom of God' or 'the kingdom of heaven' to the Apostles, used the word 'Paradise' to the dying brigand on the cross. The connotation of a term rises and falls with the mood of the speaker. But with the Speaker on this occasion, His mood is always regulated by the receptivity of the hearer. This man never knew much of any world beyond his own world of violence and rapine. He was dying now. What he needed was a form of comfort—real and true, no doubt, but such as he could reach and relish. He was writhing in thirst and agony, and the simple, common, current idea of Paradise, with its rest and relief, was to him, for the time being, the chiefest good. The hope of such a change was a simple hope; but a plain thought may be as true, as far as it goes, as a complex one; just as an outline may be as correct as a finished portrait. Anything more advanced would have meant nothing to the repentant robber. He who 'knew what was in man' gave the promise. See, further, art. 'Paradise' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, and the Literature cited there.

Literature.—As bearing upon Christ's use of the word, special ref. may be made to Salmond, *Christian Doct. of Immortality*, 346 ff.; Edersheim, *LT [Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].]* ii. 600 f.; W. H. Brookfield, *Sermons*, 13 ff.; Cairns, *Christ the Morning Star*, 270 ff.; Maclaren, *Sermons Preached in Manchester*, i. 160 ff.; C. H. H. Wright, *The Intermediate State*, 152 ff.; R. E. Hutton, *The Soul in the Unseen World*, 155 ff.

▣ Paradox

PARADOX.—The paradoxes of the Gospels may be divided into three kinds. (1) Truth may be expressed in a way to shock opinion from its dogmatic slumber. Brief and vivid statements are made without qualification or explanation; metaphors are used to arrest the attention and stimulate the imagination, rather than to give a definite picture of the truth; a contrast which will force the hearer to think for himself is preferred to an argument which he need only follow. ‘Paradoxes,’ it has been said, ‘are the burrs of literature—they stick.’ (2) Truth often appears paradoxical at the time of its discovery, because it runs contrary to current conventions. Our view of men and things contains little knowledge, but much opinion. Custom alone makes us forget that we are living upon a volcano, until the revelation of some new truth revolutionizes all. So the fact that the world moves appeared paradoxical enough in the 16th century. Its strangeness was due to the environment into which it was thrust. (3) But sometimes the most adequate expression of a truth that we can reach still retains its paradoxical character in spite of time and familiarity, owing to the conflict of the conceptions united in its expression. We believe that the opposition is harmonized in reality, but we have as yet no clear and distinct idea of the reconciliation.

Each of these three kinds of paradox may be abundantly illustrated from the Gospels; and some of the most remarkable of the sayings of Jesus exemplify all three (Mat 5:39, Joh 12:24-25).

1. Much of the teaching of Jesus naturally took the form of condensed and vivid aphorisms. Systematic discourse, such as a moral philosopher might attempt, would not have been appropriate. It could hardly have been recorded; it would not have been understood. Moreover, Jesus was setting forth fundamental principles which could not be demonstrated, but appealed directly to the moral intuition for acceptance (Mat 5:3 ff; Mat 3:9 ff.). Further, He often suggested spiritual truths through analogies or metaphors, which, however suggestive, cannot be pressed in detail (Mat 11:12; Mat 17:20, Luk 18:25, Joh 13:3-17). Again we find contrasts that were clearly intended to enforce reflexion (Mat 7:1-6; Mat 10:34-39, Luk 14:26, Joh 15:12; Joh 15:17). In short, Jesus would naturally avoid expressions which could be taken quite literally (Mat 5:38-41; Mat 18:21-22; Mat 6:34; Mat 25:1-13). For He came to give a new spirit to the world, not to lay down a detailed scheme of life and order of society, which in time must have become antiquated, if not lifeless.

2. The moral and religious teaching of Jesus, though foreshadowed by the Law and the Prophets, came into sharp conflict with the formalism that petrified Jewish life in His day (Mat 15:10-20, Mar 2:18-28; Mar 3:1-6). More paradoxical still must have appeared His condemnation of the Pharisees (Mat 23:1-36), His friendship with publicans and sinners (Mat 9:9-13, Mar 2:15-16, Luk 19:1-10), His conception of the Messiah (Mar 10:45; Mar 8:27-38).

3. Finally, there is the important class in which opposite and apparently conflicting aspects of truth, life, and duty are expressed in a form which does not completely harmonize them. In the teaching of Jesus we have unworldly simplicity united with worldly shrewdness (Mat 7:15; Mat 10:16-17; Mat 16:6; Mat 18:2-3, Luk 16:1-12), the universal beneficence and compassion of God bound up with severe and inexorable justice (Mat 5:45; Mat 11:20-30; Mat 18:15-35; Mat 20:1-16; Mat 25:14-30); we have the great and deep conceptions of life through death, joy through suffering, love through severance, peace through conflict, victory through surrender, self-realization through self-renunciation, the conquest of the world through the cross of shame (Luk 14:25-33, Joh 12:24-26; Joh 16:20; Joh 16:33; Joh 12:32). Here are the profoundest truths, and yet the most paradoxical, for they are expressed through ideas that are partially contradictory to one another. We believe that if we could apprehend the whole truth, if we could understand through and through the whole meaning and purpose of creation, we could express these truths in a manner that would not shock our reason. But in the twilight of our knowledge we must be content to hold fast to half-truths, none of which is quite free from error or, at any rate, indefiniteness. Some who prefer consistency to comprehensiveness would sacrifice one part of the antithesis and elaborate the other. But though these may play a useful part in the dialectical movement of progress, they appear to be further removed from the whole truth than those who embrace the seeming contradiction, unable to fathom its depths, yet assured that in it is realized a perfect reconciliation. See also art. Parable, p. 314^a.

A. J. Jenkinson.

■ Paralysis

PARALYSIS.—In the NT the terms *παραλυτικός* (Mat 9:1-8, Mar 2:1-12) and *παραλελυμένος* (Luk 5:17-26) are employed to designate the nervous affection variously known as paralysis or palsy. Palsy commonly denotes loss of motor power in a muscle or set of muscles, and is equivalent to motor paralysis. When the power of transmitting sensory impressions to the brain centres is lost, we have sensory *paralysis*. The

affliction is due to disease of the cerebral centres or of the nerves, owing to injury or morbid changes. In some cases the paralysis depends on removable causes; most commonly, however, upon alteration of structure involving permanent loss of function. There are two forms of paralysis: *hemiplegia*, where one side of the body is affected; and *paraplegia*, where the lower limbs are rendered useless. In the instance above given in the Synoptics the term used by Lk. (παραλελυμένος) indicates that it was not a case of hysterical paralysis where a shock would be available to remove the trouble (Bennett), but that it was rather paralysis arising from serious nervous disease. All three Evangelists make prominent the impression of Divine power and majesty caused by this significant healing work of Jesus. And St. Luke prefaces his account with the additional reference to the power of God. 'The power of the Lord was with him to heal' (εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι). All the accounts likewise record a mighty expectation of healing on the part of the friends, leading them to overcome all obstacles in the path to the great Healer—an expectation which we may believe energized also in the one to be healed. The combination of a vitalizing faith on the part of the people, and the activity of Divine power and healing purpose in Jesus, was precisely such as was most favourable to efficient curative action. St. Luke's account may be placed side by side with his record of our Lord's words ascribing His healing to the direct action of the Divine power (Luk_11:20), and the whole compared with the statement repeatedly ascribed to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, that the source of all healing power (as of true wisdom) was in the Divine indwelling (see art. Miracles). For the question arising here as to the connexion between the infirmity and human sin, see art. Impotence.

The case of the Centurion's servant (Mat_8:5-13, Luk_7:2-10) is marked by one feature which is significant. The patient was 'grievously tormented' (δεινῶς βασανιζόμενος), where, however, the description is not given by Luke, but by Matthew. The indication may therefore not be medically so suggestive. Bennett (*Diseases of Bible*) inclines to regard it as a case probably of 'progressive paralysis attended by muscular spasms and involving respiratory movements,' while Macalister (art. 'Medicine' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible), on the ground of Matthew's description of the pain involved, prefers to regard it as one 'possibly of spinal meningitis.' The narratives are, however, not medical, and their central interest lies in the centurion's 'great faith' so warmly eulogized by Jesus, and in his simple straightforward conception of the nature of the power and authority possessed by our Lord. He compares it to the authority conferred upon and exercised by himself—on the one hand being a power derived from the supreme source of all authority, and on the other being absolute in enforcing and obtaining promptest obedience. It is significant that our Lord accepts this conception, and commends in the fullest fashion the faith of which it was a part (see art. Cures).

Parents

PARENTS

1. *Jewish parents.*—A few introductory remarks on the conjugal relation are necessary. The husband was supreme in the household, his authority recognized by the wife—and here it may be noted that, while polygamy was permitted by the Jewish law, the principle of ‘one man one wife’ had won general acceptance. As for the legal status of the wife, the provisions in respect to some things (see Divorce) were onesided; but her position, if subordinate, was by no means one of absolute dependence, nor was she relegated to the seclusion common in other Oriental nations. The husband ruled; the wife’s influence in all domestic concerns was great. Fidelity was expected on both sides. The match might have been arranged by other parties (see Marriage), but the relations of the wedded pair would be characterized by a growing love. The honourable position of the faithful wife (Pro_31:10-31) would be evidenced in countless Jewish homes. To the strong attachment of husband to wife, of wife to husband, there is frequent and touching allusion in later Jewish literature. It would make itself felt in the whole family life.

This brief notice of the conjugal relation should help to a correct appreciation of the relations now to be considered, viz. the parental, and, by consequence, the filial. At once it may be set down that the requirements of the Fifth Commandment had taken deep hold in Jewish life. As Bousset (*Rel. d. Jud.* 402) remarks, it was not forgotten that in the Decalogue the duties of children to parents follow immediately upon those which turn on matters religious and ritual. The requirements, it should be noted particularly, place both parents on the same level. In practice the supremacy of the father as ruler of the household was, indeed, recognized; his power over his children was almost absolute: at the same time, the utmost respect and obedience to both father and mother were demanded and yielded. Domestic discipline was exceedingly strict; the behaviour of child to parent would be marked by that courtliness of etiquette which was once a feature of English family life; there was, perhaps, little demonstrativeness of affection in the case of the father. Restraint is, in short, observable; but it formed no barrier to a love deep and strong which knit child to parent and parent to child: the full pathos of the love which linked a Jewish father to his son cannot be set down in words. The joyousness of child-life was in no wise cramped: allusion is met with to the readiness of parents to provide for, and to enter into, the amusement of the children. Not until the 2nd cent., was the maintenance of children the subject of legal enactment; fulfilment of the duty had probably been

taken as a matter of course. It was certainly expected that children should minister to the necessities of aged parents. See, further, Boyhood.

2. *The home at Nazareth.*—Joseph was in any case the legal father of Jesus (Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*); hence the parental and filial relation as illustrated in the Holy Family may be discussed apart from questions treated of elsewhere (see Virgin-birth). The glimpses afforded are but few: there are the stories in the opening chapters of Matthew and Luke, and some incidents in our Lord's ministry. Fragmentary notices; and yet a great deal may be read into them when studied in connexion with the preceding paragraphs.

What, then, is discernible in the parents of Jesus? Conjugal attachment; so also a genuine and simple-hearted piety. They are punctilious in the observance of religious duties (Luk 2:21-22); if attendance at the Passover was only demanded of men, Mary is quick to avail herself of a privilege which had been extended to women also (Luk 2:41). That the child Jesus 'increased in wisdom' (Luk 2:40; Luk 2:52) is a statement not to be interpreted without thought of the parental care which watched over His ripening intelligence. If His 'understanding and answers' were cause of astonishment (Luk 2:47), the explanation points, in part at any rate, to early training given by His mother; to the careful discharge, by Joseph, of the paternal duties, so preparing Him for the eventful day when, arrived at the age of twelve years, He would become a 'son of the Law.' There was the further discharge of paternal duty as the lad was taught a trade (Mar 6:3). The strict discipline above spoken of is implied in Luk 2:51 (καὶ ἦν ὑποτασσόμενος αὐτοῖς): the respect and obedience which Joseph and Mary claim as their due are promptly rendered by the boy, the growing youth.

There the narrative of the early life of Jesus breaks off; of Gospel record of the next eighteen years there is none. With the resumption of the narrative Jesus has arrived at manhood; Joseph disappears from the scene, and attention accordingly centres on the relations of Jesus with the widowed mother. No longer is He a member of the family circle; Mary is cared for by sons and daughters; but the respect, the affection, the loving solicitude of 'her firstborn son' is still enjoyed by her. He asserts His independence, but with perfect courtesy (Joh 2:4; 'the address is that of courteous respect, even of tenderness,' Westcott). He is not to be understood in Mar 3:32-34 as disowning parental ties; rather as speaking of a family of God that is greater than the human family. The touching incident recorded in Joh 19:26-27 is significant of maternal and filial devotion to the very end.

3. *Sayings of our Lord.*—Attention must now be directed to notes struck by Jesus where recorded sayings of His have reference to the parental and filial relations. Few in number, they are significant. For Him parents are the natural guardians (Luk 8:56).

He has seathing condemnation for the legal fiction which affords means of escape for children unwilling to contribute to their parents' support (Mat 15:3-6, Mar 7:9-13); the Fifth Commandment, for Him, is paramount above other religious duties (see Corban). He takes obedience to the Fifth Commandment for granted (Mat 19:19, Mar 10:19, Luk 18:20); its observance is a condition of 'eternal life.' If in days near at hand parent will betray child and child parent, the unnatural circumstance will be but evidence of tribulation predicted by Him (Mat 10:21, Mar 13:12, Luk 21:16). What He says in Mat 10:37 (Luk 14:26) is tantamount to a recognition of the strength of family ties. Very beautifully has it been said that His favourite illustration was drawn from the home. Thus in the Lord's Prayer it is the idea of the home that governs the Prayer. The relations between the Heavenly Father and His children are set forth in terms richly suggestive of the human relationships. 'Reverence and submission—that the parent has a right to obtain from the children; support, forbearance, and protection—that the children on their part have a right to ask from the parent' (A. W. Robinson, *Church Catechism Explained*).

Two sayings may present difficulty. One of them occurs in Luk 18:29; it must be compared with Mat 19:29-30, Mar 10:29-30, where descriptions of the blessings of the Messianic Kingdom are set forth in terms familiar to the Jews of our Lord's day. Mention is indeed made of circumstances under which the renunciation of earthly ties may be demanded; they are, however, exceptional circumstances, where the ties in question are incompatible with a higher allegiance. The other saying occurs in Mat 8:21 (cf. Luk 9:59). Request and rejoinder have been explained of proverbial allusion (Adeney); it has been held that the permission really sought was to remain and support an aged father until he died (Theophylact); and this is possible. It is certainly hard to believe that, with burial following so quickly upon death as is the case in the East, a request so thoroughly in accord with Jewish feeling (cf. Tob 4:2-4) was abruptly refused by Jesus. His reply is, perhaps, capable of metaphorical interpretation: 'Think not only of the dead, remember the needs of the living.' There may be, however, a reminder in it of the exceptional circumstances above alluded to. Besides, the teaching of Jesus had its sterner aspect.

Literature.—Schürer, *HJP* [*Note: JP History of the Jewish People.*], II. ii. 27; Abrahams, *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages*, which goes back to earlier days; Joseph, *Judaism as Creed and Life*; Maurice, *Social Morality*; J. R. Seeley, 'The Church as a Teacher of Morality' in *Lectures and Essays*. For the subject in regard to modern life see Mason, *Home Education*; Turnbull, *Hints on Child Training*; Mrs. Craik, *Sermons out of Church*.

H. L. Jackson.

Paronomasia

PARONOMASIA (Gr. παρονομασία, Lat. *annominatio*).* [Note: Winer in his NT Grammar (tr. Moulton, 1882, pp. 793-796) distinguishes between paronomasia and annominatio, defining the former as ‘a combination of like-sounding words’ (e.g. Luk 21:11, Mat 21:41), and the latter as ‘having respect to the meaning of the words as well as to their similarity in sound’ (e.g. Mat 16:18). See also Blass, NT Grammar, tr. Thackeray, 1898, p. 298.] —A play on words of similar sound. This linguistic use, which in the present day is usually confined to humorous writing, is found in ancient, and especially Oriental, works in the most serious passages. In Hebrew it is frequent, largely with proper names. There are many examples in the OT, e.g. Gen 9:27; Gen 25:26; Gen 48:22, Exo 2:10, Rth 1:20, Isa 63:1, Mic 1:10-15.† [Note: also Ecc 7:1 a אִשׁ, אִשׁ.] In the New Testament the writings of St. Paul, whose early training had been Jewish, furnish some instances of *paronomasia* (e.g. Phm 1:11, Ὀνήσιμον—ἄχρηστον—εὐχρηστον), but in the Gospels it is rare, being found chiefly, if not wholly, in the Hebraistic Gospel according to St. Matthew. The best known and most certain example is Mat 16:18 σὺ εἶ Πέτρος (a rock), καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτη τῇ πέτρῳ (? fragment of rock) οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. If, as seems probable, our Lord spoke in Aramaic, the word used would be *Kepha* (כֵּפֵא, cf. Heb. כְּפִים Jer 4:29, Job 30:6 = ‘rocks’). The *paronomasia* makes the reference to St. Peter certain, although there may still be room for doubt whether Christ meant that St. Peter, as the leader of the Apostolic band, should be the human founder of the new Church, or that it should be built on the foundation of the confession, Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος. The former of these views is the more reasonable, and would probably have been almost universally accepted had it not been for the extravagance of some Roman Catholic commentators.

There are also possible examples of *paronomasia* in Mat 2:23; Mat 3:9. In the former of these passages the words Ναζωραῖος (=an inhabitant of Nazareth) κληθήσεται are not found in any prophet, but it seems not unlikely that they contain an allusion to the language of Isa 11:1 where Messiah is called נֹצֵר (= a branch), and possibly also to the word נָצַר (to preserve); cf. Isa 49:6. In Mat 3:9 (cf. Luk 3:8) the Baptist says δύνανται ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῶν λίθων τούτων ἐγεῖραι τέκνα τῷ Ἀβραάμ. The Hebrew words for λίθοι and τέκνα are similar in sound. There may therefore be a *paronomasia* here: ‘God

can from these stones (אבנים 'ăbânîm) raise up children (בנים bânîm) to Abraham.' These passages have been used to support the view, which is as old as Papias, that parts at least of Mt. had a Hebrew or Aramaic original.* [Note: It is, of course, possible that in our Lord's discourses, spoken originally in Aramaic, there were examples of paronomasia which have been lost in the Greek version. Eichhorn (Einl. in d. NT, i. 504) and others have made conjectural attempts to restore some of these, but they are not convincing. Mat_10:25 may contain a paronomasia if Βεελζεβούλ is to be connected with וְבַיִל and made = 'lord of the dwelling' (οικοδεσπότης).]

Literature.—C. B. Michaelis, *de paronomasia sacra* (Hal. 1737); J. F. Boettcher, *de paronomasia finitissime ei figuris Paulo Apostolo frequentatis* (Lips. 1823); Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , Extra Vol., p. 165 (by König).

H. W. Fulford.

☩ Parousia

PAROUSIA.—In connexion with the intimations of His approaching death, Jesus frequently spoke of His coming again to earth in a way that would give proof of His indestructible life and power. It is evident, however, that in those predictions of the future it was not always in exactly the same sense that He meant His coming to be understood. His sayings on the subject from time to time obviously pointed to several comings, each of which was to have its peculiar character and aim (see Coming Again). But there was one coming which He foretold in language of exceptional emphasis and impressiveness,—His appearance in celestial majesty at the end of the world, to perfect the work interrupted by His death, but still to be renewed and carried on through the ages by His spiritual energy. This was to be the supreme manifestation of His glory; and to it the term Parousia (παρουσία) is distinctively applied (Mat_24:3; Mat_24:27; Mat_24:37). It will signalize the final triumph of His cause, and the complete establishment and consummation of the Kingdom of God. It is the great crisis which has been designated in common usage the Second Coming.

It was at Caesarea Philippi, after His first announcement of the tragic end awaiting Him at the hands of men, that Jesus made also the first announcement of His future glorious return (Mat_16:27, Mar_8:38, Luk_9:26). He repeated it subsequently under varied circumstances and to varied groups of listeners, and towards the close of His ministry the Parousia, or Second Coming, assumed a marked prominence in His teaching.

In His utterances regarding it, as recorded in the Gospels, there are three points which call specially for consideration,—its time, its manner, and its decisive significance.

1. Time.—As to the time of the Parousia, we find two classes of statements that are somewhat perplexing to reconcile. In one set of passages Jesus looks forward to its early, and even speedy, approach. The existing generation was to witness it (Mat 24:34). On one occasion He told those standing by that some of them should not taste of death till they saw the Son of Man coming in His Kingdom (Mat 16:28; cf. Mar 9:1, Luk 9:27), and the same idea of nearness is expressed in Mat 10:23 and Mar 14:62. Yet we are confronted by another set of passages that suggest a lengthened period of waiting, and the probability of the Parousia being deferred. Such are the parables of the Ten Virgins (Mat 25:1-12) and the Tyrannical Upper Servant (Luk 12:42-46 and Mar 13:35). Jesus did not Himself profess to define the time; indeed, in one memorable saying He disclaimed with the utmost distinctness all positive knowledge of the day and hour of the supreme consummation (Mat 24:36 || Mar 13:32). In the great Eschatological Discourse recorded in Matthew 24 and Mark 13 (cf. Luke 21), the subject is complicated by the manifest reference in certain sections to the disastrous collapse which threatened the Jewish State.

Some, taking the discourse as a homogeneous unity, have been led to maintain that the predictions of Jesus respecting His coming were all fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem (Stuart Russell, *Parousia*). Many critics, however, find themselves unable to regard the discourse, in the form reported, as one continuous and connected deliverance of Jesus. Wendt and Charles, following Colani, contend that some parts of it are interpolations from an apocalyptic document of Judaeo-Christian authorship, belonging to the year a.d. 67-68. It seems more reasonable to adopt the view, advocated by Professor Bruce and others, that in this discourse the Evangelists have gathered together in one place words spoken on different occasions, and have connected future events more closely than the utterances of Jesus justified. It is at least clear that certain passages in the discourse point to the judgment on Israel as a nation and the impending fall of Jerusalem and its Temple-worship, whilst it is equally clear that other passages refer to a crisis, certainly to be looked for, but still lying in the distance (Mat 24:43-50, Mar 13:34-37).

With the purport of these latter passages, indicating a possible delay in the coming, there are several other sayings of Jesus that distinctly agree, as, *e.g.*, the two parables already mentioned (Mat 25:1-12 and Luk 12:42-46), and also the parable of the Unjust Judge (Luk 18:1-7). We find, besides, that in a particular group of parables—the Mustard Seed, the Leaven (Mat 13:31-33), and the Growing Grain of Corn (Mar 4:26-29)—the Kingdom He came to establish is represented as subject to the law of growth. Evidently Jesus was not unmindful of the preparatory process it

might be necessary for the world to pass through ere He could usher in the Kingdom in its full glory. His words can be interpreted as indicating a recognition of the natural course of human development as an essential factor in determining the time when the world would be ripe for the final manifestation of His power. Moreover, He spoke also of the evangelization of the Gentile races as a work to be undertaken ere the end should come (Mat 24:14; Mat 26:13, Mar 13:10). The gospel was first to be published among all nations, that they also might have an opportunity of accepting the offer of grace; 'the times of the Gentiles must be fulfilled' (Luk 21:24). Here again there is foreshadowed a lengthened process, requiring, not a generation only, but an era, for its accomplishment. Manifestly Jesus took into account the gradual evolution of human affairs in contemplating the triumph of His Kingdom, while at the same time His faith in that triumph was so real and assured, and His vision of it so intensely clear, that it seemed to Him imminent, on the eve of fulfilment; and when He spoke under this feeling His disciples gathered the impression that it was close at hand, and they naturally understood the supreme event to be synchronous with the fall of Jerusalem, though in time, as it proved, they were mistaken.

2. Manner.—As to the manner of the Parousia, a considerable number of passages represent it as altogether startling and unexpected. It is to break in upon the world as a sudden surprise, while men are busied with their earthly affairs, like the Flood in the time of Noah, or the destruction of Sodom in the time of Lot (Luk 17:26-30; Luk 17:34), its approach shall be as that of a thief, stealing into the house without warning (Luk 12:39 f.), or as the arrival of an absent master at an hour when his servants are not looking for him (Luk 12:42-46), or as the return of the bride-groom in the night-time, leading his bride and the marriage party to the wedding-feast (Mat 25:1-13). On the other hand, there are passages in the Eschatological Discourse in Matthew 24 and Mark 13 which seem to represent the final coming as preceded by certain manifest signs which shall give evidence of its nearness—the appearance of false Christs (Mat 24:5, Mar 13:6; Mar 13:22), wars, earthquakes, and famines (Mat 24:7, Mar 13:7-10), persecutions and tribulations (Mat 24:9, Mar 13:11-13), the darkened sun and falling stars (Mat 24:29, Mar 13:24-25). If, however, the view of the composite character of that discourse, as we now have it, is accepted, the passages describing such arresting phenomena may be interpreted as vivid pictorial forecasts of the calamitous state of things by which the threatened Jewish crisis would be ushered in. But whether that view is accepted or not, special weight must be attached to the warning given by Jesus that even the most striking and palpable signs might be misread. The heralds of the great climax, He declares, must not be taken as the climax itself; 'All these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet' (Mat 24:6). After all, apparently, whatever may be the catastrophic social or other upheavals by which it is precluded, the signal event is to come suddenly and unexpectedly, at such an hour as men think not (Mat 24:44, Luk 12:40; Luk 12:46).

Yet, when it does come, there shall be no dubiety; the splendour shall be dazzlingly patent, like the lightning-flash illumining all the heavens (Mat 24:27).

3. Significance.—The decisive significance of the Parousia was expressed by Jesus in words of profound solemnity. What it will involve, according to His teaching, may be briefly summed up as follows:

(1) The Divine dignity of His Person shall then be disclosed. He will appear in heavenly majesty, attended by His holy angels, and His glory and power shall be fully revealed (Mat 24:30; Mat 25:31; Mat 26:64, Mar 8:38).

(2) His authority as Judge shall be put in force. Entrusted by the Father with supreme judicial functions (Joh 5:22-23), He will gather all nations before Him to receive a reward according to their works (Mat 16:27; Mat 25:32); the secrets of all hearts shall be unveiled (Luk 12:2); there shall be a sifting and separation of the good from the bad, the spurious from the true (Mat 7:22-23; Mat 13:41; Mat 13:49; Mat 25:32); and the sentence of approval or of condemnation passed shall depend on the attitude and spirit towards Himself by which the life has been swayed (Mat 25:34-46).

(3) The future destinies of men shall be determined. The day shall at last have arrived—‘that day’ (Mat 7:22, Luk 10:12) so momentous to every soul—when there can be no more self-deception, and the results of the law of recompense shall have to be faced, the righteous and pure-hearted being raised to eternal life and blessedness in the presence of the Father, and the unworthy and insincere cast into the outer darkness (Mat 13:41-43; Mat 22:13; Mat 25:34-46, Mar 8:38).

Thus (4) the Kingdom shall be exalted to its triumph and perfection. It shall be cleansed of all things that offend, and them that do iniquity (Mat 13:41); the supremacy of righteousness shall be vindicated by the elevation of the godly to salvation, the ingathering of all elect souls (Mat 24:13), and the exclusion of the wicked from the eternal inheritance.

Then (5) the existing world-order shall come to an end. In the teaching of Jesus Himself there is no trace of the thought that the Parousia would inaugurate an outward visible sovereignty on earth, when He should assume the reins of government, and rule as King in the realm of temporal affairs. That thought arose among His followers only at a subsequent period. The idea implied in His utterances is rather that His final glorious advent shall mark the definite close of the long drama of human life on the earth, by the removal of all His true disciples to the heavenly state, and the consignment of the unfaithful to the doom prepared for them. That shall be the Last Day, when the human race shall have had its full trial under the dispensations of the Divine truth and grace,—the winding-up of the world’s history.

Literature.—Charles, *Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian* (1899); Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, ii. 274-351; Weiss, *Bib. Theol. of NT*, ii. 145-158, and *Life of Christ*, iii. 80-97; Beyschlag, *NT Theol.* i. 190-204; Bruce, *Kingdom of God* (1889), 272-294; Stuart Russell, *Parousia* (1887); Warren, *Parousia* (1885); Muirhead, *Eschatology of Jesus* (1904); Adams Brown, art. 'Parousia' in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible*; Dorner, *Syst. of Chr. Doct.* iv. 373-428; Salmond, *Chr. Doct. of Immortality*, 300 ff., 425 ff.; J. A. Beet, *Last Things* (1905), 19; G. Jackson, *Teaching of Jesus* (1905), 207; G. B. Stevens, *Theology of NT* (1899), 150; Sanday-Headlam, *Romans*, 379 ff.

G. M'Hardy.

☩ Passion Week

PASSION WEEK.—What origin can we assign to the sacred institution known variously as Holy Week, Passion Week, or the Silent Week? What documentary evidence have we for the belief that the Triumphal Entry took place on a Sunday, so that exactly a week elapsed between that event and the discovery of the empty tomb?

1. Investigators of the Life of Jesus find a fulcrum in Joh 12:1. Even Keim, who puts no faith in the narratives of the Fourth Gospel, least of all in its chronology, accepts its testimony in this particular passage (see *Jesus of Nazara*, v. 274). It is there stated that Jesus 'six days before the Passover (πρὸ ἕξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα) came to Bethany'; and (Joh 12:12 f.) that He went to Jerusalem next day. But it is a little difficult to understand what the narrator means by the 'six days' in question. The idiom of πρὸ ἕξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα (cf. LXX Septuagint, Amos 1:1 πρὸ δύο ἐτῶν τοῦ σεισμοῦ), which bears a resemblance to the Latin formula *ante diem tertium kalendas* (cf. *Inscr. Insularum Mar. aeg.* iii. 325, πρὸ τε καλανδῶν Αὐγούστων), is genuine primitive Greek (Moulton, *Gram. of NT Greek*, i. 100 f.). The question is, then, whether the Passover day, the 14th Nisan, on which the Passover was eaten, is or is not included in the number 'six.' If it is included, Jesus must have arrived in Bethany on the 9th Nisan; if not, then on the 8th. The latter alternative is the more natural, since the six days are spoken of as coming *before* the Passover; and on this assumption Jesus must have entered Jerusalem on the 9th Nisan. Now, since according to Joh 19:31 the 15th Nisan was a Sabbath, the 8th must likewise have been a Sabbath, and the day of the Triumphal Entry a Sunday. It is to these Johannine data that we trace our Passion Week.

2. Now the Johannine reckoning appears to be corroborated by at least one of the Synoptics, viz. Mk. For one thing, Mk. assigns the death of Jesus to the παρασκευή (Mar_15:42, cf. Mat_27:62, Luk_23:54), His repose in the sepulchre to the Sabbath, and the finding of the empty tomb to the Sunday (Mar_16:2, cf. Luk_24:1, Mat_28:1), and consequently the Last Supper to the Thursday evening. Further, it is obviously the design of our Mk. to number the days in proper order, as may be seen in its striking succession of morning and evening, thus:

Mar_11:11 Evening of 1st day (the Triumphal Entry): καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντα, ὄψε ἡ δὴ οὔσης τῆς ὥρας, ἐξῆλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν.

Mar_11:12 Morning of 2nd day: καὶ τῆ ἐπαύριον ἐξελθόντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Βηθανίας.

Mar_11:19 Evening of 2nd day: καὶ ὅταν ὄψι ἐγένετο, ἐξεπορεύετο ἔξω τῆς πόλεως.

Mar_11:20 Morning of 3rd day: καὶ παραπορευόμενοι πρῶτ' ...

Mar_13:1 Evening of 3rd day (?): καὶ ἐχπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ...

To this point the enumeration is quite clear. We may ask, indeed, whether the various colloquies of Mar_11:27 to Mar_12:44 all took place on a single day. But in view of the care with which Mk. distinguishes the previous days, we can only infer that the absence of time references in the disputations is likewise a matter of design.

We must now inquire, however, how Mar_14:1 is connected with what precedes. Are the words ἦν δὲ τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἄζυμα μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας meant to imply that the foregoing discourse of Jesus on the Mt. of Olives was spoken two days before the Passover, *i.e.* on the very day the religious authorities held their conference? And must we suppose the Anointing at Bethany (Mar_14:3 καὶ ὄντος αὐτοῦ ἐν Βηθανίᾳ) to have taken place that day also, *i.e.* on the evening of the third day, and after the Parousia discourse? Again, on what day does Mk. place the betrayal by Judas (Mar_14:10 f. καὶ ... ἀπῆλθεν ... καὶ ἐξήτει ...)? On the day following, *i.e.* the fourth? In truth, the Evangelist's chronology in these passages is as vague as in Mar_11:11-12; Mar_11:19-20 it was unmistakable.

Nor is Mk.'s enumeration of the days between the decision of the Sanhedrin and the Last Supper quite explicit. If we regard Mar_14:12 καὶ τῆ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων, ὅτ

ε τὸ πάσχα ἔθουον as referring to the 14th Nisan, then in all probability Mar 14:1 synchronizes with the 12th Nisan, and Mar 14:10 f. with, say, Mar 14:13. But this is not said in so many words. Nevertheless, the writer possibly had in his mind some such synopsis as follows:

1st day, Mar 11:1-11 : Sunday, 10th Nisan.

2nd day, Mar 11:12-19 : Monday, 11th Nisan.

3rd day, Mar 11:20 to Mar 14:9 : Tuesday, 12th Nisan.

4th day, Mar 14:10 f.: Wednesday, 13th Nisan.

5th day, Mar 14:12-72 : Thursday, 14th Nisan.

6th day, Mar 15:1-47 : Friday, 15th Nisan.

7th day, Mar 16:1 α διαγενομενου τοῦ σαββατου, Saturday, 16th Nisan.

8th day, Mar 16:1 b: Sunday, 17th Nisan.

It is also possible, however, that there is an interval between Mar 13:1 to Mar 14:1, so that the Anointing would fall on the day after the Parousia speech. This would so far dislocate the above scheme by making the first day coincide with Saturday, 9th Nisan (as probably in Jn.), the second day with Sunday, the third with Monday, and the anointing with Tuesday. If this be so, we must allow for a period of *nine* days between the Entry and the Resurrection. In point of fact, we cannot solve the difficulty from Mk.'s data; its mode of reckoning still leaves a residuum of doubt. In particular, we are at a loss regarding what Jesus does and where He is during the day previous to the Anointing. But, notwithstanding these obscurities, it is an unmistakable fact that Mk. makes an attempt—though by no means an entirely effective one—to distinguish and enumerate the days between the Triumphal Entry and the Resurrection. Especially does the *sequence* of chronological references seem to postulate a definite calendar of the interval in question.

3. We turn now to Mt. and Lk. Mt. indicates a clear break only at the close of the Triumphal Entry day (Mat 21:17 καὶ καταλιπὼν αὐτοὺς ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω τῆς πόλεως εἰς Βηθανίαν καὶ ἠύλισθη ἐκεῖ). The second day runs without interruption from Mat 21:18 to the end of Mat 21:25. In passing to the narrative of the Passion proper, Mt. exhibits the same ambiguity as we found in Mk. We cannot decide whether the words

of Jesus in Mat 26:1 f. were spoken on the second day, or whether we must assume an interval between chs. 25 and 26.

Possibly, however, we err in looking for chronology at all in this section of Mt. We can understand the narrative quite as well on the hypothesis that the writer was not in the least concerned to tabulate the days, but simply joined incident to incident without regard to time. We find a similar uncertainty in Lk.: the writer's own words in Luk 20:1 ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν clearly imply that he had no distinct idea of the number of days between the Triumphal Entry and the Passover (cf. also Luk 21:37 ἦν δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων). This lack of precision admittedly extends also to the story of the actual Passion. Instead of the 'two days' (Mar 14:1, Mat 26:2), Lk. says only ἤγγιζεν δὲ ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων (Luk 22:1), and in place of the precise reference of Mar 14:12 τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων, ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθουον, Lk. simply has it that the day of unleavened bread 'came' (Luk 22:7). This loose way of indicating time in Mt. and Lk. strikes us as strange in view of the generally accepted theory of their common dependence upon Mk., which designedly and explicitly gives an all but complete diary of the time. How are we to explain the fact that the two Evangelists who make use of the oldest Gospel are here less precise in details than their common source?

4. The recognized explanation, viz., that the later writers did not trouble about such matters of detail, is most unsatisfactory, as all investigation of the growth and progress of the Evangelical record goes to show a constantly increasing interest in such minutiae as time and hour, place and number, name and personality; witness, e.g., the NT Apocrypha. In fact, had we not other grounds for deeming Mk. the oldest of the Gospels, its ostensible precision in such things would lead us to regard it as the latest.—The present writer is of opinion that we can best explain Mt.'s and Lk.'s omission of the time references of Passion Week, by the hypothesis that the recension of Mk. used by them did not itself contain these references (*Ur-Markus Hypothesis*). Or, in other words, our Mk.'s enumeration of the days is the work of a later hand, a redactor, the Deutero-Mark. This view is so far confirmed by the presence of a certain artificiality in the arrangement. It would seem as if a definite scheme had been forcibly stamped upon the material. The *first* trace of this appears in Mar 11:11. While Mt. and Lk. quite simply and naturally make the Cleansing of the Temple succeed the Triumphal Entry, upon the same day, Mk. has it that Jesus, having come to the city, spent the rest of the day in seeing the sights (as if He had not been often enough in Jerusalem during His thirty years), and that then, as it was late in the day (too late, *i.e.*, to begin His great work), He went out to Bethany with His disciples. This apparently so exact piece of information really strikes us as utterly trivial and pedantic. What interest could Mark suppose his readers to have in such a petty detail?

or what concern had he himself, so indifferent, in general, to all chronology, in such exactitude at that particular point? There is, as it seems to us, but one explanation of the anomaly, viz., that the writer of Mar_11:11 was anxious to intercalate one day more than the facts naturally allowed; that is to say, he figured to himself a definite number of days, and must distribute them somehow in the material before him. A *second* trace is found in the circumstance that Mk. divides the incident of the Barren Fig-tree between two days (Mar_11:13 f., Mar_11:20 f.). Here, too, Mt. gives the more natural account. For, granting the miracle of judgment upon the ill-starred tree, it is much more in harmony with popular views that the blight should instantly follow the curse (Mat_21:18 f.). In Mark's report, according to which the word of Jesus takes a day to work its effect, we seem to discern a rationalizing tendency. The Evangelist, with all his belief in the miraculous, can more easily grasp the phenomenon by allowing for some sort of natural process.* [Note: A similar tendency emerges in the two miracles of healing reported by Mk. alone, in which the spittle of Jesus comes to the aid of His omnipotence (Mar_7:33, Mar_8:23); in the healing of the blind, the narrator pictures to himself a gradual advance towards perfect vision (Mar_8:24-25).] Further, the partition of the Fig-tree incident enables the redactor of Mk. to give a sharper distinction to the two days (Mar_11:12-19 and Mar_11:20 to Mar_13:1) by means of the two morning walks from Bethany to Jerusalem (Mar_11:12; Mar_11:20). A *third* indication of the artificiality of Mk.'s arrangement is seen in Mar_14:49, where Jesus speaks in such a manner as to imply that He had taught in the Temple for several days. But according to the said scheme, again, the whole of the teaching at this time occupies but a single day (Mar_11:20 to Mar_12:44), or, at most, two days if we include also the day of the Cleansing. Hence we are justified in inferring that the diary is not only not organic to the events, but actually at variance with them. In fact, the sayings and discourses at Jerusalem, as set down in Mk., give no hint whatever of a chronological order. They are as exempt from time references as are the five controversies of Mar_2:1 to Mar_3:6. The true design of either series is to illustrate the antagonism between Jesus and the hierarchy, and they may have been uttered either on one day or on several successive days.

We would therefore hazard the suggestion that our Mk.'s tabulation of the interval under consideration, and notably the passage Mar_11:11-12, is due to the redactor, and that the latter was imbued with the Johannine tradition. For our own part, indeed, we have been able to collate a mass of evidence in support of the theory that the text of Mk. has been very thoroughly revised from the Johannine standpoint, that a host of Johannine characteristics were inserted into it at some period subsequent to its use by Matthew and Luke. It is, of course, impossible here to submit the detailed proof of such a theory, and we can but invite the reader to test it for himself. The design of the present article does not carry us beyond the advocacy and proof of the thesis: As originally the Synoptic tradition neither contained a complete diary of our Lord's last visit to Jerusalem, nor implied that His stay covered exactly one week, it is

in the last resort to Jn. that we must trace the order of our Passion Week. See also art. Dates.

Literature.—J. Weiss, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 1903; C. A. Briggs, *New Light on the Life of Jesus* (1904), 101 ff.; A. G. Mortimer, *Meditations on the Passion* (1903); R. Winterbotham, *Sermons in Holy Trinity Church* (1900), 140-184.

J. Weiss.

☞ Passover (I.)

PASSOVER (I.) (Heb. פֶּסַח *pesah*, Aram. Aramaic ܦܫܚܐ *pasha*, in Greek πάσχα, φασέκ, and φάσκα [Josephus], NT πάσχα).—The most distinctive festival of the Jewish religion. Its origin, significance, and method of celebration are given in Exo 12:1-49; Exo 23:18; Exo 34:25, Lev 23:5-8, Num 9:1-14; Num 28:16-25, Deu 16:1-8.* [Note: The derivation of the word is uncertain. It may be derived from a root meaning to leap or pass over, used of the sun at the spring-time; or to pass over, in the sense of sparing, the traditional meaning.]

Modern criticism has discovered certain variations in the ritual and significance, has distinguished layers and stages in the ideas the festival was to suggest, and has sought to connect it with earlier and ethnic rites. Without accepting all such contentions, it may be granted that there is, at least, the union of an agricultural feast with a commemoration of the Exodus out of Egypt, in which commemoration certain of the circumstances which marked the historic deliverance are more or less literally repeated. Jewish expositors distinguish between 'the Egyptian Passover' and those which were subsequently observed,—'the perpetual Passover' or 'Passover for the generations,'—and narrate the points in which they differ from each other; in the former the impure partook, the blood was sprinkled on the lintels, the fat was not burned, and no hymn was sung; with other details.

The references in the OT to the observance of this festival are comparatively rare. There was the observance at the time of the Exodus, in the second year after coming out of Egypt (Num 9:5), at the entry into Canaan (Jos 5:10-11). The feast was apparently observed during the reign of Solomon (2Ch 8:13). Under Hezekiah there was a great act of observance, but in the second month, when the feast was prolonged by one week, and even the Levitically unclean were permitted to participate (2Ch 30:15-23). At the period of the revival of religion during the reign of Josiah, there was another celebration that stood out conspicuously among the

memories of the festival (2Ki 23:22, 2Ch 35:1-17). One Passover is also recorded as kept by the returning exiles (Ezr 6:19). With the period of the NT writers, of Josephus, and the Mishna, the feast has become one of regular observance, drawing multitudes to Jerusalem from many lands, and forming a strong bond of unity to the scattered nation.

From the references outside of the Pentateuch little can be learnt as to the details of the celebration of this feast. Nor is much to be gathered from the NT apart from the history of the Last Supper, regarding which there is doubt as to whether it was a true Paschal celebration, and whether the ordinary ritual was observed, or whether it was purposely modified and departed from (see following art. and Last Supper). We are driven for information as to the order and details of celebration to the Mishna (c. a.d. 200), the Gemara, an ancient supplement of the same, the commentaries of later Jewish Rabbis, as Maimonides and Bartenora. There is consequently a certain doubt as to how far the practices enjoined in the Mishna were observed in the time of our Lord; but, since the traditions are for the most part very ancient, the regulations laid down give a fairly accurate representation of the feast as observed at the time of the Evangelists.

One month before the feast, preparations for the same were put in hand. Roads and bridges were repaired for the companies of pilgrims, and burying-places which were lying in the way, and likely to be unnoticed, were whitened, that the travellers might avoid defilement. Flocks and herds were tithed, and persons ceremonially unclean went up to Jerusalem out of the country to purify themselves (Joh 11:55). As the time drew nearer, the significance and laws of the feast were explained in the academies and synagogues, the last two Sabbaths before the Passover being specially occupied with this exposition.

The number of those who took part in this festival was enormous. Every male Jew residing within fifteen miles of Jerusalem, and not ceremonially unclean, was required to do so, and in addition, numerous visitors from other parts of the Holy Land, and from other countries near and far, travelling with their gifts, and with song, swelled the number of residents. Women as well as men were eligible for participation, and though the observance was not compulsory, the privilege was often embraced (1Sa 1:3-7, Luk 2:41-42, Josephus *BJ* VI. ix. 3, Mish. *Pesachim* ix. 4). The nearest approach to a census is that given by Josephus, and, though certainly exaggerated, it shows the vast concourse which the feast brought together. He states that at the Passover of a.d. 65 there were 3,000,000 persons present (*BJ* II. xiv. 3), while in another place (VI. ix. 3) he relates that, at the request of Cestius, the priests counted the number of lambs slain as 256,500. Remarking that the minimum number permitted for a lamb was ten persons, Josephus calculates the number at 2,700,000. An ancient Jewish tradition gives the number of Passover lambs on one occasion as

1,200,000. It was customary to extend hospitality to the numerous visitors. This was done without charge, but as a return the host received the skin of the lamb and the vessels used by his guests. Many must have tented outside the city. In this vast crowd, with the sense of nationality strong, and its religious feelings at the highest tension, it is easy to understand the dread of possible disturbance which from time to time appears in the Gospel narratives (Mat 26:5, Luk 23:24, Joh 18:39).

The feast proper began with the evening of the 14th Nisan; it must be borne in mind that, according to Jewish reckoning, this was the first half of the day. It was succeeded by the days of Unleavened Bread, which sometimes gave a name to the whole festival (Luk 22:1). On the evening of the 14th it was the duty of the master of each house to take a lighted wax candle, in silence thoroughly to search all the house for leaven and to remove it to a safe place. This investigation was preceded and followed by prayer. A portion of leavened food sufficient for the family requirements had been put aside, and it was lawful to eat this until 11 o'clock on the morning of the 14th, though a stricter school drew the limit at 10 o'clock. At midday all leaven was to be completely and solemnly destroyed, by burning or otherwise. The times of this obligation were notified in the following way: 'Two cakes of thanksgiving offering which had been desecrated were exposed on a bench or gallery of the Temple. While they lay there all the people yet ate leaven; when one was removed, they abstained from eating it but did not burn it; when both were removed, all the people commenced burning the leaven' (*Pes. i. 5*). Secular work was gradually ceasing. In Galilee the whole day was one of rest. In Judaea work continued till noon; but only what had been begun could be finished; no new work could be commenced. Only tailors, barbers, and sandal-strap makers were allowed to follow their avocations. At 1.30 o'clock the daily evening sacrifice was killed, and at 2.30 it was offered up. In each case this was one hour before the usual time of killing and offering; if the 14th Nisan fell on a Friday (*i.e.* Thursday evening and Friday morning according to our reckoning), these times were made each yet an hour earlier to avoid possible desecration of the Sabbath. By the time this daily sacrifice was offered, the lambs had been brought to the Temple by those who had been selected to represent each Passover group at the slaughter of the victim. Each lamb was required to be not less than eight days or more than one year old. The great company was divided into three sections, the ritual observed being the same in each case. The first section entered the Court of the Priests, the gates being thereupon closed, and the trumpets blown three times. Although the priestly course on duty for the week attended to the daily sacrifice, to meet the necessity of the Passover the whole priestly body was in attendance. It stood in two lines which ended at the altar, one row holding silver, the other golden bowls. Each man representing a Passover group killed his own sacrifice, the nearest priest caught the blood in his bowl, passed it to a fellow-priest and he again to another, while each as he received the full bowl handed back an empty one. The bowls were made without bases, and could not stand if placed on the ground,

coagulation being in this way avoided. When the bowl was received by the priest nearest to the altar, he cast it with one jet at the base. Meanwhile the 'Hallel' (Psalms 113-118) was recited, the Levites leading the song, the people repeating the first line of each Psalm and also three others of the closing Psalm, but otherwise responding 'Hallelujah' to each line. If the sacrifices were not completed, the Hallel was sung a second or even a third time.

The preparation of the sacrifice now took place. The lambs were hung on iron hooks fastened to the walls and pillars of the court, and when these were all in use, upon staves which rested on the shoulders of two men; if the day were a Sabbath, the use of staves was not permitted, and two offerers laid one the left hand the other the right on his neighbour's shoulder and so suspended the lambs. The sacrifices were then skinned, the portions appointed for sacrificial use (Lev 3:1-5) were removed and cleansed, the fat separated and placed on a dish and then offered with incense on the altar. The company was then dismissed to their dwellings to partake of the feast, the incense was burnt, the lamps trimmed, and the Temple court washed. If the sacrifice fell on a Sabbath, the first and second divisions stayed in appointed parts of the Temple until the whole of the victims had been sacrificed, that they might not profane the Sabbath by bearing a burden.

It was required that careful attention should be given to the cooking of the lamb. It was to be roasted, in an earthenware oven; a spit of pomegranate wood was to be put in at the mouth and to pass through at the vent; Justin Martyr (*Tryph.* 40) states that a transverse spit was passed through the victim, thus forming a cross. If any part of the lamb touched the oven, it was to be pared off, as was also the case with any part on which fat from the oven had fallen. No bone of it was to be broken, no part was to be taken out of the house where the feast was held, and none of it was to be left over.

The meal was partaken of, not as at the first Egyptian Passover, in travelling dress, 'with loins girded, with shoes on the feet, and staff in the hands,' but in festive garments, and reclining on the left side 'as free men do, in token of their freedom.' The table was probably arranged as a triclinium, and this explains the position of St. John, the question addressed across the table by St. Peter, and the unheard conversation of our Lord with Judas Iscariot (Joh 13:23-24, Mat 26:25). See art. Upper Room.

A cup of red wine, mixed with water, was poured out for each guest, not by the host but by a servant, for all things were on this night to be done with distinction; and over it the following blessing was spoken:

‘Blessed art Thou, Jehovah our God, who hast created the fruit of the vine. Blessed art Thou, Jehovah our God, King of the Universe, who hast chosen us from among all people, and exalted us from among all languages, sanctified us with Thy commandments. And Thou hast given us, O Jehovah our God, in love the solemn days for joy, and the festival and appointed seasons for gladness; and this feast of unleavened bread, the season of our freedom, a holy convocation, the memorial of our departure from Egypt. For Thou hast chosen us, and hast sanctified us from among all nations, and Thy holy festivals with joy and gladness hast Thou caused us to inherit. Blessed art Thou, O Jehovah, who sanctifiest Israel and the appointed seasons. Blessed art Thou, Jehovah, King of the Universe, who hast preserved us alive, and sustained and brought us to this season.’

The use of wine at this festival was compulsory, even upon the poorest; it might be the gift of charity, or procured by selling or pawning raiment or hiring out one’s labour; but used it must be, even by persons commonly abstaining and young persons. After this, each participant washed his hands, our Lord apparently varying the custom and teaching a new and deeper lesson by Himself washing the feet of His guests (Joh_13:3 ff.).

The Paschal table, with its appropriate viands, was then placed in position. These comprised the lamb, the bitter herbs (lettuce, endive, garden endive (or succory), urtica, and bitter coriander (or horehound)), and the *harôseth*, a paste of dates, raisins, etc., with vinegar, which was held to represent the mortar of Egypt, and salt water. The president of the company took some of the bitter herbs, dipped them in salt water, ate a portion the size of an olive, and gave a similar portion to his companions. A second cup of wine was now poured out, and this was followed by the *Haggâdâh* or ‘showing forth’ (cf. 1Co_11:26 ‘ye proclaim’). The son of the family or the youngest member of the company inquired the significance of the feast in which they were participating: ‘Why is this night distinguished from all other nights?’ ‘Then the father instructs his child according to the capacity of his knowledge, beginning with our disgrace and ending with our glory, and expounding to him from “A Syrian ready to perish was my father” (Deu_26:5), until he has explained all through, to the end of the whole section’ (*Pes. x.*). This involved a recital of the national history from the Patriarchal times to the deliverance out of Egypt, and the constitution of the emancipated people by means of the covenant at Sinai. After this, the president explained the significance of the Passover-lamb, of the bitter herbs, and of the unleavened bread. In acknowledgment of the great redemption, the first part of the Hallel (Psalms 113, 114) was sung, and a benediction added: ‘Blessed art Thou, Jehovah our God, King of the Universe, who hast redeemed us and redeemed our fathers from Egypt.’ The second cup of wine, which had been previously filled, was now drunk.

After a second washing of hands, one of the two unleavened cakes was broken, and pieces containing between them bitter herbs were, after dipping in the *harôseth*, handed to each one in the company. This was probably the sop which Judas Iscariot received (Joh 13:26). After this the Paschal lamb was eaten, the hands were again washed, a third cup of wine filled, a blessing said, and the cup drunk. This was known as ‘the cup of blessing,’ and was probably that in which our Lord instituted the cup of the Eucharist, which is called by St. Paul ‘the cup of blessing’ (1Co 10:16). There remained another cup to be drunk, for the number four was insisted upon, and became the subject of various interpretations; the second part of the Hallel (Psalms 115-118) was sung—probably the ‘hymn’ after which ‘they went out unto the mount of Olives’ (Mar 14:26)—and the feast ended with a benediction, ‘the blessing of the song.’

On the next day, the 15th Nisan, sacrifices additional to those offered ordinarily were brought (Num 28:19), and peace-offerings, the *hagigah*—which on this day was compulsory, but on the 14th needed not to be offered except where the lamb would not suffice for the feast—were presented. On the 16th day the barley for the omer (Lev 23:11) that was to be presented was cut; this was threshed in the Court of the Priests, parched, and then ground fine. When sufficiently fine, one omer by measure was taken and mixed with oil; frankincense was placed upon it, and it was ‘waved’—moved to and fro—before the Lord. The 17th to the 20th days were the *Mô’çd Kâton*, or ‘lesser festival,’ when no new work might be commenced. With the 21st Nisan the feast ended, the day being kept as a Sabbath.

In the case of persons Levitically unclean or living at a distance, it was permitted to celebrate the Passover on the corresponding day of the following month (Iyyar), according to the legislation of Num 9:9-12, 2Ch 30:2; but in this case there was no search for and removal of leaven, no Hallel was sung at the supper, and no *hagigah* offered and eaten.

Literature.—Comm. on Pentateuch, esp. Driver’s *Deut.*; Bibl. Archaeol. of Keil, Nowack, and Benzinger; Buxtorf, *Syn. Jud.*; Reland, *Ant.*; the Mishnic tractate *Pesachim*, with comm.; Maimonides, *Yad Hachazakah*; artt. in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible, Smith’s *DB* [Note: *Dictionary of the Bible.*], Kitto’s *Cyclopaedia*, the *Ebi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*], Hamburger’s *RE* [Note: *E Realencyklopädie.*], the *JE* [Note: *E Jewish Encyclopedia.*]; Edersheim, *The Temple*, etc.; Chwolson, *Das letzte Passamahl Christi*; J. P. Lilley, *The Lord’s Supper* (1891), 35 ff.

J. T. L. Maggs.

Passover (II. In Relation To Lord's Supper).

PASSOVER (II.: in relation to Lord's Supper).

1. The historical relation.—The chronological difficulty raised by this topic having been adequately discussed in previous articles (see Dates, vol. i. p. 413 ff., Last Supper, and Lord's Supper (I.)), it is unnecessary to reopen it here. It may be assumed as certain that the Last Supper of Jesus took place not on the night of the general Jewish Passover, but on the evening preceding. It does not follow, however, that the Last Supper was not a Paschal meal. To the present writer it seems impossible to set aside the distinct evidence of the first three Gospels on this point, reinforced as that is by the language of St. Paul (Mat 26:17 ff., Mar 14:12 ff., Luk 22:7 ff., Luk 22:15; cf. 1Co 5:7-8; 1Co 11:23-26).

(1) It has been objected by Spitta (see the essay, 'Die urchristl. Traditionen über Ursprung u. Sinn des Abendmahls' in his *Zur Gesch. u. Litt. des Urchristentums*; cf. G. H. Box, *JThSt* [Note: *ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.*] , Apr. 1902), the most prominent representative of the view that the Last Supper bore no resemblance to the Passover, that the descriptions of it given in Mt. and Mk. do not suggest a Paschal meal, and in particular that the lamb is never mentioned. This has been called a 'significant omission'; a remark which assumes that, if Jesus had been observing the Passover, the Evangelists would naturally have given some account of the proceedings at the Jewish meal. But, since they had already stated with the utmost plainness that the meal to which He sat down with His disciples was an eating of the Passover, it was quite unnecessary for them to describe it in detail, since all Passover suppers were exactly similar. What they were concerned with were those novel and significant acts and words of their Master by which, while sitting at the table of the OT feast, He instituted the sacrament of the New Covenant.

(2) A similar objection is that at the Passover supper each participant had his own cup to drink from, while in the celebration of the sacrament there was only one cup. But this is to confound two things that are perfectly distinct. The fact that at the Jewish meal there was a cup for each person present is surely no reason why Jesus, in appointing the new rite of the Christian brotherhood, should not have taken one cup and passed it round to His disciples, saying, 'Drink ye all of it.'

(3) A further ground of objection is found in the fact that Jesus draws no parallels between the Paschal meal and the Christian sacrament, and in particular that, when He is choosing a symbol to represent His body, He takes a loaf of bread for the purpose, and not a portion of the roasted lamb. To speak in this way suggests a poor conception of our Lord's insight into the nature and destiny of His own religion. For, unless Jesus was altogether lacking in this respect, He must have foreseen, as clearly

as we can see today, that the broken loaf of bread was infinitely better suited than a piece of the Jewish Paschal lamb to serve to the Church of the future as the symbol of His sacrifice of love.

Criticisms like these seem trivial at the best. And it must be remembered, on the other hand, that those who deny that there is any outward connexion between the Passover and the Lord's Supper have to meet difficulties of the most pressing kind, and above all the difficulty of accounting for the unanimous testimony of the Synoptics on this very point. What are we to make of this testimony, and especially of the testimony of Mk., presumably the most original of all? It is suggestive that Spitta solves the difficulty by pronouncing the whole paragraph in which Mk. affirms the Paschal character of the Supper (Mar_14:12-16), to be an interpolation that stands in no organic connexion with the rest of the narrative (*op. cit.* p. 228). But even if there were any grounds of textual criticism for regarding the statements of the first three Gospels as later interpolations, we should still have to explain how it came to pass that at a very early date in the history of the Apostolic Church a false tradition not only sprang up but became dominant, according to which the Last Supper of Jesus with His disciples took the form of a Passover meal. Spitta admits that in St. Paul's view of the Sacrament the connexion with the Passover meal is evident (*op. cit.* p. 265; cf. Box, *op. cit.* p. 365). How, then, are we to explain this entire transformation of what, according to this theory, was the original tradition—a transformation so early that it must have been completed before Paul became a Christian and received from the first Apostles the story of what took place in the Upper Room on that night in which the Lord Jesus was betrayed? It is hard to see how, within a few years of Christ's death, and at the headquarters of the primitive Church, there could have grown up a tradition as to a simple matter of fact that was an entire falsification of what the Eleven knew to be the truth.

We regard it, then, as practically certain that the Last Supper took the form of a Passover meal. And since it was held on the evening before the general Jewish observance, it must have been an anticipated Passover (cf. Sanday, *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible* ii. p. 634; Zöckler, *PRE [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.]*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ix. pp. 32, 42). It is sometimes affirmed that this view will not bear the slightest examination (Box, *op. cit.* p. 360; cf. Gwilliam, art. Last Supper, p. 8^a). It is assumed, e.g., that it would have been impossible for our Lord and His disciples to procure the sacrifice of a lamb before the following day. But Chwolson, an expert in Jewish antiquities, anticipates these and similar objections, and shows how precarious the grounds are on which they rest (*Das letzte Passamahl Christi*, p. 37 ff.). And he further makes the interesting suggestion that a very slight textual error at this point in a supposed Aramaic source would account for the apparent identification

by the three Synoptics (Mat 26:17, Mar 14:12, Luk 22:7) of the occasion of the Last Supper with the regular night of the Jewish Passover (*ib.* p. 11).

2. The spiritual connexions.—In order to establish these, two things are necessary. First, we must understand what the Passover meal meant to Jesus and His disciples; next, we must trace the links between the Paschal supper in the Upper Room and the Christian sacrament that sprang out of it.

(1) *What did the Passover mean to Jesus and the Twelve?* For evidently it is with the Passover of our Lord's time that we have primarily to do. It is not uncommon to meet with doctrinal constructions of the Lord's Supper (*e.g.* Gore, *Body of Christ*, p. 12 ff.; Illingworth, *Divine Immanence*, p. 126 ff.) in which a leading rôle is assigned to ideas drawn from the modern study of Comparative Religion as to the significance of the ancient rite of the blood-covenant (see Trumbull, *The Threshold Covenant*, p. 203 ff.), or as to a sacrificial 'eating of the god' on the occasion of a harvest festival (see W. R. Smith, *RS [Note: S Religion of the Semites.]* p. 461; Frazer, *Golden Bough*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , ii. ch. 2). But it seems safe to conclude that archaeological considerations such as these were not uppermost in the mind of Jesus when He said to His disciples, 'With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer' (Luk 22:15), and that what He and they alike were thinking of was the Passover of Jewish history and tradition. Nothing could be further from the minds of a pious Jewish company at the dawn of the Christian era than the notion that God would partake of human food, or that they could enter into communion with the Highest by drinking the blood of a slain animal, or even by drinking wine considered as a substitute for blood (*cf.* Act 15:20; Act 15:29). What, then, did the eating of the Passover primarily mean for Jesus and His disciples?

(a) In the first place, it was *the memorial of a great historical deliverance*—that redemption of Israel from her bondage in Egypt which was also her birth-hour as a nation (Exo 12:3 ff., Exo 12:26 f.).—(b) But further, the Passover was a *covenant-meal based on the fact of the covenant made by sacrifice at Sinai* (Exo 24:3-8). It is certainly impossible to find within the circle of ideas suggested by the narrative of the first Passover in Egypt a full explanation of the words of Jesus at the institution of the Lord's Supper. One of the special merits of recent critical investigations into the nature of the sacrament is that they have brought fully into view the connexion between our Lord's words about the New Covenant (Mat 26:28 ||) and the story of the covenant at Sinai, taken along with the great prophetic anticipations (Jer 32:40, Eze 34:25; Eze 37:26, Isa 55:3) of what the author of Hebrews calls 'a better covenant established upon better promises' (Heb 8:6). It does not follow, however, as some have thought, that the covenant idea excludes that of the Passover, much less that the combination of them was altogether impossible (so Schultzen, *Das Abendmahl in NT*, p. 40). On the contrary, the narrative of the first

Passover in Egypt appears to anticipate that of the covenant made at Sinai, while apart from the former the latter would have no historical explanation. In any case, in the time of our Lord, the Jewish Passover was an annual covenanting feast at which the nation's covenant fellowship with Jehovah was solemnly renewed. The narrative of Exo 24:3-8 makes it clear that the original covenant rested on the fact of a covenant-sacrifice, and there seems little reason to question that in its essence this sacrifice was of a piacular nature (cf. A. B. Davidson in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible i. p. 512). The annual renewal of the covenant at the Feast of Passover evidently rested in like manner on the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb, and that this sacrifice also was conceived of as having a propitiatory effect it is hardly possible to doubt.—(c) Once more, the Passover was a joyful social meal, *the meal of Jewish brotherhood*, in which the participants, as members of the Divine covenant, gave expression to their covenant fellowship with one another as well as with Israel's God.

(2) If the Lord's Supper in its external relations sprang out of an immediately preceding Passover meal, and if that meal had for those who partook of it some such meaning as has just been described, the spiritual connexions between the two are evident. *The thought of the Jewish Passover underlies the Supper*, helping us to determine its true nature and purpose and religious significance.

(a) This outward relation between the Passover and the Lord's Supper goes far to decide the question whether or not the Supper *refers to our Lord's death*. Spitta's elaborate efforts to dissociate the Last Supper altogether from the Jewish Passover find their chief motive in his theory that the Supper had no bearing whatsoever on the death of Jesus, but was meant to have a purely eschatological reference, as an anticipation of the glorious Messianic meal in the heavenly Kingdom (*op. cit.* pp. 266 ff., 282 ff.). But if, on the other hand, it was at the close of a Passover meal that Jesus broke the bread and gave it to His disciples, saying, 'This is my body for you,' the analogy between the slain lamb and the broken bread can hardly be mistaken.—(b) It bears, again, on the question whether or not the Supper *was meant by Jesus to be repeated*. From the fact that in the Mk.-Mt. text of the institution of the Supper we do not find that command for a repetition of the observance which is given in Paul-Lk. (1Co 11:24-25, Luk 22:19), a number of critical scholars have concluded that Jesus never spoke the words, 'This do in remembrance of me'; that He had no thought of instituting a rite for perpetual celebration by the Church; and that His purpose in breaking the bread and passing the wine was merely to bid His disciples a solemn farewell, to set before them a striking parable in action, or at most to point them forward to the hope of a glad reunion in the heavenly Kingdom (Jülicher, *Theol. Abhandl.* pp. 235 ff., 245 ff.; Spitta, *op. cit.* p. 301 ff.; cf. P. Gardner, *Origin of the Lord's Supper*). But to a Jew the Passover was essentially a memorial feast to be kept by Israel throughout all her generations (Exo 12:14). And if the Supper was deliberately set by Jesus in the closest relation to the Passover,—so deliberately that

He even anticipated by a day an observance which otherwise His death would have rendered impossible,—this goes to confirm the view, supported not only by the text of Paul and Luke, but by the unhesitating praxis of the earliest community from the first (Act 2:42; Act 2:46; cf. Act 20:7, 1Co 10:16), and the Apostolic tradition as that was handed on to St. Paul at the time of his conversion (1Co 11:23), that Jesus both intended and commanded that the Supper should continue to be observed in remembrance of Himself.—(c) If the Lord's Supper sprang historically out of a Passover meal, it naturally *falls heir to the chief meanings and associations of the more ancient rite*. It is not only a memorial of Jesus, but a memorial of His sacrifice. 'Our passover also hath been sacrificed,' says St. Paul, 'even Christ' (1Co 5:7); and he tells us that as often as we eat the bread and drink the cup, we 'proclaim the Lord's death till he come' (1Co 11:26). The Passover was a renewal on the part of the OT Church of the covenant with God that had been made at Sinai; and every Supper is a renewal by the Christian people of the covenant made for them upon the Cross. The Passover was not only a renewal of the covenant fellowship with God, but a festive social meal at which the links of Jewish brotherhood were forged afresh. And the Lord's Supper is the occasion of a glad spiritual communion of those who belong to the household of faith, both with Christ Himself—the Elder Brother and the Head—and with their fellow-members in the one family of God.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , artt. 'Covenant' (A. B. Davidson), 'Passover' (W. J. Moulton), 'Jesus Christ' (Sanday, vol. ii. p. 634); *PRE [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.]* ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , art. 'Passah, isr.-jüd.' (von Orelli); Bickell, *Passover and Lord's Supper*; Spitta, *Urchristentum*; Jülicher, *Theol. Abhandlungen*; P. Gardner, *Origin of the Lord's Supper*; Schultzen, *Das Abendmahl im NT*; Chwolson, *Das letzte Passamahl Christi*; Schaefer, *Das Herrenmahl*; Lambert, *Sacraments in NT*; G. M. Mackie, 'Jewish Passover in the Chr. Church,' *ExpT [Note: xpT Expository Times.]* xiii. (1902), 391; *JThSt [Note: ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.]* , Apr. 1902, p. 357 ff., Jan. 1903, p. 184 ff.

J. C. Lambert.

Past

PAST.—'Let the dead past bury its dead,' is the unequivocal counsel we derive from the Lord's reply to a lukewarm disciple (Mat 8:22). In Christ no past is irretrievable; Divine forgiveness may blot out what men consider it impossible to forgive (Luk 18:27). Habit and custom may be burst asunder in a moment, like the rocky tomb that could not imprison the risen Lord. The motto of the Cliffords (*Désormais*)

may recall a Christian truth of priceless value: ‘Henceforward’ sin no more (Joh_8:11). God gives a fresh start for Christ’s sake to each one who prays for forgiveness in the spirit of forgiveness (Mat_6:14). The tyranny of the past led the Galilaeans to ask, ‘Is not this the carpenter?’ (Mar_6:3); but, as signally in the call of Levi, the disciple of Christ must be ready to throw aside the past altogether for His sake (Mat_9:9).—There is a dead past to be forgotten and forgiven, for God is God of the living (Mar_12:27). And there is a living past to be remembered and commemorated. Thus all generations call her *blessed* who was the mother of the Lord (Luk_1:48). The loving gift of a forgiven woman who had been a sinner is still told for a memorial of her (Mar_14:9). Yet the Christian hope looks ever forward to the brightness of the coming day, when the shadows shall flee away.

W. B. Frankland.

☩ Patience

PATIENCE (ὑπομονή, Luk_8:15; Luk_21:19, and throughout NT; μακροθυμία, ‘long-suffering,’ only in Epp.; verbal form appears Mat_18:26; Mat_18:29, with significance ‘Give me time’).—The moral attribute which enables men to endure afflictions and to employ strength wisely. It is essentially a Christian grace. The classical conception of virtue was mainly active. ‘The old pagan world meant by a virtuous man, a brave, strong, just, energetic human being, who might be, but who probably would not be, also humble, submissive, self-subduing’ (Liddon, *Christian World Pulpit*, vol. xxiv. 138). The Oriental idea touches the opposite extreme, in which virtue consists not in such qualities as patience, but in the passivity from which feeling is expelled (cf. Newman Smyth, *Christian Ethics*, pt. i. ch. 2, iii.). As a Christian grace, patience is inculcated in the NT (1Ti_6:11, Tit_2:2, Heb_10:36, Jam_1:4, 2Pe_1:6), and exemplified in the life of Christ. His patience is referred to directly only once in the NT, and then incidentally (2Th_3:5 AVm [Note: Vm Authorized Version margin.] and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885); but examples of it are mentioned in the Epp. as incentives to believers (Heb_12:2, 1Pe_2:23).

1. The patience of Christ may be regarded

(1) *in itself*. It constitutes one of the most remarkable features of His manhood. It is not visible upon the surface of the Evangelical narratives, but it becomes impressive the moment that reflexion begins to deal with His Personality in the light of the events of His life on earth. Whatever His consciousness of Himself, He was evidently aware that extraordinary forces were at His command (Mat_4:3; Mat_26:53). ‘Just in proportion to the eminence of a man’s sphere and the genius of a man’s endowments,

the quality of patience is necessary.' To none, therefore, was it more necessary and more difficult than to our Lord, and by none was it more perfectly possessed. He set before Himself an aim which marks Him as the supreme Dreamer of history; yet, with the vision always before Him, and the longing for its fulfilment pressing on His heart (Luk 12:50), He moved unhasting, if unpausing, towards the goal. The second temptation (Luk 4:5 f.) was a trial of patience. In it He met the temptation to accomplish His purpose prematurely and superficially by means of an appeal to forces which lay ready to hand in the temper and expectations of the Jews. He preferred the patience that works perfectly, and therefore slowly, to the passion that strikes swiftly and works partially and imperfectly. At the same time, His temperament could not be described as phlegmatic. His patience was not the placidity of a pool secluded by surrounding woods from storm, it was rather the calm of an ocean which refuses to allow any gale to rouse it to anger. Not incapability of passion, but perfect self-control, lay at the heart of the patience of Christ.

(2) *In its manifestations*, (a) *As a man*, He had to endure the irritations from which none is exempt, e.g. interruptions (Mar Mar 5:21 f., Mar 6:30 f., Joh 4:6-7), the suspicions (Luk 14:1 f.) and the provocations (Luk 10:25; Luk 11:53) of His foes; the spiritual dulness (Mar 9:19, Luk 10:40 f., Luk 24:25) and carnal expectations (Mar 9:33 f., Mar 10:35 f.) of His friends. 'He was subjected to trials of temper ...; He was harassed by temptations caused by nervous irritability, or want of strength, or physical weakness, or bodily weariness; unfair opposition was constantly urging Him to give way to undue anger and unrestrained passion; or rejection and desertion would, had it been possible, have betrayed Him into moodiness or cynical despair. The machinations of His foes, the fickleness of the mob, even the foolishness of His disciples, were scarcely ever wanting to try His spirit, and would often goad Him beyond endurance' (Bernard, *Mental Characteristics of the Lord Jesus*, cited in Stalker's *Imago Christi*, p. 192 f.). It is not enough to say that our Lord endured these temptations without showing any impatience; there was a positive radiance about His patience that makes it the supreme example of the grace as manifest in human life, (b) *As a teacher*, the patience of Christ was manifested (i.) in dealing with individuals, e.g. Philip (Joh 1:45; Joh 6:5 f., Joh 14:8), Thomas (Joh 20:27 f.), Peter (Joh 1:42, Mat 14:28 f., Luk 22:31 f., Luk 22:61, Luk 24:34, Joh 21:15 f.); (ii.) in training the disciples, e.g. explaining His parables to them (Mar 4:10; Mar 4:13); teaching them only as they were able to receive the truth (Mat 16:21, Joh 16:12); repeating lessons only partially understood (Mar 9:31; Mar 10:32 bf.). It was through His patience as a teacher that our Lord was able out of very raw material to educate the men who were the founders and Apostles of His Church, (c) *As a sufferer*, His patience is conspicuous in the scenes connected with His passion (see esp. Mat 26:52 f., Mar 14:60 f., Mar 14:65, Joh 18:22 f., Luk 23:34, Mar 15:29 f.). No one ever suffered so terribly and so patiently as He. There was the extreme of physical pain, of mental torture, and of spiritual agony. The suffering was unjustly inflicted, and was

accompanied by almost every possible indignity, but the patience of the Sufferer rose above it with a quiet dignity that makes those scenes the most wonderful in history.

(3) *In its limitations.* The patience of Christ had its limits, as every noble patience has. Those limits were not where, at first, we might expect to find them; He was patient with His disciples' dulness, though it grieved Him (Luk 24:25 f.). He never lost patience under the opposition of His enemies (Luk 11:53; Luk 20:20 f.). But when it was suggested that He should avoid the cross (Mat 16:22 f.), and when He was confronted with the spiritual assumptions of the Pharisees, His patience reached its limits. Self-indulgence and self-deception were sins with which Christ had no patience (see Stopford A. Brooke, *Sermons*, 2nd series, 'Patience and Impatience')

(4) *In its implications.* The patience of Christ is set before believers, directly (2Th 3:5) and indirectly (1Pe 2:21 f.), as an example and an inspiration. There is in Christ 'a type and fountain of patience' in which the possibilities of endurance are exhibited, and from which the grace for endurance to the uttermost may be gathered. The patience of Christ represents the passive side of Christian goodness, 'its deliberate, steady, hopeful endurance, in the spirit of Him who was made perfect through suffering' (Denney, *Expos. Bible*, 'Epp. to Thess.' p. 372).

2. Human patience is mentioned: (a) in Luk 8:15, with reference to the perseverance with which the fruit of God is brought forth in the believer's life. Spiritual fruitfulness is not easily attained. A consistent Christian character is wrought only by long patience. Christ sets the staying power of vital faith in contrast with the passing fervour of those who lightly receive and as lightly abandon the word of truth (cf. Luk 8:13). (b) In Luk 21:19, in the course of Christ's prediction of the sorrows that should befall during the struggle with Rome. Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 is much the preferable rendering. Its meaning may be summed up thus, 'Heroic perseverance wins the crown' (Lindsay, *Gospel of St. Luke*, *in loc*).

Literature.—H. Bushnell, *The New Life* (1860); A. Ritschl, *The Chr. Doct. of Justification and Reconciliation* (English translation 1900), 625; J. T. Jacob, *Christ the Indweller* (1902), 149; C. L. Slattery, *The Master of the World* (1906), 121; M. Creighton, *The Mind of St. Peter* (1904), 22; M. R. Vincent, *The Covenant of Peace* (1887), 234.

James Mursell.

PAUL.—It is fortunate that our subject is limited for us at the outset. We are not called upon to consider the life and theology of St. Paul *per se* and in all their bearings, but only in that particular relation which belongs to a Dictionary of ‘Christ and the Gospels.’ That aspect alone is momentous enough. The figure of St. Paul looms so large and fills so much of the NT that he may well seem to stand between Jesus Christ and the history of the Christian Church. ‘*The Apostle*’ was the name given in the early Church to the *corpus* of thirteen (or fourteen) Epistles called after him. And in the NT at least he does throw the other Apostles—or all but one—into the shade. The Epistle to the Hebrews, if not actually his, is allied to him in spirit. Even 1 Peter is impregnated with his teaching, however this has come about. If we are to believe many modern critics, we should have to number among his disciples the author of the Fourth Gospel and the three Johannine Epistles. The only two really independent books are James and the Apocalypse.

It is indeed well to remind ourselves that this state of things is in part appearance. We are always at the mercy of our evidence, *i.e.* of such evidence as survives. And while St. Paul has ample justice done to him, the Judæan Apostles and the Judæan Church have not. Still even this is a testimony to the energy and widespread influence of the Apostle of the Gentiles.

The fact remains that the dilated figure of St. Paul seems to bar the way between the subsequent history of Christianity and its Founder. And we are compelled to ask ourselves whether that history may not have undergone a certain amount of deflexion. In other words, Christianity in its first stage appears to have passed through a powerful medium; and the question is, whether that medium left it substantially unchanged, whether it still is what its Founder intended it to be. Two things strike us at once. One is, that the teaching of St. Paul, as compared with that of his Master, is highly theological. The apparent simplicity of the Gospels has given place to elaborate arguments and statements of doctrine. We shall consider the significance of this fact shortly; but in the meantime it rather forces itself upon our attention. And the second point is, that this Apostle whose influence has been so great was not one of the original Twelve, and was not himself a personal companion of Christ.

These considerations are enough to make the question before us one of some urgency. We shall need to examine with all the closeness in our power the nature of the relation between St. Paul and Christ, or—what almost amounts to the same thing—between the Epistles (as represented by their central group) and the Gospels, as the two main divisions of the Christian half of the Bible. To do this methodically, we will break up our inquiry into the following heads:

- I. General character of St. Paul’s teaching.

- II. Data of St. Paul's theology.
- III. Genesis of St. Paul's theology.
- IV. St. Paul's knowledge of Christ.
- V. Outlines of the Pauline theology.
- VI. Comparison with the teaching of Jesus.
- VII. Legitimacy of the Pauline construction.

I. General character of St. Paul's teaching

1. *St. Paul the first Christian theologian on a larger scale.*—It is true broadly to say that St. Paul is the first Christian theologian in the more technical sense of the word. He is the first to formulate doctrine on any considerable scale. The first Christians had their simple formulations: such as that 'Jesus is Lord' (1Co 12:3), 'Jesus is the Christ' (Act 5:42; Act 17:3), 'Jesus is the Son of God' (Act 9:20), 'He died for our sins according to the scriptures' (1Co 15:3), 'Christ rose from the dead the third day' (1Co 15:4), 'The Lord is at hand' (Jam 5:8, 1Pe 4:7). Many of these occur in Pauline contexts, but in such a way as to show that St. Paul took them over from the common stock of Christian teaching. He no doubt added to and expanded these simple formulae. In his hands they became a theology—not exactly a system, in the sense in which (*e.g.*) Aristotle's *Ethics* or Calvin's *Institutes* are systems; for such coherent logical construction is alien to the Semitic mind, and St. Paul was thoroughly Semitic—but yet, at least, a body of reasoned and elaborated doctrines. In other words, the teaching of St. Paul is a great constructive effort of thought.

2. *Place of theology in religion.*—Now it is also true that at the present day, in certain wide circles, theology in this technical sense has a bad name. It is regarded as something hard, cold, and formal, possessing, perhaps, a certain relative truth for the age to which it belongs, but hardly beyond this, and in our own age only a stumbling-block and hindrance to religion.

But this is just one of those *idola tribûs* that exaggerate a certain element of truth so far as to make it untrue. Theology is a necessity of life—for the few, consciously; for the many, unconsciously. It is like philosophy. Every man really has his philosophy, expressed or implied. It is inevitable that thought should play upon subjects of such supreme interest; inevitable that it should try to formulate its beliefs, and to bring them into relation with one another. And if it does not do this upon right lines, it will do it upon wrong ones.

It is therefore a mistake to place theology, as religious thought, in contrast with religious feeling, and to call the one warm and living and the other cold and dead. It is the nature of feeling to be warm, and the nature of an intellectual process to be by comparison cold. But the two things should not be opposed to each other; they rather supplement and complete each other. They appeal to different faculties; the one supplies material for the other. Each without the other is wanting; and it is together that they become an activity of the whole man.

3. In the teaching of St. Paul there is no divorce between theology and religion.—In the teaching of St. Paul there is certainly no lack of religious emotion. And it is not fair to concentrate attention upon one side of his teaching and to ignore the other. What can be more intense or more elevated than the feeling of Rom 8:31-39, or more exquisitely delicate than that of 1 Corinthians 13? And passages like the first of these and Rom 11:33-36 are striking examples of the way in which theological thought supplies the ground for, and passes into, religious emotion. The controversial argument of Gal. is not the most attractive part of the Apostle's writings; but how lovely are the pictures of Gal 5:22-23; Gal 6:1-2! And yet these pictures are in closest contact with his theology. Indeed, the sustained enthusiasm which is so characteristic of the Apostle is kindled directly by his convictions (2Co 5:14, Rom 5:1-11).

II. Data of St. Paul's theology.—St. Paul's theology, then, was an effort of intellectual construction. And the first question that meets us is, What had he to build with?

1. Old Testament.—Like his Master, St. Paul had behind him the OT as an authoritative volume, a sacred book. He was himself to bear a part in laying the foundation of another sacred book; but this, after all, was but a second volume in continuation of the first, and which in course of time came to be placed upon the same level with it. The OT was the religious authority from which all Christians alike started. And yet new conditions had to be met in new ways. The Master boldly laid down a new law: 'Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time ... but I say unto you' (Mat 5:21 f. etc.). The disciple could not do this; but when, at a critical stage in his career, he found himself in collision with the letter of the older Scriptures, he showed great skill in turning the edge of the arguments directed against him, by the use of current methods of interpretation.

2. Contemporary Judaism, Rabbinical and Apocalyptic.—Generally speaking, the Apostle was in regard to the interpretation of the OT at the common level of his time. But he rose above this through his superior insight and strong grasp of religious principle. The OT really was a revelation from God and the work of inspired men; and by virtue of his essential kinship with these St. Paul was able to elicit from it deeper

truth than his contemporaries. His methods are not exactly those which the Christian exegete of to-day cannot help adopting; but, as he had the heart of the matter, and the OT writers also had in their measure the heart of the matter, his interpretations are really in harmony with all that was best in them. We might take as an example his treatment of Abraham's faith. There are in the OT the two elements of Law and Faith; and their ultimate relation to each other in the counsels of God is not really different from that which St. Paul made it to be.

It was not, however, purely a question of interpretation. On the common basis of the OT, the contemporaries of St. Paul had developed a number of inferences and ideas which the Apostle began by sharing with them. We may distinguish—not sharply, and as though they were mutually exclusive, but rather as at one time in alliance and at another in opposition—two main streams, the Rabbinical and the Apocalyptic. From the second century of our era onwards the former became more and more dominant, while the latter dropped into the background. And, even in the time of St. Paul, the official classes inclined strongly to Rabbinism; it was chiefly the freer speculation of the time that took the shape which is found in the Apocalypses. On both sides, along with much that was arid or fantastic, there was also not a little that was penetrating and beautiful: witness the *Pirke Aboth* on the one hand, and 4 Ezra and Apocalyptic Baruch on the other. St. Paul had at his command all this accumulated material, and he used it as it suited him. But he was not in bondage to it, and he applied it in connexion with root ideas that were peculiarly his own.

3. *The teaching and life of Christ.*—The touchstone that St. Paul applied to the current ideas of his day and generation was their bearing upon his own intense faith in Christ. Those which proved capable of assimilation to this he retained and worked into his own teaching; those which were not capable of assimilation he simply let drop.

We have spoken of faith in Christ; it is a further question how far this faith is related to detailed knowledge of Christ's life and teaching. We shall have to estimate the extent of this presently. For the moment we need only note that, whether in greater or less degree, St. Paul must have had some such knowledge, and that knowledge must have played some part in the construction of his theology.

4. *Palestinian traditions.*—Nearly all his knowledge of Christ must have come to St. Paul mediately, and not immediately. It seems a natural inference from 2Co 5:16 that the Apostle had at least had sight of Jesus during His lifetime; but it can hardly have been more than this, or his self-accusations would have been even more bitter than they were. We are coming very soon to the question of the information about Christ which St. Paul derived from others. But, besides this, there must have been in any case those simple formulae to which we have already referred, in which the first

disciples summed up their fundamental beliefs. We shall see later how St. Paul dealt with these; but they must at least have formed the starting-point of his own more adventurous and developed thinking.

III. Genesis of St. Paul's theology.—We have seen what were the materials that St. Paul had to work upon. The other leading factor that gave shape to his thoughts was the subjective habit and attitude that he brought to bear upon these materials. On this head, too, there are some remarks to be made.

1. St. Paul not an immediate disciple of Christ.—No doubt it is an important fact, and from one point of view a defect and loss, that St. Paul had not been a personal companion of Christ. And yet, when we look a little further, we can see a certain appropriateness that he should have come upon the stage as he did, and at the point where he did. Christianity consists not only in a particular body of teaching, but also in the working of great spiritual forces that flow from the incarnation of Jesus Christ. That is to say, it includes not only the teaching of Christ, but an estimate, or apprehension, of His Person and work.

From this side it was not altogether a disqualification that the Apostle's outlook should be directed forwards rather than backwards. The principle of Tennyson's well-known lines holds good, that the past does not present itself in a complete and rounded form to those who are actually moving in it. So we may well believe that the first disciples were for a time immersed in the details of their own recollections, and that their grasp on the whole as a whole was weaker in consequence. In proportion as St. Paul was less involved in such concrete details, his grasp on the central idea of his faith seems to have been all the stronger. This may seem at first sight paradoxical; but there are paradoxes in the use which God makes of His instruments. There was a sense in which the knowledge of Christ after the flesh hindered rather than helped the apprehension of Him according to the spirit.

2. His temperament and training.—St. Paul was not one of those who need for their mental sustenance a great wealth of concrete details. He had the gift of religious imagination, to fill out an idea or an impression and convert it into a powerful motive. So the vision on the road to Damascus held his fascinated gaze throughout his career. It worked ceaselessly within, and dominated all his thinking.

And then we have to remember that according to the standards of his time St. Paul was highly educated. His bent was intellectual, and it was encouraged by his training. When he sat at the feet of Gamaliel, he must have heard problems discussed like the faith of Abraham, to which we have already referred, or the origin of evil desire in connexion with the Fall of man. These active discussions took with him the place that

books do with us. St. Paul was learned as his age counted learning, and he could not help treating the questions that arose after the manner of the learned.

3. *Spiritual experience.*—But a deeper influence than learning was his own spiritual experience. Continually we see this living experience reflected in what comes to us as doctrine. St. Paul taught what he had first felt, and he verified his teaching by experience. We shall naturally illustrate this when we come to speak of his theology more in detail.

4. *The teaching of history.*—At the same time St. Paul was not a mere student, but an active missionary, who soon came to be burdened with ‘the care of all the churches.’ He had something else to do besides following the logic of his own thought. The controversy with the Judaizers was one important episode in his life: and this had a great influence upon the form which his teaching took while it was going on.

Later on, when the victory was won, when the free admission of the Gentiles was secured and Jewish churches and Gentile churches stood over against each other on an equal footing, the Apostle is able to see the Divine purpose running through the alternate acceptance and rejection, and to map out the periods of history as the balance swayed now to one side and now to the other. The letters of St. Paul all bear traces, more or less distinct, of the occasions which called them forth. If, as we believe, the Pastoral Epistles are his, their different tone and style can only be accounted for by the special object with which they were written.

For the sake of clearness we have tried to distinguish the particular causes that contributed to make the theology of St. Paul what it is. But because we have singled out these causes, we of course do not suppose that only one was at work at a time. Very often two or more were at work together, subtly blended and passing into each other. The abstract distinctions that the mind creates always have about them something artificial; and yet history becomes clearer when the process of analysis precedes that of synthesis.

IV. St. Paul’s knowledge of Christ.—We now come to the direct question, What means had St. Paul of knowing about Jesus, and what did he know? We will take the latter half of this question first, as being the less speculative, and as helping us to answer the first.

1. *Extent of his knowledge.*—We are speaking now of the historical Jesus, and not of the glorified Christ. And here we are met at the outset by exaggerated statements, that St. Paul had little or no interest in the historical Jesus, and knew little or nothing about Him. It is coming to be seen that these statements are exaggerated, and in recent years allowance is being made for knowledge on a considerably larger scale

than used to be the case (see, for instance, the opinions mentioned by Knowling, *The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ*, pp. 201-204, 503-518). There are, however, certain points that we are obliged to leave undecided.

(i.) The most important of these has reference to the two well-known passages in which St. Paul appears to show detailed knowledge—1Co 11:23-25 (the institution of the Lord's Supper) and 1Co 15:3-8 (the appearances after the Resurrection). Are these passages to be treated as just samples of St. Paul's ordinary knowledge—so that he might, if he had pleased, have described other incidents in the Lord's life with equal fulness and precision? Or are we to take these two specimens of detailed information as something altogether exceptional and abnormal? For ourselves, we believe that the first alternative is far nearer the truth than the second. The very precision with which the Apostle writes looks as if he were drawing from a well furnished store. On the other hand, the paucity of the references proves hardly anything. There is frequently something that will seem to be capricious in our experience of such matters—the proportion in which a writer quotes what he might have quoted. We have to remember that, if this one Epistle had chanced not to survive, we should have had no evidence that St. Paul possessed detailed knowledge of this kind at all. This, then, is our own belief; but at the same time, if it is questioned, we cannot profess to make it good to demonstration.

(ii.) We note further that there are express appeals to 'words of the Lord' in 1Co 7:10; 1Co 9:14. Besides these, there are coincidences of expression so striking as almost to amount to quotation in Rom 12:14, 1Co 4:12-13; 1Co 6:5; 1Co 12:2-3.

(iii.) Again, St. Paul shows a marked insight into the character of Jesus as it is described in the Gospels. He singles out exactly those traits ('the meekness and gentleness of Christ,' 2Co 10:1) which the Jesus of the Gospels took as characteristic of Himself ('Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart,' Mat 11:29). Other allusions point in the same direction (e.g. Php 2:5-8).

(iv.) Really this insight into the character of Christ is part of a phenomenon that strikes us on a larger scale. The hortatory passages of St. Paul's Epistles show that he understood to a nicety the new religious ideal introduced by Christ. The ideal was really a new one. The nearest approach to it was that of 'the poor' in the Psalter, 'the poor in spirit' of the Gospel (Mat 5:3). But even these were not free from vindictiveness; they were not prepared to say, 'Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you,' or 'If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him to drink' (Mat 5:44, Rom 12:20). It is not merely a question of verbal parallelism; the whole conception is really the same. It could not be more perfectly delineated than it is in 1 Corinthians 13. When it is contended (as it is, e.g., by Wrede, *Paulus*, p. 91) that St. Paul is thinking mainly of those who are brethren in the faith, that is really

not the case; his exhortations are in no way confined to the relations of the brethren to one another.

2. Sources of this knowledge.—That there is a real connexion, and a close connexion, between the ideal laid down by Christ and that inculcated by St. Paul cannot be denied; it is really one and the same. How did St. Paul acquire the knowledge of it? He must have done so in no merely transient manner; he must have had the ideal so completely set before him that it sank deep into his soul.

(i.) In spite of the independence which he claims for himself, we know that St. Paul had long and familiar intercourse with disciples, like Barnabas and Mark, and with others in the church at Antioch (Act 13:1), who could not fail to instruct him as to what was new and distinctive in the teaching of Christ. In Gal 1:18 he speaks of himself as paying a visit to Peter at Jerusalem and spending a fortnight in his company. Both there and in Gal 2:2 a considerable comparing of notes seems to be implied. There are sufficient indications of oral intercourse between St. Paul and the older disciples to explain the knowledge which he evidently possessed.

(ii.) Had he, in addition to this, anything in writing that he could refer to? He cannot have had access to our present Gospels; but is it not possible that he may have had in his hands one or other of the documents out of which our present Gospels are composed? The Mark-Gospel is excluded by its date; but not so the second main document, often called *Logia*, and now generally known by the symbol Q. There is nothing, so far as we can see, in this document to make it impossible for St. Paul to have had the opportunity of consulting it. If we are right in forming our conception of it from the passages common to St. Matthew and St. Luke that are not found in St. Mark, it would be a work of precisely such a character as would bring out clearly the new moral ideal taught by Christ. We may well believe that this was really the object with which it was composed—that it was a manual for Christian missionaries to put into the hands of their converts as supplying them with a rule of life. The principal argument against this view is that, if it was early enough to be used by St. Paul, it is difficult to see why it should not have been used by St. Mark. Some scholars think that it was used by him, but we should not like to commit ourselves to that alternative. The question must be left open.

On the other hand, the markedly individual character of the two chief specimens of the Pauline tradition, as compared with the Gospels, would go to show that the sources from which he drew were distinct from those used by our present Evangelists.

V. Outlines of the Pauline theology.—As we have already implied, the great and central event in St. Paul's career was his conversion. It is this that really gives the key

to his theology. It determined for him at once his conception of Christ, and the nature of his own response to the appeal which Christ made to him.

1. *The glorified Christ.*—The vision that he saw was of Christ glorified. In other words, Christ appeared to him as Spirit; and it is this spiritual Christ that henceforth controlled his experience. And yet, not that alone. The glorified Christ was none the less identical with the crucified Jesus of Nazareth. It is in this double aspect that the exalted Form that he saw made such an intense impression upon the Apostle.

2. *Christ within.*—The vision was for *him*; it appealed personally and directly to him; and he responded with all the ardour of his being. It was as if he clasped to his heart the image of Christ that he saw, and it entered into him and possessed him. Or, conversely, it might be said that the extended arms of the Christ whom he saw embraced and enfolded himself. These two ways of speaking St. Paul always treats as equivalent—to say that he clasped Christ or that Christ clasped him, that he was ‘in Christ’ or that Christ was ‘in him,’ meant the same thing. The same act had a Divine side and a human; and the one corresponded to the other. The process of which the Apostle was conscious in himself had to be repeated in his converts (Gal 4:19). It is all a way of expressing the closest appropriation, assimilation, and union.

3. *Faith.*—In another connexion St. Paul calls the act by which he entered into this relation ‘faith.’ This act of faith could be expressed intellectually as assent to the proposition that ‘Jesus is the Christ,’ or that ‘Jesus is Lord.’ But any such process of the intellect was swallowed up at once in the warmer emotion of loyalty, gratitude, and adoring love. We must think of it always as love for One who is in heaven and not on earth, and therefore as at one and the same time love and adoration. It is this which gives its peculiar quality and value to ‘faith,’ as St. Paul conceived it. The impression that the Apostle received was so overpowering, that it seemed to make his whole life a different thing; ‘a new creation,’ he called it himself (Gal 6:15); ‘the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me’ (Gal 2:20).

4. *The death of Christ.*—We go back to the Damascus vision. It was proof that Jesus of Nazareth, whose followers the Apostle in his blindness had persecuted, was no mere ambitious pretender, but all that His disciples believed Him to be—both Lord and Christ. But if that was so, the apparently shameful death that He died could not be really shameful: whatever appearance it wore in the eyes of men, there must really be in it a Divine virtue—a virtue infinite, because Divine.

Already in the infant Church, following, as we believe, hints of the Lord Himself, there was a tendency to explain the death of the Crucified by means of principles inherent in the OT, by the idea of sacrifice and by the idea of vicarious suffering; on

the one hand, by the analogy of the Levitical sacrifices, and, on the other hand, by the description of the Servant of Jahweh in Deutero-Isaiah. St. Paul took up these ideas, and worked them out in his own manner: the sacrificial idea, especially in Rom 3:25; Rom 5:9, 1Co 5:7 (cf. Heb 9:22); the vicarious idea, esp. in 2Co 5:21. St. Paul also added a new explanation of his own in Gal 3:13. This last might be described as somewhat Rabbinical; but the same cannot be said of the other two. The principles of sacrifice and of vicariousness are deeply impressed upon God's world; and that they should culminate in a supreme act of self-devotion has in it nothing incredible.

5. *Justification and reconciliation.*—The death of Christ established a new relation between God and man. It established it, as it were, objectively and ideally. For it to take full effect, man had to do his part; he had to realize the new relation in a reformed and regenerate life. But the Christian was allowed to anticipate this. He had not to wait for the Divine forgiveness, which was vouchsafed to him at once as soon as he became a Christian and was launched upon that career of amendment and advance to which as a Christian he was pledged. St. Paul uses a judicial term, and describes the convert from the first as 'justified,' *i.e.* 'declared righteous' or 'acquitted.' This is the Divine answer to the faith by which he makes his profession and has it sealed by baptism. By this decisive act the Christian enters at once into the circle of the Divine favour; he is received as a son reconciled to his Heavenly Father, as a prodigal returned. Henceforth his course is not one of weary effort and failure, but the way is smoothed for him and brightened by the Father's love.

This was one way of describing the process. Another way turned round St. Paul's characteristic manner of conceiving the relation of the Christian to Christ of which we have spoken. We have said that in St. Paul's own experience the vision of the exalted Christ was, as it were, clasped to his heart. The act was so intense and so absorbing that it amounted to a kind of identification: 'No longer I, but Christ liveth in me.' And yet this ideal Christ still wears the features of the historical Christ. It is the Christ who died and rose again. The Christian who is identified with such a Christ must himself also die and rise again—in such sense as he can, *i.e.* in a moral and religious sense; he must die to sin, and rise again to newness of life (Rom 6:1-11); he must emerge from the imprisonment in which he is held by sin into the free and spacious life of the Spirit (see below).

6. *Law and grace.*—In his earlier experience, religion for St. Paul, as for the rest of his countrymen, meant primarily obedience to law; to be righteous was to keep the Law. But that was really an impossible task. The Law might command, but it could not secure performance. Human nature was too weak to keep up obedience to its rigorous behests. In the multitude of rules and precepts there were always some that were

neglected. And to break the Law in any degree was to break it, and to forfeit the reward of well-doing.

It was otherwise with the service of Christ. Here the motive was personal loyalty and devotion, carried out under the conditions which have just been described, with the assurance of forgiveness, of Divine favour and Divine aid. Thus, whatever might be its outward conditions, the life of the Christian was one of inward joy and peace.

An incidental consequence of this new experience was that in his controversy with the Judaizers St. Paul was able to take his stand upon a broad ground of principle. He was able to contrast Christianity with Judaism as a higher type of religion, as a reign of Grace over against a reign of Law.

7. *Developed Christology.*—At this point we may turn to consider St. Paul's contribution to the Christian doctrine of God. So far as Christianity brought a change in this doctrine, it all arose from the recognition of the Divine nature and mission of Christ, and from the further consequences which that recognition brought with it. Jesus Himself had certainly come as the promised Messiah, though during His life on earth the full supernatural attributes of the Messiah were veiled and restrained. The Resurrection was the decisive proof that they were really there; and from that time onwards the little band of believers proclaimed openly the central article of its faith. It did so especially under the double title of Messiah and Son of God. St. Paul took over these titles in the full depth of their meaning. We have seen that for him the Messiah was especially the glorified Messiah. That was, indeed, since the Resurrection, essentially the case with all Christians, but St. Paul grasped his belief with peculiar intensity and concentration. Whereas, too, the title 'Son of God,' though literally and strictly meant, was used by the first disciples in a way that was naïve and unreflective, St. Paul evidently dwelt upon it, and pressed its full metaphysical meaning. He had clearly satisfied himself that the manifestations of Christ's Divine Sonship required nothing short of this. And then, as we might expect, he went on to make use of other terms that his speculative training naturally suggested, to illustrate and carry home the same fundamental idea.

8. *God the Father.*—There are three ways in which St. Paul adds to the doctrine of God the Father: (i.) By discriminating and correlating the spheres of Him whom we call God the Father and of Him whom we call God the Son. The designations were already current, and the tendency to discriminate or define all grew out of the Incarnation. There is not much set teaching, but there are many side allusions which testify to considerable activity of thought on the subject.—(ii.) By calling attention to the work of the Son as revealing the character of the Father. The whole scheme (so to speak) of the Incarnation proceeds from the Father, and therefore itself bears witness, more direct and more unmistakable than any other, to the love which

underlies the dealings of God with man—to the love not only of the Son who becomes incarnate and who suffers for human sin, but also to that of the Father who sent Him (Rom 5:8, 2Co 5:13-14; 2Co 5:17-18, Col 1:19-20).—(iii.) By marking out in a sort of broad chronology the periods of the world's history (Romans 9-11, 1Co 15:20-28). It is, no doubt, possible to press particular expressions (such as Rom 9:17-18) in such a way as to make them conflict both with the free will of man and with the justice of God. That was not at all the Apostle's intention, but only to enforce that strong sense of a providential ordering of successive events which must be felt by every religious mind.

9. *The Holy Spirit.*—The belief in the Holy Spirit was just shared by St. Paul with his fellow-Christians. The remarkable phenomena which they saw around them—prophecy, speaking with tongues, exorcisms, and the like—were all in the language of the time naturally referred to His activity. St. Paul did but adopt this language, and then perhaps extend it, more than his neighbours were in the habit of doing, to phenomena that were less extraordinary but more deeply related to the moral and religious life (we remember that 1 Corinthians 13 comes in the midst of a long passage dealing with gifts of the Spirit). It is noticeable that he—not alone, but in company (*e.g.*) with Lk. in Act 16:7 (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885)—expressly associates the Spirit, not only with God, but with Christ (Rom 8:9).

10. *The Church and the Sacraments.*—It was obvious and natural that the blessings brought by Christ must hold good in the first instance for those who rallied to the cause of Christ, and ratified their adhesion to Him by confession and baptism. The society so formed could not but start with a position of privilege analogous to that of the Jewish Church under the old dispensation. But neither under the one dispensation nor under the other was that position of privilege given only to be selfishly enjoyed. For the OT see Isa 2:2-4; Isa 11:10; Isa 19:18-25; Isa 42:1-7; Isa 49:6, Mic 4:1-3 etc. It was just an instance of 'the purpose of God according to selection.' The recipients of it were to be missionaries who were to carry the gospel to the end of the world.

This was always the ulterior object with which Christians were to use and enjoy their privileges (Rom 11:28; Rom 10:12-15). They might enjoy them, but they were bound to do what in them lay to spread them. Therefore, when St. Paul enlarges upon the felicity of being a Christian (*e.g.* in Rom 5:1-11), it is in no spirit of narrowness or exclusiveness, but rather the contrary (as appears from ch. 11). The exhortations to the Church to organize itself as efficiently as possible, and to prosecute the Christian life to the uttermost, must all be taken with this tacit condition.

The two Sacraments belong to the internal organization of the Church. They are neither of them due to the initiation of St. Paul. He found them in existence, and he fully accepted them, and from time to time he dwells upon them in such a way as to

show that he was well aware of their significance and value. St. Paul distinctly recognizes them as means of grace essential to the life of Christians. We cannot at all accept the view that he was the first to introduce repeated acts of communion; 1Co_11:25-26 implies that he found it a regular practice.

11. *The Last Things.*—The Epp. supply an important part of the evidence that the element of eschatology in the teaching of Christ, and in His own conception of Himself, was as large as we find it in the Gospels. In proportion as we go back in time to the earliest Epp., this element is seen at its greatest. In 1 and 2 Thess. it is the main topic, and in 1 Cor. it is very prominent. It became less so as time went on, but even in the latest period it does not wholly disappear (Php_4:5).

The Pauline Epp. are even more important still from the part that they play in covering the transition from a form of Christianity in which eschatology is prominent, to one in which it has fallen into the background. In the later Epp. the basis of Christianity has been silently shifted; its foundations have been ‘underpinned’ by doctrines of more permanent applicability—esp. by the stress that is laid upon the working of the glorified Christ or the Spirit of Christ.

VI. Comparison with the teaching of Christ.—We are now in a better position to take a *coup d’œil* of the relation of St. Paul’s mission and teaching as a whole to that of his Master. It has been rightly observed by more than one of those who have treated of the subject (see Knowling, *Testimony of St. Paul to Christ*, p. 514), that the Gospel of St. Paul begins where the earthly life of Jesus ends. The *dictum* needs some qualification (as we have seen); but it is in the main true. It means that the elaborate Pauline theology is of the nature of a development, so that what we have to consider is how and in what sense it is a development.

1. *The teaching of Jesus presupposed.*—That this was the case, we may see (i.) from the easy and natural allusions to the character of Christ and of the Christian ideal (§§ iv. 1. (iii.) (iv.) above); (ii.) from the general position in the earlier Epp. on the subject of eschatology, which directly continues the attitude described in the Gospels; (iii.) and, in particular, from the conception of the ‘Kingdom of God.’ This last point is so important that we must give it a section to itself.

2. *The Kingdom of God in St. Paul.*—There is no exposition of the idea of the Kingdom; it is taken for granted as well known. There are several examples in Epp. of all dates in which the phrase is used in its ordinary future sense: e.g. Gal_5:21, 1Co_6:9 f., Eph_5:5. Similar to these is the use in 1Th_2:12. But by the side of these are other passages in which the Kingdom is evidently present. Such would be: 1Co_4:20 ‘the kingdom of God is not in word, but in power’; in Col_1:13-14 it is the sphere of present forgiveness into which the Christian is translated; in Col_4:11 it has

reference to the work of missions. But most significant of all is Rom 14:17 'the kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.' Here the Kingdom is entirely a present idea, and it seems to cover the whole range of the gospel. Nothing could better mark the transition spoken of above.

3. Pauline developments.—So far, the teaching of St. Paul has been just a continuation of the teaching of Christ. But in the outlines of his theology which have been sketched above it will have been seen that there is much which goes beyond this. This developed teaching has reference primarily and especially to the conception of the Person of Christ. Another new element is the elaborate psychological analysis of the process of belief, and generally of the Christian habit of mind. And lastly, as we have seen, there is certain special teaching that has grown out of the circumstances of the time.

4. Origin of the developments.—It would be an utter mistake to suppose that St. Paul's teaching as to the Person of Christ was a new invention of his own. We have seen that it was really nothing more than a further analysis of the meaning contained in the simple doctrinal formulae; of the primitive Church: such as that 'Jesus is Lord,' 'Jesus is the Christ,' 'Jesus is the Son of God.' It would be equally an utter mistake to imagine that the primitive Church was going against the will of Jesus Himself. There are indications enough that it was in no sense doing this. The only thing that has given any colour to such an idea is the great reticence and reserve that our Lord showed in putting forward His claims. There is something of a problem in this. But that Jesus knew Himself to be both Messiah and Son, we may regard as quite certain.

It is true that St. Paul reflected upon these titles, and true that in all his teaching his own experience entered as a shaping force; but it is just that fact which gives to his teaching such depth of reality.

VII. Legitimacy of the Pauline construction.—It may be said, not without truth, by way of discounting these Pauline developments: (i.) that the methods of argument by which they are supported, especially the exegetical methods, are not always what we should consider valid; (ii.) that the personal experience on which they rest is exceptional and peculiar; and (iii.) that, in like manner, the conditions of early Christian history by which they were shaped necessarily had about them something relative and transient.

But, on the other hand: (i.) few propositions are more true than the proverbial one, that conclusions are often more right than the explicit reasoning that leads up to them. Methods of proof are often of the nature of a scaffolding the real purpose of which is to set up a construction in presentable shape, when it verifies itself after the fact by its own inherent properties in the experimental field of life.

(ii.) It is not to be denied that the personal experience of St. Paul has in it much that is exceptional and peculiar. But that is far more because of its penetrating intensity along lines that are common to lesser men, than because there is in it anything eccentric that disqualifies his experience from representing theirs. In other words, St. Paul was a religious genius of the highest order that human nature has ever produced—in the same category with the writer whom we call Second Isaiah, with Jeremiah, with many of the Psalmists, with St. John, and at a later date with that astonishing genius, St. Augustine. We believe that men like these were specially raised up by God, and endowed by His Spirit with many marvellous gifts, for the express purpose of pointing out the way in which the crowd of religious people may follow, of setting before them an ideal after the heights and depths of which they may strive. We have only to think of the consummate beauty of the chapter on Charity, which, after all, is but the culmination of other passages that are strewn thick over the hortatory portions of the Epistles; and to remember, along with this, that such passages do but translate the theoretic side of theology into the activities of daily life.

(iii.) It might be said of each of the foregoing heads, and it may be said specially of that which turns upon the relativity of the teaching that emerges from history, that at most the objection does but amount to this, that the theology of St. Paul, so far as it rests on the grounds enumerated, is subject to the conditions of all things human. All things human are relative, and relative, in particular, to the age to which they belong. But in this class at least of things human, while there is the perishable envelope which is inevitably stripped off by time, there is no less something permanent as well, a permanent residuum or deposit—not always definable in words, but very real and very precious—which passes on into all the ages that follow. This we believe to be true pre-eminently of the first age of Christianity, and true, in particular, in a very high degree of the teaching of St. Paul. The world since his day—and not the Christian world alone—has drawn sustenance from it to an extent of which it is probable that, with all its eulogies of the Apostle, it has never been fully aware. There is a large ingredient of Pauline teaching in the very life-blood that courses in a Christian's veins.

Literature.—The subject of St. Paul in his relation to Christ has been much discussed in recent years, and that on critical and modern lines. The larger works are: Feine, *Jesus Christus und Paulus* (1902); Goguel, *L'Apôtre Paul et Jésus-Christ* (1904): and in English, Knowling, *Witness of the Epistles* (1892), and *The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ* (1905). Dr. Knowling's two books are written with exhaustive knowledge, and with his invariable lucidity and accuracy of statement and admirable temper; they cover a wide extent of surface, and all that can be said on the other side is that, perhaps owing to some defect of construction, they may seem to be more upon the surface than they really are. There is a crowd of smaller tracts and articles, for the

most part dating from the last two or three years. Among these may be mentioned: H. J. Holtzmann, 'Jesus und Paulus' in *Prof. Monatschrift* (1900); Kölbing, *Die geistige Einwirkung der Person Jesus auf Paulus* (1906); Wrede, *Paulus*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (1907); Jülicher, *Paulus und Jesus* (1907) [both in the series of *Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher*]; Julius Kaftan, *Jesus und Paulus* (1906); and Arnold Meyer, *Wer hat das Christenthum begründet; Jesus oder Paulus?* (1907). Of these, the writer thinks that he has derived most from the two tracts of Wrede and Jülicher—from Wrede in a negative sense, and from Jülicher in a positive. Wrede has constituted himself a sort of *advocatus diaboli* in the case of St. Paul: his writings are all marked by very great sincerity; and his sincerity takes the form of bringing all the objections that the natural man of the twentieth century might be moved to bring. Wrede's striking career was cut short somewhat abruptly on 23rd Nov. 1906. Jülicher's pamphlet the writer believes to be one of the very best productions of its author; when allowance is made for the point of view, it is full of sympathy and insight. Kaftan is also very good, but not quite so good in the second part of his little treatise as in the first. The anon. work, *The Fifth Gospel: being the Pauline Interpretation of the Christ* (1907), and Du Bose, *The Gosp. acc. to St. Paul* (1907), may also be recommended.

W. Sanday.

⚡ Pavement

PAVEMENT.—The word occurs only in Joh 19:13 as one of the names by which was known the locality otherwise called **Gabbatha** (wh. see) In classical usage λιθόστρωτον denotes a stone pavement, and later a mosaic or tessellated pavement, in which sense the word passed into Latin. Of recent years beautiful pavements have been found in many places in Palestine; but so far there is no evidence outside the NT that any locality in Jerusalem was generally known as either Gabbatha or the Pavement, and no attempted identification of the spot is quite satisfactory. The easiest course is to regard the passage as unhistorical, and the allusions as derived only from the writer's imagination and introduced to give verisimilitude to the narrative; but such an explanation is itself as subjective as the pleas it adopts. That the reference is to the paved forecourt of the Temple, or to the usual meeting-place of the Sanhedrin, is rendered unlikely by the absence of the designation from Jewish literature, as well as by the improbability that Pilate would choose any partially consecrated spot for the inquiry. On the other hand, there are Latin usages which seem to connect the locality with the governor's official or temporary residence. Julius Caesar is described by Suctonius (*Vit. Div. Jul.* 46) as carrying about with him on his military expeditions a

tessellated pavement, which was laid down in his encampments as marking the spot from which judicial decisions and addresses to the soldiers were given. Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. iv. 6) reports that Philip the tetrarch similarly carried his tribunal with him (τοῦ θρόνου εἰς δὴν ἔκρινε καθεζόμενος ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς ἐπομένου), but there is no reference to a portable mosaic. In the case of Pilate, it is possible that he would be disposed to imitate the procedure of the Emperor, or even that of a petty sovereign, but in this matter no record to such an effect has been found; and whilst the course would not be without danger, it is not easy to think that a locality would derive its name from being one of many places on which a movable pavement was once or occasionally laid. That, moreover, there were, as a rule, in the larger centres of population, fixed places for the administration of justice is not unlikely. The provincial basilicas were often law-courts as well as exchanges, the tribunal being set in the semicircular apse, of which the raised floor was certainly paved, and exactly the kind of spot to attract a designer. There may not have been any such basilica at Jerusalem, or at least the remains of one have not so far been clearly identified. Josephus (*BJ* II. ix. 3: καθίσας ἐπὶ βήματος ἐν τῷ μεγάλῳ σταδίῳ) has been cited in support of a view that Pilate used ‘the open market-place’ (so Whiston, followed by many) at Jerusalem for the administration of justice; but the passage refers to Caesarea, and the rendering of στάδιον as a synonym of ἀγορά is not well established. Each stationary camp, again, had its tribunal, sometimes formed of turf but more frequently of stone, and from it the general addressed the soldiers and the tribunes administered justice. In Jerusalem the garrison occupied the castle of Antonia, within which would be the tribunal used in cases of military discipline, but probably not for the hearing of Jewish complaints and causes. Pilate himself would reside in Herod’s palace (cf. Philo, *ad Gaium*, 31, and the practice of Gessius Florus in Josephus *BJ* ii. xv. 5), as did also the procurator at Caesarea (*Act* 23:35). It was a magnificent building, lined outside with spacious porticoes. Here it was natural that the Jews should present themselves when seeking the execution of Jesus (*Joh* 18:28; *Joh* 19:4), who was apparently confined in the palace (*Joh* 19:9; *Joh* 19:13 a). And one of these paved porticoes may well have been known within the palace as the Pavement, upon which stood the judgment-seat, under an open cupola or within a rounded porch.

Literature.—Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible , art. ‘Gabbatha’; *Ebi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*] , art. ‘Pavement.’

R. W. Moss.

PEACE.—1. The word frequently occurs in the Gospels in the idiomatic phrase ‘to hold one’s peace,’ *i.e.* to keep silence, representing (both in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 and Authorized Version) no fewer than four different verbs in the original—ἡσυχάζω, σιγάω, σιωπάω, and φιμόω. ἡσυχάζω (Luk 14:4) is the most general term (fr. ἡσυχος, ‘at rest’), denoting a state of restfulness in which silence is included (cf.

Luk 23:56 τὸ μὲν σάββατον ἡσύχασαν ‘and on the sabbath they rested’). σιγάω (Luk 20:26) has been distinguished from σιωπάω (Mat 20:31; Mat 26:63, Mar 3:4; Mar 9:34; Mar 10:48; Mar 14:61, Luk 18:39; Luk 19:40)—the former as referring to a silence induced by mental conditions (fear, grief, awe, etc.), the latter as a more physical term denoting simply an abstinence from vocal utterance (so Schmidt in his *Synon. d. gr. Sprache*, quoted by Grimm-Thayer, *Lex.* p. 281). But in classical Gr. such a distinction between σιγάω and σιωπάω can hardly be said to be ordinarily observed (cf. Liddell and Scott, *Lex. s.vv.*), and in the NT ἡσυχάζω, σιγάω, and σιωπάω, when used in the sense of holding one’s peace, appear to be employed without any real discrimination.

On the other hand, φιμόω is a stronger and rougher word, which properly means ‘to muzzle’ (fr. φιμός, ‘a muzzle’). It is noticeable that our Lord addresses it only to an unclean spirit (Mar 1:25 = Luk 4:35) or to the raging sea (Mar 4:39, where Authorized and Revised Versions give ‘Be still!’). Once Mt. uses it to describe how Jesus put the Sadducees to silence (Mat 22:34); and in the parable of the Wedding Garment it is used (Mat 22:12) to express the speechless condition to which the intruder was reduced when challenged by the king (cf. *Twent. Cent. NT*¹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , ‘the man was dumbfounded’).

2. In the ordinary sense of *rest* or *tranquillity*, in antithesis to strife and war, ‘peace’ (εἰρήνη) is found, *e.g.*, in Mat 10:34 = Luk 12:51 (note the contrast with μάχαιρα), Luk 14:32. Generally, however, εἰρήνη in the NT means more than this, and clearly inherits the larger suggestions of the Heb. עָלֶיךָ, which primarily denoted a state of wellbeing, safety, and blessedness, of which, however, peace in the common acceptance of the term would be one of the most important conditions. It is in this way that we are to understand expressions like ‘Now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace’ (Luk 2:29), ‘his goods are in peace’ (Luk 11:21), ‘the things which belong unto thy peace’ (Luk 19:42). This also is the connotation of ‘Peace!’ when used as a form of salutation (Mat 10:12-13 = Luk 10:5-6; Luk 24:36, Joh 20:19; Joh 20:21; Joh 20:26); though, as employed by our Lord, and by His disciples according to His

instructions, the salutation is weighted with the larger Messianic meaning (see below).

3. But in its predominating and characteristic use in the NT, εἰρήνη is distinctively a *Christian word*, being employed especially to describe the mission, the character, and the gospel of Jesus Christ.

(1) *Peace was a distinctive feature of Christ's mission.*—In prophetic anticipation the coming of the Messiah was to inaugurate a reign of peace (Isa 9:7, Psa 72:3; Psa 72:7), and He Himself was to be 'the Prince of Peace' (Isa 9:6). In the Gospel story of His birth, the promise of peace heralds His advent (Luk 1:79), and 'on earth peace' is sung by the angels on the night in which He is born (Luk 2:14). His earthly ministry was a ministry and message of peace. 'Have peace one with another' was one of His injunctions (Mar 9:50), while of those who not merely live in peace, but are peace-makers (εἰρηνοποιοί), He said that they shall be called sons of God (Mat 5:9). 'Peace' was the salutation which both the Twelve and the Seventy were bidden to use when sent forth on their respective missions (Mat 10:12 f., Luk 10:5 f.); it was the word spoken by Jesus Himself in dismissing those whom He had healed of their physical or moral plagues (Mar 5:34, Luk 7:50; Luk 8:48); and again the greeting with which He met His disciples after He was risen from the dead (Luk 24:36, Joh 20:19; Joh 20:21; Joh 20:26). And in all these cases it seems evident that 'Peace be unto you!' and 'Go in peace!' are not merely conventional forms of salutation or farewell, but refer to the blessings guaranteed by Jesus as the Christ of God.

And yet there is a sense in which Jesus came 'not to send peace, but a sword' (Mat 10:34, cf. Luk 12:51). For there is a false peace (Jer 6:14; Jer 8:11); and with that He could have nothing to do. Jesus would never compromise, or permit His followers to compromise, with falsehood or error or sin; and so, in a world where these things abound, His coming inevitably meant division and struggle and suffering (cf. Luk 2:34-35). Yet, for all that, peace was the purpose of His mission, even though it had to be attained by sending forth a sword—sharp and twoedged, as the seer saw it (Rev 1:16)—a sword which will ultimately secure the victory of the good in the conflict with evil, and bring in the peace that rests on righteousness (cf. Psa 72:7; Psa 85:10).

(2) *Peace was a quality of Christ's character.*—The words 'Peace I leave with you; my peace I give unto you' (Joh 14:27) strike one of the fundamental notes of His personal being as that is revealed to us in the Gospels. Men have been known to make bequests when they had nothing to leave; but peace was a blessing which Jesus had power to bestow, because it was His own peculiar possession. At the very centre of His earthly

life, amidst all its vicissitudes, there always lies a profound peace, which is quite different from impassivity, for it is something vital and flowing like a strong calm river (cf. [Isa 48:18](#)). It was, without doubt, the magnetism of this peace-possessing and peace-diffusing strength of Jesus that drew troubled hearts around Him; and it was the consciousness of having it and being able to bestow it that inspired that most characteristic invitation, ‘Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest’ ([Mat 11:28](#)).

This personal peace of Jesus must be distinguished, of course, from the peace of outward circumstances. When He said, ‘My peace I give unto you,’ He was just about to go forth to Gethsemane and the judgment-hall and the cross. But the peace He was conscious of lay deeper than all trials and sufferings, for it came from the assurance of a perfect union in thought and heart and will with His Father in heaven ([Joh 14:11](#); [Joh 14:20](#); [Joh 14:31](#)). Christ’s peace was like that of a white water-lily—tossed to and fro by the surface waves of the lake, but unshaken from its place because its roots are buried deep in the soil beneath (cf. Wordsworth, *Excursion*, v. 555). All through His earthly life He realized, as no other human being ever could, the full meaning of the prophet’s word, ‘Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on thee’ ([Isa 26:3](#)).

(3) *Peace is a characteristic blessing of the gospel of Christ.*—Thus we find it constantly described when we pass from the Gospels to the Apostolic teaching. So characteristic of Christ’s gospel is it that this gospel is itself described by St. Paul as ‘the gospel of peace’ ([Eph 6:15](#)), and St. Peter in the Acts speaks of those who publish the message of salvation as ‘preaching good tidings of peace by Jesus Christ’ ([Act 10:36](#)). ‘Peace,’ indeed, becomes, like grace, a virtual summary for gospel blessings, and so in the benedictory salutations of nearly every Apostolic writer it is combined with ‘grace’ as the distinctive gift of ‘God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ’ ([Rom 1:7](#), [1Co 1:3](#), [2Co 1:2](#), [Gal 1:3](#), [Eph 1:2](#), [Php 1:2](#), [Col 1:2](#), [1Th 1:1](#), [2Th 1:2](#), [1Ti 1:2](#), [Tit 1:4](#), [Phm 1:3](#), [1Pe 1:2](#), [2Pe 1:2](#), [2Jn 1:3](#), [Jud 1:2](#)).

It is St. Paul, however, who works out most fully the place of peace in the Christian gospel and its immediate relation to Christ Himself. With him ‘peace’ has two distinct meanings, corresponding to two different facts of Christian experience. (a) First, there is an objective peace—the peace of *reconciliation with God* through our Lord Jesus Christ—which follows as the result of being justified by faith ([Rom 5:1](#) [[Rom 5:1-11](#) show that the εἰρήνη of [Rom 5:1](#) is the same as the καταλλαγή of [Rom 5:11](#)], [Eph 2:14-17](#); cf. [2Co 5:18-21](#)). (b) Next, there is a subjective peace—the peace of *conscious fellowship with God*—which results from a living union with Christ the Saviour. This subjective peace finds its ground in the objective peace of reconciliation, but it is clearly distinguished from it. The other is ‘peace with God’

(Rom_5:1); this is ‘the peace of God which passeth all understanding’ (Php_4:7). This inward peace is one of the fruits of the Spirit (Gal_5:22), it forms part of our joy in believing (Rom_15:13), it is a power that guards our hearts and thoughts in Christ Jesus (Php_4:7). And it is of this peace, as a glad sense of sonship and trust wrought in the soul by Jesus Christ, that the Apostle is thinking when he writes: ‘The Lord of peace himself give you peace at all times, in all ways’ (2Th_3:16).

Literature.—The *Lexx.* of Grimm-Thayer and Cremer; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. ‘Peace’; Weiss, *Bib. Theol. of NT*, i. 449 ff.; Sanday-Headlam, ‘Romans’ in *ICC* [*Note: CC International Critical Commentary.*], on 5:1; Beet, *Romans, ib.*; J. T. Jacob, *Christ the Indweller* (1902), 209; J. Martineau, *Endeavours after the Chr. Life*, 54; F. W. Robertson, *Sermons*, 3rd ser. 130, *The Human Race*, 305; E. B. Pusey, *Par. and Cath. Ser.* 1, 431; J. H. Thom, *Laws of Life*, 9, 159, 172; Phillips Brooks, *The Law of Growth*, 219; J. B. Lightfoot, *Serm. in St. Paul's Cath.* 136; W. C. E. Newbolt, *Penitence and Peace* (1892).

J. C. Lambert.

Pearl

PEARL.—This jewel, specially esteemed and familiar in the East, is twice used by our Lord as an image of the preciousness of the Christian religion: once in the saying, ‘Cast not your pearls before swine’ (Mat_7:6), and again in the parable of the Pearl of Great Price (Mat_13:46). A distinction should be observed in the choice of this jewel as a metaphorical expression. In the case of coined money such as talents or pounds, the side of religion emphasized is the active life of good works, and the lesson conveyed is that of duty. The value of the pearl is not primarily a commercial value; it is something which appeals to its possessor as a unique and priceless possession, precious for its own inherent qualities of beauty and rarity, something for which all that a man has may be sold, itself to be jealously treasured, not to be cast at the feet of those to whom it has no meaning. The pearl is not, from the purchaser's point of view, merely a counter of commerce, it has a beauty which is its own, and which can be appreciated only by him who knows. It stands not for any utilitarian aspect of religion, but for the secret shared between the soul and God, which loses its beauty and its value if it is paraded before those who do not understand its sanctity. The main points of the two passages would seem to be the transcendent beauty and preciousness of personal religion, and the need of reticent reverence to guard it.

M. R. Newbolt.

☩ Peleg

PELEG.—Mentioned as a link in our Lord's genealogy (Luk_3:35, Authorized Version *Phalec*).

☩ Penitence

PENITENCE.—See Repentance.

☩ Penny

PENNY.—See Money.

☩ Pentecost

PENTECOST (ἡ πεντηκοστή) was one of the three great national festivals of Israel at which all the males of the people were required to present themselves every year before the Lord their God, with an offering according to their means (Exo_23:17; Exo_34:23, Deu_16:16-17, 2Ch_8:13). There is evidence that in the time of Christ multitudes assembled for the Feast of the Passover, the Feast of Pentecost, and the Feast of Tabernacles, not only from all parts of the Holy Land, but also from the Jewish communities scattered throughout the Roman Empire. The attendance at the Passover would probably be the largest, while the numbers at Pentecost would embrace more Jews from foreign countries, the season being more favourable for travel. All three feasts have (1) a basis in the agricultural life of Canaan, (2) a reference to the history of the nation, and (3) a spiritual and typical significance. Of the three, the Feast of the Passover came first in the natural year, signaling the commencement of the barley harvest and the dedication of the first ripe sheaf by waving it before the Lord; commemorating the deliverance of the people from Egyptian bondage; and pointing forward, by the lamb without blemish sacrificed on the occasion, to the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world. Of the series, the Feast of Tabernacles was the last, celebrating with great rejoicings the completion of harvest and vintage; commemorating, by the erection of booths in which the people dwelt for the week, the wanderings of their fathers in the

wilderness on the way to settled life in Canaan; and having its antitype in the rest that remaineth for the people of God, or, better perhaps, in that great Harvest Home yet to come, when there shall be gathered before the throne a multitude which no man can number, out of all nations, and kindreds, and peoples, and tongues, clothed in white robes and with palms in their hands.

Between these two national festivals came Pentecost. As Passover signaled the commencement of the grain harvest, Pentecost marked its conclusion; and as Tabernacles was a great national thanksgiving for the completed vintage and fruit harvest of the year, Pentecost was a thanksgiving for the completed grain harvest.

1. Names.—The actual word ‘Pentecost’ does not occur in the canonical books of the OT, but it is found in Tob 2:1 and 2Ma 12:32. Neither does it occur in the Gospels, where the Feast itself is not mentioned. It occurs in NT three times outside the Gospels (Act 2:1; Act 20:16, and 1Co 16:6), and in these passages it is employed not as a numeral adjective, but as a substantive. The Feast is called Pentecost because it fell on the fiftieth day counted from Nisan 16, the day after the Passover Sabbath (or festival day), and fulfilled the ancient command: ‘Ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave-offering: seven sabbaths (or weeks) shall be complete: even unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath shall ye number fifty days, and ye shall offer a new meal-offering unto the Lord’ (Lev 23:15-16 cf. Deu 16:9). The names by which the Feast is known in the OT proper exhibit its basis in the agricultural life of the people. It is the ‘Feast of Weeks,’ called from the seven weeks reckoned from the morrow after the Passover when they began ‘to put the sickle to the corn’ (Exo 34:22, Deu 16:9-10, 2Ch 8:13); the ‘Feast of Harvest,’ ‘the firstfruits of thy labours which thou hast sowed in the field’ (Exo 23:16); the ‘Day of First Fruits,’ a day of rest and holy convocation (Num 28:26, cf. Exo 23:16; Exo 34:22), although, like the other Feasts, it was actually of a week’s duration. By later Judaism it was styled *Azereth* (‘conclusion’), which appears in Josephus as Ἀσσοθήα; and ‘Day of the Giving of the Law’ in commemoration of the revelation of the Divine Will to the people at Sinai (Hamburger, BE, ‘Wochenfest’; Edersheim, *The Temple*, p. 227).

2. Agricultural basis.—The distinctive features of the ritual observed at Pentecost are those of a harvest thanksgiving. When barley harvest was begun at Passover time, the omer or sheaf was brought to the priest to be waved by him before the Lord; and this was followed by a burnt-offering of a ‘he-lamb without blemish of the first year,’ with appropriate meat-and drink-offerings (Lev 23:10-14). When the grain harvest which had been proceeding through the following seven weeks reached its completion at Pentecost and the thanksgiving celebration for it took place, a larger offering was prescribed. Instead of the omer of barley—whether presented in the sheaf or, as

would appear from later practice, threshed and parched and made into flour—there were now two wave-loaves of the finest wheaten flour to be brought by the people out of their habitations and offered as a new meal-offering unto the Lord. In contrast to the Passover bread, which was unleavened, these two loaves, forming the peculiar offering of the Day of Pentecost, were ‘baken with leaven,’ which, as the Mishna informs us, was the case in all thank-offerings. These loaves are declared to be ‘the firstfruits unto the Lord’ (Lev 23:16-17), and formed with the peace-offering of two lambs the public thank-offering of the nation to God for His goodness. Instead of the single lamb of the Passover, there were now to be presented as a burnt-offering ‘seven lambs without blemish of the first year, and one young bullock, and two rams,’ with appropriate meat-and drink-offerings; whilst a kid of the goats was to be sacrificed as a sin-offering (Lev 23:18-19). It was in keeping with an occasion of national thanksgiving that freewill offerings were to be brought by the people, each as the Lord had prospered him: ‘And thou shalt rejoice before the Lord, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy manservant, and thy maidservant, and the Levite that is within thy gates, and the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow, that are among you. And thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in Egypt: and thou shalt observe and do these statutes’ (Deu 16:11-12). Although the festival proper, as we have seen, was confined to one day, it continued in a minor degree for a whole week, and was celebrated with gladness and rejoicing. All this made it peculiarly popular; and the season of the year being favourable, as we have seen, for travel, it seems from notices in Josephus, and from references in the Acts of the Apostles, to have been frequented by a large concourse of pilgrims from all the lands of the Jewish Dispersion. It is now the custom among the Jews to decorate the synagogue at Pentecost with trees and plants and flowers,—a modern substitute for the harvest festival of former times (see *Jewish Encyc.*, art. ‘Pentecost’; Rosenau, *Jewish Ceremonial Institutions*, p. 86).

3. Historical reference.—Whilst the notices in the OT, mainly in the Pentateuch, regard Pentecost simply as a harvest festival, it came to be regarded among the later Jews as commemorating the giving of the Law at Sinai. The Book of Jubilees, in the 1st cent. a.d. (Schürer, *GJV [Note: JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.]*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] iii. 277), makes the Feast of Weeks as old as Noah, and associates it further with the later Patriarchs. Josephus and Philo do not mention the giving of the Law among the associations of the Feast, yet many authorities, like Edersheim (*loc. cit.*) and Ginsburg (*Kitto’s Cyclopædia*, ‘Pentecost’), hold it to be certain that the Jews as early as the time of Christ commemorated the giving of the Law at Pentecost. With this was incorporated the legend of the Law being delivered in seventy languages, the number of the nations of the earth, and therefore meant for all the families of mankind. (See Spitta, *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 27, 28.)

4. Antitypical significance—Giving of the Holy Spirit.—As the Passover has its antitype in the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world, Pentecost has its antitype in the shedding down of the Holy Spirit, by whom the Law is written upon fleshy tables of the heart, and the bonds of intercourse between God and man are re-knit in a spiritual and enduring communion. St. Paul describes the Pentecostal gift as ‘the first-fruits of the Spirit’ (Rom 8:23), in accordance with the purpose of the day. Of this momentous event we have the record in Acts 2. If in Jewish tradition the first Pentecost after the great deliverance from Egypt was, through the giving of the Law, the birthday of Judaism, in Christian history the first Pentecost after the true Passover Lamb had been slain was, through the outpouring of the Spirit, the birthday of the Church. The presence and working of the Spirit within the Church form the distinctive characteristic of Christianity. Gracious and beneficent as was the presence of the Master with His disciples, it was better, so He Himself declared, that He should go away (Joh 16:7), and that in His stead the Paraclete, with His threefold conviction for the world, should come (Joh 16:8-11). ‘Behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you,’ said Jesus to the Eleven and them that were gathered with them as He was about to ascend up into heaven; ‘but tarry ye in the city till ye be endued with power from on high’ (Luk 24:49). Then, as the Evangelist records, He led them out until they were over against Bethany; and while His hands were lifted up in blessing, He parted from them, and was carried up into heaven. ‘And they worshipped Him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy: and were continually in the temple, blessing God’ (Luk 24:52-53).

The Temple was the chief resort of the disciples, during the period of tarrying which their Master had enjoined; but they continued also to frequent the Upper Room, now hallowed to them by its memories of the Lord (Act 1:13 f.), continuing ‘steadfastly in prayer, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren.’ And so they waited and prayed; and, lest anything should be lacking to their readiness for the promised blessing, they filled up, by the questionable arbitrament of the lot, the place in the number of the Twelve rendered vacant by the fall of Judas. It was now the eve of the second return of the Resurrection-day since the Lord had ascended, and the city was crowded and astir with the pilgrim bands which had come up to Jerusalem for the great annual harvest thanksgiving. No doubt they had counted the days; and they may well have divined that on Pentecost, the fiftieth day since their Lord had suffered as the Passover Lamb, their expectations would be fulfilled (Baumgarten, *Apostolic History*, i. p. 41).

‘The day of Pentecost was now come,’ and at an early hour the disciples, filled with anticipations awakened by the day, were all together in one place. That this place was the Temple seems natural, considering the occasion. It is a fair inference from the passage in St. Luke already quoted (Luk 24:52-53), and it harmonizes with the statement that ‘the multitude came together’ (Act 2:6) when the descent of the

Spirit became known abroad. It is said that the sound heard from heaven filled ‘all the house’ (ὅλον τὸν οἶκον) where they were sitting,—an exaggerated form of expression if only a private dwelling is meant, whereas ‘house’ is the regular designation of the Temple in the LXX Septuagint and in Josephus. Hallowed as the Upper Room had become by the institution of the Last Supper and the fellowship the disciples had there enjoyed with the Risen Lord, there was a significance beyond even that in the Temple, which had been so long the earthly dwelling-place of Jehovah, now being the place of the inauguration of the dispensation in which the believing soul is to be the temple and dwelling-place of the Spirit.

To those praying disciples, and to the Church of which they were the representatives, came on that eventful day the fulfilment of ‘the promise of the Father.’ Suddenly a sound from heaven as of a mighty rushing wind fell upon the ears of the expectant band, and filled all the house where they were sitting. It does not appear that there was an actual wind, but only the sound of it pervading all parts of the house. Then, as they looked around, they beheld tongues like as of fire distributing themselves through the building, and alighting each upon a disciple’s head. ‘And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance.’ ‘They were all filled with the Holy Spirit’ is the supreme and enduring blessing of Pentecost. It is the central fact of this remarkable narrative. Side by side with the Incarnation, and the Atonement, and the Resurrection, and the Ascension of the Lord, stands the Mission of the Comforter in the gospel scheme. As the Mosaic dispensation was inaugurated with miracles and supernatural signs, it was meet that the dispensation which replaced it should likewise be ushered in with miraculous manifestations.

These manifestations must be briefly noticed. Wind and fire are elemental emblems of the Spirit occurring from time to time in the OT. ‘He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire’ ([Mat 3:11](#)) was the Baptist’s prediction concerning the Messiah, now clearly fulfilled. ‘The wind bloweth where it listeth ... so is every one that is born of the Spirit’ ([Joh 3:8](#)), was the Lord’s own shadowing forth of the Spirit’s power to Nicodemus.

To the miraculous associations of Pentecost belong the ‘tongues’ with which the Apostles spake. Not unknown tongues, however, nor such ecstatic utterances as became familiar afterwards at Corinth and in the early Church, but tongues in which the strangers from distant countries, who had come to Jerusalem for the Feast, at once recognized their own speech, and heard the mighty works of God proclaimed. That the gift of tongues was a permanent endowment of the Apostles for their great work of proclaiming redemption to all the kindred of mankind, cannot be maintained. There is no proof that any of the Apostles of whose labours we have a record in the

Acts was thus saved the trouble of acquiring foreign tongues, and supplied with the linguistic qualifications necessary for ministering to people of other races than their own. In fact, within the Roman world of that day such tongues were by no means indispensable. The Roman world, whithersoever the Apostles went on their missionary journeys, was to all intents and purposes of one speech, and they could make themselves understood in Greek in almost every ordinary case. It was only when they travelled to the far East, or to the bounds of the West, or away up the Nile, that their message required another tongue. The Jews who had come to the Feast at Jerusalem, or perhaps, as was the case with some, were sojourners in the Holy City, from out of every nation under heaven, recognized at once the vernacular of the several peoples among whom they were scattered—the tongue of Parthia, of Mesopotamia, of Phrygia, of Egypt, of Arabia—on the lips of one or other of the Apostles; but Greek was yet the *lingua franca* by which they could almost everywhere make themselves understood. ‘The tongues’ served the immediate purpose on this historic occasion of conveying to the assembled multitudes the great facts of the completed redemption, in familiar speech, yet with unwonted impressiveness and solemnity. But they were, over and above this, a supernatural sign, not only affording a striking proof at the moment of the presence and power of the Holy Spirit with the Apostles, but also furnishing a symbol of the universality of the new faith, and pointing forward to the proclamation of the glad tidings of great joy to all the families of mankind. Thus the legend of the giving of the Law in seventy languages on Mt. Sinai was matched by the fact of ‘the tongues’ at Pentecost; and the preaching of the gospel, first in all the lands of the Jewish Dispersion and then in all the earth, was emphatically shown forth.

5. Abiding significance.—The gift of tongues which marked the effusion of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost was only one of several extraordinary gifts bestowed at first upon the Church by the Ascended Lord. These gifts continued through the Apostolic Age, and were not only varied in their character, but wholly distinct from the ordinary quickening, sanctifying, and ministerial gifts which abide in the Church through all her history. They have passed away, and though in an Edward Irving and other saintly and gifted souls some of them may seem for a little while to reappear, it is His gifts of quickening, sanctifying, and enabling that are the abiding blessing of the Holy Spirit to the Church, and that perpetuate the grace of Pentecost. The permanent blessing is not for a few, but for all believers. The Spirit had at the Creation brooded over the face of the deep; He had moved holy men to utter the oracles of God; He had rested upon anointed kings, like Saul and David; and He had dwelt without measure in the Incarnate Son of God. Now the blessing was to be for all. ‘They were all filled with the Holy Ghost,’ is the fulfilment of the prophecy of Joel ([Joe 2:28-29](#)). It is the realization also of our Lord’s promise ([Joh 7:37-39](#)). And St. Peter in his discourse to the multitudes on the day of Pentecost confirms the universality of the gift ([Act 2:38-39](#)).

Whilst the experience of the disciples on the day of Pentecost shows the universality of the gift, it also attests the working of a new power of spiritual quickening and transformation. The Apostles themselves were transformed into new men. By the baptism of fire they were made courageous and brave; their eyes were opened to see the spirituality of Christ's Kingdom; and they were filled with a great enthusiasm for the salvation of men through the preaching of the crucified Christ. And such was the power of the Spirit accompanying St. Peter's words, that the multitude who had assembled to see and to hear were pricked to the heart, and cried, 'Men and brethren, what shall we do?' And with three thousand souls added to the little band of Apostles and believers, a Church was born in a day. 'With great power gave the apostles witness,' and that power was the gift of the Holy Ghost. Under the working of the Pentecostal gift a new spirit of love takes possession of them that believe, a new fellowship is established, a new service and varied ministry instituted. Throughout the course of the Church's history it has been the mission of the Comforter to convince the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment; to glorify Christ to His believing people; to lead the Church into all truth, and to show her things to come; to sanctify them that believe; and to bestow grace upon all who serve in any ministry according to the requirement of the office which they fill. It is His mission still; and the great hope of the Church and of the world lies in the renewal of Pentecost, with its breath of refreshing and its tongue of fire, in each successive age.

Literature,—Besides the works mentioned above, see the Comm. on Acts 2, the articles 'Pentecost,' 'Feasts,' 'Pfingstfest,' 'Wochenfest' in the Encyclopaedias and Bible Dictionaries; Benzinger's *Heb. Arch.*; Mackie's *Bible Manners and Customs*; Farrar, *St. Paul*, i. 83-104; *Expositor*, i. i. [1875], 393-408; William Arthur, *The Tongue of Fire*.

T. Nicol.

People

PEOPLE.—This collective term, which occurs about 120 times in the Gospels, is used to denote sometimes in a lesser or more general way the people (λαός) among whom Christ lived and fulfilled His mission, but oftener the smaller or larger *crowds* of people (ὄχλος) who, from time to time, and in the various scenes of His labour, waited upon His ministry (see art. Crowd). But 'people' (λαός) is several times employed in the religious sense that attaches to such phrases as 'the people of God,' or 'Christ's people' ([Mat_1:21](#); [Mat_2:6](#), [Luk_1:17](#); [Luk_1:77](#); [Luk_2:32](#); [Luk_7:16](#)). It is only in

this latter sense that the word calls for special notice, and as so viewed it possesses considerable importance.

The most noteworthy thing in regard to the religious use of the word in the Gospels is, that it is never in any of them employed by Christ Himself. All the instances in which it is found are in narratives connected with His birth and infancy, except the one in [Luk_7:16](#); and in this case it was the people who beheld the restoration of the widow's son to life who said, 'that a great prophet is risen among us; and that God hath visited his people.' The fact that Christ discarded the use of the word 'people' in its religious sense cannot be regarded as a matter of little or no consequence. In doing so He must have acted with deliberate purpose, and for reasons considered by Himself to be valid. This view is evident from a variety of considerations: (1) The religious sense of the phrase 'the people of God' had occupied a place of high importance in the historical relation between God and the Hebrew race. (2) It had been organically associated by the OT revelation with the prospective advent of the Messiah and His Kingdom. (3) According to Messianic prophecy, the one people of God would eventually consist of all the peoples of the earth united in a common relation to Him. (4) Christ was aware of these facts. He knew that He was Himself the Jewish Messiah and the Saviour of the world. And He was inspired and controlled by the idea that the object of His mission was to bring the true and full sense of the phrase 'the people of God' to perfect realization in the Kingdom of heaven. (5) If He had chosen to do so, it would have been easy for Him to express all the essential truths of His message to mankind in terms of 'the people of God.' Moreover, this phrase could not be without attractions for Him. Why, then, did He never let it fall from His lips when addressing His audiences in public and in private?

One of His reasons must have been the significance of the phrase as it presented itself to His own mind. The ideas with which He would charge it may be inferred from the essential nature of the truths embodied in the message He left behind Him. In thinking of God and His people, He would think of Him as a moral Being and of them as moral beings. He would think of the relations between Him and them as moral, and therefore as founded in this direct inward relation to them as *individuals*. He would think also of His relation to them as absolutely impartial, and of their relations to Him as absolutely equal. And for all these reasons He would think of the relation between God and His people, *as His people*, as in no sense legal, and as not permitting Him to show towards any people in particular either national favour or political privileges. Finally, all this implies that Christ would think of God and His people in terms of purely moral universality. But if such is the meaning that He would attach to the phrase alluded to, does not that seem to favour His use of it, and to make His rejection of it still more difficult to understand? Quite the reverse, as another reason shows.

As a teacher, Christ had to consider not only the meaning that He attached to the phrase Himself, but also the meaning attached to it by the Jews among whom He taught, and who believed that they themselves were the people of God, and they alone of all the peoples or mankind. The people of Israel were *the* people of God. This was one of the most essential and distinctive dogmas of the fully developed, orthodox, and official Judaism with which our Lord everywhere and always had to reckon as a teacher; and this dogma, adhered to and upheld by the fanatical zeal of the rigid and conservative devotees of Judaism, was the most embarrassing that He had to reckon with as a teacher sent from God. For what did the dogma in question mean and imply? It rested upon a denial of the essential oneness of the relation of God to all the peoples of the world, and of the essential oneness of the relation of all the peoples of the world to Him. It was founded in the notion that the relation between God and His people was national, and that the nature of the national bond was not moral but legal. For Divine righteousness and the obedience of faith, the only real and permanent, because moral, conditions on which the relations between God and His people repose, it substituted ancestral descent from Abraham, and the observance of the national rite of circumcision. And the only way, it contended, for Gentiles to obtain admission within the circle of the people of God, was to become Jews by observing this national rite. It is manifest, then, that the ideas of Judaism and the ideas of Christ on the subject of 'the people of God' were in direct and complete antagonism to one another. This fact Christ had to consider, and it was necessary for Him as a teacher to weigh the question as to what the inevitable consequences would be for Himself and His cause, if He attempted in the course of His teaching to present and explain His ideas on the subject of 'the people of God' in their real and inherent antagonism to the ideas on the same subject which had become fixed and hardened in the perverted Judaism of His time. Evidently He came to the conclusion that the handling of this subject would involve Himself and the interests of His mission in great risks and dangers. It is certain that such would have been the case. For if He had taught and insisted on the acceptance of the truths of moral unity and universality that belong to the relations between God and His people as He understood them, the bigoted adherents of Judaism would have forthwith resented His teaching and made Himself the object of their fanatical and malignant hostility. He therefore persistently ignored the phrase 'the people of God.' It was highly expedient for Him to do so.

But the adoption of this course did not entail any compromise of those truths of moral unity and universality that are of the essence of the relations in which God stands to His people and they to Him. He showed His sense of the greatness and validity of these as well as of other moral truths, and secured the interests attaching to them, by two other vastly important things that He did as a teacher. In the first place, He embedded all the truths of moral unity and universality referred to in His parables, which He spoke as illustrative of the rich and diversified order of ideas presented by

Him under the designation of ‘the kingdom of God.’ His reason for couching these ideas in parabolic forms He Himself explained (Mat 13:10-16). His explanation implies that He would have preferred to employ a more explicit way of communicating the ideas in question if circumstances had permitted; that the hearts of the adherents of the existing perverted Judaism had been blinded and hardened by the influence of their system; that it was impossible for them to see the truth and validity of these ideas; and that they were not in a mood to extend to them or to Himself toleration. Such was His reason for speaking of the Kingdom of heaven in parables. The true meaning of the latter was veiled from the enemies of the truth by the blindness of their eyes. But, on the other hand, the parables, He knew, would preserve the essence of the truth as He had taught it, and to all who were of the truth the latter would in due time become revealed.

But, secondly, Christ guarded and effectively secured the interests of the truths of moral unity and universality, which are of the essence of His gospel, in another way. In the Kingdom of God and in the relations between God and His people, moral unity and moral universality are founded on their human side on moral *individuality*. In any case, therefore, it would have been necessary for Christ to give to moral individuality a place of supreme importance in His teaching. And this is precisely what He did. He knew and never lost sight of the truth that moral unity and universality can never come to actual realization in the Kingdom of heaven, or, in other words, in the relations between God and His people, unless in so far as men are saved, and become morally perfect as individuals. And therefore He not only gave His just and constant consideration to the individual, but held up before His disciples the moral perfection of God, their Father in heaven, as the ideal which they should strive individually to realize in their own character and life (Mat 5:43-48). This is the basis on which moral unity and universality are realized in the relations of men to God as His people.

W. D. Thomson.

☞ Peraea

PERAEA

1. Name and extent.—The name (ἡ Περαια), while constantly used by Josephus, is not found in LXX Septuagint or NT, in both of which it is represented by the equivalent *πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου* = עבר הירדן (cf. Isa 9:1 [Heb. 8:23], Mat 4:25, Mar 10:1). Judaea, Galilee, and Peraea were reckoned by the Jews themselves as the three Jewish provinces. The division is repeatedly assumed in the Mishna (Schürer,

HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.], ii. i. 2; cf. Josephus *BJ*, iii. iii. 3). The population of Peraea was, however, never so thoroughly Jewish as that of Judaea, or even of Galilee. In both Galilee and Peraea political vicissitudes had occasioned a large intermingling of Jewish and Gentile elements. Notwithstanding the close neighbourhood of the three provinces, the differences of their experience had produced differences of customs and manners, which gave to each of them an independent life of its own, and caused them to be regarded as in certain respects different countries (Schürer, *l.c.*).

The name 'Peraea,' like the names of many of the districts east of the Jordan, was somewhat loosely used, having a wider and a narrower signification. Josephus (*l.c.*) states the length of Peraea as from Machaerus to Pella, *i.e.* from the Arnon to the Jabbok, and its breadth as from Philadelphia and Gerasa to the Jordan, limits corresponding with those of the modern Belkâ. But in *BJ*, iv. vii. 3, he calls Gadara 'the metropolis of Peraea.' In what sense he uses this term there is no means of ascertaining, but he must intend to include under the name 'Peraea' the region extending north from the Jabbok to the Yarmuk (Hieromax), close to which river Gadara stood, that is to say, all that the Hebrews meant by 'beyond the Jordan.' His usage may depend on whether he happened at the moment to be referring to the district which was more completely Jewish, or to the whole region, which was governed as one, and which included the Hellenistic towns of the Decapolis (*Ant.* xiii. ii. 3, iv. 9). Peraea in its more limited sense corresponded with the kingdom of Sihon, or Reuben and a part of Gad. In its larger signification it was from 80 to 90 miles from north to south, and about 25 from east to west.

2. Characteristics.—As regards its physical features, Peraea consists for the most part of an elevated tableland, rising rapidly from the Jordan valley, but broken by frequent gorges and mountain torrents. It was, according to Mukaddasi, proverbially cold. Josephus (*BJ*, iii. iii. 3) says that, while larger than Galilee, it is mostly desert and rough, and much less adapted than that province for the cultivation of fruit. Still he admits that it is in parts very fertile, and produces all kinds of fruits, and its plains are planted with various trees, chiefly the olive, the vine, and the palm. It is sufficiently watered by streams from the mountains and by springs which do not fail even in summer.

Mukaddasi (c. 985 a.d.) says that the Belkâ district is rich in grain and flocks, and has many streams which work the mills. He divides Syria into four belts, from the Mediterranean eastwards. Of the third and fourth he writes: 'The Third Belt is that of the valleys of the Ghaur (the Jordan valley), wherein are found many villages and streams, also palm trees, well-cultivated fields, and indigo plantations.... The Fourth Belt is that bordering on the desert. The mountains here are high and bleak, and the climate resembles that of the waste; but it has many villages, with springs of water,

and forest trees.’ He also mentions the hot springs of the district, naming those of *Al-Hammah*. Guy le Strange, whose translation has just been quoted, thinks that the hot springs of Gadara or Amatha in the Yarmuk valley are those referred to, and he adds in regard to them, that ‘round the large basin may still be seen the remains of vaulted bath-houses. The sanitary properties of these sulphurous waters are highly extolled by many ancient writers, and to this day they have maintained their reputation among the Bedawin and *fellahîn* of Palestine, so much so that the bathing-place is regarded by all parties as a neutral ground’ (*Description of Suria*, by Mukaddasi, translation by Guy le Strange [Pal. [Note: Palestine, Palestinian.] Pilgr. Text Soc.]). Of the Jordan valley Merrill (*East of the Jordan*, p. 438) says: ‘From the Zerka (Jabbok) to the Sea of Galilee (*ib.*) it is exceedingly fertile; and in any period when the country was settled and a good government in power, it must have been one of the most wealthy and important sections of Palestine for the raising of wheat and other products, while the foot-hills would afford excellent pasturage,’

3. History, population, etc.—Under the will of Herod the Great, Galilee and Peraea were united for purposes of government under Antipas, and this arrangement was confirmed by Augustus. As these two provinces had but a very short common boundary where Galilee touched the Jordan north of Samaria, it might have seemed more natural to combine Peraea with the regions north of the Yarmuk, or with Samaria. But affinities of race and religion (cf. Josephus *Ant.* xx. i. 1; G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [Note: *GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*] , p. 539) plainly suggested the wisdom of governing them together. For the same reasons Jews journeying between Galilee and Judaea often preferred to go by way of Peraea, where they were among their own countrymen, rather than pass through Samaria (the more direct route), where they incurred the risk at least of insult (Luk 9:53, Joh 4:4; Joh 4:9; cf. Edersheim, *LT* [Note: *T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* [Edersheim].] , i. 394; Josephus *Ant.* xx. vi. 1). They used the fords opposite Beisan, north of Samaria, and Jericho, south of it. The northern parts of Peraea mingled with the region of the Decapolis, where in the towns there was a vigorous Hellenistic civilization, and apparently north of the Yarmuk the Jewish element of the population was inconsiderable. The strongly Jewish character of Peraea is indicated in the Gospels. John the Baptist worked there during part of his ministry (Joh 3:26; Joh 10:40). In Peraea multitudes gathered round Christ, among whom were Pharisees who entered into controversy with Him and displayed all the animus of their sect (Mat 19:3 ff.). Mothers, evidently Jewish, brought their children to be blessed (Mar 10:13), and the ruler who had kept the whole Law sought an answer to his question (Mat 19:16). The mission of the Seventy was to Peraea, and although the restriction laid upon the Twelve (whose number corresponded with that of the tribes of Israel), ‘Go not into any way of the Gentiles’ (Mat 10:5-6), is significantly absent in the case of the Seventy (whose number is typical of the nations of the earth), yet the scope of our Lord’s ministry makes it evident that they were to encounter, at least for the most part, Jews.

The immigration of Greek settlers into the country east of Jordan probably began with the presence there of Alexander the Great, and the towns of Pella (no doubt named from the Macedonian city which was Alexander's birthplace) and Dion may have been founded by him, as Steph. Byz. states in a somewhat corrupt passage, or by some of his followers. Besides these towns, many other powerful Hellenistic communities sprang into existence, and flourished in the midst of a population from which they were separated by their distinctive culture, and, in so far as it was Jewish, by the practice of heathen worship. The Maccabees (b.c. 166-135) endeavoured to withdraw the Jews (who presumably were at that time the smaller section of the inhabitants) to Judaea (1Ma_5:45-54). John Hyrcanus (b.c. 135-105) possibly first adopted the opposite policy, which was vigorously carried out by Alexander Jannaeus (b.c. 104-78), who brought the country from Lake Merom to the Dead Sea completely under his control (Josephus *Ant.* xiii. xv. 4; Schürer, *HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]*, i. i. 192, 297, 306). He took Hippos, Gadara, Pella, Dion, and other important towns, and extinguished the Greek culture which had flourished in them. He forced them to assimilate Jewish manners and ideas, and those places which would not submit he destroyed. In b.c. 64 the Roman province of Syria was formed, and under Pompey and Gabinius the procurator the ruined cities were rebuilt, and the Hellenistic communities regained their independence. Indeed, the sympathy of Pompey was long remembered by them, as is attested by the numerous coins which have been found impressed with his era. It was probably he who organized the Decapolis (the term ἡ Δεκάπολις is found first in the Roman period). See Decapolis.

In b.c. 20, Herod the Great obtained permission to appoint his brother Pheroras tetrarch of Peraea (*Ant.* xv. x. 3; *BJ*, i. xxiv. 5). Pheroras afterwards incurred the enmity of Herod, and retired or was driven to Peraea, where he died, not improbably by poison (*BJ*, i. xxix. 4). At his death (b.c. 4) Herod left Galilee and Peraea to his son Antipas (*Ant.* xvii. viii. 1). The tribute paid by these provinces was 200 talents (*Ant.* xvii. xi. 4). Antipas ruled with the title of tetrarch till his banishment in a.d. 39 by Caius Caesar, who added his tetrarchy to the dominions of Agrippa (*Ant.* xviii. vii. 2). Antipas was therefore in authority in Galilee and Peraea during the whole lifetime of John the Baptist and of Christ.

Among the towns of Peraea, Pella has a special interest as having been twice the refuge of the Christians fleeing from Jerusalem, in a.d. 68, and again in a.d. 135, when under Hadrian Jerusalem was taken for the second time and its name changed to aelia. The fact that Pella was a heathen city may have been an inducement to the Christians of Jerusalem to seek refuge in it, as it would not attract the hostility of the Romans. Merrill (*East of the Jordan*, p. 462 f.) thinks that Christ probably several times passed through the Jordan valley and may well have visited Pella itself. His

preaching may have been successful there, and His connexion with the town such as to suggest it as a refuge to the Christians.

Literature.—Besides authorities cited above, see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , artt. 'Peraea,' 'Gadara,' 'Decapolis,' 'Machaerus'; Thomson, *Land and Book*. For later history, Guy le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*.

A. E. Ross.

⚠️ Perdition

PERDITION.—See Destruction.

⚠️ Perdition, Son Of

PERDITION, SON OF.—See Judas Iscariot.

⚠️ Perez

PEREZ.—Mentioned as a link in our Lord's genealogy (Mat_1:3, Luk_3:33, Authorized Version *Phares*).

⚠️ Perfection (Human)

PERFECTION (Human).—Perfection is one of those 'terms which, however they may have been perverted to the purposes of fanaticism, are not only scriptural, but of too frequent occurrence in Scripture to be overlooked or passed by in silence' (Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection*, xli. c.). In the Sermon on the Mount the second grand division of the thought culminates in the command, 'Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect' (Mat_5:48). The verb in this sentence is a future indicative, but practically all scholars agree that it has the force of an imperative (Meyer, Holtzmann, Dods, Weiss, Votaw, etc.). As a command of our Lord, this saying clearly sets before His disciples the possibility and the necessity of their perfection in conduct and character; and it becomes of supreme importance to know what the

adjective τέλειος, 'perfect,' here means. It cannot stand for absolute perfection, which is defined as 'entire freedom from defect, blemish, weakness, or liability to err or fail' (*Century Dictionary*). Such perfection is clearly incompatible with finite being. Every man must confess that he falls far short of this glory; it belongs to God alone. The NT has little to say about this absolute perfection of God. It is everywhere assumed, but the word 'perfection' does not occur in any direct statement of it anywhere. When we are told here that the Father is perfect, we know that His absolute perfection is not in view, since the Master says that men may and must attain unto a like perfection. The context must determine the meaning of the word in this command.

The first portion of the Sermon on the Mount sets forth the character of the citizens in the new Kingdom which Jesus preached (Mat 5:3-16). The Beatitudes are pronounced upon those who meet the conditions for seeing God and becoming the sons of God. Since those who see God become like Him (1Jn 3:2), and the sons of God are to be like the Father who is in heaven (Mat 5:45), the character pictured in the Beatitudes is one of God-likeness (Mat 5:3-12). The influence of such character is next presented under the figures of the salt which preserves and the lamp which illuminates. The preserving and enlightening work of the Heavenly Father is to be manifest in the lives of His sons. Their works are to parallel His. They are to reproduce and represent Him. He is glorified in the good works of His children, because their works are like His own (Mat 5:13-16). Like Him in character and conduct, what will be the law of their life? That question is answered in the second great division of the Sermon. It will not be any code of external regulations. The Father is governed by nothing of that sort. He is a law unto Himself. His conduct is the spontaneous outcome of His own being. Even so the life of His children will not be measured by the standard of any written code, but by the unwritten law of a heart in perfect sympathy with the will of God (Mat 5:17-48). This law of the highest and purest possible motive will preclude not only the external act of murder, but the cherishing of anger against a brother (Mat 5:21-26). It will render impossible not only adulterous acts but impure 'meditations' (Mat 5:27-32). It will render oaths unnecessary (Mat 5:33-37). It will counsel the surrender of rights in the maintenance of peace (Mat 5:38-42). It will demand the constant exercise of love towards enemies as well as friends, towards Gentiles as well as Jews, towards the just and the unjust alike (Mat 5:43-48). This law of the inner life in harmony with the Father's will is in no danger of coming into conflict with any righteous system of legal regulations, and least of all with the Law of God as revealed in the OT. It will not destroy this Law, but fulfil it in a righteousness far exceeding that which any mere legalists can maintain (Mat 5:17-20). It will lift the life above the plane of morality into the realm of genuine religion, in which the thoughts and the affections will be as pure as the outward conduct is righteous. As all the Father's acts are the proof that His thoughts

towards us are of good and of good alone, so all His children's deeds will evidence their desire for the universal good; and they will be blessed as the Father is blessed, and active for the good of all as the Father is active for the good of all, and their motives will be as single and pure as the motives of the Father Himself. In such case, said the Master, 'ye shall be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect.' The statement is a culminating summary of all that the Master has said up to this point. The citizens of the Kingdom are to be the sons of God. The sons of God are to be like God. The children are to be like then Father in their character and their conduct and the law of their life. In love to all and in doing good to all they give the clearest and the most indubitable proof of their likeness to Him. In this their perfection consists. In this the end of their being is reached.

The root idea in the adjective τέλειος, 'perfect,' is that of τέλος, the 'end.' The perfect man is the man who has reached the end designed in his creation, the man who represents the ideal set before his own being. The Father may be said to be perfect, as completely and constantly realizing the end of His own being. God is love (1Jn 4:8). His providence is the continuously perfect manifestation of His love (Mat 5:45). Jesus commands His disciples to be perfect in the continuous maintenance and manifestation of the spirit of love. They must love the Lord their God with all their heart, and with all their soul, and with all their mind; and they must love their neighbour as themselves. On these two commandments hung the whole Law and the Prophets (Mat 22:37-40). He who kept these two commandments was perfectly obedient. He met the whole requirement of loyal service. He realized the end for which he was created.

To many persons 'counsels of perfection' are synonymous with 'demands of the impossible.' A large part of the difficulty in such minds is relieved, however, when the Master's limitation to perfection in love and loving service is made. This is seen at once to be compatible with imperfections of other sorts. The child may love his father perfectly, though he be weak in body and immature in mind. Absolute perfection belongs to God, and is demanded of no one of His creatures. Perfection in love God shares with man. He asks man to love Him with undivided loyalty and affection, and to prove his love to God in the service of his fellow-man.

Literature.—Channing, *The Perfect Life*; Ritschl, *Chr. Doct. of Justification*, 646; D. Steele, *Love Enthroned*; J. Mudge, *Growth in Holiness toward Perfection*; P. T. Forsyth, *Chr. Perfection*; H. C. G. Moule, *Thoughts on Chr. Sanctity*; Alvah Hovey, *The Higher Chr. Life*; O. A. Curtis, *The Chr. Faith* (1905), 371; F. W. Robertson, *Serm.* 3rd ser. 143; J. R. Illingworth, *Univ. and Cath. Serm.* 1; N. Smyth, *Chr. Ethics*, 108; G. Matheson, *Landmarks of NT Morality*, 250; J. Iverach, *The Other Side of Greatness*,

186; *Expos.* 4th ser. ix. (1894) 319, 5th ser. v. (1897) 30, 134, 211, 6th ser. iii. (1901) 73.

D. A. Hayes.

⚡ Perfection (of Jesus)

PERFECTION (of Jesus).—Christian writers generally take for granted the perfection of their Lord. They point to the records, and declare that such is the impression which they make on the honest reader. And that is not the mere begging of the question which it seems. Men judge of goodness by the eye. The vision of faith comes first; thought comes later with its justifications.

1. One note of perfection, though merely a negative one, is **sinlessness**. Heb 4:15 says that though He was tried in all things as we are, Christ remained without sin. Can that be proved or made clear? Certain difficulties suggest themselves. (1) Only the merest fragment of that life is known. Before His story begins, Jesus had lived for thirty years in this world, which is full to overflowing of all manner of sin. How can we be sure that no stain ever touched the purity of His soul during all those buried years, silent for ever now in quiet Nazareth? (2) There is also the whole story of a man's inward life; the dreams of the secret heart, the fancies cherished in the recesses of fond imagination, the converse which the soul holds with itself. What record can lay bare that hidden and withdrawn, but most real and vital, region of the spirit's life, with all its startling depths and unexpected glories?

One witness can testify of that—the spirit's own consciousness in the presence of God, who has been the unseen companion of all that life. And we gather from the Gospels that Jesus was weighed down by no sense of sin. It is the saints who have the keenest sense of sin. Their inward thought has always placed them in a line with the publican in the Temple who would not so much as lift his eyes to heaven, but smote on his breast and cried, 'God, be merciful to me a sinner' (Luk 18:13). Jesus, among the saints, is unique in this matter: no word of self-reproach, no hint of any thought or inward struggle which He deplored, ever falls from His lips. See, further, art. Sinlessness.

2. Another note of perfection is that *Jesus stands above the various types and classes of men*. Humanity is parcelled out among men. They have their peculiar excellences and differences; but these are usually only a part of our human nature. The most royally endowed among men are but fragments. Our life is composed of three elements—thought, and will, and feeling; and according as one or other of these may

preponderate, we have men of action, men of thought, men of passion. Jesus eludes any such classification: He has affinities with each of them; their excellences inhere in Him with none of their defects.

(a) Jesus has affinities with the *artist* and the *poet*. His eye rested on the beauty of the earth with the poet's joy and understanding. The common sights mirror themselves in His teaching: the lilies in their glory, the birds among the branches, the ravens seeking their food from God, seed-time and harvest, sowing and reaping. The face of this goodly universe spake joy within His heart. And He looked with loving, discerning eyes on all the pageant of human life. When we read His words, the life of His day flows past us. And His glance was deep as well as wide. With what irony He sketches the indecision of the Pharisees, in the story of the children who will play neither at funerals nor at weddings! What deeper criticism of a prudential morality is there than in the words 'he that saveth his life shall lose it'? what clearer perception of the hopelessness of a man's attempt at self-deliverance than the parable of the house swept and garnished but empty? There is His indictment of the Pharisees (Matthew 23). It is the most passionate invective in literature. But the marvel of it, the inner justification of it, is that there with utter clearness and precision He lays bare the essential evil of Pharisaism. Passion easily contents itself with strong denunciation. The words of Jesus are a stream of lava seven times heated from a burning heart; but they are full of light; they track the hidden ways of pride and self-seeking in the religious heart. We see in them the thinker, the seer before whose glance secret things lie open and bare, as well as the prophet with his passion for simplicity and truth.

Jesus was an artist also in His teaching. He was not content to bring before men truths about God and the way of life. He clothed His teaching in beauty. He uttered the deep things of the Kingdom in parables. And these are simple, pellucid, beautiful as with the loveliness of waters stilled at even. See art. Poet.

(b) There are the men of *action*, men in whom the will is predominant. Jesus shows them their ideal. He was no dreamer, but a man of deeds. Will was as mighty in Him as thought. He impressed all with a sense of power and mastery. The people recognized that note in His teaching: He spake with authority, and not as the scribes. It was felt at Nazareth when they took up stone to stone Him and He passed through their midst (Luk 4:30), and at Gethsemane when the soldiers fell back before the majesty of His bearing (Joh 18:6). He dominated friend and foe by the calm strength of a sovereign will. And His days were filled with active service, teaching and healing, so that St. Peter summed up His life as that of One 'who went about doing good' (Act 10:38). Men of action have their limitations. Their energy outstrips the illumination of their minds; they work for the day and its needs; their outlook is narrow and dim. But Jesus ever fed the springs of action with thought. He was no less

than thirty years of age when He was baptized in Jordan. He had been content to live with His thoughts and simple duties, perfecting there, in patient obedience, mind and heart and will for the great work. And even after the baptism, when the call had come, He went first to the wilderness, there in prayer and meditation to understand His work and His own heart. And often He stole away from the crowd, from the blinding pressure of constant activity, to gather light and balance in prayer (Mar 1:35; Mar 6:46, Luk 6:12, Joh 8:1). Hence the crown which rests on His activities. He never turned aside from His path. One purpose shapes every word and act from the beginning. Will sits untroubled on its throne, whatever dissonances of earth be round Him, though world and friend and foe conspire to turn Him aside. And peace rests upon all He does. There was no hurry in His hands, no hurry in His feet. His life was full, crowded with incident; but it flowed on quiet, unchanging, harmonious as a poet's dream. The mountain with its peace and quietness, its hours of prayer and still thought, was His place of transfiguration. There He looked into the Father's purpose, till the glory that lay beyond and the love that shone through it kindled their reflexion on His face, till He saw His way so clearly that He could never miss it, never be in any hesitation about it,—the way, amid the conflicting passions of men, to His throne on Calvary.

(c) There remains another great class, the men of *passion*. Among them have been some of the greatest and sweetest of the children of men—gentle souls with the grace of sympathy and self-forgetfulness; generous and magnanimous souls like David, whose inspirations have been to men an abiding memorial of the beauty of chivalry; heroes of faith like Paul and Luther, who change the current of human life. Jesus is the Lord of all such. Men of thought or action grow great oftentimes at the expense of their heart; but in Jesus the heart has equal sway with the mind or the will. He was full of sympathy. The sick and the sorrowful never appealed to Him in vain; His hand was laid gently and lovingly on the loathsome body of the leper; the sinful and outcast knew there was understanding and gentle judgment with Him. And His miracles of healing were never demonstrations, seals of His Messiahship; personal sympathy was their source and regulator. But Jesus does not throw the reins to sympathy. 'His sanity of judgment is as extraordinary as His depth of sympathy' (Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*, p. 85). He could not look on the adulterous woman brought to Him for judgment—He felt for her so; but though He would not condemn, neither did He excuse; He said, 'Go, and sin no more' (Joh 8:2-11). His gospel was that there is infinite patience and forgiveness with God; and yet there are no sterner words in the NT than His. He who told the parable of the Prodigal Son told also the parables of the Ten Virgins, the Man without the Wedding Garment, and the Talents. And the woman who bathed His feet in Simon's house, and Zacchaeus who lodged Him for the night, and Peter who listened to Him in the boat, all bear witness how, in His gracious presence, the sincere soul felt the evil of sin and the inflexible order of righteousness as it had never felt them before.

3. *The law of His life, its ultimate value.*—It is objected that an essential imperfection cleaves to the individual, however balanced the elements of humanity in him may be. He belongs to one age and people; and the ideal of his day, which is only in a state of becoming, and is surely passing away into some higher, fuller ideal, as the thought and experience of the race widen, inevitably bounds his spirit. Growth is the mark of all things human. The ideal of the good man grows; it draws to itself elements from different nations and different times; it passes through subtle changes and permutations. God speaks to men at sundry times and in divers manners; and not only great men, but nations, are His prophets to the spirit of the wide world which is travailing with the perfect ideal of man. So the individual can never have permanent or universal value. As the Abbé Galieni says, ‘One century may judge another century, but only his own century may judge the individual.’ That may be true of the ordinary man, or even of national heroes and saints, whose character ever seems strange and partially distasteful or even unintelligible to men of other races and times; it is conspicuously untrue of Jesus. He stands not at the bar of His century. He judges it and all times: He judges His own people and all peoples. He took their highest ideas of God and of moral duty and purified these, making them the light of to-day. Jehovah, the Holy One of Israel, became the Father in heaven whose name is Love; and the chosen people of God, all the immortal spirits God has made in His own image. And that idea wrought itself out perfectly in His teaching and conduct. It is in particulars that the prophet’s insight is tested. Jesus identified the will of God with the good of men; and He found that good in the universal elements of human life. He emptied religion of all national and accidental elements. He passed by all customs and observances that were of His day and race; He removed all barriers and limits which men put to human brotherhood. And so, though born among the most exclusive of nations, a son of Abraham after the flesh, He is no Jew: He is the first Citizen of the world; in Paul’s revealing phrase, ‘the last Adam.’

Nor is the ideal of Jesus subject to time. There is progress in all things, but not in the same way. Knowledge moves from point to point. In mathematics and in all the mechanical sciences we pass with sure foot from one thing gained to another. But as we enter the region of personality, all that is changed. The art of to-day, whether in literature, painting, sculpture, architecture, is not necessarily better than the art of even a distant yesterday. There are creative times in the world’s history when a great idea is expressed, and it becomes the task of centuries to understand and assimilate it. Jesus is the Creator of a new spiritual era. His work was to found a Kingdom, spiritual in nature, world-wide in extent. That Kingdom is based on what is ultimate in our nature—the Fatherhood of God, whose name is Love, and the brotherhood of men. Such a Kingdom is the finer breath and inspiration, the inner meaning and end, of all the imperfect, transient societies of earth. And such alone will satisfy the individual; for the end of personality is love. The ideal of Jesus may gather content in and through all the experiences and relations and offices of those who live in this

Kingdom. His spirit will bear fruit within the Kingdom beyond what it could bear during the days He lived on earth, revealing its infinite riches. But never will the mind of the world pass beyond the bounds of that ideal, or draw light from any further source.

Jesus is the Lord of the new society, not only because He enunciated with perfect clearness its ultimate law, but because He Himself followed this law unerringly in His own life 'without being let or hindered, as we are, by the motions of private passion and by self-will' (M. Arnold, *St. Paul*, p. 45). The absoluteness of this obedience is attested by the trials to which it was put. The perfectly good man must not merely show flawless, joyful obedience; he must be sifted as wheat; he must meet trial and temptation in their extremest rigour and subtlest form. Only so can the supremacy of goodness in him be affirmed. Jesus was thus tried. And the trial served only to make clear the perfect identification of His mind with the heart and will of the Father. (For the possibility of the temptation of a sinless Being, see art. Temptation).

(1) *Filial relation to God.*—In the wilderness Jesus met the trials of the future. He had there to come to an understanding with Himself, to know precisely what His mission was and what were the means of its accomplishment. One suggestion was to turn stones into bread. The loving soul will be tempted from the side of pity. To the heart of Jesus His countrymen's need of bread and of help to a better social state would always be present. But He turned aside to His task, which was to feed them with the words that proceed out of the mouth of God.

Renunciations are the lowly gateways on the narrow road of obedience. They are a measure of a man's moral sagacity, his clearness of vision both of his duty and of the means of realizing it, his simplicity of spirit and freedom from vanity or self-will. Men are readily drawn aside, the lower sort by suggestions of vanity and self-importance, the higher by the vision of some good more quickly realized. The world of political and industrial and social problems is a lower world than that in which Jesus wrought. It is a realm of expediency; its conditions change from age to age. The leaders there are men of affairs, men of practical wisdom, taught to discern what is immediately possible. The world will never lack such guides, for riches and honour and power gather quickly to them. Jesus kept aloof from such questions. He walked a more self-denying road, though one more fruitful of good to the world. He was not sent save as the physician of sick souls and the shepherd of lost ones. It was His to found a Kingdom not of this world, the Kingdom of God: and to provide, by His teaching and by the manifestation of His own loving heart in suffering and in death, what would quicken faith, and hope, and love in men throughout all lands and all times.

The Messianic idea was another great temptation. Evil is here entwined in all things; temptation lurks within a man's purest and highest aspirations. Men must always work

with the instruments at their hand. Jesus came with the consciousness of being 'God's final messenger, after whom none higher can come' (Wernle, *Beginnings of Christianity*, English translation i. 45). He had to appeal to the popular expectation, their hopes of the Messiah soiled by ignoble thought. The popular thought is ever on a lower plane than the Divine, and becomes a difficulty and a temptation to the servants of God. When Jesus saw Himself as the long-looked-for Messiah, all the worldly hopes that clung to the office in the thoughts of Rabbi or people flowed in upon Him. There were the expectation of political glory, and the worship of force, in the popular mind. There was the Rabbinic expectation of a kingdom of right obedience set up miraculously by God through the sudden appearance of the Messiah—a more refined, seemingly pious expectation, full of trust in God only and of zeal for His glory. These were the thoughts and hopes which rose up at the claim of Messiah. In the wilderness Jesus had to face them: He had to come to a clear understanding of the nature of the Messianic Kingdom and of the means He had to use to establish it. There everything material and external fell from His idea of it. The earthly kingdom became spiritual; the glory of Israel became universal; the way of its establishment was to be through an appeal to the honest heart's faith in God as the highest good and the convincing vision of goodness; and for Himself not any success and glory, but suffering, and shame, and death. These elements of His purification of the Messianic idea only emerged gradually in His teaching, but they were present to His consciousness at the beginning, when He determined to worship God only, and to serve Him in simple obedience to His highest thought, making no compromise with the Prince of this world (Mat 4:10).

Jesus had to meet again in the world all those temptations which He had vanquished in His thought. The people desired to make Him king (Joh 6:15). He made it the occasion of showing clearly the spiritual nature of His mission, and reaped for His faithfulness their disbelief. The temptation came closer. Peter, in love, took Him aside and rebuked Him when He sought to prepare the disciples' hearts for the shame and death before Him. Peter was the mouth-piece of the Prince of this world, pointing out the lower way (Mat 16:21-23). From the lips of mother and brethren the same temptation came. His mother whispered, 'They have no wine' (Joh 2:3); His brethren said, 'Go into Judaea (where the great and powerful are), that thy disciples also may see the works that thou doest' (Joh 7:3-4). Temptation thus entrenched itself against Him among the sanctities of the heart. Jesus, as in the wilderness, triumphed by simple obedience. He put the temptation aside with the words, 'Mine hour is not yet come' (Joh 2:24). He had no ear for any of the suggestions of policy or worldly prudence, whose hour is always ready; He was a man under authority, waiting for the call of the Father; and clear and sweet above the discordant voices of the world that call ever came, and He followed it to Calvary. There His obedience was perfected (Joh 14:31).

(2) *Brotherly relation to men.*—There were no limits to Jesus sympathy and love for men. (a) The religious prejudices of His day did not impair His brotherhood with the sinful and the outcast. He discerned clearly their worth. That is a witness to His brotherhood. For interest and affection are the lights which illumine the personality of others; only by them can we read their hidden worth, especially when obscured by the dominant thought and prejudices of the day. Jesus discerned the spiritual soundness which might underlie sins of passion, the capacity of generosity with its healing power, the quick and deep response to a gospel of forgiveness in the humility of self-accusing hearts, the sacred soil where love grows (Luk 7:47; Luk 18:13, Mat 21:28-32). And He drew nigh unto men in brotherly love as the physician of sick souls, the faithful shepherd seeking the lost sheep of God, though thereby He outraged the sentiments of the Pharisees (Mat 9:11; Mat 11:19, Luk 15:2; Luk 19:7), though His friendship with them was helping to raise the cross on which He was slain. The simplicity of Jesus' feeling of brotherhood for them is witnessed by the fact that they drew near to Him gladly (Luk 15:1, Mat 9:10).

(b) 'No single social type monopolized the sympathy or acceptance of Jesus' (Peabody, *op. cit.* p. 204). The zealot and the publican met in the inner circle of His disciples: Mary of Magdala, out of whom went seven devils, and Joanna, the wife of Herod's steward, united to minister to Him of their substance. He was equally at home in Simon the Pharisee's house and at the table of Levi or Zacchaeus, with their different *clientèle*; in private talk with Nicodemus, a master in Israel, and at the wayside well with the woman of Samaria. His help in sickness was for rich and poor, in all circumstances and conditions—the solitary leper, and the mourning widow in the streets of Nain; the paralytic of thirty-eight years, friendless and helpless, and the bond-servant of the household of the Roman centurion, whose name was held in honour throughout all Capernaum; the daughter of Jairus, a ruler of the synagogue, and the daughter of a nameless Gentile woman of Syro-Phœnicia. And His brotherhood went beyond the bounds of nations. He made the Samaritan the hero of His story of neighbourliness; He praised the faith of the Roman centurion; He pointed to God's care of Naaman the Syrian captain, and the widow of Zarephath. Jesus might not formulate in express terms the doctrine of the brotherhood of man. That was not His way. He dealt not in notions or abstractions. He rather inspired a spirit which sooner or later would burst all the swaddling-bands that confined humanity, and which expressed itself in the words of him who understood best the spirit of the Master, 'Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Seythian, bond nor free' (Col 3:11). Illumination rises from the heart.

(c) In Him love won also its ultimate triumph, viz. over wrong and hate. 'I say unto you, Love your enemies,' etc. (Mat 5:44). That is an ideal which thought may win; but it has been fully realized only in Him who suffered the contradiction of sinners with unflinching patience and serenity of heart, and who prayed on the cross for those

who placed Him there, and who reviled Him in His agony, 'Father, forgive them: for they know not what they do' (Luk 23:34).

Jesus' filial relation of love and obedience to the Father and His brotherhood to man reach their absolute expression on Calvary. That death was no accident, provoked by the invectives against the Pharisees; it was seen afar off as the end of His mission. It looks through the sad irony of His answer to the Pharisees when they complained of the religious light-heartedness of His followers and He said, 'The days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast in those days' (Mar 2:20). And as soon as the disciples had come to clear faith in Him as the Messiah, He began to prepare them for disappointment and tribulation and His death. This was the inevitable end of the method He had chosen in the wilderness, when He renounced all powers of persuasion but that of an appeal to the heart. The Kingdom of loving and obedient souls could be established only on the perfect sacrifice of love and obedience, and Jesus gave Himself absolutely in response to that vision of faith. In this sacrifice the law of His life, ultimate law for man, declares its victory.

4. As a result of His perfect love and obedience the character of Jesus shows certain notes of perfection, qualities in which He is unique and unapproachable among men. (1) There was in Him the union of the loftiest self-consciousness and the utmost sobriety of mind and lowliness of heart. 'I am the light of the world' (Joh 8:12); 'No man knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son willeth to reveal him' (Mat 11:27). A self-consciousness more than human is in these words. And this self-consciousness dominates all His work. He brushes aside the teachings of the scribes and the traditions of their schools; He speaks to the people as one having authority, who is greater than Jonah or Solomon (Mat 12:41-42), who stands above all the Law and the Prophets (Mat 5:17-18; Mat 21:34-37). He made also the most tremendous claims on men. He bade the rich man sell all and follow Him; His disciples were to hate wife and family for His sake. The experience of failure and the approach of the Cross availed nothing to abate these claims. At the visit of the Greeks He said that, were He lifted up, He would draw all men to Him (Joh 12:32); He told the high priest that He was the Son of God, and that he would see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven (Mar 14:62). And yet Jesus ever showed the utmost sobriety and lowly-mindedness. He always prayed humbly and submissively to God the Father. The Son did nothing but what He learned from the Father (Joh 5:19). And in the wilderness He recognized that He was to tread life's common way. Savonarola and St. Francis might offer to pass through the fire, but Jesus expected no guarding or attesting miracle. He must not cast Himself from the Temple. He must accept all the ordinary conditions of life in His work. And He accepted them. Meekly He went down the darkening ways, accepting failure and disappointment and hatred and shame as the portion appointed by the Father; and there is no sign of any inward rebellion or amazement. He walked humbly before God.

He was with men also in lowliness and meekness. When the Samaritan villagers would not receive Him, He restrained His disciples' indignation and went to another village (Luk 9:52-56); He took a place in the lower seats in the Pharisee's house (Luk 14:7-11); He was infinitely approachable by all the outcast and needy. Though He proclaimed, when need was, His greatness as the Son of God, yet He turned aside from personal questions as to whether He was the Messiah. His aim was to create in men's hearts faith in God as their Father, and He was content to let that faith come to its own appreciation of Him and His claims. The man who would not follow Him, but yet wrought cures in His name, was not to be rebuked (Mar 9:38-42) and any blasphemy against Him personally would be forgiven (Mat 12:31-32). His greatness among men was the greatness of service. This union of lowly-mindedness and loftiest self-consciousness is reflected, as in a mirror, in His parable of the Last Judgment. He sees Himself attended by all the holy angels, and seated on the throne of glory to judge men. But there His royal robe is the self-forgetting humility of love. For there no wrongs done to Himself are thought of, no disbelief in His claims, no offence against His majesty: it is the helpless and the suffering forgotten by their brethren who fill His mind. His glory vanishes within the light of love.

(2) Jesus faced the sorrow and sin of the world, and yielded nothing of His faith and joy. It has been said that He was a man of melancholy, one who never laughed, one marked and scored by the world's evil, grown old before His time. That is an *a priori* interpretation of His character. In the Gospels it is the note of joy that strikes us. Jesus Himself says to the complaining Pharisees, 'Can the children of the bridechamber fast while the bridegroom is with them?' The joy of the bridegroom was in His heart. His life then was empty of all the things in whose abundance the world thinks that man's life consists. But the sources of happiness are all within. And Jesus' joy reveals His victory over the tyranny of things. He was rich inwardly. That arose from His cheerful faith 'that all which we behold is full of blessings.' This world, to His vision, was God's world. It is He who clothes the lily with beauty, and feeds the ravens, and knows when a sparrow falls to the ground, and numbers the hairs of His children's heads. And He had faith in man. He saw in the Temple's outcast children marks of good. They could love much: the authentic Divine seal was still on their hearts. Such an outlook brings riches of interest and joy to the whole nature.

But how did that faith and that joy fare in their encounter with the world's sin and sorrow? It was tried to the uttermost. Jesus met with all the sorrows of life in others' experience, which His sympathy made real to Him, if not in His own. He met the world's sin; He had to endure the disbelief of His brethren and the forsaking of His followers; He was led to see the very throne of Satan in the hypocrisy of religious men, and in the cruelty and inhuman pride of earth's saints. But that did not touch the inward joy and peace of His faith. As He went up to Jerusalem, where alone the blood of the prophets was shed, there was a glory in His face which held His followers

awed and silent (Mar_10:32-34). It was the inward rapture of a heart that saw, beyond the darkness, light; beyond the hatreds and crimes of men, the love of the Father turning sin to blessed account. It is true that Jesus' latest words are words of judgment. That could not but be; for the days of Judah's visitation were hurrying by, and the truth which the hour revealed must be spoken. The shadow of Israel's rejection is over them. But peace, 'subsisting at the heart of endless agitation,' was His. It is present everywhere in His last discourse in the Upper Room (Joh_13:31 to Joh_17:26). A sober colouring as of even is there; but it speaks quiet assurance of victory. 'Be of good cheer: I have overcome the world.' That is its note. Peace breathes through it, peace 'whose other names are rapture, power, clear sight, and love.' Only twice during that night was this peace greatly disturbed: in Gethsemane when He prayed, 'Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me' (Mat_26:39); and on the cross when the cry burst from Him, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' (Mat_27:46). These are mysteries where we pass beyond mere moral questions into the theology of the sin-bearing. Could such a unique spirit pass through such an experience without striking notes too profound and strange for our conceiving? But only for a brief space rested His soul within the shadow. There was peace in His heart after Gethsemane, when Judas came, and when He stood before Caiaphas and Pilate, which made Him the Lord of all that evil night. And there was peace on the cross, that throne of love and obedience; peace before the darkness, when sympathy for others filled His heart, and He prayed for those who slew Him knowing not what they did, and comforted the repentant thief, and gave His mother into His loved disciple's care; peace after the darkness, when He surveyed His work, and seeing it finished thus in sacrificial death, commended His soul to the Father, whose will He was obeying. There is the perfection of Jesus' victory over the world. He yielded no hostages of joy or faith. He confronted the world's sin, the very darkness of evil where God seemed not to be, and He remained with inward glory crowned, His soul full of the joy and peace of the vision that He and all His lay in the bosom of the Father.

Literature.—The Lives of Christ; Young, *The Christ of History*; Ullmann, *The Sinlessness of Jesus*; Channing's *Works*, vol. ii.; Bushnell, *On the Character of Jesus*; Lacordaire, *Jesus Christ*; F. W. Newman, *Phases of Faith*, with Martineau's reviews thereof, in *Essays*, vol. iii.; Martineau, *Seat of Authority in Religion*, bk. v.; Wernle, *Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. i.; J. Scott Lidgett, *The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement*, ch. vi.; Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Christian Character*; Forrest, *The Authority of Christ*; Weinel, *Jesus im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*.

Richard Glaister.

⚡ Perplexity

PERPLEXITY.—The word ‘perplexity’ (ἀπορία) occurs but once in the NT (Luk 21:25), in that reminiscence of Daniel which foretells the day of terrors that shall usher in the presence of the Son of Man. But the idea has remarkable associations with Christ in the Gospels. Not only is perplexity discernible in His own experience, but He was then (as now) a frequent cause of it in others. His powers, and the amazing insight of His wisdom, were a continual occasion of astonishment to the mere onlookers (Mat 13:54-56, cf. Luk 4:22). To explain His exorcisms, the Pharisees were driven to the confusing theory of demoniac possession (Mat 9:34 || Mat 12:24, Mar 3:22, Luk 11:15). His disciples would listen to His unconventional judgments with blank perplexity. Had He not, for example, taught them the blessedness of charity, and the law of love for one’s neighbour? What, then, could they make of His defence of ‘this waste’ of a box of precious ointment (Mat 26:8 || Joh 12:4)? It was hard for a disciple to understand why He should resist an opportunity of helping the poor: men are slow to learn the value of a rightful surrender of our most beautiful and treasured possessions for the purpose of reverence only. Not a little of the disciples’ perplexity arose from their own materialistic preconceptions. When Jesus used the language of parable or metaphor, they made no attempt to reach the deeper and more spiritual meaning—as when He spoke of the Sower (Mar 4:13 || Luk 8:9), or of the ‘leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees’ (Mat 16:5-12 || Luk 12:1). Once the awful terror which is sometimes the accompaniment of perplexity seized them—when Jesus spoke with such dread certainty of the presence of one among them who was ready to give Him up, and they ‘looked one on another, doubting of whom he spake’ (Joh 13:22). Yet, while Christ perplexed others, especially those who knew Him least, they seemed powerless to perplex Him. Perfect obedience to the will of God in all things left no room for that flickering of faith which blurs the answer or the gospel of so many teachers. When questioners deliberately attempted to puzzle Him, He unravelled their tangles with instinctive ease (Mat 9:5 || Mar 2:9, Luk 5:23; Mat 12:4 || Mar 2:26, Luk 6:4). Sometimes in a phrase He re-tied the knot into a problem which they were unable to resolve, as when they asked by what authority He did these things (Mat 21:27 || Mar 11:28, Luk 20:2), or in the question of the tribute money being paid to Caesar (Mat 22:21 || Mar 12:17, Luk 20:25), or the casuistry of the woman with the seven husbands (Mat 22:30 || Mar 12:25, Luk 20:35). The pain of perplexity seems to have come to Jesus only towards the end of His life on earth, and then it was more from within than from without. In those closing days the burden of His mission, and all that it would entail in the far future of the world, seemed to weigh heavily upon Him. Near at hand He felt the weakness of His disciples’ loyalty, and was especially ‘troubled in the spirit’ about Judas (Joh 13:21). As He looked forward into the days to come, there fell upon Him the knowledge of divisions, feuds, persecutions that would arise in His name ‘to incarnadine the world.’ He was face to face with the baptism of all leadership: it would be His to kindle the flaming passions

of men, Prince of Peace as He is (Luk_12:51). Is it any wonder that on the threshold of such a task He should be distressed, perplexed (συνέχουμαι, (Revised Version margin) ‘pained’)? He is moved to hesitate: at least the temptation arises when He feels spiritual perplexity (Joh_12:27). And in Gethsemane the overstrained humanity utters the cry of longing for escape—‘Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from me: nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt’ (Mat_26:39). In that last sentence He reveals to us the key of deliverance from all cankering perplexity, all that uncertainty which confuses and enervates the will. He shows the world the supremacy of a will resigned to God. It is the truism of the choice—‘No man can serve two masters: ... Ye cannot serve God and mammon’ (Mat_6:24 || Luk_16:13). Try to serve both, and you have strife and confusion within and around: life becomes a war of irreconcilable ideals. But bend all thoughts, desires, will, towards God; learn the worth of Christ’s word, ‘Be not anxious’ as to food, life, raiment, and the rest, ‘for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of these things’ (Mat_6:25-33 || Luk_12:22-36). There are no more troubled hearts and perplexed wills for those who rest in God and live in Christ (Joh_14:1), for to them the prayer, ‘Thy will be done’ (Mat_6:10), finds its invariable answer in a sublime and heavenly peace. See also artt. Amazement, Doubt.

Edgar Daplyn.

☒ Persecution

PERSECUTION.—(1) Christ foresaw that persecution would be His inevitable lot and that of His true followers. Repeatedly He foretold the main incidents of His Passion (Mat_16:21; Mat_17:22-23; Mat_20:18-19; Mat_26:2, Mat_8:31; Mat_9:31; Mat_10:32-34). (2) Christ also forewarned His disciples that they too must suffer persecution (Mat_24:9, Mar_4:17; Mar_10:30, Luk_11:49; Luk_21:12; Luk_21:16, Joh_16:2-4; Joh_16:33). (3) Persecution was the test of true discipleship. It was mentioned in the parable of the Sower as the cause of defection among superficial believers (Mar_4:17, Mat_13:21). (4) It was the sure means of gaining a blessing, and as such is particularly referred to in the Beatitudes (Mat_5:10-12).

The methods of persecution adopted against Christ and His immediate followers were such as contempt and disparagement (Joh_8:48); ascription of Christ’s miracles to the power of the Evil One (Mat_12:24); expulsion of those believing on Him from the synagogue (Joh_9:22; Joh_9:34); attempts to entrap Him in His words (Mat_22:15, Joh_8:6); questioning His authority (Mar_11:28, Mat_21:23); (after the failure of the former) illegal arrest and the heaping of every kind of insult upon the Prisoner, who

was entitled to protection from the authorities until the authorized penalty was laid upon Him (Mat_26:67 ff. and parallels). See also art. Name, p. 217^b.

It was the fear of persecution that drove the disciples to forsake their Master at the hour of His arrest (Mat_26:56 and parallels).

C. H. Prichard.

☒ Person Of Christ

PERSON OF CHRIST.—See Divinity, Humanity, Incarnation, Son of God, Son of Man, etc.

☒ Personal Appearance

PERSONAL APPEARANCE.—See Christ in Art, vol. i. p. 314 f.

☒ Personality

PERSONALITY

1. Definition and analysis.—Personality is the substance and summary of a man's qualities, or rather it is the man himself, discovered in the last analysis and in the highest category of being short of God. Indeed, 'complete personality can be in God only, while to man can belong but a weak and faint copy thereof, (Lotze, *Outlines*, p. 72). The truth is that through the limitations of bodily existence there are mental and moral workings which do not at once cross the threshold of consciousness, but may at any time surprise the soul, as in the flash of genius or the turn of conversion. But personality implies a grip of these things as our own. We know that we exist when self is revealed to us over against the world. There the self-conscious life begins. But it is not until God is revealed over against both self and the world that personality is fully exercised. The recognition of a moral authority is the touchstone of the self-determined life. Thus, for popular purposes, personality may be expressed in terms of character. 'It is made up,' says F. W. Robertson, 'of three attributes—consciousness, character, and will.' In other words, it is the power of self-assertion on lines of character. But, philosophically speaking, the two chief

factors in personality, in so far as it can be analyzed, are self-consciousness and self-determination, the contents of which it will be necessary to examine. Put briefly, self-consciousness is the soul's utterance 'I am'; self-determination is the soul's assertion 'I will.'

(1) *Self-consciousness* is the soul's utterance 'I am.' (a) I am myself and nobody else (cf. Joh 9:9 ἐγώ εἰμι). Almost the first sense of personality is that it speaks from behind closed doors. It can look out on others, but they cannot enter uninvited to share its life. This point is brought out in Holman Hunt's famous picture 'The Light of the World,' in which the door has no handle outside. 'Each self is a unique existence, which is perfectly impervious to other selves—impervious in a fashion of which the impenetrability of matter is a faint analogue' (Seth, *Hegelianism and Personality*, p. 216). (b) I am myself amid the varied functions of my being. Spinoza based personality on the intellect, Schleiermacher on the feeling, Schopenhauer on the will. But personality subtly underlies thinking, feeling, and willing. They are only modes of the soul's self-expression. They are unified in the intuition 'I am.' In Joh 6:20 there is an illustrative use of ἐγώ εἰμι, when Jesus assured the disciples of His personal identity behind an unfamiliar appearance. (c) I am myself in a continuity of experience. In all movement of time and change of circumstances the soul still knows itself as the same. We cannot get rid of our own past; it is with us still. And no sceptical philosophy can dissolve this elemental fact. There is a corresponding sense of ἐγώ εἰμι in Joh 8:58, where Jesus says, 'Before Abraham was, I am,' and reveals the wonderful secret of His self-consciousness.—These modes of the soul's utterance 'I am' enter into the basis of our understanding, on which is erected that faculty of the soul called reason, by which we cognize and construe the world. But the soul must be considered not only in this static, but also in its dynamic aspect, in its—

(2) *Self-determination*, which is the soul's assertion 'I will.' The soul selects and pursues its own ends at the bidding of its own desires. It has music of its own to beat out, by appreciating and appropriating objects in its own environment. The whole range of enjoyment in the pursuit of happiness on the one hand, and of endurance in the path of duty on the other, rests on the use of this power of self-determination. But that which moralizes the human will is that it responds to two voices—(a) 'I can.' The sense of liberty therein expressed is an essential element of personality, and through the intuition of the soul it has held its own as an assertion of free will in spite of the affirmations of reason respecting the will of God (in theology) or the laws of nature (in science). Our moral sense is strictly bound up with this assertion of the soul, without which there can be neither merit, nor blame, nor any accountability. It is this which binds up our being with that of God.

'So near is glory to our dust,

So nigh is God to man,
When Duty whispers low, "Thou must,"

The youth replies, "I can." ' (Emerson).

(b) 'I must' Not, however, until 'I will' is consummated in 'I must' is the height of personality reached, for its liberty of will is given for the sake of its voluntary obedience. When the personality has found its master, its resources are all enlisted on the side of self-determination, especially when for love's sake we lose ourselves. In other words, the highest outgoing and incoming of personality in self-determination is in the exercise of love.

'Love took up the harp of Life, and smote on all the chords with might,
Smote the chord of Self, that, trembling, passed in music out of sight.'

2. Christ's influence on the conception of personality.—The full extension of the possibilities of personality is due to Jesus Christ. He opened up new vistas for the soul's self-consciousness by revealing the inherent but hitherto hidden natures of God, the world, and the soul, whereby the value of the personality has been infinitely enhanced; and higher ways for the soul's self-determination by bringing the gift of the Holy Spirit, in the strength of which the soul overcomes the world, submits to God, and thus realizes itself. This is what the world was waiting for. Prof. Bigg (*The Church and Roman Empire*) shows that the Eastern religions of Isis and Mithras were being welcomed because by their virtual monotheism and their proffer of peace and happiness they seemed to meet the needs, of the newly discovered personality. Christ did this completely. He supplied the key of knowledge to self-consciousness and the nerve of power to self-determination. Henceforth the soul is a possibility to be realized through knowledge in obedience. These are the two factors of faith, for 'faith is at once a vision and an allegiance' (Hort). Prior to Christ, and still apart from Him, the conception of the world has largely absorbed both the notion of God (in Polytheism, Pantheism, and Fatalism), and that of the soul (in Naturalism and Materialism). But through Christ, God and man draw out apart from the world, apart from each other too (sin being the 'sunderer'); and yet more truly close to each other, under the common conception of personality in which both share as distinguished from the world. Illingworth has put the whole point finely at the end of his 5th Bampton Lecture: 'As reason qualifies and conditions our whole animal nature by its presence, so that we are never merely animals, spirituality also permeates and modifies all that we call our natural faculties; and our personality itself is, in this sense, as truly supernatural as the Divine Person in whom alone it finds its home.'

‘God ... soul ... the only facts for me.

Prove them facts? That they o’erpass my power of proving

Proves them such.’ (R. Browning, *La Saisiaz*).

Through Christ man has learned to read God and himself as being gathered under the same categories, perfect and infinite in the one, derivative and fettered in the other. But that is only the intellectual aspect of what we owe Him. And, as Martensen has said (*Dogmatics*, p. 154), ‘No intellectual creation can ever be perfected by dint of a mere psychological possibility; it must first be fructified and awakened by a higher inspiration.’ Christ has shown us the way to the consummation of our personality in the voluntary and glad surrender to God and in fellowship with Him through the Holy Spirit (1Jn 1:3), so that we learn to say—

‘Our wills are ours, we know not how:

Our wills are ours to make them Thine.’

There is such an utter absence of the language of the schools in the speech of Christ, that one might be tempted to think that He made no contribution to the subject of personality. And it is true He was no philosopher in the accepted sense of the term. But He gave philosophy a new world to discover. He roused and satisfied experiences of the soul which at length called into being a new terminology. The fact that the analysis of personality first went to the depths in Paul’s Epistles, argues that the first perfect exposition of personality was in Paul’s Master. For a thing must be before it is thought upon. Where even Plato and Aristotle had groped blindly because they had no true conception of personality, Christ moved with perfect assurance. What was hidden from them, ‘the wise and prudent,’ was all in all to Him. It might truly be said that personality is the pivot of the gospel. ‘The gospel was in the highest and most perfect sense a personal religion’ (Bousset, *Jesus*, p. 164). It does not move in the regions of mere intellect or will or feeling, nor even in the field of their joint exercise. It moves throughout in the region of the man himself, in his self-consciousness and self-determination, and finds its highest expression in the Divine passion for the soul and the human hunger for God. Christ did not coin terms, and yet there is what may be called with Rothe, a ‘language of the Holy Ghost.’ His psychological expressions do not travel beyond the accepted antitheses of soul and body, flesh and spirit, using the first to express simply the two elements in man’s nature (Mat 10:28), and the second to emphasize their distinction in origin (Joh 3:6) and divergence in character (Mar 14:38). Indeed, Jesus did not make use of the psychology available in His own day, e.g. μακάριος οὗ οὐ κατέγνω ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ (Sir 14:2), which is a plain reference to conscience.

Although the word 'spirit' (πνεῦμα) is reserved in the Gospels chiefly for super- or sub-human agencies, it is also used indifferently as a synonym for ψυχή or 'soul,' to express the region of the inner life where the feelings especially have full play. In fourteen instances of such a kind, πνεῦμα occurs seven times (five times in reference to Jesus), and ψυχή also seven times (in reference to Jesus only twice). (With Paul, however, these two words fall apart in psychological connotation). The favourite word of the Evangelists, and presumably of Jesus Himself, is καρδία, which is not only the region of the feelings, but the seat of the will (θέλημα) and of the thoughts (διαλογισμοί). In fact, throughout the Bible it means the organ of the personality (cf. Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Psychology'). It is, by the way, suggestive of the moral emphasis of Christ's teaching that He never uses νοῦς, διάνοια, σύνεσις or their correlatives. But, while Jesus employed terms simply in their popular connotation, He sometimes transfused them with His own transcendental conceptions, and then they stand in excess of light. Thus, 'If thine eye be single, thy whole *body* shall be full of light' (Mat_6:22); 'Whosoever will save his *life* (ψυχή) shall lose it' (Mat_16:25); 'Blessed are your eyes, for they see' (Mat_13:16); 'The things that proceed out of a *man* defile him' (Mar_7:20); 'He that believeth on me, out of his *belly* (κοιλία) shall flow rivers of living water' (Joh_7:38).

But Christ's exposition of personality was not vocal, but vital. It was essentially the realm in which He lived, moved, and had His being: it was the true life to which He invited the careworn and heavy laden, and those who were entangled in their material and worldly environment. Secure in the possession of His own personality, His self-consciousness being at one with God, His self-determination being merged in the will of God, He could affirm, 'The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me' (Joh_14:30); 'I am in the Father and the Father in me' (Joh_14:10); 'I do always the things that please him' (Joh_8:29). That personality is the pivot of the gospel which Jesus lived and taught may be illustrated in detail.

(1) The personal *temptation* of Jesus is given as the record of a unique struggle within the chambers of personality. It was associated with that enhancing of His self-consciousness which was represented by the descent of the Spirit as that of a dove, and the hearing of a voice, 'Thou art my beloved Son' (Mar_1:10). The *first* temptation was overcome by His affirmation that the soul is infinitely more precious than the natural life, and that there is eternal provision for it in communion with the Father (Mat_4:4). As Christ said afterwards to His disciples, 'I have food to eat that ye know not of' (Joh_4:32). The *second* temptation was resisted on the ground that man

has the responsibility of cherishing his life and using it wisely, as the vehicle of a God-given personality. To depend on the aid of angels would be an act of presumption (Mat 4:6 f.). God has chosen that they should minister only when personality has achieved its proper work (Mar 1:13), or before personality is permitted to begin it (Mat 18:10). A true man scorns the aid of impersonal forces when affairs of the soul are at stake (Mat 26:53). The *third* temptation was met in the confidence that personality is of itself worth more than all the world. It may subject itself only to God (Mat 4:10), by whose gentleness it is made great; for it is meant to be king of all, but not through the acknowledgment of Satan (cf. 1Co 3:23). So Jesus taught elsewhere, 'What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?'; but 'The meek shall inherit the earth' (Mar 8:36, Mat 5:5).

(2) The public *teaching* of Christ never moved far from the personal character of true religion. (a) The *Kingdom of heaven* is essentially the realm of personality. It thus calls for no less an analogy than a new birth, and the breath of the Spirit (Joh 3:7-8). Its boundaries are specifically in character, for it is inherited by such as are poor in spirit, pure in heart, and peaceable in will (Mat 5:3; Mat 5:8-9), and those who revert to the attitude of children (Mat 18:3). Deeds of themselves, however zealously performed, are outside this realm (Mat 7:22 f.), for a house may be swept and garnished, yet vacant for evil spirits (Mat 12:44). But even our words will witness against us, for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh (Mat 12:35). The approach of this Kingdom, therefore, is a call to repentance (Mar 1:15): its entry involves the 'binding of the strong man' (Mat 12:29); and its extension needs such a personal influence as the word or the gospel incorporated in the lives of the disciples (Mat 5:13 f.). (b) The *inner righteousness* is only another way of stating that in true religion the personality must come to its own, as the character of fruit is fixed by the tree on which it grows (Mat 7:17). Nothing done by rote or for show is worthy of the soul's approach to its God (Mat 6:1-8). The only genuine worship is in spirit and in truth (Joh 4:23), in the consciousness that the best things may be asked for from a Father (Mat 7:11), who in turn expects the inward attitude of a believing (Mat 6:31), lowly (Luk 18:14), and forgiving heart (Mat 6:15). The only defiling thing in life is the effluence of a man's personality (Mar 7:20). The only unforgivable sin is the sin against the Holy Ghost, which is essentially a sin against one's own personality (Mat 12:31). And behind Christ's teaching were His miracles of mercy, which were sacramental of this rescue of personality from its fetters (Mar 2:5 ff., Luk 13:16). In short, with Christ, religion is positive because it is spiritual. Saintliness is not by contraction, but by expansion. Keeping the Law is acting the Good Samaritan. In a word, religion is raised to personality-power.

(3) The private *training* of Christ was always and wholly exerted on the personality of His disciples. He left behind Him no documents, nor any organization, only men who knew whom they believed (2Ti 1:12). He was satisfied, therefore, that they should be

with Him (Mar_3:14), sure that afterwards they would become ‘fishers of men’ (Mat_4:19), ‘lambs in the midst of wolves’ (Luk_10:3), all because of His influence on their character. They had nothing else to carry with them but the secret of this wonderful change (Mat_10:7 ff.). This change was due to something deeper than even the personal magnetism of Jesus. It was due to a revelation at the core of a man’s nature (Mat_16:17 f.), by an organ of personality undiscovered by the wise (Mat_11:25), and unappreciated by the rich (Mat_19:23). The Church rests on the confession of a convinced personality (Mat_16:18), in whom it has pleased God to reveal His Son (Mat_16:17, cf. Gal_1:15 f.). And this revelation provides the clue to spiritual truth and the criterion of religious authority (Mat_10:34 f., Mat_23:9, Joh_8:31 f., cf. 1Co_3:21-23, 1Jn_2:27) [cf. art. Authority in Religion (iii.)]. It is worth while for a disciple to ‘lose his life’ in order to gain the hidden life of his true personality (Mat_16:25); and if he finds stumbling-blocks to this in his nature, he must act with surgical severity (Mat_18:8-9).

On the other hand, there is an infinite range to the possibilities of personality clear to the mind of Jesus, but hardly fathomable to ourselves, as where He says that to receive a disciple is to receive One who is greater than he (Mat_10:40), and the service even of the helpless and forlorn is done to Himself (Mat_25:40, cf. Mat_26:1 f.). (Is it on this account that ‘the least in the kingdom of heaven’ is greater than John the great individualist?) Another great saying which suggests that we are more than ourselves through Christ, is, ‘Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them’ (Mat_18:20); and yet one more, ‘Lo, I am with you all the days’ (Mat_28:20). In such utterances, which give ample support to Pauline and Johannine mysticism, Christ at least suggests that personality, when once released, is not bounded by the limits of the individual, but is only fulfilled when lost in union with Himself, as the Spirit of all Love. In the words of Dr. Moberly (*Atonement and Personality*, p. 254), ‘Personality is the possibility of mirroring God, the faculty of being a living reflexion of the very attributes and character of the Most High.’ But for the final expression of this profound truth we turn to the words of our Saviour in His intercessory prayer: ‘I in them, and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one (εἰς ἓν) ... that the love wherewith thou lovedst me may be in them, and I in them’ (Joh_17:23; Joh_17:26).

3. New factors introduced by Christ.—The way in which He directly met the needs of personality was twofold—by a revelation and a reinforcement. (1) To man’s *self-consciousness* He revealed God as our Father, with the full illumination of man’s worth, hope, and destiny which this truth brings. (2) To man’s *self-determination* He brought the gift of the Holy Spirit, as a power in aid (παράκλητος) of the fettered personality. The essential conjunction, in the view of the early Church, of these two elements of redemption, which are ours through Christ, is well illustrated in the

variant of St. Luke's recension of the Lord's Prayer. After the acknowledgment of the Fatherhood stands the petition, 'Thy Holy Spirit come upon us and cleanse us.'

(1) Jesus made the soul aware of its high origin and destiny, for the acceptance of *the Fatherhood of God* clears a path through Time and through Eternity. The issues of life become of supreme account to those who believe in One who lives and loves, watches and listens, provides and controls, and will at length either welcome or reject. There is a place for the least, the last and the lost. The angels of the little ones, who have achieved nothing and possess nothing, are before the face of the Father (Mat 18:10). Though uncountried in a nation (Luk 19:9), though unvalued by society (Luk 7:47), though classed with publicans and sinners (Luk 15:1), a man is counted among the Father's children, and valued in the Father's heart (Mat 12:9 f., Luk 15:20 f.). 'It is not the will of your Father in heaven that one of these little ones should perish.' But the greatest hindrance to the full emergence of personality is not so much the lack of outward respect as the loss of self-respect through sin. Self-consciousness becomes thereby a conscience of slavery, of impotence (Romans 7, esp. Rom 7:7-11). When St. Paul speaks of having been once 'alive apart from the law' (Rom 7:9), he means a non-moral existence, before true self-consciousness was born. In the words of Schleiermacher, 'The sinner prior to conversion is overlooked, and is not in this respect a person at all in the eyes of God. He is a particle of the mass, out of which the continued operation of the same creative act of God which gave us the Redeemer does, through Him, call him into personality' (A. Vaughan, *Works*, vol. i. p. 87; cf. Aug. *de Pecc. Or.* 36). The process in the experience of many is a painful one. And although for others it is gradual and apparently natural, there does not seem to be much footing in the NT for those whom F. W. Newman designated as the 'once-born' (cf. James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 80 and Lect. 3 and 4).

'Thus conscience does make cowards of us all;

And thus the native hue of resolution

Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought.'

The tying to a dead past cramps the soul's activities. 'Now was I sorry' (says Bunyan in *Grace Abounding*, 87, 88) 'that God had made me a man, for I feared I was a reprobate.... Yea, I thought it impossible that ever I should attain to such goodness of heart, as to thank God that He had made me a man.' Yet, as St. Paul implies in the above reference, this humiliation is the way to the heights of self-consciousness, for 'guilt is the awful guardian of our personal identity' (Illingworth). Simon Peter only half knew himself when he cried to Christ, 'Depart from me: for I am a sinful man, O Lord' (Luk 5:8). The lost son did not 'come to himself, fully until he was at home with his father, reconciled. Here we come upon the great doctrine of Justification (wh.

see), which is St. Paul's interpretation of the Father's forgiveness in forensic terms. In the experience of the justified man, the 'conscience of sins' is transmuted into a consciousness of 'peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ' (Rom 5:1). 'Actually and in fact Justification is only accomplished by an act of human freedom, an act of the deepest self-consciousness in man, appropriating the redeeming love of the Son of God by the power of awakening and life-giving grace' (Martensen, *Dogmatics*, p. 391).

Starting from this point, the revelation of God as Father is the means of the enlargement of our personality in three ways, through (a) His forgiveness of us, (b) our imitation of Him, (c) the communion between Him and us.

(a) *God's forgiveness*, gratefully received, is the first stage of man's moral freedom. It must always be a factor in our filial consciousness, but at first it may be said to be the only, or at least the chief one. Thus it was the message in which Christ first expressed the meaning of the Fatherhood (Mar 2:5), and which He ever delighted to bring to the children who felt themselves farthest from home (Luk 15:4; Luk 15:32). Their repentance made joy in heaven (Luk 15:7), while the Divine forgiveness woke love in their hearts (Luk 7:47). For it is the spiritual release that goes to the root of our being, and sets free the wholesome springs of goodness, long sealed and ignored (Luk 18:14, Luk 19:8). But forgiveness was more than a 'word of grace': it was a gain for the world at the cost of Calvary (Mat 26:28). And that cost was ultimately met out of the treasures of the Father's heart, 'who so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son' (Joh 3:16, cf. Rom 8:32). Forgiveness in the name of Christ is thus the measure of the estimate in which our personality is held in the sight of God.

(b) *Our imitation of God*.—Sonship, being ours potentially through forgiveness, becomes ours actually through imitation. If one may venture to say so, without seeming to undervalue the continuity of grace, in forgiveness God pays our debts, in order that in imitation we may pay our way. We are 'made nigh' (Eph 2:13), that we may grow like our Father who is in heaven. Having 'received the adoption of sons' (Rom 8:15, Gal 4:5), we are to become 'imitators of God as dear children' (Eph 5:1). 'Even as God (or the Lord) forgave you, so also do ye' (Col 3:13). For the standard of our new nature is nothing less than $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\nu$ (Eph 4:24). This connexion of thought is as clear in John as in Paul. 'Herein is love ... that God loved us, and sent his Son.... Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought to love one another ... because as he is, even so are we in this world' (1Jn 4:10-11; 1Jn 4:17). These words point to their original in the teaching of Christ, who bade us give 'mind, heart, will, and strength' to this holy task (Mat 22:37). To 'be perfect, as our Father in heaven is perfect' (Mat 5:48), to forgive as He forgives (Mat 6:12, Mat 18:35), to make peace and love our enemies that we may prove ourselves His sons (Mat 5:9; Mat 5:45), is the Christian standard of conduct, and the final challenge to our personality.

(c) *Communion between God and man.*—If personality finds its release in the forgiveness, its scope in the imitation, of God, it finds its fulfilment in communion with Him. ‘Religion is nothing if it is not the vital act by which the whole spirit seeks to save itself by attaching itself to its principle. This act is prayer’ (Sabatier, *Philosophy of Religion*, p. 28). But prayer, to be real and effectual, must rest on faith in the Father revealed by Jesus Christ. ‘He who makes prayer simply a way to reach God “invents a god for himself, and one that does not hear.” ... There can be no true worship unless we come through Christ into the relation of children towards God’ (Luther, quoted by Herrmann, *Communion with God*, p. 244). This is the prayer that is surely answered by God (Luk 11:9-13, Joh 15:7), the worship that is in spirit and in truth, which He Himself both inspires and seeks after (Joh 4:23-24, Rom 8:26-27). This is praying after the manner of the Lord’s Prayer, when ‘the storm of desire dies away into stillness before God.’ Yet ‘whatever really so burdens the soul as to threaten its peace is to be brought before God in prayer, with the confidence that the Father’s love understands even our anxious clinging to earthly things’ (Herrmann, p. 247). There is no higher employment of the powers of personality than real (Mat 6:5-6), believing (Mar 11:24), consecrated (Joh 14:13), persistent (Luk 18:1) prayer, from a forgiving heart (Mar 11:25), when it throws itself without reserve upon the loving will of the Father (Mat 26:39; Mat 26:42). Such prayer is far more than an act: it invests all the outgoings and incomings of life with the sacred sense that the Father is ‘over all, through all, and in all’ (Eph 4:6). Thus prayer has ‘a natural effect in spiritualizing and elevating the soul. A man is no longer what he was before. Gradually—imperceptibly to himself—he has imbibed a new set of ideas, and become imbued with fresh principles. He is as one coming from kings’ courts, with a grace, a delicacy, a dignity, a propriety, a justness of thought and taste, a clearness and firmness of principle, all his own’ (J. H. Newman). Resting on life eternal as a principle, a man cannot sink into being the mere plaything of events, a puppet in his environment. Christ has invited him to ascend a higher storey of his being, whence he can see the hosts of God beyond the encircling enemy. ‘Heaven lies about us in our infancy.’ And the fulfilment of that truth is when the saint, with the heart of a little child, endures as seeing Him who is invisible.

On these three steps of heightened self-consciousness—forgiveness, imitation, and communion—stands the temple of immortality for the soul.

(2) Jesus made the soul capable of attaining its high destiny (in correspondence with its Divine origin) by *the gift of the Holy Spirit*. This was the one great object of His saving ministry besides revealing the Father. It is not that there was no Holy Spirit except for the ministry of Jesus Christ. The Holy Spirit, we must believe, was as truly at the centre and circumference of the universe as the Father Himself. But none the less, for the purposes of human personality, the Fatherhood and Spirit of God were alike the creation of Jesus Christ. On these twin pillars His Kingdom of the redeemed

is founded; Justification being the result of the Father's relation to personality, and Sanctification being the effect of the Spirit's influence on personality: both being secured through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. It were of little use to heighten the soul's self-consciousness without increasing its powers of self-determination. The knowledge that God is our Father, with all it implies, must be completed by our receiving the 'spirit of adoption' whereby we cry 'Abba, Father' (Rom 8:15), and the 'power to become sons of God' (Joh 1:12). The connexion between this Spirit of God and our spirits is too subtle for our analysis. 'In the ephemeral and empirical Me, there is a mysterious Guest, greater than the Me, and to which the Me instinctively addresses its prayer and its trust' (Sabatier, *Religions of Authority*, p. 318). But there can be no doubt (and this is the meaning of Romans 8) that the result is an enhancing of the soul's power to realize itself in respect of character which is the real realm of personality. In other words, the Holy Spirit is preeminently the mainspring of the life inspired by Christ (*vis vicaria*, Tertullian), not, however, as substitute for the will, but as its partner and prompter (cf. Gal 2:20 with Gal 5:25, and Eph 3:16 with Eph 3:17). 'The Spirit and faith,' says Dr. Denney (art. Holy Spirit in vol. i. p. 738^b), 'are correlative terms, and each of them covers from a different point of view all that is meant by Christianity. Regarded from the side of God and His grace and power in initiating and maintaining it, Christianity is the Spirit; regarded from the side of man and his action and responsibility in relation to God, it is faith.' The bearing of the Spirit on man's self-determination (*i.e.* as a moral motive) may be viewed in two aspects.

(a) There is the *entrance* of the Spirit, which is sometimes called simply a gift (Luk 11:13), but also 'a new birth' (Joh 3:3 ff.), because its origin is behind the will of man (Joh 1:13), and a 'baptism' (Mar 1:8), because its outcome is in the will of man, in his personal dedication (cf. Php 2:12).

'My heart was full; I made no vows, but vows

Were then made for me; bond unknown to me

Was given, that I should be, else sinning greatly,

A dedicated Spirit' (Wordsworth, *The Prelude*, iv. 334 ff.).

And cf. Paracelsus:—

'As He spoke, I was endued

With comprehension and a steadfast will;

And when He ceased, my brow was sealed His own.'

In any case, it brings the power of the Highest (δύναμις ὑψίστου, Luk 1:35) to those who have high work to do. Christ began His public ministry (Luk 4:14) in the power of the Spirit, who first brooded over Him and then drove Him forth (Mar 1:10; Mar 1:12). The Spirit also endowed the behaviour and bearing of Jesus with its unique characteristics (Mat 12:17 ff.). But this belongs more properly to the section below. The most critical act of the soul's self-determination is known as conversion, which is the final acceptance of the will and love of God as revealed in Jesus Christ, so that the motives stored in the gospel become henceforth dominant partners in the life of the soul. 'In conversion' (says Starbuck, quoted in James, *Religious Experience*, p. 210) 'a person must relax, *i.e.* must fall back on the larger power that makes for righteousness, which has been welling up in his own being, and let it finish in its own way the work it has begun.' This is the true leverage of all moral possibilities; and it is due to the entering of the Spirit, which has its own heavenly ways (cf. Luk 9:55 Authorized Version), and releases the soul from the encumbrance of habit and the tyranny of desire. The entrance of the Spirit thus brings the release of the personality. 'The unseen region is not merely the ideal, for it produces effects in this world. When we commune with it, work is actually done upon our finite personality, for we are turned into a new man, and consequences in the way of conduct, follow in the natural world upon our regenerative change' (Professor James, *op. cit.* p. 516).

(b) The *indwelling* of the Spirit is the consummation of the Christian faith, its distinctive feature and peculiar power (Luk 11:13; Luk 24:49, Joh 7:38; Joh 14:16; Joh 20:22, cf. Act 11:15-18; Act 19:1-6, Rom 8:2, 2 Corinthians 3, Gal 5:16 ff.). The human problem is stated in a famous chapter (Romans 7) by Paul, in a memorable sentence by Christ (Mar 14:38). Without the higher inspiration the mind becomes carnal instead of the body being consecrated. Christ Himself suffered from no division in His nature (cf. Harnack, *What is Christianity?* p. 32 f.), because He was filled with the Spirit (Luk 4:1): the Prince of this world had nothing in *Him* (Joh 14:30). And this is the *summum bonum* to which He invites His disciples: 'Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you' (Joh 14:27). It resolves the antinomies of flesh and spirit, body and soul, whereby the self-determination of man is tested, enabling us to believe, and live by the truth, that our bodies are 'temples of the Holy Ghost' which is in us, which we have from God (1Co 6:19); or, using the original analogy of Christ, that we are branches of the true Vine, into which, and through which, the sap of His ever-living word is to flow, producing fruit to the glory of God (Joh 15:1-8). The fruitfulness of life in character, which is the crown of personality, depends in short on the partnership of our personality with the Paraclete, whose dominion brings us liberty from the Law, as the obverse of our obedience to Love (Rom 8:15 cf. Rom 8:9, Gal 5:22-23 cf. Gal 5:16; Gal 5:18, 2Pe 1:8 cf. 2Pe 1:4). All this is the

process of sanctification. 'If it has come to pass that the saints of the New Covenant have a higher idea of holiness, have walked by a more perfect rule, have shown forth a more excellent and lovely character, these are the fruits of the blessed Spirit' (Dean Church, *Village Sermons*, p. 121).

The manifestation of this spiritual fact was at Pentecost (Acts 2), and it presupposed two prior events—the advent of Jesus, and His ascension. And the meaning of these three events for man's self-determination lies here.

(i.) The Spirit as revealed in the earthly life of Jesus was the unique illustration of a Personality moving only in the direction of truth, holiness, and love, and yet on the lines of human nature. And this was manifestly due to the unhindered operation of the personal Spirit of God. Henceforth the association between Christ and the Spirit is so close for us, that we may say that the Spirit *is* Christ interpreted in terms of our experience; even as the Father is Christ read into the Eternal. To use the fine analogy of Martineau (*Essays*, iii. 1, p. 50), 'If it has pleased God, the Creator, to fit up one system with one sun, to make the daylight of several worlds, so may it fitly have pleased God, the Revealer, to kindle amid the elliptic of history One Divine Soul to glorify whatever lies within the great year of His moral Providence, and represent the father of Lights.' Only we must go on to say that, in the name of God the Redeemer, Jesus represents the sunshine as well; for it is through Him the Holy Spirit is mediated to us. 'The truth is' (as against Beyschlag, vol. i. p. 279), 'not that the Spirit is identical with Christ, but that it was from the first so entirely the principle of His personality, and He was throughout so completely one with it in His Divine humanity, that He became its perfect organ and expression, not merely in a temporal and impersonal sense, but in a personal and abiding sense.... The Holy Spirit as it comes to us in Christianity, therefore, includes the personal presence of Christ' (Walker, *Spirit and Incarnation*, p. 85).

(ii.) But it is equally true that the earthly life of Jesus had to be superseded if it was to have its full effect on man's personality. On the one hand, He Himself said, 'I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me' ([Joh_12:32](#)); and, on the other hand, the response came from the experience of an Apostle: 'Even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him so no more' ([2Co_5:16](#)). 'If any one have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his' ([Rom_8:9](#)). Faith is more than an outlook; it is also an up-look and an inlook. The Christ of history must become the Christ of experience. Just as the painter passes from the stage of imitation to origination before he becomes an artist, so a Christian is one who, looking away to Christ, loses himself in Him, and so finds himself again as a new creation ([2Co_5:17](#); cf. [Mar_8:35](#)). Thus 'the Lord is the Spirit.' Christ in whose face was the glory of God-becomes 'Christ in us the hope of glory' ([2Co_4:6](#), [Col_1:27](#)). 'He that descended

is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things' (Eph 4:10).

(iii.) The significance of Pentecost is, in brief, that Christ is now to be made known to the world through 'living epistles, known and read of all men, written by the Holy Spirit on the fleshy tables of the heart,' *i.e.* in the promptings of conscience and compassion, which prove the working of the Spirit of Christ (2Co 3:2-3). In other words, the honour of Christ's name and the success of His cause are thrown upon the personality He has evoked,—that personality which in partnership with the Spirit of God, and in union with fellow-Christians, is to do even greater things than Christ in His earthly life could accomplish. And who is sufficient for these things? But we have the mind of Christ and the ministry of the Spirit (1Co 2:16, 2Co 2:16; 2Co 3:6).

4. The redeemed personality.—For the redeemed personality, Justification is its liberty; Sanctification its law. These great words were invented to express personality at its highest, and in its fulfilment, from the point of view of self-consciousness and self-determination respectively. It may fairly be said that this redeemed personality has been the keynote of Christendom, the secret of its history, the source of its progress—often misleading and misled, but having the power of an endless life. This sketch of the subject may be completed by a few suggestions as to the significance of the redeemed personality for the history of Christendom. It has caused man (1) to stand for his rights and liberties, (2) to recognize his debts and duties.

(1) *The rights and liberties of the soul.*—Modern history is the steady unfolding of the powers of the personality in answer to the challenge of the civilization by which it is surrounded. The world is so much with us through facilities of knowledge, communication, and enjoyment, that the inner life of the soul would have little chance indeed were it not continually replenished in spirit and in truth. But because personality is conscious of its eternal environment, it can 'endure as seeing him who is invisible,' and must assert itself in the name of its Creator and Redeemer. Steadily it has been rising to the height of its possibilities against the weight of an accumulating tradition and venerable institutions, in the belief that the word of God comes most directly to this world through its dedicated personalities. That 'word' has always breathed Justice as the social, and Liberty as the personal ideal. And reformers have always found their inspiration for the former in the OT, for the latter in the NT. Constitutional history could not be explained but for the continual inflow of these principles upon the consciences of the people from their springs in the Christian faith. We cannot fail to observe that the action of the Christian conscience through the leaders of the Church had much to do with the Magna Charta. The uprising from the condition of villenage in the 14th cent. was vitally connected with the Lollard movement and the distribution of the Bible in the English tongue. The Peasants' Wars in Germany which followed, and the national movements in all the northern countries

of Europe, found the secret of their power in the recovered gospel. It is the testimony of all who know, that the rights of the Christian man were the first objective of our own Puritan Revolution. Said Pym, its typical exponent: 'The greatest liberty of our country is religion.' The American Commonwealth was founded, as to its true nucleus, in the passion for 'freedom to worship God.' And although the French Revolution triumphed in an 'age of reason,' in defiance of Church and creed, its passionate hope was derived from the Christian conception of the rights of man which had certainly drifted into the mind of Voltaire.

Finally, in religion itself personality has played its true part only under the aegis of Jesus Christ. In Mohammedanism the political and social bonds are drawn very closely, and its military associations have tended to promote the type of the devoted soldier (Moslems)—'Theirs not to reason why, theirs but to do and die.' Under such a form of religion personality has little chance. The Hindu philosophy which underlies Buddhism regards personality as the chief seat of evil in the universe, and works towards its obliteration. Socially, this philosophy results in the caste system, which is well calculated to this end. The religion, if so it may be called, of Confucius, throws the weight of every moral sanction on the dead past, and, by the worship of ancestors, depreciates to the utmost extent the homage due to the living soul. Christianity has no doubt many points of contact with these and other religions; but in this respect it is utterly antagonistic, in that its unit is the individual, whatever his race, colour, or class, on the sublime ground that God seeks him and needs him. Hence its life has always been fed by personalities, whose love to God has been with the heart, mind, soul, and strength. As Christ founded His Church on Peter, so on the man who adopts the motto of the Northern university—'Men say: Quhat say they: lat them say'—in the spirit of Peter (Act 4:19), has the Church as a matter of history always been refounded. By the touch of Christ on the individual all bands and bars have snapped, and in the inspired personality the word of God has found free course and been glorified. It might almost be said that no other religion is anything but a framework. Only in the religion of Jesus Christ do we see the face of a renewed personality changed into the same image from glory to glory.

(2) But the new-found personality has not only rejoiced in rights and liberties, political and social, mental and spiritual; it has also made an ever fuller discovery of *its debts and duties*. The Fatherhood of God means the promise at least of personality in every human being, and that means the essential brotherhood of men. The Incarnation has drawn them into one by declaring them one; so that each must bear the others' burdens, and so fulfil the law of Jesus Christ. The Atonement on Calvary has focussed the conception of vicarious suffering, and summoned Christians to fulfil that which is lacking of the sufferings of Christ (Col 1:24). In the train of Christian salvation mutual service becomes the truest expression of the bond of union (Joh 13:15-17). So we are bidden to respect one another's personality, to 'honour all

men,' to 'receive one another as Christ also received us to the glory of God' (Rom 15:7). Being hopelessly in debt to God, we are to pay off all we can on the altar of humanity's need. Our indebtedness to God involves our forgiveness of others (Mat 18:32-33), our help of any one in every time of need (Mat 10:8, Luk 10:37), and especially our hope and labour for their spiritual welfare (Mat 28:19, Luk 10:2).

This consciousness of duty to humanity for Christ's sake soon showed itself in the breaking of yokes, although the yokes crumbled rather than snapped under His humane influence. It worked upon pagan notions of slavery and conquest, and after abolishing the gladiatorial shows, first eased and finally freed the human chattel. The rights of woman, too, as partner rather than subordinate, and the honour paid even to children, as against the Roman practice of infanticide, have gradually come into being through the changed standpoint from which personality is regarded through Christ. Continuing the story thus begun, the recognition of our debt and duty towards others on account of their personality has (a) secretly undermined the resistance of racial barriers. More than this can hardly be said in view of events East and West. But at any rate the Christian Church, now a fellowship of many peoples, kindreds, and tongues, has to a large extent anticipated the fulfilment of the ideal which leaped to the imagination of St. Paul, when there shall be 'neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female; for all are one in Christ Jesus' (Gal 3:28). (b) It has slowly produced an attitude of tolerance, *i.e.* a recognition of the rights of others in thought. That is a position far in advance of the claim to personal independence. Liberty of thought for others, with a resulting equality of opportunity, is an ideal hard of attainment. But because humanity is logical, though men are not, it will at length be established as the corollary to the rights of personality, (c) It has steadily permeated law with the larger justice of mercy. This is another comparatively recent development of the Christian consciousness. The criminal code and the service discipline were both administered on brutal lines, and the industrial system was beset by conditions hardly less degrading. But the claim of personality is steadily laying hold of the popular imagination and conscience, and asserting itself in the acts of our statute-book. (d) It has turned older methods of education upside down. The claim of the personality is now respected even when in the bud. The teacher now learns to sit first at the feet of the child, who is no longer trained to be a kind of imitation adult, but is desired to develop on the lines of its own personality, (e) It has inspired all crusades of compassion. Christianity has led the way, to the marvel of the world, in the provision of hospitals, asylums, orphanages, etc. And this consideration for the blind, the insane, the leper, and such afflicted ones, is the monument to Christ's care of the body as the home of the personality. (f) It has been the fulcrum of foreign missions; for there are souls to be saved wherever humanity is to be found. This is the most beautiful and characteristic task of the Church of Christ.

These are some of the modern developments of personality as to its rights and duties. By means of their proper balance and mutual influence, Christendom makes its advance. And this balance is maintained so far as man is in Christ. For from Him alone comes the ultimate sense of human dignity both for oneself and for all. At His feet we learn that personality is given its full enfranchisement in order that it may co-operate with the Father in the employments or perfect love.

Literature.—Besides the works alluded to above, see Illingworth, *Personality, Human and Divine*; Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*, esp. ch. ix.; Martensen, *Ethics*; Dorner, *Ethics*; Seth, *Hegelianism and Personality*; W. Richmond, *Personality*; Newman Smyth, *Christian Ethics*; James, *Problems of Personality*; Lotze, *Microcosmus*, i. 248 ff.; Green, *Proleg. to Ethics*; Augustine, *Confessions*, etc. See also A. Chandler in *A Lent in London* (1895), p. 193; C. C. Hall, *The Gospel of the Divine Sacrifice* (1897), p. 267; II. Rashdall, *Doctrine and Development* (1898), p. 268; T. G. Selby, *The God of the Frail* (1902), p. 22; J. Newton, *The Problem of Personality* (1905); W. N. Clarke, *Outline of Theology*, pt. 2; Lotze, *Outlines of Philosophy of Religion*, §§ 30-35; Oman, *Vision and Authority*, pp. 19-24; Myers, *Human Personality*, i. 10 ff.

A. Norman Rowland.

⚡Perverting

PERVERTING (διαστρέφω, [Luk 23:2](#); ἀποστρέφω, [Luk 23:14](#)).—The word occurs principally in the trial of Jesus before Pilate, where the first charge brought against Him was that of ‘perverting the nation.’ Such a charge, though somewhat vague, implied that He was a conspirator against the State, spreading a spirit of disaffection and rebellion among the people, and thus turning them against the Imperial Government. The charge was utterly false, but it revealed the bitter malice of the Jews and their determination to bring about the death of Jesus. The power of life and death was not possessed by the Sanhedrin: no merely religious offence could be visited with capital punishment ([Joh 18:31](#)), and therefore the object which they clamoured for could be accomplished only through the instrumentality of the civil power. Accordingly, the leaders of the Sanhedrin lay aside the charge of blasphemy, which really weighed with themselves, but of which they knew Pilate could take no cognizance, and they bring Jesus before the Roman governor as a political offender, guilty of setting Himself and others in opposition to the ruling power of Rome. A charge of this character Pilate was in duty bound to consider and examine.

Dugald Clark.

⚠️ Pestilence

PESTILENCE (λοιμός).—The word is found twice in the Gospels, in both cases in the prophecy of Christ regarding the last days (Mat 24:7 [Authorized Version ; Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 , following WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] and others, omits], Luk 21:11). In the OT the word is used in a generic sense, and usually indicates a direct Divine visitation (Lev 26:25, Num 14:12, 1Ch 21:14, Psa 78:50 etc.). The disease, whatever its nature, is not rarely associated with war and its consequences (Jer 24:10; Jer 29:17; Jer 34:17, Eze 6:11 etc.). Thus it seems to be used by Christ in the texts quoted.

The specific meaning of the word λοιμός is not easily determined. It seems to indicate a swiftly-developing and mortal illness, contagious or infectious in its nature, as we may infer from Act 24:5. It may point to the glandular or bubonic plague, well known and universally dreaded by the ancients, and the great scourge of the world in the Middle Ages. (See Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , iii. pp. 324, 755).

Henry E. Dosker.

⚠️ Peter

PETER.—The use of the names *Simon* and *Simon Peter* in the Gospels is instructive. Mt., when he first mentions the Apostle, calls him 'Simon who is called Peter' (Mat 4:18); he uses the same language in his list of the Apostles (Mat 10:2). Again, with most obvious appropriateness he calls him 'Simon Peter' at the time of his celebrated confession (Mat 16:16), while on the two occasions on which our Lord addresses the disciple directly, he is 'Simon bar-Jona' (Mat 16:17) and 'Simon' (Mat 17:25). In Mk. the name 'Simon' is employed up to the selection of the Twelve, and thereafter 'Peter' is used; but when our Lord accosts him in Gethsemane, He names him 'Simon' (Mar 14:7). In Lk. also he is designated 'Simon' with a single exception (Luk 5:8) till the choice of the Apostles, after which he becomes 'Peter'; but when our Lord speaks to him he is 'Simon, Simon,' which is softened to 'Peter' (Luk 22:31; Luk 22:34). His fellow-believers give him the same name when they relate that our Lord appeared to him after His resurrection (Luk 24:34). The practice of Jn. is equally notable. Before Peter appears on the scene at all, his brother Andrew is described as 'the brother of Simon Peter' (Joh 1:41). This double name is that which the Evangelist chiefly employs; in fact, he prefers it except when its repetition

would seem pedantic. At the same time, he indicates clearly that the Apostle's original name was 'Simon' (Joh 1:42), and he places this name on the lips of Jesus just as the other Evangelists do (Joh 1:43).

The life of Peter has a triple interest. (a) His personality is attractive because of its naturalness, buoyancy, and vigour. Belonging to the class of men who are readily understood, his impetuosity, candour, freedom of speech, transparency of motive, his large and genial humanity, appeal strongly to our hearts. Peter is the Luther among the Apostles, (b) Again, he is the most representative of the Apostles. Were it not for him, our knowledge of their views, tastes, hopes, prejudices, and difficulties would be scanty; but, owing to his words and acts, these stand out in bold relief. It is in Peter that we see the kind of men whom our Lord deliberately chose to be His closest friends and the agents for the fulfilment of His purposes. The methods, too, by which the disciples became qualified for their great functions are most fully revealed in the treatment of Peter by Jesus—the patient wisdom, the boundless charity, the humour, the severity, the perfect frankness, the unreserved intimacy. (c) Again, the career of Peter after the Ascension is the most striking evidence at once of his natural capacity and of the transformation effected in him by his friendship with Jesus. The disciple is now worthy of the designation 'Rock.' He shows himself to be the natural leader of the new community: its most powerful and energetic member both in counsel and in act.

The career of Peter falls into two great sections, divided by the Ascension: his life as a disciple and Apostle under our Lord, and his life as the first leader of the Christian Church.

1. Prior to our Lord's Ascension.—Simon Peter was the son of a man called Jonas (Mat 16:17) or John (Joh 1:42), or possibly Jonas John, a fisherman on the Sea of Galilee. His mother's name is not recorded. The place of his birth was probably Bethsaida (Joh 1:44). No mention is made of the date of his birth; but, as he was a married man when our Lord's ministry opened, it is likely that he was born about the same time as Jesus. How long his parents lived is not known: they may have died before he became intimate with Jesus. It may be assumed from his later life that he was brought up by them in habits of temperance, frugality, diligence, and piety. He could read and write, and had considerable acquaintance with the Greek tongue as spoken in Galilee. He followed his father's occupation, obtaining by it an income adequate to all the wants of his household. By the time he is first spoken of in the Gospels he is married, and living in Capernaum, where he has a house of his own, which at a subsequent date appears to have been the centre of the labours of our Lord in Capernaum (Mar 1:21; Mar 1:29; Mar 9:33).

Attracted by the Baptist, Peter and his brother Andrew became his disciples. Andrew was one of the two disciples of the Baptist who heard him declare that Jesus was the Lamb of God (Joh 1:35), and who, after their interview with Jesus, were convinced that He was the Messiah. He communicated to his brother the great discovery he had made, and brought him to Jesus, who, reading his very soul, and perceiving what he was and what he was capable of becoming, announced that he should bear the name *Peter* or 'Rock' (Joh 1:42). The acquaintanceship thus formed passed after an interval of a few months, during part of which Peter was with Jesus, into discipleship and permanent fellowship. When our Lord began His ministry in Galilee, the two brothers Peter and Andrew were summoned by Him to become, in His own striking language, 'fishers of men': and this call was immediately followed by that of two other brothers, their partners in business, James and John (Mar 1:16; Mar 1:20). The final stage of Peter's relationship to Jesus was that of Apostle. Our Lord had determined to select a very few persons from the larger number of His adherents to be constantly in His society, and to act as His messengers. Peter was the first to be chosen (Mar 3:13). This place was not given him by accident. He was the first of the Apostles, not in authority or rank or precedence, for ideas of this description were utterly foreign to the mind of our Lord; but his courage, resourcefulness, energy, and devotion constituted him the natural leader of the new body. He was their spokesman, the interpreter of their wishes, hopes, desires, and purposes. Many words specially uttered by him or spoken by our Lord to him are preserved in the Gospels, and in several of the miracles of our Lord he has a unique place. The perception of our Lord's character, and familiarity with His views of God, of man, of righteousness and of salvation, as well as with His hatred of unreality and formalism, and with the depth and range of His sympathies for the common people and even for social outcasts—set up an intellectual ferment in the mind of Peter which ultimately engendered a fixed and definite view of our Lord's Person. On two occasions that conviction was expressed in memorable terms. At Capernaum, Peter, undismayed and unmoved by the rapid fall in our Lord's popularity due to His refusal to become a political instead of a religious leader, affirmed Him to be the only possessor of the words of eternal life, the Holy One of God (Joh 6:66 ff.). Then, not long after, when the common people had ceased to regard our Lord as the Messiah, and assigned Him only the subordinate place of a forerunner, Peter, without a moment's hesitation, clothed in fit words the conviction which had now attained maturity and consistency in his mind—the ripe fruit of his intercourse with our Lord; he affirmed that He was the Messiah (Mat 16:13 ff.). This confession was rewarded with the famous promise, the sense of which is still in dispute—'Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church.' The common view among the Fathers that the rock is Jesus Himself has scarcely any support among the interpreters of to-day. A number of Protestant scholars agree with the Roman Catholic Church in understanding the rock of Peter himself; but this explanation fails to answer two questions. Why, if Peter is the rock, did not Jesus simply say 'on thee'? Whence, too, the distinction in the present text

between the two words for 'rock' (πέτρος and πέτρα), a distinction which must surely have been found in some form in the original Aramaic? But be the rock Peter himself or his confession, it is clear that our Lord was deeply gratified with the declaration, and that He recognized in it a spiritual insight and capacity which qualified the speaker for high office and service in the Kingdom of God. But, though Peter had grasped the truth that Jesus was the Messiah, he was still in bondage to the traditional conception of the Messiah as a conqueror. For hardly had our Lord, relying on his confession, proceeded for the first time to announce plainly His impending death, when Peter, shocked at His apparent despondency, remonstrated with Him, and thus drew from His lips the rebuke, 'Get thee behind me, Satan' (Mat 16:23).

The prediction of His death was made by Jesus at least thrice, in language which admits of but one meaning; but neither Peter nor any of the Apostles appears to have believed that the words were intended to be taken literally. Not one among them seems to have accepted the truth that Jesus would be crucified. But that event drew near, and Peter, as was to be expected, figures largely in the closing scenes. He refuses to allow his Master to degrade Himself by washing his feet; but when told that this refusal involves forfeiture of all interest in Him, under the impulse of the reaction generated by this reproof, he wishes that his hands and head as well as his feet should be washed (Joh 13:6 ff.). Conscious of his devotion to his Lord, he declares that though all men should stumble at Him, he never will, but would die for His sake; and draws from our Lord's lips the sorrowful announcement that he is about to deny Him thrice (Mar 14:29). When our Lord is arrested in Gethsemane, he has the courage, perhaps rather the rashness, to draw a sword and seek to cut down the very person who, it may be, was making the arrest (Joh 18:10); he follows our Lord into the palace of the high priest, and there, outworn, perplexed, thrown off his guard, unmanned, he three times declares that he knows nothing of Jesus. Then, having met the eye of his Master as He was led from one room to another, the sense of his guilt becomes intolerable, and he bursts forth into tears of deepest penitence and self-abasement (Luk 22:54 ff.). What the Apostle did after he quitted the palace of the high priest, has not been told us. Whether he was too overpowered by emotion to draw near the cross we cannot tell, but it is certain that his hopes were buried in the grave of Jesus. He and the rest of the disciples must have poured out their hearts to one another, suggesting, doubting, fearing, unable to resolve as to the future.

Not two days after the Crucifixion, Mary of Magdala informed Peter and John that the grave of Jesus was open and no body there. The two disciples started off in hot haste to verify the statement. John, the younger and fleeter, reached the tomb first, but awe prevented him from entering. Peter, unaffected by this 'motive, went into the grave as soon as he arrived, and then both disciples saw the grave-cloths lying in orderly array, with the napkin which had bound the head rolled up in a place by

itself: facts which excluded the view that the corpse had been removed by enemies. The meaning of the words which they had heard again and again from Jesus as to His rising again from the dead began to dawn on their understanding: He was risen from the dead (Joh 20:1 ff.). Soon the testimony of the women confirmed the inference they had drawn, and if any doubts continued to haunt the Apostle's mind, they were finally dispelled by a personal appearance made by Jesus to himself. The interview stands with no record save the bare circumstance, but is possibly on that account only the more impressive (Luk 24:34). It formed perhaps the most important event of Peter's life, and certainly produced on him the most extraordinary effects. What was soft and fluid in his ideas and convictions now hardened into rock: his courage acquired a new temper: his passionate loyalty to our Lord became measureless trust and devotion, chastened by a new reverence and awe. All that he had ever ventured to hope regarding Jesus was now confirmed, and rested on a basis of adamant.

Another scene is related in the appendix to the Fourth Gospel (ch. 21), which forms the fitting close to the earthly relations of the Master and His disciple. Here again Peter and John are the two chief actors, and each exhibits his distinctive characteristics. John is the first to identify the solitary figure on the shore of the Sea of Galilee with the Lord; while Peter is the first to try to reach Him, casting himself into the lake in his eagerness to welcome Him. There followed the triple question to Peter touching his love for Jesus, with answers from the Apostle which show that he had now been purged of presumption, boasting, and rash self-confidence. Then he in his turn is entrusted with the weightiest and most honourable of all charges: he is commissioned and commanded to feed and tend the flock of Christ. Finally, and as if it were the natural sequel of the high trust just allotted him, he is told that he will end his days by martyrdom. Accepting this declaration without a shadow of doubt, he ventures to inquire as to the fate of his fellow-disciple John, but is forbidden to meddle with such questions, his task being to concentrate his energies on the fulfilment of the duties imposed on himself.

2. Subsequent to the Ascension.—If Peter was the foremost of the disciples before the Ascension, he was still more so, if possible, after that event. He is represented throughout the Acts as the leader of the Church; and this view is confirmed by the references that St. Paul (Gal 2:7-9) makes to his position, which prove that he was the commanding personality in the Church. The suggestion that a successor to Judas should be appointed was made by him, and at once adopted by the body of believers (Act 1:15 ff.). The explanation of the descent of the tongues of flame at Pentecost is given by him (Act 2:14 ff.). He performs the first Christian miracle (Act 3:6 f.). The defence of the new community when its leaders are arrested by the Sanhedrin falls on him (Act 4:8 ff.). The doom of Ananias and Sapphira is pronounced by his lips (Act 5:4; Act 5:9). When the gospel is preached in Samaria, John and he are appointed commissioners to investigate the new situation (Act 8:14). He is the first to

throw open the Church to the Gentiles on the condition of faith only (ch. 10). Herod Agrippa sentences him to death as the chief leader of the sect of the Nazarenes (ch. 12). He takes a foremost place in the deliberations of the Congress at Jerusalem which determined the relations that should thereafter exist between the Gentiles and the Jews, pronouncing that the Gentiles should be exempt from all Jewish ordinances (ch. 15). At this point the account in the Acts terminates, and the remainder of his career is obscure. That he travelled about preaching the gospel, accompanied by his wife (1Co_9:5), is certain, but the one place he is known to have visited is Antioch (Gal_2:11) in Syria, the second capital of Christianity. He may have gone to Greece (Euseb. *Historia Ecclesiastica* ii. xxv. 8); he may have preached in the provinces to which his first letter is addressed (1Pe_1:1); it is possible that he spent some time in Babylon (1Pe_5:13). From the far East he turned to Rome, where he died as a martyr according to our Lord's prediction, but when and under what conditions cannot be ascertained (Clem. Rom. [Note: Roman.] *Ep. ad Cor.* v. 7).

Literature.—*Lives of Christ*; the Comm.; F. Godet, *Studies on the NT* (English translation 1879), 246; G. B. Stevens, *The Messages of the Apostles* (1900), 42; G. Matheson, *Representative Men of the NT* (1905), 93; H. T. Purchas, *Johannine Problems* (1901), 68; J. G. Greenhough, *Apostles of our Lord* (1904), 52, 221; W. M. Taylor, *Peter the Apostle* (1891); W. H. G. Thomas, *The Apostle Peter* (1904); H. A. Birks, *Life and Character of St. Peter* (1887); S. Cox, *Genesis of Evil* (1880), 280, 351; W. B. Carpenter, *Son of Man* (1893), 91; *Expos.* 3rd ser. iv. (1886) 183, ix. (1889) 187; *JBL* [Note: *BL Journal of Biblical Literature.*] xvii. (pt. 2, 1898) 31.

W. Patrick.

Pharisees

PHARISEES

I. *Origin and Development*

1. Outline of history.—The Pharisees present the most characteristic manifestation of Palestinian Judaism in the time of Christ, and His work cannot be understood without a knowledge of them; for 'later Judaism is through and through Pharisaism and nothing but Pharisaism' (Bousset, *Jesu Predigt*, 1892, p. 32). The Pharisees were an outgrowth of the long conflict between the Jews and surrounding heathenism, from the Babylonian Captivity onward. That captivity impressed the following things upon Judaism: intense monotheism, the Synagogue service, the OT Scriptures and Scribal interpretations of them, the Sabbath strictly observed as a sign of God's covenant,

and a Puritan hatred of heathenism, which put the stamp of *separation* for ever upon Pharisaic piety. The Reformers under Ezra and Nehemiah were forerunners of the Pharisees, as the priestly court party under Zerubbabel foreshadowed the Sadducees. In these international relations—Jews in Palestine and in the Dispersion—Judaism grew gradually into a Church, and as such had an inner circle of the pious in contrast with mere adherents—‘children of the world.’ This transition cannot be fully traced, but appears well marked under the Maccabees (b.c. 167-63). The Macedonian policy of Alexander made the East Greek; the Romans made the West Latin; Persia and Carthage were overthrown; then Rome absorbed the Hellenistic East; and a world-system for the first time appeared when Jesus was born under the first Emperor. The denationalizing process prepared by Greece and introduced by Rome affected even the Jews, and helped to produce the Synagogue church system. But Pharisaic Judaism reacted strongly against it at first, and under the Maccabees battled for religious independence. When, however, the Maccabean princes fought further for civil liberty, the Pharisaic party withdrew and formed a theocratic group, democratic in a measure, which soon gained the leadership of the majority of the nation. These *Hāsîdîm*, or Puritans of the century before Christ, became the Pharisees of NT times. They received the name ‘Pharisees’ or *separated*, when they withdrew from the Sadducee court party of the Maccabean rulers under John Hyrcanus (b.c. 135-105). They were the men of ἀμιξία. (2Ma_14:38) from everything heathen and impure. Their aim was in daily life to be as ceremonially pure as the priests were in the Temple.

2. Differences between Pharisees and Sadducees.—The chief differences were the following: (1) the Pharisees ‘delivered to the people a great many observances by tradition which are not written in the law of Moses’ (Josephus *Ant.* xiii. x. 6). These the Sadducees for the most part rejected. (2) The Pharisees had an elaborate doctrine of immortality, resurrection, angels, demons, heaven, hell, intermediate state, and Messianic Kingdom, about all of which the Sadducees were agnostic. (3) The Pharisees taught both predestination and free-will,—much as St. Paul did,—while the Sadducees held the Greek doctrine of absolute free-will. (4) The Pharisees had a high theory of theocracy, which led them to oppose foreign interference from the time of the Syrian kings to the Roman emperors, and reject also the Maccabean rule as inconsistent with the high priesthood. The Psalms of Solomon are full of sharp utterances against the Sadducee rulers (e.g. 4:1; 3:8; 9:4). It was this theocratic spirit which developed national Judaism into a Church, with a world-consciousness equal to that of Rome and a spiritual unity not inferior to that of Greece. (5) The Pharisees were also missionary, and made many converts (*Ant.* xx. ii.-iv.; *BJ* ii. xix. 2; Mat_23:15). Hillel said: ‘Love men and lead them to the Law’ (*Aboth* i. 2); and the international Synagogue, inspired from Jerusalem, compassed sea and land in making proselytes. The Sadducees had no such interest. This Pharisaic propaganda, however,

when it met the successful missions of the Christians, ceased making converts, condemned the translation of the LXX Septuagint, and buried itself in the Talmud. (6) The Pharisees differed from the Sadducees by the wide distance between the Synagogue, the centre of the one party, and the Temple, the stronghold of the other. The Temple was waning in influence. Jesus refers little to it, and when it disappeared the religion of the Jews went on without a break. The Pharisees even prescribed rules for the priestly Sadducees in the Temple (*Ant.* xiii. x. 5), and had their prayers introduced alongside the sacrifices. In fact, the Temple services were regarded as meritorious because done in obedience to the legal teachings of the Pharisees (cf. Kohler, art. 'Pharisees' in *JE* [Note: *E Jewish Encyclopedia.*]). Some Pharisees seem in theory to have even abandoned the Temple worship (cf. Enoch 89:58, 73, 90:28, Ps-Sol 10:8; 17:18). (7) The Pharisees formed a fraternity with peculiar vows, which separated them from the heathen, the common people, and the Sadducees. The great majority of Jews were Pharisees in belief, but only about 6000 or 7000 were members of the brotherhood. Edersheim compares them with the Jesuits in the Roman Church (*Sketches of Jew. Soc. Life*, ch. xiv.). They married, however, and their fellowship included the families of members. On entering the order, they took two vows in the presence of three witnesses, one to tithe everything eaten, bought, or sold; the other not to be guest of the 'am-hâ'ârez, and to observe all ceremonial purification. They were the true Israel, 'the saints'; their opponents were 'the ungodly,' 'the profane' (cf. Luk 18:9, Ps-Sol 14:1; 17:16). (8) The Pharisees were the religious power in Palestine in the time of Christ. They represented the authority of the Scriptures in home, school, synagogue, courts of law, and daily life. John almost identifies them with 'the Jews' (Joh 1:19; Joh 2:18). Though an outgrowth of the school of the Scribes, they eclipsed their teachers. They were in business, and their goods were legal tender everywhere. They were united, zealous, dogmatic, patriotic, stood for the people against rulers and hierarchs, preached the keeping of the Law and the coming world of blessedness as reward of obedience, and were everywhere active in moulding Jewish life according to their principles. In opposition to Sadducees and common men, the Pharisees developed a new conception of piety; it was something that could be learned, and they were its teachers. The wise men were the good, and took the place of both prophet and priest. Hillel said: 'The uneducated fears no sin; but 'he who acquires knowledge has attained eternal life' (*Aboth* ii. 6, 8). All this made the Pharisees more and more proud, formal, and uncharitable. They despised the common people (Joh 7:49); they had reached the climax of their power in the time of Jesus; and, half-feared, half-hated, they were declining in spiritual influence.

3. Pharisaic environment of Jesus.—Pharisaic Judaism in the time of Christ included the best, as well as the worst, of the people. The Jewish saints in the NT, the parents of the Baptist and of our Lord, Simeon, Anna, and others, Hillel too, and Gamaliel and Jochanan ben Sakkai, were noble types of Pharisaic Jews. Galilee especially was the home of the more earnest Pharisaic piety, with its severe living and strong Messianic

hope. Here the Zealots appeared, and the outbreaks against Rome had their seat; and here Jesus grew up and began His ministry in an atmosphere of Pharisaic devotion. He did not denounce all Pharisees, or the Pharisaic Judaism amid which He grew up; since it stood for the whole transmitted religion of Israel,—for that salvation which was of the Jews. He stood nearer the Synagogue than the Temple, and in some respects presented His teaching in the line of the Pharisees. The Rabbis taught their disciples to honour the Scriptures, to seek first after heaven and its righteousness (*Ant.* xvi. ii. 4, v. 4, vi. 8), to look past the present legal life to a future world of grace and glory, to make proselytes, to have baptisms and holy suppers in their brotherhood, to pray, to fast and give alms—these three were ‘the chief pillars of the Jewish religion’ (Bousset, *Relig. Judenthums*, p. 159). All these things Jesus favoured also, and they passed, with many others, from the Synagogue into the Church. But Jesus was not a Pharisee. He rebuked them for their anti-scriptural traditions, as He did the Sadducees for ignorance of the word of God (Mar 7:9). Neither was He a heretic; the Pharisees did not put Him out of the synagogue, though He was called a Samaritan and possessed of a devil. He preached from the common ground of the Scriptures; and, just because the Pharisees held in theory so much that was true, He castigated the more their formalism and insincerity. But, while opposing Pharisaic superstition, He did not favour the agnosticism and rationalism of the Sadducees. From the heart of Divine revelation, illuminated by the Holy Spirit and in the full consciousness of Himself as Son of God, in and through and above all the Scriptures, He proclaimed the everlasting truth of the gospel, setting aside everything in Pharisaic teaching and life that was inconsistent with it.

II. *Theology of the Pharisees and the Teaching of Jesus.*—Two views formerly held respecting the relation of Jesus and His teachings to the Pharisaic Judaism of His time may now be regarded as obsolete. One was that both He and the Jews drew so directly from the OT that their ideas of the Messiah and His work were essentially the same, the chief question at issue being whether or not Jesus was the looked-for Messiah (cf. Schöttgen, *Hor. Heb.* 1742; Bertholdt, *Christ. Jud.* 1811; Gfrörer, *Jahr. d. Heils*, 1838). The other was the theory that the gospel preached by Jesus was only a reformed Judaism (Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 1867, iii. 217; Kohler, *l.c.*). But ‘such a reconstruction of history belongs wholly to the past’ (Lucius, *Der Essenismus*, 1881, p. 8);* [Note: Cf., however, J. Weiss, Wernle, Wrede, Weinel, etc., of the Religionsgeschichtliche school, who incline again towards the position of Renan, Grätz, Geiger.] and we can set forth the relation of Jesus to Pharisaic Judaism better by way of contrast than of comparison (cf. Bousset, *Jesu Predigt*, p. 7; Chamberlain, *Grundlagen d. 19 Jahr.* 1900, i. 221). ‘Jesus’ appearance was really not a fulfilment, but a contradiction of the Jewish religion.’ If there was anything the Pharisees lacked, it was religious originality. Chamberlain says, ‘The fable that the Jews had especial qualifications for religion has been finally destroyed’ (i. 29). Jesus did stand upon the soil of OT piety, and was in vital relation to current Judaism; but

His unique Divine consciousness as Son of God led Him to speak with absolute authority respecting both. Whatever might have been said to men of old time must yield to His 'I say unto you': and no word of prophet or scribe or Pharisee had any authority for Him (Joh 7:17). When He spoke, God spoke, and all must hearken and obey (7:16).

The theology of the Pharisees was crude and unscientific,—'a terrible mass of conflicting statements and debasing superstitions' (Edersheim, *Life and Times*, i. 106), everywhere limited by national conditions. It was less reasonable than certain views of the Sadducees, and lacked the mystic freedom from sacerdotalism of the Essenes. It had no appreciation of that natural theology so dear to the Greeks, or of the immanence of God as Father which Jesus saw in every flower of the field. Art, philosophy, science, history, culture were avoided as secular and profane. The Pharisees 'killed nature by legal prescriptions' (Wellhausen, *Phar.u. Sadd.* p. 19). In their confused teachings drawn from the OT by traditional exegesis, three great groups of thought may be distinguished; they refer to God, His revelation in the Law, and the hope of a promised Messiah. The thirteen articles of the Jewish Confession of faith still show the same division (cf. Landau, *Die alten Gebete d. H.* 1843, p. 120) as appeared in Rabbinical preaching in the time of Christ. Honour God, keep His Law as far as possible, and through all failures hope for the mercy of God in the Messianic age—that is the prevalent course of thought in Pharisaic Judaism. NT writers follow it also. St. Paul teaches a just God, His holy Law, and peace through faith in the Messiah. St. Peter, when the Law convicted men of murder, preached to them repentance toward God and faith in the slain Messiah, Jesus (Act 2:37-38; Act 3:19 f.). St. John sums up the contrast between Jew and Christian in the Law of God given by Moses, and grace and truth coming in the Messiah (Act 1:17). And when the Jews attacked early Christianity, their opposition lay along these lines (Act 6:11). Stephen was stoned for blaspheming God, Moses, and the customs of the Pharisees, and doing so in the name of Jesus Christ. In like manner Jesus was accused of blasphemy against God, violating His Law, and claiming to fulfil the Messianic hope.

1. Doctrine of God.

(1) *Pharisaic view of Divine transcendence.*—The Pharisees had an abstract, transcendental view of God, which gave rise to the legalism that marks their teachings, and added colour to their Messianic hope (cf. Baldensperger, *Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, p. 45). Opposition to heathenism, coupled with Rabbinical study of the OT, produced this conception. God was Creator in the beginning, and will be final Judge at the end; but meantime He is a far-off ruler of the Universe. His name, the mysterious τετραγράμματον, was no longer spoken; and all anthropomorphic and humanlike features in God were set aside. The God who tabernacled in Israel was

succeeded by 'the God of heaven' (1Ma_3:60, Enoch 13:4; 106:11, 2Es_8:20, Ps-Sol 2:34, To 7:17). 'God' and 'heaven' became interchangeable terms; and in place of words about the personal care of Jehovah, we meet cosmological and meteorological discussions of the stars and rain and snow, with suggestions of sun-worship (Enoch 72:35, Ps-Sol 2:13-14; 4:21). It was a deistic view of God that became prominent. Two important views grew out of this theology: one was the doctrine of middle beings between God and man—good and evil spirits, angels, especially the *Memra* or mediating Word of God, and the Holy Spirit; the other was a personal conception of God, which appeared in belief in individual immortality and personal resurrection as involved in responsibility to God and hope of entrance into the Messianic Kingdom. A further outgrowth of this theology was the teaching that keeping carefully the Law of God would hasten the coming of the Messianic Kingdom. Thus Divine transcendence, mediation, individual piety, legalism, and the Messianic hope were closely related elements in the Pharisaic teachings.

(2) *Jesus' doctrine of God as Father.*—The theology of Jesus set out from the Fatherhood of God. It had been foreshadowed in the OT (Deu 32:6, Psa 68:5) and later Jewish literature (Wis 2:16), but was first taught in its unique importance and fulness by Jesus. It was peculiar to Him because He was related as none other to the Father. None but God could know Him, as He alone knew the Father (Mat 11:27). To Him alone could God appear as Father without wrath against sin in Him. This doctrine of God as Father is what was fundamentally new in the message of Jesus (cf. Bousset, *Jesu Predigt*, p. 4; Hausrath, *NT Times*, ii. 146). Through it God appeared everywhere in His love, caring for flowers and sparrows, just and unjust; beholding sin and Satan in the world, but still declaring it the happy home of God's children. He here 'broke through, at the most decisive point, the transcendental ascetic spirit of Judaism' (Bousset, *Relig. Jnd.* p. 65; Baldensperger, 225; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, i. ch. 2). This new doctrine of God led to a new doctrine of man's relation to Him. If God is Father, then men who come to Him enter into all the liberty of children, but at the same time are lovingly bound to be holy and perfect like God. The confused view of the Pharisees, that the Jew was partly in national relations to God and partly member of a holy congregation, disappears. His blurred hope of partly keeping the Law, partly being resigned to Divine chastisement, and partly redeemed in a world to come—all resting on merit—is supplanted by a joyful gospel of present peace. Instead of the other-worldliness of Pharisaic piety,—an attempt to imitate the transcendent God,—Jesus taught a present joy in a present Father for all men, '*amhâ'ârez* as well as scribe and Pharisee. Here love to God and love to man first met in reality. As the Father in heaven forgives, so men are to forgive; the latter is the proof of the former. Religion and ethics were in perfect harmony. Jesus did teach a certain separation from the world, a selling all to follow Him, a bearing the cross; but it was not separation on ceremonial or external grounds; it was a question of values, a putting the Kingdom of God first that all other things might be added thereto. So sunny and

natural was His relation to the world and common life, that He was at once denounced as a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners. Next to the fundamental doctrine that God is our Father, came this second dominating teaching of man's social relation to the world about him. Here is the great point of departure from Judaism and the Ghetto, already erected by the Pharisees in Jerusalem, towards Christianity and the gospel of humanity.

2. The Law

(1) *Written and oral.*—This was central for Judaism in the days of Jesus. It was regarded in both written and oral form as coming from God through Moses (*Aboth* i. 1). It took the place of the God of heaven. Every word was inspired, and he who 'gains the Law gains the life of the world to come' (Hillel). Obedience to God's Law under the awful Categorical Imperative of Sinai, as applied by scribes and Pharisees, was the dominant principle, the yoke upon the neck of the Jews, when Christ appeared (Act 15:10, Gal 5:1). The Oral Law of tradition arose because prophecy ceased; cases arose not provided for in the OT, and Rabbinical exegesis of the Scriptures sought the cover of ancient names.

(2) *Law as civil code.*—Here especially the OT exegesis and tradition were necessary in using the Bible as the source of civil law, when Israel changed from a small pastoral people to become a world-wide commercial race. The chequered history of centuries under heathen rule broke up many customs, as those of tithes, offerings, Sabbath, Temple service, contact with Gentiles, etc. Hence from Hillel onwards the Pharisees elaborated a civil code by means of tradition and exegesis from the Scriptures. The great loss to religion in such a process was in making it largely negative. The Rabbis counted 248 classes of things to be done, and 365 of things forbidden.

(3) *Ceremonial law.*—This the Pharisees made to touch every detail of human life. They regarded nature and spirit as so related that impurity could pass from one to the other. A bad man's body was impure, and to touch it would bring uncleanness to another man's soul. Adam's sin extended evil to unclean beasts, and foods, and the dishes holding them. There was no end to this defilement and the consequent necessary purification by various kinds of water or by breaking ceremonially the unclean vessels. Twelve treatises of the Mishna deal with this subject. It is said: 'He who lightly esteems hand-washing will perish from the earth' (*Sota*, 4). Jesus felt the utter superficiality of all this washing of the body while the inner life was unclean. Delitzsch says (*Jesus und Hillel*, 1879, p. 23) there is no historical point of departure in the time and land of Jesus for His method of contrasting the moral with the ceremonial. He here 'turned His back upon the highway of Rabbinical traditions, and opened a path which until then had never occurred to any human heart.'

(4) *Rule of faith and practice.*—The Pharisees bound spiritual and moral living also under law. But law cannot produce affection, or win the heart, or find place for the Holy Spirit, or be a vessel of grace. The idea of religion as a supreme impulse from the depths of man's nature, as Jesus taught it, independent of both superstition and ethics, was peculiarly foreign to the Pharisaic Jew (cf. Chamberlain, ii. 29). He said: 'To do right and wrong is in the work of our hands, and in Thy righteousness Thou chastisest the children of men. He who works righteousness obtains life from the Lord' (Ps-Sol 9:7-9). Do the best you can, and submit to God's punishment for your defects, was the substance of such legalism. One sad result of this national legal religion was that it had one standard for the Jew and another for the Gentile. Adultery with a Gentile was trivial compared with such offence against a Jew. Pharisaic ethics taught to hate Gentiles as enemies; their morality had no unifying principle of application to man as man—while Jesus taught love even to enemies and Gentiles.

(5) *Jesus and the Law.*—Even the best legal maxims of the Pharisees fall far short of the teachings of Jesus. Hillel's golden rule was negative, while that of Jesus was positive, showing all the difference between justice and love. The greater principle of love to God and one's neighbour, which the scribe (Mar 12:32), and Jesus, and St. Paul, and Akiba all regard as fundamental (Gal 5:14; Bacher, *Die Agada d. Tannaiten*, 1884, i. 7, 285), became a new thing in the application of Jesus. He made love to man a test of love to God; He united organically the two OT texts, Deu 6:5 and Lev 19:13; He put love to man on the same level with love to God; He widened the conception of neighbour from *haber* to 'am-hâ'ârez, from 'am-hâ'ârez to Samaritan (Luk 10:36), and to all men—thus moving in direct opposition to that separation which underlay all Pharisaic holiness. Jesus dropped the whole Law as a way of salvation,—a way the Pharisees themselves could not keep (Rom 7:8), as appeared in their numerous evasions of it, such as 'blending of courts,' and their ostentatious putting of appearance in place of reality. He threw aside the endless civil, ceremonial, and ethical rules of the Pharisees, and went back to the spiritual religion of the OT as fulfilled in Him and transformed in the gospel. The Law was, at its best, but a παιδαγωγὸς to the gospel. Salvation by way of the Pharisees was impossible, hence Jesus declared they were either blind or hypocrites in claiming to please God in that way. The best Jews admitted this (Ps-Sol 9:9-15; 13:9, 14:1-6). Jesus led men to God as Father through a new birth by the Holy Ghost, into a family of loving children, by way of repentance, faith, and union with Himself (Mar 1:14-15, Joh 3:5 f.). This gospel of the loving father and the prodigal son, of the penitent publican and the proud Pharisee, was as a honeymoon compared with the funereal legalism of the Pharisees (Mar 2:19). Gamaliel said: 'Get thyself a teacher that thou mayest be free from doubt' (*Aboth* i. 16); but Jesus showed Nicodemus that all Pharisaic learning could not give the new life of the Spirit of God and the Son of God. He brought a new cup of

blessing full of the wine of the Kingdom, a sweet blending of religion and ethics as inseparable in thought as the inside and outside of the holy cup itself. Here was 'the appearance of a new kind of humanity,' springing from contact with Jesus, 'for through Him for the first time humanity received a moral culture' (Chamberlain, i. 204, 207). It was because the gospel was utterly incompatible with Pharisaic Judaism that Jesus gathered disciples, taught them, gave them His Spirit (Joh_20:22), and sent them out to evangelize the world (Mat_28:19-20).

3. Religious hopes of the Pharisees.

(1) *Their views of the Messiah and His Kingdom.*—The void between God and man was partly filled from Daniel onwards by Apocalypses of the Messianic Kingdom. This hope roused the godly in Israel to greater obedience, that the coming of the Son of David might be hastened. Law and Messiah were two centres of Jewish thought when Christ appeared. The burden of the one led to greater expectation of the appearance of the other. In this expectation, the nature of the Messiah also took a more universal, and at the same time more personal character, corresponding somewhat to the growing sense of personal responsibility in religion among the Jews. The Messiah, as Son of Man, appeared sharing the majesty, glory, and heavenly nature of Jehovah (Enoch 47:3 and often). 'The identification of Divine hypostases with the Messiah had already taken place in pre-Christian Judaism.' It was not related at all to Philo and his *λόγος* doctrine (cf. Baldensperger, p. 88). But there was also the human Messiah, the Son of David; and two confused accounts arose among the Pharisaic theologians respecting these two views of the Messiah and His Kingdom (cf. Stanton, *The Jewish and Christian Messiah*, 1886, p. 135 f.). The one was more earthly, national, material; the other more spiritual and universal. The material was usually regarded as leading up to the spiritual, and the millennium appeared as a transition from one to the other. A full account of the ordinary expectation is given in Ps-Sol 17:23-50. The Pharisees had no idea that the Messiah would be a Saviour of all men. Even the Baptist thought He would come only to separate by judgment the evil and the good in Israel, and establish the latter in the Kingdom of God. That He would bring a new revelation, and by temptation and suffering attain victory, as Jesus did, was utterly foreign to them. Especially foreign was the conception of a suffering and dying Messiah, as Dalman has shown (*Der leid. u. sterb. Mess.* 1888, pp. iii, 22 f.). Even the Apostles did not know it (Mar_8:31; Mar_9:12-31; Mar_10:33). The usual explanation of two Messiahs did not arise till two centuries after Christ (Dalman, *l.c.*).

(2) *Messianic teachings of Jesus.*—The teachings of Jesus differed from those of the Pharisees on salvation, first, by showing it was not by law; and, second, by presenting the Messiah as a sin-bearer. By repentance and faith in Him men would be saved. From the time of His baptism He looked toward the cross; for He was to give men rest

by becoming a ransom for their sin (Mat 11:28; Mat 20:28). He did not infer He must die from the fate of the prophets—a prophet need not be crucified,—or borrow the idea from the scribes—they never had it, and they thought that to kill Him would end His Messianic claims,—nor did His disciples invent it; they fought against it, and nearly forsook Him when He taught it. Out of His Messianic consciousness Jesus went forth to die as the great Shepherd for His sheep (Mar 8:31-38; Mar Mar 9:9 f., Mar 10:32). Messiah and sufferer were inseparable thoughts; and as soon as He was confessed as Messiah and Son of God, He declared He must suffer, be rejected, be killed, and rise again (Mar 8:29 f., Mat 16:16). His preaching of the Kingdom, also, was very different from that of the Pharisees. He proclaimed it as present, not in the future; a certainty, a reality, not a hope; both within men, and yet to be fully realized in the future. Much that the Jews expected He grouped under a new doctrine, that of the second advent of the Messiah. He appropriated to Himself the lofty Messianic conception of the Pharisees; He was ‘Son of God’ (Enoch 105:2 f., Joh 19:7); ‘Son of Man’ (Dan 7:13 f., Mat 17:12); ‘son of woman’ (Enoch 62); and Κύριος (Ps-Sol 17:23). He adopted their view that He was pre-existent with God (cf. Baldensperger, p. 87); and on the ground of such consciousness forgave sins, wrought miracles, and answered prayers. It is little wonder that such words on the lips of Jesus amazed the Pharisees; in fact, nearly all He said contradicted their teachings. He had no dread of God, His law, sin, or death; and invited all men to share His rest and peace. He set aside the Law, and turned Jewish eschatology into soteriology. He and the Kingdom were one; to have Him was to share everlasting life. Jewish teachers, leading away from Him, He called thieves and robbers, and the Pharisaic conception of the Messianic Kingdom was earthly and devilish (Mat 4:8, Luk 4:5 f.). The new heavens bent already above Him; the new earth was beneath His feet; and here He gathered citizens of the Kingdom, men of the Beatitudes. In all this lies the greatest possible contrast to Pharisaic teachings; and the gospel of Jesus can by no possibility be understood in the framework of later Judaism (cf. Bousset, *Jesu Predigt*, p. 65).

III. *Opposition of the Pharisees to Christ, and His criticism of them*

1. Pharisaic opposition to Jesus.—The Pharisees quickly saw the dangerous tendency of Jesus’ teachings, and took steps to crush His work. Messianic ideas were abroad, zealots were appearing, and a false Messiah could work ruin. Jesus arose as a prophetic man in Galilee, independent of them. From boyhood He had learned nothing from the scribes (Mar 1:22; Mar 6:2, Joh 7:15), and everybody felt the authority of His words. They questioned the Baptist (Joh 1:19; Joh 1:26), who added to their anxiety by declaring the Messiah was at hand with a baptism of the Holy Ghost and of fire. As soon, therefore, as Jesus began to preach, a delegation of the Pharisees and scribes went to Galilee to oppose Him (Mar 2:6; Mar 7:1). They roused the Nazarenes to cast Him out (Luk 4:16 f.); they called forth a reaction against Him

in Bethsaida and Capernaum (Mat 11:21); induced His own family to think Him insane (Mar 3:21; Mar 3:31) and in danger; and formed an alliance with the Pharisees of Galilee to oppose Him. His first public appearances, cleansing the Temple and preaching in Nazareth, called for decisive action. He attacked moneychangers for disturbing the worship of Gentiles in the outer court, and pointed out that the prophets helped a Gentile widow and healed Naaman the Syrian, while the people of Israel were passed by. He talked with a woman of Samaria, and healed the child of a Roman. He helped all in need,—publicans, sinners, harlots, lepers, demoniacs,—and told the multitudes that a sincere heathen was better than a formal Pharisee. No wonder the Pharisees opposed Him. They attacked especially (1) His violation of the Law, and (2) His relation to God.

(1) He was assailed because He paid no attention to the *separation* principle of the Pharisees, and came in contact with the ‘*am-hâ’ârez*, Gentiles, and the diseased in a way that horrified them (Mat 9:25, Mar 3:10). It is very likely these ‘lost sheep,’ this ripe harvest field, these ‘poor’ that Jesus refers to as ‘babes and sucklings’ (Mat 11:25; Mat 21:16), perhaps also as ‘little ones’ (Mat 10:42; Mat 18:6). The Pharisees were ‘the wise and prudent.’ Jesus also violated the Sabbath law, this second bulwark of the Pharisees, and did so with such miraculous power as led the people to hail Him as Son of David, and the Evangelist to recall the prophecy that He would save both Jews and Gentiles. He spoke disparagingly also of tithing rules (Luk 11:42). A crisis had come, for the people felt Jesus could not be a sinner and do such mighty works. This led to the inquiry by what power He did these things.

(2) *Relation of Jesus to Jehovah.*—Jesus taught that He wrought Sabbath miracles and all miracles by the Holy Spirit and as Son of God (Joh 19:7). The Pharisees replied that He did wonders by Beelzebub. It was the devil incarnate that went about doing good in Jesus. His forerunner, the Baptist, was also possessed by Satan (Mat 11:18). No wonder Jesus ‘looked round upon them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts’ (Mar 3:5). It was worse; Jesus called it blasphemy against the Holy Ghost (Mar 3:28 ff.). They expected the Holy Spirit to come with the Messiah; but when both came, neither was accepted (Act 7:51-52). It was an age ‘in the highest degree religiously excited, but it did not possess the Spirit’ (Gunkel, *Die Wirkungen d. H. G.* 1888, p. 57). Jesus claimed authority over all human affairs—to regulate the Sabbath, forgive sins, and adjudge future rewards and punishments. The claim to pardon sins especially provoked Pharisee attacks (Mar 2:7), for it made Jesus equal with God (Joh 5:18). He had called them blasphemers of the Spirit; they now called Him a blasphemer of God. The contrast was complete. Jesus’ teachings and miracles prevented the Pharisees from attacking Him openly; so they tried now to catch Him by questions on purification, worship, the commandments, and tribute to Caesar. He told them they were so wicked they could not see a sign from heaven, silenced them, and declared them hypocrites. Then came His last visit to Jerusalem, and the secret

plotting of the Pharisees against Him. He appeared now openly as the Messiah (Mar_11:10). When Caiaphas asked Him, 'Art thou the Christ, Son of the Blessed?' He answered, 'I am' (Mar_14:61-62). The Pharisees asked Him to rebuke the crowd for calling Him Son of David; they sent spies to profess to be disciples and betray Him to the Romans (Luk_20:20); they cast the blind man healed out of the synagogue; and led Jesus to ask, 'Why go ye about to kill me?' (Joh_7:19). They said He had a devil, mocked Him, and took up stones to kill Him as a blasphemer in the Temple (Joh_8:22; Joh_8:59). The Pharisees supported the Sadducee leaders in the last assault upon Jesus. 'Chief priests and Pharisees' (Mat_27:62, Joh_18:3) plotted to kill Him (Mar_14:2; Mar_14:43), sent men to seize Him and went with them, judged Him in the high priest's palace, sought false witnesses against Him, heard Him say He was the Son of God and declared it blasphemy, spat in His face, smote Him, put Him on a mimic throne and said, 'In this way let us honour the Son of God' (so Justin M., 1 *Apol.* 35, and *Evang. Petri*), mocked His prophecies, and led the multitude to cry 'Crucify Him.' They charged Him with being a false prophet, deceiver of the people, a false Messiah claiming to be the Son of God (Luk_22:67, Joh_19:7), the enemy of Caesar, forbidding to pay tribute to him, and claiming to be King of the Jews, able to save others but unable to save Himself, and a destroyer of the holy nation. 'Chief priests and Pharisees' made His sepulchre sure, sealing the stone and setting a watch over 'that deceiver' (Mat_27:63-66).

2. Jesus' criticism of the Pharisees.—Jesus' criticism followed the line of Pharisaic attack, and showed

(1) *the legalistic perversion of religion in Judaism*. He showed (a) that they were utterly wrong in limiting the grace of God to the Jew under the yoke of the Law. The man who was offended at Him for helping the poor and outcast was not among the blessed. The righteousness of the Pharisees centring in themselves would never admit to heaven. The Roman centurion had more faith than the best Pharisees (Mat_8:10), and Gentiles would enter heaven while they went into outer darkness (Mat_8:11-12). (b) Jesus told them their ceremonial usages were worse than useless, for they led to transgression of God's commandments (Mat_15:3). They not only killed obedience by legalism, but made it impossible by putting small and great commandments on the same level. He told them they were doomed unless they abandoned their theology and mode of life, (c) He especially upbraided them respecting the Sabbath. In healing on that day He imitated David, the priests, the prophets, the Giver of the Sabbath and the Lord of the Sabbath, all of whom they ignorantly opposed when they taught that a man could not do good on that day. Their Sabbath theory sprang from hardness of heart, which had no mercy for the withered hand, the hungry disciples, the sick folk, the demoniac. They were blind, and with their followers perishing for lack of the knowledge He offered them. He then exhausted language in describing their

wickedness. He anticipated St. Paul's description of heathenism and applied it to the Pharisees (Matthew 23, etc., Rom 1:28-32; Rom 2:1 f.).

(2) Jesus upbraided them further for *rejection of God and His Christ*. He told Nicodemus he must be born again of the Spirit and Son of God. The Pharisees who opposed Him followed the old Serpent who deceived Adam, and did his deeds. They were liars and murderers, and could not believe Jesus, who was of the truth (Joh 8:44-45). They could not see the holy proofs that He came from God, because they were wicked and adulterers. The darkness could not comprehend the light. They were bewitched, under demoniacal influence, and their persecution of Jesus was a matter of course. Having no word of God, or love or life of God in them, they could not follow Jesus (Joh 5:38 f.). Their rejection of Him was proof that they had already forsaken God. Jesus had shown He did not break the Sabbath law. He then went on to tell the Pharisees they had no authority to criticise Him, for His works were the works of God (Joh 5:17). But they did not know the works of God when they saw them; they did not even understand Moses (Joh 5:46), or David, or the prophets, for they were utterly out of touch with Divine revelation; and the Law they thought they were defending would condemn them at the last day (Joh 6:45 f.). They stumbled especially at Jesus' forgiving sin as Son of God, and His calling men to Him as the way to God; but He told them that, unless they accepted Him as Saviour, they would die in their sins (Joh 8:24). He mixed appeals and warnings in His last dealings with them; but all in vain. Many of the common people accepted Him, but none of the Pharisees (Joh 7:48). His last words to them were a series of 'Woes,' which He closed with the terrible sentence, 'Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how shall ye escape the judgment of hell?' (Mat 23:33).

Literature.—Besides the works quoted in the text, of which Wellhausen's, Bousset's, and Baldensperger's are especially important, cf. Montet, *Essai sur les origines d. partis Sad. et Phar.* 1883; Schürer, *HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]* § 26, and *Predigt Jesu in ihrem Verh. z. AT [Note: T Altes Testament.] u. z. Jud.*; Weber, *System d. altsyn. Paläst. Theologie*, 1880; Sack, *Die altjüd. Religion*, 1889; Sieffert, 'Pharis, und. Sadd.' in Herzog, *PRE [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologic und Kirche.]* ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] xv. 264 ff.; Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, 1898 (*Words of Jesus*, 1902); Wernle, *Beginnings of Christianity*, 1903, i. chs. ii.-vii., ii. chs. iv.-vi.; Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums*, i. pp. 197-226; Ehrhardt, *Der Grundcharakter der Ethik Jesu im Verhült. z. d. mess. Hoffnungen s. Volkes*, 1895; Haupt, *Die eschatol. Aussagen Jesu*, 1895; J. Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*, 1892; Toy, *Judaism and Christianity*, 1891, pp. 220-290, 331-362; *Pro Christo et Ecclesia* (1901), 16, 33; and art. 'Pharisees' in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible*. See also H. P. Liddon, *Sermons on Some Words of Christ* (1892), 221; J. B. Mozley, *Univ. Sermon*.² [Note: designates the particular edition

of the work referred] (1876), 25; F. W. Robertson, *Serm.*, 1st ser. (1875), 115; and the controversy on the Gospel representation of the Pharisees by I. Abrahams in *JQR* [*Note: QR Jewish Quarterly Review.*] xi. (1899), 626, and C. G. Montefiore in *Hibbert Journ.* i. (1902), 335, and reply by A. Menzies, *do.* 789.

Hugh M. Scott.

Philanthropy

PHILANTHROPY.—Philanthropy (φιλανθρωπία) is the love of man as man. It is love unconditioned by self, or by partly selfish relations of family and nation. It is love unto the uttermost. The Greek word occurs twice in the NT. St. Paul uses it of the universal compassion of God for mankind (Tit_3:4), and St. Luke uses it to describe the kindness of the ‘barbarians’ of Melita towards the aliens shipwrecked on their coasts (Act_28:2). In both cases the word is correctly used to describe the compassion which recognizes no limitation. It is the element of universality that transforms humanitarian feeling into philanthropy. We shall not therefore consider here the kindness that belongs in some measure to all human intercourse, nor even that special manifestation of it which is seen in the charity of the early Christian Church. We shall confine our attention to showing how Christ infused into the common human sentiment that which completely transformed it, giving to it a finer motive, a larger range of activity, an absolute sanction, until St. John could venture to use his striking paradox, and say that the old law which they had had from the beginning was now ‘a new commandment’ (1Jn_2:7-8).

Human pitifulness for human suffering belongs to the nature of man. It has always made the tender grace in human intercourse, and not infrequently it has risen to such heights as to command the instinctive admiration of the world for all that is heroic. But at best it has been spasmodic in its manifestation, it has been uncertain in its degree of intensity, and it has been strictly limited in its range. Christ took the rudimentary instinct and made it into a universal law. It is limited now neither in the sphere of its operation, nor in the time of its application: it is valid over all the earth, and applies to all generations. It dominates all mankind, and lifts man up to those levels of life in which sacrifice is consummate and eternal. It is the germ out of which has sprung all the highest good in social intercourse; out of it have come not only the occasional amenities of life, but even the moral usages of men. It is the secret of civilization, and its hold upon the imagination and conscience has become so great that it is now woven into the moral consciousness of men. It is a commandment as definite and as binding as any in the Decalogue; it comprehends them all, and where

it is not honoured its neglect is visited with the contempt and censure of the world, while he who fails to obey it realizes in himself the degeneration which is the natural outworking of all Divine law abused by men. The Gospel story reveals the process by which this transformation has been made good. The evolution by which *compassion* has been changed into *philanthropy* is so subtly described that it may easily escape the notice of the superficial reader, but to those who possess the necessary spiritual insight and enlightenment the story has all the charm of a natural development. It establishes the origin of the law: reveals Christ as its Author. Philanthropy is the immediate product of the Incarnation.

1. Jesus could scarcely have been born into a less promising sphere for the promulgation of such a law. He could scarcely have found a less likely milieu than Judaism afforded for the cultivation of such a principle of life; nor could He have made His attempt at a time when common human pitifulness seemed at a lower ebb, than in the days that marked the decadence of the Empire of Rome. The contempt of the Roman for the conquered, and of the Greek for the barbarian, has always been recognized. Plato speaks with commendation of 'the pure and innate hatred of the foreign nature,' and Aristotle condones the slavery of his age, and complacently regards the slave as 'a kind of animate machine.' It is not until we come to the Stoicism of the Christian era that we meet with any teaching that approaches philanthropy, though even here we have Seneca laying down, as motive for the high type of benevolence he inculcated, the 'consciousness of having a noble nature' (*de Benef*, iv. 12). Blood relationships have always and universally laid down marked boundaries in the empire of love, and these have found a complete and historic embodiment in caste as it may be studied in India to-day. But it may well be considered whether even this system is not left far behind by the Jew, who held that the Gentiles without the Law were accursed, thus excluding all foreigners not only from the regard of man but even from that of God. Yet the fact remains that Christ, born into such a system, created the philanthropy that ignores all frontiers, and does not hesitate to lay down life itself for those whose one claim is that they share in the common humanity.

There are not wanting in the Gospel narrative incidents which seem to show that Christ inherited this feeling of His countrymen and of His age, at least to some extent. He limits the ministry of His disciples to the villages of Judaea, bidding them avoid the villages of the Samaritans (Mat_10:5); and in His interview with the Syrophœnician woman (Mar_7:26) He not only repeats the limitation given to His disciples as binding also upon Himself, declaring that He was not sent save to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, but speaks of the woman as a dog, and claims for the Jews that they are the children of the household. Contempt could no further go, and the words fall strangely from the Saviour's lips. But without for the moment setting against these passages others in which the sympathy of Jesus is seen to be as catholic

as it was tender, it may very well be argued that these two incidents do not establish exclusiveness in Christ, and in any case the exclusiveness broke down and gave way to the very opposite feeling in Him. But, apart from that, it may be shown that the limitation in the injunction given to the disciples was due not to any narrowness in the Saviour's sympathy, but rather to His recognition of the limitations of His emissaries. The Apostles, with their prejudices strong within them, had scarcely the tact and the culture necessary for those who would open the door of faith to the Gentiles, and subsequent events show how after many a lesson the leader of the band, St. Peter himself, was unable fully to recognize the truth so clearly seen and strongly enforced by St. Paul. At any rate it is most significant that when the lessons of Christ's life were drawing to a close the prohibition was taken away, and the Apostles were instructed to 'go into all the world, and make disciples of all the nations' (Mat 28:19). A far greater difficulty is seen in the story of the Syrophaenician woman. Here the Saviour's words are so entirely at variance not only with His own act on that occasion, but with the tenderness and courtesy with which at all other times He dealt with women, that attempts have been made from the earliest times to reconcile the contrast between the Spirit of Jesus and His harsh and contemptuous words on the occasion. The words can scarcely be justified even on the supposition that it was a harsh discipline intended to bring out the triumphant faith of the woman. We hold that Christ used the words in irony, and that, feeling the utter falseness of the leaders and teachers of the Jews, driven in utter weariness from them into Gentile territory, He assumes for the time being the narrow spirit which belonged to them, that His disciples might see how Pharisaic doctrine looked when reduced to act in dealing with the sorrow and need of the world. He throws into contrast with that doctrine the quick intuition of the woman, as well as the humility of her trust as she declares that even the Gentiles have a place in the family of God. There could be no finer method of revealing to the disciples the contrast between that exclusiveness of spirit which He had come to destroy, and the larger trust in the all-comprehending love of God which He came to fulfil.

Christ gave, then, to the human feeling of pitiful concern for another the universality which it lacked. And He did this first by His full and generous recognition of good in the alien, whether He found him in the actual commerce of life or in the imaginary scenes which He made to live in parabolic teaching. He had not found in Israel such faith as He found in the centurion (Mat 8:10-11), and He closed His tribute to that faith by saying that many should come from the east and the west and sit down with Abraham in the Kingdom of God, while the favoured people themselves should be cast out. When He was asked for a definition of a neighbour, He pointed to a Samaritan, and described him as possessing qualities lacking in priest and Levite (Luk 10:27 ff.). He had spoken of His own people with a great tenderness as 'the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Mat 10:6; Mat 15:24), but He extends that tenderness to the Gentile world when He speaks of 'other sheep not of this fold.' He says that they too are His,

and them also He must bring (Joh 10:16). Whether He spoke the words to Nicodemus or not, it is clear that John learnt from Him that the love of God was not the exclusive privilege of the Jew, but that God loved 'the world,' and that His salvation was within the reach of whosoever should believe (Joh 3:16). In 'the Gospel to the Greeks' He speaks of 'all men' as coming within the attractive power of Himself crucified and ascended (Joh 12:32). And when He gave to His followers His final commission, there was no limit to the sphere of their evangelic labours: they were to 'go into all the world,' 'to make disciples of all the nations' (Mar 16:15, Mat 28:19). Christ not only widened the domain of this law of love, pushing back the boundaries marked out by social custom or selfish expediency or fear, but He also enriched the law by giving it a deeper note, an intenser spirit. The poor man for neglect of whom Dives found himself at last in torment, was 'full of sores,' he was licked by the dog, the common scavenger of offal. Such was the claimant upon the rich man's kindness (Luk 16:20 ff.). Lowly service touched its lowliest when the Master stooped to the feet of the disciple (Joh 12:5). Throughout the East the touch of the foot brings defilement and degradation. And when the service had been rendered to His followers, He spoke to them of 'a new commandment' which He had therein given them (Joh 13:15; Joh 13:34). He called upon those who would follow Him to be ready to sell all and follow Him (Mat 19:21). The gift that won the approval of Heaven was not that which came out of the superfluity of the rich, but the widow's mite, for that was 'all that she had' (Mar 12:43). Last of all, He declared that He Himself would give unto the uttermost, for as Good Shepherd He was ready to lay down His life for His sheep (Joh 10:11). There was thus added to the length and breadth of universal love the height and depth of sacrifice, and these two elements wrought powerfully in the instinctive love of man until the neediness of each became the common burden of all, and philanthropy became a part of the spiritual equipment of men.

2. The expression of that spiritual equipment will develop from age to age. The forms of its expression in the early days of the Christian era are well known. Christ instructed His disciples to heal the sick, and generally to minister to the physically distressed. The relief of the poor seems to have been another marked form of Christian philanthropy from the first, and they were in addition to minister in spiritual things, and to seek to admit men into the Kingdom of God. It may at first sight appear as if this was a strictly limited form of philanthropy, but it is obvious that the form of expression was accommodated to the capacities of the agents chosen and to the simplicity of the life which they were accustomed to live. Such forms of sympathetic relief, we may be assured, existed long before Christ sent forth His disciples; that which He added was the twofold vitalizing principle which made the charity of the age a living reality. It became real (*ἀληθές*, 1Jn 2:8) in them, as it was already in Him. The universality and the intensity which were His contribution to the common love, the old commandment of mankind, were also notes of life. Love without limit in

range or in intensity,—such was the new commandment illustrated in the washing of the disciples' feet. It was now ἀγάπη εἰς τέλος, it was love unto the uttermost (Joh_13:1). And having dropped into the human instinct the vitalizing germ of a new principle, Christ was content to leave the new law to find wider and fuller expression as the years moved on. With the developing powers of man, that vitalized law would be certain to find a far more extended application than lay within the compass of His earliest followers. In that age the manumission of the slave, the education of the poor, the enforcement of laws of sanitation—such things as are the commonplaces of philanthropic measures in our time—were not within the power of the disciples of Christ. But we can see that that which gives them the sanction of law, that which comes into every social reform that has any promise of permanence or of helpfulness, is just that with which Christ filled the hearts of His followers as He sent them forth on their simpler mission:—all endowment is but a trust; 'freely ye have received, freely give' (Mat_10:8); there is no limit in love; the neediness of each is the common burden of all. All social reform, happily increasingly recognized, advocated, accepted, in our age, is but the working out in the larger life of to-day of the vital principle contributed by Christ when He made love's range conterminous with the universe of God, and at the same moment made it instinct with His own passion and sacrifice.

But philanthropy as Christ has taught it in the Gospel story goes further than this. It not only is the spring of all true social reform, but it possesses the power to enforce observance. It gives the sanction of duty to all such observance. It becomes not merely an added quality in human intercourse, but a positive compelling force. It is a new commandment. Neglect to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, visit the prisoner and the sick, or to translate these special terms into the general terms for which they stand,—to meet all human need as it arises,—such neglect is not in the eyes of Christ a venial offence, a trifle of indifference; it is clear He took a far more serious view of it: He taught His disciples that it meant rejection in the judgment of God; it excludes him who so neglects from the Kingdom. Philanthropy was thus invested with the august powers of a moral law. If we consider philanthropy to be the common human instinct endowed with the range given to it by Christ, the εἰς τέλος of His own showing, we can see how this binding quality, this sanction, is imparted. For such a quality in love strikes at the root of that which is destructive of all morality, and that is briefly the calculating spirit. The immoral compromises which we so often make with ourselves become impossible when love unto the uttermost is the rule of our regard for our fellow-men. It opposes every tendency to evade law where possible. It adds strength and loyalty to obedience, and imparts to scrupulous observance the gladness of enthusiasm. This operation so relines and enlarges duty, that by the side of it all other duty seems the merest travesty of duty, and to fail to reach this height of moral observance becomes a positive failure, a moral offence, a breach of law. Christ accomplished this by striking clear and strong that personal note which is the

key to all His influence. He attached men to Himself, and then exhibited in Himself the very law which He promulgated, until in after days the appeal might be made to the Christian Church that its members should bear one another's burdens, since only thus could they fulfil that Law which Christ was (οὕτως ἀναπληρώσατε τὸν νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Gal_6:2). This love unto the uttermost was lived; and lived by Him who by His own loveliness has drawn all men to Himself. It is for this reason that words which might easily have become the rules of another futile Utopia, or the striking maxims of an original teacher, have become instinct with the spiritual; and with the new law of love the power to realize it was given. When to His setting forth of the new philanthropy Christ added the words, 'Ye have done it unto me' (Mat_25:40), He endowed His words with spirit and life.

This spirit the Christian Church has sought to realize in what are called Missions. No distinction need ever be made between 'Home' and 'Foreign' Missions. Least of all should any be made when we consider, as we do here, the spirit which belongs to both. The resource and ingenuity of love will appear in all such enterprise. There is no power of modern life but will be pressed into service by the love which recognizes no limit to its operation, no limitation to its spirit. Legislative powers will be used for what they are worth. Social organization, all that art or science can teach,—in a word, all the fulness of life,—will be permeated and freely used by this great law of love. That law will find its fullest application in the service of the alien, and the foreigner. Here, if anywhere, the universality of love will be seen; when the missionary breaks every tie that makes the sweetness of his life, to carry the burdens of

'Sullen peoples, half devil and half child,'

he reveals the intensest manifestation of that love whose Divine note is sacrifice. It is no wonder that the story of the triumphs of the gospel, or of the devotion of the missionary in strange and remote regions or in circumstances of peculiar physical peril and distress, has so often come back to the Christian Church with a breath as of the ocean, a breath that infuses new life into the stale observance and gives new stimulus to the jaded servant, a breath that whispers of broad spaces, of elemental forces, of the fulness of the Infinite, the

'Deep where all our thoughts are drowned.'

Missionary service must always be the perfection of philanthropy. And philanthropy is love without limit, and love is of God, for God is Love.

Literature.—Uhlhorn, *Christian Charity in the Ancient Church*; Wernle, *Beginnings of Christianity*; v. Dobschütz, *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*; Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*; Storrs, *Divine Origin of Christianity*; Brace, *Gesta Christi*; Church, *Gifts of Civilization*; and the following Sermons:—on Joh_13:34 by F. W. Robertson (i. 234), Mat_19:18 by C. H. Spurgeon, Mar_12:29-31 by A. Alexander. The question is also treated on the basis of the Sermon on the Mount by Gore, Trench, and Tholuck.

W. W. Holdsworth.

Philip

PHILIP (φίλιππος, ‘lover of horses’).

1. Philip the Apostle.—For the little that we know regarding him, beyond the mere mention of his name in the lists of the Twelve (Mat_10:3, Mar_3:18, Luk_6:14), we are wholly dependent upon a few scattered notices in the Fourth Gospel.

(1) The first of these tells the story of his call, which took place on the day after the call of Andrew and John with their respective brothers (Joh_1:43 ff.). And the fact that it is expressly mentioned that Philip, like these men, belonged to Bethsaida, would seem to point to a certain amount of friendship as having already existed between them, while his Greek name (a peculiarity which among the Apostles he shared with Andrew) makes it at least possible that he himself was originally of Greek descent. This accords entirely with what we know of the mixed Gentile population of Bethsaida. Whether, however, this was so or not, Philip would seem to have belonged to the growing class of devout souls throughout the land who were ‘waiting for the consolation of Israel,’ even if he had not, along with the previously named disciples, been an open follower of John the Baptist. For when Jesus ‘finds’ him—evidently not by accident but as the result of a deliberate search—and addresses to him the first direct call which, so far as we know, He addressed to any man, ‘Follow me,’ Philip immediately responds, and once and for all throws in his lot with his new Master. So complete indeed is his surrender, that though as yet his knowledge of Jesus is very imperfect (cf. Joh_1:45 ‘the son of Joseph’), he shows himself endued with the genuine missionary spirit in proceeding in his turn to ‘find’ Nathanael, that together they may rejoice in the discovery of the promised Messiah. The very precision and minuteness of the terms, moreover, in which Philip announces that discovery, bring before us another aspect of his character, for they show him to have been a man of an anxious and careful turn of mind, asking for no conviction on the part of others

until he has been first convinced himself, and ever ready to submit all doubts and prejudices to the test of actual experience (Joh 1:46 'Come and see').

(2) Of this latter trait of the Apostle's character we have further confirmation, from a somewhat different point of view, in the next incident in which he is specially mentioned. For at the feeding of the Five Thousand in the wilderness it was to Philip that Jesus addressed the question, 'Whence are we to buy bread, that these may eat?' (Joh 6:5). Some have thought that the reason of this was that Philip had charge of the commissariat of the Apostolic band, just as Judas acted as their treasurer; but of this there is no proof, and St. John expressly adds that Jesus said this to 'prove' him. The Master knew His disciple's cautious and deliberate disposition, and how little he had yet shown himself able to make any of the bolder efforts of faith. And He evidently hoped that on this occasion Philip would rise from the manifest inadequacy of the existing material resources to the thought of the unseen powers which He (the Christ) had at His command. But the hope was to be disappointed. Philip was so occupied with his own careful calculations as to what the actual feeding of the multitude meant, that he could think of nothing else. And even the matter-of-fact Andrew showed more imagination when, after the mention of the lad's little store, he at least hazarded the suggestion, 'But what are they amongst so many?'

(3) The case is similar when we turn to another occasion when we find the two Apostles together. It is in entire accord not only with Philip's (possible) Greek origin, but with his sympathetic, inquiring disposition, that the Greek visitors to the Temple should select him as their ambassador to Jesus (Joh 12:20 ff.). But it is equally characteristic that, as he realized the greatness and significance of the request, coming as it did from pure Gentiles, he should hesitate to act upon it on his own responsibility. He would do nothing until he had consulted Andrew. And even when Andrew had approved, it was only in conjunction with him, and leaving him to occupy the foremost place ('Andrew and Philip'), that Philip went to tell Jesus.

(4) This 'faith without confidence' is even more marked in the last glimpse which St. John gives us of his brother Apostle. When, in His farewell discourse to the Twelve, Jesus announced that He was going to the 'Father,' and that no one could come to the 'Father' except by Him, it was left to Philip to say, 'Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us' (Joh 14:8). With him 'seeing' was 'believing.' He could not believe that any real knowledge of the Father was possible except such as resulted from an actual theophany; and so proved how blinded he had been to that higher manifestation of which he had for so long been witness in the words and the acts of the Son.

(5) With the pathetic personal appeal to him which this dulness of spiritual vision called forth (Joh 14:9), Philip disappears from the Gospel story. And we hear nothing

more of him in the NT except for the mention of his name amongst the Apostles who assembled in the upper room at Jerusalem after their Lord's Ascension (Act 1:13). Various traditions have, however, gathered round his memory.

The most interesting of these is the account preserved by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom*, iii. 4, § 25), which identifies him with the unknown disciple who, when the Lord's call came to him, asked that he might first go and bury his father—an identification at least in keeping with what we have seen of Philip's character. The apocryphal *Journeyings of Philip the Apostle* (3rd cent.) represent him as travelling through Lydia and Asia, and finally settling in Hierapolis. And it was there, according to Polycrates (bishop of Ephesus c. 190 a.d.), that he was 'buried' 'along with his two aged virgin daughters' (Eus. *Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 31; cf. Lightfoot, *Colossians 2* [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 45 ff.). The same authority adds that another daughter who 'lived in fellowship with the Holy Spirit' was hurried at Ephesus—a circumstance that may perhaps point to Philip's own residence there for a time, and consequently to a renewed intercourse with his old friend the Apostle John. If so, we have an additional reason why St. John should have introduced Philip's name so freely in the 'memoirs' on which at the time he was engaged. Of the later connexion with Hierapolis already alluded to we have now interesting confirmation in the discovery of an inscription showing that the church there was dedicated to the memory 'of the holy and glorious Apostle and theologian Philip' (τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ ἐνδεξοῦ ἀποστόλου καὶ θεολόγου Φιλίππου: see Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, i. p. 552 f.).

In the West, St. Philip's Day is observed along with that of St. James the Lesson May 1st. In the East, St. Philip's Day is Nov. 14th, St. James', Oct, 23rd.

Literature.—In addition to what has been noted above, see Westcott, *The Gospel of St. John*, p. lxxiii f.; A. B. Bruce, *The Training of the Twelve* (see 'Philip' in the Index); H. P. Liddon, *University Sermons*, 2nd ser., i. 'Prejudice and Experience' (Joh 1:46); J. B. Lightfoot, *Cambridge Sermons*, p. 129 ff. 'Show us the Father' (Joh 14:8-9); R. C. Trench, *Studies in the Gospels*, p. 68; A. Maclaren, *A Year's Ministry*, ii. 155; J. D. Jones, *The Glorious Company of the Apostles*, p. 109; R. H. Lovell, *First Types of the Chr. Life*, p. 514; and the present writer's *The Twelve Apostles* (Dent), p. 49 ff.

2. Herod Philip.—See vol. i. p. 722^b.

George Milligan.

Phylacteries

PHYLACTERIES (OT 'frontlets').—The observance of phylacteries is based on Exo 13:9-10 and Deu 6:8; Deu 11:18. For the Heb. and Greek terms see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, s.v. It is disputed whether the passages in the Pentateuch are to be understood literally (so most of the Rabbinic writers, and Ginsburg in Kitto's *Cyclop.*) or metaphorically (so Ibn Ezra, Rashbam, the Karaites, Jerome, Lyra, Calvin, Hengstenberg, Knobel, Keil, and Kennedy in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible); some assign a metaphorical meaning to the passages in Ex. and a literal to those in Deuteronomy. Under the more legal and formal interpretation and observance of the OT which flourished after the Return, the literal interpretation became dominant. The exact date of the introduction of the literal observance of the precept cannot be given. No indisputable reference is found in the OT; passages like Pro 1:9 being indecisive. From the relatively large number of regulations referring to phylacteries—some of them connected with the Tannaim—it follows that they were used as early as the time of the Sopherim, the 4th or at least the 3rd cent. b.c. (see *JE [Note: E Jewish Encyclopedia.]* x. 26). The first explicit reference, and that to the hand phylactery, is in the letter of the pseudo-Aristeas, the date of which is variously assigned between 200 and 100 b.c., where they are regarded as an established custom. They are also mentioned in connexion with Simeon ben Shetach, brother-in-law of Alexander Jannaeus (b.c. 105-78). Josephus (*Ant.* iv. viii. 13) speaks of them as an established and recognized custom. We may, therefore, regard them as having preceded by about two centuries the birth of Jesus Christ. For our knowledge of the customs associated with them we are indebted chiefly to the references in the Mishna (for which see Schürer, *HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]* ii. ii. 113). Though the collection of these traditions took place in the 2nd Christian cent., they may be regarded, for the most part, as representing an earlier state of things.

In the later Jewish writers, phylacteries play a great part; their manufacture and use are elaborately described, and their significance and importance dwelt upon at length. 'There are more laws—asccribed to delivery by God to Moses—clustering about phylacteries than about any other institution of Judaism. Maimonides (*Yad Tef.*) mentions 10; Rodkinssohn (*Tef. le Mosheh*) mentions 18' (*J [Note: Jahwist.] E [Note: Elohist.]*). According to the Kabbala, they were significant of the wisdom, reason, and greatness of God. Phylacteries were more holy than the gold plate worn by the high priest, since that contained the Divine Name once, the phylacteries twenty-three times. The Mishna taught that 'be who has Tephillin on his head and his arm, Tsitsith on his garment, and Mezuzah on his door, has every possible guarantee that he will not sin.' The wearing of them distinguished the cultured and pious from the common mass, the *am-hâ'ârez*, the 'people who knew not the law' (Joh 7:49). Though worn probably at first all day, they became limited to the time of morning prayer. Careful

directions are given as to the person (women, the unclean), the times (Sabbaths and festivals), and the places (cemeteries, etc.) where their use was prohibited.

Phylacteries are of two kinds, those for the hand and those for the head. In the case of the former, a box or house (כִּיָּה) was made of the skin of a clean animal, which had been softened in water and shaped and stiffened on a mould. In this was inserted a parchment on which the Scripture passages, Exo 13:1-16, Deu 6:4-9; Deu 6:13-21, had been written in four columns; the parchment was rolled and tied with white, washed hairs from a cow or calf, usually from the tail. This box was then sewn on to a leather base, furnished with a loop through which a leather strap passed. In the case of the head phylactery a similar box was prepared, but with four divisions, in which were placed in order, beginning from the left side, the four above named passages of the Pentateuch. On the right hand side of the box of this phylactery was impressed a three-pronged *Shîn* (שׁ), and on the left hand one with four prongs (שׂ). This, too, was sewn on a base and provided with a leather strap (see Illustration in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. 870).

In 'laying'—to use the technical term—the phylacteries, that for the hand was adjusted first. The box part was placed above the elbow on the inside of the left arm where it would press against the heart, a fact to which significance was given (Deu 6:6). A knot in the shape of the letter *Yôdh* (י) was made, the strap was wound about the arm four times and three times, and three times round the middle finger of the hand. The box of the other was placed on the forehead, where the hair ceases to grow, the band taken round the head and fastened with a knot like the letter *Dâleth* (ד), while the two ends were made to hang down in front over the shoulders. The *Shîn* on the box, the *Dâleth* knot on the head phylactery, and the *Yôdh* knot on the hand phylactery, made the letters of one of the Divine Names—שׁדדדד Shaddâi, 'Almighty.'

The following benedictions are said. At the laying of the hand phylactery—'Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who hast sanctified us by Thy commandments, and has commanded us to lay the Tephillin.' An almost identical one is uttered during the placing of that for the head, and when it is finished—'Blessed be His name, whose glorious kingdom is for ever and ever.' At the adjusting of the strap round the middle finger, which is left till the last, 'And I will betroth thee unto me for ever; yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness, and in judgment, and in loving-kindness, and in mercy. I will even betroth thee unto me in faithfulness: and thou shalt know the Lord' (Hos 2:19). In removing, the fastening of the hand is first undone, the head phylactery removed, then that on the arm; they are kissed and placed in a bag, as. to the place and use of which careful directions are given.

It cannot be doubted that the Pharisees and scribes in the time of our Lord used phylacteries; but how far the custom was followed by the people generally is uncertain. In order to emphasize their profession of religion, these people ‘made broad’ (πλατύνουσι, Mat 23:5) these mementoes of their Judaism, whether by enlarging the whole, the boxes and the straps, or, as the Sinaitic and Curetonian Syriac suggest, the straps only. It was the vain extension of the outward sign of an unreal religion that our Lord rebuked; it marked the externality and hollowness of contemporary Pharisaism. While this is the only NT reference to phylacteries, their use by a certain class should continually be borne in mind by the reader, as it may add to the vividness of the picture suggested by many incidents. Thus in Mat 22:34 || it may be considered as certain that the group of Pharisees with whom our Lord held His controversy wore their broadened phylacteries, and that the passage He quoted, the *Shema*, the foundation of Hebrew religion, would be found in the phylacteries they carried on their heads and arms.

Literature.—Comm. on Ex. and Deut., including long note in Kalisch’s *Exodus*; Maimonides, *Yad Hachazakah*, *Hilcoth Tephillin*; Wagenseil, *Sota*; artt. in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible, the *EBi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*] (‘Frontlets’), Smith’s *DB* [Note: *Dictionary of the Bible.*] (‘Frontlets’), Kitto’s *Cyclop.*, the *JE* [Note: *E Jewish Encyclopedia.*], Hamburger’s *RE* [Note: *E Realencyklopädie.*], Riehm’s *HWB* [Note: *WB Handwörterbunch.*]; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. ii. 113; Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald. and Syn. Jud.* (which contains much curious information); Edersheim, *Sketches of Jewish Social Life*; Margoliouth, *Fundamental Principles of Judaism* (much information as to modern use).

J. T. L. Maggs.

Physical

PHYSICAL (φυσικός, ‘natural,’ ‘inborn’).—To this word a distinctive and conspicuous place has been given in the terminology of modern science, and that very appropriately; for the object of science in every one of its branches is to acquire such a knowledge of the Universe as shall correspond exactly to the constituted and established nature of things. Neither the word ‘physical’ nor the word ‘nature’ (φύσις) occurs in any of the four Gospels. But nevertheless many things which fall under the description of both terms, as scientifically used, occupy a large place in all the Gospels; and there high importance is necessarily and designedly attached to them. It is true that one has only to run one’s eye reflectively over the pages of the Gospels to discover that in them the *moral* order of things is the matter of supreme and

controlling interest. But while that is so, it becomes also apparent that this moral interest is not only involved in the physical order of things, but is inevitably and to a vast extent dependent upon it. Thus, e.g., it is everywhere manifest in these narratives of our Lord's earthly life and work that He appeared among men as an *individual* Being. This implies that the physical order of existence was epitomized in Him in the same way and to the same extent as it is in every individual human being. It implies that His body was the organ of the moral order of the world as the latter existed in the spiritual constitution of His being, and as it came to manifestation in the moral or spiritual activities of His life within the sphere of His moral relations to God and to men. It implies, also, that His bodily constitution and life placed Him in direct relations with, and in constant dependence upon, the whole order of the physical environment in which He lived and moved and had His being as 'God manifest *in the flesh*' (1Ti 3:16). And so it becomes obvious that if He had not entered into these incarnate relations with the physical order of things, He never could have become the Son of Man, and if He had never become the Son of Man He never could have revealed Himself to humanity as the Son of God (John 1, 2Co 4:6). For these reasons, then, and others that sprang out of them or were otherwise related to them, our Lord was necessitated to make the physical order of the world a subject of reflexion, and to embody in His teaching such ideas of it as He considered to be fit for communication as a part of His general message to mankind. That He did make it a subject of extensive and profound, careful and sympathetic study, is as evident as any other fact in the Gospels. It is equally evident, too, that as the result of this study He formed some very definite and highly important conceptions regarding the order of things in question, more than one of which were entirely original. It may be affirmed, moreover, that none of the ideas of this order, to which as a Teacher of humanity He attached momentous importance and value, can ever be superseded by the teaching of either Science or Philosophy. What, then, were the leading constructions that He as a religious Teacher put upon the physical order of the world?

1. For one thing, this order of things presented itself to His mind as *a medium of Divine revelation* (e.g. Mat 5:44-48; Mat 6:25-30). The question as to the order of things physical, and its significance, must have shaped itself in His mind at an early stage in His life of observation and reflexion. What the result of His inquiry was appears in His teaching. The most general and important item in that result was the discovery of *the presence and activity of God in the established order of organic and inorganic existence*. To His mind God was immanent and operative in nature; and it is in the same view of the relation of God to the physical order of the Universe that modern Theism and Philosophy have begun to rest. That such was indeed His view appears from His own utterances on the relation of God to the order of things physical; which show that nothing was further from His mind than the reckless idea in which God is conceived as existing only in a relation of externality to this order and as acting upon it from without. When, for instance, He saw the sun rise and rain fall, and

pondered on the extensive and complicated orderly system of physical means and ends to which sunrise and rainfall belong, He perceived in these occurrences manifestations of the immediate activity of God (Mat_5:45), and He was too unerring a thinker not to know that God's will and therefore God Himself must be immanent in the established system of things in which He conceived the Divine activity as displayed. Nor is there any real collision here between Christ and modern science in regard to the system of activity to which sunrise and rainfall are due. When He said, 'Your Father which is in heaven maketh his sun to rise ... and sendeth rain,' He used words which are absolutely consistent with the strictest scientific ideas of the natural forces and laws by which the same events in the physical order of things are now explained. For if the scientist is able to explain, and right, from his own point of view, in explaining these events by the action of physical forces and the laws of their operation, this explanation does not account for the existence of these forces themselves, for their persistence, for the perfectly and constantly regulated mode in which their respective forms of activity are manifested, or for the originating cause of the complicated and exquisite adjustment of these forces and their activities to the ends they serve. For these things there is only one satisfactory explanation, and that is the immanent and immediate activity of God. And Science and Philosophy have been rapidly becoming aware that no better explanation is likely ever to be found.

But, further, for Christ the revelation of God and His activity in the physical order of the world possessed a *moral significance*. God as a Moral Being—and because as such He is perfect—can never act unless morally, even in the system of things physical. This truth regulated the whole of our Lord's conception of God's relation to this order, and of His ways of administering its provisions. And therefore it is that He saw in such physical events as sunrise and rainfall manifestations of God's beneficence and magnanimity. He 'maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust'! These words are a striking revelation of the perfectly fresh, intelligent, discerning eyes with which Christ looked upon the physical order of things, and contemplated God and His activity as therein manifested. This appears when three things are noted.—(1) There is only *one* established physical order of things. (2) This order is constituted throughout on one and the same homogeneous plan, and it is necessarily regulated accordingly. (3) Therefore it is impossible for this order to be so administered as to make distinctions of any kind in the distribution of its provisions among men. Here distinctions cannot be made even between the evil and the good, between the just and the unjust. Therefore as the Author and the Administrator of this system of things God makes no such distinctions. Within this sphere of the relations between God and men, the good and the evil, the just and the unjust, are the same to Him. His impartiality to both sorts of men is as absolute and universal as the rising of the sun and the falling of rain. And God Himself has so ordered the physical universe that it should be so, and that it cannot be otherwise. And, so far as any one can say, Christ was the first to

notice and fully to appreciate the true meaning of these obvious but vastly important facts. In sunrise and rainfall He saw nothing but instances of the manifestation of the loving-kindness of God to all men, good and evil alike, and of His magnanimity towards evil and unjust men. For it was one of Christ's governing ideas as a Teacher that God did not need to punish evil and unjust men for their sin by withholding from them any of the beneficent provisions of the physical order of things. He knew and taught in effect that it is with the *moral order* of things and God's unerring and all-sufficient administration of *it*, as the *moral* Governor of the world, that evil and unjust men have to reckon; and therefore, in the exercise of the magnanimity alike of His love and of His justice, God dispenses to them, in common with good and just men, a full and free share of His sunshine and rain. So Christ understood this matter (cf. Mat 5:21-30; Mat 11:25-26, Joh 9:39-41 with Mat 5:45).

2. But, further, these views that Christ held as to the physical order of the world suggest the inference that He must have looked upon this system as *an order of law*. That He did so regard it is evident from His teaching, when the latter is carefully and fairly examined from this point of view. The term 'law,' as defined by science, is of modern origin, and therefore it is never employed in this sense in the Gospels. But the Gospels are rich in recognitions of a large variety of those facts for which the term 'law,' as scientifically understood, stands; and recognition of these facts was made by Christ Himself. The modern conception of the order of things physical, which the term 'law' is employed to denote, is, that it is an order in which perfect constancy and regularity reign universally and persistently, and that even in the case of its minutest phenomena and its subtlest processes. Did Christ, then, perceive and acknowledge the great features of the physical order on which this conception is founded? He did. In all its essential forces and laws the physical order was the same in His time as it is to-day. Science has not created any of the forces or laws in question; it has only discovered and formulated them. Moreover, it is evident that Christ's observations and His reflexions on nature were prompted and controlled rather by religious than by scientific motives or reasons. It is to be admitted, again, that He never made the physical order of things a direct subject of teaching, but always made it subservient to the religious or moral ends He had in view. Still He was deeply convinced of the constancy and regularity of the physical system of existence in the midst of which He lived and taught, and on which He depended (e.g. Mat 7:16-20, Mar 4:3-32). That it was so is evinced by the following facts:—(1) A large proportion of His teaching was based on the principle of comparison. (2) The most of His comparisons were indications of resemblances between the things of the physical order of the world and the things of the Kingdom of God, which are in reality the things of the moral order of the world, considered as an order in which the will and purpose of God are coming to realization in the moral relations of God to men and of men to Him and to one another in Christ. (3) In His comparisons it was His custom to lay conspicuous emphasis on those phenomena of the physical order of things in which the constancy

and regularity of this order are prominent. (4) His manifest reasons for doing so were such as these—His whole conception of the Kingdom of God implies that He regarded it as an order of perfect moral constancy and regularity, *i.e.* as an order of moral law. But few, if indeed any, of His hearers had any idea of the Kingdom of God as being such an order. On the other hand, however, they were familiar with many of the phenomena of constancy and regularity in the physical order of things. Therefore His object in calling the attention of His hearers to these phenomena was to lead their minds up from the things of sense to the things of faith, and thereby to convey to them the conception, and to awaken in them the conviction, that the things of the moral order of the world, like the order of things revealed to their sense-perception, were things that had real existence, things that were indeed founded in moral principles of absolute constancy and regularity, and things therefore to be relied upon with the utmost confidence. (5) These considerations, then, all imply that the physical order of things from which our Lord drew His comparisons must have been regarded by Him as a system of *order*, a system in which constancy, regularity, law reigns. The whole principle of comparison as thus explained is applied, *e.g.*, in Mat 7:15-20.

3. But the physical order of the world was regarded by our Lord as also *a sphere of Providential administration* (*e.g.* Mat 5:44-48; Mat 6:25-34, Luk 12:4-7). It is important to note the fact that all His allusions to this branch of the subject here considered, imply that He conceived of the Divine providence as exercised within the boundaries of the physical system of things. This system is, so to speak, the machinery employed by God in all the various manifestations of His providential care. But if this system is an order of physical constancy or law, all the exercises of the Divine providence must be regulated by this fact. So Christ's teaching represents it as being. He never spoke of providence as in effect a system of Divine activities in which God, interposing in the interests of the objects of His care, either ignored the established order of physical existence or made breaches in its established arrangements. All the ways in which He saw the providential activities of God manifested in care for His creatures were ways in which the established orderliness of the physical world came into effect, as in the case of the rising of the sun and the falling of rain. That is to say, in Christ's view the physical order of the world is constituted on a providential plan, in which a perfectly arranged and regulated system of means is adjusted to serve the beneficent ends contemplated by God.

What Christ's ideas were of the leading features of the administration of this system is suggested by those passages of His teaching to which attention has been called. He believed the providential activities of God to be at once universal and particular, and this belief is in accordance with the nature of things. He believed also that God's providential activities are not only immanent and immediate, but persistent. They are as unslumbering and restless as the physical energies or forces in the activities and

effects of which they are manifested. He believed, moreover, that God's providential interest and care extended even to birds and flowers as well as to human beings; and this belief, also, is justified by the necessities and arrangements of the physical order of things to which they as *living* beings in common with men belong. For they, as living beings, have each physical needs according to their own respective natures and places and destinies in nature; and therefore it was not unworthy of Christ to form and take delight in the conviction that their Creator was providentially faithful to them.

But withal, it remains to be added here, that Christ believed that human beings have a higher value for God as the God of providence than the birds of the air. And this is why. The birds of the air have no place, or task, or destiny in the moral order of the Universe. But it is otherwise with men. They are endowed with a moral nature; their life is a moral vocation; they have a moral destiny to shape in co-operation with God. And this explains and manifests the perfect wisdom of Christ as a teacher, in including all men within, and in excluding all other living creatures on the earth from, the *moral government* of God and its system of administration. He constantly paid truthful and perfectly wise respect to these two great facts in His teaching:—(1) The fact that God is ever and always providentially and actively related to men as physical beings, having physical necessities and requirements in their life; and (2) the fact that He is ever and always governmentally and actively related to them as moral beings, having moral necessities and requirements and responsibilities in their life (*e.g.* Mat_11:25). This distinction between the providential and the governmental activities of God, in His relation to men and in His ways with them, has a determinative place in the truth taught in the Gospels.

4. Finally, all Christ's allusions to the physical order of the world present a deep *religious complexion*. He saw in this order, and in the relations between God and men as therein revealed, conditions and opportunities provided for the manifestation of pure and high forms of religious life. Men are dependent on the beneficent ministrations of the Divine providence. As moral beings it is their duty to recognize this fact, to pay due respect to it, and to cherish and manifest gratitude to God for all the various forms of His providential loving-kindness and faithfulness. Within the domain of Providence, moreover, reasons constantly exist and occasions are ever arising for men to exercise trust in God. Here also as well as in their own hearts men may find the presence of God in their life. And here they are summoned to imitate the ways of God's providential beneficence. In all these various ways Christ related His religion to the physical order of the world and its providential administration. His Sermon on the Mount shows that He wished and intended them all to have an essential place in the life of every one of His disciples. And in His own life they were all fully observed and manifested. See, further, Nature, Providence.

Literature.—Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, i. 151 ff.; Bushnell, *Nature and the Supernatural*; Drummond, *Nat. Law in the Spiritual World*; Mozley, *University Sermons*, pp. 122-144; *Expositor* ii. vii. [1884] 103, iii. ii. [1885] 224.

W. D. Thomson.

⚡ Physician

PHYSICIAN

1. *Luke, the physician*.—It is a fact of special importance, in reference to Christ's miracles of healing, that one of the four Evangelists was himself a physician (Col_4:14). Traces of this fact appear in his Gospel (ct. [Note: contrast.] Luk_8:43 || Mar_5:26), and still more in Acts (cf. Hobart, *Medical Lang. of St. Luke*). His training would probably be Gentile (Col_4:11; Col_4:14, cf. Eus. *Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 4), and his medicines, like Gentile food, would be unclean in Jewish eyes. See, further, art. Luke.

2. *Jewish physicians*.—Priests were inspectors of leprosy (Mat_8:4, Luk_17:14), but they were not the regular physicians. (a) The physicians whom a sufferer had consulted before she was healed by Christ are alluded to in one case (Mar_5:26 || Luk_8:43). Elsewhere physicians are mentioned in proverbial sayings only (Mat_9:12 || Mar_2:17, Luk_5:31; Luk_4:23): there is no censure of them in Christ's words, on the contrary He implies that the sick should resort to the physician; but Mar_5:26 probably gives a fair impression of their general value. (b) References to remedies are few: e.g. a lotion (Luk_10:34), an anodyne (Mar_15:23), both, we may assume, customary amongst Jews, but in neither of these cases administered by them; operations (circumcision, Luk_1:59 etc.; castration, Mat_19:12). The language of Mat_18:8 f. || speaks of mutilation rather than of surgical amputation. Superstitious cures were much sought; cf. the addition to Joh_5:3, which Westcott (*ad loc.*) describes as 'a very early note added while the Jewish tradition was still fresh.' (c) A special defect of Jewish medical science was the want of anatomy, necessarily involved in the ceremonial uncleanness of contact with the dead (cf. Mat_23:27), *i.e.* (as explained in *Jewish Encyc.* art. 'Medicine') contact with a complete corpse, or an 'anatomical unit' (a bone covered with its soft parts), or a collection of bones equal in bulk or number to more than half a skeleton. An illustration of this want may be seen in the fact that a young criminal's corpse was dissipated by long boiling, in order that the bones of the skeleton might be counted (*ib.*). The inspection of the bodies of animals slaughtered for sacrifice or food could be no real compensation for this want.

3. *Christ, the great Physician.*—Such a title is not found in the Gospels, but is at least suggested by [Luk 4:23](#); [Luk 5:31](#) || [Luk 13:32](#). [The word *ἰάομαι* is used (literally) 20 times in NT, and always, except in [Act 28:8](#), directly of Christ]. Indeed, the word ‘Saviour’ implies it ([Mat 9:21](#) f.). The following points are observable in Christ’s healings:—(a) *Variety*: blindness ([Mat 9:27](#) ff; [Mat 20:29](#) ff. ||, [Mar 8:22](#) ff., John 9), deafness ([Mar 7:31](#) ff.), palsy ([Mat 9:1](#) ff. ||), withered hand ([Mat 12:9](#) ff. ||), issue ([Mat 9:20](#) ||), dropsy ([Luk 14:1](#) ff.), fever ([Mat 8:14](#) ff. ||), leprosy ([Mat 8:1](#) ff. || [Luk 17:11](#) ff.), wound ([Luk 22:49](#) ff.), possession ([Mat 8:28](#) ff. ||, [Mar 1:23](#) ff. || etc.); (b) *purpose*: not merely works of mercy ([Mar 3:4](#), [Joh 10:32](#)), but also ‘signs’ ([Joh 4:54](#) etc.), parables of a spiritual healing ([Luk 5:24](#); [Luk 5:31](#) f., [Joh 9:25](#); [Joh 9:39](#)); (c) *universality*: without price ([Mat 10:8](#), ct. [Note: contrast.] [Mar 5:26](#)), without exception ([Mat 11:5](#), [Mar 1:27](#); [Mar 7:37](#), [Joh 9:32](#)), without fail (ct. [Note: contrast.] [Mar 5:4](#); [Mar 5:26](#); [Mar 9:18](#)); (d) *conditions*: (i.) on Christ’s part,—the (Divine) will ([Mat 8:3](#)); in some cases is added the (human) prayer ([Mar 9:29](#), [Joh 11:41](#)); (ii.) on the sick one’s or the petitioner’s part,—faith ([Mat 8:13](#); [Mat 9:2](#); [Mat 9:22](#); [Mat 9:28](#); [Mat 15:28](#) etc.) and (though seldom requiring mention) desire or will ([Joh 5:6](#); [Luk 22:50](#) ff. is altogether exceptional); (e) *preliminaries*: (i.) ordinarily an application, either personal ([Luk 5:12](#); [Luk 17:13](#); [Luk 18:38](#)) or intercessory—with ([Mar 2:3](#); [Mar 7:32](#); [Mar 9:17](#)) or without ([Mat 8:6](#), [Mar 7:29](#) f., [Joh 4:47](#) ff.) the presence of the sufferer; (ii.) often no application preceded ([Mar 5:28](#), [Luk 13:12](#); [Luk 22:51](#)—and so always in Jn., e.g. [Luk 5:6](#), [Luk 9:2](#) ff. [[Luk 11:11](#)]); (f) *performance*: usually immediate ([Mat 8:3](#) f., [Mar 5:29](#)), sometimes delayed ([Mar 7:27](#) ff., [Mar 9:21](#) ff.), rarely a gradual process ([Mar 8:23](#) ff.); (g) *accompaniments*: a word ([Mat 8:8](#); [Mat 8:13](#); [Mat 12:13](#)), never otherwise in the case of possession ([Mat 8:16](#); [Mat 8:31](#)), a touch ([Mat 8:3](#), [Mat 9:18](#); [Mat 9:25](#); [Mat 9:29](#), [Mar 5:28](#); [Mar 6:56](#)), a symbolic action ([Mar 7:33](#), [Joh 9:6](#) f.); (h) *sequel*: an assurance ([Mar 5:34](#), [Luk 17:19](#); [Luk 18:42](#)), a command ([Mat 8:4](#); [Mat 9:6](#), [Mar 5:19](#); [Mar 5:43](#)), a warning ([Joh 5:14](#)). See also artt. Cures, Disease.

Literature.—In addition to the ordinary books of reference and those already mentioned, the following touch the subject: Ebstein, *Die Medizin im NT und im Talm.*, Stuttgart, 1903; Bennett, *Diseases of the Bible*; Trench, *Miracles*. See also C. H. Spurgeon, *The Messiah*, 483.

F. S. Ranken.

 Piece Of Silver

PIECE OF SILVER.—See Money, p. 200^a.

☒ Pigeon

PIGEON.—See Animals, vol. i. p. 65^b, and Dove.

☒ Pilate

PILATE.—Pilate's first name, that by which he would be known in his own household, has not been recorded; we know only his second name 'Pontius,' and his third 'Pilatus.' *Pontius* may be derived from *pons* ('bridge'), or be cognate with πέντε ('five'); and *Pilatus* meant, no doubt, originally, 'armed with the pike' (of the Roman legionary); but we are no nearer his origin. We know nothing of his parents, his birthplace, or the date of his birth. He was a Roman citizen, and was born probably in Italy. From the position which he afterwards occupied, it is certain that he belonged in manhood to the middle or equestrian class in the community; but whether by favour of the Emperor or by birth is unknown. Admission to this class could be obtained only by those who possessed 400,000 sesterces (equivalent to about £3000 of our money, but with much greater purchasing power). The question whether he inherited this property qualification or not cannot be answered.

In order to reach the position of procurator of the Roman province of Judaea, he must have passed through a course of earlier appointments open to his order. He must have had considerable military experience, and have held one or more of the following appointments: prefecture (or tribunate) of an auxiliary cohort, or a legionary tribunate of the second class (those of the first being open only to the senatorial order), or the prefecture of a wing (*ala*) of cavalry (Cagnat, *Cours d'Épig. Lat.*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 109 ff.). The earliest age at which one could become a procurator was between twenty-seven and thirty years. These procuratorships differed in standing (see Procurator), and that of a province like Judaea was not the highest. Further promotion was open to one who did well in that position. The date of the birth of Pilate cannot have been later than about b.c. 4-1. In Mat_27:19 he appears as married, but whether he left any descendants or not is uncertain.

In a.d. 26, Pilate was appointed by the Emperor Tiberius procurator of the province of Judaea. This province comprised the former kingdom of Archelaus,—roughly Samaria and the territory south of it to Gaza and the Dead Sea,—and the procurator's duties were both administrative and military. He was in a position of subordination to the

governor of the province of Syria, but the exact nature of the subordination is not known. For all practical purposes his rule over all in the province, except Roman citizens, was absolute. At the same time, it must be remembered that in this, as in other provinces, certain communities were permitted a large measure of self-government—one of the secrets of Rome's success as a world-power. Thus in Jerusalem the Sanhedrin retained many judicial functions; death sentences, however, had to be confirmed by the governor, and were carried out under his supervision (Joh 18:31; Josephus *Ant.* xx. ix. 1, *BJ* ii. viii. 1). The religious and political zeal of the various sections of the population made the task of governing the province one of extreme difficulty, requiring statesmanlike gifts of no ordinary quality.

We derive most of our knowledge of Pilate's rule from Josephus, from whom the following incident is repeated, to illustrate the statement above made. The Jewish prejudice against images of gods was incomprehensible to the other ancient peoples; but their attitude was officially respected by the Romans, whose practice it was to refrain from introducing such into the Jews' country. They carried their conciliatory policy so far as to remove the figures of the god-emperor from those military standards which bore them. In contravention of this custom, Pilate caused the standards with their usual decoration to be carried by night into Jerusalem. The people pleaded with him to remove the objectionable images, but he remained obdurate, and eventually ordered his soldiers to surround the crowd and put them to death if they persisted. This threat had no terror for men whose religious frenzy was worked up to the highest pitch, and Pilate had to yield, for it was impossible to massacre so many. His action in this matter showed want of tact, hot temper, and weakness; and as the occurrence took place early in his period of government, it was an evil augury for his rule (*Ant.* xviii. iii. 1). On another occasion he used money from the Temple-treasury for the building of an aqueduct, and broke up the riot which threatened by introducing disguised soldiers into the crowd (*Ant.* xviii. iii. 2). Luk 13:1 is the only authority for the mention of the Galilaeans whose blood Pilate 'mixed with their sacrifices.' The cause of his action was doubtless some riot. Pilate is represented in the worst possible light by a passage in Philo, which is put into the mouth of Agrippa (*Legatio ad Gaium*, 38).—

[The Jews' threat to communicate with Tiberius] 'exasperated Pilate to the greatest possible degree, as he feared lest they might go on an embassy to the Emperor, and might impeach him with respect to other particulars of his government—his corruptions, his acts of insolence, his rapine, and his habit of insulting people, his cruelty, and his continual murders of people untried and uncondemned, and his never-ending, gratuitous, and most grievous inhumanity.'

We do not need to go beyond the Gospel narratives, and the fact that he was retained in his position for ten years by Tiberius, to realize that this picture is grossly overdrawn.

For our knowledge of the part Pilate played in the trial of Jesus we are dependent on all four canonical Gospels. As it may be assumed that Mark's narrative is the oldest, we shall take it first, then proceed to Matthew's and Luke's, which are probably almost contemporaneous with one another, and, lastly, we shall draw on the Fourth Gospel.

(1) According to *Mark* (Mar_14:53), the chief priests and scribes and elders, after Jesus had been brought from Gethsemane, led Him away to the high priest, in whose residence they all assembled. This was an extraordinary meeting of the Sanhedrin. The Court sought evidence which would lead to the death of Jesus, but failed to find any that was reliable. Such evidence as they had was false and conflicting. Jesus' statement about the Temple was repeated and misconstrued. Then the high priest elicited from Him a declaration that He was the Messiah. This statement was decided to be blasphemy, and as a result He was judged worthy of death (Lev_24:16). After the verdict He was subjected to every insult. The death sentence had by law to be confirmed by Pilate before it could be carried out. In their eagerness they lost no time in bringing Him before Pilate's tribunal (Mar_15:1). The question was put by Pilate, 'Art thou the king of the Jews?'; to which Jesus answered, 'Thou sayest' (Mar_15:2). The chief priests, being permitted by Pilate to make their charges, brought many against Him; the accused, on being asked by Pilate if He had anything to say, was silent, and caused His judge to wonder. It happened that the feast of the Passover was at hand, and on such an occasion it was the custom to release a prisoner. The crowd which stood around called for the release of a certain Barabbas, a robber and murderer. Pilate proposed instead to release Jesus, knowing that hatred had been the motive of the high priests in handing Him over. The chief priests instigated the crowd to beg for Barabbas. Pilate then asked what they wished to be done with 'the king of the Jews,' and they said, 'Crucify him.' On being asked by Pilate what evil He had done, their only answer was to repeat the cry. Pilate, being anxious to please the crowd, gratified both their requests. Such is Mark's narrative of the trial, baldly stated. It is so very brief that it is not surprising that the other Evangelists have been able to add to it. Mark has nothing further to say about Pilate except to tell that Joseph of Arimathaea begged and obtained from him the body of Jesus (Mar_15:43).

(2) *Matthew* makes only two additions of any importance to this narrative. One is the warning message sent to Pilate, when seated on the tribunal, by his wife (Mat_27:19). The Character of the incident stamps it as a reliable tradition. The second is Pilate's washing of his hands after he had acquiesced in the decision of the Jews and the

wishes of the mob, and his proclamation of his innocence, followed by the Jews' invocation of the curse upon themselves and their children. At a later stage in the narrative, Matthew alone (Mat 27:62 ff.) gives the incident of the deputation to Pilate with the request for permission to seal the tomb, and the granting of that permission.

(3) *Luke*, at the beginning of the accusation before Pilate, mentions the charge (Luk 23:2): 'We found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar, and saying that he himself was an anointed king.' The first part of this charge is directly contrary to the truth (Mar 12:17 = Mat 22:21 = Luk 20:25). It is Lk. also who mentions (23:4-12) that when Pilate learned that Jesus was a Galilaean he sent Him to Herod, tetrarch of Galilee, to whose jurisdiction He belonged. Herod could elicit no answer from Jesus, and sent Him back to Pilate. This exchange of courtesy led to a renewal of the friendship between Pilate and Herod, which had been interrupted for some reason or other. On the return of Jesus, Pilate is represented as proclaiming His innocence and confirming it by the decision of Herod.

(4) *The Fourth Gospel* makes the following contributions to the story. The informal questioning by Annas (Joh 18:19-24) is special to Jn., which gives also (Joh 18:33-38) a much longer conversation between Jesus and Pilate than the others, in which Jesus explains the nature of His Kingdom. It is quite certain that Pilate realized that Jesus' Kingdom was not an ordinary kingdom, else his conduct of the case would have been entirely different. The section Joh 19:4-15 contains a further examination of Jesus, and the terrorizing of Pilate by the Jews. The Johannine account, as it is the fullest, is also the best. It explains what is obscure in the others, and brings the whole situation before us with startling vividness. John makes Pilate the author of the inscription on the cross, and mentions his repudiation of the Jewish criticism of its wording.

The situation was for Pilate an extremely difficult one. The Jews in authority were determined that Jesus should die. Assassination was impossible, because of the people. They were therefore compelled to resort to the governor's power. In order to get him to sign the warrant, they had to show that Jesus had committed a crime worthy of death. They had to select a charge which in their opinion would leave Pilate no option. They seized upon that of treason, a charge which brought death upon some of the most influential Roman citizens during that period, as the early books of Tacitus' *Annals* show. Pilate examined Jesus on this charge, and soon found that this was no case of treason. A strong man might have defied the provincials, and set Jesus at liberty. In doing so, he would have risked all his future prospects, perhaps his own life. The procurator was in reality only an upper servant of the Emperor, and as such could be dismissed and ruined without appeal. The Jews, when they saw that Roman justice might win and Jesus be released, held over Pilate the threat of a report to the

Emperor on his conduct. Pilate, as we have seen, was not a strong man. He yielded, though he knew the accused was innocent. It must be remembered that Jesus was not a Roman citizen, was, in fact, in the eyes of a Roman officer, merely a subject, a slave, a chattel. The life of a Roman citizen was precious, that of a mere subject worthless. That Pilate had a tender enough conscience or a sound enough idea of justice to try to save this 'slave,' should be remembered to his credit. He was not of the stuff of which heroes are made, though doubtless in many respects a competent governor.

Little is known of Pilate's later history. He used armed force to suppress a fanatical movement in Samaria, which does not appear to have endangered the Roman supremacy in the slightest (Josephus *Ant.* xviii. iv. 1). So many were put to death that the Samaritans appealed to Vitellius, the then governor of the province of Syria. The governor ordered Pilate to Rome, to appear before the Emperor's council. Before he reached Rome, Tiberius had died. The result of this no doubt was that he escaped trial. Of his further career nothing is certainly known, but legend has naturally not neglected one of the most interesting figures of NT history. In the *Gospel of Peter*, which belongs probably to the middle of the 2nd cent., he is represented in a very favourable light; the author shows also anti-Jewish tendencies. As the fragment of this Gospel is put together almost entirely from the canonical Gospels, it yields in interest to another apocryphal work—the *Acts of Pilate*. In the 2nd cent. the Church began to busy itself with its own history, and to build up a defence of its faith and practice on a historical foundation. The person of Pilate was a subject of special interest, and was pressed into the service of the Church as a valuable witness to the truth of Christianity. In the *Acts of Pilate* he is acquitted of all blame, and represented as in the end confessing Jesus to be the Son of God (ch. 46). It was widely believed in ancient times that an official account of the trial of Jesus was sent by Pilate to the Emperor Tiberius and preserved in the archives at Rome. It is not impossible that such a report was sent; but this at least we can say with certainty, there is no real evidence of its existence or its use to be found in any apocryphal writing. Justin in his (first) *Apology* (chs. 35, 48) refers more than once to the *Acts under Pontius Pilate*. The *Acts of Pilate (Gospel of Nicodemus)* which we possess, however, with kindred pieces, is not of earlier date than the 4th or 5th century. Tertullian in his *Apology* (ch. 21) speaks of the report of Pilate to Tiberius as containing an account of the miracles, condemnation, crucifixion, and resurrection of Jesus, with the story of the guard at the grave. There still exists in various ancient works (e.g. *Acts of Peter and Paul*) a so-called *Letter of Pilate to Claudius (or Tiberius)*, which, though possibly interpolated at a later date, gives an impression of real antiquity, and is no doubt the document referred to by Tertullian. As to the date of it nothing can be said, except that it is older than 197 a.d., the date of the *Apology* of Tertullian: it was probably written in Greek originally, though it is extant also in Latin. Tertullian says (*Apol.* 5) that Tiberius, as the result of a communication

from Palestine, proposed to the Roman Senate that Jesus should be recognized as a god, but that the Senate rejected the motion. He further states that the Emperor held by his intention, and punished those who accused the Christians. All this must be regarded as pure legend.

Tradition has it that Pilate fell on evil days after the death of Tiberius, and ultimately committed suicide (Euseb. *Historia Ecclesiastica* ii. 7, and also in his *Chronicle*). Another account has it that he was beheaded by Tiberius' order, but that he repented before his death. His wife is commonly reported to have become a Christian, on the strength, no doubt, of the warning which St. Matthew records that she gave to her husband. It is told that Pilate appeared before the Emperor to stand his trial, wearing the tunic of Jesus, and that this tunic acted as a charm to protect him from the anger of his Imperial master. His body is said to have been first thrown into the Tiber, but the evil spirits so haunted the spot as to terrorize the populous neighbourhood, and it was conveyed to Vienne in the South of France and sunk in the Rhone. Here also the evil spirits proved troublesome, and the body was removed to the territory of Lausanne in Switzerland, where it was sunk and walled up in a deep pit surrounded by mountains. The best known legend connects itself with that country, and the mountain still known as Pilatus. The corpse is said to rest in a lake on the mountain side, whence it comes forth periodically and goes through the act of washing its hands. The Coptic Church reveres Pilate as a saint and martyr (June 25th).

Literature.—The Part. 'Pilate' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible contains a very full bibliography. A few works only are mentioned here; G. A. Müller, *Pontius Pilatus der fünfte Prokurator von Judäa* (Stuttgart, 1888); A. Taylor Innes, *Trial of Jesus Christ: a Legal Monograph* (Edinburgh, 1899); G. Rosadi, *The Trial of Jesus* (London, 1905); F. W. Robertson, *Serm.* 1st ser. 292 ff.; *Expositor*, ii. viii. [1884] 107, vi. ii. [1900] 59; J. B. Lightfoot, *Serm. in St. Paul's Cathedral*, 91; W. B. Carpenter, *The Son of Man*, 33; W. H. Simcox, *The Cessation of Prophecy*, 287; J. H. Moulton, *Visions of Sin*, 185; for the early apocryphal literature, see R. A. Lipsius, *Die Pilatus-Akten kritisch untersucht* (1871); F. C. Conybeare, 'Acta Pilati' in *Stud. Bibl. et Eccles.* vol. iv. pp. 59-132 (Oxford, 1896); E. Hennecke, *Neutest. Apokryphen*, pp. 74-76 (Tübingen and Leipzig, 1904), and *Handbuch z. neutest. Apokr.* p. 143 ff. (Tübingen and Leipzig, 1904).

Alex. Souter.

PILGRIM.—1. Although the word is not found in the Gospels, they constantly indicate the place of the annual pilgrimages in the life and thought of the people. There is always an air of movement over the scenes, and a frequent change of setting in the lives of the men and women; they are constantly moving to and fro as the festivals come round. The parents of Jesus kept this custom, and at the age of twelve Jesus made with them His first (?) pilgrimage (Luk 2:41-49). In the Fourth Gospel there are many references to other visits to the feasts (Joh 2:13; Joh 5:1; Joh 7:14; Joh 10:22; Joh 11:55-56). No mention is made of them in the Synoptic Gospels; but it may safely be assumed that Jesus had often made the journey to Jerusalem with the caravans of pilgrims (cf. Mat 23:37). The custom explains the rapidity with which news spread; the name of Jesus had become a familiar word in such places as Jericho on the main route (Luk 18:37-38). The last journey to Jerusalem was made among pilgrims. There is an implied contrast where it is said that Jesus went in silence before His disciples; pilgrims marched with song and rejoicing (Psa 42:4), but silence and fear marked the disciples (Mar 10:32). The multitudes who hailed Jesus as He entered Jerusalem included many Galilaeen pilgrims, not without a certain local pride (Mat 21:9, Joh 12:12). The rejection of Jesus by the Samaritan village (Luk 17:11-12) was due to their knowledge that Jesus and His band, though taking the less familiar route, were pilgrims to the hated Jerusalem (Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah* [abridged ed. of *LT [Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].]*], p. 297). In estimating the rapid progress of the Christian faith, especially amongst the Dispersion, it must be remembered that many strangers, such as Simon of Cyrene (Luk 23:26), would be at the feast, and would carry away some knowledge to prepare their minds for the Apostolic message.

2. These pilgrim experiences illustrate some of the words of Jesus. The disciple must travel through the world with heart detached and his treasure laid up in heaven (Luk 12:33, Mat 6:19). His must be the straitened way, not the broad path (Mat 7:13); to follow in the way he must give up all (Mar 10:29, Mat 19:29). In their missionary journeys the disciples have the equipment and the mobility of pilgrims (Mat 10:9 etc.). The would-be disciple must expect to be homeless (Mat 8:20). The disciples are to be sojourners who guard against the dangers of an alien world from which they must be detached (cf. Heb 11:13, 1Pe 2:11, where the word ‘pilgrim’ [περιδημος] is used). In the Fourth Gospel Jesus denies (Joh 4:21) that the annual pilgrimage will be an abiding necessity. Everywhere He speaks of Himself as sojourning in the world for a Divine purpose (Joh 8:14, Joh 16:28, Joh 13:37); the disciples must so look upon their life (Joh 12:35, Joh 17:16). They are in the world, but not of it (Joh 17:15-18, Joh 15:19); their true home would be in God. But even in their earthly life they would be in one of the mansions (μοναι) of the Father’s house (Joh 14:2). At intervals along the road stood the caravanserais where travellers

lodged. The disciples were like travellers, and His companionship had hitherto cheered them. Now He must leave them that He might go forward; but when they arrived He would be waiting for them. (See D. Smith, *The Days of His Flesh*, p. 449). To complete the thought of life as a pilgrimage, it is to be remembered that the journey is through the outlying parts of the Father's Kingdom to the centre. See, further, art. Feasts.

Literature.—Josephus *BJ* vi. ix. 3; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] n. [Note: note.] ii. 51, 220; Farrar, *Life of Christ*, ch. vi.; A. S. Laidlaw, 'The Priest and the Pilgrim' in *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times.*] xi. (1900) 345.

E. Shillito.

Pillow

PILLOW.—Mar_4:38 ἐπὶ τὸ προσκεφάλαιον καθεύδων, Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'the cushion.' The Gr. word occurs in LXX Septuagint, Eze_13:18-20 (probably 'fillets' used as amulets, A. B. Davidson, *Ezekiel*, 89), 1Es_3:8 (pillow of Darius). Originally it meant a pillow *for the head*, but it came to be used for any cushion (cf. the English use of 'kerchief,' originally a covering *for the head*, as found in 'neckerchief,' 'handkerchief'). Pollux (*Onomast.* x. 40) says that the poet Cratinus, in his *Horæ*, used it of the sailor's cushion (τὸ ναυτικὸν ὑπηρέσιον); and Hesychius, s.v. ποτίκρανον, further defines it as 'the leathern cushion (τὸ δερμάτικον ὑπηρέσιον) on which the rowers sit.'

'To mitigate the roughness of the beams or other seats, every rower was provided with a cushion, which he carried about with him from ship to ship' (Cecil Torr, *Ancient Ships*, 47). The following passage in the *Stratitotai* (v.) of the poet Hermippus illustrates this; 'Tis time now to come along with me, taking the rowlocks and a cushion, that leaping on board thou mayest ply the dashing oar.'

Little is known about fishing-boats in the time of our Lord (Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, Ext. Vol. 367^b; *Encyc. Bibl.* iv. 4481; Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* iii. 1285). The fishermen's belongings mentioned in the Gospels are the boat itself (Luk_5:3, Joh_21:3), with the accompanying small boat (Joh_21:8), the two kinds of nets (Mat_4:18; Mat_13:47), the hook (Luk_17:37), the baskets (Mat_13:48), the fisher's coat (Joh_21:7), and the cushion. It is clear that the condition of the fishermen of the Lake of Gennesaret was considerably removed from one of absolute poverty; we have other evidences of this in Mar_1:20 ('the hired servants'), Luk_8:3,

Mar_15:40 f. (Salome, one of those who ‘ministered of their substance’), Joh_19:27 (cf. *Speaker’s Com.* i. 203, ii. 276); Josephus *Vita*, 33, *BJ* iii. x. 1.

The τὸ before προσκεφάλαιον seems to imply that the cushion was one of the ordinary articles of the boat’s furniture, while its position ‘in the stern’ suggests that the disciples were in the habit of resting on it by turns during the night fishing (Luk_5:5, Joh_21:3). It is, therefore, not probable that it had been placed there specially for our Lord’s accommodation. On starting to cross the lake, He seated Himself on ‘the cushion in the stern’; and there, being wearied with prolonged teaching, He soon fell into a sleep so profound that not even the tumult of the elements was sufficient to disturb it. ‘Sleep is attributed to our Lord in this context only; but it is probably implied in Mar_1:35, and in passages which describe His vigils as if they were exceptional’ (Swete, *St. Mark*, 85). Bushnell compares in a striking way the sleep of Adam in Paradise with that of Jesus in the storm (*Christ and His Salvation*, 127). See also art. Cushion.

Literature.—Stephanus, *Thesaurus Græcæ Linguæ* (ed. Hase and Dindorf); Cecil Torr, *Ancient Ships*, 1895; Hastings’ and other *Bible Dictionaries*.

James Donald.

⚡Pinnacle

PINNACLE occurs only in Mat_4:5 || Luk_4:9. The word (πτερόγιον) so rendered means ‘a little wing,’ and refers to some lofty point about the Temple, from which Jesus is said to have been invited by the tempter to cast Himself down. The word used for ‘temple’ in both passages (ιερόν) denotes the whole enclosure, and not merely the Temple building proper (ναός). The ‘pinnacle’ may therefore be sought for anywhere within the Temple precincts. It is evident, from the use of the phrase ‘*the* pinnacle of the temple,’ that there was a definite point well known by this name when the Evangelists wrote; but now we are in some uncertainty as to where it was situated. Some understand the apex of the roof of the Temple building to be meant. Others suggest the roof of Solomon’s Porch, on the east side of the Temple area. But if ‘the pinnacle’ was not the summit of the Temple proper, the most likely position for it is the battlement of the Royal Portico, which ran from east to west across the south end of the enclosure, on the precipitous edge of a deep valley. Josephus (*Ant.* xv. xi. 5) says of this portico: ‘While the valley was very deep, and its bottom could not be seen if you looked from above into the depth, this further vastly high elevation of the

cloister stood upon that height, insomuch that if any one looked down from the top of the battlements, or down both these altitudes, he would be giddy, while his sight could not reach to such an immense depth.' By 'both these altitudes,' it need hardly be said, Josephus means the height of the precipice plus the height of the portico which crowned it. As the top of the portico, according to Josephus, was 100 feet above the pavement, the drop from this elevation to the bottom of the Kidron Valley would be about 300 feet; and if 'the pinnacle,' as some suppose, was a turret or spire at the eastern end, marking the south-east corner of the enclosure, then its height would have to be added to this vertical distance.

The Church historian Hegesippus (a.d. 160), as quoted by Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* ii. 23), gives an account of the death of James the Lord's brother, who, he says, was cast down by the Jews from the pinnacle of the Temple (ναός—the Temple proper). If this statement were reliable, it would be decisive in favour of the first supposition mentioned above; but the accuracy of the whole story is doubtful, and it may be questioned whether Hegesippus, writing nearly a century after the destruction of the Temple, knew any better than we do where 'the pinnacle' really was. There is still, therefore, a choice of views. On the one hand, the apex of the Temple proper would undoubtedly be the loftiest point of the whole group of buildings. On the other hand, the battlement of the Royal Portico would afford the deepest and sheerest fall, and, on the whole, it is most probable that 'the pinnacle' was situated here.

James Patrick.

☞ Pipe

PIPE (αὐλῆω).—The verb is found only in the Gospels ([Mat_11:17](#) || [Luk_7:32](#)), where the children say: 'We have piped unto you and ye have not danced.' The noun αὐλός is found in [1Co_14:7](#). The pipe was a wind instrument. It was perforated with two, three, or four holes, and was either single or double. The single form was played vertically or horizontally; in the latter case the word 'flute' would be a better rendering. The single instrument was played with two hands, the double with one hand for each pipe. Its range was naturally limited, its music monotonous. The word 'ûgâb, also translation by Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'pipe,' in the Targums was an instrument of similar structure, and has been translated by the Vulgate *organum* and Authorized Version 'organ' ([Gen_4:21](#), [Job_21:12](#); [Job_30:31](#), [Psa_150:4](#)).

☒ Pit

PIT (βόθυνος, φρέατο).—In the Gospels βόθυνος is used only of a place into which animals or men might stumble by accident (Mat 12:11), or in consequence of blindness (Mat 15:14, Luk 6:39, Authorized Version ‘ditch,’ but Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘pit’). This might mean any opening or hollow dug in the ground. In Luk 14:5 || Mat 12:11, however, φρέατο is used, so that here we should, perhaps, understand ‘pit’ as an empty cistern, or artificial well. These are seldom covered in the East or guarded in any way. In the neighbourhood of towns and villages, especially those that have fallen on decay, they are often the cause of serious accidents to unwary pedestrians. In the Apocalypse φρέατο appears as the bottomless abode of ‘the beast’ and his unholy hosts (Rev 9:1; Rev 17:8 etc.).

W. Ewing.

☒ Pitcher

PITCHER (κεράμιον).—An earthenware jar with one or two handles, used chiefly by women for carrying water (Gen 24:15, Jdg 7:16, כִּי; Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 and Authorized Version ‘pitcher’). The only occurrence of the word in the Gospels is in Mar 14:13 || Luk 22:10, in the directions given by our Lord for securing a room for the Paschal meal. It has been alleged (*Speak. Com. Luk 22:10* note) that the sign of the pitcher was not so accidental as it appears. ‘According to Jewish usage, on the evening of the 13th [of the month Nisan], before the stars appeared in heaven, every father of a family was to go to the well to draw pure water, with which the unleavened bread was kneaded. It was a real rite which they performed...’ But apart altogether from the chronological inaccuracy,—the disciples must have entered Jerusalem early in the day (Mar 14:17, Mat 26:20),—this statement is not confirmed by Mar 14:14 and Luk 22:11, from which it may be inferred that the head of the house, who has been identified in turn with John Mark, Joseph of Arimathaea, and Nicodemus, is not the bearer of the pitcher.

There is, however, presumptive evidence that the pitcher was being used in the preparation of the unleavened bread, the making of which, together with the putting

away of leaven from the houses, was part of the work in which many hundreds in Jerusalem (Josephus *BJ* vi. ix. 3) must have been employed on that day; but the demand for water for ordinary purposes alone will suggest the inference that in a city whose population was so enormously increased, the pitcher borne by this slave could not be distinctive.

Whatever the probability of recognizing or of not recognizing the sign, the most important feature of the whole incident remains unaffected. For all time the pitcher will be a sign not of the need for secrecy and sealed orders, nor even of the prescience of Christ, though that is abundantly proved, but rather of the faith of the two disciples. Here also is presented a beautiful illustration of the co-operation of the human will with the Divine, the overruling of common events for Divine ends, a demonstration of the power that is laid under service to faith. Blessing in the ordinary affairs of life, as in the greatest crises of the soul, is attainable only by implicit and unquestioning confidence in the Master mind.

Literature.—Art. ‘Pitcher’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible ; S. Cox, *Expositions*, iv. 321; the Commentaries on the Gospels, *ad locc.*; the various *Lives of Christ*.

Alex. A. Duncan.

Pity

PITY.—This word occurs once in the Gospels (Mat 18:33 Authorized Version) as translation of ἐλεέω apparently in accordance with the practice of the translators ‘that we have not ‘tied ourselves to an uniformity of phrasing or to an identity of words,’ since the same word ἐλεέω is rendered by ‘have **compassion**’ in the verse immediately before, as elsewhere.

1. *In the Synoptic Gospels* four different words occur which carry with them the notion of ‘pity’ or ‘compassion’: σπλαγχνίζομαι (σπλάγχνα), ἐλεέω (ἔλεος and ἐλεήμων συλλυπέομαι, and οἰκτίρωμαι.

Of these, the first three are used with reference to Jesus: (1) σπλαγχνίζομαι, ‘moved with compassion,’ found in Mat 9:36; Mat 14:14; Mat 15:32; Mat 18:27, Mar 1:41; Mar 6:34; Mar 8:2, Luk 7:13; (2) ἐλεέω, used in Mar 5:19 by our Lord Himself to describe His own work in the cure of the demoniac, ‘and hath had compassion on

thee,' καὶ ἤλεθεν σε; (3) συλλυαέομαι, Mar 3:5, translation 'being grieved (for the hardness of their hearts).' The word occurs nowhere else in NT, but is used by Herodotus and elsewhere with the significance of having pity or compassion (see Liddell and Scott).

By their usage in these passages the Synoptics plainly declare that in His manifestation of human nature our Saviour was drawn towards suffering humanity by that Divine gift of pity which has ever been regarded as one of the higher feelings: sickness, sorrow, being like tired sheep, even bodily hunger, filled Him with compassion for the suffering ones,—while in the solitary use of συλλυπέομαι alluded to above to describe His feeling at the unwillingness of men to receive truth, we can hardly hesitate to give to the word its classical meaning of 'pity,' when we remember the outburst of weeping which accompanied His wail over Jerusalem (Luk 19:41). And while Himself manifesting forth pity towards men and inculcating the same feeling on His disciples, He also most clearly taught them to think of His Father in heaven as One moved with compassion for His earthly family. The 'tender mercy of our God' in the *Benedictus* (Luk 1:78) is the thought illustrated in the parable of the Good Samaritan, who was 'moved with compassion' (ἐσπλαγχνίσθη) at the sight of the wounded man (Luk 10:33); as in that of the king who forgave the debtor, being 'moved with compassion' (σπλαγχνισθείς, Mat 18:27); and even more strikingly so in the description of the father of the Prodigal, who, when he saw his son returning, ἐσπλαγχνίσθη καὶ δαμαδὸν ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ (Luk 15:20). So also the solitary use of οἰκτιρῶν in the Gospels (used again only in Jam 5:11) is found in our Saviour's exhortation, 'Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful'; γίνεσθε οἰκτιρῶνες καθὼς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτιρῶν ἐστὶ (Luk 6:36).

It is true that in speaking of God as the 'Merciful One' our Saviour was repeating what is a familiar thought in the OT, רַחוּם, 'compassionate,' is there used exclusively as an epithet of God (Deu 4:31), while in Sir 50:19 we already find the simple רַחוּם as a name of God (see Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 204); but in our Saviour's teaching we recognize a new fulness and meaning in the thought that would have been impossible for men to grasp before He came who could say, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father' (Joh 14:9).

2. The teaching of St. John's Gospel.—It is striking that in St. John's Gospel we never find any word used which conveys the meaning of 'pity' or 'compassion'; Christ is never described as 'merciful' or as 'showing mercy,' nor does He so speak of the

Father; while even the exhortation to mercy as a duty of man to man is not found there.

Can we give a reason for this? or is the omission purely accidental? We believe the reason is found in the fact that in St. John's mind the thought of 'pity' is absorbed in that of 'love.'

To St. John was given the task of presenting the life of Christ upon earth in all its eternal meaning. The human idea of pity, as a feeling called forth by man's needs, is but one manifestation of love. St. John does not stop to show that Jesus Christ both pitied and also loved men, but in passing at once to the thought of love as the bond of union between God and man manifested forth in the Saviour's life upon earth, he naturally ascribes to it those actions that the Saviour's contemporaries had felt as acts of mercy. As an illustration of this, we may take the story of the raising of Lazarus. Here is a miracle performed for those who knew more of Christ than merely that 'He pitied them.' The familiar cry for help, found so often in the first three Gospels (ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς), is not the message sent by the sisters, but instead, it is a direct appeal to love—'He whom thou lovest is sick' (Joh 11:3). The delay in giving the prompt relief which pity would ask for is explained by 'Now Jesus loved Martha and her sister and Lazarus' (Joh 11:5). At the sight of the sorrow of those about Him we are told 'Jesus wept'; but the Evangelist apparently hastened to add the remark of the Jews, 'Behold how he loved him,' that the thought of His love should even here swallow up that of mere pity. And this fuller presentation of Christ's feelings for men, he shows, had also been accompanied by a teaching of Christ, both as regards man's duty to his fellow and also God's attitude towards the world, which went far beyond what had been already recorded in the Synoptic Gospels. St. Luke had preserved the saying, 'Be ye therefore merciful,' but St. John was the first to record how his Master had taught, 'A new commandment give I unto you, That ye love one another as I have loved you' (Joh 13:34).

Christians had already in their hands the teaching of Christ which spoke of God as the 'Merciful One,' but now St. John records words which tell them not of a merciful God, but of a loving Father (Joh 3:16; Joh 14:23 etc.). It is true that even this conception of God is found in the OT, but a perusal of the passages in which 'the love of God,' or God as 'loving,' are spoken of, will show that such are always equivalent to the 'pity' of God, or God as 'pitiful,'—that is, in direct relationship to man as a needy creature. In the Fourth Gospel, however, the thought is altogether different: the Father loves men with the same love with which He loves the Son (Joh 17:26); that same feeling of real affection with which Christ had let them feel He regarded them, He taught them was also the feeling of His Father towards them (Joh 14:21; Joh 14:23, Joh 16:26 f.). The common bond of fellowship between Christ and the Father and

between man and God through the Son was the power of the Divine love (Joh 17:26). But whatever doubt may exist as to the meaning of the omission of the thought of pity in this Gospel, its very omission leads us to see how St. John supplies what might be felt as a want, in the first three Gospels, in another particular.

How are men to think of that pitiful, gracious Saviour who in His own life was so sorely tried and afflicted? *Now nowhere in the Gospels*—nor indeed in any passage of the NT—is Christ presented to men as an object of pity. The thought that seems to underlie the words of some well-known hymns, and even Isaiah 53, is not found in the NT. Pity is the demand for help, and as an object of our help Christ never appealed to men. On the contrary, He said to the women, ‘Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me’ (Luk 23:28); and to the disciple Peter, ‘Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?’ (Mat 26:53). To the Father alone He cries, ‘If it be possible, let this cup pass from me’ (Mat 26:39). But if we are not allowed to pity the suffering Saviour, are we to view His passion with indifference? St. John clearly and abundantly answers this question. While the mystery of pain is not revealed, the message of the Saviour’s agony is declared to be the proof to mankind of His and His Father’s love. ‘Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends’ (Joh 15:13). That love manifested in dying is the same love spoken of in Joh 3:16, Joh 16:27, Joh 17:26.

It may well be doubted if any presentation of the Passion which moves our pity is in accordance with the Gospel (see, for a strong indictment against such, Ruskin’s *Lectures on Art*, ii. §§ 56, 57); but even if we hesitate to accept this, we must confess that unless we are led through pity to understand love, the message of pity has failed. ‘We must look through the suffering to the triumph.... The crucifix with the dead Christ obscures our faith. Our thoughts rest not upon a dead, but upon a living Christ. The closed eye and the bowed head are not the true marks of Him who reigns from the Cross, who teaches us to see through every sign of weakness the fulfilment of His own words, *I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself*’ (Westcott, *The Victory of the Cross*, vi., which see throughout).

Literature.—Trench, *NT Synon.*⁸ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 160 ff., 361; Westcott on Heb 10:28; Lightfoot on Php 1:8; Php 2:1; Liddell and Scott, s.vv.; also Maclear on Mar 3:5 (*Cambr. Bible for Schools*); Butler, *Serm.* v. vi.; T. G. Selby, *The God of the Frail* (1902) p. 1.

J. B. Bristow.

☒ Place Of Toll

PLACE OF TOLL.—See Receipt of Custom.

☒ Plague

PLAGUE.—The word ‘plague’ is used in the Gospels to render the Greek word μάστιξ, which means a whip or scourge (cf. Act 22:24, Heb 11:36). In the Apocalypse the word πλῆγη, from which the English word is formed, is exclusively used. In the Gospels the word occurs only four times (Mar 3:10; Mar 5:29; Mar 5:34 and Luk 7:21). In each of these passages it is used of distressing bodily disease, and carries the implication that such afflictions are Divine chastisements. The word is therefore used in a figurative sense, and there is no reference to the bubonic disease which is the scourge of India to-day. See art. Disease.

W. W. Holdsworth.

☒ Plan

PLAN

1. *Did Jesus enter on His ministry with a deliberate plan?*—If so, what was its nature, and how far was it subsequently modified by the pressure of events? These questions, of the first importance for a right understanding of the Gospel story, are doubly complicated by the insufficiency of our records and by the mystery in which our Lord’s self-consciousness is shrouded.

The Fourth Evangelist, looking back on the Saviour’s life when it had now receded into the distance, sees in it, from first to last, the unfolding of a vast design. He represents Jesus as bending outward circumstances to His will, and moving forward, without haste and without rest, towards the set ‘hour’ in which His purpose would fulfil itself. He assumes, in like manner, that the future development of the Church was foreseen and directed by Jesus Himself. All had happened in accordance with a Divine plan, already determined on before the Word became flesh. This Johannine view is largely the result of theological reflexion, but it also arises in part from a feeling which still impresses itself on every reader of the Gospel narrative. There is a harmony and completeness in this Life by which it is distinguished from all others. The

events appear to follow each other in inevitable sequence, as if they had all been ordered beforehand in a conscious plan.

It cannot be assumed, however, that this inward necessity which we now discern in the life of Jesus was clearly present to His own mind. Such an assumption seems to be precluded by the prayer in Gethsemane, which appears to imply that our Lord was uncertain, almost to the very end, of the Father's will concerning Him. The absolute faith in God which finds its highest expression in that prayer was at all times the chief motive in the life of Jesus. In the face of a great darkness He surrendered Himself utterly to the will of God, assured that it would lead Him wisely. Whatever may have been the programme which He had set before Him, He was prepared at any moment to change or abandon it, if God should so direct Him. This must always be borne in mind in any attempt to discover His inward purposes. The dogmatic conception that Jesus knew the end from the beginning, and gave mechanical fulfilment to a prearranged plan, is not only untrue to facts, but destroys the whole moral worth and significance of the Divine life.

At the same time it is at least equally unwarrantable to construe the life as nothing but the unforeseen result of fortuitous circumstances. It has been argued from the notices which describe the beginning of the ministry (and more particularly from Mat_4:17), that Jesus at the outset had no distinctive plan. As a disciple of John, He took up the Baptist's work after he had been cast into prison, and awoke gradually to a new conception of the Kingdom of God and to a sense of His own special calling. According to this view, His Messianic work was in a manner thrust upon Him, and was never followed out deliberately except perhaps for a brief season at the very close. Granting, however, that the appearance of John may, have given the immediate impulse to the ministry of Jesus, we have no ground for supposing that it, in any sense, produced it. The connexion between John and Jesus appears to have been at most a casual one. There is no indication that the two teachers ever met before the Baptism, and John's, imprisonment must have followed almost immediately afterwards. From the beginning, moreover, the contrast between the work of Jesus and that of John was the subject of common remark. It was recognized that the new Teacher was not merely continuing the movement of His predecessor, but had begun another movement, different in its aim and character. The facts of the narrative all bear out the only conjecture which is psychologically probable, that Jesus in His years of retirement had already planned out an independent mission. What He owed to the Baptist was merely the occasion of declaring Himself and carrying His purpose into action.

2. We assume, then, that Jesus took up His ministry deliberately, with a programme, more or less definite, already formed in His mind. *Was the Messianic claim an original*

part of this programme? We have here the crucial issue on which the whole question of the plan of Jesus may be said to hinge.

That Jesus declared Himself the Messiah is established beyond all doubt by the fact of His trial and crucifixion. The process against Him can admit of no other explanation than that He had laid open claim to the Messianic office. It has been maintained, however, by several modern writers (e.g. A. Réville) that this claim was an after-thought. The first intention of Jesus was, they say, simply to proclaim the Kingdom of God; and the assumption of Messiahship was forced upon Him by the failure of His original message. In order to retrieve His declining cause, He consented, though against His will, to bring it into line with the national hope, and appeared in Jerusalem as the declared Messiah.

It may indeed be accepted as one of the most certain results of the modern study of the Gospels, that in the earlier part of His ministry Jesus was silent regarding His Messianic claim. But the evidence is almost conclusive that He only held it in reserve, and intended from the first to make it. (1) The Messianic hope was inseparably bound up with the idea of the Kingdom of God.' From the moment that He knew Himself called by God to inaugurate the Kingdom, Jesus must have recognized His title to the office of Messiah. No other form was possible, under Jewish modes of thought, by which He might express to Himself His own relation to the Kingdom. (2) The accounts of His earliest teaching all lay stress on the *authority* with which He spoke, reflecting in His manner of utterance the consciousness of a unique personal dignity (Mat 7:29, Mar 1:27). This sense of authority is especially marked in the Sermon on the Mount, with its repeated 'I say unto you.' It seems evident that even while confining Himself to the rôle of teacher, Jesus was fully aware that He was much more. As yet He made no open claim to the place of Messiah, but the knowledge that it belonged to Him coloured His whole action and thought. (3) At Caesarea Philippi, when He at last broke the silence, He elicited a spontaneous confession from His disciples. If the incident has been rightly reported (and few passages in the Gospels bear stronger marks of authenticity), we are compelled to infer that, while concealing His claim, He had only been waiting till the disciples should recognize it of themselves. In His previous intercourse with them He had been leading them, step by step, to this final recognition. His choice of the title 'Son of Man' may have been determined by a like motive. The title was ambiguous, and did not necessarily involve the more explicit title; but it served to awaken reflexion, and to prepare the way for the definite claim to Messiahship.

We are justified, therefore, in concluding that Jesus intended from the first to declare Himself, and that His silence was part of His deliberate plan. The two chief motives that weighed with Him can be gathered, almost with certainty, from the whole tenor of the Gospel narrative. (1) He had resolved on a method of working

which would have been impossible if the people had immediately known Him as the Messiah. The Kingdom, as He conceived it, was a spiritual magnitude, and He could fulfil it only by effecting an inward change in the hearts and minds of men. As Messiah, He would have been committed at once to action of a conspicuous nature, and could never have pursued His work of teaching, healing, comforting. The story of the Temptation, which probably rests on some authentic communication of Jesus to His disciples, represents Him as choosing between the two methods of activity which were open to Him at the outset. He decided to trust Himself to the purely spiritual forces, and His silence was the necessary consequence of this decision. (2) He desired to rid the Messianic idea of the national and political character with which the popular imagination had invested it. By assuming the title prematurely He would have awakened false hopes and exposed His mission to a fatal misapprehension. It was necessary, first of all, to create a new ideal in the mind of the people by the revelation of His own character and life. When they had learned to replace their worldly conception of the Messiah by a truer and more spiritual one, He would be able to declare Himself. It was this that happened at last in the case of His immediate followers. Through their intercourse with Jesus they had attained to a higher knowledge of the Divine purposes, and recognized in Him the true Messiah. But 'he charged them that they should tell no man of him' (Mar 8:30). The nation as a whole was engrossed with its hope of a political deliverer, and was still incapable of receiving His secret.

Thus far we can regard our Lord as acting consistently on a plan, formed, most probably, before He commenced His public ministry. He knew Himself to be the Messiah, but had determined to conceal His claim until His teaching and His personal influence should produce a change in the minds of His countrymen. It is difficult, however, to avoid the conclusion that from Caesarea Philippi onward His original plan was set aside. Instead of continuing His chosen work until the whole people should spontaneously confess Him as His own disciples had done, He resolved to go up to Jerusalem and proclaim Himself openly at the Passover feast. That this was the express purpose of His journey to Jerusalem is indicated in the two symbolic acts by which He marked His arrival—the solemn entrance in fulfilment of an unmistakable prophecy (Zec 9:9), and the cleansing of the Temple by right of His Messianic prerogative. The abrupt transition from a consistent reserve to a studied publicity can be accounted for only on the ground that He had entirely changed His plan. It had become evident to Him that the expectation with which He started had missed its fulfilment. The people, so far from responding to His message, had settled into a mood of apathy or even of declared hostility. There was no longer any purpose in maintaining silence, and He determined to assert Himself at the great gathering of the nation, and bring His Messianic work to a final issue.

3. A question rises here of the profoundest interest and importance. *When our Lord decided on this second plan, did He fully realize that it would involve His sacrificial death?* To this question we can offer no definite answer. That He contemplated the possibility of His death at Jerusalem appears certain. Apart from the actual statement that He foretold the end to His disciples (Mar_8:31; Mar_9:31; Mar_10:32 ff.),—a statement which may be influenced by later reflexion,—we cannot doubt that He knew the temper of the national authorities, and consciously hazarded His life. His teaching also in that closing period assumes a new character. He no longer speaks of the Kingdom as immediately at hand, but prepares His disciples for an indefinite delay. He dwells much on the thought that whatever may befall Himself, the triumph of His work is certain. But while He surmised, with an ever clearer conviction, that the assertion of His Messiahship would involve His death, it does not appear that He chose death deliberately as necessary to His plan. We may rather infer, from the prayer in Gethsemane, that up to the very end He entertained the possibility of a different fulfilment. This only can be affirmed with entire certainty: that He was resolved to pursue His vocation to the very uttermost, leaving the manner of its final accomplishment in the hands of God.

4. We have dealt hitherto with our Lord's plan as it concerned His personal life and calling; but there is a further problem which cannot well be separated from this one. *How did He intend that His work should be completed?* How far did He contemplate the world-wide extension of the Christian community after His death? The answer must largely depend on the interpretation of His idea of the Kingdom of God, which is still in many points obscure. If He believed (as is maintained by Bousset, J. Weiss, and other recent writers) that the Kingdom would come almost immediately by a sudden act of God, there could be no anticipation in His mind of the gradual development of a Christian Church. If (as appears more probable) He allowed room for an interval, more or less protracted, before the dawning of the Kingdom, we have still to question whether He planned a development on the lines which were actually followed. The direct allusions to the Church (Mat_16:18; Mat_18:17) bear evident traces of later modification, and it would be hazardous to employ them as the basis of any theory. More consideration is due to the sayings (Mat_8:11-12; Mat_21:43) which foretell the rejection of Israel and the opening of the Kingdom to those of every nation who were worthy of it. Such thoughts may well have been present to the mind of Jesus, especially in the later days, when the hostility of His own countrymen became more and more decided. It seems clear, however, from numerous indications in the Gospels, that His original plan was confined to a mission to Israel. He chose twelve disciples, with obvious reference to the number of the tribes (cf. Mat_19:28 = Luk_22:30). He hesitated to exercise His healing power in the Gentile province, lest He might exceed the limits of His mission (Mar_7:27). He charged His disciples to avoid the Gentile and Samaritan cities and confine themselves to the 'lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Mat_10:5-6). These indications are all sufficiently explicit; and

they are confirmed by the actual history of the primitive Church. Peter and his fellow-Apostles, on the day of Pentecost and long afterwards, were still unaware that their Master desired them to proclaim His message to the wider Gentile world. The mission of Paul was a grave departure from the accepted programme, and was sanctioned only after long and anxious deliberation, and under strict conditions. It could hardly have been so regarded if the disciples had known that such a mission had been contemplated from the first, in the plan of Jesus Himself.

We can only conclude that our Lord made no definite provision for the establishment of an outward Church and its world-wide extension. He delivered His message to His own people, and formed no clear design of a work that should embrace all men. None the less He had entirely broken with Jewish particularism. Even the Messianic title, as claimed by Him, assumed a new meaning in which the traditional patriotic idea was wholly lost. His message was in its spirit universal, and made appeal to that which is permanent and central in our common nature. Whether He consciously planned the future expansion of His Church is not, therefore, a matter of the first importance. He gave the impulse which could not but result after His departure in the work of St. Paul, and in a missionary enterprise which can never know pause or limit. The inward purpose of Jesus, if not His express commandment, is rightly summed up in the closing words of St. Matthew's Gospel: 'Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations.'

Literature.—Besides the many *Lives of Jesus* (e.g. Keim, A. Réville, O. Holtzmann), the following are among the most useful recent books: Baldensperger, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu* (1891); J. Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes* (1900); Bousset, *Jesus* (1904, English translation 1905); O. Schmiedel, *Die Hauptprobleme der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*; T. Adamson, *Studies of the Mind in Christ*, 233; ii. Bushnell, *The New Life*, p. 1; see also the earlier chapters of books relating to the Apostolic Age (e.g. Weizsäcker, McGiffert, etc.).

E. F. Scoff.

Platter

PLATTER (παροψίς, Mat 23:25, πίναξ, Luk 11:39).

1. *The dish*.—The words thus translated in the above parallel passages referred probably to the same kind of tray or flat dish. The latter word (*pinax*) is also translated 'charger' in Mat 14:8; Mat 14:11, Mar 6:25; Mar 6:28. Originally a circular mat about three feet in diameter made of closely woven wheat straw in the natural

colour or of variegated pattern, it became a flat, low-rimmed tray of brass or copper, which was laid on the stool or low table around which the family gathered at meals. Similar to this, only with the rim somewhat deepened, are the smaller flat dishes, resembling saucepans, made of glazed earthenware and tin-coated copper, now used in Palestine for the serving of cooked food. The reference in the texts above quoted was probably to a dish of this sort. It is placed on the large tray, and into it each one at the table dips with a small scoop of thin bread torn from one of the loaves at his side, and thus lifts out the required mouthful of food.

2. Ceremonial reference.—Christ rebuked the artificial scrupulosity that paid more attention to contingencies of ceremonial pollution than to actual and necessary cleanliness. A dish might be soiled with dust and stains, and yet be technically free of impurity, unless it were laid on a table on which, for example, a few drops of milk had previously fallen. The table itself also (Mar_7:4) had to be washed, not out of regard for simple and wholesome cleanliness, but to avoid the danger of such law-breaking contamination. At the present day, in a house or institution conducted on strictly Rabbinical lines, the utensils for the cooking of meat, and those used in the preparation of milk dishes, must be kept in different parts of the kitchen. This is done not in deference to delicate sensibilities with regard to taste and smell, but because the juxtaposition of such vessels might create a situation in which it would be possible to commit a conjectural infringement of the prohibition against seething a kid in its mother's milk (Deu_14:21).

Rabbinical legislation with regard to food and dishes, and the relationship of Christ's disciples to such ceremonial pollution, formed one of the first difficulties encountered by the gospel. The concession on the Jewish side was a great testimony to the power of the new life in Christ, for such regulations were taught to Jewish children from infancy, and were commended by the venerated names of teachers who had ingeniously elaborated them. So great was the influence of such teaching, that St. Paul on one occasion remonstrated with his fellow-Apostle Peter for complying with it to the detriment of the gospel, and added, in language of personal compliment while condemning the dissimulation, that *even* Barnabas was carried away with it (Gal_2:13 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). See also art. Dish.

G. M. Mackie.

 Play

PLAY.—See Boyhood, vol. i. p. 222, and Games.

☞ Pleasure

PLEASURE.—Not passing pleasure but true happiness is to be sought by the disciple of Christ. Pleasure as such is transitory, but Christian joy and peace are continual and eternal. This life is a preparation for the fruition of eternal happiness, and not merely a series of opportunities for gratification to self and others (Luk 12:37). In itself pleasure is not evil, for all things were made by God through His Son (Joh 1:3). He sanctioned and sanctified social festivity in due season (Joh 2:1-11), and said of Himself, in contrast with the ascetic John the Baptist, ‘The Son of Man came eating and drinking’ (Mat 11:19). But pleasures are not always expedient, and may work eternal mischief (Luk 8:14). The days of Noah and Lot were days of pleasure and self-indulgence, when God’s visitation fell suddenly on the devotees of eating and drinking and marrying (Luk 17:27-28). Such sensual pleasure absorbs too much of man’s limited effort to be truly profitable (Joh 6:27). The *sons of this world* lead effortless lives (Luk 20:34), but Christ’s Kingdom is *not of this world* (Joh 18:36). The citizens of Christ the King must beware of careless indulgence in pleasure, being ready for His sudden presence (Luk 21:34; Luk 12:36). Yet, far more than all this, the pursuit of pleasures is disloyalty, because it is the following after will-o’-the-wisps (as it were) instead of the steadfast regard to the Light of the world (Joh 8:12; Joh 9:5). It is really a folly to accumulate the means of pleasure (Luk 12:15; Luk 12:19); but for the Christian it is treason to pursue pleasure instead of *leaving all and following Him* (Luk 5:11). In return, the Lord has unfailing promises of blessedness here and hereafter (Luk 18:29-30, Mar 10:29-30); but the true disciple must renounce everything this world offers, to be counted worthy of the eternal joy (Mat 16:24, Mar 8:34, Luk 9:23). The sensuous or sensual life of the soul (ψυχή) must not be striven after (Mat 16:25; Mat 10:39, Mar 8:35, Luk 9:24; Luk 17:33, Joh 12:25). All the pleasure the world can afford will never compensate for what is lost in such a pursuit (Mat 16:26, Mar 8:36, Luk 9:25). In this comprehensive statement even intellectual and aesthetic forms of pleasure are included. The habit of daily self-denial is to be adopted (Luk 9:23). No delight in business, however laudable in itself, must rival the call of Christ (Luk 14:18). A dreadful reversal awaits the Dives who clings to the pleasures of this age (Luk 16:25). Thus the rich are terribly handicapped in their heavenly course (Mat 19:24). The pleasures of this world may secure the horrors of hell (Luk 6:25). No, the disciple must be as his Master (Mat 10:25). The Master’s prayer was always, ‘Not what I will, but what thou wilt’ (Mar 14:36). The pleasures of popularity (Joh 12:43) and of ostentation (Mat 6:1-18, Luk 20:46) are to be avoided. Hand or eye may well be sacrificed for the sake of faithfulness to Christ in the hope of eternal salvation (Mat 5:29-30, Mar 9:43; Mar 9:47). The blessed are those who ‘hunger and thirst after righteousness,’ not after pleasure (Mat 5:6). The faithful disciple shall find tribulation rather than

pleasure (Joh_16:33), inward peace but an outward sword (Mat_10:34), joy rather than enjoyment (Joh_15:11; Joh_16:20-22; Joh_17:13).

W. B. Frankland.

☩ Plough

PLOUGH (ἄροτρον).—The plough is mentioned but once in NT (Luk_9:62), and the act of ploughing twice (Luk_17:7, 1Co_9:10). The Eastern plough appears to have changed but little since ancient times, the oldest representations closely resembling the implement now in use. It is almost entirely of wood, and is of slight construction, the furrow drawn being only 4 or 5 inches deep in light soil. It consists of a pole about 8 ft. long, in two pieces, with a joint in the middle. Through the butt-end is passed downward and made fast a piece of wood about 5 ft. long, the upper end sloping backward to form the handle. The under end is sharpened, and armed with a piece of iron. This serves as both coulter and share. The handle is grasped with the left hand, the right holding the goad to drive and guide the oxen. To the thin end of the pole is attached a crossbar with yokes which drop upon the necks of the oxen, and are fastened by the yoke-bands. See also art. Agriculture in vol. i., and in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , i. 49b (where the plough is figured).

W. Ewing.

☩ Poet

POET.—It may seem unnecessary to protest at the outset against the idea of any essential incompatibility of poetry with truth, as if, because a saying is poetry, it lay under the suspicion of being untrue, or even less true than prose. Yet that delusion has done so much harm even in regard to secular writings, that it is necessary to refer to it in the association of poetry with the most sacred writings in the world. The fact is, of course, that poetry is often the only medium of expression for a more direct and larger truth. Many truths are too subtle and too far-reaching to be expressed otherwise; and it was inevitable that God should have chosen to make use of poetry in His supreme revelation. Greek poets were prophets, and Hebrew prophets were poets. In every age and nation the connexion between religion and poetry has been so close that it excites no wonder when Lecky (*Hist. of Rationalism*, ii. 232, 253, 260) tells us that, in the past, religious dogma has been transformed into poetry, or Matthew Arnold (*Essays in Criticism*), that in the future this transformation will be

complete. It excites no wonder, for these writers were so impressed with the interest and significance of the connexion, that they did less than justice to the equally clear phenomenon of the element of indisputable facts that are permanently claimed by history and by science in the Christian religion.

No definition of poetry is here offered. Matthew Arnold's definition of it as 'a criticism of life' is true, but inadequately true. It is one kind of criticism of life—one which utilizes emotion and imagination in a peculiar way, and often affects the style of utterance in the direction of music, through rhymed or rhythmical utterance more or less deliberate and formal. The result is that subtle and yet unmistakable quality which differentiates poetry from prose, the use of which is an art akin to the graphic arts, yet often unconscious, and generally instinctive rather than deliberate.

That Jesus was in this sense an artist is abundantly manifest. We shall see how in Him the poetic and the graphic qualities blended, and nothing about Him is more evident than the delicate and indeed exquisite sensitiveness, both of body and of mind, which accompanies these qualities. Even in His unusually speedy death (Mar 15:44) we see the result of an extremely sensitive frame. It was this that led to the constant perversion of His words by coarse-grained and vulgar persons (Joh 2:19), and often led Him to keep silence (Mat 27:12) when the uncomprehending demanded speech; He knew that whatever He might say, He could not have made them understand Him.

At the beginning of the Gospels we find the story of His life set deep in poetry. The stories of John the Baptist's preaching are full of the poetry of the desert, with its intense visual images of the vipers, the axe, the stones, the fires, and the fan of the wilderness (Mat 3:9 etc.). The infancy of Jesus is cradled among songs of women and of men, in which the narrative breaks forth into the music of the earliest Christian hymns.

His biographers are poets. The Gospel which gives us by far the most intimate glimpses into His inner life is written by a man who was a poet to the very heart of him. Matthew, himself less poetical, interpolates his narrative with long swinging quotations from the poets of his native land, such as those recorded in Mat 4:12-16, or that tender and appropriate fragment from Isaiah concerning the bruised reed, introduced with so great a pathos in Mat 12:20. Even Mark, the most prosaic and almost curtly practical of them, is turned into a poet when he is writing the life of Jesus. The simple pathos of such a word as 'When he thought thereon he wept' (Mar 14:72), or the sudden reminder that Jesus in the wilderness of His temptation had for His companions the wild beasts and the angels (Mar 1:13), are inimitable.

It has been wisely said that all children are poets, and indeed there is no poetry so pure as that of the naïveté of the little child. Of the childhood of Jesus we know

practically nothing but what He retained of its spirit through later years. In a very true sense the childhood of Jesus lasted to the end, and He retained a child's heart through all His years. Children knew this when He was near them, and seem to have come to Him without hesitation (Mat 18:2) as to one of themselves. No doubt one bond between them and Him was that directness of vision and of thought and speech which characterized both. But the poetry of their minds and hearts must also be remembered.

Thus it came to pass that the Kingdom of God which He established was proclaimed as the Kingdom of the child (Mat 19:14); He quoted a prophetic verse in confirmation of His saying that the praise of God was made perfect by passing through infant lips (Psa 8:2, Mat 21:16); He thanked His Father specially for revealing to the instinctive minds of babes, truths which were unattainable by the wise and prudent (Luk 10:21); and, in the finest reference of all, He told how the angels of the children dwell in heaven, always beholding the face of the Father (Mat 18:10). When to these utterances we add the fact that He was interested in the very human children who played and quarrelled in the marketplace at their games of marriages and funerals (Mat 11:16), we have said enough to show very plainly His sympathy with the poetry of childhood.

Arrived at manhood, and having thoughts within Him that had long been struggling for utterance, and had now come to their hour, Jesus deliberately chose poetic forms of language as the medium of His speech. The characteristic mould in which Hebrew poetry was cast, was not rhythm as in the Greek and Roman poems, nor rhyme in the later Western fashion. It was a kind of measured antithesis, in which, in each saying, there was a fall balancing the rise. This antithetic balancing is seen in most of Jesus' sayings. Each of the Beatitudes in Matthew 5 illustrates this mode, while Mat 5:12 of the same chapter adopts the more complex form of the balanced triplet instead of couplet.* [Note: This subject is discussed and illustrated in Griffenhoofe's Unwritten Sayings of Jesus; and in Briggs' articles in the Expository Times, viii. [1897] 393, 452, 492, ix. 69, which, however, carry the matter further than all readers will be prepared to follow the author.]

It is true that poetry, and art in general, are very far indeed from being wholly matters of expression. There is to-day a renewal of the thoroughly unreasonable fashion of exaggerating the importance of manner in art, until the matter has come to be considered a negligible quantity. While both elements must be recognized, it will eventually be found that Johnson was far nearer the truth when he said that it was impossible for a man to be 'the good poet without first being the good man,' than those for whom style is everything and matter wholly unimportant. You do not make poetry out of prose by dividing it into antithetic or other kinds of couplets. There is, besides the form, the subtle spirit, and much more, that really determines the

classification. Yet, when all this is admitted, it remains true that form has much effect on matter, and there is an inevitable and strong reaction of the style upon the thought expressed. Thus when Jesus chose the poetic forms of His day and nation for the utterance of His speech, He drew it more and more completely within the line of poetry.

If it be true that it is not the form alone that distinguishes poetic literature from prosaic, it is equally true that it is not the matter alone. Apart from what is said, and from the literary medium through which it is expressed, there is what we have called a 'subtle spirit' which emanates from the temperament of a writer and gives the poetic quality of the writing. It is an elusive spirit to those who would define it in scientific terms, and it can only be appreciated in concrete example by those who are themselves in sympathy with it. All poets write for poets and for poets only; they count upon the poetic intelligence of their readers, and shrink back into silence when in the society of those in whom that sense is deficient. Yet there are two elements which certainly are never absent from the spirit in question, and which may be taken as essential to the building up of poetic work. These are a certain kind of emotion and of imagination, not (as we have said) definable, but unmistakable by all who are in sympathy with the poetic mood of mind.

The mention of emotion in this connexion recalls inevitably the famous definition of religion as 'morality touched with emotion' (M. Arnold, *Lit. and Dogma*, ch. ii.). It is indeed a meagre and inadequate conception of religion. Yet there is a large element of truth in it, and the emotional element in all true religion allies it with poetry.

That the temperament of Jesus was in the highest way *emotional*, is so familiar a fact that it needs little dwelling on. Christ as man of feeling is almost too well known. Perhaps we should rather say misknown, for anything of that sentimentality which vulgar minds are accustomed to associate with Him is entirely absent from Him. His emotion is always reticent and controlled, and when it finds expression, it is always utterly real and virile, without a touch of either the fantastic or the effeminate. A splendid example of the sensitive response to emotion which produces literary effect of the most delicate though unconscious poetic quality, is to be found in the story of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15). From the beginning to [Luk 15:24](#) no one can fail to feel the rising exhilaration, an effect manifestly produced by the corresponding crescendo in the narrator's feeling. Suddenly, on the entrance of the elder brother, all is damped down, and the story drags itself to the close like a stricken thing.

There are many signs of the ebb and flow of feeling in connexion with the events of Jesus' own experience. At the critical moments of His life this is naturally most noticeable. There is the outburst on the occasion of His first appearance in the synagogue of Nazareth, with the memories of thirty years behind the exhilaration.

One can feel yet the thrill of the opening quotation, 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,' etc. (Luk 4:18 quoted from Isa 61:1). Correspondingly deep is the depression manifest in His first intimation to His disciples of the inevitable cross whose shadow had begun to lie upon His path. In the words, 'Likewise shall also the Son of Man suffer of them' (Mat 17:12), there is an almost intolerable pathos. But the cross, as it came nearer, changed its aspect for Him, and as He entered on its terrific pathway at the end, one hears: a shout of exultation, almost of laughter, in the words recorded in Joh 12:23-31, when we are told that He 'rejoiced in spirit.' Yet unmistakable though these instances are, there is even a more poignant emotion in such little casual touches as the contrast between the homelessness He felt and the homes of foxes and of birds (Mat 8:20); or in such a wayside incident as that in which He defended the woman who 'hath wrought a fine work upon me' (Mat 26:10), and whose gracious deed affected Him as with the breath of burial spices.

Countless instances, and those of many kinds, might be gathered from His speech to others. The gardener's *pity* for the fig-tree (Luk 13:8) is a real touch of nature. When He addresses the dead damsel in the homely Aramaic tongue (Mar 5:41), we have the same tone in which a northern peasant of our own land might say 'Lassie!' Nor can we omit those words which must have seemed to the disciple to whom they were spoken to gather up together all the tenderness of boyish memories with that of grown man's patient suffering, 'When thou wast young, thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldst; but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldst not' (Joh 21:18).

Perhaps the point at which the emotion of Jesus reaches its deepest fulness and tenderness of suggestion is in regard to the men and women of His nation. The metaphor of the hen and her brood (Luk 13:34) was spoken with sobs. But the figure round which His emotion unquestionably gathered most of all was the favourite Israelite figure of the shepherd and the sheep. The OT image repeated by later prophets from 1Ki 22:17 ('I saw all Israel scattered upon the hills as sheep that have no shepherd') had evidently touched His heart most deeply. Carlyle points out in his *Essay on Burns* how the shepherd instinct of the poet puts him in the place of the suffering sheep; and it was the same instinct which drew from Psalms 23, and from the passage above quoted, so rich and wonderful a shepherd poetry as the sayings of Jesus afford. He knows the ways and the folding of the flock (Joh 10:14; Joh 10:16). He is touched with compassion for those lost ones of the House of Israel who are as sheep without a shepherd (Mat 9:36; Mat 15:24). His Good Shepherd is seen in such detail as only the pitiful heart could have suggested, 'leaving the ninety and nine in the wilderness' (Luk 15:4, Mat 18:12), and 'going into the mountains' in search of the wanderer. When the Shepherd is smitten, the sheep will be scattered abroad (Mat 26:31), nevertheless He will 'go before them into Galilee' (Mar 16:7), bringing the scattered flock home.

These proofs of Christ's emotion are very familiar, but His *imagination* has received less attention, and to it we shall devote a somewhat more minute study. That it was strongly in evidence is sufficiently proved by the fact that some of the Jews on one occasion took Him to be a devil-possessed Samaritan (Joh 8:48). Nothing could be a surer tribute to imagination than this judgment of the unimaginative. His actual experiences, His memories of past events, and His thoughts about even abstract truth, alike presented themselves in images to His mind. Generally the images were visual, and sometimes they were extremely vivid in outline. He thought in pictures, which rose either from what He had actually seen, or spontaneously in His imagination.

Scenes from the life—plant and animal—of nature occur in all His parables, and in very many sayings, which show the exactness and sympathy of His observations. The whitening harvest fields of the fertile valley of Samaria (Joh 4:35), sparsely dotted with the few labourers whose brilliant garments shone like flowers among the corn, is one of the very few instances of landscape in His descriptions of nature. The mountain-lands of both the north and south attracted Him, and it is striking to find Him making straight for the highlands of Galilee when His task of life was over (Mat 28:10-16). But more frequently it is a clear-cut piece of detail that lie sees, sharp-edged and complete in itself. A spring of living water (Joh 4:10), the trackless mystery of the night wind (Joh 3:8), salt shining white upon the offal heap where it had been thrown out as savourless (Luk 14:34-35), two sparrows sold for a farthing (Mat 10:29), are wayside pictures which He has engraved on the imagination of the world. His favourite image was characteristic of that land where there were few forests, but where the single tree was so precious, either for shadow or for fruit (cf. W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*). His images of single trees,—the vine, the fig, and the olive,—with their roots, branches, leaves, all seen as it were in detail, will occur to every reader (Mat 12:33 etc., Joh 15:1 etc., Mat 21:19, Mar 13:28, Luk 13:6). One of the finest and tenderest of all His imaginative descriptions is that mere touch of artistry which gives us in a flash the life of the reeds bending before desert winds (Mat 11:7).

The picturesqueness of His metaphors is very great. From the peaceful joy of the children of the bridechamber (Mat 9:15) to the storming of the Kingdom by the violent (Mat 11:12), we pass through a wonderful gallery of vivid scenes. Who can tell what great tableaux were before His mind's eyes as He said such words as these—'the Son of Man is come to give his life a ransom for many' (Mat 20:28); 'for crisis have I come into the world' (Joh 9:39); 'I have overcome the world'? (Joh 16:33). One figure has become so familiar through His use of it that we have almost forgotten that it is a metaphor—the figure of the cup (Mat 20:22, Luk 22:20; Luk 22:42, Joh 18:11). Three times He saw His appointed destiny in life under the image of a cup held to His

hands or lips by the Father's hand; and Christendom, and indeed the world, has taken over the beautiful and great symbol.

No finer instances of His visual intensity of imagination could be quoted than those which refer to the play of light and darkness. Such references recur like a sort of chorus from beginning to end of His work; and it is not without significance that the stories of the healing of the blind are told in such detail. This imagination blazes out in full splendour in the magnificent sentence, 'I am the light of the world' ([Joh_8:12](#)), and the figure is sustained and strengthened by the assurance that those who believe in the light become 'children of light' ([Joh_12:36](#))—*i.e.* themselves radiant, their upturned faces having caught and reflected the light to which they were turned. This is rendered all the more brilliant by the intense consciousness of darkness to which it is in opposition. John, in his description of the departure of Judas from the upper room ([Joh_13:30](#)), significantly adds, 'and it was night.' In the same way Jesus utilizes the sudden contrast between the flashing lamps of the banquet-room, reflected from the vessels and from the white garments of the guests, with the 'outer darkness' of the unlit street ([Mat_25:30](#)). To realize the full brilliance of this contrast we must remember that the rooms had windows only into the courtyard, and the street walls were of blank unpierced masonry. The thought of darkness always moved Christ to a kind of horror. No condition was described by Him with such frequency or with such depth of feeling as that of those who 'had no light in them' ([Joh_11:10](#)). or who deliberately loved and chose darkness in preference to light ([Joh_3:19](#)). 'How great is that darkness!' ([Mat_6:23](#)) He exclaims with a shuddering pause. He hastened men's work by the reminder of the night coming 'when no man can work' ([Joh_9:4](#)), and as we read we feel the helplessness of hands folded in the dark. When His captors and their traitor guide had come upon Him, looking through the torchlight upon their faces, He said that this was 'the power of darkness' ([Luk_22:53](#)).

His words abound in bright little sketch-pictures of the life and labours of men—etched, one might almost say, upon the margins of the Gospels. 'Fishers of men' ([Mar_1:17](#)), one with his hand upon the plough-handles but his head turned back ([Luk_9:62](#)), some with loins girt and lamps burning, waiting for the sound of their master's returning footsteps ([Luk_12:35-36](#)), another 'strong and fully armed' ([Luk_11:21](#))—these are among the countless images which will recur to every reader. The hair upon men's heads is not vaguely referred to—it is seen as black or white ([Mat_5:36](#)); the water in the cups they carry is cold water ([Mat_10:42](#)). The pictures He draws, as in a flash, of the unconscious busy life of men and women before the most terrific catastrophes, show an extraordinary vivacity ([Luk_17:27-28](#)); and there is a wonderful perfectness about the description of the farmer's life, 'as if a man should cast seed into the ground; and should sleep and rise night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how' ([Mar_4:27](#)). There is little colour in His pictures, and the rich man 'in purple and fine linen' ([Luk_16:19](#)) is

exceptional; but nothing could surpass the brightness of the scene where the King pauses as he comes to see the feast, his looks arrested by the dulness of the everyday garment in the midst of the shining raiment of his wedding guests (Mat_22:11). Not less remarkable, though of a very different kind, are such realistic pictures as that of the blind leading the blind into the ditch (Luk_6:39).

These are simple pictures, but sometimes His poetry is more elaborate. In the old Welsh songs there was a curious device by which, for mnemonic purposes perhaps, the lines of story or sentiment were interlined with references to nature, concerning the reeds in the water or the wind in the trees. Was it perhaps with the same instinct that Jesus interwove the three denials of St. Peter with the two crowings of the cock (Mar_14:30)? But some of the images are themselves complex. How subtle, for example, is the imaginative insight that first described 'the branch *abiding in* the vine' (Joh_15:4)! Again, who but the rarest of poets would have imagined the birds sowing, reaping, and gathering into barns (Mat_6:26), or have separated in thought the idea of the lily and its robes, the-flower 'clothing itself according to its nature,' or rather 'God clothing the grass of the field (Mat_6:30)'? In reference to this nature-work, Dr. Sanday contrasts Tennyson's 'Flower in the crannied wall' with the passage about the lily just quoted. 'The one,' he says, 'gives utterance to a far-off, unattainable dream or wish—the other is the expression of perfect insight and knowledge; it is not an aspiration after a glimpse of God's working in nature, but a clear unbounded vision of that working.' Thus is the Divinity of Jesus seen most plainly in His exquisite naïveté, the simpleness rather than the grandeur of His poetic vision; and we learn of Him 'not by a planet's rush but a rose's birth.'

Occasionally the images are elaborated into a pageantry, but this is generally held in check. The triumphal entry into Jerusalem was the one actual pageant which He sanctioned; and that was only after the days of His life were numbered, that the memory of the spectacle might impress men, and when it could lead to no revolutionary consequences among enthusiastic crowds (Mat_21:1 etc.). His disciples wanted the spectacular, and perhaps even missed it in His fellowship. The request of two of them for places on His right hand and on His left (Mar_10:37) hints at gorgeous dreams on their part. Its appeal to Himself is portrayed in the temptation of the pinnacle of the Temple (Mat_4:5), whose meaning undoubtedly was a magical display before the eyes of wondering crowds. Occasionally, as we said, He permitted His images this elaboration into pageantry. Now and then the canvas is crowded with angels. 'Twelve legions of. angels 'wait upon His prayer to the Father (26:53); and by those who look with opened eyes, angels may be seen daily 'ascending and descending upon the Son of Man' (Joh_1:51). The twelve Apostles are seen seated on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Mat_19:28), and for them and for all believers there are 'many mansions' in the Father's house (Joh_14:2). As to the connexion between the earthly and the heavenly life, whatsoever they bind or loose

on earth shall be bound or loosed in heaven (Mat 16:19). The accounts (Matthew 24) of His Second Coming are among the most difficult parts of the New Testament. But, however their details may be interpreted, they are brilliantly poetic flame-pictures which gather up into themselves much of the wild beauty and wonder of the apocalyptic imagination then so universal. A favourite scene is that of the Son of Man sitting on the clouds of heaven (Mat 26:64); but a sublimer picture is that which the same Son of Man draws of Himself standing ashamed among His angels because of the pusillanimous spirit of some of His followers (Mar 8:38). Nor could anything surpass the brilliance of the scene where 'the righteous shine forth as the sun' (Mat 13:43), and we seem to see great shafts of light as the cloud rack of Judgment Day passes, and past its flaming edge are seen the seats of the glorified spirits in heaven.

It need not surprise us when we find the imagination of Jesus reaching its climax of realistic vividness in the field of the weird and the ghastly. It is a tragic world, and he who, with his imagination in free play, dares to confront its facts impartially, will certainly see and tell gruesome things. There is, accordingly, frequent reference to loathsome things, whose loathsomeness had evidently affected Him. A serpent or a scorpion among food (Mat 7:10, Luk 11:12), a foul cup or platter whose exterior gave promise of cleanliness (Mat 23:25), the corruption of moth and rust among treasures of garments or metal (Mat 6:19), are among His casual notes of observation. More deliberate and (as it were) classical are such sayings as that about the carcase and the vultures (Mat 24:28), and the vipers crawling towards the flames (Mat 23:33). The bitterness of the spiritual life is driven in almost upon our senses as we read that every sacrifice must be 'salted with fire' (Mar 9:49), that He is come to bring not peace, but a sword (Mat 10:34), and that only those who eat His flesh and drink His blood can claim to have life in them (Joh 6:53). The same rises to its height in the wild picture presented in the words, 'I am come to cast fire on the earth; and what will I, if it be already kindled?' (Luk 12:49); while the whole of His reference to Mammon (Mat 16:9 etc.) is so realistic that it used to be imagined that this was the name of some Syrian god, such as G. F. Watts has painted, with bloody feet and hands pashing out the life of humanity.

Among the most conspicuous of His images of the ghastly, are two that are drawn from human life. The first is that of the cross-bearers (Mat 10:38). It is but too easy to ascertain whence this suggestion must have come, for men bearing crosses to the public places of execution were common enough in Palestine under the Romans. So we have from Jesus the weirdest of all allegorical pictures of the noble life. It is a procession of men bearing crosses, and Himself at its head. The procession is not staggering in weakness along the Via Dolorosa to Calvary. It is winding its way through the sunshine, by the waters of Galilee, in and out of villages where men are working, and women standing by wells, and children playing in the streets. The other figure is that of a spectral funeral procession, in which the dead are burying the dead

([Mat 8:22](#)). The phrase has become proverbial, but the imaginary scene in which it originated is surely one of the ghastliest. The corpse of a dead man is being carried to its tomb, but in place of the many-coloured robes of an Eastern funeral there are but shrouds like his own in the cortege; and the march of limbs bloodless and stark, and the sunlight falling upon closed eyes, are images which we may well believe never ceased to haunt the minds of those who first shuddered at them. We are not here concerned with the lessons which these images conveyed. They are among the most important of all His teachings, and the point to note is that He drove them deep into the imagination of His hearers by the most daring and unrelieved use of the ghastly.

Nature, too, lent her sinister suggestion. The sea was always an object of fear and hatred to the Jews. It was strange to them, as to all inland nations, and for many centuries they were never permitted to become familiar with it on account of the Philistine and Phœnician Gentiles, who held its harbours and its coast. In later days it was significant to them chiefly as the path of the invaders, whose maritime base for Syria was conspicuous from many mountains of Israel at Caesarea. Only on a very few occasions does Jesus refer to it, and always in ominous suggestion. He speaks of some who compass sea and land to obtain proselytes, only that they may make them children of hell ([Mat 23:15](#)). Again, He speaks of a sycamine-tree or a mountain being removed by faith and cast into the sea, as a thing stupendous and silencing ([Luk 17:6](#)). The most appalling doom that can be set against the sin of injuring His little ones, and which were still better for the injurer than what actually awaits him, is to be cast into the sea with a millstone about his neck to hold him among the wreckage and slime of decaying things in its bottom ooze ([Mat 18:6](#)). Amid the terrors of the latter Day of Judgment we hear the booming of the breakers as a terrifying undertone—‘the sea and the waves roaring’ ([Luk 21:25](#)).

Nothing in nature strikes so cold a fear into the imagination as that strange and sinister combination which has been called ‘the beauty and the terror of the world.’ In the sweetest sunshine and under the purest light of stars, lurk ever the savage cruelties and the obscene putrefactions of earth. This also Jesus noted when He spoke of ‘the whited sepulchres’ ([Mat 23:27](#))—the brightest spots, on many a sunny landscape of the East, yet suggesting a condition of physical horror within, which it needs experience to realize. But the utmost extreme of poetic power of this sort is felt in the sudden introduction of the picture of a fig-tree, blossoming peacefully in the full beauty of its leaf, age, into the midst of the magnificent horrors of the picture of the Day of Judgment ([Mat 24:32](#)).

The person of the devil is very frequently present to the mind of Jesus, and generally he is addressed or spoken of without imagery. At other times, however, he is portrayed as a princely figure—‘prince of this world’—who vainly comes to find his own in Him ([Joh 14:30](#)), and who is, by the Cross, cast out from his dominion

(Joh_12:31). There is one picture, from which Bunyan probably drew some of the imagery of his Holy War, of an attack by the Lords of Hell upon the fortress of the Church (Mat_16:18). And once, in an hour of triumph, Jesus ‘saw Satan fall as lightning from heaven’ (Luk_10:18).

Yet no victory of Good over Evil is ever complete on earth, and a deep horror remains, haunting the mind as it thinks of those who persistently refuse the Good and choose the Evil. Nowhere has this horror been more manifest than in the speech of Christ, who tells men to ‘fear him that hath power to destroy both soul and body in hell, yea, fear him!’ (Luk_12:5). He uses several figures to express this horror, all of them borrowed from the OT and its conceptions. Now it is ‘the outer darkness’ (Mat_8:12) of the unlit street which serves for an image of it; again, it is the offal-heaps of the valley of Jehoshaphat, and the fires which were always consuming them (Mar_9:44 etc.). But, for the most part, His imagination pictures the abyss of Sheol, with the ‘great gulf fixed’ (Luk_16:26) between it and the home of Abraham. It is an image closely connected with that of the ‘nether deep,’ into whose dreary vastness the demons pray that they may not be sent (Luk_8:31). It is suggestive of the homeless, empty spaces beyond the ramparts of the world. where in the thick darkness there is the sound of ‘weeping and gnashing of teeth’ (Mat_8:12 etc.). The words are repeated again and again until we seem to hear the low sound of that wailing which Dante heard within the gates of the Inferno. It is the undertone of horror which, even among merely human poets, is ever heard beneath the laughter and the voices of the world. But none has heard it and told the sound with the mingled pity and horror of the words of Jesus.

Hitherto we have noticed only the clear-cut character of the imaginative work of Jesus. But there is another side to this—a vagueness and a sense of transcending all limits and definitions—which is, as it were, the poetic obverse of the clear edge. This also enters into the true conception of the mind of Christ.

Both in regard to space and time His delight in room, and the spaciousness of His thought are evident. The most familiar example in regard to time is the much disputed word αἰώνιος (Mat_19:29; Mat_25:46 etc.). The whole point of that phrase is taken from it when it becomes a pawn in the game of theological disputation. It neither fixes the furthest limit at eternity, nor denies that the stretch is eternal. In it the mind simply flings itself out into the future, and is aware of the flowing river of the ages. It is the poetic and didactic, but not the dogmatic, purpose that is aimed at and that is accomplished. The sense of enormous duration is given with almost aching realization. The hope or the denial of a *terminus ad quem* is not given.

His allusions to vague and immense spaces are so numerous as to reveal a strongly marked and favourite habit of imagination. He seems to delight in the width of the world for the mere feeling of its roominess. The sound of a trumpet (Mat 24:31) is heard, and a flash of lightning seen (Luk 17:24) from one end of heaven to the other. Even in His reference to the birds and the lilies, already quoted (Mat 6:28), He is not satisfied till He has added 'of the air' and 'of the field' (Mat 8:20). In these mere touches the whole expanse of sky and earth opens and broadens to the horizon as we read. They are the subtle touches which only a poet's mind would give. Again, one feature of the Kingdom to which He frequently alludes is the journeying of ancient people and of those of later days across huge distances of the world (Mat 8:11). 'They shall come from the east and from the west,' to sit down at the table of Abraham, and the elect shall be gathered from the four winds of heaven (Mat 24:31). His memories of the OT recall remote nooks and crannies of the world—the far-off home of the Queen of the South (Mat 12:42), Sodom and Gomorrah, Tyre and Sidon (Luk 10:12-13), and Nineveh (Mat 12:41). Many of the people of His parables are travellers who go long distances and return (Mar 13:34 etc.), and He speaks of Himself, in one of the most wistful of all His utterances, as 'a man going a journey into a far country' (Mat 25:14). These allusions are not of so much significance in themselves as in their revelation of the stretch and travel instinct in the mind of Jesus. They become splendidly significant when we remember them in connexion with such other sayings as that about the Father who 'maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust' (Mat 5:45); and that also about the other sheep which the Good Shepherd has which 'are not of this fold,' which also He must bring, that there may be one flock and one shepherd (Joh 10:16). In that promise there is the whole breadth of His heart, who looks across the world and counts it all His pasture ground. This whole habit of His mind throws out into strong relief the spirituality of Jesus, to which it offers a sort of parallel in the region of the physical as against the literalism and preciseness of the Pharisees. While He was out among 'the ages,' they were wrangling as to the number of stars visible which marked the hour of evening; while they were settling the inches permissible for a Sabbath-day's journey, His heart was gathering disciples from the ends of the earth.

Spirituality and poetry are connected in the most intimate way, and the remembrance that Jesus was a poet may lead us past many futile controversies and into many illuminative interpretations. Two results may be selected as of very special value to the understanding of the mind of Christ.

1. His use of hyperbole.—Both His laws and His gospel have suffered many things at the hands of prosaic literalists. There are few things, for instance, which have been more confusing and harmful of late years than the perversions of Christianity which literalists have extracted from the Sermon on the Mount. Even to those who are willing to accept the doctrine thus presented in its naked literalness, it becomes but a

counsel of perfection, and life in every act of Christian service leads down a blind alley, until the discouragement of constant and inevitable failure becomes altogether intolerable. But on those who are repelled by the doctrine, the effect is even more serious. To them Christ appears a doctrinaire teacher, whose precepts have created an impossible situation; and they turn, not from the doctrines only, but from Him.

The fact is that the poet's exaggeration is the only way in which many truths can be expressed at all. Life is far too complex for any words that men have found in which to describe it. Spiritual things have no adequate language which corresponds to them; and the only way in which such truths can be communicated is by stating one side of them with such startling strength and vividness that *that* phase of truth at least shall never be forgotten. Of this fact Christ took the most fearless and unquestioning advantage, trusting wholly to the sympathetic intelligence of His hearers. Even in trifles He acted thus. The seed of the mustard plant is not the smallest of all seeds (Mat 13:32), and there is no necessity for the zeal of commentators who would search for some unheard-of variety of mustard whose seeds are smaller than the spore of ferns. No one would have been more amazed at such defence of His veracity than He who spoke the words. In the same way is to be understood the saying, 'This is my body' (Luk 22:19 etc.); and if Luther had allowed himself to perceive this most obvious of truths, what a world of unnecessary controversy would have been spared to the Church! Such licence is demanded, not for poetry only, but for the very continuance of human intercourse, which otherwise would at once become a mere interchange of pedantries. In the same way are to be interpreted such passages as that about the hatred of father and mother (Luk 14:26), and many of those commands about property, non-resistance (Mat 5:38 etc.), etc., which have been so grievous and so unwarrantable a stumbling-block to faith in modern times.

2. These considerations reach their highest value when we remember that in the teaching of Jesus there is *the spiritual idealism of the poet*. The incident of His praise of Mary rather than of Martha (Luk 10:42) has not unjustly claimed His sympathies for the dreamers and the mystics whose world is that of the ideal truth. At times this spiritual exaltation showed itself in physical effects which were recognized by onlookers. As He walked, they were amazed and afraid (Mar 10:32). It explains many of His wonderful sayings. Without it, that strange journey of the disciples would be wholly unintelligible, when they were to provide neither scrip, nor money, nor even shoes, nor any possessions but their peace (Mat 10:9 ff.). Similarly must be regarded the command to take no thought for the morrow, neither for food nor for clothes (Mat 6:34). These are ideal descriptions, not meant for the ears of literalists, but describing that world of spiritual conceptions in which His spirit dwelt. With these may be compared the exacting spirituality of His doctrine of marriage (Mat 19:4 ff.), which He Himself supplemented by the further statement that in the next world the life of the angels supersedes marriage altogether (Luk 20:36), and which leads on to

St. Paul's association of the marriage bond with the union of Christ and His Church (Eph 5:22 etc.). Such doctrine, He Himself declares, is for them that can receive it (Mat 19:11-12). And indeed the whole of Christianity introduces men into an ideal world which does not at all correspond to the actual world of public life, and towards which the individual Christian is but now feeling his way in isolated points of character. It is a life to lead with one's soul commanding and guiding the body. That is, if one has a soul; for Christ (in His poetic fashion) refuses to take it for granted that a man necessarily has a soul because he is a man, and reminds us that each man's soul has to be won (Luk 21:19). But for those who have souls, and are willing to live lives corresponding to them rather than to the flesh, Christ constructs an ideal world in which all things have suffered a 'change into something rich and strange.' The heaven is God's throne, and the earth His footstool (Mat 5:34-35). The body is a temple where the spirit dwells (Joh 2:19). The life is sustained by spiritual food which even the closest friends know not of (Joh 4:32; Joh 4:34). To live that life is to be citizens of the Kingdom which is within (Luk 17:21) and of the other world (Joh 18:36), and which cometh not with observation (Luk 17:20)—the Kingdom of the truth (Joh 18:37). The worship of such souls is in spirit and in truth (Joh 4:24), and their work is to believe (Joh 6:29).

That ideal world—so far ahead of the most spiritual of us all, yet so persistently claiming us as its children and beckoning us to the courageous renewal of our broken attempts to reach it—is a world which could have been constructed for man only by God incarnate in One who was a poet.

Literature.—Various modern *Lives of Jesus*; cf. Schürer, *HJP* [*Note: JP History of the Jewish People.*] ; Hausrath, *Hist. of NT Times—Time of Jesus*; Peyton, *Memorabilia of Jesus*. In Oscar Wilde's *de profundis* there is a passage in reference to Jesus as Artist, which, though marked by the paradoxical excess and wayward imagination of the book which contains it, is yet brilliant and suggestive.

John Kelman.

☒Police

POLICE.—The traditional and unsettled character of governmental relations in Palestine in the time of Christ, and the scarcity of definite information as to the organization of civil procedure in the provincial courts, make it difficult to ascertain exactly what were the ordinary provisions for the administration of justice. We cannot positively say, for instance, how far the earlier methods which obtained under Jewish custom were overshadowed, and at times overridden, by the interference of Roman

and military law. One fact, however, seems to emerge, viz., that as a rule, and as a matter of policy on the part of the Romans, the Jewish courts were left free to administer justice in their own way, and were permitted to retain a sufficient force of subordinate officers to execute the ordinary penalties of the law. It would only be in times of considerable disturbance, or in cases of the extreme penalty, that the Imperial power would come into evidence, and that soldiers would supplant the usual civil officers. 'The ordinary administration of the law, both in criminal and civil matters, was left in the hands of the native and local courts' (Schürer, *HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]* i. ii. 57). Generally, it may be safely affirmed, the Mosaic law still formed for the Jew the basis on which all such administration was conducted; justice was a department of religion, and the officers employed in its execution were Temple officials or servants of the local Sanhedrin.

There were two considerable exceptions to this rule—one arising from the arbitrary way in which the Herods exercised their power, and the other due to the invasion of Hellenistic ideas. In a city like Tiberias, e.g., where the Greek element was very large, administration was on the Greek model. The city had a council (βουλή) of 600 members (Josephus *BJ* ii. xxi. 9), with such officers as *archon*, *hyparchoi*, *agoranomos*, etc. (see Schürer, *HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]* ii. i. 145). The Greek cities of the Decapolis, while their local authorities were always liable to be superseded by the Imperial power (G. A. Smith, *HGHL [Note: GH Historical Geog. of Holy Land.]*, p. 605), had 'communal freedom, their own councils, ... the right of property and administration in the surrounding districts' (*ib.* p. 594). Even in purely Jewish towns, Greek influence was modifying the old usage. The large number of Greek and Latin words found in the Mishna (Schürer, *HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]* ii. i. 31-32) shows that after the 1st cent. a.d. the example of Hellenic institutions was producing a change in the methods of conducting civil government; and already in the Gospels we find traces of this, e.g., in the passage in which Jesus makes His most explicit reference to the processes of law (Mat_5:25-26 = Luk_12:58): whereas Mt. uses terms which indicate Jewish usage (κριτής, ὑπηρέτης), Lk. employs as equivalents words which suggest the Roman procedure (ἄρχων, πρόκτωρ); see below, and cf. Holtzmann, *Hand-Com. in loco*. In Mat_5:22 ('Every one who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council') Jesus is referring to the ordinary Jewish courts, the 'judgment' (κρισις) being the 'provincial court of seven' (see *EGT [Note: GT Expositor's Greek Testament.]*, *in loc.*, and below), the 'council' the Sanhedrin.

In Jerusalem there appear to have been two stipendiary magistrates, who were precluded from engaging in other occupations, and whose special province it was to

superintend the observance of the police regulations of the city (see Edersheim, *LT [Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].]* ii. p. 287). The 'Unjust Judge' of Luk_18:1-8 is probably an instance of a provincial police magistrate; but, while his unprincipled character is only too typical of Oriental judges, past and present (cf. Bruce, *Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, p. 158), it is not to be inferred from this parable that Jesus intended to reflect on the administration of justice as a whole. The usual number of judges for each city was, in accordance with ancient custom, seven (Josephus *Ant.* iv. viii. 14). Josephus, when in Galilee, 'appointed seven judges in every city to hear the lesser quarrels; for, as to the greater causes and those wherein life and death were concerned, he enjoined they should be brought to him and the seventy elders' (*BJ* ii. xx. 5).

The Mishna assumes the existence throughout the country of local Sanhedrins which possess very considerable powers. It is to these local Sanhedrins that Jesus makes reference when He tells His disciples: 'Beware of men, for they will deliver you up to councils' (Mat_10:17 = Mar_13:9). The supreme court was the Great Sanhedrin of Jerusalem, before which Jesus was tried, and in this body the religious and hierarchical character of the Jewish courts of justice was naturally more clearly preserved than elsewhere. They had under their control a body of Temple police, who were Levites, and were under the command of στρατηγοί, at whose head was an officer called στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ (Josephus *Ant.* xx. vi. 2; *BJ* vi. v. 3; Act_4:1; Act_5:24; the plural is used in Luk_22:4; Luk_22:52). The latter office was one which would be no sinecure, the numbers of people who thronged the Temple courts, even at ordinary times, being so great as to necessitate special provisions for keeping order. These Temple police were not armed or regularly trained; 'the greater part of them were unarmed and unskilled in the affairs of war' (Josephus *BJ* iv. iv. 6; cf. Edersheim, *LT [Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].]* ii. p. 540). During the great feasts the Temple was guarded by a Roman cohort, which was stationed in the Tower of Antonia (*BJ* v. v. 8). The force which arrested Jesus in Gethsemane clearly consisted of two parts: (1) a detachment of the Roman garrison; (2) a body of Temple police (Joh_18:3; Westcott, *in loc.*). As to the guard which watched the tomb (Mat_27:65-66; Mat_28:11-15), there is room for doubt whether this was a small body of soldiers detached by Pilate at the request of the Sanhedrin, or a band of the Temple *gendarmarie*. Pilate's words, ἔχετε κουστωδίαν (Mat_27:65), are capable equally of the interpretation, 'Take a guard' or 'Ye have a guard.' The fact that they report to the chief priests (Mat_28:11) suggests that they were the satellites of the Sanhedrin, and that Pilate scornfully permitted them to use their own measures; but Mat_28:14 'If this come to the governor's ears,' is in favour of the other interpretation.

The usual name for the officers charged with the execution of the law and the maintenance of order is ὑπηρέτης (Mat 5:25, Joh 7:32; Joh 7:45-46; Joh 18:3; Joh 18:12). It may be variously translated ‘apparitor,’ ‘serjeant,’ or ‘warder.’ They had the duty, among others, of inflicting the punishment of scourging (Mat 10:17 = Mar 13:9, Mat 23:34). Josephus says that each judge had two ὑπηρέται assigned to him (*Ant.* iv. viii. 14); but in this passage the word probably means ‘clerks’ rather than police constables. That the powers of the latter were extensive is evident from the drastic measures taken by Saul as the commissioner of the Sanhedrin in his persecution of the followers of Christ (Act 8:3; Act 26:10-11; cf. Act 5:18-23). Another term, used apparently more particularly in reference to cases of fines and debts, but also having a general signification, is πρόκτωρ (Luk 12:58) = ‘bailiff.’ The term σπεκουλάτωρ (Mar 6:27), used of the executioner of John the Baptist, denotes an officer belonging to the police attached to the military rulers. The weight of opinion inclines to the view that the *speculatores* were soldiers (Schürer, *HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]* i. ii. 62); but it is probable that Herod had armed satellites about his court who did not rank as regular soldiers, but would be called upon to play many parts, from apparitor to executioner. The plain-clothes detective was employed by the Herods (Josephus *Ant.* xv. x. 4), and the despotic use which they made of their power, backed up as it was by the command of soldiery, took little cognizance of the established civil authorities. The centurion in Mat 8:5-13 = Luk 7:2-10 was probably the captain of the troop quartered at Capernaum and in the service of Herod Antipas (Holtzmann, *Hand-Com. in loc.*). These troops served the purpose of clearing the country of gangs of robbers (Josephus *Ant.* xv. x. 1).

J. Ross Murray.

⚠ Political Conditions

POLITICAL CONDITIONS

1. Reign of Herod the Great.—Christ was born nearly at the close of the reign of Herod (Mat 2:1), who died in the spring of b.c. 4. Herod’s relation to Rome was that of an allied king (*rex socius*), whose title and authority alike were dependent upon the goodwill of the Emperor. He was expected to preserve order within his kingdom, and to bring it into a fit state for inclusion in the normal system of provincial government, and at the same time to protect the frontier of the Empire. With foreign policy he had nothing to do; and the right of coining was probably limited, the only known Herodian coins being of copper. A certain tribute was exacted, which Herod

raised on the other parts of his kingdom than Judaea; and instructions from Rome had to be strictly and quickly followed, the Imperial consent being necessary also to any arrangement as to the succession to the royal property or domains. Within these limits his power was restrained only by the necessity of not provoking the people either to rebel or to appeal to Rome.

2. Tetrarchy of Philip.—Special permission had been given by Augustus to Herod to bequeath his kingdom as he liked (Josephus *Ant.* xvi. iv. 5), the will being subject, of course, to Imperial confirmation. Under the pressure of various palace intrigues, and with a view to separate elements between which at the time there was no possible cohesion, Herod left Judaea to Archelaus, Galilee and Peraea to Antipas, and the north-eastern districts beyond Jordan to Philip. This partition was eventually accepted at Rome, with a few slight modifications. To Philip, with the title of tetrarch, which originally implied the government of a fourth part of a tribe or kingdom, but gradually came to be used of any petty dependent prince, were assigned the comparatively poor districts lying to the east of the Sea of Galilee, and extending northwards as far as Mt. Hermon (Luk 3:1). Over these he reigned for thirty-seven years (b.c. 4-a.d. 34), when upon his death the territory was incorporated in the province of Syria, though without losing the privilege of the separate administration of its finances (Josephus *Ant.* xviii. iv. 6). Three years later it was given to Agrippa i., with the title of king. The population was predominantly Syrian and Greek, with Jewish settlements in the south-west; and though Philip's sympathies were entirely Roman, he respected the sentiments of the different classes of the people, and his long reign was disturbed by no outbreak of popular feeling, and no peremptory interference from Rome. Like most of the Herods, he had a passion for building; and to the quiet and well-governed city of Caesarea Philippi, near the alleged source of the Jordan, Jesus withdrew (Mat 16:13, Mar 8:27) when the multitudes were crowding upon Him and His enemies tempting Him (Mat 16:1); just as Bethsaida, another of Philip's cities, was His refuge when news reached Him of the Baptist's death (Luk 9:10, cf. Mar 8:22).

3. Tetrarchy of Antipas.—The title of tetrarch was granted also to Antipas, whose dominions included the two districts of Galilee and Peraea, separated by the confederation of free Greek cities known as the Decapolis. Peraea, east of the Jordan and south-east of Galilee, bore a high reputation for the purity of its Judaism, but politically was of small importance. Its population was prevalingly Jewish; though Antipas found an opportunity for the indulgence of his passion for building in the erection of Julias on the site of the ancient Beth-haram (Jos 13:27), opposite Jericho. But the main part of the tetrarchy, as far as numbers and industry are concerned, lay to the north of Samaria, where the Jews formed the majority of a population estimated perhaps too highly (see art. Population) at three millions, and comprising almost every possible admixture of Canaanitish and Greek elements. The

administration of Antipas must have been successful on the whole, for it continued for more than forty years, though his father's diplomacy became in him craft and meanness (Luk 13:32; Josephus *Ant.* xviii. iv. 5). His private friendship with Tiberius may be part of the explanation of the length of his reign; in a.d. 39 he was banished by Caligula to Lyons, and his territories were added to the kingdom of Herod Agrippa i. (Act 12:1; Josephus *Ant.* xviii. vii. 2).

4. Ethnarchy of Archelaus.—On the death of his father, Archelaus succeeded to the lordship of Judaea, with Samaria and Idumaea. His accession was opposed by some of his own family, and by the popular party at Jerusalem, who aimed at the restoration of the theocracy, but pleaded meanwhile for the investment of the high priest with supreme civil power, in subordination to the Emperor alone. Archelaus went in person to Rome (cf. Christ's allusion in Luk 19:12), whither also journeyed an embassy from the people. Augustus substantially confirmed Herod's appointment; and Archelaus returned as ethnarch of the three districts. He was disappointed with the inferior title (which denotes literally the ruler of a nation living, with separate customs, in the midst of another race, and was possibly chosen, in contempt, to identify Archelaus with his unwilling subjects), and proceeded to make his administration (b.c. 3-a.d. 6) one of revenge. Twice, if not thrice, a change was made in the high priesthood by a ruler who was considered as of mixed blood—unclean in his birth and unclean in his practice. The tyrannical disregard of powerful sentiments was carried to such an extent that at length the Jews forgot their hatred of the Samaritans, and the Samaritans their kinship with the ethnarch, and a joint deputation proceeded to lay their complaints before Augustus. Archelaus was fined and exiled to Vienne, and his domains were made directly subject to Rome.

5. The Roman procurators.—The situation of Judaea, on the confines of Egypt and Arabia, was of such military importance that Rome could not wisely concede the repeated request of the people for the investiture of their high priest with all the functions of civil government. Instead, the country was made a kind of annex to the province of Syria, with a governor (*procurator*) of its own, of equestrian rank, who was charged particularly with the control of the army and the finances, and with the task of turning the district into a bulwark of the Empire. The legate of Syria was invested with only a general supervision; he was expected to interfere at his discretion in cases of need, but generally to remain in the background, as an unseen support of the Roman rule. The first procurator was Coponius (a.d. 6-9), a knight whose name is otherwise unknown. Accompanied by the legate Quirinius, he appeared at Jerusalem, took possession of the property of Archelaus, and turned his palace into the official abode of the procurator during the festivals, Caesarea becoming the seat of government. Their next administrative act was to arrange for the taking of a census, with a view to control the incidence of taxation, and to establish Roman methods of government. The process was to compile schedules, enumerating the local

communities, according either to houses or to families, for the purposes of a poll-tax, and providing information for the levying of taxes upon capital (originally, in Syria, one per cent., but afterwards probably increased) and upon trade. At the same time the produce of the field was valued, and made chargeable to the extent of one-tenth in the case of corn and two-tenths in that of fruit and vine. This was the enrolment referred to by Gamaliel ([Act_5:37](#)); and on religious as well as patriotic grounds, as seeming to involve even a competition with Jehovah for the tithes, the result was dismay on the part of the leaders of the people, and an actual revolt, headed by Judas of Gamala, who thereby founded the fanatical party of the Zealots or Cananaeans ([Mat_10:4](#)). On the present occasion the revolt was suppressed after some furious fighting; but the agitation smouldered, and eventually broke out in the insurrection in the course of which Jerusalem was burnt. The census schedules, when completed, would be sent to Rome for approval; but in levying the taxes there would be no delay. Such as were destined for the Imperial treasury were collected under the supervision of the procurator, who made use of the Sanhedrin and various local courts. The customs were leased to collectors, individuals or syndicates, who paid a fixed annual sum, retaining any excess in the actual yield and making good any deficiency. The contracts were then divided, and sublet to subordinate officials in the different localities, and thus an entire class of publicans of various grades ([Luk_19:2](#)) was constituted, whose average morality was probably low, but is not to be taken at the valuation of the popular hatred. Nothing more is known of the procuratorship of Coponius beyond a breach in the temporary alliance between the Jews and the Samaritans. The quarrel was brought to an issue by a successful attempt of the latter to defile the cloisters of the Temple on the eve of the Passover. Through Coponius no redress could be obtained, and the Jews had to content themselves with more stringent regulations for the exclusion of the Samaritans, and with a large extension of the police system of the Temple, the night-watchmen being increased in number to twenty-four, and an official made responsible for a periodic visitation of their rounds.

The successors of Coponius were Marcus Ambivius (? a.d. 9-12), Annius Rufus (? 12-15), Valerius Gratus (15-26), and Pontius Pilate (26-36). Of the first two the dates cannot at present be fixed with precision, and no known change of administration was introduced by them. Soon after his accession in a.d. 14 to the throne of the Empire, Tiberius adopted the policy of lengthening the term of service in these provincial appointments, in the hope of protecting the people from rapacity, by affording the governors a longer period over which to spread their exactions. The theory was not a compliment to this class of officials, and did not work well in Judaea. Of the administration of Valerius Gratus the least that can be said is that it was meddling. In eleven years he changed the high priest four times, and the changes would have been more frequent but for the temporizing character of the man (Joseph Caiaphas) upon whom his final choice lighted. The example of oppression in Rome, whence the Jews were expelled by Imperial edict, was imitated so closely in Judaea, that several

deputations were sent to Tiberius to protest against the masterfulness and avarice of his representative, with little other result than that of additions to the army of occupation.

A similar policy of oppression was adopted by Pilate, who exceeded his predecessor in resentment, but whose violence was apt to collapse in the presence of a stubbornness greater than his own. His first act was characteristic alike of his contempt for precedents and of his docility when opposed. The new troops destined for the garrison of Jerusalem were ordered not, as before, to leave at Caesarea the medallions of the Emperor that were attached to the military standards, but to proceed in full equipment to their quarters in the Castle of Antonia. To the Jews the sacrilege appeared of the worst kind, as involving them in the crime of idolatry (Exo_20:4). From all parts of the country people flocked to Caesarea, and, disdaining the threat of massacre, extorted from the procurator, by their superior resolution, an order for the removal of the medallions. This bad beginning was followed by an equally bitter quarrel over the restoration of an aqueduct that brought water to Jerusalem (cf. Luk_13:4). The scheme was of the utmost value to the city, as the supply of water conveyed through an older aqueduct at a higher level was proving insufficient; but the offence was that Pilate proposed to throw the cost upon the Temple treasury, and actually seized some of the sacred funds. A riot was anticipated; but the soldiers, dressed as citizens, were distributed among the crowd, and at a given signal turned their weapons against the people. The scheme was proceeded with, and the popular hatred grew savage. So much did Pilate disregard Jewish sentiment, that certain Galilaeans were put to death in the Temple, and their blood mingled with that of the sacrifices (Luk_13:1). By taking a prominent part in an insurrection, Barabbas endeared himself to the people (Mar_15:7, Luk_23:19). On the death of Sejanus, in a.d. 31, Tiberius assumed a more friendly attitude towards the Jews; and, soon after Vitellius added the legateship of Syria to his other high commands (a.d. 35), he found it necessary to interfere. Pilate was ordered to proceed to Rome to answer for the wanton cruelty of his administration, and Marcellus was entrusted provisionally with the duties of the procuratorship.

6. Administration, military and civil.—In Syria, as in Egypt, were regularly stationed three or four legions, to which recourse could be had in any emergency; but the ordinary garrison of Palestine consisted of auxiliaries, raised partially amongst the non-Jewish inhabitants of the country. The Jews were generally exempted at the time from military service, on account of their temperament and religious usages. The garrison was distributed over the country in such a way as to make itself everywhere felt. At Caesarea, the headquarters, was a force of three thousand men, of whom five-sixths were infantry. A cohort of five or six hundred infantry, with a detachment of cavalry and a body of spearmen or slingers (Act_23:23), was quartered in the fortress of Antonia. Smaller garrisons occupied Jericho, Machaerus, Samaria, and any

other centre whence an important district could be commanded. There is no evidence of the existence of a police corps apart from the soldiery, though a secret-service system upon a large scale was maintained by Herod, and probably also by the procurators. The military were employed in keeping order, in the arrest of persons under suspicion (Joh_18:12), in guarding prisoners (Mat_27:27), and in superintending the execution of a sentence (Joh_19:23). Use was sometimes made of the officers of the local courts and of the armed retinue of the native dignitaries (Mat_26:47). The Temple police were under the command of a captain of high rank, who probably controlled also the officers of the Sanhedrin; and these functionaries were recognized and supported within limits by the military authorities. There are traces also of the existence of a body of paid spies or secret police under Jewish control (Luk_20:20, Mat_22:16, Mar_12:13). In the provincial towns and rural districts order was kept as in Jerusalem; the administration acted through the local courts and organizations, with soldiers at hand when needed. See also art. Police.

Taxation was of two kinds—Imperial and provincial. A poll-tax and a tax on landed property were collected by the procurator, and the produce remitted to Rome (Mat_22:17). Custom duties and market tolls were collected by lessees, who paid for the privilege a fixed yearly sum, destined in the case of Judaea for the Imperial treasury, but in that of Galilee for the tetrarch. Besides these regular imposts, an arbitrary procurator might enrich himself by a variety of exactions, as the penalties of imagined offences or the condition of official support; but in Judaea the expenses of administration were met by authorized deduction from the revenue of the taxes and tolls. Economically the province was poor, though a few courtiers and ecclesiastical dignitaries were of great wealth. So heavy was the incidence of taxation, that in a.d. 17 a deputation was sent to Rome to plead for relief. Sixteen years later, the entire Empire was visited by a financial crisis so severe that bankruptcies multiplied beyond enumeration, and even some of the public treasuries suspended payments in cash. In this general distress Syria and Palestine shared, though the busy industrial centres in Galilee did not suffer so much as the crowded and unemployed population around Jerusalem.

7. Political parties (see the various articles under separate titles).—The *Samaritans*, though kindred in race with the Jews, were regarded by them as sectaries, and the bitterness on both sides was fatal to joint political action of any permanent kind. The *Sadducees* were a priestly nobility, tenacious of the prestige of their own order, but tolerant of any system of government that did not threaten their prosperity. Opposed to them were the *Pharisees*, whose national ideal was that of a theocracy, and whose endurance of an alien rule was reluctant or sullen. They were supported sometimes by the *Herodians*, who favoured the dynasty of Herod, but were not disposed to quarrel seriously with any established institution. An extreme party was gradually formed of irreconcilables, under the name of *Zealots* or *Cananæans* (Mat_10:4,

Mar_3:18, Luk_6:15), who were prepared to use the sword without delay for the restoration of a theocracy. In political theory the *Essenes* exaggerated the views of the Pharisees; but their comparatively small number in the early part of the 1st cent, and their segregation from ordinary life made them a force of little consequence except in times of excitement.

Literature.—Josephus; references to other sources in Schürer, *GJV* [Note: *JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (or *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*]), which is indispensable; Hausrath, *Hist. of NT Times*; Derenbourg, *Hist. de la Pal.*; Mommsen, *Rom.* [Note: *Roman.*] *Provinces*; Madden, *Coins of Jews*; the *Archæol.* of Keil, Riehm, Benzinger, Nowack; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, the *EBi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*] , *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.*] , and the *JE* [Note: *E Jewish Encyclopedia.*] ; O. Holtzmann, *NT Zeitgeschichte*; Moss, *Scene of our Lord's Life* [a useful elementary handbook].

R. W. Moss.

☒ Poor

POOR.—See Poverty and Poverty of Spirit.

☒ Popularity

POPULARITY.—The word does not occur in the NT, but the thing itself is not infrequently treated of. There is a true and there is a false popularity. The latter belongs to him who makes the praise of men his object, and seeks it by ostentatious piety and hypocritical charity (Mat_6:2; Mat_6:5; Mat_6:16); the former is the accompaniment of that behaviour whose ruling aim is to do the will of God regardless of all worldly ends (Mat_6:3-4; Mat_6:7-8; Mat_6:17-18; Mat_6:20-21). True popularity is that love and admiration which unselfish devotion to the welfare of others, springing from the whole-hearted love of God, cannot fail to arouse in the breasts of all who have eyes to see and hearts to understand the good and pure. 'They shall see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven' (Mat_5:16; cf. Joh_15:8). The hypocrites who sound a trumpet before them when they do their alms, who pray at the corners of the streets for all to see, who disfigure their faces that they may appear to men to fast, are examples of those who seek and obtain the reward of false popularity. Fasting and prayer that flow from a desire to hold communion with God,

charity that is the outcome of gratitude to the Heavenly Father for His wondrous mercy, are ever done in secret, so that there can be no suspicion of any unworthy motive; but the effect of these things is revealed in the man's whole life and character; it must win for him the praise and love of all good men, and for God the glory.

All this is in perfect harmony with the inwardness of Christ's life and teaching. His aim was to change the world from within outward—not to attach good fruit to a worthless tree, but to make the tree good, and to await the fruit which in due time it was bound to bear. In the same sense true popularity is inward; false, outward. The latter springs immediately from outside acts which may not be—probably are not—the revelation of the true man: the former is the effect produced upon the world by the outspokening of the whole man as he is in himself in his relation to God. At the very opening of His career Jesus rejected the outward, the false, popularity as a means of propagating the truth He came to teach. He perceived it to be the suggestion of the Evil One that He should obtain the dominion of the kingdoms of the world by the external method, by the force of His authority, by the admiration which He could so easily have produced. Even to employ His miraculous power to gain the ear of His own countrymen He put from Him as a temptation ([Mat_4:1-10](#) || [Luk_4:1-13](#)); and when, aroused to enthusiasm by their miraculous feeding, the multitude would fain have taken Him by force to make Him their king, He fled from them ([Joh_6:15](#)). He would have nought to do with any enthusiasm, however sincere, that was based upon a false conception of the nature of His Messiahship, that sprang from admiration of His power and the hope of sharing its blessings, and not from the clear perception of His holiness and the longing to share it ([Joh_2:23-25](#)). The kind of impression which He wished to make was that which expressed itself in such phrases as—'Never *man* so spake' ([Joh_7:46](#)); 'He taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes' ([Mat_7:29](#)); 'The common people heard him gladly' ([Mar_12:37](#)). It was neither *to* nor *by* flesh and blood that He desired to reveal Himself and to win a place in the hearts of men, but *to* the Divine germ within each soul, and *by* the revelation of the Heavenly Father ([Mat_16:17](#)). See following article.

And as with the Master so must it be with the servants. As the world had hated Him, so would it hate them. He had come to send not peace on the earth, but a sword and fire ([Mat_10:34](#) || [Luk_12:51](#)), the sword which would part brother from brother and father from son—the fire which should try and reveal the essential nature of each heart. This hatred and persecution are therefore to be to the disciples a cause of rejoicing ([Mat_5:11-12](#)), for these will be the signs that they are in truth the followers of Christ. 'If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love its own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you' ([Joh_15:18-19](#)). But the more the world persecutes them, the more must they bear

testimony to the cause of Christ by their loving fellowship one with another. 'By this,' He says, 'shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another' (Joh 13:35); and again—'(I pray) that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me' (Joh 17:21)—Among the disciples there must be no selfish striving for place or power. The truest popularity, the truest greatness, is to belong to the humble heart that ever preferreth other to itself, that rejoiceth to minister and to serve, to give itself freely to all even as Christ did (Mat 20:28 || Mar 10:45).

Literature.—Comm. on the Gospels; works on *NT Theol.* by Beyschlag and by Weiss; Stalker, *Life of Jesus Christ*, ch. iv.; Pressensé, *Jesus Christ*⁷ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , pp. 263-286.

W. J. S. Miller.

⚡ Popularity

POPULARITY (of Jesus).—The general subject of popularity, as treated in the foregoing article, is strikingly illustrated by the course of our Lord's public ministry; and in the present article we shall consider (1) the popularity of Jesus, (2) the grounds on which it rested, (3) the value He attached to it, and (4) the reasons of its decline.

1. The fact of His popularity.—Although the earthly life of Jesus began in a stable and ended on a cross, there was a period in His ministry when He was at once the most conspicuous and the most popular personage in Palestine. From Jn. we learn that His first definite appeal to the nation was made in Jerusalem (Joh 2:12 ff.). There, however, the dominant influences were hostile to His acceptance (Joh 2:18 ff., Joh 3:2; Joh 3:12). He soon felt that the nation was not yet ripe for a direct Messianic ministry, and so for a time He fell back in Judaea on a work of preparation similar to that which the Baptist was still carrying on (Joh 3:22, Joh 4:1-2). But when John was cast into prison, He knew that the time was come to make His own distinctive appeal to Israel, and having met with little favour in Jerusalem, He now chose Galilee as the scene of His labours (Mar 1:14 ff. ||). The Synoptic Gospels show that an extraordinary popularity was the almost immediate result (Mar 1:28). Crowds flocked to Him from every quarter (Mar 1:45, Mar 2:13, Mar 4:1, Mar 5:21 and *passim*), and followed Him about wherever He went (Mar 3:7, Mar 6:33). The people were astonished at His teaching (Mar 1:22; Mar 1:27), but also delighted with it (Luk 5:1-15, cf. Mar 12:37); they saw His miracles with joy and amazement, and glorified God in Him (Mar 2:13 ||). The enthusiasm and excitement soon spread far

beyond the borders of Galilee; and from Jerusalem and Idumaea, from beyond Jordan, and even from the region of Tyre and Sidon, multitudes came to see and hear the great Prophet of Nazareth (Mar 3:8). All along, it is true, the scribes and Pharisees persistently opposed Him (Mar 2:6 ff., Mar 2:16 f., Mar 2:24 ff., Mar 3:2 ff.), coming from Jerusalem for this express purpose (Mar 3:22, Mar 7:1). But with the great mass of His countrymen, during the earlier period of His Galilaean ministry, Jesus had a popularity of the most unqualified kind.

2. To what was this popularity due?—(1) Much must be ascribed to *His personal qualities*, and among these (a) to *His perfect accessibility and entire naturalness*. In His attitude to the people there was nothing either of the supercilious contempt of the scribes and Pharisees (Joh 7:48-49) or of the ascetic austerity of John the Baptist (Matthew 3; Mat 11:18). Any one might approach Him at any time, with the certainty of being readily and kindly received. It mattered not who came to Jesus,—rough fishers of the Galilaean lake (Joh 1:37 ff., Mar 1:16 ||), anxious parents seeking a blessing for their children (Mar 5:2 ff.; Mar 7:25 ff.; Mar 10:13 ff.), publicans whom everyone else despised (Mat 9:10; Mat 10:3; Mat 11:19, Luk 19:2 ff.), sinful women from the city streets (Luk 7:37 ff., Mat 21:31),—to all He presented Himself as a man and a brother. (b) No personal gift conduces more to popularity than the subtle, indefinable quality of *charm*, and Jesus appears to have possessed this in an exceptional measure. It may be that the χάρις or ‘grace,’ of which St. Luke tells us in his account of the sermon in the synagogue at Nazareth (Mat 4:22), refers wholly to Christ’s message, and not at all to the manner of His speech. But the way in which men and women and little children were drawn to the Saviour, as if by a kind of magnetism, testifies to a winsomeness of nature that must have gone far to secure the favour of every unprejudiced heart. (c) Still more the *intense sympathy* of Jesus must have appealed to the people. A man may make himself accessible for reasons of policy, and even the quality of charm sometimes proves to be a superficial gift of pleasing that is no guarantee for any expenditure of heart. But the Saviour’s profound sympathy for the sick, the sinful, the sorrowful, could not fail to make an impression on the popular mind. We can hardly realize, perhaps, what it meant for Him to be besieged day after day by a pressing crowd of men and women with loathsome diseases and festering sores—all demanding the touch of His hand as well as the pity of His heart (Luk 4:40 ||). The nervous tension must have been tremendous, the physical and spiritual expenditure a constant drain upon His strength (Mar 5:30, Luk 6:19). But the crowd, which not only read in His face that compassion which was one of His most characteristic qualities (Mat 9:36; Mat 14:14; Mat 15:32, Mar 1:41, Luk 7:13), but saw Him in the thick of His daily deeds of grace, must have dimly perceived something of that vicarious sacrifice which lay at the root of the Redeemer’s sympathy, as it lies at the root of all true sympathy, and which led an

Evangelist to bethink himself of the prophet's words, 'Himself took our infirmities, and bare our diseases' (Mat_8:17, cf. Isa_53:4).

(2) But the popularity of Jesus was due not only to His personal qualities, but to *His methods as a Teacher and the gospel that He brought*. (a) Much lay in His methods—in the simplicity and directness, the homeliness and picturesqueness of His language, and its entire freedom from all the professional pedantries of the Rabbis (Mar_1:22; cf. Mar_12:37). The undying power of His parables, simply as literature, enables us to form some idea of what it must have been to hear those wonderful stories as they first fell from His own lips. (b) But these things were only the outer swathings of His message—the husk, not the kernel. The form of His teaching might appeal to the imagination, but it was the substance—the joyful Galilaeen gospel of the Kingdom of God—that warmed and thrilled the listening multitudes. Christ's words were 'words of grace'—words about the Heavenly Father's love and the blessings that lay within the reach of every one who was willing to be God's child; words of forgiveness for the sinful, and liberty for the captive, of comfort for the mourner, and rest for the weary and heavy-laden soul. 'The gospel of the kingdom'—in that Christ's message was all summed up (Mar_1:14). And if the forerunner shook the nation to its centre when he cried, 'The kingdom of heaven is at hand!' (Mat_3:2), what must have been the effect of Christ's proclamation that the Kingdom of God was already come (Mat_5:3-11; Mat_12:28)—that *this* was the acceptable year of the Lord (Luk_4:19; Luk_4:21).

(3) But it is in *the miracles of Jesus* above all that we find the explanation of His popularity. His miracles of healing were evidently wrought upon a very wide scale—much wider than the enumeration of individual cases gives any idea of (cf. Mar_1:34; Mar_3:10; Mar_6:55-56). And though there were ungrateful recipients of His mercy (Luk_17:17-18), we know that at other times both those whom He had cured and their friends and relatives were filled with a passion of gratitude and devotion to His Person (Luk_17:15-16, Mar_5:20; Mar_10:52, Joh_11:2; Joh_12:3). But these gracious miracles stretched in their effects far beyond the wide circle of the actual beneficiaries. They created great expectations in the popular mind—expectations that were immensely heightened by yet more astonishing miracles, in which Christ's 'compassion for the multitude' led Him to make them in their thousands the direct partakers of His bounty (Mar_6:34 ff. ||, Mar_8:1 ff. ||, Joh_6:5 ff.). These great miracles were taken to be 'signs'—signs of wonderful events that might be about to happen in Israel. Jesus, it began to be surmised, was not merely a great prophet as His teaching showed, but much more than a prophet; not merely a marvellous healer of the sick, but the expected Deliverer of Israel. Unfortunately, however, in spite of all His teaching as to the nature of the Kingdom of God, the popular ideas on the subject were still utterly astray. And so His popularity, just when it seemed to be soaring to its highest, was made to rest upon the least worthy foundations. This brings us to the sharp dividing line (see preceding art.) between a popularity that is true and

a popularity that is false, a popularity that Jesus could desire and welcome and one that He inevitably loathed and repelled. Jn.'s narrative shows that it was Christ's fame as a miracle-worker, and most of all His feeding of the Five Thousand in the wilderness, that raised His popularity to its point of culmination (Joh 6:14-15) But it was just then that Jesus rejected most emphatically a kind of popularity He did not want. And it was also from that day that the tide of popular favour which had swelled so high began to ebb.

3. What value did Jesus attach to His popularity?—'He did not care,' it has been said, 'for the thing called popularity, but He loved human beings' (Bruce, *Galilean Gospel*, p. 10). And it is quite true that there was a kind of popularity that Jesus not only did not care for, but always despised and shunned. And yet, just because He loved human beings so much, He desired a popularity of the right sort. Was it not in search of it that He came into Galilee preaching the gospel of the Kingdom, after He had been coldly received by the ecclesiastical authorities in the capital? To be popular is just to be beloved of the people, and the highest kind of popularity is when a man is beloved of the people on grounds which God and his own conscience can approve. It is impossible for one who loves, not to wish to have his love returned; and Jesus, loving men and women as no other human being ever did, undoubtedly desired them to love Him, and trust Him, and follow Him. This is the meaning of His invitations to them to come to Him, and of His words of sorrow and reproach when they refused. His soul, accordingly, must have filled with gladness and thankfulness when He saw the multitude pressing upon Him to hear His word, and listening to it with evident joy, or when He received the assurance of heart-felt gratitude from those whom He had healed or enlightened or lifted from the depths of self-despair. But, on the other hand, when men came after Him in search of signs and wonders (Mat 12:38; Mat 16:1 ||, Joh 4:48)—something to confirm them in their false ideals of the Kingdom of God, if not merely to gratify their gaping curiosity; worse still, when the multitude began to follow Him in the hope of being furnished gratis with the bread that they might have honestly earned (Joh 6:26), and to look to Him to set up by the use of His miraculous powers a kingdom of meat and drink and political privilege, He knew that now, under the guise of a dazzling popularity, the same temptation was returning which He had faced and conquered in the wilderness at the very outset of His ministry (Mat 4:1-11)—the temptation to love the praise of men more than the praise of God, and to attempt to set up the Kingdom of heaven upon earth by methods that were not Divine, but worldly and Satanic.

4. The decline of His popularity.—The miracle of the Feeding of the Five Thousand was a great turning-point in the life of Jesus. It marked, we have said, the culmination of His popularity, but also the beginning of its decline. And the reason for this decline was just that the popularity it brought was of a kind that Jesus could not accept. The people wished to take Him by force and make Him king (Joh 6:15), while

He wished to win in their hearts a spiritual Kingdom for His Father. They would have set Him on a worldly throne, and He knew that His Kingdom was not of this world (Joh 18:36). The two ideals were utterly incompatible. Henceforth, He who had sought the people and welcomed their coming began to avoid them (Joh 6:15, Mar 7:24; Mar 8:10; Mar 8:13; Mar 8:26-27; Mar 9:30), and, when they still came after Him, spoke not only of the gladness of the Kingdom, but of the mysterious pathway of the Cross (Joh 6:26-65, Mar 8:34 ff; Mar 10:21 ff.). The result was soon apparent. Nothing more quickly cools the enthusiasm of the multitude than the refusal of its object to be popular on the popular terms. After this many even of Christ's disciples went back and walked no more with Him (Joh 6:66). And though Peter answered nobly for the Twelve to that pathetic question, 'Will ye also go away?' (Joh 6:67-69), the Lord knew that one of the very Apostles whom He had chosen had admitted into his heart a devil of dissatisfaction with his Master (Joh 6:70-71). Soon, with the vision of the Cross before Him, He 'stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem' (Luk 9:51). The disciples, as they followed, were afraid (Mar 10:32), and so He prepared them for what was coming, by those great 'Lessons on the Cross' which mark the stages of His progress towards the great act of sacrifice (Mat 16:21-28 ||, Mat 20:17-28 ||, Mat 26:6-13; Mat 26:26-29 ||; cf. Bruce, *Training of the Twelve*). Day by day the shadows lengthened across the Saviour's path. And though at His last Passover the raising of Lazarus (Joh 12:9-11) led to a transitory outburst of fresh enthusiasm among the Galilaeans who had come up to the Feast (cf. Mat 21:11 with Mat 21:10), the time of His national popularity was really over from the day of the Capernaum discourse (Joh 6:24 ff.), and what lay before Him thereafter was a growing opposition that could end only in national rejection and the death on Calvary.

Literature.—Sanday's art. 'Jesus Christ' in Hastings' db; Andrews, *Life of Our Lord*; Stalker, *Life of Jesus Christ*; Bruce, *Training of the Twelve, Galilean Gospel*; *Expositor*; v. ii. [1895] 69.

J. C. Lambert.

Population

POPULATION.—Ancient statistics are proverbially unreliable, and in no department are they less trustworthy than in the reckoning of population. Except for military or fiscal purposes, the inhabitants of a Roman province were not liable to be counted, while, even in such cases, the estimate, when preserved, is at best approximate. The sole information, of any precise and fairly contemporary character, as to the population of Galilee in the days of Jesus, is to be found in Josephus *BJ*, iii. iii. The

historian there observes that the Galilaeans have always been numerous. The fertility of the soil induced the inhabitants to cultivate it, and trading was carried on assiduously. 'Moreover, the cities lie very thick, and the numerous villages are everywhere so populous, owing to the richness of the soil, that the smallest of them contains over 15,000 inhabitants.' This is probably an exaggeration, due to the historian's desire of glorifying the country; but even when one discounts his statements fairly, a residuum of fact remains, corroborated by the occasional allusions of the Gospels to the thickly populated districts in which Jesus lived and preached. If Josephus could muster 100,000 warriors from the province, some thirty years after the ministry of Jesus, and if the larger towns, like Scythopolis, included over 30,000 inhabitants, it is probable that the population of Galilee, during the first quarter of the first century, must have exceeded one million, if not two millions, since it included over 200 towns and villages within an area of about 100 square miles. Certainly, the Galilee into which Jesus brought His gospel (Mar 1:14), with its cities like Capernaum (Mar 1:21), its country-towns (Mar 1:38), and country-districts, was no thinly peopled tract. Crowds repeatedly gather round Him (Mar 1:45, Mar 2:13, Mar 4:1 etc.). His presence is the signal for multitudes to assemble, and although these were naturally drawn from the cities (cf. Mar 6:33 f.), the same holds true of the rural districts (cf. Mar 6:53 f.). A motto for the Galilaeen ministry might well be found in the words, 'In those days again there was a great crowd' (Mar 8:1), whether Jesus was in the populous cities by the Lake or touring through the inland synagogues. 'Save in the recorded hours of our Lord's praying, the history of Galilee has no intervals of silence and loneliness; the noise of a close and busy life is always audible; and to every crisis in the Gospels and in Josephus we see crowds immediately swarm' (HGHL [Note: GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.] , p. 421).

Eastward, it was otherwise. Gaulanitis, on the opposite side of the Lake, was more bare and wild, and to this quarter Jesus resorted at least once (Mar 4:35 f.) for some privacy, when pressed by the crowds of Capernaum and the neighbourhood. The population here was thinner. Villages were more widely scattered, and, apart from the southern federation of cities known as the Decapolis, there was a comparative lack of important towns. On the later spread of Christianity in Peraea, see Harnack's *Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums*, pp. 414 f. [English translation ii. 252 f.]. How far the Christian churches in that district were recruited from a mission of Jesus it is difficult to say, since it is uncertain how much St Luke has grouped from other sources under his account of the Peraean journey (Luk 9:51 etc., cf. Mar 10:1), and since the outbreak of the Jewish War drove many Christians from the west to the east of the Jordan. In any case, Peraea was less thickly populated than Galilee, though larger in extent. Josephus [*loc. cit.*,] describes it as 'for the most part desert and rough, and much less adapted than Galilee for the growth of cultivated fruits.' Samaria, on the opposite side of the Jordan, numbered a larger population

proportionately. But if Jesus worked here, it was only *en route* from Galilee to Judaea.

The crowds which Jesus found at Jerusalem were naturally drawn from the country-districts, so that they afford no reliable clue to the exact population of the capital, although, if we may trust the calculations of Josephus (*BJ* vi. ix.), it must have been capable of including, at the Passover season, more than three millions of people. Over two and a half million orthodox worshippers were reckoned at one census under Nero.

Literature.—Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*], ii. i. 2f.; Selah Merrill, *Galilee in the Time of Christ*; Besant, *The City and the Land*, p. 113 f.; Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, English translation vol. ii. p. 6 f.

J. Moffatt.

Porter

PORTER (θυρωρός, Mar_13:34, Joh_10:3; Joh_18:16 f. [in last passage, ‘she that kept the door’]).—The English word ‘porter’ is ambiguous, meaning ‘burden-bearer’ as well as ‘door-keeper.’ ‘Janitor’ or ‘gate-keeper’ would be a better rendering. ‘Porters’ were employed to guard city gates, and to keep watch at the entrance of public buildings and of private houses. It would appear from Joh_18:16 f., where a ‘damsel’ acts as door-keeper of the high priest’s palace, that in some instances women were thus employed (cf. Act_12:13 f.); see, further, Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible, artt. ‘Gate,’ ‘Porter,’ ‘Priests and Levites’ (iv. 93a).

The identity of the porter of the sheepfold (Joh_10:3) has been much discussed. Obviously, he is the guardian of the fold, whose office is to open the door to any shepherd (Joh_10:2 [Greek and (Revised Version margin)]) whose sheep are in the fold. See art. Sheep. Thus the porter may be (1) *God*: so Calvin (*Com. on John, in loc.*), Bengel (*Gnomon, in loc.*), and Hengstenberg (*Com. on John, in loc.*); (2) *Christ*: so Cyril and Augustine (quoted by Hengstenberg), who remark that Christ is His own porter; (3) *the Holy Spirit*: so Stier, Lange, Alford, and others. Others apply the figure to John the Baptist (so Godet) or to Moses. The most natural interpretation is that given by Westcott (*Gospel of John, in loc.*): ‘The interpretation will vary according to the special sense attached to the “sheep” and the “shepherd.” The figure is not to be explained exclusively of the Holy Spirit, or of the Father, or of Moses, or of John the Baptist, but of the Spirit acting through His appointed ministers in each case.’ For

(3) μέρος is used in the sense of *fate, destiny, or lot*; as such it occurs only twice in the Gospels: Mat 24:51 'He shall appoint his portion with the hypocrites,' and Luk 12:46 'He shall appoint his portion with the unfaithful.'* [Note: It is interesting in this connexion to recall the fact that μέρος is connected radically with Μοῖρα, the goddess of Fate.] The nearest approach to this in OT usage would be in Isa 17:14, where נִרְחֵם has a special and restricted meaning. There is a slight variation in the force of the word as used in Joh 13:8 'If I wash thee not, thou hast no part (μέρος) with me'; for, while in the two former passages the reference is to a final doom, in this the meaning is rather, 'If I wash thee not, thou canst have nothing to do with me.'

In one single instance 'portion' or 'part' occurs in the unique sense of one of the ways in which God is served; but here the word is μερίς, not μέρος (Luk 10:42 'Mary hath chosen the good part'; the context seems to demand the sense of 'the best part').

W. O. E. Oesterley.

☩ Portraits

PORTRAITS (of Christ).—See Christ in Art vol. i. p. 314 f.

☩ Possession

POSSESSION.—See Demon, Demoniacs.

POT.—There are two words rendered 'pot' in the Gospels, ξέστης and ὑδρία. The first is a corruption of the Lat. *sextarius*, and stands for a wooden vessel holding about a pint and a half, used at table for holding water and wine. This it is that is mentioned by Mk. (Mar 7:4; Mar 7:8) when he is relating how 'the Pharisees and all the Jews' kept 'the tradition of the elders.' 'When they come from the market,' he says, 'except they dip themselves' (βαπτίζονται, v.l. ῥαντίζονται) 'they do not eat'; and, among the 'many other things which they have received to hold,' he specifies 'the dippings (βαπτισμούς) of cups and pots' (ξεστῶν), etc. This he mentions to explain why the Pharisees and scribes came to ask Jesus, 'Why walk thy disciples not according to the tradition of the elders, but eat bread with unwashen hands?' thus giving Jesus occasion to apply to them the prophecy of Isaiah, 'This people honoureth me with

their lips, but their heart is far from me,' and otherwise exposing and rebuking their 'hypocrisy.'

When Jn. ([Joh 4:28](#)) tells us of the Samaritan woman, in the excitement of her new-found joy, 'leaving her water-pot,' he uses the words τὴν ὑδρίαν, pointing doubtless to just such a portable earthen water-pot as women in Palestine are everywhere to-day seen carrying on their heads. But in [Joh 2:6](#) where he gives an account of the miracle at the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee, he tells of 'six water-pots of stone' (λίθιναι ὑδρίαί), which were clearly 'pots' of a very different kind—too large to use at table, or to be portable in the ordinary way. Their size may be gathered from the next clause, 'containing two or three firkins a piece'—about nine English gallons. They were probably just such huge stone pitchers as are shown to tourists to-day at *Kefr Kennâ*, and as may be found elsewhere in Palestine. Scarcity of drinking water in Palestine made it necessary to keep a supply on hand in large vessels that would serve as coolers, especially in hot weather. Then a copious supply would be needed according to Jewish custom ('after the manner of the purifying of the Jews'), for use in the washing of hands and vessels before and after meals ([Mat 15:2](#), [Mar 7:3](#)).

Geo. B. Eager.

⚡Potter

POTTER.—'The Potter's Field' was the name of the property in the purchase of which the chief priests spent the thirty pieces of silver returned by Judas, and which they proposed to use as a burial-place for strangers ([Mat 27:7](#)). [Mat 27:8](#) states that this spot came in consequence to be known as 'the field of blood—that is, the field bought with the price of blood; but a different reason for that name is given in [Act 1:18-19](#), where Judas himself purchases the field, and commits suicide in it. The 'field of blood,' or Akeldama (אַקֵּלְדָמָא), is generally identified with a spot in which there are numerous tombs, and where also clay is found, lying to the south of Jerusalem, in the valley of Hinnom, not far from the point where it joins the valley of the Kidron (Baedeker, p. 103). St. Matthew believes that this incident of the purchase of the field happened in fulfilment of [Zec 11:12-13](#); which he reads as a prediction, and ascribes to Jeremiah. This may be a mere slip due to the mention in the Book of Jeremiah of the potter's house ([Jer 18:2](#)) and the Potsherd Gate ([Jer 19:2](#)), just as in [Jer 27:1](#) *Jehoiakim* is a slip for *Zedekiah*. Or, as Mede (d. 1638) supposed, Jeremiah may actually have been the author of these chapters. It is agreed that they are not by Zechariah. Although, however, there is no doubt that St. Matthew has this passage in

his mind, his citation of it is quite free, and diverges largely from the Hebrew, and even more from the Greek, in which v. 13 becomes an injunction to throw the silver into the smelting-pit (χωνετήριον, thus reading some derivative of צֶקֶ or of צֶרֶךְ) in order to prove whether it were genuine. Neither does the Targum come any nearer to the text of Matthew. The Syr. [Note: Syriac.] of Zech. instead of 'potter' (יֹצֵר) reads 'treasury' (אֹצֵר), which is generally accepted as correct.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, artt. 'Potter,' 'Akeldama'; Edersheim, *LT* [Note: *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* [Edersheim].] ii. 575 f. The difficulties of Mat 27:7-10 are discussed with especial fulness in the *Comm.* of Meyer and Morison.

T. H. Weir.

⚖️ Pound

POUND (μνᾶ).—The value of the *denarius* (Authorized Version 'penny') being about 9½d., the *mina* (Authorized Version 'pound'), which was 100 of these, was = £4 in our money. It was the 60th part of a talent. The only Gospel reference in this sense is in the parable of the Pounds (Luk 19:11-27). 'Pound' as a weight (λίτρα = 12 oz. avoird.) is alluded to in Joh 12:3; Joh 19:39 (see artt. Money and Weights and Measures).

Modern commentators of repute. (including Calvin) treat the story of the Pounds (Luk 19:11-27) as a variant of the parable of the Talents (Mat 25:14-30). and prevailing theories on the origin of the Gospels as we have them tend to the confirmation of this view. In Mt. the parable appears as part of the prophetic discourse delivered at Jerusalem, when days of disaster were impending, and our Lord's absence from this mortal scene became naturally an impressive theme (see art. Talents). Here in Lk., while activity during that absence is enjoined as a duty, colour is added to the story from local reminiscence. Jericho (Luk 19:1) owed its magnificent palace to the son of Herod the Great, Archelaus, facts from whose history seem clearly drawn upon in the narrative. The Herodian princes, on coming to office (Luk 19:12), went to Rome to receive imperial investiture (Josephus *Ant.* xiv. xiv. and xvii. xi. 4), and this same Archelaus was in such bad odour that an embassy of protest followed him (xv. xi. 1, etc.). Compare with this the action of the citizens, 'We will not have this man to reign over us' (Luk 19:14). As if to accentuate the variation between Mt. and Lk., we have a further modification of the figures in the

Gospel according to the Hebrews (c [Note: circa, about.] . [Note: circa, about.] 20 a.d.), where one servant wastes the goods of his lord among harlots and flute-players, another multiplies the pound, while a third conceals it; in the end, one is acknowledged, another reprov'd, and the third committed to prison. That Jesus uttered the parable is not to be doubted, but there seems some uncertainty in the details. The harshness of Mat 25:27, however, as coming from His lips, can be escaped, on the theory that these words were used with reference to Archelaus, who had proved himself amply capable of cruelty.

The entire sovereignty of the Christ being not yet manifested, the broad lesson stands forth, and is unexhausted in our age, that the true note of faithfulness is active zeal in His cause (Luk 19:13). Means diligently improved yield rich results (Luk 19:17 and Luk 19:19); and although these may vary among individual men, rewards are in all cases manifold (Luk 19:17 and Luk 19:19). The highly informing contrast conies when we turn to the Pharisaic class,—specially abhorrent to Jesus,—who not only do no sacrificing deeds, but even glory complacently in negative propriety (Luk 19:20). The ultimate reason of their remissness is the wrong idea of God (Luk 19:21), whom they figure as a taskmaster who exacts, instead of a kindly father who bestows. Hence the note of the 'austere,' which passes by reflexion into their own sorry travesty of the eternal life. Daily deeds of love are the familiar exchange (Luk 19:23),—a mart which such religionists thoroughly neglect, since none are harder with their fellows. But innate law must prevail (Luk 19:26), and indifference never ends in itself—the callous soon betray diminished receptivity. Steel rusts when never out of the sheath, and the saddest cases in religion are seen in those who start fair, but achieve nothing. The figure of reaping where one has not sown (Luk 19:21), charged falsely against the master, tells truly on the critics themselves. The seed of truth lay to their hand, but it could not grow and reproduce till it was planted in the soil. Cherished mechanically, in their fashion, it was bound to shrivel into a withered husk, from which the germ of life had expired. Hence the verdict of the Master, that in spite of all appearances to the contrary, only the semblance of spiritual power remained—'even that he hath shall be taken away from him' (Luk 19:26). Conversely, the more actively men employ the graces of the Christian life, the more susceptible their souls become to higher things. It is in order to emphasize this fact—and for no other purpose—that the gainers of the ten pounds and the five pounds respectively are specified and put side by side in the story. The forfeited 100 drachms are awarded to the former, not to the latter, for 'unto every one that hath shall be given' (Luk 19:28). Life for us all means stewardship, and psychology more and more reveals a delicate and automatic system of rewards and punishments, under sanction of the One Supreme Being, who is revealed in teaching such as this, and who offers all men the saving presence of His Spirit.

Literature.—Trench and Bruce in their works on the Parables, *in loc.*; Lynch, *Serm. for my Curates*, 103 ff.

George Murray.

☒ Poverty

POVERTY.—That the life of Christ was one of poverty is an impression very generally derived from the familiar words of Is 53, and also from Php 2:7 ('took upon himself the form of a slave') and 2Co 8:9 ('he became poor, that ye through his poverty might become rich'). But the general picture of the surroundings of Christ which we find in the Gospels is one of healthy active life. Throughout NT times, until the final agony, the resources of Palestine were well used, and the population was able to bear considerable taxation with comparative ease; and though Judaea was liable to scarcity (cf. St. Paul's care for the Jewish Christians, 1Co 16:1, Act 24:17), Galilee was a hive of industry (see Swete, *Gospel of St Mark*, p. lxxxii; and Buhl, art. 'New Testament Times' in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible*, Extra Vol. p. 45, with authorities cited at end). In accordance with this distinction, the contact of Jesus with the poor as described in the Gospels is almost confined to Judaea and Jerusalem (Mat 19:16, Mar 10:21 the rich young ruler; Mar 12:42, Luk 21:1 the poor widow; Mat 26:6, Mar 14:5 'this ointment might have been sold for much and given to the poor'; Mat 20:30, Mar 10:46, Luk 18:35 the blind beggars outside Jericho; cf. Mat 25:35).

1. The place of poverty in Christ's own life.

(a) *The home in Nazareth.*—That Christ's parents were not wealthy we gather from St. Luke's narrative of the Infancy (Luk 2:24), where the offering of the poor is brought at the Presentation; that 'there was no room for them in the inn' (Luk 2:7) does not in itself show that they were badly off. Nor does the fact that Nazareth was an inconsiderable town [the question in Joh 1:46, if implying a bad reputation, is not quite borne out by the facts; see Westcott, *St. John*, *ad loc.*] condemn all its inhabitants to poverty (see Edersheim, *Life and Times of the Messiah*, i. 183). Since we are entirely without direct information on either side, we can only conjecture that the form of the townspeople's question as given in St. Mark ('Is not this the carpenter?' Mar 6:3; cf. Mat 13:55), and the movements of His family (Joh 2:12, where His mother and His brethren are staying at Capernaum; Joh 2:2, where His mother and His disciples are guests at Cana) imply a certain position of independence (cf. Joh 1:38 'Where dwellest thou?').

The story in Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 19, 20) of the grandsons of Judas ‘the Lord’s brother’ being summoned before Domitian, and removing his suspicion of them by the appearance of their horny labourers’ hands, can hardly throw light on the circumstances of Christ’s own home.

(b) *The active Ministry.*—Christ and His disciples, certainly did not subsist on charity; true, the Son of Man had not where to lay his head (Mat 8:20, Luk 9:58); but this shows only that Christ was content not to have a home of His own, not that He could not have had one. The little party had a common ‘bag’ or purse (Joh 12:6), from which they purchased necessities (Joh 4:8; cf. Mat 16:5, Mar 8:14) and gave to the poor (Joh 13:29; cf. Mat 26:9). The disciples’ question before the feeding of the five thousand, as given in St. Mark (Mar 6:37 ‘Shall we buy two hundred pennyworth of bread?’ cf. Luk 9:13), though doubtless ironical, does not suggest actual penury. It would seem that Jesus was in the habit of paying the Temple tax (Mat 17:24). As the firstborn, He would under ordinary circumstances have the larger share of whatever property His father might leave. That He was not without well-to-do friends, and used their hospitality, is certain. Zebedee would seem to have been in a good position (Mar 1:20 ‘with the hired servants’; one of his sons is personally known to the high priest, Joh 18:15). Perhaps it was through his help that Jesus was able to have a small boat constantly in attendance on Him when preaching at the Lake of Galilee (ἵνα πλοιάριον προσκαρτερῇ αὐτῷ, Mar 3:9). The same thing may be gathered of the household at Bethany (Luk 10:38; and still more Joh 11:3; Joh 11:45; Joh 12:3); certain women, including the wife of Herod’s steward, ‘minister’ to Him (Mar 15:40, Luk 8:3). He is able to secure an ass on which to enter into Jerusalem (Mat 21:3, Mar 11:3, Luk 19:31), a lodging at night through the last week (Mat 21:7, Mar 11:19, Luk 21:37), and the use of an upper room for the Passover (Mat 26:18, Mar 14:15); nor is there anything to suggest that Christ’s hunger when He was passing the barren fig-tree was the result of inability to procure food (Mat 21:18, Mar 11:12).

2. Teaching about poverty.—The blessedness of the poor is the subject of the first Beatitude (see the following article). In the same discourse occur the prohibitions against taking anxious thought (Mat 6:25) and laying up treasures (Mat 6:19). Prayer for temporal wants is to be for ‘daily bread’ (‘bread of the coming day’ or ‘bread of sufficiency,’ ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος; see Lord’s Prayer) alone (Mat 6:11, Luk 11:3). Christ bids the disciples of John observe that the poor have the gospel preached unto them (Mat 11:5, cf. Isa 61:1-2, Luk 4:18), and specially contrasts the widow with the rich donors to the Temple treasury (Mar 12:42, Luk 21:3). The danger of wealth is constantly pointed out (Mat 19:23, Mar 10:23, Luk 18:24 ‘How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of heaven’; Mat 18:8 ‘If thy hand or thy foot cause thee to stumble, cut it off’; Luk 16:19 the parable of Lazarus and Dives; Luk 12:16 the parable of the Rich Fool, following on Christ’s peremptory refusal to

divide the inheritance between the two brothers). Cf. the command to the rich young ruler, 'Sell all that thou hast,' [Mat 19:21](#), [Mar 10:21](#), [Luk 18:22](#), in which there was evidently some personal appropriateness; the demand was not universally made. According to our accounts, the Temple was cleansed of buyers and sellers both at the beginning and the end of the ministry ([Joh 2:14](#), and [Mat 21:12](#), [Mar 11:15](#)). That Christ had the true Israelite contempt for money and commercial prosperity is at least hinted in the story of the Temptation ([Mat 4:10](#), [Luk 4:8](#)), and shown quite plainly in the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard: 'It is my will to give unto this last even as unto thee,' [Mat 20:15](#),—a principle which, as Ruskin saw (*Unto this Last*), is a defiance of political economy as ordinarily understood. Compare the anti-commercial statutes in [Deu 15:1](#) f., [Exo 23:10](#) f., [Lev 25:1-15](#) as to the remission of debts and the reversion of holdings in the Sabbatical year and year of Jubilee. If faithful to the Law, it was impossible for Israel to be anything but a comparatively poor nation (note, however, [Deu 15:4](#)), as would necessarily be the case with the Christian community which obeyed the rules, 'Give to him that asketh thee,' and 'Lend, never giving up hope,' μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες ([Luk 6:35](#); cf. [Mat 6:12](#), [Luk 11:4](#)). Peabody (*Jesus Christ and the Social Question*) points out the further opposition to current Socialism implied in the parable of the Talents ([Mat 25:29](#), [Luk 12:48](#); cf. [Mat 13:12](#)).

An interesting echo of this teaching on poverty, or on the openhandedness that must prevent the dangerous accumulation of wealth, is found in the *Gospel of the Hebrews* (fragm. 11), where the rich man who came to Christ in the attitude of the young ruler is told that he could not have kept the Law, since people are dying of hunger at his gates. What we do not find, however, in the Gospels, is any eulogy of poverty for its own sake; it is enjoined simply as an almost indispensable aid to serving God aright. And the fact that Christ constantly mixes with what we should call the middle classes and the well-to-do, without rebuking them or bidding them give up all, shows that poverty must be understood in a relative sense, and not as the equivalent of penury. His life was one long protest against the attitude of 'virtus laudatur et alget.' To take [Mat 26:11](#), 'Ye have the poor always with you,' to mean that the existence of poverty must be acquiesced in, is to forget all that was said about mercifulness and liberality by Him who, when He saw the multitudes, 'had compassion on them' ([Mat 9:36](#); [Mat 14:14](#)). Christ demanded the surrender not of money in itself, but of everything that could interfere with the interests of the Kingdom of heaven; in this sense the verb ἀφίημι, 'to give up, leave' ([Mat 19:29](#), [Mar 10:28](#), [Mat 4:20](#), [Mar 1:18](#); cf. [Luk 9:60](#)), is characteristic of the Gospels,—as characteristic as it is in its other meaning of 'to forgive.' The ideal is not poverty but service ([Mat 20:27](#), 'Whosoever would become first among you shall be your servant').

Literature.—Edersheim, *Life and Times of the Messiah*; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] *passim*; Delitzsch, *Artisan Life in the Time of Christ*; Vogelstein, *Landwirtschaft in Palästina*, 1894; Merrill, *Galilee in the Time of Christ*; for good remarks on the place of poverty in Christ's teaching, see Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums* ('Das Evangelium und die Armut'); *Expos.* 6th ser. xi. (1905), 321.

W. F. Lofthouse.

☩ Poverty Of Spirit

POVERTY OF SPIRIT.—According to the Matthaean version of the Sermon on the Mount, our Lord pronounced the first Beatitude on the 'poor in spirit' (πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι). In the corresponding passage of Lk. (Luk_6:20) the words τῷ πνεύματι are omitted; and there can be little doubt that this simpler form of the Beatitude is the more original. It may be gathered, indeed, from quotations in the early Fathers (cf. Polycarp, ii. 3; *Clem. Hom.* xv. 10; Polyer. 2) that the primitive reading in Mt. also was 'Blessed are the poor,' and that the qualifying words were introduced later, in order to define the sense more exactly. Though formally an addition to the actual saying of Jesus, they were felt to be necessary for the right translation of an Aramaic term which had come to bear a peculiar shade of meaning.

1. Already in the later OT writings we find poverty associated with a certain religious temper. The 'poor' are also the contrite of heart (Isa_66:2); they are the 'meek ones' who lend a willing ear to the Divine message (Psa_37:11, Isa_61:1). This estimate of poverty is probably to be explained by historical circumstances. The foreign influences which began to operate in the period succeeding the Exile had chiefly affected the richer classes, while the poor still clung to the ancient traditions. Poverty thus acquired a moral significance, which was reinforced by the conditions prevailing in our Lord's own time. As a result of the externalizing process which had long been at work in religion, the rich were in a specially favoured position from the point of view of legal righteousness. They alone were at leisure to study the Law and to order their lives according to its requirements. They were not exposed, like tradesmen and artisans, to a constant risk of Levitical defilement. They could afford to give alms, and offer the stated sacrifices, and cast much into the Temple treasury. The distinction of wealth and poverty had, therefore, come to be a religious as well as a social distinction; and the Pharisaic spirit of pride and self-sufficiency was chiefly prevalent among the rich. In their consciousness of strict obedience to the Law, they could lay claim to peculiar privileges, and look down with contempt on the ignorant 'people of the land' (Joh_7:49). It must always be remembered that, when Jesus

speaks of wealth or poverty, He is thinking not so much of a social status as of the religious conditions involved in it. Much in His teaching that has been supposed to bear on present-day economic questions, belongs properly to quite a different sphere.

2. It is thus apparent that the words τῷ πνεύματι, although not literally uttered by Jesus, are necessary to the right understanding of His thought. He pronounces His blessing on the poor, in so far as their spiritual temper corresponds with their outward condition. Their poverty was commonly assumed to entail certain drawbacks which placed them at a hopeless disadvantage in their relations to God. Jesus declares that, on the contrary, it was their privilege. It served to foster in them the disposition which could most readily understand the message of the Kingdom and respond to it. 'Blessed are the poor who have allowed their poverty to fulfil its work in them,—who are poor in spirit as well as in worldly circumstances.' The truth of the saying may be best illustrated by the historical fact that our Lord's earliest disciples were drawn, almost wholly, from the poorer class. In this class alone He found those who were capable of entering into sympathy with Him and co-operating with Him in His work.

3. What, then, is the religious temper, the 'poverty of spirit,' which was associated in our Lord's mind with actual poverty? When we examine the saying in the light of the general context of the teaching of Jesus, we can discover three main ideas which are implied in it. (1) In the first place, poverty of spirit is the *receptivity* for the Divine message. It corresponds, in this sense, with the teachable, childlike spirit to which the Kingdom is elsewhere promised (Mat_18:2 ff.). The wealthier classes, in their scrupulous obedience to the Law, had become enslaved to custom and tradition. Before the new teaching could make any appeal to them, they had everything to unlearn, freeing their minds entirely of the prejudices and conventional ideas which had encrusted them. In the poor, the instinct for truth had never been perverted by mistaken habit and education. They could listen to Jesus with an open mind, and allow His message to make its own impression. From those who would enter into His Kingdom our Lord demands this receptivity, which in His own time He found, almost exclusively, among the poor,—the common people who heard Him gladly (Mar_12:37).—(2) The idea of *humility* is likewise implied. Arrogance and self-complacency are at all times the peculiar vices of men of wealth; and in our Lord's day these vices bore a religious as well as a social complexion. The rich man could boast, like the Pharisee in the parable, that he was not as other men, since he had fulfilled to the letter every demand of the Law. His pride as a rich man became, in the religious sphere, self-righteousness. Our Lord perceived that to such a temper of mind no true desire for God or right relation towards Him was possible. God could not bestow His gift on those who had never, in a deep sense of personal unworthiness, realized their need of it. The Kingdom of heaven was for the 'poor in spirit,'—the

poor who are conscious of their poverty, and so make their approach to God.—(3) A third idea, characteristic of the whole teaching of Jesus, seems also to be involved in the words. Discipleship is impossible without a *renunciation* of earthly possessions. The natural result of wealth is to hamper a man in his pursuit of the higher life, since he cannot help reflecting, like the young ruler, how much it is likely to cost him. The poor have little to lose, and need have no hesitancy. They can answer the call of Christ at any moment, with an instant, unquestioning obedience. It is not, however, an outward poverty that our Lord demands, but a ‘poverty of spirit,’ an inward renunciation. There may be no demand for a literal abandonment of worldly possessions, but the true disciple will hold them indifferent. He will not be retarded in any Christian service by the fear of losing them. Whatever be his outward condition, he will have laid aside every weight, detached himself from all earthly considerations, and will act in the poor man’s spirit of instant readiness at the Divine call.

The effect, therefore, of the added words in Mt. is to attach a deeper, moral significance to the original idea of poverty. Among the poor of His own land and time our Lord discovered the truest examples of the receptive, humble, unworldly temper which He demanded in His followers. The idea of social status was subordinate in His mind to that of an inward spirit, which is not necessarily confined to any particular class. By whatever process the qualifying words were introduced into the saying, they correctly interpret the real thought of Jesus, and are necessary to guard it from misconstruction.

4. The Beatitude as a whole is clearly reminiscent of OT passages which comfort the ‘poor in the land’ with the promise of Messianic blessedness (cf. esp. Psalms 37). As in the other Beatitudes, our Lord arrests attention by stating His idea in a bold paradoxical form. The poor, whom men despised and pitied, were the truly rich; a wonderful inheritance was reserved for them, and was already ‘theirs,’ in the midst of their seeming poverty. We may trace, likewise, an implied answer to current Jewish theories of worldly misfortune as evidence of God’s displeasure. The poor, so far from suffering a deserved punishment, were to be regarded as ‘blessed.’—Their hardships were the promise and guarantee of their entrance into the Kingdom.

5. This Beatitude is placed first in the versions of both Mt. and Lk., and evidently with a deliberate intention. Poverty of spirit is the fundamental requirement in the Christian life. It represents a condition of mind and heart without which a man is wholly irresponsive to the Divine influences. As Jesus began His ministry with a call to repentance, so He pronounced His first Beatitude on the ‘poor in spirit.’ He thus repeated, under a different image, the great declaration, ‘Except ye turn and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven’ (Mat_18:3).

Literature.—Titius, *Die NT Lehre von der Seligkeit*, 1805, Part i. (esp. p. 72 ff.); H. J. Holtzmann, *NT Theologie*, vol. i. 181 f. (1897); Loisy, *Le discours sur la montagne* (1903); also works of a popular or homiletical character, e.g.: Dykes, *Beatitudes of the Kingdom* (1876); Gore, *Sermon on the Mount* (1904); Griffith-Jones, *Sermon on the Mount* (1903); Iverach, *The Other Side of Greatness* (1906; cf. *ExpT [Note: xpT Expository Times.]* xviii. [1907], p. 146 f.).

E. F. Scott.

⚡ Power

POWER.—The term indicates the efficient force by which personal commands and the claims of law receive obedient attention and fulfilment.

In Authorized Version of Gospels ‘power’ is used with about equal frequency to represent two words in the original, δύναμις and ἐξουσία. These words are thus distinguished by Grimm-Thayer:—‘δύν. *power*, natural ability, general and inherent; ἐξουσί. primarily liberty of action, then *authority*—either as delegated power or as unrestrained, arbitrary power.’ Cf. also Cremer, s.vv. In Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, except in the three cases named below, ‘authority’ is given as the rendering of ἐξουσία, usually in the text, sometimes in the margin. Luk 22:53 retains ‘power’ without any marginal alternative; Joh 1:12 gives ‘right’; Joh 10:18 retains ‘power,’ but has ‘right’ in margin.

1. Power in the personal life of Christ.—During His earthly ministry, in the impression made both upon His disciples and upon the hostile Pharisees, as well as upon the mass of the people, there is abundant testimony to the transcendent personality of Christ. With this accords also the estimate concerning Him in the Acts and the Epistles. A vague attempt at assimilation likened Him to one of the prophets (Mat 16:14), and Herod saw in Him the risen John the Baptist (Mar 6:16), but otherwise His life and character were ever recognized as unique and beyond comparison (see Awe). In His works of healing, wrought on mind and body, the evidence was open to all (Mar 5:15, Luk 9:43). It was the same with His teaching (Mat 7:29). In dealing with the most venerated religious precepts and traditions, He acts with the ease and freedom of original authority, noting limitations and supplying enlarged meanings and higher applications (Mat 5:33-48). He rejects the offer of world empire (Luk 4:6; Luk Luk 4:8), and warns those whom He sent forward to tell of His approach not to rejoice even in the exercise of His delegated power (Luk 10:20). The same qualities

of range and originality are recognized in His sympathy with the outcast and suffering (Luk 7:34; Luk 13:11, Joh 11:35), in His knowledge of the heart and its temptations (Luk 5:20; Luk 7:47, Joh 4:18), and in His controversies with the Jewish leaders (Mat 22:15-46). A still deeper insight into the uniqueness of His character is afforded by what was involved in following and serving Him (Luk 14:25-35, Joh 14:12; Joh 15:8). His works were stated by Himself to have been wrought in God (Joh 14:10), who also had sent Him (Joh 9:4, Joh 16:28); and His day had been foreseen by Abraham (Joh 8:56) and Isaiah (Isa 61:1-2), and by the prophets generally (Luk 24:27). His Kingdom was to be coextensive with the world and its nationalities (Mat 8:11; Mat 26:13; Mat 28:19, Joh 10:16; Joh 17:20). The gift of His life, offered freely and apart from external constraint, was to be the bond of union among His disciples (Mat 26:26-28, Joh 15:12-13), and was to be the power that would draw the world unto Him (Joh 3:14; Joh 12:32). The impression thus made upon His disciples became in turn the testimony which they gave to the world—‘The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth’ (Joh 1:14). See Authority of Christ.

2. Power in the Kingdom of Christ.—Christ declared of His Kingdom that it was not of this world (Joh 18:36). Those worldly kingdoms were of the sword, established by and for physical dominion. As every created thing must, by the inward necessity of that condition, come to an end, so those kingdoms would perish by the sword (Mat 26:52). His Kingdom, on the other hand, did not rise from beneath, but descended from above, having its origin in the eternal thought of God, the Kingdom of heaven. With the first grasp of this meaning, its administration was spoken of as different from the law of a carnal commandment, being ‘the power of an endless life’ (Heb 7:16).

In the prophetic intimation of its advent through the mediation of the sorrows of Zion, the essential character and tendency of this Kingdom, the requirements of its citizenship, the extent of its dominion, the motive of its statesmanship, its estimate of heroism, and its rewards of service, were all so new and conflicting, that there seemed to be two Messiahs, one who should reign and deliver, and one who should serve and suffer (Isaiah 53; Isa 59:16-19; Isa 61:1-3). Only the accomplished fact was able to reveal, and in new areas of its expansion is still revealing, that for such a Kingdom the anointed Head must needs have suffered in order to enter into His glory (Luk 24:26). The new and wonderful element that made its citizenship not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man (Joh 1:13), consisted in this, that whereas in the kingdoms of the world there had been an ever-ascending scale of power, man living unto himself, and governments existing for the sake of the governing classes, so there was in this Kingdom a correspondingly descending scale of service in which all those features were precisely reversed. Whereas previously in religion men were the supplicants, and sacrificed unto their deities, and propitiated

them by gifts and promises of devotion, in this Kingdom God Himself was the chief sacrificer, offering His only-begotten Son; and the Almighty sought to reconcile the weak unto Himself (Joh_3:16; Joh_3:18; Joh_12:27; Joh_18:37), with this leading fact of the Kingdom all the others followed in complete agreement. He who would be accounted greatest must qualify for that distinction by becoming the servant of all (Mat_20:26; Mat_20:28). Women are declared to excel in faith (Mat_15:28), discernment (Mat_26:13), and courageous sacrifice (Mar_12:41-44). Little children are regarded with reverence, and the loving trust of a child's heart gives direction to the wise, and appoints the duties of the great (Mat_18:3-4; Mat_19:14). The constitution and aspirations of the Kingdom, as embodied in the Sermon on the Mount, not only surpass all similar requirements of government, but seem to invert all that the world had hitherto counted great and noble. The innermost instinct of empire, the white ensign of this unique Kingdom, is the joy of harmonious relationship to the will of God. Government is by beatitudes. The crucifixion of self for the sake of others is the recognition mark of its people. This pervades all gradations of its society, for He who is on the throne emptied Himself, and what is done unto the least is regarded as done unto Him (Mat_25:40). Instead of pride and ambition, the lust of power and possession that had created and controlled other dynasties, its regalia and administration are entrusted to the poor in spirit who claim no homage. The dispensing of the beatitudes is given to those who have become acquainted with grief and discouragement, whose necks have felt the pressure of the harsh forces and sharp limitations of life. Here also for exalted office there is the partaking of the Divine nature, but it is reserved for the pure in heart. So rich is the provision for its subjects, that even the cry of hunger becomes a feast, and to bear a burden and cross with Christ is an immediate Paradise. By its connexion with the One Name of which the OT spoke it fulfilled the vision of the prophets which Judaism had obscured, and, on the other hand, included in due place and proportion those gifts for physical need and circumstance that had been the crown and consummation of Gentile desire (Mat_6:33). These are both represented in the familiar and venerated form of prayer which in its first part lifts the language of our possession above all gifts to God Himself, but makes it treason for His Church to covet the Name, the Kingdom, and the Will. In its second part it encourages the claim of our continual frailty, ignorance, and dependence.

Again, the same principle of looking and stooping downwards and of uplifting what is beneath is the main subject-matter of the parables of Christ. The power that is seen exemplified in them is the counterpart of what is set forth in the Sermon on the Mount. Under various aspects, in whole or in part, they unfold the meaning of discipleship, the power of the Kingdom, and the dangers that attend its service. Here also, to be in the Kingdom is beatitude; and when this privilege of entrance has been prevented by any cause whatever, the regret over the one wasted life and its great opportunity is described as weeping and gnashing of teeth (Luk_13:28).

Thus in His life and death, in His teaching and labours, Christ conformed to the beatitudes of the Kingdom, and afterwards entrusted its advancement to His disciples. 'Come unto me—take my yoke—learn of me,'—salvation, self-devotion, sainthood,—these were the steps into the Kingdom, and the power of its service.

In His last message to the disciples our Lord gave two special commands about the Kingdom they were to establish and extend in His name. This communication was accompanied by a touching and solemn act of covenant, and endeared by the mention of all that He had been and would be to them. The first concerned the loyalty to Himself that was to carry with it the invincible power of the Kingdom. It was, 'Abide in me and I in you' (Joh 15:4). In His cherished presence they would know His purpose, and that would be their way of power. This presence, however, could be granted only where they loved one another as He had loved them (Joh 15:12). It was in vain to go out to the conquest of the world unless this base of operations was safeguarded. They were to tarry in Jerusalem until it became in each heart a conscious experience beyond the reach of doubt or discouragement. This enabling supernatural power of the Kingdom came to be called the grace of God. In 1 Corinthians 13 its essential meaning is breathed forth as from a vase containing the fragrance of what is no longer visible. Its power within the heart is exhibited in Romans 8, and its energy of diffusion in Romans 13.

The second charge affected the world that was to be His possession, the nations that were to bring each its special riches and glory into His Kingdom (Mat 28:19-20, cf. Mar 16:15). It was His greatest commandment, and is therefore the greatest test of love to Him. He recognized the right and claim of the world to wait until it received sufficient evidence that He had been sent to be its Ruler. He warned His disciples that the only evidence that could carry such conviction would be the sight of a Church so filled with the spirit of His Kingdom and so devoted to the fulfilment of His command, that all things would give way in order to the presentation of that proof. The world that will say the Church is one will say that Christ is Lord (Joh 10:16; Joh 17:21-23).

See also art. Force.

Literature.—W. Arthur, *Tongue of Fire*, ch. ix.; A. Maclaren, *Holy of Holies*, chs. vi. viii.; Mason, *Conditions of our Lord's Life on Earth* (1896), 84; W. N. Clarke, *What shall we think of Christianity?* (1899), 106; Forrest, *Authority of Christ*.

G. M. Mackie.

PRAETORIUM.—The word occurs in the text of Mar 15:16 only, but in the margin of Mat 27:27, Joh 18:28; Joh 18:33; Joh 19:9, with Act 23:35 and Php 1:13. In the Gr. it is a transliteration of the Lat. *praetorium*, which originally meant the tent of the commander of an army, and then the official residence of a provincial governor; other senses, such as that of the Imperial bodyguard or even of a spacious country house, were gradually acquired. In most of the passages in the Gospels it is used in reference to a part or the whole of Pilate's official residence in Jerusalem, which was probably the palace of Herod the Great (see Pavement).

Two other identifications are supported by comparatively early tradition, but are not on the whole to be approved. That Pilate's house was in the lower city, a little to the north of the Temple, is altogether unlikely. The theory has failed to be confirmed by any discovery of the site; and it is not easy to see why Pilate should prefer such a locality, when the palace built by Herod was available as the official residence of the procurator. More can be said in favour of Pilate's occupation of the castle of Antonia, which stood to the north-west of the Temple area. It was a fortress and prison, and served as the headquarters of the garrison at Jerusalem. Josephus (*Ant.* xv. xi. 4; *BJ* i. v. 4) describes it as a citadel, with abundant accommodation, and connected with the precincts of the Temple by a private way. But, again, Pilate was not likely, especially when accompanied by his wife and household (Mat 27:19), to stay there, when the sumptuous palace of Herod, with its gardens and banqueting halls, was at his disposal. It is true that the proximity of Antonia to the Temple would be a convenience to the priests and Sanhedrists, and save them from the toil of attendance at the more remote palace: but Pilate was not the man to study the wishes or comfort of the Jewish leaders at the cost of any discomfort to himself. The arguments in favour of his adoption of the castle as his residence have been accepted, amongst recent commentators, by Westcott (on John 18) and Swete (on Mar 15:16); but, on the other hand, Herod's palace has been preferred by Schürer, Edersheim, Sir C. Wilson, and commentators such as Alford and Meyer. The practice at Jerusalem would thus correspond with that at Caesarea (Act 23:33-35).

Such a hypothesis leaves the passages in which the praetorium is referred to without any serious difficulty; and it becomes possible to follow the probable order of events. According to St. John, the trial of Jesus took place in one of the porticoes of Herod's palace. When sentence was pronounced, Jesus was led away by the soldiers to Antonia, where they were themselves quartered, and where prisoners were ordinarily detained. He was taken into a court, to which also the name of *praetorium* is given (Mat 27:27, Mar 15:16), and mocked by such of the soldiers as were off duty. In this connexion *praetorium* denotes probably the place of meeting of the council of chief officers for the transaction of the business of the cohort and for the trial of offences in the absence of the procurator. Such a usage of the term is anticipated, if not illustrated, in Livy (*Hist.* xxx. 5, xxxvii. 5); and the existence of such a court would be

necessary for the maintaining of order in Jerusalem and the vicinity. When the soldiers were weary of the mocking, they led Jesus away again to be crucified.

R. W. Moss.

☞ Praise

PRAISE

1. Introductory.—Both in the OT and the NT the predominant idea of ‘praise’ is that of a tribute of homage in utterance, publicly expressed and rendered to God by His creatures. It forms the essence of worship, whether as offered by angels (cf. Luk_2:13-14; Luk_2:20, Rev_14:6 f.) or men (cf. Luk_19:37 f.). The subject of this ‘praise’ is either the excellencies of God’s attributes and revealed nature (cf. esp. Revelation 19) or the beneficent action of His providence, as shown more particularly in creation, revelation, and redemption (thanksgiving); cf. Act_2:47, Rev_15:3 f. In the Gospels Jesus is sometimes the object of praise and homage (Mat_21:16; cf. Luk_4:15), and Himself often dispenses praise for certain qualities of human nature or character (cf. Mat_8:10; Mat_11:11 etc.). The praise of man by man is usually applied in the Gospels to unreal and hypocritical commendation, and is condemned by Jesus (Mat_6:1, Luk_6:26; cf. Joh_5:41-44; Joh_12:43).

2. Jewish usage.—In Jewish worship the element of praise occupies a dominant place, and has received rich and manifold expression. The title of the Bk. of Psalms in the Massoretic Text, *Sepher Tēhillîm** [Note: The title of one of the late (synagogal) Psalms is דָּוִד תְּהִלָּה, Psa_146:1 (‘Praise-Song of David’).] (and its variants) = ‘Book of *Praises* or *Praise-Songs*,’ is an indication of the emphasis which was laid on the note of praise in later Jewish worship. This note is already prominent in the Psalter itself (cf. e.g. ‘O thou that inhabitest the *praises* of Israel,’ Psa_22:3). The close connexion existing between the ideas of praise and thanksgiving (cf. e.g. Psa_100:4 ‘Enter his gates with *thanksgiving*, his courts with *praise*’) has already been pointed out in this work (see art. Blessing, § 1). Indeed, thanksgiving (Heb. *hōdâh*)—esp. for God’s beneficence in creation, revelation, and providence—is an essential part of praise. If a distinction can be drawn, *praise* pure and simple is rather to be associated with extolling God’s perfections and holiness, while *blessing* (thanksgiving) is connected rather with thankful recognition of His goodness, beneficence, and mercy. But this is true only in a general sense; the two conceptions are so intimately related that one passes over into the other almost imperceptibly.

For the Hebrew terms employed with the meaning ‘praise’ and its cognates, reference may be made to the art. ‘Praise (in OT)’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible iv. 33 f. The most frequent are—תְּלִלָה ‘praise’ (esp. in the liturgical formula תְּלִלֵי יְהוָה = Hallelujah), חוֹדָה ‘give thanks’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), וְפָדַ בְּיָדָי ‘bless,’ וְפָדַ ‘make melody’; rare synonyms are—שִׁבְחָה ‘laud’ (but very frequent in Jewish liturgy), רִוְמָם ‘exalt,’ וְגָדַל תְּהַדְרִיל ‘magnify.’ Cf. also such phrases as ‘Sing unto J” [Note: “Jehovah.] a new song.’

In the Synagogue Liturgy the element of praise has received splendid expression. The most classical examples of this are perhaps the great ‘Benediction of Song’ (ברבחה) (הַשִּׁיר) [Note: Singer’s Heb.-Eng. Daily Prayer Book, pp. 36, 125-127. See also an art. by the present writer, ‘S. Peter in the Jewish Liturgy,’ in the ExpT [1903], xv. 93 f.] and the *Kaddish*.‡ [Note: Singer, p. 37.] The former of these, in its shortest form, runs thus:

‘Be Thy name lauded for ever, O our King, the great and holy God and King, in heaven and on earth; for unto Thee, O Lord our God and God of our fathers, song and laud are becoming, praise and psalm, strength and dominion, victory, greatness and might, renown and glory, holiness and sovereignty, blessings and thanksgivings, from henceforth, even for ever. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, God and King, great in praises, God of thanksgivings, Lord of wonders, who makest choice of melodious song, O King and God, the Life of all worlds.’

In the *Kaddish* the following characteristic paragraph occurs:

‘Blessed, lauded, and glorified, exalted, extolled and honoured, magnified and praised be the name of the Holy One, Blessed be He; though He be high above all the blessings and songs, hymns of praise and consolation, which are uttered in the world.’

These are simply specimens of what pervades the entire Jewish Liturgy. In the Gospels the Angels’ Song of Praise (Luk 2:14) is an example of pure praise in worship, parallels to which are to be found in the Apocalypse (Rev 4:11; Rev 7:12; Rev 11:17; Rev 14:7; Rev 19:1 f.). In Rabbinical theology, it is to be noticed, prayer and praise form the spiritual counterpart and fulfilment of the old daily sacrifice in the Temple. The words of Hosea (Hos 14:2), ‘We shall render as bullocks the offering of our lips,’ were interpreted in this sense. Spiritual worship thus becomes a ‘sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.’ Cf. Heb 13:15 (‘Through him’—*i.e.* Christ—‘let us offer up a sacrifice of praise’) with Westcott’s note; cf. also our Lord’s application of the words of Hos 6:6 (‘I desire mercy, and not sacrifice’) in Mat 9:13; Mat 12:7.

For the close connexion of prayer and praise—which are sometimes intermingled in the Jewish Liturgy, e.g. in the ‘Eighteen Blessings’—cf. Cheyne’s note on Psa 42:9 (*Book of Psalms* [1888], p. 118 f.).

3. Usage in the Gospels.—The note of praise so characteristic of Jewish worship also pervades the Gospels. It is esp. prominent in the Third Gospel, where it appears not only in the Jewish-Christian Nativity-narrative (chs. 1, 2) [see Hymn], but also elsewhere (cf. Luk 19:37). It is noticeable how often the people (spectators, the assembled multitude) are represented as ‘praising’ or ‘glorifying’ God for some great exhibition of power wrought by Jesus (see below).

The Greek terms for ‘praise’ and its cognates used in the Gospels are—*αἰνεῖν* ‘praise’* [Note: *ἐπαινέω* occurs once in Gospels (Luk 16:8 of the unrighteous steward whose lord ‘commended’ him for his worldly wisdom) *ἐπαινος*, never in Gospels.] (Cf. *διδόναι αἶνον τῷ θεῷ*, Luk 18:43), used in LXX Septuagint for *לְהַלֵּל לַיהוָה*; *δόξα* ‘glory,’ *δοξάζειν* ‘glorify’ (in LXX Septuagint *δόξα* most freq. = *רָבַרְב*; several times for *רָחַם*, *רָחַם*, etc.; *δοξάζω* usually = *בָּרַךְ* in LXX Septuagint]; *διδόναι δόξαν τῷ θεῷ*, Luk 17:18; *εὐλογεῖν* ‘bless’ [LXX Septuagint usually for *בָּרַךְ*]; *ἔξομολογεῖν* ‘to celebrate,’ ‘give praise or thanks to,’ Mat 11:25 and |||. See, further, art. Blessing, §§ 2 and 4.

The following formulas of praise are to be noted:

(a) The Angels’ Hymn (Luk 2:14)—

‘Glory to God *in the highest*,

And *on earth* peace among men of his goodwill.’

For the arrangement in two, not three, lines, cf. Plummer, Com. on ‘St. Luke’ in *ICC* [Note: *CC International Critical Commentary.*], *ad loc.* Here *ἐν[τοῖς] ὑψίστοις* = *בְּמַרְוָמַיִם* ‘in the heavenly places,’ and refers to the adoration of the angels in heaven (cf. Psa 148:1 LXX Septuagint : *αἰνεῖτε αὐτὸν (τὸν κύριον) ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις*; cf. Luk 19:38). With this should be compared the doxological form (*ὃ ἢ δόξα ... εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*). See below, § 4.

(b) ‘Hosanna in the highest’; see art. Hosanna.

(c) ‘Blessed is ...’; especially in the phrase, ‘Blessed is he that Cometh in the name of the Lord’ (εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου), Mat 2:19; Mat 23:39, Mar 11:9, Luk 13:35; Luk 19:38, Joh 12:13. The use of ‘blessed’ (μακάριος) in the Beatitudes is also notable; cf. also its use in personal address, Mat 16:17 (Luk 11:27-28). To these may here be added—

(d) The use of the phrase ‘give God (the) praise’ (or ‘glory’): διδόναι δόξαν τῷ θεῷ = ליהוד בבור שים (נחן), and has various shades of meaning, according to the context—e.g. of thanksgiving for benefits received, Luk 17:18; by confession (of sin), Joh 9:24; cf. Jos 7:19. The phrase is frequent in Rev. of celebrating God’s *praises* (Rev 4:9; Rev 11:13; Rev 19:7).

The frequent mention in the Gospels of the multitudes as ‘praising’ or ‘glorifying’ God, esp. for the wonderful works wrought by Christ, is worth noting. It shows how deeply this element of public worship had impressed itself upon the popular mind and heart in Israel. A typical example is Mat 9:8 (‘But when the multitudes saw it [the healing of the sick of the palsy], they were afraid, and *glorified* God, which had given such power unto men’). Cf. Mar 2:12, Luk 5:25-26, Luk 2:20 (shepherds) Luk 7:16; Luk 18:43, Luk 23:47 (the centurion at the cross); cf. also Luk 13:13 (healing of woman with spirit of infirmity: ‘and ... she was made straight, and *glorified* God’); Luk 17:15 f. (healing of the ten lepers) is esp. notable, because the grateful one who returned to give thanks to Christ, combined his thanksgiving with ‘glorifying God.’ Our Lord’s words in this connexion are striking: ‘Were there none found that returned to give glory to God, save this stranger?’ (Luk 17:18)—words which imply that the duty of grateful praise to God was not always fully recognized in individual practice.

Our Lord’s emphatic word about giving ‘glory’ to God (Luk 17:18) has already been referred to. As the spontaneous expression of a pure religious instinct, this would naturally be encouraged by Him whenever He met with it. According to Joh 5:41-44, He reproaches the Pharisees with seeking honour from one another rather than from God. But He does not hesitate to accept praise and homage offered to His own person when such is sincere and spontaneous (cf. Mat 21:16). He dispenses praise in a manner implying a unique claim to appraise and publicly express moral judgments on human character: in this way He expresses His approbation of John the Baptist (Mat 11:11), all acts of faith (Mat 8:10; Mat 9:22; Mat 15:28; Mat 16:8, Luk 7:9), good and loyal service (Mat 25:11; Mat 25:23, Luk 19:17), all generosity of gift (Mar 12:43; Mar 14:6), self-devotion (Luk 10:41), prudence (Luk 16:8).* [Note: Lock in Hastings’ DB iv. 38 (‘Praise [in NT]’), whose summary is here adopted.]

Outside the Gospels (viz. in the Epp.) the subject of Christian praise is, as is natural, mainly the great facts of redemption (cf. 1Pe 2:10, Rom 15:9-11, Eph 1:3-14, etc.). Creation and redemption are combined in the Christian Liturgies.

4. Ascriptions of praise to Christ outside the Gospels.—It is noticeable that, in at least three (and possibly more) of the Apostolic doxologies, the address is directly to Christ, viz. 2Ti 4:18 ('The Lord ... to whom be the glory,' etc.); 2Pe 3:18 ('the grace of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To him be the glory,' etc.); Rev 1:6 ('him that loveth us, and loosed us from our sins, ... to him be the glory,' etc.). Heb 13:21 and 1Pe 4:11 are possible cases also. In two cases the ascription of glory to God is made through Christ, viz. Rom 16:27 ('to the only wise God, through Jesus Christ') and Jud 1:25 ('to the only God our Saviour, through Jesus Christ our Lord, be glory, majesty, dominion, power'), etc. See, further, Westcott, Add. Note on Heb 13:21 (*Com.* p. 464 f.).

The doxology of the Lord's Prayer is probably a later liturgical addition, inserted in the text of the Gospels, perhaps, under the influence of liturgical usage. See Chase, 'The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church' (*Texts and Studies*), pp. 168-174, and art. Lord's Prayer, p. 59b.

See, further, Blessing, Hallel, Hosanna, Hymn.

Literature.—In addition to the references in the text, see the *Gr. Test. Lexicons* of Grimm-Thayer and Cremer (s.v. δοξα).

G. H. Box.

☩ Prayer

PRAYER.—For the Christian what is said in the Gospels is absolute as to the duty of prayer for himself and for others; but he need not fear that in fulfilling this duty he is doing what reason cannot approve. It does not fall within the scope of this article to attempt to find a scientific basis for prayer; nor need more be said about the reasonableness of prayer than to point out two considerations: (1) The practice of countless races of mankind throughout countless generations is not likely to be based upon a complete delusion. Untold millions of human beings, including a majority of the most gifted and enlightened, have prayed and continue to pray, because they believe that experience has taught them that prayer is efficacious. (2) We have been placed in a world that is full of good things which are suitable to our needs. Yet it is certain that the world is so ordered that very few of these good things can be enjoyed

by us, unless we take the trouble to appropriate them. There is, therefore, nothing unreasonable in believing that the world has been so ordered that some of the blessings which are within our reach cannot be enjoyed unless we pray for them. In the laws which govern the Universe, provision has certainly been made for the operation of men's wills and activities. Consequently there is nothing illogical or unscientific in believing that in those laws provision has been made for the operation of men's prayers. The cases are not completely parallel, because demonstration is possible in the one case but not in the other; for the connexion between work and its results can be proved, while the connexion between prayer and its results cannot, for the obvious reason that faith is an essential condition of prayer, and proof would destroy faith. Nevertheless, the analogy between the two cases is sufficiently complete to show that there is no necessary antagonism between knowledge of the reign of law and belief in the efficacy of prayer.

In discussing the subject of prayer in reference to Christ and the Gospels, we may consider these topics: (1) the words used to express the idea of prayer; (2) places and times of prayer; (3) attitude in prayer; (4) Christ's example; (5) Christ's doctrine.

1. There are a few words for 'prayer' in the NT which are not found in the Gospels: εὐχομαι, εὐχή, ἐντυγχάνω, ἔντευξις, ὑπερεντυγχάνω, ἰκετηρία. But the majority of such words occur in the Gospels, and their distribution is of interest.

(1) προσεύχομαι, very frequent in the Synoptics, not in John; προσευχή, 8 times in the Synoptics, not in John; (2) δέομαι, Mat 9:38; Mat 9:8 times in Luke, not in John; δέησις, Luk 1:13; Luk 2:37; Luk 5:33; (3) ἐρωτάω, rare in this sense in the Synoptics, frequent in John; (4) αἰτέω and αἰτέομαι, in all four; σῆτημα, Luk 23:24. Of these four sets of words, the first alone is specially appropriated to the *worship of God*: it implies that the person addressed in prayer is Divine. The second implies *personal need* and a special petition to God and man for the supply of a want. The third (which frequently means to ask a question), when used of making requests, generally asks a person to *do* something (Mar 7:26, Luk 8:37, Joh 4:40; Joh 4:47; Joh 14:16; Joh 17:15; Joh 17:20). The fourth indicates a simple request to *give* something (Mat 7:7-11, Luk 11:9-13, Joh 14:13-14), the middle voice sometimes adding intensity to the request. All except the first may be used of petitions to men, and have no necessary connexion with the worship of God.

2. Places and times of prayer.—The chief place was the *Temple*: 'My house shall be called a house of prayer' (Mat 21:13, Mar 11:17, Luk 19:46). Christ called it 'My Father's house' (Luk 2:49, Joh 2:16), and, as such, it is the type of heaven

(Joh 14:2). St. Luke tells of others worshipping in the Temple: Zacharias (Luk 1:9), Simeon (Luk 2:27), Anna (Luk 2:37), the disciples (Luk 24:53), and (in a parable) the Pharisee and the Publican (Luk 18:10). The worship in the *synagogues* was frequently attended by Christ, especially in the earlier part of His ministry (Mat 12:9; Mat 13:54, Mar 1:21; Mar 3:1; Mar 6:2, Luk 4:16; Luk 6:6, Joh 6:59; Joh 18:20); and no doubt His disciples frequently did the same. There is also the *inner chamber* (τ αμειτον, Mat 6:6), and the *guest-chamber* (κατάλυμα, Mar 14:14, Luk 22:11) or *upper room* (ἀνάγαιον, Mar 14:15, Luk 22:12), in which the prayer of the great High Priest seems to have been offered (John 17, although some would place the scene of this in the Temple, cf. Joh 14:31), and in which Jesus and the Eleven ‘sang a hymn’ (Mat 26:30, Mar 14:26) before going to the Mount of Olives. Nathanael’s fig-tree (Joh 1:48) and Gethsemane (Mat 26:36, Mar 14:32) lead us to think of *gardens* as places of retirement for prayer. And there is also the *mountain-top* near Bethsaida (Mar 6:46), and that other which was the scene of the Transfiguration (Mat 17:1, Mar 9:2, Luk 9:28), and which St. Luke tells us was ascended for the purpose of prayer.

Not much is said in the Gospels about **times of prayer**; but we read of Christ rising up *before daylight* and going to a desert spot to pray (Mar 1:35), and of His continuing *all night* in prayer before the choosing of the twelve Apostles (Luk 6:12). The *evening* before His arrest is another recorded instance.

3. The common attitude in prayer among the Jews was *standing*; and this our Lord assumes in His teaching (Mat 6:5, Mar 11:25, Luk 18:11; Luk 18:13). But He Himself *kneelt* in the garden (Luk 22:41): and it was perhaps in consequence of His example on that occasion that in the NT the first Christians are always represented as kneeling. Outside the Gospels no other posture for prayer is mentioned.

4. Christ’s example.—Much more important than terminology, or the mention of places, times, and postures for prayer, is the fact that Jesus Christ, by His own example, has taught us the duty of prayer. Not that we need suppose that He prayed merely in order to set us an example: prayer was one of those things which became Him, in order that He might ‘fulfil all righteousness’ (Mat 3:15). But example, as set by Him, is of the very strongest. If in such a life as His there was not only room but need for prayer, much more must there be room and need in such lives as ours. Nor were His prayers always prayers for others. In most cases we are not told why or for what He prayed: this we have to gather from the context. On one great occasion, in the garden, just before His Passion, we know that He prayed for Himself (Mat 26:39, Mar 14:35, Luk 22:41). An hour or two before this, just after the Supper, we know that He prayed for His disciples (Joh 17:6-19) and for the whole Church (Joh 17:20-26); and a few hours later He prayed for those who nailed Him to the

Cross (Luk 23:34, a verse which is historically true, whether St. Luke wrote it or not). Moreover, He has left us an example of intercession, not merely for groups of persons, large and small, but also for an individual. He assured St. Peter, 'I made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not' (Luk 22:32).

It should be noticed that the instances of Christ's praying which are recorded in the Gospels are found just before or just after leading events in the Lord's life; also that the majority of them are given us by St. Luke, whose Gospel is sometimes called 'the Gospel of Prayer.' There are, indeed, three recorded instances of His praying which are omitted by St. Luke. St. Mark (Mar 1:35) mentions His retirement for prayer after healing multitudes at Capernaum, where St. Luke (Luk 4:42) mentions only the retirement. Both St. Mark (Luk 6:46) and St. Matthew (Mat 14:23) record His retirement for prayer after the feeding of the 5000, where St. Luke (Mat 9:17) omits both retirement and prayer. And St. John (Joh 12:27-28) tells of His prayer when certain Greeks were brought to Him, where St. Luke omits the whole incident. As we might expect, the prayer for Himself in the garden of Gethsemane is recorded by all three Synoptists (Mat 26:39, Mar 14:35, Luk 22:41). Nothing in the Gospels is stronger evidence of the reality of our Lord's humanity than that prayer, and it evidently established itself firmly in the earliest traditions respecting Him. But there are seven instances in which St. Luke is alone in relating that Jesus prayed: at His baptism (Luk 3:21); before His first collision with the Jewish hierarchy (Luk 5:16); before choosing the Twelve (Luk 6:12); before the first prediction of His Passion (Luk 9:18); at His Transfiguration (Luk 9:29); before teaching the Lord's Prayer (Luk 11:1); and on the Cross (Luk 23:34; Luk 23:46).

There are three other cases where prayer on the part of Christ seems to be implied, although it is not expressly stated. *He looked up to heaven* before breaking the bread at the feeding of the 5000 (Mat 14:19, Mar 6:41, Luk 9:16). So also, before healing the deaf man who had an impediment in his speech, Jesus *looked up to heaven and sighed* (Mar 7:34). Still more clearly, before raising Lazarus, Jesus *lifted up His eyes*, and said, *Father, I thank thee that thou heardest me* (Joh 11:41). We venture to count all three of these as occasions on which Jesus prayed.

This gives us, in all, fourteen instances: two in all three Gospels, one in Matthew and Mark, two in Mark alone, two in John alone, and seven in Luke alone. They cover the whole of Christ's public life from His baptism to the moment of His death, and show His dependence upon His Father for help and strength and refreshment. To say with Victor of Antioch (Swete on Mar 1:35), that Christ prayed οὐκ αὐτὸς ταύτης δεομενος ... ἀλλ' οἰκονομικῶς τοῦτο ποιῶν, is not adequate, even if in some sense true.

Heb 5:7-8 places us nearer to the truth. We ought to beware of suggesting that our Lord's prayers were in any way unreal. It was out of the fulness of His own experience

in a life of absolutely unique difficulty, toil, and suffering that He said, 'Ask, and it shall be given you.'

5. Christ's doctrine.—In addition to His weighty example as to the duty and blessedness of prayer, we have Christ's frequent sayings on the subject. That men 'ought always to pray and not to faint' was evidently a marked feature in His teaching, and it appears in three different forms: (1) On two occasions, apparently, once spontaneously (Mat 6:5-15), and once at the request of a disciple (Luk 11:14), Christ gave His followers a *definite form of prayer*. If, however, as some think, there was only one occasion on which this was done, then St. Luke rather than St. Matthew gives the historic setting. (2) He devoted certain *parables* to the subject. (3) He uttered a variety of *sayings*, enforcing and completing the teaching of the parables.

(1) The Lord's Prayer is the subject of separate articles, to which the reader is referred.

(2) There are five *parables*, three of which bear directly and two indirectly on the subject of prayer. Two, both of them in St. Luke only, teach that prayer must be *importunate and persevering*. These are the Friend at Midnight (Luk 11:5-8), which follows the giving of the Lord's Prayer, and the Unjust Judge (Luk 18:1-8). So far as the two parables differ, the former teaches that prayer is never out of season, the latter that it is sure to bring a blessing and not a curse. But we must beware of supposing that either parable teaches that by constant prayer we at last overcome God's unwillingness. The argument in both parables is *a fortiori*, and is strongest in the second. 'If an unrighteous judge would yield to the importunity of an unknown widow, who came and spoke to him at intervals, much more will a righteous God be ready to reward the perseverance of His own elect, who cry to Him day and night.' God's desire to help is always present; by perseverance in prayer we appropriate it. In the helpful illustration of the anchored ship, pointed out by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iv. 23), the sailors who pull the rope seem to draw the anchor to the ship; in reality they draw the ship to the anchor.

The parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, which also is preserved by St. Luke alone, and is placed by him immediately after that of the Unjust Judge, teaches the frame of mind in which God must be approached in prayer, viz. a *deep sense*, not only of need (as in the other two parables), but of *unworthiness*. Before Him we have no claim to merit, no ground for self-congratulation. The parable indicates that downcast eyes and beating of the breast are natural accompaniments of a penitent's prayer. Less directly, and apart from its main purpose, the parable of the Prodigal Son teaches a similar lesson. The lost son's prayer, as planned before his return and as actually uttered, is touching in its humility.

In both these cases, the Publican and the Prodigal, the chief thing prayed for is forgiveness, as must constantly be the case with sinful man. And there is yet another parable which teaches what is requisite, if this most necessary of all prayers is to be rightly offered: the sinner himself must have a *forgiving spirit*. The Unmerciful Servant (Mat_18:21-35) by asking for forgiveness for himself thereby bound himself to be forgiving to his fellows. His refusal to recognize this obligation became fatal to his own forgiveness. The great truth, that one who asks to be forgiven must be ready to forgive, had been clearly seen by the more spiritual among the Jews. There is a striking anticipation of Christ's teaching in Sir_28:2-5.

(3) Besides the parables, there are frequent *sayings* of Christ on the subject of prayer, and these are found in all four Gospels. The necessity of a forgiving spirit is repeated in Mat_6:14-15 and Mar_11:25, with obvious reference to the Lord's Prayer. Two other things are stated as necessary accompaniments of prayer: *watchfulness* (Mar_13:33; Mar_14:38, Mat_26:41) and *faith* (Mar_11:24, Mat_21:22). This last is specially emphasized, as being the test of reality and the condition of success. It is the result of the human will being brought into complete union with the will of God, producing absolute trust in the fulfilment of His promises. And we may be all the more sure of success in our prayers *if others join with us* in making them (Mat_18:19). Prayers which are approved by many are more likely to be right. Desires in which we cannot ask others to join are likely to be selfish.

And there are two things specially to be avoided: *parade* (Mat_6:5-6; Mat_23:14, Mar_12:40, Luk_20:47) and *prating* (Mat_6:7). In the latter passage the 'vain repetitions' of Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 is apt to mislead. The 'babe' of Tindale and the Geneva is perhaps better. Repetition of prayers, even in the same form of words, is encouraged by our Lord, both by precept (Luk_18:1-8) and by example (Mat_26:44). It is the mechanical repetition of a formula (1Ki_18:26), as if it were a magical charm, to compel the compliance of the Deity, that seems to be forbidden. Our petitions must have a worthy meaning, and we must think of the meaning.

Instruction is also given as to the *right objects of prayer*. We are to pray for spiritual progress (Luk_11:13) in ourselves, in others, and in the world at large. We are to pray that we ourselves may be delivered from temptation (Mat_6:13; Mat_26:41, Mar_14:38, Luk_11:4; Luk_22:40; Luk_22:46), and that evil may be cast out from others (Mat_17:21, Mar_9:29), and that missionaries for the conversion of the world may be multiplied (Mat_9:38, Luk_10:2). In our intercessions our enemies are to be specially included (Mat_5:44, Luk_6:28). About temporal blessings we are not to be over anxious; yet prayer for them is not merely allowed but enjoined (Mat_6:11, Luk_11:3); as also is prayer against temporal calamities (Mar_13:18, Mat_24:20). The

prayer of the disciples for help in the storm was heard (Mat 8:26, Mar 4:39, Luk 8:24).

Parallels to some of the items of this teaching could be found in the OT. But there is one point with regard to the *method of prayer* which is absolutely new. Men had been taught to worship God and even to pray to Him as a Father: now they are told to pray to the Father *in the name of the Son* (Joh 16:23-24; Joh 16:26). Anything that can be rightly asked in Christ's name will be granted (Joh 14:13-14); and there is no other limit. Any request which is consistent with His character and office, as represented by His name, may be made to His Father, with confidence that the prayer will be heard (Joh 15:7; Joh 15:16). The prayer of the sons of Zebedee for the right and left hand places in the Kingdom (Mat 20:21, Mar 10:37) was not of this character, and was not commended. Nor, for the same reason, were they allowed to pray for a special judgment on the inhospitable Samaritans (Luk 9:54-55). Both requests were made in spiritual ignorance. It confirms our trust in the historical fidelity of the Fourth Gospel, that this remarkable development in the teaching of Christ respecting prayer in His name occurs in the farewell discourses.

There is yet another particular which is absolutely new, viz. *worship offered to Christ Himself as to a Divine person*: and once more the clearest instances of this are in the Fourth Gospel. St. Matthew often, and St. Mark once, mention the fact that people 'worshipped' (προσκύνησαν) Jesus. But even where this worship is accompanied by a request that He would cleanse a leper (Mat 8:2) or raise the dead (Mat 9:18), this act of prostration does not necessarily imply more than that He was regarded as a great prophet (1Ki 18:7, Dan 2:46). The worship of Him by the disciples after the Resurrection (Mat 28:9; Mat 28:17, Luk 24:52) carries us further: yet it might be argued that this also is the worship of mere reverence. But about the meaning of the worship of the man born blind (Joh 9:38) there can be little doubt; all the less so, because St. John always uses προσκυνέω of the worship of God (Joh 4:20-24; Joh 12:20), never of mere respect to great men; and the use of the word in the Apocalypse is similar. Still less can there be any doubt as to the meaning of the adoring exclamation of the sceptical Apostle (Joh 20:28)—'the loftiest view of the Lord given in the Gospels' (Westcott), and the climax to which the scheme of St. John's Gospel steadily leads up. In none of these cases did Jesus reject the worship, or rebuke those who offered it to Him.

Literature.—Works on the reasonableness and the efficacy of prayer abound, but they are outside the sphere of this article. Handbooks of Biblical Theology give little help. In Bible Dictionaries the art. on 'Prayer' in Hastings, iv. p. 42 ff., should be consulted; also in Schaff-Herzog, iii. p. 1879, and in Herzog-Plitt, art. on 'Gebet,' some information will be found.

Pre-Eminence

PRE-EMINENCE (of Christ).—The expression is St. Paul's. We shall take the passage in which it occurs as our starting-point, and work from that.

I. St. Paul's conception

1. *The statement of it.*—The *locus classicus* is Col 1:13-20. In that and its context St. Paul represents Christ as Head of both creations, the natural and the spiritual, the Cosmos and the Church. Of the former He is Creator, Upholder, and End. Its ground of existence is in Him (έν* αὐτῷ); He is before it and over it, even its highest intelligences (πρὸ πάντων), and shapes it to His purpose (εἰς αὐτόν). Of the second He is ἀρχή, at once Source and First; Redeemer, Reconciler, Saviour (Col 1:20 f.); Fountain of Life (Col 3:4); Treasury of Wisdom (Col 2:3); Hope of Glory (Col 1:27); All in All (Col 3:11). He is sole Mediator in both (Col 1:16-20), through whom all streams of creative, providential, redeeming light and power go forth, and in whom all lines of creaturely approach to God converge. Of both, therefore, He is rightful Lord, as is implied in πρωτότοκος (Col 1:15; Col 1:18; see Lightfoot, *in loc.*), βασιλεία ν τοῦ υἱοῦ (Col 1:13), and έν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθημένος (Col 3:1),—a phrase that everywhere carries with it (a) subordination to the Father, (b) rule over all else. In both He is pre-eminent (Col 1:18). And this, not for any arbitrary reason, but because of what He is, which explains both the place He occupies and the work He has done. For He is God's Son in a unique sense (Col 1:3; Col 1:13—the phrase 'the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ' in the former being common in St. Paul and other NT writers); He is the image—the visible Revealer—of the invisible God (Col 1:15); and in Him dwells permanently in a bodily manifestation the fulness of the Deity (Col 1:19, Col 2:9), *i.e.* 'the totality of the Divine attributes and powers' (Lightfoot). His eternal Divinity shines out in ἔστιν (Col 1:17), while γένηται (Col 1:18) reflects the humanity which He has assumed and glorified.

Similar teaching is found in the other Epistles of the same group. In *Ephesians* the έν αὐτῷ of Colossians becomes the dominant note. Christ is Head, Husband, and Saviour of the Church (Eph 4:15; Eph 5:25). All blessing is in Him (Eph 1:3); all things are summed up in Him (Eph 1:10). In Him all, both Jew and Gentile, are built up a holy

temple, Himself the Chief Corner-stone (Eph 2:20-22). He is the Supreme Revealer of God's grace (Eph 2:7) and wisdom (Eph 3:10), the one Lord (Eph 4:6, Eph 6:7-10) seated at God's right hand and exalted above every other present or future power (Eph 1:20-22). Here, again, it is because of what He is—the Son of God (Eph 1:13, Eph 4:13)—that He brings us to perfection, and that all these facts can be true of Him. In *Philippians* He is all-subduing Saviour (Eph 3:20-21); through Him come righteousness (Eph 1:11), peace (Eph 4:7), joy (Eph 4:4), strength (Eph 4:13). In Him we glory (Eph 3:3); compared with Him all else is as refuse (Eph 3:8); He is our life's mainspring (Eph 1:21) and highest goal (Eph 3:14). Essentially God, He laid aside the manifested glory of Deity, and assumed humanity with its sinless manifestations and deepest sufferings. Therefore God exalted Him, so that at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow and every tongue confess Him Lord (Eph 2:6-11). It is probable that the title 'Lord,' when used of Jesus by St. Paul, carries with it always (as, indeed, it does in the rest of the NT) the fulness of meaning which it has here. The letter to *Philemon* is saturated with the conception expressed by the phrase 'in Christ,' which indeed forms the basis and strength of St. Paul's appeal.

According to this group of letters, Christ is pre-eminent primarily because of His Divine dignity, and secondarily because of His work in nature and in grace—as Creator, Mediator, Saviour, Lord. In St. Paul's mind these ideas are bound up inseparably with Him, and the probability is that he meant to express them in the full title—the Lord Jesus Christ—which he so frequently employs.

2. *Genesis of this conception.*—(1) It must be prior to all St. Paul's Epistles, for it is clearly present in all of them. To take the second group first. In *1 Corinthians* Christ is God's power and wisdom (1Co 1:24; 1Co 1:30), the only Foundation (1Co 3:11), the true Passover (1Co 5:7), our perfect Example (1Co 11:1), and the Second Adam, who gives life to all in Him (1Co 15:45). The Church is His body (1Co 12:27), of which, though not expressly stated, Christ must be the Head (cf. 1Co 11:3). Especially worthy of note are 1Co 8:6 (where He holds the same place in both creations as in Col.) and 1Co 15:27 (which tallies with Eph 1:20-22 and Php 2:11). In *2 Cor.* (2Co 5:18-21) we have language substantially the same as Col 1:19-22; Col 4:4-8 answers to Col 1:15; Col 1:18 implies pre-existence (cf. 1Co 10:4); 1Co 4:5; 1Co 10:5 claim for Him unreserved obedience. In both these letters He is God's Son (1Co 1:9; 1Co 15:28, 2Co 1:19). There is no need to quote specific passages in *Gal.* and *Rom.* [*Note: Roman.*] representing Him as the only Saviour, for they are full of that thought. His universal Lordship is declared in Rom 9:5; Rom 14:9; His Sonship in Gal 1:16; Gal 2:20; Gal 4:4-6 and Rom 1:4; Rom 5:10; Rom 8:3; Rom 8:32; His Deity implicitly in Gal 1:1; Gal 1:10-12 (in the contrast between Him and man), and expressly in Rom 9:5. Even in *Thessalonians* we have the following: Deliverer (1Th 1:10, 2Th 3:2) and Saviour (1Th 5:9-10); Victor over evil in its mightiest manifestations, and Judge (1Th 5:2 f., 2Th 1:7-10; 2Th 2:8-12); God's

Son (1Th 1:10), and associated with God in salutation and prayer (1Th 1:1, 2Th 1:1 f. and 1Th 3:11). This linking of Christ and the Father in salutation, and the ascribing to Him what is ascribed to God, are regular features of St. Paul's writings. It should further be noted that in practically all these letters the comprehensive title—Lord Jesus Christ—is applied to Him, and that frequently the strongest statements are made incidentally in such a way as to indicate that they belong to the common Christian conviction.

(2) St. Luke's account of St. Paul's preaching harmonizes with this. Acts 16-28 is, roughly speaking, contemporaneous with the first three groups of St. Paul's letters. In these chapters Jesus is represented as Saviour and Lord, and, as such, worthy of our utmost devotion (Act 16:31; Act 20:21-24; Act 20:35; Act 26:18); as the Christ, the burden and goal of prophecy and the Hope of Israel (Act 17:3, Act 18:5, Act 24:14, Act 26:6-7; Act 26:22, Act 28:20; Act 28:23); as Judge of the world (Act 17:31), and even as God (Act 20:28 text of $\aleph B$). The book closes by summarizing the subject-matter of St. Paul's preaching as the Kingdom of God and the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ, where the full title is significantly given, as it is by St. Peter in his summary of the creed-content of the faith of Cornelius and his friends (Act 11:17). Working backward, we have in ch. 13 an extended report of St. Paul's address at Pisidian Antioch, which stands as representative of his teaching, at least during the First Missionary Journey. Certainly it must represent the view of Barnabas also; and its striking resemblance to St. Peter's Pentecost address is also noteworthy. In it Jesus is the Son of David, predicted by the prophets, and surely, therefore, Messiah (Act 11:22 f.); God's holy and incorruptible One (Act 13:35); God's Son (Act 13:33); the Saviour (Act 13:23), through whom alone are remission of sins and justification (Act 13:38 f.), who is the channel of grace (Act 13:43), the source of eternal life (Act 13:46), the light of the world (Act 13:47, cf. Eph 5:8-14, Php 2:15 f.). In Act 14:23 He is called Lord in a way which implies that the thought of His lordship was inseparable from faith.

The conception of Christ's Sonship here may seem to be quite different from that commonly found in the Epistles. But a comparison with Rom 1:4 may show that the two at root agree. Both here and in Romans the Resurrection is due to His holiness (Act 13:35). In Rom. [Note: Roman.] , further, the holiness is due to His sonship, of which the Resurrection is God's formal declaration, or (as Meyer) into which the Resurrection instates Him. May this not be the idea here also? Linguistic usage permits; for the priest was said 'to cleanse' the leper when he officially pronounced him 'clean'; so may it not be that the thought in Act 13:33 is that in the Resurrection God formally *declared* Jesus to be His begotten Son? On the other hand, the occurrence of the term 'justified' (Act 13:39) shows how precarious a procedure it is to assert development of doctrine according to the occurrence or non-occurrence of a

particular expression in brief letters addressed to different local conditions. The word here shows that St. Paul's doctrine of justification was not born just at the time of writing to the Galatians, even though it is not formally stated in the Thessalonian or Corinthian letters. The three accounts of St. Paul's conversion in Acts ([Act 9:22](#); [Act 9:26](#)) show how the details of an event may be varyingly presented according to the character of those addressed and the purpose of the speaker.

(3) To find the genesis of St. Paul's view of Christ, we must go back to his conversion. There his conviction, at least as to the Person and preeminence of Christ, seems to have been settled. For (a) the light that shone about him, brighter than the Syrian noon-day sun (cf. [Rev 1:16](#)), was a light out of heaven. To him, as a well-instructed Jew, that was the Glory of God's revealed presence. Would it not be natural for Saul, with his great conscientiousness, zeal for God, and hope of attaining to the promise made to the fathers ([Act 26:7](#)), to conclude immediately that the Lord had again visited His people, and that the august Person who appeared to him was none other than Jehovah Himself (cf. Isaiah 6 and [1Co 9:1](#))? If so, we can understand the pre-eminent place that Person for ever after held in his thought. The words of rebuke and heaven-laden pity naturally stun and bewilder him, and lead to the strange mingling of surprise and faith that breaks out in his question, 'Who art thou, Lord?' The definite answer, 'I am Jesus whom thou persecutest,' however it may have wrenched his soul, compelled his conversion. He surrendered unreservedly, and henceforth Jesus is his unchallenged and peerless Lord. Would such an unqualified surrender be justifiable had he not identified Jesus with the Jehovah of his people's history? Does any other view as fully explain all the facts?* [Note: A sample fact would be the use of the word Κύριος , which in LXX is used to translate Jehovah, in the Gospels 'usually designates God, and in the Epistles, especially St. Paul's, most frequently Christ' (Winer; cf. Cremer, and Somerville, *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, p. 295; and esp. Knowling, *Witness of the Epistles*, 261 ff.). The view here taken obviates Cremer's difficulty. For it would then be natural to use θεός of the invisible God (as in [Joh 1:18](#)), and Κύριος of God manifesting Himself as Jehovah in OT or as Christ in NT.] (b) Unquestionably Saul was at once committed to the acceptance of Jesus as He was preached by those whom he was persecuting. For he must have been quite familiar with the claims made on behalf of Jesus by the Apostles and their associates. That Jesus was the Messiah, for example, he must have heard again and again. And what they declared Him to be, Jesus here plainly endorses. These two facts touching Christ's Person as Divine and His office as Messiah, Saul probably apprehended in the order here given. The record of his early preaching seems to follow the same order. For there he is represented as first preaching that Jesus is the Son of God, and later proving that Jesus is the Messiah ([Act 9:20-22](#)).

Doubtless he experienced some intellectual bewilderment. It was one thing to feel that the Mighty One who had appeared to him was Jehovah, and another to understand how the Man Jesus of Nazareth could be verily God. It might seem to strike at Jewish monotheism, and yet the two facts are before him. His mind must find some solution. Possibly it flashed upon him that God was essentially invisible (hinted at in Exo 33:17-23; cf. Col 1:14, 1Ti 1:17; 1Ti 6:16), and that therefore Jehovah, the august Person who was wont to appear to men and had now appeared to him, did not exhaust the mystery of God. Possibly he remembered that in the OT the closest relation to God was expressed by 'sonship' (2Sa 7:14, Hos 11:1). Perhaps he had heard from Christians utterances which suggested distinctions of Persons in the Godhead. For certainly the language both of St. John and of the Synoptists implies them, and in the baptismal formula mention would be made regularly of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. It is quite possible that in the light of his new experience some or all of these may have led him to the assertion that Jesus is the Son of God as the first declaration of his faith. But Gal 1:15 may mean that some special access of revealing light was given him. In either case, the probability is that when he proclaimed Jesus to be the Son of God he did so in a sense transcending the ethical, equalling in significance its use on the lips of Jesus, and in full harmony with the Trinitarian conception. Jesus is God, Jesus is also Son. Certainly, if the meaning of the expression was specially revealed to him, the term chosen by St. Luke (*ἐκήρυσσεν*, Luk 9:20) becomes peculiarly appropriate, as representing not so much something which he had laboriously reasoned out, as something which he received by so direct a revelation that he can come forward proclaiming it with all the certainty of a commissioned herald.

II. Conceptions of the Twelve and their associates in the Acts.—Our discussion has brought us to the early preaching of the Twelve. Let us see more particularly the way they had come. Their approach was the opposite of St. Paul's. They began with the Man Jesus of Nazareth, and advanced slowly to the higher thought of Him; he, as a believer, began with the Divine Lord, and swiftly adjusted all else to that. They marched from earth to heaven; he came down from heaven to earth. The two forms of expression—'Jesus Christ' and 'Christ Jesus'—may represent the two lines of experience as well as the two regular standpoints of thought to which Lightfoot has called attention.

1. Statements by Peter, Stephen and Philip, and James.—St. Peter may be considered as representing the Twelve, including St. John, and his teaching may be summed up thus: Jesus of Nazareth is Lord and Messiah, exalted at God's right hand (Act 2:36; Act 10:36); into His name, *i.e.* into allegiance to Him, believers are baptized (Act 2:38, Act 10:48, cf. 1Co 1:13); He is the Holy and Righteous One, the Suffering Servant of God, the only Saviour for men anywhere under heaven, and so Prince (*ἀρχὴ*)

γός—Author as well as Ruler) of Life (Act 3:14 f., Act 4:27-30, Act 4:12); the Corner-stone (Act 4:11); the last and greatest of the prophets, who becomes the touchstone of destiny (Act 3:22 f.); the Judge of living and dead (Act 10:42). In St. Stephen's address several of these notes recur. Jesus is Lord (Act 7:59 f.); the Righteous One of whom the prophets spoke (Act 7:52); the Son of Man who in Divine glory stands at the right hand of God (Act 7:56), the designation being especially appropriate as indicating that He did not lay aside His humanity when He ascended (cf. Php 2:10 the name Jesus); while the whole trend of the argument is that as Joseph and Moses were God-appointed deliverers, so Jesus is the Supreme Deliverer and Saviour (Act 7:9-14; Act 7:22; Act 7:35; Act 7:37) St. Philip preaches Him as the Messiah and as the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53, which carries with it the ideas of Saviourship and Supremacy (Act 8:5; Act 8:12; Act 8:32-35). Of the passages quoted, three (Act 2:39, Act 4:12, Act 10:36) indicate the universality of Christ's pre-eminence, at least so far as men are concerned. This involved His being Saviour and Lord to Gentiles as well as Jews. That great fact of Christ's personal relationship to all men St. Peter seems to have seen clearly: what it involved for Judaism he had not yet apprehended,—an illustration of the fact that a great central truth may be grasped long before it is fully understood in its implications.

Whether St. Peter's conception of Christ's pre-eminence went beyond the world of men to that of higher intelligences, and the universe generally, is not so clear. And yet is it not implied in the frequent phrase 'at the right hand of God'? And might it not be understood from the prefatory words to the great Commission (Mat 28:18), which would be still ringing in his ears? Further, does not the language employed compel us to see in his thought of Christ more than mere manhood? Is this not suggested by the use 'of the word *Κύριος* in the Pentecost discourse? (See, e.g., Act 2:25; Act 2:34; Act 2:36; Act 2:39, where it is certainly applied both to Jehovah and to Jesus). It is a phenomenon that persists in the NT. We have noticed it already in connexion with St. Paul's experience. Another phenomenon equally persistent is found in Act 2:17; Act 2:33, where the outpouring of the Spirit is ascribed first to God and then to the exalted Christ. This, of course, if it stood alone, might be explained on the principle that what one does through another he does himself. But it does not stand alone. His sinlessness, here repeatedly asserted, demands some adequate explanation. To be Judge of the world demands knowledge more than human. Similar phenomena occur in St. Stephen's address (Act 7:30-32), where God, the Lord, and the Angel appear to be the same One, between whom and the people Moses mediated (Act 7:38).

We notice next the view of St. James, as gathered from Acts 15 and his Epistle, which is here accepted as of early date. On the understanding that the letter of Act 15:23-29 was drafted by him, we have two points worthy of note in that chapter.

The full title 'our Lord Jesus Christ' is given (Act 15:26), and the 'our' as well as the quotation (Act 15:16-18) show that St. James saw clearly that the sovereignty of Jesus would be accepted by the Gentiles, as well as by the Jewish world. In his Epistle there is added to the full title the phrase 'of glory,' which 'certainly attributes to Jesus a superhuman character' (Stevens, *Theol. of NT*, p. 287), and probably a Divine one (cf. Act 7:2). In Act 5:7-11 *Κύριος* is used first of God and then of Christ. In Act 4:12 the Judge seems to be God; in Act 5:9 Christ is Judge. Is there any simpler explanation of this than that they were regarded as the same Person, and identified with the gracious Jehovah of the OT? He is probably also the Righteous One of Act 5:6, and undoubtedly the Saviour in whom saving faith rests. Such expressions from a brother in the flesh who had lived with Jesus from childhood are surely commandingly striking. The Lord of Glory stands forth in the thought of St. James as at least the Supreme Lord and only Saviour of men.

2. *Genesis of their conception.*—This takes us back to the Gospel history, and that to the prophecies of the OT. (1) Andrew and John were led to follow Him through *the testimony of John the Baptist*. Others were doubtless directly or indirectly affected by John's ministry. And John links us inevitably to the OT and the prophecies that went before concerning the Messiah. With these John and most of his hearers, these first disciples among them, were familiar. It is not necessary to go into the details here (they may be found in Drummond, Stanton, Edersheim, Westcott, Kirkpatrick, and a recent book by Willis J. Beecher, *The Prophets and the Promise*). But the heart of prophecy is God's close personal relation to man, His loving interest in man and gracious purpose for him. Thus there was in it a fact and a promise—the fact of God's kindness and grace, the promise of a Divinely-wrought deliverance. The former was the vital religious force in Israel's history, the latter its hope. Through unequalled suffering and by the might of His power the promised Deliverer was to crush the adversary, save His people, and set up an everlasting Kingdom that should fill the whole earth. Language is almost exhausted in depicting the greatness of that Deliverer and the glory of His reign (e.g. 2Sa 23:1-8, Psalms 72, 89, Eze 37:21-28, Isaiah 26, 52, 53, Dan 7:9; Dan 7:27). Some passages identify the Deliverer with Jehovah Himself appearing among men as their Saviour and King (e.g. Isa 9:6 f. and, in its light and that of Mat 1:23, Isa 7:14; Isa 8:8-15; Isa 40:3-5 comp. with Mat 3:3 ||; Isa 45:21-25 comp. with Act 4:12 and Php 2:10 f.; Jer 23:5-8, where Jehovah our Righteousness is the Branch and King; Zec 12:1-10, where the pierced one is identified with Jehovah; and Mal 3:1).

Whatever may be dark or disputable in these Scriptures, the pre-eminence of the Coming One is clear. John the Baptist was the last of the prophets. In his utterances the earlier are summarized. Jesus is the 'Lamb of God' who bears the world's sin, and 'the Son of God' as possessing permanently and without measure the Spirit of God

(Joh 1:29-34, cf. the Evangelist's elaboration in Joh 3:34 f.). He is executor of God's wrath as well as of His grace, baptizing in fire as well as in the Holy Spirit (Mat 3:10-12); He is the Bridegroom, even as Jehovah was Husband to His people (Joh 3:29). In His presence John feels his own inferiority and confesses it. He is not fit to loose His sandal-strap. At best he is His herald and friend (Mat 3:11; Mat 3:14, Joh 1:23; Joh 3:29). John can tell them to repent, and can baptize them in water as a symbolic declaration of repentance; but only this greater One can deal with them in the realm of reality and baptize in the Spirit (Mat 3:11 || Joh 1:26; Joh 1:33). In the light of Christ's tribute to John's greatness (Mat 11:7-11), what a testimony John's utterances form to the pre-eminent greatness of Christ. It was the beginning of the disciples' faith.

(2) John's testimony was confirmed to them and strengthened by *Christ's own personality, words, and deeds*. His personality captivated and mastered them. The hallowed influence of the first day's fellowship (Joh 1:39), issuing in strengthened faith and open confession, is a sample of what was continuously at work thereafter. The calm and confidence, serenity and majesty of His demeanour; His absolute rectitude and sinlessness; His artless yet reverent familiarity with God and absolute devotion to His will; His exquisite tenderness, quick sympathy, abounding compassion, and unwearying beneficence, filled them with wonder, awe, admiration, and affection, and steadily ripened their faith. His words were clothed with unparalleled authority, and were full of wisdom and grace. In this setting His deeds of might and mercy accredited Him as from God, and attested His Lordship over nature as well as His Saviourship to men (see Mar 1:27; Mar 4:41, Luk 4:22 *et al.*).

To all this experience, and interpreting it, were added His own imperial claims, most fully presented in the Fourth Gospel (see art. Claims of Christ).

(3) To the testimony of John and that of His own character and claims was added *the testimony of His enemies*, both men and demons (Joh 7:46; Joh 19:6, Mar 1:24; Mar 3:11), *of angels* (Mat 28:6), and *of the Father Himself* (Mat 3:17 and Luk 9:35). The last passage is especially strong, because intended to rebuke the thought of putting Moses and Elijah on the same level with Him.

The effect of this growing body of testimony is seen in the confessions made from time to time. The early ones in Jn. needed deepening. The disciples had misconceptions, the removal of which might stagger their faith. They had as yet but poor knowledge of their own sinfulness; while of the path of suffering Jesus must take to His glory they knew nothing. The new consciousness of sin which came to St. Peter as he beheld the miraculous draught of fishes (Luk 5:8), and the deeper sense of it that came with his denial (Mat 26:75), are waymarks of progress on the one side; the testing times in the Capernaum synagogue, when not only most of the multitude but

even professed disciples forsook Him (Joh 6:60-71), and at Caesarea Philippi, whither He had gone from the growing hostility in Judaea and Galilee, mark their progress on the other. It is for this reason that that confession of His Messiahship is treated as so important (Mat 16:13-20); their faith in Him holds when others desert. Immediately the way of the cross and the stern terms of discipleship are announced. We can see how it shook them. The Transfiguration, with its double message of death and glory (Luk 9:31 f.), served to steady them during the dark months that were coming; and the voice of the Father declared Jesus' Sonship and superiority to the greatest of the olden day. That scene was perhaps a means of answering the Master's prayer that their faith should not fail. Nor did it fail utterly. Peter's tears are the proof. But though their faith in Him personally held, it was intellectually eclipsed. It was the Resurrection, His subsequent teachings, and the coming of the Spirit that finally established it in clearness and power. That great conviction is expressed emphatically by Thomas when he hails Him as his Lord and God (Joh 20:28)—a declaration which Jesus endorsed. In keeping therewith is the closing scene in Mat 28:16-20, where, on the one hand, Jesus claims all authority in heaven and on earth, and, on the other, they worshipped (Κύριος) Him,—a term which should perhaps be understood here and in Luk 24:52 in the full religious sense. Thus in the closing scenes of the Gospels these men are consciously face to face with One whom they joyfully hail as their 'Lord and God,' and the closing words fold back and into the opening quotation from the prophet that the Coming One should be 'Immanuel—God with us' (Mat 1:22 f.). When men so thoroughly steeped in monotheism as these Jews, and with the lofty thought of God all Jews had, so believe and receive Him, how for them could there be any doubt about His absolute pre-eminence? Many adjustments of their views on other things will yet be necessary; but this conviction will abide and become the centre, the touchstone of truth for them, the central fact into which all others must be fitted. As St. Paul expresses it, they will hold the Head and so increase with the increase of God (Col 2:19).

III. Conception of the later NT books

1. *Hebrews*.—The very purpose of this letter is to forestall apostasy by showing Christ's superiority to all others, including Moses and Aaron, the prophets, and all the angels. The first chapter is equal in strength and fulness to the great passages in Col. and Philippians. He is God's Son, the express image of His Person, the effulgence of His glory; Maker of the world; God's last and perfect Spokesman. The angels worship Him. The Father Himself addresses Him as God, who made all things, and outlives all things; whose throne stands for ever, whose sceptre is righteousness, and to whom all enemies shall become subject. In subsequent chapters He is represented as Captain (ἀρχηγός, Author and Leader, Heb 2:10) of our salvation; eternal High Priest made higher than the heavens, a Son perfected for evermore (Heb 7:21-25), who by the

sacrifice of Himself obtains for us eternal redemption (Heb_9:12), and secures us in an eternal covenant (Heb_8:7; Heb_8:13, Heb_9:15, Heb_13:20); the Author and Perfecter of our faith (Heb_12:2); and the great Shepherd of His sheep (Heb_13:20). He is the One who speaks from heaven, rejection of whom is doom (Heb_12:25). He is our supreme goal. Others change and pass away; He abides the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever (Heb_13:8); and to Him belongs the glory for ever and ever (Heb_13:21).

2. First Peter.—Many of the terms with which we have become so familiar are here. He is the Lord Jesus Christ (1Pe_1:3). We must sanctify Him as Lord in our hearts (1Pe_3:15). He is seated at God's right hand, angels and principalities being made subject to Him (1Pe_3:22). As Saviour He bears our sin (1Pe_2:24), redeems us with His blood (1Pe_1:19), is the Chief Shepherd, the Bishop of Souls (1Pe_5:4, 1Pe_2:25), and mediates all God's gifts to man (1Pe_2:5, 1Pe_4:11). He is the Chief Corner-stone (1Pe_2:6); Sonship unique is implied in 1Pe_1:3, His place in a Trinity in 1Pe_1:2, pre-existence in 1Pe_1:11 (cf. 'manifested' in 1Pe_1:20); His identity with Jehovah in 1Pe_2:3 (where an OT declaration about Jehovah is referred to Him). In keeping with this is the contrast between His 'blood' and 'corruptible things' in 1Pe_1:19 f. (cf. Act_20:28).

3. Second Peter is equally emphatic about His lordship (2Pe_1:2; 2Pe_1:14; 2Pe_1:16), and more explicit about His Sonship (2Pe_1:17) and Deity (2Pe_1:1, cf. 2Pe_1:11, 2Pe_2:20, 2Pe_3:2; 2Pe_3:18; for the order of words is the same, and the presumption is that in each case but one person is referred to—Jesus Christ is God and Saviour as well as Lord and Saviour). The day of the Lord, ushered in by His coming, marks the time of His full triumph and glory (ch. 3), and His Kingdom is eternal (2Pe_1:11).

4. Jude has in common with 2 Peter the use of the full title and of the term δεσπότης (Jud_1:4, 2Pe_2:1, cf. 2Ti_2:21)—a term expressive of special absoluteness of authority, and made the stronger here by the μόνον. This Epistle has in common with 1 Peter what looks like a knowledge of His place in a Trinity (Jud_1:20 f.).

5. St. John's Writings.—In Acts, St. John was linked with St. Peter, and it is instructive to note how emphatically he harks back in his Epistles to that which they had from the beginning (e.g. 1Jn_1:1 ff., 2Jn_1:5 f.). He seems anxious to guard against any change from that early conception of Christ which is summed up in his Gospel in the confession of Thomas and in his own declaration (Act_20:28; Act_20:31).

The Prologue of St. John's *Gospel* restates it in the light of all the currents of thought that he has been meeting with in the intervening years. It stands, in its lofty

conception of Christ, beside Colossians 1, Philippians 2, and Hebrews 1, and forms the great thesis which the historic testimony marshalled in the Gospel was meant to establish. That testimony has been already referred to. All its strands are bound together here,—Creator, Light, Life, Revealer of God, Saviour of Men,—and all are grounded in His Godhead. What ‘the Son’ on the lips of Jesus involves and what the Evangelist expresses by ‘the only-begotten Son’ (Joh 3:16), is here (Joh 3:18) expressed by ‘only-begotten God,’ which after all is the only adequate explanation of the phenomena, however incomprehensible to us it may be in itself. For He was in the beginning; He was face to face with God; He was God. The last statement guards against any form of Unitarianism (θεῖος would admit that), while in the use of θεός it provides for the Trinitarian conception which ὁ θεός might be understood to exclude, and fits in with the previous πρὸς τὸν θεόν, which implies two Persons in face to face fellowship. Being God, He creates the Universe and becomes incarnate, and so reveals God. Of this fact John the Baptist had some glimpse (Joh 1:15). It is here assigned as the reason for his sense of inferiority.

St. John’s *Epistles* assume all this, as the opening verses show, and are intended to point out that a life of righteousness, truth, and love is necessarily involved in that fellowship with God which faith in Christ effects. The liar is the one who denies that Jesus is the Christ (1Jn 2:22); he who believes that is born of God (1Jn 5:1). He who denies the Son hath not the Father, and will deny both Father and Son. Such is antichrist (1Jn 2:22 f.). Jesus Christ is the true God (1Jn 5:20). This is final truth, beyond which none can go and have God (2Jn 1:9).

In the *Apocalypse* the Apostle is given a vision of Christ in His ineffable glory, and a panoramic view of His march to acknowledged pre-eminence. All the main features already sketched reappear here in most striking fashion. He is the Lamb slain, the Redeemer who in His blood loosed from their sins (Rev 1:5) and purchased unto God men out of every nation (Rev 5:8 f.); the Living One who holds the keys of death and Hades (Rev 1:18) and gives life (Rev 22:17); the Ruler of the kings of the earth (Rev 1:5), the King of kings and Lord of lords (Rev 17:14); the Son of God (Rev 2:18, Rev 1:6) worshipped as God is (Rev 5:8-14 cf. with Rev 4:8-11) and as no other should be (Rev 22:8 f.). Between Him and God other parallels are drawn that find explanation and warrant only in His Deity, e.g. each is the Temple and Light of the New Jerusalem (Rev 21:22 f.); they have a common throne (Rev 22:3), and the title Κύριος is applied to both.

It is clear that all the NT writers regard Jesus Christ as pre-eminent by virtue of His Person, His work, and the place which the universe of created intelligences shall yet accord Him. For, though some of them have written briefly, all that they do say fits in

with this general conception. And it must be remembered that these early leaders formed a compact body, consciously bound together by the holiest ties, breathing the same atmosphere, receiving the same body of historic facts, professing the same vital religious experience, and drawn the closer together by the very opposition they encountered; and that, however they may have differed in minor matters, there is no symptom of difference or dispute among them as to the unapproachable greatness of their Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, or as to the fact that He is the coming Universal King. See also artt. Divinity of Christ, Incarnation.

Literature.—This is very extensive. Material may be found in the leading Commentaries, Lives of Christ, and works on Biblical and Systematic Theology, esp. those that deal wholly with the Person and work of Christ. Valuable lists may be found in *Cave's Introd. to Theol. and its Literature*. Two very valuable books there named might easily be overlooked, namely, Alexander Maclaren's 'Colossians' (*Expos. Bible*), and R. W. Dale's *Ephesians*. With them may be named Guthrie's exposition of the Colossian passage, entitled *Christ and the Inheritance of the Saints*. The following may also be consulted with advantage: M'Whorter, *Jahweh Christ*; Stalker, *Christology of Jesus*; Somerville, *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*; Forrest, *The Christ of History and of Experience*; R. J. Drummond, *Apostolic Teaching and Christ's Teaching*; Broadus, *Jesus of Nazareth*; A. T. Robertson, *Keywords in the Teaching of Jesus*; A. H. Strong, *The Greatness and the Claims of Christ* (in First Baptist World Congress); D. Fairweather, *Bound in the Spirit*, p. 265; G. A. J. Ross, *The Universality of Jesus*.

J. H. Farmer.

Pre-Existence

PRE-EXISTENCE

The OT conception of the Messiah was, for the most part, limited by the horizon of this present world. The prominent thought is that of a king of the line of David, born of the human stock ([Jer_30:21](#)), though supernaturally endowed and blessed. There are, however, traces of another and higher conception, in which the Messianic king tends to be identified or closely associated with the personal self-revelation of Jehovah. The most remarkable of these are the titles 'Mighty God' and 'Father of Eternity' in [Isa_9:6](#); the statement of [Mic_5:2](#), that the Ruler who is to come forth from Bethlehem will be one 'whose goings forth are from of old, from ancient days.' To these may perhaps be added [Bar_3:37](#). Such passages as these, whether they are understood as implying definitely the personal pre-existence of the Messiah, or only his existence in the eternal counsels of God, tended undoubtedly to raise the Messianic conception to a higher level, and to prepare for the claims of Christ

Himself, and the developed teaching of the pre-existence of Christ which is found in NT and the Christian writers generally.

In the more 'popular' teaching of Jesus Christ which is recorded in the Synoptic Gospels, though His continued existence, even to the end of time, is clearly stated, there are but few hints of His pre-existence before His human birth. His question to the Pharisees concerning Psalms 110 (Mat 22:41-45, Mar 12:35-37, Luk 20:41-44) would seem to imply, in the background of the Speaker's mind, His pre-existence before His birth of the line of David. A similar conclusion might be drawn from the language of the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen (see esp. Mar 12:6). And possibly the lament over Jerusalem (Mat 23:37, Luk 13:34, taken in connexion with Deu 32:11) implies that the attempt to 'gather together' the children of Jerusalem had extended over a much longer past than the three years' ministry.

There can be no question that St. John was profoundly convinced of the eternal pre-existence of Jesus Christ as the personal Logos. This is most clearly stated in the Prologue to the Gospel (Joh 1:1-18). Similarly John the Baptist is quoted as bearing witness of Jesus in this respect (Joh 1:30). And in the discourses of Jesus Christ which are contained in this Gospel, addressed apparently to a different type of audience from that of the Synoptics, and conveying a fuller self-revelation, there are most startling claims to pre-existence. To Nicodemus (Joh 3:13), Christ claims to know the heavenly things as having Himself descended from heaven. The same claim was made in the synagogue at Capernaum (Joh 6:33-42), and produced strife and astonishment. A little later the Jews of Jerusalem attempt to stone Christ for blasphemy. He claimed not only priority to Abraham, but apparently an eternal pre-existence (Joh 8:58). And in the climax of self-revealing at the Last Supper, Jesus in His communing with the Father twice refers to His own personal relations with the Father before the world began (Joh 17:5; Joh 17:24).

The sermons in the Acts confine themselves to the historical manifestation of Jesus Christ, the prophetic preparation for it, and the Second Advent. But in the writings of St. Paul an increasing consciousness of Christ's pre-existence and definiteness in speaking of it can be traced. In 1Co 15:47 Christ is 'from heaven,' in 2Co 8:9 His earthly poverty is contrasted with an antecedent richness. It is, however, in the Epistles of the First Imprisonment that pre-existence is not only hinted at, but expressed and defined. The remarkable passage Php 2:5-11 predicates deliberate will and choice of Christ Jesus, before His Incarnation. He willed to surrender (from a human point of view) His natural equality with God, and chose the glory which came through humiliation and sacrifice of self. And, still more definitely, in Col 1:15-17 not only priority, but an eternal priority to all creation is ascribed to Him: 'he is before all things.' With this passage should be compared the opening of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where not only similar descriptions are given of the nature of Christ, but

the words of Psalms 102, contrasting the eternity of the Creator with the transitoriness of creation, are boldly and without any explanation applied directly to Christ (cf. also Rom_10:9-15). The language of the Apocalypse is strictly parallel (Rev_1:17; Rev_3:14; Rev_21:6; Rev_22:13).

See artt. Divinity of Christ, Incarnation.

Literature.—Sanday, art. 'Jesus Christ' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ; Liddon, *Divinity of our Lord* (Bampton Lectures for 1866); Westcott, *Gospel of St. John*, 1882; Dorner, *Chr. Doct.* (English translation) iii. (1882) 283; Lobstein, *Notion de la préexistence du Fils de Dieu* (1883); Godet, 'Person of Christ' in *Monthly Interpreter*, iii. (1880) 1; Beyschlag, *NT Theol.* (English translation) ii. (1895) 249; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus* (English translation), ii. (1892) 168; Denney, *Studies in Theology* (1895), 51; Orr, *Chr. View of God and the World* (1893), 508; Barton, 'Jewish-Chr. Doct. of Pre-existence of Messiah' in *JBL [Note: BL Journal of Biblical Literature.]* xxi. (1902) 78; Du Bose, *The Gospel in the Gospels* (1906), 221; Barrett, *The Earliest Chr. Hymn* (1897), 23.

A. R. Whitham.

☩ Preaching

PREACHING.—In the Gospels three Gr. words are used for preaching, viz. κηρῦσσω, 'proclaim as a herald,' with the corresponding substantive κήρυγμα; καταγγέλλω, 'announce,' 'declare'; εὐαγγελίζω, 'tell good tidings,' with the corresponding substantive εὐαγγέλιον, 'good tidings.' A fourth word, λαλέω, 'talk,' 'discourse,' is also rendered 'preach' in Mar_2:2 Authorized Version (as also in Act_8:25; Act_11:19; Act_13:42; Act_14:25; Act_16:6); but in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 this is rendered 'speak' ('he *spake* the word unto them'). In a general way it may be said that preaching, as the proclamation of a message, was distinguished from teaching (διδαχή), the explanation and vindication of truth. In some cases this distinction is marked. Thus John the Baptist was emphatically a preacher, he came to announce the coming of the Kingdom of God; Jesus began where John left off by also preaching this message; and the Twelve were sent out to preach (κηρῦσσειν, Mar_3:14, cf. Mat_10:7, Luk_9:2). The function of the Seventy was similar (Luk_10:9). But in all but His earlier ministry our Lord was more occupied in what is expressly called 'teaching.' While John, and Jesus Himself at first, as well as His disciples

throughout the Gospel period, only preached, announcing the message from heaven, it was reserved to our Lord to explain the great truths of the gospel by teaching. The forerunner and the Apostles announced that the Kingdom was to come, without discussing its nature; Jesus Christ went further, and laboured to show what this Divine Kingdom really was. So, while John was content to prepare for the Kingdom, with the assurance that it was 'at hand,' Jesus asked, 'Whereunto shall I liken the kingdom of God?' and proceeded to illustrate its characteristics. This was regarded as teaching. Further, while the preaching was for all who would hear, a public utterance designed to arrest attention, the teaching was more especially designed for disciples; and while some of it was public, much of it was given in private. In the second year of our Lord's ministry, after the breach with the authorities and the defection of the multitude, there was less preaching and more teaching in the training of the Twelve.

This distinction cannot, however, be maintained throughout. Sometimes our Lord's most public utterances are described as 'teaching,' and are of the character of instruction (e.g. Mar 2:13; Mar 4:1-2). Moreover, teaching is blended with preaching. The difference is more carefully maintained in Mk. than in Mt. Thus Mk. states that Jesus came into Galilee *preaching* the Kingdom of God (Mar 1:14)—the public open-air proclamation; but that He went into a synagogue to *teach* (Mar 1:21), where after the scripture had been read He would expound it (cf. Luk 4:20 ff.). But in Mt. we have teaching and preaching both assigned to our Lord's work in the synagogues (Mat 4:23). We may infer from the earlier Gospel that Jesus did recognize the distinction between the two kinds of utterance, though probably one would often pass over into the other.

When we turn from verbal distinctions to the real differences, we may observe three methods followed by our Lord, according to circumstance and requirement: (1) The primitive proclamation, in making which He went on the lines laid down by John the Baptist; (2) the public teaching of the laws and principles of the Kingdom of God, offered to all who would attend to it, whether in the open air or in the synagogues; (3) the private training of His own disciples and discourse with inquirers. Both (1) and (2) come into our modern conception of Preaching, and we must understand the actual preaching of Jesus to comprehend them. See also the following article and art. Teaching.

W. F. Adeney.

PREACHING CHRIST.—The purpose of this article is to explain what is meant by ‘preaching Christ.’ It is assumed that to preach Christ is the preacher’s function, and the intention is to show what such preaching involved in the beginning, and what it must include still if it is to be true to its original. Changing conditions may demand for it different forms, but presumably under all forms there will be a vital continuity or rather identity in the substance which is preached.

1. The NT as a whole presents Jesus in the character of *the Christ*. When the first preachers preached Him, it was in this character. ‘God,’ says Peter, ‘hath made this same Jesus both Lord and Christ’ (Act 2:36). ‘Saul confounded the Jews that dwelt in Damascus, proving that this is the Christ’ (Act 9:22). All the Evangelists agree with this: see Mat 1:1; Mat 1:18, Mar 1:1, Luk 2:11, Joh 20:31. Now ‘the Christ,’ or ‘the Messiah,’ was not a meaningless expression for Jews: it had a distinct meaning, and a great range of ideas and hopes attached to it. There was a Messianic dogmatic, as it has been called, among the Jews, quite apart from the question who was to be the Messiah; or, to put it otherwise, Jewish disciples had a Christology before they became believers in Jesus as the Christ. It is easy to see the dangers connected with this situation. If we take the sentence, ‘Jesus is the Christ,’ we may put the emphasis either on the subject or the predicate. We can conceive how a Jew, whose imagination was on flame with the apocalyptic hopes associated with the Messiah, might allow these hopes, when he accepted the Christian faith, to overpower the person of Jesus; Jesus, so to speak, would become nothing to him but the person through whom expectations were to be realized which in their origin had nothing to do with Jesus. There may be occasions in the NT where we have to ask whether something of this kind has not taken place, but they are not conspicuous. In the NT, when it is said that Jesus is the Christ, the emphasis is always as much on the subject as on the predicate. The proof of the proposition is always found in something which has been done by or to Jesus. In point of fact, it is found in the first instance in His resurrection and exaltation to God’s right hand. It is this participation in the sovereignty of God that makes Him Lord and Christ; and the content of this, in all essentials, is not derived from the Messianic dogmatic of the Jewish schools, but from the experience of the Apostles themselves. This experience has two aspects, the one in the stricter sense historical, the other in the stricter sense spiritual. The one, put briefly, is, ‘We have seen the Lord’; the other, ‘He hath poured forth this—the new life at Pentecost—which ye see and hear’ (Act 2:23). The one is represented by the series of witnesses to the resurrection cited by St. Paul in 1Co 15:5-9, the other by the series of new spiritual experiences and convictions to which he can appeal in 1Co 15:12-19. It is the testimony of the Apostles to the resurrection of Jesus, and experience of the new life in His spirit, not any pre-Christian Christology, or Jewish Messianic dogmatic, that define for the first Christians the content of the title ‘the Christ.’ And it may safely be said, to begin with, that there is no such thing as preaching Christ unless it is the preaching of *One who lives and reigns*. If Jesus is at

the right hand of God,—if He is behind every revival of spiritual life in the Church,—then He is the Christ, and can be preached as such; but if not, not.

2. At first, naturally, great stress was laid upon this. The Apostles sincerely believed that they had seen the Lord, and they could not conceive of their calling as having anything in it to take precedence of this—that they were witnesses of the resurrection, and therefore of the Messiahship of Jesus. No doubt this gave its whole character to primitive Christianity; but if we accept the testimony of the Apostles to the resurrection, we shall be slow to say that it transformed its character, and made it a new and essentially an inferior thing as compared with the religion of Jesus. Jesus was not forgotten when the Apostles, appealing to the resurrection and to Pentecost, argued that He was the Christ, God's King, through whom all the hopes which God had inspired were to be fulfilled. Harnack, indeed, has argued that in its eagerness to prove that Jesus is the Christ—that is, to discharge a task in apologetic theology—the Church spent too much of the force which ought to have been given to teaching men to observe all things whatsoever He had commanded (*Dogmengesch.*¹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] i. 57 f.). But there is no necessary antagonism between the two things, and except for their faith in His exaltation as the Christ the Apostles would never have taught anything at all. Weinel (*Paulus*, 108 f.) represents the same tendency in a much less guarded form. 'After the death of Jesus,' he says, 'the ethical religion of redemption, which had entered the world with Jesus, underwent its most decisive transformation of a formal kind; it ceased to be the religion of sonship to God, and became faith in the Christ-nature of the man Jesus.... The disciples demanded faith in Him as the Messiah exalted to God, and in the conception of His death as an atonement appointed by God for sins. With the experience of the resurrection and with this dogma of the death of the Messiah, the Christ-religion, Christianity in the narrower sense, begins.' One almost wonders if Weinel thinks it a pity that Jesus rose from the dead, or that His disciples believed that He did, and were overpoweringly influenced by a faith so tremendous; but this apart, the assumption in all criticism of this sort is that when the Apostles preached Jesus as the Christ they concentrated all their attention on the predicate of the proposition, which owed no part of its import to Jesus, and treated the subject as if it had no meaning. Even on *a priori* grounds we should say this was improbable, and there is a very significant piece of evidence that it is not true. This is found in the qualifications of the man appointed to take the place of Judas. His function was to be a witness to the resurrection—that is, to the Messiahship of Jesus; he was, in other words, to be a preacher of the Christ. But he was chosen from 'the men that have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and went out among us, beginning from the baptism of John unto the day that he was received up from us' (Act 1:21 f). To preach Christ, even in the days when belief in the resurrection was so overpowering, one required to have a full knowledge of Jesus. It is idle to say that

Jesus is the Christ if we do not know who or what Jesus is. It has no meaning to say that an unknown person is at God's right hand, exalted and sovereign; the more ardently men believed that God had given them a Prince and a Saviour in this exaltation, the more eager would they be to know all that could possibly be learned about Him. If there were men alive who had lived in His company, they would wait assiduously on their teaching (Act 2:42). They would be more than curious to know what spirit He was of, and whether they could detect in His appearance and career on earth 'the works of the Christ' (Mat 11:2). They would expect to find some kind of moral congruity between His life on the one hand, and His transcendent dignity and calling on the other; there would be a demand, from the very beginning, for facts about Him. From this point of view, then, we may say that preaching Christ is not taking leave of Jesus in any sense or to any extent; it is preaching Jesus exalted and sovereign.

The passage just quoted (Act 1:21 f.) is practically coterminous with the oldest form of Gospel which we possess. 'Beginning from the baptism of John unto the day that he was taken up': these are the limits within which lies the Gospel according to Mark. Hence we might say that to preach this gospel is to preach Christ, on condition, of course, that it is preached in its connexion with Jesus exalted. Merely to narrate the history of Jesus, even if we had the materials for it, would not be to preach Christ. We need, of course, to know the historical Jesus, as the qualifications for Apostleship show; but to preach Christ means to preach that Person as present in the sovereignty of His resurrection. It is not preaching Christ if we tell the story of the life and death merely as events in a past continually growing more remote. It is not preaching Christ though we tell this story in the most vivid and moving fashion, and gather round it, by the exercise of historical imagination or dramatic skill, the liveliest emotions; it is not preaching Christ to present the life and death of Jesus as a high and solemn tragedy, with power in it to purify the soul by pity and terror. There is no preaching of Christ, possessed of religious significance, that does not rest on the basis on which the Apostolic preaching rested: His exaltation in power, and therefore His perpetual presence. The historical Jesus is indispensable; but if we are to have a Christian religion, the historical must become present and eternal. This it does through the resurrection as apprehended by faith.

3. For the purposes of this article it is assumed that the Synoptic Gospels give such a knowledge of the historical Jesus as is sufficient for the preacher's ends. No doubt He is depicted for us there by writers who believed in Him as the Christ, and for whom the light of His exaltation was reflected on the lowliness of His earthly career; but this light is not necessarily a distorting one. We have no reason to say that there is anything in these Gospels which is untrue to the historical personality of Jesus, anything which represents Him in mind, in will, in temper, in character, in His consciousness as a whole of His relations to God and man, as other than He really

was. Extravagant things have been said by many writers of *Lives of Jesus*, from Strauss downwards, on the imperfection of our knowledge, and on the way in which the real Jesus has been disguised from the very beginning by the idealization of His figure in the faith and love of those who preached Him—and especially in the Gospels. If we concentrate our attention on the character of Jesus, on the spirit of His words and deeds and death, on His consciousness of His relations to God and men—in a word, on what He was and achieved in the spiritual world—it is the present writer's conviction that we shall feel the very reverse of this to be the truth. We may be dubious about this or that word, this or that incident in the Gospels, but we have no dubiety at all about the Person. The great life that stands out before us in the Gospels is more real than anything in the world; and Jesus is so far from being hidden from us that it is no exaggeration to say that we know Him better than anybody who has ever lived on earth.

It does not follow from this that we accept the Evangelists' proofs that Jesus was the Christ, or that in preaching Christ we employ the same arguments as they to show that Jesus has the unique significance for religion which was represented for them by the Messianic title. Broadly speaking, these arguments were two—one from prophecy and one from miracles. Both may be accepted in principle without being accepted in form. The argument from prophecy is an assertion of the continuity of revelation, of the one purpose of God running through it all, and culminating in Jesus. Jesus is the fulfilment of all the hopes contained in the ancient revelation, and we look for no other: 'How many soever are the promises of God, in him is the yea' (2Co_1:20); we recognize this, and the absolute significance which it secures for Jesus in religion. But we no longer prove it to ourselves by emphasizing, in the manner of the First Gospel, particular correspondences between incidents in the life of Jesus and passages in the OT. There is no religious and no intellectual value for us in such fulfilments of prophecy as Mat_2:15; Mat_2:18; Mat_2:23. We should apply the Pauline principle (2Co_1:20) quite differently, recognizing that correspondence is one thing, fulfilment another. Jesus did not really come to fulfil prophecy in the sense of carrying out a programme the details of which were fixed beforehand; He came to fulfil Himself, or to fulfil the will of the Father, as the Father made it plain to Him from step to step; and though, on one occasion (Mar_11:1-10), He Himself arranged an incident in which a literal correspondence with a prophecy was secured, it is not such a phenomenon which makes Him the Christ to us. Its value now lies in showing that He regarded Himself as the Christ, the promised King. And so with the argument from miracles, which, though not formally put, is perhaps as characteristic of the Second Gospel as the argument from prophecy is of the First. The works of Jesus, in the largest sense,—all that He did and the power which it implied,—go to give Him the importance He has in our minds. But we do not limit His works to the class commonly called miraculous; the impression left on the minds of men by His whole being and action gathers up into itself much more than this. The arguments from prophecy and

from miracles are formal ways of expressing truths which really contain much more than these forms can carry; and our impression of the truths is too direct, immediate, and complex to have justice done it by such arguments.

4. While, however, the inadequacy of such arguments to their purpose must be admitted, the purpose of the arguments is not to be overlooked. What those who first called Jesus the Christ, or preached Him as such, intended to do, was to put Him in a place which no other could share. Whatever else the name meant, it meant the King; and there was only one King. In the Christian religion Jesus was never one of a series, a person who could be classified, and be shown to His proper place in the line of great personalities who have contributed to the spiritual uplifting of the race. The study of Comparative Religion has fostered a tendency to regard Him in this light; but it cannot be said too strongly that to admit the legitimacy of such a tendency is to abandon from the very root all that has ever been known to history as Christianity. The NT is quite unequivocal about this. From the beginning Christians call Jesus 'Lord' (1Co 12:3), and recognize that God has given Him the name which is above every name (Php 2:9). All other men in the NT meet as equals on the same level, and all bow before Him as King. In His exaltation He confronts men as one Divine causality with the Father, working for their salvation. Historical Christianity, said Emerson (*Works*, Bell's ed. ii. 195), has dwelt and dwells with noxious exaggeration about the *person* of Jesus. As a criticism of some kinds of interest in dogmatic Christology, this may be true; but if it is meant to reflect on the devotion of Christians to Jesus as a Person, it is completely beside the mark. To Christians this Person has been from the beginning, and will be for ever, what no other can be. To talk of Him as the same in kind with other prophets or founders of religions,—with Moses and Isaiah, with Confucius or Buddha, or, what is even harder to understand, with Mohammed,—is to surrender anything that a NT Christian could have recognized as Christianity. To preach Christ at all we must preach Him as *κύριος* and *μονογενής*. The first name secures His unshared place in relation to men, as the latter does in relation to God; and unless He fills such a place, Christianity has no *raison d'être*. That it has is the assumption of this article, as it is the fact presented in the NT. It is, in fact, the *differentia* of Christianity as a religion that the distinction which can sometimes be drawn between a person and the cause for which he stands is in it no longer valid. To preach what Jesus preached is not preaching Christianity unless the thing preached is preached in its essential relation to Him. The truth which He announces is not independent of Himself; it is in the world only as it is incarnate in *Him*. Thus, to take as an example what many regard as the supreme category in the teaching of Jesus—the Kingdom of God: what is meant by preaching Christ here? It is very likely impossible for us to understand precisely what the expression 'Kingdom of God' conveyed in the mental atmosphere of Judaism or of the 1st cent. generally. It may be impossible for us even to understand with certainty and precision what Jesus

Himself on any given occasion meant it to convey. All shades of meaning run through it,—political, eschatological, spiritual; national, universal; here, coming: how can anyone tell whether in preaching the Kingdom of God he is preaching Christ? The answer is clear if we remember that the Kingdom of God in His sense could come only in and through Him, and that its character is ultimately determined by that fact. He Himself, in the sense at least of being God's representative, is King in it (Mat_13:41; Mat_20:21; Mat_25:34, Luk_23:42), and it is from what we know of Him, including ultimately His resurrection and exaltation, that all our conceptions of the Kingdom must be derived. To preach the cause and ignore the Person, or to preach the cause as of universal import and to assign to the Person an importance in relation to it which He only shares with an indefinite number of others, is to be untrue to the facts as the Gospels present them. Even preaching the Kingdom of God is not preaching Christ unless the Kingdom is preached as one which owes its character to the fact that Jesus is its King, and the certainty of its consummation to the fact that Jesus shares the throne of God. Christianity is not abstract optimism; it is optimism based on the exaltation of Jesus, and on the knowledge of God as revealed in Him.

5. If we bring these ideas to a point, we shall say that to preach Christ means to preach Jesus in the absolute significance for God and man which He had to His own consciousness and to the faith of the first witnesses; and to preach Him as exalted, and as having this absolute significance now and for ever. The question then arises, In what forms did Jesus Himself present this absolute significance to His own mind? How did He conceive it, and body it forth to others, so as to make an adequate impression on them? And are the forms of thought and of imagination which He employed for this purpose in a given historical environment as indispensable to us, and as binding in our totally different environment, as they were for those with whom Jesus stood face to face? To preach Christ it is necessary to be able to answer these questions not at haphazard, but on principle; and the answer may sometimes seem difficult.

To proceed by illustration: (a) One of the ways in which Jesus represented His absolute significance for the true religion was this: He regarded Himself as the Messiah. The Messianic rôle was one which could be filled only by one Person, and He Himself was the Person in question; He and no other was the Christ. But is 'the Christ' a conception of which we, in another age and with other antecedents, can make use for the same purpose? Only, it must be answered, if we employ the term with much latitude. What it suggests to us, as already pointed out, is the continuity of revelation, and the fulfilment through Jesus of all the hopes which, through history and prophecy, God had kindled in human hearts; it is the possibility of using it to express this that justifies us in retaining the name. But it is certain that for those who first came to believe in Jesus as the Christ the name was much more definite than it is for us; it had a shape and colour that it has no longer; it had expectations connected with it which for us have lost the vitality they once possessed. In

particular, the eschatological associations of the term have not, in their NT form, the importance for us which they had for the first believers. In the teaching of Jesus these associations cluster round the title 'the Son of Man,' which, at least after the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi, is used as synonymous with 'the Christ'; the Son of Man is identified with Jesus, and comes again, after His suffering and death, to establish the Kingdom, in the glory of His Father with the holy angels (Mar_8:31; Mar_8:38, Mat_10:33; Mat_16:27). This coming again, or, as the original disciples conceived it, this coming (*παρουσία*) in the character of the Christ, was expected, by those who first preached and received the gospel, to take place in their own generation; and it is difficult to argue that this expectation could have any other basis than the teaching of Jesus Himself. Nothing was more characteristic of primitive Christianity; it was the very essence of what the early Church meant by *hope*; it was for it part of the very meaning of 'the Christ.' Account has been taken, in art. Authority of Christ (vol. i. p. 149), of any considerations which go to qualify the certainty with which we ascribe to Jesus Himself this eschatological conception of the consummation of God's Kingdom, and especially this conviction as to its imminence; but if we do connect it with Him, and regard it as part of what is meant when He represents Himself as the Christ, clearly history requires us to recognize the inadequacy of that conception to be the vehicle of the truth. The Kingdom of God has been coming ever since Jesus left the world; but Jesus Himself, after nearly two thousand years, has not yet come in like manner as the disciples saw Him going into heaven (Act_1:11). We still believe that the Kingdom of God is coming; we believe this because we believe in Jesus; we believe that it is coming only through Him and as He comes; that is what the Christian of to-day means when he says we believe in Him as the Christ. But even the belief in His exaltation to God's right hand does not make possible for us that particular kind of expectation of His coming which burnt with so intense a flame in the breast of the Apostolic Church; quite apart from any preference or effort, our outlook on the future is different from theirs; and, while we do not abate in the least our recognition of the sole sovereignty of Jesus, and our assurance that God's Kingdom can come and God's promises be fulfilled through Him alone, we are compelled, apparently, to recognize that in infusing into the disciples His own assurance of the final triumph of God's cause in His own person, our Lord had to make use of representations which have turned out unequal to the truth. He had to put His sense of the absolute significance of His Person for God and man into a form which was relative to the mind of the time. The eschatological Christ, coming on the clouds of heaven, and coming in the lifetime of some who heard His voice, was one expression for Jesus of this absolute significance; and it is as such an expression—that is, as an assurance of the speedy triumph of God's cause in and through Him, and not in its spectacular detail—that we believe in it. It is not rejecting the absolute significance of Jesus to say that this spectacular detail is relative to the age and its mental outlook; but it would be a rejection of it, and a repudiation of Jesus as the

Christ, if we denied that the Kingdom of God—however experience enables us to picture its coming and consummation—comes and is consummated through Him alone. This truth must be preached if we really preach Christ.

(b) Jesus, however, has other ways of conveying His absolute significance. One of the simplest is that in which He represents Himself as judge of men, arbiter of their eternal destinies. It may be argued, no doubt, that the form in which this is expressed in Mat 7:21 ff; Mat 25:31 ff. is, in part at least, due to the Evangelist; ‘prophesying in the name of Jesus’ was a phenomenon which came into the world only after His death, and such an allusion to it as Mat 7:22, where it is treated as an obvious thing, would hardly have been intelligible in His lifetime. But there is no reason whatever to doubt that both this passage and the other convey the mind of Jesus about His own significance for men. Whatever be the rule of the judgment—doing the will of *His Father* (Mat 7:21), or humanity exhibited in practice in relation to those whom He calls *His brethren* (Mat 25:40)—it is a rule which has been finally embodied in Him. It is in Him that we see what doing the will of the Father means; it is in Him also that we see the law of humanity fulfilled. It is what we are when measured by His standard, judged by His judgment, that discloses the very truth about us. It has been urged that this prerogative of judgment is merely an element in the Jewish conception of the Messiah, and as such has been formally transferred to Jesus in the Gospels; but nothing is less formal in the NT than the conception of Jesus as judge. It does not rest on any borrowings from a pre-Christian Messianic dogmatic, but on the most real experiences of men in the presence of Jesus: ‘Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord’ (Luk 5:8); ‘Come, see a man who told me all things that ever I did’ (Joh 4:29). The experiences by which words like these were inspired give reality and solemnity to all the representations of Jesus as judge. Here again we may say that the spectacular representations of the judgment are a form which we may recognize to have only a relative value, while yet we do not dispute in the least the absolute truth that the standard of reality and of worth in the spiritual world is Jesus, and that no life can be finally estimated except by its relation to Him. The Gospel according to John is distinguished from the others by emphasizing the function of Christ as judge, and the continuous exercise of it in what might almost be called an automatic fashion. The Father has committed all judgment to the Son (Joh 5:23); and the process of judging goes on in the Gospel under our eyes. The very presence of Jesus sifts men; they gather round Him or are repelled from Him according to what they are. Something of absolute and final significance, it may be said, is transacted before our faces, as men show that they will or will not have anything to do with Jesus. It is eternal judgment revealed in the field of time, and Jesus is the judge. No one else could fill His place in this character, and we do not preach Christ as He was and is except by making this plain. Probably, however, in this case more than in any other it is rash to discount too cheaply what we think, rightly enough in principle, are but forms of conveying this truth, and forms unequal to the reality. The picture of the

Last Judgment in Mat 25:31-46 may not be true as a picture, the moral reality of the judgment may not be dependent at all on the scenic details here presented, but whether or not it is true as a picture, it is true in the moral impression it leaves on the mind, and this is the truth that is important. There is such a thing, if there is any truth in Christ at all, as final judgment; there is a right hand of the judge and a left, an inside of the door and an outside, a character that abides for ever and a character that collapses in irreparable ruin; and to realize of what kind character is, or where it must stand at last, we have only to confront it with Him. The man who cannot withstand the attraction of Jesus does not come into judgment, he has passed from death into life (Joh 5:24); the man who will not yield to the attraction of Jesus is judged already (Joh 3:18), and the judgment will be revealed at last. To recognize and proclaim the absolute significance of Jesus here is an essential part of preaching Christ.

(c) The supreme illustration of this incomparable significance of Jesus remains. It is given in what we may call *His consciousness of His relation to God*. To Jesus, God was the Father, and He Himself was the Son. It does not matter that God is a universal Father, and that all men are or are called to be His sons; Jesus recognizes this, and insists upon it, but He claims Sonship in a peculiar sense for Himself. He never speaks of Himself as *a* child of God, but as *the* Son, *simpliciter*. In speaking of God and Himself He uses ὁ πατήρ and ὁ υἱός in a way which implies that there could no more be a plural on the one side than on the other: see esp. Mat 11:27 f., Mar 13:32. It is natural to suppose that in the account of Jesus' baptism (Mat 3:17 ||) the heavenly voice which pronounces Him Son of God, in words borrowed from Psalms 2, means the term there to be taken in the Messianic 'official' sense; it is the Messianic consciousness of Jesus, as the accompanying narrative of the Temptation proves, which is expressed in ὁ υἱός μου. What the relation may have been in His mind between this (which defines His calling by relation to OT hopes) and the Divine Sonship exhibited in Mat 11:27, we may not be able to tell. It has been argued by some that the official Messianic Sonship, the calling to be God's King in Israel, widened and deepened in the mind of Jesus Himself into the consciousness of a unique relation to God, which found its most adequate expression in the language of Mat 11:27; by others, that only such a consciousness as is disclosed in Mat 11:27 enables us to understand how Jesus could ever have regarded Himself as the Messiah. The Messianic categories have been considered above; what we have here to do is to look at the less specifically Jewish way in which Jesus here reveals His absolute significance for religion. 'All things have been delivered to me by my Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither knoweth any one the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him' (see Authority of Christ, vol. i. p. 149). Here Jesus claims in the most explicit terms to have had the whole task of revealing God to men—the whole task of saving men, so far as that depends

upon their coming to know God—committed to Him.* [Note: It is fanciful, on account of παρεδοθη, to suppose that Jesus is here contrasting His παράδοσις, which has its starting-point in the Father, with the ‘traditions’ of the elders.] It is a task to which He is equal, and for which no other has any competence at all. Everything connected with it has been entrusted to Him, and to Him alone; there is not a man upon the earth who can know the Father except by becoming a debtor to Jesus. There is no such thing as preaching Christ unless we preach this: He is the mediator for all men of the knowledge of God as Father; that is, of that knowledge of God on which eternal life depends. This is the loftiest, the most universal, and the most gracious form in which the absolute significance of Jesus can be expressed: the loftiest, because it declares Him unequivocally to be the μονογενής, having His being in a relation to God constituted by perfect mutual understanding, and belonging to Him alone; the most universal, because the relation of Father and Son, while it can only be symbolic of the reality, uses a symbolism based on nature, not on history, and is therefore intelligible to all men, and not only (like Messiah) to one race; and the most gracious, for it suggests directly not only mutual understanding but mutual love, the love which unites the Father and the Son in the work of enlightening and redeeming men (cf. Mat_11:28 f.). It is not necessary, however, to dwell on this: the point is that in this central passage Jesus emphasizes His absolute significance in the two main directions in which it can be understood: He is to God what no other is, and He can therefore do for man what no other can do. He is the only-begotten Son, and the only Mediator between God and man. In preaching Christ in this sense, we have much more to go upon than this single utterance. The truth which it conveys, indeed, is not so much a truth revealed by Christ, as the truth which is embodied in Him; in order to appreciate it, it is necessary to have the experience of coming through Him to the Father, and of recognizing the Father in the Son. The interest of the Fourth Gospel consists to a large extent in this—that it is an expansion and illustration of these words. Jesus is presented there as the Word made flesh—the principle of revelation embodied in a human life; it is His work, so to speak, to enlighten every man, and apart from His work men remain in darkness. ‘No man hath seen God at any time: the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared—or interpreted (ἐξηγήσατο)—him’ (Joh_1:18); ‘He that hath seen me hath seen the Father’ (Joh_14:9); ‘I am the way and the truth and the life: no one cometh to the Father but through me’ (Joh_14:6). This is the key to the peculiar passages in the Gospel in which Jesus says ἐγώ εἰμι without any expressed predicate (Joh_4:26? Joh_8:24; Joh_8:28, Joh_13:19): we are meant to think of Him as the great decisive Personality, who stands in a place which is His alone, and by relation to whom all men finally stand or fall. It may be that the expression given to this in the Fourth Gospel owes something to the writer as well as to Jesus; but what the writer expresses is at least the impression made on him by Jesus, and, as Mat_11:27 and Mar_13:32 show,

the impression is one which answers exactly to Jesus' consciousness of Himself. The words quoted above from Jn. only do justice to Jesus' sense of what He was in relation to God and man, and it is not possible to preach Christ in any adequate sense if we ignore or deny the truth they convey. To do so would be to reject both what Jesus said and what He was in the experience of those who first believed on Him.

6. With the rest of the NT in mind, the question is naturally raised at this point, whether Jesus gave any further definition to the idea of mediation than that which we find in this passage. All men owe to Him the knowledge of God as Father, but how does He impart it? All men must become His debtors if they are to have the benefit of this supreme revelation: is there anything which more than another enables us to estimate the dimensions of this debt? If there is, then in preaching Christ that thing would require to have a corresponding prominence. It is obvious that Jesus mediates the knowledge of God to men, not by His words only, but, as is shown elsewhere (Authority of Christ, vol. i. p. 149), by His being and life as well. It is the Son in whom the Father is revealed, and everything in the Son contributes to the revelation: His teaching, His works, His intercourse with others, His sufferings and death. The revelation is made in and through all these, and none of them can be omitted in preaching Christ. To borrow words of Wellhausen which are not without a misleading element (*Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, p. 114): 'His religion is found not only in what He taught publicly, but in His nature and bearing under all circumstances, at home and on the street, in what He said and did not say, in what He did consciously or without being conscious of it, in the way in which He ate and drank and rejoiced and suffered. His Person, with which they had the privilege of intercourse in daily life, made an even deeper impression on His disciples than His teaching.' All this is true, but not the whole truth. The NT in all its parts lays a quite peculiar emphasis on the death of Christ, and in doing so it is not false to His own conception of the way in which He mediated the knowledge of the Father to men. His death, it may be said, does not require to be interpreted otherwise than His life; it is His life carried to a consistent consummation under the circumstances of the time; it is part of His life, not something distinct from it. This also is true, but, according to the representation in the Gospels, it is less than the whole truth. His death is a part of His life which has an essential relation to His work as the revealer of the Father, and the King in the Kingdom of God; it was recognized by Jesus Himself as Divinely necessary, it was the subject of frequent instruction to His disciples, and it is commemorated by His will in the most solemn rite of Christian worship (see [Mar_8:31](#); [Mar_9:31](#); [Mar_10:33](#); [Mar_10:45](#); [Mar_14:24](#) and ||). It is a fair inference from this, combined with the place taken by the Passion in the Evangelic narratives, and the place given to the interpretation of Christ's death in the Epistles, that to preach Christ it is necessary to represent His death as a main part, or rather as *the* main part, of the cost at which His work of mediation is done. In what particular way it is to be construed is an ulterior question. Our general conception of the moral order of

the world, our sense of individuality and of the solidarity of the race, our apprehension of sin as generic, or constitutional, or voluntary, the mental equipment with which we approach the whole subject, may determine us to interpret it in ways which are intellectually distinguishable; no given explanation of the death of Jesus can claim finality any more than any given interpretation of His Person. But just as we may say that Christ is not preached unless the Person of Christ is presented in its absolute significance for religion, as the one Person through whom the knowledge of the Father is mediated to men, so we may say further that Christ is not preached in the sense which answers to His own consciousness of what He was doing, unless it is made clear and central that His mediation necessitated and therefore cost His death. In the simplest words, it is necessary to say, in preaching Christ, not only that He is *μ*ονογενής and Mediator, but that He died for men. It was not for Him to insist on this as a doctrine; it was for the Church to apprehend it as a fact, and to put it into doxologies (Rev. 1:5; Rev. 5:9); but in doing so, it could go back to unmistakable words of Jesus Himself, and to the sacrament which speaks for Him more impressively than any words.

7. Jesus' consciousness of Himself, which, however hard it may be for us to apprehend it, has certainly the character just described—in other words, is a consciousness of His absolute and incomparable significance for all the relations of God and man—must lie at the heart of all preaching of which He is the object. He had this significance while He moved among men on the earth, and it was declared and made unmistakable to His disciples when He rose from the dead. It is on Jesus' consciousness of Himself, therefore, including His consciousness of His vocation, and on His exaltation to God's right hand, that the preaching of Christ rests. As has already been remarked (see § 3), the writer of this article assumes that in the Synoptic Gospels we have a representation given of the consciousness of Jesus, on the truth of which we can quite securely proceed. No doubt this has been questioned, most recently and radically by Wellhausen. The Gospels (to put it concisely) were written by Christians, and Jesus was not a Christian. They contain the gospel, that is, the Christian religion; but He knew nothing about the gospel, although it is put into His lips. He was a Jew. He preached no new faith. He taught men to do the will of God, which like all Jews He found in the Law and the other sacred books. The only difference was that He knew a better way of doing the will of God than that which the scribes of His day enforced on the people, and that He called men to leave their traditions and learn of Him. Wellhausen not only removes from the mind of Christ in this way everything that in Christian preaching has ever been known as gospel, everything that could by any possibility be regarded as contributing to Christology and Soteriology, but the great mass of what up till now has been regarded by criticism as the best attested part of the Evangelic record, the words of Jesus common to Matthew and Luke. Most of the parables, too, are sacrificed. Even the few in Mark are

not all genuine, and Wellhausen feels free to pass severe strictures alike on those of Matthew and of Luke. All that need be said of this is, that if Jesus had been no more than Wellhausen represents Him to be, then it is inconceivable that either the Gospels or the gospel could ever have been generated from any impulse He could impart to human minds. As Jülicher puts it (*Theol. Literaturztg.* 1905, No. 23), the primitive Church is thus made to appear richer, greater, and freer than its Head: in Jerusalem it surpasses Him by producing the marvellous Evangelic history, in St. Paul it surpasses Him by producing a new imposing theory of redemption. The historian looks in vain for anything analogous to this elsewhere. We do not understand how it could be done. We do not understand how the Church so suddenly lost the power of doing it. We do not understand how a man like St. Paul, we may say how men like those who wrote all the NT books except the Gospels, should have been so incapable of writing a page which reminds us of them. Although it is true to say that truth guarantees only itself, not its author, the truths exhibited by the Evangelists have a way of coalescing into a sum of truth which is identical with Jesus. As Deissmann has expressed it,* [Note: 'Evangelium u. Urchristentum' in *Beiträge zur Weiter-entwicklung der christlichen Religion*, p. 85.] they are not separate pearls threaded on a string, but flashes of the same diamond. Separately they guarantee themselves, but collectively they are a spiritual evidence to the historical reality of the great Person to whom the gospel owes its being, and to whom all preaching is a testimony. There is a kind of criticism which tacitly assumes that it is a mistake to believe in Christ as those who first preached Him believed; He was a Person who appeared in history, and therefore cannot have the absolute significance which must attach to the object of religious faith, and which does attach to Jesus throughout the NT. Such criticism makes it its business to reduce this figure to a true scale—which means to make His personality exactly like our own, and His consciousness exactly what our own may be. Wellhausen illustrates the direct application of this criticism to the Gospels; we see how it is brought to bear on the Epistles in such a remark as Wernle's, that a faith in Christ like that of St. Paul (which as good as deified its object) implies a certain want of faith in the living God. The consciousness of God must have decayed or lost its vital intensity in the Apostle before he could write the Epistle to the Colossians. Such a writing, we are almost invited to think, is on the way to justify the Jewish sneer: the creed of Christians is that there is no God, but that Jesus is His Son. In the face of criticism of this type, we hold with confidence the trustworthiness of the Evangelic representation, and venture to say that no NT writer, not even St. Paul or St. John, has anything to say of the absolute significance of Jesus, in all the relations of God and man, which goes beyond Jesus' consciousness of Himself as the Gospels preserve it. And, further, we venture to say that no NT writing, however casual or informal, falls short of the testimony which Jesus, according to the Evangelists, bears to Himself. Everywhere Jesus has the place which He claims for Himself, and Christians are conscious of an absolute dependence on Him for their standing towards God. To give Him this place is the only way to preach Christ.

8. The earliest specimens of Apostolic preaching are the sermons of St. Peter in Acts. Their value is universally acknowledged. According to Schmiedel (*Encyc. Bibl.* i. 48), 'almost the only element that is historically important (in the early chapters of Acts) is the Christology of the speeches of Peter. This, however, is important in the highest degree.... It is hardly possible not to believe that this Christology of the speeches of Peter must have come from a primitive source.' It starts with the historical person as such: 'Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God to you by miracles and portents and signs which God wrought through him, as you yourselves know' (Act 2:22). This approbation of Jesus by His wonderful works might seem confuted by His death, but to this the Apostle has a twofold answer. On the one hand, the death itself was Divinely necessary; He was delivered up by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, evidence of which was found in the Scriptures (Act 2:23, cf. 1Co 15:4). On the other hand, it was annulled by the resurrection of Jesus and His exaltation to God's right hand. It was this that made Him both Lord and Christ, and in this character He determined for the Apostles and for all men their whole relation to God. To Him they owed already the gift of the Holy Ghost; and, as St. Peter explicitly states elsewhere (Act 11:15; Act 11:17; Act 15:8), to receive the Holy Ghost is to be religiously complete. To His coming they looked for times of refreshing, indeed for the 'times of the restoration of all things, whereof God spake by the mouth of his holy prophets that have been from of old' (Act 3:21). All prophecy, to put it otherwise, is conceived as Messianic; all the hopes which God has inspired are hopes to be fulfilled through Christ. He is Prince of life (Act 3:15), Lord of all (Act 10:36), ordained of God as Judge of living and dead (Act 10:42). Those who repent, believe, and are baptized in His name receive remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost (Act 2:38, Act 10:43). All these expressions imply that from the very beginning Jesus had for His disciples that absolute significance which we have seen belonged to His own consciousness of Himself; but in addition to this, it is put with singular force in a passage which expresses nothing else: 'There is not salvation in any other: for there is no other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved' (Act 4:12). It may be possible to strip from the gospel of St. Peter, without detriment to its essence, some of that vesture of eschatological Messianism which it necessarily wore at the time; but it is not possible that religion should be to us what it was to him,—it is not possible, in the original sense of the words, to preach Christ—unless we give to Christ that same significance in all the relations of God and man which He has in St. Peter's preaching. It is not too much to say that side by side with his frank recognition of Jesus as a man (Act 2:22), whose career in history he could himself look back upon, St. Peter regarded Jesus in His exaltation as forming with God His Father one Divine causality at work for the salvation of men. It was only in virtue of so regarding Him that he could preach Him as he did, and essentially similar convictions are still necessary if preaching is to be called preaching *Christ*. It is not necessary to argue that the Christology of the First Epistle of Peter is on a level with this. In many respects it is more explicit. There has been more reflexion on the

absolute significance of Jesus in religion, on His relation to the OT, on the power of His resurrection, on the virtue of His Passion as connected with redemption from sin, and on the example set in His life and death. But two passages may be briefly referred to as going to the root of the matter. The first is Act 1:21, where Christians are described as ‘you who through him [Jesus] are believers in God.’ It is to Him that Christian faith owes its peculiar qualities and virtues: men may be theists apart from Him, but to have specifically Christian faith in God we must be His debtors. The other is the longer passage, so much discussed, Act 3:18 to Act 4:6. Whatever else this passage reveals, it reveals the writer’s conviction that for the dead as well as the living there is no hope of salvation but Christ. Not only in this world, but in all worlds, whatever is called redemption owes its being to Him. All spiritual beings, angels, principalities, and powers, are subject to Him. The Christian is a person who is in Him (Act 5:14), and accordingly by Him everything in the Christian life is determined. To give Christ this place in our spiritual world, though a different mode of conceiving the world of the spirit may modify the intellectual form in which we do so, is indispensable to preaching Christ. Apart from His holding such a place it is possible only to preach *about* Him, not to make *Him* the sum of our preaching.

9. To pass from St. Peter to St. Paul is to pass from one who had the most vivid personal recollections of the Man Christ Jesus to one who had no such recollections at all; and it is all the more striking to find that both of them preach Christ in the same sense; or, perhaps, we should say, mean the same thing by preaching Christ. St. Paul’s acquaintance with Christ began when the Lord appeared to him on the way to Damascus, and for him Jesus is predominantly the Lord of Glory (1Co 2:8). When he preaches Him it is as Lord (2Co 4:5); that is, as exalted at God’s right hand. To call Him ‘Lord,’ to acknowledge His exaltation, is to make the fundamental Christian confession (1Co 12:3, Rom 10:9). It is often asserted that whatever differences may have existed between St. Paul and the Jerusalem Church, there can have been no difference of a Christological character; but it is not vital to Christianity that this should be so. It is just as plausible to argue from 2Co 1:19 that the Corinthians had heard preachers who did not preach Christ precisely as Paul and Silvanus and Timothy did; and the argument might be supported by reference to 2Co 5:16; 2Co 11:4. Further, the fact that St. Paul has something which he calls ‘my gospel,’ a conception of Christianity and a mode of presenting it which had peculiarities due to the peculiarity of his religious experience, might be adduced on the same side. And the presumption thus raised could not be overturned simply by an appeal to 1Co 15:4; 1Co 15:11, which would prove only that his gospel rested, exactly as did that of the Twelve, on the great facts of the death and resurrection of Jesus interpreted in the light of Scripture. What it is important to see is that, be the variations in mode of thought or conception what they may, the Apostle ascribes to Jesus that absolute significance for religion which we have already seen attach to Him both in His own

mind and in the preaching of St. Peter. This is the basis and the content of preaching Christ.

It might seem enough to refer to the salutations of the Epistles, in which St. Paul wishes the Churches grace and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ (Rom 1:7), or addresses them as having their being in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ (1Th 1:1). Here we have the Father and Christ confronting men, so to speak, on the same plane, co-operating as one Divine power for their salvation. When St. Paul preaches Christ it is as a Person who has this power and importance, and stands in this relation to God and men. Or we might refer to what perhaps comes closest in form to Jesus' own mode of expression, the passage in 1Co 15:28, in which 'the Son' is used absolutely, as in Mar 13:32. There is a subordination of the Son to the Father here, and yet no more here than in Mar 13:32 or in Mat 11:27 could we conceive of either word in the plural. Or again, we might refer to such passages as those in which St. Paul contrasts all other persons with Christ. 'What is Apollos? what is Paul? Was Paul crucified for you? or were you baptized in the name of Paul?' (1Co 3:5; 1Co 1:13). This is entirely in the line of the contrast between the many servants and the one beloved Son in Mar 12:1-12, or of the sayings of Jesus in Mat 23:8-10. Of course both these Evangelic passages have been disputed, but the present writer sees no reason to doubt that in substance both are rightly assigned to Jesus. What St. Paul means in the words cited is that any other person has only a relative importance in Christianity, while Christ's importance is absolute. The Church would have missed Paul and Apollos, but it would have been there; whereas but for Christ it could not have been there at all. It existed only *in* Him. This is assumed in all preaching of which He is the object. His significance for the Church is not in the same line with that of Paul and Apollos; it is on the same line with that of the Father. No matter what the mode in which St. Paul conceives of Christ, he always conceives of Him as having this incomparable significance, and it is worth while to note the ways in which it appears.

(a) Sometimes they are, so to speak, unstudied: the truth is put, and possibly with emphasis, but there is no particular reflexion upon it. Thus, in 1Co 3:11 'other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus.' This comes very close to Act 4:11 f. (see above). Again, when we read in 2Co 1:20 'how many soever are the promises of God, in him is the yea,' we are confronted with the same truth. There is not a single promise God has made, not a single hope with which He has inspired human hearts, which is to have any fulfilment except in Him. The mental attitude is the same in Gal 1:8 f. The form of St. Paul's arguments is sometimes more disconcerting to us in Galatians than in any other of his Epistles, yet nowhere does he keep closer to the heart of his gospel. What these two seemingly intolerant verses mean is that Christ is the whole of the Christian religion, and that to introduce other things side by side with Him, as if they could supplement Him, or share in His absolute

significance for salvation, is treason to Christ Himself. Christ crucified—the whole revelation of God’s redeeming love to sinners is there; the sinful soul abandoning itself in unreserved faith to this revelation—the whole of the Christian religion is there. Whoever brings into religion anything else than Christ and faith, as though anything else could conceivably stand on the same plane, is, wittingly or unwittingly, the deadly enemy of the gospel. Such expressions as these exhibit the absolute significance which Christ had for the Apostle in the most unquestionable way, but they imply no speculative Christology. We may hold them, and to preach Christ we must hold them, but we may do so without raising any of the theological questions which have been raised in connexion with them. There is hardly a page of St. Paul’s writings which could not be quoted in illustration. Confining ourselves to the Epp. to the Thess., as his earliest letters, and omitting the salutations referred to above, we find everywhere the absolute dependence of the Christian on Christ,—a kind of relation which would be not only inconceivable but immoral if any other than Christ were the subject of it. Just as men in general are said to live and move and have their being in God, Christians live and move and have, their being ‘in Christ.’ What space is to bodies, Christ is to believing souls: they live in Him, and all the functions of their life are determined by Him. St. Paul has confidence *in the Lord* toward the Thessalonians (2Th 3:4); he charges and entreats them *in the Lord Jesus Christ* (2Th 3:12); they stand *in the Lord* (1Th 3:8); he gives them commandments *through the Lord Jesus* (1Th 4:2); church rulers are those who are over them *in the Lord* (1Th 5:12); the Christian rule of life is the will of God *in Christ Jesus* concerning them (1Th 5:18); the Christian departed are the dead *in Christ* (1Th 4:16); all benediction is summed up in the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ (1Th 5:28, 2Th 1:12; 2Th 3:18); Jesus and the Father are co-ordinated as the object of prayer (1Th 3:11), and prayer is directly addressed to the Lord, *i.e.* to Christ (1Th 3:12). Our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we are to obtain salvation at the great day, is He who died for us, that whether we wake or sleep we should live together with Him (1Th 5:10). It is as though all that God does for us were done in and through Him; so that He confronts us as Saviour in Divine glory and omnipotence. We may trust Him as God is trusted, live in Him as we live in God, appeal to Him to save us as only God can save; and it is only as we do so that we have in Him a Person whom we can preach. Such a Person we can have, as the passages cited show, without raising any of the questions with which St. Paul himself subsequently wrestled. But the right way to express all this—which does not first appear in Colossians, but is of the essence of Christianity from the beginning—is not to say with Wernle that the consciousness of God has been weakened, but that the idea of God has been Christianized: the Father is known in the Son, and is known as working through Him to the end of our salvation. And this, it need hardly be repeated, is identical in religious import with what we have found in the mind of Christ Himself.

(b) Sometimes, however, the Apostle presents us with more speculative conceptions of Christ. He is not simply a Person who has appeared in history, and has been exalted in Divine power and glory. He is what may be called a universal Person, a typical or representative Person, who has for the new humanity the same kind of significance as Adam had for the old. Adam was the head of the one, Christ is the head of the other. As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive. The acts of Christ have a representative or universal character: the death that He died for all has somehow the significance which the death of all would itself have; in His resurrection we see the first-fruits of a new race which shall wear the image of the heavenly. Broadly speaking, this way of conceiving Christ, in which the individual historical Person is elevated or expanded into a universal or representative Person, pervades the Epp. to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians (see esp. Rom 5:12 ff., 1Co 15:21-49). As these Epp. are central in St. Paul's writings, there is a certain justification for laying this conception of Christ—the second Adam—at the basis of a Pauline Christology (as was done by Somerville in his *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*). It is the conception which lends itself most readily to 'mystical' interpretations of Christ's work and of Christian experience. To bear the Christian name we must 'identify ourselves' with all the experiences of the Second Adam. But though it is eminently characteristic of St. Paul, it is neither his first nor his last way of representing the absolute significance of Christ. It belongs to the controversial period in which everything Christian was defined by contrast. What St. Paul wanted to annihilate was legalism, the influence of the statutory in religion; and he argues that the really important categories in the religious history of humanity, those of universal and abiding significance, are not law, but sin and grace. The great figures in the history are not Moses, but Adam and Christ. He works out the parallel or rather the contrast between them with enthusiasm; but when we realize what he is doing, we feel that this is only one way of giving Christ His peculiar place. It is, however, a way which will maintain itself as long as the antithesis of sin and grace determines the religious life; and as this is a limit beyond which we cannot see, it seems involved in any adequate preaching of Christ that He should be preached in this universal character as the head of a new humanity.

(c) In his later Epp., St. Paul preaches Christ in what seems a more wonderful light. Christ is presented to us not merely as a historical, or as a universal, but also as an eternal or Divine Person. That which is manifested to the world in Him does not originate with its manifestation. The explanation of it is not to be sought merely in the history of Israel (as though Jesus were no more than a national Messiah), nor even in the history of humanity (as though He were no more than the restorer of the ruin which began with Adam): it is to be sought in the eternal being of God. When St. Paul came in contact with Jesus, he came in contact with what he felt instinctively was the ultimate reality in the universe. Here, he could not but be conscious, is the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end, all that is meant—all that has ever been meant—by 'God.' Here is 'all the fulness of the Godhead bodily' (Col 1:19; Col 2:9):

here is the revelation of what God essentially and eternally is, and here therefore is that by which all our thinking must be ruled. Christ belongs to, or is involved in, because He is the manifestation of, the eternal being and nature of God. How far does this carry us when we try to think it out? Possibly not further, in some respects, than we have come already. Christ, it may be said, is represented as an eternal Person when He is spoken of as *final Judge of all* (Act 10:42, 2Co 5:10); that is eternity as apprehended in *conscience*. Again, He is represented as an eternal Person when we speak of Him as *final Heir* or *Lord of all things* (Heb 1:2, Mat 28:18); that is eternity as apprehended in *imagination*. But in Col. it is not through the conscience or the imagination, but through a more *speculative faculty*, that St. Paul interprets his conception of the eternal being of Christ. If Christ really has the absolute significance which all Christian experience implies,—for in all such experience we meet with *God* in Him,—then *all things* must be defined by relation to Christ; the universe must be reconstituted with Him as its principle, its centre of unity, its goal. Nature must be conceived as an order of things brought into being with a view to His Kingdom, and this implies that He was present in the constitution of nature. To say that He was ideally but not actually present,—present only in the mind of God as the intended consummation of the process,—would have been to St. Paul to introduce a distinction which we have no means of applying where God is concerned. The true doctrine of Christ—this is what St. Paul teaches in Colossians—involves a doctrine of the universe. The doctrine of the universe is put only negatively, or so as to exclude error, when we say that God created all things out of nothing; such a formula teaches only the absolute dependence of nature on God. But it is put positively, or so as to convey the truth in which the world is interested, when we say that all things were created in Christ. St. Paul's conviction of this truth is based (he believes) on experience: in his consciousness as a Christian man he is assured that in Christ he has touched the last reality in the universe, the *ens realissimum*, the truth through which all other truths are to be defined and understood. In other words, a true apprehension of the absolute significance of Christ involves a specifically Christian conception of the universe. The Christian religion is not true to Christ (as St. Paul understood His significance) unless it has the courage to conceive a Christian metaphysic, or, in simpler words, *to Christianize all its thoughts of God and the world*. Put in this form, we can see that in the last resort it is still necessary to share the Apostle's convictions at this point if we mean to preach Christ. For if there is any region of reality which does not depend for its meaning and value on its relation to Him,—if the truth with which we come in contact in Him is not the ultimate truth of God, the master light of all our seeing,—then His importance is only relative, and He has no abiding place in religion which requires that He should be preached at all. But in reality He is a Person so great that all nature and history and religion have to be interpreted through Him. All we call being, and all we call redemption, need Him to explain them. The love revealed in Him is the key to all mysteries. The categories we use to make His redemption intelligible are the only categories by which we can completely understand anything.

Once Christ's absolute significance has become clear to us,—and, as already said, it is involved in every Christian experience,—we discover that our task, if we would understand the system of things in which we live, is not to find natural law in the spiritual world, but rather to find spiritual law—indeed, specifically Christian law—in the natural world. So far as we do so we are providing scientific attestation for the conception of Christ as a Divine and eternal Person.

10. The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Fourth Gospel, it need hardly be added, share in this conception of Christ. In neither is it allowed to infringe on the truth of His human nature while He lived on earth: indeed, of all the NT writings, these two in various ways make most use of Christ's humanity for religious and moral ends. But as the subject of this article is not Christology, it is not necessary to go into details. The prologue to the Fourth Gospel has precisely the same Christian experience behind it as the first chapter of Col., and the same experience, when taken seriously, will always inspire the mind to think along the same lines. The conception of the Logos, as has often been remarked, is not carried by the writer beyond the prologue: it may in reality affect the Evangelist's way of representing certain things, but it is not formally embodied in the Gospel. It was a conception widely current in the writer's time, whatever its sources, and he used it to introduce Jesus in circles which naturally thought in such terms. It does not follow that to introduce or to explain Christ among men who think in other categories, the preacher is still bound to make use of this one. 'There is only one thing,' says Dr. Sanday (*Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, 198) 'that he [the Evangelist] seeks. He wants a formula to express the cosmical significance of the person of Christ.' That in which we must agree with him if we in turn would preach Christ, is his conviction of this significance, not the formula in which it suited him at the close of the first century to express it. That like Paul he *had* such a conviction, based on experience, there is no doubt. The Son of God was not to St. John a lay figure to be draped in the borrowed robes either of Messianic dogmatic or of Alexandrian philosophy. He was a Being so great, and had left on the soul of His witness an impression so deep, that the latter felt it could be satisfied by nothing but a reconstitution of his universe in which this wonderful Person was put at the heart of everything—creation, providence, revelation, and redemption being all referred to Him. In St. John as in St. Paul the absolute significance of Christ in the relations of God and man, which is the immediate certainty of Christian experience, stamps Him as a Divine and eternal Person, by relation to whom the world and all that is in it must be described anew. We may say if we will that he uses the Logos as a formula to describe the cosmical significance of Christ, but that is perhaps less than the truth. He uses it rather to suggest that truth, as truth is in Jesus, is the deepest truth of all, and the most comprehensive, and that under its inspiration and guidance we must Christianize all our conceptions of God, nature, and history. He who is not in sympathy with this conviction will not find it easy to preach Christ in any sense in which the NT will support him.

11. If, however, we are in sympathy with this conviction, it may fairly be argued that we can preach Christ without raising any further questions. We must find the absolute significance of Jesus in the area within which Jesus presented Himself to men, 'beginning from the baptism of John until the day when he was taken up' (Act 1:22). This was the basis on which the gospel was launched into history, faith evoked, and the Church founded. This was the gospel of the original Apostolic testimony, and it is within its limits that the power of Christ must be felt. Once we do recognize this power, and its incomparable and unique significance, we are prepared to let our minds go further, and to appreciate at its true value what the Apostles and Evangelists tell us of such things as the pre-existence of Christ and the condescension of His entrance into the world. But these can never be the first things in preaching Christ. To put them first is really to put stumbling-blocks in the way of faith. Faith is evoked by seeing Jesus and hearing Him, and we see and hear Him only within the range indicated above. It is only faith, too, that preaches; preaching is faith's testimony to Christ. Hence, although faith must amount to a conviction of Christ's absolute significance, it must find the basis of this conviction in the historical Saviour, and it is only by appeal to the historical Saviour that it can reproduce itself in others. Accordingly it may exist and may render effective testimony to Christ without raising questions that carry us beyond this area. How we are to think of the superhistorical relation to God of the Person whose absolute significance we recognize in history, how we are to think of what is usually called His pre-existence, and of the marvel of His entrance into the world of nature and of history: these are questions which faith's conviction as to Christ's significance will dispose us to face in a certain spirit rather than another, but they are not questions on which the existence of the gospel, or the possibility of faith, or of preaching Christ, is dependent. With such faculties as we have, and especially such an inability to make clear to ourselves what we mean by the relation of the temporal to the eternal,—a relation which is involved in all such questions,—it may even be that we recognize our inability to grasp truth about them in forms for which we can challenge the assent of others. We can be certain from Christ's life that His very presence in the world is the assurance of an extraordinary condescension and grace in God, even if we are baffled in trying to think out all that is involved either in His coming forth from the Father or in His entrance into humanity. But if on the basis of an experience evoked by the Apostolic testimony we can call Him Lord and Saviour, recognizing in Him the only-begotten Son through whom alone we are brought to the Father, then we can preach Him, be our ignorance otherwise as deep as it may be.

12. It might have seemed natural, in the discussion of such a question, to refer more directly to the various *criteria* of Christianity which the NT itself suggests, e.g. Rom 10:9, 1Jn 4:2 f. But the last of these two passages only emphasizes the historical character of Christianity, the truth of our Lord's manhood, and the first the exaltation of Jesus: and to both of these justice has been done. The combination of

the two is indeed required in preaching Christ, and it is all that is required. The reality of Jesus' life on earth as He Himself was conscious of it, the life of One uniquely related to God, and present in our world to make us all His debtors for revelation and redemption; and the exaltation of such a One to the right hand of God: it is on this that preaching Christ depends. Into this we can put all the convictions by which the NT writers were inspired, and all that we know of the words and deeds of Jesus: and while we share at the heart the faith of Apostles and Evangelists, we do not feel bound by all the forms in which they cast their thoughts. The faith which stimulated intelligence so wonderfully in them will have the same effect on all Christians, and they will not disown any who call Jesus Lord, and give Him the name which is above every name.

Literature.—Harnack, *Wesen des Christentums*; See berg, *Grundwahrh. der christl. Rel.*; Cremer, *Wesen des Christentums*; Adams Brown, *Essence of Christianity*; Wernle, *Anfange unserer Rel.*; Orr, *Christian View of God and the World*, Lectt. vi. and vii.

James Denney.

☞ Prediction

PREDICTION.—See Prophet.

☞ Premeditation

PREMEDITATION.—1. There is frequent evidence of this quality in the teachings of Christ, and in the experiences of His life. Regarding Him simply on the common level of humanity, as for this faculty we necessarily must, there is little ground for the assertion so often made that He was an enthusiast, dependent on the inspiration of the moment. The occasional intuitions of the Divine are no explanation of the great body of His teaching. There is an inborn forethought, a native endowment of premeditation, that, humanly speaking, goes to the building up of His greatest thoughts, uttered or wrought. No accident or impulse gave birth to the Sermon on the Mount. Its varied teachings, the keywords of a spiritual and moral revolution yet to be effected in the world, strike one as the result of most careful observation, comparison, and imagination—all the product of patient premeditation. From His entrance into the active Gospel story, in that prelude of the Boy in the Temple, to the calm strength with which He faced the last days, it is a gift of deep insight into

human probabilities that we look upon. The Saviour of men foresees His task—its glories, and its awful cost.

As a boy He is surprised that His parents have not seen this, and known that His thoughts were so fixed on Divine things that in the looked-for Jerusalem He is sure to be found about the Temple and the teachers. ‘How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be in my Father’s house?’ ([Luk_2:49](#)). He ‘cometh unto John to be baptized of him’ with the decision already thought out that ‘thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness’ ([Mat_3:13-17](#) || [Mar_1:9-11](#), [Luk_3:21-22](#)). The choice of the passage from Isaiah as the text of His first sermon at Nazareth ([Luk_4:18](#)) is too distinctive to have been the chance of an opening of the roll. The more often we read and weigh it, sentence by sentence, word by word, the more wonderfully true do we find it as a summary of our Lord’s mission. What care, what hesitation, must have preceded the selection of the twelve Apostles, and the delivering of that high commission that rings down through the ages with a strange attraction to all set apart for ministry. Only the deepest premeditation could have given them such a full charge—to preach the Kingdom, raise the dead, and reveal the secret of life in the cross on the one hand, and on the other to recognize the disciple’s duty in the common needs of men, as in the giving of a cup of cold water ([Mat_9:37](#); [Mat_9:10](#) || [Mar_3:13-15](#); [Mar_6:7-12](#), [Luk_9:1-6](#)). He had found the incompleteness of the Law, and with deliberate purpose declared His mission to be one that was not to destroy but to fulfil: ‘Except your righteousness shall exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in nowise enter into the kingdom’ ([Mat_5:17](#); [Mat_5:20](#)). He sees the divisions that will come because of the gospel ([Luk_12:49](#)), but, as One who has thought out every step of the way, it can be written of Him, ‘He set his face stedfastly to go to Jerusalem’ ([Luk_9:51](#)). There He speaks of the inevitable destruction of the Temple and the officialism it had so long stood for ([Mat_24:1](#) || [Mar_13:1](#), [Luk_21:5](#)); there He weeps over the lost possibilities of Jerusalem, that ancient home of faith ([Luk_19:42](#)); and there, from the midst of His own agony and sorrow, He can bid the women of the city weep for the downfall that is to come, ‘for yourselves and for your children’ ([Luk_23:28](#)). Dwelling upon prophetic visions, He portrays the signs that shall herald the coming of the Son of Man ([Mat_24:29](#) || [Luk_21:25](#)).

But most notable of all His personal premeditations is that which gives expression to His passion and death. As One who walked beneath the shadow of the cross, His thoughts bear frequent witness to that silent companionship. He comes to the last Passover, and Peter and John are sent ahead with instructions that suggest a prepared understanding with the householder ([Mat_26:18](#) || [Mar_14:13](#), [Luk_22:7](#)), thus giving us the beautiful and precious thought that the first of the long line of celebrations of the Lord’s Supper should have taken place in a room chosen beforehand by Christ Himself. The sufferings inherent in Messiahship are foreshadowed in His many

utterances concerning the cross (Mat 20:17-19 || Mar 10:32, Luk 18:31, Luk 9:22, Mat 17:22-23 || Mar 9:31, Luk 9:44, Joh 12:23; Joh 16:16); the necessity for His imitators (disciples) to bear their cross (Mat 16:24 || Mar 8:34, Luk 9:23; Luk 14:27); the certainty that He would be delivered up to His enemies (Mat 26:21 || Mar 14:18, Luk 22:21, Joh 13:21); the desertion by His followers, who would leave Him alone, ‘and yet I am not alone, for the Father is with me’ (Joh 16:32, Mat 26:31 || Mar 14:27, Luk 22:31, Joh 13:36). But He looked beyond the cross and saw the power of the risen life, and gave the promise of the Comforter, ‘the Spirit of Truth who would lead them into all truth’ (Joh 15:26; Joh 16:13). See also art. Plan.

There are occasions on which His teaching or His action seems entirely unpremeditated. The immediacy of an intuition is seen in His use of the opportunity given Him by the woman at the well (Joh 4:7), or in the call of Nathanael (Joh 1:28), or in the treatment of the woman taken in sin (Joh 8:1-7), or in the scene at Simon the Pharisee’s (Mat 26:6-13 || Mar 14:3-9, Luk 7:36-50, Joh 12:1-8), or the freeing of the Sabbath from Rabbinic tyranny (Mat 12:3 || Mar 2:25, Luk 6:3).

2. But Christ constantly advocates forethought, that yoke which brings ordered rest (Mat 11:28). The builder who chooses his site carelessly may build on sand instead of solid foundations, and all the finely dreamed temple of his faith be brought to the ground (Mat 7:24 || Luk 6:46); or he may commence a tower too great for him to finish, as a king may carelessly engage in a ruinous war (Luk 14:28 ff.). The parables of the Hidden Treasure and the Pearl of Great Price are the records of those who thoughtfully weigh all lesser things against the great adventure (Mat 13:44-45). The parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins is obviously the story of premeditation and its worth. The Prodigal Son leaves nothing to chance when he thinks of returning: the very words with which he will meet his father are rehearsed (Luk 15:11). The first impulse of the Unjust Steward is to ask ‘What shall I do?’, and to form his plan which, though immoral in itself, shows a careful foresight that in its higher thought and morality is too often lacking in the Christian disciple; ‘The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light’ (Luk 16:1-8). The disciple who offers himself too readily is bidden to count the cost, and is reminded of the hardships: ‘The foxes have holes, the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head’ (Mat 8:20); and an unwearying watchfulness is demanded, that the servant may be ready whenever his Lord knocks (Luk 12:36). Strongly does Christ reprove those who watch the heavens for signs of weather and can read the skies, but cannot read the spirit of their day (Mat 16:2 || Mar 8:12, Mat 12:39 || Luk 11:29).

3. And yet how plainly Jesus sees that premeditation has its dangers, and may sap away the energies and effective values of a man’s life. It is easy to be over-cautious, to grow too anxious about the lesser things (Mat 6:25; Mat 6:31 || Luk 12:22), giving

all our thought to the care of these rather than of the life that is life indeed (cf. the parable of the Rich Fool, [Luk 12:15-21](#)). It was surely with this thought in mind that Jesus gave that command to His Apostles, ‘Get you no gold, nor silver’ ([Mat 10:9](#)); and ‘when they deliver you up, be not anxious what ye shall speak’ ([Mat 10:19](#)). Too calculating a spirit, too careful a measurement of possible dangers, too great a forethought as to an assured future different from that of other men, would paralyze the missionary spirit. The disciple must not be over-prudent: he must give himself ungrudgingly, and sow the seed broadcast, not being too careful about the purity and goodness of the ground in which he sows, even throwing some on the trodden pathways of the world, and on what seems the shallowest of soil ([Mat 13:1-9](#) || [Mar 4:1-9](#), [Luk 8:4-8](#)).

Edgar Daplyn.

⚠️Preparation

PREPARATION (παρασκευή, [Mat 27:62](#), [Mar 15:42](#), [Luk 23:54](#), [Joh 19:14](#); [Joh 19:31](#); [Joh 19:42](#)).—1. Since the Sabbath was a day of holy rest, the food for it was cooked and all else needful got ready on the previous day, the *προσάββατον* ([Mar 15:42](#));* [Note: [Exo 16:5](#). See Lightfoot on [Mar 15:42](#). Curiously enough the Sabbath was the day for feasting, and the viands were specially sumptuous; but they had to be cooked the previous day and eaten cold. See Aug. de Cons. Ev. ii. § 151; Lightfoot and Wetstein on [Luk 14:1](#).] and thus that day was designated by the Jews ‘the Preparation.’† [Note: Jos. Ant. xvi. vi. 2: ἐν σάββασεν ἢ τῇ πρὸ ταύτης παρασκευῆ; Wetstein on [Mat 27:62](#).] The Christians took over the term,‡ [Note: Didache, viii. 1.: ὑμεῖς δὲ νηστεύσατε τετράδα καὶ παρασκευὴν; Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. § 75: τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων, τῆς τετράδος καὶ παρασκευῆς λεγῶ. ἐπιθημίζονται γὰρ ἢ μὲν Ἑρμοῦ ἢ δὲ Ἀφροδίτης.] and it remains to this day the regular name for Friday in the Greek Calendar.

2. The term was also used of the day of preparation, whatever day of the week it might be, for any of the sacred festivals, especially the Passover. The Paschal Supper was eaten on the evening which, since the Jewish day began at 6 p.m., ushered in the fifteenth day of the month Nisan; and the fourteenth day, when all was got ready for the celebration, was called the Preparation.

The term occurs thrice in the Synoptics (Mat 27:62, Mar 15:42, Luk 23:54), and in each instance it means Friday. In the Fourth Gospel also it occurs thrice (19:14, 31, 42), and there would be no doubt that here also it means Friday[§] [Note: 19:14 παρασκευῆ τοῦ πάσχα, ‘Friday of the Passover-season,’ not ‘the Preparation for the Passover,’ which would require ἡ παρασκευή.] were it not for two other passages. (1) At Joh 13:1 St. John seems to put the Last Supper ‘before the feast of the passover.’ (2) At Joh 18:28 he says that, when on the morning after the Last Supper the rulers brought Jesus before Pilate, ‘they did not themselves enter into the Praetorium, that they might not be defiled, but might eat the passover’; whence it would seem that the Paschal Supper had not been celebrated the previous evening, but was to be celebrated that evening. It thus appears as though there were a glaring discrepancy between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel. They all agree that Jesus was crucified on Friday; but whereas according to the Synoptists that Friday was the 15th Nisan, and on the previous evening which ushered it in Jesus had eaten the regular Paschal Supper with His disciples (cf. Luk 22:7), according to St. John it was the 14th Nisan, and the Supper in the upper room on the previous evening was either not the Passover at all, || [Note: | So Clem. Alex. (fragm. in Chron. Pasch. See Dindorf’s Clem. Alex. Op. iii. p. 498): In previous years Jesus had kept the Passover and eaten the lamb, but on the day before He suffered as the true Paschal Lamb, He taught His disciples the mystery of the type.] or was eaten a day too soon.* [Note: Jesus anticipated the Passover, knowing that at the proper time He would be lying in His grave. St. Chrysostom (in Joan. lxxxii.) gives this as an alternative explanation of Joh 18:28; Calvin: Since the Passover-day, falling that year on Friday, was reckoned a Sabbath (Lev 23:6-7; Lev 23:11; Lev 23:15), the Jews, to avoid the inconvenience of two successive Sabbaths, postponed the Passover by a day: Jesus adhered to the regular day.] In the Synoptics παρασκευῆ means simply Friday; in the Fourth Gospel it means the Preparation Day, being also, as it chanced, Friday.

The problem has been discussed from the earliest times, and nowhere has harmonistic ingenuity been more lavishly expended. In our day the harmonistic method is out of fashion, and the tendency of some critics is to pronounce the Johannine representation unhistorical, and to explain how it originated. Appeal is made to the idea, suggested, it is alleged, by St. Paul (1Co 5:7), and definitely enunciated by Clement of Alexandria,† [Note: Also, according to Chron. Pasch., by Apollinaris, Hippolytus, and Peter of Alexandria.] that Jesus, being the true Paschal Lamb, must have been slain on the Preparation Day, 14th Nisan. It is pointed out that, by way of proving Him the true Paschal Lamb, St. John (1) throws back the anointing at Bethany to 10th Nisan (Joh 12:1), the day on which the Paschal lamb was chosen (Exo 12:3); (2) represents Jesus as still before Pilate at the sixth hour, *i.e.* noon, in order, it is

alleged, to make the Crucifixion synchronize with the sacrifice of the Paschal lambs, which were slain between 3 and 5 p.m.;‡ [Note: BJ vi. ix. 3.] (3) shows how the Law's prescription that the lamb's bones should not be broken (Exo 12:46, Num 9:12), was fulfilled in the case of Jesus (Joh 19:36).§ [Note: Strauss, Keim, Schmiedel (Encycl. Bibl., art. 'John, son of Zebedee').]

This is ingenious rather than convincing. (1) The anointing at Bethany actually took place, as St. John represents, six days before the Passover; and St. Matthew and St. Mark, with that disregard of chronological sequence which is characteristic of the Synoptic editors of the Apostolic tradition, have brought it into connexion with the Betrayal (Mat 26:6-16 = Mar 14:3-11); their idea being, apparently, that the traitor was angered by the Lord's rebuke (Mat 26:10 = Mar 14:6 = Joh 12:7). His foul deed was a stroke of revenge. || [Note: | Cf. Aug. de Cons. Ev. ii. § 153.] (2) If, as is possible, St. John computed the hours of the day, not, like the Synoptists, from 6 to 6, but, according to the method which probably obtained in Asia Minor, from 12 to 12, ¶ [Note: Plin. HN ii. 79. Polycarp was martyred in the stadium at Smyrna 'at the 8th hour' (Mart. Polyc. xxi.), i.e., since public spectacles began early (cf. Becker, Charicles, p. 409), at 8 a.m.] then by 'the sixth hour' he means, not noon, but 6 a.m., thus agreeing with the Synoptists (cf. Mat 27:1-2 = Mar 15:1). (3) Jesus was none the less the true Paschal Lamb, though He was not crucified between 3 and 5 p.m. on the 14th of Nisan, but at 9 a.m. on the 15th. St. Paul spoke of Him as 'our passover' (1Co 5:7); yet he regarded the Last Supper as the regular Passover, calling the communion cup 'the cup of blessing' (1Co 10:16), ** [Note: * τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας (הַכּוּפָּה הַשְּׁלִישִׁית).] which was the name given in the Paschal rubric to the third cup at the Passover feast.

In the opinion of the present writer the difficulty is due to a misunderstanding of Joh 13:1; Joh 18:28. When these two passages are rightly considered, the position seems to be established that παρασκευή means Friday alike in the Fourth Gospel and in the Synoptics. Joh 13:1 should be read as a separate paragraph. As the end approached, says the Evangelist, there was a marked access of tenderness in the Lord's deportment towards His disciples. He demonstrated His affection as He had never done before. It was the pathetic tenderness of imminent farewell. 'Before the feast of the passover, Jesus, knowing that his hour had come to pass out of this world unto the Father, having loved his own that were in the world, he loved them to the uttermost,' i.e. demonstrated His affection as He had never done before.* [Note: εἰς τέλος, not 'to the end,' but 'to the uttermost.' Chrysost. in Joan. lxi. : οὐδὲν ἐνέλιπεν ὧν τον σφόδρα ἀγαπῶντα εἰκὼς ἦντοιῆσαι. Cf. Euth. Zig.: ἀγαπᾶν of tokens of

affection; Mar 10:21 ἠγάπησεν αὐτόν, kissed his forehead. See Lightfoot on Mar 10:21, Joh 13:23.] Then begins a new paragraph, which recounts the story of the Supper (Joh 13:2 ff.), assuming an acquaintance on the reader's part with the Synoptic details of time and arrangement. It was St. John's wont to correct his predecessors wherever they had erred; and had they put the Last Supper a day too late, he would have stated expressly when it took place, and would not have said vaguely 'before the feast.'

And what of Joh 18:28? It does not imply that they were looking forward to the Paschal Supper in the evening, and that therefore that day, when Jesus was tried and crucified, was the Preparation-day, 14th Nisan. They would indeed have been defiled by entering a heathen house, but the defilement would have remained only until the evening (cf. Lev 11:24-25; Lev 11:27-28; Lev 11:31; Lev 11:39-40; Lev 14:46; Lev 15:5-7; Lev 17:15; Lev 22:6, Num 19:7-8; Num 19:10; Num 19:21-22, Deu 23:11), and they could then, after due ablution, have eaten the Paschal Supper.† [Note: Strauss argues that they 'would still have disqualified themselves from participating in the preparatory proceedings, which fell on the afternoon of 14th Nisan; as, e.g., the slaving of the lamb in the outer court of the Temple.' But they might legally have deputed the business of preparation to their servants, as Jesus deputed it to Peter and John. Cf. Lightfoot on Mar 10:26.] The truth is that it was not the Paschal Supper that they would have been precluded from, but the *Chagigah* or thank-offering, which was presented in the Temple on 15th Nisan, and had to be presented by each worshipper *in propriâ personâ*.‡ [Note: See Lightfoot on Joh 18:28, Mar 15:25.] The phrase 'eat the Passover' comprehended more than participation in the Paschal Supper. Alike in the Scripture and in the Talmud it denotes the celebration of the entire feast, including the *Chagigah*.§ [Note: Deu 16:2, 2Ch 30:1; 2Ch 30:23-24; 2Ch 35:1; 2Ch 35:8-19, Eze 45:21-24. Lightfoot on Joh 18:28.] In the Fourth Gospel 'the passover' invariably signifies not the Supper but the whole feast, τὴν ἑορτὴν πᾶσαν,|| [Note: | Cf. Joh 2:13; Joh 2:23, Joh 6:4, Joh 11:55, Joh 12:1, Joh 13:1. Contrast Mat 26:17 = Mar 14:12 = Luk 22:7-8] and it is unreasonable to suppose that in this solitary instance St. John has departed from his *usus loquendi*.

There remains a final consideration. After the Crucifixion, Joseph of Arimathaea visited Pilate, and petitioned for the body of Jesus (Joh 19:38 = Mat 27:57-58 = Mar 15:42-43 = Luk 23:50-52). He was a Sanhedrist, and had no less reason than his colleagues to shun pollution; yet he went without scruple to the governor's house. The explanation is that, when they refused to enter the Praetorium, it was the morning, and they must offer the *Chagigah* in the afternoon; when he waited upon Pilate, it was the evening (ὀψίας γενομένης), and he had already offered it.

On the above theory there is no discrepancy between St. John and the Synoptists. Both he and they represent Jesus as celebrating the Paschal Supper with His disciples on the evening which ushered in 15th Nisan; and both he and they use παρασκευή in the sense not of the Preparation-day, but of Friday. St. John says that 'that Sabbath-day was a great one' (Joh 19:31), not because, being at once the weekly Sabbath and Passover-day, it was Sabbath in a double sense, but because, as Light-foot puts it, (1) it was a Sabbath, (2) it was the day on which the people appeared before the Lord in the Temple (Exo 23:17), and (3) it was the day on which the sheaf of the firstfruits was reaped (Lev 23:11). See also, for different views, artt. Dates, Last Supper, Passover (II.).

Literature.—Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* (see references in footnotes); Strauss, *Leb. Jes.* iii. ii. § 121, and *New Life of Jesus*, ii. § 85; Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, vi. pp. 195-219; Caspari, *Chron. and Geog. Introd.* §§ 151-164; Farrar, *Life of Christ*, Exc. x.; Andrews, *Life of our Lord*, pp. 457-481; Westcott, *Study of the Gospels*, p. 43; Du Bose, *The Gospel in the Gospels*, p. 28. For the contrary view that παρασκευή does not mean Friday in both the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel, see Sanday in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, ii. 634; Godet in his *Comm.* on Lk. and Jn.; Lobstein, *La doctrine de la sainte cène*, p. 51 f.; Zöckler in *PRE [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologic und Kirche.]* ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , ix. pp. 32, 42; Chwolson, *Das letzte Passamahl Christi*.

David Smith.

Presence

PRESENCE.—The ordinary word in the Gospels for 'before' (= in the presence of) is ἐμπροσθεν. Lk. also uses ἐνώπιον, which, with the exception of Joh 20:30, is not in the vocabulary of the other three Evangelists. He nearly always uses it of the presence of God. Other prepositions employed are ἐπί, (ἀπ' ἐναντι, and ἐναντίον).—1. The value of a religion is the pledge it can give of the presence of God. In the heathen lands round Israel the Divine Being was localized in sacred places with the aid of idols. But the religion of Jehovah was rid of such a tendency through the work of the prophets, with the result that, when all other religions in the Roman Empire were vulgarized and eviscerated of power, Judaism remained like a Samson with locks unshorn, with a God who could keep His own secret, and with a faith still pregnant with possibility. True, the Divine presence had been manifested, according to the OT, in cloudy pillar and burning bush, had, indeed, been localized in the ark of the covenant. But steadily the

conception of God had been clarified from material associations, and the way in which this was done may be gathered from Jeremiah 7. So thoroughly did the moral view of God prevail, that 'the Law became God's real presence in Israel' (Schultz, *OT Theol.* i. p. 354). The 'angel of Jehovah,' so frequently mentioned in the OT, was simply 'the messenger' (מַלְאָךְ), so did all intermediaries dwindle in the blaze of the only God. But with this transcendence came aloofness. On the one hand, the Law became a very barrier between God and His people. Even those who followed hard after it, like Saul of Tarsus and the rich young ruler, thirsted only the more for the living God (Mar 10:17, cf. Rom 7:9-13, Gal 3:21-23). On the other hand, Greek modes of thought, already affected by Oriental dualism, represented fully in Philo, but also anticipated in Palestinian theology (cf. Schürer, ii. iii. § 33), bridged the seeming gulf by theosophical and Gnostic speculations. At the very moment when Judaism had its opportunity, it failed to give that abiding pledge of the presence of God which should satisfy heart, mind, and conscience. Even the religions of Mithras and Isis, impure though the latter was, had a vogue in the Empire because they did something to meet the need which arose between the barren speculations and brutal superstitions of the age.

2. At this psychological moment came Jesus with His gospel as a challenge to the world of the presence of God. St. John himself expresses this thought no more decidedly, though much more fully, than St. Mark, even though in Mar 1:1 υἱὸς θεοῦ is a secondary reading. The common testimony of the Apostolic circle may be summed up in Heb 1:2 'God ... hath in these last days spoken unto us in his Son.' But nowhere is the thought that Jesus Christ was the presence of God set forth with such sublime effect as in the Prologue to John's Gospel: 'We beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth (Heb 1:14). No need was there now of an impersonal Word or impersonated Wisdom, as between God and us (Php 2:9, Col 2:8-19); or of sacrifices and ceremonies, as between us and God (Heb 9:14, Gal 2:21); for the entire gulf between God the holy and us the sinful has been bridged in Jesus Christ our Lord (2Co 5:19, Eph 2:4-7). Thus through Christ our access to the Father is immediate (Rom 5:2) by one Spirit (Eph 2:18). 'There were to be no more finite mediators between God and man; no temple of Jerusalem, where alone men must worship; no necessity for interposing angels to interpret between the Divine and the human. Man was himself to be brought into immediate contact with God, and was to experience the deep conviction that heaven and earth had met together' (Matheson, *Growth of Spirit of Christianity*, i. 78). This faith that through Christ a man is always in the presence of God as a child in his father's house was based on (1) the testimony, and (2) the teaching of Jesus.

(1) By the *testimony of Jesus* is meant the unconscious impress of His Personality. It is evident, to use with all respect a familiar phrase, that Jesus *had* a presence. The

people marvelled because He spoke with authority, although an unlettered man (Mat 7:28-29, Mar 6:2). His eyes were as a flame of fire (Mar 3:5, Luk 22:61). In the awe of His presence the Temple-courts were cleared, and the tempest calmed (Mar 11:15; Mar 6:51); so that His disciples cried, 'What manner of man is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him?' (Mar 4:41). He drew the children to Him, and cast out demons, and said, 'If I by the finger of God cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon you' (Luk 11:20). These impressions upon His contemporaries simply correspond with His own self-consciousness. He gave up the workshop at Nazareth for the theatre of the world, because He knew Himself as God's beloved Son (Luk 3:22; Luk 4:1; Luk 4:14). His first address in the synagogue is not recorded, because it was all in one word, 'I am here' (Luk 4:21). It was enough for the disciples that they should be with Him (Mar 3:14). It was the last folly of the Galilaeen cities (Mat 11:20 ff.) that they did not believe Him for the works' sake; and of Jerusalem, that it knew not the day of its visitation (Mat 23:37, Luk 19:41 ff.). There was only one legacy He had to leave, and that alone worth leaving, His spiritual presence (Mat 28:20, Luk 24:49), which was the true Shekinah (Mat 18:20, cf. 'Ubi sedent duo qui legem traetant, Shekina cum illis est,' *Pirke Aboth*, 3 (Schultz, ii. 67)). The difference in this respect between St. John and the Synoptists is that whereas with them the testimony of Jesus to Himself is mostly unconscious, with him it is altogether self-conscious. St. John never fails to lay stress on the autonomy of Jesus (Moffatt in *Expos.* vi. iii. [1901] 469), so that, even psychologically speaking, He is not of the world, though in it.

(2) Thus in Jn. the testimony of Christ is merged in *His teaching*. He speaks of His own presence as living water, heavenly bread, light and life to a needy world (Joh 4:14; Joh 6:48; Joh 8:12; Joh 11:25). To keep His word is to keep in the presence of God as He Himself does (Joh 14:23, Joh 15:10). And that presence is an inward abiding which nothing outward can disturb (Joh 16:22; Joh 16:33). All His words in the Synoptics similarly illustrate that—

'To turn aside from Him is hell,

To walk with Him is heaven.'

Only with them His Person is, as it were, so transparent that they present God *through* Jesus rather than *in* Him, and we are left to draw the Christian inference that He Himself is the *focus* of the Father's presence. It is the essential nearness of God that gives all significance to the Beatitudes (Mat 5:8-9), to the teaching on prayer (Mat 6:8; Mat 6:8), to the interpretation of worship (Mar 7:8, cf. Joh 4:23), to the illustrations from nature (Mat 10:29), to the exhortations against anxiety (Luk 12:30-32), towards watchfulness (Luk 12:35-36), against covetousness (Luk 12:20-21), towards compassion (Mat 10:40-42). The sphere in which all the

teaching moves, which makes it simple and intimate to the heart, and transcendent in its appeal and its authority, is the presence of God the Father, the truth that—

‘Spirit with spirit can meet, Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet.’

But the immanence of God reaches a further stage in the gospel of Christ. Not only does Jesus bring God close into His world, as if οὐρανός meant the atmosphere one breathes rather than the firmament above (cf. τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, Mat 6:26 etc.), but, according to Jesus, God is immanent in the human nature that makes room for Him. This is expressed in terms of (a) relationship (Mar 3:35, Mat 5:16; Mat 5:44, Joh 1:12), (b) identification (Mat 10:40; Mat 25:40), (c) indwelling (Joh 14:16-17). This last is called the doctrine of the Holy Ghost. In order to give His own outlook to all disciples, Jesus promised His other self, the Paraclete or Comforter, in whose company and through whose intercession we live on the plane of sons, not only being in the Father’s presence, but He being present in us. Although this doctrine is fully allowed for by the Synoptists (Mat 10:20, Luk 24:49), it is the special contribution of St. John. ‘Jesus answered, If a man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him’ (Joh 14:23). From different points of view it may be said that Jesus *enjoyed* the presence of God, that He *was* that presence, and that He *gave* it. This threefold presence is really the basis of the doctrine of the Trinity.

3. What then are we to gather from all this but that, according to Christianity, Christ as God incarnate is the pledge that God is present, not only Creator-like in the universe, but Father-like in the believing heart and the consecrated life? That is really the meaning of His exhibition of God in human life, and the impartation of His own Spirit. And our safeguard against the errors of Pantheism and of all such systems as tend to merge the Divine in the human instead of moulding the human by the Divine, is to be found in one small but significant phrase, ‘ἐν Χριστῷ.’ The Christian consciousness must always testify with a modern thinker (W. S. Palmer, *An Agnostic’s Progress*): ‘When I lifted up my eyes to God, I found God not only looking through my eyes but looking *into* them.’ It is among a people redeemed from their sins and consecrated to service that God will tabernacle (σκηνώσει) as an abiding presence (*Shekinah*, fr. שָׁכַן ‘abide’). And when the brotherhood is perfected, there will be no need of a Temple (Rev 21:3; Rev 21:22-27). The revelation of God immanent in a redeemed humanity is the ideal towards which Christianity points (Ephesians 1-3, Col 1:9-20, cf. 2Pe 3:13, Joh 17:20-23), and to which it is slowly moving, but only by outgrowing many misconceptions and leaving them behind. See, further, Schultz, *OT Theol.* i. 353 f., ii. 7-11; artt. ‘Ark of the Covenant,’ ‘Shekinah’ in Hasting’s Dictionary

of the Bible ; Beyschlag, *NT Theol.* i. 95 ff.; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, § 3, ch. 2; Westcott on John 14-17).

4. Christian history has been a long series of endeavours to realize the full meaning of the Divine presence. First it was caught into Jewish preconceptions, and projected into the doctrine of the Parousia. This had its effect on the inmost circle of Christian writers with the exception of St. John, and on most of the early Fathers except for the school of Alexandria. With all its inspiration of hope, it must have tended to obscure the truth that God is present through the working of His Spirit in the individual and in society, in the unfolding of truth and the employments of love.

Under the influence of Greek thought in the Gentile world, the Divine presence has been treated as a metaphysical substance, and at last identified with the elements of the Lord's Supper (see Art. ii.), after consecration. This sacerdotal view was virtually accepted by the time of Cyprian, who wrote (*Ep.* lxiii. 17): 'The passion of the Lord is the sacrifice we offer.' The doctrine of Transubstantiation became the keystone of the ecclesiastical edifice, and was maintained as a theory, by means of the prevalent philosophy of Realism, whose greatest exponent was Thomas Aquinas. As far as English thought is concerned, it crumbled under the dialectic of John Wyclif (Lechler, *Life of Wycliffe*, p. 351), and by the discovery made by simple men, during the next two centuries, of the spiritual presence mediated through the NT in their own experience.

The Docetic views of Christ's Person, however, which throughout the Middle Ages invested Him with apocalyptic splendours at the cost of all human sympathies, called for still other means of allaying the hunger of the religious imagination. 'The remedy was found in the reverence of the image, in the substitution of the symbol for reality. Gradually that Church, which had tried to centre its affections on an absent Lord, found that its affections must be rekindled by the mediation of some earthly form. It had dismissed from its thoughts the idea of a spiritual presence; it must regain that presence through the intervention of material agencies. It must find it in the water of Baptism, in the bread and wine of Communion, in the act of ordination, in the relics of saints, in the tombs of the martyrs, in the heart of monasteries, and in the walls of consecrated cathedrals. It must see it in the figure of a visible cross, in the monuments raised to a celestial hierarchy, in the observance of festivals in memory of the sainted dead,' above all in apotheosis of the Virgin Mother (*Matheson, op. cit.* i. 322). In the meantime, as applied to the working of the Holy Spirit, the doctrine of the presence stamped infallibility upon the Councils, and finally upon the Pope. While with J. H. Newman it signified the validity of ecclesiastical development throughout the centuries, 'being the germination, growth, and perfection of some living or apparent truth in the minds of men during a sufficient period' (*Development of Doctrine*, p. 37).

But while the popular religion found the presence in the images and relies, and ecclesiastical speculations discovered it in the Conciliar assemblies and the Sacrament of the Supper, there was a parallel movement known as Mysticism, which found the real presence in the soul. To the French mystics, greatest of whom was St. Bernard of the 12th century, the presence of God was the obverse side of their own absence from the world. The Germans Eckhart and Tauler, the Dutch Thomas à Kempis, and others took up the theme, and wove it into a kind of new Stoicism, by way of purification, illumination, and union. 'They taught (following Thomas Aquinas) that the soul can even here upon earth so receive God within itself as to enjoy in the fullest sense the vision of His being, and dwell in heaven itself' (Harnack, *Outlines of the Hist. of Dogma*, p. 440). This 'practice of the presence of God' (Brother Lawrence) was the religious side of the preparation for Luther and his gospel for the people. He taught that Christianity was not a matter of consent to doctrine, as with the scholastics; or a method of losing oneself in the eternal, as with the mystics; but realizing the Divine presence as found through faith in Christ in 'the freedom of a Christian man.' Luther, commenting in his pointed way on Gal 2:16, says: 'Faith is, if I may use the expression, creative of Divinity, not, of course, in the substance of God, but in ourselves.' And again: 'When we truly say that He is Christ, we mean that He was given for us, without any works of ours, has won for us the Spirit of God, and has made us children of God ... so that we might become lords of all things in heaven and earth—that is faith' (Erl. ed. 13, 251; Herrmann, *Communion with God*, p. 125). The primary authority of the inward witness thus established by Luther has been most fully apprehended for practical purposes by George Fox and his followers. A bright example was John Woolman (b. 1720), who, in taking his stand against prevailing customs sanctioned by the Church, records in his diary (ch. 4): 'The fear of the Lord so covered me at times that my way was made easier than I expected.' And this independent standpoint, for the sake of humanity, has found poetical expression in Lowell, Whittier, and, in a fashion, Whitman. John Wesley, too, coming from his earlier devotion to Mysticism to his doctrine of assurance, repeated the experience of Luther, and, by means of an evangelical theology, helped men to see that humanity is the proper organ of the Divine presence. This has been the inspiration of modern reformers and philanthropists, but the full bearings of this truth have not yet been realized by the churches. A new vindication of the soul's authority in matters of faith has been undertaken by A. Ritschl and his disciples—Harnack, Herrmann, and the rest. With them the Divine Man Jesus, separated from every ceremony, doctrine, or dream, vouches for the inward presence of God to the soul that believes. By their theory of value-judgments they throw the whole proof of the presence of God upon the faculties of the soul.

Literature.—Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, or *Outlines*; Matheson, *Growth of the Spirit of Christianity*; Fairbairn, *Christ in Mod. Theol.*, bk. i.; Herrmann, *Communion with God*; *Imitation of Christ*; John Woolman's *Journal*; J. Campbell Whittier, *Poems*;

Stopford Brooke, *Christ in Mod. Life*; Watson, *Inspiration of our Faith*, 274; Moore, *From Advent to Advent*, 63, 98; D. Young, *Crimson Book*, 237; Phillips Brooks, *Mystery of Iniquity*, 277.

A. Norman Rowland.

☩ Presentation

PRESENTATION (in the Temple) (Luk 2:22-40).—When St. Paul had mentioned (Gal 4:4) the sending forth of the Son of God into our world, he spoke of it in two stages, ‘born of a woman,’ ‘born under the law’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885); and in both those acts or stages the Pauline Evangelist St. Luke is able and careful in his history of Jesus to exhibit Him. To the narrative of His nativity accordingly he subjoins (Luk 2:21) a notice of His circumcision on the eighth day, in obedience to Gen 17:12; and now on the fortieth day He is brought to Jerusalem to be offered or presented (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 , παραστήσαι) to the Lord, in accordance with the legal requirements of Exo 13:2 (freely quoted in Luk 2:23) and Numbers 3, 12, 18. Along with the rite of the *Presentation of the Child* there was fulfilled on the same occasion another for the *Purification of the Mother*; but we shall consider that afterwards.

1. The law as to *the Child* is described in OT as having its origin in Egypt. From patriarchal times, indeed, the firstborn had been the priest in the family; but a new obligation was laid on the firstborn in Israel by the circumstances of the Exodus. When God sent Moses to Pharaoh, the Divine message to the king ran, ‘Israel is my son, even my firstborn: if thou refuse to let him go I will slay thy son, even thy firstborn’ (Exo 4:22-23). Pharaoh refused. Nine successive plagues were sent on him in vain. The time had come for the execution of God’s threatening. The Lord was to pass through the land of Egypt to execute the judgment. Israel was not so guilty as her oppressors; but neither could she stand before God if once He were angry; and God provided for her in the Paschal lamb a victim under which each Israelite household that would believe His word and keep His commandment might find shelter. ‘By faith they kept the passover and the sprinkling of blood’ (Heb 11:28); but in token that their firstborn had been due to death and rescued by God’s mercy, all the firstborn (‘every male that openeth the womb’) were to be sanctified to Him (Num 8:17). God might have slain each, or kept him for His own especial service. He would not slay him: He permitted him (and required him) to be redeemed (Exo 13:13-15). Instead of the firstborn, however, God took for the service of His sanctuary the tribe of Levi (Num 3:12; Num 8:14-18), requiring, at the time of this substitution, that as many firstborn as there were in Israel *in excess of* the number of the Levites must be

redeemed by the payment of five shekels for each one (Num_3:44-51). Afterwards (Num_18:15-16), every *firstborn son* must be presented and redeemed by the payment of this amount. Our Lord might have claimed exemption, as the Son of God; just as afterwards when they asked Him to pay the Temple rate He declared, 'Therefore the sons are free' (Mat_17:26 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). But He came not to claim exemptions but to share our burdens, carry our sorrows, take away our sins, and, more particularly, to redeem them that are under the Law (Gal_4:5). He 'came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many' (Mat_20:28); and 'thus it became him to fulfil all righteousness' (Mat_3:15). Moreover, by being thus redeemed from the personal obligation of serving in the Temple, His love to it, which at His next visit to it He was to manifest (Luk_2:49 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), and His zeal for it which devoured Him (Joh_2:17), were brought into clearer light. They were not of constraint, but willing. Still, the leading thought in the history of His Presentation in the Temple is that of His having come 'that the scripture might be fulfilled' (Luk_21:22-24; Luk_24:44), 'and that the whole life of the God-man on earth might present a realization of that ideal depicted in the prophetic writings of the OT' (Oosterzee).

The act of presenting Him would be performed by Joseph (Exo_13:15) as the putative father, at once the shield of Mary and the protector of her child (Luk_3:23); not by the Virgin, as Cornelius à Lapede assumes, although there is some beauty in his interpretation of the five shekels, which constituted the redemption money, as 'symbolizing the Five Wounds at the price whereof Christ redeemed the race of man' (*Com. in loc.*). The Law does not seem to have prescribed any particular time for the redemption of the firstborn, but many fathers would doubtless act as Joseph did, and perform the rite on the day appointed by the Law for the sacrifice of his wife's purification. There is hardly time for the visit of the Wise Men, the Flight into Egypt, and the Return thence, between the Birth of Christ and His Presentation in the Temple; moreover, a public service at Jerusalem would have been fraught with danger after the inquiries of the Magi had aroused the jealous fears of Herod. But neither is there any need for supposing that the Wise Men's visit came so soon after the Nativity. 'From two years old and under' (Mat_2:16) was the age which Herod supposed the newborn 'King of the Jews' might be. Mary's availing herself of the permission, as a poor woman, to offer the two doves instead of the costlier lamb is not consistent with the idea that the gold offered by the Wise Men was at her disposal: while St. Luke's mention of the Holy Family returning into Galilee and Nazareth (Luk_2:39) is of the nature of a foreshortening, and does not imply that no event intervened between the Presentation and the journey to the North.

2. The *Purification of Mary*, besides synchronizing with the Presentation of her Son, was an event belonging to the same moral and religious category. It also was an act of a humble-minded and becoming obedience to the Law of Moses, under which she

lived. St. Jerome alone among the Fathers was of opinion that in her case too it was strictly obligatory, not, of course, on account of any *sin* on her part, her conception of the Child being spotless and holy (Luk_1:26-35) and an act of obedience to Almighty God; but *ceremonially* because, the Birth being a real one, she had touched things which involved ceremonial uncleanness. Whether St. Jerome is right, or the other Fathers (for the discussion see Cornelius à Lapidè), and whether or not she might have claimed exemption, she is to be praised for not doing so, but quietly and humbly accepting the law binding on ordinary mothers, and being willing, as her Son will also be, to be reckoned with transgressors (Mar_15:28, Luk_22:37). It was enough for her, as it would be enough for Him, that God knew.

The reading adopted in the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 (Luk_2:22), ‘the days of *their* (not ‘*her*,’ Authorized Version) purification,’ has the highest MS authority, and is that expressly of Origen and Cyril: it is explained when we remember that while the ceremonial uncleanness was directly that of the mother only, Joseph and the Child could hardly help—especially while living in such circumstances as were theirs at Bethlehem—contracting a like defilement, in the legal sense, by contact with her. Our Lord, all holy from the first, was often to be so defiled (Luk_15:1; Luk_19:7). He regarded it as His glory, not His, shame.

The legal ordinance (Leviticus 12) appointed that a woman who had borne a man child should be (ceremonially) unclean for seven days; for three and thirty days more she might touch no hallowed thing, nor come into the sanctuary. Then, on the fortieth day, she must bring ‘a lamb of the first year for a burnt-offering (expressive of devotion), and a young pigeon or a turtle-dove for a sin-offering (a testimony, St. Jerome says, to the doctrine of original sin), unto the door of the tent of meeting, unto the priest, and he shall offer it before the Lord, and make atonement for her; and she shall be cleansed from the fountain of her blood.... And if her means suffice not for a lamb, then she shall take two turtle-doves or two young pigeons; the one for a burnt-offering, the other for a sin-offering.’ The Virgin’s humility appears in her availing herself of this merciful provision; she disdained not to admit her poverty; we may be sure she did not (as some, thinking to exalt her, have imagined) assume a false appearance of it: even if Joseph and she had not been extremely poor before, the expenses of the journey to Bethlehem, and of living there six weeks, and the five shekels for the Child, could not have failed to make deep inroads on their purse. The order of the combined rites would be as follows:—(1) The Holy Family would come into the hall of the unclean, and stand there. (2) Then would be offered the dove for her sin-offering, and perhaps they would be sprinkled with the lustral water and the ashes of the heifer (Num_19:17). (3) Then the Child would be presented. And lastly, (4) the other dove would be offered in sign of Mary’s thanksgiving and self-devotion to God. The Virgin would not go further—even when she had been cleansed—than the Court of the Women.

The Evangelist's use of the words 'parents' ([Luk_2:27](#)) and 'father and mother' ([Luk_2:33](#)) have been urged as evidence that 'the idea of the supernatural' conception of Jesus has not penetrated to this part of the legendary materials here collected together' (Schmidt and Holzendorff, *Short Protestant Commentary*); to which we may answer that he would have been a poor redactor who, having transcribed ch. i., did not observe an inconsistency of this kind, and that in point of fact the Third Gospel is marked by its homogeneity (see Ramsay, *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?*). The explanation of the apparent inconsistency lies deep in the principle which led our Lord, sinless Himself ([2Co_5:21](#)), to accept the lot of sinners, and lay this lot also on His blessed Mother; and further, that His glory was not to be manifested till the time appointed of the Father. Till then, whatever brief epiphanies there might be were only for the favoured few. Even the Transfiguration was to be told to no man till the Son of Man was risen from the dead. The facts were secure in the hearts of sufficient witnesses ([Luk_2:19](#); [Luk_2:51](#)); they would come forth in due time. More especially, His birth of a Virgin Mother—told as it was to be by two Evangelists ([Mat_1:18-25](#), [Luk_1:26-38](#)), and always an article of faith in the Church—was not a thing to be communicated to unbelieving ears and scoffing tongues; even when His claim to have come down out of heaven was contrasted with what were supposed to be the known facts of His origin as Man ([Joh_6:42](#), [Mat_13:55](#)). The feeling of the Early Church upon the subject is expressed in a famous passage of St. Ignatius of Antioch (c. [*Note: circa, about.*] 110): 'Hidden from the prince of this world were the virginity of Mary, and her child-bearing, and likewise also the death of the Lord—three mysteries to be cried aloud—the which were wrought in the silence of God' (*ad Ephes.* 19).

Both the Purification of Mary and the Presentation of our Lord in the Temple are commemorated on the 2nd of February (Candlemas). Baronius says that the Church at Rome was led to the institution of this Feast in order to supersede the *Lupercalia*, the observances connected wherewith were of an extremely immoral as well as idolatrous character. See, further, artt. Anna and Simeon.

James Cooper.

☒ Press

PRESS.—See Crowd and Multitude

☒ Price Of Blood

PRICE OF BLOOD (τιμὴ αἵματος, Mat 27:6).—An expression used by the priests of the Temple in reference to the money Judas Iscariot had received for the betrayal of his Master. The thirty pieces of silver were the price of a traitor's service, and so ultimately the price of a man's head; and though the priests were willing to take advantage of the dastardly deed by putting the betrayed Man to death, they still regarded with feelings of disgust and abhorrence the money paid for His betrayal. It had been soiled by the hands of a traitor, and associated with blood-guiltiness of a kind that they had no desire to share. They would neither accept it for themselves, when Judas offered to restore it, nor, when flung down in the sanctuary, did they regard it as fit for the holy uses of the Temple. An appropriate use was found for it in the purchase of ground outside the walls for the burial of strangers to Jerusalem. (For the story of Judas' end, and the divergent account in Act 1:18-19, see Akeldama, Judas Iscariot).

The reasoning of the Temple priests here has been usually condemned as a piece of pious hypocrisy, implying a display of honourable diffidence that stands in suspicious contrast with their previous dealings with the traitor. If the money was soiled, who was responsible, if not those who had taken it (perhaps directly from the Temple-treasury) and sent it on its dastardly mission? Why should they, who had paid the price of blood, scruple about taking it back? 'If it was sinful to put back the price of blood in the sacred treasury, how was it any more permissible to take it out?' (Calvin, *NT Com.*). This is rather a one-sided judgment. It is true, their manifestation of scrupulous feeling was somewhat belated: it would have become them better to have no dealings whatever with Judas. But we may still give them the credit for the wish to be as little as possible involved in the crime of treachery. In point of fact, people will make use of a traitor who have no love for traitors. In this case the compact made with Judas was very much more dishonourable on his side than on theirs; for they were sworn enemies of Christ, he a professed friend. The priests might believe the money was well spent on their part, though ill gotten on his. The curse of treachery was now associated with it, and would help to intensify their loathing when they spoke of it as the price of blood. It was unhallowed gain; and they could use it only for some purpose less sacred than those connected with the Temple, and in which they themselves had no profit. We may compare with this scruple of the priests the similar feeling manifested by David in a contrasted case (2Sa 23:14-17). When the three mighty men at the risk of their lives brought the king a draught of water from the well of Bethlehem, he scrupled to drink it, because it was so closely associated with the blood of the men who had risked their lives to procure it. It had been procured at the price of blood, and he could not use it in the common way. It was hallowed by the sacrifice associated with it, just as the blood-money in Judas' hands was tainted and defiled by a betrayal equivalent to murder.

Literature.—See under Judas Iscariot, but esp. Ker, *Serm.* i. 293.

J. Dick Fleming.

☒Pride

PRIDE.—The condemnation of pride has always been very pronounced in Christian thought. It is one of the faults most distinctly incompatible with the ethics of the NT. Certain other systems of religion have not so strenuously combated this feeling. In fact, some may not unreasonably be regarded as having contributed to its indulgence. An elementary attribute in the Christian conception of character is humility.

1. It is remarkable that the word for ‘pride’ (ὑπερηφάνια) occurs only once in the recorded conversations of our Lord, and the adj. ‘proud’ (ὑπερήφανος) only once in the Gospels (Luk 1:51). In Mar 7:22 pride is classed as one of the things which defile a man. It is in the positive precepts and general example and teaching of the Master that we find the principles which have made pride so repugnant to the Christian consciousness. Chief of all these forces is the example of our Lord’s own life. The Incarnation was itself the most transcendent exhibition of humility. In it men saw their Lord counting it not a prize to be on an equality with God, emptying Himself, and taking the form of a servant. In the essential abasement of this earthly life He humbled Himself to the particular extremes of endurance of personal ill-treatment and obedience even unto death. Henceforth lowliness of station and self-forgetting passivity were consecrated by the Divine example. In the same degree the possessors of power and place were taught the limitations and responsibilities of their position, and shown the insensate evil of scornfully regarding men of inferior circumstances.

2. Before the Birth of Christ this characteristic of His mission was heralded in Mary’s song. She who described herself as a handmaiden of low estate could rejoice that in the coming Kingdom the proud would be scattered in, or by (Luk 1:51 (Revised Version margin)), the disposition of their hearts. Princes would be brought down, and rich men sent empty away. On the other hand, those of low degree would be exalted, and the hungry abundantly satisfied. The Magnificat proclaimed the truths that whilst poverty and obscurity are not bars to acceptance with God, there are evils peculiarly belonging to high rank which utterly disqualify.

3. The Temptation (Mat 4:1-11 || Luk 4:1-13) was largely an attempt to work on feelings of pride in the mind of Jesus. He was urged to prove His superiority to the conditions of ordinary humanity by a self-glorifying triumph over the laws of nature.

The Tempter strove to make Him do so either (1) by providing for His special physical needs, or (2) by a public display of His might. In the offer (3) of universal sovereignty, the lures of authority and glory were especially emphasized.

4. In His definite teaching our Lord laid especial stress on the virtues of humility and lowliness of mind as fundamental requisites in His loyal followers. The Beatitude of the meek struck the dominant keynote in this respect. Men were invited to learn of Him, for He was meek and lowly in heart (Mat_11:29). His disciples could apply to Him the prophetic description that He was meek (Mat_21:5). More than once He seems to have uttered the apothegm, 'Whosoever shall exalt himself shall be humbled, and whosoever shall humble himself shall be exalted' (Mat_23:12, Luk_14:11; Luk_18:14). Various specific forms of pride were rebuked and cautioned against.

(1) Several times our Lord severely censured exhibitions of *spiritual pride*. This vice called forth peculiar indignation and detestation in Him. The religious ostentation of the Pharisees was unsparingly reprobated. The types are eternally stigmatized who can thank God they are not as others are, who from the heights of their own complacency can look down on the supposed inferior spirituality of their fellows (Luk_18:9 ff.); who parade in public places their devotions (Mat_6:5); who do all their works to be seen of men, and obtrude their religious symbols (Mat_23:5); who for a pretence make long prayers (Luk_20:47). This species of religious self-satisfaction, of spurious spirituality, elicited the scathing invective of Christ in an altogether unparalleled degree. He declared that the publicans and harlots went into the Kingdom of God before such proud professors (Mat_21:31).

(2) The strictures our Lord passed on the *racial pride* of the Jews drew against Him their fiercest anger. He showed how vain were their boasted privileges when He proclaimed that many should be admitted to the Kingdom from all quarters of the earth, but the children of the Kingdom rejected (Mat_8:12). He tried to make them realize from their own Scriptures the futility of their reliance on descent, by referring to the favour shown Naaman the Syrian and the widow of Zarephath (Luk_4:25 ff.). The parables of the Labourers in the Vineyard (Mat_20:1 ff.) and of the Householder's rebellious servants (Mat_21:33 ff.) were plainly intended to make His hearers see how little worth was in their lofty pretensions as the children of Abraham—the chosen people.

(3) *Intellectual haughtiness* was also decidedly condemned by Christ. The inclination that springs from the consciousness of ability or learning to scornfully depreciate those of more meagre mental equipment, is one of the most insidious forms of pride. To it certain natures fall victims who would consider family pretensions or religious assumptions of superiority vulgar and discreditable. Many who would loathe the commonly recognized vaingloriousness of the Pharisees are dangerously near sharing

in the mental arrogance which prompted the latter to sneer, 'This multitude which knoweth not the law are accursed' (Joh_7:49).

The tendency to indulge in lofty contempt from the 'intellectual throne' is strikingly portrayed in Tennyson's *Palace of Art*—

'O God-like isolation which art mine,
I can but count thee perfect gain,
What time I watch the darkening droves of swine
That range on yonder plain.'

All such disdainfulness for the simple and unlearned was impressively forbidden by Christ's warning, 'See that ye despise not one of these little ones' (Mat_18:10; cf. a striking sermon by Bp. Boyd Carpenter on 'The Dangers of Contempt'). Again, our Lord bore witness to the supreme importance of simplicity and innocence, as opposed to superciliousness and pride, when He said of the little children, 'Of such is the kingdom of heaven' (Luk_18:16), and added that the only attitude which qualified for admission was that of a little child. It is noteworthy that the same dispositions of receptivity and absence of hard preconceptions are insisted on by scientists as prime requisites for the student of the kingdom of nature.

(4) The pride that comes from the enjoyment of *high official or social rank* was discountenanced in one of the most surprising actions of our Lord's earthly life—the episode of the Feet-washing (John 13). It was a vivid, unforgettable lesson in the duty of self-abasing service. No one who then was present was likely to fall into the sin of presuming on privileges of position, or treating subordinates with selfish, slighting inconsiderateness. The imagination of succeeding generations has been intensely impressed by the spectacle of the Son of God washing the travel-stained feet of His poor followers. The pride that jealously exacts sub-servience could not be more effectually proscribed. The homily against those whose self-importance made them claim the place of honour at entertainments (Luk_14:7 ff.) is directed against the same grandiose assumptions. This social arrogance of the Pharisees was one of the points in our Lord's indictment of them. They loved the chief place at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and to be called Rabbi (Mat_23:5 ff.). Any tendency among His disciples to assume lordship was strictly, tenderly suppressed. Once He called them together when such claims were mooted, and pointed out to them how among the outside Gentiles there were those who lorded it and exercised authority. In contrast to that should be their practice. Whoever of them was ambitious of greatness and supremacy could attain it only along the lines of submissive service (Mat_20:25

f.). They had Him as an example, who came not to receive service, but to minister to the needs of others, even to the point of giving up His life for them (Mat 20:28). They were not to arrogate to themselves titles implying mastership (Mat 23:8; Mat 23:10). The question of leadership among them was met by Christ taking a little child and placing it 'beside himself' (παρ' ἑαυτοῦ), and saying that the reception of a little child meant the reception of Himself and of His Father who sent Him (Luk 9:46 ff.). In the light of how so stupendous a glory was to be won, their own shortsighted strivings after precedence stood exposed. All such grasping at power and place was a contradiction or the true conception of honour. It was he who humbled himself as a little child that was greatest (Mat 18:4).

5. The essential vice of pride was glanced at in one of these conversations when the Master said, 'All ye are brethren' (Mat 23:8). Pride is an injury to the bond of brotherhood; it is disloyalty in the Christian household; it is a breach of fellowship. The selfish despising of our fellow-creatures is a contradiction of the law of love. It cannot coexist with a true-hearted affection for all men. Pride is self-centred, and plumes itself on the gap between ourselves and those beneath us. It revels in the feeling of superiority. Nothing could be more opposed than this to the self-sacrificing love which is bent on raising and helping. Pride also betrays a lack of perception as to our own true position before God. It reveals an undue magnifying of relative differences.

6. The word 'pride' is often used in another and a harmless sense which may imply no more than a fit appreciation of benefits, a lofty sense of honour, a dignified aloofness that will not stoop to what is mean or defiling. In this better sense Milton can speak of 'modest pride,' and Moore deplore the loss of the 'pride of former days.' The distinction is clear between this pardonable and highly useful feeling—a feeling which may be accompanied with real humility—and a haughtiness of spirit, a contemptuous looking down on others, a selfish glorying in one's own superiority. See also Humility, Meekness.

Literature.—Aristotle, *Nic. Ethiopic* iv. 3; Kant, *Met. of Ethiopic* (Clark's ed.), 241; Liddon, *Univ. Serm.* ii. 203, *BL* [*Note: L Bampton Lecture.*] 8 [*Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred*] , 491; Medd, *The One Mediator*, 416; Alford, *Quebec Chapel Serm.* ii. 15; Stalker, *Seven Deadly Sins*, I; Wickham in *Oxford Univ. Serm.* (ed. Bebb), 332; Bunyan, *Pilg. Prog.*, Pt. ii. 'The Valley of Humiliation'; Longfellow's 'King Robert of Sicily'; Bp. Magee, *The Gospel and the Age* ('Knowledge without Love').

W. S. Kerr.

⚡ Priest

PRIEST

1. The Jewish priests.—The few passages in the Gospels where the word ‘priest’ (ἱερεὺς) occurs apply solely to the Jewish priesthood, but of its position and functions very little is recorded either in the Gospels or generally in the NT. The Gr. ἱερεὺς is the equivalent of the Heb. כֹּהֵן. The Jewish priesthood is brought before us in the Gospels in the following connexions:—(1) The work of Zacharias (Luk 1:5-9), where we read of the priestly courses with the duties assigned to them by lot. The priesthood was divided into twenty-four courses (ἐφημερίαι), and each course was on duty twice during the year (Plummer, *in loc.*). (2) The priests and Levites who interviewed John the Baptist (Joh 1:19). (3) The lepers cleansed by our Lord were to show themselves to the priest (Mat 8:4, Mar 1:44, Luk 5:14; Luk 17:14) in proof of their healing and of the obedience of Jesus to the Law (Plummer, *in loc.*). (4) The reference to the shewbread as eaten by the priests only (Mar 2:26). (5) The priest who passed by the wounded traveller (Luk 10:31). The Gospels are much more concerned with ‘chief (or high) priests’ (ἀρχιερεῖς) than with priests, the former word being frequently found in all four Gospels. See artt. Chief Priests and High Priest.

2. Priesthood of Christ

(1) *The general position of Christ’s priesthood in the NT.*—The English word ‘priest’ represents two different Heb. and Gr. words. It is used to translate ἱερεὺς and כֹּהֵן (Lat. *sacerdos*). It is also the contraction of *presbyter* (‘prester,’ ‘prest,’ ‘priest’), which is the transliteration of πρεσβύτερος and LXX Septuagint rendering of זֵקֵן (elder). But the NT idea of the priesthood of Christ is associated solely with the former of these words. Christ is called a priest, or high priest, in the sense of a sacrificing priest (ἱερεὺς, ἀρχιερεὺς). This application of the term to our Lord is found only in Hebrews, though the priestly functions connected with sacrifice and intercession are, of course, found frequently in the NT (Mat 20:28, Joh 1:29; Joh 14:6, Rom 8:34, Eph 2:18, 1Pe 1:19-21; 1Pe 3:18, Rev 1:5; Rev 1:13). It should, however, be carefully observed that it is only in Hebrews that these functions are connected with our Lord as priest. Elsewhere they simply form part of His general work as Redeemer.

(2) *The specific purpose of Christ's priesthood in Hebrews.*—It is important to inquire why, and under what circumstances, the priesthood of Christ is brought forward in Hebrews. The situation there described is one in which the Hebrew Christians were in danger of spiritual degeneration (Heb 5:12), backsliding and apostasy (Heb 6:9, Heb 10:35). The Epistle was written to prevent this, and the means of accomplishing it was personal experience of the priesthood of Christ. In some way, therefore, Christ's priesthood is associated with spiritual steadfastness, progress, assurance. In the full understanding and acceptance of this truth will be found the secret of growth and maturity of experience. It is evident that these Hebrews knew Jesus as Saviour, and had an elementary knowledge of the truths of redemption (Heb 6:1), but they did not realize what it meant to have Him as priest. The distinction between the two may be seen by a consideration of the time and circumstances under which priesthood appeared in connexion with Israel. Apart from foreign priesthoods like those of Egypt and Midian (Genesis 47, Exodus 3), the first mention of priesthood in Israel is at Sinai. There was no priesthood in Egypt, only redemption. There was none at the Red Sea, where deliverance was the one thing needful. At Sinai they were to realize for the first time their true relation to God and God's relation to them as dwelling among them (Exo 19:4-6; Exo 25:1-8). The priesthood was appointed to provide the means of access to God and prevent fear in approaching Him. The essence of priesthood, therefore, is access to God based on an already existing redemption. The Hebrew Christians knew Christ as Redeemer; they were now to be taught the possibility, power, and joy of constant free access to God in Him, and in this, the removal of all fear and dissatisfaction. Any sense of unworthiness would be met by His worthiness, all fear removed by His nearness to them and to God as at once Son of Man and Divine High Priest. There is thus a whole world of difference between knowing Christ as Saviour and as Priest. The former may involve only spiritual childhood, the latter must necessarily include spiritual maturity (Heb 5:10-14). This is one of the great distinctions between the teaching of Romans and of Hebrews. The former is concerned with redemption which makes access possible (Rom 5:2), the latter with access which is made possible by redemption. This practical purpose of Hebrews in close connexion with spiritual growth and maturity should ever be kept in mind. Herein lies the present and permanent value of the Epistle in Christian life and service, with its constant emphasis on 'Draw near' (Heb 10:22), 'Draw not back' (Heb 10:39), 'Let us go on' (Heb 6:1).

(3) *The essential meaning of priesthood.*—In order to obtain a true idea of the priesthood of Christ, it is necessary to inquire what were the essential characteristics of priesthood. What were the functions which the priest performed as priest, those of which he had the monopoly, and which no one else could perform under any circumstances? The best definition is in Heb 5:1, where we are told that the priest was 'appointed for men in things pertaining to God,' that is, he represented man to God. What was included in this representation we shall see later, but meanwhile it

should be clearly observed that priesthood meant the representation of man to God, and was the exact opposite and counterpart of the work of the prophet, which was to represent God to man. The priest went from man to God, the prophet went from God to man. The two ideas are seen in Heb 3:1, where Christ is called ‘Apostle and High Priest’—‘Apostle’ because sent from God to man, ‘High Priest’ because going from man to God. In this twofold capacity lies His perfect mediation. If the priest did other duties, such as teaching, receiving tithes, and blessing the people, these were superadded functions and not inherent in the priesthood. The Levites could teach and the kings could bless, but by no possibility could either do the essential duties of the priesthood in representing man to God. This specific idea is clearly taught as the essence of priesthood both in OT and NT, where the Godward aspect of priesthood is always stated and emphasized (Exo 28:1, Num 16:40, 2Ch 26:18, Eze 44:15, Heb 6:20; Heb 7:25; Heb 9:24). This essential idea of priesthood as representative of man to God carries with it the right of access to and of abiding in the presence of God. In primitive days, families were represented by the patriarch or head of a clan; but as the sense of sin grew and deepened, and as the Divine purpose of redemption was gradually unfolded, it became necessary to have men entirely separated for this office. Priesthood was thus the admission at once of the sinfulness of the race, of the holiness of God, and of the need of conditions of approach to God. It is of the utmost importance that we should define and keep clear these essential characteristics of the priesthood. They can be summed up in the general ideas of (a) drawing near to God by means of an offering, (b) dwelling near to God for the purpose of intercession (Eze 44:16, Lev 16:17, Exo 28:30; Exo 30:7-8, Luk 1:9-10).

(4) *The special order of Christ’s priesthood.*—The unique feature of the discussion in Hebrews is the association of Christ’s priesthood with that of **Melchizedek**. Three times in Scripture Melchizedek is mentioned, and each time the reference is important. (a) In Genesis 14 he appears in history in connexion with Abraham. He is termed ‘priest of God Most High.’ (b) Then in Psalms 110 he is mentioned again in a Psalm usually regarded as Messianic, and as such applied to Himself by our Lord (Mat 22:44, Mar 12:36, Luk 20:42). The underlying thought in the Psalm is of a priesthood other than that of Aaron, and suggests a consciousness, however dim, on the part of spiritually-minded Jews, of something beyond and superior to the Aaronic priesthood. The bare mention of another priesthood at all is significant and striking. (c) He appears in Hebrews as a type of Christ. The record of Genesis 14 is taken as it stands and used to symbolize and typify some of the elements of the priesthood of Christ. (α) The position of Melchizedek as king indicates the *royalty* of Christ’s priesthood. (β) The meaning of the name ‘Melchizedek’ is used to suggest the thought of *righteousness*. (γ) The meaning of the title ‘king of Salem’ suggests the idea of *peace*. The order and connexion of righteousness and peace are noted in Hebrews.

First comes righteousness as the basis of relation to God, and then peace as the outcome of righteousness. Righteousness without peace vindicates the Law and punishes sin, peace without righteousness ignores the Law and condones sin.

Righteousness and peace when combined honour the Law while pardoning sin. (δ) The absence in the record of Genesis 14 of any earthly connexions of ancestry and posterity is used in Hebrews to symbolize the perpetuity of Christ's priesthood. What was true of the record about Melchizedek is present in actual fact in Christ. One point of great importance not to be overlooked is that in Genesis 14 no priestly functions are attributed to Melchizedek. The gift of bread and wine to Abraham had, of course, nothing essentially priestly in it. In the record he is just called 'priest of God Most High,' without any characteristic priestly acts being stated. This exactly corresponds to the use made of the Melchizedek priesthood in Hebrews, which does not treat of any priestly acts or functions, but of the *order* of the priesthood. The fundamental thought of the Melchizedek priesthood in Hebrews refers to the person of the priest, not to his acts. The functions, or acts, are considered in connexion and contrast with the functions of the Aaronic priesthood. It is the priestly person rather than the priestly work that is emphasized in the Melchizedek priesthood. He was a *royal* person (which Aaron was not); an *abiding* person (which Aaron was not); a *unique* person (which Aaron was not). It is the personal superiority in these respects over the priesthood of Aaron that is dwelt upon in connexion with Melchizedek. There is, of course, no comparison drawn between Melchizedek and Christ, but use is made of Melchizedek to symbolize the personal superiority of Christ's priesthood over all others—a priesthood that is older, wider, more lasting than that of Aaron.

(5) *The particular functions of Christ's priesthood.*—It is in connexion with the Aaronic priesthood that the *work* of Christ's priesthood is considered. A contrast is made, as is shown by the recurring key word 'better', (Heb 7:22; Heb 8:6 et al.). Our Lord never was a priest of the Aaronic line (Heb 7:13-14, Heb 8:4), but it was necessary to use the illustration of the Aaronic priesthood to denote Christ's priestly functions, because no characteristic priestly functions are recorded of Melchizedek. A series of comparisons between Aaron's and Christ's priesthood needs careful attention: (a) first generally in Heb 2:17-18 with reference to personal qualification; (b) then after bare mention in Heb 3:1, more fully in Heb 4:14-16. (c) But it is in Heb 5:1-10 that we have the first definite comparison. In Heb 5:1-5 the requirements of the Aaronic priesthood are stated in regard to (α) office (Heb 5:1), (β) character (Heb 5:2-3), (γ) Divine appointment (Heb 5:4-5). In Heb 5:6-10 we have the fulfilment of these requirements in Christ stated in the reverse order: (α) Divine appointment (Heb 5:5-6), (β) character (Heb 5:7-8), (γ) office (Heb 5:9-10). (δ) Then in ch. 7 we have the comparison and contrast between Melchizedek and Aaron, with

the superiority of the former, on three grounds: (α) Aaron was not royal, (β) Aaron did not abide, by reason of death, (γ) Aaron had many successors. The superiority of the person gives superiority to the functions, (e) Then in chs. 8-10 the superiority of the work of Christ is compared with that of Aaron under three aspects: (α) a better covenant (ch. 8), because spiritual, not temporal; (β) a better sanctuary (ch. 9), because heavenly, not earthly; (γ) a better sacrifice (ch. 10), because real, not symbolical. In the course of this entire discussion several elements of superiority emerge. A superior order (Heb 7:1-17), a superior tribe (Heb 7:14), a superior calling (Heb 7:21), a superior tenure (Heb 7:23-24), a superior character (Heb 7:26), a superior sanctuary and a superior covenant (ch. 9), a superior sacrifice (ch. 10). After ch. 10 there is nothing priestly in the terms used, though ch. 13 refers to functions connected with the priesthood. The functions of priesthood may thus be summed up as (a) access to God for man, (b) offering to God for man, (c) intercession with God for man; and the superiority of our Lord's priesthood is shown in the following particulars: (1) It is royal in character, (2) heavenly in sphere, (3) spiritual in nature, (4) continuous in efficacy, (5) perpetual in duration, (6) universal in scope, (7) effectual in results.

At this point there are three questions that call for attention, (α) There is no real distinction between 'Priest' and 'High Priest.' Christ is both (Heb 5:6; Heb 5:10; Heb 6:20; Heb 7:1; Heb 7:3; Heb 7:15; Heb 7:17; Heb 7:21). The difference is one of rank only, the High Priesthood being, as it were, a specialized form. The term 'high priest' occurs only nine times in the OT, of which but two are in the Pentateuch, and it is curious that the term is never once applied to Aaron. This clearly shows that there is no real distinction between the two offices, for if there had been an essential difference from the first, Aaron would have been called 'high priest.' Christ is never termed 'High Priest' in connexion with Melchizedek, but only when Aaron is under consideration. As, however, the distinction was current in NT times, it was necessary to show that Christ fulfilled both offices.

(b) Hebrews dwells very carefully on Christ's offering as connected with His death on the cross, and also on His entrance into heaven as connected with His Ascension. The absence of reference to the Resurrection (except in Heb 13:20) is explained by the fact that there was no place for this event in the type. Attention is therefore called to the two parts of the one priestly function of offering which was connected with the Day of Atonement, the sacrifice of the animal without the camp (Heb 13:11-12), and the entrance into the Holiest with the blood of the animal sacrificed. Stress is laid on the Ascension because that is regarded as the moment of our High Priest's entrance into heaven on our behalf (Heb 9:12; Heb 9:24). It is the close association of these

two parts that explains Heb 8:3 'It is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer.' The view that this verse teaches that Christ is now continually offering Himself to God in heaven is clearly inconsistent with the rest of the Epistle, which lays such stress on the association of the offering with Christ's death, and which also dwells on the uniqueness and completeness of the offering (ἐφάπαξ, Heb 7:27, Heb 9:12; Heb 9:28), and on the session at God's right hand (the attitude of a victor, not an offerer). Further, the great and essential characteristic of the New Covenant is remission of sins (Heb 8:8, Heb 10:11-12), and this was possible only after the offering was completed (Heb 4:16, Heb 9:14-22). The aorist tense in Heb 8:3 seems decisive in associating the offering with the death. It may be 'timeless' (G. Milligan, *Theol. of the Ep. to the Hebrews*), but at least it is not continuous (Westcott, *in loc.*). If with A. B. Davidson we interpret this 'somewhat to offer' of the heavenly sanctuary, as seems only natural, the conditions are exactly fulfilled by the fact and at the moment of ascension, when Christ first appeared before God for us, and then sat down at the right hand of God, having fulfilled all the requirements of the work of offering and presentation of Himself on our behalf. The offering in Hebrews is invariably associated with sin, not with consecration; with Christ's death, not with His life; and offering is thereby shown to be the characteristic work of a priest. To regard our Lord as now offering, or representing, or re-presenting Himself in heaven, is to think of Him in the attitude of a worshipper instead of on the throne. His work of offering and presentation was finished before He sat down, and it is significant that what the author calls the 'pith,' or 'crowning-point' (κεφάλαιον) of the Epistle (Heb 8:1) is a 'high priest who is set down.' This exactly answers to the type on the Day of Atonement. When the high priest had presented the blood, his work was complete; and if we could imagine him able to remain there in the presence of God, he would stay on the basis of that complete offering and not as continuing to offer or present anything. Besides, there was no altar in the Holy of Holies, and there could therefore be no real sacrificial offering. Christ is not now at an altar or a mercy-seat, but on the throne. If it be said that intercession is an insufficient idea of His priestly life above, it may be answered that offering and intercession do not exhaust His heavenly life. His presence there on our behalf as our Representative includes everything. He Himself is (not merely His death was) the propitiation (1Jn 2:2). Does it not betoken a lack of spiritual perception to demand that Christ should always be doing something? Why may we not be content with the thought that He is there, and that in His presence above is the secret of peace, the assurance of access, and the guarantee of permanent relation with God? It is just at this point that one essential difference between type and antitype is noticed. The high priest went into the Holy of Holies 'with blood'; but when Christ's entrance into heaven is mentioned, He is said to have gone 'through his own blood,' *i.e.* His access is based on the offering on Calvary (Heb 9:12). It seems impossible, therefore, to extend the idea of Christ's offering to mean 'a present and eternal offering to God of His life in heaven' (W.

Milligan, *Ascension*, p. 116). Such a view finds no warrant in the Epistle, and everything against it in the emphasis laid on the association of Christ's offering with His death (Heb 7:27, Heb 9:13-14; Heb 9:24-28, Heb 10:10-14), and the uniqueness and completeness of that as culminating in the entrance into heaven. The death of Christ meant propitiation, the Ascension emphasizes access based upon this propitiation (Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 230).

(c) The use of the two priesthoods, Melchizedek's and Aaron's, is not to be interpreted of two aspects of priesthood,—one on earth and the other in heaven successively realized by Christ,—for this would be quite opposed to Heb 7:18, Heb 8:4. It means that there is one priesthood, of which Melchizedek is used for the person, and Aaron for the work. If Christ's death is associated with the Aaronic priesthood (against Heb 8:4), then the entrance into heaven must also be associated with Aaron (against Heb 6:20 et al.), which would leave no room at all for the Melchizedek priesthood. It is impossible for the death to be associated with one priesthood, and the ascension with the other. The order or nature of the priesthood according to Melchizedek gives validity and perpetuity to the acts which are symbolized in the Aaronic priesthood.

(6) *The personal qualifications of Christ as Priest.*—The practical and spiritual use made of priesthood in Hebrews gives special point to the emphasis laid on the personal qualifications of our Lord as High Priest. These are dealt with mainly from the human side up to Heb 5:9, and thenceforward from the Divine side. Both the human and the Divine are shown to be necessary. In regard to the human qualifications, we have: (a) His manhood, involving oneness with us for sympathy and help (ch. 2); (b) His perfect sympathy (Heb 4:14-16); (c) His perfect training by obedience through suffering (Heb 5:1-10). The Divine qualifications are: (a) His Divine appointment (Heb 5:10); (b) His indissoluble life (Heb 7:16), involving an uninterrupted tenure of office as contrasted with the constant deaths in the Aaronic priesthood; (c) His inviolable or intransmissible priesthood (Heb 7:24), involving the impossibility of succession or delegation (*ἀπαράβατον*); (d) His perpetual life of intercession (Heb 7:25); (e) His fitness through character (Heb 7:26); (f) the Divine guarantee in the Divine oath of appointment (Heb 7:28); (g) His position on the throne (Heb 8:1); (h) His perfect offering (Heb 9:12; Heb 9:24, Heb 10:12) These Divine and human qualifications of priesthood are based upon His Divine Sonship (ch. 1). His priesthood inheres in His Person as Son of God. It is this uniqueness as Son that gives Christ His qualifications for priesthood.

(7) *The spiritual work of Christ as Priest.*—The various aspects of His priestly work are shown in Hebrews as follows: (a) His propitiation (Heb 2:17); (b) His ability to suffer (Heb 2:16); (c) His ability to sympathize (Heb 4:15); (d) His ability to save

(Heb_7:25); (e) His present appearance in heaven for us (Heb_9:24); (f) His kingly position on the throne (Heb_8:1); (g) His coming again (Heb_9:28). These are the elements connected with His priestly work, though there are others which are associated with His more general and inclusive work as Redeemer. The work is at once perpetual and permanent. He offered Himself through an eternal spirit (Heb_9:14); He has made an eternal covenant (Heb_9:13-14); He is the cause of eternal salvation (Heb_5:9); He obtained eternal redemption (Heb_9:12), which culminates in eternal inheritance (Heb_9:15).

(8) *The practical uses of Christ's priesthood.*—The definitely practical purpose of the truth of priesthood is what must ever be kept in view. It is by means of the experience of Christ's priesthood that Christians come out of spiritual infancy into spiritual maturity (Heb_6:1, Heb_10:1). Nowhere is the practical character more clearly seen than in the various statements and exhortations which have to do with the daily life of the believer. In particular, there are the associated phrases, 'we have,' and 'therefore let us.' (a) Heb_4:14 Having the High Priest, let us hold fast. (b) Heb_4:15-16 Having a sympathetic High Priest, let us come boldly, (c) Heb_10:19 Having boldness of access, let us draw near with *faith*; having a High Priest, let us hold fast our *hope*, let us consider one another in *love*. Then these three exhortations to faith, hope, and love are amplified respectively in ch. 11 (faith), ch. 12 (hope), ch. 13 (love). (d) Heb_12:28 Receiving a kingdom, let us have grace, (e) Heb_13:12-13 Jesus suffered; let us go forth. (f) Heb_13:14 We seek a city to come, therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise. The Epistle thus emphasizes one truth above all others. Christianity is 'the religion of free access' to God (Bruce, *Hebrews*, p. 171). It might be summed up in the exhortations, 'Draw nigh,' 'Hold fast,' 'Draw not back.' It is characteristic that the word for believers is οἱ προσερχόμενοι, 'those who come right up' to God, and its corresponding exhortation is προσερχόμεθα, 'Let us come right up' to God. Christianity is the better hope by which we 'draw nigh' to God (ἐγγιζειν τῷ θεῷ), and Christ is the surety (ἔγγυος) of a better covenant, that is, One who ensures our permanent access to God (Bruce, *Hebrews*, p. 275). In proportion as we realize this privilege of nearness, and respond to these exhortations to draw near and keep near, we shall find that element of παρρησία which is one of the essential features of a strong Christian life. It is this above all that the priesthood of Christ is intended to produce and perpetuate, to guarantee and guard. This truth of priesthood, as taught in Hebrews, is absolutely essential to a vigorous life, a mature experience, a joyous testimony, and an abounding work.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, artt. 'Priest (in NT),' 'Hebrews'; W. Milligan, *Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord*; Davidson, *Hebrews*, Special Note on 'Priesthood of Christ'; Dimock, *Our One Priest on High*, and *The Christian*

Doctrine of Sacerdotium; Perowne, *Our High Priest in Heaven*; Rotherham, *Studies in Hebrews*; Soames, *The Priesthood of the New Covenant*; Hubert Brooke, *The Great High Priest*; H. W. Williams, *The Priesthood of Christ* (Fernley Lect. 1876); J. S. Candlish, *The Chr. Salvation* (1899), p. 6; G. Milligan, *Theol. of Ep. to Heb.* (1899) p. 111; R. C. Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood* (1897); A. S. Peake, 'Hebrews' in *Cent. Bible*; Beyschlag, *NT Theol.* ii. 315.

W. H. Griffith Thomas.

Prince

PRINCE.—There are four Gr. words occurring in the Gospels or applied to Christ in the NT which either in Authorized Version or Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 are rendered 'prince.'

1. ἡγεμόν, Mat 2:6. Both Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 here give 'princes'—the only occasion of ἡγεμόν being so rendered in NT. Otherwise it is almost invariably translated 'governor,' and, in particular, is used to denote the Roman governor or *procurator*. So of Pilate (Matthew 27 *passim*, Luk 20:20), as of Felix and Festus (Act 23:24; Act 23:26; Act 23:33-34; Act 26:30). The description of Bethlehem as 'in no wise least among the princes of Judah' is perplexing in view of Mic 5:2 [1]) from which the quotation is taken. The Heb. expression is בְּאֶרְבָּבָי 'among the thousands of' (LXX Septuagint ἐν χιλιάσιν). Differently pointed, however, the word becomes בְּרִאשֵׁי 'among the heads of thousands of,' *i.e.* the chieftains; and this apparently is the sense assigned to it in the quotation. It is worth noting that in the Gr. there is a close correspondence between the 'princes' (ἡγεμόνες) of Mic 5:6 a and the 'governor' (ἡγούμενος) of Mic 5:6 b. The whole verse, however, is a very free rendering of the Heb. (see the Comm.; and cf. Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iv. 185a).

2. δυνάστης, Luk 1:52. Here Authorized Version has 'the mighty,' but Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'princes.' Elsewhere in NT the word is used only in Act 8:27 of the Ethiopian eunuch (Authorized and Revised Versions 'of great authority') and in 1Ti 6:15 of God (Authorized and Revised Versions 'Potentate').

3. ἄρχων. In Mat 20:25 Authorized Version gives ‘the princes of the Gentiles,’ where Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 has ‘rulers.’ Similarly in Rev 1:5, as applied to Jesus, we have ‘prince [Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘ruler’] of the kings of the earth’—an expression that was probably suggested by the LXX Septuagint rendering of Psa 89:27 [88:28]. More important is the use of ἄρχων in two of the Gospels as applied to Satan in the phrases ἄρχων τῶν δαιμονίων (Mat 9:34; Mat 12:24, Authorized and Revised Versions ‘prince of the devils’), and ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου (Joh 12:31; Joh 14:30; Joh 16:11, Authorized and Revised Versions ‘prince of this world’). The Matthaean phrase calls for no remark, especially as in Joh 12:24 ‘the prince of the devils’ is said to be Beelzebub (wh. see). ‘The prince of this world,’ on the other hand, is a title that belongs to the special Johannine conception of the world as an order of things that is alienated from God and hostile to Him, and of Satan as a power dominating this sinful world and operating in it and through it (cf. Eph 2:2 ‘the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience’). But, according to the Johannine view (1Jn 4:4), ‘Greater is he that is in you than he that is in the world (ὁ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ).’ The secret of the Saviour’s superiority lay ultimately in His absolute sinlessness. The prince of this world came and had nothing in Him (Joh 14:30; cf. the Temptation narratives (Mat 4:1 ff., Luk 4:1 ff.)), and especially the offer of ‘all the kingdoms of the world’). The world was Satan’s, but Christ over-came the world (Joh 16:33). So far from finding in Jesus anything that he could claim as his own, the prince of this world was himself judged by Jesus (Joh 16:11), and by Him cast out (Joh 12:31; cf. Luk 10:18).

4. ἀρχηγός is twice applied to Christ in Acts in the expressions ‘Prince [Evm ‘Author’] of life’ (acts Act 3:15) and ‘a Prince and a Saviour’ (Act 5:31). Elsewhere the Gr. word is used in NT only in Heb 2:10; Heb 12:2, both times of Christ. In Heb 2:10 Authorized Version renders ‘captain,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘author,’ (Revised Version margin) ‘captain’; in Heb 12:2 Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 have ‘author,’ AVm [Note: Vm Authorized Version margin.] ‘beginner,’ (Revised Version margin) ‘captain.’ For the precise force of the word in the two passages in Heb. reference may be made to art. Captain. The ‘Prince’ (Vulgate *princeps*) of Act 5:31 is thoroughly justified in this connexion by both classical and LXX Septuagint usage, and is particularly appropriate if, as Chase suggests (*Credibility of Acts*, p. 130), we may see in the expression ‘a Prince and a Saviour’ an echo of ‘the current phraseology—liturgical and literary—of the Messianic hope.’ In Act 3:15, on the other hand, ‘Author of life’ (Vulgate *auctor vitæ*) is more suitable than ‘Prince of life.’ The use of ἀρχηγός with a causative force (often making it practically synonymous with ἄριστος, with which it is sometimes joined) is common in

Gr. writers from Plato downwards, more especially when it is followed by the genitive of the thing. Moreover, there is no suggestion here of that idea of 'leadership' which is in keeping with both of the passages in Hebrews, and seems best to bring out their full meaning.

Literature.—The Lexx. s.vv.; Alford's *Gr. Test.*; Westcott's *St. John*; Bruce and Dods in *EGT* [Note: *GT Expositor's Greek Testament.*]; Holtzmann in *Hand-Com.*; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Prince'; Chase, *Credibility of the Acts*, p. 129 ff.; Spurgeon, *The Messiah*, 163, 175.

J. C. Lambert.

Print

PRINT (τύπος, the mark of a stroke or blow; cf. Athen. τοὺς τύπους τῶν πληγῶν ἰδοῦσα).—In the Gospels 'print' is found only in Joh 20:25, where in most Manuscripts it occurs twice: 'Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and put my hand into his side, I will not believe' (for other uses of τύπος in NT see Grimm-Thayer and Cremer, s.v.).

At the second occurrence of the word a v.l. τόπον is found in AI, which Lach., Tisch., and Treg. [marg.] read (⌘ has εἰς τὴν χεῖρα (sic) αὐτοῦ). There is considerable variety in the Lat. VSS [Note: SS Versions.]; Cod. Brixianus (OL) gives 'nisi videro in manibus ejus locum clavorum et mittam digitum meum in foramina clavorum'; others read 'figuram' (so D [Note: Deuteronomist.] lat. in both places), which occurs in Vulgate for τύπος in Act 7:43, 1Co 10:6; 1Co 10:11; and 'fissuram' is also found. Vulgate gives 'nisi videro in manibus fixuram clavorum, et mittam digitum meum in locum clavorum.' 'Fixuram' seems to be a correction made by Jerome, since it is not found in the older codices; but it may mean the place where the nail was fixed. Augustine preferred the word 'cicatrix,' in one place (on 1Jn 1:3) quoting Thomas' words as 'non credam nisi digitos meos misero in locum clavorum, et cicatrices ejus tetigero'; in another (on Psalms 21:17 (Psa 22:17), 'nisi misero digitos meos in cicatrices vulnerum, non credam.' See full note in Wordsworth-White's *NT Lat.* (Oxford). The reading τόπος would bring out more strongly what is implied in the story, that Thomas required the evidence of his senses, both of seeing and feeling; he wished to see the τύπος, and put his finger into the τόπος; cf. Grotius, 'τύπος videtur,

τόπος impletur.’ Westcott, however, holds that this reading is nothing more than an early and natural mistake; and Godet says that it takes away from the denial of the disciple precisely its marked character of obstinacy, which is shown in the deliberate repetition of his phrases.

When Jesus appeared on the evening of the Resurrection to His disciples during the absence of Thomas, it is related that He showed them His hands and His feet, evidently bearing the marks of the wounds, in order to convince them of the reality and identity of His risen body (Luk 24:39, cf. Joh 20:20). He also offered them the testimony of their sense of feeling, ‘Handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having.’ Thomas refused to accept their account of what had taken place, and required that he himself should have proof similar to or even stronger than what they had received. The wounds inflicted upon Calvary were deeply engraven on his memory, and to all their repeated assurances (ἔλεγον, Joh 20:25) he had but one answer (εἶπεν). ‘Si Pharisaeus ita dixisset nil impetrasset, scd discipulo pridem probato nil non datur’ (Bengel). A week later Christ appeared again to the disciples, Thomas being present, and offered him just the test he had demanded, giving him back his own words, but making no mention of the prints of the nails, for ‘He does not recall the malice of His enemies’ (Alford). It is a moot question whether Thomas availed himself of this offer. Tertullian, Ambrose, Cyril, and others suppose that he did, but it is psychologically more probable that Thomas rose above such a material test; the presence of his Master, and the proof of His omniscience, shown in His knowledge of what Thomas had said on the former occasion, were sufficient; with a bound he rose to the vision of highest faith (so Meyer, Alford, Westcott, Edersheim, Dods, *et al.*). With this, too, agree the words of the Lord, ‘Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed,’ *not* ‘because thou hast touched me.’

If it be asked, how the prints of the wounds could be seen, and even remain open, in His risen and glorified body, it is but one of many difficulties arising from our ignorance as to the nature of that body. On the same occasion Christ entered the room with this same body in which the prints were visible, the doors being shut. Since, therefore, the account deals with matters of which we have no experience, we must accept the fact on sufficient evidence, even though we may not be able to account for it. Meanwhile there is deep significance in the fact that the marks of these wounds remain. They prove the reality of the Resurrection body, and its continuity with that body which was crucified; though Christ glorified was in many respects changed, yet He was essentially the same who suffered, seeing that the prints could become visibly present to Thomas and the others. They show also the abiding nature of His atoning work, and teach us to connect the issue of His Agony with His Work in triumph (cf. the use of the perfect tense, Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον,

in Mat 28:5, cf. 1Co 1:23). ‘The prints of the nails are not only signs of recognition, but also signs of victory.... He points to His wounded hands and feet as proving that He bears even within the veil the tokens of redeeming love. The conception is one on which Art has always loved to dwell. We must all have seen, again and again, figures of the Lord in glory raising His wounded hands to bless, or pleading even on the throne of judgment with those who have rejected Him by the marks of His death, so showing that by these He is still known; that by these He still proclaims the unchanging Gospel, “Redemption through sacrifice” ’ (Westcott, *The Revelation of the Risen Lord*, p. 69 f.). ‘He gave them confidence in His unfailing sympathy, by shewing that He bore even to the throne of heaven the marks of His dying love’ (*ib.* p. 79).

The marks (στίγματα) which St. Paul bore in his body (Gal 6:17) have by some been connected with these prints of our Lord’s passion, as if they were reproduced in the Apostle’s body, comparing 2Co 4:10, Rom 6:5-6 etc., and referring to the well-known *stigmata* of Francis of Assisi. But an entirely different explanation of the passage is now generally accepted, according to which the allusion is to marks of ownership branded on the bodies of temple slaves and others (see Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 , Lightfoot’s note *in loco*, and art. ‘Mark’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible iii. 245). See Stigmata.

See also artt. Crucifixion, Body.

W. H. Dundas.

☒ Prison

PRISON.—The fact that no fewer than eight different Heb. roots are used to express ‘prison’ (see Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible i. 525) in the OT, testifies to the number of prisoners in ancient times, and the variety of treatment which they experienced. Not only ordinary prison-houses, but also fortresses, barracks, palaces, and temples had commonly accommodation—more or less extensive—for prisoners, just as our rural police stations have cells attached to them for temporary confinement.

The Latin and Greek terms translated ‘prison’ are expressive and significant. *Carcer* (cf. Gr. ἔργαστος) emphasizes restraint. *Ergastulum* (lit. workhouse) corresponds to our ‘penitentiary.’ Malefactors and slaves laboured therein, as in the building where Samson had languished. The *Tullianum* at Rome was a condemned cell. Perhaps the

mildest form of imprisonment recorded in the NT was that of St. Paul (Act_28:30), when he dwelt for two whole years in his own hired house (μισθωσα, —see illustration in *Rome and its Story* by Tina Duff Gordon and St. Clair Baddeley, p. 114), guarded by, and probably chained to, a soldier. οἴκημα, in polite Attic usage used for a prison, is found once (Act_12:7). τήρησις, ‘the place of keeping’ (Act_4:3; Act_5:18), translation ‘hold’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘ward’) and ‘prison’ (probably that attached to the Temple or the high priest’s palace, Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible iv. 103), also suggests the mildest form of restraint. The φυλακή or place of guarding, in which John the Baptist was confined (Mat_14:3), is believed to have been in the royal palace of Machaerus (Josephus *Ant.* xviii. v. 2). Custody in a φυλακή might mean anything, from the comparative comfort of a guard-room to the misery of a dungeon. Another word translated ‘prison’ is δεσμοτήριον, the ‘place of bonds.’ It is used interchangeably with φυλακή in speaking of John the Baptist’s prison (Mat_11:2), and became painfully familiar to the first preachers of the Cross in the course of their mission, arj journeyings. See also following article.

If those mutilations and other horrid cruelties, familiar to the older pagan world, were less common, still vindictiveness rather than reformation was a note of imprisonment at the dawn of the Christian era. The LXX Septuagint translates the place of Zedekiah’s imprisonment at Babylon οἰκία μύλωνος, ‘the millhouse’ (Jer_52:11). Grinding corn in a millhouse is a somewhat more humane punishment than hard labour on the treadmill, and some of the tasks allotted to inmates of an *ergastulum* may have been no more disagreeable than picking oakum. But much more severe treatment was often the unhappy prisoner’s lot. In our Lord’s parable of the Unforgiving Servant, that ungrateful wretch fell into the hands of *torturers* (τοῖς βασιανισταῖς, Mat_18:34)—a staff of officials whose very name is sinister. One means of torture was an instrument (ξύλον, Lat. *nervus*) in which the bodies of victims were confined. It is described as ‘a wooden block or frame in which the feet and sometimes the hands and neck of prisoners were confined’ (Robinson, *Gr. Lex. of NT*). In such durance were Paul and Silas placed at Philippi (Act_16:24). The condemned cell of a Roman prison resembled that dungeon in the court of the prison into which Jeremiah was let down with cords, and where he sank in the mire (Jer_38:6). ‘They were pestilential cells, damp and cold, from which the light was excluded, and where the chains rusted on the limbs of the prisoners’ (Conybeare-Howson, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, i. 358). The *Career Mamertinus* on the slope of the Capitoline of Rome, and the traditional scene of St. Paul’s last imprisonment, is typical of Roman prisons all over the world during Rome’s supremacy. It consists of two chambers, one above the

other—the upper one an ‘irregular quadrilateral.’ The lower, ‘originally accessible only through a hole in the ceiling, is 19 ft. long, 10 ft. wide, and 6 1/2 ft. high. The vaulting is formed by the gradual projection of the side walls until they meet.’ This prison is supposed to have been built over a well named *Tullianum*, and hence traditionally attributed to Servius Tullius (see Varro, v. 151). An inscription records that it was restored in b.c. 22 (Baedeker, *Italy*, ii. p. 226). See also art. Hell (Descent into).

Literature.—Besides the authorities referred to above, see the Commentaries, *ad loc.*; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, artt. ‘Crimes’ and ‘Prison’; Conybeare-Howson, *Life of St. Paul*, i. 357 f.; Farrar, *Life of St. Paul*, i. 497, ii. 390 ff., 547.

D. A. Mackinnon.

☒ Prisoner

PRISONER.—The word ‘prisoner’ (δέσμιος) is found in the Gospels only in Mat 27:15-16, Mar 15:6 (see also, however, Luk 23:17 (Revised Version margin)), where it is used of the prisoner whom the Roman governor was wont to release to the Jews at the Feast of Passover, and in particular of Barabbas, a ‘notable prisoner’ of the time. But, apart from the word, we read of other prisoners in the Gospels, and both there and elsewhere in the NT we learn something of the attitude of Christ to the prisoner, and the prisoner’s relations and obligations to Christ.

1. Of actual prisoners there are two in the Gospels much more ‘notable’ than Barabbas. The first is John the Baptist, who for righteousness’ sake was ‘cast into prison’ (Mat 14:3, Mar 6:17, Luk 3:20, Joh 3:24), and whose imprisonment so affected his strong, free spirit that for a time his faith in Christ appears to have faltered (Mat 11:2 ff.). The other is Jesus Himself, who was arrested (Mat 26:50) in the Garden, and taken in bonds (Joh 18:24 δεδεμμένος [which is practically equivalent to δέσμιος; cf. Mar 15:6 with Mar 15:7]) first before the high priest and then before Pilate (Mat 27:2, Mar 15:1, Joh 18:12; Joh 18:24).

2. The fact that the prisoners of the Gospels include a robber (Joh 18:40) and murderer (Mar 15:7, Luk 23:25) like Barabbas on the one hand, and John the Baptist and Jesus on the other, shows the necessity of discriminating between prisoners, and especially of distinguishing those who deserve their punishment (cf. the admission of the penitent robber, Luk 23:41) from those who ‘suffer wrongfully.’ To the former class Barabbas certainly belonged. His imprisonment was the reward of his crimes

([Luk_23:25](#)); and so long as crimes like his are committed against society, imprisonment will still be necessary. With all His pity for the prisoner, Jesus recognizes that there are cases in which a just judge will cast the offender into prison ([Mat_5:25](#)). But there are wrongful imprisonments as well as merited ones; and our Lord warned His disciples that a time would come when they themselves should be cast into prison for His name's sake ([Luk_21:12](#))—a warning that was soon abundantly fulfilled in the experience of the Apostles and the early Church ([Act_4:3](#); [Act_5:18](#); [Act_8:3](#); [Act_12:4](#); [Act_16:24](#) etc.).

3. In the Gospels Jesus comes before us as the prisoner's Friend. He proves His friendship (1) *by the deliverance He brings*. In the synagogue at Nazareth, at the very outset of His ministry ([Luk_4:17](#) ff.), He applied to Himself the glowing words of the great Messianic prophet ([Isa_61:1](#) f.), and so assumed the office of one who came 'to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound.' There is, of course, a spiritual sense in which Christ fulfils this promise—by pulling down the dungeon walls of ignorance and error, by giving liberty to the human spirit, by striking off the fetters of sin. But in a more literal fashion Christ brought deliverance to the captives by destroying the very foundations of earthly tyrannies, and making it impossible that in any society which had learned to breathe the air of His gospel men should be cast into prison to gratify the pleasure of a despot or the rage of the persecutor. 'Christ died on the tree,' Carlyle said to Emerson: 'that built Dunscore kirk yonder' (Emerson, *Works*, ii. p. 8). And in a like sense we may say that it was Christ's hand on Calvary that tore down the walls of the Bastille, and abolished the iniquities of the Spanish Inquisition.

(2) Again, Jesus proves His friendship for the prisoner *by the sympathy He gives*. We see an illustration of this sympathy in the message of consolation and blessing that He sent to John the Baptist ([Mat_11:4-6](#)) when the forerunner's heart was like to faint in the gloomy vaults of Machaerus. But above all we see it in those haunting words of self-identification with the prisoner: 'I was in prison, and ye came unto me' ([Mat_25:36](#)); 'I was in prison, and ye visited me not' ([Mat_25:43](#)). It is not merely with the righteous man who suffers wrongfully that our Lord here identifies Himself, but with the prisoner as such—the criminal, it may be, the pest of society, the man who deserves to die. It was Christ's love and pity for the prisoner that inspired the philanthropic labours of John Howard and Elizabeth Fry, and led to that great transformation in the prisoner's immemorial lot which is as much one of the 'Gesta Christi' as the modern missionary movement.

4. In the letters of St. Paul's captivity we find the Apostle describing himself as 'the prisoner of Jesus Christ,' or 'the prisoner of the Lord' ([Eph_3:1](#); [Eph_4:1](#), [Phm_1:9](#); cf. [2Ti_1:8](#)). It is a striking expression, which is by no means exhausted when understood to mean that Paul suffered imprisonment for the sake of Christ. It means

that, without doubt; but it means much more (cf. Eph 3:1 ‘the prisoner of Christ Jesus in behalf of you Gentiles,’ where ‘the δέσμιος of Christ’ represents himself as suffering *for the Gentiles’ sake*). The man who so describes himself believes that Christ has laid His arresting hand upon him, and put him where he is, and shut to the door of his prison; and that it is no other than the Lord Jesus who carries the key of that door at His girdle. St. Paul, in short, thought of Christ as the Keeper of the prison, and the thought filled him with profound content (cf. Php 4:11). Like St. Peter, he had learned in his own experience that the Lord could unlock prison doors at His pleasure and set his servants free (Act 16:26; cf. Act 12:6 ff.). And if some day the door should be opened only that the prisoner of Christ might be led forth to die, Paul knew that this would really mean his escape through Christ’s grace to a larger liberty than he could find on earth (2Co 5:1-8). And so, as the midnight hymns that he and Silas sang to God in the prison at Philippi compelled all the prisoners to listen (Act 16:25), the world has had to hearken ever since to those notes of wonder, love, and praise that turn St. Paul’s prison-Epistles into prison-songs.

J. C. Lambert.

☒ Procurator

PROCURATOR.—A ‘procurator’ (the exact Gr. equivalent is ἐπιτροπος) was properly a slave or freedman who looked after (*procurabat*) a man’s property (cf. Mat 20:8, Luk 8:2). The nearest English equivalent is ‘steward’ (wh. see). This upper servant acted for his master, in the absence of the latter, in all matters connected with money, and it may safely be said that only a small estate amongst the Romans would be without one. The position was one of responsibility, but it is obvious that the importance of the person in the world was directly in proportion to the importance of his master. An agent of the Emperor, who always possessed vast landed and house property, as well as the whole or part of the taxes of every province of the Roman Empire, held a higher position in society than the procurator of any other person. The Emperor’s financial interests were so varied, that he required a large number of such servants to look after them, and his high position enabled him to draw them from a higher class than that of freedmen and slaves. The majority of them were of equestrian rank, and some of these procurator-ships were deemed of higher importance than others. The diverse character of their duties will be seen from the fact that Cagnat (*Cours d’Épigraphie Latine*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 121 ff.) enumerates thirty-nine different kinds or procurators, whose titles have reference to every possible aspect of the Emperor’s revenue and expenditure.

Certain of the smaller Imperial provinces (see under Governor) were put under procurators as governors, to whom the Emperor delegated administrative and military functions. Such a procuratorship was, of course, one of the highest of the Imperial procuratorships, and carried with it a large salary; but it must be clearly understood that a procurator, however high, remained a servant of the Emperor, and owed his life and fortune solely to the favour of the prince, who advanced those quickest who served his interests best. The word 'procurator' is not used in the NT, but the participle of the verb (ἐπιτροπεύοντος) occurs as a variant in Luk 3:1 to ἡγεμονεύοντος, a more general term applicable to all governors of provinces, and even to the Emperor himself. Pontius Pilate was *procurator prouinciæ iudææe*. See also. art. Governor.

Literature.—Greenidge, *Roman Public Life*, pp. 414 ff., 435; Schürer, *GJV* [Note: *JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , i. 454 ff. [HJP [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] i. ii. 166 ff.]; art. 'Procurator' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible and the *Encyc. Bibl.*; Hirschfeld, *Untersuchungen aus dem Gebiete der röm. Verwaltungsgesch.* ² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (Berlin, 1905); Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, i. 554 ff.

Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] Souter.

☞ Prodigal Son

PRODIGAL SON.—The details of this parable (Luke 15) seem to have been carefully thought out, as the structure of the story is fairly complete and its movement quite natural. The younger of a certain man's sons, dissatisfied with the quiet life he is leading, resolves to leave his father's house; and, having received the share of property that fell to him, goes to a distant country and gives himself up with the fullest abandonment to every indulgence that appetite craved. But his career of gaiety and dissipation soon comes to an end. He passes from one stage to another in his downward course till he reaches the lowest. Without a friend and in the direst straits, he is forced to take service as a swine-herd—a grade of employment esteemed by Jewish society as the lowest. The misery to which he had brought himself, however, and the neglect from which he suffers, show him how great has been his folly and how wrong his conduct. He therefore resolves to return home, confess his fault, and solicit the place of a servant in his father's household. He carries out his intention, but his father receives him with the greatest eagerness and affection, and orders a feast to be prepared in celebration of his safe return.

The elder brother, however, is very indignant, and refuses to take any part in the general rejoicing. His father entreats him to enter into the spirit of the occasion; but he is obstinate and petulant, and complains that this display in honour of his brother is in marked contrast with the treatment accorded him. He who had lived at home in dutiful submission had not received the slightest token in recognition of his merits or services, whereas his brother who had squandered his means in a career of vice is being honoured in the most enthusiastic and lavish manner.

Here, then, we have a father and his son differing as to how a younger son who had grievously misbehaved himself ought to be treated. The fact of the young man's wrongdoing and the sincerity of his repentance are accepted by both; but while the elder brother challenges the justice and propriety of rejoicing over the return of one who had been so headstrong and foolish, the father firmly defends the course he had followed, and, in terminating the discussion, speaks with a finality that is not to be questioned: 'It was *meet* that we should make merry and be glad: for this thy brother was dead, and is alive again; and was lost, and is found.'

The prodigal is a minor character in the parable. The contrast is drawn between the father and the elder brother in reference to their treatment of the wrongdoer, and not between the brothers either in regard to character or conduct. The substance of the parable is this: a father who welcomes back an erring and repentant son has his action emphatically approved, and an elder brother who maintains an attitude of surly aloofness is shown to merit severe disapprobation.

The parable is thus practical in its aim—teaching men not only how they ought to treat their repentant brethren, but chiefly what is necessary to enable them to do so. For what was it that led the father to act as he did? Was it not just the love he bore his son, foolish and erring though he had been? The elder son reasoned on the lines of cold and rigid law, whereas the heart of the father spoke, and the voice of love was obeyed. And was it not just the want of this affectionate heart that allowed the elder brother to act so ungenerously? Had he loved his brother, he would have vied with his father in the warmth of his welcome; had he even loved his father, he would have acquiesced in his father's wish for his father's sake. It was poverty of affection that led him to display a selfishness that was offensive, and a temper that was childish and rude. What could the father do?—a son he loved and had lost was home again safe and sound—a son who had gone forth to a rude world had returned disillusioned and chastened by his bitter experience.

In the first instance, no doubt, the parable was meant to point out the defect in the Jewish way of dealing with those who had sinned. What was clearly lacking there was a brotherly spirit. Those who had erred were treated with unrelenting severity; the sinner looked in vain for mercy and hoped in vain for restoration, no matter how

painful and prolonged his period of repentance had been. But what was true for the Jews is true for all. Love alone is capable of rendering the conscience sensitive to the finest shades of justice. Law rigidly applied does not scrutinize the motive, does not measure the force of temptation, does not take into account the fact of repentance, and is therefore often unjust when in appearance it is most just. The father showed mercy because he loved his son, and in showing mercy dispensed the truer justice; for mercy is but justice perfectly applied. The elder brother failed in his duty to brother and father alike, because he lacked the affection that would have swept away his shallow notions of justice, and pointed out a better way.

The parable thus emphasizes one aspect of the great commandment of our Lord, that men should love one another; and in this respect shows a close resemblance to several of His other parables. In that of the Good Samaritan, the Priest and the Levite saw no duty they owed to the wounded Jew, whereas the heart of the Samaritan—a member of a despised race—responded at once to the demands of the situation. And in that of the Labourers in the Vineyard, is it not the mean and grudging spirit of the whole-day labourers that is condemned, since their rights were not infringed nor their interests invaded by the generous treatment accorded to the late-comers?

What men require in their dealings with one another is the loving heart, and in dealing with our erring and repentant brethren nothing else will give the insight and tenderness needed to fulfil the ends of real justice. In the sympathy of Christ lay the secret of His power. No one who had paid the penalty of his transgression in bitter repentance was refused His countenance or His help; and the moral sense of mankind, quickened by a genuine brotherly love, will ever admit that His way is the right way—will ever say to the harsh and unforgiving, It is 'meet that we should make merry and be glad: for this thy brother was dead, and is alive again; and was lost, and is found.'

Literature.—Goebel, *Parables of Jesus*; A. B. Bruce, *Parabolic Teaching of Christ*; M. Dods, *Parables of Our Lord*; Trench, *Notes on the Parables*; Arnot, *Parables of Our Lord*; W. M. Taylor, *Parables of Our Saviour*; also F. W. Robertson's *Sermons*, iii. 253; Dale, *Ep. of James and Other Discourses*, 160; Ballard, *The Penitent Prodigal*; Hancock, *The Return to the Father*; Willcox, *The Prodigal Son*; *Expositor*, i. ix. [1879] 137, 111. viii. [1888] 268, 388, x. [1889] 122; *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times.*] vii. [1896] 325; Parker, *People's Bible*.

D. G. Young.

PROFANING, PROFANITY

1. The terms.—The word ‘profane’ occurs only once in Authorized and Revised Versions of the Gospels, and then in the verbal form (Gr. βεβηλόω), viz. in Mat 12:5, where Jesus says, in defending His disciples and Himself from the charge of Sabbath-breaking, ‘Have ye not read in the law, how that on the sabbath day the priests in the temple profane the sabbath, and are guiltless?’ Elsewhere in NT the vb. (Gr. and Eng.) is found only in Act 24:6, where the Jews accuse St Paul of profaning the Temple. The meaning of βεβηλόω must be considered in connexion with the adj. βέβηλος from which it comes, and which is found 5 times in NT (1Ti 1:9; 1Ti 4:7; 1Ti 6:20, 2Ti 2:15, Heb 12:16), ‘profane’ being in each case the rendering of Authorized and Revised Versions. βέβηλος is the almost exact equivalent of Lat. *profanus*, whence English ‘profane.’ *Profanus* (fr. *pro* = ‘before,’ and *fanum* = ‘temple’) means ‘without the temple,’ and so ‘unconsecrated,’ as opposed to *sacer*. βέβηλος (fr. βαίνω = ‘to go,’ whence βηλός = ‘threshold’) denotes that which is ‘trodden,’ ‘open to access,’ and so again ‘unconsecrated,’ in contrast to ιερός. Originally βέβηλος (like its opposites, ιερός, ἅγιος, etc.) had a purely ritual meaning, but out of this there gradually arose ethical and spiritual connotations. The LXX Septuagint affords plentiful illustration of these various uses of the word. In Lev 10:10, e.g., βέβηλος means no more than ἀκάθαρτος, as the context shows, i.e. ritually unclean. In Lev 19:29 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘Profane [Authorized Version ‘Prostitute’] not thy daughter,’ the ethical meaning is apparent. In Eze 22:26, with its clear distinction between βέβηλος and ἅγιος, together with its conception of a profaning of God Himself, we pass from the moral into the still higher realm of spiritual religion. Similarly, in the Gospels we find a lower and a higher conception of what is meant by profanation. There is a profaneness of the law and the letter, eagerly pounced upon by scribes and Pharisees. There is a profaneness of the soul and the spirit, which stands revealed to the eyes of Jesus.

2. The sin.—The sin of profaning consists in treating sacred things with irreverence or contempt, and in the Bible the charge of profanation is found especially in connexion with the desecration or violation of *the Sabbath*, of *the Temple*, or of *the name of God* Himself. In a study of Christ’s life and teaching the sin of profaning comes up for consideration under each of these heads.

(1) *Profaning the Sabbath.*—It is significant that the only occasion of the use of the word ‘profane’ (βεβηλόω) in the Gospels is in relation to a charge of Sabbath-breaking

brought against Jesus (Mat_12:5). For, though it is Our Lord Himself who employs the word, and employs it of the action of the priests under the Mosaic Law, He evidently does so with reference to an accusation of which He was the object.* [Note: It is an interesting coincidence that in the LXX account of the incident at Nob (1Sa_21:4), to which Jesus alludes in the preceding verse, βιβηλοι ἄρτοι is Ahimelech's expression for 'common bread,' as distinguished from ἅγιοι ἄρτοι or 'shew-bread.'] And this, we must remember, was no solitary case. There was nothing that more frequently brought Jesus into hot collision with the ecclesiastical authorities than the question of Sabbath observance (with Mat_12:1 ff. cf. Mat_12:10 ff., Mar_1:21 ff; Mar_2:23 ff; Mar_3:2 ff., Luk_6:1 ff., Luk_6:6 ff., Luk_13:14 ff., Luk_14:3 ff., Joh_5:9 ff., Joh_5:16; Joh_5:18; Joh_7:22 f., Luk_9:14 ff.; note esp. the Johannine passages). In their eyes He was repeatedly guilty of a profanation of the holy day. And, though on this occasion He defends Himself by appealing to Jewish law and history, thus meeting His accusers on their own ground, He immediately passes from this *argumentum ad hominem* to state the great principles on which He really stood in His free, though reverent (cf. Luk_4:16), use of the day—that God desires mercy rather than sacrifice (Mat_12:7), and that 'the Son of Man is Lord of the sabbath' (Mat_12:8). In other words, He shows that the charge of Sabbath profanation, as brought against Him, rested on a wrong conception of Sabbath sanctity; and the charge of breaking a Divine law, on an entirely false idea of God's meaning and purpose in giving the Law (cf. Mar_2:27 'The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath'). There is a profanation according to the letter that is not a profanation according to the spirit; and there is a seeming transgression of the commandment that is in reality a revelation of the benignity of the Law itself and the 'philanthropy' of Him who gave it. See, further, Sabbath.

(2) *Profaning the Temple.*—Jealous as the Jewish authorities were, after their slavish fashion, in the guardianship of the Sabbath, they were not less jealous in defending the sanctity of the Temple against the least taint of what they regarded as profanation. The Temple police were ever on the alert. For any foot of Gentile or Samaritan to pass beyond the Court of the Gentiles meant death to the transgressor. And Josephus tells us how at one period the Samaritans were altogether excluded from the Temple enclosure because of an act of profanation committed by some of their people (*Ant.* xviii. ii. 2). The indignation shown by the chief priests and scribes at the hosannas of the children in the Temple was apparently due not merely to the hailing of Jesus as the Son of David, but to the raising of those joyful shouts within the consecrated building (Mat_21:16). But, as Jesus in meeting the charge of Sabbath-breaking showed how misplaced the Rabbinic and Pharisaic ideas of sanctity were, so in connexion with the Cleansing of the Temple (Mat_21:12 f. = Mar_11:15 ff. = Luk_19:45 f., Joh_2:13 ff.), He showed how low and poor were their views on the subject of profanation.

The presence of the stall-keepers and cattle-drovers and money-changers was strictly within the letter of the Law, since it was in the Court of the Gentiles that this market was held, *i.e.* outside of the sacred area proper. For the Temple authorities this was quite enough; they had no compunctions about a traffic that was technically legal—least of all as the rents paid by the traders for the privilege of using the Temple court as a bazaar passed into their own pockets. To Jesus this was an illustration of the readiness of the Jewish leaders ‘to blend religious rigorism and utter worldliness,’ or, in His own words on another occasion, to ‘strain out the gnat and swallow the camel’ (Mat_23:24). Thus they had made His Father’s house ‘an house of merchandise’ (Joh_2:16); nay, a very ‘den of robbers’ (Mat_21:13 ||)—an allusion either to the greed and extortion of the high-priestly family as landlords of the enclosure, or to the shameful and notorious cheating practised by the privileged traders on the ignorant country people who came up to the Feasts. Moreover, this was ‘the house of prayer’ (Mat_21:13 ||)—the place to which pious folk came up for purposes of detachment and recollection and communion with God. And by reason of these abuses, such worshippers had first to make their way through the distracting scenes of this profane bazaar; and even as they knelt at prayer on the other side of the boundary, to have their ears filled with the noisy cries of the merchants, the bleating of innumerable sheep, and the lowing of excited cattle.

In the eyes of Jesus all this, however it might be defended by ecclesiastical lawyers, was a desecration of His Father’s house, inasmuch as it was a hindrance to true spiritual worship. And the principles He lays down here on the subject of worship and its profanation are far-reaching and penetrating. The Temple at Jerusalem has long since vanished from the world, but the acts and words of Jesus in driving out the profane traffickers still find abundant application. Our Lord condemns everything that brings the spirit of the world into the atmosphere of the sanctuary, and turns the house of prayer into a house of merchandise. Much more does He condemn anything that associates His Church with methods and practices that are not even those of honest merchandise, but have the savour of dishonest gain. See, further, Temple, § ‘Cleansing of’.

(3) *Profaning God’s name.*—For this form of the sin of profanation the word ‘profanity’ is usually reserved, a word that is to be distinguished from blasphemy (wh. see)—though the distinction is not always observed, nor, indeed, possible. Blasphemy (*βλασφημία* = ‘evil-speaking’) is an insult offered to God’s majesty, and, in particular, a deliberate reviling of God and of Divine things. Profanity, on the other hand, is a taking of God’s name in vain (Exo_20:7)—understanding ‘name’ in the scriptural sense of ‘anything whereby God maketh Himself known’ (*Shorter Catech.*, Qu. 55). Profanity may, and often does, run into blasphemy, but the word finds its proper application in an irreverent treatment of holy things without the motive of the

scoffer. When Peter began ‘to curse and to swear (καταθεματιζειν καὶ ὀμνυειν), I know not the man’ (Mat 26:74, cf. Mar 14:71), he was not guilty of intentional blasphemy; he was in reality employing the most solemn forms of Jewish asseveration (cf. Num 5:21 ‘an oath of cursing,’ and see *EBi [Note: Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.]*, art. ‘Oath’). But he was guilty of profanity, for he was invoking the Divine name in support of a lie.

There was no kind of profanation against which the Jewish Rabbis were more anxious to guard than the sin of profane language. The hedge they made around the Law was particularly high at this point. Through a mistaken interpretation of Lev 24:16 they forbade the very utterance of the name *Jahweh*, and so, in the reading of the OT, *Adonai* or *Elohim* was invariably substituted. Partly, no doubt, for similar reasons, there had grown up in the time of Christ a custom of swearing not by the Divine name, but by heaven or earth or Jerusalem or the Temple (Mat 5:33-37; Mat 23:16-22)—though there emerges here, alongside of the desire to avoid the use of God’s name, the consideration that such oaths were less binding than those in which God was directly invoked (contrast the high priest’s adjuration ‘by the living God’ at the trial of Jesus, Mat 26:63). And here again, as in His cleansing of the Temple, our Lord showed how poor and mean the thoughts of the Rabbis were on the subject of profanation. That system of diluted oaths was a miserable piece of casuistry at the best. For an oath has no meaning if it is not an invocation of the Divine Being Himself as a witness; and, besides, heaven is God’s throne and the earth His footstool, Jerusalem is the city of the Great King, and the Temple the place of His indwelling (Mat 5:34 f., Mat 23:16 ff.). Moreover, those legal refinements lent themselves to all sorts of falsehood and deceit in the intercourse of men, and thus became a prostitution of the holiest realities to wicked ends. And so Jesus lays down the general principle, ‘Swear not at all’ (Mat 5:34). Make no distinctions among your statements by the use of a graduated scale of oaths, as if, while you are bound to be truthful in regard to some of the things you say, you are otherwise free to shade off your language into the veriest falsehood by diminishing grades of protestation. ‘But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay’ (Mat 5:37, cf. Jam 5:12). See, further, Oaths.

Literature.—The Lexx. 8.vv. βεβηλόω, βέβηλος, βλασφημέα; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, artt. ‘Oath,’ ‘Temple’; *EBi [Note: Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.]*, art. ‘Oath’; *PRE [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.]*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , art. ‘Eid bei den Hebräern’; Edersheim, *LT [Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].]* ; Schürer, *HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]* ii. ii. 90-125; R. W. Dale, *Ten Commandments*, p. 61 ff.; J. O. Dykcs, *Manifesto of the King*, p. 265 ff.; F. J. Coffin, ‘The Third Commandment’ in *JBL [Note: BL Journal of Biblical Literature.]* xix. (1900) 166.

⚠️ Profession

PROFESSION.—In Biblical usage, to ‘profess’ is to make a public declaration (Mat_7:23, Deu_26:3); then to take a certain stand or attitude (1Ti_2:10 ‘which becometh women professing godliness’); and, lastly, to make an unjustifiable pretension or claim (Rom_1:22, 1Ti_6:21, Tit_1:16). In general, profession and confession are so closely related that one Greek word (ὁμολογέω) is employed indifferently for both; and the Authorized Version has not clearly distinguished between them. Yet they are by no means identical; for while both words imply the utterance or declaration of faith or of fact, confession invariably implies that there is harmony between what is declared and the inward thought or feeling of the speaker, while profession carries no such implication.

Thus the word ‘confess’ answers in the OT to הִתְחַוָּה, which always implies the utterance of genuine faith or feeling (Hiph. = *humbly and thankfully to acknowledge God’s name and goodness*, 1Ki_8:33; 1Ki_8:35 [LXX Septuagint ἐξουολογέομαι]; Hithp. = *contritely to confess sin*, Lev_5:5; Lev_16:21 [LXX Septuagint ἐξαγορεύω]); while ‘profess’ answers to הִגִּיד = ‘tell out,’ ‘declare,’ ‘make manifest’ (it may be in the way of thankful acknowledgment, Deu_26:3, or of not concealing one’s sin, Psa_38:18, or even of showing forth one’s sin openly and impudently, Isa_3:9 ‘They declare their sin as Sodom’). The difference reappears in the NT, where ‘confess’ is used as translation of ἐξομολογέομαι, which is exactly parallel to הִתְחַוָּה in both its senses, and also as translation of ὁμολογιέω in the specific sense of publicly owning one’s relationship of faith and devotion to Christ, Mat_10:32, Luk_12:8; whereas ‘profess’ answers to ἐπαγγέλλομαι = *to make a profession*, whether sincerely or not; φάσκω = *to assert or pretend*; and to ὁμολογέω in the sense of making a formal declaration, or in the bad sense of making an outward pretence. Thus, while the one word has received a deep religious impress, the other is restricted to the sense of making a public declaration, a declaration which may or may not be sincere and justified by facts. The Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, in substituting ‘confession’ for ‘profession’ in the translation of ὁμολογία, for the owning of the Christian faith (Heb_3:1) or the faith which the Christian owns (4:14), has logically followed the rendering of ὁμολογέω in

its specific Christian significance, and has helped to put the distinction between the two terms in clearer light.

The 'profession' of Christ or of Christianity is at once more and less than the confession of Christ. It is more than confession; for while the latter is the witness to actual faith or feeling, profession also covers all ill-grounded utterances to which there is little or nothing in the heart to correspond. And profession is also less than confession: it is limited to the verbal expression of faith, while confession gives evidence of itself in the tone and conduct of life as well. Confession shows itself in the exercise of faith as well as in the assertion of it. The distinction between profession and confession is valuable when we consider the varying emphasis laid by the Gospels on verbal testimony as an element in the confession of Christ. The duty of verbal profession is at times strongly insisted on (see Confession [of Christ], ii. and iii.), mainly because it was the sign of loyalty and steadfastness of faith. Yet the value of such professions depended on the occasions that called them forth, as well as on their genuineness and their seasonableness. Christ regarded them as peculiarly valuable in times of stress and growing opposition. So He prized the bold testimony of Peter at Caesarea Philippi as being a sign of the rock-fast loyalty of His disciple (Mat 16:17-19); so also He mourned over the later weakness of the disciples and the verbal denial of Peter, as betokening a certain diminution of their allegiance (Mar 14:27; Mar 14:30, Luk 22:61). At the same time, Christ repudiated many kinds of profession, and taught to His disciples a certain duty of reserve in the utterance of their faith. It goes without saying that He repudiated all insincere professions; and He knew that these were to be found not only among the Pharisees, but also among His own followers (Mat 7:22; Mat 21:30). He also feared the egoism of professions of goodness (Luk 18:9-14), and the boldness of professions of constancy that might not be realized. Hence the coldness of His attitude to professions like that of the new disciple who said, 'Lord, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest' (Luk 9:57-58), or to Peter's hasty word, 'If I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee' (Mar 14:31). But, further, Christ repeatedly cautioned His followers against all ill-timed testimony. As He Himself practised a certain reserve in His own teaching (Joh 16:12), He also frequently laid upon His followers injunctions of silence. So in cases of healing He charges those who have seen or experienced His power to tell no man what He has done (Mar 3:12; Mar 5:43; Mar 7:36), and after the scenes at Caesarea Philippi and on the Mount of Transfiguration the same injunction follows (Mar 8:30, Mar 9:9). No doubt there were temporary reasons for such reserve on Christ's part, and for such injunctions of reserve; and He looked forward to the time when the things He had taught and done in private should be proclaimed upon the housetops (Mat 10:27), and when the disciples should be so fully established in the faith that no further reserve should be necessary. But in any case Christ desired no hasty testimonies in His favour. It was as if He said: The profession of My name is not always needful: its value depends on its seasonableness, and the maturity of the faith

lying behind it. Wait till the times are ripe and faith is ripe; till the private confession wells forth irresistibly from the lips; or till the crisis comes when everyone is called to proclaim his faith. There will come occasions when to refrain from declaring one's faith may be equivalent to disowning and denial, or at least to cowardice. Then those who have been confessing Christ in heart and life will also profess their faith boldly with their lips, and face all the consequences of their profession. It is then, when the day and hour are calling for a clear and living testimony, that profession becomes one with confession, and the word has fullest force: 'Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father which is in heaven' (Mat_10:32 f.).

J. Dick Fleming.

☞ Profit

PROFIT

Two Gr. words are so rendered: (1) ὠφελέω, *to further, help, profit*: Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'profit,' Mat_15:5 (= Mar_7:11) 16:26 (= Mar_8:36, Luk_9:25 Authorized Version 'advantage'), Joh_6:63; 'prevail,' Mat_27:24, Joh_12:19; 'be bettered,' Mar_5:26; (2) συμφέρω, *to bear or bring together*; 'be profitable,' Mat_5:29-30; Mat_18:6; 'be expedient,' Mat_19:10 (Authorized Version 'good'), Joh_11:50; Joh_18:14; Joh_16:7.

The address of Jesus is, for the most part, to the highest in human nature; but sometimes a less heroic note is struck, and there is direct appeal to the instinctive impulses of self-regard and self-preservation, and to the instincts of gain and the anxieties of the balance-sheet. The analogy of profitable trading gives force to the parables of the Talents and the Pounds (Mat_25:14 ff., Luk_19:12 ff.), but in one great saying the appeal to what may be termed the business instincts is direct: 'What shall a man be profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and forfeit his life? or what shall a man give in exchange for his life?' Mat_16:26 (= Mar_8:36, Luk_9:25). Here the terms of commerce are used, and the 'balance-sheet of the soul' (Morison) is struck. With this we may compare Plato's words: 'What will anyone be profited if under the influence of honour or money or power, aye, or under the excitement of poetry, he neglect justice and virtue?' (see Jowett's *Plato*, iii. 505).

This weighing of advantages and gain finds its full force in Christ's doctrine of the supreme good of the Kingdom of God, the one secure treasure of unspeakable value,

for the possession of which all other treasures may well be given in exchange
(Mat 13:44-46).

W. H. Dyson.

Progress

PROGRESS.—Christ and the essential truth of His teaching as preserved in the Gospels are entirely identified with the fact of human progress. Man's progress is a fact, a fact and not an idea, a fact, however, in which ideas are embedded and come to manifestation. This, moreover, is the greatest and most complex fact in the history of the individual and social life of humanity. It is of the highest importance, therefore, that Christ and His teaching should be set in the light of this fact; that not only His teaching, but Christ Himself should be examined and tested in this light. He and His teaching have nothing to lose, but everything to gain thereby.

1. In order to understand Christ and His teaching from the standpoint of progress, there are several historical facts as to the latter which require to be noted and kept in mind. (1) Man's history has been upon the whole a history of progress ever since he entered upon the course of his civilization. (2) But this fact does not imply that the idea of his progress in the path leading towards his destiny has been familiar to man ever since he began his career of advancement. The truth is that even at so late a date in history as the time of Christ's advent in it, the mind of pagan antiquity had nowhere been awakened to the clear consciousness that man had been pursuing, and that he had still for unknown ages to continue pursuing, a progressive destiny. The only historical instance slightly, not entirely, at variance with this general statement is the Zoroastrian theory as to the existence of good and evil, their hostile relations to each other, and the eventual subjugation and extinction of evil by the triumph of good. (3) Further, it is only within recent times that the general mind of the more advanced civilized races of mankind has become possessed by the idea and moved by the sentiment of the progressive destiny to which man is called in this world, and those men constitute a small minority who have begun in any true sense to realize the momentous importance of the meaning with which the fact of human progress is charged. (4) Again, it is of consequence to state expressly what is implied in the general truth just indicated, that neither the fact nor the importance of the fact of human progress, in any true sense of the word, was admitted for many centuries to a place of recognition in the ecclesiastical and theological developments of traditional Christianity; and this remark is true even of Augustine's *Civitas Dei*.

These facts, then, seem to encourage the conclusion, which is too often, but most unfairly, adopted, that Christ concerned Himself very little, if at all, with the fact of human progress on the earth, and that His teaching sheds little or no light upon this subject, which in reality is—as the modern mind has begun to see—a subject of urgent importance for every man and for the whole human race. But this conclusion is groundless. For in the Gospels there is abundance of evidence not only to show that the fact of man's progressive destiny had due recognition paid to it by Christ Himself and in His teaching, but also to make it manifest that in Himself and in His teaching there is a revelation of all the essential principles of human progress, and also an adequate provision of the moral conditions necessary to bring these principles to realization in the individual and social life and destiny of humanity.

2. But at this point notice requires to be taken of two other historical facts with which the position of Christ and His teaching came inevitably into immediate and important relations. *First*, the Jewish people occupied a unique and preeminent place among all the peoples of antiquity as regards the fact of human progress. Among them there had been developed, many centuries prior to Christ's time, ideas and sentiments, aspirations and hopes relative to the progressive destiny of mankind, which were entirely phenomenal, and which possessed immense value, partly because in many points they were highly enlightened, partly because of their profound *moral* significance, and partly because of the service they rendered in the preparation of the way for the new, progressive era to be ushered into the life of humanity by Christ's advent (e.g. Gen 22:15-18, Isa 2:2-5; Isa 10:1-9; Isa 42:1-11; Isaiah 62; Isa 65:17-25, Jer 31:27-34, Eze 36:22-28, Mic 4:1-4, Psalms 67; Psalms 72; Psa 102:13-22; Psa 145:1-13). The people of Israel, as the passages referred to show, conceived of their own 'golden age' and that of the Gentile peoples as lying not behind but ahead of them in the less or more distant future, and they were the first people in whose mind this idea shaped and rooted itself. In this outlook of theirs on the future all those elements which formed their general idea of the fact of progress came into play. What those elements were need not be stated here. But one other word may be added, viz., that if conditions had favoured the free and full development of all the ideas of progress and of all the progressive sentiments and strivings to which the worthiest leaders and teachers of the nation had attained in the noontide of the prophetic age, and if this development had continued until the fulness of the times had arrived for Christ's appearance, two things would have happened: the task of His Mission, on the one hand, would have been immensely lightened; and, on the other, the task of Christianity in evolving the moral progress of mankind would have been less difficult, and its success greatly accelerated.

But, *Secondly*, the progressive developments in the earlier stages of the nation's history had an arrest put upon them in various directions, and that while they were still immature. When Christ appeared, He found that the religion of Israel,

transformed into Judaism, had departed from the path of progress and committed itself to the position of finality. The religion of the Prophets, which in its ideas, sentiments, and strivings had begun to cross the boundaries of exclusive nationality, had been changed, as a system of law, as a method of Divine worship and service, as a way of salvation, and as a political ideal, into a narrow, rigid, national institution; and this institution, it was claimed, had a right to exist throughout all ages, although it was, in effect, a wall of separation not only between Jews and Gentiles, but also between the latter and God.

It was in these circumstances, then, that Christ appeared to reveal the principles of progress and to become a moral power making for their perfect realization in the life and destiny of man. And towards the two facts thus indicated He had necessarily to relate Himself, His teaching, and, indeed, His entire work and influence. Towards the first fact and the progressive elements and tendencies, He took up an attitude of appreciation and sympathy, and made it His aim and endeavour to promote their development to higher and wider forms of realization. Towards Judaism, on the other hand, so far as its anti-progressive vices were concerned, He took up what He knew would prove to be eventually an attitude of effective reaction. It is evident, however, that the finality which Judaism claimed for itself must have rendered it necessary for Him to put some restrictions on Himself as to His method of communicating and developing His ideas on the subject of progress. For any outspoken and persistent attack on Judaism on the point in question would have been sure to arouse against Him overwhelming opposition, as is manifest from what happened to Stephen the proto-martyr. This may have been one of His reasons for His persistent noninterference as a teacher either with the nature or the administration of any of the civil or political institutions that He found existing in Palestine, or knew to exist in the Roman Empire generally.

But He had another, a deeper, a much farther-reaching reason for silently letting civil and political institutions alone. It was not that He was indifferent to them, or that He considered them as not belonging to the nature and objects of His mission as the Saviour of the world. The civil and political state of society as He knew it was a matter of profound and sorrowful interest to Him (Mat 9:36; Mat 20:25). He must have been quite aware of the fact that the renewal of the civil and political life of mankind was needed everywhere in the existing civilized as well as uncivilized world. He was fully conscious of the fact that His own perfect self-devotion to the service of God and man endangered His life, and would bring Him to His cross to a large extent because of the vices of the civil and political condition of things under which He conducted His ministry (Mat 20:17-19, Joh 18:28 to Joh 19:16). He also anticipated the fact that the continuance of this evil order of things, after He was gone, would involve His servants and His cause in suffering (Mat 24:1-13).

Lastly, He never uttered a word to indicate directly and explicitly that He entertained any hope of the regeneration of the civil, or political, or economical conditions and organizations of human society. Why was this? Why did He keep Himself so entirely and persistently aloof from these and all other great interests of a kindred nature pertaining to the external relationships and well-being of human life, declining to interfere with them even when requested to do so? (Luk 12:13-14, Mat 22:17-22). He assumed and maintained this attitude because of the perfect understanding He had of the necessary conditions and requirements of human progress in every one of its departments. He had to consider what it was possible and what it was impossible for Him to accomplish during the short period of His lifetime on earth. In doing this He had to keep in view the existing state of society in all the various developments of its life at the time. And He must have known, as any one knowing and correctly interpreting the facts can see was actually the case, that if He had attempted to initiate or to achieve a reformation within any of the domains of human life in question, the result would inevitably have proved worse than useless for Himself and His cause, and for humanity. Knowing this, moreover, He, in the exercise of marvellous faith and patience, left, meanwhile, the renewal of man's social life in all its diversified forms of manifestation, in the hands, and to the times and ways, of God as the moral Governor of the world. For the time being He devoted Himself wholly and exclusively to the moral task which His Father had given Him to do; and in doing this, and doing it successfully, He rendered to the cause of human progress a service which will never cease increasing the glory of His name.

3. All that has been said makes it easy to show now how Christ Himself, His teaching, and, indeed, the whole of His work on earth and in heaven, can be explained in terms of progress. This explanation was adopted in effect and often used by Himself. So true is this that a great deal of His teaching—the most of it, indeed, when properly understood—can be construed into a theory of what is meant by the progress of humanity,—a theory never stated by Himself in abstract terms, but embodied in the general order of ideas that found such diversified forms of expression in His teaching. Briefly, the theory in question was this—(1) His teaching was all related to the cardinal facts of the moral nature of God and the moral nature of man. (2) A great deal of His teaching was concerned with the moral relations between God and men and between man and man. (3) In His teaching He dwelt much upon the inward and direct moral relations of men to God, which in every instance are relations of men to Him as *individuals*. For it is only in the individual that the moral conditions exist which make inward and direct relations of God to men possible. And this must have been one of Christ's reasons for the immense importance and value that He attached to men as individuals. (4) He also dwelt much on the subject of the rectifying and the perfecting of the moral relations of men to God and to one another. (5) He announced, and often alluded to and explained in various ways and connexions, the fact that it was His predestined task as man's Saviour to occupy the position and to

exercise the function of Mediator within the sphere of the moral relations of God to men, and of men to Him and to one another. Though He never used the word 'Mediator' in this connexion, He often spoke of His relation to God and men in expressions meaning the same thing. And He taught also that His work of mediation would be continued after His work on earth had been finished (e.g. Mat 11:27; Mat 28:18-20, John 14-17). (6) It was within the domain of the order of these great facts and ideas, which are all of an essentially moral nature, that Christ conceived the fundamental need of human progress as lying. Here also He saw the essential nature of the progress needed, and found the grounds on which to His mind man's progress was guaranteed. (7) But it was not Christ's idea that the progressive realization of these moral facts and ideas would come to manifestation *only* within the invisible moral sphere of the individual and social life of mankind. He cherished the certain conviction and hope that they would come gradually, in the course of their realization, to manifestation in the regeneration of all the various external relations of men to one another in the conditions, organizations, and activities of their social life. (8) He was fully persuaded that the course of human progress, such as He conceived its nature to be and the conditions on which it would proceed in the individual and social life of humanity, would strictly and persistently follow the laws of evolution. It may be added, finally, that it is within the region of these facts that the greatness of the extent of Christ's originality as a teacher is to be seen, and also the momentousness of the position and task He claimed for Himself as Mediator between God and men.

4. But did Christ's teaching as to human progress actually follow the lines just indicated? It did. In Mat 5:17 He identified His position in history and His work with the essentially moral nature, and with the cause and the evolution of the progress of the individual and social life of humanity. That in the Law and the Prophets which had supreme interest and value for Him, was the nature and the extent of the revelation they contained of the will and purpose of God with reference to the moral relations between God and men and between one man and another, and with reference to the historical development of human destiny. He saw that this revelation was very incomplete and imperfect. And in strict accordance with the Law of Continuity, which is one of the greatest laws of evolution and of human progress, He sympathetically put Himself and His work in direct organic relations with it, in order to complete and perfect the revelation of the Divine will and purpose to mankind, and in order so to mediate, by means of His moral power, the moral relations of men to God and to one another, that the Divine will and purpose would eventually attain to full and universal realization in their life and destiny. And so, when He said He had come not to destroy the Law and the Prophets, but to fulfil, He must have had the thought in His mind that the fulfilling in question, and His task in achieving it, would be continued after the work of His earthly ministry was done. In Mat 6:9-10 His mind is to be seen moving within the order of the same ideas and facts: 'Our Father which art in heaven,

Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven.' These words of prayer, as Christ understood them, are rooted in the truth of the moral nature of God and of man, and of the moral relations of God to men, and of men to Him and to each other. They imply that the sphere of the direct and inward moral relations of men to God and to one another in Him is the essential domain of God's Kingdom on the earth. They imply that the Kingdom of God on earth is predestined to arrive at universal realization in the individual and social life of mankind, and that *pervasively*, so that the Divine will and purpose will be manifested in all the external forms of man's existence and activities. They imply that this consummation will be reached by a progressive process of historical development; for the Kingdom of God is an order of things that is *coming*. And they imply that the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man will be the supreme governmental principles in the perfected conditions of human existence, which Christ hoped would be ushered in in answer to His prayer.

But these were not the only forms in which Christ expressed His great and rich order of ideas as to human progress. Man's progress is evolved in the course of his history, and nothing is more wonderful or beautiful than the parabolic forms in which Christ embodied His ideas as to the various phases that human progress assumes in the history of its evolution. (1) The gradual realization of God's will and purpose in the lives of men as individuals is everywhere and always the basis of moral progress in the social life and history of humanity; and therefore our Lord—no doubt designedly—illustrated the evolution of the Kingdom of God in its relation to the individual's heart and life in His first parable, that of the Sower (Mat 13:1-8; Mat 13:18-23).—(2) The progressive realization of the will and purpose of God in the moral relations of men to Him and to one another in the various social forms and manifestations of life may be conceived as a fact, which indeed it is, without taking into consideration the entanglements and dangers in which the process is involved from the existence in the world of moral evil. As so conceived, the evolution of man's moral progress is destined gradually and surely to attain to complete and manifest realization in the Kingdom of God. It was from this point of view that our Lord illustrated His ideas of human progress in His parable of the Seed Growing Secretly (Mar 4:26-29).—(3) But the progressive fulfilment of God's will and purpose in the history of man's social life and destiny may also be conceived as a process of historical evolution, and as actually entangled and endangered, which is the case, by the presence and developments of moral evil in the individual and social life of men. As thus conceived, then, the history of man's social progress towards the perfect and universal realization of God's will and purpose has the character of a conflict between moral good and moral evil. But this conflict, at every stage and in every section of its history, is presided over by the moral government of God, and is certain under His judgment to issue in a final crisis in which evil will be entirely and for ever separated from good, and in which righteousness will reign universally in the relations of men to

God and to one another in His Kingdom. From these points of view also our Lord contemplated the evolution of human progress; and He so couched His ideas on the subject in His parable of the Wheat and the Tares (Mat_13:24-30; Mat_13:37-43).—(4) Again, the history of man's moral progress starts from a very small and simple beginning, and eventually develops into a result of vast dimensions and great complexity. This fact as to man's progress our Lord likewise fully realized, and He expressed His sense of its truth and value in His parable of the Mustard-seed (Mat_13:31-32)—(5) Finally, the end of moral progress in the life and history of humanity will be a destiny in which every department of its individual and social life, external as well as internal, will be interpenetrated and regulated by the will and purpose of God as perfectly realized and manifested in a universal and established order of righteousness and love. Could it be anything else than this that our Lord meant by His parable of the Leaven and the three measures of meal? (Mat_13:33).

Thus it becomes manifest that our Lord's teaching embodied a philosophy of human history and progress. In this point of view His teaching was absolutely original. Nor can it ever be superseded. His ideas of human progress and His faith in it are a large part of essential Christianity. This part of His gospel is urgently needed by the present age. And multitudes are waiting to welcome it as a message from *Him* as the world's Saviour.

Literature.—Buckle, *Hist. of Civilization; Lux Mundi*, ch xi.; Loring Brace, *Gesta Christi*; Janet, *Theory of Morals*, 416; P. Granger, *The Soul of a Christian*, 246; Westcott, *Chr. Social Union Addresses*, 66; W. D. Mackenzie, *Christianity and the Progress of Man*, 217; A. R. Wallace, *Studies, Scientific and Social*, ii. 493; W. L. Davidson, *Chr. Ethics*, 56; Liddon, *Serm. on Some Words of St. Paul*, 246, *Serm. before Univ. of Oxford*, 1st ser. p. 25.

W. D. Thomson.

Promise

PROMISE.—The NT is full of the idea that in Christ had arrived the fulfilment of a promise made over and over again in preceding ages. The gospel is regarded by all the writers not as an event unexpected and unprepared for, but as the due and natural sequel and climax of God's dealings from of old. The εὐαγγέλιον is the fulfilment of the ἐπαγγελία. It was, indeed, the strength with which this idea was rooted in the mind of the Jew ('whose is the adoption and the glory and ... the promises,' Rom_9:4) that made it so hard for him to understand how the Gentile could come within the full

scope of the gospel. How could the ‘dogs’ share equally with the ‘children’ (Mat 15:26 = Mar 7:27)? How could the uncovenanted and un-circumcised be ‘heirs according to the promise’ (Gal 3:29)? Whole passages, therefore, in some of the Epistles (esp. Rom. [Note: Roman.] , Gal., Heb.) have to be devoted to showing that the implication of the promise was vaster than any of the forms in which it had been conveyed. There is no literature which is so saturated with the spirit of anticipation as the Hebrew, no nation which has cherished so ardent and irrepressible a belief in its destiny,—‘a people who were looking forwards from a great Past of Wonders to a Future of Good and Glory’ (Mason, *Heb. Gram.*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 98). It is in the NT, however, that this note of anticipation becomes dominant. Anticipation, indeed, here gives place to realization. While the NT contains several passages which show kinship with current Apocalyptic literature and its eschatology, and indicate a lingering belief in the mind of the writer that the fulfilment of the promises lies still in the future, the unmistakably prevalent thought of the writers is that in the work of Christ they have already seen the promises fulfilled. The Evangelic records exhibit, each in its own way, the consciousness that Israel’s hopes had found their fulfilment in Christ; and, sober and restrained as is the narrative, one can hardly miss in it the note of jubilant realization. Mt. loses no opportunity of showing that what happened to Jesus was in accordance with ancient prophecy; Mk., while seldom citing Scripture, describes Jesus as beginning His ministry with the declaration ‘The time is fulfilled’ (Mar 1:15); Lk. commences and concludes his Gospel with episodes (Luk 1:45-55; Luk 1:67-69; Luk 2:25-38; Luk 24:25-28; Luk 24:44-47) intended to show how men saw, or failed to see, in Jesus the Christ foreshadowed in the Scriptures, and Jn. (Joh 5:39) quotes Jesus as stating that the Scriptures bear witness to Him, and notes (Joh 12:16; Joh 12:41 etc.) how the reception of Jesus answered to the sayings of the prophets.

It was this aspect of Christ’s appearance—as the fulfilment of an eagerly awaited promise—that occupied most room in the earliest preaching of the gospel. See Stephen’s speech (Acts 7), Peter’s (Act 2:14-36; Act 10:34-43), Paul’s (Act 13:32 ‘We bring you good tidings of the promise made unto the fathers,’ and Act 26:6). The main line of address taken by the early preachers was always to prove that Jesus was the Christ (Act 9:22, Act 17:2-3, Act 18:5; Act 18:28).

It is to be noticed, however, that Jesus Himself in His public preaching seldom, if ever, adopted this line of appeal. Not even in His more private teaching does He appear to have attached importance to it. When, e.g., John the Baptist definitely inquired ‘Art thou he that cometh?’ (Mat 11:2-19, Luk 7:19-23), Jesus deliberately appealed not to the correspondence between Himself and the expectations formed of the promised Messiah, but to the effect being at the moment produced by His ministry. When the same question was being discussed between Himself and His disciples (Mat 16:13-16 = Mar 8:27-29 = Luk 9:18-20), Jesus was not concerned so

much about their identifying Him with the One who was to come, by means of signs and tokens which were expected to accompany His coming, as that the conviction should come in an inward and secret way ('Flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father which is in heaven,' Mat 16:17). He objected to being proclaimed as the Christ, not simply because He knew that the people, when persuaded of this, would seek to make Him a king and expect Him to use temporal resources, but because the very tenacity with which His countrymen clung to their stereotyped notions of the promised Messiah would prevent them from gaining a true understanding of the scope and purpose of His mission. He had a sublime contempt for the petty and pedantic way in which the scribes took upon themselves to say how the anticipations of Scripture were, or were not, to be verified, and held their pretensions up to scorn (Mat 22:41-46 = Mar 12:35-37 = Luk 20:41-44). It was, in short, because His mind was so filled with the larger purpose of God that He assigned little weight to the recognition of that local and national theory which had so much more of patriotic bias and ambitious desire in it than of pure love of humanity. And it was precisely because the priests and scribes, in their blind attachment to their own interpretation of the promise, saw, in His comparative carelessness about the traditional view and His frequent insistence upon a purely spiritual interpretation, a danger to their own designs, that they resolved upon His death.

It is true, of course, that Jesus commonly used one term at least which in the current phraseology of the time was closely associated with the temporal and literally-understood fulfilment of the 'promise.' He constantly proclaimed the advent of the Kingdom of heaven or the Kingdom of God. But whatever critical view be held of the records, and leaving undecided the question whether Matthew 24 and other similar passages which contain a considerable eschatological element are to be taken as representing a part of the actual teaching of Jesus, or rather His teaching as coloured by passing through minds steeped in the ideas of Jewish eschatology, it is sufficiently evident that Jesus habitually used the expression 'Kingdom of heaven' in a different sense from the ordinary and popular one, and preferred to divest it of the usual patriotic and eschatological associations. The *locus classicus* is the Sermon on the Mount beginning with the Beatitude, 'Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.' The 'promise,' as Jesus gives it here in sevenfold form, is a promise to the spiritually-minded of a spiritual grace, having no reference whatever to Messianic considerations, and this holds good even if the alternative form in which the Beatitudes are given in Lk. is held to be the earlier. Jesus, in the most royal and absolute fashion, gave assurances to His disciples, but these, in the Synoptics hardly less than in the Fourth Gospel, are assurances not of any kind of material benefit, but of spiritual grace,' e.g. 'Thy Father which seeth in secret shall recompense thee' (Mat 6:4 also vv. 6, 8); 'He that loseth his life for my sake shall find it' (Mat 10:39; Mat 16:25); 'I will give you rest,' and 'Ye shall find rest to your souls' (Mat 11:28-29); 'I will make you fishers of men' (Mar 1:17, cf. Luk 5:10); 'Your reward shall be great,

and ye shall be sons of the Most High' (Luk 6:35); 'Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free' (Joh 8:32).

It is true, of course, that there are some passages in which the assurance of blessing includes material benefit: e.g. 'All these things (*i.e.* food, clothing, etc.) shall be added unto you' (Mat 6:33); the reply to Peter that those who for Christ's sake have forsaken earthly advantage 'shall receive a hundredfold, now in this time, houses,' etc. (Mar 10:30 = Luk 18:29 = Mat 19:29); but the very connexion in which such passages occur shows in each case that Jesus attaches importance only to the spiritual blessing; better forego all earthly profit whatever than miss this (Mat 10:39; Mat 16:25-26, Luk 12:20-21). Anything like requests for a promise of personal advantage He sternly discourages (Mat 20:20-23 = Mar 10:35-45).

Generally the promises of Jesus to His disciples may be classified as follows: (a) *particular assurances to individuals*: to the thief on the cross (Luk 23:43), to the woman in the house of Simon the Leper (Mat 26:13 = Mar 14:9), to Nathanael (Joh 1:51), to Peter (Mat 16:18 = Mar 9:1 = Luk 9:27, cf. Mat 18:18), to Peter again (Joh 13:7 and Joh 13:36), also Mar 9:1 = Luk 9:27; (b) *assurances about the prevailing nature of prayer and the power of faith* (Mat 7:7; Mat 18:19, Joh 14:13-14, Mat 17:26; Mat 21:21-22, Mar 11:23-24, Mat 18:18); (c) *assurances of His continued presence and of their support and ultimate triumph* (Mat 10:19 = Luk 12:12, Mat 28:20 [Mar 16:17-18], Mat 10:32; Mat 10:39; Mat 10:42; Mat 13:43; Mat 16:25; Mat 19:28, Luk 6:38, Joh 6:40; Joh 6:44; Joh 6:54; Joh 8:51; Joh 11:25; Joh 14:22; Joh 16:20). It is to promises of this kind that James refers in Jam 1:12 'the crown of life which the Lord promised to them that love him,' and in Jam 2:5 'heirs of the kingdom which he promised to them that love him' (cf. 1Jn 2:25); (d) the outstanding promise, however, is that of *the Holy Spirit*, and this is the one promise which is most explicitly recorded as made to the disciples (Joh 14:16; Joh 14:26; Joh 15:26; Joh 16:13 etc.), and is directly recalled at the foundation of the Christian Church: 'He charged them ... to wait for the promise of the Father, which, said he, ye heard from me' (Act 1:4; cf. Act 2:23). And this promise may be said practically to include and interpret almost all the foregoing.

Literature.—Denney in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iv. 104; Sidgwick, *Methods of Ethics?* (1907), 295; Somerville, *Precious Seed* (1890), 233; Spurgeon, *Twelve Sermons on Precious Promises*.

J. Ross Murray.

PROPERTY.—Under this title two questions arise: (1) Is the possession of private property right according to the principles of the teaching and example of Jesus? (2) In what ways is a follower of Jesus to acquire and to use his property? These questions touch one another when it is suggested that a Christian should give away all his property and not seek to gain any more. They may, however, be kept distinct, and the second discussed on the assumption that the possession of private property is justifiable.

1. A very large section of a man's interest is connected with his possessions. Therefore, inevitably, the teaching and example of Jesus have an important bearing upon the question of property. And further, inasmuch as He gave to men a very different ideal of character and conduct from that of the world, it is to be expected that in regard to property His teaching will show marked divergence from the prevailing worldly view. But it is not therefore to be assumed that the authority of Jesus can be claimed for the socialistic view of property, which may be called the direct negative of the ordinary view which men hold. The question to be settled is—May we infer from the teaching and example of Jesus that the private ownership of property is unjustifiable? The relation of the teaching and example of Jesus to modern Socialism opens up a wide field for discussion, and this is seriously complicated by the difficulty of defining Socialism and disentangling it, as a clear economic theory, from the general revolt against the hardships of poverty and the tyranny of riches, from which it springs, and which is reflected in the generous literature and thought of all ages and countries.

The first point to make clear is that this revolt was certainly present among the Jews, and has left distinct traces in the OT ([Isa 5:8](#)) and also in the extra-canonical Jewish literature. 'There came to exist among them what has been called a "genius for hatred" of the rich' (Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*, p. 206). The popular view among the Jews was that godliness invariably resulted in prosperity; and one of their problems was the prosperity of the ungodly and the adversity of the pious. This problem was exceptionally acute in our Lord's day, through the dominance of the Romans, and the wealth of the publicans acquired by their faithlessness to the national cause. Thus precisely the condition from which modern Socialism springs was present. And not only so, but a well-defined socialistic experiment was being made by the Essenes, among whom 'the strongest tie by which the members were united was absolute community of goods' (Schürer, *HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]*, ii. ii. 195). It has been maintained that the teaching of Jesus was greatly influenced by that of the Essenes. But as Essenism was 'in the first place merely Pharisaism in the superlative degree' (Schürer, *l.c.* p. 210), whatever other elements entered into it, this view must be given up (Lightfoot, *Col.* 397 ff.). However, from the popular feeling about the rich, and the existence of the Essenes as a socialistic community, we may gather that the way was quite open for Jesus to adopt the doctrines of

Communism; and the argument that in His teaching we find the seed of Socialism, which only required conditions of thought and life such as are found in modern times to become fully matured, is not justified.

This is the view of the matter which representative Socialists take. As a general rule, Socialists are opposed to the Christian faith, and recognize in it a basis for the present organization of society and a hindrance to the change they desire to see brought about (for citations, see Peabody, *op. cit.* p. 15). They quote with approval the sayings of Jesus about the blessedness of the poor and the woes of the rich, but they realize distinctly that the basis of His thought is fundamentally different from theirs. The special ground of objection on the part of Socialists to the Christian religion is its teaching as to the future, which they regard as having diverted the moral enthusiasm of religious people from the present to the 'other' world. Some, no doubt, hold that this emphasis on the future is due to the corruption of the pure teaching of Jesus, and so are ready to claim His authority for their views. But even if the contrast between present and future in the teaching of Jesus could be adjusted to the satisfaction of the Socialists, it leaves the contrast between outward circumstance and inward character, in regard to which there is a vital and all-embracing distinction between the principles of Jesus and Socialism. The phenomenon, however, of what is known as Christian Socialism has to be noted. The fierce competition of modern industrial and commercial life, with the cruelties it produces, cannot be accepted as desirable by any man of sensitive Christian convictions. And, moreover, the great hold which Socialism has taken of multitudes, and the fact that it becomes to them the only religion they feel any need of, have led Christians to desire that its influence should be exerted on the side of the Church. The Christian Socialists in England (Maurice and Kingsley) were influenced mainly by the first consideration, and were enthusiastic supporters of the Co-operative movement. The second consideration, as might be expected, appealed more especially to Roman Catholics, who are represented by Abbé Lamennais; Baron von Ketteler, Archb. of Mayence; and Count de Nurn. In Germany, among Protestants, Christian Socialism has been represented by Victor Huber and Pastor Stöcker. The views of those who may be regarded as entitled to the name Christian Socialists cannot be thought of as an isolated fact. They have been partly the result and partly the cause of a general shifting of the centre of interest from the sphere of doctrinal theology to that of practical teaching. The theological literature of the last 50 years has been largely occupied with the application of the teaching of Jesus to the practical problems of life, and many have held that there is nothing in the Christian faith which is antagonistic to Socialism as an economic theory. But with some exceptions it is agreed that Jesus did not lay down any economic theory of the State, and indeed deliberately refused to take advantage of openings in this direction which He received (Mat 22:15-22; Mat 17:24-27, Luk 12:13-21). 'To speak of the economics of the New Testament is in my opinion as impossible as to speak of its dietetics

(Act 15:20-29), its hermeneutics (1Co 9:4-10), its astronomy (Mat 2:9; Mat 24:29), or its meteorology (Mat 16:23, Luk 12:24-25)’—(H. Holtzmann, *Die ersten Christen und die soziale Frage*).

Before the actual teaching and example of Jesus on the subject are analyzed, it is desirable to consider how far the glimpses we receive in the Acts of the Apostles of the social life of the first Christians at Jerusalem form an authoritative commentary upon them. We read that ‘all that believed were together, and had all things common’ (Act 2:44). And again, ‘neither said any of them that ought of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common’ (Act 4:32, cf. also Act 2:45, Act 4:34; Act 4:37). It is worthy of remark that these statements are from the pen of the author of the Third Gospel, in which the sayings of Jesus about the rich and the poor are given in their most uncompromising form (cf. Luk 6:20, Mat 5:3). We may therefore suppose that the communistic aspect of the life of the church at Jerusalem has received full attention in the Book of Acts, and that no inference which goes in the least beyond the statements of that book is justified.* [Note: For discussions on the relation of St. Luke to Ebionism, see Keim, iii. 284; H. Holtzmann, op. cit.; Colin Campbell, *Critical Studies in Luke’s Gospel*; B. Weiss, *Life of Christ*, vol. i. bks. iv., v.; cf. Peabody, op. cit. p. 192.]

A careful scrutiny of the relevant passages of the Book of Acts shows that: (1) the condition which prevailed in Jerusalem did not continue; (2) the churches organized by St. Paul (whose companion St. Luke was) show no trace of the community of goods, nor is any condemnation expressed because of this; (3) those who had houses and lands *sold* them; (4) Peter in what he said to Ananias (Act 5:4) clearly indicated that the right to private property was not questioned (‘Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power?’). No theory, therefore, can be established on the basis of what we find prevailing among the first Christians in Jerusalem. We must rather suppose that in the special circumstances of that church an exceptional condition in relation to property was produced.

An analysis of the teaching and example of Jesus brings out quite clearly that the denial of a right to the possession of private property cannot be extracted from them. It is true that many strong statements are found in the Gospels as to the disadvantages of riches, and that the poor are represented as having a special interest in the Kingdom of God (Mat 6:19, Luk 18:22, Mar 10:23, Luk 6:20-24; Luk 12:15, Mat 6:24; Mat 19:24; Mat 11:5). Far-reaching deductions have been drawn from these in condemnation of the prevailing industrial order. And their spirit is manifestly very different from that which the modern industrial and commercial struggle tends to produce. But their full force can be realized in connexion with the common effect of riches upon character, and they do not involve any condemnation of the possession of private property. It is to be remembered, too, in connexion with this, that no

single statement of our Lord can be wisely taken by itself and pressed to the extreme conclusion logically possible. This is to forget His method of teaching, which aimed 'at the greatest clearness in the briefest compass' (Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, i. p. 130). 'One who proposes to follow literally the specific commands of Jesus finds himself immediately plunged into contradictions and absurdities. He accepts the teaching of Jesus concerning non-resistance, "to him that smiteth thee on one cheek offer also the other," but soon he hears this same counsellor of peace bid His friends sell their garments "and buy a sword" ' (Peabody, ch. i.).

We must therefore set over against the words of Jesus in which He seems to condemn the possession of riches, facts and sayings which forbid any communistic conclusion being drawn from them. Thus Jesus and His disciples had a fund for their common necessities (Joh 13:14). Moreover, the disciples owned boats and nets, to which they returned after the crucifixion (Joh 21:3 ff.). Peter's house appears to have been the headquarters of Jesus at Capernaum (Mar 1:29; Mar 2:1). There is no condemnation of the settled life which Martha, Mary, and Lazarus lived at Bethany (Luk 10:38 ff., Joh 12:1 ff.). Zacchaeus, who was a rich man, was not asked to give away all that he had, but rather commended for giving a portion (Luk 19:1-9). Mary's action in 'wasting' the costly cruse of ointment (Mat 26:12) was justified and praised. The centurion who had built a synagogue for the Jews in Capernaum (Luk 7:1; Luk 7:10) received the highest praise, but nothing was said about his wealth, evidently considerable. Nicodemus must have been a man of substance, but no question of his relation to his property was raised (Joh 3:1-21). Again, some force must be allowed to the fact that in several of the parables (Luk 19:12, Mat 21:33) Jesus used the rights which men have over their property to illustrate the duty which all owe to God. This argument cannot be pressed too far, but still such illustrations would be practically impossible to one who held that the possession of private property, with the power it gives over others, is wrong.

2. On the assumption, then, that Jesus does not condemn the possession of private property, it remains to discuss the place which property is to hold in the life of a Christian, and the use which he is to make of what he owns. The ruling consideration in this discussion is that Jesus in His teaching looks not so much to the circumstances of men's lives as to the kind of men they are and may become. His teaching, therefore, about property must be considered in relation to the effects of its acquisition and use upon character. In regard to the acquisition of property, the teaching of Jesus is directed against that greedy temper of mind in which worldly advantage is regarded as of supreme importance, and a man's wealth as the sole criterion of his worth. He also condemns dishonesty and oppression in the acquisition of wealth, which spring from this temper (Mat 23:14, Mar 12:40, Luk 20:47). He warns men against covetousness on the ground that 'a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth' (Luk 12:15). He calls the man a fool

who had much goods laid up for many years, and was not rich towards God (Luk 12:16-21). He condemns over-care about making provision for the necessities of this life (Luk 12:22-34, Mat 6:19-34). And He declares that 'whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's, the same shall save it' (Mar 8:35, Mat 10:39; Mat 16:25, Luk 9:24). Thus it is clear that Jesus expects His followers to cultivate a spirit of aloofness and independence in relation to the world and its wealth.

The duty of work and of making provision for worldly needs by work may be clearly inferred from the teaching and example of Jesus, though it is not specifically inculcated. He laboured as a carpenter in Nazareth (Mar 6:3, cf. Mat 13:55). In the miracle of the miraculous draught of fishes (Luk 5:1; Luk 5:6, Joh 21:6) He set His seal of approval upon the industry of the disciples. In some of the parables the duty of faithfulness in secular pursuits is plainly taught (e.g. Luk 16:1-11). This may also be inferred from the words of Mat 6:20-34. If the fowls of the air are provided for and the lilies of the field are arrayed in glory in the way of their nature through the providence of God, so also will men be provided for *in the way of their nature*, which is declared in the words, 'In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread' (Gen 3:19). Again, the necessity of providing for those dependent upon us is no remote inference from Luk 11:13, Mat 15:5 and Mar 7:11. For the willingness of a father to give bread to his son is taken as an illustration of the willingness of God to hear and answer the prayers of His people. And the method adopted by the Pharisees to escape the practical force of the Fifth Commandment is sternly rebuked (Mat 15:3-6 || Mar 7:6-13).

About the use of property the teaching of Jesus is very full. In the first place, men are to realize that they are stewards of what they possess rather than its owners (Mat 24:45-51; Mat 25:14-20, Luk 19:11-27). They are to use their property, therefore, for the glory of God and the good of men, themselves and others. In relation to the true good of the owners, the danger of riches is very clearly and constantly insisted upon (Mar 10:23-27, Mat 6:19; Mat 6:24; Mat 13:22, Luk 18:24; Luk 6:20-24; Luk 16:19-31; Luk 12:15; Luk 18:14-25; Luk 12:21; Luk 16:11). From these passages it is clear that the tendency of riches is to hinder spiritual wellbeing. To avoid this, the renunciation of wealth is required (Luk 14:33, Mat 19:29, Luk 5:11, Mat 18:19-22, Luk 6:18-22). This renunciation of wealth is a general command holding for all who would be followers of Jesus, but it receives special emphasis in regard to the rich from the way in which the young ruler who had great possessions was dealt with. That the alienation of wealth is involved of necessity in its renunciation cannot be maintained in view of considerations formerly advanced, but, on the other hand, these considerations by no means preclude it in special circumstances (Luk 9:58-62). The way in which renunciation is to be given effect to

depends upon the circumstances of each case, and is a matter for the conscience of each individual.

Apart from the general use which a follower of Jesus is to make of all his property, which is to be determined in relation to his own spiritual welfare and that of others, he is called upon also to give (alienate) a portion of his possessions to the poor and to the support of religion. These two directions for giving were fully recognized among the Jews. And so we find that although specific injunctions as to the duty of giving are not wanting in the teaching of Jesus, it is more with the spirit in which this duty is discharged that His sayings are concerned. He definitely commands the duty of giving to the poor (Mat 5:42, Luk 6:38, Mat 19:21, Luk 18:22). We see that He and His disciples were accustomed to give alms (Joh 13:29). The parable of the Good Samaritan, again, is the charter of the Church for all the benevolent work of hospitals, infirmaries, etc. (Luk 10:30-36). Such giving, however, is never to be formal and impersonal, an easy way of satisfying a fugitive emotion of pity. It is the service done rather than the gift made, which is emphasized in the parable of the Good Samaritan. Again, almsgiving is not to be ostentatious (Mat 6:1-4), nor are gifts to be made in the expectation of a return (Luk 14:12-14). The measure of giving is to be generous (Mat 10:8), and response to a claim is to be ready and ungrudging (Luk 11:5-8), and is to be regulated by no consideration but that of need (Luk 10:30-36, Mat 5:42-48).

In regard to giving to the support of religion, the teaching of Jesus must be considered in relation to the ordinance of the law which required a tithe. He does not commend any definite portion of a man's possessions as that which he should devote to religious objects. His teaching in this matter, as in all others, deals with the spirit in which gifts are made rather than the law which regulates their amount. He condemns the ostentation of the Pharisees in their gifts (Mar 12:42, Luk 21:2), and also their idea that a gift to the Temple is acceptable to God from those who are neglecting the weightier matters of the Law (Mat 23:23-26; Mat 6:23-24, Luk 18:9-14). But He is very far from condemning the giving of a tithe (Mat 23:23), and suggests rather that this is not sufficient (Luk 21:2). He distinctly commands giving to God (Mat 22:21), and by the way in which Mary's devotion (Mat 26:12) was received we are warned against any narrow utilitarian view of the objects covered by this phrase. See also artt. Socialism and Wealth.

Literature.—Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, vol. i.; *EBr* [Note: *Br Encyclopaedia Britannica*.] 9 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] xxii. 205 ff., xxxii. 664 ff.; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People*.], *passim*; Robert E. Speer, *The Principles of Jesus*; Rae, *Contemporary Socialism*; Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*, and also *The Message of Christ to Society*; Kaufmann, *Christian Socialism*; Kirkup, *An Inquiry into Socialism*; F. Naumann, *Das*

soziale Programm der evangel. Kirche; Flint, *Socialism*, ch. ix.; Martensen, *Chr. Ethics*, iii. 126 ff.; H. Holtzmann, *Die ersten Christen und die soziale Frage*; Nitti, *Catholic Socialism*; Newman Smyth, *Chr. Ethics*, 448 ff.; Schaeffle, *Quintessence of Socialism*; Dale, *Laws of Christ*, ch. ii.; J. F. Maurice, *Life of Frederick Denison Maurice*; A. Stöcker, *Christlich-soziale Reden und Aufsätze*; Herron, *The Larger Christianity*, and *Between Cæsar and Jesus*; Gore, *The Sermon on the Mount*; Westcott, *Social Aspects of Christianity*; Lyman Abbott, *Christianity and Social Problems*; S. Mathews, *Social Teaching of Jesus*; Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, vols. iii. and iv.; Lightfoot, *Colossians*, p. 397 ff.; Renan, *Life of Jesus*, *passim*; Colin Campbell, *Crit. Studies in Luke's Gospel*; Dykes, *Manifesto of the King*, 449 ff.; Gladden, *Tools and the Man*, 55, 86.

Andrew N. Bogle.

☩ Prophet

PROPHET

I. The Messiah a prophet.—1. Our Lord's redemptive work is usually divided into the threefold—prophetic, priestly, and kingly functions; and for this there is *ancient precedent*. Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* i. 3) speaks of Him as 'the only *High Priest* of all men, the only *King* of all creation, and the Father's only supreme *Prophet* of prophets' (see also Ambrose on Ps 118:79, and Cassiodorus on [Psa 132:2](#)). The Church has rightly felt that the unction bestowed on Jesus as the Messiah separated and endowed Him to these offices. She recognized that the old dispensation was established and preserved by those who were anointed to be prophets, priests, and kings, and she believed that each of these offices found its perfection in the Person and work of Jesus Christ. When, therefore, we dwell separately on any one of these three vocations of the Messiah (as we do in this article), we must remember that we are necessarily taking a partial view of His Person; for to hold that He is *only* a prophet, is to fall into a heresy that has ever faced the Church.

Early in the Church's history the Gnostic Ebionites rejected the Catholic doctrine of Christ's Person, but felt no difficulty in believing Him to be an inspired prophet of the highest order. They regarded Him as one of the προφήται ἀληθείας, and as superior to προφήται συνέσεως οὐκ ἀληθείας; and, as such, placed Him in line with Adam, Enoch, Noah, etc. etc., upon all of whom had rested the pre-existent Christ; and in their Gospel we find the following words ascribed to Him: 'I am he concerning whom Moses prophesied, saying, A prophet shall the Lord God raise unto you, like unto me' (*Clem.*

Hom. iii. 53; cf. Dorner, *Hist. of Person of Christ*, i. i. 208 ff.); but they refused to accept the Church's teaching as to His Deity. Similarly, the Mohammedan Koran says: 'The Messiah, the son of Mary, is only a prophet' (v. 79, also iv. 160 and xix. 30); and the Racovian Catechism (a.d. 1605) of the Socinians (§ 5) accepts and accentuates the prophetic aspect of His work.

2. But while the Church thus early classified the redemptive activities of our Lord under this threefold division, it must not be assumed that *the Jews of His own time* had reached this full conception. It is clear from our Gospels that His contemporaries did not regard the 'coming prophet' as one with the coming Messiah; for when the multitude were astonished at Jesus' discourse at the Feast of Tabernacles, and were divided in opinion regarding Him, some saying, 'This is of a truth the Prophet,' and others, 'This is the Christ' (Joh 7:40), none declared Him to be the Christ, and *therefore* the Prophet.

A similar distinction is found in their view of the Baptist (Joh 1:21). The only exception in the Gospels is the words of the woman of Samaria: 'Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet.... When Christ is come, he will *declare* unto us all things' (Joh 4:19; Joh 4:25). But probably the Samaritans generally had small reason to expect the coming of a *kingly* Messiah (see Westcott, *Study of the Gospels*, note 2, ch. 2; Stanton, *Jewish and Christian Messiah*, pp. 126, 293).

3. Nor does this separation of the offices of 'the Prophet' and 'the Messiah' seem to be due to any special obtuseness on the part of our Lord's contemporaries; *the OT prophets* themselves appear also to have been unable to rise above it. Isaiah, prophesying during the monarchy, pictures the Messiah as a Davidic king, and foretells the outpouring of a fuller revelation during His reign, predicting that *then* the God of Jacob would teach Israel His way (Isa 2:3), and *then* Israel's teacher(s) would not be hidden any more, but the people would see their teacher(s), and hear a word behind them saying, 'This is the way' (Isa 30:20); but he does not unite these kingly and prophetic endowments in the one person of the Christ. Fuller light of truth is to be a mark of the Messianic reign, but Isaiah does not recognize the Messiah as the organ of the revelation.

The fullest references to a coming prophet are found in Deutero-Isaiah; and here He is clearly identified with 'the **Servant of the Lord.**' There enters largely into the prophet's conception of this great Personality the idea of His being an anointed revealer of truth. Jehovah makes 'his mouth like a sharp sword' (Isa 49:2), and 'puts his spirit upon him, so that he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles' (Isa 42:1, also Isa 59:21, Isa 61:1). But, clear as is *our* identification of 'the Servant' with Jesus, we yet know that this union of 'the Suffering One' with the Messianic King has ever been the great stumbling-block to Israel. The truth appears to be: the prophets

of Israel, influenced by the national circumstances and needs of their own day, predicted under the Spirit's influence, now a coming king, now a prophet, now a priestly sufferer with prophetic functions; and these parallel lines of yearning thought found together their satisfaction in the Person of Jesus.

The Book of Malachi closes with a prediction of the return of Elijah (Mal 4:5), and Israel's prophetic expectations centred thenceforth chiefly in him.

4. With the silence of prophecy, there came to Israel a deep yearning for the living voice of Jehovah. This was a characteristic of the Maccabean age, when the anticipation of a coming prophet overshadows that of the Messiah (1Ma 4:46; 1Ma 14:41; 1Ma 9:27, also Sir 48:10).

The same longing is found in Psa 74:9 'We see not our signs, there is no more any prophet, neither is there among us any that knoweth how long.' This Psalm is therefore thought to belong to the Maccabean period; on the other hand, similar complaints are found in the writings of the Exile (Lam 2:9, Eze 7:26).

The *Apocalyptic literature* is mostly silent on the point. But in the Book of Enoch (*Simil.* 45:3-6) the Son of Man is portrayed as revealing 'all the treasures of that which is hidden, and there are seen an inexhaustible fountain of righteousness, and round about many fountains of wisdom.' These promises of fuller revelation presumably imply a personal agent for its dissemination. The prophetic gift is advanced in the Test. of the XII. Patriarchs (Levi 8:15) as an implicit claim of John Hyrcanus to the Messiahship; and he alone was said by the Jews to have held the threefold office (Josephus *BJ* i. ii. 8).

5. If the abeyance of prophecy added to the gloom of Israel during the interval between the time that the last OT prophet delivered his message and the beginning of the Christian era, *the coming of Christ was heralded by an outburst of the prophetic gift*. It is recorded as first appearing in the priestly house of Zacharias (Luk 1:41; Luk 1:67); it was granted to the Virgin, to Simeon, and to Anna (Luk 2:25; Luk 2:36), and reached its most notable height in the person of John the Baptist. The nation, galled by a foreign yoke, and meditating on the predictions found in their sacred books, and, above all, picturing the return of Elijah as a herald of emancipation, 'mused in their heart' whether the Baptist were himself the Messiah, or Elijah, or the Prophet, or one of the old prophets returned (Luk 3:15, Joh 1:20 ff.). But John, realizing himself to be only a forerunner, and wishing to turn the thoughts of the people from himself to Jesus, refused to be anything save an impersonal voice crying in the wilderness. Fittingly thus was the world's supreme Prophet ushered upon His prophetic career by a volume of reawakened prophecy.

6. Whatever difficulty His contemporaries felt in acknowledging His Messiahship, they had *none in recognizing Him as a prophet*. Both at the commencement and at the close of His career, this was the popular view of His ministry. As soon as He became known, the general judgment was pronounced that ‘a great prophet had arisen, and that God had visited his people’ (Luk 7:16); and when at the close of His ministry He allowed the populace openly to express their feelings regarding Him, they, in answer to the question ‘Who is this?’ replied, ‘This is Jesus, the prophet of Nazareth’ (Mat 21:11; also Mar 6:15, Mat 21:46, Luk 24:19, Joh 4:19; Joh 6:14; Joh 7:40; Joh 9:17). Indeed, only those who were biassed by ecclesiastical bigotry could have concluded otherwise, for His miracles of mercy were external credentials recalling the powers of Moses and Elijah; and the authoritative tone of His teaching showed that He claimed for Himself at least the position of a God-sent teacher.

7. But not only was the title generally given to Him; He also *claimed it for Himself*. Thus He opened His ministry in His native village by reading in the synagogue the words of Isaiah (61:1), ‘The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor,’ and commenced His discourse upon them by saying, ‘To-day hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears’ (Luk 4:18; Luk 4:21). Later in His ministry, when His death was imminent, He openly placed Himself in line with the ancient prophets of Israel, foretelling that, similarly to them, He could not perish out of Jerusalem (Mat 23:29 ff., Luk 13:33); and when He used, in the parable of the Vineyard, the familiar OT figure of the Kingdom of God, He deliberately made Himself the last of the long line of God’s martyr messengers to His people; and told the Jews that, notwithstanding the fact that they had ‘shamefully handled’ His predecessors the prophets; yet He had been sent to them by God with a final call to repentance.

II. Jesus had the essential marks of a prophet.—When we turn to the records of the life of Jesus, we find predicated of Him every characteristic that marked the Hebrew prophets. 1. If Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel were all introduced to their prophetic career by a *vision* granted and a *voice* heard (Isa 6:1-8, Jer 1:4-10, Eze 3:10-14), so Jesus commenced His ministry by receiving at His baptism a vision from heaven and by hearing His Father’s voice.

The Gospel according to the Hebrews gives the words then spoken to Him in a form different from that given by the Evangelists, and interesting in the present connexion. We read: ‘It came to pass when our Lord had ascended out of the water, the whole fountain of the Holy Spirit came down and rested upon him and said unto him, “My Son, in all the prophets I was looking for thee, that thou mightest come and that I might rest in thee. For thou art my rest, thou art my firstborn Son who reignest to eternity.” ’ This form shows how strong was the belief in the earliest days of the Church that Jesus at His baptism was anointed specially to the office of Prophet.

2. The OT prophets were *men of God*. This title, doubtless, was frequently used, as conveying little more than a customary appellation of those holding the office; yet the fact of its having been chosen as a title shows the underlying conviction, on the part of the nation, that sanctity of character was a necessary condition of receiving communications from Jehovah; and it thus suggests not only the Divine purport of their message, but also the personal religiousness of the prophets. Isaiah felt that, in order to hold intercourse with God, personal holiness was requisite (Isa_6:5); and indeed so fully was this felt that the prophetic state was looked upon as closely related to *communion with God in prayer*; and the expression which was generally used in the OT for the answering of prayer was frequently applied to prophetic revelation (מִיְהוָה Mic_3:7, Hab_2:1 ff., Jer_23:35. See Oehler, *OT Theol.* ii. 336).

That Jesus bore this characteristic of the prophetic office needs no showing. He, the one sinless Man, whose whole life was lived in conscious communication, full and continuous, with His Father, must necessarily, as regards the fitness of holiness, be the very Prophet of prophets. His perfect sinlessness rendered possible uninterrupted fellowship with God, and guaranteed the perfection of the message He delivered. The pre-eminence of that message rests on the fact that whereas ‘God of old times spake unto the fathers in the prophets, he hath in these last times spoken unto us in his Son’ (Heb_1:1).

3. Further, as men of God, the message of the prophets was one of *moral import*. They, as Micah (Mic_3:8), could say, ‘I am full of power to declare unto Jacob his transgressions and to Israel his sins.’ The greater prophets had developed far beyond the earlier prophets and still earlier seers, who used their gifts to reveal matters of mere personal interest: their message to the individual or to the nation was filled, as occasion required, with moral teachings; rebuking sin, calling to repentance, and threatening Divine judgment.

It is evident that Jesus fulfilled this characteristic continuously and perfectly. For not only did He, like the prophets before Him, utter words pregnant with moral enlightenment but also by His every word and act He constantly manifested the perfection of moral being. Being Himself the revelation of God, His whole incarnate life was a continuous teaching of infinite moral import.

4. The prophets were conscious of being recipients of *direct communications from Jehovah*. In Amos (Amo_3:7) it is said, ‘The Lord God doeth nothing without revealing his counsel to his servants the prophets’; and in Jeremiah (Jer_23:22) we are told that the prophet stands in ‘the counsel of Jehovah.’ God spoke to them, and they received His words into their hearts and heard them with their ears (Eze_3:10). It might seem that here is a characteristic of the prophetic office that is not applicable to Christ. It

might be thought that as He is very and eternal God, He required no revelation, having in Himself all the fulness of Divine knowledge, and that therefore when He taught, He taught not what He had *received*, but what was intrinsically His own. A careful study, however, of the Gospel of St. John, where naturally we seek for light on the mystery of His Person, as it is the Gospel of His self-manifestation, leads us to conclude otherwise. In a remarkable number of passages Jesus speaks of *receiving from the Father* the truths He disclosed. He says, 'I speak to the world those things which I have heard'; 'as my Father hath taught me, I speak.' 'I have given unto them the words which Thou gavest me'; 'I spake not from myself, but the Father which sent me, He hath given me a commandment what I should say' (Joh 8:26; Joh 8:28; Joh 8:38; Joh 8:40; Joh 12:49; Joh 15:15; Joh 17:8; Joh 17:14).

In such words Jesus seems clearly to teach that His supernatural knowledge was a gift given to Him from the Father, 'administered to Him in His human nature on some economic principle,' so that He might be fitted perfectly to perform the functions of Teacher and Prophet to the Church. In emptying Himself of His glory in the Incarnation, He appears so to have self-limited His Divine Powers as to have been dependent upon His Father for supernatural illumination: while the reception by Him of that revelation must have been perfect through the complete sympathy that essentially existed between Him and His Father. Like the prophets of old, He received communications from God: but in virtue of His Divine Personality He perfectly heard and faithfully expressed every thought revealed to Him. (See, especially, a valuable charge by O'Brien, Bp. of Ossory, 1865 (Macmillan); and A. B. Davidson, *Biblical Essays*, p. 179).

5. A further characteristic of prophecy was its power of **prediction**. The apologetic use of prophecy in the past no doubt led to a too exclusive consideration of this aspect of the prophetic books; and the Church has gained much by regarding the prophets as men inspired by Jehovah with special moral messages to the age in which they lived. But it is not less one-sided so to over-emphasize this aspect of their work as to exclude their undoubted predictive powers. The writings of the Hebrew prophets are saturated with prediction. They foresee and announce as much of the secret purposes of Jehovah as was needful for His people to know. And the power of Jehovah to reveal to them the future raises Him, in the eyes of Israel, at once above the heathen gods, and proves to them that He is the true God (Isa 41:21-28; Isa 42:9; Isa 43:9-13; Isa 44:25 ff; Isa 48:3-7). No doubt their predictions usually announced the *general* results rather than detailed accounts of Jehovah's future dealings; nevertheless their predictions were clear unveilings of coming events. So that it may be said that a teacher without the power of foretelling would be no *prophet* (Deu 18:21-22), for the prophet has 'his face to the future,' and can see more or less clearly, by the inspiration granted to him, the results that God's love and righteousness are about to accomplish.

Now, full of prediction as are the writings of the prophets, the sayings of Jesus are even more so. With clear vision He was able to follow throughout future time the workings of the principles He taught, and was able to state as a matter of certain knowledge that their adoption would be universal. With an unparalleled insight He disclosed to the world the mysteries of eternity. He drew back the curtain not only from coming events of time, but with equal certainty from the hidden secrets of the invisible world. Hades, heaven, hell are all open to Him. And with a calm boldness, found only with absolute certainty, He tells us of Dives and Lazarus ([Luk 16:19](#)), of the many stripes and the few ([Luk 12:47](#)), and of the principles upon which the Final Judgment will be carried out ([Mat 25:40](#)).

If the Hebrew prophets received at times illumination which revealed to them glimpses of coming events, Jesus was at all times able to reveal hidden things of the future with as much certainty as He could speak of the things clearly seen in the present.

In addition to the predictions of *general* events, there is also found, but less frequently, among the Hebrew prophets, the power of foretelling *particular* events to individuals. Thus Micaiah foretells the death of Ahab (1 Kings 22), and Jeremiah the death of Hananiah ([Jer 28:16](#)). Here also Jesus surpasses them. With a certainty and clearness far beyond theirs, He was able to announce particular coming events to His disciples. Following the Gospel narrative, we find that the treachery of Judas was open to Him for long ([Joh 6:70](#) f.). The fall of Peter and his final martyrdom, and the prolonged life of John, were all equally clear ([Luk 22:31](#), [Joh 21:18](#); [Joh 21:22](#)).

Allied to His knowledge of the future of individuals was His unerring insight into character. This gift was partially granted to the prophets, and may in a measure account for their predictions. It may have been insight into character that enabled Micaiah to predict the coming cowardice of Zedekiah ([1Ki 22:25](#)), and it certainly seems to have been this that gave Elisha power to read the future of Hazael ([2Ki 8:12](#)). Similarly, only in an infinitely greater degree, Jesus read the inner depths of those around Him. At once He saw the guilelessness of Nathanael ([Joh 1:47](#)) and the strength of Peter ([Joh 1:42](#)), and was able to read the thoughts of Simon the Pharisee while Simon was misreading His ([Luk 7:39-40](#)). The records of His life show repeated instances that exemplify the statement of John, 'He knew all men ... he knew what was in man' ([Joh 2:24-25](#)).

6. As a final mark of His fulfilment of the prophetic office, His *fate*, must be mentioned. In His own Person He gathered together every insult and cruelty that had been shown in the past to the messengers of God. And if it seems strange that Israel, which more than all other nations had spiritual instincts, should have habitually rejected those sent to them with the very message they above all should have

received, and if it be stranger still that they should have crucified the Messiah whom they so passionately desired, it must be remembered that mankind at all times has been unable to receive, with patience, rebukes that shattered its self-conceit and truth that attacked its vested interests. New light ever discloses ignorance, reveals the inadequacy of much that is thought perfect, and shows the sinfulness of much that is looked upon as innocent. And thus it follows that the fuller the new light, the greater the hatred and opposition its bearer will have to endure at the hands of those who fail to recognize its truth. If, then, the preaching of Isaiah raised the gibes of the drunkards of Ephraim, and if the unwelcome predictions of Jeremiah led to bitterest persecution, is it any wonder that the clear light of the revelation of Jesus infuriated 'the blind Pharisee,' and ended in His cruel mockings and death?

III. Jesus is above all other prophets.—But while Jesus fulfils every prophetic characteristic perfectly, and is thus the world's Supreme Prophet, it is also evident, from this very perfection, that He is essentially distinct from all others who bore the title. For not only is there found in Him a man called of God to receive communications from heaven and to give them forth, when received, to his fellow-men, but in Him we have God revealing Himself directly to His creatures. As the personal, uttered '*Word of God*' (λόγος προφητικός), He manifests Himself (that is, He manifests God) to mankind. And if the essence of the prophetic office consists in revealing the Almighty to His children, then, clearly, He alone is the one perfect Prophet, who from His very nature must have (1) constantly, (2) completely, (3) infallibly, and (4) finally revealed all that mankind may know of their Creator.

1. His revelation was *constant*. OT prophets, receiving their revelation only at such times as Jehovah desired to reveal His will, could exercise their functions only intermittently; whereas Jesus, living in uninterrupted communion with His Father, was in receipt of a constant revelation of the purposes and will of God. Indeed, even in His hours of silence, He must be thought of as fulfilling His prophetic office. His every *act* was a message, and His miracles, not less than His parables, were revelations to teach men of His Father. His spontaneous lovingkindness, as exhibited to the sinful and the suffering, revealed even more powerfully than His words the fact that 'God is Love'; the beauty of His sinless life, not less than the depth of His matchless utterances, ever taught men this, the central truth of His message. Jesus, *simply by being what He was*, constantly delivered His prophetic message to the world.

2. His revelation was *complete*. The OT prophets could be recipients of only a partial revelation. As their writings are studied, it is seen how gradually God revealed His truth through them. Their knowledge of God is seen to develop, through progressive stages, from little to fuller light; prophet after prophet being sent to add his quota of

truth, each being granted that amount of illumination necessary to enable him to advance the hopes and knowledge of Israel beyond the stage already reached. With Jesus it was far otherwise. He came to raise the spiritual wisdom and knowledge of men, once and for all, to the highest point attainable by them on earth. And if we find Him, at any time during His ministry, withholding truth which He might have revealed, we know that the cause of such reserve is to be found, not in His inability to declare, but in His hearers' inability to receive (Joh_16:12).

3. His revelation was *infallible*. Great as was the usefulness of the prophets to God's chosen people, yet it is clear that in them they had no infallible guides. They had to distinguish between 'the false prophets' and those who truly represented Jehovah. For succeeding generations it may have been comparatively easy to separate them, for time would demonstrate, by events, the correctness or incorrectness of prophetic utterances; but not so for contemporaries. The false prophets were not as a class mere impostors trading on the religious feelings of the people, but rather they were men who, prophets by profession, lacked the spiritual discernment to interpret the mind of Jehovah. Their messages therefore rose no higher than current spiritual ideas. The people of Israel thus had constant need of spiritual discernment on their part to select the true and to reject the untrue in messages proffered to them, which claimed to come from Jehovah. But when experience had marked out to them a prophet as a true revealer of Jehovah's will, they were not even then certain of receiving infallible guidance. The true prophet might at times confuse his own natural judgment with the voice of God. Thus Samuel at first mistook Eliab for the Lord's anointed (1Sa_16:6); and Nathan too hastily sanctioned the project of David to build a temple (2Sa_7:1 ff.).

But the revelation of Jesus comes to us with infallible certainty. He does not, indeed, reveal *everything*; for on earth He was not omniscient. He distinctly told His disciples that there was at all events one thing He did not know (Mar_13:32). Thus He willingly limited His knowledge while on earth; and it is well for us to remember that He Himself was aware of the limitation, for He knew that He did not know. But this self-limitation in no way weakened His claim to infallibility in all He taught. *Ignorance* is one thing, *error* quite another. And being the Son of God, and so the perfect recipient of all that the Father willed to teach Him during His state of humiliation, He *knew perfectly all He knew*. Similarly, if He did not foresee everything, yet what He did foresee, *that* He foresaw perfectly. Very remarkable is the calm certainty of conviction with which He claims infallibility. The tone of authority in His utterances, the repeated 'I say unto you' astounded the multitude (Mat_7:29); while the claim itself could not have been more strongly put forth than in His words, 'Heaven and earth shall pass away; but my words shall not pass away' (Mar_13:31).

It is here especially that He stands pre-eminent. Throughout the whole course of His utterances there can be found no hesitation due to a possible conflict between His own judgment and His Father's will, but rather a claim in unmistakable language to absolute infallibility as a Teacher. In truth, His consciousness told Him that He could not be wrong, for He knew *where* He had received that which He taught. The words which He spake were not His own, but the Father's who sent Him. He spake that which He had seen with the Father,—*that* Father who was ever with Him (Joh 14:24; Joh 14:10; Joh 8:38). He knew, as none else could know, the truth regarding 'the heavenly things,' for He was 'the Son of Man, who had come down from heaven' (Joh 3:12-13). He is the one infallible Teacher of our race.

Jesus, in His interview with Nicodemus, draws a distinction between 'earthly things' (τὰ ἐπιγεια) and 'heavenly things' (τὰ ἐπουρανια). The former are spiritual truths within the range of human spiritual knowledge; the latter, spiritual truths which man can learn only by a revelation granted from God. Of these latter, Jesus is the one infallible revealer (see Adamson, *Mind in Christ*, p. 77 ff.).

4. His revelation is *final*. If the message of Jesus is thus complete and infallible, it is necessarily final. No doubt, the prophetic office of Christ is still an activity in the love of God for us; and the Church has ever the presence of the Holy Spirit leading her into fuller truth; nevertheless, the message that Jesus brought was complete in itself, and therefore final. For the office of the Holy Spirit is not to teach men something new, something outside that message, but rather to disclose truths which, though hitherto unrecognized, were implicit in His teaching. The Apostolic Church was furnished with prophets, and in a true sense prophets have appeared at intervals throughout the Christian era, and doubtless will yet appear; but, no matter how new their message may seem to the men of their own day, they are, unless they are false prophets, in reality only 'taking of the things of Christ, and declaring them' to His people (Joh 14:26; Joh 16:14-15).

IV. Christ's prophetic utterances.—When considering the prophetic utterances of Jesus, we must not confine ourselves to His predictions alone. If, as we have seen, foretelling is an essential element of prophecy, it is evident that forthtelling is no less so. The OT prophets not only foretold coming events, but also were the religious teachers of their own age; each in turn adding to the moral and religious knowledge of the nation. So Jesus, speaking as the world's Prophet, not only revealed the future, but once and for ever delivered potentially all truth to the world. The prophetic utterances of Jesus, therefore, include not only His predictions but all His teachings, and, as such, come within the scope of this article. As, however, His teaching is dealt with in a separate article, it is sufficient to refer the reader to the latter, and only to add some general remarks on the subject.

A. *Didactic utterances.*—1. The moral teaching of Christ concerned itself with general *principles* rather than with *precepts*. The Sermon on the Mount, which contains the chief elements of His ethical teaching, is not a code of injunctions, but a declaration of the fundamental principles that underlie His Kingdom; and the particular instances of right conduct mentioned in that discourse are not commandments, but illustrations of these principles. When He teaches His disciples regarding righteousness and sin, He avoids laying down laws regarding special acts, but goes at once to the very heart of moral distinctions, revealing the general principles which rule all special cases. Thus He solved all questions of meat by a single sentence, which ‘made all meats clean’ (Mar_7:19 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885); and He answered all questions of casuistry regarding Sabbath observance by pointing out the beneficent principle which led to its institution. In a word, He reduced all right action, whether towards God or towards man, to a fulfilling, and all wrong action to an outraging, of the one all-embracing commandment of Love. And thus His teaching finds its application in every act in every age.

There is but one exception recorded in our Gospels,—that in reference to divorce (Mar_10:11-12, cf. Mat_5:32; Mat_19:9). In this case He gives a concise and direct precept; but a precept, obedience to which purifies the human race at its source.

2. But Jesus not only revealed the true principles underlying all sin and righteousness, He also taught that *in Himself*, and particularly in Himself *dying*, was to be found the true atonement for sin. As soon as He was able to teach His disciples, even if it were in dark words, regarding His coming death, He connected that ‘death with the world’s salvation. Comparatively early in His ministry He announced that He would give His body ‘for the life of the world’ (Joh_6:51); later, He told them that, as the Good Shepherd, He would ‘lay down his life for the sheep’ (Joh_10:15); and as the fatal result of His ministry drew nearer, He declared, with still greater clearness, that He would give ‘his life a ransom for many’ (Mar_10:45). It is clear, then, that Jesus explicitly taught that His death was in the highest sense sacrificial; that there was a necessary connexion between that death and man’s salvation.

It is true that Jesus does not explain *how* His death wrought the Atonement, and that we must turn to the Epistles for this knowledge; but we may with confidence assume that the early Church derived its light on the matter from Jesus Himself; for St. Luke (Luk_24:47) tells us that among the truths taught the disciples by Jesus during the forty days were those regarding His ‘death’ and ‘repentance and remission of sins.’ Therefore the developed doctrine of the Atonement, as found in the writings of the early Church, are not mere subjective theorizings, but are based on the teaching of the risen Lord.

3. Jesus in His teaching taught the absolute *value of the individual*. The prophets of Israel felt the majesty of their nation as the chosen people of God, and dwelt upon Jehovah's Fatherly care of the Jewish race; but not until the preaching of Jeremiah was the Fatherhood of God over the individual brought into prominence. It was Jesus who first fully revealed the infinite value of the single soul. He insisted frequently on the madness of risking its loss, even if thereby the gain should be 'the whole world'; and He warned men that it were better that they should miserably perish than that they should cause to stumble even one of God's 'little ones' (Mar 8:36; Mar 9:42).

4. But His teaching was also *social*. The individual who was so precious in his Father's sight was not to be left unsupported in isolation. Wide and manifold as are the meanings of 'Kingdom of God' as established by Jesus, it is certain that underlying all else is the thought of its members united in love by a common life. This is essential to the very idea of a *kingdom*. And in it is ideally presented the thought of a spiritual nation composed of spiritual individuals.

The Kingdom of heaven from its spiritual nature, and as a Kingdom of ideas and principles, rather than of codified laws, is necessarily invisible, save as to its results. But man ever wants the outward or concrete; and Jesus therefore not only founded the *Kingdom of God*, but established a *Church* (Mat 16:18; Mat 18:17); the latter being an embodiment of the idea of the former, *visibly* presenting to the world its truths. *The Kingdom* is thus, in the teaching of Jesus, much wider and more fundamental than *the Church*.

5. When we pass from the ethical to the spiritual side of the didactic prophecies of Jesus, we enter upon an unparalleled field of revelation. As we have seen, He alone among men—and that because He was more than man—could disclose 'the heavenly things' (Joh 3:12) to the world. When, therefore, He speaks of the nature and acts of God, our attitude is that of reverent humble reception; and our activities are to be exercised rather in the devout investigation of the meaning of His words than in the questioning of their truth.

When we turn to the teaching itself, we find little regarding the essential *nature* of God. It was His method rather to describe how God *acts* than to define what God *is*. Indeed, the only statement approaching to an abstract definition of His Being is found in His words to the woman of Samaria, 'God is Spirit' (Joh 4:24).

The titles chiefly used by Jesus to describe the character of God are 'King' (Mat 5:35; Mat 18:23; Mat 22:2) and 'Father.' God is *Father*: in a unique sense in relation to Himself (Mat 10:32; Mat 11:27, Joh 5:17; Joh 10:30 etc.); in a special sense of His disciples (Mat 5:16, Luk 12:32 etc.); and in a general sense of mankind (Mat 5:45, Luk 15:11 ff.).

Further, His teaching concerning God reveals the doctrine of the Trinity. His own Deity, and the Deity and Personality of the Holy Spirit are plainly taught by Him; and the three Persons of the Godhead are with equal emphasis combined in the formula for baptism (Mat 28:19).

There seems no reason sufficiently weighty to cause us to regard this latter verse as an amplification of the actual words of Jesus, after the Church had grasped fully the theological doctrine of the Trinity. Rather it appears necessary to assume that some such statement must have been made by Him in order that this belief, which is found so distinctly stated in the earliest Epistles of St. Paul, may be accounted for (see Sanday in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , vol. ii. p. 624).

6. Christ as Prophet chiefly *revealed God by revealing Himself*. It is customary to emphasize as His prime revelation of God, His teaching regarding the Fatherhood of the Almighty; but rather would we emphasize His revelation of Himself as His chief prophetic work. He stood before men, and said not, 'I will teach you about God,' but, 'I will teach you about Myself, and then you will know God.' Throughout the Gospel of St. John this self-manifestation of Jesus is the one central subject. His ministry, in that Gospel, commences with His convincing self-revelation to Peter and John, Andrew and Philip, and Nathanael (ch. 1); His first miracle 'manifested forth his glory' (Joh 2:11); He closes His interview with Nicodemus by declaring His mission as a bearer from heaven of spiritual truths (Joh 3:12-13); the highest point in ch. 4 is the declaration to the woman of Samaria, 'I that speak unto thee am he' (Joh 4:26); in ch. 5 He declares His oneness in power with the Father by saying, 'What things soever the Father doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise' (Joh 5:19); the teaching of ch. 6 centres round the self-revelation of 'I am the bread of life' (Joh 6:48); at the Feast of Tabernacles He cried concerning Himself, 'If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink' (Joh 7:37); in ch. 8 He asserts His own pre-existence, saying, 'Before Abraham was, I am' (Joh 8:58); while the lengthy account of the cure of the blind man reaches its climax in the declaration, 'Thou hast both seen him, and it is he that talketh with thee' (Joh 9:37). Every section of the Gospel up to this point culminates and finds its reason in a self-revelation of Jesus made to an individual or to a few chosen ones (Joh 2:2) who were capable, by reason of their sincerity, of receiving it; while the succeeding chapters record a similar revelation granted to groups of listeners and disciples. He is 'the Good Shepherd'; 'the Door'; 'one with the Father'; 'the Resurrection' ... (Joh 10:7; Joh 10:11; Joh 10:30, Joh 11:25 ...). Clearer and clearer grows the revelation of Himself, until at last the real fulness and power, humility and truth of His self-disclosure are seen in the words, 'He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father' (Joh 14:9, Joh 12:45); that is to say, 'I have revealed God while I revealed Myself.' It is this that makes Him in Himself, as also in His deeds and words, the Supreme Prophet, as forthteller of the truth of God.

B. *Christ's predictions.*—The predictive element enters very largely into the utterances of Christ. Not only do the Gospels contain prophecies spoken with the express intention of revealing the future to the disciples, such as those relating to His own death and the destruction of Jerusalem, but also numerous prophecies which occur incidentally. An example of the latter is found in His rebuke to those that 'troubled' Mary because of her costly offering; a rebuke that foretells the universality of His Kingdom and the perpetual memorial of her deed (Mar_14:9).

If the Gospels be studied with a view to noting those sayings of Jesus which are predictive, surprise will be felt at their number. It will be seen that the parables grouped in Matthew 13 are predictions of the history of the Kingdom; that His promises not only exhibit His love and power, but also are fore-tellings of His future action (e.g. Mat_18:20; Mat_28:20). It will be found that His miracles are often prefaced by announcements beforehand of the cure to be wrought (e.g. Luk_8:50, Joh_11:11); that His discourse in John 6 is based on a prediction of His own sacrificial death, and that in John 14-16 on His foreknowledge of the Holy Spirit's descent. And, further, even in His High-Priestly prayer He shows knowledge of the future by pleading for those whom He foresees as His disciples in the coming age (Joh_17:20); and, if His first recorded word during His ministry is a prophecy of the immediate advent of the Kingdom (Mar_1:15), His last is a prophecy of its spread to the uttermost part of the world (Act_1:8). His words are saturated with prediction.

The predictions of Jesus may be classified as follows: Those referring (1) to individuals, (2) to His Kingdom, (3) to the material world, (4) to His own career, (5) to the destruction of Jerusalem, (6) to the Parousia and the consummation of the age.

1. As His *predictions regarding individuals* present no special difficulties, it will be sufficient simply to mention them. In giving Simon the name of Peter (Joh_1:42), Jesus not only revealed his character, but foretold his pre-eminence; a prediction justified at Caesarea Philippi (Mat_16:18). On this latter occasion He foretold that the Apostle would become the porter of the Church, and the Acts of the Apostles records the fulfilment. Jesus also predicted his fall and restoration (Luk_22:31, Mar_14:30), and finally announced in hidden language the death by which he should ultimately glorify God (Joh_21:18). At this time He also used words which obscurely foretold to the Apostle John a prolonged life (Joh_21:22). From an early period in His ministry Jesus read the heart of Judas (Joh_6:64; Joh_13:18), shortly after the Transfiguration He announced His coming betrayal (Mar_9:31), in the Upper Room He declared that the betrayer was one of the Twelve (Mar_14:18), and finally by the sign of the given sop He marked Judas as the traitor (Joh_13:26). To Nathanael He foretold that he would see 'heaven opened' (Joh_1:51); to Caiaphas, that he would see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven (Mar_14:62); to James and John, that they would be baptized with His baptism (Mar_10:39); and to all the Apostles, that they would be

persecuted like Himself, excommunicated, and in peril of death (Joh 15:20; Joh 16:2), that they would forsake Him in the hour of His greatest need (Mar 14:27), but that after His death they would do even greater works than He Himself had done (Joh 14:12), and ultimately would sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Mat 19:28, Luk 22:30).

2. Predictions regarding the Kingdom.—The position of Jesus in reference to the idea of the Kingdom of God is partly that of a fulfiller and partly that of a foreteller. He established during His ministry the Kingdom in its simplest stage, and so far fulfilled what the OT prophets had foretold; but having established it, He made it the subject of His own predictions, projected it into the future, with the OT limitations removed, revealed its struggles throughout time, and announced its ultimate victory.

That Jesus did establish the Kingdom of God during His lifetime can hardly be doubted. To make it entirely future, as some do, seems impossible in the face of such passages as ‘The kingdom of God is among you’ (or ‘*within* you,’ ἐγγὺς ὑμῶν, Luk 17:21; see art. Ideas (Leading), vol. i. p. 770^b); ‘The—kingdom of God is come upon you’ (ἐθ’ ὑμᾶς, Mat 12:28); ‘From the days of John the Baptist the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence’ (Mat 11:12, see Wendt’s *Teaching of Jesus*, vol. i. p. 364 ff.).

In the parable of the Sower (Matthew 13, see also Luk 14:18 ff.) He foretold the different classes of people that would become its subjects, and the varied reception they would give to its claims; and in the parables of the Tares and the Draw-net (Matthew 13), the presence within it of unworthy members. He marked out for it a long career of struggle with evil, within,—false prophets deceiving (Mat 7:15; Mat 7:22), without,—malignant foes opposing (Mat 10:16; Mat 10:33, Luk 21:12, Joh 15:20; Joh 16:2); but He promised the support of His abiding presence (Mat 28:20), and guaranteed its invincibility (Mat 16:18).

Though its beginning is unobserved (Luk 17:20), yet He predicted, in the parable of the Seed Growing Secretly (Mar 4:26), its reaching through steady growth its consummation; in the parable of the Mustard Seed (Mat 13:31), its universal extension as a visible society; and in that of the Leaven, its gradually acquired power over the hearts of men (Mat 13:33). No longer will its bounds be confined to the Chosen Race, for adherents from every quarter of the globe will enter it (Mat 8:11), humanity becoming one flock under one Shepherd (Joh 10:16); and towards this great end it will itself work, for it will evangelize the world before His return (Mat 28:19; Mat 24:14). And when He comes in the clouds, its struggles will cease, and He will gather its members to that heavenly feast which will celebrate His marriage with His

bride, and then, purged from evil, it will enter upon its career of eternal glory (Mat 24:31, Mat 22:1 ff., Mat 25:1 ff., Mat 13:41, Mat 25:34).

3. Predictions regarding the material world.—A renewal of the face of nature enters largely into the prophecies of the OT (Isa 11:6-9; Isa 30:23 ff., Isaiah 35; Isa 65:17, Hos 2:21 f., Eze 34:25; Eze 34:28), and reappears in wider form in the Epistle to the Romans (Rom 8:21), where St. Paul predicts the delivery of creation from the bondage of corruption; and in the Apocalypse (Rev 21:1), where a new heaven and a new earth are foretold (see also 2Pe 3:13). Nor can the Church look forward to any less comprehensive issue, believing as she does in the Incarnation which for ever glorifies *matter* by its union with the Godhead. The comparative silence of Jesus upon this subject is remarkable. He cannot be said to have alluded to it except in two passages, neither of which is of certain interpretation. The one is in the Sermon on the Mount, where we read, ‘The meek shall inherit the earth’ (Mat 5:5). These words may mean no more than that meekness here on earth wins more than self-assertion; but, seeing that the meek do not, as yet at all events, receive their due, the words more probably may be eschatological in reference, and predict their ultimate recognition on a renewed earth. In the other passage Jesus promises His Apostles that ‘in the regeneration’ they shall sit upon twelve thrones (Mat 19:28). But here again there is uncertainty of interpretation; for, while He calls the culmination of the Kingdom of Grace in the Kingdom of Glory ‘the regeneration,’ He leaves it uncertain whether that regeneration concerns merely the whole body of the redeemed (cf. Briggs, *Mess. of Gospel*, pp. 228, 315), or whether it includes, as seems more probable, the physical transformation of nature (cf. Schwartzkopff, *Proph. of Christ*, pp. 219, 232).* [Note: Jesus tells us that not only the brute creation (Mat 10:29; Mat 6:26), but even the vegetable kingdom is under the Father’s care (Mat 6:30).]

4. Predictions regarding Himself.—We find in the Gospels frequent predictions by Jesus of His death, and almost invariably in connexion with them allusions to His resurrection. There may be difficulty in deciding as to when He Himself first became conscious of the fatal end to His ministry, but there can be no doubt that as soon as He realized His death as imminent, He must have realized His resurrection as certain. To suppose Him to have recognized Himself as the true Messiah and then to have regarded His death as the end of all, is to suppose the impossible. Living as He lived in uninterrupted communion with the Father, He must have been conscious of the indestructibility of the Divine life that was His, and of the eternal value of His Person and work (cf. Schwartzkopff, *Proph. of Christ*, pp. 64, 147). And if a dead Messiah was a contradiction in terms to any one holding Messianic hopes, how much more was it so to the Messiah Himself?

It was not until after the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi (see Mat 16:21 ‘From that time forth ...’) that Jesus plainly foretold His death; but having done so,

He repeated the warning three times at short intervals, each time adding more definiteness to the prediction. (1) He outlined the Passion, foretelling the Sanhedrin's rejection of Him, His death, and resurrection (Mar_8:31); (2) after the Transfiguration, where the highest point of His ministry was reached, He repeated the prediction, adding the fact of the betrayal (Mar_9:31); (3) on the journey to Jerusalem He foretold in very full detail the sufferings that awaited Him (Mar_10:33), enumerating in their actual order the stages of contumely through which He was to pass. The betrayal, the judicial condemnation, the delivery to the Roman power, the mocking and spitting, the killing (Mat_20:19 'crucifying'), and, finally, the resurrection, all in turn are mentioned (cf. Swete's *St. Mark, l.c.*). See, further, art. Announcements of Death.

It is assumed by some that Jesus commenced His ministry with views as to His work very different from those with which He closed it, the rigour of events leading Him to modify the ideas with which He started (*e.g.* Weiss, *Life of Christ*, iii. 60). If this be true, then the delay in our Lord's plain announcement of His death until Peter had made his confession may well be due to the fact that He Himself had not before realized it as inevitable. But we should require the strongest proof to cause us to believe in such vacillation or change of purpose on His part. The argument from silence is always precarious, but never more so than in the case of One who distinctly tells us that He restrained His utterances because of His hearers' inability fully to bear the truth (Joh_16:12). We have, therefore, more ground for assuming that His reticence was due to His loving consideration for His disciples, who had already many doubts and difficulties to conquer, rather than to His ignorance of what was before Him. Indeed, in His last discourse He stated that now at length He felt able to speak openly, and would from that moment (*ἀπ' ἄρτι*) tell them plainly what was to come to pass, in order that they might the more readily believe that He was the Christ (Joh_13:19). His reticence and His openness alike are due to His consideration for their weaknesses.

5. Predictions regarding the destruction of Jerusalem.—The chief difficulties found in the predictions of Jesus regarding the destruction of Jerusalem are in the great eschatological discourse recorded in Mark 13, and in 'the lesser Apocalypse' in Luke 17. As both these passages will come up before us under the prophecies of the Parousia, it is not necessary to consider them here. We now refer only to those other passages which foretell it.

(a) In the parable of the King's Son, Jesus declared that those who spitefully entreated and slew the messengers would be punished by the king's armies destroying the murderers and burning up their city (Mat_22:7). These words contain, doubtless, a

prediction of the punishment that through the ages ever follows apostasy, but not the less do they foretell vividly the judgment that fell upon Jerusalem.

(b) In the next chapter (Matthew 23) we find the denunciation of the scribes by Jesus, which concludes with His lamentation over the city He loved. And He closes with the words, 'Your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.' Here, in foretelling the desolation of the Temple, He predicted its destruction; for while, no doubt, its desolation was a spiritual fact from the moment He finally quitted its precincts, yet the visible evidence of its being God-forsaken was given in its destruction.

Lk. (Luk_13:35) gives these words in a different connexion. In Mt. they are spoken at the close of His ministry, just as Jesus was leaving the Temple for the last time as a public teacher. In Lk. they arise naturally from His sad words telling that no prophet can perish out of the city. It is difficult to decide between these two occasions, and it is possible, though not probable, that the words were spoken twice by Him.

The interpretation of the last part of the prediction is also difficult. The desolation is to cease when they shall say, 'Blessed is he that cometh....' What future event does this indicate? If the words were spoken in the connexion given by Mt., they cannot refer, as some think, to the cries of the multitude on Palm Sunday, as they would have been spoken *after* that occasion. If Lk. is right, then this is a possible, but very inadequate, interpretation. Thus they may be taken as referring either to the Parousia or to the ultimate conversion of the Jews (cf. Plummer, *St. Luke, l.c.*). If the latter interpretation be accepted, then they are a prophecy of the final restoration of the Chosen Race, and supplement the prediction of their rejection (Mat_21:43; see also Luk_21:24).

(c) The most minute prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem is found in Luk_19:41-44. On the occasion of His triumphal entry, when He saw the city before Him, He announced with cries of sorrow that He foresaw its inhabitants shut in, the city itself captured, the people slain, and the walls demolished. To some this minuteness of detail suggests that the Evangelist, writing after the event, coloured his description from facts which had already occurred. But if Jesus was able to foretell the fact of the city's destruction, He could with equal ease have described the circumstances here mentioned, which are really common to all sieges.

(d) Jesus gave His last predictive warning of the coming judgment on the city to the women who wept as He journeyed to Calvary. He told them the days would come (*i.e.* the days of their city's destruction) when they would call upon the mountains to fall on them (Luk_23:30). His grief for the sorrow that the catastrophe would bring on

poor womanhood is also shown in His longer eschatological discourse ([Mar_13:17](#)), where He says: 'Woe to them that are with child and to them that give suck in those days.'

6. Predictions regarding the Parousia.—The predictions of Jesus regarding the Parousia are among the most difficult of His utterances, and many weighty questions of criticism and interpretation arise which are beyond the limits of this article. We can only state the conclusions at which we have arrived, referring readers elsewhere for fuller information (see Parousia, Second Coming). There are five chief passages in which Jesus speaks of His return, and in each of these He uses language difficult of interpretation. This fact must not be forgotten. It is not that He spoke of His return sometimes in clear and sometimes in cryptic language, but that whenever He referred to it He invariably spoke enigmatically. There must have been some reason for this persistent ambiguity; and it is to be found in the dulness of spiritual insight of the Apostles, and their unpreparedness for clearer teaching. In this connexion, as in connexion with the predictions of His death, He was unable to speak openly.

His aim seems to have been to *prepare* them for the following facts:—(a) that He was about to leave them; (b) that His death would be due to His rejection by the hierarchy and the antagonism of the populace; (c) that the sin of that generation which culminated in His death would speedily receive its punishment in the utter destruction of their city and Temple; (d) that He Himself would, by His spiritual might, be the just avenger on Jerusalem of His own death; (e) that ages of gospel preaching would then follow, during which the curse on the Holy City would last until the times of the Gentiles were fulfilled; (f) that not until the whole world was evangelized would He visibly appear; (g) but that He Himself, though visibly withdrawn, would be spiritually present with them and succeeding generations. These facts, so plain to us, could not possibly have been grasped by those who, having found the Messiah, necessarily expected immediate victory at His hands. We know that even after the forty days' instruction they still were unable to shake off their preconceptions, and still hankered after a material Messianic kingdom ([Act_1:6](#)); and we may therefore be certain that during the days spent with Him before His death and resurrection, they would have been absolutely unable to understand Him had He spoken openly of His continuous spiritual presence, of His spiritual coming during their lifetime to judge-Jerusalem, of the long ages of the Gospel Dispensation, and of His final visible return at the end of the world. What He could do, He did. In words that hiddenly contained these truths. He revealed them enigmatically; and the logic of events would, and did, interpret them to His hearers and to the Church after them.

This characteristic of the sayings of Jesus regarding His Coming accounts in a measure for the ease with which the early Church changed her view as to the time of His return. At first she lived in expectation of an immediate return of her Lord, but

when events proved that this hope was in a literal sense illusory, she, without any great rupture of faith, accepted the view that a long period would intervene before she welcomed Him in His glory. And this revolution of thought can best be accounted for by the fact that when He did not come at the expected time, she turned back to the mysterious words with which He had announced His return, and learnt, what circumstances now made plain, the deeper meaning of His pregnant sayings.

We will now consider the five chief passages which foretell His Coming, taking them not in the order in which they were spoken, but in that which best helps our investigation.

(1) Jesus, in reply to the question of Caiaphas whether He were the Christ, replied: 'I am; and ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven' (Mar 14:62). Mt. has, 'Henceforth (ἀπ' ἄρτι) ye shall see ...'

(Mat 26:64); Lk. 'From henceforth (ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν) ...' (Luk 22:69). It may be that Mk. gives the exact words spoken, and that Mt. and Lk. make the addition to show what they conceived to be the meaning; but more probably Mk. omitted the 'henceforth,' as not comprehending it. It is evident that Jesus here spoke not of His final Parousia, but rather of an immediate spiritual visitation which from that present moment Caiaphas would experience—a prediction that had not long to wait for its fulfilment; for must not the quaking rocks, the rent, veil, and the opened tomb, followed as they were by Pentecost and the victories of the Church, have been felt by Caiaphas as true comings in power of Him whom he once thought he had mastered? This passage, then, is full of importance; for here, without doubt, Jesus spoke of a 'Coming' other than the final. And it compels us, when considering His other references to the same subject, to inquire whether He refers to 'historic Comings' or to His ultimate reappearance at the end of the world. It is thought by some that to make His sayings refer to such 'historic Comings,' is to use a modern key, made merely for the purpose of getting out of difficulty (Schwartzkopff, *Proph. of Christ*, p. 246); but in this passage it can have no other meaning, unless indeed we hold that Jesus erroneously thought that His final return would be during the lifetime of Caiaphas—a view to most impossible, for it predicates of Him not ignorance but error. On the other hand, we shall find that by the use of His enigmatic words He suggested frequently that His Coming was 'not one but manifold,' and that by His frequent 'historic returns' in the great crises of the life of Humanity, He would prepare the way for and rehearse His grand final Parousia.

It is remarkable that while Lk. follows Mt. in adding 'henceforth' to the words of Mk., he separates from both by omitting the reference to the 'Coming'; substituting 'shall the Son of Man be seated at the right hand of power' for 'ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.' Did he feel

that 'the clouds of heaven,' as an apocalyptic phrase, was difficult to be understood by his Gentile readers; or did he miss the point of view that recognized many historic Comings? The omission by him of the words 'ye shall see' points in the latter direction. He understood the Session of the Son of Man at the right hand, but failed to grasp a 'Coming' that would be visible and immediate to Caiaphas. A somewhat similar change is made by him in the great eschatological discourse, where he substitutes 'know ye that *the kingdom of God* is nigh' (Luk_21:31) for '*he* is nigh' (Mar_13:29, Mat_24:33). It is not that, according to him, there is no final coming; for previously he had recorded (Luk_21:25 ff.) the prediction of the signs in the heavens which, following the 'times of the Gentiles,' precede the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds with power; but rather that where the coming does not appear to him as the *final* coming, he substitutes the Coming of the Kingdom for the Coming of Christ. He makes a similar change in the passage which will next occupy our consideration, namely, Mar_9:1, Mat_16:28, Luk_9:27. Mk. has 'some ... shall in no wise taste of death till they see the kingdom of God come with power.' Mt. enlarges it 'till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom,' while Lk. has simply 'till they see the kingdom of God'—a change which makes interpretation easy, but which removes from the words all the allusion to such historic Comings as are implied by Mt. and not excluded by Mk.

(2) 'The Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, and then shall he render unto every man according to his deeds. Verily I say unto you, There be some of them that stand here, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom' (Mat_16:27-28). Jesus predicts here two 'Comings'—one at the end of the world, when He returns in the glory of His Father to judge the world, the other within the lifetime of some of those present. Opinions may differ as to when this latter was fulfilled, whether at the Transfiguration, or at the Resurrection, or at Pentecost, or at the destruction of Jerusalem, or at each of these in turn; but unless we are to convict Jesus of error of judgment, we cannot hold that He identified any of these with His final coming to judgment. So that here, as in the words to Caiaphas, we find necessarily a prediction in mysterious language of His 'historic Comings'—a prediction that time would explain to His disciples by fulfilling.

(3) 'Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of Man be come' (Mat_10:23). These words are a fragment peculiar to Mt., and occur in the charge of Jesus to the Apostles when sending them out. Much of this charge as given by Mt. is found in different connexions in the other Synoptics; it is therefore impossible to say whether this particular prediction was spoken at the time given by Mt., but this doubt does not enable us to conclude that it never was spoken at all. On the contrary, the great difficulty on the face of the saying renders it the more certain that it was spoken by Him on some occasion. Further, it should be noticed that it occurs in that Gospel which, as we have seen, records most fully those sayings of our Lord which

refer to His 'Comings' (Mat 16:27, Mat 26:64). We therefore are right in seeing in the words a prediction of His 'Coming' at the Resurrection, or at Pentecost, or at the destruction of Jerusalem.

(4) 'The lesser Apocalypse of Jesus' is a title sometimes given to His discourse found in Luk 17:22; Luk 18:8. Having told the Pharisees that the Kingdom of God was 'among them,' He turned to His disciples and told them that in the future they would desire to see 'one of the days of the Son of Man' but would not see it; but that when 'his day' did come, there would be no mistaking it, as it would shine as lightning and come as suddenly. He, however, would have first to suffer many things and be rejected. He then told them that as 'in the days' of Noah and of Lot (Luk 18:26; Luk 18:28), worldliness predominated until 'the day' that Noah entered the ark and Lot left Sodom (Luk 18:27; Luk 18:29), so would it be in 'the days of the Son of Man' until 'the day' when He would be revealed (Luk 18:25-30). 'The days' of Noah and Lot were days of opportunity for repentance before 'the day' of retribution. So 'the days of the Son of Man' must be the period of grace that ever precedes 'the day' of His revelation in judgment, whether that judgment be the final judgment or such a penal visitation as the destruction of Jerusalem. That the immediate reference in the passage is to the latter, follows from the warning contained in the next verses, bidding those on the housetop not come down and those in the field not return home (Luk 18:31). These words could not possibly apply to the final return of Jesus, but must have been spoken in reference to the flight from the city before its destruction. And as that impending doom drew near, as the atmosphere became weighted with forebodings of coming calamity, and as their hearts failed them for fear (Luk 21:26), then they would desire 'one of the days of the Son of Man'—one of those days of God's patient waiting; but they would not see it, for all was ripened to judgment. 'His day' of vengeance was at hand. He concluded this section with 'where the body is, thither will the vultures also be gathered together' (Luk 17:37)—enigmatic words whereby He told His disciples that when the circumstances became ripe, the event would happen. Then followed the parable of the Unrighteous Judge (Luk 18:1), bidding God's 'elect' pray importunately for relief during the days of trial; and, lastly, came the sorrowful question of Jesus, whether, notwithstanding the certainty of His deliverance of His people, He, when He comes, shall 'find faith on the earth' (Luk 18:8). The worldliness of the days of Noah and Lot supply the answer.

(5) The discourse found in its simplest form in Mark 13 (cf. Matthew 24, Luke 21) is the most elaborate recorded prophecy of Jesus, and presents to interpreters many and serious difficulties; but what has been said on the four preceding passages lessens the difficulties and points to the solution. Some scholars get rid of all that puzzles by assuming that the Evangelists inserted portions of a current Jewish-Christian Apocalypse throughout the discourse of Jesus. (For a good statement of this position, and for the various authorities, see Moffatt, *Historical New Test.* p. 637; and for a

good exposition on conservative lines, see Briggs, *Messiah of the Gospels*, pp. 132-165).

It might be enough to object to such a radical solution by pointing out the entire absence of any external evidence; but, further, it should be said that it seems incredible that the Evangelists should, by this sort of literary patchwork, have concocted a discourse so difficult for themselves and their readers to understand. The undeniable difficulties of the passage lead us to think that Jesus spoke the words; they also show the conscientious regard for truth that actuated those who recorded them. It must also be remembered that the difficulties found in this discourse are precisely the same in nature as those found in the four passages we have just considered, so that to suppose that extraneous Apocalyptic literature is inserted here would lead us to give a like explanation of all these other passages. But that is impossible, for no such supposition would for a moment hold, in the case, for example, of the reply of Jesus to Caiaphas. Neither on external nor on internal grounds is such a solution to be accepted.

The discourse itself must now claim our attention. The disciples, having pointed out to Jesus the splendour of the Temple buildings, receive the reply that not one stone shall be left upon another: a prediction He had previously made regarding the *city* of Jerusalem (Luk 19:43). The words evidently sank deeply into their hearts, for when they sat with Him on the Mount of Olives they asked Him privately, ‘When shall these things be, and what shall be the sign when these things are all about to be accomplished?’ (Luk 21:7). They thus asked two questions: first, *when* it would be; secondly, what *sign* would herald it. Mt. enlarges the latter question into ‘What shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the age?’; showing that the disciples connected the destruction of the Temple with Christ’s return, and that they sought instruction as to whether it was not also the End or consummation of the age (συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος, Mat 13:39-40; Mat 13:49; Mat 28:20, cf. Heb 9:26). Our Lord’s reply is full, both as to the *time* and the *sign* of the Temple’s destruction, and is also directed to the question of His return and the end of the world. The fact that He includes these latter subjects in His reply as given in all three Gospels, goes to show that they were implicit in the shorter questions of Mk. and Lk. He first tells them that it will *not* be when false Christs arise and when nation rises against nation, for these things are but ‘the beginnings of travail’—the birth-throes preliminary to final pains issuing in a new age—(Mar 13:5-8); but that it *will* be after the gospel has been preached unto all nations, they themselves in the meantime suffering persecution; and *then* the end will come (Mar 13:10, Mat 24:14).

He then spoke of the *sign*, which would be that predicted by Daniel, namely, ‘the abomination of desolation,’ which would warn of the imminent destruction of the

Temple. He further told them that that would occur at a period of unprecedented affliction, and He bade them, when they saw the sign, escape at once to the mountains (Mar_13:14-20, Mat_24:15-22, Luk_21:20-24).

Having thus spoken of the *time* and the *sign* of the destruction, He passed on to speak of His 'Coming,' which He announced as following 'immediately' upon the tribulation which He had just described. In Mk. we read, 'In those days, after that tribulation (Mat_24:29 'immediately ($\epsilon\upsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$) after ...'), the sun shall be darkened ... and *then* shall they see the Son of Man coming in the clouds, ... and he shall send forth his angels and gather together his elect from the four winds ...' Thus both Evangelists make the coming of the Son of Man follow 'immediately' upon the foretold tribulation which was to preface the destruction of the Temple.

Briggs (*Messiah of Gospels*, p. 155) ascribes to the $\epsilon\upsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$ of Mt. a prophetic sense similar to קָרוֹב of the OT. The events were near to the vision of the prophet, but not necessarily near in actual history. But this does not get over the 'in those days' of Mk., which is almost as definite as the 'immediately of Mt.

The question at once arises, whether those words can be taken as describing the judgment of the city and Temple. As far as the signs in heaven are concerned, we may say Yes; for these theophanic signs may justly be taken as imagery of the spiritual. Thus Peter interprets the heavenly portents foretold by Joel as fulfilled in the outpouring of the Spirit (Act_2:16; Act_2:19). But as regards the gathering together of the elect from the uttermost parts of the earth, we must say No. In no sense can this be said to have taken place when Jerusalem fell. What, then, we are to conclude is as follows: Jesus here foretold His 'Comings'; He wished His disciples to look forward to an early judgment on the guilty city and church, and He wished them also to look forward to a time of ingathering to take place at the consummation of all things. As He had done before (Mar_8:38; Mar_9:1), so now He spoke of these two events, one nigh at hand, the other far in the distant future, both as 'Comings' of Himself; but the two Evangelists, untaught as yet by events, were unable to separate in their records that which to His own mind was distinct. This view is much strengthened by our finding that that Evangelist who wrote after the destruction of Jerusalem was able then to distinguish what to them was confused. It is very remarkable that Lk., instead of placing the final return of Christ immediately after the tribulation, inserts a clause which makes the entire Christian dispensation intervene. He writes, 'Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled' (Luk_21:24); and thus makes room for the ages of evangelization that intervene between the destruction of Jerusalem and the Parousia.

The discourse closed with two remarkable statements: first, that that generation would not pass away until all those things were accomplished (Mar 13:30, Mat 24:34, Luk 21:32); second, that none save the Father, not even the Son, knew 'that day and hour' (Mar 13:32, Mat 24:36). That the Evangelists should have placed side by side two such apparently conflicting utterances, can be explained only by assuming their certain knowledge that Jesus had spoken them, and by their extreme fidelity to truth. To apply both sayings to the same event makes Jesus say, 'I do not know the exact day or hour, but I know that it will occur within the lifetime of some of those present.' But the words are far too strong for such a meaning. He never would have asseverated so strongly in such a connexion the ignorance of the angels in heaven and of Himself as Son. What He evidently meant was, that He Himself would visit the Temple and city in judgment, and level them even with the ground within that generation; but that the day and hour of His final return in glory were unknown even to Himself. 'That day, is used frequently as synonymous with 'last day,' indeed appears to be always used in that sense where the antecedent is not plainly indicated, and so must be taken in that sense here (Mat 7:22; Mat 26:29, Luk 10:12; Luk 21:34, 2Th 1:10, 2Ti 1:12; 2Ti 1:18; 2Ti 4:8).

Mt. appends a series of parables which illustrate and spiritually apply the great lessons of the discourse. Jesus told His hearers to watch; for if the master of the house had kept awake, the thief would not have entered. They are to be diligent and faithful as trusted servants, so that they may receive the blessing from their Master when He returns (Mat 24:43; Mat 24:51). By the parable of the Ten Virgins He cautioned them against indolence creeping upon them because of His delay in coming. By the parable of the Talents He taught them that definite duties are entrusted to them during 'the long time' of His absence, but that on His return He will proportionately reward faithful service and punish neglect. And, finally, by the parable of the Sheep and the Goats He pictured in majestic language the great culmination of His ministerial office, when, seated on the throne of glory, He will dispense to assembled humanity the justice which their deeds of love or selfishness have merited.

The historic Comings, which are, as we have seen, so largely predicted by the Synoptists, are as plainly taught by John; in fact, it is even more impossible in the Fourth Gospel than in the first three to narrow down the sayings of Jesus that refer to His 'Comings' to any one event. When He says, 'I will come again, and receive you unto myself' (Joh 14:3), His meaning cannot be exhausted by referring the words to Pentecost, or to death, or to the Parousia; rather does it include all these. Similarly, 'I will not leave you desolate: I come to you' (Joh 14:18), is not sufficiently interpreted by referring the words to the Resurrection, or to Pentecost, or to personal spiritual revelations; but must include all these.

In both these verses the Greek is not in the future tense but present (ἔρχομαι), meaning not 'I will come,' but 'I come, at all times I am coming' (see Westcott, *l.c.*; see also [Joh_16:16](#); [Joh_16:22](#); [Joh_21:22](#)). This view of repeated 'Comings' does not prevent John from teaching the great Final Advent, for he records the words of Jesus which foretell the hour when the dead in their graves shall hear His voice ([Joh_5:28](#)); and in his Epistles uses the word παρουσία in exactly the same sense as it is used by Matthew, James, and Paul ([1Jn_2:28](#); cf. [Mat_24:3](#), [Joh_5:7](#), [1Co_15:23](#)).

The predictions of Jesus carry us even beyond His Parousia. They tell us that His Coming will be the signal for the resurrection of the dead, both bad and good alike ([Joh_5:28-29](#)), and that that resurrection will be followed by the judgment of mankind. It is revealed that He Himself will be the Judge, and that before the throne of His glory will be gathered the entire human race in order that they may receive the just recompense for their deeds ([Mat_25:31](#) ff.), each individual receiving his merited sentence ([Mat_25:32](#); [Mat_22:11](#); [Mat_16:27](#)). The judgment will thus be *universal* and *individual*. It is further revealed that the decisions of that judgment will be 'age-long' in their consequences. On the one hand, the guilty will suffer from 'the unquenchable fire' and 'the undying worm' ([Mar_9:44](#); [Mar_9:46](#); [Mar_9:48](#)); they will be shut out from the marriage feast of the King's Son, and condemned to 'outer darkness' ([Mat_22:13](#); [Mat_8:12](#); [Mat_25:30](#)). On the other hand, the righteous will pass in with the Bridegroom to the marriage ([Mat_25:10](#)), will enter into the joy of their Lord ([Mat_25:21](#)), will be received unto Himself ([Joh_14:3](#)), and will behold His glory ([Joh_17:24](#)).

As regards the predicted bliss of the pardoned, there can be no doubt that Jesus taught that it was of eternal duration, for that bliss is naught but the gift of life, and that life is the life of God Himself, and so necessarily is everlasting as He is everlasting ([Joh_1:4](#); [Joh_5:26-29](#), cf. [1Jn_5:11-12](#)). His teaching regarding the duration of the punishment of the wicked, however, is less plain. Much of His language is highly figurative, and may have been used by Him only to express the terrible punishment that awaits unrepented sin in the next world, without precluding the hope that God will finally win all to Himself by love; a hope that not a few passages in the later books of the NT suggest.

V. The prophetic office of the Ascended Christ.—We must not conceive of the prophetic office of Jesus as ceasing with His ascension; for it, no less than the priestly and kingly, belongs to His essential activities as the Redeemer of men. Error as well as sin blights human life, and truth as well as righteousness is needed to restore the fallen, and therefore from the right hand of God He still teaches the world He loves.

1. His prophetic work is carried on by Him through the instrumentality of *His Church*, which is inspired by His Spirit. It is not that He has transferred His teaching office from Himself to the Church, but that He Himself still teaches the world through her. When the earliest preachers of the gospel proclaimed their message, He, though enthroned, worked with them and confirmed the word with signs following (Mar 16:20); and it was His Spirit—‘the Spirit of Jesus’—that prevented Paul the missionary from entering Bithynia (Act 16:7), and that thus directed his steps as a teacher to Europe. In a word, the Church in her teaching office is taught, confirmed, and guided by Jesus Christ, her ever-living Prophet.

2. Shortly after the Church started on her career, the inherent prophetic power, which she possessed by her union with Christ, exhibited itself in a recognized *order of prophets*,—men and women who preached under the influence of direct inspiration, and who at times were able to foretell the future. These prophets were placed by St. Paul second in his list of Church ministrants (1Co 12:28, Eph 4:11). Their natural tendency towards independence by and by brought them into collision with the Church’s authoritative organizations; and their ministry of enthusiasm, under the pressure of the more regular and constant ministrations, gradually fell into disuse.

3. But the many movements claiming inspiration throughout her history tell us that the prophetic Spirit is ever present, though perhaps slumbering, within the Christian body. It is difficult to see how such a gift as prophecy, which by its spontaneity refuses to be bound by fixed rules, can coexist, without confusion, as a power along with the stated ministry; but not the least need of the present life of the Church is the discovery of means whereby she may develop her organized existence as a community, and at the same time permit the free utterance of those direct spiritual communications which she may receive from Christ her Prophet.

Literature.—(1) On the Messiah as Prophet: Stanton, *Jewish and Christian Messiah*, pp. 126, 293 f. (2) On Christ’s Prophetic Office: Martensen, *Chr. Dogmatics*, p. 295 ff.; and esp. Dorner, *Syst. of Chr. Doctrine*, vols. iii. and iv. *passim*. (3) On distinctive marks of prophet: Oehler, *OT Theol.*; A. B. Davidson, *OT Theol.*, also his art. ‘Prophecy’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible; Ottley, *Aspects of OT*, p. 275 ff. (4) On Christ’s didactic prophecies: Edersheim, *LT [Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].]*; Weiss, *Life of Christ [Neander’s Life, though not modern, is very useful]*; Bishop D’Arcy’s *Ruling Ideas of our Lord* (Hodder) is succinct but full and valuable, see also his art. Ideas (Leading). (5) On Christ’s predictive prophecies: for those regarding His death see Schwartzkopff, *Prophecies of Jesus Christ [English translation T. & T. Clark]*; but for conservative standpoint, Denney, *Death of Christ*; for those regarding His Return see Stevens, *NT Theol.* pt. i. ch. xii.; Briggs, *Messiah of Gospels*, ch. iv. and *passim*; S. Davidson, *Doctrine of Last Things*; Schwartzkopff, as

above; Muirhead, *Eschatology of Jesus*; art. 'Parousia' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible .

Charles T. P. Grierson.

☩ Prophetess

PROPHETESS.—Among OT prophetesses may be named Miriam (Exo 15:20), and esp. Deborah (Judges 4 f.) and Huldah (2Ki 22:14, 2Ch 34:22). The prophetess Noadiah opposed Nehemiah (Neh 6:14). While it was the exception for women to be called to the prophetic office, they were by no means excluded from it, and it is manifest that Deborah and Huldah made a deep impress upon their contemporaries. The only mention of a prophetess in the Gospels is that of Anna, who recognized the infant Messiah when His parents presented Him in the Temple (Luk 2:36). She was of the tribe of Asher, and had lived to a great age, being probably a good deal over a hundred years old. She spoke to the pious worshippers in the Temple concerning the work of Jesus. See Anna.

John R. Sampey.

☩ Propitiation

PROPITIATION.—The idea of propitiation is directly expressed in the NT by the words ἰλάσκομαι, ἰλασμός, and ἰλαστήριον, which occur but six times. The verb is found in Luk 18:13, Heb 2:17, the substantive in 1Jn 2:2; 1Jn 4:10; ἰλαστήριον, be it adjective or substantive, in Rom 3:25, Heb 9:5. As the ground of reconciliation and atonement, it is the innermost truth in reference to Christ's redemptive work.

The word ἰλάσκομαι came down from classic usage through the LXX Septuagint into the writings of the NT. As used in the latter, it refers to the relation of Christ's work to sin. We are interested chiefly in this article, therefore, in tracing the meaning it had in the LXX Septuagint in reference to the sin- and guilt-offerings. It was used to render the Heb. *kipper*, 'to cover.' That which constituted the emblematic cover which hid sin from God so that He could act as though it did not exist, was the shed blood (or life) of the sacrificial victim. In the narrow limits of this article it is only possible to refer to the conclusions reached by eminent scholars with whom the writer ventures in general to agree. He would mention especially Prof. W. P. Paterson's art.

‘Sacrifice’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible , where the conclusion is reached that ‘the expiation of guilt is the leading purpose of Levitical sacrifices,’ and that the expiation is accomplished through the sacrifice taking the place of the offender, and its death being accepted in place of his. While this seems the manifest import of the Levitical sin-and guilt-offerings with which we are in this discussion concerned, it is pretty certain that this was the view of the Jews in our Lord’s time. As Holtzmann says (*Neutest. Theol.* p. 68), ‘Everything pressed towards the assumption that the offering of a life substituted for sinners according to God’s appointment, cancelled the death penalty which had been incurred, and that consequently the offered blood of the sacrificial victim expiated sin as the surrogate for the life of the guilty.’

1. In the teaching of our Lord.—The single instance in which our Lord is reported to have used the word *ἱλάσκομαι*, in Luk 18:13, has little bearing on the question whether He thought His work a propitiation. This question must be considered on the broader ground of His thought of the relation in which His work stood to the Levitical sacrifices out of which the idea of propitiation grew. Now, the Evangelists believed much relating to His birth, lifework, and death to be the fulfilment of OT prophecy (Mat 1:23; Mat 2:6; Mat 2:18; Mat 3:3; Mat 4:15-16; Mat 12:18-21; Mat 13:35; Mat 21:5 etc.). They evidently got this impression from our Lord Himself, who saw the OT fulfilled in Himself (Mat 11:10; Mat 13:14-15; Mat 21:42, but esp. Mat 5:17 and Luk 24:13-31). He did not view His work and teaching as a break in the continuity of religious historical development, but as woven into its evolving progress. He came to fill the Law and the Prophets full of a new meaning by stripping them of Rabbinic accretions and revealing their deepest spiritual import. He saw His life and death related to Moses (the Law) and all the Prophets.

In view of this general conception, we must interpret our Lord’s references to His death. The place His death had in His thought, apart from the more direct teaching as to its purpose and import, makes it plain that it was deemed of paramount importance in His mission work. Interpreting His words at His baptism (Mat 3:15 ‘Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness’) in the light of Mat 20:22-23, but especially of His words in Luk 12:50 (‘I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished’), it would seem that His death was before Him from the first as an essential part of His mission. Of the same meaning is Mar 2:20 (cf. Mat 9:15, Luk 5:35) of the taking away of the bridegroom. He foretold that His resurrection would follow His death (Mat 12:40 || Luk 11:29). He dwelt upon the details of His betrayal and death (Mat 16:21, cf. Mar 8:31; Mar 10:32-34, Luk 9:22). In connexion with these prophetic statements He gives the warning: ‘He that doth not take his cross and follow after me, is not worthy of me,’ and ‘he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it’ (Mat 10:38-39; Mat 16:24-25, cf. Mar 8:34-35 and Luk 9:23-24, see also Joh 8:28), referring, doubtless, to the manner of His death.

On coming down from the Transfiguration, He forbade the three to mention what they had witnessed till He was risen from the dead (Mat 17:9, cf. Mar 8:30), and Luk 9:31 declares that Moses and Elijah talked with Jesus of His death as of supreme moment. As the end drew near, He dwelt more upon His death and resurrection (Mat 17:22-23; Mat 20:18-19; Mat 21:33-40, cf. Mar 12:6-8, Joh 10:11). The great space given to the circumstances connected with our Lord's death seems to show that the Evangelists saw in it the culmination of His redemptive work.

But our Lord connects Himself more explicitly with the sacrificial system. In Luk 22:37 He identifies Himself with the Servant of Jehovah of Isaiah 53, as 'he was reckoned with the transgressors.' In Mat 20:28 (cf. Mar 10:45) He says that He is to 'give his life a ransom for (ἀντί 'in the place of') many.' At the solemn institution of the Supper (Mat 26:28, cf. Mar 14:24, Luk 22:20), the wine is said to represent 'my blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many unto the remission of sins.' He was also to give His 'flesh for the life of the world' (Joh 6:51-56). St. John also identifies Him with the Suffering Servant of Jehovah of Isaiah 53, in Joh 12:38. The words of the Baptist: 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world' (Joh 1:29), probably also are in terms of Isa 53:5, as the Servant of Jehovah, 'bruised for our iniquities,' like the sacrificial lamb, endured death silently.

From all these lines of evidence it is impossible to escape the conclusion that our Lord and the Evangelists considered His death to be of paramount importance in His mission, and gave it this value because it stood to the sins of the world in a similar relation to that which the Levitical sacrifices held to the sins of the Jews.

If the conclusion be accepted that these sacrifices were expiatory and vicarious, we have a clear idea of the purpose our Lord supposed His death served. Neither need we wonder that He taught so little about the purport of His death. The false notions of His Kingdom entertained by His disciples made them invincibly opposed to His establishing it through the Cross instead of a crown. They were 'foolish and slow of heart' (Luk 24:25). Consequently He had 'many things to say' to them which they could not bear before His death shattered their false ideas (Joh 16:1-13). It was only then that this fuller instruction could be given and was promised. Immediately after His resurrection He began to instruct His disciples as to the meaning of His mission and death as they stood related to the Law and the Prophets (Luk 24:26-27). They were not the men to invent an interpretation of His death, or to go back to Levitical explanations without His sanction. They revered Him too much to break consciously with His thought. The confidence with which they taught, beginning with Pentecost, can be explained only by their receiving from our Lord Himself and from the promised Spirit a certain knowledge of the nature of His work. Any view which makes our Lord's mission a break with the religious development either before or

after, but much more with both, has against it the strongest conceivable presumption. St. Paul, St. Peter, and St. John all believed themselves to be giving our Lord's own view of the purport of His work. They were in a better position to know His own thought of Himself and His mission than any at this late time of day. From them we can get the clearest light on our Lord's own conception of the purpose served by His life and death.

2. In the teaching of the Apostles.—While we may have the key to the innermost meaning of our Lord's mission work in the forms of the word *ἱλάσκομαι*, they must be interpreted in the perspective of the general teaching of the Epistles. While the word 'propitiation' is used so seldom, the idea that our Lord's work was a propitiation is woven into the warp and woof of them all. The whole aim of Hebrews is to show that Christ, as a priest representing the people, and as a sacrifice, expiated their sin, and was the antitype of the old priesthood and sacrifices. He was, as the Passover lamb, sacrificed for men without the breaking of a bone (Joh 19:36, 1Co 5:7-8, cf. Exo 12:46); He was a sin-offering (Rom 8:3, Heb 13:11). As in the Levitical sacrifices for sin, the shed blood, representing the life given up, was the propitiation, so emphasis is laid upon the blood of Christ in His redemptive work (Rom 5:9, Eph 1:7; Eph 2:13, Col 1:14-20, Heb. *passim*, 1Pe 1:19, 1Jn 1:7, Rev 1:5; Rev 5:9 etc.). The blood of Christ is said to be the blood of sprinkling, because the blood of the sacrifices was sprinkled (1Pe 1:2, Heb 12:24). We must, then, interpret the definite words *ἱλάσκεσθαι*, *ἱλασμός*, and *ἱλαστήριον* in the light of the environing conception of Christ as the antitype of the old sin- and guilt-offerings, which was held by those who used them.

(a) *St. Paul.*—The earliest, as well as the most important, instance is in Rom 3:25; Rom 3:28 'whom God set forth *to be* a propitiation (*ἱλαστήριον*), through faith, by his blood, to show his righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God; for the showing of his righteousness at this present season: that he might himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus.' According to St. Paul's conception, Christ is a propitiation in (*ἐν*) His blood or death, and because He manifests or demonstrates the righteousness of God. The righteousness of God demanded this demonstration to vindicate it against the suspicion of its violation which might arise because of the passing over of sins done aforetime, and of the justification of the believer at the present season. The nature of this righteousness is also evident. It is that in God which demands that sins be punished and not passed over in forbearance, and that sinners be condemned and not justified. It is that in God which is cast under suspicion when the reverse of this is done, and therefore needs demonstration and vindication. It is subjective righteousness in God. It is true that God provided the propitiation which His

righteousness demands, and He does this in love (Rom_5:8), but all the same, the propitiation to demonstrate His righteousness had to be provided by love in order to vindicate righteousness in ‘passing over’ sins in forbearance and in ‘justifying’ on the condition of faith. To confound righteousness and love in their manifestations, would be to remove the very ground of the problem involved in being just and justifying. Neither is the faith which might be aroused by the setting forth of Christ in His blood that which has propitiatory value. The righteousness of God had to be vindicated by this very propitiation in the case of those who had faith in Jesus. Christ in His blood constitutes the propitiation. It becomes effective as a propitiation, through faith.

In what sense, then, does St. Paul regard our Lord as a propitiation? How could He in His blood or death demonstrate God’s righteousness, which demanded that sins be punished and not passed over, and that the ungodly be condemned and not justified when the reverse of this took place? Could it be in any other way than that, in the death of Christ, the righteousness of God which made these demands received a satisfaction for the sins of men of the same kind as would have been paid if God had let His punitive wrath (Rom_1:18) fall upon the transgressor? In His death Christ endured the just desert of sin (Rom_6:23), as ‘him who knew no sin he (God) made to be sin on our behalf’ (2Co_5:21). He could in consequence pass over sins in forbearance, and justify the believer though ungodly (Rom_4:5), and His righteousness would not be tarnished but demonstrated, because Christ stood for sinners, and all died in His death (2Co_5:14). This is the natural interpretation of the passage itself. It also brings it into accord with St. Paul’s general circle of ideas. It is in harmony with the central idea of the Levitical sacrifices for sin from which the pivotal word ἱλαστήριον is derived. In it the thought of our Lord in Mat_20:28 || Mar_10:45 (‘give his life a ransom [λύτρον] in the stead of [ἀντι] all’), and Mat_26:28 etc., is reflected and expanded. The historical continuity of thought between the OT and our Lord, and our Lord and St. Paul, is also preserved.

(b) *St. John.*—As St. Paul, in viewing Christ as a propitiation, lays emphasis upon His demonstration of the Divine righteousness, St. John sees in His propitiation a demonstration of the Divine love. Taking the two instances where He is said to be a propitiation (ἱλασμός, 1Jn_2:2; 1Jn_4:10), we find that He is a propitiation for sins. The sending of Christ as a propitiation was prompted by God’s love, not as a return for man’s love. The propitiation was for the whole world, and not for those alone who should be saved. It is Jesus Christ the *Righteous* who is the propitiation, apparently showing that His propitiatory work had a peculiar relation to righteousness. As St. John had just referred to our Lord’s blood as cleansing from all sin (1Jn_1:7), it is plain that he thought of Christ in His blood or death as the propitiation. Neither is He the propitiation for sins because of any cleansing or other work wrought in men as a consequence of His work and death; for He is the propitiation for the whole world,

many of whom will never be purified or subjectively changed by or through it. The propitiation is due to a work for us, and not in us, except as a consequence. It must then, in itself, have reference to God, and not to a work in men's hearts. This brings these passages into harmony with the Johannine conception in Revelation. There it is ever as the Lamb that was slain—the antitype of the sacrificial victim—that He is spoken of, and that His blood is said to purify and redeem (Rev 5:6; Rev 5:8; Rev 5:12; Rev 6:1 etc., cf. Rev 1:5, Rev 5:9, Rev 7:14 etc.). St. John's whole view of Christ as the antitype of the sacrificial victims, in connexion with his statement (1Jn 2:2) that He is the propitiation for the whole world, can be explained only on the ground that he thought of Christ's propitiatory work as having primarily an efficacy Godward, and manward only as a consequence.

(c) *The Epistle to the Hebrews.*—According to Heb 2:17, propitiation is made for sin. It is made by Christ as the antitype of the high-priesthood of the OT. From the whole scope of the Epistle up to Heb 10:30 it is made as He offers His own blood as the perfect antitype of the imperfect sacrificial system of the old economy, which was thereby fulfilled and then abolished. Through His sacrifice a 'purification of sins' (Heb 1:3), a cleansing of the 'conscience from dead works' (Heb 9:14), is wrought, and access to God assured (Heb 10:9-22). The eternal takes the place of the temporal, the perfect of the imperfect, the inward of the outward and fleshly, the real of the symbolical and typical. To the question whether Christ's work effected something objectively for us as well as provided for a subjective work in us, the answer is clear. By His sacrificial death He 'made purification of sins' (Heb 1:3), 'obtained eternal redemption' (Heb 9:12), 'put away sin' (Heb 9:26), 'perfected for ever them who are sanctified' (Heb 10:14). All this is regarded as already accomplished for us in Christ's sacrificial death, and not as still to be wrought in us through its influence. This work *for* us, as prior to that *in* us, is its necessary condition and ground, as apart from the shedding of blood there is no remission (Heb 9:22). The author of Hebrews uses 'sanctify,' 'purify,' and 'perfect' in these passages in the Pauline sense of 'justify.'

The sacrifices of which that of Christ was the antitype did not give access to God's favour by removing a hindrance within the soul of the offerer, but by removing one that was objective. The interpretation which would make the author of Hebrews restrict the efficacy of Christ's work to its influence upon men, dislocates it from its whole setting, destroys its plainest antitypical significance, and would make his meaning unintelligible to the Hebrew readers for whom it was doubtless prepared. Neither are there wanting hints as to how Christ's work had this objective efficacy. The emphasis put upon the fitness of Christ's sharing man's nature and condition in order to do His work for them as high priest and sacrifice (ch. 2) is significant, and the statement that He tasted death for every man (Heb 2:9) and bore the sins of many (Heb 9:28), taken in connexion with His antitypical relation to the sacrificial system,

can scarcely mean less than that He represented men in some way, so that He could bear their sins for them and die on their behalf.

What, then, does ‘to make propitiation for the sins of the people’ (εἰς τὸ ἰλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας) mean as embedded in the author’s general thought? The verb is in the middle voice with an active sense. Doubtless Winer is right in regarding it as elliptical, and meaning ‘to propitiate God for the sins of the people.’ The condition of making the propitiation is Christ’s identification with humanity in nature and condition. The propitiatory value is in His blood, as He tastes death for every man so as to bear the sins of all, in a way analogous to that in which the sacrificial victim bore those of the offerer. The propitiation thus effected was objective for us, and not subjective in us. Through it forgiveness and access to God are possible. The propitiation puts away sin once for all—puts it out of the way as an obstacle to the Divine favour and forgiveness. How the sin is removed by His death is not explicitly stated, but the whole sweep of thought is favourable to the view that it was as a satisfaction to that in God which sin offends—call it holiness or righteousness as one will—and is in substantial agreement with St. Paul’s conception. The view that the author of Hebrews thought of propitiation as effected by a ‘mysterious inherent quality’ he attributed to Christ’s blood giving it direct ‘inherent power to cleanse the life’ (Stevens, *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, p. 88 f.), is too vapid to be credited to him.

If the writer of this article has succeeded in correctly interpreting Scripture thought on this central doctrine, then our Lord neither broke with the thought of the OT, nor did the writers of the Epistles break with His conception. They were interpreting His death in the fuller light of His own teachings after His resurrection and with the Spirit’s help. We are justified in interpreting His own allusions to what was done by His death in view of both. Beneath the superficial variations due to the aspects of truth treated and the special aim of each of the NT writers, there is an underlying unity of thought as to what was effected by the death of Christ, and how it had efficacy to this end. See also artt. Atonement, Death of Christ, Ransom, Reconciliation, Redemption, Sacrifice, Vicarious Sacrifice [the last two written from a different standpoint].

Literature.—In addition to the works referred to above:—Bruce, *St. Paul’s Conception of Christianity*, 164 ff.; Driver, art. ‘Propitiation’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible ; A. Schwoller, ‘Das Wesen der Sühne der alttest. Opfertora’ in *SK [Note: K Studien und Kritiken.]* , 1891; H. Schultz, *AJTh [Note: JTh American Journal of Theology.]* , 1900, p. 286; Denney, *The Death of Christ*; Gess, ‘Zur Lehre von Versöhnung’ in *Jahrbucher fur Deutsche Theol.*, vols. iii. iv.; Lomas, ‘Fernley Lect.’ 1872; Du Bose, *Soteriology of NT* (1892), 107; Vincent Tymms, *Chr. Idea of Atonement* (1904), 191; W. M. Ramsay

in *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times.*] x. (1899) 157; and also Literature under articles on Atonement, Reconciliation, Sacrifice, etc.

C. Goodspeed.

☞ Proselyte

PROSELYTE

1. Derivation of the name.—προσήλυτος (from προσέρχομαι) means lit. ‘one who has arrived at a place,’ hence ‘a stranger,’ ‘a sojourner.’ In the LXX Septuagint it is frequently used as the equivalent of the Heb. גֵר (see *Expos.* iv. x. [1894] p. 264). By NT times it had acquired the technical meaning of ‘one who was a convert to Judaism from heathendom,’ without any indication of place of residence being involved. This special meaning had also been gradually acquired by גֵר (see W. R. Smith, *OTJC* [Note: *TJC The Old Test, in the Jewish Church*] 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 342 n. [Note: note.]; also *Oxford Heb. Lex.* s.v. גֵר), and also by the Aramaic גֵרָא (LXX Septuagint γειώρας).

2. Classes of proselytes.—In the time of Christ many foreigners had fully embraced Judaism, and were called ‘proselytes’; there were also others, far more numerous, who had partially adopted Jewish doctrines and customs. The latter are indicated in the NT by σεβόμενοι (Act 13:43; Act 16:14; Act 17:4; Act 17:17; Act 18:7) and φοβούμενοι [τὸν θεόν] (Act 10:2, Act 13:16; Act 13:26). These words indicate that they revered Israel’s God and in part obeyed the Law, but had not fully entered into the fellowship of Israel. These divisions correspond to those of the Mishna, where גֵר is a fully admitted proselyte, and the term תושב גֵר (lit. a resident alien) is applied to those who were more loosely attached to the Jewish worship. Later Rabbis expressed the same distinction by the phrases ‘proselyte of Righteousness’ (הַצִּדִּיק גֵר), as contrasted with ‘proselyte of the Gate’ (הַשַּׁעַר גֵר).

(a) *Proselytes properly so called* (NT προσήλυτος; Mishna גֵר; Rabbinic name הַצִּדִּיק גֵר). These were heathen by birth, who had been admitted to full fellowship in Jewish worship. Three observances were required for their admission: (1) Circumcision. (2)

Baptism, which was analogous to the ceremonial purifications so frequently required of the Jews (Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. ii. 321; also Edersheim, *LT* [Note: *T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* [Edersheim].] ii. 745). Some have maintained that the baptism of proselytes did not originate so early as the time of Christ, but the Mishna incidentally refers to it as if it had been long in use. (3) The offering of a sacrifice, by which atonement was made for the sins of the proselyte. Those thus admitted undertook to observe the whole Law (cf. Gal 5:3), and they were granted privileges almost equal to those of an Israelite. Such are referred to in Mat 23:15, Joh 12:20, Act 2:10; Act 6:5; Act 13:43.

(b) *Those denominated in the NT* σεβόμενοι or φοβούμενοι (Mishna תושב־בֵּית; by the Rabbis תושב־בֵּית). The Talmud represents these as keeping what were denominated ‘the seven precepts of Noah’—comprising the duties which were considered incumbent upon all men, even outside Israel (*Aboda Zara*, 64b). These precepts were: (1) obedience to those in authority; (2) reverence to the name of God; (3) abstinence from idolatry, (4) from fornication, (5) from stealing, (6) from murder, (7) from flesh with the blood in it (*Sanh.* 56b). [The decision respecting the obligations incumbent upon Gentile converts (Act 15:29) shows some agreement with these precepts].

Since תושב־בֵּית means one permanently dwelling in the country of Israel, the Talmud involves that all who were allowed to dwell in Palestine were required to keep the precepts of Noah; but this was never actually enforced—it was theoretical only.

Persons who, without becoming full ‘proselytes of Righteousness,’ inclined to a greater or less extent towards Jewish doctrines and practices are referred to in the NT, Mat 8:5-13, Luk 7:1-10, Act 10:2; Act 13:16; Act 13:26; Act 13:43; Act 13:50; Act 16:14; Act 17:4; Act 17:17; Act 18:7.

3. Proselytizing in the time of Christ.—The religious restlessness of heathenism, which favoured the introduction of Oriental creeds into the West, afforded an opportunity for Jewish proselytizing. The moral earnestness and monotheism of Judaism commended it to those who, having lost faith in heathen deities, were seeking a more rational and ethical creed. The Greek-speaking Jews, who were to be found in all the great cities of the Roman Empire, carried the Knowledge of the Mosaic Law into the midst of heathendom, and presented their faith in a form calculated to win the approval of their neighbours. This accommodation to their surroundings in the way of representing their creed was partly unconscious, through their contact with Gentile thought, and partly an intentional emphasizing of the moral side of Judaism, while merely national and ceremonial features which might repel inquirers were minimized (Schürer, ii. ii. 297). Hence, in spite of the scorn which Roman writers heaped upon the Jews (Tac. *Hist.* v. 2-8; Juv. *Sat.* vi. and xiv.;

Cic. *pro Flacco*, 28), numerous adherents were gained, who either fully or partially accepted Judaism (Josephus *c.* [Note: *circa, about.*] *Apion*. ii. 40, *Ant.* xx. ii. 3). Many of these converts were women (Josephus *BJ* ii. xx. 2; also Act 13:50; Act 16:14; Act 17:4).

From these proselytes a very considerable revenue was received by the Temple authorities (Josephus *Ant.* xiv. vii. 2). This pecuniary advantage from the spread of Judaism stimulated activity in proselytizing, such as that noticed by Christ in Mat 23:15. Some Jews fraudulently enriched themselves from the gifts of proselytes (Josephus *Ant.* xviii. iii. 5). Such unworthy motives for proselytizing were condemned by Jesus (Mat 23:15).

Illustrations of the fanatical zeal of the Jews in making proselytes are found in Josephus *Life*, 23, *Ant.* xiii. ix. 1, xi. 3, xv. 4, xx. ii. 1, *BJ* ii. xvi. 10, *XVII.* x.

The account of the Acts shows that proselytes often became converts to Christianity, and this was an important factor in the establishment of the Gentile Christian Church. The struggle between St. Paul and the Judaizers (Acts 15 and Ep. to Galatians) was an attempt on the part of Christian Pharisees to compel Gentile Christians to become 'proselytes of Righteousness.'

4. Moral quality of Jewish proselytes.—Proselytes who had accepted Judaism from pure motives must have been men of high character; nevertheless proselytes are spoken of slightingly by the Talmud. Thus we read (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Middah*, fol. 13. 2): 'Proselytes and sodomites hinder the coming of the Messiah.' This is explained to mean that proselytes often erred through ignorance of the Law. We can readily imagine that insistence upon the minutiae of Pharisaic tradition (cf. Mat 23:4) would tend to produce a debased character such as is charged against some in Mat 23:15. Edersheim, however, suggests (*LT* [Note: *T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* [Edersheim].] ii. 412) that the word 'proselyte' in this passage may signify the winning of a convert to Pharisaism, rather than a convert from heathendom to Judaism.

5. Christ's relations with proselytes.—Although the number of proselytes in Palestine must have been very great, references to them in the Gospels are few. We find: (1) *The centurion* (Mat 8:5-13, Luk 7:1-10), who was an officer in the army of Herod Antipas. There is no reason to think of him as a 'proselyte of Righteousness,' for in that case (a) he need have had no hesitation in asking Jesus to go to his house, and (b) the words of Jesus (Mat 8:11) would not be so suitable. But from the fact that he had built a synagogue (Luk 7:5), he was clearly one of the wider class of adherents to Judaism, called in later days 'proselytes of the Gate' (see Edersheim, *LT* [Note: *T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* [Edersheim].] i. 546).—(2) *The Greeks* (Joh 12:20).

From the fact that these came to attend the Feast, they would appear to have been ‘proselytes of Righteousness.’ (Geikie, however, *Life of Christ*, ii. 434, considers that they were ‘proselytes of the Gate’).—(3) On Mat 23:15 see preceding paragraphs on ‘Proselytizing’ and ‘Moral quality.’—(4) *Pilate’s wife* (Mat 27:19). Tradition (earliest recorded in the Gospel of Nicodemus, ch. 2) asserts that Pilate’s wife was a ‘proselyte of the Gate.’ Origen says that she became a Christian.

Literature.—Selden, *de Jure Nat. et Gent.*, Lib. ii.; Buxtorf, *Lex. Talmud. et Rabbin.* 8.v. פְּרֻשֵׁי; Schürer, *HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]* ii. ii. 291-327; Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*, ii. 1-24; Hausrath, *NT Times: Time of Apostles*, i. 123; Allen In *Expos.* 4th ser. x. (1894) 264; art. ‘Proselyte’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible and in *Ebi [Note: Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.]* .

F. E. Robinson.

☩ Protevangelium

PROTEVANGELIUM.—See art. Fall in vol. i. p. 571^bf.

PROVERB is the rendering of παραβολή in Luk 4:23 (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘parable’) and of παροιμία in Joh 16:25; Joh 16:29 ((Revised Version margin ‘parable’). In Joh 10:6 παροιμία is rendered ‘parable’ ((Revised Version margin ‘proverb’). Ordinarily παραβολή means ‘parable’ παροιμία ‘proverb’; but the words are sometimes interchanged in Hellenistic Greek. Both represent the Heb. *mâshâl*, the primary meaning of which is ‘comparison.’ Such comparison lies at the base of many proverbs as well as parables; in fact many proverbs are only condensed parables; and a proverb usually sets up a single case as the type of a whole class. In the LXX Septuagint *mâshâl* is nearly always rendered παραβολή, even when a proverb is clearly meant (1Sa 10:12; 1Sa 24:13 (14), 1Ki 4:32 (28), Eze 12:22-23; Eze 18:2-3; in some of these places Aq. [Note: Aquila.] or Symm. [Note: Symmachus.] substitutes παροιμία). παροιμία is found in the canonical OT only in Pro 1:1; Pro 25:1 (A² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; B¹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] have παιδεῖται); it occurs 5 times in Sirach, παραβολή 10 times; at Sir 39:3; Sir 47:17 they stand together. Thus Lk., like the LXX Septuagint, uses παραβολή for ‘proverb’ as well as ‘parable’; while

Jn., on the contrary, uses *παροιμία* in the sense of ‘figurative language, allegory’ (Joh 10:6), or ‘dark saying’ (Joh 16:26; Joh 16:29) rather than ‘proverb’; perhaps, ‘figure’ best represents his use of the word. On our Lord’s use of proverbs see following article.

Literature.—Cremer, *Lexicon*, 8.v. *παραβολή*; Trench, *Parables*, ch. 1; art. ‘Proverb’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible (by König) and *Encyc. Bibl.* (by Paterson); Königsmann in Hase and Iken, *Thes. Nov.* ii. 501; Driver, *LOT [Note: OT Introd. to the Literature of the Old Test.]* 6 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred]) p. 349.

Harold Smith.

☞ Proverbs

PROVERBS (Jesus’ use of).—It is a saying of the Rabbis that ‘the Law spoke in the tongue of the children of men.’ And so did our Blessed Lord. He did not use the jargon of the schools, but expressed His heavenly teaching, albeit profounder than either Jewish theology or Greek philosophy, in language which the simplest could understand. The Oriental mind delights in proverbs, and Jesus, in His gracious desire to reach the hearts of His hearers, did not disdain to weave into His discourse the homely and often humorous sayings which were current in His day.

1. ‘*It is yet four months, and the harvest cometh*’ (Joh 4:35). It is usual to find here a note of chronology (cf. Meyer). The harvest began in April, early enough sometimes for the unleavened bread of the Passover to be baked with new flour (Orig. *in Joan.* xiii. § 39); and since, it is argued, the harvest was four months distant, it was in December that Jesus visited Sychar in the course of His journey from Jerusalem to Galilee. There are, however, insuperable objections to this view.

(1) December is the rainy season, and with every wayside brook running full, Jesus would not have needed to crave a drink from the woman’s pitcher to slake His thirst (cf. Psa 110:7). (2) It is incredible that, when after the Passover He retired with His disciples from Jerusalem ‘into the land of Judaea’ (Joh 3:22), in order doubtless to collect His thoughts and brace Himself for the commencement of His ministry, He should have protracted that season of repose for eight months. (3) Moreover, as Origen remarks, the Evangelist’s explanation of the enthusiasm wherewith the Galilaeans received Him on His arrival (Joh 4:45), implies that His miracles in the capital during the Passover season were fresh in their memories.

In truth there is here no chronological datum. The *logion* is a husbandman's proverb, like the other which follows immediately (Joh 4:37). The seed was sown towards the end of December, and four months elapsed ere it was ripe (see Wetstein); and the proverb conveyed the practical lesson that results mature slowly (cf. Jam 5:7). Jesus was prepared to sow the good seed of the Kingdom and have long patience until it should ripen, and it filled His heart with surprise and gladness when He beheld His seed ripening in an hour. He spied the woman returning in haste from the town accompanied by an eager throng (Joh 4:28-30), and He broke out, 'Ye have a saying (λέγετε, cf. λόγος in Joh 4:37), It is yet four months, and the harvest cometh. Lo, I say unto you, Lift up your eyes, and behold the fields, that they are white for harvest!'

2. 'A prophet hath no honour in his own country, and among his own kinsfolk, and in his own house.' Jesus is reported to have quoted this proverb on two occasions (Joh 4:44, Mat 13:57 = Mar 6:4 = Luk 4:24), and it was constantly exemplified in His experience. He was rejected by His townsfolk of Nazareth; He was pronounced mad by His kinsfolk; His brethren did not believe in Him.

Origen (*in Joan.* xiii. § 54) thinks that the proverb originated in the dishonour which the prophets of Israel had always suffered at the hands of their contemporaries (cf. Heb 11:36-38); but in truth it was not peculiarly Jewish. 'Few of the most sagacious and wise,' says Plutarch (*de Exil.* § 13), 'would you find cherished in their own countries.' 'Quidquid enim domi est,' says Seneca (*de Benef.* iii. 3), 'vile est.' 'Sordebat [Protogenes] suis,' says Pliny (*HN xxxv.* § 36), 'ut plerumque domestica,' Pericles would never dine abroad, lest he should be cheapened in the estimation of the company by the familiarity of social intercourse (Plut. *Pericl.* § 7; cf. *de Imit. Chr.* i. 10, § 1: 'Vellem me pluries tacuisse et inter homines non fuisse'). Cf. the ancient proverb still in vogue: 'Familiarity breeds contempt' (Chrys. *in Joan*, xxxiv.: ἡ γὰρ συνήθεια εὐκαταφρονήτους ποιεῖν εἴωθεν; Bernard. *Flores*: 'Vulgare proverbium est, quod nunia familiaritas parit contemptum'); and the saying of the witty Frenchman that 'no man is a hero to his *valet de chambre*.'

3. In the course of His dispute with the people of Nazareth, Jesus quoted another proverb, 'Physician, heal thyself' (Luk 4:23). The Talmud has: 'Medice, sana claudicationem tuam' (cf. Eurip. fragm.: ἄλλων ἰατρὸς αὐτὸς ἔλκεσι βρῦων (ed. Witzschel, iv. p. 302); Cic. *Ep.* iv. 5: 'Malos medicos qui in alienis morbis profitentur se tenere medicinae scientiam, ipsi se curare non possunt' (see Wetstein)).

4. There is no saying of Jesus more astonishing than His answer to the disciple who sought permission to go and bury his father ere casting in his lot with Him: 'Leave the dead to bury their own dead' (Mat 8:21-22 = Luk 9:59-60). It seems as though He

were speaking here after the manner of the Rabbis, who forbade that even the burial of the dead should be allowed to interrupt the study of the Law (Wetstein on Mat 8:21), and required that a disciple should put his teacher's claims before those of his father; 'for his father indeed brought him into this world; but his teacher, who has taught him wisdom, has introduced him into the world to come' (Taylor, *Say. of Fath.* iv. 17, n. [Note: note.] 21; Schürer, *HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]* ii. i. p. 317). Is it credible that Jesus should have rivalled the Rabbis in heartless arrogance? The difficulty disappears when it is understood that the disciple's request was merely a pretext for delay. He was quoting a flippant phrase which is current in the East to this day.

A missionary in Syria once counselled a youth to complete his education by travelling in Europe. 'I must first bury my father,' was the answer. The old gentleman was neither dead nor dying; he was in good health, and the youth meant merely that his home had the first claim upon him (Wendt, *Teach. of Jesus*, ii. 70, n. [Note: note.] 1).

5. Jesus was quoting another proverb when, in answer to the man who volunteered to follow Him but craved leave first to bid his household farewell, He said: '*No one, having put his hand to the plough and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God*' (Luk 9:62). The OT story of Elisha's call from the plough (1Ki 19:19-21) seems to have leapt into His mind and suggested His reply, which is an adaptation of a common saying: 'A ploughman must bend to his work, or he will draw a crooked furrow' (Plin. *HN* xviii. § 49: 'Arator nisi incurvus praevaricatur'; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* iii. 42: 'curvus arator'). 'Conveniet,' says Erasmus, 'in negocium quod absque magnis sudoribus peragi non potest.'

6. The Sermon on the Mount abounds in proverbial phrases. '*A single iota or a single tip*' (Mat 5:18) is like our phrase, 'The dot of an *i* or the stroke of a *t*.' It is frequent in the Talmud (cf. Lightfoot and Wetstein). 'Sound not a trumpet before thee' (Mat 6:2) is a proverbial metaphor, though Calvin takes it literally, supposing that the Pharisees, those 'play-actors' (ὑποκριταί) in religion, actually blew a trumpet to summon the beggars (cf. the Greek proverb αὐτὸς ἑαυτὸν αὐλεῖ, 'play one's own pipe,' like our 'blow one's own trumpet'; Achill. Tat. viii. 10: αὕτη δὲ οὐχ ὑπὸ σάλπιγγι μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ κήρυκι μοιχεύεται).

'I have observed,' says old Thomas Fuller, 'some at the church door cast in sixpence with such ostentation that it rebounded from the bottom and rang against both sides of the bason (so that the same piece of silver was the alms and the giver's trumpet), whilst others have dropped down silent five shillings without any noise.'

*‘With what measure ye measure, it shall be measured to you again’ (Mat 7:2) is very common in the Talmud (see Wetstein; Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 225).—‘Why seest thou the chip that is in thy brother’s eye, but the log that is in thine own considerest not? Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me cast out the chip out of thine eye, and, behold, the log is in thine own eye?’ (Mat 7:3-4). This proverb is characteristically Oriental in its grotesque exaggeration, and there is no need to explain it away by supposing that ‘eye’ represents עַיִן ‘a well’: a chip in your neighbour’s well, a log in your own (see Bruce in *EGT [Note: GT Expositor’s Greek Testament.]*). It is a carpenter’s proverb, and has a special fitness on the lips of the Carpenter of Nazareth.*

It is found in the Talmud (see Lightfoot). Cf. *Baba Bathra*, 15. 2: ‘Cum diceret quis alicui: “Ejice festucam ex oculo tuo,” respondit ille: “Ejice et tu trabem ex oculo tuo.”’ The proverb is Jewish, but the fault which it satirizes is universal. ‘Many,’ says St. Chrysostom, ‘now do this. If they see a monk wearing a superfluous garment, they cast up to him the Lord’s law, though themselves practising boundless extortion and covetousness every day. If they see him enjoying a somewhat plenteous meal, they fall to bitter accusing, though themselves indulging daily in drunkenness and excess.’

*‘Give not what is holy to the dogs, neither cast your pearls before the swine’ (Mat 7:6). Cf. 2Pe 2:22 (Pro 26:11), Pro 11:22, and see Wetstein. ‘What man is there of you who, if his son shall ask of him a loaf, will give him a serpent; or if he shall ask an egg, will give him a scorpion?’ (Mat 7:10). There was a Greek proverb, ‘For a perch a scorpion’ (ἀντὶ πέρκης σκορπιόν); ‘ubi quis optima captans pessima eapit’ (Erasm. *Adag.*). ‘For a fish,’ Wetstein explains, ‘a fisherman sometimes catches a water-snake.—‘Build on the sand’ (εἰς ψάμμον οἰκοδομεῖς; cf. εἰς ψάμμον σπείρεις); see Erasm. *Adag.* under ‘Inanis Opera’) was a proverb signifying vain and unenduring labour, and it seems as though Jesus had it in His mind in His similitude of the Two Builders (Mat 7:24-27 = Luk 6:47-49).*

*7. ‘If a kingdom be divided against itself, that kingdom is unable to stand; and if a house be divided against itself, that house shall be unable to stand’ (Mar 3:24-25 = Mat 12:25). A maxim of state-craft. Cf. Soph. *Ant.* 672-674:*

ἀναρχίας δὲ μείζον οὐκ ἔστιν κακόν.

αὕτη πόλεις ὄλλυσιν, ἢδ’ ἀναστάτους

οἴκους τίθησιν.

Xen. *Mem.* iv. 4. § 16: ἄνευ δὲ ὁμονοίας οὔτ' ἂν πόλις εὖ πολιτευθεῖη οὔτε οἶκος καλῶς οἰκηθεῖη.

8. *'Prudent as the serpents and simple as the doves'* (Mat 10:16). The serpent was a symbol of sharp-sightedness, and the dove, like the sheep, of simplicity and gentleness. Erasmus (*Adagia*) quotes the proverbs ὄφεως ὄμμα and προότερος περιστέρως (cf. Rabbinical comment on Son 2:14 'Deus dixit Israelitis: "Erga me sunt integri sicut columbae, sed erga gentes astuti sunt sicut serpentes" '); see Wetstein).

9. *'He that hath found his life shall lose it, and he that hath lost his life for my sake shall find it'* (Mat 10:39). *'Proverbium est militare'* (Wetstein). Jesus here addresses the Twelve like a general exhorting his troops on the eve of battle.

Cf. Xenophon to the Ten Thousand: 'I have observed that as many as yearn to live by every means in warfare, these, for the most part, die evilly and shamefully; but as many as have recognized that death is common to all and necessary for men, and strive to die nobly, these I see rather arriving at old age, and, while they live, passing their days more blessedly' (*Anab.* iii. i. 43). Epict. iv. 1. § 165 (of Socrates): τοῦτον οὐκ ἔστι σῶσαι αἰσχροῶς, ἀλλὰ ἀποθνήσκων σώζεται, οὐ φεύγων Juv. viii. 83. 84:

'Summum crede nefas animam praeferre pudori

Et propter vitam vivendi perdere causas.'

10. *'If a blind man guide a blind, both shall fall into a ditch'* (Mat 15:14; cf. Mat 23:24). Cf. Hor. *Epp.* i. 17. 3-4: 'Ut si caecus iter monstrare velit.' Wetstein quotes Sext. Empir. *Hyp. Pyrrh.* iii. 29: οὐδὲ τυφλὸν ὀδηγεῖν δύναται τυφλός.

11. One misses the spirit of the conversation between Jesus and the Syrophœnician woman (Mat 15:21-28 = Mar 7:24-30) unless one observes that it is a bandying of proverbs. The scene was evidently the lodging of Jesus and the Twelve. The woman had followed them indoors [in Mar 7:25 Tischendorf, after ᵛLD, reads εἰσελθοῦσα], and she pressed her suit as they reclined at table. Perhaps a dog was in the apartment begging scraps. *'It is not right,'* says Jesus, quoting an apt proverb, *'to take the children's bread and cast it to the whelps.'* Cf. the Greek adage: 'You feed dogs, and do not feed yourself' (αὐτὸν οὐ τρέφων κύννας τρέφεις), which Erasmus (*Adag.* under 'Absurda') thus explains:

‘It was said of one who, while too poor to procure the necessaries of life, endeavoured to maintain an establishment of horses or servants. It will be appropriately employed against those who, by reason of the narrowness of their means, have scarce enough to maintain life, yet ambitiously endeavour to emulate the powerful and wealthy in fineness of dress and general ostentation. In short, it will be suitable to all who regard the things which belong to pleasure or magnificence, neglecting the things which are more necessary.’

There was another proverb: ‘Never be kind to a neighbour’s dog’ (μήποτε εὔξοδεν γείτονος κύνᾳ), otherwise put: ‘One who feeds a strange dog gets nothing but the rope to keep’ (ὅς κύνᾳ τρέφει ξένον, τούτῳ μόνον λίνος μένει).

‘The proverb warns you against uselessly wasting kindness in a quarter whence no profit will accrue to you in return. A neighbour’s dog, after being well fed, goes back to his former master’ (*ib.* under ‘Ingratitudo’).

It was some such proverb that shaped our Lord’s speech to the woman. He was not speaking after the heartless and insolent manner of the Rabbis, who branded the Gentiles as ‘dogs’ (cf. *Megill. Exo 12:6* : “An holy convocation to you”: to you, not to dogs; to you, not to strangers.’ *Pirk. Eliez. 29*: ‘He who eats with an idolater is like one that eats with a dog: for, as a dog is uncircumcised, so also is an idolater’). And the woman replied in like terms: ‘*Yea, Lord, for even the whelps cat of the crumbs that fall from the table of their masters.*’ Here also, it would appear, there is a proverb. Damis of Nineveh, the Boswell of Apollonius of Tyana, was once sneered at for the diligence wherewith he recorded his master’s sayings and doings, taking note of every trifle. ‘If,’ he replied, ‘there be feasts of gods and gods eat, certainly they have also attendants who see to it that even the scraps of ambrosia are not lost’ (*Philostr. Apoll. i. 19*). It may be added that there is an Arabic proverb: ‘It is better to feed a dog than a man,’ the reason alleged being that the dog will not forget the kindness, but the man may (*PEFQSt*, July 1904, p. 271).

12. ‘*The gates of Hades*’ (Mat 16:18). Cf. Isa 38:10, Job 38:17, Psa 9:13; Psa 107:18; *Hom. Il. ix. 312-313*:

ἐχθρὸς γὰρ μοι κείνος ὁμῶς Αἴδαο πύλῃσιν,

ὅς γ’ ἕτερον μὲν κεύθη ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ἄλλο δὲ εἶπη.

13. ‘*It is better if a heavy millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were flung into the sea*’ (Mat 18:6 = Mar 9:42 = Luk 17:2). Cf. *Kidd. 29. 2*: ‘Dicit Samuel,

Traditio est ut ducat quis uxorem et postea applicet se ad discendam Legem. At R. Jochanan dicit: Non molâ collo ejus appensâ addicet se ad studium Legis.’ The proverb was derived from the punishment of drowning. At Athens criminals were flung, with stones about their necks, into the Barathrum, a dark, well-like chasm (Aristoph. *Equit.* 1359-60; Schol. on *Plut.* 431). In b.c. 38 the Galilaeans rose against Herod, and drowned his adherents in the Lake (Josephus *Ant.* xiv. xv. 10).

14. *The narrow gate and the two ways* (Mat 7:13-14 = Luk 13:24). There is here an allusion to a favourite image of the ancient moralists which had passed into a proverb. ‘Vice,’ says Hesiod (b.c. 850-800), ‘even in troops may be chosen easily; smooth is the way, and it lieth very nigh. But in front of Virtue the immortal gods have put sweat. Long and steep is the way to her, and rough at first; but when one cometh to the summit, then it is easy, hard as it was’ (*Works and Days*, 287-292). Pythagoras of Samos (b.c. 570-504) adopted the image and elaborated it. He employed as a symbol of the two ways the letter ϣ, the archaic form of Y, hence called ‘the Samian letter’ (*Pers. [Note: Persian.]* iii. 56-57, v. 34-35). The upright stem represented the innocent period of childhood, and the divergent branches the after-course of youth and man-hood, pursuing the straight path of virtue or the crooked track of vice. The image is found also in the *Tablet* of Kebes, an allegory in the style of a Platonic dialogue, a sort of Greek *Pilgrim’s Progress*, purporting to be a description of a tablet which hung in the temple of Kronos, and emblematically depicted the course of human life.

‘ “What is the way that leads to the true Instruction?” said I. “You see above,” said he, “yonder place where no one dwells, but it seems to be desert?” “I do.” “And a little door, and a way before the door, which is not much thronged, but very few go there; so impassable does the way seem, so rough and rocky?” “Yes, indeed,” said I. “And there seems to be a lofty mound and a very steep ascent with deep precipices on this side and on that?” “I see it.” “This, then, is the way,” said he, “that leads to the true Instruction” ’ (*Tab.* § 15).

15. ‘*A grain of mustard-seed*’ (Mat 17:20, Luk 17:6)—a proverbial instance of extreme littleness (cf. Mat 13:31-32 = Mar 4:31-32 = Luk 13:19). *Uprooting trees* (cf. Mat 21:21 = Mar 11:23) or *mountains*,—an expression used of wonderful feats (cf. 1Co 13:2). Some of the greater Rabbis were called ‘uprooters of mountains’ (see Lightfoot and Wetstein).

16. ‘*Easier for a camel to pass through the needle’s eye*’ (Mat 19:24 = Mar 10:25 = Luk 18:25)—a proverb denoting an impossibility. The Talmud has ‘an elephant passing through the needle’s eye’ (see Lightfoot). The absurd exaggeration is characteristically Oriental, and should not be toned down either by substituting κάμιλ

ος, 'cable,' for κάμηλος, 'camel,' or by supposing 'needle's eye' to mean *postern-gate*; cf. Shak. *K. Rich. ii. v. v.*:

'It is as hard to come as for a camel

To thread the postern of a needle's eye.'

The proverb is found in Koran, ch. vii.: 'Verily they who shall charge our signs with falsehood and shall proudly reject them, the gates of Heaven shall not be opened unto them, neither shall they enter into Paradise, until a camel pass through the eye of a needle.' Did Mohammed quote from the Gospels, or was the proverb current throughout the East in his day?

17. '*Straining out the gnat and gulping down the camel*' (Mat 23:24). Cf. Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] *Shabb. 107. 3*: 'One who kills a flea on the Sabbath is as guilty as one who should kill a camel on the Sabbath.' Erasmus (*Adag.* under 'Absurda') quotes a Latin adage: 'Transmisso camelo, culex in cribro deprehensus haesit,' and refers to the bantering remark of Anacharsis the Scythian when he found Solon busy drawing up his laws. 'They are exactly like spiders' webs: they will hold back the weak and insignificant and be broken through by the powerful and rich' (Plut. Son 5:2). The proverb satirizes those who atone for laxity in important matters by scrupulosity in matters of no moment.

18. '*To every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have more abundantly; and from him that hath not, even what he hath shall be taken away from him*' (Mat 25:29). Cf. R. Hillel: 'He who increases not, decreases,' which means that one who does not improve his knowledge, loses it (Taylor, *Sayings of the Fathers*, i. 14). Jesus employs the saying in this sense in Mat 13:12, Mar 4:25 = Luk 8:18.

It raises an interesting question that several of these proverbs not only have heathen parallels but are heathen proverbs. How comes it that Greek and Latin sayings were current among the Jews? The Jewish attitude toward pagan culture was one of bitter hostility. It is true that the liberal school of R. Hillel had a more tolerant spirit. Its most distinguished adherent was R. Gamaliel, who advocated the study of the *hokhmah Javanith*. The prevailing sentiment, however, was that of the school of Shammai, which pronounced a common malediction on one who reared swine and one who taught his son Greek (Otho, *Hist. Doct. Mishn.* pp. 68-70).

The general sentiment is well illustrated by Origen's sneer at Celsus' imaginary Jew who quoted Euripides, that Jews were not wont to be so well versed in Greek literature (c. [Note: circa, about.] *Cels.* ii. 34). A Jew with Greek quotations at his finger ends was an absurd fiction. And it is certain that Jesus had no acquaintance

with Greek literature. Celsus charged Him with borrowing from Plato His saying about the difficulty of a rich man entering into the kingdom of heaven, and spoiling it in the process (*ib.* vi. 16. The Platonic passage is *Legg.* v. 743: ἀγκθὸν δὲ ὄντα διαφερόντως καὶ πλούσιον εἶναι διαφερόντως ἀδύνατον); and Origen's reply is most just: 'Who that is even moderately able to handle the subject would not laugh at Celsus, whether a believer in Jesus or one of the rest of mankind, hearing that Jesus, who had been born and bred among Jews, and was supposed to be the son of Joseph the carpenter, and had studied no literature, neither Greek nor even Hebrew, according to the testimony of the veracious scriptures that tell his story, read Plato?'

Nevertheless, despite their exclusiveness, it was impossible for the Jews to escape the leaven of external influences. (1) They carried on a very considerable commerce. They had several industries of world-wide fame. The Lake of Galilee abounded in fish, which were pickled and exported far and wide. Galilee was celebrated for its linen manufacture, and the flocks which pastured on the wilderness of Judaea furnished material for a thriving trade in woollen goods. Jerusalem had a sheep-market and a wool-market. There was also an extensive import traffic. Trade involves an interchange of ideas. The merchants imported words as well as wares, and one meets many an alien vocable, uncouthly transliterated, on the pages of the Talmud. What wonder if the Jews caught up also some of the foreign merchantmen's proverbs?

(2) The traders were not the only strangers who visited the Holy Land. There were Roman soldiers and Herod's mercenaries, the latter including Thracians, Germans, and Galatians (Josephus *Ant.* xvii. viii. 3). King Herod the Great had built a magnificent theatre at Jerusalem and an equally magnificent amphitheatre, and had instituted athletic contests every four years after the pattern of the Greek games. From every land (ἀπὸ πάσης γῆς) came competitors and spectators (*ib.* xv. viii. 1). Still more numerous, however, was the concourse of worshippers who frequented the Holy City at the festal seasons. They came from all quarters (Act 2:8-11). They were, indeed, devout and patriotic Jews, but they had settled in foreign countries, and had acquired the languages and manners of the strangers among whom they dwelt and traded. Is it not reasonable to suppose that they would introduce into the Holy Land many a pithy saying which they had learned in the countries of their adoption?

David Smith.

PROVIDENCE.—The word ‘providence’ (Gr. *πρόνοια*) is found only once in Authorized and Revised Versions of the NT, viz. in Act 24:2, where it is applied to Felix by Tertullus. ‘Providence’ (Lat. *providentia*, fr. *pro* and *videre*) literally means ‘foresight,’ but in its recognized use a much nearer equivalent is ‘forethought’ (*πρόνοια*). But providence is more even than forethought. It implies not only thought about the future, but practical arrangements for the purpose of securing premeditated ends (cf. Rom 13:14 ‘Make not provision [*πρόνοιαν*—the only other occasion of the use of the word in the Gr. NT] for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof’). And in the specific and most familiar sense of the word, as applied to the providence of God, it carries with it, as follows of necessity in the case of the Divine Being, the actual realization of the ends which God has determined. Though the word nowhere occurs in the Gospels, the subject is one that meets us constantly. And while it is the providence of God that is especially brought before us, there are not wanting suggestive references to providence on the part of man.

1. The Divine providence. (1) In the *OT* the fact of God’s providence—in nature, in history, and in the individual life—is everywhere prominent; and the problems presented by the doctrine of providence appear and reappear in the Prophets, and receive a special treatment in the book of Job and in certain of the Psalms (e.g. 37, 73). In the *Book of Wisdom* the very word ‘providence’ (*πρόνοια*) twice occurs. In Wis 14:3 it is applied to God as governing the waves of the sea; and in Wis 17:2 the heathen oppressors of Israel are described as ‘fugitives from the eternal providence.’ From Josephus we learn that *Rabbinical Judaism* was much occupied with the mysteries of Divine providence in its relation to human freedom; and that, as against the Sadducees who held an exaggerated view of liberty, and the Essenes who maintained a doctrine of absolute fate, the Pharisees kept to the middle path represented by the *OT* teaching, affirming the freedom and responsibility of man on the one hand, and the Divine providence and omnipotence on the other (*Ant.* xiii. v. 9, xviii. i. 3, *BJ* ii. viii. 14).

(2) In the *Gospels*, as in the NT generally, there is everywhere assumed the faith in the Divine providence which characterizes the *OT* writings, and is continued in orthodox post-canonical Judaism. The confidence of the Evangelists in the fulfilment of Messianic prophecy in the Person of Jesus is a testimony to their belief in the far-sighted operation of the Divine counsels (Mat 1:22; Mat 2:5; Mat 2:15; Mat 2:23; Mat 3:3, and *passim*). Their statements as to the incarnation of the Son of God furnish a supreme proof of a Providence that overrules the laws of nature by an indwelling governance, and moves down the long paths of history to the accomplishment of its own ends (Mat 1:18 ff., Luk 1:34 ff., Joh 1:1-14; cf. Gal 4:4).

(3) A doctrine of providence underlies *the whole life and teaching of Jesus Christ*. As against a Deistic view which makes God sit aloof from the world He has created, and a Pantheistic view which identifies Him with Nature and its laws, Jesus always takes for granted the fact of God's free and personal providence. It is in this confidence that He turns to His Father for power to work His miracles—miracles which in turn become signs that His trust in God's providence was not misplaced. It is in the same confidence that He goes to God in prayer (Mat 11:25; Mat 26:39 ff., Mar 1:35; Mar 6:46, Luk 3:21; Luk 11:1; Luk 22:32, Joh 11:41 f., Joh 14:16-17), and teaches His disciples to do likewise (Mat 6:6; Mat 6:9 ff., Mat 7:7 ff., Mat 9:38 etc.). Such petitions as 'Give us this day our daily bread' (Mat 6:11), and 'Lead us not into temptation' (Mat 6:13), would be mere hypocrisies apart from an assured trust in the loving providence of our Father in heaven.

(4) Not only is a doctrine of providence a constant implication of our Lord's life and ministry, it forms *an express part of His teaching*. Jesus told His disciples that God rules in nature, making the sun to shine and the rain to fall (Mat 5:45), feeding the birds of the air (Mat 6:26), and clothing the lilies of the field (Mat 6:28 ff.). He taught them that God also rules in human lives, bestowing His blessings on the evil and the good (Mat 5:45), supplying the bodily wants of those upon whom He has conferred the gift of rational life (Mat 6:25), devoting a peculiar care to such as seek His Kingdom and His righteousness (Mat 6:33). As against the pagan notion of chance (wh. see), and the analogous idea that at most the Almighty cares only for great things and does not concern Himself with the small (cf. 'Magna dii curant; parva negligunt,' Cic. *de Nat. Deor.* ii. 66), He affirmed that there is 'a special providence in the fall of a sparrow' (Mat 10:29, cf. *Hamlet*, Ac. v. Sc. ii.), and that even the very hairs of our head are all numbered (Mat 10:30). As against a doctrine of providence which would turn it into a blind fate, and make the strivings of the human will as meaningless as the motions of a puppet, we have to set His constant emphasis on the momentousness of choice and effort and decision (Mat 7:13; Mat 7:21, Mat 13:45 f., Mat 16:24 ff., Mat 18:3, etc.). As against a narrow philosophy of providence, according to which good men are openly rewarded in this life and wicked men openly punished, He taught that God governs the world by general laws (Mat 5:45), that persecution is often the earthly portion of the righteous (Mat 5:10 ff.), that disasters falling on the individual are not to be taken as Divine retributions upon special guiltiness (Luk 13:1-5), and that our views of Divine providence must be extended so as to include a coming day of judgment for nations as well as individuals (Mat 25:31 ff.). Thus in His teaching He anticipated most of those questions which have been so much discussed by theologians in connexion with this whole subject—questions as to the relation of God's government to secondary causes, of providence to free will, and as to distinctions between a providence that is special and one that is merely general.

(5) But besides the underlying implications of His teaching and its broad lines of treatment, our Lord brings forward in one well-known passage *some special views and arguments bearing on faith in the providence of God as a means of deliverance from anxious care* (Mat 6:25-34 = Luk 12:22-34). (a) The first thing that strikes us here is the emphasis He lays on the Divine Fatherhood (Mat 6:26; Mat 6:32). The revelation of God as our Father in heaven is the central fact of Christ's teaching, and it illuminates His doctrine of providence just as it illuminates His whole message. This is the point at which His doctrine of providence rises above the highest and best teaching of the OT upon the subject. God's providence is a more individual and a more loving care than the saints of old had ever dreamed of, and this it is precisely because He is our Father. Once we have realized the fundamental truth about our relation to Him, we find it not merely possible to believe in His loving guardianship of our lives, but impossible to conceive of anything else (cf. Mat 7:11 = Luk 11:13). (b) Taking for granted that His hearers believe in God as their Creator, Jesus argues from creation to providence as from the greater to the less. The life is more than meat, and the body than raiment. He, therefore, who breathed into the body the breath of life will assuredly sustain the life He has inspired, and clothe the body He has framed (Mat 6:25). (c) Next He argues, we might say, from the less to the greater. If God feeds the birds of the air, shall He not much more feed His spiritual offspring? If He clothes the flowers of the field in their radiant beauty, how can He fail to clothe His own sons and daughters? (Mat 6:26; Mat 6:28-30). (d) Again, He argues generally that the fact of our Father's knowledge of our needs carries with it the certainty that all our needs shall be supplied—an argument based directly on the thought of Fatherhood, and the love that Fatherhood implies (Mat 6:31-32).

2. Human providence.—Christ's special teaching on the providence of God in the passage just considered has sometimes been misinterpreted into a pronouncement against any providence on the part of man. The language of the Authorized Version no doubt lends itself to this; for in modern English 'Take no thought' is a very misleading rendering of μή μερομνᾶτε (Mat 6:25; Mat 6:31; Mat 6:34; cf. Mat 6:27-28). It was not forethought, however, but anxiety (see Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) that Jesus warned His disciples against, when He turned their minds to the great truth of the heavenly Father's providence (see art. Care). That He believed in the value and the need of prevision and forethought we may learn from His own example. The long years of silence at Nazareth were evidently spent in a deliberate preparation of Himself for the high tasks that lay before Him. And when His public ministry began, so far from being careless of the morrow, He shaped all His days according to a pre-conceived plan (cf. Mat 3:13 ff., Mar 1:14 f., Luk 12:50, Joh 9:4; Joh 17:4). In His teaching He lays frequent stress on the value of prudent forethought (see art. Prudence), both in worldly matters and in the affairs of the Kingdom of heaven—witness the parables of the Unjust Steward (Luk 16:1 ff.), of the

Pounds (Luk 19:13 ff.), and the Talents (Mat 25:14 ff.), of the Wise and the Foolish Virgins (Mat 25:1 ff.). His appeal, therefore, to the birds of the air and the lilies of the field was not meant to encourage a belief that God would work for the idle and provide for the improvident. The argument rather is, If God provides for His unconscious creatures who cannot exercise forethought, much more will He provide for His conscious children who can and do. If He feeds the birds that neither sow nor reap, much more will He prosper you in your sowing and reaping; if He clothes the lilies that toil not neither do they spin, be sure He will see to it that men and women, on whom He has laid toiling and spinning as a necessity, do not lack the raiment they require. Work you must; it is the law of your lives as God's rational creatures; but learn from the birds and the lilies not to be anxious in the midst of your toil. Sow your seed, trusting in God to send the harvest. Fulfil your appointed tasks, but leave the results with confidence in your Father's hands. Jesus, then, does not commend improvidence. On the other hand, He does condemn a providence that confines itself altogether to the provision of earthly things, or even gives these the chief place in the heart. He condemns the providence of the Rich Fool (Luk 12:16-21), and urges His disciples to lay up their treasure in the heavens (Luk 12:21-33). 'Seek ye *first* the kingdom of God and His righteousness' (Mat 6:33) is the counsel with which He concludes His special teaching on the relation of His disciples to the providence of the heavenly Father.

Christ's doctrines of Divine and human providence are thus complementary to each other. The thought of God's foreseeing care does not do away with human freedom and responsibility. On the contrary, it accentuates these by assuring us that we are not the creatures of fate, but the free children of God, and that we live our lives and fulfil our tasks under His watchful and loving eyes. The realization of the need of forethought and preparation on our part for the duties and events of life does not render us independent of the Almighty care. On the contrary, man's providence rests altogether upon the providence of God, and apart from it is utterly vain. And so to win Christ's approval human providence must be the providence of religious faith, and must be directed above all to the securing of higher than earthly blessings. It is only when we seek *first* the Kingdom of God and His righteousness that we have the promise that 'all these things'—food and raiment and whatsoever else we require for the bodily life—shall be added unto us.

Literature.—Schürer, *HJP* [*Note: JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. ii. 14 ff.; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, i. 205, 289; Martensen, *Dogmat.* p. 214; C. G. Monteflore, 'Heb. and Greek Ideas of Providence and Retribution' in *JQR* [*Note: QR Jewish Quarterly Review.*] v. (1893) 517; Ritschl, *Chr. Doct. of Justif. and Recon.* (English translation 1900) 614; F. H. Woods, *For Faith and Science* (1906), 93; E. A. Abbott, *Silanus the Christian* (1906), 109; W. N. Clarke, *Outline of Chr. Theol.* p. 147; Dykes, *Manifesto of the King*, p. 483; Dale, *Laws of Christ*, p. 157.

☒ Prudence

PRUDENCE.—This term has a wider and a narrower reference. It may denote practical sagacity, the right choice of means to ends, clear-sighted forecasting of consequences and the shaping of conduct in accordance therewith. This would bring under review the whole of Jesus' conduct, and His methods of teaching, with their adaptation to the ends of His mission. In its more common use, prudence refers to the more self-regarding acts. It is the narrower reference that we consider.

1. *Jesus' conduct.*—In the earlier part of His ministry Jesus withdrew from the approach of danger. When He came from the temptation in the wilderness to take up His mission, hearing that Herod had put John in prison, He departed from Jordan to Galilee (Mat 4:12). Galilee was within the dominion of Herod Antipas, but it was remote, away from the palace where John was imprisoned, away also from the place where John had baptized, and whither the crowds had come. In Galilee He would be more withdrawn from Herod's observation. Later on, when opposition was growing, and the Pharisees and Herodians were taking counsel together against Him, He withdrew for a time to the sea (Mat 12:14, Mar 3:6). And when He heard of the execution of John, He retired with His disciples to the desert (Mat 14:13, Mar 6:31). The Fourth Gospel also gives instances of His shunning Judaea when passions were stirred there against Him (Joh 7:1; Joh 7:10; Joh 10:39-40; Joh 11:8; Joh 11:54). What relation had these acts of prudence to Jesus' sense of duty and of trust in the care of the Father? He shunned danger then for His work's sake. His hour was not yet come (Joh 7:6). Then life, and not death, was the necessity of His mission. Again, Jesus taught the most absolute trust in the guarding care of the Father. Not a sparrow falls to the ground without Him (Mat 10:29). Should He not then have committed Himself to the Father: could Herod defeat the mission of the Messiah, the Son who alone could reveal the Father? In the wilderness Jesus recognized that thought to be a temptation of Satan (Mat 4:5-7). God has given us minds to look before and after; and to run into avoidable peril needlessly is to tempt God. Carefulness, even amid duty, is lowliness' way of escape from presumption. Jesus recognized that He had to accept the ordinary conditions of human life, and guard Himself, for His work's sake, from the confinement that would hinder it, or premature death that might destroy it. But there is both in the Synoptics and in the Fourth Gospel a beautiful reconciliation of Jesus' prudence with duty and faith. When He withdrew to the desert on hearing of John's death, the crowds followed Him; and Jesus, seeing them as sheep without a shepherd, had compassion on them, and began to teach them (Mar 6:34). The death of Lazarus makes Him return to Judaea, whence He had prudently withdrawn Himself

([Joh_11:4-8](#)). The emergence of a duty, an appeal from circumstances to His compassion, is a call from the Father, and then Jesus enters upon danger secure in the Father's guarding providence. When a man is doing the duty clearly laid down for him at the moment, he is walking in the day, and there is no stumbling for him ([Joh_11:9](#)).

Did Jesus sin against that earlier spirit of prudence in His last visit to Jerusalem? He knew that He was going into danger. And He went thither not quietly, but making a public demonstration. He rode up to the city on an ass's colt as the Messiah, with an enthusiastic crowd strewing palm branches and singing hosannas to the Son of David. That would rouse the Pharisees, who regarded His claim as blasphemous, and the Sadducees, who might tremble for the peace and order of the city. He went to the Temple, and drove out with a scourge of small cords them that bought and sold in the holy place. And when at last Pharisees and Sadducees were united against Him, He uttered in the public hearing His invectives against the hypocrisy of scribes and Pharisees. Jesus has been blamed for thereby running upon death. But (1) it was necessary that He should openly make His claim to be the Messiah. He had not done so at first, for He did not desire any mere political following. It was to spiritual believers, won by His preaching of the Father, who felt that He, the meek and lowly One, had the words of eternal life, that He made known the fact that He was God's Messiah. But it was necessary that the claim should ultimately be proclaimed, after all His gospel had been declared, that Israel's rejection of Him should be their rejection of Him as Messiah. (2) It was necessary also that the Lord of man's life should lay bare in judgment the evil of Pharisaism, the master sin which dwells in the Temple, serving the very altar (see *Perfection of Jesus*, p. 337). But the invectives came only after His enemies were banded together and had decreed His death. The hour was striking when He uttered the words that maddened His foes. He chose His time with forethought and sagacity. (3) The hour of sacrifice had come. This death was no way of escape from intolerable difficulties (Renan, F. Newman). It was the end foreseen from the beginning. It lies at the back of the victory over temptation in the wilderness when He put aside the suggestion to use methods of popularity. Its shadow is over the words which He spake to the Pharisees, when early in His ministry they questioned Him about His disciples and fasting: 'The days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast in those days' ([Luk_5:35](#)). And as soon as Peter had made his confession of belief in Him as Messiah, Jesus began to prepare His disciples for sufferings and death ([Mar_8:30-31](#)). That is clear evidence that though His disciples had never dreamed of the tragic ending, yet it had long been in their Master's thought. The joyousness and serenity of the early Galilaeen ministry is no proof that Jesus dreamed then of success; it only proves how absolute was His conquest over all self-assertion and all natural shrinkings of the flesh. Death was His goal, seen from the beginning. Love's kingdom could be set up only by love's absolute devotion and self-sacrifice. The Father had laid upon Him the

task of laying down His life for the sheep. And when Jesus went up to Jerusalem, He recognized that this His hour was come. He read the signs of the times (Mat 16:3).

2. Jesus' *teaching*.—His teaching follows the lines of His conduct. As in His conduct, there is a prudential side. He counsels men to lay up treasure in heaven, for that treasure abides (Mat 6:19-20, Luk 12:33). He bids them count the cost of discipleship (Luk 14:25-33). In the parables of the Unjust Steward and the Ten Virgins, He expresses His surprise at the lack of forethought and consideration on the part of the children of light. (See Foolishness). And He bids them pluck out their right eye, cut off their hand or foot, whichever it be that gives offence, and enter maimed into the Kingdom of God rather than perish (Mar 9:43-49, Mat 5:29-30). This has been called 'the distinctive principle of Christian asceticism' (Gore); and this may be granted, with the proviso that such asceticism has nothing to do with self-appointed penances or mortifications, but only with the self-denial which wise self-knowledge brings amid the inflow of life upon one. But it is rather Christian prudence, as St. Augustine has defined it, 'love making wise distinction between what hinders and what helps itself': it is a vivid commentary on the prayer, 'Lead us not into temptation.'

In Jesus' teaching, as in His life, these prudential maxims are always subservient to the ultimate principle of conduct, love's paradox, 'Whosoever will save his life shall lose it, and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it' (Mat 16:25, Luk 17:33, Joh 12:25). Self-forgetfulness through loving service of God enriches the spirit with life's treasures of wisdom and joy. That is the secret hid from the wise and prudent and revealed unto babes (Luk 10:20-21).

Literature.—W. M. Sinclair, *The Servant of Christ*. (1892), 102; H. P. Liddon, *Sermons on Some Words of Christ* (1892), 191; S. A. Brooke, *The Ship of the Soul* (1898), 4; D. T. Young, *The Crimson Book* (1903), 157; W. C. E. Newbolt, *The Cardinal Virtues* (1903), 25.

Richard Glaister.

☞ Psalms

PSALMS.—In discussing the relation of Christ to the Psalms, two questions must be kept apart: (1) His use of the Psalter, (2) His presence in the Psalter. Even if we did not know, by direct quotation and indirect allusion, that the Psalter was a favourite book of Christ's, we could have safely inferred as much from His general attitude to the OT. The Psalter, as, on the whole, the simplest and purest expression of the devotional life of Israel, must have commended itself peculiarly to Christ.

1. The influence of the Psalter upon the mind of Jesus was probably larger and more profound than His recorded allusions to it, numerous and subtle as they are, would lead us to suppose. There were indeed elements in it which He could not have appropriated—cries for vengeance upon foes (Psa 41:11 (10), cf. Psa 68:24 (23)), or of an almost cruel delight at their defeat (Psa 18:43 (42)), or sorrowful laments at the prospect of a death in which fellowship with God was believed to be interrupted (Psa 6:6 (5) Psa 39:13 (14) Psa 88:11-13 (10-12)). But there were other elements which were well fitted to express, as they may have helped to nourish. His piety. Especially must He have been attracted by those psalms which breathe the spirit of quiet confidence in God: ‘Thou art my God; my times are in thy hand’ (Psa 31:15 f. (Psa 31:14 f.)); ‘In thy presence is fulness of joy’ (Psa 16:11); ‘As for me, I am continually with thee: thou hast holden my right hand. Thou wilt guide me with thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory’ (Psa 73:23 f.). The joy which comes from fellowship with God and from the contemplation of His acts in history (95-100), the humble and childlike spirit which lifts meek eyes to the God who looks down in pity from the heavens (123, 130)—these and other such tempers and aspirations cannot have been without their influence upon the spirit of Jesus. Most welcome of all would be those fine interpretations of the character of God scattered throughout the Psalter—as of one who is not only Lord of all space and time (90, 139), but who is also ‘good and ready to forgive and rich in love to all that call upon him’ (Psa 86:5, Psa 103:8), who opens His hand and satisfies the desire of every living thing (Psa 145:16), who is father of the fatherless and judge of the widow (Psa 68:6 (5)), who rises up at the oppression of the poor and the sighing of the needy (Psa 12:6 (5)).

2. But in estimating the influence of the Psalter upon Jesus, we are not left to conjecture. On many occasions—notably at the beginning and the end of His public career—He uses it directly, and expresses, sometimes the truths of His gospel, sometimes the aspirations of His soul, sometimes His premonitions of the fate of Jerusalem, almost in its very words. The Sermon on the Mount has at least half a dozen references, direct or indirect, to the Psalter; not only words of a more general kind, such as ‘Depart from me, ye workers of iniquity’ (Mat 7:23 || Luk 13:27, cf. Psa 6:9 (8)), or the allusion to Jerusalem as the ‘city of the great king’ (Mat 5:35, cf. Psa 48:3 (2)), but even such an assurance as that the heavenly Father feeds the birds (Mat 6:26, cf. Psa 147:9); and some of the Beatitudes themselves are but echoes of the Psalter, e.g. ‘the meek shall inherit the earth’ (Mat 5:5, cf. Psa 37:11 (the land)), ‘the merciful shall obtain mercy’ (Mat 5:7, cf. Psa 18:26 (25)). Occasionally a psalm is explicitly cited by Him, e.g. Psa 82:6 in Joh 10:34, and even prefaced by the words, ‘Have ye never read?’ (cf. Mat 21:16; Mat 21:42), which assume a familiar knowledge of the book, or at least of these particular psalms (8, 118), on the part of His audience. But even where there is no such citation, the language is often saturated with reminiscences of the Psalter. There can be little doubt, e.g., that ‘my soul is exceeding sorrowful’ (Mat 26:38 || Mar 14:34) is an echo of Ps 42:6, 12,

(Psa 42:5; Psa 42:11)), or that ‘he that eateth with me shall betray me’ (Mar 14:18) is an echo of Psa 41:10, (9) (cf. Joh 13:18, where the treachery is expressly said to be in fulfilment of the utterance in the psalm), or that ‘they shall dash to the ground thy children within thee’ (Luk 19:44) is a reminiscence of Psa 137:9. In the words of a psalm (Psa 31:6, (Psa 31:5)) Jesus commended His spirit into His Father’s hands (Luk 23:46).

3. These references are not quite exhaustive, but they are characteristic; and they are very significant of Christ’s general attitude to the Psalter. He makes its words of faith His own in the moment of His sorrow, He repeats its promises to those who are prepared to be His disciples (Luk 10:19, cf. Psa 91:13; Mat 5:5, cf. Psa 37:11); but, with the single exception—if it be an exception—of Psalms 110, to be afterwards discussed, He does not seem directly to countenance, by His own example, that Messianic interpretation of the Psalter upon which the Church has, from her earliest days, uniformly insisted. True, it is recorded that He said that ‘all things must needs be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and *the psalms*, concerning me’ (Luk 24:44). But within the teaching of Christ Himself there is no *certain* illustration of *specific* passages which He applied Messianically to Himself. And this omission would be very singular, if He had generally countenanced Messianic interpretation in the narrower sense in which that word has been commonly understood. He believed in His Messiahship, but He did not rest it upon the basis of individual passages. He claimed to fulfil the Law and the Prophets; but, judging by His general practice, this appears to imply the large fulfilment of their spirit and tendency, rather than any minute and literal fulfilment of particular words. His method of dealing with the Psalms, when controversy is involved, is well illustrated by His citation of Psa 82:6 in Joh 10:34. The Jews are incensed at what they regard as His blasphemy in calling Himself the Son of God. He appeals to the psalm, to show that men exalted to high office had been in the OT called ‘gods’; and argues that, if the title was appropriate for them, how much more for Him who had a unique commission and equipment from the Father.

4. It is instructive to turn from Christ’s use of the Psalter to that of the writers and speakers in the NT; and, in this connexion, it is important to remember that most of their citations from the Psalter are made from the LXX Septuagint . Occasionally this seriously affects the argument. The author of the Ep. to the Hebrews, e.g. (Heb 1:10-12), finds, in the great words of Psa 102:26-28 (Psa 102:25; Psa 102:27)—‘Thou, Lord, in the beginning, didst lay the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hands’—an allusion to Christ. In the LXX Septuagint it is ‘the Lord’ who is said to be everlasting, and to the author of the Epistle the Lord is Christ. But in the Hebrew psalm the address is to Jehovah, a title which no Hebrew could possibly have applied to the Messiah. Here is a case—and there are others—where the argument holds only on the basis of the Greek translation; it would

be irrelevant and inapplicable on the basis of the original Hebrew (cf. Eph 4:8, Psa 68:19, (Psa 68:18)).

Again, with regard to the psalms customarily called Messianic, it has to be remembered that the songs of the Psalter have, generally speaking, a historical background. They spring, not perhaps always, but undoubtedly often, out of a definite historical situation; that situation, or some aspect of it, is their theme. In many psalms this is obvious (cf. Psalms 44, 83, 137); and the question may fairly be raised whether this is not also the case in the Messianic psalms. Doubtless time might prove that the meaning of a psalm was larger than the original intention of its composer: this is true more or less of all great literature. But to understand truly its deeper meaning, we must start from its original intention, and from the situation in view of which it was composed. While to some of the psalms whose subject is a king a Messianic interpretation has been assigned (cf. 2), in others the actual contents and implications of the psalm render that interpretation impossible. The ‘anointed,’ e.g. (Heb. ‘his Messiah,’ LXX Septuagint ‘Christ’), in Psa 20:7 (6) is almost necessarily some historical king, and the psalm appears to have been composed on the eve of a battle. If, then, in some of the psalms which deal with a ‘Messiah’ or ‘Christ,’ the reference is to a historic king of Israel or Judah, the presumption at least is raised that all the Messianic psalms may be similarly interpreted.

The tendency to find in the Psalter predictive references to Jesus must have set in very early. In Mat 13:35, e.g., the parabolic method of teaching adopted by Jesus is said to be in fulfilment of the prophecy (attributed in one MS to Isaiah), ‘I will open my mouth *in parables*, I will utter things hidden from the foundation of the world.’ In point of fact these words simply form the introduction to one of the longer historical psalms (Psa 78:2), and in them the Psalmist simply declares his intention to draw instruction from the ancient history of Israel. There is here no conceivable allusion to the parabolic teaching of Jesus. This interpretation would hardly even have been possible but for the LXX Septuagint, which happens to render the Hebrew מְשִׁיחַ by ἐν ταραβολαῖς—another good illustration of the control that the LXX Septuagint exercised over Messianic interpretation. This tendency to ‘messianize,’ wherever possible, naturally is operative also outside of the NT. There is no warrant in its pages, e.g., for referring the latter part of Psalms 24 to Christ; but the Fathers applied it to His ascension, and the *Te Deum* addresses Christ as the King of Glory. Sometimes psalms which are commonly regarded as Messianic contain sentiments which are un-Christian, and which therefore render the Messianic interpretation, in any sense worth defending, untenable. Some exegetes have even held that Psalms 18 is Messianic, in spite of such a verse as Psa 18:43 (Psa 18:42). Psalms 2, whose claims are much more generally allowed, contains sentiments (cf. Psa 2:9) which could not legitimately be reconciled with the spirit of Him who was the Prince of peace.

5. We shall now examine the psalms which are most commonly regarded as *Messianic*—for convenience' sake in the order in which they occur in the Psalter.

Psalms 2. A study of the NT allusions to this psalm is peculiarly instructive, as, though there is a general agreement that it is *Messianic*, there is considerable variety in its interpretation. One passage, indeed, does not seem even to regard the psalm as *Messianic*, at least in the narrower sense: in Rev 2:27 the promise of Psa 2:9 that the king would 'break' (LXX Septuagint and NT read ποιμανεῖς), 'shepherd,' 'rule,' pointing תרעם instead of עֲמֵתֶךָ) the nations with a rod of iron, as the vessels of the potter are broken, is applied, in the message addressed to Thyatira, to the Christian who overcomes and keeps the works of Christ to the end.

This application of the passage shows that, even in very early times, the *Messianic* interpretation of such psalms was felt to be not the only possible one. It is just possible, however, that the words of the psalm were chosen simply because they were an apposite description of triumph. This becomes the more probable when we remember that elsewhere in this same book—Rev 12:5; Rev 19:15—the passage is applied *Messianically*.

The first two verses of the psalm—'Why do the heathen rage?' etc.—are applied in Act 4:25 f. to the combination of Herod, Pilate, the Romans, and the Jews, against 'thy holy servant Jesus,' who is clearly therefore regarded as the king celebrated in the psalm. The verse which the NT most frequently lays under contribution is Act 4:7 'Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee.' This verse, or the first part of it, underlies Nathanael's confession (Joh 1:49), Peter's confession (Mat 16:16), the high priest's question (Mat 26:63), and the voice which is said to have been heard on the occasion of the Baptism (Mat 3:17 = Mar 1:11 = Luk 3:22) and the Transfiguration (Mat 17:5 = Mar 9:7 = Luk 9:35). According to the Codex Bezae in Mat 3:17, the words heard on the occasion of the baptism were, 'Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee.' This attests the belief in some quarters that the Divine sonship of Jesus, which the psalm is supposed to foreshadow, dated from the day of His baptism. But in Act 13:33 St. Paul regards the Psalmist's utterance as fulfilled not in the baptism, but in the resurrection of Jesus; and this view appears to underlie the Apostle's statement in Rom 1:4 that it was by the resurrection that Jesus was declared to be the Son of God with power. The verse is further applied in Heb 1:5 (cf. Heb 5:5) as a proof of the superiority of Jesus to the angels. In the Hebrew OT, however, the term literally translated 'sons of God' is applied to supernatural beings whether they be regarded as gods or angels; cf. Job 1:6; Job 2:1, where the LXX Septuagint renders by οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ. As, however, there are passages in which even the LXX Septuagint speaks of these beings as 'sons of God' (Psa 29:1; Psa 89:6), we must assume, if the writer has not forgotten them, that he is laying

particular stress on the latter half of the verse, 'this day have I begotten thee.' According to the Epistle, however, Jesus took part in the Creation, and was pre-existent before all eternity ([Heb_1:2](#); [Heb_1:10](#)); consequently we must suppose that the 'begetting to-day' refers to His eternal generation. See art. Begetting.

Here, then, are three different interpretations of the verse within the NT: the Divine sonship of the Messiah is variously connected with His baptism, His resurrection, or His eternal generation. These interesting fluctuations of opinion are possible only because the historical interpretation of the psalm is ignored. The phrase 'son of God' did not necessarily imply Divinity in the technical sense, for we find it applied even to the people ([Exo_4:22](#)), and we have already seen how Jesus argues ([Joh_10:34](#)) from the acknowledged application of the term to human beings. In truth, the psalm seems to be addressed to some actual king of Judah, and to express the assurance of his victory and dominion, possibly on the occasion of his coronation. The day on which he was begotten as a son of God is the day on which he was installed in his regal dignity as the representative of Jehovah, the King and Father of His people. It is, we must admit, by no means impossible, especially when we consider the soaring language of the psalm, that its subject is not any reigning king, but some king yet to be; this would be the case if the psalm belongs, as it may, to the post-exilic period, when the monarchy was no more. But in neither case can it be strictly regarded as referring to Jesus, partly because the establishment of the king upon the holy hill of Zion would have no relevance in His case; partly because the conception of His function as dashing His enemies in pieces is un-Christian. Besides, as we have seen, the NT itself is not agreed as to the precise incident which the psalm is supposed to prefigure. But its solemn and emphatic predication of the Divine sonship of the king, possibly also its outlook upon a world-wide dominion, made it natural, and almost inevitable, under the conditions of early Christian interpretation, that it should be regarded as, in some sense, a prediction of Jesus.

Psalms 8. It is interesting to compare the use made of this psalm by Jesus with that made elsewhere in the NT. [Psa_5:3](#) (2) 'Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings,' etc., is quoted by Him against the chief priests ([Mat_21:16](#)), who murmur when they hear the children cry 'Hosanna.' The NT follows the LXX Septuagint, which reads 'praise' instead of the Hebrew 'strength,' 'bulwark'; but the *essential* meaning of the psalm is finely brought out by the citation—the power, on the one hand, or the insight, on the other, of the children (cf. for a very similar thought, [Mat_11:25](#)). In [Heb_2:6-8](#), however (cf. [1Co_15:27](#) f.), 'Thou madest him a little (or 'for a little while') lower than the angels,'—vv. [Psa_8:5-6](#) of the psalm are interpreted as referring to Jesus, because the supremacy which, in the psalm, is asserted of the 'son of man' is not, as a matter of fact, true of the human race, but it is true of Jesus. This is a noble application of the passage, full of poetic and spiritual insight; but it does not justify us in supposing that the psalm was, in its original intention,

Messianic. The Psalmist is undoubtedly thinking of the human race, he marvels at the love of the great God towards His apparently insignificant creature in making him lord of all. 'Thou hast put *all* things under his feet.' To the Psalmist this supremacy is a fact: he is content with man as he finds him, and he is not thinking of One in whom this lordship would be more perfectly realized.

Psalms 16. In Act 2:25-28 (cf. Act 13:35-37) St. Peter quotes four verses of the psalm (Psa 16:8-11) in confirmation of the resurrection of Christ. The crucial verse is Act 2:27 'Thou wilt not leave my soul unto Hades, neither wilt thou give thy holy one to see corruption.' It is not quite certain whether the psalm is individual or collective. If it be collective, this verse implies no more than an assured faith in the future of Israel; if, however, it be individual, the speaker is probably expressing his own faith in immortality, though a more meagre meaning has been put upon the words, as if he were simply expressing his confidence in his recovery from a severe illness, or perhaps in his immunity from the sudden death which overtakes the wicked. In any case 'thy holy one'—an unfortunate translation—is undoubtedly the speaker himself. He is Jehovah's *hâsîd*, that is, a bond of love subsists between him and his God; and, in virtue of this bond, he is sure that Sheol cannot be his ultimate fate,—he will overleap it, and be received into glory (Psa 73:24). The last word of Psa 16:10 פִּתּוֹ, which means 'pit,' was, however, unfortunately rendered by LXX Septuagint διαφθορά, 'corruption'; and part of St. Peter's argument, as of St. Paul's in Act 13:35-37, depends upon the mistranslation. The argument is that, as the Psalmist himself 'saw corruption' (Act 13:36), he was really speaking, not of himself, but, prophetically, of Jesus, who saw no corruption. The psalm is therefore regarded as a prophecy of the resurrection of Christ, though it is, in reality, only a devout believer's confession of faith in his own immortality. But it is only fair to notice that, while the form of the argument in Acts is Jewish, and rests, in part, upon a mistranslation, in substance the argument is sound. What the psalm essentially asserts is, that where a bond of love subsists between God and a man, death has no power to destroy the man—*a fortiori* in the case of *the Man*. 'It was not possible that *He* should be conquered by *him*' (Act 2:24)—such a one as Jesus by such an antagonist as death.

Psalms 22. Nothing is more natural than that the early Christians should have interpreted this psalm Messianically, or that that interpretation should have persisted throughout the whole history of the Christian Church. It is not only that echoes of it are heard in the Passion story of the Gospels,—in the parting of His garments and the casting of the lot for His raiment (Mat 27:35 = Mar 15:24 = Luk 23:34, Psa 22:19 (18)), the shaking of the heads of the passers-by (Mat 27:39 = Mar 15:29 = Luk 23:35, Psa 22:8 (7)), the mocking cry, 'He trusted in God, let him deliver him' (Mat 27:43, Psa 22:9 (8)),—but Jesus Himself upon the cross used at least the opening words of the psalm (Mat 27:46 = Mar 15:34), and the parting of His garments is expressly said

in Joh 19:24 to have taken place that the scripture might be fulfilled. It must be admitted that there is often a very startling similarity between the details of the psalm and the narrative of the Gospels. Still, many of those details are not strictly applicable to the crucifixion. Alike in the sufferings, in the triumphant issue from them, and in the contemplated conversion of the world which is to be produced by that triumph (Joh 19:28 (27)), this psalm very powerfully recalls the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah; and the theme of both is doubtless the same, that is, the people, or at least the pious kernel of Israel. More important, however, than the similarity of detail just alluded to, striking as that is, is the large and profound insight of the psalm. It is all aglow with the consciousness that suffering means, in the end, not defeat, but victory, and that the Suffering Servant, so far from being crushed, will one day win the whole world to Himself. These truths, of course, find their highest and truest exemplification in Jesus.

Psa 34:21 (20). According to Joh 19:36 the legs of Jesus were not broken, in order that the scripture might be fulfilled, 'A bone of him shall not be broken.' In the psalm the verse is intended to express the general care which Jehovah exercises over the righteous, and therefore it could hardly be regarded as an apt citation in connexion with the crucifixion of Jesus; but more probably it is intended to be, primarily, a reminiscence of Exo 12:46, Num 9:12, which prescribe that the bones of the Paschal lamb shall not be broken. In that case the quotation would convey to a Jewish ear the subtle reminder that Jesus was the true Paschal lamb.

Psalms 40. In Heb 10:5-7 part of this psalm (Heb 10:7-9 (6-8)) is quoted, and interpreted as a prayer of Christ on coming into the world; and here, again, a large part of the argument turns upon the faulty text of the LXX Septuagint. The author is arguing that the continual sacrifices of the OT dispensation have been for ever abolished by the one sacrifice of Christ. In *the body* which God prepared for Him, He perfectly fulfilled the Divine will by the sacrifice of Himself. But the words 'a body didst thou prepare for me,' which the author adopts from the LXX Septuagint, do not represent the Heb. of Psa 40:7 (6), which reads, 'ears hast thou digged for me.'

Fortunately the origin of the mistake is not far to seek. The word for 'ears' is ΩΤΙΑ, and for 'body' ΣΩΜΑ. The Σ at the end of ΗΘΕΛΗΣΑΣ was apparently duplicated, and then the following ΩΤΙΑ was easily transformed into ΩΜΑ; so that out of an originally correct translation, 'ears,' a new word arose, which unhappily lent itself to a dogmatic interpretation almost the opposite of that intended by the Psalmist. His point is that God demands not sacrifice but obedience—the ready ear to hear; the point in the Epistle is, not the ever-recurring sacrifice, but the one sacrifice of Christ's body. As, however, the ethical worth, in one of its aspects, of Christ's sacrifice was the perfect obedience which it illustrated, we may say that here, as in the case of Psalms 16, the conclusion is essentially sound, though the argument is

fallacious, at least in so far as it rests upon a mistranslation. Historically considered, the psalm appears to be a prayer expressing the mingled feelings of the people after their return from exile. It is one of the three great psalms (cf. 50, 51) which emphatically assert the superiority of obedience and contrition over sacrifice.

Psa 41:10 (9). In the Gospel of John, as in the Epistle to the Hebrews, there is a strong tendency towards the Messianic interpretation of passages in which, to say the least, that interpretation is not necessary. According to Joh 13:18 the treachery of Judas is said to have taken place in accordance with the scripture, which must be fulfilled, 'He that eateth my bread lifted up his heel against me.' In other words, Psa 41:10 (9) is supposed to have Christ for its theme. That this is impossible, however, is clearly shown by the very verse of the psalm which follows the quotation, 'Thou, Jehovah, have mercy upon me, and raise me up, that I may requite them.' It is much more probable that Jesus simply used the words which St. Mark records of Him,—words, no doubt, suggested by the psalm, 'One of you shall betray me, even he that eateth with me.' He may have cited the words of the psalm as apposite rather than prophetic.

Psalms 45. For long Psalms 45 has enjoyed among Christian expositors the reputation of celebrating the love of Christ for His Church. But a glance at the psalm is enough to show that it, like others, has its roots in history; the pointed and definite reference to 'the daughter of Tyre' renders any other interpretation extremely improbable. It is apparently a song in celebration of the marriage of some king of Israel or Judah with a foreign princess. Psa 45:7 f. (6 f.)—'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever,' etc.—are cited in Heb 1:8 f. and interpreted as referring to the Son. Considering that shortly before, Heb 5:2, and immediately after, Heb 5:10, the author of the Epistle touches upon the pre-existence of Christ, the direct naming of the royal subject of the psalm as 'God' would be peculiarly welcome. With what admirable cogency could the psalm thus be interpreted of Christ, and how little could it be fairly referred to any one else! For the passages which some have adduced to prove that אֱלֹהִים could stand for 'judges' (cf. Exo 22:7 f.)—though they do not really prove as much—would in any case be insufficient to show that an ordinary human king could be addressed in the word *Elohim*; the king of the psalm must therefore be Divine. It has been conjectured, however, with great acuteness and probability, that instead of אֱלֹהִים 'God,' the original reading was יהיה 'shall be' (יהיה). This may have been carelessly read as יהיה, and then altered by the Elohist redactors of Psalms 42-83 to אֱלֹהִים. In that case the important dogmatic text, 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever,' becomes the innocent assertion that 'thy throne *shall be* for ever and ever,' and with the change in the text, the Messianic interpretation vanishes, especially as the next

verse speaks of his companions. Of a human king this is intelligible, but who would the companions of the Messiah be?

Psalms 69. It might seem surprising that a psalm marked by so vindictive a spirit as Psalms 69 should ever have been interpreted Messianically, but several of its verses are even in the NT brought into relation with Christ. In his usual manner St. John (Joh 19:28-30) sees in the offering of vinegar to Jesus on the cross a fulfilment of scripture, that is, of Psa 69:22 (21) (cf. Mar 15:36, Luk 23:36), while St. Matthew (Mat 27:34; Mat 27:48), who parallels the language of the psalm still more closely by speaking of the gall, does not explicitly connect the incident with the psalm, though doubtless it was in his mind. The zeal with which Jesus drove the money-changers out of the Temple, is said in Joh 2:17 to have reminded the disciples of Joh 5:10 (9) of the psalm; and Rom 15:3, where the second half of this verse is quoted, shows that St. Paul interpreted the psalm Messianically (but cf. Rom 11:9 f. with Psa 69:23 f. (22 f.)). In Act 1:20, Psa 69:26 (25) and Psa 109:8 are regarded as inspired predictions of the fate of Judas (Act 1:16). Two difficulties, however, stand in the way of interpreting this psalm Messianically: (1) It plainly reflects a contemporary historical situation; it is the product of a time when Judah is in misery and her cities are in ruins (Psa 69:36 (35)); and (2) its fierce vindictive tone (cf. Act 5:24) is altogether unlike the spirit of Him who said, 'Father, forgive them.' The similarity of incidents in the life of Jesus to certain features of the psalm may have led to its Messianic application; but it has nothing like the claims to such a distinction which Psalms 22 has.

Psalms 72. The NT lends hardly any support to the Messianic interpretation of this psalm, though this interpretation has found much favour with Christian expositors. The description of the gifts of gold that were brought to the infant Jesus (Mat 2:11) perhaps recalls, in part, the language of the psalm, cf. psalm, cf. psalm, cf. Psa 72:10 f., Psa 72:15; but in spite of the extravagant language of psalm, cf. Psa 72:8-11 (which are possibly, as some hold, a later insertion, added after the psalm began to be interpreted Messianically), it was, in all probability, originally only a prayer for some historic king. psalm, cf. Psa 72:15, in which prayer is to be continually offered for the royal subject of the psalm, shows that the Messianic interpretation is hardly admissible.

Psalms 110. No psalm is so frequently laid under contribution in the NT as Psalms 110, V. 1, e.g., is referred to, directly or allusively, in Mat 22:44; Mat 26:64, Mar 12:36; Mar 14:62; Mar 16:19, Luk 20:42 f., Luk 22:69, Act 2:34 f., Act 5:31, Act 7:55 f., Rom 8:34, 1Co 15:25, Eph 1:20, Col 3:1, 1Pe 3:22, Heb 1:3; Heb 1:13; Heb 8:1; Heb 10:12 f., Heb 12:2; and v. 4 in Heb 5:6; Heb 6:20; Heb 7:11; Heb 7:17; Heb 7:21 etc. The first verse is interpreted of Jesus, who, as the Messiah, is bidden by the Lord (*Jehovah* in the Hebrew) to sit at His right hand till He has

vanquished all His enemies; while, according to the Ep. to the Heb., He is also the priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek. Other priesthoods were transitory, His is eternal and inalienable (Heb_7:16; Heb_7:24). The use of the psalm made by Christ, together with the very deliberate, if not solemn words in which He introduces the citation, certainly raise a strong presumption that He regarded the psalm as Messianic. But in this connexion two things have to be remembered: (1) that this allusion springs from an atmosphere of controversy, and (2) that the *essential* meaning of Christ is independent of the Messianic view of the psalm. (1) As against the Pharisees, the citation had a peculiar relevance and propriety. Christ desires them to feel that they have not carefully considered the consequences of their views regarding the Messiah. (2) The real intention of Christ is to suggest the indefeasible superiority of the spiritual to the material. Starting from the conception of sonship, the Pharisees ended in thoughts of a material and political kingdom like David's, whereas, had they considered the sense in which the Messiah was David's Lord, they would have found themselves in a spiritual sphere.

It is certainly very difficult to resist the impression that the psalm is Maccabaeian. Without laying too much stress upon the singular fact that the initial letters of each verse from Psa_110:1 b to Psa_110:4, שמעון, spell the word Simon, the historical implications of the psalm point very powerfully to the Maccabaeian period. It implies that the king celebrated also bore the title of priest, and not till that period could this have been appropriately said of any ruler. The language of the opening verse, which, in the Hebrew, runs 'Oracle of Jehovah to my lord,' most naturally suggests that the psalm is composed by a poet in honour of his king, whom he calls 'my lord,' and for whom he foretells victory. But the vigorous language of Psa_110:6 hardly seems compatible with the idea that its theme is Christ.

The use made of the psalm by St. Peter in Act_2:34 f. is thoroughly analogous to his use of Psalms 16. Immediately after arguing that Psalms 16, with its seeming prophecy of the resurrection, could not refer to David because he 'both died and was buried,' the Apostle goes on to argue that Psalms 110 must also be referred to some other than David, because 'he did not ascend into the heavens.' But in truth the sitting at the right hand of God is simply a pictorial way of suggesting an idea similar to that of Psa_2:7, where a historical king is called the son of God. The grandeur of the phrase 'sitting at the right hand of God,' the contemplated completeness of the king's victory, the union in his person of the offices or priest and king, and the mysteriousness that gathered round the person and the priesthood of Melchizedek, all combined to make the Messianic interpretation easy and all but inevitable.

Psalms 118. With this psalm as with Psalms 8, Jesus assumed a certain familiarity on the part of His audience (Mat_21:42 'Did ye never read?'). His use of it strongly

suggests, though perhaps it hardly compels, the belief that He regarded it as Messianic. With the words, 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord' (Psa 118:26), He was acclaimed by the multitudes as He entered Jerusalem (Mat 21:9; Mat 21:15 = Mar 11:9 f. = Luk 19:38 = Joh 12:13), and in the same words He ends His lament over Jerusalem (Mat 23:39). The saying that 'the stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner' (Psa 118:22), is also understood to find its fulfilment in Him (Mat 21:42 = Mar 12:10 f. = Luk 20:17; cf. Act 4:11, 1Pe 2:4; 1Pe 2:7). In the psalm, the reference appears to be to Israel, despised yet victorious; but as the career of Jesus is the most perfect illustration of the principle pictorially expressed in the saying, the citation is thoroughly in keeping with the spirit of the psalm, though it cannot be regarded as a prediction. Similarly, 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord,' is more strikingly appropriate to Jesus than even to the original subject of the psalm.

6. In conclusion, it may be said that the exegetical methods and the Messianic outlook of the early Church rendered it very natural that they should find in the Psalter, as in other parts of the OT, predictions of incidents in the life of Christ, or that psalms descriptive, on the one hand, of malignant persecution and agonized suffering, or embodying, on the other hand, a large outlook upon a universal dominion, should be claimed for Him. Usually there is an appropriateness, sometimes very striking, in the application to Him of passages in the Psalter which, for various reasons, can seldom, if ever, be with any plausibility regarded as predictions of Him. Often, as we have seen, a psalm can be regarded as Messianic only by ignoring its historical background (Psalms 69), or by selecting and emphasizing certain verses while ignoring others that suggest an inadequate or unworthy view of the Messiah (Psalms 2). There are undoubtedly in the Psalter many true foreshadowings of Christ; but, speaking broadly, it is in its general spirit rather than in its isolated expressions that we may find Him. Of course, it has been commonly urged that a psalm may be typically Messianic though it is not prophetic; but it may be questioned whether it is worth while to interpret literature in this fashion. Christ's own use of the Psalter is strikingly different from the occasional use of it, e.g., in the Book of the Acts. He did not commend His Messiahship after the fashion in which His Apostles sometimes do. Profound as is the insight with which they often cite and apply the Psalter, very much more than the Master do the disciples emphasize the letter, sometimes even the letter of an inadequate translation. From His use of it we learn to find in the Psalter a support of the devotional life rather than a mainstay of Messianic argument.

Literature.—Binnie, *The Psalms, their History, Teaching, and Use*, pp. 155-217; Alexander, *Witness of the Psalms to Christ and Christianity* (BL [Note: L Bampton Lecture.] , 1876); Jennings and Lowe, *The Psalms, with Introductions and Critical Notes*, vol. i. ch. iv.; Kirkpatrick, *The Psalms* (Cambridge Bible), Introduction, ch. viii.; Cheyne, *The Christian Use of the Psalms*; A. B. Davidson, *Biblical and Literary*

Essays, pp. 139-193; Briggs, 'The Psalms,' 2 vols. (*ICC [Note: CC International Critical Commentary.]*) 1906-7, esp. Introd. p. ci ff. Allusions to the Psalter in NT are collected in Alexander's *Witness of the Psalms*, pp. 257-264; but they can be most profitably studied in Toy, *Quotations in the NT*; Hühn, *Die messianischen Weissagungen*, 2 Theil, 'Die Alttestamentlichen Citate und Reminiscenzen im NT'; Dittmar, *Vetus Testamentum in Novo*.

John E. M'Fadyen.

Publican

PUBLICAN (Gr. τελώνης).—The Roman practice of selling to the highest bidder the task of collecting the taxes and dues of a province or district for a definite period is well known. The persons thus engaged were called *publicani*, and usually belonged to the wealthy equestrian order. They, in their turn, employed local agents to get in the revenues, who were also called *publicani*. This lower class are probably the men referred to in the Gospels, wherever they belong to Judaea (or Samaria), except possibly in the case of Zacchaeus, who was ἀρχιτελώνης of Jericho (Luk 19:2), and may have farmed the revenues of that important commercial centre on his own account (but see Ramsay as cited below).

In Galilee the publicans had to collect, not for the Imperial treasury (as in Judaea), but for Herod Antipas the tetrarch. Such an official was St. Matthew (Levi), who was called to be an Apostle from the place of toll (τελώνιον) on the shores of the Lake of Galilee at Capernaum (Mat 9:9, Mar 2:14, Luk 5:27). And in his house afterwards our Lord met many other publicans of the tetrarchy at a great entertainment.

Whether in the service of the hated Roman Emperor or of Herod Antipas, who was in complete subservience to him, the tax-gatherer was most unpopular with the Jews; for, apart from the obvious liability of the method to abuse, the mere fact of the money being thus raised for an alien power was detestable in their eyes. And no doubt the publicans were often drawn from the lowest ranks in consequence. Hence common talk associated them not only with the Gentiles (Mat 18:17), but with harlots (Mat 21:31; Mat 21:22) and sinners in general (Mat 9:10-11; Mat 11:19, Mar 2:15-16, Luk 5:30; Luk 7:34; Luk 15:1).

John the Baptist's preaching attracted many publicans to him, and when they inquired in what they must mend their ways after being baptized by him, his answer

indicated that extortion was their besetting danger, as we should expect (Luk 3:12-13).

The remarkable effect that our Lord's ministry also had upon these men, as in the case of St. Matthew and Zacchaeus (cf. Luk 15:1), is not to be held as implying that He laid Himself out more for them than for other sinners who realized their need of Him; nor are we to infer that, in contrasting them with the Pharisees and scribes, as in the well-known parable (Luk 18:10 ff.), He intended to clear their character altogether from current prejudices and aspersions. Extortion and oppression were as abhorrent to Him in the one class as formalism and hypocrisy were in the other. Both stood equally in need of His salvation (Luk 19:10), but without a consciousness of the need on their part His salvation could not take effect.

Literature.—Schürer, *GJV* [Note: *JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] i. 474 ff.; Edersheim, *LT* [Note: *T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].*] i. 514 ff.; Ramsay, 'The *telonai* in the Gospels' in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible*, Ext. Vol. p. 394^bff.; art. 'Publican' in *DB* [Note: *Dictionary of the Bible.*] and in the *JE* [Note: *E Jewish Encyclopedia.*] .

C. L. Feltoe.

Publishing

PUBLISHING (κηρῦσσω, fr. κήρυξι, 'a herald').—It is a principle in the Divine economy for God to withdraw Himself from the perception of man, except in so far as the latter is able to receive a Divine revelation to his profit (Isa 45:15; Isa 53:1, Mat 7:6). It is not that God is unwilling to manifest Himself, but that the condemnation for rejecting the light is so great, that He is constantly withdrawing and veiling Himself from men's gaze (Joh 15:22). Thus it is that He is so frequently represented as shrouded in cloud (Exo 16:10, Lev 16:2, Num 11:25). Thus Christ's Divine glory at the Transfiguration was veiled in a bright cloud (Mat 17:5, Mar 9:7, Luk 9:34); thus, too, He will come at the Last Day in a cloud (Luk 21:27). It is one of the paradoxes with which we are familiar in the Gospels, that manifestation should be accompanied by concealment, and revelation connected with mystery. Just as our eyes cannot see where all is dark, nor yet again in a blaze of brightest light, but as a blending of the two is necessary for physical vision, so is the law in the spiritual life. Complete darkness would leave us hopeless; a blaze of Divine glory would blind our spiritual faculties.

Christ's childhood was wrapped in concealment. Only one incident is recorded about that period in the Gospels, and that one shows that His mother did not then understand Him (Luk_2:48 ff.). Christ was always veiling Himself throughout His ministry. He did not publish abroad the truths of His Kingdom indiscriminately. His use of parables was to avoid the casting of pearls before swine. His sayings were to a great extent allegorical. Such expressions as 'leaven' for 'doctrine' (Mat_16:6; Mat_16:11 f. ||), 'sleep' for 'death' (Mat_9:24 || Joh_11:11), cutting off the right hand (Mat_5:30; Mat_18:8 ||), the dead burying their dead (Mat_8:22 ||), the buying of swords (Luk_22:36), the undying worm (Mar_9:44; Mar_9:46; Mar_9:48), were not, of course, intended to be understood literally. All this seems to be due to His wish to spare the greater condemnation which would follow upon the greater revelation. Persons and cities who received the latter without profiting by it are specially denounced (Mat_11:23, Luk_10:15). In the explanation of the parable of the Sower a special condition of fertility was the right understanding. 'He that hath ears to hear, let him hear' (Mat_13:9). It was a spiritual and not an intellectual perception that was required, one that depended on the state of the heart and not on the shrewdness of the mind (Mat_11:25, Luk_10:21). Christ taught people as they were able to hear (Mar_4:33, cf. Joh_16:12). He did not force new wine into old bottles. He explained the meaning of His parables to His disciples in private (Mar_4:34). Towards the end of His ministry He dispensed with parables in speaking to them (Joh_16:25; Joh_16:29). The time for concealment was past.

The same principle is observable with regard to Christ's miracles. They were worked only on those who had faith (Mar_9:23). In Capernaum He did not do many mighty works, because of their unbelief. The crowd of mourners are excluded at Jairus' house because they laughed Him to scorn (Mar_5:40 ||). The post-Resurrection appearances were not given indiscriminately, but to witnesses chosen before, who had shared the intimacy of temptation and suffering. Thus it was that after the performance of so many of our Lord's miracles the recipients of healing grace were told not to publish the news abroad. It would only provoke calumny or misrepresentation. The Pharisees were not influenced favourably by the miracles which they saw (Mat_12:14, Mar_3:5 f., Joh_5:18; Joh_10:39; Joh_11:47, Luk_6:11) or heard of. It was only increasing their condemnation to publish the accounts abroad.

But it was especially in the healing of demoniacs that the principle received illustration (Mat_9:34; Mat_12:24). The evil spirits are anxious to publish Christ's Divinity. They are not allowed to do so. There was evidently something repulsive to Christ in the knowledge possessed by the demons unaccompanied by love and reverence (Jam_2:19). Human beings, having this knowledge without corresponding affection, would become like the demons, with hardened hearts. It was the sin against the Holy Ghost which is so severely denounced (Mat_12:31). This was the reason for Christ's manifestation of Himself to His disciples and not to the world

([Joh_14:22](#)). They had shown the requisite spirit of submission to the Cross. They had ears to hear.

We see, then, that it was not Christ's object to reveal Himself to every one indiscriminately, but to those only who had a desire for that knowledge, together with love and reverence. The training of such recipients was gentle and gradual. Manifestation to the hardened brought with it only condemnation. Concealment implied mercy. As man had deliberately put forth his hand and tasted of the forbidden tree, so must he show by his deliberate action that he wished to taste of the tree of life, the true knowledge of God and of His Son revealed in the Incarnation ([Joh_17:3](#)).

But while we observe in our Lord's ministry this principle of reserve with regard both to the mysteries of the Kingdom and the truth about His own Person, He never concealed, or wished His disciples to conceal, the saving message of the gospel. The gospel was to be 'published among all nations' ([Mar_13:10](#), Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'preached'). The vb. κηρῦσσω, which is used to denote a publication such as Jesus forbade of His miraculous cures ([Mar_1:45](#); [Mar_7:36](#)), is the same word as is constantly employed with reference to His own proclamation of the gospel ([Mat_4:23](#) etc.) and His instruction to His disciples to proclaim it ([Mat_10:7](#), [Mar_3:14](#), [Luk_9:2](#) etc.). When κηρῦσσω is used, however, in this specific sense, it is almost invariably rendered 'preach' in Authorized and Revised Versions . In [Mar_13:10](#), as noted above, Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 has substituted 'preach' for 'publish' of Authorized Version . See, further, Preaching, Revelation.

Literature.—Isaac Williams, *The Study of the Gospels*; cf. also, on the confession of Christ's claims by demoniacs, J. Weiss, *Das älteste Evangelium*; and artt. by W. Wrede ('Zur Messiaserkennntnis der Dämonen'), and B. W. Bacon ('The Markan Theory of Demonic Recognition of the Christ') in *ZNTW [Note: NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissen. schaft.]* , 1904, p. 169 ff., and 1905, p. 153 ff.

C. H. Prichard and J. C. Lambert.

 Punishment

PUNISHMENT

1. God's punishment of sin.—For the sufferings of Christ for sin, see Atonement: the present article is concerned only with the punishment of men. The Gospel teaching on this important subject can be briefly summarized in a few paragraphs:

(a) *The fact of punishment.*—This fact is involved in certain explicit statements of our Lord Himself (Mat 13:41-42; Mat 25:46, Joh 15:2; Joh 15:6), and clearly suggested in more than one of His parables (Mar 12:9, Mat 13:30; Mat 22:13-14, Luk 13:9; Luk 13:22 ff.). It is further implied both in the recognition of God's wrath upon men (Joh 3:36) and of a consequent difference in their destinies (Mat 13:41; Mat 13:43; Mat 25:46, Joh 5:29), and in frequent references to Gehenna (Mat 5:29; Mat 10:28, Mar 9:43-48, Luk 12:5) or to the place of outer darkness (Mat 8:12; Mat 22:13; Mat 25:30). So serious may this punishment be, that death would be a preferable alternative (Mar 9:42); and, unrestricted to individual transgressors, it may fall also both upon cities (Mat 10:15; Mat 11:21; Mat 23:38) and upon nations (Mat 21:43-44; Mat 23:35; Mat 23:38). The principle of punishment was illustrated in our Lord's action (Mar 11:12 ff., Mar 11:15 ff. ||) as well as inculcated in His words'.

(b) *The expression of punishment.*—God's punishment of men for sin, the fact of which is thus recognized by the Gospels, finds expression in different ways, (α) Our Lord seems to hint that even in the conditions of a man's present life the penalty of sin may sometimes be perceived. At least it would appear that in certain cases He allows that a connexion exists between sin and physical sickness (Mar 2:10-11 || Joh 5:14). Nowhere, however, does He approve the view, which emerges in the OT, that a similar explanation accounts for the presence in the world of human sorrow. (On the contrary, sorrow even becomes, in His esteem, a ground for rejoicing [Mat 5:4; Mat 5:10-12]). Apart from these vague suggestions of a physical penalty, the Gospels recognize both a present and a future punishment of sin. (β) There is a sense in which a man's judgment, and hence his punishment, is immediate. And not only is this true in that his sin involves remorse (Mat 26:75; Mat 27:4-5, Mar 6:16), but also because his very attitude to Christ automatically enriches his personality or issues in its impoverishment (Joh 3:18-19; Joh 9:1; Joh 9:11-12, Mat 25:28-29, cf. Luk 2:34). (γ) There is a second sense in which a man's judgment lies in the future (Mat 13:41-43; Mat 25:31 ff. and frequently). A discussion of the punishment resulting from that judgment does not fall within the scope of the present article, and the reader is therefore referred to the separate study on Eternal Punishment. Here it will suffice to observe that, whatever be its accidents, the essence of punishment will consist in banishment from the presence of Christ (Mat 7:23; Mat 25:41); and that it will be marked by varying degrees of severity (Mar 12:40, Mat 10:15; Mat 11:22; Mat 11:24, Luk 12:48), each of us by his own use of opportunity providing his own criterion (Mat 5:7; Mat 7:1-2; Mat 10:33, Mar 4:24).

(c) *The aim of punishment.*—Punishment may be conceived as either disciplinary or retributive in its purpose. Our Lord Himself, in all probability with deliberate intent, made no unmistakable pronouncement on the meaning of the doom of the rejected. All that we can do, therefore, is to deduce from His words certain general

considerations bearing more or less closely on the end that punishment has in view (α) On the one hand, the teaching of the Gospels confirms the verdict of our own moral sense, that so long as there is any hope of a sinner's recovery, the reformatory element must at least be prominent in the transaction. Inasmuch as judgment is self-acting (Joh 3:19; Joh 12:31), it inevitably accompanies God's gift of His Son (Joh 3:18; see Westcott, *in loc.*); yet we are specifically taught that not judgment but salvation is God's deepest thought for mankind (Joh 3:17; so Mat 18:14, Joh 6:39; Joh 8:11, Luke 15, cf. also Joh 5:24). It is in keeping with this that of the two words denoting 'punishment,' κόλασις and τιμωρία, distinguished in classical Greek as respectively remedial and penal in their purpose (so Plato; see Trench, *Syn.* § vii.), it is the former that is preserved in the report of Christ's teaching (Mat 25:46). That the classical shade of meaning is retained in the NT is signified by the suggestive use of *κολάζεσθαι* in 2Pe 2:9, where the punishment precedes judgment, and therefore could scarcely yet be retributive. (β) On the other hand, the terms in which Christ refers to punishment (e.g. Mat 18:35, Luk 20:47 etc.) would seem to forbid us to reduce it to the mere equivalent of discipline; and He Himself, in speaking of sin that has no forgiveness (Mar 3:28 ||, cf. Mar 14:21 and 1Jn 5:16), distinctly implies a punishment that is retributive in character. The proportion in which these two elements in the Divine punishment of men are combined, is beyond our knowledge. Human analogies can merely give us vague hints, every analogy being to some degree imperfect, and therefore to the same degree misleading. Instead of seeking to dogmatize on what does not at present fall within the sphere of our understanding, it would seem wise to confine our conclusions to two broad principles:

(i.) The punishment of the sinner is such as Love can inflict. If God *is* Love (1Jn 4:8; 1Jn 4:16), there can be no act of His which is not an expression of His nature. Sometimes Love reveals itself as tenderness. Sometimes it reveals itself as wrath (cf. the striking sequence of verses in Mat 10:28-29; Mat 21:13-14); for if sin is more than a fiction, the measure of God's love for the sinner will determine the severity of His anger against his sin. Indeed, the surest proof of the punishment of sin is to be found in the *love* of God. It is only something less than love that would palliate evil in the life of the loved one. If, therefore, punishment is an expression of Love, it will contain the elements of discipline and retribution in such proportion as Love demands. What that proportion is we cannot say: we must be content to leave ourselves in the hands of Perfect Love.

(ii.) Hence, too, it follows that the duration of punishment will be such as Love requires. It seems reasonable to expect that as soon as a sinner becomes forgivable, the retributive aspect of punishment is at an end, and discipline alone remains; and that when discipline has utterly failed to reclaim a man, it in its turn must give place

to simple retribution. Of the precise point at which either crisis is reached we have no knowledge. In one place our Lord appears to hint that it may be beyond the grave (Mat 12:32), but, as we have already seen, He gave no clear guidance in the matter. Again, we must be content to leave ourselves in the hands of Perfect Love. (On the nature and purpose of punishment, see Moberly's valuable chapter in *Atonement and Personality*, ch. i.)

2. Forms of human punishment.—(a) Among punishments mentioned as of general imposition are several which demand no detailed treatment. Such are *decapitation* (Mar 6:27, Mat 14:10), *drowning* (Mar 9:42, Mat 18:6), *incarceration* (Mar 6:17, Mat 5:25; Mat 18:30, Luk 23:19), and *hanging* (Mat 27:5), inflicted, according to Jewish custom, only for idolatry or blasphemy, and then only after the victim had already been put to death in some other way (Edersheim, *LT [Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].]* ii. 584). With these, too, may be classed the less familiar penalties of *precipitation* (attempted in the case of our Lord, Luk 4:29) and of *mutilation* ($\delta\iota\chi\omicron\tau\omicron\mu\epsilon\iota\nu$, Mat 24:51, Luk 12:46). *Stoning* (Luk 20:6, Joh 8:5, cf. Mat 21:44 || and Mat 23:35 ||) was imposed for many offences, including the unchastity of a betrothed maiden, idolatry, and blasphemy. On one occasion the Jews sought to inflict it on our Lord Himself (Joh 10:31). See art. *Stoning*. For *excommunication*, see art. *s.v.*

(b) The two prominent forms of human punishment inflicted upon Jesus were those of scourging and crucifixion. *Scourging*, used among the Jews as a penalty for debt (Mat 18:34) or for offences of a religious character (Mat 10:17; Mat 23:34), was also the customary precursor to Roman crucifixion. The Roman scourge was of leather thongs, weighted with bone or some form of metal. The victim's suffering was so intense that it frequently led to death before the capital sentence proper could be carried into effect. According to His own prophecy (Mar 10:34, Mat 20:19, Luk 18:33), our Lord was subjected to this cruel instrument of torture (Mar 15:15, Mat 27:26, Joh 19:1). It was inflicted by Pilate in the hope that it would satisfy the passion of the Jews and render the crucifixion unnecessary (Luk 23:22; see Westcott on Joh 19:1). For the details of our Lord's *crucifixion* (Mar 15:22 ||, cf. Gal 3:10-23) and their significance the reader is referred to the special article under that heading. Christ foretold this form of death for other witnesses to truth (Mat 23:34, and probably Joh 21:18) as well as for Himself (Mat 20:19; Mat 26:2, Luk 24:7, Joh 12:32-33).

H. Bisseker.

PURIFICATION (1. καθαρισμός: of washings before and after meals, [Joh 2:6](#); of baptism, a symbol of moral cleansing, [Joh 3:25](#); of the Levitical purification of women after childbirth, [Luk 2:22](#); of cleansing of lepers, [Mar 1:44](#), [Luk 5:14](#). 2. βαπτισμός: of cleansing of vessels, [Mar 7:8](#)).—From the time of the Exile onwards, the interest of the Jew had largely centred around ritual observance, conditioned, to begin with, by the necessity of maintaining the separateness of the Remnant that remained. These observances, so far as they concerned purification, had two main sources of origin. Some must have dated from a prehistoric period when religion had but little to do with ethics, and concerned itself rather with maintaining the favour of a deity, thought of as arbitrary, by avoiding practices that might trench upon his holiness. Other observances, of later date, may have had their origin in sanitary requirements. The result, however, as is well known, was that Jewish life became completely fettered by these ordinances, written and oral. When Christ came proclaiming liberty to the captives, He could not avoid running counter in many respects to the regulations dealing with purification. See art. Purity. The various ceremonies of purification referred to in the Gospels are these:

1. In case of leprosy ([Mar 1:44](#), [Luk 5:14](#), [Mat 8:2](#), [Luk 17:11-19](#)).—The uncleanness of the leper seems to have been due not to the fear of contagion, for contagious diseases were not, generally speaking, regarded as unclean, but to the repulsive appearance of this particular disease. Leprosy (wh. see) was counted to be a special scourge; and the leper was, like the madman, supposed to be smitten of God. This distinctiveness of leprosy in the view of the priest is shown by the word used of its removal. Almost invariably its cleansing is denoted by the word καθαρίζειν. The exception to this is in the account of the healing of the Ten Lepers ([Luk 17:15](#)), where the word ἰᾶσθαι is used; but this exception may be accounted for on the ground that the narrative is dealing with Samaritans, who were regarded as being an alien people. The regulations for the purification of leprosy had two parts ([Lev 14:1-32](#)). In the first ceremony, on the conclusion of which the leper was admitted to the camp, though not to his tent, two living birds were taken. One was killed over an earthenware vessel filled with ‘living’ (spring) water, in such manner that the blood dropped into the vessel. The other bird, along with cedar wood, scarlet, and hyssop, was then dipped into the blood-stained water, and the leper was sprinkled with it seven times. The bird was then released ‘into the open field,’ and was supposed to fly away with the leprosy, the blood-brotherhood between the leper and the bird being established by the immersion of the bird in the water.

The ceremony is akin to that of the laying of the sins of the people upon the head of the scapegoat, which was then sent away into the wilderness ([Lev 16:21](#)). By a similar ceremony, an Arab widow who is about to remarry makes a bird fly away with the

uncleanness of her widowhood (W. R. Smith, *RS [Note: S Religion of the Semites.]*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 422, 447).

The second part of the ceremony took place eight days after the first part. Probably the object of the interval was to ensure an additional period of quarantine in which it might be seen whether the cure had been effective. If the leper were in good circumstances, he offered two he lambs and was anointed by the priest with blood and oil. If the sufferer were poor, he could offer, in place of two lambs, one lamb and two turtledoves, or two small pigeons. Our Lord did not interfere in any way with the offerings for purification of leprosy (Mar 1:44, Luk 5:14, Mat 8:4).

2. In connexion with food (Mar 7:1-23, Mat 15:1-20, Joh 2:6; Joh 3:25).—The particular ritual connected with the ceremonial washing of hands affected Jewish life many times a day. Of the six books of the Mishna, the longest (*Tohârôth*) is devoted to the question of purification, and thirty chapters of this book deal with the cleansing of vessels. Even if the hands were already ceremonially clean, they had to be washed before a meal. A washing of the hands between the courses, as also a washing at the conclusion of the feast, was practised frequently; but this custom may have had its origin in obvious convenience, and not in any striving after ritual cleanliness (2Ki 3:11). In the ceremony itself, the hands were held over a basin while water was poured over them. The water was allowed to run down to the wrist (? Mar 7:3, see Swete's note). Such was the ritual in the case of an ordinary meal. But if holy or sacrificial food was to be partaken of, the hands had to be completely immersed in the water. If the hands were ceremonially unclean, there had to be two washings. In the first, the fingers were elevated and the water was allowed to run down to the wrist. In the second, the finger tips were depressed, so that the water might run from the wrist downward, and might thus carry off the water that had, on the first washing, contracted the defilement of the hands. The water to be used in ceremonial washing was kept from possible defilement by being kept in large jars (ὕδρῳ ἰαί, Joh 2:6). The vessel by which the water was drawn from these jars had to contain at least a quarter of a log, *i.e.* a measure equal to one and a half 'eggshells' (Edersheim, *LT [Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].]* ii. 9 ff.).

3. Before the Passover (Joh 11:55; Joh 18:28).—If the Jews were so particular to ensure ceremonial purity before an ordinary meal, they insisted on absolute ritual purity before the celebration of the Passover (Lev 7:20-21). The reason that kept Christ's accusers from following Him into the judgment-hall (Joh 18:28) may have been simply the fear of the defilement they would incur by entering a heathen house. But it is still more likely that they remained outside for fear that the judgment-hall might contain somewhere within its walls a portion of leaven. The exclusion of leaven from all sacrifices offered to Jehovah was a very early custom (Exo 23:18;

Exo_34:25), and must have been due to the desire to avoid the association of any form of corruption with the Feast. This seems all the more clear, when it is noticed that the exclusion of leaven is associated with the command that no fat or flesh shall remain over till the morning. The efficacy of the sacrifice lay in the living flesh and blood of the victim; thus everything of the nature of putrefaction had to be avoided. For this reason, milk, the commonest of foods in the East, had no place in Hebrew sacrifice (W. R. Smith, *RS [Note: S Religion of the Semites.]*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 220).

4. After childbirth (Luk_2:22).—That childbirth renders a woman unclean is an almost universal belief among primitive peoples. Among some Arab tribes it was customary to build a hut outside the camp, where the woman had to stay for a time (Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iv. 828^b; Wellhausen, *Reste*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 170). The Priestly Code recognized two degrees of uncleanness (Leviticus 12). After the birth of a boy, the mother was to be counted unclean, as in menstruation, for a week, and was to continue 'in the blood of her purifying' for 33 days longer, during which she could touch no hallowed thing nor come into the sanctuary. She was thus unclean, in greater or less degree, for 40 days. But if the child were a girl, both periods of uncleanness were doubled. At the expiry of the 40, or of the 80, days, the mother offered a lamb of the first year for a burnt-offering, and a young pigeon or a turtle-dove for a sin-offering. But if she were poor (as was Mary, Luk_2:24), she could substitute for the lamb a young pigeon or a turtle-dove.

5. Graves as causes of defilement are referred to in Mat_23:27, Luk_11:44 (cf. Tomb).

R. Bruce Taylor.

Purim

PURIM.—A feast of the Jews occurring on the 14th and 15th of the month Adar, one month before the Passover. It had only the slightest religious character, and was devoted to feasting and holiday.

The Book of Esther purports to give the origin of Purim in the feast kept by the Jews when the afflictions that threatened them through Haman were turned into joy and blessing. This explanation is now generally regarded as fanciful, in part because of the antecedent improbability of the narrative in Esther and the lack of historical

evidence for its truthfulness, and in part because of the impossibility of verifying in Persian the meaning of the word *purim* (= 'lot'), upon which the connexion rests.

Several different theories have been held of its origin. (1) The outgrowth of the Nicanor festival kept on the 13th of Adar, to celebrate the victory over that general in b.c. 161. (2) Derived from a New Year's festival of Parthian origin. (3) A Persian spring festival. (4) Connected with the Persian *Fûrdigân*, festival of the dead. (5) The Greek *Pithoigia*, corresponding to the Roman *Vinalia*. (6) Others most recently (Zimmern, Jensen, Meissner, Wildeboer) derive it from a Babylonian New Year's festival, and make Mordecai the same as Marduk, and Esther = the goddess Ishtar.

The feast is not mentioned by name in the NT, but is by some supposed to be the 'feast of the Jews' of Joh 5:1. If so, this Gospel mentions three Passovers during the ministry of Jesus (Joh 2:13, Joh 6:4, Joh 12:1), and His ministry thus extends, according to Jn., over two and a half years. On the other hand, if the alternative view is held, that Joh 5:1 is a Passover feast, there are four mentioned, and the ministry, according to Jn., extends over three and a half years. Before either figure can be assumed as giving the correct chronology of the life of Christ, the accounts in the Fourth Gospel must be subjected to criticism in connexion with those of the Synoptics. See artt. Dates, Feasts, Ministry.

O. H. Gates.

☞ Purity

PURITY.—To form a clear conception of purity in its Christian sense is a matter of some difficulty, for two reasons. Historically, the idea has undergone great changes, and the terms by which it has been expressed have been applied to very different qualities, which to-day we should classify as physical, ceremonial, and moral purity,—qualities which have nothing necessarily in common. On the other hand, if the idea in its highest significance be considered, it is singularly elusive, and therefore exact treatment is hardly practicable. It will be necessary to meet these two difficulties separately, and therefore to subdivide the subject.

1. In the Jewish world, wherein Christianity arose, purity occupied a commanding position. Since the return from the Exile, and especially since the reconstruction under Ezra and Nehemiah, there had been a strenuous and sustained endeavour to secure the purity of both the national and the individual life by means of the jealous exclusion of all that could cause impurity. The Law laid down in detail the requirements of 'clean' and 'unclean,' alike in matters of worship, of food and

conduct, and of relations with the heathen world. Purity of descent in Israel also involved great insistence on genealogical records. And all these questions had received further elaboration at the hands of the later scribes. In this way the idea of purity had become increasingly artificial and external; till at last it became an obsession which went far to destroy the spontaneity of life, and to obscure the positive aspects of virtue and religion (cf. [Act 15:10](#), [Col 2:20-23](#)). It follows that in most of the passages in the Gospels in which purity is mentioned, it is this current conception of it which is referred to; a conception which was almost entirely negative, and was mainly ceremonial, though not without confused intermixture of elements which were strictly physical, and others which were really spiritual.

There are two groups of words by which purity is expressed, alike in the Greek and in the English NT, though these do not answer strictly each to each. In the Greek the first group consists of *καθῆρός*, *καθαρίζω*, *καθαρισμός* (frequently); *καθαίρω*, *διακαθαρίζω* (twice each); *καθαρότης*, *κάθασμα*, *τερικαθασμα* (once each); and *ἀκαθαρτος*, *ἀκαθαρσία*. In the English (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) these are most often rendered by 'clean,' 'cleansed,' etc.; but often by 'pure,' 'purify,' etc. The other group consists of *ἀγνος*, *ἀγνίζω*, *ἀγνισμος*, *ἀγνότης*, *ἀγνια*, which are found less frequently, and which in the Authorized and Revised Versions are always rendered by 'pure,' 'purify,' etc., never by 'clean,' 'cleansed,' or the like. The failure of the Authorized and Revised Versions to distinguish these terms is, however, of no great importance, inasmuch as the Greek words themselves appear to be used as completely equivalent. This appears well in [Heb 9:13](#) *ἀγιάζει πρὸς ... καθαροτητα*; in the parallel use of *αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ* ([Luk 2:22](#)) and *αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ ἀγνισμοῦ* ([Act 21:26](#)); and in the use of *καθαρισμός* twice ([Act 2:6](#), [Act 3:25](#)) and of *ἀγνίζω* once ([Joh 11:55](#)) in St. John's Gospel to stand indifferently for the customary purifying of the Jews. It is, however, worth while to notice that, with the exception of the last mentioned instance, the second group of words is never met with in the Gospels. (For use of *κοινοῶ* in the sense of making impure, see below).

The important point is to observe how Christ altered the significance of *καθῆρός* and its cognates, correcting and deepening the idea of purity which they served to express. Often He used these terms in the senses which they currently bore. He employed them in connexion with physical disease: 'The lepers are cleansed' ([Mat 11:5](#), cf. [Luk 17:17](#), [Mar 1:41](#)); and of the vine in a figure where more is symbolized by the want of physical vigour ([Joh 15:2](#)). He spoke also of 'unclean spirits' when treating those 'possessed' ([Mat 12:43](#), [Mar 5:8](#)). But His characteristic habit was to look below the outward and visible evidences of purity and impurity,

whether these were physical or ceremonial, to the purity or impurity of the heart. The leading instance is Mar 7:14-23 'Nothing from without the man going into him can defile (δύναται κοινῶσαι) him.... These evil things proceed from within and defile the man.' Here the Evangelist expressly notes that the saying 'makes all foods clean.' And other passages show the same teaching if less fully expressed: e.g. the Pharisees are denounced for their hypocrisy in cleansing the outside of the cup and platter while inwardly full of extortion and excess, whereas practical love shown in alms would have made all clean to them (Mat 23:25-26, cf. Luk 11:41); and they are also condemned for being 'like whited sepulchres, full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness,' which is defined as 'hypocrisy and iniquity' (Mat 23:27-28). So He gave His blessing to the 'pure in heart' (Mat 5:8), setting the ideal of purity which He would have His followers share with Him. And that this is to be understood in no negative sense is made very plain by Christ's teaching elsewhere. In Joh 13:1-11 the practice of the Lord's own humility is taught as the means of purity in His followers: in Joh 15:3 He says, 'Ye are clean because of the word that I have spoken unto you,' with which should be compared St. Peter's words, 'cleansing their hearts by faith' (Act 15:9); while in Luk 11:24-26 || it is expressly taught that a merely negative purity of heart, due to the extrusion or exclusion of evil, is hopeless, and 'the last state of that man becometh worse than the first.'

It is in the fullest accordance with Christ's habitual standpoint and with His teaching elsewhere that He adopted baptism, which had long been a symbolic and ceremonial rite of purification in Judaism, as a fundamental ordinance for His followers: but it is equally in character with His mind and teaching that in the place of its old negative significance He gave it a new and positive meaning, by making it baptism into the Divine Name He had revealed, and into the practical observance of His commands, and the enduring possession of His Spirit (Mat 28:19-20). The reference of Christian baptism is thus far less to the past-which it was in Jewish usage-than to the future; to the life, *i.e.*, to be found and shared in the 'true Israel of God.'

2. But when the lesson has been learnt that purity can never consist in externals or negations, but must be a positive characteristic of the heart or inner man, there still remains the harder question, Wherein does such purity consist? This has often been discussed by moralists, and it is curious how little they have to give in answer. No definition based on acts can be framed, for the same act under different conditions may be pure or impure. Nor is it easy to find one by the analysis of motives, as the treatment of the matter by the casuists clearly shows; for they have almost always ended in defining impurity only—a thing best left alone. A clue to the answer may, however, be found in Christ's teaching, though not one admitting of any formal analysis or definition. He laid it down emphatically that evil things proceeding from within can defile (δύναται κοινῶσαι). The word employed is most instructive; and the

more so when one recollects that it occurs again in this sense in the decisive lesson taught St. Peter as to the nature of purity (ὃ ὁ θεὸς ἐκαθάρισεν σὺ μὴ κοίνου, [Act 10:15](#); [Act 11:9](#); cf. [Act 21:28](#)). To make common, *i.e.* to vulgarize, is the way to make impure: profanity is the ruin of purity. A well-spring of living water, fenced about by reverence—that is purity. When reverence is broken through, or when careless frequency leaves the bulwark open, every beast may enter and foul the spring after slaking its thirst; then purity is gone. Not that purity is the flow of living water, but its characteristic so long as it is guarded. The water-spring may be a fount of truth, or love, or life; it may be an aspiration, a resolve, an idea; it may consist in an opportunity met with, or an experience felt; it may be a holy memory, or an act of worship; sometimes it will be the new perception of some beauty natural or moral, and sometimes an inborn faculty of service for others. Round any or all of these God sets reverence in our hearts for a fence, and bids us bare our heads as we draw near to what for us is holy ground. If we give no heed, but vulgarize by common use that opening which was afforded us to be a ‘window in heaven,’ we may do this, but at the cost of purity. God endows all with faculties of body, of intellect, of soul, which He means to be exercised and kept pure; but used without reverence, and viewed without wonder, they miss their purpose. It was the sense of what true purity consists in that led an old writer to say, ‘Keep thy heart above all that thou guardest, for out of it are the issues of life’ ([Pro 4:23](#)),—a saying which half-anticipates the Beatitude promising the vision of God to the pure in heart. Reverence is the root from which purity grows; and never was the essential nature of purity set in more vivid contrast with that blind and brutal profanity which is its opposite, than in Christ’s striking utterance, ‘Give not that which is holy to the dogs, nor cast your pearls before the swine, that they may never trample them between their feet, and, turning, rend you’ ([Mat 7:6](#)).

Literature.—W. M. Ramsay, ‘Greek of Early Ch. and Pagan Ritual’ in *ExpT* [*Note: xpT Expository Times.*] x. (1899) 107; J. Smith, *Chr. Character as a Social Power* (1899), 143; H. Bushnell, *The New Life*, 176; W. J. Dawson, *Threshold of Manhood* (1889), 102; F. W. Robertson, *Serm.*, 3rd ser. (1876) 122; A. Maclaren, *Serm. in Manchester*, 2nd ser. 112; R. W. Church, *Village Serm.*, 2nd ser. 180; J. R. Illingworth, *Univ. and Cath. Serm.* 99; H. C. G. Moule, *Need and Fulness* (1895), 57; C. G. Montefiore, *Truth in Religion* (1906), 73.

E. P. Boys-Smith.

PURPLE.—The adj. πορφύρεος had originally no connexion with a particular colour either by derivation or by use (see Liddell and Scott's *Lex.* s.v. πορφύρω). Similarly in the Latin poets *purpureus* regularly stands for nothing more than 'bright.' In Greek, after the discovery of the purple dye, the notion of colour became inherent. The gradations of colour were φοῖνιξ (darker shades—purple to crimson), πορφύρεος (brighter red, rosy), κόκκινος (scarlet). In Mat 27:28, Mar 15:17; Mar 15:20, Joh 19:2; Joh 19:5, the last two words are used indiscriminately for the same colour (see art. Scarlet). Manufactured purples were of various kinds, all extracted from the juice of sea molluscs. The following is a summary of their varieties, though the terms employed to describe them were not always confined to their proper use.

(1) Purple proper; of a bright red hue; obtained from the purple-snail (πορφύρα, *purpura*). This was used sometimes pure (called *blatta*), sometimes diluted (*conchylium*). Of the pure there were two sorts—(a) Tyrian, the most celebrated, which was 'twice-dyed'; (b) amethystine, of a paler tint. One pound of wool dyed with Tyrian purple cost 1000 denarii, with amethystine 100 (Plin. *HN* ix. 38, 63). The use of such purples (especially the former) is mentioned frequently in satirists and historians as a feature of ancient luxury (cf. Juv. *Sat.* vii. 134 ff.; Mart. viii. 10, etc.); hence Christ's expression in Luk 16:19.

(2) Common purple; of a violet hue (*i.e.* φοῖνιξ rather than πορφύρεος); obtained from the trumpet-snail (κῆρυξ). This was much less esteemed. Its colour apparently could even be compared to the dark blue of an Eastern sky (Josephus *Ant.* iii. vii. 7): but probably there were different tints.

The fiery-red purple (proper) of antiquity had practically no resemblance, as a colour, to the modern purple: the latter could never be described, even approximately, as 'scarlet' (Mat 27:28). Yet, independently of the hue, the name carries with it in both cases the distinction of being the royal colour. Under the Roman Empire restrictions were imposed from time to time as to its general use; and the purple toga was the garb of the Emperor alone. It was as the badge of kingship that the purple formed part of the soldiers' mockery (Mar 15:17; Mar 15:20 ||).

Literature.—Becker, *Gallus*, Excursus ii. p. 446 ff.; Schmidt, *Forschungen auf dem Gebiet des Alterthums*, pp. 96-212. An older work upon the subject is Amati, *de Restitutione Purpurarum*.

F. S. Ranken.

☞ Purse

PURSE.—1. βαλλάντιον, peculiar to St. Luke, which occurs in LXX Septuagint as the translation of צִיָּוָה (Job_14:17) and פִּיס (Pro_1:14). ‘The purse of the modern Syrian peasant is a little bag, sometimes of woven silk thread, but usually of yellow cotton. The open mouth is not drawn close by a string, but is gathered up by one hand, and then by the other the neck of the bag is carefully whipped round’ (Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible, art. ‘Bag’); it, no doubt, corresponds to βαλλάντιον. The ‘Seventy’ were directed not to carry a purse (Luk_10:4); in Luk_22:35 f. Christ asked the Apostles, ‘When I sent you forth without purse, lacked ye anything?’ and gave the new direction, ‘He that hath a purse, let him take it.’ In Luk_22:36 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 gives ‘and he that hath none,’ *i.e.* no purse (so Cov. [Note: Coverdale’s Bible 1535.], Rhem. [Note: Rhemish NT 1582.], Gen. [Note: Geneva NT 1557, Bible 1560.], Meyer, etc.; on the other hand, Tind. [Note: Tindale’s NT 1526 and 1534, Pent. 1530.], Cran. [Note: Cranmer’s ‘Great’ Bible 1539.], Beza, Ewald, Godet prefer to supply μάχαιρα as Authorized Version (‘he that hath no sword’). The passage, says Wendt, is to be explained from foresight of an impending period of persecution for the disciples: Jesus sets the necessity of buying a sword in contrast to the freedom from all want hitherto enjoyed by His disciples in their work as His messengers, and bases His exhortation on a reference to the doom about to fall on Himself; a period would begin when the disciples would no longer be unharmed, but would be in the midst of conflicts and persecutions (see Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, ii. p. 358). In Luk_12:33 βαλλάντια is used in a figurative sense, ‘make for yourselves purses (Authorized Version after Tind. [Note: Tindale’s NT 1526 and 1534, Pent. 1530.] ‘bags’) which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not’ (‘continens pro contento,’ de Wette).

2. ζώνη (Mat_10:9 = Mar_6:8 in the directions to the Twelve), properly the girdle, which is still in Syria made ‘double for a foot and a half from the buckle, thus making a safe and well-guarded purse’ (Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible, art. ‘Bag’). (Revised Version margin) translation ‘girdle.’

‘There was no extraordinary self-denial in the matter or mode of their mission. We may expound the instructions given to these primitive evangelists somewhat after the following manner—“Provide neither gold nor silver nor brass in your purses. You are going to your brethren in the neighbouring villages, and the best way to get to their hearts and their confidence is to throw yourselves upon their hospitality....” At this

day the farmer sets out on excursions quite as extensive without a para in his purse' (Thomson, *LB [Note: The Land and the Book.]* p. 345 f.).

See also Bag.

Literature.—The Lexicons of Liddell and Scott, and Grimm-Thayer, s.v. βαλλάντιον; *ExpT [Note: xpT Expository Times.]* iv. [1893] 153 ff.; *Expositor*, i. vi. [1877] 312ff.

W. H. Dundas.

☩ Quarantania

QUARANTANIA.—See Wilderness.

☩ Quaternion

QUATERNION (τετράδιον).—The word occurs only once in NT, and then not in the Gospels (Act 12:4); but we know that four soldiers at a time were ordinarily told off for work in the Roman army (Vegetius, *de Re Milit.* iii. 8), and that there were that number in charge of our Lord's Crucifixion (Joh 19:23-24; cf. *Evang. Petr.* 9; see art. Coat).

C. L. Feltoe.

☩ Queen

QUEEN (βασίλισσα).—A title occurring only once in the Gospels (Mat 12:42, Luk 11:31), in our Lord's reference to the queen of Sheba as 'the queen of the south.' The visit of the queen of Sheba to king Solomon is related in 1Ki 10:1-13 and in 2Ch 9:1-9, and the chief object of her journey was to satisfy herself as to his great wisdom, the report of which had reached her, although she was also attracted by the accounts which had been brought to her of his riches and magnificence. It is to the former of these two purposes of her visit that our Lord refers. The Pharisees had demanded of Him a special sign, and He replied that no such sign should be given them, but that they should have a sign in Himself and in His burial and resurrection,

as the Ninevites had had in Jonah. But the Ninevites, He added, would in the judgment condemn the men of that generation; for they had repented at the preaching of Jonah, who was a sign to them, while the men of that generation, He implied, would not repent at the preaching of one greater than Jonah. Then, referring to the celebrated queen, He added: 'The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; for she came from the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon, and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here.'

The connexion between the case of the Ninevites and that of the queen of Sheba does not lie on the surface. Some have supposed that our Lord refers to a *woman* as the correlative to the *men* of Nineveh previously spoken of. Others think that, having spoken of the Ninevites to whom without any seeking of theirs a preaching of repentance was brought, He refers, to complete the warning, to one who was herself a spontaneous seeker of wisdom. Without setting aside these suggestions, it is more to the point to observe that our Lord brings into juxtaposition the two characteristics—so strongly emphasized in the case of Jew and Gentile—of the desire for a sign, and the seeking after wisdom; and it has been suggested that St. Paul may well have had this whole incident in mind when he wrote 1Co_1:18-27 (see esp. 1Co_1:22). We may also notice how our Lord in effect boldly claims to be what St. Paul says that He is, 'the wisdom of God.' Solomon was 'wiser than all men' (1Ki_4:31), and later Jewish literature delighted to magnify his wisdom (cf. Wis_7:17-21). For our Lord, then, to claim before a Jewish audience to be 'something more' than Solomon, was to claim to be Wisdom itself. We may also remark how here again, as in the discourse at Nazareth, our Lord chooses His examples from among Gentiles (cf. also Mat_8:11-12; Mat_10:15; Mat_11:22-24).

Abyssinian legend has many strange tales of the queen of Sheba, declaring that she came from Ethiopia, that her name was Maqueda, and that she had a son by Solomon. (For many curious details, see Ludolf, *Hist. Aethiop.* ii. 3; *Vitæ sanctorum indigenarum*, ed. K. Conti Rossini; *Legend of the Queen of Sheba*, ed. E. Littmann; also Josephus *Ant.* viii. vi. 5). All this, however, probably rests on a confusion between Seba (סבא) and Sheba (שבא), cf. Psa_72:10. Our Lord's phrase, 'the queen of the south,' falls in with the most widely accepted opinion, *i.e.* that Sheba was in South Arabia; her land was accordingly more than a thousand miles from Jerusalem, a fact which justifies our Lord's words, ἐκ τῶν περὶ τῆς γῆς (cf. Jer_6:20).

Albert Bonus.

Questions And Answers

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.—A full examination of the questions asked and the answers given by Jesus would involve a general consideration of the methods He employed in His teaching, and in meeting the difficulties of His hearers. Every good teacher must adopt the plan, associated for classical students with the name of Socrates, of using questions to make his hearers define their own position and ideas, and to help them to see clearly the admitted fundamental principles which underlie the discussion; and he will further find in the questions they ask, since they give him an insight into the way in which their minds are working, opportunities for emphasizing, explaining, or developing his teaching according to their requirements. If any one will take the trouble to read through the Gospels, and note and mark in the margin all the questions and answers of Jesus, he can hardly fail to learn from the method employed by the world's greatest Teacher much that will be of use to one who has himself to teach others. It is personal work at the records themselves that has a real value, and the main object of this article is to suggest lines of study, since an exhaustive investigation is obviously impossible within the space available.

i. **Questions put by Jesus.**—1. The prominence of interrogative sentences in the Gospels is due in part to the characteristic avoidance of indirect constructions; but no doubt both in this particular and in the number of questions introduced they reflect the vividness of the Saviour's methods of teaching. The interrogative form was also particularly adapted to make people think for themselves, and we can trace all through our Lord's utterances the desire to promote thought. In a few cases the questions are simply requests for information. One instance is of special interest. According to Mar 6:38, Jesus asked the disciples, before the feeding of the 5000, 'How many loaves have ye?' This question is omitted in Mt. (Mat 14:16 f.) and Lk. (Luk 9:13). Jn. (Joh 6:5 f.) relates that Christ asked a similar question of Philip on the same occasion, 'Whence are we to buy loaves, that these may eat?' But the Evangelist is careful to show that he does not understand this to be simply a request for information, by adding, 'And this he said to prove him: for he himself knew what he would do.' The following is a list of simple requests for information; it will be noted that they occur mostly in Mk., and fall in with the simpler conception of the Person of Christ presented in that Gospel:

Mar 5:9, Luk 8:30 'what is thy name?' [wanting in Mt.].

Mar 6:38. See above.

Mar 8:5, Mat 15:34 'How many loaves have ye?' [wanting in Lk.].

Mar 8:23; Mar 9:16; Mar 9:21 [peculiar to Mk.].

Mar 9:33 'What were ye reasoning in the way?' [Mt. avoids the question; it is wanting in Lk.].

Joh 11:34 'Where have ye laid him?'

Joh 1:38; Joh 18:4; Joh 18:7; Joh 18:34 probably do not come under this category; in each of these instances the question seems to be intended to suggest some thought to the hearers. Joh 20:15, like Luk 24:17; Luk 24:19, seems to be due to the character of a stranger assumed for the moment by Christ.

2. Instances of purely rhetorical questions occur with normal frequency (e.g. Mat 15:3, where the parallel Mar 7:9 has an assertion; Mar 4:13, Luk 18:7, Joh 6:70). Christ habitually used such questions as a form of mild rebuke, often implying a notion of surprise or of sorrow (e.g. Mar 4:40 = Mat 8:26 = Luk 8:25, Joh 3:10).

3. The use of a rhetorical question to introduce parables or parabolic utterances is characteristic of Luke, but is found also in Matthew and Mark. In the latter Gospel the parable of the Mustard-seed (Mar 4:30) is introduced by the striking double question, 'How shall we liken the kingdom of God? or in what parable shall we set it forth?' which Swete (*ad loc.*) thus paraphrases: 'How are we to depict the kingdom of God? in what new light can we place it?' He adds, 'The Lord, as a wise teacher, seems to take His audience into His counsels, and to seek their help.' Luk 13:18 retains the double question in an obviously less original and really tautological form, in which the hearers are not taken into the Master's counsels ('Unto what is the kingdom of God like? and whereunto shall I liken it?'), but Mat 13:31 drops it. Cf. also Mar 2:19 = Mat 9:15 = Luk 5:34, Mar 8:36 f. = Mat 16:26 = Luk 9:25, Mar 9:50 = Mat 5:13 = Luk 14:34; examples peculiar to Mk. are found in Mar 3:23; Mar 4:21. This use occurs also in Mt. in passages where the matter is common to himself and Lk. (Mat 6:27 = Luk 12:25, Mat 11:16 = Luk 7:31, Mat 18:12 = Luk 15:4, Mat 24:45 = Luk 12:42), but there do not appear to be any instances of it in matter peculiar to Matthew. Further examples in Lk. are Luk 6:39; Luk 11:5 (where the interrogative form in which the parable of the Friend at Midnight begins is not carried to a grammatical conclusion), Luk 13:20 (= Mat 13:33 where the question is dropped) Mat 14:28; Mat 14:31, Mat 15:8, Mat 17:7 f. A somewhat similar use is found in Joh 4:35; Joh 11:9, where a parabolic meaning is apparently given to popular proverbs.

This investigation throws an interesting side-light on the Synoptic problem: one of the four parables recorded by Mk. is introduced by a very striking interrogative formula, and many parables in the non-Markan document used by Mt. and Lk. seem to have been similarly introduced; Mt., however, did not care for this use, and was inclined to avoid it.

4. Christ often asked a question also in order to make men draw their own conclusions from His parables: cf. Mar 12:9 = Mat 21:40 = Luk 20:15 (where He apparently answered the question Himself, though Mt. ascribes the answer to the audience), Mat 21:31, Luk 7:42; Luk 10:36; Luk 16:11.

5. Very frequently Christ, by means of a question, led His hearers to admit the truth of matters of common knowledge, or of generally accepted principles, on which He was going to base His teaching: some characteristic examples are here classified:

(a) Matters of common knowledge: Mat 10:29 = Luk 12:6 (price of sparrows), Mat 17:25 (tribute collected of strangers).

(b) Appeals to common sense: Mat 5:46 f. = Luk 6:32 f., Mat 7:3 f. = Luk 6:41 f. (the mote and the beam—almost parabolic), Mat 7:9 ff. = Luk 11:11 ff., Mat 7:16 (question-form dropped in Luk 6:44), Mar 7:18 f. = Mat 15:17, Mar 12:16 = Mat 22:20 = Luk 20:24 ('Whose is this image and superscription?'), Luk 11:40; Luk 22:27.

(c) Appeals to the conscience of the hearers: Mat 23:17 ff., Mar 3:4 = Mat 12:11 = Luk 6:9, Luk 13:15; Luk 14:3; Luk 14:5 (cf. Mat 12:10 f.).

(d) Appeals to OT Scriptures: Mar 2:25 f. = Mat 12:3 f. = Luk 6:3 f., Mar 11:17 (question-form dropped in Mat 21:13 and Luk 19:46), Mar 12:10 f. = Mat 21:42 = Luk 20:17, Mar 12:26 = Mat 22:31 f. (question-form dropped in Luk 20:37 f.), Mat 21:16, Joh 10:34.

(e) To establish principles closely connected with the teaching of Christ in the immediate context: Joh 3:12; Joh 5:44; Joh 5:47; Joh 8:43; Joh 8:46.

6. Again, Jesus often asked questions to lead men to an exact understanding of the circumstances connected with a question addressed to Himself, or with a request asked of Him: Mar 10:3 (contrast Mat 19:7) leads to a clear statement of the position of the Mosaic Law in regard to divorce, and enables Christ to contrast with it the higher law of God; Mar 10:38 = Mat 20:22 corrects the false notions of the sons of Zebedee in regard to the Messianic Kingdom; cf. also Mar 10:18 = Mat 19:17 = Luk 18:19 ('Why callest thou me good?'), Mat 11:7 ff. = Luk 7:24 ff., Luk 13:2; Luk 13:4. The instances of this sort of question in the Fourth Gospel are of interest; sometimes the question seems intended to make people think what they are doing (Joh 1:38; Joh 10:32; Joh 18:5; Joh 18:7; Joh 18:23; Joh 18:34; Joh 20:15); at other times, to make them consider how they really stand in regard to Christ (Joh 1:50, Joh 3:12, Joh 6:61 f., Joh 6:67; Joh 6:70, Joh 7:19; Joh 7:23). Similarly

a direct question often made men state exactly what they wanted (e.g. Mar_10:51 = Mat_20:32 = Luk_18:41, Joh_5:6).

7. Questions were also employed by Christ to draw from men a confession of faith; the chief example is Mar_8:29 = Mar_16:15 = Luk_9:20, where, after the disciples had stated the opinions of the crowds concerning Himself, a further question led to St. Peter's great confession (cf. also Mat_9:28, Joh_6:67; Joh_9:35; Joh_11:26).

8. Quite alone stands the awful question of human despair addressed from the Cross to the Almighty (Mar_15:34 = Mat_27:46). To attempt to examine the import of that question would be to enter on a discussion of the relation in which Jesus stood to His heavenly Father. See art. Dereliction.

9. In two instances Christ asked questions of the learned men among the Jews which they were unable to answer: in each case He evidently intended to show that the fundamental principles on which their boasted knowledge rested were wrong. When they demanded by what authority He acted, He asked them whether the baptism of John was from heaven or of men (Mar_11:30 = Mat_21:25 = Luk_20:4). Their inability to answer showed that they did not possess the spiritual powers necessary for forming a judgment on claims which rested on eternal principles of right and wrong. The question (Mar_12:35 = Mat_22:42 ff. = Luk_20:41) concerning the Davidic descent of the Messiah showed that their interpretation of the Scriptures was not consistent, even when judged according to their own principles.

ii. **Answers of Jesus to questions put to Him.**—1. We turn now to the answers which Jesus gave. Very striking are those instances where the silence of Christ was more eloquent than words could have been. It was useless to attempt any answer to the charges of witnesses, brought against Him before judges who had procured their false evidence (Mar_14:61 = Mat_26:63), or to similar charges before Pilate (Mar_15:5 = Mat_27:14) and Herod (Luk_23:9); it was useless to discuss with such a man as Pilate the nature of truth (Joh_18:38), or His heavenly mission (Joh_19:9). Only when such questions are asked in a right spirit is it worth answering them. When Pilate asked Him (Mar_15:2 = Mat_27:11 = Luk_23:3, cf. Joh_18:33) whether He was 'the King of the Jews,' He gave an ambiguous answer—'Thou sayest': it was a title He had not Himself claimed, and which belonged to Him only in a sense that Pilate could not understand. But Christ did not hesitate, in spite of the obvious danger, to give direct answers to questions concerning His own claims (Mar_14:62 = Mat_26:64, cf. Luk_22:70). See art. Silence.

A very interesting problem arises, however, in regard to this last answer. The high priest asked (Mar_14:62), 'Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?' (According to Mat_26:63 he said, 'I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be

the Christ, the Son of God': Luk 22:70 has, 'And they all said, Art thou then the Son of God?'). Jesus answered, according to Mk. 'I am' (ἐγώ εἰμι), according to Mt. 'Thou hast said' (σὺ εἶπας), and according to Lk. 'Ye say that I am' (ὕμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι). It is usual to interpret the answer in each Gospel as a strong affirmation, and, in view of the fact that the order of Lk. (who continues at once, 'And they said, What further need have we of witness?') supports this interpretation, it may probably be accepted as the right one. But it is possible that the answer to the high priest was really ambiguous, as the answer to Pilate seems to have been (so Westcott on Joh 18:37), and that Mk. and Mt. each dropped a half of the answer which is more accurately preserved in Lk.

2. Often He answered a question somewhat indirectly, correcting the mental attitude, or some misconception, of the questioner. Thus in answer to, 'Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?' (Mat 18:1), He shows the character of true greatness in the judgment of God. When a man asked (Luk 13:23), 'Lord, are there few that be saved?' Jesus puts the word 'strive' (ἀγωνιζέσθε) at the head of His answer, and thus corrects the spirit of the questioner: this was no matter, He evidently thought, for academic discussion such as the Jewish Rabbis delighted in, nor was it a question of privilege—it was a practical matter, in which personal effort was of vital importance.

The following passages will repay careful study, and show how ready the Master was to avail Himself of any opportunities of giving teaching, even if they were due to the hostile questions of His foes, and also how He always drew the questioner away from details and misconceptions to principles of vital importance:—Mar 2:7-12 and parallels (the parallel between physical and mental healing—both are proper functions of the representative Son of Man), Mar 2:18-22 and parallels (formal fasting has no value), Mar 7:5 ff. = Mat 15:2 ff. (observance of the traditions of the elders), Mar 10:17 ff. and parallels ('What does the word *good* really imply?'—then the young questioner is made to feel that his knowledge, that of the letter of the Law, is not enough to lead to goodness, and a counsel of perfection is given), Mar 12:18 ff. and parallels (distinction between carnal and spiritual things), Mar 13:3 ff. and parallels (men are not concerned with foreknowing the dates of future events, but with recognizing their import as they come), Mat 11:2 ff. = Luk 7:19 ff. (What are the true signs of the Messiah?), Mat 15:12 (it matters not if the carnally-minded are offended, whatever their worldly position), Luk 9:54 f. (where the Textus Receptus evidently contains a correct exegesis), Luk 10:40 ff. (there is something better than anxious outward service), Luk 12:41 ff. (those who have to teach others must learn all they can). It is evident that in most cases the answer was given in such a way as to cause thought, without which its reference to the question is by no means obvious; this is

notably the case in Luk 17:37; the epigrammatic answer to the question of the perplexed disciples—‘Where, Lord?’—finds a solution only when we remember that the Master’s thoughts were fixed on eternal principles, not on the examples of them that take place in time.

3. Very characteristic of the Fourth Gospel is the way in which Christ is represented as making questions of quite ordinary import, or those caused by utter bewilderment, the occasion of spiritual teaching. When Nicodemus asks (Joh 3:4) how a man can be born a second time, Christ does not attempt to explain the difficulty, but goes on to speak of being born from water and spirit. Each question of the puzzled crowd in the Capernaum synagogue (ch. 6) leads on to deeper teaching, so that those disciples who could neither follow it nor accept it on trust left Him. When the Jews ask where Christ got His education (Joh 7:15), His answer points them to the Divine Author of His teaching. The disciples ask (Joh 9:2) whether blindness from birth is the punishment of pre-natal or of parental sin; the answer sets aside such a question as trivial, and embodies the only explanation of human suffering that can be given—it is necessary to the working out of God’s plan. Judas (not Iscariot) asks in surprise (Joh 14:22), ‘Lord, what has happened that thou art about to manifest thyself to us and not to the world?’—the answer shows the condition of communion with the Father. The careful student will multiply instances for himself.

4. Christ made people answer their own questions by Himself putting leading questions. The image and superscription of Caesar on the tribute money (Mar 12:16 and parallels) gave a practical answer to the question of the Pharisees and Herodians, and to the lesson thus taught He Himself added a spiritual one. Many instances in which the questioners were forced to think out the answers for themselves will be found referred to under i. §§ 5 and 6 above, for it was characteristic of Christ’s methods to answer a question by a question.

5. The answers given by Christ to questions which were asked for the express purpose of placing Him in a difficult position, or of showing the falsity of His principles, may at first sight seem to require separate treatment; but further consideration will show that He avoided the pitfalls prepared for Him by using the same dialectical methods as in replying to the inquiries of disciples: either He made the hostile questioners practically answer their own question, as in the case of the paying of tribute to Rome (Mar 12:17 ||); or else He took occasion to state a great general principle, which included and forced into its right place the particular detail referred to in the question (Mar 2:18-22 ||, and other passages referred to under § 2 above).

Literature.—Gore, *BL [Note: L Bampton Lecture.]* 198 ff.; Denney, *Gospel Questions and Answers*; Knight, *The Master’s Questions to His Disciples*.

✚ Quirinius

QUIRINIUS.—Luk 2:2 Authorized Version , ‘And this taxing was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria’ is better rendered in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 , ‘This was the first enrolment made when Quirinius was governor of Syria.’ From art. Census it will be seen that this statement probably means that this was the first occasion of an enrolment of this nature, an enrolment of population by households as distinct from a rating-enrolment in reference to property, and that it took place during the governorship of Quirinius in Syria. Here, however, there seems to emerge a great discrepancy between St. Luke’s account and what is known from secular history. It is certain that Publius Sulpicius Quirinius was the administrator of Syria from a.d. 6 to 9, and that in that period he took the rating census mentioned in Act 5:37 (Josephus *Ant.* xvii. xiii. 5, xviii. i. 1). But the birth of Jesus took place before the death of Herod the Great (Matthew 2), and that was in b.c. 4. The narratives of the two Evangelists seem to be at hopeless variance on a most important point. How are they to be reconciled?

One way of cutting the knot readily occurs. We might suppose that the clause Luk 2:2 was not in the original narrative, but was a marginal date inserted by an early copyist, who made a mistake as to the census intended; but the Manuscripts afford no warrant for this suggestion. Now, assuming the text to be as St. Luke wrote it, we can have no doubt that he did so quite deliberately, for he was most careful to give an accurate account (see Luk 1:1-4), and he himself has chronicled the census of a.d. 6 to 9 in Act 5:37. This would lead us *a priori* to reckon that as in his view at least there was no discrepancy, there must be some explanation that does not lie on the surface. Dr. Lardner’s method of solving the difficulty is to interpret the verse thus: ‘This was the first census of Cyrenius, who (afterwards) was governor of Syria,’ St. Luke taking pains to distinguish, according to this view, between the two enrolments, and giving the information that Quirinius was the man who at a later time became governor of Syria. Thus Herodian says that ‘to Marcus the emperor were born several daughters and two sons’; yet we know that some of them at least were born before he became emperor. Dr. Lardner’s interpretation, however, does violence to the construction of the text, and is at best a forced expedient to avoid a difficulty. Fortunately, later scholarship is able to dispense with it. Zumpt (*Commentatio de Syria Romanorum provincia ab Cesare Augusto ad Titum Vespasianum*) has shown that Quirinius seems to have been governor of Syria on two occasions; and this clue has been followed up by independent studies of Ramsay (*Was Christ born at Bethlehem?*). A fragment of an inscribed stone found at Tivoli in 1764 tells of the doings of a Roman

official in the time of Augustus. The name has perished, but from the facts recorded antiquarians of note agree in believing that he was Quirinius. Now this stone distinctly mentions that he was twice *legatus* of Syria. [The actual word *legatus* is wanting in the fragment preserved, but some such word is required by the context]. Still the problem is not solved by this discovery, though secular as well as sacred history must share the difficulty: for it happens that we know who were governors of that province for the whole period prior to Herod's death in b.c. 4. In b.c. 9 Sentius Saturninus succeeded Marcus Titius, and Josephus (*Ant.* xvii. v. 2) says: 'Now Quintilius Varus was at this time at Jerusalem, being sent to succeed Saturninus as president of Syria'; and this statement is verified by coins of Antioch-in-Syria bearing his name with date. As we know that Augustus had a rule that no governor of a province should hold that office for less than three or more than five years, the whole period from b.c. 12 to 4 is covered, and there is no room to place the governorship of Quirinius at the time required. He cannot have been governor before b.c. 12, for he was then consul at Rome; and even if it were of any service, we cannot place him later, for he became tutor of Caius Caesar and governor of Asia; so that there is a difficulty in fixing his earlier period of holding office in Syria, if, indeed, he was twice governor. Farrar has suggested that, the above-mentioned rule of Augustus notwithstanding, Varus was displaced 'because his close friendship with Archelaus, who resembled him in character, might have done mischief'; but of this there is no evidence, and the conjecture is but a make-shift. A better solution of the problem is to reckon that the governorship of which St. Luke speaks may have been of a different character from that held by Saturninus and Varus. Quirinius was a man who had shown himself very capable in military affairs. Now at this period there were troubles with various tribes in Syria and its frontiers. Tacitus (*Ann.* iii. 48) tells us that Quirinius waged successful war against the Homonadenses in Cilicia (which belonged to Syria) at a time prior at least to a.d. 2, when he became rector to Caius Caesar. There is therefore, to say the least, no unlikelihood that while Varus, who had no military renown, was left as the ordinary governor to administer the internal affairs of the province, Quirinius was appointed an extraordinary governor in charge of the military operations in the same region, with the title of *legatus*, or more specifically of *dux*. Inasmuch as the Greek equivalent in the case of either civil or military governor is ἡγεμῶν, St. Luke would be justified in saying, as he does, that the first enrolment was made 'when Quirinius was acting as governor' (ἡγεμονεύοντος Κυρηνίου).* [Note: Camill. 23 uses ἡγεμονία for the division of an army under an officer.] Those nearer the Evangelist's own day, for whom he was specially writing, and who were better acquainted with the secular history of the time than readers nowadays, would find the date he thus gives even more exact than if he had mentioned either Saturninus or Varus; for, as has been shown in art. Census, the enrolment was determined during the rule of the former, but, so far as Palestine was concerned, probably carried out during the rule of the latter. The likelihood of there being two simultaneous governors, one for military the

other for civil affairs, in the same province, is supported by parallel instances adduced by Ramsay (*op. cit.* 238 ff.).

Another theory in explanation of the passage about Quirinius is that he was neither civil nor military governor, but merely one of the commissioners appointed to take the enrolment throughout the whole Roman world, the district for which he was responsible being Syria. Palestine, though not at this period actually a Roman province, was under the Roman suzerainty, and from its proximity it would be included under Syria. St. Luke, having no better word for the enrolment commissioner, might use ἡγεμωναύων [ἡγ. τῆς σκέψεως ‘taking lead in the inquiry,’ Plat. *Prot.* 351 E]. Tertullian (*adv. Marc.* iv. 19) states that the census at the time of Christ’s birth was taken by Saturninus, not Quirinius, and thus seems to correct the narrative; but that must be merely because he knew that the enrolment had been decided upon during the civil governorship of Saturninus: he cannot have meant that it was actually accomplished then; for that would be utterly inconsistent with the date he elsewhere (*adv. Jud.* 1:8) gives for the nativity, b.c. 3.

Literature.—Lives of Christ; Commentaries on St. Luke; Bib. Dictt. of Smith, Kitto, and Hastings, and works by Zumpt and Ramsay mentioned in article. Schürer’s latest expression of opinion (*GJV [Note: JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.]* ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] i. 508 ff.) is strongly adverse to the accuracy of St. Luke as well as to Professor Ramsay’s theory.

Arthur Pollok Sym.

🔴 Quotations

QUOTATIONS

1. Use of the OT in the Gospels.—In general it is agreed that a quotation is the intentional reproduction of some thought or fact already expressed in language by the use of the very words previously employed. This is an exact quotation. A free quotation is one which fails to reproduce the self-same words, because, either through defect of memory or lack of care, the person making it employed language varying more or less widely from that of his source, or he may have intended merely to give the substance of the original. Ordinarily an unintentional use of the same thought or of identical words is not to be regarded as a quotation. The *intention* is essential, to constitute a quotation either exact or free. The quotations in the Gospels may be classed as follows:

(a) *Quotations which conform to both the Hebrew and the Greek of the OT:* (α) by Jesus, Mat 15:4 a (Mar 7:10 a) Mat 15:4 b (Mar 7:10 b) Mat 19:5 (Mar 10:7-8) Mat 19:18-19 a, 19b, Mat 21:13 a (Mar 11:17 a, Luk 19:46 a) Mat 22:39 (Mar 12:31), Mar 12:36 (Luk 20:42-43), Joh 10:34; (β) by others, Mat 5:21; Mat 5:27; Mat 5:38; Mat 5:43; Mat 21:9 (Mar 11:9, Luk 19:38, Joh 12:13), Luk 10:27; (γ) by the Evangelist, Joh 19:24.

(b) *Quotations conforming to the Hebrew alone:* by Jesus, Mat 9:13; Mat 12:7; Mat 27:46 (Mar 15:34), Luk 22:37; Luk 23:46.

(c) *Quotations conforming to the Greek alone:* (α) by Jesus, Mat 4:7 (Luk 4:12) Mat 13:14-15, Mat 19:4 (Mar 10:6) Mat 21:16; Mat 21:42 (Mar 12:10-11, Luk 20:17); (β) by the Evangelist, Joh 12:38.

(d) *Free quotations varying from both Hebrew and Greek:* (a) by Jesus, Mat 4:4 (Luk 4:4) Mat 4:10 (Luk 4:8) Mat 4:15-16, Mat 11:10 (Luk 7:27) Mat 18:16, Mat 22:32 (Mar 12:26, Luk 20:37) Mat 22:37 (Mar 12:29-30) Mat 22:44, Mat 26:31 (Mar 14:27), Mar 4:12; Mar 10:19 (Luk 18:20), Joh 6:35; Joh 13:18; Joh 15:25; (β) by others, Mat 2:6; Mat 4:6 (Luk 4:10-11), Mar 12:32-33, Luk 10:27, Joh 2:17; (γ) by the Evangelist, Mat 2:18; Mat 21:5 (Joh 12:15) Mat 27:9-10, Mar 1:2, Luk 2:23-24, Joh 12:40; Joh 19:36-37.

(e) *Free quotations varying less from the Hebrew than from the Greek:* by the Evangelist, Mat 8:17; Mat 12:18-21.

(f) *Free quotations varying less from the Greek than from the Hebrew:* by Jesus, Mat 15:8-9 (Mar 7:6-7) Mat 24:15 (Mar 13:14), Luk 4:18-19; Luk 8:10.

The variations in exactness of quotation and in the standard to which they conform are interesting. The importance of the variations is open to question. Few of them are noticeable. Yet more, if the teaching of Jesus had been confined to a few days or weeks, if He had spoken about the topics recorded in the Gospels but once or twice, and if there were evidence that He was particular about the exact phrasing of His teachings, the question might be of more importance. We remember, however, that Jesus lived three years with disciples, teaching them and speaking on a great variety of occasions; and these facts were inconsistent with a stereotyped mode of utterance. Moreover, the record of His deeds and teachings is brief at best. The Gospels give from one-fifth to one-third of their scanty space to a period of one week, and but slight, though vivid, glimpses of occasional scenes during the remaining three years.

He must have spoken many times on the same subjects, and have uttered the same thoughts in many modes of expression. One who insisted, as He did, upon the supremacy of the spirit over the form would scarcely have permitted Himself to be bound by a strict conformity to the letter, while appealing to the OT for the authority of the truths which He taught. This fact makes it seem strange that the collection of His teachings is not much larger and the variety of His expressions much greater. Under the influence of such a Teacher it is not likely that the disciples were over anxious to conform with exactness to the text of the OT.

The passages cited give evidence of intentional use of the OT. Usually they are introduced by some formula of citation such as 'it is written,' 'the Scripture saith,' and the like. There are about fifty different variants in the mode of introducing explicit quotations found in the Gospels.

Some of the passages given above have no formula of introduction, but the context of the passage shows conscious and intentional use of OT material. It is also to be noticed that the Gospels vary in their representation of the same passage or fact. *e.g.* the Evangelist in Joh 19:24; Joh 19:28 connects the events with a passage in the OT; the parallel narratives in the Synoptics mention these facts without connecting them in any way with the OT, so that at the utmost, so far as these Gospels are concerned, the passage is, so to say, an accidental parallel having no proper classification with quotations. It cannot be regarded as in the slightest degree an instance of use of the OT by these Evangelists. This is equally true of all events narrated in the Gospels which are not explicitly connected with OT passages, no matter how striking the coincidence; *e.g.* Isa 50:6 might well have been referred to in the narratives in Mat 26:67; Mat 27:26, Mar 14:65, Luk 22:63-64, Joh 18:22, and so also might Psa 22:8; Psa 22:16, but neither of these notable OT passages was so used. Again, while Mat 13:14-15 is unquestionably a quotation, the same thought expressed in the parallel passage, Mar 4:12, has no formula of quotation, and has such transpositions and omissions that if we did not know of the passages in Isaiah and Mt., we might well doubt if it were a real quotation. As it is, we think it was intentionally derived from Isaiah. Further, Luk 8:10 is parallel with the passages just cited from Mt. and Mk.; it has a sentence from Isa 6:9, nothing from Isa 6:10, and is much more brief than Mark. If the parallel passages in Mt. and Mk. were unknown, even though we were fully acquainted with Isa 6:9-10 we should think that the use of the OT thought and phraseology was due to familiarity with the language rather than to an intention to quote from it. As it is, we have little doubt that the writers had in mind to report the same utterances of Jesus, and that the report is more incomplete in one case than in the other. Yet it is quite possible that different discourses of Jesus are reported. These instances, the words recorded in Joh 9:39 as uttered by Jesus, and those of the Evangelist in Joh 12:40, lead us to think the passage in Isa 6:9-10 pointed many an utterance of Jesus.

How many more passages like this in Luk 8:10 do the Gospels contain? That is a matter of conjecture. It is desirable to add to the lists already given several other lists of passages which go to show the nature of the connexion between the OT and the NT.

(g) *Intentional and free use of OT laws, facts, or statements independently of the original form of expression:* (α) by Jesus, Mat 5:12 b (Luk 13:34 a) Mat 8:4

(Mar 1:44, Luk 5:14) Mat 11:14, Mat 17:10-11 (Mar 9:12-13) Mat 12:3-4

(Mar 2:25-26, Luk 6:3-4) Mat 12:5; Mat 12:40-41 (Mat 16:4 b, Luk 11:29-30;

Luk 11:32) Mat 12:42 (Luk 11:31) Mat 23:35 (Luk 11:50-51) Mat 24:37; Mat 24:39

(Luk 17:26-27), Luk 4:25-27; Luk 17:28-29, Joh 5:39 c, Joh 5:46, Joh 8:17; (β) by others, Mat 22:24 (Mar 12:19, Luk 20:28) Mat 23:30-31 (Luk 11:47-48), Luk 1:72 b,

Joh 5:10; Joh 6:31; Joh 6:49; Joh 6:58; Joh 8:5; Joh 19:31; (γ) by the Evangelist, Luk 2:22, Joh 4:5 (?).

(h) Another interesting group of passages consists of those which have a *formula of reference to the OT* as their source or authority, but *whose content cannot be referred to any specific OT passage*. These are all from the words of Jesus: Mat 26:24 a (Mar 14:21) Mat 26:34; Mat 26:56 a (Mar 14:49), Mar 9:12 b, Mar 9:13, Luk 11:49; Luk 18:31; Luk 21:22 b, Mat 24:44; Mat 24:46, Joh 1:45; Joh 17:12.

(i) Still another class of passages consists of *intentional allusions to something in the OT*, but they make *no formal use of OT material*, and are not quotations in any strict sense of the term. The allusion to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah is an illustration. (α) By Jesus, Mat 8:11 (Luk 13:29) Mat 10:15; Mat 10:21 (Mar 13:12) Mat 10:35-36 (Luk 12:52-53) Mat 11:25 (Luk 10:21) Mat 21:13 b (Mar 11:17 b, Luk 19:46 b) Mat 24:30 b (Luk 23:37) Mat 24:30 a, c (Mar 13:26) Luk 21:27) Mat 26:64 (Mar 14:62, Mat 16:27; Mat 25:31), Luk 17:32, Joh 1:51; Joh 3:14 a, Joh 3:15; Joh 8:7; Joh 8:35; Joh 8:56; Joh 9:39; (β) by others, Mat 8:21, Luk 9:54, Joh 1:21; Joh 1:25; Joh 6:14; Joh 7:40; Joh 16:32.

The instances thus far classified come almost entirely under the head of the use of the OT as an authoritative Scripture. Another influence is quite as evident. It is the literary influence. This is the influence of any work of literature over the modes of thought and habits of expression of those who make much use of that work of literature. Men may be unconscious of this influence, or they may consciously use the forms of utterance which they have learned to love. It is doubtless more a matter of habit working within the region of the unconscious, while it is the appeal to authority which is operative within the region of the conscious use of the OT. These two causes produce phenomena which are not altogether easy to classify together.

(j) Such a passage as Luk_8:10 cited above compels the recognition of passages which *may have intentionally used, the OT thought or language, yet do not give conclusive evidence that they were so used*. Its use may have been due to literary and unconscious influence. In any case there is such coincidence in thought and phraseology that an intimate connexion is shown between the thought of the Gospels and that of the OT. For example, when we read in Heb_12:29 καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκων, and learn that the last two words are found together in the LXX Septuagint only in Deu_4:24; Deu_9:3, we think it likely that the writer either intentionally used the phrase, with a thought of the passages in Dt., or that he was so familiar with Dt. that unintentionally and unconsciously he used its words and phrases. Thus also may we connect οἱ πενθοῦντες of Mat_5:4 with אֲבֵלִים or τοὺς πενθοῦντας of Isa_61:2. When we remember the fact that the mind of Jesus was saturated with the Book of Isaiah, we can easily be convinced that there is a literary connexion between the utterance of Jesus and the OT passage.

The following passages show a similar connexion: Mat_5:5; Mat_5:8; Mat_5:34-35; Mat_7:7-8 (Luk_11:9-10) Mat_7:23 (Luk_13:27) Mat_10:28 b, Mat_11:5 (Luk_7:22) Mat_11:23 (Luk_10:15) Mat_12:37, Mat_13:16, Mat_15:14, Mat_16:27 b, Mat_19:17 (Luk_10:28) Mat_19:26 (Mar_10:27, Luk_18:27, Mar_14:36) Mat_20:28 (Mar_10:45) Mat_21:11-12 (Mar_11:15, Luk_19:45, Joh_2:16) Mat_23:12 (Luk_14:11; Luk_18:14) Mat_23:37 (Luk_13:34) Mat_23:38 (Luk_13:35 a) Mat_24:2 (Mar_13:2, Luk_21:6) Mat_24:21 (Mar_13:19) Mat_24:29 (Mar_13:24-25, Luk_21:25-26 a) Mat_24:30 b, Mat_25:32, Mat_26:11 (Mar_14:7, Joh_12:8) Mat_27:46 (Mar_15:34) Mat_28:3, Luk_1:32-33; Luk_1:69; Luk_6:21; Luk_14:8; Luk_14:10; Luk_16:15 b, Luk_23:30, Joh_1:14; Joh_1:34; Joh_3:21; Joh_7:24; Joh_9:39; Joh_12:8 a, Joh_14:15; Joh_14:21; Joh_14:24.

(k) Prolonged examination brings to recognition a class of passages in which, *without marked literary relation, or intentional use of the OT, there is yet a genetic relation between the OT and the NT*. Jesus had the Spirit without measure, and was an authoritative interpreter of the OT. He had so absorbed the OT that its ideals were His commonplaces of thought, and the scattered suggestions of truth in the OT were apprehended by Him in their full or explicit meaning. Imperfect or fragmentary suggestions became positive principles. In dealing with divorce He went to the fundamental conception of marriage (Mat_13:5 = Mar_10:7-8). In dealing with the Sabbath, He said that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath (Mar_2:27). This is a universal statement which is suggested in Exo_23:12 and Deu_5:14. Again Joh_4:37 'For herein is the saying true, One soweth and another reapeth' may be a current proverb, or it may be derived in thought from Job_31:8, Mic_6:15. Whatever be true about that passage, there can be little doubt that the

words of Jesus given in Mat 5:44 ‘Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you,’ is the explicit statement of an ideal of conduct that finds suggestion in Job 31:19 and several other OT passages.

The following is a list of similar passages: Mat 5:3; Mat 5:6 (Luk 6:21 a) Mat 5:7; Mat 5:9; Mat 5:11 (Luk 6:22) Mat 5:14; Mat 5:18 a (Luk 16:17) Mat 5:28; Mat 5:30, Mat 18:8 (Mar 9:43) Mat 5:42 a, (Luk 6:30 a) Mat 5:43-44 a (Luk 6:27) Mat 5:44 b, Mat 5:48, Mat 6:6; Mat 6:9; Mat 6:11; Mat 6:14-15; Mat 6:19; Mat 6:24-26 (Luk 12:24) Mat 7:6; Mat 7:21 b (Joh 13:17) Mat 10:6, Mat 15:24 (Luk 15:6; Luk 19:10, Mat 18:12) Mat 10:10 b, Mat 10:19; Mat 10:37; Mat 10:28 (Joh 6:27; Joh 7:37 b) Mat 19:29 b (Mar 10:30, Luk 18:30) Mat 10:41, Mat 12:29 (Mar 3:27, Luk 11:21-22) Mat 12:32 b, Mat 13:39-41; Mat 13:43-46, Mat 15:13, Mat 16:26 (Mar 8:37, Luk 9:25) Mat 18:15 (Luk 17:3) Mat 21:33 (Mar 12:1, Luk 20:9) Mat 21:44 (Luk 20:18) Mat 24:16-18 (Mar 13:14; Mar 13:16, Luk 21:21-22) Mat 24:35 (Mar 13:31, Luk 21:33; Luk 16:17) Mat 25:35-36; Mat 25:40; Mat 25:45; Mat 25:42; Mat 25:46, Mat 26:28 (Mar 14:24, Luk 22:20) Mat 26:52 c, Mat 27:6, Mat 28:18; Mat 28:20, Mar 2:2; Mar 2:27; Mar 9:48, Luk 6:28; Luk 6:34-36; Luk 12:47-48; Luk 13:6-7; Luk 14:13; Luk 15:18-19; Luk 15:21; Luk 16:15 c, Luk 19:8; Luk 19:42; Luk 21:24-26; Luk 22:19; Luk 22:31; Luk 23:34 a, Joh 1:6; Joh 1:11; Joh 1:18; Joh 5:37 b, Joh 6:46; Joh 2:16; Joh 3:5 (Eze 36:25-27; Eze 11:19?) Joh 4:22 b, Joh 4:37; Joh 5:17; Joh 5:21-22; Joh 5:27; Joh 5:29; Joh 5:39 b, Joh 4:44; Joh 7:37 b, Joh 7:38-39 a, Joh 7:42; Joh 8:11; Joh 9:2; Joh 9:31; Joh 9:41; Joh 10:3; Joh 10:10; Joh 10:16; Joh 13:34; Joh 15:12; Joh 15:17; Joh 14:23; Joh 15:1; Joh 15:14-15; Joh 19:7; Joh 20:31.

These lists of passages under (j) and (k) are by no means exhaustive. Dittmar (*Vetus Test. in Novo*) gives many more passages than have been enumerated, and Hühn (*Die alttest. Citate und Reminiscenzen im NT*) gives a far greater number. It is not always easy to discriminate to one’s own satisfaction between classes (j) and (k). We must follow the more pronounced character of the passage as it appears to us at the moment of investigation. The border-line between a real literary reminiscence and an accidental coincidence is also difficult to determine. Not only would it be possible to increase the lists (j) and (k), but at least two other classes could be made out. One such class (l) would consist of expressions which belong to the life of the land, or the common utterances of the people of the land, such as Mat 9:36 ‘as sheep not having a shepherd.’ These have no real significance, literary or otherwise. Again, there is another class of expressions (m) in which imagery similar to that of the OT is found. ‘Wise as serpents’ (Mat 10:16) is possibly a comparison suggested by Gen 3:1, or it may have been current rhetoric. Or, again, the image of sifting (Luk 22:31) may have been a current phrase, or it may possibly have had a suggestion from Amo 9:9.

2. Use of other writings in the Gospels.—Are other writings than the OT used in the Gospels? This question recognizes the possibility (a) of explicit citations from writings outside of the OT as authoritative documents, or (b) of a general use of material as a source of historical example or explicit allusion, or (c) of literary relationship, or (d) of other writings with a genetic relation to the teachings of the Gospels.

(a) The passages which have been brought into debate are Mat 27:9, Luk 7:32 b, Luk 11:49, Joh 4:37; Joh 7:38.

Mat 27:9. Is this a citation from some lost writing outside the OT and attributed to Jeremiah? Apparently the dictate of common sense is that the passage is really from Zec 11:12-13, and that there was some slip in the memory of the writer of the Gospel, or that there was an error on the part of the earliest transcribers.

Luk 7:32 b. Doubtless here Jesus was using as an illustration facts with which all persons who observed children at play were familiar. It seems an attempt to manufacture a difficulty. This passage should be dismissed from consideration.

Luk 11:49. This is a passage which is not so easily explained. (1) Is 'The Wisdom of God,' the name of a book? No such book is known. (2) Is 'The Wisdom of God' a speaker in a book, after the manner of 'Wisdom' in Proverbs 8? Every trace of such a book now seems lost. (3) Is Jesus quoting Himself? See Mat 23:34, where Jesus says, 'Behold I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes,' just as in this passage Wisdom says, 'I will send unto them prophets and apostles.' The words in Mt. are dated in the second day of Passion Week, while the passage in Lk. belongs to a time several weeks or months earlier. If Jesus in Lk. is quoting Himself, it is from an utterance of an earlier date, not elsewhere transmitted to us. Resch (*Agrapha*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 184) would show that 'The Wisdom of God' was one of the self-designations of Jesus like 'The Son of Man.' To these statements it must be said that while they are possible, Jesus is nowhere else designated in this manner, nor is He elsewhere represented as quoting Himself in this manner. (4) It is claimed that the passage is founded upon Pro 1:20-31, and this is supported by the fact that in the early Christian Church the Book of Proverbs was called a *Sophia*. The passage hardly seems adequate for the words of Jesus. (5) This passage is claimed as an amplification of 2Ch 24:20-22. This is in reality the same as (7) below. (6) Used of Divine Providence, as manifested in history (cf. Pro 8:22-31), sending prophets and apostles, equivalent to saying 'God in His wisdom said.' This is supported by the passage Luk 7:35 'and wisdom is justified of all her children.' This is quite tenable. (7) The personal wisdom of God in Christ. In support of this are the facts that Jesus says the same thing in Mat 23:37 in His own Person, that He is elsewhere said to send prophets and apostles (Luk 10:3, Eph 4:11), and that this is a Logos conception of Jesus. Even so, a reason for the expression is not obvious, nor is

it at all evident why Jesus should have used this unusual phrase. There are difficulties in regard to any explanation of this passage. The greatest of all is in the theory of an extra-OT source. The passage is perfectly intelligible without such a theory, whatever be said as to the reason of the expression.

Joh 4:37. 'For herein is the saying true, One soweth, and another reapeth.' Is this an explicit quotation from some writing? The word 'saying' does not point back to a writing. It might readily be something of a proverbial character, which had its origin in the mode of thought and utterance which is found in Lev 26:16, Deu 28:38-40; Deu 6:11, Job 31:8, Mic 6:15, thus having a literary connexion of some sort with the OT.

Joh 7:38. If this is a quotation from a writing outside the OT, a wholly unknown writing has to be assumed. Nowhere else in the NT is a writing outside the OT called γραφή, 'Scripture.' It is a tenable and adequate explanation to treat it as 'a free quotation harmonizing in thought with parts of various passages, especially Isa 44:3; Isa 55:1; Isa 58:11' (Meyer). See, on an attempt to trace the saying to a Buddhist source, *ExpT [Note: xpT Expository Times.]* xviii. [1906] p. 100.

The examination of these passages fails to show the slightest probability that Jesus, a speaker in the Gospels, or any writer of the Gospels, explicitly cited any writing outside the OT as authoritative Scripture.

(b) Examination of the facts gives no greater probability that historical illustrations from writings other than the OT occur in the Gospels, or intentional allusions to such writings, in any such manner as the illustrations taken from the OT, or as the allusions to the OT found in the Gospels.

(c) It is difficult not to believe that literary connexion is quite marked. Note, especially, the following passages: Mat 5:34-35 (Sir 23:9) Mat 5:42 a (Sir 4:4-5) Mat 5:42 b (Sir 29:2 a) Mat 5:44 (Wis 12:19 a) Mat 6:12; Mat 6:14 (Sir 28:2) Mat 7:12 (To Mat 4:15) Mat 11:28 f. (Sir 51:23 ff.) Mat 19:21 (Sir 29:11) Mat 23:38 (To Mat 14:4), Luk 6:38 (Sir 14:16 a) Mat 10:25, Mat 18:18 (Enoch 40:9, Sibyl, *proæm.* 85 = frag. ii. 47) Mat 16:8 (Enoch 108:11) Mat 18:7 (Enoch 47:1, 2) Mat 18:1-8 (Sir 32:17-18) Mat 20:10-11 (Enoch 89:51), Joh 6:27 a (Sir 15:3; Sir 24:19) 8:44 (Wis 2:24, Enoch 69:6).

(d) Is the relation between these writings more important than a merely literary relation? If it is, how important is it? What does it signify? In the references above, the extra-OT books are all prior to the birth of Jesus. They reveal something of the thought of the Jews before His time, and doubtless of His own generation. The very

tone of the words of Jesus to Martha (Joh_11:23; Joh_11:25-26) shows that He assumed the truth of beliefs which had no prominence in the thought and life revealed in the OT. The non-canonical literature gives abundant evidence that the belief in the resurrection had become an important factor in the beliefs of the Jews. Such a passage as Mat_25:31-46 can hardly be said to be suggested by the OT writings. Compare it with Enoch 90:18-38, and striking similarities are found. Mat_25:41 b 'Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels,' and similar passages, as also Mat_13:42; Mat_13:50, may be compared with Enoch 103:7, 8 and 108:5, 6. In Luk_16:26 the picture of separation between the righteous and sinners in Sheol may suggest Enoch 22:9-13, where the righteous and sinners, in separate divisions, await the Great Judgment.

Although there is often a striking likeness in outstanding features, there is also a lack of harmony in details with the spirit of Jesus, which shows why He could not use these writings as an authority. For the possible connexion between the Book of Enoch and Christian thought, see *The Book of Enoch*, translation and ed. by R. H. Charles, pp. 48-53, where he enumerates 'doctrines in Enoch which had an undoubted share in moulding the corresponding NT doctrines, or at all events are necessary to the comprehension of the latter.' Without doubt the points of contact between the Book of Enoch and Christian beliefs of the earlier Christian generations were more numerous and intimate than between the Book of Enoch and the Gospels. Also such literature as the extra-canonical Jewish writings had great influence in the early development of Christian doctrine. Their importance, so far as the Gospels are concerned, is chiefly that of explaining the surroundings of Jesus and the spiritual and mental conditions amidst which He worked. Instances such as have been given could be multiplied, but it is doubtful if they could change the conclusions already given. The centuries between the prophets of ancient Israel and Jesus had witnessed a development of thought, especially on eschatological subjects. 'Jesus was a true OT saint' (Davidson, *Theology of the OT*, p. 520), and joined the work which He did as closely as possible to that of the OT prophets, using their authority for His teachings. Jesus was also a Prophet greater than any that had gone before Him, and He appropriated such current beliefs as were in harmony with His mission, without thereby authenticating other associated beliefs, but rather discrediting them by the general spirit of His teachings.

See also artt. on Old Testament.

Literature.—Allen, 'OT Quotations in Matthew and Mark,' *ExpT* [*Note: xpT Expository Times.*] xii. [1900-1901] pp. 187 ff., 281 ff. [a careful examination of the relation of the quotations in these books to the OT passages]; E. Boehl, *Die Alttest. Citate im NT* [the treatise and discussion superseded by that of Toy]; August Clemen, *Der Gebrauch des AT* [*Note: T Altes Testament.*] in *den NT Schriften*, Gütersloh, 1895 [a discussion

of the meaning of the citations in the NT context and in their original context]; Wilhelm Dittmar, *Vetus Test. in Novo*, Göttingen, 1903 [gives not only the quotations, but about five times as many parallels in thought or words in addition to the quotations. Almost invariably the Hebrew and Greek of the OT are given, and the Greek of the NT and of the Apocryphal books where they are cited. It is a valuable work]; Eugen Hühn, *Die AT [Note: T Altes Testament.] Citate und Reminiscenzen im NT*, Tübingen, 1900 [a list of passages much more full than that of Dittmar, almost twice as numerous. Few citations are given. The passages are classified as Messianic and non-Messianic. Both classes are divided into citations with formulae of citation, citations without formulae), and reminiscences. The material is valuable, but needs sifting and further classification]; Johnson, *Quotation of the NT from the Old*, Philadelphia, 1896 [discusses the literary principles exemplified in the NT quotations and defends them]; Tholuck, *AT [Note: T Altes Testament.] im NT⁶ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred]*, Gotha, 1868 [translation in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. xi. p. 568 ff.]; Crawford II. Toy, *Quotations in the New Testament*, New York, 1884 [holds that the quotations were made from the Greek or from an oral Aramaic version, the existence of which is assumed. It contains an admirable bibliography]; D. M. Turpie, *The Old Test, in the New*, London, 1868 [quotations classified according to their agreement with the Hebrew or Greek of the OT, and discussed accordingly], and *The NT View of the OT*, London, 1872 [quotations classified and discussed according to their introductory formulae]; Woods, art. 'Quotations' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iv. 184 ff.

F. B. Denio.

☞ Rabbi

RABBI (from Heb. רַבִּי, which means as adj. 'great' or 'much,' as subst. 'chief or 'master.' The final syllable is the pronominal suffix, signifying 'my,' the force of which, however, is not expressed in the use of the word).—A title of honour and respect addressed to religious teachers; and in this sense frequently applied in the Gospels to Jesus, and also once (Joh 3:26) to John the Baptist. It appears to have come into use in the time of Hillel, who was born c. [Note: circa, about.] b.c. 112. That St. John regarded it as a comparatively modern word, and not universally known in his time, seems evident from the fact that he deemed it necessary to explain its meaning (see Joh 1:38, where it is expressly stated to be equivalent to διδάσκαλος, rendered 'master' in Authorized Version, and 'teacher' in (Revised Version margin)). ῥαββι (ῥαββει, WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.]) is frequently translation

‘master’ in Authorized Version , but Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 transliterates ‘rabbi’ throughout. See Master.

Dugald Clark.

⚡Rabboni

RABBONI (from Heb. רַבּוֹן or רַבִּי) is another form of ‘Rabbi,’ but was considered a higher and more honourable title. Hence possibly its preference by the blind man (Mar_10:51) in his natural anxiety to address Jesus with the title of greatest courtesy and respect that he knew. The word occurs only twice in the Gospels, viz. Mar_10:51 (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 following the reading of most authorities), and Joh_20:16 (ῥαββουνι, Textus Receptus ; ῥαββουνει, WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort’s text.]). In the latter passage it is explained as a synonym for διδάσκαλος.

Dugald Clark.

⚡Raca

RACA.—The word occurs only in Mat_5:22, and offers one of the little riddles of the Gospels which have not found as yet a sufficient explanation. It had been spelt ‘Racha’ in the Authorized Version of 1611; so in Tindale and other earlier versions. It was replaced by ‘Raca’ in 1638, and explained ‘that is, *Vain fellow*, 2Sa_6:20,’ by one of the marginal notes added to the Authorized Version at various times, chiefly in 1762 (see the Introduction to Scrivener’s *Paragraph Bible*, p. xxx). The Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 confines itself to the marginal note, ‘an expression of contempt.’ The spelling of the Greek Manuscripts is ῥαχα in \aleph^*D , adopted by Tischendorf; ῥακα in \aleph^CBE , etc., with -ā in B, -á in other Manuscripts, as 13, 124, 556 (see Scrivener, *Adversaria*); ῥακκα, ῥακκαν, ῥακαν in *Apost. Const*, ii. 32; *racha* in most Manuscripts of the Latin Versions; *raccha* in *d*; only *f k Z^C* and the official Vulgate have *raca*; רַקָּא in all Syriac Versions, vocalized רַקָּא, רַקָּא, רַקָּא, רַקָּא (see the edition of the *Tetraeuangelium* by Pusey-Gwilliam, and the *Thesaurus Syriacus*; it is explained as = שׂוֹנֵא, *i.e.* ‘despised,’ by Bar-hebraeus).

The puzzle in the word is the *a* of the first syllable, which is not found in the corresponding Hebrew word. It is true, J. Lightfoot (*Hor. Heb.*, new ed. by Rob. Gandell, Oxford, 1859, ii. 108) writes:

‘*Raca*: A word used by one that despiseth another in the highest scorn: *very usual in the Hebrew writers*, and very common in the mouth of the nation.’ Then he gives examples from *Tanchum*, fol. 5, Colossians 2; fol. 18, Colossians 4; fol. 38, Colossians 4; *Midrash Tillin* upon Psalms 138; Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Berak.* fol. 32, 2, of which the following are worth quoting: ‘A heathen said to an Israelite, “Very suitable food is made ready for you at my house.” “What is it?” saith the other. To whom he replied, “Swine’s flesh.” “*Raca*,” saith the Jew, “I must not eat of clean beasts with you.” ’ A king’s daughter was married to a certain dirty fellow. He commanded her to stand by him as a mean servant, and to be his butler. To whom she said, “*Raca*, I am a king’s daughter.” ’ ‘One of the scholars of R. Jochanan made sport with the teaching of his master; but returning at last to a sober mind: “Teach thou, O master,” saith he, “for thou art worthy to teach, for I have found and seen that which thou hast taught.” To whom he replied, “רִיקָה *Raca*, thou hadst not believed unless thou hadst seen.” ’ A certain captain saluted a religious man praying in the way, but he saluted him not again: he waited till he had done his prayer, and saith to him, “רִיקָה *Raca*, it is written in your law,” ’ etc.

But in all these cases the Semitic word is spelt רִיקָה (with *yod*), which must be vocalized רִיקָא, *i.e.* *Reca*; see Dalman, *Aram. Aramaic -Neuheb. Wörterbuch*, p. 384; Jastrow, *Dictionary*, ii. 1476. In the first edition of his *Gram. d. Jüd.-Pal.* [Note: *Palestine, Palestinian.*] *Aram. Aramaic* (1896) Dalman assumed that in the form of the NT *ai* had been contracted to *a*, and that the spelling with χ in the Manuscripts $\alpha\delta$ was due to an aspirated pronunciation of the Hebrew *qoph*, by which it approached to the aspirated *kaph*. In the second (1905, p. 174) he suggested at last a more probable solution, that the word in Greek assumed its form through assimilation to Greek ῥάκος, ‘lump’ = rag (a tattered piece of cloth, and then used of a shabby, beggarly fellow). This is possible. But there is another strange and not yet corroborated statement about the use of the word, found in Chrysostom, who was acquainted with Syriac as spoken in the neighbourhood of Antioch. He says (p. 214) that it was not a word ‘of the highest scorn,’ as Lightfoot styled it:

Τὸ δὲ ῥακὰ τοῦτο οὐ μεγάλης ἐστὶν ὑβρεως ῥήμα, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον καταφρονησεως καὶ ὀλιγωρίας τινος τοῦ λεγοντος. καθάτερ γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἢ οἰκεταις, ἢ τισι τῶν καταδεεστέρων

ἐπιτάπτοντες λέγομεν· ἄτελθε σύ, εἰτὲ τῷ δεῖνι σύ· οὕτω κκὶ οἱ τῆ Σύρων κεχρημένοι γλώττη ῥακά λέγουσιν, ἀντὶ τοῦ σύ, τοῦτο τιθέντες. ἀλλ' ὁ φιλόανθρωπος θεὸς καὶ τὰ μικρότατα ἀναστᾶ, καθηγόντως ἡμῖν κεχρησθαι ἀλληλοῖς κελεύων, καὶ μετὰ τῆς προσηκούσης τιμῆς, καὶ ἵνα διὰ τούτων καὶ τὰ μείζονα ἀναιροῖται.

In contradistinction to ῥακά, Chrysostom considers μωρέ, as χαλεπότερον, as ῥῆμα τῆς ὕβρεως πληκτικώτερον, for which διπλῆ γίνεται ἡ πυρά. The same statement by a later hand is also found on the margin of codex B, τὸ ῥακά ἀντὶ τοῦ σύ being one of the few marginal notes of this MS; and a similar statement is made in the so-called *Opus imperfectum*, p. 62; but, at the same time, the common explanation is there given: 'Racha quidem dicitur Hebraice vacuus.' Euthymius Zigabenus is dependent on Chrysostom: Τὸ ῥακά δὲ ἑβραϊκὴ ἐστὶ φωνή, δηλοῦσα τὸ Σύ. Ἐπεὶ γὰρ ὀργιζόμενός τις κατὰ τινος οὐκ ἀξιοῖ καλέσαι τοῦτον ἐξ ὀνόματος, ὡς ἀνάξιον ὀνόματος ἀντὶ ὀνόματος δὲ τὸ Σύ τίθησιν. Augustine speaks of having heard from a Jew, that *Raca* is *vocum non significantem aliquid, sed indignantis animi motum exprimentem*. No example, however, has been found as yet of this use in Syriac. It is interesting to note that Maclean's *Dictionary of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac* gives the vocalization ܠܚܐܐ *rçca* (or *rica*) for the present dialect of the Azerbaijani Jews. This want of examples may, however, be due to the fact that a word was avoided, the use of which was denounced in the Gospel. The expression ἄνθρωπε κενέ in Jam 2:20 may be considered its Greek equivalent, as St. Paul's ἄφρων (1Co 15:36) is the parallel to μωρέ. It may be added that the εἰκὴ in the first part of the verse has been believed by some to be the Greek explanation of this *Raca*, and to have crept into the text at the wrong place. But this is not likely. The *Onomastica sacra* (ed. Lagarde) are unanimous in the explanation 'κενέ, κενός, *vacuus*,' and spell ῥακά, ῥακκά, *Racha, Raca* (cod. F). See also art. Fool.

Eb. Nestle.

RACHEL, the wife of Jacob and the mother of Joseph and Benjamin, is mentioned in Mat 2:18, in a quotation from Jer 31:15. The words of Jeremiah are understood in this passage as a prediction of the slaughter of the Innocents, but in their original connexion they refer to a historical incident in the prophet's own life. He accompanied the exiles on their way to Babylon as far as Ramah, 5 miles north of Jerusalem (Jer 40:1), and the impression produced by his last sight of them took the

form of a poetic picture of Rachel, the ancestral mother of the Israelites (who according to one tradition—[1Sa_10:2](#)—was buried in the neighbourhood), bewailing the fate of her descendants ([Jer_31:15](#)). The application of this passage to the massacre at Bethlehem seems to have been suggested by the fact that another tradition placed Rachel's tomb in the vicinity of that town ([Gen_35:19-20](#); [Gen_48:7](#)). The supposed site of this sepulchre has been shown, at least since the 4th cent. a.d., about 4 miles south of Jerusalem, and one mile north of Bethlehem. See Ramah.

James Patrick.

☞ Rahab

RAHAB.—The mother of Boaz, and thus an ancestress of our Lord ([Mat_1:5](#)).

'These names [those of Tamar, Rahab, Ruth, Bathsheba] are probably introduced as those of women in whose case circumstances were overruled by the Divine providence which, as it might have seemed, should have excluded them from a place in the ancestral line of the Messiah. They were in a sense forerunners of the Virgin Mary' (W. C. Allen, *Com. ad loc.*).

The 'faith' of Rahab is extolled in [Heb_11:31](#), and her 'works' in [Jam_2:25](#).

☞ Railing

RAILING.—See Reviling and Mockery.

☞ Raiment

RAIMENT.—See Dress.

☞ Rain

RAIN.—See Agriculture in vol. i. p. 40^a.

RAM.—A link in our Lord's genealogy, Mat_1:3 f. (Authorized Version *Aram. Aramaic*).

☩ Ramah

RAMAH (Mat_2:18) was a city of Benjamin (Jos_18:25), the site of which has been identified with *er-Râm*, a small village situated about 5 miles north of Jerusalem, at an elevation of about 2600 feet above the sea. Ramah was the point at which Jeremiah parted from the exiles who were being carried away to Babylon (Jer_40:1), and he associated it with Rachel in the passage (Jer_31:15) which is quoted by the First Evangelist. This seems to imply that he considered Rachel's tomb to be in the neighbourhood; and the existence of such a tradition is supported by the account in 1Sa_10:2, which states that Rachel was buried 'in the border of Benjamin.' The mention of Ramah in the NT quotation is a detail which has no significance in relation to the massacre of the Innocents, since Bethlehem was 10 miles away, on the other side of Jerusalem. See Rachel.

James Patrick.

☩ Ransom

RANSOM.—The word 'ransom' occurs twice in the NT, in both cases with reference to Christ's giving of Himself for the redemption of man: (1) in Mat_20:28 = Mar_10:45, where it represents the Gr. *λύτρον*: 'the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many'; and (2) in 1Ti_2:6, where it stands for *ἀντίλυτρον*: 'For there is one God, one mediator also between God and men, himself man, Christ Jesus (1Ti_2:5), who gave himself a ransom for all.' The idea, however, is implicit in the verb (*λυτροῦμαι*) and nouns (*λυρωτής, λυρωσις, ἀπολύρωσις*) used to express the thought and fact of redemption (see Redemption). It is probable from its structure that the second of the above passages (1Ti_2:6) looks back upon Christ's saying in the first (Mat_20:28); it has been thought also that the *ἐλυτρώθητε* in 1Pe_1:18 is an echo of the same saying (Denney, *Death of Christ*, p. 92). The word *λύτρον* itself is most probably the equivalent of the Heb. word *כֶּפֶר* (Wendt and others question this, but most admit the connexion), and the attempt to give a closer

definition of its meaning in relation to Christ's redemption goes back on the usage of this OT word (cf. the elaborate discussion in Ritschl's *Recht. u. Vers.* ii. pp. 70-80).

כִּפְּרָה, then, the word generally translated 'ransom' in the OT (Exo 21:30; Exo 30:12, Num 35:31-32 Authorized Version 'satisfaction'; 1Sa 12:3 Authorized Version 'bribe,' Job 33:23-24; Job 36:18, Psa 49:7, Pro 6:35; Pro 13:8; Pro 21:18, Isa 43:3, Amo 5:12), is derived, like the verb כִּפְּרָה 'to propitiate,' 'to atone,' from a root meaning 'to cover.' It may thus be used, as in 1Sa 12:3 above, of a bribe given to blind the eyes from seeing what, in justice, they ought to see (cf. Exo 23:8, Job 9:24). This connects itself with the old idea of a gift as 'covering the face' (cf. Gen 32:20) of an offended person, *i.e.* propitiating, appeasing him, or inclining him to favour. As, however, in the case of an offence, there is little difference between covering the eyes of the offended party from beholding the offence, and covering the offence from his sight, it can easily be seen how כִּפְּרָה came to take this second sense of covering the sinful person or his iniquity. This leads to the idea, which is the common one in the OT, of כִּפְּרָה as a 'ransom,' in the sense of something given in exchange for another as the price of that other's redemption, or for one's own redemption, or, what is at bottom the same idea, as satisfaction for a life. Thus in Isa 43:3-4 Jehovah is metaphorically said to have given Egypt, Ethiopia, and Seba as a ransom for ('instead of') Israel. Hofmann, in his *Schriftbeweis* (ii. p. 234, 2nd ed.), has a different interpretation. He takes the notion of 'covering' in this word to apply to 'covering in value' (one thing covering the worth of another), and so imports into כִּפְּרָה the idea of strict equivalence. It is true that 'ransom' in the OT usually includes the idea of rendering what may be termed an equivalent; but it is more than doubtful whether this can be read into the etymological signification. The term has, on the other hand, in nearly every case the direct meaning of a redemption-price for another, or for one's own life. (1) In illustration of the latter sense, we have it declared in Num 35:31-32 that in no circumstances is a 'ransom' to be taken for the life of a murderer. Again, in Exo 21:30 it is provided that if, through its owner's carelessness, an ox gore a man or a woman, the ox shall be stoned, and the owner shall pay 'for the ransom of his life' what is laid on him (in the case of a slave, 30 shekels, v. 32). So at the taking of a census (Exo 30:12), each Israelite above twenty years had to pay half a shekel—'atonement-money' (Exo 30:15 f.)—as 'a ransom for his soul (or life).' (2) In illustration of the former sense—redemption-price for another (cf. Isa 43:3 above)—two instances stand out conspicuously. One is Psa 49:7 'None of them [the rich in this life] can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him' (cf. Psa 49:8 f.); the other is Job 33:24 'Then he is gracious unto him, and saith, Deliver him from going down to the pit, I have found a ransom.' כִּפְּרָה,

in both of these passages, has clearly the sense of something given in exchange for a life, which redeems it from death.

In the above cases in the Law, the ransom is a sum of money; in the case of the firstborn, though the word כִּפְּרִי is not used, it is a sacrifice—a life for a life (cf. Num 18:15-16). Here the fact is to be noticed—of interest in the NT connexion—that in all this range of meanings the word ‘ransom’ is never in the OT directly connected with the propitiatory sacrifices. It is connected with propitiatory payments (cf. Exo 30:12 above), and in 2Sa 21:3-7 the idea, if not the word, is connected with the propitiatory delivering up of Saul’s seven sons to the Gibeonites (after refusal of a money-satisfaction, 2Sa 21:4). But the victim, even in sin- and trespass-offerings, is never spoken of as ‘ransoming’ the offerer. Its blood propitiates, atones for his sin, but the term ‘ransom’ is not employed. Yet it must be held that the connexion between the two ideas of sacrifice offered for the removal of sin (to make propitiation, כִּפְּרִי) and of ‘ransom’ (כִּפְּרִי) is very close; and that, whether the word is used or not, the expiatory sacrifice was also, in its own way, a כִּפְּרִי for the life of the offerer (the LXX Septuagint in Psa 49:8 as in 1Sa 12:3 renders the word by ἐξιλασμα). Ritschl’s generalization of the meaning of the term (applied also to the sacrifice) into ‘a means of protection’ (*Schutzmittel*), ignores the essential point of redemption (not simply protection) by the payment of a price, or offering of an expiation.

The way is now clearer for the understanding of the NT passages. There can be little difficulty, when his words are taken in the general connexion of his thought, in apprehending what St. Paul meant when he spoke in 1Ti 2:6 of Christ’s having given Himself as an ἀντίλυτρον for all. ‘Ransom’ has here its true and proper sense of ‘a price paid in exchange,’ and the ideas of ‘ransom’ and expiatory sacrifice flow together in the unity of the thought of redemption through Christ’s reconciling death (see Redemption). In St. Paul’s view, Christ has given Himself up as a sin-offering for the world upon the Cross (Rom 8:3, 2Co 5:14; 2Co 5:21, Gal 3:13 etc.). He has redeemed the world by Himself dying for it (Rom 5:6; Rom 5:9-10). His death, reconciling us to God (Rom 3:24-25, Eph 2:16, Col 1:20 etc.), brings life and salvation to mankind. St. Paul’s mind is not troubled by the monetary analogy: it is not of a money price he is thinking, but of a great ethical reparation rendered to God’s broken law of righteousness. It is to God the ‘ransom’ is paid, not to another. The Son of God, in humanity, renders it for the world.

If, therefore, St. Paul knew of the saying of Jesus recorded in Matthew and Mark, there can be little doubt how he would have interpreted it. Alike in his thought and that of St. Peter (cf. 1Pe 1:18-19), the idea of a λυτρον is involved in the conception

of ἀπολύτρωσις. Redemption has the two aspects, which can never be separated—redemption by ‘ransom,’ *i.e.* from sin’s guilt and condemnation; and redemption by power, from sin’s bondage and other evil effects. The Apostolic gospel comprehended both. But what of Christ’s own thought? The genuineness of the saying in Mat 20:28 = Mar 10:45 has been assailed (by Baur, etc.), but surely without the slightest grounds (cf. Ritschl, ii. p. 42 ff.; Denney, p. 36 f.). Its meaning also must be interpreted by the fact that Christ’s own mind at the time of uttering it was full of the thought of His death. It is His ‘life’ He gives, and He startles by saying that He yields it up as a λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν. He declares, further, that it was for this very end He came. His death was neither unforeseen, nor simply submitted to. He came to redeem the world by offering Himself as a ‘ransom’ for it. No doubt it is possible to empty the saying of most of its significance by generalizing it to mean that in some undefined way Christ’s death would be of great saving benefit to mankind, and therefore might be spoken of metaphorically as a ransom for the good of many (cf. Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, ii. p. 509 ff.). This interpretation fails, if account be taken of the redeeming efficacy which Jesus in other places (as in the words at the Last Supper) undeniably attributes to His death (see Redemption). Ritschl, though he unduly weakens the force of the word λύτρον, does not fall into any such superficializing. He sees a solemn and weighty import in the words of Jesus, and interprets them to mean that Jesus, by His voluntary and guiltless death, directed to this end, redeems the members of His community from the doom of final annihilation impending over them in the judgment of God, gives death a new character to them, and delivers them from its fear (ii. p. 87). The interpretation cannot be accepted; neither is it explained how the death of Jesus should effect such a result. Yet Jesus assuredly did view the world as lying under condemnation of God, sunk in estrangement and evil, and needing both forgiveness and renewal to righteousness, and redemption from this state He connected with His own Person, and in a peculiar way with His death, which He here speaks of as a λύτρον, or redemption-price, to that end. Further investigation must be left to other articles (see Atonement, Reconciliation, Redemption).

The idea of Christ’s death as ‘a ransom for all’ has ever been a favourite one in the preaching, theology, and hymnology of the Church. In certain circles it early became connected with the fanciful notion that the ransom was paid, not to God, but to the Evil One, who was supposed to have acquired rights over man through sin, which God, in righteousness, could not ignore. Christ’s soul, therefore, it was taught, was given up to Satan as the price of the surrender of these assumed rights over mankind. But Satan was deceived in the bargain, for, having obtained possession of the sinless soul of Jesus, he could not hold it. That sinless soul was a torture to him. This theory, connected in the early Church with Origen and Gregory of Nyssa (though Origen, at least, frequently expresses himself in a quite contrary sense), prevailed extensively in

the Middle Ages, but never really stood alone, or gained ascendancy over the abler minds. Distinguished Fathers repudiated it, and Anselm reasons against it in his *Cur Deus Homo*.

Literature.—Ritschl, *Recht. und Vers.* ii. pp. 51 ff., 192 ff.; Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, ii. p. 511 ff.; artt. 'Propitiation,' 'Ransom,' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ; Denney, *Death of Christ*, p. 42 ff.; Stevens, *Theol. of the NT*, p. 126 ff.

James Orr.

☩Raven

RAVEN.—See Animals in vol. i. p. 66^a.

☩Reader

READER.—The Gospels frequently refer to private reading of Scripture, and Jesus Christ assumes that His hearers have the sacred books and read them for themselves, e.g. Mar 2:25; Mar 12:10; Mar 12:26, Mat 12:3, Luk 6:3. At Nazareth, Jesus took the place of the public reader in the synagogue (Luk 4:16). The expression, 'Let him that readeth understand,' in Mat 24:15, cannot refer to the reading of Dan 9:27, because, although Daniel is mentioned earlier in this passage of Mt. (*i.e.* at v. 15), in Mk.'s parallel passage there is no reference to Daniel (see Mar 13:14). Therefore the words cannot be part of our Lord's utterance, and must be taken as a note interjected by the Evangelist, the writer of his source, or a reviser. Taken thus, they appear to point to the function of the reader in the primitive Church. That this function was known in very early times is indicated also by Rev 1:3, where public reading is unmistakably indicated, because it is associated with hearing by others: 'Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear,' etc. In this respect, as in many other matters, the order of the Christian assembly was moulded on that of the synagogue. Among the Jews any member of the congregation—even a minor—might be the reader both of the Law and of the Prophets, although if a priest or a Levite were present he should have precedence (*Gittin*, v. 8). Therefore it was quite in order that Jesus, although neither a scribe nor a synagogue official, should have the Prophet roll handed to Him to read. For this reason we may conclude that the reader in the primitive Church was not a man in any sense 'in orders.' For convenience, the same person might read on every occasion; but there is nothing to show that this was the case. We do not meet with the reader among the Church functionaries referred to by St. Paul. Tertullian is the

earliest Patristic writer to mention this official (*de Præscr.* c. [Note: circa, about.] 41). In the 3rd cent, he was included among the minor orders (Cyprian, *Epp.* 29, 38, etc.). See Sehürer, *GJV* [Note: *JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ii. ii. 27; Smith's *DCA* [Note: *CA Dictionary of Christian Antiquities.*], vol. i. pp. 79, 80; Harnack, *Sources of the Apostolic Canons*, pp. 54-92.

W. F. Adeney.

☞ Readiness

READINESS—The expression γίνεσθε ἔτοιμοι, ‘Be ye ready,’ is employed by Christ to denote the necessity for constant readiness to receive Him at His Second Coming (Mat 24:44, Luk 12:40). Closely akin to it in meaning is the more frequently used γρηγορεῖτε, ‘Watch ye,’ the word with which Christ demands constant watchfulness for the day of His Parousia (Mat 24:42; Mat 25:13, Mar 13:34 f., 37, Luk 21:36). The two terms are used almost interchangeably in Mat 24:42; Mat 24:44, as is evident from the fact that the illustration of the necessity for watchfulness by the case of the negligent householder who suffers his house to be broken through (Mat 24:43), is followed by the exhortation to readiness in the next verse; further evidence being found in the parable of the Ten Virgins, where the proper performance of the duty enjoined in Mat 25:13 (‘Watch, therefore’) is exhibited in the careful preparation made by the wise virgins, who are described as αἱ ἔτοιμοι, for the coming of the bridegroom.

The duty of being constantly prepared for the return of Christ is rendered urgent by the fact that the time of its occurrence is known only to the Father, and, being concealed even from the Son, cannot be communicated to the disciples (Mar 13:32). It is the ignorance of the disciples as to the day and the hour of the final Advent which lends point and emphasis to Christ's exhortations in prospect of it (Mat 24:42; Mat 24:44; Mat 25:13, Mar 13:33; Mar 13:35, Luk 12:40).

If, as some (Weiss, Charles) maintain, He foretold that the fall of Jerusalem would be the immediate prelude to the end of the world, thus furnishing the disciples with a certain clue to the date of the latter event (Mat 24:32 f.), the need for such exhortations is far from obvious, and indeed inexplicable, based as they are on the utter uncertainty that prevailed as to the time of the end. In the case of the earlier event, exhortations to watchfulness are wanting, the signs of its approach being quite

unmistakable; in the case of the later event, they are frequent, the date of its arrival being quite unknown. Weiss admits that ‘any determination of the day of His return, even if it had been possible, would only have rocked the disciples in false security’ (*Life of Christ*, iii. 93). The truth is, the question is one on which our Lord declined to dogmatize; and while His confession of nescience regarding the end (Mar_13:32) did not preclude the possibility of its speedy occurrence, neither did it preclude the possibility that it might be long deferred. He undoubtedly favoured the idea that the latter alternative was much the more likely one. ‘There are distinct hints in some passages (Mat_24:48; Mat_25:19, Mar_13:35) that the end may be delayed beyond all human anticipation, and that “an indefinitely long night of history” may intervene before the return of the Lord’ (Forrest, *The Authority of Christ*, p. 322).

The parables and parabolic sayings in the Synoptics (Mat_24:42 to Mat_25:30, Mar_13:32-37, Luk_12:35-48; Luk_19:11-27), intended to enforce the lesson of constant readiness for the Second Coming, may be described as parting counsels and admonitions to the disciples for the guidance of their conduct during the period, indefinitely prolonged, which must elapse between Christ’s departure from the world, then impending, and His return at the close of the present dispensation. They all proceed upon the assumption that membership of the Kingdom during its earthly development does not, *ipso facto*, guarantee fitness for a place in the perfected Kingdom to be inaugurated at Christ’s return. The period of His absence is a period of probation for His disciples, who are to be tested individually, and are expected to prove their individual fitness for the glorious Kingdom of the future. ‘Every man’ has his own proper sphere and work assigned him (Mat_25:14 f., Mar_13:34, Luk_19:13), and the lack of personal preparedness cannot be made up for by connexion with the believing community, animated by the common hope of the Lord’s appearing (Mat_25:1-2; Mat_25:9).

Preparedness for the last Advent naturally depends on maintenance of the moral and spiritual qualities, and continued performance of the duties, pertaining to members of the Kingdom of God—qualities and duties fully described in the teaching of Christ throughout His ministry. The fact of His departure involves no alteration in His great requirements, which are ever the same; it involves merely a deepened responsibility, an increased sense of gravity on the part of the disciples, whose conduct is to be constantly regulated and controlled henceforward by the thought of its bearing upon future destiny. Wendt remarks that ‘since Christ’s ideas of the future are comparatively general and indefinite, His admonitions regarding the future always retain a comparatively general character.’ Directions in greater detail were not needed. The character and conduct required on the part of the disciples, as outlined in Christ’s previous teaching, are calculated to satisfy the most stringent tests. The only difference is that they must now be formed under the altered conditions presented by the withdrawal of Christ’s visible presence. The proper attitude of the

disciple has to be preserved in face of the difficulties, perils, and temptations incident to (1) Christ's unexpectedly prolonged absence, and (2) His sudden and unexpected return.

(1) It is everywhere implied that Christ's withdrawal from the world affords His disciples the needful opportunity for the free and independent exercise of the gifts and powers entrusted to them. Their spiritual resources are to be developed to the utmost without the consciousness of being constantly overshadowed by His visible authority and supervision, but always in view of the day of reckoning (Mat 24:45-51; Mat 25:14-30, Mar 13:34-36, Luk 12:42-48; Luk 19:12-26). The proof of readiness for His return is thoroughgoing devotion to the interests of the absent Lord, which are identical with the interests of His Kingdom, displayed in steadfast fidelity and unflagging diligence in the use of the gifts held in trust, under the severe test of indefinitely prolonged absence (Mat 24:45; Mat 25:20 f., Luk 19:16 f.). But the same situation which creates the opportunity for freely utilizing the entrusted gifts, may lead to the misuse or to the absolute neglect of them. The perils attending a delayed Parousia, which must be guarded against with ceaseless vigilance, arise from a weakened sense of obligation issuing in slackness and lethargy, the sin of 'the untrimmed lamp and the ungirt loin' (Mar 13:36, Luk 12:35 f.), yielding to unbridled self-indulgence and the tyrannical abuse of authority (Mat 24:48 f.), faithless and inexcusable failure to improve one's trust (Mat 25:26 f.).

(2) The main strength of the appeal for constant readiness is drawn from the consideration that Christ's return will be sudden and unexpected. The frequent admonition to watch sounds a note of alarm, pointing to the danger of being taken unawares and found in a state of unpreparedness, due to the abrupt and startling manner in which the Parousia breaks in upon and breaks up the established order of things (Mat 24:50; Mat 25:6, Mar 13:36, Luk 12:36; Luk 21:34). Being of a catastrophic character, it leaves no time for the making or completing of preparations previously neglected (Mat 24:38 f., Mat 24:43; Mat 25:10). The period of probation, and with it the possibility of repairing past negligences and failures, are ended, and future destiny determined by character and achievements, now to come under searching scrutiny.

As the Parousia immediately heralds the Last Judgment (Mat 25:19; Mat 25:31), the manner in which the disciples have acquitted themselves during the period of Christ's absence is then passed under review, and appropriate destiny assigned them. Those who have proved their capacity in humbler spheres of service by fidelity to Christ's Person and interests are promoted to loftier spheres of service (Mat 24:47; Mat 25:20-23), raised to equality with Himself (Luk 12:37), and participate in the eternal blessedness of the consummated Kingdom (Mat 25:10; Mat 25:21; Mat 25:23). Those who have failed to reach the required standard are excluded, so

far as appears, irrevocably, from such high fellowship (Mat_25:11 f., Mat_25:30), and incur penalties varying in degree in proportion to their unfaithfulness (Mat_24:51, Luk_12:47 f.). See also artt. Parousia and Second Coming.

W. S. Montgomery.

⚡Reading

READING.—See artt. Boyhood in vol. i. p. 222^b, Education, Reader.

⚡Reality

REALITY.—That a spirit of clear sincerity and genuine reverence for truth pervades the narratives of the Gospel writers and inspires the central Figure they depict, is an impression irresistibly forced on unprejudiced minds. Everywhere there is evident, in the writers themselves and in the Master about whom they write, a straightforward honesty and singleness of aim, and we find ourselves unmistakably in an atmosphere of reality.

I. In the Gospel writers.—Reality, as manifested by the Gospel writers, may be recognized by several notable features, such as:

1. *The absence in them of any straining after effect.*—They relate facts as they know them, and always with a certain artless simplicity; and if occasionally they put an interpretation of their own upon the facts, it is still patent that it is an honestly framed interpretation. Invariably, in describing startling events, instead of dwelling on their startling character, they content themselves with such bare statements as that ‘fear came upon all’ (Luk_1:65), that ‘all men did marvel’ (Mat_8:27, Mar_5:20), that men were ‘amazed’ (Luk_4:36; Luk_5:26), that ‘they glorified God’ (Mat_9:8; Mat_9:33, Mar_2:12, Luk_5:26), or that ‘they were astonished with a great astonishment’ (Mar_5:42). There is often a graphic force in the description, yet the events themselves are related without any rhetorical elaboration, and no attempt is made to heighten the colours. The narrative is plain, direct, and unadorned.

2. *Their frankness in recording incidents which reflect on the leaders of their cause.*—Notwithstanding every inducement to save the credit of the disciples first chosen by the Master, far from concealing the faults and perversities of those men, they tell the story of them with simple candour, this being in their view essential to

an accurate understanding of the circumstances connected with the early beginnings of the faith. The jealous rivalries of the Twelve, and their disputes as to who should be accounted greatest (Mat 18:1, Mar 9:34, Luk 22:24), the failure of some of them to meet the duty of the hour (Mat 17:16; Mat 26:40-43, Mar 14:40; Mar 14:50), the intolerant zeal (Luk 9:54) and ambitious scheming (Mat 20:20-23) of the two sons of Zebedee, the rash presumption (Mat 14:28-30; Mat 16:22-23) and weak denial (Mat 26:69-74, Mar 14:66-71) of Peter, the treachery of Judas (Mat 26:10-16; Mat 26:47, Mar 14:43, Luk 22:48)—are all told with an unvarnished plainness which betokens an inward pressure to be strictly faithful to the truth.

3. *Their genuine absorption in their subject.*—There is evident in these Evangelists a feeling that they are dealing with a theme too sacred to be trifled with. Their attitude towards the Lord whose life and actions they seek to portray is one of profound reverential affection, constraining them to a complete sinking of their own personality, with no other aim than that of presenting a picture worthy of Him who has won their hearts. They write as men who are impelled by a pure devotion to declare what they have learned and know about things which they believe to be precious and true.

II. In Jesus.—Reality, as seen in Jesus Himself, is superlatively arresting. In an age of affectations, formalisms, and general bondage to tradition, He stood out as uncompromisingly sincere, intent on getting close to fact and truth, and keeping resolutely in view the essential and permanent interests of life. He dared to think for Himself, and rose high above all artificiality and make-believe. This spirit of reality in Jesus is convincingly attested by the following points:

1. *His thorough naturalness as a religious teacher.*—With no demure, sanctimonious airs, and no pretentious tones such as the Rabbis were wont to assume, He spoke straight to the heart and conscience; and common people felt that His utterances came home with an authority they were compelled to own (Mat 7:29). There was nothing of the professional about Him. His demeanour was that of unstudied simplicity; and when occasion suited, He could unbend and let joy and cheerfulness have their genial flow,—looking with amused interest on the children at their games (Mat 11:16-17), sharing the gladness of the social gathering (Joh 2:1-10), or lighting up His discourse with flashes of playfulness (Luk 11:5-8). While keenly alive to the seriousness of His vocation, He affected none of the Pharisaic rigour which would repress the healthy instincts of humanity—a witness for the highest truth, yet winningly human, and with a manner so gracious and open as to make Him easily accessible to all classes of men.

2. *His fearless directness in facing the actual facts of existence.*—No one ever looked with more straight and steady gaze than Jesus did on the solemn realities of human

life and destiny. The distress and suffering that are in the world (Mat 4:23; Mat 12:15), the mysteries of Providence (Luk 13:1-4, Joh 9:3), the value and needs of the soul (Mat 16:26-27, Luk 12:20-21), the curse of sin (Mat 18:8-9, Luk 13:3, Joh 8:24), the certainty of retribution (Mat 18:6; Mat 23:33, Mar 9:43-48), the necessity of spiritual renewal (Mat 9:17, Joh 3:3-7), the burden of responsibility (Mat 11:20-24; Mat 23:14, Luk 10:13-16), the imperative obligations of duty (Joh 9:4), the supreme authority of God (Mat 19:17, Joh 4:34; Joh 10:29),—on all these Jesus kept His eye fixed with an intensity of vision and purpose that was never relaxed from the beginning to the end of His career. Clearing His mind of all vague sentiment and easy superficiality, He confronted the grave problems and experiences, the mighty facts and forces, which affect man's well-being now and for ever, and dealt with them in a spirit of unwavering fortitude and sincerity.

3. His steadfast determination to reach, and hold by, the fundamental elements of religion.—Radical in the truest sense, Jesus displayed an incessant anxiety to get at the roots of things, to pierce beneath superficial respectabilities, and find the great eternal principles on which life should be based. This is seen (1) *in His teaching*. The outward observances of religion. He maintained, are nothing unless prompted by genuine gratitude and reverence (Mat 23:23, Luk 11:42). No matter how decorous the worship offered to Jehovah, if the spirit of devoutness does not fill the mind (Mat 15:8, Joh 4:24). The show of goodness may look fair, but it has no value if it be the outcome only of calculating prudence or self-flattering pride (Mat 6:2-5, Luk 16:15). Purity, mercy, clear integrity of motive in the central springs of the life, He insisted on as the essentials of goodness. Everything had to be sterling, from the heart, real [see art. Heart].—(2) *In His private life*. The demand thus made was severely searching, yet it was fully met by Jesus in His own person. If the faithful application of high spiritual principles to the common, trivial concerns of existence be a sure proof of reality, that proof was given by Him in a superb degree. It is significant that the men who knew Him best and saw most of Him in daily intimacy were also the men who adored and believed in Him most fervently; and even the one who played the traitor was yet constrained to bear testimony to the goodness he had wronged (Mat 27:4).—(3) *In His bearing towards the bigoted exclusiveness of His day*. Though threatened with the wreck of His own reputation by any association with the 'publicans and sinners,' Jesus had such profound sympathy with them in their despair of all good, begotten by the harsh ostracism to which they were doomed, that He seized every opportunity of coming into touch with them (Mat 9:10-13, Mar 2:15-16, Luk 5:29-30; Luk 15:1-2). Bent on stirring the hearts of those outcasts of society by some ray of hope, He moved straight on to His gracious object, grappling with the moral necessities of the situation, indifferent to the censures of offended propriety. He even went so far as to choose a publican as one of His immediate disciples. The same superiority to the exclusive temper of His time is evinced also in His relations with the despised Samaritans (Joh 4:4-12, Luk 17:11-19; cf. Luk 10:32-37)—His

dominant concern always being to penetrate beneath surface appearances, and to reach and make manifest the capacity for righteousness in the innermost core of every human soul.

4. *His unworldly standard of personal worth.*—While drawing a sharp distinction between the two kinds of worth,—the material and the spiritual (Mat 6:19-20; Mat 6:25),—Jesus did not denounce material success, though for Himself He never sought it. What He did denounce was the disposition to take material success as the measure of a man's value (Luk 12:15-21). It is a false measure, and He refused to be judged by it Himself, or to apply it in judging any man. Content to be estimated by His soul-qualities, He estimated others by the same test, not by their temporal status or means (Luk 16:19-26, Mar 12:41-44).

5. *His perfect candour in the bestowal of appreciation or reproof.*—Though disdainful to flatter, Jesus was ever ready to recognize good, even when found in unexpected quarters, as we see in His praise of the faith of the centurion at Capernaum (Mat 8:10), and of the offering of the poor widow at the Temple (Mar 12:42-44). Prompt and warm, too, was His approval of the genuine feeling which He found struggling to assert itself in any soul, even when others condemned, as when He threw the shield of His graeiousness over Zacchaeus of Jericho (Luk 19:9), the erring woman amid her penitence (Luk 7:44-48), and Mary of Bethany in the scene of the anointing (Joh 12:5-7). On the other hand, while benignly charitable towards natural human frailty, He could not suffer the flagrant follies and misdoings that met His eye to pass without remonstrance. The fault-finders who challenged the piety of His disciples because they did not fast (Mat 9:14-17, Luk 5:33-39), the illiberal formalists who sought to convert the Sabbath into a dreary bondage (Mar 2:23-28, Luk 13:15-16), the hardened censors who had no mercy on a woman caught in transgression (Joh 8:7), the scribes and Pharisees who turned religion into a pretentious show (Mat 23:13-35),—were made to feel the baseness of the spirit by which they were animated. There was a clear-purposed directness in the intercourse of Jesus with men; and even the chosen Twelve were not spared when they gave way to presumption, intolerance, or jealousy (Mat 16:22-23, Mar 9:34-36, Luk 9:54-56). At the risk of alienating those men, He shrank not from speaking the straight word when their errors or failings called for rebuke.

6. *His downrightness in dealing with popular expectations.*—Not even to gain a following would Jesus trifle in the slightest with truth and sincerity. When the multitudes, excited by the fame of His deeds, pressed round, expecting Him to take some step which would lift Israel to new heights of glory, instead of playing on their credulity, as for a while He might have done, He struck directly at their sensuous and extravagant hopes, insisting on their deeper needs and the more vital work which had first to be effected in their hearts (Joh 6:27 ff.). With His eye on the moral and

spiritual regeneration of men, He made it abundantly plain that He had no reliance on any such political and social revolution as they were looking for, unless it were brought about through a change of character. And when the inevitable reaction came, He let the once eager throng go their way, rather than accept their allegiance on a false understanding of what He was and sought to accomplish (Joh_6:60-66).

7. *His reverent sobriety amid popular enthusiasm.*—Dazzling as the outbursts of such enthusiasm were, Jesus would never permit Himself to indulge in the luxury of self-gratulation, but, anxious to preserve the purity of His high spiritual aims, He deliberately seized the earliest opportunity of escaping to the mountains or the wilderness for solitary communion with the Father (Mat_14:23, Mar_3:13; Mar_6:31). Even during the triumphal entry into Jerusalem He detached His mind from the ringing hosannas, and thought of the sins of the nation and the threatening doom (Luk_19:41); and when the ovation was over He withdrew to the quiet of Bethany (Mat_21:17), maintaining His spirit clear and true.

8. *His scrupulous honesty with regard to the risks of discipleship.*—That none might be misled by too sanguine expectations, Jesus took pains to give warning of the hardship and sacrifice which the adoption of His cause would involve. He told those willing to rally round Him to count the cost (Luk_14:28-33), to be prepared for the endurance of privation and the rupture of old ties (Mat_10:37, Luk_9:57-62), the severities of the world's disfavour (Mat_5:11), the cross of self-denial (Mat_16:24, Mar_8:34). Standing on the clear ground of truth, He spoke without evasion or concealment, and shrank from any homage that was not founded on a heartfelt sense of His spiritual worth.

9. *His consistent devotion to an unselfish purpose.*—The freedom of Jesus from strictly personal aims is 'writ large' on every page of the Gospel narratives. Even when constrained to assert His high claim as the bearer of a special Divine commission, there is not the slightest trace of His having any end to serve but the will of God and the good of men; and from that end the world had no bribes by which He could be tempted aside (Joh_14:30).

10. *His calm resoluteness in facing the consequences of His teaching and work.*—Though fully alive to the deadly hostility which His teaching and general line of conduct would inevitably arouse, Jesus refused to make His path smoother by any prudential concessions to conventional taste. The policy of concession was urged upon Him at various stages, from the Temptation in the wilderness to the Agony in Gethsemane, but was always energetically repelled. When Peter at Caesarea Philippi ventured to dissuade Him from carrying His principles to the point, of personal danger, He treated the suggestion as a voice from the realm of darkness (Mat_16:22 f.). Conscious of a testimony to bear for God to which He could not be untrue, and

intent on disseminating ideas which He felt to be essential to the spiritual well-being of humanity, He confronted the malice of priests, Pharisees, and scribes, and amid gathering troubles 'steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem' ([Luk_9:51](#)), where that malice at its fiercest had to be encountered. Knowing that a baptism of suffering awaited Him as the result of the work He had undertaken, He was 'straitened till it should be accomplished' ([Luk_12:50](#)), and with serene inflexibility of purpose He moved on towards the tragic climax, and braved the death which had cast its shadow over Him for many a day. See also art. Sincerity.

Literature.—In addition to the Lives of Christ, the following works may be consulted:—Ullmann, *Sinlessness of Jesus*; Lacordaire, *Conferences on Jesus Christ*; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*; Bruce, *Training of the Twelve*, and *With Open Face*; T. G. Selby, *Ministry of the Lord Jesus*; Farrar, *Witness of History to Christ*, pp. 75-88; J. Watson, *Mind of the Master*; Stopford Brooke, *Christ in Modern Life*, pp. 89-131; Smyth, *Truth and Reality*. Fruitful suggestions may also be found in the sermons of Channing, F. W. Robertson, and Martineau.

Geo. M'Hardy.

☩ Reaping

REAPING.—See Agriculture in vol. i. p. 40^a, and Sickle.

☩ Rebuke

REBUKE.—1. In restoring the man with the unclean spirit in the synagogue at Capernaum ([Mar_1:25](#), [Luk_4:35](#)), and the demoniac boy at the foot of the Mount of Transfiguration ([Mat_17:18](#), [Mar_9:25](#), [Luk_9:42](#)), Jesus is said to have rebuked (ἐπετίμησεν) *the unclean spirit*. The rebuke would help to calm the nerves and strengthen the will of the sufferer. But that was only incidental. It is clear to the present writer that Jesus recognized, in such cases, the presence of a personal evil spirit (cf. [Mat_12:25-28](#), [Luk_11:17-20](#)). He rebuked the spirit (1) because, being personal, he was susceptible of rebuke; and (2) because of his malevolence in torturing the human patient ([Mat_17:15](#)), or because of his testimony to Him as Messiah, which testimony, seeing it tended towards a faith founded upon marvels and not upon a simple love of goodness and joy in His revelation of the Father, really opposed His work ([Mar_1:24-25](#); [Mar_1:34](#), [Luk_4:41](#)). St. Luke also says that Jesus, when healing

Peter's wife's mother, rebuked the fever (Luk_4:39). This may be more figurative. Sickness was, undoubtedly, regarded as due in most cases to evil agencies (Luk_13:16); but even popular opinion then did not class fevers with cases of demoniacal possession. Neither St. Matthew nor St. Mark speaks of any rebuke here; it is therefore most probable that this is only the Evangelist's vivid description of Jesus' authoritative tone and manner of healing. On the sea of Galilee, Jesus is said to have rebuked *the wind* (Mat_8:26, Mar_4:39, Luk_8:24). It is a needless literalism to infer that He believed that the wind was demonic. It is a poetic account of His attitude (cf. Psa_106:9, Nah_1:4). His faith that God would guard Him till His work was done, was absolute; and on His rising up in the dignity and calm of such a faith and bidding sea and wind be still, the disciples beheld the threatening wind die down as if rebuked.

2. Jesus had frequent need to reprove *His disciples*; but only on two occasions were His reproofs so severe that it is written that He rebuked them. These were in the case of Peter (Mar_8:33), and James and John (Luk_9:55). The severity of His rebuke of Peter, 'Get thee behind me, Satan,' was not because Peter was, though unconsciously, acting the part of a tempter to Him. That would be contrary to the spirit of Jesus, who always forgot His own things in the presence of others' needs. It was His disciple's danger that moved Him. The test of a leader's sympathy and insight is his rebukes, whether they are addressed to mere casual faults or to those tendencies which spring from the roots of character. In these two cases, Jesus rebuked the most fatal tendencies of the two types of saintliness. 'St. John is the saint of purity, and St. Peter is the saint of love' (Newman's Sermon on 'Purity and Love' in *Discourses to Mixed Congregations*). The most dangerous temptation to loving souls is to smooth the path for those they love and reverence even at the cost of duty or of loyalty to their highest vision. Jesus here rebuked in Peter, this, love's subtlest disloyalty to righteousness. In the case of James and John, types of intensest purity, Jesus condemned that severity of judgment which is the temptation of men of integrity, and by which they may make shipwreck of their spirits, becoming narrow-minded and unbrotherly.

3. Various instances of rebukes by other persons are reported, whose value lies in their revealing by contrast the mind of Jesus. (1) The disciples' rebuke of those who brought little children to Jesus', serves to contrast their thought of the parents as inconsiderate and selfish, and of the children as beneath His notice because of their incapacity to understand His words, with His sympathy with the parents' desire to give their children a prophet's blessing, His warm love for the children simply as children (Mar_9:36), and His delight in the child-spirit as manifesting the true heavenly temper (Mar_10:14). (2) The crowd's rebuke of Bartimaeus brings into stronger relief the simplicity and brotherliness of Jesus' helpfulness (Mat_20:31). (3) The repentant thief rightly rebuking his comrade for railing on Jesus (Luk_23:40), brings out strongly Jesus' silent endurance of contumely. It sets in a clearer light His

prayer, 'Father, forgive them: for they know not what they do.' (4) The Pharisees' request that Jesus would rebuke His followers for hailing Him as Messiah, only served to make more clear and definite His acceptance of that homage with all it meant (Luk 19:39).

4. Jesus bids His disciples rebuke *a brother who sins* (Luk 17:3). The following verse shows that the sin to be rebuked is a personal wrong. This resentment of wrong seems opposed to His blessing on the meek (Mat 5:5) and His exhortation to turn the other cheek to the smiter (Mat 5:39-44). The context, however, shows that this rebuke is regarded only as the first step to forgiveness and reconciliation (Luk 17:4). Repentance is necessary before forgiveness and reconciliation can be perfected; and the rebuke is to be the act of brotherly love, showing the wrongdoer his fault to win him to that repentance.

Richard Glaister.

⚡ Receipt Of Custom

RECEIPT OF CUSTOM (Authorized Version ; 'place of toll,' Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ; 'tolbothe,' Wyclif) occurs in the parallel accounts of the call of the publican Matthew or Levi to discipleship (Mat 9:9, Mar 2:14, Luk 5:27), which took place as Jesus passed forth from His own city, *i.e.* Capernaum. The custom or toll referred to consisted of export dues on merchandise, and at Capernaum would pass into the treasury of Herod Antipas, the ruler of Galilee in the time of our Lord. Capernaum was close to the junction of the great north road to Damascus with the road that led eastwards round the northern end of the Lake of Galilee, and the important revenue station situated at this point is what we are to understand by the 'place of toll' in the Gospel story. See also Publican.

James Patrick.

⚡ Reconciliation

RECONCILIATION.—The gospel, in the Pauline acceptation, is peculiarly a message of reconciliation (*καταλλαγή*). The ministry of the gospel is a 'ministry of reconciliation.' Its preaching is a 'word of reconciliation.' Its design is that those who receive the message should 'be reconciled to God' (2Co 5:18-21). The word 'reconcile' is not found in this connexion in either the Gospels or the other writings of the NT. It is a

distinctively Pauline term. The fact is one worth remembering by those who insist so much on the absence of certain other aspects of St. Paul's doctrine from the Gospels, yet see in 'reconciliation,' at least as relates to man, the truest expression for the end of Christ's mission. If, however, the *word* is absent from the Gospels, assuredly the reality is there. It is implied, on its Godward side, in Christ's doctrine of forgiveness of sins as a primary blessing of His Kingdom (Mat 6:12; Mat 6:14-15). It is the presupposition of Christ's whole ministry as directed to the salvation of the lost (Mat 18:10-14, Luk 19:10); is exhibited in His own gracious and merciful attitude to the sinful and burdened (Mat 11:28-30, Luk 4:17-21); in His mercy, especially to those whom society regarded as outcasts (Luk 7:36-50 'friend of publicans and sinners'; Mat 11:19, Luk 15:1-2); is involved in His whole revelation of the Father. On the manward side, as necessity, duty, and privilege, it is not less clearly implied in the invitation to come to Him (Mat 11:28); in the demand for 'repentance'—a changed mind and life (Mat 4:17, Mar 1:15 etc.); in the call to sonship in His Kingdom (Mat 5:9; Mat 5:48, Luk 6:35-36 etc.), and to complete surrender of self, and trust in the Father (Mat 6:24 ff.); in the requirement of a habitual doing of the will of the Father (Mat 5:48; Mat 7:21 ff. etc.). The parable of the Prodigal Son is a typical parable of reconciliation (Luk 15:11 ff.). If, in St. Paul's gospel, reconciliation is made dependent on Christ's Person and redeeming death, it is certain that in the Gospels also Jesus views the whole Messianic salvation as depending on Himself, and on repeated occasions connects it with His death (Joh 3:14-15, Mat 20:28; Mat 26:28, Luk 24:46-47; see Redemption). This circle of conceptions involved in 'reconciliation' is now to be more closely investigated.

In the OT the word 'reconcile' occurs several times in the Authorized Version in Leviticus and Ezekiel as the translation of the verb כִּפֶּר, usually rendered 'to make atonement' (Lev 6:30; Lev 8:15; Lev 16:20, Eze 45:15; Eze 45:17; Eze 45:20 [Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 translation, as elsewhere, 'to make atonement,' 'atoning']). The idea here conveyed is that of forgiveness and restoration to Divine fellowship on the ground of a propitiation. Similarly, in the NT, Authorized Version reads in Heb 2:17 'to make reconciliation for the sins of the people,' where the word is ἰλάσκεσθαι, and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 renders, 'to make propitiation.'

In Dan 9:24, while the same Heb. word (כִּפֶּר) occurs (with direct object), Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 retains the rendering 'to make reconciliation,' and puts in the margin, 'purge away.' In 2Ch 29:24, again, where Authorized Version has 'made reconciliation,' Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 renders more accurately 'made a sin-offering.' These OT examples have only an indirect bearing on the NT word, the idea of which is not propitiation but change from variance into a state of friendship. Propitiation, in the OT, no doubt, effected a reconciliation, and, in the NT, reconciliation is made by atonement; but the ideas expressed by the words are

nevertheless distinct. The NT term for ‘reconciliation,’ as already indicated, is *καταλλαγή* (Rom 5:11 [not ‘atonement,’ as Authorized Version] 11:15, 2Co 5:18-19). With this are connected the verbs *καταλλάσσω* (Rom 5:10, 2Co 5:20; cf. of a wife, 1Co 7:11), and *ἀποκαλλάσσω* (Eph 2:16, Col 1:20-21). A related form, *διαλλάσσω*, is used in Mat 5:24 (pass.) of reconciliation with a brother. But besides these terms, there is in St. Paul, as in other NT writers, a considerable range of words and phrases which express the same idea, e.g. ‘made peace’ (Col 1:20; cf. ‘preached peace,’ Act 10:36, Eph 2:17; ‘have peace,’ Rom 5:1); ‘made nigh’ (Eph 2:13); ‘turned unto God’ (1Th 1:9-10), etc. The general meaning of the Pauline expressions is well brought out in such a passage as Rom 5:10 ‘If, when we were enemies (*ἐχθροί*), we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son,’ etc.; or in such a declaration (addressed to Gentiles) as that in Col 1:21 ‘You, being in time past alienated, and enemies in your mind in your evil works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death.’

There is no dispute, then, that, in St. Paul’s use, and generally, the word *καταλλαγή* denotes a change from enmity to friendship. The differences in regard to reconciliation in the gospel relate to two other points. (1) On whose side does the change from variance to friendship take place—on God’s side as well as man’s, or on man’s only? Is God as well as man the subject of the reconciliation, or is man only reconciled? (2) By what means is the reconciliation effected? On the first point, the view is very widely held that the reconciliation is on the part of man only (Ritschl, Kaftan, *Cambridge Theol. Essays*, pp. 206, 217, etc.); God needs no reconciliation. God is eternally propitious to the sinner: it needs only that the sinner change his thoughts and his dispositions towards God. Yet it is very doubtful if, on exegetical grounds, even in regard to the use of the word, this can be sustained. God, indeed, is represented by St. Paul as already reconciled in Christ, i.e. everything is done on His side which is necessary for the restoration of the ungodly to favour. All that is needed now is the reciprocal reconciliation of men to God (Rom 5:6; Rom 5:8, 2Co 5:18-21). But it is still implied that a reconciliation was needed on God’s side as well as on man’s, and it is declared that this has been accomplished once for all in Christ’s Cross (Col 1:21-22). It is on the basis of God’s reconciliation to the world in Christ, that the world is now entreated to be reconciled to God (2Co 5:20). This, which is the view taken of the meaning of St. Paul’s expressions by the majority of exegetes, is the only one which fully satisfies the connexion of the Apostle’s thought. Sinners, it is implied throughout, are, on account of their sins, the objects of God’s judicial wrath. They are *ἐχθροί*, a word which, both in Rom 5:10; Rom 11:28, is used in the passive sense of *objects* of wrath (cf., in latter passage, the contrast with *ἀγαπητοί*, ‘beloved’). As

Prof. Stevens, who disagrees with St. Paul, explains it: 'Between God and sinful man there is a mutual hostility. Sinners are the objects of God's enmity (Rom 5:10; Rom 11:28), and they, in turn, are hostile to God (Rom 8:7, Col 1:21). Hence any reconciliation (*καταλλαγή*) which is accomplished between them must be two-sided' (*Christ. Doct. of Salv.* p. 59, cf. his *Theol. of the NT*, p. 414). Quite similar is the view taken by Weiss, in his *Bib. Theol. of the NT*, i. p. 428 ff. (English translation); by Denney, in his *Romans*, on 5:9 ff., and *Death of Christ*, p. 143 ff.; in art. 'Reconciliation' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, etc. St. Paul's own explanation of his words, 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself,' by the clause, 'not reckoning unto them their trespasses' (2Co 5:19), makes it clear that the reconciliation intended is on God's side. If this is granted, the second question is already answered—By what means is the reconciliation effected? For the Apostle's consistent doctrine is that it was by Christ's death for our sins that God was reconciled to the world (see Redemption).

The objection, however, will not unfairly be urged—Does it not conflict with a worthy view of God's character, and detract from the grace of salvation, to think of God as at 'enmity' with any of His creatures, and needing to be propitiated or reconciled? Can such a thought have any real place in a gospel of Christ? It may be observed, first, that St. Paul did not regard his doctrine as casting any shadow on the love of God; rather, it is to this love he traces the inception and carrying through of the whole work of man's salvation. The crowning proof of God's love is just this fact, that Christ died for us (Rom 5:9). If this seems a paradox, it is to be remembered, next, that displeasure against sin, and even the assertion of holiness against it in the form of wrath, are not incompatible with love to the sinner, and with the most earnest desire to save him. In human relations also there are cases in which a very genuine displeasure requires to be removed before relations of friendship can be restored (cf. Mat 5:23-24). If God cherishes displeasure at sin at all—and would He be God if He did not?—then there must be a measure of reconciliation on His side, as well as on man's, even if it be conceived that repentance on man's part is sufficient to bring it about. But this is the whole point—Does repentance suffice to repair the broken relations of the sinner with a Holy God? And does repentance of the kind required spring up spontaneously in man, or is it not called forth by God first meeting man with a display of His own reconciling love? That this is the truer and more scriptural view cannot be doubted, and it throws us back on what it may be necessary for God to do in approaching a world yet ungodly with the message of His grace. That God has come to the world in the way of a reconciling work by His Son, is certainly no abatement from the love on which depends the possibility of a salvation for the world at all.

The other, or manward, side of reconciliation is one on which a few words will suffice. Its necessity and importance are admitted by all. Estranged from God by his

sense of guilt, and alienated in the spirit of his mind, the sinner needs, as the first condition of his salvation, to have this enmity of his heart broken down, and new dispositions of penitence and trust awakened. He needs to be moved to say, 'I will arise, and go to my Father' (Luk 15:18). The great dynamic in producing such a change is again the spectacle of God's reconciling love in Christ. 'I, if I be lifted up from the earth,' said Jesus, 'will draw all men unto me' (Joh 12:32). Along both lines, therefore, the Godward and the manward, we come to the Cross of Christ as the centre of the reconciling power of the gospel. By it we are redeemed from the curse (Gal 2:20; Gal 3:13); by it the world is crucified to us, and we unto the world (Gal 6:14). The man who truly realizes his redemption lives no more unto himself, but unto Him who died for him, and rose again (2Co 5:15).

On the different views which have been held in the Church on Christ's reconciling work, see art. Redemption.

Literature.—Ritschl, *Recht. und Vers.* iii. (English translation *Justification and Reconciliation*); D. W. Simon, *Reconciliation by Incarnation; Cambridge Theol. Essays* (v.); art. 'Reconciliation' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible; works by Stevens and Denney cited above. See also F. W. Robertson, *Serm.* iv. 208; J. Caird, *Univ. Serm.* 92; T. Binney, *Serm.* ii. 51; Phillips Brooks, *Serm. for the Principal Festivals*, 97; W. P. Du Bose, *The Soteriology of the NT* (1892), 47.

James Orr.

☞ Redemption

REDEMPTION.—An Apostle writes of Christ—'in whom we have our redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses' (Eph 1:7). It is proposed in this article to inquire what redemption in Christ means, how Christ's redemption is effected, and what blessings are included in it.

i. The Biblical doctrine

1. The vocabulary.—In the OT the idea of redemption is distinctively expressed by the two verbs פָּדָה and כָּפַר, with their derivatives. The former term is used technically, in the Mosaic law, of the redemption by price of an inheritance (by a kinsman or the man himself, Lev 25:25 ff., Rth 4:4-7, Jer 32:7-8), or of things vowed (Lev 27:14 ff.), or of tithes (Lev 27:31 ff.): the latter of redeeming the firstborn of animals or of children (Exo 13:13; Exo 13:15; Exo 34:20, Num 18:15 ff.). Outside the Law, and in relation to Jehovah, both terms are used of simple salvation or deliverance, especially

when attended by impressive displays of power, or the assertion or vindication of righteousness, or vengeance upon enemies. לָאָד appears in this sense in Gen 48:16, Exo 6:6; Exo 15:13; repeatedly in the Psalms (Psa 69:18; Psa 72:14; Psa 74:2; Psa 103:4; Psa 106:10; Psa 107:2) and in Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 43:1; Isa 44:22-23; Isa 48:20 etc.), and occasionally in other prophets. קָדַם, on the other hand, is the favourite term in Deut. (Deu 7:8; Deu 9:26 etc.), is frequent in the *earlier* Psalms (Psa 25:22; Psa 31:5 etc.), but occurs only rarely in Isaiah (Isa 1:27; Isa 29:22; Isa 51:11). The person who has the right to redeem, or who undertakes the duty, is a לְאָד, or ‘redeemer’ (Num 5:8, Rth 2:20 etc. Authorized and Revised Versions ‘kinsman’); the term is used also to denote the ‘avenger of blood’ (Num 35:12, Deu 19:6 etc.); and elsewhere, as in the famous passage Job 19:25, in Psa 19:14; Psa 78:35, and Pro 23:11, but specially in Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 41:14; Isa 43:14 etc.), is applied to Jehovah as the all-powerful, holy, and merciful vindicator, deliverer, and avenger of His people. A term related in idea to ‘redemption’ is כֶּפֶר ‘ransom.’ (See Ransom).

In the NT the terms by which the idea is directly expressed are ἀγοράζω, ‘to buy’ or ‘purchase’ (1Co 6:20; 1Co 7:23, 2Pe 2:1, Rev 5:9; Rev 14:3-4—the last translation in Authorized Version, ‘redeem’), and its compound ἐξαγοράζω, used by St. Paul in Gal 3:13; Gal 4:5; but specially λυτροῦμαι (from λύτρον, ‘a ransom’), and its derivatives (Luk 24:21, Tit 2:14, 1Pe 1:18). The special Pauline word for ‘redemption’ is ἀπολύτρωσις (Rom 3:24; Rom 8:23, 1Co 1:30, Eph 1:7 etc.,—found also in Luk 21:28, Heb 9:15). The simple form λύτρωσις occurs in Luk 2:38, Heb 9:12. The meaning of these expressions is more precisely considered below.

2. The OT preparation.—The foundations of the NT doctrine of redemption are laid in the OT conceptions of the holiness, righteousness, and grace of Jehovah, and of sin as something abhorrent to Jehovah’s holiness, which He must needs condemn and punish, but from which He desires to save. He is the Holy One, who abhors iniquity. Sinners shall not stand in His sight. He visits with severest penalties those who disregard His counsels and persist in their wickedness. Yet He is the Lord God, merciful and gracious, full of compassion and ready to forgive (Exo 34:6-7, Psa 103:8 ff.); He desires not the death of any sinner, but that he should turn from his wickedness and live (Eze 18:32; Eze 33:12). More specially, He is the covenant-keeping God, who does not allow His promises to fail, but, even when the nation in the mass is rejected, fulfils His word in due season to the faithful remnant, or to the whole people when brought to repentance (Psa 103:8-9, Isa 8:16-17, Jer 32:37 ff., Hos 1:10-11; Hos 2:14 ff. etc.). In this it is already implied that

Jehovah will manifest His power, righteousness, and love in helping and saving His people, in vindicating their cause when oppressed, in visiting their adversaries with judgments, and in working out great and astonishing deliverances for them when the hour comes for the fulfilment of His promises. It follows that His relation to them, and His concern for their good, will be seen in the course of their history in a succession of acts of *redemption*.

It has been seen, accordingly, that while, in their legal usage, the OT terms for 'redeem' and 'redemption' imply payment of a price, or, in the case of the firstborn, substitution of a life, or a monetary ransom, these terms are often used in the more general sense of simple deliverance or salvation. The great historic instance of Jehovah's redemption of His people was their deliverance from the bondage of Egypt (Exo 6:6; Exo 15:13, Deu 7:8 etc.). That held in it already the pledge of every other deliverance which the nation or godly individuals in it might need. Prayers, therefore, are frequent that Jehovah would redeem from oppression, from violence, from sickness, from death, from captivity, etc. (e.g. Psa 25:22; Psa 49:15; Psa 72:14; Psa 103:4), and thanksgivings for deliverance refer usually to the same things (e.g. Psalms 116, 124, 126, Zec 10:8 ff.). Redemption in such passages is commonly from temporal calamities or ills, endured or feared. Only in one place is direct mention made of redemption from iniquities (Psa 130:8). This last fact, however, must not mislead us. As, in the OT, outward calamities are usually connected with Jehovah's anger, or with the hiding of His face, so, it is everywhere implied, the first condition of the removal of these evils is return to God and the forsaking of iniquity; if the individual is righteous, this is the ground on which he looks to God for vindication against the ungodly oppressor (Psalms 3, 4, 5 etc.). We must beware here, and throughout this whole discussion, of building too much on the mere occurrence of a term. The *fact* of redemption is often present, where the *word* is not directly used. Behind all interpositions for deliverance and help, whatever the words employed, stand Jehovah's unchanging character, His pledged word, His inflexible will to uphold the right, His compassion for the afflicted and oppressed. Righteousness, in His deliverances, always counts for more than the deliverance itself, which is conditioned by His unerring knowledge of the moral state. Where sin has been the cause of judgments on the individual or nation, redemption includes, in the removal of these evils, forgiveness and restoration to the Divine favour and to righteousness (cf. Psalms 85, Isa 1:16 ff., Hosea 14, etc.).

The Deliverer of His people in the OT is Jehovah Himself. Hence the affection with which Deutero-Isaiah dwells on the idea of Jehovah as the גֹּאֲלֵנוּ, or 'Redeemer' of Israel. It is noteworthy, however, that in two passages redemption is attributed to the 'angel' of Jehovah—that mysterious personality, one with Jehovah, yet again distinct from Him, who figures so prominently, particularly in the earlier stages of revelation.

‘The angel which hath redeemed me from all evil,’ says Jacob, in the earliest instance of the use of the word לָקַח, in Gen_48:16; and again in Isa_63:9 we have, with the use of the same word, the like idea: ‘In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them; in his love and in his pity he redeemed them,’ etc. That is, Jehovah’s interposition in redemption is by means of His angel (cf. Psa_34:7). There is a fore-gleam here of what comes more clearly to light in the NT.

It may appear a point of contrast between the OT and the NT conceptions of redemption, that in the OT the word is never brought directly into association with sacrifice, or the ritual of atonement. The use of ‘redeem’ in connexion with the firstborn (the substitution, *e.g.*, of a lamb for the firstling of an ass) does not affect this statement, for these substitutions have not the character of atonement for sin. Here again, however, it is important to keep in memory the distinction between words and things. Apart from the use of terms, it is the case that the sacrificial ritual—so far as expiatory—was, in its own way, a means of deliverance from guilt, and, in that sense, of redemption. A direct connexion between the sacrifices of the Law and the forgiveness of sin is expressly affirmed (*e.g.* Lev_4:20; Lev_4:26; Lev_4:35; cf. Isa_6:7); a fact irrespective of any theory of efficacy. Even in regard to words, there is the important point of connexion in the word כֶּפֶר ‘ransom.’ (See Ransom).

But there is a yet closer link. There can be no question that a peculiar line of preparation for the NT doctrine lay in the development by Psalmists and Prophets of the idea of the Righteous Sufferer. The culmination of that development is reached in the matchless representation of Isaiah 53, where the Servant of Jehovah is pictured as making expiation by His sufferings and death for the sins of the people. Here at length Prophetic and sacrificial teaching touch, for the language and whole idea of the sacrificial ritual are taken over upon the Suffering Servant. The iniquity of His fellows is laid upon One who is without sin; His soul is made a guilt-offering; He bears the iniquities of the people; He pours out His soul unto death; He bears the sin of many, and makes intercession for the transgressors (Isa_53:6; Isa_53:10-12). The later Prophetic teaching is not without refrains of the same ideas (Zechariah 13, Dan_9:24 ff.). Malachi brings to a close the long preparation of the OT with his prediction of the Angel of the Covenant soon to come to His temple, whose work would be at once judging and saving (Mal_3:4).

3. Redemption in the Gospels.—With respect to the sources, it is acknowledged that a distinction is to be made between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel. The last, however, is accepted in the present article as a genuine work of the Apostle John, embodying, if with a certain colouring from his own personality and interpretative comment, that Apostle’s reminiscences of the sayings and doings of Jesus, especially

those of the Judaeen ministry. Comparison will show that, fundamentally, the teachings of the four Gospels on our immediate subject coincide.

St. Luke's Gospel begins by introducing us to the circle of those who 'were looking for the redemption (λύτρωσις) of Jerusalem' (Luk 2:38), or, as an earlier verse has it, were 'looking for the consolation of Israel' (Luk 2:25). Of these there were not a few. Zacharias and Elisabeth, Simeon and the prophetess Anna, were among the number. From the hymn of Zacharias in Luk 1:68 ff. we see how far the idea of 'redemption' was from being confined to temporal deliverance from enemies. Such deliverance was only a means towards serving the God who had redeemed His people in holiness and righteousness (Luk 1:75). Redemption included the knowledge of (spiritual) salvation by the remission of sins (Luk 1:77). This salvation was to be brought in by one from the house of David, in fulfilment of the promises made to the fathers (Luk 1:69-73). John the Baptist was to prepare the way for the Redeemer's coming (Luk 1:76, cf. Luk 3:3 ff.). We are here, in short, on the threshold of the introduction of the Messianic salvation. In three of the Gospels, accordingly, we have preparatory notes struck, which show in what sense we are to understand this wonderful redemption of the Christ. The shepherds in Lk. are apprised of the birth in the city of David of 'a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord' (Luk 2:11). In Mt. the child is called Jesus, 'for it is he that shall save his people from their sins' (Luk 1:21). In St. John's Gospel the Baptist points out Jesus to his disciples as 'the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world' (Luk 1:29; Luk 1:36). All the Gospels give prominence to the Baptism of Jesus, with its consecration of Himself 'to fulfil all righteousness' (in Mt.), its acknowledgment of Him as 'the Son of God,' and the descent upon Him of the Holy Spirit (Mat 3:13-17, Mar 1:9-11, Luk 3:21-22, Joh 1:31-34); and the Synoptics relate His Temptation, in which false ideals of Messiahship were rejected, and His true vocation was definitely grasped and chosen (Mat 4:1-11 ||).

The important question now arises, How did Jesus Himself conceive of the work of redemption which belonged to Him as Messiah? The word itself is only once attributed to Him, and that in an eschatological connexion (Luk 21:28); it affords us, therefore, little help. His conception must be sought in a less direct way, by consideration of the aspects in which His saving activity is presented in the Gospels, and of the sayings and doings in which He connects the salvation of men with Himself. An error to be sedulously guarded against here is that of fastening on one or two isolated sayings of Jesus, for instance, on the passages about His death, and giving these an interpretation as if they were without any context in Jesus' own thought, or in His general Messianic claim, or in earlier Prophetic revelation, or in the events which succeeded them, and threw light on them. A broader method must be followed if Christ's idea of redemption is to be satisfactorily grasped.

It must impress us, then, that, in the idea of redemption, or what corresponds to it, in the Gospels, the spiritual elements are prominent as they were not in the OT. This was to be expected from the spiritual nature of the teaching of Jesus, and from the larger place given to the hope of the future life. The political aspect of redemption disappears altogether. The Kingdom Jesus came to found was not of this world (cf. Mat 18:1-5; Mat 19:27-30; Mat 20:25-28; Mat 26:51-53, Luk 17:21, Joh 6:15; Joh 18:36 etc.). Salvation from bodily ills, indeed, appears as an important part of Christ's ministry, as in the healing of disease, the casting out of demons, the raising of the dead, the feeding of the multitudes (Mat 4:23-24; Mat 11:4-5 etc.). In these works of mercy Jesus revealed Himself as the Saviour of the body as well as of the soul. But the physical benefit was never an end in itself; it pointed up to, and prepared the way for the reception of, the spiritual blessing (Mat 9:2-8, Joh 6:26 ff.). It was conditioned by faith (Mat 8:10; Mat 9:2; Mat 9:22; Mat 9:28 etc.). The real evils from which Jesus came to redeem were spiritual evils; the priceless good He came to bestow was a spiritual good. Spiritual evil had its root and origin in sin; salvation takes its spring in the grace and mercy of God, and begins with forgiveness.

(1) We have first, then, to look at *sin and its consequences* as the evil to be redeemed from. The teaching of Jesus on the love and mercy of the Father should not blind us to the depth of His realization of the awful evil of sin, of the wrath of God against it, and of the peril of eternal death which overhung the sinner. Rather, in His view, is the Father's mercy to be measured by the depth of the sinner's lostness, the heinousness of his state in the light of the Divine holiness, and his inability to deliver himself from that state or its consequences. The sternness of Christ's teaching in this relation is sometimes very terrible. As the Baptist warned his hearers to flee from 'the wrath to come,' so Jesus has ever in the background of His most gracious teaching the thought of an awful Divine judgment, which surely one day will descend on the impenitent. He does not hesitate to speak of the fire of Gehenna (Mat 5:22; Mat 5:29-30, and of God, who is able to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna (Mat 10:28); of the worm that dieth not, and the fire that is not quenched (Mar 9:44; Mar 9:46; Mar 9:48); of the judgment, less tolerable than that upon Tyre and Sidon, or even Sodom, which awaits cities like Capernaum (Mat 11:20-24); of a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit which shall not be forgiven, either in this world, or in that to come (Mat 12:31-32 ||). His denunciations of the Pharisees are merciless in their severity (Mat 23:14-15; Mat 23:32-33); the language of judgment in many of the parables is hardly less strong (Mat 13:42; Mat 13:50, Mat 18:34, Mat 21:44, Mat 22:7; Mat 22:13 etc.). Those who speak of supposed judgments on others are warned: 'Nay but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish' (Luk 13:3; Luk 13:5); of a Judas it is declared, 'Good were it for that man if he had not been born' (Mat 26:24, Mar 14:21); the parable of the Final Judgment has such a sentence as, 'Depart from me, ye cursed,' etc. (Mat 25:41; Mat 25:46). The Synoptic teaching on this point is identical with that of St. John, who declares that the wrath of God

‘abideth’ on him who believes (or obeys) not the Son of God (Joh 3:36), and habitually speaks of the world as perishing in its sin (Joh 3:16-17, Joh 5:29, Joh 6:53, Joh 8:24 etc.).

Exposure to the wrath of God, therefore, is one result of sin, from which, undeniably, redemption is needed; but this, in Christ’s view, is not the worst evil, but rather flows from the infinitely heinous and hateful nature of sin itself. Sin, considered in itself, is the real evil from which men need to be delivered. It is a fountain of pollution in the heart, defiling the whole nature (Mat 15:18-20 ||; cf. Mat 23:27); evolves itself in corrupt words and deeds (Mat 7:16-20, Mat 12:33-37); brings under subjection to Satan (Mat 6:13, Mat 12:29; Mat 12:43-45); is the loss of the soul’s true life (Mat 16:24-26); entails misery and ruin (Luk 15:11-16, Mat 23:37-38); ripens into hateful vices (impurity, covetousness, pride, hypocrisy, mercilessness, etc.), and culminates in blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (Mat 12:31-32 etc.). Souls in this condition are ‘lost’; need to be, in their helplessness and misery, sought after and saved (Luk 15:3 ff; Luk 19:10). The teaching of Jesus in Jn. is here again in accord with that in the Synoptics; only that in some respects St. John’s Gospel goes deeper, in explicitly affirming the need of regeneration (Luk 3:3; Luk 3:5), in laying more stress on the element of bondage in sin (Luk 8:33-34), and in giving greater prominence to the idea of Satan as ‘the prince of this world,’ whose power over men has to be broken (Luk 8:44, Luk 12:31, Luk 14:30, Luk 16:11; cf. Luk 10:17-18).

One thing still requires to be said to exhibit in its full extent man’s need of redemption. The deepest and most condemnable aspect of sin is that it is alienation from God Himself. The first requirement of the Law is love to God (Mat 22:37-38); the proper attitude of the soul to God is that of humble dependence and trust (Mat 4:4; Mat 4:7; Mat 4:10, Mat 7:25 ff., Mar 11:22; Mar 11:24-25 etc.). But sin is the negation of this right religious relation. ‘I know you,’ said Jesus to the Jews, ‘that ye have not the love of God in you’ (Joh 5:42). Other and contrary principles—pride, self-sufficiency, self-will, the love of the honour that conies from men (Joh 5:44; cf. Mat 6:2 ff.)—had taken the place of love to God; hence estrangement from God, antagonism to His will and spirit, enmity to Him and to His messengers (Mat 23:29 ff.). Redemption means here the effecting of a change of disposition towards God, and the restoration of a spirit of love and trust—of the filial spirit (e.g. Luk 15:17 ff.). It is synonymous with *reconciliation* (see Reconciliation).

(2) This description of the evil to be redeemed from already determines *the positive character of the redemption*. The preaching of Jesus is described as the preaching of a ‘gospel’ (Luk 4:18-19)— ‘the gospel of God’ (Mar 1:14)—and the ‘salvation’ (Luk 19:9-10) proclaimed in this gospel included deliverance from the whole range of evil covered by the word ‘sin,’ with introduction into the whole sphere of privilege and blessedness embraced in the term ‘Kingdom of God.’ Jesus in His teaching has

much to say on the condition of mind necessary for the reception of this blessing. There is naturally the initial demand for repentance (Mat 9:13; Mat 11:20-21, Mar 1:15; Mar 6:12, Luk 13:3; Luk 13:5 etc.), which has the full weight of meaning involved in the etymology of the word μετάνοια, ‘change of mind.’ There is implied in this change of disposition a parting with all pride, sufficiency, and sense of merit (Luk 17:10); a coming to be humble, simple, trustful as a little child (Mat 18:1-4); in a pregnant phrase, becoming ‘poor in spirit’ (Mat 5:3, Luk 4:18). To those in this humble, trustful, self-renouncing state of mind every satisfaction and spiritual blessing are promised (e.g. Mat 5:3 ff.; see Iverach, *The Other Side of Greatness*, p. 1 ff.). This blessing is always represented as mediated through Jesus Himself. It is only through the Son that men can receive the knowledge of the Father (Mat 11:27); it is through coming to Him, learning of Him, taking His yoke upon them, that they obtain rest to their souls (Mat 11:28-30); men are called to follow Him, to become His disciples, to acknowledge Him as their Lord and Master (Mat 7:21-23, Mat 8:19-22, Mat 23:8 etc.). He requires from His disciples the most absolute surrender to Himself (Mat 10:37-39, Mat 16:24-25); it is by relation to Him that men are judged at last (Mat 25:40; Mat 25:45). As King, He dispenses the awards of service (Mat 16:27, Mat 19:28, Mat 25:34 ff.)—Of the dependence of salvation on His sufferings and death, more is said below. Those who stand in the above relation to Christ are ‘the children of the kingdom’ (Mat 13:38), sons of God, and heirs of eternal life. Received into the Kingdom, they have the blessedness of knowing that their sins are forgiven them (Mat 6:12, Mat 9:2 etc.), though, reciprocally, there is laid on those who are thus forgiven the duty of forgiving others (Mat 6:14-15, Mat 18:35, Mar 11:25 etc.). They have the privilege of calling God their Father, of trusting Him for all their need (Mat 6:25 ff.), of free access to Him in prayer (Mat 7:7-11 etc.). They are acknowledged by Christ as His brethren (Mat 12:49-50, Mat 25:40). From the Father they receive mercy, and the satisfaction of their hunger and thirst for righteousness (Mat 5:6-7); they are sustained in persecution and sacrifice by the promise of a thousandfold reward (Mat 5:12, Mat 19:29, Mar 10:29-30); it is theirs to share in the resurrection of the just (Luk 14:14); and as sons and heirs of God, they have the sure hope of ‘eternal life,’ in which is included blessedness and glory (Mat 13:43) and the perfect vision of God (Mat 5:8). These unspeakably lofty privileges and hopes imply corresponding responsibilities. It is constantly assumed that there cannot be true repentance, or genuine membership in the Kingdom, which does not manifest itself in ‘good works’ (Mat 5:16), or in the doing of the will of the Father (Mat 6:10). Only the doers of the Father’s will can be received into the Kingdom of heaven (Mat 7:21, Mat 18:4, Mat 25:34 ff.). The disciple is to have for his aim to be perfect as his Father in heaven is perfect (Mat 5:48).

Not a great deal, comparatively, is said in the Synoptic Gospels of the work of the Spirit in imparting these spiritual blessings. But the Spirit’s presence and agency are

nevertheless constantly assumed. Jesus was ‘full of the Holy Spirit’ after His baptism (Luk_4:1), and it was the Spirit of the Lord upon Him who fitted Him for His saving work (Luk_4:18). ‘The spirit of the Father’ speaks in the disciples (Mat_10:20). He is, in Lk., the supreme gift of the Father (Mat_11:13). Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is the last and highest crime (Mat_12:32 ||). The Baptist announced Jesus as the One who should baptize with the Spirit (Mat_3:11 ||), and the promise of the Spirit is Christ’s final word to His disciples (Luk_24:49). In the Synoptics, as in Jn., it is assumed that the Spirit was not yet given in His fulness, because Jesus was not yet glorified (Joh_7:39).

The Johannine teaching on salvation is once more, in all essential features, identical with that of the Synoptics. The change of mind insisted on by the latter is, in St. John’s Gospel, directly traced to a regenerating work of the Spirit (Joh_3:3; Joh_3:5), and the doctrine of the Spirit altogether is more developed (Joh_14:26, Joh_15:26, Joh_16:7 ff.); the condition of salvation is expressed generally by the term ‘believing’ (which includes in it the idea of ‘obeying,’ cf. Joh_3:18; Joh_3:36); sonship, as the fruit of regeneration, is viewed as a special supernatural gift, the prerogative of believers (Joh_1:12); salvation is connected with Christ’s being lifted up (Joh_3:14-17, Joh_12:32-33); ‘eternal life’ is regarded as already begun in the experience of the believer (Joh_3:36, Joh_4:14, Joh_6:47, Joh_17:3 etc.). But the necessity of union with Christ (cf. Joh_15:1-8), the salvation from wrath through Him (Joh_3:16-18; Joh_3:36, Joh_5:24), the dispositions to be laid aside in entering the Kingdom of heaven (Joh_5:44), and the essentials of character to be acquired by its members (humility, love, self-sacrifice, etc., Joh_13:4-17, Joh_15:12, Joh_12:25 etc.), the hope of the resurrection (Joh_5:28-29, Joh_6:40, Joh_11:24-26), and the prospect of ultimately sharing Christ’s glory in the Father’s house (Joh_14:2-3, Joh_17:24), are outstanding features in St. John’s teaching as they are in that of the earlier Gospels.

(3) The question now recurs as to *the connexion of Christ’s own Person, and especially His sufferings and death, with this redemption*, the message of which constitutes His gospel. Certain obvious aspects of that connexion have already been indicated. Christ’s ministry of teaching and healing was itself a means of redemption—of bringing men to the knowledge of it, of awakening in them the desire for it, of drawing them to the acceptance of it, of putting them in possession of part of its blessing. But in its substance also, as we have seen, Christ and His gospel could not be separated. He alone could reveal the Father, and give the world assurance of His grace; He already, as the Son of Man, exhibited in its perfect form what Divine sonship in the Kingdom of God meant; it was by coming to Him, and learning of Him, that men were initiated into His mind and spirit, which itself was salvation. His purity, conjoined with His sympathy and grace, acted as mighty moral motives in breaking down the enmity of the heart to God and in winning sinners to repentance.

These also are the aspects of Christ's connexion with redemption,—these, and not declarations about atonement,—which meet us on the surface of the Gospels. Christ is the Good Shepherd, seeking and finding the lost sheep (Mat_10:6; Mat_15:24; Mat_18:12-14, Luk_15:3-7). All-compassionating, forgiving love is the power He relies on to draw out love (Luk_8:47-50). The very majesty of His claims and the manifest authority with which He spoke gave an added power to His gentleness and grace (Mat_11:27-30).

We have still to ask, however, Is this the whole? Is this the only way in which redemption depends on Christ? If it is, what remains as the foundation of the Apostolic gospel, which undeniably connects redemption in a peculiar way, not with Christ's life and teaching, but with His sacrificial sufferings and death? The question is further pressed upon us by particular utterances of Jesus, which likewise appear to point to such connexion. Is this aspect of redemption, as some think; to be excluded from Christ's gospel? To find an answer we are driven back upon the wider question of how Jesus Himself viewed His sufferings and death. On this topic, it was remarked above that it is a very misleading method to confine ourselves to the exposition of isolated texts, without taking into account the whole context of Christ's thought, and the ideas of OT revelation in which His thought was grounded. It will be necessary to begin at this point in order to reach a satisfactory conclusion.

A sure *datum* to start with here is the indubitable consciousness of Jesus—attested by the two names 'Son of God' and 'Son of Man'—of His Messianic vocation, and consequently of the connexion of the Messianic salvation with His Person. It was He, as the whole Jewish hope implied, who was to bring in that 'redemption' for which Israel waited (Luk_2:38). That Jesus knew Himself to be the Christ, at least from the time of the Baptism, is implied in all the Gospels, though it was only to favoured individuals that the disclosure was directly made (in Jn. to Nathanael, Luk_1:47-51; to Nicodemus, Luk_3:13 ff.; to the Samaritan woman, Luk_4:26 etc.).

It is to misinterpret Peter's great confession in Mat_16:16 to take it to mean that up to that time the disciples had no knowledge that Jesus was the Christ. Apart from what is narrated by St. John (Joh_1:41 ff.), the whole ministry of Jesus, as recorded by the Synoptics—the claims He made, the authority He exercised—was by implication an assertion of that dignity; while to the direct testimony borne by the forerunner (Mat_3:11-12 ||) was added afterwards the answer given to the Baptist's doubts (Mat_11:2 ff.). What was new in Peter's confession was the inburst of new illumination, and unshakable strength of conviction, with which the confession was made (Mat_16:17-18).

On the other hand, if Jesus knew Himself to be the Messiah of OT prophecy and hope, it is not less certain that He apprehended this great vocation, and the salvation with

which it was connected, in a quite different way from most of His contemporaries. Messiahship for Him, as the account of the Temptation shows, meant the definite renunciation of all self-seeking motives, the rejection of all political and worldly ideals, the repudiation of all swerving from the sole end of seeking His Father's glory. Holding such a conception of His mission, and rooted in His consciousness, as His habitual use of Scripture and manner of deducing deep principles from its simplest words show Him to be, in OT and specially Prophetic teaching, it is impossible that, from the first, He should not have clearly perceived the collision that must ensue between Himself and the ruling classes, and the persecution, and ultimately death, which their enmity must bring upon Him. With so clear a vision of the persecutions, scornings, and death that awaited His disciples (Mat 10:16 ff. ||), He could not be ignorant of His own future. If, however, He saw thus far, it must be that He saw further. The path of self-renunciation and suffering that lay before Him must have presented itself, as we know it did, as part of His Father's ordainment in the accomplishment of His vocation; not as a fate merely, or even as a martyrdom, but as a necessary step to the founding of His Kingdom, and procurement of the great end of His Coming—the end of salvation. If this, in turn, presented itself as a problem to His thought,—we speak, perhaps, too humanly of the way in which Jesus arrived at His convictions,—the light was near at hand for its solution in the Prophetic Scriptures, especially in the picture of the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53. His sufferings were *expiatory*. No one who reads the Gospels with care can doubt the familiarity of the mind of Jesus with this portion of Prophetic testimony. It is probably this prophecy that was in view in the Baptist's announcement to his disciples (Joh 1:29; Joh 1:36); it is contained in the section of Isaiah on the Servant of Jehovah which Jesus cited in the opening of His public ministry as fulfilled in Himself (Luk 4:17 ff.); one interesting passage shows that it was directly before His mind in His last sufferings—'For I say unto you, that this which is written must be fulfilled in me, And he was numbered with transgressors: for that which concerneth me hath fulfilment' (Luk 22:37). It cannot have been absent from the numerous prophecies which Jesus declared were fulfilled in His death (Mar 9:12; Mar 14:21; Mar 14:27, Luk 18:31; Luk 24:26-27; Luk 24:46); But, indeed, the same strain of thought, sacrificial and Prophetic, which inspired the representation of Jehovah's Servant as One who must and would take upon Himself the burden of the people's sins, and, in substitutionary love, offer Himself in atonement for them, must have wrought as powerfully in the mind of Jesus, conscious as He was of His peculiar relation to both God and man, and fully aware of what sin was, and of what the forgiveness of sin meant to a holy God. If atonement for the world's sin was possible, and Jesus in, His representative capacity, and Himself sinless, could offer such atonement, it cannot be doubted that He would desire to do so.

This point of the connexion of the sufferings and death of Jesus with redemption will receive elucidation afterwards; but already, perhaps, it is possible to see how, during

His ministry, a relation of His sufferings to His saving mission might be present to His own mind, though He said little of it publicly, and only toward the end of His life spoke freely to His disciples of His approaching death. His reticence on His death would then be paralleled by His reticence on His Messiahship, which yet was present to His consciousness throughout. On such a view it may be found that the phenomena of the Gospels, as we have them, fall naturally into place,—His general silence on His death in His public teaching, the occasional disclosures in Jn. and the Synoptics, the connexion of the later announcements of His death with His resurrection, and, after His resurrection, of both with the preaching of remission of sins, and the promise of the Spirit; the coherence of this teaching with the Apostolic gospel.

For now it is to be observed that this silence of Jesus on the connexion of His sufferings and death with His saving work is far from absolute; on the contrary, the intimations of such connexion, when brought together, and read with the help of such a key as Isaiah 53 affords, are neither few nor ambiguous. It is not, indeed, till late in the ministry, after Peter's confession, that Jesus begins to speak plainly of His approaching death, and then of that death as Divinely ordained and foretold, and to be followed by resurrection (Mat_16:21; Mat_17:9; Mat_17:22-23; Mat_20:18-19 ||, see above). Thenceforth His death had an absorbing place in His thoughts. It was a 'cup' He had to drink, a 'baptism' He had to be baptized with. He was 'straitened' till it was accomplished (Mat_20:22, Mar_10:32; Mar_10:38, Luk_12:50; cf. Luk_9:51). At the Transfiguration it was, according to St. Luke, the 'decease (ἔξοδος) which he was about to accomplish at Jerusalem' which was the subject of His converse with Moses and Elijah (Luk_9:31). But the very decision and circumstantiality of these first announcements to His disciples imply that the subject had long been before His own thoughts; and that, in conformity with what has already been said, this was really the case, we gather from such a passage as Mat_9:15 ('When the bridegroom shall be taken away from them'), but much more clearly from the sayings preserved to us by St. John from the Judaeian and Capernaum ministries. Here, in the line of the Baptist's opening announcement (Joh_1:29), the connexion between Christ's death and the salvation of the world is unmistakably declared. Thus, in the conversation with Nicodemus, 'As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up,' etc. (Joh_3:14-16; cf. on the lifting up, Joh_12:33), and in the remarkable discourse at Capernaum, in which Jesus dilates on His flesh as given for the life of the world, and on His blood as shed (we must presume) for the same end (Joh_6:51-56). In the light of these sayings we must, in consistency, interpret others more general in character (e.g. Joh_10:11; Joh_10:15; Joh_10:17-18, Joh_12:24; Joh_12:23).

When we return to the Synoptics, we have again, in the closing period, more than one significant utterance. There is first the well-known passage preserved in both Mt. and

Mk.: 'The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom (λύτρον) for many (ἀντὶ πολλῶν)' (Mat 20:28, Mar 10:45).

It does not rob this passage of its force that it occurs in impressing on the disciples the lesson that the true greatness lies in service. No one will suppose that Jesus could have used language such as He here employs about the disciples, or about any other than Himself. The incidental occurrence of the saying may rather suggest that there must have been other teaching on the subject, and that Jesus here assumes the saving purpose of His death as known to the disciples.

The significance of the word λύτρον is investigated in art. Ransom; it is enough now to say that the word is most naturally taken as the equivalent of the Hebrew כֶּפֶר (allied to קָפַר 'to atone'), used of that which is given in exchange for a life, whether money or another life. The thought in Jesus' mind may well have been that of Isaiah 53. The meaning would then be that His death is the redemption-price by which the many are delivered from the ruin entailed by sin (including both the guilt and the power of sin). There is, again, the passage already cited, Luk 22:37, directly glancing at Isaiah 53, and declaring it to be fulfilled in Christ's death. There are, finally, the words at the Supper, which, amidst the variations in the four accounts we have of them (Mat 26:26-28, Mar 14:22-25, Luk 22:19-20, 1Co 11:23-25), present certain very distinguishable ideas. The bread is Christ's body, the cup is Christ's blood. The body is given or broken and the blood is shed for the disciples (in Mt. and Mk. 'for many'). The very variations support the general meaning put upon the act. If Mt. and Mk. have not the words 'given' or 'broken' spoken of the body (Luke, Paul?), both have 'shed for many' of the blood. Lk. has both 'given for you' and 'poured out for you'; St. Paul, on the other hand, has 'My body, which is [broken?] for you,' but not the corresponding 'shed for you.' All agree in the leading feature, that Jesus said: 'This is my blood of the covenant' (Mt., Mk.), or 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood' (Luke, Paul). Mt. adds: 'which is shed for many unto the remission of sins.' Even if it were conceded, what there is no necessity for conceding, that this *logion* is less original than the others [there is probably a reminiscence of Jer 31:34], it has at least the value that it shows the sense in which Christ's words were understood in the Apostolic age. That Jesus, therefore, in the words at the Supper, represents His death as a sacrifice for the salvation of many, and definitely connects the shedding of His blood with the remission of sins and the making of a New Covenant, is nearly as certain as anything in exegesis can be. The question that remains is—With what special sacrifice does Jesus regard His death as connected (Passover, ratificatory sacrifices at Sinai)? Probably it is not necessary to decide between different views. Jesus may well have regarded His death as fulfilling the truth of all propitiatory sacrifice.

There is yet one other fact to which attention needs to be directed in this connexion. The death of Jesus is evidently dwelt upon by the Evangelists with a special sense of solemnity and mystery, and there are features in the story of His Passion which deepen this feeling of mystery, and compel us to seek some special explanation. Such features are the mental perturbation which the thought of His death awoke in Jesus ('Now is my soul troubled,' etc., Joh 12:27); the sore amazement and sorrow even unto death in the Garden (Mar 14:33-34); the sweat as of drops of blood, and words about the Cup (Luk 22:42-44, Mat 26:39); the awful words upon the Cross, speaking to a loss of the sense and comfort of God's presence (Mat 27:46, Mar 15:14). We recall M'Leod Campbell's words: 'When I think of our Lord as tasting death, it seems to me as if He alone ever truly tasted death' (*Atonement*, ch. vii.). Is there nothing which connects itself with Christ's position as sin-bearer here? It is not thus martyrs are wont to die; not thus did Stephen, or Paul, or Ignatius die. Why, then, so strange a contrast in the Lord and Master of them all? On any hypothesis, must we not say that we have here something which takes *this* death out of the rank of simple martyrdom? Let us now take with this Christ's last cry upon the cross, 'It is finished' (τ ἐτέλεσται, Joh 19:30), and mark how this most unusual death is followed by a resurrection, and, after the resurrection, by an apparently changed relation of Christ to both God and man; by commissions and promises which imply that this death has been a turning-point in the history of salvation, the opening of a new dispensation of the Spirit, and of the preaching to mankind of the remission of sins in Christ's name (Mat 28:16-20, Luk 24:45-49, Joh 20:21-23, Act 1:4-8), and it may be found difficult to deny that, even within the limits of the Gospels, a saving significance is attributed to Christ's death, in perfect consonance with that ascribed to it in the Apostolic gospel.

4. The Apostolic doctrine (*Acts, the Epistles, the Book of Revelation*).—(a) It is told by St. Luke that Jesus opened the minds of His disciples to understand from the Scriptures that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name unto all the nations (24:46, 47). From the first, therefore, we find the Apostles giving prominence to the death and resurrection of Christ as Divinely ordained events, with which salvation was connected (Act 2:23-33; Act 2:36; Act 2:38; Act 3:13-18; Act 4:10-12); It would be unreasonable to look for theology in addresses which had for their primary object to bring home to the consciences of the hearers their *crime* in crucifying 'the Holy and Righteous One' (Act 3:14). We need not wonder, therefore, that we do not find it in these early discourses in the Acts. Yet the conviction was plainly there that, in some sense, Christ, as St. Paul says, had 'died for our sins' (1Co 15:3), and had been exalted to bestow salvation, and that through faith in Him, and *only* through faith in His name (Act 3:12), was the wrath of God averted (Act 2:21), remission of sins obtained (Act 2:38, Act 3:19, Act 10:43,

Act 13:38-39, etc.), the gift of the Holy Ghost received (Act 2:38, Act 11:16-17 etc.), and the way prepared for ‘seasons of refreshing’ and ‘the times of restoration of all things’ (Act 3:19-21). Very early, however, through deeper reflexion and the growing illumination of the Spirit, there necessarily came to be given a more definite interpretation of this connexion of Christ’s death with human salvation. Sacrificial and expiatory ideas were freely taken over upon it (cf. Act 20:28); a new vocabulary sprang up; there was speech, as in the common doctrine of the Epistles (cf. 1Co 15:3 ‘that which also I received’), of Christ ‘bearing our sins’ (1Pe 2:24, Heb 9:28, cf. 2Co 5:21), ‘suffering for sins, the righteous for the unrighteous’ (1Pe 3:18, cf. Rom 5:6; Rom 5:8), ‘redeeming us by his blood’ (Eph 1:7, 1Pe 1:18-19, Rev 5:9): ‘offering’ Himself as ‘a sacrifice for sins’ (Heb 10:12), ‘giving himself a ransom for us’ (1Ti 2:6), becoming a ‘propitiation’ (1Jn 2:2; 1Jn 4:10), etc. This more definite mode of conceiving of everything in salvation as depending on the redeeming death of Christ led, in turn, to a change in the form of presenting the gospel. Instead of attention being directed primarily, as in the Gospels, to the nature of salvation, as flowing from the mercy of God, the mind is now turned, above all, to the Person by whom redemption is effected, to His sacrifice as the means of redemption, and to the necessity of faith in Him as the condition of salvation. In this new perspective, the whole state of salvation and every blessing included in it are viewed as the fruit of Christ’s redeeming death. An immediate effect is forgiveness (Act 2:38; Act 13:38, Rom 4:6-8, Eph 1:7, Col 1:14, 1Jn 1:9; 1Jn 2:12, Rev 1:5 etc.). But Christ redeems also ‘out of this present evil world’ (‘delivers,’ Gal 1:4), ‘from all iniquity’ (Tit 2:14), ‘from your vain manner of life handed down from your fathers,’ etc. (1Pe 1:18). St. Paul’s special conceptions are referred to below. The efficacy of this redemption is placed by all NT writers, after the sacrificial analogy, in the ‘blood’ (Act 20:28, Rom 3:25, Eph 1:7, Heb 9:12 and *passim*, 1Pe 1:2; 1Pe 1:19, 1Jn 1:7, Rev 1:5; Rev 5:9 etc.), which here is the symbol of a sacrifice that culminates in death. This strain of teaching is so inwrought into the texture of Apostolic teaching, that it is impossible by any ingenuity of exegesis to get rid of it, or make it mean essentially anything else than what the words naturally convey, viz. that the death of Jesus had a direct and indispensable redeeming efficacy, arising from its character as an expiation for sin.

(b) The NT writer who has given this redeeming character of Christ’s death its most complete theological elucidation, it will be universally conceded, is St. Paul. A full exposition of the concatenation of his ideas hardly falls within the scope of this article, but the general import of the Apostle’s teaching on redemption is not difficult to grasp. Starting with the fact of sin as bringing the world, both Gentile and Jewish, under the condemnation (κατάκριμα) of God (Rom 1:1-32; Rom 2:1-29; Rom 3:1-31; Rom 5:16; Rom 5:18; Rom 8:1 etc.), he proceeds to the exhibition of God’s method of salvation, in bringing to mankind a new righteousness (‘the righteousness of God’),

to be received by faith (Rom 1:17; Rom 3:21-22; Rom 3:26; Rom 5:17-21, 2Co 5:21, Php 3:9 etc.). This righteousness comes through the propitiatory death of Christ (Rom 3:25); is initially realized in Christ's sacrificial death, which is at the same time the culmination of His obedience (Rom 5:19, Php 2:8); proceeds from His Cross, and is applied in God's justifying act to the salvation of the individual believer (Rom 3:24; Rom 3:26; Rom 5:1; Rom 8:1; Rom 8:33), who thereby is constituted 'the righteousness of God in him' (2Co 5:21, Php 3:9), or is 'justified' (Rom 3:24; Rom 5:1), *i.e.* pronounced righteous. The salvation thus provided in Christ is a 'redemption' (Rom 3:24, Eph 1:7, Col 1:14). The connexion of it with Christ's death is, that Christ honours the righteousness of God in Himself consenting to be 'made sin' for us (2Co 5:21), or endure sin's condemnation in His own Person, that sinners may be saved. He redeems from the curse of the Law by being made a curse for us (Gal 3:13; Gal 4:4-5). *How* such vicarious endurance of another's *κατάκριμα* was possible, St. Paul does not explain; but we may gather from the context of his thought that he would find the explanation in the peculiarity of the representative relation which Christ sustained to our race (Rom 5:12-21, 2Co 5:14-15); in the perfection of His identification with the world in sympathy and love (Gal 1:4; Gal 2:20; Gal 5:2 etc.); and in the fact that a vital union is constituted between the believer and Christ by faith, so that the acts of the Head are participated in by the members (Rom 6:3 ff.). St. Paul attaches great importance to the corporate idea (Rom 14:7-9, 1Co 12:12 ff.), and to the representative principle involved in it (Rom 5:12 ff.). Christ, in His complete identification with the race He came to save, took part in its responsibilities as under a broken law, and magnified the righteousness of God (Rom 3:25; Rom 3:31) in His endurance of death, which is the wages of sin (Rom 6:23). Sinless Himself, the sin of the world met in Him, and was atoned for in His perfect response to the mind of God in His judgment on that sin.

The attempt has been made to explain St. Paul's doctrine of the atoning character of Christ's death as a survival of his older Rabbinical notions, as well as to make out an inconsistency between this side of his teaching and his other doctrine of mystical union with Christ. But to the Apostle's own mind there was no inconsistency. St. Paul's conceptions of law, of righteousness, of sin and its desert, had their roots in something far deeper than Rabbinism—even in the OT; and there was to His thought no contradiction in setting forth Christ's death as the objective ground of man's acceptance with God, and at the same time in teaching that the end of salvation was holiness—a holiness which could be realized only through dying to sin with Christ, and rising again with Him to life in the Spirit; in other words, through personal, vital union with the Risen Lord.

(c) In the remaining writings of the NT, while the ideas are less developed theologically, and the distinctive nomenclature of St. Paul is not used, emphasis is not

less strongly laid on Christ's death as a propitiatory and redeeming sacrifice (Rom 1:18-19, 2Pe 2:1, Heb 9:12; Heb 9:15, cf. Rom 3:25), cleansing from the guilt and power of sin (1Jn 1:7; 1Jn 1:9, Heb 2:17; Heb 9:14 etc.), saving from wrath (Heb 2:2-3; Heb 9:26 ff., 1Pe 4:17-18, Rev 5:9, cf. Rev 7:14; Rev 14:4 ff. etc.), rescuing from the power of the world and the devil (Heb 2:14-15, 1Pe 1:18; 1Pe 5:8 etc.), giving access to God (1Pe 3:18, Heb 4:14-16; Heb 10:19-22 etc.), introducing into a new state of unspeakable privilege and felicity (1Pe 1:9-10; 1Pe 2:9-10, 2Pe 1:11, 1Jn 3:1-3 etc.).

Occasionally there seem links of connexion between the Epistles and the teaching of the Gospels. It is difficult, e.g., not to see in St. John's 'He was manifested to take away sins (ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἄρῃ); and in him is no sin' (1Jn 3:5), a reminiscence of the Baptist's similar saying in Joh 1:29 (ὁ ἄμνός τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου); or in St. Paul's, 'Who gave himself a ransom for all' (ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων 1Ti 2:6), an echo of the words of Jesus in Mar 10:45 (καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν). In 1 Peter there is a blending of both sacrificial and Prophetic language. Jesus redeems with His 'precious blood' (τιμίῳ αἵματι)—the blood of the Sinless One (1Pe 1:19; 1Pe 2:22); but in other places we have a clear falling back upon the ideas and language of Isaiah 53 (e.g. 1Pe 2:23-25). Christ's death did for believers all that the suffering of the Servant of the Lord in Isaiah 53 was to do for the people, and all that redeeming sacrifices did under the OT, only now in a grander and more effectual way. And St. Peter says that his readers *knew* this (1Pe 1:18)—it was the familiar doctrine of the Church. In 1 John we have prominence given to the idea of 'propitiation' (ἱλασμός, 1Jn 2:2, 1Jn 4:10). The term points to the effect of Christ's sacrifice, not on men, but on God, in averting His wrath or displeasure against sin (cf. Isa 12:1). The Book of Revelation, again, moves in the distinctively sacrificial circle of ideas. The centre of worship is the Lamb that was 'slain' (Rev 5:8-9; Rev 5:12), who, loving us, 'loosed (λύσαντι) us from our sins by his blood' (Rev 1:5), and 'purchased (ἠγόρασας) unto God' with His blood men of every nation (Rev 5:9-10)—those described after (Rev 7:14), in strong paradox, as 'having washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.' If the design was to ascribe an expiatory and redeeming efficacy to the death of Christ, it is difficult to see in what stronger way it could have been done.

It is in the Epistle to the Hebrews, however, that the relation between Christ's redemption and the sacrificial ritual of the OT is most fully wrought out. The writer of the Epistle evidently proceeds upon the view which regards the Levitical sacrifices as having a propitiatory value through the vicarious shedding of the blood (Heb 9:22 and

passim)—the victim ‘bearing the sins’ of the transgressor, and atoning for them by its death. Yet he is as clearly conscious of the typical and shadowy character of the sacrificial system (Heb 10:1), and of its inability to effect a real redemption. He lays it down as a self-evident principle that ‘it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins’ (Heb 10:4). The inadequacy of the OT sacrifices is seen in their number and their continual repetition (Heb 10:1-3); while the imperfection in the reconciliation wrought by them was signified by the barriers still interposed to complete approach to God (Heb 9:6-10). But now, once for all (*ἄπαξ*), Christ has offered the perfect sacrifice which the Law could not provide, and has obtained ‘eternal redemption’ for us (Heb 9:11; Heb 9:26). He is at once high priest and victim, for the sacrifice He offers is the sacrifice of Himself (Heb 9:26). It is a true sacrifice for sins He offers. He is a high priest to make propitiation for the sins of the people (*εἰς τὸ ἰλάσκεισθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ*, Heb. idiom, Heb 2:17). He was ‘once offered to bear the sins of many’ (Heb 9:28); He has ‘offered one sacrifice for sins for ever’ (Heb 10:12). It was appointed unto men once to die (Heb 9:27); and Christ has died once for men. His sacrifice avails for ‘the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant,’ sins which the sacrifices of the Law could not remove (Heb 9:15). To the question, Wherein lay the superior virtue of this sacrifice of Christ as contrasted with the typical sacrifices? the writer of the Epistle would answer, in the Divine dignity of the Offerer (the ‘Son,’ Heb 1:1-3 etc.), in the true humanity He has assumed (Heb 2:14-16), in the perfect sympathy and love with which He identifies Himself with His brethren (Himself being tempted and having suffered, Heb 2:10; Heb 2:17-18, Heb 4:14-16, Heb 7:26-28), above all in the obedient will in the offering itself. His sacrifice had in it this ethical element of surrender to God. The principal passage here is Heb 10:5-9. It is not meant in this passage that the simple doing of the will of God is itself the sacrifice, or takes the place of it; but it is the ethical quality of the sacrifice; it is the fact that it is an act of holy, intelligent obedience which gives the sacrifice its value: ‘by the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all’ (Heb 10:10). The sacrifice of Jesus, the Epistle teaches, at once redeems and consecrates.

5. Reasonableness of the Biblical doctrine.—The reasonableness of the Biblical doctrine of redemption, peculiarly of the NT connexion of redemption with the suffering and death of Jesus as a sacrifice for sins, can be rightly appreciated only in the light of the Bible’s own presuppositions on the character of God, on the infinite demerit of sin, on the necessity of a vindication of the righteousness of God in the forgiveness of sin, on the peculiar relation of Christ to God and man, qualifying Him to make atonement for sin, and effect a perfect reconciliation between God and humanity. More definitely, among the presuppositions of the doctrine are to be noted the following:—(1) The Biblical doctrine of *the righteousness of God*. By righteousness

is meant that in God which grounds the moral order of the world, and pledges Him to uphold that order. While, in its connexion with mercy, righteousness is frequently represented as a saving, redeeming attribute, it cannot be merged wholly, as some (e.g. Ritschl) would have it, in either love or Fatherhood. There is an essential 'right' for God as well as for men, and righteousness is that attribute of His character which leads Him to establish, uphold, and vindicate that right in all His dealings and relations with moral beings.—(2) The Biblical recognition of *the organic constitution of mankind*. Humanity has a unity as a 'race' (cf. Act 17:26), a corporate life and responsibilities, a 'solidarity,' in virtue of which 'none of us liveth to himself, and none dieth to himself, (Rom 14:7). There is personal responsibility, but there is also a measure of responsibility which every one is called to assume for others. Good acts do not end with the doer, but their benefits overflow to others. Similarly, the penalties of transgression are never confined to the transgressor, but overflow on all connected with him, and on society. One illustration of this principle is seen in heredity. As, however, through this principle it is possible for one to injure others, and for the penalties of evil-doing to be entailed on the innocent, so it is possible for one to act and suffer for the benefit and redemption of others. Scripture doctrine knows nothing of pure individualism. One is blessed in another; one is helped by the intercession of another; one would willingly, if he could, atone—sometimes, in a relative way, does seek to atone—for the sin of another. (On the application to redemption, cf. Rom 5:12 ff.).—(3) The Biblical view of *the infinite evil and hatefulness of sin*. Sin is direct contrariety to the holiness of God. Eternally, therefore, holiness must react against it in condemnation and punishment (cf. Rom 1:18). It follows that, even in forgiving sin, God cannot tamper with the condemning testimony of His law against it, but must provide for the vindication of His righteousness in the passing of it by (cf. Rom 3:25, Heb 9:15).—(4) The Biblical truth of *Christ's essential and peculiar relation to our race*. This lies at the foundation of everything that is declared of Christ's redeeming activity. He is the 'Son of God,' standing in a quite peculiar relation to both God and humanity. That relation to our race is grounded (a) in His general relation to creation (Joh 1:2-4, 1Co 8:6, Col 1:15-17 etc.), and (b) in His condescending grace in becoming man—in His incarnation (Php 2:5 ff., Heb 2:14 etc.).—(5) In this relation also account is to be taken of *Christ's perfect sinlessness* (2Co 5:21, 1Pe 2:22, 1Jn 3:5 etc.), and of His complete identification of Himself with our race in sympathy and love. Here already the substitutionary forces of love come into fullest play.—(6) The Biblical assertion that, in this identification, *Christ made Himself one with us in our whole position of responsibility and ruin under the broken and dishonoured law of God* (Rom 8:3, Gal 4:4 etc.). In this position it is impossible but that Christ should take cognizance of the relation in which sin has placed the world, not only to the commanding, but also to the condemning and punishing, will of God, and should desire, as man's Redeemer, to do the highest honour to that, as to all else in God's relation to sin.—(7) Historically, it is certain that Jesus *did enter*, in the fullest way possible to a sinless being, into what may be

called the penal evil of our state; into the experience of the deepest meaning of that evil; above all, into death, the culminating form of that evil. When even a Bushnell can speak of Jesus as ‘incarnated into the curse’ of our condition (cf. *Forgiveness and Law*, pp. 150, 155, 158); can describe Him as ‘doing all that He does and suffers, in a way to honour the precept, enforce the penalty, and sanctify the justice of law; the precept as right, the penalty as righteous, the justice as the fit vindication of the righteousness of God’; and declares that ‘no moral account of His gospel, separated from this, can be anything but a feeble abortion’ (*Vic. Sac.* pt. iii. ch. vi.), it may be felt that there is no supreme difficulty in believing that Christ, in our name and nature, may, in His acceptance of suffering and death, have rendered that acknowledgment of the righteousness of God in His condemnation of sin, which holiness demands, in order that sin may be righteously forgiven.

ii. Ecclesiastical development.—In a brief sketch of the ideas and theories which have prevailed in the Church on the subject of redemption, only leading points can be indicated. It was only to be expected that, in the multitude of aspects under which redemption is represented in Scripture, much diversity would appear in the manner in which the doctrine was apprehended by different minds in the Church. And this is what we find.

1. In the immediately post-Apostolic age, little was done to elucidate the connexion of Christ’s suffering and death with redemption. The Fathers of that age, while profuse in their allusions to redemption through the blood of Christ, content themselves, mostly, with the repetition of the Apostolic phrases, and offer no theological interpretation. The age of the Apologists which succeeded was, if possible, even more barren in this direction. Still, even in this earliest period, it would not be difficult to show that the essential fact of redemption by Christ was never lost sight of. Clement of Rome (*Ep.* 49), as later Irenaeus (v. xvii. 3), lays stress on Christ’s giving His flesh for our flesh, and His soul for our souls; and sometimes, as in Polycarp and the *Epistle to Diognetus*, a remarkably clear and evangelical note is struck. Reflexion on the mode of redemption may be said properly to begin with the old Catholic Fathers—Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, etc. A leading idea in Irenaeus is that of the *recapitulatio* of the whole of humanity in Jesus Christ. That is, Jesus sums up all history, all stages and experiences of human life, in Himself, and so can represent humanity as its Redeemer. He enters as a new Head into our race; retracts the disobedience of the Fall by His own obedience; gains a complete victory over Satan; and honours the justice of God by His submission to death for our sins (ii. xxii. 4, iii. xviii. 6, xxi. 10, v. ii. 1, etc.). This Father is sometimes credited with the idea of a ransom paid to Satan, but any allusion of this kind in him hardly gets beyond a rhetorical figure (v. i. 1). He teaches explicitly that Christ by His death has reconciled us to God, and procured for us forgiveness (iii. xvi. 9, v. xvi. 3, etc.). Origen, as Harnack (*Hist. Dogm.* ii. 367) observes, regarded Christ’s redemption from many

points of view (victory over Satan, expiation offered to God, ransom paid to Satan). The grotesque theory of a ransom paid to Satan—the devil, however, being deceived in the transaction, as he found he could not hold the soul of Jesus—is, in Origen also, hardly more than rhetoric (on Mat 16:8); but the idea took hold, and, sometimes alone, sometimes along with other conceptions, was propounded by subsequent theologians, and in the Middle Ages, as far down as Bernard and the Schoolmen, as a serious theory of redemption. Other prominent teachers, however, as Gregory of Nazianzus, Athanasius, Anselm, would have nothing to do with it (see Ransom). Athanasius takes a further step, and in his treatise on *The Incarnation of the Word* makes a brief, reasoned attempt at the *rationale* of salvation. God had ordained death as the penalty of sin, and, as it was impossible for God to lie, it was necessary that this penalty should be inflicted (*Incar.* 6, 8, 9, etc.). But it was not fitting that God should allow His creation to perish; the Logos, therefore, Creator of the world, having assumed our nature, endured this penalty in our stead, and brought into our race anew a principle of incorruption (*ib.* 8, 9). The Latin Church naturally (Hilary, Ambrose, Augustine) gave more prominence than the Greek Church to the idea of satisfaction to law or justice, but in Greek writers also (Cyril, Chrysostom, etc.) this idea is not wanting. It is important to observe that Augustine, and the Fathers generally, never lose sight of the fact that it is God's love which is the cause of Christ's reconciliation; not Christ's death, as an appeasement of justice, which is the cause of the love (Aug. on Joh 17:21-26; Calvin endorses this view, *Instit.* ii. xvi. 3, 4).

2. A new period in the history of this doctrine begins with Anselm in his *Cur Deus Homo*. Anselm's theory turns on the necessity of a 'satisfaction' to God's violated honour; but it is noteworthy that he does not find this satisfaction in the penal endurance of our curse. His theory moves rather in the circle of the Catholic ideas of supererogatory merit. Christ, as man, was bound to obey God's law, but, as sinless man, He was not bound to die. His voluntary submission to a shameful death, therefore, for the glory of His Father, was an act of such transcendent merit as infinitely to outweigh all the dishonour done to God by humanity. Anselm is strong in basing the necessity for satisfaction in God's nature; but his theory is faulty in the idea of merit on which it turns, in its ignoring of the penal aspect, and in its too external character. Abelard represented the opposite pole of doctrine—the purely *moral* view of the effect of Christ's death. Bernard opposed Abelard, and gave prominence to the important thought of the vicarious suffering of the Head for the members (*vers. Abel.* vi. 15). Aquinas sought, but without real logical cohesion, to combine all these points of view in a comprehensive scheme. Meanwhile, in accordance with the scholastic tendency to exalt the will of God at the expense of His other attributes, atonement was removed from the ground of necessity in the Divine nature on which Anselm had placed it, and was rested on the mere *fiat* of the Divine sovereignty (Duns Scotus). To this tendency the whole body of the Reformers, in the

great religious upheaval of the 16th cent., strenuously opposed themselves, and, with their clearer views of what was needed as the basis of the sinner's justification, definitely placed the atonement on the ground of a satisfaction to eternal law. Sin they regarded as 'a violation of the order of public law that is upheld by God's authority, a violation of the law that is correlate with the eternal being of God Himself'; they 'estimated the atoning work of Christ by reference to that justice of God which finds its expression in the eternal law' (Ritschl). It is this view that it embodied in the Protestant creeds. Socinianism denied the necessity of all satisfaction for sin, and explained Christ's work, as man, in terms of His prophetic office. The later Governmental theory of Grotius likewise denied the need of satisfaction to essential justice, and sought a basis for the atonement in 'rectoral' considerations. Christ's death was a 'penal example' for the upholding of public law, and the deterring from future sin. The 'Covenant' theology viewed redemption as flowing from a compact between the Divine Persons, in which Christ became surety for the elect, and purchased their salvation by His death in their room.

3. The increasingly mechanical and narrowly legal character which thus tended to be stamped on redemption led, as it was bound to do, to a reaction. Modern theology has been marked, accordingly, by a considerable revolt against every form of satisfaction theory, and by a return, in one form or another, to views more purely ethical.

(1) In certain of these theories Christ's redeeming work is brought mainly under the head of 'revelation.' Its essence lies in His revelation of the character and will of grace of the Father. His death is the culminating point in this revelation, and the supreme test of His fidelity to God in His vocation (thus, e.g., Ritschl).—(2) Bushnell's theory attaches itself specially to the idea of 'sympathy' in Christ, and finds in this the key to His vicarious sufferings. The redeeming quality of Christ's sufferings lies wholly in their moral efficacy. Christ 'simply engages, at the expense of great suffering and even of death itself, to bring us out of our sins themselves, and so out of their penalties' (*Vic. Sac.* pt. i. ch. 1). Later, Bushnell felt the need of doing more justice to the idea of 'propitiation'; but, while allowing that Christ came under the 'penal sanctions' of sin, he still held that these sanctions were 'never punitive, but only coercive and corrective' (*Forg. and Law*, p. 132). But what does 'penal' mean, if not 'punitive'?—(3) A third class of theories lays main emphasis on the surrender to the Father of the 'holy will' of Christ. In this lies the essence of His redeeming sacrifice for humanity (Maurice, F. W. Robertson, Erskine of Linlathen, etc.).—(4) A profounder view, in some respects, is that of M'Leod Campbell, whose ideas have considerably influenced later theology both at home (Moberly) and on the Continent (e.g. Häring). Campbell finds the essence of Christ's atonement in what he calls a 'vicarious repentance' for sin. The language is unfortunate, for, in strictness, no one can 'repent' for another, though he may 'confess' the sin of another, and 'intercede' for that other. The real value of Campbell's theory lies in its attempt to give an

ethical and inward character to Christ's dealing with the wrath of God against sin. He recognizes that sin's guilt, and the reality of the Divine condemnation of sin, cannot be ignored. There is but one way, he holds, in which that condemnation can be met, namely, by entering fully into God's mind regarding sin, and rendering to His judgment upon it a perfect *response*. In his own words, there goes up an ' "Amen" from the depths of the humanity of Christ to the Divine condemnation of sin' (*Atonement*, pp. 117-118). This 'Amen,' in Christ's case, is viewed by him as rendered, not 'in naked existence' (*i.e.* in purely mental realization), but under actual experience of the power of evil, and of death, viewed as including 'the sentence of the law against sin' (*ib.* pp. 259-262). A note is touched here which perhaps takes us very near the heart of the matter.—(5) Moberly's view in his *Atonement and Personality* has affinity with Campbell's, but differs from it in viewing punishment in this life as only disciplinary—chastisement inflicted for the good of the transgressor—and never retributive. [Punishment, however, must be felt to be one's *due*, or it has no good effect]. Punishment in itself does not atone; atonement arises only when the punishment is met by a spirit of perfect contrition. The essence of atonement is 'penitential holiness.' This, it is held with Campbell, is perfectly realized in Christ alone. In Christ is offered a perfect contrition for the sins of the world. But it is offered in Christ only that it may be reproduced in the believer. Great difficulty, on this theory, must be felt to attach to the idea of 'penitence' as an element in Christ's consciousness; besides, it is after all, not Christ's perfect penitence that is held to be the ground of forgiveness, but the spirit of contrition awakened in the believer himself. Christ's work has its value as producing *that*. Forgiveness, it is further taught, is not complete at once, but is proportioned to the degree of penitence; surely not a Scriptural notion.

The result of the total survey will probably be to impress upon us: (a) how defective the best of human theories are to express the whole truth on this great subject; (b) the fact that elements of truth are embraced in nearly all the theories, which a more complete view must endeavour to conserve; and (c) the need of continually reverting from human theories to the original statements in Scripture itself, which, in their breadth, variety, and fulness, refresh and satisfy as nothing else can.

Literature.—Ritschl, *Recht. und Versöhnung*, Bd. ii.; A. B. Davidson, *The Theology of the OT* (viii.-x.); Dillmann, *Alttest. Theol.*; other *Biblical Theologies of OT* (Schultz, Oehler, etc.); Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day* (1902), p. 194 ff.; artt. 'Righteousness,' 'Redemption,' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible; Stevens, *The Theology of the NT*, and *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation* (ethical aspects; rejects penal view).—On NT teaching: Denney, *The Death of Christ*; Walker, *The Cross and Kingdom* ('Sayings of Jesus,' pts. ii. iii.); Scott-Lidgett, *The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement* (ch. iii.); Crawford, *The Atonement* (pt. i.); Dale, *The Atonement* (ii.-vi.); *Bib. Theologies of NT* (Weiss, etc.).—On Christ's work in Redemption: F. D. Maurice,

Theological Essays (vii. 'The Doctrine of Sacrifice'); Bushnell, *The Vicarious Sacrifice, and Forgiveness and Law*; M'Leod Campbell, *The Nature of the Atonement*; D. W. Simon, *The Redemption of Man, and Reconciliation by Incarnation*; Ritschl, *Justification and Reconciliation*, vol. iii.; Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*; Kähler, *Die Lehre von der Versöhnung*; Seeberg, *Der Tod Christi*; Dale, Scott-Lidgett, Walker, Stevens, etc., as above.—On criticism of theories: Ritschl, as above, vol. i.; Crawford, Dale, Scott-Lidgett, Stevens, etc.—On history of doctrine: Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte* [English translation in 7 vols.]; Orr, *Progress of Dogma* (vii.).

James Orr.

☞ Redness Of The Sky

REDNESS OF THE SKY.—When the Pharisees and Sadducees (Mat 16:1 f.) demanded of Christ a sign from heaven (ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ), He replied by reminding them how, when the sky (οὐρανός, Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'heaven') was red at morning or evening, they were able to foretell foul or fair weather, and so showed that they themselves could discern the face of the sky (or the heaven). There is here an insistence on the various meanings of οὐρανός that is lost in the Authorized Version by the introduction of a second word to construe it (see Sky). The 'redness' of the sky is denoted by the verb πυρράζω, *to glow*, literally, *to become fire*. The colour of fire (πυρός) is used for 'red' in Rev 6:4; Rev 12:3. In the LXX Septuagint it stands for the Hebrew אֵשׁ. The consequences of a fiery hue in the sky at morning or evening, due to the condition of the atmospheric medium, is one of the commonest of weather maxims. It is familiarized in various old couplets.

W. S. Kerr.

☞ Reed

REED (κάλαμος).—This represents the Heb. *kaneh*, probably *Arundo donax*, a plant which grows in great abundance in the marshes of the Jordan Valley and along the river sides. The stem is tall and straight, and the head bends gracefully with a great feathery brush, sensitive to the slightest breath of air (Mat 11:7, Luk 7:24). The wood is put to many uses. It forms the frames of the rush mats with which the Arabs

of *el-Hûleh* make their slender houses. It serves as a walking-stick. When bruised, it is not only useless but dangerous; because, giving way when one leans upon it, the splinters are apt to pierce the hand (Mat 12:20). As a mock-sceptre, a reed was put into Christ's hand (Mat 27:29), and with this He was smitten (Mat 27:30). On a reed the sponge with vinegar was raised to His lips on the cross (Mat 27:48). Pens are made from the smaller stems, the Gr. κάλαμος (3Jn 1:13) again corresponding to the Arab. [Note: Arabic.] *kalam* and the Lat. *calamus*. The ancients made the shafts of their arrows from the κάλαμος, and the divining arrow of the Arab. [Note: Arabic.] is also *Kalam*. The flute and pipes played on all occasions of festivity are made from the reed (Mat 11:17, Luk 7:32). Measuring-rods were so uniformly of reed that they came to be known generally by this term (Eze 40:3, Rev 21:15 etc.).

W. Ewing.

☞ Reflectiveness

REFLECTIVENESS.—This is the habit of *bending back* the attention of the mind from action and experience to scrutinize and contemplate the nature and meaning of self and the world. Deep, steady reflectiveness is rare amid the extraordinary preoccupation in business of the modern world which, like briars, chokes the word. The parable of the Sower should help to restore the reflective habit to its high place among the duties and privileges of life (Mat 13:19; Mat 13:22). The refrain, 'Who hath ears to hear, let him hear,' is a direct appeal to the reflective man. The good scribe has thoughts new and old to reflect upon and dilate upon (Mat 13:52). It is the reflective mind that appreciates the absolute truth and varied applicability of the reciprocal principle involved in Mat 7:12 or even Mat 7:4. Nature and experience are full of suggestive facts to reflect upon (Mat 6:26-30; Mat 12:12), God's care for men being greater than for flowers, and His loving-kindness to men exceeding any shepherd's anxiety for his sheep. John the Baptist is told to reflect upon the beneficence of his successor's ministry (Mat 11:4-5). Martha was 'anxious and troubled about many things' from which her more reflective sister Mary was privileged to be free (Luk 10:41). The Virgin Mary herself is a beautiful and pathetic example of fruitful reflectiveness (Luk 2:19; Luk 2:51). Without reflectiveness the Holy Spirit's work of illumination and guidance could scarcely have its full and due fruit (Joh 14:26; Joh 16:13). Reflectiveness is necessary to grasp the lessons of truth as well as to sift error therefrom.

W. B. Frankland.

Reform

REFORM.—There is no mention of this word in the Gospels; the only use of it in the NT is Heb_9:10 ‘until the time of reformation’ (Gr. διόρθωσις). It may be well to note in what sense Jesus may be said to have approved of ‘reform.’ There was much about the State that needed reform. Did He step forward to help it on? The answer must be in the negative. He made no attempt to reform the political abuses of His time, yet by the general strain and spirit of His teaching He assuredly did much to help on society towards such reformation. In His own conduct, we find Jesus submitting to the civil authorities under whom He lived. He refused to be made a king, or a governor, or a judge, or to be involved in any way, however remotely, in political revolution. He was ready rather to die than to be engaged in any such work. When asked about the lawfulness of tribute, He said, ‘Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s, and unto God the things that are God’s’ (Mat_22:21). Although the words may not be pressed to support a doctrine of passive obedience, nor, on the other hand, taken as an incentive to revolution, He probably meant to remind His countrymen that, in return for the benefits of Roman government under which they lived, they might well be expected to share the expense by paying taxes. Again, in Mat_17:27, we find Him providing for the payment of the Temple-tax for Himself and His disciples. He thus submitted to the ordinary ecclesiastical authority, with only a mild protest. Before Pilate, He said, ‘Thou wouldst have no authority against me, except it were given thee from above’ (Joh_19:11). This surely means that all human authority is subject to the higher power of God, who regulates all by His Providence; though it has sometimes been supposed that Jesus thus acknowledged the legitimacy of Pilate’s power.

Jesus cannot be claimed with any justice as a victim on the altar of political reform. Yet it may well be affirmed that His teachings, if carried out by men, would certainly produce a reformed society. His disciples, being good men, would also be good citizens. He gave to the world principles, which have been the fruitful seed of true reform.

As to Christ’s relation to the law of Moses, it may be asked, Did He become a reformer? While declaring that ‘he came not to destroy but to fulfil’ (Mat_5:17), we must believe that, at least, He desired some reform of abuses, which had grown up through the interpretations and applications of the Law, made by scribes and lawyers of the past. Even in regard to the law of divorce, He calls attention to the right spirit of the Mosaic legislation, rather than to the exact letter of the Law (Mat_5:31-32; Mat_19:3 ff., Mar_10:2 ff.). And He treats with indignant scorn those evasions of filial duty, as in the case of the Corban, which had so long been sanctioned by the practice

of Jewish society (Mat 15:3 ff., Mar 7:9 ff.). In regard to such traditional abuses, as well as in regard to the State and general social arrangements, we may say that Jesus rather gave an impulse to reform than engaged actively in any attempt to bring the Law, as understood and practised in His day, into accordance with the eternal law of God.

When asked to consider a question about a disputed inheritance, He refused to be drawn into such quarrels, and bade men beware of a covetous spirit, remembering that man's life does not consist in the abundance of the things he possesses (Luk 12:13 ff.). He believed that by interfering with the Law, even to have justice done, His disciples might do their spiritual life more harm than such action would do good in a temporal aspect. 'Jesus' disciple ought to be able to renounce the pursuit of his rights, and ought to co-operate in forming a nation of brothers, in which justice is done, no longer by the aid of force, but by free obedience to the good, and which is united, not by legal regulations, but by the ministry of love' (Harnack, *What is Christianity?* p. 112). See art. Law.

Literature.—Denney, art. 'Law' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ; R. Mackintosh, *Christ and the Jewish Law; Lux Mundi*, ch. xi. 'Christianity and Politics'; Bruce, *Galilean Gospel*, ch. xi., *Parabolic Teaching*, p. 300 ff.; Dale, *Laws of Christ for Common Life*, ch. xii.; *Expositor*, i. v. [1877] pp. 214 ff., 436 ff.

D. M. W. Laird.

Regeneration

REGENERATION.—Of all theological ideas, regeneration is probably that which has had the most unfortunate history. The figure is an apt and obvious one to express the completeness of the change which takes place when the non-Christian becomes a Christian; but it is tempting to press it, and it has been pressed in the most inconsiderate fashion. As the beginning of Christian life (it is argued), it must be antecedent to every Christian experience; faith, justification, conversion are, strictly speaking, its fruits. As a new birth, man can no more contribute to it than to his first birth, and hence must be regarded in it as purely passive, not acting or co-operating with God. As there is no middle state between being dead and being alive, it must be conceived as instantaneous; and so on. We can see the motives in such a mode of thought, but it is full of delusions. Perhaps they have influenced Reformed theology more than Lutheran; yet, while the Lutherans were more conscious of the figure in regeneration, the Reformed were guided by the justifiable desire to give faith a real

basis in the believer,—to lay an act of God, as the only sure foundation, at the basis of the whole experience of salvation.

The word ‘regeneration’ occurs in Authorized Version only in Mat_19:28, Tit_3:5 (παλιγγενεσία), and the figure of a new or second birth is most distinctly expressed in our Lord’s conversation with Nicodemus, John 3 (γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν). But as the first of these passages is eschatological, and refers to the new world which is introduced with the παρουσία of the Son of Man, while the two others belong to the latest in the NT, it is not convenient to start with them. To see the real basis for the figure of the new birth, it is necessary to go back to the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptics, and to look at it in its substance and not merely in its formal expression. What the figure conveys, vividly and truly, is the idea that somehow a man has become another man: he has entered into a new order of being; things once real to him have lost reality; things once unknown are now alone real. If we find this idea in the teaching of Jesus, we find what is meant by regeneration, even though that figure should not expressly appear.

1. Our Lord’s teaching.—It cannot be questioned that the idea of the newness or originality of His work, and of all that depended upon it, was familiar to Jesus. Without accepting the doctrine that the Kingdom of God, as He conceived it, was purely transcendent,—a new world not spiritually evolved from the present, but supernaturally descending upon it,—we must believe that however it came, and however it was related to the present, the Kingdom introduced an order of things which was entirely new. It was itself, in a comprehensive sense, a παλιγγενεσία (Mat_19:28). (On this word see the excellent article on ‘Regeneration’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible, by Dr. Vernon Bartlet). But everything connected with it, involved in it, or leading up to it, awoke in the mind the same sense of newness. In spite, for example, of our Lord’s feeling of the continuity of His work with the OT (‘I came not to destroy, but to fulfil,’ Mat_5:17), He has the equally strong feeling that with the time of fulfilment a new era has dawned (‘The law and the prophets were until John: from that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every one presses into it,’ Luk_16:16). The newness is so complete, the distinction is so great, that the least in the Kingdom of God is greater than the greatest in the old dispensation (Mat_11:11). The same truth underlies all the passages in which Jesus claims for Himself absolute significance in determining the relations of God and man. Of these the most explicit is Mat_11:27. Jesus alone reveals the Father, and the man who knows the Father is no longer the same man. No words could be too strong to tell how completely he is another. This absolute significance of Jesus is the sum and substance of His self-revelation (cf. Mat_16:13 ff.); and the truth of ‘regeneration’ is an immediate inference from it. Further, though it is not put expressly in this form in the

Synoptics, the ‘newness,’ which is the point to be emphasized, does break through in various ways. We see it in the parables of the New Patch on the Old Garment and the New Wine in the Old Bottles (Mar_2:21 f. ||). We see it in the new spiritual liberty which Jesus in Mat_17:24-27 claims for Himself and those who through Him become children of the Kingdom. We see it especially in the words at the Supper; for there is no doubt that Mt. and Lk. give at least the thought that was in His mind when they speak of the new covenant based on His blood (Mat_26:28 D, Luk_22:20). It deserves special mention, too, that in all the Synoptics (Mar_14:25, Mat_26:29, Luk_22:16-18) the thought of the new covenant carries the mind forward to the new world in which it is to be consummated; the new religious relation to God, determined by Christ and His death, cannot be fully realized apart from immortality. The inward regeneration of the soul (so to speak) is part of the ἀποκατάστασις πάντων, or of the παλιγγενεσία in the sense of Mat_19:28. But to use the term ‘regeneration’ here is to anticipate. We have not found any suggestion of it in the words of Jesus, and, in point of fact, the only such suggestion to be found in the Synoptics is Mat_18:3 ‘Verily I say unto you, Except ye turn (ἐὰν μὴ στραφῆτε), and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven’ (cf. Mar_10:15). To become as a little child is really to be born again; it is what this figure of a new birth properly means, and it is the only key to it which the words of Jesus yield. In the words of Jesus, evidently, it describes a moral requirement; it is something He demands from those who would be His disciples and enter the Kingdom, and it is achieved through ‘turning.’ The context defines what ‘turning’ means. It means giving up ambition, pride, self-seeking, by ends in religion, and other unchildlike tempers; it is, in short, identical with what is elsewhere in the Synoptics called μετάνοια, or repentance. It is through this moral change, the responsibility for which is laid upon man, that he becomes as a little child, that is, is born again.

It should be remarked, in passing, that John never uses μετάνοια or στρέθροισθαι in the moral sense (except in the quotation from LXX Septuagint at Joh_12:40), and that the Synoptists never use ‘regeneration’ of the individual, or speak of a new birth (except by the allusion in Mat_18:3); but it is one and the same experience which they respectively describe by these terms. When that experience is regarded from the side of God, as something due to His grace or Spirit, it is called *regeneration*, a being born again, from above, of God; when it is regarded from the side of man, as an experience the responsibility for which lies with him, it is called *repentance*. But we have no meaning or substance to put into either of these terms which does not equally belong to the other.

Perhaps another approach to the figure of regeneration (though that of resurrection is equally obvious) may be recognized in the passages in which Jesus speaks of the sinful

life as death, and of recovery from it as a return to or entrance into life. There are two of these in the Synoptics (Mat_8:22 || Luk_15:24; Luk_15:32): obviously the emphasis in both is moral, not metaphysical. A change of character is in view, which, however deep and far-reaching, raises none but moral problems. More important, however, than these are the passages in which our Lord teaches that the new or higher life—the regenerate life, to call it so—can be won only through the sacrifice of a lower life. In other words, to have the life which is life indeed, we must surrender the other; we must die to nature in order to live to God. We must renounce self (*ἀπαρνῆσασθαι ἑαυτόν*: a new and radical idea, without formal analogy in the OT) if we are to share in the life of the Kingdom. The man who refuses to do so, who cannot find it in him to do violence to nature, is incapable of discipleship and of the life which is life indeed. This is the burden of our Lord's teaching in such passages as Mat_16:24 ff. || Mat_10:39, Mat_18:8 f. ||, Luk_14:25 ff. It contains all that is meant by regeneration, but it does not use that figure to express it. And again it is all within ethical limits.

2. Pauline Epistles.—The Book of Acts is a picture of the regenerate life in its workings in the Church, but it is not specially so conceived. At Pentecost what we see is rather *a* new birth than *the* new birth of the Apostles. The Spirit is not so much the author of regeneration as the source of the peculiar gifts and powers of believers. But the newness of Christianity is nowhere more strongly felt and expressed than in this book. It brings us directly to St. Paul. The Apostle of the Gentiles became a Christian in a way which must have impressed him profoundly with the difference between the Christian life and that of the pre-Christian state. No one could say with greater truth than he, 'I am now another man.' But in him the change took place in a way which was in the highest degree startling and abnormal; it could not possibly suggest to him anything so natural as being born; and it agrees with this that, though no one has a more adequate sense than St. Paul of the absolute newness of the Christian life, he never uses the figure of regeneration to convey this. He speaks of the new covenant of which he is a minister (2Co_3:6), of the new creature (*καινή κτίσις*, 2Co_5:17, Gal_6:15) which he has become, of the new world in which he lives (2Co_5:17), of the new man who has been created according to God in righteousness and holiness of truth (Eph_4:24), and who is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of Him that created him (Col_3:10); he speaks also of being transformed by renewal of the mind (Rom_12:2), and (if Tit_3:5 be his) of a renewal wrought by the Holy Spirit at baptism; of walking in newness of life (Rom_6:4), and serving God in newness of spirit (Rom_7:6); but he never speaks formally of being born again. Even when he contrasts the past and the present as death and life, the life is not conceived as coming by birth, but either by a creative act of God analogous to that by which at first He commanded light into being out of darkness (2Co_4:6), or by an exercise of the same

almighty power with which God wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead, and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places (Eph 1:20 ff; Eph 2:1; Eph 2:5): when we were dead in trespasses He quickened us together with Him. It is essentially the same change which Paul represents elsewhere as translation from the tyranny of darkness to the Kingdom of God's dear Son (Col 1:13), or from the state of condemnation to that of justification, or from life after the flesh to life after the Spirit (Ro. Gal. *passim*), or, in more mystical or metaphysical fashion, from being in Adam to being in Christ: see esp. Rom 5:12-21, 1Co 15:45 ff. It is not necessary here to discuss what is called Paul's psychology, as though he had such a thing in the sense of modern mental philosophy; he has really no psychology; he knows what he was, and he knows what he is, in the way of moral experiences, and he generalizes his past and his present into the conceptions of the natural and the spiritual man, the ψυχικός and the πνευματικός. Every man in himself is ψυχικός, a descendant and representative of Adam; every man has through the gospel the opportunity of becoming πνευματικός, a child of God and representative of Christ. But, as has been already pointed out, Paul never uses the figure of a birth to elucidate or make intelligible the process of this change. He approaches the figure indeed in two different ways. On the one hand, he speaks of himself as the father of those who receive the new life of the gospel through his ministry: 'in Christ Jesus have I begotten you through the gospel' (1Co 4:15; cf. Gal 4:19, 1Ti 1:2 'my true child in the faith'). On the other, he speaks of the spirit in virtue of which men are πνευματικοί, and walk in newness of life, as specifically the spirit of sonship (υιοθεσία), by which men are made to be, and are identified as, children of God. It is usually the dignity and privileges of this relation to God on which Paul lays stress, and these are suggested by υἱός; but he has also the sense of the kinship to God which it involves, and this is expressed by τέκνον. The latter, though relatively infrequent, occurs in passages so characteristic that we can say that Paul was no stranger to that intimate sense of kinship to God which is so notable in the Johannine type of Christianity (Rom 8:16-21, Eph 5:1).

There are two points of contact between the Pauline presentation of truth on this subject, and that which we have found in our Lord's teaching, which require to be emphasized. (1) There is in both the same outlook to immortality; the Spirit in Paul which makes men children of God is also the earnest of a life which vanquishes death (Rom 8:11, 2Co 5:4 f., Eph 1:13 f.). Indeed, the new life is often identified with the resurrection life of Jesus in such a way that the present spiritual experience of it seems rather a deduction from that transcendent possession than something having an independent existence of its own. This applies, e.g., to Rom 6:1-11, Eph 2:1-5. In the

gospel, and in the experience of the Christian, there is the revelation at once of ζωή and ἀφθαρσία (2Ti 1:10). (2) There is in both our Lord and St. Paul the same idea that the new life is entered on through a death. 'Our old man was crucified with Christ' (Rom 6:6), and it is through that crucifixion that the new man comes into being (compare what is said above, § 1 *ad fin.*). It is one process, one experience, in man, in which the Adam dies and the Christ comes to be. In Paul the process is normally connected with baptism, and in view of Rom 6:2 ff., Col 2:11-13 it is not easy to maintain that Paul could not have written 'the laver of regeneration, and of renewing wrought by the Holy Spirit' (Tit 3:5). No doubt it is against the Pauline origin of the last phrase that it introduces the figure of regeneration which is so conspicuously wanting in the undoubted Epistles. When St. Paul spoke of baptism, however, as involving men in the death and resurrection of Jesus,—making them mysteriously participant in all that was meant by both, a death to sin and a life to God, with the assurance of immortality at the heart of it,—he was not thinking of baptism as a sacrament which produced these effects as an *opus operatum*. He could think of it only as he knew it, that is, as an ordinance administered to people confessing their sins and accepting the love of God in Christ,—an ordinance that gathered into it the whole meaning of Christianity, and in a high and solemn hour raised to its height the Christian's sense of what it is *to be* a Christian. He says expressly in Col 2:12 that in this ordinance we are raised with Christ '*through faith in the working of God who raised him from the dead.*' The same holds of Rom 6:2 ff. Baptism there is a picture of what is meant by the faith which looks to a dead, buried, and risen Saviour as its one object; in faith we identify ourselves with Christ in all these aspects, and so are taken out of the region to which sin belongs: this is what baptism shows even to the malignant or unintelligent persons who carped at Paul's gospel of salvation by faith alone. The sacrament, as St. Paul was accustomed to it, shut the mouth of anybody who denied that the Christian life rested on a death to sin; and in guarding this fundamental truth it guarded (as we have seen) one of the primary teachings of Jesus. It is an immediate inference from all this that when we ask whether any particular passage in Paul—say Rom 7:14-25—applies to the regenerate or the unregenerate man, we are asking a question which the Apostle himself does not formally enable us to answer. He does not think of his experience in terms of regenerate and unregenerate. He can speak of the old man and the new, of the natural and the spiritual, of being under law and under grace, in Adam and in Christ, dead to sin and alive to God, and so on; but the distinction between the states is moral rather than metaphysical, and it is in doctrine rather than experience that it is absolute. One personality subsists through all experiences, all changes of state; nature, or the old man, is not extinct even in those who are in Christ and have the earnest of the Spirit; and though St. Paul, like all religious teachers, often speaks absolutely, not telling his converts to be what they should be, but to be what as Christians they are, he does not allow the religious interest to engulf the moral. It is to men *dead* in Christ, whose old

man has been crucified with Him, that he says, '*Put to death* your members that are on the earth' (Col 3:5), '*Reckon yourselves to be dead* unto sin' (Rom 6:11). Experience is not a quantum but a process, and in the life of a spiritual being it cannot be dated; the things that in a sense happened twenty years ago are also present experiences, and it may be only now that we are discovering their real meaning. This holds especially of such generalized experiences as are embodied in the passage referred to. Only the new man, who by becoming such has learned what the life of the old man meant, could have written it, but it is unreal to say that it is the experience of either, to the exclusion of the other. The new man understands it better than anybody, but the fact that everybody understands it in some degree is the evidence that all men are capable of the experience it describes.

3. Catholic Epistles.—We find the idea of regeneration both in James and 1 Peter. In Ja. (Jam 1:18) God is the author of it, Christians its subjects, and 'the word of truth' the instrument. We are reminded here of the parables in which the word of God—that is, the gospel—is spoken of as a seed, and of 1Co 4:19, though in James it is the will of God and not the ministry of an Apostle to which the new birth is referred. When James contemplates Christians thus begotten as a kind of first-fruits of God's creatures, he has apparently in view the universal *παλιγγενεσία* of Mat 19:28. The regeneration of individual men has the promise in it of new heavens and a new earth. There is a similar connexion of ideas in Rom 8:21 ff. Peter, who uses twice (1Pe 1:3; 1Pe 1:23) the word which is exactly rendered by regenerate (*ἀναγεννᾶν*), connects the experience which he so describes first with the resurrection of Christ, and then with the incorruptible seed which he identifies with the word of God—the gospel message which has been delivered to his hearers. The first brings him closely into line with Paul: the new life is distinctively life in the power of Christ's resurrection, a living hope which has an incorruptible inheritance in view (cf. 1Pe 1:3 and Rom 6:4 f.). This resurrection life is, of course, ethical, because it is Divine, but its ethical character is more explicitly secured by reference to the incorruptible seed from which it springs. 'Love one another from the heart fervently, having been born again,' etc. (1Pe 1:22 f.). The figure is continued in 1Pe 2:1 f., where the readers are exhorted (precisely as in Eph 4:22) to 'put off' all that was characteristic of their former life, and as 'newborn babes' to desire the spiritual milk which is without guile. Another parallel to Paul (and to our Lord) in making the new life rest on death to the old is found in 1Pe 4:1 f.; but though the reality is the same, the figure differs.

4. Johannine writings.—It is in the Fourth Gospel and 1 Jn. that the figure of a new birth is most frequent and explicit. John does not indeed use *ἀναγεννάω*, but he says *γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν* (Joh 3:3; Joh 3:7); he speaks nine times in the 1st Ep. of being born of God (*ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ*), and twice in the Gospel and four times in the 1st Ep. of

children of God (τέκνα θεοῦ). The fundamental passage here is that in John 3, in which Jesus explains the new birth to Nicodemus. No experience is described or demanded in it which has not already come before us independently; the new birth is only a new figure which gives vivid and suggestive expression to a truth which Jesus Himself in the Synoptic record, and the Apostles in their writings, have already expressed in other forms. It may fairly be argued, when we look to the general relation of the discourses in the Fourth Gospel to the indisputable words of Jesus, that the real text of this discourse is Mat 18:3. The Evangelist is guided by the Spirit of truth into all the truth of this apparently simple saying (Joh 16:13); he universalizes it, and sets it in the various relations which bring out its meaning; he shows the necessity of the new birth, the method of it (so far as experience enabled him to do so), and the seat of the power which produced it. But he gives no description of its contents—no analysis of it as an experience—which enables us to put more into it than we put into ‘turning and becoming as little children,’ or into ‘dying to sin and living to God,’ or into ‘putting off the old man and putting on the new.’ He does indeed put in the most general form the necessity for the new birth when he says, ‘that which is born of the flesh is flesh.’ This does not mean that human nature is essentially or totally depraved; it means that that which is natural is not *ipso facto* spiritual; it is not what we get from our fathers and mothers which enables us to appreciate Christ, or to enter God’s Kingdom; it is something which we can get only from God. This is the same truth as St. Paul teaches in 1Co 15:45 ff. ‘That is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual.’ The birth by which man enters into relations with the natural world has an analogue in the experience by which he enters into relations with the spiritual world. It, too, is a birth—which is variously described as a second birth, or a birth from above, a being born of God, or of the Spirit, or of water and spirit. It cannot be denied that in generalizing the necessity for the second birth, the Evangelist passes from the safe and intelligible moral ground of Mat 18:3 into a more metaphysical region (as St. Paul also does in 1Co 15:45 ff.); but in the circumstances this is not of much consequence. What St. Paul means by τὸ ψυχικόν and St. John by τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τῆς σαρκός is not any metaphysical abstraction, but human beings as they are encountered in the world; and it needs no argument that they must become other than they are, through and through, if they are to dwell with God. It needs no argument, either, that they cannot make themselves other than they are. To be born again they must be born of a power which comes from above, and that power—as the whole experience of his life taught St. John, and had taught St. Paul before him—was the power of the Spirit. To be born again is to be born of God. When the truth is put in this way—in what we may call without offence the onesidedly religious way—its mysteriousness is apparent. The action of God through which the new life emerges in men cannot be prescribed or calculated; it is as unquestionable in its effects as His action in nature, but there is something in it which eludes control. The sense of this underlies all the predestinarian

passages in both St. John and St. Paul, but, of course, these are not to be read alone. We should completely misrepresent both Apostles if we supposed that their sense of dependence upon God for being the new men they were impaired their sense of responsibility in this relation. The mind is apt, and perhaps the feeble or insincere mind is glad, to escape from the moral to the metaphysical, from Mat_18:3 to Joh_3:6; there is more to talk about and less to do; but there is no ground for bringing this charge against the Apostles. St. John's interest in this passage is not in the earthly truth (Joh_3:12) of the necessity of regeneration—it needs no revelation from above to make that plain; bitter experience teaches it to all men; his interest is in the possibility and the method of regeneration, the heavenly truths which only Jesus can reveal. The new birth is a birth of water and spirit (Joh_3:6): in other words, it is a birth which is realized through Christian baptism. That the Spirit is the important matter appears from the fact that the water is mentioned only once, and then the Spirit alone (Joh_3:6; Joh_3:8). Here, as in the case of St. Paul (see above), baptism must be taken in the whole circumstances and conditions in which it was familiar to the Evangelist. It was not the baptism of unconscious infants, but that of penitent and confessing believers. The importance of it in this passage is seen when we look on to Joh_3:14 f. The heavenly truth (Joh_3:12) of the passage is that the power through which men are born again is lodged in the Son of Man lifted up as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness. The baptism through which the new birth comes is baptism in His name—baptism, as in Romans 6, into His death and resurrection—baptism which means the believing abandonment of the soul to the love of God revealed in that strange 'uplifting' which includes both the cross and the throne, a believing abandonment for which man's responsibility is complete, and the refusal of which is the only fatal sin (Joh_3:36). When we realize that this is the connexion of ideas in the conversation with Nicodemus, we see that it falls into line with the teaching of St. Paul, entirely so far as its substance is concerned, and even in form more nearly than is at first apparent; while the teaching of both Apostles is securely based at once on their experience as Christians and on thoroughly attested words of Jesus.

It is as easy with regard to St. John as with regard to St. Paul to ask questions connected with his doctrine of regeneration to which he himself does not afford any answer. Thus the new birth is made dependent somehow on baptism; but it has been argued that in Joh_1:12 f. 'children of God' are spoken of, who were 'born of God,' before the Incarnation, and that in Joh_11:52 'children of God' are spoken of as 'scattered throughout the world' who are to be gathered into one by the death of Jesus. As to the first of these passages, the interpretation which refers it to the ages before the Incarnation seems to the writer more than doubtful, but in any case the Logos doctrine is a way of expressing the truth that the meaning and power of the Incarnation and Passion are independent of time. In the second passage 'children of God' is probably prophetic; there are men everywhere who will yet gather round the

cross of Jesus, and by the power which descends from it into their souls be born again as τέκνα θεοῦ. Another kind of question with regard to those who are born of God is raised by some passages in the 1st Epistle. In 1Jn 1:8 it is said of Christians, 'If we say that we have not sin, we deceive ourselves,' and in 1Jn 1:10 'If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar.' But in 1Jn 3:9 we read, 'Every one that is born of God doth not sin, for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he has been born of God.' This is in another form the same difficulty as we encounter in St. Paul when he says in one breath, 'Ye are dead,' and in the next, 'Put to death, therefore'; or when we try to tell whether any given spiritual experience is that of the regenerate or the unregenerate man. The regenerate and the unregenerate man, for better or worse, cannot be separated in this summary way. The practical interest of the Apostles compels us to interpret them everywhere through experiences that we can understand; hence it is vain to seek in them any suggestion of what regeneration can mean in the case of baptized infants. There is no indication in the NT that they ever contemplated any such case. Regeneration is a moral experience regarded as the work of God, and repentance is the same moral experience regarded from the side of man; but in neither the one aspect nor the other can we speak of it in the case of beings who have as yet no moral experience at all.

Regeneration is not an exclusively NT idea, and those who regard NT Christianity as a kind of religious syncretism have sought the key to some of its ideas, its terminology, and its rites, especially where this doctrine and its sacramental connexions are concerned, in the Greek and Oriental mysteries which were so popular in the Roman Empire during the first two or three centuries of our era. That powerful influences from these sources—especially, perhaps, from the religion of Mithras—did at a certain period tell upon popular Christianity, cannot be questioned; but the period was not the creative one for Christianity, and the channel of these influences was not Jewish Apostles who held every kind of pagan religion in horror. The writer is convinced that there is nothing in the NT, either about the new birth or about baptism, which cannot be explained from experiences specifically and exclusively Christian; and that to drag in the *Taurobolium*, and the *renatus in æternum* of Mithraic monumental inscriptions, to explain NT ideas, while ignoring the historical connexions which these ideas assert for themselves, is mere wantonness.

Literature.—The works on NT Theology (Holtzmann, Weiss, Stevens); books mentioned under the article Holy Spirit; Gennrich, *Die Lehre von der Wiedergeburt*; Kaftan, *Dogmatik*, §§ 54, 55; Kähler, *Die Wissenschaft der christlichen Lehre*, 493 ff.; Orr, *God's Image in Man*, 278 f.; Ritschl, *Rechtfertigung u. Versöhnung*, iii. § 61; W. N. Clarke, *Outline of Chr. Theol.* 395; Laidlaw, *Bible Doct. of Man*, chs. xiii. xiv.; Denney in *Expositor*, Oct. and Dec. 1901. For kindred ideas in other religions, see Anrich, *Das*

antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum; Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*; Reitzenstein, *Poimandres* (s.v. παλιγγενεσία in Index).

James Denney.

☩ Rehoboam

REHOBOAM.—Son of Solomon, mentioned as a link in our Lord's genealogy (Mat_1:7).

☩ Rejection

REJECTION.—The word 'rejection' does not occur in the Gospels, but the idea of 'casting-off, despising, rejecting' is familiar to the writers of the NT. Mat_21:42, under the figure of the cornerstone, refers to the rejection of Jesus by the Jews; and in Mar_12:10 and Luk_20:17 the same reference occurs. Jesus knew that He would be rejected, and anticipated the result to Himself (Mar_8:31, Luk_9:22; Luk_17:25), to the Jewish nation (Luk_19:43), and to the world (Joh_12:48). Regarding Himself as a prophet, He expected a prophet's treatment (Luk_13:33-34, Mat_23:37). Jesus regarded Himself as the test applied to nations and individuals, and according to their acceptance or rejection of Him would be their progress or decay. When the Jews rejected Jesus, they wrote their own sentence of doom, while the Gentiles who have accepted Jesus have secured the leadership of the world. As the national rejection of Jesus was attended by national disaster, so the individual rejection is marked by loss of character. See also art. Despise.

Coll. A. Macdonald.

☩ Religion

RELIGION.—The Lat. word *religio* did not come into Christian usage until in the 4th cent. Lactantius (*Instit.* iv. 28) wrote, 'Religion is the link which unites man to God.' The reason was that the implications of the word were altogether external, and, in accordance with the Roman genius, almost administrative. But the Greeks were equally unable to supply a word which would correspond with the Christian faith and its fruits. θρησκεία, translation 'religion' in Act_26:5 and Jam_1:26 f., was also spiritually threadbare, and suggested nothing more than the ceremonial side of public

worship. With this history behind the word, religion has come to be a complex conception; but for the present purpose it may perhaps be defined as the soul's response to the spiritual revelation by which it is illumined, kindled, and moved. With some the revelation does not pass beyond the mind, with others it calls for little more than an indulgence of feeling, with others, again, it brings out only a discipline of obedience. But in true religion all three elements are present. 'It includes the whole energy of man as reasonable spirit' (Fairbairn, *Phil. [Note: Philistine.] of Religion*, p. 201). The key-words of religion then are: (1) revelation, (2) response.

1. Religion as revelation.—The quality of the response depends on the character of the *revelation*. Religion must always mean something different from what it was before the revelation of grace and truth which came by Jesus Christ. Of what that consisted will appear later. Meantime it might be noted that the factor of revelation has been minimized in the workings of thought during the last two centuries, in reaction, no doubt, from the emphasis on external authority, not only in the Catholic Church, but in older theology generally. On the one hand, in the 18th cent. there was, if one may say so, an artificial construction of 'natural' religion, in which Christ was put out of court. On the other hand, in the 19th cent. the rise of psychological and humanitarian interests has created a tendency to lose the revelation in the response. Thus Schleiermacher in his *Reden über die Religion* has nothing to say on religious authority, and in a chapter on the nature of religion practically identifies revelation with intuition and original feeling (p. 89). Ritschl, again, in his theory of value-judgments, throws the weight of authority on the soul's response; while Sabatier, in his beautiful study of the genesis of religion, speaks of the spirit attaching itself to its principle, and seems also liable to the dangers of subjectivity (*Outlines of Phil. [Note: Philistine.] of Rel.* p. 28). The alteration of standpoint is thus expressed by F. D. Maurice (*Life*, i. p. 340):

'The difficulty in our day is to believe in a revelation as our fathers did.... Our mind's bear a stronger witness than the minds of our forefathers did to the idea of a revelation: so strong a witness, that we think it must have originated in them. We cannot think it possible that God has actually manifested Himself to us, *because* the sense of a manifestation is so near to us that we think it is only our sense, and has no reality corresponding to it.'

But no good end is served by minimizing that side of religion that is 'not ourselves.' For although, as Oman so well shows (*Vision and Authority*, p. 81), 'the supreme religious fact is the individual whose capacity of vision is the channel of authority,' yet if truth is ultimately one, it must proceed by way of revelation from some objective source. 'Faith,' says Dorner (*Syst. of Chr. Doctrine*, i. p. 133), 'does not wish to become a mere relation to itself, or to its representation and thought. That

would be simply a monologue: faith desires a dialogue.’ See, further, art. Fact and Theory.

Now, revelation finds its way to the soul both mediately and immediately. And it is essential to give due consideration to both these channels of religious authority. Jesus Christ, who is the norm of religion as well as the focus of revelation, made use of both. It must not be overlooked that He took over without hesitation the general conception of God’s nature, kingdom, and law which He inherited from the teaching of home (Luk 2:51), synagogue (Luk 4:16), and Scriptures. The OT provided Him not only with illustrations of His own original thought (Mat 12:39-42, Luk 4:25-27), but with canons of judgment and standards of authority (Mat 5:18), and even with personal assurance in the time of moral temptation (Mat 4:4; Mat 4:7; Mat 4:10) and of mortal weakness (Mat 27:46, Luk 23:46). But this attitude of our Lord must not be misunderstood. In leaning on the Word of God in the Scriptures of His people, He was not compromising the Church on critical questions. Moreover, it cannot be affirmed that He gave any guarantee of an infallible book. On the contrary, He handled it with perfect freedom, treating it as a guide but not as a goal (Mat 5:21 ff.). Its validity for Him, as for us, lay in its being the chosen testimony of those who gave the best response that was in them to the revelation they received, and so became witnesses of the truth.* [Note: The communication of religion, says Schleiermacher (op. cit. p. 150), is not to be sought in books. In this medium, too, much of the pure impression of the original production is lost.]

So far our Lord behaved Himself as the ‘root and offspring of David.’ But He was also ‘the bright and morning star.’ And religion was His by a revelation that was immediate, as well as by that which was mediated. Into the secrets of His sublime self-consciousness as the beloved Son of God and one with the Father we cannot penetrate. But His words are before us, with all their august claim: ‘It was said by them of old, ... but *I* say unto you’ (Mat 5:21 f. etc.); ‘Ye search the Scriptures, ... but ye will not come to *me*,’ etc. (Joh 5:39 f). The immediacy of revelation to Him is fully declared in Mat 11:27 ‘All things are delivered unto me of my Father, and no one knoweth the Son save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him.’ None has ever challenged that solitary claim. Yet it is notable that our Lord did not shut up His followers to a revelation that is mediated even through His own blessed words.

‘Christ found men everywhere ready to receive Him as a Rabbi. On the authority of other people they would accept anything. But He insisted on basing what He taught on the authority of their own hearts and consciences. To this end He spoke in parables that they might not understand on any other conditions’ (Oman, *Vision and Authority*, p. 104).

And it is for us to remember that Christ has not left us His revelation, as it were, on deposit. The partial records of His life, first in the flesh and then in the spirit, which are ours through the NT, are certainly means whereby the Divine grace and truth are mediated to us, providing, indeed, our canon of spiritual judgment. But we are to trust also to the immediacy of Divine access to our minds, knowing that there is a Spirit to lead us into all the truth, enabling us to judge all things and approve those that are excellent (Joh 16:13, 1Co 2:15, Php 1:10).* [Note: 'Not every person has religion who believes in a sacred writing, but only the man who has a lively and immediate understanding of it, and who therefore, so far as he himself is concerned, could most easily do without it' (Schleiermacher, op. cit. p. 91).] Thus Christianity is like an ever new commandment, being true in Him and in us (1Jn 2:8). See, further, art. Revelation.

2. Religion as response.—The primary *response* to the revelation of God may be said to run on three lines, the sense of (a) dependence, (b) estrangement, (c) obligation.

(a) The soul's response in a sense of *dependence*. The soul, when it comes to itself, finds itself solitary and orphaned. The issues of life run up into eternity, and the soul first proves it is awakened by crying out for the living God. The fact that man is a spiritual being soon asserts itself in the life that is not wholly preoccupied with things temporal. In the words of St. Augustine (*Confess.*), 'Thou hast made us for Thyself, and our heart is restless until it find its rest in Thee.' Thus begins a 'commerce, a conscious and willed relation, into which the soul in distress enters with the mysterious power on which it feels that it and its destiny depend' (Sabatier, *Outlines*, p. 27). This need of security and rest is perfectly met by Christ. He satisfies the soul's sense of dependence by drawing it to Himself. In His Divine Personality men find their long-sought God. To the soul once awakened there is no resting-place except in the eternal Christ, 'the same yesterday and to-day and for ever.'

'Holding His hand, my steadied feet

May walk the air, the seas;

On life and death His smile falls sweet,

Lights up all mysteries.

Stranger nor exile can I be

In new worlds where He leadeth me.'

(b) A second primary response of the soul in religion is a sense of sin, or *separation*. Religion has found expression in sacrifices on account of the well-nigh universal instinct that something must be offered in order to avert the wrath or unkindness of the Deity, or at least to restore happy relations between the worshipper and the world that is beyond his control. Whether they were originally offered in fear of malevolent deities, or in commemoration of the ghosts of the departed, or to renew the covenant of a tribe with its proper deity, does not greatly matter. Suffice it that the sacrifice is intended to restore communion with God in such a way that in the place of guilt and fear there may come a sense of favour through prosperity and peace.

This strong sense of a separateness that may be bridged is more or less efficient in all human response to the Unseen, and is the basis on which the higher religions rest. The danger is that the interest may run out towards the material sacrifice and its attendant rites in such a way that the end is forgotten in the means. But here Christ meets the supreme need of reconciliation in the only worthy way conceivable. On the cross the soul's reliance can be securely planted. It so suffices that all other sacrifices can only be put aside as mistaken, superfluous, and vain ([Heb_13:15](#)), unless they are the sacrifices of empty hands and a full heart.

(c) There is a third primary strand of religion in the sense of *obligation*, by which the soul is brought under a supreme law and purpose. There is a constraining influence in all religion, in addition to the feeling of dependence and the sense of estrangement. Religion really begins for us, says Lotze, 'with a feeling of duty' (*Phil. [Note: Philistine.] of Religion*, p. 150). It involves a committal of the life, the framing of its career on lines that often lie athwart the obvious advantages of life. The Indian fakir or Buddhist monk is moved strongly by this sense of obligation, and observes conditions of consecration even to the crippling of his life. But here, again, the faith of Jesus Christ fulfils this need of the soul in a way that liberates and enlarges it. He made that absolute claim on the soul's affection and the life's service to which so many have thankfully responded. He knew human nature too well to ask for a partial surrender, and an obedience in outward things which is hard and toilsome. But His yoke is easy, because it brings the whole life, love, and strength under contribution to a reasonable service; so that 'I ought' is transmuted into 'I must,' and the struggling life of division becomes the soaring life of dedication. And as *prayer* is the expression of the sense of dependence, and *sacrifice* of the consciousness of estrangement, so the *sacrament* is the symbol of the sense of obligation.

3. True religion embodied in Jesus Christ.—It is evident from this brief analysis of religion on its responsive side, that Christ has the key to all its intimacies, because the meanings of religion are consummated in Himself. The religion which we believe to be universal and everlasting in its character is just the fuller knowledge and

obedience of Christ. He is His own religion, and therefore He not only harmonizes the various *feelings* of religion, as we have just seen, by satisfying the desire for security, for reconciliation, and for authority, but He also brings into unity its various *forms*. There are three chief forms which religion has taken, corresponding to the emotional, intellectual, and volitional elements in human nature: (a) the *ritual* side of religion, presided over by the priests, (b) the *speculative* side, represented by the theologians and philosophers, and (c) the *legal* or customary side, typified by the office of the scribes. All these departments are resolved in the NT into the headship and hegemony of Christ. He did not incorporate His religion in a hierarchic order (as with the Buddhists), or in philosophical books (as with the Brahmans), or in codes and customs (as with the Confucians and Muhammadans). He is Himself the Way, the Truth, and the Life (Joh 14:6) for all humanity.

(a) Christ is the perfect expression of the Temple symbolism (Heb 9:11 f.). His name is the shrine (Mat 18:20, cf. 2Co 5:17); His will is the altar (Mat 25:40, cf. 2Co 8:5). In His self-surrender He is the sacrifice (Mat 26:36 ff., cf. Heb 10:10); in His self-manifestation He is the priest (Mat 11:27, Joh 14:6). 'Having then a great high priest, who hath passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our confession ... let us draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace' (Heb 4:14; Heb 4:16). (b) Christ is also the final secret of revelation. The Spirit's work was to be focussed on Himself (Joh 16:14 f.), for to know Him is to know the Father (Joh 14:9), and that is life eternal (Joh 17:3). This is a wisdom that the rulers of this world never knew (1Co 2:6 ff.), though prophets and kings have desired to look into it (Luk 10:24). For the mystery of God is Christ, in whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge (Col 2:3). (c) Christ is, moreover, 'the end of the law unto righteousness to everyone that believeth' (Rom 10:4). His spirit of love is a law of liberty to His disciples (Joh 13:17; Joh 15:14, cf. Jam 1:23). Keeping the commandments is consummated in following Him (Mar 10:21), *i.e.* walking in love (Eph 5:1 f.); for love is the fulfilling of law (Rom 13:10) and solves the complicated problems of social life (Rom 14:18).

The three provinces of religious manifestation correspond with the three primary sensibilities of the religious life. The religious philosopher seeks to rationalize the consciousness of dependence on some theistic basis. The priest comes into being through the urgent need of reconciliation. The scribe meets the desire for some authority amid the tangled questions of practical life. Thus Christianity, which is essentially a life hid with Christ in God, is always in danger of being drawn down to the level of those who would reduce religion to a ritual of worship, a system of thought, or a fashion of life. But the fact that Jesus Christ is His own religion is the one guarantee of religion arriving at perfection. For it may truly be said that religion is in its essence the consciousness of personal being under the eye of the eternal Personality. It is surely too vague to define it, with Max Müller, as a 'perception of

the infinite,' or, with Schleiermacher, as the 'immediate consciousness of the eternal in the temporal.' Lotze gives the following propositions as the characteristic convictions of the religious mind: (1) Moral laws embody the will of God; (2) individual finite spirits are not products of nature, but are children of God; (3) reality is more and other than the mere course of nature, it is a Kingdom of God. In each of these propositions the note of *personality* is sounded, both subjectively and objectively. And Ritschl states one side of this truth strongly when he explains religion out of 'the necessity which man feels of maintaining his personality and spiritual independence against the limitations of Nature.' But surely the religious man is at equal pains to assure himself of an all-embracing Personality at the heart of things, to which his own soul can return and be at rest (Psa 116:7). That being so, we can see that only through Christ, the God-man, can this twofold consciousness be securely maintained, and the balance kept true between the objective and subjective elements in religion.

In Christ is perfected both the revelation and the response. He is the focus of revelation and the norm of religion. In fact, 'He reveals most because He awakens most' (Matheson, *Growth of Spirit of Christianity*, p. 8). He enables us to see in God our Father, because He quickens in us a filial consciousness and behaviour. As for His revelation of Godhead, men have seen in Him that interwoven authority of love and law, of truth and grace, which gives fulness of meaning to the conceptions of a Father in heaven, free will and human immortality. As for the response which He has awakened in men, they have been won to His ideal through His fulfilment of filial and fraternal obligations in His sacrificial life. The authority and the obedience were alike pre-eminent in the Cross. Thence came the kindling spark which made the Person of Christ a vital religious fact for humanity. Man had thought of himself as being in some sense on a cross because of the presence of suffering, sin, and death; and, so far as he was religious, tried by ritual to propitiate the Almighty, by philosophy to vindicate His ways, by methods of conduct to reduce the mischief of evil. But in Christ crucified man has found God Himself on the cross; and with Him there, there can be no injustice in suffering, no victory for sin, no sting in death.

4. Characteristics of Christ's religion.—Having set this corner-stone, it only remains to mention seven characteristics of the religion which is derived from Jesus Christ and lives upon Him still.

(1) Christ has made religion *personal in its authority*. He is the only and absolute Lord. His spirit has broken and broken again the bands of ecclesiastical systems which multiply the scruples of conscience. The authority which is *not* as that of the scribes has been in more or less effectual operation through all the history of Christendom. Unlearned men, the weak and foolish of this world, have more than held their own in the name of Jesus of Nazareth (Acts 4, cf. 1Co 1:26 ff.). His people have gone forth, indifferent to praise or blame, favour or persecution, and even suspending their

judgment of one another on the ground that to their own Master they stand or fall, before whose judgment-seat all must appear (Rom 14:4; Rom 14:10 f.). Heroic exploits have been undertaken and meanest duties performed by those whose one desire is to be well-pleasing unto Him (Heb 13:21) whom not having seen they love (1Pe 1:8). Christianity loses its secret when it forgets the glorious egotism of the Master, who not only made Himself a law to the disciples who accompanied His ministry (Mat 23:10), but gave Himself back to them as more than ever theirs after death (Mat 28:20, John 20, 21). Christian mysticism is not only in place, it is imperative for the believer. Though he may not rise to the full height of St. Paul's 'Not I, but Christ' (Gal 2:20), he must be in conscious touch with his Lord.

(2) Christ made religion *human in its sympathy*. It was stamped upon the remembrance of His disciples that He went about doing good. Jesus presented to a world much given to religiosity the problem of One who reserved His devotions for the solitude of night, and filled His days, including the Sabbaths, with helping the needy and the outcast. True, He went up to the national Feasts (Joh 2:13 etc.), but He was most Himself when He provided a miraculous meal of His own (Mar 6:35 ff. ||). True, He revered the Temple; but the occasions of His triumphs, and the moment of His transfiguration, were in secular places (Mat 17:1 ff. ||). True, He was subject unto the Law; but He made its requirements a secondary consideration when the cause of humanity was at stake (Mar 2:23 ff; Mar 3:1 ff.). These incidents are typical of the attitude of Jesus towards religious duty. He denounced the advocates of 'Corban,' and those who 'devoured widows' houses and for a pretence made long prayers'; demanded 'mercy instead of sacrifice, and reconciliation rather than ritual' (Mat 9:13; Mat 5:23 f.); and declared that the service of the 'little ones,' the least of His brethren, was the true way of honouring the Father in heaven (Mat 10:40; Mat 25:40, Joh 13:14). Slowly the disciples were weaned from their contempt for the multitude, their disparagement of women and children (Mar 10:13 ff.), their vexation with men like Bartimaeus and Zacchaeus who interfered with their religious plans (Mar 10:48, Luk 19:7). At last they deserved the name of 'League of Pity.' Their first social experiment was to have all things in common (Act 4:34). Their first economic problem was how to distribute alms most wisely to the widows (Act 6:1). They invented a new virtue called 'brotherly love,' in which all shared who were of the faith, whatever their status or nationality. The revolution which Christ effected in humanizing the conception of religion may be clearly seen in a study of words. There were three Greek words for service: *διακονία*, which was used for service from man to man, chiefly reserved for slaves; *λειτουργία*, which was used for the service of a man to the commonwealth; and *λατρεία*, for the service rendered to the gods.

The Christian consciousness rejected the last word; but adopted and hallowed the other two, which stood for human, not Divine service. They appear in 'deacon' and

'liturgy' respectively: the third word is left embedded in idolatry.—See, further, below, § 5.

(3) Christ has made religion *moral in its character*, because He is pre-eminently the Saviour from sin. Religion under other auspices may mean almost anything but a moral conflict and victory. It may even, as in various Asiatic beliefs, spread its sanction over immorality. And even where there is a high ethical standard, as in Confucianism, goodness is rather a codified substitute for religion than the vital substance of it. Nowhere but in Christianity is love for God identified with a passion for real righteousness and inmost cleansing. Not that there is no teaching to this end in the OT. On the contrary, it is the main burden of the prophets. And John the Baptist stood in the true succession when he turned religion into the terms of a repentant and reconstructed life. But it too easily became a means to an end, so that personal righteousness became subsidiary to national rights. And goodness became so degenerate in the chair of the scribes that their ideal was not so much rectitude as correctitude.

But the religion of the Sermon on the Mount breathes out a holiness which consumes every lesser thing, and carries the moral imperative into the inmost recesses of the soul. It is a remarkable thing that Jesus brought so few charges of sin against the irreligious people. If one might venture on a reason, it is that sin itself, *i.e.* the enthronement of self against God, meant so much to Him that He let other things pass in order to strike at the Prince of this world (Joh_12:31; Joh_16:11). His life and spiritual presence have made men conscious of sin without the aid of any catalogue of transgressions. On the other hand, Christ's conception of morality was always warm and positive, on the ground that 'no virtue is safe that is not enthusiastic' (Seeley, *Ecce Homo*, ch. i.). Every token of self-abandonment in humility, faith, and love drew forth His admiration, whether it was the quiet confidence of the centurion (Mat_8:5 ff., Luk_17:2 ff.), the moral enthusiasm of the young ruler (Mar_10:17 ff. ||), the sacrificial giving of the poor widow (Mar_12:42 ff. ||), or the overflowing repentance of the woman who wept at His feet (Luk_7:36 ff.). Every human trait that escaped the imprisonment of self was in the eyes of Jesus the material of true religion. And it was a radiant goodness, unconscious and unlaboured, in the early Christians that chiefly arrested the attention of the world.

(4) Christ has made religion *individual in its responsibility*, because He is the Lord of all. Religion always tends to congeal into a system. There is, of course, a solidarity of mankind, of which religion must take note, of which indeed it is an expression. Sin is a common inheritance, and redemption, too, is a universal fact. It is on this truth that the gospel of Jesus rests. But starting from this truth the gospel lays a test and an obligation on individuals as such. There is no safeguard in being a son of Abraham or a disciple of Moses without giving personal credence, allegiance, and service, μόνον πισ

τευε is the keyword by which the individual escapes from ‘an evil and adulterous generation,’ and all that threatens the full exercise of personality. From the beginning Jesus kept the multitude at the distance of a strait gate and a narrow way, which can be traversed only by one at a time, by the giving of the will, and the crucifying of the self. And what is true of entrance to the Kingdom holds good of its final appointments. Punishment will be proportioned to knowledge and reward to fidelity. With all that He Himself brought, Jesus did not allow men to take anything for granted, but bade them ‘watch, as if on that alone hung the issue of the day.’

(5) Christ has made religion *spiritual in its essence*, because ‘the Lord is the Spirit’ (2Co 3:17) as God is Spirit (Joh 4:24). Religion is apt to become a mere sediment of observance, a shell from which the life has departed. It certainly was so in the days of our Lord; it threatens to be so still. The words in vogue among the Greeks were λατρεία and θρησκεία, the latter word being translated ‘religion’ in Act 26:5 and Jam 1:26 f., the former ‘service’ in Joh 16:2, Rom 9:4; Rom 12:1, Heb 9:1; Heb 9:6. But they only connoted rites of worship and sacrifice: they were old bottles which could not be entrusted with the new spirit of Christianity. St. James uses θρησκεία almost ironically when he says that ‘pure religion and undefiled is visiting widows in their affliction and keeping one’s self unspotted from the world.’ St. Paul (Rom 12:1) takes up λατρεία and θυσία with equal scorn, qualifying the former word with λογική and the latter with ζῶσα, before allowing them to be applicable to Christianity.

It was in this way that Christ Himself had dealt with the prayers and almsgiving of pious Jews (Mat 6:1-8); and the whole tendency of professional separatism among the Pharisees (cf. *Pro Christo et Ecclesia*). His Father ‘sees in secret,’ and ‘seeks those to be his worshippers who worship in spirit and in truth’ (Mat 6:4, Joh 4:24). By resting religion on spirituality, and giving free access by the Spirit to the Father (Rom 5:5, Eph 2:18), the whole basis of the sacrificial system was undermined and sacerdotalism became an anachronism.

‘The society as founded by Christ has in its collective being a priestly character, but is without an official priesthood. It has no temple save the living man; no sacrifices save those of the spirit and the life’ (Fairbairn, *Christ in Modern Theology*, p. 49).

(6) Christ made religion *independent in its action*, because, as He once said, ‘My kingdom is not of this world’ (Joh 18:36). Being the expression of His eternal Spirit, Christianity has never been stamped or cramped by the language of a given period or the fashion of a particular people. His gospel, being a secret of personal experience, has received a most varied witness even within the NT. It has continually broken

through language and escaped. And while the Christian religion in its purity has always been able to shake itself free from the encumbrance of a theological system, it has been no less an independent spirit in regard to other departments of human activity. It has been free to enter and often able to renew them without being itself captured in the process. Political movements, new departures in art, and even advances in science, have as often as not received guidance and support from the Christian spirit. But to none of them has it remained captive, because it moves by right in a higher realm. Thus 'age cannot stale its infinite variety.' It exercises the royal prerogative of lending to all, but borrowing nothing in return, and so is free for every emergency which history unfolds in the whole compass of humanity.

(7) Christ has made religion *missionary in its outlook*, because He is the Saviour of the world. Christianity is not equipped like, e.g., Muhammadanism, for capturing whole tribes at once, for it is not, properly speaking, nationalist in its range. But it stands alone among all other religions in its power to emancipate individuals, and ultimately to regenerate society in every race under the sun. It takes secure root in the universal soil of human needs and possibilities, and with such a grip it is in command of the future. All it waits for is that its professors should realize that it increases in proportion as it is given away, and is truly known only by those who try to make it known.

Christ always believed in small beginnings, but His hope was ever set on great and triumphant conclusions. That He was alone, with nowhere to lay His head, did not trouble Him, for He knew that when He was lifted up from the earth He would draw all men unto Him (Joh_12:32). That His disciples were not wise and learned satisfied Him perfectly, because He saw them (metaphorically speaking) seated on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. That none of the rulers believed on Him did not perturb Him greatly; for He foresaw the time when they would come from the east and the west, the north and the south, to sit down in the Kingdom of God (Luk_13:29). His parables suggested His confidence in the irresistible contagion of the lives of men who had once been won for the Kingdom. He likened His word to a fire (Luk_12:49), to leaven (Mat_13:33), to a seed (v. 19), so potent is its influence on life and on society. And because the needs of the world are so great and deep, and the fields white unto harvest, He gave Himself up wholly to the ingathering work of the Father, and, more than that, He laid it as a last charge and responsibility upon His disciples that they should go out into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature (Mat_28:19).

Literature.—Bruce, *Chief End of Rev.*; Herrmann, *Com. with God*, and his art.

'Religion' in *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.*] ³

[Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; Illingworth, *Div.*

Immanence, and *Personality Hum. and Div.*; Gore, *BL* [Note: *L Bampton Lecture.*];

Newman Smyth, *The Rel. Feeling*; Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection* (esp. Introd. Aphor. xxiii); Menzies, *Hist. of Rel.*; Schleiermacher, *Reden über die Rel.* [English translation by Oman]; Orr, *Chr. View of God and the World*; Caird, *Fundamental Ideas of Christianity*; Harnack, *What is Christianity?*; Martineau, *Studies in Christianity*; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*; Oman, *Vision and Authority*; Forrest, *Authority of Christ*.

A. N. Rowland.

⚡ Religious Experience

RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE

1. Evidential value of religious experience.—Experience is the ultimate test of truth. All knowledge comes from within. World-knowledge, self-knowledge, God-knowledge, all equally depend upon the trustworthiness of this inner organ of information. A universal experience, or an intuitive consciousness, gives us knowledge lifted to the highest power. That which is most universal and most enduring is vouched for by the nature of things. The religious consciousness is as clear and universal as the world-consciousness. It is as natural to man as volition or mathematics. Every baby is born blind and dumb and without the power to will, and there may be some tribes with poor eyes and slow tongues and no theology; but in normal humanity there is a latent capacity for sight and speech and volition, and at least a hope that the soul has relations with the supernatural. Religion is not something miraculous. It is as natural to man as eyesight and star-gazing. It is as normal as any physiologic function. Modern psychology has indisputably proved that religious experience is as closely related to the nerves and blood as puberty; the vital organs and psychic mechanism are built with reference to it. Its importance and value to the race are doubly starred, for ‘its best fruits are the best things history has to show’ (James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 259). To doubt its veracity would be an insolence to the Providence of the universe. Modern psychology has only emphasized Augustine’s decision: ‘Lord, if we are deceived, we are deceived by Thee.’* [Note: Professor James, from a study perhaps too largely devoted to abnormal developments of the religious emotions, reaches nevertheless the significant conclusion that, ‘if intercourse between man and God is not a fact, then religion does not simply contain elements of delusion, but is rooted in delusion altogether’ (op. cit. p. 465, cf. p. 547).] It is because the NT grew out of, and is the record of, genuine first-hand religious experience that it has the gift of tongues, and can speak to every man in the language wherein he was born.

2. Pre-requisites of religious experience.—The great fundamental pre-requisites of religious experience the Gospels take for granted. There is no more of an attempt to prove God's existence than man's existence, or God's power of speech than man's. God loves to speak to man, and man can understand. God is the imperative preliminary to all religious life; He is the chief factor in its continuance and perfecting. Each soul possesses as its birthright a knowledge of moral distinctions, a sense of moral obligation, a conscious power of obedience or disobedience to such law as the soul knows. All this, where not affirmed, is assumed by all the Gospel writers.

3. Pre-Christian religious experience.—Much of the religious experience described in the Gospels is pre-Christian. Primitive Christianity never imagined that a rich religious experience was not possible outside the Christian community. The Divine Shepherd has 'other sheep' besides the Israelites ([Joh 10:6](#)). Jesus Himself expressly affirms this, and refers to Naaman the Syrian, the widow of Zidon, the Roman centurion, and the Syrophenician woman as possessing better religious experience than their Jewish neighbours, and definitely announces that 'many' shall come from the heathen nations and enter the future Kingdom in peace ([Joh 12:20](#); [Joh 12:23](#), [Luk 4:25-28](#), [Mar 7:24](#), [Mat 8:10](#); [Mat 15:28](#)). So, the Samaritans were at various times praised by Jesus, and one of them was selected as the ideal type of brotherhood ([Luk 7:11](#); [Luk 7:19](#); [Luk 10:25-37](#)). Yet, while Jesus proclaimed faith and gratitude and compassion to be religious virtues wherever found, and evidently preferred honest heresy to thoughtless orthodoxy, He nevertheless regarded Gentiles and Samaritans as heretics, and the Jews as the natural 'children of the kingdom' ([Mat 8:12](#); cf. [Mat 18:17](#), [Joh 4:22](#)). The Apostles were all Jews, and the holy men and women whose prayers and hymns filled the earth with prophetic hope at the birth of John and Jesus were representative OT saints. They had been 'prepared for the Lord' ([Mar 1:17](#)), and were 'prayerful,' 'devout,' and 'righteous' people who 'rejoiced in God,' being 'filled with the Holy Ghost,' and could depart this world 'in peace' ([Luk 1:6](#); [Luk 1:47](#); [Luk 1:67](#); [Luk 2:25-29](#), cf. [Joh 1:47](#)). Such religious fruit does not grow on a tree with a rotten root.

4. Christian experience contrasted with all other religious experience.—Nevertheless, as compared even with the best religious experiences of the Old Covenant, those of the New seemed like 'new wine' ([Mar 2:22](#)), like newly discovered treasure ([Mat 13:34](#)), like a wedding day ([Mat 9:15](#)), like the 'one pearl of great price' ([Mat 13:46](#)), like a king's banquet ([Mat 22:2](#)), like the rising of the sun ([Luk 1:79](#), cf. [Joh 1:17](#)). The religious knowledge and outlook even of that holy prophet and herald of whom Jesus Himself said that there had been 'none greater born of women,' were to be so eclipsed that he who was 'little' in the New Kingdom should be greater than he ([Mat 11:11](#)). New standards, new ideals, new spiritual magnitudes, above all, a new spiritual dynamic had appeared, and with these a

totally new spiritual experience. The new things introduced by the gospel have often been catalogued, but Jesus was the supremely new thing in the new religion. Much of the teaching, even its central Golden Rule, was old, but He was new. He, not His teaching, was the centre of the new gospel. He was the gospel; Himself the glad tidings of great joy. His coming brought a new morning to the world (Luk 1:78), and originated a new vision of righteousness and a new sunrise type of religious experience in the souls of men.

5. Religious experience of Jesus.—But although Jesus created a new religion characterized by strangely new religious dispositions, it is a difficult task to discover from the records the facts concerning His own soul life. That He prayed and had the inner certainty of reply; that He was tempted; accepted the Father's will even when unexplained to Him; that He had great confidence in God, and felt a peculiar harmony between Himself and the Infinite Goodness,—all this, and much more, is known. But did the self-identity with the moral law which He claimed (Joh 14:6, cf. Mar 8:34; Mar 10:21; Mar 13:31, Mat 5:17) involve the consciousness of self-identity with Jehovah? So St. John's Gospel certainly teaches. According to all the Gospels, He claimed a jurisdiction here and hereafter which no other sane man has ever ventured to claim. He showed no hesitancy in calling Himself 'meek and lowly,' while in almost the same breath He demanded absolute submission of intellect and will from all who expected to remain His 'friends,' or hoped to be at peace with God hereafter (e.g. Mat 7:21 ff; Mat 11:28 ff., Luk 6:46, Joh 15:14). Even in Mk. He is represented as claiming, without misgiving, to be the expected Messiah and Judge of the world (Mar 8:29), who has power to forgive sins (Mar 2:10), and to whom all men owe absolute spiritual allegiance (Mar 8:34; Mar 8:38). The other Synoptics, as well as Jn., specifically represent Him as claiming to be superior to the wisest lawgivers and prophets of the past (Mat 12:42; Mat 19:8, Luk 11:31, Joh 1:17)—One whose mission in the world was to give His life a ransom for the race (Joh 3:16, cf. Mar 10:45), Himself the centre and object of the devotion of all men loyal to the inner light (Luk 19:14; Luk 20:18, Joh 5:40; Joh 7:17), the only Being who knew God (Mat 11:27), a Saviour and Judge whose 'Depart from me' was the severest penalty which could be pronounced on guilty man (Mat 1:21; Mat 7:23). Yet, notwithstanding all this, He is represented in every Gospel as being peculiarly calm, sincere, humble, and self-forgetful, possessing a heart of singular purity, having not the slightest doubt of His own right relationship to God, trusting the inner witness perfectly, and constantly possessing a peace 'deep as the unfathomed sea,' which peace He believed He could impart to others. The self-consciousness of Jesus was the spring underneath the Temple-altar, out of which flowed the healing waters of Christianity.

6. Christ's relation to Christian experience.—Whatever we think, who never ate at the same table with Him, there is not the slightest doubt as to what the earliest Christians thought of Jesus. They never attempted to analyze His states of

consciousness,—He was to them the object rather than the subject of religion,—but of one thing they were absolutely sure, it was He who had worked the mighty change in them. Whereas they had been blind, they could now see; whereas they had been helpless, they now had conscious victory over sin; and new powers in many directions were theirs. These new experiences came through Him. In coming to Him they had found God, and a new type of thought and life had appeared within themselves. Jesus Christ was the source of this change of personality. All the NT writers agree as to this.

A writer in the *JE* [*Note: E Jewish Encyclopedia.*] (art. 'Jesus'), though believing that Jesus never claimed to be the Messiah, at the same time acknowledges that 'his most striking characteristic was his claim that spiritual peace and salvation were to be found in the mere acceptance of his leadership.' Nathaniel Schmidt (*Prophet of Nazareth*, 1905) also makes a suggestive admission when he says that, while Jesus never claimed to be the Messiah, yet all the hopes of OT prophets embodied in King, Redeemer, and Divine Manifestation were more than fulfilled in Him; and although He never, probably, claimed to forgive sins, yet He could forgive them, and historically He has actually been the Saviour of the world, and is saving men yet (pp. 8, 203, 317).

That Jesus Christ was the Saviour every man needed, One who could save up to and beyond the limit of the man's best hope, was the common thought of those who most thoughtfully observed His influence and reported His words. It is constantly assumed as a fact of consciousness, and often declared in unequivocal language, that every man has so flagrantly sinned against light and become such a slave to sin that he needs the very power of the Almighty to enable him to fulfil his moral duty and reach his spiritual ideal. He needs more than one act of omnipotence. He needs a God who will come and stay close to him, ruling the life, not from without but from within (Mar 7:15, Mat 15:8, Luk 17:21, Joh 4:21; Joh 15:1-6). The earliest Christians are unanimous in the declaration that in coming to Jesus Christ they had found the Father, and that He was not afar off but within; and after Pentecost they speak of the inward Presence either as 'God,' 'Spirit of God,' 'Holy Spirit,' or 'Spirit of Christ.'

7. Origin of Christian experience.—Herein lies the explanation of the earliest typical Christian experience. The new religion was rooted in a new conception of the Holy Ghost. A perfected Christian experience was not possible until after Pentecost. There is no emphasis in the Gospels upon personal experience. They have to do with 'Jesus only.' His statements as to truth and His promise of future blessedness were sufficient grounds of certainty without any 'experiences' to corroborate them. Salvation, according to the earliest Christian Gospel, is proved not by personal experience but by practical morality, a compassionate spirit, and obedience to the inner law—this inner law being objectified in Jesus Christ when He is known (Mat 25:14-45). The proper use of talents, helpfulness, mercifulness, prayerfulness, and love for brother

man—these are the marks of a Christian. To be humble and self-forgetful, to care for the poor, and the sick, and the sinful—this is to ‘inherit the kingdom’ (Mat 6:14). A man may be a member of Christ’s Kingdom even though he has not consciously been serving Him (Mat 25:37-39). He who forgives shall be forgiven (Mat 6:14). To be a Christian is not to ‘accept the word with joy,’ but to live, bearing fruit (Mat 13:20-23, Luk 8:13). In Mk. it is not even remembered that Jesus ever promised ‘joy,’ or ‘peace,’ or ‘rest.’ These words do not meet us in this earliest Gospel. Jesus was the sole object of thought. How a disciple felt was of too little importance to be noticed. In Mt. the transforming principle is the word spoken by Jesus, and the result is ‘rest’ (e.g. Mat 7:28; Mat 11:29; Mat 13:23). In Jn. the transforming principle is Jesus, who is ‘the Word’ and ‘the Life,’ and the result is ‘peace’ (Joh 3:4, Joh 6:33, Joh 14:27, Joh 17:3). With St. Paul the transforming principle is the Holy Ghost applying the redemption purchased by the blood of the cross, and the result is ‘joy’ and ‘glory.’ In the Synoptics the command is ‘Come,’ and if you endure to the end you ‘shall be saved.’ In Jn. the command is ‘Believe,’ and he that believeth ‘hath everlasting life.’ With St. Paul the central interrogation is, ‘Have you received the Holy Ghost?’—if so, you ‘have been saved’ (cf. Eph 2:5). In the Synoptics it is following Jesus that is emphasized; in Jn. it is being one with Jesus; in St. Paul’s letters it is being united with Him in His death. In the Synoptics salvation is educational; in Jn. it is biological; in St. Paul’s letters it is sacrificial. The first type of thought emphasized the fact of salvation, the second its psychology, the third its philosophy. In their deepest meaning these three are one; but they represent three types of Christian thought, from which resulted three types of Christian doctrine and Christian experience. Each type finds its root in the Gospel teaching; but the appeal to the ‘inner witness,’ the making prominent of Christian experience, and the rise of what may be called the emotional type of Christianity, are all post-Pentecostal developments. So long as Jesus remained with them, the disciples did not think it worth while to talk of themselves, or notice their own inward emotions or mental experiences. But Jesus left them, and in utter loneliness and sorrow they stood gazing into the heavens which had received Him. But at Pentecost they began to awaken to the fact that He was still alive, still near them, still able to talk with them, and make their hearts burn as He talked. Then their eyes were turned within, and Christian experience began to be of vital theological importance. It was the new Christian thought of the Holy Ghost which gave birth both to the Johannine and to the Pauline theologies and experiences. The Holy Spirit represented Christ in the believer’s heart. It spake with the authority of God Himself, and in the very accents of the One now gone. Christ was with them again. He had promised to come, and to abide with them always (Joh 6:56; Joh 14:18). He had kept His promise. The Word was again incarnate, and was in each one of them. The believer’s flesh was His flesh (cf.

Eph 5:30, and especially the startling words of 2Co 3:17 ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν). This discovery, that it was the Lord Jesus Himself who was speaking within them in

the Person of the Holy Ghost, brought the experiences of the soul into new importance. It was this consciousness of the indwelling Christ which filled the hearts of the early Christians with joy, and made them a wonder to the heathen world.

Typical Christian experience did not begin until Pentecost (Joh 7:39, Act 2:17; Act 19:2); yet the Synoptic Gospels contain all the roots of the beautiful rod which budded in those later ecstatic experiences. Although, when a sinner repented and was forgiven, it was only the joy of God and the angels which the Synoptics thought important enough to mention (Luk 15:7; Luk 15:10), incidentally we learn that the return to God brings a kiss to the soul and a song to the lips (Luk 15:20; Luk 15:24). It was a home-coming. There can be no doubt that 'praising God,' and 'gladness of heart,' and an exhilaration which was like the exhilaration of wine, were characteristic of the earliest Christian experiences (Act 2:15; Act 2:46-47). Every later Apostolic experience, however jubilant, appears prophetically in Jn. (e.g. Joh 4:36; Joh 15:11; Joh 16:20; Joh 16:22; Joh 16:24).

8. Range and content of Christian experience.—No part of human nature is excluded from the influence of saving grace. Schleiermacher centred religion in the feelings, Hegel in the intellect, Kant in the will; but Jesus Christ centred it in the man. The Torah of Jesus brought into loftiest prominence the fact that all man's faculties of sensibility, intellect, and volition must be brought to focus in the act and state of loving self-surrender to God (Mar 12:30). Christian experience, as depicted in the NT, includes a new intellectual vision, a radical shifting of the emotional centre, and a rectification and strengthening of the will.

The first step in a typical Christian experience is the recognition of a new horror in sin. Sin is a more hateful and deadly thing to the Christian than to the Hebrew or the Babylonian. It is not only an epidemic universal and fatal (Joh 1:29), a blood-poisoning (Joh 9:41, Joh 15:22; Joh 15:24), worse than a lifelong paralysis (Joh 5:14), which may be eternal (Mar 3:29), a slavery (Joh 8:34), and an insanity (Luk 15:17); it is ungrateful (Luk 16:6), traitorous (Mar 14:56), unfilial (Luk 15:11); the assassination of one's higher self (Luk 9:25), and a fratricidal blow at Jesus Christ (Mat 21:38, Luk 9:22). The cross shows God's thought of sin, and those who have seen the cross get a totally new view of the guilt of sin. Jesus can never be seen as a Saviour, in the Gospel sense, until a man sees himself to be a lost sinner having no hope of help except from God (Luk 7:42; Luk 15:4-32; Luk 19:10). It is no sign of 'healthy-mindedness' to feel no terror of sin. The 'neurotic state' is not one of keen sorrow for sin, but a state of hardness and callousness (e.g. Luk 15:17, cf. Eph 2:1). Repentance is not a 'pathological condition of melancholia,' which is to be avoided; it is the sinner's only hope. It is the goodness of God which leadeth him to repentance. To be 'pricked to the heart' when one faces the cross is characteristic of a genuine Christian experience. When one reaches a state where he cannot feel these sharp

goads of pain, then even God Himself cannot help him (Mat 12:31; Mat 12:41, cf. Heb 6:6). Sackcloth and ashes are the appropriate clothing for the penitent (Mat 11:21). Yet it is not the emotional drapery, but the decisive action of the soul away from the wrong and towards the right (*i.e.* Christ) which is made emphatic (Joh 14:6). The first call is to repentance (Mar 1:15). This is the first thing commanded, for it is the first possible active effort of the man co-operating with the constant effort of God—without whom he could neither will nor act aright—in his own salvation. It is the first active human preliminary to a conscious Christian experience. It is a radical change of mind (μετανοέω), involving a radical change of front (ἐπιστρέφω). The response of the will to revealed duty is the ‘Yea’ or ‘Nay’ to God’s call. With the ‘Yea’ his eyes open, and he gets new vision. Sin can shut out even the sight of God and blind the soul to the difference between good and evil (Mat 12:24). Purity of intent and purpose cleanses the lens of the intellectual telescope so that one can see God; and when one sees God, many other things previously obscured become visible (Joh 4:29; Joh 5:40).

Saving faith, according to the Gospels, centres in Christ. It is not faith in one’s self or in one’s own salvation, present, past, or future; it is a loyal surrender to Him who represents the soul’s highest ideal of right, as Lord. Having accepted Him as Lord, the soul then finds Him to be Saviour (Joh 5:23-24). In the Synoptics the words πίστις, πιστεύω do not mean as much as with St. John and St. Paul, because the words ‘Christ’ and ‘Saviour’ did not mean as much; but in every case the surrender is to Jesus up to the level of all the light received. Whosoever ‘wills to do his will’ shall know at least this, that Jesus can be trusted (Joh 7:17, cf. Joh 9:36). The testimonies to conscious personal trust in Jesus Christ as the supreme standard of right and the never-failing and ever-present Helper of all sin-sick souls, fill every page of the NT. The result of the exercise of faith is not infrequently a change of opinion and judgment; it is always a change of affection and volitional relation to God. The man’s whole nature changes. Jn. states this by the strongest possible figure—that of a second birth (Joh 3:10); but the Synoptics hint prophetically at the same thing. The man must make a new beginning, as radical as if he had become a child again (Mat 5:45; Mat 18:3, cf. Mar 10:15). A new seed of personality must be planted within him (Luk 8:4-15; Luk 17:21). There must be a change of the life passion (Mat 6:25; Mat 10:39). Newborn thoughts and feelings and powers must develop until the vital functions are practically reversed (Mar 8:35; Mar 12:30; Mar 12:35, Mat 5:3-10; Mat 16:25, Luk 17:35).

St. Paul constantly dwells upon this. The new life which one consciously obtains through faith in Jesus Christ is likened to that which would be needed in quickening a corpse or bringing about a resurrection from the dead (1Co 15:22, Col 2:13,

Eph 2:5). The man obtains a new self, as if he had been recreated (2Co 5:17). Christ has started a new race, as truly as did Adam (1Co 15:22; 1Co 15:45), and the result is a new manhood, a new humanity (τὸν καινὸν [τὸν νέον] ἄνθρωπον, Eph 4:24, Col 3:10), governed by a new law of life.

All the Gospel writers mention, though incidentally or prophetically, the liberty and the new strength and courage to will and to do the right which come with trust in Jesus, as well as the new and glad sense of love for both man and God (e.g. Mar 12:30-31, Mat 11:30; Mat 25:40, Luk 6:32; Luk 11:21-22, Joh 8:36). One is not merely conscious of his own sincerity; he can testify that a Father's welcome has been given him, and that Christ has 'manifested' Himself to him (Luk 15:20, Joh 14:21). Perhaps the Gospel doctrine most fully developed in the later writings of the NT is that of spiritual unity with Christ, through self-surrender to become one with Him. This doctrine is found in germ in every Gospel, but comes to complete flower in the profound teachings of St. John. Unity with Christ does not, however, mean identity. The disciple may be perfectly like his Lord, but magnitudes differ. The best experience has in it a good hope of a better experience. Unity with the Divine does not make man a god, but splendidly and fully human. The Ego not only finds peace when it turns to God, but finds itself (Mat 10:39; Mat 15:16; Mat 15:25, Luk 15:16-17). Progress is now possible. The man can now 'win' his own soul (Luk 21:19). Jesus lifts life out of the 'tragedy of the commonplace' by offering to it a perfect ideal and the highest possible impulse to reach it. This guarantees never-ending development. He who takes the Perfect for his ideal, and strives for an experience to match his vision, must have grace and more grace, life and more life (Joh 1:16; Joh 10:10).

Literature.—See *Biblical Theologies* for main discussion. Among best recent books on validity of knowledge given by experience: Bowne, *Theory of Knowledge, Metaphysics*. On content of Christian consciousness: Starbuck, *Psychology of Religion*; Coe, *Spiritual Life*; Hall, *Adolescence* (vol. ii.); James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*. On content of consciousness of a pious non-Christian: art. by present writer in *Meth. Rev.*, Sixth Series, vol. xxiv. Best popular works on religious experience: Black, *Chr. Consciousness*; Newbolt, *Gospel of Experience*; Granger, *Soul of a Christian*; Forrest, *Christ of History and Experience*; Everett, *Psychologic Elements of Religious Faith*; Dale, *Living Christ*; Clifford, *Chr. Certainties*; Hall, *Universal Elements of Christian Religion*, and *Chr. Belief interpreted by Chr. Experience*; Stearns, *Evidence of Chr. Experience*.

Camden M. Cobern.

☞ Rending Of Garments

RENDING OF GARMENTS.—The practice of signifying grief by tearing the clothes. There were four occasions on which rending of garments was enjoined by the Jewish Law: (1) death; (2) the apostasy of a member of the family; (3) the destruction, during persecution, of a copy of the Law; (4) blasphemy. In the case of a member of the family becoming apostate the clothes were rent as for his death, and the mourners sat for one hour on the ground and ate bread and ashes. The קדיעה הלכות (Laws of Rending) are very minute, and embrace no fewer than thirty-nine rules. For the dead the rending was to be performed just before the body was finally hid from view, and it was to be done standing. Both sexes were ordered to rend the clothes ‘to the heart,’ *i.e.* to the skin, but in supposed obedience to Joe 2:13 it was to be ‘no farther than the navel.’ For father or mother all the garments were rent till the breast was exposed, but a woman was enjoined to rend her under garment in private, and to wear it reversed. This was for the sake of decorum, and the outer garment was then rent in public without her skin being exposed. For other relations (brothers and sisters) the outer garment only was rent. For father and mother the rent was over the heart, but in the case of others on the right side. The rent garment was worn for thirty days. The rent was ordered to be of the size of a list (טפה). It was not to be repaired in the case of mourning for parents till the time of mourning was past, but for others it might be loosely drawn together, leaving a ragged tear, after seven days, and properly repaired after thirty days. A woman, however, might in all cases repair after seven days. The rending of clothes was not to take place on the Sabbath, but if it were done on that day in excess of grief, it was excusable on account of the piety it betokened. No rending of garments was obligatory unless news of the death were received within thirty days, except in the case of the death of parents.

The action of Caiaphas (Mat 26:65, Mar 14:63) is an instance of the rending of garments for blasphemy. In this case the high priest was enjoined to rend ‘both his outer and his inner garments with a rent that could never be repaired.’

Literature.—Edersheim, *LT* [*Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].*] ; Mackie, *Manners and Customs of Bible Lands*; Thomson, *LB* [*Note: The Land and the Book.*] ; art. ‘Mourning’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible .

W. H. Rankine.

☞ Renunciation

RENUNCIATION.—Ideas of renunciation in the teaching of Jesus may be classed under three heads: (1) renunciation of what is sinful, (2) surrender of worldly possessions, (3) special self-abnegation. It may not be possible to draw clear lines of demarcation, but these divisions are nevertheless distinct. The cares of this world and the deceitfulness of riches and the lusts of other things (Mar_4:19), that check the life of the soul as weeds choke the growth of the grain, may be said to indicate them in the reverse order.

1. *Sin*, of course, is to be renounced without qualification or compromise; and whatsoever leads to sin. The ‘thou shalt not’ of the Decalogue is carried into the inner sphere with an extent and thoroughness of application not known to the lawgivers of the world. ‘We have renounced,’ says St. Paul, ‘the hidden things of dishonesty’ (2Co_4:2). But Christ’s commands go farther. ‘If thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out’ (Mat_5:29-30; Mat_18:8-9). These laws require not only the renunciation of whatever desire, impulse, aim, or intention is contrary to the will of God, but also of things innocent that might tend to ‘lead into temptation’; the renunciation of that trebly manifested evil (1Jn_2:16) by which the world is placed in antagonism to the Father.

2. Renunciation in its bearing on *temporal possessions* is expounded in the address that followed the rebuke of covetousness (Luk_12:13-34, Mat_6:19-34). Here Jesus emphasizes the distinction of the inward and the outward, the primary and the subordinate, the essential and the accidental. The life is a far greater thing than the material means of sustenance, the body by which we live is much more important than its protecting garment. ‘A man’s life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth.’ If what is primary and essential is made secure, what is secondary will follow as a matter of course. The error of the Gentiles is that they devote themselves to the secondary and neglect the fundamental. Men feed the outward life and starve the soul, or they adorn the body and disregard its real dignity. They store up wealth, but are not ‘rich toward God.’ But ‘treasure in heaven’ is the true riches. The spiritual is supreme. Our prayer should be for ‘daily bread’ or the satisfaction of necessary requirements. We should seek the Kingdom of God, in the assurance that temporal matters will find adjustment according to providential law.

3. *Special self-abnegation* has its clearest statement in Mat_19:12. Whether that passage is literal or figurative is immaterial. The value is in the principle. The duty of abandoning good may be laid on men of hesitating disposition who need to be untrammelled, or on special ministers such as the disciples, who forsook all and followed their Master that they might give undivided effort to the preaching of the gospel. The things surrendered may be possessions, kindred, or even life (Luk_18:29). An important lesson on the subject is found in the interview of the rich ruler with Jesus (Luk_18:18 etc.). This man was outwardly perfect, yet conscious of

imperfection. He had rank, position, wealth, manners, and he had kept the Law. Jesus called on him to surrender his property and become a disciple. The first reflexion here is that formal is not real excellence; that not the outward life only, but the heart, and soul, and spirit are to be judged. Hence it is that not the righteousness of the Law, but the righteousness by faith is the hope of the Christian. With this youth may be contrasted his contemporary St. Paul, who attained to the mind of Christ, and for the sake of the higher life counted all things but loss. The second reflexion (which is virtually the same) is the ethical principle that benevolence precedes prudence, that the cause of the community is prior to that of the individual. The command to 'sell ... and give to the poor' was the form adapted to the individual case in which the principle of renunciation was expressed in the shape of social duty. In a religion which begins with the requirement of repentance and renovation of life, and which in all aspects exalts the spiritual, subordinating the temporal and earthly, nothing is more fitting than the childlike spirit; the graces of humility, meekness, and gentleness belong to the new conception of the beautiful; while the strain of public duty requires the propelling motive of philanthropy and the ready acceptance of self-sacrifice. But renunciation is not without reward. The individual is one in a large family of brethren, and his own good is promoted by the health of the community. He who subordinates the self-regarding virtues to the altruistic, who abandons rights and possessions while he cherishes the love of God and of man, will find even in this life ' manifold more.' Sharing the life of others, he will receive from them more than he gives. By the frustration of false developments the basis of his personal life is strengthened; and by fellowship and service his life becomes richer, nobler, more blessed. Thus is realized the paradox (Mar 8:35) that the Christian loses his life to save it. The dethronement of self is the beginning of moral victory and power. The path of renouncement leads to spiritual wealth.

These principles derive strength from a study of Christ's own life. The Son of Man had no possessions, no fixed abode. He toiled for the relief of the suffering. The project of kingship He recognized as the temptation of Satan. He saved others—He could not save Himself. The model life was at all points a life of renunciation; a life, too, of uncomplaining endurance of wrong. But from the date when the cross came distinctly into view, renunciation was inculcated as a necessary condition of membership in His community. 'If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross' (Mat 16:24 etc.). Victory through cross-bearing, life through death, became the final maxims of duty. And the disciples were required at once to behold the career of their Master, and to be prepared to undergo a similar experience. The principle of renunciation took the form of a courageous facing of difficulties, a steadfast endurance of ills, a heroic encountering of persecution, and a submission even unto death. Perhaps the typical Christian is St. Paul. To him crucifixion is the image of his relation to established society. 'The world is crucified to me and I to the world' (Gal 6:14). For Christians in general his language is more restricted but not

substantially different: 'they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh' (Gal 5:24). But, nevertheless, his tones are triumphant: 'all things are yours' (1Co 3:22). The cross is the centre of history, and cross-bearing is the soul of virtue; and the afflicted are 'more than conquerors' (Rom 8:37).

The law of Renunciation has been repeatedly restated in modern literature. 'Die and re-exist' was a maxim of Goethe. Self-renouncement was expounded by Matthew Arnold (*Lit. and Dogma*) as the *secret* of Jesus. 'Die to live' is a principle of Hegelianism. This latter axiom has been expounded by Dr. E. Caird (*Hegel, ad fin.; Evolution of Religion*, ii. 6-8) as the fundamental principle of a universal ethic. According to this authority, it is a law of the spiritual world, as contra-distinguished from the natural, that self-realization is to be attained by self-sacrifice. The theorem 'die to live' involves on the one hand absolute surrender of self and of every good to the Father of spirits, and on the other hand restoration in another form through the possession of an enlarged life filled with deeper and wider interests. The sacrifice of selfishness proves the birth of the true self, the individual deriving from the universal the good for which it exists. The death of Christ was no accidental phenomenon, but the highest revelation of the Divine in conflict with the world's evil. The surrender of a life as a sacrifice to a cause tends to give a universal value to the life so sacrificed. This, of course, does not differentiate the death of Christ from ordinary martyrdom; but we may agree with Caird that paramount moral doctrine must accord both with the lessons of history and with the highest reason of a universal spiritual philosophy. By such tests we distinguish the true from the false renunciation, and arrive at a clearer comprehension of the Divine intuition of Jesus.

On the other side, the reverse doctrine, that self-assertion is the essence of sin, has been rightly accepted as a fundamental truth of the moral sphere. The term so used includes the exaltation of the lower nature over the higher, and the placing of the individual or particular before the social or universal. This principle denies equality of right, repudiates the primary law of love, and treats with scorn the consciences of men. Its essential manifestation is in the lust of power and pride of life, though every other selfish gratification may be included. In mediaeval ideas pride held the dark pre-eminence, and conceptions of Satan were formed therefrom. But in modern times, and especially since Milton, the historic view is modified. In the career of the master-fiend whose history is the history of evil (as that career is in *Paradise Lost* portrayed for all time), it is 'pride and, worse, ambition' that rule. True it is that down the Christian ages, and even within the Church, self-assertion has been as prominent (though not so abundant) as self-denial. But it is equally true that where such egotism has flourished spiritual life has died. See, further, art. Selfishness.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Self-Surrender'; Newman Smyth, *Christian Ethics*, p. 372 ff.; Müller, *Christian Doct. of Sin*, ii. 362 ff.; Channing,

Complete Works [ed. 1884], p. 259 ff.; W. Archer Butler, *Serm. i. 27*; À Kempis, *I mit. of Christ*; George Eliot, *Mill on the Floss*, bk. iv. ch. 3; G. Macdonald, *The Religious Sense in its Scientific Aspect* (1903), 79; J. Strachan, *Heb. Ideals* (1902), 48.

R. Scott.

✚ Repentance

REPENTANCE.—In Christ's own life repentance has no place. The four Gospels contain no expression, direct or incidental, of any feeling of penitence or of regret for anything He ever did or left undone, for anything He ever said or left unsaid. He never prays for forgiveness. He never knows of a time when He was not in peace and harmony with God; He never speaks of coming into peace and harmony with God. Though He teaches insistently that all others must repent and become sons, and even then must pray for the forgiveness of their sins, yet He Himself knows nothing but that He is the Son of His Heavenly Father, and He never loses by any act the consciousness of the Father's approval. See, further, art. Sinlessness.

1. Christ's teaching on repentance.—In the teaching of Jesus the fundamental category was the Kingdom of God (βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ), *i.e.* the spiritual rule of God in the heart of a man or in the hearts of men. This βασιλεία simply means God's authority established, God exercising His will and having His way, whether it be in a single human soul, or in a Church, or in a Christian community (as in the primitive Church of Pentecost), or in the Church universal, or in the world. God's Kingdom has come, that is, His rule is established, when and where His will is done as it is supposed to be done 'in heaven,' that is, ideally, whether that be in a single heart or 'on (the whole) earth.'

This enables us to understand why Jesus has so much to say about righteousness. Righteousness was another name for the fulfilling of the will of God; it was doing what God wanted done; it was the realizing of *the rule of God*. Hence men were called on to repent and become righteous. Repentance, as conceived and taught by Jesus, meant a change of the whole life, so as to subject it and to conform it to God, a radical and complete revolution of one's view of God and attitude toward God. This involved a change of the whole of life in its inlook as well as in its outlook; a change, in short, of one's self, one's motives, aims, pursuits.

Jesus' primary thought was of a change *to*. For His starting-point was God. Hence the burden of His message was God and righteousness. But this implies that there was

something to change *from*. Men were to free their mind from one thing and to fix it on another. They were to exchange one habitual, fixed state of mind for another—for its opposite, namely, for one that recognized, preferred, hungered after and sought for righteousness as the fulfilment of the will of God, as the realization of *the rule (Kingdom) of God*.

What was it then that they were to change *from*? Naturally it was from that which was the opposite of righteousness, that which refuses the rule of God and excludes Him from life. In other words, it was from sin. In turning to God it was necessary, in the nature of the case, to turn from that which is opposed to God, from that state of mind which loves, chooses, enjoys sin, which is permeated and dominated by sin, and which brings about the inevitable consequence of living in the practice of sin. So that, while Jesus had much to say about righteousness, He had much to say, and inevitably, about sin. We are now better prepared to understand what He meant when He called on people to repent. Popularly, repentance is understood to be a sense of regret and self-abasement, looking to the forgiveness of the wrong-doings of the past. This is one part of repentance, but it is the least part. Sin lies deeper than the act. It is in the unrenewed, perverse nature behind the act. So repentance goes deeper than the act. Sin has its root in the inherent condition of man's nature; repentance contemplates a change in this condition. And until this change is effected, sin will inevitably continue to rule. Repentance then, while it is a sense of regret and sorrow for the wrong-doings of the past, is far more. It is an agonizing desire, leading to an agonizing and persistent effort, to realize such a radical change in the state of the mind as will secure and ensure against wrong-doing in the future. Born of a realization, more or less clear and pungent, of our natural sinward tendency and of our hopeless inability to correct it or control it, it impels us to desire above all things and to seek before all things that change of mind and moral condition which will not only lead us to choose righteousness, but also enable us triumphantly to realize righteousness. Repentance goes to the root of the matter. The very word goes to the root of it. For what is μετάνοια but a 'change of mind'? That this was the meaning of the word in the thought and intent of Jesus, the whole drift of His teaching implies. But it is specifically shown in those sayings of His which reveal His view of the inherent sinfulness of human nature: 'If ye being evil' (πονηροὶ ὄντες, [Mat 7:11](#)); 'a corrupt tree cannot (οὐ δύναται, [Mat 7:18](#)) bring forth good fruit'; and that terse statement of the whole situation which in one epigrammatic sentence sums up all that St. Paul says in the seventh and eighth chapters of Romans: 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit' ([Joh 3:6](#)). It is what St. Paul calls 'the mind of the flesh,' and as good as calls *the mind of sin* (see [Rom 7:17](#); [Rom 7:20](#)).

Repentance, as used in the Synoptic Gospels, covers, as a rule, the whole process of turning from sin to God (as in [Luk 24:47](#)). So that in the broad, comprehensive sense

of the Synoptics, it includes faith, which is a part of the process, the last step of it. It is so used also in the discourses of the early chapters of the Book of Acts. There the comprehensive condition of admission to the brotherhood of believers and of participation in the life of the Spirit is repentance (Act 2:38; Act 3:19; Act 5:31). Faith is not mentioned, though, in the nature of the case, it is included.

In the Fourth Gospel the reverse is the case. There faith is the condition of salvation (Joh 3:15-16; Joh 3:36) But while repentance is not specifically mentioned, it is included in the notion of faith. Faith is the trustful commitment of one's self to God for forgiveness of sins, and deliverance from sin; but it is psychologically impossible to commit one's self thus to God without renouncing and turning away from all that is contrary to God. And this impossibility is expressed or implied in the discourses of the Fourth Gospel. For they clearly set forth the moral conditionality of faith. A man *cannot* exercise faith whose heart is not right, whose moral condition and attitude of will are opposed to the right (Joh 5:44). And this moral conditionality of faith is exactly what is meant by repentance, in its narrower sense. Faith is the condition of entrance into the experience of salvation, the enjoyment of eternal life; but repentance is the psychological and moral condition of faith. As eternal life is unattainable without faith, faith is unattainable without repentance.

But Jesus was a preacher, not a theologian. Consequently His call to repentance is, as a rule, in the form of those exquisite parables that speak to the heart. Such is the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican (Luk 18:9-14), and that of the Prodigal Son (Luk 15:11-24). The latter of these is the truest, the humanest, and the tenderest picture of repentance to be found in the Bible. The essential elements in the repentance of the Prodigal are (1) a realization of his desperate condition: 'He came to himself'; (2) a definite mental determination to reverse his course and retrace his steps at any risk: 'I will arise and go to my father'; (3) the decisive act of breaking away from his surroundings and going straight into the presence of his much wronged father: 'He arose and came to his father'; (4) his absolute, abject, self-effacing humility: 'I am no more worthy to be called a son of thine; make me as a servant'; (5) his open, outspoken, unreserved, unqualified confession: 'I have sinned to the very heaven, and my sin is against thee, O thou best of fathers.'

2. How Christ leads men to repentance.—If repentance means what we have seen, namely, the change from the self-centred life to the God-centred life, then Jesus is the author and inspiration of repentance. No other was ever able to reach down deep enough into human nature to effect this change. And He does it (1) by means of the revelation which He gives of the beauty and blessedness of righteousness in contrast with the ugliness and wretchedness of sin. This revelation makes one 'hunger and thirst after righteousness.' (2) By means of the revelation which He has given of God and the Fatherly compassion of God toward alienated and sinning men. (3) By means

of the surpassing and compelling exhibition of His own love in renouncing self and enduring such suffering as He did for the reconciliation and redemption of men. (4) By working in man through His Spirit that sorrow for sin and hatred of sin which lead men to renounce it and to turn away from it, seeking forgiveness and deliverance. (5) By holding out to men and giving to men the power to forsake sin and to overcome the tendency to sin. (6) Through the convincing effect of examples of that moral transformation which He is continually working in men and women of all sorts and conditions. In short, the history of Christianity in the past and the Christendom of the present both form a solid commentary of fact on the pregnant and potent words of St. Peter: 'Him hath God exalted as Prince and Saviour, to give repentance and forgiveness of sins' (Act_5:31).

Literature.—Bruce, *Kingdom of God*; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*; Stevens, *Theology of NT*; Beyschlag, *NT Theology*; Alexander, *Son of Man*; Weiss, *Life of Christ*; Stapfer, *Jesus Christ before His Ministry*; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Repentance'; W. Herrmann, *Communion with God*, 253; de Witt Hyde, *Jesus' Way* (1903), 55; Gilbert, *Revelation of Jesus* (1899), 62; C. A. Briggs, *Ethical Teaching of Jesus* (1904), 68; J. Watson, *Doctrines of Grace* (1900), 25; J. Denney, 'Three Motives to Repentance' in *Exp.* 4th ser. vii. (1893) 232; C. G. Montefiore, 'Rabbinic Conceptions of Repentance' in *JQR* [*Note: QR Jewish Quarterly Review.*] xvi. (1903) 209; P. J. Maclagan, *The Gospel View* (1906), 71; H. Black, *Edinburgh Sermons* (1906), 89.

Gross Alexander.

⚠ Repetitions

REPETITIONS.—The word 'repetitions' is found in the Gospels only in the phrase 'vain repetitions' in Mat_6:7 'When ye pray (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'in praying'), use not vain repetitions, as the heathen (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'the Gentiles') do: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking.'

The original word (βατταλογέω, written by modern scholars with *a* in the second syllable, after ⚗B) seems to be unknown to classical Greek, occurring only in the comment of Simplicius on Epictetus (c. [*Note: circa, about.*] 530 a.d.), and in Christian literature influenced by the Gospels.

Its origin has been explained in three ways: (1) as a word related to βατταριζω, and derived from Battus (Βάττος), the name of a Libyan stammerer said to be associated with the early history of Cyrene, or a wordy poet; (2) as an onomatopoeic word

imitating the utterance of a stammerer (Grimm, H. Holtzmann, Meyer); (3) as a hybrid composed of a Semitic element-New Hebrew *batal*, Aram. Aramaic *batal*, 'to be idle,' 'vain,' 'worthless,' represented in modern Arabic by *batal*, a term of contempt (*ExpT [Note: xpT Expository Times.]* xii. 60), and λογέω. The last derivation, which may have been in the minds of some of the Syriac translators (Syr [Note: yr Syriac.] *sin* and Pal. [Note: Palestine, Palestinian.] *Lect.*), has the powerful support of Blass (*ExpT [Note: xpT Expository Times.]* xii. 60), and apparently of Zahn. It is not wholly new, for some earlier scholars regarded the word as a hybrid, but found a different Semitic element. Zahn suggests that it was coined by Greek-speaking Semites, who, in writing the word with ττ, thought of βατταρίζω, and wished to connect their new formation with it. This ingenious explanation is not absolutely certain, but may be safely pronounced more probable than the first, and is, on the whole, preferable to the second.

The meaning of the word, or at least part of the meaning, is suggested by πολυλογία in the latter part of the verse. What our Lord condemns is clearly verbosity, the unthinking use of many words, and perhaps also the formal, careless use of expressions which are in themselves appropriate. The reference to Gentile errors in this respect is well illustrated by the cry of the priests of Baal on Carmel (1Ki 18:26), and the shout of the Ephesian mob, kept up for more than an hour (Act 19:34). Additional illustrations are supplied by Hindu practice (Ward, cited by Rosenmüller, *Das alte und neue Morgenland*, v. 38 f.) and Tibetan Buddhism (Rhys Davids, *Buddhism*, 209 f.). For an Egyptian condemnation of the practice, see *ExpT [Note: xpT Expository Times.]* vi. 537. That the later Jews were liable to wordiness in prayer might be inferred from the Lord's warnings, and is put beyond doubt by a number of passages in the Talmud. It is noted with approval (*Berakh. 32b*) that the righteous of an earlier age used to devote three hours a day to prayer and six-hours to waiting, an hour before and an hour after each hour of prayer. R. Meir (of 2nd cent. a.d.) is reported to have said that a man ought to utter a hundred benedictions in a day (*Menahoth, 43b*). R. Shimeon ben Nathanael, one of the disciples of R. Jochanan ben Zakai, warned his hearers against formalism: 'When thou prayest, make not thy prayer an ordinance, but an entreaty before God' (*'Abôth*, ii. 17, ed. Taylor). The threefold repetition of the 'Eighteen Blessings,' a custom the germ of which may have begun to develop in our Lord's day, was of itself calculated to encourage formal repetition. Some of the Rabbis recognized the peril and tried to check the tendency. An instance of verbosity which elicited a rebuke from a Rabbi is given in *Berakh. 33b*, 'O God, great, mighty, awful, glorious, strong, terrible,' etc. Vain repetitions are still in favour in the East, in Islam and its sects (Robinson Lees, *Village Life in Palestine*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , pp. 48, 51 f.; John P. Brown, *Dervishes*, p. 57).

Literature.—Besides the authorities cited above, see Wetstein and Zahn on Mat 6:7; Bischoff, *Jesus und die Rabbinen*, 1905, p. 71.

W. Taylor Smith.

☪ Rest

REPOSE.—1. It seems superfluous to labour (e.g. as Liddon, *Bampton Lecture*, p. 20; Edersheim, *LT* [Note: *T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* [Edersheim].] i. 599 f.) the point that Jesus needed repose, bodily rest, relaxation, as witnessing to His real human nature. This feature of His experience, along with others, appears as a quite simple and natural thing in the picture of the Prophet of Nazareth as presented by the primitive Evangelical tradition. The Synoptics repeatedly speak of the crowds that gathered about Jesus in the course of His work. The brief story is full of movement, press, and popular excitement. Withdrawal from time to time for rest and prayer was simply imperative. Mark conspicuously calls attention (as in Mar 6:31 δεῦτε ... κ. ἀναπαύσασθε ὀλίγον) to the various occasions when Jesus sought escape and relief from the crush. The Fourth Gospel, too, for all its peculiar portrayal of Jesus, accords with the Synoptics in this description of His ministry: see especially the mention of popular excitement in Jerusalem and elsewhere in chs. 6, 7 and 10. Nor must we overlook in another connexion the homely picture of Jesus resting, tired out with His journey, given in Joh 4:6. This in a way matches the memorable picture found in the threefold Synoptic narrative, in which the Master beats a speedy retreat after one busy and exhausting day, and sleeps like a child through the storm (Mar 4:35-38 ||). At the same time it is to be noted that undoubtedly Jesus sought by such withdrawals from public life not only repose and relief, but also opportunities for the special instruction of the Twelve. As particular instances of this, Mar 3:13; Mar 7:24-37 may be cited (see Bruce, art. 'Jesus,' § 11, in *Ebi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*] , vol. ii.).

2. Repose of spirit as a trait in the character of Jesus abundantly appears in the Gospels. If in doing the works of Him that sent Him (Joh 9:4) He often seems 'ohne Rast,' He is always in manner and spirit 'ohne Hast.' Suppliants for His help in healing the sick are often frantic in their appeals; He in responding ever displays composure and deliberation. Contrast, e.g., the entreaties of Jairus (Mar 5:22 f.) and the calmness of the whole attitude of Jesus (Mar 5:36); the quiet response, 'I will come and heal him' (Mat 8:7), and the hurried, eager request of the Roman captain on behalf of his servant. These are typical instances. John presents the same feature in the description of our Lord's behaviour on hearing of the sickness of Lazarus (ch. 11). The paroxysm of grief which shakes Him when He comes to His friend's grave

([Joh_11:33-34](#)) only throws into relief the normal composure which recovers itself in [Joh_11:41](#) f. Such, too, is the relation of Gethsemane's agony to the calm dignity which shows itself through all the rest of the *Via Dolorosa*. It is also a characteristic of the teaching of Jesus that there is an entire absence of the impatience, fuss, and strain which so often characterize the schemes of social and religious work launched by His well-meaning followers. With all the zeal and diligence that His sayings lay stress on, He always speaks with the accent of one who can afford to wait. It is not a mere matter of chance that serenity sits on the face of the Lord, as He is represented in the unbroken tradition of Christian art.

3. In the well-known passage [Mat_11:28-30](#) Jesus offers the gift of repose (*ἀνάπαυσις*, Authorized and Revised Versions rest) to those who will learn of Him. It is true, *ἀνάπαυσις* strictly speaking denotes relief from labour, a break to afford rest to tired toilers (see Trench, *NT Synonyms*, § 41); and it seems also to imply the resumption of labour. The words of Jesus, however, teach that to take His yoke and bear His burden, to live and serve as He teaches and as He lived and served Himself, will itself be *ἀνάπαυσις* as compared with other modes of living and serving, the yoke of which is never to be resumed. 'A Christi corde manat quies in animas nostras' (Bengel, *in loc.*). Tranquillity of soul, then, is a promised accompaniment of true Christian discipleship. A temper eagerly cultivated by Stoics (*aequanimitas* was the last watchword given by Antoninus Pius to his bodyguard) is also a precious Christian grace.

'Drop Thy still dews of quietness,

Till all our strivings cease:

Take from our souls the strain and stress,

And let our ordered lives confess

The beauty of Thy peace.' (Whittier).

J. S. Clemens.

REPROACH.—The word is found in Authorized and Revised Versions as a rendering of four Gr. terms that either occur in the Gospels or are used in the NT with reference to Christ Himself—the nouns ὄνειδος, ὀνειδισμός, and the vbs. ὀνειδίζω, ὑβρίζω. ὄνειδος = ‘shame,’ as the ground of reproach (whereas ὀνειδισμός is the actual reproaching), is found only in Luk_1:25 (of Elisabeth’s barrenness). ὑβρίζω is once rendered ‘reproach’ (Luk_11:45), but properly means to ‘insult.’ ὀνειδισμός and ὀνειδίζω are the terms with which we are specially concerned. The subject comes before us in three forms: (1) *reproach as uttered by Christ*; (2) *reproach as borne by Him*; (3) *reproach as falling upon His people*.

1. As uttered by Christ.—The language of rebuke (ἐπιτιμῶ) is several times ascribed to Jesus (see art. Rebuke), but seldom the language of reproach. When we distinguish between the two, the difference seems to be that rebuke denotes the simple censure of a fault, while reproach carries with it some emphasis upon the personal shame (ὄνειδος) attaching to it. And so it seems to be part of the method of Jesus, as understood by the Evangelists, to point out faults rather than to fasten the stigma of disgrace upon the culprit; He was more anxious to effect improvement than to inflict punishment—His eyes being ever towards the future rather than towards the past (cf. ‘Neither do I condemn thee: go thy way; from henceforth sin no more,’ in the *Pericope Adulterae*, Joh_8:11). Once in Authorized and Revised Versions (Luk_11:45) the word ‘reproach’ is used with reference to our Lord’s utterances, but there by a misrendering; for the Gr. vb. is ὑβρίζω, which means to ‘insult,’ not to reproach. But the Evangelist, it is to be noted, does not say that Jesus insulted any one; it is ‘one of the lawyers’ who accuses Him of insulting the legal class. It was not our Lord’s way, however, to insult people, even though they were His enemies; and, on examination, the charge of this lawyer serves only to illustrate the tendency of offended pride to regard a declaration of the honest truth as a ground of personal offence.

Only on two occasions is the vb. ὀνειδίζω employed to describe the language of Jesus, and both times Authorized Version renders ‘upbraid,’ which Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 rather inconsistently retains. In Mat_11:20 Jesus reproaches the cities in which most of His mighty works were done, because they repented not; and in the Appendix to Mk. (Mar_16:14) He reproaches the Eleven for their slowness to receive the testimony of His resurrection. These cases suggest that Jesus did not hesitate to add reproach to rebuke when He thought it deserved. Capernaum was ‘his own city’ (Mat_9:1; cf. Mat_4:13); Chorazin and Bethsaida had shared with it in the fullest manifestations of His power and grace. The men whom He is said to have reproached for their unbelief and hardness of heart were those whom He had specially chosen to

be the depositaries and messengers of His gospel, and whom He had trained through long months for this very purpose, lavishing upon them all the wealth of His Divine treasures of knowledge and love. No wonder that in these cases the censure of Jesus became reproachful. And indeed His reproach was more frequent than we might gather from the occurrence of the word in the Gospel narratives, and was most frequent when He was dealing with those of whom, loving them the best, He expected the most. Was He not speaking reproachfully when He said, ‘How is it that ye do not understand?’ (Mat 16:11); ‘How long shall I be with you? how long shall I bear with you?’ (Mat 17:17); ‘Have I been so long time with you, and dost thou not know me, Philip?’ (Joh 14:9). Was there not a more piercing reproach in His voice when He said to the traitor, ‘Judas, with a kiss dost thou betray the Son of Man?’ (Luk 22:48); and in His eyes when, as the cock crew, He turned and looked upon Peter (Luk 22:60-61)?

2. Reproach as borne by Christ.—So far as the term is concerned, it is only by the two robbers who were crucified along with Him that our Lord is said to have been reproached (ὄνειδίζω, Mat 27:44, Mar 15:32; see Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). This reproach by the robbers belongs to the general subject of the reviling of Jesus Christ in connexion with His trial and crucifixion, for which see art. Mockery.

In the Epistles the word ‘reproach’ receives a much wider meaning, as denoting generally the shame and contempt, the hardships and suffering which Christ endured in the days of His flesh. In Rom 15:3 St. Paul exhorts Christians to a life of unselfish consideration for others by pointing to the example of the Master, and quotes in this connexion the exact words of the LXX Septuagint translation of Psa 69:9 (Psa 68:10) ‘The reproaches of them that reproached (οἱ ὄνειδισμοὶ τῶν ὄνειδίζόντων) thee fell upon me.’ The Psalm describes the sufferings of the righteous man at the hands of the ungodly, and the verse quoted represents him as telling how he has to bear the reproaches directed against God Himself. The Apostle, however, transfers the words to Christ, and makes them describe how He bore the burden of reproach for others, and so serve to give point to an exhortation against self-pleasing.

In two passages the author of Hebrews uses the expression ‘the reproach (ὄνειδισμός) of Christ,’ or ‘his reproach,’ to denote the earthly shame and sorrow of Jesus. In the first case (Heb 11:26), Moses is described as ‘esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt.’ The writer’s idea appears to be, not only that by identifying himself with his despised people Moses took upon himself a burden of contempt and suffering resembling that which was afterwards borne by Christ on our behalf, but that he had Christ prophetically in view—saw Him afar off, even as Father Abraham did (Joh 8:56), and was strengthened by the vision to run his own race with patience (cf. Heb 12:2-3). In the second passage (Heb 13:13), the

Jewish-Christian readers are exhorted to a fellowship with the sufferings of Christ, in the words, 'Let us go forth therefore unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach.' The allusion apparently is to the sin-offering on the Day of Atonement without the camp of Israel, and to the suffering of Jesus without the city gate; and the meaning is that those Jewish-Christians must forsake the sphere of the OT religion, break off the old ties of national fellowship, and face all the pain and contumely that this would involve, so that they might share in the better blessings of the great Sin-offering.

3. Reproach as falling upon Christ's people.—Both in Mt. (Mat_5:11) and Lk. (Luk_6:22) reproach forms a part of the last Beatitude—the Beatitude of Persecution. There are, we have seen, two kinds of reproach—a reproach that is just, and one that is unjust; such reproach as Christ uttered, and such reproach as He endured. In deserved reproach there lies great sorrow and shame. The Lord's backward look through the open door of the hall sent Peter out into the night to weep bitterly (Luk_22:61 f.); the remembrance of the last words addressed to him by his Master must have been as a barb to the arrow of remorse that sank so deep into the soul of Judas (Mat_26:50, Luk_22:48). On the other hand, both honour and blessing belong to undeserved reproach falling upon Christ's people for their Master's sake. Jesus frequently forewarned His disciples that persecution would come upon them through following Him (Mat_5:10 ff., Mat_5:44; Mat_10:23; Mat_10:38; Mat_13:21; Mat_16:24, Mar_10:30; Mar_10:38, Luk_6:22; Luk_21:12, Joh_15:20). And in this Beatitude He specially forewarns them of the persecution of false and bitter tongues—more trying to some natures than the stones of the mob or the tyrant's scourge and sword.

The Apostles and the early Church had their full share of the reproach of evil tongues (cf. Act_2:13; Act_6:11; Act_17:32; Act_21:28; Act_22:22; Act_24:5-6, Rom_3:8, Jam_2:7, 1Pe_4:4). But the glory that lies in being reproached for Christ's sake, and the Lord's great promise regarding this experience, were never forgotten. It was this that taught St. Paul to bless when he was reviled (1Co_4:12). It was evidently with the very words of Jesus echoing in his ears that St. Peter wrote, 'If ye be reproached (ὀνειδίζεσθε) for the name of Christ, blessed are ye' (1Pe_4:14). And when the author of Hebrews speaks of the 'reproach of Christ'—telling of the manner in which it was esteemed by Moses, and urging his fellow-believers of the Jewish race to go forth without the camp with that reproach upon them—it may be that he also is recalling how Jesus taught His disciples to rejoice in reproach because their reward in heaven was great (Mat_5:12, Luk_6:23). For in the one case he represents Moses as forming his estimate of the reproach of Christ from his respect unto the recompense of the reward (Heb_11:26), and in the other he exhorts Christians to the bearing of the same reproach, on the ground that they look for the abiding city which is to come (Heb_13:14).

⚡ Reserve

RESERVE.—In Mat 7:6 Jesus counsels reserve in the communication of religious truth. That maxim, which has had great and sinister developments in the Church, stands alone, both in its place in the Sermon on the Mount and in His teaching. Its meaning, then, can be gathered only from His practice.

1. It was never Jesus' custom to meet *religious curiosity or speculation*. As He was teaching, one said unto Him, 'Lord, are there few that be saved!' (Luk 13:22-25). He did not answer; He said, 'Strive to enter in at the strait gate ...' He turned His hearers' attention from that speculation, which has no saving power in it, to the clear duty and wisdom of the moment. When Peter asked if the parable of the Servants waiting for their Lord was addressed to the disciples specially, or to all, Jesus did not answer (Luk 12:41). He painted, instead, another picture for the inward eye of the heart. In both cases it was the practical and most imperative needs of the soul's relation to God that He considered. That directing purpose shown in these cases, explains the silences of His teaching, the reserves of His revelation. When He spoke of those on whom the tower fell, and of the Galilaeans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices (Luk 13:1-5), the old problem of the suffering of the innocent was suggested; but He shed no light upon it. He made practical use of it, instead, as a call to repentance. The immortality of the soul is the presupposition of all His teaching about the love of the Heavenly Father for men, His children. 'The life after death, Lightfoot and I agreed, is the cardinal point of Christianity' (*In Memoriam*, Author's Notes, p. 227 n. [Note: note.]). But Jesus, of His own impulse, only enunciates this truth at the end of His mission. And a practical need then impelled Him. His disciples needed consolation for the days after His death, and He left them the hope which would strengthen their faith and loyalty (John 14). With Jesus, the declaration of any truth depended wholly upon the needs of faith in the heart.

2. Jesus practised reserve as to *His personal claims*. The Jews came and asked Him, 'How long dost thou make us doubt: if thou be the Christ, tell us plainly' (Joh 10:24). They were surprised at His silence about what seemed to them so important. And His blessing of Peter (Mat 16:13-17) shows that He had been silent also in private, even among the inner circle of His disciples. His reserve is explained, not by the slow growth of His own conception of His Messiahship, but by the method of establishing the Kingdom of God which He had set before Him from the beginning. The weapons of His warfare were to be purely spiritual. His aim was to set up the Kingdom within men's hearts, to win their heart's love and trust in the Father. And for that end the

appeal of all His activities, miracles of help and healing and words of teaching, was single. He aimed at the heart, the seat and source of faith, where the vision and the love of goodness, with their dynamic impulse, are. And Peter's confession was a joy to Him, because it came from his heart's assurance that Jesus had the words of eternal life (Joh 6:68, Mat 16:17). It was faith in goodness asserting itself against the appearance of things. To this faith Jesus confessed His greatness and Divine mission. He did so, because then He was merely certifying the Divine supremacy of that goodness which had, in its lowliness and simplicity, won the love and trust of their hearts. Through their faith they reached His authority. Jesus recognized no other path to faith in Him as Messiah, the revealer of the Father, and the founder of the Kingdom of God upon the earth. He sent the inquiring Jews back to this road (Joh 10:25-27); He withdrew from the people who, from material ideas and expectations, would have made Him king (Joh 6:15); and He declined to answer the chief priests and elders, who came inquiring for His authority, because they were not simple-hearted or honest inquirers (Mat 21:23-27). This single regard for the interests of faith in the heart explains also His reserve with the messengers of John (Joh 11:2-6). John belonged to the old economy (Joh 11:11); his prophecy of the Messiah's coming had been a prophecy of judgment (Joh 3:12). The simple acknowledgment by Jesus that He was the Messiah could never have brought to him enlightenment and faith as to that Kingdom of heaven whose least disciple was greater than he. Its inevitable consequence would have been to confirm him in his old expectations of judgment; it would have appeared to him a call to wait in patience the good time of the Messiah, when He would play the stern part John had foretold. Therefore Jesus gave no direct answer to John's question. He pointed rather to all the gracious activities which were partly the causes of John's doubting impatience. These were the signs of that Kingdom of love which Jesus was establishing; and if John were ever to gain the higher and richer conceptions of God and of man manifested there, he must see the Messiah through these quiet and lowly activities of loving helpfulness, and believe in Him as Him that should come, because of them and not despite them.

3. *The sufferings of the Messiah.*—It was immediately upon Peter's confession that Jesus began to teach the necessity of suffering and death for Himself (Mat 16:21, Mar 8:31). There are a precision and a fulness of detail in the account of this teaching, which are probably reflected back upon it from later experience. But the tragic note enters then and dominates the later teaching both in public and private. Its emergence at that time does not prove that Jesus entered then upon a new conception of His mission, taught by the progress of events. It is more probable that this tragic note was in His conception of the task of establishing the Kingdom from the beginning. His wilderness temptation argues that (Mat 4:8-9); it is implicit in His Beatitudes upon the meek and the persecuted, and in His teaching of the earthly rewards of hypocrisy (Mat 6:2; Mat 6:5; Mat 6:16); and the deeper spirit of the OT, with its history of religious growth through the sufferings of the saints and the

long-suffering patience of Jehovah's love, could not be veiled from the insight of His meditation thereon in the years of His preparation. The joy of the early days does not contradict this. It was the natural answer of the heart to those new thoughts of the love of the Father which Jesus preached. And in Jesus' own thought this tragic element was not in contradiction with that instinctive, buoyant joy in His gospel, though then He had many things to say to them which they could not bear (Joh_16:12). Peter's confession brought the opportunity of revealing further the depths of the riches of the wisdom and love of God.

Reserve, as practised by Jesus, was never a politic means of leading men's minds gradually to doctrines which might startle or offend them at first sight; it consisted only in seeking, with a single aim, the practical needs of faith in the heart—belief in that Divine Love whose outgoings are redemptive, and in whose fellowship and service stands eternal life.

Literature.—Ker, *Sermons*, 1st ser. xx.; *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times.*] iv. [1893] 446; Paget, *Studies in the Chr. Character*, xxii.; J. Smith, *The Magnetism of Christ* (1904), 269; B. Whitefoord in *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times.*] vi. (1895) 22.

Richard Glaister.

☒ Resistance

RESISTANCE.—See Retaliation.

☒ Rest

REST.—1. There is in the Gospels frequent allusion to the value of rest as the purchase of preceding effort, the compensation that is provided for sore afflictions. The Sermon on the Mount, as the proclamation of the new Kingdom, guarantees such rest and peace to those who serve and suffer for the sake of that Kingdom (Mat_5:1-12). Prosperity in the world can make no such promises (Luk_12:20; Luk_16:25).

2. As rest, physical, social, and religious, is an organic necessity of life, and is protected by conditions of time and place, it should not be set aside for effort that is uncalled for, or that confuses the lower and higher forms of rest. Such was the lesson given in the home at Bethany (Luk_10:42). Similarly, the lilies of the field, while

developing to the full their own character in their own place, are content to remain lilies (Mat_6:28-29).

3. There is an ignoble state of rest that may slothfully or blindly oppose the call to a higher and truer contentment (Mat_11:17; Mat_11:22, Luk_19:40). Christ's gift is life abundant (Joh_10:10), but the bestowal involves asking, and faith's exertion of knocking is expected at the entrance into life (Mat_7:7).

4. In the parable of the Sower, the recompense is in the abundant harvest. This increase is the way of nature where hindering things cease to operate. The list of obstacles typifies the things that impoverish or prevent altogether the fruitfulness of discipleship. In the Kingdom of heaven the instinct of citizenship is to be rich toward God. Its gratification is not toil but rest (Mat_11:28; see art. Repose).

Literature.—The subject is treated homiletically in many vols. of Sermons, as H. Allon, *Indwelling Christ* (1892), 41; Stopford Brooke, *Gospel of Joy* (1898), 123; R. Flint, *Christ's Kingdom* (1865), 22; E. W. Moore, *The Promised Rest* (1904); R. Rainy, *Sojourning with God* (1902), 37; J. H. Jowett, *Apostolic Optimism* (1901), 87. See also *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times*.] ii. (1891) 110, viii. (1897) 239, x. (1899) 48, 104, xii. (1901) 466.

G. M. Mackie.

☞ Restoration

RESTORATION.—Round this word gather some of the most fascinating problems of our thought in regard to the possibilities of human destiny. Every lover of his kind, and everyone who has caught something of the spirit of the Lord Christ, is compelled, for his own mental and spiritual satisfaction, to ask, What is to be the issue of all this complex life of man, the beginnings of which we see on the earth, the final issue when the Divine purpose concerning the race is accomplished? And naturally the Scriptures of the NT are eagerly scanned to discover what declarations are there made, or hints given, respecting the issue. Above all, has the Master of Truth left us any definite teaching on which a fair and inspiring hope may be built? At first sight it must be confessed that to those who look for express statements of our Lord and His Apostles in regard to future destiny, the results of a restrained exegesis are disappointing. Isolated expressions and passages may be, and often have been, pressed into the service of preconceived hopes; but, on the whole, the statements of Scripture afford too slender a basis on which to raise a structure of dogmatic assertion, and do not throw light very far into the great mystery of the future. The

disappointment, however, is modified by two considerations: (1) Many of the references to the future life are quite incidental, and occur in writings which are themselves obviously of the most occasional character, in which, therefore, the immediate doctrinal or ethical concern is paramount, and no intention of dealing with the problems of Eschatology was before the writer's mind. (2) The mysteriousness which everywhere surrounds our human existence is an essential part of life's discipline. If all the mystery concerning the future were dispelled, the race would be without one of its most refining and sanctifying influences, much of life's interest would vanish and its finest essence evaporate. The Evangelists, the Apostles, and even our Lord Himself in His earthly life, were required to vindicate to themselves the Divine purpose in this mortal career without having all the future destiny of mankind revealed to them. Limitation of knowledge here seems to be essential to the very being of human nature.

In considering the Scripture intimations regarding the hope of a universal Restoration of humanity, it must be clearly seen that whatever hopes may, more or less distinctly, emerge in the expressed thought of the Apostles, are all clearly based upon, and inspired by, an enlarging thought concerning the Person of Jesus Christ, and the revelation given in Him and recorded in the Gospels.

The word 'restoration' (ἀποκατάστασις, Authorized Version 'restitution') is found only once in the Gospels, and in its verbal form, in Mat 17:11, in connexion with a hope current in our Lord's time of a moral renovation of the nation under the leadership of Elijah (cf. Mal 3:1; Mal 4:5-6), and declared by our Lord to be fulfilled in the great spiritual movement initiated by John the Baptist (Mat 17:10-12). The noun is employed in Act 3:21, where it would be extremely interesting if we could believe that St. Peter, in his anticipation of the χρόνος ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων, had in his mind any thought of the universal restoration of mankind, and its final uprising to the life of fellowship with God. His need of mental enlargement, given later by means of the vision (Act 10:9-33), to enable him to believe in the possibility of Gentile salvation, is decisive against such an interpretation. We may well inquire, however, how far the expression, calculated to express so much, was due to the writer of the Acts, St. Luke, to whom such a pregnant phrase and such a large hope for humanity would naturally commend itself.

But the question remains, Does the larger idea of the restoration of humanity as a whole to obedience, and to the condition of blessedness for which it was created, receive a warrant from the words and thoughts of Scripture?

1. In examining, first, *our Lord's own teaching*, which we take as fundamental in the consideration of the question, it must be clearly understood what we are to ask

concerning it. We desire to know if we have any evidence from the words of Jesus reported in the Gospels, that He Himself held the faith of the final restoration of all men. Was it for Him included in the possibilities of the future? or have we any express declaration that in this life only is there a possibility of right moral decision being made, with the consequent attainment to a right and saving relation to God? The last question stands on the threshold of the inquiry; for if it be unmistakably answered in the affirmative, it must determine the whole problem for those who accept His authority as final; while, if no such declaration is found, the way is left open for a redeeming process beyond the bounds of this brief mortal life.

Our Lord is reported to have spoken of everlasting or eternal punishment (κόλασιν αιώ
νιον), apparently as the opposite of life everlasting or eternal (ζωὴν αἰώνιον,

Mat 25:46). The use of the same term αἰώνιος of both life and punishment has inclined many to regard the passage as decisive on this momentous question; but the majority of modern scholars consider that the aeonian (literally 'age-long') life or suffering is to be understood as at least possibly terminable, and that the expression applied is qualitative rather than quantitative, referring to the relation of both life and death to God rather than to duration of time. 'Eternal' and not 'everlasting' is its true equivalent. It may also be said that even if the expressions are meant to refer to the endlessness of the punishment or of the blessedness, they may properly be understood as a very strong assertion of the undoubted fact that the suffering that comes of sin is eternally, endlessly bound up with the sin, even as the blessedness of the righteous is necessarily involved in their obedience. The hopelessness of the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is summed up in the words 'he is guilty of eternal sin' (Mar 3:29). The latter possibility, however, is nowhere asserted of all who 'die in their sins' (Joh 8:24), and leave this world unrepentant. See Eternal Sin.

Similarly, the same fact of the eternal and necessary association of suffering with sin is expressed in Mar 9:43-48 'the worm that dieth not,' and 'the fire that never shall be quenched.' But in neither case is it declared that those who are sent away into that searching experience are doomed to abide there endlessly. The fire of the Divine wrath against sin is essential to the Divine Being, and while God is God it cannot but burn. Both passages convey a most solemn warning to men against being caught into that holy wrath, the fiery trial of suffering and remorse that inevitably waits upon all disobedience, against that dissolution of the life which elsewhere our Lord describes as the cutting of man asunder, and as that terrible portion of the unbeliever or hypocrite which is weeping and gnashing of teeth (Mat 24:51, cf. Luk 12:46). Unspeakable horror of the world to come for the impenitent and disobedient reveals itself in all that He teaches us regarding it; in His sense of sin, and the mischief, corruption, and agony which it works; in His urging that it were 'profitable,' good for a man, to make the utmost sacrifice of all that makes life good to live, even to the

plucking out of the eye or the cutting off of the hand, rather than to be cast into that loathly Gehenna which our Lord glances at, rather than depicts (Mat_5:29-30); but of the duration of that state of woe He gives no hint. Although it may with much force be maintained that the images He employs—the worm, the fire, the salting with fire—are all most naturally interpreted as purifying and cleansing agencies, yet it is wiser to see that He leaves the Divine purpose in all that mysterious process of retribution to be inferred from the whole revelation of God which He had given in His earthly life. See, further, Eternal Fire, Eternal Punishment.

Due weight must be assigned to the remarkable reticence maintained by Jesus regarding the world to come, both concerning the nature of the blessedness of heaven, and the future destiny of the unrepentant. In His incarnate condition, under the limitations necessarily involved in the taking of a veritable human nature, much of that future was hidden from His view as from ours. The discipline of mystery concerning the future world, which is so salutary for our nature, was not without its value in the perfecting of the Redeemer. And therefore, while He possessed absolute knowledge of the moral conditions of that life, kindred as they were with the moral conditions of life here, He was not privileged to see all that future unfolded. And it is surely most significant that of the course of events in that ‘sequestered state,’ in that world to which the sinful pass at death, He speaks no word. And He nowhere precludes the possibility of moral growth and betterment in that vast Unseen; the parable of Dives and Lazarus (Luk_16:19-31) speaks of ‘a great gulf fixed’ prohibiting a passage from either of the two contrasted states of being to the other, but it was not a gulf across which there could come no communication or redeeming influence, for Dives and Abraham can hold converse; and the parable hints not obscurely at some betterment of the selfish rich man who begins to have a genuine concern for his brethren (unless it must be interpreted as a subtle form of self-excuse).

The Gospels contain no word of this life as being absolutely and finally decisive of all human destiny, and remembering the complexity of life not for the heathen only, and for nations chosen to play another part than a religious one, in the great purpose of God, but for men living in full gospel light, yet doomed from their birth and before it to an almost hopeless incapacity for truth and virtue, our moral nature shrinks irresistibly from such a thought. On the contrary, we have certain indications, not beyond question and yet full of hopeful suggestion, that the mind of Jesus reached out beyond all the complexity and travail to a glorious issue and consummation worthy of being called ‘the glory of the Father.’ He speaks in Mat_19:28 of a coming Regeneration (*παλιγγενεσία*) in which those who have faithfully followed Him shall share His rule; but we have no clue as to whether His words are intended to reach beyond the definite establishment of His Kingdom as an actual fact among men. But in

that Kingdom once established He placed His hope, and He taught us to pray for its coming as the equivalent of the Divine will being done on earth as it is in heaven.

In Joh 12:32 (cf. Joh 3:14) He declares that His 'lifting up' shall be the means of 'drawing all men' to Himself, and His words are naturally interpreted as expressing His hope and expectation of a complete redemption of mankind, and can scarcely be satisfied by saying that though this is the natural effect, it may never be the actual effect of His supreme sacrifice.

On the whole, while it must be confessed that we have no certain statement from our Lord as to the final issue of things, we have yet much to encourage a hopeful attitude, in harmony as that attitude is with the intuitions of the human heart, and with the whole disclosure of God's love 'in the face of Jesus Christ.' The Son of Man and Son of God has 'thrown light' not only upon the intimations of immortality which existed in the heart of man, but also upon the problem as to future restoration, not so much by what He says as by His whole Personality, His revelation of and abiding relation to the unseen Father.

2. Upon that revelation in the actual Jesus of Nazareth, and upon their increasing sense of the infinite importance of the Christ who ever liveth, *the Apostles* found their thought and speculation, so far as these find place in their writings, regarding the larger and ultimate issues of redemption. Whatever hopes they permit themselves to express, all centre in His Personality and power. The vagueness which characterizes most of the references to the question is due to the fact that the writings are all casual. In no case are the authors specifically or systematically dealing with the problem, being not theologians so much as practical Apostles, dealing with the ethical questions of the Churches and with individual salvation.

(a) In the Johannine writings are found many principles of truth on which far-reaching inferences may legitimately enough be founded, such as the assertion that 'God is light, and in him is no darkness at all' (1Jn 1:5); but there is no evidence that the writer had apprehended these logical inferences.

(b) In the First Epistle of Peter two important passages are 1Pe 3:18-20; 1Pe 4:6, which, in spite of a considerable weight of adverse exegesis which forbids any dogmatic assertion based upon the words, may fairly be taken as suggesting that the scope of redemption is not limited to the present scene. The Apostle has the conception of an underworld from which a moral process is not excluded.

(c) In the Pauline writings the most conservative exegesis reads a clear declaration of the Divine purpose that all men shall be saved, but denies that any certain hope as to the final issue can be built upon the fact. Here many will naturally diverge in

judgment, and feel that they can raise their hope so securely nowhere else as upon the expressed purpose and will of God (Rom 11:32, 1Ti 2:3-4, cf. 2Pe 3:9). When once the holy *will* of the Father, in its might and energy and Divine persistence, is realized, the Christian man may at least ‘rest in hope’ of an issue beyond our farthest vision. Martensen (*Christian Dogmatics*, English translation 474-484) is a type of those who regard Scripture as presenting two sides of the truth respecting future destiny which are at present unreconcilable; but the antinomy which no doubt exists will largely disappear if the process of development in Apostolic and especially in Pauline thought be allowed for. In his earlier Epistles (1 and 2 Thess.), St. Paul is largely influenced by the apocalyptic ideas of traditional Judaism (1Th 4:15-17, 2Th 2:3-10). But in the later stages of his writing a larger conception of the Divine purpose begins to find expression. In Rom 8:19 he anticipates a glorious ‘revelation of the sons of God’—and in Rom 11:32 he expresses the widest design in the Divine mind, determining all the mysterious process of redemption, as ‘that he might have mercy upon all.’ And, as his thought matures, his hope expands under an enlarged sense of the central position of the ever-living Christ in this world and in all worlds, and under his feeling of the larger spaces in the Divine purpose and working—the ‘ages upon ages’ (Eph 2:7; Eph 3:21). In Col 1:16-17 the Son is declared to be the creator of all things visible and invisible. All things (τὰ πάντα) find their cohesive principle in Him (συνέστηκεν), and their final consummation (εἰς αὐτόν). In Eph 1:10 He is the Head of all, in which the whole creative and redeeming process is to be summed up (ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ χριστῷ), and in Php 2:10 His is the Name at which the whole created universe is to bow with undivided acclamation. In Col 1:20 the blessings of redemption are extended to the whole system of things (cf. Eph 1:21-22) on, which Toy (*Judaism and Christianity*, pp. 407-408) says: ‘If we are to see here the conception of a final reconciliation between God and His creatures, a blotting out of evil in the sense that it shall be transformed into good, a complete harmonizing of the universe so that neither angel nor man shall be found to set himself against the Divine ethical order, then we must hold this view to spring out of a philosophical thought which does not find support elsewhere in the NT, and which did not afterward meet with wide approval in the Church.’ And though this may be conceded, and though we must not be blind to the fact that the issues thus gloriously expressed were not fully thought out by the Apostle or applied to the question of Restoration, yet, based as they are upon the Person of Christ and supplemented by the principles of His teaching and revelation, they may be taken to express a sober and restrained hopefulness for the ultimate issue, which shall never for a moment be suffered to lessen the evangelic urgency that ‘Now is the accepted time; now is the day of salvation’ (2Co 6:2).

The hope of a final completion of the Divine purpose in the restoration from sin's dominion of all mankind must derive much of its force from a contemplation of the alternatives; from the difficulty of supposing a Divine purpose and will eternally active yet never attaining to its desire, or of conceiving of any human soul as eternally incapable of responding to the all-pervasive Love of God, or of thinking of any eternal felicity of the blessed which can be undisturbed by the knowledge of living souls abiding in a hopeless doom. Alleviations of the idea of eternal punishment such as that of 'Conditional Immortality' offend almost equally against the fundamental instincts of the human heart, which cannot think that the All-wise and All-loving has created any soul in His own image to prove but a waste and an abortion.

'Which else He made in vain—which must not be!'

Such thoughts are in the human intuition, and they are based upon the nature of God as made known to us in Christ Jesus, and upon the eternal Personality of Him 'who was dead, and is alive for evermore; and hath the keys of death and the unseen world' (Rev 1:18). They are reinforced by the human love for its own kind, which at its highest finds voice in Browning (*Saul*):

'Would I fain in my impotent yearning do all for this man,

And dare doubt He alone shall not help him, who yet alone can?'

And on these rests the conviction that 'faith in the exceeding grandeur of reality shall never be confounded' (Sir O. Lodge, *Life and Matter*).

Literature.—The subject is treated, *in loc.*, by the following: various works on NT Theology; Salmond, *Christ. Doct. of Immortality*; Petavel, *The Problem of Immortality* (1892); Toy, *Judaism and Christianity*, ch. vii. (1892); Row, *Future Retribution*; Maurice, *Theological Essays*; R. H. Charles, *Eschatology*, chs. ix. x.; J. Fyfe, *The Hereafter* (1890); Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, English translation i. pp. 364-408, ii. pp. 340-374. W. R. Alger, *Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*¹⁰ [Note: 0 designates the particular edition of the work referred] (1880), is critical from the point of view of a past generation, but contains, amid much strained and perverse exegesis, and considerable rhetoric, many illuminating suggestions in favour of a final Restoration. On the same or kindred lines, but with truer exegesis, are Farrar, *Eternal Hope* (1878), *Mercy and Judgment* (1881); Cox, *Salvator Mundi: Is Christ the Saviour of all Men?* (1877); Jukes, *The Second Death and the Restitution of all Things* (1888); Plumtre, *Spirits in Prison* (see pp. 193-204 for citation of divines, ancient and modern, in favour of Restoration); *Letters of Erskine of Linlathen*—one on 'Final Salvation of all.'

☩ Resurrection Of Christ

RESURRECTION OF CHRIST

1. St. Paul's summary of the Resurrection appearances (1 Corinthians 15) is, says Godet (*Com.* ii. 435), the most ancient and most official of the records we possess. If Harnack's chronology be made our basis (*Gesch. der Altchristl. Lit.* vol. ii. (i.) 236 ff.), our Lord's death was in a.d. 29 or 30; St. Paul's conversion in 30; his correspondence with Corinth, 53. His visit to St. Peter at Jerusalem would be in 33. Thus he had known this tradition for nearly 20 years, and recorded it within 23 years of the Resurrection. On St. Paul's list of the witnesses we note:—(1) That it is a list and not a narrative. It is the barest summary, expressed with the utmost conciseness (cf. *Cambr. Theol. Essays*, p. 331). (2) It is derived and not original (1Co_15:3 'I received' [παρέλαβον], 'I delivered unto you' [παρέδωκα]). If we here possess a primitive tradition orally communicated to St. Paul by the older Apostles, then it would be uncritical to infer that St. Paul 'knows nothing' of any appearance which he does not record. (3) The order of the list is chronological. This is shown by the use of εἶτα, ἔπειτα: 'then to the Twelve; then ... to above 500; then ... to James; then to all the apostles.' (4) The purpose is not primarily apologetic (cf. *Cambridge Theol. Essays*, 395, 329, 330). The Resurrection of Christ was not disputed at Corinth. The introduction of the list here is due to that instinct for systematic completeness, that determination to go down to first principles, which is eminently characteristic of St. Paul, rather than to any apologist's desire to convince men who do not believe that Christ is risen. (5) The selection is evidently official (cf. Knowling, *Testimony of St. Paul*, p. 301)—St. Peter as the first of the Apostles, St. James head of the Church at Jerusalem. 'Peter and James were at the time of writing the two most prominent persons in the Christian Society, St. Paul himself not being excepted' (*Ch. Quart. Rev.*, Jan. 1906, p. 330). The same applies to the Apostles in a body. The other appearance is recorded for its numerical importance. Thus the omission of the Women from this official list is not surprising. It is noticeable that the Fourth Gospel, although recording the appearance to Mary Magdalene, yet omits it from the official enumeration (Joh_21:14). Thus the Fourth Gospel supports St. Paul's procedure, and demonstrates that omission is not necessarily due to ignorance.

On St. Paul's list of the witnesses, see, further, *Ch. Quart. Rev.*, Jan. 1906, 327-331; Knowling, *Testimony of St. Paul*; Gess, *Das Dogma von Christi Person und Werk*, xvii.

2. The personal testimony of St. Paul to Christ's Resurrection.—A comparison of the three accounts of St. Paul's conversion in Acts 9, 22, 26, which may be respectively denoted A, B, and C, shows certain variations.

(1) The intervention of Ananias, contained in A and B, is omitted in C; the instruction given by him being in substance transferred in C to Christ. It may be, as Blass considers (*Act. Apost. ix.*), that the historic order is maintained in A and B rather than in C, since such instruction as to the Apostle's duty would come more naturally under calmer circumstances and at a later time. It should also be noted that of these three accounts the first is the historian's narrative in the course of the events, where Ananias would necessarily be mentioned. The second was spoken to the Jewish throng on the ascent to the Praetorium, where the mention of Ananias and his orthodoxy would be reassuring to the hearers (cf. Knowling, *op. cit.*). The third, spoken before the magistrates, omits him, because the reference would not in any degree strengthen the Apostle's case, nor be desirable on Ananias' account. Again, it is noteworthy that the incident of Ananias is, as Blass says, separable from the main event. Its omission by St. Paul in 1 Cor. shows this. It does, however, entail the important loss of reference to St. Paul's baptism given in A and B. It may be psychologically difficult to separate Ananias' instructions from St. Paul's own reflexions. But this again is distinct from the momentous issue.

(2) The effect upon the attendants is recorded with variations. In A they are described as ἀκούοντες μὲν τῆς φωνῆς μηδὲνα δὲ θεωροῦντες. In B, τὴν δὲ φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν τοῦ λαλοῦντός μοι. In C the attendants are not mentioned. It is usually said that the distinction of case after ἀκούειν implies that the attendants heard the sound (genitive) but could not distinguish the substance (accusative) of the message (cf. Grimm-Thayer, *Lex.*).

But, taking the extreme case that these details cannot be reconciled, do they vitally alter the central affirmation? Is not some confusion between the effect on St. Paul and that upon the attendants very readily accounted for on the religious principle that receptiveness varies with spirituality? Zeller (followed by Pfleiderer, *Urchristentum*, i. 61) has, indeed, made the most of these differences (*Acts*, vol. i. p. 287), on the ground that for the objective character of the appearance great importance must attach to the testimony of St. Paul's companions. But the essential points are perfectly clear; that the attendants were bewildered and confused by an external incident whose nature they evidently took for supernatural but could not further explain.

On the three narratives in Acts, see, further, Knowling, *Testimony of St. Paul*; Sabatier, *L'apôtre Paul*; Goguel, *L'apôtre Paul et Jésus Christ*; Chase, *Credibility of Acts*; Rackham, *Acts*.

So far as to St. Paul's personal testimony recorded in Acts. To this must be added the references in his Epistles. It is certainly remarkable that amid his courageous self-revelation no account of his own conversion is given in the Epistles. And yet any such account would obviously be necessary for his opponents rather than for his converts, who must have heard the story orally; and this is precisely what the allusions and inferences in the Epistles suggest. There are here three points to be remembered: (1) The external or objective character of the appearance outside Damascus; (2) the fact that this external appearance is not incompatible with intellectual preparation for the change; nor (3) with an inner revelation in the department of the intellect as to the significance and far-reaching character of the external revelation bestowed (cf. Maurice Goguel, *L'apôtre Paul et Jésus Christ*).

(a) Theologians were formerly disposed to confine the intellectual change in St. Paul to the period of reflexion subsequent to conversion. Modern writers place it chiefly in the period before. It may well have been in both. Consciousness of the impossibility of unaided compliance with the requirement of the moral ideal (Romans 7) may well have prepared the way for the acceptance of Christianity, although by no means necessarily even suggesting, still less involving, its truth. On this point the greatest caution is essential. We have no information. The elaborated hypotheses whereby St. Paul is supposed to have made the transition to Christianity in purely subjective ways are wonderful feats of critical ingenuity, but they have no necessary relation to history. What is certain is that he believed the transition to have been suddenly effected by the manifestation of the Risen Christ.

(b) Similarly with the question of the inner revelation of Christ within the mind of St. Paul (Gal 1:15-16 'to reveal his Son *in me*'). Because St. Paul received a mental enlightenment, it cannot possibly follow that he did not see an outward vision or hear a voice. Rather that which he heard and saw formed the external data of his inward thoughts and convictions. The careful distinction drawn by St. Paul between inner visions of the Lord (2 Corinthians 12), as to which he cannot tell whether they were in the body or out of the body, and the event appealed to in 1Co 9:1 as the certificate of his Apostleship, show how vividly conscious he was of the external objective nature of that vision of the Risen Christ (see Goguel, p. 82). But that there was an inner revelation also as the result of the external vision is, of course, essential to the value of the vision. Indeed, it would not be easy to exaggerate the vastness of this inner revelation, to St. Paul, provided always that space is left for the external circumstance which created it.

As to the external, objective character of St. Paul's vision of the Risen Christ, this and nothing less is required by the Apostle's language. 'The metaphor of an untimely birth, which he employs in regard to himself (1Co_15:8), implies a sudden, violent, abnormal change which brought him weak and immature into a new spiritual world' (Chase, *Credibility*, p. 72). Moreover, St. Paul places the appearance to himself in the same category with those to the Apostles in general (1 Corinthians 15; cf. Gal_1:13-14 and Lightfoot's paraphrase).

3. Evidence of the Evangelists.—The Synoptic problem must, of course, be studied elsewhere. Nor do our limits allow an analysis of the various documents. (1) The *original of Mk.*, so far as we possess it, ends with the vacant grave, but no appearance of the Risen Master. [On the question of the last twelve verses of the present Mk. see above, p. 131 ff.]. (2, 3) But what the original Mk. no longer gives us is supplied by *Mt. and Lk.*, who almost certainly wrote with Mk. before them; and whose agreements may partially supply the missing conclusion of the earliest narrative. To do full justice to the documents would require a careful analysis and comparison of the appearances given by *Mt.*, *Lk.*, and *Jn.*, together with the existing conclusion to Mark.

From what source the distinctive features of the Resurrection narratives in *Mt.* and *Lk.* were derived is not known. Attention has often been drawn to their diversities. They are certainly difficult to harmonize. But the substantial identity as to the central fact is not less impressive because of the diversities. The peculiar difficulties as to locality will be considered presently.

(4) *The existing conclusion of Mark.*—'We may say with confidence,' writes Dr. Sanday (*Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 241), 'that its date is earlier than the year 140—whether we argue from the chronology of Aristion, its presumable author, or from its presence in the archetype of almost all extant Manuscripts, or from the traces of it in writers so early as Justin and Irenaeus.' 'It belongs at the latest,' says Dr. Swete, 'to the earlier sub-Apostolic age' (*Apostles' Creed*, p. 66). (See, further, Chase, *Syriac Element in Codex Bezae*, 1893, pp. 153-157).

(5) *The Fourth Gospel.*—The value set on this evidence will vary with critical estimates of the Fourth Gospel, into which it is impossible to enter here. Suffice it to say that a very marked tendency exists in more recent writers to return to older views. So advanced a critic as Jülicher, for instance, dates the Gospel between a.d. 100 and 110 (*Introd. N.T.* p. 401). In no case is reception or rejection more influenced by philosophic and theological presuppositions than here.

We note then that the documentary evidence, while certainly less than we might desire, is adequate for its purpose. Partial discrepancies are not only compatible

with, they may be confirmatory of, substantial veracity (cf. Gwatkin, *Gifford Lect.* ii. 48).

4. Canonical as contrasted with Apocryphal Gospels.—The Canonical narratives form but a small portion of the early accounts of Jesus Christ. And it is important to consider why we lay exclusive stress upon the Four. The Canonical Gospels, as their name implies, cannot be regarded merely as documents; they are the property, and indeed the product, of a community, the Christian Church. The documentary evidence for the Resurrection requires to be supplemented by the evidence of the existence of the institution and its principles. The Church gave its recognition to certain Gospels, and refused it to others.

‘It was not the prestige of an Apostolic name that made it canonical, for the “Gospel of Peter” was rejected. Great antiquity and respectful quotation by learned Church writers did not avail to include the “Gospel acc. to the Hebrews,” nor did philosophical thought avail the document commonly called the “Oxyrhynchus Logia” ’ (Burkitt, *Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 230).

What was the principle which led to their exclusion? What was it that the Four Gospels had which these had not? The answer manifestly is, that the contents of the Gospels called Canonical were in harmony with the principles of the Christian community which received them. The Church recognized the Four as possessing characteristics in which the others were more or less defective. ‘And,’ says Prof. Burkitt, ‘it should not be forgotten that those of the non-canonical Gospels which we know enough of to pass judgment upon, show a sensible inferiority’ (p. 259). ‘Marcion’s Gospel is in every way inferior to Luke, and the Gospel of Peter to either of the Synoptic accounts of the Passion’ (*ib.*). Their extravagant wonder-workings and obviously fictitious character impress readers of any school of thought (cf. Pfleiderer, *Urchristentum*, ii. 121).

5. The empty grave.—This is witnessed to by (1) *the Evangelists*; cf. the original narrative of Mk. (Mar_16:1-8). ‘There is no reason to doubt,’ says O. Holtzmann, ‘that the women could not carry out their purpose [of embalming the body], simply because they found the grave empty’ (*Life of Jesus*, p. 497). According to the tradition accepted by St. Paul, the first manifestation was on the third day, and therefore in Jerusalem. This agrees with the Apostles’ visit to the grave, which should be contrasted with their visit with our Lord to the grave of Lazarus. That the grave was empty, would also seem to be required by Jewish contemporary ideas on resurrection (cf. Dan_12:2).

Considerable thought has of recent years been bestowed on St. John’s description of the manner in which the grave-clothes were lying. As far back as Chrysostom’s time,

attention was called to the fact that myrrh was a drug which adheres so closely to the body that the grave-clothes would not easily be removed (*in Joan. Hom.* lxxxv). Cyril of Alexandria suggested that, from the manner in which the grave-clothes lay folded, the Apostles were led to the idea of resurrection: 'Ex involutis lintheaminibus resurrectionem colligunt,' as the Latin version renders it (Migne, vii. 683). Latham's theory is that the word ἐντετυλιγμένον implies that the napkin which had been wrapped around the sacred head still partially retained the annular form thus given it (*The Risen Master*, p. 43). The grave-clothes still marked the spot where the body had rested, and still retained the general outline of the human form (cf. p. 50). If this interpretation be correct, that St. John saw the napkin which had been about the head of Jesus, not lying with the linen clothes, but apart, twisted round, away by itself, then the suggestion would be not only the emptiness of the grave, but that 'that which died had passed away into that which lived' (Richmond, *Gospel of the Rejection*, p. 109).

On the evidence, so far, to the empty grave, we are constrained to say that the weight of the Evangelists' united testimony is so strong that it cannot with any justice be rejected. (For critical acknowledgment of this see *Our Lord's Resurrection* in Oxf. Libr. Pract. Theol. p. 87 f.).

(2) But it has been asserted that, whatever the Evangelists might think, at any rate *St. Paul's* theory of the Resurrection was independent of all interest in the empty grave (O. Holtzmann, *Life of Jesus*). His theory of the spiritual body, so it is said, does not require the resurrection of the material elements of the buried corpse. And it is further remarked that St. Paul, in his evidences of the Resurrection, not only makes no appeal to the emptiness of the grave, but actually makes no reference to the subject at all in his teaching. This supposed indifference of St. Paul to the question of the empty sepulchre is based partly on the character of his theology, and partly on his omission of any reference to the fact. But here we must remember St. Paul's antecedents. He was educated in the principles of the Pharisees, and doubtless held the prevalent theory of physical resurrection. As Schmiedel truly says, 'His theology came into being only after his conversion to Christianity. When he first came to know of Jesus as risen, he was still a Jew, and therefore conceived of resurrection at all in no other way than as reanimation of the body' (*EBi [Note: Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.]* iv. 4059); cf. 1Co 15:3-4. The suggestion in the term 'rose' (ἐγείρειν) as applied to the dead is that death is compared with sleep, and the resurrection out of the former to the awakening out of the latter. Moreover, the fact of the burial implies that the Resurrection was not merely of one who died, but also of one who was buried. Thus resurrection refers to an experience affecting the body, and not to an isolated experience of the soul; cf. Rom 8:11, where resurrection is described as quickening our mortal bodies. Thus the grave of Jesus cannot be considered by St. Paul otherwise

than as empty (see Schmöller in *SK [Note: K Studien und Kritiken.]*, 1894, p. 669). St. Paul believed in 'a highly objective resurrection, including a bodily somewhat, though of a non-fleshly order' (V. Bartlet, *Apost. Age*, p. 4; Riggerbach, p. 7).

(3) There is the further evidence of the application to Jesus Christ of the passage in *the sixteenth Psalm (Psa 16:10)*: 'Neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption' (*Act 2:27*). St. Peter sees an exact parallel between this language of the Psalm and the physical experience of the dead Christ. It is a reference to the Resurrection. 'He [David] seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither did his flesh see corruption' (*Act 2:31*). No contrast could be greater than between this and the ordinary experience as exemplified in David. David manifestly saw corruption. 'He is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day' (*Act 2:29*). Corruption its sad work had done. The foul engendered worm had fed on the flesh of 'the anointed one.' But St. Peter's contention is that, in the case of Christ, the physical frame saw no corruption. The fact of the empty grave is here involved, and is, moreover, thrown out as a challenge in the very city where our Lord was buried; and that within six weeks of the burial! It has well been asked: Was not St. Peter disturbed by the misgiving that the hearers might interrupt him with the crushing remark—We know where he was buried, and that corruption has begun its task (Ihmels, *Die Auferstehung Jesu Christi*, 1906, p. 26). The whole argument of St. Peter would be absolutely worthless, if any could refute the major premiss of the empty grave.

(4) The emptiness of the grave is acknowledged by *opponents* as well as affirmed by disciples. The narrative of the guards attempts to account for the fact as a fraudulent transaction (*Mat 28:11-15*). 'But this Jewish accusation against the Apostles takes for granted that the grave was empty. What was certain was that the grave was empty. What was needed was an explanation.' So far as the present writer is aware, this acknowledgment by the Jews that the grave was vacated extends to all subsequent Jewish comments on the point.

Here, for instance, is a 12th cent. version of the empty grave circulated by the Jewish anti-Christian propaganda. The story is that when the queen heard that the elders had slain Jesus and had buried Him, and that He was risen again, she ordered them within three days to produce the body or forfeit their lives. 'Then spake Judas, "Come and I will show you the man whom ye seek: for it was I who took the fatherless from his grave. For I feared lest his disciples should steal him away, and I have hidden him in my garden and led a waterbrook over the place." ' And the story explains how the body was produced (*Toledoth Jesu*; see Baring Gould, *Lost and Hostile Gospels*, p. 88). It is needless to remark that this daring assertion of the actual production of the body is a mediaeval fabrication, but it is an assertion very necessary to account for

facts, when the emptiness of the grave was admitted and yet the Resurrection denied.

Substantially, then, St. Matthew's narrative is corroborated by the admissions made by opponents of Christ. That the disciples removed the body was a saying commonly reported among the Jews 'until this day' (Mat 28:15). And this admission by opponents is enough to show that the evidence for the empty grave was 'too notorious to be denied' (*Cambr. Theol. Essays*, p. 336).

(5) The grave, then, was assuredly empty. But *the emptiness of the grave does not demonstrate resurrection*. The alternatives are that this was a human work or a Divine. Either somebody removed the corpse, or the Almighty raised the dead. The momentousness of the alternative it is scarcely possible to exaggerate. The ultimate decision must be largely influenced by the entire range of a man's presuppositions. Two antagonistic conceptions of God and the world and mankind meet at the grave of Christ. It will always be possible to construct naturalistic hypotheses to account for the vacant grave, but it is impossible to conceal the rationalistic assumptions upon which such constructions are based. We may here quote a recent and extremely independent critic.

'It is admitted that with the Resurrection the body of Jesus also had vanished from the grave, and it will be impossible to account for this on natural grounds' (Wellhausen, *Das Ev. Matt.* p. 150).

(6) If we keep to the evidence, it is certain that *the empty grave was not the cause of the disciples' faith*. According to the Evangelists, the fact of the empty grave created no belief in the Resurrection in the case either of Mary Magdalene, or of the women, or of St. Peter. The only exception, and that under conditions of peculiar reticence and reserve, was St. John.

'Thus the oft repeated expression that the faith of the Christian Church is founded on an empty grave is one which requires explanation. The Easter faith did not really spring from the empty grave, but from the self-manifestation of the risen Lord' (S. Simpson, *Our Lord's Resurrection*, p. 103).

6. The locality of the appearances.—The narratives present us with a double series of manifestations of the Risen Lord, distinguished by locality: the Judaeian series and the Galilaean series.

(1) Any true criticism should start from the data of the *original Mark*. According to this (Mar 16:7), not only did the women visit the grave on Easter Day and therefore were still present in Jerusalem, but the message sent to the disciples, 'He goeth

before you into Galilee,’ implies the presence of the disciples also in Jerusalem on that day. Accordingly the theory that ‘they all forsook him and fled’ (Mar 14:50) means fled direct home to Galilee, is refuted by the implications of the same Evangelist (cf. Rördam, *Hibbert Journ.*, July 1905, p. 781). On the other hand, the direction ‘he goeth before you into *Galilee*’ would seem to indicate that the lost conclusion of this Gospel must have contained a description of an appearance in Galilee. This may be true. But what we cannot determine is whether any Judaeen appearance was also recorded.

(2) *Mt.* (28:9) relates that the first appearance took place to the women near Jerusalem, and then adds a manifestation to the Eleven in Galilee.

(3) *Lk.* contains an exclusively Judaeen series of manifestations. He ‘knows nothing’ of appearances in Galilee. The significance of this must depend on St. Luke’s worth as a historian. Harnack has recently exhibited a profound mistrust of the Lukan account (*Luke the Physician*). St. Mark, who is assumed to have recorded nothing but a Galilaeen series, is endorsed as correct. On the other hand, the high value of St. Luke as a historian is vigorously asserted by so critical a scholar as Ramsay, who came to the study greatly prejudiced against him. He places the author of the Acts ‘among historians of the first rank’ (*Paul the Traveller*, pp. 4 ff., 8, 14). Then, further, St. Luke cannot possibly, as St. Paul’s companion, have been ignorant of the Jerusalem tradition. How could he conceivably have written a version of the Resurrection manifestation which the Jerusalem Church could not receive? It is quite possible that he derived his information as to the 40 days at Jerusalem itself. St. Paul gives no locality, but the natural view is that he considered the first manifestation to have occurred in Jerusalem. Is it possible that St. Luke’s exclusive interest in the Judaeen series is due to the purpose for which his Gospel was written? Writing for Greek believers, it would be natural that he should concentrate attention upon the Holy City. Is it not possible conversely that St. Matthew, as Palestinian and Jerusalemite, gives for that very reason the more distant and less known manifestations in Galilee?

Harnack seems reduced to the singular position that the only evidence for the Galilaeen series is St. Mark’s conclusion, and that does not exist. For he lays all stress, for St. Mark’s value, on St. Matthew as his copyist. He depreciates the independence of St. Luke and rejects the authority of St. John. Thus, after all, the testimony to a Galilaeen series is reduced to a solitary witness whose testimony is lost.

The first impression derived from *Lk.*—that the Ascension took place on the same day as the Resurrection—is partly corrected on further consideration of the Gospel itself. For there does not seem sufficient time to crowd all these events into a single day. Emmaus is reached towards evening when the day was far spent (Luk 24:29). The

meal in the town must have taken some little time. And Emmaus is threescore furlongs (Luk_24:13) = 7 miles from Jerusalem. The whole journey would take the greater part of two hours. Then follows the conversation with the two and the Eleven. Afterwards, Christ Himself appears and gives them an instruction in the Scriptures—the Law and Prophets and the Psalms (Luk_24:44). This must have taken a considerable time. Finally is placed the journey to Bethany and the Ascension. This could scarcely be before midnight. Yet certainly (as Rördam says) the account gives the impression that the event was conceived as happening in the daytime (*Hibbert Journ.*, July 1905, p. 774). If the incident has suffered condensation, the difficulty is at once explained.

In this connexion it is worth noting that Ramsay describes St. Luke as deficient in the sense of time. 'It would be quite impossible from Acts alone to acquire any Idea of the lapse of time' (*Paul the Trav.* p. 18). And the fault is not individual. It is the fault of his age. St. Luke 'had studied the sequence of events carefully, and observes it in his arrangement minutely,' but 'he gives no measure of the lapse of time implied in a sentence, a clause, or even a word. He dismisses ten years in a breath, and devotes a chapter to a single incident.' Thus 'Luke's style is compressed to the highest degree; and he expects a great deal from the reader. He does not attempt to sketch the surroundings and set the whole scene like a picture before the reader; he states the bare facts that seem to him important, and leaves the reader to imagine the situation' (p. 17). These are said to be characteristics of the writer of the Acts. And they will explain some of the difficulties in his narrative of the Resurrection.

But it is asked, Since our Lord's prediction was that He would meet the disciples in Galilee and the angel's direction was in accordance with the same, is it not contrary to the logic of the situation, as well as to the original command, that appearances should occur in Jerusalem?—To this difficulty Rördam's reply is:

'This apparently insoluble difficulty is very easily explained. We learn (Luk_24:11; Luk_24:24) that nobody believed the women's tale, and even those who had listened most to their words returned disappointed after having seen the empty grave. This fully explains why appearances followed in Jerusalem. For that such sceptics would not go to Galilee to meet Christ is obvious. Therefore, just as the original story was that Christ appeared to the women, because they doubted the *angel's* words, so the narrative goes on to relate how Christ had to appear to the apostles and the disciples together with them, as they did not believe the *women's* words' (p. 778).

7. The nature of Christ's resurrection body.—(1) *The statements of the Evangelists are commonly classified as of two kinds: (a)* Those which exhibit a purely materialistic view, the most impressive instance being Luk_24:39 'Handle me and see: for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.' (b) An immaterial series,

illustrated in His vanishing and reappearing, in the difficulty of recognition and the alterations of form.

One school of criticism here endeavours to impose a dilemma, bidding us select between the two views, on the ground that it is impossible to accept both. Keim, for instance, says, 'There is a capricious alternating between a subtle and a gross corporeity ... which is self-contradictory' (*Jesus of Nazara*, vi. 340). We may, however, decline the dilemma, and declare ourselves prepared to accept both series of statements, as forming parts of a perfectly conceivable and intelligible conception. This 'alternating between a subtle and gross corporeity,' to adopt Keim's expression, is, to begin with, profoundly original. The contemporary Pharisaic, idea of resurrection had no subtlety about it. It was grossly and even repulsively animal. The martyred Maccabees expect to repossess the same physical organs and limbs in the same condition as on earth. This is expressed with a coarseness which cannot be mistaken in 2Ma 7:11; 2Ma 14:46 (see also Gröbler in *SK [Note: K Studien und Kritiken.]*, 1879, p. 682 ff.). It is resuscitation of the same body to the same estate as before. The Book of Enoch, it is true, speaks of the resurrection state as resembling that of the angels, but it describes the latter in such physical and animal terms as to deprive the resemblance of much value (cf. Enoch 51:4 with 15:1). The description of 'revealing every thing that is hidden in the depths of the earth, and those who have been destroyed by the desert, and those who have been devoured by the fish of the sea and by the beasts, that they may return and stay themselves on the day of the Elect One' (61:5, ed. Charles, p. 160), is equally suggestive of a grossly material view.

The exact antithesis to the Pharisaic conception, which was prevalent in the Apostolic age, was the Greek conception of emancipation from the body and continued existence as pure spirit. See preceding article.

The view given by the Evangelists is independent of both of the above conceptions. It certainly possesses a strongly materialistic side. Yet with equal certainty it is no mere resuscitation of the animal frame. It is anything rather than a return to life under the same conditions. The broadest distinction is drawn by the Evangelists between the revivification of Lazarus and the Resurrection of Christ. Lazarus is obviously represented as granted a re-entrance into earthly life under the same conditions as before, to become again the possessor of a corruptible organism, subject to the same fleshly necessities, and destined again to expire in a second experience of physical death (cf. Kruger, *Auferstehung*, p. 21 f.).

(2) *The Pauline conception of the risen body.*—St. Paul's doctrine is condensed into the two crucial phrases, a 'psychical' body and a 'pneumatical' body. The psychical body is the organ and instrument of the animal force; the pneumatical body is the

organ and instrument whose vitalizing principle is the spiritual personality. The psychical body is that which discharges the functions of animal self-maintenance and reproduction. It is the organ adapted to life under terrestrial conditions. The pneumatical is the organ adapted to life under non-terrestrial conditions. It is the best self-expression of spirit (*Our Lord's Resurrection*, p. 164 f.). Now, St. Paul's doctrine firmly maintains two points, of which the first is *identity* between the body which died and the body which rose. This is implied in all that we have seen of St. Paul's interest in the empty grave; in his illustration of the relation between the two states of the body as akin to that between the seed and the perfected plant. It is further taught by his description of his vision of Christ under the idea of Christ's Resurrection.

But if, on the one hand, St. Paul affirms identity, he no less emphatically affirms a *distinction* between the characteristics and qualities of the body on earth and beyond it. 'Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God' (1Co 15:50). 'Thou sowest not that body that shall be' (v. 37). The vastness of the distinction is so strongly asserted in the term the 'spiritual body,' that the identity might almost seem to be, what it never is, really obliterated. But the risen body of Christ was spiritual, 'not because it was less than before material, but because in it matter was wholly and finally subjugated to spirit, and not to the exigencies of physical life. Matter no longer restricted Him or hindered. It had become the pure and transparent vehicle of spiritual purpose' (Gore, *Body of Christ*, p. 127).

(3) A comparison of the Pauline doctrine with the Evangelists' statements does not lead, then, to the conclusion that their principles diverge. There is an extreme improbability that St. Luke, for instance, considering his relation to St. Paul, should be in hopeless contradiction with the Apostle's principles. But there is no manner of contradiction. The Evangelists are concerned with the historic manifestations of the Risen Christ, St. Paul with the intrinsic nature of the resurrection body. The former describe the body of Christ during the temporary periods in which its presence was ascertainable by the senses; the latter considers the body as it is in itself. The former say, This is what we touched and saw, and our hands have handled; the latter is concerned with the profound inquiry as to what constitutes the nature of the risen body. Thus the aspects are complementary not antagonistic.

(4) If we attempt, then, to formulate the Christian conception of the nature of Christ's risen body, we shall affirm that, according to Christian doctrine, man consists of the personality or self together with a vehicle of self-manifestation. This vehicle is material. Under terrestrial conditions this vehicle must possess characteristics, properties, organs, adapted to such conditions. Otherwise it would be no self-expression at all. Such was the psychical body of Christ. But at death the self passed out of terrestrial conditions, leaving the fleshly condition of the body behind,

but by no means continuing bodiless. The self is re-endowed with a vehicle of self-expression which is still material, only under the complete dominion of spirit. The self now exists under heavenly conditions. The fleshly organism would be impossible there, because hopelessly unadaptable to such conditions. Its whole system, construction, solidity, its parts and organs, its methods of self-maintenance, would be worse than meaningless under non-terrestrial conditions. We should suppose that the pneumatical or risen body of Christ was, in its normal state, as an ideally perfect utterance of spirit, imperceptible to the human senses as we now possess them. But the capacities of this ideally perfect self-expression are so great that it can manifest itself to persons living under terrestrial conditions. And we believe that this pneumatical body of Christ did temporarily assume such conditions of tangibility and visibility as to bring His 'subtle corporeity,' for evidential and instructive purposes, within range of our 'grosser corporeity.'

This leads to the difficult subject of the relation between the psychical and the pneumatical body of Christ. That they are related, in the Apostolic conception, is clear. But the question is, To what extent? Does the existence of the pneumatical body require the disappearance of the psychical? or can they coexist? Can the one remain intact within the grave while the other is declared to have risen? Is the emptiness of the grave in Joseph's garden essential to belief in Christ's transition into the pneumatical estate? Since it is impossible for us to determine the precise relation between these two conditions of the bodily life, we must be prepared for the possibility of the coexistence of the psychical and the pneumatical body. Would it therefore follow that the emptiness of the grave in Joseph's garden is indifferent to Christian thought? No, not in the very least. We must surely here distinguish between the Resurrection of Christ and the resurrection of mankind. It was clearly necessary for evidential purposes that the risen Lord should reappear within a terrestrial environment, and that for the same reason His grave should be vacated. Belief in the reality of His Resurrection in presence of the corpse was to that age absolutely impossible.

Max Müller expressed years ago a regret that the Jews buried and did not burn their dead. For in that case, he thought, the Christian idea of the Resurrection would have remained far more spiritual. And the question has been quite recently asked, What kind of Resurrection would your gospel have exhibited if the body of Jesus had been cremated? Max Müller's regret is more than justified by the deeply materialistic conceptions which have heavily burdened the Christian mind. But it has no weight whatever in view of the teaching of St. Paul. The suggested cremation of the body of Jesus would not in the slightest degree have affected the Pauline conception of the pneumatical body. Nor would it have removed the necessity for visible and tangible manifestations under terrestrial conditions. Christ must in any case have reappeared with features and form as of old, whether His body had been buried or burned. The

scars must have reappeared upon it. The facts of dissolution of ordinary human bodies have not altered the ordinary belief in their physical reappearance in the Resurrection. The disintegration of the body and its return to dust, the cremation of the martyrs, did not prevent mediaeval discussions whether one who died in childhood would appear full-grown in the future life. The Maccabees, at any rate, knew nothing of the Resurrection of Christ, but that did not prevent their holding the grossest ideas of a resurrection state. 'As for cremation, Christian reverence shrinks from discussing the cremation of our Lord's sacred body,' says Dr. Liddon; 'but cremation, had it taken place, could have made no difference except in the sphere of imagination' (Liddon, *Easter Sermons*, i. 111).

If the account given by Sir Oliver Lodge, in the *Hibbert Journal* (Jan. 1906), of Christianity and science may be viewed as representative of modern thought, it would seem clear that contemporary thought ought not to have much difficulty in accepting the Pauline doctrine of the resurrection body. The question is, 'What is the relation between the spiritual personality and the material side of human existence?' It is plain,' he says, 'that for our present mode of apprehending the universe a material vehicle is essential' (p. 318). The only evidence of the existence of spiritual activity is the manifestation of that activity through matter. We are manifested to each other through the medium of the senses. 'Now,' argues the writer, 'this dependence of the spiritual on a vehicle for manifestation is not likely to be a purely temporary condition: it is probably a sign or sample of something which has an eternal significance, a representation of some permanent truth' (p. 319). 'To suppose that our experience of the necessary and fundamental connexion between the two things—the something which we know as mind and the something which is now represented by matter—has no counterpart or enlargement in the actual scheme of the universe, as it really exists, is needlessly to postulate confusion and instrumental deception' (p. 319). Consequently the conclusion is that, 'though it by no means follows that mind is dependent on matter as we know it, it will probably be still by means of something akin to matter—something which can act as a vehicle and represent it in the same sort of way that matter represents it now—that it will hereafter be manifested' (p. 320). Now, certainly this statement of the relation of mind to matter, of personality to the vehicle of self-manifestation, is one which St. Paul would find no reason to dispute. As the writer himself recognizes, 'This probability or possibility may be regarded as one form of statement of an orthodox Christian doctrine' (p. 320). Such advances of modern thought towards the Pauline conception are as hopeful as they are significant. 'What is wanted,' he adds, 'to make definite our thoughts of the persistent existence of what we call our immortal part, is simply the persistent power of manifesting itself to friends, *i.e.* to persons with whom we are in sympathy, by means as plain and substantial in that order of existence as the body was here' (p. 322). 'We may surmise that any immortal part must have the

power of constructing for itself a suitable vehicle of manifestation, which is the essential meaning of the term “body” ’ (p. 323).

For the nature of the resurrection body see Goulburn, *Bampton Lectures*; Skrine, *Contemp. Rev.*, Dec. 1904, 870.

8. The sayings of the Risen Master are most significant. Their *manner* is perfectly distinct from that of the ministry. What Keim (*Jesus of Nazara*, vi. 354) describes as the ‘simple, solemn, almost lifeless, cold, unfamiliar character of the manifestations,’ calls attention to the striking aloofness and unearthliness of the Easter tone. Familiarity is altered into distance and awful dignity. Yet with this difference, which is inevitable, if the circumstances are historic, the Personality is just the same. And as with their manner, so with their *substance*. They occupy, very marvellously, an intermediate position between the teaching of the ministry which they presuppose, and the teaching of the Apostles which they account for and explain.

9. Christ’s Resurrection and modern thought.—*Non-Christian explanations of Christ’s Resurrection.*—There are only two ultimate explanations possible: either the event was the action of God, which is the Christian explanation; or else it must be accounted for within purely earthly and human limits. Rejection of the Christian or supernatural account leaves the necessity of providing a naturalistic explanation; otherwise there would always be a danger that the supernatural, although cast out on principle, would nevertheless return again. Non-Christian theories of Christ’s Resurrection form a series. No one has summarized them better than Keim (vi. 327 ff.).

(1) There was the theory, now quite obsolete, which denied Christ’s death. He fainted away on the cross, and recovered in the grave. The valuable point in this theory is its recognition that the Apostles did really see their Lord alive again as a solid objective fact confronting them. Its monstrously irrational character lies in its impossible assumption that a half-dead form, with difficulty brought back to life, leading an exhausted existence, and finally dying over again, could ever have inspired in His adherents triumphant faith in Him as a risen conqueror and Son of God. The well-known sentences of Strauss have effectually disposed of this miserable fabrication, with all the wretched immoralities which it included. It is, says Réville, ‘un tissu d’in vraisemblances matérielles et morales’ (ii. 455).

(2) Another theory was that the body was secretly removed from the grave—either by opponents or by friends. Imagination hovers between Pilate, or the Sanhedrists, or Joseph of Arimathaea, or the gardener, or Mary Magdalene. Of the attempt to account for the empty grave as an imposture, Keim justly remarks: ‘All these

assumptions are repellent and disgraceful; they show that the holy conviction of the apostles and the first Christians ... has not in the slightest degree influenced the hardened minds of such critics' (p. 325). This theory also has passed away. Critics, says Keim, have left off seeking an explanation from external facts.

(3) But there is still a world of mental facts. The naturalistic explanations of to-day are sought through psychology. There is the Vision hypothesis—a self-generated appearance, the product of reflexion on the uniqueness of the Personality. Jesus' followers, studying the Scriptures, came to the conclusion that it belonged to the vocation of the Messiah to pass through suffering to glory. From the principle, 'He must live,' they passed involuntarily to the assertion, 'He does live,' and to the further assertion, 'We have seen Him'! Thus they took a leap from a conclusion of the intellect to a fact of history. Keim's criticism is that reflexion requires time. Its advocates postulate a year—ten years. But the Apostolic evidence concurs in asserting that the interval between the death and the belief in the Resurrection was exceedingly brief. Strauss himself gave up the theory, and adopted another. 'Not so much by way of reflexion, it is now said, as by the quicker road of the heart, of the force of imagination, and of strong nervous excitement, the disciples attained to belief in the living Messiah' (p. 334). The invincible Jesus hovered before their minds (p. 343). When Mohammed died, his adherents swore to decapitate any one who dared to say that the Prophet had expired (p. 344). In reality Jesus was not dead to the disciples, since they had witnessed neither His Passion nor death nor burial. Back in Galilee the old associations revived, far from the disasters and the graves of Jerusalem—unbounded excitement, intensified by abstinence from food and by the feverish moods of the evening, caused the limits of the outer and inner world to disappear. They thought they saw and heard externally, while they only saw and heard within. Martineau adopted something of this subjective theory of emotion and reflexion combined. It is the most popular non-Christian explanation of the day. But Keim deliberately rejects it.

Keim admits that the Apostolic age was full of more or less self-generated human visions. But if these visions had been the same in kind as the appearances of the Risen Christ, St. Paul would certainly not have closed his list with the fifth or sixth manifestation. Why does the Apostle consider the manifestation to himself as last of a series (ἔσχατον, 1Co_15:8), obviously last of its kind, carefully differentiating it from the visions which may have come either to himself or to others? 'Having made such a sharp and clean division, it is to be taken as proved that there lay between the first 5 or 6 appearances and the later often-repeated visions such a great and broad gulf of time, and indeed of character, as rendered it impossible to reckon the latter appearances with the former' (p. 353).

A vision of departed persons does not necessarily imply their resurrection. If Moses and Elijah were seen at the Transfiguration of Christ, did the disciples infer their resurrection? Contemporary belief in the Apostolic age had assumed that patriarch and prophet and saint of OT times lived on in Paradise, but this did not involve belief in their resurrection. Visions were perfectly compatible with the continuance of the dead body in the grave, and no belief in their resurrection would ensue. Why then did the Apostle, having seen Christ after His death, affirm His Resurrection (cf. Schmöller in *SK [Note: K Studien und Kritiken.]*, 1894, p. 689)? Was it not because this 'seeing' Him was consciously different from the seeing in a dream, or from any kind of seeing except one involving physical identity? The idea of resurrection introduces an after-death experience as it concerns the body. It affirms that that which rose is also, however altered, that which died.

Keim's judgment, then, upon the Vision theory, as a whole, is as follows: 'All these considerations compel us to admit that the theory which has recently become the favourite one is only an hypothesis which, while it explains something, leaves the main fact unexplained, and, indeed, subordinates what is historically attested to weak and untenable views' (p. 358).

(4) Keim then comes to his own explanation. 'If the visions are not something humanly generated or self-generated, if they are not blossom and fruit of an illusion-producing over-excitement, if they are not something strange and mysterious, if they are directly accompanied by astonishingly clear perceptions and resolves, then there still remains one originating source, hitherto unmentioned, namely, God and the glorified Christ' (p. 361). Keim accordingly propounds a theory of *objective* Vision created by Christ Himself. 'If the power that produces the vision comes, as according to our view it does, entirely from without, and the subjective seeing is merely the reflex form of what is objective, the immediate cessation of the seeing and of the will to see, as soon as the operating power ceases to operate, becomes perfectly intelligible.' 'Even the corporeal appearance may be granted to those who are afraid of losing everything unless they have this plastic representation for their thought and their faith' (p. 362). Thus, according to this view, the Resurrection manifestations are a God-created message of victory. To quote Keim's oft-quoted expression, they are 'a telegram from heaven,' an evidence given by Christ Himself and by the power of God.

This objective Vision theory, although far beneath the Christian conviction, is nevertheless a very remarkable approximation towards it. It is a most significant recognition of the inadequate character of all purely subjective explanations of the Apostles' belief. It acknowledges a God-created reality in the Easter faith. The theories of fraud and fiction and self-delusion are hereby deliberately set aside. The Almighty produced the Apostles' faith.

On the objective Vision theory see, further, Steude, *Auferstehung*, p. 99; Lotze, *Microcosmos*, ii. 480 (English translation).

The ultimate reasons for rejecting the Resurrection evidence are not historical. As Sabatier truly says, ‘Even if the differences were perfectly reconciled, or even did not exist at all, men who will not admit the miraculous would none the less decisively reject the witness. As Zeller frankly acknowledges, their rejection is based on a philosophic theory, and not on historic considerations’ (*L’Apôtre Paul*, p. 42). Strauss long ago fully admitted that ‘the origin of that faith in the disciples is fully accounted for if we look upon the Resurrection of Jesus, as the Evangelists describe it, as an external miraculous occurrence’ (*New Life*, i. 399). Nothing can be more genuine than Strauss’ acknowledgment that he was controlled by *a priori* considerations, to which the fact of a resurrection was inadmissible; cf. p. 397:—

‘Here, then, we stand on that decisive point where, in the presence of the accounts of the miraculous Resurrection of Jesus, we either acknowledge the inadmissibility of the natural and historical view of the life of Jesus, and must consequently retract all that precedes and give up our whole undertaking, or pledge ourselves to make out the possibility of the results of these accounts, *i.e.* the origin of the belief in the Resurrection of Jesus without any correspondingly miraculous fact.’

This is his conscious, deliberate undertaking—to give an explanation of the evidence on the presupposition of a certain view of the universe. It invariably amounts to this. At the grave in Joseph’s garden two antagonistic world-theories confront each other (cf. Ihmels, *Auferstehung*, p. 27; Luthardt, *Glaubenslehre*). Spinoza, it has been said, could not believe in the actual Resurrection of Jesus, because such belief would have compelled him to abandon his theory of the universe. Obviously the pantheist must account for the manifestation on naturalistic principles.

Those who are anxious to dissociate religion from facts will naturally resent the position which Christianity ascribes to Christ’s Resurrection. The relation between eternal truth and historic incidents cannot, of course, be treated in the limits at our disposal. But it must be remembered that a religion of Incarnation cannot possibly be dissociated from the facts of history. The objection, therefore, to the connexion between doctrine and history is fundamentally an objection to the whole principle of an external and specialized revelation, or to a progressive revelation which culminates in Divine personal entrance into history and self-manifestation within its limits (see Gwatkin’s *Gifford Lectures*).

Similarly, the attitude of individuals towards the evidence is affected by their conception of the relation of body and soul. There are, says Grützmacher (*l.c. inf.* p. 120), ultimately three conceptions. Either body and soul are both integral portions of

a complete humanity; or man is only body, of which the soul is nothing but a transient function; or man is only soul, and the body is its entanglement and its prison. Of these three theories, says the same writer, the last is the least congenial to modern thought. Psychology is strenuous in its insistence on the intimate and necessary relationship of soul and body (p. 121). The second theory is materialism pure and simple; but its unsatisfying character is to modern thought sufficiently obvious. There remains, in the long run, only the first conception, which places upon the body a very high value indeed. Immortality without embodiment is not a theory which harmonizes with the deepest reflexions of the day.

10. The Apostolic teaching on the meaning of Christ's Resurrection

(1) *Evidential as to His Messiahship.*—According to the prevalent interpretation of Deu 21:23, adopted by the LXX Septuagint, 'cursed of God is every one that is hanged upon a tree' (cf. Josephus *Ant.* iv. viii. 6), the crucifixion of Jesus had, in Jewish contemporary thought, finally condemned Him in the sight of God and man. 'To a Jew the cross was infinitely more than an earthly punishment of unutterable suffering and shame; it was a revelation that on the crucified there rested the extreme malediction of the wrath of God. The idea was no theological refinement. It could not but be present to the mind of every Jew who knew the Law. Within a few years (1Co 12:3) it was formulated in a creed of unbelief—ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς. It found expression in the name by which in later days the Lord was known among the Jews—דְּחָלִי, "the hanged one" ' (Chase, *Credibility of Acts*, p. 149). ' "Whom ye slew, hanging him on a tree" (Act 5:30). Here was a public, an impressive, a final attestation of what Jesus of Nazareth was in the sight of God. Here was an end' (p. 150). There could be but one conclusion. Now here are appreciated the force and the meaning of the Resurrection. If 'the God of our fathers raised up Jesus' (Act 5:30), then it was clear that the estimate inevitable from the hanging upon a tree had been mistaken, and must be reversed; that earth's rejected was God's accepted; then it was possible to believe of this Crucified One, 'Him hath God exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour' (Act 5:31).

Thus, on the basis of the Resurrection, St. Peter describes Jesus of Nazareth as Lord and Christ (Act 2:36), Prince of Life (Act 3:15), only source of salvation (Act 4:12), ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead (Act 10:42; cf. Act 17:31).

'It is the expression,' says B. Weiss (*Bibl. Theol. NT*, i. 239), 'of the most immediate living experience, when Peter says that they were begotten again unto a living hope by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ (1Pe 1:3). Not till it took place was the dead Jesus manifested with absolute certainty as the Messiah.'

(2) *Evidential as certifying the redemptive character of His death.*—It required a new interpretation to be placed upon His death. The Resurrection showed the death to possess a Godward validity, affecting the Divine relations with mankind. It was the Divine response to the death, and the explanation to mankind of its meaning (see Gloatz in *SK [Note: K Studien und Kritiken.]*, 1895, p. 798; cf. Rom 6:4; Rom 6:10). The Resurrection, says Horn in a striking phrase, is the ‘Amen’ of the Father to the ‘It is finished’ of the Son (*NK Ztschr.* 1902, p. 548).

(3) *Christ’s Resurrection is evidential of His Divinity.*—St. Paul begins the letter to the Romans with this thought: Rom 1:3-4 ‘... the gospel of God ... concerning his Son, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead.’ Here the essence of the gospel, that is, of Christianity, is said to be concerning God’s Son. And the expression ‘God’s Son’ is, says Meyer, not by any means to be taken merely as a designation of Messiah; it is in St. Paul a Son who has pre-existed, and proceeded out of the essence of the Father, like Him in substance (cf. Liddon, *Analysis*, p. 4). The gospel of God concerning His Son is concerned with Sonship in the highest of all senses. It designates neither adoption nor official place, but personal equality.

God’s Son, then, is viewed by the Apostle in two aspects, which both represent constituent elements of His nature,—according to the flesh, and according to the spirit of holiness. The former describes His humanity, the latter His higher Self. Regarded in the former aspect, He was born of the dynasty of David; regarded in the latter, He was declared to be the Son of God. The term translated ‘declared to be’ (ὁρισθέντος) might refer either to an actual appointment or to the declaration of a fact. If our exposition of the title ‘Son of God’ be correct, it is the second that is intended here. Jesus is, then, here declared to be the Son of God with power by the Resurrection. A powerful demonstration of His higher Self has been made in the sphere of resurrection (cf. Liddon, *Easter Sermons*, vi. 94, iv. 58: Gifford on *Romans*; contrast Du Bose, *Gospel acc. to St. Paul*, p. 31).

(4) *Instrumental in effecting Christ’s Exaltation.* The Resurrection is in Apostolic theology by no means merely evidential. It is no mere certificate of acceptance. It is not merely an indirect means through which men have become believers, a matter which can be dispensed with so soon as faith is gained, or is unnecessary if faith is obtained some other way. It is also instrumental, and produces its own necessary and indispensable effects. It has primarily its own effect on Christ Himself. Obviously it does not only certify Him to be the Christ. It is instrumental in effecting His Exaltation. It is through the Resurrection that Christ ‘enters into his glory’ (Luk 24:26; cf. Act 2:33, Rom 6:9). St. Paul (Act 13:33) applies to the Resurrection

the Psalm, 'Thou art my Son, this day (*i.e.* Easter Day) have I begotten thee.' The primary reference (? to the coronation of Solomon) is here, accordingly, mystically transferred to the Exaltation of Jesus. Not that the Resurrection constituted Him God's Son (which He was throughout), but that it effected the transition into a glorified state. Jesus, as having expired on the cross, would be conceived by the Jews as transferred to the gloom of Hades. Jesus, as risen, was thereby exalted to a condition hitherto unprecedented among the occupants of the other world (cf. Rev 1:18). As the result of the Resurrection, Jesus 'is at the right hand of God,' 'making intercession for us' (Rom 8:34).

(5) The Resurrection is also *instrumental in effecting justification*. The great passage is Rom 4:25 'Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.' The two clauses are by no means identical—an antithesis of phrases without antithesis of meaning—as an attempt to transpose them ought to show. St. Paul could not conceivably have said, 'Who died for our justification, and rose again for our sins.' There is an intimate connexion between the categories of death and sin, and those of resurrection and justification. Moreover, both Death and Resurrection have their functions to discharge in completing the work of redemption. In the first place, Christ was delivered over to death as a Sacrifice on account of our offences. Thereby objectively reparation was made in behalf of humanity by its representative, and reconciliation secured. But this, while complete on the Divine side, leaves the earthward yet to be effected. The reconciliation must be subjectively appropriated by each individual. Accordingly Christ was raised again on account of our justification. Our individual acceptance is said to be due to the Resurrection. This is for two reasons: (a) because we can appropriate justification only by belief in the saving significance of Christ's death. And we can attain to this belief only through the fact of the Resurrection (cf. B. Weiss, *Bibl. Theol.* i. 437). But it should be most clearly understood that this is only a partial statement of the truth. Our individual acceptance is also due to the Resurrection; (b) because it was only by His Risen Life that Christ became the new life-principle for mankind. Justice will never be done to this great passage so long as the effect of Christ's Resurrection on our justification is restricted to its being a mere certificate of His acceptance with God (contrast Pfleiderer, *Paulinism*, i. 119, and Stevens, *Pauline Theol.* 254 f.).

The Resurrection becomes the medium through which the glorified life of Jesus is infused into the personality of the believer. Apostolic Christianity, we are profoundly persuaded, does not limit itself to the former of these two conceptions, but embraces the latter. It is not Christ outside us, but Christ within us that completes the Apostolic view. It is not the recorded Christ appealing to us across the centuries, but the Living Christ imparting His glorified strength, that is the ultimate Christian principle. This is the meaning of St. John's teaching on eating Christ (John 6). This assimilation of Christ becomes possible only through His Resurrection. And St. Paul can mean no less

when he writes, 'raised again for our justification.' Thus, as B. Weiss says, the relation between the Death of Christ and His Resurrection is, that 'the former was the means of procuring salvation, the latter the means of appropriating it' (*Bibl. Theol.* i. 437).

On this most important passage see, further, Meyer on Rom 4:25; Liddon's *Analysis*; Newman's *Sermon*, 'Christ's Resurrection the Source of Justification.'

(6) The Resurrection of Christ is also, according to Apostolic teaching, *instrumental in effecting the physical resurrection of all believers*. As early as 1Th 4:14 St. Paul appeals to Christ's Resurrection as the ground of consolation to the mourner. Similarly St. Peter is represented (Act 4:2) as 'preaching through Jesus the resurrection from the dead' (cf. Rom 6:5; Rom 8:11, and above all 1 Corinthians 15).

Specially noteworthy is St. Paul's argument in Rom 8:10 f. On the supposition that Christ *is* in us—if Christ has really entered into the individual believer—if His power has taken possession—then the result is (a) that although the body—the human body—is dead because of sin—*i.e.* belongs to the category of dead things owing to the influence of moral evil—not merely mortal but dead—yet the spirit—the human spirit—is life because of (Christ's) righteousness. That is to say, a resurrection has taken place already *on the spiritual side*. We are already risen with Christ—in the region of personal renewal—because the righteousness of Christ is in us—imparted to us. (b) But if so (Rom 8:11)—if the resurrection has already taken place in the spiritual,—the new vitality shall in process of time extend itself into the physical: 'He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies.'

The Christian doctrine proclaims both a moral and a physical resurrection. Attempts were made in the Apostolic age, under the influence of non-Christian presuppositions, to lay exclusive emphasis on the former and reject the latter. Men declared that the resurrection was past already (2Ti 2:18). Death was to be understood in a moral sense, and resurrection was its moral antithesis, it was a restoration out of the death of ignorance, a giving of life to the morally dead. Attempts are also made in modern thought to maintain exclusively a moral resurrection. But nothing can be more paradoxical than endeavours to shelter this exclusiveness under the authority of St. Paul. To say that 'in St. Paul's ideas the expression [resurrection from the dead] has no essential connexion with physical death' (Matt. [Note: Matthew's (*i.e.* prob. Rogers') Bible 1537.] Arnold), is to say what is preposterous to any one who has the great words of 1 Corinthians 15 ringing in his mind. It is, as has been accurately said, 'claiming the authority of St. Paul's spiritual teaching in order to discredit the historical faith without which he declared his preaching vain' (Waggett, *The Holy Eucharist*, p. 200). All attempts to limit St. Paul's idea of resurrection to the moral sphere are worse than useless. The fact is that St. Paul did not gratuitously attach a

relic of incongruous materialism to a spiritual theory complete and consistent with itself. 'He believed, indeed, in our Lord's bodily Resurrection, but not in spite of his spiritualism: rather because of the triumphant character of his spiritualism' (Waggett, p. 201). The severance of human life into two distinct departments, the one the spiritual and moral over which resurrection prevails, the other the physical over which resurrection has no power, is not a true spirituality, but a false and timid spirituality. 'It is false precisely through timidity, and by failing to invade in the name of Spirit the regions of sensible experience' (Waggett, p. 200). The intimate connexion of the two spheres, the moral and the physical, is fundamental throughout the Christian revelation. Death in Christianity is physical, and death is also moral. And the two interpenetrate. Redemption involves an intimate association between the two. The Death of Christ is moral surrender and physical experience. Death physical is awfully real, as real in its province as is death in the moral sphere. It is therefore impossible, consistently with Christian principles of redemption, to separate sin and dissolution into two worlds having no connexion. The Christian conception is of a life-giving force which pervades the moral sphere already, and is to pervade the material hereafter. It has done both these already in the case of Christ. And the Spirit of Christ already pervades the Christian here in the present world. He is already morally risen with Christ. The force of the Resurrection of Christ is already at work in the sphere of mind and affection and will. But there is a redemption of the body yet to come. (On the relation of moral to physical resurrection, see also Du Bose, *Gospel in the Gospels*; and Denney, *Atonement and the Modern Mind*).

(7) Consequently it is seen that the Resurrection of Christ is *the foundation of Apostolic Christianity*, and this for dogmatic just as truly as for evidential reasons, (a) Their consciousness of its basal character is shown in the position it occupies in their witness. An Apostle is ordained to be a witness of the Resurrection (Act 1:22). The content of St. Paul's Christianity is thought at Athens to be 'Jesus and the resurrection' (Act 17:18). The early sections in the Acts reiterate the statement, 'This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses' (Act 2:32). (b) Moreover, negatively, the consequences to Christianity of a denial of the Resurrection of Christ were drawn out with all the dialectic force of St. Paul. And it is surely significant every way that this acute and searching analysis of the doctrine was made by one of the first teachers of Christianity. The fearlessness with which he propounds his great dilemmas is in itself extremely valuable and reassuring. He saw, with a clearness never surpassed, what the Resurrection of Christ involved; and seeing that, was calmly prepared to risk everything upon it. It would seem indisputable that St. Paul's entire exposition proceeds on the assumption that the Resurrection of Christ was not in controversy in the Church of Corinth. The section of Corinthian churchmen whom St. Paul has in mind accepted the Resurrection of Christ, but rejected the future resurrection of the dead. Their philosophic antecedents rendered such rejection entirely natural (see Heinrici, *in loc.*; Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conception of the*

Last Things, 225), while their Christianity constrained them to make a concession to faith in the altogether exceptional case of Jesus Christ. They were practically combining incompatible elements from the Old and the New, and had not the clearness of thought to realize the incompatibility. There is certainly nothing abnormal to human religious experience in this. But to St. Paul's logical intellect it was intolerable. If there be no such thing as a resurrection of dead persons, then is not Christ risen (1Co_15:13). The denial of the general principle will not permit the affirmation of particular instances.

St. Paul then proceeds to show the effect of this denial of Christ's Resurrection: first, on the proclamation of Christianity, whose sum and substance become words lacking in contents and in truth, if Christ be not risen; secondly, on the believer's faith, which in that case becomes equally empty, being created by a baseless message; and thirdly, on the Apostolic proclaimers, who have delivered as fact what in reality is fiction, and have misrepresented God by affirming as His deed what He has not done. Thus in all three departments the denial of Christ's Resurrection evaporates everything. The substance of Christianity has gone, the believer's faith has gone, the Apostolic veracity has gone. To dwell on the second of these: The faith of a Christian depends on Christ's Resurrection, because forgiveness depends on the redemptive power of Christ's Death, and this is certified by the Resurrection. If the Resurrection is not historic fact, then the power of death remains unbroken, and with it the effect of sin; and the significance of Christ's Death remains uncertified, and accordingly believers are yet in their sins, precisely where they were before they heard of Jesus' name.

That St. Paul's estimate of the place of Christ's Resurrection in Christianity is profoundly true seems proved, conversely, by the invariable results which follow upon its denial. Without belief in the Resurrection there may easily exist a reverence for the moral sublimity of Christ's character, and a glad recognition of the religious value of His prophetic instruction. But these are widely different from faith in Him as understood by St. Paul. All distinctively Christian belief in Jesus has been founded on a knowledge of His Resurrection. It is this which has characterized and determined the nature of the faith which men have placed in Him. To their minds there has been a revelation which the Risen Christ has made, and which He could not have made otherwise than as having risen.

As a historic fact, it has been His Resurrection which has enabled men to believe in His official exaltation over humanity. It is not a mere question of the moral influence of His character, example, and teaching. It is that their present surrender to Him as their Redeemer has been promoted by this belief, and could not be justified without it. Indeed, those who deny His Resurrection consistently deny as a rule His Divinity and His redemptive work in any sense that St. Paul would have acknowledged. Pauline

conceptions of Atonement are intimately bound up with Pauline conceptions of Easter Day. The former do not logically survive the rejection of the latter. Thus it comes naturally to pass that denial of the Resurrection issues ultimately in another religion, which, whatever may be said about it, is not Apostolic Christianity. The whole doctrine of reconciliation through the Word's assumption of the flesh, redemption by incarnation, moral death and rising again of the individual believer in and with Christ, are inseparable from Christ's own Resurrection.

Literature.—On the doctrinal significance of Christ's Resurrection see Php 3:10, Col 1:18; an cf., further, Grützmacher, *Moderne positive Vorträge*, 1906, p. 113; Goguel, *L'apôtre Paul et Jésus Christ*, p. 256; *Lux Mundi*, p. 235; Borg-Schüttmann in *NK Ztschr.* 1901, 667-693.

W. J. Sparrow Simpson.

☩ Resurrection Of The Dead

RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD

1. Jewish beliefs current in the time of our Lord.—The doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, symbolically applied to the nation (Hos 6:2; Hos 13:14, Eze 37:1-14), implicit as regards the individual in prophecy and psalm (Job 14:13-15; Job 19:23-27, Isaiah 65, 66, Psalms 49, 73), has its first explicit expression in Isa 26:14-19 as the hope of the righteous, based on conviction of God's power and faithfulness and on their persistent relation to Him. It appears in the Canon as formal prediction and definitely in Dan 12:2, and became part of that 'consolation' which the devouter part of Judaism, in the absence of official prophecy, but upon the basis of past prophetic utterance and on the lines of prophetic indication, developed. 'The Pharisaic movement offered salvation to the Jewish race ... partly by opening wider hopes to those who obeyed' (Swete, *Apocalypse, Apocalyptic of St. John*, p. xxiii)—proximately the Messianic hope, and eschatologically the hope of the resurrection. The literature of the period preceding and following our Lord's appearance shows three views as to the future of the dead, viz. (1) the traditional doctrine of Sheol; (2) a doctrine, variously held, of resurrection; (3) a Platonic doctrine of immortality.

(1) Of these Sirach (Sir 17:27-30) knows only the first unmodified, repeating the thought of Psa 6:5 and of Hezekiah's psalm (Isa 38:8-9)—the days of man are to the eternity of God as a drop to the sea,—wherefore the Divine pity (Sir 18:8-11); the dead have lost the light and are at rest (Sir 22:11); even of the righteous only the

name and deed survive (Sir 44:9-15). Samuel's death is 'his long sleep.' In Tobit death is dissolution (ὅπως ἀπολυθῶ) and permanent (τὸν αἰώνιον τόπον, Tob 3:6). As to the doctrine of 1 Mac. the evidence is negative; no future life is referred to. 'We fight for our lives and our laws' (1Ma 3:21). In Judith the enemies of God in the Day of Judgment shall meet His vengeance in putting fire and worms εἰς σάρκας αὐτῶν (Jdg 16:17), and shall feel the pain of it for ever; but in the absence of more, this scarcely implies a doctrine of physical immortality. This traditional eschatology had still its adherents in the Judaea of our Lord's lifetime (Mat 22:23, Mar 12:18, Luk 20:27, Act 23:8).

(2) In 2 Mac. there is a clear statement of a developed doctrine of *bodily resurrection for the righteous*. God shall raise up those who have died for His laws; the very members which have been stricken from the martyr being restored to him, and 'breath and life as at the first' 'unto an everlasting life' (2Ma 7:8; 2Ma 7:11; 2Ma 7:23; 2Ma 14:46). The faith of such a restoration is felt as an ethical necessity. It is not so much a theory of human destinies as a conviction of the Divine justice and truth. The problem of martyrdom has compelled it—the problem whether supreme fidelity can issue in loss. That it should seem even for the present so to issue is realized as a difficulty, and is explained as a chastising, a temporal penalty (βραχὴν ... πόνον) for personal and national sins; the martyr's rôle being one of self-offering and expiation for these (2Ma 7:18; 2Ma 7:37-38) Resurrection is God's reconciliation with His servants, and is implied in their persistent relation to Him—they are 'dead under God's covenant of everlasting life' (2Ma 7:33; 2Ma 7:36). But for the enemies of God there is no resurrection (2Ma 7:14; 2Ma 7:36).

As to the *extent* of the resurrection, the case in 2 Mac. is that of the martyrs only; but the confidence expressed with regard to them is probably based on a wider hope, including Israel, or at least the faithful in Israel (σὶν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς σου, 2Ma 7:29, hardly implies this, the ἀδελφοί are literal; but the tone of the whole passage [see 2Ma 7:14] implies a faith for others than the actual speakers). In the apocalyptic literature, which did much to extend the doctrine of resurrection in Judaism, it is generally presented as limited to Israel. For the question with which the Apocalypses deal is one of fulfilment of promises to Israel, and the deeper question whether 'the righteous shall be as the wicked'—at what point and in what form the faithful in Israel are to be vindicated and the apostates meet Divine justice. The earlier section of Ethiopic Enoch seems to expect a resurrection universal to Israel, with the exception only of the absolutely evil: 'complete in their crimes' (22:13). The second section excludes none—all Israel is raised, but the righteous and holy are chosen from the rest for reward (51, 61:4, 5). In the third section 'the judgment appears to be followed by

the resurrection of righteous Israelites only' (Charles, *Bk. of Enoch*, p. 27). The conception of a resurrection general to mankind does not occur in this literature until the close of the period under discussion, when the Apocalypse, Apocalyptic of Baruch (1st cent. a.d.) expressly proposes the question of the number of those who shall rise (28:7, 41:1, cf. Luk 13:23), and teaches a first resurrection at the Advent of the Messiah, of 'all who have fallen asleep in hope of Him'; but also apparently a resurrection of good and evil, Gentiles and Israelites, for the purpose of judgment (50:3, 4, 51:1-6). 2 Esdras teaches one general resurrection of the same character (2Es 7:32-35).

With regard to this development, there seems no adequate reason for regarding it as introducing a mechanical and unspiritual conception of resurrection (Charles, *Eschatology*) as distinguished from a 'high and spiritual' conception of resurrection limited to the just. This also rises from an ethical root. It is based in apprehension of the necessity of Divine justice, conceived as requiring not only the vindication of righteousness, but the condemnation on equal terms of unrighteousness; a justice from which death itself affords no hiding. The doctrine of a general resurrection of good and evil alike follows from the apprehension of God as Judge of the whole earth, dealing with man and not with Israel only, and marks a widening of eschatological outlook from being an interest in the fulfilment of promise to Israel to become an interest in the assertion of God as fulfilling righteousness for the world.

As to the *nature* of the resurrection body, in 2 Mac. only the facts of restoration and identity are insisted on. In Enoch, while the resurrection body is one in which the righteous shall 'eat and lie down and rise up,' it is changed to be imperishable and glorious—'garments of glory ... garments of life' (61:14-16); they are 'clad in shining light,' and share the nature and rank of the angels (51:4, 104:6). In Apocalypse, Apocalyptic of Baruch the dead are raised as they have died, in order that the living may know the verity of their resurrection (49:2-4); but thereafter a judicial change passes upon both them and those who have been alive at the time (51:1), the wicked 'becoming worse' than those who presently occupy Gehenna (52:2, 15, 16), while the righteous are transfigured and are fitted for immortality and the eternal world (57:3, 4, 9-14). We have here much more than a doctrine of physical resuscitation; resurrection is apprehended as advance to a new and higher plane of life.

(3) The doctrine of *immortality without resurrection* appears in two forms—Palestinian and Alexandrian, (a) In the Palestinian form the consummation of the soul's destiny is postponed to the end. There is an intermediate state, in which the righteous and wicked are already separated; and there is Final Judgment, after which the righteous pass to the heavenly world of glory and felicity, and the wicked to eternal woe. Thus the Book of Jubilees speaks of the 'Day of the Great Judgment,' and goes on to say of the righteous: 'Their bones will rest in the earth and their spirits

will have much joy' (23:11, 13); and this is probably the view of the Assumption of Moses as well (10:3-10), and perhaps of the Slavonic Enoch. In the latter the translated Enoch does indeed receive a raiment of Divine glory instead of his 'earthly robe' (equivalent to the changed body, 'garments of glory,' of the *Simil.* of Enoch); but his case is exceptional, and he is destined for 'the highest heaven' (67:2). Nothing is said of any reclothing for those who have died. There is a place prepared for every soul of them (49:2), 'Many mansions ... good for the good, evil for the evil' (61:2), 'their eternal habitation' (65:10). With regard, however, to these two last-named writers, there is silence as to the resurrection rather than denial of it; and it is difficult to say, especially of the Assump. of Moses, that they were conscious of divergence from current beliefs.

(b) Alexandrian Judaism, adopting a Hellenic philosophy, taught a doctrine of personal immortality of the individual soul, which it endeavoured more or less successfully to disentangle from the questions of the corporate destiny of the nation and of cosmic judgment. Accepting from Platonism the ideas of the eternity and evil of matter, it necessarily ignored that of resurrection; and accepting from the same source the ideas of the soul's pre-existence and of salvation by wisdom, it was compelled to regard each soul as working out its own fate in this life, and as reaching that fate at the point of severance from the flesh; immortality in its final form beginning from the moment of death. Thus in Wisdom the body is essentially 'subject to sin' (Wis 1:4); the soul is pre-existent and essentially good (Wis 8:20), but is entangled in matter which weighs it down (Wis 9:15); man is destined for immortality (Wis 2:23), which the wise attain (Wis 8:13; Wis 8:17), and find it in all blessedness as they depart from our sphere of knowledge (Wis 3:1-5, Wis 4:7-14, Wis 5:15). The despisers of wisdom, on the other hand, have neither hope nor comfort in death; it is for them an immediate passage to judgment and retribution (Wis 3:16-19, Wis 4:18-20, Wis 5:14). The Hebrew idea of death as unnatural and punitive is nevertheless, however inconsistently, also present to the mind of the writer. God made not death, but the impious called it in (Wis 1:13-16); death entered by envy of the devil, and is the portion of his servants (Wis 2:24). The idea of a future Judgment, a 'day of decision,' also keeps its place in the writer's thought (Wis 3:18, Wis 4:20). Nor is his conception that of an immortality wholly immaterial; the righteous shall receive a palace and royal crown; they shall judge the nation and have dominion over the people, sharing their Lord's kingdom (Wis 3:8). He has not successfully assimilated his Hellenism, but requires the Hebraic eschatology to supplement it. The teaching of Wisdom on this subject is substantially that of Philo as well: 'Apparently he did not look forward to a general and final judgment. All enter after death into their final abode' (Charles, *Eschatol.* p. 260). The philosophy of 4 Mac. is Stoical, not Platonic; but it agrees with Wisdom and Philo in ignoring the ideas of an intermediate state and of resurrection, and in teaching an immortality of the spirit only, commencing when this life ends.

2. The teaching of Jesus.—Our Lord found Himself in an atmosphere of thought in which ideas representative of these various forms of doctrine were more or less current. The Rabbinic teaching on the whole held the field as a popular orthodoxy, identified in the common mind with devoutness and earnest religion: and it asserted the resurrection of the dead. This was generally conceived of as twofold—a resurrection of the just, and a general resurrection preparatory to universal judgment (Muirhead, *Eschatol. of Jesus*, p. 91); the anticipation of resurrection was a commonplace of piety (Joh 11:24). At the same time, the Sadducaic party adhered to an unmodified Sheol doctrine and contended aggressively for it. No allusion to the Alexandrian doctrine of an immortality without resurrection appears in the NT; but the Palestinian schools cannot have been unaware of its existence. Throughout His teaching Christ puts aside the second and third of these doctrines, and sets His seal to the first. He teaches a resurrection of the dead.

The teaching of Christ as to resurrection is widely scattered through the Gospels. The capital passages are Mat 22:23; Mat 22:33 (Mar 12:18-27, Luk 20:27-38) and Joh 5:19-31; Joh 6:32-56. The term used is commonly ἀναστασις; once (Mat 27:53) it is ἔγερσις. Verbal forms of ἀνιστάναι and ἐγερειν seem used interchangeably, occurring consecutively in the same passages (as in Mar 12:25-26, Luk 11:31; Luk 11:22), or in parallel passages (cf. Mat 16:21; Mat 17:23 with Mat 17:9), without apparent distinction of sense. ἀναστασεως τῶν νεκρῶν occurs in Mat 22:31, but in the parallel Mar 12:25 ἀν, ἐκ νεκρῶν, and in Luk 20:35 τῆς ἀν τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν (cf. Act 2:31). ἐκ γεκρῶν is the phrase used of Christ's resurrection predicted (Mat 17:9, Mar 9:7; Mar 9:10); of the supposed resurrection of the Baptist (Mat 14:2), and of the case of one rising from the dead (Luk 16:31). In the Epp. ἐκ is used of Christ's resurrection, ἀν. τῶν νεκρῶν of resurrection generally. A distinction of usage seems to exist, ἐκ implying an individual or a non-universal resurrection. ζωοποιεῖν occurs in Joh 5:21; Joh 6:63 (cf. Rom 4:17; Rom 8:11, 1Co 15:22; 1Co 15:36; 1Co 15:45), but is more than a synonym for ἀνιστάναι or ἐγείρειν.

'To Jesus the OT Scriptures as a whole conveyed the pledge of the will and power of God to raise the dead who had lived unto Him' (Muirhead). In His reply to the Sadducees He does not instance the more precise predictions of the prophets, but argues from the broad relation of God to His servants, not as a covenant but as a vital relation. Their resurrection is so involved in the nature of the case that it requires no other demonstration than that God lives and that God is their God. He appeals to the common usage which called God 'the God of their fathers,' 'of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob' (men who were dead), and to its authority in the oracle of the Bush; and needs

no more than the admission that such language conveyed a truth. As touching the dead that they rise, has not God confessed that He is theirs? recognized that in this life they had already entered into possession of Him? Such possession, once established, cannot be lost. God is theirs—how can their life (for surely they live to Him) remain permanently mutilated? Surely it shall again be for them life in fulness of their nature. They have fallen; death is death: Christ does not minimize the penal and privative character of what was to Himself a great horror; but they shall rise again—for God is theirs: they have a hold and right in God, who has life in Himself and is essentially the Giver of Life.

The argument appears excessive in simplicity, but involves more than it expresses. If man is capable of possessing God, then man is potentially akin to God; if man has known and loved God (as man must, if God has in any sense become his), then God must have laid hold on him and must have given Himself to man. God is their God: they have then even in this life attained an interior contact with the Divine, and have so far entered the sphere of the imperishable; they have gained an inheritance which is essentially eternal. In possessing God they have secured a place in God's future, and in whatever God will reveal or accomplish. Our Lord thus moves the question to a higher ground than that of promise or covenant or even of ethical necessity, and grounds upon a concrete relation which is recognized as vital and dynamic. The argument involves whatever is involved in the nature of human personality; its reflexion of the Divine unity, its indestructibility and capacity to resist and survive the shock or physical dissolution, and its necessity of full self-realization in God. It is impossible to limit the destiny of that which possesses God. It is impossible to deny to it completeness of development along the lines of initial character. Death interrupts but cannot ultimately bar that development. As touching the dead, that they rise again—that life shall be for them reconstituted and perfected—have we not read that God calls Himself their God?

The discussion in this case was with those who 'deny that there is any resurrection of the dead' (Luk 20:27), and it was enough for its purpose to consider the case of those who in life have possessed God. On the face of it the argument might seem to apply to these only. On the other hand, it seems to identify (at least for man) immortality with resurrection. What it proves is that the dead are living (οὐκ ἔστι θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ ζώντων; what it assumes is that, if they live, they will rise again. Christ does not contemplate that they may be immortal apart from that destiny, or discuss the alternative conception (which cannot have been unfamiliar to his interlocutors) that the patriarchs might live in God for a merely ghostly eternity. The alternatives which He seems to oppose are that either they no longer live (in any effective sense) or that they shall live completely—there shall be an ἀνάστασις, a reconstitution of that duplex life of spirit and organism which is characteristically human. The question whether

the finitely spiritual can be conceived of as self-conscious, apprehensive or active apart from organism, or whether the fact of its limitations local and temporal and of relations to other finite existence does, not imply organism, is involved, but is not the whole question. The question is of man, who is distinctively the meeting-point of two worlds, the spiritual and the material, at which the Creator has 'breathed into the dust,' and at which the creation becomes conscious of God. The *differentia* of humanity is this incarnation, making possible the ultimate Incarnation in which the Word became flesh. In virtue of this duplex nature man is essentially the priest of the material creation, interpreting its testimony to God, and capable of furnishing the medium in which Creator and creature reach an absolute unity in Him who is Head over all things and in whom all things consist. By death this dual constitution is broken—resurrection is its recovery; reconstitution in the totality of the elements of our nature which condition fulfilment of man's distinctive vocation in the cosmos. The redemption which is to redeem man must reach his being in its completeness—the organism of the spirit as well as the spirit itself. It must reach even the body which has been 'the entrenchment of sin' (Gore). Not as resuscitation, but as 'change'; so that on a new plane of life, unexplored by us and therefore meantime indescribable to us, it may be the adequate organism of a spirit perfectly correspondent with the Divine Spirit, and death be swallowed up 'not in life, but in victory.' The norm of Christ's personal resurrection may seem to imply this: His work in redemption is not completed by a sacrificial death, but must go on in a triumphant rescue of the body from death. It is not left as an 'outworn tool,' but is brought again, quickened and transformed, to be the instrument of a universal mediation; its reassumption is for Him entrance upon an eternal priesthood. Incarnation is not a passing phase of Deity; it is the realization of the Divine purpose in humanity. Death is privative; disembodiment is incompleteness. Our salvation implies our reconstitution, not only in the spiritual which places us in correspondence with God, but in the organic which places us in correspondence with God's creation. God will not leave us 'hopelessly stunted and imperfect' (Milligan, *Res. of the Dead*, p. 161), but will 'give a body.' With regard to the scope of the resurrection, the question is not touched in the discussion with the Sadducees, unless in so far as the argument used may seem to identify immortality with resurrection. (St. Paul in 1 Corinthians 15 has the same alternatives: 'if the dead are not raised ... then they also which sleep in Christ have perished.' He recognizes no third possibility, of a merely spiritual immortality). Elsewhere, however, Christ teaches a general resurrection (Joh 5:28-29) of 'all that are in the graves'; not only an elect of them, but they who have 'done evil' as well as they who have 'wrought good'—and distinguishes 'the resurrection of life' from 'the resurrection of condemnation.' The rejection of these verses as an interpolation, on the ground that their teaching is not found elsewhere in the Synoptics or in Jn. itself, is not justified. A general resurrection of just and unjust forms at least the background of the thought in Mat 5:29-30 (μη ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου βληθῆ εἰς γέενναν)

Mat 10:28 (καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα ἀπολέσαι ἐν γενένη) Mat 12:41-42, Luk 11:32 (ἄνδρες Νινευῖται ἀναστήσονται κ.τ.λ.), and in Mat 25:31-46. It is implied in the sequence to the statement that God is not the God of the dead but of the living, reported by Lk. (Luk 20:38), ‘for all live unto him’—the thought of which would seem to be that not such only as the patriarchs were have a link to God, but that men as men ‘live to Him,’ and that this must have its inference for all. The absence of bias on St. Luke’s part towards a doctrine of general resurrection, peculiar to himself among the Evangelists, is evident from the extended form in his account (Luk 20:35) of the saying more briefly reported in Mat 22:30, Mar 12:25. As reported by St. Luke (‘they which shall be accounted worthy,’ etc.), the saying would seem to contemplate a particular resurrection only. Nor can bias on St. Luke’s part be argued from the fact that (Act 24:15) he reports St. Paul as preaching to Felix a resurrection of the just and of the unjust, while St. Paul himself in his Epp. deals only with the believer’s hope in Christ; the one concerned Felix, the other did not. A doctrine of general resurrection does appear in the reports of the Synoptists. And in Joh 6:39-40; Joh 6:44; Joh 6:54 the emphasis laid upon a resurrection which is *by Christ Himself* (ἐγὼ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν) seems to imply that there is also resurrection of another character, and to be consecutive with the teaching of Joh 5:28-29.

The salvation constituted and offered in Christ is a positive salvation, to be realized and possessed in Himself. With that salvation the gospel is occupied. Our concern is with that—with the hope which is declared to us and with the Kingdom which He has opened to believers. We know the end, for we know the way. There is an alternative—a way that is not to life and an end that is not with Christ. It is named only, for our fear. It is the background of outer darkness against which the glory in Christ is thrown up into splendour. But it is in no sense the subject-matter of revelation. That which is revealed is life and incorruption (2Ti 1:10). This is the general principle of Christian teaching. Two aspects of resurrection are accordingly discoverable in that teaching, and first in the teaching of our Lord. Of these the one belongs to the essence of positive gospel; the resurrection of Christ Himself is already its beginning and pattern, and the root for us of its power; it is matter of assurance and exposition; our present life in Christ is full of experiences referable to it, and is explicable only in its terms; it is dynamically identified with whatever we are in Christ now or hope to be in Him hereafter. The other, resurrection of condemnation, is only indicated as in some sense an element of final adjustment of the issues of life. It remains in the sphere of apocalyptic, out of which the resurrection of life has been brought into the historic present by the resurrection of Christ which already demonstrates and illustrates it. This resurrection, in which He is our forerunner, of which His victory over death is the operative force, which shall result in us as the effect of our vital union with Him, and is the extension to us of the life from death to

which He has attained, is the subject of our faith and the topic of Christian doctrine. See preceding art. § 10 (6) (7).

Literature.—Charles, *Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian*; Apocalypse, Apocalyptic of Baruch, ed. Charles; Book of Secrets of Enoch, do.; Book of Enoch, do.; Muirhead, *Eschatology of Jesus*; Milligan, *Resurrection of the Dead*; Swete, *Apocalypse of St. John*; Westcott, *Gosp. of St. John*; Gore, *Ep. to Romans*; Schwartzkopff, *Prophecies of Jesus Christ*; J. M. Whiton, *Beyond the Shadow*; Church, *Cath. and Univ. Sermons*, p. 131; R. C. Moberly, *Christ our Life*, p. 98.

H. J. Wotherspoon.

⚡Retaliation

RETALIATION (Mat 5:38-48, Luk 6:27-45).—1. The *lex talionis* must have been part of the most primitive Semitic law, as it was current in almost identical words in Babylon and Canaan. The Code of Hammurabi prescribes (§§ 196, 200): ‘If a man has caused the loss of a gentleman’s eye, his eye shall one cause to be lost’; ‘if a man has made the tooth of a man that is his equal to fall out, one shall make his tooth fall out.’ The verse Exo 21:24, which Christ quotes (Mat 5:38), belongs to the Book of the Covenant, the oldest stratum of Hebrew law.

2. In various ways the later Hebrew legislation mitigated the severity of the *lex talionis*. That law could be, at best, but a very rough-and-ready method of dispensing justice. The man who had only one eye, and who destroyed the eye of another, would suffer, by the loss of his remaining eye, a penalty infinitely greater than the damage he had inflicted. And, apart from actual difficulties in the working of this law as a hard-and-fast rule,—difficulties which were, in point of fact, settled by the judge as they arose (Exo 21:22 ff., Lev 24:19-22),—there was a growing feeling that the exaction of the full letter of the Law was out of harmony with what was known of the will of God (Lev 19:18): ‘Thou shalt not avenge nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people’ (cf. Pro 20:22; Pro 24:29, Sir 28:1-7). It was in harmony with this sentiment that the Hebrews, in the later days of the kingship, mitigated the severity of the old desert law, by refusing to allow the children to suffer for the sins of the parents, and *vice versa* (Deu 24:16); but this alleviation of the penalty was an innovation (1Ki 21:21, 2Ki 9:26).

3. When Christ came to deal with the Pharisees, He found that this broader interpretation of the Law was lacking. The interest of the scribes lay not in the effort to do the will of God as between man and man, but in the academic discussion of the

compensation to be awarded, in soulless casuistry instead of in the effort to make straight the way in the practical business of life (Mar_7:11). In nothing was His teaching more utterly at variance with the received traditions of His day than here. The law of the Kingdom was love. Men were to be moved not by the spirit which was always seeking its own, but by the spirit which desired the welfare of the other. Christ put forward a principle instead of insisting upon the observance of a multitude of details. The whole question of the treatment of the adversary was lifted into another sphere. And what Christ counselled in the Sermon on the Mount He practised in His own life and death. The disciples who wished to call down fire from heaven upon the inhospitable village were rebuked (Luk_9:54); the disciple who began to meet armed force by arms was told to put up his sword into its sheath (Joh_18:11); the false accusers were met by silence (Mar_14:61).

The lesson that Christ taught was well learned by the Apostles. St. Paul, in his earliest letter, warns his readers to ‘see that none render evil for evil unto any man’ (1Th_5:15, cf. 1Pe_3:9) Again, he points out that men should not seek their own vindication, but should leave that to God (Rom_12:17-19). Lawsuits of Christians between themselves are frowned upon by this same broad reading of Christ’s teaching. When Christians are more concerned with gaining a personal victory than with seeking the honour of God, Christ’s cause suffers (1Co_6:1-7).

4. *Is Christ’s teaching a new law?*—Literal obedience to Christ’s teaching on this subject would destroy the structure of society. If no man were, in the strictest sense, to count as his own that which he had, there could be no such thing as private property; the home would disappear; the State would lapse into a condition of anarchy. And while a believer might, in his desire to obey his Lord, give to any one who took away his coat his cloak also, he might be doing the robber and society a very ill turn. The beggar is best helped not by indiscriminate charity, which does not attempt to get at the root of the trouble, but by being put in the way of earning a living for him self. The robber has information laid against him and is punished, not to satisfy a personal grudge, but to force him to amend his ways and to protect the fabric of civil life. It is clear that what Christ lays down in these particular verses, and in the Sermon on the Mount generally, is not a new code of law, but a broad principle of action. As much of the discourse is aimed at the Pharisees, who had made an idol of the minutiae of the Law, it is wholly improbable that Christ meant to lay down a new set of rules, which could be worthily observed only by adhering to their letter. It was necessary, in order that men should remember His teaching, that He should put the truth He had to propound in vivid and concrete form. St. Matthew, the most Judaistic of all the Evangelists, does apparently read the new principles as being legal directions; but the version of the Sermon given by St. Luke shows that this was not how the Apostles, whose outlook was towards the Gentiles, understood them. The injunction to turn the other cheek is thus not an injunction to be fulfilled to the

letter, but an illustration of the principle that is to guide a man in disputes. He is not in passion to smite the wrong-doer, and to requite one wrong by another; he is to try to win the offender by love. He is to consider the other.

‘So far as our personal feeling goes, we ought to be ready to offer the other cheek, and to give, without desire of recovery, whatever is demanded or taken from us. Love knows no limits but those which love itself imposes. When love resists or refuses, it is because compliance would be a violation of love, not because it would involve loss or suffering’ (Gore, *Sermon on the Mount*, p. 103).

5. *Modern theories of non-resistance.*—George Fox took the Sermon on the Mount as another law; and as he fulfilled the injunction to take no thought for clothing, by wearing a leather suit, so he practised to the letter the injunction with regard to non-resistance. ‘Did we ever resist them? Did we not give them our backs to beat, and our cheeks to pull off the hair, and our faces to spit on?’ is a familiar phrase in his *Journal*. But his followers have got below the letter into the spirit. With all their charity, they have not given indiscriminately. They have made their place in philanthropic work by their insistence on searching into the causes of social evils, and, while helping others, have themselves accumulated wealth.

The great modern representative of the non-resistance view is Tolstoi, who carries his adherence to the letter of Scripture to a point which involves a return to anarchy. He takes the case (*Letter on Non-Resistance*) of a robber found killing or outraging a child. The child can be saved only by killing the robber. Should the robber be killed? Tolstoi answers in the negative. Even the non-Christian should not kill the man, Tolstoi argues, because he cannot say whether the child’s life is more needed or is better than the robber’s life. He, therefore, has no sufficient rational ground for action. But the Christian, who sees the meaning of life in fulfilling God’s will, has no ground at all for killing the robber. ‘He may plead with the robber, may interpose his own body between the robber and the victim; but there is one thing he cannot do—he cannot deliberately abandon the law he has received from God, the fulfilment of which alone gives meaning to his life.’ The answer, of course, is that the fulfilment of God’s law may not mean the observance to the letter of one phrase. We are to manifest love towards others. In this case, should it not be shown to the child who is innocent and helpless rather than to the man who is proving himself by his deed to be dangerous to his human kind?

Literature.—Butler, *Serm.* viii. ix.; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*, chs. xxii. xxiii.; Dykes, *Manifesto of the King*, 287; *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times.*] iv. [1893] 256, vi. [1895] 338, vii. [1896] 145; J. B. Mozley, *Leading Ideas in Early Ages* (1877), 180, 201; C. F. Kent, *Israel’s Lawgivers* (1902), 59; W. H. Hunt, *Sermons on Social Subjects* (1904), 196.

Reticence

RETICENCE.—See Reserve.

Retribution

RETRIBUTION.—We shall understand by this word the operation of the Divine justice, rewarding and punishing, in this world and the next. (For human justice see art. Vengeance).

1. The doctrine in our Lord's time.—As is well known, the primitive religious consciousness of the Jews expected earthly happiness to correspond strictly to merit and demerit. Facts made it impossible to hold such a theory, and we have the problem of the Divine justice as it is raised in the Psalms, Job, etc. The remarkable thing is that the next life is *not*, at least with any consistency of belief, called in to redress the balance of this (see, *e.g.*, Kirkpatrick, *Psalms*, p. xciv.). Later Jewish thought, developing the doctrine of immortality, found in it the natural answer to the problem, as in the opening chapters of the Book of Wisdom. But the conception of recompense moved mainly on external lines; the rewards and punishments which did not come in this life were expected in the next, or in a Golden Age on earth. And so in our Lord's day—

‘The religious relation between God and His people was a legal one, upheld by God as righteous Judge, in the way of service and counterservice, reward and punishment.’ Pious Jews here and there might remember that forgiveness and free grace were part of the character of Jahweh, ‘but with most Jews this mode of view was overshadowed by the legalistic conception, whereby every act of obedience was regarded as having an exact recompense, and every blessing to be obtained as requiring previous service.’ ‘Desiring to earn a Divine reward, and as great reward as possible, they sought to practise a strict legal righteousness, and, wherever possible, to exceed what the law demanded. But yet again, anxious to attain that reward on the easiest possible terms, they wished to do no more than was absolutely necessary for attaining their purpose’ (Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, i. p. 39 ff.).

The charge that religion is only an enlightened selfishness, is valid against this position and the popular conception of Christianity. The object of this article will be to show that it is not valid as against the teaching of Christ.

2. The teaching of Christ.—(1) *He showed once for all that there is no invariable connexion between individual suffering and sin in this world.* The Heavenly Father bestows His gifts on evil and good alike (Mat 5:45, Luk 6:35). Luk 13:1 ff. is decisive on this point. ('Ye shall all in like manner perish' refers to the special doom of the Jewish nation, and falls under the exception mentioned below). It is true there may be a connexion between suffering and sin, but it is undefined (Mat 9:2, Joh 5:14), and it must not be assumed in any given case (Joh 9:3). There are in the Gospels no 'poetic justice' parables, no limelight scenes of sensational punishments of evil-doers or dramatic vindication of virtue. There is no hint of any special doom on the Herods, Pilate, or the priests as individuals (cf. *per contra* Act 12:20). Judas is an exception, though Christ Himself never speaks of his punishment in this world. The treatment of *nations and cities* is also an exception (Jerusalem [Mat 21:43; Mat 23:35, Luk 19:41-44], Chorazin, etc. [Mat 10:15; Mat 11:20]). The life of the nation or city is long enough to show the inevitable results of moral decay. Further, all desire for personal vengeance now is forbidden (Sermon on the Mount, Luk 9:51 ff.). There is nothing of the spirit of the imprecatory Psalms or the Apocalyptic literature.* [Note: An exception is Luk 18:7, which is closely akin to Rev 6:10 and to the frequent prayers for vengeance which meet us in Enoch. But the vengeance in this passage is that of the Last Day, and is part of the final consummation, which is the real object to which the prayers of the elect are directed.]

The clearest and most decisive proof of the truth we are considering is Christ's own death and the sufferings and persecutions promised to His followers. Suffering may be a mark of God's love no less than of His anger (cf. Hebrews 12); the grain of wheat must die to bring forth fruit (Joh 12:24), therefore death and all that leads to it cannot be regarded as retributive. The cup of suffering which the disciple drinks is the cup of Christ, not the wine of the wrath of God.

(2) *Christ teaches equally decisively the fact of retribution in the next world, and uses freely the language of reward and punishment.* The doctrine of personal responsibility is indeed fundamental to Christianity, and it is necessary to refer to only a few typical passages: *Parables* (Mat 13:24; Mat 18:23; Mat 22:2; Mat 22:25, Luk 12:16; Luk 12:16), *Rewards* (Mat 19:28, Luk 14:14), *Punishments* (Mat 5:26; Mat 10:28; Mat 12:36, Mar 9:42; Mar 14:21, Joh 5:29).

(3) *Retribution is to the character rather than to the act, and is automatic.* 'Every act rewards itself, or, in other words, integrates itself, in a two-fold manner; first, in the thing, or in real nature; and secondly, in the circumstance, or in apparent nature.'

Men call the circumstance the retribution. The causal retribution is in the thing, and is seen by the soul' (Emerson, Essay on 'Compensation'). The truth is seen most clearly in the Fourth Gospel. Life is the result of faith in Christ and of the knowledge of God (Joh 3:18; Joh 5:24; Joh 17:3). Judgment is immediate, the self-inflicted result of wilful blindness, and of the rejection of the message of life (Joh 3:19, Joh 8:24, Joh 12:48). At the same time this is no purely abstract law; behind it is the personal God, and the Son to whom judgment is committed (Joh 5:22); see Westcott, *St. John*, p. xlvi. So in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, 'the gulf' is the character* [Note: The name 'Lazarus' ('God has helped')—the only name given in a parable—must be intended to be significant of character, no less than the names in the Pilgrim's Progress.] which has been formed on earth and is unalterable. The spiritual condition of the two cannot be altered by a mere change of place. In the parables of the Talents and the Pounds, neglect of opportunity brings unfitness for trust; use of opportunity automatically opens the door to the reward of greater opportunity. The cutting down of the fig-tree is the inevitable doom of its barrenness (Luk 13:6; cf. Mar 11:13 and the teaching of the Baptist, Mat 3:10). The same principle is seen in the blindness men bring on themselves (Mat 6:22; Mat 13:12), and if the blind lead the blind, they must fall into the ditch (Mat 15:14). The measure we receive is in the nature of things the counterpart of that which we give to others (Mat 7:2), the judgment the counterpart of our judgment, God's forgiveness of our forgiveness (Mat 6:14). The house must stand or fall according to the foundation on which it is built (Mat 7:24-27).

Accordingly, acts have their results rather than their rewards, and the idea of 'the punisher' tends to disappear.

'It is well to remember that infliction from without, by another, so far from being an essential element in all thought of punishment, tends more and more completely to disappear, as having no longer even an accidental place, in those deeper realities of punishment which human punishments do but outwardly symbolize. The more we discern their process and character, the more profoundly do we recognize that the punishments of God are what we should call self-acting. There is nothing in them that is arbitrary, imposed, or in any strict propriety of the word, inflicted. As death is the natural consummation of mortal disease, not as an arbitrary consequence inflicted by one who resented the mortal disease, but as its own inherent and inevitable climax; so what is called the judgment of God upon sin is but the gradual necessary development, in the consistent sinner, of what sin inherently is' (Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*, p. 15).

It is from this point of view alone that we can harmonize the fact of *forgiveness* with that of judgment or retribution. So long as we look on the latter as the inevitable result of *acts* considered each on its merits, there can be no room for forgiveness, or

at least it appears as an arbitrary interference with law. As soon as we realize that both have to do with *character*, the difficulty largely disappears. Our retribution depends on character. Forgiveness affects the character, being bound up with μετανοία, the change of character. The dying thief may have lived a life of sin; under the attraction of the grace of Christ, his whole self experiences a change, and so his future can be changed too. The woman who loves much finds the sins of her past forgiven because she has become a new creature. The unmerciful servant finds his old debt back upon him, because the conditional forgiveness of his master has not touched his character.* [Note: The significance of the truth may best be emphasized by a contrast. Buddhism, strictly interpreted, leaves no loophole for forgiveness. Its doctrine of Karma is that every act has its strict and inevitable resultant in another existence, either by transmigration, or in heaven or hell. This effect depends on the act per se, and has nothing to do with the character. The embryo-Buddha in one of his existences destroyed a widow's hut in a fit of temper. Though he repented and built her a better house, and had performed innumerable other good deeds, yet for this he suffered in hell for eighty thousand years.]

(4) *Christ spiritualized the conception of reward and punishment.*—Reward consists not in having certain things, but in seeing God. It is the result of character and the fruition of character. Punishment is the leaving of the self to be identified with sin, and so to depart from Christ into the outer darkness which is separation from God. Again we refer to the Johannine conception of life (Joh 17:3). In the Synoptics, happiness is connected with the Kingdom, as particularly in the Beatitudes; it consists of treasure in heaven (Mat 6:20, Mar 10:21). Specially significant is Luk 10:20; the main cause of rejoicing to the disciples is not the possession of exceptional powers, but the knowledge that their names are written in heaven. All centres round the personal relation of the believer to Christ (Matthew 25, Luk 12:8). And this happiness is enjoyed even now; the believer has life (Joh 3:36 etc.). He enjoys the good things of this life, not as specific rewards for good actions, but as gifts of the love of God which he has fitted himself to use (Mat 6:33). There can indeed be no thought of a claim against God (Luk 17:7; Luk 6:35). We cannot appear as litigants before His judgment-seat.

Accordingly we may say that Christ destroyed the distinction which existed in the Jewish thought of His time, and which still exists in popular ethics, between rewards in this world and the next. If men know where to find their happiness, how to seek for their reward, they have it now, just as the retribution of the evil conscience is immediate. Only this happiness will be a personal possession of the soul; it may be accompanied by trouble and persecution in the world (Mar 10:30, Joh 16:2; Joh 16:33). The believer must not look for the twelve legions of angels to vindicate him; none the less he will know the peace of Christ, and his joy will be fulfilled even

here and now. The Beatitudes and the section on the rewards of discipleship (Mar 10:29) are particularly instructive on this point.† [Note: It is obvious to compare Plato, Republic, x., on rewards, of the δίκαιος.]

To sum up, Christ did not so much change the place and time of happiness as alter its conception. He transformed the idea of retribution, connecting it not with the isolated act, but with the permanent character which lies behind the act. To find His deepest teaching we must go to the Fourth Gospel and to kindred sayings in the Synoptics. Few will dispute this method, whatever be our ultimate view of the nature of the Fourth Gospel. It is, of course, perfectly true that Christ uses more popular language without scruple, as all teachers must. He appeals to the fear of punishment, and speaks of many and few stripes (Luk 12:47). He figures the blessedness of the Kingdom under the current image of a feast (Mat 22:2, Luk 14:15), and He uses freely the motive of reward (Mat 6:1-34; Mat 10:41; Mat 19:28, Luk 6:23; Luk 14:12); He even speaks as though it were the conscious motive of humility (Luk 14:7-11). We must interpret such language in the light of His profounder teaching. Even so, some have found it a fault that the thought of reward does not entirely disappear. Religion should be so completely unselfish that all thought of self should be eliminated. The connexion of virtue with the desire for happiness is one of the ultimate problems of Ethics, and cannot be fully treated here. But this we may say. The claim of extreme altruism must fail because it ignores personality (Gore, *Sermon on the Mount*, ch. vi.). We cannot think ourselves away. We can cease to look for our own happiness in our own shortsighted manner, at the expense of others, apart from God. We can come to identify our own ends with God's purpose for the world, but we cannot dismiss the hope that in the realization of that purpose we shall find our own happiness, that when the Kingdom comes we shall see it and have our place in it. In one sense we learn to do good, hoping for nothing again; or else in seeking to save our life we shall lose it. And yet in the background there is always the consciousness that in losing our life for Christ's sake, we do in the fuller sense find it. In this paradox is summed up the teaching of Christ and the NT. See also Reward.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Eschatology'; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus* (esp. i. pp. 39 ff. and 210 ff.); B. Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. of NT*; Moberly, *Atonement and Personality* (chs. i. to iii.); Du Bose, *Gospel in the Gospels*; Froude, Essay on 'Job'; Emerson, Essay on 'Compensation'; J. Drummond, *Via, Veritas, Vita* (1894), 269; A. T. Ormond, *Concepts of Philosophy* (1906), 533; C. A. Row, *Future Retribution* (1887); J. A. Beet, *The Last Things* (1905), 1; J. M. Schulhof, *The Law of Forgiveness* (1901), 94.

C. W. Emmet.

Reu

REU.—A link in our Lord's genealogy (Luk 3:35, Authorized Version *Ragau*).

Revelation

REVELATION

1. The question stated.—Few theological or philosophical problems have received keener and more industrious examination than the problem which is suggested to us by the word 'revelation.' Does the word stand for any real disclosure of His secrets by the Eternal? Does God stoop to unveil His face to men? And if He does, what is the mode of such manifestations? What are the conditions under which we may believe that a revelation has been given? Is there any room in a rational scheme of the Universe for a revelation? It is pointed out, on the one hand, that every great religion has been promulgated in the faith of its adherents that its message was a veritable message from heaven, and not merely a well-reasoned theory about life; while, on the other hand, it is a part of the claim of Christianity that the revelation of God in Christ is unique and final. 'Comparative Religion' has reached the dignity of a science, and it will not allow us to pass by the non-Christian religions of the world with a mere phrase of patronizing criticism or approval; while the teaching of the Christian creeds will not allow us to regard our own religion as only one among the many in which men have sought and have found their God. And, within the last half-century, a yet more searching question has been suggested by the scientific view of man's gradual development in mental and moral, as in physical, stature, which dominates at this moment all scientific investigation. Is not revelation rather a gradual disclosure than a sudden unveiling? And may it not be that what men have taken for an act of God should rather be described as an acquisition on man's part which came to him, as all natural knowledge has come, by the gradual quickening of his spiritual faculty, in response to the discipline of life!* [Note: This is, seemingly, the view taken in Canon Wilson's essay on 'Revelation and Modern Knowledge' (Cambridge Theological Essays, p. 229 ff.).]

These are among the largest and most momentous questions on which the human mind can be engaged. It would require encyclopaedic knowledge to answer them fully, and only the briefest treatment is possible here. But it may help to prepare the way for an answer if we examine the aspects under which the idea of revelation is set forth in the NT, and the presuppositions which it is necessary to make before the

questions that have been rehearsed can be clearly apprehended. We cannot entertain the idea of a Divine revelation without making certain large assumptions as to God and man of which it is well to remind ourselves at the outset. They are all assumed in the NT.

2. Presuppositions.—(a) First, then, we take for granted the central fact of life—the fact that God is a living Being, Merciful and Just: that ‘God *is*, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him’ (Heb 11:6). One must begin somewhere, and we begin here. That is, we assume that, supposing God’s creatures to be capable of understanding His purpose in Creation, He is capable, on His part, of making it known to them. He is the Giver of all good things, the Author of all knowledge; and we recognize that the highest of His gifts may be the knowledge of His will and the stimulus of His grace. (b) To say this implies, secondly, that there is a certain capacity in the recipients of such Divine communications. No one will maintain that the Eternal Spirit could thus reveal Himself to the brutes; for, to be sure, a revelation is limited by the capacity of those to whom it is addressed. Revelation, as Maurice said, is always the unveiling of a person; and a revelation can be made to personal beings only in terms of personality.

Thus far, no assumption has been made which is peculiar to Christianity. The thesis is simply this: that whatever difficulties are found in believing that men could appreciate a revelation, there is no difficulty in believing that God could give them one, if He be indeed alive. Whether man could securely recognize it as *revelation*, and not as a mere *discovery* of new truth, is another question, to which we shall return later. All that is here asserted is that God *may* communicate with man. If He be a Personal Being, communication with Him is possible. This is the first principle of all religion worthy of the name.

(c) We assume, in the third place, that as revelation is thus *possible*, it may also be described as *probable*. Creation involves responsibility for the creature, and thus there is a probability that He who made the world will continue to guide it. Mankind is not perfect, and it is not doubtful that the progress of the race towards holiness and truth would be made easier by the grace of heaven bringing light and life.† [Note: This is the thesis expounded by Butler (in opposition to Tindal and the Deists of his day) at the beginning of Part ii. of the Analogy: ‘To say Revelation is a thing superfluous, what there was no need of, and what can be of no service, is, I think, to talk quite wildly and at random.’] To assert that revelation is *probable* is then only to assert that God has pity for human weakness, and that it is not His will that it should be left unaided to perish.

3. Aspects of idea of revelation.—We have now to consider the aspects under which the idea of revelation† [Note: The word ἀποκάλυψις occurs in the Gr. OT (e.g. 1Sa 20:30, Sir 11:27; Sir 22:22; Sir 4:21), but never in the sense of a Divine communication.] is presented in the NT. There are, as it seems, two lines of thought in St. Paul about this great matter which we must try to distinguish. Sometimes he speaks of Divine revelation in terms which would be acceptable to every believer in a spiritual religion; at other times he uses language which can be interpreted only if we remember that to him Jesus Christ was a supreme, a unique, a final revelation of the character of the Eternal God. We may take these separately, although they are quite consistent.

4. Revelation in general.—There is a sense in which all religion must presuppose a revelation—that is, the unveiling of His purposes by the Supreme, and the response with which He meets the aspirations and the yearnings of human souls. No religion, e.g., can live which does not encourage and justify the habit of prayer, which does not claim that prayer is heard and answered. In other words, all religion presupposes not only movements of the human spirit towards God, but also a movement of the Divine Spirit towards man. And in every age, and by men of every religious creed, it has been believed—and we cannot doubt that the belief was well founded—that God enters into holy souls and makes known to them His will. In every age and place men have realized His providence, have believed that the Eternal manifests Himself in the world. Now this manifestation may be either *ordinary* or *extraordinary*; by which it is not intended here to suggest any distinction between what is natural and what is supernatural. That distinction may not be tenable, for we do not know all the possibilities of nature, and so do not know what may be above it. But what is meant is that there are two distinct kinds of experience, in which men become assured that God is speaking to them—one the commonplace, everyday routine of life, and the other the experience of rare moments of high spiritual exaltation.

(1) Multitudes of religious men have felt, as they looked back upon the past, that their course was ordered from the beginning by an unseen hand, that a Providence has guided them into the paths which were prepared beforehand for them to walk in, and they have been enabled to perceive in the opportunities of life the calling of a Divine voice. They have felt, moreover, that this is the only intelligible interpretation of life; and that without this revelation—for such it is—of its meaning, life would be chaos, and the secret of the future a dreadful and portentous enigma. The light by which they walk is ‘the light which lighteth every man,’ and they rejoice in the illumination which it sheds upon their path. Some of the most saintly lives that the world has seen have been lived in the strength of the conviction that the changes and chances, as others call them, of the years are but the unveiling of a Divine face; and that the vision of God becomes brighter when seen through the mists of pain. This is

the belief of those men and women among us who have the best right to be heard; their spiritual emotions are not altogether born of their own patient hopes; they are due to the stirring of the Divine Spirit, and the stimulation of the Divine Life; they are a revelation of the unseen.

(2) And to such souls there come rare moments of spiritual ecstasy and exaltation, when they are filled with an overpowering conviction of the presence of God, of His Will for them, of His Will for others. Such a moment it was in the life of St. Peter when he reached the supreme conviction of his life, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God' (Mat 16:16); and we have the highest of all authority for the source of his inspiration: 'Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.' Such a moment came to St. John at Patmos when, being 'in the Spirit on the Lord's day' (Rev 1:10; cf. Rev 4:2), he heard the Heavenly voice pronouncing judgment on the Churches, and saw in a vision the Heavenly figure which is always standing unseen in their midst. Such a moment came to St. Paul when the vision of the Christ at the gates of Damascus changed the whole course of his career; 'it pleased God to reveal his Son in me' (Gal 1:16) is his description of the experience. And again and again St. Paul refers the certainty of his convictions to the fact, which is for him indisputable, that they reached him *by revelation*. The 'mystery of Christ,' as he calls it, that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs of the gospel—this was 'made known' to him 'by revelation' (Eph 3:3). The gospel which he preached came to him, he writes to the Galatians, 'not from man, but through revelation of Jesus Christ' (Gal 1:12). Such were the revelations of which he wrote, while there were yet others which he counted too intimate, too sacred, to commit to words, as when he says that he 'was caught up into Paradise, and heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter' (2Co 12:4). It was one of St. Paul's deepest convictions that to him were revealed at times from heaven thoughts greater than his own; so sure is he of this, that he is careful on occasion to explain that all his utterances have not the same supreme authority. 'The things which I write, they are the commandment of the Lord' (1Co 14:37). So he says of one subject. Concerning another, 'I have no commandment' (1Co 7:25) is his prelude, although he concludes, 'I think that I have the Spirit of God' (1Co 7:40). But he is sure that the Divine message has been disclosed to him in a fashion which may be sharply distinguished from the ordinary ways in which knowledge is acquired. Human wisdom is not identical with Divine wisdom; so he warns the Corinthians, as he quotes the ancient words, 'Things which eye saw not, and ear heard not, and which entered not into the heart of man, whatsoever things God hath prepared for them that love him'; and declares, 'Unto us God revealed these things'—not the secrets of the future, but the secrets of the present—'these things God revealed through the Spirit' (1Co 2:9-10).

These and similar passages show beyond doubt that the NT saints, and St. Paul in particular, were quite convinced that God at times reveals His secrets—His

mysteries—to a devout and earnest spirit; and that this revelation is consciously recognized by the soul as distinct from the discovery of a Divine purpose in life, or the assurance of Divine guidance, which are reached by patient striving after the highest things. The one is the experience of all good men; the other is the portion of the saints, the elect to whom a fuller disclosure of the Divine will is made. It is the portion of the prophets, the ‘seers,’ to whom the ‘word of the Lord’ speaks with an irresistible authority. Yet in both cases—in the ordinary and the extraordinary experiences alike—there is not only a movement of the human soul towards God, but a movement of the Divine love towards man. We generally keep the word ‘revelation’ for the extraordinary or abnormal experiences; and there is no objection to this restriction, provided we understand that in neither case does man’s spirit act without response or without stimulation from heaven. But this it is essential to bear in mind. ‘Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you’ ([Joh_15:16](#)) are words of universal application.

We have now to interpose with an inevitable question. What is the *test* by which we may assure ourselves that the imaginings of pious souls are not merely of subjective value, that is, that they are anything more than the expression of discontent with the limitations of human knowledge and of human life? What is the test, or is there any test, by which we may ‘try the spirits’ ([1Jn_4:1](#)), by which we may convince ourselves or others that a true revelation of the Divine will and purpose has been vouchsafed? The theology of the 18th cent. did not hesitate in its answer to this question. The answer was found in the word *miracle*. Miracles were the appropriate credentials of revelation, which could not be guaranteed as objectively valid without them. Paley and Butler and their successors do not delay to prove this; it seems to them beyond dispute. And forty years ago Dr. Mozley put forward the same view in a well-known passage in his Bampton Lectures (*On Miracles*, p. 15): ‘The visible supernatural is the appropriate witness to, the outward sign of, the invisible supernatural—that proof which goes straight to the point; and, a token being wanted of a Divine communication, is that token.’ Taking this view of miracles and of revelation, it has been sought to distinguish *natural* from *revealed* religion by the circumstance that miraculous signs are not needed to guarantee the truth of the former, which commends itself at once to man’s reason, while they are necessary to confirm our belief in the doctrines of the latter, which are not discoverable by our unassisted faculties, and which may be surprising and even unwelcome to faith.

This is a view which presents many difficulties, clear-cut and definite as it seems. (i.) It is impossible to distinguish sharply *natural* from *revealed* religion, because, in fact, *all* religions have presupposed a revelation, an unveiling of the Unseen Realities. ‘Natural religion,’ said Guizot (*Méditations*, ii. 237), ‘exists only in books.’ In all religion there must be a reciprocal communication between man and God; there must be not only man’s aspiration heavenward, but heaven’s benediction earthward. And

this latter is in its measure a revelation. (ii.) It is true that a revelation of new truths requires to be certified to the intellect as valid, but it is not the *anomalousness* or the *inexplicability* of the circumstances in which it is given that supplies such certificate; it is their *significance*. A 'sign' need not necessarily be 'miraculous' (see art. 'Sign' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible), although it may have this character (see 'Miracle,' *ib.* vol. iii. § 5). The context, so to speak, of revelation helps to disclose its meaning and purpose, and thus enables us to refer it to its true author; but the significance of the context may depend upon concurrences and combinations, none of which, taken separately, need be abnormal or even unusual. (iii.) The revelation itself may be conveyed by these 'signs' which in fact constitute it. The σημεῖα of the Gospels are vehicles, or media, or instruments of revelation quite as much as evidential adjuncts. Their interpretation leads to new thoughts of God and man, undiscoverable, or at any rate undiscovered, without them; and thus it is that 'signs' such as the resurrection of Christ (which would be classed as miraculous) or the moral beauty of His life (which some would not regard as necessarily a miracle) form the premises of Christian theology (cf. Westcott, *The Gospel of Life*, p. 80). They unveil the Divine love, and power, and holiness; and they are accepted as true revelations, in part because of the existing testimony to them as historical facts, but in part also because they find a response and a welcome in men's hearts. Such revelations serve to unify the bewildering experiences of life, and provide a means of co-ordinating our thoughts about the highest things. That is to say, in brief, they are accepted as true because they are coherent with our spiritual experience, while at the same time they enlarge its boundaries and illuminate its dark places.

Thus the question, What is the ultimate test of revelation? is not to be answered merely by pointing to miracle as its guarantee. It is part of a much larger question, What is the ultimate test of truth? And to this there is only one answer: *experience* (cf. Wilson, *l.c.* p. 242), either individual or general; that is the one unfailing test of opinion in every department of human life.

(α) First, as to the experience of the individual. That, in the region of the spirit, is not capable of transference from one to another, and—in so far—it can be valid only for him who has had the experience. But for him the sense of 'realized fellowship with the unseen' (cf. Westcott, *l.c.* p. 83) is so vivid and so vital that he cannot call it in question. He is conscious not only of the strivings of his own soul, but of a response from the spiritual world. And if it be urged that, after all, it would be impossible for him to be sure of this, so subtle and deep-seated are the movements of the soul, his only reply can be that he *is* sure of it. He is able to distinguish, he will tell you,—for St. Paul's experience here is not singular or even unusual,—between the convictions which he has reasoned out for himself and those which have presented themselves to him with an irresistible authority from without. And he will point, in justification, to

what is an admitted fact of mental life, viz., that our powers of discovery are no true measure of our powers of recognition. We can all recognize as true, and as obviously true, many a principle, or law, or fact, when it is once brought before our notice, which we should have been quite incapable of discovering for ourselves.* [Note: This is fully admitted by so thoroughgoing a Rationalist as Kant: 'If the Gospel had not taught the universal moral laws in their purity, reason would not yet have attained to so complete a knowledge of them; although, once they are there, we can be convinced through pure reason of their truth and validity' (Letter to Jacobi in Jacobi's Werke, iii. 532).] And it has been the deep-seated belief of the saints that their most cherished and intimate convictions were such as they could never have reached had they not been guaranteed to them by a message from the spiritual world.

(β) But, it will be said, there can be nothing trustworthy in such merely individual convictions. To claim to be in possession of a revelation from heaven is one of the commonest symptoms of mental disorder; and those who make such claims most persistently are the most intractable patients in asylums for the insane. There is, unhappily, no doubt of it. The mystical spirit is divorced, in too many cases, from any just sense of the logic of facts; and incapacity to judge aright of things temporal is often combined with an eager and extravagant judgment upon things eternal. It may be—we do not know—that sometimes a true vision of the spiritual order has proved too much for a brain intellectually feeble, and that the mental powers have been permanently injured by too great an effort being demanded of them. And—conversely—it is undoubtedly true that when the brain fails to do its work, whether from disease, or overstrain, or other causes, the man ceases to be able to distinguish fancies from facts, both in the physical and the spiritual world. But to conclude, therefore, that all alike who have claimed to have had visions of the spiritual order, or who believe that God has answered their prayers directly, are necessarily insane, would be a strangely perverse and illogical inference. Indeed, experience suggests a quite different generalization. Despite these abnormal cases, the men of spiritual insight who see 'visions,' who live near to the boundary of the spiritual order, are the truly 'practical' men, and achieve most of enduring benefit for the race. The truth is that, taken separately, spiritual experiences cannot be verified by any one except the recipient of them; but they cannot be dismissed as untrustworthy merely because some who claim to have enjoyed them are not very wise.

The spiritual experience of the individual is not transferable—apparently, for it would not be well to dogmatize on such a point—from one to another. So far, then, it does not submit itself to any objective test of its trustworthiness. But when we find, as we do find, that in a large number of cases the individual experiences which are reported or recorded are of an identical character as regards the information which they supply

of the spiritual order, they present a phenomenon which is within the reach of scientific investigation. That the Eternal guides human lives and does not permit them to drift aimlessly into the paths which lead nowhere, that He answers prayer, that He supplies counsel and strength—these are not specially Christian convictions, they are shared by countless multitudes who would all offer the same proof of their truth, namely, personal experience. This is a solid fact of human nature which demands recognition. And if such convictions are not entirely mistaken, then the Eternal has in so far given a revelation of His power and of His love. He has intervened in human life; He has given men some insight into His purposes.

The test of truth is experience; experience must count for something when we are examining the widespread belief of mankind that the Eternal reveals Himself in the life of the individual and in the life of the race alike.

We have seen that the general experience of religious men gives identical testimony as to God's power and willingness to communicate with them in their need. But we saw, too (§ 2), that a certain mental and spiritual capacity must be presupposed in the recipients of any revelation. And, as this grows from age to age in the history of the race, and is by no means equal in all races at the same period, or in all men even of the same race and epoch, it will follow that revelation, if made at all, must be made gradually and progressively, in correspondence not only with the needs but with the capacity of men. We have all learnt the truth of this in regard to the history of the race, and it is unnecessary to dwell upon it. If the minute and careful study of the OT history and literature, which has occupied the best thoughts of so many of our best Christian scholars for 40 years, had taught us nothing but this, we should still have learnt a lesson of the most far-reaching significance—a lesson which is full of hope and inspiration. It is a lesson which is illustrated by the history of every religion in which men have sought to find God; the measure of His grace is their capacity of receiving it, and not any Divine economy by which there is a jealous hiding of His face. And the same is true of the individual soul. It is in correspondence with the gradual quickening of our spiritual faculty that the Divine secret is gradually disclosed. 'Unto him that hath, to him shall be given' ([Mat_13:12](#)) is not a paradox of the Divine bounty; it is a law of nature, and therefore of revelation as well. Not all at once can we expect to experience the Beatific Vision, but only in proportion as we grow more and more into the Divine likeness, and learn, through the slow and often disappointing discipline of life, to read the Divine purposes. This is not to evacuate the idea of revelation of its content, and regard our spiritual progress as due entirely to the efforts and strivings of our own souls. These must be present,—there must be a movement on man's part if he is to reach at last his highest,—but the revelation which is given is not his discovery, but a Divine act of unveiling.

It is the consummation of this progress, both for the individual and for the race, which is portrayed in the vision of the prophet as the moment when ‘the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together,’—not as isolated individuals, but as members of the great company of the saints,—‘they shall see it together: for the mouth of Jehovah hath spoken it’ (Isa_40:5).

5. The revelation of Christ.—So far, we have been considering the idea of revelation in general—the idea of God revealing His will to man—which appears again and again in Scripture, and which has been abundantly justified by the experience of the saints in every age. But nothing has yet been said which is distinctively Christian, or which touches the belief of Christians that in Christ there is a supreme and sufficient revelation of God. If the doctrine of revelation which has been here set forth exhausted the content of the idea, then there would be no place left for that which is specially characteristic of the Christian religion. What has been said about the possibility and the gradual progress of a revelation would apply to other nations as well as to the Jews, for God has never ‘left himself without a witness’ (Act_14:17). And nothing has been said at all about the revelation of God in Christ, which is the centre of the Christian hope. The passages which were quoted from the NT have a general application. We have now, however, to examine passages of a different character.

St. Paul urges, in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, that if the message of the Christ was not understood by the Jews, it was due to their incapacity, not to its obscurity. ‘If our gospel is veiled,’ he says, ‘it is veiled in them that are perishing’ (Act_4:3), *i.e.* the fault lies with the hearers, not with the giver, of the message. That is his way of expressing a great principle which we have already considered, that revelation, to be instructive, presupposes a certain mental capacity, a keenness of spiritual vision, in those to whom it is addressed. In the previous chapter of the same letter, St. Paul had urged that the Jews had never recognized the transitory character of the Law which was their discipline; ‘a veil was upon their heart’ (Act_3:15), which prevented them from seeing that the Law was only a stage in the Divine education of Israel. But, he adds, allegorizing the old story of the veil on the face of Moses, ‘if they turn to the Lord, the veil is removed’ (Act_3:16), and an open vision is granted. The consummation to which they should look is that ‘the light of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should dawn upon them’ (Act_4:4). And, in like manner, he points out elsewhere that ‘the law was but a tutor to lead them to Christ’ (Gal_3:24). ‘Christ is the end of the law’ (Rom_10:4), in whom it received a perfect fulfilment. This, indeed, is the burden of the Apostolic preaching, that ‘God, who of old time spoke to the fathers by divers portions and in divers manners, hath in these last days spoken to us by his Son’ (Heb_1:1). It is not needful to multiply quotations which illustrate this familiar Christian thought—that highly favoured as the Jewish people

had been by revelations of the Divine will, yet the complete—the perfect—revelation of God is in Christ.

(1) There is a sense in which it demands no special gift of faith to discern in Christ a revelation such as had not dawned upon the world before. And there are passages in the NT which, taken by themselves, would not go beyond this. He was ‘a prophet, like unto Moses’ ([Act_3:22](#)), although with a clearer, a more urgent message. For the most part, He is represented in the Synoptics as *the Great Teacher*, strong, wise, and merciful—whose words were powerful to move men towards holiness, and whose teachings shed a new light upon the perplexities of conduct. ‘A new teaching,’ His hearers said; and they were right. The Fatherhood of God, the dignity and supreme value of the spiritual life, the significance of faith, the Catholic sympathy of love (see *Wendt, The Idea and the Reality of Revelation*, p. 28)—these are truths of which, indeed, there had been anticipations in the prophets, but they were expounded by Him with a lucidity and an authority which distinguished Him at once from all the great teachers of the past. And even if we could get no further than this, the claim of Jesus Christ to be the spiritual Master of mankind would be a claim which we could not lightly neglect. If the utterances of holy men in every age deserve a reverent attention, as expressing convictions born of a true spiritual experience, the words of Christ demand a deeper reverence of submission, for He was—at the lowest—the greatest Master of the spiritual life.

(2) Not even yet, however, have we touched upon those claims of His which mark Him out as *unique*, those aspects of His life which require us to think of His teaching as differing from other teachings, not only in degree, but in kind. We have not, indeed, to read the Gospels very closely to observe that Jesus Christ claimed to be more than a Teacher, and that His authority was other than that of the greatest of the prophets. He said that He was the Messiah, who was to ‘declare all things’ ([Joh_4:25](#)). He is the Son beloved of the Father, to whom the Father showed all His works ([Joh_5:20](#)). He alone has ‘seen the Father’ ([Joh_6:46](#)); and not only is this vision peculiarly His, but through Him it may be revealed to men: ‘He that hath seen me hath seen the Father’ ([Joh_14:9](#)). These phrases are all taken, it is true, from the Fourth Gospel; but the view of Christ’s Person which they present is not peculiar to St. John, for the common tradition of St. Matthew and St. Luke preserves the tremendous assertion, ‘No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any the Father, but the Son, and he to whom the Son willeth to reveal him’ ([Mat_11:27](#) = [Luk_10:22](#)). It is clear that Christ is represented in the Gospels as more than a Teacher of Divine wisdom; He is the Revealer of the Divine character. The matter, the content, of the revelation which He offers to mankind transcends the message of prophets and holy men, in this, that it has to do not merely with man’s relation to the Supreme, with man’s duty and man’s destiny, but with the inmost nature of God. Not only is He an ambassador of

Heaven; but He has *seen the Father*. No such claim as this is made in the record of the most intimate and sacred spiritual history of the saints.

It is this aspect of Christ as the Revealer of God which is indicated in the profound phrases of the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel. He is the Word, the Eternal Wisdom; He was ‘from the beginning with God,’ and is God. Revelation is the act of self-manifestation of God to man, and the Word is the eternal expression of Deity, as in Creation at the first, so in the Incarnation when the fulness of time had come. So Athanasius: ‘It was the function of the Word, who, by His peculiar providence and ordering of the universe, teaches us concerning the Father, to renew that same teaching’ (τοῦ γὰρ διὰ τῆς ἰδίας προνοίας καὶ διακοσμήσεως τῶν ὅλων διδάσκοντος περὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς, αὐτοῦ ἦν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν διδασκαλίαν ἀνανεῶσαι, *de Incarn. Verb. Dei*, c. 14). The same idea is in Irenaeus: ‘Per ipsam conditionem, revelat Verbum conditorem Deum, et per mundum fabricatorem mundi Dominum, et per plasma eum qui plasmaverit artificem, et per Filium eum Patrem qui generaverit Filium’ (c. *Haer.* iv. 6). These high speculations are perhaps beyond the modest capacity of human reason, but at all events they are in accordance with the phrases of Scripture, which represent the Word as the Agent of Creation, and as the Expression of the Divine Will. Christ is set before us in the Bible and the Church as the Revealer of the Divine nature and not only as the Revealer of Divine secrets.

It has been urged by some writers that the uniqueness of Christ as Revealer is indicated in the NT by the fact that, while revelation is continually represented as proceeding *from* Him, it is never represented as given *to* Him. He is the exponent, not the recipient, of revelation; and is, in a sense, the Revealer and the Revealed (1Ti 3:16), both the subject and the object of revelation. This, however, is to use language that strict exegesis does not justify. ‘The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him to show unto his servants’ ... (Rev 1:1), is the view of Christ’s office as Revealer which is presented in the Fourth Gospel as well as in the Apocalypse. Christ describes Himself as ‘a man that hath told you the truth which I heard from God’ (Joh 8:40); ‘as the Father taught me, I speak these things’ (Joh 8:28); ‘the Father which sent me hath given me a commandment, what I should say and what I should speak’ (Joh 12:49).

The distinguishing features of the ‘revelation of Jesus Christ’ are, rather: (a) He reveals *the inmost nature of God* (see above). (b) The revelation to the Son is not intermittent, but *continuous and perpetual*. ‘The Father showeth him all things’ (Joh 5:20); ‘himself hath given (δεδωκεν) me a commandment’ (Joh 12:49), the tense marking the continuance of the action of the command (so Westcott).* [Note: Sabatier has observed (Outlines of a Philosophy of Religion. p. 41) that a phrase in the Gospel according to the Hebrews brings this out well. At the moment of His baptism,

the Holy Spirit says to Jesus: ‘Mi Fili, Te expectabam in omnibus prophetis, ut venires et requiescerem in Te. Tu enim es requies mea.’] (c) *All* has been revealed to Him. ‘The Father showeth him *all* things that himself doeth’ (Joh_5:20). The Son sees *all*, while we see *parts* in Him (so Westcott). The revelation which Christ in His own Person gave of the Divine nature is represented as complete; and the task of the Divine Spirit throughout the ages is to assist mankind in the understanding of it (Joh_14:26), and in the application of it to life. It is not to be understood all at once (Joh_16:12), nor will it be perfectly apprehended until the Day of Consummation, when the human race shall have fulfilled its destiny, ‘the day when the Son of Man shall be revealed’ (Luk_17:30), the day to which the Apostolic Epistles continually point as the day of ‘the revelation of Jesus Christ’ (1Co_1:7, 1Pe_1:13), for which humanity is to wait in patience and hope.

These quotations have been given at length, because it is this claim of Christ to be the Revealer of the Eternal God, as no other was, which is the centre of the Christian religion, and it is this claim which is felt to be difficult to reconcile with the claims of other religions to the possession of revealed truth. But it will bear repetition that it is no article of the Christian faith that God does not reveal His purposes and His will except in Christ, or that those who seek His face without the knowledge of Christ shall be disappointed of their hope. Wherever and whenever the spirit of man has sought communion with the Eternal Spirit, a response—we must believe—has been given; and such response is, in its measure, a revelation of light and life. By whatever avenues of thought men reach new truth about the highest things, the light which makes their journey possible is a light in the heavens. It was a favourite thought of the early Christian apologists that the aspirations of pagan philosophy after God were prompted and encouraged by the Eternal Word speaking to men’s hearts. ‘Those that have lived with Reason’ (οἱ μετὰ λόγου βιώσαντες), writes Justin Martyr, ‘are Christians, even though they were counted atheists, such as Socrates and Heraclitus and others among the Greeks, and among the barbarians Abraham and the rest’ (*Apol.* i. 46). That there is always the seed of Divine Reason (λόγος σπερματικός) in man is urged by the same writer more than once: τὸ ἔμφυτον παντὶ γένει ἀνθρώπων σπέρμα τ οὔ λόγου (*Apol.* ii. 8) is a typical utterance. Whatever we may think of the technical phrases of Christian theology used by these writers, we cannot doubt that their main thought was true. God is *always* revealing Himself to the world. Yet—the question recurs—how then are we to express our belief in a *special* revelation in Christ, a revelation differing not only in degree but in kind from all that went before? We are so much affected, in this age, by the idea of orderly and continuous progress in nature, and by the idea of the gradual quickening of man’s spiritual faculty, that we find it unwelcome to be presented with the conception of *crisis*, and with any theory

of knowledge or life involving a breach of that rule of *continuity* by which we are accustomed to guide our thoughts.

6. Recapitulation.—It will be convenient to approach our final answer by re-stating in our modern ways of speech that view of revelation in general, and of the Christian revelation in particular, which seems to be presented in the NT. It is, at any rate, coherent, and is taught by St. Peter as well as by St. Paul, by the Synoptists as well as by St. John. Nor is it out of harmony with the profoundest teachings of science about nature and about man.

The Christian doctrine of God presupposes that He is a Personal Being who lives and acts eternally. We cannot confine His Personal life by the conditions which limit our own; to use the homely phrase of Wm. Law, perhaps the sanest of English mystics, He is really greater than man; He *transcends* nature, for He is its Author. But He does not stand apart, as it were, from the created life which has issued from Him; He is, as philosophers express it, *immanent* in nature; He is its Life and its Light. The sun enlightens the earth with its beams, and warms into life the beings with which it is peopled; but the Eternal Spirit is the Life and Light of all creation, and communicates this Life and Light consciously and with a purpose of love. In nature and in history God is always present, always active, always compassionate.

But neither in the field of nature nor in the field of history would it be true to say that the purpose of the Supreme is everywhere clearly revealed. On the contrary, it is for the most part veiled from our eyes. We may speak, indeed, of the Creation itself as a revelation of the Eternal. Perhaps it was an exhibition of that Divine law by which love always seeks an object on which to spend itself, that law which in human life at its noblest always demands sacrifice. Perhaps the law that we only secure our highest life by not attempting to save it received here a stupendous illustration. We cannot tell. But, at any rate, throughout creation, as it is, the Divine love is veiled. In the struggles and competitions of created life, pain and death are the inevitable issue for the weak; in nature it is only the strong that survive. It is a perpetual tax upon faith, in the face of nature's cruelty, to believe—as nevertheless we do believe—that God cares for the sparrows, and that the meaner creatures of the earth are not beyond the reach of His compassion.

(1) Where, then, in nature is God most clearly seen? There is only one possible answer. It is in *man*, the highest creature of His that we know; in man, who is unique among the creatures, because he reflects, however dimly, the Divine image in which he was made. Man, indeed, is far removed in fact from that which he was intended to be. *Corruptio optimi pessima*. His capacity for good, by misuse, has become a capacity for evil, to which the humbler animals cannot sink. That is all true. But even in the most degraded man or woman there is that affinity to the Divine which makes

redemption possible. In this seed of goodness, which lingers even in the foulest soul, there is always the hope of the future. It is *in* this elect creature—this creature chosen to be the highest because the best fitted for the service of the Creator—that God perpetually reveals Himself, as we perceive that love is, after all, stronger than hate. It is *to* this elect creature—despite his kinship with the beasts, a kinship displayed during every hour of his earthly life—it is *to* this elect creature, and to him alone, that God deigns to reveal His will,—not perpetually, indeed, but at those too rare moments when the spirit is completely master of the flesh. God is always active in nature; He unveils His face only to the elect of creation, and to the elect individuals of the elect race.

(2) The like is true of the Divine revelation in the field of history. Of the destiny of nations, God is the supreme arbiter. Not theologians only, but historians too, will be found to declare that human history is providentially ordered, that ‘the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men’ ([Dan 4:32](#)). And viewing history on a large scale, that *may* be the inevitable conclusion. But we cannot say that it is self-evident, or that perplexities do not present themselves to any one who endeavours to trace an eternal purpose in the decline and fall of empires. In the philosophy of history it is not always easy to find certain tokens of a superintending Providence. In history, as in nature, we see such tokens with greater distinctness when the observation is directed to a particular part of the field. The secrets of the Divine rule are disclosed to us most clearly when we recall the history of the Chosen People, the race elect of the Supreme as His instrument for the education of the world. No history reveals the Divine intention in the same degree as the history of Israel. And thus we rightly look upon the Hebrew literature and history as preserving for us in a special manner the revelation of God’s purposes in the education of mankind. This is not to make any arbitrary distinction between sacred history and profane history. All history is sacred, for it is directed and controlled by the Eternal Wisdom. But not in all history alike are we permitted to discern the guidance of God who thus reveals Himself. It is no more anomalous or surprising that the revelation should be explicitly recognized as such only in the history of the elect nation Israel, than that His revelation in nature should be recognized as such only in the character of the elect creature—man. The Divine action is always implicit in nature and in history; both are potential revelations, so to speak, of the Eternal Light and Wisdom, but in neither field does the revelation become actual, save in the chosen organ of the Divine life. Man is not an anomaly among the creatures, nor is Israel an anomaly among the nations; but as man with his reason and power of choice is the best fitted of creatures, and Israel with its genius for religion is the best fitted of the nations, to receive and to impart the revelations of the Divine will, to man and to Israel have they been entrusted in a peculiar degree. The story of *revelation* is always a story of *election* (cf. Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 13).

If we can go thus far, we are constrained to go a step farther. For in the Christ is the consummation, the summing up, of humanity. He is the Representative Man. And in the Christ, too, is the fulfilment of Israel's high destiny as the Servant of Jehovah, the Messenger and Ambassador of the Most High. It is not surprising, then, that He should claim to be the Revealer of the Godhead, in a sense and after a manner unexampled elsewhere. He, too, is the *Elect*, the *Beloved*. There is a coherence in the NT account of Christ the Revealer which demands for it a reverent hearing from every thoughtful man, no matter what his belief about historical Christianity may be. We do not assume any breach in the continuity of nature when we hold that a revelation of God may be perceived in man which cannot be perceived in the lower creatures. We do not make history discontinuous if we hold that a revelation of God may be perceived in the record of His dealings with Israel which cannot be perceived in the record of His dealings with Greece, although He is the Supreme Arbiter of the destinies of Israel and Greece alike. To the creature and to the nation uniquely fitted to receive and to reflect a Divine revelation, it has been given, in divers portions and manners, according to the need and the capacity of the recipient. But the Christ stands alone, in nature and in history, the flower of humanity and the culmination of Israel's hope—alone, for God has become man in Him. There can be no interruption or faltering in the communion between the Perfect Man and God, for He is perfect because He shares the Divine nature itself. The revelation is no longer occasional, but permanent; no longer a gradual unveiling, but the full disclosure of the Father's face; no longer to be conceived as for one race only, for 'this is the revelation of the mystery which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest—made known to all nations for the obedience of faith' (Rom 16:25 f., cf. 1Co 2:7).

Literature.—Cremer, *Bib.-Theol. Lex.*, s.v. ἀποκάλυψις; Kaftan, *Dogmatik*, § 4; Martensen, *Chr. Dogm.* p. 5 ff.; Ewald, *Rev.: Its Nat. and Record*; Fairbairn, *Christ in Mod. Theol.* p. 493 ff.; Flint, *Theism*, Lect. x.; Luthardt, *Fund. Truths of Chty.*, Lect. vii.; R. H. Hutton, 'Revelation' in *Theol. Essays*; Newman, *Oxford Univ. Sermon*, ii.; Dale, *Ephesians*, Lect. vii.; *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.*] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , art. 'Offenbarung'; G. P. Fisher, *Nature and Method of Revelation*; C. Harris, *Pro Fide*, 274; Sabatier, *Outlines of a Phil. [Note: Philistine.] of Rel.*, bk. i. ch. 2; Bruce, *Apologetics*, 298; Christlieb, *Mod. Doubt*, Lect. ii.; A. J. Balfour, *Foundations of Belief*; W. Sanday, *Inspiration*; Illingworth, *Reason and Revelation*; W. Morgan, 'Faith and Revelation' in *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times.*] ix. (1898) 485, 537; M. Dods, *The Bible, its Origin and Nature*, 61.

J. H. Bernard.

Revelation, Book Of

REVELATION, BOOK OF.—Whatever perplexities may still attend the interpretation of the Apocalypse, there can be no question as to the place which it assigns to Jesus Christ, or the copiousness and variety of the references which the writer makes to His Person and His work. For him the fact of Christ conditions the whole of human history. He is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world (Rev 13:8), and He is the Bridegroom-Judge, whose eagerly expected coming will bring to a close the history of the world that now is. And what is true of the world's history is also true of the book itself; its whole contents are a 'revelation' (Apocalypse) of Jesus Christ (Rev 1:1), a revelation which proceeds from Him, and is mediated 'by his angel' to 'his servant John.'

It will be convenient to examine the references and the doctrine which lies behind them in the order of our Lord's experience, beginning with His life on earth. In the first place, it is noteworthy that the human name 'Jesus,' borne by Christ when He was on earth, which is rare in the writings of St. Paul and absent from those of St. Peter, occurs here nine (or ten) times. The martyrs are 'the witnesses of Jesus' (Rev 17:6); their witness is 'the testimony of Jesus' (Rev 1:1 etc.); and it is by this simple human name that the Divine Speaker describes Himself (Rev 22:16). In this usage we may see an indication of authorship by one who had 'known Christ after the flesh,' to whom the name He had then borne was both familiar and dear. If authoritative criticism no longer permits us to see direct allusions to either the birth or the ascension of Jesus in the story of the 'man-child' contained in ch. 12, His death by crucifixion is very pointedly alluded to as an historical fact (Rev 11:8), His victory in Rev 3:21 ('as I also overcame'), and His resurrection in Rev 1:5; Rev 1:18. His twelve Apostles find mention in Rev 21:14, and there are echoes of His teaching as recorded in the Gospels in Rev 3:5; Rev 3:10, Rev 7:17, Rev 21:6 and Rev 21:23.

These recollections of Jesus of Nazareth have not been obliterated by the vision of the exalted Christ; rather are the two elements held together in a singular harmony of conviction. Passing to the second, we find that the richness of the conception of Christ which marks the Apocalypse may be gauged by the variety and significance of the aspects in which He is presented—the Word, the Lamb, the Shepherd, the Bridegroom, the Judge, the King of kings. Here only outside the Fourth Gospel does Christ receive the deeply significant title of 'the Word of God' (Rev 19:13), and the idea of pre-existence which the name carries with it also lies behind the declaration twice repeated, 'I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end' (Rev 1:17, Rev 21:6). But the commonest and the most characteristic title of Christ in this book is 'the Lamb'—a title which is used by the writer with great freedom, as though it had

come to have for him almost the force of a proper name (cf. [Rev 21:9](#); [Rev 21:23](#); [Rev 21:27](#), [Rev 22:3](#)). The use of the name is, however, rooted in the conviction of the redemptive efficacy of Christ's sacrifice; it suggests the aspect of His work which is most prominent to the mind of 'John.' It should be noted that the word itself is not identical with that applied to Jesus in John's Gospel ([Joh 1:29](#); [Joh 1:36](#)); it is a diminutive and a neuter; but the meaning is the same, and the sacrificial reference is indubitable. The Lamb stands 'as though it had been slain' ([Rev 5:6](#)); He is hailed as One who has 'redeemed us to God by his blood' ([Rev 5:9](#)); the adoring saints in heaven are those 'who have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb' ([Rev 7:14](#), cf. [Rev 1:5](#)). These latter passages emphasize the ethical consequences of the Atonement, and trace them to the 'blood' of Christ in the same way as the First Epistle of John. The spiritual principle of the Atonement is suggested by the figure of the Lamb itself, in which are combined the attributes of lamb-like character—meekness, gentleness, and purity—and the sacrificial function historically associated with a lamb. At the same time, 'the Lamb,' originally a figure for Christ in the sacrificial aspect of His work, takes on, besides, attributes which belong to Him in other of His functions, and so we read of 'the wrath of the Lamb' ([Rev 6:16](#)), of 'the Lamb's book of life' ([Rev 21:27](#)), of kings making war with the Lamb and being overcome by Him ([Rev 17:14](#)), of 'the marriage of the Lamb' ([Rev 19:7](#)), and, finally, of the Lamb as ruler of the heavenly city ([Rev 22:3](#)), as at once the temple of it and 'the light thereof' ([Rev 21:23-24](#)). Thus, while every aspect of the work of Christ, whether in earth or heaven, finds adoring record here, there is a subtle recognition of the fact that all the forms of His relation to men spring out of the fundamental function of redemption.

The writer of the Apocalypse, therefore, holding firmly to the humanity of the Jesus whom probably he had known in the flesh, yet ascribing to Him as the Lamb functions of redemption, government, and judgment, offers to Him throughout his book the homage which is due only to 'God manifest in the flesh.' This is seen alike in the titles, the functions, and the attributes assigned to Him. Every detail of description serves only to enhance the dignity and the glory of His Person. He is 'the Lord of lords and King of kings' ([Rev 17:14](#), [Rev 19:16](#)). To Him is attributed all the honour and authority pertaining to the Messiah and more. Angels who refuse worship offered to themselves ([Rev 19:10](#), [Rev 22:8](#)) unite with all creation to worship God and the Lamb ([Rev 5:11-13](#)). His existence reaches back before the beginning of things created. Himself the principle from which all creation issues ([Rev 3:14](#); cf. [Col 1:15](#), [Pro 8:22](#)), He is the absolutely Living One from whose lips are heard words which can be spoken by God alone: 'I am the first and the last, and the Living One' ([Rev 1:17](#), cf. [Rev 1:8](#)). He holds the keys of Death and of Hades ([Rev 1:18](#))—keys which, according to the later Jewish tradition, were held by the hand of the Almighty alone. In the vision of the Son of Man which introduces the Letters to the Seven Churches, the writer takes one after another of those phrases which had been consecrated from

old times to the description of the Most High God, those attributes in which He had been apparelled by prophets and psalmists, and lays them simply upon Christ as upon One whose right to bear them was beyond question. The description of 'the Ancient of Days' (Dan_7:9) is transferred to Him, as well as the power to 'search the heart and the reins,' which is the peculiar attribute of Jehovah (Rev_2:23, cf. Psa_7:9). It is not strange, therefore, that to this Divine Figure is committed the unfolding of the Book of human Destiny (Rev_5:5), the waging of the final conflict with evil, and the holding of the Divine assize.

This complete and unhesitating attribution of Divine rank and authority to Jesus Christ is the more remarkable when we give due weight to the intense Hebraism of the writer. A Jew of the Jews, his mind saturated with Hebrew thought, a true son of the race to which monotheism had become a passion, and the ascription of Divine honour to any other than God a horror and a blasphemy, the author nevertheless sets Jesus side by side with the Almighty. One meaning of the phenomenon is plain. It offers the most striking proof of the impression made by Jesus upon His disciples, one which had been sufficient to revolutionize their most cherished religious belief; for them He had the value of God. And the special aspect of His Person and work which is emphasized, as we have seen, in the Apocalypse, gives the clue to the explanation of this exalted Christology. The kernel of experience from which the process starts is indicated in the declaration: 'He hath loosed (v.l. 'washed') us from our sins.' John and those in whose name he wrote had found the sin-barrier between them and God removed, and the sin-dominion over them broken; and this experience they traced to Jesus, to what He had done for them in dying, and in them as living again. And if, along with this their indubitable experience of forgiveness of, and deliverance from, sin, we take the universal conviction of their time, expressed in the question of the Pharisees, 'Who can forgive sins save God only?' we have little difficulty in perceiving the avenue along which the gaze of the Apocalyptist travelled till it beheld the throne of God as a throne which was shared also by 'the Lamb.'

C. Anderson Scott.

☞ Revenge

REVENGE.—See Vengeance.

☞ Reverence

REVERENCE.—The sentiment of veneration, a feeling of high regard and admiration. When cherished towards a superior, it is an emotion of respectful awe. When directed towards God, it is an essential factor in Divine worship. This sentiment usually finds expression in acts of courtesy, respect, or adoration, so that the object held in reverential regard receives fitting homage. But it is to be noted that the term *θροσκεία*, which in Act 26:5 emphasizes the ritual side of religion, does not occur in the Gospels (cf. Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection*, Introd., Aphor. xxiii.).

The terms which denote reverence towards God come properly under ‘worship,’ in which reverence is an essential quality; but it may be proper to include in this article passages which involve reverence towards Jesus Christ in the days of His flesh. In the Gospel narratives several terms are used to express the feeling of reverence, but there is no decisive reason to distinguish the usage of these terms as they occur in the Synoptics and in the Fourth Gospel. The term ‘reverence,’ as the translation of *ἐντροπέσθαι*—‘to turn one’s self unto’—is found only a few times. It is used in the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen (Mat 21:37, Mar 12:6, Luk 20:13), where the idea is that even those who had ill-treated the servants might show proper respect and honour to the Son. (See also the usage of the same word in the parable of the Unjust Judge, who ‘feared not God, neither regarded man,’ Luk 18:2-4).

The word *τιμή* and its derivatives are used to express high reverential regard and profound respect (Mat 13:57; Mat 15:4-6, Mar 7:10, Joh 5:23; Joh 5:41; Joh 8:49; Joh 8:54). Here the regard due to a prophet of God, the affectionate respect of children for their parents, and reverence for the Son, as for the Father, are expressed. The term *προσκυβεῖν*, which means ‘to kiss the hand to,’ and then ‘to bow down before,’ is often used in the Gospels to signify the sentiment of reverential regard, and even of worship (Mat 2:2; Mat 2:8-11; Mat 4:9; Mat 14:33; Mat 15:25; Mat 20:20; Mat 28:17, Mar 5:6; Mar 15:19). In these passages we have reference to the adoration of Jesus by the Magi, Herod’s desire to do homage to the child at Bethlehem, the request of the devil that Jesus should worship him, the disciples doing homage to their Lord by the sea, the Canaanite woman humbling herself before Jesus, the mother of James and John as she made her bold request for her two sons, the disciples after the resurrection of Christ, the demoniac of Gadara before Jesus, the mock homage paid to Jesus on the Cross. In many of these passages the outward act of bowing down is implied.

In one place (Joh 9:31) the term *θεοσεβής* is used to describe a worshipper of God, or one who regards and treats God with reverence. In several places certain physical

acts are significant of reverence, such as προσπίπτειν, ‘to fall down before’ (Mar 3:11; Mar 5:33, Luk 8:28); γονυπετεῖν, ‘to bend the knee’ (Mat 17:14, Mar 1:40); πίπτειν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον, ‘to fall upon the face.’ These movements of the body are expressive of feelings of reverential regard. In some passages δοξάζειν, ‘to glorify,’ is used in a rather suggestive way to set forth the idea of giving reverence to (as in Mat 6:2; Mat 9:8, Mar 2:12, Luk 5:25-26; Luk 7:16, Joh 8:54; Joh 17:1-4), where hypocrites seeking glory of men, people of different sorts giving glory to God, the Father glorifying the Son, and the Son giving glory to the Father, are alluded to. In the Lord’s Prayer, ἀγιάζειν, ‘to hallow’ or ‘hold sacred’ (Mat 6:9) the name of God, implies the sentiment of reverence in its highest form. The terms ἀσπάζειν, ‘to salute,’ and ἀσπασμός, ‘salutation’ (Mar 9:15; Mar 15:18, Luk 1:29-41), are also expressive of reverential regard.

Some additional passages may be merely noted, wherein words and phrases denote reverence in different aspects: Mat 7:29; Mat 8:8; Mat 9:27; Mat 12:23; Mat 16:16; Mat 21:9-15; Mat 22:21; Mat 23:12; Mat 26:12, Mar 1:7; Mar 9:1-10, Luk 2:9-20; Luk 7:16; Luk 7:44-45; Luk 8:35-37; Luk 19:35; Luk 23:11, Joh 12:3; Joh 12:14; Joh 13:13; Joh 21:15; Joh 21:17.

In the Gospel narratives it is evident that the sentiment of reverence has a large place. It is at root a certain psychical state, or temper of the soul. This temper seeks expression in certain outward acts. In religion this state of the soul is fundamental, and its expression in ritual acts is natural.

Literature.—C. F. Kent, *Messages of Israel’s Lawgivers* (1902), 247; A. H. M. Sime, *Elements of Religion*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 15, *Epic of God* (1902), 53; E. Wordsworth, *Thoughts on the Lord’s Prayer* (1898), 63; G. H. Morrison, *Flood-tide* (1901), 103; Newman, *Par. and Plain Serm.* i. 295, v. 13, viii. 1; T. G. Selby, *Lesson of a Dilemma* (1893), 123; Phillips Brooks, *Light of the World* (1891), 253.

Francis R. Beattie.

Reviling

REVILING.—1. Insult was as prominent as cruelty in the tragedy that ended on Calvary. See art. Mockery.

2. In Mat 5:11 (|| Luk 6:22) Jesus pronounces a blessing upon those who are reviled for His sake (ὄνειδίζω here is the same word as is used in Mar 15:32 of the reproaches of the Cross). That the secret of the blessedness lies in the spirit in which the abuse is borne is shown by the ‘Rejoice and be exceeding glad’ of the following verse, as well as by St. Paul’s ‘Being reviled, we bless,’ in a passage (1Co 4:12-13) where he evidently has the Eighth Beatitude in mind. St. Peter (1Pe 2:23) says of Jesus that ‘being reviled, he reviled not again’ (λοιδορούμενος οὐκ ἀντελοιδορεῖ). And the author of Hebrews suggests that the best preservative against hasty reprisals and a violent temper is a contemplation of the patient silence of Jesus. ‘For consider him that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds’ (Heb 12:3). See also Reproach.

J. C. Lambert.

☞ Reward

REWARD.—1. The NT word for this is μισθός, which appears in its more literal sense as ‘hire’ (Mat 20:8, Luk 10:7) or ‘wages’ (Joh 4:36). Besides μισθός, St. Paul twice uses ἀντιμισθία (Rom 1:27, 2Co 6:13); while Ep. to Heb. uses μισθαποδοσία (Heb 2:2; Heb 10:35; Heb 11:26). Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 prefers, in passages where the Greek has a verb, —ἀποδίδωμι, cf. μισθαποδοσία,—the colourless rendering ‘recompense’ (Mat 6:6, Mat 6:18). It might be questioned whether, in the 17th cent., the English word ‘reward’ had so definitely as now the sense of a favourable or desirable retribution. Or is there a touch of conscious paradox in the translation ‘reward evil for good’ (Psa 35:12)? But see Psa 7:4, Heb 2:2. On the other hand, Hooker (*Ecclcs. Polity*, Books i.-vi., 1592 or 1594) already employs the expression ‘rewards and punishments, Which stamps a favourable sense upon the ‘rewards’; cf. also—

‘A man, that fortune’s buffets and rewards

Hast ta’en with equal thanks.’—*Hamlet*, iii. ii. 71.

At Luk 23:41 ‘due reward of our deeds,’ Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, stands for a periphrasis in the Greek.

2. Christ's teaching is popular, and He has no hesitation in using the conception of 'reward in heaven' as a stimulus to zeal (e.g. Mat 5:12; Mat 6:20). Reward on earth is also found among His promises, if apparently with a touch of irony (cf. Mar 10:30). Yet we cannot conceal from ourselves that reward, like the cognate conception of merit, belongs to a secondary order of moral categories. 'Merit lives from man to man, and not from man, O Lord, to thee.' In public life the bad citizen is punished, while the good citizen's *reward* is—life as a citizen! Literal 'rewards' are for the nursery or primary school. There is perhaps more of morality in 'punishment.' Moral protoplasm—potential goodness—may exist in the much decried fear of hell oftener than in the hope of heaven. Punishment emphasizes guilt, calls for repentance, and may prove the door to a new life; reward implies righteousness, and the thought of it may tend to *self*-righteousness. (In order to shut this out, or for some other reason, the 'righteous' (Mat 25:37-39) are *unconscious* of their claim to reward). 'Other-worldliness' is a much rarer vice than worldliness, the allurements of such distant prizes being faint and cold. Yet a fanatical greed for the future life is not impossible.

3. In Christ's teaching there is comparatively little which carries us *beyond* the thought of reward. Most noticeable is Luk 17:10 'We are unprofitable servants,' or, according to Wellhausen's fine conjecture, 'We are servants! we have done that which it was our duty to do.' Also there is an approach to the Panline standpoint in the flavour of irony with which our Lord describes 'the righteous' in contrast to sinners. He 'came not to call' them (Mat 9:13 ||). 'There shall be joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine righteous persons which need no repentance' (Luk 15:7; Luk 15:10; Luk 15:32). Luk 7:47 has the clearest trace of irony. 'Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; [you can see that it is so] for she' showed such signs of love. 'But to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little.' Again, the call to self-sacrifice (Mat 16:24 ||) shuts out any vulgar conception of reward, though, in point of form, the acceptance of *earthly* suffering does not cancel *heavenly* reward.

4. We must recognize, then, that hope of reward is a legitimate motive. It bears the highest *imprimatur*; and it keeps a place in the general Christian scheme, even as unfolded by that Apostle who might seem most opposed to it on principle. We need not think to do without it, even while we pass on to higher motives and fuller conceptions of duty. Christian labour and sacrifice are never in vain. The struggle 'availeth' (A. H. Clough's *Poems*, 'Say not the struggle'). See also art. Retribution.

Literature.—Studies of the teaching of Christ—*Ecce Homo* (close of ch. xi.), Wendt, Horton; Huntington, *Chr. Believing and Living*, 209; *Expositor*, ii. 1. [1881] 401; Briggs, *Ethical Teaching of Jesus* (1904), 206, 240; Manning, *Serm.* (1844) 159; Cox,

Expositions, i. (1885) 68; R. Vaughan, *Stones from the Quarry* (1890), 136; Liddon, *Serm. on Some Words of Christ* (1892), 19.

Robert Mackintosh.

⚡ Rhesa

RHESA.—A link in our Lord's genealogy ([Luk_3:27](#)).

⚡ Riches

RICHES.—See Wealth.

⚡ Right

RIGHT.—In the Authorized Version the word 'right' is the equivalent of two distinct Greek words, δίκαιος, 'righteous' ([Mat_20:4](#); [Mat_20:7](#), [Luk_12:57](#)), and ὀρθῶς, 'correctly' ([Luk_7:43](#); [Luk_10:28](#); [Luk_20:21](#)). The English word is etymologically associated with Lat. *rectus* (from *regere*, 'to rule'; cf. 'direct' and cognates). It implies that which is *straight, according to rule*. In the Gospels the idea of 'right,' as distinct from the word, runs through the whole of our Lord's revelation of God. His teaching is at once a demand for that which is right and the source of all instruction about it.

1. The *standard* of right is always found in the will of God as expressed in His law. Everything is referred to that. Doing the will of God is the simple but exhaustive summary of all true life ([Mar_3:35](#)).

2. The *extent* of right is to be understood as absolute conformity to the law of God, with no immunity and no reservation. Not only actions and words, but also thoughts, desires, and motives, are always included in its scope ([Mat_5:22](#); [Mat_5:28](#)). Since 'right' means conformity to God's character and will, it necessarily follows that this conformity must be absolute. Our Lord contrasts the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees with that which He demanded from His followers ([Mat_5:20](#)). His requirement was higher because of His higher conception of the character, will, and claims of God. To them righteousness was nothing more than a superficial outward

conformity to the Divine law as interpreted and altered by their tradition. They measured by means of an imperfect standard, while our Lord laid down an absolute law (Mat_5:48). See art. Righteousness.

3. The *motives* to right are variously stated and implied, (a) First and foremost is the (always implied) motive based on the truth that right is right and therefore must be done. (b) Then obedience to the will of God, because it is God's will, is emphasized (Mat_5:33, Mat_7:21). (c) A secondary and yet important motive is found in the spiritual blessings associated with the performance of right (Mat_5:1-11, Mat_6:1; Mat_6:4; Mat_6:6; Mat_6:18). (d) Yet again we have the spiritual influences and effects of right as no inconsiderable motive for righteousness of thought, word, and deed (Mat_5:13-14).

4. The *encouragements* to right are found in (a) the joy of satisfaction in obedience to God; (b) the approving testimony of conscience as the result of righteousness; (c) the blessing of God manifestly resting upon the life (Mat_10:28-31); (d) fellowship with Christ in faithful and true living (Mat_10:25, Mat_12:50). These points concerning right are only a bare summary of what is both implicit and expressed in the whole of our Lord's teaching, especially in the five great sections of teaching found in Matthew.

5. The *secret* of right is found in personal union and communion with Christ. There is nothing dry, formal, and abstract in 'right' as conceived of in the NT. It is no question of an impersonal abstract τὸ δίκαιον or τὸ καλόν, but a warm, loving, living, and personal life of right thinking, right speaking, right doing, in union with Him who is pre-eminently ὁ δίκαιος and ὁ καλός. It is this that differentiates Christian ethics from all others. Christianity not only depicts an ideal and insists on its realization; it proclaims and provides the power to realize it, in union with Him who has Himself lived the life and fulfilled the Divine ideal, and whose grace is sufficient for all who receive it. In all that concerns 'right,' the followers of Christ accept and know by experience the truths of two great statements; one of the Master, and the other of one of His Apostles: 'Apart from me ye can do nothing' (Joh_15:5); 'I can do all things in him who is empowering me' (Php_4:13).

W. H. Griffith Thomas.

 Right Hand

RIGHT HAND.—See Session.

☞ Righteous, Righteousness

RIGHTEOUS, RIGHTEOUSNESS

i. History of the terms.—The root notion of the Heb. word **יָדָן** is that which is just, right, and normal; and its exact meaning fluctuates in each epoch according to the standard by which right and wrong are measured. It is true that in the OT this standard is always based on the will of Jehovah; but we observe great changes—chiefly progressive—in the Jewish notion of what He requires. In more primitive times the conception of **יָדָן** is mainly forensic, meaning that which accords with custom as fixed by the Divinely given decisions of the people's judges. But the prophets raised the whole conception of the law of God, and insisted that its moral aspect was infinitely more important than its ceremonial. Indeed, though like all OT writers they dealt with action rather than character, they almost foreshadow in places the NT teaching, that it is a clean heart that makes a righteous deed. Hosea and Jeremiah illumined the conception of man's duty to his neighbour by the preaching of God's loving-kindness to His people. Deutero-Isaiah goes further still, and finds in the thought of God's unfailing righteousness the pledge that He will comfort and redeem His servants. As used of Him, the word **יָדָן** denotes moral consistency and faithfulness to His promises, and in the highest prophetic teaching this was felt to include the love which pardons the penitent, though ever stern to the obdurate.

In the age of formalism, which was marked by the cessation of prophecy, the notion of righteousness became more ceremonial and external. Already in some of the Psalms we have 'the righteous' as a regular party in the land, and the term ultimately became the self-designation of the Pharisees. **יָדָן** was now identified mainly with almsgiving in the sphere of private morals; and, in the judicial sphere, with readiness to help the weak as opposed to the letter of strict judgment.* [Note: See Dalman, *Die richterliche Gerechtigkeit im AT*, as quoted in art 'Righteousness (in OT)' in Hastings' DB iv. 281.] In the LXX Septuagint the word is translated usually by **δικαιοσύνη**, but also by **κρίσις**, **ἔλεος**, and **ἐλεημοσύνη**; and the adj. **יָדָן** usually by **δίκαιος**, but also by **ἀμεμπτος**, **καθαρός**, **πιστός**, and **εὐσεβής**.

The Gr. **δικαιοσύνη**, like the Heb. **יָדָן**, was generally used in a much broader sense than our word 'justice,' and denoted social virtue as a whole. Aristotle defines it as ἄ

ρετή τελεία καὶ οὐχ ἀπλῶς ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἕτερον ... οὐ μέρος ἀρετῆς, ἀλλὰ ὅλη ἀρετή (*Ethics*, v. 3. 1129b; cf. Plato, *Republic*, 443). The chief difference between the Heb. and Gr. words lies, not in the terms themselves, but in the radical distinction between the religions of the two races,—the former being based on the relation of man to God, the latter on man's duty to himself; thus in Greek ἀδικία is usually distinguished from ἀσέβεια.

ii. NT usage.—The NT writers inherited the word **צְדָקָה** with all its religious associations, and used as its equivalent δικαιοσύνη, and as its opposite ἀδικία. The latter word is sometimes contrasted also with ἀλήθεια (e.g. Rom 1:18, 2Th 2:10); for 'truth passing into action is righteousness' (Westcott on 1Jn 1:9). ἄδικος is also contrasted with πιστός (Luk 16:10-11), εὐσεβής (2Pe 2:9, cf. Rom 4:5), ἅγιος (1Co 6:1). The first of these three words expresses an idea always present in the word 'righteousness' (namely, consistency); the other two give its basis for man,—devotion to God,—but do not immediately express the notion of duty towards one's neighbour.

Jesus Christ transformed the whole conception of righteousness; for He broke down the externalism of His day by emphasizing character rather than action, and set religion on an entirely new basis by making it a real response of the whole personality to God, and pointing to love as the essence of righteousness. It is significant in this connexion that it was Christianity that created the very conception of personality, and so ultimately the word itself. Jesus Christ tells His followers that their righteousness is to be based on the eternal character of God (Mat 5:44-45), as uniquely revealed in human life by Himself (Mat 11:27 ||). Accordingly the early Christians seem to have spoken of Christ as 'the righteous one' (see Act 3:14; Act 7:52; Act 22:14, Jam 5:6). But we must examine in more detail the righteousness taught and exemplified by Him.

1. The Synoptists

(a) *General usage*.—The Synoptic writers all use δίκαιος and δικαιοσύνη generally, of the man who tries to do his duty in the sight of God, whether Christian or not (Mat 1:19; Mat 5:45, Mar 6:20, Luk 1:6; Luk 2:25). But St. Matthew also uses the words especially of believers in Christ, to denote the character which He requires in citizens of the Kingdom of heaven (Mat 5:10; Mat 6:1 etc.). St. Luke, indeed, approximates to this in three passages at least (Luk 14:14, Act 24:15; Act 24:25); but with him it can scarcely be called a well-defined usage. The explanation of this

peculiarity of the First Gospel no doubt lies in the fact that its chief aim is to represent Christianity as the consummation of Judaism (cf. Mat 5:17). But a still more noteworthy fact is that the Synoptic writers do not directly speak of righteousness as a Divine attribute. [Mat 6:33 is no exception, for 'his righteousness' there means the character which God expects of us, though this is implicitly based on the nature of the Father]. Nor is Christ ever directly termed *δικαιος* by them, except in the mouth of unbelievers (e.g. Pilate's wife in Mat 27:19), and in the cases mentioned above from the Acts, where St. Luke represents three different speakers as calling Him *ὁ δίκαιος*. In this connexion it is significant that in recording the centurion's words at Calvary, St. Luke (Luk 23:47) writes, 'Certainly this was a righteous man'; but St. Matthew (Mat 27:54) and St. Mark (Mar 15:39) give *υἱὸς θεοῦ* in place of *δικαιος*. Now, when we remember that our Lord, in the Synoptic accounts, does not speak of Himself as *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, though He accepts the title from others, and acknowledges His unique Sonship before the Sanhedrin (Luk 22:70 ||), we see why He does not call Himself *ὁ δίκαιος*. He does not put forward His own claims in the Galilaean ministry, but leaves His followers to infer them from His words and acts (cf. Mat 16:15-17). And when men have drawn the inference, then they call Him *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* rather than *ὁ δίκαιος*. Similarly, He Himself does not speak of the Father's righteousness, because to His hearers the word would not convey enough. He speaks rather of the Father's love.

(b) *God's righteousness*.—What we have said above leads us on naturally to ask, What is the central idea in Christ's teaching about the Father's righteousness (for though He does not Himself apply the word to God in the Synoptic accounts, the idea is not excluded)? Our Lord bases everything on the truth that God is a loving Father to all men, and they are potentially His sons; by love they may know Him, and so make that potentiality actual. Such is the teaching of the parable of the Prodigal Son (Luk 15:11-32). In Mat 5:45-48 Christ tells us that God loves both good and evil, both righteous and unrighteous; and His followers are to do the same 'in order that ye may be (*γένησθε* = 'show yourselves to be'; or else 'become') sons of your Father which is in heaven.' And His summary of the whole matter is, 'Ye therefore shall be perfect (*i.e.* in and through love) as your heavenly Father is perfect.' But this love in God, if it makes Him infinitely merciful to the penitent sinner, makes Him equally stern to the impenitent. Again and again Christ, by means of a series of parables, teaches the future suffering of the wicked. It will suffice to quote one which shows the unity of the Divine love in its two aspects of mercifulness and sternness—the parable of the king that took account of his servants and punished him who showed no mercy to his fellow (Mat 18:23-35). He is ready to forgive the largest of debts if only the servant

proves his love; but he has no mercy for the ungrateful and unloving; 'he delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due'

(c) *Christ's righteousness.*—If we may rightly speak of the absolute righteousness of God in the Synoptic accounts, we have no less reason for speaking of the absolute righteousness of Christ. A close examination of His words may even seem explicitly to sanction this. In Mat_5:10 He pronounces a blessing on those who are persecuted *for righteousness' sake*; and in the next verse He goes on, 'Blessed are ye when men shall ... persecute you ... *for my sake.*' We may compare Mar_8:35 'Whosoever shall lose his life *for my sake and the gospel's* shall save it' (also Mar_10:29). Throughout his Gospel St. Matthew makes δικαιοσύνη the character of the citizens of the Kingdom of heaven. But Jesus Christ is the inaugurator of that kingdom (Mat_11:11; Mat_12:28). It is He, as the Son of Man, who sows the good seed of the Kingdom (Mat_13:37); He, again, who can give 'the keys of the kingdom' (Mat_16:19). He has authority over the angels in *His* kingdom, which is the kingdom of the Father (Mat_13:41; Mat_13:43). He not only gives to men a unique revelation—the only revelation—of the Father (Mat_11:27 ||—a passage which implies His sinlessness), but He is the giver of the Holy Ghost (Mat_3:11 ||). This teaching is confirmed by the order of words in Mat_24:36 and Mar_13:32 (men—the angels—the Son—the Father). So He claims to be *the* Son of God (Luk_22:70 ||), and suffers condemnation for blasphemy; as such, He is transfigured, before three of His Apostles, with the Divine glory (Mat_17:1-8 ||). And so again He assents to the statement that He is quite different from one of the prophets (Mat_16:14-18); they were righteous, but He is *the* righteous Man, and more also. The whole teaching of the Synoptic Gospels is implicitly the same; nowhere does our Lord show any consciousness of sin; again and again He emphasizes the sinfulness of all men and their need of repentance. Therefore He is to be the judge of mankind, in the consummation of God's kingdom (Mat_7:22 f., Mat_13:41, Mat_16:27, Mat_25:31 ff.).

(d) *The contents of righteousness.*—What, in brief, was the ideal of which Christ was the perfect example, and which He sets before His followers? Obviously an adequate answer to this question is far beyond the limits of this article. But we must try to apprehend a few leading principles. This is the easier, because Christ sought to 'educate' His disciples by giving them principles rather than precepts; His service was to be a free development, not a slavish system. St. Matthew has collected for us, in the Sermon on the Mount, much of our Lord's teaching on the Kingdom of heaven and the δικαιοσύνη which marks its citizens. They are to seek above all else 'the kingdom of God and his righteousness' (Mat_6:33); they are to 'hunger and thirst' after it (Mat_5:6). The Kingdom only reflects the eternal character of the King (Mat_5:45). Thus δικαιοσύνη, which is very close in meaning to our modern word 'morality,' is throughout based on religion, and treated as inseparable from it. Matthew 6 opens

with a warning against ostentation in *δικαιοσύνη* (if, indeed, that is the right reading); and the examples given are those of almsgiving (Mat 6:2), prayer (Mat 6:5), and fasting (Mat 6:16)—the second of which, at least, is often treated by us as outside morality. Now the central principle of God's being is, as we said, represented to be love. Consequently love is the unfailing measure of human *δικαιοσύνη*. The first commandment is 'Love God'; the second, 'Love thy neighbour as thyself' (Mar 12:29-31 ||); and, according to St. Matthew (Mat 22:40), Christ adds the words, 'on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets' (words almost repeated in Mat 7:12 and presupposed in Gal 5:14 and Rom 13:8).

Here, then, is the principle by which we may test all our actions. God judges men by what they are rather than by what they do; we, being human, and unable to read the heart, are to judge by their deeds what men are (Mat 7:16), though with much caution against rash and censorious judgments (Mat 7:1). But the final judgment is God's, who takes account of motive as well as act. He who nurses wrath against a brother, or treats him with bitter contempt, is guilty before God as well as the man who proceeds to murder (Mat 5:21-22); and 'every one that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart' (Mat 5:28). It has been well said that 'inwardness' is the guiding principle of the Sermon on the Mount. The hard sayings of Mat 5:39-42 must clearly be interpreted on the same principle of love towards our neighbour, resting on love towards God; they do not forbid all resistance of evil (such as resistance to a thief or one of overbearing temper), but they prohibit resistance which springs from personal resentment; they do not inculcate indiscriminate charity, but command us to do, without thought of self, whatever is best for those in need. On the same principle, Christ tells us that it is quality, not quantity, that matters. In prayer we are not to 'use vain repetitions,' as if we should be heard for our 'much speaking' (Mat 6:7); yet it is to be observed that Christ Himself sometimes spent the whole or the major part of the night in prayer (Luk 6:12, Mar 6:46-48). Men may 'cast out devils' and do 'many mighty works' in Christ's name, and yet be no true followers of His (Mat 7:22-23). The widow who cast a farthing into the treasury was doing a greater thing than those who brought rich offerings (Mar 12:41-44 ||).

Love to God is the first commandment; love to man is included in it, as the less in the greater. The motive which makes the service of men righteous in the highest sense is that it should be done for Christ's sake (Mar 9:41, Mat 10:42; Mat 18:5), or, in other words, in order that men 'may glorify your Father which is in heaven' (Mat 5:16). We must really lose ourselves before we can find our true selves (Mat 16:25 etc.); *i.e.* self-development is included in the end, but it can never come through selfishness. The Christian's paradise is not like the Mohammedan's; the reward of self-denying toil in Christ's service is more toil (Luk 19:17). The Lord's Prayer opens, not with

petition, but with adoration and thanksgiving; and petition must be qualified with the thought, 'nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done' (Luk 22:42).

Thus one important aspect of love is filial trust, or faith in God. But this faith is certainly not intellectual in essence. Without love it is void and empty (Mat 7:22 f.). It is the faith which seeks God's kingdom and His righteousness *first*, and makes the daily toil for the material necessities of life subordinate to these, in its calm certitude that God will give sufficient for our needs. But how, it may be asked, are we to win such faith as this? Partly by contemplation of God's love in Nature (Mat 5:45; Mat 6:26-30, Luk 12:24-32); partly by the evidence of Christ's life, death, and resurrection (Mat 16:8-10; Mat 28:19-20 etc.); partly by turning into earnest prayer the measure of faith that we have (cf. Mar 9:23-24); and partly by loving service of our brother men in all humility (see Luk 17:5-10).

Again, as love for mankind is incomplete except when based on love for God, so is love for God an idle sentimentality unless it is realized by the service of men. 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven' (Mat 7:21). This is set forth in detail in the picture of the Last Judgment (Mat 25:31-46). Here the test of men is whether they gave food, drink, and shelter to strangers and to those who were needy, or sick, or outcast. For the 'Golden Rule,' which sums up 'the Law and the Prophets,' is, 'All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also to them' (Mat 7:12, Luk 6:31). Nor is any man to be outside the pale of a Christian's love. To the scribe's question, 'Who is my neighbour?,' Christ replies by a parable, in which a Samaritan is represented as doing for one of his traditional enemies, the Jews, what the priest and Levite of the man's own race had left undone (Luk 10:29 ff.). So He abolishes the Jewish belief that 'neighbour' includes only those of one's own race. And His last words on earth lay before His Apostles their duty of teaching *all* nations (Mat 28:19, Luk 24:47, cf. Mar 16:15). He uses also the term 'brother' in a no less catholic sense, in all probability, though He never explicitly tells His disciples that they are to consider all men as brethren (see Mat 7:3; Mat 18:15; Mat 18:21, Luk 17:3-4). The teaching of the parable of the Prodigal Son is still more emphatic on this point. It is also true that He uses the word 'brother' in a narrower sense, to denote specially the man, whoever he is, that does the will of God (Mar 3:35 ||). See art. Brotherhood.

It was the simplicity and the 'inwardness' of this supreme test of righteousness by love that were to make Christ's 'yoke easy' (Mat 11:30), in contrast with the 'heavy burdens' imposed on men's shoulders by the externalism and endless rules of the Pharisees (Mat 23:4). He said, 'Except ye turn and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven'

(Mat 18:3-4, cf. Mar 9:35); and He called the scribes and Pharisees ‘children of hell’ (Mat 23:15)—a term which he never applies even to the publican or the harlot—because He found in their self-exaltation and censoriousness (cf. Luk 18:11, Mat 23:5-10) the very antithesis of the meekness and humility which were to Him the essence of righteousness (Mat 11:29; Mat 7:1-5, Luk 17:7-10). His mission, He says, is not to the self-righteous, but to the man conscious of his sin (Mat 9:13 ||, cf. Luk 15:7). To the Pharisee ceremonial was everything, the spirit of action nothing (Mat 23:25-26); to Him the ceremonial was useless unless carried out in the spirit of love (Mat 5:23-25), and the rule of law must always give way to the rule of love (cf. His treatment of Sabbath-observance, Mar 2:23 to Mar 3:5). Therefore He said, ‘Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven’ (Mat 5:20).

This leads us to speak briefly of His treatment of the Mosaic Law. He made a rule of observing it, but never in a literal, slavish manner. In everything He acted on the principle that ‘the Son of Man is lord even of the Sabbath’ (Mar 2:28). He yielded to authority (cf. Mar 12:17 ||, Luk 17:14, Mat 17:27). except when doing so meant the violation of a higher law (see Mat 23:3). The Law was to Him sound in principle, but not perfect. His work in respect to it was not revolutionary, but evolutionary (Mat 5:17-20). Not ‘a jot or tittle’ of its underlying principles was to perish; and the man who should ‘break’ (λύση in Mat 5:19 picks up καταλύσαι in Mat 5:17; cf. Joh 7:23) them would be acting against Christ’s command.* [Note: This passage has caused such difficulties to the commentators that some of them have declared it inconsistent with Christ’s teaching, and have held that He never said these words (cf. Hastings’ DB, Ext. Vol. p. 24f.). But that Joh 7:18 really applies to the principles of the Law, and not its letter, is surely proved by the addition of Joh 7:20, where the scribes and Pharisees are denounced as having broken it while seeming to ‘hedge it round.’]

On the other hand, He gives new and deeper applications to the laws of Moses, as in the case of the law of murder (Mat 5:21 ff.). He does not hesitate to add new restrictions to it, as in the case of the laws of adultery, false swearing, and retaliation (Mat 5:27; Mat 5:33; Mat 5:38); and He definitely abrogates a law of Moses when He declares all meats clean (Mar 7:15-19).

In connexion with the question of Christ’s relation to the Law, there is one passage which calls for special mention—Mat 3:15, where, in answer to the Baptist’s protest against baptizing Him, He says: ‘Suffer it now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.’ We are sometimes told that δικαιοσύνη is here equivalent to the ceremonial law; but this cannot be so, inasmuch as there was no ceremonial law about baptism. Nor did baptism mean the same to Him as to most who underwent it.

To them the ceremony selected by John brought assurance of forgiveness of sins, but no conscious outpouring of the Holy Spirit (Act 19:2-3); to Him it brought no forgiveness of sins, but a visible descent of the Spirit. For He never, all His life through, raised Himself above the ordinary human dependence on outward act and form, as His use of symbolic action and the institution of the two Sacraments show us. By δικαιοσύνη, then, in this passage, He clearly means the general use of outward religious ritual current at His time, and He makes this the occasion of receiving spiritual power.

(e) *The communication of Christ's righteousness to His followers.*—It would be going beyond the limits of this article to discuss the *method* of Justification and Sanctification (see sep. artt.), as represented in the Synoptic writers; it only remains to show the place they give to the *facts* which these words represent (even though it is impossible entirely to separate method and fact). We have seen that Christ claimed a unique knowledge of the Father and a unique power of revealing Him to man (Mat 11:27 ||),—a revelation which He consistently represented as possible only through love. Nor was this power to fail at His death. As their risen Lord He would always be with His disciples, to pour upon them power from on high (Mat 28:18-20, Luk 24:48-49). He was now to fulfil the Baptist's prophecy that He should baptize them with the Holy Spirit (Act 1:4-5; Act 2:1-13). The Holy Spirit, representing the risen Christ (Mat 28:20), was to give them the righteousness which should, by God's love, fit them for the Kingdom of heaven,—righteousness growing with their growing love and faith, which were to be its essence. Christ distinctly took His stand on the appeal to morality. Works were to be the necessary outcome of true love (Mat 7:21 etc.). When He says, 'Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be tilled' (Mat 5:6), He does not mean in the next world only, but in this also. Indeed, throughout His teaching, the life to come is treated as an orderly development of this life. He speaks, on the one hand, of the Kingdom of heaven as already come in some measure,—'the kingdom of God is within you' (Luk 17:21, cf. Luk 6:20; Luk 11:20), and it is to come with more marked power still within the lifetime of some of His disciples (Mar 9:1 ||). Yet, on the other hand, its consummation is not for this life, but for the life to come (Mat 25:34, Mar 14:25 = Luk 22:18 = Mat 26:29). So Christ taught His disciples to pray, 'Thy kingdom come,' *i.e.* in ever more and more fulness until the end (συντέλεια). Meanwhile (as is everywhere implied, and nowhere stated) God sees each member of the Kingdom not as he is, but as he is becoming 'in Christ,' and treats him as a son for his faith and love.

2. St. John.—When we turn to the Johannine writings, we pass into a new atmosphere. We are no longer dealing so much with the outer activities of Christ's life in its earthly setting. St. John had pondered through long years and with deep

reverence over the inner meaning of that life. To him Christ was primarily the λόγος, the revelation of the eternal nature of the Father, though it had been given them to touch and see Him in earthly form. Consequently we have a series of sayings unlike anything in the first three Gospels: ‘God is Spirit’ (Joh 4:24), ‘God is Light’ (1Jn 1:5), ‘God is Love’ (1Jn 4:8; 1Jn 4:16), ‘I am the way, and the truth, and the life’ (Joh 14:6). So the thought of righteousness as a Divine attribute is peculiarly developed in St. John. It is parallel to his favourite use of ἀλήθεια, which he treats almost as a synonym for ἀγιωσύνη, representing the less active side of righteousness (cf. ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν in Joh 3:21 and 1Jn 1:6 with ποιεῖν τὴν δικαιοσύνην in 1Jn 3:7). So in Joh 8:32-34 ‘the *truth* shall make you free ... but he that doeth *sin* is a slave.’ Again, the conception of the Kingdom becomes in St. John the thought of life eternal; and the latter in Jn., as the former in the Synoptists, is spoken of, now as a present possession (Joh 3:36), now as that which shall be fully bestowed only in the next life (Joh 12:25).

Thus the thought of righteousness as a Divine attribute meets us at every turn, and its explicit mention not infrequently. δίκαιος εἶ, cries the angel to the Eternal in the Apocalypse (Rev 16:5, where the thought is chiefly of His sternness to the wicked [cf. Rev 15:3, Rev 16:7, Rev 19:2] in delivering His saints). Πατὴρ δικαίε are Christ’s own words in prayer (Joh 17:25), where the thought is primarily of God’s gracious mercy and faithfulness in revealing His love to His chosen ones. δίκαιος occurs again in 1Jn 1:9 in a similar sense of ‘true to his loving nature.’ ‘If we confess our sins, he is *faithful and righteous* to forgive us our sins, *and to cleanse* us from all unrighteousness.’ In exactly the same way righteousness is predicated of Christ throughout as One who is consistent in His mercy to the penitent, and loving in His necessary sternness to the obdurate. ‘If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous’ (1Jn 2:1); ‘They that have done good (shall come forth) unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done ill, unto the resurrection of judgment.... My judgment is righteous’ (Joh 5:29 f.). Yet ‘I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. He that rejecteth me ... the word that I spake ... shall judge him in the last day’ (Joh 12:47-48). Christ, that is to say, seeks but to save the wicked, in His love for them; but if they will not have His mercy, they are self-doomed.

The Divine part throughout is that of absolute love: ‘God is love,’—that sums Him up in a word; and that is the newness of the Christian teaching (Joh 13:34, Joh 15:12) which transforms the notion of what makes goodness in deed. Our whole duty is to love God, which involves obedience to Him (1Jn 5:3), and is declared to be the only means of knowing Him (1Jn 4:7). The love of God necessarily carries with it the love

of man (1Jn 4:11-12; 1Jn 4:20); it is the love of God, shown by sending His Son to die for the world, which teaches us to love other men (1Jn 3:16, 1Jn 4:9-10), and the one love must be as catholic as the other (cf. Joh 12:32). Elsewhere, in emphasizing the inwardness of all true righteousness, Christ shows that it depends on God's nature as Spirit. 'God is Spirit, and they that worship him, must worship in spirit and truth' (Joh 4:24). And the corollary is that true worship is independent of locality and ceremonial (Joh 4:21),—though this is not to be taken as implying that all ceremonial may be safely cast aside.

But it is by developing Christ's teaching about the second or spiritual birth that St. John especially marks both the essential inwardness and the continuous growth of righteousness. The *locus classicus* for this is the Lord's discourse given in Joh 3:3-21, where the eternal life given by the second birth is brought into immediate relation with His own pre-existence and resurrection (Joh 3:13-16). This chapter is illustrated in the First Epistle, where he writes:

'Every one that loveth is begotten of God' (1Jn 4:7).

'Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God' (1Jn 5:1).

'If ye know that he (probably Christ) is righteous, ye know that everyone also that doeth righteousness is begotten of him' (1Jn 2:29).

But here we notice a further point. Christ 'was manifested to take away sins; and in him is no sin. Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not ...'; the righteous man is 'he that doeth righteousness, ... even as he is righteous.... *Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin*, because his seed abideth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is begotten of God' (1Jn 3:5-9). At first sight this seems inconsistent with 1Jn 1:8-9, where the Apostle tells us, 'If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins ...' Clearly, in the former passages, sin is thought of as a lasting state of rebellion against God; in the latter, it is treated rather as an act due to weakness. He that is born of God cannot deliberately rebel against God, as long as the new life is in him; cf. Joh 13:10 'Ye are clean, but not all' (Christ excepts only Judas, Joh 13:11); Joh 15:3 'Already ye are clean because of the word which I have spoken unto you'; for, as He goes on to say, this cleanliness of heart comes from the union of Himself with the disciple, effected by love. 'Abide in me and I in you.... He that abideth in me and I in him, the same beareth much fruit; for apart from me ye can do nothing' (Joh 15:4 f., cf. Joh 17:21; Joh 17:23). Here we have explicitly stated what is implicit in the Synoptic Gospels, namely, that only by the union of love with the risen Christ (cf. Joh 8:31-32, Joh 15:13-15) can we do righteousness, receiving more and more of 'his fulness ... and grace for grace' (Joh 1:16), having already in us the eternal life which

is to be consummated at the last day (cf. Joh_17:3, Joh_20:31). This is the general meaning of Joh_16:8-10. '(The Holy Spirit), when he is come, will convict the world in respect of ... righteousness ... because I go to the Father, and ye behold me no more'; that is to say, the Holy Spirit will not only reveal Christ's righteousness to the world, but will show men the infinite possibilities which are theirs in union with Him, because Christ is henceforth alive for evermore with the Father, having conquered death and sin. All this implies, what St. Paul explains so fully, that God sees us as we are becoming 'in Christ,' rather than as we are; but St. John does not analyze forgiveness as St. Paul does, and throughout he looks rather at the eternal fact than the temporal process.

3. St. Paul.—In St. Paul's Epistles *δικαιος* generally bears the same meaning as elsewhere in the NT, and so is associated with *δσιος* and *ἅγιος* (cf. Tit_1:8, Rom_7:12). However, once at least he seems to revert almost unconsciously to the Pharisaic idea of the *δικαιος* as one who conforms to law; for in Rom_5:7 he apparently differentiates between the 'righteous' and the 'good' (*ἀγαθός*) man in much the same way as the Gnostics afterwards called the God of the OT 'righteous' (meaning 'just'), and the God of the NT 'good.' This is not his usual custom, however; indeed, in Eph_5:9 he couples *ἀγαθωσύνη* and *δικαιοσύνη*; and in Rom_7:12 he puts *δικαία* between *ἀγία* and *ἀγαθή*.

In Rom_14:17 St. Paul tells us that 'the kingdom of God is ... righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost,'—words which remind us of St. Matthew. But, unlike the First Gospel, he often speaks of the righteousness of God. In the years which preceded his conversion, he had known all the suffering of a sensitive man who feels that, in spite of all his desire to keep God's law, he is constantly breaking it in act, and generally failing to live up to the spirit of it. The salvation of his life had come to him in the conviction that God takes the will for the deed, and that in union with the risen Christ the human will is kept constantly true. This is the truth that he has to work out intellectually in his Epistles. And he begins by showing that Christ had not lowered the standard of God's righteousness to meet human weakness, but raised it (cf. Rom_3:21-26). God is and must be true to His righteous nature; He is the righteous judge who will reward those who serve Him and punish those who do not. It is not the fact of God's righteousness that has been abolished by Christianity, but the old standard of service. This comes out very clearly in Romans 10. Israel, he says, were ignorant of God's righteousness (though they knew God's law, Rom_10:3), for 'Christ is the end of the law unto righteousness unto every one that hath faith' (Rom_10:4). The Jew had thought that he must 'ascend into heaven' or 'descend into the abyss,' that is, make superhuman efforts to keep the Law. But the righteousness which is of

faith saith, ‘... The word is nigh thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart; that is, the word of *faith* which we preach.’ ‘For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation’ (Rom_10:6-10). It is not keeping the Law in act that God demands so much as ‘*faith working through love*’ (Gal_5:6); ‘the end of the charge is love out of ... faith unfeigned’ (1Ti_1:5). ‘For the whole law is fulfilled in one word, even in this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself’ (Gal_5:14, cf. Rom_13:8). Without love, the most wonderful of God’s other gifts—even faith itself—or the most perfect acts of self-devotion, are vain and empty (1Co_13:1-3): love is greater than faith (1Co_13:13), though it necessarily contains faith (1Co_13:7). Thus Mosaism is ἡ διακονία τῆς κατακρίσεως, but Christianity ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης (2Co_3:9). God, ‘the *righteous* judge,’ shall give the crown of righteousness (*i.e.* perfect righteousness as a reward; cf. τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς, Rev_2:10, Jam_1:12) to all them that have *loved* His appearing (2Ti_4:8).

So St. Paul, though he constantly emphasizes the truth that ‘faith is counted for righteousness’ (Rom_4:5 etc.), never means by faith merely an intellectual belief, but that faith which is part of love, *i.e.* a response of the whole personality to God. Therefore it is obviously quite unfair to represent his doctrine of justification by faith as entailing a legal fiction. The faith and the love must be actual in the believer, and must issue in action (Rom_2:13), and as they grow, so must action become more perfect; it is not the action, however, that constitutes righteousness in God’s sight, but the faith and love. God views us *sub specie aeternitatis*: He looks on us as we shall be some day by virtue of our union with Christ. St. Paul puts forward, in different language, the truth which St. John expresses by saying that the man who is begotten of God cannot sin. As the believer beholds through faith ‘the glory of the Lord,’ he is ‘transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit’ (2Co_3:18). Christ is the Second Adam (Rom_5:12-15); we are, by the mysterious union of love, ‘*in* Christ Jesus, who was made unto us righteousness and sanctification’ (1Co_1:30). We may ‘become the righteousness of God *in* him’ (2Co_5:21). ‘I can do all things *in* him that strengtheneth me’ (Php_4:13). Sometimes St. Paul’s language touches that of St. John: ‘If Christ is *in* you ... (your) spirit is *life* because of righteousness’ (Rom_8:10; cf. the opposition of θάνατος and δικαιοσύνη in Rom_6:16; cf. also ‘reigning in life,’ Rom_5:17, where χάριτος—God’s gracious gift—is coupled with δικαιοσύνης).

4. The rest of the NT.—The other books of the NT present few new features which call for notice here. *The Epistle to the Hebrews* emphasizes Christ’s absolute righteousness, in order to show Him as the one sufficient Victim and High Priest. He is ‘the effulgence of (God’s) glory and the very image of his substance’ (Heb_1:3). The

Psalmist's words apply to Him uniquely, 'Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity' ([Heb_1:9](#)). He was 'in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin' ([Heb_4:15](#)). He is the 'king of righteousness' ([Heb_7:2](#)). With regard to His work for His followers, the writer of the Epistle usually employs the words ἀγιάζω and τελειόω. He exhorts his readers to have 'experience of the word of righteousness,' that is, 'to press on unto perfection (τελειότης), not laying again a foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, of the teaching of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment' ([Heb_5:13](#) and [Heb_6:1-2](#)). This perfection comes only through Christ ([Heb_7:11](#); [Heb_7:19](#)); He is the risen High Priest, who 'ever liveth to make intercession for us' ([Heb_7:25](#), cf. [Heb_4:16](#), [Heb_5:9](#), [Heb_6:19-20](#)). His blood purges us 'from dead works to serve the living God' ([Heb_9:14](#)). 'By one offering he hath perfected for ever (*i.e.* potentially) them that are being sanctified' ([Heb_10:14](#)). Therefore we must 'follow after the sanctification without which no man shall see the Lord' ([Heb_12:14](#)). The Epistle bases our sanctification on love through faith, just as St. Paul does ([Heb_3:19](#) with [Heb_4:2](#)). The OT heroes wrought all their great deeds through faith (ch. 11); but faith could not possibly bring them such τελειώσεις as it can to the Christian, who is united with his risen Lord ([Heb_11:40](#)). The Christian's work rests on a fuller faith; but love is what makes it fruitful,—love to man rooted in love to God ([Heb_6:10](#), [Heb_10:24](#)). Our first duty is to offer up loving worship to God; our second, 'to do good and to communicate' ([Heb_13:15-16](#)).

The Epistles of St. Peter touch the subject at several points; but, being practical rather than doctrinal, they do not treat it systematically. The writer of the Second Epistle salutes those 'that have obtained a like precious faith with us in the righteousness' (*i.e.* consistent mercy) 'of our God and (the) Saviour Jesus Christ' ([2Pe_1:1](#)). Christ, the righteous, died for us the unrighteous ([1Pe_3:18](#); cf. St. Peter in [Act_3:14](#)); He is the 'lamb without blemish and without spot' ([1Pe_1:19](#)). 'He bare our sins in his body upon the tree, that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness' ([1Pe_2:24](#)), by the power of the risen Lord ([1Pe_1:3](#), [1Pe_3:21](#)). Our union with Him in love and faith works out the salvation of our souls ([1Pe_1:8-9](#)). For faith ends in love ([2Pe_1:5](#); [2Pe_1:7](#)). The Christian's duty, therefore, is to love his neighbour 'from the heart fervently' ([1Pe_1:22](#)); 'above all things being fervent in love ... for love covereth a multitude of sins' ([1Pe_4:8](#)). But the end of all his good works is that men may glorify God ([1Pe_2:12](#)). So shall he be saved unto the new heavens and new earth, where this righteousness shall dwell in perfection ([2Pe_3:13](#)).

The Epistle of St. James follows closely the Sermon on the Mount. He speaks once of God's righteousness, meaning the righteousness which God demands of us ([Jam_1:20](#)). And in all probability he refers to Christ as ὁ δίκαιος ([Jam_5:6](#)). He speaks of love for

one's neighbour as 'the royal law' (Jam 2:8); and he insists at some length that the faith which was accounted unto Abraham for righteousness was not merely intellectual; it could not be separated from his works, in which it was realized and made perfect (Jam 2:22-23).

Literature.—The subject is treated, in some of its aspects, in so many books that it is hard to select any for special mention. There are chapters on it in almost every work on NT Theology; e.g. Beyschlag and Stevens; see also Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, vol. i. § iii. ch. iv.; Bruce, *Kingdom of God*, chs. viii. ix. For individual passages in the NT, reference must be made to the standard Commentaries. Probably the fullest analysis of the word is in Cremer's *Bib.-Theol. Lex. of NT Greek*.

C. T. Wood.

☩ Ring

RING.—When the Prodigal Son in the parable returned to his father (Luk 15:22), the latter ordered a ring (*δακτύλιος*) to be placed on his son's finger. This was not only a mark of opulence (Jam 2:2), it is perhaps intended also as a token that he was restored to a place of authority in the house, and allowed to issue orders in his father's name (see Gen 38:18; Gen 41:42, Est 3:10). For the allegorical fancies that have clustered round this ring, see the works on the Parables; cf., further, art. Seal.

C. H. Prichard.

☩ River

RIVER (*ποταμός*).—'River' (Mar 1:5 etc.), 'flood' (Mat 7:25), 'stream' (Luk 6:48), and 'waters' (2Co 11:26) stand for the same Greek word *ποταμός*. 'Stream' in Luk 6:48 corresponds to 'flood' in Mat 7:25.

The Jordan is the one true river in Palestine. The name occurs frequently in the Gospels, but only once connected with 'river' (Mar 1:5). See Jordan.

The 'stream' (Luk 6:48) or 'flood' (Mat 7:25) is evidently the rushing torrent raised by wintry rains. From Rev 12:15-16 we gather that *ποταμός* may signify any great volume of water rolling over the land. St. Paul's 'perils of rivers' (1Co 11:26) were

doubtless such as the Eastern traveller has perpetually to face in fording bridgeless streams in times of rain and melting snow.

To one reared in Palestine, where only water is required to turn the wilderness into a garden, a river, with its beautifying and fertilizing power, might well seem an apt symbol of life (Rev_22:1-2).

W. Ewing.

⚡Roads

ROADS.—Roads imply a certain amount of civilization. In primitive times it was only near the great centres that regularly built roads were to be found, and even there they were poor and few. In the days of the Empire it was different. The Romans knew the value of good roads, and spared no pains on them. The remains that have come down to us would do credit to modern engineers. They were well bottomed and well laid, and from ten to fourteen feet wide, generally broadest when the cutting was through solid rock. The foundations were of stone, and when allowed to fall into disrepair were rough and slippery, and very trying to the nerves of travellers. In the provinces the roads were under the care of the governors; elsewhere they were under the charge of special officers—frequently of high rank. Along the great military highways were stations, or guard-houses, where the soldiers had not only to see to the preservation of peace and the safety of travellers, but had also to attend to the maintenance of the roads themselves. There the tolls were levied. It was probably at one of these places that Matthew was sitting at the receipt of custom when Jesus called him (Mat_9:9). As the highways between the East and the West passed through the land of the Israelites, making its geographical position unique, it may be well to indicate one or two of these. Cf. map of Palestine in vol. i.

1. The most northerly, and in some respects the most important, was that connecting the Mediterranean Sea and the Euphrates Valley. Starting at Acco (Ptolemais), it ran, according to Ramsay, till it came to Karn Hattin near to Cana, and then almost due east to Tiberias. Skirting the shores of the Sea of Galilee, it crossed the Jordan near Bethsaida, and went over a spur of the Anti-Libanus, and then east by north to Damascus. This road is said to have been a rich source of revenue to the Romans. In the time of the Crusades it was known as the *Via Maris*.

2. From Damascus there came another road, a little to the east of the former, which reached almost to the Sea of Galilee, and then, bending southward on the east side of Jordan, passed beyond the Dead Sea. This was probably the way that the Syrian and

Assyrian armies took in their advance on Israel (2Ki 8:28; 2Ki 9:14; 2Ki 10:32, 1Ch 5:26).

3. There was also the road along the Mediterranean; and this, both in peace and war, was of the first importance. It ran through Acco, Caesarea, Joppa, Ashdod, and Gaza into Egypt. Along this road St. Paul was sent to Caesarea (Act 23:23; Act 23:33).

4. From Jerusalem roads branched out to north, south, east, and west. (a) There was one through Samaria connecting Judaea and Galilee. Although the direct road from Jerusalem to Galilee, it was seldom used by the devout Jews, on account of the hatred that existed between them and the Samaritans. It was by this road that Jesus journeyed when He spoke to the woman of Samaria (Joh 4:4). (b) In ordinary circumstances the Jews preferred to avoid intercourse with the Samaritans, hence in going northward they took the road leading down by Jericho, over the Jordan, and up through Peraea. (c) To the west, another road ran from Jerusalem to Jaffa, passing Gibeah, Bethoron, and Lydda; while (d) to the south the road went through Bethlehem to Hebron, where it split in two: one going through the wilderness by way of Beersheba, and the other going west to the coast and passing through Gaza. The latter is supposed to be the way taken by Philip (Act 8:26), because tradition has it that the eunuch was baptized in the vicinity of Hebron.

These roads played an important part in the diffusion of the gospel. The people who live on the main avenues of traffic are usually of a freer spirit and more open mind than those who dwell in the quiet and cultured towns; and for this reason Jesus got a better hearing in Galilee than in the more polished south. By following the main routes of travel and traffic, St. Paul was led to the chief cities of his day, and found there acceptance for his message, which was carried thence by traders and others into the remote corners of the Empire. The roads were not, even in the days of the Romans, free from danger; witness Luk 10:30; but neither brigandage nor violence was common upon them.

Literature.—G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [Note: *GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*], Index, s.v. 'Roads'; artt. by F. Buhl and W. M. Ramsay in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible*, Extra Vol. pp. 368-402; Thomson, *LB* [Note: *The Land and the Book.*]; Stanley, *SP* [Note: *P Sinai and Palestine.*]; Conder, *Palestine*; Kinglake, *Eothen*.

R. Leggat.

ROBBER (ληστής, Vulgate *latro*) is found in Authorized Version only in Joh 10:1; Joh 10:8; Joh 18:40 (Barabbas). In Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 it stands for the same Greek word also in Mat 21:13 = Mar 11:17 = Luk 19:46 ('den of robbers'); Mat 26:55 = Mar 14:48 = Luk 22:52 ('Are ye come out as against a robber?'); Mat 27:38; Mat 27:44 = Mar 15:27 ('two robbers'); Luk 10:30; Luk 10:36 ('fell among robbers'). In all these places Authorized Version has 'thief,' which elsewhere is the equivalent of κλέπτης. The two Greek words differ precisely as the two English; the ληστής (robber, brigand, highwayman) takes by force, the κλέπτης (thief) by stealth. Judas was a thief (Joh 12:6), Barabbas a robber (Joh 18:40, cf. Mar 15:7). But earlier English versions join with Authorized Version in ignoring this distinction; 'thief' occurs in them all in the above passages from the Synoptists; in Joh 10:1; Joh 10:8 when another word was needed, Tind. [Note: Tindale's NT 1526 and 1534, Pent. 1530.] and Geneva have 'robber,' but Cranmer 'murtherer' (cf. Luther, *Mörder*); in Joh 18:40 Wyc. [Note: Wyclif's Bible (NT c. 1380, OT c. 1382, Purvey's Revision c. 1388).] and Rhem. [Note: Rhemish NT 1582.] have 'thief,' Tind. [Note: Tindale's NT 1526 and 1534, Pent. 1530.] 'robber,' Cran. [Note: Cranmer's 'Great' Bible 1539.] and Gen. [Note: Geneva NT 1557, Bible 1560.] 'murtherer.' But in 16th cent. English, 'thief' was used in a wider sense than now, including all kinds of robbery. Thus Shakespeare calls pirates 'water thieves' (*Merchant of Venice*, i. 3); Latimer (*Sermons*, Parker Soc. 208) calls Robin Hood 'a traitor and a thief,' and (139) applying Is 1:23 says 'He calleth princes thieves. Had they a standing at Shooter's Hill or Standgate Hole, to take a purse?' So Cranmer (*Remains*, Parker Soc. 107), 'Job said not "These wicked thieves have wrought me this woe"; but referred all to God.' See Trench, *NT Synonyms*, § xliv.

Palestine has always, if its government has been weak, been infested by robbers, to whom its rocks and caves afford plentiful cover and shelter (cf. Jdg 9:25, Hos 6:9; Hos 7:1). Herod, when quite young, first made his reputation by ruthlessly executing robbers in Galilee (Josephus, *Ant.* xiv. ix. 2, *BJ* i. x. 5). At a later time he destroyed robbers who lived in inaccessible caverns, by lowering chests full of soldiers from the cliff above (*Ant.* xiv. xv. 4-5, *BJ* i. xvi. 2-4). This reminds us of 'den of robbers' (Jer 7:11, Mat 21:13 ||). Not only had the Temple become a haunt of 'robbers'—the dealers in the Temple market were notorious for their extortion—but it gave them fancied security in their evil-doing. (During the Jewish War the Temple was literally the stronghold of the robbers or Zealots, *BJ* iv. iii. 7, etc.). There was a great outbreak of robbery on the death of Herod (*Ant.* xvii. x., *BJ* ii. iv.). We read later of robbers plundering a servant of the Emperor's, near Bethhoron, which was avenged on the neighbouring villagers by Cumanus (*Ant.* xx. v. 4, *BJ* ii. xii. 2), and of Fadus, Felix, and Festus destroying large numbers of them (*Ant.* xx. i. 1, viii. 5, 10, *BJ* ii. xiii. 2, xiv. 1). Under the later procurators the country swarmed with them. It is probable

that some of these ‘robbers’ were really Zealots, in rebellion against the authority of Rome, so that there was an element of misplaced, patriotism and even religion in their proceedings. Trench (*l.c.*) shows how this may throw light on the character of the ‘Penitent Robber.’ In any case, Josephus at a later date identifies robbers and Zealots (*BJ* iv. iii. 3, 9, etc.).

The road from Jerusalem to Jericho, the scene of the parable of the Good Samaritan, has always had a bad name for robbers. Near it Pompey destroyed two robbers’ strongholds (Strabo, xvi. 2); Jerome (on [Jer_3:2](#)) speaks of its dangers, and derives the ‘ascent of Adummim’ on this road from the blood shed there by robbers (*Loc. Heb. s.v.*). See Stanley, *Sin. [Note: Sinaitic.] and Pal. [Note: Palestine, Palestinian.]* 314, 424, and art. Samaritan (The Good).

Harold Smith.

☞ Robe

ROBE.—See Dress.

☞ Rock

ROCK (πέτρα).—1. In [Mat_7:24](#) the word stands for a rocky foundation, which would remain solid, notwithstanding the sapping effect of floods; while the sandy foundation means a carelessly chosen site, where the loose formation of the soil would be very easily penetrated by torrents, thus making the building erected on it very insecure. The moral and spiritual parallel is that of two contrasted lives, one durable, the other perishing and worthless. The man who listens to Christ’s words but does not carry them out, never allowing them to affect his character, is one who builds upon the sand. He, again, who hears the word and straightway carries it into action, doing the will of God with his might, has chosen the rocky foundation. To him the storms and trials of life act as tests of character, which show it to be securely founded, and make it more firm and durable. Perhaps faith and obedience are the two prominent characteristics of the man who builds his house upon the rock. See art. Building.

2. At Caesarea Philippi, Christ asked His disciples about the various opinions men were holding regarding Him. St. Peter answered for the Apostles: ‘Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.’ The Saviour was pleased by this answer of faith, which had been revealed to Peter by the Heavenly Father, and commended him by saying

(Mat 16:18), ‘Thou art Peter (πέτρος), and on this rock (πέτρα) I will build my Church.’ St. Peter thus showed himself to be one who had profited by Christ’s teaching, being a doer of the word as well as a hearer. Only the faithful and obedient heart could have given him such a deep knowledge of the truth. As Jerusalem stood on the rocky foundation of Mt. Zion, and was faced by the dark rocks of the valley of Hinnom, a scene of death and corruption; so the new city of God, the ἐκκλησία of Christ, is to be founded on imperishable foundations, so that the opposing gates of Hades (all the power of evil) should never prevail against it. St. Peter, in showing himself a man of faith, is a specimen of the believing ones who shall constitute the strong foundation on which the Church is to rest. As πέτρος is a fragment of πέτρα, so the believing St. Peter is an example of all who should hereafter believe (cf. 1Ti 1:16).

It is well to note that the Fathers took the rock to mean either Christ Himself, or the faith or the confession of St. Peter, but never St. Peter as an *individual*. In later days, the text Mat 16:18 was used for polemical purposes, in defence of the Papacy. The Reformers returned to the earlier view of the Fathers, mostly holding that the confession of faith made by St. Peter was the rock. Another view held by Luther, following Augustine, was that Christ, in speaking the words, pointed to Himself as the rock. Perhaps this would best accord with the general teaching of the New Testament. St. Paul calls Christ the foundation (1Co 3:11), and again speaks of Apostles and prophets being the foundation, while Christ is the chief corner-stone (Eph 2:20). Is it not most likely, however, that our Lord looked on St. Peter as the type of converted, believing men, on whom, as a foundation, an unconquerable Church should be built? Origen well says: ‘If thou hast Peter’s faith, thou art a rock like him. If thou hast Peter’s virtues, thou hast Peter’s keys.’ See also artt. Caesarea Philippi and Church.

3. The word ‘rock’ occurs in Luk 8:6; Luk 8:13, in the parable of the Sower. It is the equivalent of the ‘stony (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘rocky’) places’ of Mat 13:5; Mat 13:20 (τὰ πετρῶδη), and gives at once the right sense, a thin coating of soil covering a hard rocky surface, where there could be no depth of earth. The rock here, in the interpretation, signifies a sinful worldly nature, incapable of being penetrated by the living seed. That which makes a good foundation is not at all fitted to be a good seed-bed. See art. Seed.

4. In Mat 27:51 we read that the rocks (πέτραι) were rent, at the hour of Christ’s death on Calvary. There is nothing figurative here; but the earthquake would make it appear to men’s minds as if the very earth shuddered at man’s wicked deed, so that its hardest elements were broken asunder.

5. Finally, the sepulchre in which our Lord was laid was 'hewn out of a rock' (Mat 27:60 = Mar 15:46).

D. M. W. Laird.

☩ Roll

ROLL (βιβλίον, κεφαλις).—The word 'roll' is found in NT only in the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, and in the Gospels only as a marginal reading. In the account in Luke of our Lord's sermon in the synagogue at Nazareth it occurs thrice in the margin (Luk 4:17 bis, lk 4:17 20) as the rendering of βιβλίον, where Authorized Version and text of Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 give 'book.' In Heb 10:7 'In the volume of the book it is written of me' Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 gives 'roll' for Authorized Version 'volume' as the rendering of κεφαλις. The latter word occurs here only in NT, but it is quoted from the Septuagint (Psa 40:7), and thus its meaning is determined, as it is the translation of the Heb. פָּרָךְ, 'roll,' although in Liddell and Scott κεφαλις is given as meaning 'chapter or passage.' Why κεφαλις is taken to represent פָּרָךְ is uncertain, although it has been held that the reference was to the knobs or rounded heads of the roller about which the manuscript was rolled (see Grimm-Thayer, *Lex. s.v.*). The roll was the form of the book both in Palestine and Egypt, although usually, if not always, the Hebrew rolls were, originally at least, of skins which had gone through some process of tanning (see art. Book), while the Egyptian rolls were of papyrus. When papyrus began to be used in Palestine it is difficult to say. The codex form of book is generally held to have been introduced after the invention of parchment, but there is reason to believe that the Egyptians occasionally employed it for papyrus manuscripts, while the roll was the prevailing form.

Literature.—Comm. on the NT; Kenyon's art. 'Writing' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, and his *Textual Criticism of the NT*, p. 19 f.

Geo. C. Watt.

☩ Rome, Romans

ROME, ROMANS.—Though the name ‘Romans’ appears only once in the Gospels (Joh 11:48), if we except the adverb Ῥωμαῖσι (Joh 19:20), which is translation ‘in Latin’ by Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, Rome and the Romans are a very real presence in the Gospel narratives, forming a sort of background to the action of the leading figures. The influence of the world-power is shown by the references to the Emperor (Mat 22:17, Mar 12:14, Luk 2:1; Luk 3:1; Luk 20:22; Luk 23:2, Joh 19:12), the governor Pontius Pilate (see Pilate), the tax-gatherers (Mat 5:46 etc.), the centurions (Mar 15:39, Luk 7:2 etc.), and the soldiers (Mat 27:27 etc.). The Gospels testify to the ultra-national feeling of those Jews who were antagonistic to the Roman power, and illustrate the hatred and contempt felt for those of their countrymen—the tax-gatherers, for example—who took employment from the government. The more intellectually enlightened among the Jews—the Sadducees, for instance—welcomed the Roman rule as they welcomed the Greek civilization and culture which it brought with it; but the great mass of the people were in a state of unreasoning opposition to it. The disposition of Pilate may be advanced as an excuse for their attitude, but in general it cannot be denied that the Jews did not deserve to retain their former liberty, that they were ungrateful to the Romans for the special privileges conferred on them, and that they forgot the advantages which the powerful protection of Rome and the advancement and security of trade thus accruing brought to them. The student of history will regard the fate which came upon them in a.d. 70, and which is referred to in Luk 21:20 ff., as deserved. The stiffneckedness of the Jews brought upon them a ruin which other subject-races in the Empire had escaped by a wise submission.

The beginnings of Rome are shrouded in obscurity, but the spade has helped to correct and amplify what we learn from history. The city was situated on the left bank of the Tiber, about eighteen miles from its mouth. The original Rome was built only on the Palatine Hill. When the people of Romulus Mere united with the Sabines, the Capitoline Hill, the Forum, and perhaps part of the Quirinal, were added. Mons Cœlius was occupied by Etrusean colonists from the other side of the river, and conquest led to the later inclusion of the Aventine, the Viminal, the Esquiline, and Quirinal Hills, on which early settlements had existed. Tradition has it that one of the kings, named Servius Tullius, built a wall to enclose the now largely extended city. This wall, called the *agger*, because it was built specially for purposes of defence, remained the wall of Rome till, late in the Empire, in the time of Aurelian (3rd cent. a.d.), a new and extended line of fortifications was built. Outside the Servian wall there was a trench 100 ft. broad and 30 ft. deep. Within this the wall proper was built of large rectangular blocks, and behind this wall there was an embankment 100 ft. wide and 30 ft. high, pierced by the channels of aqueducts. Portions of the wall have been discovered in thirty-seven different places, and it is possible to trace its entire course. Advantage was taken by the engineers of all the natural features, and where

these were lacking, as on the northwest, the above plan was followed. Between the Capitoline and the Aventine the river was thought to afford sufficient protection. The whole circuit of the wall was about 5 miles, and it was pierced by 19 gates. Within there was a large area of vacant spaces, which were gradually built on later, and at the beginning of the Empire the city was not only congested with buildings, but large areas without the wall were also covered with houses. In the year b.c. 10, Augustus divided the city into 14 wards (*regiones*), and these were in their turn subdivided into smaller quarters (*vici*). Some of the principal buildings must be referred to. The Roman Forum, an open space measuring over 300 ft. in length and about 150 ft. in breadth, was the centre of political, legal, and commercial life. At one end was the *rostra* or platform, from which speeches were delivered to the public; at the other end were shops. On one side were the *Curia* or senate-house and the *Basilica aemilia*, a law-court; along the whole of the other side, with the *Sacra Via* between, stretched the *Basilica Julia*, a very large law-court, surrounded by two rows of square columns. Other important buildings in the immediate neighbourhood were the Temple of Janus, the Temple of Caesar, the Arch of Augustus, the Temple of Vesta, the Temple of Castor and Pollux, and the Temple of Saturn, where was the treasury, with the *Tabularium* (record-office) behind. On the top of the Capitoline Hill was the *Capitolium* or great temple dedicated to Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva, and on the Palatine Hill the principal residence of the Emperor, and the Temple of Apollo containing the public libraries, Greek and Latin. In the Imperial period four additional *fora* were built, devoted entirely to legal, literary, and religious purposes—the *Forum Julium* begun by Julius Caesar, the *Forum Augustum* built by Augustus, the *Forum Transitorium* completed by Nerva, and the *Forum Trajani* built by Trajan, the most splendid work of Imperial times. Considerations of space will not allow mention of the markets, circuses, theatres, baths, and gardens, which were characteristic features of the city and its life. The great roads which converged at Rome, and the aqueducts, can merely be mentioned. Various estimates of the population of Rome in the time of Christ have been given, ranging from 800,000 to 2,000,000: the latter seems more likely than the former. All nationalities in the Empire were represented, and the slave population was very large.

Only a very brief sketch of the progress of the Romans can be given. Their history is curiously parallel to our own. They were a mixed race, and passed through the three stages, pastoral and agricultural, commercial, and imperial. The kernel of the race was Latin, but there was an early intermixture with Sabines and Etruscans, the latter, according to tradition, emigrants from Lydia, in Asia Minor. The Romans began as one of the members of the Latin league of which, having become presidents, they eventually became masters. After conquering Latium, they were inevitably brought into conflict with the other races of Italy. They rose again after the Gallic invasion and destruction of their city in 390, and by the time their trade interests brought them into conflict with the Carthaginians, about the middle of the 3rd cent. b.c.,

they were sovereign over most of Italy. The close of that century saw them possessors of Sicily and Sardinia, as well as conquerors over 'Africa.' About this time they began to interfere in Eastern politics, and the Macedonian wars and the conflicts which grew out of them resulted in the conquest of Macedonia and Greece in the same year as they finally became masters of 'Africa.' Ere this they had become possessed of most of Spain. The extension of Roman territory steadily continued, until in the time of Christ it included, roughly, Europe (except the British Isles, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, and Russia), the whole of Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt, and the north-west of Africa.

The internal history of the Roman people was no less remarkable. Great dangers from within were successfully surmounted. The conflict between the patricians and the dependent class lasted for hundreds of years. At first the Roman State was ruled by a king, with a body of patrician advisers. On the substitution of a dyarchy for a monarchy—a change effected not without difficulty—the new office, called the consulship, tenable for one year, was open only to the patrician class. Even from the earliest times there appears to have been a popular assembly, which played some part in legislation, but to define its powers or to state their exact relation to the powers of the king and senate is impossible. The consuls were elected by the citizen-army, which assembled in classes according to the property qualification of each citizen-soldier. The whole procedure of this assembly was in the hands of its patrician presidents, so that there was more of the semblance than the reality of power. Further, the plebeian had no appeal against the arbitrary authority of a chief magistrate. At the very beginning of the Republic the famous Valerian law was passed, that no magistrate should put a Roman citizen to death unless the sentence had been confirmed by the assembly of citizen-soldiers. This law was always regarded as the great charter of a Roman's liberties, but at first it was difficult to enforce. The plebeians adopted on more than one occasion the plan of deserting the city for a time, and thus wrung concessions from the unwilling patricians. It was in this way that they succeeded in obtaining magistrates of their own, called tribunes, who were authorized to protect them against the consuls. The development of the powers of this magistracy had more to do with the progress of the Roman democracy than any other factor, and even in the Empire the most important of the Emperor's statutory powers was his 'tribunician authority.' The tribunes convened assemblies of the plebeians, and carried resolutions of importance to that class. The resolutions of this body, which met by tribes, were later on to become the most powerful force in the State, having at a comparatively early period been declared to have the force of laws (b.c. 287). The first plebeian consul was elected in 367, about a century and a half after the traditional date of the establishment of the Republic, and by the end of the fourth century b.c. every office in the State was open to the plebeian class. The plebeians had won all they sought.

The establishment of the equality of the orders was not the establishment of a real democracy. It was the beginning of a new struggle between the governing class, which was mainly plebeian in origin, and the mass of the people. The rapid expansion of the Roman territory, the necessity for the appointment of new magistrates to govern the new countries, and the establishment of a governing class alone possessed of the experience necessary for coping with foreign affairs, tended more and more to withdraw the real power from the popular assemblies and to concentrate it in the hands of the senate. By the theory of the constitution the popular assemblies had all the power, but in practice, between the middle of the 3rd and the beginning of the 1st cent. b.c., the senate was all-powerful. Circumstances also produced great distress among the people in general. In the absence of the farmer, serving in the army abroad, his farm was neglected, and trouble came upon him and his household. He had to borrow money, which in many cases he was unable to repay. His acres were bought by the rich, who worked them with slave labour, which was cheap owing to the enormous influx of captives seized in war. The small landholder disappeared, to join the hungry proletariat in Rome; and Italy became a country of large estates, which, in the words of Pliny, wrought her ruin. The attempts made by the Gracchi (b.c. 133-122) to redress this state of matters were rewarded with assassination. Periodically, to the end of the Republic, agrarian laws were brought forward, but were unable to check the evil. Even under the Empire it was only partially checked, and a large part of the Roman population was fed by the Emperors.

A Roman 'province' consisted of the sphere of duty of a magistrate, and the word had not primarily a territorial application. The inhabitants were disarmed and taxed. The main lines under which a province was to be governed were set forth in a special law, generally drawn up by the senate. This law always took account of local conditions, such as the form of government already in existence before annexation, and the favour shown to Rome by particular cities. In some provinces certain States were free, such as Athens in the province of Achaia. It was the custom to send a body of commissioners to start the new constitution on its way. Some of these constitutions were modified as time went on, but others which had been established in Republican times were found still existing in Imperial times. Much was left to governors in the time of the Republic. Cruelty and rapacity were very common, but incompetence was unknown. The provincials could hardly get redress for injuries inflicted on them in Republican times. All the eloquence of a Cicero, engaged to plead the cause of the province of Sicily, availed only to remove Verres, the cause of the evil; the evil was not healed.

During the last century of the Republic, Rome and Italy were torn by a long succession of ruinous civil wars. It said much for the machinery of the government that foreign enemies did not imperil its very existence. There was a longing among all the better citizens for an era of peace and prosperity, and it had become increasingly clear that

this goal could be reached only under an Imperial rule. The need of the time was satisfied by Augustus, who ruled as autocrat under constitutional forms. The appearance of a republic was retained, but the reality was gone, and the appearance itself gradually disappeared also. For the city the Empire was a time of luxury and idleness, but the provinces entered upon an era of progressive prosperity. The Emperor was responsible for the government of all provinces where an army was necessary, and governed these by paid deputies of his own. The older and more settled provinces were governed by officials appointed by the senate, but the Emperor had his financial interests looked after by procurators of his own even in these. The provinces were now much more protected against the rapacity and cruelty of governors. The Emperors themselves stood for just as well as efficient administration, and most of them gave a noble example by strenuous devotion to administrative business.

The resident Romans in any province consisted of (1) the officials connected with the government, who were generally changed annually; (2) members of the great financial companies, and lesser business men, whose interests kept them there,—the *publicans* of the Gospels were agents of the former; (3) citizens of *coloniae* (or military settlements), which were really parts of Rome itself set down in the provinces; (4) soldiers of the garrison and their officers. These formed the aristocracy of any city in which they lived. A fifth class of Roman citizens might be made out of those natives of the province who, for services rendered to the State, were individually gifted with the citizenship. It was a great honour, which was not conferred on all the inhabitants of the Empire till a.d. 212.

The Romans have left a great legacy to the world. As administrators, lawyers, soldiers, engineers, architects, and builders, they have never been surpassed. In literature they depended mainly on the Greeks, but they claimed that satire was a native product. So with sculpture, music, painting, and medicine. In the arts they never attained more than a respectable standard, by imitating the Greeks, who could turn their hands to anything.

Literature.—For an account of Rome itself, nothing surpasses the various works of R. Lanciani (all published by Macmillan): *Ancient Rome in the Light of Recent Discoveries*, *Pagan and Christian Rome*, *The Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*, *The Destruction of Ancient Rome*, and *New Tales of Old Rome*,—see also his chapters in W. Ramsay, *A Manual of Roman Antiquities*¹⁵ [Note: 5 designates the particular edition of the work referred] (London, 1894); three excellent Maps, with Key, are in H. Kiepert and Ch. Huelsen, *Formae Urbis Romae Antiquae: accedit nomenclator topographicus* (Berlin, 1896). For the Forum, see Ch. Huelsen, *The Roman Forum: its History and its Monuments* (Rome, 1906). For the general history, Th. Mommsen, *The History of Rome*, 5 vols. (London; Macmillan) [the Republic], *The History of the*

Roman Provinces, 2 vols, [one aspect of Imperial history]; H. F. Pelham, *Outlines of Roman History* (London, 1893, 4th edition, 1905), a masterly work; J. B. Bury, *A History of the Roman Empire from, its Foundation to the Death of Marcus Aurelius* (London, 1893, 1896, and later). On the political life, A. H. J. Greenidge, *Roman Public Life* (London, 1901). On the literature, W. S. Teuffel, *History of Roman Literature*, 2 vols. (London, 1891-92); and esp. M. Schanz, *Geschichte der Romischen Litteratur*, four parts (second half of part 4 to complete the work, as yet unpublished), (München; first three parts in second edition: publication began 1892). The above list constitutes only a small selection of the very best works on what appear to be the more important topics.

Alex, Souter.

☪Roof

ROOF.—See House in vol. i. p. 753^a.

☪Root

ROOT (ῥιζα).—The ‘root’ is that part essential to the life of a plant (Mat 13:6, Mar 4:6), which penetrates the earth, and draws sap and nourishment from the soil. ‘Root’ is, therefore, taken to signify that condition of heart without which religious life is impossible (Mat 13:21, Luk 8:13). The intelligent and stable Christian is described as ‘rooted’ in love (Eph 3:17), and ‘rooted’ in Christ (Col 2:7). Utter destruction is signified by plucking up by the root (Mat 13:29, Jud 1:12). The Baptist’s vivid ‘the axe is laid unto the root’ (Mat 3:10, Luk 3:9) points to the complete overthrow he desired for the rampant growth of evils in his day. As applied to Christ (Rev 5:5; Rev 22:16), the title ‘Root’ probably means more than ‘branch or sucker from an ancient root.’ Rather does it point to Him as Himself the ‘root’ whence David and his tribe sprang, appearing at last to manifest His transcendent power and glory.

W. Ewing.

☪Rue

RUE (πήγανον, *Ruta graveolens*) is a low-growing shrubby plant of the natural order Rutaceae, and is still cultivated in Palestine. It has a strong, unpleasant smell, and is bitter and pungent to the taste. The ancient Romans made use of the leaves of rue for culinary purposes. An essential oil, which is obtained by distillation with water, is used in medicine, chiefly as an antispasmodic. In Luk 11:42, where the only Biblical allusion to rue occurs, it is named along; with mint (wh. see) as one of the common garden herbs on which the Pharisees paid tithe.

Hugh Duncan.

☞ Rufus

RUFUS.—See Alexander and Rufus.

RULE

1. (a) **ἀρχή.**—Luk 20:20 παραδοῦναι αὐτὸν τῇ ἀρχῇ καὶ τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος, ‘to deliver him up to the rule and to the authority of the governor’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885)—ἀρχή = *principatus*, ἐξουσία = *magistratus* or *munus* (Stephanus, *Thesaurus*, ed. Hase-Dindorf). Here ἀρχή ‘relates to Pilate’s position and authority [as procurator], ἐξουσία to the executive power connected therewith’ (Cremer, *Lex.* 115, 237). Pilate’s remitting our Lord to ‘Herod’s jurisdiction’ (Luk 23:7 ἐξουσίας) was intended as an act of civility to a reigning prince (‘Jesus of Nazareth’ being under Herod’s tetrarchate), and perhaps also in order to gain time.

ἀρχή and ἐξουσία are also used together of earthly rulers, Luk 12:11, Tit 3:1; of the ranks of the angelic hosts, Eph 3:10, Col 1:16; Col 2:10; of the powers of evil, Eph 6:12, Col 2:15; apparently incl. of both heavenly and earthly powers, 1Co 15:24, Eph 1:21.

(b) **ἄρχειν.**—Mar 10:42 ‘Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles (οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν: in || Mat 20:25 οἱ ἄρχοντες) lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). Lk. reports that words of similar import were spoken at the parting meal, 22:25. οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν may mean ‘they who are supposed to rule,’ with the implication that

they are not rulers in the true sense of the word.* [Note: There are parallels to this idea in Plato: e.g. Rep. 336 A, the tyrant is one who μέγα οἶετ'κ' δύνασθαι: he and his like have really no power (Gorg. 467 A). For the use of δοκοῦντες, cf. Rep. 406 C, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν τλοασίων τε καὶ εὐδαιμόνων δοκούντων εἶναι οὐκ αισθανόμεθα, also 420 A, 423 C. Sometimes, however, in classical Greek δοκεῖν does not exclude the reality: e.g. Plato, Rep. 539 A, and Soph. OT 402. [Note by the late Dr. Adam of Cambridge].]

Swete (*St. Mark*, 239) renders 'they who are regarded as rulers,' and says that our Lord 'did not admit that the power of such a ruler as Tiberius was a substantial dignity: it rested on a reputation that might be suddenly wrecked, as indeed the later history of the Empire clearly proved.' Cf. Harnack (*What is Christianity?* 106) and Gould (*Com. on Mk.* 202) for a somewhat similar view.

In Gal 2:2; Gal 2:6; Gal 2:9 οἱ δοκοῦντες, Lightfoot thinks (*Com. on Gal.* 107), is 'depreciatory,—not indeed of the Twelve themselves, but of the extravagant and exclusive claims set up for them by the Judaizers.' The Gr. commentators, however, do not find 'any shade of blame or irony in the expression' (see Ellicott, *Gal.* 24^b). Cf. also Ramsay (*Com. on Gal.* 289, 300), who renders, 'the acknowledged leaders,' and shows that the interpretation, 'the so-called leaders,' is opposed to the spirit of the narrative.

The two passages referred to by Winer (*Gram. NT*⁸ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 766) are important: Sus 5 χριτῶν οἱ ἰδόχουν κυβερνῶν τὸν λαόν, 'judges who were accounted or recognized as governing the people'; Josephus *Ant.* xix. vi. 3 οἱ δοκοῦντες αὐτῶν ἐξέχειν, 'they who are recognized as outstanding men among them.' In these passages the phrase appears to be used, without any disparagement being implied, in speaking of recognized authorities, or persons of admitted eminence.* [Note: This is the usage in class. Gr., e.g. Eurip. Hec. 295, where αἱ δοχοῦντες is opposed to οἱ ἀδοξοῦντες; Plato, Euthyd. 303 C, τῶν σεμνῶν καὶ δοκούντων τι εἶναι, 'the grave and reverend seigniors' (Jowett's tr.).]

In the words κατακυριεύουσιν and κατεξουσιάζουσιν,—the latter found only here and in || Mt.—an unfavourable judgment is passed upon the manner in which 'the recognized rulers' exercise their authority. 'Civium non servitus sed tutela tradita est.' 'Our Lord spoke at a time when free government all over the world lay crushed beneath the military despotism of Rome' (*EBr* [Note: *Br Encyclopaedia Britannica*].)

xi. 11). There was present to His mind the fundamental law of His Kingdom, 'My kingdom is not of this world' (Joh 18:36).

But our Lord's words do not exhibit that 'moral hatred of all the visible power of the world regarded as a vast selfish manifestation and embodiment of evil,' which finds expression in the following passage from one of the letters of Gregory vii. (he is writing to Herman of Metz, one of his partisans): 'Who can be ignorant that kings and nobles took their beginning from those who, not knowing God, by their pride, robberies, perfidy, and murders, in short, by almost every kind of crime, no doubt at the suggestion of the prince of this world, the devil, have in blind ambition and intolerable presumption had a mind to tyrannize over other men who are undoubtedly their equals?' Milman asks, 'Are we reading a journalist of Paris in 1791?' (*Latin Christianity*, iii. 191; cf. Mozley's Sermon on 'The Roman Council,' *Univ. Sermon*, p. 1).

Our Lord, it is true, speaks of the exercise of domination and coercion that is characteristic of the rulers of the Gentiles as an example to be avoided by His disciples as members of a Kingdom not of this world: 'so shall it not be among you.' With them, greatness is to come through ministering love (cf. art. Minister, 3). At the same time, in His great saying, Mar 12:17,—a saying which reveals that the whole domain of duty lay open before Him,—our Lord teaches that a kingdom of this world, even the principality of a Tiberius, has its own sphere of right, and that when it keeps within it, and exercises its administrative functions,—of which the levying of tribute is a representative instance,—it is to be obeyed without demur. This saying was probably present to the mind of St. Paul when he wrote, under Nero (but in the earlier and better part of his reign), his weighty exposition of the ethics of citizenship (Rom 13:1-7).

2. ποιμαίνειν.—Mat 2:6 'And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda: for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'be shepherd of') my people Israel' (ὅστις ποιμαίνει τὸν λαὸν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ). Here three things demand our attention.

(i.) Mic 5:2 (1 Heb.) and its context.—Like his older contemporary Isaiah (Isaiah 9, 11), Micah looks forward to the end of the Assyrian invasion as the time when the Messianic hope shall be fulfilled.

'The daughter of Zion must pass through the pangs of labour before her true king is born; she must come forth from the city and dwell in the open field; there, and not within her proud ramparts, Jehovah will grant her deliverance from her enemies. For a time the land shall be given up to the foe, but only for a time. Once more, as in the days of David, guerilla bands gather together to avenge the wrongs of their nation

(Mic_5:1). A new David comes forth from little Bethlehem, and the rest of his brethren return to the children of Israel—that is, the kindred Hebrew nations again accept the sway of the new king, who stands and feeds his flock in the strength of Jehovah, in the majesty of the name of Jehovah his God. Then Assyria shall no longer insult Jehovah’s land with impunity’ (W. R. Smith, *The Prophets of Israel* 1, 291).

This being the meaning of the prophecy, it is evident that it was never literally fulfilled. But when we look at the deeper side of the Messianic hope which it sets forth—the heart-felt longing for a true Kingdom of God, ‘the perception that that Kingdom can never be realized without a personal centre, a representative of God with man and man with God,’ who shall attain to true greatness through humility—we see that the purpose which was in the mind of God, when He moved the prophet to write, was fulfilled in the highest sense when He sent His Son into the world, and when Jesus Christ entered, by being born and that in a low condition, on that life of humiliation that led to His exaltation to the place of power, and will finally lead to ‘all things being put under His feet.’

(ii.) *The quotation in Mt.*—It is not in verbal agreement with the LXX Septuagint or with the Heb. text. The most important differences from the latter are the following:—

(α) Instead of לְתֵימֹת צְעִיר, lit. ‘little for being’ (‘a town too small to be reckoned as a canton in Judah,’ W. R. Smith, *l.c.*), Mt. has οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ, ‘art in no wise least’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). Turpie (*OT in the New*, 190) translates the Heb. ‘And art thou, Bethlehem, little for being (=so little as not to be) among the thousands of Juda?’—following Grotius (*Opera*, ii., Amst. 1679), who received the suggestion from Pesh., where the clause is rendered interrogatively. Others conjecture that a לָא has dropped out of the Heb. text (cf. W. C. Allen in *ExpT [Note: xpT Expository Times.]* xii. [1901] 283; *Com. on Mt.* p. 13). These suggested emendations are unnecessary. Micah says that the ideal king is to come out of Bethlehem, a town held in little estimation; and Mt., in view of the dignity bestowed on the town by the birth of Christ, says, ‘Thou art by no means the least.’ They agree in spirit.

(β) The words of Micah, ‘he that is to be ruler in Israel,’ are expanded by Mt. into ‘a ruler who shall be shepherd of my people Israel.’ He thus introduces into his quotation the words of the promise to David, ‘And thou shalt be shepherd of (תִּרְעֶה) my people Israel’ (2Sa_5:2 || 1Ch_11:2). But in Mic_5:4 (3 Heb.) the words, ‘And he

shall stand and be shepherd of' (רֹעֶה), are a reminiscence of the promise to David. The Evangelist simply gives the promise at full length.

To most Biblical scholars these differences will not seem of much account. The quotations in the NT are an important subject of study, but it is not now considered necessary, in the interests of revelation, to make out a verbal correspondence between these quotations and their OT equivalents. See art. Quotations.

(iii.) *The nature of Christ's rule as set forth by ποιμαίνειν.*—רֹעֶה is first applied to God by Jacob, Gen_48:15, ('who shepherded me'), Gen_49:24 (prob. 'the shepherd of the stone of Israel,' and = 'the God of Bethel' [Driver, *Gen.* [Note: Geneva NT 1557, Bible 1560.] 1 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] Addenda xvii]). His people are 'the sheep of his pasture' (Psa_95:7; Psa_100:3); He led them and fed them in the wilderness as a shepherd (Psa_77:20; Psa_78:52; Psa_80:1, Hos_13:5 [LXX Septuagint] ἐποιμαίνόν σε ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, Isa_63:11, Jer_2:2 'thou wentest after me'—the shepherd leading); He will bring them back from the Dispersion (Eze_34:12, cf. Psa_147:2); His care for His flock comprehends the most considerate tending of individuals (Psa_23:1-3 a, Isa_40:11, Psa_119:176 seeking the lost sheep). To David, as His vicegerent, He commits the care of His flock (2Sa_5:2, Psa_78:71), and He will yet set up one shepherd over them, who shall be pre-eminent in those qualities which David in a large measure manifested as a ruler (Mic_5:4, Eze_34:23; Eze_37:24, Psa_2:9 [LXX Septuagint, following Pesh., ποιμανεῖς αὐτοὺς ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ, so quoted Rev_2:27; Rev_12:5; Rev_19:15; cf. Briggs, *Com. on Psalms*, i. 22]). To Mt. this shepherd is Jesus Christ, and it is fitting that in this early chapter he should employ this title respecting Him whose life on earth, as set forth in the succeeding chapters of his Gospel, was to illustrate so abundantly His shepherd-rule in its tenderness and strength. Christ is the compassionate Shepherd (Mat_9:36; Mat_15:24); His flock fear no evil, because He is with them (Luk_12:32); He goes after that which is lost till He finds it (Mat_12:11, Luk_15:4-6); He is the noble (καλός) Shepherd, who gives His life for His sheep (Joh_10:2; Joh_10:11; Joh_10:16), who provides for their being fed and tended after His departure to heaven (Joh_21:15-17; cf. Act_20:28, Eph_4:11, 1Pe_5:2), and who still carries on in glory His own work as 'the great shepherd of the sheep' (Heb_13:20) and the ἀρχιποιμὴν (1Pe_5:4—a title combining the two words of our present study);—moreover, their being under His shepherd-rule will be the blessedness and joy of His people to all eternity (Rev_7:17).

It is well known that ποιμαίνειν is a favourite figure with Greek writers to denote the kingly office. Plato is very fond of the comparison; see *Rep.* 343 A with the note in

Adam's ed. (Camb. 1902). In a passage in the *Nicom. Ethics* (viii. 11), Aristotle refers to Homer's well-known words, εὖ γὰρ ποιεῖ τοὺς βασιλευμένους, εἴτερ ἀγαθὸς ὢν ἐτ μελεῖται αὐτῶν, ἢν εὖ πραττωσιν, ὥστερ νομεῖς τροβατῶν · ὅθεν καὶ Ὅμηρος τον Ἄγα μέμνονα τοιμένα λαῶν εἶπεν. 'It seems to me desirable,' Dr. Adam observes, 'whenever possible, to quote classical Greek parallels to the figures of the NT, as well as parallels from the Hebrew: the use of figures already familiar to the Greeks cannot but have made the NT writings more acceptable to Greek readers.'

James Donald.

☞ Ruler

RULER.—This word is used in Authorized Version of the Gospels to translation six different Greek words, and it is therefore necessary to classify the instances according to the word represented. (1) In Mar 13:9 and Luk 21:12 ἡγεμόνων (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'governor'), for which see art. Governor. (2) In Mat 24:45, (47), Mat 25:21, (23), Luk 12:42, (44) κύριος, which means an owner of property, especially of slaves. It is hardly too much to say that the word κύριος suggests the word δοῦλος, 'slave.' The one word is correlative to the other. A κύριος is one who possesses slaves; a δοῦλος is one who belongs to and is bound to serve an owner. St. Paul, for example, regarded himself as standing in that relation to Jesus Christ. (3) In one passage, Joh 4:46 (AVm [Note: Vm Authorized Version margin.]), βασιλικός, a general term, not infrequently found, to indicate any one in the service of a royal person. In this passage a man in the service of Herod, tetrarch of Galilee, is doubtless meant. The word appears to be used only of those in the service of Eastern potentates, and never in connexion with the Roman Emperor. (4) In Joh 2:9 the expression 'ruler of the feast' occurs. This is a translation of the compound word ἀρχιτρικλινος, lit. 'ruler of the dining-room' (with three dining-couches). His position at a dinner or banquet corresponded very much to that of a head-waiter at a modern public dinner. He had to see to the arrangement of the dining-conches, the laying of the table, the supply of food and drink; in short, to supervise everything connected with the comfort of the guests and the success of the banquet. (5) In the great bulk of the instances the word 'ruler' represents ἄρχων, a more or less vague term which generally answers to the English (*city*) *magistrate*. In the following passages it

indicates a member or officer of the Sanhedrin (wh. see): Luk_23:13; Luk_23:35; Luk_24:20, Joh_3:1. In Mat_9:18-23, if we compare the parallel narratives (Mar_5:22, Luk_8:41), it would appear to mean ‘ruler of the synagogue,’ as in Joh_12:42, the context of which seems to settle the question. We are probably to understand this implication also in Luk_18:18, Joh_7:26; Joh_7:48. (6) The title ‘ruler of the synagogue’ (ἀρχισυνάγωγος) is explicitly used in Mar_5:22; Mar_5:35-36; Mar_5:38, Luk_8:41; Luk_8:49; Luk_13:14 (in all the passages except the last it is Jairus that is referred to). The name was applied in Palestine to the chief official of the synagogue as a place of worship. He had, for example, to maintain order in the building, and had to select those who were to take part in the service. Outside Palestine the title was frequently honorary, and carried no duties with it.

A. Souter.

☞ Rust

RUST (βρωσις [fr. βιβρώσκω, Lat. *voro*, ‘to eat.’ Properly the act of eating, and so ‘corrosion’], Mat_6:19 f.; also used for ‘food,’ Joh_4:32; Joh_6:27; Joh_6:55).—The corroding influence liable to tarnish treasures or precious metals, which in Eastern countries were often stored in the ground (Mat_13:44) or on inhabited premises (Luk_15:8).

C. H. Prichard.

☞ Ruth

RUTH.—Named in our Lord’s genealogy (Mat_1:5), probably for the reason noted in art. Rahab.

☞ Sabbath

SABBATH (Heb. שַׁבָּת, Gr. σάββατον).

1. Sabbath observance in the time of Christ.—Although the Mishna dates from c. [Note: *circa, about.*] 200 a.d., many of the provisions there recorded were current

at a much earlier time; hence we may often use it to illustrate Jewish life in the time of Christ. Two of its treatises, *Shabbath* and *Erubin*, besides portions of others, deal with the observance of the Sabbath. *Shabbath* is concerned with regulations respecting what is lawful or unlawful on that day, and *Erubin* treats of modifications of the laws concerning travelling or moving anything from one place to another on the Sabbath.

In accordance with the Jewish custom (derived from the recurring expression ‘the evening and the morning were the ... day’ in Genesis 1, see *Erubin*, v. 5), the Sabbath was considered to begin at sunset on the Friday and to end at sunset on the Saturday. The day preceding the Sabbath (or other feast) was called the day of the Preparation, παρασκευή (Luk 23:54, Joh 19:31; Joh 19:42), on which all work must be finished, and nothing fresh attempted, unless there was time enough to complete it before sunset. For instance, a tailor must not go out carrying his needle near dusk on the Friday, lest through forgetfulness he should carry it on the Sabbath (*Shabbath*, i. 3); and meat, onions, or eggs must not be fried unless they can be quite done before the sunset at which the Sabbath begins (*ib.* i. 10). This explains the request of the Jews to Pilate that the bodies of Jesus and the two robbers should be taken down (Joh 19:31), in accordance with Deu 21:23. It was the custom of the Jews to take down the bodies of those who were condemned and crucified, and to bury them before the going down of the sun (Josephus *BJ* iv. v. 2). It also explains the haste in the entombment of the Saviour. He did not die until the ninth hour, *i.e.* 3 p.m. (Mat 27:45-50), and Joseph of Arimathaea and his friends had to finish the temporary burial and to return home before sundown when the Sabbath began, leaving the completion of the embalming until the Sabbath was past (Luk 23:56). They could prepare the spices after sunset on the Saturday, and be ready to go to the tomb very early on the following morning (Luk 24:1).

Just before sunset the Sabbath lamp was lighted; to neglect this was a transgression (*Shabbath*, 2). As no fire was allowed to be kindled, all meals had to be prepared before the Sabbath began. Three meals were customary (*ib.* xvi. 2), one on the Sabbath eve (Friday after sunset); another on the following morning, called ἄριστον (as Luk 11:38, see Edersheim, *LT*, ii. 205; but in later times the word was applied to ‘dinner,’ see Grimm-Thayer’s *Lex.*); the third meal was towards evening, called δεῖπνον (Joh 12:2). To preserve the festive character of the day, the provisions were the best obtainable, and the best clothes were worn. Religious exercises were provided by the synagogue services, which were generally two in number, one on the Sabbath eve (Friday night) and the other on the following morning.

The traditional rules of the Mishna, which at least partially existed in the time of Christ, introduced very embarrassing limitations to actions lawful on the Sabbath. The distance which might be travelled was limited to 2000 cubits. This rule was obtained as follows. According to Exo 16:29, no man may go out of his place on the Sabbath. The extent of a 'place' was fixed by the Rabbis at the traditional distance of the Tabernacle from the camp of Israel in the wilderness. This was somewhat arbitrarily set down as the same distance as that by which the Ark of the Covenant preceded the people at the crossing of the Jordan (Jos 3:4). In this way arose the measurement called a 'Sabbath day's journey' (Act 1:12, see Lam by, *ad loc.*). This limitation to the distance which might be travelled seems also to illustrate the words of Jesus in Mat 24:20 'neither on the Sabbath day.' (For the way in which this traditional rule might be evaded, see *Erubin*, iv. and v.). The Mishna names thirty-nine *aboth* (אבות) or principal kinds of work unlawful on the Sabbath, and from these it deduces a number of others (called *toledoth*, תולדות), which it pronounces likewise unlawful; and it proceeds by casuistry to define what actions are permissible (see *Shabbath*; also Edersheim, *LT [Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].]*, Append. xvii.). It must here suffice to refer to these rules only in so far as they illustrate passages in the Gospels.

2. Gospel incidents connected with the Sabbath.

(a) *Preaching in the Synagogue at Nazareth* (Luk 4:16-30 || Mar 6:1-6).—Some regard these passages as referring to two distinct incidents, of which that recorded by Lk. is the earlier (so Edersheim); others think the incident in Mk. is the same as the former, but related out of its chronological order.

(b) *Healing of the infirm man at the Pool of Bethesda* (Joh 5:5-18).—It was lawful to carry a sick person on a bed, because the bed was only accessory to the carrying of the person (*Shabbath*, x. 5), but to carry the bed alone was unlawful, as it was then an ordinary burden. Thus those who carried the man to the Pool of Bethesda escaped censure (although it is difficult to see how they could do this, according to the Mishna, unless the man were in danger of death [see *Yoma*, viii. 6], but this may be a more stringent rule than was then in force); but when the healed man carried his bed, he was decidedly breaking the Law as interpreted by the Rabbis. Indeed, the healing of the man, unless he were in danger of death, would appear to be regarded as an infraction of the Sabbath law (Mar 3:1-6). Food or outward applications to the body might be used on the Sabbath only if they were in customary use in health; thus a man who had toothache might not rinse his teeth with vinegar (for that was not a common act in health), but he might wash them as he did every day (*Shabbath*, xiv. 4). If, however, there were danger of death, the Sabbath law did not apply.

(c) *Healing of the man with an unclean spirit at Capernaum* (Mar_1:21-27 || Luk_4:33-37).

(d) *Healing of Peter's wife's mother* (Mat_8:14-15 || Mar_1:29-32, Luk_4:38-40).—The healing of those with divers diseases on the evening of this day took place when the sun set and the Sabbath was past.

(e) *Plucking the ears of corn* (Mat_12:1-8 || Mar_2:23-28, Luk_6:1-5).—The action of the disciples was legitimate on week-days, according to Deu_23:25; but on the Sabbath it was held unlawful, as involving the two actions of reaping and of threshing. The illustration given by our Lord in His reply (Mat_12:5)—the Temple service in its relation to the Sabbath—was a difficulty which the Talmud discusses (see Edersheim, *LT [Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].]* , ii. 59). In this case the Law ordained service which apparently broke its own requirements.

Lk. specifies this Sabbath as δευτερόπρωτον (Authorized Version 'second Sabbath after the first'; Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 omits in text, 'second-first' being placed in the margin as the reading of 'many ancient authorities'). The expression has been variously explained, and no aid is to be derived from the Talmud. The fifty days between Passover and Pentecost were reckoned from the second day of the feast (Nisan 16), on which the wave-sheaf was offered (Lev_23:11). Hence the Sabbath indicated has been taken as (i.) the first Sabbath after that second day of the feast (Scaliger, Ewald, de Wette, Edersheim, and others); or (ii.) the second Sabbath after the day (Nisan 16) which was the first in counting the time to Pentecost (Delitzsch). Other explanations are (iii.) the first Sabbath of the second year of the Sabbatical series of seven years (Wieseler); and (iv.) the first Sabbath of the second month. The reading of the text is doubtful; δευτερόπρωτον is omitted in \aleph BL [Note: L Bampton Lecture.] , 1, 33, 69 (see Plummer, 'St. Luke' (*ICC [Note: CC International Critical Commentary.]*), *ad. loc.*; and Edersheim, *LT [Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].]*).

(f) *Healing of the man with a withered hand* (Mat_12:9-14 || Mar_3:1-5, Luk_6:6-11).—On the lawfulness of healing on the Sabbath according to the Mishna, see (b) above. The legitimacy of lifting a sheep out of a pit on the Sabbath is discussed in the Talmud (*Shabbath*, 117a; see Edersheim).

(g) *The defence which Jesus made against the charge of Sabbath-breaking* (Joh_7:23-24).—The Mishna (*Shabbath*, 19) expressly permits all ceremonies relating to circumcision and all preparation for it to be carried out on the Sabbath.

(h) *Opening of the eyes of one born blind (Joh_9:1-18).*—This involved the ‘making of clay’ on the Sabbath for application to the man’s eyes, which would be a breach of the Sabbath law, in addition to the general question of the legitimacy of healing discussed in (b) above.

(i) *Healing of the woman who had a spirit of infirmity (Luk_13:10-17).*—Regulations for the watering of cattle on the Sabbath are found in the Mishna (*Erubin*, ii.). The Talmud even allows water to be drawn and poured into the trough for the animals to drink.

(k) *Healing of the man who had the dropsy (Luk_14:1-6).*

(l) *The supper at Bethany (Joh_12:1).*—Jesus reached Bethany on Friday, and the supper was the festive meal (δεῖπνον) on the following Sabbath.

(m) *The Sabbath between the Crucifixion and the Resurrection (Mat_28:1 || Mar_16:1, Luk_23:55-56).*

3. Teaching of Jesus respecting the Sabbath.—The observance of the Sabbath was one of the most easily apparent points upon which the teaching of our Lord differed from the punctilious legalism of His time. Mistaken patriotism had employed itself in elaborating the provisions of the Law and raising a fence around it (*Aboth*, i. 1). The teaching of Jesus was more akin to that of the ancient prophets than to that of the scribes. He preferred spiritual obedience to ceremonial literalism. The traditions of the scribes, which added burdens to the original Law, were regarded by Him as obscuring the underlying truth, and thus hindering true godliness (Mat_15:3-20; Mat_23:13-33). This is illustrated in His treatment of the Sabbath.

(1) *The practice of Jesus upholds the general use of the institution.*—It was ‘his custom’ to worship in the synagogue (Luk_4:16). He observed the usual requirements of the Law, except in cases where casuistical refinements had brought it into opposition to spiritual service. He seems to have intended this to be the attitude of His Jewish disciples (Mat_24:20 possibly supports this), and they certainly understood that this was His will, and they only dropped Jewish ceremonies as the Church outgrew them. The decision recorded in Act_15:24-29 did not release Jews who became Christians from obedience to the Law. St. Paul himself kept the Law (Act_21:24-26).

(2) *Christ asserted that the well-being of man was more important than the rigid observance of the Sabbath law as interpreted by the scribes.*—This appears in the many instances of miracles of healing on the Sabbath, and the arguments with which He met criticism. He taught that the Sabbath law is to be subordinated to man’s good

(Mar 2:27). This is in accordance with the reason for the Sabbath in Deu 5:14. The Sabbath was intended to afford opportunity for religious worship and the culture of the soul, and we may regard Jesus as teaching that attention to the physical well-being of man on the Sabbath was legitimate in so far as it ministered to spiritual life. In this life spiritual exercises are to a certain degree dependent on bodily conditions, just as a sound body is a condition requisite for a sound mind. He taught that physical need supersedes the ceremonial Law, in His illustration from the life of David (Mat 12:3, Mar 2:24-25), and that God prefers mercy, exercised by man towards his fellows, and by Himself towards men, to sacrifices (Mat 12:7).

(3) *Christ taught that the ceremonial observance of the Sabbath must give way before any higher and more spiritual motive.*—Upon this principle the Temple service to which Christ refers (Mat 12:5) was legitimate, and He did not find fault with it. In this way it is possible to explain the verse which in Codex Bezae (D [Note: Deuteronomist.]) is inserted after Luk 6:5 (which may possibly be an instance of a genuine saying of Christ which is not elsewhere recorded): ‘On the same day, seeing one working on the Sabbath, He said unto him, O man, if indeed thou knowest what thou doest, thou art blessed; but if thou knowest not, thou art accursed and a transgressor of the law.’ That is, the breaking of the Sabbath in obedience to a higher motive is allowed, and the man is pronounced ‘blessed’ as being free from the trammels of Jewish tradition; but if his action lacks such motive, he is guilty of wilful disregard of the command.

4. The change of day from Saturday to Sunday in the Christian Church.—This change took place very early in the history of the Christian Church, but its date and reasons are somewhat indefinite. It scarcely requires any argument in justification, as (i) it preserves the spirit and purpose of the older practice; and (ii) the change occurred so early that it must have had the sanction of the immediate disciples of Christ. Probably the change arose owing to Sunday being the day of Christ’s resurrection, and the day upon which He appeared to His disciples (Joh 20:19; Joh 20:26). The work of redemption, being the creation of the new world, was regarded as superseding in importance the work of physical creation; so the *Ep. of Barnabas* (15) speaks of Sunday as ‘the beginning of another world,’ and says: ‘Wherefore also we keep the eighth day for rejoicing, in the which also Jesus rose from the dead, and, having been manifested, ascended into the heavens.’ Evidences of the change are found in the NT in 1Co 16:2, and Act 20:7. The name ἡ κυριακὴ ἡμέρα for Sunday occurs in Rev 1:10. In early Christian writings we find that the change had already taken place (*Didache*, 14; Ignatius, *Magnes.* 9; Pliny, *Ep.* x. 97; Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 67). Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 27) says that the Ebionites kept the Jewish Sabbath and also Sunday (see Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, ii. 129; Allen, *Christian Institutions*, p. 467). See also ‘Lord’s Day’ in art. Calendar, vol. i. p. 251 ff.

Literature.—The Mishna (esp. *Shabbath* and *Erubin*); Edersheim, *LT* [*Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].*] ; Geikie, *Life of Christ*; art. ‘Sabbath’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible ; Farrar, *Life of Christ*, ch. xxxi.; Schürer, *HJP* [*Note: JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. ii. 96. For the history of Sunday observance see Hessey, *Sunday* (Bampton Lect. 1860).

F. E. Robinson.

⚠Sabbath Day's Journey

SABBATH DAY’S JOURNEY.—See preceding art. and Travel.

⚠Sackcloth

SACKCLOTH.—A coarse, dark-coloured cloth, made of goat’s or camel’s hair (Gr. *σάκκος*, Heb. *שֵׂשׁ*), used in ordinary life for sacking, sieves, strainers, and the like, but in the Gospels twice named in connexion with prevalent mourning customs (Mat_11:21, Luk_10:13), coupled with ‘ashes’ (wh. see) as an expression of penitential grief. The mourner wore the sackcloth garment, sometimes next the skin; and because of the garment’s coarseness it became a constant reminder of his grief, its irritation being a sort of penance; sometimes it was worn as an outer garment as a visible expression of mourning. Closely related to this use of sackcloth was the use of it by ascetics and prophets (cf. later use by pilgrims). So John the Baptist wore a garment of camel’s hair (Mat_3:4, Mar_1:6) as the expression of a certain austerity of life, and as a rebuke to the love of ease and luxury which characterized the age.

E. B. Pollard.

⚠Sacrifice

SACRIFICE.—The saving significance of the death of Jesus Christ is of necessity the most important part of any article on the NT idea of sacrifice; for it is in the light of the sacrifice of Christ that all Christian sacrifice must be viewed.

It is now universally admitted that there is development and difference in the doctrinal standpoint of the NT writers. The old method of taking texts at haphazard

from the various Gospels and Epistles, and setting them side by side, has been given up. The only satisfactory results are to be obtained by examining in turn the teaching of each writer; and this is the method which it is proposed to adopt in considering the subject of the sacrifice of Christ.

1. We begin with *the teaching of our Lord as set forth in the Synoptic Gospels*. Here there is nothing to be found in the nature of dogmatic assertion. The statements of our Lord as to the significance of His death are far from numerous, and in no case can they be looked at wholly by themselves. His whole life and teaching is their context. To any one carefully reading the Synoptic Gospels it becomes plain that it is only towards the end of His life on earth that the meaning of His death begins to occupy anything like a prominent place in the consciousness of Christ. There is not a single word regarding it in the Sermon on the Mount. There He is the second Moses, the new Lawgiver, the Revealer of the Father and His will, the Preacher of that new Kingdom whose laws should be written upon the hearts of men. Man is to be transformed inwardly by the renewal of his mind as leaven works in dough. All external religious practices are valueless except in so far as they manifest inward spiritual life. But it is already a Father of infinite tenderness and love, a Father only waiting to be gracious, whom He reveals, not a God full of wrath against sinful man, who must be propitiated and reconciled by the death of His Son before He can pardon. Forgiveness is already offered to all who will do the Father's will, to all who in love forgive the trespasses of their brethren. There is not one word to suggest that pardon and reconciliation are conditional upon the sacrifice of Himself still to be offered. Here Christ is the Teacher of morality, with an authority greater than that of Moses, it is true; but He has not yet revealed Himself as the Way and the Truth and the Life. He is implicitly the Saviour in that His Person and work are alone the guarantee of the will of the Father, in that He embodies the attractive power of righteousness, in that He is the source of healing grace to all afflicted ones who come with faith in Him; but He has not yet made surrender to Himself the only way of salvation. It is only in consequence of the opposition of His countrymen that He gives expression to the thought that He is Himself the Mediator of salvation, the only Revealer of God (Mat 11:25-30). He realizes that it is offence at His humility and lowliness that keeps 'the wise and prudent' from hearing His word, and that it is love to Him that draws the poor and despised and sin-laden to the knowledge of the Father and the doing of His will. From that time the thought that He is the personal Mediator is frequently upon His lips (Mat 10:40; Mat 12:30; Mat 18:20, Luk 12:8 etc.). It is opposition, too, that arouses in Him the consciousness of being the Conqueror and Dethroner of Satan and all the powers of darkness (Mat 12:29, Mar 3:27, Luk 10:18-19; Luk 11:21). As time goes on, this opposition develops into a bitter hatred which threatens His life. Selfishness and world-love array themselves against Him and His doctrine of world-renunciation. His power is too great to be overlooked. The world-spirit which dominates the bulk of His countrymen demands His death; and even His most faithful followers are still enslaved

by the world's toils—bound to earth by that material glory which, according to their selfish hopes, His Messiahship is to procure for them. While He lives, they will still buoy themselves up with false hopes: they will not understand the pure spirituality of His life and work—that His 'kingdom is not of this world.' The perception of these dangers, then—of that which from the outside threatened His life, of that which from within threatened the purity of His disciples' faith—became to Him a further revelation of the Father's will,—a revelation that His death was decreed, and that by it He should accomplish that for which His whole life had been but the preparation. But we must not expect many explicit statements on the subject. His followers were not yet fit to bear this truth. He was leaving this to be made plain to them by the Holy Spirit after His departure. Yet there are hints enough to lead us to a right understanding. 'I have a baptism to be baptized with,' He says on one occasion, 'and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!' (Luk 12:49-50). Manifestly the baptism was the baptism of death (cf. Mat 20:22-28). In Mat 20:28 the reason for the necessity of His death is made plain—'to give his life a ransom for many.' The idea clearly is that men are enslaved, and that Christ gives His life to set them free; but the question still remains as to the nature of the bondage. 'From death, from the guilt of sin and its punishment,' says the old theology, or, as it is sometimes expressed, 'from the wrath of God.' But there is not a single word upon the lips of Christ to justify this interpretation; and, as we shall see later, wherever in the NT the death of Christ is called a deliverance or a ransom, it is always a being purchased *for* God, a being delivered from the bondage of sin to serve God, that is thought of (Rom 6:1-11, 1Co 6:20; 1Co 7:23, 1Pe 1:18 ff. etc.). Moreover, the whole mission of our Lord and the whole meaning of His teaching was to deliver man from sin, to make him love, and long for, righteousness. It is impossible to imagine the Preacher of the Sermon on the Mount accounting it the great work of His life merely to deliver men from the consequences of their sins. Can any one believe that such a Moralist would be content with less than the deliverance from sin itself, the worst bondage of all to which man is subject? The context of the words, too (Mat 20:17-29), must lead us to the same conclusion. There is no thought of death or even of guilt; but there is a thought of sin—of the sin of self-seeking, bound up as it was with the expectation of material glory in an earthly kingdom, which had just prompted the request of James and John, and of the selfish indignation of the other disciples who resented that request as an attempt to obtain an unfair advantage over them. That Christ should think of His coming death as certain to break for ever the cords of their worldliness, so that their love for Him might draw them away from the world unto righteousness and God, is perfectly conceivable. His cross, borne for love's sake as the last step in the path of perfect holiness which He was called to tread, must for all time crucify the world unto all who truly believed in Him, and them unto the world. To imagine that Christ in these words represents the Father as requiring a ransom at His hands before He can forgive mankind, is to render His revelation of the Heavenly Father wholly inconsistent, is to give the lie to all His earlier words regarding the mercy and

compassion of God. The parable of the Prodigal Son in the light of this later presentation becomes an impossibility.

But let us proceed to the institution of the Lord's Supper, whence the most definite teaching as to the saving import of His death is to be drawn (Mat 26:26-28, Mar 14:22-24, Luk 22:19-20). Here He speaks of the surrender of His life as a thing advantageous to those who believe on Him, and St. Matthew adds the words—'for the remission of sins.' In the Sacrament thus instituted there is a twofold reference to the ritual of the Jews—(1) to the Passover, in the breaking of bread, the symbol of His broken body; (2) to the sacrifice of the covenant at Sinai, to which the giving of the cup with the words—'This is my blood of the new covenant' clearly alludes. Now the Passover signified exemption from the death of the firstborn which overtook the Egyptians. By the death of the lamb, which the Israelites appropriated to themselves by eating it, forgiveness and life were granted to them. But the Passover meant more than this. It brought them freedom not only from death, but also from bondage. It transformed a multitude of slaves into a free nation; it made them God's people; and sent them forth to serve Him. Its aim was the service of God. Our Lord, then, in the institution of the bread expressed the thought that His life given up to death is to be appropriated by His followers, that it may become their life, that it may set them free from the bondage of sin, and make them free servants and sons of God. This, too, must be noted, that it is not the fact of His death in itself that is significant. Had He thought of abiding in death, the whole meaning of the institution would have been taken away. The idea is that He surrenders His physical life for their sakes, that His spiritual life may dwell in and inspire them. In the closing chapters of St. John's Gospel this thought is most clearly expressed. As to the institution of the cup and its reference to the ratification of the Sinaitic covenant, the idea here is that of purification on entering into communion with God. In Exodus 24 the sprinkling of the blood is the completion of the covenant already made: it symbolizes the need of purity in those who would obey God. Just as the baptism of John was valueless without change of mind, and could confer no forgiveness without the bringing forth of fruit worthy of repentance, so the sprinkling of the blood expressed the thought that purity and sincerity are necessary for all who would enter into the covenant relationship with God—that there can be no forgiveness except it be followed by sincere obedience. There is further present to the mind of our Lord the prophecy of Jeremiah regarding the New Covenant (or Testament) (Jer 31:31-34) which should be an inward relationship, a covenant of regeneration—'I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it on their hearts.' In this covenant forgiveness was to be granted in consequence of an internal reformation (Jer 31:34). When the power of sin is broken and cast out, when the heart is dead to sin, God is just to pardon. Thus Christ called His blood about to be shed the blood of the New Covenant, in the sense that His death of love would inspire His followers with new life, would be to them in the first place a means of breaking the power of sin in their lives, of recreating them in the love of

holiness, and only in consequence of that an assurance of pardon. The saving significance of the death of Christ, then, as it is set forth in the Lord's Supper, is this—to create in the believer a new power of spiritual life which should make sin hateful and so destroy its bondage, and to assure him of pardon by the guarantee of God's perfect love as revealed in the life and death of His Son. Christ's death is a sacrifice in that it removes for ever all doubt of God's forgiving love, and makes man's willing, loving obedience possible; in that it proves the absolute victory of good over evil; and, lifting His life beyond the limits of time and space, makes it a spiritual force communicable to all who accept Him as their Saviour.

2. When we turn to *the Gospel of St. John*, we find at once much to confirm the hints which the Synoptics have already given us. He wrote long after the departure of his Lord, and his experience and spiritual insight had made clear to him the meaning of many words that had been dark to the earlier writers. In the teaching of Jesus as St. John presents it, the thought of His death as setting free a spiritual life-giving principle emerges with much greater distinctness. He is the Bread of Life, the Living Water, that giveth life to men (Joh 6:1-71; Joh 7:37-38; Joh 3:10-15); He is the Resurrection and the Life (Joh 11:25); but that this πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν may act with completed power, it must pass through death to larger life. 'Except a coin of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone,' etc. (Joh 12:24). 'It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come to you,' etc. (Joh 16:7). But the death itself has a value apart from the resurrection, for in it is revealed the triumph of holy love over the power of evil: it is the means whereby the Father glorifies the Son (Joh 12:27-28, Joh 13:31-32). All men are subject to this power save Jesus only; and the power of evil is broken through His meek submission to that death which the evil world forces upon Him (Joh 12:31). The spirit of selfishness no longer rules the earth when its utmost wickedness is outdone by the obedience of perfect love even unto death. This power of overcoming the world and its spirit, He will communicate to those who follow Him. He will draw all men unto Him when He is lifted up (Joh 12:32, cf. Joh 16:33). The cleansing power of His death, which in the Synoptics is symbolized by the institution of the Supper, here finds its place in the washing of the disciples' feet (Joh 13:2-17). They were already clean by the word which He had spoken unto them (Joh 15:3): the death was but the completion, the final cleansing. According to St. John, then, the efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ lay in this—that it was an act of perfect obedience to the will of the righteous Father (Joh 14:31) and of love to the world (Joh 10:11, Joh 15:13),—an example, therefore, and an inspiration; but also that it broke the power of sin, and, through the glorified life which of necessity followed it, became a means of spiritual energizing and sanctification to all believers. Once again there is no word to suggest the judicial theory of satisfaction.

3. Proceeding now to *the Acts of the Apostles* and to *the Epistle of James*, we are met by this remarkable fact, that in neither is there a single reference to the saving significance of the death of Christ. The accusation of having put the Holy One to death is brought home most forcibly in the speeches of Peter and Stephen (Act 2:23; Act 3:13-15; Act 7:52); but the Cross is not once spoken of as necessary to salvation. Repentance and conversion are alone mentioned as essential to forgiveness; and even when (Act 8:28 ff.) Philip overhears the Ethiopian reading the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah and interprets it for him, though this chapter above all others seems to speak of Messiah's vicarious suffering and death, the all-important passage—'He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities,' etc. (Act 8:5), is not even quoted. The natural conclusion is that the sacrificial significance of Christ's death, so far from having been a cardinal doctrine of the Church from the outset, had not yet dawned upon the disciples' minds. The glad facts of the Resurrection and Ascension, with all of spiritual quickening that these had brought them, were the all-important things to them. The death, except in so far as it was the passage to this larger life, was still obscure. They had no thought that Christ's sacrifice alone procured their pardon; for if they had, they could not possibly have kept silence regarding it. It was the Resurrection they preached, not the Cross (Act 3:13-16; Act 10:40-41).

4. When we turn to *the First Epistle of St. Peter*, we find a marked advance upon this early preaching. The Apostle explains the death of the Lord as an example, as a power of redemption, and as a deliverance from the sense of guilt. But throughout, this development is on the lines of Christ's own teaching. He does not speak a word to which a parallel could not be found in the Gospels. As the Lord told His disciples that the world would treat them as it treated Him, so St. Peter bids his readers follow in the steps of Christ; 'for this is thankworthy,' he says, 'if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully.' 'If, when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God' (1Pe 2:19-20; cf. 1Pe 3:17; 1Pe 4:1). Here he inculcates a sacrifice on the part of believers similar to the sacrifice of Christ, and asserts its acceptance in God's sight. Of the redemptive power of Christ's sacrifice he speaks in 1Pe 1:18-22, 1Pe 2:21; 1Pe 2:24, 1Pe 3:18; and in each of these it is redemption from sin's bondage that is thought of, with the end in view of service to God. Forgiveness is never thought of by itself as a consequence of the death of the Saviour, but always in connexion with sanctification, its end and aim. Believers are redeemed from their vain conversation by the blood of the Lamb, that they may purify their souls in obeying the truth. He bears their sins that they should live unto righteousness. He suffered for sins to bring them to God. Christ's death is only for those who let it act upon them. It is not a satisfaction of God that removes for ever the guilt of men by bearing their penalty: it is a moral deliverance: it is the impression which it creates upon the hearts of believers that is the delivering power—a power increased and fulfilled by the influence of the quickening Spirit

(1Pe 1:22). In 1Pe 4:1 St. Peter says, 'He that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin.' By following Christ's example men are to be delivered. Just as the suffering of a mother for her erring son becomes to that son redemption,—a force to make sin hateful in his eyes,—so the picture of Christ's suffering for us acts upon our hearts; and our imitation of Him, our suffering borne for righteousness' sake, breaks the will of the flesh, so that in St. Paul's words we die to sin and live to God. That Christ 'suffered once for sin, the just for the unjust' (1Pe 3:18), means simply that human sin brought Him to death, a death which love and righteousness compelled Him to bear for our sakes, and that the spectacle of that Divine transcendent love becomes to all believers a power of regeneration. But, further, it is also a pledge of Divine forgiveness. In 1Pe 1:2 he mentions the 'sprinkling of the blood of Christ' along with obedience and sanctification of the Spirit, and by it he can mean only the remission of sins—the removal of the sense of guilt. Moreover, in 1Pe 1:18-21 he speaks of the shedding of the blood of the Lamb as having for one object 'that your faith and hope may be in God.' What can this mean but that the love of the Father manifested in the death of His Son is to be to believers a means of breaking down the barrier which the sense of guilt had erected between them and God? It shows the Father ready to forgive and draw men unto Him (1Pe 3:18). To get rid of sin and to be assured of pardon are the two essentials to salvation, which by His death Christ has procured, but He has procured them only for those who make Christ their example by suffering Him to write God's law upon their hearts—who appropriate God's life unto themselves.

5. It is in *the writings of St. Paul*, however, that the Cross of Christ attains its pre-eminent position. The whole gospel is to him the preaching of the Cross. 'Christ and him crucified' is the subject of all his teaching. Yet the emphasis he lays on it is never one-sided; for the death of Christ is but the consummation of His holy life of Divine love, and at the same time the prelude to the fuller life of glory beyond; both of which are essential to the meaning and value of the sacrifice. Nor is it that the mind of the Pharisaic Saul has led him to the contemplation of the Cross because of his close study of the OT ritual. It is his own personal experience of salvation that has caused him to understand—the marvellous change wrought in him by the Lord who appeared to him on the road to Damascus, and which he has expressed in the words, 'I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me' (Gal 2:20; cf. Gal 6:14).

It certainly cannot be denied that in many passages the Apostle speaks of the death of Jesus as a means of deliverance from guilt, or of justification (Rom 3:25-26, 2Co 5:21, Gal 3:13, Col 2:14 etc.); and in the Epistle to the Romans the first place is certainly given to this doctrine; but justification is always conditioned by faith; Christ is never represented as reconciling God to us, but contrariwise, God through Christ reconciles the world to Himself; even our faith in Christ is useless except Christ be

risen (1Co 15:17), *i.e.* except He be in us a living power to lead to sanctification; and Christ is never said to die ἀντι, but always ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν; all of which facts are radically opposed to the theory of legal substitution. But, most important of all, guilt is no more than sin's consequence, and we cannot conceive of St. Paul, who above all others understood the meaning of sin's bondage, ascribing to Christ a mere redemption from sin's consequences and not from sin itself. The Apostle, however, speaks for himself. It was, he says, to deliver us from the evil world, it was that we should live together with Him, it was that men should not henceforth serve sin, that Christ died (Gal 1:6, 1Th 5:10, Rom 6:6). The whole sixth chapter of Romans is on this theme—death to sin in Christ; and the seventh expresses the same thing in reference to the Law. The death of Christ is in his view, then, the direct cause of our death to sin, the breaking of sin's bondage, the putting off the sensuous selfish nature, the subjugation of its desires and appetites (Col 2:11, Rom 3:24; Rom 6:3-4; Rom 7:4); and this is the first step to the energizing of the life-giving Spirit of the glorified Lord within us. The passage in 2Co 5:14-15 seems to express St. Paul's view with perfect clearness. Here we are told that it is the love of Christ that constraineth—that makes the death of the One a means of death to sin in all. It is as the Lord of humanity, the spiritual Head, spiritually related to all, that He dies; but He rose again and lives now, so that all who recognize the relationship are compelled, by the love which His perfect sacrifice excites, to break for ever with sin—sin which slew Him—and to live henceforth His life, the life of love and righteousness (cf. Rom 6:10-11; Rom 5:19; Gal 2:19-20). It is not, however, the love of Christ only that is manifested by His death, but also that of the Father. 'God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us' (Rom 5:8; Rom 5:10). The attitude of the fleshly mind is enmity against God (Rom 8:7). Men are rebels towards Him. It is the sense of guilt that keeps them from Him. They cannot even believe it possible that God can pardon. It is this, then, that God seeks to remove by the death of His Son. He gives an infinite pledge of His desire to forgive (2Co 5:19). Yet it still remains true that this pledge is not the actual justification of the sinner. He must accept God's offer; he must allow God's love to enter his heart; and that means death to sin, and makes him a new creature (2Co 5:17). Sanctification in principle is his from that moment. Thenceforth he lives spiritually—lives to God. In St. Paul, too, we find that aspect of Christ's death as a conquest of evil, an objective breaking of the power of sin, of which we have already spoken. He speaks of Christ coming in the likeness of sinful flesh and condemning sin in the flesh (Rom 8:3). By this he means that Christ's death was the completion of a life of righteousness, and the final act of triumph over evil. He condemned sin in that He resisted it all His life, and in the end gave His life to that resistance. He submitted to the shameful death of the Cross, because to that the path of Divine righteousness led Him. It is for this reason that there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus (Rom 8:1). In Him they spiritually delight in the law of God; by their love to

Him and life in Him they, too, condemn sin; and ‘the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has made them free from the law of sin and death’ ([Rom 8:2](#)). It is in the same manner that the Apostle represents the death of Christ as a ‘propitiation through faith in his blood’ ([Rom 3:25](#)). It is not a propitiation to God in the sense that it hides sin from His eyes, but in that Christ’s sacrifice contains the power of breaking sin in all who accept Him by faith. God is just in forgiving the sin of the believer, because Christ’s victory is the guarantee of ultimate victory to all who live in Him (cf. [2Co 5:21](#) and [1Co 5:7](#)). Finally, the importance which St. Paul attaches to the resurrection of Christ enforces all that has been said. Without that fact his whole doctrine of the scheme of salvation would fall to pieces ([1Co 15:17](#)). It is not even the death of Christ, but only the risen Saviour that justifies ([Rom 4:25](#)). It is in Christ—therefore in a Christ who lives—that justification is obtained ([2Co 5:21](#), [Eph 1:7](#)), and that sanctification is rendered possible ([Rom 5:10](#); [Rom 8:34](#); [Rom 14:9](#), [2Co 3:17-18](#), [Gal 2:20](#)). It is only because the believer is in living union with the holy Lord that God can justify him; for the union and communion are the guarantee that the work of sanctification begun will be carried to completion, that the believer will be conformed in all things to his Redeemer. To have Christ dwell in our hearts by faith, to be rooted and grounded in love, to know the love of Christ, is to be filled with the fulness of God ([Eph 3:17-19](#)). If the old view of legal satisfaction through the sufferings of Christ be accepted, all this becomes absurd.

6. We now come to *the Epistle to the Hebrews*, which, more than any other NT writing, relates the sacrifice of Christ to those of the Mosaic ritual. In this relation the author views the sacrifice of Jesus as the only one that can satisfy the needs of men, the one which alone requires no repetition. Following the example of our Lord Himself in the institution of the Supper, the writer alludes to the covenant sacrifice of Exodus 24; and it is perfectly manifest from the way in which he speaks of it that he no more regards Christ’s death as having created the New Covenant, than he does the sacrifice at Sinai as having procured the Old. In each case it is but a dedication, a ratification. He also refers to the offering of the great Day of Atonement, and with it he compares the sacrifice of Christ, calling it the great atonement by which the conscience is purged from dead works to serve the living God ([Heb 9:14](#); cf. [Heb 10:22](#)). The mention of conscience, of course, suggests deliverance from the sense of guilt; but the immediately following words—‘to serve the living God’—point to something far beyond mere escape from punishment, namely, to sanctification and obedience. Repeatedly he tells us that the sacrifices of the OT could not take away sin ([Heb 10:4](#); [Heb 10:11](#)); but if by taking away sin he means merely remission of guilt, his words become meaningless; for why should not obedience to a Divinely appointed ordinance have procured deliverance from guilt? Wherein they failed—what made their continual repetition necessary—was not that they could not give the sense of pardon, but that they could not give deliverance from the bondage of sin. It was in this that Christ’s sacrifice was superior to all the Mosaic offerings, that it led to the

service of the living God, that it put sin away (Heb_9:26), that it perfected them that are sanctified (Heb_10:14), that it worked a change in the will of the believer, realizing the covenant which Jeremiah foresaw when God's law should be written on the mind and heart (Heb_10:16). If holiness is the great essential to salvation (Heb_12:14), and Christ's sacrifice procured no more than deliverance from guilt, then it did not procure salvation. The old ritual could not make the worshipper 'perfect as pertaining to conscience' (Heb_9:9, Heb_10:1), because it only pointed to the need of purity: it could not create the power to attain that purity: there was no force in it to break the power of sin and set free the will to attain holiness and communion with God. We are accustomed to think of atonement as meaning that God is made willing to pardon; but to make Christ's sacrifice an atonement in this sense is to charge it with exactly the same weakness as belonged to the old ritual. Unquestionably Christ's death does, in the writer's view, guarantee forgiveness; but everywhere this forgiveness is regarded not as an end in itself, but only as the accompaniment of deliverance from the power of sin and the attainment of actual holiness. Indeed, there can be no certainty of pardon to the conscience until it is sensible of sanctification. God forgives not because Christ's death has been accepted in lieu of the punishment of men, but because the perfect holiness and love of Christ's life consummated by a death of shame are a pledge to God for the sanctification of all believers (Heb_10:9-10). Christ's life and death established perfection as an actual fact in human history, broke the hitherto victorious power of evil; and by virtue of His resurrection and ascension that power of victory can be communicated to all who believe. It is in this sense that Christ intercedes for men in heaven, in that He is there as a guarantee of the perfectibility of human nature; and because of His pledge that in those who are His, sin is, and will be, conquered and cast out, God is just to forgive (cf. Heb_7:25, Heb_8:1, Heb_9:12; Heb_9:14; Heb_9:24, Heb_13:20, Heb_7:16, Heb_2:11, Heb_5:9).

7. We come, finally, to *the Epistles of St. John*, with which we shall conclude our consideration. Here, as was to be expected in the Beloved Disciple, the ultimate explanation of the sacrifice of Christ is love, the love of God (1Jn_4:10). There is nowhere a suspicion of the thought that a change is made in God by the offering of Jesus. It was as the manifestation of the Father's love that the Son was sent to suffer and die, and it is the influence of this love on us that creates love in us (1Jn_4:19), and renders possible the keeping of God's commandments (1Jn_5:3). To be filled with love is to dwell in God (1Jn_4:12), to be born of God; and this ensures the victory that overcometh the world, and sin, which is the world-spirit (1Jn_5:4-5). Selfishness and hatred are the signs of unregenerateness, because salvation means love to God, and consequently love to all mankind (1Jn_4:20-21). The death of Christ was the proof of His Divinity, because it showed perfect love. Once more, then, in St. John's view also it is a morally effective sacrifice, a power of renewal, not a substitution. God forgives all in whom sin is broken by the death of Christ, and who are being sanctified by His

indwelling life. 'If we confess our sins,' he says, 'he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins' (1Jn 1:9); for if we confess, it is plain that the holiness and love of Christ are acting upon us, so that we realize our sinfulness, and hate it (cf. 1Jn 1:7). The belief in Christ, as the whole Epistle shows, to which forgiveness and cleansing are granted, is no mere passive acceptance of deliverance from guilt, no mere belief in substitutionary merit, but the perception of the perfect holiness and love of Jesus Christ, so that sin is revealed in all its hideousness as rebellion against a Father of love, and the man is delivered from its power by his hatred of it, and longing to serve and love God and the brethren. It is the creation in man of a spirit akin to that which fired the life of Jesus, that is man's salvation; and it is the power in Christ's self-sacrifice to produce this and to perfect it, that is the pledge to God of man's sanctification, and that makes Him just in forgiving sin.

On the whole subject this must be added, that sacrifice is acceptable to God only in virtue of the spirit which lies behind it and which it expresses. It is never the outward value of the offering, never the amount of suffering it entails, that makes it precious in God's sight. The multiplicity and costliness of the sacrifices under the old ritual became hateful in His eyes whenever they became a mere attempt to bribe God's favour, and ceased to be the symbol of dependence and gratitude and obedience in man (cf. Isa 1:13-14). Mercy toward man and love to God must always be the underlying, inspiring spirit of sacrifice, else even the minutest observance of ritual becomes worthless (Mat 23:23-33; Mat 9:13; Mat 12:7). Christ's sacrifice, then, was acceptable to God, not because of the amount of suffering or the shame of the death,—the willingness to undergo so much was but the revelation of the greatness of the love,—but because it manifested perfect obedience, perfect holiness, perfect Divine love. It is in the same way—it is in Christ only—that the sacrifices of Christians are a sweet incense unto God. Men no longer need offer sacrifice for sin, but the Father still asks of the believer burnt offerings of self-dedication (Rom 12:1), thank-offerings of grateful love. These are sacrifices which the love of God and the holiness for which the believer longs make it a joy to offer, because they are a revelation of the spirit which inspires his heart and works in his whole life—the spirit of Jesus Christ (Eph 5:19-21, Heb 13:15-16, Php 4:17-18, Mat 5:23-24). See also next art. and artt. Atonement and Propitiation.

Literature.—Art. 'Sacrifice' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible and in *Encyc. Bibl.*; Dorner, *Syst. of Chr. Doct.* iv. 1-124; Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics*, 302-315; Clarke, *Outline of Christian Theol.* 308-368; Bushnell, *Vicarious Sacrifice and Christ and His Salvation*; F. D. Maurice, *Doctrine of Sacrifice*; Beyschlag, *NT Theol.*; Weiss, do.; Cave, *Script Doct. of Sacrifice*; Dale, *Atonement*; Denney, *Death of Christ*; Fairbairn, *Christ in Mod. Theol.* 479-487; Godet, *NT Studies*, 148-200.

W. J. S. Miller.

☩ Sacrifices

SACRIFICES (of OT in relation to Christ).—Sacrifice is an act of homage resulting in a degree of friendship with God. So long as the creature is not incorporated into the Creator, homage must always be due from man to God. Not even under the gospel have we outgrown the attitude expressed by sacrifice. We have passed away from animal sacrifices, but we have passed into the region of the sacrifice of Christ.

The sacrifices of the OT may be divided into ritual or prescribed, and the spontaneous, primitive usages of which instances occur both before and after the time of Moses, and among heathen as well as in the direct line of revelation (Gen 4:3; Gen 8:20; Gen 12:7, Exo 18:12, Num 23:1, Jdg 11:31, 1Sa 7:9, 1Ki 3:4; 1Ki 18:23, 2Ki 3:27). This distinction, however, is not dwelt upon in the NT, and is noteworthy only for the light which the older form of sacrifice throws upon the origin of the Mosaic sacrifices.

1. It is generally agreed that the sacred record represents sacrifice as a practice found already in existence among men, when the special revelation to Israel begins (Gen 4:26). A sense of dependence upon God, the need of His friendship, and the duty of rendering homage to Him by gifts, are the universal elements in sacrifice. It is not clear whether the friendship of God was taken to be assured, and the sacrificial meal only expressed it, or whether it was usually felt that there was some amends to be made, and the favour of God obtained, before His friendship could be enjoyed. But this matter was made clearer afterwards in the separate appointment of sin-offerings and peace-offerings in the Mosaic system. Meantime, we have here a universally implanted instinct in human nature that responds to the sovereignty of the Unseen in homage, thankfulness, confidence, or fear. Thus there was in the Mosaic law of sacrifice a language being prepared that would be intelligible to all men, and that was fitted to be the vehicle of a world-wide revelation of God.

It is of importance to notice that the usage of sacrifice is not only adopted and regulated in the OT, but is expressly commanded by prophets of God from Moses to Malachi (Exo 23:15, Mal 1:7-14). This fact makes the use of sacrificial language in regard to the death of Christ to be of very much greater significance than if sacrifice had merely provided Christ and His Apostles with an illustration that lay to hand. And it is the more to be attended to because so often the sacrifices of the Mosaic law seem to be disparaged by the prophets. What they found fault with was that the people complied with the outward rules of God's worship, and did not lay to heart the high requirements of His law; for if these sacrifices meant that they were in friendly relations with God, this ought to have carried with it a life and conduct consistent

with so high a religious profession (Isa 1:11-16, Jer 7:9). Since, therefore, sacrifice was undoubtedly of Divine institution, through the prophets, we may take it that whatever feelings of confidence toward God, or of the consciousness of guilt, were expressed by sacrifice, these were not only Divinely allowed and sanctioned, but were required by God on the part of His people towards Him.

2. The Mosaic ritual was inaugurated by a *covenant* (Exodus 24). The sacrifices then offered are called burnt-offerings and peace-offerings (Exo 24:5). This latter term usually implies that the flesh of the sacrifices was eaten by the worshippers, and accordingly we read that the elders did 'eat and drink' in the presence of God (Exo 24:11). The covenant between Jacob and Laban (Gen 31:54) was of a similar nature. Other covenants are between God and Abraham (Gen 15:18), and in Jer 34:18. It was a feature of these sacrifices that the animals sacrificed were divided, or the blood was divided, so that the parties to the covenant were assumed into a mystic unity of life. It is this particular sacrifice that is adduced in the Epistle to the Hebrews as signaling the covenant between God and Israel (Heb 9:20). We have then these points to notice—(1) Everything in the subsequent history of the relations between God and Israel depended upon the fact that this covenant had been made. (2) It was a celebration of friendship between God and Israel, involving reverent obedience on their part, and securing to them the immense privilege of being welcome to draw indefinitely upon the aid of the Almighty. (3) The covenant was sealed by sacrifice, and more particularly by blood. This is insisted on in Heb 9:18 as giving an element of effective force to what was done. An oath is spoken of in somewhat similar terms (Heb 6:16). A covenant made by sacrifice was not only dramatic and memorable, but it had a sanctity, as of a visible oath (cf. 1Sa 11:7, Jer 34:18-20).

In all this there was no emergence of the question of sin, nor was amends offered to God for sin. There was set forth a tie of friendship between God and His people, to begin with: of the existence of which friendship the whole events of the deliverance from Egypt were incontrovertible proof. At the same time the root-idea of a friendship subsisting between God and His people, and the obtaining of His favour by propitiation, if that should be necessary, are not widely different. A usually friendly attitude on the part of God is the presupposition which underlies the offering of sacrifice to remove His displeasure because of particular sins, or to obtain His favour in any special enterprise (1Sa 7:9). The Creator has bestowed innumerable benefits upon His creatures, and is justly to be regarded by them as their Friend. If Israel limited this to themselves, and had a feeling of their proprietary interest in God, and His in them, there is in that feeling the germ of the doctrine of special providence, and of God's interest in the salvation of individuals; and all the confidence and intimacy of faithful affection therein contained may be appropriated to the believer's relationship with God. The ignorance of those who thought they alone had a portion in

God does not invalidate the truth and beauty of the mutual affection which that very ignorance allowed them to realize.

3. Under the general shelter of this covenant relationship the sacrifices of the Mosaic law were instituted (Gal 3:17; Gal 3:19). These consisted of two great classes, Sin-offerings and Peace-offerings. There were sin-offerings for the nation (Lev 4:13), for the priests (Lev 4:3), and for individuals (Lev 4:27): of which the first two were entirely consumed by fire, and the last were eaten only by the priests (Lev 4:26). Guilt-offerings, with whatever differences, belonged to the same general class; and with them may be reckoned the various offerings of purification. All these assumed their most characteristic form in connexion with the yearly Day of Atonement (Leviticus 16). Peace-offerings, on the other hand, may be taken to include the Passover, and all offerings of first-fruits and tithes and bloodless sacrifices. Thus Christ acknowledged the one class (sin-offering) when He bade the leper 'offer for thy cleansing what Moses commanded' (Mar 1:44); and the other class (peace-offering) when He said, 'Leave there thy gift before the altar' (Mat 5:24). As we have seen, the sacrifices offered at the making of the covenant were peace-offerings. These were acts of homage, and seals of a happy relationship between God and His people. Thus Solomon offering sacrifices received a gracious revelation that he might ask what he pleased (1Ki 3:4, cf. Psa 20:3).

Sin-offerings took notice of human unworthiness to approach God. The offences atoned for by sacrifice were sins of ignorance or inadvertence, and also misfortunes such as leprosy (Lev 14:19). For wilful disobedience there was no sacrifice (Num 15:30, 1Sa 2:25; 1Sa 3:14, 1Jn 5:16). Where there was a civil penalty, there was a sacrifice as well. That is to say, the fact of sin against God was taken into account (Lev 6:5). The holiness of God was the dominating principle of the OT sacrifices for sin. Whatever was unsightly and degrading was to be abhorred: regard to propriety was enforced. By purity and seemliness of outward behaviour everything that tended to pollute the mind was atrophied, and only what was helpful to the higher nature was allowed to influence the future. Constituted as human nature is, physical purity is not only a picture of godliness but a help to it. Thus the OT sacrifices outclassed the customs of the heathen by their blamelessness, and collaborated with the prophets and with God's providences to inculcate a high quality of conduct (Lev 20:23, 1Co 10:20).

In the sacrifices which involved the death of animals, a sense of the sacredness of life was expressed by the reverent use of the blood (Lev 17:11). Whatever was ratified by the taking of life obtained a sanctity thereby, and the putting away of human sin in making approach to God was so ratified, and the transaction made sacrosanct and secure. So far as we know, the animals sacrificed were put to death with no unnecessary pain; they did not expiate sin by suffering (contrast 1Ki 18:28): it was

the deprivation of life they suffered, and it was the blood representing life which had mysterious significance. No one might eat the blood of sacrifices, or of any animal (contrast [Psa_16:4](#) 'drink-offerings of blood'). There was no festive garland placed on the victim, to make believe that it went willingly; but it must be without blemish, partly because only the best should be given to God, and partly, it may be, because the mystery of death is greater in the case of a perfectly healthful life.

In a sense the life of the animal went for the life of the worshipper. This was signified when the offerer laid his hand upon the victim's head ([Lev_1:4](#), etc.). And the same substitution is suggested when a ransom ([Mat_20:28](#)) was paid for the firstborn, although no animal substitute is mentioned ([Exo_13:13](#), cf. [Num_3:47](#)). But the vicariousness of the suffering of Christ is anticipated in the OT rather by the priestly feeling of responsibility expressed in [Ezr_9:6](#) and [Dan_9:5](#) (cf. also Isaiah 53), than by anything explicit in the appointment of animal sacrifices. See § 5, below.

4. The prophecy of the New Covenant ([Jer_31:31](#)) forms the principal link between the sacrifices of the OT and Christ's fulfilment of them. For in that passage the promise of a covenant between God and His people is connected with the forgiveness of sin; and in the NT this conjunction is all-important. The NT is full of allusions to the law of sacrifice: 'Christ died for our sins' ([1Co_15:3](#)); 'Christ our passover is sacrificed for us' ([1Co_5:7](#)); and the words 'ransom,' 'redemption,' 'propitiation,' 'cleanse,' 'purify,' 'sanctify,'—all occur frequently. But especially this reference is to be found in Christ's words at the institution of the Supper: 'For this is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many unto remission of sins' ([Mat_26:28](#)); and in the Epistle to the Hebrews (chs. 8-10). In both these places attention is drawn to the covenant at Sinai. That was the OT sacrifice which especially corresponds in its position and efficacy to the position and efficacy of the death of Christ. By it there was solemnly established a relation of friendship between God and His people, once for all. So for all believers Christ's one sacrifice avails to make them the people and children of God. As the slaying of animals, according to a well-understood language, gave sacredness to the older covenant, so the dying of the Saviour gave greater sacredness to a greater covenant. But these descriptions of the efficacy of Christ's death also refer, as does the prophecy of Jeremiah, to the taking away of sin, to which there was no reference in the Old Covenant. Moreover, the words, 'Take, eat,' 'Drink ye all of it,' taken along with [Joh_6:53-57](#), introduce in sacrificial language the thought of fellowship with God. *Consecration* is the other side of reconciliation ([Exo_29:15](#); [Exo_29:33](#)). 'We have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin' ([1Jn_1:7](#)). So in Hebrews, from the words 'Let us come boldly' ([1Jn_4:16](#)) to 'Let us draw near' ([Heb_10:22](#)), the whole matter of our salvation is pictured under the form of access into the happy condition of being at peace with God (cf. [Rom_5:1-2](#)), which was given under the Mosaic law by the covenant sacrifice, and continued by the sacrifices that were commanded; but for us

this has been obtained once for all by Christ (Heb 10:10), and remains ours as we abide in Him. It is understood that more had to be done in the fulness of time to assure God's people of His favour than sufficed for that when they came out of Egypt. Now, they had a conscience of sin. This the Law had produced (Gal 3:19; Gal 4:3). Accordingly, in the New Covenant provision was made for the remission of sin, for redemption, for propitiation (Rom 3:24-25, 1Jn 4:10). Even while the Apostles are setting aside the sacrifices of the OT, they can express the work of Christ in no other than sacrificial language. There was something in the sacrifices for sin that could not be set aside. Thus, to meet the displeasure of God witnessed by an accusing conscience (Rom 2:15) or by experience of the state of the world (Rom 1:18), there was need of 'the *redemption* that is in Christ Jesus, whom God set forth to be a *propitiation* by his blood' (Rom 3:24 f.).

In the last chapter of Hebrews the fate of the sin-offering is made into a parable of the state of believers (Heb 13:10-16). They do not rest in the enjoyment of God's favour in this world, as the Jewish worshippers rejoiced before God and feasted on their peace-offerings. This is not our rest. Here we have no continuing city. We are not of the world, as Christ is not of the world. But the sin-offering was burned 'in a clean place' without the camp (Lev 4:12), and it was most holy. The place where it was consumed by fire was made a holy altar by it. So not in a worldly but in a spiritual manner those who go out unto Jesus without the camp have the highest, happiest enjoyment of the friendship of God; Christ Himself by His sacred and faithful life and death is their temple, and there they 'offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually.'

5. Finally, the sacrifices of the OT do not cover in analogy the whole of the Saviour's work. The Epistle to the Hebrews employs the priesthood of Christ, as well as His sacrifice, to set forth all He is to us. Moses and Joshua and Aaron and Melchizedek were imperfect anticipations of Christ, besides the sacrifices. In Isaiah 53 the prophet is compelled to go beyond his sacrificial parable, and to say, 'By his stripes we are healed,' 'He shall see of the travail of his soul.' The lamb could give its life, but it needs a human representative of the Saviour to show His priestly sympathy and responsibility and sufferings. And this being so, no doubt the decided preference of Scripture and of Christian feeling for dwelling rather on the sacrifices than on the men who were anticipations of Christ, is because it is so supremely important that Christ should be seen to stand alone among men, no one near Him. A prophet may be a man of God, but Christ is the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world,—that to God may be all the glory of man's redemption. See also the preceding article.

Literature.—P. Fairbairn, *Typology*; A. B. Davidson, *Theology of the OT*, and the same writer's Com. on the *Epistle to the Hebrews*; Bp. Westcott, *Hebrews*; Denney, *Death*

of Christ; art. 'Sacrifice' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible (by W. P. Paterson) and in *Encyc. Brit.*⁹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (by W. R. Smith).

T. Gregory.

⚠Sadducees

SADDUCEES

1. Derivation and use of the name.—It seems impossible to attain certainty as to the derivation of the name 'Sadducees' (Σαδδουκαῖοι; סַדּוּקָיִם). Formerly it was supposed to be connected with the adjective *zaddîk*, 'righteous'; but this derivation is now generally given up, for philological and other reasons. No explanation can be given of the change from *i* to *u*; and the Sadducees were never regarded, either by themselves or by others, as specially righteous. In more recent times the commonly accepted derivation is from the proper name *Zadok*; but neither is this without its difficulties. The doubling of the *d* is not well accounted for, and the problem as to which Zadok gave name to the party is one upon which there is considerable difference of opinion. Many hold that it was Zadok the priest, the contemporary of David and Solomon (2Sa 8:17; 2Sa 15:24, 1Ki 1:8; 1Ki 2:35 etc.), whose posterity officiated in the Temple down to the time of the Exile, and even formed the chief element of the post-exilic priesthood; but Kuenen says this conjecture is burdened with insurmountable difficulties' (*Religion of Israel*, iii. p. 122). A Jewish legend states that it was a disciple of Antigonus of Socho, named Zadok; but this is almost universally admitted to have no historical foundation. To solve the difficulty, Kuenen and Montet postulate a Zadok, 'perhaps a contemporary of Jonathan the Asmonaeon' (Kuenen, *l.c.*), from whom the name may have been derived; but this, again, is purely hypothetical. Yet another suggestion is offered by A. E. Cowley (art. 'Sadducees' in the *Ebi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*]), that the word may have been of Persian origin, connected with *zindîk*, which is used in a general sense for 'infidel.' The suggestion is interesting, but is put forward 'with great diffidence' by its author.

But however uncertain the derivation may be, there is no dubiety about the application of the name 'Sadducees.' It is always used to designate the political party of the Jewish aristocratic priesthood from the time of the Maccabees to the final fall of the Jewish State. The chief authorities for its use are the NT, Josephus, and portions of the Mishna. It is important to note that, while any one, whatever his rank or station, could be a Pharisee, no one could be a Sadducee unless he belonged to one

of the high-priestly or aristocratic families. It was not enough to be a priest. There was as great a distance between the higher and lower orders of the priesthood as between the aristocracy and the common people.

2. Outline of history.—From the beginning of the Grecian period of Jewish history, and even before that time, the whole conduct of political affairs was in the hands of the priestly aristocracy. Influenced by Hellenic culture, they sympathized to some extent with the policy of Antiochus Epiphanes which provoked the Maccabean rebellion; and although, as a consequence, they fell into the background during the earlier period of Hasmonaean rule, they recovered their position in the time of John Hyrcanus, under whom we find them, now known as Sadducees, in direct antagonism to the Pharisees, or party of the scribes. These for a short time acceded to power under Alexandra, but immediately afterwards the Sadducees came again to the front. In the Roman period their power was considerably diminished, in this respect that while they were able to retain the high offices for themselves, they were compelled to adopt the policy of the Pharisees, who had an overwhelming influence with the people. The high priests at the head of the Sanhedrin were Sadducees, but they were always in a minority; though essentially a political party, they had apparently no independent existence apart from Jerusalem and its Temple, and with the fall of the Jewish State they disappear entirely from history.

3. Special characteristics.—The chief outstanding feature of the Sadducees was probably their conservatism. They stood by the established position, held by the old points of view, and rejected everything that partook of the nature of novelty. They were priests, but priests of aristocratic family, and, as such, their duties were political as well as religious. Brought into close contact with their Gentile rulers, their political interests tended to thrust the religious into the background. Their aim was the welfare of the State as a secular institution, rather than the purity of the nation as a religious community. As sober, practical statesmen, representative of moderate Jewish opinion, they entertained no extravagant notions of the coming high position or brilliant future of Israel. And being themselves in comfortable circumstances, they were satisfied with the present, and felt no special need of a future rectification in the interests of justice. The intellectual standpoint of the Sadducees seems to have been mainly negative. They were characterized chiefly by their denial of certain doctrines, and had no positive religious or theological system of their own. They stood in most things in direct opposition to the Pharisees, yet in an opposition which involved no fundamental principle, but into which they had been driven by their historical development.

The leading difference between the two parties is to be found in this, that the Sadducees held by the written Law, and rejected the Pharisaic tradition. It is not, however, correct to say that the Sadducees acknowledged only the Pentateuch and

rejected the rest of the OT. Kuenen even maintains that they accepted the Oral Tradition, 'in so far as this was already established when they constituted themselves a party' (*Rel. of Israel*, iii. p. 144). Schürer says that they agreed with the Pharisees on some—perhaps many—particulars of the tradition, but 'only denied its obligation, and reserved the right of private opinion' (*HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]* ii. ii. 38). A number of minor differences are recorded in Rabbinical literature, of which full accounts will be found in Schürer, or in art. 'Sadducees' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible. The Sadducees are stated to have been more severe in penal legislation, adhering more strictly to the letter of the Law; and in questions of ritual, while admitting the principle of Levitical purification, they ridiculed the Pharisees for the absurdities of their traditional regulations. It has been maintained that the attitude of the Sadducees was largely determined by their desire to magnify the importance of the priesthood; but Schürer denies that any such motive can be traced. Probably they felt that the Pharisees vitiated the Law by their self-contradictions, and that only by an adherence to what was definite and authentic could the system be conserved according to which alone God could be rightly worshipped.

The distinctive Sadducean doctrines are usually classed under three heads:—(1) They denied the resurrection, personal immortality, and retribution in a future life. So far they merely stood by the old Hebrew position, and from their materialistic and worldly point of view they felt no need of a future life to compensate for the inequalities of the present. In the same spirit they also renounced the entire Messianic hope, at least in the form then current. (2) They denied the existence of angels and spirits. This was scarcely the position of the OT, but their worldly common sense and general culture were bound to prejudice them against the fantastic products of the Pharisaic imagination in the wild extravagances of its angelology and demonology. (3) They denied foreordination and the supremacy of fate, and upheld the freedom of the human will, maintaining 'that good and evil are at the choice of man, who can do the one or the other at his discretion.' This is quite in keeping with the rest of their views. They felt no special need of a Divine Providence to order their life, and claimed that whatever they possessed was due to their own efforts. Generally it may be said that, after the manner of an aristocracy, they resented any attempt to impose on them an excess of legal strictness, and that 'advanced religious views were, on the one hand, superfluous to their worldly-mindedness, and, on the other, inadmissible by their higher culture and enlightenment' (*HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]* ii. ii. 41). Yet the distance between them and the Pharisees was not so great as it might appear. Politically at least there was no insuperable barrier. The two could sit together in the Sanhedrin, and could combine to make common cause against Jesus and to plan His destruction.

4. Relations to Jesus.—The Sadducees are not often mentioned by name in the Gospels, but it has to be remembered that, when mention is made of the chief priests, practically the same persons are referred to. Jesus did not come into the same constant antagonism with the Sadducees as with the Pharisees. For the most part they seem to have ignored Him, at least in the early part of His ministry. They joined with the Pharisees in asking Him to show them a sign from heaven (Mat 16:1), and shortly afterwards He warned His disciples to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees, meaning probably, so far as the Sadducees were concerned, their utterly secular spirit. They resented His action in the cleansing of the Temple, and along with the scribes and elders they demanded His authority (Mar 11:27 f.), and from this time forward sought to destroy Him (Mar 11:18). They thought to inveigle Him with the Roman power by asking whether it was lawful to give tribute to Caesar (Luk 20:22), and they attempted to discredit His teaching by presenting to Him the problem of the woman who had been married to seven brethren, and asking whose wife she should be in the resurrection; but they only brought upon themselves discomfiture, and the reproof that they knew neither the Scriptures nor the power of God (Mat 22:23 ||). They sat in the Sanhedrin which condemned Him, and with the others mocked Him upon the cross. Their opposition to Christian doctrine did not cease with the death of Jesus. There is no record of any Sadducee being admitted into the Christian Church, and before long they were merely a memory, hazy and indistinct.

Literature.—See under Pharisees and Scribes.

Joseph Mitchell.

☞ Sadoc

SADOC.—A link in our Lord's genealogy (Mat 1:14).

☞ Saints

SAINTS.—The word 'saints' (οἱ ἅγιοι) occurs in the Gospels in Mat 27:52 only. Elsewhere in the NT it is never used of any but Christians (e.g. Act 9:13, Rom 12:13, Rev 11:18). In the LXX Septuagint (Dan 7:22; Dan 7:25; Dan 7:27; Dan 8:24) ἅγιοι is the equivalent of קְדוּשִׁים 'the holy ones' (*i.e.* angels). The root idea seems to be that of 'separation,' so that a 'saint' is one who is separated, consecrated, one who

belongs to God. Its occurrence in Mat 27:52 opens up the entire question of the meaning of the section. The incident is peculiar to the First Gospel, and occurs in the course of the narrative of our Lord's crucifixion and death. It is stated that at the moment of His death there was a supernatural earthquake which caused the tombs to be opened, and that immediately following His resurrection on the first day of the week many *bodies* (σώματα) of dead saints arose from their graves, and the *persons* (ἐξεληθόντες, masc.) thus raised from the dead appeared in the city of Jerusalem to many. Several theories have been put forward to account for this remarkable statement.

1. It is said to be an interpolation. In reply, it is argued that the textual evidence of Manuscripts and Versions is exactly the same for this passage as for the rest of the First Gospel. It is also urged that the incident seems plainly referred to as early as Ignatius (*Ep. ad Magn.* 9).

2. It is said to be a legendary addition. It is thought that the graves were rent by an earthquake which actually occurred, and that then this statement was subsequently added as a spiritual explanation of the natural phenomenon. Bruce (*EGT [Note: GT Expositor's Greek Testament.]*, *in loc.*) says: 'We seem here to be in the region of Christian legend.' Meyer takes the same general view. Those who oppose this view argue that textual considerations give no indication of a later addition, and that the writer of the First Gospel evidently believed in the incident, and wished his readers to do the same.

3. It is accounted for as a wrong explanation of incidents which were in themselves true. Farrar (*Life of Christ*) suggests that these ghostly visitants were the product of the imagination of those who were impressed by the events then taking place. To this it is replied that there is no trace of it in the narrative which now is, and apparently has been from the first, an integral part of this Gospel.

4. It is explained by saying that we have in the incident a striking testimony to the supernatural character and far-reaching power of our Lord's death; that not only did it affect nature (earthquake), the Jewish economy (the rent veil), and human life (centurion), but that its influence penetrated even to the unseen world. The narrative as it stands says that it was at the moment of His death that the tombs were opened, but that the actual rising of the saints did not take place until after the Lord's resurrection. He was 'the first-fruits of them that slept.' The fact that the incident is found in one Gospel only is, it is urged, no necessary argument against its credibility. On this view, the question as to who were the saints would seem to be answered by the narrative itself. The tombs were near Jerusalem, and the fact of recognition implied in the appearance of the risen ones in the city suggests that the saints were

some of those who, during their earthly life, had been led to faith in Jesus as the Messiah: godly people of the type of Anna, Simeon, Zacharias, and Elisabeth. Those who accept its genuineness fully recognize that the incident is mysterious, but they point out that the narrative as it stands is a calm, quiet statement, marked by reserve and by the absence of all legendary details. The upholders of the authenticity consider it full of spiritual meaning as to the supernatural character of our Lord's death in relation to the holy dead, holding that it was a manifestation of His power over death and the grave (1) by the resurrection of some from Hades, (2) by the clothing of them with a resurrection body, and (3) by permission to appear to those who knew them. On this theory the narrative is to be accepted as it is, and the exegesis of the passage strictly adhered to without endeavouring to draw conclusions which go beyond the brief record.

Literature.—(1) in favour of historicity: Alford, *Com. in loc.*; Westcott, *Introd. to Gospels*⁴ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 329 f.; *Thinker*, vol. v. (2) in favour of legendary character: Bruce, Meyer, etc.

W. H. Griffith Thomas.

⚡Salim

SALIM.—Mentioned only Joh 3:23 'aenon near to Salim,' to fix the place where John was baptizing, 'because there was much water there.' Scrivener's edition of the Authorized Version gives as marginal references, 'Gen 33:18? or Jos 15:23? or 1Sa 9:4?'; other editions only the last passage (where the text has Shalim, or rather Shaalim, in Heb. שַׁלִּימ), the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 only the first (margin). It is to be noticed that the former view is also that of Jerome, in his *Liber interpret. Heb. Nom.*, when he writes: 'Salim pugilli sive volae aut ortus aquarum, quod brevius graece dicitur βρυοντα'; *pugilli* and *volae* = שַׁלִּימ. And before Jerome, Origen also explained in a similar way (on Joh 10:39, p. 543 of the Berlin ed.): Αἰνῶν ὀφθαλμὸς βασάνου καὶ Σαλήμ αὐτὸς ὁ ἀναβαίνων. In the *Com. on Joh 3:23* the new edition has in the text Σαλίμ but thinks in the apparatus that Σαλήμ would perhaps be better. With the view of a plural agrees the fact that most Manuscripts spell the ending -ειμ, and not -ημ, as in the Complutensian Polyglott; the latter spelling (Σαλήμ) would favour identification with שַׁלִּימ. In the article aenon (vol. i. p. 35), most of the topographical identifications proposed for these places are discussed. We may add

that αινων η εγγυς του σαλιμ is entered already on the mosaic map of Madeba on the left bank of the Jordan, and that the oldest and most explicit discussion of these sites is found in the pilgrimage of the so-called Silvia of Aquitania (or Etheria of Spain), about 385. A special monograph was published in 1903 by C. Mommert (*aenon und Bethania die Taufstätten des Täufers, nebst einer Abhandlung über Salem die Königsstadt des Melchisedech*, Leipzig), on which see G. H. Gilbert, *AJTh* [Note: *JTh American Journal of Theology.*] vii. 777; cf., further, Κλ. Μ. Κοικυλίδες: ὁ ἐν Ἰορδάνῃ νη τόπος τῆς βαπτίσεως τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ τὸ μοναστήριον τοῦ ἁγίου Προδρόμου (Jerusalem, 1905); also Löhr, 'Wie stellt sich die neuere Palästinaforschung zu den geographischen Angaben des Johannesevangeliums,' *Deutsch-Evangelische Blätter*, Dec. 1906.

When Silvia had finished Jerusalem, she wished to go 'ad regionem Ausitidem' to see 'memoriam sancti Job.' It took her eight days (*mansiones*) from Jerusalem to Carneas: 'in quo itinere iens vidi super ripam Jordanis fluminis vallem pulchram satis et amœnam, abundantem vineis et arboribus, quoniam aquae multae ibi erant et optimae satis. Nam in ea valle vicus erat grandis qui appellatur nunc *Sedima*. In eo ergo vico, qui est in media planitie positus, in medio loco est monticulus non satis grandis, sed factus sicut solent esse tumbae, sed grandis: ibi ergo in summo ecclesia est.' She inquires after the place, and receives the answer: 'haec est civitas regis Melchisedech, quae dicta est ante *Salem*, unde nunc corrupto sermone, *Sedima* appellatur ipse vicus.' For further details, amongst which is the statement that when people dig for foundations of new buildings, they find 'aliquoties et de argento et aeramento modica frustella,' the reader is referred to Silvia. She then remembered that in the Bible it was written: 'Baptizasse sanctum Johannem in Enon juxta Salim.' Therefore she inquired also after aenon, and was shown the place 'in ducentis passibus ... hortum pomarium valde amœnum, ubi ostendit nobis in medio fontem aquae optimae satis et purae, qui a semel integrum fluvium dimittebat. Habebat autem ante se ipse fons lacum, ubi parebat fuisse operatum sanctum Johannem baptistam. Tune dixit nobis ipse sanctus presbyter: In hodie hic hortus aliter non appellatur graeco sermone nisi *eepos tu agiu lohanni*, id est quod vos dicitis latine "hortus sancti Johannis" ' (for further particulars, see again the text). Going on for some time 'per vallem Jordanis super ripam fluminis ipsius,' the traveller sees after a little the town of the holy prophet Elia, 'id est Thesbe,' where his cave is, and also 'memoria sancti Gethae,' of whom we read in the Books of the Judges (this is, of course, Jephthah, and not Gad, as has been suggested by Mommert).

This localization of the two places agrees exactly with the statement of Eusebius that aenon was 8 miles south from Scythopolis (see vol. i. p. 35, and supply from the Berlin ed. p. 152, the reference to Procopins, who helps to fill up the lacuna in the Greek

text with Σαλουμίας, just as Jerome reads). But instead of seeking the place west of the Jordan at *Sheikh Salim*, Mommert now seeks aenon east of it at 'Ain Djirm ('well of the leprosy'), at the foot of the hill 'Scharabil,' as he spells it, or 'Scharhabît' as it is spelt on the map of Fischer-Guthe, opposite to *Tell Ridhgah*, with which it has been identified hitherto.

We thus get the following identifications: (1) *Tell Ridhgah*, (2) *Sharabil*, (3) *Salim* east of Nâblus, (4) *Wady Sulcim* near Anata, (5) 'Ain Karim, (6) *Shilhim* in the Negeb. A definite result has not been reached as yet; the identity of aenon and Bethany (Joh_1:28 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) is not improbable.

Eb. Nestle.

Salmon

SALMON.—A link in our Lord's genealogy (Mat_1:4 f., Luk_3:32 [(Revised Version margin) *Sala*]).

SALOME (Gr. Σαλώμη, possibly shortened from Heb. שְׁלֹמִי'צַל *Shĕlômi'cl* or the name = שְׁלֹמַת *Shâlôm* with Gr. termination).—1. The daughter of Herodias, mentioned (although not by name) in Mat_14:6-11, Mar_6:22-28. See Herod in vol. i. p. 722^a and Herodias.

2. The mother of James and John, and wife of Zebedee (Mar_15:40; Mar_16:1; cf. Joh_19:25, Mat_20:20; Mat_27:56). In St. Matthew's account of the ambitious request of the sons of Zebedee, she is represented as coming with her sons and prostrating herself before Jesus. St. Mark does not mention her in this connexion. She was one of the women who followed our Lord and ministered to Him (ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ καὶ διεκόνουν αὐτῷ, Mar_15:41), and was present at the Crucifixion. Along with Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James the Little, she came after the Sabbath was over, bringing fragrant oils (ἀρώματα, μύρα [Luk_23:56]) with which to anoint the body of Jesus. In the narrative of St. John there are mentioned as present at the Crucifixion (standing 'by the cross') 'his mother and his mother's sister, Mary of Clopas and Mary Magdalene.' It has been argued by some that three women only are here mentioned, and that the words 'Mary of Clopas' are explanatory of 'his mother's sister.' Most of the more recent commentators, however, notably Westcott ('St. John' in *Speaker's NT Commentary*, p. 275), hold that four women are meant, and that 'his

mother's sister' is Salome. The following considerations seem fairly conclusive in favour of this latter view: (1) it is most unlikely that two sisters in a private family should bear the same name; (2) the parallelism ('his mother and his mother's sister; Mary of Clopas and Mary Magdalene') is characteristic of St. John; (3) 'the circuitous manner of describing his own mother is in character with St. John's manner of describing himself' (W. L. Bevan in Smith's *DB* [Note: *Dictionary of the Bible.*] , art. 'Salome'); (4) the Peshitta inserts 'and' before Mary of Clopas; (5) Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James the Little (who is certainly the same as Mary of Clopas), and Salome are mentioned by St. Matthew and St. Mark as present. The supposition that Salome = 'his mother's sister' harmonizes St. John's account with that of St. Matthew and St. Mark.* [Note: Epiphanius (Haer. lxxviii. 8) says that Salome was a daughter of Joseph, and Nicephorus Callistus (HE ii. 3) makes her Joseph's wife. These traditions, at any rate, indicate a belief in some connexion between Salome and the house of Joseph.] See also artt. Clopas, Mary.

Literature.—Besides the authorities quoted in the article, see Wieseler, *SK* [Note: *K Studien und Kritiken.*] , 1840, p. 648 ff.; art. 'Salome' in Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible* (cf. art. 'Herod,' *ib.*), in *Encyc. Bibl.*, and in Herzog's *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.*] ; Commentaries of H. A. W. Meyer (English translation 1880), Alford, and Luthardt (on St. John's Gospel, iii., English translation 1880, where, against his former view, he identifies Salome with 'his mother's sister').

H. W. Fulford.

☞ Salt

SALT (ἅλας).—Salt has been used from very early times to season and preserve food. In Palestine there was always a plentiful supply. The chief sources were (and are) the great rock-salt cliffs known as the *Khasm Usdum* to the S.W. of the Dead Sea, and the marshes and pools around its shores. The cliffs are from 30 to 60 feet high, and stretch from 6 to 7 miles along the coast. In the Bible this sea is sometimes called the 'salt sea' (Gen_14:3, Deu_3:17). Three lbs. of its water are said to yield 1 lb. of solid salts.

In addition to its common use as a condiment or preservative of food, salt from early times had religious and social significance. As a fitting emblem of incorruptness, it was habitually offered along with the sacrifices (cf. Lev_2:13). The preservative qualities of salt probably led to its being regarded as an essential element in the making of any enduring covenant (cf. Lev_2:13, Num_18:19, 2Ch_13:5). As a

sacrificial meal was usually celebrated in connexion with the making of a covenant, the salt of the meal naturally became the salt of the covenant. Among Eastern peoples, 'to eat of his salt' is a sign of enduring friendship and peace. The Arabs use the phrase 'there is salt between us' as expressing the fact that a bond of loyalty is in existence (cf. Ezr_4:14).

In the Gospels, salt is used for the most part metaphorically: (1) As an emblem of preservation from corruption, 'Ye are the salt of the earth' (Mat_5:13). The new spiritual life of the disciples was to purify and preserve the life of the world. Jesus solemnly warns them against the danger of losing the power which would enable them to fulfil this function, 'for if the salt have lost its savour ('become saltless,' Mar_9:50), wherewith shall it be salted?' (Mat_5:13 || Luk_14:34). (2) There is also a suggestion of its significance as a symbol of concord in the counsel, 'Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace one with another' (Mar_9:50); for it is given in connexion with disputes or discussions as to which of the disciples should be the greatest (Mar_9:33-37). These disputings may also be regarded as one of the influences which render the salt saltless (*ἀναλον*). (3) As a symbol of incorruption in connexion with sacrifice. In Mar_9:49 the words *πᾶσα θυσία ἀλλ' ἀλισθήσεται* are omitted by Tischendorf, WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.], and Nestle, following Manuscripts \aleph BL [Note: L Bampton Lecture.] Δ . The words in the text thus adjusted (*πᾶς γὰρ πυρὶ ἀλισθήσεται*) have been translated 'for every one shall be salted for the fire' (Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 121), and 'for every one shall be salted with fire' (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). The latter is almost certainly the right translation, since 'with fire' (*πυρὶ*) takes the place of 'with salt' (*ἀλί*), as indicating the new spiritual element which was to be present in the sacrificial life of the disciples. In the old economy every sacrifice was to be salted with salt, and would not be accepted without it; so in the new economy, the 'living sacrifice' of the Christian disciple will not be rightly prepared without the 'fire' which alone makes it acceptable. As the old sacrifices were prepared with salt, so the new sacrifices must be prepared with fire. The fire is most probably to be interpreted as the fire of judgment, as in the verse immediately preceding ('where their worm dieth not and their fire is not quenched,' Mar_9:48). There is a twofold judgment by fire. It may be Divine and penal (Mar_9:48), or personal and corrective (cf. 'If we would judge ourselves we should not be judged,' 1Co_11:31). The previous context interprets the personal, salutary judgment by fire, by which the life is to be prepared as an acceptable sacrifice: 'If thy hand offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched' (cf. Mar_9:43; Mar_9:47). Swete (*St. Mark, ad loc.*) interprets the lire of the Christian life as the Holy Spirit, but fire as a symbol of the Spirit is not found in

Mark. It may, however, be said that no self-judgment will be complete, or sufficient, unless it is carried through under the influence of the Holy Spirit.

Literature.—W. R. Smith, art. ‘Salt,’ *Encyc. Brit.*⁹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; E. Hull, art. ‘Salt,’ *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible* ; Beyschlag, *NT Theol.* i. 180; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, ii. 62 ff.; Bruce, *Training of the Twelve*, p. 215, notes; Kelman, *Expos. Times*, xii. [1900] p. 111; Shalders, *Expositor*, 1st ser. xi. [1880] p. 79 ff.

John Reid.

☩ Salutation

SALUTATION.—See Greetings.

☩ Salvation

SALVATION.—The Gospel usage of this word is closely connected with that of OT.

The corresponding Heb. words are derivatives of **ישע** and **נצל**. Of the former, the Niphal and Hiphil are found in the verb; of noun forms **ישע**; or **ישע**, **ישועה**, **ישועות**, **ישועות**, **ישועות** and some proper names, of which the most important is **יהוה ישוע** ‘Jehovah is salvation.’ The root **נצל** occurs in the Niphal and Hiphil of the verb; its only noun-derivative is the **ἄταξι λεγομενον, הצלה**, **Est 4:14**. The fundamental meaning of **ישע** appears to be ‘enlargement,’ whence the notion of ‘deliverance’ naturally springs, the same association of ideas being observed in the use of ‘compression,’ ‘confinement’ as figures for ‘distress.’ So far as the verbal forms of both roots are concerned, the idea of ‘saving’ is entirely negative, that of deliverance from some evil, no reflexion being passed upon favourable, positive consequences. A negative sense is very clear in such passages as **Psa 28:9**; **Psa 69:35**, where the positive results of the saving act are named as something additional. From other words denoting deliverance ‘to save’ is distinguished by the constant presence of two elements, that of a delivering agent, and that of an active interposition on his part for the removal of actual evil or peril. For mere ‘preservation’ or mere ‘escape’ other words are used: ‘healing’ also is expressed by different terms; of. **Gen 45:7**; **Gen 47:25**, **Exo 1:17**, **Jer 48:6**, **Eze 3:18**, **Psa 6:5**; **Psa 41:3**, **Job 2:6**. The evil from which salvation takes place

varies; in most cases it is the oppression of Israel by its enemies; sometimes, though not frequently, it appears in the acute form of individual or national death (Psa 68:19-20). While the noun-forms frequently have the same negative meaning as the verb, they pass over more readily into the positive sense, so that the act of deliverance becomes the point of departure for the bestowal of favour, blessing, and prosperity. Thus יְשׁוּעָה and תְּשׁוּעָה come to mean ‘victory’ (1Sa 14:45, 2Sa 19:2, 2Ki 5:1, Isa 60:18). ‘Salvation’ becomes synonymous with other positive terms like ‘righteousness,’ ‘blessing,’ ‘light’ (Isa 45:8; Isa 46:13; Isa 49:6; Isa 61:10; Isa 62:1, Psa 24:5; Psa 106:4). In the Prophets and the Psalter it obtains an eschatological (Messianic) sense, and stands as one of the terms for the great final deliverance and the final blessedness to follow (Isa 12:2 f., Isa 45:17; Isa 45:22; Isa 49:8; Isa 51:6; Isa 51:8; Isa 52:7; Isa 56:1, Jer 23:6; Jer 33:16, Mic 7:7, Hab 3:8; Hab 3:18, Psa 14:7; Psa 35:4; Psa 74:12; Psa 85:8; Psa 98:2-3; Psa 109:27; Psa 118:15; Psa 118:21.) The religious importance of the conception in the OT springs not so much from the nature of the evil removed, or from the nature of the blessedness bestowed, as rather from the fact that salvation, of whatever nature, is a work of Jehovah for His people, a Divine prerogative; hence the frequently recurring statements that salvation belongs to Jehovah, is of Jehovah, that Jehovah is salvation, the Saviour of Israel (1Sa 14:39, 2Sa 22:3, 2Ch 20:17, Isa 12:2-3; Isa 33:22, Psa 3:8; Psa 62:2; Psa 118:14; Psa 118:21). In so far as salvation is valued not merely from the point of view of its benefits for man, but as a pledge of the Divine favour, the idea becomes spiritualized in principle. Besides, in so far as all national developments in the history of Israel have a religious and moral background, it is felt that every act of salvation must have for its antecedent a change in the people’s spiritual condition (Isa 33:22; Isa 33:24). In a few passages the conception is directly transferred from the national-political to the purely religious sphere, sin being named as the evil from which Israel or the individual is saved (Eze 36:29, Psa 51:14).

The LXX Septuagint renders the Heb. verbs by σώζειν, the nouns by σωτηρία. and σωτηριον. These words, however, are likewise used to render Heb. terms of a different shade of meaning, and thus to a large extent the nice distinction of the original between ‘salvation’ specifically so-called and such more general terms is obscured. Thus σώζειν stands for נִפְּלַג Niphel, Piel, and Hiphil, frequently in the Passive for mere ‘escape,’ also for forms of פָּלַג and פָּיַג. On the other hand, σώζειν never bears in the LXX Septuagint the specific sense of ‘healing’ (Jer 17:14).

In the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical writings the usage does not vary much from that of the OT; cf. Sir 51:12 (ἐξ ἀπολείας), Wis 16:7, Jdt 9:11, Enoch 48:7 (of ‘the

Son of Man'; 'in his name are they being saved, and he is the God of their life') 50:3 (eschatological-negative, mere salvation without glory) 63:8, 4 Ezr 6:25, 7:131, 9:8, 12:34, 13:26, 8:39 (the righteous shall he satisfied with salvation in connexion with the Messiah), Ps-Sol 6:2, 10:8, 12:6, 18:6, Bar 4:22; Bar 4:24; Bar 4:29, Test. Jud 1:22, Test. Daniel 5, Test. Napht. 8, Jub 23:29, 1Ma 4:30; 1Ma 9:9, 4Ma 11:7; 4Ma 15:3 ('piety which saves unto eternal life') 4Ma 15:27. In most of these passages the conception is eschatological-positive, and in many of them it has reference to the issue of the Last Judgment, wherein lies a transition from the OT to the NT usage. There is also an advance in this, that in a couple of instances the act of salvation is connected with the Messiah.

In the Gospels σώζειν occurs 54 times (not counting Luk 17:33, where ζωογονήσει is better attested than σώσει of the Textus Receptus, nor Mat 18:11, a verse omitted by the best authorities). The noun σωτηρία occurs 5 times (not counting αἰώνιος σωτηρία in the rejected shorter conclusion of Mk.)—Luk 1:69; Luk 1:71; Luk 1:77; Luk 19:9, Joh 4:22. τὸ σωτήριον is found twice—Luk 2:30; Luk 3:6. Of the instances of this use of the verb 14 relate to the deliverance from disease or demoniacal possession—Mat 9:21-22 bis, Mar 5:23; Mar 5:28; Mar 5:34; Mar 6:56; Mar 10:32, Luk 8:36; Luk 8:48; Luk 8:50; Luk 17:19; Luk 18:42, Joh 11:12; in 20 instances the reference is to the rescue of physical life from some impending peril or instant death—Mat 8:25; Mat 14:30; Mat 16:25; Mat 27:40; Mat 27:42 bis., Mat 27:49, Mar 3:4; Mar 8:35; Mar 15:30-31 bis. Luk 6:9; Luk 9:24; Luk 9:56; Luk 23:35 bis. Luk 23:37; Luk 23:39, Joh 12:27; in the remainder of cases, 20 times, the reference is to religious salvation technically so called—Mat 1:21; Mat 10:22; Mat 19:25; Mat 24:13; Mat 24:22, Mar 8:35; Mar 10:26; Mar 13:13; Mar 13:20; Mar 16:16, Luk 7:50; Luk 8:12; Luk 9:24; Luk 13:23; Luk 18:26; Luk 19:10, Joh 3:17; Joh 5:34; Joh 10:9; Joh 12:47. The noun σωτηρία is used twice in the OT sense of deliverance from the enemies of Israel—Luk 1:69; Luk 1:71; Luke, 3 times in the more specifically religious sense—Luk 1:77; Luk 19:9, Joh 4:22. τὸ σωτήριον in Luk 2:30 has the same distinctly religious associations; in Luk 3:6 it stands in a quotation from Isa 40:5, where the meaning is eschatological from the OT point of view.

1. First we examine the passages relating to the *deliverance from diseases or demoniacal possession*. The question is whether the import of σώζειν here is exhausted by the notion of 'healing.' The Greek word has this meaning, being connected with σῶς (σᾶος), 'whole,' 'sound,' therefore σώζειν = 'to render whole, sound.' The Authorized Version accordingly renders in most of these cases 'to make whole' or 'be whole,' in two 'to heal' (Mar 5:23, Luk 8:36), in one 'to do well'

(Joh 11:12), and only once ‘to save’ (Luk 18:42). In one instance it offers ‘to save’ as a marginal reading for ‘to make whole’ (Mar 10:52). Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 everywhere follows the rendering of Authorized Version except that it makes the two passages where the latter has ‘to heal’ and the one passage where it has ‘to save’ uniform with the others; further, that it renders in Joh 11:12 ‘to recover,’ and that it offers in all passages except Mar 6:56 the marginal alternative ‘to save.’ It should be noticed that on other occasions the Evangelists use, and make Jesus use, different words, whose import is restricted to ‘healing’ in the medical sense, and that not only where the object is some disease or disability, but also with a personal object; so θεραπεύειν (Mat 4:23-24; Mat 8:7; Mat 8:16; Mat 9:35; Mat 10:1; Mat 10:8; Mat 12:10; Mat 12:15; Mat 14:14; Mat 15:30; Mat 17:16; Mat 17:18; Mat 19:2; Mat 21:14, Mar 1:34; Mar 3:2; Mar 3:10; Mar 3:15; Mar 6:5; Mar 6:13, Luk 4:23; Luk 4:40; Luk 5:15; Luk 6:7; Luk 6:18; Luk 7:21; Luk 8:2; Luk 8:43; Luk 9:1; Luk 9:6; Luk 10:9; Luk 13:14; Luk 14:3, Joh 5:10) and ἰᾶσθαι (Luk 6:19; Luk 9:2; Luk 9:11; Luk 9:42; Luk 14:4; Luk 22:51, Joh 4:47). The question is not, of course, whether the element of ‘healing’ as a connotated idea should be entirely eliminated from σώζειν. Not only would this have been impossible to a Greek speaker or writer in cases where the saving act as a matter of fact consisted in or involved healing, but it is also excluded by the observation that Jesus more than once referred to His saving work as the work of a physician, and in the instruction to His disciples spoke also of it as ‘healing’ (Mat 9:12; Mat 10:1; Mat 10:8; Mat 13:15, Mar 2:17, Luk 4:18; Luk 5:31; Luk 9:1-2; Luk 10:9). The only point at issue is whether the Evangelists are aware of a difference between statements where ‘healing’ is designated as such, and other statements where ‘healing’ is implied, but where for a certain purpose it is characterized as ‘saving.’

The data above cited show that this last question must be answered in the affirmative. In view of the fact that Aramaic lies behind the Greek form of the words of Jesus or the Evangelists, we shall also have to assume a clearly marked difference between the two sets of cases. The additional element which the use of σώζειν introduces into the situation is that of deliverance from the sphere or power of death. In Mar 3:4, Luk 6:9, while speaking of His healing work, our Lord contrasts σώζειν with ἀποκτείνειν, which implies that He regarded it as the opposite of ‘killing,’ *i.e.* as rescuing from death and restoring to life. According to Mar 5:23, the purpose of ‘being saved’ is ‘to live.’ In Luk 7:3 διασώζειν, the use of the preposition marks the process as a transition from death to life. It is true that in some instances the disease or infirmity from which Jesus saves is not fatal in itself, *e.g.* the withered hand (Mar 3:4), the issue of blood (Mar 5:28), certainly some of the diseases of Mar 6:56, blindness (Mar 10:52). Still even here the act of saving is viewed not from a medical

point of view, but from the religious point of view, according to which all disease and infirmity lie on the side of death, so that it belongs to the function of one who delivers from death to work deliverance from these consequences of sin and precursors of death likewise.

This is further continued by the general interpretation Jesus puts upon His healing miracles as prophecies and pledges of the approaching Kingdom, in which all sin and death shall be done away with. With regard to the casting out of demons, the correctness of this view is vouched for by the explicit statement (Mat_12:28 = Luk_11:20). But it applies equally well to the other miracles of healing. Jesus did not look upon these as works of philanthropy merely, or as signs authenticating His mission primarily. While the latter was one of the purposes for which they were intended—and this is brought out prominently in the Fourth Gospel—in the Synoptics, where Jesus' teaching is centred in the Kingdom-idea, the miracles are before all else signs of the actual approach of the Kingdom,—proofs that the saving power of God, which calls the Kingdom into being, is already in motion, and therefore so many instances of σωζειν. Jesus' saving power is simply the Kingdom-power applied to the individual under the influence of sin and death. Thus only can we naturally explain the fact that, where 'salvation' has a direct religious reference, both in our Lord's own and in the later Apostolic teaching, the close connexion between it and the ideas of death and life is unmistakable. If this religious usage is at all dependent on the physical aspect of our Lord's saving activity, it can be only through the common element of victory over sin and death. Jesus Himself has sufficiently indicated the connexion between the two, both in the Synoptical sayings and in the Johannine discourses. In the former the physical evils, which the saving Kingdom-power removes, have a moral and spiritual background. Hence Jesus makes such physical salvation the occasion for suggesting and working the profounder change by which the bonds of sin are loosed, and the rule of God set up in the inner life of man. The external and the internal are significantly placed side by side as co-ordinated halves of an identical work (Mar_2:9). And in the Fourth Gospel we are explicitly told that the physical acts are intended to point to corresponding spiritual transactions; the healing of the blind, the raising of the dead, are symbolic of Jesus' saving work in the spiritual sphere (Joh_5:14; Joh_5:19-29; Joh_9:3; Joh_9:39; Joh_12:25-26). On three occasions our Lord has brought out the spiritual significance of the physical salvation by calling special attention to its dependence on the exercise of faith: the woman with the issue of blood (Mar_5:34 = Mat_9:22 = Luk_8:48), the blind man near Jericho (Mar_10:52 = Luk_18:42), one of the lepers (Luk_17:19). The words 'thy faith has saved thee' are on these occasions the same as were used in such a case of purely spiritual salvation as is recorded Luk_7:50. They were intended as a suggestion that faith, which had yielded such results in the physical sphere, could be made equally

fruitful in the sphere of spiritual salvation. Thus the external and internal are linked together by the common factor of faith.

That *σώζειν* has to do with the contrast of life and death becomes plain also from those instances of its natural use where deliverance from evil other than disease or demon-possession is referred to, for here everywhere the evil is that of physical death (Mat 8:25; Mat 14:30; Mat 16:25; Mat 27:40; Mat 27:42; Mat 27:9, Mar 8:35; Mar 15:30-31, Luk 9:24; Luk 9:56; Luk 23:35; Luk 23:37; Luk 23:39, Joh 12:27).

2. In connexion with the *directly religions use* in the Gospels several questions emerge. (1) Is the saving act, when belonging to the spiritual sphere, still viewed as a translation from death into life, and what is the meaning of death and life as related to salvation in this sphere? (2) Is the deliverance conceived eschatologically, as something to be experienced in the Last Day, or is it treated as an experience already attainable in this present life? (3) Is the conception negative or positive, or both negative and positive, *i.e.* does it express merely the removal of spiritual evil, or also the bestowal of positive spiritual blessings, especially the gift of life in a positive, pregnant sense?

(1) The answer to the first question is that spiritual salvation still revolves around the contrast between life and death, and that in a twofold sense. Both as subjective and as objective states, death and life come under consideration here. In other words: Jesus saves from spiritual death as a condition of the soul, and He saves from eternal death as a punishment awaiting the sinner. As the object of His saving activity, our Lord names τὸ ἀπολωλός 'that which has become lost and now is lost' (Mat 10:6; Mat 15:24; Mat 18:12-14, Luk 15:4; Luk 15:6; Luk 15:8; Luk 15:24; Luk 19:10). From the figures used it appears that the Gr. ἀπόλλυσθαι has in this connexion the sense 'miss,' 'be missing,' not primarily the sense 'destroy,' 'be destroyed.' The 'lost' are like sheep gone astray upon the mountains, like the coin slipped out of the hand of its owner, like the prodigal who has left the father's home. A lost condition means estrangement from God, a missing of all the religious and moral relations man is designed to sustain towards his Maker. But this lost condition is further identified by Jesus with spiritual death, for of the prodigal the father declares: 'This thy brother was dead and is alive again, and was lost and is found' (Luk 15:24; Luk 15:32). Elsewhere also the state of sin is described as a state of death (Mat 8:22, Luk 20:38). Salvation of 'the lost,' therefore, is salvation from spiritual death. As such it includes both forgiveness of sin and moral-religious renewal. To the woman who had anointed Him Jesus said: 'Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace,' and this obviously repeats in another form the preceding statement, 'Thy sins are forgiven' (Luk 7:48; Luk 7:50). In the case of Zaeedaeus also assurance of pardon is undoubtedly implied when Jesus declares 'salvation' to have come to his house (Luk 19:9). Here, however, the

salvation manifests itself also in the moral transformation of the publican, issuing directly into repentance and good works. The prodigal is pardoned and restored to the privileges of sonship. But salvation is not confined to deliverance from this subjective spiritual death, just as the conception of being 'lost' is not exhausted by estrangement from God. ἀπόλλυσθαι is used in a retributive sense in connexion with the judgment of God to which the sinner is subject; it involves exposure to objective death as a result of condemnation. With reference to this the two senses of the verb, 'to be missing' and 'to be destroyed,' are used side by side. From the point of view of man the judgment may bring a 'losing' or a 'finding,' 'keeping' of the soul or life (Mat 10:39; Mat 16:25, Mar 8:35, Luk 9:24-25; Luk 17:33, Joh 12:25). From the point of view of God as Judge it may bring 'destruction.' This is the ἀπώλεια, which is spoken of in Mat 5:30; Mat 7:13; Mat 10:28; Mat 18:14, Luk 13:3; Luk 13:5, Joh 3:15-16; Joh 6:39; Joh 10:28; Joh 17:12; Joh 18:9. The two aspects of ἀπόλλυσθαι—the subjective spiritual 'being lost' and the objective retributive 'being lost' or 'perishing'—are joined together in Mat 18:10-14, where first the sinning one is compared to a sheep gone astray and to be sought, and then, to give the motive for this search after the subjectively lost, Jesus adds: 'Even so it is not the will of your Father who is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish' (ἀπόληται); that which is already lost in the one sense must be diligently sought, lest it should be lost in the deeper, absolute sense. And the deliverance from this final ἀπώλεια, as well as the deliverance from the other lost condition, is σώζεσθαι, σωτηρία. Thus in Mar 16:16 'to be saved' is the opposite of 'to be condemned'; in Joh 3:16-17 of 'to be judged' and 'to perish,' in Joh 10:9-10 of 'to be destroyed,' in Joh 12:47 of 'to be judged.' This ἀπώλεια, however, not less than the other 'being lost,' is equivalent to death. It is a losing of the *life* (ψυχή, Mat 10:39; Mat 16:25, Mar 8:35, Luk 9:24-25, Joh 12:25); its opposite is 'to have eternal life' (Joh 3:16; Joh 10:28), or 'to be raised up at the last day' (Joh 6:39). Thus it appears that salvation in its special religious sense is still viewed throughout as a deliverance from death and an introduction into the sphere of life.

(2) The second question was whether 'salvation' is conceived eschatologically or as something experienced already in this present life. It has been answered in principle by the above, for present salvation coincides with deliverance from subjective spiritual death; eschatological salvation coincides with deliverance from objective death in the Judgment. In a number of the passages already considered the reference to the present is very plain. To the woman who anointed Him Jesus addressed the words, 'Thy faith has saved thee.' Of Zacchaeus He declared: 'To-day is salvation come to this house'; and in the following statement—'The Son of Man came to seek

and to save that which was lost,'—the 'saving' must belong to the same time as the 'seeking,' *i.e.* to the present time of our Lord's earthly ministry. In Joh 12:47 the saving of the world for which Jesus has come is a present thing as distinct from the judging of the world for which He has not come, but which is reserved for the future. In Mat 1:21 the sins of the people being the evil from which Jesus saves, the salvation is viewed as a present one. In other passages the eschatological reference is equally obvious. 'He that endures to the end shall be saved' (Mat 10:22; Mat 24:13). Mat 16:25, Mar 8:35, Luk 9:24 speak of the finding or saving of life in the future Judgment as conditioned by the willingness to sacrifice one's life here. This is clear from the context (Mar 8:38 in Mk., Mat 16:27 in Mt. = Luk 9:26 in Lk).

The point of the saying is not, as often interpreted, that for one *kind* of life, physical life, given up, another *kind* of life, spiritual life, will be received in return; in which case the future tenses might be purely logical, and no eschatological reference implied. The meaning is that for life, in its general sense, sacrificed by accepting physical death, life in the same general sense will be received in reward through the escape from death, when Jesus comes to judge and to render every man according to his deeds. As Zahn observes, the distinction between two kinds of 'life' or 'soul' is scarcely in harmony with the Hebrew point of view, according to which the 'life' or the 'soul' is frequently called 'the only one' (*Com. on Matthew, in loco*).

Eschatological is also the reference in the question of the disciples recorded in Mat 19:25, Mar 10:26, Luk 18:26. 'Then who can be saved?' The question was called forth by Jesus' declaration, that the rich would with great difficulty enter into the Kingdom of God, which was in turn called forth by the question of the rich young man, 'What shall I do, that I may inherit eternal life?' Here 'to be saved' = 'to enter the Kingdom' = 'to inherit eternal life,' and the qualification of life as *eternal*, as well as the further context,—St. Peter's question about future rewards, and our Lord's answer to this,—prove that the whole discussion is eschatological in its scope. Mat 24:22 || Mar 13:20 'Except these days had been shortened, no flesh would have been saved,' is best understood as follows: The temptation in these last times will be so severe, that, if their duration had not been kept within certain limits, all men, even the elect, would have fallen away, and so no flesh would have been ultimately saved in the Day of Judgment.

This interpretation seems to be required by the fact that the shortening of the days is for the sake of the elect. The mere preservation of physical life could have no special bearing upon the destiny of the elect, since, even when killed in the body, they would be sure to inherit the Kingdom; the whole representation concerning the possibility of none being saved, and the elect falling away and the shortening of the days, is, of course, conceived from the human point of view (cf. Zahn, *Com. on Matthew, in loco*).

In the remainder of the passages there are no means of determining whether 'salvation' be future or present. For Mat 18:11 (Textus Receptus only) the reference to the present is supported by Luk 19:10. In Luk 8:12 'that they may not believe and be saved,' the eschatological sense would be quite plausible, but the other view is slightly favoured by the general import of the parables dealing with the present invisible aspect of the Kingdom. In general, the representation of the Kingdom as both present and future creates a presumption in favour of the view that our Lord regarded salvation as both a present and an eschatological experience. The form σωζόμενοι, 'those who are being saved,' in Luk 13:23, probably reflects the two-sidedness of the process, as belonging to both present and future, and therefore unfinished in this life. In the case of the Johannine sayings (Joh 3:16-17; Joh 4:22; Joh 5:34; Joh 10:9) we shall have to assume, in harmony with the generalization of the conception of 'life,' 'eternal life,' in the discourses of this Gospel—which makes out of it a conception indifferent to the distinction between present and future—that the same will be true of the synonymous conception of salvation. The future in Joh 10:9 is purely logical in its force.

(3) The third question concerned what may be gathered from the Gospels in regard to the positive or negative context of the idea of religious salvation. The negative aspect—escape from death—stands in the foreground in Mat 24:22, Mar 13:20 : if the days had not been shortened, not even the elect would have escaped the fate of death in the Judgment; similarly in Mat 16:25, Mar 8:35, Luk 9:24 : he who will sacrifice his life here shall escape the loss of life in the Judgment. Probably Mat 10:22; Mat 24:13 should be interpreted on the same principle: the enduring now will save from greater calamity in the Last Day. On the other hand, in Mat 19:25, Mar 10:26, Luk 18:26, where 'salvation' is equivalent to entrance of the Kingdom and inheriting of eternal life, the emphasis rests on the positive side. In the Johannine passages the positive content of the idea is very marked. According to Joh 3:16-17, 'to have eternal life' and 'to be saved' are synonymous. In Joh 5:34 also the preceding context revolves around the idea of life (Joh 5:21-29), and in the sequel the same idea is again brought forward (Joh 5:39). Again, in Joh 10:9-10 'salvation' and 'life' appear in close conjunction; Joh 12:47 receives its interpretation from Joh 3:17. The same difference as is observable with reference to eschatological salvation may be observed where present salvation is spoken of. Sometimes the conception is negative (Mat 1:21, Luk 7:50), sometimes positive as well as negative (Luk 19:10); the salvation which came to Zacchaeus' house certainly included more than pardon, since it issued in renewal of life. The facts, therefore, do not bear out the contention of B. Weiss, who maintains that σωζεσθαι has everywhere a purely negative meaning.

In the saying of [Luk_19:10](#) Jesus declares 'saving' to be the highest category under which His Messianic activity is to be subsumed. He *came* to save, *i.e.* His entrance into the world was for this specific purpose (cf. [Mar_10:45](#)). The connexion between Him and salvation consists not merely in this, that as a preacher of the gospel He proclaims it. Everywhere the supposition is that salvation is in some way bound to His Person. For the Johannine discourses this needs no proof. But it is no less true for the Synoptics. Because He lodged with Zacchaeus, salvation entered the latter's house. The rich young man was not saved, because he refused to follow Jesus. The saving acts in the physical sphere are suspended on faith, and this faith involves trust in Jesus,—in Jesus, to be sure, as the instrument of God, but none the less so that on Jesus' Person together with God the act of faith terminates. It is psychologically inconceivable that in those who were helped by the miracles of Jesus, faith should not have assumed the form of personal trust in Him. Faith in God and faith in Jesus here inevitably coalesce. On the occasion of the storm, Jesus rebukes the disciples for their lack of confidence in His presence with them as a guarantee of absolute safety ([Mat_8:26](#)). Similarly Peter, when walking upon the water, calls upon Jesus to perform the saving act. From the close connexion in which these transactions stand to the specific religious salvation, it may be safely inferred that in the latter also Jesus occupies a necessary place. This is confirmed by [Luk_7:50](#), where the woman's faith, which is declared to have saved her, consists in the attitude of trust she had assumed towards Jesus; the love shown the Lord is here the result of the forgiveness of sins ([Luk_7:47](#)), and inasmuch as this love terminated on Jesus, the faith which conditioned the forgiveness must likewise have had Him for its object. Similarly in the discourse at Caesarea Philippi, 'salvation' in the Last Day is made dependent on following of Jesus and sacrifice of life for Jesus' sake and the gospel's sake, and the corresponding acknowledgment by Jesus in the Judgment ([Mar_8:34-35](#); [Mar_8:38](#) || [Mt.](#) and [Lk.](#)).

It is not true, as is being frequently asserted of late, that in the gospel preached by Jesus there is no place for His own Person, it being merely a gospel about God. Though not frequently in so many words, yet in acts we find our Lord seeking to cultivate a relationship of faith between the disciple and Himself and, in Himself, with God. If only once in the Synoptics we read explicitly of faith in Jesus ([Mat_8:10](#)), and that in a passage where the authenticity of the words $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\mu\varsigma$ is doubtful, this is counterbalanced by the fact that not more than once God Himself is specified as the object of faith ([Mar_11:22](#)). Jesus, conscious of being the Messiah, the Judge at the Last Day, who would finally dispose of the destiny of all mankind, could not help ascribing a central soteriological position to Himself. Such a figure as He was in His own view, could not be kept outside of the saving transaction, which in a certain sense forestalls the Last Judgment. The absence of more direct affirmations of this principle is simply the result of Jesus' method of not directly proclaiming at first His

Messianic dignity, but rather allowing it to be gradually inferred from the impression made by His Person and the witness of His works. On the basis of our present Gospels, apart from critical reconstructions of the teaching of Jesus, no other view is possible than that our Lord represented salvation as in some way bound to and wrapped up in His Person. He did not represent salvation as something unconditioned, flowing simply from the love of God, which would overleap every necessity of mediation. The parable of the Prodigal Son, so often quoted to the contrary, furnishes, when rightly read, the clearest demonstration of this, for it was spoken to describe not God's attitude towards sinners in the abstract, but the historic approach of God to lost men in the appearance of His Son Jesus. It was the attitude of *Jesus* towards publicans and sinners that drew forth the parable, and therefore it describes God's attitude towards them as bound to that assumed by Jesus (cf. Ernst Cremer, 'Die Gleichnisse Lukas 15 und das Kreuz' in *Beitr. z. Förder. Christl. Theol.* 1904, Heft 4). The gospel is not a mere announcement of the love of God unprecedented and unattended by any action on His part; it is the glad message of the love of God in action, of what God does in Jesus to give His love effect in actual, substantial salvation. The unfolding of what the Person of Jesus as the bearer and worker of salvation contains could not be fully given by our Lord before His saving work had actually transpired, but had to be left to Apostolic teaching.

3. Humanly considered, *salvation is dependent on faith*. This is not merely explicitly announced (Mar 16:16, Luk 8:12, Joh 3:16-17), it is likewise presupposed or expressed in connexion with the healing acts of Jesus. It is a striking fact that in the Synoptics nearly the whole of our Lord's teaching on faith attaches itself to the performance of miracles. This is because miracles embody that saving aspect of the Kingdom to which faith is the subjective counterpart. The miracles, almost without exception, have two features in common. *Firstly*, they are transactions in which the result depends absolutely on the forth-putting of the Divine supernatural powers, where no human effort could possibly contribute anything towards its accomplishment. And, *secondly*, the miracles are healing miracles, in which the gracious love of God approaches man for his salvation. Faith is the spiritual attitude called for by this twofold element in God's saving work. It is the recognition of the Divine power and grace,—not, of course, in a purely intellectual way, but practically so as to carry with it the movement of the whole inner life. How faith stands related to the saving power of God is most clearly illustrated in the narrative of Mar 9:17-24. "When the disciples could not heal the child with the dumb spirit, Jesus exclaimed, 'O unbelieving generation!' The father says, after describing the severity of the case: 'But if thou canst do anything, have compassion on us and help us.' To this Jesus replies: 'What, *if thou canst!* all things are possible to him that believeth.' Faith is omnipotent. To speak, with reference to it, of an 'if thou canst' is an absurdity. Thus to faith is ascribed what can be affirmed of God alone. And elsewhere also this same principle is emphasized by our Lord (Mat 21:21-22, Mar 11:22-23, Luk 17:6). The

explanation lies in this, that faith is nothing else than that act whereby man lays hold of, appropriates, the endless power of God. This line of reasoning, however, is not applicable to the miracles only. The miracles, as has been shown, illustrate the saving work of God in general. All salvation partakes, humanly speaking, of the nature of the impossible: it can be accomplished by God alone (Mat 19:25-26, Mar 10:26-27, Luk 18:26-27). All genuine saving faith is as profoundly conscious of its utter dependence on God for deliverance from sin and death as the recipients of our Lord's miraculous cures were convinced that God alone could heal their bodies from disease. Faith, however, is more than belief, more than a conviction regarding the necessity and sufficiency of the Divine power. It also involves trust, the reliance upon God's willingness and readiness to save. Jesus never encouraged the exercise of faith as a mere theoretical belief in supernatural power. The performance of a sign from heaven, such as men might have witnessed without trust in God or Himself, He persistently refused. He who truly believes, realizes that God is loving, merciful, forgiving, glad to receive sinners. Faith transfers to God in the matter of salvation what human parents experience in themselves with reference to their own children, the desire to help and supply (Mat 7:7-11). This reliance of faith is not confined to the critical moments of life; it is to be the abiding, characteristic disposition of the disciple with reference to his salvation as a whole. Faith, in those on whom the wonderful cures were wrought, may have manifested itself at first as a momentary act, but, as shown above, Jesus frequently called the attention of such people to what faith had done for them, thus suggesting that it was permanently available as an instrument of salvation.

4. In proper names, the conception of 'saving' occurs twice in the Gospels, namely, in the name *Jesus*, and in the exclamation *Hosanna*. A reflexion upon the meaning of the name *Joshua* is found also in Sir 46:1, and in Philo, who explains it by σωτηρια κυριου (*de Mut. Nom.* 21). The meaning of Mat 1:21 is not that Jesus will bear this name symbolically in illustration of the fact that 'Jehovah is salvation,' but rather that in Him Jehovah saves, or even, He is Jehovah who saves; for thus only can we satisfactorily explain the joining together of the two statements, 'Thou shalt call his name Jesus,' and 'for it is he that shall save his people from their sins.' It has been held that in the cry 'Hosanna,' raised by the people at Jesus' entrance into Jerusalem, and by the children in the Temple (Mat 21:9; Mat 21:15 ||), the original idea of 'saving' inherent in this word as an appeal to God to bestow salvation (Psa 118:25 'Save now, we beseech thee, Jehovah'), was no longer felt by the Evangelists, and the word meant with them simply a general shout of applause to the Messianic King, equivalent to 'Vivat' or the German 'Hoch.' Dalman (*Die Worte Jesu*, i. 180), who takes this view, couples with it the inference that the writer of the First Gospel was not a Hebraist, consequently not the Apostle Matthew, because no Hebraist could have thus misinterpreted a familiar form. He finds the same

misunderstanding in Mk. Both Evangelists, according to him, make the people use the shout in the sense which it bore to the early Church, ignorant of the *Hebrew* meaning. Dalman therefore assumes that what the people actually exclaimed was the simple ‘Hosanna,’ and that both ‘to the Son of David’ and ‘in the highest’ are unhistorical embellishments dependent on the Greek misinterpretation of the word. Zahn, on the other hand (Com. on Matthew, *in loco*), takes the view that to the common people of Jesus’ time, already the old meaning of the Hebrew form may have become obliterated, so that they already used it as a shout of applause for Jesus, in which case the Evangelists would be accurate in their report of the occurrence. But Zahn does not explain what meaning, on this view, the people could have attached to the words ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις, which in a shout addressed to Jesus would remain meaningless. In view of this, only two explanations seem possible. Either we may adhere to the older opinion that ὠσαννα is consciously addressed to God, ‘save now,’ and that τῷ υἱῷ Δαυειδ introduces Jesus as the object of the salvation invoked from God (יהושיע, as Dalman himself observes, being sometimes construed with ה of the object—Psa 72:4; Psa 116:6), and that ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις designates heaven as the place from which God is called upon to bless the Son of David. That for the expression of the latter idea ἐξ ὑψίστων would have been absolutely necessary can hardly be maintained. Or we may make a distinction between the two hosannas, assuming that the former is addressed to the Son of David, the latter to God, and both not as invocations, but as ascriptions of praise. This is suggested by Lk.’s version (Luk 19:38), which resolves the ὠσαννά ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις into the paraphrase ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνη, καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις. This would be a modification of Zahn’s view, preferable because it does not leave the ἐν ὑψίστοις unexplained.

5. To the foregoing may be added a rapid survey of the usage of σώζειν and σωτηρία in the remainder of the NT. ‘Salvation’ in connexion with healing, but at the same time projected into the specific religious sphere, reappears in Act 4:9; Act 4:12; Act 14:9. That the idea in the Apostolic teaching largely revolves around the contrast between life and death, is made abundantly plain by the following passages: Act 3:15; Act 5:30; Act 13:46-47, Rom 1:16-17, 1Co 5:5, 2Co 2:15-16; 2Co 7:10, Php 3:20, 2Ti 1:10, Tit 3:5, Heb 5:7, Jam 5:15; Jam 5:20, 1Pe 3:20-21. Where the saving act is referred to a definite point of time, this is most frequently the eschatological future (Rom 13:11, 1Co 3:15; 1Co 5:5, Php 1:28, 1Th 5:8, 2Th 2:13, Heb 1:14; Heb 2:10; Heb 9:28, Jam 5:20, 1Pe 1:5; 1Pe 1:9-10; 1Pe 4:18). Instances where salvation is made a matter of the past or present are Eph 2:5; Eph 2:8, 1Ti 2:4, 2Ti 1:9, Tit 3:5, Jam 1:21 (?), 1Pe 3:21, Jud 1:21. In many connexions,

however, it is not possible to determine whether the usage is eschatological or not (Rom 1:16; Rom 10:1, 2Co 7:10, Eph 1:13, Heb 2:3, Jam 2:16). For this peculiar indetermination of the idea the following passages are of interest: Act 2:47, 1Co 1:18; 1Co 15:2, 2Co 2:15, in all of which the present participle σωζόμενοι, ‘those who are being saved,’ is found (cf. with the past participle σεσωσμένοι, ‘those who have been and are saved,’ Eph 2:5). The negative aspect of the deliverance is on the whole not more prominent than the positive: Act 2:40 (from this crooked generation, *i.e.* from the judgment which will befall it), Rom 5:9 (from the eschatological wrath of God), Jam 5:20 (from death), Jud 1:23 (from the fire); and, on the other hand, Act 13:46-47 (eternal life), 2Co 2:15 (unto life), Php 3:20 (Saviour through the resurrection), Tit 3:5 (palingenesis), Heb 1:4 (inherit salvation), Heb 2:3 (so great a salvation), Heb 5:9 (eternal salvation), 1Pe 1:4-5 (inheritance = salvation), Rev 12:10 (salvation parallel with power and Kingdom), Rev 19:1 (salvation parallel with glory and power). In 2Ti 1:10 the negative and the positive side are named together: ‘our Saviour, who abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.’ Salvation from sin specifically appears in Rom 11:26 in a quotation from the LXX Septuagint of Isa 59:20.

6. It ought to be observed that σωτηρία in the NT relates to what is dogmatically called ‘the application of redemption’ in distinction from ‘the impetration of redemption,’ or the objective work of Christ. This is the natural result of its original eschatological significance, for what takes place in the end lies on the line of the subjective transformation of the believer.

The view has recently been advocated by Wendland (*ZNTW [Note: NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissen. schaft.]* v. [1904] 351) that the original background of the conception of σώζεσθαι is the rule and influence of evil spirits, of which death and disease would be only the peripheral manifestations. The facts cited above do not bear out this hypothesis, or even favour it. In the Gospels there is only one passage which applies σώζειν to the casting out of a demon (Luk 8:36). In all other cases of deliverance from demoniacal possession other expressions are used. It would be far more correct to say that sin and death lie at the centre, demoniacal influence, in the periphery of the conception. On the other hand, it creates an equally wrong distribution of the emphasis to conceive of our Lord’s σώζειν as in its primary aspect a species of ‘healing,’ and of Jesus Himself as chiefly a spiritual physician. Against Harnack, who in his work, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, goes too far in this direction, Wagner (*ZNTW [Note: NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissen. schaft.]* vi. [1905] 234, 235) well observes, that the NT writers do not, like the later Church Fathers, who stood under the influence of

the Stoic philosophy, view sin as a disease of the soul, but as a species of death, and that Jesus is to them far more than a physician, viz. One who leads from death to life.

Literature.—Cremer, *Lex. svv. σώζειν and σωτηρία*; the various handbooks on *OT and NT Theology*; Klaiber, *Die NT Lehre von der Sünde und Erlösung*, 1836; Titius, *Die NT Lehre von der Seligkeit*, 4 parts, 1895-1900; Klöpffer, *Der Brief d. ap. Paul. a.d. Philipper*, on 1:19, 28 (note) and 3:20, *Der Brief a.d. Epheser* on 2:5 and 5:23; Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen*, 1894, p. 47 ff.; Wobbermin, *Religionsgesch. Studien*, 105 ff.; Harnack, *Reden und Aufsätze*, 1899, 1900, i. pp. 301-311; Soltan, *Die Geburts-gesch. Jesu Christi*, 1902; Wendland, ‘Σωτήρ: Eine religionsgesch. Untersuchung’ in *ZNTW [Note: NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissen. schaft.]* v. [1904] p. 335 ff.; Wagner, ‘Ueber σώζειν und seine Derivata im NT,’ *ib.* vi. [1905] p. 205 ff.; Jeremias, *Babylonisches im NT*, 1905, pp. 27-46.

Geerhardus Vos.

☞ Samaria, Samaritans

SAMARIA, SAMARITANS

1. Description.—‘Samaria,’ originally the name of the city built by Omri (1Ki 16:24), became in a very short time a common name for the Northern kingdom (Amo 3:9, Jer 31:5, 2Ch 25:13); but during the Greek period it became limited to the province of Samaria, and so in NT times it is the designation of the district that lies between Galilee and Judaea (Joh 4:4). The limits and extent of the Samaritan territory varied from time to time (Josephus *Ant.* xii. iv. 1; 1Ma 11:34), and it is impossible to define with absolute certainty the boundaries in Gospel days. These, however, may be known generally. We learn that Ginea—the modern *Jenîn*—on the south edge of the plain of Esdraelon, was its northern boundary (*Ant.* xx. vi. 1); and this is confirmed by the fact that Caphar Outheni—now *Kefr Adan*—4 miles distant, was in Galilee (*M. Gittin* i. 5). The southern boundary is stated as ‘the Acrabbene toparchy’ (*BJ* iii. iii. 4), and a village named Anuath or Borkeas was on the border (*ib.*). As these have been identified with the modern villages of ‘*Akrabe* and *Berûkîn*, we conclude that this boundary ran westward to the Shephelah along Wady Ish‘âr. In that case it would then naturally run eastward to the Jordan down Wady Zamar. There seems, however, good reason to fix it farther north at this point, as Karn Sartabeh seems to have been in the hands of the Jews (*M. Rosh.* ii. 4), unless, indeed, it was a border hill accessible alike to Jews and Samaritans. This seems the more likely, as it was the only signalling station in the neighbourhood of Samaritan territory where false lights

could be kindled to deceive the Jews on the occasion of the new moons, and this the Samaritans are accused of having done (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Rosh. 22b* and margin). The eastern boundary was, of course, the Jordan, while the hill slopes towards the Shephelah constituted the western—the plain between Caphar Outheni and Antipatris being regarded as a heathen district (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Gittin 76a*). This gives us a territory of about 20 miles from north to south, and 30 from east to west.

The region consists of scattered mountain groups and rounded hills with plains between, the chief of these being Merj el-Mahna, to the east of Nâblus, Merj el-Ghuruk or the plain of Sanur (a lake in the winter and spring), and the plain of Dothan, which last opens into the plain of Esdraelon. Samaria presents a striking and beautiful contrast to Judaea with its barren hills. Here they are for the most part covered with fruit trees of every kind, chief among which are the olive, the fig, the mulberry, the orange, the apricot, and the pomegranate. On the Samaritan hills great flocks of sheep and goats find pasture. The whole country is studded with villages, and the fertile plains and valleys produce rich crops of grain. Only to the east, extending along the Jordan boundary, is the country rough and broken, and the mountains, which descend precipitously to the river, naked and barren; and this they have always been (*BJ iv. viii. 2*). The rest of the country is well watered everywhere, and in many places it is extremely beautiful. In the early centuries the gardens of Samaria (סבסטי פרדסות, *M. Erakhin iii. 2*) were famous, and to-day the fruit orchards and beautiful gardens of Jenîn are equally well known, while all must agree with Thomson (*LB [Note: The Land and the Book.] ii. 110*) when he says: 'One may be excused for becoming somewhat enthusiastic over this pretty vale of Nâblus, sparkling with fountains and streams, verdant with olive groves and fig orchards, interspersed with walnut, apple, apricot, orange, quince, pomegranate, and other trees and shrubs.' But, notwithstanding its superiority in richness and beauty to the south country, the Jews of the 1st cent, were very unwilling to admit that Samaria was part of the Holy Land. When they spoke of it they reckoned only the *three lands*,—Judaea, Galilee, and Peraea (*M. Shebhiith ix. 2*),—always omitting Samaria, as not being Jewish soil. But even the district we have described is not to be regarded as having been at any time fully occupied by the people we call Samaritans. The name was strictly limited to the religious sect, the metropolis of which was Shechem (*Ant. xi. viii. 6*). There, and in many of the towns and villages, they were numerous and strong, but almost everywhere there were also Grecian settlers, and with the city of Samaria itself the Samaritans had little or nothing to do.

2. History of the Samaritans in their relationship to the Jews.—Although the Samaritans claim descent from the patriarchs ([Joh 4:12](#)), and present us with an unbroken history, and although it is to some extent true that they represent the spirit

of the tribe of Ephraim (Renan, *Lang. Semit.* p. 230), we must date their characteristic existence as a people only from the time of their conflicts with Ezra and Nehemiah. We regard the Samaritan statement (*el-Tolidoth*), that 300,000 men besides women and children were brought back from captivity in the days of Sanballat, as baseless; but, on the other hand, when Israel was carried away captive, a remnant must have been left; and that such was the case we have abundant evidence (2Ki 23:17-20, Jer 41:5). Their appearance as a community dates only from the time of their mingling with the Assyrian colonists settled in the land, and it is from the leading party amongst these that they are frequently designated Cuthaeans (2Ki 17:24). There can be no question of the accuracy of the OT narrative of the originally mixed origin of the Samaritans, but repeated accessions from Judaism (Neh 13:28-29; *Ant.* xi. viii. 2 and 6), probably ultimately outnumbering the original colonists, and the manifest reversion to the pure Semitic type, induce us to believe that the existing Samaritan race has but little connexion with the old Turanian colonists, and is probably now of almost as pure Hebrew blood as the modern Jew.

For their rejection from all participation in the rebuilding of the Temple the Samaritans never forgave the Jews (Ezr 4:3-4, Neh 2:20), and for their attempted hindrance of that work the Jews bore the Samaritans no less a grudge. The breach became irrevocable when a rival priesthood and temple were set up on Gerizim. Jewish and Samaritan tradition agree as to the date of this event, which Josephus sets down wrongly in the time of Alexander the Great and Jaddua the high priest (b.c. 332)—one hundred years too late (*Ant.* xi viii. 2); but, though his account is clearly mixed with fable, there may still be some historical basis for the extra details he gives. About b.c. 200, during the weak rule of the high priest Onias ii. (d. b.c. 198), the Samaritans, being then in a flourishing condition, are accused of having harassed the Jews and carried away captives to serve as slaves (*Ant.* xii. iv. 1). In his account of Maccabaeian times Josephus continually accuses them of denying all kinship with the Jews, when they see them in suffering and difficulties, and of claiming to be Sidonians (*Ant.* xii. v. 5); but, on the contrary, when good fortune befalls the Jews, they claim to belong to that race, and to derive their descent from Joseph (*ib.* ix. xiv. 3, xi. viii. 6, xii. iv. 5). John Hyrcanus (c. [*Note: circa, about.*] b.c. 128) made an expedition against Samaria (*Ant.* xiii. x. 2). After repeated successes against their ally and protector Antiochus Cyzicenus, he took Samaria, ravaged the country, subdued the Cuthaeans who dwelt about the temple at Gerizim, and destroyed their temple (*Ant.* xiii. ix. 1). During the period of unrest that followed the deposition of Archelaus (a.d. 6), the Samaritans became so aggressive that they came privately into Jerusalem by night, and, when the gates of the Temple were opened just after midnight, they entered and scattered dead men's bodies in the cloisters to defile the Temple (*Ant.* xviii. ii. 1). Another incident is later recorded, which led to very serious consequences. A number of Galilaean pilgrims were attacked, and many killed, at Ginea (*Jenîn*), the first Samaritan village on the way (*Ant.* xx. vi. 1-3). This led to civil

war for a time, then to the intervention of the Roman authorities, and ultimately to a decision in favour of the Jews by Claudius himself (a.d. 51). At a still later period we find the Jews excluding the Samaritans, as also Christians and pagans, from Capernaum, Nazareth, and Sepphoris (Epiphanius, *adv. Haer.* i. 11). Nor was it only in Palestine that the jealousies continued to exist. Alexander and Ptolemy Lagi had taken many Jews and Samaritans to Egypt (*Ant.* xi. viii. 6), and there in Alexandria we read of rivalry and disorders between them (*Ant.* xii. i. 1), the disputes being, as usual, regarding the relative merits of Jerusalem and Gerizim.

Jewish literature is full of manifestations of the same spirit. Ben Sira speaks of 'the foolish folk that dwell at Shechem,' and characterizes them as 'no nation' (*Sir* 50:25-26). Josephus invariably calls them 'Cuthaeans,' and will not admit—except sometimes for a purpose—that they are of Hebrew blood. The Rabbis, though hesitating to call them 'Gentiles,' use the same name. Regarding their food, we read: Let no man eat the bread of the Cuthaeans: for he that eateth their bread is as he that eateth swine's flesh' (*M. Shebhiith* viii. 10; *Bab.* [Note: Babylonian.] *Kidd.* 76a). In the matter of gifts and offerings to the Temple, including the half-shekel, the Samaritan was put on the same footing as slaves and heathen (*M. Ab. Zar.* i. 5: *Jerus.* [Note: Jerusalem.] *Ab. Zar.* i. 4). If a Samaritan were witness to a bill of divorce, that in itself made the document invalid (*M. Gittin* i. 5). Rabban Gamaliel, quite in keeping with the liberal spirit he always shows (cf. *Act* 5:38), was, however, inclined to accept such testimony, and at a later period we occasionally meet with a less bitter tone; for, while some of the Rabbis, remembering *2Ki* 17:25; *2Ki* 17:28, called them 'proselytes of the lions,' Rabbi 'Akiba was ready to recognize them as true proselytes (*Bab.* [Note: Babylonian.] *Kidd.* 7:5b), while others said it was permitted to have dealings with one who became a true proselyte (*Jerus.* [Note: Jerusalem.] *Shek.* i. 4). Samaritan wine was universally condemned, but 'the victuals of the Cuthaeans are permitted if not mixed with wine or vinegar' (*Jerus.* [Note: Jerusalem.] *Ab. Zar.* v. 4); and the unleavened bread of the Cuthaeans is permitted (*Bab.* [Note: Babylonian.] *Kidd.* 76a). Although Samaria is not part of Israel, 'the land, the roads, the wells, and the dwellings of the Cuthaeans are clean' (*Jerus.* [Note: Jerusalem.] *Ab. Zar.* v. 4). An Israelite might circumcise a Cuthaeon, but the contrary was not permitted, as it might then be done in the name of Gerizim (*Jerus.* [Note: Jerusalem.] *Jebamoth* vii. 1). It was permitted to add 'Amen' to a blessing asked by a Cuthaeon, but only after hearing the whole blessing (*M. Ber.* viii. 8). Meat slaughtered by a Cuthaeon is allowed if an Israelite is present, or if the Samaritan himself eats from it (*Bab.* [Note: Babylonian.] *Cholin* 3b). Samaritan literature is, on the whole, less aggressive; but that arises from the fact that we have less of it, and the greater necessity the Samaritan had to stand on the defensive. Still, in every proof they bring forward in favour of their sanctuary as the *one* holy place, there is implied or expressed the idea that the Jew is schismatical, if not heretical. They use the designation 'Israelite' for themselves alone, and refuse it to the Jews. Still, they have

no objection to be called 'Samaritans,' which they write שומרי or שומרים—'Guardians of the Law.' (See Letter to Ludolf). They have an intense dislike to Jerusalem, and the bitterness of their hate culminates in their play upon its name, when they describe the Jews as שלם אדורי—'accursed to perfection' or 'perfectly cursed' (*el-Tolidoth*). The more moderate attitude of which we have spoken seems to have been, on the whole, later than the days of the Gospels, and may have been caused by the Samaritans having made common cause with the Jews against Vespasian (*BJ* iii. vii. 32). At that time they shared in the Dispersion, and their synagogues were then to be found in Egypt and Rome. At the present moment the relationship between the two races is no closer than in the past. Some twenty years ago, the Samaritans, fearing the extinction of their sect, sought to arrange for intermarriage with the Jews, but this was refused.

3. Religion.—The basis of the Samaritan religion is the Pentateuch, as they read and understand it; and to this they have been as loyal as the Jews to their Law. Since long before the Christian era they have been strongly monotheistic. Not only are they the enemies or images and every visible representation of the Deity, but they have ever resented as strongly as do the Jewish Targums every anthropomorphic representation of God; and, so far as we can judge, they have made no concessions to heathenism. They were, indeed, accused by the Rabbis of worshipping a dove on Gerizim (*Cholin* 6a), and also of worshipping the idols Jacob buried (*Gen* 35:4) under the oak of Moreh (*Ber. Rab.* § 81); but these were malicious falsehoods. From the Jewish point of view another offence against the Law was that they pronounced the Sacred Name—*Jahweh*—with its own vowels (Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] *Sanh.* x. 1; Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Sanh.* 90). Theodoret seems to confirm this, and tells us that their pronunciation was Ἰαβὲ (β = v, as in mod. Greek)—a point of interest is that scholars for grammatical reasons pronounce it in the same manner. For some centuries, however, they have been accustomed to pronounce it *Shima* ('the name'), just as the Jews use *hasshem* in conversation (Letter to Ludolf). In the matter of their ritual orthodoxy we have even the testimony of Josephus; for, when he tells of Jewish fugitives accused of ritual irregularities being received by the Samaritans, he adds that they complained of being falsely accused (*Ant.* xi. viii. 7). To this we may add the remarkable confession of Rabban Simeon, the son of Gamaliel, who says: 'Every command which the Cuthaeans keep they observe more strictly than the Israelites' (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Cholin* 4a). They practise circumcision, and keep the Law strictly. They observe all the Mosaic feasts; and, in accordance with their reading of the Law, they go three times a year to Gerizim for the feasts of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles, and at such times practically the whole community lives in the mountain. Only at the Passover season, however, do they offer sacrifices, and, as the arrangements at that time bring before us much more vividly the occasion of the

institution of that feast than the calm order of the Jewish ritual, it claims our attention. The usual order is that seven days before the Passover the whole community camps out on the top of Gerizim in the neighbourhood of the sacred rock, which they regard as the site of their ancient temple. On the evening of the 14th Nisan the whole congregation assembles, and the high priest reads the words of institution in Exo 12:1-12. Precisely at sunset, as he concludes the sixth verse, a sufficient number of lambs for the community is slain by men dressed in white clothing. Each member of the congregation then marks his forehead with the blood. The wool is removed by scalding with boiling water previously made ready. The bodies are now examined, to make sure that there is no blemish, and thereafter they are spitted and roasted in a pit arranged as an oven. An hour or two later, when they are sufficiently cooked, the Samaritans *standing*, eat *in haste* with their *loins girded*, with *shoes on their feet*, and with *staff in hand*. All that remains, together with the right shoulders and hamstrings previously removed, is carefully gathered up and burned in the night. Early on the morning of the fifteenth day they all return to their duties in the town.

In accordance with the Law, the levirate marriage is practised; but with the difference, that it is not the brother, but the nearest friend that takes his wife. As among the Sephardic Jews also, a second wife is allowed during the life of the first when she has had no children.

Beyond these things their religious ideas are vague. The Pentateuch is their sole canonical book, and beyond its life they never seem to have passed. They were never called upon to go through a stirring national crisis, like the Jews during the Maccabean times, and so they never rose to the same vigour and intellectual life. The written sources of their dogma are late, but from these and from Jewish sidelights we can learn something. It is discussed in the Talmud as to whether they are to be classed with the Sadducees in belief, and the Jews seem to have had some ground for thinking so, for they are represented as saying that 'no resurrection is recorded in the Law' (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Sanh.* 90b). Still, the modern Samaritan believes in a resurrection, in the distinction between good and evil spirits, in a judgment, and in the creation from nothing. It is to be remarked, however, that Arabic writers in the Middle Ages tell us of Samaritan sects professing the distinctive beliefs of both Pharisees and Sadducees, so that the opinions of both parties must have been held by individuals at an earlier date. In Joh 4:25 we find that the woman of Samaria looked forward to the coming of a prophet whom she, like the Jews, designated 'the Messiah.' That this word should have been used by her has been regarded as peculiar, since it does not occur in the Law, but in the 1st cent. we find Samaritans familiar with and quoting the prophets (*Mid. Debar.* § 3); and, besides, we must see that it would be impossible for a faith like theirs, continually under the pressure of a foreign bondage, to survive without absorbing many of the elements of

Jewish eschatology; and of these the Messianic idea was the most widely spread in the 1st cent., so much so that it was hardly possible for even the Samaritans to escape its influence. It was doubtless in connexion with such a hope that the prophet arose, and tumults occurred which were put down by Pilate, causing him finally the loss of his office (*Ant.* xviii. iv. 1); as it also led Simon Magus to give himself out as some great one (*Act* 8:9). When the Messianic idea took final form, they expected the Messiah's coming in the year 6000 a.m., but did not think that he should be greater than Moses. Whether he should be of the tribe of Joseph does not appear, but they denied the application of *Gen* 49:10 (where their reading varies from the Massoretic Text) as proof that he should spring from Judah. From the Jews they adopted the synagogue system; and, apart from the feast days kept on Gerizim, all their worship is conducted in *Kenîset es-Sâmiré*, the synagogue of the Samaritans, in the S.W. of the town (Nâblus). The high priest, who is said to be of the tribe of Levi, conducts their services, and, according to the Law, he receives tithes from his people.

4. Literature.—The most ancient and important document the Samaritans possess is the (Hebrew-) Samaritan Pentateuch; and this they seem to have become possessed of at a very early date—indeed, before the Babylonian (אשורִי) alphabet had supplanted the older Hebrew, for, like all the later books of this people, it is written in a character that is now peculiar to them,—the Samaritan alphabet,—but which in itself is nothing more or less than a cursive form of the old lapidary script of Hebrew, Phœnician, and Moabite. Another testimony to their early reception of the Torah is that it is not divided into *parâshahs* like the Massoretic Text , but, on a totally different principle, independent alike of the Rabbis and the Alexandrian critics, into *ketzîn*. These number in all 962, Genesis containing 250, Exodus 200, Leviticus 134, Numbers 218, and Deuteronomy 160. While the language of this recension of the Pentateuch is Hebrew, it supports in the matter of various readings rather the LXX Septuagint than the Massoretic Text , the number of agreements being not less than 2000, while in the ages of the patriarchs it differs from both the LXX Septuagint and the Massoretic Text . But more to be considered than all these taken together are *certain variations* that have had an important hearing on their religion. The Jews were wont to accuse the Samaritans of having corrupted the Law; and the charge was well founded. In *Deu* 27:4 (cf. also v. 7) we find the substitution of 'Gerizim' for 'Ebal,' and at the close of the Decalogue in both *Exo* 20:17 and *Deu* 5:21 a long passage is inserted—

'And it shall be when the Lord thy God shall bring thee into the land of the Canaanite, whither thou goest in to possess it, thou shalt set up for thyself great stones, and thou shalt plaster them with lime, and thou shalt write upon the stones all the words of this law; and it shall be when ye pass over Jordan, ye shall set up these stones, which I command you this day, on Mount Gerizim, and thou shalt build there an altar to the

Lord thy God, and thou shalt offer upon it sacrifices to the Lord thy God, and thou shalt offer peace-offerings, and thou shalt eat there, and rejoice before the Lord thy God. That mountain is beyond Jordan after the way from the rising of the sun, in the land of the Canaanite, who dwelleth in the West, over against Gilgal, near by the oak of Moreh, over against Shechem.'

This, according to the Samaritan division of the Decalogue, was reckoned the *Tenth Commandment*, and, like the others, of perpetual obligation, so that the Samaritans regarded not only the Temple at Jerusalem, but also the tabernacle at Shiloh, though in Ephraim, and the whole Jewish priesthood after the settlement of the land, as schismatical.

Other books of the OT they do not consider canonical. They do, indeed, have a deep veneration for Job and the Psalms, and they read Joshua and Judges, but they are all regarded as apocryphal.

The synagogue system, which among the Jews led to the formation of the Targums, was also the means of producing an Aramaic-Samaritan Pentateuch (שמרוני תרגום), which, however, Nöldeke dates at not earlier than the 4th cent., though it may contain earlier elements; and in favour of this it is to be noted that in general it agrees with τὸ Σαμαρειτικόν of Origen. It closely represents the Heb.-Sam. [Note: Samaritan.] Pentateuch, and in language it differs but little from the Palestinian Aramaic.

Their later works consist of material directly connected with their religion and life as a people. They possess over a dozen volumes, mostly unpublished, which they designate *Tarteel* ('chanting'). These are in Hebrew mixed with Aramaic, and contain the services for the various seasons of the year, and they are probably ancient. Another dozen volumes are made up of commentaries on various portions of the Pentateuch text; and, although these also are written in Hebrew, they are usually accompanied by an Arabic translation. The best known Samaritan commentary is that of Markah, which was published in Europe by Heidenheim in 1896. The author probably lived in the 4th century. In addition to these they possess a few historical works:—*Kitab es-Satir*, a history of the period from Adam to Moses; *et-Tabakh*, an account of judgments which befell the Jews; the Book of Joshua (in Arabic, but probably in parts from a Heb. original), which closely follows the canonical Joshua, but has many apocryphal additions and eight concluding chapters, bringing the history down to the time of Alexander Severus; Chronicle of Abul-Fath; *el-Tolidoth*, a short Hebrew history from Adam till the present high priest, accompanied by an Arabic translation.

So far as Manuscripts are concerned, the only one that, on account of its antiquity, merits our consideration is the jealously guarded Pentateuch roll in Nâblus. It is preserved in a covering of crimson satin in a silver case engraved with a plan of the tabernacle. The roll itself is written on parchment much discoloured by age. The Samaritans claim that it was written by Abishua the son of Phineas, thirteen years after the settlement of the land; but this is incredible, though they show an acrostic made by the thickening of certain letters in the roll itself as proof. Socin thinks it may belong to the 6th cent.; but other scholars with whom the present writer has discussed the question, would carry its date back even to a short time before the Christian era, so that there is a bare possibility of its having been in use when Christ passed through the streets of Shechem: like ordinary synagogue rolls, the MS is written in columns. These are 7 in. wide, and contain 70 to 72 lines. The writing is small, and the letters are of the oldest Samaritan type.

Samaritan books are all un-vowelled, and in their pronunciation of both Hebrew and Aramaic this people differs widely from the Jews and Syrians. The gutturals, which the Galilaeans confounded with one another, are altogether omitted by the Samaritans. The vowel system also at first sight seems to have nothing in common with the Massoretic pronunciation, so much so that a recent writer on the subject expresses the opinion that 'it follows certain laws of language as yet unknown to us' (Rosenberg's *Lehrbuch*, p. 11). However, when we come to compare the modern Samaritan pronunciation of both Hebrew and Aramaic with that of the Jews and the Syrians, we see that the former in nearly every detail bears to the latter the same relationship as the vulgar Palestinian Arabic dialects bear to the older classical speech. It thus appears that, in the absence of vowels to preserve the memory of the sounds when Arabic supplanted these languages as the colloquial, and in the absence of any formulated grammar till the year 1400, the Samaritan pronunciation was allowed to go through the same processes of decay as the common sister Semitic dialects on the same soil. A careful consideration of these processes enables us to produce the Samaritan as a valuable testimony to the general accuracy of the Massoretic pointing; while, if we read the Samaritan Targum with the pointing of Onkelos, we shall attain to a very close approximation to the speech of Christ with the woman of Samaria and with the people of Sychar.

5. Relationship of Christ to the Samaritans.—To understand even imperfectly the beauty and tenderness of the attitude of Jesus to this despised race, we must remember that His ministry occurred during the period when the separation of Jew and Samaritan was most absolute, and the bitterness of feeling most intense. Yet they were invariably treated with respect and forbearance by Christ, as also by His Apostles after the Resurrection; and just as His gentleness won the affection and gained the gratitude of publicans and sinners, so also did His treatment of the Samaritans. It was the one Samaritan and not the nine Jews who returned to give

thanks (Luk 17:16), and who was contented to wait for the official verdict, and the freedom it would bring, that he might continue in the company of Jesus; and all that is related of the conversation at the well, and of the relations with the villagers of Sychar, reveals the same attractiveness and consideration. True it is that at the beginning of His ministry, and when sending out the Twelve, He directed them not to enter into 'any city of the Samaritans' (Mat 10:5); but we can well understand the reason for that, when we see that not even the *inner circle* of the Twelve sufficiently understood the nature of the gospel to be entrusted with such a mission (Luk 9:54). We must also bear in mind that Samaria was designated by our Lord as the first circuit, beyond Judaea proper, that He meant to receive the gospel message. In the parable of the Good Samaritan, too (Luk 10:25-37), He has taken and ennobled that name which till His time was almost a synonym for devil (Joh 8:48), and which no self-respecting Jew would pronounce—even the lawyer evading it (Luk 10:37) when forced to confess that he 'showed mercy on him.' In view of such feelings between the two peoples, it would have been, in any mere man, an act of almost unpardonable rashness to have depicted to a Jewish audience the Samaritan as an example of noble generosity and of disinterested neighbourliness; and not only is this what Christ does, but He goes much further. Priest and Levite are put into the balance and outweighed by this wayfaring stranger, and every later point in the picture is incalculably in favour of the Samaritan. He is in the country of the Jews, in a place of bad repute—*Tala'at ed-dam*, the Ascent of Blood,—in danger from the Jewish people—robbers, friends of the man assisted,—even of insult and rejection by the khan-keeper, and of perhaps being taken and treated as the robber himself. He had every reason for excusing himself. He and his provisions, especially the wine, were impure, and there was every prospect that it would be an ungrateful task. What must we think of the Lord Jesus Christ, who, in opposition to every racial prejudice and purely human feeling, depicts with such beauty the hated Cuthaeon, and that just after He had been rejected (Luk 9:52-54) by the Samaritans in such a manner that the hearts of His disciples were filled with bitter indignation? Controlled by circumstances, or a product of the age in which He lived, could He have risen to this?

See also Gerizim, Jacob's Well, Sychar.

Literature.—*Samaritan Pentateuch*, London and Paris Polyglotts; Blayney, Oxford, 1790; Petermann-Vollers, *Pentateuchus Samaritanus*, Berlin, 1872-89; *Samaritan Grammar*, Brüll, Frankfurt a. M. 1873-76; Nicholl's *Samaritan Grammar*, London, 1858 (pedantic); Petermann, 'Linguae Samaritanae Grammatica,' etc., in *Porta Linguarum Orientalium* series; Rosenberg, 'Lehrbuch' in Hartleben's *Bibliothek der Sprachenkunde* (a compilation, but good); Castelli, *Lex. Heptaglotton*, 1669; Gesenius, *De Pentateuchi Samaritani origine, indole, et auctoritate*, Halle, 1824; Grimm, *Die Samaritaner*, München, 1854; Mills, *Nablus and the Modern Samaritans*, 1864; Kohn, *Samaritanische Studien*, Breslau, 1868, also *Zur Sprache, Litteratur u.*

Dogma der Samaritaner, Leipzig, 1876; Nutt, *A Sketch of Samaritan History, Literature, and Dogma*, London, 1874; Brüll, *Zur Gesch. u. Lit. der Samaritaner*, Frankfurt, 1876; Herdenheim, *Bibliotheca Samaritana*; Rappoport, *La Liturgie Samaritaine*, 1901; Montgomery, *The Samaritans*, 1907

Wm. M. Christie.

☞ Samaritan, The Good

SAMARITAN, THE GOOD (Luk 10:25-37).—Jesus had bidden His last farewell to Galilee, and was travelling to Jerusalem (Luk 9:51). He had passed through Samaria and reached Judaea, and in some town on the route, probably Jericho, He visited the synagogue,* [Note: The scene was evidently a synagogue, since His hearers were seated (cf. v. 25).] as He was wont (cf. Luk 4:16), and discoursed to the congregation. It was customary for the hearers, when the preacher had concluded, to ask him questions,† [Note: Lightfoot and Wetstein on Mat 4:23.] and so it happened on this occasion. One of those whose business was the interpretation of the sacred Law, rose and asked, ‘Teacher, what shall I do to inherit “eternal life”?’ He was no anxious inquirer. He thought to display his superior knowledge, and humble Jesus before the congregation; and his question was a foretaste of the dialectical warfare which awaited Jesus in Jerusalem, and which reached its climax in that succession of encounters with the rulers in the Temple court during the Passion week. Nor was Jesus deceived. ‘What stands written in the Law?’ He asked, ‘how readest thou?’ Glad to display his theological proficiency, the lawyer glibly replied, ‘Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole strength, and with thy whole mind, and thy neighbour as thyself.’ Jesus accepted the answer: ‘Thou hast answered rightly. This do, and thou shalt live.’ The lawyer was an astute controversialist, and he perceived a new opening for disputation. ‘Neighbour’ was defined both by the Law and by the Rabbis as a fellow-Israelite, ‘a son of thy people,’‡ [Note: Lev 19:18; Lightfoot on Luk 10:29.] and he expected that Jesus would give the word a larger significance, thus exposing Himself to a charge of heresy. He clutched at the opportunity. ‘And who,’ he asked, ‘is my “neighbour”?’ Jesus answered with a parable.

The road from Jericho to Jerusalem had a very evil reputation. It wound up barren and rugged hills, infested by brigands, who assailed travellers, robbing and sometimes murdering them; and from those deeds of violence it derived a ghastly name—the Ascent of Blood.§ [Note: Jos 15:7. Jerome, Ep. xxvii, ad Eustoch. Virg.: ‘Locum Adomim, quod interpretatur sanguinum, quia multus in eo sanguis crebris latronum fundebatur incursibus’; on Jer 3:2 : ‘Arabas, quae gens latrociniis dedita usque hodie

incursat terminos Palaeestinae et descendentibus de Hierusalem in Hiericho obsidet vias.’ Hence, probably, the two brigands who were crucified with Jesus. Cf. Lightfoot on Luk_10:30; G. A. Smith, HGHL p. 265.] It was much frequented. It was the highway between the capital and the prosperous City or Palm-trees; and, moreover, since half of the officiating ‘course’ lodged at Jericho, where provision was abundant, || [Note: | Lightfoot on Luk_10:30.] there were continually priests and Levites passing to and fro. Jesus told how a man, travelling down the Ascent of Blood, was set upon by brigands, plundered, maltreated, and left half-dead. Presently a priest came down the road, and, when he spied the wretch, he ‘passed by on the other side.’ Next came a Levite, and he behaved with like inhumanity. Then came one riding on an ass, a merchant probably, who often passed that way in the prosecution of his business. ¶ [Note: He was known to the innkeeper, and had good credit (cf. Luk_10:35).] Since the holy men had ‘passed by on the other side,’ it would have been no marvel had he done the like, especially since he was a Samaritan, one of that hated race with which the Jews had no dealings. But he was moved by the piteous spectacle, and, dismounting, he dressed the sufferer’s wounds, according to the medical prescription of that day, with oil and wine; ** [Note: * Cf. Wetstein.] then he mounted him on his beast, and conveyed him to an inn and tended him. Those offices of humanity detained him from his journey, and he rose betimes ‘toward the morrow’ (ἐπὶ τὴν αὔριον), to push forward. But ere he set out he handed the host two *denarii*, and bade him see to the unfortunate man until he should be fit for the road. Since a *denarius* was a day’s wage, * [Note: For a vinedresser (Mat_20:1-16); for a Roman soldier (Tac. Ann. i. 17).] the two would probably suffice; but in case of need he enjoined that no expense be spared, undertaking to settle the account on his return journey.

‘Which of these three,’ says Jesus, ‘seemeth to thee to have proved “neighbour” to the man that fell in with the brigands?’ Only one answer was possible. The lawyer should have replied, ‘The Samaritan’; but he could not endure to utter the odious name, and he reluctantly faltered out, ‘The one that took pity on him.’ ‘Go thy way,’ said Jesus; ‘do thou also likewise.’ It was a masterpiece of dialectic. He had avoided entanglement in an unprofitable and perilous controversy, and had forced His adversary to pronounce judgment on himself. See also art. Neighbour.

Literature.—The standard *Comm.*; the works of Trench, Bruce, Dods, and Taylor on the Parables; Edersheim, *Life and Times*, ii. 234 ff.; Vinet, *Vital Christianity*, p. 508 ff.; *Expositor*, 1. vi. [1877] 186 ff.

David Smith.

☩ Sanctify, Sanctification

SANCTIFY, SANCTIFICATION.—Sanctification is the translation of ἁγιασμός, which is one of the group of words that includes ἅγιος, and ἁγιάζω, and ἁγιωσύνη. The root idea of the group seems to be ‘separation’ or ‘restricted use’ (see Holiness). ἁγιασμός denotes primarily a process; but in NT it is used also to describe the state resulting from that process. This wider usage is familiar in our language, and therefore we take ‘sanctification’ to describe both a state and a process. It is the process by which men are made holy, and it is also the state into which men pass as they become holy. Therefore this article must discuss what state is considered by Jesus Christ to deserve the name ‘sanctification,’ and what is the process whereby He conceives men are sanctified.

The first fact to be noticed about this entire group of words is that it occupies a meagre place in the teaching of Jesus. The number of times when either of them is put into His lips is very small, and none of these few usages refers to man. ἅγιος is used as follows: He addresses God as ‘Holy Father’ (Joh 17:11); He speaks of ‘the holy angels’ (Mar 8:38 ||); He uses the name ‘Holy Spirit’ (Mat 12:32 || Mat 28:19, Mar 12:36; Mar 13:11, Luk 12:12, Joh 14:26; Joh 20:22); He warns against giving ‘that which is holy’ unto the dogs (Mat 7:6); and He refers to the abomination that stands ‘in the holy place’ (Mat 24:15). ἁγιάζω is used of ‘the temple that sanctifieth the gift’ (Mat 23:17; Mat 23:19); and there are three very important usages in Joh 10:36; Joh 17:17; Joh 17:19. It occurs also in the Lord’s Prayer in the sentence, ‘Hallowed be thy name’ (Mat 6:9). This petition suggests that both the ceremonial and ethical aspects of the word were present to our Lord’s mind. The ‘name’ of the Father is to be revered. It casts awe upon the worshipping soul. But also the name stands for righteousness. It is a name whose ethical splendour must not be smirched. The same double reference can be traced in His usage of ἅγιος. When Jesus employs these words, He seems to give them their true historical sense as implying (1) a state of consecration to the Divine purposes, and (2) a state of ethical holiness.

ἁγιασμός, the NT word for ‘sanctification,’ does not occur at all in the recorded sayings of Jesus. But He was constantly speaking about the thing itself. Therefore we are constrained to recognize some special significance in the absence of the familiar words from the Lord’s teaching. Probably the explanation is found in the state of religious feeling in His day. ἅγιος is the nearest Greek equivalent of the Hebrew שִׁדְדָה. This term, with its kindred terms, had acquired a distinct connotation. It has been

pointed out that the idea of holiness in OT is progressively spiritualized, and receives more and more ethical content. But whilst this is true of OT usage, the Greek period in Jewish history had ushered in a time of reaction in the significance of religious terms. The struggle of pious Jews to resist Hellenizing tendencies threw the emphasis of religion upon keeping the Law. Thus arose the Pharisaic interpretation of piety as rigid obedience to the Law. Under this influence holiness was again interpreted ceremonially instead of morally. When Jesus was born, the religious phraseology of the day was legal rather than ethical. Now this conception of sanctification was the subject of unsparing denunciation by Jesus. One long chapter in Matthew's Gospel gathers up seathing rebukes of those who put the emphasis of religion upon what is external (Mat 23:1-36; cf. Luk 11:39-52). In the Sermon on the Mount He said: 'Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter the kingdom of heaven' (Mat 5:20). So that, if Jesus had used the current terms, He would have been understood in the current sense. In order to secure new moral contents for the terms, He had to drop them, and to use other phraseology to describe their true meaning.

A further explanation of the absence of the familiar terms is found in Jesus' method of teaching. His teaching was not doctrinal. He did not express His ideals in formulas, but in pictures of what men ought to be. Instead of reiterating familiar maxims, He minted new precepts for men's daily use. Neglecting the outworn dogmas of the scribes, He uttered sharp calls to men as to what they ought to do. His teaching was 'new,' and was 'with authority' (Mar 1:22; Mar 1:27). When we turn to the Epistles, we discover that, though the familiar terms reappear, they reappear in a new form. They have no longer the Pharisaic connotation. They have a new Christian connotation, which lifts them above the highest ethical attainment of OT. The NT writers use OT words with the significance that Jesus Christ has given to the idea they represent.

1. Christ's teaching about sanctification.

i. *His teaching about the ideal of sainthood.*—Jesus Christ's conception of sanctification started from the holiness of God the Father. He found certain attributes in God that are capable of being the ideal for men. These attributes belong to the Fatherhood of God. He summed up many exhortations in the words, 'Be ye therefore perfect, even as your heavenly Father is perfect' (Mat 5:48). This command held out a new ideal of perfection. Hitherto men had found their ideal in various human excellences. Jesus fixed attention upon God the Father. There are many Divine attributes that are inaccessible to men. No man can be perfect even as God is perfect. The omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence of God are absolutely beyond human reach. But as 'Father,' God displays certain qualities that may be copied by men; and these qualities unite to form the Christian ideal. Such teaching

rested upon the underlying belief of Jesus that man has a capacity for sonship of God, and that he reaches his ideal by realizing his sonship. And Jesus could conceive sonship only in the ethical realm. To give men power to become children of God, is to make them resemble their Father ethically (Joh 1:12).

The details of the teaching may be summarized conveniently under some of the leading categories of thought used by Jesus:—

(1) *His own example*. He claimed to set forth the moral ideal, because He was the Son of God (Joh 14:6). As the Son, He revealed the Father (Mat 11:27, Joh 14:9-10); therefore the children of God are those who resemble Him (Mat 11:29). The imitation of Christ is the true sanctification.

(2) *Love*. The central and all-pervading glory of the Divine Fatherhood is love (Mat 5:45, Joh 14:21; Joh 14:23). The Apostolic phrase ‘God is love’ (1Jn 4:8) sums up the irresistible testimony of Jesus to the Father (cf. 1Jn 3:1; 1Jn 4:9-10, Joh 3:16). Therefore holy people must be loving. The first demand is for love towards God. To ‘love the Lord’ is the greatest commandment (Mat 22:37 ||). The character that lacks this devoted love for the heavenly Father is fatally defective. But Jesus bracketed the commandment to ‘love thy neighbour as thyself’ with this ‘first and greatest’ (Mat 22:39 ||); and the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luk 10:25-37) has been interpreted as teaching that ‘charity is the true sanctity’ (Bruce). Likeness to the heavenly Father is impossible without the cultivation of a loving spirit (Mat 5:43-48, Luk 15:25-32). This love must be unselfish (Luk 14:13-14). It must forgive freely and unweariedly (Mat 18:21-22). It must not judge (Mat 7:1-2). It must be full of compassion towards all needy ones, and must find a neighbour in any one requiring assistance (Luk 10:24-35). Jesus also inculcated the supreme importance of love by His rebukes of its opposites: of lack of compassion (Mat 18:23-35, Luke 10); of selfishness (Luk 16:19-31); of inhumanity (Mat 25:41-45). Equally terrible were His denunciations of Pharisaic injustice to the weak (Mat 23:4-14 ||).

(3) *Righteousness*. The love of the Father is a holy love. God is the ‘righteous Father’ (Joh 17:25). Jesus came into the world from the Father to save from sins (Mat 11:19, Luk 15:7; Luk 15:10; Luk 15:18, Mat 26:28, Joh 3:16-17). Therefore no man can resemble the Father who does not desire supremely to be cleansed from sin. Likeness to the Father involves complete consecration to His holy purpose, and readiness to be separated from every evil thing (Mat 5:6; Mat 13:43; Mat 18:8 ||). The Christian must seek first the righteousness of the Heavenly Father (Mat 6:33). His goodness must be manifest in deeds as well as words (Mat 7:21). He must be pure in heart (Mat 5:8). His righteousness must be inward and real, not outward and ceremonial (Mat 5:20, Mat 23:25-28).

(4) *Life*. Jesus came that men might have life (Joh 10:10). Moral perfection is conceived as the true self-development (Mat 25:46, Mar 10:30). God has made us for Himself; unflinching obedience to the will of God leads to fullness of life (Mat 19:17, Joh 17:3). Mutilation is urged in preference to the loss of life (Mar 9:43; Mar 9:45 ||). But mutilation is only second best. The moral ideal is to find perfect life (Mar 8:35 ||).

(5) *Citizenship in the Kingdom*. Jesus taught that moral perfection cannot be realized by men in isolation. This is the aspect of sanctification brought out by His teaching about the Kingdom of God. His ideal man is a citizen as well as a son. He must live as a member of a Society, showing those qualities that help to build the City of God (cf. Mat 5:9; Mat 5:13-16; Mat 5:19). Such a recognition of other lives will keep men meek (Mat 5:5, Mat 11:29), and will fill their hearts with humility (Mat 18:1-6 ||).

ii. *Christ's teaching about the process of sanctification*.—(1) We note that sanctification is *a process having a definite beginning*. It is not another aspect of natural development. Its history is distinct from the record of physiological and psychological growth. We note the striking saying about His forerunner: 'Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist: yet he that is but little in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he' (Mat 11:11). Here two kingdoms are distinguished: the natural kingdom into which men are 'born of women,' and the Kingdom of heaven. The latter kingdom belongs to a higher order than the former, as the animal kingdom is higher than the vegetable, or as the weakest mammal is greater than the strongest reptile. The babe in the higher kingdom of men is greater than the tiger in the kingdom of animals. So the least in the Kingdom of heaven belongs to a higher order, and has larger possibilities of spiritual development, than the greatest among those 'born of women,' *i.e.* produced by natural birth and growth. This implies that entrance into the Kingdom of heaven is secured by a new principle of life. This necessity is further hinted at in the teaching about defilement proceeding from the heart (Mat 15:11). It is not enough to adorn a life with kind actions, to hang bunches of grapes on a thorn bush (Mat 7:16). Good actions must be the fruit that grows on a good tree (Mat 7:16-18, Joh 15:4). The tree must be made good; the heart must be cleansed; the river of life must be purified at its source. It will not suffice to build a fine house on a wrong foundation. The hidden principle must be made secure if the life is to be saved (Mat 7:24-27). These hints prepare us for the demand, 'Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven' (Mat 18:3 ||). Sanctification involves the quickening of a new life in men. The maturing of their physical nature cannot suffice; their spiritual nature must pass through the stages of birth and childhood before it can attain maturity. This teaching finds exact expression in the words addressed to Nicodemus: 'Except a man be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God' (Joh 3:3). Man's destiny is not achieved through his physical birth

into a physical kingdom. 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh' (Joh 3:6); therefore no number of reincarnations can produce a spiritual result. Before we can be born into a spiritual kingdom, we must have a second kind of birth corresponding to the kingdom; we must be 'born of the Spirit' (Joh 3:5-8).

(2) A second group of passages hints that sanctification may be *a long process before it is completed*. This is suggested in the parable of the Sower (Mat 13:3, Mar 4:3); the parable of the Seed as growing up—'first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear' (Mar 4:28); and in all the figures of fruit-bearing, because fruit-bearing is the late result of a long process (cf. Joh 15:2, Luk 13:8). Another set of parables represents men as servants of a long-absent Lord, who have to show diligence in trading with the pounds, fidelity in the use of talents, and patience in watching (Mat 25:14, Luk 19:12, Mat 24:42). Probably this thought is contained also in the identification of true life with the knowledge of God (cf. Joh 17:3, Mat 11:27). Such knowledge is not merely an intellectual apprehension; it is a spiritual fellowship. It implies ethical likeness through surrender of the whole being to the Divine will. Such likeness can be secured only through long conformity of the heart and mind and will to God. A pure heart is the organ of such a vision of God (Mat 5:8).

(3) There are definite statements as to *the means* whereby this ethical likeness to the Father is secured.

(a) *By prayer*. Jesus was a man of prayer. There are fifteen references to His prayers in the Gospels. It is specially noteworthy that He betook Himself to prayer when any fierce temptation assailed Him (Luk 5:16; Luk 9:28, Joh 12:27, Mat 26:36 ||), when any work of critical importance had to be undertaken (Luk 6:12, Joh 11:41; Joh 11:17), or when He was exhausted with toil (Mar 1:35, Mat 14:23); and that it was while He was praying that He was anointed with the Holy Spirit (Luk 3:21), and that He was transfigured (Luk 9:29). But it is clear also that He was accustomed to pray on all occasions (cf. Luk 10:21, Luk 11:1, Luk 22:32, Luk 23:46). It is instructive, therefore, that He urged men to pray (Mat 5:44; Mat 6:6; Mat 26:41 ||, Luk 11:2; Luk 18:1; Luk 21:36). He encouraged prayer by promising large blessing (Mat 7:7-11, Mar 11:24). He declared that true prayer 'justified' a man (Luk 18:14). All these references seem to make it clear that prayer ministers to our sanctification.

(b) *Self-denial*. Jesus had a very definite philosophy of life; but it was clean contrary to worldly wisdom. He summarized it thus: 'Enter ye in by the narrow gate: ... for narrow is the gate, and straitened the way, that leadeth unto life' (Mat 7:13-14 ||). 'Whosoever will lose his life for my sake and the gospel's, shall save it' (Mar 8:35 ||). Self-denial is thus taught not for its own sake, but as the only way to reach self-perfection (Mat 16:24 ||).

(c) *Good works.* We have noticed the emphasis put by Jesus on works of love and mercy. It must be pointed out now that He taught their sanctifying efficacy. The blessed of the Father, who inherit the Kingdom, have qualified by good works (Mat 25:31-40). The young ruler could be perfect if he would keep the commandments (Mat 19:21), and the lawyer could inherit eternal life in the same way (Luk 10:28). Several times Jesus promised a reward for obedience, fidelity, and diligence (cf. Mat 25:10; Mat 25:14-30, Luk 19:12-27, Mar 10:29-30 ||); and if heavenly rewards are granted to those morally fit, as is taught clearly by the parable of the Pounds (Luke 19), these passages imply that sanctification is advanced by a life of obedience to God's will.

(d) *Faith in Christ.* There is a large group of passages in all the Gospels, and there are specially important discourses in John, in which Jesus Christ is offered to men as a means of their sanctification.

(α) Sometimes sanctification is promised to those who copy His example. This is done in the gracious invitation (Mat 11:28-30). Learning of Jesus, we may become meek and lowly in heart; yoked with Him under the yoke which He wears and which He graciously invites us to share, we may hear our burden easily. It is also taught by His claim to be the one Master whom all are to obey (Mat 23:10).

(β) Sanctification is bound up with obedience to His teaching. The wise man is one who builds on the words of Jesus (Mat 7:24). He offered His words as the rock of eternal truth on which men may build for eternity, in place of the shifting sand of opinion and hypothesis which will not continue. Eternity will put the strain of judgment upon the characters we are building; and only those characters resting on the rock of His words will stand the strain (Mat 7:25-27). The same truth is taught in the impressive words of Mat 10:32-33. To confess Him and His words is the same as building upon them; whilst to be ashamed of them is to refuse to make them the foundation for conduct. The same sentiment is expressed in Joh 5:24. He that 'cometh not into judgment,' because 'he hath passed out of death into life,' is one in whom the signs of sanctification are recognized. This sanctified man is 'he that heareth my word and believeth him that sent me.'

(γ) Sanctification is secured by union with Jesus as the Son of God. It has been pointed out that 'knowledge of the Father' is one of Jesus Christ's descriptions of sanctification. And a very solemn claim made by Jesus is that 'none knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him' (Mat 11:27). The Son willeth to reveal the Father to all, for the very next word is, 'Come unto me all ye that labour': but there is no relaxing of the claim that men must come to Him and learn of Him if they would know the Father; cf. Joh 6:46;

Joh 14:6. Other conceptions of God may be attained by other means. 'The Father' can be revealed only by One who fulfils perfectly the complementary relationship.

(δ) Separate reference may be made to the discourses in John's Gospel, because these amplify the teaching in the Synoptics, though the germs are found there. We may note the claim of Jesus to be the light of the world (Joh 8:12; Joh 9:5; Joh 12:35-36; Joh 12:46; and cf. Joh 1:4-5; Joh 1:9; Joh 3:19); to be the living water (Joh 7:37-38, Joh 4:14); to be the bread of God come down from heaven to feed the world (Joh 6:32-35; Joh 6:47-58). These figures imply that men must follow Him if they would walk in the ways of holiness, and must sustain their life by union with Him, if they would have it strong and healthy. This last means of sanctification is described quite definitely in the words, 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him' (Joh 6:56, cf. Joh 15:1-10). The words have been interpreted sacramentally, as referring solely to the elements offered to the participants in the Lord's Supper. But such an interpretation is entirely opposed to the spirit of Jesus, and would have been inexplicable to the people addressed. And though an allusion to the Lord's Supper as a 'means of grace' need not be denied (cf. Mat 26:26-28 ||), it is plain that our Lord was thinking of a spiritual union between Himself and His followers, maintained by their faith. Another significant passage occurs in Joh 8:31-38. It has affinity with passages emphasizing the importance of His words (Joh 8:31; Joh 8:38). But it passes on to the statement, 'Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.' This is explained to mean freedom from sin (Joh 8:34); therefore it implies sanctification. And as 'the truth' is changed in Joh 8:36 to 'the Son,' this is another direct claim on the part of Jesus to be our Sanctification (cf. Joh 14:6, Joh 15:3-4; Joh 15:10). It leads us naturally to the very important text Joh 17:17; Joh 17:19. Jesus prayed for His disciples, 'Sanctify them in the truth: thy word is truth.... For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they themselves also may be sanctified in truth.' 'Sanctify' seems to be used here with its full meaning. The idea of consecration is not absent (cf. Joh 17:18 and (Revised Version margin)); but Joh 17:14-16 prove that the ethical significance is prominent. This sanctification is secured 'in truth.' The truth is identified with 'thy word,' which has been given to the disciples by Jesus (Joh 17:14), partly by His words (Joh 14:10), and partly by His character and example (Joh 1:14, Joh 14:9). The thought seems to be that the disciples are to be sanctified by abiding in this revelation, and by being led farther and farther into it. The "truth" ... is (as it were) the element into which the believer is introduced and by which he is changed. The "truth" is not only a power within him by which he is moved; it is an atmosphere in which he lives. The end of the truth is not wisdom, which is partial, but holiness, which is universal' (Westcott, *in loco*.) This teaching finds more complete expression throughout chs. 14-16. The disciples must abide in Christ, who is the true Vine, if they would bear much fruit (Joh 15:1-8). When the Master is gone, he will send another Comforter, the Spirit of

Truth, who will guide 'into all truth' (Joh 14:16-17; Joh 14:26, Joh 15:26, Joh 16:13-15). They are in the truth already; but they will be guided into its deeper recesses by the Spirit of truth. Thus they will be sanctified, knowing the Father more perfectly as He is revealed in the Son (Joh 16:14), and bearing much fruit through this knowledge (Joh 15:5). All their consecration of themselves to the work to which their Master sent them must move within the sacred sphere of 'the truth.'

(ε) One sentence in this prayer is very valuable for our purpose, 'For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they themselves also may be sanctified' (Joh 17:19). Jesus Christ's sanctification of Himself is primarily His devotion of Himself to the Father's will. His sanctification was unique in that there never was any refusal of that will as it was made known to Him. But such a refusal was always possible whilst His earthly life lasted. In that sense Jesus had to be progressively sanctified. He had not fulfilled the entire will of His Father until He could say upon the cross, 'It is finished' (Joh 19:30). Therefore He had to continue sanctifying Himself until then. The immediate reference of the words in the prayer seems to be to His death. The prayer is the renewal of His surrender. Again He takes up His cross. He is willing to die, in obedience to the Father's will, that the disciples may be sanctified. Two points must be noticed. (1) This complete surrender to the Father's will, 'obedience even unto the death of the cross,' makes Jesus the absolutely perfect example for our sanctification (Php 2:5-8). (2) But also there is a distinct reference to His death as helping to secure the sanctification of his disciples. This hint is not solitary. It gathers other words to itself. 'I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself' (Joh 12:32). This drawing is part of the process of sanctification. 'Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit' (Joh 12:24). By dying Jesus will become a fruitful Personality in the world, producing 'much fruit' in His disciples. 'This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many' (Mar 14:24). The New Covenant is written on men's hearts. It is concerned with a spiritual sanctification as distinguished from one that is merely ceremonial. Jesus connects His death with this New Covenant as a means of securing sanctification 'for many.' 'The good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep' (Joh 10:11). This sacrifice by the Shepherd ensures that the lost sheep are found, and being 'found' is one of Jesus Christ's words for at least the beginnings of sanctification (Luk 15:5; Luk 15:9; Luk 15:32). These sayings make it certain that Jesus thought of His death as playing an important part in the process whereby sin's prisoners are delivered, and are set forth upon the road to holiness.

At the same time the reference of Joh 17:19 cannot be confined to His death, if only because His sanctification of Himself in His death was but the perfect flower of a life that was one long sanctification. His death cannot be isolated from His life. He came into the world to save sinners; and His entire earthly experience ministered to that

salvation. At each critical stage He sanctified Himself: the act of the critical moments reflected His daily temper, It is this continued sanctification, culminating in His death, that is the means of the sanctification of His disciples. See, further, on the sanctification of Christ, art. Consecrate, Consecration, in vol. i.

(ζ) The passages quoted have led us already to the teaching of Jesus that our sanctification is ‘through the Holy Spirit.’ Although this teaching is developed in John, it is not absent from the Synoptic tradition. The unpardonable sin is blasphemy against the Holy Spirit—called ‘an eternal sin’ (Mar_3:29 ||). Luke’s Gospel substitutes ‘give the Holy Spirit’ for ‘give good things’ (Luk_11:13, cf. Mat_7:11). All the Synoptists concur in ascribing to Jesus the promise, ‘The Holy Spirit shall teach you what you ought to say’ (Luk_12:12, Mat_10:20, Mar_13:11). Moreover, a large place is given to the Spirit in the sanctification of Jesus. His miraculous birth is ascribed to the Spirit (Mat_1:18, Luk_1:35), The descent of the Spirit upon Jesus at His baptism was the Father’s anointing in response to the Son’s consecration (Mar_1:10-11 ||). It was the Spirit that drove Him into the wilderness to be tempted (Mar_1:12 ||). Jesus returned to His work ‘in the power of the Spirit’ (Luk_4:14) and He claimed to fulfil the prophecy, ‘The Spirit of the Lord is upon me’ (Luk_4:18). In answer to the charge that He cast out devils by Beelzebub, He asserted that He cast them out ‘by the Spirit of God’ (Mat_12:28). These texts furnish considerable material for a doctrine of sanctification through the Spirit.

But the doctrine is stated very clearly in John 14-16. The Holy Spirit is described as the *alter ego* of Jesus: He will do for the disciples, after their Master’s departure, what the latter has done for them during His earthly life (Joh_14:16-18). The Spirit of truth will abide with the disciples and will be in them (Joh_14:17). He will teach them (Joh_14:26), and will guide them into all truth, declaring to them things that are to come (Joh_16:13). He will also convict the world of sin, of righteousness, of judgment (Joh_16:8). The promise of the Spirit is the consolation offered by Jesus in view of His approaching departure (Joh_16:7); and His coming will secure their loyalty and their development. Indeed, it may be said that the language of Jesus suggests that the Holy Spirit will be Himself returning in His glorified spiritual nature, and continuing in more complete form the work He has begun in the disciples during His ministry.

2. Christ and sanctification in the NT outside the Gospels.

(1) *The teaching of St. Peter.*—The Petrine conceptions are simple and practical. 1 Peter exhorts to the practice of various virtues that go to make up the Christian character. The starting-point for Christian sanctification is entirely reminiscent of the teaching of Jesus: it is found in the obligation of Christians as children of a holy Father, whose holiness constrains theirs (1Pe_1:14-16). The attainment of holiness is

called 'salvation' (1Pe 1:5; 1Pe 1:9); and 'the two pillars of salvation are the sufferings and death of Christ and the resurrection and exaltation of Christ' (Beyschlag). He is the Son of God whose resurrection 'begat us again' (1Pe 1:3). He is the Lamb whose offering has redeemed Christians from their old sins (1Pe 1:18-19). He is 'the chief corner-stone' of that temple of God in which Christians are placed as living stones (1Pe 2:5-6). He is the Example for all who are suffering (1Pe 2:21): especially has He shown us the right attitude to sin by His suffering for sins (1Pe 2:22-24). By giving Himself to die for us, He has become the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls (1Pe 2:25). He is 'the Lord' who is to be revered in our hearts (1Pe 3:15). He is the adorable Saviour whose name is potent enough to secure our devotion (1Pe 2:13, 1Pe 4:14). Finally, He is the coming One, whose appearing will consummate the purposes of God, and will perfect us in salvation (1Pe 1:7, 1Pe 5:10). Thus Jesus Christ focusses all Christian effort and hope and faith upon Himself. The Christ who lived, died, and rose again, and was exalted—the Christ of the Gospels, whom Peter had known (1Pe 1:3; 1Pe 1:8)—is the Divine original for our sanctification, and is the Divine Mediator through whom our deliverance from sin is accomplished.

(2) *The teaching of St. John.*—It is to be noted that St. John makes very slender use of the ἅγιος group of words. In this he is like his Master. In his First Epistle 'sanctify' and 'sanctification' do not occur. 'Holy' is used only once, and then in reference to God (1Jn 2:20). In Revelation 'holy' is found frequently. It describes God Almighty (Rev 4:8), Jesus Christ (Rev 3:7, Rev 6:10), the City of God (Rev 11:2, Rev 21:2; Rev 21:10, Rev 22:19), men (Rev 22:11). Also in Revelation 'saints' is constantly used to describe believers in Jesus Christ. But though the more usual words are absent from the Epistle, it is a passionate plea for sanctification in Christ. John describes sanctification under such phrases as 'walking in light' (1Jn 1:7; 1Jn 2:11), 'not sinning' (1Jn 2:1, 1Jn 3:6, 1Jn 5:18 [the idea of a prevailing habit being prominent]), 'keeping his commandments' (1Jn 2:3, 1Jn 3:22-24, 1Jn 5:2-3), 'overcoming the world' (1Jn 5:4-5, cf. 1Jn 2:13-14, 1Jn 4:4, and Rev 2:7; Rev 2:11; Rev 2:26; Rev 3:5; Rev 3:12; Rev 3:21; Rev 12:11; Rev 21:7), 'having life' or 'having eternal life' (1Jn 2:25, 1Jn 3:14-15, 1Jn 5:11-13; 1Jn 5:16; 1Jn 5:20, and cf. Rev 2:7; Rev 2:10; Rev 3:5; Rev 13:8; Rev 17:8; Rev 20:12; Rev 20:15; Rev 21:6; Rev 21:27; Rev 22:1-2; Rev 22:14; Rev 22:17; Rev 22:19). The core of sanctification is love (1Jn 4:16-19), manifested toward God (1Jn 2:15, 1Jn 4:20, 1Jn 5:1-2) and towards brethren (1Jn 2:10, 1Jn 3:10-18, 1Jn 4:7-12; 1Jn 4:20-21). This sanctification is connected intimately with the Person and work of Jesus Christ. He is the propitiation for sins, through whom believers are forgiven, and by whose Word they are cleansed from sin (1Jn 1:7 to 1Jn 2:2, 1Jn 4:10). He is the Advocate upon whom we may rely for help in the struggle with sin (1Jn 2:1). He is the Ideal towards whom all Christian effort must be directed (1Jn 3:3; 1Jn 3:16, 1Jn 4:17). He is the Son of the Father,

whose presence in the world manifests the Father's love (1Jn 3:16, 1Jn 4:9-10; 1Jn 4:14; 1Jn 4:16), and through whom believers may become possessed of the Father (1Jn 2:23, 1Jn 4:15). So He brings to men that eternal life which makes sin impossible (1Jn 3:9, 1Jn 5:18); and He communicates to them that eternal love which is the very essence of goodness because it is the essence of God (1Jn 4:12; 1Jn 4:16). So intimate is this connexion between Christ and sanctification, that the object of His manifestation is declared to be 'to take away sins' (1Jn 3:5), and 'to destroy the works of the devil,' which are 'sins' (1Jn 3:7-10). It is clear, therefore, that St. John, as well as St. Peter, conceives Christ's redeeming work under the category of sanctification, and also conceives sanctification as possible only through faith in Christ. Both of them view sanctification as a state into which the believer is introduced by an initial act of faith in Christ, through whom he is begotten of God (1Pe 1:3; 1Pe 1:18; 1Pe 1:23; 1Pe 2:3; 1Pe 2:9, 1Jn 1:9; 1Jn 5:1); but it is also a state which has to be progressively realized by abiding union with Christ (1Pe 1:5; 1Pe 2:11; 1Pe 5:10, 1Jn 1:7; 1Jn 2:1; 1Jn 3:2).

(3) *The teaching of St. Paul.*—This may be summed up under the chief categories used by St. Paul to describe Jesus Christ's relation to men.

(a) *Jesus Christ as the second Adam.*—St. Paul thought of Adam as the pioneer of the race; and he could not escape the responsibility of pioneers. The entire subsequent history of the race is influenced by the course taken by the first man. His sin caused a divergence from the path of rectitude, which grew wider as the race progressed, because the initial direction was wrong. Jesus Christ was introduced into the world as a new pioneer. He was not an ordinary child of the race. He did not inherit the entail of bias to evil. 'The first man is of the earth, earthy' (1Co 15:47). He was the child of an animal ancestry, and was weighted by animal instincts: to him holiness was only a possibility. 'The second man is of heaven.' His antecedents were spiritual. With Him holiness was the instinct, and evil was only a possibility. So He gave a new start in the direction of holiness. He stopped the race's drift from God, and He began a new movement Godward (Rom 5:12-21, 1Co 15:20-26; 1Co 15:45-49). Therefore all who become followers of Jesus Christ are rescued from the fatal effects of Adam's sin. They are led into the right road and are under the direct influence of the Spirit of God (Rom 8:12-17). Thus they are being sanctified in accordance with the will of God, and will be brought at last to the perfect state He has designed for them (cf. Rom 5:21; Rom 8:17, 1Co 15:49; 1Co 15:54).

(b) A corollary from the previous thought is that men may be '*in Christ.*' The second Adam is more than a leader of a redeemed race. He is the Head of a new humanity, which secures its life from Him by vital communion with Him. He brought new spiritual energy into the world: this energy can be communicated to all who are united to Him by faith. The bonds between the first Adam and the race were physical

and mechanical; those between the second Adam and the race are spiritual and personal (cf. Joh 5:21-29, 1Co 15:45, Eph 1:6; Eph 1:13). This state of union between Christ and the believer is described by St. Paul under the phrase 'in Christ'; and it is mentioned as a condition of sanctification (1Co 1:2; 1Co 6:11; cf. Rom 1:6-7, Eph 1:1; Eph 1:4; Eph 1:7; Eph 1:11; Eph 1:13; Eph 2:10; Eph 2:13, Php 1:1, Col 1:2). The idea is the Master's (cf. 'I am the vine, ye are the branches,' Joh 15:5): He connected it with, sanctification (Joh 15:4-6). St. Paul emphasized this message. Thus we are 'complete in him' (Col 2:10). Every human being comes into the world as a possibility. A process of involution must go forward, by which the germinal life will absorb from its environment those elements that minister to its development. Our moral possibilities can be realized only when we are 'in Christ.' The soul that lives without Him is stunted, or maimed, or becomes a moral freak. The soul that lives 'in him' becomes 'complete.' All the fulness that can realize our possibilities is gathered into Him (Col 2:9). He is the way in which men must 'walk' who would attain to holiness, the plant in which men must be 'rooted' who would bear much fruit, the plan according to which men's lives must be 'built up' if they are to become temples of God (Col 2:6-7; Col 1:23, and cf. Joh 15:1-10; Joh 14:6).

(c) Another category used by St. Paul is *Jesus Christ's death and resurrection as the source of the believer's renewal*. This thought has affinities with the preceding one. But it shows, from another standpoint, how intimately the Apostle connects our sanctification with Christ. The teaching is developed in Romans 6; it occurs also in Rom 8:11, Gal 2:20, 2Co 5:14-15, Col 2:12-13; Col 3:1-4. The believer is associated with the Saviour in His death and resurrection. These crises are not only an ideal for the Christian, but also an experience which in some real spiritual sense he shares with his Lord. By them Jesus Christ became the Conqueror of sin and death. The believer identifies himself with Jesus Christ in the spiritual significance of these tremendous events: then he becomes 'dead unto sin and alive unto God,' though actually he is rather dying than dead to sin, and though the physical process of dissolution has still to be faced—but without its sting. This union with Christ secures the imparting of eternal life, and makes the believer a 'new creature' (2Co 5:17), who is renewed in holiness. Such teaching harmonizes with the demand of Jesus for a new birth (Joh 3:3).

(d) A fourth category is *the work of the Spirit using the truth 'as it is in Jesus' as His instrument in sanctification*. This is another of the ideas of Jesus emphasized by St. Paul. The Pauline Epistles connect sanctification with the work of the Holy Spirit (cf. especially Romans 8, 1 Corinthians 2; 1Co 3:16-17; 1Co 3:12). 'The Spirit's function is, before all things, to help the Christian to be holy' (Bruce, *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, p. 248). The instrument used by the Spirit in sanctifying men is the revelation made in Jesus Christ. This had been foretold by the Master (Joh 16:14); St. Paul sees His word fulfilled in all the work of the Spirit. 'The Lord' and 'the Spirit' are

identified sometimes (2Co 3:17-18), and the Spirit dwelling in the heart sanctifies through Christ dwelling in the heart (cf. Eph 3:17, Rom 8:9-10, 2Ti 1:14). Man is pictured as a shrine in which the Spirit dwells. This 'temple of the Holy Spirit' must be kept from all defilement, and must ever be made worthier of its Divine guest (1Co 3:16-17; 1Co 6:19-20, 2Co 6:16).

(e) *The Church as the Body of Christ* is an important Pauline conception. It bears upon the problem of sanctification, inasmuch as the moral health of each individual member is influenced by the condition of the body (1Co 12:12-27, Eph 1:23; Eph 4:16, Col 2:19). The Apostle does not contemplate Christians remaining outside the visible Church, and he always assumes that a Christian's sanctification will be perfected within its fellowship. This does not imply any sacramental conception of sanctification. It rests upon the conviction that the Church is indwelt by the living Christ (Eph 1:23, Col 1:24). Therefore all believers who remain living members of the Church maintain a vital union with their Lord, through means of His own appointing. This secures their due spiritual development.

(f) Finally, we may note St. Paul's thought of *Jesus as 'Lord.'* This name was used by the early Church to express their faith about Jesus. All the NT books reflect the usage, except the Epistles of John. But, owing perhaps to the circumstances of his conversion (Act 9:5), the designation dominates St. Paul's thought of Jesus to a remarkable degree. It carries with it an obligation to acknowledge His sovereignty over all our life. Our sanctification is secured by implicit obedience to His commands, and by close imitation of His example.

3. Church History.—It only remains to offer a very brief suggestion as to the historical development of the idea of sanctification in its relation to the Person and work of Jesus Christ. Four outstanding modifications of the idea may be mentioned.

(1) The first is *the monastic idea of sanctification*. It had affinities with tendencies that are native to man; and it gained ground in the 4th cent., when multitudes of semi-converted pagans were pressing into the Church. Although it took its laws from the recorded life and teaching of Jesus Christ, it cannot be recognized as a fruit of vital union with Him. Rather it must be regarded as a product of a restless age of rapid enlargement, reacting upon the longing for reposeful communion with God. During this time the Church's interest in Christ was academic rather than practical, theological rather than religious. Thus men were left to seek holiness by methods of their own devising.

(2) The second idea of sanctification is *the mediaeval*. This has many points of union with the monastic; but it shows a much closer relation to Christ. The restlessness had given place to torpor. This drove earnest souls back to Jesus. Many of the monastic

evils permeated Europe, and there was very little imitation of Christ amongst the masses of the people. But the mediaeval idea of holiness is characterized by a growing devotion to the Lord Jesus, which found expression sometimes in such fervent hymns as those of Bernard, sometimes in such service of the poor as was nobly carried through by Francis of Assisi, and sometimes in such seeking after liberty as has immortalized Wyclif.

(3) The third idea of sanctification is connected with *the Reformation*. That movement placed all the emphasis upon Christ's work for us. One result was the upgrowth of an idea of sanctification as something objective. It was almost identified with 'justification.' Christians are sanctified by receiving the robe of righteousness from Jesus Christ.

(4) The fourth or *modern idea of sanctification* tends to place the emphasis upon Christ's work in us. Sanctification is much more subjective. This is a development which should be welcomed. But care must be taken lest the reaction from a too objective idea of sanctification by Christ leads to a too subjective idea of sanctification in Christ which fails to give the NT emphasis to both aspects of Christ's work.

It may be pointed out that the modern idea of sanctification in Christ has been approached from the standpoint of the work of the Holy Spirit. What is known as the 'Keswick School' has rendered valuable service by calling attention to the Personality of the Holy Spirit, and to His power to sanctify the human soul. But it must be remembered that the Holy Spirit is Christ's *alter ego*. Rightly understood, this modern development leads us to the Pauline position, that 'Christ Jesus is made unto us ... sanctification' (1Co_1:30).

Literature.—The usage of terms may be studied in artt. 'Holiness' and 'Sanctification' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible . For general reference, cf. Beyschlag, *NT Theol.*; Stevens, *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation* and *The Theology of NT*; Harnack, *What is Christianity?*; Forrest, *The Authority of Christ*; the Comm. in the *Internat. Critical Commentary* series. The teaching of Christ is examined by Bruce in *The Kingdom of God* and *The Training of the Twelve*; Wendt, *The Teaching of Jesus*; Du Bose, *The Gospel in the Gospels*; Denney, *The Death of Christ*; and Comm. on the Gospels by Swete, Godet, and Westcott. Bruce discusses the Pauline teaching in *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*; cf. the Comm. of Lightfoot, Westcott, Delitzsch, and Godet, which are most suggestive; also Haupt on *First Epistle of St. John*. Some of the Sermons in Inge's *Faith and Knowledge* deal with Sanctification in a fresh manner. Valuable discourses on the psychological and physiological aspects are contained in Coe's *Education in Religion and Morals* and *The Spiritual Life*. Amongst modern devotional books, Horton's *The Open Secret* and Gordon's *Quiet Talks on Power* may

be highly recommended. The teaching of an influential modern school is contained in 'Addresses on Holiness' (Star Hall Convention, Manchester). Ref. may also be made to C. H. Spurgeon, *The Messiah*, p. 579; H. W. Webb-Peploe, *Calls to Holiness* (1900); W. L. Watkinson, *The Blind Spot* (1899), p. 57; A. J. Gordon, *Yet Speaking* (1897), p. 9.

J. Edward Roberts.

☞ Sand

SAND (ἄμμος).—Sand, which, however closely packed and hard, seems almost to melt at the touch of water, is a foundation on which only a fool would build (Mat_7:26). St. Luke in the parallel passage gives ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, 'on the earth' (6:49). The surface of the earth, baked hard in the heat, goes swiftly to soft mud when the rains come.

W. Ewing.

☞ Sandal, Shoe

SANDAL, SHOE.—A covering for the feet was rendered necessary by the burning heat of the ground as well as by the presence of stones and thorns. Such protection was especially required by men on a journey, by shepherds on the hills, and by peasants when cutting wood or collecting thorns for fuel. An Oriental shepherd with bare feet and a crook-headed staff is one of the ignorant traditions of Western sacred art. The sandal consisted of a thick sole of leather attached to the foot by thongs of the same material. The transition to the shoe form was marked by a slipper-like cover and a supporting band behind the heel, which latter, however, the wearer often preferred to press down when walking.

In the East the foot can only be alluded to apologetically, and reference to the shoe is one of the commonest expressions of contempt. To be unworthy to unloose the latchet of His shoe was an intense repudiation of all thought of comparison with Christ (Joh_1:27). As the shoe was in immediate contact with the common ground, it was removed at the entrance to houses and sacred buildings. As socks are not usually worn in the East, dust is effectively removed either by taking off the shoe and beating it on a stone, or by projecting the foot with the toes bent upwards so that the dust may fall out from the open heel of the shoe (Mat_10:14).

The Roman soldier, like the Eastern shepherd, had nails in the shoe to prevent slipping, and thus the missionary symbolism of Eph_6:15 meant determination as well as direction.

G. M. Mackie.

Sanhedrin

SANHEDRIN.—The supreme council and high court of justice in Jerusalem during the Greek and Roman periods.

1. Names and Composition

(a) *Of the whole body:* (α) Greek: (1) συνέδριον, so first, in point of historical reference, in Josephus *Ant.* xiv. ix. 3-5, and thereafter frequent in Josephus and NT. (2) γερουσία, first, in point of reference, in *Ant.* xii. iii. 3; frequent in OT Apocrypha: once in NT, Act_5:21* (cf. below). (3) βουλή, fairly frequent in Josephus, especially in the *BJ*, but NT never uses βουλή in this sense, though βουλευτής is used of Joseph of Arimathaea in Mar_15:43 and Luk_23:50. (4) πρεσβυτέριον, Luk_22:66, Act_22:5. (5) Josephus also uses τὸ κοινόν, or κοινὸν τῶν Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν, esp. in the *Vita*, with special reference to the Sanhedrin. (β) Hebrew: (1) In the Talmudic literature the commonest word is סנהדרין, a transliteration of συνέδριον, also written סנהדרין, and even סנהדרין, from which again plurals were formed סנהדריות, or סנהדראות (cf. Jastrow, *Dict. of Talmud*, 1005). Variations are סנהדרין גדולה and סנהדרין של שבטים. (2) הגדול בין בית. (3) On Hasmonaean coins חכר 'collegium,' is associated with the reigning high priest, and presumably designates the Sanhedrin.

These names throw light upon the composition and functions of the court. συνέδριον suggests a court of justice, and so, still more explicitly, does בית דין. γερουσία is a term applied only to aristocratic councils, and the Hasmonaean חכר suggests an aristocratic body associated with the monarch.* [Note: Act_5:21 presents a certain difficulty in its use of the phrase τὸ συνέδριον καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γερουσίαν. According to this, the γερουσία would have a wider meaning than συνέδριον, whereas in OT

Apocrypha it is the regular word for συνέδριον. The identity of the two terms can hardly be doubted, as there is no evidence of the existence of any other court to which the name γερουσία might be applied. As it is unnatural to take και in an explanatory sense (= i.e.) here, it must be supposed that the author used one of the words loosely, regarding συνέδριον as an inner circle within the general court. [Possibly he wished to emphasize the fact that on this occasion not only the necessary quorum but the whole council of 71 members was summoned.]

(b) *Of its component parts.* Quite as suggestive are the names of the various classes of members of the court. The principal expressions, ignoring minor variations, are οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, οἱ ἄρχοντες, οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, οἱ δυνατοί, οἱ πρότοι, οἱ γνώριμοι, οἱ γραμματεῖς. Some of these terms are interchangeable, or nearly so, and they fall into three main classes. (1) Most important of all were the ἀρχιερεῖς, the chief priests, the members of the sacerdotal aristocracy. In Josephus and NT they are almost invariably mentioned first when the names of the classes composing the Sanhedrin are given (cf. Mat 27:41; Josephus *BJ* ii. xvii. 2, and frequently). Often they are the only class particularly mentioned (cf. Mar 14:55 οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ ὅλον τὸ συνέδριον). The high priest was president of the court according to Josephus and NT (cf. Act 5:17, which testifies not only to the presidency of the high priest, but also to the fact that the priestly party was Sadducee; cf. also Josephus *Ant.* xiv. ix. 3-5, and other passages from both sources). This is in agreement with the general constitution of the post-exilic Jewish community, in which civil-as well as religious authority was in the hands of the high priest. The priestly nobility were the leading persons in the community, and they were the most conspicuous members of the Sanhedrin. See Chief Priests, High Priest. The ἄρχοντες may be roughly identified with the ἀρχιερεῖς as the ‘rulers’ of the community. Occasionally they are mentioned where one would expect ἀρχιερεῖς: so frequently in Josephus (cf. Act 4:5 τοὺς ἄρχοντας καὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους καὶ τοὺς γραμματεῖς, Act 4:8 ἄρχοντες τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ πρεσβύτεροι || Act 4:23 οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι). Very occasionally, however, the ἄρχοντες are mentioned alongside of the ἀρχιερεῖς (cf. Luk 23:13), showing that the term might be used loosely for ‘leaders’ or ‘rulers.’ (2) πρεσβύτερο = מַבְרָן, in the first instance a general name for the principal men of the community, and so, apparently, a general designation of members of the Sanhedrin (cf. πρεσβυτέριον). But in actual practice it describes those members who were neither ἀρχιερεῖς nor γραμματεῖς. The πρεσβύτεροι

made common cause with the ἀρχιερεῖς against the γραμματεῖς, *i.e.* they belonged in general to the Sadducee party (cf. Act 23:1-14). With this class may be identified the δυνατοί, πρῶτοι, or γνώριμοι (unless qualified in some way, as, γνώριμοι τῶν Φαρισαίων). Josephus frequently uses δυνατοί along with ἀρχιερεῖς, evidently as the equivalent of πρεσβύτεροι. They were the secular nobility of Jerusalem, closely allied to the sacerdotal aristocracy. (3) οἱ γραμματεῖς, the scribes, a class which hardly requires description here. In the main they formed the Pharisee element in the Sanhedrin, though individual members of the other classes may have been Pharisees, and many Pharisees, adhering to the scribal party, were not themselves professional scribes. See Scribes.

These names indicate with sufficient clearness the general character and composition of the court. It was an aristocratic assembly and high court of justice, in which, alongside of the priestly nobility and the noble families outside the priestly circle, representatives of the more numerous Pharisee party found a place, the Sadducee element, however, retaining the weight of influence.

As to the method of appointment to the Sanhedrin, nothing definite can be gathered from the Greek sources. According to the Mishna, new members were appointed by the court itself. At first, membership was confined to the aristocratic families. Subsequently the political rulers of the country seem to have appointed members by their own authority in some cases at least (cf. Salome's introduction of a Pharisee element).

The Greek sources agree in giving one picture of the Sanhedrin, while the Mishnic representation is radically different. That the representations are mutually irreconcilable, and that of the Greek sources is preferable in all respects, is now generally recognized by scholars, and the point requires to be stated rather than argued here. According to the Greek sources, as appears from the above, the Sanhedrin was composed of chief priests, elders, and scribes, and was presided over by the high priest. The chief priests and elders belonged in general to the Sadducee party, while the scribes formed the Pharisee element, which, however influential among the people, was seldom in the ascendant in the Sanhedrin. The Sanhedrin was thus a political assembly and court of justice, representing in the main the aristocratic elements in the Jewish community. According to the Mishnic literature, on the other hand, it was a court of Rabbis, presided over by the leading Rabbi of the time, in which the priestly element as such does not appear, while the Sadducees are mentioned only as heretics to be refuted. The presiding Rabbi bears the title *Nasi* (otherwise a political title), and another, apparently the vice-president, is called *Ab-beth-din*. It was an ecclesiastical rather than a political assembly. The

irreconcilability of the two representations is most marked in the answer they give to the question, Who was the President of the Sanhedrin? We have lists of Rabbis filling the offices of *Nasi* and *Ab-beth-din* during the two centuries preceding the destruction of Jerusalem, whereas the Greek sources furnish explicit evidence that during this period the high priest presided. Where individual names are mentioned in both sources the contradiction is very evident: e.g. Gamaliel was president according to the Mishna, but in Act 5:34 he appears simply as Φαρισσαιος ὀνοματι Γαμαλιήλ. The Greek sources are contemporary, while the Mishna is late and was compiled under totally changed conditions. The account given in the Greek sources accords with all that is known of the constitution and history of the Jewish community, from the Maccabean revolt to the destruction of Jerusalem. Further, the evidence they furnish, while perfectly explicit, is largely incidental, proceeding from no theory, but simply reflecting the actual state of affairs. There is no trace of 'tendency,' and no motive for misrepresentation. On the other hand, the Mishnic account is true only of the reconstituted Sanhedrin which sat at Jamnia after the destruction of Jerusalem and the disappearance of the old aristocratic and Sadducee element. The character of this Sanhedrin, which bore little more resemblance to the older court than the 'Sanhedrin' which Napoleon endeavoured to establish, was transferred to the assembly of which we have accurate descriptions in the contemporary Greek sources. How far the Mishna has preserved reliable traditions on points of detail connected with the Sanhedrin is not easy to determine. Considerable use is often made of it even by those who admit the superiority of the Greek sources (cf. Bacher, art. 'Sanhedrin' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible). In view, however, of the chasm which the destruction of Jerusalem made in the constitution and history of Judaism, and the radically false conception of the Sanhedrin which appears in the Mishnic tradition, statements based on the unsupported authority of the Mishna must be regarded as little better than conjectures.

2. History.—The Mishnic tradition connects the Sanhedrin with Moses' seventy elders, then with the alleged Great Synagogue of Ezra's time, then with such names of leading Rabbis as had escaped oblivion (cf. opening sections of *Pirke Aboth*), and so gives the Sanhedrin of Jamnia an appearance of historical continuity with the past. In point of fact, however, the Sanhedrin emerges into authentic history first in the Greek period. It must have existed earlier, but its origin is covered by the darkness which obscures all Jewish history from the time of Nehemiah (and even earlier) till the Maccabean rising. The post-exilic Jewish community was nominally a theocracy, enjoying a certain measure of independence under foreign rule. At its head was the high priest, who was assisted by a *γερονσία* consisting chiefly of members of the aristocratic sacerdotal caste. The administration of secular affairs tended to produce in this caste a certain worldliness, a more or less exclusive interest in worldly business and culture, and consequently a readiness to fall under the influence of Hellenism.

Passively opposed to them were the *Hāsîdîm*, the pious students of the Law and the legal tradition, whose interests and aspirations were exclusively religious and ecclesiastical. When the crisis came under Antiochus Epiphanes, the aristocratic caste, and consequently the *γεροῦσία*, or Sanhedrin, was in the main ready to yield completely to the pressure of an enforced Hellenism. The *Hāsîdîm* continued to offer steadfast but passive resistance to the persecutor. There arose, however, a third group, consisting of men who, while not specially in sympathy with the *Hāsîdîm*, wished to maintain the ancient religion and also the liberties of the people. The Hasmonaean family led them in armed revolt, and under the skilful leadership of Judas Maccabaeus and his brothers they not only regained religious liberty, but achieved the political independence of the Jewish State, of which the Hasmonaeans and their loyal followers became the rulers. The old aristocracy was practically destroyed, and the remnants of it were forced to acquiesce in the rule of the new dynasty. The *Hāsîdîm*, who had supported the Hasmonaeans until liberty of religion was secured, drifted away from them as the political aspect of the struggle became more prominent, and resumed towards them the same attitude of passive opposition which had characterized their relation to the older aristocracy. They were especially incensed at the Hasmonaean assumption of the title and functions of the high-priesthood, which they regarded as usurpation and as a secularizing of the theocracy. At the time of John Hyrcanus, therefore, the Sanhedrin consisted of adherents of the Hasmonaean dynasty—the new aristocracy combined with the remnants of the old, representing two of the three elements of the later court, the chief priests and the elders—and was overwhelmingly, if not exclusively, Sadducee. The Pharisees, the representatives of the earlier *Hāsîdîm*, stood aloof, and devoted themselves to the cultivation of their moral and religious influence with the people. It became necessary to conciliate them, and Hyrcanus made an effort to do so.* [Note: Josephus (Ant. xiii. x. 5-6) relates a story which tells how Hyrcanus broke with the Pharisees, to whom he had hitherto been attached, and went over to the Sadducees. But a critical examination of the story, and a comparison of its presuppositions with the previous history as related in 1 Mac., show that what took place was not a breach with the Pharisees, but an unsuccessful attempt to conciliate them. There is no evidence that they sat in the Sanhedrin before Salome's change of policy. Cf. Wellhausen, *Pharisäer und Sadducäer*.] But their terms were too high. They demanded that Hyrcanus should resign the high-priesthood, and thus destroy the constitution and government which his father and uncles had established. His refusal to concede the demand made the opposition of the Pharisees to the ruling party more acute, and under Alexander Jannaeus there was open war. The Sanhedrin, composed as it was of the Hasmonaean nobility, supported Jannaeus. But the attitude of the people showed that the Pharisees could no longer with safety be left in opposition. Salome reversed the policy of her predecessors, and admitted them to a share in the government—for a time the dominant share—and to the Sanhedrin.

From that time onwards the Sanhedrin consisted of chief priests, elders, and scribes. It was a house divided against itself, and the bitter conflicts of Sadducee and Pharisee contributed in no small degree to the confusion and decay of the century and a half preceding the destruction of Jerusalem. The path of the Romans and of the Herodian house was made smooth by the inability of the Sanhedrin to act in unity and lead a united people. Pompey abrogated the kingship, but left the high priest at the head of the people and of the Sanhedrin, as heretofore. Gabinius went further, and established five *συνέδρια* in place of the single court, thus largely destroying its influence (57-55 b.c.). Some years later, however, the Sanhedrin was restored to its former position, and resumed the exercise of authority over the whole Jewish territory. Herod is stated to have commenced his reign with a massacre of the members of the Sanhedrin (Josephus *Ant.* xiv. ix. 4). According to another account (*ib.* xv. i. 2), he put to death 45 members of the party of Antigonus. His object was to destroy the influence of the Sadducee nobility, his consistent opponents and only possible rivals. With the same object in view, he reduced the dignity and importance of the high-priesthood by making it no longer hereditary and tenable for life, and by frequent changes. Under his rule the Sanhedrin had but little influence,—less probably than at any other time. Herod's death was followed by the dismemberment of his kingdom, and the authority of the Sanhedrin ceased to extend beyond the limits of Judaea.

The government of the Roman procurators was on the whole favourable to the Sanhedrin. They had not the Herodian jealousy of the local nobility, and were content to leave considerable powers of internal control in their hands. Josephus and the NT bear witness to the influence and authority of the Sanhedrin during this period. So long as it retained control of the people, there was a fair measure of peace and good government. Ultimately, however, the people, under the influence of the Zealots, became unmanageable, and, against the advice of the older and more experienced aristocrats, embarked on the fatal revolt against the Roman authority. Even then the Sanhedrin, had it been left to itself, might have saved Jerusalem from total destruction. But the Zealots usurped its authority, rid themselves of those who counselled moderation, and inaugurated a Reign of Terror, which was terminated only by the entry of the Roman troops into the city.

Under the totally new conditions which prevailed after the destruction of Jerusalem, a new court established itself, bearing the name 'Sanhedrin,' but differing in essential features from the older body. The new Sanhedrin had no political authority, and was composed exclusively of Rabbis, whose discussions and decisions were mainly theoretical. It exercised considerable judicial authority over the Jewish people, owing to its moral influence, but was quite without governmental importance. The real Sanhedrin fell with the city.

3. Functions and authority.—The trustworthy sources give only incidental indications of the functions of the Sanhedrin and the extent of its authority. The changes in the constitution, also, from the time of the Maccabean rising to the fall of the city, were so great and so frequent, that it is difficult to say how much authority was actually vested in the Sanhedrin at any one time. Under the Hasmonaeans it must have been considerable, both in administration and jurisdiction, though the stronger kings, like Jannaeus, may have ruled very independently. It was much more limited under the Herodian kings, whose authority was quite independent of the Jewish constitution. By the Romans the constitution was as far as possible respected, and the Sanhedrin, though subordinate to the Roman authority, had again considerable powers, perhaps greater than at any other time. The system of short tenure of the high-priestly office would throw more influence into the hands of the permanent body. In these later days, also, its moral authority over the Jewish people was much wider than its actual power. Territorially its actual authority extended under the procurators over Judaea only. On the other hand, its recommendations were regarded by orthodox Jews outside Judaea as possessing the force of commands (cf. Act 9:2). In general, it may be said that under the procurators the Sanhedrin exercised such authority as was not either within the competence of local councils or reserved by the Romans, and that, while it had considerable powers of police administration and in the levying of taxes, and a certain responsibility for the maintenance of order, its main function was that of a supreme judicial tribunal. Except in the case of capital sentences, its authority was absolute, and it had the power to carry its decisions into effect. An effective sentence of death could be pronounced only by the procurator's court. The stoning of Stephen (Act 7:57 ff.) without the sanction of the procurator was an illegal act, not an execution but a 'lynching.' In the case of one offence, that of profanation of the sanctuary, even Roman citizens might be tried and condemned by the Sanhedrin, subject, of course, to the procurator's revision of the capital sentence. In spite, however, of the constitutional powers conceded to the Sanhedrin, the Roman authority was always absolute, and the procurator or the tribune of the garrison could not only summon the Sanhedrin and direct it to investigate a matter, but could interfere and withdraw a prisoner from its jurisdiction, as was done in the case of St. Paul (Act 22:30; Act 23:23 ff.).

4. Sessions and procedure.—The Sanhedrin could sit on any day except the Sabbath and holy days; and as sentence of death could be pronounced (according to the Mishna) only on the day after a trial on a capital charge, such charges were not heard on the day preceding a Sabbath or holy day. The place of meeting is called by Josephus the βουλή, and was near the Xystus, which appears to be indicated in the Mishnic הַבַּיִת לְשֹׁבֵת 'hall of hewn stone' (cf. Schürer, *GJV [Note: JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.]* ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , ii. 211). It was close to the upper city, but not in it, as it was destroyed by the

Romans before they had reduced the upper city (Josephus *BJ* vi. vi. 3). The references in NT to meetings of the Sanhedrin (cf. Acts 23) show that its proceedings might be enlivened by stirring debates, and by the stormy scenes which occasionally take place even in the most dignified political assemblies. In the case of ordinary trials, the procedure may have resembled that described in the Mishna. According to its account, the proceedings were conducted according to strict rules, and the members gave judgment in regular order. Twenty-three members formed a quorum, and while a bare majority might acquit, a majority of two was necessary to secure condemnation. If a majority of one gave a verdict of guilty, more members were summoned, until either the requisite majority was obtained for a legal verdict, or the full number of seventy-one members was reached, when a majority of one was decisive on either side.

The accounts of the trial of Jesus present considerable difficulty, and it is not easy to accommodate them to the regular procedure of the Sanhedrin. See art. Trial of Jesus Christ.

Literature.—This is extensive, comprising all Histories of the Jews during the period b.c. 200-a.d. 70, as well as the relevant articles in all Bible Dictionaries, and some special works. The most useful and accessible comprehensive statement is that of Schürer, *GJV* [Note: *JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ii. 188-214 [*HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. i. 163 ff.]. The most illuminating account of the history and composition of the Sanhedrin is Wellhausen, *Pharisäer und Sadducäer*. To these may be added Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Sanhedrin' (Bacher); *Ebi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*], artt. 'Synedrion' (Canney), and 'Government' (Benzinger), § 28-31.

C. H. Thomson.

☞ Sarepta

SAREPTA.—See Zarephath.

☞ Satan

SATAN.—1. The word 'Satan' (שָׂטָן, Σατανᾶς), which in the NT is invariably used as a proper name denoting the arch-enemy of God and man, occurs in the Hebrew of the

OT originally as a synonym of the common words for ‘adversary,’ as the verb *שׁוּב* is used simply in the sense of withstanding, taking the opposite side. In this sense it is used in Num 22:22 even of the angel of the Lord, who is said to go forth to be a Satan to Balaam. In other passages it is applied, with no sinister meaning, to David, who, as the Philistines feared, might desert Achish and turn against them in battle (1Sa 29:4); to Abishai when he opposed David’s purpose of clemency towards Shimei (2Sa 19:22); and again to a foreign enemy in general (1Ki 5:4); and to Hadad and Rezon in connexion with their revolt against Solomon (1Ki 11:14; 1Ki 11:23; 1Ki 11:25). Elsewhere, as in the Book of Ps. (109:6), in the first two chapters of the Book of Job and in Zechariah 3 it is used in a technical or legal sense as the equivalent of *ἀντιδικός*, an opponent in law, an advocate, whose function it is to plead for the condemnation of an accused person. In Job 2:3 Jehovah taxes ‘the Satan’ with over-officious zeal in his efforts to test the motives of the righteous man whom he is permitted to accuse; and again in Zec 3:2 He distinctly rebukes him for pressing his charge against Joshua. But notwithstanding such suggestions that an evil spirit, a malicious accuser, is described (like the Satan, the accuser of the brethren, *διάβολος, κατηγορός* of the NT), there is no explicit indication that this is the case. The being thus described as ‘the Satan’ or the Adversary appears in Zechariah as an official accuser, and in the Book of Job he takes his place among ‘the sons of God’ in the court of heaven as one having a right to be there, and that in connexion with the function attributed to him of ‘going to and fro upon the earth,’ and ‘considering’ and reporting upon the conduct of the sons of men. He is recognized as a minister of the Divine justice, although God does tax him with overdoing his part. All that appears to be indicated there is the thought that there is in the Court of God one whose office it is to plead for the condemnation of sinners. Of a malignant enemy of God and His cause, a personal spirit of evil called Satan, there is no express mention in the OT. The temptation of our first parents is ascribed in Genesis to ‘the serpent,’ and no interpretation is offered of the symbolism of the story. Again, though in one passage in Chronicles (1Ch 21:1) we read that Satan tempted David to number the people—a presumptuous offence for which the king was severely punished—the parallel passage (2Sa 24:1), much the older narrative, attributes David’s conduct to trial at the hands of God, not to the temptation of the Evil One. Similarly the deception of the ‘lying spirit’ who lured Ahab to his destruction (1Ki 22:19-23) is said to have had the express sanction of God. Altogether it is one of the most noteworthy features of the theology of the OT, that so little reference is made to Satan as the great adversary of God and His people, or as the malignant tempter and accuser of man. The Satan of the Book of Job and of the prophecies of Zechariah is described in language very different from that in which the arch-enemy is spoken of in the NT.

This fact, together with the circumstance that references to Satan as an accuser of mankind occur only in those books of the OT which belong to a comparatively late period, has been taken as a proof of the theory that the Jewish belief in Satanic agency was introduced into the Hebrew theology from a foreign source. Traces appear elsewhere of early beliefs current among the Hebrews in the existence of demons, satyrs, liliths, and the like, as in the use of the name 'Azazel,' a mysterious being mentioned in the Pentateuch in connexion with the ordinance of the scapegoat (Leviticus 16). It has been supposed that upon those popular beliefs of early Semitic religion there was grafted, from Persian sources, the conception of a Prince of Darkness whose agency is similar to that which, in the religion of Zoroaster, is ascribed to the demon-god Ahriman, and that the belief in Satan and his angels as fallen spirits was thus introduced into Hebrew theology. But, as a matter of fact, the connexion between Satan and the Zoroastrian Ahriman is more apparent than real. A simpler explanation of the history of the doctrine of the personality and agency of Satan is that it has been the subject of development under the influence of a progressive revelation. The complete revelation of such a being as the malignant author of evil was reserved for the time when, with the advent of Christ's Kingdom, the minds of God's people were prepared, without risk of idolatry, or of the mischievous dualism of such a religion as that of Zoroaster, to recognize in the serpent of Eden and in the Satan who appeared as the adversary of Job and of Joshua, the great Adversary of God and man, whose power is to be feared and his temptations resolutely resisted, but from whose dark dominion the Son of God had come to deliver mankind.

2. If the OT is remarkable for its reticence on this subject, we find in the NT the doctrine of Satanic agency very fully developed. It meets us on the threshold. It is one of the most conspicuous elements of NT teaching. Jesus and His disciples distinctly assume the reality of Satan and his kingdom as a mighty power for evil, opposed to the Kingdom of God in the world and in the hearts of men. This is nowhere more noticeable than in the Gospels, and there in the direct teaching of our Lord. At the outset of the Gospel narrative Satan appears as the antagonist of Christ. The story of the Temptation, which must have been communicated to the disciples from the lips of Jesus Himself, is related by the three Synoptists. St. Mark (Mar 1:13) informs us that Jesus was forty days tempted of Satan, using that word or title as a proper name. St. Matthew (ch. 4) and St. Luke (ch. 4), who relate the incident with clear circumstantiality of detail, note three distinct temptations, in which they quote the arguments used by the Tempter and the answers returned by Jesus. They describe the Tempter as ὁ διάβολος, 'the devil,' using the recognized word for betrayer or malicious accuser. According to St. Matthew's account, Jesus addresses him as 'Satan.' St. Luke concludes the narrative with the significant words, 'When the devil had ended all the temptation, he departed from him for a season,' as if to indicate

that the conflict with Satan was renewed and continued throughout our Lord's ministry. St. Matthew tells us that when the devil left Him, angels came and ministered unto Him. Thus the Synoptic Gospels distinctly describe the source of the temptation as the direct suggestions of a person, and that one who is variously called Satan and 'the devil.'

Again, these same Gospels, as also the Acts of the Apostles, take notice of Christ's works of healing, and especially of those wrought upon persons possessed with demons, as illustrating the nature of His mission, which was to heal 'all that were oppressed of the devil' (Act 10:38). St. Luke (Luk 22:3) no less clearly than St. John (Joh 13:2) informs us that Satan entered the heart of Judas and prompted him to betray his Lord.

In the recorded utterances of Jesus, in His express teaching, allusions are clearly made to the power and activity of Satan as a personal being, and the great Adversary of God and man. He attributes the trouble of the woman who had the spirit of infirmity to the malign power of Satan to afflict even the bodies of men (Luk 13:16). Thus, so far from discouraging the popular belief which ascribed to Satan and his angels power over soul and body, Jesus distinctly acknowledged it. Accused by the Pharisees, representatives of those to whose speculations in angelology and demonology that popular belief has been traced, of casting out demons through Beelzebub the prince of demons, Jesus, so far from controverting or throwing doubt upon the current opinions of the time, repels the charge by the argument that if Satan should cast out Satan, he would only be defeating his own ends and destroying his own work. Then He proceeds to say, 'But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you' (Mat 12:28, cf. Luk 11:20), illustrating His argument by the similitude of the strong man and the Stronger than he, implying that Satan is the strong man who would enslave mankind, but that Jesus Himself is the Stronger than he, who has appeared for the deliverance of the victims of Satanic power. That Jesus should thus have argued in controversy with the Pharisees has its own significance. We cannot explain it away on the principle of accommodation. Jesus could and did rebuke the spirit of Pharisaic traditionalism which led them to introduce all manner of mischievous subtleties, making void the Law by their unauthorized traditions, but never once did He even cast suspicion upon this part of the doctrine of the Pharisees. He accepted it without question.

Again, when the Seventy expressed their joy at the success of their mission, and exclaimed, 'Lord, even the demons are subject unto us,' Jesus replied, 'I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven,' and went on to say, 'Behold, I give you power to tread upon serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy' (Luk 10:17-19). Passing over such passages as those in the Sermon on the Mount, 'Whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil' or 'the evil one' (Mat 5:37); 'Deliver

us from evil' or 'the evil one' (Mat 6:13), which have been explained, and even, as in the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, translated as referring to the personal Author of Evil, we find Jesus in His discourses and in warnings addressed to His disciples making distinct allusion to Satan as the great adversary whom they have cause to fear. In the parables of the Sower and the Tares, the Evil One, variously termed 'the devil,' 'Satan,' 'the enemy,' 'the wicked one,' is described as seeking to frustrate the work of Christ by catching away the good seed sown in the heart (Mat 13:19, Mar 4:15, Luk 8:12); or by sowing tares among the wheat (Mat 13:38-39), the tares denoting the children of 'the wicked one' as the enemy that sowed them is 'the devil.' Here we see clearly illustrated the New Testament doctrine of the irreconcilable antagonism between the Kingdom of Christ and that of Satan.

Again, Jesus warns Peter on one occasion that Satan has asked and obtained the Divine permission to sift the disciples as wheat; and indicates that their only hope lies in the intercession of Christ Himself, who has prayed for Simon that his 'faith fail not' (Luk 22:31).

Once more, in Christ's discourse on the Last Judgment, it is expressly stated that the everlasting punishment to which the unfaithful are condemned was 'prepared for the devil and his angels' (Mat 25:41), a passage which well illustrates the manner in which, in the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus is consistently represented as alluding to Satan and his power and kingdom. That is, that the doctrine is not so much set forth by way of dogmatic statement as assumed, taken for granted. Jesus does not enlarge upon it, but quietly accepts it, presupposes it as a matter about which there is no dispute. The belief is there, and Jesus sets upon it the seal of His authority.

To these examples from the Synoptic Gospels must be added the very emphatic testimony of the discourses of Christ according to the Fourth Gospel. The darkness under whose dominion, according to the introductory verses, the world is held, the dead weight, the *vis inertiae* of human insensibility to the Divine light, is no negative thing, but itself a power, a kingdom in deadly opposition to the Kingdom of Christ, and under the rule of Satan. Jesus directly attributes the opposition of His antagonists to the malice of the devil. So He says to the Jews, 'Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do' (Joh 8:44). The false accusations of Scribe and Pharisee, and the untiring malignity of their persecuting zeal, show the spirit and are the work of him who was a liar and a murderer from the beginning. Again, He speaks of Satan as the Prince of this world, and represents as the aim and the certain result of His own work, the judgment and the easting out of Satan and his kingdom (Joh 12:31; cf. Joh 14:30, Joh 16:11).

3. The other portions of the NT confirm but do not materially add to the testimony of the Gospels on the subject of the personality and the power of the Evil One. Thus St.

James (Jam_4:7) merely counsels his readers to resist the devil, assuring them that he will flee from them; while in another passage (Jam_2:19) he speaks of ‘the demons’ (τὰ δαιμόνια), evidently meaning by the term the subordinate agents of Satanic power, as believing that there is one God—a belief which fills them with terror. St. Peter assures us that Satan, whom he describes as ἀντίδικος (‘adversary,’ a technical or official word), and compares to a roaring lion, may be successfully resisted by the power of steadfast faith (1Pe_5:8-9). St. John in his First Epistle repeats the teaching of his Gospel, and in the Apocalypse identifies Satan with the serpent of Eden, and seemingly also with the accuser of Job and of Joshua (Rev_12:9-10), and foretells his coming doom. St. Paul accepts the current doctrine; but though in his Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians he seems to add to the teaching of Christ in the Gospels other elements from the demonology of the Pharisaic schools and from other sources (Eph_2:2; Eph_6:11, Col_2:15), and in his Epistles to the Corinthians and to Timothy (1Co_5:5, 1Ti_1:20) ascribes to Satan a certain power of discipline as a minister of Divine judgment, really contributes to this branch of Christian doctrine no essential element additional to that which is furnished in the Gospels. See, further, articles Accommodation and Demon.

Literature.—Cremer, *Bibl.-Theol. Lexicon*, s.v.; Commentaries of Meyer, Alford, etc.; Cheyne, *The Origin of the Psalter*, pp. 159, 270 ff., 281; A. B. Davidson, *The Book of Job* (Cambridge Bible), pp. 7-13, also *Theol. of OT*, p. 300 ff.; Schmid, *Bibl. Theol. of NT*, p. 187; Beyschlag, *NT Theol.* 7 p. 93; Reuss, *Christian Theol. of the Apostolic Age*, i. pp. 162, 420; Wernle, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, p. 47; Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, p. 368; Wright, *Zechariah and his Prophecies*, p. 46 ff.; art. ‘Satan’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible (Whitehouse), and in the *Encyc. Bibl.* (G. B. Gray and J. Massie); art. ‘Teufel’ in *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (A. Wünsche); H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrb. d. neutest. Theol.* i. pp. 53, 226.

H. H. Currie.

☞ Saviour

SAVIOUR.—‘Saviour,’ like ‘to save’ and ‘salvation,’ is a word of frequent occurrence in the OT.

It occurs mostly in the form of the ptcpl. Hiph. of מוֹשִׁיעַ = יִשַׁע. For the specific meaning of ‘to save’ in distinction from other cognate Heb. verbs, cf. art. Salvation. Most

commonly God is called the Saviour of Israel or individuals. A standing combination is ‘God the Saviour’ often with a possessive genitive (1Ch 16:35, Psa 24:5; Psa 27:1; Psa 27:9; Psa 62:2; Psa 62:6; Psa 65:5; Psa 79:9; Psa 95:1, Isa 12:2; Isa 17:10, Mic 7:7, Hab 3:18). To be a Saviour is God’s exclusive prerogative (Psa 60:11; Psa 108:12, Isa 43:11; Isa 45:22). As instruments of God, however, human deliverers likewise receive the title (Jdg 3:9; Jdg 3:15, Neh 9:27). There is no passage in the OT where the Messiah is called ‘Saviour.’ Wherever the Messiah is connected with the idea of salvation, He is not the subject but the object of it (Psa 28:8; Psa 144:10, Zec 9:9). This is different in Apocryphal and Pseud-epigraphical literature, for here it is not merely declared that in the name of the Son of Man the people are saved, and that He is the Goel of their life (En 48:7), or that the righteous in connexion with Him shall be satisfied with salvation (4 Ezr 8:39), but also that *Christus liberabit creaturam* (4 Ezr 12:34, 13:26), and that from Judah and Levi the Lord will raise a Saviour for Israel (Test. Gad 8). God, however, here also is more frequently called Saviour (παντων σωτήρ, Ps-Sol 16:7; αίωσιος σωτήρ, Bar 4:22; ἅγιος σωτήρ, 3Ma 6:29; 3Ma 7:16). Used of God, σωτήρ is synonymous with such terms as ἄνα, ὁ ῥύστης, ὁ λυτ
ροῦμενος (En 48:7, 1Ma 4:11, 3Ma 7:23).

1. In the Gospels σωτήρ occurs but three times—Luk 1:47; Luk 2:11 and Joh 4:42. In the Song of Mary, the words ‘My spirit has rejoiced in God my Saviour’ are a reproduction of the common OT usage. In Luk 2:11 σωτήρ is not a formal title, but a descriptive designation of the Messiah, ‘a Saviour who is Christ the Lord.’ But the word evidently has a deeper meaning to the angels than the noun σωτηρία and the participle ῥυσθέντας have to Zacharias in Luk 1:71; Luk 1:74; for in the two latter passages the conception moves entirely within the OT limits. The doxology of Luk 2:14 associates Jesus’ saving work with the production of peace on earth among mankind as the objects of God’s good pleasure. Here σωτήρ undoubtedly covers the Lord’s Messianic work in the most universalistic sense. And it will be noticed that σωτ
ήρ is synonymous with χριστὸς κύριος, so that the reference cannot be confined to our Lord’s earthly ministry, but extends to His activity as the glorified Messiah. As ‘peace’ and ‘good pleasure’ indicate, not the giving of life but the bestowal of reconciliation with God stands in the foreground (for the connexion between σωτήρ and εὐδοκία, cf. Ps-Sol 8:39). In Joh 4:42 ὁ σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου receives its import from the rich and pregnant meaning σῶζειν and σωτηρία acquire in the discourses of the Fourth Gospel. As Jesus had represented Himself to the woman not as a mere revealer (Joh 4:19; Joh 4:26), but as the giver of ‘living water,’ and ‘water unto

eternal life', (Joh 4:10; Joh 4:14), so the Samaritans, in acknowledging Him as σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου, prove to have attained a deeper conception of Messiahship than was commonly current among them, both as to the nature and extent of the Messiah's calling (cf., however, for σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου, 4 Ezr 13:26).

2. The fact has not escaped observation, that St. Luke, who alone of the Synoptists introduces into his record the word σωτήρ, also employs it twice in Acts, where it occurs once in a speech of St. Peter (Act 5:31), and once in a speech of St. Paul (Act 13:23). In Act 5:31 we have the combination ἀρχηγός καὶ σωτήρ: Christ was made both by the Resurrection and by the Ascension. ἀρχηγός is found also in Act 3:15, another speech of St. Peter, and is here combined with ζωή; the Jews asked for a murderer to be granted them and killed the Prince of Life, whom God raised from the dead. It is plain that the meaning of σωτήρ in Act 5:31 is determined by that of ἀρχηγός, and Act 3:15 proves that ἀρχηγός has specifically to do with Jesus' life-giving power, whence also in both passages the Resurrection is emphasized. Besides Lk., Hebrews is the only NT writing which employs ἀρχηγός (Act 2:10, Act 12:2). The former of these two passages confirms the close connexion already found between σωτήρ and ἀρχηγός, for it calls Jesus ἀρχηγός σωτηρίας; in the other passage He is called ἀρχηγός καὶ τελειωτῆς πίστεως, 'the leader and perfecter of faith.' (For a thorough discussion of ἀρχηγός, cf. Bleek, *Der Brief a.d. Hebräer*, ii. pp. 301-303). The use of the word in combination with σωτήρ is interesting, because both are employed in the LXX Septuagint of the 'judges' sent by God to deliver Israel (Jdg 3:9-15; Jdg 11:6; Jdg 11:11; Jdg 12:3 [σωτήρ = שׂוֹטֵר, ἀρχηγός = רִצְקָ]). In Hebrews, however, the rendering 'captain,' which brings out the idea of military leadership, and the general rendering 'author,' are inadequate; the word plainly has the connotation of 'model,' 'example,' 'forerunner,' the leader first experiencing in Himself and receiving in Himself that to which he leads others. Thus Jesus is ἀρχηγός σωτηρίας in Heb 2:10, because He Himself is conducted to glory by God, and in His attainment to glory draws with Him all the other sons of God. In Heb 12:2 Jesus' career of faith is represented as exemplary for believers; by preceding in the exercise of an ideal faith He enables others to follow in the same ἀγών of faith. Heb 5:9 proves that where the author does not wish to emphasize this peculiar idea of precession, but merely to express the causal relationship between His work and the

salvation of believers, he uses the general term *αἴτιος*: ‘He became author of eternal salvation.’ The reference to the Resurrection in both Petrine passages renders it probable that the word *ἀρχηγός* is here used in the same pregnant sense: Jesus is in virtue of the Resurrection a leader of life, one who has Himself attained unto life, and now makes others partakers of the same. As the murderer in Act 3:14 inflicts death, so the *ἀρχηγός* τῆς ζωῆς bestows life. *σωτήρ*, then, is identical with *ἀρχηγός* so far as the impartation of life is concerned, but leaves the exemplification of the life-content of the *σωτηρία* in Jesus’ own Person unexpressed. In the speech of St. Paul (Act 13:23) the use of *σωτήρ* clearly attaches itself to the LXX Septuagint of the Book of Judges, if the reading ἤγειρε of the Textus Receptus be followed, for this is the verb by which the LXX Septuagint in Jdg 3:9; Jdg 3:15 renders the Heb. *הִקִּי*. If, on the other hand, we read with WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort’s text.] ἤγαγε, the more immediate reference seems to be to Zec 3:8; but even then the word *σωτήρ* itself points back to the Book of Judges.

3. In St. Paul’s writings, apart from the Pastoral Epistles, *σωτήρ* is found only twice—Eph 5:23 and Php 3:20. The interpretation of the former passage is much disputed. The husband’s relation as head to the wife and Christ’s relation as Head to the Church are compared, and in this connexion Christ is called *σωτήρ τοῦ σώματος* (of the Church). This last statement seems to imply that Christ’s headship over the Church is based on His being the Saviour of the Church-body. The question is whether this must be understood in the sense which will likewise be applicable to the relation between husband and wife. In the ordinary sense the husband could hardly be called the saviour of the wife’s body. But Wagner (*ZNTW* [Note: *NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissen. schaft.*] vi. [1905] p. 220) has called attention to a passage in Clement (*Paed.* ii. 5) where it is stated that the Creator provides man with meat and drink *τοῦ σώζεσθαι χάριτι*, ‘for the sake of keeping alive.’ Applying this to our passage, he obtains the very congruous sense: As the husband is *σωτήρ* of the wife, by supplying the sustenance of her physical life, so Christ is *σωτήρ* of the Church, inasmuch as He endows her with eternal life; and for this reason both hold the position of head. This secures for *σώζειν* the sense of ‘endowing with eternal life.’ The peculiarity of the passage, thus understood, would lie in this, that the ordinary religious use of *σώζειν* is illustrated by analogy with a natural use of the verb which seems to be without precedent in earlier Biblical Greek. In Php 3:20 the word *σωτήρ*

has a specific eschatological reference: Christ is σωτήρ, because at the resurrection He will transform the body of believers into the likeness of His own glorious body. σώζειν therefore here also is equivalent to the bestowal of life.

4. With sudden and remarkable frequency σωτήρ emerges in the Pastoral Epistles (10 times) and in 2 Peter (5 times). In the Pastorals there is further the peculiarity that the name is applied to both God and Christ: to God, in 1Ti 1:1; 1Ti 2:3; 1Ti 4:10, Tit 1:3; Tit 2:10; Tit 3:4; to Christ, in 2Ti 1:10, Tit 1:4; Tit 2:13; Tit 3:6. In 2 Peter the reference is always to Christ. In Jude also God is once called ‘our Saviour through Jesus Christ’ (v. 25). The designation of God as Saviour can appear strange only on the basis of our established custom to reserve this title for Christ; on the basis of the OT it was a perfectly natural usage, for here always God, never the Messiah, is called מוֹשִׁיעַ, σωτήρ. And in the NT itself the act of saving is, where a subject is indicated, as naturally ascribed to God as to Christ (comparatively few passages reflect on the subject). Except perhaps for the one passage, 1Ti 4:10, it cannot be said that the meaning of σωτήρ in the Pastorals and 2 Peter differs from its ordinary import, or that of σώζειν in the NT elsewhere. Christ is Saviour, because He abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel (2Ti 1:10); as Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ has an eternal Kingdom into which believers receive entrance (2Pe 1:11). He is called ‘the great God and Saviour,’ in so far as believers look for the blessed hope and appearing of His glory (Tit 2:13). The hope of eternal life comes from God our Saviour (Tit 1:2; Tit 2:14). Eschatological also is the reference in ‘the commandment of the Lord and Saviour’ (2Pe 3:2). In Tit 2:10 the thought is implied that God is Saviour in the ethical sphere, whence ‘the doctrine of God our Saviour’ becomes an incentive to holy living. But peculiar is 1Ti 4:10 where God is called ‘the Saviour of all men, especially of them that believe.’ Wagner proposes to apply here the same sense given to σωτήρ in Eph 5:23 : God is Saviour of all men, inasmuch as He supplies them with natural life; Saviour especially of believers, because He supplies these with the higher life of the Spirit (*l.c.* p. 222, where Philo [*de Mundi Opif.* 60: God = εὐεργέτης καὶ σωτήρ] is quoted). This might seem to be favoured by 1Ti 6:13 ‘God who keepeth all things alive,’ or ‘who giveth life to all things’ (cf. the alternative reading ζωογονήσει for σώσει in Luk 17:33). But it is less in keeping with Tit 2:11 where a similar universalism of God’s σώζειν is affirmed, and yet this is a matter of redemption, not of nature. Wagner is quite correct, however, in urging against von Soden that ‘God σωτήρ of all men’ cannot mean ‘God is *willing* to be σωτήρ of all men’; and against B. Weiss, that it cannot mean ‘God has made salvation

objectively possible for all men, while subjectively He realizes it in believers only.’ The solution of the difficulty must be sought elsewhere, viz. in connexion with the pronounced universalism of the Pastoral Epistles in general. The emphasis and frequency with which this principle is brought forward render it probable that something specific in the historical situation to which the Pastorals address themselves lies at its basis, and at the basis also of the frequency with which the words σωζειν, σωτηρια, σωτήριος, σωτήρ are employed. There is absolutely no reason to suspect the writer of any intention to weaken or neutralize the doctrine of predestination. Besides involving denial of the Pauline origin of the Epistles, this would leave unexplained why, in other passages, the principle of predestination is enunciated with all desirable distinctness. The only plausible view is that the passages under review contain a warning against the dualistic trend of that incipient Gnosticism to whose early presence in the Apostolic period the Epistles of the First Captivity also bear witness. In a twofold sense it might become of importance to vindicate, over against this theory, the universalism of saving grace: on the one hand, in so far as Gnosticism on principle excluded from salvation those who lacked the pneumatic character; and, on the other hand, in so far as those belonging to the *pneumatici* might be considered to carry the power of salvation by nature in themselves. In other words, it might become necessary to emphasize that God saves all men, not merely one class of men, and that no man is by his subjective condition either sunk beneath the possibility or raised above the need of salvation. Perhaps also the emphasis upon the fact that God as well as Christ is Saviour, though perfectly natural from the OT point of view, is specially directed against a system which tended to separate between the Creator-God of the old dispensation and the Saviour-God, Christ, of the new. The recent investigations of Friedländer have shown that there existed long before the 2nd cent. of our era a Jewish type of Gnosticism, so that it can no longer be asserted that an anti-Gnostic polemic of this type *per se* militates against the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles.

In recent times attempts have been made to explain the rise and development of the NT conception of σωτήρ and σωτηρια from extra-Biblical sources. Anrich (*Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christenthum*, 1894) pointed out how in the cult of the ‘Mysteries’ the promise of σωτηρια, in the sense of immortality, plays a large role. Similarly Wobbermin (*Religionsgeschichtliche Studien*, 1896), who asserts that especially in the cult of the subterranean gods the word σωτήρ was common as a name for the Deity. In two articles published in the *Christliche Welt* for 1899 and 1900, entitled ‘Als die Zeit erfüllt war’ and ‘Der Heiland,’ Harnack calls attention to certain inscriptions discovered in Asia Minor, at Priene and Halicarnassus, dating probably from the year b.c. 9, in which the Emperor Augustus is invested with Divine predicates, and called σωτήρ, the one who has been filled for the good of mankind

with gifts, a god whose birthday has brought to the world the evangel connected with his person, the Zeus of the fatherland and the σωτήρ of the human race.

Harnack assumes that St. Luke in calling Jesus σωτήρ was influenced by these and similar pagan forms of expression current in the cult of the Emperors, and that the same influence may be seen at work in the frequency with which the Pastoral Epistles and 2 Peter employ the title. He further suggests that St. Paul purposely avoided its use, because of the eudaemonistic, political flavour it had acquired from these pagan associations. St. Luke, in the 'Gospel of the Infancy,' the writer of the Pastorals, the writer of 2 Peter, and the Fourth Evangelist, meant to represent Christ as the true σωτήρ in whom lay the reality of what paganism falsely ascribed to its rulers, dead or living.—Soltau (*Die Geburtsgeschichte Jesu Christi*, 1902) reaches the same conclusions, independently of Harnack, on the basis of the same and other classical material, and also asserts derivation of the story of the virgin birth from the same pagan circle of ideas.—Wendland (*ZNTW [Note: NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissen. schaft.]* v. [1904], p. 335 ff.) investigates the use of σωτήρ in antiquity with reference to both gods and deified men—a usage dating back from before the production of the LXX Septuagint. Up to the time of Alexander the Great, σωτήρ was not applied to men, because it was still felt to be a cult-name reserved for the gods. The first trace of its application to men appears in Thucydides, where it is given to Brasidas, and in Polybins, where Philip of Macedon is called σωτήρ. After that, the custom became quite common among the Ptolemies and the Seleucidae: first the dead, then also the living rulers were honoured with this title. It was also combined with the Oriental idea of the incarnation of the godhead, whence such a term as ἔτιφρα νῆς was applied to rulers. A feast celebrated on the day of such a σωτήρ was called σωτήρια. From the Greek dynasties the custom passed over to the representatives of the Roman power, especially to the Emperors. Examples are adduced from Cicero, whose rhetorical exaggerations in speaking of great Romans are believed to have sprung from his knowledge of the Oriental forms of speech. Even a philosopher like Epicurus could be called σωτήρ after a semi-Divine fashion, and that in his lifetime. Finally, in connexion with the recent trend towards explaining Biblical conceptions from Babylonian sources, it has been proposed to find in the NT idea of σωτήρ an embodiment of the Oriental myth of a Saviour-King (*Erlöser-König*); cf. A. Jeremias, *Babylonisches im NT* (1905), pp. 27-46.

It is not proposed here to subject the above hypotheses to an exhaustive criticism. To some extent the later forms have effectually criticised the earlier ones. Thus

Wendland disposes of much in Anrich, Wobhermin, and Soltau. Wagner (*ZNTW [Note: NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissen. schaft.]* vi. [1905]) skilfully attacks the position of Wendland. A few remarks must here suffice. The derivation of the whole idea of σωτήρ and σωτηρία from the Oriental expectation of the Saviour-King is impossible, because OT prophecy not at all, and Jewish theology very rarely, applies the name מָשִׁיחַ, σωτήρ, to the Messiah, and yet in eschatological Messianism it would be natural to look first of all for the evidence of such Oriental importation. As to the alleged connexion between the Greek mysteries and Christianity, it should be observed that the cult of the mysteries flourished in the 2nd cent. of the Christian era, and that none of the authorities quoted by Anrich in support of his view dates further back than this. The Asian inscriptions, of which Harnack and Soltau make so much, offer at the best some striking analogies to the NT mode of representation; but a real literary dependence cannot be made out, as even Wendland admits. In his second article, 'Der Heiland,' Harnack expresses himself much more guardedly than in the first, after this fashion: 'On the Jewish and on the Grecian line numerous religious conceptions existed, which covered each other and so simply could pass over into each other.' σωτήρ in the cult of the Emperors has quite a different sense from what it has in the NT; in Hellenism it never means 'the one who translates from death into life.' It is also exceedingly doubtful whether St. Paul consciously and purposely avoids the use of σωτήρ with reference to Christ, because of its pagan, idolatrous associations. Why did not St. Paul avoid κύριος for the same reasons? Why not σώζειν and σωτηρία themselves as well as σωτήρ? A far more simple explanation is that the non-use of מָשִׁיחַ in the OT with reference to the Messiah continued to exert its influence in the usage of St. Paul. An allusion to the Emperor-cult and the rôle played in it by σωτήρ in Php 3:20 is not impossible, for in the words 'our πολιτευμα is in heaven' the pronoun is emphatic. Where, apart from St. Paul, the conception of σώζειν is first joined to the Person of Christ, this is done in dependence on the Hebrew meaning of the name 'Jesus,' i.e. in dependence on the OT (Mat 1:21). *A priori* there would be no objection to the hypothesis that in Luke and the Pastoral Epistles and 2 Peter and the Fourth Gospel there is a conscious appropriation of, and at the same time a protest against, the pagan use of the word, and that the sudden frequency of its occurrence in the Pastorals and 2 Peter is to be explained from this. As a matter of fact, however, this involves, according to Harnack, the unhistorical character of at least the present form of the *Magnificat* and of the message of the angels to the shepherds (Luk 1:47; Luk 2:11); further, the unhistorical character of at least the present form of the speeches of St. Peter and St. Paul (Act 5:31; Act 13:23); and, finally, the unhistorical character of at least the form of the discourse of our Lord in

Joh 4:42. It has been shown above, that the Lukan record can be readily explained from the historical situation which it reports. For Joh 4:42 (and 1Jn 4:14) σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου, a comparison with 4 Ezr 13:26, where the same phrase occurs, proves that even here we do not necessarily move in Greek trains of thought, but are still in the Jewish sphere. All that remains of Wendland's contention is, that possibly in the Pastoral Epistles there is some adjustment in the use of σωτήρ to the manner of its handling in pagan quarters, for an apologetic purpose. But even here considerable weeding of Wendland's assertions will be necessary. Thus he brings the χάρις, which is named as the motive of the Divine act of σώζειν, into connexion with the *benignitas* and *clementia* of the Roman emperors. But Eph 2:5-9 shows how all this can be readily explained without resorting to such far-fetched analogies. Similarly the πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων of Tit 1:2 and 2Ti 1:9 is treated by Wendland as an allusion to the eternity of the Roman Emperors, which takes no account of the fact that the latter was an eternity of post- not of pre-existence. In Tit 3:7, where he would find the same analogy, the eternity is not that of the σωτήρ, but of believers. Most, perhaps, could be said in favour of the Hellenistic association of such terms as ἐπιφάνεια, μέγας θεος, and φιλανθρωπία in their joint use with σωτήρ (cf. Wagner, p. 232). But, taken as a whole, σωτήρ is shown to be a thoroughly OT conception by its dependence on σώζειν and σωτηρία, about whose OT provenience there can be no reasonable doubt.

See also art. Salvation, and the Literature there cited.

Geerhardus Vos.

☩ Saying And Doing

SAYING AND DOING.—The contrast between 'saying' and 'doing' is based on an axiomatic principle of the moral and spiritual life, which, notwithstanding its simplicity and obviousness, is apt to be overlooked, viz. the importance of character as distinguished from profession, the supreme value of ethical ideals and practice above ritual observance, the vital connexion between creed and conduct. The distinction thus suggested necessarily finds a large place in the teaching of our Lord, who, as the Founder of a religion of inward reality, frequently emphasized the importance of 'doing' rather than 'saying.' 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father

which is in heaven' (Mat 7:21). Not that Jesus by any means underrated the importance of 'saying'; He made confession of His name one of the most solemn obligations of discipleship (Mat 10:32-33, cf. Luk 8:38-39). But a profession must rest upon a solid foundation of character. The recurrence, in various forms, of the phrase 'to do the will of God,' and the prominent place given to this conception, is a marked feature of Christ's teaching; see Mat 12:50; cf. Mat 7:24-27; Mat 16:27; Mat 25:40; Mat 25:45, Luk 10:30-37; Luk 11:28; Luk 13:6-9 etc. 'Doing' is the testing quality of the Christian life (Mat 5:19; Mat 5:47), and the sure and only way to spiritual enlightenment (Joh 7:17). Of this doing of God's will Jesus Himself set the supreme and inspiring example (Joh 4:34; Joh 5:30; Joh 6:38). In contrast with this ideal of 'doing,' Jesus warned men against the subtle dangers of mere 'saying.' Even when sincerely meant, He checked the impulsiveness of a hasty and ill-considered profession (Mat 8:19-20; cf. Mat 26:33-34, Luk 14:28); but His severest rebukes were reserved for those who substituted a hollow and obtrusive pretension for the realities of moral and spiritual character. It was the great sin of the religious leaders of the time that they were so strong in profession and precept, and so neglectful of practical righteousness; 'they say, and do not' (Mat 23:3); and many too readily followed their example of easy formalism,—'This people honoureth me with their lips' (Mat 15:8). The same contrast is boldly presented in the parable of the Two Sons (Mat 21:28-32), with special reference on the one hand to the Pharisees and scribes, and on the other to the outwardly unpromising 'publicans and sinners' who welcomed the message of the Kingdom of heaven. Right action without profession, or even in contradiction to the profession, is better than promises unfulfilled by practice. In this, as in other ways, 'many shall be last that are first; and first that are last' (Mat 19:30). The 'acted parable' of the withering of the barren fig-tree with its deceptive show of premature leaves, was a solemn warning against the danger and sin of 'saying' without 'doing' (Mat 21:18-19, Mar 11:12-14). Better that the 'saying' should follow than outrun the 'doing,' and be inspired by a truthful and humble judgment of even our best efforts and achievements; 'when ye shall have done all the things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which it was our duty to do' (Luk 17:10).

Literature.—Dale, *Evangel. Revival*, 104; *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times*.] iii. [1892] 466, viii. [1896] 85; F. W. Robertson, *Serm*, ii. 94.

J. E. M'Ouat.

☞ Sayings (Unwritten)

SAYINGS (UNWRITTEN).—Certain sayings ascribed to Christ, though recorded by early writers, are not found written in the Gospels, and therefore are known as the **Agrapha**, or Unwritten Sayings of Our Lord. They are not as numerous as might, perhaps, have been anticipated, in view of the recorded facts of Christ's ministry, and the comparative brevity of the actual reports of His discourses. The active ministry seems to have lasted for nearly three years. The records convey the impression of preachings and teachings, continued from day to day, with only rare intervals of repose. The audiences were frequently very large; they came from all quarters; the interest was widespread and intense. The words of this Galilaeen Rabbi, who attracted some and provoked the wrath of others, but could not be disregarded by any, did not die in their utterance. It was an age when the memory was much cultivated. Christ's hearers would be ready to retain, and repeat at home, and amongst their friends, whatever had impressed them most in the new doctrines. It was a literary age also. Before the Third Gospel was written, many had already composed histories of Christ (Luk 1:1). The Fourth Evangelist states that he made a selection from available materials (Joh 20:30-31; Joh 21:25).

There must once have been a large amount of *Agrapha*—of teachings and sayings which have not reached us in the pages of Holy Writ. While these were for the most part current in Palestine only, a few would spread farther, through the visits of Hellenists, and even Greeks (Joh 12:20), to Judaea. But the work of converting the world was reserved for the preaching of Christ's Apostles; and the converts' knowledge of Christianity was derived from the traditions which were delivered by the Apostles, and which were subsequently superseded by the texts of the written Gospels. Meanwhile, the Hebrew Church of Palestine, which alone possessed first-hand knowledge of Christ's teachings, faded and ultimately perished with the scattering of the Hebrew race. In these historical conditions we find the reasons why so little of the teaching of the Master has survived beyond the actual contents of the four canonical records. The entire collection of *Agrapha*, gathered from all sources, is not large. When what is apocryphal, or certainly spurious, has been eliminated, the residuum is found to be small in amount, and not very valuable.

The extra-canonical Sayings are preserved in some Manuscripts of the Gospels, and in those religious romances known as the Apocryphal Gospels, also in the Commentaries of the Fathers; but there are, besides, a few sayings which are *Agrapha* in that they are not included in the written Gospels, but yet possess high attestation as being parts of the text of Acts and 1 Cor. They stand, or fall, with the estimate held of the authenticity of those books. In Act 20:35 St. Paul quotes the words of the Lord; 'how he said, *It is more blessed to give than to receive.*' This is a specimen of the traditions (2Th 2:15) which were delivered by the first preachers of Christianity to their converts. In 1Co 11:25 St. Paul adds a phrase not found in the Evangelists' accounts of the Institution, '*This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me*';

but 1Co_11:23 may be interpreted to intimate that the Apostle had enjoyed a special revelation ('I have received of the Lord'), independently of any tradition of the words heard by the Twelve. The report of our Lord's last commands to His Apostles (Act_1:4-8), though in part a repetition of texts in the Gospels, is distinct in some expressions, and Act_1:5 has no parallel in the Evangelists. This verse is repeated by St. Peter in Act_11:16.

The sayings preserved in some Manuscripts of the Gospels are of the nature of textual variations for the most part. A few are absolutely inadmissible on textual grounds; others are accepted only by certain critics. Those which are not universally admitted may yet be authentic traditions, though extra-canonical: relics of the many sayings which were not recorded by the Evangelists. The test of these, and of others which are handed down by the Fathers, is by comparison with the sentiments which are recognized as elements in the character of Christ's teaching. The very ancient MS at Cambridge known as *Codex Bezae*, which exhibits many remarkable variations from the usual text of the Gospels, has between Mat_20:28-29 the following:

'But ye, seek ye from little to increase, and from greater to be less; but also when, having been invited, ye enter in to sup, not to go and sit down in the prominent places, lest a more honourable than thou should come in, and he that invited to the supper should come forward and say to thee, "Withdraw still lower"; and thou shouldest be put to shame. But if thou shouldest go and sit down in the inferior place, and one inferior to thee should come in, he that invited to the supper will say to thee, "Draw together still higher"; and this shall he to thee profitable.'

Between Luk_6:4-5 the following occurs:

'On the same day he beheld a certain man working on the Sabbath, and said to him. "Man, if indeed thou knowest what thou art doing, thou art blessed; but if thou knowest not, thou art accursed and a transgressor of the law." '

These paragraphs are not supported by sufficient evidence to warrant their inclusion in the text of the Gospels: whether they are worthy to be considered part of those traditions of Christ's teachings which preceded, and for a time accompanied, the written word, the English reader can judge for himself. Textual criticism has no place outside the region of documents.

The following Sayings, however, are in a different category. The evidence for them is so weighty that all are received into the text by some critics; but to others the evidence is insufficient; yet it will hardly be denied by any that the presence of the words in so many ancient documents stamps them with distinct authority, and demands their recognition as traditions of the Master's teachings. We refer here to

the Doxology (Mat_6:13); the verse Mat_17:21; the words, 'and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt' (Mar_9:49); 'Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them' (Luk_9:55-56); 'Father, forgive them: for they know not what they do' (Luk_23:34). All these passages except the last are rejected as parts of the text by the Revisers, and those of the same school of criticism; nor do they accept as undoubtedly genuine the story of the Adulteress in John 8, and the concluding verses of Mk.; yet the words attributed to Christ in these two sections, and in the texts cited above, must certainly commend themselves to unprejudiced ears as authentic reminiscences of the Master's sayings, even if we refuse them a place in the canonical records.

The Sayings of Christ which have been preserved outside the NT by ecclesiastical writers, though not actually numerous, are too many for quotation in this article. The following are specimens; and, in different ways, of interest and importance.

Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* vi. 5. 43) quotes Peter thus:

'The Lord said to the Apostles, "If, then, any one of Israel wishes to repent and believe through my name on God, his sins shall be forgiven him. After twelve years go forth into the world, lest any one say, We did not hear." '

Origen (*in Joan.* ii. 6) has:

'If any one goes to the Gospel according to the Hebrews, there the Saviour himself saith: "Just now my mother the Holy Spirit took me by one of my hairs and carried me off to the great mountain Tabor." '

Jerome quotes from the same Gospel as follows:

(a) 'After the resurrection of the Saviour, it records: "But when the Lord had given the linen cloth to the priest's servant, he went to James and appeared to him. For James had taken an oath that he would not eat bread from that hour in which he had drunk the cup of the Lord, until he should see him rising from them that sleep." And again, a little farther on, "Bring me, saith the Lord, a table and bread." And there follows immediately: "He took the bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave to James the Just, and said to him, 'My brother, eat thy bread, inasmuch as the Son of Man hath risen from them that sleep' " (*de Vir. illust.* ii.).

(b) 'There is the following story: "Behold, the Lord's mother and his brethren were saying to him: 'John the Baptist baptizes unto remission of sins; let us go and be baptized by him.' But he said unto them: 'What sin have I done, that I should go and

be baptized by him? unless perchance this very thing, which I have said, is an ignorance' ” (*adv. Pelag.* iii. 2).

(c) ‘We read, too, of the Lord saying to the disciples: “And never rejoice, except when you have looked upon your brother in love” ’ (*in Eph_5:3 f.*).

The ‘Sayings’ contained in a fragmentary papyrus of the 3rd cent., discovered at Oxyrhynchus, are in part equivalent to texts in the Gospels, but the following have no parallels:

(a) ‘Except ye fast to the world, ye shall in nowise find the kingdom of God; and except ye make the Sabbath a real Sabbath, ye shall not see the Father.’

(b) ‘I stood in the midst of the world, and in the flesh was I seen of them, and I found all men drunken, and none found I athirst among them; and my soul grieveth over the sons of men, because they are blind in their heart, and see not.’

(c) ‘Wherever there are two, they are not without God; and wherever there is one alone, I say, I am with him. Raise the stone and there shalt thou find me; cleave the wood and there am I.’* [Note: Other fragments of MSS containing words ascribed to Christ have lately been procured from the same place, but the text was not available when this article was printed. It is not unreasonable to anticipate additions to our store of Agrapha by future discoveries amongst Egyptian ruins.]

The so-called 2nd Ep. of Clement of Rome (c. iv.) has:

‘For this cause, if we do these things, the Lord said, “Though ye be gathered together with me in my bosom, and do not my commandments, I will cast you away, and will say unto you, ‘Depart from me, I know you not whence ye are, ye workers of iniquity.’ ” ’

Hippolytus (*Philosph.* v. 7) quotes the Gospel according to Thomas thus:

‘He that seeketh me shall find me in children from seven years old onwards, for there I am manifested, though hidden in the fourteenth age.’

Many sayings ascribed to Jesus have been collected from Mohammedan sources (cf. art. Christ in Mohammedan Literature [in Appendix]). One such passage is: ‘When Jesus was asked, “How art thou this morning?” he would answer, “Unable to forestall what I hope, or to put off what I fear, bound by my works, with all my good in another’s hand. There is no poor man poorer than I am.” ’ The last sentence agrees in

sentiment with a well-known text; but these Mohammedan traditions of Christ's words are for the most part of no value.

Literature.—Art. 'Agrapha' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, Extra Vol. p. 343 ff., where a good bibliography is given. The following artt. are useful: 'Sayings' from Manuscripts and Fathers—Lock, *Expositor*, iv. xi. [1894] 1, 97; 'Oxyrhynchus Sayings'—Swete, *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times.*] viii. [1897] 544, xv. [1904] 488, Cross and Harnack, *Expositor*, v. vi. [1897] 257, 321, 401; 'Sayings' from Mohammedan sources—Margoliouth, *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times.*] v. [1893-94] 59, 107, 177.

G. H. Gwilliam.

Scarlet

SCARLET.—1. Scarlet, as a dye, was obtained from the body of the female *kermes* insect (*Lecanium ilicis*), a native of S.E. Europe, where it lives upon a species of dwarf oak (*Quercus coccifera*). The insect is of the family Coccidae, to which also the cochineal of Mexico belongs. Its Latin name (derived from its appearance) was *grana*; hence the dye was called 'grain' (cf. Milton, *Penser.* 33, *Par. Lost*, xi. 242; Spenser, *FQ* i. vii. l; see Skeat, *Etym. Dict.* s.v.).

2. The *colour* is correctly represented by its name. Mat 27:28 is the only passage in the Gospels where the word 'scarlet' (κόκκινος) occurs, and it is there a substitute for the 'purple' of || Mar 15:17; Mar 15:20, Joh 19:2; Joh 19:5. It is the latter word that has changed its meaning (see art. Purple).

'The Gr. sense of colour seems to have been so comparatively dim and uncertain, that it is almost impossible to ascertain what the real idea was which they attached to any word alluding to hue' (Ruskin, *Mod. Painters*, iii. 225. Cf. also Gladstone, *Juv. Mundi*, p. 540).

Yet the ancients, as a rule, carefully distinguished scarlet from purple (Becker, *Gallus*, p. 446). Probably Mt. gives the colour actually used, Mk. and Jn. the colour intended.

3. The 'scarlet robe' was undoubtedly a military cloak, either that of a common soldier (*sagum*) or that of a commanding officer (*paludamentum*). The latter was longer and of better quality; both were regularly of scarlet (Ellicott, *Hist. Lectures*, p. 348 n. [Note: note.]). Westcott (on Joh 19:2; Joh 19:5) emphasizes, in the crown

and robe, the idea of victory as well as of royalty: 'this blood-stained robe was the true dress of a kingly conqueror.... So He was through life the suffering King, the true Soldier.'

F. S. Ranken.

⚠Schism

SCHISM.—See Unity.

⚠School

SCHOOL.—See Boyhood and Education.

⚠Science

SCIENCE.—1. The word 'science,' in the language of to-day, refers sometimes to a process and sometimes to the results of that process. The process itself is the representation in thought of the facts and events of human experience. The result of this process is the formulation of statements and doctrines which are regarded as true. We therefore use the word 'science' generally to embrace both (1) scientific method and (2) scientific truth. The object of science is to apply its method to every field of possible knowledge, and so to include within its doctrine all the facts of human experience.

I. State of science in the civilization in which Christ lived

1. Relation to Hellenism.—The civilization of Palestine was complex and syncretic. The two main factors in it were the ancient Hebrew culture (largely tintured by other Oriental elements), which preponderated, and Hellenism. This latter was a power extending throughout the Graeco-Roman world, and tending to influence every department of life; and so, despite the innate conservatism of the Jews, the more external elements of Palestinian culture received a strong Hellenistic tincture. The organism of the State was deeply affected, public institutions were modified, and social relations not untouched. The arts, too, were influenced, but, by the time the science of the Hebrews was reached, the wave of Hellenism had lost much of its vigour. The mind of the Jew was equipped against it. The Greek language was, after

all, but slightly known (cf. [Act 21:40](#); [Act 22:2](#)), and, though Herod surrounded himself with Greek *literati* and many Jews received a Greek education abroad, these facts indicate the limit of the penetration of Greek science into the life of the Jews. This may be illustrated by reference to St. Paul. Though brought up to some extent under Hellenistic influences in Tarsus, his culture was Greek only in its form and in certain of its graces. To the Hebrew mode of thought and Rabbinic logic—inward and characteristic elements of Jewish culture—he tenaciously clung. His writings are all those of a Jew rather than of a Hellenist. It is, then, unnecessary to attend to Hellenistic thought when considering the ‘science’ that formed the intellectual background of the teaching of Christ. The Aristotelian logic had no nameable influence upon His own thought, or upon the mind of the Synoptists who reported His words, or upon the conceptions of the common people who ‘heard him gladly.’ The logic of the society in which Christ moved was Rabbinic and not philosophic, and its standard of truth was religious rather than scientific.

2. Hebrew standard of truth.—We recognize that, according to the scientific standard, those propositions are true which accurately and impartially describe observed facts; that is, the test of truth is its logical form as descriptive. This notion of truth was originally foreign to the Hebrews. The words in the OT which are translated ‘true,’ ‘truth,’ etc., may be traced to roots which have primarily an ethical meaning and convey ‘the notion of constancy, steadfastness, faithfulness’ (see art. ‘Truth’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible). Hence they are more generally applied to a person than a proposition, and attach to a proposition only in a derivative way, the sayings of God being ‘faithful’ because His character is beneath and behind them,—they are established in the Divine nature, and so cannot be moved. Thus, that a proposition should tally with facts did not stand out with such importance as it does for us moderns: indeed, to the ancient Hebrew, truth was a matter of motive and character rather than of accuracy. Thus in the Decalogue there is no actual and direct condemnation of lying, but the prohibition is directed against the bearing of false witness, the dastardly motive being the thing denounced, rather than the failure accurately to describe facts. This comes out in strong relief in the Jewish notion of history. The aim of the historian was less to give a record of events than to edify. Indeed, by the time of Christ the whole circle of historical ideas had received a fanciful character, because that narrative was deemed to be the best which gave the most laudatory account of the Hebrew heroes.

Truth then, according to the Hebrew mind, was that which edified, and not merely accurate description of fact. Only from this point of view can we understand many NT sayings with reference to truth. Jesus claimed that He Himself *was* the truth. In saying ‘I am the way, and the truth, and the life’ ([Joh 14:6](#)), He is not referring to what we call scientific truth, but rather edifying and ennobling thought, or, as explained above, religious truth. Pilate, a Roman logician, had quite a different

conception of truth. When he said ‘What is truth?’ (Joh_18:38), he was moving in a universe of thought foreign to the Jews.

3. Hebrew method of attaining truth.—The Hebrew idea of truth being so different from our scientific standard, it is to be expected that their way of reaching it would correspondingly differ from our scientific method,—the observation and description of facts. The Hebrew method did not always seek facts, and, when they were at hand, was not content simply to describe them.

(1) Facts were sometimes ‘invented.’

This may be illustrated by reference to Talmudic geography. The Talmud answers the question* [Note: Tosefta, Maaser sheni, ch. 2; Hallach, ch. 2; Jerus. Shebhiith vi. 2; Bab. Gittin 8a.] as to which islands belong to Israel and which do not, by saying that if a straight line be drawn from Amanus (?a mountain in the north) to the River of Egypt, those islands situated within this line belong to the land of Israel, etc. But, of course, no islands ever belonged to the land of Israel at all. Again, it is deliberately asserted that there are seven seas in Palestine. Only six are named, but one of these is named twice in order to make up the number seven, merely so that the holy number may be introduced. And, further, apart from this specific enumeration, the Talmud names only four seas as included in Palestine. These two instances are typical. In the first, islands are said to exist which have never been observed, and in the other the number of actually existing seas is artificially increased in order to bring in the sacred seven.

(2) Metaphysical explanation was sometimes attempted, description in itself being considered inadequate. The introduction of the number seven above is an illustration of this. Psalms 24 gives another type, where Jahweh is praised for His power and skill in making the solid and immovable earth to rest upon the fluid and fluctuating sea. The observation is a bad one, but that does not concern us. The point for us to notice is that to the observation that the land is ‘founded upon the sea’ is added the metaphysical explanation that this is a miraculous exhibition of the power of God. The fact that this is poetry, and could be paralleled with passages taken from modern Western poetry, does not affect the point, for these modern passages are admittedly and obviously poetical in contradiction to scientific statements, whereas in Hebrew literature there is no such distinction. What is said in poetry is equally true to the Hebrew mind when written in prose, as when the idea of the windows of heaven is repeated in such various literary styles as are found in Gen_7:11, 2Ki_7:2, Mal_3:10. Hence the indiscriminate Jewish doctrine of inspiration, which made no distinction between styles of literature, ascribing to all passages of the Canon an equal measure of truth.

The Jews did, of course, accumulate, as the Talmud and the OT sufficiently show, a mass of valid technical knowledge. They knew much concerning metals, such as gold; other chemical substances, such as soda; and certain processes of metallurgy. 'The Jews,' says Ernst von Meyer, 'did indeed possess a certain disjointed knowledge of chemical processes acquired accidentally, but these were applied for their practical results alone, and not with the object of deducing any comprehensive scientific explanation from them.' [By 'scientific explanation' here von Meyer means what has been called 'description' above]. They never made experiments. Any conclusions concerning nature at which they arrived were due to haphazard reflexion upon chance occurrences. Accurate description was not their object, nor did they attempt it. The facts of nature, like the incidents of history, were to them properly explained by reference to other things than those which might be observed. Rabbi Joshua, for instance, gives the following account of rain: 'The clouds ascend to the heights of the heavens, then stretch themselves out like a sponge and take up the rain-water; but having holes in them like a sieve, they let the water fall through on to the earth in drops.' That only one drop falls at a time is due to a kindly Providence, for otherwise great harm would be done to the earth (Bergel). The Rabbis explained thunder as the crashing together of clouds, or as the splitting of ice in the clouds when struck by the hot lightning. Earthquakes were variously described as God clapping His hands, or sighing, or treading upon His footstool. Of all scientific efforts the Jewish teachers seem to have been most successful in Astronomy. They described the heavens as a hollow, dome-like, half-ball, spread over the flat earth. The stars they held to be fixed to the inner surface of this dome; some of them being firmly fastened and others moving along ways made for them.

To whatever branch of knowledge we turn, we find that *observations* are an insignificant part of the system of teaching about nature, and for the method of mere description we have the method of metaphysical explanation.

4. Defects of Hebrew thought.—The history, political and geographical situation, and religious exclusiveness of the Hebrews assisted in the cultivation of a type of thought as characteristic and powerful as any that the world has seen. It is not enough to say that the Hebrew mind was 'Semitic'; for, while it shares many of the characteristics of the thought of other Semitic peoples, in some respects it stands out from them in bold contrast. Among the fine qualities of the Hebrew mind were: (1) a sanity and sobriety of thought which preserved their religion and literature from all those offensive and extravagant traits which mark the popular religions of Syria, Asia Minor, and Arabia; (2) an extraordinary gift for the observation of individual incidents and facts, as appears in the inimitable narratives of the historical books of the OT; the vivid portraiture, satire, and denunciation of the prophets; and the marvellous, if often trivial, minuteness of Rabbinic discussions; (3) unparalleled energy of feeling and sense of individuality; and (4) a strength of will that alone can account for the

vitality of a people which has been exposed to a more bitter persecution and more relentless fate than any other race in history. Of these four notable characteristics the third and fourth are obviously not such as tend to the cultivation of the scientific frame of mind. With the first and second it is quite otherwise—sobriety of thought and a keen eye for particulars are necessary to a proper scientific observation. But at the same time they are insufficient for scientific description, which demands certain mental qualities in which the Hebrew mind was notably deficient—breadth of vision, systematic and architectonic power, consistent and persistent thinking. An examination of Hebrew thought discovers, in general, a notable defect, traceable to this failure in breadth of grasp and over-emphasis on the particular and strong development of the emotional and volitional nature. This defect is the absence of the power of logical abstraction, and it shows itself in two ways that are of considerable importance—first, the Hebrew mind could not frame general definitions; and, secondly, it had no notion of general law.

The Western (Greek) mode of definition *per genus et differentiam* we commonly assume not only to be the only mode possible, but also to be indispensable to thought. While it is indispensable to our modern thought, especially with its highly developed scientific method, it was not indispensable to the Hebrews, for they did without it. The Hebrews defined, not by reference to a class—as when we say ‘man is a rational animal’—but by reference to a type, as when it is implied that natural man is Adam, and redeemed man is Christ, the second Adam (Romans 5, 1 Corinthians 15).

In the second place, this inability to think abstractly prevented the Hebrews from arriving at the notion of natural law. The word ‘law’ in Hebrew literature always meant the arbitrary pronouncement of a ruler (of course a despot) or deity. Law meant nothing general or abstract. The *Torah* was an actual and definite direction given in Jahweh’s name by the priest, and was either judicial, ceremonial, or moral. The various synonyms for *torah* have in general the same definite, particular character—‘judgment,’ ‘statute,’ ‘commandment,’ ‘testimonies,’ and ‘precepts’* [Note: Respectively mishpât, hukkâh, miṣwâh, ‘çdôth, pikkûdîm.] (see art. ‘Law (in OT)’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible). When used in a general sense to indicate a large section of the OT, it is in no way abstract, but only collective.

The nearest approach which Hebrew thought offers to our highly abstract natural laws is to be found in certain proverbial sayings (e.g. Jer 31:29, Mat 16:2-3), and a few rough groupings of empirical facts which we shall notice later on. There is nothing, however, that in any real sense corresponds with the modern idea of law as ‘the *résumé* or *brief expression* of the relationships and sequences of certain groups of’ perceptions and conceptions, existing only ‘when formulated by man’ (Karl Pearson). The same characteristic explains the absence of abstract philosophic terms from Hebrew literature. The doctrine of freewill, e.g., though constantly implied in the

OT, is never abstractly stated. 'Instead of saying man is free, Scripture says man can choose; he can act; he can do' (Delitzsch, *Syst. of Bibl. Psychol.* p. 192).

5. Hebrew knowledge of Nature.—It follows from what we have seen that the Jews had no sound body of scientific doctrine. They had no very clearly defined conception of the earth and its surroundings, either in early times or at the time of Christ. They regarded the earth as the middle point of the universe. The heavens were a mere material covering or dome (Is 34:4, 40:22, Psa 104:2, Job 37:18), with doors (Gen 28:17, Psa 78:23) and windows (Gen 7:11; Gen 8:2, 2Ki 7:2; 2Ki 7:19), and the earth rested on the sea (Psa 24:2). These are obviously little more than childish reproductions of sense-impressions. The same is true of every department of physical science, including Astronomy. There is no criticism, no classification, no formulation of laws, no definite effort towards a coherent description of phenomena. When we turn to Mathematics, we find traces of very rudimentary knowledge. The square is mentioned (Exo 27:1; Exo 28:16), and the circle (Isa 44:13), the plumb-line and scales were known (Amo 7:7, 2Ki 21:13). The four simple mathematical processes appear also to have been practised: Addition (Num 1:22; Num 26:7), Subtraction (Lev 27:18, Exo 16:23), Multiplication (Lev 25:8, Num 3:46), Division (Lev 25:27; Lev 25:50).

The only department of thought in which the Hebrews can claim to have elaborated anything at all worthy to be called 'science' is literary criticism. This, however, was pursued, not in a modern spirit of desire for knowledge, but because the disasters which the nation had experienced drove its religious leaders to a more careful analysis and preservation of the Law, in order that, by obeying it, the anger of God might be appeased and the prosperity of the people might return. The scribes 'busied themselves in providing for all conceivable' legal 'cases that might occur, and especially in making a hedge or fence round the Law, *i.e.* in so expanding the compass of legal precept beyond what was laid down in the Pentateuch and in the oldest form of tradition, that it might be impossible for a man, if he observed all their traditional rules, to be even tempted to transgress the Law' (see art. 'Scribes' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible). Thus the literary and legal 'science' of the scribes had all the defects of the 'scientific' temper of the Jews—the criterion of truth was not descriptive accuracy, but edification, the method was inventive and metaphysical, there was an absence of generalizing and systematizing power, and an over-emphasis of the particular and concrete.

II. *Relation of Christ to the 'science' of His time and race.*—We have now to inquire as to the mind of Christ in respect of the various matters discussed above, that is, we have to ask whether His standard of truth was Hebrew or modern; whether He sought to explain nature by the metaphysical or the descriptive method; whether He shared

the mental characteristics of the Hebrews or not, and whether we are to assume that He held those erroneous views of nature which were common among the Hebrews.

1. Among the most obvious characteristics of the mind of Christ is His sense of the radical opposition between Himself and the life of His own day. This opposition expresses itself at every turn in many ways. The political ambitions of the Herodians, the compromising worldliness of the Sadducees, the formalism and pride of the Pharisees, and the carnal carelessness of the generality, alike met with His denunciation and appeal. The traditions of the scribes He altogether rejected, and even the authority of the Law He subjected to a penetrating criticism. Against all existing systems of thought, all Rabbinical teaching, all conventional observance, He set up one authority—His own consciousness of God, Himself. In a unique way He lived in the realities of things, never compromising, never with double mind. To the great reality of the Father and of the Kingdom was added the great reality of Himself, in simple deep-founded truth.

2. We have seen that the Hebrew notion of truth differed from the modern notion, in that it rather attached to the nature of a person than to the quality of a proposition. A proposition was true, not so much because it tallied with certain facts as because it had its origin in a certain character. In other words, the Jewish idea of truth was religious, while the modern idea is scientific. But the Jewish idea was never purely religious. It was confused with metaphysical and mechanical elements. In the mind of Jesus, however, this Hebrew notion of religious truth is purified of all foreign elements, and ceases all contact with the accidents of experience, making its home in the soul and in God.

It is noteworthy that the Synoptists report no sayings of Jesus from which these conclusions as to the meaning Christ attached to the word 'truth' can be formally drawn, though, when once they have been drawn, it is seen that none of the sayings of Jesus contradicts them. In the Synoptics the word 'truth' is not used by Jesus except in such phrases as 'of a truth,' the Gr. equivalent for 'Amen' (Luk 9:27; Luk 12:44; Luk 21:3). When we come to the Fourth Gospel, however (which we assume to be of sufficient historicity to allow us to use the words ascribed to Jesus as representing His thought), we find the words 'true' and 'truth' continually in the mouth of Christ. Now, while the criterion of truth in the mind of Christ does not vary, we must not be surprised if different shades of meaning are expressed from time to time by the same words 'true' and 'truth.' Indeed, Jesus does not use the word 'truth' always with the same *nuance* of meaning. In the first place, it represents a quality in a person (Luk 4:23, Luk 18:37), then a quality which attaches to actions (Luk 3:21), and, finally, that which may be communicated from God to man in thought so as to affect the life and give the quality referred to above (Luk 8:32, Luk 14:17, Luk 16:13, Luk 17:17). The whole conception is summed up in Luk 14:6,

where Jesus says, 'I am the way, and the truth, and the life'—the Personality of Jesus is a revelation that is ethical and vitalizing, and that comes to men to quicken consciences, illumine minds, and arouse affections. There is, indeed, in this thought an element answering to our modern notion of accuracy; it is not, however, explicit, but implicit in the idea of a faithful or reliable character. Thus Jesus carries the Hebrew idea of religious truth to its final expression, and in so doing neither anticipates nor challenges the modern notion of scientific truth. To the modern mind truth is description of phenomena—to Christ it meant spiritual insight: by the modern mind it is reached through demonstration and reasoning—for Christ it was instinctive or inspirational: to the modern mind it is part of a system of thought—with Christ it was an element or moment in life.

'ἀλήθεια,' says Beyschlag, 'is to Him not this or that worldly and finite truth, but the truth of God, the revelation of God as the eternally good, who, as such, is open-hearted to the world ... it is the sister of χάρις, for every revelation of God is a revelation of holy love' (*NT Theol.* ii. 429). See also Truth.

3. But although 'truth,' according to the mind of Christ, was a Hebrew and religious concept and not the modern scientific notion, the thought of Jesus was free from all the extravagances which we have seen to be characteristic of the Jews, though it shared some of their conceptions as to natural phenomena.* [Note: Jesus' evident acquiescence in Jewish demonology, at least in its main features, is a case in point.] If His thought was not scientific, neither was it pseudo-scientific. Neither the *midrash* of the Jewish annalist nor the magical metaphysics of the Rabbis has any place in His teaching. While He was a keen observer of nature (Mat 6:26; Mat 6:28; Mat 13:31-32; Mat 13:36-43, Mar 4:26-29, Luk 13:6-9; Luk 13:20-21), His utterances about nature never attempted explanations beyond the reach of observation; and while His judgment was to an unequalled degree independent, He neither criticised the scientific opinions of His day nor attempted to add to humanity's inadequate store of knowledge. Whether this abstinence from scientific speculation and instruction was intentional (as Wendt suggests), or the natural result of His unwavering and complete concentration of soul upon 'His Father's business,' is not important in this connexion. It is sufficient to notice that He eschewed alike Rabbinical explanations and scientific research, dealing finally only with 'those matters which are naturally the objects of spiritual intuition,' and which, unlike natural phenomena, cannot be adequately investigated by the human understanding.

So far as nature is concerned, then, we may say that the knowledge which Jesus exhibits in His sayings is just such as a free mind with great natural powers of fresh observation might gather from a joyous intercourse with the ordinary aspects of the material world.

4. One matter of considerable controversial importance, however, in this connexion demands brief attention. What was the attitude of Jesus to the literary 'science' of the Rabbis? It was a double attitude. First, He abolished certain precepts of the Law itself (Mat 5:32; Mat 5:38), and added others on His own authority (Mat 5:32; Mat 5:34; Mat 5:39); and, secondly, He disparaged and discredited the learned societies of scribes, and, by the weight of His own authority, overthrew their teaching. But this repudiation of the teaching of the schools and criticism of the Law was not conceived in any modern scientific temper, or achieved by means of modern critical apparatus. It was the inevitable outcome of Christ's conception of Divine truth as a living reality within Himself. His utterances concerning the OT were all from this point of view. He judged them according to their spiritual and religious value, not according to any canons of textual criticism, modern or ancient. This is true even in the case of the quotation from Psalms 110. 'He did not weigh a truth,' says Bishop Moorhouse, 'in what we should call critical balances ... the question of the age or authorship of any passage in the OT was never either stated by our Lord Himself or raised by His opponents.'

5. We have next to ask whether we may conclude from His recorded sayings that Jesus shared those logical characteristics which we have seen to be at the foundations of Hebrew 'scientific' thought. We noticed two main marks of the Hebrew mind—its vivid, simple, and temperate apprehension of the details of life and nature, and its inability to take such a wide and comprehensive view of fact and experience as would make the generalizations of modern science possible. The first of these is pre-eminently characteristic of the thought of Jesus. The vivid originality, profound simplicity, and pictorial impressiveness of His speech make every reader of His words agree that 'never man so spake.' His insight into the human soul, His parables so true to life, His startling paradoxes, His telling object-lessons, all show the best traits of Jewish thought carried to their highest power. The concrete, stirring, and simple elements of life are seized and appreciated with the imagination of the poet and the practical sense of the workman. Jesus is never abstract, never modern—but always particular and Hebrew. But, on the other hand, it is impossible to speak of the mind of Jesus as defective in the sense given above. While He always expresses Himself with the simple concreteness characteristic of Hebrew thought, it cannot be said that He is limited by it, for it is the best possible medium or dialectic in which to enunciate *religious* truth. It is scientific truth which demands abstraction, with definitions *per genus et differentiam* and laws. We have seen that Jesus remained always and wholly within the world of religious truth, and always and wholly outside the world of scientific statement. He was not a theologian who theorized about religious truth—He was the Truth. He was not a philosopher who tried to prove the being of God—He declared God. And so the apparatus of scientific description was for Him unnecessary. It would be futile to speculate as to whether He could have used it had He wished. All we need say is that He was a Jew with a Hebrew mind of the

highest possible type, and so in the fullest possible sense equipped to utter the highest revelation of God which has been vouchsafed to man.

Literature.—Bergel, *Die Medecin der Talmudister: Studien über die naturwissensch. Kenntnisse der Talmudisten*; Beyschlag, *NT Theol.*; Bousset, *Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judentum*; Delitzsch, *System of Biblical Psychology*; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus*; Günzburg, *Dogmat. histor. Beleuchtung des alten Judentums*; Kopp, *Gesch. der Chemie*; Lewysohn, *Die Zoologie des Talmuds*; E. von Meyer, *Hist. of Chemistry*; Moorhouse, *The Teachings of Jesus*; A. Neubauer, *Géog. du Talmud*; W. Nowack, *Lehrb. der Heb. Arch.*; Karl Pearson, *Grammar of Science*; Schürer, *HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]*, *passim*; Stevens, *Teaching of Jesus*; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*.

Newton H. Marshall.

Scorn

SCORN.—Of scorn pure and simple there is remarkably little trace in the recorded words and actions of Jesus Christ. Whereas other teachers of lofty morality have usually treated with some contempt those who made no effort to approach their ideals, Christ's attitude towards the sinner was uniformly one of sympathetic help. He alone recognized the intimate relation which exists between the Creator and the human race, and His knowledge of this relation and of the possibilities of each individual prevented Him from despising man, whom the Father had made in His own image, however much that image might have been defaced. Thus it is that we never find Him using sarcasm, a form of scorn calculated to wound rather than to improve. Even the *εἰρωνεία* of Socrates, the affected self-depreciation which threw ridicule upon the egotism of others, has no counterpart in the Gospels. When Jesus used scorn, He employed it as a skilled physician, who wounds with the intention of healing. It is thus that He uses it to the Pharisees, whose cloak of self-righteousness needed to be pierced through with some sharp weapon, if they were to be brought to the state of mind in which they might be capable of any improvement.

1. The scorn of contempt.—A single word of unmitigated contempt is recorded by St. Luke as used by Christ. It occurs in His answer to the threat used by certain Pharisees of danger from Herod Antipas ([Luk 13:31-32](#)). 'Go ye,' He said, 'and tell that she-fox.' The phrase *τῆ ἀλώπεκι ταύτῃ* is certainly surprising at first sight, and unlike any other phrase employed by our Lord, not even excepting His comparison of the scribes and Pharisees to 'whited sepulchres,' 'serpents,' and 'offspring of vipers'

(Mat 23:27; Mat 23:33). The fact of the word *ἀλώπεκι* being in the feminine gender is perhaps only an accident. The word is found, it is true, in the masculine gender in Son 2:15, but it is generally found in the feminine, e.g. Jdg 1:35, 1Ki 21:10, Mat 8:20, Luk 9:58. The fox was and is a type of knavish craftiness. The particular offence of Herod on this occasion was his crafty endeavour to get rid of an influential preacher of righteousness by uttering a threat by the mouth of others, which he had not the courage himself to carry into effect. He was unwilling to add to the unpopularity caused by his treatment of John the Baptist by a repetition of it in the case of Jesus. No doubt the general character and conduct of Herod helped to suggest the application of the expression,—his unscrupulous nature (Luk 3:19 *περὶ πάντων ὧν ἐποίησε πονηρῶν*), his tyranny (Luk 13:31), his weakness (Mar 14:9), his profession of Judaism, combined with his heathen practices, his adultery and incest, and his murder of the prophet John. Such is the character which elicits the one recorded word of contemptuous scorn from the lips of Jesus.

2. The scorn of denunciation.—While remarkably free from any contempt for those people who had ideals and failed to reach them (e.g. the young man with great riches and the Apostle Peter), or for those who from lack of any ideal were for the time outcast from society (e.g. the despised publicans, Mar 2:15-17), He showed clearly His contempt for all religious professions and practices which were not of the heart. ‘The vain practices of devotees,’ says Renan, ‘the exterior strictness which trusted to formality for salvation, had in Him a mortal enemy ... He preferred forgiveness to sacrifice. The love of God, charity, and mutual forgiveness were His whole law.’ Yet in all His dealings with the systems of the scribes and the teaching of the legal doctors, His words bear little trace of mere contempt, but rather of stern denunciation. His attitude was defined at a comparatively early stage during the ministry in Northern Galilee, when He gave His definition of moral defilement (Mat 15:11, Mar 7:15) by saying, ‘Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth the man; but that which proceedeth out of the mouth, this defileth the man.’ This attitude culminated in the sublime anti-Pharisaic discourse in which the foibles and vices of a degenerate piety were depicted with prophetic plainness and scornful denunciation (Matthew 23; cf. also Mar 12:38-40 and Luk 20:45-47).

3. The scorn of silence.—Of all the occasions of scorn displayed by Jesus, none are more marked than those when He met mere captious questions and criticism either by a definite refusal to answer, or by absolute silence. Such an instance is recorded (Mat 21:23-27) when Jesus met the question of the chief priests and scribes, ‘By what authority doest thou these things?’ with a counter question, and on their refusal to answer declined in turn to reply to their question. Still more impressive was the silent scorn with which He met His accusers at the various stages of His trial, refusing in turn to answer the accusation of false witnesses (Mat 26:60-63, Mar 14:61) and the

questions of the chief priests and elders (Mat_27:12, Mar_15:3; Mar_15:5), of Herod (Luk_23:9), and lastly of Pilate himself (Mat_27:14, Joh_19:9).

In comparing these instances, we find no word used simply for the purpose of causing pain. The contemptuous expression used on the occasion of Herod's threat is, we have seen, amply justified by the character of the man, and destined to hold up to reprobation so paltry a device and so wretched a personality. In the rest His silence is an expression of His own dignity, and of His refusal to give an answer to questions and charges which were not intended to bring the truth to light, but merely to raise unreasonable prejudice; while His severe attacks on the character of those who were too blinded by their imaginary virtues to try to amend their lives, are wonderful instances of a scorn unmarred by ill-nature and untainted with cynicism.

On scorn of which Christ was the *object*, see artt. Despise, Mockery, Reproach.

T. Allen Moxon.

☿ Scorpion

SCORPION (σχορπίος).—A real nuisance in hot countries, especially in Bible lands, scarce and comparatively innocuous in Southern Europe, the scorpion is unknown save from hearsay in Central and Northern Europe. It has, however, left its mark in the familiar expression *in cauda venenum*, as well as in astronomical science, where it counts amongst the constellations of the Zodiac.

1. *Zoological description*.—The scorpion is an arthropod, of the class of *Arachnoidea*, of the subclass of *Arthrogastra*, of the order of *Scorpionidae*. It has four pairs of legs, and in front one pair of extremely strong claws (*palpi*). Its abdomen consists of 7 anterior segments, broad and intimately connected with the cephalo-thorax, and of 6 posterior segments, which are narrower, and constitute the tail (or post-abdomen). The last of these 6 posterior segments is incurved underneath, and terminates in a pointed hook surrounded by two powerful venomous glands. The scorpion catches its prey with its strong claws, curves its tail towards it above its own back, and inflicts the death sting. The scorpion's sting is very painful even for man; it may prove fatal when the insect belongs to one of the big tropical species; and even with minor species life may be imperilled when the throat is concerned; cf. Tristram (*Nat. Hist. of Bible*⁸ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 303), who has 'known one instance [in Palestine] of a man dying from the effect of the scorpion's sting.'

There occurs in Southern Europe, sometimes even in Switzerland and Southern Germany, a species of scorpion relatively innocuous—the *scorpius Europaeus*. In the Mediterranean peninsulae as well as in the South of France, another more dangerous species is to be found, the *Buthus occitanus*. In the Eastern lands of the Bible there are six, eight, perhaps even twelve different species of scorpions belonging to the genera *Buthus* and *Androctonus*. They reach a length of 5 to 6 inches (in tropical countries 12 inches; cf. Morris, *Bible Natural History*, Calcutta, 1896, p. 101). Palgrave (*Central and Eastern Arabia*, 1883, p. 28) was stung in Arabia by one of the numerous ‘desert scorpions,’ which he describes as ‘curious little creatures, about a fourth of an inch in length, and apparently all claws and tail, of a deep reddish-brown colour, and very active.’ The Talmud of Jerusalem (*Ber. 9a*) says that the scorpion’s sting is even more dangerous than that of the snake, because it repeats it. Conder (*Tent Work*⁶ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1895, p. 113) tells that he was stung by one scorpion ‘in six places along the leg.’

Scorpions are exclusively carnivorous, feeding upon insects and worms. They are useful in destroying mosquitoes. Not infrequently they devour each other. The female scorpion eats up the male after fecundation.

Ancient authors (Aristotle, Pliny) report that scorpions devour their own parents. This assertion is connected with a false etymology of the Heb. word עֲקָרָב (true etymology unknown), as if it were derived from עֲקַר ‘to exterminate,’ and אָב ‘father.’ Thomson (*LB* [Note: *The Land and the Book.*] ii. 480) ‘tried the experiment of surrounding a scorpion with a ring of fire, and when it despaired of escape, it repeatedly struck its own head, and soon died either from the poison or its Satanic rage—I could not be certain which—perhaps from both combined.’

There are differently coloured scorpions: some are black, others brown, reddish, yellowish, grey or white, some are striped. They are frequently found in Palestine under stones, among ruins, in crevices of walls, in dung-heaps, and empty cisterns. Travellers camping in tents or lodging in the houses of natives, as well as archaeologists conducting excavations, have to be careful to guard themselves and their men from scorpions; for even when the sting is not fatal, it is a cause of acute pain, and prevents walking and working.

According to a popular superstition, a man who has eaten a scorpion is immune against the sting of any of these animals, and able to relieve a victim by sucking the wound (Conder, *l.c.*). It is also believed that by applying to the wound a squashed scorpion, or by reading some magic formulae over the patient, a cure is effected.

2. OT references.—In geography, scorpions gave their name to a place mentioned in the OT—the ‘Ascent of Scorpions,’ *ma’āleh ‘Akrabbîm* (Num 34:4, Jos 15:3, Jdg 1:36), at the limit of the territory of Judah, towards Idumaea, south-west from the Dead Sea; it is probably the pass now called *Nakb es-Safû*, leading to Wady-Fikreh, or another pass near the same wady.

This place afterwards gave its name to a toparchy (1Ma 5:3, Josephus *Ant.* xii. viii. 1), the Idumaeen *Akrabattene* which is not to be confused with another toparchy also called *Akrabattene* (Josephus *BJ* ii. xii. 4, xx. 4, xxii. 2, iii. iii. 5, iv. ix. 3, 9), from its chief city, *Akrabatta*—in the *Onomasticon* Ἀκραββαίιν (cf. Pliny, *HN* v. 14), in the *Chronicon Samaritanum* *Akrabith*, in modern times *Akrabeh*—9 Roman miles (8 English miles) east from Nâblus, on the way to Jericho (Robinson, *BRP* [*Note: RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.*] ii. 280, iii. 290 f.; Guérin, *Samarie*, ii. 3-5; *SWP* [*Note: WP Memoirs of the Survey of W. Palestine.*] ii. 386, 389; *PEFSt* [*Note: EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.*] , 1876, p. 196). There is also near Damascus a village *Akraba*, which has given its name to the *Akrabani*, a canal of the Barada (Robinson, *BRP* [*Note: RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.*] iii. 447, 459).

Once only in the OT is there mention of scorpions in the proper sense, Deu 8:15, where they are named as one of the plagues of the desert of the wanderings.

In 1Ki 12:11; 1Ki 12:14 (and v. 24 in LXX Septuagint , a verse missing in Massoretic Text) and 2Ch 10:11; 2Ch 10:14 the word ‘scorpion’ occurs in the threats of King Rehoboam to his subjects. In this case scorpion may be simply a metaphor; but it is also possible that under this name the Israelites were acquainted with some instrument of torture, either a whip consisting of several thongs loaded with knobs and books of metal, or a knotty stick armed with prominent nail heads. The Romans had such an instrument; cf. Isidorus of Sevilla (*Origines*, 27): ‘*Virga nodosa et aculeata.*’

In Eze 2:6 scorpions symbolize (with briars and thorns) the vexations inflicted on the prophet by his companions. In Sir 26:7 the wicked woman is compared with the scorpion; in 39:30 scorpions are numbered among the plagues God uses for chastising the ungodly. In 4Ma 11:10 a man fastened in the torture-wheel is compared with a scorpion curving its body. Finally, in 1Ma 6:51 a kind of machine of war for throwing projectiles is mentioned under the (diminutive) name of σκορπίδια (cf. Caesar, *BG* vii. 25).

3. NT references.—The Gospels mention scorpions twice. (1) In Luk 11:11-12 we have three questions concerning a father giving to his son a stone instead of a loaf, a serpent instead of a fish, a scorpion instead of an egg. In the parallel passage

(Mat 7:9-10) the third question is omitted (and in certain Manuscripts and Versions of Luke the first question); hence it has been asserted that the saying of Jesus in its primitive form contained only two questions or perhaps one. But Jesus may have given more than one or two illustrations of His meaning, and we have to remember that bread, fish, and eggs were (and are still) the usual food of the inhabitants of Galilee. It has been frequently asked whether a scorpion bears such a likeness to an egg that a confusion between the two would be natural. But there is no question of likeness or confusion in this third case any more than in the case of the loaf and the stone, the fish and the serpent. It is not at all satisfactory to say with Thomson (*LB [Note: The Land and the Book.]* ii. 479), that ‘old writers speak of a white scorpion; and such a one, with its tail folded up ... would not look unlike a small egg.’

The Greeks had a proverb resembling the text of the Gospels we are discussing—ἀντὶ πίρκης σκορπίον, and they used to interpret it by saying: ἐπὶ τῶν τὰ χεῖρῳ αἰρουμένων ἂν ἀντὶ τῶν βελτιόνων. The existence of that proverb does not prove that Jesus necessarily associated in one single sentence the fish and the scorpion, and that φόν has to be corrected into δψον.

(2) Jesus says (Luk 10:19) that He has given His disciples τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πατεῖν ἐπὰ νω ὄφρων καὶ σκορπίων. There seems to be in these words an allusion to Psa 91:13, where the LXX Septuagint has (Psa 90:13) ἐπ’ ἀσπίδα καὶ βασιλίσκον ἐπιβήση, whereas the Massoretic Text has ‘lion’ and ‘adder.’ The Hebrew and Greek disagreeing, it is not impossible that in another transmission the scorpion has been substituted for one of the terms signifying serpent. It is certainly more natural to combine Luk 10:19 with Psa 91:13, than with Deu 8:15 or with Eze 2:6 : both these texts are more similar *ad verbum*, not *ad sensum*.

Another question is whether ‘serpents and scorpions’ means here animals in the proper sense of the word (Mar 16:18 and Act 28:3-6 might be quoted in support of this interpretation), or if it is a metaphor indicating the powers of evil. This alternative, however, does not correspond to the notions of the ancients, who did not, as we do, make a rigorous distinction between terrestrial and supra-terrestrial beings. Joh. Weiss (*Schriften des NT, ad loc.*) says rightly that an excellent illustration of this passage of the Gospel is given in the famous verse of Luther’s hymn: ‘Und wenn die Welt voll Teufel wär ...’ Moreover, we have to observe that Rev 9:3; Rev 9:5; Rev 9:10 describe supernatural destructive beings similar, at least partially, to scorpions. This has to be brought into conjunction with an antique Babylonian conception. In the epic of Gilgamesh (Table ix. cols. ii.-iv.) we find the

mention of two scorpion-men, one male and the other female, terrible giants, keepers of a door (cf. P. Jensen, 'Assyr. [Note: Assyrian.] -Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] Mythen und Epen' in *KIB* [Note: *IB Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek.*] vi. p. 205 ff., and the same writer's *Das Gilgamesch-Epos in der Weltliteratur*, i. pp. 24-27, 79, 93). A. Jeremias (*Izdubar-Nimrod*, 1891, p. 66 f.) and F. X. Kugler ('Die Sternenfahrt des Gilgamesch,' in *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, lxvi., 1904, p. 441 ff.) have shown that those two celestial scorpions—reproduced in Babylonian sculptures—were the two zodiacal constellations Scorpio and Sagittarius. We might also see, but less probably, in the second scorpion, the constellation of the Balance, which was called by the ancient Greeks *Chelae*, i.e. the 'Claws' of the Scorpion (cf. Ideler, *Sternnamen*, pp. 174-178).

In Christian art the scorpion has received a symbolical character, as an emblem of the anti-Christian power. Thus a scorpion is to be seen on the shield of a Roman soldier in B. Luini's celebrated fresco, 'The Crucifixion,' in Santa Maria degli Angeli, Lugano.

Literature.—Bochart, *Hierozyicon*, ii. pp. 632-645; Petermann, *Reisen im Orient* 2, 1865, ii. pp. 272, 465; Wood, *Bible Animals*, 1869, pp. 640-643; *PEFSt* [Note: *EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.*] , 1869, p. 148; Van-Lennep, *Bible Lands*, 1875, pp. 309-311; Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*⁸ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1889, pp. 301-303; Doughty, *Arabia Deserta*, 1888, i. pp. 328, 438; R. Hertwig, *Lehrbuch der Zoologie* 4, 1897, p. 441 ff.; J. H. Fabre, *Souvenirs entomologiques*, ix. pp. 229-343 (extremely patient, accurate, and interesting observations).

Lucien Gautier.

☞ Scourge, Scourging

SCOURGE, SCOURGING.—In the Gospels the vb. 'scourge' is translation of two Gr. terms, *μαστιγῶω* (fr. *μάστιξ*, found in Gospels only in a metaphorical sense [Authorized and Revised Versions 'plague,' (Revised Version margin) 'Gr. scourge'], but used in its literal meaning in [Act 22:24](#), [Heb 11:36](#)); and *φραγελλῶω* (fr. *φραγέλλιον*, Lat. *flagellum*, which occurs in [Joh 2:15](#)). *φραγέλλιον* denotes the scourge proper as an instrument of punishment, while *μάστιξ* in class. Gr. is often used of an ordinary whip for driving, etc. In NT, however, *μαστιγῶω* is a synonym for *φραγελλῶω* (cf.

Mar 10:34; Mar 15:15, Mat 27:26 and Joh 19:1). The subject of scourging comes before us in three connexions.

(1) In Joh 2:15 Jesus makes a scourge (φραγέλλιον) of cords (ἐκ σχοινίων) and drives the desecrating crowd of traders, as well as their sheep and oxen, out of the Temple. Farrar and others have represented this scourge of Jesus as nothing more than a whip twisted hastily out of the rushes with which the floor would be littered—a pure symbol of authority, therefore, not a weapon of offence. In this case, however, we should have had σχοίνων, not σχοινίων. σχοινίον is a rope, not a rush, and though originally applied to a rope made from rushes, is used in class. Gr. in a general sense. On the only other occasion of its employment in the NT it means a rope strong enough to tow a ship's boat in a gale (Act 27:32). To drive a herd of oxen out of the Temple courts, moreover, something more than a symbol of authority would be required. But we need not suppose that Jesus, even in His indignation, struck the merchants themselves. For them the sign of His authority would be sufficient (cf. Joh 18:6), and, as Bengel says, 'terrore rem perfecit.'

(2) In Mat 10:17 Jesus forewarns the Apostles of a time when men would scourge them in their synagogues; and in Mat 23:34 He predicts that the scribes and Pharisees will thus treat those whom He sends unto them. The later history gives ample evidence of the fulfilment of these words (see Act 5:40; Act 22:19, 2Co 6:5; 2Co 11:23-24).

(3) But, above all, we must think of the scourging endured by Jesus Himself. According to all the Synoptics, Jesus foresaw this as part of the suffering that lay before Him (Mat 20:19, Mar 10:34, Luk 18:33). It was, indeed, almost inseparable from His vision of the Cross, for scourging formed the ordinary accompaniment of a Roman crucifixion (cf. Josephus *BJ* v. xi. 1). Sometimes it was employed in criminal cases as a means of extracting confession, but regularly as the brutal preliminary to the still more brutal death of the cross. Because of the apparent inconsistency between Mat 27:26, Mar 15:15, on the one hand, and Joh 19:1, on the other, as to the particular stage of the trial at which Jesus was scourged, some have thought that the torture was twice inflicted. A careful comparison of the four Gospels, however, does not support this idea. The statements of Mt. and Mk., though they convey, when taken alone, the impression of a scourging immediately before the crucifixion, do not necessarily bear this meaning, but may quite well be understood retrospectively, and as implying simply that Jesus had to endure the scourge before going to the cross. Probably the key to the difficulty is to be found in Lk.'s narrative, where Pilate says, 'Why, what evil hath this man done? I have found no cause of death in him: I will therefore chastise him and release him' (Luk 23:22). These words show that Pilate meant the scourging to be a compromise between the death which the Jews

demanded and the verdict of absolute innocence which was called for by his own sense of justice. And this is confirmed by Jn.'s narrative, which shows Pilate scourging Jesus ([Luk_19:1](#)) and holding Him up to mockery ([Luk_19:2-3](#)) in the evident hope of satisfying the multitude, still insisting that he found no crime in Him ([Luk_19:4](#)), and yielding at last, only with reluctance, to the demand for His crucifixion ([Luk_19:6 ff.](#)). See art. Trial of Jesus Christ.

A Roman scourging might be carried out either with rods (*virgae*, ῥάβδοι)—the weapons of lictors, or with the scourge proper (*flagellum*, φραγγέλλιον), in which leather thongs weighted with rough pieces of lead or iron were attached to a stout wooden handle. St. Paul's three Roman scourgings, as distinguished from his five Jewish ones, were inflicted by means of rods (ῥαβδιζω, [2Co_11:25](#), [Act_16:22-23](#)). But Jerusalem was not a Roman town, like Philippi ([Act_16:12](#) Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), and Pilate had no lictors. Jesus was scourged by soldiers, and the implement they used, as the vb. φραγγελλόω ([Mat_27:26](#), [Mar_15:15](#)) almost implies, would be the dreadful Roman *flagellum*. St. Peter may have witnessed it all; and what a world of meaning then lies in his words, 'by whose stripes [Gr. 'bruise' or 'weal'] ye were healed' ([1Pe_2:24](#), cf. Is 53:5).

Literature.—The Comm. on the passages quoted, esp. Westcott, *Gosp. of St. John*, and Bruce and Dods in *EGT [Note: GT Expositor's Greek Testament.]*; Taylor Innes, *The Trial of Jesus Christ: A Legal Monograph* (1899); Rosadi, *The Trial of Jesus* (1905); Farrar, *Christ in Art*, p. 378ff., *St. Paul*, i. Excurs. xi.

J. C. Lambert.

☞ Scribes

SCRIBES.—The Scribes were a class of learned Jews who devoted themselves to a scientific study of the Law, and made its exposition their professional occupation. The word which we translate 'scribes' is γραμματεῖς, 'the learned,' which corresponds to the Hebrew סופרים. This is their usual appellation, but they are also called in the Gospels, especially in Lk., 'lawyers' (νομικοί) and 'doctors of the law' (νομοδιδάσκαλοι). See Lawyer. They are very frequently associated in the Synoptics with the Pharisees, and with the chief priests and elders, but there is no mention of 'scribes' in the Fourth Gospel at all, except in the special passage dealing with the woman taken in adultery ([Joh_8:3](#)).

1. Origin, development, and characteristics.—(1) After the return from the Exile the Jewish community was organized under Ezra and Nehemiah on the basis of the regulations of the so-called Mosaic Law. At a great gathering of the people, of which an account is given in Nehemiah 8-10, the Law was publicly read by Ezra, and a solemn covenant entered into for national obedience to it. Being thus established as the binding rule of both civil and religious life, it became necessary that the Law should be thoroughly studied and interpreted to the people, who otherwise could not reasonably be expected to comprehend fully its principles and their application. This duty at first fell naturally to the priests, who for a time continued the main teachers and guardians of the Law. But gradually there grew up an independent class of men, other than the priests, who devoted themselves to the study of the Law, and made acquaintance with it their profession. These were the Scribes. Possibly at first their chief duty was to make copies of the Law, but the higher function of interpretation was soon added; and as the supreme importance of the Law came more and more to be recognized, so the profession of a Scribe came to be held in higher estimation than even that of a priest.

(2) During the Grecian period of Jewish history, a strong feeling of opposition was developed between the Scribes and, at least, the higher order of the priests. Even in the time of Ezra a feud had arisen between those who held strictly by the Law—especially in the matter of foreign alliances—and those who, like the aristocratic high-priestly families, had sought to increase their influence by marriage with outsiders. And when, through the influence of Hellenic culture, the priestly aristocracy became infected with heathen ideas, and fell away from the laws and customs of Judaism, the duty of upholding the Law fell mainly upon the Scribes, who from that time forward became the real teachers of the people, and dominated their whole spiritual life. They were still, however, mainly religious students and teachers, and had taken little part in political agitation. Their ideal was not to engage in any political scheme for throwing off the foreign yoke, but to establish the Law of God in their own midst. The attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes to suppress the Jewish religion compelled them to change their character, and drove them into open rebellion. Among the most strenuous opponents of his endeavour to Hellenize the Jews were the Hasidæans, or party of ‘the pious,’ who may be taken to represent the strictest adherents of the teaching of the Scribes, and who carried their ideas of the sanctity of the Law to the suicidal extent of refusing to defend themselves when attacked on the Sabbath. But it was only the maintenance of the Jewish religion for which they fought, and they had no objections to alien rule, provided they were allowed freedom of faith. This object they regarded as accomplished by the treaty with Lysias, which provided at once for their political subjection and for their religious freedom. When, therefore, it became clear that the Maccabæan party were aiming also at the political independence of the nation, the Hasidæans separated from them, and in the time of John Hyrcanus we find the Pharisees—‘the separated’—who practically

represented the same party as the Hasidaeans, in opposition to the Hasmonaean or Maccabaeian dynasty. See Pharisees.

(3) From this time onward to the time of Christ the influence of the Scribes became more and more predominant. They were given seats in the Sanhedrin, and were held in very high respect by the people. They never, indeed, became the governing class, but in the councils of the nation their influence could always be depended upon to outweigh that of the priestly aristocracy, who held the high appointments. They were usually addressed as 'Rabbi,' *i.e.* 'my master,' an appellation which gradually developed into a title, though not till after the time of Christ. The honour in which they were held by their pupils, and by others, was extraordinary, even exceeding the honour accorded to parents, and they were very particular in exacting it, claiming generally everywhere the first rank. Their scribal labours were understood to be gratuitous, and, if they had no private fortune, they had to provide for their livelihood by combining some secular business with their study of the Law; but the latter was always regarded as their most important occupation. It is questionable, however, if the theory of gratuitous instruction was always strictly adhered to.

From the earliest period there is evidence to show that they tended to associate themselves in guilds or families—an arrangement which would facilitate the interchange of opinion on difficult points in the study of the Law. Up till the destruction of Jerusalem the main seat of their activity was in Judaea, 'the scribes from Jerusalem' (Mat_15:1, Mar_3:22) being spoken of as the most important and influential members of the party. But they were to be found elsewhere as well, in Galilee and among the Jews in other lands, wherever the Law and its precepts were held in esteem. As a rule, they may be said to have been Pharisees, although not exclusively. The Pharisees, indeed, were those whose professed object it was to regulate their lives in strict accordance with the Law, written and oral, as that was expounded by its best accredited interpreters. Hence there was a natural affinity between them and the Scribes, whose profession it was to interpret the Law. But it is extremely probable that there were also Scribes who were Sadducees, for the Sadducees also adhered to the written Law, and doubtless had their Scribes to interpret it. Support is lent to this view by the expressions in Mar_2:16 'the scribes of the Pharisees,' and in Luk_5:30 'the Pharisees and their scribes,' which seem to indicate that there were other Scribes than those of the Pharisees. In the time of Christ the great mass of the Scribes was divided into two schools, named after the famous leaders, Hillel and Shammai, about whom little is certainly known. The School of Hillel was distinguished for its mildness in the interpretation of the Law, and that of Shammai for its strictness, corresponding to the traditional characters of the respective founders; but the points of difference between them concerned only the trivial minutiae, and never touched the weightier matters of the Law.

2. Functions.—The functions of the Scribes are well summed up in the traditional saying ascribed to the ‘Men of the Great Synagogue.’ ‘These laid down three rules: Be careful in pronouncing judgment! bring up many pupils! and make a fence about the Law!’ The professional employment of the Scribes, therefore, fell under three heads:—(1) The study and development of the Law itself; (2) the teaching of it to their pupils; and (3) its practical administration in the Sanhedrin and other courts; that is to say, they acted as students, teachers, and judges.

(1) *The study and development of the Law.*—The Mosaic Law, as embodied in their sacred records, was definitely recognized by the Jews as the absolute rule of life. To direct his conduct in accordance with it in every minute detail was the ideal of the pious Jew. But there were many subjects upon which the Law, as recorded, gave no precise direction, and much of it, for popular apprehension, required interpretation and exposition. To interpret and expound it, and to fill up what was lacking in the way of casuistic detail, was the business of the Scribes. They devoted themselves to a close and careful study of the Law, to the accumulation of precedents, to the working out of inferences and deductions, and to a general development of legal regulations so as to meet every possible circumstance which might occur in human life, and to keep the Law in harmony with the changing wants of the times. So diligently did they pursue this course, and so extensive and complicated did Jewish Law in consequence become, that only by the assiduous study of a lifetime could a man become an expert in its various branches. The difficulty of doing so was greatly increased by the fact that this mass of accumulated detail was not committed to writing, but was propagated entirely by oral tradition. It was called the Halacha, or Law of Custom, as distinct from the Torah, or Written Law, upon which it was understood to be based. See, further, art. Pharisees, p. 353 f.

But the Scribes did not confine their labours to the Law. They studied also the historical and didactic portions of Scripture, and elaborated with a very free hand the history and religious instruction contained therein. This elaboration was called the Haggadah. It ran into various extravagant forms—theosophic, eschatological, and Messianic. Imagination was given free play, so long as its products would fit in with the general framework of Jewish thought, and to its influence was largely due the circle of religious ideas existing in New Testament times.

(2) *Teaching of the Law.*—To teach the Law was also the professional business of the Scribes. In order that people should obey the Law, it was necessary that they should know it; and an elaborate system of rules such as was contained in the Jewish tradition could be learned only with the assistance of a teacher. None of these traditional rules having been written down, the teaching was of necessity entirely oral, and round the more famous of the Scribes there gathered large numbers of young men, eager for instruction as to the proper conduct of life. Of these, some in

their turn would become Scribes and teachers of the Law. The chief requisite, for both pupil and teacher, was a capacious and accurate memory. The method of teaching was by a constant repetition of the precepts of the Law, as only by this means could its multitude of minute details be at all kept in remembrance. The disputational method was also followed. Concrete cases, real or imaginary, were brought before the pupils, and they were required to pronounce judgment upon them, which judgment the teacher would criticise. The pupils were also allowed to propose questions to the teacher, and to attend disputations amongst teachers over difficult problems. But the two all-important duties were these—first, to keep everything faithfully in memory; and, second, never to teach anything otherwise than it had been taught by the master. Not even the expressions of the teacher were allowed to be changed. Accuracy in the minutest detail was the most commendable achievement.

For purposes of teaching and of disputation there were special places set apart—‘houses of teaching,’ as they were called—where the teacher sat upon an elevated bench, and the pupils on the ground. In Jerusalem, lectures were delivered in the Temple, somewhere in the outer court. The ‘houses of teaching’ were distinct from the synagogues; but as it was through the influence of the Scribes that the synagogue service originated, so doubtless they availed themselves of the opportunities which the synagogues gave them of teaching the Law to the common people. The Scripture exposition, which usually formed part of the service, might, indeed, be given by any one qualified to speak; but ordinarily it fell to a Scribe, if any were present, as the one most competent to discharge the duty.

(3) *The Scribes as judges.*—To the Scribes, as specially skilled in knowledge of the Law, it also naturally fell to take a leading part in its practical administration. From the time of the Hasmonaeans they had formed a constituent element in the Sanhedrin, being associated in that body with the chief priests and elders, and it was usually the Scribes who exercised the greatest influence in its deliberations. In the local courts they were also naturally looked to for advice and judgment. Any one, indeed, who possessed the confidence of the community might be appointed a local judge, and probably for the most part the small local courts were presided over by unprofessional men. But whenever a Scribe—a skilled lawyer—was available, the choice of the community naturally fell upon him, as, in virtue of his qualifications, he was considered best fitted for the post.

3. Relations of the Scribes to Jesus.—The ministry of Jesus could not but excite interest amongst the Scribes. His first call, like that of the Baptist, was to repentance as a preparation for the Kingdom of God. With this they were bound to sympathize. They held that what the nation needed for its salvation was a stricter obedience to the Law, and they naturally thought that the new Teacher, who was calling to

repentance for the past, would be calling also to a new and more rigid obedience for the future. There are not wanting indications that at first they were inclined to regard Him with favour. But they speedily discovered that His teaching was on very different lines from theirs, both in manner and in substance. In the exposition of Scripture their method was to give out a text, and then quote the various comments made on it by recognized authorities. Jesus followed a different plan. He had a message of His own, which He delivered with conviction and enthusiasm, not appealing to authorities, but speaking with the conscious authority of truth. And the substance of His teaching was also very different. He condemned the external, mechanical formalism which they encouraged, and declared that only the inward purity of the heart was of value in the sight of God. See, further, art. Pharisees, p. 355 f.

4. Later history.—Though it does not properly belong to our subject, it is interesting to note that after the fall of Jerusalem in a.d. 70, the authority of the Scribes increased in importance. Under much discouragement they undertook the difficult task of the reorganization of Judaism. Working on calmly and peacefully, they were able to avoid extremes, and were successful in keeping what was left of the nation faithful to the religion of their fathers, and in stimulating hope for the future. The ordinances of the Oral Law were at last written down, and to their careful preservation by the Scribes we are indebted for the Hebrew Scriptures we now possess.

Literature.—The literature on the subject is very extensive. Every History of the Jews, every Life of Christ, every Commentary on the Gospels, deals to some extent with the Scribes. Schürer's *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] may be taken as a standard authority; Ewald, Kuenen, and Wellhausen are all important; so are Edersheim's *LT* [Note: *T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].*] and W. R. Smith's *OTJC* [Note: *TJC The Old Test, in the Jewish Church*]. A very full bibliography is given in Schürer. See also artt. in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible and in the *EBi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*].

Joseph Mitchell.

⚠ Scrip

SCRIP.—See Wallet.

Scripture

SCRIPTURE.—The scope of this article does not permit the discussion in it of the employment of Scripture, or of the estimate put upon Scripture, by either our Lord or the Evangelists. It is strictly limited to the use of the term ‘Scripture’ in the NT, particularly in the Gospels: and to the immediate implications of that use.

1. The use of this term in the NT was an inheritance, not an invention. The idea of a ‘canon’ of ‘Sacred Scriptures’ (and with the idea the thing) was handed down to Christianity from Judaism. The Jews possessed a body of writings, consisting of ‘Law, Prophets, and (other) Scriptures (*K^ethûbhîm*),’ though they were often called, for brevity’s sake, merely ‘the Law and the Prophets’ or simply ‘the Law.’ These ‘Sacred Scriptures,’ or this ‘Scripture’ (הכתיב) as it was frequently called, or these ‘Books,’ or simply this ‘Book’ (הספר), they looked upon as originating in Divine inspiration, and as therefore possessed everywhere of Divine authority. Whatever stood written in these Scriptures was a word of God, and was therefore referred to indifferently as something which ‘Scripture says’ (קרא אמר, or הכתיב אמר, or קרא כתיב), or ‘the All-Merciful says’ (רחמנא אמר), or even simply ‘He says’ (ואומר הוא וכן) or merely (ואומר); that God is the Speaker in the Scriptural word being too fully understood to require explicit expression. Every precept or dogma was supposed to be grounded in Scriptural teaching, and possessed authority only as buttressed by a Scripture passage, introduced commonly by one or the other of the formulas ‘for it is said’ (שנאמר) or ‘as it is written’ (כדכתיב or רכתיב), though, of course, a great variety of more or less frequently occurring formulas of adduction are found. Greek-speaking Jews naturally tended merely to reproduce in their new language the designations and forms of adduction of their sacred books current among their people. This process was no doubt facilitated by the existence among the Greeks of a pregnant legislative use of γράφω, γραφή, γράμμα, by which these terms were freighted with an implication of authority. But it is very easy to make too much of this. In Josephus, and even more plainly in the LXX Septuagint, the influence of the Greek usage may be traced; but in a writer like Philo, Jewish habits of thought appear to be absolutely determinative. The fact of importance is that there was nothing left for Christianity to invent here. It merely took over in their entirety the established usages of the Synagogue, and the NT evinces itself in this matter at least a thoroughly Jewish book. The several terms it employs are made use of, to be sure, with some sensitiveness to their inherent implications as Greek words, and the Greek legislative use of some of them gave them, no doubt, peculiar fitness for the service asked of them. But the application made of them by the NT writers had its roots set in Jewish thought, and

from it they derive a fuller and deeper meaning than the most pregnant classical usage could impart to them.

2. To the NT writers, as to other Jews, the sacred books of what was now called by them ‘the old covenant’ (2Co 3:14), described according to their contents as ‘the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms’ (Luk 24:44), or more briefly as ‘the Law and the Prophets’ (Mat 7:12, Luk 16:16; cf. Act 28:23, Luk 16:29; Luk 16:31), or merely as ‘the Law’ (Joh 10:34, 1Co 14:21), or even, perhaps, ‘the Prophets’ (Mat 2:23; Mat 11:13; Mat 26:56, Luk 1:70; Luk 18:31; Luk 24:25; Luk 24:27, Act 3:24; Act 13:27, Rom 1:2; Rom 16:26), were, when thought of according to their nature, a body of ‘sacred scriptures’ (Rom 1:2, 2Ti 3:16), or, with the omission of the unnecessary, because well-understood adjective, simply by way of eminence, ‘the Scriptures,’ ‘Scripture.’ For employment in this designation either of the substantives γραφή or γράμμα offered itself, although, of course, each brought with it its own suggestions arising from the implication of the form and the general usage of the word. The more usual of the two in this application, in Philo and Josephus, is γράμμα, or more exactly γράμματα; for, although it is sometimes so employed in the singular (but apparently only late, e.g. Callimachus, *Epigr.* xxiv. 4, and the Church Fathers, *passim*), it is in the plural that this form more properly denotes that congeries of alphabetical signs which constitutes a book. In the NT, on the other hand, this form is rare. The complete phrase ἱερὰ γράμματα, found also both in Josephus and in Philo, occurs in 2Ti 3:15 as the current title of the sacred books, freighted with all its implications as such. Elsewhere in the NT, however, γράμματα is scarcely used as a designation of Scripture (cf. Joh 5:47; Joh 7:15). Practically, therefore, γραφή, in its varied uses, remains the sole form employed in the NT in the sense of ‘Scripture,’ ‘Scriptures.’

3. This term occurs in the NT about fifty times (Gospels 23, Acts 7, Catholic Epistles 6, Paul 14); and in every case it bears that technical sense in which it designates the Scriptures by way of eminence, the Scriptures of the OT. It is true there are a few instances in which passages adduced as γραφή are not easily identified in the OT text; but there is no reason to doubt that OT passages were intended (cf. Hühn, *Die alttest. Citate*, 270; and Mayor on Jam 4:5, Lightfoot on 1Co 2:9, Westcott on Joh 7:38, and Godet on Luk 11:49). We need to note in modification of the broad statement, therefore, only that it is apparent from 2Pe 3:16 (cf. 1Ti 5:18) that the NT writers were well aware that the category ‘Scripture,’ in the high sense, included also the writings they were producing, as along with the books of the OT constituting the complete ‘Scripture’ or authoritative Word of God. In 20 out of the 50 instances in

which γραφή occurs in the NT, it is the plural form which is used, and in all but two of these cases the article is present—αἱ γραφαί, the well-known Scriptures of the Jewish people; and the two exceptions are exceptions only in appearance, since adjectival definitions are present (γραφαὶ ἅγια, Rom 1:2, here first in extant literature; γραφαὶ προφητικαί, Rom 16:26). The singular form occurs some 30 times, all but four of which have the article; and here again the exceptions are only apparent, the term being definite in every case (Joh 19:37 ‘another Scripture’; 1Pe 2:6, 2Pe 1:20, 2Ti 3:16, used as a proper name). The distribution of the singular and plural forms is perhaps worth noting. In Acts the singular (3 times) and plural (4) occur almost equally frequently: the plural prevails in the Synoptics (Mt. plural only; Mk. two to one; Lk. three to one), and the singular in the rest of the NT (John 11-1, James 3 to 0, Peter 2 to 1, Paul 2 to 5). In the Gospels the plural form occurs exclusively in Mt., prevailing in Mk. and Lk., and rarely in Jn., of which the singular is characteristic. No distinction seems to be traceable between the usage of the Evangelists in their own persons and that of our Lord as reported by them. Mt. and Mk. do not on their own account use the term at all; in Lk. and Jn., on the other hand, it occurs not only in reports of our Lord’s sayings and of the sayings of others, but also in the narrative itself. To our Lord is ascribed the use indifferently of the plural (Mat 21:42; Mat 22:44; Mat 26:54; Mat 26:56, Mar 12:24; Mar 14:9, Joh 5:39) and the singular (Mar 12:10, Luk 4:21, Joh 7:38; Joh 7:42; Joh 10:35; Joh 13:18; Joh 17:12).

4. The history of γραφή, γραφαί, as applied to literary documents, does not seem to have been exactly the same as that of its congener γράμμα, γράμματα. The latter appears to have been current first as the appropriate appellation of an alphabetical character, and to have grown gradually upward from that lowly employment to designate documents of less or greater extent, as ultimately made up of alphabetical characters. Although, therefore, the singular τὸ γράμμα is used of any written thing, it is apparently, when applied to ‘writings,’ most naturally employed of brief pieces like short inscriptions or proverbs, or of the shorter portions of documents such as clauses—though it is also used of those larger sections of works which are more commonly designated as ‘books.’ It is rather the plural, τὰ γράμματα, which seems to have suggested itself not only for extended treatises, but indeed for documents of all kinds. When so employed, the plural form is not to be pressed. Such a phrase as ‘Moses’ γράμματα’ (Joh 5:47), for example, probably ascribes to Moses only a single book—what we call the Pentateuch; and such a phrase as ἱερὰ γράμματα (2Ti 3:15) does not suggest to us a ‘Divine library,’ but brings the OT before us as a unitary

whole. On the other hand, γραφή, in its application to literary products, seems to have sprung lightly across the intermediate steps to designate which γράμμα is most appropriately used, and to have been carried over at once from the ‘writing’ in the sense of the script to the ‘writing’ in the sense of the Scripture. Kindred with γράμμα as it is, its true synonymy in its literary application is rather with such words as βιβλος (βιβλιον) and λόγος, in common with which it most naturally designates a complete literary piece, whether ‘treatise’ or ‘book.’ Where thought of from the material point of view as so much paper, so to speak, a literary work was apt to be called a βιβλος (βιβλιον); when thought of as a rational product, thought presented in words, it was apt to be spoken of as a λόγος: intermediate between the two stood γραφή (γράμμα), which was apt to come to the lips when the ‘web of words’ itself was in mind. In a word, βιβλος (βιβλιον) was the most exact word for the ‘book,’ γραφή (γράμμα) for the ‘document’ inscribed in the ‘book,’ λόγος for the ‘treatise’ which the ‘document’ records; while as between γραφή and γράμμα, γράμμα, preserving the stronger material flavour, gravitates somewhat towards βιβλος (βιβλιον), and γραφή looks upward somewhat toward λόγος. When, in the development of the publisher’s trade, the system of making books in great rolls gave way to the ‘small-roll system,’ and long works came to be broken up into ‘books,’ each of which was inscribed in a ‘volume,’ these separate ‘books’ attached to themselves this whole series of designations, each with its appropriate implication. Smaller sections were properly called περιοχαί, τόποι, χωρία, γράμματα (the last of which is the proper term for ‘clauses’), but very seldom, if ever, in classical Greek, γραφαί.

5. The current senses of these several terms are, of course, more or less reflected in their NT use. But we are struck at once with the fact that γραφή occurs in the NT solely in its pregnant technical usage as a designation of the Sacred Scriptures. There seems no intrinsic reason why it should not, like γράμματα, be freely used for non-sacred ‘writings.’ In point of fact, however, throughout the NT γραφή is ever something ‘which the Holy Ghost has spoken through the mouth ‘of its human authors (Act 1:16), and which is therefore of indefectible, because Divine, authority. It is perhaps even more remarkable that even on this high plane of technical reference it never occurs, in accordance with its most natural, and in the classics its most frequent, sense of ‘treatise,’ as a term to describe the several books of which the OT

is composed. It is tempting, no doubt, to seek to give it such a sense in some of the passages where, occurring in the singular, it yet does not seem to designate the Scriptures in their entirety, and Dr. Hort appears for a moment almost inclined to yield to the temptation (on 1Pe 2:6, note the ‘probable’). It is more tempting still to assume that behind the common use of the plural *αἱ γραφαί* to designate the Scriptures as a whole, there lies a previous current usage by which each book which enters into the composition of these ‘Scriptures’ was designated by the singular *ἡ γραφή*. But in no single passage where *ἡ γραφή* occurs does it seem possible to give it a reference to the ‘treatise’ to which the appeal is made; and the common employment in profane Greek of *γραφαί* (in the plural) for a single document, discourages the assumption that (like *τὰ βιβλία*) when applied to the Scriptures it has reference to their composite character. The truth seems to be that whether the plural *αἱ γραφαί* or the singular *ἡ γραφή* is employed, the application of the term to the OT writings by the writers of the NT is based upon the conception of these OT writings as a unitary whole, and designates this body of writings in their entirety as the one well-known authoritative documentation of the Divine word. This is the fundamental fact with respect to the use of these terms in the NT from which all the other facts of their usage flow.

6. It is true that in one unique passage, 2Pe 3:16 (on the meaning of which see Bigg, *in loc.*), *αἱ γραφαί* does occur with a plural signification. But the units of which this plural is made up, as the grammatical construction suggests, appear to be not ‘treatises’ (Huther, Kühn), but ‘passages’ (de Wette). Peter seems to say that the unlearned and unstable of course wrested the hard sayings of Paul’s letters as they were accustomed to wrest *τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς*, *i.e.* the other Scripture statements (cf. Eurip. *Hipp.* 1311; Philo, *de Praem. et Paen.* § 11 near end)—the implication being that no part of Scripture was safe in their hands. This is a sufficiently remarkable use of the plural, no other example of which occurs in the NT; but it is an entirely legitimate one for the NT, and in its context a perfectly natural one. In the Church Fathers the plural *αἱ γραφαί* is formed freely upon *ἡ γραφή* both in the sense of ‘book’ of Scripture and in the sense of ‘passage’ of Scripture. But in the NT, apart from the present passage, there is in no instance of the use of *αἱ γραφαί* the slightest hint of a series whether of ‘treatises’ or of ‘passages’ underlying it. Even a passage like Luk 24:27 forms no exception; for if *γραφαί* is employed in a singular sense of a single document, then *πᾶσαι αἱ γραφαί* remains just the whole of that document,

and is the exact equivalent of *πᾶσα ἡ γραφή*, or (if *γραφὴ*) has acquired standing as a *quasi*-proper name) as *πᾶσα γραφή* (2Ti 3:16). Similarly *αἱ γραφαὶ τῶν προφητῶν* (Mat 26:56), *γραφαὶ προφητικαί* (Rom 16:26) appear to refer not to particular passages deemed prophetic, or to the special section of the OT called ‘the Prophets,’ but to the entire OT conceived as prophetic in character (cf. 2Pe 1:20, Act 2:30, 2Pe 3:16).

7. In 2Pe 3:16, however, we have already been brought face to face with what is probably the most remarkable fact about the usage of *γραφὴ* in the NT. This is its occasional employment to refer not merely, as from its form and previous history was to be expected, to the Scripture as a whole, or even, as also would have been only a continuation of its profane usage, to the several treatises which make up that whole, but to the individual passages of Scripture. This employment finds little support from the classics, in which *γράμμα* rather than *γραφὴ* is the current form for the adduction of ‘clauses’ or fragmentary portions of documents (cf. *e.g.* Plato, *Parmen.* 128 A-D, *Ephesians* 3 [317 B]; Thucyd. v. 29; Philo, *de Congr. Erud. Grat.* 12, *Quod Deus immut.* 2). It has been customary, accordingly, to represent it as a peculiarity of NT and Patristic Greek. It seems to be found, however, though rarely, in Philo (*Quis rerum div. hær.* 53, *de Praem. ct Paen.* 11; cf. Euripides, *Hipp.* 1311), and is probably an extreme outgrowth of the habit of looking upon the Scriptures as a unitary book of Divine oracles, every portion and passage of which is clothed with the Divine authority which belongs to the whole and is therefore manifested in all its parts. When the entirety of Scripture is ‘Scripture’ to us, each passage may readily be adduced as ‘Scripture,’ because ‘Scripture’ is conceived as speaking through and in each passage. The transition is easy from saying, ‘The Scripture says, namely, in this or that passage,’ to saying, of this and that passage, severally, ‘This Scripture says,’ and ‘Another Scripture says’; and a step so inviting was sure sooner or later to be taken. The employment of *ἡ γραφή* in the NT to denote a particular passage of Scripture does not appear then to be a continuation of a classical usage, but a new development on Jewish or Judaeo-Christian ground from the pregnant use of *γραφὴ* for the Sacred Scriptures, every clause of which is conceived as clothed with the authority of the whole. So far from throwing in doubt the usage of *γραφὴ* pregnantly of Scripture as a whole, therefore, it rather presupposes this usage and is a result of it. So it will not surprise us to find the two usages standing side by side in the NT.

9. It is an outgrowth of this conception of the OT that it is habitually adduced for the ordinary purposes of instruction or debate by such simple formulas as ‘it is said,’ ‘it is written,’ with the implication that what is thus said or written is of Divine and final

authority. Both of these usages are illustrated in a variety of forms, and with all possible high implications, not only in the NT at large, but also in the Gospels,—and not only in the comments of the Evangelists, but also in the reported sayings of our Lord. We are concerned here only with the formula, ‘It is written,’ in which the consciousness of the written form—the documentary character—of the authority appealed to finds expression. In its most common form, this formula is the simple *γέγραπται*, used either absolutely, or, with none of its authoritative implication thereby evacuated, with more or less clear intimation of the place where the cited words are to be found written. By its side occurs also the resolved formula *γεγραμμένον ἐστίν* (peculiar to Jn.; cf. Plummer on Luk 4:17), or some similar formula, with the same implications. These modes of expression have analogies in profane Greek, especially in legislative usages; but their use with reference to the Divine Scriptures, as it involves the adduction of an authority which rises immeasurably above all legislative authority, is also freighted with a significance to which the profane usage affords no key. In the Gospels, *γέγραπται* occurs exclusively in Mt. and Mk., and predominately in Lk., but only once in Jn.; most commonly in reports of our Lord’s sayings. In the latter part of Lk., on the other hand, the authoritative citation of the OT is accomplished by the use of the participle *γεγραμμένον*, while in Jn. the place of *γέγραπται* (8:17 only) is definitely taken by the resolved formula *γεγραμμένον ἐστίν*. The significance of these formulas is perhaps most manifest where they stand alone as the bare adduction of authority without indication of any kind whence the citation is derived (so *γέγραπται*, Mat 4:4; Mat 4:6-7; Mat 4:10, [Mat 11:10], Mat 21:13, [Mat 26:24], Mat 26:31, Mar 7:6; Mar 9:12-13; Mar 11:17; Mar 14:21; Mar 14:27, Luk 4:4; Luk 4:8; Luk 4:10; Luk 7:27; Luk 19:46; Luk 20:17; Luk 22:37; *γεγραμμένον ἐστίν*, Joh 2:17; Joh 6:31; Joh 12:14, [16]). The adjunction of an indication of the place where the citation may be found does not, however, really affect the authoritativeness of its adduction. This adjunction is rare in Mt. and Mk. (Mat 2:5, Mar 1:2 only), more frequent in Lk. (Luk 2:23; Luk 3:4; Luk 10:26; Luk 18:31; Luk 24:44; Luk 24:46) and Jn. (Joh 6:45; Joh 8:17; Joh 10:34; Joh 15:25); and by its infrequency it emphasizes the absence of all necessity for such identification. When a NT writer says, ‘It is written,’ there can arise no doubt where what he thus adduces as possessing absolute authority over the thought and consciences of men is to be found written. The simple adduction in this solemn and decisive manner of a written authority, carries with it the implication that the appeal is made to the indefectible authority of the Scriptures of God, which in all their parts and in every one of their declarations are clothed with the authority of God Himself.

Literature.—Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. et Talm. [Note: Talmud.]* (ed. Pitman) xi, xii; Schöttgen, *Hor. Heb. et Talm. [Note: Talmud.]* 1732; Surenhusius, *כפר המשנה sive βιβλος καταλλαγῆς*, 1713 (pp. 1-36); Döpke, *Hermeneutik d. NT Schriften*, 1829 (i. pp. 60-69); Edersheim, *LT [Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].]* i. 187, n. [Note: note.] 2; Weber, *Jüd. Theol.*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (1897) § 20; H. J. Holtzmann, *NT Theol.*, Index; Weiss, *Theol. of NT*, § 74a, n. [Note: note.] 3, § 136b, n. [Note: note.] 5, § 152b, n. [Note: note.] 4; Sepp, *De Leer des NT over de HS des OV*, 1849; Tholuck, *Ueber die Citate der AT [Note: T Altes Testament.] im NT*⁶ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; Turpie, *The NT View of the Old*, 1872; Böhl, *Die alttest. Citate in NT*, 1878; Toy, *Quotations in NT*, 1884; Dittmar, *VT in Novo*, i. 1899; Hühn, *Die alttest. Citate im NT*, 1900; Anger, *Ratio qua loci VT in Evang. Mat. laudantur*, 1801; E. Haupt, *Die alttest. Citate in d. 4. Evangg.* 1871; Clemen, *Der Gebrauch d. AT [Note: T Altes Testament.] im NT und speciell in den Reden Jesu*, 1891-1893, *Der Gebrauch der AT [Note: T Altes Testament.] in den NT Schriften*, 1895 (full literature, p. 19); Massebieau, *Examen des Citations de l'Ancien Test. dans l'Evang. selon S. Matthieu*, 1885; Swete, *Gospel acc. to Mark*, pp. lxx-lxxiv; Franke, *Das AT [Note: T Altes Testament.] bei Johannes*, 1885 (pp. 46-88, 225-281); Lechler, 'Das AT [Note: T Altes Testament.] in den Reden Jesu' (*TSK [Note: SK Theol. Studien und Kritiken.]*, 1854, 4); Grau, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, iv. 1887; Barth, *Die Hauptprobleme des Lebens Jesu*, ii. 1899 [2nd ed. 1903]; Kautzsch, *de VT locis in Paulo*, 1809; Monnet, *Les citations de S. Paul*, 1874; Vollmer, *Die alttest. Citate Paulus*, 1895.

B. B. Warfield.

☞ Sea of Galilee

SEA OF GALILEE

i. Names.—The OT name *Chinnereth* had disappeared, so far as our purpose is concerned, by the time of the Maccabees, and in its place we find a variety of designations. It is then that the familiar name *Gennesaret* first makes its appearance in the τὸ ὕδωρ Γεννησάρ of 1Ma 11:67. Josephus uses the forms λίμνη Γεννησάρ (*BJ* iii. x. 1), ὕδατα Γεννήσαρα (*Ant.* xiii. v. 7), λίμνη Γεννησαῤιτις (*Ant.* xviii. ii. 1; *Vita*, 65); Pliny has *Gennesara* (*HN* v. 15). In the Targums and other Jewish writings the name of the Sea appears as גניסר or גניס, these forms supplementing the Heb.

Chinnereth. But though the word *Gennesaret* was so familiar to contemporary writers, it appears only once in the NT as applied to the Lake, in the ἡ λίμνη Γεννησαρὲτ of Luk 5:1. Following close upon this, however, ἡ λίμνη occurs alone in Luk 5:2; Luk 8:22-23; Luk 8:33. The most popular name in the NT is ‘the Sea of Galilee’ (ἡ θάλασσα τῆς Γαλιλαίας), which occurs five times (Mat 4:18; Mat 15:29, Mar 1:16; Mar 7:31, Joh 6:1). The word ‘Sea’ (θάλασσα) stands alone in Joh 6:17-25, and the form ‘Sea of Tiberias’ (θάλασσα τῆς Τιβεριάδος) occurs in Joh 6:1; Joh 21:1. The modern designation, ‘Lake of Tiberias,’ does not occur in the NT. It is found for the first time as λίμνη Τιβερίς in Pausanias (Joh 21:7).

Many explanations have been offered of the origin of the word *Gennesaret*. Lightfoot (and others) sought to derive it from the OT *Chinnereth*, which it was supposed to replace. Such an origin, however, seems very improbable, not only on philological grounds, but because the latter name also remains simply transliterated in the LXX Septuagint as χενέρεθ, and was thus quite familiar to the Hellenistic world. Ritter (*Geog. of Pal.*) suggests that it is derived from תְּעִשָׁר or תְּאִצָּר ‘garden of treasure,’ which term, of course, he refers to the Plain, deriving thence the name of the adjoining Sea. This process is quite natural, and probably correct, but still we may be permitted to doubt his derivation of the name. G. A. Smith (*HGHL [Note: GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.]* 443 n. [Note: note.]) has also noted that the form points to some compound of תְּ ‘garden,’ or נַי valley; and to us this seems indisputable, so that on the whole we must admit that either the explanation given by Caspari (§ 64), יַנֵּי סַר יַנֵּי (‘gardens of the [lake] basin’), or that of the older Rabbis (*Ber. Rab* 98), גַּנֵּי טָר (‘gardens of the prince’), is most satisfactory. The termination in *Gennesaret* might then be regarded as the Aramaic determinative form, and compared with *Nazareth* from Nazara.

With reference to the name ‘Galilee,’ it has been said that it originally designated only that small tract of land given by Solomon to Hiram (1Ki 9:11), and that the name gradually extended till in the days of the Maccabees it included Zebulun and Naphtali, so that only after this took place could the Sea be known by that name. Furrer (*Wanderungen*) has also drawn attention to the other names. He asserts that *Gennesar* or *Gennesaritis* is characteristic of the 1st cent., being found in Josephus, Pliny, and Strabo, while from the 2nd cent. onwards the official designation became ‘Sea of Tiberias’; and as proof of this statement he cites the Palestinian Talmud. He then ventures to infer that Joh 21:1 indicates a later date than the rest of the book

demands, and at the same time he suggests that Joh_6:1 has been emended. This reasoning, however, seems inconclusive; for, apart from the fact that the Palestinian Talmud contains much that is old, it seems impossible, in view of the conservatism of the Rabbis, that such a name as 'Sea of Tiberias' should be found in their writings, unless it had been in common use for a considerable time. For the history of the district surrounding the Lake see art. Galilee.

ii. Description.—The Lake presents 'a beautiful sheet of limpid water in a deeply depressed basin' (*BRP [Note: RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.]* 2 ii. 380), its average below sea level being 682½ ft.; but with the season of the year the level may vary to the extent of 10 ft. The rise and fall are dependent on the rainy season on the one hand, and, on the other, on the melting of the snows on Hermon as the spring advances; and it is this latter cause that generally, in conjunction with the later rains, brings about the high level at the time of harvest (Jos_3:15). But as the heavier rains decrease before the melting of the snow begins, there may have been already a fall of as much as 3 ft. even in March. The Sea is 13 miles long by 7 across at its broadest part—between Mejdél and Kersa; but in the clear Eastern atmosphere it looks much smaller than it really is. From no point on the western shore can it be seen in its whole extent at one time; but from the slopes above Tell Hûm, or from almost any point on the eastern shore, it is all visible. It is not quite oval, but rather pear- or harp-shaped (כַּנְיֹוֹר), narrowing to the southern end. The sea level and the configuration of the shores have not changed to any considerable extent during the past nineteen centuries, so that, in so far as hills and valleys, ravines and slopes to the seashore are concerned, their present description gives a very true conception of what they were in Gospel days. On the west the hills are not so high and generally not so steep as on the eastern side; but they approach more closely to the shore, and are more rugged and stony. On the western side, from a short distance above what was once the western outlet of the Lake into the Jordan, and stretching some 3 miles up the Lake-side, the hills—here somewhat rounded and tame, and with but little that is picturesque in their form—slope down to the water's edge. Then to the north of this comes a *strip* (Heb. רִקְקָה, which seems to justify the identification of Tiberias with the older Rakkath, Jos_19:35; *Megilla*, 5b, 6a; G. A. Smith, *HGHL [Note: GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.]* p. 447) about 2½ miles long and ¼ of a mile broad at its widest part, and at the north end of this is the modern town of Tiberias. Passing it, we have another 3 miles of sloping hills, broken about midway by the *Wady Abu el-Amîs*. At Mejdél we now enter *el-Ghuweir*, the well-known Plain of Gennesaret. Behind the village to the west is *Wady Hamâm*, known in the early centuries as אַרְבֵּאל בְּקַעַת, and containing in its cliffs the once famous caves of Arbela (*Ant.* xiv. xv. 4). This is certainly the wildest and most impressive gorge around the whole Lake. On its south side it bears some resemblance, though on a far grander scale, to the crags around

Arthur's Seat. There is the same perpendicular wall, but here it rises in places to a height of 1500 ft.; and there is also the same mass of broken rocks, making a steep slope to the plain below.

El-Ghuweir curves along the Lake from Mejdal to Khân Minyeh, a distance of 3 miles, and it has a breadth of one mile. In addition to the stream from *Wady Hamâm*, it is watered by three others from 'Ain Mudauwarah, *Wady Rabadîyeh*, and *Wady Leimôn*, and these flow throughout the year. Just behind Khân Minyeh and its fountain 'Ain et-Tîn at the N.W. corner of the Lake, the rounded hill *Tell Oreime* slopes down to the water's edge, ending in a series of sharp rocks—the only place around the Lake where we find anything like a cliff beside the shore. Around the face of *Tell Oreime* there is a deep rock-cutting now used as a pathway, but in ancient times an aqueduct, as is attested by the discovery of the remains of the old piers of its continuation across the next valley to 'Ain et-Tâbigha. Remains of masonry show that the water was led eastward as well as westward from the towers built around the springs of *et-Tâbigha* (Ἐπτάπηγον of Nicephorus), so that there can be little doubt that this is the spring of Capernaum mentioned by Josephus (*BJ* iii. x. 8). From this point onward to the Jordan the hills again extend down to the shore, but by gentler slopes than even to the south of Tiberias. Between *et-Tâbigha* and *Tell Hûm* the shore forms a number of semicircular creeks, which, with the sloping embankment at this point, assume the shape of amphitheatres. Studying the subject on the spot, the present author was convinced that one of these must be the place where the sermon from the boat was preached (Mat 13:2 etc.). Something peculiar in the tones of our voices induced us to test the acoustic properties of the place, and we found that a speaker on the boat could be heard far up the slope, while the hum and bustle of a crowd on the shore would not disturb him.

After crossing the Jordan we meet with another plain—*el-Batiha*—corresponding to the one on the west, but somewhat more extensive. It is covered with green grass (Mar 6:39, Joh 6:10) at nearly all seasons of the year. With a breadth of 1 to 1½ miles, it extends 3 miles along the coast, and then narrows, extending nearly 3 miles more to Kersa, a short distance to the south of which we meet with the only steep place (Mat 8:32) on the eastern side of the Lake. At this point there is practically no shore, but immediately the eastern rampart of hills—2000 ft. high, now bleak and bare, but showing streaks of green where the springs trickle out between the white sandstone and the black superimposed lava—begins to recede, leaving a plain ¼ to ½ mile broad, and this to the south of *Kul at el-Husn* widens out into the Ghor or Jordan Valley. At the village of Semakh, the southern end of the Lake forms a beautiful circular bay, which is enclosed by earth walls 16 to 32 ft. in height. There is deep water close in to the shore, and the currents manifestly wear away the rich alluvial soil. In so far as physical changes have taken place, we should expect that the land

has suffered losses here, while there may have been slight gains by deposits on the shore of the plains of *el-Batiha* and *el-Ghuweir* (Gennesaret). What used to be the western outlet of the Jordan has also become silted up, for it must be remembered that in former times the Jordan flowed out from the two sides of a triangular island, now occupied by the ruins of Kerak—without doubt the remains of the once famous Taricheae (*BJ* iii. x. 1).

Compared with other lakes, the Sea of Galilee cannot be said to be deep. The maximum depth is from north to south along the course of the Jordan, and here it is 130 to 148 ft. according to the season [greater recorded depths have been proved to be in error], and except along the shores of the Plain of Gennesaret, deep water is reached all round the Lake within a few yards of the shore. The steep place at Kersa slopes down at once to a depth of 49 ft., and a short distance farther out the sounding gives 102 ft. A mile to the southeast of Tell Hûm the depth is 78 ft., and midway between Tiberias and Kersa it is 114.

One more notable feature of the Lake valley is to be found in the hot springs with which it abounds. The best known of these are at *Hammam* (cf. Josephus *Vita*, 16), south of Tiberias (132° to 144°), 'Ain *Bârïdeh* (80°), 'Ain *Mudauwarah* (73°), 'Ain *et-Tîn* (82°), and 'Ain *et-Tâbigha* (73° to 86°). Others certainly exist in the Lake itself. A brackish taste can be perceived at different places, and especially at a point $\frac{2}{3}$ across between Tiberias and Kersa, where in the warmer water great shoals of fish are wont to congregate. It was probably the drinking from a spot of this kind that led Strabo (*Geog.* xvi. 45) to express so bad an opinion of the waters of the Lake (ἕδωρ μὲν χθηρὸν λιμναῖον). These springs are all more or less sulphurous, and in all the centuries they have been used for medicinal purposes—especially those at Tiberias (*BJ* ii. xxi. 6). A reference to these in the Talmud shows us the relationship of the Rabbis to the Sabbath, and throws some light on their attacks on Jesus (Luk_13:14 etc.). The use of the means of healing was forbidden on the Sabbath; but these baths, though medicinal, were permitted, because in addition they ministered to indulgence in pleasure and luxury, and that was permitted. (*Pesach.* 8b).

Complaint has been made by some of the tameness of the scenery around the Lake, and of the want of picturesqueness of the hills; while, on the other hand, Seetzen (*Reisen, in loc.*) has declared that 'in the whole land of Palestine there is no district whose natural charms could compare with those of this.' There can be no doubt that much depends upon the season of the year when the district is first visited, as well as upon the expectations formed. In the present unwooded state, with its uncultivated fields and barren hills often, as at the north end of the Lake, washed down to the bare rock by the rains of centuries, there may be little to attract, especially when the whole country has been blackened by the summer suns and the burning siroccos. But

even now the earliest rains change the whole aspect of nature. The hills and the valleys on both shores become clothed in a luxuriant greenness, while, as the season advances, the fresh bursting buds of the olive, the fig, the vine, and the pomegranate, with here and there a palm tree, add variety and pleasantness to the landscape. Very soon, too, the fields are covered with great patches of anemones of varied colours—white, red, purple, and deep dark-blue, interspersed with various species of the lily family and stretches of the dark green-leaved and yellow-flowered mustard, while the watercourses and shores of the Lake are marked out by the red blooms of the oleander with its dark-green and silvery-backed leaves; and on the western shore variety is added by the gigantic reeds of the papyrus, topped by their reddish-brown waving plumes; on the higher grounds, too, every crevice of the rock is shaded by the blossoms of the cyclamen and many another flower of the field. But what must it have been in the year a.d. 27-28? It had been passing through, was indeed still in the period of transition after, the desolations of war, famine, and pestilence; but the worst was now long past, and 20 years of uninterrupted peace and prosperity had made it blossom like the rose. There was nothing in the rule of the tetrarchs Antipas and Philip to discourage perseverance, so that the land was coming more and more under cultivation. It must have been beautiful, indeed, when human industry was developing all its resources and changing the whole scene into a blooming paradise. Nothing can give a better idea of what the whole district was becoming, than the classic passage in which Josephus (*BJ* iii. x. 8) describes the Plain of Gennesaret in his own day (see art. Gennesaret [Land of] in vol. i.).

With Josephus' glowing description the Rabbis are in fullest harmony. Rish Laqish says: 'If Paradise be in the land of Israel, Beth-Shan is its entrance' (פיתחה ביתשאן). Again we read: 'Seven seas,' spake the Lord God, 'have I created in the land of Israel, but only one have I chosen for myself, that is the sea of Gennesar' (*Midr. Teh*, fol. 4). *Siphre* on Deu 33:23 explains the fulness of the blessing of the Lord as the Plain of Gennesaret. On the hills around the Lake were 'vines and fruitful fields' (*Meg. 6a*). 'It is easier,' saith Rabbi Eliezer ben Simon, 'to nourish a legion of olives in Galilee than to bring up one child in the land of Israel' (*Ber. Rab. c. 20*). The oil of the Galilaean hills was more plentiful than any in Palestine (*Men. 85b*), and the wheat of Chorazin is specially commended (*ib. 86a*). An illustration of the productiveness of the district, and a parallel to the hundredfold of the parable, may be seen in the enumeration of the products of a single ארבליית סאה 'half bushel of Arbela' (Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] *Peah*, vii. 3). The Gentile world also lends its testimony. To the early Fathers the district was τὰ χροάτισα τῆς Γαλιλαίας, 'the crown of Galilee,' while in the 3rd cent. C. Julius Solinus (*Collectanea*, xxxv. 13) says: 'Lacus Tiberiadis omnibus anteponitur ingenuo aestu et ad sanitatem usu efficaci.'

But the district was not yet reduced to the calm beauty of a prosperous agricultural country. There would still be stretches of woodland remaining, tenanted by birds of brilliant colours and various forms. There would be here and there beautiful oaks, either singly or in groups, that had grown up during the years when the population was small (*Baba Bathra* v. 1). There would be rocky stretches, especially to the north-east of the Lake, covered with brambles, wild mustard, and coarse grass, or dotted with prickly bushes (*nubk*), where the wolf, the jackal, the fox, and the hyaena would make their homes, and where the brown serpent and the silvery-breasted poisonous snake would glide about.

The population would not be so dense nor the land so fully cultivated as in the days when Josephus wrote, so that there would be a more equal mingling of the wild beauties of nature with the advancing and taming conquests of agriculture. The landscape, too, was becoming varied by the presence of many buildings. It has been said that 'the shores of the Lake seem to have borne cities and towns instead of harvests' (Tristram, *Land of Israel*, 444); and this, understood in the light of what we have already said, is very true. These would for the most part be constructed of black stone, but varied at times by buildings of white marble, while even the polished granite of Syene helped to break the monotony; and although, on the whole, the majority of the buildings would be dull and sombre, still, in the midst of waving fields of green and gold, the presence of the humble village, and the beach sparkling with the houses and the palaces, the synagogues and the temples of Jewish and Roman inhabitants, would present a scene of great beauty, so that we can well understand how the wild desolations of the pre-Christian century, and the calm and peaceful years that followed the advent of the Messiah, combined to render the district more beautiful when Christ was a citizen of Capernaum than at any other time during its whole history.

iii. Climate.—The climate of the Jordan Valley is in many ways very peculiar. Its low level—the lowest depression in the world—gives it many characteristics which are all its own. The absence of all frost, and the general warmth throughout the whole year, explain to us fully the peculiar open-air life that we meet with in the Gospels. For the most part Christ speaks out of doors. So did the Rabbis of His time. Ben Azzai taught on the shores of Tiberias (*Erubin*, 29a), and Rabbi Jehudah in the open air (*Moed Katon*, 16a). In the Gospels the sick are freely carried about (Mat 4:23, Mar 2:3), are allowed to wait in the crowd (Luk 8:43 f.), and the people are indifferent if the night find them away from home (Mat 15:32, Mar 8:2-3). The average temperatures of the air (night and day) in January are 37° and 74° respectively, while in June they are 68° and 108°; but in July the thermometer frequently rises many degrees higher. The present writer has seen it at 106° at 6 a.m., and 139° has been recorded on the shore of the Lake at midday in August; and even the soil, the rocks, and the pebbles around the Lake side become so intensely heated that the bather must wait till long after

sunset if he would enter the water without the risk of burning his feet. In such conditions, under the fiery glow of the sun and with months of drought, we can well understand that all the grass and herbage are burned up, and so in its present state of naked dreariness, visitors at such a season are naturally disappointed; but in other circumstances, and in days of universal irrigation, the whole scene would be very different (cf. Robinson's *Researches* under 19th June). Another noteworthy point is that the temperature of the body may rise much higher in cases of fever, and without serious results, than would be possible in other climates, e.g. a temperature of 110° is not uncommonly recorded. This may explain the expression 'great fever' (πυρετῶ με γάλω) of Luk 4:38.

The temperature of the waters of the Lake does not vary so much as might be expected, and is very little lowered even by the melting of the snows on Hermon. This is to be accounted for by the fact that such waters have already passed through Lake Huleh and have also had a considerable course in the upper Jordan. The average to a depth of 30 ft. is 68°, from 30 to 50 ft. it is 62°, and at a greater depth there is a constant temperature of 59° (*PEFSt [Note: EFS Quarterly Statement of the same.]*, 1894, pp. 211-220).

Rain.—The average number of rainy days during the year is 60, and the rainfall 22.5 inches. There is no rain during the months of June, July, August, and September. Two-thirds of the rainfall occurs in December, January, and February; the other months having only one to five days on which rain falls, which may mean either now and again, a whole day, or merely slight showers. The degree of humidity is greatest in January, when it stands at 77. It decreases till June, when it is 42; but in August, again, it has risen to 45; while in September it drops as low as 39.

Winds.—From May till October there are often sirocco days. They generally come 3, 7, or 10 at a time, though sometimes the hot wind lasts but one day, and then the day following brings a delightful sensation of coolness, enjoyment, and satisfaction. On the sirocco days the heat on the Lake and in the surrounding region is intensely depressing, but between the visits of the hot wind, westerly breezes blow in summer, and this makes the east side of the Lake pleasant. The western shore, however, south of Mejdal benefits little, as the winds pass over the protecting hills and strike the Sea far out, leaving the air inshore close and stifling. The north end of the Lake does not suffer to the same extent, because to the west of the Plain of Gennesaret the hills are somewhat lower and farther back, and, besides, the wind blows freely down the Valley of Pigeons, and gives the district around Capernaum all that the east side enjoys at such seasons. These westerly winds usually spring up in the afternoon, they become strong as the evening advances, but generally cease about 10 p.m. During the rest of the year the weather is more variable, and the winds blow from different

directions. Strong winds sometimes come from the north-east, and when they diverge to the north and come over Hermon the temperature is still more reduced, and a sensation of chill is felt in the atmosphere. This sometimes occurs till well on in May; while, on the other hand, a hot south wind will sometimes blow up the *Ghor* (Jordan Valley) in April, bringing with it clouds of dust which dim the sunlight and darken the hills, giving one a premature sensation of the summer's glow.

Storms.—The rainy season is generally introduced by thunderstorms. In October and November, small clouds, scarcely larger than a man's hand, gather on Tabor, Jebel Jarmuk, and the other hills of Upper Galilee. They grow in size and in threatening aspect, and generally in three days' time a violent thunderstorm with heavy rains bursts over the valley. This is then usually followed by a time of calm with a clear blue sky overhead. Such storms, but not generally so violent, occur from time to time during the winter, and the rainy season may be closed by something of the same nature. In the beginning of May the sky will be clouded, and there will be one or two days' rain with or without thunder. Sometimes, however, when the valley has been enjoying the most peaceful calm, it will be affected by storms that have occurred elsewhere. The hills of Upper Galilee may have been hidden in dense mists for a day or two, but nothing has disturbed the peace of the Lake. There have been rains, however, on the high lands only a few hours distant, and these, forming themselves into mountain torrents, have come down, sweeping all before them (Mat 7:27, Luk 6:49) in their descent, and flooding what but a few minutes earlier had been a dry channel. The present writer has personally watched the *Wady Rabadīyeh* and the *Wady Leimôn*, both of which cross the Plain of Gennesaret, as they became in an incredibly short time changed from little more than dry, stony river-beds to impassable foaming torrents; and, when the hills have been dark with clouds, has heard the warning given to get over these wadys 'before the stream comes down.'

Storms may occur on the Lake at any season, and there are few places where changes come so suddenly. The experience of Lynch is that of every one who has spent any time here: 'While pulling about the Lake, a squall swept down one of the ravines, and gave us a convincing proof of how soon the placid sea could assume an angry look' (p. 164). The storms on the Sea of Galilee are in many ways peculiar, and sometimes the wind seems to blow from various directions at one time, tossing the boat about. This arises from the fact that the winds blow violently down the narrow gorges and strike the Sea at an angle, stirring the waters to a great depth. Many of the storms, too, are quite local in their character. This may be understood by the fact that when a westerly wind is blowing, all may be smooth along the shores to the north and south of Tiberias and for a mile out, but there we may pass in a moment from the region of perfect calm into a gale so violent that the only chance of safety is to run before the wind to the eastern shore. At other times the south end of the Lake may be comparatively peaceful, but, sailing northward, we no sooner reach Mejdel than the

wind from *Wady el-Hamâm* will seize the sail, and, unless it be instantly lowered, overturn the boat. These winds are from the west, but it is generally the wind from the north-east that raises a general storm over the whole Sea. This wind blows right into the Sea from *el-Batiha*, and from this direction no part is sheltered. The suddenness, too, with which the storms spring up may be illustrated by a storm which came from this direction, and which the present writer observed. A company of visitors were standing on the shore at Tiberias, and, noting the glassy surface of the water and the smallness of the Lake, they expressed doubts as to the possibility of such storms as those described in the Gospels. Almost immediately the wind sprang up. In 20 minutes the sea was white with foam-crested waves. Great billows broke over the towers at the corners of the city walls, and the visitors were compelled to seek shelter from the blinding spray, though now 200 yards from the Lake side. It is further to be noted that the north end of the Lake, being less sheltered than the rest, is more subject to storms. Indeed, only in peculiar circumstances could it escape having a chief share in any storm.

These facts may now be used to illustrate the two occasions on which Jesus is recorded to have been on the Sea in a storm (Mat 8:23, Mar 4:37, Luk 8:23; and Mat 14:24, Mar 6:48, Joh 6:18). On the former of these the journey was from Capernaum to Gergesa, and the wind was from the north-east. Thus the boat was struck on its side, and so 'the waves beat into the ship' and it became 'filled.' On the second occasion they were attempting to pass from Bethsaida Julias to Capernaum. The wind was against them, blowing down the *Wady Hamâm* and over the Plain of Gennesaret, so that they were 'toiling in rowing, for the wind was contrary.' It is also made clear to us that, although the wind prevented their getting to Capernaum, it was not such as would prevent boats coming from Tiberias (Joh 6:18-24). Even in the height of the storm they could have, under the shelter of the western hills, proceeded as far as Mejdél, and thus come early upon the scene at any point at the north end of the Lake when once the storm was calmed.

It might be imagined that the cessation of the storms might mean simply the passing from an exposed and stormy to a calmer and protected region, but in both the cases recorded this is impossible. In the first instance, when the wind was from the north-east, the whole Sea would be disturbed; while in the latter case the Sea to the north of Mejdél would be all affected by the storm; and as the passage was between *el-Batiha* and the Plain of Gennesaret, the boat would not even approach the region of calm.

iv. Industries.—During the peaceful years of Christ's ministry the whole Lake-basin was becoming a focus of life and energy. We have already indicated, by references to Josephus and the Rabbis, what the land was in the process of becoming in so far as *agriculture* was concerned. The tilling of the soil must have been a tempting

occupation where the land was so fertile, so well watered everywhere, and enjoyed so much of the sunshine. Besides, it could be sown two and even three times in the year. At the present time in the plain of *el-Batiha* this is the case. After the corn harvest is gathered in, Indian corn may be sown; and when this also has ripened and been cleared off, the land and the season are ready for vegetables and water melons. The peculiar climate, too, ripens the harvest a month earlier than on the higher lands of Galilee and Bashan. The melons and the cucumbers are ready for use fully four weeks before those of Acre and Damascus, so that the prospect of greater gain by being able to anticipate the markets in all the larger towns must have been a powerful incentive to diligence when the means of transport were easier than now. We know that the fruits of Gennesaret were taken to Judaea (M. *Ma'aser Shenii* ii. 3), though it is said that they were not allowed in Jerusalem, lest on account of their goodness they should form an inducement, apart from the spiritual one, for pilgrims to journey thither (*Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] Pesach. 8b*). With so much activity was this work pursued, that the hiring of day-labourers seems to have been quite common, and they were wont to go from Tiberias to till the lands of Beth-maon (*Kul'at ibn Ma'an*), which lands we believe to have been in the Plain of Gennesaret (Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] *Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] Met. vii. 1*; and cf. Mat 20:1-17). Nor can we overlook the work of the shepherd, so closely bound up with agriculture, and to which there is so frequent reference in the Gospel story; but, just as in modern times, this work would be less pursued by the Lake side than on the neighbouring hills, where we know that even the flocks of Judaea were pastured (*Baba Bathra* v. 1).

Then the Gospels set before us a very great activity in *fishing*. There was a Jewish tradition that the fishing in the Lake was to be free to all, subject to the one condition that stakes were not to be set that might impede the progress of boats; and tradition further said that the freedom had been conferred by Joshua (*Baba Qama, 80b*). Not only the statements of the NT, but the names of the towns and villages, lead us to the knowledge of activity in this direction. Thus we have two towns of the name of *Bethsaida* ('Fisherrow'); a village called *Migdol Nunia* ('Fish-tower'), probably situated at 'Ain Baridch (*Pesach. 46a*), and the great city of *Taricheae* ('Fish factory') at the south end of the Lake. At *Taricheae*, as the name indicates, the fish were salted and dried, and to-day the salt can be seen here encrusted on the sand like hoarfrost. So far as the Mosaic law was concerned, the fish in the Sea of Galilee were all clean; but, as one passage in the Gospels draws a distinction between 'good' and 'bad' (Mat 13:47-48), it may be of interest to note that the Jews of the present day, for some superstitious reason, refuse to eat one kind named *burbût* (Lynch, p. 165). Josephus (*Vita, 12*) found that the fishers were a strong party in Tiberias also, so we may conclude that the boats that came thence were used for fishing (Joh 6:23).

The chief fishing ground to-day is in the neighbourhood of *el-Batiha*, and here the work is conducted in boats with drag-nets (σύροντες τὸ δίχτυον, Joh 21:8); but in other places the want of a boat need not prevent a man becoming a fisher. If he simply possess a net and learn to cast it (βάλλοντες ἀμφιβληστρον, Mat 4:18), he may be very successful in places where the water is not deep. Where the warm springs flow into the Lake the fish congregate in great numbers. We have seen shoals at 'Ain Barideh and 'Ain et-Tabigha so great as to cover an acre of the surface, and so compact together that one could scarcely throw a stone without striking several. In such cases the handnet is thrown out with a whirl. It sinks down in a circle, enclosing a multitude, and these are then gathered in by the hand, while the net lies at the bottom. The hook (ἄγκιστρον, Mat 17:27) is also used in our day, and frequently a large quantity is taken in a short time. In the days of Josephus (a.d. 67) there were very many boats on the Lake, —230 at Taricheae alone (*BJ* ii. xxi. 8), —but in the year a.d. 27-28 they must have been still far below the number they reached in later years.

The fishing industry implied many others. Delitzsch (*Handwerkleben zur Zeit Jesu*) tells us that the fish from the Lake were sold in Jerusalem; and when we think of the greater refinement of the Apostle John, his acquaintance with the high priest (Joh 18:15), and his having a house in the Holy City (Joh 19:27), we feel almost compelled to infer with Nonnus that he had acted there as agent. The sale of fish in Jerusalem and elsewhere would mean the employment of a goodly number of muleteers, and in ordinary circumstances the Apostolic band would travel in such caravans, just as Joseph and Mary had previously done (Luk 2:44). We must get away from the idea that they always travelled on foot.

Then on the shore of the Lake itself the fishing industry implied *boat-building and repairing*, and this, amongst other things, may have helped to decide our Lord's settlement in Capernaum, for there, as a carpenter, He could still from time to time exercise His own calling. At any rate, after He had settled here for some time, He was still known as 'the carpenter' (Mar 6:3). That this should be the case was quite in harmony with the practice of the teachers of those days. We find Rabbi Abin also working as a carpenter (*naggâr*), while Rabbi Ada and Rabbi Ise are said to have been fishers (*zayyâdîn*). To some extent also the boats may have been used for transport trade; but we are inclined to think that the fact that the two sides of the Lake belonged to two different tetrarchies, each with its own customs and taxation, would militate against this.

The Talmuds and Midrash bring to our notice other occupations carried on beside the Lake, especially at Magdala, a portion of which was named Migdol Zebaya (*Erubin* v. 7) from the *dueing operations* there conducted. So late as the year 1862, Sepp found

this work still in existence, and indigo being grown in the fields of Mejdol. Then we read that there were 80 shops in the same town for the sale of *linen* (*Taan.* iv. 5), and we learn later that the linen of Galilee was *fine* (*Baba Qama*, 119a; *Ber. Rab.* c. 20). But perhaps of more interest than either of these is the fact that Magdala contained 300 shops for the sale of pigeons (*Midr. Echa*, 75d), which were used for purifications in the Temple (Luk 2:24). These pigeons would be captured among the overhanging rocks of *Wady Hamâm*, where they are so plentiful to-day, or trapped in nooses laid out in the adjoining fields (cf. *Baba Qama* vii.). These would be transferred to Jerusalem, where we learn that there were booths on the Mt. of Olives for the sale of such (*Cholin*, 53a), as well as in the Temple courts when the sellers had invaded the sacred precincts (Mat 21:12 etc.). In this connexion it is to be noted that when those who sold doves were driven out of the Temple they could not be ignorant of the personality and power of Him who expelled them. Magdala and the Mt. of Olives being thus connected, another item is cast into the balance in favour of some relationship between Mary of Magdala and the family of Bethany (cf. Baronius, *Annales*, cap. 32). It may also be interesting to note here a still further connexion, for in the year a.d. 67, when the Jewish war broke out, the Jews took occasion to destroy the booths on the Mt. of Olives because the occupants 'established their doings on the Law, and did what was forbidden by the words of the wise' (*Cholin*, 53a); and during the same year Magdala and other towns in Galilee were destroyed, and the epithets used in the reasons given seem to indicate that the inhabitants were Christian (Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] *Taanith* iv. 5; *Baba Mez.* 88a; *Midr. Echa* ii. 2). These industries gave the Lake valley a trade connexion with the outside world; but, apart from those engaged in these occupations, multitudes would be employed in making articles for home use, as well as for the supply of the two courts and the various garrison towns. All trades would be represented, and these we sometimes read of incidentally, as in the case of *tanning* and the manufacture of *earthenware* at Migdol Zebaya.

v. Geography.—This has long been a vexed question, and is likely to remain so till excavating work is undertaken. The sites of Tiberias, Magdala, and Julias seem alone to be undisputed, so far as the Gospel history is concerned. The questions regarding the various sites will be treated each in its own place. The towns with which we are concerned were for the most part Jewish; but there were also Greek cities (πόλεις Ἑλληνίδες) around the Lake. In Tiberias and Julias, built by the tetrarchs, in Gamala, Hippos, Gadara, Taricheae, and in Philoteria (Polybius, v. 70), all trace of which has been lost, Greek influence would be paramount, though, of course, there was a Jewish element dwelling among the Gentile population (*Rosh-Hash.* ii. 1). These cities would have their own influence on the people of the surrounding districts. It may seem strange that the Gospels never touch them, and that the fact of their existence is no more than recorded, though they were large and important in comparison with the Jewish towns named. We feel justified in believing that Christ never entered

these fashionable Greek cities. We know that the pious Jew specially abhorred Tiberias, and would not enter it, as it had been built on an ancient cemetery (*Shebhiith* ix. 1). We read, indeed, of a circuit through Decapolis (Mar_7:31); but in view of Christ's relationship to the nearer towns, and His own statement (Mat_15:24), we are constrained to believe that He confined Himself to the country districts as occupied by the Jewish population. In harmony with this is His desire not to have His works proclaimed in these Greek towns (Mar_8:26).

Roads.—The Sea of Galilee was in no sense in the 1st cent. what it is now, something of the nature of a retired mountain lake. On the contrary, it was kept in constant touch with the whole world. The western shore was one of the chief meeting-places of the world's highways. The *Via Maris* (the Way of the Sea, Mat_4:15), a well-known trade route, along which the wealth of the East passed westward, touched its north-eastern shore. Paved portions of it still remain. Details of the network of highways meeting in this region will be found in their own place (see Roads); but we have to remark that the Jordan could be passed not only at the usual fords, but, during the spring and summer months, also by wading knee-deep along a kind of bar formed by pebbles and sand, where the river enters the Lake (Mat_14:13, Mar_6:33). Further, it is to be noted that most if not all of these roads were available not only for mules and camels, as in modern times, but also for vehicles, for we learn that on account of their quantity the contributions were sent from Magdala, Cabul, and Sogane to Jerusalem *in waggons* (*Ta'anith*, iv. 5).

vi. Population.—We can now well understand the various classes of people who dwelt in and around this district. In the Greek towns the population would be chiefly Greek-speaking sojourners of mixed race—the Levantines of those days. The Roman soldiery would be there in considerable numbers as well as scattered through the towns, especially where customs were collected. There would be *courtiers* around the Herods in Tiberias and Julias—'Herodians,' as they were called; and they were, for the most part, *Sadducecs*. The *publicans* would have their headquarters in the two capitals, but they would be employed everywhere, and would be specially active at the north end of the Lake, on the great trade routes. There, too, the *Pharisees* and probably also the *Essenes* (*BJ* ii. viii. 4) would be chiefly in evidence. It is the population at this north end that chiefly concerns us; for amongst them the Lord dwelt, and there He had His own city (Mat_9:1). The people here were essentially Jewish, but there was a world of difference from the Judaism of Judaea. Graetz (ii. 148, English ed.) has well described this when he says: 'Morality was stricter in Galilee, and the laws and customs more rigidly enforced. The slightest infringement was not allowed, and what the Judaeans permitted themselves the Galilaeans would by no means consent to.' We might almost put it, Judaea had much of the semblance of piety, Galilee more of the reality. Indeed, their piety as Jews had already impressed even the heathen world (Luk_7:5). The Talmuds tell us that the Galilaeans

loved honour more than wealth, and that the contrary was the case in Judaea (Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] *Keth.* iv. 14); that the marriages were simpler and more decently conducted (*Keth.* 12a, with which cf. Joh 2:1-11; Edersheim, *Sketch of Jewish Social Life*, p. 152 ff.), and also that the widow's right of occupancy of her husband's house was fully recognized (Mishna, *Keth.* iv. 12 and Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] *Keth.* iv. 14; cf. Mat 8:14). The Galilaeans, too, were accused by their neighbours of being too talkative with women; and in this connexion the expression גלילאה סומה 'foolish Galilaeans,' came into use (*Erubin*, 53b; cf. Joh 4:27). Josephus also speaks well of the Galilaeans, commending their courage, and adding that they were inured to war from their infancy (*BJ* iii. iii. 2). There is another remark in the Talmud regarding their character that is worth noting: היו קנמרניך גליל אנשי 'the men of Galilee were disputatious' (*Nedar.* 48a). This has always been a characteristic of the Jew; he has never been able to argue calmly; and when we add to this acknowledged characteristic of the people the circumstances of a fishing and boating life, we must admit the truth of the accusation; and knowing this, we can well understand that many of the scenes around the Lake were much noisier than the calm words of Scripture would lead us to suspect (Mat 9:24-25, Mar 3:22, Luk 8:37 etc.); and we can appreciate the facility with which Peter relapsed into what must have been an old habit (Mar 14:71). Then the inhabitants of the district would not be over cleanly in their habits. We can infer nothing from the neglect of hand-washing (ידיים נמילה), for it is at best purely ceremonial; but the Jew generally was, in the 1st cent., the butt of the Gentile world on account of his uncleanness, just as he is to-day (Seneca, *Ephesians* 5; Perseus, *Sat.* v.). Apart from the Greek towns, which, like Tiberias and Gamala, were supplied by aqueducts (portions of which still remain), the general water supply was from the Lake; and in consideration of the traffic that existed and the absence of sanitary arrangements, this could not be satisfactory in the neighbourhood of a town like Capernaum. Then every village would have, as at the present time, its own dunghill, a fruitful source of swarms of flies.

Great extremes of wealth and poverty there would not be. We meet, indeed, with a knowledge of wealth (Mat 7:6; Mat 13:46; Mat 18:24, Luk 12:18-19); but on the whole the life was of the simplest, as we see from the nature of the household furnishings,—*the* bushel, *the* candlestick (Mat 5:15), there being but one; and the mention of the food—bread, eggs, fish (Mat 7:9-10, Luk 11:11-12).

Then it is to be noted that the people were to a certain extent *bilingual*. Judging from similar conditions in this district and elsewhere at the present day, we should say that the language of the homes and of the Jewish population among themselves was *Aramaic*, but that the men would generally be acquainted colloquially with the *Hellenistic* speech of the larger towns. The native language, too, had its own peculiarities (Mat 26:73), the chief of which was a remarkable confusion of the

gutturals, which is repeatedly ridiculed in the Talmuds, where a notable example is given of a Galilaean being asked, when shouting on the street, whether he wished to sell 'wool,' 'a sheep,' 'wine,' or 'a donkey' (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Erubin*, 53b; *Berakhoth*, 32a).

To sum up, then, the population of this district was as manly, industrious, independent, moral, pious, and experienced in the world as any in Palestine. It was among men who were *morally right* that our Lord chose to settle. It was such that He made His first disciples, and finally His Apostles. Had these been willing to compromise conscience, they might easily have passed into easier walks of life. In the full strength of early manhood, they might have had a share in the settlement of Tiberias (*Ant.* xviii. ii. 3), but they had resisted that temptation. It is true that Matthew the publican (Mat 10:3) was among them, but it is to be remembered that here he did not serve an alien like the *publicani* in Judaea. The taxes he collected would go to the coffers of Antipas in Tiberias (Titus Livius, 32 F; Cicero, *in Verr.* ii. 72), and they would be drawn from the tax on goods passing along the highways as well as on the fish from the Lake, as at the present day. This latter fact suggests a peculiar relationship between Matthew and the 'fisher-folk' among the Twelve, and a still more interesting one between him and Simon the Zealot, who had fought against these taxes.

We conclude by observing that, as no land in the world save Palestine could have given us the Bible, no part of the land save this, with its wealth of recent historical association and variety in nature, from the torrid heat of *el-Ghuweir* to the perennial snows of Hermon, could so well have suited the Great Teacher in His appeal to men of every kindred and every clime. In its calm beauty it was in many ways worthy of the presence of the Son of Man, and it presents us with a beautiful picture of many aspects of His life and character. It deserved all that Jew and Gentile said in its praise even in their playing with its names—Tiberias (מבְרִיא ראייתה טובה), 'beautiful of appearance'; Capernaum (נְעִים כַּפֶּר, χωριον παρακλησεως), 'land of pleasantness or consolation.' Before the time of the Lord Jesus the Sea of Galilee was to the world an unknown, neglected, and almost unnamed distant inland lake; but He has changed all this. He has rendered it immortal.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible and *Encyc. Bibl.* art. 'Galilee, Sea of'; G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [Note: *GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*] , ch. xxi.; Merrill, *Galilee in the Time of Christ*; see also art. Galilee and the Lit. given there.

Wm. M. Christie.

☩ Seal

SEAL.—The only reference in the Gospels to the literal use of a seal is Mat_27:66,* [Note: A finger-ring (δακτύλιος), in which the seal was usually set, is mentioned in the parable of the Prodigal Son (Luk_15:22).] where we read that the chief priests and Pharisees, after consultation with Pilate, in order to guard against the removal of our Lord's body by the disciples, secured the sepulchre to the best of their power by setting their seal upon the entrance stone (cf. Dan_6:17) as well as by placing soldiers to guard it. The process would be accomplished by stretching a cord across the stone that blocked the entrance, and by sealing the two ends of the cord against the wall of rock. Twice in the Fourth Gospel the act of sealing is used figuratively to describe (a) the solemn confirmation by the believer, from his own experience, that God is true (Joh_3:33); (b) the destination and authentication of the Son by the Father as the bestower of the food which nourishes eternal life (Joh_6:27). In all of these three cases it is the verb σφραγίζω that is used, the noun σφραγίς not being found in the Gospels.

C. L. Feltoe.

☩ Seam

SEAM.—See Coat.

☩ Searching

SEARCHING.—*Searching* (of Latin-French derivation) is a richer word than *seeking* (of Anglo-Saxon origin), because it implies examination as well as looking and asking (cf. 1Pe_1:10). Thus while ζητέω and its compounds are always translated 'seek,' the words corresponding to 'search' are ἀνακρίνω (Act_17:11 only), ἐξετάζω, and ἐρευνάω. In Mat_2:8 ἐξετάζω is appropriately used for the identifying of the child of Messianic promise: 'Search out carefully concerning the young child' (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ; whereas Authorized Version translation as if it were ἐκζητέω). In Mat_10:11 it means 'get to know exactly who is genuinely worthy,' rather than settle down with the first man who is spoken of for his piety. In Joh_21:12 the same word is used to suggest that the disciples did not venture to probe the mystery any further.

Reverence held them back,—the sense that faith must at such a moment take the place of criticism.

But the exact equivalent of ‘search’ is ἐρευνᾶω. It is used twice in Jn. (Joh 5:39; Joh 7:52) of ‘searching the Scriptures.’ It may well be believed that it connoted more on the lips of Jesus (Joh 5:39), who knew how to distinguish the spirit from the letter (Mat 7:12, Luk 7:27; Luk 10:26 ff., Joh 6:33), and to bring forth treasures new as well as old (Mat 13:52; cf. Mat 5:21 f., Mat 5:43 f., Mat 9:13; Mat 12:40 ff.), than it did upon the lips of the chief priests and Pharisees (Joh 7:52).—With Christ it meant to search the Scriptures with a candid mind and reverent spirit to find the will of the holy Father whose name is Love. But there was a ‘veil upon the faces’ of the Jews (2Co 3:15), because they did not look behind a private or traditional interpretation. The priests, who were mostly Sadducees, ‘searched’ for passages that would serve a casual purpose (Mar 12:18 ff.), and the Pharisees ‘searched’ for what would maintain their burdensome traditions (Mar 2:7; Mar 2:24, Luk 13:14, Joh 9:28), or even enable them to evade a moral issue (Mat 19:7).

In Joh 5:39 ἐρευνᾶτε may be either Imperative (as Authorized Version) or Indicative (as Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) [cf. πιστεύετε in Joh 14:1]. The former falls into line with the general tenor of Christ’s teaching, that the Jews had only to use the means at their disposal in order to see in Himself the fulfilment of the Law and the Prophets (Mat 5:17, Luk 16:31; Luk 24:27, Joh 7:38). But the Indicative seems in best accord with the immediate context (‘*because ye think,*’ ‘*and these are they,*’ ‘*ye will not come to me*’) (cf. Westcott, *in loc.*).

Literature.—Westcott on *John*; Martineau, *Hours of Thought*, i. 54, 201, ii. 183 f.; S. A. Tipple, *Sunday Mornings at Norwood*, p. 161 ff.; Forrest, *Authority of Christ*.

A. Norman Rowland.

☞ Second Adam

SECOND ADAM.—See Divinity of Christ in vol. i. p. 477^b.

☞ Second Coming

SECOND COMING.—This is the designation commonly given to the final return of Jesus in glory at the end of the ages, to perfect His Kingdom. The term does not occur in the Gospels, but it has long been adopted in general usage to signify the supreme crisis of the Parousia, the most momentous and decisive of the various future comings which Jesus foreshadowed when He spoke of His death at the hands of men, and the manifestations of His triumphant life and power that would follow it. The subject is dealt with under Coming again, and more fully, with a note on the Literature, under Parousia.

G. M'Hardy.

Seed

SEED.—Excluding the use of this term as equivalent to *progeny*, *offspring*, or *race* (cf. e.g. Mar_12:19-24, Luk_1:55, Joh_7:42), we find it exclusively employed in the parables of Jesus as an apt symbol for Divine influence, or for the expansion of the moral and religious life in communities or individuals.

1. In Mar_4:26-29, a parable peculiar to Mark, Jesus uses the process of sowing and the subsequent conduct of the farmer to illustrate the certain success of His Kingdom upon earth. What He preached about seemed perhaps to the disciples, as well as to outsiders, as weak as a grain of seed flung upon a field. Yet neither is an isolated or foreign thing in the world. On the side of the gospel were certain mysterious powers which would ensure its success, apart from human aid or interference. All it required was time. The order of things was a ripening order, and at the proper moment these favourable conditions would bring about the fruit and result of what at present seemed a very precarious and unpromising movement among men. Such is the general point of the parable. The seed's vital energy and its appointed correspondence with the powers of nature symbolize features in the gospel which enable Jesus to await the future with quiet confidence and an easy mind. Neither is just what it seems to the outward eye. Each sets in action a slow but sure process of growth, upon which the sensible person will count. 'Fruit grows thus,' said Epictetus; 'the seed must be buried for some time, hidden, and then grow slowly if it is to reach perfection.' It is by an extension, or rather a special application, of this usage that the self-sacrifice of man is compared to the burying of the seed in the furrow (Joh_12:23-25), with special reference to the death of Jesus Himself. The ultimate effects of such self-immolation depend on the thoroughness of the process itself.

The Kingdom is also compared to seed in the parable of the Mustard Seed (Mar_4:30-32 = Mat_13:31-32 = Luk_13:18-19). A small thing to begin with, it

ultimately surpasses all other movements which make a greater show at first to the untrained eye. Here the Kingdom is conceived of, not eschatologically, but historically. When it is likened to 'seed,' the thought is mainly of the immense possibilities of growth in it, as compared with its initial size, the correspondence between it and the soul of man, and the pledge, which it contains, of some final and splendid issue.

2. Seed, on the other hand, depends to a certain extent upon soil. While essentially designed to co-operate with the vital forces of nature, it may be rendered wholly or partially barren. And in this further sense it forms a symbol for Jesus of the Divine word and its fortunes in the world of men. Consequently we find that in two other parables the seed represents not the Kingdom, but the word (cf. Mat 13:19).

The first of these, the parable of the Sower and the Soils (Mar 4:2 f. = Mat 13:3 f. = Luk 8:5 f.), bears on the difficulties and disappointments encountered in the preaching of the word of God. The latter is compared to the vital germ or grain of the plant, which, through no fault of its own or of the sower, may fail to germinate, owing to the unpromising nature of the ground on which it chances to fall. Nevertheless, the work of the sower must proceed. The partial failure of his efforts is not to render his career or calling void. In the parable itself, which is undoubtedly genuine, the original reference is to the experiences of Jesus Himself as a preacher. 'Jesus has to preach; the rest is God's concern' (Wellhausen). But in the subsequent interpretation of the parable, which, like other interpretations, must be held to contain in whole or part reflexions of the Apostolic age and traces of the editor's hand, the scope widens to include the general preaching of Christian evangelists, who are counselled not to let themselves be daunted by finding the unsympathetic and the preoccupied among their hearers. The seed must be sown. The word must be trusted to do its work in congenial hearts. The teaching must be imparted. Such is the supreme lesson for evangelists drawn here by Jesus from the vegetable world.

The other parable is that of the Tares, or darnel (Mat 13:24 f.), which may be an allegorized variation, and in part an expansion, of the ideas contained in Mar 4:26-29. Certainly, whatever be the original nucleus, the editorial reflexions indicate a rather advanced period in the history of the early Church's mission and discipline. Growth, here too, is a partial feature of the situation. But the seed or word is further exposed to deliberate and widespread corruption and rivalry. Another power of influence is stealthily at work among men. God's message finds no virgin soil, for the growth of the seed is thwarted; and specious, vigorous rivals abound.

Both of the latter parables, in so far as they emphasize the nature of God's word or message as seed, thus touch wisely and earnestly on its mysterious power of growth. The spoken word is essentially fruitful. It is the instrument of the Divine mission. 'We

forget too often that language is both a seed-sowing and a revelation,' says Amiel. 'Man is a husbandman; his whole work rightly understood is to develop life, to sow it everywhere.' And the supreme method is the contact of one personality with another, especially through the medium of that spoken intercourse which conveys the truth of God to the soul of man. This, and no external means, is the chosen way of Jesus.

Literature.—In addition to the critical editors on the passages above cited, and writers on the Parables (especially Trench, Bruce, Jülicher, and Godet), cf. T. G. Selby, *Ministry of the Lord Jesus*, p. 157 f.; Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, iv. p. 138 f.; and J. Rendel Harris, *Union with God*, p. 171 f.

J. Moffatt.

☞ Seeing

SEEING.—In the Gospels there are three Greek words (βλέπω, θεωρέω, ὁράω) used for 'see,' sometimes rendered in the Authorized and Revised Versions by 'behold,' 'take heed,' 'beware,' 'regard.' The most ordinary significance of the word 'see' is, of course, the natural one—to recognize by the act of vision ordinary external objects, as when the blind are described as seeing (Mat_15:31, Joh_9:7), or men are promised that they shall see the Son of Man, or when the disciples think they see a vision, or the multitude see the miracles of Jesus (Mar_14:62, Luk_24:23, Joh_6:2).

The more significant uses of the word are, however, *figurative*. (1) The first usage under this head is where the verb 'to see' is used of the recognition of objects not strictly visible, as, for example, when it is said of Peter that he saw the wind (Mat_14:30); or when men are told that, if they first cast out the beam out of their own eye, they will then be able to see clearly to cast the mote out of their brother's eye (Mat_7:5); or, again, when it is said that a man shall see death (Luk_2:26, Joh_8:51); or when the Lord speaks of a man as 'seeing the light of this world' (Joh_11:9), where, of course, it is more strictly the vision of objects made possible through the presence of the light of day.

(2) The second figurative sense is a very ordinary one in the Gospels, where the verb 'to see' is employed in the sense of the spiritual vision of the mind and soul. In the Beatitudes, for example, the blessing of the pure in heart is that they shall see God (Mat_5:8). The angels also possess the same privilege (Mat_18:10). The disciples are told that in seeing Christ they have already obtained the vision of the Father (Joh_14:9); while in another passage of the same Gospel the seeing of Christ and believing on Him are the conditions of possessing eternal life (Joh_6:40). In the Lord's

great prayer for His disciples He desires that they may see His glory (Joh_17:24), which implies a participation in the understanding of Divine things of the highest and most intimate character. In this connexion also is to be noted the strange utterance of our Lord in Luk_10:18, where, on the return of the Seventy, He speaks of His beholding Satan 'fallen as lightning from heaven,' which must imply His spiritual prevision of the final overthrow of the powers of evil, and the establishment of His Divine kingdom. Most significant of all this class of passages, however, are those found in Joh_9:39, and Mat_13:14-16 with its parallels in Mar_4:12 and Luk_8:10. The passage in Jn. distinctly states that the purpose of Christ's presence in the world was first to bring light to blind eyes, but, secondly, to make blind those who were able to see; and this last statement is further explained in the passage by the answer given to the indignant question of the Pharisees as to whether they also were blind, that their fault consisted in claiming to possess the power of spiritual vision, while their hearts were closed to the real significance of Christ's message; and so their boast of spiritual perception only magnified their sin. On Mat_13:14-16 || see Parable, p. 315 f.

(3) A third general significance of the word 'see' is that of an ethical warning in the sense of the English phrase 'take heed.' For example, in Mat_24:6 we read, 'See that ye be not troubled'; and in Mar_8:15 two words are combined in the warning, 'Take heed (ὀρᾶτε), beware (βλέπετε) of the leaven of the Pharisees, and the leaven of Herod.'

When combined with a preposition (εἰς), the verb βλέπω signifies 'regard,' in the sense of 'pay obsequious attention to,' as in Mat_22:16; and, finally, the word is used of God Himself in His vision of the hearts of men, as in Mat_6:6, which reads, 'Thy Father which seeth in secret shall recompense thee.'

As a general result of the examination of the above passages, it will be noticed that in Jn. the word 'see' has a special significance. It is, indeed, one of the words that form a leading conception in his writing. Just as the idea of life arises out of the miracle of the feeding of the multitude, so does that of light spring from the miracle of the healing of the man blind from his birth. In Jn.'s spiritual vocabulary, Christ Himself is the light of the world; and the illumination of the souls of men and the blessing of the gospel can be spoken of in terms of light and its enjoyment as suitably as in terms of life and its possession. Thus the miracles of giving sight to the blind become peculiarly significant; but we need not, therefore, assume that, though they are in this way acted parables, the narratives of such miracles are not to be regarded as of any historical value, but as mere pictorial representations of the spiritual truths they are meant to convey.

Literature.—The Comm. on the various passages, esp. the *Expos. Gr. Test.*, and Westcott's *St. John*; Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden Jesu*, pp. 121-149; Bugge, *Die Haupt-Parabeln Jesu*, vol. i. pp. 1-89; *Expositor*, 6th ser. vol. i. [1900] p. 231 ff.; Fiebig, *Altjüd. Gleichnisse und die Gleichnisse Jesu*; Phillips Brooks, *Mystery of Iniquity* (1893), 208.

G. Currie Martin.

⚡Self-Assertion

SELF-ASSERTION.—See Character of Christ and Claims of Christ in vol. i., and art. Renunciation above.

⚡Self-Consciousness

SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS.—See Consciousness.

⚡Self-Control

SELF-CONTROL.—The Scripture term for self-control is ἐγκράτεια, which with its cognates occurs several times in the NT; but in the Gospels only the privative ἀκρασία is found, with the rendering 'excess' (Mat 23:25). The English word is not used in Authorized Version, and in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 is confined to the margin, with the single exception of 2Ti 3:3. It denotes (see Chrysostom *Hom. Tit 1:8* τὸν πάθους κρατοῦντα) the exercise of dominion by man over the constituents of character within, as well as over external influences that would tend to baffle or frustrate him. It may be distinguished from self-denial as discipline is from destruction, the one making the self the centre of purpose and effort, the other aiming at its extinction or suppression. The one reduces the self, or certain of its elements, to zero; the other directs and uses it, turning all its powers into the channel of some activity, viewed as advantageous or benign. Mastery within the living organism of man is the principal suggestion of both; but self-denial gives greater prominence to the possible inherence of evil and to the ascetic processes by which it must be purged, whilst self-control implies rather freedom and strenuousness, and involves no depressing view of man or of life (see art. Self-denial). More particularly,

self-control means the control of the temperament, the instincts, emotions, and will, both in themselves and against the various appeals that are made to them in daily life, with a view to the accomplishment of some purpose or the maintenance of some phase of character. In the Gospels it is exhibited in the Man Jesus Christ in a perfect degree, and by Him commended to His disciples, together with the secret of its attainment and retention.

1. Self-control on the part of Christ.—(1) It is rather doubtful whether, in the current, though vague, sense of the word, *temperament* can be predicated of Christ. Strictly the word denotes a certain general characteristic of a man's temper and moods, by which his progress in intelligence and morality is in various ways promoted or hindered. It means the set of the inner life towards some specific expression or action, and implies both a disproportion in the constituents of character and a consequent degree of imperfection and disapproval. From a very early time the typical temperaments have been classed as four—sanguine, sentimental or melancholic, choleric, and phlegmatic; and in each of them is found in varying measure a surplus of some quality which, by reason of its excess, spoils the proportion, and makes self-control under certain conditions specially difficult. As the humanity of Christ is perfect, and in Him all the virtues meet and harmonize, an excess in any direction is out of the question. He had moods of unbounded hope (Joh 12:32), of depression and shrinking (Mat 26:38, Joh 12:27), of indignant anger (Mat 23:13-36), of equanimity and comparative insensibility to passing impressions (Luk 13:32, Joh 19:11); but there was no such long-continued pre-eminence of one good quality over another as would allow the placing of Him, in regard to temperament, in any of the ordinary categories. If He is to be placed at all, a new class must be formed, and He may be regarded as the type of the religious temperament (Luk 2:49, Joh 6:38), with the right principles of self-control in action from the beginning. In the same group, though by no means on the same level, may be put all the *animæ naturaliter Christianæ*, amongst whom the obligation of self-control, if rendered easier of discharge by their disposition, should be more quickly and actively met (Mat 13:12; Mat 25:29, Luk 12:47 f.).

(2) *Control over instincts and the entire appetitive life*, wherein the ethical rule is indulgence with restraint, is traceable in Christ both in the particulars of His historical manifestation, and as sustained with completeness in times of special temptation. By 'instinct' is meant the impulse and faculty of acting in such a way as to produce certain results, without deliberate or even conscious foresight. Some of these impulses are rooted in the body and aroused into activity by its uneasiness and recurring needs. Christ, for instance, knew weariness and its massive appeals for physical rest, but was so completely master of Himself as to be able to postpone, if not to withhold, the response (Mat 8:24, Joh 4:6 ff.); and of sluggishness on His part there is no record in the Gospels. During the week of the Passion the nights were

spent at Bethany (the village or its neighbourhood: [Mat 21:17](#), [Mar 11:11](#)), in part probably with a view to bodily rest after the busy days. So, too, with hunger and thirst, whose importunity was sometimes clamorous, yet easily silenced or put off ([Mat 4:2](#), [Mar 3:20](#); [Mar 6:31](#), [Joh 19:28](#)). In regard to the physical nature, Christ neither practised nor enjoined its suppression, but only the maintenance of its proper relation amongst natural promptings and activities. To this rule there were no exceptions, the apparent ones proving on closer examination to be designed each for a special didactic or ethical purpose. The cursing of the fig-tree was not done unthinkingly under the stimulus of a disappointed appetite ([Mar 11:12](#) ff.), but in illustration of the doom awaiting Israel, emblem of all who abound in leaves but fail in fruitfulness (cf. [Luk 13:6-9](#)), and of the power of faith in dealing with evil ([Mat 21:20](#) f.). 'A gluttonous man and a wine-bibber' ([Mat 11:19](#), [Luk 7:34](#)), on account of its very difficulty to some expositors, must not be rejected as an interpolation. It is not meant to indicate Christ's real habit; but it is an almost amused comment by Him on the equal readiness with which certain types of men protest against the severity of one teacher and the graciousness of another. A professed neutrality which is really childish and angry self-will deals of necessity in exaggeration; and in this case its evidence proves no degree of self-indulgence on the part of Christ, but merely magnifies His geniality, and the gentle way in which He moved amongst all innocent forms of human life, into a charge against Him of excess.

Of the mastery exercised by Christ over His emotions the characteristics appear to be a recognition of the legitimacy of emotion, sometimes even of free and unrestrained emotion, with the avoidance of all such qualities and extremes as the world has learned to condemn. Sympathy was full at Bethany ([Joh 11:35](#)) and on the approach to Jerusalem ([Luk 19:41](#)), but not allowed to become so sentimental or overwhelming as to interfere with service. The anger of just indignation finds expression and becomes even torrential in [Mat 23:13-36](#); but there is nowhere any trace of personal rancour. In Gethsemane the sacred anguish transcends analysis, for the vicarious Passion was begun; but if any influence of fear or regret or intolerable burden ([Luk 22:40](#)) is to be acknowledged, the shrinking is quickly mastered, and the Saviour goes forth calmly to die ([Mat 26:45](#) f., [Mar 14:41](#) f., [Heb 5:7](#) ff.). Similarly the cry on the cross ([Mat 27:46](#), [Mar 15:34](#)) is no sign of a temporary loss of control, the collapse of the human spirit of Christ in the bitterness of approaching death. It should be connected with His work of atonement rather than with His personal experience, and marks the culmination of the pressure of the world's sin ([Gal 3:13](#)). For man Christ passes through the deep valley of sin's doom, and at the supreme moment is compassed about by darkness unrelieved; but He did not falter, nor was the ordered unity of His inner life in His oneness of purpose with the Father broken. At the other extreme of emotion are the sense of relief after long strain, with its associated perils of 'letting oneself go,' and such an exultation of joy as is apt to cause a lapse in vigilance. The relief and the joy are traceable in Christ ([Mat 11:25](#), [Luk 10:21](#),

Joh 17:1; Joh 17:4), who on the earlier occasion immediately proceeds, according to the one tradition, to offer rest to the weary, and, according to the other, to pronounce a benediction upon His disciples. Joy that becomes exuberant and beyond control, and wastes itself in moods of sheer ecstasy, is nowhere recorded of Him. He preserves consistently the wise mean, well removed from the ordinary dangers, on either side, of excess and of defect. His self-respect was complete, never degenerating into immodest vanity or giving place to servility (Joh 6:15; Joh 12:12-15; Joh 18:21; Joh 18:37). Fear could not be excited in Him by the antagonism of the people or by His apparent powerlessness in the hands of the authorities (Mat 12:14 f., Luk 4:29 f., Joh 18:23; Joh 19:11). He was sociable yet free, interested but not absorbed in nature and in man, subject to every pure emotion but possessed and mastered by none. And the sensitive life of Christ is most correctly viewed as an organized comity of well-graded sentiments and feelings, amongst which due order was maintained without either difficult effort or occasional failure.

(3) To this, the negative side of self-control, the subjection of the various instincts and sensibilities, must be added *the positive introduction of some controlling end or purpose*, without which the main factor in determining the merit of self-control and the moral quality of the life will be absent. Self-control by itself may be simply a tribute to strength of will, neutral in regard to quality, and capable of being turned to bad uses. As exhibited in Christ, it means not only steadiness and freedom from irritability, a calm temper unruffled by influences from without, but the inflexible direction of the spirit and will upon the accomplishment of purposes than which neither ethics nor religion can disclose any worthier. This superiority to disappointment, difficulty, apparent disaster, is shown in many lights; and if there are times when it appears for a moment to be obscured, it is recovered in another moment, and unflinchingly held. The atmosphere in which Jesus lived was often impure, vitiated by the influence of successes that were won by insincerity as well as by the prosperity of many vices; yet by men who are competent to judge, no moral fault or compromise with wrong has ever been charged against Him (Joh 8:46). There is no instance of His having been diverted from His purpose by the 'gainsaying of sinners' (Heb 12:3), the blundering clamour of the people, or their unbelieving disavowal of His mission (Mar 14:58); and even widespread alienation amongst His followers was turned into an occasion for deepening the convictions and strengthening the loyalty of the others (Joh 6:67). Neither the bitter craft of the religious leaders with their emissaries dogging His footsteps (Mat 22:15 ff., Luk 11:53 f.), nor the jealousy or fear of the petty overlords (Luk 13:31 f.), could break the inward unity of His spirit or the stability of His will. In the select group of His disciples were dispositions to protest or interfere (Mat 16:22, Luk 9:54), sometimes ignorance and unwillingness to learn (Mat 20:20 ff., Luk 17:20; cf. Act 1:6), tempers and views that were discordant and unseemly, with a traitor lurking in the midst; yet Christ never

allowed the strain of His work, or the uncongeniality or impotence of the men who were nearest to Him, to divert His sympathy or to ruffle the settled quiet of His demeanour. Death itself, rendered inconceivably horrible by the concentration upon Him of every man's sin (Heb 2:9), was anticipated without alarm, and undergone in all its shame without loss of personal dignity or any weakening of His loving resolution to save. He set His face steadfastly (Luk 9:51) in no sudden bracing of His will in the presence of an unexpected peril; but the perfect self-control, which made it possible for Him to become incarnate, was maintained through all the incidents of the historical manifestation, and even on the cross itself. In the freedom of His contact with nature and man, His heart never more than momentarily failed, and His self-control in times of confusion and danger helped to make Him the most consummate Leader of sinful men, serene and strong, and always confident in God and in the issue.

(4) Beyond the action of Christ's own will, two further causes of His self-control may be distinguished. The one was *His personal trust in God the Father*, and the other *the influence of the Holy Spirit in response*. (a) At the beginning of His career the part played both in His practice and in His inner life and thought by the recognition of His Father's claims upon Him, against the attractions that appeal to youth, and the dependence and clinging that earthly parents naturally desire, was indicated in His reply in the Temple (Luk 2:49), and on later occasions (Joh 4:34; Joh 5:30 b, Joh 6:38, Joh 14:31). A sense of security in the remembrance of the Father's power and purpose is part of the secret of Christ's complete self-possession in the final crisis (Mat 26:53). He entered upon His Agony with bitter forebodings, which in solitude became almost unendurable (Luk 22:44); absolute acceptance of the Father's will (Mar 14:36) enabled Him to press down any reluctance to die (Heb 5:7 ff.)—'made perfect' Himself thereby, and fitted to be 'the author of eternal salvation.' So important was His consciousness of this relationship with the Father, that in it lay for Him the kernel and germ of all truth, and in its revelation to man the sum of all duty and pleasure. (b) The action of the Holy Spirit in sustaining the self-control of Jesus against appetites and evil appeals is conspicuous in the records of the Temptation (Mat 4:1, Mar 1:12, Luk 4:1), and referred to by each of the Synoptists (see Temptation). But it also appears elsewhere. From His childhood 'the grace of God was upon him' (Luk 2:40); and that communicated grace of the Spirit wrought in Him (Luk 2:52 b (Revised Version margin)) all that He as a man accomplished or became. The unction or illapse at His baptism was not temporary, but the Spirit permanently abode with Him (Joh 1:32 f.); and if Act 10:38 refers primarily to invigoration for service, St. Luke elsewhere represents Jesus as 'full of the Holy Ghost' (Act 4:1, cf. Joh 3:34), and as thereby prepared for personal testing and discipline as well as for His mission of mercy and redemption. For Him, as for His disciples, the soul's thirst for unity and self-mastery is assuaged, and all needed resources are obtained, in the same way and from the same fountain (Joh 7:37-39).

2. Self-control on the part of man.—For man self-control assumes a double aspect, according as it is a rule of restraint or of activity. On the one hand, it keeps the indulgence of the natural appetites and impulses within the bounds of reason, grading and co-ordinating them all as elements of a coherent rational life. On the other, it concentrates the energies, reversing any original tendency to diffusion, and integrating moral life under the steady pressure of a master conviction and a master purpose. In other words, since Christianity is not an ideal or a theoretical ethic, but a practicable way of living, and since each man's difficulty does not arise from the impulses generally, but from the predominance of some single group of impulses, self-control as exhibited and required by Christ comes to mean the control of individual temperament, the avoidance of the various evil excesses to which each man is prone, and possibly even the substitution of some form of good for some form of evil as an instinctive besetment. Symmetrical development of each man's spirit may be said to be the object of the Gospels, which are far from silent either as to the method by which it is to be effected, or as to the pains and satisfactions of the process.

Control of the senses and appetites is to be carried, if necessary, to the point of mutilation, for excess must be prevented, whatever the pain or cost (Mat 5:29 f., Mat 18:8 f., Mar 9:43-48); and not even relationships that are legitimate and pure must be allowed to interfere with the interests of the Kingdom of heaven (Mat 19:12, cf. 1Co 7:32). Inclinations and impulses are to be distrusted, and the Christian should be their master and not their slave (Mat 5:39-41, Luk 6:29 f.; cf. Rom 12:17 a). The need of integrating the life by giving supreme sway to some right and rightly conceived purpose at its centre is shown in the conversation with the young ruler (Mat 19:21, Mar 10:21, Luk 18:22), where the renunciation of wealth is a necessary preparation for all-absorbing devotion to Christ, the great test of discipleship (as in Joh 10:27; Joh 12:26), as well as the secret of perfection. The same is the bearing of the sayings as to the 'single' eye (Mat 6:22, Luk 11:34), the impossibility of serving God and mammon (Mat 6:24, Luk 16:13), the necessity of becoming 'as a little child' (Mar 10:15), as well as the great law of Mat 6:33, the observance of which not only safeguards the spirit from the distressing influence of suspicion and fear, but especially keeps it a well-ordered unity, with quiet strength and readiness to act as its prominent qualities. If the control be threatened from without, it is recovered or retained by recognizing God's superior claims, and counting nothing so important in experience as His good pleasure (Mat 10:28, Luk 12:4 f.). Against opposition and difficulty of every kind the rule is steadiness (Mat 10:16-26; Mat 10:34-39), neither purpose nor self-control being shaken, because of the unrivalled constraint of the love of Christ (Mat 24:9, Joh 15:18-21; Joh 16:2; Joh 16:20-22). 'For my sake' gives the secret of a self-control that never breaks down; and the love and devotion are continuously fed by the Spirit of the Father (Mat 10:20, Joh 16:14). By the forgiveness of sins Christ sets the will free from bondage to past evil, and His Spirit,

ruling in the life because in the heart, becomes an unfailing source of strength and peace, reproducing in mortal experience the self-control of Him who never wavered from duty, or yielded to temptation, or allowed the Kingdom within to be disturbed by a breach of will between Himself and the Father. His self-control, in its completeness and in its means, is the measure and guarantee of what is possible to man. See also art. Temperance.

Literature.—The *Lexx.* of Grimm-Thayer and Liddell and Scott, 8.vv. ἀκρασία, ἐγκράτεια; Aristotle, *Ethiopic* bk. vii.; Martensen, *Chr. Ethiopic* ii. 411; C. E. Searle in *Camb. Serm.* (ed. Bebb), 1893, p. 70; J. Iverach, *The Other Side of Greatness* (1906), 109.

R. W. Moss.

Self-Denial

SELF-DENIAL.—Self-denial is undoubtedly an essential part of the religious life as set before men by Jesus Christ. ‘If any man will come after me, let him deny himself’ (Mat 16:24). The word used (ἀπαρνέομαι) occurs elsewhere only in the parallel passages (Mar 8:34, Luk 9:23); in the accounts given by the four Evangelists of St. Peter’s denial (Mat 26:34-35; Mat 26:75, Mar 14:30-31; Mar 14:72, Luk 22:61, Joh 13:38); and in our Lord’s denunciation of apostasy (Luk 12:9). It is used in the LXX Septuagint to translation אָפּוּר. It is a strong word, and its meaning is best understood perhaps by comparing it with the corresponding expression of St. Paul, ‘I count as loss’ (ἡγοῦνγε ζημίαν, Php 3:7-8). It must be understood to include a conquest of the insistent and unruly demands of the body, denial of the lower self; and a bringing into subjection of the ambitions and emotions of the intellect and spirit, denial of the higher self.

1. The denial of the carnal self.—The practices by which men have sought to accomplish this kind of self-denial pass generally under the name of asceticism. There are five such kinds of discipline recommended or countenanced by our Lord’s teaching and example: (1) fasting, (2) celibacy and sexual restraint, (3) almsgiving, (4) vigils, (5) the refusal of luxury in the surroundings of life.

(1) *Fasting* was practised by our Lord Himself (Mat 4:1 ff. ||). It was presupposed as likely to form part of the religious life by His disciples (Mat 6:16 ff., Mar 2:20). It was practised by the Apostles and the Church in their time (Act 10:9; Act 10:30;

Act 13:3; Act 14:23, 1Co 7:5), and traditions of the severity of their fasting survived into the 2nd cent. (*Clem. Recog.* vii. 6; Clem. Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] *Paedag.* ii. 1; *Can.* [Note: Canaanite.] *Murat.* i. 11). In the sub-Apostolic age, probably as a result of the example of the Pharisees, fasting on stated days became a common form of self-denial (*Did.* viii.; Hermas, *Sim.* v. 1; Clem. Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] *Strom.* vii. 12). The Lenten fast grew from an original 14 days (Tertull. *de Jejun.* 15) to 40 days, in imitation of our Lord's fast in the wilderness. The Friday fast, the Lenten fast, and the custom of fasting before receiving the Communion, were very general, if not universal, in the early Catholic and the mediaeval Church. See art. Fasting.

(2) *Celibacy* is countenanced by our Lord, but not generally recommended (Mat 19:12, Luk 14:26). It and temporary sexual restraint are recommended and even deemed specially honourable by the Apostles (1Co 7:29; 1Co 7:35, Rev 14:3-4). In the sub-Apostolic age the idea of the superior sanctity of the virgin state grew rapidly (*Did.* xi. 11; Ignat. *Ep. ad Polyc.* v.; Just. Mart. *Apol.* i. 15; Athenag. 33, etc.). See art. Celibacy.

(3) *Almsgiving*, as a form of self-denial, is distinctly recommended by our Lord (Mat 6:1 ff., Luk 11:41; Luk 12:33, Mar 12:43; cf. Luk 6:38, Mat 5:42, Act 20:35), and He Himself, though poor, practised it (Joh 13:29). The Apostles insisted on the duty of almsgiving, at first apparently indiscriminately (Act 2:44-45), afterwards with more caution (Rom 12:8, 2Co 8:3, Jam 2:14 f., 1Jn 3:17, Heb 13:16, Jam 1:27, 2Co 9:6-7, Gal 6:9, 1Co 16:1, 2Co 9:1, Rom 15:26, Act 11:27-30; cf. 2Th 3:10). In the early Church, almsgiving, either weekly or monthly, was a recognized duty (Tertull. *Apol.* 39; Cypr. *de Oper. et Elec.*). See Almsgiving.

(4) *Vigils*.—Watching and wakefulness as a form of self-denying service to God were no doubt suggested by our Lord's commands (Mat 24:42; Mat 26:41, Luk 12:37) as well as by His own practice (Mat 14:23; Mat 26:38), and in this sense were understood many of the Apostolic exhortations (1Co 16:13, 1Th 5:6, Eph 6:18). Examples of vigil services are to be found in the records of the Apostolic Church (Act 12:12; Act 20:7) and in the practice of St. Paul (2Co 6:5; 2Co 11:27). The heathen Pliny's description (*Ep.* x. 97) of the Christians as 'meeting before daybreak' probably points to nothing but a desire for privacy and a feeling of the necessity for avoiding public notice, but we have certainly allusions to vigils in the strict sense of the word in the writings of several of the early Fathers (Clem. Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] *Paedag.* ii. 9; Tertull. *ad Ux.* ii. 5; Cypr. *de Laps.* 34 ff.; Lactant. vii. 19; August. *Ep. ad Januar.* 119; Socr. i. 37, v, 21; Sozom. ii. 29, iii. 6).

(5) *Refusal of luxury*.—Another region in which self-denial might be exercised was found in the surroundings of life, clothes, household arrangements, etc. Our Lord's own example (Mat 8:20) was appealed to, and certain hints in His teaching were felt

to have a bearing on the subject (Mat 10:10; Mat 11:8, Luk 16:19). The teaching of the Apostles was more detailed and definite (1Ti 2:9, 1Pe 3:3 f.). The question of the amount of luxury permissible to Christians came up in the Montanist controversy (Euseb. v. 18. 4; Tertull. *de Coron. Mil.* 5, 10, 11). It occupies a considerable part of the *Paedag.* of Clem, of Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] (see especially ii. 11, ii. 8-12, iii. 2, etc.), and is discussed by Cyprian (*de Virg. vel. and de Cult. fem.*).

2. The denial of the higher intellectual and psychical self.—When we consider the teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ, we are at once struck by His definite and marked departure from the ethics of classical antiquity. For Him there is no such word as ἀρετή (cf. ἄρης, and the Lat. *vir-tus*) with the sense of elevated manliness. Nor has He anything to correspond with the classical tetrad φρόνησις (or σοφία), ἀνδρεία, σωφροσύνη, δικαιοσύνη. These express the completest development of the higher, better self in man, and proclaim as the ideal the attainment of the truest ‘manliness’ in the face of an appreciative and admiring world. For our Lord the ideal is a different one. His life fulfils the conception of the prophet. He has no beauty that men should desire Him. He is despised, rejected, a Man of sorrows, acquainted with grief. He is ‘meek and lowly of heart’ (cf. Zec 9:9, 2Co 10:1, Php 2:7). He is ‘one that serveth’ (Mat 20:28, Joh 13:13-17). It is ‘the poor in spirit,’ ‘they that mourn,’ ‘the meek,’ and those that ‘are reviled’ whom He calls blessed (cf. Mat 18:3-4; Mat 19:30; Mat 20:14, Mar 10:27 ff., Luk 1:48). It is quite evident that the ideal here set up is wholly different from that of the classical philosophers. The two are, in fact, in fundamental opposition. The one is the ideal of the development, the other the ideal of the denial of the higher self. The Apostles understood the Master very well and taught as He did (but see the use of ἀρετή in what *may* be its classical sense in Php 4:8 and in 2Pe 1:5). Indeed, they insisted with even more than His iteration on the denial of self (1Co 1:28-29, 2Co 1:5; 2Co 6:10, Php 2:6-8, 2Co 10:1, 1Pe 2:21, Gal 5:23; Gal 6:1, Eph 4:2, Col 3:12, Jam 1:21; Jam 3:13, 1Pe 5:5, 2Co 12:21).

Literature.—1. Historical: Zöckler, *Askese und Mönchtum* (1894), *Die Tugendlehre des Christentums* (1904); Mayer, *Die Christl. Askese, ihre Wesen und ihre histor. Entfaltung* (1894); A. Ritschl, *Gesch. des Pietismus* (1880-86); W. Bright, *Some Aspects of Primitive Church Life* (1898); J. O. Hannay, *The Spirit and Origin of Christian Monasticism* (1902); Migne, *Dictionnaire d’Ascétisme, Encycl. Théol.* vols. 45, 46; Bingham, *Antiquities of the Christian Church*.

Theological and Devotional:—Rothe, *Theol. Ethik*, iii. (1848); Dorner, *Syst. d. chr. Sittenlehre*; Newman Smyth, *Christian Ethics* (1894); Jeremy Taylor, *Holy Living and Holy Dying*; J. Keble, *Letters of Spiritual Counsel*; J. H. Newman, *Historical Sketches*;

Bp. Paget, *The Spirit of Discipline*; J. O. Hannay, *The Wisdom of the Desert* (1904); Thomas à Kempis, *The Imitation of Christ*; Baxter, *Self-Denial*.

J. O. Hannay.

☩ Self-Examination

SELF-EXAMINATION.—‘Our conclusion, then, is that the state of mind which is now most naturally expressed by the unspoken questions, Have I been what I should be? Shall I be what I should be, in doing so and so? *is that in which all moral progress originates*’ (T. H. Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, p. 337).

1. Duty of self-examination.—Every man’s conscience bears witness to the reasonableness and necessity of self-examination. It means taking oneself seriously, and applying to the moral and spiritual life methods analogous to those adopted in all other departments of knowledge and skill. It is the comparison of our motives and actions with the Ideal of what they should be; and all such self-scrutiny, as T. H. Green suggests, has a real identity with the reformer’s comparison of what is actual with a social ideal. He who would attain excellence in any difficult work must be constantly testing and examining his results. He must be on the alert to overcome slackness, discover errors, ensure progress. In Christian discipleship, the most arduous, as it is the most noble, of all pursuits, there is the same imperative demand. This duty is enforced (1) *By Holy Scripture*. The mission of the ancient prophet, as distinct from that of the priest, was to apply a constant spur to the consciences of men. Much of his message was expressed in the exhortation, ‘Let us search and try our ways, and turn again to the Lord’ (Lam_3:40). He bade men examine themselves in the light of God’s known character and will (Isa_1:10-20, Jer_7:1-28, Eze_18:19-32, Hos_14:1-9 etc.). If Jesus did not in so many words call on men to examine themselves, yet the necessity and duty of such self-criticism were implied in all His ministry and teaching. In the Sermon on the Mount, as in so many of His parables, He was holding up before men the ideal by which they must test their lives. And the same may be said of all the Apostolic Epistles (1Co_11:28, 2Co_13:5).—(2) *By the experience of wise and good men*. The saying, ‘Man, know thyself,’ was frequently on the lips of Socrates. He made it the text of his life and teaching. But how shall a man know himself unless he brings his thoughts, his passions, his conduct, into strict review, and scrutinizes them in the light of conscience and duty? What a large place, again, did this work of self-examination fill in the lives of serious-minded men and women of earlier and simpler times than ours. Thomas à Kempis, in the *Imitation of Christ*, is much occupied with this duty; and Jeremy Taylor, in *Rules and Exercises of Holy Dying* (chapter ii.), devotes many pages to the reasons and benefits of the habit

of the daily examination of our actions. 'He that does not frequently search his conscience,' he remarks, 'is a house without a window.'

2. Difficulties and dangers of self-examination.—(1) There is the danger of a *morbid self-consciousness* hurtful to the spiritual life. An analogy may be drawn with bodily health. A sure way of producing sickness and physical disorder is for a person to be constantly worrying himself about his health, and living, as it were, with his fingers always on his pulse. 'Is this self-consciousness a good thing? Does it not hinder action, destroy energy? Does it not cultivate a habit of mawkishness, an indelicate desire to expose the most secret passages of our souls, even to the public gaze?... In how many other ways do men testify that they feel this self-consciousness to be a disease which will destroy them if they cannot be cured of it! What numbers does it bring to the feet of the spiritual director!' (F. D. Maurice). Do we not live our best life when we just go on doing our duty and filling our place, never considering ourselves at all? 'There is a kind of devotion to great objects or to public service which seems to leave a man no leisure and to afford no occasion for the question about himself, whether he has been as good as he should have been, whether a better man would not have acted otherwise than he has done. And again, there is a sense in which to be always fingering one's motives is a sign rather of an unwholesome preoccupation with self than of the eagerness in disinterested service which helps forward mankind' (T. H. Green).—(2) A more serious difficulty is that in this work of self-criticism we occupy *the double position of being both the examiner and the examined*. We are at once the judge, the witness, and the prisoner at the bar. What scope for self-deception, for evasion, for duping ourselves! Are we not in danger of condemning trifles and overlooking serious faults and vices? How easy to confuse the issues in this complicated process! to lose sight of the due proportion of things! to play tricks with ourselves! Is there any escape from this difficulty?

3. Suggestions for self-examination.—If the dangers mentioned above are to be escaped, this exercise must be conducted (1) *with the most humble dependence upon God and desire for His help and guidance*. Consider specially Psa 139:23-24. The Psalmist could not trust himself. He knew how sin eluded him, how it disguised itself, how it hid in secret chambers where his search could not follow it. He needed the aid of One who could accomplish a deeper and more penetrating work than he himself could undertake. Consider also 1Ch 28:9; 1Ch 29:17, Psa 26:1-2; Psa 44:21, Pro 16:1-2; Pro 20:27, Jer 17:9-10.—(2) The examination must be *very largely objective*, *i.e.* not merely, or chiefly, a scrutiny of feelings or motives, but an investigation of actual conduct in the light of God's law and of Christian ideals. The desire expressed in the hymn, 'Tis a point I long to know.... Do I love the Lord, or no?' may often be best answered by a reference to such words as are found in Joh 14:15; Joh 14:21; Joh 15:14. See also Mat 7:21-29, Mar 3:35. 'Do you notice how many times our Saviour says: "If ye love me, keep my commandments"? It is as if a child

should rush passionately to its mother and throw its little arms round her neck, and say convulsively, "O mother! I do love you so!" "Well, my dear child, if you do, why are you not a better child?" ' (H. W. Beecher, *Conduct the Index of Feeling*).—(3) Special consideration should be given to 2Co 13:5 'Jesus Christ is in you.' Therein lies the secret by which self-examination may be a reality and not a fiction; therein is found the protection from the dangers already referred to. There is a true Light which lighteth every man; One who dwells with us, near us, in us; One who will save us from self-flattery and self-deception, and from mawkish self-consciousness. In the light of His presence self-examination is safe and fruitful.

Literature.—The most suggestive remarks which the writer has seen on this subject are found in a sermon by F. D. Maurice, *Lincoln's Inn Sermons*, vol. iii. p. 179, 'How Self-Examination is possible.' T. H. Green's *Prolegomena to Ethics*, Bk. iv. 'The Application of Moral Philosophy to the Guidance of Conduct,' chs. i. ii., is worthy of most careful study; cf. Jeremy Taylor, *The Rules and Exercises of Holy Dying*, ch. ii. 'On the Daily Examination of our Actions'; Thomas à Kempis, *Of the Imitation of Christ*, Bk. i. 'Admonitions useful for the Spiritual Life'; W. G. T. Shedd, *Sermons to the Natural Man* (1879), p. 181; W. L. Watkinson, *Studies in Christian Character*, 1st ser. (1901) p. 10; W. S. Wood, *Problems of the NT* (1890), p. 83; T. B. Dover, *Alive unto God* (1888), p. 37.

Arthur Jenkinson.

☩ Self-Renunciation

SELF-RENUNCIATION.—See Renunciation and Self-Denial.

☩ Self-Restraint

SELF-RESTRAINT.—See Self-Control.

☩ Self-Suppression

SELF-SUPPRESSION.—Religion may be thought of as having for its aim either the complete suppression or the development to its highest expression of the individuality of man. In the history of Christianity both these conceptions have been adopted, and each has been regarded as the true interpretation of the spirit of the Lord.

Those Christian teachers whose bent is towards Mysticism have for their ideal the ultimate suppression of self. The elevated expression which their doctrine found in the German mystics of the 14th cent. gives us the clearest view of this tendency. Eckart, and afterwards Tauler, taught that the spiritual life was at its highest when self was annihilated. The complete suppression of self was attempted in a wholly different spirit by certain societies of late origin, notably by the Society of Jesus. In the Jesuit system the individual is completely subordinated to the community, and the suppression of each man's self is of vital necessity for the accomplishment of perfect discipline. The tendency of Protestantism, on the other hand, has been towards the development of individuality. Its teachers have aimed at allowing free play to natural diversities of character, and have even justified the accentuation of the various ways in which men differently constituted have apprehended the gospel message.

Our Lord, in His dealings with men, seems always to have assumed that natural varieties of character and the varied environment of each individual required differences of treatment. His advice changes according to the temperament and circumstances of those to whom it was given. A leper, after his healing, is bidden to 'tell no man' what was done for him (Mat 8:4). Other lepers are told to go and show themselves to the priests and make the offerings commanded in the Law (Luk 17:14). One who wished to follow Him but desired first to bury his father, receives the stern word—'Let the dead bury their dead' (Mat 8:22). A restored demoniac, anxious 'to be with him,' is told to go home to his friends (Mar 5:19). One rich man is commanded to sell all that he has (Mat 19:21). Others are allowed to continue in possession of the whole or part of their property (Luk 19:8, Mat 27:57). To a certain hard saying the Lord appends the caution, 'He that is able to receive it, let him receive it' (Mat 19:12). These and other sayings which might be quoted display our Lord's evident desire to develop rather than annihilate individuality. In the training of the Twelve, who were to carry on His work after the Ascension, He aims not at creating a spirit of unquestioning obedience to plain commands, but rather at developing a highly intelligent and spiritually energetic kind of character. We are necessarily ignorant of much that passed between Him and them especially during those forty days when He spoke to them 'of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God' (Act 1:3), but we know enough to feel sure that He wished the Twelve to work for His cause with a certain independence and personal responsibility, rather than to suppress in them personal freedom of intellect and will. See also Self-Denial.

Literature.—A. W. Hutton, *The Inner Way*; W. R. Inge, *Light, Life, and Love*, and the same writer's *Christian Mysticism*; R. A. Vaughan, *Hours with the Mystics*; Molinos, *The Spiritual Guide* (English translation Glasgow, 1885); Zöckler, *Askese und Mönchtum* (pp. 592, etc.); art. 'Jesuitenorden' in *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie*

*fur protest. Theologic und Kirche.]*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] vol. viii.

J. O. Hannay.

☞ Selfishness

SELFISHNESS.—The self-sacrifice which Christ demands of all who would be His followers might lead one to imagine that Christianity was a religion of asceticism; that the Gnostic dualism of good and evil, matter and spirit, was the logical outcome of the teaching of Jesus; that God required the renunciation of all earthly things, and even of life, for the sake of the sacrifice itself. But it is a total misconception of the religion of Jesus to suppose that He makes asceticism an end. What we find Him teaching is not that the world is evil, but that the soul of man is good; that the soul is eternal, not of time, and therefore that in God alone, to whom it is akin, can it attain its complete satisfaction (Mat 6:19-21 || Luk 12:33-34). He demanded self-renunciation (Luk 14:26-27; Luk 14:33), and at the same time He inculcated the absolute value of the self (Mat 16:26 || Mar 8:36-37). He sets moral self-love over against natural selfishness (Mat 16:25 || Mar 8:35), and He insists that the perfect, the eternal development of the human personality is to be found not in separation and independence, but in union and communion with universal life,—life as it is in God, life as God has put it into the world (cf. Matthew 5, 6, 7). To pour out oneself in love, to lose oneself for Christ's sake, to give oneself to God and to the world of men, is 'to find,' 'to save' oneself in Him. To make the law of God, the Creator of the world and the Heavenly Father of each human soul, the fundamental law of one's life, is to render all temporal and corruptible things innocuous. It then becomes possible to employ them, in a way of which the Stoic hardly dreamed, to the end of perfect self-development (Mat 6:33). 'What is a man profited,' Christ asks, 'if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?' To preserve and to save his soul is thus a man's highest profit, his one great task. But to seek to save it in the worldly sense is to lose it in the spiritual and eternal. Natural selfishness is humanity's greatest danger—the great source of sin. It is manifest that our Lord accepts the common division of human nature into its two spheres of flesh and spirit. He has, it is true, no explicit psychology such as St. Paul elaborated; but to Him the natural and the spiritual man are as evidently in continual conflict as to St. Paul. It is the natural self that must be denied, that must be subjected, if the spiritual self is to grow. Each of these Christ calls the 'self,' the 'life'; but it is the latter only—'the soul'—that is of absolute value. The value of the former is but relative; and its good, which has a measure, must always be subordinated to that of the other, which is measureless. Even the gaining of the whole world by the natural self is worthless if it entails

spiritual loss; for to lose the true self is to have but the life of time, is to miss that of eternity (cf. the parable of the Rich Fool, [Luk 12:16-21](#), and the profound statement of the same truth in Christ's Temptation in the Wilderness, [Mat 4:1-11](#), [Luk 4:2-13](#)). Moral self-love, therefore, consists primarily in love to God; and whenever the good of the natural self conflicts with the dictates of that love, it must be denied as a temptation of Satan ([Mat 16:21-23](#)). To sink the self in the sensuous and finite, to cultivate the lower nature, to lay up abundant goods, and to imagine that the joy of one's soul is to be found therein, is to lose one's soul; and when death comes, the loss of all is immediately manifest ([Luk 12:16-21](#)). It is in the light of eternity that man must view the world. It is the aim of the true self to lay up treasure in heaven, that the heart may dwell continually in the atmosphere of the eternal life.

That the denial of selfish desires is not to be regarded as an end in itself, is made clear by a whole series of parables uttered by our Lord upon the subject of labour. An idle faith, an idle self-sacrifice, did not satisfy Christ. To serve God is the soul's great aim, and at the same time its salvation (cf. parables of the Talents, [Mat 25:14-30](#); the Pounds, [Luk 19:11-27](#); the Servants Watching, [Luk 12:36-48](#); the Ten Virgins, [Mat 25:1-13](#); the Labourers in the Vineyard, [Mat 20:1-15](#)). From all these it is clear that the reward is in no sense proportionate to the work done, but to the zeal and fidelity shown; and, further, that the reward is the labour itself, and grows out of it. It is true that life eternal is the grand reward, but in that life he is already a sharer who makes God's service his aim in this world. The complete perfection of the self comes only when sin has passed away with mortal life; but there will be no gap between this world and the next. To serve God hereafter will be the heavenly joy of the redeemed, just as it is their chief joy on earth. Heaven is not idleness, but holy service rendered in perfect freedom from the constraints of sin. It is thus manifest that there is not the slightest ground for bringing against Christianity the charge of inculcating a higher form of selfishness; for selfishness implies an opposition between the self and the not-self—that the well-being of the former is sought at the cost of the latter, whereas in the religion of Jesus there is no such opposition. The good of the self is itself the good of the world, the fulfilment of the will of God; and even the reward is nothing other than the enlargement of the human powers so that the man becomes capable of yet greater labour for the world's welfare. Selfishness is hurtful alike to self and to mankind. Spiritual self-love is the self's completion, God's glory and the world's joy. By faithfulness in the unrighteous mammon, in that which is another's, we receive that which is our own ([Luk 16:10-12](#)).

Literature.—The Comm. on the NT; standard works on the Parables; Beyschlag's and Weiss' *NT Theology*; Müller, *Christian Doct. of Sin*, i. 94-182; Martensen, *Christian Ethics*, ii. 282 ff.; Newman Smyth, *Christian Ethics*, p. 327 ff.; Laidlaw, *Bib. Doct. of Man*, ch. vi.; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, artt. 'Flesh,' 'Psychology'; F. W.

Robertson, *Serm.* 4th ser. p. 42; J. Ker, *Serm.* 1st ser. p. 98; R. C. Trench, *Serm. New and Old*, p. 112; J. W. Rowntree, *Palestine Notes* (1906), p. 144.

W. J. S. Miller.

☩ Semein

SEMEIN.—A link in our Lord's genealogy (Luk 3:26, Authorized Version *Semei*).

☩ Separation

SEPARATION.—In discourses descriptive of the present condition and future prospects of the Kingdom of God, Christ taught that the Kingdom in its ideal state of purity would not be realized till the end of the world, when the object in view is to be attained by means of a judicial separation between real members and those who are members only in outward appearance or profession (Mat 13:24-30; Mat 13:36-43; Mat 13:47-50). In opposition to prevailing ideas on the subject, Christ plainly indicated that the Kingdom of God, throughout the course of its earthly development, must contain conflicting elements of good and evil, and gravely deprecated any premature attempt at separating them. The intermixture foreshadowed was not a pure kingdom existing amid a corrupt environment, but a kingdom itself invaded and pervaded to some extent by a corrupt element.

Wendt maintains that Christ did not 'contemplate an outward separation of His disciples from the fellowship of the Israelitish nation and religion' (*Teaching*, ii. 351 f.); and that the parables of the Tares and the Drag Net were intended to guard against any attempt in that direction. But the evil element referred to in the parables is not that which has always existed in the world, and must be expected to continue, but that which has entered the Kingdom in the course of, and as the result of, its own operations, which tend to gather within its pale spurious adherents as well as genuine (Mat 13:47). A separation, moreover, from the Jewish Church, as Christ must have foreseen, was imminent and inevitable, if for no other reason, because the spirit and aims of the society founded by Him were so widely different (Mat 9:16 f.), and it is clearly implied in the announcement of the approaching downfall of the Jewish State (Luk 19:43 f.).

Serious objection must also be taken to the view, which has often been advocated, in the interests of a pure Church, since the Donatist controversy in the beginning of the

5th cent., that the evil element is in the world, the good element in the Kingdom, and the blending of the two merely contiguity or co-existence in space. It is hard to see why our Lord should have been at such pains to point out what must be perfectly obvious to everybody, that the world is evil, and why He should recommend a tolerant attitude toward the evil, instead of making it a reason for earnest evangelistic effort. Such a condition of things had long existed, and was only what might be expected. It could by no possibility give rise to the painful reflexion and inquiry described in the parable (Mat_13:27, which are in reality due to the circumstance that the sin which exists in the world 'is always forcing its way anew into the circle in which the Kingdom of God is being realized.' The surprise and disappointment expressed by the servants are occasioned by the emergence of a phenomenon wholly unexpected, when the field originally sown with good seed is found *afterwards* to contain tares—an alien and unwelcome addition; and their impatient zeal to begin at once the work of purification is, in the circumstances, extremely natural. It is almost needless to remark that if the Son of Man at the end of the world is to 'gather out of his kingdom all things that offend (πάντα τὰ σκάνδαλα), and them which do iniquity,' they must have existed previously within it (Mat_13:41).

The contrast is obviously between the mixed state of affairs now prevailing, and the Kingdom as it shall be, when, freed from all admixture, it shines forth in its pure native lustre (Mat_13:43). Meanwhile the disciples are directed to exercise a wise patience, and to refrain from drastic measures of reform which might result in injuries still more serious to the cause they have at heart (Mat_13:29). Their attitude of tolerance is by no means to be taken, however, as implying sanction or approval of existing abuses. Christ freely admitted that the presence and conduct of unworthy members were inconsistent with the Divine ideal of the Kingdom, and could not but prove injurious to its best interests (Mat_13:28; Mat_13:39). But the possibility of admixture was unavoidable, in view of the fact that the Divine Kingdom welcomed all without distinction, on their professed compliance with the conditions of admission to its membership. The wide and sweeping character of its operations exposed it to the risk of gathering into its bosom some who might do it serious discredit in the eyes of those who had its purity and welfare at heart, as well as of the world at large (Mat_13:47).

It would be a mistake to suppose that Christ meant to withhold from His disciples authority to exercise discipline in the case of grave offences against the laws of the Kingdom, discipline which they did, in point of fact, afterwards exercise (Act_8:20-23, 1Co_5:3-5), but which had for its object the edification, and not the destruction, of believers (2Co_10:8). The infliction of censure or punishment in the case of gross offenders was intended to have a healing effect, and instead of aiming at permanent exclusion from religious fellowship and privileges, had ultimate

restoration to these in view. What our Lord deprecates is any attempt to forestall the Final Judgment by the absolute separation of offenders from religious fellowship, a separation issuing only in destruction (Mat 13:40). Having regard to the imperfections that cleave to human nature while still in a state of probation, it is evidently His intention that lenity rather than severity should characterize the treatment of offenders, lest good and evil be rashly included in one common condemnation, and the remedy prove so violent as to be worse than the disease (Mat 13:29). Besides, the exercise of a decisive judgment would in many cases require a delicacy of discrimination and an insight into human character possessed only by a Divine person, and it is accordingly reserved for the Son of Man, in His capacity as Judge, at the end of the world. Even strong presumptive proof of moral unworthiness would not, in the case of mere human judgment, afford sufficient guarantee against the risk of mistake (Mat 13:29). See Church, Excommunication.

While the disciples are enjoined to preserve an attitude of patient endurance toward evil within the Kingdom, Christ held out to them the prospect of a day of final sifting in which it would be completely eliminated (Mat 13:30; Mat Mat 13:48). The period of intermingling is at last to come to an end. The great separation to be then effected between the two elements so long opposed, has primarily in view the interest of an ideal purity, for which all earnest ones have anxiously hoped and striven. The burning of the tares does not refer so much to the fate which ultimately overtakes evildoers, as to the fact that they can no longer exert a depressing effect on the fortunes of the Kingdom. Hitherto they have existed as an obscuring medium, but with the removal of the scandals and their authors (Mat 13:41) the character of the righteous at last appears, without shadow of eclipse, in all its unsullied purity and splendour (Mat 13:43). The sifting out of unworthy members results in irreparable loss, at the same time leading, as it does, to their permanent exclusion from heavenly privileges (Mat 24:50, Mat 25:11 f., Mat 25:30). The grounds of separation are quite general, consisting in broad fundamental distinctions of moral character, not clearly apparent at the outset, but becoming increasingly manifest as time goes on (Mat 13:26), so that at last a division into two classes, the righteous and the wicked, becomes inevitable (Mat 13:41; Mat 13:43; Mat 13:49). Elsewhere the twofold classification is made to turn on characteristics of a more specific kind, such as confession or denial of Christ in times of peril (Mat 10:32 f.), faithful or unfaithful exercise of stewardship (Mat 24:45; Mat 24:48), diligence and fidelity in the use of entrusted gifts, or failure to improve them due to unbelief and indolence (Mat 25:20; Mat 25:22; Mat 25:24 f.). Profession without practice (Mat 7:21-23), selfish ambition (Mat 18:1-3), an unforgiving disposition (Mat 18:34 f.), mark men out for exclusion from the perfected Kingdom; while childlike humility (Mat 18:3), lowly acts of service (Luk 22:24-30), preparedness for all kinds of sacrifice up to that of life itself (Mat 16:25; Mat 16:27; Mat 19:27-29), are sure passports to participation in its benefits. See, further, artt. Eternal Punishment, Universalism.

Literature.—E. L. Hull, *Serm.* 2nd ser. 191; H. Bushnell, *New Life*, 306; B. F. Westcott, *Peterborough Serm.* 3; T. G. Selby, *Unheeding God*, 24; G. Body, *Life of Love*, 27.

W. S. Montgomery.

Septuagint

SEPTUAGINT.—The Version ‘according to the Seventy.’ 1. This name for the Greek translation of the OT has its origin in the legend that Ptolemy ii. Philadelphus was advised by his librarian Demetrius Phalereus to procure from Jerusalem copies of the Hebrew Scriptures, and men learned in the Hebrew and Greek languages to translate them. Ptolemy accordingly sent ambassadors to Eleazar the high priest, who sent back to Alexandria seventy-two elders, six from each tribe, with magnificent copies of the Hebrew Scriptures. They were treated with the highest honour; they were assigned a quiet and convenient building on the island of Pharos, removed from the distractions of the city; and there, in seventy-two days, they translated the Hebrew Bible into Greek, for the enrichment of Ptolemy’s library; and the translation was received with delight by king and people.

This legend is related in a pseudonymous letter purporting to be written by Aristeas (an Alexandrian, and one of Ptolemy’s ambassadors to Jerusalem) to his brother Philocrates. The text, edited by St. J. Thackeray, is printed at the end of Swete’s *Introduction to the OT in Greek*, and a translation by Mr. Thackeray appeared in the *JQR* [Note: *QR Jewish Quarterly Review.*] , April 1903. Other forms of the tradition are given by the Alexandrian writers Aristobulus and Philo, and by Josephus. And the early Fathers or the Christian Church from the 2nd century onwards received the story without suspicion, and amplified it. What amount of truth underlies the legend it is difficult to decide; but the following facts are probable: (1) that the translation was begun at Alexandria; (2) that it was not undertaken officially, by order of the king (though he probably encouraged it), but resulted from the needs of the Alexandrian Jews, who knew no Hebrew and probably little or no Aramaic; (3) it may be true that Hebrew rolls were brought from Jerusalem; (4) the translation was, as might be expected, cordially received by Hellenistic Jews, who would be glad to have a Greek account of the origins of the Hebrew people.

The Alexandrian version embraced only the Pentateuch; and the letter of Aristeas professes no more. Josephus and Jerome recognized this, but Christian writers, generally, failed to notice the limitation. It could not, indeed, have embraced more in the reign of Ptolemy ii., for the *Torah* alone was complete by that time, secure in

its position as a collection of sacred books and ready for translation (Ryle, *Canon of the OT*, p. 113). But other books would be translated from time to time when they reached Egypt with Palestinian recognition of their canonicity. And before the Christian era Alexandria probably possessed the whole of the Hebrew Bible in a Greek translation, with the possible exception of Ecclesiastes.

2. The importance of the LXX Septuagint version to the student of Hebrew literature and philology can scarcely be overestimated (see Swete, *Introduction*, Pt. iii. c. 4). And it is hardly less essential to the student of early Christian writings. Patristic writers for the most part accepted it not merely as the best version of the Hebrew OT, but as no less inspired than the original. Even Augustine could say: ‘*Spiritus qui in prophetis erat quando illa dixerunt, idem ipse erat in LXX Septuagint viris quando illa interpretati sunt*’ (*de Civ. Dei*, xviii. 43). Being entirely dependent on it, and unable to appeal to or form comparisons with any other version, ‘they adopted without suspicion and with tenacity its least defensible renderings, and pressed them into the service of controversy, dogma, and devotion.’ ‘It was argued that the errors of the Greek text were due to accidents of transmission, or that they were not actual errors, but Divine adaptations of the original to the use of the future Church’ (Swete, Pt. iii. c. 5).

But the present article is concerned with that which is the chiefest importance of the LXX Septuagint –its relation to (a) the beginnings and the growth of Christianity, (b) the expression of Christian doctrines and ideas.

(a) *The LXX Septuagint was an important factor in preparing the way for the reception of the Christian religion.* In our Lord’s time the Jews were scattered throughout the known world. And though they preserved their religious connexion with Jerusalem by payments of money and by frequent attendance at the three annual festivals (see art. Dispersion), yet one and all had lost the knowledge of the classical Hebrew of the Scriptures, with the exception of the learned—the priests and Rabbis—of whom the original language of the OT was almost the exclusive property. It may be realized, therefore, what a blessing was conferred upon the Jewish race by Alexandria when she gave them their own Scriptures in the universal language of the day. They were provided with a valuable controversial weapon, whereby they could prove to their heathen neighbours the real importance and the hoary antiquity of the Hebrew nation. An army of apologists was raised up, of whom Josephus and Philo are, for us, the chief, because so much of their work is extant; but they must have been well-nigh equalled in weight and influence by such writers as the historians Alexander Cornelius (‘Polyhistor’), Demetrius, Eupolemus, Artapanus, and Aristeeas, the poets Philo, Theodotus, and Ezekiel, the philosopher Aristobulus, and Cleodemus or Malchas, small fragments of whose writings are preserved in Clem. Alex. [Note:

Alexandrian.] *Stromateis*, i. 22, 141, 153 ff., and Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* viii. 10, ix. 6, 17-34, 37, 39, xiii. 12.

But though she knew it not, Alexandria provided them with something greater. Christianity, by the power of God and by the coming of Christ, sprang out of Judaism. 'Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet; Vetus in Novo patet' (Aug.). By enabling Jews and Gentiles to read the OT Scriptures, the Greek version, in spite of all its mistakes and grotesque mistranslations, revealed the guiding providence of God in Hebrew history, and the gradual development of religious ideas of which the OT is the record; and above all it gave a lasting impetus to the growth of Messianic expectations. A train was laid which only needed the Divine spark to burst into flame. Christ came 'to send fire upon the earth,' and the LXX Septuagint had been instrumental in supplying fuel.

The quotations from the OT in the NT are seldom mere literary adornments, such as a modern writer might introduce from Shakespeare or other classical authors; they are for the most part used as a definite foundation for Christian teaching, or at least weighty illustrations of the writers' statements and arguments. Our Lord's teaching struck His hearers with amazement, because it did not blindly follow the footsteps of the scribes. Against the Jews He used their own Scriptures with conclusive force; and with His loving but fainthearted and ignorant disciples He adopted the same course; 'beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself' (Luk_24:27). And His disciples afterwards followed His example both in their speeches and in their writings (Act_8:35).

(b) *The LXX Septuagint played a large part in the moulding of Christian terminology.* It is difficult to gauge the extent to which religious conceptions were affected by the results which ensued from the wedding of the Greek language to Hebrew thought. Their offspring the LXX Septuagint was the parent of a yet nobler heir. There are few more interesting lines of study than to trace the debt which Christianity owed to the LXX Septuagint in the matter of words and terms, and to see how the borrowed terminology was consecrated and adapted to higher uses.

3. The LXX Septuagint must now be studied in two aspects, so far as it affected the four Gospels and the Apostolic conceptions of Christ's Person and work.

A. *Direct quotations.*—It will be convenient to give a list of the direct quotations from the OT in the Gospels, taken from Swete's *Introduction*, pp. 386 ff.

Mt.

Mk.

Lk.

OT

Mat_1:23

Isa_7:14*

| | | |
|--|----------------|--|
| | | <u>Luk 2:23</u> <u>Exo 13:12</u> |
| <u>Mat 2:6</u> | | <u>Mic 5:2*</u> |
| Matthew 2; Matthew 15 | | <u>Hos 11:1*</u> |
| <u>Mat 2:18</u> | | <u>Jer 38:15</u> |
| <u>Mat 3:3</u> | <u>Mar 1:3</u> | <u>Luk 3:4-6</u> <u>Isa 40:3-5*</u> |
| <u>Mat 4:4</u> | | <u>Luk 4:4</u> <u>Deu 8:3</u> |
| <u>Mat 4:6</u> | | <u>Luk 4:10</u> f. <u>Psa 90:11</u> f. |
| <u>Mat 4:7</u> | | <u>Luk 4:12</u> <u>Deu 6:16</u> |
| <u>Mat 4:10</u> | | <u>Luk 4:8</u> 13 |
| <u>Mat 4:15</u> f. | | <u>Isa 9:1</u> f. * |
| <u>Mat 5:21</u> | | <u>Exo 20:13</u> |
| <u>Mat 5:27</u> | | 14 |
| <u>Mat 5:31</u> | | <u>Deu 24:1</u> |
| <u>Mat 5:31</u> | | <u>Num 30:3</u> (cf. <u>Deu 23:21</u>) |
| <u>Mat 5:38</u> | | <u>Exo 21:24</u> |
| <u>Mat 5:43</u> | | <u>Lev 19:18</u> |
| <u>Mat 8:17</u> | | <u>Isa 53:4*</u> |
| <u>Mat 9:13</u> (<u>Mat 12:7</u>) | | <u>Hos 6:6</u> |
| <u>Mat 11:10</u> | <u>Mar 1:2</u> | <u>Luk 7:27</u> <u>Mal 3:1*</u> |

| | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| <u>Mat 12:7</u> | | <u>Hos 6:6</u> |
| <u>Mat 12:18-21</u> | | <u>Isa 42:1*</u> |
| <u>Mat 13:14 f.</u> | | <u>Isa 6:9 f.</u> |
| <u>Mat 13:35</u> | | <u>Psa 77:2*</u> |
| | | <u>Luk 4:18 f.</u> <u>Isa 61:1 ff.</u> + <u>Isa 58:6*</u> |
| <u>Mat 15:4</u> | <u>Mar 7:10</u> | <u>Exo 20:12;</u> <u>Exo 21:17</u> |
| <u>Mat 15:8 f.</u> | <u>Mar 7:6</u> | <u>Isa 29:13</u> |
| | <u>Mar 9:48</u> | <u>Isa 66:24</u> |
| <u>Mat 19:5 f.</u> | <u>Mar 10:6-8</u> | <u>Gen 1:27 +</u> <u>Gen 2:24</u> |
| <u>Mat 19:18 f.</u> | <u>Mar 10:19</u> | <u>Luk 18:20 f.</u> <u>Exo 20:12-17</u> |
| <u>Mat 21:5</u> | | <u>Zec 9:9 +</u> <u>Isa 62:11*</u> |
| <u>Mat 21:13</u> | <u>Mar 11:17</u> | <u>Luk 19:46</u> <u>Isa 56:7 + Jer 7:11</u> |
| <u>Mat 21:16</u> | | <u>Psa 8:2</u> |
| <u>Mat 21:42</u> | <u>Mar 12:10</u> | <u>Luk 20:17</u> <u>Psa 118:22 f.</u> |
| <u>Mat 22:24</u> | <u>Mar 12:19</u> | <u>Luk 20:28</u> <u>Deu 25:5 (cf.</u> <u>Gen 38:8)</u> |
| <u>Mat 22:32</u> | <u>Mar 12:26</u> | <u>Luk 20:37</u> <u>Exo 3:6</u> |
| <u>Mat 22:37</u> | <u>Mar 12:29 f.</u> | <u>Luk 10:27 a</u> <u>Deu 6:4 f.</u> |
| <u>Mat 22:39</u> | <u>Mar 12:31</u> | <u>Luk 10:27 b</u> <u>Lev 19:18</u> |

(i.) As regards the *matter* and *purpose* of these quotations, it is noticeable that of the 46 in the Synoptic Gospels 17 (marked with*) are ‘Messianic,’ *i.e.* they are quoted as being predictions of facts connected with the life and work of Christ; and of these, 6 (Mat 21:42; Mat 22:44; Mat 26:31; Mat 27:46, Luk 4:18 f., Luk 22:37) are cited by our Lord Himself. With these may be reckoned Mat 22:32, quoted as a proof of the resurrection of the dead. 6 (Mat 2:18; Mat 13:14 f., Mat 15:8 f., Mat 21:13; Mat 21:16, Mat 24:15) are quoted as predictions which have found—or, in the last passage, will find—fulfilment in the lives and characters of persons other than Christ, all except the first occurring in His own discourses. 19 of the remainder are quoted by our Lord (except Mar 12:32 f.), and consist of legal and moral precepts, mostly from the Pentateuch, which should guide men’s actions (with the exception of those in Matthew 5, which He quotes in order to contrast with them His own higher moral law). 3 which come under none of these heads are Luk 2:23, Mat 4:6; Mat 22:24. Of the 13 in the Fourth Gospel, 7 (marked with*) are ‘Messianic,’ all being quoted by the writer (except Joh 15:25, which is by our Lord). In the rest of the NT, ‘Messianic’ quotations occur chiefly in the Apostolic speeches in the Acts (Act 2:17-21; Act 2:25-28; Act 2:34 f., Act 3:22 f. (= Act 7:37), Act 4:25 f., Act 8:32 f., Act 13:33-35), and in Hebrews (Heb 1:5, (= Heb 5:5) Heb 1:6; Heb 1:8 f., Heb 1:10-13, Heb 2:6-8; Heb 2:12-13, Heb 5:6 (= Heb 7:17; Heb 7:21) Heb 9:20, Heb 10:5-9), in the other Epistles see Rom 9:33; Rom 10:11; Rom 15:3, 1Co 15:45, Gal 3:13, Eph 4:8, 1Pe 2:6.

(ii.) As regards the *form* of the quotations, the dependence upon the LXX Septuagint shown by the NT writers may be seen by the following facts, which are summarized from Swete’s *Introduction*, pp. 391-398.

Every part of the NT affords evidence of a knowledge of the LXX Septuagint, and a great majority of the passages cited from the OT are in general agreement with the Greek version. In the Synoptic Gospels there is a marked contrast between (α) quotations belonging to the common narrative or to the sayings reported by all three or by two of them, and (β) quotations which are peculiar to one of them. (α) The former (with the exception of Mat 15:8 f., Mat 26:31) adhere closely to LXX Septuagint. (β) Of the 16 in Mt. which are not found in Mk. or Luke, 4 (Luk 5:38; Luk 9:13; Luk 13:14 f., Luk 21:16) are in the words of the LXX Septuagint with slight variants; 4 exhibit important variants; and the remaining 7 bear little or no resemblance to the Alexandrian Greek. Neither Mk. nor Lk. has any series of independent quotations; Mar 9:48; Mar 12:32 are from the LXX Septuagint, but show affinities to the text of A; Luk 4:18 f. differs from the LXX Septuagint in important particulars.

The causes which have produced variation are manifold: (1) loose citation, (2) the substitution of a gloss for the precise words which the writer professes to quote, (3) a desire to adapt a prophetic context to the circumstances under which it was thought to have been fulfilled, (4) the fusing together of passages from different contexts. Further, (5) some variations are recensional. The Evangelists appear to have employed a recension of the LXX Septuagint which came nearer to the text of A than to that of our oldest uncial B. In some cases it may be argued that the text of the LXX Septuagint Manuscripts was influenced by the NT; but this objection is greatly minimized by the fact that Josephus, and to a less extent Philo, show the same tendency. And there are occasional signs that NT writers used a recension to which the version of the later translator Theodotion shows some affinities. (6) Some variations are translational, and imply an independent use of the original, whether by the Evangelist or by the author of some collection of excerpts which he employed. Prof. Swete (pp. 396 ff.) prints in full, and annotates, five of these passages from Mt (Mat 2:6; Mat 4:15 f., Mat 8:17; Mat 13:35; Mat 27:9 f.), together with the corresponding passages in the LXX Septuagint; and he comes to the conclusion that while 'the compiler of the First Gospel has more or less distinctly thrown off the yoke of the Alexandrian version, and substituted for it a paraphrase, or an independent rendering of the Hebrew,' 'our evidence does not encourage the belief that the Evangelist used or knew another complete Greek version of the OT or of any particular book.'

The writer of the Fourth Gospel quotes from the LXX Septuagint, with varying degrees of exactness. The citations in Joh 2:17; Joh 10:34; Joh 12:38; Joh 19:24-36 are *verbatim* or nearly so; those in Joh 6:31; Joh 6:45, Joh 13:18, Joh 15:25 are freer; in Joh 1:23, Joh 12:15; Joh 12:40 he paraphrased loosely, with a general reminiscence of the LXX Septuagint wording; in Joh 19:37, ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν is a non-Septuagintal rendering of Zec 12:10, which was perhaps current in Palestine, since εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν appears also in Theod. [Note: Theodotion.] (Aq. [Note: Aquila.] ἐξεκέντησαν, cf. Rev 1:7; Symm. [Note: Symmachus.] ἐπεξεκέντησαν).

The quotations in the Acts are exclusively from the LXX Septuagint, but sometimes they are inclined to be free and paraphrastic.

In St. Paul's quotations the same phenomena appear: the majority are verbally exact, but many contain important variants; sometimes the Apostle appears to quote from memory; in some cases he freely conflates two or more passages. In Hebrews, in which the argument is carried on largely by a catena of quotations from the LXX Septuagint, 'the text of the quotations agrees in the main with some form of the

present text of the LXX Septuagint ' (Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 476). On 1Pe 2:6 see Hort, *St. Peter*, in loc.

In this short summary of Prof. Swete's results enough has been said to show the large extent to which the Alexandrian Greek version influenced the direct quotations made by the NT writers. But direct citation formed only a fraction of the immense use which they made of the LXX Septuagint . Their writings, and the utterances of our Lord, abound in expressions and phrases from the LXX Septuagint which are not formal quotations, but which were due to their intimate knowledge of the OT. These are conveniently marked by uncial type in WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] 's text of the NT. In many cases the force and meaning of the NT passage are multiplied when the OT context is taken into consideration. [N.B.—There are no quotations from the Apocryphal books which were included in the Greek Bible. There are, however, in the Epistles some half-dozen reminiscences; see Wis 7:26; Wis 9:15; Wis 13:1; Wis 15:7, Sir 5:11; Sir 7:34; Sir 15:11].

B. *Borrowed terminology*.—It must not be forgotten that the LXX Septuagint was but a very small part of a large Greek literature whose ideas and vocabulary and grammar differed materially from those of the old classical writers. New philosophical and theological conceptions, changes political and social, developments in the arts of life, increased opportunities of intercourse with foreign nations, all combined to alter the language. The κοινή or Ελληνική διάλεκτος 'was based on Attic Greek, but embraced elements drawn from all Hellenic dialects. It was the literary language of the cosmopolitan Hellas created by the genius of Alexander' (Swete, *Intr.* p. 294). 'The language used by the writers of the Greek Diaspora may be regarded as a subsection of an early stage of the κοινή' (*ib.*), and of this subsection the LXX Septuagint and the NT are the best representatives in Egypt and Palestine respectively. Though a change began to appear as early as Xenophon, the era of the κοινή may be said to have opened in the latter half of the 4th cent. b.c.; and its golden age extends from c. [Note: circa, about.] b.c. 145 (Polybius) to c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 160 (Pausanias). The NT vocabulary, then, was derived not only from the LXX Septuagint but from the current language of the day. See the Appendix in Grimm-Thayer's *Gr.-English Lexicon of the NT* (pp. 691-696), in which are collected a large number of non-classical words which find parallels in Greek writings (including LXX Septuagint) from b.c. 322 to a.d. 100.

For our present purpose, however, a supreme interest attaches to the NT words which, though found in classical Greek, have acquired a new moral or theological meaning. Many words as used in the NT are exclusively Christian, and their special significance is not derived from any literary source (e.g. ἀνακεφαλαιοῦμαι, ἀντίτυπον, ἄ

νίχριστος, δύναμις (miracle), πρωτότοκος, σταυρός—όω, χάρις). But many others have gained, or at least advanced towards, their new meaning by contact with Hebrew thought. The following are among the more important, and will repay careful investigation with the help of Thayer's *Lexicon* and the NT commentaries. The short notes here attached to each word are not intended to be in any way exhaustive of their meanings or applications, but may be helpful in suggesting lines for study. Words which do not occur in classical Greek are marked with*.

ἄγγελος. Classical meaning 'messenger.' Early Heb. thought conceived of the 'Angel of Jahweh' as a visible or active manifestation of Himself, Gen 22:11, Exo 3:2, Mat 1:20, Luk 2:9. But the more developed angelology of later times is reflected in the NT, e.g. the names of two great angels appear—Michael (Dan 10:13; Dan 10:21; Dan 12:1, Jud 1:9, Rev 12:7) and Gabriel (Dan 8:16; Dan 9:21, Luk 1:19; Luk 1:26). See also Mat 18:10.

ἅγιος. Class. 'sacred (to a god)'; 'holy.' Note two special uses: (a) οἱ ἅγιοι, the ideal body of consecrated people, Dan 7:18; Dan 7:22, 1Es 8:57 (58); freq. in St. Paul's writings of Christians. Not in Gospp., but see Joh 17:14-19. (b) τὰ ἅγια, the holiest part of the Tent; in NT typical of Heaven where Christ our High Priest intercedes for us, Hebrews 9, Hebrews 10.

ἀδελφός. Class. 'brother'; 'near kinsman.' LXX Septuagint and NT a member of the same privileged race, Deu 18:15, Rom 9:3. Hence in NT a fellow-Christian, Mat 23:8 and freq. in Acts and Epistles.

αἷμα. Class. 'blood'; 'bloodshed'; always emphasizes the fact of death. In the Jewish sacrificial system the blood is the *life*, Gen 9:4, Lev 17:11; Lev 17:14, Deu 12:23. On the Christian use of this thought see Westcott, Add. note on 1Jn 1:7 and on Heb 9:12.

αἰών. Class. 'human life-time'; 'eternity.' (a) In LXX Septuagint freq. in plur., denoting the sum-total of the fixed periods (each being an αἰών) into which eternity is divisible, Psa 77:8 (Psa 76:8), Luk 1:33. (b) The NT adopts the Rabbinic conception of two 'ages,' ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος (הַיָּמִים הַזֵּה) and ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐρχόμενος or ὁ μέλλον (הַיָּמִים הַבָּא) the age before, and after, the advent of the Messiah, Mat 22:32, Mar 10:30.

ἀνάστασις. Class. ‘a rising up’ (e.g. from a seat); ‘a making to rise’; ‘a removal.’ LXX Septuagint ‘resurrection,’ 2Ma 7:14; 2Ma 12:43; cf. Dan 12:2, Mat 22:23 and freq. (See aesch. *Eum.* 617 f.).

ἀναφέρω. Class. ‘bring up’; ‘undertake’; ‘refer’; ‘restore.’ LXX Septuagint freq. ‘offer up’ (as a sacrifice) = פלען. Heb 7:27 bis, 1Pe 2:5; 1Pe 2:24 al.

ἀποκαλύπτειν (*ἀποκάλυψις). Class. ‘reveal.’ In LXX Septuagint and NT freq. Divine revelation of things which man of himself could not know.

ἀπολυτρόω (*-τροωσις). Class. ‘release on payment of ransom.’ In the OT the word is applied (with little or no idea of ransom) to the action of God for His people, in delivering them (לָנַס or פָּדָה) from trouble or death. This, with the thought of ransom partially restored, appeared in the NT as the Christian ‘redemption’ from sin. See Westcott, *Hebrews*, pp. 295 ff.

ἄφεσις. Class. ‘a setting free’ (of a captive); ‘discharge’ (from the obligations of a bond). In LXX Septuagint mostly the periodical ‘release’ of Hebrew slaves. But the Messianic interpretation of such passages as Isa 61:1 (cf. Luk 4:18) was a step towards the NT meaning of ‘release from the chain and the guilt of sin’. In Isa 22:14 ἀφεθήσεται is used in connexion with ἀμαρτία. See Mat 26:28, Mar 1:4; Mar 3:29, Luk 1:77; Luk 3:3; Luk 24:47.

βαπτίζομαι. Class. metaph. ‘to be soaked’ (with wine); ‘to be drowned’ (with questions). LXX Septuagint 2 (4) 2Ki 5:14 uses the word in connexion with miraculous cleansing; Sirach 34 (31):30 with cleansing from ceremonial pollution. Both are partial types of Christian baptism.

βεβαιόω. Class. ‘confirm’ (a statement); ‘secure’ (a person in one’s own interests). In LXX Septuagint Psa 41:13; Psa 119:28 the word is used of God establishing or strengthening man. Hence in NT of Jesus Christ strengthening the soul and character, 1Co 1:8.

δαμόνιον. Class. ‘deity’; ‘divinity’; also an inferior divine being, ‘between divine and mortal’ (Plat. *Symp.*). It needed the OT monotheism to *condemn* the thought of divine

beings other than Jehovah, Deu_32:17, Psa_96:5. Hence in NT ‘evil spirit.’ [δαίμων (Mat_8:31)], which is very similar, is not found in the LXX Septuagint ? Isa_65:11].

διάβολος. Class. of one who accuses maliciously or slanderously. LXX Septuagint (= אַבּוּל or אַבּוּל) ‘an adversary,’ used of a superhuman agent of evil, Job_1:6-7 etc. Zec_3:1-2, 1Ch_21:1. Hence in NT ‘the devil,’ used by every NT writer except St. Mark.

δίκαιος, δικαιοσύνη, etc. Class. mainly ‘just,’ ‘justice.’ See Sanday-Headlam, Add. note on Rom_1:17, ‘The word δίκαιος and its compounds.’

δόξα, δοξάζω. Class. ‘opinion’; ‘credit’ or ‘renown.’ LXX Septuagint Exo_24:17 al. (= תִּכְוָה, New Heb. תְּכָוָה) the ‘glory’ of God, the visible manifestation of His presence. Hence in NT (a) the manifestation of God’s character, Joh_1:14, (b) the spiritual participation of it by men, Joh_17:22. See 2Co_3:7-18.

ἔθνος (*ἔθνικός). Class. ‘nation.’ LXX Septuagint , NT of nations other than the chosen people; ‘Gentiles.’

εἶδωλον. Class. ‘phantom’; ‘reflected image’; ‘fancy.’ LXX Septuagint , NT ‘the image of a god’; ‘idol.’

ἐκκλησία. Class. ‘assembly’ of citizens. LXX Septuagint (= עֲדָתָא) an assembly of Israelites, the chosen people. Hence in NT the body of Christians spiritually called out from the rest of mankind by God; ‘the Church.’

ἐκλεκτός. Class. ‘selected.’ LXX Septuagint the ‘elect’ people of God, Isa_65:9; Isa_65:15; Isa_65:22, (Isa_65:23), 1Ch_16:13, Wis_3:9; Wis_4:15. Hence in NT of Christians, Mat_24:31 al.

ἐπισκοπέω, -πος (*-πή). Class, vb. ‘inspect,’ ‘examine,’ ‘visit’; subst. ‘overseer,’ ‘guardian.’ The use of the words in the LXX Septuagint (esp. ἐπισκοπή) of the action of God, either for help or punishment, gave rise to the spiritual force acquired in the NT, Luk_19:44, 1Pe_2:12; 1Pe_2:25.

εὐαγγελίζομαι (*-ζω), εὐαγγέλιον. Class. vb. ‘bring good tidings’; subst. ‘reward for good tidings.’ In the OT such Messianic passages as Isa 40:9 *al.* led to the Christian use of the terms. [Sing. εὐαγγέλιον not in LXX Septuagint, which always has plur.].

εὐλογέω, -ια. Class. ‘praise.’ (a) LXX Septuagint (= בָּרַךְ) ‘bless’; and so in NT of the action of either God or man. (b) ‘Consecrate with prayer,’ 1Sa 9:13, Luk 9:16, 1Co 10:16. (c) εὐλογία is a concrete blessing or benefit, Deu 11:26 *al.*, Eph 1:3, Heb 12:17 *al.* (not in Gosp.).

ζωή. Class. ‘life’; ‘existence.’ In the LXX Septuagint (= חַיִּים) it is freq. used of a happy life, blessed by God. Hence in NT of spiritual life (Joh 5:24) gained by union with Christ, the source and principle of life (Joh 10:10; Joh 14:6, 1Jn 5:12).

ζωογονέω, ζωοποιέω. Class. ‘breed animals, or germs.’ LXX Septuagint ‘give life to,’ Neh 9:6; ‘preserve alive,’ Exo 1:17, Psa 71:20. Hence in NT ‘endue with spiritual life,’ Joh 6:63; ‘restore to life,’ Joh 5:21.

ἡμέρα. Class. ‘day.’ In LXX Septuagint freq. of the ‘Day of Jahweh,’ a future time of judgment (Am., Is., Zeph. etc.). Hence in NT of the coming of Christ to judgment, Mat 7:22 *al.* (The thought of ‘judgment’ was so closely attached to the word that St. Paul could use the expression ἀνθρωπίνη ἡμέρα, 1Co 4:3).

θάνατος. Class. ‘death’ of the body. From the OT teaching that death is the punishment of sin is derived the NT use of the word for spiritual death, either as a present, unregenerate state (Joh 5:24, 1Jn 3:14), or as a future penalty (Wis 1:12; Wis 2:24, Rom 1:32).

θεός. Class. ‘a god.’ OT monotheism led to the use of ὁ θεός for the One God in LXX Septuagint and NT. (God’s representatives are called θεοί, Psa 82:6, quoted in Joh 10:34).

ιλάσκομαι. Class. ‘propitiate,’ ‘appease.’ (a) LXX Septuagint pass. ‘be propitiated,’ Psa 78:38; Psa 79:9. So NT Luk 18:13. (b) LXX Septuagint ἐξιλάσκομαι (not in NT) ‘make propitiation for,’ ‘expiate.’ So in NT ιλάσκομαι, Heb 2:17.

*ἱλασμός ‘a means of propitiating,’ Eze 44:27, 1Jn 2:2; 1Jn 4:10.

*ἱλαστήριον ‘the place of propitiation,’ ‘the mercy-seat.’ LXX Septuagint and Heb 9:5. [In Rom 3:25 masc. adj. of Christ].

κακία. Class. ‘badness, depravity’; ‘cowardice.’ LXX Septuagint , NT ‘evil,’ ‘trouble,’ Amo 6:3, Mat 6:34.

κατάπαυσις. Class. ‘a putting to rest’; ‘a causing to cease.’ LXX Septuagint (= קַטְוּתָא) ‘rest,’ ‘cessation,’ Psa 95:11. NT Heb 3:11; Heb 3:18; Heb 4:1; Heb 4:3; Heb 4:5 etc.

κέρας. Class, ‘horn.’ LXX Septuagint , NT symbol of strength, 1Sa 2:10, Psa 89:18, Luk 1:69.

κληρονομέω, -ία, -ος. Class. ‘inherit.’ In OT the words are frequently used for the occupation of Canaan by the gift of God. So in NT they are used spiritually for the gaining of the privileges involved in Divine sonship in union with Christ, Mat 5:5; Mat 25:34.

κληρος. Class. ‘an object used in casting lots.’ LXX Septuagint ‘an allotted portion,’ a possession or privilege assigned by God to His people, Wis 5:5. NT in Mat 27:35 ||, Act 26:18, Col 1:12.

κοινώω, -ός. Class ‘to make common,’ ‘to communicate’ (opp. ἴδιος). LXX Septuagint ‘to make unhallowed,’ ‘profane,’ ‘defile’ (= βεβηλώω, -ος), 4Ma 7:6, 1Ma 1:47; 1Ma 1:62. NT Mat 15:11; Mat 15:18; Mat 15:20, Mar 7:2; Mar 7:5, Act 10:14; Act 10:28.

κόσμος. Class. ‘order’; ‘ornament’; ‘the Universe’ (as a system of order). LXX Septuagint ‘the inhabitants of the world,’ Wis 2:24; Wis 10:1; Wis 14:6; Wis 14:14. NT in Mat 13:38 and frequently. Hence in NT ‘the ungodly masses of men,’ Joh 7:7 and freq.; also ‘things of the world,’ ‘desires, pleasures,’ etc., Mat 16:26 and frequently.

κτίζω, κτίσις. Class. vb. ‘to found’ (city, colony, etc.); subst. ‘the act of founding.’

LXX Septuagint vb. ‘create’ (= ברא), Deu 4:32, Psa 51:11, Isa 45:7; subst. ‘the sum of created things,’ Jdt 9:12; Jdt 16:14, Wis 5:17, (18), Wis 16:24 al. NT vb. Mar 13:19 al., subst. Mar 10:6 al.

κύριος. Class. ‘lord,’ ‘master,’ ‘owner.’ LXX Septuagint *passim* for יהוה ‘Jehovah.’ NT both with and without the article (a) for Jehovah, (b) for Christ.

λαός. Class. ‘nation,’ ‘people.’ In LXX Septuagint specially of the chosen people. Hence in NT applied to Christians, Luk 1:17, Act 15:14, Heb 4:9 al.

λειτουργέω, -ία. Class. ‘render a service to the state at one’s own expense.’ LXX Septuagint (vb. שָׁמַע, subst. עֲבֹדָה), the service of the priests in the Tent and the Temple. So NT Luk 1:23, Heb 8:6; Heb 9:21; Heb 10:11. [The classical idea is adopted in 2Co 9:12, Php 2:30.]

λυτρόω. Class. ‘release on payment of ransom’; ‘deliver by payment of ransom.’ In LXX Septuagint of the action of God, ‘deliverance’ from evils, Deu 13:5, 2Sa 7:23, Psa 49:9 al. So in NT Luk 24:21 (cf. Act 7:35). λύτρον (*λύτρωσις). Class. ‘the price paid for ransom.’ In LXX Septuagint λύτρον ψυχῆς (= כִּפּוּר ‘atonement’) Num 35:31, Pro 13:8, and λύτρωσις coupled with λυτρώσεται ἐκ πασῶν τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτοῦ, Psa 130:7 f., show that the later writers of the OT were approaching the spiritual use of the words. Hence in NT λυτρόω Tit 2:14, 1Pe 1:18, -ρον Mat 20:28, Mar 10:45, -ρωσις Heb 9:12.

μυστήριον. Class. ‘a secret,’ a mystery known only to the initiated. LXX Septuagint ‘hidden purpose, or counsel’; of men, Tob 12:7; Tob 12:11, Jdt 2:2; of God, Wis 2:22; Wis 6:22. In NT of God’s plan of salvation which was not known until revealed to the Apostles, Mat 13:11 (= Mar 4:11, Luk 8:10), Rom 11:25 al.

νόμος. Class. ‘usage,’ ‘custom’; ‘law.’ LXX Septuagint ‘the Mosaic law.’ NT (a) the volume of ‘the Law,’ Mat 12:5, or its contents as binding upon Jews, Mat 5:17 f; (b) a burdensome and ineffectual system of commands and prohibitions from which Christ has freed us, Rom 3:21 and frequently.

οἰκοδομέω (*-μῆ). Class, ‘build.’ LXX Septuagint metaph. ‘grant prosperity to,’ Psa 28:5, Jer 33:7. In NT ‘help and prosper spiritually,’ ‘edify’ (this use of the word was rendered easier by the thought of Christians as being the ‘building’ and ‘temple’ of God, Act 20:32 al.).

ὄνομα. Class. ‘name’; ‘fame’; ‘pretext.’ LXX Septuagint , all that a person’s name implies, his personality and attributes, 1 Kings 21 (3 K 20):8, Son 1:3. Very freq. of the Name of God. So in NT, of men Mat 10:41, Joh 5:43 b; of God Mat 6:9, Joh 12:28, and frequently.

οὐρανός. Class. ‘heaven,’ ‘sky.’ LXX Septuagint , a periphrasis used by late Jews for the Divine Name (Dan 4:23 a, 1Ma 3:18 f. and freq.). NT in Luk 15:18; Luk 15:21 (see Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, English translation 217-220, and 91 ff.).

παῖς. Class. ‘child’; ‘slave.’ In LXX Septuagint the word acquired a special force as representing a ‘servant of Jehovah’; of men, Psa 113:1, Wis 2:13 al.; of the Messianic Figure in Isaiah 41, 42 etc. So in NT of men who devoutly serve God, Luk 1:54; Luk 1:69; of the Messiah, Mat 12:18, Act 3:13; Act 3:26; Act 4:27; Act 4:30.

παράδεισος. Class. ‘park,’ ‘pleasure-garden.’ From the story of the garden of Eden (Genesis 2, 3) the word came to be used figuratively in the OT for Divinely given peace and prosperity, Eze 28:13. In Jewish apocryphal writings it acquired the meaning of an upper region in the ‘third heaven’; cf. 2Co 12:2; 2Co 12:4. Hence it was used of the abode of the pious after death, Luk 23:43, Rev 2:7.

πειράζω (*-ασμός). Class, ‘test,’ ‘try.’ LXX Septuagint (= נִסָּה) (a) of men trying God, Exo 17:2, Deu 6:16, Isa 7:12; (b) of God testing men, Gen 22:1. So in NT (a) Mat 4:7, Act 15:10; (b) 1Co 10:9. Hence freq. of ‘temptation’ by the Devil.

περί. The LXX Septuagint use of περὶ [τῆς] ἁμαρτίας to express תְּשֻׁבָה or תְּפִלָּה ‘a sin-offering,’ Lev 6:18 (25), Lev 14:19 al., Psa 40:7, led to the use of περί in the NT with a sacrificial force, ‘to expiate or atone for (sins)’ (Heb 10:6), Rom 8:3, Heb 5:3; Heb 10:18; Heb 10:26 al.

περιτέμνειν (*-τομή). Class. ‘cut round’; ‘curtail’; ‘intercept.’ LXX Septuagint freq. ‘circumcise,’ NT (a) ‘circumcise’ (physically); (b) ‘separate from lust and spiritual impurity,’ Col 2:11, Rom 2:29 (cf. Exo 6:13; Exo 6:30; Lev 26:41, Eze 44:7, Act 7:51).

πιστεύειν, πίστις. The broad distinction between the classical and the Biblical use is that in the former 'belief' is intellectual, in the latter it is spiritual. (See Hatch, *Hibbert Lectures* 1888, Lect. xi., and *Essays in Biblical Greek*, pp. 83-87; Sanday-Headlam on Rom 1:17, 'The meaning of Faith').

πνεῦμα. Class. 'wind,' 'air'; 'spirit,' the life principle of all created things; also 'inspiration,' 'afflatus'; later 'the all-pervading Soul' of the Stoics. In the OT a moral force is added to the word, a power derived from God, Psa 51:12-13, Job 32:8, Isa 48:16; Isa 61:1. Hence in NT (a) the 'spirit' of man, the highest part of his trichotomy; (b) the Holy Spirit.

πορνεύω, -νεία, -νή. Class. 'commit fornication.' LXX Septuagint metaph. of the worshipping of idols by Israel, God's bride, Hos 1:2; Hos 9:1, Psa 73:27, Jer 3:6 al. Hence freq. in Apocalypse, Apocalyptic and at least with the underlying thought in Joh 8:41.

προφήτης, -τεύω (*τεία). Class. 'interpret an oracle,' 'foretell.' In LXX Septuagint and NT the words gain a higher meaning than that of interpreting the frenzied utterances of a μάντις. A 'prophet' is one inspired with a Divine intuition to declare God's will both in historical events and in things spiritual.

σάρξ. Class. 'flesh' (physical). LXX Septuagint and NT (a) 'physical origin,' 'relationship,' Gen 37:27, Jdg 9:2, 2Sa 5:1; 2Sa 19:13, Joh 3:6, Rom 1:3; Rom 11:14, Gal 4:23; Gal 4:29 (b) 'man,' considered as weak and mortal, Psa 56:5; Psa 78:39, *al.*, Joh 1:14, Mat 16:17, Joh 8:15, 1Pe 1:24. Hence in NT (c) the lowest part of human nature (opp. πνεῦμα) with its tendency to sin, Mat 26:41, 1Jn 2:16; and (d) an unspiritual, unregenerate state, only in St. Paul, Rom 8:4-13 al.

σκότος (*σκοτία). Class. 'darkness,' 'obscurity.' LXX Septuagint attaches to it a moral significance, Job 30:26, Psa 112:4, Isa 5:26; Isa 9:2. So in NT, Mat 6:23, Luk 1:79; Luk 11:35, Joh 1:5; Joh 3:19; Joh 12:35 al.

σώζω, σωτήρ, -τηρία, -τήριον. Class. 'save' (from injury, death, etc.). LXX Septuagint to deliver from the penalties of the Messianic judgment, Joe 2:32 (Joe 3:5), Isa 45:17; Isa 49:8 al. Hence in NT 'save from sin,' Mat 1:21, Luk 2:11; Luk 1:69; Luk 2:30 and frequently.

φῶς, φωτίζω (*-τισμός). Class. subst. 'light'; vb. 'shine,' 'give light.' In LXX Septuagint the subst. acquires a moral force (opp. σκοτός), Psa 27:1; Psa 119:105, Isa 5:20 and freq.; and the vb. is used transitively 'to teach,' Psa 119:130, Sir 45:17. Hence both in NT freq. of spiritual enlightenment and freedom.

χάρις. Class. 'kind feeling'; 'a kindness done'; 'gratitude' and 'thanks'; 'enjoyment.' In LXX Septuagint (= ἱπ) freq. in the expression 'find favour before God.' In NT this kindness of God becomes a twofold theological conception: (a) the undeserved kindness by which man is saved from sin, (b) the state of heart kept alive by the Holy Spirit in one who has received God's grace.

χριστός. Class. 'to be rubbed on,' 'used as ointment.' LXX Septuagint 'a person who is anointed'—king, priest, or prophet—for Ἰησοῦς. Hence the Messianic conception which gave rise to the NT title ὁ χριστός.

Literature.—Swete, *Introd. to the OT in Greek*; art. 'Septuagint' (Nestle) in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible*; *Speaker's Commentary*, 'Apocrypha,' vol. i. pp. xi.-xxiii.; art. 'Apocrypha' (Ryle) in *Smith's DB [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.]* 2; Toy, *New Testament Quotations*; Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*; Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*; Grimm-Thayer, *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*; H. A. A. Kennedy, *Sources of NT Greek*; Dittmar, *Vet. Test. in Novo*; Hühn, *AT [Note: T Altes Testament.] Citate u. Reminisc. im NT*; Commentaries on the NT. A very full Bibliography will be found at the end of Nestle's art. 'Bibelübersetzungen (Griechische)' in *PRE [Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie fur protest. Theologic und Kirche.]* 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred]

A. H. M'Neile.

☩ Sepulchre

SEPULCHRE.—See Tomb; and for 'Holy Sepulchre' see Golgotha.

☩ Sermon On The Mount

SERMON ON THE MOUNT.—Professor Votaw’s learned and exhaustive article in the Extra Vol. of Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible is a mine of information and critical study, to which the reader is referred for a full treatment of questions concerning the Sermon on the Mount that must here be treated more briefly.

1. Sources.—The contents of Matthew 5, 6, 7 are commonly regarded as constituting one discourse, with the title ‘The Sermon on the Mount,’ on account of the introductory statement in Mat 5:1. Some portions of the contents of these chapters reappear, with more or less difference of form, introduced in a somewhat similar way, in Luke 6. Other sayings of Jesus contained in the three chapters of Mt. are found scattered over the narrative in Lk., and a few are in Mk.; two are duplicated in Mt., and one is duplicated in Lk. The following is the Synoptic distribution of the Sermon:

| | Matthew. | Mark. | Luke. |
|--------------------|--|---|--|
| | <u>Mat 5:1</u> | | <u>Luk 6:17</u> ; <u>Luk 6:20 a</u> |
| | <u>Mat 5:3-4</u> ; <u>Mat 5:6</u> | | <u>Luk 6:20 b</u> , <u>Luk 6:21</u> |
| <u>Luk 6:22-23</u> | <u>Mat 5:11-12</u> | | <u>Luk 6:22-23</u> |
| | <u>Mat 5:13</u> | <u>Mar 9:50</u> | <u>Luk 14:34-35</u> |
| | <u>Mat 5:15</u> | <u>Mar 4:21</u> | (1) <u>Luk 8:16</u> , (2) <u>Luk 11:33</u> |
| | <u>Mat 5:18</u> | | <u>Luk 16:17</u> |
| | <u>Mat 5:25-26</u> | | <u>Luk 12:58-59</u> |
| (1) | <u>Mat 5:29-30</u> , (2) <u>Mat 18:7-8</u> | <u>Mar 9:47-48</u> ; <u>Mar 9:43</u> ; <u>Mar 9:45</u> | |
| (1) | <u>Mat 5:32</u> , (2) <u>Mat 19:9</u> | <u>Mar 10:11-12</u> | <u>Luk 16:18</u> |
| | <u>Mat 5:39-48</u> | | <u>Luk 6:29-36</u> |
| | <u>Mat 6:9-13</u> | | <u>Luk 11:2-4</u> |
| | <u>Mat 6:20-21</u> | | <u>Luk 12:33-36</u> |
| | <u>Mat 6:24</u> | | <u>Luk 16:13</u> |

Mat 6:25-34

Luk 12:22-34

Mat 7:1-5

Luk 6:37-42

Mat 7:7-12

Luk 11:9-13

Mat 7:13-14

Luk 13:22-24

Mat 7:16-27

Luk 6:44-49

A comparison of these columns will bring out certain clear results, viz.:

(1) Mk. is not the source of any of these sayings. Only four verses or paragraphs of them are in that Gospel at all. Of these four, three are also in Lk. A comparison between the several forms of the three shows (a) that Lk. and Mt. are nearer to one another than either of them is to Mk., and (b) that in the two cases of duplicates in Mt., Mk. is nearer to Mt.'s second renderings of the sayings than to his earlier renderings, which are those of the Sermon on the Mount, showing that if Mt. is dependent on Mk. in either case, it is in the later passages where the sayings are given in another connexion, not in the Sermon. We may account for the duplicates in this way. The first appearance of them is due to the non-Markan source; the second is perhaps derived from Mk.

(2) It is now generally conceded that the main sources of the common elements in the Synoptic Gospels are Mk., and the collection of *Logia* which Papias says Matthew compiled and wrote in Hebrew, or Aramaic. Further, it is agreed that the *Logia* must have been translated into Greek, and that it was in a Gr. form that our Evangelists used it. More recently the differences between Mt. and Lk. in their renderings of the same sayings, as well as various other phenomena connected with them, have led scholars to the conclusion that (a) there were two or more versions of Matthew's *Logia*, or (b) that there were other collections of sayings of Jesus besides that made by Matthew (Wendt, Jülicher, Wernle, J. Weiss, Feine, Hawkins, Votaw, Bacon). Probably both of these suggestions must be admitted. Nevertheless, even after admitting this, we may still recognize the probability that the Sermon, as we have it in our First Gospel, is derived from Matthew's *Logia*; for (α) that Gospel—apart from its opening and closing sections—consists virtually of Mk., split at 5 places, or as some reckon at 7 places, with blocks of *Logia* wedged in at these openings, the Sermon being the first such insertion; and (β) since our chief collection of the sayings of Jesus is that contained in Mt., since Papias ascribed to the Apostle Matthew the only collection of *Logia* he is reported to have mentioned, and since the Gospel containing

it bears the name of that Apostle in all Patristic references to its origin, there is a strong presumption that the *Logia* it contains are from Matthew's collection, although this does not forbid us to conclude that the collection may have been used by the Evangelist in a revised form. Nor, of course, does it exclude the suggestions of interpolations, glosses, etc., which can only be considered in detail as they arise in the course of the study of the text. The general conclusion is that as a whole our Sermon on the Mount is derived from Matthew's *Logia* in a Greek version.

2. Integrity.—The question of the integrity of the Sermon must be considered quite apart from that of its genuineness. We may be convinced that the three chapters of Mt. contain only true *Logia* of Jesus, and yet see reason to think that these *Logia* were not all spoken on one and the same occasion, in fact, that they do not actually constitute a sermon. (a) The first difficulty arises from the wealth and multiplicity of the utterances. We have here a concise concentration of many most pregnant sayings of Jesus. It is not to be supposed that a popular audience could take in so much at one hearing. But Jesus was welcomed everywhere by simple peasants and the people generally much more than by trained thinkers and the educated classes. Since 'the common people heard him gladly,' His style must have been adjusted to slow-moving minds; but no popular preacher would pack so much into one sermon as we have in Mt.'s three chapters.

(b) The variety of topics treated in the three chapters is inconsistent with the unity of a single discourse. Thus the encouragements to prayer and the warnings against anxiety are alien to the main topic in which the principles of the new order are contrasted with the old laws and customs.

(c) A more important consideration arises from a comparison of the portions of these chapters which reappear in Lk. with the circumstances in connexion with which they are there introduced. *A priori* it is improbable that any Evangelist would break up a discourse of Christ and scatter its sentences among his narratives, fitting them into the incidents gratuitously. But a study of the circumstances under which these sentences are met with in Lk. inclines us to think that they are in their right place. It will be observed that the Gospel's most full and consecutive rendering of sayings found in St. Matthew 5-7 is in St. Luke 6. Provisionally we may regard this chapter as giving St. Luke's version of the Sermon on the Mount. Let us turn to those sayings of the Mt. chapters that are in other parts of Lk. First we have Mat 5:13 reappearing in Luk 14:34-35. This is a warning against degenerating and becoming as salt that has lost its savour. In Mt. it has no evident connexion with the Beatitudes that it follows; in Lk., however, it occurs in connexion with warnings of the danger of abandoning the following of Christ after having commenced, and serves to clinch those warnings with a final illustration. Moreover, this saying is also in Mk. (Mar 9:50), where it seems to have been introduced by association with another reference to salt in the previous

verse. Therefore it would seem to have been a floating *logion*, which naturally found its way into Mt.'s collection. In Mt. the saying about salt losing its savour is followed by that of the lamp under the bushel—a *logion* which appears in Mk. (Mar 4:21) and twice in Lk. (Luk 8:16; Luk 11:33). None of these passages evinces much connexion with its context. It is to be observed that the second appearance in Lk. is nearer to Mt. than the first, since it has 'the bushel' as the covering article, as also Mk. has, while the first of Lk.'s renderings of it has 'a vessel.' Here again it would appear we have another floating *logion*. The solemn assurance that the Law cannot fail is not more intelligible in Lk. (Luk 16:17-18) than in Mat 5:18; this, therefore, is rather exceptional.—The next of the Third Evangelist's departures from the order of the Sermon on the Mount in Mt. is Luk 12:58-59 which corresponds to Mat 5:25-26. This is the advice to agree quickly with an adversary lest it be too late, and a serious judicial sentence have to be submitted to. In Mt. this follows advice to be reconciled with a brother on grounds of the higher principles of Christ's teaching, which forbid the quarrelsome temper. In Lk. it follows the warnings of the approach of a day of reckoning. In neither place is it inappropriate. Perhaps it was spoken on two occasions. We must always allow for that possibility.—The next three cases are more convincing. Mt. has the Lord's Prayer following warnings against hypocrisy in prayer, which are associated with other cases of hypocrisy (Mat 6:1-18). The subject of this whole paragraph is unostentatious sincerity, as opposed to pretentious hypocrisy. In Lk. (Luk 11:1-4) the Lord's Prayer is introduced after Christ's disciples have asked Him to teach them to pray, as John had taught his disciples to pray. Thus it comes appropriately as a model prayer, while in Mt. no form of prayer is immediately required when the subject is privacy in prayer as against public display. Next, the warning against worldly anxiety (Mat 6:19-34) has no direct connexion with the rest of the Sermon on the Mount. In Luk 12:22-34 it follows the warning against covetousness and the parable of the Rich Fool, which were occasioned by one of the multitude appealing to Jesus to decide a question of inheritance between himself and his brother.—Lastly, the saying about the narrow gate (Mat 7:13-14) appears in Lk. in reply to the question whether they are few that be saved (Luk 13:22-24).

For such reasons it is now generally admitted that the three chapters in Mt. contain sayings of Jesus which were not parts of the original Sermon. This fact, however, does not justify the assertion that Matthew's Sermon on the Mount 'is a composition rather than an actual address' (Moffatt, *Ebi* [*Note: Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*], vol. iv. col. 4377). While Bacon rules out the matter which is not in Luke 6, and is scattered over other parts of Lk., he allows that the Sermon, apart from such interpolations of alien sayings of Jesus, is a connected discourse (*The Sermon on the Mount: Its Literary Structure*, etc.). Votaw, while admitting some interpolations, vindicates the greater part of Mt.'s rendering of it (*loc. cit.* pp. 7-9). The fact that we have a block of *Logia* here inserted in the narrative of Mt. is no proof that much, if not all of it, may not belong to a single discourse. Moreover, the descriptive introduction (Mat 4:23 to

Mat 5:1) indicates an important discourse given on a specific occasion. It is the same with the parallel in Luk 6:17-20. Then there is a clearly marked unity in those parts of the Sermon in Mt. that remain after the apparently alien matter has been removed, and this is the case with the whole of Lk.'s shorter version. Nor need we cut down the Sermon to the limits of what is contained in Lk., for there was an evident reason for the Third Evangelist's omission of the references to the Pharisees and to Jewish customs which Mt. has preserved, since the former was writing for Gentiles who would not be interested in these matters; while, on the other hand, they are evidently integral to the discourse as this is given in Mt., because they help to bring out the ethical principles of the new order that Christ was introducing by contrast with the old order that He was superseding.

3. Original form.—A comparison of Matthew 5-7 with the parallel passages in Lk. (especially with the discourse in Luke 6) raises the question as to which of these two versions of our Lord's utterances is the more original. For, while it has been maintained (by Auger, Greswell, Osiander, Patricius, Plumptre, Sadler, etc.) that we have here reports of sermons given on two occasions, this view is not widely accepted by scholars at the present day.* [Note: See Paul Feine, 'Ueber das gegenseit. Verhältniss d. Texte der Bergpredigt bei Mat. und Luk.' (Jahrb. f. prot. Theol. ix. 1); also Plummer, 'St. Luke' (ICC), pp. 176-179.] It is not to be denied that Jesus may have repeated the same discourse on more than one occasion. But, in the present case, it is to be observed: (a) Each Evangelist has only one report, neither betraying any knowledge that the Sermon was preached twice. (b) Both Evangelists describe the same circumstances in introducing the Sermon—*i.e.* the gathering of the multitude, the collecting of disciples, and the connexion of the scene with a mountain (for though in Mt. the Sermon is on the mountain and in Lk. on a level place after Jesus had come down, this is only one of the small discrepancies invariably met with in separate accounts of the same event, and, in fact, it does not involve a direct contradiction even in the details referred to). (c) The character of the Sermon and its position in the life and work of Christ give it a unique value as the presentation of fundamental principles for the guidance of Christ's disciples in their conduct among men. But if we grant that we have here two reports of one and the same discourse, the striking differences between them lead us to ask, In what form was this discourse actually given? In the first place, it cannot be that either of the two Evangelists simply used and altered materials that he had derived from the other, for on wider grounds it seems to be demonstrated that neither drew upon the other in any case; the probability is that while both knew Mk., neither the First nor the Third Evangelist knew the other (see Wernle, *Die Synopt. Frage*, p. 20). Nor can so violent a dealing with his materials be charged against either Evangelist. For a similar reason, we cannot suppose that they were both dependent on the same version of Matthew's *Logia*; because, if so, one or both of them must have treated its venerated contents—consisting of reports of the sayings of Jesus—in the same unscrupulous way.

They must have been working on two different collections of *Logia*, though perhaps both originally based on Matthew's Hebrew collection; and the divergence must have taken place earlier—among irresponsible transcribers—by more gradual stages. But if this be the case, the task of determining between the two reports is exceedingly difficult. Probably neither can be preferred in all respects to the other. In some cases Mt. appears to be the more correct, but in other cases the probability is with Luke.

In this connexion the most important question is that of the original form of the Beatitudes, in regard to which the following points claim our attention: (1) In Mt. there are 7 (or perhaps 8) Beatitudes; in Lk. there are 4 Beatitudes, followed by 4 Woes which do not appear in Mt. (2) The Beatitudes in Mt. are (all but the last) in the 3rd person: those in Lk. are in the 2nd person. (3) The Mt. Beatitudes describe character and its corresponding rewards; those in Lk. describe only social conditions and the future reversal of them. Now, in favour of the originality of Mt., it may be urged that the greater spiritual value of its version of the Beatitudes points to their originality, for we cannot believe that it was given to copyists and catechists to greatly enrich their Master's teachings. On the other hand, the following points should be noted: (a) It is not denied that the four Beatitudes not found in Lk. are genuine and characteristic sayings of Jesus. Assuredly the blessing on the pure in heart, which is among them, fell from His lips. But we may admit the genuineness of the sayings and yet deny them a place in the original Sermon on the Mount; for it has been shown above that Mt.'s three chapters contain insertions of sayings of Jesus spoken on various occasions, (b) The First Evangelist—or St. Matthew himself, the author of the *Logia*—elsewhere makes collections of sevens. Thus he gives 7 clauses in the Lord's Prayer (Mat_6:9-13), 7 parables (ch. 13), 7 woes (ch. 23). The genealogy consists of a triad of fourteens (Mat_1:1-16). [See Hawkins, *Hor. Synopt.* pp. 133, 134]. We know that Jesus uttered beatitudes on other occasions (e.g. Mat_11:6, Mat_13:16, Mat_16:17, Mat_24:46). (c) It is difficult to think that if our Lord gave the sayings originally with their ethical and spiritual characterization, this could have dropped out accidentally, or have been deliberately eliminated so as to confine them to social relations. To attribute the alteration to St. Luke's 'Ebionism' is to accuse the Third Evangelist of an offence in flat contradiction to his honest, declared purpose (καμοὶ π
αρηκολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς, Luk_1:3). (d) If, however, Jesus gave the Beatitudes as in Lk., His disciples may have discerned in them a deeper meaning, knowing that He was accustomed to speak in parables; or He Himself may have explained them, for we must remember that in the Gospels we have excerpts from the teachings of Jesus, pregnant sayings, parables, and aphorisms that stuck in the memory, while the fuller exposition which must often have followed is rarely given, perhaps never completely, (e) It is more likely that Jesus, when addressing His own disciples, would have used the 2nd person than that a later hand would have turned the 3rd person style of speech into the 2nd. The direct address is the more original in

form; it would be natural for catechists to generalize this, rather than the reverse. We cannot say that it was according to St. Luke's style for the 2nd person to be substituted for the 3rd, for the reverse is the case; almost every other ascription of blessedness in Lk. is in the 3rd person (*i.e.* [Luk 1:45](#), [Luk 7:23](#), [Luk 10:23](#), [Luk 11:27-28](#), [Luk 12:37-38](#); [Luk 12:43](#), [Luk 14:15](#), [Luk 23:29](#)),* [Note: [Luk 14:14](#) is in the 2nd person; but this takes the form of a promise, not that of benediction; similarly [Luk 1:22](#).] while in Mt. We have benedictions in the 2nd person (*i.e.* [Mat 13:16](#), [Mat 16:17](#), although [Mat 11:6](#), [Mat 24:46](#) are in the 3rd person). Mt. even concludes the Sermon on the Mount Beatitudes with one thrown into the 2nd person style ([Mat 5:11](#)). (f) It must be admitted that the Woes upon the rich seem out of place in an address to Christ's disciples. These, like the Beatitudes in Lk., are in the 2nd person; they must be taken as apostrophizing the absent. Still, it was our Lord's method on other occasions to speak antithetically (*e.g.* [Mat 6:19-20](#); [Mat 7:13-14](#); [Mat 7:24-27](#); [Mat 8:11-12](#)). On the whole, these considerations point to Lk.'s as the original version of the Beatitudes.

In the teaching on divorce, Lk.'s absolute statement ([Luk 16:18](#)) must be preferred to Mt.'s more qualified form of the saying ([Mat 5:32](#)), containing the clause *παρεκτός λόγου πορνείας*, although that recurs in [Mat 19:9](#) (so Holtzmann, *Hand-Com.*; but Swete, *St. Mark*, accepts the clause as original), because (a) it is not found in the more primitive version of the saying in [Mar 10:11-12](#), and (b) the softening of an apparently harsh saying by a gloss was in accordance with the tendency of scribes.

The case of the Lord's Prayer is more difficult. We saw above that the way in which it is introduced in Lk. points to the conclusion that the original setting of it was in the incident there recorded rather than in the Sermon on the Mount. Jesus may well have given the Prayer more than once (so Bernard in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, vol. iv. p. 43^a), but in Lk. it certainly appears as something new for the benefit of the disciples in answer to their request, and this is later than the version in the Sermon.

The two versions are as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Mat 6:9-13 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 . | Luk 11:2-4 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 . |
|---|---|

Over Father which art in heaven,

Father,

Hallowed be thy name.

Hallowed be thy name.

Thy kingdom come.

Thy kingdom come.

Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth.

Give us this day our daily (ἐπιούσιον) bread. Give us day by day our daily (ἱπιούσιον) bread.

And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors.

And forgive us our sins: for we ourselves also forgive every one that is indebted to us.

And bring us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one.

And bring us not into temptation.

Authorized Version of Lk. had all the clauses in Mt., but there is ample justification for the omissions seen in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 (see art. Lord's Prayer, p. 57^b). They could easily have come in through assimilation to Mt. The enrichment of the Invocation would be a natural growth. Elsewhere Mt. shows a *penchant* for the use of the word 'heaven.' Thus he, and he alone, has the expression 'the kingdom of heaven,' elsewhere invariably 'the kingdom of God.' In Rom 8:15 we have 'Abba, Father,' as the Christian invocation; cf. Mar 14:36 (see Wellhausen, *Einleit. in die drei ersten Evangelien*, p. 38). The clause 'Thy will be done,' etc. (which is better attested than the other omitted words, since it is in \aleph), may be regarded as an expansion of the clause which precedes it—'Thy kingdom come'—founded on words of Jesus spoken on another occasion (Mat 26:39, Mar 14:36, Luk 22:42). The final clause in Mt. may be taken as the antithesis and completion of the clause 'and bring us not into temptation.' These points seem to be in favour of the originality of Lk. Nevertheless, it was the Mt. fuller form of the Prayer that was adopted in the Church, as far as we have evidence, from the earliest time, for this is the form in the *Didache* (viii.). Both forms must be traced to a common Greek translation of the Aram. original, since they both contain the rare and difficult word. ἐπιούσιον Dr. Chase considers that they both exhibit the Prayer as changed for liturgical purposes.* [Note: TS, vol. i. No. 3; this is cited by Dr. Plummer in ICC on 'St. Luke'.] Dr. Plummer considers that Mt.'s form of the Prayer is the nearer to the original (Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. 141 f.). Thus he points out that the $\delta\delta\varsigma$ ἡμῖν σήμερον of Mat 6:11 is more likely to be genuine than the $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\upsilon$ ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν of Luk 11:3, because (a) καθ' ἡμέραν occurs in NT in St. Luke's writings only (Luk 19:47, Act 17:11), and (b) the present form of the verb ($\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\upsilon$), which this involves, is an exception to the forms in the other clauses, which have aorists, as Mt. has here ($\delta\delta\varsigma$).

It is not so easy to account for the omission of whole clauses by Lk. Accordingly, Dr. Plummer holds that Christ gave the Prayer originally on two different occasions in two different forms. But it has been pointed out that Lk.'s occasion requires us to view it as the first introduction of the Prayer, and yet this is later than the Sermon on the Mount. Besides, we must compare the briefer form of the Prayer with the briefer form of the Beatitudes. In both cases it is likely that the explanation is the same. Either Lk. abbreviates in both cases, or Mt. expands in both cases. With the Beatitudes we saw that the latter is the probability. Moreover, viewing Mt. as a whole, we see in it a fulness of expression not found in the other Gospels, due possibly to a catechetical use of the sayings of Christ. Thus we have the sign of Jonah explained in Mat 12:40 with a reference to the whale, while it is left indefinite in Luk 11:30; in Mat 16:16 'the Son of the living God' added to St. Peter's confession in Mar 8:29 'Thou art the Christ,' where Luk 9:20 has 'the Christ of God'; in Mat 16:28 'the Son of Man coming in his kingdom,' while Mar 9:1 and Luk 9:27 have only 'the kingdom of God,' etc.; at Mat 26:28 'unto remission of sins' with reference to the blood of the covenant at the Lord's Supper, a clause not found in Mar 14:24, Luk 22:20, 1Co 11:25. Still Lk. has characteristic additions, such as in the verse, 'I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance' (Luk 5:32), where the last two words appear to be a didactic gloss, since they are not found in Mat 9:13, Mar 2:17, and are not required by the context, but are congenial to Lk., the penitents' Gospel. Lk. has also characteristic alterations; for instance, for 'good things' in Mat 7:11, Luk 11:13 has 'the Holy Spirit,' in accordance with that Gospel's peculiarly frequent references to the Spirit of God—leaving the probability of originality with Mt. in this case. Therefore we cannot make an invariable rule of giving Lk. the preference. While, however, we cannot be positive in deciding the question, the reasons stated above seem, on the whole, to point to Lk.'s version of the Lord's Prayer as the more original. While admitting this, we may hold it probable that Mt.'s additional clauses are echoes of teachings of Jesus given on other occasions, or of His own explanations of the Prayer, analogously to the case of Mt.'s Beatitudes compared with Lk.'s. See, further, art. Lord's Prayer.

In other parts of the Sermon on the Mount the question of priority and superiority of authority is of less importance, since the divergences between Mt. and Lk. are less significant (see Wellhausen, *Einleitung*, pp. 67-73).

4. Scene and circumstances.—A Latin tradition, that cannot be traced back earlier than the 13th cent. and is not found in the Eastern Church, gives *Karn Hattin*, a two-peaked hill a little south west of the plain of Gennesaret, as the locality of the delivery of the Sermon. All that can be said in its favour is that this mountain would be a very suitable spot; but there is no means of confirming so late a tradition. There is a discrepancy between Mt. and Lk., the one stating that Jesus gave the Sermon when He was on the mountain, the other that it was on a level place after He had

come down from the mountain. It has been suggested by the harmonists that the level place might be somewhere among the hollows and shoulders of the mountain, so that, while Jesus had to descend to it, it was still in some degree on the mountain. But while this may be allowed as a possibility, the discrepancy is only one of many that are scattered over the Gospels, most of which may be regarded as too trivial to affect the question of historicity.

The circumstances under which the Sermon on the Mount was delivered justify the exceptional importance that has always been attached to it. It was given early in our Lord's ministry, though not at the commencement. It belongs to the first year, before the disfavour of the authorities had arisen, or at all events before it had become serious; but it is sufficiently late for the popularity of the new Teacher to have reached a climax. The primitive stage of the Galilaean mission consisted of a round of preaching in the synagogues; the second stage, still in the first year, is characterized more by open-air preaching, necessitated by the vast growth of the crowds who pressed to hear the popular Teacher, and by their insistence on hearing Him in season and out of season without waiting for the set times of the synagogue services. Internally the teaching of Jesus has undergone development. At the primitive stage it followed closely the lines laid down by John the Baptist, and could be summarized under the formula, 'Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand,' that is to say, it was an announcement of the coming Kingdom. But at the more advanced stages, to which the great Sermon belongs, Jesus had passed on from 'preaching' (κήρυγμα) to teaching (διδασκαλία), and was now expounding the nature of the Kingdom, its character, principles, processes. The Sermon on the Mount comes into this category. It is teaching, rather than preaching. Further, as a consequence, it was originally designed for disciples, for those who seriously desired to learn. This is made evident by the introductions of both Evangelists. In Mt. we read, 'And seeing the *multitudes* (τὸν ὄχλον), he went up into the mountain; and when he had sat down, his *disciples* (οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ) came unto him: and he opened his mouth, and taught them (αὐτοὺς),' *i.e.* the disciples (Mat 5:1-2). Here the distinction between the crowd and the learners is very marked. It was to avoid the crowd that Jesus retreated to the mountain—a common habit, referred to on several occasions. Then the eager inquirers followed; and finding Him there, led Him to speak to them, or, as seems more likely, they came at His own invitation. The situation is not so clear in Lk., where the coming of the crowd to Christ follows His visit to the mountain, which He had ascended for prayer (Luk 6:12), and where He had chosen the Twelve Apostles (Luk 6:13); and whence He had come down with them, after which He 'stood on a level place' (Luk 6:17). Still Lk. preserves the distinction between the disciples and the crowd by saying, 'And a great multitude of his *disciples*, and a great number of the *people* from all Judaea,' etc. (Luk 6:17). Having described the cures, which in Mt. preceded the

ascent of the mountain, he says, 'And he lifted up his eyes on his *disciples*, and said,' etc.—here commencing his version of the great Sermon. Thus in Lk. this is delivered to the first of the two groups, the disciples in distinction from the crowd, as in Mt. Moreover, the use of the 2nd person in the Lukan version of the Beatitudes evidently indicates disciples—a fact which the apostrophe of the absent rich does not nullify; because in each case a specific class, not the mixed multitude, is contemplated. As we proceed with the Sermon, this fact repeatedly emerges. It is only to His own disciples that Jesus could say, 'Ye are the salt of the earth' ... 'Ye are the light of the world' (Mat 5:13-14). It is no objection that towards the end of the discourse Jesus says, 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven,' etc. (Mat 7:21), and concludes with the parable of the Two Foundations, because these warnings might well be needed by many disciples. There was a traitor even among the Twelve. We are not to conclude, however, that these disciples consisted only of the Apostles. St. Luke had expressly said that 'there was a great multitude of his *disciples*' (Luk 6:17) present on this occasion.

In Lk. (Luk 6:13) the Sermon follows the choosing and appointment of the Apostles; and this fact has led some to regard it as 'the charge to the Twelve.' But in Mt. there is no description of the choice of the Apostles, and they are not especially associated with the Sermon. In both Gospels the introduction of the Sermon introduces a much larger audience. All the genuine 'hearers of the word,' all who expressly sought out Jesus and set themselves to learn of Him, are included in the comprehensive group of 'disciples.' Still the audience was virtually confined to this group. The Sermon was for disciples, not for the world at large. It may be pointed out, on the other hand, that while the introduction to the Sermon in both Gospels has this indication, the comments which follow it in each case seem to point to the general public. Thus in Mat 7:28 it is said, 'And it came to pass, when Jesus ended these words, the *multitudes* were astonished at his teaching,' etc., and in Luk 7:1 'After he had ended all his sayings in the ears of the *people*.' The language, however, is indefinite in both cases and perhaps not specially considered, for no emphasis is here laid on the nature of the hearers, as was the case in the introductory descriptions.

5. Purpose and character.—The purpose of the Sermon on the Mount can be understood only when account is taken of the audience to which it was addressed. Since this audience consisted of disciples and not the public, we must read the discourse as an ethical directory for Christians. Therefore the question as to whether its precepts can be embodied in the laws of the State is irrelevant. A group of Galilaean peasants in a province of the Roman Empire had nothing whatever to do with the business of legislation; and even in contemplation of the future spread of Christianity it could not have been the intention of Christ that principles which He desired to see working outward from the heart should be imposed upon a community by force with the external authority of the magistrate. But while it is a mistake to

regard the Sermon on the Mount as a model for civil and criminal law, on the other hand it would be an error to abandon its ideal in favour of a lower code of ethics even in the police courts. The disciple of Christ will always desire to see His will carried out; but this does not mean that he is at liberty to force his Master's precepts on a society that is reluctant to obey them because it has not submitted to the authority from which they emanated. If we can look forward to a condition in which the State is effectually Christianized, then we shall have a society in which the magistrate is not needed; that is to say, the removal of the conditions which now prevent the Sermon on the Mount being applied in the police court will abolish the police court itself as an anachronism. Therefore we must view the Sermon on the Mount as primarily aiming at the direction of the conduct of Christians in their personal behaviour as individuals and members of a brotherhood. It has relations to the outside world in so far as Christian men and women have such relations. For instance, commands about love to enemies and kindness to persecutors are especially concerned with the conduct of Christians towards people who are not of their own fellowship. Still, it is the conduct of Christians only that is considered. These considerations should safeguard the interpreter against two other misapprehensions: (1) It is an error to regard the Sermon on the Mount as the sum and substance of Christianity, and to condemn later developments as not of the essence of Christianity (Hatch, Harnack). We have no evidence that Jesus Christ intended to put His whole message into this one discourse. He is here discussing the ethics of the Kingdom of heaven. Elsewhere He treats of other features of the Kingdom. (2) Since this discourse lays down principles of conduct for discipleship, the discipleship must have been previously established in other ways (e.g. denying self, taking up the cross, following Christ, turning and becoming as little children, etc., as elsewhere indicated by Jesus Christ).

In the main, the Sermon on the Mount indicates the character of life and conduct that Jesus Christ commends to His disciples as the rule of life. Commencing with the Beatitudes, He points out the way to true happiness. This is more apparent in Mt. than in Lk.; but if the Beatitudes in the former Gospel may be taken as at least a true exposition of the deeper meaning of the simpler felicitations in the latter Gospel, it is safe to say that Jesus here teaches that blessedness is associated with character. The conduct commended throughout the Sermon is set forth by Christ as a fulfilment of the Law and the Prophets (Mat. 5:17). It completes what was imperfect in the earlier religion by realizing its essential principles and developing them to perfection. The consequence is that external precepts of the more primitive condition are abrogated—not universally, but wherever they conflict with a later ethical development. This applies to the Sacred Torah as well as to traditions of the scribes, as in the examples of hatred, divorce, swearing, and revenge, formerly permitted under certain conditions, though regulated and restrained by the Law, but now absolutely forbidden by Christ. In the next place, conduct condoned or even honoured hitherto is condemned as unworthy of the higher standard set up by Christ. In

particular, ostentation in almsgiving, in public praying, and in fasting is reprobated, and the habit of judging others is reprov'd. The Sermon closes with warnings against being deceived by false prophets, and insists forcibly that mere discipleship in hearing the teaching is vain; the end of all is energetic conduct in obedience to this instruction. The principal interpolations consist of (1) two passages encouraging prayer (Mat 6:9-15; Mat 7:7-11), and (2) one long passage discouraging worldly anxiety (Mat 6:19-34). They rest their exhortations equally on the Fatherly goodness of God. They are among the choicest and most beautiful of our Lord's teachings, plainly vindicating their right to places in the *Logia* by their character as of the inner essence of His message, even if their inconsistency with the How of the argument in the Sermon, supported by the fact that they are placed in other parts of His narrative by Lk., leads us to regard them as out of place when inserted in this particular discourse.

See also such articles as Authority of Christ, Law, Teaching of Christ, etc. etc.

Literature.—This is given exhaustively at the end of Votaw's art. 'Sermon on the Mount' in the Ext. Vol. of Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible . The following selection may be found useful: Tholuck, *Bergrede Christi* [English translation from 4th ed., Edin. 1860]; Achelis, *Die Bergpredigt*, 1875; B. W. Bacon, *Sermon on the Mount*, 1902; J. B. Bousset, *Le Sermon sur la Montagne*, 1900; C. Gore, *The Sermon on the Mount*, 1896; W. B. Carpenter, *The Great Charter of Christ*, 1895; J. Oswald Dykes, *The Manifesto of the King*, 1881; the Comm. of B. Weiss, H. Holtzmann, Morison, Bruce, Plummer, etc.

W. F. Adeney.

☞ Serpent

SERPENT.—The prevalence of serpents in ancient Palestine is illustrated by the fact that no fewer than 11 Heb. words are rendered 'serpent' in OT. Tristram (*Nat. Hist. of Bible*) states that 33 different species of serpent are still found in Syria. Of 18 varieties which he himself secured, 13 were innocuous and 4 deadly, including cobras and vipers. Naturally there are numerous references, in the OT, in the NT, and in Rabbinical literature, to serpents as well-known but generally disagreeable inhabitants of the country. So unpleasantly common were they, that it was regarded as one of the perpetual miracles of Jerusalem that no one was ever bitten by a serpent there. The references in the Gospels may conveniently be grouped under three heads.

1. In Mat 10:16 our Lord charges His disciples, ‘Be ye wise as serpents’ (φορόνιμοι ὡς οἱ ὄφεις). There may be here a reference to Gen 3:1 ‘the serpent was more subtil (עָרֵם) than any beast of the field.’ The Heb. word means ‘shrewd,’ and is used also in a good sense (cf. Pro 12:16; Pro 12:23), although the parallel root in Arabic suggests only a bad sense. It is probable, however, that our Lord refers to the well-known habits of the serpent, its ability to conceal itself in unexpected places, and to escape swiftly and silently in time of danger (cf. בְּרַחַת נָתַשׁ ‘the swift serpent’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 , Job 26:13, Isa 27:1).

2. But the phrase which follows in Mat 10:16 ‘and harmless (ἀκέραιοι) as doves,’ suggests that there was also in the mind of Jesus the equally well-known reputation of the serpent as a dangerous reptile; and this is borne out by other passages in the Gospels. Almost parallel are Mar 16:18 ‘they shall take up serpents,’ and Luk 10:19 ‘I give you power over serpents’; while the noxious and repulsive nature of the serpent is referred to in Mat 7:10, Luk 11:11 ‘if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent?’

In all the above passages, ὄφεις, the generic name for a serpent, is used. But in Mat 3:7; Mat 12:34; Mat 23:33, Luk 3:7 we find ἔχιδνα, which probably means a *poisonous* serpent, and is rendered ‘viper’ both in Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 . In Mat 23:33 Jesus employs both words to describe the Pharisees—ὄφεις, γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, ‘serpents, offspring [see Generation] of vipers’ (cf. Mic 7:17).

3. Very different is the passage Joh 3:14 ‘and as Moses lifted up the serpent (τὸν ὄφιν) in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up,’ where the reference is to the plague of serpents among the Israelites in the wilderness and the miraculous cure, as recorded in Num 21:6-9. Full consideration of this passage, and of its relation to 2Ki 18:4, does not fall within the scope of this article (see art. ‘Nehushtan’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible iii. 510^b). It is interesting, however, to note, in connexion with Joh 3:14, that both passages in the OT have been regarded as pointing to serpent-worship in some form among the early Hebrews.

Literature.—On the symbolism of the serpent: Baudissin, *Studien zur Semit. Religionsgesch.* i. 257-292; Nöldeke, ‘Die Schlange nach arab. [Note: Arabic.] Volksglauben’ in *Ztschr. f. Völkerpsychologie*. On natural history: Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*; O. Günther, *Die Reptilien und Amphibien von Syrien*; Doughty, *Arabia Deserta*. See also Schultz, *OT Theol.* (English translation) ii. 272; Sayce, *Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia*, pp. 208-214; Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible iv. 459.

☩ Serug

SERUG.—A link in our Lord's genealogy (Luk_3:35, Authorized Version *Saruch*).

☩ Servant

SERVANT.—See artt. Service, Slave; and for 'Servant of the Lord' see Prophet, p. 432^a.

☩ Service

SERVICE.—There are 5 words which with their derivatives are used to convey the idea of 'service' in the NT: λειτουργεῖν, λατρεύειν, ὑπηρέτης, διάκονος and δοῦλος. Of these λειτουργεῖν (λεῖτος = δημόσιος and ἔργον) is used to denote service rendered to the State. It indicates the unreckoned generosity, the uncalculating devotion of patriotic service of city or country. This idea is fully indicated in such passages as Rom_15:16, Php_2:17, and in connexion with διακονία in 2Co_9:12. The word was early used in the Christian Church to indicate the service of God in special offices and ministries. Thus in the one passage in which it appears in the Gospels (Luk_1:23) it is used of the priest Zacharias, as it is afterwards used of the great High Priest in Heb_8:1 ff. Very much the same may be said of the second word λατρεύειν. In classical Greek it was used of the service of the gods, and in the NT it is used of the service rendered to Jehovah by the whole tribe of Israel (Act_26:7 and Rom_9:4). Thus Augustine says: 'λατρεία ... aut semper aut tam frequenter ut fere semper, ea dicitur servitus quae pertinet ad colendum Deum' (*e. Faust.* 20, 21). This distinct use of the word appears in all those passages in which it is used in the Gospels: Mat_4:10, Luk_1:74; Luk_2:37. Though these words are full of significance as used in the NT, we need not in this article examine further into their use, inasmuch as they do not appear in the Gospels in connexion with that form of service which Christ either illustrated in Himself or explicitly taught. It is in the remaining words that we must find whatever teaching is suggested by the terminology of the Evangelists.

διάκονος is used in what was doubtless the original meaning of the word, *i.e.* ‘one who waits at table,’ in [Joh 2:5](#); [Joh 2:9](#) (see also [Mat 22:13](#) and [Joh 12:2](#)). It represents the servant in his activity rather than in any relation to his Lord. The δίακονος executes the commands of his master. Thus, while in [Mat 22:2-14](#) the δούλος invites the guests to the feast, it is the διάκονος who expels the unworthy guest. Another word closely allied in use to διάκονος is ὑπηρέτης, ‘the rower,’ then the subordinate official, and then the performer of any hard labour ([Mat 5:25](#), [Luk 4:20](#)). The difference between the two words is to be sought in the direction of the official relation of the ὑπηρέτης to his master.

By far the most commonly used word in this connexion is δούλος, ‘the bondservant.’ It is used almost as an equivalent to διάκονος to indicate the lowliness of the service rendered. Where the two words are brought into juxtaposition, the difference between them seems to lie in this, that while διάκονος indicates the activity of the servant, δούλος indicates rather the completeness of his subordination. Thus, in speaking of Christ, St. Paul calls Him the διάκονος of the circumcision ([Rom 15:8](#)), while he says that He took upon Him the μορφήν δούλου ([Php 2:7](#)). So also in [Luk 12:37](#) watchfulness is the token of the activity of the servant. The humility of service, therefore, while not lacking entirely from the word διάκονος, belongs more particularly to δούλος. It is on the lines of this distinction that the words of Christ as recorded in [Mat 20:26](#); [Mat 20:28](#) may be explained. There it will be seen that, while διάκονος is the antithesis of μέγας, the antithesis of δούλος is found in πρῶτος; as though Christ would teach that true greatness lies in the doing of service, while the highest position in His Kingdom belongs to him who will accept the lowly position of the slave.

In this last passage and again in [Luk 22:26](#) Christ lays down service as the law of His Kingdom. The position of a minister was that which He accepted for Himself; ‘He came not to be ministered unto, but to minister’ ([Mat 20:28](#)), and He looked to those who would follow Him to accept a similar rule of life for themselves ([Luk 22:26](#), [Joh 13:16](#); cf. [Joh 12:16](#)). This idea of service as the law of the Kingdom of God was no new one in Jewish thought. Many years before, the author of Isaiah 40-56 had spoken of both the deliverer and the delivered as ‘the servant of Jehovah.’ Both He who through suffering should redeem the people, and the people themselves, idealized as they were in the vision of the seer, were to serve. The one was to be

‘despised and rejected of men,’ and the other, blind, deaf, plundered, and despised, was to be exalted by the very service in which he proved his submission and obedience. Each was to be Jehovah’s δούλος.

Throughout the parabolic teaching of Jesus the use of this word is sufficiently frequent to be significant; but if He had given no other teaching in this connexion, His mind would have been sufficiently expressed in His acted parable on the occasion when He Himself stooped to the most menial of all menial service, and washed the feet of His disciples. When at length His self-imposed task was complete, ‘He said unto them, A servant is not greater than his Lord; ... I have given you an example that ye also should do as I have done unto you’ (Joh 13:1-17). In this service, which Christ enjoins as well as accepts, there are one or two notes which are peculiarly His own. The first of these is, that it is a service which is not imposed upon the individual from outside, but is a spontaneous act of submission. It was in this way that He Himself had entered upon that service μορφήν δούλου λαβών (Php 2:7), and it is in this way that He calls upon His disciples to serve (Mat 20:26). Indeed, it was only thus that service could be of any moral value to the servant. The compelled service is barren of aught but the spirit of rebellion, and it finds no place in Christ’s scheme. The service that is grudged or unwilling is not to be discovered in His example. As St. Paul afterwards taught, there is a recognition of the freedom of the individual in this, that he is allowed to ‘yield himself a servant unto obedience,’ and the bond which he thus casts upon himself grows closer with every subsequent act of obedience (Rom 6:16). The second note is that of completeness. This service is complete in its self-dedication and exclusive in its object. Christ acknowledged from the beginning a sense of constraint when He said that He must be in His Father’s house (Luk 2:49). His surrender to that compelling force was full; He found it His ‘meat to do the will’ of His Father, and to accomplish His work (Joh 4:34). Equally full was the devotion which He realized, for He ‘did always the things that pleased him’ (Joh 8:29).

These with the other passages already cited sufficiently indicate the character of the service which belongs to the Kingdom of God. It has a definite and undivided purpose. It is not qualified either in its sanction or in its claim to occupy and dominate the whole life of the Christian. Equally marked is its measure or intensity. Both in the terms that are used and in the examples afforded, it is taught that sacrifice, even that ultimate form of sacrifice which for mortals is realized in death, is the one condition of service.

Literature.—Fairbairn, *Religion in History and in the Life of To-day*; Church, *The Gifts of Civilization*; Westcott, *Lessons from Work*; Wendt, *The Teaching of Jesus*, i. p. 325 ff.; Bruce, *The Kingdom of God*, p. 220; Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*; Ely, *Social Aspects of Christianity*; Lyman Abbott, *Christianity and Social*

Problems; S. D. Gordon, *Quiet Talks on Service*; J. H. Thom, *Laws of Life*, 2nd ser. 347; Phillips Brooks, *Addresses*, 1; A. Smellie, *Service and Inspiration* (1904).

W. W. Holdsworth.

⚡Session

SESSION.—In the exaltation of Jesus Christ which followed His death upon the Cross, three distinct stages are indicated, viz. the Resurrection, the Ascension, and the Session, which means the *sitting* or the *state of being seated*. Harnack indeed thinks that in some of the oldest accounts the resurrection and the sitting at the right hand of God are taken as parts of the same act, without mention of any ascension. But take one of these accounts: in Rom 8:34 St. Paul writes: Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀποθανὼν μᾶλλον δὲ ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν, ὃς ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὃς καὶ ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. ‘Here,’ writes Swete (*Apostles’ Creed*, p. 67 f.), ‘are four well-marked links in a chain of facts—our Lord’s Death, Resurrection, Session, Intercession. It is difficult to see why the second and the third, the Resurrection and the Session, should be taken as parts of the same act, when the first is clearly distinct. If the Ascension is not mentioned, it is implied in the Session, for it is contrary to the usage of the NT to interpret ἐγείρεσθαι of any exaltation beyond the mere recall from death. In other passages the ellipsis is equally easy to supply. Thus St. Peter’s words in Act 2:32 (τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνέστησεν ὁ θεός ... τῇ δεξιᾷ οὐρανῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ὑψωθείς) are interpreted by 1Pe 3:21-22’ (δι’ ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ, πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν). It would go against the whole tenor of the NT to regard them as merely different names for the same event; the Session is the glorified state into which the Ascension was the solemn entrance.

The Session is related as a fact of history only in Mar 16:19 : He ‘sat down at the right hand of God,’ which belongs at latest to the earlier sub-Apostolic age. Yet this is not so remarkable when we remember that St. Matthew and St. John do not carry their accounts beyond the Resurrection. Its truth, however, is amply established by the fact that it was expressly foretold by Christ Himself (Mat 19:28; Mat 25:31; Mat 26:64 ||). It was the fulfilment of prophecy; cf. Psa 110:1, to which reference was made by the Lord (Mat 22:42 f.), which was quoted by St. Peter (Act 2:34) and the author of Hebrews (Heb 1:13), and enlarged upon in Eph 1:20 f.; cf. also Psa 2:6; Psa 45:6, Isa 16:5, Luk 1:32. And it found a prominent place in the doctrinal system of the NT

writers (Eph 1:20, Col 3:1, Heb 1:3; Heb 1:13; Heb 8:1; Heb 10:12, Rom 8:34, 2Co 5:10 (βῆμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ), 1Pe 3:22, Rev 3:21).

That Psa 110:1 was taken in the Messianic sense by the Jews of the time of our Lord is evident from Mat 22:42 f., where His opponents did not deny that the writer was speaking of the Christ; and in many of their older exegetical writings this interpretation was adopted. Jennings and Lowe (*The Psalms*) quote the following passage which occurs in the Midrash *Tillim* on Psa 18:36 : ‘R. Yoden said in the name of R. Chama, In the time to come the Holy One, Blessed be He, causes the King Messiah to sit at His right hand, according as it is said, “The utterance of Jehovah to my Lord, Sit Thou on My right hand,” and Abraham on His left. And the face of Abraham grows pale, and he says, “The son of my son sits on the right hand, but I on the left”; and the Holy One, Blessed be He, appeases him, and says, “The son of thy son is at My right hand, but I am at thy right hand”: and this is implied by (ביכיל), “Jehovah upon thy right hand.” ’ Later Jewish writers seek to explain the words as referring to Abraham (Rashi), David (Aben Ezra, Mendelssohn), Hezekiah, or Zerubbabel, with regard to which interpretations see Jennings and Lowe, *op. cit.*; Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. vi.; and Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 405. Kautzsch in his art. ‘Religion of Israel’ (Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible , Extra Vol. p. 727), thinks the primary reference was to a Maccabaeen priest-prince, possibly Simon, who in the year 141 b.c. became by a popular resolution hereditary high priest and prince of the people. Delitzsch considers this Psalm the only one which is directly Messianic, in the sense that it contains prophecy immediately pointing to the person of a coming; Anointed One, who was fully to set up God’s Kingdom on earth. On the whole question of interpretation consult Davison’s art. ‘Psalms’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible , vol. iv. p. 160.

Accordingly the Session forms a distinct article (‘ascendit in caelos, sedet ad dexteram Patris’) in the old Roman Creed as represented in the Greek confession of Marcellus and in the Latin of Rufinus, of which Harnack writes: ‘We may regard it as an assured result of research that the old Roman Creed ... came into existence about or shortly before the middle of of the second century.’ It is found also in a form of creed given by Tertullian (*de Praeser. Haeret.* c. 13), ‘in caelos ereptum sedisse ad dexteram Patris,’ and in another (*de Virg. Vel.* 1), ‘receptum in caelis sedentem nune ad dexteram Patris.’ Its importance is equally marked in the formulae; of the Eastern Church, καθίσαντα ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρὸς (early Creed of Jerusalem collected from Cyril), καθεσθέντα ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρὸς (Creed of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, vii. 41), καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρὸς (Creed of Constantinople).

In NT the reference is sometimes to the act of taking a position; cf. Heb 1:3 ‘sat down (ἐκάθισεν) on the right hand of the Majesty on high,’ which describes the solemn assumption of the seat of authority, which rightly belongs to One whose dignity is expressed in such unique terms as are used in the preceding clauses; and ‘throughout the Epistle to the Hebrews (except Heb 1:13, κάθου from LXX Septuagint) the reference is uniformly to the act of taking the royal seat’ (Westcott on Heb 10:12, cf. also Rev 3:21); in Rev 12:2 the Perfect (κεκάθικεν), found in the best Manuscripts , denotes the entrance on a permanent state. In Mat 19:28; Mat 25:31 the reference is to taking the throne of His glory for judgment. The verb is twice used transitively to describe the action of the Father in raising Christ from the dead and making Him to sit at His right hand (Eph 1:20 and Act 2:30 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). Elsewhere the Session is described rather as a state; cf. Mat 26:64, Luk 22:69 (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘shall be seated,’ Vulgate ‘erit sedens’), Col 3:1 (οὗ ὁ Χριστός ἐστίν ... καθήμενος, ‘where Christ is seated,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), and Rom 8:34, 1Pe 3:22 where ὅς ἐστίν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ has the same meaning; in Psa 110:1 κάθου (LXX Septuagint) also marks continuous session as distinct from assumption of place.

The Session is spoken of as ‘at the right hand of God’ (Mar 16:19, Col 3:1 et al.; cf. Eph 1:20 and Act 2:33 (Revised Version margin)), elsewhere variously, ‘at the right hand of power’ (Mat 26:64), ‘of the power of God’ (Luk 22:69), ‘of the Majesty on high’ (Heb 1:3), ‘of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens’ (Heb 8:1), ‘of the throne of God’ (Heb 12:2). The Greek is either ἐκ δεξιῶν, which is the uniform phrase in the Synoptics and in quotation of Psa 110:1 (Act 2:34, Heb 1:13), or ἐκ δεξιᾷ, which is used in the Epistles (Rom 8:34, Eph 1:20 et al.; cf. Act 2:33 τῆ δεξιᾷ, ‘at the right hand,’ (Revised Version margin)). It is difficult to determine what is the exact force of the expression. God is Spirit, He has no body, and He is omnipresent, consequently the right hand of God is everywhere (*dextera Dei unigue est*). Therefore its use as referring to the Father is to be taken as a necessary accommodation to our limited minds, which can think only in terms of time and space, and which can have no conception of pure spirit. Among men, to be set on one a right hand has a well-defined meaning: it signifies to be in the highest place of honour, to be recognized as a sharer in rule; cf. 1Ki 2:19, Psa 45:9, Mat 20:21; Josephus *Ant.* vi. xi. 9 (παρακαθεσθέντων αὐτῷ, τοῦ μὲν παιδὸς Ἰωνάθου [1Sa 20:25] ἐκ δεξιῶν). Thus ‘Hiempsal ... dextra Adherbalem adsedit ... quod apud Numidas honori ducitur’ (Sallust, *Jugurtha*, xi. 3). See art. ‘Symbol’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible , Extra Vol. p. 172. This is the sense in which the Fathers interpret the words; as Westcott

points out in his notes on Heb 8:1, they carefully avoided all puerile anthropomorphism in their treatment of ‘the right hand of God’; for example, ‘plenitudinem majestatis summamque gloriam beatitudinis et prosperitatis debemus per dexteram intelligere in qua filius sedet’ (Primas.); οὐχ ὅτι τόπω περικλείεται ὁ θεός, ἀλλ’ ἵνα τὸ ὁμότιμον αὐροῦ δειχθῆ τὸ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα (Theophylact).

As regards Jesus Christ, however, it is not so clear that the expression is entirely figurative. He ascended with His human body, which was indeed glorified and freed from many of its previous limitations; but it belongs to the very essence of the idea of a body that it should occupy a certain definite space. Since, then, His body cannot be ubiquitous, it seems necessary to think of it as raised at the Ascension to some distinct place. ‘He went into the place of all places in the universe of things, in situation most eminent, in quality most holy, in dignity most excellent, in glory most illustrious, the inmost sanctuary of God’s temple above’ (Barrow, *Sermon on the Ascension*). Thus Stier holds fast ‘the certain ποῦ of heaven, yea, of the throne of God in it.’ And Meyer (on Mar 16:19, Eph 1:20) says the expression is not to be transferred into a vague conception of a *status cœlestis*, of a higher relation to the world and the like, but is to be left as a specification of place; for Christ is with His glorified body, as σύνθρονος of the Father, on the seat where Divine Majesty is enthroned (cf. Mat 6:9), from which hereafter He will return to judgment; meantime He is patiently waiting at the centre of all worship and power (Heb 10:12-13): cf. also Ellicott on Eph 1:20. This view agrees with the tenor of the Holy Scriptures, which seem to imply that while God is everywhere, yet there is a place (described as ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, ἐν οὐρανοῖς) where He specially manifests Himself in peculiar glory to heavenly beings (cf. Isa 6:1; Isa 66:1, Psa 2:4; Psa 102:19, 1Ti 6:16), whence the Holy Spirit and the voice of God came (Mat 3:16-17, Joh 12:28). Yet, on the other hand, Milligan (*The Ascension of Our Lord*, Lect. I.) points out that heaven in the NT ‘is contrasted with earth less as one *place* than as one *state* is contrasted with another,’ comparing Joh 3:13 ‘No man hath ascended into heaven, but he that descended out of heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven’ [but ἄβλ [Note: L Bampton Lecture.] do not give ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ], and quoting Westcott (on Heb 1:3), ‘all local association must be excluded,’ the reference being to dignity and honour, not locality; cf. also Joh 1:18, Eph 4:10. And Grimm-Thayer says ‘that these expressions are to be understood in this figurative sense and not of a fixed and definite place in the highest heavens, will be questioned by no one who carefully considers Rev 3:21.’ See also Abbott, ‘Ephesians’ (*ad 1:20*), in the ICC [Note: CC International Critical Commentary.] .

Sitting at the right hand of God is the compendious description of the present life of Christ in glory. It is evident from those passages which speak of it as a continuous state, that the expression cannot be taken literally, otherwise they would convey the idea that the attitude of sitting is perpetual. Besides, we find simply 'is at the right hand' in Rom 8:34, 1Pe 3:22; in other places He is represented in a different attitude, as standing (Act 7:56), walking (Rev 2:1; Rev 3:4; Rev 14:4); and John (Rev 1:13) saw Him 'girt about at the breasts with a golden girdle' (which was 'worn in this manner by priests when they were engaged in active service' [Milligan]).

In the vision of St. Stephen a beautiful explanation of the 'standing' has long been given, viz. that he saw Jesus as risen from His throne and in the act of coming to help His suffering servant and faithful martyr. So Meyer, Trench, Conybeare and Howson, *et al.*, following Chrysostom, τί οὐ, ἰστώτα καὶ οὐχὶ καθήμενον; ἵνα δείξη τὴν ἀντίληψιν τὴν εἰς τὸν μάρτυρα καὶ γὰρ περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς λέγεται 'ἀνάστα ὁ θεός,' and Gregory the Great, 'Stephanus in labore certaminis positus stantem vidit quern adiutorem habuit.' See the Collect for St. Stephen's Day, and Alford's note on Act 7:55, where he inclines to a different interpretation.

The Session of Christ is connected with His work as King, Priest, Intercessor, and Judge. (1) It expresses His *sovereignty and majesty*; thereby He entered on the full and permanent participation in the Divine glory, not merely resuming the glory which He had resigned at the Incarnation (Joh 17:5), but receiving the added glory won by His obedience even unto the death of the Cross (Php 2:8 f., Heb 2:9); thereby the promises made to David concerning his son were fulfilled (cf. Psa 2:6; Psa 24:9, 1Co 15:25, Eph 1:20 f.). All power is given unto Him in heaven and in earth (Mat 28:18), God 'hath put all things in subjection under his feet' (1Co 15:27). (2) It betokens *an accomplished work* (Heb 10:12 f.); His earthly life completed, the suffering and the humiliation ended; *yet not inactivity*, for Joh 5:17 still holds true of the exalted Christ; such perfect rest as 'answers to the being of God "who worketh hitherto" without effort and without failure' (Westcott, *The Historic Faith*, Art. vi.), and is consistent with His readiness to sympathize with His people on earth, and to help them in time of need; cf. Heb 2:18; Heb 4:15 f. (3) It signifies His *unique dignity and honour*. In God's presence the angels stand, or fall on their faces (Isa 6:2, 1Ki 22:19); the priests stood in the Temple when ministering (Heb 10:11). He alone is said to sit on God's right hand. τὸ ἐστάναι τοῦ λειτουργοῦν ἐστὶ σημεῖον, οὐκοῦν τὸ καθῆσθαι τοῦ λειτουργεῖσθαι, and τοῦτο οὐχὶ τοῦ ἱερέως ἀλλὰ τοῦτο ᾧ ἱεραῖσθαι ἐκεῖνον χρὴ (Chrys.). Θεὸν ἔχομεν ἀρχιερεῖα. τὸ γὰρ καθῆσθαι οὐδενὸς ἄλλου ἢ θεοῦ (Theophylact). (4) It expresses His *dignity as Priest-King*. Westcott remarks (Add. Note on Heb 8:1) that in this Epistle to the Hebrews His Session is always (except in 1:13) connected with the fulfilment of priestly work, of which it marks two different

aspects. Before He sat down He fulfilled the type of Aaron, offering the sacrifice of Himself and passing into heaven, into the presence of God. Since that time He fulfils the royal priesthood of Melchizedek; He intercedes for men as their representative (Rom 8:34, Heb 7:25, 1Jn 2:1), presenting their petitions and praises (Heb 13:15, Rom 16:27, 1Pe 2:5), securing access for His people now to 'the holy place' where He Himself is, by His blood (Heb 4:16; Heb 10:19 f.), and acting as a minister (λειτουρογός) of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle (Heb 8:2 where see Westcott's note); He also rules and guides His Church, being with His people always, even unto the end of the world (Mat 28:20), and in the midst where two or three are gathered together in His name (Mat 18:20). (5) It implies His work as *Judge*, which is the aspect chiefly presented in the Gospels (Mat 19:28; Mat 25:31, Mar 14:62; cf. Isa 16:5 and 2Co 5:10 'the judgment-seat of Christ'). Thus we are to understand by the Session that Christ, having accomplished on earth the work of redemption, now occupies the place of highest honour, most exalted majesty, and perfect bliss, and that God has conferred upon Him all pre-eminence of dignity, power, favour, and felicity. With regard to the particular form in which this is expressed, Sanday (in his art. 'Jesus Christ' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. p. 642^b) well says: 'We speak of these things κατὰ ἄνθρωπον; or rather, we are content to echo in regard to them the language of the Apostles and of the first Christians, who themselves spoke κατὰ ἄνθρωπον. The reality lies behind the veil.' See also art. Ascension.

Literature.—Denney, art. 'Ascension' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, vol. i.; Sanday, 'Jesus Christ,' *ib.* vol. ii. p. 642; Swete, *The Apostles' Creed*; Westcott, *The Historic Faith and Epistle to Hebrews*; Milligan, *The Ascension of Our Lord*; Trench, *Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount*, ch. vi.; Pearson, *Exposition of the Creed*, Art. vi. The relation of the Session of Christ to His presence among His people and to the Lutheran doctrine of His ubiquity is discussed at length in Martensen's *Christian Dogmatics*, §§ 174-180.

W. H. Dundas.

☩ Seth

SETH.—The patriarch, mentioned as a link in our Lord's genealogy (Luk 3:38).

☩ Seven Words, The

SEVEN WORDS, THE.—These words, spoken by our Lord from the cross, are recorded by the different Evangelists, one by St. Matthew and St. Mark conjointly, three by St. Luke, and three by St. John. The progressive stages by which they are characterized may be taken to show a gradual unfolding of the will and purpose of God for the redemption of mankind. They seem to sum up in themselves the whole of the gospel. The first three words, ‘Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do’ ([Luk 23:34](#)), ‘Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise’ ([Luk 23:43](#)), and ‘Woman, behold thy son ... behold thy mother’ ([Joh 19:26-27](#)), were spoken between the third and the sixth hour, and they reveal to us the great High Priest, in His life of ministry, interceding for the transgressors, proclaiming pardon to the penitent, and blessing His own. The two next words, ‘My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?’ ([Mat 27:46](#), [Mar 15:34](#)), and ‘I thirst’ ([Joh 19:28](#)), were spoken in the darkness; nature is wrapped in gloom as the God-man, bearing the burden and the curse of sin that is not His own, reveals to us something of the mystery of suffering. The two last words, ‘It is finished’ ([Joh 19:30](#)), and ‘Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit’ ([Luk 23:46](#)), were spoken in the restored light. They reveal to us the victory, the completed work, and the entering into rest. All seven words are words of love. It was love that animated Him from the time when ‘for us men and for our salvation He came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made Man’ (Nicene Creed). It was love that entered into the whole of His life on earth, but that love shines with its brightest lustre in the cross. His ministry of intercession, of reconciliation, of blessing, His suffering, His thirsting, His triumph, all reach their climax in the cross. They are the outcome of the great love wherewith He so loved us that He gave Himself for us.

1. ‘Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.’—This first word was probably spoken when the soldiers were driving the nails into His hands and feet, and were about to lift up the cross with its sacred burden and plant it in the ground. From His hard bed, the cross, while suffering untold agony, He intercedes for them, and adds to His intercession an excuse for their deed, ‘They know not what they do.’ In one sense they did know, they must have known, even those rough Roman soldiers, that they were perpetrating an act of gross cruelty; but familiarity with suffering had made them callous. It was part of their work; they were paid to do it, and they did it. But they did not know all, they did not know that they were crucifying the Lord of glory, they were but unconscious instruments doing what they were bidden; and so the Saviour prayed for them and made excuse for them, and not for them only, but for all who had taken part in that deed of violence, for all who, during all the ages that have since elapsed, have been crucifying the Son of God afresh.

2. ‘To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.’—Having interceded for the transgressors, Christ from His cross proclaims pardon to the penitent robber on his cross. This man had been one of a band of robbers, perhaps the same band to which

Barabbas belonged, a band of men living wild and reckless lives; and now both he and his fellow, having fallen victims to the power against which they have been in revolt, are suffering the extreme penalty of the law. Crucified with them, in the same condemnation, is the pure and holy Jesus, who did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth. He was numbered with the transgressors. He descended to the lowest depth of human degradation that He might lift humanity to the height of holiness and heaven. From His cross He will exert a world-wide attraction: 'I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me' (Joh 12:32); and now this attraction is beginning. Both these robbers had at first reviled the Holy Sufferer; one remained hardened and impenitent to the end, but the other was brought to a better mind. Perhaps this was not the first time that this man had seen the Christ; he may have been among those who listened to His words on some previous occasion, he may have seen some of His miracles; now, however, he is brought face to face with the power of His love, conviction dawns within him, he sees himself in his true light; turning to his fellow, he says, 'Dost not thou fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation? And we indeed justly, for we receive the due reward of our deeds; but this man hath done nothing amiss' (Luk 23:40-41). He confesses his sins, and not only is there a confession of sins but a wonderful faith, and this faith is manifested, not when Christ is at the height of His popularity, but in the depth of His humiliation. He sees in the cross a throne, and in the thorn-crowned sufferer a king seated upon it, and he prefers his request, 'Lord, remember me, when thou comest in thy kingdom.' And Jesus turns to this penitent robber and proclaims the gospel of forgiveness, 'To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.'

3. 'Woman, behold thy son ... behold thy mother.'—Christ from His cross has interceded for the sinful world, He has proclaimed the gospel of forgiveness to the penitent robber; but He has yet, in the progressive stages of His ministry of love, another blessing to bestow. In this word our Lord comes near His own. His first word was for His enemies; His second for one who had been His enemy, but was no longer one; His third was for those who had never been His enemies—for His mother and the disciple whom He loved. 'There stood by the cross of Jesus his mother' (Joh 19:25). For this the aged Simeon had prepared her, when, taking the infant Jesus in his arms, he had told her that a sword should pierce through her own soul (Luk 2:35); and now these words were being fulfilled. Jesus from His cross beholds His mother, and is mindful of the years which He had spent under her tender care in the quiet home of Nazareth. He had told her, both when she found Him in the Temple and also at the marriage feast in Cana (Luk 2:49, Joh 2:4), that there was a higher duty than that which He owed to her, a higher relationship than that between mother and son,—He was not only her son, He was also her Lord,—yet the earthly relationship is not forgotten. He will not depart before He has provided a home for her; with His parting breath He commits her to the care of the disciple whom He loved: 'Woman, behold thy son ... behold thy mother.'

4. **‘My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?’**—A long space of time intervenes between the third and fourth words. ‘From the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land unto the ninth hour’ ([Mat_27:45](#)). The first three words were spoken before the darkness, but now a change has come—darkness reigns on Calvary, as if God had drawn a veil over the scene. Three hours of silence and darkness. It is the climax of the sufferings of our Lord, the hour and power of darkness; what takes place we know not; He trod the winepress alone ([Isa_63:3](#)). He is alone in His conflict with the powers of evil, dark without, dark within,—how dark we may gather from the awful cry that escaped from His lips at the end of those long hours, ‘My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?’

What did it mean? It did not mean that He was forsaken by His Father. Had not the Father Said, ‘This is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased’ ([Mat_3:17](#))? Had not He Himself said, ‘Behold the hour cometh, yea, is now come, that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone: and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me’ ([Joh_16:32](#))? But there was a connexion between the death of Christ and sin; it was an atonement for sin: ‘The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all’ ([Isa_53:6](#)). And the misery of sin is that it hides the face of God. It is the loss of God’s presence; and Christ, as our representative, in bearing our sins, entered into our condition, involving the consciousness of the loss of God’s presence. He felt as though God had hidden His face. He descended with us into the depth of our degradation, made like unto us in all things, yet without sin. But the mystery of this bitter cry we, with our finite understandings, can never fathom: ‘I and the Father are one,’ and yet ‘My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?’ This the early Christians fully realized, for in their oft-repeated litanies they used to say, ‘By Thy sufferings known and unknown, good Lord deliver us.’ See also art. Dereliction.

5. **‘I thirst.’**—‘The last word,’ it has been said, ‘was the cry of the human soul in separation; this is the cry of the human body in its weakness.’ The darkness is now passing away, and as, at the Temptation, He suffered hunger when the crisis was over, so now He gives expression to the thirst that is parching Him. Intense thirst was usually the most intolerable part of the suffering of those who were crucified, and He had been hanging there for six long hours, His open wounds scorched by the blazing sun. Two draughts were offered to our Lord: the one He refused, the other He accepted; the one which He refused was the ‘vinegar mingled with gall’ ([Mat_27:34](#)) or the ‘wine mingled with myrrh’ ([Mar_15:23](#)). It was a cup of wine drugged with bitter herbs of a narcotic tendency, and it was given in kindness to condemned malefactors to deaden pain. Our Lord refused the soporific; He would not meet death with His senses stupefied; but the undrugged wine which was offered to Him when He said ‘I thirst,’ He accepted. He would not add to His sufferings by refusing the cooling draught.

6. **‘It is finished.’**—The conflict is over and the victory won. Christ from His cross announces to the world that all is finished. Τετέλεσται. In one word He sums up the whole of man’s redemption. Finished was all that prophecy had foretold and type foreshadowed. Finished was the work which His Father had given Him to do. He looks back on His life from the time when He said, ‘Lo, I come to do thy will, O God’ (Heb 10:9), and is able to say with regard to every jot and tittle of His life’s work, ‘It is finished.’ He has made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. We enter into no theory of the Atonement, we accept it as a fact; we know that the chasm between God and man, formed by the sin of man, has been bridged over, and that the way to the Father is open, for ‘when He had overcome the sharpness of death, He opened the Kingdom of heaven to all believers’ (*Te Deum*).

7. **‘Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.’**—The two last words were spoken in rapid succession. The word of victory is followed by the word of rest—rest after the burden and heat of the day. It is a word of calm, beautiful trust, of perfect sympathy between the Father and Son, revealing to us what death was to Christ and what it is to all those who are united to Christ by a living faith; that it is not a leap in the dark, not a plunge into an unknown void, but a going home. ‘Man goeth forth unto his work and to his labour until the evening’ (Psa 104:23), and then cometh rest—rest with Christ in Paradise. Death is the summing up of the life; repeated acts form habits, habits form character, and character is the sumtotal of the life, which we carry with us into the unseen world. To live the forgiven life, the life that is being formed and fashioned after the life of Christ, by the power of the Holy Ghost—this is the true preparation for death. This alone can rob death of its sting; one with Christ in our life, we shall be one with Him in our death. ‘To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain’ (Php 1:21). ‘Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.’

Literature.—The *Lives of Christ*, esp. Edersheim, *Life and Times*, ii. 593-610; Stier, *Words of the Lord Jesus*, in *loc.*; Tholuck, *Light from the Cross*; Stalker, *Trial and Death of Jesus Christ*; F. W. Robertson, *Sermons*, iv. 307; Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, 324; C. Stanford, *Voices from Calvary* (1893); W. R. Nicoll, *Seven Words from the Cross* (1895); M. Creighton, *Lessons from the Cross* (1898), 75-132; W. Lowrie, *Gaudium Crucis* (1905).

Rowland Ellis.

☞ Seven, Seventy

SEVEN, SEVENTY.—See Number.

Seventy

SEVENTY.—The mission of the Seventy,* [Note: Some very ancient MSS (BDMR) read Seventy-two (ἑβδομήκοντα δύο); but \aleph ACL Ξ , etc., omit δύο.] recorded in Luke 10, belongs to the third year of our Lord's public ministry. They were sent forth some time after the Transfiguration (Luk 10:1), when the Galilæan ministry of Jesus had closed, and when He had 'set his face to go to Jerusalem' (Luk 9:51). The mission of the Twelve had taken place in the previous year (Luk 9:1; Luk 9:10).† [Note: Although only Luke mentions the Seventy, indications of Jesus having a wider circle of 'disciples' than the Twelve are found elsewhere, as in Joh 6:66, Act 1:15, 1Co 15:6.] Seventy was regarded by the Jews as a complete number of persons for any important work.‡ [Note: The descendants of Jacob who entered Goshen were seventy (Gen 46:27). Seventy elders assisted Moses in the work of judgment and instruction (Exo 18:25; Exo 24:9, Num 11:16; Num 11:25). The Sanhedrin consisted of seventy besides the president (Hastings, DB iv. 399). The LXX is so called from the tradition (first told in a literary fiction usually ascribed to about b.c. 200) that seventy or, more exactly, seventy-two elders executed the version (Hastings' DB iv. 438). Josephus appointed seventy rulers of Galilee (BJ ii. xx. 5).] Our Lord may have had specially in view (1) the seventy elders under Moses, who was a type of Himself; (2) the Hebrew tradition that the nations scattered at Babel were seventy in number (pseud.-Jon. Targ. [Note: Targum.] on Gen 11:8),§ [Note: Seventy-two, according to Clem. Recogn. ii. 42. See Driver, Dt. p. 355 f.] just as the appointment of the Twelve may have been suggested by the number of the tribes of Israel.

1. *The office and mission of the Seventy resemble those of the Twelve.*—(1) A twofold commission is given in each case to preach and to heal, Mat 10:7-8, Luk 10:9. (2) Instruction is given to both (a) to go in pairs, two and two, Mar 6:7, Luk 10:1, in order to strengthen their testimony and to give mutual help and sympathy; (b) to take with them neither purse (for the labourer is worthy of his entertainment), nor wallet (for needless encumbrance was to be avoided), nor shoes, *i.e.* in addition to the sandals which they wore (for sandals befitted the poor, shoes the well-to-do), Mat 10:9-10, Mar 6:9, Luk 10:4. || [Note: | A somewhat similar prohibition existed (no staff, shoes, scrip, or purse) for those about to enter the Temple: so that this particular instruction to the Seventy may suggest that those sent forth were to perform their service in the spirit of worshippers (Edersheim, The Temple, etc. p. 42).] (3) In each case the burden of the message was 'Peace' and the 'Kingdom of God.' Peace was and still is the favourite Eastern salutation; the Kingdom of God was the Jews' highest aspiration. The Seventy, however, like the Twelve, would use these words, doubtless, with a fresh significance. Peace would include peace with God as well as with men, peace of conscience, the peace of

discipleship to a perfect Master (Mat_11:28-30): the Kingdom of God would be, not a mere external, but an internal theocracy, the reign of God within as well as over men (Mat_12:28, Mar_4:26-27); and this Empire of God was Peace. (4) In both instructions the warning is added that they would be as sheep or lambs amid wolves, Mat_10:16, Luk_10:3. The Seventy, like the Twelve, were to be prepared for persecution and tribulation. Even in Christ's lifetime there are indications of His followers being persecuted (Joh_9:34; Joh_12:10); and some of the Seventy at least were destined to suffer for Christ's sake.

2. On the other hand, there are *important differences in the two commissions*. (1) The mission of the Twelve was permanent; they were pre-eminently Christ's Apostles: that of the Seventy was temporary; they disappear, as a body, from view, like the Seven of Acts 6, although the office of evangelist, without Apostolic status, continues (Act_21:8, Eph_4:11). (2) The Twelve were not only to minister, but to administer—to exercise discipline and government (Joh_20:23, Act_1:20-26). To the Seventy no such functions were committed: they were simply preachers and healers. (3) The commission to the Twelve was expressly limited to 'the lost sheep of the house of Israel.' 'Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not' (Mat_10:5-6). It was expedient at first to postpone the obtrusive extension of the privileges of the Kingdom beyond the Jews, lest these should be prejudiced against the gospel. By the time, however, that the Seventy were sent forth, Christ Himself had gone into 'the borders of Tyre and Sidon' (in addition to His earlier visit to Samaria), and had healed the Syrophenician's daughter (Mar_7:24). His disciples had thus been educated so far into realization that the Kingdom was intended to embrace others than Jews. The restriction, accordingly, is omitted in the commission to the Seventy, although there is no positive evidence that any of them preached, at this time, to Gentiles. (4) The commission to the Twelve included not only healing, but raising from death: that to the Seventy omits the latter. It is notable that only Apostles in the special sense are ever represented in the NT as raising the dead (Act_9:40; Act_20:9-10). (5) A definite itinerary was arranged for the Seventy: they were to go 'into every city and place where Jesus himself intended to come' (Luk_10:1), so as to prepare the way for Him. Their mission field thus included the country east of the Jordan, which was visited by our Lord during this closing year of His ministry. (6) A special feature of the directions to the Seventy was the injunction to 'salute no man by the way.' The 'time when he should be received up' was at hand: there were many places still to be visited; delay in preparing the way must be avoided; the profuse and elaborate salutations, customary on a journey, must be forgone.* [Note: Geikie (*The Holy Land and the Bible*, i. pp. 328-329) describes graphically the salutation of two Orientals in Palestine even at the present day. On meeting, each lays his right hand on his heart, then raises it to his brow or mouth. Thereafter they take hold each of the other's hand, and a series of particular inquiries follows, taking up considerable time.]

3. *Return of the Seventy (Luk 10:17-20)*. (1) Their return collectively is related; but we need not infer, what the nature of the case must have prevented, that they all returned simultaneously. As Christ approached some town or district in the itinerary, some pair out of the Seventy would report the outcome of their particular mission. (2) The Seventy return with exultation. Their satisfaction culminated in this: 'Even demons are subject to us in thy name.' There was something commendable, and something defective in their joy. It was right to rejoice in the power of exorcism, but there was a higher joy of which, apparently, they thought little, the joy of enrolment among the servants of God. Accordingly (3) the Lord (a) manifests His sympathy, 'I was beholding Satan fall like lightning from heaven'; as if He had been following the Seventy in spirit during the progress of their mission. (b) He assures them of security against real harm from the powers of evil. Although they were among 'serpents and scorpions,' 'nothing shall in any wise hurt you'; a special providence would be their privilege, (c) He raises their aspirations to a higher level. Even to die in such a service would be 'gain'; their 'names are written in heaven' (cf. Is 4:3, Dan 12:1). They were fellow-workers with the King, whose cause, even should they suffer tribulation, must prevail.

4. *The credibility of the mission of the Seventy* has been doubted by Strauss, Baur, de Wette,* [Note: Strauss, *Life of Jesus*, ii. 94-96; Baur, *Evangelien*, pp. 435, 498; de Wette, *Erklärung Luc.* p. 79; Köstlin, *Com.* p. 267.] and others, owing to (1) the silence of the other Gospels regarding it; (2) the lack of later authentic trace of the Seventy; the close resemblance between the mission of the Seventy and that of the Twelve, being suggestive, it is argued, of confusion.

(1) The argument from silence is not strong; because, owing to the temporary character, so far as appears, of the commission, there was nothing in the organization of the Church, as it existed when the three Gospels were written, such as would constrain an Evangelist to relate the history of the Seventy; whereas the position and work of the Twelve made it natural, if not necessary, to give some account of the origin of the Apostolate. (2) The fact that Luke relates also the mission of the Twelve, and the notable differences (chronological and circumstantial) between the accounts of the two missions, render it highly improbable that the two narratives refer to a single event. (3) It is inaccurate to say that there is no authentic trace of the Seventy in later times. Philip 'the evangelist' was probably, from this designation (Act 21:8), one of them. Clement of Alexandria, writing in the latter part of the 2nd cent., names Barnabas, Matthias, and Cephas, who 'had the same name with the Apostle,' as others of the Seventy.† [Note: Strom, ii. 20, *Hypotyposes*, v., as quoted by Eus. i. 12.] The historian Eusebius, without giving his authority, states that the Barsabbas of Acts and the Sosthenes mentioned in 1Co 1:1 are said to have been of the same company.‡ [Note: i. 12.] The early disappearance of the Seventy as an organization is readily accounted for. They had no authority as rulers such as would make the

appointment of successors requisite. One, as we have seen, became an Apostle; Philip became one of the ‘Seven’ of Acts 6; a considerable number were probably included in one or other of the orders of evangelists, prophets, pastors, and teachers (Eph 4:11). The individuals thus, for the most part, doubtless survived, and occupied more or less influential positions; although the office itself, like that of the ‘Seven,’ disappeared. § [Note: A professedly complete catalogue of the Seventy is given by pseudo-Dorotheos (6th cent.) as follows:—James (brother of the Lord), Timothy, Titus, Barnabas, Ananias, Stephen, Philip, Prochorus, Nicanor, Simon, Nicolas, Parmenas, Cleopas, Silas, Silvanus, Crescens, Epenetus, Andronicus, Amplias, Urbanus, Stachys, Apelles, Aristobulus, Narcissus, Herodion, Rufus, Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermes, Hermas, Patrobas, Rhodion, Jason, Agabus, Linus, Gaius, Philologus, Olympas, Sosipater, Lucius, Tertius, Erastus, Phygellus, Hermogenes, Demas, Quartus, Apollos, Cephas, Sosthenes, Epaphroditus, Caesar, Marcus, Joseph Barsabbas, Artemas, Clemens, Onesiphorus, Tychicus, Carpus, Euodius, Philemon, Zenas, Aquila, Priscas, Junias, Marcus (2), Aristarchus, Pudens, Trophimus, Lucas the Eunuch, Lazarus. The list is manifestly untrustworthy. With some probability, indeed, are included all the seven ‘deacons’ (so called), along with some others (as Barnabas, Barsabbas, Marcus, Cleopas, Silas, Agabus, and Ananias), who were primitive disciples resident in or near Palestine. But many others, including such Gentile Christians as Titus, Tychicus, Trophimus, and brethren like Timothy and Apollos, who became converts long after our Lord’s Ascension, are obviously the outcome of indiscriminating conjecture.]

5. *The appointment of the Seventy* for a definite ministry, yet without ecclesiastical authority such as was conferred on the Twelve, is significant and instructive. Our Lord does not appear to have instituted any definite and detailed form of Church government, but to have left such outward arrangements to the Apostles as His chosen disciples, and through them eventually to the Church itself, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Yet the appointment of the Seventy clearly indicates the principle that Christian ministry, including preaching, is neither to be confined to those who bear rule, nor regarded as entitling those who exercise such ministry to receive office as rulers. On the one hand, some who are able to give valuable service to the Church as evangelists or teachers may not be suitable, or even if suitable may not be required at the time, for rulership. On the other hand, those who bear rule in the Church are not, in the spirit of hierarchical exclusiveness, to discourage brethren who (without having the faculty or opportunity of government) possess some useful gift, from exercising it under due supervision, for the good of the Church and of the community at large.

Literature.—Trench, *Studies in the Gospels*, 231-242; Plummer, ‘St. Luke’ in *ICC* [Note: *CC International Critical Commentary*.]; A. B. Bruce, ‘Synoptic Gospels’ in *EGT* [Note: *GT Expositor’s Greek Testament*.] i. pp. 538-542; Meyer, *Com. in loc.*;

Edersheim, *Life and Times*, ii. pp. 37-43; *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times.*] xv. [1903] 14.

Henry Cowan.

☒ Shame

SHAME

1. *Objectively* = dishonouring treatment, that which causes shame; usually ἀτιμία, ἀτιμᾶζειν (Mar 12:4, Luk 20:11). Shame is mentioned in several passages of the OT which are usually applied to Christ's sufferings (Psa 44:15; Psa 69:7; Psa 69:19; Psa 89:45, Isa 50:6); but the word is, curiously enough, never so used in the Gospels. Heb 12:2 speaks of the shame (αἰσχύνη) of the cross, Heb 13:13 of Christ's reproach (ὄνειδισμός), and in Heb 6:6 those who fall from grace are said to crucify Him afresh and put Him to an open shame (παράδειγματιζεν). In Joh 8:49 the unbelieving Jews dishonour (ἀτιμᾶζειν) Him, and in Act 5:41 the Apostles rejoice at suffering shame (ἀτιμασθῆναι) for His name.

The shame which Christ in fact bore is seen specially in such incidents of the Passion as the night arrest as of a thief or robber, the spitting, the scourging and the mockings, the public procession through the streets of Jerusalem, the taunts, the stripping naked of His body, and the hanging side by side with criminals. But above all, it is seen in the manner of His death, the cross being peculiarly the death of shame.* [Note: See the well-known passage in Cic. in Verr. v. 66: 'Quid dicam in crucem tolli? Verbo satis digno tarn nefaria res appellari nullo modo potest.'] In the passages in the Gospels which speak of crucifixion and taking up the cross (Mat 20:19, Mar 8:34 etc.), though the prominent thought is that of sufferings, the idea of shame and ignominy is undoubtedly present as well. This shame must be willingly borne both by Christ and by His followers.

2. *Subjectively* = the feeling of shame; usually αἰσχύνη and cognate words.† [Note: For distinction between αἰσχύνη and αἰδώς, see Trench, *NT Syn.* §§ 19, 20. The latter is the better word; 'αἰδώς would always restrain a good man from an unworthy act, while αἰσχύνη would sometimes restrain a bad one.'] It is interesting to note that the typically Greek and almost untranslatable αἰδώς has practically dropped out of

Biblical Greek. In the LXX Septuagint it occurs twice in Mac.; in NT only in 1Ti 2:9 μετὰ αἰδοῦς κ. σωφροσύνης ('with shamefastness and sobriety,' Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ; 'shamefacedness,' Authorized Version * [Note: See Hastings' DB, s.v.]), and in Textus Receptus of Heb 12:28 (Authorized Version 'reverence'), where edd. [Note: editions or editors.] read δέους. It may be that, like such words as ἀρετή and φιλία, it was avoided as having a technical and unsuitable sense. In Homer and Hesiod it ranks high, being coupled with νέμεσις, and personified; it is the sense of what is due to oneself and others. Aristotle,† [Note: See Eth. iv. 9; Rhet. ii. 6.] however, regards it not as a virtue, but an emotion (πάθος), which he does not consider very valuable to ethics. It is the fear of ἀδοξία, the loss of reputation, and, while proper to the νέος, it is out of place in the πρεσβύτερος or ἐπιεικής (the good man). They ought never to do, or wish to do, things that might evoke the feeling of shame.

Shame is not, then, a motive which we shall expect to find prominent in Christian ethics. Its essential idea being φόβος ἀδοξίας, it looks only to the varying standard of public opinion, to what people would say, or might be conceived of as saying if they knew. And its source is not the moral sense of right and wrong, but at best the feeling of propriety and decency. At its highest it is a neutral word. If it may sometimes deter from a wrong action, regarded as disgraceful, it is even more likely to deter from a right action, as unpopular.

It is in this sense that it is most prominent in the Gospels. It may keep a man from honest work (Luk 16:3). Christ warns those who are ashamed of Him and of His words, that He too will be ashamed of them (Mar 8:38, Luk 9:26; cf. Joh 12:43). It is this false shame that is emphatically repudiated by the Apostles (Rom 1:16, 2Ti 1:8; 2Ti 1:12, 1Pe 4:16).

Shame may also follow an action; and here too the idea is not the conviction of sin, but the confusion which comes from discovery, though this may be an element in a future awakening of conscience. It is the fate of one who unduly exalts himself (Luk 14:10). Christ's enemies are put to shame (Luk 13:17), *i.e.* they are enraged at being exposed before the people. Though the word is not mentioned, it is presumably the feeling of the man who hid his talent or pound, when brought face to face with his master (Mat 25:24, Luk 19:20); and it is certainly implied in Joh 8:9, whether the words 'convicted by their conscience' are genuine or not. The Pharisees are ashamed of being found exploiting a sin for their own ends.

It is possible that in the passage last quoted (the episode of the woman taken in adultery) we have an instance of shame in another aspect, the sympathetic shame evoked by sin in others. Christ was face to face with the type of sin which particularly rouses that feeling, and with a callous attempt on the part of His enemies to use that sin for their own advantage. He blushed for those who did not blush for themselves.

‘He was seized with an intolerable sense of shame. He could not meet the eye of the crowd, or of the accusers, and perhaps at that moment least of all of the woman.... In his burning embarrassment and confusion he stooped down so as to hide his face, and began writing with his finger on the ground’ (Seeley, *Ecce Homo*, ch. ix.).

We may note that the word is far rarer in the NT, and particularly in the Gospels, than in the OT. The typically Hebraic use of בִּזְיוֹן = *to be disappointed of a hope*, is not found in the Gospels; it occurs in [Rom_5:5](#); [Rom_9:33](#); [Rom_10:11](#), [1Pe_2:6](#). In each case a quotation is implied or expressed, though, curiously enough, from a passage (Is 28:16) where שִׁבוּץ does not occur in the Hebrew. The shame or reproach of childlessness, which is so prominent in the OT, is referred to in [Luk_1:25](#).

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , art. ‘Shame’; Trench, *NT Synonyms*; G. Salmon, *Gnosticism and Agnosticism* (1887), 164; R. W. Church, *Village Serm.*, 3rd ser. (1897), 236.

C. W. Emmet.

☞ Shealtiel

SHEALTIEL.—A link in our Lord's genealogy ([Mat_1:12](#), [Luk_3:27](#), Authorized Version both times *Salathiel*).

☞ Shechem

SHECHEM.—See Sychar.

☞ Sheep, Shepherd

SHEEP, SHEPHERD

ἀμνός, ‘lamb’: Joh 1:29; Joh 1:36, Act 8:32, 1Pe 1:19; with the classical acc. plur. ἄρνας, Luk 10:3 (where Cod. A reads πρόβατα), and the diminutive from the same stem, ἀρνίον, in Joh 21:15 (ⲐABC2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred]) and (of Christ) Rev. *passim* (Rev 5:6 to Rev 22:3). All three words are used only figuratively in NT.

πρόβατον, ‘sheep’: Mat 9:36; Mat 12:11-12; Mat 18:12, Luk 15:4; Luk 15:6, Joh 2:14-15; Joh 2:10, Rev 18:13, and (figuratively) Mat 7:15; Mat 10:6; Mat 10:16; Mat 15:24; Mat 25:32 f., 26:31, Mar 6:34; Mar 14:27, John 10, 21 (15. C*D) 16, 17, Act 8:32, Heb 13:20, 1Pe 2:25; its diminutive προβάτιον in Joh 21:16-17 (B, C, Tisch., WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort’s text.]).

ποιμήν, ‘flock’: Luk 2:8, 1Co 9:7, and (fig.) Mat 26:31, Joh 10:16; its diminutive ποιμνιον, always figurative, in Luk 12:32, Act 20:28-29, 1Pe 5:2-3.

ποιμήν, ‘shepherd’: Mat 9:36; Mat 25:32, Mar 6:34, Luk 2:8; Luk 2:15; Luk 2:18; Luk 2:20, Joh 10:2; Joh 10:12, and (fig.) Mat 26:31, Mar 14:27, Joh 10:11; Joh 10:14; Joh 10:16, Eph 4:11, Heb 13:20, 1Pe 2:25.

ἀρχιποιμήν chief shepherd’ (fig.), 1Pe 5:4.

ποιμαίνω, ‘shepherd,’ ‘tend,’ a flock; Luk 17:7, 1Co 9:7, and (fig.) Mat 2:6, Joh 21:16, Act 20:28, 1Pe 5:2, Jud 1:12, Rev 2:27; Rev 7:17; Rev 12:5; Rev 19:15.

βόσχω, ‘feed a flock’: Mat 8:30, Mar 5:11, Luk 8:32; Luk 15:15; οἱ βοσκοντες, Mat 8:33, Mar 5:14, Luk 8:34. βόσχω is fig. only in Joh 21:15; Joh 21:17.

1. The sheep of Palestine are still the broadtailed breed of Biblical times (Exo 29:22, Lev 3:9; Lev 3:11 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘fat tail’). The tail is from 5 to 15 inches wide, and weighs from 10 to 15 lb., sometimes even as much as 30 lb., supplying 10 lb. and upwards of pure fat, which is packed for winter use. The sheep are white, though some have brown faces: only the rams have horns. They ‘find pasture’ (Joh 10:9) in the lower lands in winter and on the mountains in summer, the best pastures being in S. Palestine (the Negeb and Gerar) and on the plain to the E. of the Jordan; but even ‘the pastures of the wilderness’ (Psa 65:12, Joe 2:22) are welcome in spring, when grass and flowers have grown which are burnt up in summer.

The shepherd leads his sheep (Joh_10:4) during the day in the cool months, but in the hotter part of the year from sunset to early morning, when he brings them back to the fold (Joh_10:1; Joh_10:16) or leaves them to lie under a prepared shelter in the bushes (Son_1:7). The fold (αὐλή) is a low flat shed or series of sheds, with a yard surrounded by a wall (Joh_10:1; cf. Num_32:16, Jdg_5:16, Zep_2:6); on cold nights the flocks are shut in the buildings. The wall is surmounted by a fence of sharp thorns to keep out the wolves (Joh_10:12) and other wild beasts (Isa_31:4, 1Sa_17:34); jackals and hyaenas prey almost up to the walls of Jerusalem, while leopards and panthers often leap over the high fence of the fold, and the shepherd is still at times known 'to lay down his life for the sheep' (Joh_10:11). Robbers are as great a source of danger; a lamb or a kid is sometimes carried off by a bird of prey, and there are deadly snakes in the limestone rocks. The Gospel parable does not exaggerate the rejoicing of the shepherd when he has recovered a sheep that has gone astray 'upon the mountains' (Mat_18:12-13, Luk_15:4).

The shepherd keeps watch by night in the open air (Luk_2:8, cf. Nah_3:18), sometimes using a temporary shelter or a shepherd's tent (Son_1:8, Isa_38:12), which recalls the nomad habits of the early Israelites and their Semitic ancestors (Heb_11:9, Gen_4:20). On the march he carries a bag or wallet (Mat_10:10), a staff (Mat_10:8, Psa_23:4), and a sling (1Sa_17:40). At the watering-places (Psa_23:2) the sheep answer to the shepherd's call (Joh_10:3-4), and, when they have drunk, move on at his word to make room for another flock. A shepherd is sometimes followed by several flocks, but each comes or goes at a separate call, and he often knows each sheep by a name (Joh_10:3). Sheep-dogs (Job_30:1) are not mentioned in the NT, but they must have been used, as they are still, to protect the flock and keep the sheep together.

2. Sheep were used for food (Rev_18:13), and their milk for drink (1Co_9:7, Deu_32:14); their skins were used for tents and for a baggy kind of coat (μηλωτή, Heb_11:37). The importance of sheep to a pastoral people like the Israelites is emphasized by one of their favourite names, *Rachel*, which means 'ewe' (W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem.* [Note: Semitic.]² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 311), and by the choice of a lamb for the Paschal Supper in their most sacred festival. Every morning, also, and every evening, they had to offer in sacrifice 'a he-lamb without blemish for a continual burnt-offering' (Num_28:3-6), with two he-lambs in addition every Sabbath day (Num_28:9). Seven he-lambs and one ram were required at every new moon, on every day of the Passover, and at the Feast of Weeks (Num_28:16-31), at the Feast of Trumpets, and on the Day of Atonement (Num_29:1-11). At the Feast of Tabernacles (Num_29:12-38) this offering was included on the eighth day, but was doubled on each of the first seven days, with varying numbers of bullocks. Goats were generally used for sin-offerings, but a leper in the day of his cleansing (Luk_17:14) had to bring a he-lamb for a guilt-offering,

besides a he-lamb for a burnt-offering and a ewe-lamb, the two latter being commuted for a pair of turtle-doves in the case of the poor (Lev 14:10-22). Any of the common people, also, might substitute for the male goat of the ordinary sin-offering a female lamb without blemish (Lev 4:27-32). This piacular offering of sheep was a Semitic practice which is found also in ancient Cyprus, and was adopted by Epimenides at Athens when he was summoned from Crete to purify the city from the Alcmaeonid pollution. (W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem. [Note: Semitic.]*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] note G).

3. The interest of these sacrificial requirements centres in the NT round the representation of Christ as 'the Lamb' (Rev 5:6; Rev 22:3). To some extent, of course, the figure is suggested by 'the meekness and gentleness of Christ' (2Co 10:1, Mat 11:29), the perfect realization in Him of the spirit of beautiful confidence and loving obedience which we associate with Psalms 23 (cf. *Ecce Homo*, chs. i. and ii. pp. 5, 6, 10, 12). But where the figure is explained, it is always in a sacrificial sense: 'He was led as a sheep to the slaughter' (Act 8:32); 'redeemed ... with precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, (even the blood) of Christ' (1Pe 1:18-19); 'a Lamb standing as though it had been slain'; 'worthy is the Lamb that hath been slain' (Rev 5:6; Rev 5:12); 'the book of life of the Lamb that hath been slain from the foundation of the world' (Rev 13:8). In the same way John the Baptist hailed Jesus of Nazareth as 'the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world' (Joh 1:29). It is superfluous to say (with Alford) that the reference is not to the Paschal lamb, 'which did not suggest atonement for sin'; on every day of the feast, as we have seen, lambs were offered as a burnt-offering; and if it was not Passover-time when John spoke, his hearers would readily understand his meaning from the sin-offering of the poor, or the morning and evening sacrifice of every day. These kept before the eyes of all Israelites the principle of substitution, the surrender of another life for the human life that was forfeited or consecrated (Heb 11:4; Heb 10:10). John may have uttered his prophecy at the time of the regular evening sacrifice, the time at which the prophecy was afterwards to be fulfilled (Mat 27:45); but the language of Isa 53:7-12 would of itself explain the meaning of his words. The correspondence of Christ's death with a sin-offering is distinctly assumed in Heb 13:10-13, and St. Paul also sees in the occurrence of that death at Passover-time the true Passover sacrifice of the Lamb (1Co 5:7). We need not be concerned to limit to any one ceremony the thought in the mind of the Baptist: the Lamb, in his words, was the atoning Lamb. Christ (as M. Dods suggests in *Expos. Gr. Test.*) may have revealed the truth to him after the return from the Temptation in the wilderness: He Himself three times foretold His coming death (Mat 16:21; Mat 17:22-23; Mat 20:18-19) before He repeated the substance of John's prophecy as His own (Mat 20:28).

4. Christ is also ‘the Good Shepherd’ (Joh 10:11; Joh 10:14), ‘the Shepherd and Bishop (overseer, guardian) of souls’ (1Pe 2:25), ‘the chief Shepherd’ (1Pe 5:4). His people are His flock (Joh 10:16, Luk 12:32), as the chosen people of old were the flock of God (Psa 77:20; Psa 79:13; Psa 80:1; Psa 95:7; Psa 100:3). As God undertook by the voice of His prophets to feed His flock (Isa 40:11, Eze 34:14-15), so Christ pledges Himself ‘to give unto them eternal life’ (Joh 10:28; cf. Joh 6:48-58), to ‘guide them unto fountains of waters of life’ (Rev 7:17). He requires of His sheep (Joh 10:14; Joh 10:27) the life of unquestioning obedience and trust which the Psalmist accepts with such happy contentment (Psalms 23): He promises that no one shall snatch them out of His hand if they hear His voice and follow Him, if they make themselves familiar with Him (γινώσκουσι, Joh 10:14) as He makes it His concern to know them and to know the Father. When He speaks of ‘the fold’ in which they will find protection, He calls Himself ‘the door’ (Joh 10:7-10) through which one must enter in to be made safe: He becomes the shepherd (Joh 10:11-16) as He passes from the thought of the fold to describe the flock. So later (Joh 14:6) He says, ‘I am the way,’ before He calls Himself ‘the truth and the life.’ No one ‘fold’ can include all His sheep (Joh 10:16): the flock is greater than the fold, the shepherd more essential than the door: and the one necessary condition of the Christian life is the personal devotion and obedience to the living Shepherd. Where that condition is observed, there may be many folds, ‘other sheep’; but He will know His own (Joh 10:14), and in the eyes of all at last ‘they shall become one flock, one shepherd’ (Joh 10:16).

In His more active ministry Christ found the appropriate figure for His disciples in the patient hard-working cattle which ploughed the earth to prepare it for men’s food, or carried the burdens of their daily life (Mat 11:29-30): work under His guidance with the meek and lowly spirit is the secret of rest. It was as the shadows of the end fell upon Him that He returned to the OT figure of the sheep of God’s pasture: ‘Fear not, little flock’ (Luk 12:32), resumes the ‘Be not afraid’ of Luk 12:4 at the close of the perilous scene when the crowded courtyard was His refuge from the hatred of His enemies (Luk 11:37-54). So the beautiful pictures and promises of John 10 belong to the time of danger (Joh 10:39) in the closing winter (Joh 10:22) of His life, when He was being forced into the retirement (Joh 10:40) from which He came out at the risk of death to restore Lazarus to his sisters. The Shepherd’s care of His sheep is the gospel first for the sorrowful and helpless: ‘the whole portraiture of the Good Shepherd is a commentary on Isaiah 53’ (Westcott).

5. One other NT analogy is derived from the same figure. As rulers who ‘observe dooms from Zeus’ are called in the *Iliad* (i. 263, ii. 243, etc.) ποιμένες λαῶν (cf. Mic 5:4, Mat 2:6), and he that receives authority over the nations ‘shall shepherd them with a staff of iron’ (Rev 2:27; Rev 12:5; Rev 19:15), so the Church receives πο

μένους καὶ διδασκάλους among the gifts of its glorified Lord (Eph_4:11). Their duty is to ‘tend the flock of God’ (1Pe_5:2), ‘the flock in the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers’ (Act_20:28): it is the false shepherds who ‘without fear feed themselves’ (Jud_1:12). In ‘tending’ the flock, the first and last duty is to ‘feed’ it: βόσκει τὰ ἀρνία μου, ποιμαίνει τὰ προβάτιά μου, βόσκει τὰ προβάτιά μου (Joh_21:15-17). The shepherd’s ways with the sheep may be most winning and his music of the sweetest; but if he does not minister to them ‘the bread of life,’ other shepherds will have to be found who will ‘feed them’ (Jer_23:4). As the shepherds themselves belong to the flock of Christ, they are also to be ‘examples to the flock,’ ‘and when the chief Shepherd shall be manifested, ye shall receive the crown of glory that fadeth not away’ (1Pe_5:3-4).

Literature.—For the sheep and shepherds of Palestine see Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, pp. 201-205; Geikie, *The Holy Land and the Bible*, pp. 13, 81-84; Post in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible iv. 487; Shipley and Cook in *Encyc. Bibl.* iii. 4441 (cf. *ib.* i. 711). There are expository sermons in F. W. Robertson, *Serm.* 2nd ser. (1875) 251; H. Alford, *Eastertide Serm.* (1866), 32, 62; B. F. Westcott, *Revelation of the Father* (1884), 77; A. F. W. Ingram, *Good Shepherds* (1898); A. G. Mortimer, *Studies in Holy Scripture* (1901), 161; also W. Lock on ‘the Sheep and the Goats’ in *The Bible and Chr. Life* (1905), 162. For connected subjects see Literature under Atonement, Church, Redeem, Rule (p. 539), Sacrifice.

Frank Richards.

☞ Shekel

SHEKEL.—See Money.

☞ Shekinah

SHEKINAH (Heb. שְׁכִינָה ‘that which dwells’ or ‘resides,’ the ‘dwelling’).—This term, together with ‘the Glory’ (אִיקָרָה) and ‘the Word’ or ‘Memra’ (מִמְרָא, מִימְרָה), is used in the Targums as an indirect expression in place of ‘God.’ It denotes God’s visible presence or glorious manifestation which ‘dwells’ among men: the localized presence of the Deity. See art. ‘Shekinah’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible . In the NT the term Shekinah appears in more than one Greek form. The invisible Shekinah is also

alluded to, as well as the visible. The visible Shekinah, though distinct from ‘the glory,’ was associated in the closest way with the Divine ‘glory.’ It was conceived of as the centre and source from which the glory radiated. In the NT this ‘Shekinah-glory’ is several times denoted by δόξα. The classical passage is Rom 9:4, where St. Paul, enumerating the list of Israel’s privileges, says: ‘whose is the adoption, *and the glory*,’ *i.e.* the Shekinahglory, ‘the visible presence of God among His people’ (cf. also Act 7:2 where St. Stephen speaks of ‘the God of glory,’ *i.e.* the God whose visible presence, manifested in the Shekinah, had sanctified Jerusalem and the Temple). In the Gospels this ‘glory’ is referred to in Luk 2:9 ‘the glory of the Lord (δόξα κυρίου) shone round about them.’ There is also an obvious allusion to the Shekinah in the description of the theophanic cloud of the transfiguration-narrative (Mat 17:5 ‘a bright cloud overshadowed them, and behold a voice out of the cloud, saying,’ etc.; cf. Mar 9:7, Luk 9:34 f.). Here the same verb (ἐπισκιάζω) is used as in the LXX Septuagint of Exo 40:34-35 of the cloud which rested on the Tabernacle when it was filled with the ‘glory of the Lord,’ which in the Targum (pseudo-Jonathan) becomes the ‘glory of the Shekinah of the Lord.’ The ‘voice out of the cloud’ is also, doubtless, the voice of the Shekinah; cf. 2Pe 1:17 where, in reference to the transfiguration, a ‘voice’ uttered by ‘the excellent glory’ (*i.e.* the Shekinah-glory) is spoken of.* [Note: Similarly in the Jerus. Targum to Gen 28:13 the glory of J” says, ‘I am the God of Abraham’ (Marshall in Hastings’ DB, loc. cit.).] In Heb 9:5 ‘the cherubim of glory’ must be explained in the same way, as meaning the cherubim on which the Shekinah was enthroned.

In three NT passages (all having reference to Christ)† [Note: See Marshall, *ib.*] an allusion to the Shekinah is probable, though disputed, viz. (a) Rom 6:4 ‘Christ was raised from the dead by means of (δοῶ) *the glory* of the Father.’ Here ‘glory’ prob. = the Shekinah-glory rather than ‘glorious power’ (cf. the *Midrash Rabbe* to Gen 44:8, in which the Shekinah is said to release the bound in Sheol);‡ [Note: A similar idea may be implied in the words ascribed to our Lord in Joh 11:40, where, with reference to the release of Lazarus from the grave, Jesus says to Martha: ‘Said I not unto thee, that, if thou believedst, thou shouldst see the glory of God?’] (b) 1Pe 4:14 ‘the (Spirit) of *glory* and the Spirit of God’ (τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ θιοῦ πνεῦμα). Here ‘glory’ may = Shekinah, which is identified with Christ. This identification may be seen more clearly, perhaps, in (c) Jam 2:1 τὴν πίστιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς δόξης, which not improbably = ‘the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, *the Shekinah*’ (Mayor). For further doubtful reff. in the NT, see below.

There can be no doubt that the word σκηνή, 'tabernacle' (and its verb σκηνοῦν, 'to tabernacle'), has been chosen for use in Joh 1:14 and Rev 21:3 from its likeness both in sound and meaning to the word Shekinah, and conveys a direct allusion to the latter. The Revelation passage runs: 'Behold the *tabernacle* (σκηνή) of God is with men, and he will *tabernacle* (σκηνώσει) with them.' In Joh 1:14 'The *Word* (Logos) ... *tabernacled* (ἐσκήνωσεν) among us, and we beheld his *glory*,' etc., all the three Hebrew terms, *Memra* (מִמְרָא = ὁ λόγος), *Shekinah*, and *Yekara* (דֹּξָא = קִרְבָּן) are represented. 'All the three entities became incarnate in Jesus.'* [Note: Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 231. To these should be added the great passage in Heb 1:3, where the Son is said to be the 'effulgence of the glory,' i.e. of the Shekinah-glory as 'the manifested Deity.']

The identification of Jesus with the Shekinah has already been referred to above in connexion with 1Pe 4:14 and Jam 2:1. Another example where the same idea may be implicit is Mat 18:20 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them'; compare with this *Pirke Aboth* iii. 5: 'Two that sit together and are occupied with words of Torah, have the Shekinah among them.' Cf. also 2Co 4:6 'God that said, Out of darkness light shall shine, is he who shone in our hearts for the illumination of the knowledge of *the glory of God in face of Jesus Christ*.' The last phrase may = the glory of God made manifest in the presence of Jesus Christ, i.e. Jesus is the Shekinah of God. Shekinah in these connexions is practically = Immanuel ('God with us').

Other passages worth examination in this connexion are Eph 1:17 (the remarkable phrase 'the Father of the glory' [ὁ πατήρ τῆς δόξης] =? 'the father of the Shekinah' (incarnate in Jesus)'), Luk 2:32 ('the glory of thy people Israel'). Cf. also 1Co 2:8 (Jesus 'Lord of glory'). The representation of man as a temple in which God dwells (cf. 2Co 6:16 'we are a temple of the living God,' Joh 14:23 'we will come ... and make our abode with him') was probably suggested by the Shekinah-idea, which may also have influenced the language applied to Christ in Col 2:9 ('for in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily').

In the identification of the Shekinah and cognate conceptions with the incarnate Christ, 'a use is made of these ideas,' as Dalman says, 'which is at variance with their primary application.' It marks a specifically Christian development, though the way had certainly been prepared by hypostatizing tendencies.

Literature.—Weber, *Jüd. Theol.* 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] esp. pp. 185-190; Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, i. esp. p. 301 ff.;

Langen, *Judenthum zur Zeit Christi*, 201 ff.; art. 'Shekinah' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible and in *JE [Note: E Jewish Encyclopedia.]*; the Lexicons, s.v. שכִינָה (Buxtorf, Levy, Jastrow, Kohut); Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 43; the Comm. on Ep. of St. James by Mayor and Knowling (on [Jam_2:1](#)).

G. H. Box.

☞Shelah

SHELAH.—A Judahite ancestor of our Lord ([Luk_3:35](#)).

☞Shem

SHEM.—The patriarch, mentioned as a link in our Lord's genealogy ([Luk_3:36](#)).

☞Shewbread

SHEWBREAD, 'bread of the face or presence' (*lehem pânîm*), was placed on a special table in the Holy Place, in the presence of God. This was a very ancient custom in Israel, and is found also among other Semitic peoples. The bread was originally designed for the god to eat, but, of course, this early notion did not persist; the bread, however, was still held to imply the presence of God, and His acceptance of the worship rendered to Him.

Shewbread is mentioned in the Gospels on only one occasion, [Mat_12:4](#) || [Mar_2:26](#) and [Luk_6:4](#). Jesus and His disciples, passing through the cultivated fields on the Sabbath, were plucking the ears of grain, rubbing out the kernels, and eating them. They were challenged by the Pharisees for doing what was unlawful on the Sabbath. The plucking of grain without instrument, while walking through another's field, was expressly permitted by the Jewish law, but the manual labour involved was interpreted as harvesting and threshing, which were forbidden on the Sabbath. Jesus replied to the Pharisees by citing two illustrations (according to Mt.), one of which was an act of David as recorded in [1Sa_21:1-6](#). In David's flight from Saul he had come to Nob, to Ahimelech the priest. He was hungry, and asked for food for himself and his men. There was no bread at hand except the shewbread, which, after lying on the

table for the week, had been replaced by fresh bread. The bread is described as 'holy.' There is no hint in the passage that David did an unlawful thing in eating the bread. He did not do it without due deliberation, for the question of the legality was expressly raised by the priest. Before giving the men the bread, he asked if they were 'clean.' This was his one concern, and, being satisfied on this point, he readily gave it to them. If it had been unlawful for any to eat except the priests, that surely would have been stated, and the 'cleanness' would have been of no moment. In case the parley is considered, as it may be, to have been the effort of later tradition to clear the king from the charge of irregularity in the matter, the state of the case is not altered. The passage seems to show that no law was knowingly broken in the transaction.

Jesus, however, says that it was unlawful. The statement is in accord with the Jewish law of His day, which can be traced back to a provision of the Priests' Code from post-exilic times (Lev 24:9), which says that the shewbread was for the priests, and must be eaten by them in the Holy Place. Such an act as David's was illegal in the time of Christ; it was not illegal in the time of David. The real issue between Jesus and the Pharisees in Matthew 12 was the extent to which such laws as that of the Sabbath were binding. The Jews held that the law was eternal, unchangeable, supreme. Jesus held that it was 'for man,' and the Son of Man was lord of it. More recently the argument of Jesus has been vastly strengthened by the recognition of the gradual development of the OT legislation. According to the Jews, their great king had violated the Law, and the only justification was the stress of his hunger; but to use this argument to justify David was in effect to acknowledge the very principle upon which Jesus acted in allowing His disciples to pluck the grain.

Literature.—Stade, *Bibl. Theol. des AT* [*Note: T Altes Testament.*] , p. 168; art. 'Shewbread' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible and in the *JE* [*Note: E Jewish Encyclopedia.*] .

O. H. Gates.

☞ Shilling

SHILLING.—See Money.

☞ Ship

SHIP.—See Boat.

☞ Shoe

SHOE.—See Sandal.

☞ Shore

SHORE.—See Beach.

☞ Sick, Sickness

SICK, SICKNESS.—See Disease.

☞ Sickle

SICKLE (δρεπανον).—The crops in Palestine are, to this day, reaped almost entirely with the sickle (Mar 4:29). The scythe is seldom seen save in the hands of a foreigner, and the whirr of the reaping machine is still unknown. δρεπανον is the LXX Septuagint equivalent of two Heb. words שִׁמְרִית and מַגֵּל which seem to have been two names for the same thing. The Palestinian sickle is a little longer than our common shearing-hook; the blade describes a somewhat wider curve, and the point, instead of terminating sharply, is slightly turned backward. Sometimes the edge is toothed like a saw, but oftener it is plain and sharp like our own hook. The total length of handle and blade is from 18 to 24 inches.

W. Ewing.

☞ Sidon

SIDON (for much of common reference, see Tyre).—A narrow, rocky district as well as a once famous city in Phœnicia, the city being 30 miles S. of Beirût and 26 miles

slightly N. by E. of Tyre, and 60 miles N. of Capernaum. Like nearly all settlements on the east coast of the Mediterranean, Sidon owed its location to certain prominent rocks in the sea, which at first served as a breakwater, and then, through gradual connexion with the land, produced a northern and a southern harbour, the latter now filled with sand.

Sidon is so ancient that all certainty as to the origin of its name has vanished. Some have deemed it 'fishing'-town, others the seat of the worship of a deity Sid. Sidon and the Sidonians are heard of earlier and more influentially than Tyre, which finally distanced its northern rival. All the Phœnician cities seem to have known little but rivalry down to the appearance of such world-powers as Assyria, Babylonia, Persia, Greece, and Rome, which made them all, sooner or later, subject and abject. Each had its 'king,' its 'god,' its colonies, its coinage. Each sent its trading vessels seaward to the Mediterranean world; landward, each was in touch with the markets of Damascus and the East by means of those caravans of 'ships of the desert'; each sat as queen over a semicircular domain with a radius of some 15 to 20 miles. Through faction in the 8th cent. b.c. Sidon lost many of her merchants, chiefly to Tyre. At length her limited territory, her merely commercial aim, her being sapped by colonization and dissension, her final surrender of leadership to Tyre, combined with her conquests by the world-powers, left her under the Romans in the days of Christ a merely provincial capital, richer in the vices of ancient paganism than in its virtues. Some from Sidon were in the multitude that thronged Jesus at the Sea of Galilee (Mar_3:8), and Sidon was pronounced more excusable in the day of judgment than the more favoured cities of Jesus' own country and race (Mat_11:21 f.). The present *Saida* has about 10,000 inhabitants, and is surrounded by delightful orange groves, beneath which lie archaeological treasures. Beirût, with its Damascus railway and improved harbour, has robbed Sidon of its last vestiges of commerce.

In a sense Sidon was, and in another sense was not, within the limits of the Holy Land. In the ideal distribution of Canaan recorded in Joshua the lot of Asher would seem to have included about all of Phœnicia, extending 'even unto great Sidon' (Jos_19:28). The coast cities and their daughter villages, however, remained utterly unconscious of their assignment, while Asher became so assimilated thereto as to retain in Israelitish history little more than a name.

The Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 declares that Jesus 'came through Sidon,' a distinct and exact statement unknown to the Authorized Version ; and thereon depends our conception whether or not Jesus Himself, from choice, ever went into the way of the Gentiles. Many points as to the primariness, structure, and transmission of the Gospels are illustrated by this case.

Mat_15:21 ff. Authorized Version

Mar_7:24 ff. Authorized Version

Mat 15:21 Then Jesus went thence, and departed into the coasts of Tyre and Sidon. Mat 15:22 And, behold, a woman of Canaan came out of the same coasts, etc.

Mar 7:24 And from thence he arose, and went into the borders of Tyre and Sidon, and entered into an house, and would have no man know *it*: but he could not be hid. For a *certain* woman, etc. [A Greek].

Mat 15:29 And Jesus departed from thence, and came nigh unto the sea of Galilee; and went up into a mountain, and sat down there.

Mar 7:31 And again, departing from the coasts of Tyre and Sidon, he came unto the sea of Galilee, through the midst of the coasts of Decapolis. [East of the Jordan].

After the Revisers' most conscientious work, with their better evidence, this is the form in which we read the same:

And Jesus went out thence, and withdrew into the parts of Tyre and Sidon. And, behold, a Canaanitish woman came out from those borders, etc.

And from thence he arose, and went away into the borders of Tyre and Sidon. And he entered into an house, and would have no man know it: and he could not be hid. But straightway a woman, etc. [A Greek].

Marg. 'Some ancient authorities omit *and Sidon.*'

And Jesus departed thence, and came nigh unto the sea of Galilee; and he went up into the mountain, and sat there.

And again he went out from the borders of Tyre, and came through Sidon unto the sea of Galilee, through the midst of the borders of Decapolis.

B. Weiss sides completely with the 'some ancient authorities' of (Revised Version margin) , and reads: Jesus 'went away into the borders of Tyre.... And again he went out from the borders of Tyre, and came through Sidon unto the sea of Galilee,' etc. Thus the primary Gospel of Mark, the more ancient Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts , Professor Weiss, and the Revisers do not hesitate to depict Jesus as entering Gentile territory (twice), entering a (probably) heathen house, and dispensing blessings upon a pagan woman, going then yet farther 'through Sidon' and Decapolis. The more theological First Evangelist, however, and the judicious transcribers disliked so to state the case. So Edersheim: the 'house in which Jesus sought shelter and privacy would, of course, be a Jewish home'; and 'by "through Sidon" I do not understand the

town of that name, which would have been quite outside the Saviour's route, but the territory of Sidon' (*Life and Times*, ii. 38, 44).

Anything like a direct 'route' from the Israelitish borders of Tyre, or of Tyre and Sidon,—for Edersheim emphasizes Matthew's indication that the woman came from her territory to that of Jesus,—would take one in a south-easterly direction, and therefore away from Sidon. Accordingly, Jesus' choice to go in a northerly direction, 'through Sidon,' shows that He was not taking any near and direct and usual 'route,' but for a reason was seeking travel into heathen territory. Mk.'s connexion indicates that Jesus journeyed into the Gentile land with His disciples, on the occasion of the abolition of the Levitical distinctions as to the ceremonially clean and unclean, so as to give to His followers an example and object lesson as to the same. Sidon on the far north was for this reason included, as was the hog-herding Decapolis. It was at Caesarea, a similar Gentile city almost 100 miles nearer Jerusalem, that St. Peter received his fuller lesson on the same subject.

Wilbur Fletcher Steele.

☞ Sifting

SIFTING.—The vb. 'sift' (Gr. σιτιάζω, fr. σιτίον, a late word for a sieve) occurs only in Luk 22:31. Two varieties of sieve were used for separating the finer particles of substances from the grosser (see art. Agriculture). Scripture refers to the sieve and the process of sifting only rarely (Isa 30:28, Amo 9:9, Luk 22:31), but is full of the idea of sifting. In this process the methods of different industries join to give force to the metaphor which they supply. Of these farming is the chief, with its floors, fans, etc. (Mat 3:12, Luk 3:17). The preparation of wine also enters in with its emptying from vessel to vessel (Jer 48:11). The refining of metals (Isa 1:25, Mal 3:2 f.), too, contributes to the contents of the idea of sifting. All these moralize it. It concentrates on character. St. Peter and his fellow-disciples [plur. ὑμεῖς] are sifted; Pharisees strain out gnats (Mat 23:24); evil work avoids the sifting of the light (Joh 3:20). The ministries of John, Jesus, and the Holy Spirit (Joh 16:8), all have this trait—they sift men. Yet Jesus is Himself sifted by Satan, whose 'findings' are *nil* (Joh 14:30), while, also, the disciples are not above the Master. 'As the wheat in the sieve is shaken backwards and forwards, and thus the refuse separates itself from the grain, and falls out; so Satan wishes to trouble you and toss you about (by vexations, terrors, dangers, afflictions) in order to bring your faithfulness to me to decay' (Meyer's Luk 22:31).* [Note: Note that the point of the comparison lies in the shaking. Satan aims at destruction; Jesus is thinking of purification as the real result.]

Christ comes with His fan to get rid of chaff (Mat 3:12); Satan sifts in order to get rid of wheat. For, as Thomas Fuller says somewhere, when Satan comes with his sieve, he desires to find the chaff and not the wheat.] The case of St. Peter is not singular. St. Paul underwent the process (Php 3:7, 2Co 6:4 ff.). The sifting is a law of life. All the Father's chastenings are with a view to sift His children as wheat. It is of the essence of the ways of God with men alike in providence and grace. Its place in that economy is among the final, not initial, processes. Readier and rougher means of grace have their earlier day; this is a delicate, even final, means of dealing with the finest of the wheat.

Literature.—*Ecce Homo*, ch. vi.; Bushnell's *New Life*, sermon on 'Spiritual Dislodgements'; Longfellow's *The Sifting of Peter*.

J. R. Legge.

☩ Sighing

SIGHING.—The expression of trouble by means of involuntary respiration. This expression is used in connexion with our Lord twice, both times in St. Mark's Gospel. It is expressed in Mar 7:34 by the word στενάζω—in the LXX Septuagint the equivalent of נָאָה—and in Mar 8:12 by the compound ἀναστενάζω. In both instances the words appear in this Gospel alone, and only in these passages. The expression is evidently meant to convey the fact of the Lord's sympathy with men. In the first, the healing of the deaf and dumb man, our Lord felt the burden of the disease which He was about to cure. And here the expression is associated with prayer on His part: 'And, looking up to heaven, he sighed.' In the second, where a stronger expression is used through the compound, the Pharisees are asking for a sign, and He 'sighed in his spirit,' evidently thinking of the speedy appearance of the sign for which they asked, and mourning over the terrible nature which it would bear. On the 'groaning' of Joh 11:33; Joh 11:38 see Anger in vol. i. p. 62^b.

W. H. Rankine.

☩ Sight

SIGHT.—Christ rejoiced in His power of restoring sight to the physically blind (see below), and points to it as a most fitting exercise for One sent of God (Mat 11:5,

Luk 7:21-22; see also art. Sign). When He speaks of Himself as Deliverer, in terms borrowed from the prophets (combining Isa 61:1; Isa 42:6-7), one of the chief features of the commission He announces is the recovering of sight to the blind (Luk 4:18-19). At that rapt moment of high spiritual experience it is certain that, while bodily sight may be referred to, the emphasis lies on the higher vision He had come to impart. The need of man for true inward sight, for the knowledge of God and of self, was ever central to Jesus. That men should see Him and thus see the Father was the one burning passion of His life (Joh 14:9, cf. Joh 16:12-13; Joh 16:16; Joh 17:3; Joh 17:6; Joh 17:25-26). That men should have the capacity of vision and yet be blind to the true significance of Himself and His work, was a sincere embarrassment to Him (Mar 8:18).

In Mat 6:22 and Luk 11:34-36 He employs bodily sight with its commanding relation to the whole of human activities as an image of inward vision. The eye was the means of guidance and surety and power to the whole body—the lamp (λύχνος) of the body. If the eye be unperverted (‘single,’ or, literally, ‘simple,’ ἀπλοῦς), the whole body is lighted for all the work it has to do. If ‘evil’ (πονηρός), the whole body is darkened, and every part of the complex activity is rendered inefficient if not impossible. So of the inward, mental and spiritual eye. The power of vision is central. If that capacity to see things as they are be unimpaired, the man can be and do that for which God created him. But the man who has lost his power of inward sight is enveloped in the deepest and most hopeless gloom. If the light in a man be darkness, how great is that darkness! On Mat 13:13 ff. see Parable, p. 315 f.; and on Joh 19:30 ff. see Seeing.

In our Lord’s healing of the multitude which the Gospels on several occasions record, cases of blindness were found, loss of sight being then as now common in Syria. The common cause of loss of sight was and is ophthalmia, which varied in severity from a minor form causing redness of the lids and loss of the eyelashes, to an extreme form affecting the whole eyeball, lachrymal ducts, the glands, eyelids and lashes, and resulting in the total destruction of sight and the eyeball. The disease is still prevalent in the East, and especially in Syria, being traceable to the intensity of light and heat, and to the strong winds bearing sand and other injurious matter. The matter secreted from the inflamed glands is also transferred to other persons, making the disease highly contagious. Ophthalmia might also give rise to blindness from birth, by causing permanent opacity of the cornea.

Other affections of the parts connected with the organ of vision might produce blindness, e.g., affection of the nerves. Mat 12:22 was a case of this kind, being probably also complicated with nervous disorder. The blindness, deafness, and dumbness point to some serious defect or disease in the nervous tissue which controls

the organs of vision, hearing, and speech; and the mental disorder is organically connected with the cerebral disorganization.

As a rule, the cases of loss of sight are not sufficiently described to enable us to know what particular cause produces the blindness. Mat_9:27-31 is a case in point, the interest of the narrative being the quick faith of the blind and the sympathetic response of Jesus. The case of the man blind from his birth may have been due to any of the causes above mentioned, or to cataract (John 9). The feature of our Lord's cure of the blind is narrated in the above instances—His touching of the eyes. The blind man of Bethsaida (Mar_8:22-26) was treated similarly. Twice Jesus laid His hands upon the blind eyes. Also He spit upon his eyes—having previously gently led him by the hand out of the village. He spoke to him also of the healing which they both desired, and called forth the energy of the man in response to His own power: 'Seest thou aught?' In this instance a process was observable in the recovery, or possibly there is indicated the difficulty in one who had never seen of being able to interpret to himself new sensations. In John 9 we note that Jesus speaks concerning the cure to be wrought. His words in Joh_9:3-5 would be spoken in the hearing of the one to be healed, and would have a salutary effect in restoring hopefulness to one who might not unnaturally have given up all hope of restoration. The eyes are anointed with clay and saliva, and the man sent in the obedience of a strong faith to a distant pool.

These two instances in which our Lord uses saliva recall the familiar folk-lore of curing sore eyes. The use of saliva, especially of fasting saliva, for bleared eyes, still persists. The Talmud ascribes special efficacy to the saliva of an eldest son. Royal saliva was greatly in request for healing purposes, and an instance is recorded of Vespasian using his saliva with excellent effect, after having first inquired of the physician if the malady were curable (Tacitus, *Hist.* iv. 2; Suetonius, *Vespasian*, 7). Our Lord's use of saliva, or of saliva and clay, had no connexion with these as physical remedies, but may have been designed to encourage the mind of the patients, who were familiar with the remedy. And it is significant that all the action of Jesus was upon the psychical side. The means taken were exactly adapted to call out the response of the patient, and to evoke a real co-operation between Healer and healed. Cf. the means used in Mar_8:22-26, and for the deaf mute in Mar_7:31-35, the signs employed being evidently meant for the one to be restored.

We may note (1) that both Jn. and Mk. in the last two cases, give substantially the same account of the methods employed by Jesus. Considering the wide difference in the standpoint of the two writers, this is most significant, and indicates clearly that both descriptions are drawn from life, and that the actual method of Jesus was remembered and so far understood as to be regarded as memorable. (2) The suggestive likeness between the action of Jesus and modern therapeutic methods. Not

that these deeds of Jesus are explained by the latter, but that the Divine life manifested in Him did not work on totally different lines, although His method completely over-passed and overwhelmed them in essential power. See also Blindness, and Seeing.

Literature.—Martineau, *End. after the Christian Life*, p. 463; Phillips Brooks, *Candle of the Lord*, p. 74; N. Smyth, *Reality of Faith* (1888), 1; B. Wilberforce, *Speaking Good of His Name* (1904), 137; Macmillan, *Ministry of Nature*, ch. xii.; Hastings *DB* [*Note: Dictionary of the Bible.*] , art. 'Medicine'; *Comm.* on passages referred to; Trench and W. M. Taylor on *Miracles*.

T. H. Wright.

☩ Sign

SIGN (σημεῖον, *signum*).—The Gospels contain many references to signs in connexion with the anticipations of Messiah's advent and with the life and work of Jesus Christ. But the various shades and degrees of significance attached to the word 'sign' by speakers, writers, and the people generally, must be carefully discriminated by a close regard to the particular occasion on which it is employed. Most of all must distinction be made between the value placed upon the word by the people of our Lord's time and by our Lord Himself.

1. The fixed expectation of the generation into which Jesus was born, that signs would be associated with every true prophet and reformer and supremely with the Messiah, that marvellous events, largely of a material character, would occur in connexion with every authoritative teacher, and with every manifestation of the will of God, was part of the mental fabric of the Jewish people. The depth to which this expectation penetrated into the general consciousness may be judged by the traces of it in the Apostolic writers and in those trained under their influence. The Apostles generally did not easily throw aside Jewish prepossessions in regard to the kind of phenomena which might be expected to accompany a Messianic advent or a Divine revelation. Although they lay the main emphasis on the ethical and spiritual elements of Christian authority, the lower conceptions persist, and often no clear distinction is made between the σημεῖον and the τέρας (cf. [Mat 24:29](#) f., [Mar 13:24](#) f., [Luk 21:11](#); [Luk 21:25](#), [Act 2:22](#), [Heb 2:4](#), [2Co 12:12](#), [Rev 12:1](#); [Rev 13:13](#); [Rev 15:1](#); [Rev 16:14](#); [Rev 19:20](#), [2Th 2:8](#) f.).

It is abundantly clear that the general assumption was made that credentials of a striking and material character must be demanded of the Messiah as a proof of the authority of His teaching and Person. Repeatedly the Jews, and especially the scribes, Pharisees, and Sadducees (see below), pressed this demand upon Jesus. They wanted a clear convincing proof of His authority. The signs they had seen were possible by collusion with the powers that rule the lower world, by a compact with Beelzebub (Mar 3:22). Only a sign in the heavens would satisfy them. Clearly what they sought was of the nature of a prodigy, properly to be classed with the τέρατα, with which our Lord steadfastly refused to have any part or lot. Similarly, Herod's desire to see Jesus was animated by his wish to see a miracle (σημεῖον) performed by Him. We can be sure that what Herod desired had more relation to prodigies, as most in harmony with his nature and suited to his capacity, and the word used is due to the Evangelist, who himself drew no clear line between the σημεῖον and the τέρας (Luk 23:8).

2. Our Lord's attitude towards signs.—Indications are given that the common expectation of signs on the part of His generation was not without its solicitation to Jesus. One temptation in the wilderness was an urgent pressure on the noblest side of His nature to give a sign of this character with the view of gaining a more speedy influence over the people (Mat 4:5-7, Luk 4:9-12). The temptation was resisted and overcome. Our Lord would put no trust in external and magical signs for the furtherance of His work or the emphasizing and enforcing of His teaching. He knew their futility for the purpose of bringing real conviction to men (Luk 16:31). And the strenuous effort of His life was to resist these unspiritual conceptions of truth and reality.

The request for a sign in confirmation of His teaching He uniformly refused. The apparent response in Joh 2:18 is no exception. The sign He would give would be granted only in its due place as His career was consummated by His own resurrection. Joh 6:26 contains an apparent commendation of those who accepted Him because of His wonder-working, but it was only a relative commendation in comparison with the far lower spirit which was unconcerned about any spiritual authority so long as their physical wants were easily and bountifully provided. Luk 7:21-22 on the surface appears to be a sign given for the sake of convincing John the Baptist, and if ever our Lord could have departed from His habitual way, it was to help that lone prisoner, suffering mental and spiritual anguish because the work Messiah was doing was so unlike what he had expected—deeds of quiet beneficence instead of sharp vengeance against iniquity. But the action sprang out of the Divine impulse as our Lord, deeply moved by John's doubt, realized afresh that to bless and heal men was the truest mark of One sent of God.

Jesus resolutely and persistently refused to give any external sign for the sake of evidencing His claims, and only in the most chary manner spoke of His miracles as signs. He chose rather to call them ἔργα ('works') arising out of the need of man and prompted by His own inner life in response to that need (see art. Miracles). His works were 'signs' because they were part of His whole revelation of God, and elsewhere He regards opportunities for His miracles as occasions for the manifestation of the works of God (Joh 9:3), or for the glorifying of Himself (Joh 11:4). Self-manifestation and Divine revelation were identical in the mind of Jesus (Joh 14:13). Clearly our Lord only refrained from applying the word σημεῖα to His miracles because of the general associations of the word. To Him they were vital parts of the revelation of Divine power which He came to give.

A very particular and urgently-pressed demand for a sign 'in the heavens' is recorded in Mat 12:38-41; Mat 16:1-4, Mar 8:11-12, and Luk 11:16; Luk 11:29-32. The various accounts give a full idea of the occasion, or occasions. Mk. records the astonishment and bewilderment of Jesus at such a claim made by those who professed to be religious leaders. In an age which was full of signs, in which He Himself had been the most signal manifestation of the Divine presence and power, these religious teachers were still asking for signs. 'Why doth this generation seek after a sign? No sign shall be given.' Mt. and Lk. record our Lord's answer that no sign should be given but that of Jonah. Lk. gives the explanation of that sign to the Ninevites as consisting in the man and his message, not in his deliverance from the sea-monster, which they could only have believed on the strength of their faith in the man himself. Mat 16:1-4 gives the same interpretation, as also does Mat 12:38-39; Mat 12:41, which forms a consistent whole and regards Jonah's preaching as the sign. Mat 12:40, with its parallel to the Resurrection of Jesus, must be regarded as an after thought incorporated incongruously into the narrative. And the chief point is that our Lord declares that the one Divine sign to that generation was Himself, the Son of Man, His Person and His teaching. Simeon, under the exaltation of the Spirit, gives expression to the same essential truth (Luk 2:34). Jesus entirely severs Himself from the common conception of a sign. A mere sign was the prodigy desired by an evil generation; His 'works' were signs in the truer and higher sense of having in them a spiritual and Divine significance, and as pointing to greater possibilities of soul and higher regions of reality. They were signs of the Divine power and life which dwelt in Himself.

Joh 10:41, declaring the embarrassment felt by those who were conscious of the truth of the Baptist's message regarding Christ, together with the fact that he 'wrought no sign,' is witness that more spiritual conceptions were breaking through the ancient crust of superstition. And the Fourth Gospel is evidence that one Evangelist was able to disentangle the spiritual and ethical from the material and catastrophic. The conceptions of Christ's power set forth in this Gospel are of a

distinctly more spiritual order. The word used by the writer is invariably σημεῖον (Joh 2:11; Joh 3:2; Joh 4:54, etc.), and there are plain indications that the truer and higher significance was attached to it. The value of the sign is seen to be its revealing quality. The miracle of the Cana-marriage is described as the beginning of His signs, in which He manifested forth His glory (ἐφανερώσε τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ), showing that the disciple had truly apprehended the Master's teaching.

T. H. Wright.

☞ Silence

SILENCE.—‘Speech is of time, Silence is of Eternity. Thought will not work except in Silence; neither will Virtue work except in Secrecy.’ Carlyle’s words (*Sart.* 151) are well known and profoundly true. The silences of great men are often more significant and self-revealing than their words. Silence has an eloquence that speech cannot rival. It is in silence that souls meet and strong emotions pass from one to the other. This is peculiarly true of Jesus, whose character can never be fathomed without a special study of His silences. The sayings of Jesus are limpid gems of ethical thought, flawless in their purity, enunciating principles of universal applicability. His deeds are the perfect expression of His sinless nature. But His silences are as essentially significant of the impression He made upon the world, for they reveal the spiritual atmosphere in which He lived and which determined His attitude to human life and to the problems of human nature.

1. For thirty years after His advent, Jesus was silent as to His mission. He allowed Himself ample time for the natural development of all His powers and faculties. He passed through the ordinary phases of childhood, boyhood, youth, and attained the maturity of manhood before He took up the burden of His brief career. It is the lesson of self-repression, of concentrated preparation for a great work. Jesus took no step He was obliged on maturer consideration to retract.

2. And before He took up His lifework there is a still deeper and more significant silence, the silence of the Temptation (Mat 4:1-11, Mar 1:12-13, Luk 4:1-13). Acts are but symbols, the true human drama is the drama of the soul. All epoch-making events have been lived through in some human soul before they emerged upon the arena of history. It was in the monastery of Erfurt that the Reformation was wrought out. It was in the cave of Manresa its victorious progress was stayed. And it was in the wilderness that Jesus lived His life, fought His tremendous battle with evil, faced

every possible contingency of temptation, and came out victorious. In the silence of His own great soul was the campaign finished and the adversary baffled.

3. After the ordeal in the wilderness, Jesus began His active career, which was merely the symbol and seal of the victory already gained. The Synoptists are uniform in asserting that during the greater part of His ministry He was silent as to His Messiahship and His supernatural origin. His teaching, of which the Sermon on the Mount is a summary, is purely ethical. The first indication of any recognition of His true nature is to be found in the striking incident near Caesarea Philippi, and it is significant that it is the spontaneous acclamation of His own disciples. It is Peter who gives expression to the general feeling in the historic words, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' Peter's confession draws forth the immediate injunction to the disciples that they tell no man that He was Jesus the Christ (Mat 16:20). This silence of Jesus as to His Messiahship was not merely, or mainly, from motives of prudence. It was because the only homage He valued was the homage that sprang from a real perception of the inherent *Divineness* of His character. He sought to draw out of men a recognition of His Divine nature by the sheer force of His Personality. It was the tribute of the heart, the spontaneous uprising of the spiritual instinct in response to His Godhood, that alone had ethical worth. The mere tribute of the lips, the result of convention or authority, was meaningless to Him. Jesus was silent in order that those who knew and loved Him, and in whose soul the Divine energy was working, might testify of Him.

4. The silence of Jesus regarding His miracles is significant of His own attitude towards them (Mar 3:12, Luk 5:14). Silence here cannot have been from prudential considerations, for miracles must undoubtedly have enhanced His reputation among the people, and it was His refusal to work miracles to gratify the Pharisees that formed the ground of their offence against Him (Mat 16:1 ff.). But Jesus knew how little miracles really proved. He knew that the faith given to Him merely on account of the physical marvels He did was on a distinctly lower level than the soul's spontaneous recognition of His spiritual transcendence (Joh 14:11). He was afraid that the unhealthy craving of a superstitious people would dull their perception of ethical truth.

5. Very striking is the silence of Jesus to direct questions asked. He never ignores a question sincerely put, or even when it is put as a challenge, but He rarely gives it a categorical answer (Mat 11:3; Mat 16:1; Mat 21:23; Mat 22:16; Mat 22:34, Mar 10:17, Luk 13:13). He generally rises above the individual case and settles the general principle of which it is an instance. Jesus knew what was in men. He answers their thought rather than their words. Soul meets soul with no interposing medium of physical utterance. The sincere seeker after truth gets a truth deeper than he dreamt of, while the insincere casuist is put to silence.

6. There are various striking silences of Jesus to individuals which have each its own peculiar meaning.

(1) *The silence of probation* (Mat 15:23). When the Syrophœnician woman pleads with Jesus to cure her daughter, He answers her not a word. When she persists in her pleading, in spite of all dissuasion, He speaks, but the ethical position of the two is strangely inverted. The words of Jesus breathe the narrowness of Judaism. Those of the woman reflect the universality of the gospel. This silence of Jesus to her pitiful entreaty is the silence of probation. He recognizes her faith; and because He sees it will stand the strain, He tests it to the uttermost. See Syrophœnician Woman.

(2) *The silence of horror* (Mat 14:13). When Jesus heard of the death of John the Baptist, He said no word, but departed into a desert place to calm the tumult of His spirit in silence. The iniquity of the world He had come to redeem swept over the pure spirit of Jesus with such overwhelming force that utterance was choked, and His human nature had to seek, in silence, communion with the Father in order to regain its equanimity. It is a silence more eloquent than words of vehement denunciation would have been. It is the instinctive shrinking of a high nature from the grossness and baseness of sin.

(3) *The silence of shame* (Joh 8:6). *The Pericope Adulteræ*, though not in the original Gospel of St. John, must have belonged to a very early tradition. It is the birth of the Christian grace of modesty. When confronted with the woman, Jesus is silent, stoops down, and writes upon the ground. He averts His face from the shameful spectacle. He is filled with pity and sorrow for the woman who has lost the virgin glory of her womanhood, and with indignation against the men whose shameless indelicacy in exposing her fault shows that they utterly fail to realize in what the true gravamen of her offence consists. To the pure soul of Jesus the sin of the one is greater than the sin of the other. Hence His words, 'He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her.' The rebuke strikes home, the sense of shame flushes their cheeks, and the woman's accusers silently steal away.

(4) *The silence of indignation* (Mat 26:63, Mar 14:61). Jesus, after His apprehension, was first led before Caiaphas, the high priest. Caiaphas sought to incriminate Him by bringing against Him witnesses who made garbled and irrelevant statements of words they had heard Him utter. The high priest urged Him to say something in His defence, but Jesus held His peace. It was the silence of indignation against the utter mockery of His trial and the attitude of the time-serving president of the Court.

(5) *The silence of contempt* (Luk 23:9). Herod was a different type. He is the representative of superstitious profligacy. Herod was a weak man, with a conscience certainly, but a conscience that could be touched only by his superstitious fears. He

liked to have a saint under his patronage, provided the saint would be pliable enough to leave his patron's vices unrebuked. He had tried John the Baptist, but that experiment had failed, and now he would try Jesus. And so he questioned Him in many words, but Jesus answered him nothing. Here is apparently a seeker after truth to whom Jesus has nothing to say. It is not so. The gospel refuses the patronage of the vicious. Jesus has nothing to say to craven superstition seeking to condone its own vices by taking religion under its protection.

(6) *The silence of self-containment (Joh_19:9)*. Pilate, again, represents another and a higher type. To him Jesus opened Himself more fully than to any of His judges. He recognized in him one whose instincts were those of a capable and genuine ruler, and He sympathized with the dilemma in which Pilate was placed. Though the final decision rested with Pilate, he was the least guilty of all who were responsible for the tragedy of Calvary (Joh_19:11). In Pilate's soul a great struggle was going on. He was looking for a way of escape from a difficult situation, but he dared not take the only way that true magnanimity required. He dared not be true to his own high function of asserting the impartial justice of Imperial Rome, and the result was moral ruin. It is always so with Jesus. To the soul that once recognizes His claims no half measures are possible. It is all or nothing—absolute loyalty or a treason that leads downwards to the pit. And Jesus had a clear perception of the character of the Roman ruler, who alone had insight enough to recognize the essential greatness of his prisoner. One imperial soul met another. On the plane on which they met there was no difficulty of intercommunication. Jesus has no hesitation in asserting His royalty and His claim to be the Revealer of eternal truth. Pilate has culture enough at least to understand what He means, and his scepticism is the scepticism of sadness and perplexity rather than of scorn. But when Pilate, struck with the largeness of soul displayed by Jesus, touches on the higher mysteries, He is silent. To the question, 'Whence art thou?' Jesus has nothing to say. It is not that He fears to commit Himself. It is simply that He cannot give an answer that would be intelligible to Pilate.

(7) *The silence of self-absorption*. There have been many commentaries on the seven words of Jesus on the cross, but His silence there is as striking as His speech. Jesus has nothing to say to the jeers and mockery of the infuriated people, or to the taunts of priests and Pharisees. He is self-absorbed. For the self-hood of Jesus is His mission, His purpose, the idea of His life. And even in the agony of the cruelest death the malignity of man has ever devised, He is not shaken out of this self-absorption. His words have all reference to the central idea which constitutes His earthly existence. Pity for sinning humanity, love for those whose hearts are His, His attitude to the Father with whom all along He has realized His oneness,—these are the emotions that dominate His soul. There is not even the faintest trace of anger against those who have wreaked their vengeance upon Him. There is scarcely even a consciousness of their presence.

7. It is instructive to note the different valuation put upon speech and silence by Jesus and those who surrounded Him. Jesus silenced the Sadducees when they propounded to Him knotty points of theology (Mat 22:34), and suffered not the demons to speak (Mar 1:34). But when the multitude rebuked the blind men who cried importunately to Him at the gate of Jericho, Jesus listened to their appeal (Mat 20:31); and when the disciples sought to silence the mothers who brought their children to be blessed, Jesus encouraged them with one of His most striking and characteristic sayings (Mat 19:13, Mar 10:13, Luk 18:15). And, further, He who in the earlier part of His career carefully concealed His Messiahship from the people, on the critical occasion when He made His triumphant entry into Jerusalem gave an emphatic refusal to silence the acclamations with which He was hailed by the people.

Literature.—Carlyle, *Sartor Resartus*; Maeterlinck, *Treasure of the Humble*; E. A. Abbott, *Philochristus*; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*; the various Lives of Christ; W. M. Taylor, *The Silence of Jesus* (1894), p. 105; H. P. Liddon, *Passiontide Sermons* (1891), p. 153; W. W. Sidey, *The Silent Christ* (1903); A. Maclaren, *The Holy of Holies* (1890), p. 255; Phillips Brooks, *The Light of the World* (1891), p. 124.

A. Miller.

☩ Siloam

SILLOAM.—Josephus (*BJ* v. iv. 1) places the spring at the mouth of the Tyropœon Valley. This, and references of later writers, point to *Birket Silwân*, on the slope S. of the Temple area. A larger pool, *Birket el-Hamra*, now almost filled up, lies lower in the valley. *Birket Silwân* is built within the rock-hewn space occupied by the original pool, 75 ft. × 71 ft. The water was approached by steps cut in the rock. In NT times a covered arcade within the pool, 22½ ft. high and 12 ft. wide, ran round the four sides. From 'Ain Sitti Maryam, the Fountain of the Virgin, on the slope below the eastern battlements, a conduit led the water to the pool; but, probably in Hezekiah's time, a tunnel was cut through the rock, and the fountain apparently covered over, as Josephus does not seem to have known it apart from Siloam. An inscription in ancient Heb. characters was found on the wall of the tunnel in 1880, which gives an account of the cutting. The tunnel is about ⅓ of a mile in length. It is bent as if to avoid obstructions. Two shafts to the surface, at important points, would afford guidance as to direction.

The spring is intermittent. During the rains it may flow twice a day, but in the late summer, once in two days. Such springs are held in superstitious reverence, and credited with power to heal many diseases. Josephus pronounces the water good and

plentiful, and says that this and other fountains flowed more copiously after falling into the hands of Titus.

The phrase 'tower in Siloam' ([Luk 13:4](#)) perhaps indicates that this part of the city was called Siloam, 'the tower' being part of the adjoining wall.

A church was built above the pool in the 5th cent., and later was altered by Justinian. Ruins, possibly of this building, block a great part of the pool.

On the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles, water from this fountain was poured on the altar (Neubauer, *Géog. du Talm.* [Note: *Talmud.*] 145). In the 10th cent. the water was 'good' (Mukaddasi); it is good no longer, percolating, as it does, through vast accumulations of refuse. The village of Siloam, *Kefr Silwân*, on the E. slope of the valley, over against the pool, dates from post-Arab times. Its handful of poor inhabitants still use the impure water for domestic purposes.

W. Ewing.

☛ Silver

SILVER.—See Money.

☛ Simeon

SIMEON (Συμεών) is a transliteration into Greek of the common Heb. name שִׁמְעוֹן, which is first met with as that of the second son of Jacob and Leah in [Gen 29:33](#), where a derivation from שָׁמַע, 'hear,' is suggested.

1. An aged saint ([Luk 2:25](#) ff.), who took the infant Jesus in his arms at the Presentation in the Temple on the completion of the mother's period of purification, and broke out into an exultant song of praise. Afterwards he foretold to Mary the varied results that would attend the mission of her son.

He has been identified with a Rabbi of the same name, who is described as the son of Hillel and father of Gamaliel i.; but the original author (*Shabbath*, 15a) merely mentions him as intermediate between Hillel and Gamaliel as *Nasi* of the Sanhedrin. Beyond that statement, which is not in the Mishna, nothing is known of him; and the Lukan phrase, 'a man in Jerusalem whose name was Simeon,' is too modest to allow

of identification with one who was at once the son of Hillel and the leading authority on jurisprudence in the nation. Another legend is preserved in the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, to the effect that Charinus and Leucius, two sons of Simeon, had been raised from the dead, and had been summoned to describe before the Sanhedrin the occurrences they had witnessed in the underworld at the death of Jesus. Their narrative is said to have been afterwards reported to Pilate, who ordered its Incorporation in the official *Acts* of his procuratorship. This Apocryphal Gospel is not only of a late date (4th or even 5th cent.), but was evidently composed in the interest of apologetics, with a view particularly to represent the resurrection of Jesus as attested by evidence which even His enemies regarded as irrefutable. Until the period of uncritical search for legends in the 13th cent., little historical value was ascribed to the story, which may be confidently regarded as destitute of any.

Of the lineage or descendants of Simeon no contemporary evidence has survived; and for the man himself St. Luke is our only authority.

Simeon is described as (1) 'righteous and devout,' or conscientious in regard to God and His law (cf. [Act_22:12](#)); (2) as looking for the Messiah; and (3) as moved by the Holy Spirit (not merely the spirit of prophecy) to believe that he would not die before he had seen the Messiah. Guided by the Spirit to the courts of the Temple, he no sooner saw Jesus there than the words of the famous *Nunc Dimittis* (wh. see) rose to his lips. Whilst Mary was wondering at the meaning of such words, Simeon turned to her and foretold the diverse results of the mission of Jesus. A stumbling-block and an offence to some, it would be the inspiration of a new life to others; and with her own blessedness would mingle anguish unspeakable. In the issue the deepest needs of many souls would be excited and met, and men's hearts would be probed, enriched, and satisfied. After this brief appearance in history, Simeon passes again into obscurity, leaving only a few imperishable words behind him.

2. An ancestor, otherwise unknown, of Joseph, the husband of Mary ([Luk_3:30](#)). In this case, with some inconsistency, Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 turns the name into 'Symeon' (as in [Act_13:1](#); [Act_15:14](#)), which is the more normal vocalization of the Greek, though not of the Hebrew.

R. W. Moss.

☞ Simon

SIMON.—The form *Simon* is not a transcription of [שִׁמְעוֹן](#), but is either a contraction for *Simeon* or an independent Greek name. The latter view is much the more probable. In

the NT the name is frequent. The Gospels mention—1. Simon the brother of our Lord (Mat 13:55, Mar 6:3). 2. Simon the Zealot (see Cananaean), one of the twelve Apostles (Mar 3:18 ||). 3. Simon of Cyrene, who was impressed to bear our Lord's cross (Mat 27:32 ||). 4. Simon 'the leper,' in whose house the anointing of our Lord by Mary of Bethany took place (Mat 26:6, Mar 14:3). 5. Simon the Pharisee, in whose house the penitent woman anointed our Lord's head and feet (Luk 7:36 ff.). See Anointing. 6. Simon the father of Judas Iscariot (Joh 6:71; Joh 13:2; Joh 13:26). 7. Simon Peter. See Peter.

W. Patrick.

Simple, Simplicity

SIMPLE, SIMPLICITY (ἀπλοῦς, ἀπλότης; the latter does not occur in the Gospels; the former only in Mat 6:22 and Luk 11:34).

The words ἀπλοῦς, 'simple,' and 'single' spring from the one root (Giles, *Man. of Comp. Philol.* p. 156). It appears in Greek in ἐν (= σμεν), ἅμα, and as ἄ in ἄπαξ and ἀπλοῦς; in Lat. in *semel*, *simul*, *simplex*, and *similis*; in English in *same*, *simple*, and *single*. The basal meaning, therefore, is *oneness*, *sameness* (cf. 'one and the same'); the fundamental contrast is between one and more than one; and only in *similis* and its derivatives does it branch out into the idea of *likeness*. In medicines it yields the antithesis: simple or pure v. mixed or adulterated; in other realms, that of single or double—as of a road, the sole of a shoe, etc. The former, transferred to the moral sphere, gives the idea of *purity*, *genuineness*; the latter, that of *singleness*, *openness*, *frankness*, *straightforwardness*, *simplicity*, *candour*, *artlessness*. The antithesis in the former is *impurity*, *adulteration*; in the latter, *double-mindedness*, *duplicity*, *hypocrisy*, etc. The two conceptions really flow together in *guilelessness*, *sincerity*.

These meanings are found throughout the classical and NT periods. A third appears in Isoc. and Arist., where the word sometimes descends to *silliness* or *folly*, as in English. But this is never so in LXX Septuagint or NT (see Liddell and Scott, Cremer, and Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, s.v.). Of the meanings given above, 'singleness' almost exhausts the thought of simplicity in the Gospels. But 'guilelessness' is so close to it that it must also be briefly treated. Other English senses of the word, as well as the idea of purity above, do not properly come under this head in the Gospels.

1. The leading passage is Mat 6:22. In that chapter Jesus expounds the first great commandment touching our duty to God, as in Mat 7:1-12 He enforces the second, which concerns our duty to man (cf. Mar 12:29-31). The form of the teaching was determined by Pharisaism, which serves as a dark foil for the truth. Outwardly religious, the Pharisees were essentially worldly. Professing ostentatiously to be servants of God and shepherds of the people, they were oppressors of the people and servants of their own selfish ambitions. Thus they lived a double life, loving the praise of men more than the praise of God. Over against their worldliness, with its doubleness and hypocrisy, Jesus sets before us the obligation to obey and please God in everything as our supreme duty (Mat 6:1-18), while in Mat 6:19-32 He meets our unbelieving fear that such a course would bring loss and bankruptcy, by assuring us that we may well trust our Heavenly Father's care. It is all summed up in Mat 6:33 f. in the command to seek first God's Kingdom and righteousness, and in the promise that He will give all needful earthly good, so that we need not worry. That this singleness of aim is the main thought, is clear from the illustration He employs in Mat 6:22. The 'single' eye is that which looks at one object alone, and sees that clearly; as contrasted with it, the 'evil' eye is that which (not 'sees double,' but) endeavours to look at two objects at the same time (and the context suggests two in opposite directions), and therefore sees neither clearly. The natural antithesis to ἀπλοῦς would have been διπλοῦς, instead of which πονηρός is used, both to turn attention sharply from the physical to the moral which it was meant to illustrate, and, by avoiding the thought of 'seeing double,' which διπλοῦς in itself would naturally suggest, to make it easier to think of the unusual attempt to see things in opposite directions, and so pass to the common moral experience of cherishing, as objects of ambition, things that are diametrically opposed. Accordingly, πονηρός must be interpreted as 'evil' in this particular sense. For the double aim to serve God and mammon is evil, both in its very nature, as being really a rejection of the sole sovereignty of God, and in its results, as leading inevitably to the double life with its darkness and doom. Such a life is only apparently possible. Really it is impossible; a choice must be made. We cannot serve God and mammon. Pharisees could not believe, because they sought glory from one another rather than the glory that comes from God (Joh 5:44; cf. Joh 12:42 f.). Life becomes simple when we accept God's will as our law and His Kingdom as the object of our endeavour. And that life leads to the blessings here mentioned. It floods the whole being with light. It means, as surely as God cares for birds and flowers (Mat 6:22), that He will care for our temporal needs better than any man can care for himself, though he be rich, cultured, and powerful as King Solomon (Mat 6:25-32). Moreover, it ensures imperishable treasures in heaven (Mat 6:19).

2. The passage in Lk. (Luk_11:34-36) is to the same effect. That wicked generation forms the background (Luk_11:29). Some of them had charged Jesus with being in league with Beelzebub (Luk_11:15; Mt. calls them ‘Pharisees,’ Mat_12:24; Mk. ‘scribes,’ Mar_3:32). In refuting that charge, He declares that it is by the finger of God He casts out demons, and that therefore in Him the Kingdom of God has come near to them (Luk_11:20). The man who is not with Him is against Him (Luk_11:23), and therefore against God. None such can be blessed, but only those who hear God’s word and keep it (Luk_11:28). Then to the thronging multitudes He points out the sin of that generation (Luk_11:29). He is a sign to them, as Jonah was to Nineveh. But inasmuch as He is superior to Jonah and all who have gone before Him (Luk_11:31-32), and His light has not been hidden, but conspicuous (Luk_11:33), He has, with unparalleled clearness, presented to men God’s claim upon themselves. Then, with a swift turn to personal warning and appeal (shown in the singular pronoun), He declares to each of them that, if he strives to lead the double life, he will inevitably be guilty of refusing God’s claim, and so will sink into darkness and condemnation; but if, with single-eyed devotion, he heeds God’s message and claim, he shall be filled with light and blessedness.

3. Very similar to this is the thought in Mat_11:16-30, though the word ἀπλοῦς is not employed. The upbraided cities, with much formal religion, were yet devoted to mammon and had no real heart for God. Hence their darkened judgment, as shown by their inability to understand John or Jesus, and hence their inevitable doom. Over against these worldly ‘wise and understanding’ people Jesus sets the ‘babes’—those who, less wise in their generation than the children of the world (cf. Luk_16:8), cry out in their need and helplessness not for the world’s prizes, but for the One they must have, even the Father. Their cry the Father answers; to all such the Son gives rest. The same idea is expressed pointedly in Luk_10:20 (‘rather rejoice that your names are written in heaven’) and Luk_10:42, where the one thing needful is to listen to Him. This passage (Mat_11:16-30) shows how easily the transition is made from ‘singleness of aim to ‘childlike guilelessness.’ In the eyes of the world this may seem foolishness, but in Jesus’ thought it is wisdom (Mat_11:19). It is a mark of those in His Kingdom (Mat_18:3 ff., Mar_10:15, Luk_18:15-17). Apart from these, there are only two or three passages that properly belong here. One is Mat_10:16. The English ‘harmless,’ based on a false derivation of ἀκέραιος, is unfortunate. It should be ‘guileless’ or ‘simple ‘as in the Lat. and many English versions. Prudence alone may lead to trickery; simplicity alone, to silliness. The Apostles are to be both prudent and guileless. Nathanael is already an illustration of it—it constitutes the true spiritual Israelite (Joh_1:48).

Such is the gospel conception of the simple life—a life of trustful obedience to the will of God. It will manifest itself in various ways:—in unequivocal speech (Mat_5:37);

in healthy independence of the opinion of men (Mat 6:1; Mat 6:5 etc., Joh 5:41); in judgments based on principle and reality rather than on appearance or custom—as about the Sabbath (Mar 2:23 to Mar 3:6) and the two anointings (Luk 7:36-50, Mar 14:3-9); in righteousness (Mat 6:33), calm (Mat 12:19; Mat 11:29) courage (Mat 14:4), etc. It is indeed the very root of all virtue, the very heart of the Christian life. It underlies all Christ's teachings. To exhaust it in all its implications would be to exhaust the Gospels.

Jesus Himself is in this, as in all other matters, the incarnation, the living illustration, of His own teachings. His first recorded utterance strikes that note (Luk 2:49 Authorized Version); it reappears on the threshold of His public career (Mat 3:15), repeatedly in the course of His ministry in conversations with disciples or controversies with opponents (Joh 4:34; Joh 6:38; Joh 8:29; Joh 8:42-47; Joh 9:4), and even in His prayer to the Father toward its close (Joh 17:4). And, as we study His conduct and character as He moves in the midst of friends and foes, we can see how unfailingly that life of single-hearted devotion to God is marked by insight and wisdom; courage and calm; steadfastness and consistency; beauty and strength; loyalty, patience, and heroism; righteousness, truth, and love; grace, majesty, and blessedness. It cuts a straight path through all the shams and sophistries of men, and rises victorious over all weakness and worry, all waywardness and wickedness.

Literature.—Of the Comm. those of Broadus and J. A. Alexander on Matthew give the best exposition. Bengel on Mat 6:22 shows his usual insight, though he has tripped on 10:16. See also Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , artt. 'Simple,' 'Simplicity.' We may add, for the benefit of any who are interested in modern discussion of 'the Simple Life': Wagner, *The Simple Life*; W. J. Dawson, *The Quest of the Simple Life*; M'Leod, *The Culture of Simplicity*; and *Letters on the Simple Life*, republished from the *Daily Graphic*. Some of these are as instructive by their contrasts to, as in their agreements with, the NT conception. See also R. F. Horton, *The Commandments of Jesus* (1898), 63; Phillips Brooks, *New Starts in Life* (1896), 158; S. A. Brooke, *The Gospel of Joy* (1898), 161; G. H. Morrison *Sunrise* (1901), 124.

J. H. Farmer.

⚡ Sin

SIN.—Sin is personal hostility to the will of God. Christian teaching with regard to it is relative to the facts of the gospel, being necessarily implied by the death of Christ considered as a work of redemption. It is the Christian interpretation of facts of experience, which are independent of any explanation of life, whether offered by

theology, philosophy, or scientific theory. Its value is irrespective of the view which historical criticism may suggest of the literature of the OT. Neither is it affected by theories of the organic development of the world or human life derived from modern biological thought. Philosophic systems, monistic or otherwise, cannot be allowed to govern or modify a doctrine which in the first instance can be tested only by relation to beliefs grounded not upon metaphysic, but experience. The Christian will rather hold that a philosophic theory inadequate to the facts of the gospel has been too hastily identified with reality.

1. *The gospel* never rises above the limits of its first publication as the Kingdom of God (Mar 1:14-15). No doubt the terms are deepened and spiritualized, as well by the subsequent teaching of Jesus (Luk 17:20; Luk 19:11, Act 1:7-8) as by the accomplishment of His atoning work (Luk 24:44-49). But though what might have remained an external and almost physical conception became the manifestation of one eternal life (Joh 3:15-16, 1Jn 1:1-3), nevertheless the Church of the living God (1Ti 3:15), the relation of a people of possession to their rightful Lord, King, and Father (Tit 2:14) is constant. Allegiance, faith, sonship are the marks of those who share the membership of this Kingdom. What Jesus the Messiah found was disobedience and disloyalty. Human life, as He was called upon to deal with it, involved subjection to another prince (Joh 14:30), bondage to another master (Joh 8:34), 'sonship' to another 'father' (Joh 8:44). To the consciousness of Jesus, Satan was present, not as a convenient personification of evil that became actual only in the individual wills of men, but as the author of sin, the person in whom evil has its spring, even as God is the fount of life. Jesus' sense of dependence upon the Father did not carry with it a monism which saw God in all and all in God. For Him, as for St. John, the whole world lay in the Evil One (1Jn 5:19, cf. Luk 4:5-6). His own conflict was with the prince of this world (Joh 14:30). To be delivered from the Evil One was the converse of being brought into temptation (Mat 6:13 : the insertion of *ἀλλὰ* in Mt., and the absence of the clause in the best Manuscripts of Luk 11:4 suggest that it is correlative to the preceding clause, representing the same act differently). He had seen Satan fallen as lightning from heaven (Luk 10:18). Over against the Kingdom of God was the kingdom of Satan (Mat 12:26-28; Mat 16:27; Mat 25:41, cf. Rev 16:10). The drama of human life was accomplished in presence of this already existing dualism. Christ assumes the current Hebrew conception of a world of spiritual personalities under the leadership of Beelzebub (Luk 11:14-26). The stampede of the swine at Gerasa witnesses to their control, within the limits of Divine permission, over natural forces (Mar 5:13). Physical disease results from Satan's bondage (Luk 13:16). Possession by demons is an abnormal case of its influence over human beings (e.g. Mar 9:20-22). And all opposition to the purpose of God is inspired by Satan (Joh 8:42-47). The Jews were of their father the devil, so that the works wrought by them were antithetic to the works of God manifested in Jesus (Joh 8:44). Even the

chosen Twelve Satan had asked to have, that he might sift them as wheat (Luk 22:31). So the Passion was a continuation of the Temptation, a direct agony and death-struggle wherein the prince of this world was cast out (Joh 12:31; Joh 16:11), the strong man spoiled (Luk 11:21).

From the first the proclamation of the good news, accompanied as it was with the curing of diseases and the casting out of demons (Mat 10:7-8, Luk 9:1-2), witnessed to the real character of Christ's work as redemption, ransom, and salvation. For the true unification between the normal and universal purpose of the gospel—the forgiveness of sins—and the occasional and particular accessories of it—exorcism and healing—lay not so much in the analogy between bodily disease and spiritual wickedness, as in the fact that both are the exercise of the one Satanic power within the usurped kingdom of evil. No doubt there is a certain suggestiveness in the parallel between disease and sin, which Jesus Himself recognized. But there is nothing in His teaching to suggest the later ideas of taint, infection, vitiated nature. It is trespasses which the Heavenly Father must do away, and that by forgiveness (Mat 6:15); salvation from sins (Mat 1:21), *i.e.* actions involving guilt, is implied by the name *Jesus* (see art. Guilt). The bringing forth of the people from Pharaoh's bondage to serve Jehovah is the ancient experience which is before the mind of devout men under the old covenant as the pattern of the deliverance which Messiah was to accomplish (Mat 2:15, cf. Hos 11:1). Salvation is therefore not the restoration of spiritual health, but the liberation of God's people from an evil service. The ministry of the Son of Man consists in giving His life a ransom (Mar 10:45, Mat 20:28; cf. 1Ti 2:6). And the Fourth Evangelist only interprets the mind of the Master when he speaks of Jesus as dying for the nation, and destined to gather together into one the scattered children of God (Joh 11:51-52). He was the shepherd bringing home the lost sheep dispersed upon the mountains (Joh 10:16); or, somewhat to vary the idea, the Redeemer coming into the world, not to judge it along with its prince, but to save it from the Evil One (Joh 3:17-18, Joh 12:31; Joh 12:47, Joh 17:15), and casting out the indwelling Satan by the finger or Spirit of God (Luk 11:20). The acceptable year of the Lord is a year of release (Luk 4:18-19).

2. From the implications of the Gospel narrative we pass to *the theology of the Epistles*. In order to gain a clear view of St. Paul's doctrine of sin in its completeness, it is necessary to go behind the Epistle to the Romans. We must bear in mind, first of all, the essentially Jewish basis of his thought. To him salvation, or redemption, carried all the associations which had gathered round it in Hebrew history. The Kingdom of Messiah was a vivid reality, and the earlier Epistles show that at first he was not without the common anticipation of its immediate establishment in manifested power. Satan was a concrete fact. If at one time it was the Spirit of Jesus that suffered him not (Act 16:7), at another Satan hindered him (1Th 2:18). The thorn in the flesh was a messenger of Satan (2Co 12:7). The Christian is armed in

order to ward off the fiery darts of the Evil One (Eph 6:16). Principalities and powers were the unseen antagonists of Christ's servants (Eph 6:12, cf. Luk 22:53), the enemies over whom Christ triumphed in the Cross (Col 2:15). If Messiah was to be manifested at the Parousia, Satan was also destined to be manifested in the Man of Sin (2Th 2:3-11). A remarkable parallel to the conception of 'the Evil One,' which appears both in the Synoptics and in the Fourth Gospel, is found in 'the prince of the power of the air' (Eph 2:2). The same passage describes those who become sons of God as by nature children of wrath (Eph 2:3), dead not in sin but through trespasses (Eph 2:5), sons of disobedience because inwrought by this evil spirit (Eph 2:2). Demons are as much part of St. Paul's world as of that which appears in the Synoptists. He identifies them with the heathen gods (1Co 10:20-21). Belial is the antithesis of Christ (2Co 6:15). To lapse from Christian conduct is to turn aside after Satan (1Ti 5:15); to be separated from Christian fellowship is to be delivered to Satan (1Co 5:5, 1Ti 1:20). And that redemption meant primarily for St. Paul translation from the kingdom of Satan to the Kingdom of God (Col 1:13), is attested by the form in which he narrates before Agrippa the story of his commission as Apostle of the Gentiles (Act 26:18). All this is in close correspondence with the mind of Jesus, and must be brought with us to a closer examination of the Pauline doctrine of sin.

That sin is essentially disloyalty to God is the substance of the *locus classicus* on the nature of sin, Rom 1:18-32 'Knowing God, they glorified him not as God, neither gave thanks' (Rom 1:21). It will be observed, first, that the Apostle here speaks of sin in its widest signification, including such distinctions as are involved in the theological conceptions of original and actual. We have here, therefore, a definition of sin which must govern all subsequent uses of the term. All the elements which enter into particular sins, or transgressions of known law, are represented—knowledge of God and dependence upon Him (Rom 1:20), wilful and therefore inexcusable refusal of due homage (Rom 1:21), the incurring of guilt and consequently of God's wrath (Rom 1:18). Further, it is noticeable that the plural 'men,' not the collective 'man,' is used throughout the passage. There is nothing abstract in this general view of sin, even though it be universal (cf. 'all sinned,' Rom 5:12; 'all died,' 2Co 5:14). Another point is, that St. Paul is led to disclose this 'vision of sin' as the necessary postulate of the gospel (Rom 1:16-18), in which is revealed a righteousness of God' (Rom 1:17, Rom 3:21). Lastly, there is no confusion, as in the popular mind, between those physical excesses which are called vice, and the inward refusal 'to have God in their knowledge' (Rom 3:28), whether it applies to the sensuous or the spiritual nature of men, which alone is sin. 'God gave them up unto a reprobate mind' (Rom 3:28), with all its consequences to the complex personality of man. This is of great significance. St. Paul's appeal is not to the equivocal testimony of external facts, which considered in themselves are non-moral, but to facts as interpreted by conscience. Fundamentally this is the appeal to personal experience, and it is clear from the Epistle to the Romans, as from the whole Pauline theology, that the Apostle is

universalizing his own experience, as he saw himself in the light of the vision of Jesus of Nazareth (Gal 1:11-17, Rom 7:7-25).

Now St. Paul expresses his relation to sin in the phrase 'sin dwelleth in me' (Rom 7:17). He is describing the common experience of an inward struggle, when neither good nor evil is finally in the ascendant. The complete sinful condition would be one of consent (Rom 1:32, 2Th 2:12), in which 'the law of sin' was unchecked by 'the law of the mind' (Rom 7:23, Gal 5:17). The terms must not be misunderstood in view of the modern conception of scientific law, 'Law' in St. Paul's theology involves the personality of the lawgiver, so that to find this 'law in the members' (Rom 7:23), to be inwrought by sin, seems to point to an indwelling spiritual presence. Is this a mere figure? St. Paul reverts to it in a still more significant form. Christians are not to let sin reign in their mortal bodies (Rom 6:12). Compliance with evil involves an obedience (Rom 6:16), a slavery (Rom 6:17). There is a close parallel between those who, as alive in Christ Jesus, are servants of God, and those who being dead in trespasses serve sin (Rom 6:15-23). Two hostile kingdoms, two rival loyalties, make their claim upon a man's allegiance. So, when under the form of 'Adam's transgression,' sin is considered in its universal aspect (Rom 5:14), a personal sovereignty is again suggested—'death,' *i.e.* sin in its consequent development, 'reigned through the one' (Rom 5:17). The effect of Adam's transgression is represented as the establishment of an authority (cf. 1Co 15:24, Eph 2:2; Eph 6:12, Col 1:13) over his descendants rather than as a corruption of their nature, carrying with it therefore condemnation (Rom 5:16; see art. Guilt) as the due sentence of God upon those who reject His law. This personal embodiment of hostility to the Divine law and government, in view of St. Paul's general outlook on the spiritual world, can be none other than Satan, exercising, as captain of 'spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places' (Eph 6:12), not an external compulsion but an inward influence, not therefore impairing the responsible personalities that are indwelt. Thus St. Paul can say, 'Death passed unto all men, for that all sinned' (Rom 5:12). Sin is always a personal attitude, never a pathological condition. Death is its consequence (Rom 5:12), but the physical analogy of St. James (Rom 1:15) has no parallel in St. Paul. It is always the sentence, punishment, or wages (Rom 6:23; see art. Guilt), the sequel to the righteous judgment of God (Rom 2:5). So, too, salvation is not a remedy for mortal disease, but a personal act of kindness and mercy on the part of an offended but loving God (Eph 1:5-10; Eph 2:7, Tit 3:4-8). Looking to the state from which men are rescued, it is redemption (Gal 3:13; Gal 4:5); looking to that into which they are brought, it is reconciliation (Rom 5:10-11; Rom 11:15, 2Co 5:18-19). Both involve the personal action of the Father's loving will, whereby He chooses to forgive the past and bring back His children into fellowship with Himself (Rom 5:3-8, Col 1:19-22; cf. 1Pe 3:18). As applied to the individual, this is justification (Rom 3:24; Rom 4:25; Rom 5:9 *al.*), which represents not a process of renewal, but an amnesty extended to the sinner. What Christ slew by the Cross was the enmity

(Eph 2:15-16). Its effect, therefore, is not an infused righteousness, but a free pardon whereby sins are no longer reckoned (Rom 4:7-8, 2Co 5:19).

3. The rest of the NT is in general agreement with St. Paul. *St. James*, though he speaks of sin as the intermediate stage between lust and death (Jam 1:15), yet by the very figure used to describe their relationship, clearly recognizes that all three are essentially the same in kind. Lust is not animal impulse but undeveloped sin. The sinner is one who has committed sins (Jam 5:15), which may be covered by repentance (Jam 5:20) and forgiven in answer to prayer (Jam 5:15). Sins, therefore, are personal transgressions against God, which, if unremitted, involve judgment (Jam 5:12), a personal condemnation and sentence on the part of the Judge (Jam 4:12, Jam 5:9). Lust is not even a pathological condition of the will. It has the nature of sin, being not a result of ignorance, but essentially a personal determination of will. This is more clearly brought out by the assertion that lust, not God, is the tempter (Jam 1:13-14), which suggests the presence of an evil will, the source of that friendship of the world which is enmity against God (Jam 4:4), taking occasion of the natural passions and desires of men to influence spiritually the human personality. The wisdom which cometh down from above is set over against a wisdom which is devilish (Jam 3:15; Jam 3:18; Jam 3:17).

St. Peter, while he speaks of fleshly lusts that war against the soul (1Pe 2:11), is even more emphatic than St. James in his recognition of the personality of evil. Sin is part of a man's activity, a vain manner of life from which we are redeemed by the blood of Him who bore our sins, *i.e.* our actual transgressions, that He might bring us to God (1Pe 1:18-19, 1Pe 2:24, 1Pe 3:18). For the redeemed Christian it still exists in the person of God's enemy, who is now the adversary of God's people also, seeking once more to draw them away from their allegiance (1Pe 5:8).

St. John, with his profounder insight, gives to the doctrine of sin what is perhaps the widest and most comprehensive sweep in the NT. 'Sin is lawlessness' (1Jn 3:4). This sentence, with its coextensive subject and predicate, is all but a definition. It recognizes no distinction in kind between 'sin' and 'sins,' which are practically interchangeable in the Johannine writings. If the Lamb of God 'taketh away the sin of the world' (Joh 1:29, Vulgate *peccata mundi*), the Son is manifested 'to take away sins' (1Jn 3:5). If the blood cleanseth from all sin (1Jn 1:7), Jesus Christ is the propitiation for our sins (1Jn 2:2). The cleansing is sacrificial (*ἱλασμός*), implying personal dealings with God. It is therefore forgiveness of sins which those for whom it is prevalent receive (1Jn 1:9, 1Jn 2:12). St John does not speak of sin as a state. Doing sin is opposed to doing righteousness (1Jn 3:4; 1Jn 3:7-8). 'In him is no sin' (1Jn 3:5) is equivalent to 'Which of you convicteth me of sin?' (Joh 8:46, cf. 1Pe 2:22),—a clear record rather than a perfect state. That which abides in him who

believes in the name of Jesus (1Jn_3:23) is the love of the Father, a personal relation having been established which is opposed to the love of the world (1Jn_2:15-16). Here, however, is no condemnation of the natural impulses or of matter. That Jesus Christ is come in the flesh to save the world is St. John's cardinal doctrine (1Jn_4:2, 2Jn_1:7). But, as with St. James and St. Peter, it is lust, and the corruption that is in the world through lust, which constitute the bondage from which men need deliverance (1Jn_2:16; 1Jn_5:4-5). What then is lust? That is the point at which St. John's whole view opens out before us. The Fourth Gospel has recorded the prayer of Christ for His disciples, not that they should be taken from the world, but that they might be kept from the Evil One (Joh_17:15); and also His condemnation of the Jews because, continuing in the bondage of sin, it was their will to do the lusts not of their body, but of their father the devil (Joh_8:44). And the Apocalypse unfolds the mystery of iniquity in language fully accordant with the view of sin implied in the Gospel. The old serpent the devil (Rev_12:9; Rev_20:2) deceives the whole world (Rev_12:9, Rev_20:2; Rev_20:10), having power ($\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$, Rev_13:2) and even authority ($\epsilon\acute{\xi}\theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$, Rev_13:4; cf. Luk_4:6) over the nations, manifesting his rule in the mystic Babylon (Rev_16:19; Rev_17:1-6), and the kingdom of the beast (*13 passim*), until He who is the Alpha and Omega, having by His angel sealed the servants of God (Rev_7:2-3), brings in the final salvation, the Kingdom of God and the authority of His Christ (Rev_12:10). St. John's last word is written in the First Epistle. Behind human history is the devil, 'who sinneth from the beginning' (1Jn_3:8). The explanation of human sin, therefore, is the relation of the world to this spirit. 'The whole world lieth in the evil one' (1Jn_5:19). To be begotten of God (1Jn_3:9), who is light (1Jn_1:5), truth (1Jn_5:20), and love (1Jn_4:8), is a reversal of those relations described as being 'of the devil' (1Jn_3:8), who is a murderer and liar (Joh_8:44), and the power of darkness (1Jn_2:11; cf. Luk_22:53, Act_26:18). Philosophically, there can be little doubt that St. John is content with a dualism, which he is not concerned to resolve, starting as he does from the facts of experience (1Jn_1:1; 1Jn_4:14; cf. Joh_19:35). Though evil is antithetic to good, it is not in a Platonic sense as non-being ($\tau\acute{o}\ \mu\grave{\eta}\ \acute{\omicron}\nu$). The problem is approached from the positive and concrete standpoint of personality. Though God is indeed the beginning and the end (Rev_1:8; Rev_21:6; Rev_22:13), yet a similar phrase is used in speaking of the author of evil as in describing the Word (1Jn_3:8; 1Jn_1:1): both are 'from the beginning.' The final triumph, though complete, is represented symbolically as the imprisonment (Rev_20:2-3; Rev_20:7; Rev_20:10), not the annihilation, of Satan. The Hebrew mind, which, in spite of mystical affinities with Platonism and, possibly, of direct influence from Greek sources, is dominant in St. John, did not feel the necessity of a metaphysical monism, being content to respond to the revelation of a supreme spiritual Person, the fear of whom was the beginning of wisdom and man's chief end (Job_28:28, Psa_111:10,

Ecc 12:13). It is enough to know that they who 'abide in him that is true' have by a transference of allegiance overcome the Evil One (1Jn 2:13).

The *Epistle of Jude*, with which *2 Peter* must be closely associated, clearly exhibits that apocalyptic view of the spiritual issues behind the facts of human life and experience of which there are abundant traces in the NT outside the Book of Revelation, and which indicate a 'war in heaven' (Rev 12:7) as the ultimate explanation of sin (Jud 1:6; Jud 1:9; Jud 1:14, 2Pe 2:4; 2Pe 3:7; 2Pe 3:12). To the Jewish mind this language is not what Western thought would understand by mere symbol. It is rather the symbolic representation of real existence, the Hebrew equivalent of Greek mysteries. It is a mistake, therefore, to neglect either the Apocalypse or the apocalyptic passages of other writings in the interpretation of the NT, or to fail to perceive that their characteristic ideas underlie the theology of the Apostolic age, as the Platonic mould of thought governs the religious philosophy of the 4th cent., the biological that of the 19th. The contempt of millenarianism, while it banished much that was fantastic in Christian teaching, had the correspondingly unfortunate result of obliging interpreters of the NT to arrange its statements against a background not contemplated by the writers themselves. The result in the case of sin has been the assigning of inadequate and shifting values to the term, and the misapplication of physical or other analogies. For Apostolic Christianity the background is always God with His Kingdom of angels and men on the one hand, and on the other the devil with his angels, extending his usurped authority over those human servants whom he holds captive. Sin is active hostility to God.

4. The whole question of **original sin** is removed from the atmosphere in which it is usually discussed, when it is realized that the difference between sin and righteousness is not one of infused or implanted characters, but of relationship to God. It need not be either affirmed or denied that moral and spiritual tendencies are, like the physical organism, capable of transmission. Still more irrelevant is the discussion whether acquired characters descend by inheritance. These are questions for psychological research, and may be left for decision upon scientific grounds. No doubt theories of transmission, from the crudest Augustinian notions of sexual propagation to the subtlest doctrine of heredity, have been advanced by religious philosophers to account for the universal need of salvation. So inveterate has this type of thought become, that it adheres to the phrases, e.g. 'depravity,' 'corruption of nature,' and the like, in which theology has endeavoured to express the Scripture teaching. Though the confessional formulas that employ such phrases are not committed to interpretations of the NT which imply a theory, opponents of what is supposed to be the traditional doctrine have in consequence been allowed to attack it in the interests of a more scientific psychology, on the assumption that original sin is held to be a predisposing cause of actual sin. Mr. F. R. Tennant, for example, in his *Hulsean Lectures*, starting from the premiss that ethical attributes are not rightly

applied to anything but the activities of a will that knows the moral law, has no difficulty in proving that appetites and passions are the raw material of morality, belonging to the environment of the will, not an 'universal and hereditarily transmitted disturbance of man's nature.' The consequence follows that sin, which must involve guilt, applies properly only to the individual, while 'original sin is little more than a name for the solidarity in nature and environment of the race of actual sinners. Whatever may be said of the background of Augustinian thought or the atmosphere in which the confessions of the 16th cent. were drawn, there can be no doubt that they only reasserted the language of the NT in ascribing the wrath of God to the race no less than to the individual. Terms like 'abnormal humanity,' 'taint of nature,' 'infirmity of will,' may be useful practical analogies, but, like all analogies, they defeat their end if rigorously pressed. For what Scripture means is, not that individual responsibility is conditioned by racial defect, but that the guilt attaching to individuals belongs, in the first instance, to the community (see art. Guilt).

5. The controversies that have arisen about the question whether sin is a *privation* or a *depravation of nature*, would have lost much of their force if theological thought had adhered more closely to the Scripture mode of regarding sin. The later mediaeval view, stereotyped by the standards of Trent, represented man as deprived of a gift which raised him above nature (*supernaturale donum*). The unsophisticated experience of human nature leads us to regard it as not in its chief outlines evil, and so far as it denies an inherent corruption in the actual content of manhood the Tridentine position is sufficiently justified. But the Reformers were right in their main contention, which was that sin involved a positive departure from the Divine purpose. If sin in its essence is neither the loss nor the disturbance of personal endowments, but simply disloyalty to God, then to be outside the Kingdom and to own allegiance to the Evil One means that positive hostility to the law of God which is to be 'very far gone from original righteousness.' For sin disturbs nature only in the sense in which all personal action disturbs, by directing towards spiritual ends the material which nature supplies. Again, we have to emphasize the truth that sin enters only when spiritual relations have been established.

6. This consideration will also show the irrelevance of inquiring into *the origin of sin*, in so far as this means an empirical investigation of human history. For if sin postulates responsibility, we are no nearer a solution of the problem by a knowledge of the rudimentary forms of what, in its final development, we call conscience. Only if emotions and passions be regarded as sinful, can it be of use to note that impulses, the ultimate restraint of which becomes imperative, are at certain stages necessary for the preservation of the individual or the propagation of the race. There need be no desire on the part of any Christian theologian to question the premisses on which the scientific evolutionist pursues his investigations into the origin of the human species. We may grant, for example, that no chasm separates the appearance of man

upon the earth from the development of other and lower forms of life. It is hazardous, and quite unnecessary, to contend for organic and moral life as new departures. Taking a merely external view of man, we may say that the conditions under which sin not only becomes possible but actually takes place, are 'the perfectly normal result of a process of development through which the race has passed previously to the acquisition of full moral personality' (F. R. Tennant, *Hulsean Lect.* p. 81). But then sin is a determination of the 'full moral personality.' Even if we accept the story of man's first disobedience as historically a fact, it is no more explicable as a necessary stage in human evolution than the latest instance of wrong done by one man against another. That all men are the enemies of God until reconciled by the mediation of Christ, is a question of personal relationship unaffected by scientific research. The observer can do no more than register, so far as he can discover them, the conditions under which activities have resulted which, in view of the will of God, assumed to be known, are recognized as disloyalty and therefore as sin. No doctrine of sin is possible except on the assumption of a personal experience involving the recognition of God. The universality of the need which it expresses is attested, not by any demonstrative proof, but by the conviction of sin through which each individual has passed to the freedom of the Christian life. Of such Christian experience the witness of the Church is the summary, and its missionary labours are the measure of its faith that redemption is applicable to all. With this alone is Christianity as such concerned. It does not go behind the activity of a self-determining being, judged by conscience. Its doctrine of the 'Fall,' therefore, is not a pseudo-scientific account of the strength of passion or of the 'survival of habits and tendencies incidental to an earlier stage in development,' which is refuted by the discovery that the story of mankind is that of a continuous progression. It has nothing to do with the material of actual sin, which, though environment may have been vastly modified by corrupt action, cannot rightly be spoken of as 'polluted.' But it is the expression, in the only manner of which language admits, of the postulate of guilt and slavery involved in preaching the gospel, God's message of free salvation, to every creature.

The story of the Fall, recorded in Genesis 3, though it shaped the form in which St. Paul stated the universality of sin, does not vitally affect a teaching which, in its absence, would have sought another method of expression. Indeed, its essential features are all present in the Epistle to the Romans before it is stated in terms of Adam's transgression. To say that the doctrine is merely illustrated by the story, would be to attribute to the Hebrew Christian mind of the 1st cent, an attitude towards the OT possible only in a critical age. Nor will the use of 'Adam' as a category for summing up the human race in 1Co 15:21 f. warrant us in believing that St. Paul was led to his characteristic idea of human solidarity otherwise than along the lines natural to a Jewish interpreter of the OT in Apostolic times (see Sanday-Headlam, *Romans*, p. 136, 'Effects of Adam's Fall,' etc.). But it is equally certain that St. Paul's

use of the OT is far removed from a hard Western literalism, its narratives being the authoritative forms under which spiritual truths are apprehended rather than the material of historical science (see Sanday-Headlam, *ib.* p. 302, 'St. Paul's use of the OT'). The canons of interpretation applied to the early narratives of Genesis cannot affect their doctrinal use in the NT. If the first truth which concerns the moral life of man be the Divine origin, and therefore the essential goodness, *i.e.* conformity to the Divine intention, of the material world and of his own personality, the second is that nevertheless he is an alien from God. This interpretation of the facts of life, which escapes the negation of a true morality involved alike in Oriental dualism and philosophic monism, is entirely independent of the Genesis stories, and separable from them in the NT. It is, however, remarkable that even in these early narratives the religious truth is presented with a completeness conspicuously absent from many later theologies. The three personalities of God, Man, and the Evil One,—disobedience, guilt, exclusion from the Kingdom, the need of liberation from an external tyranny typified in the promised bruising of the serpent's head,—all are essential to the reality of sin. It is difficult to understand how this could be better represented than by attributing an act of disobedience against God and of compliance with 'the voice of a stranger' to a common ancestor of all living. The situation thus expressed is briefly summarized by St. Paul, 'All have sinned, and (therefore) fall short of the glory of God' (Rom 3:23).

Confusion is often caused by the tendency to revert to a materialistic conception of sin on the part of those who would explain its presence in terms of the evolution hypothesis. It is sufficient, so the argument runs, to observe the difficulty that each must encounter 'of enforcing his inherited organic nature to obey a moral law' (Tennant, *Hulsean Lectures*, p. 81). But, apart from the fact that what needs explanation is the self-arraignment which the process entails, it is contrary to experience, no less than to Scripture, thus to place the 'organic nature' in an essential relation to sin, which is made to consist in the failure to 'moralize' it. The publicans and harlots go into the Kingdom of heaven before those with whose wilful rejection of God the physical and emotional nature has least to do. Even popular Christianity places 'the devil' at the climax of temptation; nor are 'youthful lusts,' though they may constitute the earliest and most obvious material of transgression, the deadliest and most intimate occasion of sin. The impulse to make stones bread, or appropriate the kingdoms of the world, masks a temptation to independence of Divine authority which is the essential element in guilt. St. Paul's doctrine of the Flesh with its passions and lusts (Rom 7:5; Rom 8:8, Gal 5:24 etc.) cannot be set against this. It has been abundantly shown that the Pauline anthropology, to use the words of Lipsius, 'rests entirely on an OT base.' The 'old man' (ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος, Rom 6:6 etc.) is, therefore, the body, not as uncontrolled by spirit, but as inwrought by the Evil One (see above). According to Christian teaching, sin 'takes occasion' by

any commandment or recognized purpose of God, whether related to the physical nature or not; nor would the theologian of any age be a whit less emphatic than the modern theorist in placing it, not in the impulse, but in the 'deliberate refusal to reject the impulse.' All men are born in sin, not as inheriting insatiable and abnormal appetites, which, however strong, are still outside their personal responsibility, but as subject to influences which, 'felt within us as ourselves' (Tennyson, *Locksley Hall Sixty Years After*), well up in personalities hostile to the Kingdom of God.

It will be urged that influences such as these are still external to the individual, of whom, therefore, sin cannot be predicated anterior to positive acts of transgression. But, in the first place, this separation between actions and character does not correspond with experience. The man as distinct from his activities is an abstraction. The 'psychological infant' is an ideal construction (see Martineau, *Types of Ethical Theory*, bk. ii. c. 2). No one has any knowledge of himself except in action. It is empirically true that 'concupiscence hath of itself the nature of sin' (*Thirty-nine Articles*, 9), because in experience the line between suggestion and acquiescence is imaginary, and 'he that looketh on a woman to lust' knows that he has already committed adultery. And this is not inconsistent with the complementary truth that temptation is not sin. But, secondly, while it may be admitted that sin on this view is metaphysically not free from difficulty, it must be observed that no peculiar problem is created by it. It is not exposed to the objection which naturally arises if it is explained in terms of a theory of heredity. Such theories are necessarily tentative and provisional, and it is the vice of all explanations based upon the current hypotheses of scientific investigation, that they tend to outrun assured results, and to involve religious truth in the imperfections of systems always in process of becoming antiquated. As soon, however, as it is perceived that the supposed analogy of an 'acquired character' transmitted by propagation to descendants does not accurately represent the teaching of Scripture, objections raised on this score from the point of view of advancing science lose their force. The problem involved in the exercise of personal influence acting through the self-determining will of another personality, remains just where it is, whether sin be a reality or not; St. Paul's 'I, yet not I' stands for an experience which is constant, whether the inspiring influence be 'the grace of God' or 'sin that dwelleth in me.' Whatever may be true of hypnotic suggestion or of abnormal conditions like demoniacal possession, the normal course of personal influence, even of one man upon another, is not to paralyze the individual, so that the resultant action is not his but another's. That sharp separation of personalities which makes one human being wholly external to another may to some extent be due to the illusion of physical limitations. But at any rate, in dealing with 'spiritual wickedness,' we reach a sphere where these conditions are left behind, and the distinctions which they involve are inapplicable. That spirit should thus act upon spirit involves no new difficulty, because its possibility is involved in the creation of free, responsible personalities, capable of love and therefore of enmity, of responding to a

spirit of evil no less than to the Spirit of God. This may involve a race, just as the Holy Spirit indwells the Kingdom of heaven and each member of it. Sin is the antithesis, not of freewill, but of grace. The true analogy of redemption is rather the exorcism which leaves the subject 'clothed and in his right mind,' than the remedy which repairs the ravages of disease. Salvation is not the process by which the sinner is gradually transformed into the saint, but the justifying act whereby the unrighteous is transferred to the Kingdom of grace. No doubt the evil spirit may return to the house from which it went out, and we are not, therefore, compelled to reject facts of experience, and deny the gradual nature of self-conquest. But to think of sin as an inherited or acquired character which is being gradually reduced, is to introduce a distinction between original and actual sin which removes the former altogether from the category of guilt. Satan 'entered into Judas' ([Luk 22:3](#), [Joh 13:27](#)); and our Lord's statement—'He that is bathed needeth not save to wash his feet' ([Joh 13:10](#))—seems to imply liability to incur fresh guilt rather than a redemption as yet incomplete. That sin remains even in the regenerate is sufficiently accurate as an expression of the observed fact of the imperfect lives of Christians. But the deeper view of St. John is that disciples, being still in the world, have constant need to be kept from the Evil One in whom it lies, and to receive afresh propitiation and forgiveness for sins actually committed in consequence of this spiritual contact.

7. The Biblical doctrine of sin, as here outlined, enables us to interpret *the Incarnation* in harmony with the best modern psychology. It is no longer possible to think of human nature apart from personality as a bundle of facilities, among which, as we have experience of it, is the faculty of sin. Sin therefore is not an ingredient in ordinary humanity, which must be regarded as absent from the pure humanity assumed by the Son of God. To inquire whether the manhood in Christ was capable of sin is irrelevant, when it is perceived that impersonal natures are abstractions of thought with no existence in fact. Sin is hostility to what Jesus Christ is, the living God. The house of a personality, human or Divine, or, as in the case of Christ, both, cannot be divided against itself. The truth expressed in the old theological conception of the impersonal humanity of our Lord is simply this, that He received by inheritance from the human race whatsoever is capable of transmission, the structural fabric with which biology is concerned, the material within which conscious personality expresses itself. Thus He is in all points like to His brethren, who inherit from their ancestry what in itself is morally neither good nor bad. He was identified with human sin, not only representatively but vitally ([Rom 5:12-20](#), [Psa 2:2-4](#))—a truth which so far eludes statement as almost inevitably to involve in heresy those who, like Edward Irving, seek to express it. But the Word became flesh, and that without sin, not because the virus was omitted in the act of conception, but because, being God, He cannot deny Himself, the terms 'sin' and 'God' being mutually exclusive. God became man under those conditions which sin had created, viz. the environment of Satan's kingdom together with the guilt and penalty of death. He did not therefore redeem by

becoming man, but by surrendering Himself to the entire consequences, reversing the sentence of condemnation, by death overcoming death, and opening the new environment of the Kingdom of heaven to all believers. The fact of the Atonement witnesses against the view that the Incarnation was the destruction of an evil heredity through union with the Divine nature. Its principle is the indwelling of the Personal Spirit or holiness first in Jesus Christ ([Rom 1:4](#)) and thereafter in the free personalities of the children of God ([Rom 8:11](#)), expelling by His presence and power 'the spirit that now worketh in the sons of disobedience' ([Eph 2:2](#)).

Literature.—J. Müller, *The Christian Doctrine of Sin*, English translation 2 vols.; J. Tulloch, *The Christian Doctrine of Sin*; A. Moore, *Some Aspects of Sin*; C. Gore, Appendix ii. on 'Sin' in *Lux Mundi*¹⁰ [Note: 0 designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; O. Pfleiderer, *Philosophy of Religion*, § 'Sin'; Clemen, *Die Christl. Lehre v. der Sünde*; F. R. Tennant, *The Origin and Propagation of Sin* (Hulsean Lectures), also *Sources of the Doctrine of the Fall and Original Sin* (valuable on account of its historical survey of the development of Christian theory); Professor James Orr, *God's Image in Man*, etc.; *The Child and Religion* (a volume of essays by various authors; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, artt. 'Sin,' 'Fall, and 'Heredity.' In addition to these, most of the standard works on Systematic Theology may be usefully consulted; also Sanday-Headlam's *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. For science, G. Romanes, *Exam. of Weismannism*; Haeckel, *The Last Link*; P. N. Waggett, *Religion and Science*. For the Ritschlian theory see A. Ritschl, *Justification and Reconciliation*, English translation ch. 5; also A. E. Garvie, *The Ritschlian Theology*, ch. 10.

J. G. Simpson.

☞ Sincerity

SINCERITY

The term.—In the English of 1611 'sincere' was an apt translation of ἄδολος applied to γάλα—'the sincere milk of the word' ([1Pe 2:2](#)). It has no longer, however, the sense of 'unadulterated' other than in an ethical sense, so that the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 goes back to the older version of Wyclif—'without gile.' 'Sincerity' must, however, always bear the association of that which is *unmixed*. In origin and in meaning it is akin to 'simplicity' and 'singleness' (ἀπλοῦς); in meaning to 'purity' (καθαρός, ἀγνός); but it is most often used in the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 to

translation ειλικρινής. In so far as this word differs from others of like meaning, it contemplates character as ‘the purged, the winnowed, the unmingled.’ If ‘purity’ (καθαρός) speaks of freedom from the defilements of the world as soiling the soul, ‘sincerity’ speaks of freedom from its falsehoods as from a foreign admixture (Trench, *Synonyms*, § lxxxv.). The word is used also to translation ἀγνῶς and γνήσιον; but in every case it implies the absence of all that is false and that makes life double (Lightfoot on Php_1:10).

It follows from the usage of the word that it may be applied to mind, or to act, or to speech; but everywhere it carries the sense of unadulterated or unmingled, so that, while the word is not used in the Gospels, it is plain that these set forth in Christ the pattern of sincerity. It is also clear that Christ demanded of men sincerity, if they were to enter and to abide in the Kingdom of God. It is at once the presupposition of a Christian experience, and the bond of the Christian society.

1. The sincerity of Jesus.—The character of Jesus sets the standard of perfect sincerity; ‘guile was not found in his mouth’ (1Pe_2:22); He is ‘the true one’ (ὁ ἀληθινός, 1Jn_5:20), opposed by that title to all that is counterfeit. To know Him is to know the Truth and the Life (Joh_17:3). The perfectly sincere man must be one (a) whose mind is perfectly responsive to the truth. It is not enough that he should speak and act from conviction. The conviction must be *sincerely formed*, without doublemindedness, without any falsehood of heart (Mat_5:8, 2Pe_3:1). All that Jesus said and did must be the manifestation of an inner life; but the believer needs also the assurance that there was nothing in the mind of Jesus to distort the truth. It is not enough to believe that He means what He says; we must believe that He is able to receive without loss or deflexion the rays of the truth. In the Fourth Gospel much is said of the truth of Christ; this is more than His veracity (cf. Robertson’s *Sermons*, vol. i. ‘The Kingdom of the Truth’). He is the Way because He is the Truth (Joh_14:6); He is the Light of the world (Joh_8:12), and His light is the light of life. He is full of grace and truth (Joh_1:17). His Kingdom is of the truth (Joh_18:37). He is set over against all that is unreal and partial and transitory. In Him there is an unbroken course for the revelation of the light and life of God (Joh_17:8; Joh_17:10; Joh_17:21 etc.). Sincerity implies the single heart and eye, which alone can receive the vision of God. The sincerity of Jesus is more than the consistency of His action and speech with His thought; it involves His trustworthiness as a mediator of the truth. (b) But sincerity, in the more common usage of the word, implies that between the inner self and the expression, nothing intervenes to confuse or to distort. In the Gospels there is a picture of a life in which there is nothing to conceal; Jesus speaks and acts in such a way as to convince men that He is revealing His conviction. The Gospels manifest a

life of perfect harmony. The manifestation is varied, but the motive is single. His gentleness and His sternness are alike the expression of His holy love, and never spring from idle sentiment, or personal feeling, or those cross-motives which break the peace of other lives.

At the outset of His ministry there comes the temptation to accept a compromise in the pursuit of His aims: He answers, 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve' ([Luk_4:8](#)); no tampering with the mission in its means or in its ends could be tolerated. 'His means are pure and spotless as his ends' (Wordsworth). He is early contrasted with the scribes because of His authority ([Mar_1:27](#)); this impression could have been made only by One acknowledged to be sincere. He wins from the first group of disciples the confidence accorded only to a manifest conviction. Even the scribes come to shrink from His clear gaze ([Mar_11:18](#)). The accepted opinion is that Jesus speaks truly ([Luk_20:21](#)). Many think Him mistaken, or beside Himself ([Mar_3:21](#)), or blasphemous ([Mar_14:63-64](#)), but none treat Him as a conscious deceiver. Jesus proves His sincerity by His steadfastness in His calling; dark as the way becomes, He never wavers ([Mat_16:22-23](#)). It is possible that the Pharisees would not have been unwilling to compromise with Jesus, but He would keep back nothing of the truth.

In his *Life of Jesus*, Renan makes allowance for a lower standard of sincerity in the East than that to which the Western nations conform. 'To the deeply earnest races of the West, conviction means sincerity to one's self. But sincerity to one's self has not much meaning to Oriental peoples, little accustomed to the subtleties of a critical spirit.... The literal truth has little value for the Oriental; he sees everything through the medium of his ideas, his interests, and his passions. History is impossible if we do not fully admit that there are many standards of sincerity' (ch. 16). By such means Renan seeks to explain the attitude of Jesus to popular illusions, and the willingness which he finds in Jesus to take advantage of them in the interest of His enthusiastic purpose.

A truer criticism would rather attribute the story of such accommodation, if it were discerned, to the imperfect understanding of the disciples. There is, however, no need to resort to such explanations; the narratives make it sufficiently plain that Jesus deliberately refused to work upon popular illusions. Nor can it be forgotten that the standard of sincerity, of which Renan speaks, has been set by Christian faith. Nowhere is there a more stern demand for truth and sincerity than in the Apostolic writings, which owe their inspiration to 'the mind of Christ.' It is impossible to regard as one among many phases of Oriental religion a faith which in its preparatory history declared that God demanded truth in the inward parts, and in its fulfilment manifested to the world One who was known as 'the Truth.'

2. Teaching of Jesus.—Everywhere Jesus demands reality. It is the pure in heart who see God (Mat 5:8). It is the condition of spiritual vision. If the eye be single, the whole body shall be full of light (Mat 6:22). Jesus calls for truth of heart. ‘There is a truth which lies behind the recognition of particular truths. It is the basis of all right beliefs.’ ‘Sincerum est nisi vas quodcunque infundis acescit’ (Horace, *Ep.* i. 2. 54). Those who receive the revelation which Jesus brings are likened to babes (νηπιους) (Mat 11:25). Only those who become as little children can enter into the Kingdom (Mat 18:3). It is the singleness of the child, his truth of heart, and freedom from ulterior motives, that are praised. In the life that is in the Kingdom there must be no confusion of ends; it must be perfect (τέλειος), as the Father is perfect (Mat 5:48). It is the unpurged mind that misses the vision. If the soul is divided, the profession of the lips will be of no avail (Mat 7:22). Words must not be idle (Mat 12:36) (ἀργόν), without any correspondence in inward thought and outward action. Words must be the ‘incarnation of thought.’ Nothing must intervene between the mind of the speaker and his word. Oaths are condemned as likely to take from the severe demands of truthful speech. The yea must be yea, the nay, nay (Mat 5:37). An oath lowers the value of normal speech. In all other departments of life there must be the same absence of duplicity. There cannot be two masters (Mat 6:24). The disciple must seek first the Kingdom (Mat 6:33), and must not be over-anxious for food and raiment. He must not only be wise as a serpent, but sincere, simple (ἀκέραιος) (Mat 10:16) as a dove (cf. Php 2:15). He must worship in spirit and in truth (Joh 4:24). It was this simplicity that Jesus found in the disciples whom He chose; like Nathanael, they were Israelites *without guile* (Joh 1:47), ἐν ᾧ δόλος οὐκ ἔστι.

Literature.—W. Bright, *Morality in Doctrine*, 220; G. Matheson, *Leaves for Quiet Hours*, 10; W. G. Rutherford, *Key of Knowledge*, 40; G. H. Morrison, *Flood-Tide*, 22; R. M. Pope, *Poetry of the Upward Way*, 29.

E. Shillito.

☩ Singing

SINGING.—See Music.

☩ Sinlessness

SINLESSNESS.—‘The sinlessness of Jesus’ is a phrase which only imperfectly indicates the ground it is intended to cover. It is too negative. ‘The sinless perfection of Jesus’ would be a more adequate phrase. But ‘the sinlessness of Jesus’ has an attractive sound; it is the title of a book—that of Ullmann cited below—which may be called classical; and it would be unwise to displace it from the position of honour it occupies, although we must use it with the understanding that it means more than it says. It is not to be confounded with the errorlessness of Jesus. Indeed, the very latest writer on the subject (Max Meyer, *op. cit. infr.*) refers with the utmost frankness, if we ought not rather to say thoughtlessness, to the mistakes of Jesus (p. 9), while vigorously defending His sinlessness. But on this subject see the much more profoundly considered judgments of Dorner (*Glaubenslehre*, ii. p. 472 ff.) and Tholuck (*Das AT [Note: T Altes Testament.] im NT*, p. 24 ff.).

An argument for the sinlessness of Jesus has been elaborated by Ullmann from the prevalence of holiness in Christendom.

Wherever Christianity exists—thus the argument proceeds—there holiness also is to be seen. While exceptionally advanced holiness may be of rare occurrence in any society, there is not a country, or even a town or village, in which Christianity is established but there will be found in it numbers of persons striving after a holy life. In every Christian congregation there are at least a few specimens of character so striking that even those who are themselves destitute of religious aspiration acknowledge them to be no earthly products, but to have a heavenly origin; while more sympathetic observers will say that to them the sight of one such holy person has been a more convincing argument for the reality and the blessedness of religious experience than all the verbal arguments they have ever listened to. For this phenomenon is specifically Christian. It is true that heathenism has its so-called holy men—that is, persons separated from the world and devoted to God—but it requires little discrimination to perceive the difference between an Indian fakir and a Christian saint. The classical nations produced many a splendid specimen of human nature; but the best of them were essentially different from those whom Christendom would recognize as holy. Even Socrates, as every one must know who has read the *Memorabilia* of Xenophon, was not holy in the Christian sense, but, at certain points, very much the reverse. In what precisely the difference consists it may not be easy to say, but it is quite easy to feel, holiness being, like beauty and some more of the finest things, in the last resort indescribable. But whatever may be its exact definition, holiness is, at all events, essentially Christian. Those who are possessed of it would acknowledge that they owe it to Christ, their communion with God being based on the sense of reconciliation through Christ, and their benevolence towards men due to their adoption of His views as to the dignity and destiny of human nature. They are imitators of Him, yet they always know Him to be infinitely above them. Here, then, is the argument: ‘If Christ is the source of holiness in others, and if He

stands far above the holiest of those who derive it from Him, it is a reasonable inference that He must Himself be sinless' (*op. cit.* pt. ii. ch. 2, § 3).

On different minds such an argument will make different impressions; but we are certainly going upon more solid ground when we turn to the testimony of Scripture.

1. Here the first thing to be noted is **the impression which He made in the days of His flesh on both friends and foes**. Thus, when He presented Himself for baptism among the multitude at the Jordan, the Baptist forbade Him, saying, 'I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?' (Mat 3:14). Whether this sense of inferiority and unworthiness on the part of the Baptist be ascribed to a long acquaintance with Jesus beforehand, or to the rapt dignity in the expression of Jesus at the moment, it is equally remarkable. Even more pronounced was the sense of the same contrast expressed by St. Peter, when, after the miracle wrought before his eyes in his own boat, he shrank away, exclaiming, 'Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord!' (Luk Luk 5:8). This was the spontaneous effect on a sensitive conscience of the proximity of the Divine; it was the terror of sin at the manifestation of sinlessness. These were testimonies of friends; but His enemies, in their involuntary tributes, were no less explicit. Thus, the centurion who presided over the crucifixion exclaimed, as he saw Him expire: 'Certainly this was a righteous man' (Luk 23:47). The wife of Pilate made use of almost the identical expression when she sent to her husband the message: 'Have thou nothing to do with this just man' (Mat 27:19). Pilate himself said: 'I find no fault in him' (Joh 19:6). And even Judas Iscariot, though he had known Him long, and had, at the moment when he spoke, a strong interest in recalling anything with which he could have found fault as an excuse for his own conduct, acknowledged that he had betrayed 'innocent blood' (Mat 27:4).

2. Of more theological importance are **the statements in what may be called the authoritative parts of the NT**. St. John says: 'Ye know that he was manifested to take away sins; and in him is no sin' (1Jn 3:5). Such was the total impression carried away by this disciple from the years of intimacy with his Master. Elsewhere he expresses the same sentiment more positively, as for instance in the prologue to his Gospel; but this statement of the negative may here suffice. Next to St. John in intimacy was St. Peter; and he summed up his experiences, very soon after these had been received, when, in his great speech on the Day of Pentecost, he referred to Jesus as 'the Holy and Righteous One' (Act 3:14); and that, with the process of time, his convictions on this point had not changed is proved by the declaration in one of his Epistles: 'Christ also suffered for sins, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God' (1Pe 3:18). St. Paul echoes the same sentiment when he states: 'Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf, that we might become the righteousness of God in him' (2Co 5:21). No other NT writer has, however, set down statements on this theme so striking and beautiful as those of the author of the

Epistle to the Hebrews, who calls Jesus 'holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners' ([Heb 7:26](#)); and, in another passage, declares: 'We have not an high priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin' ([Heb 4:15](#)). These quotations are not exhaustive; but they are so directly to the point that it is useless to add to them. If there be any virtue in proof-texts, the sinlessness of Jesus is proved beyond contradiction.

3. Of all the testimonies of the NT, however, the one to which we turn with the keenest curiosity is **the testimony of Jesus Himself**; and we have to see whether He committed Himself on this subject. The result of such an investigation is perhaps less satisfying than might have been hoped. On one occasion, indeed, He said to His opponents: 'Which of you convicteth me of sin?' ([Joh 8:46](#)); and if, as appears to be the case, this was a general challenge in reference to His whole life and conduct, and not a denial of a particular sin, it would hardly have been possible to make a more distinct claim to sinlessness. On the same occasion He said: 'He that sent me is with me: he hath not left me alone; for I do always the things that are pleasing to him' ([Joh 8:29](#)). Very similar was His declaration on another occasion: 'My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to accomplish his work' ([Joh 4:34](#)). To the Apostles, at the Last Supper, He said: 'I will no more speak much with you; for the prince of this world cometh, and he hath nothing in me' ([Joh 14:30](#)), which seems to be a denial that in Him there was any point of contact where the Evil One might bring his accusations or fasten his temptations. It will be observed that all these citations are from the Gospel of St. John; and there are none of equal force in the other Gospels.

But if the things about Himself which He says in this connexion are less striking than might have been expected, all the more impressive are the things about Himself which He does not say. He never makes any confession of personal sin. This is one of the cardinal facts of the Gospels. It is not as if He had been one of those religious teachers who, whether deliberately or inadvertently, pass by the subject of sin. Not only did He spend a great deal of His activity in the denunciation of sin, but He taught His own intimate disciples to pray habitually for deliverance from it; no fewer than three of the petitions of the Lord's Prayer being to this effect. Yet what He advised others to do He never, as far as we can learn, did Himself. Of His intimate life of prayer we possess pretty ample records; but in none of these are there any confessions of sin. This omission is all the more remarkable when the practice of other conspicuous figures in Holy Writ is noticed. The most prominent names of the OT are all remarkable for their frequent and ample confessions of personal guilt. Thus the Psalmist says: 'Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me' ([Psa 51:5](#)); Isaiah says: 'Woe is me; for I am undone; for I am a man of unclean lips' ([Isa 6:5](#)); Job groans: 'I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes' ([Job 42:6](#)); Ezra prays: 'O my God, I am ashamed and blush to lift up my face to thee, my God:

for our iniquities are increased over our heads, and our guiltiness is grown up unto the heavens' (Ezr 9:6). With the corresponding figures of the NT it is not different. Thus, St. Paul cries: 'O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?' (Rom 7:24); and even the saintly St. John confesses: 'If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us' (1Jn 1:8). Thus, both the worthies of the OT, from whom Jesus learned, and the worthies of the NT, who learned from Him, speak on this subject with one consent; and it may be added that the more of religious genius any of them had, the more poignant were their cries for pardon. Jesus, however, differs in this respect radically from them all, and science must assign a reason for the contrast. If it was a defect, it was a serious one. If He sinned, like the other children of Adam, but failed to be humbled and to confess His fault, this brings Him down beneath the religious heroes of the race; for what feature of religious genius is more essential than humility? But if it was no defect, what other explanation of it can there be but sinlessness?

4. Objections.—Ever since the time of Celsus there have been objections raised to the sinlessness of Jesus, and exceptions, more or less specific, taken to His moral character. During the greater portion of Christian history, however, it has been taken for granted that He was without sin; this being the very least that has been spontaneously conceded by any affecting to believe on Him in any sense. Even the early Socinians were ardent defenders of this doctrine. It was not till the age of Deism and Rationalism that to express doubts on this subject became a common characteristic of unbelief. The revival of evangelical faith in the nineteenth century raised up a host of defenders, not only those in the full current of the revival being on this side, as a matter of course, but many distinguished scholars who stood somewhat aside, such as Schleiermacher, Schweizer, Hase, Keim and Weizsäcker being forward in the same cause. On the contrary, Strauss, in his books on the Life of Jesus, advanced further and further in the direction of denial; and Pécaut in *Le Christ et la Conscience*, 1859, displayed a zeal worthy of a better cause in heaping up every conceivable objection to the Saviour's conduct. On the whole, the great series of Lives of Christ, which have formed a leading feature of the theology of the last two generations, have been loyal to the conviction and testimony of Christendom; but, in the very latest productions which have appeared in this field, an uncertain sound is heard (see, e.g., O. Holtzmann, *Leben Jesu*, esp. p. 34; Weinel, *Jesus im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, esp. pp. 61 ff. and 274 ff.), so that it is quite within the bounds of possibility, or even probability, that this belief may have to be earnestly contended for in the not distant future.

The objections alleged are either (a) of a more general and philosophical order, or (b) relate to actions of Jesus in the Gospels which are considered inconsistent with a perfect character.

(a) In the days of the Old Rationalism the commonest objection was that sinless perfection is inconsistent with moral development: man has to raise himself from matter to spirit, and from imperfection to perfection. Kant held that virtue consists solely of moral conflict; and many, appealing to him, concluded that Jesus could not be a genuine man unless He began in imperfection and fought His way up to sinlessness. Similar to this is the well-known position of Strauss, that it is not the way of the idea, in fulfilling itself in actuality, to pour all its fulness into one specimen, which is thereby enabled to boast itself over all the rest; but that, on the contrary, it likes to display its riches in a multiplicity of specimens, which mutually supplement and complete one another. Such objections formed part and parcel of the intellectual world in which they were excogitated; and, as that world has long ago passed away, it is hardly necessary now to attempt the refutation of them.

Far more persistent has been the impression that sinlessness is inconsistent with genuine temptation; and as it is certain that Jesus was tempted, it may be argued that He cannot have been sinless.

Under the stress of this consideration, Schleiermacher, who made the sinlessness of Jesus the very basis of his speculative system, practically denied the reality of the temptations of Jesus. Edward Irving, on the other hand, appealing to such texts of Scripture as Rom_8:2 and Col_1:22, taught that the human nature of Jesus had in itself the principle of sin and error, and not only was capable of erring and falling, but was disposed to all evil; although, by the energy of the Holy Ghost within Him and the energy of His holy will, He overcame every temptation as it arose.

What Irving and others who have agreed with him or adopted kindred notions have felt has been that, without such imperfection in the human nature of Christ as they postulate, there can have been no real conflict with evil, and that so the accounts of our Lord's temptation, which are intended to be so priceless to His tempted disciples, lose their virtue, the conflict being reduced to a sham fight. To this it has been replied, by Dorner and others, that the presence in the human nature of our Lord of the contrast between knowing and willing makes real conflict possible; for the knowledge is antecedent, and then the will has to be brought up to the level of knowledge. Further, the contrast between body and spirit makes conflict possible, because the body may, without sin, feel strongly all the instincts of life; yet the spirit may discern the necessity for overcoming these and accepting, as Jesus did, suffering and death in loyalty to a peculiar vocation. As a faultless man, Jesus had a right to all the rewards and pleasures which ought, in the nature of things, to ensue upon well-doing; and it could not be without conflict that He resigned His rights and embraced a lot so contrary to His deserts. In the little work of Meyer, mentioned below, the greater part of the space is devoted to the solution of these riddles.

However the enigma is to be solved, certain it is that Jesus was tempted. The scenes in the Wilderness, in Gethsemane, and on the Cross, when He is represented as in conflict with the powers of evil, were not less severe than the similar experiences of ordinary mortals, but far more so. His purity made the inrush of temptation more painful. His humanity had not the stolid calm of a lethargic temperament, but was sensitive at every pore; He felt not less but more than others the condemnation of unjust authority, the desertion of friends, and the apparent frustration of Providence. Even if the attempt to reconcile the two should be beyond the reach of human wisdom, we will not surrender either member of the great assertion, that He was tempted 'like as we are, yet without sin' (Heb_4:15).

(b) The other kind of objection relates to specific statements of the Gospel history which are held to be inconsistent with sinlessness. Thus, it is contended that His staying behind at Jerusalem, when He was twelve years of age, and His answer to Joseph and Mary, were not worthy of an obedient child; and objection is, in like manner, taken to His sharp reply to His mother when she tried to turn Him back from the fulfilment of His vocation. In cleansing the Temple, He is charged with displaying undue vehemence, and it is held that He exhibited an arrogance unbecoming His youth and His position in His attacks on the scribes and Pharisees. In cursing the fig-tree, it is claimed, He gave way to temper; and, in the casting of the demons out of the possessed man of Gadara and giving them permission to enter the swine, with the result that two thousand of these were lost to their owners, He displayed a lack of respect for the rights of property. Most of such charges are venerable with age and have been answered so often that it may be scarcely necessary to attempt to answer them again; but there are two more, of which something may require to be said.

It has been held that the action of Jesus in presenting Himself before John to receive 'the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins,' betrayed a consciousness of guilt. This objection has been recently revived by O. Holtzmann, who quotes from the *Gospel to the Hebrews*—a document to which he attaches great importance—a statement to the effect that, when solicited by His mother and His brethren to accompany them to the Jordan, Jesus demanded wherefore He should go, as He had no sin to wash away, but immediately checked Himself by adding, 'Unless, indeed, this is uttered in ignorance'; and the author adds that, unless Jesus had said this, no writer of a Gospel would have invented it. Much more, however, than is known of the *Gospel to the Hebrews* would require to be ascertained before this could be asserted; it may have been the organ of an Ebionite tendency in the early Church, to which such an invention would have been congenial (cf. Enseb. *HE* iii. 27). The movement of John had a positive as well as a negative side: it was not only a 'baptism of repentance,' but a great new consecration to God and country, in which Jesus was bound to take the lead; and many have believed that, even at this stage, He so identified Himself with His people that He felt their sin to be His own, and in the act

of baptism symbolized that washing of it away which was to be accomplished through His death.

The other objection to which importance attaches is the answer of Jesus to one who addressed Him as 'Good Master'—'Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God' (Mar 10:18). It is not obvious why Jesus should have objected to be called 'Good Master,' such a mode of address being, one would suppose, a form of courtesy in which there was no harm; and this suggests the probability that the humour or irony of Jesus may have been at play; so that it is dangerous to interpret Him too literally. What was it that He wished to turn the inquirer's attention to? Stier's dilemma ought not to be forgotten: 'Either, There is none good but God; Christ is good; therefore Christ is God: or, There is none good but God; Christ is not God; therefore Christ is not good.' The reading in Mt. (Mat 19:17), where the point under discussion is the Good in the sense of the *Summum Bonum*, renders it dubious what was the real topic of the conversation. But if it really was about whether or not Jesus was good, then it is possible to say that Jesus was not 'good' in the same sense as God; because His goodness, being that of a human being, was only in process of becoming, and had to realize itself on every step of a long ascent. The comment of Dr. A. B. Bruce in *EGT* [*Note: GT Expositor's Greek Testament.*] may be subjoined: 'The question means not "The epithet is not applicable to Me, but to God only," but "Do not make ascriptions of goodness a matter of mere courtesy and politeness." The case is parallel to the unwillingness of Jesus to be called Christ indiscriminately. Weinel complains that this objection is usually answered with too much levity; and it cannot be denied that there is a body of objections worthy of candid and careful investigation. Not only will they bear pondering, but they will reward it; for if they do not cause the student to stumble, they will have the opposite effect of leading him further into the mystery of the Person of Christ.

5. The relation of the sinlessness of our Lord to other elements of the Christian system.

(1) It has an obvious bearing on *the Virgin-birth*. Had Jesus been an ordinary link in the chain of humanity, He could not have been sinless; for 'there is none righteous, no, not one': in all who have descended from Adam by ordinary generation, there is a 'law in the members warring against the law of the mind.' It has been said, indeed, that immunity from this sad inheritance could not have been secured in the way suggested, because the motherhood of Mary, unless she also had been sinless, would have transmitted the tainted nature. We know, however, too little of the way in which the soul is transmitted to be sure of this. And if it must be allowed, on the other hand, that we know too little to have scientific assurance of the contrary, yet the providential arrangement seems intended to suggest this end. It may, indeed, be said that it suggests it too obviously, and that the story of the miraculous birth was an

afterthought, to confirm the sinlessness. But the theory of the Gospel history which presents one part as fitted to another with miraculous cleverness, so as to make one idea account for another, is not consistent with the simplicity of the character of the authors or the straightforwardness of their narration. There is a logic in facts as well as in ideas; and this seems to be an instance of fact answering to fact in the Divine intention, the human mind only discerning the fitness as it looks back on the accomplished history.

(2) It has a bearing on the doctrine of *the Divinity of Christ*. Some have, indeed, held it directly to prove His Divinity; because, they have argued, the moral force of mere manhood would not have been equal to the task of maintaining a life of sinlessness in a sinful world. If even Adam, in an empty and sinless world, fell, what chance was there of another, standing in a world so corrupt and a society so perverted as that in which Jesus lived, moved and had His being? To bring the Divine nature, however, into play, to account for the sinlessness, would obscure the reality of the temptation of Jesus; and it obscures the vital truth that His sinlessness was not only a gift but an attainment, which He had to secure afresh on every step of a human development, and which rendered Him supremely well-pleasing to His Father in heaven. God gave the Spirit without measure unto Him (Joh_3:34); and, by constantly receiving this Divine communication and giving it free play within Him, He garrisoned His human nature against the advances of sin. This is enough to account for His constant victory over temptation. Although, however, His sinlessness does not directly prove His Divinity, it is not without a bearing on it of an important kind: it lends weight to all His statements, and especially to His statements about Himself. A sinless being could not make statements which were false, extravagant, or overweening. Now, Jesus made statements about Himself that either were visionary and unbecoming, or proved Him to be greater than the children of men; and if His character supplies strong reason for accepting these as words of truth and soberness, the bearing of this fact on our beliefs about Him cannot be ignored.

(3) It has a bearing on the doctrine of *the death of Christ*. The Apostles of Jesus did not expect Him to die; and the reason of this was that they knew Him to be without sin. Death is for sinners; but why should one die who is sinless? This was the puzzle with which the followers of Jesus were perplexed when He was lying in the grave, and it seemed as if His cause had perished in this unanswerable enigma. It is well known what came, through the illumination of the Resurrection and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, to be the Apostolic solution of this mystery. The Apostles believed and taught that He had, indeed, died on account of sin, yet not on account of sin of His own, but for the sins of others. Jesus Himself had declared in the days of His flesh that He would give His life a ransom for many (Mat_20:28). Had He been one of the sinful sons of Adam, He could have done nothing of the kind; for 'none of them can

redeem his brother or offer to God a ransom for him' (Psa_49:7). Had Jesus been a sinner like the rest, He would have had to die like the rest for His own sin.

There are probably other elements of the Christian faith on which this subject could be shown to have a bearing; but these will suffice. Since Ullmann's celebrated exposition this argument has proved one of the handiest and most effective of apologetic weapons. Persons who have grown up in a Christian atmosphere readily yield to its truth; and then they can be shown how much more it involves. In those times of inward storm, due to many causes, to which young minds are subject, it is sometimes of the greatest advantage to find a spot of shelter in which to cast anchor, till the onset of doubt has subsided a little; and for this purpose the sinlessness of Jesus is without a rival. It is not a place to rest in, but a stage on the way.

Literature.—Ullmann, *Die Sündlosigkeit Jesu* [first sketch appeared in 1828 in *SK* [Note: *K Studien und Kritiken.*], seven editions in author's lifetime, English translation, T. & T. Clark]; Dorner, *Jesu sündlose Vollkommenheit* [appeared in 1862 in *JDTh* [Note: *DTh Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie.*]], see also chs. 105 to 107 in the same author's *Glaubenslehre* [English translation, T.&T. Clark]; Schaff, *The Person of Christ*¹² [Note: 2 designates the particular edition of the work referred], 1882 [with bibliography]; Liddon, *BL* [Note: *L Bampton Lecture.*], Lect. iv.; Forrest, *Christ of Hist. and of Experience*, Lect. i., and *Authority of Christ*, 10. The latest publication is Meyer's 'Jesu Sündlosigkeit' in *Zeit- und Streitfragen*.

James Stalker.

☞ Sinners

SINNERS.—In order that we may understand what the word means in the Gospels, it is necessary to consider for a moment the peculiar viewpoint of the Law, by which the teaching of Christ and that of the Rabbis are utterly differentiated. To the latter the Law came with the inexorable demand for absolute and complete obedience, as something to be dreaded, therefore. Thus the mass of the people, who were ignorant of the endless Rabbinical precepts, were held to be 'accursed' (Joh_7:49). Christ, on the contrary, saw in the Law a moral ideal, something to be befriended and loved. He bade men strive after attaining this ideal, which was the embodiment of love, and He sought to set them free from the Rabbinical interpretation of the Law. A mere outward violation of the letter of the Law did not necessarily constitute an offence. Thus He exculpated His disciples, who had plucked ears of corn on the Sabbath day, by citing the example of David (Mat_12:1-4). He excused the healing of the impotent man (Joh_5:1-9) by citing the custom of circumcising on the eighth day, though it fell

on the Sabbath (Joh 7:23). With Christ a higher principle always set aside the letter of the Law. This viewpoint fully explains His attitude to sin and to the sinner. And yet these peculiar views of the Law are associated with the profoundest reverence for it (Mat 5:17 f., Mat 7:12, Mat 22:40, Luk 16:17 etc.).

1. Christ's relation to sinners.—Here His mission shone resplendent in all its fulness. For them He came to this world, to them He had a special message. (a) *He freely mingled with them*, and that without fear of contamination, Mat 9:10-11; Mat 11:19, Mar 2:15-16, Luk 5:30; Luk 15:2; Luk 19:7. The Samaritan woman is a clear case in point, John 4. (b) *He had compassion on them*, Luk 7:47. (c) *He irresistibly drew them*, Luk 15:1 etc. (d) *He specially called them*, Mat 9:13 || Mar 2:17 and Luk 5:32. (e) *He rejoiced in their salvation*, Luk 15:7; Luk 15:10; Luk 18:13-14.

2. Use of the word 'sinners' In the Gospels.—The word ἁμαρτωλός from ἁμαρτία, 'sin' or 'error,' is used in several senses, (a) *The national sense*. Thus it indicates the distinction between Jew and Gentile from the ethnico-religious standpoint. St. Paul thus later used the word, Gal 2:15 'We who are Jews by nature and not sinners of the Gentiles.' Thus it is used Mat 26:45, Mar 14:41, Luk 24:7. See also Luk 6:32 f., where ἁμαρτωλοὶ replaces τελῶναι and ἔθνηκοί in the parallel passage Mat 5:46-47, which would seem to indicate that St. Luke also uses it here in the national rather than in the ethical sense. (b) *The social sense*. Thus it seems to indicate the distinction between the righteousness of the Law-burdened Jew and his more ignorant brethren, who, not knowing the Law and therefore continually trespassing its commandments, were deemed 'accursed.' Here the word seems to have a negative rather than a positive meaning, pointing to the absence of legal righteousness rather than to actual transgression. Thus 'publicans' and 'sinners' are always associated in the Gospels. In this connexion the latter term does not qualify the moral status of the publican, but rather points to the forced association of the ignorant and ostracized elements of Jewish society with the hated minions of Rome. (c) *The purely ethical sense*. In this sense conscious or unconscious moral guilt is associated with the word. Thus Peter in Luk 5:8; 'sinners' and 'righteous' people are placed in antithesis in Mat 9:13, Mar 2:17, Luk 5:32; in Mar 8:38 the word is associated with μοιχαλῖς; so also in the story of the sinful woman, Luk 7:37 : so in the great parables of Luke 15, and esp. in the story of the healing of the man born blind, in John 9, where it repeatedly occurs in a manifest ethical sense. See, further, art. Sin.

Henry E. Dosker.

SIR (κύριε).—The title is employed as a term of courtesy or reverence in various relationships. It is the salutation of servants (slaves) to their masters ('Sir, didst thou not sow good seed?' Mat_13:27); of a son to a father ('I go, sir,' Mat_21:30); of the priests and Pharisees to Pilate ('Sir, we remember that that deceiver said,' Mat_27:63); of the Greeks to Philip ('Sir, we would see Jesus,' Joh_12:21). In the English versions 'lord' (κύριε) is frequently used in the same sense ('Lord, thou deliveredst unto me live talents,' Mat_25:20; Mat_25:22; Mat_25:24; 'Lord, let it alone this year also,' Luk_13:8; Luk_14:22; Luk_19:16; Luk_19:18; Luk_19:20). It is also a term frequently employed in addressing Jesus, both by disciples and others ('Lord, if thou wilt thou canst make me clean,' Mat_8:2, Joh_11:12); so the woman of Samaria says to Jesus, 'Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with' (Joh_4:11). See art. Lord.

John Reid.

☩ Sisters

SISTERS.—1. Nothing is known positively of these *female relatives of Jesus*. There is but one incidental reference to their existence (Mar_6:3 = Mat_13:56 αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ) by His fellow-townsmen of Nazareth, who were astonished and offended by His assumed claims to be their religious Teacher. The knowledge which they possessed of His family affairs was too intimate to allow them to examine without prejudice the words and deeds of Jesus. The question as to the precise family relationship which His 'brothers' and 'sisters' bore to Jesus is one which has occupied the attention of scholars and writers in every age of the Christian Church (see art. Brethren of the Lord). It is, perhaps, significant of the estimation in which women were held, that although the names of Jesus' 'brothers' are given in detail, we are nowhere in the canonical Gospels told either the names or the number of His 'sisters.' That there were more than two seems to follow from the Matthaean addition (παῖσαι) to the Markan question, 'Are not his sisters here with us?' It is true that tradition ascribed two daughters to Joseph, though one uncanonical Gospel at least describes Joseph as acknowledging sons, but denying the presence of daughters in his household.

This interpretation of the words ἀλλ' οἶδασι πάντες οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι μου θυγατὴρ (*Protev. Jacobi*, c. xvii., in Tischendorf's *Evang. Apocr [Note: pocr Apocrypha, Apocryphal.]* .) seems to the present writer to be warranted by the context, though doubtless the words have a primary reference to the Virgin Mary (see Lightfoot's 'The Brethren of the Lord' in *Dissert. on the Apostolic Age*, p. 28). The

daughters of Joseph are almost universally said to be two in number ('Genuit quoque sibi ... duas filias,' *Hist. Josephus Fabri Lignarii*, cap. ii.; 'Ambae pariter nupserunt filiae,' *ib.* cap. xi., cf. also pseudo-Matt. [Note: Matthew's (i.e. prob. Rogers') Bible 1537.] cap. 42), while there seems to be no agreement in these documents, nor, indeed, among Church writers generally, as to their names ('nomina duarum filiarum [erant] Assia et Lydia,' *Hist. Jos. Fabri Lignarii*, cap. ii. '; cf. the Bohairic Version of the same writing, which changes their names to Lysia and Lydia). Other writers give their names very variously as Mary and Salome, Anna and Salome, Esther and Thamar; while Theophylact curiously enough names three as the daughters of Joseph—Esther, Thamar, and Salome (see Donehoo's *Apocryphal and Legendary Life of Christ*, p. 27 n. [Note: note.]⁴ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred]).

These Apocryphal additions can, however, have but little claim on our sympathy, and one Church Father at least betrays his sense of the inadequacy of the sources of his information by appealing from Scripture as his authority for the names Mary and Salome (Epiphanius, *Haeres.* p. 1041, ed. Petav. referred to and quoted by Lightfoot [*op. cit.* p. 40]), which he chooses as the names of Jesus' 'sisters.'

If Jesus had sisters, as the writers of the first two Gospels evidently believed, it is easy to understand what was the source of His general attitude towards women which drew them to Him in humble and loving service (cf. Luk 7:37 f., Luk 8:1-3, Mar 14:3-9 = Mat 26:6-13, Joh 12:1-8; Joh 4:7 ff; Joh 8:10), outlasting in its loyalty the devotion of the majority of His disciples, and stretching beyond the cross and the grave (Mar 15:40 f., Mar 16:1, Mat 27:55 f., Mat 28:1, Luk 23:49; Luk 23:55; Luk 24:1-10, Joh 19:25; Joh 20:1 f., Joh 20:11; Joh 20:18). Traces, moreover, of His keen appreciation of the beauty and happiness attaching to the home life of the human family may be seen in His reference to the highest act of self-abnegation demanded from His followers; where the pointed reference to 'sisters' (ἀδελφάς) alongside 'brethren' (ἀδελφούς) marks this characteristic feature of Jesus' teaching (see Mar 10:29 f. = Mat 19:29, Luk 14:26).

2. On *the sisters of Bethany* see artt. Martha, and Mary § 3.

3. Amongst the witnesses of the Crucifixion mentioned by all four Evangelists were, according to St. John, two sisters—Mary the mother of Jesus, and His mother's sister. Though it has been argued that Mary the (wife) of Clopas (Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ) was the sister of the Virgin, it is now generally agreed that the interpretation of Pesh. (Joh 19:25), which inserts the conjunction 'and' between the words 'His mother's sister' and 'Mary of Clopas,' is correct (cf., on the other hand, *pseudo-Matt.* c. 42: '... Jesus et Maria mater ejus cum sorore sua Maria Cleophae,' where the reason given

why two sisters should have the same name is that the first having been devoted to the service of the Lord, the second too was called Mary for the consolation of her parents). From a comparison of the names of the women who witnessed the Crucifixion, given by the first, second, and fourth Evangelists, the most likely conjecture would seem to be that by 'the sister of his mother' St. John meant his own mother Salome (see, however, Schmiedel's art. 'Mary' in *EBi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*] iii. 2969, which denies her identity either with 'Mary of Clopas' or with Salome; cf. also Edersheim, *LT* [Note: *T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* [Edersheim].] ii. 602, and Westcott, *Gospel of St. John, ad loc.*). If the identification by Hegesippus of Clopas with the brother of Joseph be correct, we have the interesting fact that this Mary, thus referred to by St. John, was closely connected with Jesus by the ties of family relationship (see Euseb. iii. 11, iv. 22).

J. R. Willis.

☞Skins

SKINS.—See Bottle and Wine.

☞Skull, Place Of

SKULL, PLACE OF.—See Golgotha.

☞Sky

SKY.—In the two places (Mat 16:2, Luk 12:56) where this word occurs in the Authorized Version of the Gospels, the term 'heaven' is substituted in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885. There is no doubt that this tends towards consistency of rendering, as heaven is the translation of the Greek word (οὐρανός) elsewhere (see Redness of Sky). Where 'sky' is referred to in the Gospels it is the usual sense of cloud region or aerial expanse that is intended. This was the primary sense, indeed, of οὐρανός—the firmament, the vault above the earth. There is nothing in the two passages above to differentiate the 'sky' from the 'heaven' of Mat 24:31. The word is the representative of the Hebrew שָׁמַיִם the upper regions. It reflects the old supposition that the firmament was an actual canopy above the earth. Still the figurative use of

the term is indispensable even in scientific treatises (like, for instance, Tyndall's *Fragments of Science*). In both passages the immediate reference is to the meteorological interpretations of the colour of the sky.

W. S. Kerr.

☞ Slave, Slavery

SLAVE, SLAVERY.—While δούλος is the general term for 'a slave,' οἰκέτης (Luk 16:13; cf. Act 10:7, Rom 14:4, 1Pe 2:18) denotes specifically one employed in household service or in immediate attendance upon the master or δεσπότης. Except in the latter form the institution did not flourish amongst the Jews in NT times. Field-work was done generally by hired labourers (μισθιος, Luk 15:17; or less technically ἐργάτης, Mat 10:10; Mat 20:1, cf. Jam 5:4). In large houses, especially of a Gentile (Luk 7:2) or foreign type, there would be slaves, generally of non-Jewish or mixed blood, as also in the great establishments of the Sadducean and priestly aristocracy. In Palestine the institution was familiar enough in experience as well as tradition to supply popular illustrations and give point to practical religious teaching; but features met with in Greek and especially in Roman usage must not be transferred without modification to the Jewish practice. Not only were the dimensions different, but the prevalent oppression and fear in the one case were replaced in the other by a general spirit of kindness and content.

1. Jewish slaves abroad.—On several occasions before the Fall of Jerusalem, large numbers of Jews had been deported and sold into captivity. Such incidents were frequent during the wars of the Seleucids and Ptolemies (cf. 1Ma 3:41, 2Ma 8:21), and recur during the period of the Roman over-rule (Josephus *BJ* vi. ix. 3). Herod ordained that thieves should be sold to foreigners; but the enactment aroused such a degree of animosity as rendered its enforcement impracticable (Josephus *Ant.* xvi. i. 1). The supply of Jewish slaves was kept up almost entirely from among prisoners taken in the numerous campaigns, and the children of those who were already in captivity, with a few who lost their freedom under the laws of the foreign country or city in which they resided. Their treatment, like that of other slaves, was as a rule cruel to the degree of barbarity. Exceptions are met with, where courtesy to slaves is commended, as by Seneca (*Ep.* xlvii.). But the great mass of evidence is on the other side. Pallas, a brother of Felix (Act 23:24), considered his slaves too abject to be spoken to, and would signify his pleasure to them only by a gesture or nod (Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 23). The slave was merely property, and could be transferred like any other property. He was incapable of contracting a legal marriage, and was not regarded as

invested with any rights. On the ground of expediency, he was gradually protected against excessive cruelty. By the Lex Petronia, which may have been first enacted in the time of Augustus, a slave could not be punished by condemnation to fight with gladiators or wild beasts; and the master's power of life and death was threatened, if not actually restricted, by Claudius. In such hesitating improvements of their condition Jewish slaves abroad would share.

The redemption of Jewish slaves was regarded in theory as a sacred duty (cf. Neh 5:8); but there is no evidence of any general attempt during our period to acquire the merit of such service. The wealth of the country was chiefly in the hands of those sections of the people in whom racial feeling was not strong; and the majority were at once too poor and too much hindered by political conditions to be able to act in other than rare individual cases. The price of a slave, or of his redemption, varied with his qualities, and with the state of the market. Exact particulars for the 1st cent, are not available. Ptolemy Philadelphus redeemed Jewish captives in Egypt at the price of 120 drachmae, or about £4 each (Josephus *Ant.* xii. ii. 3). And Nicanor endeavoured to raise the Roman tribute of 2000 talents by the sale of Jews at the rate of ninety per talent (2Ma 8:10 f.).

2. Slaves in Palestine.—Nehemiah's influence had made it a fundamental rule in Jewish practice that no Jew should be held as a slave by another Jew (cf. Neh 5:8); and as the rule obtained also in Talmudical times (cf. Winter, *Die Stellung der Sklaven*, 10 ff.), it is almost certain to have been observed in the intermediate period. Even thieves were not to be reduced to a state of permanent slavery; and while the disorganization of trade due to a strict observance of the Sabbatic law of Deu 15:1-11 was prevented by Hillel's statute of *Prosbol*, which made registered debts always recoverable, other means were adopted of freeing poor Jews from the burden of their mortgages than that of their reduction to actual servitude. Work was accepted and required as a substitute for repayment, but as far as possible the personal freedom of the debtor was respected. In regard to females, the Talmud decides that a wife can never be sold into slavery, but that a daughter under marriageable age can; with the apparent proviso that, if she be sold again, the purchaser must not be a foreigner. Amongst the Essenes, the holding of slaves was unknown and not allowed (Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 457, 482; Josephus *Ant.* xviii. i. 5). In a few of the great houses of alien officials there would be the retinue usual in other lands; but even then the slaves would be chiefly of Canaanitish or mixed blood. In Jewish houses free service was the rule for men, whilst some of the girls might be servile in status, though comparatively unrestrained. By law, and even more effectually by usage and public sentiment, they were protected from many cruelties customarily practised upon their class elsewhere.

3. Treatment of slaves.—Discipline without undue laxity was recognized as the right treatment of slaves (cf. Sir 33:24 ff., where the two prominent features are the severity to which the discipline might legally be carried, viz., ‘yoke and thong’ and even ‘racks and tortures.’ and the kindness that was the customary rule). So in NT times the master could legally imprison or chastise a slave (Mat 25:30, Luk 12:46 with the alternative rendering ‘severely scourge’), though the power of life and death was withheld, as also any punishment that led to the loss of a limb. An early tradition recounts a controversy between Pharisees and Sadducees, assumed to have taken place in or about our period, as to the incidence of the responsibility for an injury done by a slave (*Yadayim*, iv. 7). The solution of the Pharisees was that the slave himself, and not the master, must be held responsible, as the slave was capable of reasoning, and not to be classed with beasts of burden. Another regulation (*Babâ kammâ*, viii. 4) required the slave to make compensation on his release, and thus has clearly in view a case of temporary servitude amongst Jews, akin to those met with in the OT.

At a time when Pharisaism was predominant, such slaves as were found in a Jewish household, whether Hebrews or aliens by birth, had on religious grounds to be treated humanely. They shared the family worship, and in regard to obligations were classed with the women and children as bound to observe all religious ritual in the home, except the repetition of the *Shema* and the wearing of phylacteries. Laws of an earlier date required the circumcision of slaves (Gen 17:12) and their participation in feast and sacrifice (Deu 12:18; Deu 16:11). Such regulations could not have fallen into desuetude without involving the ceremonial pollution from which it was one of the first objects of the legalists of the first century to escape. The knitting together of master and slave in religious bonds supplied a strong motive for kindness and forbearance. And in later literature the life of the Jewish home is represented as united and happy, master and slave partaking of the same food, exchanging words of respect and tenderness, and mourning over the separation effected by death (*Berakhôth* 16b, *Kethubôth* 61). Altogether the condition of slavery, as far as it existed, was much less oppressive than in Greece or Rome, and was already being superseded by the freer relationships of voluntary service, which alone are in complete accord with the genius of Christianity.

4. Teaching of the Gospels.—The institution of slavery was not directly condemned by Christ, but its continuance was undermined by the new principles of social life which He emphasized. Supreme praise is passed upon service marked by absolute submission (Mar 10:44). The title of slave is appropriated to the highest usage (Mat 21:34, Mar 12:2; Mar 12:4, Luk 20:10 f.), and sanction is thus given to the practice which had applied it to Moses (cf. Jos 14:7, Psa 105:26), and made it the formal style of a prophet (cf. Jer 7:25, Zec 1:6, and the Pauline usage of the term). Redemptive love recognizes no distinctions of sex or status, but makes men of all

social ranks equally responsible for their attitude towards God; and thus society becomes an organism of free men, amongst whom the only authority that is strictly imperial or beyond questioning is that of Christ. The bond-servant of Jesus Christ can be bound to no other master; and in their equal dependence upon Him disciples cease to be able to maintain artificial distinctions of grade or privilege.

Literature.—Articles in the handbooks of Jewish Archaeology, and in such Cyclopaedias as those of Hamburger, Riehm, and Herzog-Hauck; Winter, *Die Stellung der Sklaven bei den Juden ... nach talm. Quellen*; Grünfeld, *Die Stellung ... nach bibl. und talm. Quellen*; Brace, *Gesta Christi*, ch. v. For the conditions in non-Jewish districts see Mommsen, and Smith's *Dict. of Gr. and Rom.* [*Note: Roman.*] *Ant.*

R. W. Moss.

☩ Sleep

SLEEP (ὕπνος, καθεύδω, ἀφυπνῶω, κοιμάομαι).—The mention of sleep is frequent in the Gospels, both in its literal and in its figurative meanings.

1. *Literally*, e.g. 'Joseph being raised out of sleep' (Mat_1:24); 'Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep' (Luk_9:32); (Jesus) 'findeth them asleep' (Mat_26:40-43); 'Simon, sleepest thou?' (Mar_14:37). Jesus, as is noted by all the Synoptists, fell asleep in the boat as He and His disciples were crossing to the other side of the Sea of Galilee (Mat_8:24 || Mar_4:38 || Luk_8:23). Mk. adds the detail that He slept 'on the pillow' (ἐπὶ τὸ προσκεφάλαιον), probably a boat cushion, or a headrest made of wool. Lk. indicates that He was fast asleep (ἀφυπνῶω), which accords with the fact that the severe storm which had burst forth while they were crossing did not awake Him.

2. *Figuratively*: (i.) As a metaphor for death, 'The maid is not dead, but sleepeth' (καθεύδει, Mat_9:24 || Mar_5:39 || Luk_8:52); 'Our friend Lazarus sleepeth' (is fallen asleep, κεκοίμηται, Joh_11:11). No distinction is to be made between the verbs καθεύδω and κοιμάομαι, for the disciples reply, 'Lord, if he sleep (κεκοίμηται), he shall do well' (Joh_11:12); cf. also Mat_27:52 with Mat_28:13 || Luk_22:45, and Act_7:60; Act_13:36 with Act_12:6. St. Paul frequently uses κοιμάομαι to describe the dead (1Co_15:18; 1Co_15:20 || 1Th_4:13-15), and to express the fact of death (1Co_7:39;

1Co_11:30; 1Co_15:6; 1Co_15:51; cf. also 2Pe_3:4). The metaphor is very ancient. It is found in the OT, ‘Since thou art laid down’ (in the LXX Septuagint ‘fallen asleep’ [κεκοίμησαι], Isa_14:8; cf. Isa_43:17 || 1Ki_11:43); and in classical literature (Hom. *Il.* xi. 241; Soph. *Elect.* 509). (ii.) As symbolizing the lack of watchfulness: ‘while men slept his enemy came’ (Mat_13:25); ‘lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping’ (Mar_13:36). (iii.) The interpretation of the sleep of the virgins (‘while the bridegroom tarried, they all slumbered [γυστάζω, ‘nodded’] and slept,’ Mat_25:5) is uncertain. Many of the ancient interpreters take it as the sleep of death which comes to all. By some modern writers it has been interpreted as the sleep of ignorance, symbolizing that the day of the coming of the bridegroom, *i.e.* of Christ, is unknown, or as a hint that that day is not immediately at hand. Others take it as the sleep of security, indicating that the wise and the foolish virgins, having made such preparation as they thought necessary, awaited the coming of the bridegroom with such calmness of mind that they fell asleep. Probably the best interpretation is that which regards the sleep as the natural and innocent unconsciousness or obliviousness of the future and the eternal, and especially of the coming of Christ, which inevitably creeps over the wise and the foolish alike. This forgetfulness, however, is full of danger to those who do not keep themselves in such a condition of readiness for any event that they are prepared for it when it comes. We are not to be always thinking of the Lord’s coming, but are to live so that that event will not come upon us in a state of unreadiness. ‘The tension of the mind may innocently and must naturally vary. It is enough that its intention is ever the same—that we live under the power of the future and the eternal even when not thinking of it’ (Bruce).

Literature.—Trench, *Parables*; Bruce, *Parabolic Teaching of Christ*; Winterbotham in *Expos.*, 1st ser. ix. [1879] p. 76 ff.; Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*; Goebel, *Parables* (T. & T. Clark); Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus* (T. & T. Clark), vol. i. p. 136; R. Rainy, *Sojourning with God* (1902), 95.

John Reid.

☞ Slothfulness

SLOTHFULNESS

1. *Gospel usage.*—The noun ‘sloth’ is not found; the adj. ‘slothful’ (ὄκνητος) occurs once only (Mat_25:26). The wicked, slothful, and unprofitable servant is silhouetted once, for all men and time. The words, ‘Thou wicked and slothful servant,’ ‘were in the Gospel well coupled; and the first epithet was grounded on the second, he being

therefore wicked, because he had been slothful' (Barrow). It is the man of one talent, and he who has buried the same, that is guilty of the sin of sloth. That is true psychology. But let every man give heed unto himself. Genius has yielded to this sin as well as mediocrity. Stewardship of five talents has been neglected, and equally in that case the 'precipitate' of character has been sloth.

2. *The life of Jesus a rebuke to slothfulness.*—The Saviour was in all respects a complete opposite to 'the slothful servant.' The zeal of the Lord ate Him up (Joh_2:17). Early and late He wearied not in well-doing, but accomplished what was given Him to do. 'Our great example, the life of our blessed Lord Himself, what was it but one continual exercise of labour? His mind did ever stand bent in careful attention, studying to do good. His body was ever moving in wearisome travel to the same Divine intent' (Barrow). His practice stimulates to diligence, His preaching warns to avoid sloth. The Apostle Paul was built on the same model. When he bids men be 'not slothful in business' (Rom_12:11 Authorized Version), these are the words of a man who was in labours most abundant (2Co_11:23).

Literature.—Bruce, *Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, 'The Talents'; Horton, *Proverbs*, 'Idleness'; Barrow, *Sermons*, on 'Industry'; Drummond, *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*, 'Degeneration'; Stalker, *Seven Deadly Sins* (1901), 115.

John R. Legge.

⚡ Slowness Of Heart

SLOWNESS OF HEART.—A disposition which our Lord discerned in His disciples, especially in relation to His Person and work (Luk_24:25 βραδεῖς τῆ καρδίᾳ). He connects it with 'emptiness of mind' (ἀνόητος, cf. Bengel, who paraphrases, 'void of mind and slow of heart') as the joint cause of their failure to understand and believe the testimony of the prophets concerning Himself. This dual disposition is characteristic of the disciples' attitude toward the whole of Christ's teaching (cf. Mat_15:15-17; Mat_16:8-12, Joh_14:9); and the order in which the epithets are employed in Luk_24:25 suggests that slowness of heart is the root from which dulness of mind concerning spiritual truth springs. The disciples believed, but slowly, and with a heavy heart. There was an element of reluctance in their faith. Jesus was not the sort of Messiah they expected, and His teaching was not the kind of teaching they desired. He and His words, in consequence, encountered in their hearts an unwillingness to believe which generated, in its turn, failure to understand. Slowness of heart thus reveals a moral fault. The free action of faith is hindered by prejudice

of one kind or another. The will is biased in a different direction (cf. Joh_7:17). As Godet says, 'If they had embraced the living God with more fervent faith, the fact of the resurrection would not have been so strange to their hopes' (Com. on *St. Luke's Gospel*, vol. ii. p. 354). Slowness of heart is the opposite extreme to that over-quickness of faith which our Lord stigmatized in the parable of the Sower under the figure of the rocky ground. Between these extremes there is a quickness of heart which is ready to believe whatever bears the sufficient warrant of the Word of God. Of this quickness Nathanael is a striking instance (Joh_1:45-49). Thomas, on the other hand, illustrates slowness of heart, while Christ's treatment of him shows us how He deals with such slow believers and quickens their faith into great confessions (Joh_20:24-29).

James Mursell.

☩ Smoking Flax

SMOKING FLAX (λίον τυφόμενον, Mat_12:20).—The little earthenware lamp is largely replaced to-day, even in the houses of the *fellahîn* in Palestine, by lamps made by travelling tinsmiths from the tins in which petroleum is imported. But the old-fashioned lamp, resembling those dug out of ancient graves, is still to be seen. Olive oil is poured into the bowl of the lamp, and for wick a few strands of flaxen fibre or cotton thread twisted together are inserted. As the oil is consumed the flame sinks, and the wick fills the house with peculiarly disagreeable smoke. The lamp must be replenished with oil, and the wick trimmed, or, as more frequently happens when the smoking stage is reached, the flax is 'quenched' and cast out.

W. Ewing.

☩ Snare

SNARE (παγίς, βρόχος).—παγίς (Luk_21:31, Rom_11:9, etc.) is primarily a trap, then a trick or snare. βρόχος (1Co_7:35) is a noose or slip-knot for hanging or strangling, then a snare for birds, or the mesh of a net. We can hardly take παγίς in Luk_21:35, with Godet (Com. *in loc*), as a net enclosing a flock of unsuspecting birds. The idea in both words is simply that of taking unawares, as the bird in the fowler's trap—the

fakhkh, in the use of which Arab boys are so expert—or the hare in the noose cunningly spread in its path.

W. Ewing.

❖ Snow

SNOW.—See Agriculture in vol. i. p. 40^a.

❖ Sociability

SOCIABILITY.—See Character of Christ in vol. i. p. 289 ff.

❖ Social Life

SOCIAL LIFE

1. State of society in the time of Christ.—(1) A sympathetic reconsideration of the materials at our disposal has gone far to prove that the society of the Roman world at the beginning of the Christian era was not in the absolutely rotten state apparently pictured by contemporary satirists and moralists. Their animadversions and strictures cannot be regarded as applying to more than a proportion of the population. The vigour and earnestness of their denunciations are proofs in themselves of a spirit to which the prevalent immoralities were odious. That age is not wholly bad which has grace in some of its members to be ashamed. Juvenal denounces the inhumanity with which slaves were so often treated, and gives vivid and pungent utterance to an indignant tenderness and pity which would no longer submit to be stifled. From other sources of information it appears that there were middle-class circles, particularly in the provinces, which maintained a laudable level of life, keeping themselves free at least from the polluting and demoralizing vices of the capital and its urban imitators. Of them the worst that could be said was that they pursued empty lives devoted to frivolous aims and bubble ambitions, whose vanity was accentuated by their unconsciousness of it. The age was not without its high ideals and earnest idealists. But aspiration was crippled through lack of clearness as to the ideals it would realize. There are abundant manifest indications that a deep, strong, spiritual movement which made for better things had begun. Springing from a profound realization of the

evils current, it yet had no clear understanding of their origin and causes, and blindly groped after ways of cure.

(2) It would seem as if the coming of Jesus opened the channels for the inflow of fresh Divine influences which voicelessly and mysteriously began to permeate human hearts and quicken a new and healthy life. The vague ideal which hung in solution in so many minds began to take shape and form. The Divine Spirit gave content and direction to the semi-conscious aspirations and half-blind desires moving restlessly in the depths of the human heart, reinforced the spirit of reaction which had set in, imparting to its champions a new passion for the righteous, the pure, and the true.

2. Influence and methods of Jesus.—(1) Into the society in which this new life was stirring came Jesus, and very soon the influence of His teaching and spirit began to make itself felt. It would be an error, however, to attribute to that alone the social reformation which gradually evidenced itself as in progress. Other factors were already operating. The rebellion of misery against cruel economic conditions, a mutinous sense of the unjust and unjustifiable inequalities of life, the strong infusion of democratic sympathies into the governing circles, through the increasing number of those whose native ability had secured them wealth and position, the mixing of different races whose blood was strongly impregnated with inherited qualities often anti-toxic and mutually corrective,—these were factors which contributed to bring about radical changes in outlook and conduct. The social teaching of Jesus was not entirely new. Much of it had already been the staple propaganda of eloquent and earnest advocates. But Jesus made the body of principles He inculcated vitalizing forces in the shaping of human society, determining and dominating factors in its evolution, after an unprecedented fashion. He made them the accepted and controlling commonplaces of reform and reconstruction. He enunciated laws for the regulation of communal life which tended to eliminate the disorderly element of mere personal caprice and whim. In a word, He created a social conscience.

(2) In any consideration of Christ's influence upon social life, it must be clearly recognized that it operated not only, and perhaps not so much, through the propagation of His teaching as through the infusion of His spirit into society. The work of His Holy Spirit in awakening men to the evils amidst which they lived, and impelling them to energetic suppressive and alterative measures, must be assigned its due place and value. The changes wrought upon society in the course of generations are the product of men educated upon the principles of Jesus, but freely using their personal judgment under the guidance and inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

(3) Nor must it be left out of account that the fact of the Incarnation, theologically conceived and estimated, with its pregnant suggestions of the worth and destiny of

man and the Divine hopes and aims regarding him, provided for thoughtful and responsive minds a purified impulse towards a new humanitarianism.

(4) Profound as the influence of Jesus upon social life has been, it was by no means His primary function to procure its reformation. The social rectifications which unquestionably trace their original impulse to Him are of the nature of by-products of His work. He came to reveal God to man and to bring man to God. Nevertheless, He had an ulterior purpose, to which this was in a sense a preliminary step, in the founding of an ideal community, designated the Kingdom of God, composed of individuals whose mutual relations were determined by the implications of their proper relationship to God. The immediate implication of the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God is the brotherhood of man. These two doctrines are basal to, and determinative of, Christ's whole ethical system. The ultimate aim of Jesus, then, may be said to have been social, inasmuch as the final end of His mission would be achieved only in the realization of a regenerate society.

(5) Jesus consistently set an ideal of perfection before men. Himself sinless, He would have all men sinless as well (Joh 5:14; Joh 8:11 'Sin no more'; Mat 5:48 'Be ye perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect'). But this perfection was not merely a negative condition, a state of freedom from every evil spot or stain. The context of Mat 5:48 clearly indicates the connotation the word τέλειος is intended to have. It meant such perfection as that of His Father in heaven, which, on the positive side, was determined by the gracious activities and loving ministries of which men were the objects and beneficiaries. Human perfection was then to be attained only through a life of similar beneficent activity. It cannot be achieved in isolation. Christ never contemplates human life so situated. He regards man as essentially a social being, whose full self-realization can only be attained in vital relationship with his fellows. No man may go apart by himself and live a truly godly or saintly life (Joh 17:11; Joh 17:15). The ideal character, according to Jesus, is to be realized only through the proper discharge of the social responsibilities entailed by communal life (Mat 19:21) Sin with Him, and sin of the most blameworthy kind, is largely neglect or failure to fulfil social duties and obligations (Mat 25:42 f.) The virtues, on the other hand, which distinguish the good man after the mind of Christ are those which emerge in a life of vigilant and incessant beneficence and self-sacrificing love (Mat 25:35 ff., Joh 15:14). The whole spirit of Christ's teaching condemns the hermit existence as one which gravely imperils a man's title to be considered a citizen of the Kingdom of God. The root of the world's evil is selfish individualism.

(6) Jesus, then, was not properly a social reformer; He was an inspirer of social reform. He enunciated principles in the light of which the evil of prevalent conditions, practices, and accepted institutions became increasingly apparent. He

changed things by first changing men. He made many things impossible by making them intolerable to the sensitized conscience and Christianized heart.

3. Attitude of Jesus to existing social relationships.—(1) All this is borne out by the consideration of Christ's attitude to the society of His own day. Upon its constituent elements He passed no strictures suggestive of an attitude of protest or condemnation. He accepted its inequalities of position and possessions without demur; nor did He range Himself with that species of socialism which anticipates an epoch when the relationships of master and servant, rich and poor, employer and employed, capital and labour, shall cease to exist (Mat 10:24, Luk 17:7-9, Mar 14:7). These characterize the normal and stable state of society, which He seemed to regard as fittingly ordered to provide the opportunities or agencies for the evolution of the type of character which most conformed to the image of God, and the realization of the type of life which best expressed His spirit.

(2) If, then, the essential features of society as presently constituted undergo 'a sea-change into something rich and strange,' it will not be because Jesus deliberately legislated to that end, but because the spirit He infused into men, educated on His principles, demanded different conditions for its fuller and more perfect expression. His sympathies were inferentially on the side of an industrial and economic order wherein individual talents, capabilities, and fidelities would have ample scope to prove and exercise themselves, and would meet with such suitable and proportionate reward as would stimulate and foster healthy aspiration, honest ambition, and those qualities of industry, integrity, and disinterested fidelity which go to form the ideal character (cf. Luk 12:42 ff; Luk 19:12 ff.).

(3) Jesus did not forbid the accumulation of *private property*. Rather He accepted it as a fundamental right of every man to possess in security whatever property honestly belonged to him (Mat 20:15; Mat 25:20 f., Mat 25:29; Mat 13:44-46). That is the underlying assumption of those maxims which inculcate giving, and of those utterances which approve a saintly charity (Luk 6:30; Luk 6:35; Luk 6:38). He had no word of censure for the many persons of means whom He numbered amongst His friends. His disciples continued to own property (Joh 21:3 ff., Luk 19:2-9), and His little company subsisted on a common, if meagre, purse (Joh 12:6; Joh 13:29). Poor Himself, He inflamed no envy of the rich, nor fostered any class feeling. Money He accepted as an effective instrument for the furtherance of the Kingdom of God. He recognized that, while for one it might be a snare and therefore should be foregone (Luk 18:22; Luk 18:24), for another it provided means towards the better doing of God's will. He was urgent in His warnings regarding the spiritual dangers which attended its ampler possession. He magnified its subtle power to enthral the affections and divorce the heart from God by winning that trust for itself which should be reposed in Him alone (Mar 10:24, Mat 13:22). He vividly portrayed how it

dried up the spirit of unselfish sympathies and tended to Tender men indifferent and callous to human need (Luk_16:19 ff.). He understood how its successful acquisition developed an unquenchable thirst for more, and therefore He admonished all to beware of covetousness, the greedy spirit which wants more than it can profitably or enjoyably use (Luk_12:15 ff.). In various ways He impressed upon men that money was not the true wealth, and could not of itself procure true blessedness (Luk_18:18-23; Luk_12:21; Luk_16:11). See, further, art. Wealth.

(4) It is evident that Jesus held the institution of *the family* in profound reverence. He expounded His theology in terms of its relationships. He displayed a peculiarly anxious concern in dealing with questions that affected its integrity. The state of things in His day urgently called for outspoken protest and warning. There was an increasing laxity of view and practice with regard to marriage. Divorce (which see) was common, and resorted to upon meagre enough grounds. The school of Hillel sanctioned it for no better reason than that a wife had spoilt her husband's dinner, this opinion being founded upon a liberal interpretation of Deu_24:1. There is no subject on which Jesus spoke more uncompromisingly and unequivocally. He recognized that the stability and wholesomeness of social life depend largely on the health and purity of domestic life. While recognizing its physical basis, Jesus conceived of marriage as an essentially spiritual union. He regarded it as a Divine institution and ordinance, which involved the parties entering into it in the most solemn and sacred mutual obligations. In the highest, and to Him the only legitimate view of it, it was a consummation of mutual love mediated by God Himself (Mat_19:6). That was therefore no true marriage which was entered into for the gratification of sensual passion or on the score of worldly considerations. It was not within the province of man to sunder those whom God had joined, *i.e.* to cancel their vows and annul the relationship that had bound them to one another. No human law-court has the right to undo the tie made and sealed by God Himself. See, further, artt. Adultery, Divorce, Eunuch, Family, Marriage.

(5) Jesus, then, acquiesced in the indefinite continuance of the ordinary relationships of life then obtaining, as constituting the normal state of society. He gave *no countenance to anarchism*. He Himself offered an example of law-abiding citizenship, consistently demanding that due respect be paid to the requirements and enactments of the civil power legislating within its own proper sphere. He rebuked the spirit of revolt which demurred to the right of government to levy taxes, He himself submitting to be taxed, even when He might have claimed exemption (Mat_17:27 ff.). He consistently acquiesced in the right of properly constituted authorities to act in accordance with their legal powers; He would permit of no resistance to the emissaries of the Sanhedrin sent to arrest Him. The case against Him founded on charges of law-breaking collapsed. Pilate, with the best will, could find no fault in Him (Luk_23:14).

4. Jesus nevertheless did not fail to denounce with vehemence current injustices and abuses, His recognition of the prevalence of oppression, extortion, corrupt practices, and the pinched poverty due to them, not only finds explicit and scathing utterance (Luk 20:47), but is reflected in many of His parables and implied in many of His sayings. Yet He does not speak as if the emergence of these were the inevitable outcome of established social conditions. The blame is always laid upon individuals who guiltily abused their powers and opportunities. He allowed no word to escape His lips which might countenance the methods of violent revolution. He started no popular agitation to secure social reconstruction. No forcible alteration in the mere externalities of life would ensure the disappearance of prevalent evils. Jesus plainly taught that social amelioration must be brought about by the gradual assimilation of the mass to the ideal type, and the infusion of the principles of His gospel into all the veins of the body politic (Mat 13:33). By evolution, not by revolution, lay the path to the realization of the Kingdom of heaven. Jesus did not share the prophetic enthusiasm of impatient expectation to which the Day of the Lord seemed already at the doors. From the beginning He impressed it upon His disciples that it was indefinitely far off (Mar 4:26 ff., Mat 24:14). He had a profound appreciation of the protracted manner in which a regenerate state of society of a stable kind may only be attained, through the working of healthy spiritual forces in individual hearts (Mat 5:13). In this He stood alone. His doctrine surprised and perplexed His disciples. It was out of harmony with the traditional beliefs and hopes on which they had been nurtured (Mar 13:3 ff.).

Nevertheless, Jesus did not anticipate that the Kingdom would come by a peaceful and progressive process of evolution, without the shocks of revolution. He foresaw that the forces of reform would rouse the strenuous hostility of antagonistic spiritual elements in society, with the consequent outbreak of anarchic convulsions (Mat 24:3 ff.). Indeed, He anticipated that the ideal society would never be attained as the result of pure evolution. The forces of evil would refuse to be ousted, and would prove too strong to be suppressed. Successive Divine interferences would be required, culminating in a final catastrophic one, to secure their suppression and the realization of the Kingdom of heaven on earth in stable and universal sway (Mat 10:21; Mat 11:12; Mat 13:41; Mat 13:49).

5. Fundamental principles of Christ's social teaching, and their outcome.—(1) Jesus laid the foundation of the social structure of the future by His doctrine of *the equal essential worth of the individual*. This had already been preached with conviction and power, but with, little practical outcome. Rigid lines of demarcation continued to separate the various classes in Roman society (cf. Dill, *Roman Society*, p. 270 ff.). It was through Jesus that the doctrine ceased to be little more than an academic proposition, and became a vitalizing element in civilization, and a regulative principle in the development of the new social organism. He laid the foundations of a pure,

universal democracy—a democracy based, not on equality of personal possessions, but on equality of individual rights. He awakened a new sense of the essential dignity of human nature, and gave a meaning and a value to the most obscure life. He invested the common people with a new self-respect which elevated and fortified, and with a sense of personal responsibility which steadied and deepened, while eliminating the dangerous sense of purposelessness and insignificance. Every human being was a storehouse of Divine potentialities; His whole ministry consistently enforced and illustrated this pregnant truth. Though consenting to social inequalities, He did not allow these to be regarded as the sign or token of any differences in the intrinsic worth of the human soul. In His intercourse with all sorts and conditions He manifested a lofty indifference to rank and position, practically ignoring the artificial distinctions of society (Luk 7:36 ff.). There was no human being beneath respectful regard or outside the radius of brotherly love. This He drove home by incarnating God's concern for the outcasts and the fallen, the pariahs of society. The express purpose of His mission was to seek and save that which was lost. By His self-sacrifice on the Cross, necessitated to procure redemption, approved and accepted by the Father, He made plain that the worth of the individual soul was, in God's regard, beyond calculation. Thus was a new sense of the sacredness of personality impressed upon the mind and heart of the world. From the acceptance of this doctrine flowed many and far-reaching consequences. Life might no longer be held cheap. Every human being, whatever his position, had certain rights which must be respected.

(a) *Slavery* could not and did not long persist as a normal institution of society. It speedily came under the ban of healthy Christian sentiment (Phm 1:16). Such a condition was not consonant with the essential dignity of human nature as hall-marked by Christ. It became impossible to regard human beings as mere goods and chattels, to be bought and sold as household furniture. Nor might they be treated with the callous brutalities of an inhumanity which made no distinction between slaves and beasts. The slave was also a man, and entitled at least to the regard proper to one possessed of an immortal and priceless soul.

(b) *Woman* also came into her kingdom. Generally speaking, she had been treated as an inferior being, who had duties but no rights, except what man chose to grant her. Her nature was 'cribb'd, cabin'd, and confin'd.' There were indeed many and brilliant exceptions in women who dignified the sex and won the warmest admiration. But the common contempt in which woman was held inevitably reacted on her nature, and, by lowering her self-respect, made of her what went to confirm the general opinion regarding her. Jesus changed all that. He emancipated her from her position of sex-inferiority. He did this by Himself treating her as an equal, in no wise of less essential worth than man (Luk 10:38 ff., Joh 11:5). He gave her peculiar honour. Some of the most significant incidents in His life are associated with women (Joh 4:9

ff; Joh 11:32 ff.). He overturned the estimates of the past and revoked its unquestioned judgments. See, further, art. Woman.

(c) Jesus was the Saviour of the *child*. He put an end to the inhumanities with which unwelcome infants were treated (Mat 18:6; Mat 18:10; Mat 18:14, Luk 17:2). He gave the child an importance which resulted in increasing attention being paid to its well-being. The Early Church led the way in interpreting and applying the mind of the Master. Wherever His spirit has been most active, there has the child been the object of the most thoughtful and solicitous care. One of the fruits of the Reformation was the new interest taken in the education of the young. The modern deep and earnest study of child life, the many and varied institutions for promoting the physical and moral welfare of the young, are the outcome of a deepening and more sympathetic appreciation of the worth Jesus gave to the child (Mar 9:33-37, Mat 18:5). See, further, art. Children.

(2) Jesus preached *the brotherhood of men*, based on their common relationship to the Father-God, to whom all alike owe their being. Thus He linked the whole human race in a common kinship. The Stoics had ineffectively taught this doctrine. Jesus made it a substantial fact. Through Him it became a principle profoundly influential in determining the nature of the relations between man and man. It operated towards the obliteration of the artificial distinctions between class and class which obtained in a society ordered according to pagan ideas and ideals, distinctions which almost implied the tacit assumption of a gradual differentiation of nature. The Early Church gave practical illustration of the necessary outcome of Christ's teaching in their gatherings for worship, where rich and poor, master and slave, employer and employed, mingled indiscriminately, with the freedom and mutual regard based on the cordial recognition of their common brotherhood.

(a) Through the inculcation of this doctrine Jesus generated a social conscience, the sense of individual responsibility for the corporate well-being. He sowed the seed of the fruitful idea of the solidarity of the race. He gave a new meaning to the word 'neighbour,' and exalted neighbourliness to the rank of a supreme Christian virtue (Luk 10:29 ff.). He widened the area of duty till it embraced the whole of mankind (Act 1:8). There is no horizon to the sphere of personal obligation. It reaches to the circumference of human need.

(b) Jesus thus evoked a new sense of humanity. He gave it a comprehensiveness, an outlook, and an insight, which it never possessed before. The Mosaic Code contains many enactments relative to the treatment of strangers and foreigners, but these rested on no broad human basis. They were instructed and qualified by considerations of nationality, antecedents, and prudential policy. Jesus refused to allow barriers of race to restrict the outflow of the spirit of beneficent love (Mar 7:26, Joh 4:9;

Joh 4:40). He taught it to reach out to the uttermost, as well as to reach down to the lowermost. His Church was to make the brotherhood of man a visible reality, environing within it people of all nations and tongues (Luk 13:29, Joh 12:20 ff.). The duty of preaching the gospel to every creature involves the obligation of treating all alike in the spirit of the gospel. The sympathetic appreciation of the Heavenly Father's attitude to the erring and the wretched, as pictured in the parables, and as reflected in His own life, set men of whatever race or condition in a new light. The outcast, the fallen, the depraved, all those whose moral and spiritual condition classed them amongst the lost, became the objects of a compassion which yearned for their restoration. Their recovery became the serious concern of every soul bent upon the imitation of God. Christ infused the Saviour-spirit into the world, to which all need is a summons to help, and in whose eyes every sinner is a possible saint (Mat 12:20, Luk 23:43). There was no bondage to sin from which emancipation was not possible, no far country from which there was no return. Despair was a word foreign to Christ's vocabulary (Luk 6:35). He instituted the method of redemption by pity and love, whose intelligent application is gradually operating to effect what He proved in individual instances it was actually fitted to achieve (Joh 8:11, Luk 19:1 ff.). He discredited the method of spiritual cure which relies upon threats and penalties alone.

(c) He inaugurated the day of specifically Christian charity. Charity had been exercised before, but it was largely a matter of expediency, or the outflow of a mere pitifulness for misery and want. Jesus gave it a new heart and a new will, a new sight and a new insight. It was not to be left henceforth to a few munificent gentlemen like Pliny to dispense. Its exercise became the duty of all alike, according to their ability and opportunity. The organization of charity has been justly characterized as the finest achievement of the Early Christians (v. Dobschütz). Jesus erected charity into a supreme Christian virtue. He regarded its absence as a convicting proof of the absence of that spirit which qualified for entrance into the Kingdom of God. That was a sure indication of a soul out of fellowship with God (Mat 25:41 ff., Luk 12:20 f., Luk 16:20 ff.). Jesus enjoined as a primary duty the prompt and ungrudging use of one's means in the relief of necessity of whatever kind. The priest and the Levite who passed by on the other side were transgressing the first and last law of love. Jesus would allow of no limit to the sacrifices one must be prepared to make in obedience to its legitimate demands (Luk 12:33). Charity must not be of the nature of unwilling acquiescence in a begging request. It must be the fruit of that spirit which is ready to give more than is asked, and will err on the side of generosity rather than of meanness (Luk 6:30). Yet the exercise of charity must not be indiscriminate or unregulated. It must always tend to promote the ends of the law of Christian love. It must be regulated by regard to the Golden Rule, interpreted in the light of the Heavenly Father's example. It must be well considered, ever keeping in view the highest welfare of those who invite its aid. Each case must be taken on its own

merits. Charity is legitimate, only when it subserves the spiritual interests of the individual assisted,—when it makes him not only better off, but a better man. It is forbidden to give after such wise as will only encourage or confirm evil habits. To do so were to keep the lower law while breaking the higher,—the law of Christian love, which forbids the infliction of the ultimate moral injury that inevitably eventuates from indiscriminate and heedless giving. We must always do the studiously loving thing. True charity finds its exemplar in the Heavenly Father, who will not give what is harmful or useless, but only good things (Mat_7:11, Luk_11:13); and it seeks with wise concern to foster the virtues of self-reliance, self-help, manly independence, and industry, whose exercise reduces the occasions of charity.

(3) Jesus preached *life as a stewardship*, and its powers, means, opportunities as a trust from God for the proper use of which each man was answerable. Talents must be regarded as gifts, to be used, not for the possessor's selfish purposes, but for the ends of an altruistic love. The teaching of Jesus uncompromisingly condemns the life which is spent in the pursuit of wealth for what it may yield of selfish pleasure, and the expenditure of means on purely personal gratification (Luk_12:16 ff.). We are given that we may give. 'A man does not own his wealth; he owes it.' From the highest point of view, there is no such thing as private means. All possessions are a public trust. Jesus was urgent in His demand for the generous open-handedness of a large-hearted benevolence whose instinct was always to consent or comply rather than to refuse or withhold (Mat_5:42). To those who exercised it He made the most lavish promises (Luk_6:38; Luk_18:28 ff.). The only saying preserved in the Canon outside the Gospels is an incitement to unselfish liberality on the ground of the blessedness it procures (Act_20:35). Jesus bestows as strong condemnation upon the indifferent spirit which fails to use its means for the right ends, as upon those who wantonly abuse them for the wrong ones (Mat_25:26 ff., Luk_16:19 ff.). Means must always be regarded as a means. Their exploitation for selfish or sinister purposes invites and incurs penalties of the direst kind (Mat_24:51). The same duties and responsibilities are laid upon small means as upon large,—upon the man of one talent as upon the man of ten (Luk_16:11; Luk_19:13-27).

Literature.—Brace, *Gesta Christi*; Dill, *Roman Society from, Nero to Marcus Aurelius*; v. Dobschütz, *Primitive Life in the Primitive Church*; Lecky, *History of European Morals*; Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*; Sanday, art. 'Jesus Christ' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*; Westcott, *Social Aspects of Christianity*; Sceley, *Ecce Homo*; Harnack, *What is Christianity?* Forrest, *Authority of Christ*.

A. M. Hunter.

SOCIALISM

1. **Definition, etc.**—‘The watch-word of the Socialist is *Co-operation*; the watch-word of the anti-Socialist is *Competition*. Any one who recognizes the principle of Co-operation as a stronger and truer principle than that of Competition, has a right to the honour or the disgrace of being called a Socialist.’ This definition was written by Frederic Denison Maurice in the first of a series of Tracts on Christian Socialism, which was published in 1849. Maurice, Kingsley, and T. Hughes deliberately adopted the word ‘Socialist’ for the movement which they founded, and incurred, as Hughes has testified, much ‘anger and bitterness’ as a result; but, since then, the Socialist idea has had a secure place in the speculations and activities of modern Christianity. It is evident, however, that Socialism so defined is a much broader thing than the State Socialism of economic theory, or than that of the Social Democratic parties of contemporary politics. Fifty years ago, indeed, many men did regard competition as a stronger and truer principle than co-operation; and Socialism (in Maurice’s sense) has had an easy victory over the *laissez-faire* Individualism which was dominant in the political economy of his day; in this sense the famous saying is true that ‘We are all Socialists now.’ But a man may be against Individualism or Anarchism, and to that extent a Socialist, and yet may be opposed to the current conceptions both of economic and political Socialism; he may possibly regard the growth of municipal undertakings with alarm, and he may even look, as Thomas Carlyle did, to the ‘strong man,’ and not to the democracy, for deliverance from the evils of insufficiently restricted competition.

Yet general principles are of more importance than economic theories which must necessarily shift with changing conditions of life; and Socialism, defined as the principle of fellowship, may safely claim to be an integral part of Christianity, working itself out in one age through feudalism and canon law, in another through representative government and factory legislation, and tending, through the improvement of individual character, to the ideal state. That ideal state might prove to be either socialist or anarchist, or to be (as society now is) somewhere between these two extremes; for, indeed, if men were perfect, the machinery of society would be a matter of indifference. It is because men are imperfect that the economic and political machinery is a matter of urgent importance. Here ‘Socialism,’ as an active Christian principle, comes in; for though Christians must always claim the supreme importance of personal regeneration, as against those who think that society can be made perfect by the mere operation of the State, it must also be admitted that a religion which attempts to deal only with the individual, and leaves society to its own devices and the laws of supply and demand, is untrue to itself, and is doomed to

failure. Individual character cannot be regenerated while it is being destroyed by bad housing, or by intemperance, or by commercial selfishness and dishonesty, or while multitudes are 'submerged' and 'sweated.' Such things as these are therefore the immediate concern of the Christian; and far more so the great causes—economic, political, ethical—which lie behind them. Now it is undeniable that, for a considerable period before Maurice wrote, the 'religious world' as a whole had ignored this truth, and had neglected its social duty to the weak and oppressed,—a neglect of which the results are still painfully evident to-day. There had indeed always existed a better tradition: the Quakers* [Note: A good example of 18th cent. Quakerism is John Woolman. See the Bibliography in the Fabian Society's edition of his tract, *A Word of Remembrance and Caution to the Rich.*] had been a powerful leaven of commercial morality; Wilberforce and his friends had, after a protracted battle of 20 years, conquered Individualism in the interests of the black slaves; Shaftesbury (a Conservative in politics) had already won a signal victory over the even more horrible 'white slavery' that went on in English factories. Both these men were devoted religious leaders: but they were not the 'religious world'; hence the protest of the Christian Socialists,—a protest which has really changed the face of British Christendom.

The Maurician definition of Socialism is thus a very real one, and is practical as well as fundamental. The Christian men who opposed Shaftesbury were Individualists; they left society to the laws of supply and demand—in other words, to competition; they regarded the aim of Christianity as the salvation of individuals—or perhaps of a small minority of the elect, for Calvinism was in truth the theological parent of this Individualism. If Socialism be regarded broadly as the antithesis of Individualism, as a theory of life and not only of economics, then it is true that the Christian Socialists won the day and now hold the field. It will clear the ground if we give here a definition of Bishop Westcott in which Maurice's words are repeated and expanded:

'The term Socialism has been discredited by its connexion with many extravagant and revolutionary schemes, but it is a term which needs to be claimed for nobler uses. It has no necessary affinity with any forms of violence, or confiscation, or class selfishness, or financial arrangement. I shall therefore venture to employ it apart from its historical associations as describing a theory of life, and not only a theory of economics. In this sense Socialism is the opposite of Individualism, and it is by contrast with Individualism that the true character of Socialism can best be discerned. Individualism and Socialism correspond with opposite views of humanity. Individualism regards humanity as made up of disconnected or warring atoms; Socialism regards it as an organic whole, a vital unity formed by the combination of contributory members mutually interdependent.

It follows that Socialism differs from Individualism both in method and in aim. The method of Socialism is co-operation, the method of Individualism is competition. The one regards man as working with man for a common end, the other regards man as working against man for private gain. The aim of Socialism is the fulfilment of service, the aim of Individualism is the attainment of some personal advantage—riches, or place, or fame. Socialism seeks such an organization of life as shall secure for every one the most complete development of his powers; Individualism seeks primarily the satisfaction of the particular wants of each one, in the hope that the pursuit of private interest will in the end secure public welfare' (Westcott, *Socialism*, pp. 3, 4).

If the social principle, the principle of brotherhood, had been forgotten, it certainly came to its own again in the 19th cent., though it may be at present rather overwhelmed by the problems which had grown up during its abeyance. Its rapid revival in the Churches was due to the fact that the men who proclaimed it were able to point to half-forgotten Scripture ideas—as with other objects men had gone back to the teaching of Scripture at the Reformation. It was easy for the pioneers of the social revival to show that the Gospels and Epistles were full of social teaching, and gave no support to the doctrine of 'the devil take the hindmost,' or (in more subdued language) of noninterference. The following extract from a pronouncement of the entire episcopate of the Anglican Churches throughout the world (Lambeth Conference, 1887) shows, on the one hand, how completely the principle was accepted within 40 years of the first Christian Socialistic movement, and, on the other, how entirely its justification was felt to lie in the NT. Such utterances seem commonplace now, only because the Christian Churches have changed. They are not to be found in the official documents of the preceding era:

'The Christian Church is bound, following the teaching of her Master, to aid every wise endeavour which has for its object the material and the moral welfare of the poor. Her Master taught her that all men are brethren, not because they share the same blood, but because they have a common heavenly Father. He further taught her that if any members of this spiritual family were greater, richer, or better than the rest, they were bound to use their special means or ability in the service of the whole.... It will contribute no little to draw together the various classes of society, if the clergy endeavour in sermons and lectures to set forth the true principle of society, showing how Property is a trust to be administered for the good of Humanity, and how much of what is good and true in Socialism is to be found in the precepts of Christ.'* [Note: This extract is given because it emanated at a comparatively early date from a body which had for long been specially associated with conservative opinions. Its sentiments can be paralleled from the statements of the Lambeth Conference of ten years later, and from the official utterances of most other religious bodies in recent years. The Church of England, the Church of Scotland, and some other Churches have now large 'Christian Social' societies. Nor must it be supposed

that the movement which it illustrates is confined to Great Britain. It is equally strong both among Protestants and Roman Catholics on the Continent of Europe and in America; indeed, it is numerically far stronger on the Continent than in Great Britain. The subject may be studied in Professor Nitti's Catholic Socialism, Laveleye's Socialism of To-Day, the Preface to Ensor's Modern Socialism, and other works mentioned at the end of this article. The most recent English work on the subject is Woodworth's Christian Socialism in England.]

2. The Gospels.—The Gospels are certainly full of those ideas which inspire the Christian Socialist. The Incarnation itself proclaims as the root principle of religion the unity and solidarity of the human race (this is worked out in Westcott, *The Incarnation, a Revelation of Human Duties* (S.P.C.K.)); and the manner of Christ's coming—His lowly birth, His humble companions, His hard life, His death at the hands of the Law—can well be claimed as democratic. He declared, indeed, at the outset, according to St. Luke (Luk_4:18), that He had come to preach good tidings to the poor; to His mother His coming meant the exaltation of them of low degree (Luk_1:52); to His forerunner also it meant a certain levelling of existing conditions (Luk_3:5), and indeed John the Baptist himself advocated that *voluntary* communism which is an undisputed characteristic of all early Christian teaching ('He that hath two coats, let him impart to him that hath none,' etc., Luk_3:11). There is in all this a definite proclamation of *brotherhood*. When we turn to the teaching of our Lord, we find quite clearly that He concerned Himself with secular things, and did not give any justification for that 'other-worldliness' which would ignore physical evils. His miracles were in the main works of mercy, designed to reduce the misery, or, as at Cana, to increase the happiness, of everyday life. His parables teach social principles of the most far-reaching importance. The parables, e.g., of the Kingdom explain the nature of the Christian fellowship, its inclusiveness (e.g. Mat_13:24-30), its ultimate world-wide extension (e.g. Mat_13:31-33). The condemnation of riches could hardly be more strongly expressed than in the parables of Dives and Lazarus (Luke 16), and of the Rich Fool (ch. 12), and in the warning about the needle's eye (Mar_10:25). The parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10) gives a new meaning to the word 'neighbour,' and teaches the obligation of what nowadays is called social service; and this lesson is even more strongly expressed in the most important parable of all—that of the Judgment (Mat_25:31-46)—where we are told that salvation will depend on whether we have succoured the poor and outcast, with whom Christ identifies Himself.

The Sermon on the Mount in this aspect may be called a simple manual of social teaching. It is sufficient to allude to the Beatitudes, and to point out how much of the teaching in the rest of the Sermon is still regarded as Utopian, as that about love of enemies (Luk_6:27), oaths, non-resistance, litigation and property, free giving (Mat_5:33-48), lending without interest (Luk_6:34-35), money-making (Mat_6:19),

worrying about the future (Mat 6:24-34). The Christian Socialist may agree with the ‘Socialist of the Chair’ that Collectivism would make these principles less difficult of application than they are to-day; but he would add the warning that the secular regeneration of the world can only be accomplished by spiritual means. One sentence of the Sermon sums up the whole truth, when, after picturing in a vivid image material well-being (Mat 6:26-29), our Lord says, ‘Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you’ (Mat 6:33).

If we turn to another central part of Christ’s teaching, the Lord’s Prayer, we find again the social side interwoven with the spiritual. It was given as a private prayer (Mat 6:6), yet it begins, ‘Our Father,’ and is throughout a prayer for the human brotherhood. It asks for the hallowing of God’s name, the coming of His Kingdom, and the doing of His will upon earth,—in other words, it teaches the Christian to pray for Utopia, and it makes incumbent upon him the duty of considering all social and political schemes with a view to the perfecting of society in this world. The prayer for daily bread asks that all may have the necessities of material life, and this again involves far-reaching social considerations. The prayer for forgiveness is accompanied by a special clause guarding it against an individualist interpretation. As for the prayer against temptation, the temperance movement alone shows that British Christianity has appreciated the social significance of that clause; and in other matters it is clear that, if the worship of Mammon be the antithesis of the worship of God, a society based upon commercial competition is constantly leading its members into the gravest temptation of all.

Christ then teaches that man has a double duty—to love God and love his neighbour. He must love his neighbour not less than himself, and must do to others as he would have them do to him. Christ condemns the rich and blesses the poor; He teaches brotherhood, social service, and the abnegation of private possessions; He teaches that men are to strive to bring about a Divine Kingdom of justice on the earth, and that they will finally be judged by their works of mercy to those whom the world despises. And, binding it all together is the gospel of Love which St. John has preserved most fully—‘This is my commandment, that ye love one another’ (Joh 15:12).

3. The Apostles.—The rest of the NT contains abundant evidence that this social gospel was understood. Indeed, in the first flush of their enthusiasm the Christians of Jerusalem established a *voluntary* communism, and ‘had all things common’ (Act 4:32-35). It was voluntary, and did not deny the right of a man to possess his own property, as St. Peter said to Ananias (Act 5:4), but it shows that almsgiving had a very thorough meaning to the first Christians. The doctrine of equality and brotherhood was also strongly felt. St. Paul more than once had to remind slaves that though in the sight of God there was no respect of persons (Col 3:25, cf. Jam 2:9),

yet slaves must not turn against their masters: this balance between the brotherhood of master and slave on the one hand, and the duty of slave to master on the other, are very beautifully expressed in Philemon (cf. [1Co 7:20-24](#), [Eph 6:5-9](#)). This is characteristic of the early Fathers also (see below, 'Patristic Teaching'); the conditions of society were to be accepted, and men were to do their duty in them, although the Christian fellowship was working out towards a higher ideal (e.g. [1Ti 6:1-2](#), cf. [1Pe 2:13-17](#)). But St. James (whose Epistle contains passages which are often quoted on democratic platforms at the present day) is very definite as to the levelling power of the gospel, e.g. 'But let the brother of low degree glory in his high estate: and the rich, in that he is made low: because as the flower of the grass he shall pass away' ([Jam 1:9-10](#); cf. [Jam 2:5-10](#)). St. Paul is as strong as St. James as to the danger of riches (e.g. [1Ti 6:10](#)), and the evil of covetousness (e.g. [Col 3:5](#)), and the duty of mutual service (e.g. [Php 2:4](#)), and of mutual love (1 Corinthians 13). But his most valuable contribution to the social aspect of Christianity is his teaching about the solidarity of mankind; the social principle in its very essence is in the declaration that 'There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female: for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus' ([Gal 3:28](#); cf. [Col 3:11](#), [1Co 12:13](#)); nor could it be better taught than by the illustration of the body and its members in 1 Corinthians 12, and the great description of the unity of the Christian body in Ephesians 4. The fundamental doctrine of brotherhood and love is the theme of the First Ep. of St. John, in which it is definitely stated that without loving his brother whom he hath seen, a man cannot love God ([1Jn 4:20](#)); that the children of God are distinguished from the children of the devil by their righteousness and love of their brethren ([1Jn 3:10](#)); that to dwell in love is to dwell in God ([1Jn 4:16](#)), and that 'every one that loveth is born of God and knoweth God,' while 'he that loveth not, knoweth not God' ([1Jn 4:7-8](#)). This is indeed the evidence of salvation—'We know that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren' ([1Jn 3:14](#)). It is clear, then, that from the beginning it was taught that Christianity had an intensely strong and real practical side in secular matters, that this side—the duty to the neighbour—was equally incumbent on the believer with the duty to God, and that it is bound up with the 'social' ideas of brotherhood, solidarity, unity, mutual love, co-operation, voluntary equalization of condition by giving up of possessions—in some cases, as in that of the Rich Young Man ([Mar 10:21](#)). of all possessions; while there is throughout strong condemnation of riches, of luxury, pride, and the clinging to class distinctions.

4. Patristic Teaching.—There is not space to do more than allude to the teaching of the Christian Fathers. Authorities on the subject are given at the end of this article: some of their more salient sayings will be found in Nitti's *Catholic Socialism*, where their socialist character is exaggerated, and in Carlyle's *Mediaeval Political Economy*, vol. i., where this side is perhaps underestimated. The Patristic writings are, indeed, extremely difficult to estimate, because of the distinction between what was ideally

right as belonging to God's plan (*Jus naturale*) and what was right under present conditions (*Jus gentium*)—a distinction which is characteristic of Cicero and Seneca as well as of the Christian writers of a later date. Thus the Fathers held that all men were naturally equal, but at the same time they accepted slavery, though indeed the manumission of slaves was a recognized Christian virtue. It was the same with private property. Extracts can be gathered from the Fathers which are as strong as anything in the writings of modern socialists; for instance, Proudhon's famous saying, 'La propriété, c'est le vol,' is almost exactly paralleled by St. Ambrose's 'Natura igitur jus commune generavit, usurpatio jus fecit privatum' (*de Off.* i. 28). But St. Ambrose does not mean that property is unlawful, only that it is not a 'natural' institution—it belongs to the *jus gentium*. In the same way he does not advocate land-nationalization when he says, 'Deus noster terram hanc possessionem omnium hominum voluerit esse communem, et fructus omnibus ministrare: sed avaritia possessionum jure distribuit' (*In Psa 118:8; Psa 118:22*); but goes on to say that for this reason the poor have a *just* claim on the rich to give them a share of what was meant for all. This may be taken as typical also of the earlier Christian writers. They assume the existence of private property as an institution, and that it is not evil if rightly used; but they do not consider it as belonging to the state of innocence—like slavery it is due to the fall into sin; 'their whole thought,' Mr. Carlyle says, 'is dominated by the sense of the claims of the brotherhood,' and the Christian man is bound to use his property to relieve the wants of his fellow-man. This is almsgiving, but, unlike modern almsgiving, it is based on a definite principle of justice. An early example of this is in the *Didache* (iv. 8), 'Thou shalt not turn away from him that hath need, but shalt share all things with thy brother, and shalt not say that aught is thine own: for if ye are partners in the immortal, how much more are ye partners in the perishable?' Here the reference to the community of goods in *Act 4:32* is obvious. Compare with it the 'All is common with us, except women,' of Tertullian (*Apol.* xxxix.), or St. Justin's declaration, 'We bring all we possess into a common stock, and share everything with the poor' (*Apol.* i. 14). There are many passages in other Fathers, such as Chrysostom and Basil, Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory the Great, which have a strong socialist character, and they all used language about the selfishness of the rich which would cause some offence if uttered from the pulpits of the present day. The fact that Clement of Alexandria took a different view in his *Quis Dives salvetur* considerably increases the significance of the rest of the Patristic literature: he explains the command to the Rich Young Man in *Mar 10:21* in a purely allegorical sense, and protests that there is no advantage in poverty except when it is incurred for a special object, and that riches are serviceable if rightly used, and are not to be thrown away. That he should stand almost alone even in this much qualified defence of property is a remarkable fact.

If we turn from theory to practice, there is no doubt that the Church produced a profound social change in the Roman Empire, and was recognized from the first as

based upon the principle of fraternity. In this connexion it is noteworthy that Lucian was struck as much by the social as by the theological aspect of the new religion—‘Their original lawgiver,’ he remarks, ‘had taught them that they were all brethren one of another.’ Membership in the Church meant the admission into a fellowship in which the rich man became poorer and the poor man richer; in which the stranger, the outcast, and the slave were welcomed and loved as brothers. Harnack, in his *Expansion of Christianity* (i. bk. ii. c. iii.), describes this change, pointing out, amongst other things, that the principle of *Labour* was consistently put into practice. Following St. Paul’s maxim (2Th_3:10), the Church insisted, (1) that it was the duty of every Christian man to work, (2) that it was the duty of the Christian Society to see that there was work for all its members, and (3) that it was the duty of Christians to make provision for those who were not able to work. This fails to be pure State Socialism only because the Church was not yet coterminous with the State.

5. Later Developments.—It is impossible here even to sketch the developments of Christian social theory and practice in subsequent history. The subject can be conveniently studied in Ashley’s *Economic History and Theory*. But it is necessary to point out two main facts: first, that the principle of voluntary communism was preserved as a living fact by the Monastic orders, and was pressed further by St. Francis and the early Friars; and, secondly, that the Church taught certain social doctrines which were accepted and practised by the whole community. The two leading doctrines were that concerning the *justum pretium*, and that concerning usury: these were enforced not only in the pulpit but also in the ecclesiastical courts. The first doctrine was aimed against free competition: a man was not to ask what he could get for an article, but the ‘just price,’ what it was worth, that is, what would enable him to earn by his work a decent living according to a definite standard. The second doctrine was aimed against usury (because of Luk_6:34-35), and usury meant all receiving of interest on capital. In other words, the system upon which modern manufacture and commerce and indeed the whole of modern society is based, was forbidden by the Church up till the Renaissance and Reformation; and not only this, but the prohibition was accepted and carried out in ordinary business affairs. Here again the modern social-democrat touches hands with Christian principles that were practiced throughout the Middle Ages and summed up by St. Thomas Aquinas; just as the modern trade unionist finds that the great Christian trade guilds were carrying out his principles of fellowship even among the peasantry before the modern era began. The guilds were destroyed in the sixteenth century, and the whole mediaeval system crumbled away to make room for a new order. Of that system Professor Ashley says: ‘No such sustained and far-reaching attempt is being now made, either from the side of theology, or from that of ethics, to impress upon the public mind principles immediately applicable to practical life’ (*Econ. Hist.* i. 388). The modern era has brought many reforms, notably in connexion with liberty and the democratic idea; but as the humanitarianism of its later phase has begun to work in the realms of sociology

and economics, it has but joined hands with the great tradition of Christian fraternity,—a tradition that has always been at work in society since the foundations of brotherly love were laid by our Lord and His Apostles. The success of the Christian principle has always been partial and its application incomplete, because its perfect realization is dependent on the regeneration of mankind. Whether we call it Socialism will depend upon our conception of what Socialism is; but those to whom Socialism is an ethical ideal will not cease to find their inspiration in Christianity; and those who take Christ in thoroughness and simplicity as their Guide In secular affairs will increasingly remember that He who said ‘One is your Master,’ said also ‘and all ye are brethren.’ From St. John to St. Francis of Assisi, from Latimer to Maurice, what is now called Christian Socialism has had many prophets. At the present day it is a great and growing force in all Christian countries.

Literature.—The mass of Literature on Christian Socialism in general is very large. A list of 140 books and pamphlets bearing specially on the movement in England was compiled by the present writer in 1897, and may be mentioned because it can be obtained for a penny (Appendix to *Socialism and the Teaching of Christ*, by [J. Clifford, Fabian Society, Clement’s Inn, W.C.). A better and more recent bibliography is in A. V. Woodworth, *Christian Socialism in England*. Tracts containing statements of the position can be obtained from the Hon. Sec., Christian Social Union, Pusey House, Oxford. This Union has also produced several volumes of Sermons, *Lombard Street in Lent*, *The Church and New Century Problems*, *Preachers from the Pew* (lay sermons on social questions), etc. For the social teaching of the Fathers, see A. J. Carlyle, *History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West*, vol. i. (1903), with its bibliography; F. S. Nitti, *Catholic Socialism* (1895); Laveleye, *Le Socialisme Contemporain (Soeialism of To-day)* (1890); Feugueray, *Essais sur les doctrines politiques de Saint Thomas d’Aquin* (1857) (ch. on ‘Démocratie des Pères de l’église’); F. Villegardelle, *Histoire des Idées Sociales* (1846); L. Brentano, *Die Arbeiterversicherung gemäss der heutigen Wirtschaftsordnung* (1879). The mediaeval history of the subject can be studied in W. J. Ashley’s *Economic History*, where a list of authorities is given at the head of each chapter. Kirkup’s *History of Socialism* is an admirable summary. An excellent short history is H. de B. Gibbins’ *Industrial History of England*. Perhaps also it may be worth while to allude to the various Lives of the Saints, and to the literature of St. Francis, e.g. the *Fioretti*; to T. Carlyle’s *Past and Present*, W. Morris’ *Dream of John Ball*, Thorold Rogers’ *Six Centuries of Work and Wages*, Hyndman’s *The Hist. Basis of Socialism in England*; to Ruskin’s works in general, and especially *Unto this Last*; and to such classics of English literature as *Piers Plowman*, Latimer’s *Sermons*, and More’s *Utopia*. For the history of modern Christian Socialism, see L. Brentano, *Die Christliche Sociale Bewegung in England* (1883), and cf. B. Webb, *The Co-operative Movement*, and S. and B. Webb, *History of Trades Unionism*. See also Kingsley’s *Letters and Life* (1877); Ensor, *Modern Socialism*; M. Kaufmann, *Christian Socialism* (1888) and Charles Kingsley (1892); E. de Laveleye, *The Socialism of*

To-day; F. Maurice, *Life of F. D. Maurice* (1884); F. S. Nitti, *Catholic Socialism* (1895); J. Rae, *Contemporary Socialism* (1901); G. von Schulze-Gavernitz, *Zum Socialen Frieden*—translation ‘Social Peace’ (1893). See also the files of *The Christian Socialist*, *Journal of Association*, *Politics for the People*, *The Church Reformer*, *The Economic Review*, *The Commonwealth*, the last two being still in existence. See also the writings of T. Hughes, Charles Kingsley, F. D. Maurice, E. V. Neale among the early Christian Socialists, and the following among the later, J. G. Adderley, Prof. R. T. Ely, Bishop C. Gore, T. Hancock, Stewart D. Headlam, H. Scott Holland, Bishop C. W. Stubbs, and Bishop B. F. Westcott. Among these may be specially mentioned Kingsley, *Sermons*, *Alton Locke*, and *Yeast*; Maurice, *The Kingdom of God*; Ely, *Social Aspects of Christianity*; Gore, *The Social Doctrine of the Sermon on the Mount*; Hancock, *Christ and the People*; Headlam, *The Laws of Eternal Life*; Holland, *Sermons*; Stubbs, *Christ and Economies*, and *A Creed for Christian Socialists*; Westcott, *The Incarnation, a Revelation of Human Duties*, and especially *Social Aspects of Christianity*. The name of Tolstoi should also be mentioned, since, though his writings cannot be classed with the above, they have a far-reaching influence over European and American thought.

Percy Dearmer.

☒ Sodom

SODOM.—The overthrow of the ‘cities of the plain’ was, according to Hebrew traditions, a Divinely-sent catastrophe, second only to that of the Deluge. The sinfulness of Sodom (often with the addition of ‘Gomorrah’) is frequently referred to as typical of terrible *wickedness* (e.g. Deu 32:32, Isa 1:10; Isa 3:9, Jer 23:14, Lam 4:6, Eze 16:46-49, Wis 10:6-8); and even more frequently is the devastation of the guilty cities typical of Divine *punishment*. And similarly in the NT:

1. Mat 10:15 || Luk 10:12. In St. Matthew the words occur in the course of our Lord’s charge to the Twelve. If they came to any place in which their words were not received, they were to shake off the dust of their feet; ‘Verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for that city.’ In St. Luke, on the other hand, the words form part of the charge to the Seventy; he has ‘Sodom’ for ‘the land of Sodom,’ ‘Gomorrah’ is omitted, and instead of St. Matthew’s favourite expression ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως (‘in the day of judgment’), is used ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ (‘in that day’) [D [Note: Deuteronomist.] ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, so Syrr.]. In Mar 6:11 the whole phrase from St. Matthew (exc. Σοδόμοις ἢ Γομό

ροεις for γῆ Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρων) is inserted in A and some Latin Manuscripts . Hence it found its way, through the Textus Receptus , into the Authorized Version .

Our Lord here implies the great fact, which in the passage dealt with in the following section He states more clearly, that since privileges bring responsibilities, their neglect brings punishment. And therewith He further implies the mysterious truth that at ‘the day of judgment’ the punishments awarded to men will vary. ‘It shall be more tolerable—more bearable’ cannot be a mere figure of speech. The same truth is taught in Luk 12:47 f., and its converse in Luk 19:16-19.

2. Mat 11:23-24. Our Lord uttered Woes against three Galilaeen cities which refused to accept His mighty works and repent (Mat 11:20). These denunciations were a practical carrying out of the figurative injunctions which He gave to His disciples in Mat 10:14. The three cities named are Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum. The two former He compares with Tyre and Sidon; and to the latter He uses somewhat similar language in referring to Sodom: ‘for if in Sodom had been done the mighty works (δυνάμεις) which are being done in thee [the city], it would be remaining until to-day. However, I say unto you [the people] that for the land of Sodom it shall be more tolerable in the day of judgment than for thee [the city].’ St. Luke has not preserved this reference to Sodom, though he gives the denunciation against Capernaum (Mat 10:15). With regard to Mat 11:24 Wright (*Synopsis*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 216) says that the author ‘appends a sentence which reminds us of [Mt] Mat 10:15. These refrains are very effective for Church reading, but they often seem to be editorial.’

The typical use of ‘Sodom’ as an example of sin reaches its height in Rev 11:8, where Jerusalem is described as ‘the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt.’

3. Luk 17:29. This passage, like the two preceding, is absent from the Markan tradition. Sodom is here not so much a type of sin as of sudden and fearful destruction. Our Lord uttered many *logia* concerning the coming of the Son of Man. In one of these (Mat 24:37-39, Luk 17:26 f.) He likened the ‘parousia’ (Mt.)—the ‘days’ (Lk.)—of the Son of Man to the Deluge in the days of Noah. St. Luke alone adds, ‘In like manner as it came to pass in the days of Lot; they were eating, drinking, buying, selling, planting, building; but in the day that Lot went out from Sodom, he rained [Gen 19:24 κύριος ἔβρεξεν] fire and brimstone from heaven and destroyed (them) all. Likewise shall it be in the day that the Son of Man is revealed.’ The destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah is also coupled with the Deluge in 2Pe 2:5-7 as an example of punishment. See also Jud 1:7, Rom 9:29 = Is 1:9.

☒Soldiers

SOLDIERS.—Throughout the Roman Empire, and especially in a praetorian province like Syria, of which the various divisions of Palestine practically formed part, soldiers were a common sight, and took a prominent share in the administration of affairs. The references to them, however, in the Gospels, except, as is natural, in connexion with our Lord's trial and crucifixion, are not numerous.

1. In Luk_3:14 we read of soldiers who came to John the Baptist and asked him what they were to do. The word here is στρατευόμενοι (not στρατιῶται) and implies that they were on active service at the time. They can hardly have been Roman legionaries, but may have been members of Herod Antipas' army engaged in some local expedition, of which we know nothing, or even, as Ewald supposes, only a kind of police or gendarmes employed in custom-house duties. The Baptist's answer to their inquiry shows what the temptations of such folk were in those days. They must be careful, he says, henceforth not to do violence or extort money by false accusations, and to be content with their pay.

2. In Mat_8:9 and Luk_7:8 the centurion (no doubt a proselyte, though a Roman officer; cf. Act_10:1) who desired to have his servant healed, speaks of the soldiers who were under his command, and, in contrast to (1) above, his remarks bring out forcibly the idea of discipline and organization, which was to be found in a Roman legion.

3. The armies (στρατόπεδα) that would encircle Jerusalem in the fatal siege of Titus (a.d. 70) are referred to in Luk_21:20 (cf. Luk_19:43).

4. In the parable of the Marriage of the King's Son (Mat_22:1 ff.) we read of the armies (στρατεύματα) which the king sent to avenge the murder of his servants.

5. After the trial before Pilate, when our Lord had been scourged and condemned to be crucified, Pilate's soldiers on duty took Him into their own quarters, and, gathering the whole band together, proceeded to treat Him with the grossest insults and mockery (Mat_27:27, Mar_15:16, Joh_19:2). And during the long hours of crucifixion He had to endure similar maltreatment from the soldiers who were in charge (Luk_23:36; cf. Mat_27:48, Joh_19:29). It is recorded also (Joh_19:23-24) how they parted His garments among them (see Coat and Quaternion); and further that,

when the end had come, finding He was already dead, they refrained from breaking His legs, as Pilate had ordered, before taking Him down; but ‘one of them with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith there came out blood and water’ (Joh_19:32; Joh_19:34).

6. Lastly, soldiers were keeping guard at the sepulchre when the Resurrection took place (Mat_27:65 f., Mat_28:11-13; see Watch).

C. L. Feltoe.

☞ Solitude

SOLITUDE.—We may infer from the phrase used in Luk_5:18 (ἦν ὑποχωρῶν, see Bengel’s note, *ad loc.*) that our Lord frequently sought solitude during the period of His ministry. Sometimes He retired from the multitude, but did not seclude Himself from His disciples (e.g. Mat_14:13; Mat_17:1). At other times His solitude was absolute, and He only returned to His disciples or was rejoined by them after an interval (e.g. Mat_14:23, Mar_1:35, Luk_5:16; Luk_6:12). It is this latter complete solitude that is of importance to the student of our Lord’s Person and work.

1. We observe that He sought solitude, or, if the phrase is permissible, was forced into solitude, at certain critical times of special trial. The battle of the Temptation (Mat_4:1 ff., Mar_1:12 ff., Luk_4:1 ff.) was fought out in solitude. No human being was within call, and only after the victory was won did angels come to minister to Him. The final struggle against the weakness inherent in the flesh took place in solitude (Mat_26:41, Luk_22:39). Although He yearned for human sympathy, He deliberately withdrew Himself from the companionship of His disciples. The account of the supreme crisis of His work of redemption witnesses to a solitude too complete and awful for our understanding (Mat_27:46). We ought perhaps to class the solitude which He sought after the feeding of the five thousand (Mat_14:23, Mar_6:46, Joh_6:15) with the three instances just mentioned. The people wished to make Him a king, and may well have suggested a temptation similar to that recorded in Mat_4:8.

2. Our Lord sought solitude in order to obtain spiritual help for specially important work (Luk_6:12), and spiritual refreshment after periods of exhausting labour (Mar_1:35; Mar_1:45, cf. Luk_5:16). We may suppose that on these occasions, as on another, ‘virtue had gone out of him,’ and that in a literal sense ‘Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses’ (Mat_8:17), thereby coming to feel the need for fresh intercourse with the Father unvexed with human companionship.

A very curious and suggestive commentary on this twofold use of solitude in our Lord's life is afforded by the experience of the earliest monks, those Egyptian recluses whom we shall not be wrong in regarding as specialists in the spiritual life. They believed that in solitude a man is exposed to the full fury of the powers of evil, that temptation is not completely conquered because not met in its utmost strength except by him who ventures to meet it alone (Cass. *Coll.* vii. 23; Athanas. *Vita Anton.* xiii.). Their thought would explain our Lord's 'being led up of the Spirit into the wilderness, to be tempted of the devil' (Mat 4:1). It was, no doubt, necessary (cf. the general conception of Milton's *Paradise Regained*) that He should be exposed to the utmost strength of the Tempter. Therefore He faced the Evil One in solitude.

The hermits also believed that spiritual communion with God and the graces which flow from it are attainable best in solitude. The abbot Allois sums up their teaching in his deeply suggestive word, 'Except a man say in his heart, "I and God are alone in the world," he cannot have peace' (*Verba Seniorum, ap. Rosweyd. Interpr. Pelagio*, x. 5; see also Cass. *Coll.* xix. 5, xxiv. 4). In this respect their experience fits in with our Lord's retirements in search of refreshment and strength.

The literature of early Western monasticism and much of the teaching of the later Mystics on the subject of solitude fall into line with the recorded experience of the Egyptians, and form a further commentary on the recorded facts of our Lord's solitude. On the one hand, there is an evident dread of the extreme temptations of solitude, and a feeling that they ought not to be faced except by those far advanced in the spiritual life. On the other hand, there is a recognition of the possibilities of spiritual advancement which solitude affords (see, besides books cited below, Cass. *Inst.* v. 4; Basil, *Reg. Fus. Tract.*; *Reg. Brev. Tract.*; Bened. *Reg.* i.; Joann. Clim. *Grad.* iv. etc.; Basil, *Epp.* ii., xxiii., xlii.; Bened. *Reg.* iv., xlviii. etc.).

Literature.—Works quoted; Martin Crugott, *Der Christ in der Einsamkeit* (1761); I. G. Zimmermann, *Die Einsamkeit* (1784); R. W. Emerson, *Society and Solitude* (1862); P. Zingerle, *Reden des hl. Ephraem über Selbstverleugnung und einsame Lebensweise, aus dem. Syr. [Note: Syriac.] übersetzt.* (1871); H. D. Thoreau, *Walden* (repr. 1886); T. T. Lynch, *Letters to the Scattered*, 522; F. W. Robertson, *Serm.* i. 220; Martineau, *Endeavours*, 159; Rendel Harris, *Memor. Sacra*, 135.

J. O. Hannay.

SOLOMON.—Jesus makes two references to Solomon, speaking on one occasion of his ‘glory,’ and on another of his ‘wisdom.’ In Mat 6:29 = Luk 12:27 He places the pure natural beauty of the lilies above the consummate type of artificial splendour, and uses the contrast to point the lesson of trustful dependence upon God, the Giver of all that is necessary for the body as well as for the spirit. In Mat 12:42 = Luk 11:31 the eagerness of Solomon’s contemporaries to hear his words of worldly wisdom is contrasted with the indifference and spiritual blindness of the men of Jesus’ own day, who failed to understand and appreciate the truer wisdom of a greater teacher.

For ‘Solomon’s Porch’ see Temple.

C. H. Thomson.

☛ Son Of David

SON OF DAVID.—The phrase is used in the NT as a title of the Messiah, except in Mat 1:1; Mat 1:20 (cf. Luk 1:27), where it has the ordinary genealogical force. For the general discussion of the Messiahship of Jesus, and of the Messiah as king, see Messiah; the present article concerns only the use of this particular title.

1. The Messianic value of the title comes out forcibly in the puzzling question put by Jesus to the Pharisees (Mat 22:42 f., Mar 12:35, Luk 20:41)—a question that they were unable to answer: ‘The scribes say that the Christ is (to be) the Son of David; but David calls him Lord; how then is he his son?’ The passage is not to be interpreted as a repudiation of the title on the part of Jesus. Of such a repudiation there is no evidence either in His own teaching, or in other parts of the NT. On the contrary, the relationship is specifically taught by St. Paul (Rom 1:3, 2Ti 2:8), seemingly as of some importance, and it is assumed of the Messiah in the Apocalypse (Rev 5:5; Rev 22:16). The passage is a repudiation of the notion of the Jews—implied in their use of the title—that it fully expresses the functions of the Messiah. The Messiah does not owe His dignity to His Davidic descent. His work far surpasses that of the great king of Israel. The proper answer to Jesus’ question would have involved an entire reconstruction of the ideas of the Jews concerning the Messiah, of which they were, of course, utterly incapable. If Jesus did not expect this result to follow from His question, He could at least show by it the logical absurdity of the emphasis they put upon the Davidic sonship. The connexion of the Messiah with the royal house and city was deemed so essential, that Jesus, of Galilaeen extraction, was declared by some to be ineligible to the high office.

2. The particular phase of Messiahship which the title properly expresses is, of course, the royal estate and function. Such was the case when it was applied to Jesus on the occasion of His triumphal entry into Jerusalem (Mat 21:9; Mat 21:15). It was so understood, and the anger of the priests and scribes was aroused in consequence. Compare also the Annunciation (Luk 1:32), where it is said that Jesus shall be given the throne of His father David.

3. There is, however, no reason to suppose that, as used in NT times, the title alluded to military prowess, or to a career of conquest on the part of the Messiah. Indeed, the Hosannas of the people were in praise of very different qualities. Such a conception of the force of the phrase is entirely inconsistent with the cry of the blind men (Mat 20:30 f. [= Mar 10:47 f., Luk 18:38 f.] and Luk 9:27) and of the Canaanitish woman (Mat 15:22), 'Son of David, have mercy.' The title came naturally to the lips of those who sought Jesus' aid in their great distress. Likewise the works of healing which He had wrought called forth—so characteristic were they of the Messiah who was expected—the query whether this might not be the Son of David (Mat 12:23).

4. These NT applications of the title are in close harmony with the OT description of the Messiah. David was the founder of the kingdom of Israel. Whenever in later centuries the nation and its welfare were in the mind, the thought naturally turned to David. When the house of David no longer ruled, and the kingdom was shattered, prophets and singers lamented the misfortunes that had overtaken David and his house. When their hopefulness and faith in God expressed itself in visions of a bright future, they naturally spoke of a second David, a branch of his house, who should restore the nation to its former prosperity. As the past, and especially David's rule, grew fairer by contrast with the dismal present, so the new kingdom of David in the future was pictured in extravagant colours. The Kingdom should extend over the whole earth, irresistibly, triumphantly. But this conquest was not conquest for conquest's sake. It was a process without which the longed-for prosperity could, in their imagination, not be realized. It was but an incident in the larger blessedness of the future. To the Jew of the later pre-Christian centuries, David stood for much else besides military prowess and political prestige. If this element had been predominant, it would have been incongruous to ascribe to him so large a part of the Psalms as bear his name. If we seek for the cause of this change of emphasis, it is doubtless to be found in the very distress that they suffered. That distress was personal, individual. Character became the condition of enjoying the benefits of the new Kingdom, and in turn the new Kingdom—Messianic, ideal—was to exist for the sake of the individual, to save him from his woes, and to lead him to righteousness. Psalms 72, in spite of its warlike sentiments, is the utterance of one to whom, after all, the welfare of the people, the oppressed and the defenceless, is paramount. These are the poor and the blind to whom Jesus gave salvation, by such ministry proving, even to His contemporaries, that He was worthy to be called the Son of David.

See also art. Names and Titles of Christ.

Literature.—Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, pp. 492-496; Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, ii. 434 ff.; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] ii. ii. § 29.

O. H. Gates.

☩ Son Of God

SON OF GOD.—As the word ‘Christ,’ which was at first a title, has come to be a proper name, this change being, indeed, accomplished even in the NT, so the title ‘Son of God’ is now appropriated to the Second Person of the Trinity; and the ordinary reader of the Bible assumes this to be the meaning wherever he finds the phrase. He has only, however, to read with a little attention to perceive that this is an assumption which ought not to be made without inquiry, because in Scripture there are many ‘sons of God.’ (1) The angels are thus designated, as when in the Book of Job ([Job_38:7](#)) it is mentioned that at the dawn of creation ‘the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy.’ (2) The term is applied to the first man, when, in Luke 3, the genealogy of the Saviour is traced back to Adam, ‘who,’ it is added ([Luk_3:38](#)), ‘was the son of God.’ And, if the general scope of Scripture may leave it questionable whether the same high title can be applied to all the first man’s descendants, the authority of our Lord may be claimed, on the ground of the parable of the Prodigal Son, as deciding the question in the affirmative. (3) The Hebrew nation collectively is frequently thus designated, as when, in the land of Midian, Jehovah sent Moses to Pharaoh with the message: ‘Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son, even my firstborn, and I say unto thee, Let my son go’ ([Exo_4:22](#) f.). Whether, according to Scripture usage, it was applicable to individual Israelites, is not so clear, but probably it was; for not only did the Jews, in speaking to Jesus, claim, ‘We have one Father, even God’ ([Joh_8:41](#)), but Jesus Himself said, ‘Let the children first be filled’ ([Mar_7:27](#)). (4) It was a title of the kings of Israel. Thus, in [Psa_89:26](#) f., an ancient oracle is quoted in which Jehovah says of King David, ‘He shall cry unto me, Thou art my Father, my God, and the rock of my salvation; also I will make him my firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth.’ Similarly Jehovah says of King Solomon ([2Sa_7:14](#)), ‘I will be his Father, and he shall be to me a son.’ (5) In the NT the title is conferred on all who believe in the Saviour. Thus, in the Prologue to the Gospel of St. John, it is said, ‘But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name’ ([Joh_1:12](#)); and, in his First Epistle, the Evangelist exclaims, ‘Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God’ ([1Jn_3:1](#)).

It would require some investigation to determine what is the reason for the bestowal of this lofty title in each of these cases, and in all probability the reasons might be different in the different cases. In the case of the angels, the relation suggested may be that of the Creator to His creatures; and this notion may cover also the application to men in general, who were made in 'the image of God.' The application to the nation of Israel refers undoubtedly to the choice which the grace of God made of the Hebrew people from among all the nations of the earth; and In the Jewish kings this grace reached its climax. In the case of Christians, the reasons are obvious in the texts quoted in reference to them. It is usual to lay all the emphasis on the sentiments entertained by God towards those honoured with this title, as if it expressed solely His choice of them; but Nösgen (*op. cit. infr.*) contends that in all cases at least some reason for the designation must lie in the qualities or history of the person designated; and this is a contention which seems to have common sense on its side.

It will thus be seen that 'the son of God' was a phrase much in use in the world before it was attached to our Lord; and the question naturally arises, from which of its anterior uses it was that its transference to Him took place. In all probability it was from the fourth mentioned above—that is, its application to the Jewish kings. If the application to the nation culminated in that to the kings, so the application to the kings culminated in Him who was to be the fulfilment of the regal idea in Israel. That is to say, the term is, in the first place, politico-Messianic. But it does not follow, as is too often assumed, that this is its only sense. On the contrary, in all the deeper passages where it occurs, whether in the Synoptics or in Jn., it points strongly to the personal qualities of Him who bears it, and to an intimate relationship with Him whose Son He is said to be. The political title rests upon personal qualities and experiences; He is not the Son of God because He is the Messiah, but, on the contrary, He is the Messiah because He is the Son of God. That is to say, the term is ethicoreligious. But it does not follow, as is often assumed, that because it is official-Messianic and ethicoreligious it is not also physical or metaphysical. On the contrary, the closeness of the ethicoreligious relation may be such as to demand a metaphysical relationship of an intimate and peculiar kind between Father and Son. It seems to be strangely forgotten in many quarters that ethical intimacy is, in all cases, limited by the closeness of metaphysical relationship; the limitation of the intimacy between a dog and a man, for example, is due to the lack of metaphysical unity between them, whereas the closeness of sympathy and intimacy possible between a woman and a man is due to their metaphysical oneness. There is no reason whatever why all the three kinds of relationship indicated above should not be united; in point of fact, they often are. The kingship of a king, for example, may be, first, official, he being actually the reigning monarch; secondly, personal, he possessing the ethical qualities which become and secure his position; thirdly, physical or metaphysical, because he is of the blood royal, and has in his composition the hereditary instincts of

long descent. In like manner the Messiahship of Jesus may rest on a spiritual and ethical relationship to God; but this may be of so intimate a kind as to demand a peculiar relationship to the Father physically or metaphysically; and in all the Gospels there is reference, more or less, to all the three.

1. The Synoptics.—In the Synoptics Jesus does not, of His own motion, call Himself in so many words ‘the Son of God.’ But the title is applied to Him in about twelve passages in Mt. and fully half that number each in Mk. and Lk., and in several of these cases He treats this application in such a way as to show that He adopts it. On several occasions (six times in Mt., once in Mk., thrice in Lk.) He denominates Himself ‘the Son’ ‘in such a way as to prove unmistakably that He regards Himself as ‘the Son of God’; and many times in all three Gospels (over a score of times in Mt., thrice in Mk., nine times in Lk.) He in the same way refers to God as His Father. (The quotations in detail will be found on p. 86 of Stalker’s *Christology of Jesus*, mentioned below in the List of Literature).

(1) Beyschlag observes (*NT Theol.* i. 68) that *the occurrence of the term in the mouths of others* shows that it has its roots in the OT and was already current in Israel, and therefore, that for the sense in which Jesus applied it to Himself we must go back to the OT. It is also usual to state that it is employed in the pseudepigraphic literature of the period between the OT and the NT as a synonym for the Messiah. If, however, the only two passages of this sort supplied by Dalman (*op. cit. infr.*) be referred to, it will be found that this notion rests on a very slender basis. If the Textus Receptus of Mar 1:1 be correct,—‘the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God,’—it would be rash to limit the Evangelist’s intention to the Messiahship; but the reading is suspected. In Luk 1:35 the reason why Jesus is to be called ‘the Son of God’ is supplied in the memorable statement to Mary, ‘The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee.’ This is a physical explanation of the term, which it is rather surprising never to find elsewhere. The nearest approach to it in the Gospels would be the exclamation of the centurion at the Cross, ‘Truly this was the Son of God’ (Mar 15:39); but it is dubious what a heathen may have meant by such an observation.

Still more dubious, one would suppose, must it remain what the demoniacs intended by calling Jesus by this title, though it is usually taken for granted that they must have used it in the Messianic sense, because they also sometimes acknowledged Him as the Messiah. When Satan, in the Temptation, played with the title, he was obviously referring back to the voice which, at the Jordan during the Baptism, recognized Jesus as ‘the Son of God’; but how much that voice intended, or how much the Tempter understood of what it meant, might require considerable discussion.

When 'they that were in the ship' on the occasion when Jesus stilled the tempest and rescued St. Peter from the sea, 'came and worshipped him,' saying, 'Of a truth thou art the Son of God' ([Mat_14:33](#)), the most natural interpretation may be that they were acknowledging Him as the Messiah. If they were, they anticipated, in a remarkable manner, the subsequent confession at Caesarea Philippi; and this raises a doubt which may incline us to understand their language rather as an involuntary recognition of the Divine in Jesus, occasioned by the sight of a remarkable miracle.

Undoubtedly the most convincing case for the identity of meaning in the terms 'the Messiah' and 'the Son of God' is the confession of the Twelve, through the lips of St. Peter, at Caesarea Philippi; because, whereas St. Matthew reports them as confessing, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God' ([Mat_16:16](#)), the other two Evangelists omit the second phrase ([Mar_8:29](#), [Luk_9:20](#)). Now, it is argued, they could not have omitted this, had it contained a momentous addition to the acknowledgment of the Messiahship; against which the only *caveat* that can be hinted is that there are many examples to prove that it is perilous to rest much on the silence of one or more of the Gospels.

Another passage which is confidently appealed to as demonstrating the identity of meaning between the two terms, is the demand addressed by the high priest to Jesus, on His trial, to say whether He were 'the Christ, the Son of God.' Yet, in reporting this incident, St. Luke excites doubt as to the identity, because he represents Him as being asked first simply if He were 'the Christ'; but when He wound up His reply with the imposing words, 'Hereafter shall the Son of Man sit on the right hand of the power of God,' they proceeded, 'Art thou, then, the Son of God?' and the affirmative answer to this second question seems to have shocked and irritated them far more than the answer to the first, occasioning a tempest of rage and insult in all present, with a unanimous agreement that He had been guilty of blasphemy ([Luk_22:69](#)). H. J. Holtzmann, who writes with extraordinary feeling on this subject, recently, in a review in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, declaring it to be a shame that Protestant scholars should even doubt the identity, affirms that 'the blasphemy can only have been found in the fact that a man belonging to the lower classes, one openly forsaken of God and going forward to a shameful death, should have dared to represent himself as the object and fulfilment of all the Divine promises given to the nation'; but the blasphemy is far more obvious if the claim to be 'the Son of God' was understood to mean more than even Messiahship.

From the foregoing examination of the passages in the Gospels where the phrase is used of Jesus by others than Himself, it will be perceived that there is considerable variety of meaning and application; it certainly is Messianic, but it is not uniformly or exclusively so.

(2) When we turn to *the passages in which Jesus speaks of Himself as 'the Son,' or calls God His Father*, the official-Messianic element is almost entirely absent, the language being that of intimacy and confidence. Here and there, indeed, there may be Messianic associations involved, as when Jesus promises to the Twelve that, in the day of the full manifestation of the Kingdom, they shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Mat 19:28), or when He predicts that on the judgment-day He will appear in the glory of His Father and of the holy angels (Mar 8:38); but, as a rule, one might read the greater number of these sayings without being reminded that they proceeded from the lips of one claiming to be the Messiah. The consciousness to which they give expression is that of a personal relationship, as when, in Gethsemane, He prays, 'O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt'; and, farther on, 'O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done' (Mat 26:39-42); or when, on the cross, He cries, 'Father, forgive them: for they know not what they do'; and, farther on, 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit' (Luk 23:34; Luk 23:46).

The climax of this ethicoreligious sentiment is reached in the great saying of Mat 11:27, || Luk 10:22 'All things are delivered unto me of my Father; and no man knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.' In recent times this passage has attracted great attention, not a few looking upon it as the profoundest utterance of Jesus in the Synoptics. Holtzmann, indeed, hesitates between such a decision and a suggestion of Brandt's that it is a cento, put into the mouth of Jesus, of words borrowed partly from other Scripture and partly from the Apocrypha; but by Keim it has been reverentially interpreted, and scholarship has, on the whole, knelt before it as expressing the innermost mystery of the consciousness of Jesus. The words were spoken at a crisis, when He was roused out of deep depression at the apparent failure of His mission, by the return of the Seventy, bringing a joyful account of the results of their labours. 'In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes; even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight' (Mat 11:25 f.). Then followed the words already quoted. The first of them, 'All things are delivered unto me of my Father,' may be best understood, as is suggested by Lütgert (*op. cit. infr.*), of the Messianic dominion in its widest extent, as it had been promised in prophecy from of old; while the next words, 'For no man knoweth the Son but the Father,' etc., express the consciousness of His own right and ability to fill this position, because He has all the resources of the Divine nature to dispense to those who come to Him. This is why He proceeds immediately to say, 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest' (Mat 5:28). The mood in which He was consisted of a joyful uprising within Himself of the consciousness of all He was able to do for those who trusted Him; and this was due to His intimate and perfect union with Deity.

Most scholars, however, hasten to add that this sonship was purely ethical, and was not different from that to which He was prepared to introduce His disciples. He showed, it is remarked, the true pathway to this position, and the one by which He had reached it Himself, in such sayings as the following: 'Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you; that ye may be sons of your Father which is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust' (Mat_5:44 f.). Certainly this sonship of Jesus is ethicoreligious, and this indicates the pathway by which the disciples of Jesus may participate in His sonship; but that His sonship and theirs are in all respects identical is contradicted by the unfailing usage of Jesus in speaking of God as 'my Father' and 'your Father,' but never as 'our Father.' Of this difference Holtzmann makes light in the same way in which he lays down the wholly unsupported assumption that Jesus prayed the Lord's Prayer with the disciples, including the fifth petition; but the fact is a radical one; and the conclusion to which it points is not without other confirmation.

Thus, in the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, the owner of the vineyard, after sending servant after servant to negotiate with the labourers, sends his own son, Mk. adding 'his well-beloved,' by whom Jesus obviously intends Himself. Of course, it may be said that the Messiah was different from all the prophets, and that this difference may be indicated by the difference between a son and a servant; but the analogy would be closer if a more intimate and personal relationship were assumed.

One of the most striking passages pointing in the same direction is one that, at first sight, seems to point the opposite way. In Mar_13:32, speaking of a date in the future, Jesus says, 'But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.' Naturally this has been often quoted as a conclusive disproof of the orthodox doctrine of the Sonship of our Lord, and it has been one of the chief occasions for the invention of the kenotic theories, as they are called, of His Person; but, on the other hand, it is one of the clearest indications of a consciousness superior to mere humanity, for it places the speaker above both men and angels so obviously, that even Holtzmann, in an unwonted outburst of concession, exclaims: 'This is the single passage in which the Son, while opposed along with the angels to the Father, appears to become a metaphysical magnitude' (*NT Theol.* i. 268).

The inference appearing to follow from the passage just quoted is that Jesus was a Being above both men and angels, but inferior to God. But a more profound and true knowledge is supplied by the most impressive passage of all on this subject in the Synoptics—the words of Jesus with which the First Gospel concludes: 'All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am

with you always, even unto the end of the world' (Mat 28:19 f.). The close resemblance will be noted between the opening words of this statement and the opening words of the saying in Mat 11:27, already commented on. The promise, 'Lo, I am with you always,' has likewise a parallel in Mat 18:20 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.' But the association of 'the Son' with the Father and the Holy Ghost is the most remarkable expression in the Synoptics of the self-consciousness of Jesus. How much it implies is a problem for dogmatic theology; but it is enough to remark here that it undoubtedly runs up into the ontological or metaphysical. Of course, its authenticity as a saying actually proceeding from Jesus has been fiercely disputed, and in certain quarters the air is affected of treating it as beyond dispute an addition to the actual words of Christ; but its place in the ordinance of baptism connects it closely with the Author of that rite; and there is no reason for rejecting it which would not, at the same time, imply the rejection of the whole section of the life of our Lord which follows His death on the cross.

2. The Fourth Gospel.—When we turn from the Synoptics to the Fourth Gospel, we are immediately conscious of being in a different atmosphere and at a different altitude, and the effect is at first bewildering. Instead of a studied reticence on the subject of who and whence He was, such as we encounter in the previous Gospels, Jesus places this subject in the foreground, and instead of letting His higher claims escape only at rare intervals and in the society of His chosen friends, He proclaims them to all and sundry, and, as one might say, from the housetops. This raises many questions as to the origin and purpose of this Gospel, which cannot be fully discussed in this place; but it may be said that, if both representations are to be accepted as historical, we must conceive the words of Christ as having ranged over a wider area than is usually assumed. If in His mind there were circles of thought as diverse as those of the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel, there must have been ample spaces round both circles, in which the outer elements of both might touch and blend. There is a tendency, due to the preoccupation of study, to narrow the life of Christ down to what has been actually recorded; but this is in many ways misleading, and it is mistaken. It is certain that the acts recorded of Him are only a few stray flowers thrown over the wall of an ample garden; and it is not unreasonable to infer that the same is true of His words.

As, however, we grow accustomed to the new environment in the Gospel of St. John, we begin to perceive that the figure which stands in the midst is not so different as it appears at first sight from the one we have just been studying. He is still 'the Son of Man' as well as 'the Son of God,' though the proportion in which these names occur is reversed. The way in which He here calls Himself 'the Son' and God His Father is exactly similar to the usage in the Synoptics, only He has these terms far more frequently on His lips. Not a few of the most astonishing statements He makes about

Himself are substantially anticipated in the verse of an earlier Gospel so frequently referred to, Mat 11:27. He does not hesitate, even in Jn., to say 'my Father is greater than I' (Joh 14:28), or to speak of God as 'my God' (Joh 20:17). We have here the same three elements in the sonship as formerly—the theocratic, Messianic, the ethicoreligious, and the physical or metaphysical—only they may be mingled in somewhat different proportions. The Messianic we see in its most unmistakable form in the testimonies of the Baptist (Joh 1:34), of Nathanael (Joh 1:49), of Martha (Joh 11:27), and of others; but the boundaries of the other two will require more careful investigation.

Two things are new—the description of the Son as 'only begotten' Joh 1:14; Joh 1:18, Joh 3:16; Joh 3:18), and the claim to pre-existence on the part of Jesus.

(1) The adjective *μονογενής* describes the unique Sonship of Jesus. St. John is not unaware that there are other sons of God. So far from it, his Gospel opens with the great statement, already quoted, 'But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name' (Joh 1:12); and in his First Epistle he exclaims, 'Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is' (1Jn 3:2); but such are not sons of God in the same sense in which Jesus is 'the Son of God.' Wherein, then, does the uniqueness consist? It cannot lie in the ethico—spiritual region; for it is there that in this respect Jesus and those who receive Him are one, except in degree of intimacy with the Father. Most assume that it lies in Messiahship; and, no doubt, in being the Messiah, Jesus is unique. Even Weiss takes it for granted that this is where it lies, contending again and again that nothing metaphysical is suggested. This, however, is a mere piece of dogmatism; for the uniqueness might quite as well lie in this quarter. In fact, the verbal idea in the adjective rather suggests it; and it is very significant that St. John treats the claim of Jesus to Sonship as involving equality with God. In Joh 5:18 we read, 'Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said that God was his Father, making himself equal with God'; and in Joh 10:35 'The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not, but because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God,' this being because He had stated, 'I and my Father are one' (Joh 5:30).

The force of this is turned aside by Wendt with the assumption that these notes are from the pen of a redactor, who, both here and elsewhere, has wrought confusion in the record emanating from the disciple whom Jesus loved. Beyschlag takes the bull more boldly by the horns with the suggestion that these remarks of the Jews are quoted as evidences of their perversity and stupidity, the sayings of Jesus on which they were comments not having implied at all what they supposed. But it may be left

to everyone to say whether or not this is a natural manner of reading St. John's narrative. At all events, as a historical statement, it is of the utmost importance that by the contemporaries of Jesus His claim to be the Son of God, put forward as it was by Him, was interpreted in this way.

(2) The passages in which Jesus claims pre-existence are four—Joh 6:62 'What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?'; Joh 8:58 'Verily I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am'; Joh 17:4-5 'I have glorified thee on the earth, I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do; and now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was'; and especially, Joh 17:24 'Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me be with me, that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me; for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world'; to which may be added Joh 16:28 'I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.' In all these cases, not excepting the last, the leaving of the world—surely a real, historical event—is put in the plainest terms in opposition to His entry into the world, which must, therefore, be equally a real, historical event.

Beyschlag attacks the pre-existence with vigour, and displays remarkable ingenuity in explaining it of an ideal existence in the mind and purpose of God. Thus, before God thought of Abraham, He was thinking of Jesus, who was anterior and superior in the Divine plan. But, after the laborious analysis is over, these great sayings draw themselves together again and stare the reader in the face as a united and coherent aspect of the self-consciousness of Jesus. Wendt applies to these texts his favourite device of showing that what is said of Jesus, and is supposed to imply something superhuman, is also applied to others of whom nothing superhuman can be predicated. Thus, if Jesus (Joh 8:38) says to the Jews, 'I speak that which I have seen with my Father,' He adds, 'And ye do that which ye have seen with your father,' explaining, further on, 'Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do' (Joh 5:44); and the argument is, that if this implies that Jesus pre-existed with God, it must imply also that the Jews with whom He was contending had pre-existed with the devil. But how futile this kind of argumentation may sometimes be, is shown when the statement of St. Paul, that 'the saints shall judge the world' (1Co 6:2), is used to take all the greatness and solemnity out of the statements of Jesus as to the position which He is to occupy at the Last Day as the Judge of the quick and the dead. Wendt habitually reduces the great sayings of Jesus to the lowest possible terms, and then assumes that this must be the meaning in every case. But the reader wearies of such a process: he feels that surely Jesus cannot have put the minimum of significance into His words on all occasions; or, if so, how is He to escape the charge of employing big language to express small ideas, or confusing His hearers with enigmas which might easily have been cleared up, had He only uttered a few plain words of explanation? Holtzmann gives up the attempt to read a commonplace

meaning into words like these. Such sayings, according to him, are not genuine words of Jesus: they are utterances of Christianity rather than of Christ, and of Christianity after it had passed through the mind of St. Paul (*op. cit. infr.* ii. p. 433). But the situation is in all probability the reverse: the deep resemblance between the Christology of St. John and that of St. Paul, which undoubtedly exists in spite of superficial unlikeness, is due rather to what St. Paul learned from the older Apostle either directly or through the knowledge and ideas of the beloved disciple being diffused in the atmosphere of that age; while the consent on this great subject, not only of these two but of the primitive Church as a whole, may be traced back without hesitation to the tradition of our Lord's own testimony to Himself.

The witness of Jesus to His own pre-existence is not confined to the texts just quoted, remarkable as these are, but pervades the whole mass of His words in the Fourth Gospel, and forms the presupposition of all the rest of His utterances about Himself. It is by commencing at this starting-point and following this clue that the student finds everything expanding before him as he goes on, and all the various ideas arranging themselves in their places on the right hand and on the left.

Whether there be any analogy to the consciousness of Jesus at this point in what some of the ancients believed about this life being a reminiscence of a life preceding, or in what some of the modern poets have hinted about human beings trailing clouds of glory from an antecedent home, may be left to everyone's own judgment; but Jesus habitually spoke as if He were conscious of having had an anterior existence, where He had seen and heard what He repeated during His earthly life, and had received commandment how He should afterwards act. Thus to Nicodemus He says (Joh 3:11-13), 'Verily, verily, I say unto thee, We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness. If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things? And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven.' In the great intercessory prayer He says to His Father (Joh 17:8), 'I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me.' Cf. also Joh 6:46-62, Joh 7:28-29, Joh 8:23; Joh 8:26-27; Joh 8:38, Joh 12:49, Joh 14:31, Joh 15:15, Joh 17:8.

Out of this pre-existent state Jesus was conscious of having been 'sent' into the world. This recalls the mission of the prophets of the OT, who, though not haunted by any reminiscence of a previous state of existence, yet were all profoundly conscious that they had been chosen and ordained to do a particular work at a particular time; some, like Jeremiah, being told that even from the womb they had been destined to their peculiar vocation. With this prophetic consciousness that of Jesus was in close analogy; yet the references to it suggest a deeper mystery. Corresponding with this

sending on God's part is a 'coming' on the part of Jesus Himself; and in some of the passages in which He says, 'I am come,' there is the same suggestion of something weighty and more than usually significant. Not infrequently both conceptions are blended, as in Joh 6:38 'I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me'; or Joh 7:28-29 'Ye both know me, and ye know whence I am; and I am not come of myself, but he that sent me is true, whom ye know not; but I know him; for I am from him, and he hath sent me'; or Joh 8:42 'If God were your Father, ye would love me; for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me.' Cf. Joh 5:23-24; Joh 5:36-38, Joh 6:44, Joh 7:16; Joh 7:33, Joh 8:16; Joh 8:18; Joh 8:26; Joh 8:29; Joh 8:42, Joh 9:4, Joh 10:36, Joh 11:42, Joh 12:44; Joh 12:49, Joh 14:27, Joh 15:21, Joh 16:5, Joh 17:8; Joh 17:18; Joh 17:23, Joh 20:21; also Joh 6:33; Joh 6:38, Joh 7:14, Joh 9:39, Joh 10:10, Joh 16:27-28.

The object or purpose for which He was thus 'sent' and 'came' into the world is expressed in a great variety of forms, all of which, however, are more or less suggestive of the dignity and uniqueness of Him of whom they are predicated, though of course some make this impression more than others. Thus He comes to reveal the truth and to glorify God thereby. So He said to Pilate, 'To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth' (Joh 18:37). In His great High-Priestly prayer He says to the Father, 'I have glorified thee on the earth, I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do'; again, 'I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world'; and again, 'I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it; that the love where with thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them' (Joh 17:4; Joh 17:6; Joh 17:26). So illuminating and comprehensive is this revelation, that He calls Himself 'the light of the world' (see Joh 8:12, Joh 9:5, Joh 12:36; Joh 12:46). Sometimes He comes to judge. He even goes so far as to say, 'The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son' (Joh 5:22). Sometimes He comes to 'save,' as in Joh 10:9 'I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture'; or Joh 12:47 'I came not to judge the world, but to save the world.' But oftenest His mission is to give life, this being expressed in a great variety of forms. Thus, in Joh 10:10, He says, 'I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.' Sometimes the opposite alternative is tragically suggested, as in the well known Joh 3:16, where 'to perish' stands in contrast with 'life'; or in Joh 8:51 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death,' where death awaits those who do not receive 'life' from Christ. Frequently the adjective 'eternal' is joined with life. It is a peculiarity of the Fourth Gospel to conceive of eternal life as capable of being enjoyed even in the present world; but it also comprehends the future, and this is sometimes the ruling idea. The intimate connexion of Jesus Himself with the bestowal of this life is extremely significant. Thus, in Joh 5:26, He claims, 'As the Father hath

life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.’ At the grave of Lazarus He exclaimed, ‘I am the resurrection and the life; be that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.’ The communication of natural life is interchanged with that of spiritual life; in [Joh 5:21](#), for example, He says, ‘As the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will’; and farther on, at [Joh 5:25](#), it is added, ‘Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live.’ The personal share of Jesus in all this is further indicated in His claim to be the bread of life ([Joh 6:27](#); [Joh 6:32-33](#); [Joh 6:47](#); [Joh 6:51](#)), and to give the water of life ([Joh 4:10](#); [Joh 4:14](#), [Joh 7:37-38](#)). In view of such sublime statements, the term ‘Messianic’ is frequently used in a way that is a delusion and a snare. What explanation of such pretensions is it to say that He who made them differed from other men and prophets by being the Messiah? The possession of no office whatever is able to make a mortal capable of such functions: there must be something far above the competency of mere man in any one who can be the subject of such predicates. In *Cur Deus Homo* Anselm develops the argument that, the Person being such as He was, the work must be Divine; but the logic tells equally in the opposite direction: the work being such, the Person must be Divine.

Some of these works are, however, invisible, because spiritual, and some belong to the distant future. Hence Jesus could not show Himself in the act of doing them. But He did works, which all could see, that were signs and guarantees of these. He healed the blind, in order to prove that He was the organ of revelation; He raised the dead, in order to prove that He would be the Lord of the resurrection at the Last Day. So He Himself interpreted His miracles; and He appealed confidently to their evidential power, ‘If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not; but, if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works; that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me and I in him’ ([Joh 10:37-38](#); see also [Joh 1:48](#), [Joh 4:16](#), [Joh 8:18](#), [Joh 10:25](#), [Joh 11:4](#); [Joh 11:15](#), [Joh 14:11](#), [Joh 17:23-24](#); [Joh 17:26](#)).

All the time, however, whilst doing His works on earth, He was in uninterrupted communion with His Father in heaven, actually speaking of Himself once ([Joh 3:13](#)) as ‘in heaven,’ if the reading can be trusted. Such expressions have been used to break down the testimonies to His pre-existence, as if none of these might mean any more than such an ideal presence elsewhere. But this is a distinct aspect of His testimony to Himself, and there is no inconsistency between the two. His doctrine, His words, His works He knew to be all the Father’s ([Joh 7:16](#), [Joh 8:26](#), [Joh 14:10](#); [Joh 14:24](#), [Joh 5:19-20](#)). He could say, ‘He that sent me is with me; the Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that please Him’ ([Joh 8:29](#)). With the most touching *naïveté* He spoke of the Father’s love to Him and His own love to the Father ([Joh 10:17](#), [Joh 17:23-24](#); [Joh 17:26](#)). He strives for language strong enough to

express the unity between His Father and Himself (Joh 6:36, Joh 10:38, Joh 14:10, Joh 17:21). At last the climax is reached in the utterance which brought down on His head the charge of blasphemy, 'I and the Father are one' (Joh 10:30).

Though, however, thus united with God on earth, He longs for return to the other world, which is His true home. To this He often refers, not infrequently connecting the thought of going thither with that of having come from the same place; and what could be more natural? Thus, in Joh 8:14 He says, 'Though I bear record of myself, yet my record is true; for I know whence I came and whither I go; but ye cannot tell whence I come and whither I go': and in Joh 16:28 'I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.' See also Joh 6:62, Joh 7:33-34, Joh 8:21, Joh 13:33, Joh 14:2; Joh 14:12; Joh 14:28, Joh 16:5; Joh 16:7, Joh 10:16, Joh 17:11; Joh 17:13, Joh 20:17.

Such is a slight sketch of the Christology of Jesus as presented by St. John. Not every statement is expressly connected with 'the Son of God' in so many words; but this is the phrase that embodies all these various elements. The summits of the testimony are such verses as Joh 5:23; Joh 5:26, Joh 8:58, Joh 10:15; Joh 10:30, Joh 11:4; Joh 11:25, Joh 12:45, Joh 13:31-32, Joh 14:6-7; Joh 14:9, Joh 13:14. Longer passages specially worthy of consideration are Joh 3:10; Joh 3:21, Joh 5:19; Joh 5:47, Joh 6:35; Joh 6:40, Joh 8:42; Joh 8:47, Joh 15:17. In one passage He deals directly and deliberately with the charge that, in calling Himself 'the Son of God,' He was making Himself equal with God. Here was an opportunity of disclaiming anything of the kind, and explaining, as many are now forward to do for Him, that the question was only of function and character, not of nature. He did, indeed, refer to some who, in the OT, were called 'gods' on account of function alone; but He set His own claim above theirs as supported by a far higher reason: 'If he called them gods unto whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken, say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?' (Joh 10:35 f.). And He goes on to affirm, 'The Father is in me and I in him' (Joh 5:38). It is true that it is arguable whether in these words only function is referred to, but the point is that something deeper is not only not excluded but suggested. Those who believe that all such expressions have reference to superiority of function and character, but not of nature, have no difficulty in finding words by which this distinction can be made perfectly intelligible. Why then did Jesus, when thus directly challenged, not find such words? The numerous sayings quoted in the foregoing paragraphs amply prove that, in speaking of His own origin and the source of His authority, He habitually used language of dazzling splendour and magnificence. Was this an exaggerative manner of expressing what was ordinary, or was it an effort to body forth in human speech what was too glorious to be expressed? The halo round the head of 'the Son of God' is not an invention of primitive Christianity or ecclesiastical councils—for whatever excesses of superstition or

dogmatism these may be answerable—but is due to the consciousness and the testimony of Jesus Himself; and by the character of Him who was ‘meek and lowly in heart,’ as well as by the conviction of His power to save wrought by centuries of experience into the mind of Christendom, the acknowledgment is demanded that it is not an exhalation from beneath, but an emanation from the eternal throne.

Literature.—The relevant portions of the works on NT Theology by Weiss, Beyschlag, H. J. Holtzmann, Stevens, Bovon; also of Wendt’s *Teaching of Jesus*, Dalman’s *Words of Jesus*, Nösgen’s *Gesch. Jesu Christi*, and Beyschlag’s *Christologie des NT*. See also Grau, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*; Nösgen, *Der Menschen-und Gottessohn*; Gore, *Bampton Lectures and Dissertations*; Stevens, *The Johannine Theology*; Weiss, *Der Johanneische Lehrbegriff*; Lütgert, *Die Johanneische Christologie* (1899) and *Gottes Sohn und Gottes Geist* (1905); Stalker, Cunningham Lectures, *The Christology of Jesus*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (1900); F. W. Robertson, *Serm.* ii. 136, 235; P. Brooks, *Law of Growth*, 346.

James Stalker.

☩ Son Of Perdition

SON OF PERDITION.—See Judas Iscariot, ii. (g).

☩ Son Of The Law

SON OF THE LAW.—See Boyhood and Education.

☩ Son of Man

SON OF MAN

1. Occurrences of the expression in the NT

(a) *In the Gospels* it is found in the following passages—eighty-one in all: Mat 8:20; Mat 9:6; Mat 10:23; Mat 11:19; Mat 12:8; Mat 12:32; Mat 12:40; Mat 13:37; Mat 13:41; Mat 16:13; Mat 16:27-28; Mat 17:9; Mat 17:12; Mat 17:22; Mat 19:28; Mat 20:18; Mat 20:28; Mat 24:27; Mat 24:30, *bis* Mat 24:37; Mat 24:39; Mat 24:44;

Mat 25:31; Mat 26:2; Mat 26:24, bis. Mat 24:45; ,Mat 26:64—[30 times]; Mar 2:10; Mar 2:28; Mar 8:31; Mar 8:38; Mar 9:9; Mar 9:12; Mar 9:31; Mar 10:33; Mar 10:45; Mar 13:26; Mar 14:21, bis. Mar 14:41; Mar 14:62—[14 times]; Luk 5:24; Luk 6:5; Luk 6:22; Luk 7:34; Luk 9:22; Luk 9:26; Luk 9:44; Luk 9:58; Luk 11:30; Luk 12:8; Luk 12:10; Luk 12:40; Luk 17:22; Luk 17:24; Luk 17:26; Luk 17:30; Luk 18:8; Luk 18:31; Luk 19:10; Luk 21:27; Luk 21:36; Luk 22:22; Luk 22:48; Luk 22:69; Luk 24:7—[25 times]; Joh 1:51; Joh 3:13-14; Joh 6:27; Joh 6:53; Joh 6:62; Joh 8:28; Joh 9:35 (Revised Version margin) 12:23, 34 bis 13:31—[12 times]. It is obvious to remark that these eighty-one passages do not by any means represent as many different occasions on which the phrase is reported to have been used. Thus of the thirty passages cited from Mt. it will be found on examination that nine have direct parallels in both Mk. and Lk.; that four have parallels in Mk. only, and eight in Luke only; while the remaining nine are peculiar to Matthew (see the tables provided by Driver in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iv. 579, Schmidt, *EBi [Note: Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.]* iv. 4713, and by J. A. Robinson in *The Study of the Gospels*, p. 58 f.). To the parallel passages in the Synoptics, which exhibit diversity in regard to this particular expression, attention will be directed later.

(b) *Apart from the Gospels* 'the Son of Man' is found only in Act 7:56 (cf. Luk 22:69). in Rev 1:13; Rev 14:14 the expression used, though akin, is not the same: it is 'one [sitting] like unto a son of man,' which is a precise reproduction of the phrase in Dan 7:13.

With but one exception the name as found in the Gospels is used only by our Lord Himself. The exception is Joh 12:34, and even there it is presupposed that Jesus had spoken of Himself as 'the Son of Man.' 'The multitude therefore answered him, We have heard out of the law that the Christ abideth for ever; and how sayest thou, The Son of Man must be lifted up? Who is this Son of Man?' The multitude are familiar with the title 'the Son of Man'; to them it is a designation of the Messiah; their difficulty is to reconcile Messiahship with exaltation through death. The impression derived from this passage, that the title under discussion was by no means new upon the lips of our Lord,—however great the access of content it received from His employment of it,—is confirmed by the significant fact that throughout the Gospel narratives there is not a trace that disciples, or the wider public, were in any wise perplexed by the designation. This fact, it may be remarked in passing, has not been allowed its due weight by those who, like Westcott (*Gospel of St. John*, p. 33 ff., 'It was essentially a new title'), regard the designation as originating with our Lord; or who, like B. Weiss (*NT Theol.* i. 73), explain the employment of it by Jesus on the supposition that, if not new, it was not one of the current Messianic titles. If new, or unfamiliar, the frequent use of such a self-designation must have occasioned remark, and called for explanation, which would surely have found record in one or other of the Evangelic narratives. If then the Gospels, both by what they say and by what they leave unsaid,

favour the view that 'Son of Man' was already known, prior to the ministry of Jesus, as a Messianic title, it becomes needful to trace, in so far as we may, its history. Next, we must try to ascertain at what period in His ministry this title was assumed by our Lord, and why He used it with such marked preference; and, finally, we must seek an explanation of the absence of the name in NT writings other than the Gospels.

2. Source of the title.—Baldensperger, writing in 1900 (*Theol. Rundschau*, p. 201 ff.), regards it as one of the 'fixed points' gained in the course of recent discussion, that the origin of the NT phrase, and in large part its explanation, are to be sought in the OT, and especially in Dan 7:13. Previous discussion had been limited too exclusively to the Gr. expression ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; and, owing to such limitation, results were obtained (such as that our Lord reiterated 'His mere humanity,' or that He was 'the ideal man,' or that 'nothing human was alien to Him') which stood in no obvious relation to passages in which the title is predominantly used—passages bearing on our Lord's Passion and Parousia. The appropriateness of the use of the title in sayings of the latter class was at once apparent when it was viewed in the light of Dan 7:13. Not that the title itself is to be found there. The writer of Daniel describes a vision in which four great beasts come up from the sea—a lion, a bear, a leopard, a beast with ten horns. They are judged by the 'Ancient of Days,' and their dominion is taken from them. Thereupon the prophet proceeds:

'I saw in the night visions, and, behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man, and he came even to the ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given to him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.'

It will be noted that in this more accurate rendering (that of the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) the phrase which is of most moment in the subject now under discussion is quite indefinite: 'one like unto a son of man,'—*i.e.* one with human attributes in contrast to the ferocity of 'the beasts.' The question at once arises, Whom are we to understand by the 'one like unto a son of man'? The answer most commonly given has been—the Messiah; and there is much to be said for that answer yet, in spite of the dissent of a large number of more recent exegetes. They point to the fact that when Daniel receives the interpretation of his vision (Dan 7:17-27), not a word is said about the 'one like unto a son of man,' but with threefold iteration (Dan 7:18; Dan 7:22; Dan 7:27) it is asserted that after judgment upon the beasts, dominion will be given to 'the saints of the Most High.' Hence it is said that on the testimony of the text of Daniel itself, the 'one like unto a son of man' does not denote a person, but 'the glorified and ideal people of Israel' (see, *e.g.*, Driver, *Com.*

on *Daniel*, p. 102; Drummond, *Jewish Messiah*, p. 229). So strongly indeed has this view impressed itself upon the minds of some, that they apply the impersonal interpretation of the phrase in [Dan_7:13](#) as a test to the passages in which our Lord is represented by the Evangelists as using the words 'the Son of Man.' Thus J. Estlin Carpenter (*The Synoptic Gospels*, pp. 372, 388), regarding the phrase in Daniel as 'emblematic and collective,' and maintaining that Jesus used it in its original meaning, arrives at the conclusion that 'wherever ... the term is individualized and used Messianically, we have evidence of the later influence of the Church. Jesus never used it to designate Himself.' It is obvious that the application of such a canon would have far-reaching results. But is the interpretation upon which it is based quite sure? The writer of Daniel does not regard 'the saints of the Most High' as coming down from heaven. They are already upon the earth, suffering the oppression of the tyrant symbolized by the 'little horn,' and awaiting deliverance and reversal of condition, which come when the Most High sits for judgment. It would surely be somewhat incongruous to symbolize the saints passing from the depths of misery to exaltation by one who descends from heaven to earth. On the other hand, it accords entirely with the conception which dominates Daniel 7 of a complete change of conditions, if by 'one like a son of man' we understand a Divinely empowered Ruler sent from on high to reign where the 'four kings,' the 'great beasts,' whose origin had been of the earth ([Dan_5:17](#)), had borne sway.

If it be urged that had the writer of Daniel 7 intended the Messiah in [Dan_5:13](#), he could not have omitted mention of Him when he goes on to interpret the vision, and could not have spoken so unreservedly of the bestowal of 'kingdom and dominion' upon the saints of the Most High, it may be replied that it is quite in harmony with what may be discerned in other prophetic writings, if the thought of the author of Daniel is found to dwell more on the glories of the Kingdom of the latter days and the felicity of those who have part in it, than upon the Messianic King. Large sections of prophecy, so far as they seek to portray the better future, omit all direct reference to the Messiah. There is no warrant, therefore, as Driver (who, however, holds that 'the title ... does not in Daniel directly denote the Messiah,' *op. cit.* p. 104) points out, for saying that 'the Kingdom is not to be thought of without its King.' And there is also no sufficient warrant to assume that if in the recital of a vision there is mention of the Messianic King, He, rather than His subjects, must have mention when the vision is interpreted. It is through failure to make allowance for this that N. Schmidt (*Ebi [Note: Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.]* iv. 4710) complains that the Messianic interpretation of [Dan_7:13](#) 'fails to explain how the Messiah, once introduced, can have dropped so completely out of the author's thought, not only in the explanation of the vision, where He is unceremoniously ignored, but also in the future deliverance, with which Michael has much to do but the Messiah nothing.' Hence Schmidt suggests that the 'one like unto a son of man' is no other than Michael himself, the guardian angel of Israel ('Michael your prince,' [Dan_10:21](#))—a belated

expedient, affording no real assistance. The absence of any mention of the guardian angel in the interpretation of the vision is not more easy of explanation than the absence therefrom of the mention of the Messiah. Indeed, of the two conceptions, that of the gift of everlasting dominion over all peoples to the guardian angel Michael, being the more unfamiliar, would urgently demand some explicit word of explanation.

In order to discover how Jewish readers of the Book of Daniel in the time shortly preceding and shortly following our Lord's ministry interpreted that figure, which was presented so suddenly, to be so speedily withdrawn, we turn to the evidence of the *Similitudes* of the Book of Enoch and of 2 Esdras. Both books are quite certainly of Jewish origin, and both afford unmistakable testimony as to the deep impression made by the apocalyptic teaching of Daniel, which would carry with it familiarity with the concept of 'one like a son of man.' The date of the Book of Esdras is undisputed; it belongs to the closing decades of the first century of our era, approximately to a.d. 81. The date of the *Similitudes*—a later portion of the Book of Enoch—is more open to doubt. R. H. Charles (*Book of Enoch*, p. 29) holds them to have been written between b.c. 94-79, or b.c. 70-64. Schürer (*HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]* II. iii. 68) places them somewhat later: 'at the very soonest, in the time of Herod,' *i.e.* between b.c. 37-4. Thus, according to both these authorities, the *Similitudes* are pre-Christian. Whether they have been subjected to interpolations at Christian hands has been much debated. The plea that such interpolations, had they taken place, must have gone further, appears conclusive. Schürer (*l.c.*) claims, with reason, that 'this much at least ought to be admitted, that the view of the Messiah presented in the part of the book at present under consideration [the *Similitudes*] is perfectly explicable on Jewish grounds, and that to account for such view it is not necessary to assume that it was due to Christian influences. Nothing of a specifically Christian character is to be met with in any of this section.' We are concerned here with the Messianic teaching of the *Similitudes* only so far as they adopt and develop the concept derived from Daniel of a heavenly 'Son of Man.' The following extracts (cited from Charles' translation) may suffice:

In ch. 46, Enoch is represented as saying, when relating his vision of the Judgment: 'And there I saw One who had a Head of Days, and His head was white like wool, and with Him was another being whose countenance had the appearance ... like one of the holy angels. And I asked the angel who went with me and showed me all the hidden things, concerning that Son of Man, who he was, and whence he was, and why he went with the Head of Days? And he answered and said unto me, This is the Son of Man who hath righteousness, with whom dwelleth righteousness, and who reveals all the treasures of that which is hidden, because the Lord of Spirits hath chosen him, and his lot before the Lord of Spirits hath surpassed everything in uprightness for ever. And this Son of Man whom thou hast seen will arouse the kings and the mighty ones from their couches, and the strong from their thrones, and will loosen the reins

of the strong and grind to powder the teeth of the sinners. And he will put down the kings from their thrones and kingdoms, because they do not extol and praise him, nor thankfully acknowledge whence the kingdom was bestowed upon them.’ In ch. 62 we read: ‘And thus the Lord commanded the kings and the mighty and the exalted, and those who dwell on the earth, and said, Open your eyes and lift up your horns if ye are able to recognize the Elect One. And the Lord of Spirits seated him (*i.e.* the Messiah) on the throne of His glory, and the spirit of righteousness was poured out upon him, and the word of his mouth slew all the sinners, and all the unrighteous were destroyed before his face. And there will stand up in that day all the kings, and the exalted, and those who hold the earth, and they will see and recognize him how he sits on the throne of his glory, and righteousness is judged before him, and no lying word is spoken before him.... And one portion of them will look on the other, and they will be terrified and their countenance will fall, and pain will seize them when they see that Son of Man sitting on the throne of his glory. And the kings ... will glorify and bless and extol him who rules over all, who was hidden. For the Son of Man was hidden before Him, and the Most High preserved him in the presence of His might, and revealed him to the elect.’ See also 69:27 ‘And he sat on the throne of his glory, and the sum of judgment was committed unto him, the Son of Man, and he caused the sinners and those who have led the world astray to pass away and be destroyed from off the face of the earth.’ These passages leave no room to question how the author of the *Similitudes* interpreted Daniel’s ‘one like unto a son of man.’ To him the phrase characterized no symbolic figure, but a celestial person, Divinely endowed with world-wide dominion, and appointed to be the judge of all men. The descriptive expression is in process of becoming a title; passing through demonstrative stages—‘*this* Son of Man,’ ‘*that* Son of Man,’—it emerges as ‘*the* Son of Man.’

In 2 Esdras 13 there is no such development of the phrase, ‘one like unto a son of man,’ as we find in the *Similitudes*, but the dependence upon Daniel and the Messianic interpretation of [Dan 7:13](#) is not less clear. Esdras is represented as recounting a dream, in which he saw coming ‘up from the midst of the sea as it were the likeness of a man; and I beheld [he proceeds], and, lo, that man flew with the clouds of heaven: and when he turned his countenance to look, all things trembled that were seen under him.... And after this, I beheld, and, lo, there was gathered together a multitude of men, out of number, from the four winds of heaven, to make war against the man that had come out of the sea.’ This multitude he destroys by the mere breath of his mouth, and then he is seen to ‘call unto him another multitude which was peaceable.’ When Esdras seeks the interpretation of the dream, he is told: ‘Whereas thou sawest a man coming up from the midst of the sea, the same is he whom the Most High hath kept a great season, which by his own self shall deliver his creatures: and he shall order them that are left behind.... Behold, the days come when the Most High will begin to deliver them that are upon the earth.... and it shall be when these things shall come to pass, and the signs shall happen that I showed

thee before, then shall my Son be revealed, whom thou sawest as a man ascending.... And this my Son shall rebuke the nations which are come for their wickedness.... And he shall destroy them without labour by the law, which is likened unto fire.’ The ‘peaceable multitude is further explained to be Israel, of whom this ‘son’ of the Most High is not the symbol, but the Saviour.

The writings of Enoch and Esdras are, it is reasonable to assume, only the survivors of other Apocalypses of the same period, which in like manner founded themselves on the vision of Daniel, and sought to supply in their own way what the prophet had left untold concerning ‘one like unto a son of man.’ If so, that phrase would also inevitably turn in the popular mind into a definite Messianic title, calling for no question when it was heard from the lips of Jesus, unless it were as to His right to appropriate it. It is suggestive to find that later on a more subordinate expression in Dan 7:13 was adopted in similar fashion, and that נפלי בר = ‘son of cloud,’ or ‘cloud-man,’ became a Rabbinic title for the Messiah (see Levy, *NHWB [Note: HWB Neuhebräisches Wörterbuch.]*, s. v. נפלי).

At this point it is needful to pause to consider how our Lord’s use of the expression ‘the Son of Man’ is affected by the fact that He spoke Aramaic. If ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is turned into Aramaic, does it give an expression which could be employed as a title? Or, to put it otherwise, is perhaps ὁ υἱὸς τ. ἀνθρώπου a mistranslation of the words actually uttered by Jesus, or an expression of later growth imported into His sayings by Greek-speaking Christians? Within the last decade, more especially, these questions have been keenly discussed. Wellhausen gave stimulus to the debate by a footnote in his *IJG [Note: JG Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte.]* ² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (1895, p. 346), in which he said: ‘Since Jesus spoke Aramaic He did not call Himself ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, but *barnascha*; that, however, means ‘the Man,’ and nothing else, the Aramaeans having no other expression for the notion. The earliest Christians did not understand that Jesus called Himself simply the Man. They held Him to be the Messiah, made accordingly a designation of the Messiah out of *barnascha*, and translated it not by ὁ ἄνθρωπος, as they should, but quite erroneously by ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.’ Wellhausen further lays stress on the fact that St. Paul makes no use of the expression ‘Son of Man,’ and refuses to admit any evidence which might be cited from Enoch, on the arbitrary plea that ‘the Son of man in the Book of Enoch must be left out of account, so long as it is not established that the relative portion of the book was known, or could be known, to Jesus.’

In 1896, H. Lietzmann published a brochure—*Der Menschensohn*—in which, after a review of previous opinions, he enters into a discussion of ‘Son of Man’ in Aramaic, with the result that he declares the expression to have been in Galilaean Aramaic, ‘the most colourless and indeterminate designation of a human individual’—one that might be used as an indefinite pronoun (p. 38). The use of בֶּר in the compound phrase is described as a ‘genuine Semitic pleonasm,’ and it is maintained that no intelligible distinction existed between אֲנִישׁ and בֶּר נִישׁ. To say with Wellhausen that where the Gospels have ὁ υἱος τ. ἀνθ. the translation should have been ὁ ἄνθρωπος will not do, according to Lietzmann, since that could be no distinctive designation, and the Evangelists do most certainly intend the phrase they use as a definite title; but ‘Jesus has never used the title “Son of Man” of Himself, since in Aramaic it does not exist, and for linguistic reasons cannot exist’ (*op. cit.* p. 85). The formula is to be regarded as a *terminus technicus* of Hellenistic theology, which, originating in Christian Apocalypses, was applied first to passages relating to our Lord’s Return, then to His Passion, and finally to other sections of the narratives.

In 1899, Wellhausen returned to this subject (*Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Sechstes Heft), and in the main declared his adoption of Lietzmann’s conclusion that Jesus, speaking Aramaic, could not make the difference which is made in Greek between ὁ ἄνθρωπος and ὁ υἱος τ. ἀνθ.:—that so far as this difference is made in the Gospels it is not authentic, but is derived from interpreters and editors. Wellhausen withdraws from the position he had formerly advocated, that Jesus did adopt ‘the Man’ as a title, meaning thereby that He fulfilled the ideal of humanity. He now declares that to impute such a meaning to our Lord is not warrantable, and that in the absence of that meaning the supposed title would be wholly meaningless, and therefore it was not employed. The use of ὁ υἱος τ. ἀνθ. in the Gospels is explained as due to the fact that the expressions of Dan 7:13 are put into the mouth of Jesus in Mar 13:26, that there after it became the custom in all passages which refer to the Return of Jesus to avoid the *pronoun*, and to place instead ‘the Son of Man.’ Then followed the same usage in other than eschatological passages (*op. cit.* p. 210). Wellhausen again adduces in confirmation of the position that this self-designation of Jesus is not authentic, the *argumentum ex silentio*—the entire absence of the expression in other NT writings than the Gospels.

On the other hand, Dalman (*Die Worte Jesu*, 1898 [English translation 1902]) and Schmiedel (*Protestant. Monatshefte*, 1898, Hefte 7 and 8) called in question the linguistic premises of Lietzmann and Wellhausen, and contested their conclusions. They both maintain that Jesus did certainly call Himself ‘the Son of Man,’ using the title in a Messianic sense, and with direct reference to Dan 7:13, though both hold

the primary sense of ‘a son of man,’ in that verse, to be collective, and not personal. Dalman adduces evidence to show that ‘the Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the earlier period possessed the term אַנְשׁ for a human being, while to indicate a number of human beings it employed occasionally אַנְשׁא בְּנֵי. The singular number אַנְשׁ בְּרַ was not in use; its appearance being due to imitation of the Hebrew text, where [apart from Ezekiel] אַרְם בֶּן is confined to poetry, and, moreover, uncommon in it. The case in Dan 7:13, where the person coming from heaven is described as אַנְשׁ כְּבָר, ‘one like unto a son of man,’ is just as uncongenial to the style of prose as the designation of God in the same verse as יוֹמֵי עָתִיק ‘the advanced in days’ (*op. cit.* p. 237). Moreover, just as in Hebrew אַרְם בֶּן is never made definite, so is the definite expression אַנְשׁא בְּרַ ‘quite unheard of in the older Jewish Aramaic literature.’ The common use of אַנְשׁ בְּרַ = ‘man’ in Jewish Galilaean and Christian Palestinian literature is to be regarded as a later innovation. That this later usage was not already in vogue in the dialect spoken by our Lord (of which no written specimen from His time is in evidence) is demonstrated by His words as reported in the Gospels. ‘“Man,” both in the singular and in the plural, is frequently enough the subject of remark. How is it that υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου never occurs for ‘man,’ and οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων only in Mar 3:28? Can the Hellenistic reporters—apart from the self-appellation of Jesus—have designedly avoided it, although Jesus had on all occasions said nothing but “son of man” for “man”? That cannot be considered likely.’ Hence, against Lietzmann and Wellhausen, Dalman holds both that ‘Son of man’ was a possible expression in the Aramaic of our Lord’s day, and that by its singularity it was adapted for use as a title. ‘To the Jews it would be purely a Biblical word.’ To the same effect Schmiedel, who sums up his view of the linguistic part of the controversy thus: the Aramaic Lexicon ‘must not say *barnascha* means “man,” and nothing more, but it must run thus: *barnascha*, (1) man, (2) abbreviated designation of the form “like a son of man” (*i.e.* “like a man”) in Dan 7:13, which, although, according to Dan 7:18; Dan 7:22; Dan 7:27, signifying the saints of the Most High, was held to be the Messiah. We, on our part, declare that second meaning to be extant, and to have been so already before the time of Jesus’ (*l.c.* 264). Reference is made below (§ 5) to the replies of Dalman and Schmiedel to the argument *ex silentio*, by which, as already stated, it has been sought to lend support to the theory that ‘the Son of Man’ in the Gospels is no genuine utterance of Jesus.

In 1901, P. Fiebig published the result of a fresh and very thorough examination of the linguistic evidence on the matter at issue. The main contribution in his dissertation (*Der Menschensohn*) is a demonstration that אַנְשׁ and אַנְשׁא were, in spite of their

formal indefiniteness and definiteness, completely interchangeable; and that similarly the compound expressions **נש בר** and **נשא בר** were alike employed to express either of the three meanings—(1) the man, (2) a man, (3) some one. Hence, either expression might be rendered by \acute{o} υἱὸς τ. ἀνθ., or by υἱὸς ἀνθ., or—since, according to Fiebig, the use of the compound expression as the precise equivalent of **אנש בר** without **בר** was no relatively late introduction from the Syriac—by ἄνθρωπος (p. 56). That in the Gospels a distinction is maintained by using \acute{o} υἱὸς τ. ἀνθ., and not \acute{o} ἄνθρωπος alone, is due to the desire to bring out that the fuller phrase is used with direct reference to **אנש בר** in [Dan_7:13](#). But whether in all cases the distinction has been accurately made by the translators is matter for investigation, having regard to the ambiguity of the Aramaic expression. Further, Fiebig holds, on the evidence of Enoch and Esdras, and of the Synoptics themselves, that ‘the Son of Man,’ or rather ‘the Man,’ was in our Lord’s day a current title for the Messiah.

The above linguistic discussion has demonstrated considerable diversity of opinion, as could hardly fail to be the case in the absence of any contemporary example of the dialect spoken in Galilee at the time of our Lord’s earthly ministry. In their estimate of probabilities afforded by cognate dialects, or by later usage, scholars are sure to differ somewhat. Nevertheless, the whole investigation has been fruitful in suggestion to the NT critic. But the attempt made in connexion with it to account for the presence in the Gospels of ‘the Son of Man’ on some other grounds than that it represents a self-designation employed by our Lord, can only be characterized as an elaborate failure. Wellhausen’s invocation of hypothetical Apocalypses to explain the presence in the records of Jesus, and in those records not in the apocalyptic passages alone, of a title which (*ex hypoth.*) He did not use, removes no difficulty, but only calls aloud itself for explanation how such a thing could be. The belief that the title is the genuine utterance of Jesus is left unshaken.

3. When did our Lord adopt the title ‘Son of Man’?—There can be but one answer, if we are justified in assuming that ‘the Son of Man’ was already a Messianic title before our Lord employed it. He can have adopted it only subsequently to St. Peter’s confession of His Messiahship at Caesarea Philippi. But do the Gospels lend colour to any such limitation? Turning to the earliest of the Synoptics,—and we may confine our attention just now to the Synoptics,—we are met by the significant fact that St. Mark has the phrase only twice ([Mar_2:10](#); [Mar_2:28](#)) prior to the Caesarean incident; St. Luke has it four times ([Luk_5:24](#); [Luk_6:5](#); [Luk_6:22](#); [Luk_7:34](#)), and St. Matthew nine times ([Mat_8:20](#); [Mat_9:6](#); [Mat_10:23](#); [Mat_11:19](#); [Mat_12:8](#); [Mat_12:32](#); [Mat_12:40](#); [Mat_13:37](#); [Mat_13:41](#)). Thus, in by far the greatest number of cases the title occurs subsequent to Peter’s confession. What, then, is to be said as to its occurrence in

such cases as are prior to that confession? No one answer will suffice. Certainly it will not do to resort to the expedient of saying that the title was but little known, and that its Messianic application might be missed until our Lord Himself, late in His ministry, brought it into direct relation to Daniel's prophecy; or to adopt the alternative offered by Holtzmann (*NT Theol.* vol. i. p. 264) of saying that 'the son of man' or 'man' was used by Jesus at first in its ordinary significance, and then, by reason of the stress He laid on it, came to be to the disciples an enigmatic word, which brought them to see that their Master was a man not as others, but with a unique calling, and at length to find in Him the Messiah. Either supposition would leave unexplained how the adoption of the title, whether unfamiliar or familiar, could have passed unchallenged, and not have called forth questions as to the sense in which Jesus was using the words. As little is help to be found in Fiebig's suggestion that one reason why our Lord chose this title ('the Man,' according to Fiebig), was that men would find in it a meaning, though they might fail to apprehend *the* meaning with which Jesus employed it (*op. cit.* p. 120). Here, again, allowance is not made for the extreme difficulty of supposing that a speaker could apply a title to himself unless it were with an obvious purpose, which his hearers would certainly discern. There is not the least ground for supposing that it was a more usual thing in Aramaic than it is in our own language for any one to speak of himself in the third person. Such a form of speech might lend itself to more definite self-revelation, but clearly it was in no wise calculated to secure self-concealment. Wrede, in a note in *ZNTW* [*Note: NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissen. schaft.*] (1904, Heft 4), urges that in recent discussions about the 'Son of Man' too little attention has been given to the really astonishing fact that Jesus is represented in the Gospels as quite habitually speaking of Himself as of a third person, and yet, so far as the Gospels show, no one thought it strange. Wrede is justified in saying that only our early familiarity with the language of the Gospels makes us insensible to the difficulty created by the frequency of the recurrence of the title; but he surely greatly exaggerates the difficulty when he finds in it a most convincing argument to deny that Jesus used this self-designation at all. Certainly it was an unusual and striking form of speech to adopt. But that constitutes no sufficient reason for assuming that our Lord did not adopt it, even because it was more calculated to arrest attention when He desired to lay stress on His Messianic claims, and on special aspects of them. The real difficulty lies in the supposition that an unwonted form of speech, most calculated to provoke inquiry concerning the speaker, was adopted by Jesus at a time when, according to the testimony of the Synoptics, He studiously avoided making His identity known, when He had not even affirmed His Messiahship to the inner circle of the Twelve. It is needful, therefore, to look in detail at the passages cited above, in which the title is found prior to the declaration of our Lord's Messiahship. For that declaration, see Mat 16:16, Mar 8:29, Luk 9:20.

Taking first the passages in St. Mark, with their parallels in the other Synoptics, and turning to Mar 2:10 (cf. Luk 5:24, Mat 9:6), we are confronted at once with the representation that quite early in His ministry, when in the presence of hostile scribes, Jesus definitely identifies Himself with the 'Son of Man.' '... that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins ... I say unto thee, Arise.' It is, of course, possible that the incident is not here in its due chronological position—that it properly belongs to a much later time in the Evangelical narrative. But there is no reason, unless it be the presence of the phrase now in question, to think so. More likely is it that in this case the ambiguity of the Aramaic is accountable for the presence of the title in the Greek rendering. The scribes were charging Jesus with blasphemy because He assumed to pronounce the forgiveness of sins, that being, as they held, in the power of God only, and not in that of any man. Jesus responds by undertaking to afford a convincing sign that even 'a man [meaning Himself] hath authority,' etc. Such a reconstruction of the passage finds support in Mat 9:8, where we read that the multitudes who stood by 'glorified God, which had given such authority unto *men*'—the multitudes understanding our Lord to have employed no title, and taking the expression He used in its collective sense.

In Mar 2:28 (cf Luk 6:5, Mat 12:8) our Lord's argument in regard to the observance of the Sabbath seems to demand that 'man' should be substituted where we now read 'the Son of Man.' He is vindicating' the action of His disciples, and asserting for all others the same freedom in regard to the use of the Sabbath as they had exercised. Jesus is not concerned to assert His own personal rights, but those of His followers, and of all who suffered from restrictions which threatened to turn that which was given for man's benefit into a bondage. 'The Sabbath was made for man ... so that man is lord [or rather "owner"—κύριος answering here to a familiar sense of the Hebrew בעל—Swete, *Com. on St. Mark*] even of the Sabbath.'

Taking next the two remaining pre-Caesarean occurrences of 'the Son of Man' in St. Luke, the earlier of the two, Luk 6:22, presents little difficulty. It is an obvious case of an editorial insertion of the title. Where St. Luke has 'for the Son of Man's sake,' Mat 5:11 has, 'for my sake'—the latter being clearly the earlier form of the saying. Luk 7:34 (cf. Mat 11:19) is quite conceivably another case of the reverent substitution by tradition of the title in place of a pronoun. Our Lord is contrasting His action with that of the Baptist. What more likely than that He should say, 'John the Baptist is come ... I am come'? The title can be deemed here in no wise essential.

It remains to glance at six passages in the First Gospel besides those already mentioned, in which 'the Son of Man' is found prior to Peter's confession. Taking these cases in order of their occurrence in the Gospel, it is sufficient as to the first, Mat 8:20, to note that its parallel is Luk 9:58—*i.e.* according to St. Luke the incident

of the scribe who volunteered to follow Jesus was subsequent to Peter's confession. There is no reason to suspect here any misconception of our Lord's words on the part of His translators. He cannot have said that in contrast to beasts and birds 'man' hath not where to lay his head. The contrast drawn is between such creatures and Himself, the Messianic 'Son of Man.' If even He had no resting-place, His followers might know thereby what hardship they must be prepared to undergo. Mat 10:23 is quite clearly not in its true chronological order; it belongs to a later time than the first mission of the Twelve, and to a connexion in which a larger work was contemplated than that with which they were then entrusted. But the Evangelist, following his preference for topical arrangement, has linked these later words to the instructions given to the Twelve when they were about to set out on their earliest missionary expedition.

Mat 12:32, when compared with Luk 12:10 and with Mar 3:28, is found to be a combination of two different reports of our Lord's saying as to blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. Mar 3:28 has no mention of 'the Son of Man,' but it has the expression, quite unique in the Gospels, 'the sons of men.' It runs thus: 'All their sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and their blasphemies ... but whosoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit....' In the parallel in St. Luke, the unwonted phrase 'the sons of men' disappears, and its place is taken by the familiar expression 'the Son of Man,' and the entire saying is modified in accordance therewith. That St. Mark has the utterance in its genuine form is unquestionable. Whether it properly belongs to the period before the incident at Caesarea, or, as St. Luke suggests, was later than it, it did not contain the title 'the Son of Man.'

Mat 12:40 (cf. Luk 11:30). It is sufficient to point out that St. Luke places this saying in order of time considerably later than does St. Matthew, and as before, preference must be given to St. Luke in a matter of chronological order.

Finally, the parable of the Tares, in the explanation of which the title appears twice (Mat 13:37; Mat 13:41), may, with good reason, be said to belong to a late period in our Lord's ministry. It owes its present position to St. Matthew's desire to bring it into the collection of parables comprised in his 13th chapter.

Thus, of the instances in which our Lord's self-designation appears in the Synoptic Gospels prior to their recital of Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi, there is not one which can, on examination, be held to afford proof that this Messianic title was used by Him before His follower had declared Him to be the Messiah, or to invalidate the assumption that the use of the title by our Lord began at the time of that declaration, not earlier.

In St. Matthew's account of the incident at Caesarea there are remarkable additions, both to our Lord's question and to Peter's answer. In Mat 16:13 we read: 'Who do

men say that the Son of Man is?' The answer is given: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' In Mar_8:27 the question is: 'Who do men say that I am?' The answer is simply: 'Thou art the Christ.' St. Luke (Mar_9:18; Mar_9:20) agrees, with but slight variations, with St. Mark. He has: 'Who do the multitudes say that I am?... The Christ of God.' We have here another case—the most notable of all such cases—in which the title has been substituted for the pronoun which our Lord employed. It is possible that in this case the additional clause was first appended to Peter's answer, and that the substitution in our Lord's question was occasioned by it—a substitution which represents the desired answer as already provided in the statement of the question. Holtzmann may be right in suggesting that doctrinal interests are answerable for such a result. He says (*op. cit.* vol. i. p. 258) that 'the First Evangelist appears as the theologian, who sees in the "Son of Man" the obverse of the "Son of God," and so prepares the way for the doctrine of the two natures.' Whether the clauses in question are to be ascribed to St. Matthew himself, or whether they may be due to the theological tendency of a later hand, may be regarded as an open question.

For other instances than those already cited of this variation—the title appearing in one Gospel, but not in the parallel passage in another, or in the other two—see Luk_12:8 as compared with Mat_10:32; Mat_16:28, cf. Mar_9:1, and Luk_9:27; Mar_10:45, and Mat_20:28, cf. Luk_22:27; Mar_8:31, and Luk_9:22, cf. Mat_16:21.

As to the occurrence of 'the Son of Man' in the earlier chapters of the Fourth Gospel, it need here only be pointed out that such occurrence is in entire accord with the representation of St. John, that from their earliest association with Him our Lord's followers knew that He was the Divine Christ. The declaration of Messiahship and the use of the title are concurrent in the Fourth Gospel as in the Synoptics. This agreement is to be emphasized here: the reconciliation of the view, which represents our Lord's Messiahship as declared from the outset of His ministry, with the threefold testimony that such declaration followed only when disciples had received prolonged training in the course of that ministry, does not come within the scope of our present purpose. The first occurrence of the self-designation in St. John's Gospel affords a striking parallel to our Lord's use of it in response to Peter's confession (Mar_8:29; Mar_8:31). Nathanael declares Jesus to be 'the Son of God ... king of Israel,' and to that confession Jesus responds With the promise: 'Ye shall see the heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man' (Joh_1:51). Similarly in Joh_3:13, it is when Jesus has declared to Nicodemus that He has Himself descended from heaven and can therefore tell of heavenly things, that He goes on to designate Himself 'the Son of Man,' and to foretell His suffering on behalf of man. Here it may be noted that in the Fourth Gospel, precisely as in the Synoptics, not a hint is given that the title was unfamiliar and one that called for explanation. Nicodemus was not indisposed to ask questions; but St. John leaves us to infer that as to this designation he found no difficulty. Three times in ch. 6 (Joh_6:27; Joh_6:53;

Joh 6:62), in connexion with the discourse in which Jesus speaks of Himself as ‘the bread which came down out of heaven,’ the title occurs, accompanying and used to emphasize an open declaration of our Lord’s claims as to His Person and Work.

The later occurrences of the title in the Fourth Gospel all, with the exception of Joh 9:35 (if ἀνθρώπου be the right reading there), are found—as is the case with most of its later occurrences in the Synoptics—in passages relating to our Lord’s Passion, or to the glory which would follow thereon. This fact suggests, at least in part, the answer to a further inquiry which must now be made.

4. Why did our Lord adopt this in preference to any other Messianic title?—Nowhere does He tell us in precise terms; but His usage leaves no room to doubt that its attraction lay in its freedom from the limitations which beset other Messianic names.

(a) First and foremost, *it permitted the blending of the conception of the Suffering Servant with that of the Messianic King*. That was the great enlargement which Jesus gave, in His use of it, to the title He adopted. True, there was nothing in Daniel’s delineation of ‘one like unto a son of man’ to suggest such a blending, but there was also nothing to preclude it. Whether the coming of the heavenly Son of Man in glory, and for universal dominion, was to be preceded by a coming in humiliation and a reascension through suffering, the writer of Daniel did not tell. But what the prophet failed to disclose, Jesus revealed. He was indeed the son of man, whom Daniel beheld, but passing through a phase of existence anterior to that of which the seer had a glimpse, and a phase which none were anticipating. Jesus was indeed the Messiah; but the expectations which gathered about that name made no allowance for that which was foremost in the purpose for which He came to earth. Hence, no sooner did His disciple exclaim ‘Thou art the Christ,’ than ‘he began to teach them [the disciples] that the Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again.’ Put even so,—as a fresh disclosure concerning the Son of Man,—the teaching was not easy of reception, as Peter’s remonstrance showed; but to have said at that juncture that the ‘Son of David,’ or ‘the Christ,’ must suffer and be killed, had been to make the teaching yet harder of reception.

As Dalman says (*op. cit.* p. 265): ‘The name Messiah denoted the Lord of the Messianic age in His capacity as Ruler; in reality it was applicable only when His enthronement had taken place, not before it. Suffering and death for the actual possessor of the Messianic dignity are, in fact, unimaginable according to the testimony of the prophets. When Jesus attached to the Messianic confession of Peter the first intimation of His violent death He did so in order to make it clear that the entrance

upon His sovereignty was still far distant.... But the “one like unto a son of man” of Dan 7:13 has still to receive the sovereignty. It was *possible* that he should also be one who had undergone suffering and death.’

Hence, in reiterated statements to the disciples concerning the death toward which He moved, the invariable self-designation on the lips of our Lord is ‘the Son of Man.’ See Mar 9:9; Mar 9:12; Mar 9:31; Mar 10:33; Mar 14:21; Mar 14:41, and the parallels in St. Matthew and St. Luke. Only when the Crucifixion and the Resurrection were accomplished facts, in the light of which His disciples might discern how false and misleading had been their narrow conception of what Messiahship could be, does Jesus speak to them of Himself in other terms: ‘Behoved it not the *Christ* to suffer these things?’ and again: ‘Thus it is written that the *Christ* should suffer’ (Luk 24:26; Luk 24:46).

(b) If ‘the Son of Man’ was a title capable of being associated with suffering and death, it was *a title already associated with the glorious coming of One who should have everlasting rule over a world in which the powers of evil should no more have sway*. That was the form of expectation present to the mind of Jesus as He passed on His way to the baptism of suffering, and that was the form of Messianic hope which He sought to strengthen in His followers as He spoke to them, with growing frequency, of the coming of ‘the Son of Man.’ The utterances concerning the return of ‘the Son of Man’ in glory, and the predictions that ‘the Son of Man’ must suffer and die, are in strict correlation (see Bousset, *Jesus*, p. 92 ff.). It is this coming from heaven, this realization of the Kingdom of heaven upon earth, to which Jesus looks forward. Wholly unlike the anticipations entertained by men around Him concerning the Davidic Messiah, the vision of Daniel is that which Jesus again and again calls to mind. He will come ‘in the glory of the Father with the holy angels’ (Mar 8:38); ‘They shall see the Son of Man coming in clouds with great power and glory’ (Mar 13:26; see also Mar 14:62); ‘When the Son of Man shall come in his glory and all the angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all the nations: and he shall separate them one from another ...’ (Mat 25:31 ff.). This function of separation, of judgment, is not in the Danielic sketch of ‘the son of man’; it is a feature added by our Lord. In Daniel the judgment is effected by the Most High. It is significant of much, that Jesus, while adopting and citing that prophecy, does not hesitate to modify it in this important particular, and to declare that it is *He* who will come to be our Judge (cf. Joh 5:27).

(c) If ‘the Son of Man,’ telling of descent from heaven, spoke of a closer association with God than did any other current Messianic title, so did it speak also of *closer association with man—with the race*. All narrow particularism falls away. He who bears this title is no mere ‘Son of David,’ or ‘King of Israel.’ Especially when regard is had to the idiomatic use of בר in Aramaic, as of בן in Hebrew, such a title expresses in

the strongest possible way that He who is called by it has the nature and the qualities of [mankind, and that He who calls Himself by it claims thereby relationship with man everywhere.

It is in such reasons as these that we may find the true clue to our Lord's adoption of this name—not in its supposed unfamiliarity, nor in an ambiguity enabling the speaker to use it in one sense, while He could confidently anticipate that it would be understood in another by His hearers.

5. Why did our Lord's followers, with the exception of Stephen, not apply this title to Him?—The fact that a designation which meets us so frequently in the Gospels is, with the single exception of Act 7:56, wholly absent from the rest of the NT, is remarkable and significant. But of what? Wellhausen and Lietzmann answer, of this: that it was unknown to St. Paul and the other writers of the Epistles and to the author of the Apocalypse that such a title was employed by Jesus, and that the presumption is that only after their day was it introduced into the Gospels. But how this could be done, and how such an important modification of the most cherished records of the Church could be carried out with such enduring success, there is nothing to show. Certainly it is not safe to conclude that St. Paul and other NT writers did not know that this was our Lord's self-designation because they make no direct reference to it. Schmiedel (*l.c.* p. 260 f.) points to Heb 2:6 ff. as affording evidence that the name was not unknown to the writer of that Epistle. Similarly, he holds that St. Paul in 1Co 15:27 makes his reference to Psalms 8 because of the presence in that psalm of the terms which he associated with his Lord—'the Son of Man.' Schmiedel is on firmer ground when he goes on to rebut the contention, that had St. Paul known of the title he must have cited it in such a verse as 1Co 15:47. He urges that it should be borne in mind that St. Paul wrote for Greeks, who would not, like the Jews, understand by 'the son of man' simply 'man,' but would take 'son' quite literally. To this may be added that, apart from the suggestion of a purely human parentage, which Gentiles might receive from the title, its use would for them lay an undue, and therefore a misleading, stress on our Lord's humanity. To the Jew 'the Son of Man' suggested the Lord from heaven; not so to the Gentile. Where the association of the name with heavenly origin and majesty could not be assumed, there the Apostles and early exponents of Christianity adopted other terms as they spoke or wrote of their risen and ascended Lord, and proclaimed Him as 'the Christ, the Son of God' (Joh 20:31). To use the words of Dalman (*op. cit.* p. 266), 'the Church was quite justified in refusing, on its part, to give currency to the title; for in the meantime "the Son of Man" had been set upon the throne of God, and was, in fact, no longer merely a man, but a Ruler over heaven and earth, "the Lord," as St. Paul in the Epistles to the Thessalonians, and the *Teaching of the Apostles* in its apocalyptic statement, rightly designate Him who comes with the clouds of heaven.'

In short, the absence of the title ‘the Son of Man’ from other early Christian records than the Gospels, is significant of the widening range of the Church’s appeal beyond the confines of Judaism; its retention in the Gospels is no less significant of the fidelity with which the words of Jesus were preserved by His followers.

Literature.—For a summary of various interpretations of ‘the Son of Man,’ see articles by Driver in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible ; N. Schmidt in *EBi [Note: Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.]* ; and Baldensperger in *Theol. Rundschau*, 1900, Hefte 6 and 7. Many of the more important modern contributions have already been indicated. Of those not directly cited may be mentioned: Appel, *Die Selbstbezeichnung Jesu*; Bruce, *Kingdom, of God*; Sanday, *Expositor*, Jan. 1891; Bartlet, *ib.* Dec. 1892; Stanton, *The Jewish and the Christian Messiah*; Wendt, *The Teaching of Jesus*; Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*; Weiss, *Life of Christ*.

George P. Gould.

☩ Son, Sonship

SON, SONSHIP

υἱός, which definitely = ‘son,’ is of commonest occurrence in the Gospels, though the more indefinite τέκνον is also frequently used interchangeably with υἱός. The use of τέκνον in the vocative as an affectionate form of address (‘child,’ ‘my child’) is specially noticeable (see, e.g., [Mar 2:5](#), [Luk 2:48](#); [Luk 15:31](#), [Mat 21:28](#)). The latter term is several times rendered ‘son’ in Authorized and Revised Versions without discrimination. Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, indeed, usually indicates ‘child’ in mg. as the exact equivalent, but this is not always the case (see [Mat 21:28](#) τέκνον).

1. The duties and privileges of the filial relation find frequent incidental illustration in the Gospels. The son has a natural claim on parental bounty ([Mat 7:9](#)); he is the object of deep parental love and solicitude ([Mat 10:37](#); [Mat 20:20](#) f.). (A peculiar appeal to such solicitude is made in [Luk 14:5](#), if we are to follow the best attested reading (see (Revised Version margin)); though the collocation of υἱός and βοῦς is so odd that it is a temptation to defy the canons of textual criticism, and, following rather the analogy of kindred passages ([Luk 13:15](#), [Mat 12:11](#)), still read ὄνος). By consequence, strife between father and son is a most painful form of estrangement ([Luk 12:53](#)), whilst the restoration of a happy relationship between those who have

been so estranged calls for the highest rejoicing (Luk 15:22-24). The natural heirship of the son appears in Mar 12:6 (and parallels) and in Luk 15:12, where the technical term (τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος) for the heir's portion occurs (see Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, English translation p. 230). In the former instance—the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen—the position of an only son as carrying with it sole heirship is emphasized. The ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός of Luk 20:13, in this connexion, appears to be tantamount to ὁ υἱὸς ὁ μονογενής (Joh 3:16), as denoting an only son (cf. also Mat 3:17; Mat 17:5 etc.). In the latter case (Luk 15:12) we have a son claiming and obtaining his inheritance during his father's lifetime. This serves the purpose of the parable; but it may be doubted whether such an occurrence was common in actual life. The counsels of ancient Jewish prudence (Sir 33:19 ff.) were, at any rate, dead against it. The more usual course is exemplified in the case of the elder son, whose share in the patrimony was still in his father's hands (Luk 15:31), but was fully assured to him in spite of his complaint in Luk 15:30 (ὁ καταφαγών σου τὸν βίον). A special instance of a son's privilege is made use of in Mat 17:25 f.; the sons of 'the kings of the earth' are exempt (ἐλεύθεροι) from the tribute exacted from their subjects.

On the other hand, the duty of sons to render obedience, service and help to parents similarly appears. The parable of the Two Sons (Mat 21:28 ff.) thus illustrates filial dutifulness and undutifulness. The significance of our Lord's words, 'Behold thy son,' in Joh 19:26, is at once understood as securing loving care and provision for His mother (v. 27). Christ's interpretation of the Fifth Commandment as involving the duty of helping and supporting parents in case of need, is accompanied by a biting denunciation of the Pharisaic ruling that such duty could be nullified by a vow (Mar 7:10 ff. Corban).

It is clear that Jesus found in sonship an instrument of prime importance for the illustration and enforcement of His teaching. It is certain His exemplification of the filial relationship in His own life was perfect. The scanty hints of Luk 2:40-52 (in such striking contrast to the volubility of the Apocryphal narratives) may be accepted as witnessing to such a fulfilment of filial duties during the long years of silence as makes Him the very 'flower and pattern' of all good sons. Mary's surprised expostulation in Luk 2:48 suggests the perfect dutifulness of His childhood's years; and we may be sure the child was 'father of the man,' as to what He was in the after-time as (probably) the mainstay and head of the home at Nazareth on the death of Joseph. Yet the day also came when He illustrated in His own experience His own exacting demand (Mat 10:37), and showed how filial regard must yield to higher claims, summing all up in the impressive *logion* of Mar 3:34 f. (= Mat 12:49 f., cf. Luk 8:21). Luk 11:28 embodies a similar sentiment.

2. Arising out of the notion of the filial relation in its natural sense, we have the idiomatic use of the phrase ‘son of’ as a familiar characteristic of the Gospel phraseology. A poetic feeling underlies the description of a wise man as a ‘son of wisdom,’ and at the same time its appropriateness is self-evident, *υἱός* and *τέκνον* both occur in this connexion, and instances of the use of the idiom found in the Gospels may be grouped as follows: (a) = *belonging to, connected with, or destined for*. Persons are described as sons ‘of the kingdom’ (Mat 8:12; Mat 13:38); ‘of this world’ (age) (Luk 16:8; Luk 20:34); ‘of the bridechamber’ (Mar 2:19 ||); ‘of Jerusalem’ (= inhabitants) (Mat 23:37); ‘of the Pharisees’ (followers, adherents, Mat 12:27 = Luk 11:19); ‘of the evil one’ (Mat 13:38; *Twentieth Cent. NT* renders simply ‘the wicked,’ evading a personal significance in τοῦ πονηροῦ); ‘of Gehenna’ (Mat 23:15); ‘of perdition’ (Joh 17:12); ‘of the resurrection’ (Luk 20:36). (b) = *characterized by certain qualities*: ‘sons of thunder’ (Mar 3:17); ‘of peace’ (Luk 10:6); ‘of light’ (Joh 12:36); ‘of wisdom’ (*τέκνα*, Mat 11:19 = Luk 7:35); as similarly ‘of consolation’ in Act 4:36 (this without reference to the correctness of the etymology indicated). (c) = *descendants*: ‘sons of them that slew the prophets’ (Mat 23:31); ‘of Israel’ (Mat 27:9, Luk 1:16); ‘of Abraham’ (*τέκνα*, Joh 8:39; *υἱός*, Luk 19:9; cf. Luk 13:16).

Deissmann (*Bible Studies*, pp. 161-166) labours to modify the common explanation of such circumlocutory forms as Hebraisms and due to ‘the Oriental spirit of language’ (Buttmann, quoted in *loc. cit.*). As features of NT diction he is willing to see in them a ‘Hebraism of translation’ (due to Semitic originals rather than to a Hebraistic style or habit in the writers themselves), but is eager to maintain that such constructions are not foreign to the genius of Greek. He is not, however, entirely successful. Of course, the use of the phrase ‘sons of’ as = inhabitants or descendants, may be widely paralleled in various languages (as, e.g., the Homeric *υἱες Ἀχαιῶν* = *Ἀχαιοί*); but in manifold other uses, especially as in (b) above, the case is different. The expression *υἱὸς τύχης* (in Horace, *filius fortunæ*) is noteworthy, but ‘one swallow does not make a summer’; and, moreover, Plato’s use of *ἔκγονος*, specially adduced by Deissmann, hardly affords a true parallel. In *Phædr.* 275 D [Note: Deuteronomist.] , e.g., τὰ ζαγορίας ἔκγονα, denoting the *productions* of art, a painter’s *works*, falls short of such uses as are indicated in (b), whereby personal qualities are described. The expression is, on the other hand, so characteristic of Semitic speech as to amount to an idiom, and the OT writings abound in it. Its occurrence in the NT is best explained in this connexion: and it is difficult to think that it might have occurred in exactly the same way had the writers been writing in an independent Greek style.

3. An arresting feature in the teaching of Jesus is His description of men as the sons ($\nu\iota\omicron\iota$, τέκνα) of God. The most conspicuous name that He uses for God in His relation to men is that of 'Father,' usually with the Jewish addition of 'in heaven' or 'heavenly.' Some of His most noticeable parables and illustrative sayings are based on the relation of father and son as best representing the relation between God and man (see, e.g., Luk_15:11 ff., Mat_7:9 ff.). See artt. Children of God, Son of God.

Notice may be taken of the curious phrasing of Luk_20:36 $\nu\iota\omicron\iota$ εἰσὶν θεοῦ τῆς ἀναστάσεως $\nu\iota\omicron\iota$ ὄντες. This *per se* seems to limit the description 'sons of God' to those who are accounted worthy to attain the resurrection life (Luk_20:35). They 'are sons of God *through* being sons of the Resurrection' (Weymouth). Or perhaps we may equally well interpret by saying that the fact of their having risen *shows* that they are God's sons. It has to be pointed out, however, that this is part of an expansion of our Lord's reply to the Sadducees quite peculiar to Lk., presenting a striking divergence from the Synoptic parallels. It seems to be merely an amplification of the term ἰσαγγελοὶ, itself a Lukan ἀπαξλεξ. for the simpler ὡς ἄγγελοι of Mt. and Mk. At any rate, it cannot be pressed so as to conflict with the general representation of men as being all God's sons in one way and another, found so often in the Gospels. A connexion with Rom_8:19 may be suggested (cf also phrasing in Rom_1:4).

4. The term 'son' is used of Jesus Himself in various ways. (α) In the ordinary sense of the word He is described as 'the son of Joseph' and 'the son of Mary.' See Mar_6:3 = Mat_13:55 = Luk_4:22, Joh_6:42 (cf. Joh_1:45) is also in close agreement with Luk_4:22, with the interesting addition, 'whose father and mother we know.' (This is one of the smaller points in which the Johannine Gospel stands on a basis of common tradition with the Synoptics). The expression in Mat_13:55 ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός, may possibly have originally meant no more than ὁ τέκτων in Mar_6:3. Cheyne's conjecture, that 'Jesus the son of Joseph' may mean 'Jesus a member of the house of Joseph' (*Ebi [Note: Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.]* ii. 2598), may be ingenious, but is an unnecessary departure from tradition. We cannot arbitrarily push aside the plain suggestions of the Birth-narratives and the genealogies as to the personality of Joseph in this connexion.

It is to be pointed out that it is only in the account of the visit to Nazareth, as above, that the Synoptists explicitly indicate such a designation of Jesus. (The Johannine instances are in quite different connexions). Corresponding references to His parentage are found, however, in such passages as Luk_2:22-51 ('his father and his

mother,' 'his parents,' 'thy father and I') and Mar 3:31 ff. with its parallels. τέκνον as applied to Jesus occurs just once, in Luk 2:48. The dominant presentment of our Lord in the Gospels transcends the interest attaching to simple human relations. See also the following three articles.

J. S. Clemens.

☩ Sons Of Thunder

SONS OF THUNDER.—See Boanerges.

☩ Sop

SOP

1. *The meaning of the word.*—'Sop' occurs in Authorized and Revised Versions only in Joh 13:26 bis. 27, 30 (AVm [Note: Vm Authorized Version margin.] 'morsel'). It is akin in derivation to 'sup' and 'soup,' and denotes food soaked in liquid before being eaten. The Gr. word in each case is ψωμίον, dim. of ψωμός, 'a morsel.' ψωμίον does not occur in LXX Septuagint, but ψωμός is found in Rth 2:14, Job 31:17, and in Authorized and Revised Versions is rendered 'morsel.' Its use in Ruth—'Dip thy morsel (ψωμόν) in the vinegar'—is exactly analogous to that of ψωμίον in John.

2. *The nature of the sop given to Judas.*—Edersheim (*LT [Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].] ii.* 506) and others, on the ground especially of the definite art. (τὸ ψωμίον. Edersheim says, 'Mark the definite article—not "a sop"'), hold that it was a specific sop, used at the Passover supper in the time of Christ, which consisted of a piece of the flesh of the Paschal lamb, a piece of unleavened bread, and some bitter herbs, all wrapped together and dipped in the *harôseth*—a sauce made of raisins, dates, and other fruits, mixed with vinegar—and then passed round to the company by the host. Jesus, as the host at the Last Supper, would hand this sop, first of all, to Judas, who is supposed to have occupied the place of chief honour at the table (see art. Passover [I.], p. 326^b, and Upper Room). It is not enough to brush this view aside, as Meyer does, on the ground that, according to John, the Last Supper was not a Passover meal; for, even though it was not the regular Passover of the Jews, it may have been a Supper of a similar kind (see art. Passover [II.], p.

327^b). On the other hand, Edersheim's argument from the definite art. is precarious, since its use in v. 26b is doubtful (see WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.]); and, in any case, the Evangelist, writing long afterwards and with a profound sense of the momentous character of the incident, probably wrote 'the sop,' meaning thereby 'the tragic sop,' 'that fatal sop'—which sealed the traitor's doom. It seems much more probable, then, that this sop was not the specific Paschal sop passed round to the company by the host, but a particular sop that Jesus offered to Judas on purely personal grounds. At an Oriental feast the host sometimes presented a guest with a special tit-bit from the food on the table, as a distinguishing mark of his favour. And it was not by any accident of Judas' position at the table, but because of a deep purpose in the heart of Jesus, that this sop was given.

3. Its significance.—This offering of the sop to Judas, which is not mentioned by the Synoptists (though Mt. and Mk. make Jesus say that the betrayer should be the one who dipped his hand with Him in the dish [Mat 26:23, Mar 14:20]), comes before us with a double significance. (a) It was a sign given to the beloved disciple, in response to his question, 'Lord, who is it?' that Judas was the one of the company who was about to betray his Master (Joh 13:25-26). (b) But it was much more than this. There was nothing hypocritical on Christ's part in the action. He did not make a show of friendliness to Judas merely for the sake of giving John a private sign. What was commonly understood to be a token of hospitable goodwill was, without doubt, meant in this case to be the expression of a feeling deeper than any ordinary human affection, and at the same time to be a last appeal to the better nature of this erring disciple, with a note of warning underlying the appeal (cf. Joh 13:18; Joh 13:21). A whole world of blessed possibility lay for Judas in that proffered sop; Divine love was in it, and free forgiveness, and full restoration—if only he would repent of his meditated crime. And just because of the immensity of meaning that lay in Christ's gift was the awfulness of its result. Judas 'received the sop' (Joh 13:30), and doubtless ate it. He understood what Jesus wished him to understand—the mingled love and warning and promise and appeal that lay in His act. But at this crisis of his fate he closed his ears to Christ's offers and his heart to Christ's grace. And immediately the light that still lingered in him was turned into darkness. For 'after the sop, then [τότε—at that very moment] Satan entered into him.' 'The violent effort he made to close his heart to the heavenly power opened it to the powers of evil' (Godet). Jesus knew that all was over. 'That thou doest,' He said, 'do quickly' (Joh 13:27). And so Judas, 'having received the sop, [note the significant repetition of the ominous word], 'went out straightway: and it was night.'

Literature.—The Lexx. s.vv. ψωμίον, ψωμός; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Sop'; the Comm. of Meyer, Godet, Westcott, Dods, *in loc.*; Edersheim, *LT* [Note: *T*

Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].] ii. 505 ff.; *ExpT [Note: xpT Expository Times.]* iii. [1891] 107; Martin, *Winning the Soul*, 17.

J. C. Lambert.

☩ Sorrow, Man Of Sorrows

SORROW, MAN OF SORROWS.—We shall find in the Gospels no theory of sorrow, or abstract discussion of the problem of pain and suffering. The problem is taken for granted, and a solution is given. The solution is experimental, and centres round the life of Christ. If we ask why sorrow comes, the answer is not speculative, but practical; we are simply pointed to His experience (Hebrews 12). Accordingly, the method of this article will be to deal first with Christ as the Man of Sorrows, and afterwards with the meaning of sorrow in human life generally, and particularly in the life of the Christian.

1. The ‘Man of Sorrows’—The phrase comes from Isa 53:3 (מְכַאֲבוֹת אֵיִשׁ; LXX Septuagint , ἄνθρωπος ἐν πληγῶν; Vulgate *virum dolorum*).

Objection has been taken (e.g. by Cheyne, G. A. Smith, Skinner, Workman) to the rendering ‘sorrows,’ ‘pains’ being preferred in this verse and the next as a nearer parallel to מַלְיָ (‘sickness’ rather than ‘grief’). But the *Oxford Heb. Lex.* gives many instances of both the vb. and noun as referring to *mental pain*, and classes this passage under that head. While allowing that the picture in Isaiah is primarily of physical suffering, we may without hesitation retain the familiar rendering of Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 .

The title is never applied to Christ in the NT. It belongs, in fact, to popular rather than to technical phraseology, expressing in picturesque form what the theologian means by speaking of Christ as the ‘Suffering Servant of Jehovah.’ Either phrase implies equally that the prophecy of Is 53 was in a true sense fulfilled in Him. Whatever may have been the primary historical bearing of that passage, it is generally admitted that in the time of Christ there was no expectation of a suffering Messiah. The indications of the Gospels and Acts agree completely with the evidence of pre-Christian Jewish literature. ‘The idea of the Messiah’s sufferings is not found in any Jewish document up to the close of the first century’ (Stanton, *Jewish and Christian Messiah*, p. 123). ‘Man of Sorrows’ would have been the last title to have caught the popular imagination of that age. ‘Son of David’ expressed the contemporary hopes of what the Messiah was to be. That the one title has been

entirely displaced by the other is significant. The one is national, more or less materialistic, pointing to an earthly kingdom. The other expresses the universal attraction of Christ, His spiritual empire over the hearts of men, and the means by which His influence has been won. See, further, art. Messiah.

2. The nature of the sorrows of Christ.—Though, as noted above, the phrase ‘Man of Sorrows’ may be retained as the translation of Isa 53:3, there can be little doubt that the general picture of the passage in its literal sense is of one visited with the extreme of physical suffering, a Job; many see in it the description of a leper, as in Psalms 88. If the view is correct that it was never intended to apply to an individual, but was typical of the nation, or of part of it, it will none the less remain true that the figure the writer has chosen is that of bodily sickness. The sorrows of Christ were not of this nature, nor was His appearance unattractive, still less repulsive, as of one suffering from a loathsome disease. In the Gospels but little stress is laid on the physical sufferings even of the last days. He Himself expressly deprecates so doing (Luk 23:28). He once refers to the privations of His life (Luk 9:58) in order to check one who had not counted the cost of discipleship. A single word from the Cross (Joh 19:28) has to do with His bodily needs. Where the thought of His own sufferings comes to His mind, the impression we have is of spiritual sorrow (Mar 10:32; Mar 14:34; Mar 15:34, Luk 12:50, Joh 12:27), and commentators of all schools have connected this sorrow with His contact and conflict with sin. He sighs at the presence of the deaf and dumb man (Mar 7:34). When face to face with death, He is moved with sympathetic compassion (Luk 7:13); He groans in spirit, is troubled, and weeps (Joh 11:33). The underlying thought in these passages seems to be His sense of what lies behind human suffering. So it is different degrees of sin at which His sorrow is implied or expressed;—dulness, unbelief, or hardness of heart in the disciples (Mat 16:8, Mar 8:21; Mar 9:19; Mar 10:14; Mar 14:27; Mar 14:37, Luk 22:38, Joh 14:9);—the wilful blindness and opposition of His countrymen (Mar 3:5; Mar 6:6; Mar 8:12, Luk 13:15). Specially significant are the laments over Jerusalem (Mat 23:37, Luk 19:41). He is grieved at ingratitude (Luk 17:17), at lack of hospitality (Luk 7:44), at the profanation of the Temple (Mat 21:12), above all, at the treachery of Judas (Mat 26:20, Joh 13:21). He feels sorrowful compassion over the multitude without a shepherd (Mat 9:36, Mar 6:34). On the other hand, His joy is specially mentioned at the conquest or removal of sin (Mat 18:13, Luk 10:21; Luk 15:5). A study of these passages will show the sense in which He was a Man of Sorrows. On the one hand, He was brought into a relation to sin from which His nature shrank, and which even seemed at its climax to lead to a separation from God (Mar 15:34). On the other hand, in His conflict against sin He was spiritually alone. He knew more clearly than any the nature of sin and its results. He saw what man might be if he chose, and what in fact he was. He realized every hour the tragic irony of the situation, that He had come to His own and they would not receive Him. The horror of His rejection by His countrymen lay not so much in the suffering it implied for

Himself, as in their own loss of opportunity. Isaiah 53 was profoundly true. Men did not perceive or desire the beauty of His holiness. They despised and rejected His message; they hid their face from Him because they could not bear to look on the splendour of the goodness and love He came to reveal.* [Note: From this point of view the nearest parallel to Christ is Jeremiah, the 'man of sorrows' of the OT. There, too, we have the one standing in moral solitude over against the whole nation, in bitterness of soul because he knows that none will listen to his message. If, as is often thought, his experience had some share in moulding the conception of Isaiah 53, that chapter forms a close link between him and Christ, pointing back to the one and forward to the other (cf. G. A. Smith, Isaiah, vol. ii. ch. 2, etc.).]

3. The necessity of sorrow in the life of Christ came from the spiritual character of His work. From the point of view of the disciples, and the popular conception of the Messiah, a certain amount of conflict and hardship could readily be allowed for. The Roman could not be expected to yield without a blow; and as it became clear that opposition from within His own nation was to be expected, temporary disappointments and misunderstandings would fall within the disciples scheme of the future. They were ready for the hardships of an earthly struggle, *i.e.* to drink His cup as they understood it. They were not prepared for the Cross, because they had not a deep enough conception of His work. Not Roman or Sadducee, but sin, was the enemy; His end was the establishment of a spiritual and universal empire. The national mission of the Son of David had passed into the world-wide mission of the Servant of Jehovah,† [Note: See Workman, The Servant of Jehovah, ch. vii.] and the means which might have sufficed for the one would no longer serve the other. His work moved on a higher plane, and the weapons of His warfare must be more mysterious and spiritual than any outward miracle. These weapons were the attractive and atoning power of service, and sorrow. Mar_10:45 shows this clearly. The Cross, the life of service, and all it implied of sorrow and suffering, were necessary because He had come to give His life a ransom for many (cf. Joh_12:32).

The fuller discussion of the redemptive value of Christ's sufferings belongs to other articles (see art. Atonement). It must suffice here to insist on what all theories admit, that only as Sufferer could He be Saviour. He had come to serve God as man; therefore suffering was necessary to the perfection of His obedience (Heb_2:10; Heb_5:8). It is a fact of history that as the Sufferer He has conquered and drawn men unto Him. The title 'Man of Sorrows' expresses, more perhaps than any other, His attractive power; it has been the inspiration of Christian art and music. The thought underlying it is not primarily any logical theory of Atonement, but the all-embracing sympathy of the God-man. His 'Come unto me' (Mat_11:28) is a comfortable word, because it is spoken by One 'who, in that he himself suffered being tempted, is able to succour them that are tempted' (Heb_2:18; Heb_3:15, cf. Mat_8:17).

4. The Christian conception of sorrow.—Sorrow is, properly speaking, a psychological term, being a description of a state of mind. It should be distinguished from the suffering, mental or physical, which may be its occasion. We may define it as the sense of discord, the consciousness that things are not as they should be, in ourselves, or in the world. It is an experience peculiar to man, and can be attributed to animals only by an effort of personification.* [Note: See the remarkable passage in Rom 8:22, where Nature is represented as sharing in the imperfection and hopes of man. Cf. Sanday-Headlam, ad loc.] In the fact of its being a privilege peculiar to man we may begin to see something of its purpose.

‘The inherent necessity in man of sorrow ... testifies that his essential constitution and nature, as man, is something which all this world’s life and the conditions of it—by the very fact that they are what they are—cannot match and cannot satisfy. The very constitution of his being and the necessary conditions of his life are out of harmony together. They do not and cannot fit; the one is too small to satisfy the other. Set man, being what man is, in this world, as the conditions of this world are, and the necessary result is, sooner or later, sorrow’ (Moberly, *Sorrow, Sin, and Beauty*, p. 7).

To a creature made in the image of God, sorrow is the necessary condition of the struggle against sin in an imperfect world. Given the fact of sin, suffering ceases to be a problem. Only in a perfect state could it be desirable that sorrow and sighing should flee away.

Hence if sorrow is a privilege of man as a spiritual being, we shall expect to find that it is in a special sense the privilege of the Christian. The second Beatitude (Mat 5:4) speaks absolutely of its blessedness. The underlying thought seems to be that dissatisfaction with things as they are will lead to the effort to right them. Discord within the soul, *i.e.* sin, is specially in view. Mourning is the evidence of the break-up of the self-complacency which is the chief obstacle to the Kingdom of God. Sorrow, indeed, is of no value unless it leads to the striving after higher things. There is no blessedness attached to vain regret for the past (Mat 25:11; Mat 27:3, Mar 10:22), or to the sorrow which finds its vent in weary sleep instead of in prayer (Luk 22:45). The bearing of pain, voluntary or otherwise, is in itself neutral; it is effective only when it is the means of rooting out from the self a cause of offence (Mat 5:29, etc.). The sorrow which is fruitful is the travail which issues in the birth of a new life (Joh 12:24; Joh 16:21). The one object of the purging is that the branch may bring forth more fruit (Joh 15:2).

If sorrow is a necessary accompaniment of the attempt to right things in oneself, it will also accompany the attempt to right things in the world. It was Christ’s experience, and it will be the experience of His followers (Joh 15:20 etc.) as they share His work. The traditional saying of Christ that ‘he who is near me is near the

fire' (Orig. *Hom. in Jer. xx. 3*) is at least authentic in spirit. The disciples must bear the cross He bears (Mar_8:34), drink His cup, and be baptized with His baptism (Mar_10:38), carry His yoke (Mat_11:29). The sword must pierce the Virgin's heart because of her nearness to Him (Luk_2:35); even the Innocents suffer unconsciously on account of their connexion with Him (Mat_2:16). The *via dolorosa* is the only road to union with Him.† [Note: It need hardly be added that this thought dominates the rest of the NT (e.g. Php_3:10, Col_1:24, 1Pe_4:13).]

In John 16 the sorrow of the disciples is contrasted with the transient joy of the world. The world rejoices (Joh_16:20) 'as having been freed from one who was a dangerous innovator as well as a condemner of its ways' (Westcott, *ad loc.*); *i.e.* it is satisfied to have no Christ, even to have removed Him, and is content with things as they are. The sorrow of the disciples is connected with the departure of Christ. The primary reference is to the immediate crisis, but in all ages His disciples will have sorrow in all that hinders their full vision of Him, the complete establishment of His Kingdom, and His return in glory. Though He has overcome the world, they must have tribulation in it, till the victory won ideally is realized in fact (Joh_16:33). Sorrow cannot be completely turned into joy till what is, is identical with what should be, till He returns again and we see Him as He is (1Jn_3:2). As we said before, we find no abstract discussion of the nature and meaning of sorrow. The solution of the problem is found in the experience of Christ, which is the experience of the Christian.* [Note: 'The real Christian looks at sorrow not from without, but from within, and does not approach its speculative difficulty till he is aware by experience of its practical power' (Lux Mundi¹⁵, p. 89).] Sorrow is bound up with every attempt to combat sin in the self and in the world. It is the reaction against sin, and those who feel this most keenly must drink most deeply of the cup. The consolation lies in the fact that the disciple is sharing the lot of His master here, and will share His joy hereafter (Mat_19:28, Rom_8:17, 2Ti_2:11).

5. Sorrow and happiness.—It would be an inadequate treatment of the teaching of Christ to conceive of sorrow merely as the condition of future happiness. Christianity is a religion of present happiness. An exultant joy is the note of the songs which hailed Christ's birth. Joy is a present fruit of the Spirit (Gal_5:22); the Kingdom of God is now joy and peace (Rom_14:17). The promises of the New Heaven and the New Earth are not purely eschatological; they belong, ideally at least, to our life now. One of the characteristic paradoxes of Christianity is that its sorrow and happiness coexist. Again we turn first to the experience of Christ. He is the Man of Sorrows, yet we cannot think of Him for a moment as an unhappy man. He rather gives us the picture of serene and unclouded happiness. Beneath not merely the outward suffering, but the profound sorrow of heart, there is deeper still a continual joy, derived from the realized presence of His Father, and the consciousness that He is doing His work. Unless this is remembered, the idea of the Man of Sorrows is sentimentalized and

exaggerated. And again the disciple shares the experience of His master. Neither Christ nor the true Christian can for a moment wish, like a Job or a Jeremiah, that he had never been born. The Beatitudes express His own humanly discovered secret of happiness; He has Himself known the blessedness or mourning, though never, of course, over His own sin, and He imparts the secret to His follower. And though the promises of John 16 can be completely realized only when the Christian departs to be with Christ (Php_1:23), yet even now His joy is in him and is fulfilled (Joh_15:11); even now, in prayer and in communion with Him, he knows the joy which no man can take from him (Joh_16:20; Joh_16:22; Joh_16:24). ‘Sorrowful, yet always rejoicing’ (2Co_6:10), is the paradox of the gospel, and each side of the paradox is needed to counteract an unbalanced view of life. On the one hand, sorrow is no figment of the imagination, to be thought away. It is a fact of life, and a necessary fact, necessary to the perfection of the sinless One, much more to our own; the condition of all progress and of all true work for God. This is the truth ignored by the ‘sky-blue’ optimism, which strives to live ever in the sunshine and blinds itself to sin.† [Note: See James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 80 ff.] On the other hand, sorrow is not the last word of life. The world is a κόσμος, a creation of order and beauty. We find in Christ’s teaching nothing of the sentimental attitude, which looks on suffering with complacency, as though it were good in itself. To Him evil is evil, and suffering is suffering; He came as the Saviour to destroy them.* [Note: So Harnack most admirably, in *What is Christianity?* ch. vi.] Here Christianity is in strong contrast to Buddhism, and to all forms of morbid asceticism. Bacon’s aphorism that ‘prosperity is the blessing of the OT, adversity the blessing of the NT,’ is true only when it is understood that beneath the adversity, and the sorrow of heart which it brings, there is even here and now the peace which passeth understanding, the joy which comes of union with Christ, of sympathy with man, and of work for God.

Literature.—Davidson, *OT Prophecy* (ch. 22); Stanton, *Jewish and Christian Messiah*; G. A. Smith, *Isaiah*, vol. ii.; Moberly, *Sorrow, Sin, and Beauty*; Du Bose, *Gospel in the Gospels*; *Lux Mundi*, ‘The Problem of Pain’; Workman, *The Servant of Jehovah*.

C. W. Emmet.

☩ Soul

SOUL.—In every act of thinking, a distinction exists between the thinker and his thought, or, as it is otherwise expressed, between the self and the not-self, the ego and the non-ego, the thinking subject and the object of thought. This ego, self, or thinking subject, is denominated *the soul* (ψυχή, שֵׁנָה, נַפְשׁוֹ), or *spirit* (πνεῦμα, רִיחַ; see

Spirit); often also, both in the OT and NT, *the heart* (καρδία, לֵב, לִב; see Heart). In the OT the soul is sometimes confused with the blood or with some important physical organ, but in the NT it is clearly distinguished from the body as an immaterial principle, the seat of conscious personality, and essentially immortal (Mat 10:28 etc.; see Immortality). There was much speculation in our Lord's time, and had been for some two centuries, on the mysterious questions of the soul's origin and destiny. Some, following Plato and Philo, believed in its eternal pre-existence (cf. Wis 8:19 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885); others (mainly orthodox Rabbis) in its creation at the creation of the world (cf. 2Es 4:35 ff.); others in its premundane creation (Slavonic Enoch 23:5); others (perhaps the majority) in its concreation with the body, which is apparently the doctrine of the OT (Isa 44:2; Isa 44:24; Isa 49:1; Isa 49:5, Job 31:15). A few supported the Platonic speculation of metempsychosis (so apparently Josephus; see *BJ* iii. viii. 5). The disciples of Jesus were aware of these discussions, and on one occasion asked Him whether a certain man had been born blind as a penalty for sins committed by him in a previous state of existence. It is a significant illustration of the economy of revelation that Jesus avoided entering upon the discussion (Joh 9:2).† [Note: The Creationist view of the soul's origin was held by all Jews in our Lord's time. The Traducianist hypothesis first appears in Tertullian (a.d. 200).]

1. The use of ψυχή in the Gospels.—In the Pauline Epistles, as is well known, there is frequently a decided difference of meaning between ψυχή and πνεῦμα. There ψυχή is used for the principle of life of the natural man, while πνεῦμα, is the principle of supernatural life which manifests itself in the regenerate Christian. Hence the derivative ψυχικός (literally 'soulish') comes to be used in a depreciatory, and even in a bad sense (1Co 12:14; 1Co 15:44, Jam 3:15, Jud 1:19). But in the Gospels there is no such distinction of usage. As applied to the human soul, ψυχή and πνεῦμα are synonyms throughout the range of their meaning. Thus in the sense of *natural life*, we have Mar 3:4, cf. Joh 13:37 (ψυχή); and Mat 27:50, cf. Luk 23:46, Joh 19:30 (πνεῦμα). (For the lower sense of πνεῦμα, cf. also Mar 8:12, Luk 8:55; Luk 24:37; Luk 24:39, Joh 11:33; Joh 13:21). ψυχή, as well as πνεῦμα, is used quite normally for the soul in its highest religious activities (see, e.g., Luk 1:46, where the identity of ψυχή and πνεῦμα is especially apparent; Mat 11:29; Mat 22:37, ||; cf. 1Pe 2:11; 1Pe 2:25; 1Pe 4:19, 2Pe 2:8 etc.; and even in the Pauline Epp. see 2Co 1:23, Eph 6:8, Php 1:27; cf. Heb 6:19; Heb 13:17). In one passage (Joh 10:24) ψυχή seems even to stand for the rational or deliberating faculty (λόγος, νοῦς). There is, however,

between ψυχή and πνεῦμα, as used in the Gospels, one slight distinction. ψυχή emphasizes more strongly than πνεῦμα the idea of individual personality. Hence ψυχαί (not πνεύματα) is used for ‘individuals’ or ‘persons’ (Act 27:37, 1Pe 3:20); and it is usual to speak of the salvation or loss of the ψυχή rather than of the πνεῦμα (Mat 6:25; Mat 10:39; Mat 16:25-26, Mar 8:35, Luk 9:24; Luk 17:33; Luk 21:19, Joh 12:25, Heb 10:39, Jam 1:21; Jam 5:20, 1Pe 1:9). Yet the salvation of the πνεῦμα is alluded to (1Co 5:5, 1Th 5:23). πνεῦμα, however, is not by any means a strictly impersonal term (see Mat 5:16, Heb 1:14). It is used like ψυχή to denote a disembodied soul (Luk 24:37; Luk 24:39, Heb 12:23, 1Pe 3:18, Rev 6:9; Rev 20:4). In Mat 12:18 (a quotation from Isa 42:1) God is said to possess a ψυχή. In Joh 4:24 He is said to be spirit (πνεῦμα).

The following particular statements about the soul (ψυχή) are made in the Gospels. As the principle of physical life it is sustained by food (Mat 6:25); as the organ of spiritual life it ‘magnifies the Lord’ (Luk 1:46). It is capable of physical and sensuous pleasure (Luk 12:19), also of spiritual rest and refreshment (Mat 11:29). It can suffer acute sorrow (Luk 2:35) and anxiety (Joh 10:24). It can grieve (Mat 26:38) and love (Mat 22:37). It can be lost and saved (Mat 10:39 etc.). At death it is yielded up (Joh 10:11; Joh 10:15; Joh 12:21), but survives as a personal self-conscious being (Mat 10:39 etc.).* [Note: It follows from this, that in the view of Jesus and the Twelve, the ψυχή and πνεῦμα of man are not distinct principles or entities, as, according to some, St. Paul affirms in 1Th 5:23, cf. Heb 4:12. The language of the Gospels makes decisively for the unity of the soul, and for a dichotomy of man (body and soul), not for a trichotomy (body, soul, and spirit).] See, further, Spirit.

2. Christ’s teaching about the soul.—According to Jesus, the soul, being a man’s inmost self, the seat of his self-conscious personality, and inherently immortal (Mat 10:28), is precious beyond all price. Nothing can be accepted in exchange for it, and the gain of the whole world will not compensate for its loss (Mat 16:26). Jesus drives home this truth in the parable of the Rich Fool, who said to his soul, ‘Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry’; and whom God rebuked with the awful words, ‘Thou fool, this night *they* (*i.e.* the ministers of my vengeance) require of thee thy soul’ (Luk 12:18-21). Much is said in the Gospels about the gain or loss of the soul, generally with a play upon the double meaning of ψυχή (‘life’ or ‘soul’). Most of these passages take the form of exhortations to martyrdom, as, for instance, Mat 10:39 ‘He that findeth his soul (*i.e.*

he that saves his life by denying me in time of persecution), shall lose it (by eternal punishment in Gehenna); and he that loseth his soul for my sake (*i.e.* he who confesses me in time of persecution, and suffers a martyr's death), shall find it (in heaven)'; (see also Mat 16:25, Luk 17:33, Joh 12:35). All these passages refer primarily to martyrdom, but in their secondary applications teach that even lesser sufferings and trials endured patiently for Christ's sake have as their reward the salvation of the soul (Mat 10:38). The same idea is expressed in Luk 14:26, where the strange phrase 'to hate the soul' is a rhetorical expression for willingness to suffer martyrdom or any lesser inconvenience for Jesus' sake (cf. also Joh 12:25). The gain or salvation of the soul means certainly its eternal happiness in heaven, and the loss or destruction of the soul, as certainly, not its annihilation, but its eternal punishment in Gehenna. The endlessness of the soul's final retribution is not simply an inference from the soul's immortality, but is exegetically established from Mat 25:46 etc. According to the conceptions represented in the parable of Dives and Lazarus, retribution does not wait till the Last Day, but begins as soon as the soul leaves the body. At death the disembodied soul passes to a 'middle state' (Hades), where, if righteous, it experiences rest and refreshment in 'Abraham's bosom,' or 'Paradise'; or, if unrighteous, expiatory punishment (symbolized as a tormenting flame) in a *limbus* or 'prison,' which is separated by an impassable barrier from the abodes of the righteous. The disembodied souls are represented as conscious and intelligent, able to converse with one another, and interested in the welfare of their friends upon earth (Luk 16:19; Luk 23:43, 1Pe 3:18, Rev 6:9).

The most important question about the intermediate state is whether spiritual change is possible in it. The point has been keenly debated, but the affirmative opinion seems to have the better exegetical support. For (1) the NT represents not death, but the Second Advent, as the time when the soul will render its final account to God. Presumably; therefore, the middle state is included in the period of probation. (2) Christ appears to the present writer to teach that some sins may be forgiven after death (Mat 12:32); and at least to hint that even grievous sinners may be released from torments, after adequately expiating their crimes (Mat 5:26). (3) The torments of Dives seem to have been remedial in effect, causing him for the first time to interest himself in the spiritual welfare of others (Luk 16:27). (4) The descent of Christ into Hades, and His preaching to the disobedient spirits there (1Pe 3:18), plainly presuppose the possibility of repentance after death.* [Note: the striking words of Clement of Alexandria: 'The Apostles, following the Lord, preached the gospel to those in Hades.... [God's] punishments [in Hades) are saving and disciplinary, leading to conversion, and choosing rather the repentance than the death of a sinner.... Did not the same dispensation obtain in Hades, so that even there, all the souls, on hearing the preaching, might either exhibit repentance, or confess that their punishment was just because they believed not?' (Strom. vi. 6). See also the Shepherd of Hermas, Simil. ix. 16: 'These Apostles and teachers, having fallen asleep, preached

also to those who had fallen asleep before them, and themselves gave the seal of their preaching.’]

At the Last Day, according to Jesus, there will be a bodily resurrection of all men, followed by a final judgment, and a final settlement of the destiny of each soul (Mat 25:31-46). The resurrection of the wicked is clearly taught in Mat 10:28, Joh 5:29. See, further, Resurrection of the Dead, Eschatology, Abraham (§ ‘Abraham’s bosom’), Paradise, Hell [Descent into].

Jesus claimed to stand in the same relation to human souls as God Himself; and as the Lord of souls issued the universal invitation, ‘Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden ... and ye shall find rest unto your souls’ (Mat 11:28-29). He also declared that His special object in coming into the world was to save souls (Luk 9:56) by laying down His own soul as a ransom (Joh 10:11; Joh 10:15; Joh 17:3).

3. The soul of Jesus.—If Jesus was perfect man, it follows that He must have possessed not only a human body, but also a human soul and a human spirit; and this is, in fact, the doctrine of the Gospels and of the NT generally. Thus He came to give His soul (ψυχήν) a ransom for many (Mat 20:28 | |). After the interview with the Greeks (Joh 12:27), His soul (ψυχή) was troubled, and He doubted what to say. In Gethsemane His soul was exceeding sorrowful (περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή μου, Mat 26:38 | |). There are similar references to His human spirit. He groaned (or was angry) in spirit (ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι, Joh 11:33); and was troubled in spirit (ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι, Joh 13:21). On the cross He commended His spirit to God (παραιτήμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου, Luk 23:46), and yielded up His spirit (ἀφῆκε τὸ πνεῦμα, Mat 27:50; παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα, Joh 19:30). After death, His Divine Personality, still in hypostatic (*i.e.* personal) union with His disembodied human spirit, descended to Hades, and there preached to the disobedient spirits in prison (1Pe 3:18, cf. Eph 4:9); visiting also, we infer from Luk 23:43, that compartment of Hades which is reserved for the spirits of the just. It is obvious from these and other passages, that the view of Apollinaris that Christ did not possess a human soul,* [Note: Apollinaris admitted that Jesus possessed the lower or animal soul (ψυχή ἄλογος), but denied to Him the distinctively human or rational soul (ψυχή λογική).] but that the Divine Logos took its place, is not Scriptural. The soul and spirit of Jesus were subject to human weakness and infirmity, and were therefore human, not Divine.

But the rejection of Apollinarism, and the adoption of the view that Christ possessed a perfect human soul, involves a great psychological difficulty. A perfect human soul

is *personal*, and therefore, if Christ was perfect God and perfect man, it seems to follow that He must have been *two persons*, as Nestorius thought, or was supposed to think. This difficulty has never yet received a full solution. The solution of the ancient Church was that the human nature of the incarnate Christ was *impersonal*. The human ψυχή of Christ, which, under normal conditions, would have developed independent personality, was prevented, owing to its hypostatic union with the Logos, from doing so. It attained personality, not in itself, but in the Divine Logos with which it was united; and hence, though Christ possessed a true human ψυχή, His personality was single, being seated entirely in the Divine Nature. The Patristic view is open to criticism on several grounds, but it still holds the field as the best attempt to reconcile the two apparently conflicting principles of Scripture, that Christ is perfect God and perfect man, and yet only one Person.† [Note: The details of the question are in the highest degree intricate, and cannot be entered upon here. The reader may consult Dorner, Person of Christ, ii. i. 116 ff., 152 ff., 201 ff., 266 ff., for an acute criticism of the Patristic view. See also Ottley, Incarnation, pt. vii. 1. 4, 2. 2.]

4. The human will of Jesus.—Jesus, as possessing a human soul, possessed also a human will, for volition is one of the most characteristic activities of the soul. The Gospels regard Jesus as endowed with a human will, which, though in the end always conforming itself to the Divine will, yet did so sometimes at the cost of an inward struggle. Thus in the Agony in the Garden, Jesus prays (Luk 22:42), ‘Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me; nevertheless not my will, but thine be done’ (πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου, ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γινέσθω). The distinction of wills is evident also in Joh 5:30 (cf. Joh 6:38) ‘I seek not mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.’ It is thus the teaching of Scripture that there are two wills in Christ, a Divine and a human, and that these two wills are united in one Person. The reconciliation of the two different points of view (duality of will, and unity of Person) is not easy. According to modern ideas, the faculty of willing is so essentially a function of personality, that it seems necessary to postulate two egos where there are two wills. The ancients, however, did not connect willing with personality so closely as we do; and, moreover, ‘will’ is too strong a term to translate their θέλημα (*voluntas*). θέλημα, it is true, in its stronger sense, approaches the meaning of ‘will,’ but more often it bears the weaker sense of ‘wish,’ ‘liking,’ ‘inclination,’ ‘propension.’ The true Greek term for will in our sense is γνώμη, or more definitely προαίρεσις, or still more definitely αὐτεξουσιότης, or αὐτεξούσιον (self-determination). It is clearly in the weaker sense of ‘inclination’ that θέλημα is used in the Gospels, and it is probably in the same sense that Dyothelitism was declared by the Sixth General Council (a.d. 680) to be the doctrine of the Church.‡ [Note: On the Monothelite and Dyothelite question

see Dorner, op. cit. ii. i. 155 ff. The last word (even from the strictly orthodox point of view) has not yet been said upon this difficult subject.]

See also art. Incarnation in vol. i., esp, p. 812 f.

Literature.—M. F. Roos, *Fundamenta Psychologiæ ex sacra Scriptura collecta* (brief, but valuable); J. T. Beck, *Umriss der bibl. Seelenlehre* [English translation 1877]; Böttcher, *de Inferis* (a storehouse of Biblical and Rabbinical material); Olshausen, *de Nat. Human. Trichotomia* (in *Opusc. Theol.*); von Rudloff, *Die Lehre vom Menschen*; Franz Delitzsch, *Syst. d. bibl. Psychol.* [English translation 1867] (learned, but fanciful); J. Laidlaw, *The Bible Doctrine of Man*; J. B. Heard, *The Tripartite Nature of Man*; W. P. Dickson, *St. Paul's Use of Flesh and Spirit* (contains short bibliography); Ellicott, 'The Threefold Nature of Man,' in *The Destiny of the Creature*; W. R. Alger, *Destiny of the Soul* (contains exhaustive bibliography by Ezra Abbot); R. H. Charles, *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*; Salmond, *Christian Doctrine of Immortality*; F. W. H. Myers, *Human Personality and its Survival of Bodily Death*; Piat, *Destinée de l'homme*; Welldon, *The Hope of Immortality*; Martineau, *Study of Religion*, bk. 4; Mason, *Purgatory*; Plumptre, *Spirits in Prison*; Luckock, *After Death*; Pusey, *What is of faith as to Everlasting Punishment?*; C. Harris, *pro Fide*, c. [Note: circa, about.] xv.; A. Westphal, *Chair et Esprit*; Lüdemann, *Die Anthropologie des ap. Paulus*; art. 'Psychology' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible; art. 'Geist' in *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyclopädie fur protest. Theologic und Kirche.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; artt. 'Soul,' 'Eschatology,' 'Immortality of the Soul' in *JE* [Note: *E Jewish Encyclopedia.*] ; art. 'Eschatology' in *EBi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*] ; consult also OT Theologies of Schultz, Smend, Oehler; and the NT Theologies of Schmid, van Oosterzee, B. Weiss, Holtzmann.

C. Harris.

☞ South

SOUTH (νότος).—

1. *The locality indicated.*—The southern direction was called by the Hebrews *Têman* (Jer 49:20), that is, the country 'on the right side' to one facing eastwards in Palestine. In the same way their kinsmen and successors, the Moslem Arabs, called the southern part of their empire *Yemen*, the 'right hand' country, and designated Syria and Palestine to the North as *al-Shâm*, the 'left' region. The queen of Sheba was referred to as the queen of the South (Mat 12:42). In a more limited and special sense

the Hebrews gave the name 'South Country' to the wilderness of Judaea and the region lying beyond it (Jos 12:8, Act 8:26).

2. *Character of south wind*.—Passing over an area with little or no vegetation, it was both hot (Luk 12:55) and lacking in vitalizing power. The rarefaction produced by the sun's rays on the bare desert gave rise to whirlwinds, which gathered up the dust in tall swaying columns that moved like evil genii over the land until they suddenly broke and dispersed (Job 37:9, Zec 9:14). It was essentially a transition current, being the dry east wind shifting round towards the humid west. It thus partook of the nature of both, and resembled the close steamy air of a palm-house. The allusion in Job 37:17 is either to the lethargy induced by its enervating influence, or to the cool refreshment of the showers that usually follow it.

G. M. Mackie.

☞ Sowing

SOWING.—For 'sowing' as a metaphorical expression of the activity and influence of Christ and His Apostles, see under Seed. The Gospels further contain, however, three semi-proverbial uses of the term which merit notice.

1. One is in connexion with the counsel against worldly anxiety (Mat 6:26 = Luk 12:24 birds neither sow nor reap), where sowing denotes one of the ordinary operations and occupations of men in order to secure a livelihood. Jesus is here quoting a familiar proverb of the ancient world, which was current in several forms (e.g. 'aves sine patrimonio vivunt et in diem pascuntur').

2. In Mat 25:24; Mat 25:26 = Luk 19:21-22, a grasping, unscrupulous character is defined as one that reaps where it has not sown, *i.e.* enriches itself at the expense of other people. Several ancient parallels, both from Jewish (cf. Taylor's *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, 1897, p. 143) and from pagan (e.g. aelian, *Var. Hist.* iii. 46 and iv. 1; and Plato, *Leges*, xi 913 C) sources, are quoted for the second clause of the verse, which is probably to be taken as an expansion of the first.

3. Finally, two semi-proverbial (cf. e.g. Mic 6:15, Psa 126:5-6) sayings upon sowing, in a figurative sense, are preserved in Joh 4:36-37. Taken as part of the story of Jesus at Sychar, the passage starts from the responsiveness of the Samaritans to the gospel (their full-grown faith being contrasted with the indifference and unbelief of Judaism upon the whole). The sight of the Samaritans streaming out of the city suggests to Jesus that a rich harvest of souls is to be reaped here, and reaped apparently without

the usual delay and interval. Samaria is ripe already for the gospel. 'Four months more, then harvest,' may be the time in Nature; but here, in the order of the Spirit, sowing is hardly done ere reaping begins.

J. Moffatt.

♣ Sparrow

SPARROW.—See Animals in vol. i. p. 66^a.

♣ Spear

SPEAR.—This word occurs in NT only in Joh_19:34 'one of the soldiers pierced Jesus' side with a spear' (λόγχη). A comparison, however, of Mat_27:48 'put [the sponge] on a reed' (περιθεὶς καλάμῳ), makes it probable that in Joh_19:29 for ὑσσώπῳ περιθέντες, 'put it upon hyssop,' ὑσσῶ π. should be read. ὑσσός is the Roman *pilum* (Polybius, i. 40. 12, etc.). The head of this spear is said to have been buried within the principal church of Antioch, where, under direction of Peter of Amiens, it was discovered by the besieged Crusaders, and proved their salvation from the onslaught of the prince of Mosul in 1098.

T. H. Weir.

♣ Spices

SPICES (Lat. *species*).—The word denotes primarily the kind of a thing, a sample or specimen of anything. Then it means a certain touch or taste of something. More definitely, it denotes any aromatic or pungent substance. In general, spices are aromatic condiments used for seasoning food, or fragrant ointments used as perfumes. In the NT the term is used in both of these senses; and, in a few cases, it has a somewhat wider meaning.

In the Gospels there are several words used to describe various kinds of spices. It is scarcely possible to classify them. See artt. Myrrh, Frankincense, Nard, Spikenard, Mint, Anise, Cummin, Rue.

Spices (Gr. ἀρώματα, Lat. *aromata*) are mentioned in Mar 16:1, Luk 23:56; Luk 24:1, Joh 19:40. We have here probably a general term to denote the mixed spices used in embalming the bodies of the dead.

Francis R. Beattie.

Spies

SPIES (ἐγκάθετοι, best derived from ἐγκαθίημι, ‘to send down in (secret)’ [Grimm-Thayer], ‘men suborned to lie in wait’; Vulgate *insidiatores*).—Though the word occurs only once in the Gospels (Luk 20:20; cf. Job 19:12; Job 31:9, Sir 8:11), there is abundant evidence of a regular system of espionage directed against Jesus from the time when He first attracted the notice of the ruling classes. Emissaries were sent from Jerusalem for this purpose (Mar 7:1 and Mat 15:1 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), and in the latter portion of His public ministry He could hardly speak in any synagogue or other public place without seeing some of these spies in His audience. Their action is variously described: (1) ‘They watched him’ (παρατηρεῖν, παρατηρεῖσθαι, ‘to watch insidiously, in a furtive manner’—‘ex obliquo et occulto,’ Bengel); cf. Mar 3:2 = Luk 6:7; Luk 14:1; Luk 20:20, where Authorized and Revised Versions add ‘him,’ though the verb is probably used generally of watching for an opportunity. (2) ‘They began to press upon him vehemently, and to provoke him to speak of many things (ἀποστοματίζειν, αὐτόν), laying wait for him to catch something out of his mouth’ (ἐνεδρεῦοντες αὐτόν θηρεῦσαι τι ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, Luk 11:54), where ἀποστοματίζειν is explained by Euthym. Zig. as ἀπαιτεῖν αὐτοσχεδίου καὶ ἀνεπισκέπτους ἀποκρίσεις ἐρωτημάτων δολερῶν (the Vulgate gives *os ejus opprimere*, as if from a reading ἐπιστομίζειν). So Luk 20:20 tells how the chief priests and scribes watched and ‘sent forth spies, which feigned themselves to be righteous, that they might take hold of his speech, so as to deliver him up to the rule and to the authority of the governor.’ The putting of the question about the tribute money, which immediately follows, was a cunning plot, in which the Pharisees and the Herodians, two mutually hostile parties, joined (cf. for a similar union in Galilee, Mar 3:6). The Pharisees sent their disciples (Mat 22:16), young men apparently, fresh, earnest, zealous, and anxious to do right, hoping thus to avoid exciting suspicion of their designs. St. Mark (Mar 12:13) describes their object as ‘that they might catch him in talk’ (ἵνα αὐτόν ἀγρεύσωσι λόγῳ); St. Matthew (Mat 22:15) says

they took counsel ‘how they might ensnare him in his talk’ (παγιδεύσασιν ἐν λόγῳ), the verb used being from παγίς, ‘a trap or snare,’ into which if He fell He would be held fast with a view to further proceedings. Compare also Mat 19:3, Joh 11:46, and Luk 19:39 where some Pharisees mingled with the rejoicing multitude, no doubt for a similar purpose. The murmuring in favour of Jesus mentioned in Joh 7:32 was possibly reported to the Pharisees by spies. Christ was always conscious of the presence of such men, and on these occasions seemed to court publicity for His actions; cf. the direction to the man with the withered hand, ‘Stand forth’ (Mar 3:3). The futility of the system of espionage as directed against Him was shown at the trial, where all their efforts resulted in inability to bring forward anything as a charge except His words about the Temple.

The use of spies for a different purpose, viz. to facilitate His arrest, is implied in Mar 14:1, where His enemies sought how they might take Him with subtilty (ἐν δόλῳ), and in Joh 11:57 by the command that if any man knew where He was he should give information (μηνύσει), that they might take Him. Such a measure was necessary because of His popularity with the multitude. In this sense Judas was the great spy, being in close touch with Jesus, and familiar with all His movements,—a fact which explains the roundabout directions given to the two Apostles as to where they should prepare the Passover meal. It was essential that Judas should not know the place beforehand, in order that the solemn proceedings and Christ’s last discourse might not be interrupted by the coming of the band from the priests to effect His arrest.

W. H. Dundas.

☞ Spikenard

SPIKENARD (= ‘spiked nard’).—The Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 rendering of *νάρδος πιστική* in Mar 14:3, Joh 12:3, or rather of the Vulgate *nardi spicati* (in Jn. *nardi pistici*). The word ‘spikanard’ (*sic*) appears first in Wyclif’s version, the Anglo-Saxon having merely ‘deorwyrðes’ (= ‘precious’). Tindale has ‘pure.’ These various translations indicate the doubt as to the meaning of the Greek, which was felt from very early times, and is reflected in the Versions generally. The oldest Syriac version and some Old Latin texts simply transliterate, while the Peshitta renders by *rishâyâ* (= ‘choicest’). Of the various explanations of the word *πιστική*, the most generally accepted are: (1) ‘Genuine,’ as though it were connected with *πίστις*

(Meyer, Weiss, etc.). The word πιστικός does actually occur in Artemidorus (*Oneir.* 2. 32) in the sense of 'faithful' (γυνή πιστική καὶ οἰκουρός); and we learn from Pliny (*HN* xii. 26) that adulterations of nard were frequent.* [Note: Theophylact, τὴν ἄδολον νάρδον καὶ μετὰ πίστεως κατασκευασθεῖσαν (Com. on St. Mark. Migne, Pat. Gr. cxxix.)] (2) 'Liquid,' as though it was connected with πίνω. Ovid (*Ars. Am.* iii. 443) uses the epithet *liquida* with *nardus*; and Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* ii. viii. 64) distinguishes between μύρα ὑγρὰ and μύρα ξηρὰ. (3) 'Drinkable.' Athenaeus tells us that some unguents were drunk (689 C). But the Greek word for *drinkable* is ποτός, not πιστικός.† [Note: Scaliger derived the word from πῖσσειν, 'to pound.' But this does not give a satisfactory sense.] Some have suspected a 'primitive error' in the text here, and have proposed various emendations. It has been suggested that the true reading is Ἴνδικῆς. All our authorities agree in stating that the genuine nard came from India, while inferior sorts came from other countries. Others would read σπικατήσ (= Vulgate *spicati*), a word found in Galen, vi. 178 C, 182 C, E. Naber (*Mnemosyne*, 1902, pp. 1-15) conjectures an original form, σπειστικῆς (= 'liquid'), which, being a ἄπαιστος λεγόμενον, might have been corrupted into πιστικῆς. Prof. E. N. Bennett (*Classical Review*, 1890, p. 319) suggests that the true form may be πιστάκης, and points out that the resin of the *Pistacia terebinthus* was anciently mixed with the oil of nard, and that it was a very valuable scent (Dioscorides, i. 91). All these emendations, however, ingenious and interesting as they are, are rendered improbable by the fact that neither in St. Mark nor in St. John is there any variation in the Manuscripts .

It is difficult to say with anything like certainty what the meaning of the word was. It may be a local name, as (Revised Version margin) suggests.* [Note: Ὀπιστικῆς (from Opis, near Babylon), ψιττακιῆς (from Psittake on the Tigris), and Πίστης (from the (?) Persian town Pisteira) have been suggested as possible readings. But none of these is an Indian town.] Possibly it is the Greek equivalent of *Pisitá*, one of the Skr. names for *Nardostachys jatamansi* (Dymock, *Pharmacographia Indica*, ii. p. 233). But most likely it is a technical term denoting some specially valuable kind of nard.† [Note: This idea is found as early as Theophylact (c. 1077 a.d.), who says that the word may denote εἶδος νάρδου σῦτω λεγόμενον.] Modern experience goes to show how easily the exact meaning of similar technical or 'fancy' names can be lost. Such has probably been the case with the word we are discussing. See also artt. Nard, Ointment.

Literature.—See the authorities cited at end of art. Nard. The question is discussed by C. F. A. Fritzsche (*Com. on St. Mark*, Leipzig, 1830) at great length, and very fully by Morison (*Com. on Mk., in loc.*).

H. W. Fulford.

✚ Spinning

SPINNING.—From very early times in Palestine, spinning of wool and flax by means of hand-spindles was one of the common occupations, especially of women. Jesus referred to spinning (νήθειν) in teaching God's providential care, even of the lilies of the field, which are richly clothed though they neither toil nor spin (Mat 6:28, Luk 12:27).

E. B. Pollard.

✚ Spirit

SPIRIT (πνεῦμα).—This word occupies a very important place in the writings of the Evangelists, covers a wide area of thought, and is not always clearly defined as to the particular use it is put to in a given context. The prominent place thus assigned to the word may be considered as indicative of the position which the principal idea embodied by it fills in the general scheme of constructive Christian psychology. In this respect we have a good example of the almost instinctively creative power of Jewish, and especially of Christian-Jewish, religious thought. In classical writings πνεῦμα is found largely employed in a physiological sense (cf. τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, 2Th 2:8; and for a similar use see Joh 3:8, Heb 1:7), but in them it never appears as a psychological term, as it does so often in Biblical writings both of the OT and the NT (see Cremer's *Bibl.-Theol. Lex. s.v.*).

The determining factor in the employment of this word by NT writers is the profound belief, inherited from the prophets and teachers of the OT, that there existed from the very beginning a unique fellowship between God and man (cf. πνοήν ζωῆς, Gen 2:7 [LXX Septuagint]). In spite of much and repeated unfaithfulness on man's part (cf. the difficult, though, for our present purpose, the sufficiently significant passage, 'My spirit shall not remain [καταμείνη] for ever in man,' Gen 6:3), this

fellowship continued to be realized more and more intensely as one generation succeeded another, and warriors and poets, prophets and priests, all found their inspiration in the firm belief that the Spirit of God was the living motive power animating their words and deeds.

There can be no doubt that the Incarnation formed the culminating point, as well as the final guarantee of the truth, of this historic realization. Henceforth there was established in the human consciousness a relationship between God and man which can be conveyed only in terms expressive of the closest mutual intimacy and communion. Not only can it be asserted that God's Spirit 'dwells in' man, but the counterpart of that truth consists in the resultant abiding of man 'in the Spirit' (ἐν πνεύματι, Rom 8:9). The consequence of the Divine Spirit's activity in this sphere is the co-operative activity of man's spirit attesting the reality of the relationship and working towards 'the righteousness of God' (Rom 10:3, 2Co 5:21; cf. Rom 8:10-16). The Pauline identification of 'the Spirit of Christ' and 'the Spirit of God' is for us ultimately justified in the twofold story of the birth of Jesus, narrated, as we must think, from two distinct points of view. The Spirit of God was the operative agency by which the Incarnation was accomplished (Mat 1:18; Mat 1:20; cf. the interchangeable terms πνεῦμα ἅγιον and δύναμις Ἐψίστου, Luk 1:35). The revelation of the Sonship of Jesus followed immediately upon His anointing (ἐχρίσεν, Act 10:38) with the Holy Spirit, and the twofold connexion established by the Synoptists between this revelation and His Temptation seems to establish beyond doubt that, in their opinion, the consciousness of Jesus became then for the first time fully alive to the wondrous position which He occupied, and to the character of the work He was destined to undertake (cf. the burden of the heavenly message ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, and the implied doubt repeated in the Temptation εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, as well as the part played by the Spirit in each of these incidents, Mat 3:16; Mat 4:1 ff., Mar 1:11 f., Luk 3:22; Luk 4:1 ff., also Joh 1:32 f.; see Plummer, 'St. Luke,' in *ICC [Note: CC International Critical Commentary.]*, *ad loc.*).

The realization of the abiding presence of the Spirit continued to be for Jesus the dominating feature in His ministry of power (see Mat 12:28; cf. the corresponding expression ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ, Luk 11:20), and gives terrible force and point to His solemn warning against that continued deliberate opposition to His claims which springs from love of darkness and obedience to the spirit of evil. Here, too, lay the secret of that absolute conviction of the truth of His message to the world, resulting as it did in the astonished recognition of its inherent authority by those who heard it (cf. Joh 6:63; Joh 7:39; Joh 7:46, Mat 7:28 f., Mat 13:54; Mat 22:33, Mar 1:22; Mar 6:2; Mar 11:18, Luk 4:32). Nor would Jesus confine this conviction to Himself.

The descriptive title ‘the Spirit of truth,’ three times reiterated in the Johannine discourses, emphasized that side of His teaching which laid particular stress on the identity of the guiding principle of His life and work with that moulding the activity of His disciples. At the same time it guaranteed the continuity of the context of His message and theirs to the world (Joh 14:17; Joh 15:26; Joh 16:13, cf. the actual bequest in which His promises were, partly at least, fulfilled, Joh 20:22; see also Joh 7:39). That they might entertain no doubt as to the authoritative position they were to occupy in carrying out the work begun by Him, Jesus spoke of His own permanent return to them as practically identical with the continual abiding of the Holy Spirit in and with them (cf. the phrase ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, Joh 14:18). ‘Christ is in fact from the moment of His Resurrection ever coming to the world and to the Church, and to men as the Risen Lord’ (Westcott, *Gospel of St. John*, on Joh 14:3). In fact the work of ‘the Spirit of truth’ is mainly the glorification of Jesus by gradually making Him known to the world as to His Person and work (ἐκεῖνος ἐμὲ δοξάσει, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήμψεται καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν· πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ ἐμὰ ἐστίν, κ.τ.λ., Joh 16:14 f.; cf. ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ, Joh 15:26).

The profound oneness of Jesus and His followers is nowhere more insistently dwelt on than in these passages, and that not alone in the character of the aims which He and they have in view, but also in the motive power helping and the underlying principle guiding them, which are identified by Him as the forces at work in His own life and Person. By an argument *a fortiori* He gives them an assurance that He will bestow the Holy Spirit on those who recognize their need of His guidance (Luk 11:13). To such the gift will always be proportionate to their immediate needs (Luk 12:12). We must not forget that the peculiar Lukan phrase πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐπλήσθη (Luk 1:15; Luk 1:41; Luk 1:67) is used in connexion with the spiritual experiences of three people whose work lay in the preparatory stage of the coming Kingdom of the Incarnation.

Notwithstanding the transcendent relationship in which Jesus stood to the Holy Spirit, we are not left without witness that even in this sphere of His life He was like us in all things (see Westcott, *Gospel of St. John*, on Joh 11:33). It is this word (τὸ πνεῦμα) that is used to describe the death on the cross by three of the Evangelists (cf. Mat 27:50, Luk 23:46, Joh 19:30), although in other places we find ψυχή employed in a sense very similar (see Joh 10:15; Joh 10:17, cf. Joh 15:3; Joh 10:11). It is possible, however, to see in the use of the former word a wider range of thought, as if it was intended to include the latter in its scope. It is as if Jesus desired to commend to His Father’s keeping not only the spirit, the principle of His highest and

Divinest life, but also the soul, the seat of His personal earthly life (cf. Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , vol. iv. 612^a).

That ψυχή is, nevertheless, sometimes found to denote more than this is evident from references by Jesus Himself to its indestructibility and its incomparable value as the goal of all human progress, where we should have expected either πνεῦμα or πνεῦμα and ψυχή to convey His full meaning (cf. Mat 10:28; Mat 10:39, Luk 17:33, Mar 8:35, Joh 12:25). The distinction and confusion, however, in these two words are in accordance with OT usage, where *ru'ah* (NT πνεῦμα) denotes the Divinely imparted principle of life, and *nephesh* (NT ψυχή) the result of the impartation (see 1Co 15:45; cf. Gen 2:7, where *nephesh hayyâh* occurs, an expression which is also used of the lower life of the animal creation, Gen 1:20). The indiscriminate use of these two words to denote the same idea is found, e.g., in Isa 26:9 (LXX Septuagint), a parallel to which we have in the Song of the Virgin Mary (Luk 1:46 f.). See Soul.

In other places where this word is used in connexion with the Personality of Jesus, we find it employed somewhat vaguely and in loose contrast with the outward or physical senses. He is said to have perceived the gist of the murmured reasonings of His critics 'in his spirit' (ἐπιγνοὺς τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ, κ.τ.λ., Mar 2:8; cf. Gould, 'St. Mark' in *ICC [Note: CC International Critical Commentary.]*, *ad loc.*). There is here an evident contrast implied between that intuitive knowledge gained by inference and deduction, and that acquired by direct hearing with the ears. Again, He is spoken of as sighing inwardly, as distinct from audibly (ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ, Mar 8:12), and being indignant 'within himself' or 'in his spirit,' without expressing His feelings in words (cf. ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι, Joh 11:38, and ἐν ἑαυτῷ, Joh 11:38). An interesting example of a subtle psychological distinction between πνεῦμα and ψυχή is found in the personal experiences of Jesus with two distinct sources of trouble and sorrow. As the cross drew near, His 'soul' (ἡ ψυχή μου τετάρακται, Joh 12:27) revolted from the horrors of the vision; while we, as we read the narrative of self-revelation, perceive the origin and cause of His sympathy with 'the feeling of our infirmities' (Heb 4:15). On the other hand, and in close connexion with His approaching death, there was the dark treachery of Judas; and when we remember the profound joy and holy satisfaction with which Jesus reviewed the success of His work in keeping near Him those committed to His charge (see Joh 17:12), we can understand the grief caused by the loss of 'the son of perdition.' With reference to this fact, St. John notices that Jesus 'was troubled in spirit' (Ἰησοῦς ἐταράχθη τῷ πνε

ύματι, Joh 13:21), as though he would wish us to infer that He was stirred to the very depths of His being by the sight of a soul hurrying to its doom.

Instances are not wanting in the Gospels of contrasts, simple and definite, in which this word plays a part, though we have no example of the antitheses so familiar to students of the Pauline Christology. Perhaps the nearest to the latter is the reference by Jesus to the contrast between the strength and perseverance of the spirit and the weakness of the flesh (τὸ πνεῦμα πρόθυμον ... ἢ σὰρξ ἀσθενής, Mar 14:39 = Mat 26:41). When, in His conversation with Nicodemus, Jesus refers to fleshly (ἐκ τῆς σαρκός) birth and spiritual (ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος) birth, He is not contrasting the limitations of the one with the inherent independence, as to time, space, etc., with their consequent imperfections, of the other. He has in His mind simply the two spheres of being to which man, *quâ* man, stands related. By his σὰρξ he is in fellowship, spiritual, mental, and physical, with the whole visible creation. By his πνεῦμα he touches and enters the sphere of spiritual life in the entirety of his complete nature. Both orders of existence have their characteristic principles, and it is man's unique privilege to unite the two in his complete life and experience. The perfect synthesis is accomplished only in the Incarnation, and it is only by keeping steadily in view the two great constituent elements in Jesus' Person that we shall succeed in truly interpreting His language in His discourses at Capernaum, which were so vitally misunderstood. Neither the spirit alone nor the flesh alone can apprehend and appropriate the Christ, the Son of Man. 'The flesh' is of no avail (ἡ σὰρξ οὐκ ὠφελεῖ οὐδέν, Joh 6:63), 'the spirit' alone has the power of conveying life (τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν τὸ ζῶπον). At the same time, in order to a genuine participation, the life-giving message must be clothed in language which may be heard and, in part at least, understood (τὰ ῥήματα ... πνεῦμά ἐστιν καὶ ζωή). The historic fact of the Incarnation was necessary to meet the needs of man both on his spiritual and fleshly side, and so we understand the force of the words of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (οὐ γὰρ δὴ πού ἀγγέλων ἐπιλαμβάνεται, Heb 2:16). And while it would be going beyond the strict limits of certainty to say that Jesus on this occasion is making specific reference to the rite which He afterwards instituted in words of similar import, it will scarcely be disputed that in His Last Supper He embodied the principles referred to above. In it, too, 'the flesh profiteth nothing,' it is the spirit that giveth life; but the invisible, intangible spirit is clothed with a visible, tangible body, while man, working through and by the latter, reaches upwards and partakes of the former (cf. Westcott, *Gospel of St. John, ad loc.*).

When Jesus, in His conversation with the woman of Samaria, identifies Spirit with the Being of God (πνεῦμα ὁ θεός, Joh 4:24), He at once proceeds to foreshadow the abiding result, as well as the condition of man's approach to Him. The arena, so to speak, upon which the activity of the Divine Spirit displays His manifold and world-wide character, is the human spirit. If we are to offer to God a spiritual (ἐν πνεύματι) worship, and apprehend clearly the methods by which He quickens human life, the first and last requisite is that we shall be in the Spirit (Joh 4:24; cf. Rom 8:15 f., Eph 2:18 etc.). It is not enough, though it is perfectly true, to say that 'the spirit in man responds to the Spirit of God' (Westcott, *Gospel of St. John*, on Joh 4:23). The spirit *in* man becomes the spirit *of* man (τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν, Rom 8:16), and acting, as it does, in harmony with the Spirit of God, is guided into all the truth (cf. the sequence τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας ... εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν, Joh 16:13). Henceforth man's, spiritual home is within the region of that absolute truth which the Person and the work of Jesus were destined to disclose and make real.

Just as we are led to believe in and hope for this co-operative activity of the Holy Spirit, so the Evangelists are insistent in the belief that the spirits of evil are ever watchful to make their home within us. In words of solemn warning Jesus implies that our need of spiritual guidance is so profound that we stand in constant danger of harbouring these active enemies (note εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου, Luk 11:24), and that the only way of successfully guarding against their presence is to admit the Holy Spirit as the supreme and only Guest (cf. Plummer, 'St. Luke,' in *ICC [Note: CC International Critical Commentary.]*, on Luk 11:25). So close is the analogy between these conceptions that St. Mark does not hesitate to denote the presence and the relation of the evil spirits to the possessed by using the same preposition (ἐν) which he employs when speaking of the guiding influence of the Holy Ghost (Mar 1:24; Mar 3:22; Mar 5:2; cf. Mar 12:36, Luk 2:27). The diseases which these spirits were supposed to convey to their victims were often spoken of as belonging to them inherently (Mar 9:17; Mar 9:25 etc. See art. Demon).

We shall not be surprised, after these considerations, to learn that when men have the same ends in view, pursue them by similar methods of work, and betray the same general characteristics in their mental and spiritual outlook, they are said to have the same spirit. John the Baptist and Elijah, though separated by centuries of time, were believed to be so far identified that the former lived and acted 'in spirit and in power' (ἐν πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει, Luk 1:17), *i.e.* under the shadow and guidance of the latter (cf. Jesus' method of interpreting the popular belief in the pre-Messianic return of Elijah, Mat 11:14). At the same time, the historian is careful to note that

the Baptist's childhood was marked by a gradual development and strengthening in spirit side by side with his bodily growth (Luk_1:80). See, further, artt. Flesh, Holy Spirit, Soul.

Literature.—In addition to the Lexx. and Dictionary artt. and the Lit. at Soul, see Laidlaw, *Bible Doct. of Man*, esp. 131 ff.; Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. of NT*, § 27; W. H. Hodge, 'Bibl. Usage of Soul and Spirit' in *Pres. Ref. Rev.* viii. (1897), 251; F. E. Brightman, 'Soul, Body, Spirit' in *JThSt* [Note: *ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.*] ii. (1900) 273; W. H. Schoemaker, 'Use of Pneuma in NT' in *JBL* [Note: *BL Journal of Biblical Literature.*] xxiii. (1904) 13.

J. R. Willis.

☩ Spirituality

SPIRITUALITY.—See Character of Christ in vol. i. p. 286 f., and art. Spirit.

☩ Spiritualizing Of The Parables

SPIRITUALIZING OF THE PARABLES.—'The legs of the lame,' says a Hebrew proverb, 'hang loose; so is a parable in the mouth of fools' (Pro_26:7); but it is possible to err in the opposite direction by pressing a parable too far, and, if the expression may be allowed, riding it to death. Such was the manner of the ancient interpreters, and it has been imitated by not a few in modern times. The error lies in forgetting that a parable is designed to teach one broad lesson, and insisting on discovering some significance in every detail. A glaring instance is Theophilus of Antioch's exposition, quoted approvingly by St. Jerome,* [Note: ad Algas. Quæst. vi.] of the parable of the Steward (Luk_16:1-12), which inculcates simply the duty of being as shrewd in spiritual matters as men are wont to be in worldly affairs. The rich man, according to Theophilus, is Almighty God; the steward, St. Paul; the debtor who owed 100 *baths* of oil, the Gentiles, 'qui magna indigebant misericordia Dei'; the debtor who owed 100 *cors* of wheat, the Jewish people, 'which had been nourished by the wheat of God's commandments.' Euthymius Zigabenus, whose interpretation of 'the fatted calf' (Luk_15:23) as 'the holy body of Christ' is saved from being blasphemous only by the good monk's simple piety, makes out that the rich man is God (τὸν φιλόανθρωπον καὶ ἀνευδεῖ θεόν); the steward, every possessor of riches, such being 'not lords but stewards'; the steward's dismissal, death. Some modern interpreters have gone quite

as far in extravagance. Schleiermacher makes the rich man represent the Romans, the steward the tax-gatherers, the debtors the Jewish people. According to Olshausen, the rich man is ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου, while the steward is the man who applies earthly riches to spiritual uses.

Origen's exposition of the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luk_10:30-37) is a masterpiece of ill-applied ingenuity. The traveller is Adam; Jerusalem is Paradise; Jericho is the world; the robbers are hostile demons; the Priest is the Law; the Levite is the Prophets; the Samaritan is Christ; the wounds are disobedience; the beast is the Lord's body; the inn is the Church; the two *denarii* are the Father and the Son (the New and the Old Covenant, says Euthymius Zigabenus); the innkeeper is the Bishop.* [Note: In Luc. Hom. xxxiv. St. Augustine (Quæst. Ev. ii. § 19) gives a similar interpretation, but with still greater luxuriance of fancy.]

The parable of the Ten Virgins (Mat_25:1-13) has furnished another fruitful field to spiritualizing interpreters. According to St. Chrysostom the lamps are the grace of virginity (τὸ τῆς παρθενίας χάρισμα); the oil is philanthropy, alms (τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν, τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην); the sellers are the poor, who afford the opportunity for alms-giving; the sleep of the virgins is death; the cry at midnight (cf. 1Th_4:16) shows that the Resurrection will take place by night. The lesson of the parable is that virginity without philanthropy is darkness. According to Origen and St. Jerome, the five virgins are the five senses. According to the latter, the oil is good works; according to the former, it is teaching, the vessels being the souls of the learners. There is much shrewd sense in Calvin's caustic remark: 'Some greatly torment themselves about the lamps, about the vessels, about the oil; but the simple and real gist is that eager zeal for a brief space does not suffice, unless unwearied constancy be added thereto.' See, further, artt. Parable and Circumstantiality in the Parables.

David Smith.

☞ Spitting, Spittle

SPITTING, SPITTLE (πτύω, πτύσμα, ἐμπτύω).—References to spitting occur in the NT in the Gospels only, and there always in connexion with Christ.

1. Spitting was a common mark of derision and contempt. Christ foretold it among the insults which He as Messiah would endure (Mar_10:34, Luk_18:32); and during His Passion He was spit upon both by Jews (Mat_26:67, Mar_14:65) and by Gentile soldiers

(Mat 27:30, Mar 15:19). Allusions to the custom with this injurious meaning are found in the OT (Num 12:14, Deu 25:9, Is 50:6). Variant forms, still customary among Orientals, are spitting upon the ground before any one, or even at the mention of a despised and hated name.

2. Three occasions are recorded on which Christ made use of His spittle in the work of healing: with a deaf and dumb man in the Decapolis (Mar 7:33), when He touched the tongue of the afflicted with moisture from His own mouth; with a blind man at Bethsaida (Mar 8:23), when He ‘spat upon his eyes’; and with one born blind, at Jerusalem (Joh 9:6-7), when He made clay of the spittle and anointed the eyes of the blind. In the two former instances Christ is stated first to have taken the man apart, and Meyer suggests that this secrecy was due to His use of the spittle; but no reason for secrecy suggests itself, and the third act of healing appears to have been performed publicly. Trench (*Miracles*, on John 9) adduces Pliny (*Hist. HN* xxviii. 7), Suetonius (*Vespas.* 7), Tacitus (*Hist.* iv. 8), to witness to the prevalence of an ancient belief in the medicinal value of human saliva, especially for eye troubles. See Blindness.

John Muir.

☞Sponge

SPONGE.—See Animals in vol. i. p. 67^a and Vinegar.

☞Staff

STAFF.—Two different words occurring in the Gospels are rendered ‘staff’ in Authorized and Revised Versions .—(1) ῥάβδος, (2) ξύλον.

1. Only once is ῥάβδος found in the Gospels, viz. in the Synoptic account of the instructions given by Jesus to the Twelve as He sent them on their mission (Mar 6:8 = Mat 10:10 = Luk 9:3). It denotes, of course, the ordinary walking-staff of the traveller, which, as used in the East, is somewhat longer than the walking-stick we know, and is simply a long, slightly-tapering rod, serviceable for support and for defence.

The main interest of the reference to the staff in the connexion above mentioned lies in the textual difference exhibited by the parallel passages. The instruction as given in Mar_6:8 was that the Twelve were to take nothing with them, ‘except a staff only’ (εἰ μὴ ῥάβδον μόνον); whereas, according to Mt. (μηδὲ ῥάβδον) and Lk. (μητε ῥάβδον), they were to take nothing at all, not even a staff. Wright cites this in support of a suggestion that Mt. and Lk. were ‘affected by the tendency to expect exceptional severity in the case of religious teachers’ (*Synopsis*, p. 57). But perhaps it is adequately explained as due at first to a mere copyist’s assimilation to the other negative items that occur. In both Mt. and Lk., again, there is a v. 1. in some Manuscripts which gives the plural ῥάβδους, ‘neither staves.’ This variant is not necessarily to be ascribed to a set purpose to afford a loophole for harmonizing the accounts. The Authorized Version, however, reading ‘staves’ in both cases, lies open to suspicion on this point; for in Mat_10:10 it gives ‘nor yet staves,’ with the extraordinary marginal note ‘Gr. *a staff*,’ showing that their text actually read ῥάβδον. So the way is left open for the puerile suggestion that the accounts are consistent, inasmuch as Jesus meant that His disciples were not to take more than one staff each! Yet Wyclif’s earlier version (following the Vulgate) had rendered ‘nether a yerde’ in Mat_10:10 (similarly Luk_9:3), careless of the discrepancy with Mar_6:8 (‘but a yerde oneli’). Cf. Tindale in Mat_10:10 ‘nor yet a rodde.’ The superiority of Mk.’s account is self-evident: there is a touch of perfect naturalness about it.

2. The ξύλον mentioned in Mar_14:43 (|| Mat_26:47, and see Luk_22:52), like the sword, is distinctly a weapon. Joh_18:3 uses the general expression ὄπλα. The ξύλα (Authorized and Revised Versions ‘staves’) were the wooden truncheons or clubs of the Jewish police (ὑπηρέται). Josephus (*BJ* ii. ix. 4) mentions them as weapons used by Pilate’s soldiers in attacking a crowd of Jews at Jerusalem.

J. S. Clemens.

☞ Stall

STALL.—See Manger.

☞ Star

STAR

1. Introductory.—Occasional reference is made in the NT to a star or stars, and, in most cases, an extraordinary significance of some kind is associated with the mention of such.

Two Greek words are employed, viz. ἀστήρ and ἄστρον. The latter also bears a collective meaning (= a group of stars, a constellation), but not in the NT. ἀστήρ is often applied metaphorically (see below). ἄστρον occurs in Luk 21:25, Act 7:43 ‘the star of the god Rephan’ (a quotation from Amo 5:25 f.), Act 27:20, Heb 11:12. Elsewhere (exc. 2Pe 1:19, where φωσφόρος, ‘day-star,’ occurs) ἀστήρ is used.

Sometimes these references are without any special significance (e.g. Act 27:20, Heb 11:12 ‘as the stars of heaven in multitude’), but more often some definite symbolical application is apparent, as, for example, when a period of calamity marking a Divine visitation is described as a time when the light of the sun and the moon is withdrawn and ‘the stars fall from heaven’ (Mat 24:29, || Rev 6:13; Rev 8:10-11; cf. Eze 32:7). In Rev 9:1 the image of the ‘fallen star’ has a personal reference, Satan apparently being denoted by it (cf. Luk 10:18 ‘I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven’); on the other hand, by the figure of ‘the seven stars’ which Christ holds in His right hand (Rev 1:16; Rev 2:1; Rev 3:1) are signified the angels of the seven churches under the direction of Christ; cf. Rev 1:20 (Grimm-Thayer). In Rev 12:1 the ‘crown of twelve stars’ may be intended to symbolize the twelve tribes (or the twelve Apostles ‘regarded as the crowning ornament of the Jewish Church’). A mythological allusion is apparent in Rev 12:4 (‘a woman arrayed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars’). One passage (Rev 22:16) identifies Christ with ‘the bright, the morning star’ (ὁ ἀστήρ ὁ λαμπρός, ὁ πρωϊνός), in accordance with which also Rev 2:28 (‘I will give him the morning star’) and 2Pe 1:19 (‘until the *day-star* [φωσφόρος] arise in your hearts’) are probably to be interpreted (see, further, below).

2. The star of the Magi (Mat 2:1-12).—In its main outlines the story of the visit of the Magi to Jerusalem and Bethlehem is probably based upon what the compiler of the First Gospel believed to be facts. It rests upon a historical basis. The widespread expectation of the coming of a World-Redeemer, about the time of the beginning of the Christian era, and the interest of Eastern astrologers in His advent in the West are well attested, and may well have led to some such visit as is described in Mt.* [Note: See esp. the admirable discussion in W. C. Allen’s ‘St. Matthew’ (ICC), pp. 11-15.] (See, further, art. Magi). It must be remembered, however, that Mt.’s narrative is governed by an apologetic purpose. It was written for the special object of meeting the needs and objections of Jewish readers. One influential motive at work in

Matthew 2 seems to be a desire on the part of the Evangelist to suggest a likeness between the Divinely guided career of Moses, the instrument of Israel's redemption from Egypt, and the Messianic Redeemer who saves His people from their sins. 'Thus the story of the Magi and the star has a striking parallel in the *Midrash Rabbâ* to Exodus in the section which deals with the birth of Moses. There we are told that Pharaoh's astrologers (האסטרוֹלוֹגִים) perceived that the mother of the future redeemer of Israel [*i.e.* Moses] was with child, and that this redeemer was destined to suffer punishment through water. Not knowing whether the redeemer was to be an Israelite or an Egyptian, and being desirous to prevent the redemption of Israel, Pharaoh ordered that all children born henceforth should be drowned.' † [Note: See an art. by the present writer in *The Interpreter* (Jan. 1906) on 'The Gospel Narratives of the Nativity and the alleged influence of heathen ideas.'] But perhaps the leading motive in Mt.'s narrative in this section of it is to suggest the homage of the Gentile world, and the selection of the gifts (gold, frankincense, and myrrh) may have been influenced by passages from OT Messianic prophecy which predict the allegiance of the nations (Isa 60:1 f., Isa 60:5, Psa 72:11-12; Psa 72:15). ‡ [Note: Notice esp. Isa 60:3 'And the Gentiles shall come to thy light.'] A contrast may also be intended to be suggested between the spiritual Kingship of the Messiah, and the earthly kingship of secular rulers (like Herod) who are instinctively hostile to the new force that has entered the world.

It is noticeable, however, that Mt. here does not cite any proof-passages from the OT (in Mat 2:5-6 the quotation from Micah is placed in the mouth of the Sanhedrin). If the compiler had in mind the passage in Num 24:17 ('There shall come forth a star out of Jacob,' etc.), as has been sometimes supposed, § [Note: E.g. by Wünsche, *Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien*, p. 12.] his failure to cite it would indeed be surprising. But it is to be observed that in Numbers the star is identified *with* the Messiah, and would hardly be applicable in this story. (See, further, below).

It may be, as Zahn* [Note: *Das Evangelium des Matthäus* (1903), p. 101.] suggests, that Mt. regards the episode of the visit of the Magi to render homage to the newborn King not so much in the light of a fulfilment of ancient prophecy, as a *new* prophecy 'which indicates that the Messiah Jesus, who has been born to save His own people from their sins (Mat 1:21), will be sought out and honoured by heathen, while the leading representatives of the religious thought and worship of Israel ask no questions concerning Him, and leave it to the tyrant, who enslaves them, to concern himself about the true King of the Jews, and then only with the object of compassing His destruction.' On this view the star and the astrologers—the Magi—become significant as proof that God uses even such imperfect means as astrology for bringing the heathen to the knowledge of the truth.

The 'star' of the narrative doubtless refers to some particular star, or to some unique astral phenomenon which the Magi were led to connect with the birth of the World-Redeemer in the West. The detail about the star 'which they saw at its rising' going 'before them, until it came and stood still above (the place) where the child was,' is, doubtless, not intended to be understood literally. It is merely a poetical description of the illusion which makes it appear that a luminous heavenly body keeps pace and maintains its relative position with the movement of the observer.

Various attempts have been made to identify the 'star' of this narrative with some exceptional heavenly phenomenon, and to fix its occurrence by means of astronomical calculation. The most famous of these is that of Kepler (1605), who thought of a close conjunction of the planets Jupiter and Saturn in the constellation Pisces,—a rare combination which takes place only once in 800 years, and which occurred no less than three times in the year 747 a.u.c. (= b.c. 7). See Edersheim, *LT [Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].]* i. p. 212 f. But the data are too indefinite to allow of any certain conclusion in the matter. Moreover, the ignorance displayed by Herod and 'all Jerusalem' as to the nature of the star hardly suggests that its appearance would strike any but practised astrologers.

The association of the birth of great men with such phenomena was a common feature in the ancient world where astrology was held in high esteem. Thus, e.g., 'on the birthnight of Alexander, Magi prophesied from a brilliant constellation that the destroyer of Asia was born' (cf. Cic. *de Divinatione*, i. 47, cited by Allen, *op. cit.* p. 12). On Jewish ground we have already seen the same idea at work in connexion with the birth of Moses in the Midrash passage cited above. Edersheim (*op. cit.* i. p. 211 f.) also cites some late Midrashic passages which connect the coming of Messiah with the appearance of a star. But these are of very uncertain value.

3. The star of the Messiah.—Sometimes the Messiah Himself is metaphorically referred to as a Star, † [Note: The same word is used metaph. in Arabic for a ruler.] a description which is based, apparently, on Num_24:17 :

'There shall come forth a star out of Jacob,
And a sceptre shall rise out of Israel';

In the Targum Onkelos this is rendered:

'When a king shall arise out of Jacob,
And the Messiah shall be anointed from Israel';

And in pseudo-Jonathan:

‘When the mighty King of Jacob’s House shall reign,

And the Messiah, the Power sceptre of Israel, shall be anointed.’

Here, it will be noticed, the Star is expressly identified with the Messianic King. A similar Messianic application of this passage meets us in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, where (Judah, 24 [Greek text]) the following occurs:

‘Over you a star shall proceed out of Jacob,

And a man shall arise from my seed like the sun of righteousness’ (cf. Mal_4:2). Cf. also Test. Levi 18.

In the first part of the 3rd Messiah-Apocalypse embodied in *The Apocalypse of Baruch* (ch. 53), the seer beholds the Messiah appear like lightning ‘on the summit of the cloud’; and this lightning ‘shone exceedingly so as to illuminate the whole earth’ (cf. Mat_24:27 ‘For as the lightning cometh forth from the east, and is seen even unto the west, so shall be the coming of the Son of Man’; Luk_17:24 and the other NT passages cited below; cf. Volz, *Jüd. Eschatologie*, p. 221).

It was apparently from Num_24:17, Messianically interpreted, that the false Messiah Simeon derived his designation *Bar Cochba* (*i.e.* ‘Son of the Star’). When Rabbi Akiba acknowledged him as the Messiah, he expressly cited this Scripture passage (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Sanh. 97b*) as applicable to Simeon, though this opinion was not generally shared by the learned among the Jews of the time. Bar Cochba seems to have been invested with a Messianic character by the irresistible force of popular public opinion. After the disastrous issue of his revolt it became necessary to apologize for Akiba’s mistake, and one such explanation seems to be reflected in some of the minor *Midrashim* which make the reference apply to Messiah ben Joseph, who was destined to be killed in battle before Messiah ben David could appear.* [Note: the Pesikta Zutarta (ed. Wilna, 1880, p. 129b) and Jellinek’s Beth ha midrasch, iii. p. 141, etc.] There is thus good evidence that in the time of Christ the ‘Star’ of Num_24:17 was popularly identified with the Messianic King.† [Note: For an early Christian application of Num_24:17 to Christ, cf. Justin Martyr, Apol. i. 32: ‘Isaiah, another prophet, prophesying the same things by other expressions, thus spake: “There shall rise a star out of Jacob, and a blossom shall ascend from the root of Jesse,” ’ etc.]

This idea may have influenced those NT passages where Jesus is represented as the ‘Morning Star’ (Rev_22:16; Rev_2:28), though it must be remembered that the angels

are described symbolically in the Bk. of Enoch (lxxxvi. 1, 3) as ‘stars’—a metaphor which helps to explain the symbolism by which Jesus is here described as ‘the Morning Star.’ ‘Among the stars of the spiritual firmament,’ Jesus is ‘the brightest in the whole galaxy’ (Swete, *Apocalypse*, p. 306). A similar conception meets us in 2Pe 1:19 (‘Take heed unto the lamp of prophecy until the day dawn, and the day-star [φωσφόρος] arise in your hearts’), and, in fact, the essential idea is present in all those passages of the NT which speak of the spiritual illumination that accompanies the revelation of the Messiah (cf. the fragment of an old Christian hymn in Eph 5:14 ‘Awake, thou that sleepest ... and Christ shall *shine* upon thee’; cf. Joh 1:9 Christ ‘the *Light* which lightens every man coming into the world,’ etc.). There is also the remarkable description of the Messiah as the ‘Day-spring from on high’ (ἀνατολή ἐξ ὕψους) in the Song of Zacharias (Luk 1:78), which may possibly have been associated in thought with the Messianic Star.‡ [Note: See an art. by the present writer in ZNTW, vol. vi. p. 96 f. (Feb. 1905), where this point is specially discussed.]

The association of the idea of light with the Messiah and the Messianic age was well established in Jewish Literature. This idea is founded on—or, at any rate, finds classical expression in—Isa 60:1 f. (‘Arise, shine; for thy light is come’). The Midrash (*Yalkut Shim.*) on this passage is instructive. It comments thus:

‘What is asserted by the words of the Psalm, “In thy light shall we see light” (Psa 36:10)? It is *the light of the Messiah* that is meant. For when it is said, “God saw the light that it was good” (Gen 1:4), it is thereby taught that the Holy One (Blessed be He) contemplated the generation of the Messiah and his works, before the world had been created, and that He concealed the light for the Messiah and his generation beneath His throne of glory. Then spake Satan before the Holy One (Blessed be He): “Lord of the World, for whom is the light hidden beneath Thy throne of glory destined?” [Answer] “For him who in the time to come will subdue thee and bring thee to shame.” ’

The Midrash then goes on to relate that at his request Satan was allowed to see the Messiah, and at the sight of him trembled and sank to the ground, crying out; ‘Truly this is the Messiah, who will deliver me and all heathen kings over to Gehenna.’* [Note: See the whole passage in Weber, *Jüd. Theol.* 2 p. 397 f. Edersheim, LT ii. p. 728 (Appendix ix.).]

Gressmann (*Der Ursprung der isr.-jüd. Eschatologie*, p. 307 f.) traces the association of light in connexion with the Servant of Jahweh, who is represented as the Light of the World in Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 49:6; Isa 51:4) to the mythical representation of the World-Ruler as a solar hero in the old Saga.

In fact, under the figure of light the salvation and felicity of the Messianic age are constantly depicted (see esp. Volz, *Jüd. Eschatologie*, pp. 328-331). The heavenly Jerusalem of the Apocalypse is a city filled with celestial light (Rev_21:23; Rev_21:25; Rev_22:5). The long drawn out contrast between light and darkness that pervades the Fourth Gospel is also significant in this connexion.

G. H. Box.

☩ State After Death

STATE AFTER DEATH.—See Dead and Eschatology, I. (A.) § 5 (c).

☩ Stater

STATER.—See Money.

☩ Stature

STATURE.—See Age.

☩ Steward, Stewardship

STEWARD, STEWARDSHIP

The former word is a translation of ἐπίτροπος in Mat_20:8, Luk_8:3, and of οἰκονομος in Luk_12:42; Luk_16:1; Luk_16:3; Luk_16:8; the latter, of οἰκονομία in Luk_16:2-4. In Luk_16:2 the verb οἰκονομεῖν occurs. The distinction between οἰκονομεῖν and οἰκονόμος has been variously stated. Horne treats them as synonyms; Meyer says the former is a more general term; Schleusner, that the ἐπ. is appointed by law or a magistrate, the οἰκ. by will; Elliott and Lightfoot agree in thinking that ἐπ., like our ‘guardian,’ has special reference to ‘persons’; οἰκ., like ‘steward,’ to property (see their notes on Gal_4:2 and references there cited, and Smith’s *Dict. of Gr. and Rom.* [Note:

Roman.] Ant., s.v. ἐπίτροπος). The last view is probably the right one. But the exact duties of each of them doubtless varied in different cases and under different masters, and often the two are used interchangeably (so Meyer on Mat_20:8). Meyer's view is probably true of the Gospels, although if Chuza as ἐπίτροπος (Luk_8:3) had special charge of the education of the royal children, it might lend further colour to Sanday's theory of Joanna's relation to the authorship of Luk_1:2. In Mat_24:45 δοῦλος is used of one whose position is evidently that of the steward, as may be seen by comparison with Luk_12:42. Usually, indeed, the steward is a slave or freedman, corresponding to Lat. *dispensator* or *villicus* (as in Luke 12, Matthew 24); occasionally he is a freeman, Lat. *procurator* (Luke 16). See Plummer in *ICC [Note: CC International Critical Commentary.]* on Luk_12:42; Luk_16:1, and Hatch, *Bibl. Greek*, p. 62.

The primary passages are Mat_20:1-20 (Labourers in Vineyard), Mat_24:45-51, Luk_8:3; Luk_12:42-48; Luk_16:1-21 (the Unjust Steward). Some would add the parables of the Prodigal and of Dives as illustrations of wealth wrongly used. The secondary are Mat_21:33-46 (Wicked Husbandmen) Mat_25:14-30 (Talents), Luk_19:12-27, (Minae), Mat_10:24 f., Mat_18:23-35, Mar_13:34, Joh_15:14-27, Luk_17:10. Of these Luk_8:3 yields no teaching.

The facts and teachings of the others may be thus summarized:

1. The steward's position.—He was entrusted with the oversight of part or all of his master's estate, including persons and property. He had the 'management of his affairs, the care of receipts and expenditures, and the duty of dealing out the proper portion to every servant and even to the children, (Grimm-Thayer). The education of the children as well as their maintenance was under his charge. His control was more or less absolute according as the master was absent or present. Christ teaches that we are all God's stewards. The trust covers (a) ourselves (for we are His); (b) others whom we can influence; (c) our time, means, opportunities, etc. For everything we rightfully have is from God (cf. Mat_5:45). What one has wrongfully seized is no part of his trust.

2. The steward's duty was to manage everything with most watchful fidelity and utmost efficiency, and to do it in the interest of his master. So with us. We should therefore (a) discipline ourselves—body, soul, and spirit, so as to realize God's ideal for us and be most efficient for service—a duty demanding care of the body, training of the mind, culture of the affections, discipline of the will, etc.; (b) pursue our calling, whatever it may be, in the interest of God's Kingdom, whether our work be that of the labourer, the farmer, the merchant, the lawyer, physician, statesman,

teacher, preacher, or any other; (c) utilize time, influence, opportunities, money, in the wisest way; (d) urge and help others to do the same. One must plan one's probable life as a whole that it may subserve God's purposes in the largest measure possible.

3. The master's duty was (a) to assign to the steward only just and honourable work, and (b) to provide for his needs. The righteous God can be trusted to do both (Mat 6:33). This leads to the topic that is commonly uppermost when Christian stewardship is thought of; only it approaches the matter from a rather different, but the true, standpoint.

The arrangements between master and steward varied. Is it so in our relation to God? or is there any definite arrangement or understanding? Some have held that tithing represents it. Yet a regulation like that does not seem fully in harmony with the spirit of the new dispensation (cf. Jer 31:33), which deals in principles rather than rules, just because God is more careful to develop character than to get men's gains. Perhaps the best way of stating the case, however, would be this: God wills that His stewards should spend on themselves such a proportion of the income as is necessary to their highest working efficiency. This will vary with different persons according to conditions. Each must determine honestly for himself. 'To his own Master he stands or falls.' In general, it will mean less than is commonly supposed. It must be determined not by love of ease or pleasure, not by selfishness or pride, not by custom or fashion (where these are wrong), nor even by what would be reasonable and allowable in a normal world of sinlessness and blessedness, but wholly by the spirit of Divine love in view of the pressing needs of this abnormal world with its appalling sin, ignorance, and wretchedness.

4. Rewards and penalties.—All rewards are of grace (Luk 17:10). These begin now, but their fulness is hereafter. Through faithful service there comes the perfecting of character, the richer development of the personality, and the final winning of our souls (Luk 21:19). We are now stewards holding all on trust. We shall then receive as our own the inheritance prepared from the foundation of the world (Luk 16:12, Mat 25:34). We shall be welcomed into eternal tabernacles (Luk 16:9) and be entrusted with the rule and authority for which we have become fitted (Luk 12:14, Mat 24:47; Mat 25:20-23). The unfaithful shall be beaten, or stripped of what they had, cut asunder as hypocrites, and cast into outer darkness with the unbelieving (Luk 12:46, Mat 24:51; Mat 25:28-30).

Literature.—Commentaries: works on the Parables; Stirling, *Stewardship of Life*; Hartman, *The Business Aspect of Christian Stewardship*; F. W. Robertson, *Serm. iv.* 239; C. H. Spurgeon, *An All-round Ministry*, 260; A. L. Moore, *God is Love*, 52; W.

Houghton, *Secret of Power*, 80; the best treatment is that of C. A. Cook, *Stewardship* (Am. Bapt. Publ. Soc.).

J. H. Farmer.

☩ Stigmata

STIGMATA (στίγματα, Authorized and Revised Versions ‘marks’).—The word occurs only in Gal_6:17 ‘From henceforth let no man trouble me: for I bear branded on my body the marks of Jesus’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). The subject of the ‘stigmata (*or* marks) of Jesus’ comes before us in two ways: we have to consider (1) the meaning of the word *stigmata* as used by St. Paul; (2) the special sense in which it has come to be employed from the time of St. Francis of Assisi and onwards, esp. in the Roman Catholic Church.

1. St. Paul’s use of the word.—(1) By the ‘*stigmata* of Jesus’ Bonaventura and many others have supposed the Apostle to refer to bodily marks resembling the nail prints and other insignia of the Saviour’s Passion—thus making him affirm an experience, in his own person, of the phenomena of ‘stigmatization’ (see 2). But the technical sense in which the word *stigmata* was used in the time of St. Paul—viz. as denoting marks of ownership (either brands made with hot irons, or cuts which, as they healed, were prevented from closing, and so became broad scars), as well as the meaning of the whole verse when considered in the light of the context and its analogies in other parts of the Apostle’s writings (esp. 2Co_11:23 ff.)—shows that Ἰησοῦ must be taken as the gen. of possession, and that the reference is not at all to the wounds on the Lord’s body, but solely to certain marks on St. Paul’s own body that stamped him as belonging to Jesus Christ.

(2) A few commentators, following Augustine (*Com. on Gal., in loc.*), have transformed St. Paul’s *stigmata* into his manifestation of the fruits of the Spirit, with special reference to his Christian asceticism (cf. 1Co_9:27). But the technical signification of *stigmata*, as well as the expression ‘on my body,’ seems to put such an interpretation altogether out of the question.

(3) Assuming, then, that the *stigmata* were marks of ownership, what is the particular figure that St. Paul means to suggest? (*a*) Soldiers, in honour of an adored commander, sometimes branded on their bodies the initial letter of his name. But though the idea of the Christian life as a military service is a familiar one in the Pauline writings (1Co_9:7, 2Co_10:4, 1Ti_6:12, 2Ti_4:7), it is not in keeping with the

present context, which brings Jesus before us as Lord (Gal 6:14; Gal 6:17), not as Captain. (b) Slaves attached to the service of a heathen temple (ιερόδουλοι) were branded with the names of the deities to whom they ministered; and Lightfoot (*Com. on Gal., in loc.*) and others (e.g. Westcott in *Expos.* vi. [1887] 241) have thought that the metaphor is most appropriately understood in the light of this fact. But, as Meyer pointed out (*Com. in loc.*), the references to the branding of ιερόδουλοι found in Herod., I'lut., Lucian, etc., bear upon the usage of other nations, and we have no evidence for Galatia itself. Even if we had, a reference to the branding of the slaves in heathen temples would be needlessly recondite, in view of the much more familiar practice of branding domestic slaves. And, above all, as the ιερόδουλοι were very frequently women attached to a temple for immoral purposes, it seems unlikely that the Apostle would have in his mind a term that carried associations so degrading, (c) It is most likely, therefore, that St. Paul is alluding to an ordinary domestic custom. In the East (not in Rome, where branding was the mark of a runaway slave, and so a badge of disgrace) slaves were regularly branded by their owners, and Artemidorus Daldianus bears witness to the practice in Galatia (*Oneirocritica*, i. 8. The verb he uses is στιζω, from which στιγμα comes. See W. M. Ramsay, *Hist. Com. on Gal.* pp. 84, 472, who tells us that this ancient custom is familiar even yet to the observant traveller in Turkey). St. Paul never calls himself a ιερόδουλος, but the thought that he was the δούλος of Jesus Christ was one of his ruling ideas (Rom 1:1, 1Co 7:22, 2Co 4:5, Gal 1:10, Php 1:1). And when he says, 'I bear branded on my body the marks of Jesus,' he means certain marks that bore witness to the fact that Jesus was his Master and he was Jesus' slave.

(4) But what were these marks that St. Paul bore branded on his body! Without doubt, he meant the scars he had earned in the service of Christ—perhaps the general signature upon his face and whole person of all his toils and trials, but, at all events, the laceration and disfigurement produced by Jewish scourges and lictors' rods and the cruel stones of the multitude (Act 14:19; Act 16:23, 2Co 11:24-25). These marks of his servitude to his Lord the Apostle looked upon not only as a badge of honour, but (and this is his reason for referring to them here) as seals set upon his claim to be the Apostle and minister of Jesus Christ (cf. 2Co 11:23 ff.), and so as tokens of his right to speak with authority. (For the idea of authority as springing out of complete subjection to a greater, cf. the centurion's 'I also am a man under authority,' Mat 8:9, Luk 7:8). The verse thus falls into line with the whole Epistle as an intensely personal message of remonstrance and appeal. Once more, at the end as at the beginning (Gal 1:1), St. Paul exalts his Apostleship. And what he says here is, 'Let no man trouble me after this, by challenging my right to declare the truth of the gospel;

for I bear branded on my body the marks which testify that I am the slave of Jesus—that He is my Master and my Lord.’

2. The ecclesiastical use of the word.—According to the earliest biographers of St. Francis of Assisi (Thomas of Celano, the ‘Tres Socii,’ and Bonaventura, whose ‘Vitae’ are all included in the *Acta Sanctorum*), the saint, while meditating in his cell on the sufferings of Jesus, fell into a trance, and had a vision of the Crucified Himself in the form of a seraph. When he awoke he found that he was marked in hands and feet and side with the wounds of the Lord—wounds which remained till the time of his death, that in the side bleeding occasionally. Numerous witnesses testify to having seen these marks in the body of Francis, both during his life and after he was dead. Bonaventura (*op. cit.* xiii. 4) addresses the saint in the following words: ‘Jam enim propter stigmata Domini Jesu quae in corpore tuo portas, nemo debet tibi esse molestus.’ This is an appropriation to the case of Francis of the Vulgate version of St. Paul’s language in Gal. 6:17 : from which the inference is natural that the biographer, by a mistaken interpretation of the text, conceived the *stigmata* of Francis and those of the Apostle to be of a like kind.

From the first the stigmatization of St. Francis was generally accepted in the Catholic Church, not only as a fact, but as a miraculous evidence of the Divine favour; though the Dominicans objected, and attributed the alleged miracle to Franciscan deceit. In the next century, however, similar marks were affirmed to have shown themselves on the person of the well-known Dominican nun, St. Catherine of Siena; and thereafter down to modern times (the last well-authenticated instance was in 1868) the phenomena of stigmatization have repeatedly been vouched for, the subjects, in the great majority of cases, being women. That some of the alleged instances were pure frauds is practically certain, while in other cases the *stigmata* appear to have been nothing more than wounds self-inflicted by persons in a state of epileptic hysteria. On the other hand, in a number of cases, and notably in that of St. Francis, the positive evidence is too strong to be rejected on either of the above grounds (see esp. the biography of St. Francis by P. Sabatier, mentioned below). And now modern investigations, esp. in the region of psycho-physics, have furnished evidence that goes to support the historical testimony, by assuring us that there is a ‘scientific background’ to the phenomenon of stigmatization. It is certain that, in sensitive subjects, the influence of the mind in modifying bodily states and producing new conditions is exceedingly great; and stigmatization is now commonly placed by competent students among the peculiar phenomena attributed to hypnotic auto-suggestion. It is accepted as a fact that *stigmata* have actually appeared on the bodies of persons whose nervous susceptibility was abnormal, when, under the excitement of strong feeling, they have fixed their minds steadily upon the thought of the sufferings of Jesus, and especially on the *insignia Passionis* (see *EBr [Note: Br Encyclopaedia Britannica.]* xxii. 550, xxxii. 53; Otto, *Naturalism and Religion* (1907)

351-52). But while modern science leads us to accept stigmatization as a pathological certainty, it also teaches us to regard it not as a mark of the Divine favour, but as an evidence rather of the presence of hysterical neurasthenia. And modern criticism, again, assures us that the view that it is identical with St. Paul's 'stigmata of Jesus' must be relegated, in Sir W. M. Ramsay's words (*op. cit.* p. 472), to the 'Dark Ages' of scholarship.

Literature.—For 1: the Comm. of Lightfoot, Alford, and Meyer, *in loc.*; Ramsay, *Hist. Com. on Gal.* 472; Phillips Brooks, *Candle of the Lord*, 355. For 2: artt. 'Stigmatization' in *EBr* [Note: *Br Encyclopaedia Britannica.*] (by Prof. Macalister of Cambridge) and *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologic und Kirche.*] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 'Stigmata' in *Prot. Dict.*, 'Franz von Assisi' in *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologic und Kirche.*] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; the Lives of St. Francis by Thomas of Celano and Bonaventura in *Acta Sanctorum*: P. Sabatier, *Vie de S. François d'Assise* (1894—English translation same year), ch. xvii., and 'Etude critique sur les stigmata' in the Appendix; W. J. Dawson, *The Reproach of Christ*, p. 167; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , Ext. Vol. Index, s.v. 'Stigmata.'

J. C. Lambert.

☩ Stone

STONE

1. The Greek terms.—Apart from the vb. 'to stone' (for wh. see Stoning), there are 5 Gr. words translation 'stone' in the NT which call for notice in the present article.

(1) λίθος (LXX Septuagint for ~~ἄξ~~) is the general term. It occurs very frequently in the Gospels, and is the word with which in this art we are chiefly concerned. λίθος is distinguished from πέτρα as in English 'stone' is distinguished from 'rock.' (2) λιθινός (fr. λίθος), 'made of stone'; found in the Gospels only in Joh 2:6 λιθίνοι ὕδριαι, 'waterpots of stone.' (3) πέτρος is rendered 'stone' only in Authorized Version of Joh 1:42 'Cephas, which is, by interpretation, a stone.' AVm [Note: Vm Authorized Version margin.] gives 'Peter,' while Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 has 'Peter' in the text and 'rock or stone' in the margin. 'Rock' is certainly more adequate than 'stone,' for πέτρος properly denotes a mass of detached rock, as πέτρα does a living

or solid rock. (So πετρῶδης in the parable of the Sower [Mat 13:5; Mat 13:20, Mar 4:5; Mar 4:16] does not mean ‘stony’ [Authorized Version] but ‘rocky’ [Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885]—not ground full of loose stones, but a thin soil with shelves of rock lying underneath). Probably, however, the sense is best conveyed by the proper name ‘Peter’—the meaning of ‘Peter’ being, of course, understood (cf. Mat 16:18). (4) λαξευτός, ‘hewn in stone (fr. λᾶς ‘stone’ and ξέω ‘scrape’ or ‘carve’), applied in Luk 23:53 to the tomb in which Jesus was laid. Mt. (Mat 27:60) and Mk. (Mk 15:46), however, describe it as hewn out of rock (πέτρα). (5) ψῆφος, ‘pebble,’ represents ‘stone’ in the ‘white stone’ which in the Ep. to the Church in Pergamum Christ promises to him that overcometh (Rev 2:17).

2. Stones crying out.—The stones of Christ and the Gospels form a suggestive subject. There are sermons in these stones, we might say, for they have lessons to impart to us regarding Christ’s history, His teaching, and His Person as the Messiah.

(1) *His history.*—(a) Whether or not we accept the ancient tradition that Jesus was born in one of the limestone caves of Bethlehem, it is very likely that His manger would be a manger of stone—built with stones and mortar if not hollowed out of the solid rock (see Thomson, *LB [Note: The Land and the Book.]* [ed. 1878] p. 413). If so, the first bed on which the Lord was laid, like the last one to which He was carried by Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathaea (Joh 19:38 ff.), was a bed of stone.

(b) In Christ’s spiritual struggles on the very threshold of His public life, He had to do with the stones. It is a curious fact that they play a part in two out of the three acts that make up the drama of the Temptation in the Wilderness. In the one case, Jesus is tempted to use His miraculous powers to turn the stones that lie about Him on the rough mountain-side into loaves of bread wherewith to satisfy His hunger (Mat 4:2-4, Luk 4:2-4). In the other, He is tempted to leap from a pinnacle of the Temple by the reminder that it is written (Psa 91:11-12) that God’s child shall be upheld by angels, and so preserved from dashing his foot against a stone (Mat 4:5-7, Luk 4:9; Luk 4:12). In the one case, the stones were to nourish His life; but contrary to God’s law of sowing and reaping. In the other, they were to refuse to dash Him to death; but contrary to the Divinely fixed law of gravitation. Satan meant the stones to be stones of stumbling to Jesus, on that difficult path of obedience and self-renunciation to which in His baptism He had just consecrated Himself. But Jesus by His faith and patience turned them into stepping-stones to higher things.

(c) At Cana of Galilee Jesus ‘manifested his glory’; and there, we might say, He was again beholden to the stones; for the six waterpots by whose aid He wrought His first miracle were waterpots of stone (Joh 2:6).

(d) But not always were the stones His servants and ministers. Twice in Jn.'s Gospel (Joh_8:59; Joh_10:31, cf. Joh_11:8) we read how the enemies of Jesus took up stones to cast them at Him, because He claimed that He was the Son of God.

(e) Against the cave which was Lazarus' tomb there lay a stone (Joh_11:38)—rolled there to shut in the dead during the awful process of decay (Joh_11:39), as well as to shut out the ravaging wild beasts. 'Take ye away the stone,' Jesus said (Joh_11:39); and when they had done so, another word of command turned that gravestone at Bethany into a parable to all the ages of the rolling away from human hearts of the crushing bondage of death (Heb_2:14 f.) by Him who is the Resurrection and the Life (Joh_11:25).

(f) It was not long after, when the Lord's own body was carried to another tomb 'hewn in stone' (Luk_23:53), and laid on one of the stone shelves prepared for such a purpose. Against the door of His sepulchre also 'a great stone' was rolled (Mat_27:60 ||), and a seal was set upon the guardian stone. And that great stone, which the Jewish rulers would fain have made the incontrovertible proof that the world had seen the last of Jesus of Nazareth (Mat_27:62 ff.), has become the shining and perennial monument of His victory over death—proclaiming, in St. Peter's words, that 'it was not possible that he should be holden of it' (Act_2:24). For whenever Christian men think of the Lord's sepulchre, they always see that great stone rolled back from the door, and the angel of the Resurrection sitting upon it (Mat_28:2 ||).

(2) *His teaching.*—One of the most self-evident proofs that Jesus ever gave of the Heavenly Father's love and the reality of prayer, lay in the question, 'What man is there of you, who, if his son shall ask him for a loaf, will give him a stone?' (Mat_7:9). One of the most memorable examples of His heart-searching irony was when He said to the accusers of a sinful woman, 'He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her' (John 8 :[7]). One of the most striking assertions of His claim to Messianic dignity lay in His answer to the Pharisees when they appealed to Him to rebuke the enthusiastic shouts of His disciples: 'I tell you that if these shall hold their peace, the stones will cry out' (Luk_19:40). One of His clearest and most emphatic predictions of the coming fate of Jerusalem was when He said of the Temple, adorned with goodly stones, 'There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down' (Mar_13:2 ||).

In the Ep. to the Church in Pergamum the author of the Apocalypse represents Jesus Christ as promising a 'white stone' to the victor in the good fight of faith (Rev_2:17). Numerous explanations of this white stone have been suggested, but the one that seems best to satisfy all the requirements is that which takes it to be the *tessara gladiatoria*, bestowed on the victorious young gladiator when he exchanged the name

of *tiro* for that of *spectatus* (see *ExpT [Note: xpT Expository Times.]* i. [1889] p. 2, viii. [1897] p. 291; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iv. 618^b).

The 5th of the Oxyrhynchus (1897) 'Sayings of Jesus' contains the striking words, 'Jesus saith ... Raise the stone and there shalt thou find me; cleave the wood and there am I.' The words have lent themselves to various ingenious explanations; but the most probable interpretation is the one which also most readily suggests itself—that we have here an affirmation of the immanence of Christ in natural things. The saying may be understood in a sense that is perfectly in keeping with teaching that is found in the NT (e.g. Joh 1:3, Col 1:16 f.), but was more probably written with a leaning to a kind of Gnostic Pantheism. It is generally agreed that, in their present form at least, these 'Sayings of Jesus' were not spoken by the Lord Himself, and do not even belong to the earliest age (see Lock and Sanday, *Two Lectures on the 'Sayings of Jesus'* (1897); cf. *ExpT [Note: xpT Expository Times.]* ix. [1898] p. 194 ff.).

(3) *His Person*.—On one occasion (Luk 20:17 = Mat 21:42) Jesus took a stone (*λίθος*; cf. His symbolic use of 'rock' (*πέτρος*) in Mat 7:24 f., ||, Mat 16:18, and St. Paul's 'spiritual rock,' 'that rock was Christ,' 1Co 10:4) as a symbol of His own Person. He had just spoken the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, and after announcing their doom, He quoted exegetically Psa 118:22 'The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner.' Thus He identified the rejected 'Son' of the parable with the rejected stone of the Psalm, and the wicked husbandmen with the scribes and Pharisees as the 'builders' of Israel's theocratic edifice; but at the same time intimated to the latter that they must not think that by rejecting Him and putting Him to death they would be done with Him for ever. So far from that, He went on to say, 'Every one that falleth on that stone shall be broken to pieces; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will scatter him as dust' (Luk 20:18 = Mat 21:44).

In Act 4:11 we find St. Peter taking up Christ's symbol, and boldly declaring to the Sanhedrin that Jesus Christ of Nazareth was the stone set at naught by them the builders, but made by God the head of the corner. And in his Epistle he returns to this parable of the stone as a symbol of Christ's Person, and dwells upon it with much greater fulness (1Pe 2:4-8). He describes the Lord now, with evident reference to His Resurrection (cf. Act 4:10 with Act 4:11), as a 'living stone,' rejected indeed by men, but to God chosen and precious, upon whom His people are built up into a spiritual house. The allusion to the verse in Psalms 118 is unmistakable; but in what he proceeds to say the Apostle makes use further of two passages in Isaiah. First he quotes Isa 28:16 'Behold I lay in Zion a chief corner stone,' etc., and next the words of Isa 8:14 about the 'stone of stumbling and the rock of offence.' And it seems clear that his reminiscence of the latter passage has been inspired by his recollection of the

Lord's own words as to those who fall upon the Stone which is Himself, and those upon whom that Stone shall fall (cf. Isa 8:7-8 with Luk 20:17-18 = Mat 21:42; Mat 21:44). See, further, art. Rock.

Literature.—The Lexx. on the various Gr. words, and the Comm. on the passages quoted.

J. C. Lambert.

☩ Stoning

STONING.—There are three Greek verbs in the NT which mean 'to stone'—λιθοβολέω, λιθάζω, and καταλιθάζω. These, again, are the equivalents of the two Heb. synonyms לִקְדוֹ and רָגַם, each of which may denote either the mere throwing of stones by a mob at any person who has incurred their ill-will (Exo 17:4, Num 14:10), or the legal execution of a criminal by letting fall one or more large pieces of stone upon his body. Mere stone-throwing is mentioned in the Gospels in the following passages: The priests fear that the people may stone them (Luk 20:6); the prophets were so treated (Mat 23:37, Luk 13:34); the husbandmen in the parable beat or stone the messengers (Mat 21:35, Mar 12:4 Authorized Version); and in St. John's Gospel the Jews so threaten Jesus (Joh 8:59, Mar 10:31; Joh 10:33, Joh 11:8).

The Jewish Senate (*Bêth Dîn*) recognized four forms of capital punishment,—stoning, burning, beheading, and strangling (*Sanh.* vii. 1). In the case of stoning, the two witnesses took their stand on an elevation of about twice the height of a man. The convict was laid on his back beneath, and one of the witnesses dropped a stone upon his heart. If this did not prove fatal, the second witness cast one; and if the victim still survived, then all Israel (Deu 17:7). The bodies of all stoned persons were crucified according to one account; according to another, only those of blasphemers and idolaters, a man being hung with his face to the people, a woman with hers to the tree. According to another account, women were not crucified (*ib.* vi. 4). A person who had been stoned was not buried in the sepulchre of his fathers (vii. 1).

In the Law and in practice capital punishment was inflicted for offences against any of the first seven ordinances of the Decalogue—that is, upon persons guilty of apostasy (Deu 13:10), idolatry (Deu 17:5), blasphemy (Lev 24:16, 1Ki 21:13), Sabbath-breaking (Num 15:35), disobedience to parents (Deu 21:21), murder (Lev 24:21), unchastity (Deu 22:21; Deu 22:24), as well as for practising sorcery (Lev 20:27), for kidnapping (Exo 21:16), and for special offences (Joshua 7). An ox

which gored a man in the course of a bull-fight was not stoned (*Baba kamma*, iv. 4; Exo 21:28). In each of the above cases the penalty takes the form of stoning, though this is not explicitly mentioned in the case of murder, of kidnapping, or of unchastity on the part of a married woman (Deu 22:22). Stoning was thus the regular means of executing criminals among the Hebrews, as strangling was with the later Jews. Both processes avoided the shedding of blood, and reduced the risk of vengeance on the part of the relatives.

In the narrative Joh 8:1-11, which is generally regarded as spurious, not being part of the text of the best Manuscripts, the scribes were therefore justified in stating that ‘Moses in the law commanded us that such should be stoned,’ the reference being to Deu 22:23-24. This would imply that the woman was betrothed merely, but not married, the mode of execution in the case of a married woman not being specified (Deu 22:22), and being, in fact, at the time strangling (*Sanh. 51b*: ‘A daughter of Israel who is married, by strangling, who is betrothed, by stoning’).

T. H. Weir.

☛ Storm

STORM.—See Sea of Galilee, p. 591s.

☛ Stranger

STRANGER.—The Authorized Version has only the one rendering—‘stranger’—for five different words in the Greek. It is the natural translation of the term which has the most general signification—*ξένος* (Mat 25:35; Mat 25:43; Mat 27:7 etc.); and there is no other word in English to express the exact force of *ἀλλότριος* (Mat 17:25-26, Joh 10:5; cf. Joh 10:12—the *ἀλλότριος* is the one ‘whose own the sheep are not’). For *ἀλλογενής* the proper equivalent is ‘alien,’ as in Luk 17:18 ((Revised Version margin)). For *παροικίος* and *παρεπίδημος* Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 rightly uses ‘sojourner’ (Act 7:29, 1Pe 2:11; cf. Luk 24:18, 1Pe 1:1, Heb 11:13). These words indicate a sentiment which is (1) racial or national (Mat 17:25-26 the kings of the earth take tribute from ‘strangers,’ not from sons), (2) humanitarian (Mat 25:35 ‘I was a stranger, and ye took me in’), and (3) religious (1Pe 2:11 ‘I beseech you as sojourners and pilgrims to abstain,’ etc.).

Generally, however, it may be said that the connexion in which the words occur in NT is illustrative of the difference between the current Jewish conception of the stranger in the time of Christ, and that which is suggested by the Gospel. Jesus found His countrymen steeped in the idea that all foreigners were 'dogs,' that 'the peoples' was a term almost synonymous with 'the heathen,' and that only under rigid conditions and upon sufferance might a non-Jew obtain any of the privileges considered to be the Divine right of a Jew. He left His followers possessed of the thought, however unconscious they might be of all that it involved, that to Him the Samaritan and the Gentile, the man outside the pale and the man of no caste, were as much the objects of His mission as the favoured son of Abraham. 'Stranger,' to the average Jew, was the name for one with whom he might have commercial dealings and certain social or political relations, but with whom religious affinity or fellowship was practically impossible; to Jesus it meant one who had a special claim upon Him and His (Mat 25:35 ff.). The impression which He created was not merely that Christianity meant a deepening and extending of that sense of the sacred duty of hospitality and kindness which already existed in the Jewish mind, as it does throughout the East (Exo 23:9; Exo 22:21, Luk 19:35, Deu 10:18-19, Jer 7:6 etc.; cf. the practice existing among the Essenes, Josephus *BJ* ii. viii. 4, 5), but that it involved a complete change of the attitude which assumed that a different treatment was to be meted out to the stranger from that which was naturally shown to one's own kith and kin (Mat 5:43-48 etc.). See, further, artt. Cosmopolitanism, Hospitality, Gentiles, Universalism.

It is further to be noticed that Christianity gave a new signification to the word 'stranger.' The way had been prepared by the use of the Hebrew word 'Ger' (LXX Septuagint . πάροικος, see artt. 'Ger' in *DB* [*Note: Dictionary of the Bible.*] and 'Stranger' in *Encyc. Bibl.*), which designated the sojourner who dwelt within the gates of Israel, and who, while having a certain status there and a temporary home, belonged to another country. The fact also that the Jews themselves had from the time of Abraham so often been sojourners in a land not their own (Act 7:6; Act 7:29, Heb 11:9), and the lessons taught by the dispersion in postexilic times, led to that metaphorical use of the term which has entered so largely into religious speech and poetry. The follower of Christ saw in it a description of himself as of one who was absent from his proper country, and whose citizenship was in heaven (Php 3:20). When St. Peter writes to the 'sojourners of the Dispersion' (1Pe 1:1), and beseeches them 'as sojourners and pilgrims' to abstain from fleshly lusts (1Pe 2:11), he is diverting the term from a geographical to a spiritual sense (cf. 1Pe 1:17). The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews has the same thought, 'For we have not here an abiding city, but we seek after the city which is to come' (Heb 13:14; cf. Heb 11:13-16).

Literature.—Uhlhorn, *Chr. Charily in the Ancient Ch.*; Brace, *Gesta Christi*, ch. xvi.; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*, chs. xiv. xvii.

J. Ross Murray.

☩ Stream

STREAM.—See River.

☩ Street

STREET.—In place of ‘street’ in Mar_6:56 we should read with Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘market-place,’ the open space or square (ἀγορά) where goods are brought for disposal to the merchants from the bazaars, and where people at leisure gather for conversation. πλατεῖα stands for ‘street’ in the ordinary sense. In Luk_14:21 it is apparently distinguished from ὀύμη, as ‘street’ from ‘alley’ or ‘lane.’ But the distinction is ignored elsewhere; and certainly the ‘street’ (ὀύμη) called ‘Straight’ in Damascus (Act_9:11) is no ‘alley.’ In the East it would be difficult to maintain the distinction. Even the main streets in cities like Jerusalem and Cairo are often narrow and crooked, more like ‘alleys’ than ‘streets’ in our sense. The footway is made narrow, the upper storeys frequently overhanging the road, for protection against the heat of the sun. Seclusion is a main object aimed at in building Eastern houses: the wall to the street is seldom pierced by windows; the door usually leads through a passage into a court, round which the rooms are arranged. All sorts of filth are cast into the streets (Rev_11:8). In spite of the scavenging of dogs, their condition is often not only loathsome, but a source of danger to health.

W. Ewing.

☩ Struggles Of Soul

STRUGGLES OF SOUL.—The Gospels use varied language in describing the conflicting emotions of Jesus. At the grave of Lazarus He *groaned* in the spirit or in Himself (Joh_11:33; Joh_11:38, Gr. ἐνεβριμήσατο and ἐμβριμώμενος, from ἐμβριμάομαι *to snort*

in, to be very angry, to be moved with indignation, Mar_14:5; sternly to charge, Mat_9:30, Mar_1:43); He was disturbed inwardly by pity for the mourners, by grief at their hopeless view of death, and by disappointment at their lack of trust in Him. His feeling found expression in tears (*Mar_1:35*). When restoring hearing and speech by the unusual means of putting His hands in the ears and touching the tongue, prayer, and the word 'Ephphatha,' He *sighed* (*ἐστέναξεν, Mar_7:34*). Unbelief either in the sufferer or in the multitude seems to have been felt by Jesus as a hindrance to the cure, to which His pity moved Him (cf. *Mat_13:58*). Soon after, when asked for a sign, He *'sighed deeply in spirit'* (*ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι, Mar_8:12*), distracted by His desire to win the nation and His purpose not to use any illegitimate means (cf. the second temptation, *Mat_4:6*). When the Greeks sought an interview with Him, He confessed, 'Now is my soul *troubled*' (*τετάρακται, Joh_12:27*); the possibility of finding faith among the Gentiles, and the necessity of His sacrifice on account of Jewish unbelief, were probably the thoughts that so distressed Him. The knowledge that Judas would betray Him *troubled Him in spirit* (*ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι, Joh_13:21*), love, grief, disappointment, indignation struggling together. His emotions in Gethsemane are described in varied phrases by the Evangelists (see Agony). There, as Bengel comments on *Joh_12:27*, 'concurrerat horror mortis et ardor obedientiae.'

Besides these descriptions of the Evangelists, we have other indications of the struggles of soul of Jesus. His *prayers* on other occasions than Gethsemane were probably strenuous efforts to discover and to submit to the Father's will. He withdrew for prayer after the first Sabbath of healing in Capernaum (*Mar_1:35*), after the cleansing of the leper (*Luk_5:16*), and after dismissing the multitude which He had fed (*Mar_6:46*). He was prepared by prayer for the choice of the Twelve (*Luk_6:12*), and for His willing acceptance of death (*Luk_9:28*). But inward conflict arose also from *temptation* (see Temptation), for 'he was in all points tempted even as we are' (*Heb_4:15*). This experience was not confined to one occasion, for, as Luke (*Luk_4:13*) states, the tempter 'departed from him for a season,' and it is not improbable even that the narratives of the Temptation (*Mat_4:1-11, Mar_1:12-13, Luk_4:1-13*) bring together a series of trials, separated by intervals of time. The language He used shows that He felt as temptations to turn from His Divinely appointed path, His mother's appeal at Cana (*Joh_2:4*), and Peter's remonstrance at Caesarea Philippi (*Mat_16:23*); and even the request of the Greeks for an interview (*Joh_12:27*). Gethsemane must also be regarded as a time of temptation (*Mat_26:41, Mar_14:38; cf. Luk_22:40; Luk_22:46*). His dread of encouraging curiosity or wrong belief by His miracles (*Joh_4:48*) came in conflict with His desire to help and comfort; and when the Evangelists call attention to *compassion* as the motive of His performing a miracle, we may conclude that there had been such a struggle of soul (*Mat_14:14; Mat_15:32; Mat_20:34, Mar_1:41, Luk_7:13*). So also this feeling of sympathy came in conflict

with His desire for rest and privacy (Mat 9:30, Mar 1:44; Mar 6:31). His conflict with the scribes and Pharisees regarding Sabbath observance, fasting, ceremonial washing, and intercourse with sinners must have distressed His spirit; for He too would need to face the issue—would He follow custom or conscience? We have more distinct evidence of the inward strain felt by Him, because His regard for Jewish prejudice and exclusiveness in relation to the Gentiles, in order that He might not estrange His countrymen, compelled Him to assume an attitude of aloofness to the Gentiles (the Roman centurion, Mat 8:10; the Syrophenician mother, Mat 15:26; the Greeks, Joh 12:23).

What struggles of soul must have resulted from the thwarting of His love and grace by the misunderstanding or unbelief of His relatives (Mar 3:31-35), His disciples (Mat 15:17; Mat 16:9; Mat 26:31, Mar 14:27), His fellow-townsmen (Mar 6:6), and the Jerusalem which He so loved that He wept over it (Luk 13:34; Luk 19:41)! He strove to turn Judas from his betrayal (Joh 6:70, Mat 17:22; Mat 26:23, Joh 13:27, Luk 22:48), and to save Peter from his denial (Luk 22:32). His struggle of soul culminated, severe and grievous as it had often been, in the agony and desolation of the Cross, when the beloved Son of God was so made sin (2Co 5:21) and a curse (Gal 3:13) for mankind, that in His darkness and loneliness He felt Himself forsaken of God (Mat 27:46).

Alfred E. Garvie.

☒ Stumble, Stumbling-Block

STUMBLE, STUMBLING-BLOCK.—See Hindrance.

☒ Suffering

SUFFERING.—Suffering was not a mere accident in the career of Christ. Neither is it so in the life of any of His true followers. It came to Him in the fulfilment of His Divine mission. Just so must it come to all those who are co-workers with Him in the Kingdom of God. Therefore in the NT the sombre background of physical and spiritual suffering is never absent from the thought of the writers. St. Peter, perhaps more than any other, dwells upon it in its doctrinal and practical aspect, but all were profoundly impressed by the significance of Christ's sufferings, and endeavoured to interpret the tribulations of His followers in the light of His own varied experiences.

1. Concerning the distressing events in the Master's life, the NT gives us warrant for holding to several conclusions. We misinterpret the meaning of Christ's entrance into humanity, if we limit His tribulations merely to the agony of the Passion. The bitter experiences of His last week were typical of the harsh events of His life as a whole. His emptying of Himself (Php 2:7) to become the humble partner of humanity in its struggle against sin and for holiness, was itself the acme of suffering. The Agony in the Garden and the terrors of the death on the Cross were but the last scenes in the drama of His humiliation. Nor must the intensity of His physical sufferings blind us to the reality of the woes of His spirit. With His Divine sensitiveness to selfishness and disobedience and hard-heartedness and unresponsiveness and sin, how poignant must have been the griefs which His sinless soul endured! For this 'man of sorrows, acquainted with grief' (Isa 53:3), every day must have been one of crucifixion. Against Him who came to destroy sin was displayed all the violence of which evil was capable. That He must needs suffer in His effort to accomplish His mission was the inevitable consequence of His Messiahship (Act 26:23, Luk 24:26). But not by His mere sufferings did He redeem humanity. These, in themselves, were not necessary to His office as the 'anointed One,' out were the certain results of the lifework upon which He had entered. Only as He was willing to endure whatever human experiences might come to Him could He reveal the Father and help to turn men to righteousness, by showing them the enormity of sin (Heb 13:12). Against Him were displayed the fearful extremes to which sin would go in its effort to overcome good. But by this high discipline was His own spirit cultured (Heb 5:8); and through His heroic, victorious endurance of sin-imposed suffering did He become our High Priest, able to succour those who are tempted (Heb 2:17-18, Heb 4:15). In this noble sense are the sufferings of Christ central to His gospel, so that St. Peter can justly call himself a witness of the sufferings of Christ (1Pe 5:1).

2. Nor are the followers of Christ to escape the experiences that came to Him (Joh 15:20). See art. Sorrow.

Charles W. Rishell.

☞ Summer

SUMMER (θερος, Mat 24:32, Mar 13:28, Luk 21:30).—This term stands in the Gospels for the time of heat as distinguished from χειμών, the season of cold and rain-storms. These terms indicate the great division of the year in the East. Scripture has no special words for 'spring' and 'autumn'; and while the Arab speaks of *er-rabî'a*, 'the time of fresh pasture,' and *el-kharîf*, 'the time of gathering' of grapes and other

fruits, they are hardly regarded as distinct seasons. *Saif wa shitta*, 'summer and winter,' sum up the year for him. When, in the less frequent showers of early April, the fig-leaves burst out and cover the immature fruit on the twigs, the days of cloudless sunshine are 'at hand.' These last from April, through the harvest in the end of May, the threshing and winnowing that follow, and the gathering of the fruits in August and September, until the clouds of October herald the coming of rains and cold.

W. Ewing.

☪ Sun

SUN.—The rising of the sun marks the morning (Mar_16:2), and its setting the evening (Mar_1:32, Luk_4:40). Its light is one of the gifts which the Creator bestows on all men without distinction (Mat_5:45). By 'signs in the sun' (Luk_21:25) we are to understand the phenomena of eclipse, as described more clearly in the parallel passages, Mat_24:29, Mar_13:24. The statement in Luk_23:45 as to 'the sun being darkened' (Authorized Version) or 'the sun's light failing' (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885) at the time of the Crucifixion, cannot be explained in this way, since an eclipse of the sun can happen only at new moon, whereas the Crucifixion took place at a Passover, when the moon was full. The sun's scorching heat, so destructive to vegetation, is an emblem of tribulation or persecution (Mat_13:6; Mat_13:21, Mar_4:6; Mar_4:17). The appearance of the face of Christ at the Transfiguration (Mat_17:2) and in the opening vision of the Apocalypse (Rev_1:16) is compared to the brightness of the sun. The same thing is said of the glory in which the righteous shall appear after the final judgment (Mat_13:43).

James Patrick.

☪ Supernatural

SUPERNATURAL.—It is generally recognized that this word is difficult to define, and its definitions are difficult to defend. The reason of this is simple. It is not a scientific but a popular term, and is therefore liable to the ambiguity and vagueness besetting words which really involve metaphysical considerations, but which have grown into use without any proper discussion of the metaphysical questions involved. The word means that which is *beyond* or *above nature*; but the word 'nature' is ambiguous, and it is therefore uncertain what, if anything, corresponds to the word 'supernatural.' In

ordinary speech, 'supernatural' would appear to mean anything outside the ordinary course of the phenomenal world. Everything connected with ghosts, for instance, is described as supernatural, and such things as telepathy are said to border on the supernatural. But even in such cases as this the idea attached to the word is not clear. A ghost, let us say, raps on a table, or makes the sound of a carriage driving up to the door. These are perfectly natural and ordinary sounds: they are called 'supernatural' only in the sense that they are produced in an extraordinary way. And by this is apparently meant that the spiritual or volitional cause of the sounds is in an unusual relation to the material world. A chairman rapping on the table at a meeting, or a cabman driving up to the door, is a spiritual or volitional cause of the sounds produced, but he is in the ordinary relation to matter. So the phenomena of telepathy are said to border on the supernatural, because in them effects are produced in a way which the popular mind regards as peculiarly mysterious.

Those who hold that the world was made and is ruled by God, have to imagine to themselves in some shape the mode in which God exercises His sway. For ordinary purposes it suffices to treat the world as an independent organization, carried on by laws which are regarded as invariable, and it is unnecessary to refer continually to the Primary Cause of all. This view of the world is harmless enough, but it has the disadvantage of developing an inveterate tendency or habit of thought, by which the world is set up over against God, as equivalent to 'nature' or the 'natural order'; while all action on the part of God is treated as having the character of disturbance or interference in an order which possesses independent rights, or as being supernatural, in virtue of the fact that it does interfere or disturb. From this habit of mind come all those phrases by which miracles are described as 'suspensions of the order of nature,' and the like. If a person under the influence of this habit of thought meets with the suggestion that miracles are themselves orderly, and illustrate a higher law than that of ordinary experience, he is disquieted, because he thinks that in losing the character of disturbance, miracles lose their 'supernatural' character.

Two things are clear in regard to this difficulty: (1) that the source of it lies in the (unverified) dualism between God and the world; (2) that there is a real point involved in the distress of the plain man at what he thinks is an attenuation of the meaning of miracle. We will consider the second point first. It is manifest that if the law which governs miracle differed from that governing ordinary experience, merely in complexity, the distinction of natural and supernatural would disappear; so far the plain man is right. A conjurer does not profess to use any but the most ordinary laws: yet a savage might look upon the common trick of bringing live pigeons out of a hat as a real, creative 'supernatural' act. Some of the language used by critics of miracles and the term 'supernatural' have a tendency to bring these events down to the level of tricks or deceptions. It is said, for instance, that a fuller knowledge of natural processes would lead us to see in the miracle at the wedding-feast at Cana merely an

acceleration of such processes, which would quite surrender itself to ordinary methods of interpretation. If this were true, the miracle would cease to be in any sense 'supernatural'; it would be merely a special, imperfectly analyzed case of an ordinary occurrence. This is a real attenuation of the meaning of the word, and the plain man is right in objecting to it. But he is wrong if he objects to it on the ground, expressed or implied, that Divine action is necessarily explosive or disruptive; for this would mean that Divine action is irrational, and that a miracle must be as great a marvel to God as to man. Whatever the appearance of the supernatural to us, to God it must appear rational and orderly. God is the author of nature and its laws. Their uniformity represents His normal action and will for the world. But nature and its laws have no independent validity or rights as against God. They are entirely at His disposal and under His control. If, for whatever reason, He diverges from what is normal, it will be for sufficient cause. He will act in a new way upon the old material, reminding man of the dependence of all upon Him. And the difference between the normal and the abnormal action does not consist in the nature of the laws employed, as if the usual operation of natural law were broken or suspended by some intrusive and alien force; but in the fact that the action of God upon the order of created being is in one case what we expect, in the other widely different. There is no reason why the word 'supernatural,' which will certainly not be driven out of our vocabulary, should not be used as a label for certain characteristic groups of actions and events. It appears necessary to vindicate the freedom of God to take such action: otherwise we subject Him to the tyranny of His own laws. But there is no reason to associate the word with a variety of half-conscious dualistic assumptions, which cannot be defended in theory. See also art. Miracles.

Thomas B. Strong.

⚠Superscription

SUPERSCRPTION.—See Title on Cross.

⚠Supper

SUPPER (δεῖπνον).—The term applied in the time of Christ to the principal meal usually partaken of in the evening, and also to more elaborate collations for the entertainment of guests (weddings, birthdays, arrival and departure of friends or distinguished persons, sheep-shearing, completion of wine-making, funerals, etc.). Invitations were conveyed by slaves (Mat_22:3 ff.). Guests were welcomed by the host

with a kiss (Luk 7:45); their feet were washed by slaves (Luk 7:44); their hair, beards, and sometimes their clothes and feet were anointed with perfumed oil (Luk 7:38, Joh 12:3); and garlands of flowers were sometimes provided for the decoration of their heads (Wis 2:7 f.; Josephus *Ant.* xix. ix. 1). On formal occasions the guests were arranged at the table by the master of the feast (ἀρχιτροίκλινος), usually a friend of the family, according to his conception of their relative social rank, nearness to the host being the mark of honour. Guests commonly reclined on benches (sometimes elaborate and luxurious), three or five to the bench, the feet of each extending behind, and the back of the head of each reaching to the bosom of his neighbour on the left (Joh 13:23; Joh 21:20). The tables were usually three in number, arranged to form three sides of a square. The guests reclined upon the outside, and the servants ministered from the inside. The left elbow was used for support, while the right hand and arm were free for conveying food. A somewhat formal giving of thanks preceded each meal (εὐλογία, εὐχαριστία). This practice was carefully observed by Jesus and His disciples (Mat 14:19; Mat 15:36; Mat 26:26, Luk 9:16, Joh 6:11). At suppers of the more formal or festive type the host served the guests with equal portions as far as was practicable, where no special honour was to be done to special guests. In the latter case, a double, triple, or even quintuple, or a particularly choice portion was bestowed upon the guest of honour. At less formal suppers the food was cut into small pieces and put into large dishes, from which the guests took them with their fingers and conveyed them to flat cakes of bread which served as plates, where they pulled them to pieces before conveying them to their mouths. Pieces of the bread were used as spoons for dipping gravy from the common dish. Individual knives, forks, and spoons were not used even by the wealthy until long after NT times. The practice of hand-washing immediately before the meal had thus its special appropriateness. When women were admitted to suppers of the more formal kind (which was probably unusual), they seem to have sat rather than reclined. Wine was drunk during the meal and after the eating (Mishna, *Berakhoth* vi. 5 f., cf. viii. 8). Thanksgiving and hand-washing closed the meal.

The ordinary suppers of the well-to-do classes were far less formal. The suppers of the poor were no doubt partaken of without tables or seats, the family sitting, or squatting on the ground, around a skin or mat, and partaking of the plain food (flesh being rarely used) out of common vessels with the fingers. See also artt. Food, Meals, and Last Supper.

Literature.—Artt. in the Bible Dictionaries of Smith, Kitto, Hastings, Schenkel, Riehm, the *Ebi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*], Winer's *RWB* [Note: *WB Realwörterbuch.*], Herzog-Hauck, *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ; Wetzler u. Welte,

Kirchen-Lexikon; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*; E. Robinson, *BRP* [Note: *RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.*]; Buxtorf, *de Conviviis Ebræorum*; and Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xxx.

Albert Henry Newman.

☩ Supremacy

SUPREMACY.—Few things are more remarkable in the Gospels than the absolute supremacy over nature and man which Christ is represented as both claiming and exercising. In this respect the Synoptics bear, if anything, a more striking witness than the Fourth Gospel. Christ appears from first to last as exercising lordship over matter and natural forces. He heals incurable diseases, stills the storm by a word, multiplies food, withers the barren fig-tree. And, beyond these things, He appears also as supreme over the world of spirits. He calls back the human soul to the body after they have been separated by death. He is acknowledged as lord by the unwilling and undesired testimony of the demons (Mar 1:34, Luk 4:33-35 etc.). Such a supremacy He appears, in the Gospel narrative, to exert without laying any special claim upon it. He accepts, indeed, with praise the confession of the centurion (Mat 8:5-13), that such authority belongs naturally to Him; yet He does not represent these wonders as being the chief purpose of His ministry. He appeals at times to their evidence; but His most characteristic claim is something even greater and more fundamental.

Christ plainly claims supremacy over the moral nature of man, over human conscience and human destiny—a supremacy extending through all time, and without limitation. His association with or subordination to the Father is not referred to as limiting, but rather as justifying His own claim (Mat 16:27, Joh 5:19-27). On His own sole word He reverses human standards of judgment (Mat 5:3-10; Mat 19:30, Luk 6:20-26). He expands, modifies, or abolishes by His own 'I say unto you,' laws or institutions which were admittedly Divine in their origin (Matthew 5; Mat 19:3-9; cf. Mat 7:28-29). Yet at the same time He refuses to enter into competition with temporal rulers, or to give decisions, as even a prophet might have done, on human matters of dispute (Joh 6:15, Luk 12:13-14), His supremacy is too great and too comprehensive for Him to involve Himself in such controversies, which men will learn to settle when they have learned the greater lesson. His words, He asserts, are more lasting than heaven and earth (Mat 24:35). He proclaims Himself King and Judge of the Kingdom which He is founding. The members of it are His servants, and responsible to Him alone (Mat 24:25, Mar 13:34; Mar 13:37, Luk 12:35-48). But His supremacy extends beyond the limits of His own Kingdom. He claims to be the final Judge of all the nations, to allot the eternal punishment or reward of every individual soul (Mat 16:27; Mat 25:31; Mat 25:46; cf. Mar 13:26-27, Luk 21:27-36). And this universal dominion

over both matter and spirit is expressed finally in the tremendous closing verses of Mt., 'All authority hath been given (ἐδόθη, the aorist of an eternal fact) unto me in heaven and in earth.' It is indeed in this Gospel that the claim of Christ to be King and Judge of all men is stated in the most detailed and vivid manner. But there is no inconsistency with the other Gospels. A similar claim is implied in all; cf. esp. Luk 19:11-27.

In the Acts, Christ is preached by the Apostles as 'Lord' (Act 2:36), as 'prince (ἀρχηγός) of life' (Act 3:15), as universal Judge of men (Act 10:42, Act 17:31). St. Paul from the moment of his conversion speaks of Jesus as his absolute Master, whose 'slave' he is (Rom 1:1), whose 'marks' he bears branded upon his body (Gal 6:17). The descriptions of the nature and office of Christ in the Epistles of the First Imprisonment state and justify this supremacy in the most startling and comprehensive manner. 'In the name of Jesus' all creation must bow; all creation must confess His Lordship (Php 2:10-11). All things have been created through Him and unto Him: creation not only starts from Him, but converges in Him (Col 1:16-18). Christ is the 'head of all principality and power' (Col 2:10). All things are 'in subjection under his feet' (Eph 1:21-22).

This supremacy of Christ is again the most characteristic feature of the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Everywhere the eye of the believer is directed to Him (Heb 2:9; Heb 3:1; Heb 4:14; Heb 8:1; Heb 12:2-3; Heb 13:8; Heb 13:20). His figure dominates the whole of man's life; and the writer plainly implies that this supremacy is essential and indefeasible.

The same teaching appears in a more pictorial form in the changing scenery of the Apocalypse. Christ receives the homage of all creation (Rev 5:9-14), He is associated with God the Father in the possession of 'the kingdom of the world' (Rev 11:15), He Himself is 'King of kings and Lord of lords' (Rev 19:11-16).

Christian worship, Christian art, Christian sufferings are full of the same testimony. Christ is worshipped personally as Lord and God. He is portrayed as universal ruler, bearing the insignia of empire over all the thoughts and needs and works of men. The martyrs incurred the reproach of disloyalty to temporal rulers, nay, even of being enemies to human society, by their unswerving allegiance to Christ as supreme over all human laws and customs. Polycarp, confronted with death, confesses Him as 'Saviour and King.' The narrative of his martyrdom contrasts the brief authority of Jewish and Roman officials with 'the reign of the eternal King, Jesus Christ' (*Letter of the Smyrnaeans*, 21).

The Christ of the Gospels, the Christ of Christian experience, must be supreme or nothing at all. The idea of a limited or temporary supremacy is self-contradictory. The Christian conscience, however laggard the will, cannot but confess the justice of the Master's question: 'Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?' (Luk_6:46). See also artt. Authority of Christ, Divinity of Christ, King, Lord.

Literature.—Liddon, *Divinity of our Lord* (Bampton Lectures, 1866); Gore, *Incarnation of the Son of God* (do. 1891); Seeley, *Ecce Homo*, 1866; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, 1883; Père Didon, *Jesus Christ*, 1891; Sanday, art. 'Jesus Christ' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ; Westcott, *Christus Consummator*, 1887; Ellicott, *Christus Comprobator*, 1891; Stubbs, *Christus Imperator*, 1894.

A. R. Whitham.

Surprise

SURPRISE.—The word has an objective as well as a subjective reference: it means both 'the act of taking unawares' and 'the emotion caused by anything sudden.' The emotion is closely akin to *wonder*, 'the state of mind produced by something new, unexpected, or extraordinary'; but sudden emergence is its distinctive characteristic. It may enter in as an element in *disappointment*, when hopes are defeated, purposes miscarry, or efforts are frustrated suddenly. When the nature of an object is inexplicable, unintelligible, when the occurrence of an event is unexpected, uncalculated, *surprise* is felt. It necessarily implies limitation of knowledge, an incapacity of the subject knowing to completely possess and command in thought the object known. In the objective reference, some instances of surprise, or at least the attempt to surprise, are found in the Gospels. The enemies of Jesus tried to 'catch Him in talk' (Mar_12:13, Luk_11:54) by the questions they put to Him. They 'watched Him whether He would heal on the Sabbath day, that they might find an accusation against him' (Luk_6:7). He had to be constantly on His guard against their malignity. By the treachery of Judas they were able to surprise Him, unprotected by the multitude, in Gethsemane. Peter's denial was in some measure due to his being taken by surprise, even although Jesus had forewarned him. It is in the subjective reference of the term that we are specially interested in reading the Gospels—the surprise Jesus felt and the surprise He caused. So different was Jesus in character, purpose, spirit, from His environment, that He could not always understand it, still less could it understand Him. During His earthly ministry the secrets of all hearts were not laid bare to Him, although He occasionally displayed an extraordinary insight into the thoughts and wishes of others; nor was the veil of the future altogether withdrawn, even although He did, in regard to His own death and resurrection, and the doom of

the city which rejected Him, show an exceptional knowledge. But supernatural as in these respects His knowledge was, it was not a Divine omniscience—for which *surprise* is impossible, as for it there is neither the inexplicable nor the unexpected. The subject of the limitation of Jesus' knowledge is more fully dealt with in the art Kenosis. Jesus was *surprised* by the anxiety felt and the search made for Him by His parents, when He remained behind in the Temple. 'How is it that ye sought me?' (Luk 2:49); He ' marvelled because of their unbelief, in Nazareth (Mar 6:6); He was disappointed at the dulness of understanding of His disciples (Mat 15:17; Mat 16:9; Mat 16:11) and of His hearers in Jerusalem (Joh 8:43), and at the unbelief of His generation (Mar 8:12). But, on the other hand, the faith of the centurion (Mat 8:10) and of the Syrophœnician woman (Mat 15:28), brought Him glad surprise. The storm on the Sea of Galilee (Mat 8:24) was a surprise to Him even as to His disciples, although His faith was not disturbed as theirs was; so also He knew not that He was sending His disciples into any danger when He dismissed them after the feeding of the five thousand (Mat 14:22; see the discussion of these two incidents in Adamson's *The Mind in Christ*, pp. 5-10). He was disappointed in His desire for rest with His disciples (Mar 6:31; Mar 6:34), and for secrecy (Mar 7:24-25). He expected to find fruit on the barren fig-tree (Mar 11:13). Although the growing estrangement of Judas was, from its beginnings, perceived by Him (Joh 6:64; see Dods' comment *in loco* in *Expositor's Gr. Test.* i. p. 759), yet when He called him He did not anticipate his treachery. His state in Gethsemane was one of *amazement* (Mar 14:33); there was an element in the doom He looked forward to that He could not understand, and had not looked for. His amazement is expressed in the cry of desolation on the Cross (Mat 27:46). What He then experienced was worse than He had anticipated. As man's sin had ever been a surprise to Him, so was its worst consequence when it fell on Him.

Jesus Himself so transcended the world in which He lived, taught, and wrought, that He was constantly a surprise to men. This He Himself expected (Joh 3:7; Joh 5:20; Joh 5:28; Joh 7:21). The marvel began with Joseph and Mary in the Temple at Simeon's prophecy, and at Jesus' own words (Luk 2:33; Luk 2:50). The multitudes marvelled at His teaching, His healing, His forgiveness of sins, His wisdom in answering the questions of His opponents, and His grace in preaching the gospel (Mar 1:22; Mar 1:27, Mat 7:28-29, Mar 2:12; Mar 5:20; Mar 5:42, Mat 9:8; Mat 9:33; Mat 12:23, Luk 9:43; Luk 7:49, Mat 22:22, Luk 20:26; Luk 4:22). His disciples were astonished at His command over the storm (Mar 6:51), His teaching regarding the rich (Mat 19:25), and the curse on the fig-tree (Mat 21:20). His disregard of the current customs caused surprise (Luk 11:38, Joh 4:27), as did the freedom from these He allowed to His disciples (Mar 2:18; Mar 7:5). The world's surprise at Jesus is its tribute to His unique perfection; His surprise at man's sin and unbelief the evidence of its need of the grace and truth of the Son of God. See, further, Amazement.

Literature.—A. J. Mason, *Conditions of Our Lord's Life on Earth*, 135-138; T. Adamson, *Studies of the Mind in Christ*, 5-12, 167; Gore, *BL [Note: L Bampton Lecture.]* 147f.

Alfred E. Garvie.

☞ Susanna

SUSANNA (Σουσάννα fr. שושנה, fem. שושנה, which denotes a lily or any lily-like flower).—All that is known of her is that she was one of the women who ministered to Jesus (Luk_8:3). The mention of her name without further particulars implies that she was well known. This may have been due to her special devotion, in which case reference to her on other occasions would have been expected, or to her social rank, which view may derive support from the succession of her name to that of Joanna (wh. see).

R. W. Moss.

☞ Swaddling Clothes

SWADDLING CLOTHES.—The custom of wrapping the newborn infant in bands of cloth (σπαργανόω) has long prevailed, and still exists in the East. This treatment was supposed to make for the strengthening and proper growth of the back and limbs, as well as being convenient for carrying the child. The infant Jesus was not neglected in this particular, though laid in the manger (Luk_2:7; Luk_2:12); the absence of swaddling bands being regarded as a sign of extreme poverty or of neglect (cf. Eze_16:4).

E. B. Pollard.

☞ Swearing

SWEARING.—See Oaths.

☒ Sweat

SWEAT.—The word ‘sweat’ occurs only in one passage in the NT, namely Luk 22:44, in the narrative of our Lord’s agony in Gethsemane, where we read: ‘His sweat became, as it were, great drops of blood falling down upon the ground.’ In approaching the discussion of the passage there are three matters to be considered: (1) the textual problem, (2) the interpretation of the words ‘became, as it were,’ and (3) the possibility of the phenomenon known as ‘bloody sweat (*hæmadrosis*),

1. In turning first to the textual question, we find that Luk 22:43-44 are omitted in many of the best authorities for the text of the NT (the great uncials \aleph^a ABRT). A number of other uncials (ESVΓΔΠ) mark the passage as doubtful; and in the case of Codex \aleph the hand of one corrector has apparently inserted it, while that of another has deleted it. The Church Fathers, Hilary, Jerome, and others bear witness that there were many Manuscripts known to them which did not contain these two verses; and certain Manuscripts insert them in the parallel passage in Mt.’s Gospel, namely after Mat 26:39. Of the Versions, one MS of the Old Latin omits them, as do also the best of the Egyptian, Armenian, and the oldest Syriac versions. Cyril of Alexandria omits the verses in his *Homilies* on Lk.’s Gospel, while the silence of such writers as Clement of Alexandria and Origen cannot be without significance. One cursive MS (124) omits them, while No. 13 has them inserted by a corrector. In the Greek Lectionaries the verses are generally omitted from the lesson in which they would naturally appear, but are inserted in the Mt. passage, a custom that seems to have influenced Chrysostom in his reference to the passage, though, as WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort’s text.] admit, ‘a mere comparison of the parallel narratives of the Evangelists would suffice to suggest to him the reference.’ On the other hand, the Manuscripts that include the verses as they stand in Lk. are the following: uncials $\aleph^*DFGHKLM$ QUXA, and nearly all cursives. While A omits the passage, as we have seen, it has the reference section-number in the margin, showing that its presence in other Manuscripts must have been known to the scribe. The verses are contained also in the majority of the Manuscripts of the Old Latin, some few Egyptian, the Syr-Pesh. and Syr-Hier. They are known also to Justin Martyr (who quotes them in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, 103), Iren., Jerome, and Augustine. The verses gave rise to much discussion among early writers, some of whom held that they had been wilfully cut out by some who were afraid of their employment by unorthodox writers; though, on the other hand, they constituted a strong weapon of proof against those who denied the reality of our Lord’s humanity.

The conclusion to be drawn from this evidence is that the main witness to the presence of the verses is of a Western order; but this need not mean more than that,

as is the habit of the Western text of Lk. in particular, many elements of tradition that would otherwise have been lost are contained in it. This is the conclusion to which WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] come. Their words are: 'These verses can only be a fragment from the traditions, written or oral, which were, for a while at least, locally current beside the canonical Gospels, and which doubtless included matter of every degree of authenticity and intrinsic value. These verses and the first sentence of Luk_23:34 may be safely called the most precious among the remains of this Evangelic tradition which were rescued from oblivion by the scribes of the 2nd century.' Neither do these editors think that there is any evidence of the omission of the verses for doctrinal reasons. It would appear, therefore, as if they stood very much in the same position as does the *Pericope Adulteræ*; that is, as an early story of the Evangelic tradition that had not found its way into all the copies of the canonical Gospels.

2. The next point to consider is the interpretation of the words 'as it were great drops of blood.' Here again there is a secondary question of reading, because certain manuscripts and versions (ⲠⲪⲱ, Vulgate Boh.) read the genitive of the word rendered 'falling down,' agreeing with the word for 'blood,' and not the nominative in agreement with the word for 'drops,' as do the majority of the authorities. The Greek word *θρόμβος*, either with or without *αἵματος*, can itself bear the meaning 'a drop of blood,' and is so used in classical Greek writers (see *aesch. Eum.* 184; *Plato, Crit.* 120 A). Tatian in his *Diatessaron* renders in an exaggerated form, 'like a stream of blood,' which Bernard supposes would be visible in the moonlight.

When Justin quotes the verse he also omits 'of blood'; but this may be because he regarded the word *θρόμβοι* as bearing that signification. Even when all is said, however, the expression may not mean more than that there was a resemblance between the falling of the heavy drops of perspiration and the plashing of blood-gouts from a wound, so that the verse does not absolutely and necessarily assert that blood flowed from our Lord's body in the moment of His extreme anguish.

In a special discussion of the subject by Harnack, that writer maintains that the stamp of Lk. is clearly manifest on the verses in question, and it is to be remembered that it is a very remarkable thing that the only record of this event should occur in the Gospel attributed to the man whom tradition asserts to have been a physician, and whose own language supports the statement. This remarkable phenomenon is the very thing we should expect a physician to take special pains carefully to record. Harnack in the same discussion draws attention to the passage in Joh_12:27; Joh_12:30, which he regards as that Evangelist's account of the same incident. It is remarkable that while the passage in Lk. speaks of an angel succouring Jesus, the passage in the Fourth Gospel tells of a voice from heaven that answered His prayer, which voice was

regarded by some of the people as that of an angel. In Harnack's opinion the Fourth Gospel draws its material for the Passion narrative from the Synoptics, and here he thinks we have another version of the story contained in Luke. Harnack also reminds us that there are two points in the Lukan story that would offend orthodox readers, first, the mention of an angel as strengthening our Lord, which might be a strong support to those who exaggerated the importance of angel ministry; and, second, the fact that the agony was the result of an inward struggle, which might be taken as pointing to too great human weakness in our Lord's Person to be consonant with the full maintenance of His Divine nature.

3. There has been much discussion as to whether such a thing as a bloody sweat is a possibility, and here we come into the realm of medical evidence. Much has been written on the matter, both in older days and up to the present time; a great deal of it, one must admit, being irrelevant. The less critical medical writers of an earlier time were content to quote Galen as their authority for the statement that sometimes 'the pores are so vastly dilated by a copious and fervent spirit, that even blood issues through them and constitutes a bloody sweat' (see R. Mead, *Medical Works*, 1762, ch. 13). The most recent medical conclusion on the subject seems to be that it is physically possible for blood to exude through the sweat glands, as the contiguity of the blood vessels and these glands is so close and oftentimes the walls that divide them are so extremely thin.* [Note: In the case of haemophilic persons it seems not only possible but probable. Again, however, the relevancy is not very apparent.] It may thus be granted that such an event as the ordinary text describes was a possibility, though nothing very closely allied to it has ever been observed, and one would naturally manifest great caution in accepting the historicity of it, in view of all that has already been said about the passage.

Some writers have understood the phrase 'drops of blood' as a purely figurative one, being simply expressive of the intense agony undergone by the sufferer, and not in any sense to be taken either literally or as even suggesting that the perspiration was itself so heavy as to suggest the dripping of blood.

There remains one interesting instance of the use of the verb 'sweat' in a passage of the early Christian writing known as the *Didache*, where in ch. 1 we read, 'Let thine alms sweat into thine hands until thou shalt have learned to whom to give.' The words, indeed, are not actually quoted as Christ's, but there can be little question that the author regarded them as a traditional saying of the Lord.

Literature.—The Comm. on the passage, esp. Plummer, *ad loc.*, and the additional note on p. 544; Holtzmann in the *Hdcom.*; the *Expos. Gr. Test.*; WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.], 'Notes on Select Readings,' pp. 64-67; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Medicine'; *Encyc. Bibl.*, art. 'Sweat (Bloody),' col. 4824, also 'Cross,'

par. 5, col. 959; Harnack's discussion in *Sitzungsber. der Berl. Akad. der Wissensch.* 1901; Quain's *Dict. of Medicine* (ed. 1902, Murray), 'Sudoriparous Glands (Diseases of)'; R. Mead, *Medical Works*, 1762, p. 630; W. Stroud, A '*Treatise on the Physical Cause of the Death of Christ*, 1847; *Allgemeine Ztschr. für Psychiatrie*, 1863, xx. 51; on the case of Louise Lateau see *Macmillan's Mag.* 1871, and *Lancet*, 1871, 1, 543; Gould and Pyle, *Anomalies and Curiosities of Medicine*, 1897, ix. 388 ff.; T. M. Anderson, *Contributions to Clinical Medicine*, 1898, p. 43; Besnier et Jacquet, *La pratique dermatologique*, vol. iv. 1904, pp. 420-424; Hobart, *Medical Language of St. Luke*, 79 ff.; Harnack, *Luke the Physician* [English translation], 194 n. [Note: note.]

G. Currie Martin.

☞ Swine

SWINE.—See Animals in vol. i. p. 64^b.

☞ Sword

SWORD.—In Luk 2:35 and in some passages in the Apocalypse the word for 'sword' is ῥομαία elsewhere in the NT it is μάχαιρα. The former denoted a weapon used by barbarous nations, especially the Thracians (Livy, xxxi. 39: 'Thracas quoque romphaeae ingentis et ipsae longitudinis, inter objectos undique ramos impediabant'). It thus appears to have been rather a lance or javelin than a sword, and so may reflect the Hebrew *rômah*. In the Syr. [Note: Syriac.] of Luk 2:35 the word used is *romah*, and the phrase is probably a reminiscence of Psa 37:15 (LXX Septuagint). The word μάχαιρα may denote nothing more than a knife or dagger, as in the LXX Septuagint of Jos 5:2-3 of flint knives, but also a sword. The people who came to arrest Jesus were armed with swords and clubs: Jesus' followers also had two swords, which Jesus declared to be enough; and one of them (Peter) drew his sword and wounded a servant of the high priest (Mat 26:47-55, Mar 14:43-48, Luk 22:36-52, Joh 18:10-11).

Metaphorically the sword stands as a symbol for war (to 'fall by the edge of the sword' means to die in war), or for a divided state of society (Mat 10:34 'I came not to send peace, but a sword' [in Luk 12:51 'division']). In Mat 26:52 'They that take the sword shall perish with the sword,' the sword probably denotes the use of physical force generally, although we have also the belief that a tyrant is despatched

with the very weapon which he employs against the victims of his tyranny. The expression in Luk_2:35 'A sword shall pierce through thy own soul,' was sometimes interpreted as a prediction of martyrdom (Epiphanius, *Haer.* 78).

T. H. Weir.

☞ Sycamine

SYCAMINE.—The sycamine-tree (*συνάμινος*) is mentioned in the Gospels only once, viz. in Luk_17:6. The Heb. שקמים from which the Gr. name seems to be derived, denotes the **sycomore**, but the sycamine is by general consent identified with the black mulberry (*Morus nigra*). In his Hebrew NT, Delitzsch renders by תות, which is the name given to the mulberry in the Mishna (cf. Arab. [Note: Arabic.] *tût*). Two species are common in modern Palestine, the black mulberry and the white (*M. alba*). The latter, however, which is cultivated for purposes of sericulture, and whose fruit, owing to its insipidity, was little eaten, was hardly likely to be known in our Lord's time. The black mulberry, on the other hand, yields a compound fruit which, eaten fresh, is of fine flavour, and is a great favourite in the East. This tree, which is deciduous, has a dense foliage, and affords a most welcome shade during the heat of summer.

Thomson (*LB [Note: The Land and the Book.]* pp. 23, 24) would identify the sycamine with the sycomore. In support of this view he appeals to the common Hebrew origin of the two names; but his main argument is that

'the mulberry is more easily plucked up by the roots than any other tree of the same size in the country, and the thing is oftener done. Hundreds of them are plucked up every year in this vicinity, and brought to the city for firewood. It is not to be supposed,¹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] he adds, 'that He who spake as man never spoke would select this tree, with its short, feeble roots, to illustrate the irresistible power of faith.'

The argument is plausible, but not conclusive. On the contrary, what weight it has must be laid in the scale against this theory rather than in its support. The rooting up of the mulberry tree was a common practice. Granted; but was it not from the commonest doings and happenings that our Lord habitually drew His illustrations? When He would find some fit emblem of the Kingdom of God, He appealed not to the unusual but to the familiar, not to the heroic but to the homely. One of the marked charms of His teaching is the gift He had of making the commonplaces of earth speak the language of heaven. When, therefore, He would figure forth 'the irresistible

power of faith,' it need not surprise us that He selected the mulberry tree, the uprooting of which was quite familiar to His hearers. True, it was more easily plucked up than any other tree of the size. But that fact does not impair the force of the figure. The law of gravitation is as clearly manifested in the fall of the leaf as in the majestic order of the planets, and the power of faith is as vividly illustrated in the figure of uprooting a mulberry tree by the word of command, as in that of uprooting a sycamore, or even of moving a mountain.

Hugh Duncan.

☩ Sychar

SYCHAR (Συχάρ) is mentioned in connexion with the journey of Jesus from Judaea to Galilee recorded in Joh 4:4 f. We learn from Joh 4:5 f. that He came 'to a city of Samaria called Sychar, near to the parcel of ground that Jacob gave to his son Joseph: and Jacob's well (πηγή) was there'; Joh 4:11 adds the information that 'the well (φρέατος)' was 'deep.' Jacob's fountain, referred to here, is one of the undisputed sites of the Gospels. It lies in the mouth of the valley running up between Mts. Ebal and Gerizim to Shechem, 1 1/2 miles E [Note: Elohist.] . of the city and about 1100 yds. from the traditional site of Joseph's Tomb (Jos 24:32). The source of its water is still uncertain. Probably rainfall and percolation contributed most to the supply. According to Sanday (*Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, 32), 'it is possible that the special sacredness and real excellence of the water (on a hot day it is beautifully soft and refreshing) had something to do with' the presence of the woman from Sychar, though it has been suggested that she was fetching water for workmen employed on the adjacent cornlands and not for her own household. Now Sychar lay 'near' Jacob's ground and well, and the problem is whether it should be (1) identified with **Shechem**, or (2) located at the little hamlet of 'Askar, near the foot of Ebal, about a mile N. of the well and 1 3/4 miles E [Note: Elohist.] . N. E [Note: Elohist.] . of Nâblus. The balance of expert opinion seems to be in favour of the latter identification.

In support of (1), several considerations have been adduced. (a) Shechem could certainly be roughly described as 'near' Jacob's ground, and the disciples who went to 'the city' to buy bread were away during the whole of the conversation, that is, for some considerable time. Cheyne (*Encyc. Bibl.* iv. 4831) considers it unlikely that 'the city' which fills such a prominent place in the narrative of John 4 should be any other than Shechem. Then (b) Jerome (*Ep.* 86 and *Quaest. Heb. in Gen.* [Note: Geneva NT 1557, Bible 1560.] 48, 22) states that Sichern and Sichar are one and the same place,

and that Συχάο is a copyist's error for Συχέμ. Cheyne defends Jerome's hypothesis, holding that modern criticism has *not* disproved its possibility. It has also been urged (c) that the Jews called Shechem *Shikor* (= 'drunken') and *Sheker* (= 'false')—hence the transition from Shechem to Sychar. It can be added (d) that, for centuries after Jerome's time, his view was adopted by 'pilgrim' writers, among whom may be mentioned Arculf (a.d. 700), Saewulf (c. [Note: circa, about.] 1102), Theoderich (1172), Maundeville (1322), and Tuchem of Nurn berg (1480).

But strong objection has been taken to most of these contentions, in favour of (2). (a) Over against Cheyne's expression of opinion as to the likelihood of identification with Shechem may be set the view of G. A. Smith (*HGHL* [Note: *GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*] 368), that the Evangelist, who had such a good acquaintance with the OT, could not, in face of Gen 33:19 and Jos 24:32, have substituted (in error) *Sychar* for *Sychem*, and that if he possessed only such knowledge of the locality as the OT gave him, he would have used the name Συχέμ (like Stephen in Act 7:16). Then (b) Jerome offers no evidence for his identification, and Συχάο has now been generally adopted as the correct reading. Also Jerome translates Eusebius' note, which separates Sychar from Neapolis (or Shechem), without comment or correction (in *Onom.* s.v. 'Sychar'). (c) There is no proof whatever that the nicknames 'Shikor' and 'Sheker' were ever given to Shechem (*HGHL* [Note: *GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*] 369, and *Encyc. Bibl.* iv. 4830). And (d) in spite of the pilgrims' belief in Jerome, there is clear evidence for Sychar as a separate town, from the 4th cent, onwards.

The evidence just referred to is briefly as follows. Eusebius (*Onom.* s.v. Συχάο) writes to the effect that Sychar lay 'before Neapolis, near the piece of ground which Jacob gave to his son Joseph, where Christ, according to John, held discourse with the Samaritan woman, by the fountain: it is shown to this day.' Jerome simply translates this, adding in place of the last sentence, 'ubi nunc ecclesia fabricata est.' [But see Eusebius' *Onom.* s.v. Συχέμ and Βάλανος Σικιμών, where *Shechem* is distinguished from Neapolis]. The Bordeaux Pilgrim (c. [Note: circa, about.] 330 a.d.) mentions a Sychar distinct from Shechem, and about a Roman mile away—to which testimony must be added that of the *Itinerary of Jerusalem* (a.d. 333), and later on of the Abbot Daniel (a.d. 1106), of Fetellus (1130), and of John of Würzburg (c. [Note: circa, about.] 1165). In the *Samaritan Chronicle* (not later than the 14th cent.) a town spelt 'Ischar (with initial Aleph) is referred to, 'apparently near Shechem' and the same as Sychar. Finally, the traveller Berggren found the name 'Askar or 'Asgar (with Ayin) given both to a spring and to the whole plain. This name still attaches to the modern village at the foot of Ebal. G. A. Smith (*HGHL* [Note: *GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*] 371) and Cheyne (*Encyc. Bibl.* iv. 4831) agree that 'Askar may well have

grown out of *Suchar*—the intermediary form being *'Ischar*. There is a parallel in the case of *'Ashkelon*, mod. *'Askalan*. To this evidence for separating Shechem and Sychar must be added references in the Talmud (noted by Lightfoot) to a place called *Suchar* or *Sichar*, a 'fountain of *Suchar*' and 'a plain of en-*Suchar*.' The spring and the plain just mentioned can hardly be other than those referred to by Berggren (*Reise*, ii. 267).

These references and opinions seem to justify the conclusion that St. John's Sychar is the modern *'Askar*, with its ruins and fine spring.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iv. 635; *Encyc. Bibl.* iv. 4828 f.; Robinson, *BRP* [Note: *RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.*] iii. 133; Stanley, *SP* [Note: *P Sinai and Palestine.*] 240 f., 223 (note); Thomson, *Land and Book*, ch. 31; Buhl, *GAP* [Note: *AP Geographic des alten Palästina.*] 203; Sanday, *Sacred Sites*, 31-33, 91; Baedeker-Socin, *Pal.* [Note: *Palestine, Palestinian.*] pp. 328, 337; G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [Note: *GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*] 367 f.; Ewald, *Gesch.* iv. 284; Neubauer, *Géog. du Talm.* [Note: *Talmud.*] 169; Raumer, *Pal.* [Note: *Palestine, Palestinian.*] p. 163.

A. W. Cooke.

☞ Sycomore

SYCOMORE.—The sycomore tree (συκομορέα, Luk 19:4 only), of which mention is made in the story of Zacchaeus, is the *Ficus sycomorus*. The Gr. name means literally a 'fig-mulberry,' and was bestowed upon it because it yielded a fruit akin to the fig, while its leaves, which are heart-shaped, bore some resemblance to those of the mulberry. In the OT it is called *shikmîm* (1Ki 10:27 etc.), from which is probably derived the Gr. *σικάμινος*, though that denotes a quite different tree (see Sycamine).

The sycomore, which must not be confounded with the British sycamore (*A cer pseudo-Platanus*), flourishes best in districts having a warm, equable climate. In Palestine it is found principally along the coast and in the low-lying plains around Jericho, and is often planted by the roadside. In the extreme north of Syria it is not met with, as it is not hardy enough to withstand the occasional frosts (Psa 78:47). It attains a great size, and its principal branches being long and wide-spreading, and its foliage plentiful, it yields a most delightful shade. It is deciduous, but the old leaves do not fall off till the new ones come out. Its fruit resembles that of the common fig (*Ficus carica*), but is much smaller, and very much inferior in flavour. It is eaten only by the poorer classes of the population. The 'figs,' of which there are several crops

each year, grow on short, leafless stems which spring from the trunk and from the larger branches. The process of ripening is hastened by cutting off the apex of the fruit or making an incision in it (cf. Amo 7:14 where the prophet describes himself as שִׁקְמִים בֹּלֵם a 'nipper of sycomore-figs'). The tree is very easily climbed, and its lower branches are a favourite perch for children.

Hugh Duncan.

☞ Symeon

SYMEON.—See Simeon, No. 2.

☞ Sympathy

SYMPATHY.—The subject of sympathy, considered in its relation to Jesus Christ, is so large as to be almost co-extensive with His whole life and work. The Incarnation and the Atonement, whatever be the exact theological meaning of the two words, are undoubtedly exhibitions of the intense sympathy which resulted not only in the human ministry of Christ, but in the redemption of the world. It is therefore impossible here to treat fully of the sympathy of Christ in its broader aspect. The scope of the present article will be limited to the consideration how far the sympathy of Christ which made the redemption of the world possible was manifested in His dealings as the Son of Man with His fellow-men.

1. The miracles as expressive of sympathy

(a) *Miracles of healing.*—The miracles of healing are truer expressions of the sympathy of Christ to us to-day than they were in the earlier days when miracles were regarded more as a proof of His Divinity than an incident connected, with it. The tendency of Biblical critics of late years has been to modify very considerably the scepticism of a generation ago. Especially in reference to cures of disorders of a nervous character, men of science have no hesitation in admitting the power of such a Personality as that of Jesus Christ in dealing with these complaints. Yet this way of regarding the miracles adds greatly to the significance they possess as expressive of human sympathy. The power to perform such acts of healing presupposes a combination of the tenderest sympathy with commanding authority, and it is interesting to consider that some, at least, of these miracles are instances of

sympathy according to its etymological meaning (σὺν, παθεῖν), and that Christ Himself shared the suffering in the act of relieving it. This idea is suggested by His remark with regard to the healing of certain demoniacs (Mar_9:29), that the performance of the miracle must be preceded by prayer, and is illustrated in the healing of the woman with the issue of blood (Mar_5:30), when Christ perceived ‘that virtue had gone out of him.’ According to this view, the healing ministry is not to be regarded as a proof of His Divinity so much as an outcome of it; and in this context it is especially important to notice that He never appears as a mere worker of marvels, but in a larger and grander way as the friend of sufferers, relieving their physical suffering, no less than their sorrows and their sins, by human sympathy.

(b) *Nature miracles.*—The sympathy of Christ, as revealed in His miracles, was not confined to the relief of physical sufferings occasioned by disease. The feeding of the 5000 (Mar_6:35 etc.) shows sympathy for the ordinary needs of the body; the raising of Jairus’ daughter, of the widow’s son at Nain, and of Lazarus at Bethany, illustrates His sympathetic interest in family life with all its joys and sorrows. The stilling of the storm (Mar_4:37) shows His willingness to allay the fears of His disciples in the time of personal danger. Standing in a class by itself among the miracles is the turning of the water into wine (John 2), and yet this is an act of especial interest as revealing an aspect of the sympathy of Christ which must be borne in mind. It reminds us that His sympathy extended to a wider range than the mere relief of distress. He who watched the games of the children in the market-place, as they played at weddings and funerals (Mat_11:17, Luk_7:32), and used their games as illustrations in His discourses, entered no less readily into the social pleasures of their elders. The sympathy of Christ was broad enough to cause Him to desire actively to promote social happiness, and to supply not merely the necessaries of life, but the means of enjoying its luxuries.

2. Christ’s teaching as expressive of sympathy.—What Christ showed by His own deeds and actions to be the rightful attitude in dealing with others, He also enunciated clearly in His teaching, which may be regarded as the ethical counterpart of His sympathy. The central feature of Christ’s teaching dealt with the ‘Kingdom of God,’ and the subjects and members of this Kingdom in their relation to one another no less than in their relation to God. The Sermon on the Mount is full of His teaching on this subject. The ‘Reign of God’ would witness the transmission of the Divine love and sympathy into the various subjects of the Kingdom. The clearest enunciation of the principle is in His ‘Golden Rule,’ which bids us place ourselves in the position of others in order that we may be guided as to the effect of our actions upon them (Mat_7:12). Combined with this are His various injunctions to be merciful (Mat_5:7, Luk_6:36), forgiving (Mat_6:14, Luk_17:3), pitiful (Mat_18:33), and to show these qualities to enemies as well as to friends (Mat_5:44). In all these cases the Divine

example is adduced as the chief motive. God makes His rain to fall on the evil and on the good, on the just and on the unjust; and His children must be ready to follow His example, to reconcile an offended brother, and to forgive an enemy. The teaching is further illustrated in several of the parables. The unmerciful servant (Mat 18:23-35) forfeited his claim on God's mercy. Every act of love and kindness would be revealed in the final separation on the Judgment Day as done to Himself (Mat 25:31-46). The parable of the Good Samaritan (Luk 10:30) taught the universal brotherhood of man, apart from the artificial distinctions of creed and country; that of the Prodigal Son (Luk 15:20) shows the Great [Note: reat Cranmer's 'Great' Bible 1539.] Father as bestowing the same mercy and forbearance as He would have us display. The parable of Dives and Lazarus (Luk 16:19-31), again, inculcates the duty of mercy, while that of the Pharisee and the Publican (Luk 18:9) was directed against certain who 'despised others.' Such teaching as this is thoroughly in keeping with the life of One whose chief occupation was to go about doing good, and who on the cross prayed for His murderers.

3. Christ's relation to others as expressive of sympathy

(a) *Christ's relation to sinners.*—By His friendly attitude towards 'publicans and sinners' He gave a practical expression of His doctrine of mankind, and of the power of human sympathy to reclaim. The great social gathering of outcasts in Capernaum (Mar 2:15-17), brought together by Levi or Matthew, was a concrete statement of the great truth that a man at his worst is still a man, and a bearer of the Divine image, however that image may have been defaced by faults of character and actual sin. It was this attitude towards the individual—an attitude so different from the conventional attitude of the religious world of the day—that gave Him power over such a soul as Mary Magdalene. Two classical instances of this power may be quoted, and both from St. Luke's Gospel. One is the feast in the house of Simon the Pharisee (Luk 7:36 ff.). The contrast is pointed between the self-righteous host and the sinful woman who loved much because she had been forgiven much. Christ had come to call not the righteous, but sinners to repentance, and so His work lay with the publican, with the harlot, and the poor. The other instance is that of Zacchaeus (Luk 19:1-10). The reclaiming of Zacchaeus is an illustration of the fact that a man will tend to assimilate his character to the opinions which others entertain of him. Zacchaeus was an outcast only so long as he was treated as an outcast. Jesus reclaimed him not by condoling with his trials, not by talking to him about his soul or by preaching to him about his sins, but simply by treating him as a friend and an equal. His simple words, 'I will abide at thy house,' seemed to identify Him with the publican, and to acknowledge a brother.

(b) *Christ's relation to various people.*—His sympathy was not confined to publicans and sinners. He was sorry for the young man whose riches stood between him and life.

He could deal with the unbelief of Thomas and the fall of Peter. His heart went out particularly to those who were in any spiritual need, and the conversation with the woman of Samaria shows how the 'doctrine of mankind' rose superior to the superficial cleavages of race, descent, occupation, or even character, and pronounced them all of small account in comparison with that which is common to all humanity—a soul. Indeed, as His whole mission was one of self-sacrifice and compassion for the race, it is fitting that the rare instances recorded of His weeping should be for the sorrows of others—at the grave of Lazarus—and for the sufferings of Jerusalem, rather than in the Garden of Gethsemane or for His own sufferings; and that in His death-pangs His thoughts should be on the daughters of Jerusalem, on His mother, on the dying robber, and on His murderers, rather than on Himself. It is left to the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb 4:15 f.) to state plainly the continuing nature of the Divine compassion of the Son of Man: 'We have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly,' etc.

4. Characteristics of Christ's sympathy

(a) *It was universal.*—It was not evoked by any one need, but by every need of which the human nature is capable. He could rejoice with them that did rejoice, and weep with them that wept. His presence at festivities of various kinds caused the Pharisees to bestow on Him the title of 'glutton and wine-bibber.' He appears at other times as the patron of family life, sharing alike in its joys and sorrows. Yet amid all this there stands out conspicuously the claim of the outcast, which He expressed Himself by saying that 'the Son of Man was come to seek and to save that which was lost' (Luk 19:10). The call of pain, whether bodily, mental, or spiritual, was especially strong.

(b) *It was individual.*—There is a vague way of speaking of the work of Christ in the Atonement which does not realize the tender, affectionate, and personal love by which that constant reconciliation is effected. The sympathy of Christ was not merely love of men in masses. He loved the masses, but He loved them because they were made up of individuals. 'He calleth his own sheep by name' (Joh 10:3). Christ held the master-key to the being of each one. In the Garden He uttered the one word 'Mary' (Joh 20:16). Many had called her by that name before, but none with the same revealing and interpreting inflexion. It is true that 'he had compassion on the multitude,' but He had also discriminating, special tenderness for erring Peter and Thomas. He felt for the despised and lonely Zacchaeus in the sycomore tree. He had compassion on the discomfort of His disciples. He added His tears to those of others by the grave of Lazarus. He called the abashed children to His side. He detected the individual touch of faith: 'Master, the multitude throngs thee, and sayest thou, Who touched me?... Someone hath touched me' (Luk 8:45 f.).

(c) *It was loving and judicious.*—Sympathy is not always welcomed by those on whom it is bestowed. When it savours of superiority, it is resented more than scorn. Yet this was never the case with Christ's sympathy. 'He knew what was in man' ([Joh_2:25](#)), and was capable of sympathizing in the full meaning of the word,—of entering into the state of the individual for the time being, and of identifying Himself with it. An interesting question arises on account of the persistent mention of the need for faith on the part of the recipient of His acts of compassion, and it has been asked whether mutual sympathy was the medium of the miraculous cures. Suffice it to say here that the sympathy of Christ was so tactful and so judicious as to inspire confidence, and with it the faith that was needful on the part of the sufferer to co-operate in the work of relief.

(d) *It was practical.*—Christ did not openly sympathize with the sinner as such on account of the supposed beauty inherent in the sinner's nature, as has been suggested by a recent writer of the aesthetic school (Oscar Wilde, *de profundis*, pp. 113-116). He sympathized only with the sinner in whom the germ, at any rate, of repentance was present. Compassion would have been wasted upon the Pharisees; stern treatment was necessary there. They were in the position of a man who suffers from a hidden disease, and must have it revealed to himself before he will co-operate in effecting a cure. Divine sympathy is a remedy which can operate only when the wound is open.

(e) *It was free from mere sentiment.*—The sympathy of Christ has nothing in common with a type of modern humanitarian sentiment, which is but a parody of the Divine compassion. There is a tendency to prize feeling *qua* feeling, and to praise and admire its possessor. There is a kind of sympathy which exists only to palliate sin,—to excuse it on grounds of environment, antecedents, and other causes. Such sympathy rarely does good, and generally leaves the sinner where it finds him. Christ's sympathy was no such exotic, beautiful to look at, too delicate to use. With Him feeling led to this: 'He went about doing good' ([Act_10:38](#)). With Him sympathy expressed itself in this: 'grace to help in time of need' ([Heb_4:16](#)).

(f) *It was consistent with sinlessness.*—There is an idea that it is necessary to have experienced a state of mind to be able to enter into it with proper sympathy, and that it is necessary for us to obtain experimental proof of the power of sin in order to sympathize with those who are under its sway. This was not so with Christ. He could sympathize with the sinner, because He knew what it was to be tempted. He had all the natural appetites of mind and body. 'He *suffered* being tempted' ([Heb_2:18](#)). Yet He exhibited a sinless nature by a perfect subjugation of the desire to sin to the will to do right. And the sympathy of Christ is valuable in disproving the fallacy that only the guilty can sympathize with the guilty. 'We have not a high priest which cannot

be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, *yet without sin*' (Heb_4:15). See, further, art. Pity.

Literature.—F. W. Robertson, *Serm*, i. 99; A. B. Bruce, *Gal. Gospel*, 128; R. W. Dale, *Jew. Temple and Chr. Church*, 88, *Laws of Christ for Common Life*, 123; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*, chs. xix. xx.; B. Jowett, *College Serm.* 148; *ExpT* [*Note: xpT Expository Times.*] v. (1894) 156, x. (1899) 360.

T. Allen Moxon.

⚡Synagogue

SYNAGOGUE

1. The name.—συναγωγή is the Gr. equivalent for the Heb. סוּבָּה derived from the rare verb סָבַב of which the radical meaning is 'to gather.' The term means primarily a gathering together of any objects or persons for any purpose, in Scripture an assembly of the members of a local community either for the purpose of worship or for joint action under professedly religious sanctions (Luk_12:11; Luk_21:12). Thence the word was applied to the building in which such a meeting was held, and in that sense is of frequent occurrence in the NT. For a time the term was current amongst Christians as the designation of their meetings or places of meeting; cf. Jam_2:2, Heb_10:25 (Gr.), and such Patristic notices as Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxx. 18, συναγωγὴν δὲ οὗτοι καλοῦσι τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ οὐχὶ ἐκκλησίαν. This usage lingered amongst the Ebionites and longer still amongst the Marcionites, but in other quarters a distinction early appeared. Either because of the growing divergence between the two faiths, or because ἐκκλησία was regarded as a better expression of the genius of Christianity with its preference for other than ethnic or racial ideals, the terms 'church' and 'synagogue' ceased to be interchangeable. The two senses of each were retained, as an assembly and a place of 'assembly; but a strictly Christian or Jewish association was definitely attached to each.

2. Origin and history.—In NT times the institution of the synagogue was popular and widespread, and was believed to date back 'from generations of old' (Act_15:21); but few materials are available for assistance in the attempt to trace its actual history, and its origin can only be conjectured. Later traditions (e.g. Pal. [*Note: Palestine, Palestinian.*] *Targ.* [*Note: Targum.*] on Exo_18:20, a Midrash in *Pesikta*, ed. Buber, 129b) connect it with the primitive times after the settlement in Canaan. During the

exile in Babylon, worship at the Temple necessarily ceased, and the conditions of the Captivity have consequently been regarded as a favourite soil for the germs of the institution (Wellhausen, *IJG* [Note: *JG Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 193). But the purposes served by the synagogue make it indispensable that some such institution should have been in existence centuries earlier. The synagogue was a school and a court of local government before it became pre-eminently a place of worship. In ancient times the scattered peoples might go up to the Temple at the festivals, and in the intervals avail themselves of the local sanctuaries; but as business connexions multiplied (cf. § 7), the father could no longer be relied upon for the regular instruction of his sons, whilst a centre would have to be found in every village or group of villages for the administration of justice, and for the transaction of the affairs of the community, in subordination to the recognized authority, whether regal or priestly. Hence the germs of the institution are to be sought far back in the exigencies that arose as civilization became more complex; and the Exile marks not the first stage in the origin of the synagogue, but an important modification of its functions, worship becoming thenceforward the principal though far from the sole occupation, and the administrative functions falling for a time into abeyance. After the Temple was rebuilt, popular usage may well be conceived as temporarily reverting to the previous practice; hence the silence of the later part of the OT, Psa 74:8 (though Briggs *in loc.* substitutes 'festivals' for 'synagogues,' whilst retaining the latter term in his lexicon, cf. *Oxf. Heb. Lex. s.v. מִדְּבָר*) containing the only explicit reference. In the OT Apocr. [Note: Apocrypha, Apocryphal.] the silence is even more complete; and the post-Maccabaeen revival of the strong accentuation upon the religious side of the functions of the synagogue was contemporaneous with the revival of interest in the study of the Law at the close of the bitter struggle for national independence.

3. A feature of normal Jewish life.—In the 1st cent. a.d. synagogues abounded wherever a Jewish population was found. In Jerusalem itself the number is variously given as 394 (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Kethub. 105a*) or 480 (Jer. *Megilla, 73d*). The figures are, of course, exaggerated, but are an indication of the degree to which the institution had extended. In addition, there was a synagogue within the Temple itself, with others for the communities of foreign Jews settled in the city (Act 6:9; cf. Act 9:29). Galilee was studded with synagogues, as the thickness of its population would lead one to expect. Mention is made in the Gospels of those at Nazareth (Mat 13:54, Mar 6:2, Luk 4:16) and at Capernanm (Mar 1:21, Luk 7:5, Joh 6:59). It is not improbable that the last-named should be identified with the ruins recently discovered at Tell Hûm—one of eleven groups of ruined synagogues found in Northern Galilee and dating in part from the 1st cent. (*SWP* [Note: *WP Memoirs of the Survey of W. Palestine.*] i. 231 f., 252, 397 ff., 401). Agrippa I. built a synagogue at Dora (Josephus *Ant. xix. vi. 3*), in imitation of his grandfather's practice elsewhere. The

same state of things obtained outside Palestine. In Asia Minor and Greece, St. Paul found synagogues everywhere. Philo speaks of ‘thousands of houses of instruction’ opened on the Sabbath day (Mangey, ii. 282). And in our Lord’s time the synagogue was as common a feature of Jewish life as places of worship are of conventional life in our own country to-day.

4. Site, architecture, equipment.—Two rules as to the building of synagogues require that they should stand on an elevated site, and, like the Temple, be entered from the east. The Galilaean ruins show that these rules were not followed in the 1st cent. in Palestine; for the ruins do not occupy prominent positions, and in every instance except one the entrance is from the south. In different countries the local style of architecture was adopted, and there never was any style peculiar to synagogues. In Palestine, as the ruins indicate, Graeco-Roman influences can be traced, with an over-elaboration of ornament that was rather Oriental in its character. The building proper consisted of a quadrilateral, divided into three or five aisles by means of two or four rows of pillars. Admission was gained through three doors, in front of which was sometimes a highly decorated portico. Of the equipment the most important item was the press or *ark* containing the sacred writings. Above it was a canopy, and in front a curtain; and each of the rolls was wrapped in an embroidered cloth. In small synagogues, near the ark, which stood probably against the wall opposite the entrance, was a raised *tribune*, furnished with a lectern for the reader and a chair for the speaker (Luk 4:20). In larger buildings this platform was brought forward nearly to the centre. The *chief seats* (Mat 23:6, Mar 12:39, Luk 11:43; Luk 20:46) were in front of the platform and ark, or in larger synagogues at the further end of the building, opposite the doors, and in either case faced the congregation, who generally sat on chairs or mats arranged across the building, sometimes lengthways, with an open space between the first ranks on either side. *Lamps* were a regular part of the furniture, and were probably in use in our period, since two early traditions refer to the oil that was burnt and to the custom of keeping the lamps lighted through the Day of Atonement (*Terumoth*, xi. 10; *Pesachim*, iv. 4). The adoption of a screened gallery or even of *separate seats for women* was a late arrangement, and not the custom in our period. No such rule occurs in the Talmud or other ancient source, whilst the evidence points to the actual participation of women in the synagogal service (cf. *JBL [Note: BL Journal of Biblical Literature.]*, 1898, 111 ff.; and Abrahams, *Jew. Life in Mid. Ages*, 25 f.), and their qualification to serve in the Diaspora even as ἀρχισυνάγωγος (*REJ [Note: EJ Revue des Etudes Juives.]* vii. 161 ff.), which should not be resolved into a mere title of honour.

5. Officials.—In a large synagogue a numerous staff might be employed, the principal officials being duplicated, and a variety of teachers and interpreters added. But no synagogue would be without two officers. The duty of *the ruler of the synagogue* was

not to conduct the service himself, but to choose and invite competent persons for the purpose (cf. Act 13:15), and to check any indecorum or disorder (Luk 13:14). In all probability he was responsible also for the maintenance of the synagogue in good repair, and for the safe keeping of its property. He might or might not be, but probably generally was, one of the elders, who occupied with him the chief seats, and formed together the governing body of the community. The other indispensable official was *the attendant* (*hazzan* or ὑπηρέτης, Luk 4:20), whose duties were varied and, whenever possible, distributed. He had to prepare the building for the public services, and to announce with a thrice repeated trumpet-blast from the roof the advent of the Sabbaths and other festivals. In the course of the services he presented the sacred roll to the reader, and in due course replaced it ceremoniously in the ark. In small congregations he had to read the lesson himself (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Meg. 25b* gives an instance at the beginning of the 2nd cent.), and to lead the prayers (Jer. *Berakh. 12d*). Besides all this, he had to teach the children, and to scourge such culprits as the synagogue, when acting as a court of law, condemned to that punishment. For the faithful discharge of these manifold duties he was treated with special respect (*ib. 6a*), and classed in rank with one of the grades of scribes. Other officials, where the synagogue was large enough to need them, comprised the administrators and collectors of alms, and the translators of the Scripture lessons from Hebrew into the vernacular of the congregation. In our Saviour's time these offices, where they existed, were honorary, as was probably always the case with the controllers of the charities.

6. The synagogue as a place of worship.—Before the destruction of the Temple the ordinary services were simpler than they afterwards became; but the order followed generally the rule prescribed at a later date in the Mishna (*Meg. iv. 3*). Of the four principal parts (*a*) the first was the *Shema'* (so called from the opening word of Deu 6:4, which should read 'Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God, the Lord is one,' as cited in Mar 12:29), with introductory and closing benedictions. It is true that this verse is cited in the NT without any mention of its liturgical use; but other evidences point to a contrary conclusion. The *Shema'* comprised altogether Deu 6:4-9; Deu 11:13-21 and Num 15:37-41, in which the wearing of frontlets and fringes is prescribed as a symbolic reminder of legal obligations. That these injunctions were interpreted literally by the zealous legalists of our Saviour's time is shown by His references to the wearing of phylacteries (Mat 23:5). This practice is difficult to explain except on the assumption that the passages quoted in justification were supposed to be invested with special sanctity. Both customs may be confidently referred to the period of the ascendancy of the *Ḥasidim*, a century and more before the birth of Christ; and the recitation of the *Shema'* with its accompanying ritual was a confession, both of faith in the unity of God and of the imperative obligation to keep His Law. (*b*) What prayers originally followed the recitation of the *Shema'*, it is

impossible at present to say. Those adopted at a later time would be inappropriate before the destruction of the Temple, the memory of which colours several of the phrases. From the example of the Baptist in teaching his disciples to pray, and from the request for similar instruction addressed to Jesus (Luk 11:1), it may be inferred that forms of prayer were not yet familiar to the Jews, and possibly that a disposition towards the adoption of such forms was now arising. Psalms or selections may have been used; but the time had apparently not yet come for anything more, (c) The reading of extracts from the Law and the Prophets was the central part of the synagogal worship on the Sabbath day. That this was customary in NT times appears from many passages (e.g. Luk 4:17, cf. Act 13:15; Act 15:21, 2Co 3:15). The sections of the Law were apportioned among several members of the congregation, any male who was acquainted with Hebrew being eligible. Next a passage was read from the Prophets by any one upon whom the choice of the ruler of the synagogue fell. Eventually an official lectionary was adopted, so arranged that the reading of the Pentateuch was completed in a year, the section from the Prophets being selected as far as possible with a view to enforce the lesson of that from the Law; but in the time of Christ the reader of the Prophetic section seems to have been at liberty to select whatever part he liked (Luk 4:17). (d) With the reading of the Scripture the service proper terminated. Gradually, as Hebrew ceased to be a spoken language, it was found necessary to translate the lessons into Aramaic or Greek or whatever might be the vernacular of the congregation. For this purpose an interpreter (*methurgeman*) was employed, or the schoolmaster or any competent man amongst the audience acted in his stead. The lesson from the Law was paraphrased verse by verse, that from the Prophets by three verses at a time (*Meg.* iv. 4). These paraphrases were not literal translations, but rather condensed interpretations, of a passage, and mark an important stage in the history of preaching. The next development was an extended exposition, which was the usage in NT times (Mat 4:23, Mar 1:21; Mar 6:2, Luk 6:6, Joh 18:20). The instruction was didactic rather than rhetorical, as may be inferred from the sitting posture (Luk 4:20, cf. Mat 5:1; Mat 26:55, Joh 8:2); and though naturally the Rabbis were looked to for such service, they had not yet become a class of professional preachers, but any distinguished stranger (cf. Act 13:15), or even any ordinary member of the community, might be invited to give an address.

7. The synagogue school.—The OT ideal makes parents responsible for the education of their children, and draws an idyllic picture of the father and the son turning every opportunity to profit for instruction in religion and in duty (Deu 6:7). Such an arrangement was suitable only to primitive times (cf. § 2); and as trade extended, and the father's absence from home became necessary and frequent, the need of public elementary schools made itself felt. The main idea of the synagogue service was originally instruction rather than worship, for which in its associated forms the Temple was provided, and in its intimate forms privacy could be secured. Not only does the NT make teaching the chief function, but Philo in one place (*Mangey*, ii. 168)

almost protests against synagogues being regarded as other than schools. The adults in their regular services educated themselves in the Law, and strengthened the social as well as the private sense of obligation. The children were gathered regularly for instruction of a similar kind in the synagogue itself or an adjoining room, under the care of the *hazzan*, or, in larger centres of population, of a professional teacher. For advanced studies and for technical Jewish training, provision was made in some of the towns or near the residence of some distinguished Rabbi; but everywhere the elementary school was an inseparable adjunct of the synagogue. See artt. Boyhood (Jewish), and Education.

8. The synagogue as a court.—Under the strict conception of a theocracy there can be no distinction between things ecclesiastical and things civil. Hence, in places where the population was preponderantly Jewish, local administration was in the hands of a court, which took cognizance of all the Jewish interests of the neighbourhood, and of which the Roman over-rule was apt to avail itself for both executive and minor judicial business. Where the Jews were outclassed in numbers or influence, the synagogal authority was proportionately reduced, though without any loss of respect within the Jewish community. If there were several synagogues in a Jewish town, all were knit together into some kind of organization, under a controlling council which regulated also all the civil affairs of the community. The case of a town with but a single synagogue was simpler, but not radically distinct. Here the council, or local Sanhedrin (Mat 5:22; Mat 10:17, Mar 13:9), met in the synagogue, where their plans were matured, their decisions taken, and often their penalties exacted. The court proper consisted of twenty-three members where the population was considerable, elsewhere of seven; and this college of elders (Luk 7:3) or rulers (Mat 9:18; Mat 9:23, Luk 8:41) exercised a wide jurisdiction. For minor offences (*Makkoth* iii. 1) the penalty was scourging (Mat 10:17; Mat 23:34, cf. Act 22:19; not to be confused with the Roman penalty of scourging of Mat 20:19 and Joh 19:1), limited to forty stripes save one (cf. 2Co 11:24), and administered in the synagogue by the *hazzan*. Excommunication was the punishment of offences that were thought to imperil the stability of the Jewish community (Luk 6:22, Joh 9:22; Joh 12:42; Joh 16:2). See art. Excommunication in vol. i. p. 559^a.

9. Other uses of the synagogue.—There are indications in early Jewish literature, belonging some of them to the 1st cent., that the synagogue served also the purposes of a public hall or general meeting-place, and regulations for its reverent treatment were gradually adopted. Notices respecting the interests of the community at large, or even of private members, were given there (*Baba mezia*, 28b). It was the place for funeral orations over the death of men of distinction, and at a later period could be used for some of the ceremonies of private mourning (*ib.*). Josephus says (*Vita*, 54) that political meetings were held in the synagogues at the time of the war against Rome. They became increasingly a common meeting-ground for the Jews of the

neighbourhood, where their affairs might be discussed informally or in a summoned assembly, and a variety of matters might be conveniently settled. Thus a secularizing—or, from a Jewish point of view, a communal—tendency developed, such as had already shown itself in the case of the courts of the Temple (Mat_21:12, Mar_11:15, Joh_2:14 ff.); and arrangements had eventually to be made in the interest of decorum. People were forbidden to discuss trifles on the premises of a synagogue, or to walk aimlessly about, to shelter there from the heat or rain, to come in with soiled shoes or garments, or to make a thoroughfare of the courts. Some of these regulations are of a later date than the Gospels, but their necessity arose from habits that were already becoming fixed. The synagogue was not only a place of authoritative instruction in the Law, but the centre of the Jewish life of a district, and, as such, its purposes were determined by both social and racial needs.

10. Financial administration.—Most of the officials of the synagogue were honorary; but the schoolmaster and the attendant would require at least partial support, whilst the cost of erection, with that of repairs and maintenance, must have been considerable, to say nothing of the fees paid at a later period to ‘ten unemployed men’ as the minimum of a congregation. It is a problem, for the settlement of which sufficient materials are not at present available, how these expenses were met. In some cases a wealthy man, Jew or Gentile, wishing to ingratiate himself with the people or out of pure kindness, may have provided a synagogue (cf. Luk_7:5; Jos. [Note: Law of Holiness.] *Ant.* xix. vi. 3). In other cases, though the authorities are not explicit, the synagogue must have been erected by means of a general levy upon the community, and the revenue for its maintenance provided in the same way. The Mishna invests the whole property, including buildings and equipment, in the civic community (*Meg.* iii. 1; *Nedarim*, v. 5), and classes it thus with the baths and roads of the neighbourhood. But as to the principle on which the necessary moneys were raised, and the means by which payment was enforced, very little is at present known. A set of synagogue accounts from the early part of the 1st cent, would be a discovery of much value.

Literature.—Of the works cited in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, Schürer is still the most important. The German edition is the best; the reference to the English translation is n. [Note: note.] ii. 52-89. Add Dalman's art. ‘Synagogaler Gottesdienst’ in *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.*] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] vii. 7-19; Nowack, *Heb-Arch.* ii. 83 ff.; Dembitz, *Jewish Services in Syn. and Home*. Any of the technical Cyclopaedias may be consulted; but care should be taken, especially in the case of Hamburger, by checking the dates of the original authorities, to distinguish the periods for which they stand.

R. W. Moss.

⚡ Synoptics, Synoptists

SYNOPTICS, SYNOPTISTS.—The term ‘Synoptics’ is, according to the universal practice of modern NT scholars, applied to the Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, as distinguished from the Gospel of St. John; and these three Evangelists are known as the ‘Synoptists.’ It is so used because these Gospels are so constructed that, together, they present a *synopsis* or conspectus of the leading features of the work and teaching of our Lord. From Tatian, in the 2nd cent., to our own day, frequent attempts have been made to exhibit the Canonical Gospels in the form of a Harmony. Such a Harmony usually took the form of a compilation of these accounts of the life of Jesus, arranged in parallel columns, so as to present a complete Gospel, constructed out of the materials supplied by each Evangelist. The title of Tatian’s lost work, the *Diatessaron* (τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων, ‘the one by means of four’), illustrates the principle adopted in such Harmonies. In the early Church, and indeed until the time when the modern view of the mutual relations of the Gospels was first stated by Griesbach in 1774, the example of Tatian was followed, and the Synopsis was made to embrace all four Gospels; some, like Irenaeus, being led by various reasons, more or less fanciful, to lay stress upon the fourfold nature of the Gospel. Modern scholars, however, observed that the Fourth Gospel differed from the others in so many important points as to call for separate treatment. It has been noted, for instance, that while St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, except in their accounts of the closing scenes, relate almost exclusively the Galilaean ministry of Jesus, St. John confines himself mainly to His work in Judaea. It may be observed, in particular, that the first three Gospels ‘proceed in the main upon a common outline ... variously filled up and variously interrupted, but’ which ‘can be easily traced as running through the middle and largest section of each of their Gospels.’ These Gospels form, in fact, a group altogether unique, in which, while each member has its own distinctive peculiarities, all three are of a common type. See, further, art. Gospels, and the artt. on each of the Gospels.

Hugh H. Currie.

⚡ Syroph

nician Woman

SYROPHŒNICIAN WOMAN.—So designated in Mar_7:26.* [Note: The readings are various. \aleph AKL and other MSS have Συροφοινίκισσα; EFGH, etc., Σύρα Φοεγίκισσα. For the Συροφοίνισσα of the TR there is little authority.] She is described further (1) in the same passage as a Greek (Ἑλληνίς), *i.e.*, according to Heb. usage, one who spoke Greek as her ordinary language;† [Note: The word Ἕλλην is, indeed, often used in the NT in a yet wider sense, as the equivalent of Gentile (Act_19:10, Rom_1:16; Rom_2:9.)] and (2) in Mat_15:22 as a Canaanite (Χαναανία), equivalent here to Phœnician, in conformity with the LXX Septuagint, which renders *Canaan* by φοινίκη. The woman was apparently a Greek as regards language and culture, a Phœnician by descent, and a Syrian by provincial connexion.* [Note: In the reign of Hadrian, Syria was subdivided into (1) Syria proper, (2) Syro-Phœnicia, (3) Syria-Palestina (Lucian, de Con. Deor. 4). The political division, then officially made, probably followed an already existing popular nomenclature, so that a Syrophœnician may mean simply a Syrian resident in Phœnicia proper (Hastings' DB iv. 652). There is no distinct authority for the possible interpretation, half-Syrian, half-Phœnician; although Juv. (viii. 159) is regarded by some as such, and there is an analogy in the use of Libyphœnix to denote a mongrel person (Livy, xxi. 22).] Her name is mentioned in the *Clementine Homilies* (ii. 19, iii. 73) as Justa, and that of her daughter as Bernice.

1. *The woman's approach to Christ* on her daughter's behalf is remarkable, for (1) Jesus belonged to a race which hated or despised her countrymen, and were hated and despised by them. (2) He had healed none of her people, and had come into her district not for ministry, but for retirement and rest. (3) She had evidently received no encouragement from the disciples. Yet she comes to Him and addresses Him not as a general philanthropist, but as Son of David. She had heard about Christ, probably, from some of 'those about Tyre and Sidon' who had waited early on His ministry before the appointment of the Twelve (Mar_3:8). Her national prejudice against Jesus and a Jewish Messiah had been broken down, her faith in His healing and exorcizing power was complete. The incentive to her faith and appeal is maternal love along with sore need. She is in great trouble, and one who has helped others in trial is at hand. She loves her stricken daughter, and warm affection surmounts all barriers.

2. Still more remarkable is *our Lord's triple apparent repulse*. (1) His silence at first and seeming indifference: 'He answered her never a word' (Mat_15:23). (2) His apparent refusal on account of lack of authority: 'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.' (3) His seemingly scornful reproach: 'It is not meet to take the children's bread and to cast it to the dogs' (Mat_15:26, Mar_7:27). For this

repeated repulse, however, there was a triple reason. (1) Consideration for Jews. It was part of God's providential plan to use the Jews for the education and conversion of the world; therefore they must not be needlessly and prematurely alienated from a Christ who was to be a Messiah equally for Jews and for Gentiles. The alienation was destined to come eventually for the nation as a whole, but it must not be hastened and intensified through any sudden process; the extension of the Kingdom must be shown to be natural and inevitable—the proper recompense of a faith in Jehovah which constituted Gentiles genuine sons and daughters of Abraham. (2) Education of disciples who shared more or less in the national prejudice and exclusiveness. The Twelve were to become Apostles to the world, and Christ wished their eventual mission not to be merely imposed by authority, but to be the out-come of inward prompting. Accordingly He excites (a) their pity, so as to cause them to become, even if selfishly, intercessors for the woman;† [Note: Mat 15:23-24, where Christ's reply indicates that He understood the disciples to mean, 'Send her away with her entreaty granted.'] and (b) their admiration, by the manifestation in her of a faith which exceeded that of their own countrymen. (3) Development of the woman's faith and love. He who 'knew what was in man' saw the strength of the Syrophœnician's faith, and He desired to perfect it (Jam 1:3) through such trials as, to His discerning insight, she appeared able to bear. He sought to deepen within her that humility which is the condition of exaltation, and to render yet warmer that motherly love which had opened her eyes to love Divine. Doubtless, had her faith been less strong, her humility less deep, her love less self-forgetful, He would have dealt more tenderly with her, so as not to 'break the bruised reed'; but these qualities being already well developed, He braced her character with the cold yet wholesome wind of seeming discouragement.

3. *The woman's triumph and reward.*—Over Christ's silent apathy, as it appeared (Mat 15:22), she triumphs with renewed supplication; over His seemingly narrow refusal of ministry to an alien she triumphs with lowly worship of Him as Son of David,—such worship as was withheld by His own countrymen, as a whole; His outwardly harsh description of her as a heathen dog, to whom it was not meet to give the children's bread, she overcomes with the apt rejoinder that the little dogs (*κυνάρια*) under the table eat of the children's crumbs.* [Note: Christ Himself had suggested this response by His use of the diminutive *κυνάρια*, which was applicable not to the roaming dogs of a city, but to the pet dogs of a home.] Her victory is signal. Her faith, like that of the centurion in Matthew 8, is attested as great (Mat 15:28), and the more than willing surrender of Christ is graciously ascribed by Him to herself. 'For this saying go thy way' (Mar 7:29). The reward is complete and immediate: 'Be it unto thee even as thou wilt'; 'her daughter was made whole from that very hour' (Mat 15:28).

4. *The main lessons* of this incident are obvious. (1) What the Christian preacher or teacher is tempted to regard as the least promising soil—individuals or communities outside the Church's pale—is sometimes that from which the richest harvest is reaped. (2) What men most fear in their life's experience—suffering, adversity, trouble—often serves as a straight path to God, often reveals itself as a husk of evil enclosing and concealing a kernel of spiritual blessing. While sorrow does not always sanctify, but sometimes breeds moroseness or scepticism, still it is Divinely fitted to move us to go to Him who can sympathize and relieve. (3) Warm love towards those near and dear to us, although sometimes leading the heart away from the Creator to idolatry of the creature, is intended and fitted to open the eyes of the soul to the Fatherly mercy or God, to the brotherly sympathy and saving grace of Christ. Love within us discerns, believes in, realizes love outside of us in God, in Christ, and in fellow-men. (4) What *men* dislike most in a request is among the things that please God best—importunity. This lesson taught us by the record of the miracle is also impressed on us by two of Christ's parables—those of the Midnight Guest (Luk 11:5) and of the Importunate Widow (Luk 18:1). It is the same lesson that was inculcated long before by the suggestive story of Jacob's wrestling, when the patriarch cried, 'I will not let thee go, except thou bless me' (Gen 32:26).

Literature.—Trench, *Miracles*, pp. 359-369; E. P. Gould, 'St. Mark' in *ICC [Note: CC International Critical Commentary.]* pp. 133-137; A. B. Bruce, 'Synoptic Gospels' in; E. P. Gould, 'St. Mark' in *ICC [Note: CC International Critical Commentary.]* pp. 133-137; A. B. Bruce, 'Synoptic Gospels' in *EGT [Note: GT Expositor's Greek Testament.]* p. 390 f.; Chadwick, 'Gospel of St. Mark' in *Expositor's Bible*, pp. 195-200; Luckock, *Footprints of the Son of Man*, pp. 156-161; Sam. [Note: Samaritan.] Rutherford, *Trial and Triumph of Faith* (Twenty-seven sermons on the Syrophœnician Woman); Ker, *Serm.* ii. 200; Lynch, *Serm. for my Curates*, 317; Bruce, *Kingdom of God*, 103, *Galilean Gosp.* 154; *ExpT [Note: xpT Expository Times.]* iv. [1892] 80, xii. [1901] 319; Dale in *Expositor*, v. v. [1897] 365.

Henry Cowan.

☞ Tabernacles, Feast Of

TABERNACLES, FEÂST OF.—The Feast of Tabernacles is mentioned in Joh 7:2; Joh 7:37. It was the third and the most important of the Jewish festivals, requiring the presence of all males at Jerusalem. It began on the 15th of the seventh month, the month Tishri, and in the time of Christ continued for eight days.

In early times it was called the Feast of Ingathering (Exo 23:16; Exo 34:22), a name that testifies to its agricultural origin and character. In the time of the Judges it appears as a Canaanitish festival at Shechem (Jdg 9:27) and as an Israelitish festival at Shiloh (Jdg 21:19, 1 Samuel 1). It was the occasion that Solomon chose on which to dedicate his Temple (1Ki 8:2). The date given in this chapter, viz. the seventh month, does not correspond with the date of the completion of the Temple as given in 1Ki 6:38, and may be a later insertion giving the date of the Feast as fixed later. From the original character of the Festival, it is obvious that no precise date could be fixed at first. The early legislation in Exodus requires its observance, but does not give its date or duration.

The Deuteronomic Code calls it the Feast of Tabernacles, and requires it to be kept seven days, but does not fix a date. It describes it as a day of joy for all, including servant, stranger, and widow (Deu 16:13 ff.). In accordance with the sweeping centralization of worship of Deuteronomy, it must be kept at Jerusalem, and we may be sure that this change involved very radical alterations in its character.

The Book of Ezekiel significantly assigns it an exact date (Eze 45:25).

The Priests' Code requires (Lev 23:33-43) the people celebrating it to dwell in booths to commemorate the fact that their fathers did likewise of necessity as they came out of Egypt. Sacrifices are prescribed (Num 29:12-38), and an eighth day is added. At the time of the promulgation of the Code as the law of the land in post-exilic times, the Feast was kept with the greatest enthusiasm (Neh 8:14 ff.), and as an examination of the Law showed that the dwelling in booths was required, this was done, as an innovation. The early practice had doubtless died out as incongruous with the centralized observance from the time of Deut., but was now restored with a special significance attached to it.

Later Jewish laws added to the regulations, and the Feast was kept at Jerusalem until the destruction of the Temple. Since then it has remained one of the great feasts of the Jews, although the mode of its observance has suffered changes to accord with modified conditions.

One rite which was observed in NT times was the drawing of water from Siloam, and the pouring of it out as a libation in the presence of the people. This Feast was regarded as the appropriate time for special prayer for abundant rain to ensure a plentiful harvest for the ensuing year. Many hold that this rite and custom furnished our Lord the occasion for using the figure of water for the thirsty, in His invitation on the great day of the Feast (Joh 7:37-38). This may have been the case, even though that particular rite was regularly omitted on the eighth day; but the teaching of Jesus seems to be very different, at least from the original thought of the rite on this Feast

of Ingathering. It may be only a natural coincidence that an important part of Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the Temple on the occasion of this Feast was for answer to prayers for rain, as they should be made statedly thereafter.

Literature.—Art. 'Tabernacles [Feast of]' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, and in *EBi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*] and *JE* [Note: *E Jewish Encyclopedia.*]; Edersheim, *LT* [Note: *T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].*] i. 145 ff.; cf. Benzinger, *Heb. Arch*, *passim*; and the Comm. *ad loc.*

O. H. Gates.

Table, Tablet

TABLE, TABLET (Luk_1:63 πινακίδιον, 2Co_3:3 and Heb_9:4 πλάξ).—The word πινακίδιον, not wholly unknown in classical Greek, although it is not commonly used, occurs but once in the NT and not at all in the Septuagint. When it is used in Luk_1:63 it denotes, in all probability, a wax-covered wooden writing-tablet. The ordinary LXX Septuagint word for 'tablet.' or 'table' is the word πλάξ which is found also, as mentioned above, in the NT in two passages. In Isa_30:8 we find πυξίον (ἐπὶ πυξίον), which is a writing-tablet of box-wood, and in Jer_17:1 we have στήθος (ἐπὶ τοῦ στήθους τῆς καρδίας), 'breast,' 'surface.' Both πυξίον and στήθος, however, stand, for the Heb. תַּבְּלָטָה, which is the ordinary word for 'tablet' or 'table,' and is used, e.g. in Exo_31:18, in reference to the tables of the Law. תַּבְּלָטָה (Isa_8:1), rendered in the Authorized Version 'roll,' is in the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 more suitably rendered 'tablet.' Tablets were in almost universal use in the ancient world alike for purposes of correspondence and for literary purposes in general, and were formed of various materials, such as stone, clay, and wood, the wood being sometimes whitewashed, sometimes covered with wax. Bronze also was employed for tablets, at least in some of the countries about the Mediterranean, but seemingly only for such tablets as contained inscriptions of an official nature.

Literature.—The Commentaries; artt. in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible and *Encyc. Bibl.*; works on Assyria, Babylon, and Egypt in general; allusions in Ramsay's *Letters to the Seven Churches*.

Geo. C. Watt.

✚ Tabor, Mount

TABOR, MOUNT.—A notable landmark, of rare beauty and symmetry, six miles east of Nazareth, on the north-east arm of the plain of Esdraelon. In the works of Josephus and the Septuagint its designation is *Itabyrion*; in Polybius, *Atabyrion*; elsewhere, *Thabor*. The modern Arabic name—identical with the name of the Mount of Olives—is *Jebel et-Tur*. Mount Tabor stands apart, clear and distinct, from the rugged elevations grouped around it, except on its western side, where a low narrow ridge connects it with the hills of Galilee. Its apparent isolation, and its noble domelike contour, rising directly from the level of the Plain,, make it the most conspicuous mountain in Lower Galilee. Its outline varies somewhat when viewed from different positions. As seen from the south and south-west, it resembles the segment of a sphere; from the north-west a truncated cone. Its true figure, according to W. M. Thomson, is an ‘elongated oval, the longitudinal diameter running nearly east and west.’ Its flattened summit, not easily distinguishable from the levels near its base, is 1400 feet above the average elevation of the plain, and almost 1900 above sea level. Like the hills south and west of it, Tabor is a mass of cretaceous limestone, and the soil on its summit and sides is deep and rich. It is conspicuous among the mountains of this section for its wooded slopes and leafy glades, as well as for its regular form and graceful outline, and yet it is not ‘densely wooded,’ as some have described it. There are dense clumps of undergrowth in places, but the trees, which for the most part are scrub and evergreen oaks, resemble the growth of an orchard or park rather than of a forest. The summit of the mountain is a flattened platform, oval in outline, and thickly strewn along its outer edges with ruined walls and massive substructions of different periods and styles of architecture.

A tradition as old as the 4th cent, locates the scene of the Transfiguration on Mount Tabor, and until the middle of the 19th cent, this was the generally accepted place of pilgrimage and devotion in commemoration of this event. The earliest references in this connexion are by Cyril of Jerusalem, Jerome, and others (*Cat.* xii. 16; *Epp.* 44 and). In the 6th cent., three churches, corresponding to the three tabernacles of Peter (Mar 9:5), were built on its summit. Saewulf speaks of three monasteries (c. [*Note: circa, about.*] a.d. 1103), which, with later reconstructions by the Crusaders, were destroyed in the 13th century. There is no mention of Mount Tabor in the NT, and no intimation which in any way connects it with the scene of the great Epiphany. It is an unquestioned fact, based upon the statement given above, that Tabor at the date of this occurrence was not a suitable place for a quiet retreat, such as is implied in the narrative of the Evangelists. Apart from this objection, not in itself decisive, all the events immediately associated with it unquestionably took place on or about the southern slope of Mount Hermon (Mat 16:17-28, Mar 8:27-38, Luk 9:18-37). Of the six

days which followed the prophetic declaration of Jesus concerning His approaching sufferings and death, there is no record, but it is in keeping with the entire narrative to assume that they were spent in retirement and prayer. There is no intimation that He passed the momentous hours of this transition period in travel, or that He sought another place in the most densely populated part of Galilee for this crowning manifestation of His Divinity and Messiahship. On the contrary, it is asserted in Mar_9:30 that Jesus 'passed through Galilee' after He had healed the spirit-possessed child at the foot of the mountain. While, for the reasons given, the time-honoured tradition which connects this 'strange and beautiful mountain' with the Transfiguration has been almost universally abandoned, it is nevertheless true that it was one of the most prominent objects of vision from the outskirts of the early home of Jesus, and its graceful outlines were often before Him, as He journeyed to and fro during the greater part of His public ministry.

Literature.—Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii. 136; Schaff, *Through Bible Lands*, 330-336; Baedeker-Socin, *Pal.* [Note: *Palestine, Palestinian.*] 364; Stanley, *SP* [Note: *P Sinai and Palestine.*] 419; Merrill, *Galilee*, 54; Robinson, *BRP* [Note: *RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.*] ii. 353, and iii. 221; Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xvi. 391; Andrews, *Life of our Lord*, 357, 358; *PEF* [Note: *EF Palestine Exploration Fund.*] *Mem.* i. 388-391; de Vogüé, *Églises de la Terre Sainte*, 353; G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [Note: *GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*] 394, 408, 417; C. W. Wilson in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iv. 671 f.; Buhl, *GAP* [Note: *AP Geographic des alten Palästina.*] 107 f., 216 f.

R. L. Stewart.

☞Talent

TALENT.—See Money.

☞Talents

TALENTS (Parable of).—In Mat_25:14-30 we have the story of a man who went away on a journey into a far country, and entrusted to one of his slaves five talents, to another two, and to another one. The story resembles so closely the parable of the Pounds in Luk_19:11-27 that many scholars have considered them to be different versions of the same parable.

1. It is therefore necessary to begin with an investigation of *the relations between the two parables*. (a) In the parable of the Talents we have three slaves mentioned, who seem from the expression chosen—‘his own slaves’—to stand in a relation of peculiar intimacy to their master. He is, therefore, already familiar with their capacity, and allots the talents he distributes to them in harmony with his knowledge. To the most capable he gives five talents, to one not so capable he entrusts two, and to a third with less ability than either he entrusts one. He does not give them any instructions, since they ought to understand that such large sums of money are not intended to lie idle, but should be used in increasing their master’s possessions. As soon as his master has departed, the first servant goes at once and trades with his lord’s money. The master is absent for a long time, so that by legitimate trading the servant doubles the capital he has received. The second servant, although of less capacity, exhibits an equal devotion to his lord’s interests, and while his capital is smaller, he also succeeds in doubling it. The third servant, however, while he does not squander the money entrusted to him, buries it in the earth, and keeps it safe for his master’s return. After a long period has elapsed, the master comes back and reckons with his servants. The first two slaves bring the capital they have originally received and that which they have made by trading. In each case they use the same formula; each receives precisely the same commendation and reward. The third servant is conscious that he must find some excuse for his failure, and he throws the responsibility for it on the character of his master. He is a driving, avaricious man, determined to enrich himself even at the cost of dishonest reaping where others have sown. He was therefore afraid to trade with the money lest misfortune should overtake him, and he lose some or all of the capital entrusted to him. The master, without deigning to justify himself from the harsh character thus given to him, points out that were the slave right in his estimate, he ought at least to have taken the trouble to see that the money was entrusted to the bankers. Lazy as he was, he ought not to have grudged the trouble involved in taking the talent and flinging it down at the banker’s, so that the capital might at least have accumulated interest. He is accordingly deprived of his talent, and it is given to him who has ten. And, of course, he cannot enter into the joy of his lord, but from the brilliantly lit banqueting-hall where the feast is held is thrust into the homeless darkness outside the mansion. He has proved himself a useless servant, and the penalty of uselessness is that his master has no further use for him.

(b) The parable of the Pounds (see art. Pound) has many significant points of contrast with that of the Talents, and the contrasts harmonize with the difference of the situation presupposed. It is in this case not a merchant, but a nobleman, and his object in going to a far country is to receive a kingdom. It is, in fact, held by many that in the parable of the Pounds we have two parables blended together, one of which described how a nobleman was opposed in his efforts to obtain a kingdom by his fellow-citizens, and how, having received the kingdom, he executed vengeance

upon them. The other parable went on similar lines to the parable of the Talents, the differences being due either to a difference in the lesson Jesus intended to teach, or to variations of the story that grew up as it was told and retold in the Christian Church. It is, however, important in this connexion to observe that the whole parable is dominated by the idea that it is of a prince that the story speaks. In other words, the situation from which the story of the nobleman starts out is reflected in the details of the story of the servants, some of which, indeed, become intelligible only in the light of it. It is probable that the parable rests on a historical incident, and the view of most interpreters is that it is the journey of Archelaus to Rome to secure his kingdom and the embassy of the Jews to thwart him to which Jesus here alludes. The internal harmony of the story speaks strongly for its unity. In this case the nobleman calls, his ten servants and gives each of them a pound. It would, of course, be possible to suppose that, while nobly born, he is in indigent circumstances, and has little money to spare; but this is probably not the real reason why the sum entrusted is so small. In the parable of the Talents we have apparently to do with a merchant whose object is to make money. He therefore entrusts his servants with a large capital in order that they may have ample opportunity for gaining large sums of money. Moreover, he has already tested their capacity in precisely this kind of work. That accounts for the difference in distribution, and for the absence of any command that they should trade with the money. They know their master and his objects too well to doubt what he means them to do. But naturally a nobleman is not a merchant, hence his servants are quite unpractised in commercial enterprise. If, however, he is to receive a kingdom, it will be necessary for him to have men who are skilled in financial administration. He therefore employs the interval of his absence in testing the business capacity of his slaves, in order that he may know whom to appoint to the various offices of State when he comes into his kingdom. Accordingly he assigns to each an equal sum of money, that all may have equal advantages and be differentiated according to their zeal and capacity. And inasmuch as his object is not to make money, for he will have ample opportunities of doing that when he receives his kingdom, he does not entrust them with a large but with a slender capital. Fidelity and ability can be tested by the use of slender as well as of large resources. When the servants come back, three of them are specially singled out for mention. There is no need to suppose that this is an incongruity in the parable. Ten slaves are, it is true, selected, because there are several offices in the State to be filled, whereas in the case of the merchant only three are chosen, because the capital is more profitably distributed into few than into many hands if the purpose is to make money. It would have been tedious, however, to mention each slave individually in the parable of the Pounds, hence three only are introduced as specimens of the rest. Besides, the parable is subordinated to the aim of teaching its lesson, and attention would have been distracted by the multiplicity of detail, even if ten different lessons could have been drawn from the different conduct of the ten slaves. The vital thing was to bring out the main lessons, and not confuse the broad issues by minute differentiations. The

first slave tells the prince that his pound had won ten pounds. His zeal and enterprise win the prince's warm approval, and, since he has been faithful in a very little, he receives authority over ten cities. The second has been less successful, his pound has made only five. He receives a reward proportionate to that of the other; that is, he is set over five cities; but apparently the prince suspects that his relative failure is due not simply to his slighter capacity, but to his feebler devotion to his master's interests. Accordingly he meets with a chill reception, and there is no word of approval, but simply the curt indication of the office he is to fill in the government. When we compare the treatment of the two servants in the parable of the Talents, the difference becomes significant. In that parable the two slaves have unequal capacity, but they have exhibited the same zeal for their master, and achieved a similar result; that is, each has doubled his capital: accordingly they receive the same reward with the same warmth of praise. In the parable of the Pounds the slaves start from an equal position, but achieve an unequal result. They therefore receive an unequal reward, and the commendation given in the one case is withheld in the other. The case of the third servant is substantially the same in both, though with verbal and other differences. It is, of course, obvious that the slave who has received a pound will treat it otherwise than the slave who has received a talent: the large sum is naturally buried in the earth, the smaller one is carefully put by in a napkin. He, too, is deprived of his pound, and it is given, in spite of the protests of the bystanders, to the one who has ten. The parable concludes with the genuinely Oriental trait of the execution of the malcontents who sought to keep the prince out of his kingdom.

It will be clear, then, from this comparison, that the two parables presuppose different situations, each of which is harmoniously worked out in detail, and that each has different lessons to teach. There is, therefore, no substantial reason for assuming that the same original parable has developed into these two very different stories. It is difficult to believe that, had this been the case, the internal consistency of each should have been what it is.

The above conclusion is due to no harmonistic prejudices, for it may be freely granted that different versions of the same sayings were current in the Church, and have been incorporated in our Gospels. But it is a mere prejudice, on the other side, to imagine that similarities are always to be accounted for as variants of the same original, and we may well hold that Jesus deliberately developed a similar story along these two different lines, just because He thus brought out significantly different lessons. It is by the comparison of the two that the full meaning of each becomes clear. At most, it might be admitted that the two stories exercised a mutual influence on each other. Possibly the words, 'I will set thee over many things,' are an intrusion in the story of the Talents. Apparently the main portion of the master's capital has already been entrusted to his slaves (Mat_25:14), so that there is an incongruity when the five

talents are called 'few things,' and that over which the slave is to be set is called 'many things.' And the incongruity is even greater when the same promise is repeated to the second slave. The total amount is in each case merely a doubling of the original capital, and the contrast between half and the whole is exaggerated if it is described as a contrast between few and many. Accordingly, it is not impossible that here the parable of the Pounds has influenced the report. There the contrast between the one pound and the ten cities might well be described in the terms employed in the parable of the Talents. It is, however, possible that here the application determined the form of the story, and that Jesus, or possibly His reporter, is thinking of the contrast between earthly opportunities and the heavenly reward. In that case the contrast between the many and the few is quite appropriate. The passage, however, reminds us strongly of Mat 24:45-47 = Luk 12:42-44 on the faithful servant whom his lord set over his household in his absence, and whom on his return he will set over all that he has. In the parable of the Pounds the description of the sum entrusted as very little is entirely appropriate.

The significance attached to the parts relating to the first two servants has already been pointed out in the course of the comparison. In the parable of the Talents the lesson is, that difference in endowment or opportunity involves no difference in the reward. It is assumed that such differences exist; all that is demanded is that the opportunities afforded should be faithfully employed. Where like faithfulness has been shown, like reward will be given, in spite of the disparity of opportunity and of result. The significance in the parable of the Pounds is different: each starts from the same level, but they reach a very different result. To what the difference is due is not stated, but to a certain extent, at any rate, it seems to be to the comparative slackness of the second servant. The lesson again is that devotion to the master's interests is what counts in the final reward. Another lesson, common to both parables, is that reward for work is more work, but work on a larger scale with ampler opportunities. In the case of the third servant, some of the lessons are quite clear. Slothfulness in the service of the king is the unpardonable sin. The failure to use opportunity is punished by the withdrawal of opportunity and dismissal from the master's service. What further lessons can be drawn out depends on the view we take of the servant's excuse. If it really represented his belief, it suggests that unjust thoughts of God may paralyze a man's action. The servant had constructed a caricature of his master, and feared that his grasping avarice might be disappointed if he lost part of the capital in trade; and therefore he felt that his duty was done if he returned it to his master as he received it. But the words of the master, 'Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee,' suggest rather that the fault did not lie with the wrong estimate that he had formed of his master's character, but with the laziness of his disposition. If he was unwilling to trade with it himself, he might at least have taken it to those who would have traded with it and returned it with interest. And, in any case, the slave had his orders, tacitly, it is true, in the parable of the Talents, but

explicitly in the parable of the Pounds. The responsibility for misfortune was therefore removed from his shoulders; his duty was to obey orders.

2. The question remains as to *the relation between these two parables and the Second Coming*. Lk. introduces the parable of the Pounds with the statement that it was occasioned by the approach of Jesus to Jerusalem, and the expectation entertained by His followers that the Messianic Kingdom was immediately to be established. The parable of the Pounds fits that situation in so far as it indicates that the master is going on a distant journey and will be away for a long time, and that the kingdom is to be established only upon his return. The opposition of the Jews to the Messianic claims of Jesus, and the vengeance that is to come upon them at the Parousia, are also suggested. The eschatological colour is not so deep in the parable of the Talents, still it is present. It is, however, noteworthy that the main point of both parables is not the explanation of the delay in the Second Coming. This comes out more clearly in Mat 24:48-51. There the unfaithful servant abuses his trust precisely because his lord delays his coming, and there are other closely related sayings and parables which bear on the need for watchfulness and on the suddenness of the Second Coming. There is no need to suppose that the parables of the Pounds and the Talents are a development of Mar 13:34-37, or to think that the experience of delay in the early Church created the parables. Even if it be true that Jesus expected to return within a generation, the evidence that He warned His disciples that His absence might be protracted is very strong. Lk. may have accurately stated the occasion of the parable of the Pounds, though there are other parables that would suit better the particular situation.

Literature.—Commentaries on Matthew and Luke. Discussions in works on New Testament Theology, Teaching of Jesus, and Lives of Christ, and especially the works on the Parables by Trench, Bruce, Dods, Jülicher, and Bugge.

Arthur S. Peake.

☞ Talitha Cumi

TALITHA CUMI (for Greek *ταλιθα κουμι*, which, in turn, is a transliteration of the Aram. Aramaic *קומי תליתא* 'Maiden, arise').—The words occur in Mar 5:41, and were uttered by our Saviour over the daughter of the Jewish ruler, Jairus. The Aram. Aramaic noun is *עֲלִי* = 'lamb.' This has its emphatic form, masc. *עֲלִיתָא*, fem. *עֲלִיתָא*; or, according to the analogy of Edessene Aram. Aramaic preserved in the Peshitta,

מְלִיךָ. It is interesting to note that in Palestinian Aram. Aramaic the word מְלִי passes from meaning ‘lamb’ to being a term of endearment for a ‘child.’ We thus reproduce the words of Jesus accurately, if we render them, ‘Lambkin, arise.’ In the Gr. of Mar 5:41 the Aram. Aramaic words are translated τὸ κοράσιον, ἔγειρε. The ‘articular nominative’ is in NT used sixty times for the vocative case (Moulton, *Gram. of NT Gr.* p. 70). In Luk 8:54 we have ἡ παῖς, ἔγειρε.

The Gr. codices \aleph BC read κοῦμ for κοῦμι. The latter is more accurate for Galilaeen Aramaic. The former is due to the fact that in some Aram. Aramaic dialects the final letter, though written, was not pronounced.

J. T. Marshall.

ⲧ:Tamar

TAMAR.—An ancestress of Jesus (Mat 1:5). Cf. art. Rahab.

ⲧ:Tares

TARES (ζιζάνια, Mat 13:25 ff.; only in this passage in NT and only in Gr. and Lat. authors influenced by the NT; Arab. [Note: Arabic.] *zawân* [‘nausea’]; Syr. [Note: Syriac.] *zizna*; Lat. and scientific name, *Lolium temulentum* [‘drunken’]).—The bearded darnel, a weed much resembling wheat in its earlier stages, and growing mostly in grain fields. Its area of distribution is wide, embracing Europe, Western Asia, North Africa, India, and Japan. The kernel is black, bitter, and smaller than wheat. As a matter of fact it is poisonous, producing dizziness, sleepiness, nausea, diarrhoea, convulsions, gangrene, and sometimes death; this is due, however, not to the darnel itself, but to the ergot which usually infests it. It does not harm poultry, for which it is raised and sold in Oriental markets. Though very closely resembling wheat till the grain is headed out, afterwards ‘even a child knows the difference’ (Thomson). See Tristram (*Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 486), and Thomson (*LB [Note: The Land and the Book.]*, vol. ii. pp. 395-397) esp. for an explanation of the common Oriental but unscientific idea that darnel is degenerate wheat.

The parable of the Tares and its explanation are found only in Mat 13:24-30; Mat 13:36-43. Our interpretation of it is affected by a few exegetical details. In

Mat 13:24 the aorist ὡμοιώθη is significant (as also the aorists in Mat 18:23 and Mat 22:2, and the future in Mat 25:1) if the use of this tense means that the Kingdom of heaven has 'been made like,' etc., by the course of events, that in the progress of the history it has become like. This ties the parable to the historical situation in which it was spoken, forbidding an exclusive reference to the future; while the fact that it is the Son of Man (= Messiah) who has sown the good seed (cf. Mat 13:37) excludes all reference to the origin of evil in the world. The time of the parable is the time of the question of the servants (Mat 13:27), when the tares had been already recognized as such (ἐφάνη, Mat 13:26). As to Mat 13:25, it is not at all necessary to think that this was a common method of revenge in Jesus' day and country. Thomson did not find a person in Palestine who had ever heard of sowing darnel maliciously. If new to Jesus' hearers, it would emphasize this quite possible malice as extraordinary, unheard-of, and outrageous. In Mat 13:26 χόρτος means the grassy crop, including all that grew in the field, and was chosen just in order to embrace both tares and wheat. 'Made fruit' does not mean 'produced fruit,' but refers to the period of the formation of the kernel. 'Then,' and not till then, appeared also the tares as tares. Mat 13:27 and the following verse show that the idea of wheat degenerating into darnel is foreign to the parable; the servants think of mixed seed, the master of an independent sowing of darnel. Still less is there any idea in the parable that darnel may become wheat (B. Weiss). Weeding wheat (Mat 13:28-29) is common to-day in Palestine as in America, and has been observed there by Stanley, Thomson, and Robertson Smith; but it must be done either before the milk stage of the wheat, *i.e.* before it is headed out (impossible in this case on account of the similarity between wheat and darnel in the earlier growth), or later when the kernel has hardened. The reason for this is that any disturbance of the wheat when 'in the milk' is especially harmful to it. So the master will not allow the weeding then, lest the servants pull out and so disturb the roots of the wheat, interlaced as they are with the roots of the darnel. There is no question here of pulling up wheat for darnel by mistake. The darnel has already appeared as darnel, and just on that account comes the servants' question (Mat 13:27). The question of the servants is then, from the point of view of the Galilaean agriculturists addressed, an intrinsically foolish one. No one who knew anything about farming would think of removing the darnel at that juncture. The master's reply does not seem strange to the crowd. It is reinforced by their knowledge and common sense. So Jesus gains the approval of the common man to back His teaching. The harvesters of Mat 13:30 (cf. Mat 13:39) are different from the servants, although this is merely implied here, and is first made perfectly clear only in the explanation. It is absolutely necessary to avoid the mingling of the kernels of the darnel and the wheat, lest the bread be poisoned. This may be effected (a) by weeding, (b) by carefully picking out the stalks of darnel one by one from the cut grain, probably the former here (cf. Mat 13:30; Mat 13:28 συλλέξατε, συλλέξωμεν), or

(c) by sifting (after threshing) with a sieve so constructed as to allow the smaller darnel seeds to fall through, while retaining the larger wheat. All three methods are used in Palestine to-day. The weeding would trample down the grain, to be sure; but, as to-day in America, it would rise again enough to be cut by the sickle, always used in Palestine; cf. Deu 16:9; Deu 23:25, Mar 4:29, Rev 14:14-19. It is probable that τὰ σκάνδαλα in Mat 13:41 is to be taken personally as in Mat 16:23. The πάντα, not repeated before τοὺς ποιούντας, seems to include both under one vinculum; up to this time all, both tares and wheat, have been interpreted as persons (Mat 13:38); and, finally, only persons are subject to the final judgment (Mat 13:42).

The correct interpretation of this parable flows directly from its historical setting. It is a stage in the development of the Kingdom which allows itself to be described (ὡμοιωθῆναι, v. 24) by the story of the Tares. The men addressed, whether the Twelve or the multitudes, were Jews, with the common Jewish ideas of the Messianic Kingdom, and these ideas Jesus was engaged in modifying and spiritualizing. The Sower had been a parable of disillusionment, disclosing that the success of the Messianic Kingdom would not be so universal or immediate as they had fondly imagined, that its method was to be preaching and not cataclysm, that it depended for its spread on its reception in human hearts. The Tares is equally a parable of disillusionment. John the Baptist had at least, publicly and prevailingly, described the Messiah as coming for judgment (Mat 3:10-12), and this was in perfect accord with the popular anticipation that the Messianic reign would begin with a judgment (Schürer, *HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]* ii. ii. 163-168, 181). But Jesus had not shown any indication of being such a judge, nay He had taken quite another course (Mat 12:15-21), so that doubt came into the mind even of John the Baptist (Mat 11:2 ff.). For the inauguration of the Messianic reign with a judgment the disciples were eagerly looking. 'On that day' (Mat 13:1) of the parables, or at least a short time before it, the Pharisees had shown their true colours by charging that Jesus cast out demons by Beelzebub, the prince of the demons (Mat 12:22-32). Jesus *had* indeed given them a solemn warning (Mat 12:32), but no lightning stroke had destroyed them, and the disciples were disappointed. Their spirit, described in the question of Mat 12:28, was later expressed by James and John (Luk 9:54 f.), 'Lord, wilt thou that we bid fire to come down from heaven and consume them?' In this parable Jesus teaches them that *the judgment which they momentarily expected, the separation of the sons of the Kingdom and the sons of the Evil One, shall surely come, not now, but at the end of the age, and that meantime the wicked shall continually spring up among the righteous. This is to be expected, and is to be borne with patience.* The parable therefore discloses the fact that, instead of being victorious at one stroke, the

progress of the Kingdom is to be continually hindered and hampered (cf. τὰ σκάνδαλα, Mat 13:41), till the consummation of the age.

This interpretation leaves unanswered those questions about Church discipline which have made the parable an ecclesiastical battle-ground for centuries, because *the parable has nothing to do with such controversies*. (1) The field is not the Church, but the world of men (Mat 13:38), the Messiah's world which He is sowing, just as it is in the Sower, the Mustard Seed, and the Leaven. (2) The Kingdom is not the Church, but the Messianic Kingdom of Jewish expectation. It is extremely doubtful if the Kingdom ever = the Church, certainly never the visible, organized Church. (3) There was no background for the idea of 'Church,' much less of Church discipline, in the disciples' minds at this time. It is only at Caesarea Philippi (Mat 16:18) and afterwards (only Mat 18:17), that Jesus begins to introduce that idea in a very rudimentary way, by what Aramaic word we know not. (4) If the parable refers to Church discipline, it forbids it *in toto*, while the parable of the Net on a similar interpretation makes it impossible. It is idle to say that it prohibits only the exclusion of masses, and permits that of the very bad, or inculcates a general attitude of mind towards Church discipline. (5) All men are to appear at the Judgment, not merely professing Christians (Mat 25:31-32). (6) The Apostles did not so understand the parable, for they insisted on Church discipline (1Co 5:2; 1Co 5:13, 2Co 2:5-11, 2Th 3:6; 2Th 3:13, Rev 2:14-16; Rev 2:20-23; cf. Mat 18:15-20). The history of the interpretation of the parable shows that such a use of it was first made by Cyprian during his bishopric (248-258), in support of his theories of the Church. Tertullian, a half century earlier, may have held it. Origen (b. 182, d. 250) knew of this interpretation, but rejected it. Irenaeus knew nothing of it. (7) Last and most important, such an interpretation ignores the historical situation, would have been a riddle to the disciples (cf. Bruce, *Parabolic Teaching*, p. 43), a prophecy with no root in the present; it takes no account of the emphasis in Christ's interpretation, and of His omission of the servants' question and the master's answer therein (cf. Mat 25:28-30 a. with Mat 25:37-43).

Two objections to the interpretation of the parable proposed in this article deserve attention. (1) In Mat 25:41, Jesus says that the angels shall gather *out of His Kingdom* all offences and them that do iniquity, whence it is inferred that the tares were in the Kingdom and not in the world. It is admitted that the word 'Kingdom' is used in this parable in a very loose sense. But this is the universal fact throughout the Synoptics, in proof of which the long controversies in the theological world about its meaning are conclusive (cf. Sanday in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. 619 f.). The Kingdom of Mat 25:24, which the course of events has already made like the field of the following narrative, is a most intangible and indefinable entity, a congeries of truths and principles characteristic of the coming age, which take shape in the world as they

embody themselves in the lives of men. In the process of taking shape, the parable tells us, opposition has risen in the world of men which these truths and principles claim as their rightful sphere, and which men expect them to occupy. The sons of the Kingdom (Mat 25:38) are those who receive these truths and embody them in their lives and conduct. These are sown in the wide field of the world of men, which the Messiah claims as rightfully His—His Kingdom (Mat 25:41), or, if preferred, which He calls His Kingdom at His coming to claim it as such (cf. Mat 16:28, 2Ti 4:1, Rev 11:15; cf. Mat 13:49). Finally, the Kingdom of their Father (Mat 13:43, cf. Mat 26:29; Mat 25:34; Mat 25:46) is the consummated Kingdom of glory. (2) The related parable of the Net (Mat 13:47-50) is supposed to refer to the discipline of the Church. This is, however, a mistake. (a) The Kingdom is not like the Net; but its principles and history, here especially its consummation, are illustrated by the following story (cf. Mar 4:26). (b) The explanation of Mat 13:49-50 lays not the slightest emphasis on anything except the consummation. (c) Those who draw the net and those who separate the good and the bad are the very same persons (Mat 13:48), *i.e.* the angels (Mat 13:49). (d) The parable, if it relates to Church discipline, makes that absolutely impossible. (e) Its position at the end of the sermon of Matthew 13, whether due to Jesus or Mt. or an editor, is an additional proof that its teaching is the same as that of the Tares: *i.e.* at the end of the age, and only then, shall the good and the bad be separated.

The historical criticism of the Gospels gives no assured results here. Holtzmann and Pfleiderer think that the Evangelist has worked over and added new traits to Mar 4:26 ff. B. Weiss says that Mt. and Mk. have worked over the same original parable, Mt., however, adding only Mar 4:25; Mar 4:27-28 a. The explanation, as also that of the Sower, is from the Evangelist's hand. Jülicher acknowledges an unrecognizable parable-kernel here, which lies at the bottom of both Mt. and Mk. The parable, as it stands in Mt., is, however, the result of a working over of Mk.'s parable and the original parable, the companion of the Net, while the explanation is from the same editor's hand. Hilgenfeld and Holsten look on Mk.'s parable as a weakened form of the Tares, or a substitute for it. J. Weiss thinks that the idea of gradual development is not in this or its sister parables.

Literature.—Broadus, *Com. on Mt.*; Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, ii. 546-569; also B. Weiss, Zahn, Goebel, Trench, and Bruce (*Parabolic Teaching*), cf. his remarks in *Expos. Gr. Test., in loc.*; Arnot (*Parables*) may be compared as a pioneer of the correct interpretation. See also R. Flint, *Christ's Kingdom upon Earth* (1865), 122; H. S. Holland, *God's City* (1894), 181; R. J. Campbell, *The Song of Ages* (1905), 77. The controversy of the Donatists with Augustine first brought out the arguments on both sides.

Frederick L. Anderson.

☛Tax

TAX (ἀπογράφω, Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘enrol’),

☛Taxing

TAXING (ἀπογράφω, Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘enrolment’), occur in the Gospels only in Luk 2:1-5. The words refer to the registration of the inhabitants of Palestine, with a view to levying taxation upon them for Imperial purposes. In the present instance this appears to have been done, not by the usual Roman method of enrolling persons under their place of residence, but by the Jewish method of enumerating them according to the cities and towns with which their families were originally connected. For the enrolment is mentioned in order to explain why Joseph and Mary came from Nazareth to Bethlehem at the time when Jesus was born. The passage would need no further comment, were it not for the historical difficulty that has been raised in connexion with the statement of v. 2 about Quirinius. There was a well-known enrolment (Act 5:37) which took place in Judaea under his supervision, after the deposition of Archelaus in a.d. 6 (Josephus *Ant.* xvii. xiii. 5, xviii. i. 1); but it has been seriously questioned whether he held an earlier governorship of Syria before the death of Herod the Great [Note: reat Cranmer’s ‘Great’ Bible 1539.] , and whether such an enrolment as St. Luke describes really took place at that time. With regard to the first point, it is now admitted that Quirinius probably held a post of responsibility in Syria before the governorship which began in a.d. 6 (see Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] i. i. 353 ff., and art. Quirinius). With regard to the second point, it has been shown by Sir Wm. Ramsay (*Was Christ born at Bethlehem?*) that, in Egypt at least, enrolments took place every fourteen years, that traces of the same arrangement have been found in other parts of the Empire, and that it may have extended to Palestine. The dates, when traced backwards, would include a.d. 20, a.d. 6, and b.c. 8. If an enrolment were actually due in Palestine in the last-named year, its completion may have been somewhat delayed by the disturbed state of Herod’s kingdom, and may have fallen as late as b.c. 6, which is the probable date of the birth of Jesus.

James Patrick.

Teacher

TEACHER.—*διδάσκαλος*, though strictly meaning ‘teacher,’ is translated ‘master’ by Authorized Version throughout the Gospels except in Joh 3:2. In two other passages besides this, viz. Mat 23:8 and Joh 3:10, Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 gives the correct translation; and in every case where both Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 translate ‘master,’ (Revised Version margin) gives ‘teacher’ as an alternative reading. In Luk 2:46 *διδάσκαλος* is rendered ‘doctor,’ and in Joh 1:38 it is stated to be equivalent in meaning to ‘Rabbi’ (see artt. Rabbi and Master).

This was the word by which our Lord was always addressed. Even His enemies admitted His claim to be a teacher. And not only was He recognized as a teacher, but the supremacy of His teaching was, and is, universally acknowledged. His contemporaries felt His superiority and could not withstand the influence of His teaching, ‘for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes’ (Mat 7:29), and ‘never man so spake’ (Joh 7:46). In modern times, too, even those who cannot assent to some of the cardinal doctrines of His religion bow before the majesty of His speech, and proclaim Him the greatest moral and religious teacher the world has ever seen. See Supremacy.

Christ’s great bequest to the world as a teacher is His revelation of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. This twofold message is peculiar to His gospel, and forms the keynote of His teaching. Christ the Teacher is indeed Christ the Revealer. He reveals the truths concerning man’s true nature and destiny, and his relationship to God; and sheds an ineffable light upon all the dark and perplexing problems of life, death, and immortality.

But Christ was more than a mere teacher. His teaching is not only instructive: it is also creative. His words do not come with power to the intellect alone: they also appeal to the heart and influence the will. ‘They are spirit and they are life’ (Joh 6:63). They pass into the soul of man and there quicken and create new life. The discourse with Nicodemus (John 3) was intended to emphasize this very fact, that Jesus was not only a Teacher but a Saviour, and that the passport into the Kingdom of God was not mere knowledge, but a new life which demands new birth. Christ is not merely the truth: He is also the life. His truth liberates and saves; and those who receive it into their hearts and minds are thereby raised to a higher and a nobler life of righteousness and holiness, and are endued with power to become ‘sons of God’ (Joh 1:12). His teaching still exercises this cleansing and life-giving power; and everywhere men in quest of God and salvation re-echo the assertion of St. Peter, ‘Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life’ (Joh 6:68).

☞ Teaching Of Jesus

TEACHING OF JESUS.—The place and meaning of knowledge in the Christian religion constitute a question of supreme importance. It has been answered in differing ways in different times and places, and with far-reaching effects, often of the saddest character. Yet the answers have usually been of the nature of instinctive assumptions rather than results of deliberate investigation into the grave problem involved; indeed, it has seldom been realized that a problem existed. In our own day, however, the spread of the mode of thought known as Agnosticism—a term coined in protest against a too confident attitude of *gnosis* or full knowledge—has helped to bring home the fact and something of the nature of the problem underlying the various bodies of ‘doctrine’ claiming the authority of Christ. In so stating the case, our thoughts travel back to the final form of the question,* [Note: In this connexion Latham’s *Pastor Pastorum*, chs. i. and iii., offers certain regulative ideas of high value.] which must control all others, viz., What sort of ‘knowledge’ did Jesus Himself offer to men, and how is it related to human knowledge in general and to man’s religious consciousness as such? Some suggestions towards a true answer may be gained from a study of the terms found in our Gospels as used in this connexion, such as ‘know,’ ‘knowledge,’ ‘teach,’ ‘teaching,’ ‘teacher,’ ‘mystery,’ in the light of their originals, Aramaic and Greek. Here, on the whole, it seems needless to distinguish between Christ’s own usage and that of the Evangelists themselves, for these coincide generally. The few exceptions in the Synoptics can be noted incidentally, while the special Johan nine usage is treated by itself.

The characteristic Greek term *γνώσις* occurs in our Gospels only in Luk_1:77 ‘knowledge of salvation,’ and Luk_11:52 ‘the key of knowledge’ (see below); and the intellectual interest connoted by it, as also by ‘wisdom’ (*σοφία*) and ‘the Wise man,’ among the Greeks, is here quite absent (*ἐπιστήμη* does not occur at all). All this points to the concrete, personal, or experimental nature of the knowledge implied in the religion of the Gospels, as of the OT,—a fact which comes out also in the contexts in which ‘know’ occurs.

‘The OT everywhere assumes that there is such a thing as the knowledge of God, but it is never speculative, and it is never achieved by man. God is known because He makes Himself known, and He makes Himself known in His character. Hence the knowledge of God is in the OT = true religion; and as it is of God’s grace that He appears from the beginning speaking, commanding, active, so as to be known for

what He is, so the reception of the knowledge of God is ethically conditioned.... It is in this sense of an experimental acquaintance with God's character, and a life determined by it, that a universal knowledge of God is made the chief blessing of the Messianic age.... Side by side with this practical knowledge of God, the OT makes room for any degree of speculative agnosticism. This is especially brought out in the Book of Job' (Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iii. 8 f.).

The distinction between gradual experimental recognition (γινώσκειν, ἐπιγινώσκειν) and the actual possession of knowledge (εἰδέναι) is well preserved; e.g. in Joh 14:7 'If ye had come to recognize me (in my true character), ye would have had knowledge of my Father also.' Corresponding to the ethical quality of the knowledge acquired by growing personal receptivity, is the nature of the 'teaching'* [Note: This didache consisted of didaskaliæ or definite 'instructions' as to conduct, cf. Mar 7:7, Mat 15:9 'teaching for instructions human injunctions' (διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων, after Isa 29:13).] (διδασχῆ), as defined by the contexts in which this term and its verb stand; e.g. Mat 7:28 'The crowds were exceedingly astonished at his teaching; for he was teaching them as having authority, and not as their scribes (after Sermon on the Mount). Finally, the fact that Jesus was habitually addressed as 'Rabbi,' and so treated, suggests that He dealt with the same subject-matter as the official 'teachers' of the Jewish Law (*Tôrah*), viz. the sort of conduct pleasing to the God of Israel (cf. Mat 5:17-20), though He differed in going behind the act to the motive, and in setting this in the light of the Father's character. There was, we may be sure, a certain fitness in the plausible compliment, as coming even from Pharisaic lips, 'Rabbi, ... of a truth thou teachest *the way of God*' (Mar 12:14, ||, cf. Mar 12:32). We do well, then, to approach the meaning of 'knowledge' and 'teaching' in the Gospels through the senses which these terms bore in contemporary Judaism. Philo describes Jews as 'taught ..., even long before the sacred laws and also the unwritten usages, to recognize as one God the Father and Creator of the world' (*Legatio ad Gaium*, 16). Here we have a starting-point for consideration of the knowledge Jesus offered to impart, as regards its substance.

i. The Synoptic Gospels.—Jesus' own knowledge was rooted in the essential teaching of the OT, interpreted by a unique religious experience, which even in childhood enabled Him to make marvellous use of its contents (Luk 2:46 f.), and which developed as a 'wisdom' that matured with His years (v. 52). The determinative element in it was a consciousness of the God of Israel as His Father in a peculiarly intimate personal sense. Through this the OT revelation, as written and as currently taught, was gradually filtered, until only those elements and interpretations remained effective in His mind and speech which were valid in the light of the idea of the Holy Father and His practical relations with men. Thus the 'sacred laws' of Mosaism were

transmuted into 'the teaching' of Jesus, the Messiah, with its new spirit and fresh emphasis. But the lines of the new were continuous with the old as regards the primarily practical reference of the new teaching, which superseded that of the scribes of the Pharisaic school, then dominant (Mar 1:22-27; Mar 2:16-18). Thus the 'knowledge' which Jesus aimed at imparting in His 'teaching' was analogous in scope to that recognized as such in current Palestinian Judaism, and bore essentially on true piety conceived as doing the will of God' (Mar 3:35). But the form of its presentation, and much of its resulting spirit, were largely determined by two features peculiar to Jesus as a teacher: (a) a note of fresh, personal authority, in contrast to the derivative authority claimed by the scribes (Mar 1:22); (b) constant reference to 'the kingdom of heaven,' the true Theocracy for which Israel had long been waiting and watching, in connexion with Messiah, its Divinely commissioned Inaugurator. John the Baptist had spoken of such a Theocracy as imminent. Yet so little had he realized the spiritual experience proper to it in its fulness, that Jesus, even in the act of recognizing John's supremacy in the order of prophets, can declare that 'He that is but little in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he' (Mat 11:11, Luk 7:28). The Messianic Kingdom, then, is bound up in a unique manner with Jesus Himself as its Announcer (*κηρύσσω*) and Legislator (*διδάσκων*)—the two aspects in which He conveys 'knowledge' of it, and so of religion as it is known to the Gospels.

Wellhausen, indeed, roundly denies this (*Einleitung in die drei crsten Evangelien*, 105, 106 ff.): 'From the Kingdom as present, Jesus as already constituted (*dagewesener*) and present Messiah is inseparable; accordingly He cannot Himself have spoken of it.... In Mark He speaks only of the future Kingdom; but He does not say that He is to bring it.... It is thought that the declaration of this future Kingdom was actually the proper content of His preaching. Far from this, it recedes completely into the background in Mark. In the Galilæan period He does not as a rule preach at all, but He teaches: and indeed not about the Kingdom of God (which doe not occur at all, save in the addition Mar 4:30; Mar 4:32), but, in unconstrained succession, touching this and that matter which comes in His way; obvious truths, with reference to the needs of a general public, which is misled by its spiritual leaders' (p. 106). As regards the Kingdom of God, the idea of which He could assume as present to His hearers' minds, 'He emphasized in any case warning more than promise.... He began not with allusions to blessings (*Glückwünschen und Seligpreisungen*), but with the preaching of penitence: The Kingdom of God is at hand, repent! Like Amos before Him, and like John the Baptist, He thereby protested against the illusion of the Jews, as though to them the Judgment were bound to bring the fulfilment of their wishes' (107 f.). Wellhausen goes on to question whether the phrase 'the gospel' was ever found on Jesus' own lips, since even in Mark 'the gospel is tantamount to Christianity,' *i.e.* what the Church came to understand as the purport of its Master's life and death. Here Wellh, seems to take 'gospel' in too rigid and uniform a sense,

rather than as ‘good tidings’ which may vary in connotation. In any case, it is one thing to argue that the Evangelists have made Jesus use a phrase proper to their age, not His (yet [Isa_61:1](#), in view of [Mat_11:5](#), [Luk_7:22](#); cf. [Luk_4:18](#), makes His use of the verb ‘preach good news’ [[εὐαγγελιζεσθαι](#)])—as in Lk., who never uses the substantive [[εὐαγγέλιον](#)]*—far from unlikely*): it is quite another to have disproved the historic truth of the idea thereby conveyed, viz. that Jesus’ own announcement of the Kingdom as imminent was in a different key from John the Baptist’s. Both, no doubt, urged repentance as befitting such an expectation; but how differently this may be done, how different the motives suggested—in a word, how different the spirit of the two messages! (see [Mar_2:18](#) f. ||, [Mat_11:16](#); [Mat_11:19](#), [Luk_7:31](#); [Luk_7:35](#)). In the one the note of severity was uppermost, in the other that of gladness Surely the very point of the striking saying in [Mat_11:11](#), [Luk_7:28](#) is that the spirit of John’s message was defective, as we feel it to be, in its negative and threatening tone, as compared with the positive and winning note of benediction and hope added by Jesus, in the light of God’s true attitude to men—a revelation which by no means took from the force of the summons to repentance for sins, now seen more clearly in the purer light. So we read in [Mar_6:12](#), even after much of the Galilaeen teaching was already given, that the Apostles ‘went out and preached that men should repent’ (Wellh. *l.c.* p. 112, questions even whether there were any ‘apostles’ during Jesus’ lifetime). The spirit of the above distinction is finely given by Longfellow’s lines (cited in Sir A. F. Hort’s Com. on [Mar_1:15](#)):

‘A voice by Jordan’s shore,
A summons stern and clear:
Repent! be just, and sin no more!
God’s judgment draweth near!
A voice by Galilee,
A holier voice I hear:
Love God, thy neighbour love! for see
God’s mercy draweth near.’

The idea of the Kingdom necessarily determines the sense and emphasis given to ‘repentance’ in relation to it; and as ‘righteousness’ meant to Jesus something very

different from what it did on John's lips, so with their respective teaching as to 'the Kingdom.'

As to the 'future' and 'present' Kingdom, surely on Jesus' idea of the essentially spiritual nature of the Kingdom this distinction loses its full force; where the righteousness of the Kingdom is, there is the Kingdom already in a real sense.

As 'preaching' the Kingdom, He declares the fact of its near advent, so 'giving knowledge of salvation' as yet nearer than John's preaching was able to announce (Luk 1:77). Reception of such knowledge meant repentance for sins as unfitting the sinner for membership in the Kingdom soon to 'appear,' and confidence in the forgiveness which was part of the expected Messianic blessings. Then as 'teaching,' He gave knowledge of the laws and principles of the coming era of the Father's realized sovereignty. Relying on this teaching and obeying its precepts, the man who accepted the 'preaching' of the Kingdom as at hand was assured of participation therein when it arrived. Of such 'teaching' the Sermon on the Mount is the summarized expression (Mat 7:28 f.). It represents 'the key of knowledge' touching God's will, as it should be done in the true Theocracy or Kingdom, which the official guardians of the Law had removed out of men's reach by their traditions (Luk 11:52). But the same knowledge was also given less fully and formally, in occasional and piecemeal fashion, in the 'teaching' Jesus was wont in His earlier ministry to give at the Sabbath services in synagogues of Galilee, in close connexion with the reading of the Law and its regular exposition (Mar 1:21; Mar 6:2, Luk 4:15; cf. Luk 4:43 for 'preaching also), as well as on other and less formal occasions. Its main subject 'would seem to have been the nature of the Kingdom and the character required in its members (Sanday), treated in the light of the Fatherhood of God

At first, moreover, His own Person formed no part of His explicit teaching. Apparently the practical recognition of His plenary authority as Revealer of the Kingdom and the truths constitutive of it, enforced by the object-lesson of His deeds (Luk 10:23-24) of beneficent authority in the healing of the body and soul (see Mar 2:5; Mar 2:12), was what Jesus had most at heart in the earlier stage of His ministry at least. What went beyond this was allusive and suggestive rather than dogmatic, being contained in the title by which, in preference to all others, He chose from first to last to refer to Himself and His ways—'the Son of Man.' The sense which He gave to it, as distinct from the associations currently attaching to it in various circles of Judaism, seems to be chiefly 'brotherhood with toiling and struggling humanity, which He who most thoroughly accepted its conditions was fittest also to save' (Sanday). It was only as criticism and challenge forced Him to fall back upon His ultimate and inner credentials, that He referred explicitly to His mysteriously unique experience of Sonship to the Father as the ground of the revelation He imparted in His

teaching—particularly as to the Divine Fatherhood which lay at the heart of that teaching (Mat 11:25 ff., Luk 20:21; Luk 20:24).

In this we get some insight into one of the most significant features of Christ's teaching, viz. His pedagogic method, which implied that religious knowledge is not to be thought of or taught as if it were all on one level, or as if it were of little moment how it is imparted and acquired. In other words, nothing is more characteristic of 'truth as it is in Jesus' than the psychological conditions under which it should be learned, by progressive assimilation, as the learner is able to bear it. His was the experimental method of religious knowledge, to a degree surpassing all other teachers. This fact comes out in several connexions,* [Note: Among these we can only allude to the stages in Jesus' teaching of His disciples in the latter part of His ministry, which dates from the decisive confession at Caesarea Philippi.] of which His use of parables deserves special notice.

As regards Jesus' use of the parable proper, as distinct from mere figurative maxims or illustrations, it is often strangely overlooked that the Gospels do not represent it as a form of communicating religious knowledge employed by Jesus from the first. In fact it emerges relatively late in His ministry, when already He had proved the general unreceptiveness of His hearers and the positive hostility of their official teachers. This appears not only from the first occasion on which, in the relatively historical order preserved in Mk., Jesus is said to have 'taught in parables' (Mar 4:2, Mat 13:3; Mar 3:23, Luk 5:36; Luk 6:39 do not prove the contrary), but also from the fact that His disciples ask Him as to the meaning of the first recorded parable, plain as its meaning is to us (Mar 4:10; Mar 4:13). Further, that meaning is one which implies a disappointing experience of various types of hearer,—the good being in the minority,—such as suits a comparatively prolonged period of experiment, during which Jesus had proved how unprepared the majority of His countrymen were to embrace the Kingdom as He meant it. In fact the psychological moment at which He began His full parabolic method on principle, was just that depicted in Mark's narrative (cf. Latham, *op. cit.* p. 324). Already the Scribes, both local (Mar 2:6; Mar 2:16) and from the religious centre in Jerusalem (Mar 3:22), the Pharisees generally (Mar 2:18; Mar 2:24, Mar 3:6), and even the disciples of John,—presumably a specially prepared class,—had indicated pretty clearly that their attitude was likely to be unreceptive. Thus we read in Mar 3:7 of His withdrawing from before Pharisaic hostility—which already felt that He must be got rid of at any cost (v. 6)—with His circle of disciples, from the synagogue and the city, where friction was likely, to the seashore, there to continue His effort to win the unsophisticated hearts of the common people. Then follows the selection of the Twelve from the larger body of disciples habitually about Him, with a view to their acting as 'apostles' or missionaries, to assist in what was opening out before Him as a longer and more arduous ministry than had, perhaps, at first seemed needful. That in itself is significant; and its significance is enhanced by

the scene which precedes the first parables, when He dwells on the spiritual ties binding Him to the disciples, in contrast even to His own blood relations. All this implies that Jesus fell back, as it were, upon the parabolic teaching which we regard as so beautifully characteristic of Him, largely under the necessity of adjusting the form of His teaching, for deep spiritual reasons, to the disappointing unreceptivity of His hearers generally. Nor was the state of His disciples much better in point of intelligence, though their practical self-committal to Him as their trusted authority and teacher implied a moral affinity of great latent possibility for future insight and knowledge. This comes out most clearly in Mark's narrative, which, throughout the chapter on the beginnings of parabolic teaching, preserves the original historic atmosphere to a degree far surpassing what the other Evangelists, owing to their later perspective, particularly as regards the intelligence at that time of Christ's personal disciples (see Mar 4:13, omitted by Mt. and Lk.), have been able to achieve.

Observe the following, compared with the parallel passages in Mt. and Lk.: 'He proceeded to teach them in parables many things, and to say to them in his teaching, Listen (Mar 4:2) ... He who has ears to listen, let him listen (Mar 4:9).... And he went on to say to them* [Note: i.e. to the disciples, to whom He is explaining His new method.] (that the light of the lamp is meant to be seen, and so), there is nothing hidden except with a view to its being ultimately made manifest.... If any one hath ears to listen, let him listen (Mar 4:21-23). And he went on to say to them, See to it what ye hear (= understand, cf. Luk 8:18 'how ye hear'). According to the capacity of the measure ye use, it shall be meted out to you, and with interest (προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν, cf. Mat 13:12; Mat 25:29 καὶ περισσευθήσεται, after the next clause); for he who hath (*i.e.* by receptiveness), there shall be given to him, and he who hath not (by unreceptiveness), even that which he hath (through his ears merely, cf. Luk 8:18 'what he supposes he hath') shall be taken from him' (Mar 4:24-25). Then, after two more parables,† [Note: Probably not spoken on the same occasion, but added by the Evangelist (in keeping with catechetical tradition), by affinity of theme; and this addition leads up naturally to the use of 'to them' in Mar 4:33 = to the people.] we read: 'And with such parables, and many of them, he used to speak to them the word just as they were able to listen; but without parable used he not to speak to them, whilst privately to his own disciples he used to resolve (the meaning of) all things' (Mar 4:33 f.).

Running throughout the whole account in Mk. is a single coherent conception of the function of parable as a vehicle of religious knowledge, viz. that it is a sort of veil spread over the face of truth, in order that only those who are morally ready to act aright in regard to it shall perceive its Divine lineaments. This implies (*a*) that it is bad for a man to see the truth in the wrong, *i.e.* unsympathetic mood, and (*b*) that it is the special nature of spiritual or religious knowledge to be morally conditioned in

its communication. Accordingly it can be received, in the sense alone valued by Jesus, only gradually, by successive acts of use or vital obedience. But the teacher's ulterior object in parable, as in plainer modes of speech (as the context of the simile of casting pearls before swine helps to make clear, Mat 7:6 ff.), was that as many, not as few, as possible of the average hearers addressed might, *by seeking* and its discipline, come to find *aright*, instead of resting in imaginary possession of a knowledge that was really error.‡ [Note: A. B. Bruce, *The Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, pp. 18-23, and Latham, *Pastor Pastorum*, ch. x. ('To those who have, is given'), in support of this and much of what follows.] The treasure of knowledge touching the Kingdom could not be had without real spiritual quest; it was a 'secret,' to be shared in only by awakened curiosity and desire. What is received too easily is held loosely; or rather, in the case of spiritual truth, it is not received at all, when taken passively and not by the activity that is also self-committal; or, again, it is received in so crude a sense—what comes from without being overlaid or distorted by what already exists within—that it had better not be received at all in this fashion. The remedy is that the reception should be gradual, through a process of piecemeal and even painful adjustment of the mind and will of the hearer to the essential form of the truth enshrined in the message or teaching. Then, what is so won becomes the basis of fresh discoveries of the same kind. In this beneficent yet deeply serious sense Jesus 'was wont to speak the word' to men '*just as they were able to listen to it.*'

Such seems the philosophy of Christ's parabolic teaching, when we regard the trend of this fundamental section and the general effect of His teaching in the Gospels. But what are we to make of the motive assigned to it in Mar 4:12 'That seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest haply they should turn again and it should be forgiven them'? Can we believe that in these words—if read in the sense of a 'judicial blinding'—we have a quotation from Jesus' lips uncoloured by the tradition lying between Him and the Gospel records? Hardly. The saying is an isolated one in the Synoptics. But a like use of the passage in Isaiah (Isa 6:9 f.) here drawn upon, occurs in Act 28:25-27, in an address to leading Roman Jews, and in Joh 12:39-40, which contains the reflexions of the Evangelist himself. Here we seem to have the clue to the 'paradox' as some would call it, 'incompatibility' as it will seem to others. That is, Jesus' own use of Isaiah's language underwent development in the Church's tradition, being first reapplied to specific Jewish unbelief (as in Acts), and then hardened in its spirit* [Note: Surely Dr. Sanday (Hastings' DB ii. 618) does not allow enough for the change of spirit between Jesus' own reference to the law of continued insensibility involved in Isaiah, and the less sympathetic use of the words in John. Hence he speaks of their 'strange severity' in Mark's context, 'which would be mitigated if they could be put later in the ministry, where they occur in St. John.' We have argued that even in Mk. they do belong to a relatively late stage in the ministry; but we would give them a gentler sense on Jesus' own lips, viz. one of sadness, not of severity.] (as in Jn.). The conclusive thing

appears to be this. Not only are the words virtually quoted from Isa 6:9 f., but they are not given uniformly in the other Synoptics. Then it is only in the anti-Judaic reflexions in Jn. that the sense of judicial blindness is given to them at all, by a deliberate change of form, which attributes the blinding and dulling of hearing to direct Divine action. It seems natural, then, to assume that Jesus simply made an allusive use of the phraseology of Isa 6:9, so far as it lent itself to His purpose; and that in the Church's tradition this reference was taken up, fully applied, and even, as in Joh 12:40, emphasized in an anti-Jewish direction. Here Mk. shows us the first stage in the tradition, at which the regret with which Jesus contemplates the inevitable effect of the law that unreceptiveness tends to become a fixed habit, is apparent in the quick transition to 'lest haply they should turn back and forgiveness should be theirs' (ἀφεθῆ ἀποτοῖς, an adaptation of Isaiah's ἰάσομαι αὐτούς on Jahweh's behalf). Against this the telic 'with a view to' (ἵνα) cannot weigh decisively, since its exact degree of purposiveness is not always the same. Here it may well be no more than a recognition of the providential nature of the law of moral continuity, as well as of those inevitable effects which Jesus knew to be involved in His deliberate resort to parabolic teaching,† [Note: Which is, as Matthew Henry puts it, a 'shell that keeps good fruit for the diligent, but keeps it from the slothful'; cf. also Bruce, l.c. pp. 21 23.] in place of plainer proclamation, touching the Kingdom—its inner and gradual operation, and its fortunes, especially in the near future. Further, the less severe reading seems required by what follows in Mar 4:21-23, viz. that the object of the light's coming is *to be seen*; and any temporary 'covering' or 'hiding' is all meant to be subservient to this. All is simply adjusted to existing ability to hear (Mar 4:33).

Why then, it may be asked, resort to this obscurer form of instruction? Because He was *now passing on to a new side or aspect* of His teaching. Henceforth the more unambiguous form of declaration would have met immediately with a summary rejection‡ [Note: The lessons as to the slow and gradual progress of the Kingdom, as bound up with its spirituality, 'were so strange to the Jews ... that He had to adopt a method of instruction that might conciliate and provoke reflection, and gradually make a way to their minds for new truth' (Salmond on Mar 4:1 in Century Bible).] so decisive as to jeopardize the very completion of His own ministry and cut short the training of His disciples, the actual nucleus of the coming Kingdom, on whom its future realization depended. The popular receptivity towards such a Kingdom as Jesus had in mind, one radically spiritual,—as distinct from national and hedonistic,—had already been tested by clear enunciation of its ethical nature and requirements; and but few had definitely responded. That was the daunting experience which had been His for some months at least, months of such ethical intensity for all within range of His influence as to mean more than as many years of the ordinary testing of life. Already He saw that His lot was to be akin to that of the prophets of old, who achieved their mission only after and through a period of general rejection, during

which disciples learned their message vitally, and then helped in the conversion of Israel. But while this was the case on the whole, there were still individuals to be gained over one by one to the 'little flock' of His disciples, if only they had time to ponder the new ideal of the Kingdom—as coming only *gradually*, from a *very small nucleus* (Mar_4:26-32). Elect souls could do so most profitably under the very stimulus of curiosity aroused by the parabolic or suggestive method, regarded on its positive side; while for the impatient mass it had only its negative function, veiling the full truth from the profane gaze of those insensible as swine to the real charm of pearls—and apt, when disappointed, to turn like swine and rend the bearer of jewels. Hence Jesus spoke His parables publicly, to call such prepared or preparing souls, as well as to instruct His own inner circle in the deeper or more trying aspects of the Kingdom they had already in principle and at heart received. For this seems the point of Mark's 'To you the secret*' [Note: The 'secret' consisted of the true nature of the Kingdom itself, as being such as Jesus revealed it in Himself and His ministry of deed and word (corresponding to 'seeing' and 'hearing' in the next verse). This fundamental 'secret' made its possessor a 'disciple' (cf. Mat_13:52 'every scribe made a disciple to [or 'by'] the kingdom of heaven' μαθητευθεὶς τῇ βασιλείᾳ τ. οὐρανῶν), corresponding to the 'initiated' in the Greek and other Mysteries. Those who shared it not were 'those outside,' who move wholly in the sphere of 'parable,' the outer simile never opening and revealing the inner truth or reality thus kept 'secret.']] (mystery) hath been given, touching the kingdom of God' (Mar_4:11). Disciples as such had the qualifying 'secret' in their souls, the key to further understanding in the detailed knowledge of the Kingdom. It is rather this latter that Mt. and Lk. have in mind in writing (according to the form of the saying most familiar to them), 'to you it hath been given to recognize the secrets (mysteries) of the kingdom.' This probably represents a later turn given to the original thought as found in Mk., the truth of which is borne out by what follows at once in Mat_13:12 'he that hath, to him shall be given,' etc. Here the possession that is the basis for further additions, must be primarily the recognition of the Kingdom in principle. When this fundamental issue, as conditioned by the original historic situation, faded more and more into the background, and various detailed aspects of the Kingdom came practically to the front in the Church's experience, it was natural that the saying should be coloured thereby and its shade of meaning changed. Further, we can see how the later form would lend itself to the growing reflective tendency which showed itself in Gnosticism, a mode of thought alike unbiblical and un-Jewish in spirit, but akin to Greek intellectualism or one-sided reliance on 'knowledge' (*gnosis*) as such. Yet rightly understood, *i.e.* in relation to the whole genius of Christ's 'teaching' in the Synoptic Gospels at least,† [Note: Confirmed also by the character of 'the Teaching of the Lord through the Twelve Apostles' as it was understood in the circle represented by the Didache,—a fact the more striking if, as seems probable, this compilation of traditional matter represents in the main Syrian Christianity (c. 75-100 a.d.), the

source also of our Synoptic tradition.] not even the later form warrants the idea that ‘Gnostic’ or metaphysical doctrines are here meant in any degree. The ‘secrets’ in question are just those detailed aspects of the Kingdom and its development, as parts of the Divine counsels, which form the essence of the parables which follow in this connexion and elsewhere. They are of the nature of moral principles such as verify themselves in the experience of the loyal life, rather than remain ‘mysteries of faith’ in the later sense of these words.

This is not the place for full discussion of the limits of knowledge, even religious knowledge in a sense, attaching to the gospel in the mind of Jesus Himself. Such limits clearly exist as regards ‘the times and seasons’ of the Kingdom’s temporal development. This is manifest in the saying in Mar_13:32 || ‘But of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father’ (alone). It is also implied in the parable of the Seed Growing Unobserved (Mar_4:26; Mar_4:29), if the Sower who ‘himself knows not *how*’ the seed grows, be none other than Christ, as seems to be the case,—a fact which at once explains the omission of the parable by Mt. and Luke. Such ignorance only confirms our general view as to the strictly spiritual character of the ‘knowledge’ conveyed by Jesus in His ‘teaching,’—a statement which applies even to the knowledge referred to in the high utterance in Mat_11:25-27, Luk_10:21 f., touching Jesus’ unique knowledge of the Father and His corresponding ‘revelation’ of Him to receptive souls. See, further, art. Kenosis.

ii. The Fourth Gospel.—So far we have had in view ‘knowledge’ and the ‘teaching’ of it in the Synoptic Gospels only. But like results hold good in essence of the Fourth Gospel also, though with characteristic differences as to form. There, while the special word for ‘knowledge’ (γνῶσις) does not occur, the corresponding verb, with its suggestions of progressive insight gained by moral affinity, is very frequent (e.g. Joh_10:38 ‘recognize and go on recognizing,’ Joh_13:7 ‘thou dost not know now, but thou shalt come to recognize hereafter,’ cf. Joh_14:7). The knowledge in view is still such as can be verified by spiritual experience, and not such as must necessarily remain mere objective theory or ‘dogma’ in the later sense.

A typical passage is Joh_3:1-21, where, however, it is impossible to say exactly how much is due, in form at least, to the Evangelist, and how much to Him of whom he writes. At Joh_3:16 even the form ceases to be historic, and passes into reflexion on the principles involved in what precedes. But what underlies the whole is the idea of religious experience as conditioning insight into such knowledge as the new Rabbi had to convey (Joh_3:2 ff.). Its subject-matter is the ‘Kingdom of God,’ the nature of which dawns on a man’s inner eye like the light of a fresh world of experience, into which he comes as by a new birth. This correlation of ‘light’ and ‘life’ implies that the knowledge in question is not abstract or impersonal, but vital and personal, such

as can best be learned from and through a person, as it animates and gives him his specific character and attitude to life. Thus the 'life' in Jesus Himself was the 'light' He bore about in His personal walk among men. This is why 'belief in' Jesus as a person and recognition of the 'light' of His message are so closely related, indeed practically identified, in the Fourth Gospel in particular. Both attitudes of soul are conditioned by a man's will, and this again by his underlying character—so far as developed—and the sympathetic affinities proper thereto. 'For everyone that doeth ill hateth the light, and cometh not to the light, lest his works should be reprov'd. But he that doeth the truth cometh to the light, that his works may be made manifest, that they have been wrought in God' (Joh 3:20 f.). Here we get the Johannine terms in their most essential meaning, as defined by the context. Christ's manifestation of the knowledge of God (on which the Kingdom depends) as His essential life, is the 'truth' about God and man in their mutual relations,—a truth, therefore, practical in its scope,—and so the 'light' of men as regards their special concern, the art of life. 'He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life' (Joh 8:12). 'My teaching is not mine, but his that sent me. If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it be of God, or whether I speak from myself (Joh 7:16 f.).

This agrees essentially with the Synoptic teaching as to 'righteousness' and its conditions;* [Note: Wendt, *The Teaching of Jesus*, i. 256 ff., as well as his general conception of the relation between the Synoptic and the Johannine representations of Jesus' teaching.] it even coincides in form as regards the metaphor of 'light' for man's footsteps in the journey of life (Mat 6:23, Luk 11:33 f., Joh 8:12), and the vision or blindness of men as determined by their prior moral affinities (Mat 15:14; Mat 23:16-26, Luk 4:18; Luk 6:39). What is peculiar to the Johannine presentation is the use of 'truth' where the Synoptic word is 'righteousness.' But OT usage† [Note: Hastings' DB iii. p. 9a: 'The conception of true religion as the knowledge of God is probably the true antecedent and parent of some NT expressions for which affinities have been sought in the phenomena of Gnosticism. John (Joh 6:45) quotes Isa 54:13' ('All thy children shall be taught of the Lord').] helps us to see their equivalence in idea, and that 'truth' is here at bottom no more speculative or dogmatic than 'righteousness.' It means 'the way of God in truth' (Mat 22:16, Luk 20:21; cf. Luk 16:11); and the Fourth Evangelist's choice of the more intellectual synonym is probably due to a habit which he had adopted in bringing the message home to men of Greek rather than Jewish training. But the practical and vital sense in which the term is used appears, for instance, in the central saying: 'I am the way, the truth, and the life. No man cometh to the Father but by me' (Joh 14:6). When, too, Jesus goes on with, 'If you had come to recognize me (for what I am), of my Father also you would have had knowledge' (εἰ ἐγνώκατε ... ἂν ἴδατε), He does not pass into another sphere than that of spiritual quality and power, experimentally perceived: 'He that

hath seen me, hath seen the Father.’ The very fact that this is said in surprised reply to Philip’s request, ‘Show us the Father,’ proves that distinct and explicit teaching as to the Father in Himself had formed no part of ‘the teaching’; it had all been implicit in the authoritative yet dependent or filial mien with which the Son had spoken and acted for God.‡ [Note: Latham, *op. cit.* p. 17, observes that Jesus ‘trusts to men’s believing that the Father is in Him, not because He has declared it in set dogmas, but because He has been “so long with them.” ’ This is part of His chosen method of teaching, to the most religious effect, in view of the nature of man as a being whose spiritual faculties are to be evoked and trained freely and ethically.] How far any sayings recorded in the great discourse and prayer which follow, go beyond such manifested spiritual unity, into the realm of metaphysics, is still an open question among scholars. Yet it should be remembered that the thought moves ever on the devotional rather than the dogmatic level of thought, especially in the prayer in ch. 17; and that to all believers is open a like oneness to that between Jesus and His Father (ἵνα ὧσιν ἐν καθῶς ἡμεῖς ἐν, Joh 17:22), though this comes to others through relation to Himself (ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί, Joh 17:23). In any case the unity is that of Love made perfect (Joh 17:23; Joh 17:26), and rests on recognition of the Father’s name, gained by recognition of Jesus as sent of the Father (Joh 17:25 f.).

In confirmation of this view, namely, that Jesus’ teaching, even in the Johannine Gospel, moved essentially in the region of knowledge accessible to spiritual perception acting on kindred facts of experience, analogously to ordinary sense perception, we have the idea of Jesus as ‘the true and faithful witness’ (Rev 1:5; Rev 3:14). Jesus ‘witnesses’ to His message in various aspects (Joh 3:11; Joh 5:31; Joh 7:7; Joh 8:13 f., Joh 18:37), in such words and deeds as make failure to recognize its truth a self-judgment passed by each man upon the state of his own conscience or spiritual faculty, as determined by past conduct and motive (Joh 3:17-21; Joh 15:22; Joh 15:24, cf. Mar 4:21-25 ||). Thus ‘the witness’ of Jesus constituted a ‘manifestation’ (Joh 2:11; Joh 7:4; Joh 17:6) within the reach of men independently of intellectual capacity, on the sole basis of moral perceptivity and receptivity (see Joh 7:16 f., quoted above, cf. Joh 5:30), in which the common folk excelled the learned (Mat 11:25). The real object of such perception by nascent moral affinity, the specific revelation in Christ, was the total effect of Jesus’ teaching, what we should style its ‘spirit.’ To resist this impression by practically judging it evil in nature and origin, was sin against ‘the Holy Spirit’ at work in the conscience—the most fatal, because the most radical of all sins (Mar 3:28-30, Mat 12:31). The ultimate source, then, of insight into the message witnessed and the character of the Messenger as sent of God, especially in the full and perfect sense constituting Him the Messiah (Mar 8:27-30 ||), was the revealing action of the Father Himself (Mat 16:17, Joh 5:32; Joh 6:44; Joh 8:18, cf. Mat 11:27), as distinct from all mere human conditions of knowing (cf. Latham, *op. cit.* 337 f.). The Father

Himself was the ultimate witness. Not only were Jesus' works manifestly God's works (Joh 5:36; Joh 17:10); His 'voice' gave the final silent confirmation within the conscience; His 'immanent word' answered to the word uttered without by His witness; the vaguely dim outline of His character or Name was but fulfilled in clearer form in the Name given by and in His witness (Joh 5:37 f.). And so the 'light' from within met and recognized the light from without, and rose to the triumphant faith that the Light promised to Israel had indeed risen upon it.

iii. General Results.—In all this there seems essential harmony between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel, though in the latter the emphasis on the inner conditions of insight, and upon the Person of Jesus as summing up the spirit of His own teaching by word and deed, is more marked. In both types of Gospel the educative method* [Note: The wonderfully original and quickening nature of this is analyzed in Latham's *Pastor Pastorum* as nowhere else, perhaps, not excepting *Ecce Homo*.] of Jesus appears, even if, from its different scope, the Fourth Gospel does not bring this out concretely and progressively, as does the Synoptic narrative by its very nature as a narrative largely concerned with the gradual 'training of the Twelve' through actual intercourse with their Master. Perhaps we may say that the immediate influence of the Personality of Jesus, through eye and ear, is more apparent in the Synoptic account; while in the Johannine, the universal significance of His 'Person' as Messianic and Divine is set in relief—as it would be in later Christian experience. But in neither does the knowledge go beyond the scope of the Kingdom of God, the true Sovereignty of the Righteous Father—first its principles, and then its future developments—in close connexion with the destiny of its Founder and Lord, the Messiah, seen in His true character as unique Son of God. It is continuous with the Covenant idea of personal relations between God and His chosen people, and with the Divine name or character revealed *in concreto* through those relations.† [Note: Psa 25:14 RV, 'The secret (counsel) of the Lord is with them that fear him; and his covenant, to make them know it' (τοῦ δηλῶσαι αὐτοῖς). Here the LXX inserts reference to 'the name of the Lord' between the parallel clauses, as a third synonym.] The 'secret' or mystery revealed is the more spiritual and less national nature of the Kingdom; and its essential contents form the New Covenant, which, towards the end of His private teaching to the inner circle of disciples, Jesus declared was destined to be consecrated or sealed in His own life-blood. The emphasis on the connexion between the message and the Messenger, the Messianic Kingdom and His own Person as Messianic Son of God, increased with the growing opposition encountered; so that confidence in Himself became the very sheet-anchor of the cause to which He was from the first consecrated. Thus the perspective of the 'teaching' changes somewhat. The side at first implicit, becomes more and more explicit, especially in the intimate intercourse of Jesus and His inner circle. But there is essential continuity of spirit throughout. Nor is there any esoteric knowledge, in the

strict sense, different in kind from the public teaching. The inner side was simply the darker side of difficulty and rejection, that most apt to repel the hearer until his confidence in the Master was well grounded. These were 'the mysteries'* [Note: True to the OT usage = 'secret counsels'; cf. Rev 10:7 'then is finished the mystery of God, according to the good tidings which he declared to his servants the prophets.'] of the Kingdom, if Jesus ever used such an expression (Mat 13:11, Luk 8:10, where Mk. has 'the mystery,' and above, p. 702). There was no new 'theology' in the abstract and Greek sense, as distinct from that of personal relations with man. Accordingly there is in the teaching of Christ no real warrant for the Gnostic developments which began once the Gospel passed from Jewish to Greek soil. It is significant that religious knowledge was not taken in a Gnostic sense among Palestinian Christians (as distinct from the mixed Samaritan type). This implies that Christ's teaching was felt to move within the circle of general Hebrew metaphysics, and not to have any direct knowledge here to convey.

Such a judgment is confirmed, positively, by the so-called 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,' which in its present form is probably of Palestinian or Syrian origin, and understands 'the teaching (διδασχῆ) of the Lord' to have differed from Judaism only ethically, in the deeper knowledge of God's will, fuller spiritual life, and firmer grasp on immortality (γνώσις καὶ πῆσις, ζωή, ἀθανασία, 9:3, 10:2), which it bestowed. Its negative confirmation lies in the very fact that Gnosticizing versions of Christ's teaching early arose in the centres where the Hellenic spirit was strongest. Such 'apocryphal' Gospels, professing, as a rule, to supply from a secret line of tradition the words of 'deeper wisdom' which it was assumed must have fallen from the lips of the great Revealer of the spiritual world (here regarded cosmically rather than ethically), only show what the speculative spirit missed in our Gospels, with their concrete, practical teaching, often in terms of an individual case. Most probably Christian Gnostics felt some encouragement and justification afforded them by the less Hebraic tone of the Fourth Gospel, even though it is mystical rather than metaphysical in its distinctive elements, and is tinged with Christian experience rather than cosmical philosophy. Probably also their first efforts at Gospel-writing were more ethical than metaphysical in scope and interest. This was certainly the case in some circles, notably that represented by the Gospel to which belong the Oxyrhynchus 'Sayings of Jesus' (published in 1898, 1904), in which the non-original element is largely inspired by the 'Wisdom' literature of Hellenistic Judaism, and takes the form mainly of glossing certain actual sayings of Jesus with developments and expansions in terms of the deeper moral philosophy of the day, e.g. of the maxim, 'Know thyself,' and the Platonic doctrine of Wonder as the mother of Wisdom. Once this process of free development was started, however, and sanctioned among Christians imbued with Hellenic and Oriental notions, both philosophical and mythological,—for the age was one of syncretism,—for the age was one of syncretism,—

of very diverse origin,—it was bound to go ever further and further away from the attitude and horizon of historic Gospels. If the remains of 2nd cent. Gospels known to us were not so scanty, we should be able to see the stages by which the later types, in which the historic element of Jesus' teaching in word and deed is at a minimum, evolved gradually, rather than sprang full-blown to life. Thus the uncanonical Gospel drawn on by the preacher whose homily is known traditionally as '2 Clement,' whether it be the *Gospel according to the Egyptians* or not, represented the next stage of idealization to that marked by the Oxyrhynchus Gospel; but it still contained much matter found in (and probably borrowed from) our Synoptic Gospels.* [Note: See *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, Oxford, 1905.] Quite the opposite kind of development, though one which also carries us away from the historic teaching of Jesus, is seen in the Judaizing *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, in its two forms or stages, in which the reactionary reading of Jesus' message, the tendency to make it Judaic in letter and spirit, becomes more and more manifest.

Midway between these two opposed tendencies—the Judaic or legal, and the Gnostic or esoteric, mysterious, metaphysical—lie our historic Gospels. They are full of the spirit of Hebraic teaching as to knowledge of Divine things; but raise it to a new power and universality by contact with the Personality and spirit of Jesus, Himself the heart of the Gospel within the Gospels, the prime source of their perennial vitality and authority. Nor must we overlook the fact that the very form of these Gospels fits them, in a wonderful way, to be the vehicles of religious teaching after the mind of Jesus Himself, through 'being narrative instead of didactic, and coming from the Evangelists instead of from Christ' Himself direct. 'If our Lord,' says Latham (p. 13), 'had left writings of His own, every letter of them would have been invested with such sanctity that there could have been no independent investigation of truth. Its place would have been taken by commentatorial works on the delivered word,' on the lines of the scribes and Rabbis. The letter of Jesus' teaching would have been so revered, that its 'spirit and life' would have had less chance of reproducing itself through personal effort freely to find its meaning by inner moral quest. So would the very end of that teaching have been frustrated. For 'in all His sayings and doings, our Lord was most careful to leave the individual room to grow.' 'He cherishes and respects personality.' And so 'He gave *seed thoughts* which should lie in men's, hearts, and germinate when fit occasion came' (*ib.* pp. 5, 10, 12). All this is permanently secured by the simple narrative form of the Gospels, especially the Synoptics. Herein the outer form of the NT—its Epistles hardly less than its Gospels—is as characteristic of the religion it enshrines as the Koran is of Islam. It is a notable fact that the Apocryphal Gospels steadily moved away from the narrative to the didactic manner, many of them transposing their key from the third to the first person, by the device of making their teaching ostensibly post-resurrectional (even the Oxyrhynchus Gospel does this), with a view to make it more dogmatically impressive. In so doing they came nearer the Koran and most other sacred books

representing founders of religions; but they receded further from the earlier type of Christian written Gospel, of which the four in the Church's canon are the most perfect samples.

See also artt. Discourse, Illustrations, Originality, Parable, etc.

Literature.—As bearing on the form of Jesus' teaching and its leading terms, so far as determined by their original Aramaic character, Dalman's *Die Worte Jesu* is invaluable [English translation of first part = *The Words of Jesus*, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1902]. Equally fundamental for the meaning of Jesus' teaching in the Synoptics, compared also with that in the Fourth Gospel, is Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu* [English translation *The Teaching of Jesus*, 2 vols., Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1892]; cf. A. B. Bruce, *The Kingdom of God*, Edinburgh, 1890, *The Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, London, 1889. Perhaps the best book in English on the whole subject is Latham's *Pastor Pastorum* (Cambridge, 1890), which gives special attention to 'the way in which our Lord taught His disciples, both in what He did and in what He refrained from doing' and saying. Incidental help is also afforded by the larger Lives of Christ; while the articles on 'Knowledge' and 'Teaching' in Bible Dictionaries and Encyclopaedias often contain a section on our special subject.

Vernon Bartlet.

☞Tears

TEARS.—The only two passages in Authorized and Revised Versions of the Gospels where tears are mentioned are Mar 9:24, where the father of the epileptic lad is said in Authorized Version to have cried out with tears, 'Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief' [Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, however, following decidedly the best Manuscripts, omits the words 'with tears']; and Luk 7:38-44, where, in Simon the Pharisee's house, the penitent harlot washed with her tears the Saviour's feet. If, however, we enlarge our article by references to weeping, we have several instances of sorrow calling forth those tears which are its frequent, but by no means invariable, expression. Mary of Magdala wept when on the third day after the crucifixion she found that the body of her beloved Lord was no longer in Joseph's sepulchre (Joh 20:11-16). Peter wept tears of bitter shame when the sound of the cock-crowing brought home to him his sin in denying the Master on the night of betrayal (Mar 14:72 and parallels). In each of these cases it may be useful to notice that tears were turned into joy; for to the penitent woman Christ said, 'Go in peace'; Mary's grief was changed to adoring rapture when the risen Saviour pronounced her name; and to Peter, by a special revelation of grace, He granted the blessedness of the man whose

transgression is forgiven and whose sin is covered. In no case was the lamentation vain remorse, like that of Esau, who found no place of repentance, though he sought the blessing of his father diligently with tears (Heb_12:17).

Most important of all are the passages where Jesus Himself is reported to have wept. They are three. (1) On the day when He rode into Jerusalem on the ass's colt, while the multitudes were rejoicing with shouts of Hosanna, His heart was not in tune with their mirth. Luk_19:41 says that when He was come nigh, He saw the city, and wept over it. There was good reason for His wails. [The word ἐκλαυσεν does not actually express tears so much as loud cries]. The sins which that city had committed in killing the prophets and stoning them that were sent unto her—sins which were to culminate in a few days when He Himself was to be the victim of their malice—lay sore on the heart of Him who would gladly have gathered her children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and who saw His salvation rejected. The dishonour done to His Father and the degradation of His Father's house filled Him with a grief which not only made rivers of waters run down His eyes, but drew words of indignation from His lips. The sorrows which were about to swamp Jerusalem in a flood of woe wrung from His heart the agonizing cry, 'If thou hadst known in this day, even thou, the things which belong unto peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes' (Luk_19:42). It was not for Himself that He lamented, nor for Himself that He would allow tears to be shed by others. Even while He was ready to faint under the load of the cross that was to be His anguish and shame, He said, 'Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me.' If they had tears, let them prepare to shed them now for themselves and for their children, because of the fearful tragedies that were to be enacted in their city ere a few years had passed (Luk_23:27-31). The Man of sorrows and acquainted with grief (Isa_53:3) was in His characteristic attitude of agonizing for others when the load of their sins lay heavily upon Him that day, and He was like the prophet (Jer_9:1) who wished that his head were waters and his eyes a fountain of tears, that he might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of his people.

(2) Joh_11:35 'Jesus wept.' The word here is ἐδάκρυσεν, 'shed tears.' This was at the grave of Lazarus when He was about to raise him from the dead. There is something here to surprise us, though much that was very natural in the tears of the Saviour. To the widow of Nain who was following the bier of her only son He said, 'Weep not' (Luk_7:13), as He had said to those who lamented the daughter of Jairus, 'Why make ye this ado, and weep?' (Mar_5:38-39). He was about to dry their tears and silence their wails by restoring their dead to life. Yet here (Joh_11:33-35) it is recorded that He Himself groaned in spirit, and wept as He joined the company of those who were weeping with the bereaved sisters. The tears of Jesus on this occasion have been a source of much consolation to those who mourn their dead. One is reminded of the lines of Erasmus Darwin—

No radiant pearl which crested Fortune wears,
No gem that, twinkling, hangs from Beauty's ears,
Not the bright stars which Night's blue arch adorn,
Nor rising stars that gild the vernal morn,
Shine with such lustre as the tear that flows
Down Virtue's manly cheek for others' woes.'

They prove to us the perfect humanity of the Redeemer. He who with Divine authority was about to call the dead to life yet had the human weakness to shed tears. 'The possession of a body enabled Him to weary; the possession of a soul enabled Him to weep' (F. W. Robertson). They also show His thorough sympathy with those who have to endure grief, especially bereavement, how in all their afflictions He is afflicted. Perhaps they may also be evidence of the anguish He felt at the woe which was caused in the world by that sin in the train of which misery and death came into the world. Further, the tears may have been drawn forth as He thought of the anguish that would be caused to His mother and His friends when He Himself should be laid within such a sepulchre as that before His eyes. And no doubt while on this occasion in Bethany He was about to turn sorrow to joy and heaviness to mirth, yet He was aware that there were multitudes who would have to sorrow without hope, and bewailed that he who had the power of death must claim so many victims ere he was himself destroyed.

(3) Heb 5:7-8. In this interesting passage, which, while it does not occur in the Gospels, refers to Christ, we are reminded how, in the days of His flesh, He offered up prayers with strong crying and tears unto Him who was able to save Him from death. The allusion is chiefly to the agony of Gethsemane, though possibly to other occasions of Christ praying to the Father. It is hardly within the scope of this article to discuss the question of what it was for which our Lord then prayed. It can hardly have been merely such a prayer as that of Hezekiah when he turned his face to the wall and wept sore on being told that his sickness was mortal (2Ki 20:1-3), or that of the Psalmist who, as he mingled his drink with weeping, said: 'O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days' (Psa 102:9; Psa 102:24). For a discussion of the subject see Westcott, *Hebrews*; Schauffler in *Sunday School Times*, of America, 1895; *Expository Times*, vi. 1894-95, pp. 433, 522. It is evident that the writer's thought is to a large extent linked with the mediatorial office of Christ in the perfect obedience of His humanity which was learned through suffering. Death to Him, as well as to all Christians, had an awful meaning; and however willing the spirit of Christ might be to

meet it, yet the flesh was weak, and tears might well gush forth in prospect of its bitterness. Here, again, from the tears of the Saviour, we learn the thorough sympathy of Christ with men, even the identification of the Son of Man with those for whom He was to die.

Literature.—Lives of Christ and Commentaries on Gospels and on Hebrews; numerous published sermons, among which there stand out as noteworthy: Donne (vol. i.); Henry Melvill, ‘Fifty Sermons’; F. W. Robertson, ‘The Human Race.’

Arthur Pollok Sym.

⚡ Temperance

TEMPERANCE.—In the Sermon on the Mount Christ dwells on the restraint under which not only our actions and our words must be held, but also our thoughts. He sees in the angry thought the germ of murder, in the impure thought the germ of adultery, and so He goes to the root of the matter. It is of no use to try to cleanse the stream at a certain point in its course, if the fountain from which it flows is impure; if the stream is to be kept pure the fountain must be kept pure; and if the words and actions are to be under control, the thoughts of the heart must be under control. It is from within, out of the heart, that all kinds of irregularities proceed, therefore ‘keep thy heart with all diligence,’ or, as in the marginal note, ‘above all that thou guardest, for out of it are the issues of life’ (Pro 4:23).

In the parable of the Prodigal Son we see the depth of degradation into which a man is brought when he breaks away from his God. In the case of the prodigal, the initial step was taken when the undisciplined thought was harboured in the heart. His mind fretted and rebelled against the restraints of his father’s house, he wished to go out into the world and to see life, he wanted to be free from all control. The next step was the undisciplined word, ‘Give me the portion of thy substance that falleth to me.’ And the final step was the undisciplined act, ‘He took his journey into a far country, and there he wasted his substance with riotous living.’ Here the thought first ran riot, and the rest followed.

Christianity, therefore, is a religion not merely for a part of our being, but for the whole man; it touches him in every relationship of life and in every aspect of that relationship. It teaches him to ‘live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world’ (Tit 2:12). While righteousness represents his attitude towards his fellow-men and godliness his attitude towards God, soberness represents his attitude towards himself. Soberness (σωφροσύνη) is a right balance in all things; it is the bringing of the

lower part of the nature into subjection to the higher, the flesh into subjection to the spirit; it means the spirit of man, guided by the Holy Spirit of God, governing the soul or intellect; then the soul or intellect, thus sanctified, governing the flesh; and the whole man, body, soul, and spirit, kept under control, held in hand, just as a spirited horse is held in hand by an experienced rider; moving on, not torn asunder by conflicting interests, but advancing steadily in one direction upwards and heavenwards.

A temperate man is one who rules himself, who lets every act that he performs have its own proper place, who gives everything its own due proportion, who does not eat too much, drink too much, sleep too much, talk too much, or do anything in excess. We live in days when there is an inordinate craving for amusement: amusements have their place, and, within limits, are not only necessary but good for us; but when they absorb so large a portion of our life that its more serious duties have to give place to them, then they become extremely hurtful. They should be regarded as sidings off the main line of our life, opportunities for recruiting our tired and weary energies, so that we may return to our work with renewed vigour; and when thus used they are very helpful. A temperate man will exercise self-control with regard to these as well as in all other matters.

But while temperance is an all-round virtue, the term has come to be used very largely with reference to self-control in a particular direction, viz. in the matter of strong drink. When we speak of 'the Temperance cause' or 'Temperance work,' we generally mean the efforts that are being made to suppress intemperance in the use of alcohol. Our Temperance Societies are directed towards this object, and so the word 'temperance' has come to be used almost exclusively in this connexion; and it cannot be denied that there is some justification for it, because the effects of the abuse of strong drink are so patent and so terrible that they attract attention in a way that few other sins do. Temperance is not necessarily total abstinence; it is the use, as distinct from the abuse, of strong drink. Total abstinence may be necessary; for the inveterate drunkard it *is* necessary; for him the only remedy, under God, is to abstain altogether from that which he cannot use in strict moderation (cf. Jesus' words in [Mat_5:29-30](#)). Again it may be necessary for others besides drunkards, viz., for those who are to rescue the victims of strong drink, for we all know that example is far more powerful than precept; we are far more likely to be able to help those who have fallen into this abyss by saying to them, 'Do as we do,' than by saying, 'Do as we tell you.'

But while total abstinence may be necessary for some, especially for those of us who are working in the slums of our large towns, it is not enjoined upon all; the strictly moderate use of alcohol cannot be said to be a sin; and to speak of it as though it were a sin, as has sometimes been done, is only to weaken the cause that we have at

heart; it is the abuse of it that is a sin, and therefore, while abstinence is not enjoined upon all, temperance is enjoined upon every Christian man and woman.

Our Lord tells us what is the end and aim of our fallen but redeemed and regenerate humanity, 'Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect' (Mat 5:48). This is the goal set before us; and to reach this goal our attitude must be that of the spiritual athlete, straining every nerve and exerting every muscle, keeping under the body and bringing it into subjection, running the race set before us, 'looking unto Jesus' (Heb 12:2), looking unto Him as our example, looking unto Him for strength, pressing onward from stage to stage, from strength to strength, from one degree of perfection unto another, 'unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ' (Eph 4:13).

And here our Lord stands before us as our Ideal. The Jesus of the Gospels presents to us a life which is the very embodiment of temperance, a life of perfect self-restraint, of complete self-mastery; a life free from excess on the one hand and defect on the other, well-balanced, well-proportioned, without flaw, without spot, perfect in all its parts; a life which had for its object the glory of God, from the time when He came into the world, saying, 'Lo, I come to do thy will, O my God' (Heb 10:7), to the time when, having finished all, He exclaimed with the voice of a conqueror, 'I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do' (Joh 17:4). To copy this perfect Ideal and to reach this goal we, by a life lived in union with Him and by the power of the Holy Ghost, must strive to be temperate in all things. See, further, art. Self-Control.

Rowland Ellis.

☞Tempest

TEMPEST.—See Sea of Galilee, p. 591.

☞Temple

TEMPLE

i. *Use of terms.*—1. The word which is most frequently used in the Gospels for the temple is τὸ ἱερόν (הַמִּקְדָּשׁ בַּיִת); it occurs nearly 50 times. Under this term is included, generally speaking, the whole of the temple area, *i.e.* the Court of the Gentiles, the Court of the Women, the Court of the Israelites, the Priests' Court, and the Holy

Place, together with the Holy of Holies. In this wide sense it is used in Mat 12:6; Mat 24:1-2, Mar 11:11; Mar 13:1; Mar 13:3; Mar 14:49, Luk 19:47; Luk 21:37-38; Luk 22:52; Luk 24:53; but in a number of passages it is used in a more restricted sense, viz.: in reference to the *Court of the Gentiles*, Mat 21:12-16; Mat 21:23, Mar 11:15-18; Mar 11:27, Luk 19:45; Luk 22:53, Joh 2:14-15; Joh 5:14; Joh 8:59; in reference to the *Court of the Women*, Mar 12:41, Luk 2:27; Luk 2:37; Luk 21:1; in reference to the *Court of the Israelites*, Mat 26:55, Mar 12:33, Luk 2:46; Luk 18:10; Luk 20:1, Joh 7:14; Joh 7:28; Joh 11:56; Joh 18:20. The particular part of the temple referred to cannot always be ascertained with certainty, especially in the case of the *Men's Court* (Court of the Israelites), but presumably the mention of 'teaching in the temple' would usually refer to Christ teaching the Jews (in view of such passages as 'I am not sent save unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel,' Mat 15:24), in which case the women, according to Jewish custom, would not be present. In a few instances *ιερόν* is used of some particular part of the temple, viz. of the actual sanctuary, Luk 21:5, Joh 8:20; in this passage the treasury is spoken of loosely, as being in the temple (*ιερόν*), strictly speaking it was in the Sanctuary (*ναός*). The same applies to the mention of Solomon's Porch in Joh 10:23. In reference to the wing or pinnacle of the temple (Mat 4:5, Luk 4:9) *περὶ γίον τοῦ ἱεροῦ* is used; as to where this spot was precisely scholars differ. See Pinnacle. Once the phrase *τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ θεοῦ* is used (Mat 21:12), but the addition of *τοῦ θεοῦ* is not well attested.

2. The word *ναός** [Note: It was that part in which God 'dwelt' (*ναίω*), and corresponded to what was originally also the most sacred part, i.e. *bêth-'El* (cf. the Hebrew name for the temple as a whole, *בַּיִת* 'house'), the 'house of God'; the early conception of a temple was that of being essentially a 'dwelling-place' for God (cf. 2Sa 7:5-7).] (*הַיְקָל*) denotes the *Sanctuary*, i.e. that part of the temple which was holy, and to which, therefore, none but the priests had access; it included the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies (see Luk 1:21-22). The *ναός* was built of white marble, overlaid in part with gold sheeting; this costliness is referred to in Mat 23:16-17. Other references to the Sanctuary are: Mat 23:18-19; Mat 23:35, which speak of the altar; Mat 27:5-6, the treasury (but see below); Luk 1:9, the altar of incense (here the phrase *ὁ ναός τοῦ κυρίου* occurs for the only time); Mat 27:51, the heavy veil between the Holy of Holies and the Holy Place (see also Mar 15:38, Luk 23:45). Finally, Christ speaks of His body as symbolizing the Sanctuary in Joh 2:19-21, cf. Mat 26:61 (where the only occurrence of the phrase *ὁ ναός τοῦ θεοῦ* is found) Mat 27:40, Mar 14:58; Mar 15:29. In Joh 2:20 *ὁ ναός* is inaccurately used in the

words ‘Forty and six years was this temple in building’ (*i.e.* has this temple been in building up till now), for it was the whole temple area with all included in it that had so far been worked at for forty-six years; it was not finished until shortly before its final destruction by Titus in a.d. 70-71.

3. A few other expressions used for the temple may be briefly referred to: ὁ οἶκος μου,* [Note: ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θιοῦ (Mat 12:4, Mar 2:26, Luk 6:4) is used in reference to the sanctuary at Nob, 1Sa 21:4-6.] Mat 21:13, Mar 11:17, Luk 19:46, Joh 2:17; οἶκος προσευχῆς, Mat 21:13, Mar 11:17, Luk 19:46; ὁ οἶκος τοῦ πατρὸς μου, Joh 21:6. All these expressions are used in the larger sense of τὸ ἅγιον. The ‘Holy Place’ is specifically referred to in Mat 23:35 ‘between the sanctuary (ναός) and the altar, *i.e.* the space between the outer veil (see below) and the altar for burnt-offerings; in Mat 24:15, ἐστὸς ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ, but in the parallel passage (Mar 13:14) the reading is ἐστηκότα ὅπου οὐ δεῖ.† [Note: On this passage see Swete, in loc.] Lastly, the expression ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν, Mat 23:38 (‘Your house is left unto you desolate’),‡ [Note: Ἰσραηλ is read by \aleph CD OL, but omitted by all other authorities.] apparently also refers to the temple, for it is in the temple that these words were spoken, and it is to the temple that the disciples point when admiring the beauty of the building, in reply to which Christ says: ‘There shall not be left here one stone upon another, which shall not be thrown down’; thus ‘your house’ evidently means the temple building in its external form, in contradistinction to the ‘house of God,’ the spiritual building not made with hands.

ii. *Herod’s temple*.—There are several admirable descriptions of Herod’s temple published and easily available;§ [Note: The most useful are those in Riehm’s HBA ii. pp. 1636-1645; the section ‘Tempel des Herodes’ in Nowack’s Heb. Arch. ii. pp. 74-83; the account in Guthe’s Kurzes Bibel-Wörterbuch, pp. 653-658. The best, however, is that in Hastings, DB; it is very full, and the excellent illustrations enable one to form a definite picture of what the temple looked like in the time of Christ; the art. in the Encyc. Bibl. is very useful; there is also an interesting art. in vol. xii. of the Jewish Encyclopedia. See, further, the literature at the end of this article.] all are based on the main sources, viz. Josephus *Ant.* xv. xi., *BJ* v. 5., c. [Note: circa, about.] ap. 1. 22, and the Mishnic tractate *Middoth*.|| [Note: | ed. Surenhusius, see also Hildersheim’s description in Jahresbericht des Rabbiner-Seminars für das orthodoxe Judentum (Berlin, 1876-1877). *Middoth* belongs to the 2nd cent. a.d., but its account of the temple is evidently based on reliable data. The original sources are not always in agreement, but taking them together a sufficiently accurate picture of

Herod's temple is obtainable.] It will, therefore, not be necessary to give a detailed account here, but a general outline to illustrate the Gospel references is necessary. Herod the Great [Note: reat Cranmer's 'Great' Bible 1539.] commenced rebuilding the temple¶ [Note: It was not completed until the procuratorship of Albinus (a.d. 62-64). Its site is to-day occupied by the Haram es-Sherif, though this includes also part of the site formerly covered by the Tower of Antonia, which stood at the north-west of the temple area.] in the year b.c. 20 (the eighteenth year of his reign), on the site of the second temple; but the available space was insufficient for the much larger building which he intended to erect. He therefore constructed immense vaulted chambers** [Note: * Called by the Arabs 'Solomon's Stables'; opinions differ as to whether they belong to an earlier period, and were only renovated by Herod, or whether Herod constructed them himself, or whether they belong to a later date altogether.] on the south side of the hill on which the earlier temple stood; by this means the area at his disposal was doubled. A general idea of the whole will be best gained by indicating its main divisions:

1. The Outer Court.—This large space (two *stadia*†† [Note: † A stadium = 606¾ English feet.] in length, one in breadth, the perimeter being six *stadia*), which surrounded the temple proper, was enclosed by a battlemented wall. The main entrances to this enclosure were on the west, leading from the city; here there were four gates, the remains of one of which have been discovered.‡ [Note: ‡ Known, after the name of the discoverer, as Wilson's Arch (see Warren and Conder's Survey of Western Palestine, 'Jerusalem,' p. 196).] On the south side were the two 'Huldah' gates, remains of which have also been discovered. On the south-west corner there was a bridge which led from the city into the temple area; a huge arch which formed part of this bridge was discovered by Robinson, and is called after him. There was one gate on the east, which has been walled up; this was called the 'Golden Gate,' which tradition identifies with the 'Beautiful Gate' mentioned in Act 3:2.* [Note: Possibly to be identified with the 'Shushan Gate' mentioned in Middoth.] On the north there was likewise one gate, called in *Middoth* the 'Tadi Gate.'† [Note: The 'private' gate, used only by mourners and those who were ceremonially unclean.] All these gates led directly into the great temple area, or outer court; around the whole area, within the walls, were ranged porticoes with double rows of pillars; but the finest was that on the south side; here there were four rows of Corinthian columns made of white marble. All these porticoes were covered with a roof of wood. The eastern portico was called **Solomon's Porch** (Joh 10:23, cf. Act 3:11; Act 5:12); it belonged to an earlier building which tradition ascribed to Solomon. On the north-west two sets of steps led up to the **Tower of Antonia**; the Roman garrison stationed here kept constant watch during the feasts and other occasions of great gatherings, in case of tumult (cf. Act 21:35; Act 21:40). This temple area was called the 'Court of the Gentiles'; it was not part of the temple proper, and therefore not sacred soil, consequently any one might enter it. It is to this outer court that reference is made in

Mat 21:12-18, Mar 11:15 ff., Luk 19:45; Luk 19:48, Joh 2:13-17; the money-changers‡ [Note: The temple tribute was half a shekel annually; as this had to be paid in the form of the ancient coin, the money-changers who exchanged them for current coin had an opportunity, which they did not neglect, of making considerable profits on commission.] and those who sold animals for the temple sacrifices had free access here.

2. The Court of the Israelites.—This inner court was raised fifteen cubits§ [Note: A cubit = 1 ft. 5 1/2 in. or 1 ft. 8 1/2 in., according to the shorter or longer measurement; see Hastings' DB and Encyc. Bibl. art. 'Weights and Measures.'] above the outer one just referred to; it was surrounded by a terrace (*hêl*), ten cubits in breadth, which was approached from the outer court by ascending fourteen steps; these steps ran round the whole terrace, and at the bottom of them there was a low wall or breastwork (*sôrçg*) which was the limit to which non-Israelites might approach; along it were placed, at intervals, inscriptions warning Gentiles not to pass beyond, on pain of death; they were written in Latin and Greek; one of the latter has been discovered by Clermont-Ganneau. || [Note: | It runs: 'No Gentile may enter within the balustrade and wall encircling the temple. Whosoever is caught (doing so) will have to blame himself for the consequence, —the death penalty' (cf. Act 21:26 ff.): see PEFSt, 1871, p. 132; cf. Jos. Ant. xv. xi. 5.] On entering this inner court, 'holy' ground was reached, which accounted for the prohibition just referred to; only the seed of Abraham might enter here, hence its name. It was divided into two portions:

(a) *The Women's Court.*—This was the smaller division; it occupied the eastern part. The court received its name from the fact that it formed the limit to which women might advance towards the sanctuary, not because it was reserved for the use of women.¶ [Note: In modern Jewish places of worship a special gallery is reserved for the women.] It was on a lower level than the Men's Court, which was entered through six of the nine gates belonging to the Women's Court. Of these gates, three deserve special mention, viz. that presented by Alexander of Alexandria; it was one of the largest, and was covered with gold and silver; secondly, the Eastern gate, which was covered with Corinthian bronze; and, above all, the gate of Nicanor;* [Note: An interesting reference to the gate of Nicanor is to be found on a recently discovered bilingual inscription, in Greek and Hebrew, in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem; it was found inscribed on an ossuary from a sepulchral cave, and runs: Ὅστᾱ τῶν τοῦ Νεικάν ορος Ἀλεξανδρέως ποιήσαντος τὰς θύρας דַּבְּרֵי אֶלְכְּסָא ('The bones of [the children of?] Nicanor, the Alexandrian, who made the doors. Nicanor Aleksa.'). Prof. Clermont-Ganneau says that this inscription 'can scarcely refer to any other than the family or descendants of Nicanor,' and that the 'doors' must be understood as referring to 'the famous door of the temple of Herod, known as the Gate of Nicanor, after the rich individual who had presented it to the Sanctuary'; see PEFSt, 1903, pp.

125-131.] this was called the ‘Great [Note: reat Cranmer’s ‘Great’ Bible 1539.] Gate’; it was fifty cubits high and forty broad; fifteen steps, semicircular in form, led up to it from the Women’s Court. Whether the ‘Beautiful Gate’ mentioned in [Act 3:2](#) referred to this or to the Eastern gate of the Outer Court (see above) is quite uncertain.

(b) But the *Court of the Israelites* proper was the western and larger court, called also the *Men’s Court*, and to this only men had access. It ran round the whole of the Sanctuary itself, in which was included the Priests’ Court (see below). In the Men’s Court were (according to Josephus) the treasury-chambers, where all the more valuable temple belongings were kept. The ‘treasury’ spoken of in [Mar 12:41](#); [Mar 12:43](#), [Luk 21:1](#) was clearly entered by women; the discrepancy may, however, be explained by supposing that one of the trumpet-shaped receptacles into which offerings were cast, and which usually stood in the Men’s Court, was at certain times placed in the eastern portion of the court, so that every one, including the women, might have the opportunity of making the offerings; on such occasions the Women’s Court was, for the time being, a treasury. On the other hand, the treasury mentioned in [Joh 8:20](#) would appear, from the context,† [Note: ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα ἐλάλησεν ἐν τῷ γαζοφυλακίῳ διδάσκων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ. It was teaching which, according to Jewish ideas, concerned men.] to refer to that in the Men’s Court, the word being used here in the strict sense (see, too, [Mat 27:5-6](#)).

3. The Court of the Priests.—Before entering the most sacred parts of the Sanctuary, the Priests’ Court had to be traversed. In this court there stood, in the centre, the great altar for burnt-sacrifices, and close to it the brazen laver for the priestly ablutions. On the right of these, on entering, was the place for slaughtering the animals brought for sacrifice. On either side of the court were the priests’ chambers; it is probable that one of these was the *Lishkath parhedrin*, ‘the Hall of the πρόεδροι’ (‘assessors’), in which the members of the Sanhedrin met in a *quasi*-private character before they met officially in the *Lishkath ha-gazith*,‡ [Note: The tribunal was called תְּהוֹל הַיָּד הַגְּדוֹלָה (‘The great house of judgment’).] ‘the Hall of hewn stone.’ Where this latter was precisely, it is impossible to say, owing to the conflicting evidence of the authorities; the only thing that seems tolerably certain is that, while it was within the enclosure of the temple proper, it was not within the Priests’ Court; this is certain from the fact that none but priests might enter the court called after them; the only exception to this was that which permitted the entrance of those who brought offerings, for they had to lay their hands upon the sacrifice, in accordance with the prescribed ritual.

4. The Holy Place (*hêkhâl*).—This was separated from the Priests' Court by a high porch (*'ûlâm*, see above, i. 1), running north and south; it was a hundred cubits in height (the highest part of the whole temple) and breadth, but only eleven in depth. The Holy Place stood on a higher level than the surrounding court, from which twelve steps led up to it. Its furniture consisted of the altar of incense (see [Luk 1:9](#)), the table of the shewbread, and the seven-branched candlestick.

5. The Holy of Holies (*děbîr*).—No human foot might enter here, with the one exception of the high priest, who entered once a year, on the Day of Atonement, for the purpose of presenting sacrifice and incense before God. It was properly the place wherein the ark should have rested; but nothing is heard of the ark after the Captivity, and the Holy of Holies was, therefore, quite empty. The 'foundation stone' ([שִׁתֵּיה אֶבֶן](#)) upon which, in the first temple, the ark had stood, was nearly in the centre of the Holy of Holies; in the second temple it was exposed to the extent of about six inches;* [Note: Encyc. xii. 92.] there is no mention of this anywhere in reference to Herod's temple, but, as this was built on the site of the earlier temple, it is difficult to believe that it was not there. There was no means whereby any light could enter the Holy of Holies; it was, therefore, always in total darkness, excepting when artificially lighted. It was separated from the Holy Place by means of two veils, with the space of a cubit between them; in [Mat 27:51](#), [Mar 15:38](#), [Luk 23:45](#) (cf. [Heb 6:19](#); [Heb 9:3](#); [Heb 10:20](#), though it is not Herod's temple that is referred to in these passages) only one veil† [Note: This must not be confounded with the 'Babylonian' veil, which hung before the Holy Place, and which is not referred to in the Gospels. See Warren and Conder, 'Jerusalem,' pp. 340-341.] is spoken of; but as the two were so close together, they were probably regarded as two parts of one whole.

iii. *Christ and the temple.*—1. The earliest mention of the temple in connexion with Christ is on the occasion of His being brought there for 'presentation' and 'redemption' thirty-one days after His birth, in accordance with Jewish law ([Luk 2:22-39](#), cf. [Exo 13:1-16](#)). This ceremony took place in the Court of the Women, as the presence of Mary and Anna shows; it was a simple one,‡ [Note: Probably more simple even than among modern Jews; see Firstborn.] consisting only of the formal presentation of the child to the priest, who offered up two 'benedictions,' or thanksgiving prayers, one on behalf of the child for the law of redemption, the other on behalf of the mother for the gift of the firstborn son.

From [Luk 2:41](#) it may be assumed that Christ was brought annually to Jerusalem for the Passover celebration in the temple; there was no need for Him to be left behind,§ [Note: Josephus tells us that the provincial towns of Judaea were empty and deserted on the occasions of the annual feasts,—though there is an obvious exaggeration when

he says that at the Passover in the year 63 there were no fewer than 2,700,000 Jewish people present in Jerusalem (Ant. xiv. xiii. 4, BJ vi. ix. 3).] and the presence of children in the temple was evidently of common occurrence (Mat 21:15); the visit, therefore, recorded in Luk 2:42 was not the first time that Christ was present at the yearly Passover feast in the temple. || [Note: | Against Edersheim, Life and Times, ii. 242. See also art Boyhood, vol. i. p. 225b.]

One other reference, prior to the time of Christ's public ministry, but on the threshold of it, is contained in the parable of His Temptation, whose second scene (in Lk. the third) is represented as having taken place on the pinnacle of the temple.

2. By far the most important part of Christ's connexion with the temple is His teaching given within its precincts. On a number of occasions we read of the representatives of different classes coming to Him in the temple, often, no doubt, with the genuine object of profiting by His teaching, but frequently also for a more sinister purpose (e.g. Mat 16:1; Mat 22:15). The most elaborate account of such teaching is probably that contained in the long passage Mat 21:23 to Mat 23:39; the whole of this discourse, addressed, as opportunity offered, to a variety of hearers, would appear to have been spoken in the large outer court (ii. 1). The many sided character of Christ's teaching in the temple is well illustrated by this section; the first who are here mentioned as coming to Him were the chief priests and elders of the people, who asked Him by what authority He taught; the series of parables which constituted His reply to their question concluded with an appeal to Scripture: 'Did ye never read in the Scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner?' (Psa 118:22); there was peculiar aptitude in the quotation being given in the temple, for 'stone' was a figurative expression for the leader of the people, which must have been familiar to His hearers (cf. Isa 19:13, Jdg 20:2, 1Sa 14:33, Zec 10:4); a family, and also a nation, were conceived of as a building (cf. 1Pe 2:5), the head of which was regarded as the most prominent feature—the part of the spiritual building which stood out most conspicuously. There is ample evidence to show that the Jews regarded the temple as, in a real sense, a symbol of their nation. When Christ spoke of Himself as the 'corner-stone,' He was claiming for Himself the leadership of the people, *i.e.* He was, in effect, declaring Himself to be the Messiah.* [Note: The 'corner-stone,' as implied above, has nothing to do with the foundation of a building; this is quite clear from the Heb. פִּינָקוּרֵי אֶשֶׁר and from the Syr cur and Pesh. ܦܝܢܩܘܪܝܐ, the root-idea of ܦܢܐ is that of 'excrescence' (see Brockelmann, Syr. Lex. s.v.). Literally, the phrase might be rendered, 'the top of the highest point'; and the spot indicated would probably be the same as that referred to in the narrative of the Temptation.] Christ's teaching was next addressed in turn to the Pharisees, the Herodians, the Sadducees, the lawyers, and, lastly, to the surrounding people; the whole section gives a vivid picture of the use He

made of the temple for His teaching of all sorts and conditions of men. Other references to His teaching in the temple are Luk 19:47-48, from which it is clear, on the one hand, how exasperated the chief priests and scribes were, and, on the other hand, how the people flocked into the temple to hear Him (Mat 26:55, Mar 14:49, Luk 21:37-38; Luk 22:53, Joh 18:20).

But perhaps the most impressive teaching of Christ in the temple was during the great festivals, when immense numbers of people from all parts of the country came up to Jerusalem. It is in the Fourth Gospel that the details of this teaching are, for the most part, preserved; thus in Joh 7:10 ff. we read that during the Feast of Tabernacles, Jesus went into the temple and taught, so that the people marvelled at His teaching; and that on the last day of this feast a climax was reached; for, while on the one hand He was declared to be the Messiah, on the other this claim was disputed; and that the chief priests and Pharisees, believing that their opportunity had come, attempted to take Him, but in vain, for the majority of the people sided with Christ. The method of Christ's, public teaching in the temple together with the way in which the learned Jews sought to combat it, is graphically described in such passages as John 7, 8; the whole of the episode dealt with in these chapters took place in the outer Court of the Gentiles, where the largest number of people congregated: this is clear from the fact that some of the people took up stones† [Note: The other courts were paved.] to cast at Christ (Joh 8:59). Again, at the Feast of Dedication, Christ was once more in the temple, teaching, with the like result, that the people threatened to stone Him: in this case we are definitely told (Joh 10:22-42) that it took place in 'Solomon's Porch,' which was in the Court of the Gentiles (see above, ii. 1). Lastly, that Christ was again present in the temple, and teaching, during the other great feast, the Passover, seems tolerably clear from Joh 12:12-38.

It is certain, therefore, that Christ made every use of the opportunities afforded of pressing home His teaching in the temple;* [Note: also the activity of Jeremiah in this respect.] no other spot offered the same favourable conditions, viz. it was the most convenient centre for the gathering together of the multitude; the frequent presence of priests, Pharisees, scribes, and lawyers enabled Christ, in the hearing of the multitude, to contrast His teaching with theirs; there was also the fact that teaching in the temple naturally appealed to the multitude more than if given anywhere else, as the temple was the officially recognized place for instruction.

3. It is extraordinary that no instance of a miracle of healing by Christ is recorded in the Gospels as having been performed in the temple; but in view of such passages as Act 3:1-12; Act 5:12 we cannot doubt that such did take place, especially as the Outer Court of the temple would be a natural spot for the lame and crippled to congregate for the purpose of arousing the pity of those going up to worship.

Only once is the temple the scene in a parable, namely, in that of the Pharisee and the Publican (Luk 18:10-14); while in one other, the Good Samaritan (Luk 10:30-36), temple officers are referred to.

4. There are, in the next place, a certain number of passages in the Gospels in which there are direct references to the temple, or something connected with it, though it is not mentioned by name. The temple and its furniture would have been so well known to the people that Christ could use both symbolically without actually mentioning them, and yet His hearers would perfectly understand the reference. The most striking instance of this is where the sanctuary is used as a symbol of Christ's risen body (Joh 2:19-21; cf. Mat 26:6 f., Mat 27:40, Mar 14:58; Mar 15:29). But, as a rule, these references are not so obvious to modern ears as to those who heard them. The significance of these examples is enhanced in the case of those which were spoken in the temple itself; among them are: Joh 8:12 'I am the light of the world'; one may reasonably infer that there was a reference here to the seven-branched lampstand in the Holy Place;† [Note: But cf. Westcott, in loc.] but for this artificial light it was altogether in darkness; the context ('he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness') receives emphasis when one remembers this. Christ is drawing out the contrast between the Jewish teaching, according to which the close approach to God in the Holy of Holies meant darkness, and His own, according to which the nearer one approached to Him, the Son of God, the greater the light. Again, there is a reference to the temple service of praise when Christ quotes Psa 8:2 (LXX Septuagint): 'Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings thou has perfected praise' (Mat 21:16); here again was an implied contrast between the formalism of the temple-worship and the whole hearted praise of the children crying, 'Hosanna to the Son of David.' A further and more direct reference to the worship of the temple is to be found in Mar 12:29, where Christ quotes the *Shema*: 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is One'; the *Shema* (Deu 6:4) was one of the earliest portions of the temple liturgy,‡ [Note: See Box in Encyc. Bibl. iv. cols. 4953, 4954.] and was recited every morning and evening.§ [Note: Queen Helen of Adiabene fixed a golden candelabrum in the front of the temple, which reflected the first rays of the sun, and thus indicated the time of reciting the Shema' (Yoma, 37b, quoted in Jewish Encyc. xi. 266).] In the same section occurs a reference to the daily sacrifices in the temple, viz. that to love God and one's neighbour is 'more than whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices' (Mar 12:33). Other references of this kind are in Mat 5:22, where Christ speaks of the Sanhedrin ('Council'); Mat 5:23-24, where the offering on the altar in the Court of the Priests (see above, Mat 2:3) is mentioned; Mat 23:16 ff., which contains the prohibition of swearing by the temple or the altar; Mar 7:11, where Christ speaks against an abuse which was clearly of frequent occurrence;* [Note: See Ecc 5:2-5.] the word *korban* (see Corban) was a technical term used in making vows, and meant that a gift was made to God; the abuse arose when a man would say to another (who as a relative or the like had a claim upon him): 'My property is *korban* to thee,' for by this means he

could prevent his relative from deriving any benefit from his possessions. *Korban* means lit. 'offering'; it was used also of the sacred treasury in which gifts for the temple were kept; it is used in this sense in Mat 27:6.† [Note: Jos. BJ ii. ix. 4, where it is spoken of as the 'sacred treasure.'] In Mat 23:2 Christ speaks of 'Moses' seat,' *i.e.* the Rabbinic college, the official deliberations of which took place in the temple. Not all of these references were spoken in the temple itself, but it cannot be doubted that Christ had the temple, or something connected with it, in His mind when He spoke. Lastly, there are other passages which record sayings or actions of Christ in which a connexion of some kind with the temple is to be discerned, *e.g.* Joh 15:1 'I am the true vine'; golden vines, with immense bunches of grapes, were carved on the door leading into the Holy Place (*Hêkhâl*);‡ [Note: Westcott, ad loc. Jos. (BJ v. v. 4, cf. Ant. xiv. iii. 1) and Tacitus (Ann. v. 5) refer to this; the vine was the symbol of the Jewish nation, and is found as such on Maccabaeian coins.] it is permissible to assume that Christ based His teaching here, as so often elsewhere,§ [Note: *e.g.* in Mat 4:19; Mat 22:19 etc.] on what was familiar to His hearers. Again, at the washing of the disciples' feet, Joh 13:5 ff. recalls to mind the priestly ablutions at the brazen laver near the great altar in the Priests' Court,|| [Note: | See above, ii. 3.] preparatory to their undertaking the duties of the priestly office; it must be remembered that Christ, in the episode referred to, was about to perform an act appertaining to His high-priestly office, and the disciples were being consecrated in a special manner to their future work.

One has but to bear in mind the part that the temple and its worship played among the Jews, not only of Palestine but also of the Diaspora, to realize that the references indicated above are not fanciful.

iv. Christ's attitude towards the temple worship.—The Gospels present to us two elements in Christ's attitude towards the temple and its system of worship which appear, at first sight, to be contradictory; but they can, nevertheless, be satisfactorily accounted for.

On the one hand, Christ evinces a great love and reverence for the temple; His frequent appearance there cannot have been only for the purpose of teaching the people, for, while it is true that the Gospels never directly record an instance of His offering sacrifice, there can be no reasonable doubt that He fulfilled the duties incumbent upon every true Israelite; this the following considerations will bear out:

The keynote of Christ's subsequent observance of the Law (cf. Mat 5:18) was already sounded at His presentation in the temple (Luk 2:22-24); from boyhood He was taught to observe the Passover (Luk 2:41-42), and it is inconceivable that He should, later on, have omitted what was a sacred duty in the eyes of every Jew, *viz.* taking His share in the family sacrifice in the temple at the Passover feast.¶ [Note: Although the

Passover was celebrated in the home in our Lord's time as well as at the present day among Jews, yet the Paschal lamb might be killed only in the temple, the central sanctuary. At the Passover even laymen were permitted to kill the sacrificial animals, on account of the immense number that were offered. But, in any case, every Jew had to take part in the offering, by means of the consecrating act of laying the hand upon the victim on the altar.] Moreover, all Jews took a direct share in the ordinary services and worship of the temple; a crowd of worshippers was always present at the daily morning and evening sacrifice which was offered up on behalf of the congregation; they waited either in meditation or in prayer while the high priest entered into the Holy Place to present the incense-offering, and when he came forth they received, with bowed head, the priestly benediction; they listened to the chant of the Levites, and at the conclusion of each section, when the priests sounded their silver trumpets, the whole multitude prostrated themselves.* [Note: See Bousset, *Religion des Judentums*, p. 94.] That Christ, furthermore, observed the Jewish feasts has already been shown, and His own words as to the celebration of the Passover (Luk 22:7 ff.) clearly show His attitude towards the sacrificial system generally. Then, again, several occasions are recorded of His distinctly enjoying the fulfilment of the law of sacrifice: Mat 8:4 (cf. Mar 1:44, Luk 5:14) Mat 5:23-24; Mat 23:2, Luk 17:14. (cf. Joh 5:46; Joh 7:23); and His reference to the shewbread in Mar 2:26, Luk 6:4 is also to the point. Indeed one has but to recall His instinctive desire to be 'in his Father's house' (Luk 2:49), His zeal for the 'house of prayer' (Luk 19:45-46), His sense of the holy character of the sanctuary (Mat 23:17), His insistence on the need of paying the temple tax (Mat 17:24 f.), to realize how fully He acquiesced in the contemporary conceptions regarding the temple and its worship.

But, on the other hand, there are references, equally decisive, though fewer in number, in which both the temple and its worship are regarded as of quite subordinate importance. Thus in Mat 12:6, where Christ speaks of Himself as 'greater than the temple,' He was uttering words which, at all events to Jews, must have implied a depreciation of the temple; in the same passage the quotation from Hos 6:6 'I will have mercy and not sacrifice' (repeated in Mat 9:13) pointed distinctly to the relative unimportance of sacrifice. Again, the parable of the Good Samaritan illustrates what Christ thought of the priesthood (Luk 10:31); and most striking is His reply to those who lavished praise on the beauty of the temple: 'Verily, I say unto you, There shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down' (Mat 24:2, Mar 13:1; Mar 13:3, Luk 21:5-6), in connexion with which must be taken Joh 4:21 'Neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem shall ye worship the Father.'† [Note: This attitude of Christ towards the temple and its worship receives corroboration in an exceedingly interesting fragment of a lost Gospel, discovered at Oxyrhynchus, which contains an account of a visit of Christ and His disciples to the temple; they meet there a Pharisee who reproaches them with neglecting to perform the usual purification ceremony before entering the 'holy place' (presumably the

Court of the Israelites is meant). Christ, in reply, emphasizes the need of inward purity, compared with which the outward ceremonial is as nothing (cf. Mat_23:25-26, Luk_11:37-40).]

This twofold, and apparently contradictory, attitude of Christ towards the temple and its worship has also a twofold explanation. There can be little doubt, in the first place, that Christ's realization of the relatively minor importance of the temple and its worship stood in the closest relation to His second coming (παρουσία) and the doctrine of the last things. This is very distinctly seen in that it is immediately after the prediction of the destruction of the temple (Mat_24:2, Mar_13:1, Luk_21:6)‡ [Note: On the 'Abomination of Desolation' see Cheyne in Encyc. Bibl. i. cols. 21-23.] that He recounts the signs which shall precede His second coming (see esp. Mat_25:31 ff., cf. 2Th_2:1-12); the near approach of the end (Mat_24:14) emphasized the temporary character of the temple and all that pertained to it.§ [Note: This was in direct contradiction to the Jewish belief in the inviolability of the temple, see Jos. BJ vi. v. 2; cf. Bousset, op. cit. p. 97; cf. Act_7:48 f.] In the second place, it is to be explained by the ever-widening conceptions which Christ experienced regarding His Person and work. In the early part of His ministry the influence of Jewish up-bringing and environment was strongly marked; but as the realization of His own Divine Personality and the world-embracing character of His work grew more and more clear, all that was distinctively Jewish and of local colour receded into comparative insignificance. The evolution of Christ's Divine consciousness brought with it a new perspective, which revealed Him to Himself not merely as King of the Jews, but also as the Divine Saviour of the world (cf. Mat_24:14).

Cleansing of the temple.—This episode, together with the triumphal entry into Jerusalem, is one of the few events (apart from the story of the Passion) recorded by all four Evangelists; this is significant, for its importance can scarcely be exaggerated. There are slight variations in the four accounts, but the substantial fact is identical in each (Mat_21:12-17, Mar_11:15-18, Luk_19:45-46, Joh_2:14-21). It is necessary to realize clearly that this act of 'cleansing' (the expression is quite misleading) belonged to a definite course of action marked out by Christ for Himself, and that it formed the last great act [the narrative in Jn. being misplaced] of His public ministry prior to the Passion. It is therefore important to connect it with the leading events of the few months preceding it.

According to Mk., which may be regarded as offering the earliest and most strictly historical account, that which definitely and irrevocably marked the final breach between Christ and the ecclesiastical authorities was the question of Sabbath observance (cf. Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 68 ff.); the controversy on this subject culminated in the healing of the man with the withered

hand on the Sabbath (Mar 3:1 ff.). This occurred in the country under the jurisdiction of Herod Antipas, *i.e.* during the Galilean ministry, which had as one of its most notable results the adherence to Christ of the masses. It was on account of this popular support that the religious authorities deemed it advisable to get help from the secular arm, if this movement, so dangerous from their point of view, was to be checked. For this reason they appealed to the Herodians (Mar 3:6); their appeal was evidently successful, for Christ found it necessary to leave Galilee, and to remain in such parts of the country as were outside the jurisdiction of Herod Antipas; thus freeing Himself from the molestations of the Herodians. During this time the multitudes flocked to Him; but His main purpose consisted in preparing His disciples for what was to come. This preparation went on for some months. Then Christ determined to go up to Jerusalem for the Passover and appear publicly once more,* [Note: As Judaea was not under the jurisdiction of Herod Antipas, Christ would be more unfettered in His action there.] though He knew what the result must be, and did not hide it from His disciples (Mar 10:32-34). He thereupon entered Jerusalem publicly, accompanied by His followers (Mar 11:7 ff.), and the next day the ‘cleansing’ of the temple took place. That is to say, in the cycle of events just referred to, the ‘cleansing’ formed the climax. Now, the essence of *practical* Judaism, according to the ideas of the religious official classes, consisted, above all things, in the strict *observance of the Sabbath*, and the due and regular carrying out of the *sacrificial system*. Christ had dealt with the former of these, as referred to above; and, in making it a real blessing, had of necessity run directly counter to the traditional rules of observance; that is to say, while holding firmly to the spirit of the Law, He abrogated the Sabbath in the old Jewish sense of the word. The ‘cleansing’ of the temple denotes His intention of doing the same with the other prime mark of practical Judaism, *viz.* the sacrificial system. That this is really the inner meaning of the ‘cleansing’ of the temple, the following considerations will show:

(i.) Excepting on this supposition, there was no meaning in Christ’s action; the *Outer Court*, or ‘Court of the Gentiles,’ where the ‘cleansing’ took place (see above, ii. 1), was not ‘sacred’ soil; it cannot, therefore, have been on account of profanation of the temple that Christ acted as He did. The sheep and oxen, doves, and money-changers, were all absolutely essential for the carrying on of the sacrificial system of the time; Christ’s action was too significant to be misunderstood.—(ii.) The stress laid in each of the three Synoptics on the temple being a ‘house of prayer,’ seems to point in the same direction. There is some significance, too, in the dialogue which took place very shortly after between our Lord and one of the scribes (Mat 12:28), when the latter says: ‘... and to love his neighbour as himself, is much more than whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices,’—words which Christ describes as ‘discreet.’—(iii.) The event took place just before the Feast of the Passover, *i.e.* at a time when the sacrificial animals would be crowding in as they did at no other time of the year. This made Christ’s action all the more significant.—(iv.) The whole belief

and attitude of both hierarchy and people regarding the sacrifices were such that the abrogation of these latter was an indispensable necessity if Christ's teaching was to have practical and permanent results. Vast as the number of public, official sacrifices were, those of private individuals were of an infinitely greater number; it was these latter that formed one of the characteristic marks of the worship at Jerusalem.

'Here, day after day, whole crowds of victims were slaughtered and whole masses of flesh burnt; and when any of the high festivals came round, there was such a host of sacrifices to dispose of that it was scarcely possible to attend to them all, notwithstanding the fact that there were thousands of priests officiating on the occasion. But the people of Israel saw, in the punctilious observance of this worship, the principal means of securing for themselves the favour of their God' (Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP Law of Holiness.*] ii. i. 298).

These considerations seem to show that the 'cleansing' of the temple really did connote an intention in the mind of Christ to abrogate entirely the Jewish sacrificial system; if this is not what it meant, it is difficult to see any point in it at all. In how far Christ intended to mark Himself out as Him in whom was hereafter to be centred a purified, spiritual 'sacrificial system,'—or, in other words, what the relations were between the 'cleansing' of the temple and the words spoken in the upper chamber, 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood,'—is a question which cannot be dealt with here.

If the meaning of the Cleansing of the Temple here advocated be correct, it will at once be seen that few actions of our Lord possessed greater significance.

Literature.—Besides the various works referred to above, the following selection of books is recommended: Fergusson, *The Temples of the Jews*, London, 1878; Warren and Conder, *Survey of Western Palestine: 'Jerusalem,'* pp. 117-341, London, 1884; Stade, *GVI* [Note: *VI Geschichte des Volkes Israel.*] ii. p. 491 ff., Berlin, 1888; Benzinger, *Heb. Arch.* pp. 402-404, Leipzig, 1894; Clermont-Ganneau, *Archaeological Researches in Palestine*, chs. iv.-vii., London, 1899; Box in *Encyc. Bibl.* iv. 4948-4956 (for the services of the temple), London, 1903; Sanday, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, pp. 106-117, Oxford, 1903; Babelon, *Manual of Oriental Antiquities*, ch. vii., London, 1906.

W. O. E. Oesterley.

TEMPTATION.—The word *πειράζω* (noun *πειρασμός*, [Luk 4:13](#); [Luk 8:13](#); [Luk 22:28](#), [Mat 6:13](#); [Mat 26:41](#); intensive form *ἐκπειράζω*, [Luk 10:25](#), [Mat 4:7](#)) has a neutral, a good, and a bad sense. It may mean simply ‘to try,’ ‘make trial of,’ ‘test,’ for the purpose of ascertaining the quality of a man, what he thinks, or how he will behave himself; but usually there is either a good ([Joh 6:6](#), perhaps also [Mat 22:35](#)) or a bad intent. In the latter case it means *to solicit to sin, to tempt*. That the word may be used in the wider sense, even when rendered ‘tempt,’ must not be forgotten. In [Jam 1:12](#) ‘temptation’ is used of *trial* generally, the issue of which is intended to be the crown of life; but in [Jam 1:13](#) ‘tempted’ is used in the sense of *solicited to sin*; and the writer very emphatically asserts, ‘God cannot be tempted (*ἀπειραστος*) with evil, and he himself tempteth no man.’ This statement seems to be contradicted by Jesus’ quotation from [Deu 6:16](#) in His answer to the second temptation in [Mat 4:7](#), as well as by the sixth petition of the Lord’s Prayer ([Mat 6:13](#)); but tempting God does not mean soliciting Him to sin, but trying His justice and patience, challenging Him to give proof of His perfection to such a degree as to incur His displeasure, and to expose oneself to His judgment; and the temptations into which God is asked not to lead us, are the circumstances or the states of mind which, though to the strong they might prove the opportunities of winning ‘the crown of life’ ([Jam 1:12](#)), to weakness may be the occasions of failure and transgression. This weakness of His disciples, while admitting their good intentions, Jesus recognizes in His warning in Gethsemane ([Mat 26:41](#)), and commends their fidelity to Him in the trying experiences they had shared with Him ([Luk 22:28](#)). To the enthusiastic but shallow hearers of His words He affirmed that trials (persecution, etc.) would prove morally fatal ([Luk 8:13](#)). The cares and riches and pleasures of this life ([Luk 8:14](#)) He regarded as hindrances to the higher life. Noteworthy is the emphasis He lays on the peril of wealth ([Mat 19:23-24](#)). That Jesus discovered the moral peril in which Judas was placed from the very first indications of distrust and disloyalty to Himself, is suggested by [Joh 6:70-71](#), which shows also the danger He feared for the other disciples. His repeated references to His coming betrayal ([Mat 17:22](#); [Mat 20:18](#); [Mat 26:2](#)), His plain allusion to the presence of the traitor at the Last Supper ([Luk 22:21](#)), His giving the sop to Judas ([Joh 13:26](#)), may all be regarded as loving endeavours to strengthen him against temptation; and even when all these efforts had proved vain, what good was still in him was appealed to in the pathetic reproach, ‘Betrayest thou the Son of Man with a kiss?’ ([Luk 22:48](#)). Peter, too, was warned against the temptation that threatened him ([Luk 22:31-32](#)); and Jesus, who feared his fall through his self-confident weakness, hoped for his recovery, and the help he could be to others after his recovery, because He believed in the power of His own intercessory prayer.

Jesus Himself was both tried and tempted. He seems to confess His own liability to temptation when He refuses the epithet ‘good’ ([Luk 18:19](#)), although He never

confesses to have fallen before temptation; and the attitude He assumes to sinners implies His own sinlessness. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews ([Heb_4:15](#)) states His moral position in the words, 'in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin'; and St. Paul seems to indicate this liability to temptation without the actuality of sin in the phrase 'in the likeness of sinful flesh' ([Rom_8:3](#)). St. Luke's statement that the tempter 'departed from him for a season' ([Luk_4:13](#)), and Jesus' own reference to the temptations ([Luk_22:28](#)) which His disciples had endured with Him, show that the experience in the wilderness was not solitary. It is not improbable even that the narratives of the Temptation ([Mat_4:1-11](#), [Mar_1:12-13](#), [Luk_4:1-13](#)) are a summary of a succession of moral trials through which Jesus in the course of His ministry passed, or at least that this record of an early experience has been coloured by reminiscences of later experiences. Be this as it may, we can find in the Gospels indications of similar trials of His fidelity to God. The desire of the people for healing ([Joh_4:48](#)) and bread ([Joh_6:28](#)), the demand of His enemies for a sign ([Mat_16:1](#)), the attempt to make Him a king ([Joh_6:15](#)), may be regarded as illustrations of the three kinds of temptation recorded. A careful study of the record of the early ministry (in John 2-4) warrants the assumption that Jesus was tempted by His *enthusiasm* (which see) to force the issue between Him and His enemies prematurely, and that the reserve in language and restraint in action He displayed as soon as He had discovered this peril, are to be regarded as a conquest over temptation. His 'escapes,' as Bruce calls them (*With Open Face*, ch. vii.), were intended, in the later part of His Galilaean ministry at least, not only to secure quiet for the training of the Twelve, but to withdraw Him from the danger threatened by His enemies. Had He run risks before His hour, He would have fallen before what seems to be indicated by the Second Temptation ([Mat_4:5-6](#)). His own family were a source of moral peril to Him. His words to His mother in Cana ([Joh_2:4](#)) are explicable only if in her request He found a suggestion of evil, that He should use His miraculous power at the bidding of His natural affection instead of at God's command alone. The completeness of His repudiation of the claims of His mother and brethren upon Him in relation to His public ministry indicates how intensely He felt this peril ([Mat_12:48-49](#)). The attempt to influence Him was nevertheless renewed by His brethren, when they advised Him to go up to the feast and so manifest Himself to the world ([Joh_7:3-4](#)). Peter was rebuked as the Tempter ([Mat_16:23](#)) almost immediately after being commended as the Confessor, because he sought to turn Jesus from His sacrifice. May His refusal of the request of the Syrophœnician woman ([Mat_15:24-27](#)) not have been due to the fear lest a ministry of healing among the Gentiles might divert Him from the path of sacrifice to which He knew that His Father called Him? The request of the Greeks also ([Joh_12:21](#)) stirred so deep emotion, because it seemed to suggest the possibility of an escape from the Cross, which had to be rejected as a temptation. The same temptation in its most acute form presents itself in the Agony (which see) in Gethsemane.

Tests or trials which were not felt by Jesus as temptations, but which were intended by His enemies either to discredit Him with the multitude or to obtain some ground of accusation against Him, were the questions addressed to Him about the tribute to Caesar, the resurrection, and the greatest commandment (Mat_22:15-40), and divorce (Mat_19:3). The man with the withered hand in the synogogue (Luk_6:6-7) was a trap set for Him, to involve Him in the guilt of Sabbath-breaking; so also was the woman taken in adultery (Joh_8:6), that He might either by His severity estrange the people, or by His laxity be shown to be in opposition to the Mosaic law. The sufferings and sorrows Jesus passed through were Divinely appointed trials that He might learn obedience, and so be made perfect (Heb_5:8; Heb_2:10); but it is not necessary here to illustrate this discipline in detail (see Struggles of Soul). To the data from the Gospels here presented, a few observations may be added regarding the possibility, the necessity, and the nature of temptation in Jesus' life.

As God cannot be tempted, the liability of Jesus to temptation proves that there was a Divine *Kenosis* (which see) involved in the incarnation of the Son of God. Jesus could be tempted, because He was limited in knowledge, subject to emotion, and undergoing a moral development. Omniscience has an insight into the moral character of all conduct, and a foresight into the moral issues of all choice, which exclude even the possibility of temptation; omnipotence has such a command over all its moral resources that its moral efforts, can never involve any moral strain, such as is experienced in temptation; omniscience and omnipotence, therefore, cannot know the disturbance of feeling which is possible to limited knowledge and power. To ascribe these Divine attributes to the incarnate Son of God is to deny His liability to temptation, and to make His moral development a semblance and not a reality. Liability to temptation, necessary to moral development, does not, however, imply any necessity to sin. There may be growth unto perfection, with a constant choice of good. Temptation does not arise only in a sinful nature. Natural instincts and appetites, which are morally neutral, become sinful only when seen to be in conflict with the will of God as revealed in conscience. The opinions, sentiments, and desires of sinful men may become the occasions of temptation to a sinless nature. Temptation is not sin, involves no necessity of sin, although it brings the possibility of sin.

It was necessary for the fulfilment of Christ's vocation as the Saviour of men that He should be tempted without sin. His moral teaching gains force from His moral example, and He can be a moral example to us only because He passed through a human moral development. His own moral struggles enable Him to feel with us in ours (Heb_4:15). To condemn the sin of mankind (Rom_8:3) it was needful for Him not only to suffer for sin, but also to overcome sin by withstanding its assaults.

The nature of His temptation was determined by His unique vocation. The lower passions and appetites seem never to have assailed Him. He was tempted to abuse His miraculous power, His privileged position, His supreme authority as Son of God, to fulfil the popular expectations instead of His own ideal of the Messiahship, to shrink from the agony and desolation of the Cross. His temptations transcended the common experience as much as He Himself did; but, though possible to Him alone, they were as real for Him as are the lower temptations for other men. See, further, the following article.

Literature.—Butler, *Anal.* ch. v.; Dods, *The Prayer that Teaches to Pray*, 143 ff.; Liddon, *BL* [Note: *L Bampton Lecture.*] 3 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] 512; Ullmann, *Sinlessness of Jesus*, 123 ff., 264 ff.; W. C. E. Newbolt, *Gospel of Experience*, 98; J. D. Jones, *Elims of Life*, 92; D. Fairweather, *Bound in the Spirit*, 33; W. H. M. H. Aitken, *Temptation and Toil*, 1-205; G. A. Smith, *Forgiveness of Sins*, 51; J. Stalker, *The Four Men*, 29.

Alfred E. Garvie.

☒Temptation

TEMPTATION (in the Wilderness).—[On the general subject of temptation see preced. article]. The continuousness and variety of our Lord's temptations have probably been obscured by the circumstance that attention has been concentrated upon one episode in His life which is distinctively known as '*The Temptation.*' This very significant incident is fully related in Mt. ([Mat_4:1-11](#)) and Lk. ([Luk_4:1-13](#)), mentioned in Mk. ([Mar_1:12-13](#)), and omitted from the Fourth Gospel. St. Mark's account is of the briefest: 'And straightway the Spirit urges him forth into the desert. And he was in the desert forty days, tempted by Satan; and he was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered to him.'* [Note: The 'desert' is possibly that known as Quarantania, from the forty days, and since the 12th cent. traditionally accepted as the same, a few miles from Jericho; or it may have been, as Conder thinks, some miles farther south—the dreary desert which extends between the Dead Sea and the Hebron mountains. See his picturesque description, pp. 213 to 214 of his Handbook.] The mention of 'wild beasts,' which is peculiar to Mark, is usually supposed to be introduced for the purpose of accentuating the solitariness of Jesus, and His remoteness from all human aid. But Professor Bevan (*Trans. of Soc. of Hist. Theol.* 1901-2) finds in this mention the key to the whole incident. It seems that in the East, or at any rate in Persia, there is a traditional custom, called 'the subjugation of the *jinn.*' In order to achieve this victory the candidate retires to a desert place, fasts for forty days, and when the jinns appear in the forms of a lion, a tiger, and a dragon, he

must hold his ground fearlessly. Doing so, power over the demons is attained. 'The conclusion,' says Professor Bevan, 'which we may draw from these facts is that the story of the Temptation, in its original form, was a description of a practice by means of which it was believed that man could acquire the power of controlling the demons.' The analogy is interesting. Our Lord in this critical conflict with Satan did 'bind the strong man,' and secured that in all future encounters He would conquer. But is there any evidence at all that the Persian custom prevailed among the Jews? Is there any ground for supposing either that our Lord would follow such a custom, or, on the other hand, that there is no foundation for the story of the Temptation in the facts of His career? And is not the simple expression, ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων, inadequate to suggest such a conflict as is supposed?* [Note: Besides, as O. Holtzmann (Life of Jesus, 143) says: 'In old Israelitish times lions still inhabited the thickets beside the Jordan (Jer 49:19); in the age of Jesus the chief beast of prey in Palestine was, as it still is, the jackal. But Mark's sole object in making this addition would appear to have been the desire to bring into greater relief Jesus' complete severance from human society, with the idea of imparting more body to his description.' Dr. Abbott's Clue, p. 115, is suggestive in this connexion.]

Order of Temptations.—In Mt. and Lk. the order of the second and third temptations is inverted, while the substance of them remains identical. The order followed by Mt. is generally accepted as correct. There seems to be an ascending scale in the temptations as recorded in the First Gospel, though Plummer (Luk 4:5) says: 'The reasons given for preferring one order to the other are subjective and unconvincing. Perhaps neither Evangelist professes to give any chronological order.'

Source of the story.—As, according to all the accounts, Jesus was not accompanied by anyone during His temptation, the question naturally arises, How did the knowledge of what took place become public property? To this there can be but one answer: Our Lord informed His disciples of what had taken place. That He should have done so is probable. At first, perhaps, they might not be prepared to understand the incident; but after they had acknowledged Him as Messiah many questions as to His procedure must have arisen in their minds, and to these questions an account of His initial temptations was the best answer.

Character of the incident.—The more clearly the reality of the Temptation is grasped, the less need does there seem for supposing that the tempter took a visible shape, or that any bodily transport to 'the high mountain' or 'the wing of the temple' took place. It is more difficult to determine whether such bodily transport was thought of by the Evangelists or is implied in their words. In Lk. the 'high mountain' is omitted except in so far as reference may be found to it in the word ἀναγαγών. In the *Gospel of the Hebrews* there occurs a characteristic apocryphal embellishment: 'Forthwith

my Mother the Holy Spirit took me by one of the hairs of my head and carried me away to the high mountain of Tabor.’

Its connexion.—In all the Synoptic Gospels and in the development of our Lord’s life, the Temptation follows upon the Baptism. In His Baptism He had been proclaimed Messiah, called out of private into public life, summoned to take among men a place which could be filled by Himself alone. He was called from the carpenter’s shop to redeem a world. The village youth was to represent in His person the wisdom, the holiness, the love, the authority of the Highest. How could He face this task? By what hitherto untried methods accomplish it? He had no counsellor, example, or guide. None had as yet attempted or even adequately conceived the part He was to play.

Its necessity.—The burden and glory, the hazard and intricacy and responsibility of His vocation must have stirred in His soul a ferment of emotions. O. Holtzmann may overstate the risk when he says (*Life of Jesus*, English translation 141): ‘There was a grave danger of His personal life being disturbed by so august a revelation, of its causing Him to plunge headlong into fantastic dreams of the future, and into acts of violence, with the object of realizing His dreams.’ Our Lord was not unprepared for the great vocation; He must often have considered how He could best bring light and life to His fellow-countrymen, but now that He was actually launched on the work, all past thoughts must have seemed insufficient, and He felt that still His decisions were to be made. Solitude was necessary. The Spirit that came upon Him in Baptism compelled Him to contemplate action, and in order that He might finally choose His path and His methods He must turn away from the expectant gaze and eager inquiries of John’s disciples and seek the solitude of the desert.

Its conditions.—The intensity of our Lord’s emotion and the difficulty of decision are conveyed by the Evangelists’ statement that for forty days (*i.e.* for an unusually long period, ‘forty’ being used as a round number indicative of magnitude)* [Note: ‘It is only by travelling that one becomes aware how universal is the application of the number 40 to the features of Oriental architecture. If there is a famous building with something over a score of columns, or a town with a like number of minarets, it will be styled the hall of 40 columns or the city of 40 towers’ (Arthur Arnold in *Academy*, 12 March 1881). ‘“Forty” means “many” ’ (Angus, *Bible Handbook*).] He forgot to eat. This gives us the measure of His absorption in thought. The temptations indeed are spoken of as if they occurred at the close of the forty days’ fast; naturally, because then only out of the turmoil of thought did these three possible lines of conduct become disengaged and present themselves as now finally rejected. To one who adequately conceives the stupendous task awaiting our Lord and the various methods of accomplishing it which He had often heard discussed, no statement of His absorption in thought or of the strife of contending pleas will seem exaggerated.

Lines on which the Temptation proceeded.—The key to the Temptation is found in the necessity laid upon Jesus of definitely determining the principles and methods of the great work that awaited Him. There were necessarily present to His mind as possible courses the various expectations current among the people. Eventually these presented themselves in three great questions: Am I as Messiah lifted above human needs and trials? What means may I legitimately use to convince the people of my claims? What kind of Messianic kingdom and Messianic King am I to represent? To each of these questions there was an answer present to the mind of the Lord, cherished by most of the people He was now to influence, and with much which superficially commended it, but which He recognized as Satanic.

The absence of the article before *υἱός* has given rise to the idea that the temptations were not Messianic. Against this it has been pointed out that the predicate is regularly anarthrous. But Middleton (*Gr. Article*, p. 62) shows that 'we sometimes find that the predicate of the *εἰμι* has the Article, where the subject is a personal pronoun or demonstrative, *ἐγώ, σύ, οὗτος*,' etc. This rule is borne out by NT usage: see [Mat 16:16](#); [Mat 26:63](#); [Mat 27:11](#), [Mar 3:11](#) etc. For this and other reasons we should expect the Article here, if the meaning were, 'If thou art the Son of God, or, the Christ.' The meaning rather is, 'If thou art God's Son' [the emphatic place being given to *υἱός, εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τ. θεοῦ*], if this relationship to God be the determining element in your life. But this by no means excludes reference to His Messianic dignity, it rather implies it. It was as God's Son He had been hailed at His baptism proclaiming His Messianic vocation, and fitly, because Divine Sonship was that out of which the Messiahship sprang, and which underlay the whole vocation of Jesus as the Christ.

First temptation.—The first temptation was to use for His own comfort and preservation the powers committed to Him as Messiah. The circumstances in which He found Himself lent immense force to the appeal. He found Himself faint and ready to perish. What a fiasco would His Messianic calling seem if He died here in the wilderness, and how easy apparently the means of relief: 'Say the word.' 'How oft the sight of means to do ill deeds makes ill deeds done!' Once only in His life can He have suffered more acutely from this same temptation: only when He knew He could command twelve legions of angels to His aid, only when He was taunted, 'He saved others, himself he cannot save.' The use He might legitimately make of His powers as God's Son must once for all be settled: and He settles it by recognizing that having taken human nature He must accept human conditions, and elevate human life not by facing life's temptations on wholly different terms from the normal, but by accepting the whole human conflict: 'Man lives—and I, being man, therefore live—not by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.' He accepted absolutely the human condition with its entire dependence on God. Duty was more

than food. His life was to be ruled by intimations of God's will, not by fear of death by starvation. He, like all other men, was in God's hand.

Second temptation.—The second temptation was to establish the Messianic claim by the performance of some astounding feat, such as leaping from the roof of the wing of the temple into the crowded courts below. Once for all our Lord had to settle by what methods His claim could be made good. That which the people so frequently demanded, 'a sign,' must have suggested itself as a possible means of convincing them. And it was an easy means, for was it not written in the book He had pondered as His best guide: 'He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest haply thou dash thy foot against a stone' (Psa 91:11 f.)? Were these words not prepared for this Messianic manifestation? Could the people, ever craving for signs, be in any other way led to accept Him as God's messenger? Might not His whole mission fail, might He not miss the accomplishment of God's purpose, if He did not condescend to the weakness of His countrymen and grant them a sign? But now, as always, He saw the incongruity and insufficiency of such signs: 'an evil and adulterous generation seeketh a sign, and *no* sign shall be given to it' (Mat 12:39 | |). But that which settles the matter in His own mind is the consideration that to attempt the performance of any such feat would be a tempting of God. He rebuts the temptation with the words, 'Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.' He perceived that He had no right to expect the protection of God in any course but the highest, in any course which His own conscience told Him was a short cut to His end. To abandon the region of man's actual needs and work wonders not for their relief and as the revelation of God's love, but for mere display, was, He felt, to trespass the Father's intentions. He could not count upon the Father's countenance and help if He departed in the slightest degree from His own highest ideal. Spiritual ends must be attained by spiritual means, however slow and uncertain these seem.

Third temptation.—The third question which had now once for all to be settled was, What kind of kingdom must the Messiah establish? Shall it be a kingdom of this world, such as many expected and would promptly aid Him to secure? The glory of the kingdoms of the earth had a present lustre all its own. There was in their power and opportunity an appeal to beneficent ambition not easily resisted. What might not be accomplished for the down-trodden, the heavily-taxed, the outcast, the despairing? He had Himself groaned with the rest of His countrymen under the unrighteous exactions of fraudulent publicans; why not win for His people the blessings of freedom? More than once this temptation returned in the attempts of the multitude to make Him a king. But our Lord recognized that for Him to depart from the idea of founding a spiritual kingdom in which God should be acknowledged would be to serve Satan. The craving for earthly dominion was inextricably mixed up with worldly ambitions, and could only be gratified by the use of means alien to the Divine Spirit. He felt such a kingdom to be incompatible with the sole and exclusive service of

God—not that all earthly kingdoms are necessarily Satanic, but His calling was to introduce the true reign of God among men. He saw that in order to win earthly dominion He would require to appeal to evil passions and use such means as the sword—in a word, to avail Himself of the aid of evil. This was impossible.

Literature.—The various Commentaries on the Gospels, and the Lives of Christ; Liddon, *Bamp. Lect.* 8 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 512 f.; *Expos. Times*, iii. [1891] 118 ff., xiv. [1903] 389 ff.; *Expositor*, i. iii. [1876] 321 ff.; Trench, *Studies in the Gospels*, 1; W. H. Brookfield, *Serm.* 252, 262, 275; T. Christlieb, *Memoir with Serm.* 219, 238, 255; A. B. Davidson, *Waiting upon God*, 107; H. Wace, *Some Central Points of our Lord's Ministry*, 59-132; Th. Zahn, *Bread and Salt from the Word of God* (1905), 1.

Marcus Dods.

☩ Tent

TENT (σκηνή).—The light shelter of the nomad, here to-day and away to-morrow, is an apt symbol of what is fleeting and transitory. This lends the suggestion of irony to our Lord's phrase (Luk_16:9) 'eternal tents.' The notion of transiency is uppermost also in 2Co_5:1; 2Co_5:4 (σκήνος).

The ordinary Eastern tent is made of black goats' hair cloth, spun and woven by the women with very primitive implements. The women pitch the tents, and on removing they strike and pack them for the journey. The roof is supported by three rows of three upright posts, from 6 feet to 8 feet in height, the middle row being highest. It is stretched by cords fastened to the edges, and attached to pegs driven firmly into the ground. The 'walls' are hung like curtains round the eaves, and a breadth of cloth across the tent cuts off the women's compartment from that open to the public. It is an effective shelter from the sun. When wet, the cloth shrinks and becomes quite waterproof. σκηνή may also mean a hut, booth, or other temporary structure, like those made by the Arabs of *el-Huleh* from the reeds that abound in the marshes close by the base of Hermon. Peter was doubtless familiar with these rude peasant structures, the leafy shelters erected on the roofs for cool retreat in summer, and the booths for the Feast of Tabernacles (Mat_17:4 etc.).

W. Ewing.

⚠ Terah

TERAH.—Father of Abraham; named as a link in our Lord's genealogy (Luk 3:34).

⚠ Testament

TESTAMENT.—1. The Gr. word *διαθήκη*, translation 'covenant' Luk 1:72 Authorized Version, 'testament' Mat 26:28 || Mar 14:24, Luk 22:20 Authorized Version and (Revised Version margin), is in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, *ll. cc.*, uniformly 'covenant.' The last of these passages is bracketed by WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] as a 'very early interpolation.' The word does not occur elsewhere in the Gospels. The rendering 'covenant' (wh. see) is unquestionably right: 'testament' has come from the Lat. Versions.

2. In classical literature *διαθήκη* denoted a will, and apparently nothing else (Ar. Av. 440, if an exception, is unique). A Greek will, however, was a settlement or trust-deed rather than a will in the Roman (*i. e.* the modern) sense. In it the conditions of inheritance were, indeed, in the first place at the sole discretion of the testator, but it was publicly and solemnly executed, and thereupon at once became absolute, irrevocable, and unalterable.

3. The LXX Septuagint translators adopted the word as the equivalent of the Heb. *בְּרִית*. The following considerations are supposed to have influenced their choice:—(a) *διαθήκη* represented essentially a 'one-sided covenant,' *συνθήκη* (the ordinary word) a mutual one; (b) *διαθήκη* was charged with religious ideas, inasmuch as the Greek will conveyed the religious institutions as well as the property of the family (cf. the similar case of the Hebrew 'birthright'). It may possibly also have been used, in the popular spoken dialect, in a wider sense than that of a will (cf. *διατίθεσθαι*).

4. (a) The special reference in Luk 1:72 [= Psa 105:8 f.?] is to the covenant with Abraham (Genesis 15, 17). (b) The words of Mat 26:28, Mar 14:24 [Luk 22:20] are plainly drawn from Exo 24:8. The addition of 'new' (Authorized Version, (Revised Version margin)) in Mt. and Mk., *ll. cc.*, has small MS authority, and is rejected in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 text: it is due to 1Co 11:25. Yet the idea of a 'new covenant' had been the theme of OT prophets (cf. Jer 31:31 ff. etc.), and its application to the Christian covenant was in current use among the Apostles: the 'old' covenant in the implied contrast was the Mosaic not the Abrahamic (2Co 3:6,

Heb_9:15 etc.), and the allusion to Exo_24:8 seems tacitly to suggest the same contrast here.

Literature.—Ramsay, *Hist. Com. on Galatians*, p. 349 ff.; Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 298 ff.; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, artt. 'Covenant,' 'Testament.'

F. S. Ranken.

⚑ Tetrarch

TETRARCH (τετραρχης is the classical form, but in NT the MS evidence is strongly in favour of τετραρχης [Tisch., WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.], and Nestle]).—The title is used in the Gospels of Antipas (Mat_14:1, Luk_3:1; Luk_3:19; Luk_9:7), and of Philip and Lysanias (Luk_3:1). Originally it denoted the ruler of a fourth part of a country or province. Euripides (*Alc.* 1154) is the earliest writer to use the term τετραρχια, and applies it to Thessaly, which in primitive times was divided for civil administration into four districts. This arrangement was restored in the constitution given by Philip of Macedon (*Demos. Philipp.* iii. 26, where the word is clearly technical and free from the doubt in which Euripides leaves it). A similar system was met with in Galatia, where each of the three tribes had its four tetrarchs (Strabo, 430, 566 f.). Pompey afterwards reduced the number to three, one for each tribe, but retained the original title (Appian, *Mithridat.* 46). Thenceforward, if not at an even earlier date, the name lost its etymological meaning, and could be applied to any petty dependent prince, subordinate in rank to kings but enjoying some of the prerogatives of sovereignty (Cic. *pro Milone*, xxviii. 76; Hor. *Sat.* i. iii. 12; Tac. *Ann.* xv. 25; *et al.*). Such tetrarchs seem to have been numerous, especially in Syria. Antony conferred the title upon both Herod and his brother Phasael (Josephus *Ant.* xiv. xiii. 1, *BJ* i. xii. 5); but the rank was almost purely titular, and left them inferior in dignity to the high priest, Hyrcanus ii. In b.c. 30 another brother, Pheroras, was made tetrarch of Peraea (Josephus *Ant.* xv. x. 3), he nominal honour being maintained on an income granted by Herod himself. In the Gospels the etymological signification of the term has evaporated. For, though Herod divided his kingdom into four parts, the one assigned to Salome consisted merely of a palace with the revenue of certain so-called free towns, and was in no sense a tetrarchy. With this exception, his kingdom was divided into three parts, and the title of 'tetrarch' was conferred by the will of Rome upon Antipas and Philip, whilst that of 'ethnarch,' or recognized head of a nation, was similarly bestowed upon Archelaus. On two occasions Antipas is styled 'king' (Mat_14:9; cf. Mat_14:1, Mar_6:14; Mar_6:22; Mar_6:26 f.); and the obvious explanation is that his subjects were encouraged, and some of them perhaps

disposed, to speak of him by the higher title, for which Rome had substituted a lower, without any allusion to its strict meaning. Similarly in the case of Lysanias. He was ruler of the district of Abila in the Lebanon, which had been severed from the kingdom of Ituraea on the execution of Lysanias i. in b.c. 36. That kingdom was in the course of time broken up into three parts, of which Abilene formed one, with another Lysanias as its tetrarch (Josephus *Ant.* xviii. vi. 10, xix. v. 1; *CIG [Note: IG Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum.]* 4521, 4523). The term may have been selected because of the smallness of the district in comparison with the earlier kingdom, but it preserves no record of the division of a country or association of tribes into four parts. In the Gospels the tetrarch is merely a petty prince, dependent upon Rome for the retention of his few emblems of sovereignty, whilst encouraged to self-repression and loyal service by an occasional promotion to a higher dignity.

R. W. Moss.

Text Of The Gospels

TEXT OF THE GOSPELS

1. The problem.—All true criticism must begin by taking cognizance of, and as far as possible accounting for, existing facts. The leading facts in regard to the text of the Gospels may be briefly stated as follows:

(i.) A Greek text substantially the same as the text underlying the Authorized Version has been almost universally accepted by Christendom as the authentic Greek text from about the year a.d. 350 till the development in modern times of the critical study of the text of the NT. This text is found in the great mass of existing Greek Manuscripts, and was used by almost all ecclesiastical writers from Chrysostom onwards. Translated into Syriac, under the name of the *Peshitta* version, it was used by most of the Syriac-speaking Churches from at least the 4th cent. onwards. It was the only Greek text printed on the revival of learning in the West, and received the name of *Textus Receptus* (Textus Receptus) from an expression used in the preface to the second Elzevir edition, 1633: 'textum ergo habes nunc ab omnibus receptum, in quo nihil immutatum aut corruptum damus.'

(ii.) Against this general unanimity in regard to the Greek text must be set the fact that the Churches of the West read the Gospels in the Latin translation of Jerome (a.d. 384), according to a text substantially different from the Textus Receptus. Moreover, existing Manuscripts and Patristic quotations of the earlier Latin versions differed from the Textus Receptus even more fundamentally, and similar types of

text are found to have been very widely spread, speaking in a geographical sense, and occur in some important Manuscripts , in many ancient Versions, and in the quotations of many Christian writers, especially in the earliest times. This text (or, more correctly speaking, texts of this type) has been named ‘Western’; and, although it has long been well known that the term is not exclusively applicable in a geographical sense (indeed, it is quite possible that at least some members of this family may have had their rise in the East), yet for the sake of convenience it must for the present be employed.

(iii.) But a few of our earliest Greek Manuscripts , supported by the quotations of the most scholarly Fathers of the earlier centuries, and by a few Versions, present a different text, which has commended itself on its intrinsic merits, as well as on account of its proved antiquity, to most modern critical scholars: it forms the base of practically all the modern critical editions, and of our English Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 .

2. The Received Text.—A text substantially the same as the Textus Receptus has been called by Dean Burgon and his school the ‘Traditional Text’; by Dr. Hort (in the Introduction* [Note: This Introduction was written by Dr. Hort, and will in this article be cited under his name, though the two editors accept joint responsibility for it.] to Westcott and Hort’s *The New Testament in the Original Greek*) the ‘Syrian’ Text. Hort also suggests the name ‘Antiochian,’ which is preferable, because it avoids any chance of confusion with the totally distinct Syriac versions. For reasons that will be explained later on in this article, Hort considers that the Antiochian text affords practically no evidence for the reconstruction of the original Greek of the NT, and he may therefore be considered as the most extreme opponent of the Textus Receptus . In his opinion (*Introduction*, § 185) the Antiochian text ‘must be the result of a recension in the proper sense of the word, a work of attempted criticism, performed deliberately by editors and not merely by scribes.’ He further distinguishes two stages in the revision, and thinks (§ 190) that the final process was completed by 350 or thereabouts, and that the first process took place at some date between 250 and 350. According to Burgon and his close follower Miller, these recensions are purely imaginary creations; they believe the Church of Antioch (in company, no doubt, with practically all the Greek-speaking Churches) to have preserved the pure text from the first. It is at any rate certain that Chrysostom used this text: he was born at Antioch about the middle of the 4th cent., and lived in that city till 398, when he became bishop of Constantinople. We have seen above that even the main opponents of this text allow that it took its final shape probably about the time of Chrysostom’s birth. From that time onwards it held practically undisputed sway, and the main mass of later Manuscripts contain it. When at length, some time after the introduction of printing, the first New Testaments in Greek were published, they naturally rested on the Manuscripts in ordinary ecclesiastical use, and thus the Antiochian text became

the 'Received' Greek text of modern Christendom, from which our own Authorized Version was made.

As has been shown above, the history of the printed text in the 16th cent. is part of the history of the Antiochian text; although of no critical importance, it is a subject very full of interest. [A good short account of the early printed editions will be found in *Scrivener's Plain Introduction* (ed. Miller, 1894), vol. ii. ch. 7. Cf. also Tregelles, *Account of the Printed Text of the Greek NT*, 1854]. The NT was first printed in Greek as vol. v. of the Complutensian Polyglott Bible. This magnificent work was prepared at the cost of Francis Ximenes de Cisneros, Cardinal-Archbishop of Toledo, and was printed at Alcalá (*Complutum*), where he had founded a university. The OT was given in Hebrew, Latin, and Greek; the Apocrypha and NT in Greek and Latin. The volume containing the NT (which was the first to be printed) was completed on 10th Jan. 1514; but owing to the death of the truly great Cardinal, the publication of the whole work was delayed, the Pope's license not being granted till 22nd March 1520. Meanwhile, in order to forestall the Spanish edition, John Froben, the celebrated publisher at Basle, employed Erasmus to prepare an edition of the NT in Greek, accompanied by a revised Latin version: this was hurried through the press, and published in 1516. Erasmus published other editions in 1519, 1522, 1527, and 1535. Other important editions are those of Robert Stephen (especially the folio of 1550, which is regarded by many as the standard text), Theodore de Bèze (Beza), and the brothers Elzevir. All printed editions, even those prepared by the great founders of textual criticism, were based upon the *Textus Receptus* until 1831, when Lachmann published a text constructed directly from the ancient documents.

Whatever may be the ultimate verdict of textual criticism, the *Textus Receptus* must always remain a monument worthy of deep veneration and of close study. It is an essential factor in the history of the development of Christianity. Through it the Spirit of God has, during the greater part of the existence of the Church of Christ, spoken to the greater number of her members. It has controlled the doctrine and the life of Christians, and by its means we have been freed, in part at least, from the heavy yoke of mediaeval sacerdotalism and superstition. Those who translated it into modern languages have left us in their work something of their own life and spirit. If extent of influence for good is to be our criterion, then surely, whatever its origin, the *Textus Receptus* and the translations made from it bear the impress of the seal of God's Spirit, and have an unsurpassed and almost unsurpassable claim to the veneration and gratitude of mankind.

This much every thinking Christian will surely grant. But it is a different thing to go on to say: 'therefore this text must be the original authentic text.' It would be as logical to argue that because the gospel was given to the world in the Greek language, therefore Jesus must have spoken in the same language. It is quite in accordance with

our experience of God's methods of working that He should employ an instrument fashioned and conditioned not only by the circumstances under which it took its rise, but also by those through which it has passed in the course of its history.

It is an unfortunate thing that Burgon and Miller's writings seem to imply (we believe, indeed, that the Dean stated it in so many words) that of necessity God must have provided for the accurate preservation of the text of the book which He had given to man. It appears to have been inconceivable to Burgon that the true text should be any other than that commonly accepted by the Church: to him the Church was the guardian of Holy Writ in the same sense as some people believe her to be the guardian of doctrine. If this view, even though not expressly stated, is felt to underlie the student's conclusions, then those conclusions are removed from the domain of matters with which the critic can deal. They may, as in the case of views as to the authority of the Church in matters of faith, or of theories as to the inspiration of the Bible, conceivably rest on a true spiritual perception, but they do not rest on evidence, with which alone the critic is competent to deal. We have pointed out above that a large, and the most enlightened, portion of the Christian Church read the Scriptures in the Vulgate, or Latin translation of Jerome, and regarded it as the only authoritative exponent of the true text and sense of the original. There never has been a unanimous tradition as to the text of Scripture: only for the three centuries that followed the first printing of the Greek NT has there been even an appearance of such unanimity. But though the writings of Burgon and Miller force one to the conclusion that for them personally their theory rested on *a priori* grounds, yet they have with great labour, assiduity, and learning collected a vast amount of evidence in support of the 'Traditional Text.' Unfortunately, Burgon wrote in such a contemptuous manner of the leading textual critics and of the most ancient Manuscripts of the NT that most of his work has the appearance of an *ex parte* statement rather than of a solid contribution to the investigation of a difficult problem. Miller, who edited and completed many of Burgon's papers after his death, adopted a more temperate tone; but so much of Burgon's language is incorporated, that the subject is still treated rather after the fashion of a polemical controversy than of a critical investigation. Moreover, Burgon's contention was that the 'Traditional Text' is the only one that has any claim to be regarded as the true text; all documents that differ from it are treated as of practically no value. Hort, on the other hand, considered the 'Traditional' or 'Antiochian' text to be valueless as evidence. Thus the subject has been treated at its extreme points, and neither side has taken sufficient trouble to discover how much truth is contained in the views of the other side. We lay a good deal of stress on this matter, because we think there has been a strong disposition to regard the 'Traditional Text' as a hobby of Burgon's, and to treat his defence of it with the same contempt that he poured so freely on others.

3. Hort's 'Syrian' or 'Antiochian' Text.—In part iii. of Hort's *Introduction*, chapter ii. bears the heading, 'Results of Genealogical Evidence proper.' Section i. (§§ 130-168) is devoted to proving the posteriority of Antiochian to other known types of readings. We hope to show later on that the evidence here adduced is not entitled to be called 'genealogical' in a strict sense, but with this we are not for the moment concerned. Hort begins (§ 130) by stating the incontrovertible fact that all great variations of text were prior to the 5th cent., since the text of Chrysostom and other Syrian Fathers of the 4th cent, is substantially identical with the common late text; and (§ 131) the text of every other considerable group of documents is shown by analogous evidence of Fathers and Versions to be of equal or greater antiquity. If we were living in the age of Chrysostom, the problem to be solved would in all essential points be the same as it is now. Hort then adduces three lines of evidence to prove the posteriority of Antiochian readings: (i.) by analysis of conflate readings (§§ 132-151), (ii.) by Ante-Nicene Patristic evidence (§§ 152-162), (iii.) by internal evidence of Syrian (*i.e.* Antiochian) readings (§§ 163-168). We must deal with each of these divisions separately.

(i.) When one reading is found in one group of documents, another in a second group, and the two different readings are found combined in a third group, this reading is said to be 'conflate.' Of course it has to be assumed that the first two readings are prior to the conflate reading, or else it is not a conflate reading at all. Thus the argument goes in a circle, unless *either* it can be proved that the two separate readings existed at a time when it can be shown that the conflate reading did not, *or* the conflate reading is so obviously wrong that it cannot conceivably be the original reading. If neither of these conditions is fulfilled, then conclusions based on the so-called conflate readings are matters of judgment, not of evidence. Hort adduces and examines eight cases of readings which he believes to be conflate: in each case, according to his view, the Antiochian text has combined two separate readings found in earlier texts. Obviously eight examples, taken four from Mark and four from Luke, afford but a slender foundation on which to build: it may be, and has been, urged that these eight examples are only specimens taken from a large number available, but until further examples are collected and published the case must be judged by the eight given.

For the sake of illustration, we give here the main readings in the instance selected for special discussion by Hort. In Mar_6:33 (following *and the people saw them going, and many knew them, and they ran there together on foot from all the cities*) we find the following readings:

καὶ προῆλθον αὐτούς (*and outwent them*), \aleph B lect 49 Lat. vg Boh Arm and (with προσῆλθον for προῆλθον) L Δ 13 lect 39; Syr. [Note: Syriac.] vg has καὶ προῆλθον αὐτὸν ἐχ εἶ.

καὶ συνῆλθον αὐτοῦ (*and came together there*), D [Note: Deuteronomist.] \mathfrak{G} r 28, 604 b (2P^e d ff r have καὶ ἦλθον αὐτοῦ, a simply *et venerunt*, Syr. [Note: Syriac.] *sin and when they came*: these documents might be taken to support either of the shorter readings).

καὶ προῆλθον αὐτούς καὶ συνῆλθον πρὸς αὐτόν (*and outwent them, and came together unto him*), all known uncials, except the five named above, all cursives except eight, f q Syr. [Note: Syriac.] hcl aeth.

In this case it will be noticed that there is no evidence to show that καὶ συνῆλθον πρὸς αὐτόν alone was ever read; moreover, the evidence for καὶ συνῆλθον αὐτοῦ is very slender, and quite possibly later than the supposed conflation. Mill suggested with much probability that D [Note: Deuteronomist.] omitted the words *and outwent them* because they contradicted Mat 14:13 and Luk 9:11 ‘the crowds *followed* him.’ Swete, *ad loc.*, quotes 33 as reading συνέδραμον πρὸς αὐτούς καὶ συνῆλθον πρὸς αὐτόν: this appears to have been another way of getting rid of the words objected to.

The reading of the mass of Manuscripts gives such good sense that Hort himself says (§ 136), ‘There is nothing in the sense that would tempt to alteration: all runs easily and smoothly, and there is neither contradiction nor manifest tautology’; and again (§ 138), ‘Had it been the only extant reading, it would have roused no suspicion.’ He does, indeed, argue that the fresh point made by *and came together unto him* ‘simply spoils the point of ἐξελθῶν in Luk 5:34; the multitude “followed” (Mt., Luke) the Lord to the desert region (ἐκεῖ), but the actual arrival at His presence was due to His act, not theirs, for He “came out” of His retirement in some sequestered nook to meet them.’ But Swete, *ad loc.*, far more naturally takes the ἐξελθῶν to mean ‘having landed,’ and thus the only objection that Hort could find to the language of the fuller reading falls to the ground: the crowd were the first to reach the spot whither Jesus and His disciples were going, they ran together on the beach to meet Him; and as He landed He saw them, and realized that He could not secure the quiet He sought. It is therefore quite possible that the reading of \aleph BL [Note: L Bampton Lecture.] Δ is due to the accidental omission of a clause.

In none of the eight cases can it be proved that the two parts of the longer reading both existed separately at a time when the combined reading did not exist, and it is a matter of opinion whether the readings in which the two separate ones are combined are likely to be right or not.

Dr. Salmon (*Some Thoughts on the Textual Criticism of the NT*, p. 68) says that 'Canon Cook elaborately discussed Hort's eight cases, contending that in every one of them the conflation hypothesis gives the less probable account of the facts.' He adds: 'In each of these cases I did not myself follow Hort altogether without misgivings.' Miller also discusses the supposed confluations in Appendix ii. of his 'Causes of Corruption,' and makes out a fairly good case for the originality of the supposed conflate readings.

(ii.) Hort's next argument to prove the posteriority of Antiochian readings is founded on Ante-Nicene Patristic evidence.

It will be convenient to follow Hort's example in giving at this point some general considerations in regard to the character and the use of Patristic evidence. We will speak first of the disadvantages and difficulties experienced in using it. To begin with, the material is necessarily very fragmentary in more senses than one. Each writer quotes but a limited number of passages, so that it is only in the case of a few specially prominent passages that we can get together a really representative collection of Patristic quotations. It follows that any kind of Patristic apparatus is more or less deceptive. It may be, for instance, that Origen has a reading which agrees with Manuscripts most approved by critical writers, but that the passage in which it occurs is not quoted by Clement of Alexandria. Here we are placed in a difficulty, because Clement and Origen did not by any means always agree, and, if a quotation had been preserved in which Clement used a different reading, it would be probable that Origen's reading did not belong to the text traditionally current at Alexandria, but that he had obtained it from some other source; his evidence, therefore, would be simply of a personal character. It is necessary, therefore, in weighing Patristic evidence to deal with the author's quotations as a whole, in order to form a judgment of the character of the text he used. When Clement's and Origen's quotations are thus dealt with, it is found that Origen in part agrees with the text most favoured by critical editors, but that his predecessor Clement used a substantially different text of a 'Western' type; Origen too, in part, followed 'Western' texts: the conclusions to which these phenomena lead will be discussed later on. The important point to note at this stage is that the whole mass of a writer's quotations must be treated as one whole, and that, while we can discover the type of text he used, our knowledge of it is only fragmentary, and necessarily confined as far as details are concerned to the passages explicitly quoted.

A moment's reflexion on the way in which the Bible is quoted in extempore sermons or in conversation will be sufficient to show that a writer's quotations may not always reproduce the text that he considered the best, supposing him to have formed a critical judgment on the subject. Natural looseness of quotation from memory, familiarity with more than one text, and confusion between parallel passages in the Gospels, will account for many deviations that cannot be considered genuine variant readings. A knowledge of the proneness of the human brain to repeat a mistake once made, will render us cautious even when a writer quotes a passage more than once in the same unusual form. Even with great care and wide experience it is difficult for a student to feel sure that a quotation gives the reading which the writer, in answer to a direct question, would have deliberately stated to be the right one.

Moreover, we often feel great doubt whether the quotation stands in our printed editions in its original form. The works of many Greek Fathers have been notoriously badly edited, and it is only when we have had personal experience of the editor's methods that we can feel any security that full advantage has been taken of the Manuscripts and other evidence available. Dr. Nestle (in his *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek NT*, English translation 1901, p. 145) refers to an extreme instance of supineness and ignorance on the part of even a fairly recent editor: he gave in his MS the first and last words of quotations, and left the printer to fill them up from a printed copy of the NT.

And when we go behind the editions, we often find that only comparatively late Manuscripts are now extant, and we have to allow for the natural tendency of scribes to substitute, both consciously and unconsciously, familiar for unfamiliar readings. Sometimes the comments that follow the quotation enable the student to detect the substitution, but such alterations must have been made by scribes in numberless passages in which there are no means of discovering them.

The case of Fathers writing in a language other than Greek presents further difficulties, because it is often impossible to say how far the form of the quotation is due to a knowledge of the original Greek, and how far to familiarity with the version in their own language. Analogous difficulties arise in the case of works which are preserved only in translations, because the translator was likely to introduce readings familiar to him in the vernacular.

We have enlarged somewhat on this matter in order to show how much care is needed in forming a judgment on the Patristic evidence in regard to individual readings. But, on the other hand, we desire to emphasize as strongly as possible the immense importance of Patristic evidence when employed with due precautions for its proper purpose, namely, the dating and localizing of special types of text.

But, again, we must remember that the remains of Ante-Nicene Christian literature that have come down to us are very fragmentary. 'The only period for which we have anything like a sufficiency of representative knowledge consists roughly of three-quarters of a century, from about 175 to 250' (Hort, § 158). Besides Clement and Origen, Hort names Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Novatian, belonging to the period named; Methodius towards the close of the 3rd cent.; and Eusebius of Caesarea in the first third of the 4th century. 'The text used,' writes Hort (§ 159), 'by all those Ante-Nicene Greek writers, not being connected with Alexandria, who have left considerable remains, is substantially Western.'

We are now in a position to consider the value of the argument for the posteriority of Antiochian readings which Hort bases on Ante-Nicene Patristic evidence: it is an *e silentio* argument—that no extant writer before Chrysostom used the Antiochian text. The force of this argument is considerably lessened if we reflect that, had the writings of Origen perished, we should have had practically no Ante-Nicene Patristic evidence for the type of text contained in the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 .

Miller (*The Traditional Text*, p. 94 ff.) has attempted to prove the antiquity of the Traditional or Antiochian text by a wide appeal to Patristic evidence. In a sense he fails, because if a reading is shown to be older than the supposed revision which produced the Antiochian text, it is said by the school of Hort to be not distinctively Antiochian, but a 'Western' reading adopted by the revisers. To one who does not adopt an extreme view on either side, this will probably appear very like a fight over empty names. The Antiochian text confessedly contained an ancient element, and the real question is whether critical editors have paid sufficient attention to the evidence afforded by it. Call the text by what name you will, but let it be judged on the intrinsic value of its readings, not in accordance with uncertain theories. Its very existence forms evidence in favour of certain types of the Western text, which must go back to the 2nd cent., as is shown by Miller; and the real question at issue is, What weight is to be attached to the evidence of these texts?

(iii.) The judgment of such a scholar as Dr. Hort on the intrinsic value of the Antiochian readings must carry the greatest weight. It will be most satisfactory to quote his own words. 'Another step is gained by a close examination of all readings distinctively Syrian (Antiochian) in the sense explained above, comparing them on grounds of Internal Evidence, Transcriptional and Intrinsic, with the other readings of the same passages. The result is entirely unfavourable to the hypothesis which was mentioned as not excluded by the phenomena of the conflate readings, namely that in other cases, where the Syrian text differs from all other extant ancient texts, its authors may have copied some other equally ancient and perhaps purer text now otherwise lost' (§ 163). This decision may be regarded either as an expression of subjective judgment, in which case its value will vary according to the estimate

formed of its author's ability as a critic; or else it can be regarded as the result of certain lines of argument, in which case it is the business of other critics to examine those arguments.

The conclusions which Hort reached in regard to the conflate readings discussed above rest on, and indeed may be fairly considered to assume the truth of, his views as to the genealogical relations of the different families into which he divides all extant NT documents. His whole text is indeed based on those views; and therefore, if we are to discuss the problem before us intelligently, it is essential to have correct knowledge of the exact nature of genealogical evidence, and of how far it is available for the criticism of the NT text.

It is an obvious truth that, if the original of a document exists, no number of copies will possess any value for settling its text, which can be ascertained by reference to the document itself. This is the simple ground on which all genealogical evidence rests. If three independent copies have been made of a document which has itself perished, it may fairly be assumed that where all three agree they correctly represent the original; and further, in cases where two of the copies agree against the third, we shall confidently judge that these two preserve the right text, and that the third is in error. Now suppose that fifty copies have been made of this third original copy, and that it has itself perished, then it is clear that the evidence of the two extant primary copies outweighs the evidence of the fifty secondary ones. In this example it is assumed that the exact parentage of every copy is known. This is, of course, seldom the case with the Manuscripts of ancient authors; but, when the parentage of every MS concerned can be ascertained, then genealogical evidence gives results from which there can be no appeal.

This matter is of such importance that it is worth while to illustrate further what we have said, by reference to an actual instance. A fair number of Manuscripts exist of the *Paedagogue* of Clement of Alexandria. In one family of these, consisting of eight or more members, a passage of considerable length is left out. Now two leaves have been lost from a MS preserved at Florence (called F), which contained exactly this passage; it is therefore beyond doubt that the Manuscripts referred to were copied from F after the loss of these leaves, and they are therefore of no value as evidence. There exists also at Paris another MS (P [Note: Priestly Narrative.]), considerably older than F. At one time there was some little doubt about the relation existing between these two Manuscripts; but after a time it was pointed out by a German scholar, Dr. Stählin, that certain notes that were written in P [Note: Priestly Narrative.] by different people and at different times, are written in F in the hand of the original scribe; this makes it certain that F was copied, directly or indirectly, from P [Note: Priestly Narrative.], and it can therefore also be put aside. Further researches showed that every known MS of the work was derived from P [Note:

Priestly Narrative.] , which consequently forms our only authority for the text. It is very seldom that such certain results as these, can be reached in actual practice. It is generally possible to group Manuscripts to some extent by observing their agreement in obvious errors, because it is not likely that different scribes would make the same mistakes independently in several different places. It is obvious that the confidence with which we can employ genealogical evidence is proportionate to the certainty with which the relations of the Manuscripts have been ascertained. In the case of certain cursive Manuscripts of the Gospels strictly genealogical evidence is forthcoming, and it has been shown that the cursives 13, 69, 124, 346, and certain others, are derived from one common ancestor; but, except for this one important and interesting case, the genealogical relations of Gospel Manuscripts are matters of deduction, if not of guesswork.

It appears, then, that it is impossible to acquiesce in Hort's unqualified condemnation of the Antiochian text, so far as that condemnation rests on (i.) the analysis of conflate readings, which presupposes certain genealogical relations to exist between certain groups of Manuscripts , and involves an argument in a vicious circle, because those relations cannot be independently shown to exist; and (ii.) so far as it rests on Patristic evidence, this being precarious from its fragmentary character, while at the same time it does prove that the Antiochian text contains a very ancient element. It remains, therefore, to judge this text on its intrinsic merits.

4. The generally accepted Critical Text.—Once again, it is with Hort's views that we must principally concern ourselves, because WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] 's text is the only one published which can be regarded as in any way self-consistent. No textual student would place much confidence in Tischendorf's judgment, which is embodied in his *editio octava critica major*; the Greek text underlying the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 does not appear to have been formed in accordance with any ascertainable principles; and Weymouth's 'Resultant Text,' and similar editions, founded on the consensus of critical editors, from their nature have no independent critical value. We have, therefore, to consider the principles on which WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] founded their text. We have already shown how the great mass of documents, containing an Antiochian text, were set on one side. The pre-Antiochian texts Hort divided into three families, and, on what appear to many students insufficient grounds, assumed that they stood in certain genealogical relations to one another. One of these families consists of the group of texts commonly called 'Western'; after setting these aside as obvious corruptions of the original text, only a small body of Manuscripts , Versions, and Fathers remains. This small residuum, however, Hort proceeds to again divide into 'Neutral' and 'Alexandrian' documents. It is now, we think we may say, generally acknowledged that this distinction cannot be maintained (cf. Salmon, *Some Thoughts on the Textual Criticism of the NT*, p. 50 ff.). Practically, he classes as 'Alexandrian' the readings of

documents which usually agree with Codex B, when they differ from B and are not supported by much Western evidence. We shall therefore treat these documents as forming one group, and distinguish the readings, as Salmon suggests, as early and later Alexandrian. Hort frankly admitted the close relation existing between his Neutral and Alexandrian readings, since he conceived both sets of readings to be derived from a common non-Western ancestor; this led him, in the case of an important set of readings, which he called 'Western non-interpolations,' to prefer the testimony of a small group of Western documents to the practically unanimous evidence of all other documents.

It will be convenient here to give a list of the main documents with which criticism has to deal. We begin with those which more or less regularly support the Alexandrian readings. See also art. Manuscripts.

B, the famous Codex Vaticanus, assigned to the 4th cent., is by far the most interesting; according to Hort, it contains a purely 'Neutral' text in the Gospels.

Ⲛ, Codex Sinaiticus, discovered by Tischendorf on Mt. Sinai, and probably to be assigned to the 4th century. This MS is thought by Hort to be free from Antiochian readings, but to contain a 'mixed' text, that is, one in which Western, Neutral, and Alexandrian elements are all found, though in the Gospels he looks on it as largely Neutral; this is equivalent to saying that its agreements with B are very numerous.

C, Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus, a palimpsest preserved at Paris, and belonging probably to the 5th century. The text of this MS is undoubtedly of great importance. Miller (*Plain Intr.*⁴ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] vol. i. p. 123) well describes its text as 'standing nearly midway between A and B, somewhat inclining to the latter.' Hort considers C to contain an Antiochian and also a Western element.

L, Codex Regius, preserved at Paris, belonging to the 8th century. This MS is especially remarkable for the number of readings it has in common with B. According to Hort (§ 209), 'The foundation of the text is Non-Western Pre-Syrian.' But he adds: 'The fundamental text has been largely mixed with late Western and with Syrian elements.'

T, Under this symbol are placed several fragments of Manuscripts containing a Greek text and a translation in the dialect of Upper Egypt (Sahidic or Thebaic). They range in date from the 5th to the 7th century.

X, Codex Monacensis, preserved at Munich, of the 9th or 10th cent., has a fundamentally Antiochian text, but is of interest because it often joins with CL in giving readings which may be regarded as late Alexandrian.

Z, Codex Dublinensis Rescriptus, perhaps to be assigned to the 4th cent., contains 295 verses of Mt. in 22 fragments. The text is apparently pre-Antiochian, and agrees more closely with \aleph than with B.

Δ , Codex Sangallensis, of the 9th or 10th cent., has an ordinary Antiochian text, except in Mk., in which Gospel it has many readings in common with CL.

S, Codex Xacynthius, a palimpsest, probably of the 8th cent., belonging to the British and Foreign Bible Society in London. This MS contains 342 verses of Lk., giving an apparently pre-Antiochian text, in which both Western and Alexandrian elements are found.

1, A minuscule, preserved at Basle, assigned to the 10th, 12th, or 13th cent., often agrees with \aleph B and BL [Note: L Bampton Lecture.] .

33, A minuscule of the 10th cent., preserved at Paris, has been called 'the queen of cursives.' It has a very interesting text, containing many ancient elements, but agreeing now with one, now with another type of readings.

The ancient Egyptian Versions, as might be expected, to some extent support the Alexandrian text; but there is so much uncertainty in regard to these Versions that it is not easy to reckon with them as an element in the critical problem presented to us. Forbes Robinson, in his art. 'Egyptian Versions' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , declines to follow Lightfoot and Hort in assigning one, if not both, of the principal Egyptian Versions (*i.e.* the Bohairic and the Sahidic), or at least parts of them, to the close of the 2nd century. He gives good reasons for thinking that the Sahidic Version, which was current in Upper Egypt, was the earlier of the two; and it must be regarded as fundamentally Western rather than Alexandrian. The Bohairic (misleadingly called Coptic, and also Memphitic) Version, current in Lower Egypt, confessedly agrees in general with B, and perhaps even more closely with the text used by Cyril of Alexandria. If it has to be assigned to a date as late as the middle of the 3rd cent., it is evident that it may be the result of the type of text then current in Alexandria, and cannot be used as evidence for the greater antiquity of that text. The remains of the Bashmuretic Versions—those current in Middle Egypt—are so scanty that they offer little help at present.

It would be easy to extend this list by including documents which occasionally support the Alexandrian text, but it will be found that the nucleus of the attestation for most of Hort's readings lies practically in the group \aleph BCLX 33, often supported by the Egyptian versions.

At the same time, it is most necessary to bear in mind that the greater part of the attestation for Hort's readings is often afforded by documents which he classes as Western, and whose evidence he would put on one side were it not supported by some member or members of the Alexandrian group. We proceed, therefore, to give a list of the main Western documents, which have not already been mentioned as containing an Alexandrian element.

D [Note: Deuteronomist.] . Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis, of the 6th century. This is in many ways the most interesting MS of the Gospels extant: its text is, to a great extent, unique, and gains in interest and importance from the support which it often receives from the most ancient versions known, the Old Latin and the Old Syriac. All evidence tends to show that it preserves for us a text which was widely read in the 2nd cent., and the questions connected with this text are likely to increase rather than to decrease both in importance and in practical interest.

P [Note: Priestly Narrative.] and Q. Two palimpsests preserved at Wolfenbüttel, assigned respectively to the 6th and 5th centuries. P [Note: Priestly Narrative.] contains 31 fragments, consisting of 518 verses from all four Gospels; Q 12 fragments of 247 verses from Lk. and John. The ancient element in these Manuscripts is partly Western and partly Alexandrian.

R. Codex Nitriensis, a palimpsest of the 6th cent., in the British Museum, contains 25 fragments of Lk., consisting of about 516 verses. The pre-Antiochian readings are mostly Western.

Two groups of minuscules are of importance. 1-118-131-209 are fairly closely related, and offer some interesting readings: but far more important are the minuscules of the Ferrar group mentioned above, 13-69-124-346-543-(788)-826. This group preserves the readings of a lost MS containing a peculiar Western, text, different from that of D [Note: Deuteronomist.] , but in a manner parallel to it. Another important minuscule, of the 9th or 10th cent., is preserved at St. Petersburg, and is named by Miller-Scrivener 473 (565 of Gregory, 81 of Hort, 2P^e of Tischendorf).

The evidence of the Versions is of great importance in regard to the Western text, for it shows how widespread this text was in the earliest times, and teaches us that the name 'Western' cannot properly be applied to it in a geographical sense. From East

and West and from the south of Egypt we get evidence of the prevalence of distinctively Western types of readings.

The Old Latin (*i.e.* the pre-Vulgate Latin) is found in different forms, which have been distinguished as African, European, and Italic; the last of these, however, approaches so nearly to the Vulgate text, that we shall now leave it on one side. The most important MS of the *African* Latin is *k* (Codex Bobbiensis), of the 5th or 6th cent., preserved at Turin. Unfortunately, it contains only portions of Mt. and Mark. The close agreement of its readings with the quotations of Cyprian proves that it contains a text used in Africa in early times; *e* (Codex Palatinus), of the 4th or 5th cent., preserved at Vienna, contains a version of a similar type, though by no means so homogeneous as that of *k*. Of the *European* Latin there are several Manuscripts : *a*, *b*, *ff* (Mt. only), *h* (part of Mt.), *i* (part of Mk. and Lk.), *m* (not a MS, but a collection of passages [*testimonia*] from the OT and NT, known as the 'Speculum'); this type is also found to some extent in *c*, *f*, and *q*, and in many fragments of Manuscripts .

The text of the Latin Vulgate is preserved in very numerous Manuscripts . It is fundamentally Western in character, as being a descendant of the Old Latin, but has been much modified, especially in the Gospels, by the influence of Greek Manuscripts of the Antiochian type.

In Syriac, the Peshitta Version holds a place analogous to St. Jerome's Vulgate in Latin, and supports the Antiochian text. Another Version, called by the followers of Hort the 'Old Syriac,' is preserved in two Manuscripts ; one in the British Museum, the text of which was published by Cureton, is called after him the 'Curetonian Syriac' (Syr [Note: yr Syriac.] ^{cur}); the other was discovered by Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson in the Library of the Convent on Mount Sinai, and is known as the 'Sinaitic Syriac' (Syr [Note: yr Syriac.] ^{sin}). These Versions, allied, but by no means identical, have an essentially Western text. Another factor in the Syriac problem is the *Diatessaron* of Tatian (flourished a.d. 160), the text of which has to a great extent been recovered from an Arabic translation, from an Armenian translation of the Syriac commentary of Ephraem Syrus, and from the quotations of the Syrian writer Aphraates. The *Diatessaron* was a harmony of the four Gospels, which was widely used in Syriac-speaking countries in preference to the separate Gospels; and in compiling it Tatian used a Western text, similar in character to the Old Syriac. The mutual relations of these documents are still in dispute, but the most probable view is that the Old Syriac stands to the Peshitta as the Old Latin does to Jerome's Vulgate. Two later versions must be mentioned; one is the Harkleian revision of the Philoxenian Syriac, made by Thomas of Harkel about the year 616, the text of which is based on the Peshitta, but important readings from Greek Manuscripts of a Western type are given in the margin; the other is an Evangelistarium, or Church-lesson book, of the 11th cent., known as the 'Jerusalem Syriac,' which sometimes offers very interesting

readings of the Alexandrian type. It has already been stated that the Sahidic version of Upper Egypt is fundamentally Western.

In order to complete this brief survey of the most important documents, we must here mention A—the important Codex Alexandrinus of the 5th cent, preserved in the British Museum; it contains a pure form of the Antiochian text, and it is quite possible that critics will learn to allow more weight to its evidence than is at present the case. The main mass of uncials that have not been here mentioned, and of the minuscules, may be regarded as simply supplementing the evidence of A, because the importance to be attached to them depends upon the estimate formed of the value of the text of A.

We have now to consider in more detail the use which Hort makes of the Alexandrian group of documents. We have already tried to show how precarious any argument is which rests on genealogical considerations, owing to the lack of sufficiently full evidence; at the best, genealogical evidence affords us no help in judging between the Western and the Alexandrian texts, because they are confessedly parallel to each other, and have equal claims to consideration on genealogical grounds. But if it can be shown that the Alexandrian group consistently supports readings intrinsically better than those of the Western documents, this will afford good reason for following it. In other words, the question comes to this: Is the text of WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] , which all critics admit to be substantially a text used at Alexandria early in the 3rd cent., *on the whole* preferable to the Textus Receptus , and to such a text as would be formed by following exclusively Western documents? The answer of critics at the present time to this question would undoubtedly be in the affirmative. But, in the great majority of cases in which it differs from the Textus Receptus , WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] 's text has the support of the best Western as well as of the Alexandrian documents; it is possible, therefore, to argue that its general excellence is due to the pure form of the Western element which it contains, and to look upon the distinctively Alexandrian readings as blemishes. On what grounds does Hort prefer these distinctively Alexandrian readings? His main argument is the internal evidence of groups; all the readings supported by a group such as \aleph B or \aleph D [Note: Deuteronomist.] are examined, and judgment is passed on them collectively, and also on the text common to the Manuscripts forming the group. Now, the text common to \aleph and D [Note: Deuteronomist.] is, according to Hort's classification, Western, and in his opinion gives inferior readings (of course, when unsupported by other primary documents); whereas the agreement of \aleph and B almost invariably gives readings which he considers intrinsically excellent. This method of forming a judgment on a wide consideration of the general readings of a group, to a great extent does away with the personal element which is so great a danger when individual readings are considered each on its intrinsic merits, but it still leaves plenty of room for the personal equation, since a general judgment is based on a special

individual judgment in a number of separate cases; thus Hort's system is far less impersonal than it appears to be at first sight. It is obviously impossible to enter into all this minute research unless one is able to devote many years of close work to the subject; yet, without doing so, it appears presumptuous to dispute Hort's conclusions.

But judgment in this matter really rests on a wider question. If it can be shown to be probable that the Alexandrian text is the result of a revision, then the greater part of Hort's work has been expended in restoring the original text of that revision, and is only a step, though an important one, in getting back to the readings of the original autographs. Now, recent investigations seem to tend to render two facts probable: (1) that all documents giving an Alexandrian text are connected with Egypt, and (2) that the text current in Egypt prior to the time of Origen was fundamentally Western, not Alexandrian. If a strong probability can be made out for these two views, then it will be a reasonable conclusion that the Alexandrian text had its rise in Egypt during the early part of the 3rd cent., and it will have to be treated as parallel to, though earlier and more important than, the Antiochian text. Egypt was the home of scholars, and if such a recension was made there, it is natural that the conclusions of early scholars should commend themselves on their intrinsic merits to men of similar training even at a much later date; we have also to remember that it is quite probable that those early scholars, with more evidence before them than we now have, did select the best readings, and may have preserved to us many true readings which would otherwise have perished. The dislike with which the later students of Antioch regarded the opinions of the earlier Alexandrian Fathers, and the taint of heresy which attached to them, easily account for the text they preferred not having continued in general use, if indeed it was ever widely current. Hort has declared that there are no grounds at all for believing in this Alexandrian revision, but we are not aware that he has gone beyond assertion on this point. In the same way, Burgon and Miller declared that Hort's Antiochian revisions were the creations of Hort's imagination. But the fact remains that the Alexandrian text cannot be traced earlier than the first quarter of the 3rd century. Clement of Alexandria used a distinctively Western text; it is true that he sometimes has what are commonly regarded as Alexandrian readings, but it is manifestly impossible to prove that these may not have been part of the Western text, current in Alexandria, and naturally taken up by the revisers. If it is the case that the Sahidic version is earlier than the Bohairic, again we find the Western type preceding the Alexandrian; and if Robinson is further right in assigning the Bohairic to the 3rd, and not the 2nd cent., then it may very possibly have been made from Manuscripts with the revised Alexandrian text, and its character is thus accounted for.

The great importance which Hort assigns to the agreement of \aleph and B depends on his contention that the two Manuscripts are independent of each other; but there are

really strong reasons for doubting this. Hort (§ 288) admits the truth of the fact pointed out by Tischendorf, ‘that six leaves of the NT in \aleph , together with the opening verses of the Apocalypse, besides corrections, headings, and in two cases subscriptions, to other parts, are from the hand of the same scribe that wrote the NT in B.’ He adopts the obvious conclusion that the scribe of B was the corrector of \aleph , and adds that it shows that the two Manuscripts were written in the same generation, probably in the same place. He argues, however, that the evidence of the text, supported by differences in the order of the books and other externals, creates a strong presumption that they were copied from independent exemplars. But where so much depends on the absolute independence of two witnesses, this close local connexion must cause the most serious doubts. Have we any means of saying where it is likely that the two Manuscripts were written? Both Manuscripts contain a peculiar system of chapter numbers in the Acts, in each case in a very early hand, and with such differences that in neither case can the numeration have been copied from the other MS, but must have come from a common original. Dean Armitage Robinson, in his ‘Euthaliana’ (*TS [Note: 5 Texts and Studies.]* iii. 3), gives reasons for believing that this chapter-numeration is the same as that connected with the name of Euthalius, and points out (p. 35) that a Euthalian codex claims to have been collated with the accurate copies in the library at Caesarea of Eusebius Pamphili. The connexion of Origen with this great library is well known, and suggests (though it can hardly be called more than a suggestion) that the same library may have been the birthplace of these two great Manuscripts which, when in agreement, support the text which Origen mostly used, and with the rise of which he may well have been connected. It is impossible to speak with any confidence until a great deal more work has been done, but it does seem as if the evidence in favour of an Alexandrian revision is growing (cf., further, Burkitt, *TS [Note: 5 Texts and Studies.]* v. 5).

We are able to judge of Hort’s work only by the results, and to some extent our judgment must be based on a consideration of extreme instances, that is, we must judge the theory by cases in which he has pushed it to its furthest limits. No one denies that the greater part of his text, right or wrong, is of extreme antiquity, being based on the agreement of Alexandrian and Western documents; the question is whether his theory has led to the inclusion of readings that cannot be shown to be earlier than Origen, and may therefore be due to an Alexandrian revision, or may be errors that had crept into the Western text current at Alexandria on which that revision was based. We propose to examine a few examples which throw light on the methods he employed.

One of the most important, instructive, and truly typical examples occurs in Joh 1:18. The passage has been exhaustively discussed by Hort in the first of *Two Dissertations* (1876). The verse runs in the Alexandrian Manuscripts : θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρα

ακεν τώποτε· μονογενῆς θεός ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο. For
 μονογενῆς θεός the vast majority of documents give ὁ μονογενῆς υἱός: Hort's reading
 is supported by a small, and nearly homogeneous, group of documents, \aleph^{BC^*L} 33, the
 Pesh. Syriac, the margin of the Hark. Syriac, and the Bohairic. The Sahidic and Gothic
 Versions and the Sinaitic Syriac are not extant here, and the evidence of the aethiopic
 is divided. So far, this would appear to be an exclusively Alexandrian group, were it
 not for the support of the Pesh., which can hardly be suspected of complicity with
 BC^*L , and seems to show that the reading must be older than the alleged Alexandrian
 revision. The Patristic evidence is as usual confused and doubtful, but there can be
 little doubt that Clement of Alexandria's usual reading was ὁ μονογενῆς θεός (the
 article is found with θεός also in \aleph^C 33 Bohairic), but he was acquainted with the
 reading υἱός which comes once in an allusion of his own, once in the *Excerpta ex*
Theodoto. Irenaeus seems to have known the reading θεός, which is also found in
 several later Fathers, including Origen. But the important point is that we have good
 evidence for the existence of this reading prior to the time of Origen. We may
 therefore regard it as an old reading current in Alexandria. On the other hand, the
 evidence of the great majority of Manuscripts and Versions, supported by a good
 array of Fathers, shows that the rival reading was widely spread at an equally early
 period. Hort had no doubt how to decide on the evidence, impressed as he was with
 the general excellence of the Alexandrian group, and he argued so well that internal
 evidence supports μονογενῆς θεός that it is hard to read his words without feeling
 convinced that he is in the right. Yet it is at least doubtful whether such a phrase as μ
 ν ονογενῆς θεός could have been used before Greek philosophy obtained a commanding
 influence over Christian theology. Godet, who was second to none in the exegesis of
 St. John's Gospel, and was singularly unbiassed in matters of textual criticism, deals
 with the rival readings in a few words (*Com. ad loc.*): 'La leçon des Alexandrins: *le*
Dieu fils unique, malgré l'autorité du *Vatic.*, n'a été admise à peu près par aucun des
 éditeurs modernes, et l'appui du *Sinait.* ne lui procurera pas à l'avenir un meilleur
 accueil. Elle a trop la saveur de la dogmatique postérieure. Le fait qu'elle se trouve
 chez Clément d'Alexandrie et chez Origène, est un indice de son lieu d'origine.' It
 does, indeed, seem impossible to believe that the writer of the Gospel, immediately
 after saying 'God, no one has ever seen,' should continue, 'the only-begotten God ...
 has declared him.' In fact, the word θεός can apparently be in place here only if used
 in the secondary sense assigned to it by Origen, as distinguished from ὁ θεός, a term
 which he thought could not properly be used of the Logos. Hort thinks that the
 reading cannot have arisen from an accidental confusion of $\theta\varsigma$ and $\nu\varsigma$, because of the

omission of the article in most Manuscripts reading θεός; but the testimony of Clement suggests that ἕ μονογενῆς θεός may have arisen accidentally; the reading would be welcomed by the school of Origen, but the article would naturally be omitted.

We next select an instance which exemplifies a particular excellence of the Alexandrian text—freedom from readings introduced to make one Gospel harmonize with the parallel passage in another. In Mat_1:25 ⲁBZ 1, 33 read ἕως οὗ (B omits) ἔτεκεν υἱόν, and they have the support of important Manuscripts of the Old Latin (*a*^{vid} *b* *c* *g*¹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] *k*), of the Egyptian versions, and the Curetonian Syriac. The mass of Manuscripts and Versions bring Mt. into harmony with Lk. by reading ἕως οὗ ἔτεκεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον.

A very similar group (with the addition of D [Note: Deuteronomist.] , but without the Curetonian Syriac) omits the doxology to the Lord's Prayer in Mat_6:15.

In Mat_7:13 we have one of the instances in which WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] desert B, omitting the words ἡ πύλη with ⲁ* and the Old Latin, supported by strong Patristic evidence. But the Patristic evidence is discounted by the fact that the extreme familiarity of expressions referring to the 'Two Ways' (cf. *e.g.* *Didache*, § 1) might easily result in no reference being made to the 'Gate.' Most people who are not professed textual critics would prefer to follow the main mass of Manuscripts .

Mat_16:2 *b*, 3 is omitted by ⲁB, supported by 3 uncials (including X), 14 minuscules, the Curetonian Syriac, one MS of the Bohairic, and apparently Origen. Jerome says that the passage was omitted in most Manuscripts . Hort says: 'Both documentary evidence and the impossibility of accounting for omission prove these words to be no part of the text of Mt. They can hardly have been an altered repetition of the parallel Luk_12:54-55, but were apparently derived from an extraneous source, written or oral, and inserted in the Western Text at a very early time.' This example brings us face to face with an important problem: the natural tendency of scribes was to make their MS as full as possible, and it is usually impossible (except in cases of homœoteleuton) to account for omission. B and its allies frequently omit phrases or passages found in the majority of documents. Is this a proof of the superiority of their text? It is hard to resist the conclusion that it is. Yet it is unsatisfactory, and indeed uncritical, to adopt a sweeping theory that all omissions are right, for they may have arisen from accidental causes which we cannot know of.

A far more interesting and important case is the omission of Mar_16:9-20. It is impossible here to go into the evidence fully. The internal evidence of these verses renders it most probable (personally we think it almost conclusively proves) that they did not belong to the original Gospel. But textual criticism has to answer only the question, Were they in the copy from which our Manuscripts are derived? They are omitted by \aleph B: let us deal first with the evidence of these two Manuscripts. Are they independent witnesses? The question is well discussed by Dr. Salmon, *Histor. Introd. to the Study of the Books of the NT*, in a note at the end of ch. ix. The leaf containing the conclusion of Mk. in \aleph is admitted to have been written by the scribe who wrote B: apparently as corrector of the former MS he cancelled and rewrote the leaf. Lk. begins as usual on a new leaf, and there would be room on the last leaf of Mk. for the disputed verses. It is an obvious conjecture that the scribe of \aleph copied the verses from his archetype, and that the corrector deliberately removed them. We have seen that there is some reason for connecting \aleph and B with the great library of Caesarea: Eusebius was no doubt a great authority on points of Biblical criticism there, and we know that his opinion was against these verses (Mai, *Script. Vett. Nov. Collect.* i. p. 1). They were not reckoned in the Ammonian Sections or the Eusebian Canons. His 'testimony is to the effect that some of the copies in his time contained the verses, and some did not; but that those which omitted them were then the more numerous, and, in his opinion, the more trustworthy.' It is quite possible that the evidence we have so far considered comes to no more than this—'Manuscripts preferred by Eusebius.' If he rejected these verses on internal grounds, we believe he was right in doing so, but we must take care that subjective evidence is not treated as objective textual evidence. It is probable that the scholia found in various minuscules, to the same effect as the testimony of Eusebius quoted above, are derived from him, and have no independent value. But a shorter ending to the Gospel was also current, which was undoubtedly spurious, and this affords indirect, but definite, evidence for the omission of Mar_16:9-20, because it could arise only through the Gospel ending abruptly at Mar_16:8. This shorter ending is found in the Old Latin MS *k*, 247 *margin*, Hark. Syriac *margin*, one codex of the Bohairic *margin*, and in the aethiopic Version. Both endings, the shorter coming first, are found in L₁₂ [Note: 2 designates the particular edition of the work referred] $\Theta\Psi$. It is obvious that the strictly textual evidence against Mar_16:9-20 is very inconclusive: apparently they were omitted (either on internal evidence, or through a strange coincidence by accidental damage to a papyrus roll) in an early group of Manuscripts; and the omission commended itself to Eusebius, as it does to most scholars at the present day.

In Mar_6:22 nearly all documents read καὶ εἰσελθούσης τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς τῆς Ἡρωδίας: WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] follow \aleph BDL Δ 2P^e (238) in substituting αὐτοῦ for αὐτῆς τῆς, making the dancer a daughter of Herod bearing the same name as her mother Herodias. This is quite impossible, and we have to understand τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτοῦ to mean step-daughter; but even so an unknown character is introduced, for the daughter of Herodias, according to Josephus, was named Salome. Clearly B and its allies, in spite of the support of D [Note: Deuteronomist.] , must be wrong here.

In Mat_27:49 \aleph BCL, with some late support, add (after σώσων αὐτόν) the words ἄλλος δὲ λαβὼν λόγχην ἔνυξεν αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευράν, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα. WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] suspend judgment by placing the words in the text within double brackets; but they are fairly obviously an interpolation, put in at the wrong place, from Joh_19:34.

In Mar_6:20 WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] read, with \aleph BL [Note: L Bampton Lecture.] Boh., ἠτόρει for ἐτοίει. Both readings make excellent sense, but many people will think the simpler one the more likely.

In Luk_4:44 WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] read Ἰουδαίας instead of Γαλιλαίας. It is difficult to understand how any one can accept Ἰουδαίας as even a possible reading in view of the context (but see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible i. 406 f.). In the (Revised Version margin) we read that 'very many ancient authorities read *Judaea*.' It is interesting to observe the authorities which agree in this obvious error: they are \aleph BCLQR 1-131-209, 22, 157, and 11 other minuscules, 6 lectionaries, the Bohairic, and the text of the Hark. Syriac—an unusually wide and very representative Alexandrian group. Soon after (Luk_6:1), a similar though smaller group (\aleph BL [Note: L Bampton Lecture.] 1-118-209, 22, 69, 33, 157, with the Bohairic and some Latin and Syriac documents) omits the difficult word δευτεροτρόπῳ. WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] and the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 accept the evidence of this group.

The excellence of the Alexandrian group is well seen in Luk_11:2; Luk_11:4; there can be little doubt that the short form of the Lord's Prayer is right in Lk., as Godet unhesitatingly declared. The constant element in the attestation for the three

omissions consists of BL [Note: L Bampton Lecture.] 1, 22, 130, Latin Vulgate; \aleph and 57 join in two of the three places.

The number of Patristic references to the omission in Manuscripts of Luk_22:43-44 (the ministering angel, the bloody sweat) renders it almost certain that they do not form part of the true text; they are omitted by \aleph^a ABRT 13*-69-124 *f*, Hark. Syriac *margin*, and some Manuscripts of the Egyptian Versions; they are marked as probably spurious in many later documents.

The variants in Joh_7:39 are of peculiar interest, because there can be little doubt about the right reading, οὕτω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα without addition. The difficulty of this statement is so obvious, that it is a wonder more attempts were not made to soften it down. We do not think any passage bears more conclusive testimony to the excellence of the text of the NT as transmitted to us. The words are found without addition in \aleph TKII 42, 91, some Manuscripts of the Latin Vulgate, the Curetonian Syriac, the Bohairic, and the Armenian. The great majority of documents add ἅγιον—a natural insertion which does not affect the main point. Most Latin documents support the insertion of δεδομένον after πνεῦμα. It is very remarkable that B (254) (with *e g*, Jerusalem and Hark. Syriac) has the fullest reading, πνεῦμα ἅγιον δεδομένον. D [Note: Deuteronomist.] (with *f go*) gets over the difficulty in a different way by reading το πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐτ' αὐτοῖς.

It is not an easy thing to convey a fair impression by a selection of readings, but we hope the above passages are sufficient to show two things, the undoubted excellence of the Alexandrian tradition, and the inadvisability of following it against internal evidence of readings. If Hort's views of the genealogical relations of the main texts are, as we believe, unproved, then the Alexandrian group must stand on its merits alone, and we must bear in mind that its readings may be due to a definite revision;* [Note: Hort looked upon what he called the Alexandrian text (as distinguished from the Neutral) as the result of a revision; according to the view of the present writer, \aleph and B were not unaffected by the revision.] in any case, however, whether there was an Alexandrian revision or not, the text preserved by this group of documents is the purest and the most important now known to us. We believe that the following passage from Dr. Salmon (*Introd. to the NT*⁴ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 164, note) well expresses what will be the ultimate verdict in regard to the work of the two great Cambridge critics:

‘It seems to me that textual critics are not entitled to feel’ absolute confidence in their results, if they venture within range of the obscurity that hangs over the history of the first publication of the Gospels. Such a task as Bentley and Lachmann proposed to themselves, viz., to recover a good fourth-century text, was perfectly feasible, and has, in fact, been accomplished by Westcott and Hort with triumphant success. I suppose that if a MS containing their text could have been put into the hands of Eusebius, he would have found only one thing in it which would have been quite strange to him, namely, the short conclusion on the last page of St. Mark, and that he would have pronounced the MS to be an extremely good and accurate one. But these editors aim at nothing less than going back to the original documents; and, in order to do this, it is in some cases necessary to choose between two forms of text, each of which is attested by authorities older than any extant MS. Now, a choice which must be made on subjective grounds only cannot be made with the same confidence as when there is on either side a clear preponderance of historical testimony. And, further, there is the possibility that the Evangelist might have himself published a second edition of his Gospel, so that two forms of text might both be entitled to claim his authority.’

In his treatment of this difficult subject, the present writer has tried to set out main principles rather than to go into minute details: he has also tried to show how a judgment must be formed rather than to express his own opinions. But it is almost impossible to move in textual criticism without having a working hypothesis. Supporters either of the Traditional Text or of WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort’s text.]’s views have the advantage of starting from a clearly defined position, and attack or defend definite theories. The present writer has found it necessary to intimate, as a working hypothesis, what his own views are, and has attempted to show the reasons why he holds them. We can reconstruct a text which was current at Antioch by the middle of the 4th cent., and which won its way to practically universal acceptance in countries which used the Greek language; this would not differ in any material respects from the Textus Receptus. We can also reconstruct a text current in Alexandria probably as early as the first quarter of the 3rd cent.; this would be almost the same as Westcott and Hort’s text, if we except those passages where they give the preference to Western documents. What are we to do with the documents of very divergent types, which are loosely classified as Western? This is really the main problem which textual critics now have to face. We may perhaps roughly distinguish the following groups of documents as attesting different types of readings, but it is necessary to remember that there is continual cross-attestation: (a) D [Note: Deuteronomist.] supported by the old Latin; (b) groups in which \times sides with Western documents against distinctively Alexandrian readings; (c) the ancient text underlying the Antiochian. revision, which is often very difficult to distinguish; (d) the Ferrar group of minuscules; (e) the Old Syriac; we also know of a certain number of readings

which were evidently widely spread in early times, but which have left little or no trace of their existence in extant Manuscripts and versions.

It is impossible within the limits of this article to enter on this very wide question; nor is it possible at the present stage of criticism to say that any really definite results have been reached. Whatever may be the history of the origin of the Western texts, and however strongly certain isolated readings may commend themselves to the judgment of a few students, it is not likely that any known type of Western text in its entirety will ever command the respect of a considerable body of students of textual criticism and of exegesis; and it must be borne in mind that the final decision must rest on exegesis, unless textual evidence at present not even guessed at should be brought to light. The truth appears to be that the Antiochian text adopted much of what was best in the various Western texts; but at the same time the agreement of Western and Alexandrian documents in many readings that are almost undoubtedly right warns us that right readings may lurk in the most divergent texts, though it is improbable that much of value escaped both the Alexandrian and the Antiochian revisers.

But the existence of these early divergent types of text, in regard to which textual criticism can give no definite verdict, has a very distinct practical lesson to teach, and one which is greatly needed at this critical period in the history of Christianity; it is impossible to recover at present the *ipsissima verba* of the NT writers. Of course the limits of doubt are very narrow, and the possible variants are few and for the most part unimportant; but the fact of doubt remains, and is a standing protest against all mechanical theories of inspiration, for however slight the discrepancies the question must arise, 'Which text or reading is inspired?' We must build on the general sense, not on the mere letter of Scripture; this is the practical lesson which textual criticism teaches us at this moment. And what result can be happier than if the study of the letter, by its inconclusiveness, leads us to a firmer grasp of the general sense, in which is the 'spirit that maketh alive'?

Literature.—Art. 'Textual Criticism (of NT)' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, Ext. Vol. p. 208 ff.; Scrivener, *Introd. to Criticism of NT*⁴ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1894; Gregory, *Textkritik des NT*, 1900, *Prolegomena* to Tischendorf, 1884-94, *Canon and Text of NT*, 1907; von Soden, *Die Schriften des NT*, 1902 ff.; E. Miller, *Guide to the Textual Criticism of the NT*, 1886, *The Oxford Debate*, 1897, *The Present State of the Textual Controversy*, 1899, *The Textual Controversy and the Twentieth Century*, 1901, *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, 1896 [jointly with Burgon], *Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text*, 1896; Hort, Introduction to WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort's text.] 's *NT in Greek*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1896; Nestle, *Introd.*

to *Text. Crit. of Gr. NT*, 1901; Salmon, *Some Criticism of the Text of the NT*, 1897; K. Lake, *The Text of the NT*, 1900; Kenyon, *Handbook to the Text. Crit. of NT*, 1901; Hammond, *Outlines of Textual Criticism applied to the NT*, 1902.

P. M. Barnard.

THADDAEUS occurs only Mar_3:18 and Mat_10:3; in the latter place in the Authorized Version in the form: 'Lebbaeus, whose surname was Thaddaeus.' On the textual questions, see artt. Judas (vol. i. p. 906), Lebbaeus (above, p. 22), and 'Thaddaeus' (*DB [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.]* iv. 741). In the Western Church neither 'Lebbaeus' nor 'Thaddaeus' became common, their place being taken by 'Judas,' occurring in Lk.'s Gospel and Acts as *Judas Jacobi*, and found in Mt. as *Judas Zelotes* in the oldest Latin witnesses, and as *Judas son of James* in SyrSin; his day falling with that of Simon on the 28th October.* [Note: In the Calendar of Cordova for 961 the entry runs. 'festum Simonis Cananei et Tadei apostolorum'; see M. Férotin, *Le liber ordinum en usage dans l'église Wisigothique et Mozarabe d'Espagne*, Paris, 1904 (= *Monumenta ecclesiae liturgica*, ed. Cabrol-Leclerq, vol. v.).] But even under the name of Jude this Apostle never became very popular. The *Calendar of the English Church, Illustrated* (Oxford and London, 1851), knows only of *two old* churches in England dedicated in the joint names of Simon and Jude, and of several instances in *modern* churches of their names being honoured separately, as in Liverpool, Manchester, Bethnal Green, West Derby; 'but this is quite against the mediaeval custom.' Neither was 'Thaddaeus' frequent as a proper name; cf., however, for instance, the Italian painter Taddeo Gaddi. In the Greek Church the 19th June is kept as *μνήμη τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ ἐνδόξου ἀποστόλου Ἰούδα*, who by Luke, in the Gospel and Acts, is called Ἰούδας; by Matthew and Mark, *Θαδδαῖος καὶ Λεββαῖος, ἀδελφὸς κατὰ σάρκα χρηματίζων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὡς υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ τοῦ μνήστορος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ γνήσιος Ἰακώβου τοῦ ἀδελφοθέου, ὁ καὶ τὴν φωτιστικὴν καὶ δογμάτων ἔμπλεον τοῦ Πνεύματος ἀνθρώποις ἅπασιν ἐπιστεῖλας ἐπιστολήν*. It is then told that he was sent by Christ Himself ὡς ἀδελφὸς καὶ μυσταγωγὸς to Mesopotamia, came to Edessa, healed Abgar, and was shot with arrows by the infidels in the town Ararat. On 30th June, the day of all Apostles, he is numbered 12th; the place where he died in one MS being called *ἐν Ἀράτῳ τῇ πόλει*. On the 21st August the Greek Church celebrates *μνήμη τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου Θαδδαίου τοῦ καὶ Λεββαίου ἐνδὸς τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα*. He is said to have been from Edessa, a Hebrew by birth, who came to Jerusalem in the days of John the Baptist, was baptized, and afterwards followed Jesus till His Passion. Then he returned to his home, healed Abgar of the 'black' leprosy, came to Syria, and died

in Βήρυτος; cf. the *Acta Apostolorum Apocr.* [Note: *Apocrypha, Apocryphal.*] , ed. Tischendorf.

On the identity of Lebbaeus-Thaddaeus-Judas Jacobi with the author of the Epistle and the brother of Jesus, see Mayor, 'Brethren of the Lord' (*DB [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.]* i. 320); Dom J. Chapman (*JThSt [Note: ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.]* vii. 412-433); Th. Zahn, *Forschungen*, vi. [1900] 225-363. For evidence that the Epistle of Jude is quoted occasionally under the name of Thaddaeus, see *ZNTW [Note: NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissen. schaft.]* iii. [1902] 251. In the Syrian Churches, Jude is identified with Thomas, and sometimes regarded as twin brother of Jesus; see J. R. Harris, *Dioscuri in the Christian Legends*, and *The Cult of the Heavenly Twins* (1906), p. 105. In the *Onomastica sacra* the name 'Thaddaeus' is explained by αἰνετός (ed. Lagarde, 202. 83). The same etymology is followed in the Talmud, *Sanh.* 43, where the last of the five disciples of Jesus is called *Thoda*, and [Psa_100:1](#); [Psa_50:23](#) are applied to him.

On monuments of Christian art the name does not seem to occur frequently (see Mrs. Arthur Bell, *The Saints in Christian Art* (1901), vol. i. ch. viii. 'The Twelve Apostles'; ch. xvi. 'St. Simon, St. Jude, and St. Matthias'). In the mosaic of S. Paolo fuori le Mura, Thaddaeus is the last of the Apostles; on its bronze doors, cast at Constantinople in 1070, he is left out altogether along with James the Less and Matthias. The Romanic *frontale aureum* of the altar of the church at Comburg (Württemberg), representing the Salvator Mundi in the midst of the Twelve Apostles, gives him under the name *S. Tatheus*. When the Creed is apportioned among the Twelve, 'Thaddaeus dixit: *carnis resurrectionem.*' In the Hexameters ascribed to Bernard of Clairvaux, 'Restituit carnem Judas'; with Firminius: 'Judas Jacobi dixit: *sanctorum communionem, remissionem peccatorum*' (Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , pp. 52-54, 97, 104).

In the *Const. Apost.* the ordinances about widows are ascribed to Thaddaeus (8:25).

Very complicated is the question about the relation of the Apostle Thaddaeus to Θαδδαῖος, who is said by Eusebius to have been one of the Seventy, and to have been sent after the Ascension, by Thomas, to Edessa to heal King Abgar. Jerome, on [Mat_10:4](#), tells the same about the Apostle Thaddaeus, while in the Syrian legend the messenger to Edessa is called *Addai* (on the form *Haddai* in one of the Manuscripts of the Syriac Version of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* of Eusebius, see *DB [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.]* , s.v. 'Thaddaeus'). Zahn thinks that Eusebius is guilty of the confusion of Addai with Thaddaios. On the Syriac *Doctrine of Addai*, see Lagarde, *Reliquiae juris*

eccles. antiqu. syr. p. 32 = Gr. p. 89; Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents*; G. Phillips, *The Doctrine of Addai* (1876).

As the place of his burial there is mentioned, besides Beirut in Phœnicia, the town Ostracine in Egypt (see *Const. Apost.*, ed. Lagarde, p. 283), where Θαδδαῖος ὁ Λεβαῖος καὶ Ἰούδας is distinguished from Judas Jacobi, the latter, after preaching throughout the whole of Mesopotamia, was stoned by the Jews, and lies at Edessa; the former preached to the Edessenes, was crucified, and buried in ‘Ostracine,’ the town of Egypt.

The most probable etymology of the name ‘Thaddaeus’ seems to be that proposed by Dalman, who sees in it the Heb. abbreviation of a Greek name beginning with Theo-, as in *Theudas*. The ‘Gospel of Thaddaeus’ mentioned in some Manuscripts and editions of the *Decretum Gelasii* is due to a clerical error. On the legends connected with Thaddaeus see Lipsius, *Die apokr. Apostelgeschichten*, ii. pp. 142-200 (1884).

Literature.—Artt. Jud_1:1 and Lebbeaus in the present work; ‘Judas’ in *DB* [*Note: Dictionary of the Bible.*] ii. 798^a; ‘Lebbeaus,’ *ib.* iii. 92; ‘Thaddaeus,’ *ib.* iv. 741; ‘Judas,’ ‘Lebbeaus,’ ‘Thaddaeus,’ in *Ebi* [*Note: Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*]; Zahn, *Forschungen*, vi. 293, 321, 344; Dom Chapman, ‘The Brethren of the Lord’ in *JThSt* [*Note: ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.*] vii. 412 ff.

Eb. Nestle

☩ Thanksgiving

THANKSGIVING (εὐχαριστία, εὐχαριστέω) is an important Christian virtue, and in pre-Christian Greek the word is rare. Used chiefly of man’s attitude to God, it implies a recollection of Him, a recognition of His actions in the past (cf. ὁμολογεῖν and cognates, Heb_13:15, Mat_11:25 etc.), quite apart from any thought of petition for the future. Meaning originally *to do a good turn to a man* (cf. ἔχειν χάριν, 1Ti_1:12), εὐχαριστία acquires the meaning of repaying a favour, and hence of showing gratitude. Philo uses it in the technical sense of thank-offering. Outside the Gospels and Apocalypse it occurs in the NT only in the writings of St. Paul.

1. Usage in the Gospels.—The word εὐχαριστέω (εὐχαριστία does not occur in the Gospels), though found in other connexions (Joh_11:41, Luk_17:16), occurs principally

in relation to grace before meat, especially at the miracles of the loaves, and the institution of the Lord's Supper (Mat 15:36; Mat 26:27, Mar 8:5; Mar 14:23, Luk 22:17; Luk 22:19 [before the breaking of the bread we have in the || Mat 26:26, Mar 14:22 εὐλογήσας (Authorized and Revised Versions 'blessed') for εὐχαριστήσας in Lk.], Joh 6:11; Joh 6:23). From this fact, in later times, though not in the NT itself, the word *Eucharist* became a recognized term for the Holy Communion, and is found in the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (9:1) and other sub-Apostolic literature (Ign. *Smyr.* 7, Just. *Mart. Apol.* 1, 65), as well as in later writings. See, further, artt. *Benediction and Blessing*.

Besides εὐχαριστέω we find in the Gospels, as terms denoting the giving of thanks, (1) ἔξομολογέομαι (Mat 11:25 || Luk 10:21, (Revised Version margin) 'praise'); (2) ἀνθρομολογέομαι (Luk 2:38); and (3) ὡχῶ χάριν (Luk 17:9; cf. Luk 6:32 ff.). In (1) Jesus Himself thanks His Father for revealing to babes what is hidden from the wise and understanding. In (2) Anna the prophetess gives thanks to God for the vision of the infant Jesus. In (3) Jesus sets aside the idea that a servant should be thanked for doing the things which were commanded him.

2. Christ's lessons regarding thanksgiving.—(1) *His own example is a lesson.* He gives thanks to His Father for daily bread (Mat 15:36 || Mar 8:6, Joh 6:11; Joh 6:23; cf. Luk 24:30); for the revelation to babes of the secrets of the heavenly Kingdom (Mat 11:25 || Luk 10:21); for the Divine hearing of His prayer (Joh 11:41); for the bread and wine of the Holy Supper, and all the spiritual blessings which they connote (Mat 26:26 f., Mar 14:22 f., Luk 22:17; Luk 22:19, 1Co 11:24 f.). (2) *His words convey lessons.* We have no claim to be regarded as profitable servants, deserving to be thanked, if we have merely done our duty (Luk 17:9 f.). There is a kind of thanksgiving to God which is only a form of hypocrisy, being really a flattery of ourselves (Luk 18:11). The truly thankful heart is rare (Luk 17:16 ff.); it recognizes God's hand in the gifts of human benefactors (Luk 17:18); it is inspired by faith, and wins great blessings (Luk 17:19).

It is worth noting that it is to St. Luke alone that we owe the story of the Ten Lepers and the Grateful Samaritan, which is typical of the Christian grace of gratitude that finds expression in thanksgiving; while it is to St. Luke's beloved friend and teacher, St. Paul, as to no other, that we owe the repeated and characteristic Christian utterance of thanks to God for His unspeakable gift (2Co 9:15, and the Pauline Epistles, *passim*).

Literature.—Cremer, *Lexicon*, s.vv. εὐχαριστέω, εὐλογέω; Swete, *JThSt* [*Note: ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.*], Jan. 1902, p. 163; Trench, *Miracles*, 357 ff.; Mozley, *University Sermon*. 253; Rashdall, *Christus in Ecclesia*, 179.

H. C. Lees and J. C. Lambert.

☞ Theophilus

THEOPHILUS.—The name of an early Christian to whom a couple of NT documents, the Third (canonical) Gospel and its sequel, the Acts of the Apostles, are addressed (Luk_1:3, Act_1:1). This does not, of course, imply that the writer had no wider audience in view. The two books in question are far too carefully composed to be mere private communications. In modern parlance they are ‘dedicated’ rather than addressed to Theophilus; that is, if we suppose the name to be a genuine proper name. On this point, however, there has been some difference of opinion. Conceivably *Theophilus* (= OT *Jedidiah*, ‘God’s friend’) might be no more than a conventional title for the average Christian reader, an imaginary *nom de guerre* for the typical catechumen. This symbolic sense of the word was conjectured by Origen. At the same time, instances of *Theophilus* as a proper name are not uncommon, and it seems simpler, on the whole, to regard it as such in the NT. A modification of the above theory has also been proposed (e.g. by Ramsay and Bartlet), which would make Theophilus a baptismal name given to a Roman official, and employed here for the sake of safety. This is possible, but rather unlikely.

The name, then, is to be taken as denoting some contemporary of Luke (or of whoever wrote the Third Gospel and Acts). Otherwise he is unknown to history. Later tradition naturally busied itself with fanciful conjectures upon his personality, turning him eventually into the bishop of Antioch or of Caesarea (cf. Zahn’s *Einleitung*, § 58. 5). But this is the region of guesswork, though modern critics have often been tempted to stray back into it. As, for example, Beck, who, in his *Prolog des Lk.-Evangeliums* (1900), deduces from ἐν ἡμῖν (1:3) the fact that the author was one of the two Emmaus disciples, while Theophilus must have been a wealthy Antiochene tax-collector, an acquaintance of Chuza and Herod, who accompanied Herod and Bernice to Caesarea, where he fell in with St. Paul and St. Luke. Godet opines that Luke was a freedman of Theophilus. The latter, at any rate, may have been the *patronus libri*, expected to be responsible for the publication and circulation of the Gospel and its sequel. Whether he was of Greek extraction or a Roman, possibly of equestrian rank, it is impossible to say; but one may cheerfully set aside the theories which identify him with Philo or Seneca.

We are thus reduced to an examination of the internal evidence for any knowledge of the position and character of the man. (1) Plainly, to begin with, he was a Christian when the Third Gospel was composed. He had been 'instructed' in the faith by some Christian teachers as a catechumen. But either he or his friend, the author, felt that some fuller acquaintance with the historic basis of the Christian religion (not of the Pauline gospel, as Hilgenfeld argues in *Ztschr. für Wiss. Theologie*, 1901, pp. 1-11) was advisable, and it was with this end in view that the Third Gospel and its sequel were addressed to him, in order to remove uncertainties caused by diversity, inexactness, lack of thoroughness, and absence of order, in the current accounts of Christ's life on earth. Some critics still hold that Theophilus was simply a pagan interested in Christianity. But the term *κατηχῆθης* (Luk 1:4, cf. Act 18:25; Act 21:21), especially in the light of its context, seems to preclude this hypothesis. St. Luke's preface implies that he was more than merely an interested inquirer. It suggests, as Wright says (*Composition of the Four Gospels*, p. 55), that 'busy men like Theophilus had been catechized in their youth, but later occupations had driven out many of the lessons, and unless a man could secure the same catechist whom he had attended as a boy, the frequent discrepancies in the ever-changing tradition would jar on the precision of youthful memory, and produce a general sense of disappointment and uncertainty.' Oral tradition had its merits. It was vital and free from any danger of codifying the Christian spirit. But among its defects were liability to discrepancies (cf. Josephus *c. [Note: circa, about.] Apion*. i. 2) and absence of uniformity. Furthermore, if there is no other instance of one Christian hailing another by a secular title in the NT, on the other hand there is no case of a Christian writing for the benefit of any save fellow-Christians. Besides, such a title need not have been incongruous with Christianity. If Theophilus was of high rank, the faith which bade Christians honour all men would not preclude a Christian author from employing such a title once in a semi-formal prologue to his work. (2) That Theophilus was a man of rank is suggested by the term *κράτιστε* = 'most excellent' or 'your excellency' (Act 23:26; Act 24:3; Act 26:25), which may be almost semi-technical, and in any case implies respect for exalted position and high authority, though the idea of intimacy and affection need not be excluded (cf. Josephus *Ant.* vi. 8, etc.). He may have been on the proconsular staff, or an official of some kind in the Imperial service. And this would tally with the special emphasis laid by St. Luke upon the relation of the Church to the Empire, and the repeated connexions which he suggests between the political affairs of the age and the progress of Christianity (cf. e.g. Ramsay, *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* ch. iii.), especially in Acts. His social position is further suggested by the internal evidence of the Third Gospel, which, as has been often pointed out (cf. e.g. *Encyc. Bibl.* 1792), is specially concerned with the hindrances thrown up by money and rank in the path of a consistent Christian character. 'Lk. seems to see, as the main obstacles to the Faith, not hypocrisies, nor Jewish backsliding, but the temptations of wealth and social position acting upon

half-hearted converts; and his sayings about building the tower, putting the hand to the plough, renouncing all one's possessions, and hating father and mother, are pathetic indications of what must have been going on in the divided household of many a young Theophilus.' In the case of Theophilus, however, wealth and dignity did not form an obstacle to faith. It says something for this well-to-do Christian that he was willing to be instructed, and evidently keen to learn the historic principles of his faith. To his open-mindedness we owe, in one sense, two of the most important historical documents in early Christian literature. For it is plain that this man's need stirred his friend to write. Behind Theophilus he probably saw many a likeminded inquirer. This catechumen's case was in some ways typical and characteristic, and thus St. Luke was led to write his Gospel narrative, an instance of the 'first and noblest use' of the human imagination, 'that is to say, of the power of perceiving things which cannot be perceived by the senses,' viz. 'to call up the scenes and facts in which we are commanded to believe, and be present, as if in the body, at every recorded event of the history of the 'Redeemer' (Ruskin, *Frondees Agrestes*, § 9). The writer's aim was personal, as well as modest and religious. Early Christian literature sprang from no literary ambition. Even in its historic form it was practical and didactic. But in this case the writer, like Burke, who originally drew up his *Reflections on the French Revolution* for the benefit of a puzzled young friend, has gained a wider reach and range for his pen's products than perhaps he contemplated when he began.

The omission of the semi-formal adjective *κράτιστε* in [Act 1:1](#) is not unnatural. It is needless to see anything subtle or significant in the change from [Luk 1:3](#). No doubt the excessive use of the term was one feature of ancient servility (Theophrastus, *Char.* 5). But St. Luke might well have used it twice in two volumes without any fear of incurring the charge of obsequiousness, and we cannot suppose he dropped the adjective lest he should be guilty of bad taste. Still less probable is the conjecture that the absence of the title in [Act 1:1](#) denotes the conversion of Theophilus to Christianity since [Luk 1:3](#) had been written. For this there is no evidence whatsoever, and we have already seen that there was no necessary incongruity in applying such a title of honour, pagan though it was, to a fellow-Christian.

Literature.—In addition to the articles in Bible Dictionaries. *s.v.*, and to the critical editors on [Luk 1:1-4](#), see the monographs on that passage already referred to, and add Blass, *Philology of Gospels*, pp. 7-20, with Zahn's *Einleitung in das NT*, § 60.

J. Moffatt.

THIEF (κλέπτης).—Thieves are mentioned in the following passages of the Gospels, besides several others where Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 substitutes ‘robber’ as the equivalent of ληστής. See Robber. 1. Mat 6:19-20 = Luk 12:23. Christ’s disciples should have their treasure where thieves do not break (lit. ‘dig’) through and steal. Eastern houses, being commonly of mud or sun-dried brick, are easily broken into; cf. Exo 22:2, Job 24:16, Eze 12:5; Eze 7:2. Mat 24:43 = Luk 12:39. The unexpectedness of Christ’s coming is compared to that of a thief’s entry. This figure seems to have greatly impressed the Apostles; it is echoed several times in the NT (1Th 5:2, (4), 2Pe 3:10, Rev 3:3; Rev 16:15). 3. Joh 10:1; Joh 10:8; Joh 10:10. False and self-seeking teachers—whether false Christs, or, more probably, Pharisees—are compared to thieves and robbers. 4. Joh 12:6. Judas ‘was a thief, and having the bag’ (lit. ‘box’) ‘took away what was put therein’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885).

Harold Smith.

☩ Thirst

THIRST.—The occasions on which the physical suffering arising from thirst is noted by the Evangelists are connected in every instance with the personal experiences of Jesus. Early in His public ministry, as He was journeying back from Judaea to Galilee, leaving the former country as a result of Pharisaic hostility, the writer of the Fourth Gospel notices that Jesus suffered the pangs of thirst, and records His request for a drink of water from the Samaritan woman as she came to draw water from ‘Jacob’s spring’ (πηγή τοῦ Ἰακώβ, Joh 4:6). It is remarkable that this author mentions this fact, as well as the weariness felt by Jesus in His journey, side by side with the title (ὁ κούρος, Joh 4:1) which betrays the writer’s attitude towards His claims over human life and conduct.

The other instance of Jesus’ suffering in this respect is also mentioned by this writer, who records His cry ‘I thirst’ (διψῶ, Joh 19:28) from the cross. And although he seems to connect the expression with the fulfilment of Messianic prophecy (cf. Psa 69:21), there can be no doubt as to the reality of the feeling which prompted the utterance of the Sufferer. The intensity of His suffering is attested by the unwonted interference of one of the soldier-guards, who, out of compassion for the Crucified, attempted to allay His anguish. One result of these and such like incidents in the course of His life is to be seen in the vivid portraiture by Jesus of the great Day of

final judgment. The common physical wants of struggling humanity afford opportunities of service in the sacred cause outlined by the two great commandments of the Law (Mat 22:36 ff.). Nor must we omit to notice the basis upon which Jesus has placed the service of man by men, and the grounds upon which He distributes the final awards. To every believer in the cosmic significance of the Incarnation the use of the first person (ἐδίψησα, etc.) by the Judge-King (Mat 25:34) who is ‘the Son of Man’ (Mat 25:31), reveals the nature and character of His sympathy with our weaknesses (συνπαθῆσαι ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν, Heb 4:15), and guarantees the truth of the assertion that ‘it was necessary that he should in all things become like his brethren’ (ὡφείλεν κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι, Heb 2:17).

Following the example of OT thinkers, Jesus employed the idea embodied in the word ‘thirst’ to express the conscious needs of the human soul for something higher and more satisfying than it could discover in its earthly experiences (cf. Isa 55:1, Psa 42:2 etc.). Just as man in the vigour of physical health revolts against physical deprivation in the shape of thirst, so in proportion to his spiritual health and energy he reaches out and cries for spiritual satisfaction, and cannot rest as long as his wants are unsupplied. In this restlessness Jesus sees a source of men’s ultimate happiness, and those He accounts blessed (μακάριοι) who thirst for righteousness (διψῶντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην, Mat 5:6). As might perhaps be expected, the Johannine writer makes the most frequent reference to this feature of Jesus’ teaching. Belief in Himself, Jesus asserts to be the means by which spiritual thirst is assuaged (cf. Joh 6:35; Joh 7:37); and if we compare this statement with its expansion and elaboration, we will observe that by belief He means the spiritual appropriation of His entire Manhood (ἡ σὰρξ μου ... τὸ αἷμά μου ἀληθὴς ἐστι πόσις, Joh 6:56).

On two distinct occasions Jesus makes incidental, though didactic, reference to the profound union, between Himself and those who believe on Him, hinted at above. In His conversation with the woman of Samaria He characteristically emphasizes His teaching by the details in her drawing of the water from the fountain. For her the well was a source of the satisfaction of personal need, and at the same time a means of supplying the needs of others dependent on her. In a manner analogous to this, if she had drunk of the living water which He was ready to supply, Jesus promised her a part in His glorious work of sharing with others out of the fulness she had received (cf. Joh 1:16). In her the living water would become ‘a fountain springing unto eternal life’ (ἐν αὐτῷ πηγὴ ὕδατος ἀλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, Joh 4:14). This thought is more definitely and directly stated by Jesus during the Feast of Tabernacles which He

attended in Jerusalem. His invitation to all who thirsted (ἐάν τις διψᾷ, Joh 7:37) to come to Him and drink was followed by the promise, founded on the phraseology and thought of the OT (Isa 12:3; Isa 58:11, etc.), that they who accepted would themselves become sources of blessing and satisfaction to their fellow-men (ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας, κ.τ.λ., Joh 7:38). ‘He who drinks of the Spiritual Rock becomes in turn himself a rock from within which the waters flow to slake the thirst of others’ (Westcott, *Gospel of St. John, ad loc.*). It is impossible not to see in this living relationship between Jesus and believers the foundation upon which must ultimately rest all human activities, as they display themselves in the service of the race.

J. R. Willis.

☩ Thistles

THISTLES.—In the NT thistles (τριβόλοι) are mentioned twice (Mat 7:16, Heb 6:8 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). The term, however, is loosely employed, and probably embraces several genera of spinous plants, in which Palestine is peculiarly rich. In Hebrew there is a very extensive and varied nomenclature, about twenty terms being employed which denote prickly shrubs or weeds; but in many instances the precise meaning is unknown, while in many others the words are used in the most general way. Tristram, who goes very fully into the matter (*Nat. Hist. of Bible*, 423-432), identifies Heb. *hōah* with the common thistle (*Carduus*) and *dardar* with knapweed (*Centaurea*). Of the former there are many species, the most common among them being: (1) *Notabasis syriaca*, a tall thistle with pink flowers; (2) the yellow spotted thistle (*Scolymus maculatus*); and (3) *Carthamus oxycanthus*, which has a yellow flower. Of the latter there are also many species, notably the star-thistle (*Centaurea calcitrapa*). These plants were exceedingly troublesome to the farmer, the corn-fields often being overrun with them.

The only reference to thistles which occurs in the Gospels is in our Lord’s question, ‘Do men gather ... figs of thistles?’¹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (Mat 7:16).

Hugh Duncan.

☩ Thomas

THOMAS.—One of the twelve Apostles. (For the name see Didymus). In the lists of the Twelve his name is always in the second group of four. In Mar 3:18, where the names are not in pairs, he is eighth; so in Luk 6:15, where he is coupled with Matthew. In Mat 10:3 he is seventh, coming before Matthew. In Act 1:13 he is sixth, and is coupled with Philip. No incident is recorded of him in the Synoptics or in Acts; but he comes into some prominence in the later scenes in the Fourth Gospel. When Jesus is about to return to Judaea because of the death of Lazarus, and the disciples are afraid of Jewish hostility, Thomas says, ‘Let us also go, that we may die with him’ (Joh 11:16). In the conversation after the Supper, Thomas interjects the remark, ‘Lord, we know not whither thou goest; and how can we know the way?’ (Joh 14:5); and thereby elicits the great saying, ‘I am the way, the truth, and the life’ (Joh 14:6). When Jesus appeared to the disciples on the evening of the Resurrection day, Thomas was absent, and was unable afterwards to accept the testimony, ‘We have seen the Lord.’ He must himself not only see the Master, but touch His body before he could believe (Joh 20:24-25). A week later Thomas is present when Jesus again appears; and then his doubts vanish, and he rises to the completest confession of faith recorded in the Gospels, ‘My Lord and my God’ (Joh 20:26-29). Thomas is mentioned also in Joh 21:2 as one of the group to whom Jesus appeared on the morning by the Lake-side.

Later traditions of Thomas, obviously of little value, are mentioned in Eusebius and in the Apocryphal *Acts of Thomas*. He is spoken of as a missionary to Parthia, or to India. Some traditions assign to him the honour of martyrdom; and his supposed grave was shown at Edessa in the 4th century.

The personality of Thomas has a clear and consistent expression in the incidents which the Fourth Gospel records. He belongs to the quiet, reflective group of the Apostolic company; and his temperament is that of a man who finds the best things too good to be true, and who usually imagines that the worst foreseen possibility will be realized. He requires direct personal evidence, and will not hastily accept the testimony even of his friends. Yet he is not lacking in devotion and love to his Lord. He will die with Him rather than desert His cause; and in his gloomiest days of unbelief he does not separate himself from the Apostolic company. Though not persuaded of the reality of the Resurrection, he keeps his old loyalty and love; and when the Master’s presence is utterly sure, he gladly accepts the highest that the revelation of Christ implies. His unbelief was never a failure to respond to the spiritual truth and love brought to him by his Master; at most it was an inability to accept unexpected and marvellous external manifestations of that truth. ‘In Thomas we have a man incredulous but tenacious; despondent but true; with little hope but much courage; sincere in love though perplexed in faith; neither rushing to the right conclusion as Peter might have done, nor rushing away from it into danger and dishonour as Peter did’ (T. T. Lynch).

The scepticism of Thomas has a real apologetic value. It goes to disprove the contention that the Apostles were credulous persons easily misled by their hopes, and so deluded into a mistaken belief that their dead Master had spoken to them. Thomas believed because the fact which was too good to hope for became too certain to reject.

Literature.—Among expository sermons on Thomas may be named F. W. Robertson, *Serm.* ii. 268; T. T. Lynch, *Serm. for my Curates*, 33; H. M. Butler, *Univ. and other Serm.* 43; A. B. Davidson, *The Called of God*, 317.

E. H. Titchmarsh.

✠Thorns

THORNS.—Palestine is unusually rich in acanthous plants. As many as 50 genera and 200 species occur in Palestine and Syria, ‘besides a multitude clothed with scabrous, strigose, or stinging hairs, and another multitude with prickly fruits’ (Post in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible iv. 753). In the OT references to thorns are numerous, and many different words are used to express them. But the vocabulary, though full, is very indefinite, many of the terms employed being as vague and general as our own English word ‘thorns.’ We have the reflex of this uncertain terminology in Authorized and Revised Versions, which renders almost indiscriminately by ‘thistle,’ ‘thorn,’ or ‘bramble,’ a single Hebrew word. In the NT three terms occur, viz. ἄκανθα, τριβόλος, and σκόλοψ. The last-named is found only in 2Co 12:7 ‘There was given to me a thorn (σκόλοψ) in the flesh,’ but in this instance the rendering should rather be ‘stake’ or ‘pale.’ The second (τριβόλος) has already been explained (see Thistles). It remains that we should consider ἄκανθα (Mat 7:16; Mat 13:7; Mat 13:22, Mar 4:7; Mar 4:18, Luk 6:44; Luk 8:7; Luk 8:14, Joh 19:2, Heb 6:8), which is invariably translated ‘thorns.’ Strictly speaking, this term denotes *Acanthus spinosus*, a Showy perennial with deeply indented and spiny leaves, and bearing white flowers tinged with pink. In the NT, however, it is a quite general term for all thorny or prickly plants, and is applied to bushes and weeds alike. Among the most common are thorny Astragali, which abound in the higher mountainous regions, and many species of Acacia, Eryngium, Rhamnus, Rubus, Solanum, etc. Some of them, such as *Poterium spinosum* and *Rhamnus punctata*, are found in all parts of the country. In our Third Gospel mention is made of the bramble (βάτος, Luk 6:44). This may quite possibly be the common bramble (*Rubus fruticosus*), which is found in many parts of Palestine. It is

noteworthy, however, that, except in this one passage, βάτος is always rendered 'bush,' and is used only of the 'burning bush' of Moses (Mar 12:26, Luk 20:37 etc.). The corresponding Heb. word (אֲרָז) is similarly restricted in its use. As the bramble is not found on Horeb (Sinai), it has been thought by some that the 'bush' was a kind of acacia. For the crown of thorns which was set in mockery on the head of Christ (Joh 19:2), see Crown of Thorns.

Much might easily be said regarding the symbolism of thorns in the Scriptures. But it may be sufficient merely to note that they were regarded as the direct consequence of human sin, and so became the natural symbols of sin and the sufferings in which it issues (Gen 3:18, Num 33:55, Pro 22:5 etc.). In the light of this symbolism there is an apt pathos and beauty in the fact that Christ was crowned with thorns (see Cox, *An Expositor's Note Book*, 349 ff.; and Earl Lytton, *Fables in Song*, i.).

Hugh Duncan.

☞ Three

THREE.—See Number.

☞ Threshing-Floor

THRESHING-FLOOR.—See Agriculture in vol. i. p. 40^a.

☞ Throne

THRONE (θρόνος) is a term applied, first of all, to the royal seat of a king; and, secondly, to the official seat of a judge or subordinate ruler. In the former sense it is employed of heaven as the throne of God (Mat 5:34; Mat 23:22). The Messianic reign of Jesus is foretold by Zacharias in the words, 'The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David' (Luk 1:32). Jesus speaks of His own exaltation as the time 'when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory' (Mat 19:28; Mat 25:31). The universal dominion which He is to share with His Father is suggested by 'the Lamb in the midst of the throne' (Rev 5:6; Rev 7:17), and by 'the throne of God and of the Lamb' (Rev 22:3). So in Heb 8:1; Heb 12:2 Christ is seated 'on the right hand of the

throne' of God. The promise given to the Twelve, of sitting on thrones of judgment (Mat 19:28 || Luk 22:30), is practically given to all who overcome in the battle with evil (Rev 3:21). In Col 1:16 'thrones' are among the subordinate powers of the universe which owe their creation to Christ.

James Patrick.

⚡Thunder

THUNDER (βροντή) is but twice mentioned in the Gospels (Mar 3:17, Joh 12:29). In mountainous Palestine, with the long deep gorge of the Jordan, it is perhaps the most awe-inspiring of natural phenomena. It seldom occurs save in the winter half of the year, and is almost invariably accompanied by rain. For the old Israelites thunder was the voice of God, with a meaning which persons specially gifted might understand. 'It seems probable that the "voice out of heaven" (Joh 12:28-29) was a thunder-peal, as indeed most of those present thought, and that its significance was recognized and interpreted by Jesus alone' (Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iv. 757^b). The surname 'sons of thunder' given to James and John (Mar 3:17) disappears at once and finally from the records. On the available data no sure opinion can be formed as to why it was applied to them. As men in the East are called 'sons' of that which is most characteristic of them, there was doubtless something 'thunderly' about them,—a tendency, e.g., to wrathful resentment of slight or injury (Luk 9:54). See Boanerges.

W. Ewing.

⚡Tiberias

TIBERIAS (Τιβεριάς).—A city situated on the W. shore of the Sea of Galilee, founded by Herod Antipas, and named by him in honour of the Emperor Tiberius. The original inhabitants were foreigners, whom Herod either forced to reside in the new city or to whom he gave special inducements if they would. Our Lord, so far as is known, never visited Tiberias, it being His custom to avoid Gentile cities. The only reference to the city in the NT is Joh 6:23, in which it is stated that 'there came boats from Tiberias unto the place where they ate the bread after the Lord had given thanks' (cf. Joh 6:1; Joh 21:1).

1. Location.—The ancient city was situated directly on the shore of the Sea of Galilee, and therefore approximately 682 feet below the level of the Mediterranean, at the north end of a narrow rectangular plain about two miles long, which was bounded by a rather steep ridge of hills rising abruptly to the west. From the ruins still to be found in the vicinity it is probable that the ancient city extended considerably farther south of the modern town. Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. ii. 3; cf. *BJ* iv. i. 3) says that there were ‘warm baths a little distance from it in a village called Emmaus’ (Hammath?). According to the Talmud (Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] *Megilla*, i. 1), the city was built upon the ancient site of Rakkath of Naphtali; and it is further stated (*Sanhed.* 12a) that in the 4th cent. the Jews had actually dropped the name Tiberias and reverted to the ancient name Rakkath. On the other hand, in the Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] Talmud, Tiberias is sometimes identified with Rakkath, sometimes with Hammath, and sometimes with Chinnereth (cf. Jos 19:35). Jerome (*Onom.* 112. 28 ff.) identifies it with Chinnereth.

2. History.—Herod Antipas is supposed to have completed the building of Tiberias about a.d. 22. Ancient sepulchres were removed to make room for the new foundations, and accordingly the Jews regarded the new city as legally unclean (cf. Num 19:11 ff.). Nevertheless the town grew with great rapidity, and, before the downfall of Jerusalem had become one of the chief cities of Palestine. Herod had made it the capital of Galilee, removing the seat of government from Sepphoris, the former capital. The city was fortified by Josephus when commander-in-chief of Galilee (c. [Note: circa, about.] a.d. 66). During the struggle of the Jews with Rome, its inhabitants remained loyal to the national cause. When, however, Vespasian appeared before its walls with three legions, the citizens yielded without resistance. Vespasian restored it to Herod Agrippa II., who stripped it of its political prestige by transferring the capital again to Sepphoris. When Agrippa died (a.d. 100), it fell directly under Roman rule. Shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem (a.d. 70), Tiberias became the chief seat of the Jews and of Jewish learning. According to Epiphanius, it was not long before the city was inhabited exclusively by Jews. In the 2nd cent. the Sanhedrin, which had been shifted from Jerusalem to Jamnia and then to Sepphoris, was established at Tiberias under the presidency of the celebrated Rabbi Judah the Holy.

3. Present condition.—The modern town is called by the Arabs *Tâbarîyeh*. Traces still remain of the ancient city along the Lake, especially to the south of the present town. Heaps of stones, columns of grey granite, foundations of buildings, and of a thick wall which extended almost to the famous baths, all confirm the supposition that the ancient city extended at one time farther south. The present town is defended on the land side by a wall furnished with towers. There are the ruins of a once imposing castle at the N.W. corner. But castle, walls, and houses were seriously damaged by the earthquakes of 30th Oct. 1759 and of 1st Jan. 1837. Among the

famous tombs of Tiberias are those of Maimonides, and Rabbis 'Akiba and Jochanan. To-day Tiberias has a population of approximately 4000 souls, of whom about two-thirds are Jews and the other third Mohammedans and Christians of different sects. The Protestants have a well-equipped hospital, and are doing a good religious work under the United Free Church of Scotland. The Jews occupy a squalid quarter in the middle of the town, adjacent to the Lake. The city as a whole is 'a picture of disgusting filth and frightful wretchedness.' Of late, however, the place is improving somewhat, having become the seat of a Turkish *kaimakan*, or governor.

Tiberias is hot and fever-haunted. The breezes from the Mediterranean are prevented from striking the city by the hills which bound the plain on the west. The winters are mild, snow being very rarely known. The Lake furnishes the only supply of water. The view from the city embraces the whole extent of the Sea of Galilee except the S.W. extremity. Schürer speaks of Tiberias as 'the most beautiful spot in Galilee,' which, however, is an exaggeration. At present it is one of the four sacred cities of the Jews in Palestine, the others being Jerusalem, Hebron, and Safed. The study of the Talmud still flourishes in Tiberias.

Literature.—Robinson, *BRP* [Note: *RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.*] iii. 254 ff.; Baedeker-Socin, *Pal.* [Note: *Palestine, Palestinian.*] 286 ff.; Guérin, *Galilée*, i. 250 ff.; Neubauer, *Géog. du Talm.* [Note: *Talmud.*] 208 ff.; Merrill, art. 'Tiberias' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible : Buhl, *GAP* [Note: *AP Geographic des alten Palästina.*] 226 f.; Reland, *Pal.* [Note: *Palestine, Palestinian.*] ii. 1036; G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [Note: *GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*] 447 ff.; Burckhardt, *Travels*, 320 ff.; Murray, *Syria-Pal.* [Note: *Palestine, Palestinian.*] 251; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] II. i. 143 ff.; Wilson, *Lands of the Bible*, ii. 116 ff.; Ritter, *Geog. of Pal.* [Note: *Palestine, Palestinian.*] ii. 256 ff.; art. 'Tiberias' in *Ebi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*] iv.

George L. Robinson.

☞Tiberius

TIBERIUS.—In Luk 3:1 f. it is stated that a word of God came upon John the Baptist, in the 15th year of the rule of Tiberius Caesar. It is by no means certain what year is indicated by this date. The sole rule of Tiberius began in a.d. 14; the 15th year of this sole rule would be a.d. 28. But it is more probable that we ought to count from the time at which Tiberius received power equal with that of Augustus over the provinces of the Empire, that is, from the end of a.d. 11; this brings us to a.d. 25-26 (Ramsay, *Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?* p. 199 ff.).

Tiberius Claudius Nero, named after his adoption Tiberius Julius Caesar, on the monuments bears the name Tiberius Caesar Augustus. He was the son of Tiberius Claudius Nero (a Roman noble) and Livia (whom Augustus took to wife while her husband was still alive), and was born in b.c. 42. Constitutionally, the principate died with each Emperor, and the Emperor could not appoint a successor. Augustus got over this difficulty by appointing a partner or co-regent in the Empire: it was practically impossible to pass over such in electing to the principate. The Imperial powers were gradually conferred on this consort. M. Vipsanius Agrippa first held this position (died b.c. 12). Marcellus (who died b.c. 23) and Gaius and Lucius Caesar were marked out as successors. In their youth they were entrusted to the care of Tiberius, who was forced to divorce his wife and marry Augustus' daughter Julia (b.c. 11). By this time Tiberius had proved himself an able soldier, and in b.c. 9 was raised to the position which Agrippa had occupied. Augustus had a dislike to Tiberius, and did not desire his succession. This obvious desire to use Tiberius selfishly, for his own ends, embittered the life of the latter, and in b.c. 6 he retired to Rhodes, and remained there eight years in solitude, while his young stepsons received advancement in the State. But they died—Lucius in a.d. 2, and Gaius in a.d. 4. In this latter year Tiberius was adopted by Augustus, and was at the same time compelled to adopt his own nephew Germanicus. In a.d. 11 he was raised practically to a position of equality with Augustus. On the death of the latter, in a.d. 14, his sole reign began. He was a thoroughly competent Emperor; but a naturally reserved temperament, influenced by early disappointments and outraged feelings, resulted in weakness and cruelty. His fear of conspiracy made him encourage informers, and many supposed rivals were put to death. In the second half of his reign he was much under the influence of one Sejanus, an accomplished schemer, whose duplicity and crime he realized only after much evil had been wrought by him. By this time he had retired to spend the closing years of his life in the island of Capri, where he died on 16th March a.d. 37. His principate thus covers all the period of the Gospel history.

Literature.—J. B. Bury, *A History of the Roman Empire* (London, 1893 and later); J. Bergmans, *Die Quellen der Vita Tiberii des Cassius Dio* (Amsterdam, 1903); R. Cagnat, *Cours d'Épigraphie Latine*³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (Paris, 1898), p. 179 ff. etc. It is generally admitted that the ancient authorities take too severe a view, based on the memoirs of Agrippina, the enemy of Tiberius: these ancient authorities are, Tacitus, *Annals*; Suetonius, *Life of Tiberius*; and Dio Cassius.

Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.] Souter.

TILES.—The man sick of the palsy was let down ‘through the tiles’ (Authorized Version ‘tiling’). See art. House in vol. i. p. 753^a.

Timaeus

TIMAEUS.—See Bartimaeus.

Time

TIME.—1. The word ‘time’ is used in the Gospels in a variety of phrases more or less indefinite. Probably the most definite expression is ἐν στιγμή ἁρόνου, ‘in a moment of time’ (Luk_4:5). ἁρόνος is used of time in general (Luk_1:57; Luk_8:27, Mar_9:21, Joh_5:6), passing or having passed. In a similar sense we find ὥρα (Mar_6:35) rendered ‘day’ in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 (see Day). More definite is ἀπὸ τὸτε, ‘from that time’ (Mat_4:17; Mat_16:21, Luk_16:16), and ἕως τοῦ νῦν, ‘until now’ (Mat_24:21 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, Mar_13:19). The most important word, however, is καιρός, used invariably of a definite period or occasion. Three uses in this sense are noteworthy. (1) It is used to indicate the time of certain events in the ministry of Jesus (Mat_11:25; Mat_12:1; Mat_14:1). (2) In a special sense we have the remarkable passage Joh_7:6; Joh_7:8 ‘My time is not yet come, but your time is always ready,’ where the contrast is used apparently to emphasize the peculiar character of Jesus’ mission and the hostility which it aroused in Jerusalem. (3) Most important is the use of καιρός to indicate the dawn of a new epoch—πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρός, ‘the time is fulfilled’ (cf. Joh_13:33, Luk_12:56, Mat_16:3)—which the ministry of Jesus had inaugurated. This new era is contrasted with the past (Mar_1:15) and with the future (Mar_10:30, Luk_18:30; see artt. Day [That], Generation). In a similar sense of world-period or era we have καιροὶ ἔθνῶν, ‘the times of the Gentiles’ (Luk_21:24; but cf. גְּיִים עַתָּה, *i.e.* judgment-day, Eze_30:3). καιρός is also used of a season of the year (Mar_11:13, Mat_13:30; cf. Luk_12:42).

2. Various methods of reckoning time were in existence at the beginning of the Christian era, and this fact makes it extremely difficult to locate events with any certainty. The time of day was reckoned at the outset mainly by physical

considerations, temperature, etc. (Gen 3:8; Gen 18:1, 1Sa 11:9, Job 24:15), or by the sun's movements (Gen 19:15; Gen 32:24); the night in early Jewish history was reckoned by watches (see artt. Day, Hour, Night, Watch). The days of the week were numbered, not named.

The division of time into **weeks** was probably of Babylonian origin, and would be suggested by the moon's phases, although there is no trace of this influence either in OT or NT. The word for 'week' in the Gospels is *σάββατον* (Luk 18:12). The use of the plural (Mat 28:1, Mar 16:2, Luk 24:1) may have arisen from the Aram. Aramaic *Sabbēthâ*, 'the Sabbath' (Heb. *Shabbâth*), which at an early date gave its name to the whole week.

Of the larger divisions of time, the **month**, so familiar in OT times, is hardly mentioned in the NT (Luk 1:26; Luk 1:36, Joh 4:25). The Jewish month was lunar. Hence the usual Hebrew name for 'month' (*שָׁנָה*) is properly the 'new moon.' Three methods were employed to distinguish the month: (1) old Canaanite names, of which only four now survive; (2) numerals (Gen 7:11, Exo 19:1 etc.); (3) Babylonian names (see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iv. 765).

The Jewish **year**, like the month, was originally lunar, consisting of 354 days. But as this fell so far short of the full solar year, difficulty would naturally arise in celebrating feasts at the same time in each year. To avoid this, it became necessary to add an extra month at least once in three years. This was done by adding a second Adar (the Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] name for the twelfth month), February-March, so contrived that the Passover, celebrated on the 14th Nisan (the first month), should always fall *after* the spring equinox. The exact method of doing this is somewhat obscure. But as a month in three years was hardly sufficient, a cycle of eight years was observed in which three months were intercalated, based on general observation of the seasons. This continued until some time after the Christian era, when a more perfect system, a cycle of nineteen years with seven months intercalated—the invention of an astronomer of Athens named Meton—was adopted. It seems unlikely that the Jews had any fixed chronological calendar in the time of Christ, but this is disputed (see Wieseler, *Chronol. Synopsis of the Four Gospels*, p. 401, etc.).

The *method of reckoning years* is a complicated and difficult subject. In accordance with Eastern ideas, that precision in reckoning events to which we moderns are accustomed was unknown. It was not considered necessary (cf. e.g. the loose phrases 'in the days of Herod the king,' Mat 2:1; and 'Herod being tetrarch of Galilee,' Luk 3:1); nor was it easily attainable. For it was possible for a writer in NT times to employ various systems of reckoning, and it was also possible to employ any one system in various ways. In addition to the various eras in which it was common to

reckon, viz. the Olympiad era beginning b.c. 776; the Seleucid, used in the Books of the Maccabees, beginning b.c. 312; the Actian beginning b.c. 31; there was also the Roman method of reckoning by consuls or emperors (Luk_3:1), and the Jewish by high priests. Further, the year began at a different time in different countries, e.g. the Roman year began on Jan. 1, but in a few cases the emperors dated their years from the date of their election as tribunes of the people on Dec. 10. The Jewish *saercd* year began about the vernal equinox, as did also, in all probability, the years of the Seleucid era. But in Asia Minor a year beginning in autumn was also observed in ordinary use. These and other considerations render it almost impossible to give the precise date of any event even in NT times (see art. Dates). The one date given with any apparent precision is in Luk_3:1 'in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar.' This seems tolerably accurate, but the actual date intended depends on how St. Luke reckoned. He may have dated from the death of Augustus, Aug. 19, a.d. 14, counting that year as the first of Tiberius' reign, or from the beginning of a.d. 15, which was also a method of reckoning. Or he may have reckoned from Dec. 10, a.d. 15, when Tiberius assumed tribunician authority. Or, as the tribunician authority was interrupted in the reign of Tiberius, St. Luke may have dated his reign from the time when he assumed tribunician power the second time. In addition, there is the question whether St. Luke would reckon according to the Roman year from Jan. 1, or, according to local methods prevalent in Syria, from the autumn equinox.

Literature.—Kaestner, *de Aeris*; Bilfinger, *Die antiken Stundenangaben*; Schwarz, *Der Jüd. Kalender*; Lewin, *Fasti Sacri*; Wieseler, *Chron. Synopsis of the Four Gospels*; Ideler, *Handbuch der Chronologie*; Schürer, *HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]* i. 37, ii. App. iii. and iv.; W. M. Ramsay, *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* v.-xi.; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iv. pp. 762^b-766^b, also specially Ext. Vol. 473^b-484.

G. Gordon Stott.

Tithe

TITHE.—On the tithe as a Jewish institution, see art. 'Tithe' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible .

Our Lord makes but three references to the tithes, and they are all of the observance of them by the Pharisees (Mat_23:23, Luk_11:42; Luk_18:12). In the first two passages He contrasts the minute exactness with which the Pharisees observe their less important and external laws of tithe with their careless disregard of the inner and more important virtues of justice, mercy, faith, and the love of God. In Luk_18:12 He

illustrates how compliance with external requirements, especially when these are exceeded, as in the case of the Pharisees, and dissociated from the corresponding state of heart, breeds a culpable and overweening self-righteousness. Our Lord in these references, as also in Mat 5:19, recognizes degrees of importance in the Law's demands. Minute observance of the less important does not excuse from attending to the greater, but neither does compliance with the greater absolve from the obligation to observe the lesser. 'This ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.' Our Lord evidently thought the tithe, as well as the other OT institutions, of Divine origin, and binding upon the Jews of His day. At the same time, He foresaw a period when outward observances should give place to the more purely inward, as men should worship the Father in spirit and in truth (Joh 4:21-24). See also artt. Anise and Rue.

G. Goodspeed.

☩ Title On The Cross

TITLE ON THE CROSS.—The technical word τίτλος is found only in Joh 19:19; Mat 27:37 has αἰτία, Luk 23:38 ἐπιγραφή, and Mar 15:26 ἡ ἐπιγραφή τῆς αἰτίας. Again, as regards the wording of the *titulus*, no two Gospels agree exactly. Mt. has οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; Mk. ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; Lk. ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὗτος; and Jn. Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

The only important variation is in the case of Lk., where the Textus Receptus reads οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ β. τ. Ι., probably from assimilation| to the form given by Mt. The form above given (Luk 23:38) is found in \aleph BL [Note: L Bampton Lecture.] , and is supported by the Latin of D [Note: Deuteronomist.] : *rex Judæorum hic est*. The so-called Gospel of Peter, taking the words as an insult to Jesus on the part of the Jews, reads: οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ β. τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

It was customary at Roman executions, at least in the case of remarkable prisoners, for the charge under which the prisoner was suffering to be written briefly on a tablet (σανίς) covered with gypsum (γύψω ἀλημιμένος, Suidas; cf. *titulus qui causam pœnæ indicavit* [Suet. *Cal.* 32], and μετὰ γραμμάτων τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς θανατώσεως αὐτοῦ δηλοῦντων [Dio Cassius, liv. 3]). This was usually hung round the neck of the criminal, or

carried before him to the place of execution (*præcedente titulo* [Suet. *Cal.* 32]). It was afterwards hung from, or fixed to, the top of the cross.

Other words for this tablet are *πίναξ* and *λεύκωμα*. The letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons, preserved by Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* v. 1), gives an instance of such a *titulus* in the case of one of the martyrs. The words are: *πίνακος ἀπὸν προάγοντος, ἐν ᾧ ἐγγράφητο Ῥωμαῖσι, οὗτός ἐστιν Ἄτταλος ὁ χριστιαγός*. This agrees exactly with the form of the title as given by Mt.

The Synoptists merely mention the fact that such a title was placed over the cross of Jesus. St. John, who writes as an eye-witness, adds some interesting particulars—(1) that Pilate wrote the title; (2) that it was written Ἑβραῖσι, Ῥωμαῖσι, Ἑλληνισί (the similar words in the Textus Receptus of Lk. are merely an interpolation from Jn.); (3) that Pilate, in spite of the expostulation of the chief priests, scornfully refused to alter the form of what he had written. With reference to (1) Westcott (on Joh 19:19) remarks: ‘The Roman governor found expression to the last for the bitterness which had been called out in him by the opposition of the Jews ... the heathen governor completed the unwilling testimony of the Jewish priest’ (Joh 11:49 f.). The three languages of the *τίτλος*—Hebrew (*i.e.* Aramaic), Latin, and Greek—represent, as Westcott remarks, the national, the official, and the common dialects respectively. The true reading, therefore, preserves the more natural order.

Bilingual and trilingual inscriptions such as this were naturally common in the East under the Roman Empire. Grotius (on Mat 27:37) mentions the case of the inscription on the tomb of the Emperor Gordian, which was written in no fewer than five languages; the five being the three above mentioned, together with Persian and Egyptian.

The wording of the title differs in all the four Gospels, as above remarked, and many attempts have been made to harmonize or explain the variations. Wordsworth (on Joh 19:19) has even supposed that the title really ran thus: ‘This is Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews.’ Such an attempt at harmonizing the variations is absolutely unnecessary. All four Gospels agree in giving the important words which were offensive to the chief priests, viz. ‘the King of the Jews.’ Others have supposed the variations to be due to slight differences in the form of the title in the three languages. This, as a general idea, is possible, even probable; but, as regards detail, agreement seems to be nearly hopeless. The uncertainty appears greatest as to the Latin form, which Edersheim finds in Mt., Cook (*Speaker’s Com.*) in Mk., Farrar in Lk., Grotius and Swete in John. In the case of the other two languages the more general consensus of opinion finds the Greek in Mk. and the Hebrew, or rather Aramaic, in

John. It can be said with some confidence that it is more natural that ὁ Ναζωραῖος should represent the word of the Aramaic inscription, as this method of description would have little point for those who would read the Greek or the Latin (cf. Sadler on Joh 19:19). We have seen above that the form given by Mt. agrees with that of the Latin *titulus* mentioned in the letter of the Churches of Gaul. Assuming, then, that Jn. gives the Aramaic form and Mt. the Latin, the Greek must be looked for in Mk., as Lk. agrees with Mt. in retaining the word οὗτος. We may suppose, then, that the various forms were somewhat as follows:

Aramaic: דִּיהוּרָא מְלִכָא דְנַצְרֵי יְשׁוּ

Latin: Hic est Jesus Rex Judaeorum.

Greek: ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

This view agrees with Edersheim (*Life and Times*, ii. 591 n. [Note: note.]), except as regards the order. He supposes the Latin to have been at the top and the Aramaic last; but this is contrary to the only evidence we have. He is certainly right in his attempt to give the Aramaic form of the inscription in words which are really Aramaic. It is strange to explain Hebrew to mean Aramaic and then to give the words in their Hebrew form (cf. Geikie, quoted in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iv. 781, and Farrar's *St. Luke*).

It may be, as Alford writes, 'hardly worth while' to comment on, and endeavour to explain, 'the variations in the Gospels with regard to the Title on the Cross; but one can hardly forbear to remark, what has been so often noticed before, how the three great languages of the world of the time bear witness to the Saviour of Mankind.' 'The three representative languages of the world at that time,' says Plummer (on Joh 19:19)—'the languages of religion, of empire, of intellect—were employed. Thus did they tell it out among the heathen that the Lord is king (or reigned from the tree. Psa 96:10 LXX Septuagint).' These three languages, Westcott writes, 'gathered up the results of the religious, the social, and the intellectual preparation for Christ, and in each, witness was given to His office.' These modern writers expand slightly the more expressive words of Grotius: 'Ille enim erat cui cedere debebat religio judaica, eruditio graeca, robur latinum' (cf. also some little known words of Priscillian [Tract, i. p. 30]: 'In omni littera sive hebraea sive latina sive graeca in omni quod videtur aut dicitur, rex regum et dominorum dominus est, in quibus linguis etsi titulus crucis ponitur, divinum tamen deo testimonium litteratur'). 'Thus the three languages represent not only three races, but their qualities and tendencies. Wherever these exist—where there is an eye to read, a hand to write, a tongue to speak—the cross has

a message and the King a kingdom. The “Title” is, in St. John’s view, the witness of language to the King of the Jews, who is also the King of humanity’ (Alexander, *Leading Ideas of the Gospels*, pp. 277, 278).

Literature.—The Comm., esp. Swete on Mar_15:26, Plummer and Farrar on Luk_23:28, Grotius on Mat_27:37; art. on same subject in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible , vol. iv.; and Edersheim, *LT [Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].]* ii. pp. 590-591.

J. M. Harden.

⚭Tittle

TITTLE (Gr. *κεραία* [WH [Note: H Westcott and Hort’s text.] *κερέα*; see vol. ii. App. p. 151]).—Both the Gr. and the English words occur in NT only in Mat_5:18, Luk_16:17. *κεραία* (‘little horn,’ dim. of *κέρας*) was used by Hesychius and other grammarians of the accents and diacritical marks in Gr., and the slight points and bends by which in Heb. such letters as כ and ך, ך and ך, ה and ך are distinguished from each other. ‘Tittle,’ which is just ‘title’ in another form of spelling (the shorter form is used in all the English VSS [Note: SS Versions.] , except the Rhemish, up to and including the Authorized Version of 1611), comes from *titulus*, which was used in late Lat. to denote any mark or stroke whereby one letter was distinguished from another. It was adopted by Wyclif and Tindale to render *κεραία*—Luther similarly employing *Tüttel* (*Titel* in modernized Germ. spelling). Great [Note: reat Cranmer’s ‘Great’ Bible 1539.] importance was attached by the Rabbis to the little marks by which certain Heb. letters are distinguished from others that they closely resemble, and there are several Jewish sayings which declare that any one who is guilty of interchanging such letters in certain passages of the OT will thereby destroy the whole world (see Edersheim, *LT [Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].]* i. 537 f.; cf. Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* xi. 99).

On the lips of Jesus the saying, ‘One jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law till all be fulfilled’ (Mat_5:18), is startling; and a number of modern critical scholars are inclined to meet the exegetical difficulty by denying the genuineness of the *logion*—regarding it as an answer of the Evangelist himself to the Pauline anti-legalism, or even as a later Jewish-Christian insertion Certainly, if the saying stood by itself, unqualified and uninterpreted in any way, there might be some warrant for such criticism, even although on textual grounds there is nothing to be

said against the verse, which, moreover, reappears in Luke, though in a shorter form. But the very fact that our Lord proceeds in what follows to repeal the old Law at various points, and to substitute for its enactments precepts of His own (Mat 5:31 f., Mat 5:33 ff., Mat 5:38 ff.), suggests that Mat 5:18, so far from being likely on His lips to mislead His hearers utterly, would be understood easily enough as nothing more than an emphatic affirmation, in the Master's own characteristic style, of the rounded perfection of the ideal law. The objection that the reference to the jot and the tittle implies the written Law, and not the ideal law, has little force. One might as well say that when Jesus, in Mat 5:29-30, bids His disciples pluck out their right eyes or cut off their right hands, He is urging them to a literal self-mutilation, inasmuch as hands and eyes are physical realities, not ideal things.

When we remember that Jesus was constantly charged by His enemies with being a law-breaker (Mar 2:16; Mar 2:18; Mar 2:24 etc.), we may see in the saying an utterance that has its polemical bearing. Immediately after (v. 20) we find Him declaring, 'Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven.' And elsewhere He affirms that the Pharisaic and Rabbinic legalism led to a positive dishonouring of the Divine law in the interests of a human tradition (Mar 7:8-9; Mar 7:13). There were thus two reasons why on polemical grounds Jesus should assert the claims of the OT Law in the strongest possible way: (1) Because His enemies themselves continually dishonoured it: (2) because they falsely accused Him of being indifferent to it. And apart from polemics altogether, there was this positive reason why He should 'magnify the law and make it honourable'—He knew (Mar 7:17) that the very purpose of His coming was, not to destroy it, but to fulfil. And so in the striking language of paradox and even of hyperbole that He was wont to use when He felt strongly and desired to speak strongly, He exclaimed, 'For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all be fulfilled.'

The point of the saying clearly lies in the word 'fulfilled.' Christ comes, not to lower the standards of righteousness, as His enemies said, but to exalt them (cf. Mar 7:20). He comes, indeed, to repeal much in the old Law. The jots and tittles, be it observed, *are* to pass away when the Law is fulfilled. But He is to repeal the old by supplying the power for its true fulfilment, and by showing how the letter is transcended by the spirit. Regarded in this way, the saying is nothing more than an arresting utterance of the familiar Christian truth of the relation in spiritual things between the kernel and the husk, the calyx and the flower. Every fibre of the husk is precious—until the time comes for the living germ to be released. Each tiny, pointed sepal of the enfolding calyx must be preserved in its integrity—until the hour arrives for the bursting of the perfect corolla. Thus Jesus comes, not to destroy the least commandment (Mar 7:19), but to fulfil it. His 'royal law,' as St. James calls it (Jam 2:8), the law of liberty and

love, is an abrogation of the Divine Law that went before only in the sense in which the blossom abrogates the bud and the flower the blossom. See, further, art. Law, § 6.

Literature.—Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , art. 'Tittle,' and Ext. Vol. p. 24 f.; Weiss, *NT Theol.* i. 108; Beyschlag, *NT Theol.* i. 40; Wendt, *Teach. of Jesus*, ii. 7 ff.; Bruce, *Kingdom of God*, p. 64, and *EGT [Note: GT Expositor's Greek Testament.]*, Mt. *in loc.*; Dods in *Expositor*, iv. ix. [1894] 70 ff.

J. C. Lambert.

☩ Toleration, Tolerance

TOLERATION, TOLERANCE.—The Lord Jesus Christ exemplified the highest forms of toleration and encouraged the virtue in His disciples (Mar_9:38-40). The Jews had no dealings with the Samaritans (Joh_4:9), yet Jesus laboured in Samaria (John 4, Luk_9:52), healed and praised a Samaritan leper (Luk_17:15-19), and chose a Samaritan, in preference to a Levite and a priest, to exhibit the meaning of the term 'neighbour' (Luk_10:30-37). When His enemies asked, 'Say we not well that thou art a Samaritan, and hast a demon?' He passed over the former and limited His reply to a denial of the latter charge (Joh_8:48 f.). While by example and teaching He sought to build a bridge of kindly consideration from the side of Judaism, He built also from the other side, and declared in Samaria that the Jews were to be respected as the possessors of the means of salvation (Joh_4:22; cf. Rom_3:1-2; Rom_10:2; Rom_11:25-31). There are other kinds of tolerance manifested by the Lord. Persons of diverse views, habits, temperaments, were attracted to Him, so that Petrine and Johannine minds, the tax-gatherer Matthew and the tax-hater Simon, Nicodemus and Zacchaeus, Martha and Mary, found in Him what they needed. His gracious comprehensiveness shielded the good in all. The ascetic Baptist (Mat_11:18), who drew men into the wilderness (Mat_11:7-9), received the highest commendation (Luk_7:26-28) from Him whose scene of ministry was the street and the synagogue, and who honoured with His presence bridal and other feasts (Mat_9:10-12, Joh_2:1-11; Joh_12:2). The Samaritan villagers (Luk_9:52-58), whose intolerance James and John would have avenged, were left alone; thus were they punished, whereas they might have made their place glorious, as he did who lent the Lord the room in which the Holy Supper was instituted (Luk_22:7-20). In this case we see the intolerance of the Samaritans borne with, and (as in Luk_9:49-50) the intolerance of the disciples rebuked.

Again, though the Lord Jesus was frequently compelled to attack the Pharisees on account of their doctrines and practices, He showed them consideration by accepting their hospitality ([Luk_7:36](#); [Luk_11:37](#)); and He reminded His disciples, on an occasion when His enemies criticised His conduct ([Luk_5:30-33](#)), that those who preferred old ways were to be judged leniently ([Luk_5:39](#)). The great parables of Luke 15, besides being a rebuke of the leaders in religion for neglecting to minister to publicans and sinners, are a gracious appeal to share in the delight of seeing men saved,—an appeal to the benevolence latent in the hearts of Christ’s unscrupulous critics. He was tolerant to the intolerant. There is, moreover, a striking proof of the existence, in the minds of the Pharisees, of a strong belief in our Lord’s toleration. No matter how vehemently He denounced their hypocrisy, they were convinced that He was free from animosity. Always they counted upon His forbearance. Of the reality of His power they entertained no doubt, though they could assign it to a Satanic origin ([Luk_11:15](#), [Mat_9:34](#); [Mat_12:24](#)); and yet so confident were they of impunity, that they never anticipated injury at His hands, and they ridiculed Him openly ([Luk_16:14](#)). They were aware that His graciousness alone spared them, and they knew that that graciousness would not fail.

W. J. Henderson.

☒Toll

TOLL.—See Publican, and Receipt of Custom.

☒Tomb, Grave, Sepulchre

TOMB, GRAVE, SEPULCHRE

The terms ‘tomb’ and ‘sepulchre’ are used in Authorized Version indifferently to translation [μνημεῖον](#), [μνήμα](#), and [τάφος](#). ‘Grave’ is used 8 times ([Mat_27:52-53](#), [Luk_11:44](#), [Joh_5:28](#); [Joh_11:17](#); [Joh_11:31](#); [Joh_11:38](#); [Joh_12:17](#)) as rendering of [μνημειον](#). This last is by far the most frequent Greek word, [μνήμα](#) occurring only in [Mar_5:3](#); [Mar_5:5](#); [Mar_15:46](#), [Luk_8:27](#); [Luk_23:53](#); [Luk_24:1](#). The usage of the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 is as follows. ‘Sepulchre’ is reserved as translation of [τάφος](#) (lit. ‘burying-place’): [Mat_23:27](#); [Mat_23:29](#); [Mat_27:61](#); [Mat_27:64](#); [Mat_27:66](#); [Mat_28:1](#) [all the Gospel occurrences of [τάφος](#)]. In all the other passages

'tomb' is substituted for 'sepulchre,' or retained where Authorized Version already has it, as translation either of *μνημεῖον* or *μνῆμα*. 'Grave' thus disappears entirely in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 .

The forms of sepulture that a people adopts depend partly upon religious belief, partly upon climate, partly upon the geological structure of the country. Among the Hebrews, while the conception of a personal resurrection arose only after the return from the Exile, the belief in Sheol as a place where the soul after death remained in some sort of connexion with the body did much to determine the disposal of the corpse and the nature of the tomb. Early in Hebrew history the burial customs became stereotyped. Between the days of Abraham and Jesus they underwent no essential modification.

1. Religious belief demanded (a) that the body should be buried (see Burial). The soul of the unburied person was supposed to have no rest, and even in Sheol the souls of such lurked in the corners (Isa 14:15, Eze 32:23). Any one, therefore, who discovered a dead body was under a sacred obligation to bury it. The soul of the body left unburied was regarded as almost under a curse (1Ki 14:11; 1Ki 16:4; 1Ki 21:24). (b) That members of the same family should be buried, if possible, in the same tomb (Gen 47:29-30; Gen 49:29-31, 2Sa 19:37, 1Ki 14:31, Neh 2:5). For this reason the family tomb was often situated upon the family property. It was this dread of being buried apart from one's kith and kin that was one of the elements of the Hebrew's hatred of the sea (Rev 21:1). (c) That, except under very exceptional circumstances, the family sepulchre should be reserved for the burial of members of the one family. There are no Hebrew monumental inscriptions; but from Aramaean inscriptions calling down curses on any who should intrude their dead upon the dead already lying there, we can measure the intensity of feeling on this point. To allow a stranger to be buried in the family tomb was a sign of the very greatest magnanimity and love (Mat 27:60, Gen 23:6). (d) That no body should be *burned* except as part of the punishment of the most odious of crimes (Lev 20:14; Lev 21:9, Jos 7:25). To burn the body of a foe was to do something that passed all the rights of belligerents (Amo 2:1).

2. Climate demanded that interment should take place as soon as possible after death (Mat 9:23, Act 5:6; Act 5:10; Act 8:2).

3. The geological character of the country conditioned to a large extent the particular form of sepulture. The country is one long limestone ridge, and almost everywhere the hills are naturally terraced, while the soft rock is easily worked. But the simplicity of the Hebrew burial customs should be noticed. It is not a little remarkable that a people living between two such civilizations as those of Babylonia and Egypt, in which the cult of the dead played so large a part, should have remained uninfluenced by

such ornate and imposing ceremonial. The Jews did not embalm their dead. They raised no elaborate sepulchres over them; indeed, the building of a sepulchral chamber was an innovation based on the practices of Greece. While this may have been due in some degree to the lack of artistic capacity in the Hebrew, it was due also to spiritual views of death, and to the dread of idolatry that had always characterized the Semitic race. Wherever, in Syria or Arabia, Greek or Roman civilization has left some representation of the human body, the traveller finds that the face at least has been disfigured by the nomads.

The forms of sepulture were these:—(a) The simplest, though not the commonest, form was an excavation in the rock surface, roughly corresponding to the shape of the human body, and covered with a slab of stone countersunk till it was level with the ground. All over Syria these primitive graves are to be met with. The Jews were most careful to keep the stone whitewashed, lest any should unwittingly walk over the grave and so incur ceremonial defilement. This kind of burial is referred to in Luk 11:44 'Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, for ye are as graves which appear not, and the men that walk over them are not aware of them.' (b) A chamber was excavated in the limestone rock-face, and long narrow recesses, perhaps six feet by two, were cut into the rock at right angles to the face. The bodies, covered with the simplest of grave-clothes (Mat 27:59, Joh 11:44), were thrust into these. The recesses were known as *kokim*, and were frequently made of double width, intended for the reception of two bodies. Sometimes, but very rarely, a chamber would have only one recess; generally it had several. It might, as in the case of the Tombs of the Kings and the Tombs of the Prophets, have one chamber opening off another, each chamber having many *kokim*. Three other forms of sepulture are in reality only modifications or combinations of these two main modes already mentioned, (c) Shelf tombs. Inside the chamber the recess for the body, instead of running in at right angles to the wall, was simply cut parallel with the wall, and formed a shelf on which the body was laid. The notable thing about many of these shelves is their narrowness. (d) The shelf was sometimes excavated so as to form a trough in which the body was laid, (e) In the floor of the chamber itself, or in the passage leading from one chamber to another, a grave might be cut, as in (a), and covered, with a slab.

It was in one of those chamber-tombs that our Lord was laid (Mat 27:60, Mar 15:46, Luk 23:53); and disused tombs of this kind were used as places of abode by the outcast and the homeless (Mar 5:2). To prevent desecration by wild beasts, the tombs were often cut in almost inaccessible places; and ancient tombs in the Kidron Valley and in the face of Mount Quarantania are used even now as cells by anchorites, who may be seen climbing by ladders to and from their abodes. This form of sepulture in chambers was used also by the tribes of the desert. Doughty found such tombs at Medain Salih.

‘The mural *loculi* in the low hewn walls of these rudely foursquare rooms are made as shallow shelves, in length as they might have been measured to the human body, from the child to the grown person.... In the rock floors are seen grave-pits, sunken side by side, full of men’s bones, and bones are strewn upon the sanded floors.... In another of these monuments I saw the sand floor full of rotten cloths, shivering in every wind, and taking them up, I found them to be those dry bones’ grave-clothes’ (*Arabia Deserta*, i. 108).

In the time of Christ the protection of the tombs was comparatively easily secured. The door of the sepulchre was made intentionally small, and was closed by a great stone, sometimes circular, that ran in grooves in the rock. Ceremonial defilement was guarded against by whitewashing the stone at the door of the sepulchre every spring (Mat 23:27). In Lebanon the present writer saw a tomb which had been excavated in the rock-face from a point below the normal level of the soil. After a body had been interred, the stone was replaced in the entrance, the earth was tossed back against the door, and all trace of the tomb was obliterated. This special precaution may have been peculiar to a district where wild animals were common. A tomb was never opened save for a fresh interment. It is this that gives point to St. Paul’s saying (Rom 3:13, cf. Psa 5:9): ‘Their throat is an open sepulchre’ (τάφος), *i.e.* at every opening of their mouth they bury, by slander and detraction, some one’s fair fame. On the Holy Sepulchre see Golgotha.

Literature.—Artt. ‘Burial’ and ‘Sepulchre’ in Hasting’s Dictionary of the Bible , ‘Tombs’ in *Encyc. Bibl.*, ‘Begräbnis bei den Hebräern’ in *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , ‘Beerdigung’ in Hamburger’s *RE* [Note: *E Realencyklopädie.*] ; Nowack, *Heb. Arch.* i. 8 f., 187 ff.; Benzinger, *Heb. Arch.* 163 ff., 224 ff.; Bliss, *Excavations at Jerusalem*; *PEFSt* [Note: *EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.*] , *passim*; *ZDPV* [Note: *DPV Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.*] , *passim*; Tobler, *Topogr.* ii. 227 ff.; Sepp, *Jerus.* [Note: *Jerusalem.*] *und das heilige Land*, ii. 273 ff.; *Revue Biblique*, *passim*.

R. Bruce Taylor.

☞ Tongue

TONGUE (γλῶσσα)–.

1. *The organ of speech* (Mar_7:33; Mar_7:35). Its power for good or evil is indicated in Scripture by the figures of a sword (Psa_57:4; Psa_64:3), a serpent (Psa_140:3), an arrow (Jer_9:8), fire (Isa_30:27, Jam_3:6), a beast of prey (Jam_3:8). It is referred to as a personality with independent will and the power of devising and executing plans (Psa_50:19; Psa_52:2, Pro_18:21). It walks (Psa_73:9), it rises in rebellion (Isa_54:17), it has ethical and emotional qualities (Psa_120:2-3; Psa_126:2), it performs acts of worship (Isa_45:23, Rom_14:11, Php_2:11).

2. *Language* (Mar_16:17, Act_2:8).—In this sense it forms a counterpart to deed and actuality (Mat_7:21, 1Jn_3:18). In Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 of Act_1:19; Act_2:8; Act_21:40; Act_22:2; Act_26:14 ‘language’ is substituted for Authorized Version ‘tongue’ as translation of *διάλεκτος*, local and provincial speech. Language formed one of the first antipathies that the preaching of the Kingdom encountered, and one of its earliest triumphs was in the discovery and declaration that in the new citizenship there was neither Greek nor barbarian (Rom_1:14, Col_3:11).

3. *Index of nationality*, Rev_5:9; Rev_14:6, being thus equivalent to ‘race,’ ‘people,’ ‘humanity.’

In keeping with the important influence attached to language, Christ charged His disciples to avoid unloving, untruthful, and irreverent speech (Mat_5:22; Mat_5:33-37). He trusted the defence of Himself and His teaching to the power of right words (Luk_12:11-12), and the future extension of His Kingdom to the proclamation of a definite message (Mat_10:27; Mat_28:19).

G. M. Mackie.

☞Tooth

TOOTH (ὀδούς).

1. *In legal compensation*.—The tooth was the least important of the particulars enumerated as exemplifying the exaction of like for like (Exo_21:24, Lev_24:20, Deu_19:21). Under primitive conditions of social life, this law acted mercifully in repressing wanton disregard of life and limb in the relationship of master and slave, and of the strong towards the weak generally. It also inculcated respect for the body by the compensation awarded when any mutilation had been inflicted or disability incurred. Although the item of loss was in itself insignificant, the claim connected with it lay within the area and application of a great principle, which by its

recognized standard of liability protected both parties, and prevented private abuse. It thus in due time formed part of the boundary line of an outgrown ideal, the transcending of which led at once and definitely into the Kingdom of the Beatitudes (Mat 5:38-39).

2. *In emotional expression.*—Gnashing of the teeth, with weeping and wailing (Mat 8:12; Mat 13:42; Mat 13:50; Mat 22:13 etc.), is the physical expression of regret over remembered advantages and opportunities lost. It was also a sign of evil possession (Mar 9:18), and a manifestation of malignant hatred (Act 7:54). Among the modern inhabitants of Palestine, on account of the similarity in physical accompaniment, the same Arabic word is used to indicate both violent indignation and the sorrow of bereavement. When a forgotten promise or matter of neglected duty is suddenly recollected, or it is discovered that a grave mistake has been committed, Orientals indicate their feeling of annoyance and regret by slapping the hand on the thigh (Jer 31:19, Eze 21:12), and by thrusting the knuckle of the forefinger into the mouth, as if instinctively seeking something on which to press and clench the teeth.

G. M. Mackie.

☛ Torch

TORCH.—In the six passages in which the word ‘torch’ occurs in the Gospels (Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), once in the text (Joh 18:3) and five times as an alternative rendering in the margin (Mat 25:1; Mat 25:3 f., Mat 25:7 f.), it answers to the Greek *λάμπας*, which in the LXX Septuagint represents the Hebrew *lappîd* in Gen 15:17, Exo 20:18, Jdg 7:16; Jdg 7:20; Jdg 15:4 f., Job 41:19, Isa 62:1, Eze 1:13, Dan 10:6, Nah 2:4, Zec 12:6. Now the regular meaning of *lappîd* is ‘torch,’ by which it is mostly rendered in the OT either in the text or in the margin. This meaning fits in very well with the context in Joh 18:3, but seems unsuitable in the other passages, where a light fed with oil is required. Probably we are to think in them of a lamp borne on a pole, and therefore bearing some resemblance to a torch, or of a torch fed with oil in some way from time to time. The use of the former is attested for Arabs in the Middle Ages by a statement to which Lightfoot called attention (*Works*, ed. 1684, vol. ii. p. 247), found in the mediaeval lexicon ‘*Aruch*, and, on the authority of Rabbi Solomon, in a gloss on the reference to *lappîd* in *Kelim*, ii. 8. It has been often cited or referred to, but a literal translation from the gloss may be of interest:

It is a custom in the land of Ishmael for the bride to be conducted from the house of her father to the house of her husband in the night before she goes into the *huppah*, (cf. Psa_19:4), and for ten poles to be borne before her, on the top of each of which is a sort of saucer of brass containing pieces of garments and oil and pitch—these are kindled, and give light before her.

The other custom, the use of torches fed with oil, is said by the German writer, Ludwig Schneller, who was born in Jerusalem, and was for a time a minister in Bethlehem, to be in force in the Holy Land at the present day. These torches consist of long poles, round the upper end of which are wrapped rags saturated with olive oil. Unless fed with fresh oil, they burn down in less than a quarter of an hour (*Evangelienfahrten*, p. 460). The maidens of Bethlehem, says the same writer (*ib.* p. 459), assemble at sunset on the occasion of a marriage, and move with dance and song through the street to the house of the marriage festival bearing torches in their hands. Bauer also (*Volkleben im Lande der Bibel*, p. 94) mentions the use of oily torches by the women who go out to meet the bridegroom. On the other hand, Robinson Lees (*Village Life in Palestine*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 87 f.) affirms that small earthenware lamps are still carried in villages by the virgins who go to meet the bridegroom, together with little jars containing an additional supply of oil. He admits, however, that torches are used in the cities. With our present slender knowledge of the marriage customs of the Jews in the time of our Lord, it is impossible to determine exactly the nature of the torches or lamps of the parable, but the balance of probability seems to incline to some kind of lamp-torch lifted high into the air. See Lamp.

Literature.—Besides the authorities cited above, see Wetstein and Zahn on Mat_25:1; Edersheim, *LT* [Note: *T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* [Edersheim].] ii. 455.

W. Taylor Smith.

Torment

TORMENT.—The literal and figurative references to suffering in the Gospels are to be distinguished.

1. In *the natural sense* of pain caused by disease the words βάσανος and βασανίζειν are used (Mat_4:24; Mat_8:6); also, of evil spirits anticipating Christ's displeasure (Mat_8:29 | |). Similarly, the use of the word 'tormentors' (βασανισται) by Christ (Mat_18:34) must be taken as a reflexion of well-known severities of the time; cf.

‘cut him asunder’ (with scourging) in Mat 24:51. It has not been an infrequent occurrence that cruelties have been inflicted on prisoners with a view to inducing their friends to raise the sum of money demanded for their release.

2. The one example of *the figurative use* of the word in the Gospels is in the parable of Dives and Lazarus (Luk 16:23-28 βάσανος, ‘torment’; ὀδυνᾶσθαι, ‘to be tormented’). Christ addressed the startling language of this parable to men who were hurting their souls by covetousness. To pierce the hard crust of complacency born of wealth He used the heaviest strokes of threatening; and, choosing language that was most fitted to cause a smart to the softness of their luxury, He spoke of torture, agony, and fire. Ethical truth has always to be expressed in terms of physical sensibility, and these were things His hearers could understand. Christ read off to them in vivid words what their vision was too dull to see,—the penalties attached to their sin by the law that ‘Justice founded and eternal Love.’

T. Gregory.

Touch

TOUCH.—The word ‘touch’ is always associated in the Gospels with Christ Himself, except in one instance. The exception is Luk 11:46 ‘Ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers,’ a passage requiring no exposition.

I. *Christ’s touch*

1. **Christ’s touch of healing.**—Christ habitually established outward contact with the sick as a sign and means of healing. Besides the word ἅπτεσθαι, ‘touch,’ there are used such phrases as ἐπιτιθέναι τὴν χεῖρα, ‘to lay the hand upon,’ and κρατεῖν τῆς χειρὸς, ‘to take by the hand.’ It might at first be supposed that there was a slightly more mediatorial significance about the latter phrases, as though our Lord were rather acting as the delegate of another than on His own authority, but it will be found, on examination of parallel passages, that this distinction cannot be observed. The wide extent of Christ’s contact by touch with human malady is seen as soon as the passages recording this act are enumerated. By a touch only, recorded in its simplest form (ἅπτεσθαι), Christ healed a leper (Mat 8:3), fever (Mat 8:15 where Mar 1:31 has κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς), blind people (e.g. Mat 9:29), the ear of Malchus (Luk 22:51). By a touch, recorded in its stronger form of grasp or imposition of hands, He healed one deaf and

dumb (Mar_7:33), the blind man at Bethsaida (Mar_8:22-26), a woman with a spirit of infirmity (Luk_13:13), the epileptic lad (Mar_9:27), many divers diseases (Mar_6:5), and the dead daughter of Jairus (Mat_9:25).

2. Christ's touch, other than of healing.—Here four instances are to be noted: the *arresting* touch laid upon the bier of the widow of Nain's son (Luk_7:14 ἤψατο τῆς σοροῦ); the *upholding* touch or grasp offered to Simon Peter upon the sea (Mat_14:31 ἔκτε ἵνας τὴν χεῖρα ἐπέλαβετο αὐτοῦ); the *encouraging* touch laid upon the disciples after the Transfiguration, when 'he touched them, and said, Arise, and be not afraid' (Mat_17:7 ἤψατο αὐτῶν; cf. Rev_1:17 'He laid his right hand [ἔθηκε τὴν δεξιάν] upon me, saying, Fear not'); the touch of *blessing* vouchsafed to the children brought by their mothers (Mat_19:15 ἐπιθεῖς αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας).

The Incarnation itself has been truly described in one of its aspects as God's coming into touch with men, or God's putting Himself where men can touch Him. St. Paul says that men 'seek the Lord, if haply they may feel after [lit. 'handle'] him' (ψηλαφῆσαι, Act_17:27); and one purpose of the Incarnation is that in Christ this desire may be satisfied. And, accordingly, to recognize something symbolic about the 'touches' of Christ mentioned in the Gospels, is no mere exercise of fancy.

(1) In the instances recorded above we are, as a first step, permitted to see the broad fact of Divine love seeking friendly *contact* with those for whom it cares. Our Lord is not ashamed to call men brethren. He lays His hand upon the bier; takes children in His arms; holds up a sinking disciple; encourages by touch as well as by word those who otherwise are overwhelmed by fear. Thus we see already an acted parable of how in the Incarnation our Lord '*taketh hold of the seed of Abraham*' (Heb_2:16 ἐπιλαμβάνεται, the word already quoted of Jesus 'catching' Peter on the waves to hold him up). In Christ, 'God put on the garment of humanity, and drew near in person, that we might clasp Him as a kinsman in our arms' (Ker, *Sermons*, 1st ser. 191). Instead of the spoken 'word' of the OT prophets, addressed only to the hearing, there is now the living 'Word,' meeting the lives of men in warm and friendly contact.

(2) But a further and deeper truth suggests itself when we pass to the many records of Christ's touch of healing. There we see what might be called the victorious *vitality* of the Incarnate Saviour, whose touch represents not only a sign of friendliness, but the opening of a channel of life imparting power. If it be true that the 'fundamental meaning of the symbol' of laying on of hands in the OT—on an offering, a criminal, a young disciple, etc.—was 'identification by contact' (Swete in Hasting's Dictionary of

the Bible iii. 85^a), then even to the self-consciousness of Jesus there must have been something deeply significant about the deliberate touch or imposition of hands on others. It meant that He identified Himself with them in their weakness; and that He identified them with Himself in His superabounding life. 'He touched nothing which He did not'—*heal*. Christ said to men, 'Because I live, ye shall live also' (Joh 14:19). He revealed this Divine power amid immense variety of malady, and amid the human helplessness of many of the cases.

(3) Still another step is offered to us when we observe that Christ healed by touch such a disease as *leprosy*, where contact with the polluting ailment was distinctly forbidden by the Levitical law (Lev 13:46). For here we see a vivid representation of Christ's identification with mankind, not only in weakness but in *defilement*. To touch the blind or deaf was the act of a Divine physician; but to touch the leper was more than this—it was the act of One who could triumph over pollution, who could come in contact with defilement and yet not be defiled. 'Another would have defiled *himself* by touching the leper: but He, Himself remaining undefiled, cleansed him whom He touched; for in Him health overcame sickness, and purity defilement, and life death' (Trench, *Miracles*, 233). Thus the life revealed in the Incarnation not only sustains and heals, but delivers from the guilt which it is not afraid to meet in closest contact.

(4) Finally, in many of the instances we can discern in Christ's touch an admirable means of suggesting the presence of a Healer, and so of *challenging faith*. 'Then touched he their eyes, saying, According to your faith be it unto you' (Mat 9:29). The touch of our Lord must often have been of the nature of a challenge. It provoked attention, proffered help, and awaited response.

II. *Touching Christ*.—The occasions on which men are recorded in the Gospels to have touched, or sought to touch, our Lord may be arranged as follows. The principle guiding the arrangement will be referred to when the instances have been collected.

1. The touch of desire or faith (the verb in this first group is ἅπτεσθαι).—'As many as had plagues pressed upon him, that they might touch him' (Mar 3:10). 'They besought him that they might touch if it were but the border of his garment' (Mar 6:56 ||). 'A woman ... came in the crowd behind and touched his garment. For she said, If I touch but his garment, I shall be whole' (Mar 5:27-28 ||). With these may be associated the act of the woman in Simon's house, who washed Christ's feet with tears, and anointed them with ointment, and of whom the Pharisee said later, 'This man, if he were a prophet, would have perceived who and what manner of woman this is which toucheth him' (Luk 7:39).

2. The touch of curiosity or indifference.—The most vivid instance of this is in the story above referred to of the woman with an issue of blood, where, in the different Gospels, no less than four Greek words are used to depict the thronging of the multitude, so finely distinguished from the significant touch of faith which brought healing to the sufferer. Mk.'s word is συνθλίβειν, 'throng' (Mar_5:31). Lk. uses no fewer than three words: συμπνίγειν, lit. 'choke'; συνέχειν, 'press'; ἀποθλίβειν, 'crush' (Luk_8:42; Luk_8:45). 'Out of that thronging multitude one only touched with the touch of faith. Others crowded upon Him, but did not touch Him, did not so touch that virtue went forth from Him on them' (Trench).

3. The hostile hold of restraint or enmity.—Since, in dealing with the touch of Christ, we included instances of His 'laying hands' on others, so in pathetic contrast the following instances must be included here. 'And when his friends heard it, they went out to lay hold on him' (κρατῆσαι αὐτόν, the word often used of Christ's more kindly activity) (Mar_3:21). 'No man laid hands on him (ἐπέβαλεν τὴν χεῖρα), for his hour was not yet come' (Joh_7:30). Though the connexion be not one of verbal identity, such references to a false or hostile touch of Christ suggest themselves as the betraying kiss of Judas (Mar_14:45), and the smiting in the high priest's palace (Mar_14:65).

4. It is better to class separately the very interesting references to the touching of our Lord after the Resurrection. These are as follows: 'They came and took hold of his feet (ἐκράτησαν αὐτοῦ τοὺς πόδας), and worshipped him' (Mat_28:9)—the *permitted grasp* of recognition and adoration. 'Handle me (ψηλαφήσατέ με), and see' (Luk_24:39); 'Reach hither thy hand (φέρε τὴν χεῖρά σου), and put it into my side' (Joh_20:27)—the *solicited touch* of reverent experiment. 'Touch me not (μὴ μου ἅπτο υ), for I am not yet ascended unto the Father' (Joh_20:17)—the *forbidden handling* of selfish and premature rapture.

When God and man were brought near in the Incarnation, it was natural that the Divine hand should be seen stretched out manwards in healing and help (see above); but natural also that human hands should be seen groping Godwards, seeking closer contact. An American missionary bishop tells of an Indian who knocked one day at his door, and said: 'I have often gone out into the woods, and tried to talk to a Great [Note: read Cranmer's 'Great' Bible 1539.] Spirit of whom my father told me. But I could never find Him. Perhaps you don't know what I mean. You never stood in the dark, and reached out your hand, and *could not take hold* of anything.' The idea is

precisely that of St. Paul; men ‘seek the Lord, if haply they may *handle* him’ (ψηλαφήσειαν αὐτόν, Act_17:27). Now it is this identical word, strangely enough, that our Lord uses in the gracious invitation to His disciples: ‘Why are ye troubled? See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; *handle* me and see.’ In the Incarnation this longing has been responded to. So that, when St. John sets forth the main purpose of his First Epistle, he uses this same word again, and with what Westcott declares to be a ‘distinct reference’ to the passage in Luke, he states that purpose to be the disclosure to others of ‘that which we beheld, and our hands *handled*, concerning the Word of life’ (1Jn_1:1).

In the Incarnation, then, God has put Himself where men might touch Him; and in the various instances of touching Christ, grouped above, we see how men responded to this opportunity. There were those who sought with all their hearts for closer contact, impelled by the sense of need, or by the impulse of adoring love; ‘the history of all God’s dealings with man is the record of an approach nearer still, and nearer ... until faith puts its fingers into the print of the nails, its hand into the wounded side, and constrains us to cry, My Lord, and my God’ (Ker, *l.c.*). There were those who merely jostled and thronged our Lord, but obtained no blessing, because enlightened by no deep desire. And there were those whose only impulse towards God manifest in the flesh was one of repudiation and dislike.

Only one passage of those quoted above seems at first sight to put itself outside the general symbolism. This is the record of our Lord’s saying to Mary Magdalene: ‘Touch me *not*, for I am not yet ascended unto the Father,’—a passage of which the interpretations are nearly as numerous as the commentators. But is not the explanation to be found in the present tense of the injunction, combined with the contrasted command, ‘But *go*,’ etc.—as though our Lord were saying, ‘Keep not on touching me, making sure of me in a selfish rapture, for the duty of the moment calls thee to be a witness to others; handle me not, but *go* to my brethren, and say unto them’? And if it be objected, as by Godet, that on that view the following words, ‘I am not yet ascended,’ present ‘absolutely no sense,’ the answer is that the hour was coming later, when, after the gift of the Spirit, close and intimate communion with Christ could be given *along with* the work of witness and service,—when it would be possible for a soul to be both in contact with the living Lord and also a messenger for Him,—when (in other words) the disciple could be in ‘touch’ with Christ by His Spirit and also ‘go’ on His errands.

R. Stevenson.

☞ Towel

TOWEL.—‘Towel’ in the two passages in which it occurs in the Gospels (Joh 13:4 f.) represents λέντιον, which is clearly the Latin *linteum*, a word meaning, in the first instance, ‘linen cloth,’ and then ‘napkin’ or ‘apron’ worn by slaves or servants, and especially ‘bath-towel.’ Under the Empire this Latin word made its way not only into Greek, but also into late Hebrew in the form *’aluntith*. It is found in the Mishna (*Shabbath* xxii. 5) of the bath-towels used at the hot baths of Tiberias and elsewhere. That slaves or attendants wore the *linteum* is more than once referred to in the classics. The best known passage is in Phaed. *Fab.* ii. Joh 13:11 ff., where an officious attendant of Tiberius, who was snubbed for his pains, is described as—

‘Ex alticinctis unus atriensibus

Cui tunica ab humeris linteo Pelusio

Erat destricta.’

Less known, but even more interesting, as at the same time supplying parallel and contrast, is the anecdote given by Suetonius (*Calig.* 26) of the humbling of distinguished senators by the mad Caesar Caligula, by allowing them to stand at his couch or his feet, girt with towels (*suceinctos linteo*). This is evidently recorded as a grave indignity to which the haughty Romans submitted with the greatest reluctance.

Literature.—Wetstein on Joh 13:5; Becker’s *Gallus* (English translation), 1849, p. 395; Fürst, *Glossarium Græco-Hebræum*, 1890, p. 51^a.

W. Taylor Smith.

☞ Tower

TOWER.—‘Tower’ (πύργος) is mentioned three times in the Lord’s teaching: in the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen (Mat 21:33, Mar 12:1), in the allusion to an accident in Siloam which led to the loss of eighteen lives (Luk 13:4), and in the illustration of the builder who was unable to complete his undertaking (Luk 14:28). Two, if not three, kinds of tower may be referred to in these passages:—(1) The builder who exposed himself to ridicule by beginning what he could not finish (Luk 14:28) may be thought of as building a house. The larger houses in the Holy Land are sometimes provided at one end with a tower-like annex. A good representation of

one in the neighbourhood of Sidon is given in the *Polychrome Bible* ('Judges,' p. 59). The 'alîyyâh or upper storey, seen from a little distance, must suggest a tower rather than a dwelling-house (see also *Land and Book*, ed. 1874, p. 160). (2) The tower in Siloam (ἐν τῷ Σιλωάμ, Luk_13:4) may have been connected with some fortifications. The walls of ancient Oriental cities were generally provided with towers at frequent intervals. Many illustrations could be given from Assyrian sculptures, and the old wall in the Jerusalem of the 1st cent. a.d. had sixty towers (Josephus *BJ* v. iv. 3), two of which, Hippicus and Phasaelus, are probably represented to some extent by two of the towers of the modern citadel, the latter being partly preserved in the so-called David's Tower (*Picturesque Palestine*, i. pp. 1, 5, 7-11). Edersheim (*Life of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 222) suggests that the tower may have been connected with the building of the aqueduct constructed by Pilate with money taken from the temple treasury (Josephus *Ant.* xviii. iii. 2; *BJ* ii. ix. 4); but that is unsupported conjecture. If the Tower was situated literally in Siloam, the nature of the ground may help to explain the accident. The village of *Silwân*, which represents the ancient Siloam, 'is built on a steep escarpment of rock, on which a building with good foundations would stand for ever; ill-laid foundations would drop their superstructure to the very bottom of the valley' (Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Tower'). For the Tower of Antonia see art. Jerusalem. (3) The vineyard tower referred to in the two other passages (Mat_21:33, Mar_12:1; cf. Is 5:2) can be illustrated from ancient ruins and modern practice. Tristram remarks (*Eastern Customs in Bible Lands*, p. 139 f.) that 'in many cases we still find the remains of the solidly-built tower which commanded a view of the whole enclosure, and was probably the permanent residence of the keeper through the summer and autumn.' Dr. W. Wright observes that every vineyard and garden in Syria has its tower (*Palmyra and Zenobia*, p. 332 f.). A representation is given in that work (p. 279) of a stone tower in the Hauran constructed of black basalt, with a stone loft at the height of 14 feet, reached by a spiral staircase (see also Porter, *Jerusalem, Bethlehem, and Bethany*, p. 18; Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, 421).

Literature.—Besides the authorities cited above, see Heber-Percy, *Bashan and Argob*, p. 123 ff.; Swete on Mark 12.

W. Taylor Smith.

☞ Trachonitis

TRACHONITIS.—A Roman province of Eastern Palestine over which Herod Philip held rule when John the Baptist entered upon his public ministry (Luk_3:1). The Greek word τραχωνίτις or τραχων signifies a 'rough or stony place,' and its identification

with the wild and rugged volcanic region within the limits of ancient Bashan, which the Arabs designate *el-Lejâ* ('the refuge'), is unquestioned. This was the heart, as well as the most notable portion, of the province, and gave to it its distinctive name. The phrase *τραχωνιτιδος χώρας* ('the Trachonite region,' [Luk_3:1](#)) implies an extent of territory beyond the limits of the Trachon, or lava-bed section. The name does not occur elsewhere in the NT, but the boundaries of the province can be approximately defined, from statements concerning it in the works of Josephus, Ptolemy, Strabo, and other writers. Josephus informs us that its N.W. limit extended to the districts of Ulatha and Paneas, at the southern base of Mount Hermon; and also that it bordered on Auranitis (*en-Nukra*) and Batanaea (*Ant.* xv. x. 3, xvii. ii. 1; *BJ* i. xx. 4). The line of the western border is not definitely given, but it probably extended to the eastern limit of Gaulanitis (Jaulan), which is frequently alluded to as a separate district of Herod Philip's dominion.

Literature.—Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria*, 110 ff.; Wetzstein, *Reisebericht über Hauran*, etc., 110 ff.; de Vogüé, *Syrie Centrale*, 89 ff.; Schumacher, *Across the Jordan*; Porter, *Damascus*, ii. 268-272, *Giant Cities of Bashan*, 24-97; Graham in *Jour. Royal Geog. Soc.* 1858, p. 256 ff.; Ewing in *PEFSt* [*Note: EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.*], pp. 41 ff., 60 ff., 131 ff., etc.; Merrill, *East of the Jordan*; Stewart, *Land of Israel*; G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [*Note: GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*]; Tristram, *Topog. of the Holy Land*; Baedeker's *Pal.* [*Note: Palestine, Palestinian.*] ⁵ [*Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred*] pp. 193-194; Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible*, articles 'Argob' and 'Trachonitis.'

R. L. Stewart.

Trade and Commerce

TRADE AND COMMERCE

1. The terms.—The terms used in the NT in its allusions to mercantile transactions give but little indication of the remarkable developments which had taken place in the trade and commerce of Palestine since OT times.

Schürer (*GJV* [*Note: JV Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes.*] ³ [*Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred*] ii. 50-61) gives a considerable list of trading terms which had been borrowed from the Greek, and were in ordinary use among Palestinian Jews, but few of these appear in the NT. The only term, e.g., for 'merchant' is *ἐμπορος* ([Mat_13:45](#), [Rev_18:3](#); [Rev_18:11](#); [Rev_18:15](#); [Rev_18:23](#)), this

being the equivalent etymologically of the two terms which are common in OT—**סֶוֶר** and **רָכַל**—both of which seem to have the root-idea of *travel*, whether by land or sea. What is, however, significant is the frequency of the words **ἀγορά** and **ἀγοραζω** (Mat 20:3; Mat 23:7, Mar 6:56; Mar 7:4; Mat 21:12; Mat 14:15, Mar 14:5; Mar 15:46, Luk 14:19, Joh 4:8 etc.), which, when it is remembered that in the OT, with the exception of Is 23:3,* [Note: In Eze 27:12-25 the words translated (AV) ‘fairs’ and ‘market’ will not bear that meaning; see RV.] there is no mention of markets properly so called, shows that the old conception of the merchant, as one who travels with his goods, is giving place to a more settled and organized system of trade. But the NT indications of a busy and complex commercial life are mostly indirect and general, e.g., in such terms as **ἐργάζομαι**, Mat 25:27; **πραγματεύομαι**, Luk 19:13 (see context in both places); **τραπεζίτης** and **τόχος**, Mat 25:27; cf. the apocryphal saying of Jesus, ‘Show yourselves tried bankers’ (**τραπεζίται**, see Westcott, *Introd to Gospels*, p. 458). Though general references of this kind are fairly numerous, technical names for traders, such as **τορφυρότωλις** (Act 16:14), are very rare. Even in the graphic description of the trade of the Roman Empire in Rev 18:11; Rev 18:20 there is no word more specific than **ἔμπορος**, the various trades of the merchants being described simply by mentioning the article in which they deal.

2. The status of the trader.—There is considerable evidence that in Herodian times the occupation of a merchant was held in more repute than had formerly been the case among the Jews. Such a statement as that of Josephus—‘We have no taste for commerce or for the relations with strangers which it establishes’ (c. [Note: circa, about.] *Apion*, i. 12), must not be taken too literally (cf. Herzfeld, *Handels-gesch. der Juden*, p. 80). Josephus himself makes numerous references to the widespread trade carried on by Alexandrian Jews, without any implication that they incurred disparagement thereby; he mentions the ‘Upper Market-place’ of Jerusalem; the Valley of the Cheesemongers (*BJ* v. iv. 1), the wool-merchants, the cloth-mart (v. viii. 1), the timber-market (ii. xix. 4); he tells us of the exportation of corn from Judaea to Arabia (*Ant.* xiv. v. 1), and through Joppa to Phœnicia (xiv. x. 6); he mentions the influence which a Jewish trader, Ananias, exercised at the court of Adiabene (xx. ii. 3, 4); he relates how John of Giscala made himself rich by obtaining the monopoly of exporting oil from Galilee (*BJ* ii. xxi. 2); and in various places indicates the growing prosperity and affluence of the Jews (e.g. *Ant.* xii. iv. 10, *Vit.* 26, etc.). In no case do we discover any indication that the fact of engaging in trade was a reflexion upon a true Jew, so long as he took care not to defile himself by such contact as the Law forbade (cf. Mar 7:4 ‘when they come from the market-place, except they wash themselves they eat not’). There can be little doubt that the encouragement which

high priests like John Hyrcanus gave to trade, and the fact that Herodian princes themselves engaged in it, tended to raise the status of the Jewish trader. Priests were sometimes themselves traders. Josephus describes the high priest Ananias as a keen moneylender (*Ant.* xx. ix. 2). There were, of course, different grades of traders recognized. Sirach (26:29) distinguishes between a merchant and a huckster. Between the merchant-prince and the mere pedlar there was a vast variety of persons who found no difficulty in reconciling their commerce with their religion, and perhaps we may infer from the following that even the humblest trade was not despised: 'Rabbi Jehudah the Nasi called Elazar b. Azariah a huckster's basket, and compared him to a huckster who, taking his basket, goes about the country, and the people come flocking around him, inquiring for various articles, and find he has everything' (*Aboth*, 2). In the Gospels the allusions to persons engaged in trade take it for granted that merchants have a responsible and even an honourable place in the national economy. In the parable of the Pounds (Luk 19:12-27), a man of noble birth carries on trade through the agency of his servants, and there seems to be no sufficient reason for A. B. Bruce's supposition (*Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, p. 219) that such a transaction was 'a most unusual one for a nobleman.' In the East, indeed, royalty from early times had associated itself closely with the development of trade.* [Note: See art. 'Trade and Commerce' in EBi p. 5192a.] The teaching of Jesus is 'full of appreciation of the bigness of the methods of trade and of the brave tempers required in it.'† [Note: lb.; cf. also To 1:13, where a Jew is the honoured purveyor (ἀγοραστής) of a foreign monarch, and his nephew is steward and accountant (1:22).]

The gradual change by which the Jews, from being an agricultural people, became a people devoted to commerce, is illustrated by many Talmudic passages: e.g. 'Rabbi Eleazar said, There is no worse trade than agriculture; and Rabbi Rab added, Commerce is worth all the harvests of the world' (*Jebamoth*, 63. 1). This change, however, took place only very slowly; the time of Christ was the transition period, and while there were many pious Jews who did not hesitate to engage in foreign trade, there were others who viewed it with suspicion and dislike, and some who would have nothing to do with it. The Essenes abjured trade, apparently, at least among themselves (*BJ* ii. viii. 4). The two things which laid a stigma upon it were (1) the extensive contact with foreigners which it involved, and the consequent risk of ceremonial pollution; and (2) the moral deterioration which it seemed to bring.

The fact that Sirach has several passages emphasizing the latter danger indicates the prevalent fear that, with the growth of Hellenistic influences, there was coming in a relaxation of Hebrew strictness and integrity: e.g. 'A merchant shall hardly keep himself from doing wrong, and a huckster shall not be acquitted of sin' (Sir 26:29); 'Sin will thrust itself in between buying and selling' (Sir 27:2); 'Take not counsel with a merchant about exchange nor with a buyer about selling' (Sir 37:11).

Delitzsch, indeed, thinks that it was not until about 500 years after Christ that the Jewish people began to show any special preference for those branches of trade which deal in work furnished by others (*Jewish Artisan Life in the time of Christ*, p. 19), but the passages which he quotes appear to be not so much indicative of the Jew's aversion from trade, as such, as instances of the feeling that a commercial occupation is hardly compatible with a devout life: e.g. 'Wisdom, says Rabbi Jochanan, in reference to Deu_30:12, is not in heaven,—that is to say, not to be found among the proud; nor beyond the sea—that is to say, you will not find it among traders and travelling merchants' (*ib.* and *Erubin*, 55a).

In the NT there is no disparagement of trade as such. A passage like Jam_4:13 'Go to now, ye that say, To-day or tomorrow we will go into this city and spend a year there and trade (ἐμπορεύομαι)' is not directed against trading, but only against that commercial spirit which leaves God out of account. The passage Rev_18:11 ff. (based on Ezekiel 27) suggests, not the prevalence of an anti-trade spirit in the early Christian community, but a Puritanic protest against the excessive luxury of a materialistic society.* [Note: For a description of the demands of society for which the trade of the day catered, see Friedländer, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengesch. Rome*, iii. 'Der Luxus.'] Whatever the obscure passage Rev_13:16 'that no man should be able to buy or to sell save he that hath the mark, even the name of the beast or the number of his name,' may mean, the writer can hardly be taken to mean more than that the habits of trade were so mixed up with pagan practices that it was difficult for a Christian to be a trader without becoming stamped with the 'mark of the beast.' In this connexion it may be noted that Deissmann (*Bible Studies*, p. 241 ff.) finds a reference to seals, bearing the name of the Roman emperor, which seem to have been necessary in documents of a commercial nature. We may, at any rate, set over against Delitzsch's assertion that 'in the whole Talmud there is scarcely a word in honour of trade,' the statement that in the NT there is no word in its dishonour.

3. Commercial morality.—From some of the passages already quoted it might be inferred that trade in the Roman Empire in the 1st cent. was particularly corrupt. Was this actually so? It is, of course, not difficult to put together a number of instances in which the trader appears as a person of smirched reputation. Autolycus had his parallel in Palestine, The merchants of Lydda seem to have been notorious for dishonesty (according to *Pesachim*, 62b). Sirach (Sir_29:1-7) dwells upon the difficulty of getting loans repaid, and upon the ready excuse of 'bad times.' Zacchaeus (Luk_19:1-10), who probably farmed the revenues from the famous balsam-gardens of Jericho (see Josephus *BJ* iv. viii. 3, *Ant.* xiv. iv. 1; cf. G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [Note: *GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*] p. 267, note), was, according to the generally received interpretation, given to unscrupulous exaction. In the parable of the Unjust

Steward (Luk 16:1-9) we have a graphic picture of a factor whose dealings are a tissue of knavery. It is probable, too, that the publicans, who appear in the Gospels with so poor a reputation, owed this partly to a shady connexion with the traffic which passed through their hands. But it is obviously unfair to assume from such data as these that there was any more dishonesty among Jewish than among other traders. Herzfeld justly claims (p. 276 f.) that, though the reproach of usury attached to the Jews of the Middle Ages, it appears that among the Jews of earlier times the rate of interest was lower than among other peoples engaged in trade. The enemies of the Jews in Roman times did not scruple to bring against them the most ridiculous charges, but precisely this charge of dishonesty in business relations is not found. In the Talmud usurers are regarded as in the same category with gamblers (*Rosh ha-shana*, i. 8). Surely, too, the close connexion between business and religion, which is so often emphasized in the Bible (e.g. Lev 19:35-36; Lev 25:36-37; Deu 15:2; Deu 23:20, Pro 11:1; Pro 16:11; Pro 20:10; Pro 23:4 f., Pro 28:22, Amo 8:5, Mic 6:10-11, cf. Sir 42:4), and of which the Talmudic writers have so much to say (cf. Herzfeld, p. 162 f.), was not without its effect upon mercantile morality. That trade was directly recognized as having the sanction of religion would appear from an allusion (*Joma*, v. 3) to a prayer offered by the high priest on the Day of Atonement for 'a year of trade and traffic.' The indignation of Jesus when He ejected the traders and money-changers from the Temple courts (Mat 21:12-13, Mar 11:15-18, Luk 19:45-47, Joh 2:14-16) must no doubt have been prompted partly by a knowledge of the dishonesty of their dealings ('a den of robbers'); but His denunciation is a quotation from Jeremiah (Jer 7:11), and must not be pressed. What stirred His wrath was the conjunction of unscrupulousness with high religious pretensions. It was because their practice was not in harmony with their principles that He drove them forth. That they suffered it with so little resistance seems to show a tacit admission on their part that they were departing from the strictness of Jewish law. Jesus never singles out the trader, as such, as an example of covetousness or fraud; when He inveighs against corrupt practices, it is rather the Pharisees 'who devour widows' houses' (Mar 12:40), and who are 'full from extortion' (Mat 23:25) that are selected for castigation. If, as is not improbable, the Good Samaritan of Luk 10:30-37 was suggested by the merchants who travelled regularly on the trade-route that led through Jericho (cf. Luk 10:35), we have an instance of the way in which Jesus contrasted the humanity often characterizing men of the world with the inhumanity which professors of religion may be capable of showing.

4. Relations of Jesus with the mercantile community.—It has been said* [Note: EBi, art. 'Trade and Commerce,' 5191a.] that the trade of Palestine is often reflected in the parables of Jesus spoken as He passed along the busy trade-routes of Galilee and Judaea. Typical of these is the parable of the Merchant seeking Goodly Pearls (Mat 13:45-46). Jesus would be sure to meet traders on His frequent journeys. Merchandise was still carried, for the most part probably, on pack-animals—asses,

mules, or camels (cf. Josephus *Vit.* 26 f.); for, though under Imperial Rome there had been a great development of the means of transit, and a fast service of conveyances had been established on the great trunk roads of the Empire, this would hardly be the case in Palestine in the time of Jesus. But conditions had arisen more favourable to commerce: the roads were safer; brigandage was put down with a strong hand (Josephus *Ant.* xiv. xv. 2, iv. 4); in addition to the usual town-markets, which in the time of the Maccabees seem to have been held monthly, and to which the country people came in (1Ma 1:58, cf. Herzfeld, p. 75 f.), there was a good deal of trade done at the regular stopping-places of the caravans, and at the inns; periodical fairs also sprang up at certain places, e.g. Gaza, Acco, and Tyre (Herzfeld, p. 134). In the towns, at any rate the larger towns, merchants would have their recognized exchange for corn, wool, etc., and their bazaars for manufactured articles. They had their trade guilds, capable sometimes of exercising a considerable influence (cf. Act 19:23 ff.), and their trade leagues between neighbouring towns, e.g. those of Decapolis (Herzfeld, p. 148; HGHL [Note: *GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*] p. 595); there were trading corporations, which had their representatives in the important centres. Thus, there were Antiochian Jews settled in Jerusalem, presumably for purposes of trade (2Ma 4:9; 2Ma 4:19), and there is little doubt that at the times of the great feasts, many who came up to Jerusalem combined business with religion, and used the opportunity to establish trade relations with their fellow-countrymen coming from other parts of the Empire. The sea, now cleared of pirates, no longer offered obstruction to the spread of commerce; the Jews had at last ports of their own; Philo (*in Flaccum*, 8) refers to Jewish shipmasters at Alexandria; Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. ix.) and the Talmud refer to the wealth of Babylonian Jews. Through Galilee ran some of the most frequented trade-routes; and in this province, more than elsewhere, the influence of the enterprising Greek was in evidence.

Jesus was in close contact, then, with the busy traffic of His day, and the allusions to it in the Gospels are many; e.g. the trade in oil (Mat 25:9), in spices (Mar 16:1; Mar 14:5, Joh 19:39); an indication of the extent of this traffic may be gathered from the statement made by Josephus, that at Herod's funeral there were 500 spice-bearers [*Ant.* xvii. viii. 3]), in clothes (Mar 15:46, Luk 22:36), in cattle (Luk 14:19), in weapons (Luk 22:36). It is a little remarkable that there is no special reference to what must have been the trade best known to Christ's disciples, that in dried fish, for which Taricheae on the Lake of Galilee was a famous centre (Strabo, xvi. ii. 45; *BJ* III. x. 6; HGHL [Note: *GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*] p. 455). Absorption in trade is hinted at in the case of the man who neglects the king's invitation, that he may go to his merchandise (Mat 22:5), and in Mat 18:25 we get a glimpse into a trade the dimensions and importance of which must have been much greater than is indicated by anything in the NT,—the slave-trade. This, however, would be wholly in the hands of foreigners, its chief centre being at Delos (Strabo,

xiv. v. 2), where as many as 10,000 slaves might be found at one time. Phœnician merchants seem to have been the usual intermediaries, in this traffic (1Ma 3:41, 2Ma 8:11, *Ant.* xii. vii. 3); and, while the only direct allusion to the slave-merchant in the NT is Rev 18:13, this personage must have been a too familiar figure on the roads of Galilee.

Literature.—Herzfeld, *Handelsgesch. der Juden des Alterthums*; art. 'Trade and Commerce' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible and in *Ebi* [*Note: Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*]; on the general subject of the relation between commerce and religion see G. A. Smith's *Isaiah*, vol. i. ch. 18.

J. Ross Murray.

⚡ Trades

TRADES.—It had long been a custom, which almost had the force of law, among the Jews, that every youth, of whatever station, must have a trade. The Rabbis insisted upon it. Of the distinguished teachers in the days of Herod the Great [*Note: reat Cranmer's 'Great' Bible 1539.*], Hillel and Shammai learned and wrought the trade of mechanics. So with Gamaliel, a contemporary of our Lord. It was quite usual, though by no means universal, for a son to follow the trade of his father, as Jesus did that of Joseph, who was a carpenter (Mat 13:55, Mar 6:3). Tradition says Jesus made ploughs, ox-yokes, chairs, and the like. The most common trades of Christ's day were those of the smith, the carpenter, the stone-mason, the baker, the tanner, the sandal-maker, the weaver, the spinner, the wool-comber, the tailor, the tentmaker, the potter, the perfumer, the jeweller, the fuller. These occupations are seldom directly mentioned in the Gospels, but the implements or wares connected with many of them are referred to, or are used as illustrations in parables of our Lord = ploughs and yokes, work of the carpenter, Luk 9:62, Mat 11:29; of the mason, Luk 23:53, Mat 21:42; of the weaver, Mat 3:4, Joh 19:23; of the tailor, Mar 2:21; the fuller, Mar 9:3; of digging, Luk 16:3; of spinning, Mat 6:28.

While mechanical labour was regarded with honour among the Jews, all the trades were not looked upon with equal respect. The tanner, probably because of the unclean nature of his work, the donkey-driver, the butcher, and the followers of a few other occupations, were more or less discredited. Sewing, weaving (Joh 19:23), spinning (Luk 12:27), grinding (Mat 24:41), baking (Mat 13:33), and the like, were largely occupations of women. The industry of catching and curing fish (see art. Fish) was a most important one, more particularly about the Sea of Galilee; Jesus called

several of His disciples from this occupation, [Mat_4:18](#), Mark 16. See separate articles on several of the trades above mentioned.

E. B. Pollard.

☛ Tradition

TRADITION.—In its simplest and most primitive form, the conception of tradition involves what is contained in the English word *delivery*. Tradition is the act of transmitting the story of an event or the teaching of a master. From being thus first of all the act of transmission, it becomes in the next place the thing transmitted, and finally a whole body of narratives or teachings passed from generation to generation. In the history of all religions, traditions play a very important part. The times of Jesus and the Gospels were not exceptional in this regard. Explicit mention of tradition is made in [Mat_15:2-3](#); [Mat_15:6](#), [Mar_7:3](#); [Mar_7:5](#); [Mar_7:8-9](#); [Mar_7:13](#). Both of these passages refer to the same transaction, and therefore represent the same condition of affairs in the environment and the same attitude on the part of Jesus towards the subject.

The environment was as thoroughly pervaded by the recognition of the authority of tradition as any other that we know of, either in ancient or in modern times. In fact, it stands pre-eminent in this particular ([Mat_15:2](#), [Mar_7:3](#)). The Sadducees took exception to the prevalent state of mind (Josephus *Ant.* xiii. x. 6); but the attitude of the Pharisees was the very opposite, and exerted a dominant influence in the matter. In the Talmud it was written that ‘Moses received the oral Law from Sinai and delivered it to Joshua, and Joshua delivered it to the elders, and the elders to the prophets, and the prophets to the men of the Great [Note: read Cranmer’s ‘Great’ Bible 1539.] Synagogue. They said three things: Be deliberate in judgment, raise up many disciples, and make a fence for the Law’ (*Aboth* i.). The Rabbis interpreted [Exo_20:1](#) as involving the idea that all that was to guide the Israelite into the knowledge of the nature and the law of God had been given to Moses on Mount Sinai. More expressly, they found the different parts of the complex rule of faith advocated in the phraseology of [Exo_24:12](#). The expression used in this passage is, ‘I will give thee the tables of stone, and the law, and the commandments, which I have written, that thou mayest keep them.’ The ‘tables of stone’ were understood to mean the Ten Commandments; ‘the law,’ the written prescriptions of the Pentateuch; ‘the commandments,’ the Mishna; ‘which I have written,’ the prophets and Hagiographa; ‘that thou mayest teach them,’ the Talmud (*Berakh.* 5a, lines 11-16). A place was thus made for a large body of precepts which do not appear in the OT Scriptures; and all this was of at least equal authority with the written Law, because given at the

same time and through the same person, Moses. To the question why it was not written down at the same time as the written Law, the answer was that Moses did indeed desire to reduce it to writing, but was forbidden by God, because in the days to come Israel would be scattered among the Gentiles, and the written Law would be taken from them; the oral Law would then be the distinctive badge of the Israelite.* [Note: Hence the name Oral Law has prevailed in modern Jewish usage. (Cf. JE, art. 'Oral Law').]

By some it was held that the oral or traditional Law was even superior to the written, because the latter was dependent for its authority upon the oral testimony of Moses. In other words, the oral precedes and underlies the written. The covenant was founded not on the written, but on the oral word of God; for it is said, 'after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel' (Exo 34:27).

From the nature of the case, tradition was not a clearly defined body. A large portion of it was simply a repetition of the written Law, with elaborations of detail and embellishments. Another portion consisted of distinct additions, a third of provisions looking to the strict observance of the Torah. As far as this tradition was prescriptive or legal, it was called *Hălâkhâ* (-*khôth*), *i.e.* decision (or decisions) having the force of statutes. As far as it was narrative, it was called *Haggâdâ* (that which is related). As a reiteration of the Mosaic Law, it was called *Mishna* (repetition). As a series of questionings into or investigations of the meaning of the Law, it was called *Midrâsh* (*Midrâshîm*). As a means of teaching, or the body of what was to be taught, it was the *Talmud*. The whole body of tradition together with the Prophets and Hagiographa, in fact the whole rule of faith with the exception of the Pentateuch, was called *Kabbâlâh*, that which is received. A doctrine of *paralepsis* was thus developed, to correlate with the doctrine of *paradosis*, 'tradition.'

The administration or practical use of such a body of tradition was not an easy matter. In fact, for the average layman it was an impossibility; hence the rise of a class of men who devoted themselves to the work of studying it, and informing inquirers about it (see Scribes, Lawyers). But this method raised the interpreters of the Law to a place of authority. Interpretations of the Law were accepted as binding, because they said so, not because the Law was seen to involve them. The Law was obeyed not because its Divine origin was perceived, but upon the authority of men. Tradition thus came to be doubly the enthronement of human authority. On the one side, it massed together man-made rules and representations of God's thought; on the other side, it wrought out man-made interpretations of the Law which truly came from God. For the former a direct Divine authority was claimed in the teaching that they were actually delivered to Moses on Sinai; some corroboration for each separate precept thus brought down was sought for in the written Law. For the latter not even this semblance of connexion with the known revelation of God could be adduced. In

neither case could the stream rise higher than its source. The teachings of men came to take the place which belonged to those of God. It could not go further back than the elders (Fathers), and those who were called upon to accept it must do so upon the authority of human statements. Tradition thus canonized the media of communication, and lost sight of the value and validity of the things communicated on one side, and of the authority of Him from whom the communication came on the other. Whatever the claim for the Divine origin of the Mishna might be, the practical result of its acceptance was the exaltation of the means through which it came to the supreme place of authority.

Jesus' attitude towards tradition relates itself decidedly to this aspect of it. He saw in it a means of transgressing the commandments of God. He denied first of all the Pharisaic teaching that tradition was of equal weight with the Law. He did not, however, definitely affiliate Himself with the Sadducaic teachings on the subject. As against the Pharisees, He taught that the Law of God could not come in conflict with itself, whereas between the traditions current and the Law there were conflicts. In many cases traditional prescriptions did stand in the way of the right observance of the Law (Mar_7:11 ff.). As contrasted with the Divine Law, He calls the tradition 'your tradition.' Finally, He classes all tradition with matters of form or lip-service. He relegates the application of it into the sphere of the non-ethical. So far as such traditions could be made serviceable in the promotion of ethical or spiritual ends, they might be unobjectionable, but they must in no case stand in the way of the clearly revealed will of God (Mat_15:2-20, Mar_7:2-23. See also art. Corban).

Literature.—Barclay, *The Talmud*, 1878; Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, 1711; Zunz, *Die Gottesdienstl. Vorträge d. Juden*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1892; J. H. Weiss, *Dor* [1876], i. 1-93; Edersheim, *LT* [Note: *T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] [1886], ii. 205-211; Friedländer, *The Jewish Religion*, 1891, pp. 136-139.

A. C. Zenos.

 Traitor

TRAITOR.—See Judas Iscariot, ii. (c).

☒ Transfiguration

TRANSFIGURATION.—The name given to that event in the course of Christ's ministry in which He was visibly glorified in the presence of three selected disciples. Difficulty has always attached to any attempt to explain it. That it represents a singular enhancement of His Person and a singular attestation of His message was seen from the beginning (2Pe 1:16-18). As such it took its natural place among the evidences of His Divinity. To that position its significance has been very generally limited, and there conceived for the most part in a purely external manner. The paucity of essential ideas associated with it has diverted attention to its details, which have lent themselves to much conjectural and picturesque description, too realistic in character to be serviceable to knowledge. In recent NT scholarship a new interest in the event has sprung up, directed by the modern analytical study of Christ's self-consciousness, and discerning in the experience it embodies a moment of profound import in His self-development.

1. Narratives of the event.—(1) The *evidence* for the Transfiguration is remarkably strong. It is recorded by all three Synoptics in its incidents, and by the Fourth Gospel in its inner mood (Mat 17:1-9, Mar 9:2-10, Luk 9:28-36, Joh 12:23-41). In the first three Gospels both the precision of detail and the agreement are striking, including the following facts: the occasion—six days after the preceding incidents just narrated; the place—a high mountain apart; the chosen three—Peter, James, John; the supernatural light; the heavenly visitants and their speech; the suggestion of Peter; the overshadowing cloud and the Divine voice from its midst; the awe, yet joy, of the disciples; the return of Christ to ordinary conditions of human life; the charge of silence. Additional features of importance are given by Lk. (Joh 9:28 f.): the motive of the ascent, viz. prayer, during which the unearthly lustre appeared; the subject of discourse, viz. the decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem (Joh 9:31); the physical state of the disciples, viz. 'heavy with sleep, and, having kept themselves awake, they saw his glory' (Joh 9:32); together with two points of time, viz. 'about eight days' (Joh 9:28), and the descent from the hill 'the next day' (Joh 9:37). Touches, less important, peculiar to the others, are Christ's allaying the fear of the disciples (Mat 17:7), and Peter's embarrassment and agitation (Mar 9:6). The silence of Jn. has been specially commented on as weakening the authority of the Synoptic witness (cf. Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, pt. ii. c. [Note: circa, about.] 10). But when we recognize the totally different *animus narrandi* in his case from that which we discover in the Synoptics, we may be reassured. The Fourth Gospel separates itself from the others in making prominent the fact that the *motif* and explanation of Christ's words and acts are to be found, not in the circumstances and persons around Him, but in a higher necessity incumbent on Him in virtue of His nature or His office or His work or the will of God, *i.e.* a higher law at work. Accordingly we may expect in the Fourth Gospel, less the outward incidents* [Note: the omission of the

Temptation narrative.] and more the interior mood corresponding to them, to be emphasized. There can be little doubt that the Johannine counterpart of the Synoptic narration is to be found in Joh_12:23-41, the passage which stands between the record of Christ's public ministry and the ensuing scenes of His glorifying through death, resurrection, and ascension—a position identical with that occupied by the Transfiguration event in the Synoptics.

The details of the Transfiguration are seldom referred to throughout the rest of the NT. Explicit allusion is made only once, viz. in 2Pe_1:16-18, a writing whose authenticity is seriously doubted.† [Note: Moffatt, *Historical New Testament*, pp. 596-598; per contra, Swete, *Epistles of St. Peter*.] The effort (Jannaris, *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times*.] xiv. [1903] 462) to find in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel a direct reference to the Transfiguration is of interest, but unconvincing. Better material may be found in such passages as 1Jn_1:1-4, Rev_1:13-17, Heb_1:3-4; Heb_3:3; Heb_3:6-7, 2Co_4:6, in which we have statements obviously coloured from immediate conviction of Christ's visible glorification; even here, however, we have only indirect testimony. The extra-Synoptic reticence is not to be denied. It is quite explicable. It is a reticence only as to details: the *idea* of the Transfiguration story is so manifestly accepted that he who runs may read. In the Epistles the aim of the writers is not historical statement, but doctrinal elucidation and practical edification—an aim which calls for but slight advertence to the outward facts of Christ's earthly life. There is, too, the clear belief in the minds of the writers that all those facts pale in impressiveness and meaning before that of the Resurrection, the event which is not simply analogous to them, but that in which they find their rationale and explanation. By that fact more than by any other the glory of Christ's Person was revealed, and the Divine purpose and message in Him realized. In the light of it, the Transfiguration appeared but its pledge and forecast (cf. Mat_17:9, Mar_9:9). It is probably true to affirm that the central idea of the event lay in its significance for Christ Himself rather than for His disciples, who are brought in more as spectators of its marvel than as participants in its meaning.

(2) The *place* of the Transfiguration is not definitely located in the Gospels. The phrases are in Mt. and Mk. 'unto an high mountain apart,' and in Lk. 'into a mountain.' Earlier tradition almost‡ [Note: There appears to have been another, identifying the site with the Mt. of Olives.] unanimously fixed on Mt. Tabor—a tradition which has enshrined itself in the calendar of the Eastern Church, where the Festival of the Transfiguration is celebrated on 6th Aug. as τὸ Θαβώριον. Modern opinion almost as unanimously regards as more likely Mt. Hermon, either one of its spurs or even its summit (Conder, *Tent-Work in Palestine*). The argument relies mainly on the fact of the distance of Mt. Tabor, lying near Nazareth, far to the south from Caesarea Philippi in the N.W., in whose neighbourhood the immediately

preceding incidents took place. The departure of Christ and His company from Caesarea is not mentioned till later (Mat 17:22, Mar 9:30). There is, perhaps, a certain fitness in the Transfiguration scene having occurred in the vicinity of its intimate antecedents, and in the intense atmosphere charged with their novel and perplexing intimations. It is perhaps, too, not a mere fancy that Hermon's glittering cone of snow suggested Mk.'s expression, λευκά λίαν ὡς χιῶν, if the last words are to be admitted into the text.* [Note: For a fuller discussion on the site, consult Keim, Jesus of Nazara, iv. 306, n.; Edersheim, LT; Farrar, Life of Christ. For an interesting note against Hermon's claims, see ExpT xviii. [1907] p. 333. The facts are too few for anything beyond conjecture.]

(3) There is a little more definiteness about the *occasion*. Each of the three narrators connects it by time with what goes before: 'six days,' 'eight days'; the latter (Lk.) evidently, according to the common Jewish reckoning, inclusive. The note of time is not without a purpose. The link is intentional between the new wonder and the surprising revelations recounted. Those were three in number: (a) the great confession by Peter of Christ's Messianic dignity (Mat 16:13-20, Mar 8:27-30, Luk 9:18-21); (b) our Lord's solemn announcement of His near suffering (Mat 16:21-26, Mar 8:31-37, Luk 9:22-26); and (c) the definite prediction of His coming in His Kingdom (Mat 16:27-28, Mar 8:38; Mar 9:1, Luk 9:26-27). Compare with these the statements concerning His mind in (a) Joh 11:27, (b) Joh 11:47-52, Joh 12:7, and (c) Joh 12:12-26.

(4) As for the *time* of the day when the occurrence took place, the favoured view is that it was by night. For (a) night was generally the time of His retirement for prayer (cf. Luk 6:12 with Luk 9:28); (b) the disciples were 'heavy with sleep,' and had to 'keep themselves awake'; † [Note: διαγρηγορήσαντες = 'having kept themselves awake throughout.'] and (c) they descended the mountain 'the next day,' *i.e.* after spending the night on its summit.

On the high land, ‡ [Note: τὸ ὄρος ὑψηλόν may mean simply 'the high land.'] then, close by Caesarea, possibly in the early dawn, withdrawn a stone's cast from the disciples (cf. Luk 22:41), communing face to face with the Father, Christ yielded His heart, wholly preoccupied with self-discovery and tragic anticipation, to the experience of the hour, and received the illumination and strength for which He was ripe. To the disciples it seemed as if a Divine splendour beamed around Him, lighting up the departing darkness, imparting its brightness to His raiment, and suffusing His features with a wondrous lustre, so that He appeared to be transformed.§ [Note: μετεμορφώθη: μετά change of, μορφή 'the abiding form.'] And with it, from within the veil, came, standing forth as men (Luk 9:30), the greatest of OT men of God, Moses

and Elijah, to talk with Him of His decease (ἔξοδος), and to manifest the absorbing interest of the spirit-world in His work (cf. 1Pe 1:12). Then, to the overwhelming awe of the three, there drew near a still Greater Presence, for the cloud which now cast its shadow over them all was the cloud of God Himself, and the voice heard was His, proclaiming the Son's high state and attesting His heavenly call.

2. Reality of the occurrence.—The narratives throw upon the mind of the reader the most powerful sense of the reality of the event. Their primary impression is of the outward actuality of the scene. The structure defies dissection, || [Note: | Of its textual construction, criticism has, so far, failed to give any clear account. Cf. the divergent theories of, e.g., Strauss, Keim, Bacon, Schmiedel.] the substance invention. The simple naturalness of the one, the stupendous magnitude of the other, betray no indications of artificiality, while the story as a whole is as inextricably embedded in the surrounding records as the supernatural element in the historical setting of the Gospel itself. It presents accordingly a problem to faith and unfaith alike. For the former its substance is too thin, for the latter its form too full; both are often in; danger of missing its inner force.

With the external details of the Transfiguration of Christ primitive opinion concerned itself but slightly. It dwells on the fact they served to portray—'his majesty,' with the assured conviction of which the whole attitude of the early Church was animated. Patristic and mediaeval expositors connect the event with the prediction preceding, defining it as the inauguration of His Kingdom, not indeed in its actual working, but in that personal condition of their Lord which should be the cause and signal of its commencement. Doubt of the objective reality of the glorification of Christ does not occur, and only rarely even any doubt of the literal realism of its accompanying details.* [Note: Tertullian is the most outstanding exception.]

In the modern period the historical credibility of the Transfiguration has been ably contested by rationalistic criticism, and unwisely defended by spiritualistic theory. The prepossession of naturalistic thought against the supernatural has pushed it to a variety of shifts. There is the hypothesis of *fraud*, according to which Jesus had arranged a secret meeting on the hill, when a peculiar play of light and of clouds, perhaps also a thunderstorm, caused the disciples to suppose they had perceived the transfiguration of Jesus, and helped them to mistake the two confederates† [Note: One writer, Venturini, identifies them with Joseph of Arimathaea and Joseph father of Jesus.] in the plot for Moses and Elijah (Paulus, Schleiermacher)—an unfounded conjecture, which has justly lost all repute. There is the hypothesis of *myth*. Here the incident is taken in connexion with the subsequent Elijah conversation (Mat 17:10-13, Mar 9:11-13) as its duplicate, and regarded as originating at a later date, when it was not held sufficient that in the Messianic time of Jesus, Elijah should only have

appeared figuratively in the person of the Baptist—when it was thought fitting that he should also have shown himself personally. The legend was constructed skilfully from OT figures and analogies (especially from the parallel illumination of Moses' countenance on Sinai), and from the prophecies as to the appearance of the Messiah and His forerunner (Mal 4:5) Elijah. The aim of the story was to glorify Christ over Moses, and to exhibit His message as the fulfilment of the Law and the Prophets (Strauss). With inconsiderable modifications, the foregoing view is maintained by Keim and others. The mythical hypothesis has the merit of directing attention to the probable sources from which the descriptive details were drawn, and to the natural character of their application in the picture of the event. There is the hypothesis of *allegory*, which finds in the incident a symbolization of the disciples' intoxicated perception of the destiny of Jesus and His relation to the OT. The high mountain symbolizes the height of knowledge which the disciples then attained; the metamorphosis of the form of Jesus and the splendour of His clothes are an image of their intuition of the Messianic idea; the cloud which overshadowed the appearances signifies the dimness and indefiniteness in which the new knowledge faded away, from the inability of the disciples to retain it; the proposal of Peter to build tabernacles is the attempt of this Apostle to fix at once in dogmatic form the sublime intuition (Weisse)—an absurd suggestion of ill-fitting symbols. There is the hypothesis of *dream-vision*. During or after prayer offered by Jesus or by themselves, in which mention was made of Moses and Elias, and their advent as Messianic forerunners desired, the three disciples slept, and dreamed that Moses and Elijah were present, and that Jesus conversed with them—an illusion which continued during the first confused moments after waking (Neander and others)—a most superficial perception of the situation.

The latest attempts have more interest, as discovering a certain measure of independent fact in the event. One finds the substratum of real history embodied in it in the confession of Peter made previously, which was elaborated by idealizing tendency into a vision and attributed to the disciples (Bacon, *AJTh* [*Note: JTh American Journal of Theology.*], 1902, pp. 236-265). A second regards as the reality underlying the occurrence an inner revelation made to Jesus alone, a short time before Peter's confession and in his presence; Peter had discernment enough to recognize its effect on the Master's mind and intuitively grasped its meaning (Réville, *Jésus de Nazareth*, ii. 204-206). A third holds that the story reflects the crisis when Jesus became convinced that He was the chosen heir of God. The event admits very easily of being regarded as having taken place in the inner consciousness of Jesus; probably in the company of the three, who, after awaking from sleep perhaps, received a powerful impression of the wondrous majesty with which Jesus came to meet them after He had heard the heavenly voice, the terms of which He afterwards made known to them (Schmiedel, *EBi* [*Note: Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*] 4571). A fourth sees in the scene a report by men who were confessedly in great agitation

when they witnessed it, who yet were well aware that what they saw was not reality but vision. It is to be regarded as symbolic, and consequent on the determination of Jesus to go to Jerusalem and possibly encounter a fate which, to the ordinary Jewish mind, would entirely destroy His claim to be the Messiah, or in any way a chosen instrument of Deity. It is at this moment that He puts on, to the eyes of His most intimate friends, heavenly radiance, and appears as One whose true nature is not to be judged by His human mien or His outward fortunes. It is then that His figure becomes framed to His friends' eyes in the same picture with the principal figures of the sacred history of Israel: Elijah, because of his prominence in Messianic thought, and Moses, the founder of the Old Covenant: their presence indicating that He is not to destroy their work, but to carry it further. The Transfiguration is the enthronement of the Apostolic Christology (Menziés, *Earliest Gospel*, p. 174). Akin in one respect to the foregoing is the theory of Wimmer and Holtzmann, that we have here *Dichtung*, truth in a picture. The glorified conception of Christ reached by His followers after His death is transferred to the time of His ministry, and in this picture represented as foretold then. The attractive aspect of these efforts is that they seek to identify the Transfiguration of Christ with a fresh increase of His self-realization. The event centres in His Person, and for it marks a period. All the foregoing hypotheses prove inadequate in failing to recognize the super-terrestrial powers which are represented as appearing, and as communicating a sense of their presence, to the disciples.

The lacuna is filled by Spiritualism, which finds a congenial theme in the very facts which rationalism would dissipate. The super-terrestrial is its special delight. It sets forth principles which are alleged to account for the unaccountable features of the light, the visitants, the voice. The existence of a 'spiritual body' is asserted, by means of which man may pass out of his ordinary mode of being, of sight and of hearing, into the spirit-sphere or unseen world which is everywhere around him, and there be and see and hear, in the unusual conditions subsisting in that sphere, what he never can in this. The notion seems to be that in each man there is a 'spirit,' made of a sort of thin matter, existing within the outward body, but having a purer existence.

'Deep within,

Some say, the spirit has another frame,

Invisible, magnetic, beauteous, thin,

And fine as any ether, scent, or flame.'

(J. C. Earle, *Light leading unto Light*).

In the Transfiguration the 'spiritual body' in Christ shone forth in its native might and splendour, overpowering the dimness of the flesh which He had assumed. And by the 'spirit-body' in them, the disciples were enabled to contemplate His and those of Moses and Elijah.

Scarcely so materialistic, yet quite in the same plane of thought, are the ideas of the spiritualization and subtilizing of the bodily frame until it became luminous by some inherent law connecting the physical radiance with the ripened image of God in man* [Note: Olshausen has a theory that all through the earthly life Christ's body was being etherealized, and that here we have a glimpse into the process.] (cf. e.g. George Macdonald, *Miracles of our Lord*, xii.). The error of such theorizing springs from imagining the two as existences of the same kind, and from not realizing the conception of spirit as mind or self-consciousness, which is the only way of conceiving its actual presence in our world. Spirit exists in the medium of consciousness, not in a peculiar kind of matter. The spiritualization of the natural body is not to be looked for in an astral or angel-body, but in the gesture, dignity, and noble mien that make the body of the civilized man the outward image of his soul. When we leave this track we land in vulgar mysticism,—and 'that way madness lies.'

The reality of the Transfiguration may be reasonably maintained on the basis of such considerations as these:—(a) that it primarily displays the state of the inner consciousness of Christ at its height; (b) that it was the direct resultant of the preceding events; and (c) that in the description, on the face of it, there is much that is symbolical. The Transfiguration is the transcript of an exalted spiritual experience, and only in the form of symbol can such be portrayed. To the writers it was the natural mode where their Master was concerned (cf. the Temptation and Christophanies). They were but following illustrious models on which their faith had been nurtured—of Abraham (Genesis 15), of Jacob (Gen 28:10-22), of Elijah (1 Kings 19), of Isaiah (ch. 6), of Jeremiah (Jer 1:4-10; Jeremiah 20), and above all of Moses (Exo 34:1-10; Exo 34:27-35), of Daniel (ch. 10), and of later Jewish Apocalyptic. The story is written in one mould; it is not manufactured; it tells its truth in words and images that come easily for the purpose, and wed themselves to the truth so freely that it is not possible to divorce them. Material fact and impalpable vision shoot through each other and cannot be dis severed. But this at least is plain, the body† [Note: It is a just instinct which relates the lustre to the inner life. No satisfactory explanation has yet been given of it. For hints, but only hints, cf. Dean Church's sermon on 'Sense of Beauty a witness to Immortality' in his Cathedral and University Sermons. Cf. also Browning's fine passage in *Easter Day*, in which he suggests the thought of Michael Angelo painting in heaven.] shared in the experiences. There is no attempt to picture more than has been seen, but it is implied that what has been seen is nothing in comparison with what has been felt.* [Note: the disciples' awe.] It is the picture of an exalted emotion quickened by the sense of contact with a fact so

vast that the spectators are absorbed in contemplation of it. The thought of it cannot be recaptured or recounted, because it is so unexpected, so surprising, so new, so unlike all else. Everything is swallowed up in awe and in joy, the joy of feeling face to face with a tremendous experience, an adventure beside which all the glory of the world sinks into insignificance.† [Note: Mat_17:2, Mar_9:3.] Accordingly we find two unique characteristics, the absence of imagination, and the sober insistence on circumstance. Both testify to reality. The fact to which the narrators point transcends experience, and imagination can create nothing which transcends experience. Then, odd as it may seem, the mind in recovering from transcendent wonder and retailing it, continues to regard as impressive details which are really immaterial, but without whose aid the wonder itself would remain hid. Here, then, we have no dream of a fevered twilight, but the fit expression of a mystery, beyond thought and observation, of insight and vision,‡ [Note: The name used by Christ Himself (Mat_17:9)—τὸ ὄραμα = ‘vision,’ not in the sense of dream, but ‘that which has been seen.’ For the closing reflexion, cf. Tennyson, *The Higher Pantheism*.] where the soul is like a dreamer, enthralled by sleep, and struggling with all his might to make some familiar motion.

3. Significance of the Transfiguration.—The inner meaning of the Transfiguration is best brought out by considering it in relation to Christ’s Person and Ministry. In relation to His Person it denotes (a) *a sublime self-discovery*, and (b) *a supreme self-dedication*. In relation to His Ministry it initiates *important departures in the purpose, method, and sphere of His activity*.

The event was naturally led up to. We can distinguish the several moments of its development. There was, to begin with, Jesus’ gradual enlargement of the Messiah-ideal. Neither Moses nor the prophets satisfied Him. This is one of the most certain results of contemporary NT learning. Jesus claimed to be the Messiah of prophecy, but declined the current expectations of what the Messiah should be. His own thought immensely enriched both the prophetic and the popular forecasts. The Temptation implies that consciousness. The interval between the Temptation and Transfiguration, *i.e.* His public ministry in Galilee, reveals it partly in acts, partly in hints, partly in explicit reserves. At the beginning we see the clear-cut decision; throughout its course the deepening realization of what the decision involved: *there* He is neither simply working, nor simply instructing, He is also ‘manifesting’ Himself. In the life of that *Self* the lines are complex and interwoven. They include, but are not circumscribed by, those specifically appropriate to the Messianic Hope. His *Self* is greater. That at the Baptism and the Temptation Christ saw the plenitude of its greatness and the multiplicity of its interior self-relationships is not to be believed. It revealed itself in the living process of His mental and practical powers which it excited to constant energy, and which all radiate from and converge again into it. It is a *Self* which has its definite stages of progression, whose outward signs are

traceable,§ [Note: His expressions: His 'time not come,' His 'hour,' His being 'straitened to accomplish,' He 'must work the works of God,' His raising Lazarus 'for the glory of God,' His cure of the blind man 'that the works of God be made manifest,' etc. etc.] but which finds within the veil of outward seeming its proper home, living there a concurrent life on a higher plane, with peculiar relations to an unseen world, holding power over it, and bringing power from it; and in such wise that men, observing His external attitudes, grew in wonder, debate, belief, or unbelief. His *Self* grew. Day by day it enlarged its domain, and took on an extraordinary presence of which He was conscious, a secretly luminous life known to Himself, only glimpses of which He could bring within the ken of the disciples.

Nor was this whole process secret from the disciples. We have to note in them a growing perception of the mystery of His life. They began their following of Him with their own mental prepossessions. These He was daily disturbing. Their attention He was continually arresting. The particulars of His life they were driven to scan eagerly from their various points of view, curious concerning it, questioning regarding it, taking sides about it, some slowly rising towards a clear knowledge of the reality, others hardening into the exact reverse. A calm and unimpassioned looking at the material outside manifestation of His Life without any reference to the inward reality of it, was precisely the one thing that did not happen. That it was more than human they divined, but what, how, to what extent the 'more' came in, they could not explain; they were earnestly inquiring. And thus they reached the stage when they could acknowledge His Messianic proportions: the confession at Caesarea. That great avowal precipitated the crisis. It was bound to be followed by a further revelation of His purposes. Then came the startling announcement of the Death, opening before their eyes a dark foreground of repudiation and suffering, of whose features Christ Himself, it is probable, could at the moment furnish no clear picture: an announcement whose effect was not mitigated by the further revelation of Resurrection and the coming of the Kingdom. It was a memorable week that followed. The silence of the narrative tells of the intensity of the time. They were on the summits where life absorbs the soul. Thither the juncture of events had brought them. The Master must be lucid.

But first to Himself. A necessary hour is upon Him. Knowing it, He, according to His wont, restrains not the inevitable, but seeks solitude and God. He spends the night in prayer. In the light of His people's destiny, in the face of His prophetic forerunners, conscious of a deeper need and a more desperate struggle than theirs, He presses His life closer to God's, reaching out after completer sympathy and perfect understanding of His purposes and of His own part in fulfilling them, and receives in return that wonderful and beautiful inflow of life which stirs up unfathomable springs of purity within, and transmutes even His face and form. It was as when in the sunlight, peering into the heart of a gem, we see depth opening beyond depth until it looks as

if there were no end to the chambers of splendour that are shut up in the little stone; flake after flake of luminous colour floating up out of the unseen fountain which lies somewhere in its heart. In that high hour Christ knew Himself.

He likewise learned His task. In the same self-revealing hour the issue of His life was registering itself in the sight of God, who 'seeth the end in the beginning,' and won His approval. The issue was inevitable. For Christ to know God's will was to do it. There was neither doubt nor debate, but immediate decision. He had no instinctive unwillingness like Jeremiah. Rather He resembled Isaiah, who, when he had seen the Majesty of Jehovah, came forth from His presence with an awe upon him that never left him, and a force of conviction that never deserted him, and with the feeling of an imperative necessity lying on him to speak His word to men which he could not resist. So Christ. He had seen His own glory and felt its power in Him, and was uplifted with a radiant energy before which, as it seemed, no wickedness could stand, and which inspired with a joy deep and strong and solemn. The sweet and awful gladness of His consecration fills His heart and shines out in His face. The Transfiguration was the Divine defiance of the coming darkness (cf. 2Co 4:6).* [Note: Matheson (Studies in the Portrait of Christ, vol. ii.) interprets the Transfiguration as designed solely to inspire and comfort Christ in prospect of His approaching Sufferings by providing an anticipation of the glory of the Resurrection ['decease' = exodus by resurrection and ascension]. Dr. Mason (Faith of the Gospel, p. 194) thinks the Transfiguration an opening of the door of heaven for a splendid departure, His earthly probation being now ended. An ingenious writer in the Church Quarterly Review (July 1901, 'A Study of our Lord') draws out these parallels:—transfiguration of body in face of maltreatment of body, appearance of Elijah and Moses in face of rejection by rulers and people, the cloud and voice in face of the hiding of the Father's face. Such exegesis is exaggeration and misses proportion.]

The Transfiguration event transformed His mind: it transformed also His ministry. Its fascination was upon Him, impelling Him to make it manifest with a certain eager wistfulness. The motive is not: Death is before Me, the sooner it is over the better; but, The beauty of the Father's face has risen upon Me, let it shine out into the hearts of men, and draw all men unto it.

The endeavour to bring this home to the disciples now dominates His thought and directs His activity, dividing both from His Galilaeen teaching and work by the clearest line of demarcation. Themes original to the Law and the Prophets yield to the 'excellent glory' of the Cross, and the nature of the Kingdom His death would introduce. Miracles† [Note: Miracles are now rare—and enter exceptionally.] and parables cease as an integral part of His ministry. Public addresses, which hitherto had been the rule, are now limited, so far as we read, to the Temple courts and the Sanhedrin; their place is taken by more private converse. There is a less obvious

calling of attention to Himself, in view of a keener anxiety to concentrate *attention on the Spirit that animates Himself and the Father*, and is needful for that higher form of fellowship of men with God than Israel had known, which He Himself enjoyed, and which He promises will glorify them as it had glorified Him.‡ [Note: John 16, 17.] From this last consideration we deduce the significance of the event for us. It is the same as for Christ and His disciples. 'We shall be like him,' says the disciple who had felt most effectually the power of His personal presence (1Jn_3:2).

That points to an organic change that will take place in us at His coming. It has to be taken in conjunction with this other, 'Christ in you the hope of glory' (Col_1:27). The moral transformation is the root and beginning of the organic. Christ not only so acts upon us as to conform us to His holy and exalted pattern now; when He comes again, it shall be to reflect His glory into the persons of His believing followers. The Church of the redeemed will mirror His surpassing loveliness and majesty, 'He shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be marvelled at in all them that believe' (2Th_1:10).

Literature.—The literature of the Transfiguration is not large, and is found chiefly in sermons, for a bibliography of which see *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times.*] xviii. [1907] p. 313, adding, Ruskin, *Fronde Agrestes*, 178; Rendel Harris, *Memoranda Sacra*, 87. For critical discussion consult Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, pt. ii. c. [Note: circa, about.] 10; Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, vol. iv.; *JThSt* [Note: *ThSt Journal of Theological Studies.*] , Jan. 1903, July 1903, Jan. 1904; *AJTh* [Note: *JTh American Journal of Theology.*] , 1902. For expository articles see *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times.*] xvii. [1906] p. 372 ff., xiv. [1903] p. 442 ff.; Trench, *Studies in the Gospels*, Essay 8; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , art. 'Transfiguration'; the Lives of Christ, specially, those by Farrar, Edersheim, and Matheson.

A. S. Martin.

☞ Transmigration

TRANSMIGRATION.—The idea of the pre-existence of the human soul seems to be assumed in the question which the disciples put to Jesus with reference to the man born blind (Joh_9:2). The pre-existence hinted at is presumably and at first glance an incarnated one, for it is possible to sin in it. But if this exegesis of the passage be correct, then, at least in the minds of the disciples who propounded the question, there was a doctrine of transmigration. In order to ascertain the correctness or the exegesis, it is necessary to look into the antecedents and broad setting of the thought.

The doctrine of transmigration, *i.e.* the idea that when the soul leaves the body at death it passes into another body, was held widely among the Egyptians, the Hindus, and the Greeks. Each one of these peoples, however, developed it in a peculiar form of its own. Through the long history represented by their combined life, it assumed a large variety of aspects. Broadly speaking, these may be reduced to two, the cruder and the more refined metempsychosis.

(a) In the crudest form, belief in transmigration was simply the belief that the moving principle of a living being, either immediately upon the death of that being or after a more or less prolonged interval, takes upon itself another organism. In this form of it, the doctrine does not distinguish between human bodies and bodies of other living beings; or, to be more precise, of other material forms reputed to be living. The soul is supposed to pass into another organism of the same class, or of a higher or a lower class. A man might be reborn as a brute, or as a tree or stream, or even as a star. The ethical idea associated with this form of metempsychosis is in the belief that the kind of body taken by the soul depends on its realizing or failing to realize ethical ideals. Of this form of the doctrine, it is quite safe to say, there is not the slightest trace either in the NT or in the whole range of Hebrew literature, with its sequel of Jewish Rabbinical teaching of the earlier period. If it appear at all in Jewish thought, it does so as an importation in a much later stage than the Biblical.

(b) The more refined form of the doctrine of transmigration limits the sphere of movement to the human race. The human soul or personality is, according to this conception, capable of reappearing and taking part in the world. In the strictest sense of the word this is, of course, not transmigration, but reincarnation. But whatever it may be called, there are a number of expressions in the Gospels which point to the existence of the belief in the time of Jesus. Chief and foremost among these are the passages which refer to John the Baptist (Mat 11:4; Mat 17:12-13, Mar 9:13). Here the disciples are puzzled by the apparent inconsistency between the fact that Jesus is the Messiah and the fact that Elijah has not appeared, as, in accordance with an authoritative interpretation of the prophecy of Malachi (Mal 4:5), he was expected, to precede and prepare the way for the Messiah. The disciples evidently accepted the teaching of the scribes. This belief, however, does not put it beyond doubt that the doctrine of transmigration or even reincarnation was current. Elijah had not died and been divested of his first body. His reappearance could only be conceived of as involving his descent from heaven with the same body which he took there at the time of his ascension. The difficulty in believing that John the Baptist was Elijah consisted, at least in part, in the fact that he was known to have had a natural birth; whereas the return of Elijah would necessarily exclude such birth. Jesus' answer to the disciples simply removes the case from the physical into the spiritual sphere, and thus makes the question before their minds an irrelevant one. The prophecy had been

fulfilled, but its fulfilment involved neither the reincarnation of Elijah nor his descent from heaven with his first body.

Another instance of belief which might be mistaken for transmigration is that suggested in Herod's words (Mat_14:1 f.) identifying Jesus with John the Baptist. But here, too, the words scarcely point to belief in transmigration. All that is necessary to assume is that the remorse-stricken Herod saw in the miracles reported of Jesus that John the Baptist had risen from the dead. It is belief in resurrection rather than in rebirth.

Still another case is that in which the disciples, in answer to the question of Jesus, report that some believed Him to be Elijah, others Jeremiah, and others one of the prophets (Mat_16:14, Mar_6:14-17). The idea of transmigration is more natural in this passage, but even here it is not clearly set forth. As far as Jesus is concerned, it is certainly not only not held or encouraged by Him, but quite definitely set aside. At most, it can be only an idea entertained by the common people.

Outside of the Gospels, the traces that a belief in metempsychosis was held in Palestine at the time of Jesus are very scanty. It appears that among the Essenes it was held that the soul was immortal, and its life upon earth due to its being drawn from its native ether and entangled in the body as in a prison cell (Josephus *BJ* ii. viii. 11). The affinity of this belief with the Platonic teaching regarding the nature and origin of the soul suggests that the Platonic idea of transmigration, as its inevitable logical corollary, was held also by the Essenes.

In general, there was nothing in the nature of Jewish thought to prevent the adoption of the idea of transmigration as soon as the distinction between soul and body supplanted the older idea of the unitary character of the human being. On the contrary, there was very much to make the thought welcome in the Rabbinical system. The doctrine of pre-existence (of the Messiah, of the Torah, of the Tabernacle) would easily lend itself as a basis for the idea of the pre-existence in some form or other of human souls. Further, belief in the possession of the body by more than one spiritual being (demoniac possession) would tend to prepare the way for the belief in the return of disembodied spirits into human bodies. Finally, the idea of resurrection from the dead furnished an analogue to reincarnation. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, if the notion should appear more or less clearly in the later Rabbinical theology (cf. Epiphanius Wilson, *The Talmud*, Preface). The question of its existence in the days of Jesus Christ must be left open, while the question of its being entertained by Him or taught in the Gospels must be answered in the negative.

Literature.—On the general subject of metempsychosis, cf. Alger, *Hist. of the Doctrine of the Future Life*, 14, Boston, 1889, pt. v. ii.; ed. D. Walker, *Reincarnation*:

A Study of Forgotten Truth, Boston, 1888. On the allied doctrines of pre-existence of souls in Jewish thought, cf. Weber, *Jüd. Theol.*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] pp. 212, 225 ff.; Drummond, *Philo Judaeus*, i. 336; Siegfried, *Philo v. Alexandria*, p. 242 ff. On the idea of transmigration in the NT, Pryse, *Reincarnation in the NT*, N.Y. 1900. [This last work, however, is scientifically of very little value].

A. C. Zenos.

☞ Travel

TRAVEL.—Travelling for pleasure was almost, if not altogether, unknown in the ancient world. This is to be accounted for by lack of roads, lack of conveyances, and perils by the way. Travellers had usually some definite object in view; Abraham seeking for a home at the command of Jehovah (Gen 12:1 ff.); Jacob fleeing from his brother (Gen 28:10); the Israelites going up to their sacred places, and later to the Temple at Jerusalem. As the sea had special terrors, travelling was chiefly by land, and not till well on in history did men launch boldly out into the deep. In the days of the Empire, sailing was confined to certain well defined tracks, and to certain seasons. On land, travel was done for the most part on foot; hence the custom of washing the feet (Gen 18:4, Jdg 19:21 etc.) was almost a necessity as a token of hospitality. Horses were used for war, and camels for the desert. Persons of rank rode on mules (2Sa 13:29, 1Ki 1:33), while the ass was more usually kept as a beast of burden. Wheeled waggons were not in general use, and, on the rare occasions on which they were employed, were heavy, cumbersome, and without springs. Joseph sent waggons for his father (Gen 45:19; Gen 45:21); the kings of Israel had their chariots (1Ki 22:35); and the Ethiopian eunuch made his journey to Jerusalem in a chariot (Act 8:28); but wheeled vehicles of any kind were rare. Long journeys were generally undertaken in the summer, when the roads were good and firm. In the winter the roads were soft, and other conditions unfavourable. In Mat 24:20 Jesus says, 'Pray that your flight be not in the winter time,' which means the rainy season, when roads are practically impassable, and food difficult to obtain *en route*. This accounts for St. Paul's desire to have Timothy with him before the winter set in (2Ti 4:21). In the morning the traveller started on his journey, and continued it till noon-day, when he took refuge for an hour or two under some kindly shade from the scorching rays of the sun, and then resumed his course (Son 1:7). To refuse hospitality to a traveller was a breach of good manners, if not, indeed, an insult to God. This state of affairs continues largely in Palestine to-day, though on the tourist routes the people have fallen in with the spirit of the age.

The ordinary way of reckoning the length of a journey was not by miles, but by time (Gen 30:36 יום י הרהד, Jon 3:4 יום מהלך, Luk 2:44 ἡμέρας ὁδός), and this makes it difficult to determine accurately the distances covered. Moses asked that the children of Israel should be permitted to go into the wilderness a three days' journey (Exo 5:3), and in Gen 31:23 it is said that Laban pursued after Jacob a seven days' journey. There would be a great difference between the speed of these two companies, and consequently in the ground traversed. In hilly districts the progress would be less than in the flat country, and a small company or a single individual would go faster than a caravan. An ordinary day's journey might be put down at about 20 miles, but it would require an extraordinary stretch of imagination to make that fit in with Num 11:31. In Luk 2:44 it probably meant not more than 6 miles, for these festal caravans, with their crowds, moved at a leisurely pace; and tradition has it that the halting-place was Beeroth, which is 6 miles north of Jerusalem.

The longer the journey the slower the pace, for provision for man and beast and equipment for the way had to be carried. 'Take victuals with you for the journey' (Jos 9:11) was the rule and not the exception. This led Christ to say to the Twelve, when He sent them out, 'Provide neither gold nor silver for your journey' (Mat 10:9-10 ||), so that they might not be hampered by these things, and that they might receive a much-needed lesson in faith.

Reference is made in Act 1:12 to a **Sabbath day's journey** (σαββάτου ὁδός). This is the only place where the phrase occurs. Olivet is said to be a Sabbath day's journey from Jerusalem. The expression is very indefinite. Josephus in one place (*Ant.* xx. viii. 6) gives the distance from Jerusalem to the Mount of Olives as 5 furlongs, and in another as 6 (*BJ* v. ii. 3). Schleusner makes it 7½ stadia or furlongs. The difference seems to lie in the varying length of the cubit, which in the older Hebrew measurement was longer than in the later. The result is the same—2000 cubits, which would bring it into conformity with Rabbinical law, 'Let no man go walking from his place beyond 2000 ells on the seventh day' (Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] Targ. [Note: Targum.] on Exo 16:29). A Sabbath day's journey was by common consent 2000 cubits or ells, though some Rabbis allowed a kind of sliding scale, and spoke of the greater journey (2800), the medium (2000), and the smaller (1800). This was purely Rabbinical, and deduced from (1) Exo 16:29 'Abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day'; (2) from the distance between the Ark and the people on the march (Jos 3:4); and (3) from the conditions laid down as to the cities of refuge (Num 35:5). In Exo 16:29 the 'place' by a process of Rabbinical reasoning became the city where a man dwelt; and it was argued that 'if one who committed murder accidentally was allowed to take this journey of 2000 ells on the Sabbath day without violating the sanctity of the day, innocent people might do the same.' By a little ingenuity a Sabbath day's journey could be considerably extended.

If a person desired to do so, he had simply to carry to some point within the Sabbatical limit two meals before the Sabbath began, one of which he had to eat and the other to bury; and that place became for him his dwelling-place. It is even alleged that by fixing his eye upon a tree or wall within the prescribed limit, and uttering certain words, he could make that his starting-point.

In NT times it was customary, as indeed it is to-day, to accompany a departing guest on a part of his way (Rom 15:24, Act 15:3, 1Co 16:6) as a token of goodwill and affection.

Literature.—Thomson, *LB* [*Note: The Land and the Book.*] ; G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [*Note: GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*] ; W. M. Ramsay, *The Letters to the Seven Churches*; Conder, *Palestine*; *PEFSt* [*Note: EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.*] ; *RP* [*Note: P Records of the Past.*] ; artt. in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , Extra Vol. pp. 368-402.

R. Leggat.

☞ Treasure

TREASURE.—The word ‘treasure’ upon the lips of a Hebrew signifies a store of anything that constitutes wealth—of corn and wine and oil, as well as of gold and silver and precious stones (Mat 13:52). Hence spiritually the word suggests an apt figure of the true eternal riches. Just as on earth the worldly-wise may lay up stores of wealth, so in the heavens the man who seeks after spiritual things may lay up for himself an eternal treasure. It has been imagined by some commentators that by ‘treasure in heaven’ our Lord means merely the reward which shall be given hereafter to all who suffer loss for His sake on earth. ‘Go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven’ (Mat 19:21, Mar 10:21, Luk 18:22), they take to mean merely, ‘Give away thine earthly wealth, and God shall give thee instead heavenly blessedness’; but so to interpret the words is to miss by far the most valuable part of their teaching. It was this interpretation that formed the chief justification for the monkish asceticism of the Middle Ages. It gave rise to a false spiritualism, to the fatal and irreconcilable dualism of sacred and secular. In addressing the words to the rich young man, our Lord was treating a particular case, the case of one whose spiritual aspirations were crushed beneath the burden of his wealth. The treasure in heaven which Christ told him he should have was not to be gained by the simple process of denuding himself of his worldly possessions—God would not step in to supply in the next world what he had voluntarily sacrificed in this. Such teaching would have been an appeal to selfish prudence merely, would

justify, if it were correct, all that unbelievers have said about the selfishness of Christianity. It was not to the man's selfishness that Christ addressed Himself, but to the earnest longing after righteousness which He perceived in him. 'What lack I yet?' the man had said, even after asserting that he had kept the commandments from his youth up. Christ therefore bade him cast aside the temptation which bound him down, that his aspirations might at last have free play; that, untrammelled by earthly cares, he might take to himself the treasure of righteousness and truth which he had always longed to make his own.

That spiritual treasure is regarded by our Lord as a personal thing, not as a mere reward assigned from without, is rendered even more plain by what He says regarding the 'treasure of the heart' ([Mat_12:35](#) || [Luk_6:45](#)). This treasure of the heart is manifestly the accumulated tendencies which we call character, the habits which a man makes, the qualities which he acquires, by the repeated choices of his life. He who strives continuously to follow the dictates of righteousness and love, makes for himself a righteous and loving character. His past deeds become a store from which he can continually draw anew. The more good deeds he does the richer grows his heart in goodness, and the greater will his joy become in doing what is right. His heart will of itself bear fruit of goodness. But the same is true also of the evil man. The second lie is proverbially easier than the first. The more evil he does, the more evil grows his heart, until it is well-nigh impossible for it to produce what is good. His heart becomes callous and hard, so that he can no longer take delight in goodness. Thus, again, it is true that 'where the treasure is, there will the heart be also.' The heart of the good man brings down heaven to earth, while that of the evil man could find no bliss in heaven itself.

When in [Col_2:3](#) St. Paul tells his readers that in Christ are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, he is but following out the same figure. ἐν Χριστῷ expresses one of the two great principles of the Pauline theology. To win the true treasure a man must be in Christ; for He is the universal Man, the ideal of manhood, the only perfectly loving and wise and true of all mankind. In Him only was the heavenly treasure revealed in perfect fulness. He who would share it must therefore be in Christ, must be inspired by His spirit.

The true treasure of the human heart is the Kingdom of heaven. To have the Kingdom of God within one, is to be spiritually rich indeed. In setting forth the manner in which the Kingdom is received into different kinds of hearts, our Lord once again uses the figure of treasure, in the parable of the Treasure hid in a field ([Mat_13:44](#)). Here He refers to an experience not uncommon in the East, where the uncertain tenure of property led men often to hide their wealth, and where the equal uncertainty of life caused it often to remain unclaimed. This and the parable of the Pearl of Great

[Note: read Cranmer's 'Great' Bible 1539.] Price (another kind of treasure), which follows it, describe the two ways in which the truth of the gospel is received by men. There is the finder who has never sought at all, and who comes upon his find by accident; and there is the finder who has spent his life in seeking. In this, however, they are like, that when the treasure is discovered each is willing to part with all he has for its possession. Indeed, this willingness is the test of the true finder; but it is also the essential mark of the true treasure. It is of such a nature that it cannot be possessed for less than all that a man is and has. It lays hold upon the true finder's heart; for in it he recognizes the satisfaction of all his longings: it is the completion of his being, the source of his life to all eternity.

Literature.—The Comm. on the NT; standard works on the Parables; Beyschlag's and Weiss' *NT Theol.*; Flint, *Christ's Kingdom upon Earth* (1865), 196; H. Scott Holland, *God's City* (1894), 161; W. G. Tarrant in *Serm. by Unitarian Ministers*, i. (1905). 25.

W. J. S. Miller.

☞ Treasury

TREASURY.—Two words are trad. 'treasury' in the Gospels.

1. γαζοφυλάκιον (fr. γάζα, a word of Persian origin = θησαυρός, 'treasure,' and φυλακή, 'guard'), 'a place for keeping treasure,' i.e. either a treasure-chest or a treasure-chamber (Mar_12:41; Mar_12:43 || Luk_21:1, Joh_8:20). (1) In the two Synoptic passages it is used, in connexion with the incident of the poor widow who gave her two mites, to denote a treasure-chest, or receptacle into which offerings were cast by worshippers coming into the Temple—a sense in which the word is found also in Josephus (*Ant.* xix. vi. 1, where Agrippa hangs his chain of gold ὑπὲρ τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον). According to the Talmud (*Sheqalim*, vi. 5), there stood in the court of the women, the most frequented part of the sacred enclosure, 13 brazen chests, into which were dropped the contributions made for the service of the Temple, the support of the poor, and other pious purposes. These chests were of a peculiar shape—bulging out beneath so as to be of considerable capacity, but tapering upwards to a narrow mouth, into which the offerings were put—and, because of their resemblance to inverted trumpets, were known as *shôphârôth* (תִּרְפִּישׁ, 'trumpets'). It was into one of these *shôphârôth* that the widow would cast her all. (2) In the Authorized and Revised Versions rendering of Joh_8:20 Jesus is said to have spoken

‘in the treasury’ (ἐν τῷ γαζοφυλακίῳ), as He taught in the Temple. This rendering would imply that the γαζοφυλάκιον in question was not a treasure-chest merely, but a part of the Temple itself in which treasure was kept. Now, we know that there were special treasure-chambers within the inner court, in which not only the precious vessels of the sacrificial service and the costly garments of the priests, but vast sums of money and various other valuables were kept, and that these treasure-chambers, which were under the charge of officers known as γαζοφύλακες, were called γαζοφυλάκια (Neh 10:37 LXX Septuagint ; Josephus BJ vi. v. 2). That Jesus would be found teaching in one of these inner treasure-chambers is, however, exceedingly improbable. And when we put such a supposition aside, two views may be taken of the meaning of ἐν τῷ γαζοφυλακίῳ. (a) We may take γαζοφυλάκιον to denote, as in the Synoptics, nothing more than a treasure-chest, and understand ἐν to be used in the sense of proximity merely (so Meyer; cf. ἐν δεξιᾷ θεοῦ [Rom 8:34 and frequently], ‘at the right hand of God’), so that the phrase would signify ‘at or near the treasury.’ (b) We may take ἐν in its strict local sense (so Winer, *Gram. of NT Gr.* 481), and then understand γαζοφυλάκιον to denote that part of the Women’s Court in which the treasure-chests were kept. But in either case the general meaning will be the same. Jesus was not in some closely guarded chamber of the inner Temple, but sitting ‘near the *shôphârôth*,’ or ‘in the colonnade where the *shôphârôth* stood.’

2. κορβανᾶς (fr. κορβᾶν; see Corban) occurs in NT only in Mat 27:6, where it denotes the sacred treasury of the Temple. Into this treasury the chief priests would not put Judas’ thirty pieces of silver, ‘because it is the price of blood.’ In Josephus (*BJ* ii. ix. 4) the word is used not of the Temple treasury, but of the treasures it contained. Herod is said to have created a disturbance in Jerusalem by expending upon aqueducts ‘that sacred treasure which is called *corbanas*’ (τὸν ἱερὸν θησαυρόν, καλεῖται δὲ κορβανᾶς).

It may be added that, although in Authorized and Revised Versions θησαυρός is invariably rendered ‘treasure,’ it is occasionally used in a sense that corresponds to ‘treasury’ or the place where treasure is kept. In Mat 12:35 || Luk 6:45 it denotes the treasury of the heart; in Mat 13:52 that of the well-provided householder, to whom Jesus likens the ‘scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven.’

Literature.—The Lexx. and Comm.; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* p. 536 ff.; Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* [Note: *Talmud.*] p. 2506; Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, v. 192 ff.; Edersheim, *LT* [Note: *T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].*] ii. 164 f., 387; Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] i. ii. 260 ff.

J. C. Lambert.

☩ Tree

TREE (ξύλον, Lat. *lignum, arbor*).—A poetic name for the Cross (Act 5:30; Act 10:39; Act 13:29, 1Pe 2:24; cf. Gal 3:13; nowhere in Gospels). The name no doubt originated in the practice (cf. Jos 10:26) of employing a tree in case of haste for the purpose of crucifixion* [Note: Lips, *de Cruc.* ii. v. Though ξύλον is rarely applied to live wood in classical Greek (see Liddell and Scott, s.v.), it is frequently so used in later and Biblical Greek; cf. Jdg 9:8-15, Psa 96:12; Psa 104:16, Luk 23:31, Rev 2:7; Rev 22:2.] (cf. *gallows-tree*), but in mediaeval times it was explained by a quaint legend. As he lay a dying, it was said, Adam sent his son Seth to the angel that guarded Paradise, to crave a bough from the tree of life. The angel gave it, and Seth carried it to his father, but found him dead. He planted the bough upon his grave. In course of time, when Solomon was building the Temple, the tree was cut down, but it refused to be fitted into any part of the Temple, and was placed over a stream to serve as a bridge. By and by the queen of Sheba came with her gifts and offerings. Seeing the tree she would not walk over it, since she recognized that the Redeemer of the world would suffer on it. Long afterwards the Jews took it and cast it into a stagnant pool, which derived a miraculous virtue from its presence: an angel descended from time to time and troubled the water, and the first that stepped in after the troubling was healed (cf. Joh 5:4). There it remained until the time of our Lord's Passion, when it was taken out of the pool and fashioned into the Cross on which He suffered.† [Note: Daniel, *Thes. Hymnol.* i. c. n.]

Much devout fancy was inspired by the term. It suggested a reference to the Cross in Son 2:3; Son 2:5, which runs thus in the Vulgate: 'Sicut malus inter ligna silvarum, sic dilectus meus inter filios. Sub umbra illius, quem desideraveram, sedi: et fructus ejus dulcis gutturi meo. Fulcite me floribus, stipate me malis: quia amore languedo.' The hymn-writers extolled the 'arbor salutifera' which bore such sweet and precious fruit. One says:‡ [Note: i. cxli.]

'Fertilitate potens, O dulce et nobile lignum,

Quando tuis ramis tam nova poma geris.’

And in his exquisite *Laudismus de S. Cruce* St. Bonaventura says:§ [Note: ii. cxxii.]

‘Crux est arbor decorata,
Christi sanguine sacrata,
Cunctis plena fructibus;
Quibus animae eruuntur,
Cum supernis nutriuntur
Cibus in caelestibus.’

The Fathers loved to contrast the first tree whose fruit brought death into the world, and the second tree whose ‘leaves are for the healing of the nations’ ([Rev_22:2](#)). Cf. St. Jerome on [Mar_15:23](#) ‘Hic figitur salus in ligno, ligno primo infixata mors. Lignum primum lignum scientiae boni et mali est. Et secundum lignum boni tantum nobis et vitae lignum est.’ In *Evangel. Nicodem.* xxiii., after the ‘harrying of hell’ Hades says to Satan: ‘All that thou gainedst by the tree of knowledge (διὰ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς γνώσεως), by the tree of the Cross (διὰ τοῦ ξύλου τοῦ σταυροῦ) thou hast lost.’ See also art. Cross.

Literature—Reference may be made to ‘The Legend of the Cross’ in Baring-Gould’s *Curious Myths of the Middle Ages*, and to Farrar’s *Christ in Art*, p. 276.

David Smith.

☩ Trial Of Jesus

TRIAL OF JESUS.—The narratives of what may be termed, for the sake of convenience, the twofold trial of Jesus yield a record of the proceedings which is fairly intelligible and substantially authentic, but which is bound up with a triple set of problems. Some of these are topographical or archaeological; some are legal, connected with the jurisprudence of the trial; while others are historical, arising from the literary criticism of the Evangelic traditions. The fragmentariness of these traditions* [Note: The relevant passages are [Mar_14:53](#) to [Mar_15:20](#), [Mat_26:57](#) to

Mat 27:31, Luk 22:54 to Luk 23:25, Joh 18:12 to Joh 19:16.] and the lack of any outside testimony occasionally prevent criticism from throwing a steady ray of light upon the exact course of affairs, and this is particularly the case with regard to the first two classes of the trial-problems.

1. The topographical problem.—This includes the question of Pilate's Praetorium (see vol. i. p. 859, and Praetorium), the precise meaning of Gabbatha (Joh 19:13, cf. Gabbatha and Pavement), the problem whether Annas and Caiaphas had separate residences or stayed together in an official house, and the site of the meeting-place of the Sanhedrin (in the house of Caiaphas or elsewhere). These details are discussed elsewhere in this Dictionary, and it is unnecessary to examine them afresh, particularly as the decisive evidence, such as it is, has to be drawn as a rule from considerations which lie outside the words of the Gospels. The same remark applies, though in a less degree, to

2. The legal problem.—The question whether Jesus was legally condemned to death starts an interesting problem in historical jurisprudence, but it was not present to the minds of the Evangelists or of the original reporters of the Passion; and this, combined with the condensed, fragmentary, and even discrepant character of their traditions, renders it extremely difficult to answer the question with any confidence in the affirmative or the negative. If the Talmudic law was in force in Palestine during the lifetime of Jesus, there would be no course open but to agree with some savants of last century that the Sanhedrin acted illegally.† [Note: Thus the ablest of recent jurists who have discussed the problem, Mr. A. Taylor Innes, sums up his inquiry in the words: 'A process,' begun, continued, and apparently finished in the course of one night, commencing with witnesses against the accused who were sought for by the Judges, but whose evidence was not sustained even by them; continuing by interrogations which Hebrew law does not sanction; and ending with a demand for confession which its doctors expressly forbid; all followed, twenty-four hours too soon, by a sentence which described a claim to be the fulfiller of the hopes of Israel as blasphemy—such a process had neither the form nor the fairness of a judicial trial.' This needs to be qualified, but substantially it seems accurate.] But the Talmud represents a much later phase of Jewish jurisprudence, and it is probable that, viewed in the light of contemporary practice, the Council were careful on the whole to observe the letter, though not the spirit, of justice, and to practise most of the forms of legality.‡ [Note: Contrast, on this point, the juristic colouring of the *Acta Pilati* (cf. von Dobschütz, *ZNTW*, 1902, 89-114, and Mommsen, *ib.* 198 f.).] Thus it is, far from certain that they met formally at night, though it seems as if they passed their resolution before daybreak; and the main counts against them are the neglect to warn the witnesses solemnly before giving evidence, the judicial use of the prisoner's confession, and the undue haste with which the proceedings were rushed through.

They were kept within judicial limits only so far as it was necessary to save appearances.

The proceedings before Pilate are less obscure. It was necessary for the Jewish authorities to obtain the governor's sanction for the execution of the death sentence, and this involved a fresh trial of the accused. Pilate seems to have acquitted Jesus of the *majestas* or high treason which the Council first brought forward against Him, but there is some doubt as to whether the acquittal was formally pronounced in accordance with law. In the Markan tradition, followed by Matthew, Pilate never pronounces Jesus to be innocent, although it is plain that he did not believe Him to be guilty. His reason for allowing Him to be crucified is a desire to curry favour with the people. When he discovers that they prefer Barabbas to Jesus, and that the latter is not after all a popular infatuated leader, he has little or no scruples about handing Him over to the tender mercies of His compatriots. His blood be on their heads!

The Lukan tradition, followed substantially in the Fourth Gospel, raises the problem of jurisprudence definitely by affirming that Pilate thrice pronounced Jesus innocent (Luk 23:4; Luk 23:14; Luk 23:22). If so, the first acquittal makes the reference of Jesus to Herod illegal. But, as we shall see, it is probable that this formal verdict is at least antedated, and that Jesus was not finally acquitted, if He was acquitted at all, until He had been sent back from Herod. Thereafter the proceedings are destitute of justice; Pilate is concerned not with his legal duty, but with the interests of his personal safety and popularity, which were endangered by his conscientious desire to release the prisoner.

Only a critical analysis and comparison of these early Christian traditions can yield evidence for estimating aright the problems of the jurisprudence of the trials; and even the results of such an inquiry are not final, especially in the case of the Jewish trial. It is with a preliminary caution of this kind that we enter on the third and most important stage of our discussion.

3. The historical problem.—The confusing and even conflicting features in the narratives of the trial of Jesus, which followed His arrest (cf. Arrest and Betrayal), are due to the fact that no uniform or complete account of it was ever circulated among the early Christians. The Gospels betray different currents of tradition, and these currents do not always flow in the same channel. Here and there, in different circles, different phases or reminiscences of the trial were preserved; but not even in the Markan narrative, with its Petrine basis, does an exhaustive, accurate record of the proceedings lie embedded. The later Gospels treat the account in their own way, omitting, adapting, and adding, to suit their own religious interests; and one of the tasks of criticism is to determine how far these may preserve some authentic traits, for it is as erroneous to presuppose that all later additions to the Markan outline are

unhistorical as to assume that the details of the four canonical stories can be harmonized into a protocol of the actual proceedings.

In compiling the later Acts of the Martyrs, Christians were better off. For one thing, these subsequent trials were usually deliberate; occasionally they were expected for some time, so that the Church was not taken by surprise, and in any case attention was piously paid to the last words and experiences of the saint. By the 4th cent. the shorthand reports of the trials became also accessible to the martyrologist; he was thereby enabled to write dialogues which had the merit of expressing not only what the accused and the accusers should have said, but sometimes what they did say.* [Note: F. C. Conybeare, *The Apology and Acts of Apollonius*, pp. 6-7.] The trial of Jesus found His adherents quite unprovided for any such record of what happened. 'The sudden Roman faces and the noise,' the circumstances of horror and surprise which attended the arrest of their Master, the haste of the proceedings, and the shock of fear which overtook them, were enough to prevent the disciples from realizing what was going on. All was over before they could steady their minds to anything except the general fact of the Master's arrest and execution. Afterwards, they were able to piece together, from their own observation and from the information of councillors like Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathaea, or of sympathizers in the crowd, or of some of the women, several of the words and experiences of their Lord before the Council and the procurator. The exigencies of controversy with the Jews and the natural desire to remember as vividly and completely as possible the details of the scene, would foster this movement towards a recollection of the trial. The extant records show how comparatively scanty was the harvest of memory. But their very scantiness proves that the instinct for embroidering the facts with unhistorical fancies did not operate to any serious extent within the primitive Christian traditions, while their tone of moderation tells in favour of the essential historicity of the method in which they record actions of the Jews and Romans which must have outraged and shocked the later Christian conscience. There is neither reprobation of the accusers and judges, nor any effusive sympathy shown with the Sufferer. The Evangelic narratives do not burn emotional incense before the figure of Jesus. Nor are they tinged with serious and direct censure. Thus St. Luke, e.g., is content to record the painful story without pointing a moral or adorning the tale; he does not stop or step aside to blacken Judas or Herod, as Thucydides has exposed Cleon and Hyperbolus, or as many subsequent writers in Christianity have treated the Jewish and Roman actors in the Passion-story. Against the sentimental, unhistorical rhetoric of the latter class, John Stuart Mill's protest may stand. In the second chapter of his essay *On Liberty*, he remarks: 'The man who left on the memory of those who witnessed his life and conversation, such an impression of his moral grandeur, that eighteen subsequent centuries have done homage to him as the Almighty in person, was ignominiously put to death, as what? as a blasphemer. Men did not merely mistake their benefactor; they mistook him for the exact contrary of

what he was, and treated him as that prodigy of impiety, which they themselves are now held to be, for their treatment of him.’ These men, he proceeds to argue, ‘were, to all appearance, not bad men—not worse than men commonly are, but rather the contrary; men who possessed in a full, or somewhat more than a full measure, the religious, moral, and patriotic feelings of their time and people; the very kind of men who, in all times, our own included, have every chance of passing through life blameless and respected. The high priest who rent his garments when the words were pronounced which, according to all the ideas of his country, constituted the blackest guilt, was in all probability quite as sincere in his horror and indignation as the generality of respectable and pious men now are in the religious and moral sentiments they profess.’ This estimate is, of course, too roseate to stand the scrutiny of historical research. Even a Jewish authority like Jost admits the illegality of the verdict against Jesus. Mill forgets, too, that some of the blackest crimes of history have been connived at, if not started, by men of quite respectable character. Sincerity is no essential proof of innocence, even if it could be shown that Caiaphas and the other priests were open-minded people who acted in good faith when they misunderstood their prisoner. But the spirit which Mill properly desiderates in an estimate of such men is wonderfully preserved in the Gospels. Their records have no trace of the outraged partisan, any more than of a pious desire to cast some adventitious halo round Jesus; and when one considers how numerous were the temptations to make capital against the Jews out of this Passion-story, or to decorate it with trivial and extravagant circumstances (as is the case in most of the relevant Apocryphal Gospels), one can better appreciate the sober and wonderfully restrained character of the Evangelic traditions.

To receive the due religious impression of the Evangelic narratives, it is generally enough to read each by itself. But while devout feeling is seldom perturbed by any discrepancies, such differences do exist both in conception and in detail, and the juxtaposition of the four Gospels in the canon obliges faith to look at the variety of the records and make some attempt at a historical estimate of their relative contents. The main business is to appreciate their religious interests. Yet, whilst these are both obvious and independent of critical research, a comparative inquiry into the different traditions is imperative. ‘Investigations of this kind, which attempt to weigh the merits of conflicting or parallel accounts, have always a somewhat cold-blooded and judicial spirit in them, a spirit which cannot but be out of harmony with that in which we can study the Passion of our Lord to our soul’s profit. Yet these historical questions must be faced, if our estimate of the gospel is to be lifted out of the region of mere inherited sentiment.’* [Note: Professor Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission* (p. 139).] Fortunately, verbal accuracy is not equivalent to inner veracity. The occasional divergences of the records do not affect seriously either the religious truth or the historical value of the traditions as a whole.

The primary fact which emerges from such a study is that when Jesus was brought before the Jewish authorities,* [Note: Paul sometimes makes the whole nation (1Th 2:14-15), sometimes the rulers especially (cf. Act 13:27-28), responsible for the crime, and once he ascribes it to demonic impulse (1Co 2:8). St. Peter, in Act 3:13 ff., also biames the Jerusalemites, rather than Pilate, whom from the first the Evangelic tradition rightly regarded as less culpable. But even within the circle of the canonical Gospels it is possible to trace the beginnings of that tendency to compare Pilate favourably with the Jews, which afterwards went to quite extravagant lengths.] He was judged worthy of death, and thereupon remitted to Pilate. But was He really tried? and if so, before what authorities? and of what specific charge was He found guilty? These questions cannot be answered off-hand. Still less can any one Gospel be assumed to be the standard by which the others are to be measured. An examination of all four is necessary, if the problems are even to be stated, much less solved.

(a) *Jesus before the Jewish authorities* (Mar 14:53-65 = Mat 26:57-68 = Luk 22:54-71).—The arrest of Jesus, all the Gospels agree, was at once followed by His removal to the palace of the high priest in custody of the guard. What occurred between this and the crucifixion on the following day is usually described as the trial of Jesus, but a glance at the order of affairs will soon show that it is extremely doubtful if Jesus really was ever tried, in the strict sense of the term. Pilate made an attempt to try Him, yet we cannot be sure if it was carried out adequately. He gave his general impressions of the prisoner, asked a few questions of Him and His accusers, and strove to avoid a decision. A rough and honest informality marked the opening stages, at least, of the intercourse between the Roman governor and the Galilaeen prisoner. Latterly, Pilate failed to recognize any rights on the part of Jesus. When he gave Him up to be crucified, it was against his better judgment, and in ratification of a previous sentence pronounced by the Jewish Council. Even here, as we shall see, it is questionable if all the legal forms were observed.† [Note: Chwolson, in the appendix to his *Das letzte Passamahl Christi*, argues that the illegal haste of the proceedings was due to the fact that the Sadducees, who were adherents of the Roman government, were in power at the time. Their antipathy to one whose teaching threatened their class privileges in the Temple and the political status quo of the nation, led them to breaches of the law which would have been less probable in the case of the Pharisees. Derenbourg in his *Essai sur L'Histoire et la Géographie de la Palestine* (1867), p. 201, had already urged this view. He explained the precipitate conduct of the proceedings as impossible for Pharisees, and due to the well-known severity of the Boethusians. Rabbi Ziegler (in *Der Kampf zwischen Judentum und Christentum*, 1907, p. 34 f.) fixes the blame upon the Herodians.]

According to one tradition, the Jewish trial took place at once in the house of Caiaphas, where the Sanhedrin had gathered, despite the lateness of the hour. Not a moment was lost. The arrest was followed by the examination. Then, after being

found guilty of blasphemy, Jesus was kept waiting till morning, and exposed meanwhile to the coarse mockery and rough play of the company (probably, for the most part, the servants of the high priest and the rest of the underlings). At daybreak an adjourned meeting was held, at which He was formally bound (the sentence perhaps being ratified) and handed over to Pilate's jurisdiction.

The Lukan tradition defers the examination till the morning. After His arrest, Jesus was detained in custody in the house of the high priest, and, in the absence of the judicial authorities, suffered violence at the hands of His captors. Then, at daybreak, the Sanhedrin was hastily convened. An abbreviated account of its proceedings is given, in which all reference to false witnesses and the charge about the Temple is omitted, but the end is the same. Jesus is found guilty, and taken away to Pilate.

The latter tradition is more true to the regular practice of the Sanhedrin, which met by day; for only then were its decisions valid (cf. Sanhedrin). But this does not necessarily prove that it is more original, for St. Luke may have been smoothing out what appeared to him an irregularity in the previous tradition. Upon the other hand, the difficulties involved by the Markan view are serious. Once Jesus was in their hands, the authorities had nothing to gain by rushing through the trial before morning. It would be in their own interests to preserve most of the forms of legal process; and it is difficult to think of the Council, or even a quorum of twenty-three members, being already summoned hurriedly to await the nocturnal arrest of Jesus, when nothing decisive could be done for hours.

The probability is, therefore, that while, no doubt, Caiaphas, Annas, and some others were on the spot, the Council was not formally convened until the early morning, about 6 a.m., and that Jesus spent the night in custody. Even the Markan tradition includes a morning examination (Mar 15:1 = Mat 27:1, a full and formal meeting of the court), which, after the nocturnal one, would be no more than a closing deliberation or a hasty ratification of the sentence already passed. The colourless and brief mention of this second examination shows that the Petrine tradition had no exact knowledge of its proceedings. In reality, it had no room for it, and its preservation is due simply to the fact that the morning trial, which St. Luke has described, was too firmly established in the primitive record to be entirely ignored even when it was deprived of its proper point. As to the reasons which led the Markan tradition to dilate on a nocturnal trial, the clue is probably to be found in the fact that there really was such a hasty preliminary cross-questioning of Jesus; only, it was not before Caiaphas, but before Annas (see Annas), the influential ex-high priest, who had been at the bottom of the whole movement to arrest Jesus. The prisoner was taken illegally and informally before him, questioned about His disciples and His teaching,* [Note: Jesus ignores the query with regard to the disciples (which involved an insinuation of sedition and conspiracy), and asserts that His teaching was open and

above-board, no esoteric doctrine. The well-known parallel is the remark of Socrates in the Apologia (xxi.): 'If any one says he ever learnt or heard from me in private what all other people did not hear, be sure he is not speaking the truth.' Twice only, here and in Mar 14:48, does He expostulate with the priestly authorities for their unfair treatment of Him. Evidently He saw that they were determined to have their way, and no further protest fell from His lips (see vol. i. 756-757). The blow of Joh 18:22 is illustrated by that of Act 23:2. it is arbitrary to take the latter as the prototype of the former.] and then removed to the house of Caiaphas, where the proceedings eventually took place which are recorded by Mark and Matthew.

The fact that this preliminary examination or ἀνάκρισις before Annas is recorded only in the Fourth Gospel (Joh 18:12-14; Joh 18:19-24) has excited, not unnaturally, strong suspicion of its authenticity, and efforts, more or less plausible (cf. Keim, vi. 36 f.), have been made to show that the author has wrongly inferred from Luk 3:2, Act 4:6; Act 5:17, the high authority of Annas; and that the latter is brought in for the sake of novelty or variety. These efforts are quite unconvincing. Historical criticism cannot be put off nowadays with the assumption that the Markan tradition is so exhaustive and infallible as to prove a standard for judging the later Gospels. Certain data in the tradition even of the Fourth Gospel (e.g. the date of the Crucifixion, cf. vol. i. 413 f., 882 f., with Kattenbusch in *Die Christliche Welt*, 1895, pp. 317 f., 331 f.) are winning more and more credence from critics of all schools, and the insuperable difficulty about eliminating the Annas trial is the impossibility of detecting any adequate motive for its invention and introduction. The various theories which explain its growth from a misconception of the Synoptists will not hold water. The details of it are also uncoloured by any specific Johannine interest.† [Note: The historical basis of the report is recognized not merely by Ewald, Renan, and Hausrath, but by so thoroughgoing a critic as A. Réville (*Jésus de Nazareth*, ii. 378 f.). The likelihood is that it forms, as Oscar Holtzmann admits of Joh 18:28 (*Life of Jesus*, Eng. tr. p. 480), 'a fragment of the good tradition preserved in the Johannine Gospel.' The idea of Christ's publicity (Joh 18:20) is, of course, a genuinely Johannine trait (cf. Joh 7:14 f.), but this does not explain why the author should have invented the Annas trial for it.] It is not shot through, as is the later trial before Pilate, by Johannine conceptions. The Fourth Gospel, it is true, ignores the details of the trial before Caiaphas; but this difficulty is not more serious than that of the Synoptic silence upon the Annas trial, for the latter might well appear too insignificant or private to be retained beside the Caiaphas trial, or even to be accurately distinguished from it. As the ex-high priest had no power to pronounce sentence, the tendency of tradition would naturally be towards the decisive proceedings before Caiaphas.

The traditional order of the text in John 18, however, does not appear to represent the original. Some distortion has taken place, as the Sinaitic Syriac version shows, and efforts have been made to restore the true sequence (see Moffatt, *The Historical New Test.* pp. 528 f., 693 f.), perhaps the most plausible proposal being that of Professor G. G. Findlay, who would read Joh_18:19-24 between Joh_18:14 and Joh_18:15. Some such rearrangement is necessary, at any rate, in order to give a coherent sense to the passage, the denial of Peter taking place, as in the Synoptic account, at the house of Caiaphas (Joh_18:15-18; Joh_18:25-27). On Wellhausen's recent attempt to excise all the allusions to Caiaphas, see the present writer's paper in the *Expositor* (July 1907, pp. 55-69).

It does not necessarily follow from Luk_3:2 that St. Luke assumed the high priest of 22:54 f. was Annas. But if he did, he (or his source at this point) tacitly corrects the Markan tradition. On the other hand, St. Luke ignores Caiaphas entirely. When the Council meet, they act unanimously and simultaneously (22:66 f.); there is no need of any mouthpiece or spokesman.

These efforts of the high priest and the Council to secure evidence against Jesus proved at first a failure. Many witnesses came forward, but nothing tangible or crucial could be made out of their statements.* [Note: The term ἵσασι (Mar_14:56, cf. Mar_14:59) refers to harmony of statement. Had the Evangelist meant 'adequate,' 'equal to the occasion,' he would have used ἰκαναί or some equivalent.] At last some people appeared with a garbled version of one saying which seemed relevant and final. As given by the three writers who record it, it runs thus:

| <u>Mar_14:58.</u> | <u>Mat_26:61.</u> | <u>Joh_2:19.</u> |
|--|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| I will destroy (καταλύσω) | I am able to destroy | Destroy (λύσατε) |
| this temple made with hands, | the temple of God, | this temple, |
| and after three days I will build another not made with hands. | and after three days to build it. | and in three days I will raise it. |

The saying bears on its face the stamp of authenticity,† [Note: Compare the discussion of Strauss (*Life of Jesus*, Eng. tr. by George Eliot, § 114), who upholds its historicity against the suspicions of Bretschneider.] but it is impossible to ascertain

its original place or significance. The Synoptic omission of its utterance by Jesus is all the more striking, since it would fit in excellently with the Synoptic account of the cleansing of the Temple, which preceded and determined the arrest of Jesus. The Fourth Evangelist, who misplaces this incident, actually cites it in this very connexion (Joh 2:19), but characteristically he gives it a double meaning. Jesus, he declares, was speaking of His resurrection, the temple being the body—according to the familiar symbolism of the age. The Jews, however, took Him literally. In all probability the saying was ‘one of those mystic pregnant words which imply more than they explicitly state, or than any one thought of when they were first uttered’ (cf. Bruce, *Kingdom of God*, pp. 306-310). The original meaning may have been that Jesus, who claimed to be greater than the Temple (Mat 12:6), would raise His community, even though the Jewish system of worship was shattered. His cause was not bound up with the Temple. If He came to associate His own death with the ruin of the sanctuary, it was inevitable that the conception of His personal resurrection should further colour the saying. But in any case the later Christian reflexion would read it in the light of the resurrection, whether with or without any historical justification. The Fourth Evangelist, who makes Jesus not only fully conscious of His Messianic dignity and approaching death from the first, but outspoken on the subject, has naturally no difficulty in placing the statement at the threshold of His ministry, and it has been argued that this length of time between the saying and its quotation at the trial is historically necessary in order to explain ‘that hesitation and contradiction about the evidence of the “false witnesses,” and the extreme difficulty in procuring it, which both St. Matthew’s and St. Mark’s accounts of the trial of Christ distinctly attest’ (R. H. Hutton, *Theological Essays*, p. 228). The contention is unconvincing. Such a saying, if uttered even a day or two before to an excited crowd, would readily be caught up and twisted according to the sympathies or the antipathies of people. Words such as those of Mar 13:2 would inevitably colour it, and the passion of these utterances indicates that the mind of Jesus must have been concerned with the Temple and its future in relation to His message more deeply than our extant records happen to disclose. In any case, popular *animus* needed but a few days to distort an enigmatic saying of this kind. Many versions of it would be afloat on the bubbling tide of gossip in the Jerusalem streets, and some of these were uttered by hostile lips to hostile ears before the Council.

St. Mark bluntly calls this information a piece of false evidence, false because it misrepresented the real meaning of Jesus by attributing to Him a revolutionary design of which He was innocent. It failed, owing to the disagreement of the witnesses. For some reason, which the Evangelist leaves unexplained, their testimonies did not tally; no coherent and decisive proof could be picked out of their conflicting reports. St. Matthew, on the other hand, will not go this length. Not merely is he silent upon the disagreement of the witnesses (contrast Mar 14:58-59), but he refuses to call them *false witnesses* outright, although this may be implied in Mat 26:59-60. To the

Evangelist any witness against Jesus probably counted as false witness. He lays stress upon the original desire of the authorities to find false witness, implying that they would stick at nothing to secure the conviction of Jesus, and that they eventually managed to secure evidence which, being in itself blasphemous, and being legally corroborated by two witnesses (Mat 26:60-61), enabled them to proceed with their design. St. Mark, who admits that the authorities were bent on compassing the death of Jesus, does not accuse them of deliberately searching for false witness from the first, though he points out that even the evidence they secured was inadequate from a legal standpoint (cf. vol. i. 575-576).

Both agree, however, that Jesus, on being challenged by the high priest, refused to answer the charge. He kept a dignified silence,* [Note: Bushnell's *Nature and the Supernatural* (ch. x.)] probably for the reason given in the words put by Luke into His mouth (Luk 22:67-68). It was idle to argue with those who had already made up their minds to find Him guilty. His stern, calm silence was a judgment of His so-called judges. Their malevolent prejudice deprived them of the right to demand information about His mission. The high priest, who spoke in their name, was eager, not to elicit the truth, but to make the prisoner incriminate Himself as a *mezith* or sacrilegious foe of Judaism, by giving some explanation of the alleged saying. The silence of Jesus baffled and irritated him. It threw him out in his calculations. There were probably some in the Council who were not particularly favourable to the designs of Annas and Caiaphas; the failure to attack Jesus for cleansing the Temple may indicate, perhaps, that several members† [Note: They reasoned, or might have reasoned, that the cleansing of the Temple would be a very unlikely act on the part of a reformer who designed its destruction. But in any case, that action was not seriously and instantly challenged by the authorities (Mar 11:27), and its sequel proves that no exception was taken to it by the religious people of the city or even by the Romans.] rather approved of the act; and it was a matter of moment to bring the whole Council into line against Jesus, to rouse every interest, sacerdotal (cf. vol. i. pp. 297-298) and official, in order that a unanimous verdict might be carried to Pilate. Furthermore, there was the people to consider. Jesus had sympathizers whose number was unascertained. If He was to be got rid of, it must be on some broad, serious charge which might command a wave of overwhelming popular enthusiasm and indignation. Sacerdotal diplomacy is generally a past master in the art of playing upon such prejudices and organizing popular feeling in aid of its own ends, and the next move of the high priest showed no inconsiderable skill. He chose his new ground admirably. But it is not clear why he shifted his position so suddenly. Was he aware of the Messianic claims of Jesus and astute enough to use them, as a last resource, for the purpose of forcing some incriminating answer? Or was the ground really shifted? Might it be inferred from the primitive Evangelic tradition, as reproduced by Mk. and Mt. alike, that the saying about the Temple (Mar 14:58 = Mat 26:61) was held to imply a sort of Messianic claim* [Note: The reconstruction of the Temple in the new age was

one work of the Messiah, according to some circles of pre-Christian Judaism (cf. Enoch 90:28 etc.; Bousset, *Religion des Judentums*, 226 f.).] upon the part of Jesus? In that event, the high priest's next question would be simply a further move on the line already taken. The former hypothesis is, upon the whole, the more likely of the two. But in any case the point is plain. Foiled by the silence of Jesus in his attempt to make capital out of the witnesses' report, Caiaphas proceeds to put the straight and final question, 'Art thou the Christ?' (Mar 14:61 = Mat 26:63, cf. Luk 22:66; Mk.'s addition, 'the Son of the Blessed,' is probably more original than Mt.'s generalized 'the Son of God').† [Note: The avoidance of God's name, in accordance with Jewish usage, is, as O. Holtzmann points out (*Life of Jesus*, pp. 164, 475), 'a strong point in favour of the soundness of our tradition.'] It was a categorical and crucial query. Matters were now brought to an issue which Jesus could not and would not evade.

His answer is variously reported: 'I am (ἐγὼ εἰμι): and you will see the Son of Man seated on the right hand of the Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven' (Mar 14:62); 'It is as thou sayest (σὺ εἶπας). Yet I tell you, in future you will see the Son of Man seated on the right hand of the Power, and coming on the clouds of heaven' (Mat 26:44); 'You will not believe if I tell you, nor will you answer if I question you. But from henceforth the Son of Man shall be seated on the right hand of the Power of God' (Luk 22:67-69). Primarily, the saying is a reminiscence and application of the Messianic passage in Dan 7:13, though the Speaker has also the opening of Psalms 110 in His mind—a psalm which in those days was more than once upon His lips (cf. Mar 12:36). So much is clear. But the details of the answer are not always quite intelligible. Thus St. Luke‡ [Note: 'The Power' of Mk. and Mt. is more original than Lk.'s explanatory phrase.] divides the question into two, and, in reply to the query, 'Art thou the Son of God?' makes Jesus reply: ὑμεῖς λέγετε, ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι (Luk 22:70). On the other hand, the Markan answer is perfectly explicit (cf. Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel*, p. 267). Jesus replies, 'I am.' St. Matthew, again, gives an evasive or ambiguous turn to the words by the phrase σὺ εἶπας, which here, as in Mat 26:25, is commonly understood to mean a qualified affirmative. The person addressed replies in the sense of the questioner. 'You say so. I will not contradict you.' 'I answer you out of your own lips.' Recently, however, Chwolson, followed by Merx, N. Schmidt (*The Prophet of Nazareth*, p. 287), and others, has challenged the interpretation of the phrase as a Rabbinic form of affirmation; instead of being equivalent to the Latin *dixisti*, it is held to be really a denial. This is most unlikely, to judge from the context; and even linguistically, as Dalman has shown (*Words of Jesus*, p. 309 f.), it is unnecessary.* [Note: H. Holtzmann, *Das messianische Bewusstsein Jesu* (1907), pp. 29-31, as against Wrede's idea (*Das Messiasgeheimnis*, 74 f.) that the phrase 'Son of God' must be taken in a metaphysical, not in a theocratic sense.]

But, minor discrepancies apart, the answer reveals three cardinal traits of Jesus: His courage in confessing the Messianic vocation, when death was the inevitable consequence; His serene confidence in the success of His cause upon earth; and His admission that only the future could unfold the real meaning of His Person.† [Note: Bengel, on Mat_26:64, has one of his fine comments: ‘In adversissimis quibusque rebus summos fines exitusque intueri, maxime juvat filios dei.’] The last point is to be noted specially. The high priest’s question was so contrived as to make any answer fatal, whether negative or affirmative. In the one case, Jesus would lose all His influence and authority; in the other, He would be liable to judgment as a pretender. But Jesus realized that even a bare affirmative would be misleading, since His Messianic vocation was widely different from what the ordinary expectation imagined. Hence the fuller statement, wrung from the tension and passionate faith of His soul. The words seized on by the Council were those referring to His claim to sit at the right hand of the Power, but it must not be inferred‡ [Note: As by Wellhausen, who omits Mar_14:61-62 in order to support this reading of the incident. But Mar_14:63 does not follow the silence of Jesus very aptly; the blasphemy is more naturally connected with the straightforward utterance of Jesus than with the divergent reports of the witnesses, and Lk.’s ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ is probably a correct gloss.] from this that the charge of constructive blasphemy for which Jesus was condemned was dissociated from His Messianic claims. The contention that such claims were not blasphemous in themselves all depends on the character of the person who made them. The Council considered themselves, rightly or wrongly, absolved from entering into any minute examination of the conduct and aims of Jesus.§ [Note: Mar_2:7.] On that their minds were already made up, as His arrest shows. The attitude of Jesus to the Law and the Temple and the cherished religious traditions of Judaism left no doubt in their minds that He was a dangerous person, in whom it would be superfluous to look for any Messianic criteria. His presumption in claiming Messianic honour was in itself blasphemy of a capital order, as it involved a supersession of the Mosaic Law, and His words now corroborated the impression already made by His actions that He was a discredited pretender to Divine rank, and a false and disloyal prophet. In short, the verdict of the historian, as Holtzmann puts it, must be: ‘Jesus confessed Himself to be Messiah, was condemned as a false Messiah, and executed as a pretender.’ || [Note: | *Das Messianische Bewusstsein Jesu* (1907), pp. 35-36, where the various views of recent critics on this point are adequately summarized. For the punishment of a false prophet, see Deu_13:1-5; Deu_18:20-22.]

Caiaphas had now gained his point. He had induced Jesus to convict Himself out of His own mouth, and with a pious gesture of horror (cf. 2Ki_22:11, 1Ma_11:71, Isa_37:1 etc.) he professes himself at once shocked by the blasphemy of the Galilaean, and satisfied with the result of his interrogation. He appeals theatrically to the Council if this is not enough evidence, and they obsequiously agree.

The condensed and cursory nature of the report makes it impossible for us to be sure whether this verdict was as premature and illegal as it appears to be, and whether the irregularities were held to be justified by the emergency which had transpired. The Evangelic tradition was naturally more concerned with the result than with the precise processes of the trial. In any case, however, it is unmistakable that the priests had now got what they wanted. They had secured from Jesus a confession which was nominally equivalent to a blasphemous claim (on this see vol. i. pp. 209-210), derogatory to the Divine Being. But we are in the dark as to how far the ordinary forms of jurisprudence were observed, whether the witnesses were cautioned before giving evidence, whether the case for the defence was first of all opened, and so forth. The outstanding point is that Jesus was condemned primarily for blasphemy. To convict Him of claiming to be Messiah, and charge Him with that, would not have appealed to the Sadducees. More was needed, and this was supplied by the fact of Jesus, a Galilaean peasant, with revolutionary views upon the cultus, daring to claim for Himself Messianic honours, and thus threatening to supersede the sacrosanct legal system of Judaism.

(b) *Jesus before Pilate* (Mar_15:1-20 = Mat_27:1-31 = Luk_23:1-25 = Joh_18:28 to Joh_19:16).—If the proceedings before the Jewish Council strained even the letter of justice, those before the Roman authorities show little or no attempt whatsoever to try the prisoner judicially. Jesus does not appear to have been legally tried before Pilate. The Roman governor, after the first turn in the case, seems to have been principally anxious to discover the most politic course of action, as well as to thwart the authorities. His sense of justice was overborne by considerations of personal advantage and civil prudence. But he was not driven to this end without reluctance, and the record of the proceedings, which took place in the open-air in front of his palace or tribunal, is of considerable psychological interest.

The first phase of the trial before Pilate is the procurator's dismissal of the grave charge of *majestas* brought against Jesus by His accusers,* [Note: Their ritualistic scruple about entering the Praetorium is noted by the Fourth Evangelist (Joh_18:28) with deliberate meaning. In the light of the Christian interpretation, it acquired a sinister significance. 'Polluting their souls with blood, they dare not pollute their bodies by breach of outer etiquette.... Men must have some scrap of conscience left to hide them from themselves. Inward defilement, unprincipled action, are atoned for by outer decorum' (Reith, Gospel of John, ii. 135).] who naturally fixed upon the political rather than the religious side of the Messianic claim as the more likely to carry weight with the governor.

According to one tradition,† [Note: The Fourth Evangelist (Joh_18:33), like St. Matthew (Mat_27:11), here follows the condensed Markan tradition (Mar_15:2), leaving it unexplained how Pilate had come to hear of the accusation of royalty, but

implying that Jesus had not heard the priests laying this information before the governor.] Pilate takes the initiative by asking Jesus if He is really the king of the Jews. The question breathes pity and contempt and wonder. This forlorn Galilaeen peasant (σὺ emphatic) a claimant of royalty! The quiet reply is, σὺ λέγεις (cf. vol. i. 931^b). To the subsequent outburst of accusation from the Jewish leaders, Jesus vouchsafes no reply; nor will He even deign to interpret His silence to the astonished procurator. Plainly, this is a very abridged version of the actual facts, and we turn for fuller details to Luke. According to his account, the Jewish authorities push forward with their accusation before Pilate has time to speak, and the charge is threefold: He is accused of being a seditious agitator, of forbidding the payment of tribute to the Roman emperor, and of claiming to be 'Christ, a king.' A political charge is thus cleverly foisted into the religious complaint, and the procurator, who would have nothing to do with a vague accusation, naturally fixes on the third point, asking Jesus (as in the other tradition) if He is really the king of the Jews. Luke's account certainly gives a better sense here than the other, for it explains how Pilate came to put his question; whereas, in the evidence of Mar_15:2 = Mat_27:11, there is nothing to account for the governor seizing this point at all. That the charge of the Jews was astute but unjust needs no proof (cf. vol. i. p. 246^a). The Gospels show how scrupulously Jesus kept clear of abetting the fanatical hatred of Rome felt by many of His fellow-countrymen, and probably it was this refusal to side with them which secretly instigated their plan of attack. At any rate, as Renan observes, 'Conservative religious bodies do not generally shrink from calumny.' To refute the charge was superfluous in the eyes of Jesus. His silence did all that was necessary; it repudiated the accusation.

The silence of Jesus before Pilate was due to moral reasons. Dr. Salmon, in his posthumous work, *The Human Element in the Gospels* (1907, p. 512), prefers, indeed, to attribute it to physical fatigue. 'The only way that occurs to one of accounting for His silence is that, after the strain of the work of the previous day, of the sleepless night, and the brutal insults of His tormentors, His physical frame was incapable of conducting a discussion. And we could sufficiently account for Pilate's unwillingness to condemn, if he perceived that the man against whom so much accusation was brought was quite unable to say a word in His own defence. In this choice between Jesus and Barabbas, might he not feel that the more dangerous enemy to Caesar was the man in vigorous health who had already taken part in an insurrection in which many lives had been lost, and not the so-called prophet, who seemed unable to speak, much less to act. And if he had no trust in the loyalty of the Jewish advisers, might he not have even suspected that they were willing to sacrifice one whom they regarded as useless, in order to save the life of one who would be really dangerous?' Whatever may be thought of the psychological suggestions in the latter part of this paragraph, the opening sentence does not seem adequate to the facts. Even when

wearied (4:6 f.), Jesus would not allow fatigue to prevent Him from speaking, if utterance were necessary. If He was silent, it was because He was unwilling, not because He felt unable. Besides, the impression left by the record of the last two days of the life of Jesus is that His physical strength must have been considerable. Upon the whole, then, it is needless to attribute His silence before Pilate to any other reason than a belief that protestations of innocence were useless, coupled, as that belief was, with a calm consciousness of truth which left no room for even a vestige of anxiety about the ultimate success of His cause.

The impression made by Jesus upon Pilate started a series of attempts upon the part of the procurator to extricate himself and his prisoner from the situation created by the rancour of the Jewish authorities. Three separate movements were made by him in this direction. The first was to change the venue of the trial; for Herod as a Galilaean might be expected to judge this Galilaean peasant more fairly than the Jerusalem authorities. After this device had failed, Pilate tried to get behind the priests, and appeal to the better feelings of the people when unbiassed by sacerdotal and ecclesiastical intrigues; surely a Messiah would be popular, he argued, recollecting the hot patriotism of the nation. But, to his disgust and dismay, Barabbas was preferred to Jesus. Finally, as a last resource, he tried to work on their pity, now that their patriotism was out of the question; he presented Jesus to them, with the bloody marks or scourging upon Him, as an object to excite compassion (Joh 19:1 f.). This again proved of no avail, and with its collapse Pilate saw the disappearance of the last chance of rescuing the prisoner. Such is, in rough outline, the scheme of events which we can recover from a careful scrutiny of the extant records.

St. Luke, indeed, makes Pilate at once pronounce Jesus innocent (Luk 23:4). But this is far too abrupt. The probability is that (Mar 15:3-5 = Mat 27:12-14) the priests and elders continued to heap fresh accusations upon Him, and that His silence under the strain of calumny roused Pilate's astonishment. The procurator was evidently puzzled to know what to do with this prisoner. For though silence may have been equivalent, in Roman law, to a confession of guilt, he was unwilling to pronounce sentence in this case without some further evidence, and the invectives of the Jewish authorities did not point to any conclusive or reliable ground for arriving at a judgment. The very silence of Jesus, as Keim properly observes, impressed the procurator more than the eager, noisy vehemence of His opponents. 'He did not infer guilt or obstinacy from the silence, as the official and imperious consciousness even of a mild Pliny the Younger was apt so quickly to do: an evidence this of Pilate's intelligence, and still more of the impression produced by the Lord even when He uttered no words.' In the midst of this perplexity the word 'Galilee,' flung up on the torrent of invective, caught his ear. He seemed to see a chance of relieving himself, and perhaps of helping Jesus. For if Jesus had been guilty of crime within the borders of Galilee, plainly Herod Antipas was the man to deal with Him; he might be more impartial, too,

than the local priests and scribes. Besides, it was a politic attention to Antipas. So the procurator gladly dismissed his prisoner to the Galilaen tetrarch, only too relieved to be quit, as he hoped, of this inconvenient responsibility. But this change of venue was futile. It was not exactly illegal, for, as has been observed, the words of Luk 23:4 are probably introduced too early; the other Gospels know nothing of such an acquittal at this point. But it did not help Pilate. The crafty Herod was shy of touching any charge of *majestas*. As Mr. Taylor Innes puts it, ‘the Idumean fox dreaded the lion’s paw, while very willing to exchange courtesies with the lion’s deputy.’

The transference of Jesus to Herod (cf. vol. i. 722) is one of St. Luke’s special contributions to the story of the Passion (Luk 23:6-16, cf. Act 4:27). Whether taken from oral tradition (cf. Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 103) or from the Jewish Christian source (note the technical Jewish $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\nu$ βασιλέα = king Messiah, Luk 23:2) which some critics trace below his narrative, it goes back to the memories of the Christians who belonged to the Herodian *entourage* (cf. Luk 8:3, Luk 9:4), and ought never to have been suspected by a sane criticism. No satisfactory motive for its invention can be adduced.* [Note: The ordinary theory that Herod is made the representative of Judaism, to exculpate paganism (Pilate), contradicts Luk 23:15.] St. Luke (Luk 13:1) was perfectly aware that, when it suited his purpose, Pilate had no hesitation in killing Galilaeans. The author rightly hints at other motives for his action now. The presence of the high priests and scribes at the interview (Luk 13:10) is, at first sight, certainly a difficulty; it might suggest that here, as perhaps at Luk 22:52 (cf. Luk 22:66), the historian has gone too far in emphasizing the activity of the Jewish authorities. But it is just possible that they feared to let the prisoner out of their sight. Herod was not to be relied on. He might take it into his head to release Jesus out of spite or caprice, as Pilate had threatened to do, and with relentless† [Note: There is a dramatic contrast between the two uses of this Lukan term $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu\omega\varsigma$ here and in Act 18:28.] vigour some of the authorities may have kept on the track of their victim. The omission of Luk 23:10-12 in the Sinaitic Syriac version is probably due to harmonizing tendencies. Certainly Luk 23:15 affords no adequate ground for excising it (so Wellhausen‡ [Note: He deserts here his favourite D ($\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\pi\epsilon\mu\psi\alpha$ γὰρ ὑμᾶς πρὸς αὐτόν). Compare, against him, Blass in *The Philology of the Gospels*, pp. 183-184.]) as a later gloss, for even if the inferior reading, ‘I sent him (Jesus) to him (Herod),’ be adopted, it does not necessarily imply that the authorities were not present at Herod’s examination. Pilate is not giving them fresh information. He is simply rehearsing the facts of the case in a semi-formal fashion.

St. Luke does not exaggerate the share of Herod in Christ’s death, as does the later Gospel of Peter, which makes Antipas sentence the prisoner formally. The historian simply brings out the idle curiosity of the tetrarch.§ [Note: Bengel’s caustic comment

on v. 8 is: 'Potentes minus obvium habuere Jesum: et illi solent esse ultimi in cognoscendis rebus regni dei.'] The mockery of Jesus, in which he is said even to have participated himself, was probably due to irritation at his failure to elicit any answer from the prisoner. Herod's wounded dignity and baffled curiosity were up in arms to take a petty vengeance (cf. vol. i. 454^a), and both he and Pilate were consoled for their trouble and annoyance by getting their fend patched up and their mutual jurisdiction recognized. Their treatment of Jesus gave each the opportunity of a politic and inexpensive generosity.

Pilate then, according to Luke, proposes a weak compromise (Luk 23:13-16). To appease the Jews he will scourge this harmless fanatic, Jesus, before releasing Him; for release Him he must, as His guilt has not been proven. The innocence of Jesus seems to be formally pronounced. Herod's refusal to convict Him gives Pilate the tardy courage to acquit the prisoner before His accusers, but it does not lend him courage to carry out the strict legal consequences of the decision. Utilitarian motives come into play.* [Note: Compare the defence of the governor's action in Sir James Stephen's Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, p. 88 f. It is not a bench on which historical criticism will be content to rest for long. See Zimmermann's Histor. Wert der ältesten Ueberl. (1905) p. 184 f.] The governor realizes that he must try to conciliate the infuriated Jews. Since his offer to scourge Jesus is ignominiously rejected, some other compromise must be devised.

Here all the Gospels come into line, with an account of Pilate's next attempt to save Jesus, this time at the expense of Barabbas (see Barabbas and Insurrection), though St. Luke less happily omits all reference to the custom of releasing a prisoner, and makes the idea of Barabbas originate with the Jews (Luk 23:18), not with Pilate, while St. Matthew inserts a piece of very secondary tradition about Pilate's wife (Mat 27:19, cf. vol. i. p. 495) in order to explain the governor's hesitation, as well as to throw the malice of the Jews into relief. A further addition† [Note: Besides the account of Judas (27:3 ff.; cf. vol. i. 911); on these fragments of Palestinian Jewish tradition see W. C. Allen's 'St. Matthew' (ICC), p. 315. 'When truth is in danger,' said Dr. John Ker, 'the conduct of many is to wash their hands in Pilate's basin of weak neutrality; but they only soil the water, and do not cleanse their hands.'] of St. Matthew is the dramatic incident of Pilate washing his hands before the people, and proclaiming his innocence of the judicial crime which they were bent on perpetrating (Mat 27:24-25).‡ [Note: Note the intentional repetition of ὑμεῖς ὄψεσθε from Mat 27:4.] The incident may be St. Matthew's anecdotal way of depicting the idea of the Jews' real responsibility for the death of Jesus. In any case, once the people deliberately prefer Barabbas, Pilate plainly throws off all responsibility for all that follows. Probably the revelation of Christ's unpopularity§ [Note: The opposition of the people to Pilate's suggestion may have been due in part to his own unpopularity. The

Jews would readily take any opportunity of thwarting a proposal from one who had so repeatedly defied their prejudices and religious tastes.] removed the last scruple of conscience which he felt. Why should he endanger his position and risk a tumult among the people for the sake of a Galilaeen dreamer who had not a single adherent to stand by Him? Pilate could afford to thwart the priests, perhaps, but it was another matter when the people asserted their wishes.

In response to his half-perplexed, half-ironical inquiry as to what, then, is to be done with Jesus the so-called Christ, the reply (unanimous, according to Mat 27:22) is, 'Crucify him.' Carlyle, in the sixth of his *Latter-day Pamphlets*, takes this to be an illustration of the absurdity of universal suffrage. 'Can it be proved that since the beginning of the world there was ever given a universal vote in favour of the worthiest man or thing? I have always understood that true worth in any department was difficult to recognize; that the worthiest, if he appealed to universal suffrage, would have but a poor chance.... Alas, Jesus Christ asking the Jews what He deserved, was not the answer, Death on the gallows!' But the point of the incident is not quite this. The Markan tradition, followed by Matthew (Mat 27:20 = Mar 15:11), indicates the responsibility of the priests rather than of the people. The latter were instigated by the sacerdotal authorities, who were afraid of Pilate's appeal, and jealous* [Note: This ill-will (Mar 15:10 = Mat 27:18) towards one who had challenged their vested interests and ecclesiastical authority was patent to Pilate (cf. vol. i. 521 f., and Lidgett's *Spiritual Principle of the Atonement*, p. 11 f.). As we know from the record of his previous conflict with the Jews, he took an insolent delight in humiliating them, which had thrice led to an even more humiliating surrender upon his own part. The trial of Jesus gave him another chance of thwarting the authorities. But he had learned prudence by this time. He would use Jesus as far as possible to exasperate the Jews, but he would have little hesitation in sacrificing his prisoner to safeguard his own credit and popularity, particularly when he found that the Galilaeen was unpopular Himself.] of the possible popularity which Jesus might win among the crowd. Accordingly they worked—how, we are not told—upon the passions of the mob, religious and political. The result was a wild outcry for the release of Barabbas, which at once showed Pilate that Jesus was not a favourite of the people, but merely a discredited provincial.

The general outline of the closing scene, despite variations in detail, is fairly distinct. Pilate allows himself to be overborne by the popular clamour. Finding that his attempts to expostulate with the mob are fruitless, he at last lets them have their own way, pronouncing the fatal words ἐξελευσῆ εἰς σταυρόν (*ibis ad crucem*).

Before ordering the prisoner off to the death which, in Roman law, must immediately follow the capital sentence, he bids the lictor, *I, lictor, conligamanus, flagellis*

verberctur; Jesus is then subjected to the scourging which preceded, in Roman usage.† [Note: Thus the Jews caught outside Jerusalem during the siege by Titus ‘were first scourged, then tormented with all kinds of torture before they died, and were crucified opposite the walls of the city’ (Jos. BJ v. xi. 1).] the last act of the death punishment. Such at least, according to one tradition (Mar 15:15 = Mat 27:26), was the significance of the scourging; it was a mere accessory to the crucifixion. In Luke, it occupies an earlier and a different position, as we have seen, whilst‡ [Note: Perhaps founding on the hint of Luk 23:22, where it is part of Pilate’s suggested compromise. The position of the scourging, with the subsequent Ecce Homo incident (Joh 19:1-4 f.), is rightly assigned by the Fourth Evangelist.] in the Fourth Gospel (Joh 19:1 f.) it forms part of the mockery, and issues in Pilate’s presentation of Jesus to the people in order to excite a pity or a contempt which might allay their malice. This is probably correct. In closely associating the scourging with the mockery, though not in placing them prior to the formal condemnation, the Fourth Evangelist is following the Markan tradition. He rightly brings out the third and last appeal of Pilate, before the final sentence is pronounced. But for the details of this bloody punishment we must look outside the Gospels. All four eschew any harrowing pictures of the scene. The simple and sober mention of the fact is all that the tradition has preserved.

(c) *The mocking of Jesus* (see Crown of Thorns, Mockery, Reed, Thorns).—That Jesus was insulted and ill-treated during the course of His trial is a fixed part of the Evangelic tradition,§ [Note: How far the tradition has been affected by the natural desire (cf. Act 13:27-28) to conform the sufferings of Jesus to such OT prophecies as Isa 50:6 f. (cf. Mic 5:1), it is impossible to determine. Even Matthew, with his predilection for discovering fulfilment of prophecy, does not refer to such passages. The likelihood is, as Strauss admits (§ 128), that while Jesus was actually maltreated as the Evangelists record, ‘their descriptions are modelled on prophecies which, when once Jesus appeared as a sufferer and maltreated person, were applied to Him.’] but it is uncertain when and where the cruel sport took place. According to one tradition (Mar 14:65 = Mat 26:67-68) it followed the condemnation by the Sanhedrin; either the bystanders|| [Note: | Apparently including even some of the councillors themselves—a trait of Oriental passion which, in view of Jos. BJ vi. v. 3, is not to be taken as a touch of the Evangelic tradition inconsistent with the dignity of the authorities. Wellhausen thinks Mt.’s version (= high priests) is original.] or the servants of the high priest or the councillors (Mt.) blindfolded Him, spat in His face, and rained blows upon Him,* [Note: Professor Burkitt (*The Gospel History and its Transmission*,. pp. 51-53) holds that τις ἐστὶν ὁ παίσας σε (Mat 26:68) is a secondary addition of the Evangelist, and that the real meaning of Mar 14:68 is that the face of Jesus was covered because He was formally condemned (Est 7:8). But, In this event, the blindfolding would immediately follow the condemnation, whereas the spitting

intervenes, showing that horseplay had begun. Besides, Luke's version corroborates the Markan view as reproduced in Matthew, and probably is one of his harmonizing touches, which smooth out details in Mark and Matthew into a graphic and intelligible picture. Wellhausen omits the blindfolding in Mar 14:65 (with D and Syrsin), which, in his view of the context (see above), implies that the prophesying of Jesus was to be about the destruction of the Temple.] asking Him with jeers to prophesy who struck Him. St. Luke (Luk 22:63-65) more accurately places this horseplay during the nocturnal interval between His arrest and the assembling of the Council in the morning, when no responsible parties were present to prevent vulgar indignities being heaped on the defenceless prisoner. St. Luke also narrates (Luk 23:11) that Herod and his troops treated their prisoner with rough ridicule as a *soi-disant* king; and, when the incident of the Herod interview is accepted as historical, there is no reason to doubt that such violence may have been inflicted, unless Luke is held to have transferred to Herod the mockery which the earlier tradition (Mar 15:16-20, Mat 27:27-31) ascribes to Pilate.

This second mockery consisted in the troops arraying Jesus in a scarlet military mantle, spitting on Him (in caricature of the kiss of homage), crowning Him with thorns, putting a reed in His hand, and paying mock deference to Him.† [Note: A similar grim jest was practised by the Mediterranean pirates upon any Roman citizen whom they captured. Plutarch (Vita Pomp, xxiv.) describes how they affected to be struck with terror, dropped on their knees before him, threw a toga round him, and finally made away with him.] Then, beating Him unmercifully, they stripped Him of this finery, and re clothed Him in His own garments. 'In our time, when a man has been sentenced to death, we do not think it right to add to his sufferings by preliminary torture; but it was not so in former days; if bystanders, in their indignation, added to what had been sentenced by the judge, all this was looked upon as no more than giving the criminal his deserts; and this volunteered addition to the judge's sentence was no doubt the severest part of the penalty.'‡ [Note: Salmon, The Human Element in the Gospels (p. 506). The soldiers were probably seizing the opportunity to vent their contempt for the Jews, quite as much as to express personal animosity towards Jesus.] The rough treatment of Jesus, however, by the soldiers of Pilate took place within the barracks. As it was aimed at the nation through the person of Jesus, it was not politic to conduct it in the open air.

The mockery of Jesus was thus twofold. That inflicted by the Jews was meant for Jesus the prophet; that of the Roman soldiers, as of Herod's Syrian troops, was occasioned by His pretensions to be a king. He was ill-treated, as He was condemned and crucified, for being a royal pretender. There is no reason to suppose that the second mockery is an unhistorical echo of the former, or that even the former is (Brandt, *Evangel. gesch.* p. 69 f.) constructed elaborately out of Old Testament suggestions. But a more real problem has been raised, in recent years, with regard to

the meaning of the mockery. Several scholars§ [Note: G. Frazer, *Golden Bough*², ii. 24f., 253 f., iii. 150 f. Wend-land, in his paper on Jesus as a Saturnalian king (*Hermes*, 1898, pp. 175-179), thinks that the Roman troops ridiculed Him in the farcical garb of Saturn; but the late *Acta* of Dasius the martyr are too unreliable to serve as evidence for this period, even had the Romans been tolerant of human sacrifices.] have attempted to find, in the details of this incident, allusions to the mock coronation which preceded the grotesque Saturnalia of the Sacaeen festival in ancient Babylonia,—celebrated throughout Asia Minor in connexion with the worship of the Persian goddess Anaitis,—where, in the course of other orgies, ‘a condemned prisoner was arrayed in royal attire, only in the end to be stript of his borrowed finery, scourged, and hanged or crucified.’ Another theory (advocated by Reich in his essay on *Der König mit der Dornerkrone*, 1905) casts back to the popular buffoonery which accompanied the mimes, e.g. at Alexandria (cf. Philo, in *Flacc.* 5-6, quoted by Grotius in this connexion), while Mr. W. R. Paton (in *ZNTW* [Note: *NTW Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissen. schaft.*], 1901, 339-341) further points out that the trait of a triple crucifixion reflects the Persian custom of crucifying a pretender or usurper upon three crosses. It is, of course, quite possible that two robbers were crucified with Jesus simply because no more happened to be in prison at the moment; but, in view of this custom, it seems not unlikely that the number of victims, like the mock homage paid previously to one of them, may have been determined by some hazy notion of imitating a pagan bit of ritual. The un-Jewish character of these accompaniments of the crucifixion would certainly lend additional relish to the soldiers’ contemptuous pleasure in crucifying a caricature of a Jewish monarch.* [Note: the present writer’s remarks in the *Hibbert Journal* (1903), p. 775 f.] But, while the possibility of this may be granted, it is impossible to regard the Gospel accounts as legendary products of any such pagan custom. For one thing, Jesus was not crucified on three crosses, nor was His death taken as an offering. Again, Dr. Frazer’s identification of Purim with Sacaea is too precarious† [Note: Andrew Lang’s criticism in *Magic and Religion*, pp. 76 f., 200 f.] to support firmly the inference that Jesus perished as a Haman at this Jewish festival; nor did it require any coarse pagan rite to stimulate military horseplay among soldiers, even although they may have been, like Herod’s Syrian troops, familiar with such customs, or had been, like Pilate’s Roman legions, stationed at one time on the Euphrates where the rites in question may have survived. It is extremely unlikely that such a confusion of Sacaea with the Jewish festivals should have arisen, or that any reminiscence of the Alexandrian outburst should have prompted the records of the horseplay at Jerusalem.‡ [Note: This is well put by Dr. J. Geffcken in *Hermes* (1906). p. 220 f., and by Vollmer in *ZNTW* (1905) 194-198, criticising Reich.] See, further, art. Mockery.

ῥάπισμα (Mar_14:65, Joh_18:22) is a blow inflicted with the open hand (cf. Field’s *Notes on the Transl. of the NT*, p. 105). This is the most probable meaning, on the

whole, though the dubiety of the reading in the former passage (ἐβαλλον or ἐβαλον, ἐλαμβανον or ἔλαβον) introduces a slight element of uncertainty as to the sense.

4. Special points in the NT narratives.—Most of the characteristic features in the various reports of the trial have already been noted, but it remains for us to glance briefly at the Evangelic records one by one. The Petrine tradition in Mk. (cf. Bennett in *Expositor*, Dec. 1906, p. 545 f.) is substantially reproduced in Mt., most of whose additions are of secondary historical importance. St. Luke, again, appears to have access to a special source for this part of his narrative, while the Fourth Gospel presents a problem of peculiar intricacy, since its record of the Passion contains not merely elements which in form and content are plainly due to the writer's underlying religious aims, but also one or two passages which are either modelled upon the Lukan tradition or due to a good source which may have been known, at an earlier period, independently to St. Luke himself.

St. Mt.'s omission of the blindfolding of Jesus (Mat 26:66-67) is certainly remarkable, but it merely gives another view of the scene. We see Jesus pulled hither and thither by a crowd of exasperated fanatics, twisted from side to side, knocked about, struck behind His back, and jeeringly invited to guess who struck Him. The blindfolding makes the picture more dramatic, but not more intelligible. On the other hand, the introduction of οἱ πρεσβύτεροι in Mat 27:12; Mat 27:20 (cf. Mat 27:41), and of τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστόν (Mat 27:22), is probably due to the author's characteristic desire to accentuate the Jewish details, while changes such as the omission of Mark's favourite ἤρξαντο (Mat 26:67; Mat 26:71, Mat 27:29), or the substitution of aorists for imperfects (Mat 26:60; Mat 26:67; Mat 26:72; Mat 26:75, Mat 27:18; Mat 27:34), are simply literary and stylistic, adding nothing to the real sense of the narrative. Evidently the author or editor of Matthew had not access to any wider channel of authentic information than he found in the Markan tradition. At one point it is possible that the canonical text of Mark has even been enriched from Matthew, for the words ὁ ἐστὶν πραιτώριον (Mar 15:16), as Prof. Menzies (*The Earliest Gospel*, p. 276) after Brandt observes, do nothing 'to make Mark's narrative clearer, but rather the opposite, and may have crept in first as a gloss on the margin from Matthew, where the statement appears to be that the soldiers took Jesus off to another building, viz. to the praetorium, and collected there the whole cohort.' See Blass in *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times.*] x. [1899] 185 f.

A much more significant and complex character belongs to the Lukan narrative. Thus the freedom with which the historian has treated the Markan narrative* [Note: Compare Sir John C. Hawkins in *Expository Times*, xv. [1903] 124 f. On Luke's

omissions see EBi, col. 1793f.] may be gathered from the fact that his order, in the opening scenes of the trial (denials of Peter, mockery of Jesus, examination of Jesus), exactly reverses that of the earlier Gospels. He also forgets to mention that any evidence† [Note: The condensed nature of his account here lends too precipitate a character to the proceedings. Possibly the search for witnesses was loosely begun during the night; but even so Luke's narrative is defective on this point. That he knew the Markan tradition of the false evidence is plain from the retention of ἔτι in Luk 22:71. On his own scheme the word is superfluous, since no word of any previous witnesses occurs in the narrative.] was laid against Jesus (cf. Luk 22:66), or that Jesus was ever bound—a point on which the Fourth Evangelist is more correct (Joh 18:12). Furthermore, he omits all reference to the saying about the destruction of the Temple, though it was plainly known to him (cf. Act 6:14). Possibly an 'apologetic' motive underlay this alteration. If Luke, writing after the destruction of the Temple, viewed it as a Divine judgment upon Israel, 'which might be regarded as inflicted by Jesus Himself, he might wish to avoid saying that the testimony' of the witnesses 'was false,' and so left out the entire inquiry before the Council (*EBi [Note: Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.] 1772*). The attempt to trace an 'apologetic' element in Luk 23:12, as though this meant the pact of Judaism and paganism against Christianity (cf. Act 4:27), is rather beside the mark, however. Herod considered Jesus quite beneath his notice, no danger was to be apprehended from Him; He was beneath hatred, though not below contempt. Nor did Pilate regard the prisoner with enmity. It is indubitable, on the other hand, that St. Luke views the conduct of the people at this point in a more severe light than the other Gospels. He omits the sacerdotal device (cf. Luk 23:18 with Mar 15:11 and Mat 27:20), writing as though the people of their own accord demanded Barabbas (cf. also Luk 22:66; Luk 23:1-2; Luk 23:13), at one in this with the high priests and the rulers, though possibly, in view of passages like Luk 18:43, Luk 19:48, Luk 21:38, we are to take the people here as supporters of the priests.‡ [Note: So B. Weiss in *Die Quellen des Lukasevangeliums* (1907), 225-226.] The Fourth Evangelist, again, takes a slightly milder view of the people (cf. the omission in Joh 19:6), and this leads us to notice the idiosyncrasies of the trial-story in that Gospel.

Here Peter (cf. vol. i. 444-445) is not the only disciple who follows Jesus into the place of trial; another disciple, who is probably to be identified with the 'beloved disciple,' enters the high priest's palace, and, in virtue of his position there ('he was known to the high priest'), is able to introduce Peter. The estimate of this assertion depends upon the general view taken of the relation between the historical and the religious element in the Gospel; either (a) the anonymous disciple is the author, John (see vol. i. 800 f.), or (b) the authority to which the author refers, or (c) a purely ideal figure (cf. E [Note: Elohist.] . F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, 1907, pp. 57, 144, etc., and, from the opposite side, Lepin's *L'Origine du Quatrième Évangile*, 341-398).

While the Synoptic Gospels make the entire proceedings before Pilate take place in the open air, the Fourth Evangelist makes Pilate repeatedly go between the Jews outside and Jesus inside the palace.* [Note: Joh 18:31-32 is the early Christian interpretation of what was necessary for several ordinary reasons. The Jews could not stone their false prophet to death with impunity. They preferred to make the Romans responsible for the death of Jesus, as well as to make that death more infamous in the eyes of the people. Besides, they had no witnesses to cast the first stones, after the breakdown of the evidence about the Temple saying. Compare Nestle's Einführung in das Griechische NT, p. 213.] The attempts of the governor to save his prisoner are dramatically sharpened, if not multiplied; Jesus speaks far more than in the earlier accounts; and a certain superstitious fear is even attributed to Pilate as one result of these interviews (Luk 19:8).

The two private conversations between Pilate and Jesus (Luk 18:33-38, Luk 19:8-11) bring out the Evangelist's conception of Christ's Kingdom as a reign of truth, not of political or military force. In dramatic juxtaposition, Pilate and Jesus, the representatives of world-power and heavenly power, are confronted, and Jesus meets the Roman governor with undaunted calmness, actually putting questions to him as One possessed of independent authority. He judges His judge, in fact.† [Note: In Joh 18:37 Jesus appeals to a higher court than that of Pilate. As the Evangelist suggests, the verdict passed on Jesus had been subsequently reversed.] The Evangelist uses his favourite form of dialogue in order to bring out this conception of the meaning of the crisis. Pilate, to him, is less culpable than the Jews. He is first impatient, but soon impressed by Jesus, and finally convinced of His innocence. The insolence and rancour of the Jews form a foil to his anxiety to release the prisoner, and the dramatic conversations between the governor and the accusers bring out the contempt felt by the former for the latter's intriguing spirit, but also the weakness of character upon which the Jews were clever enough to play. Threatening Pilate with high treason to the emperor Tiberius (cf. vol. i. 246^a) if he acquits Jesus, they force his hand, until angry, like any weak man who is publicly forced to be disloyal to his convictions, he hands over the prisoner to be crucified.‡ [Note: 'That a Roman administrator capable of taking this sensible view of a case so dishonestly got up should nevertheless suffer his sense of justice to be overborne by the outcry of a threatening priesthood and a noisy populace, is indeed deplorable, but only too credible in that age of decay of the civil virtues' (Martineau, Seat of Authority in Religion, bk. v. ch. ii.).]

It is plausible to read, between the lines of this scene, the author's plea for the political innocence of Christians at the opening of the 2nd cent. (as in Luke's Gospel and Acts), and to this apologetic element may be added an emphasis on the malevolent instigation of persecution by the Jews (as at Polycarp's martyrdom in Smyrna), and a corresponding emphasis on the greater hopefulness of the Gentile

mission. The Jesus of the Fourth Gospel's trial recognizes no duty of confession towards Judaism. While in the Synoptic Gospels He confesses His Messiahship to the Sanhedrin, and is silent on it before Pilate, the reverse is the case in the Fourth Gospel (cf. 1Ti 6:13). But even in describing and defending His mission before the governor, Jesus appeals not to him but to the world of sincere, elect souls, who are 'of the truth' (cf. Joh 12:20 f.), Greeks or Jews, the latter having no precedence whatsoever. It is in this light, as Loisy points out, that Pilate's famous question, *What is truth?* must be read, not as the word of an inquirer, nor of melancholy regret, but as a reflexion of the half-contemptuous scepticism felt by some Roman authorities for the inconvenient enthusiasm of Christians, who persisted in taking seriously what no man of the world would allow to disturb his own conscience (cf. Truth).* [Note: As usual in the Fourth Gospel (cf. Joh 12:34), Jesus is made to utter a deep, enigmatic saying which is misunderstood by the literal mind of His opponent. See, further, Matheson's Land marks of NT Morality, p. 244 f.] The idea of a man letting himself suffer for the sake of 'truth,' a chimera of the schools! As for the dramatic confession of the Jews, *We have no king but Cæsar* (Joh 19:16), with its affectation of patriotism in order to get rid of the King of truth, what the author means to bring out, especially in the light of the crisis of 70 a.d., when Caesar destroyed the Jewish State, is the abnegation by Judaism of its proper mission. That mission was spiritual. 'Judaism was the sheath to a seed: if it ceased to enfold transcendent hope, it lost all meaning. What found its expression in the rejection of Christ was that renegade Judaism in alliance with the world which we know as Pharisaism. For Judaism to ally itself with Rome, with Herod, with any earthly dominion, is, for a races called on to uphold trust in God, to confess that in any real stress of need the recourse must be to material springs of power' (Julia Wedgwood, *The Message of Israel*, p. 302).

Three further points in the Johannine narrative demand a final word of notice, (a) Are the famous words *Ecce homo* (Joh 19:5, cf. vol. i. 507) meant to represent Pilate, like Caiaphas (Joh 11:49-52), as an involuntary prophet? This would be likely if ὁ ἄνθρωπος were taken (with Nestle, *Einführung in das Griech. NT*, 237 f.) in the sense of the Son of Man (cf. Joh 1:51, Joh 3:14), an interpretation favoured by Grill (*Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums*, pp. 49-50). We should then have a play upon words which literally meant, 'Behold the fellow!' or, 'Look at this poor wretch!'

(b) To whom does Jesus refer in the words (Joh 19:11), 'He that delivered me to thee has the greater sin'? To Satan, to Judas, or to Caiaphas? Most probably it is the high priest who is in the author's mind. The previous words of the verse (cf. Coleridge's *Table Talk*, May 20, 1830) emphasize one cardinal idea of the Gospel, viz. that the fate of Jesus was due to the Divine will alone; the latter part of the verse reiterates the other conception of the Jews as more culpable than the Roman authorities (cf. A. R. Eagar in *Expositor*, July 1905, p. 33 f.).

(c) Is ἐκάθισεν (Joh 19:13) intransitive or transitive? Did Pilate seat himself or Jesus on the tribunal? The latter rendering, supported by a tradition voiced in the Gospel of Peter and Justin Martyr (see vol. i. 678^a), would give a good sense, Jesus being symbolically enthroned as the King of truth, and Pilate's irony really indicating the true position of his prisoner (so Loisy, after Professor Roberts, *Expositor*, 1893, 296 f., and others); but unfortunately the grammatical and psychological probabilities tell seriously against it.† [Note: Abbott's Johannine Grammar, 2537, and Zahn's Einleitung in das NT (§ 69, note 12).]

Literature.—Besides the references already cited, the literature under Caiaphas, Judas, Peter, and Pilate, and the relevant sections in the various editions of the Gospels and the biographies of Jesus (notably those by Strauss, B. Weiss, Neander, Farrar, Beyschlag, Keim, A. Réville, Edersheim, O. Holtzmann), there are special studies of the subject by Brandt, *Die evangel. Gesch. und der Ursprung des Christenthums*, 1893, pp. 53-68, who gives the most searching and sceptical view of the details, and, on conservative lines, by S. J. Andrews, *The Life of our Lord* (1892), pp. 505-544; Ewald, *History of Israel*, vi. 429-437; F. L. Steinmeyer, *The History of the Passion and Resurrection of our Lord, in the light of Modern Criticism* (Edinburgh); Prof. Stalker, *The Trial and Death of Jesus Christ* (London, 1894); Dr. John Watson, *The Life of the Master* (pp. 363-382); and Auguste Wabnitz, *Hist. de la Vie de Jésus—La Passion, la Mort, et la Resurrection de Jésus* (Montauban, 1904), pp. 175-273; see also H. B. Workman, *Persecution in the Early Church* (1906), pp. 10-20; and, from a different standpoint, the tenth chapter of E. Clodd's *Jesus of Nazareth*. On the legal aspects the standard monograph in English is Mr. Taylor Innes's *The Trial of Jesus Christ; A Legal Monograph* (1899), a dignified and subtle study, to which the relevant pages of Signor G. Rosadi's *The Trial of Jesus* (English translation of 3rd Italian ed. 1905) add little or nothing; see, further, Dalman in *Sunday School Times* (May 6th, 1899); H. M. Cheever, 'The legal aspects of the trial of Jesus,' *Bibl. Sacra* (1903), 495-509; and the popular descriptions in two works by S. Buss, viz. *Roman Law and History in the NT* (1901), pp. 174-239, and *The Trial of Jesus: Illustrated from Talmud and Roman Law* (1906). In addition to these studies, the preacher will find excellent material in W. F. Besser, *Leidengeschichte* (1855); H. Müller, *Der leidende Jesus* (Halle, 1856); A. Nebe, *Die Leidengesch. Jesu* (Stuttgart, 1881); Süskind, *Dispositionen zur heil. Passion* (Berlin, 1887); M. J. Ollivier, *La Passion* (Paris, 1902); H. Werner, *Christi Leidengesch. das Meisterwerk des göttlichen Vorsehung* (1902); J. L. Meagher, *The Tragedy of Calvary, or The Minute Details of Christ's Life from Palm-Sunday morning till the Resurrection and Ascension* (New York, 1905); together with A. M. Fairbairn's *Studies in the Life of Christ* (ch. xvi.); W. R. Nicoll's *The Incarnate Saviour* (ch. xviii.); Parker's *The Inner Life of Christ*, iii. 232 f.; Joseph Hall's invaluable *Contemplations* (vol. iii. ch. xxx.-xxxi.); W. M. Clow's volume. *In the Day of the Cross* (1899); Dr. William Hanna's *The Passion Week*; Gerhard's *Erklärung*

der Historie des Leidens und Sterbens unseres Herrn Jesu Christi (Berlin); and Hengstenberg's devout volume of *Vorlesungen über die Leidengeschichte* (Leipzig, 1875). There are notable sermons on Mar 15:15-20 ('Crowned Suffering') by H. W. Beecher, on Mat 27:12-14; Mat 27:20-23 by Prof. G. A. Smith (*The Forgiveness of Sins*, 1904), on Mat 27:22 ('What will you do with Christ?') by H. W. Beecher, on Joh 18:31; Joh 18:38 ('The Postponement of Pilate') by S. A. Brooke (*Sermons*, second series, p. 294 f.), and F. W. Robertson (*Sermons*, first series, xix.-xx.), on Joh 18:36 by Mozley (*University Sermons*, No. 1), and on Joh 19:10-11 by Liddon (*University Sermons*, second series, p. 236 f.). Compare also Steele's paper in the *Spectator* (No. 356) for April 18, 1712, Mr. Wratislaw on 'The Scapegoat—Barabbas' (*ExpT [Note: xpT Expository Times.]* iii. [1892] 400-403), and, on Joh 18:37-38, Phillips Brooks' *The Influence of Jesus* (ch. iv.); with R. J. Campbell (*City Temple Sermons*, p. 50 f.) on Joh 19:5.

James Moffatt.

☛Tribe

TRIBE (φυλή) is used mostly in the special OT sense of an Israelitish tribe, composed of the descendants of one of the sons of Jacob. The prophetess Anna belonged to the tribe of Asher (Luk 2:36). The Messianic claims of Jesus were strengthened by the fact that He sprang from the royal tribe of Judah (Heb 7:14). Galilee comprised the territories allotted in OT times to the tribes of Zebulun and Naphtali (Mat 4:13; Mat 4:15). The promise to the Twelve Apostles that they should judge the twelve tribes of Israel (Mat 19:28 || Luk 22:30) may be regarded as an instance of the way in which Jesus sometimes expressed His teaching in the language of popular apocalyptic conceptions of the Kingdom of God (cf. Rev 7:4 ff.). Less probable is the explanation of Weiss, that 'their judging the twelve tribes is only the reverse side of their being sent to the twelve tribes, which are exposed to judgment just because the offer of salvation was made to them through the Apostles' (*NT Theol.*, English translation i. 154). In Mat 24:30 (quoted from Zec 12:12) 'tribe' has the wider sense of a branch of the human race.

James Patrick.

☛Tribulation

TRIBULATION.—The Gr. word θλίψις (which means literally ‘a pressing,’ ‘a pressing together,’ ‘pressure’) is translated in the Authorized Version by the words ‘tribulation,’ ‘affliction,’ and ‘anguish.’ In every instance of its occurrence save one, viz. Joh 16:21, where the Authorized Version translation ‘anguish’ is retained, the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 uniformly employs the term ‘tribulation.’ The verb θλίβω occurs twice in the Gospels: in Mar 3:9, where it describes the action of the crowd in ‘thronging’ Jesus; and Mat 7:14, where it represents ‘the ways that leadeth unto life’ as being ‘straitened’ (τεθλιμμένη). In his *Study of Words*, Trench gives a very interesting account of the history of the English word ‘tribulation.’ Derived from Lat. *tribulum*, the threshing instrument or harrow by means of which the corn was separated from the husks, *tribulatio*, the term applied to the process of separation, came to be used for the disciplinary ordeal of distress and adversity. The following grouping of passages indicates the various usages of the word in the Gospels:

1. In the Apocalyptic discourse ‘tribulation’ is declared to be in store for the Jewish nation (Mat 24:29, cf. Mar 13:19). The necessity of this tribulation is emphasized (Mat 24:6, Mar 13:7, Luk 21:9), and the circumstances attending it are described in terrible and pathetic detail.
2. ‘Tribulation’ is announced by Jesus as the outward lot that awaits His disciples (a) In the confusion and conflict that would sweep the nation on to the final catastrophe, the disciples were to be involved (Mat 24:9). They would draw this relentless hostility on themselves in consequence of their testimony and activity as disciples. It behoved them to endure (ὑπομένειν, Mat 24:13) and prove themselves ‘brethren and partakers in the tribulation, and kingdom, and patience (ὑπομονή) which are in Jesus’ (Rev 1:9 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 , cf. Rom 5:3). (b) Similarly, but without reference to any particular ordeal, the disciples are warned about the treatment they must expect to meet with ‘in the world’ (Joh 16:2; Joh 16:33). On account of their relation to Jesus, they would be subjected to this treatment. But their attitude ought to be one of ‘good cheer’ (θαρσεῖτε). ‘The way that leadeth unto life’ was, therefore, in the case of the disciples to prove ‘straitened’ (τεθλιμμένη).
3. ‘Tribulation’ and persecution (διωγμός) ‘because of the word’ are mentioned in the parable of the Sower as the conditions which cause those ‘to stumble straightway’ that ‘hear the word, and straightway with joy receive it, and have no root in themselves’ (Mat 13:21, Mar 4:17). A mind only emotionally interested in the ‘word,’ that is to say, as distinct from one intellectually and morally interested (Mat 13:23,

Mar_4:20), is incapable of withstanding the emotional shock occasioned by tribulation and persecution. With his feelings sustained and refreshed by no continuous and immediate experience in relation to the 'word,' such a person cannot resist the assault upon them of actual harassing events. See also Sorrow, Suffering.

Literature.—Trench, *Study of Words*; Bushnell, *The New Life*; Maclaren, *The Unchanging Christ*; W. Archer Butler, *Serm.* 2nd ser. (1866) 78; T. Arnold, *Christian Life* (1878), 217; Moulton-Geden, *Gr. Concordance*; Grimm-Thayer, *Gr. Lex.* s.vv. and Comm. on passages.

A. B. Macaulay.

☞ Tribute

TRIBUTE is used in the Gospels in two distinct senses. 1. The *tribute-money* (διδραχμοῦ, Mat_17:24 ff.) was the Temple-tax levied on all male Israelites of twenty and upwards, to meet the cost of the daily burnt-offering and the other sacrifices offered in the name of the people, and for other objects of a public character. In the days of Nehemiah the amount was a third of a shekel (Neh_10:32-33), but in NT times it was half a shekel (Josephus *Ant.* xviii. xix. 1), which was also the sum fixed in Exo_30:11-13. It was collected in the month Adar, and was paid in money of the early Hebrew standard. The 'piece of money' (στατήρ) of Mat_17:27 was equal to a shekel (about 2 Samuel 9 d.), and so was sufficient to meet the Temple-tax for two persons. 2. The *tribute to Caesar* (φόρος, φόροι, κῆνσος) denoted the taxes payable by the Jews, as Roman subjects, into the Imperial treasury (*fiscus*). These included taxes on land and property (*tributum soli*), and the polltax (*tributum capitis*), from which only children and old men were exempt. The Roman authorities made use of the Jewish courts in collecting their revenue from these sources (Josephus *BJ* ii. xvii. 1). It was the lawfulness of paying such taxes about which Jesus was questioned by His enemies (Mat_22:17 || Mar_12:14 || Luk_20:22). His reply gave no ground for the charge of forbidding their payment, which was afterwards brought against Him (Luk_23:2).

Literature.—Schürer, *HJP* [Note: *JP History of the Jewish People.*] i. i. 65, ii. 107 f., ii. i. 250 ff., ii. 162, and the authorities there cited.

James Patrick.

Trinity

TRINITY.—Our subject is the doctrine of the Holy Trinity in relation to Christ and the Gospels. We have to consider how far that great conception of God's being and nature is revealed or implied in the fact of Christ as presented in the Gospels and in the teaching of our Lord Himself.

I. The witness of our Lord's consciousness as revealed in the Gospels

(i.) *As regards Himself.*—It was not our Lord's custom to take to Himself the names and titles to which He knew He had a right. The passage which exhibits this fact most clearly is that in which we find Him questioning His disciples, first as to the popular opinion, and then as to their own belief (Mat. 16:13 ff., Mar. 8:27 ff., Luk. 9:18 ff.). After St. Peter had made his great confession, our Lord charged the disciples to keep the truth which had just emerged, to themselves. No doubt He desired to avoid the mistakes arising from the popular conceptions of the Messiah. He wished also to train the minds of the disciples, to lead them gently from truth to truth, so that spiritual experience might keep pace with knowledge. And yet our Lord's thoughts about Himself were loftier far than could be imagined from the mere names and titles which He acknowledged. When the passages which contain His statements about His own relation to God and man are collected and viewed as a whole, they are found to imply claims which are far in advance of the first and more obvious meanings of the titles.

It is being more and more fully recognized by critical students of the life of Jesus that He certainly regarded Himself as the Messiah, and that the names and titles by which He described Himself and permitted others to describe Him are Messianic in their significance. But when this has been granted to the full, there remains a very large proportion of His self-revelation unaccounted for. Bousset considers that the reserve of our Lord on the subject of His Messiahship was due to His deep sense of the inadequacy of the Messianic title for that which He felt Himself to be (*Jesus*, p. 175 ff., English translation). And certain it is that, among all the conceptions which clustered round the Jewish anticipation of the Messiah, none is great enough, none deep enough, to correspond with the revelation of Himself which our Lord makes in the Gospels. (See art. 'Development of Doctrine' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, Ext. Vol.; Charles, 'Enoch' and 'Eschatology' in vol. i.; also Briggs, *The Messiah of the Gospels*). True, we have the great OT conceptions of the later Isaiah and of the Book of Daniel, and we have the latter repeated, and in some respects enlarged, in the *Similitudes of Enoch*. In this probably pre-Christian work there is a wonderful picture of the *Son of Man*, which corresponds remarkably with certain passages in the Gospels. He is, as it seems, regarded as pre-existent, was named in the presence of God before creation, and takes part in judgment. But there is no anticipation of that

extraordinary union of earthly humiliation with transcendent relationship to God the Father which is the principal deliverance of our Lord's consciousness concerning Himself. The truth is that the difficulty of representing that consciousness by means of the understood and recognized terms of the religion and theology of the day was almost inconceivably great.

It was this very inadequacy of all existing conceptions to convey the truth of our Lord's Person in His relation to God and man which rendered necessary that careful and patient handling of the faith of the disciples which we find everywhere in His dealing with them. A spiritual experience of a new kind had to be created before the new language could be learned. The new wine needed new bottles. The first danger to be guarded against was a premature precision, a hasty definition. The one title which our Lord constantly used of Himself, 'the Son of Man,' most skilfully avoided anything of the nature of definition. Messianic in its associations, it was yet not so distinctively Messianic as to constitute a claim, and it was capable of infinite suggestion, according to its application and context. It was a continual challenge to reflexion. See art. Son of Man above and in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible .

These reflexions will help us to discern the true nature of the problem which is presented by our Lord's revelation of Himself. The facts of that problem may be summarized as follows, the Synoptic evidence and that of the Fourth Gospel being exhibited separately.

(1) *Direct statements or claims to a position or authority more than human.*—The strongest passage in the Synoptics is the solemn declaration recorded by Mt. (Mat 11:27) and Lk. (Luk 10:22), 'All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth who the Son is, save the Father; and who the Father is, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him.'

These words form the most striking connecting link between the Christology of the Synoptics and that of the Fourth Gospel. But they do not, as some critics would have us believe, stand alone. On the contrary, they but sum up teaching which may be found everywhere, expressed or implied. In many places our Lord speaks of His mission from God in a manner which sets Him above and apart from men (Mat 20:28, Mar 9:37; Mar 10:45, Luk 9:48, Mat 28:18 etc.). He is King in a superhuman sense of the term (Mat 24:30 ff; Mat 25:34; Mat 25:40, Mar 15:2, Luk 19:38-40; Luk 22:29; Luk 23:2-3). He is Judge of all and Lord of the future (Mat 25:31 ff; Mat 16:27; Mat 19:28; Mat 26:64, Mar 8:38; Mar 13:26-27; Mar 14:62, Luk 9:26; Luk 12:8-9; Luk 12:40 ff., Luk 13:25 ff., Luk 17:30; Luk 21:36; Luk 22:69 etc.). He is David's Lord (Mat 22:43-45, Mar 12:35 ff., Luk 20:44). He is higher than the angels (Mar 13:32). He demands the most complete devotion as His right, and the most extreme self-sacrifice (Mat 8:22; Mat 10:32-33; Mat 10:37; Mat 10:39; Mat 11:29;

Mat 16:24; Mat 16:26; Mat 26:10 ff., Mar 8:34 ff; Mar 10:29, Luk 9:23 ff; Luk 14:26 ff; Luk 21:12 ff. etc.). These passages express the Divine claim upon the loyalty of mankind in terms which could not be surpassed. So it is that our Lord declares Himself greater than the Temple (Mat 12:6), Lord of the Sabbath (Mat 12:8, Mar 2:28), greater than Solomon (Mat 12:42).

In the Fourth Gospel this great claim of Christ occupies a much larger space, and is more explicit and more fully stated, but it is a mistake to suppose that it is more strongly expressed. Such a passage as Joh 5:22-23 'He hath given all judgment unto the Son; that all may honour the Son even as they honour the Father,' is very definite, but it is only putting into general terms the teaching of Mat 10:37; Mat 25:31 ff., Mar 8:34-38, Luk 14:26. The tremendous statement in Joh 10:30 'I and the Father are one,' summing up as it does the teaching of the whole Gospel, finds perhaps its most perfect explication in Mat 11:27, Luk 10:22. The great section, John 14-17, is but the further development of the same doctrine, introducing, as was necessary, the promise of the Holy Spirit and certain fundamental instruction concerning His function and work.

(2) When from direct statements made by our Lord Himself we pass to the revelation of His consciousness of His unique relation to God which is to be found implied in *His life and methods*, we are able to note the following:

(a) *The unvarying tone of authority* which characterizes all His actions and utterances—authority as regards the greatest subjects which have ever engaged the mind of man. See, further, artt. Authority of Christ and Claims of Christ.

(b) *The serene certainty of His judgments upon the greatest questions of morality and religion*. This characteristic is most noticeable in the Sermon on the Mount, and in all those parts of His teaching which deal with His own relation to God, and God's love to man. All the highest and greatest things are to Him easy and familiar. He walks upon the mountain peaks of vision with unhesitating confidence. He speaks as One who sees clearly into the heart of God. Examples will be found in the following passages:

Mat 5:43 ff; Mat 6:25-34; Mat 7:7-12; Mat 11:20-30; Mat 12:30-37; Mat 17:20; Mat 18:7-14; Mat 22:19-21; Mat 22:29-33; Mat 23:37, Mar 2:18-22; Mar 2:27; Mar 9:33-50; Mar 10:42-45; Mar 14:3-9, Luk 2:49; Luk 4:21; Luk 7:22-23; Luk 7:47-50; Luk 10:24-37; Luk 10:15; Luk 17:4; Luk 17:10; Luk 17:20-21; Luk 18:9-14, Joh 3:3; Joh 4:24; Joh 5:17; Joh 14:2 etc.

(c) *He never prays with His disciples*. He teaches them to pray, He prays for them, but not with them. (See Chadwick, *Christ bearing witness to Himself*, pp. 104, 105;

and Forrest, *The Christ of History and of Experience*, p. 22 ff., and Appendix to 5th ed.). We read of solitary prayers (Mar 6:45-48, Joh 6:15).

(d) *The harmonious combination of opposite qualities in His character.*—Characteristics which would be incompatible in any one else unite freely and with perfect consistency in Him. Here is perhaps the strongest proof of the absolute truth of the portrait presented in the Gospels. Nothing but the strength and reality of the Personality which inspired the various accounts could have made such a result possible. See, further, artt. Character of Christ, Divinity of Christ, Mental Characteristics.

(ii.) *His relation to the Father*

(1) Our Lord asserts and implies that He stands in a relation of *unique intimacy with God the Father*. The great passage already quoted (Mat 11:27, Luk 10:22) is the fullest statement in the Synoptics. The language here associates the Son with the Father in a manner which exalts Him above all creation. It corresponds with certain characteristic phrases and mental habits of our Lord. For example, He calls God 'my Father' in a manner which sets the relation indicated by the words far apart from that Fatherhood which He attributes to God in relation to men, whether disciples or not: see Mat 7:21; Mat 10:32-33; Mat 11:27; Mat 15:13; Mat 18:10; Mat 20:23 etc., Mar 8:38, Luk 2:49; Luk 22:29; Luk 24:49, Joh 5:17; Joh 10:29-30; Joh 14:20; Joh 20:17 etc. These passages but supply the correlative to the announcement at the Baptism and the Transfiguration (Mar 1:11; Mar 9:7). They also interpret for us the title 'Son of God' attributed to Him and accepted by Him (Mat 4:3; Mat 4:6; Mat 8:29; Mat 14:33; Mat 27:40; Mat 27:43; Mat 27:54, Mar 3:11; Mar 12:6-8; Mar 15:39, Luk 4:41; Luk 22:70, Joh 1:34; Joh 1:49; Joh 9:35; Joh 11:27 etc.).

In connexion with this we observe the cloudless serenity of His relation to God. It has been remarked that the absence of any note of repentance is the strongest proof of our Lord's perfect sinlessness. But we have in His life the marks of a moral state which is very much more than mere sinlessness. The value of the negative is entirely relative to the corresponding positive. The perfect innocence of a soul which possessed but small moral capacity would, so far as we can see, be of but little value as a moral factor in the universe. But, in the case of our Lord, we find a moral capacity which is absolutely without parallel in human experience, and we find the moral Being who possesses this capacity not merely conscious of innocence, but living a life which is wittingly and willingly all that God would have it be (see Forrest, *op. cit.*, Lect. I.).

(2) *Unity with the Father.*—The revelation which our Lord gives us of His relation to the Father amounts to much more than a manifestation of a peculiar intimacy

between Himself and God. He claims distinctly certain Divine attributes and privileges. He is King and Judge of all. He is to be the object of the most absolute trust, the utmost devotion. No sacrifice is too great to be made for His sake (see above). To reject Him or His messengers is to reject God and to incur the severest judgment (Mat 10:15; Mat 10:40; Mat 11:22; Mat 11:24, Mar 12:9, Luk 10:13-14; Luk 10:16; Luk 13:34-35 etc.). The right of the Almighty to supremacy over the hearts and lives of men could not be expressed in stronger terms than those in which Jesus claims human allegiance. The only possible explanation of His attitude is that given by His own words, 'All things have been delivered unto me of my Father' (Mat 11:27, Luk 10:22).

When we turn to the Fourth Gospel, we find this teaching expressed with a fulness and clearness of statement which ought not to appear extraordinary. There must surely have been an inner side to such a life as we find portrayed from the outside in the Synoptics. If the external accounts give so many indications of a unique relation to God, the revelation of the inner life of the wonderful Personality must display that relation with special clearness. What is truly extraordinary is that the inner history, as we have it in St. John's Gospel, does not reveal any essential element which cannot be found, expressed or implied, in the external histories (see above). And this is the more remarkable when we consider that the method and style of the Fourth Gospel contrast so strongly with those of the others.

From St. John we learn then to think of our Lord: (1) As One who came from God, with whom He was before, on a mission of mercy to mankind, Joh 3:11-14; Joh 3:16-17; Joh 3:31 ff., Joh 5:24; Joh 5:30; Joh 5:43; Joh 6:29; Joh 6:32-33 ff., Joh 6:62; Joh 7:16; Joh 7:28 etc. Joh 8:23; Joh 8:42 etc. Joh 16:28 ff. (2) As One whose relation to the Father is essential and unique, Joh 3:13; Joh 3:18; Joh 3:34, Joh 5:17-18; Joh 5:23; Joh 5:26, Joh 6:57, Joh 8:16, Joh 10:15; Joh 10:38, Joh 14:7; Joh 14:11. (3) As the only-begotten Son of God, Joh 3:16; Joh 3:18, and see Joh 1:14; Joh 1:18 (in Joh 1:18 the stronger $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$ $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ seems the better reading). (4) As with the Father from all eternity. This may be gathered from Joh 8:58 'Before Abraham was, I am,' and Joh 17:5; Joh 17:24 'the glory which I had with thee before the world was,' 'Thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.' These passages justify the extraordinary language of the Prologue (Joh 1:1-2), 'the Word was with God,' 'the same was in the beginning with God' ($\pi\alpha\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\nu\varsigma$ $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\nu$). The $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ $\epsilon\iota\mu$ of Joh 8:58 certainly implies more than mere pre-existence. (5) As one with the Father: 'I and the Father are one' (Joh 10:30); 'All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine' (Joh 16:15); 'All things that are mine are thine, and thine are mine' (Joh 17:10), etc. The $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ (one) in Joh 10:30 is very remarkable. It signifies *essence*, as distinguished from person. which would be $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$. The force of it is greatly

strengthened by its relation to the context. Our Lord is declaring His power to keep His people. He appeals to the Almighty power of God (Joh 10:29), identifying His own power with it and adding the explanation, 'I and the Father are one.' See also Joh 5:17, Joh 12:45, Joh 14:7-10 etc.

This classification of passages enables us to pass along an ascending plane of thought to that great doctrine which is so comprehensively and yet so briefly expressed in the Prologue to the Gospel. We learn that the Evangelist intended us to gather that the conception of the Logos which is there presented is the true and necessary implication of our Lord's consciousness of Himself and His work in relation to God and the world.

II. The revelation of God in the Gospels

(i.) *The Father.*—We must never forget that Christianity was built upon the foundation of Jewish monotheism. A long providential discipline had secured to the Jewish people their splendid heritage of faith in the One and Only God. 'Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our God is one Jehovah: and thou shalt love Jehovah thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might' (Deu 6:4 f.). This was the corner-stone of the religion of Israel. These were perhaps the most familiar of all sacred words to the ears of the pious Jew. They were recited continually. Our Lord Himself had them frequently in His mind (Mat 22:37, Mar 12:29-30, Luk 10:27). That He thought of God always as the Supreme One is unquestionable. Indeed the very idea of Fatherhood, which, with our Lord, is the characteristic conception, and which is capable of being presented in a way which might weaken or injure a true monotheism, becomes in His teaching absolutely monotheistic because absolutely universal (see Mat 5:45; Mat 5:48; Mat 7:11; Mat 8:11; Mat 10:29, Luk 6:35; Luk 13:29-30; Luk 13:15). To the Jewish mind, the sovereignty of God was the natural and characteristic thought. In our Lord's teaching the Divine Fatherhood overshadows and also transforms the Divine sovereignty, but never threatens to dissolve the pure and splendid monotheism of the original doctrine.

There are three degrees of the Divine Fatherhood presented in the teaching of our Lord: God is the universal Father (see reff. given above); He is, in a very intimate and special way, the Father of the disciples of Jesus (Mat 5:16; Mat 6:1; Mat 6:8-9 ff., Mat 7:11, Luk 12:32 etc.); He is, in the highest, and unique, sense, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (see above).

It is evident that our Lord makes a very clear distinction between His own Sonship and the relationship in which others, even the most faithful of disciples, stand towards God. Yet, in thus setting Himself apart as the Son of God, He was in truth providing that very element which was required to form a connecting link between the Divine

and the human. The great danger of monotheism is its tendency towards a *transcendence* which removes man to an infinite distance: God and man seem to stand apart from one another in hopeless opposition. Such was the tendency of the Jewish conception in the time of our Lord. (See art. 'God (in NT)' by Dr. Sanday in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible).

We find, then, that the teaching of our Lord and of the Gospels concerning God is the union of a true and unwavering monotheism with a great doctrine of mediation, according to which God and man enter into very close relationship in the Person of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.

(ii.) *The Son*

(1) *The Son is a distinct Person from the Father.*—It is easy to complicate this question by a discussion of the meaning of the word 'personality.' The Latin word *persona* was chosen to represent the Greek ὑπόστασις, but neither the original nor its translation was adequate. To endeavour to minimize the difficulty of the traditional doctrine by recalling the primitive meaning of *persona* is surely vain. The truth is that the conception of personality, as we now understand it, did not enter into the thoughts of the ancients at all. They used the language which attached itself most easily to the new distinctions which the rise of Christian theology forced upon their attention, and, in doing so, laid the foundations of our modern philosophical and theological terminology. But the true force of their technical terms may be more accurately gauged by considering the meanings to which they tended, than by going back to meanings which they forsook. It is much better to interpret the Trinitarian doctrine with the help of the modern conception of personality than by means of the Latin word *persona*; for if the connotation of the term has altered, its denotation is, in this case, the same, and the change of meaning was simply the inevitable development.

The truth of this will become evident when we turn from abstract doctrines and *a priori* arguments to the facts of the life of Christ as we have them in the Gospels. If any result has emerged from our examination it is this: the Personality of our Lord is the most distinct and the most concrete of which we have any knowledge. If His consciousness included elements which are outside the range of our experience, if His character combined qualities which do not coexist under ordinary human conditions, if there was an unexampled completeness about His moral and spiritual being, then all these great spiritual possessions belonged to His Ego, and therefore that Ego had a distinctness and concreteness surpassing any other human being who ever lived. To confuse the boundaries which give the Ego its distinctness, for the sake of making an abstract doctrine appear more intelligible, is surely a dangerous error. Our Lord was

very man, and His Ego had all the self-possession and self-consciousness which give to every human soul its personal distinctness. While we find, in His self-revelation, that He constantly entered into a communion with God which is quite without parallel in human experience, and that He knew the heart of God from within, we also find Him ever distinguishing Himself as a Person from the Father. There is no trace anywhere of the breaking down of the boundaries of personal life. The Hebrew prophet was frequently impelled to speak as the mouthpiece of Jehovah, his personality seemed to dissolve, and the voice of Deity seemed to speak through his lips. So with the mystic, the individual being seems to vanish in the moment of insight, the human drop seems to blend with the ocean of Divinity. In the records of the inner life of our Lord will be found no sign of such experiences. His utterances reveal no displacement of the centre of personal life. He is always self-contained, even in Gethsemane.

This personal distinctness may be seen clearly in the following passages. They are among our Lord's greatest utterances: 'All things have been delivered unto me of my Father, and no one knoweth the Son save the Father,' etc. (Mat_11:27, Luk_10:22); 'The Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels' (Mat_16:27); 'Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, the Son of Man also shall be ashamed of him, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels' (Mar_8:38); 'Not what I will, but what thou wilt' (Mar_14:36); 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit' (Luk_23:46); 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' (Mar_15:34); 'My Father worketh hitherto and I work' (Joh_5:17); 'I and the Father are one' (Joh_10:30); 'I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no one cometh unto the Father but by me' (Joh_14:6), etc. These examples are selected out of a great number. The Fourth Gospel is especially rich in such passages, and this fact is the more remarkable because it is the Gospel of Christian mysticism. In it we are taught to think of the great unities which are realized in Christ: 'Thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us'; 'I in them and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one' (Joh_17:21; Joh_17:23), etc. Yet St. John is very clear as to the distinctness of the Persons: 'The Logos was with God,' 'The same was in the beginning with God' (Joh_1:1-2). The phrase is remarkable, *προς τον θεόν*. It signifies personal distinctness with active relationship. (Cf. 1Jn_1:2 *προς τον πατερα*). We have already seen how emphatic this Evangelist is as to the humanity of our Lord. We now find him equally emphatic as to the true Personality. Yet he is our clearest teacher about the Divinity. Surely we must recognize, as the source of this extraordinary combination, the reality of the life and consciousness to which he testifies, the fact of Christ.

(2) *Organic relation of the Son to the Father*

(a) *The subordination of the Son.*—This truth is presented everywhere in the teaching of our Lord. Though He speaks ever as One who enjoys a unique relation of intimacy with the Father, though He claims God as His own Father, yet it is clear that He was filled with reverence towards the Eternal Source of all things from whom His own being is derived.

Certain passages express this very distinctly: Mar_13:32 ‘Of that day and that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.’ These words are usually considered in connexion with the doctrine of the *kenosis* (wh. see). But they are quite as important as a testimony to our Lord’s consciousness of His own Divine Sonship. Here we find Him placing Himself above the angels in heaven, next to the Eternal Father, and the fact of His ignorance of the great secret noted as extraordinary. The truth is that the implications of this passage involve a Christology which agrees perfectly with the teaching of St. John. There is, however, the clear assertion of the subordination of the Son; and even if His ignorance of the great day be regarded as temporary, part of the limitation involved in His humiliation while on earth, none the less the assertion remains.

Secondly, especial mention may be made of Joh_14:23 ‘The Father is greater than I.’ As Coleridge observes (see *Table Talk*, 1st May 1823), these words, which have been used to supply an argument against the orthodox creed, contain, in truth, a very strong implication of our Lord’s Divinity. For a mere man to say, ‘God is greater than I,’ would be monstrous or absurd. Comparison is possible only between things of the same nature. While, therefore, the assertion implies the Divinity, it is a direct statement of the filial subordination of the Son. It is remarkable that, in this statement, our Lord uses the emphatic ‘I,’ as in Joh_8:58 (τὸν Ἀβραὰμ γενεσθαι ἐγὼ εἶμι) and Joh_10:30 (ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἓν ἐσμεν). He does not say, ‘the Son,’ or, ‘the Son of Man.’ It is inadmissible, as Westcott points out, to suppose that He is speaking here otherwise than ‘in the fulness of His indivisible Personality.’ We cannot think that the statement refers merely to the human life of Christ on earth. ‘The superior greatness of the Father must therefore be interpreted in regard to the absolute relations of the Father and the Son without violation of the one equal Godhead.’ (See Westcott, *loc. cit.*, and Additional Note on Joh_14:28).

(b) *The derivative nature of the Son’s Divinity.*—We are left in no doubt as to what is the essential nature of this subordination. The Son derives His being, His knowledge, His power, His active life, at every moment, from the Father. For the detailed proof of this we are mainly dependent upon the Fourth Gospel. But here the range of passages which may be adduced is extraordinary.

‘The Son can do nothing of himself’ ([Joh_5:19](#)); ‘As the Father hath life in himself, even so gave he to the Son also to have life in himself’ ([Joh_5:26](#)); ‘I can of myself do nothing’ ([Joh_5:30](#)); ‘I am come down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me’ ([Joh_6:38](#)); ‘I do nothing of myself’ ([Joh_8:28](#)); ‘I spoke not from myself; but the Father which sent me, he hath given me a commandment, what I should say and what I should speak’ ([Joh_12:49](#)); ‘The Father abiding in me doeth his works’ ([Joh_14:10](#)); ‘Thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee’ ([Joh_17:21](#))

(c) *The kenosis*.—It is this derivative nature of the Son’s Divinity which helps us to realize that the limitations to which He submitted during His life on earth involved no breach of His Divine identity. Our ordinary experience teaches us that the limitation of our powers does not destroy our identity. If we shut our eyes, we impose upon ourselves voluntarily a limitation which, while it lasts, diminishes very considerably our hold upon reality; yet we continue to be the same identical persons that we were before, and that we shall be again when the voluntary limitation has come to an end. But it is hard to imagine anything similar in the case of the Eternal Source of all being. All that is depends on Him, and any reduction or limitation of His power is inconceivable. Certainly that would seem to be the case, when we think of the Eternal Father. But surely it is different with the Eternal Son. His Divinity is derivative, dependent from moment to moment upon the Father: and therefore there is no difficulty in accepting what seems to be a necessary inference from the facts of the Gospel history, that, during our Lord’s life on earth, there took place a limitation of the Divine effluence. Nor is it necessary to suppose that this limitation was always the same in extent or degree. Here may be the explanation of the awful cry, ‘My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?’ Such a view is not inconsistent with the declaration of St. Paul that ‘it was the good pleasure of the Father that in him should all fulness dwell,’ the whole *πλήρωμα* of the Deity ([Col_1:19](#)).

(d) *The Logos*.—For the use of this term in Christian theology we are indebted to St. John. It is a mark of the inner truth of the Fourth Gospel that nowhere is our Lord represented as using it; for it is not in His manner, nor does it arise naturally out of the thought of the first age of Christian experience (but see [Rev_19:13](#)). It belongs essentially to the age of reflexion and philosophic construction. Yet the term was familiar to the minds of thinkers of various schools at the time. It was the means of drawing together the religious thought of Palestine and the philosophy of Alexandria. In the former, the *Memra* or Word of Jehovah was regarded as a *quasi*-personal Divine agency by which the Most High effects His purposes in the world. In the latter, the Logos is a personified abstraction, and must be connected with the Immanent Reason of Greek speculation, though sometimes conceived more concretely (by Philo) as executive power. (See Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, ch. ii. § 5, etc., and throughout, for further development of the Logos conception). See, further, art. Logos.

Both speculatively and historically the Incarnation is the starting-point for that course of thought which leads inevitably to the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity. As soon as Christian thinkers came to realize that the Christ is the Son of God as being the Incarnate Divine Logos, their thought was launched upon that vast speculation as to the nature of God, and especially as to the relation of the Son to the Father, which occupied the minds of theologians during the earlier centuries of Church history.

(iii.) *The Holy Ghost*.—For a general statement of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit the reader may be referred to art. Holy Spirit in vol. i. and the corresponding art. in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible*. Here a briefer and more limited treatment must suffice.

(1) *The evidence of the Synoptic Gospels*.—The Gospels record a renewed activity of prophetic inspiration in connexion with the Advent of Christ. Of John the Baptist it was foretold, 'He shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb' (Luk 1:15). So we read (Luk 1:41; Luk 1:67) of Elisabeth and Zacharias, that, filled with the Spirit, they uttered prophetic language. See also Luk 2:25-27; Luk 2:36. Again, the miraculous conception is ascribed to the operation of the Spirit (Luk 1:35, Mat 1:18; Mat 1:20). Equally clear is the statement of the agency of the Holy Spirit at the Baptism of our Lord (Mar 1:10, Mat 3:16, Luk 3:22). As He entered upon His ministry, the Evangelists tell us that our Lord was guided by the Holy Spirit (Mar 1:12, Mat 4:1, Luk 4:1-2; Luk 4:14; Luk 4:18). His miracles are performed in the Spirit (Mat 12:28). In His hour of most profound concentration upon the mystery of His own Person and work we are told, 'He rejoiced in the Holy Spirit' (Luk 10:21).

Our Lord's own teaching on this subject, as given in the Synoptics, recognizes the inspiration of the OT (Mar 12:36, Mat 22:43), and connects His own miraculous works (Mat 12:28) and His mission (Luk 4:18) with the agency of the Holy Spirit. Certain of His promises to His disciples can be fully understood only in the light of the teaching which we find in the Fourth Gospel. See Mat 10:20, Luk 11:13; Luk 12:12; Luk 24:49, Act 1:4-5; Act 1:8. Perhaps, however, the strongest passage of all is that in which our Lord warns against the awful sin against the Holy Ghost (Mar 3:29, Mat 12:32, Luk 12:10). The intensity of our Lord's language here certainly points to the Deity of the Spirit. See, further, art. Unpardonable Sin.

(2) *The evidence of the Fourth Gospel*.—Here the work of the Holy Spirit is frequently mentioned. He is the agent in the new birth (Joh 3:5-8); he living water (Joh 4:14, Joh 7:39); the Paraclete (Joh 14:16); the Spirit of truth (Joh 14:17, Joh 15:26, Joh 16:13), etc. In these and other passages the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Father and to the Son, and His agency in connexion with the work of God in the Church and the world, are presented with extraordinary impressiveness.

(3) *The Personality of the Holy Ghost.*—It is inevitable, owing to the very use of the ambiguous word πνεῦμα, that in many cases it is impossible to be certain, from the mere language of the passages in which the word occurs or from their context, as to the nature of the agency to which reference is made. It is also necessary to remember that the personification of abstractions may be carried to great lengths when the conception of personality is indefinite, as it certainly was among the ancients, at least to a far greater degree than at present. It would, therefore, be a mistake to infer the Personality of the Holy Spirit from the mere use of language concerning Him which seems to imply it. Such language must be understood in relation to the whole Christian revelation and its interpretation in terms of thought. Yet the language is very strong and very definite. ‘I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete, that he may be with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth’ (Joh 14:16-17). The Spirit is here indicated as ‘another,’ One who is to take the place of our Lord Himself as His substitute. Also He is ὁ παράκλητος, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον (Joh 14:26). The masculine form of the word is certainly used to impress upon the disciples the truth that the Presence which is to take the place of that to which they had been accustomed is no less a Personal Presence than the other. And this view is strengthened by the repeated and emphatic ἐκεῖνος: ‘he shall teach you’ (Joh 14:26); ‘he shall bear witness’ (Joh 15:26); ‘he, when he is come, will convict ...’ (Joh 16:8); ‘he shall guide you ...’ (Joh 16:13); ‘he shall glorify me’ (Joh 16:14). Not merely the language, strong and emphatic as it undoubtedly is, but the whole argument demands the doctrine of the Personality of the Spirit.

This group of passages also shows very clearly that we are here taught to think of the Spirit as not only personal, but as distinct from the Father and the Son. This appears remarkably in Joh 14:26 ‘The Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you.’ Again in Joh 15:26 ‘Whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, he shall bear witness of me.’ Language could not make the distinctness of the Persons clearer. Yet strong and clear as this teaching is, we find its strength and clearness greatly increased by the fact that it fits into the scheme of Christian thought as we find that scheme developing in the Epistles of St. Paul and taking more rounded dogmatic form in the later ages of Christian reflexion.

(4) *The Divinity of the Holy Ghost.*—We can have no doubt on this subject when we have reached the point at which we attain the conviction that, in His great discourse, our Lord teaches us unmistakably the Personality of the Spirit as distinct from that of the Father and of the Son. The Three Persons are here viewed upon a plane of being which is above that of all created things.

In Joh_14:16; Joh_14:18; Joh_14:26; Joh_15:26; Joh_16:14-15 the inter-relationship of the Divine Three is expressed and implied. The dependence of both the Son and the Holy Ghost upon the Father appears: 'I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete.' The Spirit 'proceeds' from the Father and is sent by the Son (Joh_15:26, Joh_16:7). His presence is equivalent to the presence of the Son, for with reference to His coming, our Lord declares (Joh_14:18), 'I will not leave you desolate: I come unto you.' In His relation to the Son, the Spirit is to bring all our Lord's words to the remembrance of the disciples (Joh_14:26); He is to bear witness of our Lord (Joh_15:26), to glorify Him (Joh_16:14), etc. So important is the work of the Spirit in its connexion with that of the Son, that our Lord solemnly declares the expediency of His own departure in order that the period of the Spirit's activity may begin. And to this teaching we must add such statements as the following: 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father' (Joh_14:9); 'I am in the Father, and the Father in me' (Joh_14:10); 'If a man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him' (Joh_14:24); 'All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine, therefore said I, that he (*i.e.* the Spirit) taketh of mine and shall declare it unto you' (Joh_16:15). All these refer to the nature and effects of that dispensation of the Spirit concerning which our Lord is instructing His disciples in this great discourse.

Such teaching certainly implies both the Divinity and the Unity of the Three Persons, which throughout are at once distinguished, regarded as inseparably united, and placed upon a plane of being far above all created existence.

III. Summary

(i.) *The Baptismal Formula.*—We have omitted from our consideration one great passage of first-rate importance on every branch of our subject. It has been kept to the last because it is the nearest thing to a comprehensive and formal statement of the doctrine of the Trinity to be found in Holy Scripture. In Mat_28:18-20 there is, as the last word of that Gospel, a solemn charge which it is stated our Lord gave to His disciples when they met Him, by His special command, after His resurrection. The charge includes:

(1) a declaration of *His universal authority*, 'All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and in earth,' containing a very strong implication of His Divinity and agreeing with Mat_11:27 and Luk_10:22 as well as with the teaching of the Fourth Gospel.

(2) A *great commission*, 'Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you,'—words which

are at once the greatest command, the greatest prophecy, and the greatest dogmatic statement ever given.

(3) A *promise*, 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world,' which has been a source of power and inspiration to the Church ever since.

It is true that this passage belongs to a part of St. Matthew's Gospel which has been assailed with great persistence, and, on internal grounds, with some apparent reason. It is often argued that the First Gospel contains many additions to the Evangelic narrative which arose from the habits of thought and practice, as well as from explanatory teaching, current in the primitive Church. The account of baptism given here would then be a reflexion of the teaching of a later time. Against this, we have to note that there is no textual evidence against the passage, that 2Co. 13:14 contains the threefold Divine name in a way which shows that the combination was familiar to the mind of the Christian Church at a time which was certainly less than thirty years after the Ascension, and that there is a continuous stream of testimony from the earliest times as to baptism into the threefold name, the *Didache* providing the connecting link between the Apostolic age and Justin Martyr. But stronger than all these is the fact that this passage merely sums up the teachings concerning God which, as we have seen in detail, may be found scattered throughout the four Gospels. It is surely somewhat hard to suppose that the Christian doctrine of God could have so rapidly assumed the form in which we find it in St. Paul's Epistles, if our Lord Himself had not brought together the various strands of His teaching; and when was this so likely to happen as when He manifested Himself to His disciples after His resurrection? The truth is that this passage in Mt. supplies exactly the clue we need in order to understand the rapid development of doctrine and the continuity of custom in the early Church. (See Sanday in art. 'God' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ii. p. 213, and his *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 218; also Scott in art. 'Trinity' in *DB [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.]*, Ext. Vol. p. 313). But there is this further proof of genuineness, that the language here possesses all the power, concentration, and authority which are everywhere the marks of the true sayings of Jesus. There is not a word in this utterance, from ἐδόθη to αἰῶνος, which has not been, in all ages, a source of life to the Church. Here the meaning of the life, death, and teaching of the Son of God is translated into a language which appeals to the minds and hearts of all ages of human history, and this in the most Jewish of the Gospels. Moreover, the prophecy here contained is on too large a scale to have arisen naturally out of the life of the Christian community of the 1st century. Not even to St. Paul was granted so wide an outlook upon the history of mankind. This great vision of a world-wide Christianity belongs to the mind of Him who spoke of the Grain of Mustard Seed and the Draw-Net, and taught His disciples to pray, 'Thy kingdom come.'

We may, unless our judgments are obscured by critical prejudices, turn to this passage as supplying the needful summary of all those thoughts about God which we have gleaned from the teaching of Christ and the Gospels. The expression εἰς τὸ ὄνομα is important: Christian Baptism is to be 'into the name.' The phrase recalls the language of the OT in which the 'Name' of God stood for Himself as revealed or brought into relation to men. So the name *Jehovah* was the sign or mark of the old covenant. Can we fail to gather that the name which marks the new covenant is that of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? In this name is contained the revelation of God which Christ brought to man. It must also be observed that the word is singular, τὸ ὄνομα, suggesting the unity of the Godhead. The name is threefold, yet it is *one*.

The doctrine of the Trinity is, then, the summing up of the teaching concerning God which is contained or implied in the Christian revelation. It is not a philosophic construction. It is not the outcome of abstract discussion upon the Being and attributes of God. In its origin it had nothing to do with logical or dialectical methods, nor did it arise out of the efforts of the understanding. Its source is simply the fact of Christ Himself. That amazing and, to the merely scientific intelligence, most mysterious fact, which still, after so many centuries, presents to mankind the old question, 'Who say ye that I am?' is the revelation of the Trinity. Jesus Christ manifests God as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

(ii.) *The illuminating power of the doctrine.*—When from the position which has now been attained we look back over the life and teaching of our Lord, we find that sudden light is thrown upon much that otherwise seems obscure. It is this reflex illumination of Christian experience which constitutes the verification of the doctrine—a verification which may be traced throughout the whole history of the Church, and which to this day may be discerned in the vitality of orthodox Christianity and its continued value for the religious consciousness of mankind in contrast with Deism in all its forms. Here we confine our brief survey to the Gospels, and note the following. At the Annunciation the angel replies to the Virgin's question (Luk 1:35): 'The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee: wherefore also that which is to be born shall be called holy, the Son of God.' At the Baptism the three Divine Persons are represented: 'He saw the heavens rent asunder and the Spirit as a dove descending upon him; and a voice came out of the heavens, Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased' (Mar 1:10-11, also Mat 3:16-17, Luk 3:21-22). At the Transfiguration the glory of the Son and His relation to the Father are manifested (Mar 9:7, Mat 17:5, Luk 9:35).

But more profound even than such indications as these is the truth that the doctrine of the Trinity underlies the whole movement of Divine providence for the redemption and elevation of man as we have it presented in the NT. Here it is sufficient to note

that everywhere in the Gospels, while God the Father is regarded as the ultimate source of all things, both in creation and in redemption, certain special functions are declared to belong to the Son and the Spirit, and yet there is no separation or opposition between the Divine Persons. God the Father is the Creator, yet all things were made by (διὰ) the Logos, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν (Joh 1:3). Redemption is the work of the Son: ‘The Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost’ (Luk 19:10). He came ‘to give his life a ransom for many’ (Mar 10:45, Mat 20:28). He is the Shepherd seeking the lost sheep (Luk 15:3-7). But the love which surrounds the sinner from his birth, which remains constant throughout his life of sin, and which receives him into a perfect reconciliation on his repentance, is the love of the Father (Luk 15:11 ff.). Further, the salvation which is the result of the death of Christ is everywhere presented as the work of God Himself. Thus is the love of God revealed in Christ, and assurance as regards God’s mind and will towards us attained. The unity of the Divine Persons is the underlying truth of the Atonement. So again, the works of Christ are ‘in the Spirit’ (Mat 12:28), and the Spirit is called by Christ ‘the Spirit of your Father’ (Mat 10:20). The Son is the means of communication between man and the Father (Mat 11:27, Luk 10:22, Joh 14:6 etc.), yet the Spirit is the source of the life which makes this communication possible (Joh 3:3-8). Further, the Spirit is the gift of the Father (Luk 11:13), and none can come to the Son unless the Father draw him (Joh 6:44). It is sufficient to point out, finally, how closely interrelated are the functions of the Three Persons as described in John 14-16. The coming of the Paraclete is identified with a coming of the Son (Joh 14:18), and the coming of the Son with a coming of the Father (Joh 14:9; Joh 14:23). His office is to carry on the work of the Son, which is the work of the Father (Joh 16:14-15), in the Church (Joh 14:17 ff. etc.) and in the world (Joh 16:8) after the departure of the Son. It is commonly said that the characteristic work of the Father is creation, of the Son redemption, of the Holy Ghost sanctification. The distinction is certainly Scriptural, and yet there is no one of these works in which each of the Divine Persons has not a share. The Trinity in Unity is, to use the old-fashioned language, both ontological and economical.

And all this has its counterpart in the Christian experience of our own time, for Christianity is, for the Church and for the individual, the revelation of the Fatherhood of God through and in that Christ who presents Himself afresh to every age as the manifestation of the love of God, and whose personal influence, in some mysterious manner, survives every shock of revolution as well as the slow movement of the ages.

(iii.) *The philosophical aspect.*—This is not the place to consider the great question as to how far the doctrine of the Trinity can commend itself to, or be justified by, the philosophical reason of mankind. The problem is as old as Christian theology, and is latent in all discussions which touch the life of the Christian creed. If it has not been

greatly canvassed, at least directly, in recent times, it is because all the resources of Christian thought have been devoted to a work which has been in truth more pressing, the endeavour to grasp more firmly and to realize more perfectly the facts to which the Scriptures testify, the elements of the great revelation upon which the doctrine depends. When the time for full discussion comes, there is at least a probability that the general mind will be prepared. The old objection that the doctrine is apparently contradictory, that it cannot be made logically consistent, is certainly losing its plausibility. All the lines of thought which have guided so many in the direction of Agnosticism have converged upon this: that there must be an element of mystery in the nature of God. The old Deistic conception of a solitary Sovereign in the skies, standing above and apart from creation, is now impossible for the instructed. The doctrine of the Trinity stands in truth midway between Agnosticism and Deism. With the former it recognizes the impossibility of presenting to our minds the inmost nature of the Supreme One, with the latter it insists upon the absolute necessity of thinking of the Deity in terms of personality. But it keeps closer than either to the facts of the religious consciousness and the needs of humanity, because it builds upon actual experience, the experience which stands central in the history of the race, and it interprets this experience by means of the only perfect Personality known to man.

In addition to this general consideration, there are tendencies in recent thought which seem to promise new light on the old doctrine. Philosophy and psychology have both been dealing with the question of personality, and have been revealing the existence of problems of extraordinary complexity and suggestiveness in connexion with it. For both, human personality appears, from one point of view, as a self-sufficing unity, and, from another, as an illuminated portion of a vast world of spiritual existence. It is both inclusive and exclusive, both universal and limited, according to the way in which it is regarded, and no principle has yet come to light by means of which these oppositions can be shown to be overcome.

The more usual way of approaching the application of the principle of personality to the doctrine of the Trinity is to follow the line indicated by Lotze (*Microcosmos*, bk. ix. ch. iv.) and regard personality as it exists in man as incomplete, perfect personality belonging to God only. If this conception be justifiable, we may well expect to be able to apply an ancient method and find that distinctions which we know to exist in man's personality may be correctly regarded as corresponding to distinctions of a much profounder degree in the Divine Being. The best modern exposition of this view is Illingworth's *Personality, Human and Divine*, a work which may justly be regarded as representing for our time the classic point of view, that of St. Augustine in his *de Trinitate*.

The difficulty which is inherent in this method was, however, clearly seen by Augustine himself, and it cannot be said that modern philosophers have been able to

surmount it successfully. Regarding the distinctions in the Godhead as corresponding to the three, 'memory, understanding, love,' which we know of in ourselves, he yet perceives that 'Tria ista ... mea sunt, non sua; nec sibi sed mihi agunt quod agunt, imo ego per illa,' and again, 'Ego per omnia illa tria memini, ego intelligo, ego diligo, qui nec memoria sum, nec intelligentia, nec dilectio, sed haec habeo. Ista ergo dici possunt ab una persona quae habet haec tria, non ipsa est haec tria' (*de Trinitate*, bk. xv. ch. xxii. § 42). Nor can it be said that Augustine or any of his successors in this great adventure, not even Hegel in his *Philosophy of Religion*, has been able to show how what in us is only the attribute, faculty, or thought of a *persona*, can become a *Persona* in the Deity.

There is, however, another line of thought in recent philosophy, which seems to the writer to promise much better results for the Christian thinker. Out of the Hegelian school have arisen some who, feeling the force of certain considerations relied on by Agnostic reasoners, hold that the nature of the Ultimate Reality is beyond us, our highest categories and our most concrete experiences being inadequate alike to express or to present it. In addition to this, there has been slowly gaining recognition the importance of the conception of *degrees of reality*. Bradley in his *Appearance and Reality* has done more than any other writer to call attention to this principle. Foe to theology, as he professes to be, he may prove its most useful ally. The work of Pringle-Pattison points in the same direction. Personality may be, for human thought, the highest of all categories; but the existence of certain fundamental antinomies and oppositions, speculative and practical, proves clearly that it is not the ultimate form of being. There is a degree of Reality, a final Unity, higher, more concrete, than Personality. There must be, because a person is, after all, essentially one among many. A person is what he is, not merely because he is inclusive as regards his own experience, but because he is exclusive as regards his neighbours' experience. Personality cannot therefore be a full definition of the Divine nature. God is personal and something more. In His final Unity He is super-personal, and this super-personal unity is the ultimate Reality, concrete and universal. Here is exactly the condition demanded by the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. The most complete monotheism is compatible with the recognition of a personal multiplicity in the Godhead.

Literature.—Bull, *Defensio Fidei Nicaenae*; Waterland, *Vindication of Christ's Divinity*, and other works; Dorner, *Syst. of Christ. Doctrine, and Hist. of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*; Pearson, *On the Creed*; H. Browne, *Exposition of the Articles*; Swete, *The Apostles' Creed*; Martensen, *Dogmatik*; Works on NT Theology by Schmid, Weiss, Oosterzee, and Beyschlag; Liddon, *Divinity of our Lord*; Gore, *The Incarnation*, and *Dissertations*; Scott, art. 'Trinity' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible (Ext. Vol.); Sanday, art. 'God (in NT),' *ib.* (vol. ii.); art. 'Trinität' in *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.*]; Chadwick, *Christ bearing witness to Himself*; Forrest, *The Christ of History and of Experience*; R. H.

Hutton, *Theol. Essays*, Essay on 'The Incarnation and Principles of Evidence'; Knight and Martineau, *Inter Amicos*; Armstrong, *The Trinity and the Incarnation* (from the Unitarian point of view; see also Martineau, *Seat of Authority in Religion*). On the philosophical side, Hegel, *Philosophy of Religion*, must not be forgotten. Among recent books, Illingworth's *Personality Human and Divine*, Rashdall's *Doctrine and Development*, and the present writer's *Idealism and Theology*, endeavour to deal with aspects of the question. The subject has not been treated systematically by recent writers.

Charles F. D'Arcy.

☞ Trumpet

TRUMPET.—The sole mention of the trumpet in the Gospels occurs in Mt.'s version of the small apocalypse which has been incorporated in the eschatological discourse of Jesus. There ([Mat 24:31](#)) we read that when the Son of Man comes in the clouds for the final judgment, He despatches His angels 'with a loud trumpet' to gather His elect from the four corners of the earth. The context, especially in Mt., is a Jewish-Christian application of the older Messianic tradition (cf. e.g. [Is 27:13](#), [Zec 2:10](#) [LXX Septuagint]) which depicted the scattered members of Israel being summoned together by a trumpet-blast at the Messiah's advent. The figure was natural, for the trumpet-blast denoted the approach of majesty. 'Power, whether spiritual or physical, is the meaning of the trumpet: and so, well used by Handel in his approaches to the Deity' (Fitzgerald's *Letters*, i. 92). It was a favourite figure of John Knox, too, as Stevenson has noted (in *Men and Books*). But it is rather as a rallying summons than as a herald of royalty or even an awakener of sleepers, that the trumpet is employed as a pictorial detail in the passage before us. The writer does not develop the sketch. We are not told who blows the trumpet, though possibly the angels were meant. St. Paul seems to reflect, in [1Th 4:16](#), the tradition which connected it with the archangel Michael, but Mt. merely inserts the realistic trait, owing to his characteristic love of Hebrew Messianic prophecy.* [Note: Wellhausen argues that as 'the trumpet is singular, it cannot be connected with the angels, but must be posited as a separate unit.' This seems prosaic. 'Trumpet' may have been meant to denote 'trumpet-blast,' as indeed the gloss φωνῆς suggests. We should rather conjecture that μετὰ σάλπιγγος μεγάλης, preceded by καί, originally stood after δόξης πολλῆς, which would give a better order.]

Literature.—See Huhn's *Messianischen Weissagungen* (§ 45). Volz's *Jüdische Eschatologie* (1903, § 45b); Bousset's *Antichrist* (English translation pp. 247, 248),

and the same author's *Die Religion des Judentums* (1903, p. 224 f.); also Haupt's *Die eschatolog. Aussagen Jesu* (1895, pp. 116 f., 128 f.).

James Moffatt.

Trust

TRUST.—That personal trust is the innermost essence of the faith that God requires, is almost universally recognized by Protestant theologians. Only in rare instances may one still meet with the pronounced intellectualistic view which regards faith as the assent to a sum of doctrines. On the other hand, one may note here and there a tendency towards the opposite extreme—to ascribe a value to faith as a subjective state without special regard to the reality of its ground and content. But the one view is as un-Evangelical and un-Biblical as the other.

When Bellarmin (*de Justif.* i. 4) declares: 'haeretici fidem *fiduciam* esse definiunt; Catholici fidem *in intellectu* sedem habere volunt,' he states accurately enough the fundamental distinction between the Catholic and the Evangelical conception of faith, and yet in his discussion he betrays a fatal misapprehension concerning the latter. Protestants do define faith as *fiducia* (trust); but this is not a bare and empty trust—the *inanis haeticorum fiducia* against which the Council of Trent impertinently protested. A trust that is merely subjective is indeed groundless and empty, and therefore worse than worthless (cf. 1Co 15:2; 1Co 15:17-20). Faith has no value *per se*; its value lies solely in its object. If the object is unreal, the faith is vanity. Or if the object, though real, is not strong enough to bear up him that trusts himself to it, his confidence can bring him only loss. It is not enough that a man believes; the vital question is, *whom* he believes. We may not divide men into the two classes: those who believe and those who do not. For in varying degrees of confidence all men believe (trust). He who doubts God, believes men or the spirit of this world. Confidence in any object other than God, who alone has power over sin and death, could not in any case have saving value. And even so our faith would not be 'saving,' unless God freely purposed to save. And man, though free in the act of faith, is utterly unable to produce it of himself. Only the revelation of His grace can call forth and ground faith in God. Any possible confidence toward God not grounded in the revelation of His purpose is not faith, but presumption.

When it is said that Christian faith is personal trust in God in and through Jesus Christ, one need not conclude that 'faith' and 'trust' are exactly equivalent terms. The thought is only that the deepest essence of faith is trust, and that there is no Christian faith that is not personal trust in God. An examination, however, of the

passages in the NT in which these words occur will clearly show that even here—to say nothing of later ecclesiastical usage—faith, *formally regarded*, is the more comprehensive term.

‘Two factors (*Momente*) are to be distinguished in faith, one relating to the object, the knowledge of God mediated through Christ, the other relating to the state of the subject, the trust in salvation resting upon Christ. But the two cannot be separated from each other, since the Christian knowledge of God arises only in and with the trust in salvation. To the distinction between these two sides of faith correspond the two formulae *fides quae creditur* = the content of faith, and *fides qua creditur* = the attitude of faith. Only it should be kept in mind that the content of faith consists primarily not in a theologically formulated doctrine, but in the immediate beholding and understanding of the saving revelation itself’ (Kirn, art. ‘Glaube’ in *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyclopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred]).

It is accordingly unwarrantable to speak of ‘a purely intellectual faith in God.’ The mere holding a doctrine to be true is not faith at all. Earlier dogmaticians divided the function of faith into three acts: *notitia*, knowledge, instruction in the facts and doctrines of Christianity; *assensus*, assent to the teaching; *fiducia*, personal trust. This view, however, is misleading; for faith, however many aspects it may have, is yet an integral thing, not formed by the synthesis of several acts. And

‘*notitia* and *assensus* have nothing to do with religious faith except as they are included in the *fiducia*. That saving trust does not arise without the hearing of the message of salvation (*ἀκοή*, Rom_10:17) is self-evident and undisputed. On the other hand, the *assensus*, as the sure persuasion of the power of Christ as Redeemer and of the reality of the God who is above the world, is brought about only in and with the *fiducia*.... Only this one thing must remain unobscured, that the right and proper answer of man to the saving revelation that comes to him is the *fiducia*, and that out of it grows all certainty and knowledge of God and Divine things’ (Kirn).

Some, again, have attempted to draw a positive distinction between faith and trust, regarding faith as the receiving from God, and trust as the yielding of self to God. The essential characteristic of faith is indeed receptivity; but it is a mistake to suppose that the trustful yielding of self to God is anything more or other than the opening of the heart and life to His influence and control through the overmastering revelation of the grace of Christ. In other words, even the trustful devotion of self to God remains at bottom a receiving from God.

The attempt has been made (cf. esp. E [Note: Elohist.] . W. Mayer, *Das christliche Gottvertrauen und der Glaube an Christus*, 1899) to show that while Christ, according to the NT, is the object of 'faith,' only God is the object of the full 'trust' of the Christian. As Jesus, the Christ, revealing in word and deed the Father's holy love, bears the offer of salvation to men, so through their faith in His revelation He brings men to the Father in trust. Trust in God is the consequence of faith in Christ. But can this view be consistently maintained? Faith in Christ—not as Prophet merely, but as the Bearer of salvation—is justified only as we have ground for the assurance that in Him God is dealing with us. So then faith in Christ *is* trust in the Father, and trust in the Father as revealed in Christ is also trust in the Son, the Bearer of salvation (Joh 14:1 ff.). Certain it is that the writers of the NT saw in Christ more than Teacher and Example. Even as their exalted Lord He continued to be a personal Helper.

So long as the revelation of God's grace was not yet complete in the sending forth of His Son and then of the Spirit of His Son (Gal 4:4-6), faith could not rise to its full measure. Before Christ the full conception of faith could not be reached. The word 'trust' occurs frequently in the Psalms and not seldom in certain other OT books. It does not, however, signify the perfect fellowship of the child of God, but only a reliance upon God's faithfulness. The predominant idea in the trust of the OT was *hope*. There were heroes of faith before Christ, but their faith could not be perfect, for they had not received the object of their hope (Heb 11:39-40) In Christ the filial disposition is established (cf. e.g. Heb 1:1 ff.). And so fundamental and all-comprehensive was His work as Mediator of the New Covenant that He could be truly called 'the author and perfecter of faith' (Heb 12:2). Only as men know God in Christ can they know what faith in its full sense is. The life of faith is communion with God in and through Christ, and the nerve of that communion is personal trust. Christian trust is reliance upon God, but not upon 'God out of Christ.' Neither can it be reliance upon Jesus except as the essential revelation of the Father.

Not unknown in Church history is a view of the redemptorial work of Christ which would make it consist in appeasing an angry God. According to this view Christ and not the Father is the Reconciler, God and not the world is reconciled. In such a case perfect childlike trust is not to be thought of. There would be no firm ground for it. If God has once changed His purpose, why should He not do so again? Only where God is manifest in Christ as the Reconciler of the world (2Co 5:19) can there be perfect security for time and eternity. Where Christ is thought of as having wrought a change in the will of God, men will with wavering hope implore Him to intercede with God on their behalf, and will perhaps also invoke the aid of many saints. Perfect assurance is not to be reached by this road.

Only as we have the Son do we have the Father (Joh 14:6 ff., 1Jn 2:23-24), but we have the Son only because of the Father's love (Joh 3:16). Jesus knows the Father,

and He teaches us to know Him. His life is the glorious example of trust in the Father's love. But it is not through the contagious example of the 'inner life' of Jesus that men are led into perfect filial trust. He promised His disciples a perfect joy, which no one should take away (Joh 16:20-24), but this was to come only after He should have been glorified. God's boundless love for sinners must first be manifested in the cross of Christ (Rom 5:8; Rom 8:32). Yet even Christ's dying and rising again on our behalf (2Co 5:15) is not the final proof of God's love. God has also sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts (Gal 4:6, Rom 8:14 ff.). The gift of the Spirit means the reality of communion in prayer, and the Spirit's work in us is the pledge of our complete salvation at last (cf. e.g. Rom 8:26, 2Co 5:5). To be rooted and grounded in the love of God, that one may be strengthened to know that love which passeth knowledge (Eph 3:17 ff.); to know and have believed the love which God hath in us (1Jn 4:16); and to keep ourselves in the love of God (Jdg 5:21)—this is the meaning of Christian trust.

Since the sovereign grace of God manifested in Jesus Christ is the only ground of our assurance, we must place no confidence in the flesh (Php 3:3 ff.). The seed of Abraham or of Israel may not trust in this relation (Mat 3:9, Joh 8:33 ff., Rom 2:28-29, Gal 3:28-29). Nor may we trust in works of righteousness (e.g. Rom 3:19 ff., Eph 2:9, Tit 3:5), or in our good purpose, effort, or zeal (e.g. Rom 9:16; Rom 10:6 ff., Php 3:6). Even the confession of Christ and the profession of faith will avail nothing without the vital union with Him in the faith that works by love (Mat 7:21 ff., Jam 2:14 ff., 1Co 10:1-13, Rev 3:1). Moreover, not even what men call a good conscience can give security (1Co 4:3-4, 1Jn 1:8 ff.). The wondrous fact of fellowship in the love of God is indeed a token of the life of God in us. And where in so ever our heart condemn us, we shall obtain assurance in the way of sincere obedience to the Spirit of love. God is greater than our heart—He can pardon and heal. And when by His grace our heart is set free from self-condemnation, our communion with God may be unbroken.

Upon the immovable foundation of the reconciliation of the world in Christ (2Co 5:14 ff.) the individual appropriates to himself the promise by faith. Thereby he experiences a present grace and rejoices in the sure hope of the glory of God (Rom 5:1-2). Because he has the earnest of the Spirit—because God's love has been shed abroad in his heart—he can even glory in tribulations (Rom 5:3-5, cf. Rom 12:12). Even bearing the cross and being crucified with Christ are his joy and glory (Gal 2:20; Gal 6:14, Php 3:8 ff.). Out of the richness of the grace of this fellowship he can know that all things work together for his good, that is, for his salvation, and he is persuaded that nothing can separate him from the love of God which is in Christ. There is no power that can gainsay the loving will of the eternal God (Rom 8:18-39). In every condition he proves the sufficiency of Christ's grace (e.g. 2Co 12:9), and by prayer and supplication finds that God's peace, far surpassing

all understanding of men, keeps guard over his heart and thoughts in Christ Jesus (Php 4:6-7). Through faith he is kept in a hope sure and steadfast unto the final salvation which awaits him (e.g. 1Pe 1:3 ff.). But the sureness of the hope does not work carelessness. 'Every one that hath this hope set on him purifieth himself even as he is pure' (1Jn 3:3). The true believer is 'careful without care.' Moreover, the grace of our fellowship works zeal in service (1Co 15:10). Only the Christian can enjoy perfect freedom from anxious care in order that he may devote himself fully to the work which God has given him. The past is under the blood and the future is secure in the promises of God (Tholuck). And because he sees in Christ the grand purpose of God in the redemption of the world and the security for the final accomplishment of that purpose, he cannot despair of the world any more than he can despair of himself. Because he knows the grace of Christ he can gladly accept his own lot in life, and 'in the patience of hope and the labour of love' serve and wait and watch (Luk 12:35-36, 2Co 5:9-10).

Christian trust is a state of heart; yet it has seemed better to lay stress upon its ground and essential significance than upon its psychological aspects. Christian joy and peace are effects of a power beyond ourselves. Only God can give them. It is our part to make sure of our union with Christ, and then to see that we receive not the grace of God in vain (2Co 6:1). The full realization of the meaning of Christ's promise of peace is not to be had at once. It is the goal of the path of trust. But if there is established the relation of such confidence in God that all our weaknesses, doubts, fears, and sins drive us to our sure Helper, the goal of perfect peace will surely be reached at last (cf. Mat 11:28-30, Heb 4:16).

Literature.—The art. Faith is presupposed throughout, and also that of Dr. Warfield in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible . See also Drummond, *Pax Vobiscum*; Herrmann, *Faith and Morals*, and *The Communion of the Christian with God*; Kähler, *Zur Lehre von der Versöhnung*, and *Der Lebendige Gott*; J. G. Tasker, 'Trust in God and Faith in Christ' in *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times*.] xi. [1900] 490.

J. R. van Pelt.

Truth

TRUTH.—Apart from the adverbial phrases 'of a truth' (Mar 12:32, Luk 4:25) and 'truly' (e.g. Mar 14:70, Luk 9:27; Luk 12:44), which are used in their ordinary colloquial sense (cf. Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 227), the only occurrence of this term in the Synoptic Gospels is in the hypocritical address of the Pharisees and Herodians to Jesus (Mat 22:16, Mar 12:14, Luk 20:21), where these *soi-disant*

inquirers compliment Him on His sincerity as a teacher. Here loyalty to the truth is opposed to the disingenuous spirit that allows itself to be swayed by fear or flattery. The impression made by Jesus on His opponents was one of fearless honesty and candour; He was no casuist or time-server, and it was His recognized character of religious frankness and veracity which suggested their trap. For all His sympathies, they knew He would be straightforward. They could count upon His telling dangerous and unpleasant truths, no matter what His word might cost Him. He had the courage without which truthfulness is impossible, and these Jews were cunning enough to trade upon His very virtues.

In the Fourth Gospel, however, 'truth' is used in a special, pregnant sense, characteristic of the writer and of his age. It is one of the leading categories or themes of the book, and its proportions, as well as its perspective, are entirely different from anything in the Synoptics. Occasionally, no doubt, the ordinary sense of the term occurs, as in the phrases about true witness (Joh 5:31-32; Joh 21:24), or credible statements (Joh 8:14); here, as elsewhere, the word means no more than veracity, and its adjective represents 'trustworthy' (cf. Joh 10:41 with Joh 7:18, Joh 8:16 f., Joh 8:40; Joh 8:46 and Joh 16:7). In Pilate's remark, 'Truth! what is truth?' (Joh 18:38), however, we are on the way to a more definite conception. There is, no doubt, in this scene the implied censure of a false attitude to truth, as Cowper has pointed out.—

'But what is truth? 'Twas Pilate's question put
To Truth itself, that deigned him no reply.
And wherefore? will not God impart His light
To them that ask it?—Freely—'tis His joy,
His glory and His nature, to impart.
But to the proud, uncandid, insincere,
Or negligent inquirer, not a spark.'

(*Task*, bk. iii. 1. 270).

Truth, in this passage, however, has the further connotation of speculative or abstract knowledge, and the majority of the references throughout the Gospel are tinged by such associations. They converge on the principle that the spiritual is the real, and that the truth of human life is attainable only in relation to Christ, who is at

once the true Life of God and the true means whereby men appropriate that Divine and absolute nature.

Two small linguistic problems lie at the threshold of any attempt to investigate the meaning of 'truth' in the Fourth Gospel. (a) Attempts have been made, notably by Wendt (e.g. in *SK [Note: K Studien und Kritiken.]*, 1883, p. 511 f., and *Teaching of Jesus*, i. p. 259 f.), to read ἀλήθεια as equivalent to 'faithfulness' or 'rectitude,' on the analogy of the LXX Septuagint rendering (ἔλεος καὶ ἀλήθεια) for the Hebrew original of 'grace and truth.' Certainly, in Joh 1:14; Joh 1:17, the OT antithesis is unmistakable. But, apart from the fact that χάρις is substituted for ἔλεος, the author is evidently using 'truth' here in a deeper and special meaning of his own. The general usage of the term throughout the Gospel, whether as applied to God or man, cannot be explained by 'faithfulness' or 'righteous conduct,' any more than by mere 'veracity.' Even where the OT form of expression is retained, the content and the substance of the thought are extended and intensified. (b) A cognate difficulty is occasioned by the use of two adjectives, ἀληθής and ἀληθινός, in connexion with ἀλήθεια (see *ExpT [Note: xpT Expository Times.]* xv. [1904] 505, xvi. 42-43). No rigid distinction can be drawn between them in the Gospel (note the variant in Joh 8:16), as if they were equivalent precisely to *verax* and *verus*. The latter may be translated 'true,' in the sense of *real*, as opposed to what is counterfeit (Joh 15:1) or transient and inadequate (Joh 1:9, Joh 6:32; Joh 6:51); but often what is *true*, in the sense of veracious and sincere, is thereby substantial, the sole reality amid the shadows of falsehood, just as God, who is *true* (cf. Field, *ON [Note: N Otium Norvicense.]* iii. p. 104), as opposed to deceptive and disappointing idols, is also *real*, in the sense of being living and lasting. Hence ἀληθής (Joh 8:26) and ἀληθινός (Joh 7:28) are applied equally to God (cf. Joh 3:33), as the Father who has sent the Son, while the former adjective is used (e.g. in Joh 6:55) where the latter, in the sense of *real* or genuine, would have been equally appropriate (cf. Joh 6:32, Joh 1:9).

Truth, in this specific sense, forms one of the *nuclei* of the Fourth Gospel. It is equivalent either to the knowledge of God's being and will, or to the Divine being and will itself; in other words, it represents the higher and heavenly reality of things, transcendent and absolute, and corresponds generally to light (cf. Joh 1:8; Joh 5:33) in its sphere and functions. Like the light, however, the truth is not an abstract entity, much less an intellectual system, to the author, but this Divine reality as manifested in the incarnate Logos, as revealed in the Son. He is the Truth (Joh 14:6); He and it are identified (cf. Joh 8:32; Joh 8:36). All else is transitory and unsubstantial. Whatever appears to compete with this truth is either counterfeit or merely relative. Jesus, as the perfect Son of God, is the final and adequate

embodiment of God's saving will; and the common term for that heavenly nature, in relation to man's errors and ignorance, is *the truth*. But the errors and ignorance against which it has to struggle are moral rather than intellectual. It is truth to be *done* (Joh 3:21), not speculation to be understood. The prerequisite for coming to the light of the Logos is a sound moral disposition, faithfulness to the light of conscience, and genuine sincerity of thought and deed. Such is the point pressed by the author of this Gospel. He was surrounded by a world which included earnest seekers for the truth (cf. Joh 12:20 ff.) and so-called 'philosophers' or religious theorists, in Judaism and paganism, who refused to accept the Christian estimate of Jesus, and probably preferred Gnostic presentations of communion with God. To meet both of these contemporary currents, he states his conception of Christ as the Truth. With that Christ all truly sincere souls have an affinity, which, if allowed to develop naturally, will bring them into touch with Him. On the other hand, the objections to Christ, often paraded on intellectual grounds, are run back to moral defects, and failure to see the reality of God in Christ is attributed to some unreality or human character.

The roots of this unique conception may partly be found in Philo, but ultimately they run back to Platonism and the later Stoicism (cf. Grill, p. 204 f.), while even Egyptian theology had crowned the god Thoth with the attribute αἰὲν ἀληθῆς of the Logos (cf. Reitzenstein, *Zwei religionsgesch. Fragen*, pp. 56, 80 f.). But the distinctive usage of the Fourth Gospel lies in its correlation of this conception with the historic personality of Jesus Christ. The Asiatic-Greek audience for which the book was immediately composed, learnt that He was a king of truth (Joh 18:36), instead of being king of some realm whose Jewish Messianic associations failed to impress Hellenic readers. This was a timely presentation of the Gospel. It was a reading of Christ's personality which could not fail to commend itself to those for whom the more local and national associations of Judaism, or of Jewish Christianity, had lost much, if not all, of their interest and appeal. Hence the emphasis on the two realms of truth and falsehood, or of reality and unreality, which, like the cognate antithesis of light and darkness, helps to body forth the moral dualism of the Gospel. The opposition of men to Christ as the Logos is referred to their connexion with the realm of the devil (Joh 8:40 f.), whose hereditary policy is hatred of the Divine truth. The author does not speculate on any fall of the devil, nor does he discuss the origin of this cosmic feud; he is content to trace it through history, in the practical experience of mankind. Truth and falsehood, reality and unreality, light and darkness, are set in juxtaposition. His Christ is a King of Truth. 'He reigns as Himself holy and true, by the power of the truth which He reveals—truth in the conscience, truth in the heart, and truth in the mind—and over those who, through His grace and spirit, have become fundamentally true; who stand in the eternal, abiding relationship of peace and love and holiness towards God' (Reith, *The Gospel of John*, ii. p. 138). The contrast between this and the realm of

falsehood and unreality is moral, rather than metaphysical, for the writer, though the metaphysical basis is plain.

Hence there is a distinction between the witness borne to the truth by John the Baptist (Joh_5:33) and that borne by Christ (Joh_8:40, Joh_18:37). The former passage (where 'the truth' is meant to cover more than its ordinary sense, although the language of the latter is employed) is in the line of Joh_1:7 f., 1Jn_1:9 f. But when Jesus is said to bear witness to the truth, or to tell the truth, it is in the sense that He bears witness to Himself (Joh_8:14) as the Truth. His whole Person and work are an adequate revelation of the Father's inner being. To see Him is to see the Father. His witness, therefore, consists in what may be termed His loyalty to Himself, and His devotion to that vocation of being true to God's will for which He became incarnate, and from which no fear of death could deter Him (cf. Lidgett, *The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement*, p. 24 f.). A further line of witness to the truth of God is afforded by those who accept the revelation of Christ (Joh_3:33). Their adhesion to the truth affords to the world fresh evidence of the truth's power; they, as it were, accredit the transcendent purpose of God by their obedience to it as the moral ideal of their life. This is indicated already in the Prologue by the words 'we beheld ... we have all received.' Finally, there is the living witness of the Spirit of Truth (see below) in the Church, which, unlike the so-called Gnostic revelations of fresh knowledge, is ever loyal to the historical personality of Christ, and aims consistently at glorifying, instead of obscuring or diminishing, the vital significance of His life for the human soul.

This note is struck loudly and clearly at the very outset, in the Prologue: 'And the Logos became flesh and dwelt among us. And we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth.... For of his fulness we have all received, even grace upon grace. For the law was given through Moses: grace and truth came through Jesus Christ' (Joh_1:14; Joh_1:16-17). Here, just as the conception of the Truth is subordinated to that of the Way in Joh_14:5-6, the aspect of grace controls that of truth. Religion, in this definition, is not the arduous aspiration of man's soul, stretching up wistfully to communion with God, but the gracious revelation of God to men through the Person of Jesus Christ; the initiative is on God's side; and the Divine nature, in its absolute reality, is mediated for the soul by Christ alone, not by any number of theosophic aeons. All that either the OT economy or contemporary Gnosticism could offer the soul was a partial disclosure of God's inner being. Time-honoured and plausible as rival methods might be, they were at best imperfect. The full revelation was in Christ as the Logos or Son of God *par excellence*, the Truth of God, and therefore of man, amid shadows and appearances. He is the revealer, or rather the revelation Himself. His personality is the sum and substance of that Divine essence which He alone can communicate in all its fulness to believing men, and through which men realize themselves fully. He is the true way to

life. The author emphasizes this central and primary conception on two lines. Not only does he change the ‘mercy’ of the Gr. OT into ‘grace,’—a change which is all the more significant that this great Pauline term never recurs in the Gospel,—but the companion idea of *truth* (cf. Exo 34:6) is expanded from faithfulness or veracity to what a modern might describe as the absolute character of the Divine Being, an inner, heavenly reality, or rather the Reality, which Christ alone (Joh 1:18) could disclose. The ‘truth’ of God is thus neither information to be gained, nor dogmas to be supernaturally revealed, but is at once personal and full of initiative. It is God Himself manifesting His essential life to the faith and need of man. As Maurice once put it, ‘Truth must be a person seeking us, if we are to seek him.’

While this mission and ministry of the truth have reached their climax in the brief earthly life of Jesus, the latter phase was only its final, not its first manifestation. Like the Light, the Truth has been in the world prior to its absolute revelation and embodiment in Christ the Logos (Joh 3:20-21). In all ages, and from all quarters (cf. Joh 18:37), Christ draws to Himself those who *practise the truth*. In the OT and elsewhere (Jos 2:14 [LXX Septuagint], Ps-Sol 17:17 with ἔλεος, cf. Psa 83:12) this phrase means simply to deal truly or to act sincerely, according to the context. The author of this Gospel, however, follows his usual method of putting into such phrases a deeper and specific content, so that here it denotes rather the active exercise and practical manifestation by good people of what corresponds to God’s real character. To *practise the truth* is a synonym for doing works *in God* (Joh 3:21). This is independent of nationality. It is also evidently intended to cover the pre-Christian era; or rather, according to this Gospel, the history of humanity, prior to the coming of Christ, was not wholly out of touch with the true Spirit and Life of God (Joh 1:5; Joh 1:9). The present passage, taken along with a remark like that of Joh 18:37 (‘every one that is of the truth heareth my voice’), suggests a view of paganism similar to that of Rom 2:12 f. Furthermore, it implies that men grasp this ‘truth’ of God by the exercise of their entire moral nature. The reality of God, as Spirit and as Personal Life, cannot be known except by real men, by those whose character is real to the core. The conditions of that personal knowledge are singleness of mind, purity of conscience, and openness of heart. It is the exercise of these that brings a man into permanent touch with the reality of the Divine nature as manifested in Christ. The *locus classicus* for this profound conception is Joh 7:17; although the term ‘truth’ does not occur there, the identification of disinterestedness and candour with the genuine spirit of truth (cf. Joh 7:18) shows that the idea was in the writer’s mind.

This inwardness, with its corollary of freedom from national or local cults, is brought out with especial clearness in the well-known definition of Christian worship (Joh 4:23-24), where *truth* is associated with spirit. In contrast to external and ritual worship, the genuine worshipper must approach God inwardly; it is like to like, as in

Joh 3:2 f. The spiritual is the inward, the real. As God's nature is such, His worshippers must correspond to Him; and if worship is offered *in the spirit*, it is thereby genuine. A similar antithesis to the symbolic and unsubstantial worship of the OT underlies Joh 17:17-19, where *truth*, in a certain abstract sense, denotes the eternal reality of the Divine nature as revealed to men, the ideal or truth of life realized in Christ, and, through Him, in His people. By His consecration or devotion of Himself to the fulfilment of this purpose of revelation, Christ makes it possible for His disciples to be consecrated to God's service—a consecration which, as the double meaning of the term allows, implies personal purification from sin. Negatively, the vocation is equivalent to a deliverance from the stains and illusions of the transient world, which is superior to the OT ritual. Positively, it denotes an adherence to the cause of God. His name and His truth are the same. They represent the reality of the Divine revelation in Christ, with the twofold antithesis, running through the entire Gospel, between this final revelation and the inadequate OT religion on the one hand, and contemporary philosophic or theosophic speculations about truth on the other.

A further application of this freedom, inherent in the absolute and inward character of the Christian revelation, occurs in the debate (cf. Peyton, *Memorabilia of Jesus*, p. 446 f.) between Jesus and the Jews in Joh 8:31 f.—a passage which reproduces the great Pauline ideas of Gal 3:7 to Gal 5:13, although redemption as usual is included under the aspect of revelation, rather than *vice versa*. The effects of truth, when received by men, are here described summarily as *freedom* (Joh 8:32 f.). The argument is this. As the Father seeks true worshippers, whose note is spirituality, so the Son seeks true disciples, whose characteristic is loyal adherence to His teaching, *i.e.* to Himself (cf. Joh 8:32; Joh 8:36) as the revelation of the Father. Adherence or obedience of this kind yields a knowledge of God's real nature; it initiates men into the true purpose and mind of the Father, and invests them with the Divine nature itself (Joh 17:3). Their knowledge, that is to say, is not a process of abstract learning. There is no intellectualism about it. It is not a mastery of theosophic principles or subtle theories, but participation in a personal Life. And contact with this brings a verve and independence into life, a simplicity and a reality, a freedom from bondage and legalism, which can be attained only by a nature whose capacities are set free to realize themselves fully. In another aspect, freedom may be considered as deliverance from sin; although such a reference is not excluded even in Joh 8:32, it is definitely suggested in Joh 17:19, where participation in the Divine life is made to involve personal purification, through the death of Christ. 'What men needed was to be sanctified, that is, to be consecrated to God. It was not in their power—surely no reason can be conceived for this, but that which lies in their sin—to consecrate themselves, and what they were not able to do for themselves Christ did for them in His own person. He consecrated Himself to God in His death' (Denney, *The Death of Christ*, p. 269).

A third aspect of this inward and absolute knowledge of God in Christ is presented in the conception of the Spirit or Paraclete throughout the closing chapters (14-17). Considered under the category of a liberating power, these references to the function of the Spirit of Truth (which, it is curious to recollect, were applied to Mohammed by Mohammedan divines) may be defined as a presentation of the liberating effect of the truth, as opposed to traditional and antiquarian views of Jesus which, even within the Church, might restrict the full appreciation of His Person. The author had to meet a twofold danger, and he chose to state his new conception of Christ and Christianity in the form of a Gospel, not of a treatise or an Epistle. One reason for this, as he suggests in the sayings reproduced in Joh 15:26 and Joh 16:13, is his heartfelt conviction that the Person of Christ is the sum and substance of the Divine revelation, and that no fresh statements or progressive views, such as those promulgated by Cerinthus and other Gnostics, are authoritative unless they represent elements already present by implication in the words and works of the incarnate Logos. The deeper interpretation of Christ, with which he came forward to meet the requirement of a later age, is none other than a fresh discovery of latent truths in Christ. The influence of the Spirit on the consciousness of the Church is not directed to the manufacture of independent oracles or to the task of striking out original additions to the revelation of Christ, which would render the latter, in any sense, superfluous or inferior. The test of all such new interpretations is their loyalty to the historic manifestation of the Logos. The *Spirit of Truth*, bestowed by Christ upon His Church (Joh 14:16 f.), recalls to the mind of all true disciples the bearing and meaning of Christ's own teachings; 'he shall bear witness of me ... he shall guide you into all the truth (for a different reading in Jerome, etc., cf. Nestle's *Einführung*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. 98), for he shall not speak from himself ... he shall glorify me, for he shall take of mine, and shall declare it unto you' (cf. Bruce, *The Training of the Twelve*, pp. 376 f., 418 f.). This great definition of the right and limitations of true freedom of movement within the Christian consciousness, safeguards it alike against the abuses of Gnostic speculation and the disinclination to advance beyond the Jewish-Christian, or rigidly Messianic, interpretation of Christ's Person which had been promulgated by the first generation of the disciples. To *know Christ after the flesh* was far from exhausting the significance of His Person. His Spirit, *i.e.* His living presence in the Christian Church and consciousness, had still more to unfold of truth and grace. Hence one privilege of being in contact with this 'Truth,' as embodied in Christ, is that disciples, no longer in touch with the earthly Jesus, are fitted to adapt it to varying conditions, to see it in ever fresh bearings, and to apply it with inexhaustible power, while at the same time they preserve its essential meaning. Their training in it, so far from involving any disloyalty to it, is a part of their fidelity to its principles.

‘They who follow the Spirit’s guidance will not receive an illumination enabling them to dispense with truth, but the enablement to lay hold of truth.... On the one hand, the Truth given in Christ will need from age to age His expounding to unlock its stores; and, on the other hand, the faith in Him and His office in the present shall never loosen men from the Gospel given once for all, or draw them away from the eternal Father, by enabling any voice born only of the present to seem wholly Divine. Standing fast in the unchanging Truth, and an endless progress in taking knowledge of it shall be indissolubly united’ (Hort, *The Way, the Truth, and the Life*, p. 58 f.).

Thus, while the author carefully and stringently safeguards the future revelations of religious truth by limiting them to the sphere of the historical Logos, he contemplates fresh advances in the apprehension of Christ (Joh 16:13), just as he does in the practical extension of the Church (Joh 17:20). Revelations in the future, and of the future, fall within the scope of the Spirit of Truth. The latter is not fettered by the past. This prophetic function of the Spirit may seem rather one-sided (so Beyschlag, *NT Theol.* i. 282) as compared with its ethical presentation in Paul. But it is in line with the Synoptic tradition, where the Spirit is primarily, if not entirely, a spirit of witness; while the other, more ethical aspect, is at least suggested in the context (cf. Joh 14:16-17). The *truth* or reality of the Divine life, at any rate, includes the future (cf. Psa 25:5 [LXX Septuagint]); as indeed it must, if God’s purpose is a developing plan throughout history and experience, and if this truth or reality is personal. For as a personality is *ex hypothesi* full of resources and surprises, the richer is its life. Its spirit must be a perennial self-expression, conditioned only by the receptive powers of men. Consequently the aim of the Fourth Gospel, in these allusions to the progressive witness of the Spirit of Truth, in the future and of the future, is to prevent loyalty to the historic essence of Christianity from degenerating into stagnant adherence to an institution or a creed. What Jesus said, as Cyprian used to insist, was: ‘I am *the Truth*,’ not, ‘I am *Tradition*.’ Christ is God’s last Word to the world. But, as the writer strikingly implies in the phrase, ‘The Spirit shall guide you into all the truth,’ the full interpretation of that Word was not attained by the primitive generation of the disciples. They had no monopoly of it. ‘Most friends of truth,’ said Vinet, ‘love it as Frederick the Great [Note: reat Cranmer’s ‘Great’ Bible 1539.] loved music. It used to be said of him that, strictly speaking, he was not fond of music but of the flute, and not indeed fond of the flute but of his flute.’ It is to prevent any religious aberration of this kind that such words of the Fourth Gospel are put forward. They express the spirit of Christ’s revelation, which cannot be held by a trivial or narrow life, any more than it can be selfishly grasped or adequately weighed by the most advanced age of Christendom.

Literature.—The conception of truth in the Fourth Gospel is handled by all the editors, notably by Westcott and Oscar Holtzmann. Besides the special essays of Wendt (see above) and Rülmg (*NKZ* [Note: *KZ Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift.*], 1895, 625

f.), see Schrenck's *Die johann. Anschauung vom Leben* (1898), p. 86 f.; J. Grill, *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evang.* (1902) pp. 201-206; E [Note: Elohist.] . A. Abbott, *Johannine Vocabulary* (1703, 1727); V. H. Stanton in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible* iv. 816-820; Cheyne in *EBi [Note: Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.]* 5217-5219; Weiss, *NT Theol.* (English translation) ii. § 147; H. J. Holtzmann, *NT Theol.* ii. p. 375 f.; Hort, *The Way, the Truth, and the Life* (1894), p. 41 f.; Du Bose, *Soteriology of NT*, pp. 291 f., 297 f.; R H. Hutton, *Theological Essays* (p. 18 f.); Phillips Brooks, *The Influence of Jesus* (p. 142 f.); E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, 253 ff.

James Moffatt.

☞Turning

TURNING

1. The Gospel terms.—In Authorized and Revised Versions of the Gospels the vbs. 'turn,' 'convert' represent no fewer than 8 different Gr. words. The ordinary terms, and the ones we have almost exclusively to do with in the following article, are στρέφω and ἐπιστρέφω (whence ἐπιστροφή, 'conversion,' in [Act 15:3](#)). In addition to these we find (each, however, used only once in the Gospels) ἀποστρέφω ([Mat 5:42](#)), ὑποστρέφω ([Luk 2:45](#)), ἀναχωρέω ([Mat 2:22](#)), ἀνακάμπω ([Luk 10:6](#)), ἀποβαίνω (21:13), γίνομαι ([Joh 16:20](#))—all associated with the idea of turning, and rendered by 'turn' either in Authorized Version or Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 .

(1) *Literal turning.*—Both στρέφω and ἐπιστρέφω are used in this sense. Once στρέφω occurs transitively, where Jesus bids His disciples, when smitten on the right cheek, turn the other to the smiter ([Mat 5:39](#)). Both vbs. frequently occur in the passive form, but with a reflexive or middle meaning, to denote the turning of oneself round. Usually it is Jesus Himself who thus turns round (στραφείς, ἐπιστραφείς), to look for someone (e.g. [Mar 5:30](#), [Luk 22:61](#)), or to address some pointed word to those who follow (e.g. [Mat 16:23](#), [Luk 9:55](#)).

(2) *Figurative or spiritual turning.*—In this sense both στρέφω and ἐπιστρέφω are employed, but the former only once ([Mat 18:3](#)). The noun ἐπιστροφή, corresponding to ἐπιστρέφω in its spiritual sense, does not occur in the Gospels, and is found only in

Act 15:3. Both in the Gospels and elsewhere in the NT the Authorized Version frequently renders these vbs., when they denote a spiritual turning, by ‘convert,’ and in Act 15:3 it renders ἐπιστροφή by ‘conversion.’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 retains ‘conversion’ in the last-mentioned passage, and ‘convert’ in Jam 5:19-20 (where the vb. is active and transitive—‘convert a sinner’); but otherwise it has substituted ‘turn’ for ‘convert’—a wise course, in view of the fact that in modern religious speech ‘conversion’ has come to be used in a conventional sense that does not always correspond to the meaning of the original. In another important respect the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 has corrected a wrong impression produced by the Authorized Version renderings. The latter, through the influence of the Vulgate (*converter*), not only uses the vb. ‘convert,’ but renders the reflexive στρέφεσθαι, ἐπιστρέφεσθαι as if they were genuine passives, and instead of ‘turn’ has ‘be converted.’ A still more glaring mistranslation appears in the quotation from Is 6:10 [LXX Septuagint] given in Mat 13:15, Joh 12:40, Act 28:27 (cf. Mar 4:12). In Is 6:10 Authorized Version, correctly enough, has ‘lest they convert’—‘convert’ in the time of King James being used intransitively. But in the NT passages, though the Gr. vb., except in Joh 12:40, is in the active form, just as in the LXX Septuagint, the ‘convert’ of Isaiah is changed into ‘be converted.’ Both in the last-mentioned passages and in those cases in which, in accordance with the ordinary usage, the vbs. though passive in form are certainly reflexive in meaning, Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 has changed the ‘be converted’ of Authorized Version into ‘turn’ (see Mat 13:15; Mat 18:3, Mar 4:12, Luk 22:32, Joh 12:40, Act 3:19; Act 28:27). It is with this spiritual turning or ‘conversion’ that we shall be occupied in the remainder of the article.

2. The NT facts.—(1) So far as *the term* ‘turn’ or ‘convert’ is concerned, the Gospels can hardly be said to afford sufficient data for a doctrine of conversion in the modern sense of the word. In Mat 13:15, Mar 4:12, Joh 12:40 an OT prophecy (Isa 6:10) is referred to; but both in its original use and its NT application it is a national rather than an individual turning that is meant. Again, the notable passage, Mat 18:3. ‘Except ye turn, and become as little children,’ etc., though often taken as a fundamental utterance of our Lord on the subject of conversion, can hardly be used for this purpose when read in the light of the context. For it was addressed directly to the Twelve at a time long subsequent to their call to the Apostolate; and, with the exception of Judas, who will venture to say that the Apostles at this period were ‘unconverted’ men? Moreover, the turning which Jesus demanded of them was not that absolute turning from sin in order to follow Himself which the word ‘conversion’ is used to denote, but a turning from those foolish, unworthy ambitions which had just prompted the question, ‘Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?’ (v. 1), and a recognition of the truth that in God’s Kingdom humility is the real badge of

greatness. Similarly, when our Lord says to Peter, ‘When once thou hast turned again (Authorized Version ‘When thou art converted’), stablish thy brethren’ (Luk 22:32), it seems evident that the Apostle did not lack conversion in the technical meaning of the word, but that he was being summoned beforehand to a fresh and more devoted return to his Master’s service after his fall.

When, we pass to Acts, however, we do find ἐπιστρέφω and ἐπιστροφή in a sense that corresponds to the familiar use of the term ‘conversion.’ When St. Peter, preaching to the multitude in Solomon’s Porch, says, ‘Repent ye therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out’ (Act 3:19), the turning he demands is unquestionably the kind of turning that conversion implies. When it is said of the inhabitants of Lydda that they ‘turned to the Lord’ (Act 9:35), it is their conversion that is referred to. So likewise at Antioch, when ‘a great number that believed turned unto the Lord’ (Act 11:21); and when Paul and Barnabas preached to the people of Lystra that they should ‘turn from these vain things unto the living God’ (Act 14:15); and again when the same Apostles passed through Phœnicia and Samaria ‘declaring the conversion of the Gentiles,’ and causing great joy unto all the brethren (Act 15:3; see, further, Act 15:19, Act 26:18; Act 26:20).

In the Epistles the use of the figure of turning to denote the great spiritual change that constitutes a man a Christian is infrequent; but we have it in 2Co 3:16, and notably in 1Th 1:9 ‘How ye turned unto God from idols, to serve a living and true God.’ And this use of the word ‘turn,’ we must remember, was not only a natural figure to denote a great spiritual transformation, but one that was especially familiar to every pious Jew. The prophetic writings are full of it. And no where, whether in the OT or the NT, is there a finer expression of the idea than in the words of Deutero-Isaiah: ‘Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon’ (Isa 55:7; cf. Isa 6:10, Psa 51:13, Jer 3:14, Eze 33:11, Hos 12:6, Joe 2:12 f., Zec 1:3 f.).

(2) But we are not confined to the terms for ‘turning’ in the NT, in seeking there for the fact of conversion. *The reality itself* is constantly in evidence. In the ministry of our Lord Himself we have manifest cases of conversion in the sinful woman in the house of Simon the Pharisee (Luk 7:47 ff.), in Zacchæus the publican of Jericho (Luk 19:8 ff.), in the penitent robber on the cross (Luk 23:42-43). The parable of the Prodigal Son (Luk 15:11 ff.), who ‘came to himself’ and then returned to his father, is a parable of conversion. And what are those great appeals that Jesus constantly makes—for a taking up of the cross in order to follow Him (Mat 16:24 ||), for a willingness to lose one’s life in order to find it (Mat 10:39, Mat 16:25, Mat 18:8-9),

for a 'hating' of one's dearest friends in order to be His disciple (Luk 14:26)—but a demand for conversion, even though the figure of turning is not employed?

In the story of the Apostolic Church, again, we have constant illustrations of the great spiritual change—the 3000 souls brought into the Church on the day of Pentecost (Act 2:41), and those who thereafter were added to them day by day (Act 2:47); the results that everywhere followed the preaching of the word, whether by the lips of evangelists (Act 8:5-6; Act 8:12, Act 11:21; Act 11:24) or Apostles (Act 9:35, Act 10:44, Act 14:1 etc.); the striking individual cases of the Ethiopian eunuch (Act 8:37), Cornelius (Act 10:44 ff., Act 11:18), Lydia of Thyatira (Act 16:14 f.), and the jailer of Philippi (Act 16:30 ff.). Above all, we have the case of St. Paul himself—the most typical and remarkable example the world has ever seen of that complete and conscious turning of the soul which we name conversion (Act 9:3 ff., Act 22:6 ff., Act 26:12 ff.).

(3) Once more, the fact of conversion is brought before us in *the teaching of the Epistles*, and above all in the Pauline Epistles, by the employment of other figures than that of turning. For it is evidently conversion that is described by the putting off of the old man and the putting on of the new (Col 3:9), by the transition from a world of darkness to a kingdom of light (Rom 13:12, Eph 5:8, Col 1:13, 1Jn 1:7; 1Jn 2:8), by the ideas of a crucifixion of the old self (Rom 6:6), an awaking out of sleep (Eph 5:14), and even a rising from the dead with a view to walking in newness of life (*ib.*, Rom 6:4). This last figure of a rising from the dead reminds us how near conversion as a forthputting of the human will approaches to regeneration as an act of the Divine Spirit, and so brings us to consider the subject in its larger doctrinal relations.

3. The Christian doctrine.—Properly speaking, conversion as we use the word is a modern and popular rather than a Scriptural or theological term; but, while its inexactness leads sometimes to its being misapplied, it is nevertheless a convenient word to denote the conscious side of that great change by which a man becomes a Christian. In dwelling further on it we may think (1) of its essential nature; (2) of its particular contents; and (3) of its types or modes.

(1) *The essential nature of conversion.*—There is a very frequent misconception, according to which conversion is thought of as a passive experience rather than an active energizing of the human will. We have often heard it said, for example, that someone 'has got converted.' Most, if not all, of the blame for this incorrect use of the word must be laid at the door of the Authorized Version, with its 'be converted' instead of 'turn.' The Greek lends no support to the idea of a passive conversion. If we except Jam 5:19-20 (where the reference is to the action, not of the Divine power, but of the human preacher or teacher who mediates the message of

salvation), there is not a single case in the NT where the word for turning or conversion is so employed as to suggest that something is wrought upon a man from without. Always it is an act of the man himself that is so described; the turning is a self-turning, a human and moral, not a supernatural and metaphysical change.

This, of course, is not to deny that there are other figures in the NT which represent the process of becoming a Christian as something that is carried through by the operation of a Divine power. The new birth (Joh 3:3 ff.), the new creation (2Co 5:17, Gal 6:15), the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost (Tit 3:5), all point to another side of the matter. But what we have to notice here is that, as distinguished from regeneration, conversion at all events is always represented as a work and a duty the full responsibility for which is laid upon man.

When we come to consider the precise relations between conversion and regeneration, we pass into a difficult region where questions are raised which, as Professor Laidlaw has said, it has been the habit of theologians to avoid. 'Reformed theology presents no reasoned connexion between regeneration in the stricter sense and conversion with its fruits' (*Bib. Doct. of Man*, 266). And for lack of a reasoned and definite theory, or even of a careful study of the NT teaching, the figure of regeneration has very commonly been overworked, while the moral side of the change involved in becoming a Christian has been neglected. But, while it is Scriptural to say that when a man becomes a Christian a mysterious Divine work has been effected within him, it is equally Scriptural to say (and Scripture says it much oftener) that we become Christians by our own free choice, and that the power of deciding whether we are to be Christ's disciples or not rests with ourselves. Thus we are brought face to face with the larger problem of the relation between human freedom and the Divine will, and can only say here that in the NT regeneration and conversion come before us as one and the same process, looked at from the Divine and the human side respectively, but looked at as essentially a moral rather than a metaphysical change. Men are born of the Spirit, but they must turn if they are to enter into the Kingdom of God. 'This my son was dead, and is alive again,' exclaimed the father of the Prodigal, for he recognized a miracle of Divine grace in his son's return. But that heavenly mystery had its human counterpart, that miracle of grace its moral coefficient; for the Prodigal had turned away from the swine-trough, 'and he arose and came to his father.' See, further, art. Regeneration.

(2) *The particular elements of conversion.*—When we analyze conversion, two elements show themselves; for two moments are involved in every act of turning: there is a turning *from* and a turning *to*. Christian conversion is a turning from self, the world, and sin; and a turning to God in Christ. But these are just the two moral acts which in the NT are commonly designated by the names 'repentance' and 'faith.' And so it seems proper to say that repentance and faith are the elements that go to

make up conversion. And this is confirmed when we find that in the record of the Apostolic preaching conversion or turning is associated with repentance on the one hand and faith on the other. 'Repent ye therefore, and turn again' is the point to which St. Peter brings his sermon in Solomon's Porch (Act 3:19); and St. Paul's claim, as he stands before King Agrippa, is that he has declared alike to Jew and Gentile 'that they should repent and turn to God' (Act 26:20). On the other hand, we read of the Greeks of Antioch that 'a great number that believed turned unto the Lord' (Act 11:21). Corresponding again with this separate presentation of the two sides of conversion, is the fact that St. Paul combines the two when he says to the elders of the Ephesian Church, as he sums up his ministry among them, that both to Jews and Greeks his testimony has been this: 'repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ' (Act 20:21). Much has been written on the question whether in conversion repentance comes before faith, or faith before repentance. From the point of view of theory it is a somewhat barren discussion; and when we come to practice, the fact appears to be that in the conscious experience of the soul faith rises into more immediate prominence in some cases and repentance in others. But what is of importance is to note that in conversion both are inextricably joined together in the unity of a complex but single moral act.

(3) *The modes or types of conversion.*—(α) Two strongly contrasted types meet us in the NT and in the whole history of Christian experience. The one is marked by deep contrition for sin—contrition that amounts in some cases to a positive agony of mental distress. From the other the element of pain and contrition is almost wholly absent; it consists in a joyful and unclouded acceptance of the love of God as revealed in the face of Jesus Christ. St. Paul and the jailer of Philippi are representatives of the *violent and painful* type of conversion—reproduced in the later history of the Church in the experience of such men as Augustine and Bunyan. Cornelius, the Ethiopian eunuch, and Lydia 'the seller of purple,' may stand, perhaps, for the *gentler and simply trustful* type—forerunners of multitudes like them in every subsequent age. Theologically the difference between these two types might be accounted for by saying that as repentance and faith are the two elements that go to make up conversion, in the one case repentance is more prominent, and in the other faith. For while it is true that repentance is primarily a change of mind, and is not to be confounded with the mere feeling of sorrow on account of sin, yet repentance is at all events that side of conversion which represents the soul's backward and downward look, just as faith is the aspect of it in which the soul looks forward and upward. And so contrition for the sorrowful past, even while it must be distinguished from true repentance, is yet in certain cases its very natural accompaniment. The full explanation, however, of the differences between these two types of conversion must be sought from psychology rather than theology, in the field of experience and not in that of doctrinal theory. They are due for the most part to diversities in natural

temperament, in personal history, in religious education, and especially in the prevailing atmosphere of religious thought and belief. Professor Henry Drummond, remarking on the fact that in his wide experience as an evangelist he had never met with conversions of the agonizing type so common in an earlier generation, once raised the question whether the Holy Spirit may not in these days have changed His *modus operandi*. The question is startling; but considered in the light of Joh 16:13 it may have the kernel of truth in it. For the Holy Spirit has led the Church of our time into new and larger views regarding the revelation of God in Christ; and the comparative infrequency of a once familiar type of conversion is probably due to the fact that, without surrendering their belief in the reality and heinousness of sin, both the Christian evangelist and his hearers have gained a better understanding of all that is involved in the Fatherhood of God and the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.

(b) Two other well-known and strongly contrasted types are those of *sudden* and *gradual* or, as it is sometimes called, *nurtural* conversion. Of the former the NT affords numerous examples; indeed, nearly all the NT conversions are evidently sudden in their mode. It does not follow, however, that we should take this to be the ordinary, much less the only legitimate type. In NT times it lay in the nature of the case that conversion should be sudden. The gospel made its appeal at first to those who had grown up in a world ruled by principles the very opposite of those of the Divine Kingdom, and the transition from either Judaism or paganism to Christianity was bound to be of the nature of an absolute and sudden break. And such conversions, of course, are common still, in Christian lands as well as in the mission field,—in the case of those who find themselves standing face to face at last with the Christ of whom they have never heard before, or of whom they have never rightly thought, or whose grace, though long familiar enough, they have hitherto deliberately resisted. Then constantly there takes place, as Henry Drummond said, ‘an experience which words are not allowed to utter—a something like the sudden snapping of a chain, the waking from a dream’ (*Nat. Law in the Spir. World*, 94).

It is different in the case of those who from infancy have been brought up under the nurturing care of the Christian Church and a Christian home, and who have almost unconsciously been responding to this nurtural treatment. Timothy suggests to us an example in NT times of gradual or nurtural conversion (Act 16:1, 1Ti 1:5); though it was through St. Paul’s teaching, no doubt, that his early training blossomed into the flower of a rich personal faith (1Co 4:17). In later times nurtural conversions become common; and under ideal conditions of Christian education they may be regarded as the normal type. When one has been born in a Christian home, dedicated to Christ in infancy, surrounded continually by a Christian atmosphere, and so has learned ‘from a child’ to know and love and follow Jesus, a sudden and startling conversion is not to be looked for. Christians with such a history can seldom tell the day and hour of their conversion. And yet the name of ‘conversion’ is not to be withheld from certain

experiences that have usually come into such lives. For the unconscious Christianity of childhood needs to be transformed into the conscious Christianity of developed character. There may be no day and hour that can be named, but there is generally a pretty well-defined period when the first instinctive love and faith and obedience pass into the deliberate attitude of the surrendered will.

Modern students of the psychology of religious experience have proved to how large an extent what we call 'conversion' is associated with those physiological and psychological changes that belong to the transition from childhood to dawning manhood or womanhood. This transition is not a sudden process, not a thing of a day or an hour. It covers a considerable period, but in that period a momentous work is going on. And in those days there comes to every young soul that has been well nurtured a new feeling of the beauty and mystery of life, and a fresh sense also of the possibilities that life offers of good as well as of evil. The old Greek stories about the parting of the ways and the choice of youth are not only perennially true, but have a special Christian application. Even those who have learned from their earliest childhood to love and honour Christ as their Saviour and Lord do not escape the need for a critical decision. When the time comes for taking up the free development of character, Jesus Christ stands at the parting of the ways; and though He knows of very many that they have been following Him hitherto, He asks whether they are going to forsake Him now or follow Him still. When a young heart replies, like Simon Peter of old (Joh 6:67 f.), 'Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life,' that heart has turned consciously and deliberately to Christ. Of such conversions there are multitudes; for in order to conversion a soul does not need to be violently plucked up by the roots and transplanted to another soil. It is enough if, knowing what it does, it turns joyfully to Christ, as the flower turns to follow the pathway of the sun.

(c) The question is sometimes raised whether it is possible for a man to be converted more than once; and point is given to the inquiry by the fact that in the night in which He was betrayed the Lord said to Peter, 'When once thou has turned again (Authorized Version 'when thou art converted'), stablish thy brethren' (Luk 22:32). It is impossible, however, to suppose that that process of conversion which is the full equivalent on the human side for the Divine act of regeneration is an experience that can be repeated. And in the case of St. Peter, it is evident from the Gospels that the definite yielding of his will to Christ took place at the beginning of the Lord's ministry, and not after the ministry was ended. But these words of Jesus to His Apostle suggest that while conversion in the express and primary sense can be experienced only once, there are *secondary conversions*, of one kind or another, that may fall within the compass of a true Christian life. One such is when a Christian man, as in Peter's case, has fallen into grievous sin, but repents and turns to Christ again, not only 'with grief and hatred of his sin,' but with a fuller purpose of new obedience

than he ever cherished before. This is that repentance of a Christian man which St. Paul describes in 2Co 7:11—a repentance which may work in him such indignation against himself, such vehement desire to make amends for his backsliding, and as it were to be ‘avenged’ upon it, that he may become in many respects a stronger Christian than he was before, and thus better able to stablish and strengthen his brethren. Another type of secondary conversion is when a man, without the quickening spur of repentance for some great backsliding, comes to a fuller realization of Christ’s claim upon him for the costliest and best he has to give, and so makes a, fresh and higher departure in the Christian life, a departure that is deliberate and definite, and thus may properly be described as a turning. In ways. like these there may be several conversions or spiritual turning-points in a Christian’s history—zigzags, so to speak, on the steep ascending path upon which he made his definite entrance when he first turned to Christ, with full consciousness, as. the Lord and Master of his life.

Literature.—The *Lexx.* of Cremer and Grimm-Thayer, s.vv. στρέφω, ἐπιστρέφω; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. ‘Conversion’; Field, *Notes on the Translation of NT* (1899), 246; *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times.*] vii. [1896] 396, xi. [1899-1900] 4, 244, 289, XV. [1904] 337. On the doctrine of conversion see Augustine’s *Confessions*; Bunyan’s *Grace Abounding*; Charnock, *Works* (Nichol’s ed.), iii. 88; Laidlaw, *Bib. Doct. of Man*, 263; W. N. Clarke, *Outline of Chr. Theol.* 401; Stevens, *Chr. Doct. of Salvation*, 483; Stearns, *Evid. of Chr. Experience*, 126; Drummond, *Nat. Law in the Spir. World*; ‘The Psych. of Conv.’ in *ch. Quart. Rev.* lvi. (1903) 17; A. E. Whately, ‘Conv. and Mod. Thought’ in *Churchman*, xx. (1906) 413; A. J. Mason. *The Ministry of Conversion* (1902); W. Adams Brown, *Chr. Theology in Outline* (1907), 408; and more fully, for the psychology of the subject, J. B. Pratt, *Psych. of Rel. Belief* (1907), with the literature on p. 312 f.

J. C. Lambert.

☞Turtledove

TURTLEDOVE.—See Animals in vol. i. p. 65^b.

☞Twelve

TWELVE.—See artt. Apostles, Disciple, Seventy.

☛ Tyre

TYRE (for many common features, see Sidon).—The most noted district and city of Phœnicia, the city being 40 miles N.W. of Capernaum in Galilee. Its name is simply the 'Rock,' from two rocks in the sea—a larger and a smaller—a mile distant from the shore, lying parallel therewith, about 3000 feet in length, and containing some 150 acres. This 'Rock,' as a breakwater, early invited mariners, and ultimately furnished the elements of two harbours,—the Sidonian, north; and to the south the Egyptian, now long filled with sand. It served also as a fortress, as well as a treasure-house for the merchandise that there was stored for transshipment between East and West. Old Tyre was the residential portion, extending at times for 5 miles along the shore.

As early as the monuments of Egypt and the Amarna tablets, Tyre is mentioned with Sidon as a locality of note. Its daring sailors had mastered the art of sailing the open sea by the stars, thus outdoing rivals who as yet had to steer by sight of land, and anchor at night. In the height of their power Tyrian merchantmen frequented every Mediterranean port, sailing the Atlantic to the tin mines of Britain, and even perhaps circumnavigating Africa.

In the middle of the 7th cent. B.C. Ashurbanipal laid siege to Tyre and practically destroyed the land city. Alexander the Great [Note: reat Cranmer's 'Great' Bible 1539.] besieged Tyre for seven months, at the end of which he completely subdued it. Under the Romans it was in a state of decay, morally as well as otherwise. To-day it clings to the rock, a community of some 4000, a stagnant Arab village of fisher-folk.

As the conflict between the authorities and Jesus waxed to the murder-point, the masses of the people flocked to Him all the more. St. Mark ([Mar_3:8](#)) paints the mixed throng on the banks of Gennesaret as coming from all points of the compass, including a curious Gentile multitude from 'about Tyre and Sidon.' St. Luke's specification ([Luk_6:17](#)) is not so extensive, but, true to his breadth of interest, portrays 'a great multitude of the people from ... the seacoast of Tyre and Sidon,' while St. Matthew ([Mat_4:25](#)) is oblivious to such. Compared with the disbelief of Jesus' hearers and kin in Galilee, Tyre should stand immeasurably above those of greater light and opportunities, but of less susceptibility and response to the same ([Mat_11:21](#) f.). Guilt and condemnation are relative. When Jesus had had to break with the carnally-minded populace that desired only an insurrectionary leader and temporal king, He retired for intensive instruction of the Twelve to the parts of Tyre ([Mat_15:21](#) | |); and there it was that there was found and shown to them a rudimentary, but for all that a potent, faith in an apparently pagan heart. See Syrophœnician Woman.

∴ Ubiquity

UBIQUITY.—See Omnipresence.

∴ Unbelief

UNBELIEF.—The withholding of belief, incredulity. In respect to Divine things the term implies absence of faith, credence refused to religious tenets. *Infidelity*, in its sense of want of faith or belief, is a synonym; not, however, *scepticism*, for the latter word is more properly used of the indecision of the reflective mind. Nor is *disbelief* an exact equivalent: *unbelief* suggests rather the failure to admit; *disbelief* implies deliberate and positive rejection. The *unbeliever* is open to conviction; the one who *disbelieves* is convinced (at all events for the time being) of the inadequacy of proofs submitted, of the improbability or impossibility of that which is proposed for acceptance. In the one case the explanation may point to want of knowledge; in the other the exercise of the reasoning faculty presupposes acquaintance, if imperfect, with the questions at issue.

Illustrations in the Gospels.—The term rendered ‘unbelief’ is the noun ἀπιστία (occurring 5 times: Mat 13:58; Mat 17:20, Mar 6:6; Mar 9:24; Mar 16:14), with a range of meaning between distrust and disbelief. There is the use of the verb πιστεύω with the objective (οὐ) or subjective (μὴ) negative; occasionally the intensitive (οὐ μὴ) is met with: here again varying shades of significance are observable. Four times (Mar 16:11; Mar 16:16; Luk 24:11; Luk 24:41) the verb ἀπιστέω occurs; and in each case the ‘disbelieve’ of Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 suggests that it is used absolutely. It may be remarked generally that the questions at issue differ, and that there are differences in regard to mental attitude.

(a) *In the Synoptics.*—Jesus is on a visit to ‘his own country.’ If Luk 4:16 refers to a previous visit (which is unlikely), He will seek once more to win His fellow-townsmen when (Mat 13:53-54, Mar 6:1-2) He takes His stand in the synagogue at Nazareth. They are, indeed, astonished at His wisdom: the reports of mighty works done by Him have filled them with amazement; but they are little disposed to give a patient and sympathetic hearing to one of whom they themselves have known so much, and withal

nothing that has augured greatness. His claims scandalize them. They reject His teaching and Himself. ‘And he marvelled,’ διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν (Mar 6:6); it became evident that ‘a Divine “cannot” answers to a Divine “must” ’ (Westcott). If the unbelief manifested on that occasion amounted to a positive disbelief, it was certainly not consequent on prolonged and serious reflexion. Adverse opinions were precipitated by bias; those who were swayed by prejudice were quick to disallow. And this unbelief of prejudice is again met with in the case of elders and chief priests and scribes as they question Jesus in their council (Luk 22:66; Luk 22:68). The reply which conies from Him is significant: ‘If I tell you, ye will not believe’ (οὐ μὴ πιστεύετε); in the face of hostile and preconceived opinion further speaking would be to no purpose.

A group of passages may be taken next where the unbelief illustrated is, generally speaking, that of incredulity. But the incredulity is diverse: its explanations point to reasonable distrust, want of receptiveness, power of discernment overcome for the time being by various emotions, knowledge limited, inability to apprehend that which is outside the sphere of previous experience. Thus Luk 24:11 (καὶ ἠπίστουν αὐταῖς): where reports brought by the women are discredited as idle tales by disciples unable to grasp the idea of a life lived under new conditions. Their doubt becomes assurance; but the sudden gladness told of in Luk 24:41 (ἀπιστούντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς) renders it impossible to rise to a full apprehension of what is still the inexplicable. Despondency lies in the background of the unbelief referred to in the appendix to the Second Gospel (Mar 16:11; Mar 16:13); a despondency which, because yielded to, has sunk into a settled disinclination to be convinced. The thought here is of that stolid unbelief in which the heart is hardened and the mind unreceptive of spiritual truth (Mar 16:14). And this incredulity of apathetic minds is perhaps noticeable in the attitude which ‘the priests and the scribes and the elders’ had adopted in the case of John the Baptist (cf. Mat 21:23-27, Mar 11:27-33).

If, on the one hand, there is an incredulity which Jesus reproves (Mar 16:14), so, on the other hand, there is an incredulity which He not merely sanctions but enjoins. He makes’ large demands for faith, trust, belief; what He will not have is that mere credulity which bespeaks the inert mind, that superficiality which is ready to assent to anything. There is surely a depth and width of meaning in the μὴ πιστεύσητε addressed to the disciples in His recorded predictions (Mat 24:23, Mar 13:21); and the warning against false Messiahs may be equally a warning against perverted notions of Deity, false conceptions of religion. By implication, a demand is made that tests be applied, discrimination exercised. The reality of faith will then manifest itself in the deliberate rejection (disbelief) of whatever does not bear the hall-mark of eternal

truth. 'Religion is belief—surely it requires little thought to see that religion is, or should be,' belief in what is 'true' (A. T. Lyttelton).

There is an unbelief which is indicative of a want of knowledge. But along with it there is the desire to know, to rise to a fuller apprehension of that whereof already there is the dim perception. Faith shines out in it; faith which, up to a certain point, is strong, and which can even declare itself openly; at the same time there is a profound consciousness of infirmity and limitations. And this is strikingly exemplified in the father of the demoniac boy (Mar 9:14-29); the unbelief which, realized by himself, he will not conceal from Jesus, has not deprived him of the capacity to trust. That he can, and does, trust is evident from his pathetic utterance (Mar 9:24 πιστεύω, βοήθει μου τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ). Pleading the compassion of Jesus instead of his own faith, he unconsciously shows a genuine faith (Gould, *St. Mark*).

(b) *In the Fourth Gospel*.—A characteristic feature should be duly noted, the enhanced demand for belief in the Son of God ('statt der Sache überall nur die Person' is the distinction drawn by Wernle [*Quellen des Lebens Jesu*, 18]). Passages bearing on the subject will, however, be discussed as they stand, and without raising questions dealt with elsewhere (see John [Gospel of]).

There is the conversation with Nicodemus. The unbelief referred to by Jesus (Joh 3:12 καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε) is the failure to apprehend, which involves spiritual unreceptiveness. No credence has been given to things which lie within the range of human experience; how then shall there be perception of truths which have their sphere in a higher order? A few verses further on there come the reflexions of the Evangelist, and here thought is directed to that from which such unbelief springs. Sharp is the contrast between the ὁ μὴ πιστεύων of Joh 3:18 and the ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτόν of its opening words; in the former case full adherence to the Son of God has been deliberately refused; that refusal has meant a rejection of the highest manifestation of God, which is ultimately traceable to an evil disposition, evil works. Of similar import are the comments of the Evangelist in Joh 12:37-40; the miracles wrought by Jesus had not indeed been denied, at the same time they had made but a transient impression, and had sometimes been attributed to the powers of darkness; of unreserved confidence in and full acceptance of Himself there had been none whatever. That it should be otherwise was, after all, impossible where perceptive faculties had been dulled and moral sense blunted. The unbelief manifested was but the effect produced by the abuse of religious privileges and failure to profit by a progressive revelation. To look back to Joh 5:44 is to find precisely the same thought expressed by Jesus Himself. The long-continued education in Divine things had been all in vain for those Jews who had studied 'Moses' and yet remained blind to the

progressive teaching of the OT. How then should they have ready acceptance for the One in whom another, and a higher, revelation had been given?

The attitude of the rulers referred to in Joh 12:42-43 demands consideration. It would seem that conviction had come to them; closer examination shows that it was a conviction of the intellect only; that, because of unworthy fears, it went no further, it found no outward expression in the life. 'This complete intellectual faith (so to speak) is really the climax of unbelief' (Westcott); and yet it may be capable of transformation, of passing into that larger faith which dominates the whole man. Possibly the case of Nicodemus may serve as illustration. It was an intellectual conviction that brought him to Jesus in the first instance (Joh 3:1-2); if he shrank then from publicity, he appears later on as one who has felt his way to an avowal of discipleship; the τὸ πρῶτον of Joh 19:39 is at least suggestive of repeated interviews and faith in process of development. Where there was the secrecy of the earliest visit there is at length the act of reverence done openly at the Cross.

It has become customary to speak of the 'doubt' of Thomas. 'Unbelief' would be the better word; for the attitude ascribed to him is rather suggestive of emphatic if tentative denial than of perplexity and hesitation. And yet it is not incompatible with an allegiance deep and strong to which all the stories told of him (in Fourth Gospel only) bear ample testimony. He is pictured as ready to go with Jesus to death (Joh 11:16); the thought of separation from his Master (Joh 14:5) has sorely distressed him; the crucifixion has dashed his hopes, but he will not sever himself from the company of the disciples (Joh 20:26) although for him the assurance is wanting which has come to others (Joh 20:25). For want of conclusive proof their glad tidings leave him unconvinced, and so there comes that round disclaimer (ἐὰν μὴ ἴδω ... οὐ μὴ πιστεύσω) which reveals his unbelief. And this attitude of his, how is it to be explained? Is it really the case that he is to be regarded as the 'rationalist among the Apostles'; that with him the reflective powers are stronger than the susceptible (see Robertson's sermon on *The Doubt of Thomas*, ii. 268); that he is one who will not be satisfied until all his grounds are established; that, ready to believe when he can, he is healthily averse from the belief of mere credulity; that his soul desires 'not a refuge but a resting-place' (Toynbee), and that he knows no security as long as there is one possibility of delusion left? The explanation is an attractive one, but it is doubtful whether it can be sustained in the face of the narratives above alluded to. They are scarcely suggestive of the highly speculative turn of mind. What they do betray is a gloomy temperament, a tendency to pessimism. Thomas is so constituted that he will always take the darker view of things. He simply cannot shake off the 'desponds and slavish fears' (*Pilgrim's Progress*) which weigh down his soul. Of himself he is incapable of gladsome belief; and yet, when assurance comes, he can

rise to the great confession (Joh_20:28). As the light breaks in upon him he can say his 'Farewell night, welcome day' with a full heart.

It is difficult, then, to see in Thomas one who will painfully think out truth in order that when once found it may be the more firmly grasped. Not, therefore, is he to be classed with those referred to in Joh_4:48 (ἐὰν μὴ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἴδητε, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε). They stand on a far lower level. For with all his defects of character, Thomas has nothing shallow about him; nothing to suggest the undeveloped intellect. The Galilaeans, on the other hand, would seem to be characterized by childishness. Like the emissaries of Vladimir, who reported in favour of Greek Christianity because the grand services at Constantinople had appealed to their imagination, they are to be reached only by that which strikes the eye. The faith to which they can rise is, at best, a feeble faith. And yet, with one of them, it is strong enough to secure a blessing (Joh_4:49-50). There is a 'complete spiritual parallel' (Westcott) between the nobleman of Capernaum and the father of the demoniac boy (Mar_9:24).

See also artt. Belief, Doubt, Faith.

Literature.—Flint, *Agnosticism*, 381; Christlieb, *Modern Doubt and Christian Belief*, 325 and *passim*; Newman, *Oxford Univ. Sermon*. 230; Ker, *Sermons*, ii. 1, 83; Martineau, *Endeavours after the Christian Life*, 343.

H. L. Jackson.

☩ Unclean Spirit

UNCLEAN SPIRIT.—See Demon.

☩ Uncleanness

UNCLEANNES.—See Purification.

☩ Unconscious Faith

UNCONSCIOUS FAITH.—Faith is a venture of the soul. In the highest instances the soul stakes its all, and if the faith proves vain, is then of all most pitiable; but if the

venture be justified, discovers that it has lost itself only to find itself as never before, and so in its endurance the soul is won. Can faith thus understood be unconscious? Assuredly it can. On the one hand, ignorance may conceal the fact that any venture is involved; and, on the other hand, where the actual stake is known, it may be welcomed through sheer exuberance of spiritual vitality without any such reflexion on the risk as to make it a conscious venture. An investor may put his capital into some undertaking without knowing that it is a speculation, or he may do so because his native enterprise prompts him to seize an opportunity without reflecting that the best opportunities are connected with larger risks. And the soul which ventures faith may do so without consciousness of what it is doing, either because its knowledge of life is restricted, or because it acts from instinct rather than consideration. But usage gives to the expression 'unconscious faith' a wider scope than this its strictest meaning. A faith conscious of its own activity may yet be unconscious of the person or fact on which it is actually set. The soul's venture may be made on the ground of an object of faith which is either unrecognized or unperceived, and which is yet, in point of fact, the ground of such a venture being made at all. Where the real object of faith does not come into consciousness, there is still warrant for calling this 'unconscious faith,' even though verbal exactitude might stickle at such phraseology. But when this degree of latitude is conceded, it ought not to be forgotten that the definition of 'unconscious faith' is made more difficult, not only in respect of its connotation, but of its denotation also. For the cases in which there is no consciousness of the true object on which faith rests, pass by imperceptible gradation into those in which there is some consciousness of the object, but no true perception of its real nature, and even into those in which the perception of this is markedly imperfect. But, of course, there are few cases of faith where this perception is anything like perfect; for not only is our knowledge usually very far from complete in matters spiritual, but where it is most nearly coextensive with the truth, least occasion is left, as a rule, for faith. Bearing all these limitations in mind, however, 'unconscious faith' stands for an experience by no means rare in human life, and of very great importance in the Kingdom of God. Our object must be to understand its nature, and to realize the place it holds, and has held, in the relations of mankind to Christ.

1. At the outset we must recognize fully *Jesus Christ's constant requirement of faith* from all who sought or needed His help, and His refusal to give help where this requirement was not met (Mat_13:58, Luk_23:8-9). Only so shall we appreciate the welcome He always showed for every sign of unconscious faith. 'He that is not against us is for us' (Mar_9:40) is a principle which recognizes what may be far short not only of full avowal, but also of conscious faith. It is obvious that in saying, 'I know that Messiah cometh' (Joh_4:25), the woman of Samaria had little consciousness of the real meaning of her words, yet her imperfect faith drew the disclosure, 'I that speak unto thee am he.' Similarly the faith of the Syrophœnician woman, who won the help she sought, can hardly have been conscious of what she was pleading for when she

urged that 'even the dogs under the table eat of the children's crumbs' (Mar_7:28). A more striking instance is that of the cripple who was cured of his infirmity on Christ's order to rise, of whom it is recorded that 'he that was healed wist not who it was' that had healed him (Joh_5:13). And to this the case of the blind man who received sight in Jerusalem is somewhat similar; for when the Lord afterwards confronted him with the question, 'Dost thou believe on the Son of God?' he was only able to reply, 'Who is he, Lord, that I may believe on him?' (Joh_9:35). An instructive passage as to Christ's estimate of faith which is unconscious is Luk_11:29-32. He was condemning the contemporary generation in Galilee for its want of faith shown in the repeated demand for a 'sign.' In contrast with this He set two instances of greater faith recorded in much earlier days where less might have been looked for. The first is that of the men of Nineveh, whose repentance on Jonah's appearance among them is told in the Book of Jonah; the second is that of the Queen of the South, whose visit to Solomon's court is picturesquely narrated in the Book of Kings. In the one case it is written, 'The people of Nineveh believed God, and they proclaimed a fast' (Jon_3:5); in the other the queen says: 'I believed not the words until I came ... and, behold, the half was not told me' (1Ki_10:7). The credit given to the prophet's message, and to the fame of Solomon's wisdom, is taken as evidencing a deeper and unconscious faith in the righteous God who was judging the iniquity of the great city, and in the all-wise God whose inspiration was the source of the king's wonderful ability. And this unconscious faith of heathens is deemed worthy to shame and condemn the faithlessness of the generation which demurred to Christ's claims, and demanded signs.

2. There were times when the Lord Jesus put this point of view into express teaching with more of generality. Perhaps the words, 'If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed ...' (Mat_17:20, Luk_17:6), were not intended solely to suggest the diminutive size of the seed, but also the inert grain in which the life lies latent for the present, though hereafter it will become active and develop. At all events when 'he called to him a little child and set him in the midst' (Mat_18:2), bidding His disciples 'become as little children,' no characteristic of childhood can have counted for so much in His mind as the spontaneous readiness to trust without limit where love is, which at the same time makes a child so wonderfully teachable, and gives it charm too apt to be robbed by increasing years. A child is the very personification of eager instinctive faith unconscious of itself. There were times too when Christ's gaze ranged wider, and He welcomed the unconscious faith in Himself of those who had never known an opportunity of trusting Him. Such was the case when the Greeks who were introduced by Andrew and Philip seemed to Him the first-fruits only of a far greater harvest, and He looked on to the time when, 'being lifted up,' He 'would draw all men unto himself' (Joh_12:32). It is impossible to limit this forecast to cover those only who in time to come should consciously become His disciples. He has drawn, and is now drawing, many to Himself who are unconscious of the power which is attracting them.

And there seems to be a similar recognition of a widespread unconscious faith which needs to be made conscious that it may be perfect, in the saying, 'Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold; them also I must lead, and they shall hear my voice' (Joh 10:16). A still more remarkable recognition of an unconscious faith in Himself, in days long anterior to His manifestation in the world, is to be found in the saying, 'Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it, and was glad' (Joh 8:56).

The instance last cited opens out a view of the propaedeutic character of the whole life history of Israel, as it has been well called. Not Abraham alone, but all the prophets in Israel, and even all 'they that feared the Lord, and thought upon his name,' rejoiced to see Christ's day, and saw it with joy; for all of them are included in the Divine saying, 'They shall be mine in the day which I do make, even a peculiar treasure' (Mal 3:16-17). For whatever of Divine truth, of spiritual life, was discerned in those earlier ages, was just so much of the revelation of God made in Jesus Christ His Son. He 'was the light of men,' and those who saw His light saw Him, and rejoiced to see Him. This, of course, was the real nature of prophecy. It was not its function to be predictive of historical detail before the event, but to discern and disclose the unseen and eternal in the things that were seen and temporal. Inasmuch as the eternal belongs to no one epoch more than another, the teaching of the prophets was bound to find its realization in after times so far as it concerned itself with the real principles and laws of spiritual life; and to this extent it was predictive in what concerned 'the deep things of God.' But the special power of prophecy was insight, not foresight. This, however, was of necessity both preparatory and anticipatory, since the revelation of God was an evolution in time. So the prophets are accurately described by St. Peter as 'searching for what, or what manner of season, the spirit of Christ which was in them was disclosing, protesting beforehand of the sufferings destined for Christ (τὰ εἰς Χριστόν) and the glories that should follow them' (1Pe 1:11). The faith of the prophets was thus an unconscious faith in Christ no less truly than it was a conscious faith in God. And this view is explicitly taught both in His own words and in the NT Epistles. To the professed students of Scripture round Him He said: 'Ye search the Scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life: and these are they which bear witness of me; and ye will not come to me that ye may have life' (Joh 5:39-40). And among His own disciples, 'beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself' (Luk 24:27; cf. Luk 24:4; cf. Luk 24:47).

There are two sections of the NT in which this idea of unconscious faith is developed at some length, and given the emphasis which its importance deserves. The more obvious is in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the great roll-call of those sons of faith in many ages who were 'looking unto the Pioneer and Perfecter of "faith, even Jesus'

(Heb_12:2). Of these it is written that they ‘all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen and greeted them from afar, and having confessed that they were strangers and sojourners on the earth’ (Heb_11:13, cf. Heb_11:39-40). The faith by which they lived and in which they died was no doubt a more or less distinctly conscious faith in God and in the unseen world; but the writer of the Epistle is not content to view it so. To his eyes it was also an unconscious faith in Jesus Christ, who alone embodies faith in its conscious perfection, and is Himself the ultimate ground of its reality in all.—The other, and the deeper treatment, is in St. Paul’s later Epistles. In his earlier writings there are occasional passages in which the same thought is expressed, e.g. ‘They drank of a spiritual Rock that followed them, and the Rock was the Christ’ (1Co_10:4); but it is only in the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians that St. Paul discloses his whole mind. In these he dwells with enthusiasm on ‘the mystery which hath been hid from all ages and generations ... which is Christ in you (Gentiles), the hope of glory’ (Col_1:26-27, cf. Eph_3:1; Eph_3:12). St. Paul is not so deeply moved by the thought of a secret kept out of sight in the Divine counsels, while for ages men were being destroyed for lack of knowledge, and only disclosed at the last. God’s purpose, he felt, was an eternal purpose; and if salvation through faith in Christ—in whom He ‘purposed to sum up all things’ (Eph_1:10)—remained for long a hidden mystery, it was not for the interval ineffectual. All through the long time of waiting, here was a secret hope for all men, though theirs might be an unconscious faith as yet. And ‘in the fulness of the times’ this hope was revealed through Apostles and prophets and saints in the Church (Eph_3:5, Col_1:24), that the faith which had been unconscious and incomplete might become conscious and resolute and full of glory, working in power in all (*ινεργουμένη εν δυνάμει*). It is a truly magnificent view of life which is here unfolded to sight. It brings all time before Christ’s earthly manifestation, and all races which have not known Him, and—we may fairly add—all souls which love and revere the holiness which they see in Him, though they do not feel able to confess His Name as the Saviour, or the Son of God, within the reach of healing and help in virtue of their unconscious faith. This is not, indeed, universalism, for it does not anticipate the ultimate judgment of God; but it does teach that it is God’s will ‘that all men should be saved and come to a knowledge of truth’; and it teaches that this is through faith—conscious or unconscious—in ‘one mediator between God and men, himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom on behalf of all, the testimony being appointed for its proper seasons’ (1Ti_2:4; 1Ti_2:6).

E. P. Boys-Smith.

✚ Understanding

UNDERSTANDING

1. συν-ιέναι, -εις adj. ετός (priv. ἀσύνετος), to bring one thing alongside of another: (1) for combat; (2) metaph., for critical comparison, ‘to bring the outward object into connexion with the inward sense’ (Liddell and Scott), ‘to put the perception with the thing perceived’ (Grimm-Thayer), to ‘apprehend the bearings of things’ (Lightfoot, *Col.*). The typical passage is Mat 13:19; Mat 13:23, where the exact significance is distinctly brought out. The hearer ‘by the wayside’ differs from ‘him that was sown upon good ground’ in this, that the former ‘understandeth not’ while the latter ‘understandeth’—the former does not apprehend the bearing of what he hears on practical conduct, the latter sees the bearing and acts accordingly. The former ‘does not recognize himself as standing in any relation to the word which he hears or to the kingdom of grace which that word proclaims’ (Trench, *Parables, in loc.*), while the latter does so recognize. In Mat 13:51, concluding the series of parables, Jesus asks His disciples if they have apprehended the meaning of all that He has said. In the same sense (Mat 17:13) the disciples have, by the exercise of their critical faculty, recognized that in speaking of Elias, Jesus was in fact referring to the Baptist. Hence the contrast between συν. and other words—ἀκούειν, Mat 13:13-15; Mat 13:23, Mar 7:14, Luk 8:10, the sound of the word spoken falling on the ear contrasted with the exercise of such criticism as leads to the apprehending of its personal bearing: νοεῖν, Mar 8:17, perceiving contrasted with earnest reflexion. A comparison of Mat 16:12 with || Mar 8:21 is interesting, Mt. representing the disciples as having recognized on further consideration, while Mk. gives ‘a stimulating question which leaves the Twelve to think out for themselves’ the comparison of leaven with teaching (Swete, *in loc.*). Similarly, Mar 6:52 (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, ‘considered’ Authorized Version) of the miracle of the loaves and the walking on the sea; ‘debuerant a pane ad mare concludere’ (Bengel). Lk. employs the word less frequently than Mt. or Mk. In Luk 2:50; Luk 18:34; Luk 24:45, where it occurs in the narrative, the meaning of apprehending the significance of the word spoken, recognizing its bearing on the circumstances (the mission of Jesus, the crucifixion, and the sufferings), is apparent. He does not use the special thought in his account of the exposition of the parable of the Sower.

The privative adj. ἀσύνετος ‘without understanding,’ exhibits the precise meaning of the verb, Mat 15:16, Mar 7:18. ‘The ἀσύν. is the man who lacks the discernment which comes from the due use of the illuminated intelligence’ (Swete). The positive adj. συνετός (Mat 11:25, Luk 10:21), Authorized Version ‘prudent,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘understanding,’ preserves the idea of critical comparison, in contrast with the more general intelligence denoted by σοφός; but the reference is to material not spiritual things: ‘the “wisdom of the world” which is “foolishness with

God” [contrasted with] the “foolishness of the world” which is “wisdom with God,” on which St. Paul was so fond of dwelling’ (Farrar).

The noun *σύνεσις* occurs only in Luk 2:47, where the precise idea is implied of the growth of Jesus in the development of His faculty of recognizing truth in every aspect along with His growth in stature; and Mar 12:33, where, however, the reading is more than doubtful.

St. Paul’s usage of the word cannot be overlooked. It is in strict harmony with that of the Gospels. See especially Col 1:9, where he combines ‘understanding’ with ‘wisdom’ in his prayer, and Eph 3:4 of ‘the mystery of Christ,’ 5:17 of ‘the will of God’ (Eph 1:18 *διανοίας* is a disputed reading). See Lightfoot, *Col.*, where Aristotle’s definition is expounded.

2. *νοεῖν* Mat 15:17, Mar 7:18, Mat 16:9, Mar 8:17, Mat 16:11 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘perceive,’ Mat 24:15, Mar 13:14 (Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), Joh 12:40 (from Isa 6:9) Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘perceive’: *to perceive* (1) *with the senses*, (2) *with the mind*. As distinguished from *συν.* it occupies a middle place between bodily sensation and critical apprehension. The first step is the sensuous perception (*ἀκούειν*, *ιδεῖν*, etc.), then the mental act of attention to what is thus presented (*νοεῖν*), which in turn precedes the derivative critical act (*συνιέναι*), by which one is enabled to form a judgment on it. The process of digestion, the multiplication of the loaves, the passage read, the word heard, are objects first of sensation, then of attention, and lastly of reflexion, in order that their true bearing may be apprehended. Cf. 2Ti 2:7 and Ellicott’s note.

3. *γινώσκειν* is rendered by ‘understand’ (Authorized Version) in Mat 26:10, Joh 8:27; Joh 8:43; Joh 10:6; Joh 12:16 (cf. rendering of its privative *ἀγνοεῖν* in Mar 9:32 = Luk 9:45). In other cases *γ.* is rendered by ‘know,’ and it is difficult to find a reason for not adhering to that rendering in these verses. *γ.* differs from *συν.* in so far that while *συν.* generally marks an *antithesis* to sense-perception, *γ.* marks an *advance* upon it. Preoccupation with lower thoughts, self-complacency excluding apprehension of spiritual truths, present circumstances obscuring the full significance and necessitating a further enlightenment by new circumstances and prolonged pondering, hinder this advance. Only when these difficulties are removed can one *come to know* the higher aspects of the reality. (For the thought, compare Joh 2:22;

Joh 13:7; Joh 14:26). *ἀγ*. (Gospels only Mar 9:32, Luk 9:45) preserves this idea of *advance*, ‘there was a Divine purpose in their temporary ignorance’ (Swete). The disciples were unwilling to admit the idea of suffering and death, and the rebuke administered to Peter made them afraid to ask questions; thus they remained ignorant for a time.

Literature.—The Lexicons and Commentaries, all of which refer to Lightfoot’s *Colossians*, 1:9; R. W. Dale, *Week-Day Sermons* (1867), p. 10.

R. Macpherson.

☞ Undressed Cloth

UNDRESSED CLOTH

1. Ingredients in dressing.—The principal cleansing agents were two kinds of crude alkali salt.—(a) *Mineral*. This consisted of the natural deposits, chiefly in Egypt, of potassium or sodium carbonates. It was the Heb. *nether*, Arab, *natrûn*, Authorized and Revised Versions (incorrectly) ‘nitre,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ‘lye’ (Jer 2:22). White clay was also used, chiefly as a detergent or scrubbing agent.—(b) *Vegetable*. This was obtained chiefly from the soap plant called in Arabic *ishnûn*, growing on the desert plains of Syria. When burnt, it yields a crude substance named *kali* in Arabic, corresponding to the Heb. *borith*, ‘soap’ (Mal 3:2).

2. Process of dressing.—(a) *For cotton and linen*. The cleansing of these was carried out after the cloth had been woven. The present custom in Syria is to dip the cloth in water, and lay it out on a flat surface of rock. It is then sprinkled with *natrûn* (lye) or *kali* (soap), and beaten with rods or clubs, and is finally rinsed in fresh water and spread out under the sun to dry.

(b) *For wool*. On account of the presence of natural oil and many accretions and impurities in the fleece, the cleansing had to be done before the cloth was woven. For this the chief ingredient was urine collected and kept till it formed ammonium carbonate during putrefaction. Because of the offensive odours of such cleansing agents, as well as on account of the free space needed for drying purposes, the fullers’ establishments were placed near or outside the city walls. The wool was further purified in several changes of water containing the lye or soap already mentioned, and was finally rinsed in running water.

(c) *For silk.* This also had to be treated before being woven, in order to remove from the thread the gluey substance called sericin (fr. *σηρικόν*, [Rev_18:12](#)), which not only gave off an offensive odour, but, if allowed to remain, would make the cloth hard and lustreless. To remove this, the silk fibre had to be kept for several hours in a bath of hot water containing soap made of olive oil and alkali salt. This process tested the skill of the fuller; for if the soaking were insufficient, some of the sericin still adhered to the silk fibre, and if prolonged beyond a certain point it imparted an indelible yellow stain. The raw silk was then transferred for a short time to a bath of water in which dog or pigeon dung had been mixed, and, as in the case of the other materials, the last stage was a thorough washing in pure water.

The eye-witnesses of our Lord's majesty in the Mount ([Mar_9:2-8](#)) testified that on that occasion the white radiance of His garments was beyond the art of any fuller on earth.

3. Christ's parabolic use of undressed cloth.—In [Mat_9:16](#), [Mar_2:21](#) Christ, in reply to the question of the disciples of John the Baptist as to why His disciples did not fast, employs the figure of a piece of undressed cloth (*ῥάκος ἄγναφον*) sewed on an old garment, to show the incongruity between fasting according to rule and the new spirit of Christianity, *ῥάκος* (fr. *ῥήγνυμι* 'to break') is properly a piece of cloth torn off, cf. English 'rag'; *ἄγναφος* (fr. *α* privative and *γνάπτω*, 'to full or dress cloth' [whence *γναφεύς*, 'a fuller,' [Mar_9:3](#)]) = 'unfulled,' 'undressed.' Neither of the Gr. words occurs elsewhere in NT. In the parallel passage [Luk_5:36](#), where, however, a somewhat different turn is given to the saying, *ἱμάτιον καινόν* ('new garment') occurs instead of *ῥάκος ἄγναφον*. By the rendering 'undressed cloth' Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 brings out the point of the original, which is quite lost in the colourless 'new cloth' of Authorized Version, though suggested by the 'raw or unwrought' of AVm [Note: Vm Authorized Version margin.] . A piece of cloth that is undressed or unfulled is certain to shrink with a wetting, and so to strain and tear away the old garment to which it is sewed. Thus, as Christ said, it 'taketh from the garment, and a worse rent is made.' For the religious significance of the saying see esp. Bruce, *Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, p. 302 ff. Cf. also artt. Bottle in vol. i., and Law, above, p. 12^b.

G. M. Mackie and J. C. Lambert.

UNION

1. Union of the world with God.—In a sense the creation is always closely related to the Creator, and has no separate, independent existence: ‘thy heavens’ (Psa 8:3), ‘in him we live, and move, and have our being’ (Act 17:28). Yet it is in a relative independence of the creation that all things happen. Hence we read in Eph 1:10 and Col 1:20 that God will gather together all things in Christ, and will reconcile all things unto Himself. This is spoken in reference to the human spirit and its salvation. By the redemption of man, God will perfect the relationship of the creation to Himself. All things are so linked together that God’s approach to the human race, and His causing of the human race to approach to Him in Christ, is also a drawing of the whole world into a more perfect union with God.

2. Union between God and the human race.—It is only from the human side, and as matter of history, that we can study the union into which God has progressively entered with the spirit of man. It is the effect of any religious exercise that is matter of observation. Thus we are made aware of the dawning consciousness of God in the human spirit; ‘then began men to call upon the name of the Lord’ (Gen 4:26). Those who were receptive above their fellows of the Divine influence were prophets (Deu 18:15, 1Sa 9:9). This being the case, we are led to postulate and believe in a corresponding communication on the part of God towards men, and to observe its development (see Revelation). The history of Israel was so shaped by providences, and spiritual progress was so determined by prophecy, that Christ was prepared for, and came (Gal 4:4), and in Him the union of God with our race was perfected (Isa 7:14; Isa 8:10).

In regard to the union of God with man in Christ, the emphasis in Scripture is not laid upon the manner of that union so much as upon the fact of it. If Creeds and Catechisms seem to do otherwise, it is still to be remembered that their chief concern is to establish the fact that God was in Christ. In Php 2:5-11 St. Paul says nothing of the manner of the union of the Divine and human natures in Christ, but accepts as assuredly true that He was God with us, and that the same Person who emptied Himself and took the form of a servant, also humbled Himself and became obedient even unto death, yea the death of the cross.

When we turn to the narrative of Christ’s words in the Gospels, we find that His attitude towards God was ethically perfect, as of a Son to a Father, in obedience, sympathy, comprehension, honour, love, trust (Mat 11:25; Mat 11:27, Joh 5:19; Joh 5:30; Joh 6:57; Joh 10:30; Joh 11:41, Luk 23:46, and many other passages). This is what we are permitted to see of the relationship between God and Christ. But the Son who so manifested His oneness with the Father did so in our human nature. Here therefore is humanity in the person of its Head seen to be in union with God. So

far as every OT saint was able to anticipate and prefigure Christ, so far this union between God and man was a process which was progressively unfolded and perfected. And so far as believers by fellowship with Christ enter into His relationship with God, the union between God and our race is still being realized; and it must always take the form perfectly set forth by Christ (1Jn 4:17).

3. Union between believers and Christ.—It is necessary that individual souls should be united by faith to Christ, if the union of mankind with God is to be general (Joh 10:16; Joh 12:32). The Gospels record how in process of events men became disciples of Christ (Joh 1:7, Mar 1:18). That which was so effected was afterwards in many ways confirmed (Joh 6:68; Joh 20:22), and is described in the parable of the Vine and its Branches (ch. 15). Again, those who believed when the Apostles preached, and to whom the Spirit was given, without being personally attached to Christ in His earthly life, nevertheless became partakers of spiritual union with Him (Act 11:17. See also Heb 3:14, 1Co 1:9, 1Jn 1:3). This union of the believer with Christ is more than the tie between a disciple and a teacher, and is expressed by the words ‘in Christ,’ ‘in the Lord,’ ‘in him,’ which occur more than 150 times in the NT, notably in 2Co 5:17 ((Revised Version margin)) and Rom 16:7. As this union is entered into by trust and obedience and full consent, so it consists of identity of interests and companionship in everything. In the region of the *conscience*, union with Christ gives peace (Rom 8:1); in that of the *will*, regeneration (Gal 2:20); in regard to our *activity*, ‘we are labourers together with God’ (1Co 3:9, 2Co 6:1); and in regard to all *events*, we are sharers with Christ in suffering and in glory (Rom 8:17, 2Ti 2:12; see also Joh 17:20-24).

4. Union of believers with one another.—The Lord’s Supper is the simplest and most perfect outward expression of the union of Christians with one another, because of their common attachment to Christ, and deriving of benefit from Him. Thus in Act 2:42; Act 20:7, 1Co 10:16-17, it is assumed that heart-union with Christ and with one another went along with the outward expression of that union, in their partaking of the same significant bread. The obedience of the soul to Christ which alone constitutes any one a disciple may or may not coincide with participation in this or any other outward observance. Yet, like the kernel and the containing shell of a nut, they as a matter of fact appeared and developed together. Union with Christ produces an attachment of loyalty to Him, and to everything that belongs to Him; besides also the fruits of Christ-like character, which are in their nature unifying: ‘The glory thou gavest me I have given them, that they may be one’ (Joh 17:22). Should this unity be broken, the remedy is that all parties should renew their allegiance to Christ (1 Corinthians 1-3, 2Co 10:7).

Union among believers is compared to the organic unity of a body (Rom 12:4, 1Co 12:12, Eph 4:4). This has not the effect of ignoring the differences between

believers; on the contrary, the fullest provision is made for differences of gift. So far from the eye ceasing to be specifically an eye, because the body has hands and feet, there is the more need of the eye, and it has more work to do. Individuality is to be conserved and strengthened, and not destroyed or weakened. The case taken for comparison is not that of the failure of the eye to see, when the hand would do its best to aid the eye, and do its work; but such a healthy state of things as would allow every sense to do its own work. At the same time, all are under the law of love to Christ and to one another, and are sensitive to each other's suffering or success, and their life is wholly directed to mutual helpfulness. The result is that each is exercised in the use of whatever gift he has, and the whole society is maintained in spiritual vigour and growth (Eph. 4:12, Phil 6). See also Oneness, Unity.

Literature.—Westcott, *Gospel of St. John*; Sanday, *Jesus Christ* (reprinted from art. in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible); A. B. Davidson, *Theol. of OT*; Rendel Harris, *Union with God*; A. Maclaren, *Holy of Holies*; Illingworth, *Divine Immanence*.

T. Gregory.

☩ Uniqueness

UNIQUENESS.—Beyond dispute Christ appears on the theatre of human history as a unique Personality. In however large a sense He may be revealed as sharing the lot and the nature of men, He stands forth as the possessor of traits which have never been duplicated. Let a parallel be drawn between Him and any other who has won renown in human annals, and it will be found that the points of unlikeness more than match the points of likeness.

1. In several respects the self-consciousness which the Gospels show to have been resident in Christ was of a unique kind. (1) We look in vain throughout their records for any indication that He recognizes the common call to repentance as applying to Himself. No utterance that is put into His mouth conveys a hint that the slightest shadow of condemnation ever rested upon His spirit. He speaks as if He felt Himself to be the channel rather than the needy recipient of grace, as if, in truth, His inner life was as stainless as it was assumed to have been in Apostolic thought. (2) Again, the self-consciousness of Christ appears to have been of a unique type as including a perfectly clear and marvellously potent sense of sonship towards God. So rounded is the filial ideal which He presents that it is impossible to find a point at which it admits of supplement. Who can imagine a more complete expression of filial trust than that which is contained in His precepts on putting away every anxious care about the stoics which the morrow may bring (Mat. 6:25-34)? Who can conceive of filial

devotion ascending to a higher stage than was made manifest in the words, 'Not my will, hut thine be done' (Luk 22:42), spoken in the presence of the most bitter cup of shame and suffering? Who can think of filial intimacy more close and constant than is attested by the whole body of Christ's words and deeds? In truth, it is impossible to review the record without being struck with the aptness of the Evangelical description which speaks of Him as the 'beloved Son (Mat 3:17) and as dwelling 'in the bosom of the Father' (Joh 1:18). (3) Still further, a unique order of self-consciousness is disclosed in the pronounced sense of an extraordinary mediatorial vocation which was characteristic of Christ. 'No man cometh unto the Father but by me' (Joh 14:6)—that is the strong declaration which the Fourth Gospel places upon His lips; and a full equivalent is supplied by the other Gospels in such sentences as these: 'The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many' (Mat 20:28). 'All things have been delivered unto me of my Father; and no one knoweth the Son save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him' (Mat 11:27). To what prophet or leader of the race beside have we any warrant for imputing such a conception of personal vocation? Surely it must be admitted that in His sense of the prerogative and the burden of mediation Christ makes a class by Himself; He has no peer or companion. (4) Once more, the unique character of Christ's self-consciousness is seen in His extraordinary sense of authority or rightful lordship. 'While He came not to be ministered unto, He still made it evident that in the depths of His spirit there was an unhesitating affirmation of a pre-eminent royalty. He spoke as one who needed not to accommodate His words precisely to the instructions of Moses or to any other ancestral standard. He claimed an allegiance so unqualified as to reduce to a secondary place the most imperative obligations enforced by earthly ties. In words which match the significance of the Pauline declaration that in His name every knee shall bow and every tongue confess His lordship (Php 2:10 f), He pictured the gathering of all nations before His throne of judgment, to receive from His lips the merited sentence (Mat 25:31 ff.). Thus in various ways Christ gave expression to a transcendent and marvellous self-consciousness.

2. Almost rivalling the impression which comes from a consideration of the exceptional self-consciousness in Christ is that which is properly derived from a contemplation of the union and reconciliation in Him of strongly contrasted traits. (1) He was unique in His combination of meekness with the fullest energy and force of character. With quietness of mind He accepted the yoke of parental and national requirements. He submitted to a consecration rite at the hands of one who declared that he was not worthy to unloose the latchet of His shoe (Joh 1:27 | |). In all His conduct there was no trace of aristocratic superiority; among all His mighty works no deed that savoured of ostentation. But while He was meek and lowly of heart, He was masterful and commanding, inflexible in purpose, remote from weak conciliation, perfectly resolute to march against a perverse generation, to confront its frown, its

mockery, and its homicidal hatred. (2) Again, Christ exemplified the union of tender compassion for the sinner with sharp intolerance for sin. He was neither moved by the depth of His compassion to make unguarded allowances for the transgressor, nor incited by His intense repulsion against sin to lose the brother in the censor. In dealing with erring souls that had any longing for better things He fulfilled the prophetic picture of one who should not break the bruised reed or quench the smoking flax (Isa_42:3, cf. Mat_12:20). At the same time, He showed Himself the absolutely uncompromising enemy of unrighteousness, insisting that it must be excluded from the thoughts as well as from the deeds, and requiring that the offending right hand should be cut off and the offending right eye be plucked out (Mat_5:29 f.). Tender as the dew where there was any place for a healing ministry, He was yet sharp and unsparing as the lightning against every form of iniquity. (3) In another respect also Christ exhibited a unique ability for reconciling diverse traits. We see in Him a remarkable union of spirituality with kindly contact with the world. He knew how to be unworldly without being ascetic; how to throw the weight of emphasis upon the treasure laid up in heaven without patronizing any eccentric form of self-denial. He ministered to bodily needs as well as to the needs of the spirit. Herald as He was of the Kingdom of heaven, He yet stood in sympathetic relation with the sensible world, treated it as the workmanship of His Father's hands, and used it as a book of divinity from which to read to His hearers most beautiful and comforting messages of truth.

3. Corresponding to this extraordinary balance of the various traits of ideal character, Christ showed a unique competency as a teacher to bring into a unity the diverse orders and interests of truth. In the standard of life which He set before His disciples He reconciled loftiness with simplicity. The standard is undoubtedly very high. It towers above the average level of human living like an Alpine summit. But with all its loftiness it is peculiarly free from the strained and the unnatural. Its attainment involves no sacrifice of manhood or swamping of the true self, but rather just the achievement of manhood and the realization of the true self. Rebuking nothing that is purely and truly human, it requires only that the human should come to its best by standing in the transfiguring light of intimate association with the Divine. A great reconciling function is also fulfilled by Christ's teaching in the just tribute which it pays at once to morality and to religion, and in the indissoluble union which it assumes to subsist between them. From the standpoint of that teaching no man is a fit subject to bring a gift to God's altar until he has done his utmost to establish right relations with his fellows (Mat_5:23 f.). No man is an acceptable petitioner for the Divine clemency until he is willing to forgive the one who has trespassed against himself (Mat_6:14 f.). Ceremonial scrupulosity and ecclesiastical performances count for nothing apart from the intention and the habit of righteous dealing. They are no better than a counterfeit appearance, a whitewash upon the sepulchre (Mat_23:27). Religion divorced from morality is a delusion and a pretence. But, on the other hand,

the teaching of Christ is vastly remote from contentment with a bare morality or discharge of the common duties of man to man. The presence of the Heavenly Father lay about Him like a radiant atmosphere. To do the will of that Father He regarded as the prime necessity of His life, His very meat (Joh 4:34). In the assurance of the Father's complacent love He found the unfailing spring of consolation and rejoicing, and the return of His heart in fervent love to the all-perfect One He counted the most obvious and the sweetest of all conceivable obligations. Accordingly, it could not but come about that His teaching should be thoroughly transfused with a religious element, with the thought of Divine relationships. From beginning to end it is beautified and illumined by lofty and intense religious convictions. In short, stress upon the ethical factor is not permitted in the least degree to diminish the emphasis rendered to the religious factor in man's life. The harmonious combination of the two makes one of the fairest and most fruitful ideals that has been brought to the attention of the race.

Literature.—Carl Ullmann, *The Sinlessness of Jesus*; G. A. Gordon, *The Christ of To-day*; A. B. Bruce, *With Open Face*; Hastings Rashdall, *Doctrine and Development*, 77 ff.; Lives of Christ by Edersheim, Geikie, Farrar, Rhees, Sanday, and Keim; Works on NT Theology by Weiss, Holtzmann, Beyschlag, Stevens, and Adeney.

Henry C. Sheldon.

☩Unity

UNITY.—In the NT the term 'unity,' like its Gr. equivalent ἐνότης, occurs only in Eph 4:3; Eph 4:13—both times with reference to the unity of the Christian Church (Eph 4:3 'the unity of the Spirit,' Eph 4:13 'the unity of the faith'). But the idea of the unity of the Church as the 'body of Christ' is one that constantly meets us both in positive and in negative forms—in connexion, *i.e.*, alike with exhortations to Christian unity and with the deprecation and rebuke of **schism** or of the divisive spirit.

St. Paul in 1 Cor. (1Co 1:13; 1Co 11:18; 1Co 12:25) is the first to use 'schism' (σχίσμα) with an approach to its present technical meaning. The σχίσματα, however, which he condemns are parties only in the Church, not sects; 'strifes,' but not separations. There is no suggestion that those who called themselves 'of Paul' had ceased to communicate with those who called themselves 'of Apollos' (1Co 1:12). The 'divisions' apparent in their meetings for worship (1Co 11:13-21) were of class, of richer and poorer (1Co 11:22), and did not prevent the common meeting. The 'schism' deprecated in his parable of body and members (1Co 12:25) amounts only to

carelessness of mutual interest; solution of continuity in the body of Christ is not contemplated. The word αἵρεσις (Authorized and Revised Versions ‘sect,’ ‘heresy’). comes nearer in NT use to the idea of ‘sect,’ though it does not reach it. It still denotes any party or faction within a single communion, as of the Sadducees (Act 5:17), of the Pharisees (Act 15:5, Act 26:5), or of Christians considered as a school of Judaism (Act 24:5; Act 24:14, Act 28:22). It goes no farther in Gal 5:20, where αἱρέσεις are counted among works of the flesh, as the natural sequence of ἐπιθῆναι and διχοστασίαι. In 2Pe 2:1 they are the secret work of pseudoprophets, and are αἰρ. ἀπωλείας; but there is no suggestion that they amounted to separations: they work ‘among you.’ The strongest expression used on the subject is that of St. Jude (Jud 1:19), who speaks of some as ἀποδιορίζοντες, ‘marking themselves off’ from their fellows; but apparently only in tone and conduct—there was no interruption of formal fellowship: the murmurers still ‘feasted’ with the Church, and were present at its ἀγάπαι. The Nicolaitans (Rev 2:6; Rev 2:15) were a party within the Church, not a separation from it. The idea of communions severally arranged upon differing bases of opinion or order does not exist within the NT thought. What is conceived as possible, only to be reprobated, is the tendency to faction, or the spirit of party, or the ‘divisive course’: as for actual schism—μὴ γένοιτο.

1. *Our Lord’s personal teaching* on the subject is positive, not negative; He inculcates unity rather than forbids division. It is to be gathered (1) from His example, (2) from His recorded sayings.

(1) The condition of religion in the Jewish commonwealth of His time was profoundly unsatisfactory to Him. It called forth His sharp rebuke. Its teachers, their doctrine and their practice, incurred His denunciation. The Temple demanded cleansing at His hands; the synagogues were in possession of those scribes and lawyers and Pharisees on whom He cried ‘Woe,’ as hypocrites. Nevertheless, He bade His disciples respect their authority and obey their ordinances—always without imitating their conduct. They ‘sit in Moses’ seat’ (Mat 23:2); a seat self-assumed,—their office had no recognition in the Law,—but in a sense they represented the prophetic succession, and *de facto* stood for constituted order. Christ neither separated Himself, nor allowed others to separate, on the ground of their corruption, error, or abuse of power; though He recognized that all these existed, and protested against them. His custom was to go up to the synagogue on the Sabbath days. He observed the Feasts of the Temple, that of the Dedication (which had only customary sanction) as well as those prescribed. His example suggests no extremity of circumstance under which separation from the Divine Society becomes the course of duty.

(2) His express teaching is as emphatic as the circumstances permit us to expect. He establishes a Kingdom which in time and place is to be represented by the Ecclesia which He will build upon the confession of Himself (Mat 16:18). The essential unity of the Kingdom necessarily reflects itself in the unity of the representative society. Unity is involved in the fact that its bond is a relation to Himself: the one Shepherd implies the one flock, the one door implies the one fold (Joh 11:9; Joh 11:16). It is presented under similes which convey the idea of unity: it is one building on one foundation (Mat 16:18), one enclosed vineyard (Mat 20:1-11), one shoal taken in a single net (Mat 13:47-48), one company of watchers (Mat 25:1-13), or of guests at one feast (Luk 14:7-24); it is a perfect century of sheep, a complete sum of money, and the breaking of its completeness is intolerable (Luk 15:4; Luk 15:8).

Its unity is primarily theological, necessitated by its causation in the unity which is in God (Joh 17:11; Joh 17:21), and objectively effected by the indwelling in its constituents of the one Christ (Joh 17:23). The subjective unity in mutual affection of which Christians are conscious is a result of this objective unity, and is evidential of their common relation to Christ (Joh 13:35, cf. 1Jn 3:14; 1Jn 3:19); but that sense of unity does not constitute the bond which unites Christians; the bond is antecedent to the sense of it, and stands in the life of Christ transfused through the discipleship. This transfusion of life is effected by the mission of the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost mediated by Christ in His heavenly intercession (Joh 14:16-19), and results in a vital unity of Christ with the recipients of the Paraclete; which is comparable to that of a single organism (the True Vine, Joh 15:1-8) in which the individual inheres by the fact of his inherence in Christ (Joh 15:6-7). So much our Lord declares of His own operation; for the rest, He implies that He is in measure, in this as in all, dependent for the realization of His purpose on our apprehension of it and co-operative obedience. Undoubtedly He desires that the vital and spiritual unity which He effects should have a concrete expression—such expression as is apprehensible, not only to the spiritual man discerning spiritual things (1Co 2:11-16), but to the world, which cannot receive the Spirit (Joh 14:17), and is aware of that only which with eyes of flesh it sees. He commands us, as a condition of the world's recognition of our discipleship, to love one another 'as I have loved you' (Joh 13:34). He prays the Father that we may be one in such fashion that the world, seeing it, may believe in His mission: and defines this unity as comparable to His own unity with the Father. Beyond question He demands a unity manifested in terms of the common understanding of the man of this world. He prays, not that believers may be 'at one' (in harmony of faith or temper—or as Abraham and Lot were at one in agreeing to part peaceably), but that they may be 'one thing,' ἓνα ὄσιν ἓν (Joh 17:11; Joh 17:21-22); 'completed into one thing' (Joh 17:23). It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that this 'one thing' is, spiritually, the Kingdom which His Incarnation brings among us (Luk 17:21); representatively, the Society which He builds (Mat 16:18), to which by

His institution the one Baptism (Eph 4:5) admits, and which the one Bread (1Co 10:17) shows. Every kingdom, He says, divided against itself (the Kingdom of heaven is included in the argument) is brought to desolation; every city or house (the City of God, the House built of living stones, is included) divided against itself shall not stand (Mat 12:25, Mar 3:24-25). The unity which our Lord teaches appears, then, to be a visible and organic unity, based upon a vital unity in the Holy Ghost, and necessary both for evidence and for stability. His verdict upon schism, as the interruption of such unity, must be inferred—it is nowhere stated* [Note: The possible exception is where (Mat 24:51, Luk 12:46) Christ threatens the evil servant who smites his fellow-servants and eats and drinks with the drunken, that He ‘will come and cut him asunder (διχοτομήσει αὐτόν). The RV translators and others suggest for this remarkable phrase (ἀπ· λεγ. in NT) ‘will scourge him severely’—which is as if one were to say in our speech ‘will flay him alive,’ and is an expression which one has difficulty in hearing with that sense from those lips. Ruskin somewhere interprets it of the judicial aspect of schism, as ‘God’s revenge’ upon worldly and oppressive priesthods—an interpretation which the history of schism may seem to commend.]—from the sanctions assigned to unity, and from the intensity of His supplication that it may be realized in the experience of His Church.

2. In this sense *the Apostolic writers* have understood Christ. It is noted that the disciples were ‘all with one accord in one place’ to receive the Spirit (Act 2:1); that, as the result of Pentecost, they ‘were together, and had all things common’ (Act 2:44); ‘the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul’ (Act 4:32). The assumption of the Epistles is that ‘the saints’ anywhere are ‘the church of God’ which is there (Rom 1:7, 1Pe 1:1 etc.). If they are ‘churches,’ they are not less one fellowship in the unity of Christ (Gal 1:1, Rev 1:4).

St. Paul is copious on the subject. The unity on which he insists is not only of spirit; it is also embodied unity. Many as we are, we are one loaf and one body, being partakers of the one sacramental food (1Co 10:17; cf. *Did.* ix. 4). The one Spirit makes us one body, and members one of another (1Co 12:4-27), ‘that there should be no schism in the body.’ The unity of the Spirit is to be guarded in the bond of peace—‘one body, one Spirit,’ as there is unity in every basis of our life (Eph 3:4-6). This body is the Body of Christ, and requires for its attainment to completion the harmonious interworking of every member and group, as constituting a single organism in which all inhere (Eph 4:13-16). The Church is a Body, of which Christ is Head (Col 1:18; Col 1:24; Col 2:19). It is ‘the mystery of Christ’ that the Gentiles should be of the same body with Israel (Eph 3:6). Baptism is into a unity to which neither race nor status nor sex is a barrier (Gal 3:27-28). It is against first principles to assume the name of any leader as a party distinction (1Co 1:13); to do so is ‘carnal’ (1Co 3:3-4). God is to be glorified with one mouth, as well as with one mind

(Rom_15:5-6). The Churches of God have no custom of love of controversy (1Co_11:16); God is not the author of confusion but of peace; and so it is in all the Churches (1Co_14:33). The contentious earn indignation and wrath (Rom_2:8); those who cause divisions are to be noted and discouraged (Rom_16:17); a partisan after repeated admonition is to be rejected (Tit_3:10). A Church is commended which follows other Churches already in Christ (1Th_2:14). Doubtful disputations are to be avoided; the weak to be borne with; uniformity of opinion on ceremonial or ritual points is not to be insisted upon; to insist on uniformity may be 'to destroy the work of God' (Rom_14:1 to Rom_15:3). It becomes the gospel of love that men should stand fast in one spirit with one mind (Php_1:27): nothing is to be done through strife or vainglory—the guard of unity is humility (Php_2:3); we are to do all things without murmurings or disputings, as children of God (Php_2:14 f.).

St. Peter assumes the same general conception; diffused as the Church is (1Pe_1:1), it is one building, one priesthood, one nation (1Pe_2:5; 1Pe_2:9). *St. John* conceives of the Church as a fellowship with Apostles who have fellowship with God (1Jn_1:3), united in love, which is to be in deed and truth, not in phrase (1Jn_3:18). The Epp. to the Churches of Asia deal with conditions of corruption, moral and doctrinal; but there is no thought of self-segregation as the duty of the faithful, even where deeds that Christ hates are tolerated (Rev_2:6); He lays no other burden on His servants but to hold fast (Rev_2:24-25).

The teaching of the NT, in fact, is positive. It shows a *threefold unity* of the Church:—(1) *An objective unity* of origin and of vital relation of its constituent elements, which (like the racial unity of blood) is constituted by the Divine act and exists antecedently to any action, for it or against it, of ours; to which we may do violence, but which we cannot abrogate; and which is the Church's spiritual oneness. (2) *A social unity*, the result and therefore the manifestation of this common Divine life, which is related to the life communicated in the Holy Spirit as the physical organism of the individual is to the personal life which co-ordinates that of its component cells, one body for one spirit; which (being body) may be wounded, but only with suffering and to its hurt and weakening. (3) *A unity of temper and intention, of consent in belief and thought*, which it rests with us to supply; which is the co-operation with the Divine action that is required of us,—obedience to the law of the nature of the Body of Christ in which we find ourselves—the bond of peace in which we are to observe (τηρεῖν) the unity of the Spirit (Eph_4:3). The existence of a state of schism is not contemplated in the NT, nor is any direction given for conduct in such a case. Party spirit and divisive courses are condemned, but there is 'no precept for the regulation of the relations of one sect to another.' The Apostolic doctrine as to schism can be inferred only from these facts.

3. According to the conception of *the Church of the first centuries*, unity was locally constituted by association in acts of communion with God (especially in the Eucharistic *synaxis*), and by recognition of the authority representing the discipline of the Church; œcumenically, it was constituted by intercommunion, evidenced by reception on the part of each local community of the *formatœ* (commendatory letters) of the rest, by homologation of each other's discipline, by the encyclical letters of their respective chief pastors, and later by common Conciliar action. It was jealously a unity in the faith, but not necessarily in identity of expression of the faith; the Creed, as repeated in different Churches, was not in all verbally the same. It was a unity in moral obedience, but not a uniformity in ceremony or custom: each Church ordered its own liturgy, and determined its own ritual and usage; wide differences might exist in practices, e.g. of fast and festival (Eus. v. 24—Polycarp and Anicetus, Irenaeus and Victor). Such differences were held only to demonstrate identity in the faith: 'in una fide nihil officit sanctae ecclesiae consuetudo diversa' (Greg, *ad Leandr.*, quoted by Bingham; see also his letter to Aug. of Cant. in Bede, *Hist.*). For the sojourner or incomer to scruple at local custom in things indifferent, or to abstain from the common worship on account of unfamiliar details, was in itself a schismatic act (Aug. *ad Januar.*, *ib.*).

In the earlier stages of the Church's life, government by bishops and presbyters in one local community could coexist with government by college of presbyters in another, without offence to either; Antioch, Epbesus, Smyrna communicated with Rome and Corinth. Ignatius addresses the collegiate Church at Rome as cordially as he does the monepiscopal elsewhere. Clement has no criticism for the absence of a bishop at Corinth, but only for insubordination to its presbyters. Churches autocephalous (externally independent of each other) might exercise large discretion in internal arrangement, yet recognize each other's sacraments and discipline. The centre of unity was in heaven, not on earth. It was a unity as that of Hellas, rather than as that of the Empire. Local Churches were 'as bays of the one sea.' Unity was essentially maintained when intercommunion was maintained. Schism was the interruption of communion: 'schismaticos facit, non diversa fides, sed disrupta communionis societas' (Aug., quoted by Sprott, *Macleod Lect.* 'Schism,' p. 2).

As for local unity, the safeguard of that was the recognized principle that only one valid ecclesiastical authority could exist in the same community; latterly, that only one bishop could validly occupy one seat, that presbyters could not act validly without him, and that the flock should communicate with him in sacraments and prayer. The worst form of schism was held to be the violation of this rule, as it produced sect within the same area, and led to the setting up of 'altar against altar'—a greater evil than interruption of communion between one local Church and another, as civil war is a greater evil than war between State and State. The converse responsibility was equally recognized: that no uncatholic or heretical term of

communion should be locally imposed or required between Church and Church. In the case of that being done, the schism was held to be on the part of the authority imposing such terms, or of the Church requiring them. Thus Firmilian writes (with reference to the excommunication by Stephen of Rome of those who disallowed the baptism of heretics): 'While thou thinkest that all may be excommunicated by thee, thou hast excommunicated thyself alone from all' (*Epp. of Cyprian*, lxxv., Oxf. translation p. 284).

4. It was to this latter principle that the *Reformers* generally appealed, as justifying in Catholic order their action in reclaiming the autonomy of national Churches, and in continuing their administration independently of the Roman See; which they regarded as a 'tyranny,' under which impossible terms of communion were schismatically demanded. As to schism generally, the Reformers maintained the traditional doctrine, and Calvin's view may be taken as typical: 'Such is the value which the Lord sets on the communion of His Church, that all who contumaciously alienate themselves from any Christian society in which the true ministry of His word and Sacraments is maintained, He regards as deserters of religion' (*Inst.* iv.).

5. The modern tendency is to recognize that responsibility for divisions has generally been a diffused responsibility, and that a distinction is to be drawn between that of the authors of separation and of the inheritors of positions of confusion which personally they have not created; to accept the essential validity of the conceptions of unity which guided the Church in its inception, while recognizing the difficulty of return to their practice; and to welcome the efforts of those who desire to be called 'repairers of the breach, restorers of paths for men to dwell in.' See, further, artt. Church, Communion, Oneness.

Literature.—Augustine, *de unitate Ecclesiæ*; Ambrose, *Epistles*; Calvin, *Institutes*, iv.; Bacon, *Essays*, 'Of Unity in Religion'; Barrow, *Of the Unity of the Church*; Bingham, *Ant.* xvi.; Archp. Wake, *Letters*; Walker, *Scot. Theol.*; Durham, on 'Scandal,' 1659, *Com. on Revelation*, 1660; Boston, Sermon on 'Schism'; Wood of St. Andrews, *Works*, 1664; Ferguson, 'Sermon before the Synod of Fife,' 1653; Rutherford, 'Due right of Presbyteries,' 1644; Bp. A. P. Forbes, *Nicene Creed*; Sprott, *Macleod Lecture*, 1902; Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*; Gore, *Body of Christ*; Dale, 'The Idea of the Church' in *Essays and Addresses*, and 'The Unity of the Church' (Lect. xv.) in *Ephesians*; Fairbairn, *Christ in Modern Theology*, 513 ff.; Denney, *Stud. in Theol.* 186 ff.; Lindsay, *Church and Ministry*, 10 ff.

H. J. Wotherspoon.

☞ Universalism

UNIVERSALISM.—Three different, though connected, problems are raised by this word: (1) The universality of Christianity as a gospel for all races (as against the early Ebionism (wh. see) which confined Christianity to the circumcised); (2) the universal purpose of Christ's death—for 'all men' (as against the Augustinian and Calvinistic doctrine of Christ's death on behalf of those elected out of the mass of sinful mankind); (3) the ultimate salvation of *all* souls (as against the eternal suffering of the wicked; or, their destruction; or perhaps as against uncertainty—subjective uncertainty, due to our ignorance, or objective uncertainty, due to the *indefiniteness* of the sentence of the Great Day; see below).—A study of Christ and the Gospels is very specially concerned with the first problem.

I. *Universality of Christianity.*—1. There are two ways in which religions qualify as 'universal.' They may reveal the missionary impulse (Zoroastrianism? see Jackson, *Zoroaster the Prophet of Ancient Iran*, 1899, p. 92; Modern Hinduism, sucking up hill-tribes into its fellowship?). Or *in addition* they may simplify very greatly—in contrast with the legal or national character of developed systems of religion in the ancient world.

Buddhism went furthest in the way of simplifying. From the first, apparently, a proselyte might have the benefits of Buddhism without renouncing the practices of his former faith; and at this hour many of the population of China are said to practise concurrently the three religions—Confucianism, Taoism, Buddhism. Muhammadanism is missionary and is simple, but it institutes a new legalism in the strictest sense. Pre-Christian Judaism, in its proselytizing, revealed the missionary impulse; but simplification of ritual—a simplified *creed* was hardly needed—could not be granted, unless to the *σεβόμενοι* ('devout persons'); and their position was theoretically very insecure.

2. The Apostolic Church had the missionary impulse, but practised the OT law as inherited custom; was it also sacred duty? The question threatened to rend the new fellowship. Should the missionary impulse be given free scope? And should life be simplified—in the first instance, for those of Gentile birth—by abrogation of OT law? Or should the missionary impulse be slowly throttled by Jewish laws and customs? Both parties were pushed back, and led to define their principles more sharply. The Judaizers claim that the Law is necessary to salvation (Act 15:1), or at least to full salvation (Gal 3:3). St. Paul justifies his attitude of antagonism by declaring that the Gentile Christian, who accepts circumcision and the Law, renounces Christ (Gal 5:2-4). On both sides, law is treated, not as customary, but as religious in value—good religion to the Judaizers, bad religion to St. Paul (though in mere custom he himself 'became a Jew to win Jews,' 1Co 9:20). In the end the various sections of

Christian Jews all died out, or merged themselves in the rival camps—the Synagogue and the Catholic Church. It may seem as if universalism failed. Christianity has been known to history as a Gentile and non-Jewish institution—a strange state of matters, were we not blinded by familiarity. And in other ways, too, success has been very partial. No religion, not even the Christian, has ever attained the destiny of universal sway to which all the higher prophetic religions aspire. Yet Christianity persists in claiming that it is truly universal. It excludes none. The Jewish people excludes itself. (Individual Jews, of course, are entangled in hereditary custom, and can break away only by self-will or moral heroism).

3. The simplifying of religion, which was carried through in controversy by St. Paul, begins uncontroversially in the teaching of Jesus. He brings the Law to a principle (Mat 7:12) or to a pair of principles, drawn from different parts of the OT (Deu 6:5, Lev 19:18), and recognized by the Master as connected by an inward likeness (Mat 22:37-40 ||). All these principles, of course, are moral and indifferent to ceremonial. So, too, the religious life is brought to a single principle by the name which Jesus steadily uses for God. If God is our Father, religion is sonship. This is a simplifying of the highest order—a simplifying which is also a deepening, an ennobling, a perfecting of the religious life. Thus Christ's teaching is universalist at the core. If religion consists in the belief of God's Fatherhood and in love to man, there is no reason why a Jew should be preferred to a Gentile. Nor do corollaries from these principles fail to appear in the teaching of Christ. He rejects, as lacking Divine authority, that tradition (Mat 15:3-9 ||) by means of which the Pharisees, morally the most earnest among the Jews, safeguarded the OT law and applied it to new details, at the cost of making it ever more and more a burden. He hints repeatedly that ceremonies, even those taught by the OT, are of inferior moment in comparison with moral duty (Mat 9:16-17, Mat 12:7, cf. Mat 17:26, Mat 22:21 ||). He speaks of sin and pardon (Mat 9:6 ||, Luk 7:48), and of His own approaching death (Mat 20:28 ||, Mat 26:28 ||), in words which send us back to the prediction of a 'new covenant' (Jer 31:31). And thus He connects the new body of principles contained in His teaching with His own Person and destiny.

4. On the other hand, the universalist corollary itself seems strangely absent. For Christ conceives His calling upon earth as confined to Israel (Mat 15:24 ||). His intercourse with Gentiles (Mat 8:5 ff.), or even with the half-heathen Samaritans (Joh 4:9, Luk 9:52; Luk 17:16), was but casual. He bids His disciples, at their first going out, confine themselves to Jews (Mat 10:6). All this, as we can see, was involved in His recognition that God called Him to be Messiah—Israel's king. If 'anointed' to 'preach' (Isa 61:1, Luk 4:18), He must direct His prophetic message to Israel. The shaping out of His royalty depends, under God, on the attitude of Israel in response to His appeal. These things are plain to us; still, there was room for doubt under the historic conditions of the early disciples. It was plausible for Jewish

Christians to hold that the Master's example sanctioned particularism rather than universalism. Very Possibly Matthew 10—as borrowed by the author of our Gospel from an older document (the *Logia*? one version of the *Logia*?, see Logia)—was originally a gathering together in a single context of sayings that might throw light on the *permanent* duties of an evangelist; if so, the original draft of the chapter confines the itinerant preacher to an audience of Jews. (We must not expect that Evangelists should write like critical historians, with exact notes of time and circumstance). On the other hand, our Gospel of Mt., as a whole, certainly presents a different outlook. Yet it is only after the Resurrection—and, in all the Synoptics, with a very definite contrast to the past—that we have the record of a positive command to preach to all men. Not that the mind of our Master is really uncertain on this point. OT prophecy had extended hope to Gentiles (Is 2:2, e.g.); and Jesus stands higher, not lower, than His prophetic forerunners. Could He—speaking in the light of such promises; or could He *at all*—preach a gospel universalist from its centre outwards, and not know what He was doing? He knew it well. And so the principles of His teaching come to their rights through the witness of St. Paul, who—in forms of his own, or, at any rate, in forms which owed to him their full and sharp development—vindicates the universal religion which has succeeded to the Old Covenant through the atoning death for sin. See also artt. Cosmopolitanism, Exclusiveness, Gentiles, Missions.

Literature.—The present writer's *Christ and the Jewish Law*, 1886, quotes older literature. Interesting recent statements, from a position of some theological latitude, in Harnack's *What is Christianity?*; Wernle's *Beginnings of Christianity*, and Weinel's *Jesus Christus im 19ten Jahrhundert* [the last not yet translated].

II. *Universal purpose of Christ's death.*—1. Granted that Christ is the Saviour of all races, did He die for all men in all races, or only for such as actually reap the benefits of His sacrifice? The question may seem somewhat academic. It is admitted on both sides of the controversy that the merits of Christ suffice to redeem all men; and it is [or was; but see III. below] admitted on both sides that only a certain number of souls are advantaged by the Christian salvation. Still, it seemed—e.g. to Wesley—a new and ugly particularism to affirm that, by Divine decree, the salvation, professedly offered to all, was confined to some, chosen arbitrarily or upon unknown grounds.

2. In our Lord's Synoptic teaching, or in the very simple theology of the first three Evangelists, the point now before us is hardly touched on. Christ is to give His life a ransom for 'many' (Mat 20:28 ||); and so, too, His covenant blood is shed for 'many' (Mat 26:28 ||). The contrast in view is between the One suffering and the many saved. In Jn. the phenomena are more various. The shepherd gives His life for the sheep (Joh 10:11). Christ loves His own (Joh 13:1). He prays for them and not for the world (Joh 17:9). On the other hand, the ulterior aim is 'that the world may believe' (Joh 17:21 (23)). Lifted up, He is to draw 'all men' (Joh 12:32). And, when we turn

from the Johannine teaching of Christ to other parts of the Fourth Gospel, we find strong emphasis laid on the fact that Christ is the Saviour of the whole world (Joh 1:29, Joh 3:17, Joh 4:42). A Gospel so penetrated with the thought of universalism (I.) was not likely to lend itself to a new particularism as against universalism (II.).

3. It is to St. Paul that the Augustinians and Calvinists look back as their explicit master. All that happens, happens by God's will. All that fails to happen, fails just because it was no part of God's purpose. Salvation, especially, is efficacious; grace is 'irresistible.' Predestinated—called—justified—glorified—the stately sequence moves on without pause or uncertainty (Rom 8:30). (We omit the initial term 'foreknown' as somewhat difficult—difficult perhaps to both schools of theology). What God plans, He accomplishes. The necessary obverse of this doctrine—unless transformed by universalism (III.); so Hastie, *Theology of the Reformed Church*, 1894—is that neither God nor Christ meant any blessing for those who are in the issue unsaved. Christ died for some, not for all. But the NT writes differently. Even St. Paul joins in the common confession—'He died for all' (2Co 5:15). Language which in later theology is found characteristic only of transition Calvinism—*i.e.* of Calvinism in a state of decay, like Amyraldism—is the natural expression of the faith of St. Paul and of all the NT writers. True, A. Ritschl (*Justification*, vol. iii., translation H. R. Mackintosh and A. B. Macaulay, ch. ii. § 22) contends that this form of expression is of inferior scientific value to the other set of expressions—noted by us in the Johannine teaching, and in Romans 8—according to which grace is destined to the Church. Ritschl's peculiar doctrine—the Elect = the Church and not = a body of individuals—has found few supporters, and probably will find fewer in the future. His preference for Calvinism is noteworthy, though he was no genuine Calvinist.* [Note: Universalism (III.), Ritschl dismissed as 'sentimental.' His own inclination was towards a doctrine of conditional immortality, but he left his eschatology somewhat in the dark.] Yet we feel bound to hold that it is deeper spiritual vision and not simply lowered logical acumen that makes the NT writers—conceivably, sometimes, at the cost of systematic coherence—hail Christ as Saviour of all men. Otherwise, Universalism (I.) seems emptied of moral meaning. In point of fact, the Calvinistic limitation is little heard of now in Great Britain, except among some of the Evangelicals in the Church of England and some of the Baptists. And few would now rank it as a burning question. The controversy has gone to sleep. Or judgment in the cause goes by default.

Literature.—Besides Ritschl and Hastie, referred to above, the attentive reader will find fossil marks of the controversy in some of the hymns of the Evangelical Revival, both Calvinistic and Wesleyan.

III. *Universal, ultimate salvation.*—1. At the present day, 'Universalism' most naturally suggests to the reader the doctrine of the final restitution of all souls (there

are Universalist churches in America in this sense). The doctrine is not, indeed, a novelty. It is found, qualified by his extraordinary insistence upon individual freewill, in Origen's closely-knit speculative system; also in Gregory of Nyssa, and others. And Ritschl (*Gesch. des Pietismus*) notes, with scorn, among the symptoms of post-Reformation 'pietism,' that, ever and anon, hope is expressed even on behalf of condemned and lost souls. The most earnest and ardent supporters in Great Britain of the universalist doctrine have been Thomas Erskine of Linlathen (in his later years; d. 1870), Samuel Cox (*Salvator Mundi*, 1877), and Caleb Scott of Manchester. But Tennyson's *In Memoriam* (1849) has perhaps done more than any formal theological work to move opinion in this direction; and there has been a great break-up of the old unhesitating belief in literally unending punishment. Some have taught conditional immortality (E. White, *Life in Christ*, 1875; Petavel [French-Swiss], *The Problem of Immortality*, 2 vols. 1890-91 (English translation in one vol. 1892); W. D. Maclaren), others a mitigated punishment (F. W. Farrar, *Eternal Hope*, 1878, *Mercy and Judgment*, 1881; hinted also in J. R. Illingworth's *Reason and Revelation*, 1902, ch. xii.). Others plead for uncertainty (E. H. Plumptre, *Spirits in Prison*, 1884, with full and interesting references; Plumptre's brother-in-law, F. D. Maurice (*Theological Essays*, 1853), had stated philosophic doubts as to the meaning of 'eternal.' Present writer's *Essays Towards a New Theology*, 1889). An original and very curious suggestion is found in A. M. Fairbairn's *Christ in Modern Theology*, 1893, p. 467. Deity 'cannot annihilate, but the sentence of condemnation is *indeterminate* rather than eternal (like sentences of committal to Elmira reformatory prison, N.Y.). Repentance *always* remains possible. If or when the damned repent, they shall emerge. Besides all these changes or innovations in belief, the growing reticence, and one may say reluctance, among those who maintain full traditional orthodoxy is even more significant. Few would now write as Charles Reade did (1856) in his brilliant novel, *Never Too Late to Mend* (ch. 21), as if the last moments of life on this side the veil were necessarily the last moments of hope for the soul ('Never' too late?).

2. Much of what we have just mentioned concerns us only in so far as it represents a great swaying of opinion towards universalism (in the fullest sense). The three senses of the word which we have been studying form a climax—Christ for all races, Christ for all souls, Christ actually redeeming and winning all. In the theological discussion just noted—Fairbairn is an exception—the question is generally argued as one of NT interpretation. The present writer does not think that hopeful. He sees no ground for challenging the old doctrine on exegetical lines. Words often applied to the universalist hope—*Apokatastasis*, 'restitution of all things,' Act 3:21 (cf. Mat 17:11 ||, Act 1:6)—do not really bear the meaning supposed. One passage teaches probation after death (1Pe 3:19), but it hardly falls within the limits of this article. Eternal punishment had come to be the doctrine of the synagogue, and it passed into the NT with perhaps even sharper definition, as a witness to the unspeakable evil of sin. True, the doctrine was not rigorously formulated, and it is a question among

interpreters whether St. Paul's teaching *is* eternal punishment or rather a certain type of conditional-immortality doctrine. But generally the NT is clear, even the language used by Christ; although we note that what is freshest and most personal in our Lord's words (Luk 12:47-48) goes to modify the dreadful wholesale dogma, and foreshadows, at however remote a time, the ultimate challenging of the *letter* of this article of the theological creed. Again, as a matter of exegesis, we cannot claim either the Johannine teaching of our Lord (Joh 12:32), or the culminating point in St. Paul's great argument (Rom 11:32), as asserting universal salvation. Other plainer passages are decisive. There is a 'son of perdition' (Joh 17:12), and St. Paul denounces 'eternal destruction' on sinners (2Th 1:9). Still, the question recurs here, too, whether the spirit and inner drift of such words—words spoken on the mountain-tops of spiritual vision—can be satisfied by anything less than their full meaning.

3. Recent change in theological opinion is largely a matter of moral recoil. We may sum up the moral postulate by saying that, as long as there is hope of rescuing the soul, any severity is a holy and even—though one trembles at the words—a gracious thing. But if character sets permanently in the ways of evil, can we credit long-drawn-out suffering? Our generation, from a sense of duty, puts even the cruellest of murderers to a painless death. We, who dare not torture, cannot conceive that God's administration includes endless torment.

4. Passing from simpler moral considerations to a religious speculation, we note that optimism enters into every theistic creed. In some sense—in the deepest sense—what happens in God's world is the best. It is best that evil should be permitted, should show what is in itself, should be conquered. Above all, when God's providence and grace have reached their goal in history, we must be able to say, 'It is best.' Again, God is omnipotent. He cannot, of course, do anything formally impossible or inherently absurd; nor can He 'deny Himself.' But any lawful desire of His children He can and will supply. All that He has is ours, for we are 'heirs of God.' He acts in His own way, according to His own will; yet He grants what we desire, *or something better*. This is the key which unlocks the riddles of our private lives. Its grandest and most public application is found in redemption. God could not, or would not, ignore the world's sin. He did what was far better, when He sent Jesus Christ. Now, here it seems incomparably the divinest issue of history that redemption should prove universal, and God all in all, not through slaughter of His enemies ('Order reigns in Warsaw'), still less through chaining them in hopeless misery and hatred, but through winning in every heart that victory which, in some of the hardest and darkest of hearts, Christ has won already.

'His blood can make the foulest clean;

His blood availed for me.'

Again, God is our Father. Men have said in the writer's hearing,—some lightly, some with the profoundest gravity and tenderness,—'I could leave no child of mine to endless misery. Can God do that?' We, being evil, cannot but raise this question. Our Maker must answer it.

5. On the other hand, we cannot banish from our minds the tendency of character to set, for good or for evil. As we know it, this tendency remains incomplete. None are perfect, nor may we regard any as beyond rescue. But even a child learns how repetition facilitates either evil or good, and how a delayed reform grows harder and less likely to be achieved. It is no skirmish or sham fight for which we are enlisted. As right differs from wrong by the whole diameter of being, so the issues of the life that has been won for righteousness and love must differ from those of the life that has willingly preferred sin. Measured and limited ill-consequence is in no sort of proportion to the infinite evil of wilful wickedness; and the rhetoric of universalism in the minds of those who 'eddy round and round' is the lazy and lying assurance, 'It will come to the same thing in the end.' God cannot brook this. He must needs threaten sin with its wages; and we have no right to affirm that the most awful of all threats is but an empty or ideal possibility. So, longing with full hearts for a universal restitution of lost souls, we must leave this theme of mystery and terror upon the steps of the Redeemer's throne of grace.

Literature.—Besides the works cited in the art., cf. Salmond, *Chr. Doct. of Immortality*, 628; J. A. Beet, *Last Things*, 203; Newman Smyth, *Orthodox Theol. of To-day*, 55; Alcott, 'Universalism a Progressive Faith' in *New World*, iii. (1894), 38.

Robert Mackintosh.

☞ Unleavened Bread

UNLEAVENED BREAD.—See Passover.

☞ Unpardonable Sin

UNPARDONABLE SIN.—The expression is not a Scriptural one, but rests partly upon a saying of Jesus reported in different forms by all the Synoptists, and partly upon two analogous passages in Hebrews and one in 1 John. It is only with the saying in the

Gospels that we are directly concerned, but the passages in the Epistles must be glanced at as bearing upon our interpretation of Christ's words, and something must be said also as to the place of the subject in Christian experience.

1. In the Gospels.—It is the solemn declaration of Jesus that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit shall never be forgiven which forms our fundamental authority. In an examination of these words, several points have to be considered.

(1) *The occasion of the utterance.*—Both Mt. and Mk. connect the saying with calumnious charges of the scribes and Pharisees, based upon our Lord's action in curing demoniacs (Mat 12:22 ff., Mar 3:11; Mar 3:22 ff.). Lk. gives it a different setting (Luk 12:8 ff.; cf. Luk 11:14 ff.); but while it is possible that Jesus used the words on separate occasions, there can be little question that, if He spoke them only once, it is from Mt. and Mk. that we get the proper historical connexions. His work in delivering demoniacs from the power of evil spirits had deeply impressed the multitude, who, according to Mt. (Mat 12:23), began to ask, 'Is this the Son of David?' But when the Pharisees heard it, they said, 'This man doth not cast out devils but by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils' (Mat 12:24, Mar 3:22; cf. Luk 11:15). Jesus showed the absurdity of such a charge, considered from the point of view of mere reason and common sense (Mat 12:25 ff., Mar 3:23 ff., Luk 11:17 ff.). And then, suddenly changing His tone as He passed from the logical weakness of His adversaries to lay His finger on their moral and spiritual fault, He uttered those memorable words in which He declared that while all other sins and blasphemies, even blasphemy against Himself, shall be forgiven, whosoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit shall never be forgiven (Mat 12:31-32, Mar 3:28-29; cf. Luk 12:10).

(2) *The nature of the sin.*—In seeking for this, the occasion of the utterance serves as a guide. A study of the context in Mt. and Mk. at once disposes of some of the views that have been entertained as to the nature of the sin against the Holy Spirit—all those, e.g., that are associated with the idea that only Christians can be guilty of it. Jesus was speaking to Pharisees, and it is by thinking, in the first place, of the Pharisees and their attitude to Him and His teaching that we get on the right line for arriving at the meaning of His words. He had cast out demons; and the Pharisees said that He did this by the help of Beelzebub. He had delivered men and women from unclean spirits (Mar 1:23 ff., Mat 10:1, Luk 4:33 ff. and *passim*); and they said of Himself, 'He hath an unclean spirit' (Mar 3:30). Now, such language regarding Jesus strikes us, first of all, as blasphemy against the Son of Man Himself—and this it undoubtedly was. But this was not the aspect of the sin upon which Jesus fastened. On the contrary, He declared that all blasphemy against the Son of Man shall be forgiven. It was possible for men to insult Him personally, through want of thought or ignorance as to His real character. Of all such offenders He was ready to say, as He said at last of those who nailed Him to the cross or reviled Him hanging there,

‘Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do’ (Luk 23:34). But apart from all questions of His personal dignity, Jesus came revealing in His words and deeds the Divine spirit of holiness and love. The works He did testified to the manner of spirit He was of. But in the presence of the Divine goodness that shone from His beneficent activities, the Pharisees only gnashed their teeth and declared that the spirit of Jesus was the spirit of Satan. This was blasphemy, not against Jesus only, but against the Divine Spirit that was manifested in Him. And such blasphemy, we must remember, the Pharisees were guilty of, not once, but constantly. Jesus might have affirmed of them, as Stephen afterwards affirmed in the face of the Sanhedrin, ‘Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost’ (Act 7:51). John the Baptist had come ‘in the way of righteousness’ (Mat 21:32); and they said of him, ‘He hath a devil’ (Mat 11:18, Luk 7:33). Jesus came in the way, not only of righteousness, but of love; and of this incarnation of the Divine grace they said again and again, ‘He hath a devil’ (Mat 9:34, Mat 12:24, Mar 3:22, Luk 11:15, Joh 7:20; Joh 8:48; Joh 8:52; Joh 10:20). They said this, moreover, not rashly or carelessly, but deliberately and malignantly; not because they were blind to the tokens of God’s presence with Jesus, but because they hated Him for having crossed them in their, paths of selfishness and pride, and revealed both to themselves and others the utter emptiness of their religious life. Their blasphemy thus was not the hasty utterance of a moment, but a vice of their indwelling thoughts and character (Mat 12:25); not a single act, but a habitual attitude. The light that came into the world shone round about them; but they loved the darkness rather than the light, because their deeds were evil. And at last they came not only to prefer the darkness, but to hate the light so bitterly that nothing would serve them but to declare to others and try to persuade themselves that it came not from God, but from the devil.

(3) *Its unpardonable character.*—The unpardonableness of such blasphemy as this, Jesus affirms in language that can hardly be mistaken. In Lk. once (Luk 12:10) and in Mt. twice (Mat 12:31-32) He declares, ‘It shall not be forgiven’—adding in Mt. (Mat 12:32) the ominous words, ‘neither in this age (*αἰῶν*), nor in that which is to come.’ The attempt is sometimes made to soften down the force of the last expression. The present age, it is said, was simply the Mosaic age or dispensation under which the Jews were living; while ‘the age to come’ was the Messianic age or Christian dispensation Our Lord’s words thus mean only that, whether men live under the Law or the Gospel, blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is unpardonable. They have no reference to the future life; they tell us nothing about a state of doom after death; they do not carry us on to any final issues (so Cox, *Expositor*, ii. iii. [1882] 322). But while it is true that the Jews of our Lord’s time used the phrases ‘this age’ and ‘the coming age’ to denote the period before and the period after the advent of the expected Messiah (cf., however, Schürer, *HJP [Note: JP History of the Jewish People.]* ii. ii. 177), it is clear from the Gospels that Jesus Himself habitually

employed them to indicate the age before and the age after His own Parousia (see Mat 13:39-40; Mat 13:49; Mat 24:3; Mat 28:20, Mar 10:30, Luk 18:30; Luk 20:35), thereby throwing ‘the age to come’ into that future world which lies beyond His Second Advent and the resurrection of the dead (see Salmond, *Chr. Doct. of Immort.* 381). And if Mt.’s language left us in any doubt as to the absoluteness of His meaning, the doubt would disappear when we turn to Mk. For there we find Him saying of the man who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit that he ‘hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin’ (Mar 3:29 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). Even if it stood by itself, ‘hath never forgiveness’ would carry a sound of finality with it. And when there is added, ἀλλὰ ἔνοχός ἐστιν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος, it seems hardly possible to escape from the conclusion that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is here described as a sin for which there is no remedy. The words in the original are exceedingly striking. ἔνοχος (= ἐνεχόμενος, fr. ἐν and ἔχω) means ‘held in the grip of’ (see Morison, *Matthew, in loc.*). And if we give to αἰώνιος the meaning it regularly has on the lips of Jesus, ‘an eternal sin’ appears to mean a sin that eternally persists, a sin that has so engrained itself in the character as to become fixed in the form of destiny. See, further, Eternal Sin.

(4) *The reason for its unpardonableness.*—This does not lie in any limitation of the grace of Christ or of the forgiving mercy of God. It lies in the very nature of the sin as just described. The sin is unpardonable because the sinner has no desire for pardon; it ‘hath never forgiveness’ because it is not repented of. For when men for selfish reasons hate the light, and persistently shut their eyes against it and blaspheme it, they gradually put their eyes out. God’s ‘sov’reign vital lamp’ still shines about them, but they can no more see it, since they have extinguished their own power of seeing. Eternal darkness is the necessary consequence of eternal sin. It is quite true that ἁμαρτήματα generally stands for an act, not a state. But from the point of view of exegesis, little can be built upon this. For an act may be the revelation of a state; and when the Pharisees said of Jesus, ‘He hath an unclean spirit,’ this particular piece of blasphemy, as we have seen, was really the expression of a settled attitude of mind.

2. In the Epistles.—There are two passages in Hebrews that bear upon the subject. In Heb 6:4-8 the writer describes the impossibility of a renewal unto repentance for Christians who have fallen away from Christ after having once ‘tasted of the heavenly gift’ and become ‘partakers of the Holy Ghost.’ In Heb 10:26-31 he declares that there is no more sacrifice for sins in the case of those who sin wilfully and persistently after they have received the knowledge of the truth. It is impossible to suppose that he means that a Christian cannot be forgiven if he falls into sin, however grievous, or that Jesus is unable to save men to the uttermost (cf. Heb 2:17, Heb 4:16, Heb 10:19 ff.). In the second passage certainly, and presumably in the first also, he is

speaking of a deliberate repudiation of Christ on the part of those who have tasted His blessings. Once they were enlightened, but they too loved the darkness rather than the light, and so shut the light out of their hearts, and trampled under foot the Son of God, and did despite unto the Spirit of grace. Thus we have here again, though now in the case, not of Pharisees, but of members of the Christian Church, a manifestation of the same kind of sin as before.* [Note: The case of Esau (Heb_12:16-17), though often quoted in connexion with this sin, has no real bearing upon it. The repentance which he sought was a change of mind on his father's part, not on his own. But Isaac had already bestowed the blessing, and the past could not be undone.] In 1Jn_5:16 the writer distinguishes between 'a sin unto death' and 'a sin that is not unto death'; and while urging Christians to pray for one another with respect to the latter, says that he does not bid them make request to God concerning the former. It seems evident that there is a reference here to our Lord's language in Mat_12:31 f. ||, but in itself the passage adds nothing to our knowledge of unpardonable sin.

3. In Christian experience.—The subject is of importance, not only exegetically and theologically, but because of its practical bearings, and that in two different directions. (1) Bunyan at a certain period of his religious history (see *Grace Abounding*, §§ 96-230) is a type of multitudes who have suffered agonies of spiritual torture through the fear that they have committed a sin for which there is no forgiveness. But if the view taken above is the right one, there is no specific act of blasphemy in word or deed, standing by itself, that we are entitled to think of as 'the unpardonable sin.' The phrase, in fact, is as erroneous as it is unscriptural, though the common use of it has helped to load thousands of sensitive souls with a burden of intolerable pain. There is no mysterious transgression which is sufficient of itself to put a man beyond the power of repentance, and so outside the pale of forgiveness. Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit may find expression and come to its culmination in some specific way; but essentially it is a settled attitude of mind and heart. It is a deliberate extinguishing of that inner light which God Himself has kindled within us, and which ought to respond to His clear shining from without. Such compunctions as Bunyan had are the very best proof that a man has not committed any unpardonable sin, for they are the experiences of one who, though he has not yet realized the all sufficiency of Christ's grace, is possessed at least of that contrite spirit which trembles at God's word, and so may rest upon the prophet's assurance that unto him the Lord will look (Is 66:2). 'Sell Him! sell Him! sell Him!' was the urgent persuasion of the Tempter in Bunyan's ear. But though at last in his distraction he felt the thought, 'Let Him go if He will,' pass through his mind, the true intention of his heart was always, 'No, no! not for thousands, thousands, thousands!' (*op. cit.* § 139).

(2) But if anxious and fearful souls need to be reminded that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is not some mysterious sin into which a man may fall against all the

promptings of his better nature, the case of the Pharisees and Jesus conveys to all a message of serious warning. No one can stumble suddenly into irremediable sin; but men may drift into it after the fashion of the Pharisees. Selfishness and pride, and not least religious selfishness and pride, may slowly harden the heart and sear the conscience and seal the eyes, until men come to call good evil and light darkness, and are ready at last to say, even of one who manifests the Spirit of God and of Christ, 'He hath a devil.' The special monition of the incident in the Gospels is against that loss of vision which comes from the hardening power of sin, that continual resistance of the Spirit which leads at last to hatred of the Spirit. Poor Francis Spiera, whose case seemed to Bunyan so like his own (*op. cit.* § 163), may not himself have been guilty of unpardonable sin (cf. Martensen, *Chr. Ethiopic* ii. 128); but there is deep significance for all in his solemn sentence, 'Man knows the beginning of sin, but who bounds the issues thereof?' See, further, artt. Blasphemy, Forgiveness.

Literature.—Schaff, *Die Sünde wider d. heil Geist*; Müller, *Chr. Doct. of Sin*, ii. 418; Gloag, *Exeget. Stud.* i.; Salmond, *Chr. Doct. of Immort.* 379; Stevens, *Theol. of NT*, 102; Butler, *Serm.* x. 'Upon Self-Deceit'; Mozley, *Univ. Serm.* ii. 'The Pharisees'; Bunyan, *Grace Abounding*; *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times.*] iii. [1891-1892] 49, 215, 240, 555, xi. [1899] 1, 49; *Expositor*, ii. iii. [1882] 321.

J. C. Lambert.

Upper Room

UPPER ROOM

1. The words 'guest-chamber' and 'upper room.'—(1) *Guest-chamber* (κατάλυμα). In the LXX Septuagint κατάλυμα denotes (a) an inn or lodging-place: Exo_4:24, Sir_14:25, Jer_14:8; (b) a dwelling-place in general: Exo_15:13, Jer_32:24, (= Jer_25:38), Jer_40:12, (= Jer_33:12), Eze_23:21, 1Ma_3:45; (c) a chamber connected with a sanctuary or the Temple: 1 K (= 1 S) 1Ki_1:18; 1Ki_9:22, 1Ch_28:13, being in one case the room where the sacrificial meal was eaten, 1 K (= 1 S) 1Ki_9:22; (d) a tent: 2 K (=2 S) 2Ki_7:6; (e) the tabernacle: 1Ch_17:5 (not B). In the NT κατάλυμα occurs only in Luk_2:7 (inn, or possibly guest-chamber) and Mar_14:14, Luk_22:11 (apparently guest-chamber). The best Manuscripts of Vulgate have *diversorio* in Luk_2:7; *refectiomea* (also in *bfi*) in Mar_14:14, *diversorium* in Luk_22:11. Of other Lat. Manuscripts (besides differences of spelling, —*divor.*, *dever.*), in Luk_2:7 *e* has *stabu.*; in Mar_14:14 X* [Note: The signs here used are those adopted in Wordsworth and White's edition of the Vulgate, and Old Latin Biblical Texts. See also Hastings' DB

iii. 47-62, iv. 873-890.] *q* have *diversorium meum*, *Z* has *diversorium meum refectio mea*, *BHΘ* *Mt O* have *diversorium meum et refectio mea*, *ff2* has *refectorium*, *k* has *hospitium*; in Luk 22:11 *e f r* have *hospitium*, *a* has *refectio*, *l* has *locus*.* [Note: The signs here used are those adopted in Wordsworth and White's edition of the Vulgate, and Old Latin Biblical Texts. See also Hastings' DB iii. 47-62, iv. 873-890.]

(2) *Upper room* (ἀνάγαιον in best Manuscripts : other Manuscripts have ἀνόγαιον, ἀνω γέων, ἀνωγέως, ἀνώγαιον, ἀνώγεον).

In the LXX Septuagint ἀνάγαιον does not occur in any form, ὑπερῶνον occurs twenty-three times, apparently always in the sense of upper room. In the NT ἀνάγαιον (Textus Receptus ἀνώγεον) occurs only in Mar 14:15, Luk 22:12, ὑπερῶνον occurs only in Act 1:13; Act 9:37; Act 9:39; Act 20:8, both words in the sense of upper room. The best Manuscripts of Vulgate have *cenaculum* for both words in all places. Of other Lat. Manuscripts (besides differences of spelling, —*cacn.*, *cocn.*, *cin.*, *cenn.*), in Mar 14:15 *k* has *sub 'pedaneum' sterranœum* (having apparently first written *subpedaneum*, and then tried to alter it to *sterranœum*), *q* has *locum stratum*, *ff2* has *stratum*; in Luk 22:12 *a* has *mædianum*, *b* has *pede plano locum*, *d* has *superiorem domum*, *q* has *superiorem locum*, *c e ff2 ir* have *in superioribus locum*, *l* has *in superioribus*; in Act 1:13 *degig* Manuscripts used by St. Augustine (*Adv. Fel. Man.* i. 4; *De unit. eccl.* 27) have *superiora*, *G^{rec} Θ p. 2 tepl* have *cum introissent in cenaculum ascenderunt in superiora* (combining *cenaculum* with *superiora*: see Wordsworth and White's note on Act 1:13 in their edition of Vulgate); in Act 9:37 *m* has *superiori cœnaculo*, *p* has *superioribus*; in 9:39 *m* has *superiora cœnaculi*, *e p* have *superioribus*; in 20:8 *d* has *superioribus*.

2. Events in the upper room.—(1) The Last Supper (wh. see): Mar 14:17, Mat 26:20, Luk 22:14; (2) the washing of the Apostles' feet and subsequent discourse: Joh 13:2-20; (3) the prophecy of the betrayal of our Lord by Judas: Mar 14:18-21, Mat 26:21-25, Luk 22:21-23, Joh 13:21-35; (4) the Institution of the Eucharist: 1Co 11:23-25, Mar 14:22-25, Mat 26:26-29, Luk 22:19-20 (see Lord's Supper); (5) the prophecy of the denial of our Lord by St. Peter and subsequent discourse: Luk 22:31-38, Joh 13:36-38; cf. Mar 14:27-31, Mat 26:31-35, where such a prophecy—either that here recorded or a repetition of it—is placed after the departure from the upper room; (6) discourse: John 14; (7) the departure from the upper room: Mar 14:26, Mat 26:30, Luk 22:39, Joh 14:21.

It is possible that the room in an unspecified house in Jerusalem where the disciples met after the Resurrection (Mar 16:14, Luk 24:33; Luk 24:36, Joh 20:19; Joh 20:26),

and ‘the upper chamber (ὑπερῶον) where they were abiding’ after the Ascension (Act 1:13), were the same as the ‘upper room’ (ἀνάγαιον) in which the above events took place; and that this, again, was in ‘the house of Mary the mother of John whose surname was Mark’ (Act 12:12). ‘The combinations are quite legitimate, and only give unity and compactness to the history, if we suppose that the house of Mary and her son was the one central meeting-place of the Church of Jerusalem throughout the Apostolic age’ (Sanday, *Sacred Sites*, p. 83). At the same time, there is no positive evidence in the NT for identifying the ἀνάγαιον of Mar 14:15, Luk 22:12 with the ὑπερῶον of Act 1:13, or for placing it in the house of Mary the mother of John.

3. Places at table in the upper room.—There is some probability in the suggestion (Edersheim, *LT [Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].]* ii. 494-95) that our Lord occupied the place of the host, that St. John was on His right hand, Judas in the place of honour on His left hand, and St. Peter in the least honourable place opposite St. John.

Such an arrangement would account for (1) our Lord telling St. John by what sign to know the traitor without the rest hearing, Joh 13:26; (2) the giving of the ‘sop’ first to Judas, Joh 13:26, Mar 14:20, Mat 26:23; (3) the inquiry of Judas whether he was the traitor, and our Lord’s reply without the rest hearing the latter, Mat 26:25, Joh 13:27-30; (4) the beckoning of St. Peter to St. John, and St. Peter’s request that St. John should ask our Lord who was the traitor, Joh 13:23-24; (5) the possibility that in the ‘contention’ among the Apostles (Luk 22:24), if this took place in connexion with the Supper and before it, Judas claimed and obtained the chief place; (6) the possibility that after our Lord’s rebuke of the ‘contention’ (Luk 22:25-30), St. Peter eagerly seized on the lowest place.

4. The identification of the site.—It is thought by many good judges that the traditional site of the *cenaculum* (the present building dates from the 14th cent.) is probably the place where the upper room stood. Dr. Sanday (p. 77) writes, ‘I believe that of all the most sacred sites it is the one that has the strongest evidence in its favour. Indeed, the evidence for it appears to me so strong that, for my own part, I think that I should be prepared to give it an unqualified adhesion.’ The most interesting testimonies in the tradition are the following:

St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.* (a.d. 348) xvi. 4: ‘The Holy Ghost, who spake in the prophets and on the Day of Pentecost, came down on the Apostles in the form of fiery tongues here in Jerusalem, in the upper church of the Apostles; for with us are the most valuable privileges of all. Here Christ came down from heaven. Here the Holy Ghost came down from heaven. And truly it is most fitting that, as we speak of Christ

and Golgotha here in Golgotha, so also we should speak of the Holy Ghost in the upper church. But, since He who came down there shares in the glory of Him who was crucified here, we speak here of Him who came down there, for the worship of Them is indivisible.’

Silvia (or Etheria), *Peregrinatio* (c. [Note: circa, about.] 385 a.d.), 39-43: At Easter ‘all the people conduct the bishop with hymns to Sion. When they have come there, suitable hymns for the day and place are said, prayer is made, and that passage from the Gospel is read in which, on the same day, in the same place where the church itself in Sion now is, the Lord came in to the disciples when the doors were shut, that is, when one of the disciples, namely, Thomas, was not there.’ On the octave of the Resurrection ‘all the people conduct the bishop with hymns to Sion. When they have come there, suitable hymns for the place and day are said, and that passage from the Gospel is read in which, eight days after the Resurrection, the Lord came in where the disciples were, and rebuked Thomas for his want of belief.’ At Pentecost ‘all the people conduct the bishop with hymns to Sion, so that they may be in Sion at the third hour. When they have come there, that passage from the Acts of the Apostles is read in which the Spirit descends.... In Sion is the very place, though there is a new church, where of old after the passion of the Lord the multitude was gathered together with the Apostles.’

Epiphanius, *de Mens. et Pond.* (a.d. 392) 14: ‘Hadrian’ ‘found the whole city [Jerusalem] razed to the ground, and the temple of God trodden under foot, except for a few buildings and the little church of God. It was there that the disciples, on their return when the Saviour had ascended from the Mount of Olives, went up into the upper chamber (τὸ ὑπερῶον); for on that site had it been built.’ (If Epiphanius possessed accurate information, this statement carries back the tradition about the site to the reign of Hadrian, a.d. 117-138).

Lucian of Caphargamala, near Jerusalem, *Ep. de revel. corp. Steph.* 8, after describing the discovery of the relics of St. Stephen (a.d. 415): ‘Then, with psalms and hymns, they carried the relics of the most blessed Stephen to the holy church of Sion, where also the Archdeacon had been ordained.’ Cf. *Breviarium Romanum*, lect. v. for August 3; *Breviarium Ambrosianum*, lect. iii. for August 3.

Theodosius, *De situ terræ sanctæ* (a.d. 530), 7: ‘Sion, which is the mother of all churches, which our Lord Christ founded with the Apostles. It was the house of holy Mark the Evangelist.’

Liturgy of St. James (Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, i. 53, 54): ‘Thy all-holy Spirit,’ ‘who came down on Thy holy Apostles in the form of fiery tongues in

the upper chamber (ἐν τῷ ὑπερώῳ) of the holy and glorious Sion on the Day of the holy Pentecost.’ ‘We offer unto Thee, O Lord, also for Thy holy places, which Thou didst glorify with the manifestation of Thy Christ and the descent of Thy all-holy Spirit, especially for the holy and glorious Sion, the mother of all churches.’

Hippolytus of Thebes, *Chronicle*, (usually assigned to 10th cent., but perhaps of 7th cent.): ‘This is John, whom the Lord loved, the virgin and evangelist, who remained at Jerusalem, the mother of the churches, at his own house, to which the Apostles fled in fear of the Jews. There also was prepared the Passover. There also the first mystery was consecrated for the disciples. There also the Lord appeared to them after the resurrection. There also He showed the prints of the nails to Thomas. There the Apostles ordained as first bishop the son of Joseph, the brother of the Lord.... He [John] received the all-holy Mother of God (Θεοτόκον) in his house until her assumption (μεχρὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτῆς).’

See also the plan, identifying the place of the Last Supper, of the descent of the Holy Ghost, and of the death of the Blessed Virgin, left by Bishop Arculf, who visited Jerusalem in a.d. 685, with Adamnan at Iona, and reproduced in Adamnan, *De locis sanctis*, of which reproduction there is a facsimile in vol. xxxviii. of the *Vienna Corpus Script. Eccl. Lat.* p. 244.

Literature.—Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 482-519; Le Camus in Vigouroux, *Dict. de la Bible*, ii. 399-403; Zahn, ‘Die Dormitio Sanctae Virginis und das Haus des Johannes Markus’ in *NKZ* [Note: *KZ Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift.*], vol. x.; Mommert. *Die Dormitio und das deutsche Grundstück auf dem traditionellen Zion*; Sanday, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, pp. 77-88; J. Watson. *The Upper Room* (1895); J. Telford, *The Story of the Upper Room* (1905); D. M. M’Intyre, *The Upper Room Company* (1906).

Darwell Stone.

☩ Uriah

URIAH.—The Hittite ([Mat 1:6](#)).

☩ Usury

USURY.—See Interest.

☞ **Uzziah**

UZZIAH.—A king of Judah, named as a link in our Lord’s genealogy (Mat 1:8).

☞ **Vain**

VAIN.—1. ‘In vain’: Mar 7:7 (|| Mat 15:9) μάτην δὲ σέβονται με διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων. This is the only place in NT where the adverb μάτην is found (orig. accus. from μάτη, ‘a folly’). The Vulgate has *in vanum* in Mk., *sine causa* (= ‘without reason,’ Cic.) in Mt. Both senses are perhaps included: their worship was ‘meaningless’ and ‘to no purpose’ (cf. Jam 1:26 μάταιος θρησκεία, with Mayor’s [*Com. on James*, 71] apt quotation from Isocrates, *ad Nicoclen* 18 E, ἡγοῦ θῦμα τοῦτο κάλλιστον εἶναι καὶ θεραπείαν μεγίστην ἐὰν ὡς βέλτιστον καὶ δικαιότατον σαυτὸν παρέρχῃς).—Our Lord quotes here from Isa 29:13, where LXX Septuagint reads μάτην δὲ σέβονται με διδάσκοντες ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων καὶ διδασκαλίας. The clause in the Heb. text may be literally rendered, ‘And their fearing me is become (יִהְיֶה) a statute of men which they have learned.’ How to account for μάτην in the Gr. text is a question still unsolved. Grotius (*Opera*, ed. Amsterdam, 1679, ii. 155) thought it evident that the LXX Septuagint read יִהְיֶה (= μάτην, cf. Isa 49:4) and not יִהְיֶה in the Heb. text, so that the clause would then have meant, ‘And their fearing me *is vain*—a statute of men which they have learned!’ This brilliant emendation of the text is adopted by Turpie (*OT in the New* (1868), 196) and Nestle (*Expos. Times*, xi. 330). It is quite possible that our Lord ‘read יִהְיֶה in His Hebrew scroll of Isaiah,’ and that this was the received reading at the time that the Gospels were written. Such a solution of the difficulty would indeed be completely satisfying, but we must remember that the proposed reading is merely a conjectural one, and that no external evidence in its favour has been found. Other suggested explanations of the μάτην in the Gospels are, that our Lord used the LXX Septuagint and quoted from it, or that in reporting His answer to the Pharisees the writer or writers quoted *memoriter* from the LXX Septuagint (it will be observed that the order of the last words is not the same in

the LXX Septuagint and in the Gospels). The latter explanation is the one generally preferred by expositors, some of whom assign reasons still more unsatisfying for the presence of μάτην. But seeing that it cannot be proved that our Lord did not use an Aramaic word corresponding to μάτην in quoting the passage from Isaiah, we feel it best to accept the μάτην as stamped with His authority.—Our Lord by this citation authenticates and carries forward the teaching of the prophets of the OT as to the vanity of that worship which merely conformed to human traditions, and by which it was thought possible to gain the favour of God without moral obedience (cf. W. R. Smith, *OTJC* [Note: *TJC The Old Test, in the Jewish Church*] 293-295; Driver, *Is.* 57; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, i. 282).

2. 'To use vain repetitions': Mat 6:7 προσευχόμενοι δὲ μὴ βαπτολογήσητε ὡπερ οἱ ἔθνηκοί. Mrs. A. S. Lewis (*Expos. Times*, xii. 60) approves of the derivation of βαπτολογέω from the Arabic *b'tal*, 'vain,' 'useless,' recently suggested by Blass. 'It is one of those hybrid compounds which come into existence in countries where two or more languages are spoken.' But it is more probable that the word is onomatopoeic (like βραβραβρίζω, see Stephanus, *Thesaurus*, s.v.), and is derived from the sound made by the repetition of the same syllable in stammering or stuttering. Our Lord gives the interpretation of the word in the clause following, 'For they think that they shall be heard for their πολυλογία.' (cf. Meyer, Holtzmann, *in loc*). What He here condemns is the heathenish idea that a reluctant and ungracious Deity is to be worked upon by our saying the same thing over and over again (cf. 1Ki 18:26), or by repeating His honours and titles (cf. Act 19:34). In the words ὡπερ οἱ ἔθνηκοί He calls up a picture of those whom His hearers have no desire to resemble (*Expositor*, 1900 (i.), 239). 'Pestering the gods with entreaties,' 'dinning into the ears of the gods,' were Roman phrases: thus Tacitus speaks of Galba 'wearying with entreaties the gods of an empire no longer his' (*Hist.* i. 29); cf. Statius, *Thebais*, 2. 224, 'Superos in vota fatigant Inachidae'; Ter. *Heaut.* v. 1. 6, 'Desiste, inquam, deos obtundere.' Such expressions set forth the contrast between Jesus' teaching of the Divine Fatherhood and the low conceptions about God on which the prayers of the heathen were founded, and give point to the precept, 'Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of before ye ask him' (Mat 6:8).

That our Lord's prohibition of βαπτολογία is not meant to exclude such prolonged and repeated prayers as are genuine utterances of love and desire, the impassioned pressing-in of the devout spirit into communion with God, is evident from His enjoining increasing earnestness (Mat 7:7-11, Luk 11:9-13) and persevering

importunity (Luk_11:5 ff; Luk_18:1 ff.) in prayer, as well as from His own example, when He sought relief from the weight and pressure of His work and ‘continued all night in prayer to God’ (Luk_6:12), or when He ‘offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death’ (Heb_5:7), satisfying the fervour of His feeling of Sonship with the cry, ‘Abba, Father,’ and returning to His oratory in the depth of the Garden to offer the same prayer as before (Mar_14:39 (Mat_26:44) τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπὼν, ‘the same petition,’ rather than ‘the same words’; cf. Swete, 327). Our Lord’s prayers were the beginning of His ever-continuing intercession (Rom_8:34, Heb_7:25), and in the one instance reported of a prayer of considerable length which He offered as His disciples stood around Him (John 17) there is a repetition of the same expressions. With respect to the perfect form of words which He taught us in the Lord’s Prayer (wh. see), it is by our repeating it often that we come to understand its real depth, and how all our requests are to be brought under one or other of its petitions; and when we have not said it well, we should try to say it better a second or a third time. The true sense of our Lord’s saying is set forth in one of Bp. Wilson’s ‘Maxims of Piety’: ‘The eloquence of prayer consists in our proposing our wants to God in a plain manner’ (*Maxims*, 132), and still better by Hooker in the words, ‘The thing which God doth regard is how virtuous our minds are, and not how copious our tongues in prayer; how well we think, and not how long we talk, when we come to present our supplications before Him’ (*Eccles. Pol.* v. 32. 1); cf. Augustine’s letter to Proba, quoted by Trench (*Ser. on the Mount*, 255).

Literature.—Grotius, *Com, on the Gospels; Expos. Times*, xi, xii, *ut sup.*; Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance to the LXX Septuagint* .

James Donald.

☞ Veil

VEIL.—‘The veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom’ when Jesus died (Mat_27:51, Mar_15:38, Luk_23:45). The Temple is, of course, the Temple of Herod, and the veil is, the ‘second veil’ (Heb_9:3) which divided the הַיְבֵל or Holy Place from the הַקְּדֹשִׁים or Holy of Holies. This is the only reference to the veil of the Temple in the NT, that in Hebrews being to the veil of the Tabernacle. The Greek words are τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ. In the LXX Septuagint ναός = הַיְבֵל in Psa_28:2 and κατ. = (1) מִסְכָּה, the curtain before the door of the Holy Place and before the gate

of the fore-court in the Tabernacle; and (2) פֶּרֶקֶה, the curtain between the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies (similarly Philo, *Vita Moysis*, iii. 5). The Gospel according to the Hebrews, as quoted by Jerome, had in the above passage ‘lintel’ instead of ‘veil’ (‘superliminare templi infinitae magnitudinae fractum esse atque divisum’). It is asserted that in the Temple of Solomon there was no veil, since it is mentioned only in 2Ch 3:14; but Thenius’ emendation of 1Ki 6:21 ‘drew the veil across with golden chains’ is good. In the Mishna the veil of the sanctuary is presupposed, e.g. in *Yoma* v. 1, where the mention of the ark shows that the writer is thinking of the Temple of Solomon. Josephus (*BJ* v. v. 4) mentions a gorgeously embroidered veil before the הַיָּבֵל, and a second veil, which he does not describe, in front of the הַכִּיָּר of the Temple as he knew it.

A difficulty is occasioned by the fact that there appear to have been in Herod’s Temple not one but two veils between the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies, each representing a surface of the wall one cubit thick, which in Solomon’s Temple separated the two places. In *Yoma* v. 1 the high priest on the Day of Atonement leaves the Holy Place by the south end of the outer veil, walks northwards down the cubit space between the two veils, and enters the sanctuary by the north end of the inner veil. This cubit space is in *Middoth* iv. 7 called מֵרֶקֶסִין, that is, τὰ ραξίς, because in the first Temple it was filled with the wall, and the builders of the second did not know whether to reckon the space as belonging to the Holy Place or to the Holy of Holies. According to another account, there was only a single veil. In any case *the* veil would mean the outer one, which alone was visible to any except the priests. The Kaabah in Mecca has also a veil over its door.

The rending of the veil of the Temple would indicate the end of its sanctity, just as the tearing of a woman’s veil means dishonouring her (Hamasa, *Freytag*, i. 141).

It is a curious fact that Jewish tradition also records the occurrence of certain prodigies about this time. Josephus (*BJ* vi. v. 3) enumerates several portents which presaged the destruction of the Temple: a sword appeared suspended over the city, a heifer about to be sacrificed brought forth a lamb, and the brazen gate opened of its own accord. Lightfoot (*Prospect of the Temple*, xx. 1 [Pitman’s ed. ix. 329]) says: ‘There are three remarkable things, which the Jews do date from forty years before the destruction of the Temple—namely this of the Temple-doors’ opening of themselves, and the Sanhedrin’s flitting from the room Gazith, and the scarlet list on the scapegoat’s head not turning white.’ Compare Plutarch’s account of the prodigies which foreshadowed the murder of Caesar.

In Heb 10:20 the veil of the Tabernacle is interpreted as symbolizing the corporeal nature of Christ, and in later mysticism phenomenal existence is termed ‘the veil.’ In

2Co 3:12 ff. the veil (κάλυμμα) which Moses put on (Exo 34:33 πῶς, LXX Septuagint κάλυμμα) becomes the spiritual blindness of the Jewish nation, probably without any reference to Is 25:7, where the words are different. The veil on Israel's heart is 'done away in Christ' (ἐν Χριστῷ καταργεῖται).

Literature.—Grimm-Thayer, *Lex. s.v. κατατέτασμα*; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Veil'; Edersheim, *LT [Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].]* ii. 610 ff.

T. H. Weir.

⚡ Vengeance

VENGEANCE.—The word 'vengeance' (ἐκδίκησις) occurs in Authorized and Revised Versions of the Gospels only in Luk 21:22, where it refers to God's providential punishment of sin. ἐκδίκησις occurs also in the phrase ποιεῖν ἐκδίκησιν (Authorized and Revised Versions 'avenge') in the parable of the Unjust Judge (Luk 18:7-8), and the corresponding verb ἐκδικέω (also rendered 'avenge'; cf. (Revised Version margin) 'do me justice of') is found in the same parable (Luk 18:3; Luk 18:5). Outside the Gospels these words and the cognate ἔκδικος occur exactly a dozen times. Some of the passages will call for reference in the course of this article. We are not left, however, to the very rare use of this small group of words for our Lord's teaching on vengeance. We gather it from several passages of direct instruction, from His continual insistence on an unvengeful, a forgiving, loving spirit, and from His own conduct throughout His ministry, but especially at its close.

Our word 'vengeance' is closely related to two others,—'avenge' and 'revenge,'—between which, at least in modern usage, an important distinction is made. Both have to do with the redress of wrong. In 'avenge' the idea of the justice of the redress or punishment is prominent. In 'revenge,' on the other hand, the predominant thought is that of the infliction of punishment or pain, not necessarily unjust, for the gratification of resentful or malicious feelings (note, e.g., in Jer 15:15 the substitution in Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 of 'avenge' for Authorized Version 'revenge,' and on the other hand the retention of 'avenge' in Rom 12:19). 'Vengeance' leans, now to the one, now to the other of these meanings. It may be just, it may be malicious; even when it is just, the motive may be wrong.

1. The aim of Christ was to create in His disciples a new attitude towards those who had wronged them. Evidently He was preparing them, at least in part, for injuries that must come to them as His followers (Mat 5:10 ff.); but His teaching has, of course, a much wider application. The permission, even encouragement, of retaliation by the OT, and still more the interpretations, exaggerations, limitations of the scribes and Pharisees, Christ swept away with an authority which astounded His hearers. He denounced the attitude of retaliation and hatred, and commanded His disciples to accept the sufferings which fell to their lot. But this was more than a demand for a new attitude. It was the exorcizing of an evil spirit, and the opening of the doors of the heart to a new spirit. An attitude may be merely external and mechanical. Christ wants more. The negative must have a corresponding positive or be morally worthless. Forgiveness and benevolence must take the place of vengeance; love, not hatred, must be the motive of thought and act. 'Enemy' must be blotted out of the vocabulary of the follower of Christ, at least as a category in which any of his fellow-men may be included. Others may hate and persecute him; he must love and pray for them, and do them good. It is this new spirit that is the supreme moral difficulty; it is here that all questions of interpretation and application must find their solution. We must remember, not only Christ's 'resist not,' but also His 'pray for,' and His 'love.'

This teaching of Christ is found constantly throughout the Gospels. He pronounced 'blessed' the meek, the merciful, the peacemakers, the persecuted (Mat 5:5; Mat 5:7; Mat 5:9-10 ff.). He rebuked James and John when they would have called down fire from heaven on the Samaritan village that would not receive Him (Luk 9:51 ff.). He taught His disciples to forgive a sinning but penitent brother, not with a niggard, but with a generous and inexhaustible forgiveness (Luk 17:3 f., cf. Mat 18:21 ff.). He even makes God's forgiveness of a man depend on the man's forgiveness of his fellow (Mat 6:14; Mat 18:35, Mar 11:25 f.). He taught His disciples to pray that they might be forgiven as they forgave others (Mat 6:12, Luk 11:4). He warned the Twelve, as He sent them out on their mission (Matthew 10), that they would suffer hatred, persecution, even death, for His sake; and charged them to be, in the midst of wolves, 'wise as serpents and harmless as doves' (Mat 10:16), in the endurance of their sufferings to have no fear, but to rely on God.

2. His own conduct during His ministry is the best commentary on His teaching. It is true that there is much denunciation of evil (e.g. Matthew 23), that He upbraided for their unbelief the cities where He had wrought His great miracles (Mat 11:20 ff. ||), that He swept the Temple clear of those who had robbed it of its sanctity (Joh 2:14 ff., Mat 21:12 ff. ||). But these are echoes of the Divine wrath; they are not in any single instance the expression of personal anger, of retaliation, of hatred. On the other hand, we have His patient endurance of all manner of personal abuse, His heart-broken lament over Jerusalem (Mat 23:37 ||), His bearing during and after His

trial (Matthew 26, 27), and above all, His prayer on the cross: ‘Father, forgive them: for they know not what they do’ (Luk_23:34).

3. This teaching of Christ, forbidding vengeance, requiring forgiveness and love, is built on a firm religious basis. His aim as a religious Teacher, as the Sent of God, was to renew the sin-broken fellowship between men and God, to make men sons of God; but the indispensable condition of sonship is unity of nature. The essence of the Divine nature is love, and the highest manifestation of the Divine love is forgiveness and benevolence. The spirit of malevolence, of retaliation, of vindictive dealing with men, is alien to the spirit of God. Therefore it must be banned out of the heart of those who would be sons of God, and replaced by the spirit of forgiveness, of ungrudging love. It is this conception of the essential love of God issuing in forgiveness, in love, that is the basis of the high demands of Christ, and the inspiration and possibility of our response (Mat_5:43-45; Mat_5:48; Mat_18:23-35, Luk_6:35. Note, also, how Christ links the Second Commandment to the First as ‘like unto it,’ Mat_22:39 | |).

4. If the teaching of Christ seem at first sight impracticable, destructive of moral order, and delivering wrong-doers from the fear of punishment, the answer to these objections is not far to seek. In the first place, liberation from the spirit of vengeance is a moral triumph for the sufferer of wrong. Revenge is evil. It belongs at best to a lower stage of morality and of the knowledge of God. It cannot justify itself to those who have seen God in the face of Jesus Christ. The sons of God must be like the Son of God, like God Himself, who loves and forgives without limit. Further, love is the most potent moral force that the world has ever known. To meet wrong with revenge may be a satisfaction, and may seem a right thing to the natural man. Vengeance may accomplish its object, may fully punish and even crush the wrong-doer. But it does not conquer him, it does not crush the wrong out of his heart, it does not make him ashamed of his sin, it does not win him to good and to God. Love does—not always indeed, but often—and nothing else can. Love is a heaping of coals of fire on an enemy’s head (Rom_12:20), the kindling of a burning shame in his heart, the overcoming of evil with good, the triumph of God. See art. Retaliation.

5. There is a further and a very solemn strain in the teaching of Christ, in which we find the final answer to the fear that moral anarchy may arise from the exorcism of the spirit of vengeance. The clearest expression of it is found outside the Gospels (Rom_12:19): ‘Avenge not yourselves, beloved, but give place unto wrath [τῆ ὀργῆ, *the wrath, the wrath of God*]: for it is written, Vengeance belongeth unto me; I will recompense, saith the Lord.’ To avenge ourselves is to assume the prerogative of God. So Christ teaches, e.g., in the parable of the Unjust Judge: ‘Shall not God avenge his own elect?... I say unto you, that he will avenge them speedily’ (Luk_18:7

f.). It is in this light that we must read all Christ's words of denunciation, His parables of Judgment, His judicial acts (such as the cleansing of the Temple), His lament over impenitent Jerusalem. 'It shall be more tolerable ... *in the day of judgment*' (Mat 10:15; cf. Mat 10:33; Mat 11:20 ff; Mat 12:36 f., Mat 16:3 f., Joh 8:44). The moral order of the world will be vindicated by Him whose right alone it is to mete out vengeance to evildoers, who alone has adequate knowledge and wisdom to do justice to sin.

It would, of course, be easy to hold this teaching of Christ in a wrong spirit, to cherish a sense of satisfaction that, even if we may not avenge ourselves, yet vengeance is certainly in store for wrong-doers. This would be entirely contrary to the spirit of Christ. It would be the old evil spirit of vengeance in a new form, a more subtle and therefore a worse form. It would mean an utter absence of the love which Christ inculcates, which desires and prays for the good of the enemy. It would be the conquest of ourselves by evil, not of the evil in others by good. But, on the other hand, the moral sense which God has implanted in us, and which He has strengthened by His revelation of Himself, could not rest satisfied unless it were assured that evil shall not go unpunished, that unrepented wrong shall receive its due reward from an all-wise and, let us add, an all-loving God.

Literature.—Grimm-Thayer, *Lex. s. vv.*; *EGT* [Note: *GT Expositor's Greek Testament.*] , *ad locc. cit.*; Maclaren, *Expositions of Holy Scripture*, 'Matthew'; Tholuck, *Com. on Sermon on the Mount*; Goebel, *Parables*; Sanday-Headlam, *Romans*; Moule, *Romans*; Stevens, *Teaching of Jesus*; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible , artt. 'Anger (Wrath) of God,' 'Avenge,' 'Ethics,' 'Forgiveness,' 'Goel'; *JE* [Note: *E Jewish Encyclopedia.*] , artt. 'Forgiveness,' 'Goel,' 'Retaliation.'

Charles S. Macalpine.

☞ Verily

VERILY.—A formula of asseveration or corroboration.

The Hebrew is **אֱמֶנֶן**, and, while it is translated in the OT by the LXX Septuagint into **γένοιτο** (cf. Psa 72:19) or **ἀληθῶς** (cf. Jer 28:6), and by Aquila into **πεπιστωμενως**, it is simply transliterated by the NT writers, except St. Luke, who, in deference to his Gentile readers, gives **ἀληθῶς** in three instances where the parallels have **ἀμήν** (Luk 9:27 = Mat 16:28 = Mar 9:1; Luk 12:44 = Mat 24:47; Luk 21:3 = Mar 12:43).

According to R. Judah ben Sima, the formula had three uses: (1) in swearing (cf. Num 5:22), (2) in accepting (cf. Deu 27:15), and (3) in expressing confidence (cf. 1Ki 1:36).* [Note: Wetstein on Mat 6:13.] When a Rabbi would add impressiveness to a doctrine, he prefaced it with *Amen*, ‘Verily,’ signifying that it was a tradition received by Moses on Sinai.† [Note: Lightfoot on Mat 5:18.] The congregation responded *Amen* to the prayers in the synagogue, a usage which passed into the Christian *ecclesia*;‡ [Note: 1Co 14:16; Aug. de Catech. Rud. § 13.] and the Talmud warns against ‘an orphan *Amen*,’ meaning one uttered without consideration, or in ignorance whereto the response is being made.§ [Note: Lightfoot on 1Co 14:16.]

It is somewhat unfortunate that, where it is an asseverative preface, our versions have translated ἀμήν by ‘verily,’ and, where it is a liturgical response, have simply transliterated it. Let it be understood that the word is the same in both cases. See art. Amen.

Jesus, like the Rabbis, was accustomed, by way of bespeaking His hearers’ attention, to preface important declarations with *Amen*, ‘Verily.’ || [Note: | Aug. in Joan. Ev. Tract xli. § 3: ‘Multum commendat quod ita pronuntiat; quodammodo, si dici fas est, juratio ejus est, Amen, amen dico vobis.’] All our Evangelists represent Him as doing so; but whereas the Synoptists put on His lips a single ‘Verily,’ St. John makes Him in every instance reduplicate the formula, saying ‘Verily, verily.’ What is the explanation of this divergence? It is out of the question to suppose that, since the Johannine and the Synoptic *logia* are in no case identical, Jesus may have spoken after both fashions, employing now the single, now the double ‘Verily.’ It does not appear that the latter was in use among the Jews, and it may be assumed that Jesus always spoke according to the Synoptic representation. Lightfoot makes a shrewd and far-reaching comment on Mar 5:41. *Talitha, kûm* means merely “Maiden, arise!” And this is all that Jesus actually said; ‘but in His pronunciation and utterance of these words there flashed forth such authority and commanding energy, that they sounded no less than if He had said: “Maiden, I tell thee, arise.” ’ (Cf. Mat 9:6 with Mar 2:11 = Luk 5:24). May not this be the explanation of St. John’s reduplicated ‘Verily’? Jesus actually used the single formula; but such was the authority of His tone that St. John, reproducing not merely His language but His spirit, reiterated the asseveration, very much as a modern writer might underline the word, or as the Hebrew idiom expressed *plurality* or *magnitude* by repetition; e.g. Gen 14:10 ‘full of pits of asphalt,’ literally ‘pits, pits of asphalt.’ The beloved disciple held every tone, look, and gesture of the Master in reverent remembrance; and when he limned His picture, he was in nowise careful to reproduce details with slavish and pedantic accuracy, but, with the artist’s instinct, sought to catch those subtle and elusive expressions which reveal the true personality. When he reduplicated ‘Verily,’ he designed to make his readers realize the majesty wherewith the Lord spoke and the authority which His words carried.*

[Note: Just. M. Dial. c. Tryph., ed. Sylburg, p. 225 C: δέος γάρ τι ἔχουσιν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ ἱκανοὶ δυσωπῆσαι τοὺς ἐκτρεπομένους τῆς ὀρθῆς ὁδοῦ, ἀνάπαυσις τε ἡδίστη γίνετα ἰ τοῖς ἐκμελετώσιν αὐτούς.]

Literature.—Bruder, *Concord.*, and Grimm-Thayer, *Lex.* s.v. ἀμήν; Hastings, *DB* [Note: *Dictionary of the Bible.*] , art. ‘Amen’; *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times.*] viii. [1896] 100 ff., 190 f., xiii. [1902] 563 ff.; Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, 226 ff.

David Smith.

☩ Vicarious Sacrifice

VICARIOUS SACRIFICE.—The word ‘vicarious’ (*vicarius* from *vicis*, ‘change,’ ‘alteration’) means acting, or suffering, for another, or in the place of another. The idea of change, transfer, or substitution pertains to the term. It has the same root as ‘vice’ in ‘vicegerent,’ ‘viceroy’ or ‘vicar,’ and other words which signify that one person has assumed the place, position, or office of another. It may mean ‘instead of’ (ἀντί), or ‘in behalf of’ (ὑπέρο). The word ‘sacrifice’ (from *sacer*, ‘sacred,’ ‘holy,’ and *facere*, ‘to make’) means something devoted, or offered at a cost; and in the stricter religious sense means something consecrated, or offered to a divinity as an acknowledgment of benefits received, or as a propitiation for favours to be extended. Sacrifice (wh. see) is a somewhat different act in different cults and in different stages of religious development, but has in it the idea of a means of approach to Deity through a material oblation for the purpose of securing His favour. When the service is voluntarily undertaken, or when it is assumed at a cost to the individual and for the sake of another, no personal benefit being expected in return, we have sacrifice which is vicarious. Vicarious sacrifice, therefore, has been appropriately defined as ‘voluntarily assuming the place and entering into the condition of some one for his benefit.’ The two words, ‘vicarious’ and ‘sacrifice,’ add to each other, and together well define a phenomenon which we find occurring in the more advanced religions, and especially in the religion of Christ.

‘Vicarious sacrifice’ is not a Scripture expression, but is used by theologians to represent the meaning of a large number of passages found in the NT, in which the substitutionary character of Jesus’ sufferings are referred to, as, e.g., the one in which Jesus describes the end of His coming as a λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, a ransom for many (Mar_10:45). These passages have generally been held to teach vicarious

sacrifice; but just how the words are to be understood, in what sense the sufferings of Jesus were vicarious, whether we are to consider the terms to mean ‘in behalf of,’ or ‘in the place of,’ whether the vicarious sacrifice was made in the interests of God (Satisfaction theories), or of men (Moral and Sympathy theories), or both (Mediation theories)—these questions have constituted some of the most disputed problems of theology, and have been the ground on which have been developed diverse conceptions which for hundreds of years have agitated the Church. As far as the words ‘Vicarious sacrifice’ are concerned, they can be used in either sense, for Christ’s sacrifice would be vicarious if it were made to propitiate the offended dignity of God, or uphold His justice, or maintain His law, or satisfy the demands of His ethical life, or reveal the content of His ethical nature in a supreme manifestation of saving love. To determine in which sense the words are to be understood, that they may reveal to us the true teachings of Scripture, it is necessary to make a careful study of those passages which they are used to sum up or represent.

In doing this we meet with the following serious difficulties. (1) The lack of unity in the Biblical mode of representation, the view-point of Christ’s work and sufferings being diverse and manifold. (2) The fact that Christ’s work is set forth both by Himself and the Apostles in metaphors and symbols which cannot be given a close logical interpretation. It has been well said, ‘We make a mistake if we take their symbols of thought as equivalents of spiritual realities, or if we treat their sentences as propositions from which we may deduce the uttermost corollaries. Their figures are illustrations, not definitions; their expressions were forced on them by their past thought and experience, and are flung out towards truth as their best means of approximating to it’ (Lewis). (3) While some of the figures are rooted in popular conceptions of religious service and are drawn from the Jewish sacrificial system, others are bold strokes of the imagination, and are capable of various meanings. (4) The different views held of the Jewish sacrificial system from which the NT figures and expressions are drawn constitute a difficulty. Some regard them as close types and symbols of Christ’s work, and give them expiatory value (P. Fairbairn); while others affirm that ‘they disclose no trace of the idea of vicarious substitution, nor of propitiation’ (Westcott). (5) Some texts used singly seem to teach what other texts contradict, showing that they are loose statements, not to be taken with logical exactness; or that they represent phases of a doctrine and not the whole of it, or that they are metaphorical. (6) The fact that there are two ideas of sacrifice in the OT—one of the priests and the other of the prophets; and that Hebrews and Jn. seem to have worked out their ideas on the basis of the Levitical standpoint, while Jesus and St. Paul represent more the ideas of the prophets. (7) The difficulty of freeing ourselves of *a priori* ideas in our interpretations of Scripture, dogmatic conceptions having been planted in our minds in childhood, and become a part of the religious atmosphere in which we move. (8) Finally, the difficulty of getting at the meaning attached to terms among the Palestine Jews of Jesus’ time, such terms, for example,

as ‘ransom,’ redemption,’ ‘propitiation,’ and certain legal expressions. In studying the Scriptures, therefore, to ascertain in what sense we are to understand Christ’s vicarious sacrifice, we are to note the individualism of the expressions, their figurative character, their lack of logical exactness and definition, their relation to their time, and the fact that their authors are concerned with stating facts and results rather than developing theories. We are to interpret the passages in a free and vital rather than in an exact and literal way, note the general impression they make, the essential truth they reveal, and the conception of their meaning which will best harmonize the variant and diverse statements into a consistent unity.

1. The teachings of Jesus in the Synoptics.—Our first source of information concerning the way we are to understand the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus must be His own teachings. Too many have overlooked this and started with the conceptions of St. Paul, as if the human teacher were a clearer witness than He who was Himself the revelation. If there is any squaring to do, St. Paul must be squared with Jesus, not Jesus with St. Paul, for the Master did not preach a partial gospel. As we study His sayings concerning His sacrifice, we note that He regards it as necessary, voluntary, vicarious, and redemptive, and that He relates it (1) to the establishment of the Kingdom, (2) to the remission of sins, (3) to the ratifying of the covenant. (1) Jesus considers His vicarious sacrifice as necessarily involved in His work of establishing His Kingdom. He opened His ministry with the announcement, ‘The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand’ (Mar 1:15, cf. Mat 4:17). The Kingdom of God was not the ‘politico-ethical commonwealth’ (Pfleiderer) which Jewish prophecy had described, but a spiritual society, established by the grace of God, of righteous men having fellowship with one another and with a common Father. To the founding of His Kingdom He devoted Himself with singleness of heart, understanding well the hazard it involved; for He realized the traditionalism of the age, its formalism, its lack of spiritual vision, its worldly lust and ambition, and He knew full well the opposition He would stimulate and the conflicts He must encounter. The history of the prophets was before Him, and the blood of the martyrs cried to Him from the ground. Even Plato was able to perceive ‘that one perfectly just could not appear among the senseless and wicked without provoking a murderous hatred.’ The law of righteousness, fundamental in His Kingdom, would, He knew, cut across the self-interests of men, as well as the conservatism of the Rabbinical teachers of the day. Consequently He compares Himself to the good shepherd who lays down his life for the sheep, and states the terms of His discipleship as follows: ‘If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me’ (Luk 9:23). Nor did He mistake the facts, for early in His career the antagonism developed which increased in intensity until it culminated in the Crucifixion. Only by a denial of His vocation in establishing the Kingdom of God could He have saved His life; only by what was impossible with Him—the forgetting of the will of God and the ceasing to love men. Thus we see that vicarious sacrifice was necessarily involved in His work of establishing His Kingdom,

and in this sense was not singular or exceptional, but came under the general law of service. 'Whatever more is to be said as to the significance of Christ's death, this at least is certain, that he died as a faithful martyr for truth and love' (Bruce).

(2) There seems, however, to be something deeper in Jesus' consciousness than the mere fact that His work of founding His Kingdom will so cross the world-spirit of selfishness and sin that He will develop an antagonism which will end in His vicarious death. He clearly relates it to the fact of *remission of sins*. In Luk 22:37 there is a deeper thought than Hollmann has in mind when he says: 'He is only thinking of the dreary fact that His countrymen are going to treat Him as a criminal instead of as the Holy One of God,' for this passage was associated in the minds of His hearers with a Messianic work of the greatest significance. Stronger statements are found in Mar 10:32-33 ff. Jesus is going with His disciples to Jerusalem, and on the way seeks to impress them with what He has stated very earnestly before, that in Jerusalem He will be delivered to mockery and death, but in three days will rise again. This announcement is followed by the ambitious request of James and John for chief seats in His Kingdom. With His mind filled with the thought of His coming passion, He replies to them, 'Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink the cup which I drink, or be baptized with the baptism with which I am baptized?' Then follows in an address to the disciples, who are indignant at James' and John's request, the notable words, 'For the Son of Man also came not to be ministered to, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.' The correct interpretation of this passage is most important, for it is much emphasized by those who seek to find in Jesus' teaching an expiatory reference.

Dr. Baur and others have questioned its integrity, affirming that there is nothing like it in the Synoptics except Mat 20:28, which Baur also casts under suspicion, that it is introduced so abruptly as to be questionable, and that it has a Pauline flavour, and it genuine, would not have been omitted by Luke. The criticism, however, seems scarcely valid, for in speaking to the disciples about the nature of greatness—that its value lies in service—it was natural that Jesus should allude to His expected death of which He had previously spoken, using it as an illustration of the point He was enforcing.

The passage has had various interpretations. Usually much weight has been attached to the word *λύτρον*, 'ransom,' and its Heb. equivalents, these being assumed to fix its meaning; but this is unsatisfactory, for the LXX Septuagint has employed *λύτρον* to translate four different Heb. terms, and besides, since Jesus spoke Aramaic, it is not certain that *λύτρον*, in the way the LXX Septuagint uses it, exactly represents what Jesus said. If an exact interpretation were required, we should have to know the

Aramaic word of which λύτρον is the translation. Hollmann has discussed this term cogently and ably, showing that Jesus probably did not use the Aram, cognate of *kôpher*, but the equivalent of a Heb. word derived either from פָּדָה 'to ransom,' נָצַל 'to deliver,' or פָּרַק 'to set free.' Thus λύτρον would mean a, purchase price, or a means of setting free. In this case ἀντί, of which much is made, would not signify 'in place of' and establish a thought of substitution, but 'for,' and the passage would mean that Jesus would give His life for the freeing or saving of many—an interpretation which would fit in with the context much better than if λύτρον is taken as the equivalent of *kôpher*. The idea would then be that men of the world find greatness in assuming superiority over others, whereas Jesus finds it in serving others. But if we assume that λύτρον means in this passage what it means in the LXX Septuagint translation of Leviticus, where the main idea of the ransom is that of substituting one thing for another, and if we hold that ἀντί means 'in place of,' the most that we can make out of the passage is that Jesus gives His life as a ransom price to liberate many who are in bondage. But what is the bondage? Taking Jesus' other teachings into account, we cannot doubt that it is bondage to selfishness and sin, such selfishness and world-spirit as James and John had just shown. This would accord with the use of λυτρόω found in 1Pe 1:18 and Tit 2:14. But even if this is the meaning, the passage does not state the *process* or *manner* of the ransom. The thought that because the word is taken from the old sacrificial system we must find there the meaning that is to be attached to it, is not warranted by sound principles of exegesis. That the thought of a vicarious satisfaction offered to God is not intended, is rendered clear by the fact that such an interpretation would contradict the whole tendency of the teachings of Jesus, who constantly emphasized the free grace of God as ready to forgive every repentant sinner. Jesus does not conceive of His work as an offering to God, or for the sake of God, but as performed solely in behalf of men. We conclude, then, that this important passage simply means that Jesus vicariously sacrificed His life in order to save men from the selfishness of sin. How He thought His death would accomplish this is not stated, and is a matter of inference. If anything is implied, it is that a complete surrender to the good of men is such a break with the world spirit which has just revealed itself, even in such good men as the sons of Zebedee, that if men will accept this serving spirit and act from the motive of self-denying love, they will thereby win an inner, moral victory over the world, and thus be freed from its bondage and evil.

Another passage in the Synoptics which has been made to do service in attempts to explain the nature of Jesus' vicarious sacrifice and its relation to the remission of sins, is His utterance upon the cross. The depth of agony there expressed in the cry,

‘My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?’ is said to indicate that in this dark experience Christ as a substitute was suffering in its fulness the wrath of God against sin; that He was exiled from the joys of God’s presence (Dale), because He was vicariously bearing the consequences of the transgressions of the race. There has been a tendency since asceticism invaded the Church, and the body was made the seat of sin,—and to crucify it was considered a way to please God,—to magnify the importance of the physical sufferings of Christ and make them the supreme sacrifice through which remission of sins has come. This was not the thought of the Apostolic age, which was impressed with His grace rather than by His physical sufferings. Christ’s death had long been before His contemplation, and from it He never shrank. He spoke of it with calmness and dignity, and sometimes with apparent rapture: ‘the Son of Man should be glorified’ (Joh 12:23). But when He refers to its modes and agents, He assumes another tone. It is the *form* not the *fact* of death from which He appears to shrink. He is overcome by the thought that the agents of His suffering are the religious leaders of His time, and that from His own company has arisen a traitor. Evil is using the occasion of His voluntary, vicarious death as an opportunity for more violent manifestation, and the men He is trying to save are at work to put Him to death. The highest revelation of His grace is the occasion for the highest manifestation of wickedness. Being in the midst of it, not thinking about it, but experiencing it, this fact of evil comes upon Him with an overwhelming reality, and for a moment His sensitive soul is clouded, and He lays hold of a sentence found in Psa 22:1 and utters it as the most suitable words at hand by which to express His agony. The psalm does not mean abandonment by God, but abandonment to suffering, for later it increasingly expresses the confidence of the sufferer that he will be heard and delivered by God, so that he shall yet come to praise Him; nor does Jesus mean that He is abandoned by God and, substitutionally, under the crushing load of His displeasure, for He stays Himself on the fact that in His agony God is His God. As has been said: ‘He who wrestles with death with such pious longing upon His lips has not fully lost His God, but rather presupposes a still abiding relationship with Him (Wendt). We cannot, therefore, believe that the words on the cross are in any sense a consciousness of God’s displeasure.

(3) But not only do the Synoptics relate Christ’s vicarious sacrifice to the remission of sins, they also connect it with *the ratification of the New Covenant*, especially by the words spoken at the Last Supper. The account is found in all the Synoptics and in 1 Corinthians 11. There has been a good deal of criticism concerning the true text, some holding that εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν and περὶ πολλῶν, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν are later additions. Some also affirm that ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη of Lk. are words due to the influence of St. Paul. Some of the reasons suggested for this criticism seem to have weight, but nothing that has been said is at all decisive, so that it is best to let the text stand. To interpret its meaning we must remember the occasion with which it is

connected—the celebration of the Passover. This feast was regarded as a memorial of the delivery from bondage, and was at the time of Jesus a joyful festival. In the discourse of the Last Supper the symbolism used is not drawn from the Paschal lamb, but rather from Exodus 24, where the sacrifice established to celebrate the new covenant between Jahweh and Israel at Mount Sinai is described. The victim was slain, divided into two parts, and the contracting parties passing between these parts were sprinkled with blood. Thus the covenant was solemnized, and the partaking of the flesh in common indicated communion. As the offering at Sinai sealed the Old Covenant, so Jesus, when about to die, looked upon Himself as the victim whose blood would seal the New Covenant which He had established in inaugurating the Kingdom of God. Says Stevens (*Chr. Doct. of Salv.* 50):

‘The Supper is, then, the symbolic ratification of the New Covenant, analogous to the solemn rite by which the ancient covenant was confirmed by an offering denoting the establishment of communion with God and participation in the blessings of His grace. If regard be had solely to the language of our Lord at the institution of the Supper, it must be admitted, I think, that it is adapted to carry our thoughts not in the direction of the current Jewish ideas of propitiation by sacrifice, but rather toward the conception of a new relation of fellowship with God and obedience to Him constituted by Jesus’ death.’

We conclude, therefore, that we do not find in the Synoptics any teaching which warrants the theological deduction often made, that the vicarious sacrifice of Christ is an offering made to satisfy the justice of God, propitiate Him in the sense of removing His displeasure, or secure the remission of sins by removing objective obstacles to the free movement of God’s grace.

2. Vicarious sacrifice in the writings attributed to St. John.—The writings which are ascribed to St. John present the vicarious sacrifice of Christ in a somewhat different light from the Synoptics. There is much use, in these writings, of the thought that men become free through light, or that salvation is by revelation. If one walks in the light, that is, holds fellowship with God in righteousness and love, he is saved.

It is not necessary here to go into the critical questions concerning authorship and other special difficulties which these writings present. We believe the balance of argument is in favour of their authenticity. One cannot fail, however, to note that the historic reality which characterizes the Synoptic accounts is here invaded by the subjective, mystic type of thought of the author. The parable gives way to the doctrinal discussions. The doctrine of the Kingdom is supplanted by discourses about eternal life. There is also clear evidence that the discourses of Jesus found in Jn. were not delivered in the form there presented, but have been worked over in the contemplations of the Apostle. St. John’s religious consciousness, however, has been

developed under the influence of Jesus, and his statements and discourses are built up on the basis of the real sayings of the Master. They are therefore of the highest value.

(a) The Prologue to the *Gospel* especially draws out the above conception, and makes the object of Christ's vicarious sacrifice the revelation of the Father. By illuminating the world, Jesus saves the world. He shines in on the darkness of human society and thus gives life. 'This is life eternal, that they should know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent' (Joh 17:3).

But along with this conception of redemption through revelation, there is another line of passages which refer to the sufferings and death of Christ, and which relate these to His saving office. St. John seems to have clearly recognized that sin is a power which excludes the coming in of light, and that therefore it needs in some special sense to be overcome. The first of these passages is the announcement of John the Baptist: 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world' (Joh 1:29). Many have questioned the genuineness of a statement so different from those with which the Synoptics begin the ministry of Christ; but admitting it to be authentic, we have the following facts to note concerning it: (1) It is suggested by Isa 13:7. (2) The phrase ὁ αἴρων means 'who removes,' as the LXX Septuagint uses other terms for bearing sin. (3) While the words 'the Lamb of God' go back to the Jewish sacrificial system, as here used they are connected with the conception of prophecy and not of ritual. (4) There is certainly nothing clearly to join this passage to the idea of bearing the consequences, or punishment of sin.

Joh 3:14-16 is a passage which seems to represent a sentiment of Jesus, probably enlarged and given in the words of the Apostle. It contains the following teaching: (1) That the vicarious sacrifice of Christ originated in the love of God. (2) That acceptance of it by faith secures eternal life. (3) That the lifting up on the cross is an exaltation before men. (4) That it is necessary (δεῖ) in order that men should not perish, but have eternal life. There is no expiatory idea suggested in the passage, but the thought seems to be that the voluntary death of Christ on the cross 'is the mode in which the love of God asserted itself and became effectual for the salvation of the world' (Terry).

The vicarious sacrifice of Jesus is taught also in other passages: as Joh 6:50-51; Joh 10:11; Joh 10:15; Joh 12:24; Joh 15:13 and in the High-Priestly prayer in ch. 17, Joh 6:50-51 is not an allusion to the Lord's Supper, but is connected with the miracle of the loaves, the feeding of the multitude suggesting the idea of spiritual feeding, of Jesus' mission to bring to men spiritual manna by the partaking of which they would have life. It does not refer to atonement, but to something present and available.

The dominating idea is that of ethical appropriation, which Lightfoot describes as follows: 'To partake of the Messiah truly is to partake of Himself, His pure nature, His righteousness, His spirit.' Joh_10:11; Joh_10:15 does not speak of an expiatory offering for sin, but rather 'of an exposure to loss of life consequent upon faithful care of the sheep' (Terry). Joh_12:24 states only the general law that to effect results in the moral world one must sacrifice himself, a principle of which the life of Jesus is the supreme illustration. Joh_15:13 is an important passage, as some have made *τιθέναι τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὲρ* point to a substitutionary death of judicial significance; but there is no reason to see in it more than a complete consecration of life to the good of others, that withholds not even when it leads to death. The Johannine use of *τιθέναι* favours this interpretation, as does the relation of this passage to the counsel how men should give themselves to one another's good. Nor does the word *ἀγιαξέειν* (Joh_17:19) necessitate a sacrificial or expiatory giving of Himself; for in other passages in Jn. the word is not used in this sense. Moreover, the disciples could not sanctify themselves in this manner. The passage simply means the complete consecration of His life to His work with all that it involved, but it does not give any special interpretation of His death.

(b) In the *Epistles* of St. John we come upon passages which seem more dogmatic, notably 1Jn_1:7; 1Jn_2:1 f., 1Jn_3:15, 1Jn_4:10. In these passages, as in the Fourth Gospel, we have clearly set forth the fact that the work of Christ originates in the love of God, and is 'a move on His part to provide a covering of sins.' The word *ἱλασμός*, which is translation 'propitiation,' means covering or blotting out. Westcott says: 'It contains the notion not of appeasing one often in anger, but of altering the character of that which interposes an inevitable obstacle to fellowship. The propitiation, when it is applied to the sinner, neutralizes the sin.' Deissmann shows that its strict classical meaning is lost in the NT, and that it is applied to any sacrificial offering. The context in 1 Jn. also is against giving the term a relation to the righteousness of God, since it is deduced from the Divine love (1Jn_4:10). Consequently we must see in this word a covering of sin in the sense of cleansing from it, or *propitiation*. That which separates from the fellowship of God is not any exigency of the Divine government, or any offence to the Divine nature, but it is the fact that man has chosen to walk in darkness, has participated in the works of the devil. His sin must be put away, and this the blood of Jesus is able to accomplish. If we are asked how, we know no better reply than that of Beyschlag in the following passage (*NT Theol.* ii. 448):

'Now what can "cover" the sin of the world in the eyes of God? Only a personality and a deed which contain the power of actually delivering the world from sin. For the sin

which allows itself to be broken, and to disappear—that only can God forgive and consider extinct. This is the general view of the OT and the NT. Christ in His death has gained a power to thus deliver the world from sin. By His union with God and His love to God and the brethren in the conflict, even to blood and death, with the spirit of the world, He has overcome the spirit of selfishness and evil which rules the world, and in consequence of that He is able to overcome it in every heart into which He finds entrance. He has thus become to the Father the Surety for the purification of humanity, and for His sake the Father can offer forgiveness, if men will receive and obey Him.’

(c) The ideas found in the *Apocalypse* are practically the same as those found in the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles. They have been summarized as follows: ‘(1) That death is regarded as a great demonstration of love (Rev 1:5). (2) It is a death which once for all has achieved something. There is a finished work in it (Rev 1:5). (3) It is a death which has an abiding power (Rev 1:6). (4) This abiding power is exercised in this, that it enables men to be faithful to Christ under persecution, to suffer with Him rather than sin, finally, rather to die than to sin (Rev 12:11). (5) Hence the blood of Christ both does something once for all, in breaking the bond which sin holds us by, and bringing us into such a relation to God that we are a people of priests; and does something progressively, in assuring our gradual assimilation to Jesus Christ the faithful witness’ (Denney, *Death of Christ*, p. 250).

3. The doctrine of vicarious sacrifice in the writings of St. Paul.—St. Paul’s doctrine of vicarious sacrifice is very difficult to interpret, although strongly emphasized; and consequently opinions have varied more concerning his meaning than concerning the thought of any other Biblical writer.

The reasons for this are: (1) The unsystematic form in which he often presents his ideas. (2) The use of diverse figures. (3) His considering the subject from different standpoints. (4) His frequent use of abstract and ideal rather than historic conceptions. (5) The failure to realize that St. Paul is controlled by a practical rather than a theoretical motive, that he is not consciously developing a systematic statement, but is writing out of his experience, and trying to adjust his own religious conceptions, (6) His large use of Pharisaical phrases and forms of thought in describing his new experiences, making it difficult to decide how literally they are to be taken. (7) His evident desire to find a harmony between certain incongruities between his old beliefs and his present conceptions and experience. (8) His rhetorical temper, leading to extravagant emphasis in the midst of logical discussion. (9) The necessity he felt of dwelling on some conceptions, as the sufferings and death of Christ, because they were so contrary to current thoughts and expectations. (10) The confusing way in which the doctrinal and the historical are sometimes mixed, and his taking Adam and the Fall as literal historic facts. (11) The little use he makes of the

Christian tradition, seldom referring to the life or teachings of Jesus—‘I neither received it from man, neither was I taught it’ ([Gal 1:12](#)). (12) The fact that Christ with him is the Christ of his spiritual intuition rather than of historic knowledge and observation.

Because of these characteristics, we are, in interpreting St. Paul, to observe the following principles: (1) Not to be too literal or exact in method, or to crowd his figures. (2) To understand that we have to do not simply with the revelation of Christ, but with the reflexion of a man of deep religious feeling, ‘fiery fancy,’ and extraordinary logical power, who is developing facts into doctrines. (3) That he is doing this for practical purposes rather than to give the Church a theology, and aims to meet needs and special points of view characteristic of his day. (4) That the inner religious experience of the man. out of which he wrote, is not fully dissociated from Rabbinical dialectics and Pharisaical conceptions, which had been well wrought into the framework of his religious thinking. He had to express himself by means of ‘the ideas and association of ideas lying ready in his consciousness,’ which bore a decided Jewish stamp. (5) That he is sufficiently tinctured with Alexandrian methods of interpreting Scripture to use Biblical citations in accommodated senses. (6) That the Alexandrian ideas about the opposition of flesh and spirit, the earthly man and the heavenly man, have determined the direction of some of his reflexions. (7) That the Pharisaical theology had much to do in determining the form of his presentation of the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice. This theology construed the relations between man and God from the legal standpoint. Men who do not fulfil the Law are responsible and involved in guilt. This guilt must be recompensed, or punishment must be visited on the offender. Good deeds, meritorious performances, voluntary mortifications are availing, but with most men the guilt of misdoing is so great that such compensations are not sufficient to balance accounts and avert deserved punishment. Hence it is necessary to look to the superfluous merits of some eminently just or holy person to be imputed to sinners for the covering of their deficiencies. (8) While the husk of St. Paul’s thought is at times Jewish, there is in him a kernel of his own, a spiritual and inner side which we must grasp to understand his real teachings. Most of the theories of vicarious sacrifice which do not accord with our modern ethical spirit and with the principles of our modern thought, arise from making too much of the ‘earthen vessels’ into which Paul’s real beliefs are cast, and it is clear that we must get rid of these to find the ‘heavenly treasures.’

Most interpreters see in St. Paul a twofold representation of Christ’s vicarious sacrifice, a juridical, based on his Pharisaical conceptions, and an ethico-mystical, a product of his vital religious experience. A. B. Bruce thinks they indicate different stages of the development of the doctrine of reconciliation in the Apostle’s thinking, but one can scarcely consider them as ‘two doctrines,’ for (1) They are wrought out in the same Epistles; (2) They interpenetrate. Pfleiderer explains them psychologically,

making them the expression of ‘two souls which always struggled with each other in the breast of the Pharisee and the Apostle Paul, namely, the legal Jewish soul and the evangelical Christian soul.’ As the juridical conception arises in his discussion with the Jews and has reference to Jewish ideas only, it may be that the juridical element is adopted as a form of argument which will be most convincing to a special class, and that it is not intended for a universal form in which to put the doctrine. We shall, therefore, not depend so much on the form as on the reality which seems to lie behind it—the spiritual idea—in trying to set forth Paul’s view. The main positions of the Apostle which bear on his conception of Jesus’ vicarious sacrifice can be stated under the following heads:

(1) *Man is separated from God by the fact of sin.*—This is due (a) to the attitude of God toward sin. The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who, light having been given them, are without excuse and are treasuring up for themselves wrath in the day of wrath (Rom 1:18 ff., Eph 5:6, Col 3:6). (b) Man because of sin is at enmity with God, minding the things of the flesh and not the things of the spirit, nor being subject to the law of God (Rom 8:6-9). For men to be brought back to God they must be led to renounce sin, for God can never allow it or harmonize with it.

(2) *God wants to save men from sin and reconcile them to Himself.*—(a) The work of reconciliation, St. Paul says, is begun by God, who was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself (2Co 5:18-19), who sent Him forth (Rom 3:25, Gal 4:4) to redeem them which were under the Law; and since He ‘spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not also with him freely give us all things?’ (Rom 8:32). In view of these explicit statements, there is no place for the idea that Jesus’ vicarious sacrifice was to reconcile God to us. The word *καταλλάσσω*, ‘reconcile,’ is used three times in 2Co 5:18-20, and in each case the reconciliation is to God, and not of God to the world. The noun *καταλλαγή* is twice used in this passage to indicate something given to us, and reinforces the affirmation of the verb. The peace the sinner receives through this reconciliation is a peace *πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, *toward God*, and not a peace of God toward men. Christ, therefore, in seeking the salvation of man, is the expression of God; it is God’s action, God’s kindness, God’s sacrifice. Whatever Christ meant in His life and work God meant, (b) This idea is further enforced by the passages which speak of Christ’s work as one of grace (Rom 3:24): those who would be justified by the Law are fallen away from grace (Gal 5:4), for salvation is the gift of God (Eph 2:7-8).

(3) *There are certain obstacles to God’s free forgiving grace which must be overcome.*—(a) Such an obstacle is not the ethical nature of God, or His justice, which demands a propitiatory offering or substitute in punishment to make it possible for

Him consistently to forgive. This idea is entirely out of harmony with the passages just referred to, which make God originate the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, and which make Christ's act God's own. If God is Himself acting in Christ, St. Paul cannot anywhere mean that Jesus is seeking in His sacrifice to obtain something from God which He is not willing to give. It has been well said, 'since God was working in Christ there was nothing in God to overcome' (Clarke). Certain passages, however, are said to teach a theory of expiation which has objective reference, and show the necessity of removing obstacles to forgiveness in the nature of God. Some of these are Rom_3:26, 2Co_5:21, Gal_3:13, and Col_2:14. St. Paul, it is held, in these passages teaches that sin is an offence to the righteousness of God, and this righteousness must be vindicated and compensated before forgiveness is possible. Bearing in His death the punishment due to us, Christ has satisfied the Divine righteousness, so that God can consistently exercise His grace toward sinners. This makes Christ's vicarious sacrifice penal.

The interpretation is objectionable for the following reasons:—(a) Judicial punishment and forgiveness are incompatible, for forgiveness means the withdrawal and not the infliction of such punishment. The disapproval of God is the soul of the punishment of sin, but this is withdrawn when forgiveness is extended. If it is the purpose of God to reconcile man to Himself, and if He is in the world in Christ seeking to bring this about, the attitude of disapproval of the sinner which makes the penalty of the sin has been cancelled by His own act, and there can be no moral necessity in God which demands a judicial rather than an ethical vindication of His righteousness. (β) Punishment is non-transferable, and any infliction of it on a substitute is not punishment but something else. (γ) When St. Paul speaks of Christ's sacrifice in relation to us, he always uses ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν 'in our behalf,' not ἀντὶ ἡμῶν, 'instead of us.' (δ) St. Paul's conception of the righteousness of God is not judicial but ethical, and it is not satisfied by something offered to it, but by such an expression of it as destroys sin in man. (ε) It is difficult to see how, if our sins have been atoned for by a substitutionary sacrifice, faith in Christ is necessary to salvation. When a debt is paid the obligation is released, (ζ) The idea does not do full justice to God's antagonism to sin, as the extinction of it is more to be desired than the punishment of it.

The statement in Rom_3:25 that God sent forth Christ to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to show His righteousness, cannot mean that Christ's vicarious sacrifice is intended to *make it* righteous for God to forgive sin. εἰς ἔνδειξιν means to show, or demonstrate. Now, as Tymms has said: 'Before the righteousness of an act can be shown, or proved, or demonstrated, it must actually be righteous in itself. To say that a demonstration of a thing or a quality can produce a thing, or confer the

quality demonstrated, is absurd.' If God is in Christ, this whole line of interpretation must be cut out. The passage is contradictory and incapable of being understood, if with Sanday ('Romans' in *ICC [Note: CC International Critical Commentary.]*) we reply to the question, Who is propitiated?, 'the answer can only be "God."' The word ἰλαστήριον has been given four interpretations, of which we prefer the translation 'mercy-seat,' since this is its accredited meaning in Biblical Greek, and since the symbolic significance of the mercy-seat made it a fitting figure for the Apostle to use. This interpretation also best explains the phrase 'in his blood,' and the middle voice employed in the Gr. verb προέθετο, 'set forth for himself.' The thought, therefore, is that God sent forth His Son 'as the reality and fulfilment of all that was symbolized in the mercy-seat.' God will no longer look upon sin, or consider it, in the case of those who by faith in the blood of Christ accept His provision. Thus God's righteousness will be revealed in His grace.

(b) Nor is the obstacle to God's forgiveness 'the Law,' of which St. Paul makes so much, considered as a judicial principle, having rights which must be met. It is often said that Christ suffered vicariously to satisfy the claims of the Law, and sometimes this idea of law is developed into a system of moral government which must be vindicated. Gal 3:13 says, 'Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law.' 'The law' here is manifestly the Mosaic law, and the 'us' cannot mean those who never lived under this law, but must refer to Hebrew Christians. The Jews who were under this discipline were freed from it when they believed in Christ, for He established a new covenant. St. Paul's language must not here be made universal, for it applies only to a limited class of people. St. Paul clearly tells us that we are justified, not by anything done to or for law, but 'apart from law,' as a pure act of grace. All thought of justification on the principle of law is in Rom 3:20 ruled out. As has been said, Christ's gospel is not a 'veiled legalism,' and He did not work out for men a 'law-righteousness which they could not have obtained for themselves.' Says W. N. Clarke (*Outline of Theol.* p. 336): 'If grace comes simple and whole-hearted into the world, it does not come to satisfy legal demands or win law-righteousness... God does not deal with men through Christ in the character of lawgiver, or judge, or in any special character, but in His real character as God, His own very self, in personal relations with His creatures as their very selves.' Indeed, what is the Law in any true sense but God revealing to men His nature as righteous? It is not an abstract thing apart from God that has rights, or can make demands, or needs vindication. Our relations are with a person and not with a system.

There is, however, according to St. Paul, one thing necessary in order to make it possible for God to forgive, and that is, His opposition to sin must be shown. He must be Himself revealed as One who wants men to leave off sinning and become

righteous. God could not be satisfied without providing some adequate revelation of this fact, and He has provided it in Christ.

(4) *The reconciliation which God desires to effect is accomplished by the vicarious sacrifice of Christ*; for this Christ was sent into the world; for this He lived, suffered, and died. St. Paul makes much of the cross. It is the heart of his theology, because it is God's supreme self-expression in sacrifice to sinful man. In 2Co 5:15 we read: 'He died for all, that they which live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who for their sakes died and rose again.' No clearer passage is needed to show that God's forgiving grace is mediated through the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, and that His inmost heart is thus made manifest. Christ became man's Saviour (a) by His absolute obedience. 'For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous' (Rom 5:19). Christ has resisted sin unto suffering, sacrificed the creature will to the will of God, become obedient unto death, even the death of the cross (Php 2:8), and so has conquered sin by breaking through its general dominion. To those who join themselves to Him, He imparts the same power through the influence of the Spirit. (b) He has also vicariously borne our sins. St. Paul does not say that He has borne the consequences of them, or the punishment of them, but He has taken our sins on Himself in such a way that they have been a burden to His heart and caused Him to suffer. He has borne them in the sense that He has borne with them. To God incarnate in Christ, sin, as the despoiler of those whom He loves and wishes good, must be offensive, must be an affliction, a source of suffering and pain. God's sympathy is always being taxed by the evil of the world, His holiness is always being offended, and His heart is ever being grieved. In a real and vital way this is sin-bearing—this enduring it in patience, this carrying it upon the heart. Another way in which Christ bears our sins is in labouring to overcome them. Sin puts on God a great task, that of suffering and labouring to save the world. This sin-bearing is what St. Paul refers to when he says, 'Him who knew not sin he made sin on our behalf, that we might become the righteousness of God in him' (2Co 5:21). This does not mean that He made Him a sinner, for God was in Christ; but in His work of expressing God's love for men, Christ so identifies Himself with humanity that He feels its sin as a personal burden. It is an utter mistake to interpret this passage, as many have done, to mean that Christ was made to suffer the punishment of sin, or that guilt was imputed, or transferred to Him, which is an ethical impossibility. The bold figure simply refers to such an identification with men as to make their burden of sin Christ's own. The much quoted passage in Gal. (Gal 3:13), 'Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree,' is to be explained in a similar manner. This is a strong expression based on Deu 21:22-23. Christ's death on the cross had the outward appearance of His being an accursed criminal, and by metonymy expresses the humiliation and sin-bearing of Christ in 'His vicarious identification with man under the curse of the law.' Says Terry: 'He entered into the

depths of human suffering, and felt most keenly the bitter exposure of sinful man to the curse of violated law; and, being Himself personally without sin and without any condemnation from law, He was the more capable of becoming “greatly amazed and sore troubled” over the desperate situation of sin-cursed humanity under the curse of holy law.’ (c) In bearing sin, Christ condemns it and establishes God’s righteousness, establishes it by manifesting it. The punishment of sin is not the strongest way of expressing one’s condemnation of it; a stronger way is to be willing to endure sacrifice to save one from it. It must be an awful thing, if God will go to such lengths of suffering to rescue men from its evil (Joh 3:16). Men risk their lives only to save their fellows from calamitous dangers. God suffers in Christ, only because He looks at sin as an awful, destructive fact. Nowhere is the righteousness of God, as over against sin, seen so clearly as in the death of Jesus. (d) The vicarious sacrifice of Christ also expresses God’s willingness to save. ‘God commendeth his own love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us’ (Rom 5:8-11). It is a voluntary expression of interest in us that withholds not at the greatest possible cost; and wins gratitude and response if anything can awaken them. Love can go no farther. In such a work God does His utmost to bring men to Himself. The vicarious element in Christ’s life satisfies God, for it is God’s highest effort for man’s recovery; and it satisfies man, for it shows Jesus as his personal Saviour.

(5) *The vicarious sacrifice of Christ becomes available through faith.*—Men cannot maintain a passive relation to Christ and be saved from sin; they must join themselves to Him by a living faith. They must die with Him on the cross, and rise with Him to newness of life. They must be one with Him in the fellowship of His sufferings. Christ must be in them their hope of glory. ‘I live no longer,’ cries the Apostle, ‘but Christ liveth in me; and the life I now live, I live by faith in the Son of God’ (Gal 2:20). By fellowship with Christ the old man is put off and dies. The Christ living in us becomes the power by which we break absolutely with the sin of the world, and win a victory over it. This is being saved—being delivered from sin and brought to righteousness. A man who in the obedience of faith—faith being not the intellectual principle of belief, but the act of trust—joins himself to Christ, brings himself thereby into fellowship and moral unity with Him, and becomes possessed of the mind of Christ—the mind of hostility to sin and love of the good (Gal 3:26). Christ who has ascended in the Resurrection, descends into the heart of the believer in order to assist and complete the freeing, saving work. It is because of this that St. Paul lays such emphasis on the Resurrection in connexion with his doctrine of salvation. He ‘was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification’ (Rom 4:25). Having been reconciled to God, the believer lives the new life of righteousness by faith, which becomes a continuous experience, and will be consummated in an eternal salvation.

(6) St. Paul also has a doctrine of *a new humanity obtained through Christ’s vicarious sacrifice*, which grows out of the importance he attaches to human solidarity.

Salvation is not only individual, but also social. This feature of St. Paul's thought has recently been worked out in an interesting way by Dr. Olin A. Curtis in *The Christian Faith* (pp. 317-337). The end of God in redemption is 'to obtain a race of holy men.' 'God wanted an entangled race.' While Christ is the source of help and strength, the social solidarity of men makes it essential that the social organism be redeemed, for men must help to complete one another. The new humanity built up in Christ becomes a body of which He is the living head, and for which He ever makes intercession.

4. The doctrine of vicarious sacrifice in Hebrews.—The doctrine of vicarious sacrifice as set forth in Hebrews, although elaborate, need not be especially considered here, as this Epistle gives us no new information of importance. The subject is extensively discussed with special reference to the symbolism of the OT, the doctrine being set forth largely in terms of sacrifice. We do not hear anything about 'the law,' or about satisfaction to it or to God's righteousness. Here Christ is a pure offering in sacrifice to God, but His death is not received as a substitutionary expiation. The absence of this idea is the more remarkable that the author so closely approximates it. Had he shared this conception, it is not easy to see why he did not bring it forward in connexion with such assertions as that Christ made propitiation (ἰλάσθηαι) for the sins of the people (Heb_2:17), tasted death for every man (Heb_2:9), and was offered to bear away the sins of many (Heb_9:28).

'Not the satisfaction of the law, the removal of the curse, the endurance of the penalty of sin, but a Divine fitness, or decorum, is assigned as the reason why the Author of salvation should be made perfect through sufferings (Heb_2:10). Elsewhere he deduces the necessity of Jesus' death from the very fact that He is a priest. It is the calling of a priest to offer sacrifice, hence "this high priest must also have somewhat to offer" (Heb_8:3), and that "somewhat" can only be His own life. In another place this necessity is derived from the import of the word διαθήκη. This word has two meanings—"covenant" and "testament." Our author passes from one meaning to the other in the elaboration of his argument. The first *covenant* was sealed by a death; in fact, wherever a *testament* or will goes into effect, it does so in consequence of a death: therefore it was needful that the establishment of the *New Covenant* should be ratified by a death, that is, by the death of Christ' (Stevens, *op. cit.* 76 f.).

One interesting fact concerning this Epistle is the ethical meaning the author attaches to the whole conception of sacrifice, making it, as applied to Christ, an entirely different thing from what it is in the Levitical ritual and ceremonies.

The Epistles of St. Peter will not be considered, for they shed no new light on the problem under discussion.

5. Summary of results.—In concluding our investigation of vicarious sacrifice in the NT, we summarize our results as follows: (1) The doctrine of vicarious sacrifice is the very heart of the Scriptures. It is the harmonious note of all the Biblical writers, finding expression in the OT sacrifices, in the life and teachings of Jesus, and in the writings of the Apostles. God is seeking to develop a righteous people, a holy race, and the process or method is by vicarious sacrifice.

(2) In the Scriptures the doctrine is largely expressed in figures, and symbols, and current conceptions which make its interpretation difficult, and have led to much misunderstanding. Many theories have been built up on what close analysis shows to be only a metaphor, or Jewish sacrificial term. We must not strain popular language to give exact scientific statement.

(3) While Biblical writers assert their individuality in stating the fact of vicarious sacrifice, setting it forth in different ways, they all agree in what it is and what it does—that it is a method of God to save men from sin and bring them into fellowship with Himself.

(4) The Scriptures discuss the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice from different standpoints and in different relations, and do not give us what may be called a theory of the subject. It is proper for us to attempt to construct one from what is revealed, but we must have in mind the significance of the Scripture presentation.

(5) St. Paul differs from other writers in having a theology, and in having worked over the facts of Christ's vicarious life and death in the crucible of his own thinking. In doing this he has had in mind a special class of hearers, the Jewish law under which they and he have lived, and the relation of Christ's work to it; and he has expressed his thought in terms of the Pharisaic theology in which he has been trained, and has used certain conceptions from Palestinian and Alexandrian sources which we must take into account in interpreting him. While he has developed his conceptions in legal forms, he has saved himself from legalism by exhibiting the ethical content of Christ's work and vitally relating it to life.

(6) The doctrine of vicarious sacrifice is grounded not in a judicial or rectoral relation of God, but in a deeply personal fact and expression. (*a*) It is founded by God in His personal interest in and love for men. It is the unfolding of God's heart to sinners, and God is in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, (*b*) It seeks a personal end, namely, the salvation of sinners and their restoration to the personal relation of fellowship

with God. (c) All theories, therefore, which make it effect a change in God are un-Scriptural. The fact that Christ is the Logos effectually routs such conceptions.

(7) Christ's vicarious atonement, because grounded in personal relations, is to be explained not as a judicial, but as a deeply ethical and spiritual fact. It embodies and represents not God's rectoral or judicial relations, but His moral nature. It is a transaction in the realm of spirit, expressing in an empirical event a spiritual principle. We can interpret it only by rising above the abstract fictions of logic into the realm of the realities of the moral life, seeing in it not forensic transactions, but the living action of spiritual laws. Therefore, it is not (a) a compensation to law, as if law had an objective reality, and rights apart from the Being whose expression it is; or (b) a compensation to justice, as if justice and grace were in antagonism in the Divine nature, and His attributes were more than diverse reflexions of the action of His harmonious being, or as if a mechanical device, of which God is Himself the author, can compensate His justice. 'Divine justice seeks the triumph of good over evil, and hence identifies itself with love.' (c) It is, therefore, in no sense penal. It really impeaches the moral government of God to introduce an expedient, in order to render it possible for a moral Being who has created men, and taken upon Himself responsibilities in so doing, to be able to forgive His erring creatures. All these and other theories are developed out of the old idea of God's transcendence, considering Him as a Being above, ruling from without, a King on His throne, a Judge on His judicial bench, at least a Being separate, outward, remote, when the true conception is that of His immanence, as One who acts in the world, tabernacles with men, entangles Himself with our life. This is the Scriptural idea: 'In him we live and move and have our being.'

(8) Vicarious sacrifice is an expression and revelation of God. This the Scriptures abundantly teach. It manifests God's feelings about sin, the intense opposition with which He regards it; and it reveals God's love for the sinner, the depth and power and sacrificial character of it, leading even to suffering and death.

(9) The work of Jesus in salvation is closely related to the Kingdom of God. The teachings of Jesus centre about this Kingdom. He dwells on it, and puts it forth as the thing He is come to establish on the earth. But men can enter this Kingdom only by availing themselves of the benefits of the vicarious sacrifice of Christ. They must thus come to know God, and live in that spiritual fellowship with Him which constitutes the social bond of His Kingdom.

(10) The mediation of Christ's sacrifice is rendered available through faith. Not all receive its benefits as they would if it were a penal satisfaction rendered to law or Divine majesty. It must be changed from an outer to an inner fact, to an experience of life, and this is possible only through a living faith which unites men to God in

obedience and fellowship. By the personal participation in Christ's vicarious work for us, we become 'partakers of the divine nature' (2Pe 1:4), and Christ comes to 'live within us,' 'our hope of glory' (Gal 2:20, Col 1:27). God's method of salvation, therefore, is by faith, bringing the soul into constant and living contact with One who embodies the higher spiritual life. We are not saved by example, but by touch.

(11) Salvation through the appropriation of Christ's vicarious sacrifice is a continuous process, and not a finished work. His life and death are historic facts, but they are perpetuated in their meaning in this, that Christ has passed into the heavens, where He abides as our perpetual Mediator. He was 'raised for our justification'; but, more than that, He has come to us invisibly in the person of His Spirit, who continues His work by taking on Himself the burden of trying to influence us to accept the benefits of Christ's sacrifice and God's forgiving grace. 'The eternal Spirit and God and Christ are all one in this ministry of reconciliation, and the Lord Christ has no more finished His work of mediation than has the Holy Father or the Holy Spirit finished yearning for mankind' (Terry).

(12) Christ's vicarious sacrifice has constituted a new humanity, for it is not simply an individual, but a racial fact, seeking to produce a redeemed human family, that shall constitute the very 'body of Christ.' There is a profound meaning in the intercessory prayer of Jesus that we may be *one*, as He and the Father are one,—'I in them and they in me,'—and to the effect that we may be 'sanctified by the truth' and 'perfected in one,' and finally be with Him where He is, participating in the glory which He had with the Father before the world was (Joh 17:19-24). St. Paul has this end in mind in Eph 2:6, where he speaks about being raised up with Christ, and coming to sit with Him in the heavenlies. The discipline of life is to help in completing our work of preparation, and in enabling us to realize the great consummation of our salvation in Christ.

For the history of the doctrine see art. Redemption.

See also artt. Atonement, Death of Christ, Propitiation, Ransom, Redemption, Sacrifice, etc.

Literature.—Schultz, *OT Theol.*; Smend, *Alttest. Religionsgesch.*; G. F. Moore, art. 'Sacrifice' in *EBi* [Note: *Bi Encyclopaedia Biblica.*]; A. B. Davidson, *Theol. of OT*; Trumbull, *The. Blood Covenant*; Hollmann, *Die Bedeutung des Todes Jesu*; Hoffmann, *Der Tod Christi in seiner Bedeutung für die Erlösung*; Denney, *Death of Christ*; Ritschl, *Justification and Reconciliation*; Beyschlag, *NT Theol.*; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*; Weiss, *NT Theol.*; Babut, *La Pensée de Jésus sur sa Mort d'après les Evangiles Synoptiques*; Stevens, *Christian Doctrine of Salvation*; Weber, *Jüd. Theol.*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred]; Bousset, *Religion des*

Judentums; Pfleiderer, Paulinismus; Feine, Jesus Christus und Paulus; Cone, Paul, the Man; Cremer, Die Paulin. Rechtfertigungslehre; Ménégoz, Le Péché et la Rédemption d'après St. Paul; Everett, The Gospel of Paul; Ménégoz, La Théologie de l'Épître aux Hébreux; Bushnell, Vicarious Sacrifice; Tymms, The Christian Idea of Atonement.

Samuel Plantz.

☩ Victory

VICTORY (νῆκος, Mat 12:20, 1Co 15:55; 1Co 15:57; νίκη, 1Jn 5:4; אֱשֶׁרָה, 1Sa 19:5, Pro 21:31).—Mat 12:20 is a quotation from Isa 42:3; but in the latter the word used is אֱשֶׁרָה 'truth,' and not 'victory.' It is the same word, νενίκηκα (fr. νικάω), which is used by our Lord in Joh 16:33 'I have overcome the world,' and in many other passages throughout the NT, to express the idea of 'overcoming.' To the mind of Jesus there is only one kind of victory. It is not the triumph over social and financial difficulties which issues in worldly success, but that mastery over our lower nature and the powers of evil within and around us which issues in self-control, and the subjection of the whole life to the will of God. This is the one real victory, without which any other is but a fleeting phantom. It was the victory which He Himself gained, and which His true disciples are enabled to achieve through His aid and guidance. This victory brings with it such blessings as forgiveness, deliverance from the dominion of sin and from the fear of death, a deep sense of the moral order of the world, peace with God, and life everlasting.

Dugald Clark.

☩ Vine, Allegory Of The

VINE, ALLEGORY OF THE.—In the allegory of the vine (Joh 15:1-10) Christ describes the close relation which exists between the disciples and Himself, and impresses on them the necessity of the continuance of this intimate union as the indispensable condition of fruitfulness on their part. The figurative side of the allegory is not developed first and then followed by the interpretation, but figure and interpretation are woven together throughout the passage. When we separate them we find that the figurative material is comparatively slight. It presents to us the picture of a vine tended by a husbandman who takes away the unfruitful branches and cleanses the fruitful, *i.e.* cuts off from them all useless shoots, that they may become more

productive. Attention is also directed to the fact that the unfailing condition of fruit-bearing is that the branch abide in the vine. If by any chance it is separated from the parent stock, it is of no more use, but is cast forth from the vineyard and withers away, and is fit only for firewood.

In the interpretation Christ Himself is the vine ('the true vine' is the phrase used, of which we shall discuss the significance presently); His Father is the husbandman, believers, especially the disciples, are the branches. As there are unfruitful branches in the natural vine, so there may be some who, in spite of their communion with Christ, yet prove unproductive. The fate which overtakes them is similar to that of the unfruitful branches of the natural vine. The Heavenly Husbandman severs the connexion between them and Christ (Joh_15:2 a). Wherein fruitfulness consists Christ does not say. Some take it as the keeping of His commandments (Joh_15:10), and the practice of that righteousness whereby the soundness of the tree is proved (Mat_7:16; Mat_7:20-21), while others think specially of that Apostolic work which is to fall to the disciples (so Bruce, *Training of the Twelve*, p. 402). By the cleansing of the branches (Joh_15:2 b) we must understand such Divine dealings as tend to greater fruitfulness in the life of the believer. The process of cleansing in the natural vine suggests to us the chastening discipline to which the Father subjects believers (so de Wette). But in proceeding to speak of the disciples, to whom He now directly refers as the branches, Christ gives a more general interpretation of the figure of cleansing. They are already clean, He says (Joh_15:3), on account of the word which He has spoken to them, *i.e.* the revelation He has given them has had a purifying influence upon their life. The vital matter for them is to continue in such close relationship to Christ, whose word has had this cleansing influence upon them, that they may ever remain clean. Therefore He proceeds to insist upon the necessity of their abiding in Him, *i.e.* making Him the source from which they derive all their strength and nourishment (Joh_15:4). This is the indispensable condition of fruitfulness in the spiritual life (Joh_15:4-5).

Before proceeding to describe with greater fulness the blessed results that follow from such close adherence to Him, Christ pauses to indicate the fate of those who sever their connexion with Him (Joh_15:6). They are like the branches that have been broken off from the vine, which are cast out of the vineyard and wither away, and are gathered together and burned. Some would find an exact equivalent to all the details in this description. The casting forth corresponds to their exclusion from the Church, the withering to their loss of spiritual life, the gathering to the work of the angels (Mat_13:30; Mat_13:39), and the fire to Gehenna. In any case the language indicates the certainty of the destruction that awaits all who break away from their adherence to Christ. In contrast to this, Christ proceeds to describe the condition of those who abide in Him. United to Him in close communion, they will obtain whatsoever they ask (Joh_15:7). The result will be abundant fruitfulness to the glory of the Father,

whereby they will become true disciples of Christ (Joh_15:8). The exhortation to abide in Him is finally strengthened by an appeal to the example of God and Christ in their relation to one another. Christ's love to the disciples is like the love of the Father to the Son. As Christ abides in the love of the Father by keeping His commandments, so will the disciples abide in the love of the Son if they keep His commandments (Joh_15:9-10).

Such is the course of the allegory. The following points in connexion with it may be briefly discussed:

1. What is meant by the *true* (ἀληθινή) vine? It is often taken as suggesting that the natural vine only imperfectly represents the idea of the communion of Christ with believers. But why should the vine be selected rather than any other plant? And in what respect is the organic relationship suggested by the figure only imperfectly represented by the natural vine? H. Holtzmann understands the phrase as meaning that Christ is the vine which belongs to the higher world and has been planted by God in the midst of mankind; and he finds here another instance of the Platonic tendency of the Fourth Gospel to regard sensible things as imperfect copies of archetypes which exist in the world above (*Handcom. ad loc.* and p. 35). Calvin takes the phrase as equivalent to 'Ego vere sum vitis'; and van Koetsveld (*De Gelijkenissen van den Zaligmaker*, ii. 199 f.), on the analogy of the true light (Joh_1:9), and the true bread (Joh_6:32-35), understands it as meaning the vine which may be called so in truth, and does not merely bear the name and appearance of such. But in the case of the true light and the true bread we can understand the force of the adjective in this sense, as light and bread are metaphors which we are in the habit of employing in a spiritual reference, and it is proper to emphasize the fact that, for the illumination and nourishment of the spiritual life, a higher light and bread than the natural are necessary. But before we can understand the force of the adjective as applied to the vine, we must recognize in what sense it is appropriate to introduce the vine metaphorically in a religious reference. The Old Testament supplies the connexion. The vine was a familiar metaphor as applied to Israel (Jer_2:21, Eze_15:1 ff; Eze_19:10 ff., Psa_80:8 ff., cf. Isa_5:1 ff.). But Israel had proved unfaithful to her calling. She had 'turned into the degenerate plant of a strange vine' (Jer_2:21). Delitzsch has further pointed out that the vine is used as a symbol of the Messiah (*Iris*, English translation pp. 184-186). It is with reference to this familiar metaphor that Christ calls Himself the *true* vine. The idea that was held before Israel in the prophetic application to her of the figure of the vine is realized in Him and His disciples.

2. What is the relationship between Christ and the disciples indicated by *the mutual abiding in one another*? Viewed from the side of the disciples, this relation is

presented as an injunction, 'Abide in me'; from the side of Christ as a promise, 'and I in you,' *i.e.* and I will abide in you (Joh 15:4). This is the usual interpretation of the verse, though Bengel makes the injunction embrace the whole: 'Facite ut maneatis in me et ut ego maneam in vobis.' In the following verses more particular statements occur, which seem to define more clearly the relationship thus indicated. But the difficulty is to determine to which of the sides of the relationship the statements in question apply. Thus in Joh 15:7 we have the phrase, 'If ye abide in me and my words abide in you.' Does the latter clause take the place of the 'and I in you' of Joh 15:4, or is it a fuller description of the clause immediately preceding it, thus corresponding to the 'abide in me' of Joh 15:4? Either view may be adopted with some show of reason. In support of the first, it may be pointed out that, on this interpretation, the phrase exactly corresponds to the 'He that abideth in me and I in him' of Joh 15:5. On the other hand, when it is remembered that the 'and I in you' of Joh 15:4 contains a promise, and that in Joh 15:7 the two clauses together embrace the condition upon which the promise which immediately follows ('ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you') depends, there seems good ground for taking the clause 'and my words abide in you' as a more definite statement of what is involved in our abiding in Christ; while the promise which immediately succeeds may be regarded as presenting under a new aspect what is meant by Christ's abiding in us.

Again, in Joh 15:9 we have another aspect of abiding presented, 'Abide ye in my love,' *i.e.* continue to be the objects of my love. Here again the question arises, To which of the two abidings does the phrase apply? To our abiding in Christ, or to Christ's abiding in us? The parallelism of the phrase to the 'abide in me' of Joh 15:4 favours the first alternative. On the other hand, it may be pointed out that while the phrase occurs in Joh 15:9 as an injunction, it is repeated in Joh 15:10 as a promise, conditional on our keeping Christ's commandments. Now, in the interpretation of Joh 15:7 suggested above, to have Christ's words abiding in us, *i.e.* to keep His commandments, corresponds to the 'abide in me' of Joh 15:4. Here, therefore, the promise which is held forth to those who keep the commandments, *i.e.* to those who abide in Christ, will correspond to the promise of Joh 15:4, and to abide in Christ's love will represent under a new aspect what is meant by Christ's abiding in us.

Each of the ways of regarding the verses in question yields a view of the relationship of the believer and Christ to one another which seems to be true in fact, and to harmonize with the general Johannine conception of that relationship. To have Christ's words abiding in us is a phrase which, in view of the importance assigned in this Gospel to the word, may well represent what is meant by abiding in Christ. It is in the word that Christ reveals Himself, and that only is the true relationship to His Person which involves trustful acceptance of, and obedience to, His word (Joh 8:31; Joh 14:15; Joh 14:21). On the other hand, just because of the importance thus assigned to the word as that through which Christ reveals Himself, the phrase may

likewise denote the manner in which Christ abides in the believer. The sanctifying power of the word has already been referred to in the passage (Joh 15:3). The words which Christ speaks, they are spirit and they are life (Joh 6:63), and to have them abiding in us is already to have everlasting life (Joh 5:24). In like manner, to abide in Christ's love is a phrase which may equally well describe either our abiding in Him or His abiding in us. Our abiding in Christ may in Joh 15:4 be the condition upon which the promise of Christ's abiding in us is given. But in the spiritual life it is difficult to draw a hard and fast line between conditions and consequences. The conditions upon which promises or blessing are fulfilled become an integral part of the blessedness bestowed. To abide in Christ's love is at once the condition and the constituent of spiritual blessedness. It is at once our abiding in Christ and Christ's abiding in us. These two abidings seem to be the same relation regarded from different sides. On the one side we have the subjective aspect of the relation presented, on the other the objective (Weiss, *Die johan. Grundbegriffe*, p. 71); on the one side the attitude of faith towards the Saviour, on the other the response of the Saviour to the faith which unites the believer to Him. See also art. Abiding.

3. Can we accept the allegory as *authentic in its present form*? It has been felt by some that that form is far from satisfactory. Illustration and interpretation are mixed together throughout. No clear and connected picture, of which the details are in due course interpreted, is brought before the mind; but the figure of the vine is used as the foundation upon which is based a series of metaphors, loosely strung together, describing the relation of Christ and the believer to one another. When we compare it with the parables and similitudes of the Synoptic Gospels, we realize at once what a vast difference there is between them. It has been suggested that the allegory of the vine may have been originally a parable which John has worked up into its present form. B. Weiss believes he can find the original elements in Joh 15:2; Joh 15:4; Joh 15:6, and thinks that it had taught that, as the husbandman does all in his power to make the vine productive, but if his efforts are in vain casts forth the worthless branches and burns them up, so God's purpose in the planting of the Kingdom of God in Israel had been to increase the fruitfulness of its members, and if that purpose is not fulfilled the only result will be the exclusion of Israel from the Kingdom. The main point in the parable could not have been that the increasing fruitfulness of the branches depended upon their abiding in the vine, but that this abiding might be forfeited by continued unfruitfulness. But the Evangelist, who ever puts the personal relation to Christ in the foreground, made this abiding in Christ as the condition of fruitfulness in the religious life the central thought, though in Joh 15:2; Joh 15:6 the original tendency of the parable is still apparent (in Meyer's *Kommentar*, 1893, *ad loc.*, and *Leben Jesu* ii. 334 ff.). Jülicher thinks that Weiss is influenced by a desire to make John approach as closely as possible to the Synoptists; and while he does not believe the allegory as preserved by John to be genuine, confesses himself unable to

conjecture what its original form was, supposing it to be based upon authentic reminiscences (*Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, 1888, pp. 120, 196).

4. Is the *present place* of the allegory in the Gospel the *correct* one? Sanday (*Fourth Gospel*, p. 231) thinks that it belongs to an earlier and more didactic period in the life of Christ, and that it is out of place in the present speech, of which the object is to comfort the disciples in view of their Lord's departure. De Wette and B. Weiss bring forward the same objection. The latter thinks that the allegory in its original parabolic form, of which the main point was a warning against unfruitfulness, belongs to the period of crisis in the life of Christ, when the multitudes who had been attracted to Him fell away, and He foresaw that even one of the Twelve was to prove unfaithful. The Evangelist has brought together in these farewell speeches all that seemed to deal with the self-revelation of Christ to believers; and as the interpretation which he put upon the allegory, by making the central point of it an exhortation to abide in Christ, led him to include it in this category, he has inserted it here (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 334). Bruce meets the objection that the allegory is out of place in the farewell discourse, by showing that Christ's object in that discourse is not merely to comfort the disciples in view of His departure, but to prepare them for the continuance of His work. When we realize that this is the purpose of the speech in which it occurs, the aptness of the allegory cannot, he thinks, be questioned (*Training of the Twelve*, p. 401).

Literature.—The various commentaries and works on NT theology; Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, ii. 497 f.; Weiss, *Die johan. Grundbegriffe*, § 8; van Koetsveld, *De Gelijkenissen van den Zaligmaker*, ii. 194-204. For homiletical treatment see Maclaren, *Holy of Holies*, 168 ff.; Macmillan, *Bible Teachings in Nature*, 174; A. Whyte, *Walk, Conversation, and Character of Jesus Christ*, ch. xxxiv.; A. Murray, *Abide in Christ*, *passim*; Westcott, *Revelation of the Father*, 119; P. J. Maclagan, *Gospel View of Things*, 146; *ExpT* [*Note: xpT Expository Times.*] ix. [1898] 211.

G. Wauchope Stewart.

☞ Vine, Vineyard

VINE, VINEYARD (ἀμπελῶν).—Vine-culture was one of the oldest industries in Palestine. This is attested by the presence of rock-hewn wine-presses and traces of ancient vine terraces where all is wilderness to-day. Work in the vineyard furnished occupation to many (Mat_20:1 ff; Mat_21:28). Landowners planted vineyards, and let them to husbandmen (Mat_21:33 ff. etc.). The vineyard requires much care and attention. It is surrounded by a dry-stone wall, a bank of thorns, or fence of prickly

pear. If it be on a slope, the terraces must be kept in good repair, lest the soil be washed away by winter rains. The ground is well worked with the hoe, and thoroughly cleansed of alien roots. Pruning is done in Dec. or Jan.; the blossom is out in April and May; the vintage is general in Sept. [Note: Septuagint.] , but somewhat earlier in the Jordan Valley. The 'tower' (Mat_21:33 etc.) is the shelter for the watchman who guards the crop against injury from man and beast.

The familiar form of the vine, with its abundant and luxuriant branches, would lend itself all the more readily to the allegorical use of Jesus, inasmuch as 'in the OT, and partially in Jewish thought, the vine was the symbol of Israel, not in their national, but in their Church capacity' (Edersheim, *LT [Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].]* ii. 520; cf. John 15). See next article.

The fig and the vine are often closely associated (Luk_13:6). The mod. Arab, *karm* stands for both vineyard and fig-orchard. From the Mishna we gather that 200 years after Christ vine-culture was still a flourishing industry in Palestine. With the coming of the Arabs, vineyards almost entirely disappeared. During the last cent. the industry has in some measure revived under the influence of the German and Jewish colonists in Palestine, and the French in the Lebanon. Both E. and W. of Jordan the vine is now largely cultivated. The grapes of Eshcol are in high repute.

W. Ewing.

☞ Vinegar

VINEGAR (ὄξος, *acetum*) was credited with manifold efficacy by the ancient physicians.* [Note: HN xxiii. 27 ff.] Nor was the medicinal its sole use. It served as the drink of the lower orders, especially slaves;† [Note: Mil. Glor. iii. 2. 23.] and it was the only refreshment allowed to soldiers while engaged in active service. 'The vigilant humanity of Julian,' says Gibbon,‡ [Note: and Fall, ch. xxiv. See Wetstein on Mat_27:34.] 'had embarked a very large magazine of vinegar and biscuit for the use of the soldiers, but he prohibited the indulgence of wine.'

It is twice mentioned in the story of the Crucifixion. The quaternion of soldiers (cf. Joh_19:23) charged with the execution had with them a jar of their *posca*, as it was termed; and, when they had accomplished their laborious task, they refreshed themselves from it. The bystanders, led by the exultant priests, were meanwhile mocking the meek Sufferer and deriding His Messianic claim. 'He is King of Israel,' they cried: 'let him come down now from the cross, and we will believe on him.' The

soldiers heard the taunt and joined in. (Luk 23:35-43 = Mat 27:39-44 = Mar 15:29-32).

Again, after He had uttered His cry of desolation: *Eli, Eli, lama 'ăzabhtâni* (see Dereliction), Jesus moaned, 'I thirst'; and one of the bystanders, probably a Roman soldier, § [Note: So Jerome, Euth Zig., on the ground that Jews would have understood the Hebrew Eli.] moved by pity, took a sponge and, dipping it in the *posca*, put it on the end of a hyssop reed. His comrades interfered. Ignorant of Hebrew, they took *Eli* for the name *Elias*, and supposed that Jesus was invoking the help of one of that name. 'Hold!' || [Note: | Mt.'s ἄφες may be the Hellenistic sign of Imperat. (modern Gr. ἄς): cf. Mat 7:4 = Luk 6:42; but its construction as an independent Imperat. is equally permissible (cf. Epict. iv. i. 79) and yields a better sense, besides being favoured by Mk.'s ἄφετε.] they cried. 'Let us see if Elias is coming to save him.' But the man persisted in his humane purpose, and held up the sponge to the parched lips (Mat 27:45-50 = Mar 15:33-37 = Joh 19:28-30).

St. Mark's account is much confused. It represents the offering of the vinegar as an act of mockery, in opposition to both St. Matthew and St. John, and the cry, 'Hold,' etc., as uttered, without any apparent provocation, by the man with the reed. There is here an example of the style of modification which the Evangelic tradition—in this instance correctly reproduced by St. Matthew—suffered in the process of oral transmission: (1) The interference of the bystanders was omitted; and (2) ἄφες, suitable when addressed to one man, was altered to fit the new conception of the situation into ἄφετε.

It is nothing strange that Jesus accepted the *posca* after refusing the 'myrrhed wine' (Mar 15:23 = Mat 27:34). He refused the narcotic (see Crucifixion), He accepted the refreshment.

David Smith.

☠ Violence

VIOLENCE.—In Luk 3:14 part of the advice given by John the Baptist to the soldiers was, 'Do violence to no man' (μηδὲνα διασεισητε), the verb meaning, 'like *concutio* in juridical Latin, to extort from one by intimidation money or other property' (Grimm-Thayer). The word occurs again in Mat 11:12, where the adjective 'violent' is

also found in Authorized Version . The adverb ‘violently’ appears in Luk_8:33 Authorized Version , ‘the herd ran violently (ώρμησεν) down a steep place,’ and in Luk_16:16 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 , ‘every man entereth violently into it’ (βιάζεται). Interest centres chiefly on the two passages Mat_11:12 and Luk_16:16, which are so much alike, though in different contexts, that they are obviously two versions of the same saying. We place them side by side in order that they may be more easily compared.

Mat_11:12-13.

Luk_16:16.

(a) πάντες γὰρ αἱ προφηταὶ καὶ ὁ νόμος (α) ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφηταὶ μέχρι Ἰωάννου ἕως Ἰωάννου προεφήτευσαν νου.
(Mat_11:13).

(b) ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν Ἰωάννου τοῦ β (β) ἀπὸ τότε.
απιστοῦ ἕως ἄρτι.

(c) ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται. (γ) ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγ γελίζεται.

(d) καὶ βιασταὶ ἀρπάξουσιν αὐτήν. (δ) καὶ πᾶς εἰς αὐτήν βιάζεται.

It is evident that *a*, *b*, *d* closely correspond to α, β, δ; why, then, should not *c* be taken to convey the same idea as γ? This is the view of Melanchthon, Stier, Banks, and others, who hold that βιάζεται in Mt. is the Middle voice, as it undoubtedly is in the last clause of Luke. The translation will then be, ‘the kingdom of heaven advanceth violently,’ it forcibly introduces itself, coming with urgency and beating down all obstacles, ‘sese vi quasi obtrudit’ (Bengel, who adds ‘saepe LXX Septuagint βιάζομαι ponunt, vim adhibeo’). This is quite in keeping with the context, where Christ is extolling the work which John the Baptist had done as a pioneer and forerunner (cf. Mat_3:5 f., Mar_1:5, Luk_7:29). It may be illustrated by the parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven (Mat_13:31-33), and it has the great advantage of conveying the same sense as the parallel clause in Lk. ‘the kingdom of God is preached.’ The only serious objection urged against such a rendering by Meyer, Alford, and Bruce (in *Expos. Gr. Test.*) is that it would be inconsistent with the words following—‘the violent take it by force.’ Is there necessarily any inconsistency, however? May we not have here one of those passages where by a slight change in the expression, by a

turning of the coin, as it were, a new and complementary truth is conveyed? Would there be any inconsistency if one were to say ‘the train is advancing quickly, and those who are quick succeed in entering it’? On the other hand, the translation of the Authorized and Revised Versions is open to the charge of being tautological.

βιάζεται is, however, usually taken as Passive in Mat_11:12 (‘suffereth violence,’ Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ; ‘is gotten by force,’ AVm [Note: Vm Authorized Version margin.] ; *vim patitur*, Vulgate ; βιαίως κρατεῖται, Hesychius). The image may be taken from the storming of a city or from forcing an entrance through an opposing army: the word is used in Thucyd. *Hist.* vii. 70, 72, of the Athenian fleet forcing its way out of Syracuse (βιάζεσθαι τὸν ἔκπλουν), and in Xen. *Hell.* [Note: *Hellenistic.*] v. ii. 23, of cities forced into a union (πόλεις τὰς βεβιασμένας).

The further question now arises, From whom does the violence proceed? and three answers are possible: (1) from true disciples, (2) from other aspirants, (3) from enemies, e.g. the scribes and Pharisees. If the last be adopted, the meaning will then be, ‘the kingdom of heaven is violently resisted, is crushed, and violent men tear it to pieces.’ So Dalman explains the passage (see below), and similarly Hilgenfeld in Mt. (‘is violently crushed’), but he would render in Lk. ‘every man is constrained by the gospel,’ taking βιάζεται as Passive). This, however, is partly an anachronism, for the imprisonment of John hardly justifies such strong language, and is partly forbidden by the connexion with v. 13 and with what goes before (see Meyer’s note). ‘Non est h. l. querela de vi mala, nam querela incipit versu 16’ (Bengel). ‘The subject is not the resistance made to the kingdom of heaven, but the difference between a prophesied and a present kingdom of heaven’ (Alford). The second answer is based on the supposition that Jesus here meant to rebuke a wrong method, not to commend a right one, and expressed disapproval of the violence of those who, misled by the free invitations of the gospel, were inclined to force an entrance, disregarding the requirements of the Law. In its favour it may be urged that this explanation admirably snits the difficult context of Luk_16:16 and the use of πᾶς, ‘every man entereth violently into it.’ Jesus shows in v. 17 f. that ‘the same orderly methods were to obtain in the Kingdom as under the Law; so much so that the Law itself might be said to be maintained in every detail. The Gospel was not a release from, but a deepening and widening and spiritualizing of the Law’s requirements’ (Canon Bindley, who advocates this view in a paper entitled ‘The Method of the Christ,’ *Expos. Times*, Feb. 1905).

The first answer, however, is preferred by most commentators, viz. that the βιασται are the disciples who seek a share in the Heavenly Kingdom with ardent zeal and intensest exertions, 'who strive to obtain its privileges with the utmost eagerness and effort' (Grimm-Thayer), 'men of violence' (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 ; there is no art. in the Greek), 'violent men' (Wycl. [Note: Wyclif's Bible (NT c. 1380, OT c. 1382, Purvey's Revision c. 1388).]), 'they that go to it with violence' (Tind. [Note: Tindale's NT 1526 and 1534, Pent. 1530.]), 'the violent' (Authorized Version , Cran. [Note: Cranmer's 'Great' Bible 1539.] , Gen. [Note: Geneva NT 1557, Bible 1560.] , Rhem. [Note: Rhemish NT 1582.]), πάντες οἱ μετὰ σπουδῆς προσιόντες (Chrys.). Like the publicans and sinners, like Zacchaeus, they take the Kingdom by force, they drag it to themselves (ἀρπάζουσι, cf. Joh 6:15), they clutch at it like spoils and make it their own, 'ut raptim, celerrima vi, perruptis obstaculis, ad se redigant bonum in medio positum' (Bengel). This explanation agrees best with Pindar's use of the similar word βιατάς, which has always a good sense (Meyer), 'mighty, strong,' and closely corresponds to Luke's πᾶς εἰς αὐτήν βιάζεται, 'entereth violently into it' (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), 'vi ingruit pia' (Bengel); 'presseth into it' (Authorized Version) is too weak. The hindrances are like a hostile army round a city which must be broken through with force; the same strenuous effort is required which is commanded in such passages as 'strive (ἀγωνίζεσθε) to enter in by the narrow door' (Luk 13:24), 'ask, seek, and knock' (Mat 7:7), 'fight the good fight of the faith' (ἀγώνιζου, 1Ti 6:12), 'so run that ye may attain' (1Co 9:24), 'contend earnestly for the faith' (ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι, Jud 1:3). 'Every man' (πᾶς) is perhaps emphatic, showing that the Pharisees and the scribes must no longer look on the Kingdom as the exclusive possession of their nation or class; it was open to all nations, and might be entered by even the lowest men, though it would appear from the warning of the following verses that not all would seek it in the right spirit. 'Jesus uses this strong figurative expression of violence and seizure, which in their peculiar meaning were applied to the unjust, forcible appropriation of others' goods, not because He finds the point of analogy in the injustice and violence, as if men could appropriate a share in the Kingdom of God in opposition to the Divine will, but because He sought to lay stress upon the necessity of urgent energetic laying hold of a good to which they can make no claim. It is of no avail in regard to the Kingdom of God to wait idly, as in other cases men may take a waiting attitude in regard to a gift; nor does it avail to seek laboriously to earn it: but it does avail energetically to lay hold of and to retain it. It is ready as a gift of God for men, but men must direct their desire and will towards it' (Wendt, *The Teaching of Jesus*, ii. 49, English translation). It is possible, however, to take the words as a description rather than as a commendation of the disciples,

and to find in them a reference to those earthly ideas of the Messianic Kingdom which even the Apostles held until the day of the Ascension (cf. Act 1:6).

Dalman (*The Words of Jesus*, pp. 139-143, English translation) in an important section, the substance of which is here transcribed, seeks to find the probable Aramaic antecedent of βιάζεται. A. Meyer suggests ܕܫܢ, cf. Dan 7:18; Dan 7:22; but this would mean merely 'to take possession of,' and would hardly cause one writing in Greek to use βιάζειν. He finds a better equivalent in ܕܫܢܐ, which means in Peal 'to be strong,' in Aphel 'to hold fast'; in Deu 22:25, Onkelos has ܕܫܢܐܝܢ for Heb. ַיִּחַזְקוּ, while the LXX Septuagint renders by βιασάμενος. It is important to remember that ܕܫܢܐ has no Passive; from this it would follow that the Passive βιάζεται, is not derived immediately from an Aramaic prototype. A solution more in conformity with the Greek may be arrived at provided ܕܫܢܐ he made the starting-point, for it can mean 'to use force' and 'to rob.' The text (Mat 11:12) thus refers to that period of the theocracy (*i.e.* the Kingdom of God) which was introduced by the imprisonment of John the Baptist; it is its peculiarity that the theocracy suffers violence, not, of course, from believers, but from those in authority. The words ἀρπάξουσιν αὐτήν (ܕܫܢܐܝܢ) are not intended to suggest that the violent seize the theocracy, but merely that they maltreat it in the persons of its representatives. The utterance occurs in St. Luke in an entirely different connexion. According to him, it is applied in opposition to the Pharisees, who despised the admonition as to the right use of money. Jesus declared to them that the proclamation of the theocracy since the time of John made it possible for any one to intrude himself violently into it: nevertheless it was not their own estimate, but the judgment of God that decided who was worthy of entrance. The context, however, in Lk. may be pronounced peculiarly Greek. Neither the Passive εὐαγγελίζεται nor εἰς αὐτήν βιάζεται is capable of being directly rendered into Aramaic, especially if ܕܫܢܐ is used.

If it be supposed, adds Dalman, that by using (Luk 16:15-18) sayings of our Lord which originally had quite a different association, Lk. obtains the transition to a new parable, it may be surmised that he has given to Luk 16:16 its present form to accommodate it to the context. The saying which Mt. and Lk. found in their sources made mention only of the violent treatment of the theocracy since the time of John. St. Luke thought of attempted entrance into it, and thus found it natural to insert it here. St. Matthew, with greater reason, understood it to refer to the violent treatment of the preachers of the theocracy, and therefore connected it with the answer of Jesus to John. Neither by Jesus nor by the Evangelists is it suggested that

any one could actually appropriate the theocracy by force. Unless absolutely driven to it, we ought not to try to discover beneath these words an idea so distinctly at variance with the whole style of our Lord's teaching.

Literature.—In addition to the works cited above, a good article in *Expos. Times*, 1892-93, p. 510, by J. S. Banks, will be found useful. See also *Expositor*, i. iii. [1876] 252, v. [1877] 197, iv. vii. [1893] 224.

W. H. Dundas

☩ Viper

VIPER.—See Animals in vol. i. p. 66^b.

☩ Virgin Birth

VIRGIN BIRTH.—*Introductory.*—A cursory examination of the Gospel narratives is sufficient to reveal certain apparent inconsistencies of statement and implication regarding the parentage of Jesus. He is popularly regarded and spoken of as the son of Joseph (cf. Mat 13:55 'Is not this the carpenter's son?' Luk 4:22, Joh 1:45; Joh 6:42); and even in the Nativity narrative of the Third Gospel, Mary and Joseph are several times referred to as 'his parents' (γονεῖς, Luk 2:27; Luk 2:41; Luk 2:43),* [Note: Once 'his father and his mother' (Luk 2:33).] while once the mother of Jesus herself is made to say, 'Thy father [*i.e.* Joseph] and I sought thee sorrowing' (Luk 2:48). It is quite clear that Jesus was popularly looked upon by His contemporaries as Joseph's son by natural generation. On the other hand, both the First and the Third Gospels contain special sections dealing with the circumstances of the birth of Jesus in detail, and, though obviously independent, the two traditions embodied in the Nativity narratives agree in stating unequivocally that Jesus was born of a virgin mother without the intervention of a human father (Mat 1:18 f., Luk 1:34-35).

No real inconsistency is, however, necessarily involved in the narratives as they stand. The secret of Jesus' birth may have been for long jealously guarded within the narrow circle among whom it was originally known. It apparently formed no part of the early Apostolic teaching and preaching, and was not included in the common form of the Synoptic Gospel-tradition (note that the Second Gospel begins with the Baptism). In preserving, therefore, the popular references to Jesus as Joseph's son, the First and

Third Gospels conform to psychological and historic truth. In one part of the narrative, popular opinion is accurately reflected and expressed; in the other, knowledge of a special character derived from private sources.

That no inconsistency was felt to exist in this double use of description appears from the fact that it occurs even in the Apocryphal Gospels, where the virginity of the mother of Jesus is often insisted upon with unnecessary stress. Thus in the *Gospel of pseudo-Matthew* (ch. 27) the following, e.g., occurs: 'And some went away to the chief priests, and to the chiefs of the Pharisees, and told them that Jesus the son of Joseph had done great signs,' etc. A few pages further on (ch. 30) Jesus is made to say: 'But I am an alien in your courts, because I have no carnal parent.' On the other hand, if such references as those cited above from the Gospels had exhibited a mechanical consistency in describing Jesus as the Son of Mary (to the entire exclusion of Joseph), the representation would have justly been impugned as violating the canons of historical and psychological truth.

In social life and as a member of the Jewish nation, Jesus, during His earthly life, would necessarily be regarded as Joseph's son. As Dalman has pointed out, 'If no other fatherhood was alleged, then the child must have been regarded as bestowed by God upon the house of Joseph'; and while Joseph was alive, Mary and her son were undoubtedly under his legal protection. This consideration will help to explain the fact that both genealogies trace the Davidic descent of Jesus through Joseph (not through Mary). On any view Jesus belonged to the family of Joseph; and if any formal and official birth-register ever had any independent existence in the Temple or elsewhere, Jesus would naturally appear therein as Joseph's son.

The genealogy in Matthew 1 in anything like its present form can hardly have formed part of such a document. Special didactic features are too pronounced in it.† [Note: for this point a discussion in ZNTW by the present writer (1905, Heft 1, p. 85).] Regarding the text of Mat 1:16 see esp. Sanday, art. 'Jesus Christ' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible (ii. 644 f.) On the other hand, the genealogy in the Third Gospel (Luk 3:23-38) has a greater appearance of independence, and may have been incorporated by the Evangelist from a written source (cf. Sanday, *op. cit.* 645).

It would be strange, indeed, if the writer of the Fourth Gospel possessed no knowledge of the tradition of the virgin birth of Jesus as embodied in Matthew 1-2 and Luke 1-2. Silence in this case would presumably imply not ignorance, but tacit acceptance. Unless the tradition were contradicted either explicitly or tacitly, the presumption in such a case is that it was accepted. It is certainly significant that the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel, Which occupies a similar place to that of the genealogy in the First Gospel, traces the origin of the Logos, which became incarnate in Christ, to the inner life of God. What the genealogies attempted to do partially is

here carried out fundamentally and finally. The question arises, Is the Prologue intended to be a tacit correction of the Matthaean and Lukan Nativity traditions? Or are these—at any rate as regards their central feature—the virgin birth—silently accepted and supplemented by the statement of fuller and deeper truth? The latter alternative accords with the characteristic manner and method of the Fourth Evangelist. So far from excluding the possibility of the virgin birth, it may be argued that the Prologue presupposes it. In view of the fact that the tradition of the virgin birth must already have been current in certain Christian circles, and can hardly have been unknown to the writer of the Johannine Prologue, this conclusion becomes at least highly probable. If the writer had conceived of the method of the Incarnation of the pre-existent Logos as being otherwise, we should at least have expected to find some hint or suggestion to that effect. In the only verse, however, in the Prologue where any allusion to birth occurs (Joh 1:13), the reference is certainly not incompatible with the tradition of the virgin birth, but may be regarded as lending it, if anything, some presumptive support.

This conclusion is reinforced if the contention of Carr (*ExpT [Note: xpT Expository Times.]* xviii. [1907] 522) is accepted, that μονογενοῦς (Joh 1:14), ‘from its position in the Prologue, and from its form as a composite of γίγνεσθαι, must refer not to the eternal generation of the Son of God, but to the human birth of the Son of Man’ (cf. also Allen, *Interpreter*, Oct. 1905, p. 52 f.). There is also the remarkable reading, known to Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and perhaps Hippolytus, according to which v. 13 directly refers to Christ’s supernatural birth: ‘*who* (sing.) *was* born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.’ Here natural generation by a human father is denied and excluded in the most categorical manner. Even if this reading be not accepted, it is a pertinent question to ask: ‘Why the elaboration of the theme, above all why the θελήματος ἀνδρός, unless he [the writer of the Prologue] has in mind the supernatural birth of the Logos as a kind of pattern or model of the birth of the children of God? As He was born into the world by supernatural conception, not through the process of human generation, so they were born out of the world into the higher life by a spiritual process, symbolized indeed by generation, but transcending it’ (W. C. Allen, *ib.* p. 57 f.; see, further, the whole of his admirable discussion).

With regard to the alleged silence of St. Paul, it is by no means clear that silence in this case any more than in that of the Johannine writings is to be taken as implying ignorance. Nor is it certain that indirect allusions to the virgin birth are entirely absent in the Pauline Epistles (cf. Gal 4:4 ‘born of a woman,’ 1Ti 2:15). The most that can be urged is that in the Pauline Christology no emphasis was laid on the dogma of the virgin birth.

1. The Gospel sources.—The question really narrows itself down to one concerning the amount of credibility that is to be attached to the Gospel narratives of the Nativity contained in Matthew 1-2 and Luke 1-2. This is not the place to enter into a full discussion of these narratives as a whole, or to repeat what has already been said on the subject in the art. Birth of Christ in this work. But one or two points of special significance in this connexion may be dealt with. Recent critical discussion has largely been concerned with these narratives, around which the critical battle has fiercely raged. In the result it may be said with confidence (*a*) that the Palestinian character and origin of the narratives have been firmly established, and (*b*) that the attempt to disintegrate the Lukan account has not been attended with signal success.

(*a*) *The establishment of the Palestinian origin and character of the two Birth narratives* carries with it important consequences. The narratives have been shown to be Jewish-Christian through and through. It follows that the tradition of the virgin birth gained currency among Christian circles in Palestine at a relatively early date, probably by the middle of the 1st century.* [Note: See W. C. Allen, *Interpreter*, Feb. 1905, p. 115.] A further inference is that we must look for the *origin* of this tradition 'on Palestinian soil at sufficiently early a date to account for its presence in two quite independent forms in the First and Third Gospels. That being so, the view that they are based upon actual facts and came ultimately from the family of Christ Himself, is infinitely probable.'† [Note: C. Allen, *ib.* p. 122.]

(*b*) *Critical objections have been raised to the integrity of the Lukan Birth narrative.* In Luke 2, it is urged, the view of the narrative is that Mary was Joseph's wife, and that he was the father of Jesus (cf. [Luk 2:33](#) 'his father and his mother,' [Luk 2:41](#) 'his parents,' [Luk 2:48](#) 'thy father and I'); the Davidic pedigree of Jesus is traced through Joseph, with the harmonistic explanation 'as was supposed' ([Luk 3:23](#)); 'and with this agrees the early reading apparently preserved in the Sinaitic-Syriac, [Luk 2:5](#), "with Mary his wife." ‡ [Note: Estlin Carpenter, *The Bible in the XIXth Century*, p. 486.] The narrative in ch. 1 could be harmonized with that in ch. 2 if [Luk 2:34-35](#)—which contain 'the only reference to the virgin birth in the Third Gospel'—could be removed as an interpolation. This procedure—which has the support of such scholars (among others) as Harnack, Holtzmann, Pflleiderer, Schmiedel, and Usener—is justified on the following grounds:

The reference to Elisabeth in [Luk 2:36](#) certainly seems to follow better on [Luk 2:33](#). In that passage, moreover, the child whose birth is announced is already designated Messianically as 'Son of the Most High': but the title 'Son of God' in [Luk 2:35](#) has a quite different signification; it denotes not official adoption, but actual origin: [Luk 2:35](#) is thus a doublet of [Luk 2:31-32](#) on another plane. Moreover, the incredulity of Mary concerning the possibility of motherhood ([Luk 2:34](#)) seems inexplicable in one

already betrothed; yet it does not (like that of Zacharias, [Luk 2:18-20](#)) expose her to rebuke or penalty; the doubt seems introduced only to give occasion for the explanation in [Luk 2:35](#). The real reply of Mary to the original announcement in [Luk 2:30-32](#); [Luk 2:36-37](#) follows in [Luk 2:38](#) 'Be it unto me according to thy word,' and her submission to the heavenly will wins the blessing of Elisabeth ([Luk 2:42](#)).[§] [Note: Estlin Carpenter, *ib.* p. 487 f.]

A closer examination of the suspected verses does not, however, lend any support to the theory of interpolation. Their phraseology is unmistakably Hebraistic in character, the language being suggested by and derived from the OT. In fact, as Professor Briggs has pointed out, 'the Annunciation represents the conception of Jesus as due to a theophany.' || [Note: | *The Messiah of the Gospels*, p. 50.] The verses are of the same character as the rest of the narrative, and must be the work of a Jewish writer; and there is every reason to believe, with Gunkel, that they are translated from a Hebrew original. This consideration will help to elucidate the meaning of the announcement in [Luk 2:31](#) more closely. The Hebrew original of *συλλήψη* there would be a participle, ¶ [Note: the translations in the Hebrew New Testaments.] and the exact rendering would be, 'Behold, thou art conceiving now.' An immediate conception is meant, not one that would naturally follow after Joseph had in due course taken her to wife; and this immediate conception is implied by the words 'with haste' in [Luk 2:39](#). Besides, [Luk 2:36](#) ('And behold, Elisabeth, thy kinswoman, she *also* hath conceived a son in her old age') implies that a conception of an extraordinary character has been mentioned in the previous verses in reference to Mary; and the words suggest that a not unnatural doubt and surprise on her part are being set at rest (cf. esp. [Luk 2:37](#) 'for no word of God shall be impossible'). There would be nothing extraordinary in Mary's conceiving a son as Joseph's wife.

Again, the Lukan genealogy, far from discrediting, seems to the present writer to offer a positive argument for the authenticity of the suspected verses. Jewish genealogies usually have some edifying purpose in view, and the list in [Luk 3:23-38](#) seems to be no exception to the rule. The striking feature about it is that it traces the descent of Jesus right up to Adam (*the son*) of God. Evidently, in linking Adam to Christ, the editor or compiler intends to suggest that Christ is the Second Adam, the re-founder of the human race; and that just as the first Adam was *son of God* by a direct creative act, so also was the Second (by the power of the Holy Spirit). For genealogical purposes it was necessary to link Jesus to previous generations through His foster-father Joseph. But the suggestion is that the Second Adam, like the first, owes His human existence to a direct creative act on the part of God. [Luk 3:38](#) thus supports the genuineness of [Luk 1:35](#) (*υἱὸς θεοῦ*), and the whole genealogy, viewed in

the light of its edifying purpose, guarantees the original character of the alleged interpolation.

The fact that υἱὸς θεοῦ in the genealogy involves the occurrence of υἱὸς in the physical sense of origin exactly as in [Luk_1:35](#), has an important bearing on the objection noted above, viz. that while in [Luk_1:32](#) ('Son of the Most High') 'son' denotes official adoption, in [Luk_1:35](#) it describes actual origin.* [Note: The former is a characteristic Hebrew usage.] But the two ideas are not mutually exclusive. At the same time, it is difficult to see what can have suggested such an otherwise un-Jewish application of the term 'son' in such a context, and amid language so Hebraistic, except the actual occurrence of the fact narrated.

But the theory of interpolation is confronted with a further radical difficulty. It is not enough to remove the suspected verses to make the narrative congruous with a non-miraculous birth. The significant fact still remains that the figure of Joseph is quite subordinated in the Lukan account, while that of Mary is proportionately enhanced in lonely importance. This feature dominates the whole structure of Luke's first two chapters; and in this particular a sharp (and obviously designed) contrast is suggested between the nativity of John the Baptist and that of Jesus. While in the case of the Baptist's birth the annunciation is made to the father ([Luk_1:13](#) f.), in that of Jesus it is made to the mother ([Luk_1:28](#)); and while the Baptist's birth is represented as the occasion of such profound joy on the part of Zacharias that the latter's dumbness is overcome, and he bursts into the strains of the *Benedictus* ([Luk_1:68-79](#)), no such rôle is assigned to Joseph. What reason can be adduced for this deliberate minimizing of the part assigned to Joseph—a feature that characterizes the Lukan narrative throughout—except it be that the fundamental fact, dominating and forming the climax of the whole, is the miraculous birth of Jesus of a virgin mother?† [Note: the article (cited above) by the present writer in ZNTW, p. 93] [Cf. also the criticism of this theory of interpolation in the art. Birth of Christ, vol. i. p. 203].

(c) *The Matthaean account of the virgin birth* ([Mat_1:18-25](#)) has already been discussed in the art. cited above (vol. i. p. 206). Here it will be necessary to emphasize only one or two special points. The intensely Jewish character of the narrative, its sobriety and delicacy, have been justly insisted upon. It is difficult to trace in so restrained a narrative the 'pagan substratum' of which Usener speaks. The full-blown myth has certainly been divested of all its bloom. In fact, the points of difference far outnumber the resemblances with the ancient myth, as even Cheyne admits (*Bible Problems*, p. 89 f.). In this connexion the difficult problem arises as to the real significance of the quotation in Mt. of [Isa_7:14](#) (LXX Septuagint): '*Behold, the virgin* (ἡ παρθένος) *shall conceive and bear a son, and they shall call his name*

Immanuel. Two points are clear: (1) No trace exists in Jewish (as distinct from Christian) literature known to us of any Messianic application of this text; nor is it possible to adduce any indubitable evidence from Jewish sources that the belief in the Messiah's being born of a virgin was ever current among the Jews. (2) It is generally agreed among critical scholars that the narrative of Mt. could not have been suggested by the quotation (Isa 7:14), but that the quotation was, in accordance with his usual method, added by the narrator as a proof-passage from Scripture in support of the story.

It is, however, difficult to account for the LXX Septuagint rendering (*παρθένος*). It may, perhaps, have been adopted under the influence of 'current mythological ideas' in order to enhance the mysteriousness of the future Deliverer's origin, or it may be due simply to the fact that the translators regarded *παρθένος* as being the true Greek equivalent of *הַעַלְמָה*, without consciously giving it any definite reference to the Messiah. If, as Gunkel supposes, Messiah's birth of a virgin had become a fixed element in Jewish Christological belief before the birth of Jesus, which was afterwards transferred in Jewish-Christian legend to our Lord's nativity, how is it that no trace of such a belief has survived in Jewish literature? Why the reluctance and reserve manifested in proclaiming the alleged fact, if such a birth had come to be regarded as one of the distinguishing marks of the true Messiah? But so far from its being a popular or even familiar belief among the Jews, it may be inferred with practical certainty from Mt.'s narrative that the story of the virgin birth was to Jewish readers a stumbling-block, which it required special apologetic efforts to overcome. Not improbably Jewish calumny regarding Jesus' birth had already made itself felt before Mt.'s narrative was published. The reference of Isa 7:14 to the circumstances of Jesus' birth can, therefore, only have been suggested by the event, or, at least, by what the narrator looked upon as the actual facts. Consequently the Messianic application is purely Jewish-Christian. In Justin Martyr (*Dial. c [Note: circa, about.] . Tryph. lxiii.*) there is a curiously interesting collection of proof-passages from Scripture in support of the virgin birth: viz. besides Isa 7:14, also Isa 53:8 ('Who shall declare his generation?'), Gen 49:11, Psa 110:3 ('In the beauties of thy saints, from the womb have I begotten thee before the morning star': so LXX Septuagint). In the last passage the LXX Septuagint clearly interprets of the pre-existent Messiah;* [Note: for traces of this idea in the LXX, Bousset, *Relig. d. Judent.* 2 303 f.] the application to the virgin birth of Messiah would seem to be Jewish-Christian. Psalms 110 was undoubtedly understood Messianically in the ancient synagogue. Cf. also the passages quoted in Raymundus Martini, *Pugio Fidei* (ed. Carpzov, p. 154 f.) on the authority of R. Moses ha-Darshan (which cannot now be verified): '*Redemptor quem suscitabo e vobis non habebit patrem*'; cf. Zec 6:12, Isa 53:2 ('a root out of a dry ground'), Psa 110:3; Psa 2:7.

The obviously mythological figure in Revelation 12 of the woman 'arrayed with the sun' who 'was delivered of a son,' if it is derived from an earlier Jewish source, shows that the Babylonian myth was not unfamiliar among apocalyptic circles within Judaism. It can hardly, however, have influenced or suggested the Jewish-Christian tradition of the virgin birth. 'But,' to use Mr. Allen's words, 'it is worth while raising the question whether the author of the book [of Revelation] did not incorporate this section with direct reference to the tradition of the supernatural birth of Christ, with which he must therefore have been acquainted' (*Interp.*, Feb. 1905, p. 123). It is possible, of course, that in Isa 7:14 the prophet makes use of current eschatological ideas, and by the 'young woman' means the mother of the coming Deliverer (whom he expected to appear at the same time as the Assyrian invasion). 'The wonderful child of whom you all know, of whom the ancient prophecy speaks, whose name is Immanuel, is already on the way to being born.' The prophet is not thinking so much of the circumstances of the birth as the time. What was generally regarded as a vague possibility of the unknown future is announced by the prophet to be a present reality. No stress, it will be noticed, is laid upon the virginity of the mother. The point does not arise. And this remark applies to the later Jewish transformations of the idea (the origin of the Messiah is often pictured as mysterious and obscure); and the 'woman' of Revelation 12 is no exception.

It is important to remember that the Nativity narrative of the First Gospel is governed by an apologetic and (partly) polemical purpose. The compiler is meeting Jewish objections and (probably) Jewish calumny, which finds its explanation in a distorted version of the virgin birth. The prominence of Joseph is also noticeable. This may also, perhaps, be due to the compiler's desire to meet Jewish calumny. It was important to show what exactly Joseph's relations were to his espoused wife, to make clear that Mary and her child enjoyed his protection, in order to meet Jewish slander. Another motive, too, may have been at work. The Jews were at no time disposed to exalt the unmarried state above the married. The story of the Virgin, with Joseph completely subordinated, might easily lead to such a result, which, from the strict Jewish point of view, it was important to avoid.

2. The sources of the two Nativity narratives.—The present writer's conclusion, arrived at independently, closely approximates to that of Professor Briggs, who points out that the material of which the 'Gospel of the Infancy' is composed is in the form of poetry embedded in prose narrative. This poetry is of the same kind as the poetry of the Old Testament. It was translated from Hebrew originals,* [Note: The poetical pieces are not confined to the 'Canticles' usually recognized, but include the words of the Annunciation (Luk 1:28; Luk 1:30-33; Luk 1:35-37) as well as other pieces.] and in its Greek form embodied by St. Luke in his opening chapters. 'It is probable that the prose which encompasses this poetry comes from the authors of the Gospels, the poetry from other and probably several different authors. Therefore we are not to

look for an earlier written Gospel of the Infancy of Jesus, but are to think of a number of early Christian poems with reference to that infancy from which the author of our Gospel [St. Luke] made a selection.... These songs which have been selected for use in the Gospel of Luke doubtless represent reflexion upon these events by Christian poets who put in the mouths of the angels, the mothers and the fathers, the poems which they composed. But the inspired author of the Gospel vouches for their propriety and for their essential conformity to truth and fact.'† [Note: Briggs, *Messiah of the Gospels*, p. 42 ff.] In the Matthaean narrative the annunciation to Joseph (Mat 1:20-21) is probably a citation from one of these Hebrew hymns, which has been translated into Greek. All the hymns were, perhaps, composed for liturgical use, and were so used in the early Jewish-Christian community in Palestine. As we have seen, they will probably have been in existence at least as early as the middle of the 1st cent. a.d. Their whole tone—so intensely Jewish and Messianic, but yet so spiritual—and their primitive Christology suggest early conditions. Their authority must therefore rank exceedingly high. It has often been remarked that the narrative in the First Gospel is written from the standpoint of Joseph, that in the Third from the point of view of Mary. The delicacy of feeling, the exquisite reserve, the intimate touches which mark each narrative, well accord with this conclusion. Sanday's conjecture, that the Lukan material is based upon a tradition derived from the mother of Jesus through one of the women mentioned in Luk 8:3; Luk 24:10, is a suggestive and valuable one.

3. Heathen analogies.—As early as the time of Justin Martyr (*Dial. c [Note: circa, about.] Tryph. lxvii.*), the mythological tales of virgin birth were cited to discredit the Christian doctrine. 'Amongst the Grecian fables,' says Trypho, 'it is asserted that Perseus was born of the virgin Danae; Jupiter, as they call him, coming down upon her in a shower of gold.' Such tales are widespread. 'We can no longer ignore the fact,' says Mr. Estlin Carpenter, 'that the idea of a wondrous birth without human fatherhood appears in a multitude of tales which can be traced literally round the world "from China to Peru." '‡ [Note: cit. p. 490.] A large collection of these has been made in Hartland's *Legend of Perseus*. But for purposes of comparison here the great majority of them can be dismissed. The Greek fables, which impute the physical origin of great men (heroes and benefactors) to the gods (not only to Zeus, but to Apollo, Mars, Mercury), doubtless are the expression of popular feeling which finds in splendid endowments and achievements something marvellous and inexplicable on natural grounds. The soil for such beliefs in the popular feeling and consciousness was a fertile one. But this was not the case among the Jews. Such feeling assumed quite a different form among them, at any rate within historical times. It is difficult to see how ideas of the kind prevalent in the pagan popular consciousness regarding the sons of the gods could have found an entrance into primitive Christian circles—least of all Jewish-Christian circles. To borrow Dr. Weiss' words, 'The shameless glorifying of

sensual desire in these myths could only provoke in the primitive Christian consciousness the deepest abhorrence; every endeavour to refer any such idea to Jesus must have appeared a profanation of what was most holy, by thus dragging it through the mire of sensuality.’* [Note: Quoted by Knowling, *Our Lord’s Virgin Birth*, p. 42 f.] Cheyne, indeed, following Gunkel, has made out a stronger case for the introduction of mythical material regarding the mother of the Messiah from Babylonian sources (cf. *Bible Problems*, p. 76 f.). As has already been pointed out, the ‘woman clothed with the sun’ of Revelation 12 is clearly mythological. And she was regarded by the author of the chapter as being the mother of the Messiah.

Now it is undoubtedly true that the Jewish Messianic idea bears traces of the influence of the universal myth of the World Redeemer. It is indeed, when analyzed critically, found to be largely a transformed and refined edition of the old material. The universal craving which found varying expression in the world-myth of the coming Deliverer assumed its highest and most spiritual phase in some forms of Jewish Messianic belief. One feature of the myth was the representation of the mother of the coming Deliverer. The mother plays an important rôle, but no father is mentioned. Here in all probability we must see a survival of the idea of the goddess-mother as distinct from the later one of the goddess-wife.† [Note: Barton, *A Sketch of Semitic Origins*, ch. iii.] In Isa 7:14 the goddess-mother has been transferred to earth, and has become simply the Israelitish woman who is to bear the wonderful child.

In Rabbinical literature this idea seems to have survived in the various forms in which the conception of the Messiah’s earthly pre-existence comes to expression.

(1) He is represented as leading a hidden life and then suddenly manifests himself (cf. Mat 24:27; Mat 24:43-44). In the Midrash *Ex. Rabba*, i., it is said that as Moses, the first deliverer, was reared at the court of Pharaoh, so the future Deliverer will grow up in the Roman capital. Another Midrash says that the Messiah will suddenly be revealed to Israel in Rome.

(2) The Messiah is represented as born, but not yet revealed.‡ [Note: Justin Martyr (*Dial. c. Tryph. viii.*): ‘But Christ, if He is come, and is anywhere, is unknown; nor does He know Himself, nor can He be endued with any power till Elijah shall come and anoint Him, and make Him manifest to all men’; cf. also *xlix.*] Cf. the well-known passage *Sanh. 98b*, where R. Joshua b. Levi is quoted as saying that the Messiah is already born and is living in concealment at the gates of Rome. According to the Targ. [Note: Targum.] (*Jerus.* [Note: Jerusalem.]) on Mic 4:8, the Messiah is on the earth, but is still in concealment because of the sins of the people.

(3) The Messiah is represented as having been born at some time in the past (according to one account, born at Bethlehem on the day the Temple was destroyed; according to another, born in the days of king David and now dwelling at Rome).[§] [Note: JE viii. 511, where the above details are given.]

In the curious story of the Messiah's birth quoted by Lightfoot (*Horæ*, on Mat 2:1), the birth of the Messiah (whose name is Menahem, son of Hezekiah) is connected with Bethlehem and the destruction of the Temple. His mother's name is not given, she being described simply as 'the mother of Menahem.' At Bethlehem she is found with her infant son by the Jew who has been mysteriously apprised of Messiah's birth. The Jew leaves, and 'after some days returns to that city, and says to her, "How does the little infant?" And she said: "From the time you saw me last spirits and tempests came, and snatched him away out of my hands." '

In all these forms of the myth it is to be observed that the mother of the Redeemer is nowhere called a 'virgin.' Where the mention of a father does not occur, this feature may be due to the prominence of the mother in an earlier social stage, surviving in the form of the goddess-mother; an idea which later assumed the form of the Messiah's being concealed and unknown, and manifesting Himself suddenly. It is also to be observed that in Revelation 12 the woman is a heavenly being: in other words, the conception in this passage is nearer the primitive myth than it is in Isa 7:14. It is difficult to imagine how the representation in Revelation 12 can have suggested the idea of the *virgin* birth, though it is easy to see that the prominence assigned to the virgin mother of Jesus in the Christian story may have influenced the author of Revelation in selecting so crude a piece of mythological material for the purposes of his book. In other words, it was the Gospel story that suggested the selection of the mythical representation in Revelation 12. It would be easier to suppose that the LXX Septuagint of Isa 7:14 had given rise to the story of the virgin birth than the mythical figure in Revelation.

In order to overcome this difficulty, Professor Cheyne is driven to conjecture 'that in some of the early Jewish versions of the Oriental myth of the Divine Redeemer (which has not, so far as we know as yet, been preserved) the mother of the Holy Child was called a "virgin" ' (*Bible Problems*, p. 81). And, further, it is necessary to suppose that παρθένος ('virgin'), which in its original application (e.g. to the great mother-goddess of Asia Minor) meant one who was not bound by the marriage tie (and therefore connoted anything but the virginity of Luk 1:34), in the process of transition to the *conjectured* Jewish version of the myth, lost its original connotation, and was interpreted in the strict sense; 'for nothing is easier than for Divine titles to pass from one religion to another, and for their original meaning to be forgotten' (*ib.*). This, however, is hardly a plausible explanation of the idea of virgin birth in its

various heathen forms. Some at least of these inherently possessed a high religious value (cf. the Egyptian examples cited by J. Estlin Carpenter, *op. cit.* p. 491 f.). On the whole question, some weighty words of Professor Sanday may well be pondered. 'If we believe that the course of human ideas, however mixed in their character—as all human things are mixed—is yet part of a single development, and that development presided over by a Providence which at once imparts to it unity and prescribes its goal,—those who believe this may well see in the fantastic outgrowth of myth and legend something not wholly undesigned or wholly unconnected with the Great Event which was to be, but rather a dim unconscious preparation for that Event, a groping towards it of the human spirit, a prophetic instinct gradually moulding the forms of thought in which it was to find expression' (*op. cit.* p. 647).

It is, however, all-important to remember that the Gospel narratives belong to the sphere of history, and were produced under the limitations that condition the record of historic facts. The creations of the mythopœic fancy flourish in a different atmosphere. 'They are part of a common stock of imaginative material reproduced without purpose or authority from age to age and land to land, destitute of historic significance.'* [Note: Estlin Carpenter, *ib.* 490.]

4. Results of the discussion.—Is the Gospel story of the virgin birth a legend? If so, it must have grown up within the Jewish-Christian community of Palestine, and must represent a primitive Christological dogma expressing the idea of the perfect moral and spiritual purity of Jesus as Son of God. The Christian consciousness, it might be urged, working on such a passage as '*Thou art my Son, this day I have begotten thee*' (Psa 2:7), together with the Scripture promise of the fulness of the Spirit that should rest upon the Messiah (Isa 11:2), may have been led to transfer these ideas to the physical beginnings of Jesus' life.* [Note: This is substantially the position taken up by Lobstein in his *Essay on The Virgin Birth of Christ* (Eng. tr., Williams & Nor-gate, 1903). Lobstein contends that 'the conception of the miraculous birth of Christ is the fruit of religious feeling, the echo of Christian experience, the poetic and popular expression of an affirmation of faith' (p. 96). He also denies pagan influence, and maintains that the conception 'has its roots deep down in Israel's religion transformed by the new faith' (p. 75, cf. p. 69 f.).] But in the absence of any analogous developments in the Christian consciousness elsewhere, this is hard to believe. Why did the Christological process assume just this form, and in this (*a priori* most unlikely) quarter? The impulse must have been given from without. But the hypothesis that it was imported from heathen sources into so strictly Jewish a circle is incredible; consequently it must have grown out of a conviction, cherished originally within a limited Palestinian circle of believers, that the traditional belief among them was based upon facts, of which some members of that community had been the original depositaries and witnesses.

When subjected to the criteria properly applicable to it, such a tradition would seem to possess high claims to historical credibility. The restrained character of both narratives of the virgin birth, the verisimilitude of small details, the reserve that characterizes them, their very inconsistencies, argue against the hypothesis of invention or of their being mere mythical figments. And these characteristics distinguish them as much from the apocryphal Christian versions as from heathen myths. Everything, indeed, suggests their 'essential conformity to truth and fact.' The essential truth embodied in the Christian tradition has been admirably stated by Professor Briggs:† [Note: cit. p. 49 f.]

'The virgin conception of Jesus ... is not to be interpreted as if it were a miracle in violation of the laws of nature, but rather as brought about by God Himself present in theophany. The conception of Jesus in the womb of the Virgin Mary differs from all other conceptions of children by their mothers, in that there was no human father. The place of the human father was taken by God Himself; not that God appeared in theophany in human form to beget the child, after the analogy of the mythologies of the ethnic religions, but that God in a theophany in an extraordinary way, unrevealed to us, and without violation of the laws of maternity, impregnates the Virgin Mary with the holy seed. The words of the angel imply a theophanic presence; for though it might be urged that the coming of the Spirit upon her was an invisible coming, after the analogy of many passages of the Old Testament, yet the parallel statement that the Divine power overshadowed her cannot be so interpreted. For it not only in itself represents that the Divine power covered her with a shadow, but this is to be thought of, after the uniform usage of Scripture, as a bright cloud of glory, hovering over her, resting upon her, or enveloping her with a halo of Divinity, in the moment when the Divine energy enabled her to conceive the child Jesus.'

The evidence suggests that the secret of Jesus' birth was not at first generally made known. 'The doctrine of the Virgin Birth was not generally revealed in the earlier part of the Apostolic Age.' Mr. Arthur Wright (*Synopsis*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , p. xlii) believes it 'to have been kept back until conflict with heresy brought it forward.' This is not improbable. It has already been pointed out above that in all probability one strong motive at work in the Matthaean account was to meet Jewish calumny regarding Jesus' birth. If this view is correct, the Matthaean narrative must have been composed later than the Lukan, which shows no such strong interest, and contains more original material.

5. Meaning of the virgin birth.—If we assume, then, that the virgin birth is a fact, in accordance with the conclusions reached above, we have further to ask, What is the meaning of the fact? In the Lukan account the birth is already invested with a Christological significance. Jesus is Son of God, because He is begotten in the womb

of the Virgin by the Divine energy. This represents an early stage in Christological development. In St. Mark the Divine Sonship of Jesus is connected with the Baptism (Mar_1:11); in St. Luke (Luk_1:34-35), with the supernatural birth; in St. Paul, with the Resurrection; in St. John (Prologue to the Fourth Gospel), with the essential and eternal relationship subsisting between the Father and the Son.

But the central and abiding significance of the fact consists in the expression it affords of the perfect moral and spiritual purity of Jesus. It proclaims the entrance into the world of a sinless manhood, in which 'the sinful entail' has been broken. 'It involves the introduction of a new factor, to which the taint of sin does not attach. If like produces like, the element of unlikeness must come from that to which it has itself affinity. Our names for the process do but largely cover our ignorance, but we may be sure that there is essential truth contained in the scriptural phrase, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee; wherefore also that which is to be born shall be called holy, the Son of God." '* [Note: Sanday (ut cit. supra).]

Literature.—To the literature already cited in the body of the art. and in the art. Birth of Christ, add W. C. Allen, 'St. Matthew' (*ICC [Note: CC International Critical Commentary.]*) on chs. 1-2; an art. by Briggs in the *North American Review* (June 1906) on 'Criticism and the Dogma of the Virgin Birth'; a series of Lectures on 'The Virgin Birth of Christ,' by Dr. J. Orr (1907).

G. H. Box.

☩ Virtue

VIRTUE.—Authorized Version translation in Mar_5:30, Luk_6:19; Luk_8:46 of δὴναμις (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 'power'), referring to the healing influence that went out from Jesus. On the early English use of the term see art. 'Virtue' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible .

☩ Vision

VISION.—See Dream.

☩ Visitation

VISITATION.—1. The ecclesiastical term applied to the visit of the Virgin Mary to Elisabeth three months before the birth of the Baptist (Luk_1:39-56), commemorated in Western Church Calendars on 2nd July.

2. ἐπισκοπή (Luk_19:44). Occurs only once in the Gospels, but is found also in Act_1:20, where it = ‘charge,’ ‘office,’ ‘bishopric’ (Authorized Version); cf. 1Ti_3:1, where it = ‘oversight,’ ‘office of a bishop’ (Authorized Version). It occurs in a sense more nearly approaching that of Luk_19:44 in 1Pe_2:12, where, however, ‘the day of visitation’ (ἡμέρα ἐπισκοπῆς) seems to imply trial and affliction, whereas in Luk_19:44 ‘the time of visitation’ (ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς) is suggestive rather of the special care and mercy of God, and the opportunity thereby afforded.

In classical Greek ἐπισκοπή is found only in Lucian, ἐπίσκεψις being the usual form. In LXX Septuagint תָּרַב, רָבַרְבִּי are rendered by ἐπισκέπτομαι, ἐπισκοπή (Gen_50:24-25, Exo_3:16; Exo_13:19, Isa_10:3 [ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, as in 1Pe_2:12], Jer_10:15 [καιρὸς ἐπισκοπῆς, as in Luk_19:44], Psa_8:4). In the Apocrypha the word is used in the sense of inspection or examination, though in Wis_14:11 there is an implication of Divine wrath, derived, however, mainly from the context. In NT ἐπισκέπτομαι is used to signify visitation in sympathy or compassion (Mat_25:36; Mat_25:43, Jam_1:27); God’s gracious regard (Luk_1:68; Luk_1:78; Luk_7:16, Act_15:14, Heb_2:6); in the sense of ‘going and seeing’ (Act_7:23); and to imply enquiry for the purpose of selection (Act_6:3).

To the general use of ἐπισκέπτομαι, ἐπισκοπή, we may find a parallel in the use of the English word ‘regard,’ which, in addition to the sense of ‘observation,’ may imply also a kindly or gracious purpose. ἐπισκοπή may be said generally to signify critical inspection (by God), in which due regard is had to the good and bad features in the characters of the persons inspected. ἐπισκέπτομαι implies also a Divine purpose of blessing. [The technical use of ἐπισκοπή, indicated above, to denote the office of a bishop, is of course secondary]. Thus in Luk_19:44 we may understand the ‘time of visitation’ as being either the time during which Jerusalem was being critically regarded by God, and neglected, through ignorance of this inspection, to display those features of national character which would have redeemed it in God’s eyes; or the time of spiritual opportunity, afforded by the presence of ‘God manifest in the

flesh,' in which it might have known and sought 'the things which belonged unto its peace.' In the latter sense, the 'time of visitation' would be equivalent to 'this thy day' in Luk_19:42.

S. J. Ramsay Sibbald.

☞ Voice

VOICE

1. Introductory.—The Gr. word of which 'voice' is a rendering in the NT is φωνή. In the Authorized Version other renderings are sometimes given: as 'sound' (Joh_3:8) and 'noise' (Rev_6:1) [but cf. Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 where this inconsistency is generally removed* [Note: Cf., however, Mat_24:31 ('sound' both in AV and RV).]]. The Gr. word is sometimes used of inarticulate utterance (= 'sound'), e.g. of trumpet, Mat_24:31, 1Co_14:7 ('things without life, giving a *voice*, whether pipe or harp,' etc., Authorized Version 'sound' here), Rev_14:2 ('*voice* of many waters,' Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), Joh_3:8 of the wind ('thou hearest the *voice* thereof,' Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), etc.; sometimes of articulate utterance, ascribed to God (Mat_3:17 etc.), and, naturally, to men (Mat_3:3 e.g.).

φωνή is often used in such combinations as τὴν φωνὴν αἶρειν (ἐπαίρειν) = 'to lift up the *voice*' (e.g. Luk_17:13; Luk_11:27), with the general meaning 'to cry out,' 'call'; φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, 'with a great (loud) *voice*,' is often added to verbs; see the Lexx. and cf. art. Cry.

The 'voice' of God and the 'voice' of Christ are referred to in various connexions (some eschatological). Jesus compares the call which He makes to that of the shepherd to his sheep (Joh_10:3-5 'the sheep hear his *voice*'; cf. Joh_10:16; Joh_10:27, Joh_18:37); in an eschatological connexion, Rev_3:20 ('Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my *voice* and open the door, I will come in to him and sup with him, and he with me'); of the resurrection cry, 1Th_4:16 (the *voice* of the archangel awakening the dead; cf. Joh_5:25; Joh_5:28, the voice of Christ awakening the spiritually dead). The *voice* of God is spoken of as admonishing in the OT Scriptures (Joh_5:37, Heb_3:7; Heb_3:15; Heb_4:7), and as 'shaking the earth' (Heb_12:26).

An antithesis is drawn by Gr. writers (esp. Plutarch) between φωνή and λόγος, and this was afterwards transferred by the Fathers (Origen, Augustine) to John the Baptist and Christ, ‘the first claiming for himself no more than to be “the voice of one crying in the wilderness” (Joh 1:23), the other emphatically declared to be the *Word* which was with God and was God (Joh 1:1).’ See, further, Trench, *NT Synonyms*, § lxxxix., where Augustine’s interesting disquisition on this contrast is summarized.

2. The Voice from Heaven.

(a) *In the NT.*—A ‘voice from heaven’ is mentioned in the Synoptics in Mat 3:17 || (φωνή ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν), in the narrative of the Baptism (‘And lo, a voice out of the heavens, saying, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased’), and again in Mat 17:5 || in the narrative of the Transfiguration a ‘voice out of the cloud’ is spoken of (‘And behold, a voice out of the cloud, saying,’ etc.). In both cases, as Dalman (*Words of Jesus*, p. 204) has pointed out, the mention of the heavens and the cloud is derived from the context, and both representations are due ‘to the Evangelic narrative and not to the words of Jesus.’ In the Fourth Gospel one reference occurs, viz. in Joh 12:28 ‘There came therefore a voice out of heaven, saying,’ etc.; and it is mentioned several times in the Apocalypse (Rev 10:4; Rev 10:8; Rev 14:2; Rev 18:4 etc.)—in all these passages introducing a heavenly revelation.

(b) *In Rabbinical literature.*—The ‘Heavenly Voice’ is frequently met with in Rabbinical literature under the designation *Bath Kol* (‘daughter-voice’). Here also it often introduces a Divine revelation. The Bath Kol was one of the means used by God for imparting a revelation. It was heard all through Biblical times, and, in fact, oftenest during the classical period of Israel’s history before prophecy was extinguished, and while the Holy Spirit was abiding in its fulness among the people (symbolized by the Temple). Thus at the death of Moses a Bath Kol was heard saying: ‘Fear thou not, Moses! I myself will care for thy burial’ (*Deut. R.* on xxxiv.). But it also survived beyond the Biblical period, and was regarded as the only means of Divine revelation then operative (Bab. [Note: Babylonian.] *Sota*, 48b; *Yoma*, 9b). In time, however, it fell into disrepute, owing, perhaps, to the assiduous way in which it came to be looked for and appealed to by certain teachers as a means of further revelations; and by the Rabbis of the 2nd cent. it was decided that ‘no attention is to be paid to it when arrogating to decide against the moral conviction of the majority. The Torah is not in heaven. Its interpretation is left to the conscience of catholic Israel.’* [Note: Schechter, ‘Rabbinic Parallels to the NT,’ JQR xii. 426 (April 1900).]

A distinction must be drawn between the true Bath Kol—the Heavenly Voice which proceeded really and miraculously from God Himself directly—and the secondary Bath Kol, which was merely ‘a human utterance heard by some chance, to which was

attributed the significance of a Divine intimation' (Dalman). In the former of these senses the expression is used to denote audible speech, appealing to the faculty of hearing, uttered by God Himself. Only, the Rabbis shrank from saying baldly, 'God said so and so,' and made use of the phrase 'A Bath Kol came (or was given)' instead. The phrase, like many others, is merely precautionary, nor has it any hypostatic significance.

One striking feature about the revelations conveyed by the Bath Kol is that these were usually expressed not in original words, but in some verse or sentence taken from the Hebrew OT or (in some cases) from the Apocryphal books. Thus it is said that when the Rabbinical authorities proposed to include King Solomon among the finally lost, a Bath Kol was heard saying in the words of Job 34:33 'Shall his recompense be as thou wilt, that thou refusest it?'† [Note: Cited by Schechter (op. cit. ib.). There are many other instances.]

(c) *Significance of the Heavenly Voice in the NT.*—Parallel with the true Bath Kol, which was regarded as one of the organs of Divine revelation, is the Heavenly Voice, heard at the Baptism of Jesus (Mat 3:17, Mar 1:11, Luk 3:22), at the Transfiguration (Mat 17:5, Mar 9:7, Luk 9:35), before the Passion (Joh 12:28), as well as that heard by St. Peter and again by St. Paul (Act 9:4, cf. Act 22:7 and Act 26:14; Act 10:13; Act 10:15). It is to be noticed that the Voice at the Baptism and the Transfiguration combines two sentences of Scripture (Psa 2:7 and Isa 41:1) quite in the manner of the Bath Kol spoken of in Rabbinical literature. An audible voice solemnly affirming or introducing a Divine revelation seems to be intended in every case.

The NT formula ἤλθεν εἶν φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (Joh 12:28, cf. Rev 10:4; Rev 10:8; Rev 18:4 etc.) is the equivalent of the Rabbinical Hebrew השמים מן קול בך יצאה and the Aram. Aramaic שמיא מן קלא ברת נפקת. In later Rabbinical literature the expression was abbreviated ('from heaven' being omitted), but its significance remained unaltered. For parallels in the extra-canonical literature of the OT, cf. Jub 17:15, Bk. of Enoch lxv. 4, 2 (4) Est 6:13 f. 'God's Voice,' i.e. the Heavenly Voice, is, of course, the correlative of 'God's Word' or 'Speech' (the *Memra* of J" [Note: " Jehovah.]. מִמְרָא . דִּי (הַפּוֹרָא, דִּי). Cf. Bousset, *Rel. d. Jud 1:2* [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] p. 362 f.

The attempt of Edersheim (*LT [Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].] i. p. 285 f.*) to discredit 'any real analogy' between the Bath Kol and the Voice from Heaven mentioned in the Gospels is unwarranted. His contention that the Bath Kol could not be represented as accompanying the descent of the Holy Spirit

is shown by the facts adduced above to be baseless. On the contrary, it would only be natural to represent the revival of prophecy and the return in full power of the Holy Spirit as including also the mode of revelation expressed by the 'Daughter-Voice.' Only so would the scale of revelation be complete.

Literature.—The Lexx. s.v. φωνή, esp. Grimm-Thayer and Schleusner. To the important literature on Bath Kol already cited in the body of the article, add art. 'Bath Kol' in *JE* [Note: *E Jewish Encyclopedia.*] (with the literature cited at end) and in *PRE* [Note: *RE Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche.*] ³ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] ii. 443 f. (by Dalman); Weber, *Jüd. Theol.* ² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] (reff. in Index). The passages relating to קול בת have been collected by Pinner in his ed. of *Berakhoth* (Berlin, 1842), pp. 22-24; an elaborate presentment of the *data* with full discussion is given by E. A. Abbott in *From Letter to Spirit* (1903), pp. 139-460; add also Lightfoot, *Hor.*, *Heb.* on Mat 3:17.

G. H. Box.

☩ Vows

VOWS.—A vow (*votum*, εὐχή) is a promise made to God ('promissio Deo facta,' Thom. Aquin. ii. ii. Q. 88). It is a perfectly natural, and indeed inevitable, expression of religious feeling wherever there is a conception of a personal God with whom men come into any kind of relationship. Thus vows form part of the great pre-Christian and non-Christian religious systems. They are of two kinds: (1) vows made in hope of receiving some desired good, or of delivery from some special danger; and (2) vows of devotion made in expectation of attaining closer relationship with God. In the OT we have examples of (1) in Gen 28:22; Gen 28:22, Jdg 11:30, 1Sa 1:11. Such vows may involve the dedication to God of a person, an animal, a field, a house or other property. Accurate laws were made for the regulating of such vows and the defining of persons competent to make them (Leviticus 27, Num 30:1 ff.). Of (2) the Nazirite vow taken for life (Jdg 16:17) or for a fixed period (Num 6:13) is an example.

In our Lord's teaching there is only one mention of vows (Mat 15:4 ff. || Mar 7:10 ff.). Here He rebukes in the severest manner the making of vows which interfere with the simple and obvious duties of man to man, and, as may be gathered from the Rabbinical teaching on Corban, hypocritical vows which were not meant to be kept. He says nothing about the making and keeping of justifiable and proper vows. It is

therefore in accordance with a natural religious instinct and with the assumption of the rightness of making vows which underlies our Lord's rebuke of the Pharisaical abuse of them, that the Church subsequently imposed vows upon candidates for baptism. The baptismal vow is in reality a dedication of the whole person to God, and is in harmony with the general spirit of the gospel as well as with the Apostolic teaching (Rom 5:11; Rom 12:1-2, 1Co 7:16-17). The various monastic vows were supposed to be analogous to the OT Nazirite vow, and were regarded as means of attaining specially close communion with God.

Literature.—Robertson Smith, *RS [Note: S Religion of the Semites.]* 2 [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 1894; Rothe, *Theol. Ethik*, vol. iii. [1848]; Zockler, *Krit. Gesch. der Askese*; Daab, *Die Zulässigkeit der Gelübden*, 1896; Ramsay, 'Greek of Early Church and Pagan Ritual' in *ExpT [Note: xpT Expository Times.]* x. (1899) 13.

J. O. Hannay.

☞ Vultures

VULTURES.—(Revised Version margin) for 'eagles' in Mat 24:28 and Luk 17:32. See Animals in vol.i. p. 65^b.

☞ Wages

WAGES.—1. ὀψώνιον is the technical term for a soldier's pay, and occurs only in Luk 3:14. 'From a root πεπ we get ἔψω, ὄψον, "cooked" meat, fish, etc., as contrasted with bread. Hence the compound ὀψώνιον (ὠνέομαι, "to buy") = (1) provision money, ration money, or the rations in kind given to troops. (2) In a more general sense, "wages" ' (Sanday-Headlam on Rom 6:23). In the time of Julius Caesar, a foot soldier received $\frac{2}{3}$ of a denarius a day. This was increased by Augustus. John the Baptist bids the soldiers (probably those engaged in police duty connected with the customs) abstain from adding to their wages by extortion through violence, threats, or false accusations.

2. μισθός is the ordinary term for wages, and is translated indifferently throughout the Gospels as 'wages,' 'reward,' 'hire.' The labourers in the parable hire themselves

for a denarius a day (Mat 20:8). That was a fairly generous rate for such work (cf. Tob 5:14). The denarius was equivalent in money value to 9½d., and in purchasing value to about 2s. (see artt. 'Money,' § 8, and [in Ext. Vol.] 'Wages' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible).

The analogy of service and wages is freely used by Jesus in His teaching; but it is not so much the receipt of wages that rules the thought as the quarter whence they come. The labourer is always worthy of his hire, but what that will be depends upon whether he is serving the world or God. The Pharisee is really the world's hireling, and receives his wages from it, viz. honour, consideration, power, wealth, and not from God, whom nominally he serves (Mat 6:2; Mat 6:5; Mat 6:18). But those persecuted for righteousness' sake (Mat 5:11), those whose religious obedience is unobtrusive and self-forgetting (Mat 6:4; Mat 6:6; Mat 6:18), those who help any of God's servants and do them a kindness for His sake (Mat 10:41-42, Mar 9:41), those who go beyond the world's self-regarding way, and love their enemies, and do good and lend, hoping for nothing again (Luk 6:35, Mat 5:45-46), are servants of the unseen Father. Their wages are not counted out to them in the world's coin; they receive the Father's open acknowledgment and gather fruit unto life eternal (Mat 6:4; Mat 6:6; Mat 6:18, Joh 4:36).

Jesus' remark that the labourer is worthy of his hire, or of his meat (Luk 10:7, cf. Mat 10:10), probably a quotation of a common proverb, is of a different order. It is an encouragement to His disciples to accept hospitality, in their missionary journeys, from those to whom they have ministered in spiritual enlightenment.

Literature.—The vols. on the Parables, esp. Bruce, *Parabolic Teaching*, 178; Phillips Brooks, *New Starts in Life*, p. 1; Griffith Jones, *The Economics of Jesus* (1905); *Expos*, i. iii. (1876) 81, 427; *ExpT* [*Note: xpT Expository Times.*] v. (1894) 549.

Richard Glaister.

☞ Wagging

WAGGING.—See Gestures in vol. i. p. 646^b.

☞ Wailing

WAILING.—The expression of sorrow by loud cries is several times alluded to in the Gospels: Mat 2:18 ‘In Rama was there a voice heard’; Mat 11:17 ‘We have mourned unto you’ (cf. Luk 23:27, Joh 16:20). The Jewish custom is abundantly evidenced from the OT (see esp. Jer 9:10; Jer 9:17); in the Gospels only two instances are detailed, one at the death of Jairus’ daughter, and the other at Christ’s death. On both of these occasions mourning with loud cries is indicated (Mat 9:23 ‘flute-players,’ ‘tumult’; Mar 5:38 ‘wailing’; Luk 23:27 ‘lamented,’ ἐθρήνουν). The word used in Mk *l.c.* is ἀλαλάζειν (cf. Jam 5:1 ὀλολύζειν, ‘howl’). In most other places the word translation ‘wail’ or ‘bewail’ is κόπτεσθαι, literally, *to beat upon the breast*, so that any outcry is inferred only. The phrase ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγὸς τῶν ὀδόντων was formerly translation ‘wailing and gnashing of teeth’ only in Mat 13:42; Mat 13:50; but now the Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 has brought these passages into line with the others where the same words occur, and correctly renders ‘weeping.’ See also Mourning.

T. Gregory.

Walk

WALK.—1. περιπατεῖν. The passages in the Gospels where this word occurs may be classified as follows: (1) ‘To move along leisurely on foot without halting.’ It is used in this literal sense of our Lord’s walking by the Lake (Mat 4:18 περιπατῶν δέ),—the words following show that the subject of His thoughts as He walked was the analogy between Peter and Andrew’s present occupation and the work to which He was about to call them, that of ‘fishers of men,’—Mar 1:16 has the more vivid παράγων παρά, ‘passing along by’ (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885, cf. LXX Septuagint Psalms 128:8); of His walking near Jordan, when His mien as He passed riveted John’s gaze (Joh 1:36); of His walking on the sea (Mar 6:48-49, Mat 14:25-26, Joh 6:19—ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης in Mk. and Jn., ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν in Mt.).

‘The genitive points to the apparent solidity of the water under His feet (cf. Mar 6:47 ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς), the accusative to the progress implied in περιπατῶν’ (Swete, *St. Mark*, 130). Cf. LXX Septuagint Job 9:8 περιπατῶν ὡς ἐπ’ ἐδάφους ἐπὶ θαλάσσης, Job 38:16 ἦλθες δὲ ἐπὶ πηγὴν θαλάσσης, ἐν δὲ ἰχνεσιν ἀβύσσου περιεπάτησα, Sir 24:5

έν βάθεσ ἀβύσσων περιεπάτησα. Particular OT events also form suggestive parallels: Exo 14:22 (cf. Psa 77:19-20, Hab 3:15), Jos 3:16, 2Ki 2:8; 2Ki 2:14.

Our Lord's walking on the sea reveals Him as making material nature an instrument through which His interest in us is shown (Illingworth, *Div. Immanence*¹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 124), as coming to our aid across the troubled waters in which our conflict lies (Westcott, *Characteristics of Gosp. Mir.*¹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 15, 19), and so leading us to the confidence expressed in Rom 8:28; Rom 8:35. The same word is used also of Peter's walking on the sea (Mat 14:29 περιεπάτησεν ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα), so that it is incorrect to say that Peter merely 'attempted' to walk on the water: the words imply that he made some progress in going to Jesus. By the invitation 'Come!' Jesus expressed His warm sympathy with Peter in his desire for closer fellowship with Him, and gave a pledge that He would support him in the enterprise of his faith. The cause of his temporary failure was his betaking himself again to his own resources after having committed himself to a course that involved full dependence on Christ's strength. Then, after the grasp of our Lord's hand had revived his faith, he was really enabled to carry through what he had undertaken, probably walking on the sea with Jesus in returning to the boat (cf. A. B. Davidson, *Waiting upon God*, 241, 250). Two texts, Joh 15:5 and Php 4:13, show how we should apply this narrative to ourselves. περιπατεῖν is also used: of men's gait, whereby the blind man who was being gradually restored to sight recognized the true nature of the objects which he would otherwise have taken for trees (Mar 8:24 βλέπω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὅτι ὡς δένδρα ὁρῶ περιπατοῦντας, 'I see men; for I perceive objects like trees, walking'; cf. Jdg 9:36; Swete, *in loc.*); of people's walking over hidden graves (Luk 11:44 : see Woe); of the scribes, τῶν θελόντων περιπατεῖν ἐν στολαῖς (Luk 20:46 || Mar 12:38 'love to go in long clothing,' Authorized Version ; see Dress); and in the question with which the Risen Lord began the conversation with His two disciples whom He joined on the road to Emmaus (Luk 24:17 τίνες οἱ λόγοι ... οὓς ἀντιβάλλετε ... περιπατοῦτες; cf. Mar 16:12).

(2) Of those to whom Jesus miraculously restored the power of walking: the paralytic (Mar 2:9 || Mat 9:5, Luk 5:23). No passage in the Gospels is more significant of the character, or more persuasive of the credibility, of our Lord's miracles of healing than this. He says to the paralytic, 'Son, thy sins be forgiven thee'; and in order that those who cavil at this saying 'may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins,' He commands him, 'Arise, take up thy bed, and walk,' which was, from their point of view, a harder thing for Him to say, because it could at once be proved

whether His words had any effect. The miracle is thus an outward and visible sign of something greater than bodily healing; it points to an inward and spiritual power, destructive of evil, now present among men. It is implied that disease is the physical effect of sin (cf. Joh 5:14), and by healing the one our Lord gives an evidence of His power to destroy the other (cf. 1Jn 3:8). He teaches that the perfect idea of redemption is realized in ‘a redeemed soul in a redeemed body,’ and that He is come to deliver the entire personality of man, soul and body, from the dominion of evil (cf. Illingworth, *l.c.* 97). Man forgiven is enabled to ‘walk and not faint’ (Isa 40:31), and this looks forward to the time when ‘the inhabitant of Zion shall not say, I am sick; the people that dwell therein shall be forgiven their iniquity’ (Isa 33:24, cf. Rev 7:14-17). So of the impotent man at Bethesda (Joh 5:8-9; Joh 5:11-12—a Sabbath miracle: the others being Mar 1:23; Mar 1:31; Mar 3:1 and ||, Luk 13:14; Luk 14:3, Joh 9:14); the lame who walk (Mat 11:5; Mat 15:31, Luk 7:22; cf. LXX Septuagint Isa 35:3 ισχύσατε ... γόνατα παραλελυμένα, also Isa 35:6; Act 3:6; Act 14:3); also of the daughter of Jairus whom our Lord raised from the dead (Mar 5:42 περιεπάτει, ‘she began walking about’). In all His raisings from the dead there was an immediate restoration of the bodily powers (Luk 7:15, Joh 11:44).

(3) It is also used in a special sense of our Lord’s life of movement and unwearied activity. This use of περιπατεῖν is peculiar to St. John. In Joh 11:9-10 Jesus speaks in parabolic fashion, first of His having a full working day (cf. Joh 9:4) of twelve hours, during which He walks in the light of life without fear of danger in the path of His heavenly Father’s will, and then of the coming on of the night of death, when walking, as regulated by present conditions, will be ended for Him; because it is His enemies’ ‘hour,’ coinciding with that permitted to ‘the power of darkness’ (Luk 22:53; cf. Joh 13:30; Plummer, *St. Luke*, 513; Camb. Bib. *St. John*, 230).

Joh 6:66 ‘many went back,’ καὶ οὐκέτι μετ’ αὐτοῦ περιεπάτουν; the last words picture His journeyings to and fro, in which they had been in the habit of accompanying Him on foot, and hearing His teaching. In the same sense: Joh 7:1, ‘walked in Galilee, for he would not walk in Jewry’; Joh 10:23 walking in the Temple (‘ut in sua domo,’ Beng.; cf. Mar 11:27); Joh 11:54 ‘walked no more openly among the Jews.’ This use of περιπατεῖν is also found in Rev 2:1 of our Lord’s life of activity in His exalted state: ‘walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks,’ as if journeying forth by the circular route which, after traversing all the Churches mentioned, returns to Ephesus (Ramsay, *Letters to the Seven Churches*, ‘Letter to the Church in Ephesus,’ Introduction). It is likewise used by our Lord of Peter’s working life (Joh 21:18 περιεπάτεις ὅπου ἠθέλησ, as when he had said to his fellow-disciples, ‘I go a fishing,’ v. 3), and of the life of the redeemed (Rev 3:4 περιπατήσουσι μετ’ ἐμοῦ ἐν λευκοῖς; cf.

Zec 3:4; Zec 3:7), which is thus suggestively represented as a life of action conjoined with purity (cf. 1Jn 3:2-3).

(4) ‘To act and behave in any particular manner,’ ‘to pursue a particular course of life’: Mar 7:5 (the only passage in the Synoptic Gospels where περιπατεῖν is used in this sense—‘why walk not thy disciples κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων’; κατὰ indicating conformity with a standard [as in Rom 8:4; Rom 14:15, 2Co 10:2-3, Eph 2:2; Win.-Moul. 500]. הלכה in Rabbinical language is ‘the rule by which men must walk’ [הלך]; cf. Swete, *in loc.*; see Tradition), Joh 8:12, where the condition of ‘not walking in darkness’ (= ignorance and self-deception, narrowness, joylessness, and death) is stated to be our ‘following the Light of the world,’ Jesus our Sun (cf. Joh 11:9, Psa 27:1, Isa 9:2; Isa 42:5; Isa 60:19-20, Mal 4:2), whose rising is the signal to awake and work (Eph 5:14, Heb 3:13), and whose movement as He mounts to attain His perfect day is a call to progress in righteousness and love (Psa 19:5, Pro 4:18, Php 3:14). St. Paul developed this figure: he who follows the Light of the world becomes himself ‘light in the Lord’ (Eph 5:8-9, 1Th 5:5). Cf. Joh 12:35 (‘fides non est deses sed agilis in luce,’ Bengel. So also is love, 1Jn 2:9-11).

περιπατεῖν is used of the conduct of life; Aquila, Gen 5:22 (Enoch) περιεπάτει σὺν τῷ θεῷ, where LXX Septuagint has εὐηρεστησε (cf. Heb 11:5); LXX Septuagint 2Ki 20:3, Ps 11:9 (12:8), Pro 8:20, Ecc 11:9. St. Paul uses περιπατεῖν in the ethical sense thirty times, and it is found in this sense in all his Epistles except Philem. and the Pastorals. He has also another word for ‘to walk’ which is not found in the Gospels (στοιχεῖν, ‘to march in file’). This word ‘may imply a more studied following of a prescribed course than περιπατεῖν’ (Ellic. *on Gal.* 122). Compare with the passages in St. John’s Gospel, 1Jn 1:6-7; 1Jn 2:6-11, 2Jn 1:4, 3Jn 1:3-4

2. πορεύεσθαι is used in the same sense as περιπατεῖν (3) in Luk 13:33 ‘I must walk to-day, and to-morrow, and the day following’; ‘I must go on my way,’ Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 . ‘The duration of my course is ordained by God, and no power on earth can shorten it: (cf. Joh 11:9 f.; Burkitt, *Gosp. Hist. and its Transmission*, 95). It is used in the same sense as περιπατεῖν (4) in Luk 1:6 (‘walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless’); cf. LXX Septuagint Pro 10:9 (with Barrow’s Sermon) 14:2, Mic 6:8 πορεύεσθαι μετὰ κυρίου θεοῦ σου, ‘to walk humbly with thy God,’ Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 .

3. διέρχασθαι, 'to pass through': Mat 12:43 (|| Luk 11:24) 'walketh through dry places,' 'passeth through,' Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 (cf. Psalms 106 (107):35). 'Apart from humanity, evil powers have only an empty, unproductive existence; and accordingly they lie in wait continually for the opportunity to return to the world of men, and to set up their abode there' (Martensen, *Dogmatics*, 196).

Literature.—Swete, *Com. on St. Mark*; A. B. Davidson, *Waiting upon God*; J. H. Jowett, *Thirsting for the Springs*, 167; Illingworth, *Div. Immanence*; Westcott, *Characteristics of the Gospel Miracles*; Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance to the LXX Septuagint* .

James Donald.

Wallet

WALLET (Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 translation of πήρα, Mat 10:10 etc.; Authorized Version 'scrip').—This corresponds to the *kělî hârô'îm*, or *yalkût*, of 1Sa 17:40 (see, however, H. P. Smith, *Samuel, in loc.*). It is a bag made of partially tanned kid-skin, bound by a strap round the waist, or slung from the shoulder. In it the shepherd carries his supply of provisions when going with the flock to distant pasture. The coarse loaves of the country, olives, and dried fruit form the staple diet, with an occasional lump of cheese. The wallet, however, serves the purpose of the boy's pocket among ourselves, and often contains a curious assortment of articles. The Authorized Version 'scrip' appears in our literature with the same meaning. Milton (*Comus*, line 626) speaks of the shepherd's 'leathern scrip' in which are carried 'simples of a thousand names' (cf. Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, Act iii. sc. 2). Setting out on a journey, the Syrian peasant carries a wallet well furnished, which he opens for refreshment as he rests by the way, or in the shelter of the *khân* at nightfall. Christ's Apostles were to go unencumbered on their special mission (Mat 10:10, Mar 6:8, Luk 9:3; Luk 10:4), trusting to hospitality, and the providing care of their Master.* [Note: Edersheim compares certain Rabbinical ordinances which laid down that no man might go on the Temple Mount with his staff or with shoes, or with his scrip, or with money tied to him in his purse. Whatever he might wish to contribute must be carried in his hand, possibly to indicate that the money about him was exclusively for an immediate sacred purpose. He suggests that, for similar reasons, Jesus transferred these very ordinances to the disciples when engaged in the service of the real Temple, and says the direction of Mat 10:9 f. will then mean: 'Go out in the same spirit and manner as you would to the Temple services, and fear not,—"for the workman is worthy of his meat."' In other words: Let this new Temple service be

your only thought, undertaking, and care' (The Temple, etc. p. 42).] But, as an ordinary rule, provident forethought is to be commended (Luk 22:36).

W. Ewing.

☒ War

WAR (πόλεμος).—As the Gospels record the story of Christ, whose mission was to bring 'peace on earth and goodwill to men,' the references to war are not numerous. But St. Luke has three references well worthy of attention.—1. In Luk 3:14 'the soldiers' (στρατευόμενοι, (Revised Version margin) 'soldiers on service') consult John the Baptist. It is not possible to say who the soldiers were, or in what expedition they were engaged, but they were not Roman soldiers, or any part of the force of Herod Antipas against his father-in-law Aretas, since the quarrel between Herod Antipas and Aretas had not developed then.—2. In Luk 14:31 (where He is enforcing the general lesson that we should not undertake what we have neither the strength nor the will to achieve, or enter upon His service unless we are prepared, if necessary, to sacrifice life itself) our Lord draws attention to the action of a king in calling a council of war. Possibly there is here a historical allusion to the war between Herod Antipas and Aretas (Josephus *Ant.* xviii. v. 3).—3. In Luk 19:43 our Lord shows His familiarity with the history of warfare when He prophesies that the enemy will cast up a bank (χάραξ) or a trench round Jerusalem. This prophecy was literally fulfilled forty years afterwards, when Titus surrounded Jerusalem with a palisaded mound and wall of masonry (*agger* and *vallum*).

Jesus seems to have recognized war as rising from the nature of man and the constitution of society; but as His teaching lays hold upon nations, the methods of war become less barbarous, and we have good cause to anticipate a time, and to work for it, when 'nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.' While, therefore, Jesus Christ did not condemn war in the abstract, the whole spirit of Christianity is against it (see Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'War').

Coll. A. Macdonald.

☒ Waste

WASTE.—The idea of waste is presented in the Gospels in two figures. (1) The first of these appears in the word διασκορπίζω, which indicates the scattering of one's possessions. It is the act of the man who, like the Prodigal, makes 'ducks and drakes' of his goods (Luk 15:13), or, like the Unfaithful Steward, squanders his master's property (Luk 16:1).

(2) The second word is ἀπώλεια, which denotes the doing to death of that which should have remained to enrich and beautify life. Judas thought that the pouring forth of the ointment upon the head of Christ was ἀπώλεια (Mat 26:8 | |). In his opinion it was waste, because the price of it might have been added to his bag, and might have remained to enrich himself (Joh 12:6). It was put to a use which did not commend itself to him, and this seemed to the man in whose heart the love of a once accepted Master had now been usurped by the money with which he had been entrusted, a loss of something like 'three hundred pence' (Mar 14:5). It is very significant that Christ used the word, which Judas had applied to Mary, of Judas himself. So far wrong was he that Mary had rendered an ever memorable act of devotion. The true 'waste' was in himself; he was the 'son of waste' (ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπώλειας, Joh 17:12). See art. Judas Iscariot in vol. i. p. 909^b.

W. W. Holdsworth.

Watch

WATCH.—1. The *noun* 'watch' in the Gospels represents (1) κουστωδία (Lat. *custodia*) in Mat 27:65-66; Mat 28:11 Authorized Version ('guard' Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). This word, which is said to have been the technical term for a company of 60 men, is used here to describe either the Roman soldiers, whom the chief priests and Pharisees obtained from Pilate, or the Temple guard, which he reminded them they already had and could employ to protect the sepulchre from being rifled. (2) φυλακή, where it denotes the divisions of the night either into 3 (Jewish and Greek; cf. Luk 12:38 (?)* [Note: It is not unlikely that in this case the fourth watch is not named, simply because the return is not likely to be so long delayed. So Meyer, Alford, Bruce, etc.]) or 4 (Roman; cf. Mar 13:35) parts. The word in this sense occurs (a) in the account of our Lord's walking upon the Lake of Galilee, which was 'at the fourth watch,' *i.e.* just before dawn (Mat 14:25, Mar 6:48); (b) in His remarks upon the uncertainty and unexpectedness of the Presence (παρουσία) of the Son of Man

(Mat 24:43, Luk 12:38). (3) φυλακή in an active sense, denoting a watching or keeping watch (Luk 2:8).

2. 'Watch' as a *verb*.—The duty of constant watchfulness (γρηγορεῖν) and vigilance (ἀγρυπνεῖν) is insisted upon by our Lord in two main connexions: (a) in regard to the particular, immediate need for it on the night of the Betrayal (Mat 26:38; Mat 26:40-41, Mar 14:34; Mar 14:38) and (b) in regard to the general attitude of disciples who await their Lord's Return (Mat 24:42-43, Mar 13:33-34; Mar 13:37, Luk 12:37; Luk 12:39; Luk 21:36).

As to the general attitude or frame of mind in which the Church is bidden by her Lord to look for His coming, the burden of His teaching is that ours must be the steadfast, active readiness of dutiful, trusty servants, who are not afraid of being caught idle or in mischief, when the Master appears and reveals His welcome, though awful presence.

C. L. Feltoe.

☞ Water

WATER (ὕδωρ).—For an Eastern country, Palestine (except in the Negeb and the districts which are desert) has a fairly abundant supply of water. It is described as 'a land of brooks (torrent-valleys), of fountains and depths, that spring out of the valleys and hills' (Deu 8:7). It is a matter of dispute whether the climate has changed since OT times. The rainy season is in winter, from November to March, when the rains are generally heavy. At other times there are only occasional showers. 'The former rain and the latter rain' (Deu 11:14) come about the autumn and spring equinox respectively. The rainfall on an average is from 25 to 30 inches in ordinary seasons (the average rainfall in England is less than 30 inches), but there are times of drought which cause great loss and suffering. In Galilee the water supply is much greater than in Judaea. The storage of water is much more imperfect than in former times. In many places the ruins of artificial tanks, pools, and aqueducts are visible. The chief waters which are referred to in the Gospels are those of the Sea of Galilee and the river Jordan.

Water is frequently mentioned in the Gospels (most instances are found in Jn.), both in its literal and figurative meanings. 1. *Literally*: e.g. 'Jesus went up straightway out of the water' (Mat 3:16 || Mar 1:10); 'Send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his

finger in water' (Luk_16:24); 'John was baptizing in aenon, near to Salim, because there was much water there' (Joh_5:1-7). The water of the pool of Bethesda (Joh_3:23) was supposed to have curative powers. Part of v. 3 ('waiting for the moving of the waters') and the whole of v. 4 are now rejected by critical editors. The moving of the water was a natural phenomenon, the flow of the spring being intermittent. The disciples who were sent to prepare for the observance of the Passover were instructed to look for 'a man bearing a pitcher of water' (Mar_14:13 || Luk_22:10). As water is usually carried by women in the East, the man bearing the pitcher would easily be distinguished. It was perhaps a token arranged beforehand, so that the place of observance should not be known till the last moment. See also art. Pitcher. In Joh_19:34 it is recorded that at the crucifixion of Jesus one of the soldiers pierced His side with a spear, and forthwith there came out blood and water; see art. Blood and Water.

2. The *figurative* use of water in the Gospels is varied. It is a symbol (i.) of the moral cleansing of life in repentance, 'I baptize you with water unto repentance' (Mat_3:11, Mar_1:8, Luk_3:16, Joh_1:23-26); (ii.) its symbolical reference in connexion with the new birth is admitted, but its significance is uncertain, 'Except a man be born of water and spirit ($\epsilon\xi \upsilon\delta\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \pi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$), he cannot enter into the kingdom of God' (Joh_3:5). The phrase 'water and spirit' has been regarded as an instance of hendiadys, and interpreted as 'spiritual water' (Neil, *Figurative Language in the Bible*). Others take it as referring to the baptism of John, and as indicating that repentance is an essential factor in the new birth (*Expos. Times*, vol. iii. p. 318). It has also been interpreted as referring to the sacrament of baptism. This is the most ancient and general view. Wendt and others, however, regard the words $\upsilon\delta\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota$ as a post-Apostolic interpolation (*Gospel according to St. John, ad loc*). This is the most probable conclusion, unless the words are interpreted as referring to the baptism of John unto repentance; see *Expos. Times*, vol. xv. p. 413. (iii.) Water is also used as a symbol of innocence: 'Pilate took water, and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just person' (Mat_27:24). (iv.) As a sign of hospitality or respect (see Gen_24:32; Gen_43:24). Jesus said to Simon the Pharisee, 'I entered into thy house, thou gavest me no water for my feet' (Luk_7:44). (v.) At the supper in the upper room (Joh_13:1-7) the water for the feet had not been provided. The disciples had not noticed the omission, or they were each unwilling to undertake the servile duty. Then 'Jesus riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments; and took a towel, and girded himself. After that, he poureth water into a bason, and began to wash the disciples' feet' (Joh_13:4-5). The ordered detail of the narrative is an indication of the profound impression which the action of Jesus had made upon the Evangelist. The act was full of significance. It was a symbolic service. It taught the disciples the duty of humility, and the need of daily cleansing from the daily defilement of sin. (vi.) In His conversation with the woman of Samaria,

Jesus linked the water which she sought at the well with the living water which He alone could give. He uses it as a symbol of eternal life, the blessings of the gospel in their satisfying and permanent power of good (Joh 4:11-15). (vii.) On the last day of the feast Jesus stood in the Temple and cried, 'If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth in me, as the scripture saith, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living Water' (Joh 7:37 f.). The Evangelist interprets the symbol: 'This spake he of the Spirit, which they which believed on him should receive: for the Holy Spirit was not yet given; because Jesus was not yet glorified' (Joh 7:39). The accuracy of the interpretation has been doubted (Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, vol. i. p. 256 n. [Note: note.]). (viii.) It is also used as a symbol of the smallest service: 'Whosoever shall give unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you he shall in no wise lose his reward' (Mat 10:42 || Mar 9:41). It is possible to punctuate the sentence so that it reads 'a cup of cold water only' or 'only in the name of a disciple.' But the first is greatly to be preferred.

Literature.—Conder, *Palestine*, pp. 25-29; Robinson, *BRP* [Note: *RP Biblical Researches in Palestine.*] i. 342 f.; Smith, *Expositor*, 6th ser. vii. [1903] 212 ff.; art. 'Water' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ; Thomson, *LB* [Note: *The Land and the Book.*] p. 459; Neil, *Figurative Language in the Bible; Expos. Times*, vol. iii. [1892] p. 318, vol. vi. [1895] p. 389, vol. xv. [1904] p. 413.

John Reid.

☞ Waterpot

WATERPOT (ὕδρια, freq. in LXX Septuagint for Gen 24:14 כַּר, Jdg 7:16, 1Ki 17:12; 1Ki 18:33, Ecc 12:6).—1. Joh 2:6-7 λίθιναι ὑδρία ἐξ κείμεναι ... γεμίσατε τὰς ὑδρίας ὕδατος. The stone waterpots (אֲבִימִים כְּלִי in Rabbinic writings) were placed outside the reception-room, for the washing of the hands before and after eating, as well as of the vessels used (cf. Mar 7:2-4, Mat 15:2, Luk 11:38). 'For such an occasion the family would produce or borrow the largest and handsomest stone vessels that could be procured' (Edersheim, *LT* [Note: *T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* [Edersheim].] i. 357).

The view of Westcott, first put forth in 1859 in a note to his *Characteristics of the Gosp. Mir.* (p. 14), and afterwards stated more fully in his *Com. on St. John* (37, 38), that it was not the water in those vessels that was changed into wine, but the water which the servants drew from the source after having filled the vessels, has

commended itself to many students of the Gospels. But it has not superseded the traditional view, which must be acknowledged to have in its favour the first impression produced on the minds of readers of the narrative in all ages,—a fact of great weight. Readers in general have understood that the number and capacity of the vessels were stated immediately before the command to fill them, in order to convey the idea that their entire contents were changed into wine (Dods, *Expos. Gr. NT* i. 704), and also that the clause ‘they filled them up to the brim’ was added in order to exclude all possible suspicion of collusion (Trench, *Mir.* 104, after Chrys.). Such are the principal objections to Westcott’s view, which, however, must not be hastily pronounced to be inadmissible, or even improbable. When the arguments in its favour are carefully weighed, the balance seems to lie almost equal between it and the ordinary view.

(i.) ‘It is unlikely that water taken from vessels of purification should have been employed for the purpose of the miracle.’ This argument holds good even supposing that the vessels had already been partially or wholly emptied by pouring water on the hands of the guests (Plummer, *in loc.*). (ii.) The words ‘Draw out *now*,’ etc., are perhaps most naturally understood to mean that the same action of drawing water from the source was to be carried on as before, but that the water so drawn was now to have a different destination. In like manner Joh 2:9 seems to imply that the servants who had drawn the water had borne it, in obedience to Jesus’ word, straight from the source to the ruler of the feast. It may, however, be argued that the *νῦν* may equally well mean, ‘Now that the vessels are quite full, bear from them to the ruler of the feast’ (in pitchers out of which he would fill the cups of the guests, Meyer, *in loc.*). (iii.) Though it would be hazardous to say that the words οἱ ἠντληκότες τὸ ὕδωρ in Joh 2:9 render it probable that ὕδωρ (also from the source) is to be understood after ἀντλήσατε in Joh 2:8, it may yet be stated that ἀντλεῖν is frequently used of the drawing of water (cf. Gen 24:13, Exo 2:16, Isa 12:3, Joh 4:7; Joh 4:15), but rarely of the drawing of wine, so that on the whole the use of the word is in favour of Westcott’s view.* [Note: Giles of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, has favoured the writer with the following note on the use of ἀντλεῖν. ‘I do not know of any example in Attic Greek of ἀντλεῖν in the sense of ‘draw wine’ (for which ἀρύτω or ἀφύσσω (in poetry) would be expected) except the following from a fragment of Pherecrates, the comic poet, κόραι ... πληρεις χύχας σίνου μέλαιδος ἀνθοσμίου ἦντων διὰ χώνης τοῖσι βουλομένοις πιεῖν (Meineke, Frag. ii. 300). Though the comic poets have so much to say of wine, this, apparently, is the sole instance. It was possibly slang, and the verb is certainly used by the Alexandrian writers as a slang word, as in

the recently discovered Herodas, iv. 14, οὐ γὰρ τι πολλὴν οὐδ' ἔτοιμον ἀντλοῦμεν (like our 'raking in the shekels'). The use for wine had also continued, because in Theocritus x. 13 occurs the proverb ἐκ πίθῳ ἀντλεῖς (like our 'going it'). Something nearer NT times would be useful, but I cannot discover that it occurs in the Papyri.] (iv.) It is suggested that this view is most in keeping with the symbolical and spiritual character of the miracle. The turning of the water into wine was a σημεῖον by which Jesus manifested His glory. The filling of the vessels with water was part of the 'sign,' and pointed to the fulfilling of the Law (cf. Mat 5:17). At the command of Jesus 'they filled them up to the brim.' This may have been designed to show that the preparation of the Law was now complete. It had reached its high-water mark, if we may so speak. The number and capacity of the vessels, and their being utilized for 'the purifying of the Jews,' may thus be regarded as providentially ordered circumstances, designed to bring out the significance of Jesus' act in its relation to the Law. The vessels were filled and then left as they stood, while the water which the servants, in obedience to Jesus' word, drew from the source was carried past them and delivered to the ruler of the feast, who on tasting it said to the bridegroom, 'Thou hast kept the good wine until now.' Full justice, it may be argued, is thus done to the spiritual import of the miracle, which was intended to represent that what the Law with its elaborate ceremonial could not do, Jesus could now do for those unto whom He had come—impart to them the true joy of salvation (cf. Psa 104:15, Mar 2:22 and parallels). The views set forth in the *Encyc. Bibl.* ii. 1796, 1800, 2539; Wendt, *St. John's Gospel*, 83, 240, may be compared with the foregoing statement.—'The symbolical interpretation of Scripture must not be hastily set aside because it has been often disfigured by unlicensed fancies' (Westcott, *Char. Gosp. Mir.* xii). A symbolical interpretation may also be quite consistently held by those who maintain the traditional view. But apart from symbolism altogether, the miracle taken by itself is comforting and edifying in the highest degree, as a proof that Christ's hallowing presence is with us in our common interests and enjoyments, and that He blesses all life's relationships.—It may be added that if it was the entire contents of the vessels that became wine, the magnitude of the gift is an example of our Lord's abundant mercies, with which we may compare the miracle of the loaves and the twelve baskets of fragments that were left.

2. Joh 4:28 ἀφήκεν οὖν τὴν ὑδρίαν αὐτῆς ἢ γυνή. The waterpot of the woman of Samaria was one of those Jars of sun-dried clay which are still in use in the East, and which are carried upon the head or on the shoulder (*Encyc. Bibl.* i. 887, iii. 3818; *Land and Book*, 576; Lane, *Mod. Egyptians*⁵ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , i. 187-188, who calls attention to the word *garrah* or *jarrah* for a water-pitcher, from which our word 'jar' is derived). Her leaving her waterpot was not, as some say, because her faith in Christ made her forget the purpose for which

she had originally come, but because it impelled her to announce her discovery of Him to others without delay; and in her haste to return to Sychar with the news, she did not choose to be encumbered with her heavy waterpot, which could be fetched at any time.

Literature.—Westcott, *Characteristics of the Gosp. Miracles, and Com. on St. John*; Edersheim, *LT [Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].]* ; Dods, *EGT [Note: GT Expositor's Greek Testament.]* ; Dictionaries of the Bible; Lane, *Modern Egyptians*.

James Donald.

Way

WAY.—The term 'way' is used in the OT and NT in a great variety of senses, physical (see art. Roads) and moral. Any good concordance will show the frequency of the word and the range of its application. Jesus calls Himself 'the Way.' 'I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father, but by me' (Joh_14:6). In the remarkable interview in which this passage occurs, the subject of conversation was the goal of life, the ultimate destiny of the little company. 'I go to prepare a place for you.' The declaration was an enigma. Thomas and Philip gave expression to the perplexity of the rest. 'We know not whither thou goest, and how can we know the way?' The *whither* is (1) union with God, (2) the Father's home, and as a corollary, (3) holiness. But the way to the end—what is it? 'I am the way.' As if He said, 'Through me, through what I have done, through what I have been teaching, through what I am about to do.' They had forgotten, or not understood, that He was the Incarnate Word, that He and the Father were one, and that He was laying down His life for them; but when they did understand these things then they would know the way. In Heb_10:19-20 the blood of Christ seems to be the way: 'Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us.' Those who believe in Christ are 'of the Way' (Act_9:2; Act_19:9; Act_22:4). Saul 'desired of the high priest letters to Damascus to the synagogues, that if he found any that were of the Way, he might bring them bound unto Jerusalem.' The name served as a convenient term by which to describe the disciples in the early Church. Among the orthodox Jews it was a term of contempt; among the disciples of honour: for had not Jesus claimed to be the Way? A way leads to somewhere. Christ the new and living way leads to holiness, and heaven, and God.

Literature.—The *Lexicons* of Cremer and Grimm-Thayer, s.v. ὁδός; Expositor, iv. x. [1894] 450 ff.; Paget, *Christ the Way* (1902).

R. Leggat.

☛ Wayside

WAYSIDE.—Two blind men sat by the wayside begging, as Jesus left Jericho on His way to Jerusalem (Mat_20:30). They had probably taken their station at a spot near the city where several paths met, and which may have been planted with trees. Again, in the parable of the Sower, some of the seed fell ‘by the wayside’ (Mat_13:4), *i.e.* along the road (*παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν*), where the ground was so hard as to be impenetrable by it. Jesus gave His own interpretation of the parable. (1) Owing to their hardness of heart men do not understand the word. They hear but do not heed. It falls like seed on a drumhead; and then (2) the fowls of the air come and devour it. Hearts worn hard by selfishness and worldliness do not give entrance to the Divine truth, and the truth lying there is either trampled and destroyed by cares and anxieties, or snatched away by the host of passing thoughts.

R. Leggat.

☛ Wealth

WEALTH.—1. The Gospels differ from each other very considerably in their contributions to the subject of wealth. The Gospel of Jn. contributes scarcely anything. Such words as *πλούσιος*, *πλοῦτος*, *πλουτεῖν*, *θησαυρός*, *θησαυρίζειν* do not occur in it; and *πτωχός* is found only in Joh_12:5-6; Joh_12:8; Joh_13:29. Mk. contributes little—only Mar_4:19 and a few characteristic touches in the narrative of the Rich Young Ruler and the discourse following upon it, as for instance Mar_10:24. It is to Mt. and Lk. that we are indebted for practically all the teaching in the Gospels on this subject. And the material supplied by them is specially rich. But it is not uniform. There is a contrast between the teaching on wealth in Lk. and that in Mt. Lk. has preserved a series of utterances of our Lord, which on the face of them seem hostile to wealth and partial to poverty. These consist partly of sayings peculiar to Lk. and partly of sayings common to Lk. and Mt., but having in Lk.’s version a sense apparently less favourable to wealth. The following sayings regarding wealth are

peculiar to Luk 1:53; Luk 3:11; Luk 4:18; Luk 6:24-25; Luk 12:13-21; Luk 14:12-14; Luk 14:33; Luk 16:1-13; Luk 16:19-31. The following are illustrations of sayings common to Mt. and Lk., but with an apparent bias against wealth in Lk.'s version of them: Mat 5:3, cf. Luk 6:20; Mat 6:19-21, cf. Luk 12:33; Mat 5:42, cf. Luk 6:30; Mat 19:21, cf. Luk 18:22; in the parable of the Marriage Feast (Mat 22:1-14) it is the 'good and bad' who are gathered in from the highways, in the parable of the Great Supper (Luk 14:16-24) it is the 'poor and maimed and blind and lame.'

Because of these differences the Gospel of Lk. has been charged with Ebionism (wh. see). It has been said that it preaches the sinfulness of wealth and the merit of poverty. By some this characteristic is taken to be a faithful reproduction of the spirit and teaching of Jesus; by others it is attributed to Lk. or to his sources, or to the influence of the sub-Apostolic period to which, by them, this Gospel is assigned. But before the Gospel of Lk. is credited with a bias against wealth and in favour of poverty, certain facts, pointing to a different conclusion, have to be taken account of. In the first place, what might be construed as proofs of Ebionism are to be found in some of the other Gospels also. The strongest saying of Jesus against wealth, 'It is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God,' is recorded by Mt. (Mat 19:24) and Mk. (Mar 10:25) as well as by Lk. (Luk 18:25). So also are the incidents of Peter and Andrew, of James and John, and of Matthew or Levi leaving all to follow Jesus (Mat 4:18-22; Mat 9:9, Mar 1:16-20; Mar 2:14, Luk 5:11; Luk 5:27-28) Mt. and Mk. tell of the Baptist's ascetic manner of life (Mat 3:4, Mar 1:6). It is to Mt. that we are indebted for the record of the sayings, 'Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth' (Mat 6:19), and 'The poor have good tidings preached to them' (Mat 11:5). In Mat 13:22 and Mar 4:19 Jesus is represented as using the phrase 'the deceitfulness of riches,'—words not recorded by Lk.; and it is Mt. and Mk., not Lk., who have preserved the saying of our Lord in which He speaks of the blessedness of leaving lands (ἀγροὺς) for His sake (Mat 19:29, Mar 10:29). On the other hand, Lk. reports incidents and sayings the reverse of Ebionitic. In the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus recorded by him alone (Luk 16:19-31), rich Abraham is in bliss as well as poor Lazarus. It is Lk. who tells of the women of position who ministered to Jesus of their substance (Luk 8:2-3). He alone records Jesus' injunction to His disciples, 'He that hath a purse, let him take it' (Luk 22:36). To him we owe the story of Zacchaeus, a rich man who won Jesus' commendation even though he still retained half his wealth (Luk 19:1-10). And he, in common with the other Evangelists, speaks in terms of approval of another rich man, Joseph of Arimathaea (Luk 23:50-53). At the same time it can scarcely be doubted that the prominence accorded in Lk. to the contrast between poverty and wealth, and to sayings of our Lord which seem to favour the poor, indicates a deep interest on the part of the writer in the problem of wealth and poverty. See Poor and Poverty.

2. What, then, is the view of wealth presented in the Gospels? What, in particular, is Jesus' view of wealth? (1) He assumes, though He nowhere explicitly declares, *the lawfulness of the possession of wealth*. This is implied in such parables as those of the Talents (Mat 25:14-30), the Pounds (Luk 19:12-27), and the Unjust Steward (Luk 16:1-8), all of which deal with the uses of money, without any disapprobation of its possession being indicated. It is implied in His parting injunctions to His disciples (Luk 22:35-36), and in the saying, 'Make to yourselves friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness' (Luk 16:9), which also involve the possession and use of money. It is implied even in the demand which He made of the Rich Young Ruler and others to part with wealth (Mat 19:21, Luk 18:22; Luk 12:33; Luk 14:33), and in the exhortation, 'Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth' (Mat 6:19). In each of these cases Jesus appealed to men to forego what He did not deny was their right. 'He was pressing on them a moral choice, not establishing an economic law' (Speer). The woes pronounced upon the rich and prosperous (Luk 6:24-26) have parallels in the OT (Isa 10:2, Amo 2:6-7; Amo 8:6), and are to be explained on the ground of the moral dangers of wealth as well as on the ground of the oppression of the pious poor by the rich. Nor is the fate of Dives (Luk 16:19-31) any proof that Jesus condemned the possession of wealth as such. See Dives.

(2) Jesus implies that *wealth is the gift of God*. This is the view of the OT (Psa 89:11; Psa 50:10-12; Psa 50:14 etc.). And it is accepted by Jesus and illustrated in the parables of the Talents (Mat 25:14-30), the Pounds (Luk 19:12-27), and the Foolish Rich Man (Luk 12:16-21). In all these, gifts and possessions, including wealth, are represented as bestowed on men by God. And this is made specially clear with regard to wealth in the parable of the Foolish Rich Man. The Rich Man's wealth came to him through the medium which is most evidently at God's discretion, namely, through his ground bringing forth plentifully. The same truth is implied in the petition, 'Give us this day our daily bread' (Mat 6:11, Luk 11:3), and in the sayings: 'If God so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?' (Mat 6:30, Luk 12:28); 'Your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things.... All these things shall be added unto you.' (Mat 6:32-33, Luk 12:30-31). And the description of wealth as τὸ ἀλλότριον (Luk 16:12) seems to carry with it the idea that wealth belongs really to God, and is only lent or entrusted by Him to men.

(3) Wealth, according to Jesus, is essentially *a subordinate good*. It is characterized by Him as ἐλάχιστον (Luk 16:10) compared with spiritual interests. It is too uncertain to be the goal of life (Mat 6:19-20). Inasmuch as it is something outside man and apart from him, the possession of it does not necessarily contribute to riches of character, but may, on the contrary, coexist with poverty of soul (Luk 12:16-21; Luk 14:18-19, Mat 22:5-6). Nor will the possession of wealth compensate for the loss

of the true life (Mat 16:26, Mar 8:36-37, Luk 9:25). Life, in fact, in the highest sense of the term, is a larger and richer thing than mere possession of wealth (Luk 12:15; Luk 12:23, Mat 6:20; Mat 6:25; Mat 6:33); and it is, to a considerable degree, independent of wealth (Mat 6:25; Mat 6:33-34, Luk 12:22-23; Luk 12:29-34).

(4) Wealth is *a means, not an end*. It is subordinate to the great moral issues of life, and it is of value only in so far as it promotes the true purpose of life. It is a test and discipline of character. The getting, possessing, and spending of wealth develop qualities which survive death, and are fraught with important consequences in the world to come. This view of wealth is presented in the parables of the Talents (Mat 25:14-30), the Pounds (Luk 19:12-27), the Foolish Rich Man (Luk 12:16-21), the Unjust Steward and Christ's comments on it (Luk 16:1-13), Dives and Lazarus (Luk 16:19-31), and in the picture of the Judgment of Men (Mat 25:31-46). In these passages wealth is regarded as a trust committed by God to man, demanding in the possessor of it fidelity, watchfulness, and foresight. Faithfulness in the administration of the unrighteous mammon prepares for greater and more serious responsibilities in the world to come, and contributes to our well-being there (Luk 16:1-13); but failure to use wealth aright entails loss and condemnation (Luk 12:16-21; Luk 16:10-13; Luk 16:19-31). On the other hand, we are taught in the parable of the Unrighteous Steward that as the Steward employed his lord's wealth in securing for himself friends who would support him after he was deprived of his office, so we should administer the wealth committed to us in such a way that it will contribute to our well-being in the world to come.

As to how exactly this is to be done Jesus lays down no detailed rules, trusting rather to the impulses of the regenerate heart issuing in right action. Where love to God and love to man rule the life, wealth will be wisely administered. 'The cross of Christ is the solution of the social problem' (Kambli). At the same time, we are not left without hints and indications as to how one inspired by the enthusiasm of Christianity will deal with wealth. In acquiring wealth he will have regard to the rights and claims of his fellowmen as much as to his own (Mat 22:39; Mat 7:12, Mar 12:31, Luk 6:31). He will be sparing in his own personal expenditure, and will aim at simplicity of life (Luk 10:41-42 (Revised Version margin)). He will be mindful of the claims of relatives (Mar 7:10-13). He will contribute liberally in gifts and personal service for the advancement of God's Kingdom, even at much sacrifice and inconvenience (Luk 21:1-4; Luk 8:1-3; Luk 23:50-56). Nor need the gift necessarily be justifiable on purely utilitarian grounds: it may be artistically expressive of devotion and gratitude (Mat 26:6-13, Mar 14:3-9, Joh 12:2-8, Luk 7:36-50). Such a one will also relieve the needs of his fellow-men, either by almsgiving or by personal ministrations, or in some other way suggested by circumstances (Mat 6:2-4; Mat 19:21; Mat 25:31-46, Mar 10:21, Luk 6:30; Luk 10:30-37; Luk 12:33; Luk 14:12-14; Luk 19:8, Joh 13:29), care, however, always being taken that ostentation or other wrong motives may not

the value of the gift or service (Mat 6:2-4). And Jesus, by His commendation of Mary for her gift of costly spikenard (Mat 26:6-13, Mar 14:3-9, Joh 12:3-8), and of the woman who was a sinner for a similar act (Luk 7:36-50), as well as by His presence at the marriage at Cana of Galilee (Joh 2:1-11), and at feasts, and by His appreciation of nature, seems to sanction expenditure of wealth in ministering not merely to the necessities of men, but also to their happiness through the gratification of their social instincts and their love of beauty.

(5) But whilst Jesus implies the lawfulness of private possessions and gives guidance as to the right use of them, He is at the same time keenly alive to *the perils attached to wealth*; and His recorded utterances contain many warnings with reference to them. This is the explanation of those sayings of His which seem on the first reading of them to condemn wealth and the possession of it. He characterizes money as 'the mammon of unrighteousness' and 'the unrighteous mammon' (Luk 16:9; Luk 16:11), not because money is evil in itself, but because the getting and possessing and spending of it are so apt to lead to unrighteousness. Again, He pronounces woe upon the rich and prosperous (Luk 6:24-25), not only because they were too often guilty of oppressing the pious poor, but also because their wealth exposed them to grave spiritual perils. And He indicates what some of these perils are. Wealth tends to delude a man as to his real worth, and to invest him with a factitious importance (Luk 12:16-21). It tends to become a man's god, and to oust the true God from His supremacy in the heart (Mat 6:24, Luk 16:13; Luk 12:16-21). The rich man is apt to trust in his riches, not in God, and to think that the possession of them insures him against adversity (Luk 12:16-21). Wealth is also apt to make him forgetful of his indebtedness to God, and to lead him to regard God's gifts to him as his own absolute possessions to do with as he pleases (Luk 12:16-21). Further, wealth has the tendency to deaden the possessor's sense of spiritual need and his aspirations after spiritual good (Mat 13:22, Luk 12:16-21; Luk 16:19-31, Mat 22:5, Luk 14:18-20). It tends also to limit the possessor's thoughts to this present world and its interests, to the exclusion of higher things (Mat 6:19-34, Luk 12:16-21; Luk 16:19-31). It is apt to come into conflict with the demands of the Kingdom of God and to indispose to the acceptance of them (Mat 19:16-26, Mar 10:17-27, Luk 18:18-27; Luk 9:57-62; Luk 14:18-20, Mat 22:5). There is the danger, too, of producing alienation of sympathy from our fellow-men and selfish ignoring of their needs and claims (Luk 12:16-21; Luk 16:19-31). And, lastly, there is the danger of covetousness (Luk 12:15, Mat 13:22), wealth tending to breed the desire for more wealth (Luk 12:16-21), though this sin may beset those also who do not possess (Luk 12:13-15).

(6) These dangers, vividly realized by Jesus and greatly dreaded by Him, led Him to make use occasionally of *language which, interpreted literally, would seem to teach the incompatibility of the possession of wealth with membership in the Kingdom of*

God. Such are the Woes pronounced on the rich and prosperous (Luk 6:24-25), the conversation following the incident of the Rich Young Ruler (Mat 19:23-24, Mar 10:23-25, Luk 18:24-25), and the demand that whosoever would be His disciple must renounce all that he hath (Luk 14:33). These utterances are to be explained partly by the circumstances of the age in which they were spoken. Jesus foresaw trouble and affliction for His followers. In the world they would have tribulation: they would be hated of all men for His name's sake. Hence, if they were to endure unto the end, it was necessary that they should hold property and friends and life cheap, ready to part with them for the sake of Christ (Mat 10:34-39, Luk 14:26). And this was specially incumbent on those who were to be the preachers and missionaries of the gospel (Luk 9:57-62, Mat 8:18-22). Hence Jesus' demand that those who would be His disciples should renounce all that they had. And hence also the severe things He says regarding the rich. But these utterances are to be interpreted also in accordance with Jesus' practice of embodying His teaching in bold, striking, picturesque utterances designed and fitted to arrest attention. He expresses Himself thus strongly in order to impress men in all ages with the extreme peril of wealth, and to admonish the rich that they should hold their wealth lightly, and be ready to sacrifice it if duty demands.

But Jesus went further, and in one case at least demanded of an aspirant for eternal life that he sell all and give to the poor if he would have treasure in heaven (Mat 19:16-22, Mar 10:17-22, Luk 18:18-23). This demand may have been made to make clear to the Young Man the inadequacy of his observance of the Divine law, and especially the shallowness of his love for his neighbour. But more probably it was made in accordance with the principle, laid down elsewhere by Jesus, that whatever interests or relationships conflict with a man's spiritual well-being and with the claims of God's Kingdom should be sacrificed, even though in themselves legitimate (Mat 5:29-30; Mat 19:10-12, Mar 9:43; Mar 9:45; Mar 9:47, Luk 14:26). It was probably perceived by Jesus that the Young Ruler's wealth was interfering with his realization of the highest good, and would render loyal and enthusiastic discipleship impossible for him. Hence Jesus called upon him to part with it. Though this is the only case of the kind recorded in the Gospels, it may well be that there were others similar. But even though it stand alone, it is sufficient to establish the principle that the influence of wealth on the possessor may be so injurious to his highest interests that he must renounce it if he is to enter into life. See also Property.

Literature.—Rogge, *Derirdische Besitz im NT*, 1897; Jacoby, *Jesus Christus und die irdischen Güter*, 1875; Holtzmann, 'Die ersten Christen und die sociale Frage,' and Kampli, 'Das Eigenthum im Licht des Evangeliums,' both in *Wissenschaftliche Vorträge über religiöse Fragen*, 1882; Wendt, 'Das Eigenthum nach christlicher Beurteilung' in *ZThK* [Note: *ThK Zeitschrift f. Theologie u. Kirche.*], 1898; Naumann, *Jesus als Volksmann*, 1894; Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*, 1900; Orello Cone,

Rich and Poor in the NT, 1902; Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums*, 1901; Heuver, *The Teachings of Jesus concerning Wealth*, 1903; Speer, *The Principles of Jesus*, 1902; Dickie, *The Christian Ethics of Social Life*, 1903; Stubbs, *Christ and Economics*, 1894; Abbott, *Christianity and Social Problems*, 1896; Denney, 'Christ's Teaching on Money' in *Union Magazine*, September 1901; Ottley, 'Ethics of Property' in *Lombard Street in Lent*; James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, 1902; Feine, *Eine vorkanonische Ueberlieferung des Lukas*, 1891; Campbell, *Critical Studies on Luke*, 1891; Milligan, 'A Group of Parables,' *Expos.*, Sept. [Note: Septuagint.] 1892; Hicks, 'The Communistic Experiment of Acts ii. and iv.,' *Expos.*, Jan. 1906; also Lives of Jesus by Strauss, Renan, Keim, Weiss, Beyschlag, etc.; B. Weiss, *NT Theol.* 1880; Beyschlag, *NT Theol.* [English translation 1895]; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, 1892; various works on the Parables; commentaries on Mt. and Lk., esp. Plummer's 'St. Luke' in *ICC* [Note: *CC International Critical Commentary.*]; artt. 'Matthew,' 'Luke,' and 'Gospels' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible .

J. W. Slater.

☞ Weariness

WEARINESS.—The one reference to the weariness of our Lord which we find in the Gospels occurs in the account of His journey from Judaea into Galilee. We read that on His way, beaten down by heavy toil (κεκοπιακῶς), He sat upon the well near to the village of Sychar (Joh 4:6). The allusion is an eloquent testimony to the fact that He who is touched by the feeling of our infirmity shared that infirmity in its commonest effect of physical exhaustion. See Humanity of Christ.

W. W. Holdsworth.

☞ Weaving

WEAVING.—In our Lord's day weaving was done by hand-looms, as still in the East generally. The loom, with its 'beam' and 'shuttle,' which furnished to OT poet and prophet figures of life's swiftness and brevity (cf. Job 7:6, Isa 38:12), is not directly mentioned in the Gospels. While in the earlier days in Palestine weaving was done mostly by men, later it fell more and more into the hands of women. The Rabbis did not give it a high place among the crafts. Among the materials used in weaving were flax, wool, camel's hair and goat's hair. Flax and wool made 'soft clothing' for the royal and the rich (Mat 11:8, Luk 16:19), the rest were wrought into the coarser

garments of the more austere, like John the Baptist (Mat 3:4), into the sackcloth of the mourner (Mat 11:21, Luk 10:13), or into tents or sails. Jesus wore a seamless garment (χιτὼν ἄρραφος, Joh 19:23), woven in one piece, from the top throughout, made probably by faithful, ministering women (Luk 8:2 f., Mat 27:55); and when He was buried, the cloth in which His body was wrapped was of linen (Mar 15:46, Mat 27:59, Luk 24:12, Joh 19:40).

E. B. Pollard.

☞ Wedding Garment

WEDDING GARMENT.—The parable in which the incident of the wedding garment occurs is recorded in Mat 22:1 ff. As there is good reason to “believe that the similar story told in Luk 14:16 ff. is not a different version of the same parable, but another teaching given on a different occasion, there will be no attempt made to find what light Lk.’s parable of the Great Supper throws on it. The wedding garment fits in as naturally with Mt.’s story as it would be out of place in Lk.’s.

Questions have been discussed with much learning as to whether the wedding garment means the righteousness of Christ or the righteousness of good works, whether it be something that we must do for ourselves or something that is done for us. The story, however, makes it quite plain that it is nothing we can do for ourselves. Those gathered from the highways and lanes had certainly no opportunity for making themselves garments that would be fit for the royal presence. There is no occasion to search for illustrations showing that in the East it was not uncommon at high festivals to provide guests with suitable garments, because whether that was the case or not historically, it is certainly the case parabolically. The attitude of the king throughout the story is represented as so generous that it is inconceivable that he should fling one of his guests into a dungeon because he was unable to find for himself a suitable marriage garment. The man is punished for his impudence in supposing that he could come into the king’s presence just as he was. If, then, we inquire what the truth is that our Lord wishes to express, it is plainly this, which we find again and again in Scripture, that no one is clean in God’s sight. And when this sinful condition is contrasted with God’s absolute holiness, no conclusion can be drawn but that man as he is cannot stand in God’s presence.

The wedding garment means, then, something that God supplies, enabling the sinner to stand in His presence. Now there is nothing in the spiritual world that properly answers to a cloak or garment. Here, dress may effect a deception, may make a man appear to be what he is not, but there all is real, and the character is seen through

and through. Commentators have therefore rightly felt that the wedding garment must denote an element in character. It is not, on the one hand, what is popularly known as good works, because they may have no root in the character; nor is it some fictitious imputation of what does not really belong to us; nor is it, as Archer Butler suggests, a spirit of sympathetic joy with the wedding festivities. It is something the lack of which deserves searching judgment, the presence of which is absolutely necessary. What is it? Is it not that definite relationship with Christ which is so clearly expressed in the hymn—

‘Rock of Ages cleft for me,

Let me hide myself in thee,’

a relationship implying the closest possible union? It is not something fictitious or unreal, but something which the fact of sin demands. For just as the spirit of independence is a ridiculous assumption for the creature in the presence of his Creator, so that of dependence on a perfect character carries with it a definite moral quality.

It may be said that this interpretation explains the substantive but not the adjective, that we have a meaning for ‘garment’ but not for ‘wedding garment.’ The wedding of the parable stands for the union of God with humanity—the Incarnation, as we call it. The indifference to that fact is the heaviest condemnation the world can receive. That was the blunder of the commercial people of our Lord’s time, who were so engrossed with their own business as to pay no attention to the presence of Christ in the world, and who, when it seemed as though it would interfere with their concerns, did their best to destroy it. The blunder of the outcast is to suppose that this wonderful condescension was not necessary. It is this that is depicted in the incident of the wedding garment.

G. H. S. Walpole.

 Week

WEEK.—See Time.

 Weeping

WEEPING.—See Tears.

⚖Weights And Measures

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.—The specific object for which the Gospels were composed did not call for anything like a full detailed use of metrical data. Within their limited compass there are only incidental allusions to a system, or rather systems, of weights and measures. These are naturally scanty and obscure. The most that can be done with them is to identify them as nearly as possible with equivalents in modern systems, and to ascertain their places in those that were current in the Palestine of NT times. At this last point a difficulty at once emerges, due partly to the absence of regard for accuracy and precision in such matters prevalent at the time and place, and partly to the mixture of standards derived from successive and widely differing populations coming in with successive waves of conquest and invasion. The situation was not unlike that of modern Syria, with its bewildering confusion of coinage and other standards of value, brought in and grafted on the native system by French, German, and English merchants.

It is generally agreed by expert metrologists that the basis and fountainhead of all systems of measurement is to be traced to Babylonia. But in passing into Western countries, the Babylonian system was naturally subjected to as many modifications as it entered regions, and gave rise to quite as many secondary or derivative systems. These, during the course of the interrelations of the peoples using them, mutually affected one another; and the result was a variety of values called by the same name, or by names derived from the same original. On account of this fact, etymological processes of reasoning are in this field of little value, if not altogether valueless and misleading. Moreover, throughout the whole history of metrology there is a tendency noticeable towards the shrinkage or reduction of primitive values, making it essential to distinguish with great care between the values current under the same name in different periods of history. In the attempt to reach the exact facts as far as the 1st cent. a.d. is concerned, it will be best to bear in mind that in Palestine during the OT period three main systems of metrology came into use more or less extensively, the Babylonian, the Egyptian, and the Phœnician, and that to these, just before the times of Jesus, the Roman conquest added a fourth as a disturbing element.

I. Weights.—The primitive unit of weight was the **shekel**. This developed into two forms, the heavy and the light (cf. Kennedy in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Weights and Measures'). The heavy shekel weighed 252.5 grs., and the light just one-half of that. Perhaps while the shekel was still being used in these forms, a third value was attached to it by the introduction of the Syrian shekel of 320 grs., and a

fourth value later, viz. the Phœnician of 224.4 grs. In Roman times the *denarius* was introduced. This was equivalent to the Attic drachm. But Josephus (*Ant.* iii. viii. 2) represents the Hebrew shekel (σίκλος) as equal to a tetradrachm (4 drs.), and a drachm-denarius was fixed by Nero at 52.62 grs. At least approximately, therefore, for the 1st cent. a.d., three units in the scale of weights may be determined, as follows: the drachm-denarius = 52.5 grs., the light shekel = 105 grs., and the heavy shekel=210 grs. Of the higher units the *mina* is equated with 100 drs., and the **talent** with 60 *minae*, hence the scale:

| | Dr. Den. | Shek. | Tetr. | Min. | Talent. | |
|---|----------|-------|-------|------|-----------|------|
| Drac hm-D enar. | 1 | | | | 52.5+ | grs. |
| Shek. (light). | 2 | 1 | | | 105+ | grs. |
| Shek. (heav y) Tetra drac hm | 4 | 2 | 1 | | 210+ | grs. |
| Mina. | 100 | 50 | 25 | 1 | 5250+ | grs. |
| Tale nt. | 6000 | 3000 | 1500 | 60 | 1 315000+ | grs. |

In the Gospels the words δίδραχμον (light shekel, [Mat_17:24](#)) and *τάλαντον** [Note: *ταλαντιοε* in [Rev_16:21](#) (cf. also Jos. BJ v. vi. 3) can in the nature of the case be only an approximation. The PEFSt, 1892, 289 f., records the discovery of a large stone weighing 64600 grs. (41900 grammes), used as a heavy talent weight.] (talent, [Mat_18:24](#); [Mat_25:15-28](#)) occur, but not as the names of weights; they are the designations of coins (see Money). The only term purely designating a weight is λίτρα (pound, [Joh_12:3](#); [Joh_19:39](#)).* [Note: In this place, according to Hultsch, the λίτρα is not the same as in [Joh_19:39](#). He understands the term to be the name of a translucent horn vessel with measuring lines on the outside, used by apothecaries in

dealing out medicines. Such a measuring instrument was used; but that it served for carrying ointment is improbable, and the identification of the λίτρα here with Joh 19:39 seems more natural.] This was identified with the *mina* of the above scale as its approximate equivalent. Its exact weight in the Roman scale of weights is given as 5050 grs., or 11 oz. avoirdupois.

II. Measures

1. *Measures of Length*.—The unit of linear measurement in earlier Biblical times was the **cubit** (אמה). This was obtained by the adoption of the length of the forearm from the elbow to the tip of the middle finger as the standard. There are evidences that such a standard was early averaged, conventionalized, and made the legal unit among the Israelites, being introduced like other standards of the kind from Baby. Ionia. The cubit did not, however, remain a fixed unit throughout. From Eze 40:5 (cf. Eze 43:13) we learn that two standards of measurement called cubits had come into use, and were employed in the prophet's day, and that these differed by one hand's breadth. The common cubit was six hand-breadths in length, the sacred cubit, seven. The question of the absolute length of either is, therefore, resolved into the value of the handbreadth. It would be useless to discuss in detail the various processes through which the solution of the problem has been attempted. The results of these processes show a divergence of over nine inches. Conder (*Handbook of the Bible*) finds the cubit to be 16 in. in length. Petrie (*Ency. Brit.*⁹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] xxiv. 484) finds it to be 25.2. Between these extremes are the following: A. R. S. Kennedy (*Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible*, art. 'Weights and Measures'), 17.5 in.; Watson (*PEFSt* [Note: *EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.*], 1897, 203 ff.), 17.7; Beswick (*ib.* 1879, 182 ff.), 17.72; Warren (*ib.* 1899, 229 ff.), 17.75 in.; Smith's *DB* [Note: *Dictionary of the Bible.*], based on Thenius, 19.5 in.; and Petrie (*PEFSt* [Note: *EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.*], 1892, 31), 22.6. If we set aside the extremes by Conder and Petrie and Smith's *DB* [Note: *Dictionary of the Bible.*], the divergence in the remainder is reduced to a margin not larger than .25 inch. Accordingly, the consensus of the most recent investigation may be safely taken to fix the value of the cubit in inches at between 17.50 and 17.75. Therefore the symbol, 17.5 + may be accepted as the approximate value of the common cubit among the Israelites. Upon this basis the longer cubit of Eze 40:5 was Eze 20:6 in. This result coincides with the Egyptian metrological system, and it appears probable that, being introduced from Egypt as the equivalent of the royal Egyptian measure of the name, the cubit was gradually reduced until in Ezekiel's day the shorter form of it had been definitely fixed. This, then, persisted up to NT times, and was identified with the Roman *cubitus* of a little less than 17.5 in. (cf. Smith, *Dict. of Antiq.* p. 1227).† [Note: In Egypt, too, there was a longer cubit and a shorter, and these two

were related to one another as 7 to 6, their values in inches being respectively 19.43 and 16.66.]

The subdivisions of the cubit were the **span**, equalling half a cubit; the **palm** or *hand-breadth*, one-sixth of a cubit; and the *digit* or **finger-breadth**, one twenty-fourth of a cubit. The multiples in common use were the **fathom**, consisting of four cubits, and the **reed**, of six cubits. Hence the table:

| | Digit. | Palm. | Span. | Cubit. | Fathom. | Reed. | |
|---------------------------|--------|-------|-------|--------|---------|---------|----|
| Digit (Finger-breadth) | 1 | | | | | -73 | in |
| Palm (Hand-breadth) | 4 | 1 | | | | 3. | in |
| Span . | 12 | 3 | 1 | | | 8.75 | in |
| Cubit . | 24 | 6 | 2 | 1 | | 17.52 | in |
| Fathom. | 96 | 24 | 8 | 41 | | 70.+ | in |
| Reed . | 144 | 36 | 12 | 6 | 1.5 | 1 105.5 | in |

In the Gospels the cubit is mentioned in Mat 6:27, Luk 12:25, and Joh 21:8. In all these passages it appears as an approximation, and neither requires nor admits or precise determination. Lengths less than that of the cubit are not alluded to. Of greater lengths the following occur, being outside the usual scale as given above. The *stadium*, or **furlong** (Luk 24:13, Joh 6:19; Joh 11:18). The term is borrowed from the Greek scale, and appears there as the equivalent of 600 ft. (more precisely 600 ft. 9 in.), or 400 cubits. The mile (Mat 5:41) was also borrowed, but is taken from the Roman scale, and was equal to 7.5 Greek stadia (furlongs), or 3000 cubits (1700 yds.). The **day's journey** (Luk 2:44), which is a common Oriental way of reckoning distances

of considerable length at the present day, seems to have been used in ancient times also. It is not, however, reducible to any definite equivalent, and was no doubt a very elastic term. See on this and on 'Sabbath day's journey,' art. Journey.

2. Measures of Surface.—Of measures of area no mention is made in the Gospels or in the NT anywhere. Occasional allusions to the purchase of land (Mat 13:44; Mat 27:7, Luk 14:18; cf. Act 1:18) are not of such a character as to include the measurement used in these and similar transactions.

3. Measures of Capacity.—These naturally fall into liquid and dry measures. Primitively the most common word for measure of volume in Bible lands was perhaps the *seah* (σάτον, μέτρον, cf. Mat 13:33, which is also the usage of the LXX Septuagint). This was the 'measure' *par excellence*. This, however, became differentiated at least as early as before the NT age into a unit of dry measure, and the *hin*, with twice the capacity of the *seah*, took its place in the corresponding liquid scale. Nevertheless, in ascertaining the values of both liquid and dry standards of measurement, the most convenient starting-point is the *seah*. This, on the one hand, is easily traceable in its equivalents in the Graeco-Roman metrology, and, on the other, as the unit on which the ephah-bath is based, furnishes a key to the Palestinian metrology of both dry and liquid varieties.

As to the equivalency of the *seah* in the classical Graeco-Roman system, the following data give testimony: Josephus (*Ant.* ix. iv. 5) says, 'A *seah* is equal to one and one-half Italian *modii*.' An anonymous writer, cited by Hultsch (*Metr. Script.* i. 81. 6), speaks to the same effect; so also Jerome (on Mat 13:33), who, however, probably simply reproduces this representation. On the other hand, according to Epiphanius (*Metr. Script.* i. 82. 8), the *seah* was equal to one and one-quarter *modii* (20 *sextarii*); but that this is not a precise statement appears from the same writer's equating the *seah* with 22 *sextarii* elsewhere (*Metr. Script.* i. 82. 9). Indirectly from the identification of the *bath*, the *cor*, and the *hin* by Josephus, with their corresponding Roman equivalents (cf. *Ant.* viii. ii. 9, xv. ix. 2, iii. viii. 3), the value of the *seah* is computed at 22 *sextarii*; and as this agrees with the equation of the Babylonian *ephah-bath* with 66 *sextarii* (Hultsch, *Griech. and Rom. [Note: Roman.] Metr.* ii. p. 412), it may be taken as correct.

This gives us the value of the *seah* in Roman *sextarii*. The reduction of the *sextarii* to present-day English standards may be made either upon the basis of the calculations of Hultsch (*Metrol* p. 453), which yield a *sextarius* of .96 pt. (cf. Smith, *Diet. of Ant.*, followed by Harper's *Dict. of Class. Lit. and Ant.*, ed. H. T. Peck), and a *seah* of 21 + pts. (2 gals. 2 qts. and 1 + pts.); or this reduction may be made upon the basis of the use of the Farnese *congius* (= 6 *sextarii*) in the Dresden Museum, which yields a

sextarius of .99 pts. The difference in results between these methods amounts to no more than .03 pt. in the Roman *sextarius*. Neither of the two methods positively excludes, the possibility of error, but the latter appears upon the whole more trustworthy. Thus in the reconstruction of a table we have the equation to start with: *sextarius* = .99 pt. The *seah* (22 *sext.* = 2 Galatians 2 qts. 1.78 pts.) is, then, approximately 23 + pts.

This yields for the dry measure the scale as follows:

| | Log. | Kab. | Omer. | Seah. | Ephah. | Cor. | | |
|-----------------------------|------|------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|------|
| Log. 1 | | | | | | =1 | pt. | |
| Kab.4 | 1 | | | | | =4 | pts. | |
| Ome7.5 r. | 1.8 | 1 | | | | =7½ | pts. | |
| Sea 24 h. | 6 | 3.6 | | 1 | | =23.75 | pts. | |
| Eph 72 ah. | 18 | 10 | | 3 | 1 | =71.28 | pts. | |
| Cor 720 (Ho mer). | 180 | 100 | | 30 | 10 | 1 | =712.8 | pts. |

And for the liquid the scale as follows:

| | Log. | Hin. | Seah. | Bath. | Cor. | | | |
|-------|------|------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|------|
| Log | 1 | | | | = | 1 | pt. | |
| Hin. | 12 | 1 | | | = | 11.9 | pts. | |
| Seah. | 24 | 2 | 1 | | = | 23.8 | pts. | |
| Bath. | 72 | 6 | 3 | 1 | = | 71.28 | pts. | |
| Cor. | 720 | 60 | 30 | 10 | 1 | = | 712.8 | pts. |

These two scales represent the values of measures of capacity of the later days of Judaism. For OT times the value of the *seah* would have to be made larger, and the table correspondingly increased. For practical purposes the *log = sextarius*= pt. equation may be deemed sufficient.

In the Gospels the following allusions to the scales occur. The *seah* (Mat 13:33, Luk 13:21) is the equivalent of one-third of an *ephah*, and so is meant to designate generally as large a quantity as was usually handled in household necessities. Three *seahs* are equal to 35½ qts. or 1 bushel. The *cor* (Luk 16:7) appears under the name of 'measure,' the expression being naturally a general and inexact one. The total quantity intended to be indicated is 100 *Cors* or 1110 bushels.

Measures not included in the above scales occur as follows. The *xestes* (ξέστης, translated 'cup,' Mar 7:4 (8)) was probably a small and handy household vessel, with the capacity of a pint measure, and used as such. The *modius* (μόδιος, Mat 5:15, Mar 4:21, Luk 11:33, translation in all the English versions 'bushel') is not the English bushel, but the Hebrew *seah*. The name is borrowed from the Graeco-Roman usage. The measure itself was, like the *xestes*, a useful household utensil. The *metretes* (μετρητής, Joh 2:6, translation 'firkin') is evidently the *bath* of the Hebrew scale, containing approximately 9 gallons.

Literature.—Hultsch, *Griech. u. Röm. Metrologie*, ii. (1882), also his *Collection of Greek and Roman Sources*, under the title of *Metrologicorum Scriptorum Reliquiæ*, 2 vols. (1864-1866); Lehmann, 'Altbab. Mass u. Gewicht' (in *Verhandl. d. Berliner Gesellschaft f. Anthropol.* 1889); Zuckermann, *Das Jüdische Masssystem* (1867); Nowack, *Heb. Arch.*, i. 198 ff.; Benzinger, *Heb. Arch.* 178 ff.

A. C. Zenos.

Well

WELL (πηγή, φρέατο, Joh 4:6; Joh 4:11).—The one well mentioned in the Gospels is that of Jacob, near ancient Shechem, under the northern cliffs of Gerizim. There is no reasonable doubt that this is the well pointed out to this day as *Bîr Ya'kûb* in the eastern opening of the pass of Nâblus. Samaritan, Jewish, Christian, and Moslem traditions support this identification with absolute unanimity. See Jacob's Well.

There is a law of the well in the East, which, although unwritten, 'receives well-nigh universal homage. Drawing water from the cisterns or wells that abound in Palestine occupies much of the women's time. The stones round the mouth of many a well are scored deeply by friction of the ropes to which the bucket or leather *daluw* is attached. Few experiences are more trying than to pass one of these 'wells' in the heat, seeing the water in the cool depths but having 'nothing to draw with.' The appeal of the thirsty to one drawing, 'Give me to drink,' is never refused. While surprised that a Jew, even when urged by thirst, should thus accost a Samaritan, the woman did not deny the Saviour's request. Even a *Metâwileh*, one of the most fanatical of all Oriental sects, will give water to the thirsty, if appealed to, although to avoid the possibility of pollution he must destroy the vessel from which the infidel has drunk.

W. Ewing.

West

WEST (δυση).—In Palestine the direction of the setting sun is also that of the sea, and the West is therefore the source from which rain is generally expected (1Ki 18:44, Luk 12:54). The observed connexion between western clouds and rain led Christ to remark on the strange inattention to the spiritual trend of the times (Luk 12:56). He attributed such disregard and misrepresentation to self-delusion resulting from insincerity. He recognized that the final stage of imperviousness and impotence had been reached, and that the Kingdom of Heaven required the removal of both teachers and teaching and a re-baptism of religious vision and thought (Mat 23:36-39, Mar 8:12, Joh 4:21).

The reference to North, South, East, and West as the equal sources from which the Kingdom of Heaven was to draw its membership, indicated the universal scope of His own relationship to the world. The same truth is suggested in the vision of the New Jerusalem as the city with an equal number of open gates on its four sides (Rev 21:13). Hence to-day, in the statesmanship of that Kingdom, it is unwise and wasteful to transport to the East the controversies and cleavages of Western Christianity. Only the universal truths of the gospel should be presented to the universal mission field.

G. M. Mackie.

☞Whale

WHALE.—See Jonah, Ninevites, Sign.

☞Wheat

WHEAT.—Of all the cereals, wheat is at once the most valuable and the most widely distributed. It has been cultivated from very early times, as is proved by the finding of wheat grains in some of the oldest Egyptian tombs. In what land it had its-origin is unknown, but de Candolle assigns the honour to Mesopotamia. In Palestine its cultivation dates back to a time prior to the Hebrew conquest (Deu 8:8). How long before cannot be said, but it was probably a considerable time. In the OT the most common name for it is תַּמְדָּה, which the LXX Septuagint renders in most instances by π υρὸς (Gen 30:14, Exo 9:32 etc.) but sometimes by σῖτος (Jdg 6:11, Eze 27:17), and the Vulgate by *triticum* and, in a few cases, *frumentum*. On the other hand, σῖτος is used also to render בָּרֶךְ (Jer 23:28, Joe 2:24), הַגָּן (Num 18:12, Jer 31:12), עֵבֶר (Jos 5:11), and שֶׁבֶר (Gen 42:2-3). In the NT this is the term invariably employed (Mat 3:12, Luk 16:7 etc.), and in Authorized and Revised Versions it is nearly always translated ‘wheat.’ Like the Heb. הַגָּן, however, σῖτος is really a general term for the cereals. But we can readily understand how, just as in Scotland the word ‘corn’ has become practically the equivalent of oats, so in Palestine σῖτος should come to mean wheat. For it was the most common and the most valued of the staple products of the country, and was, as it still is, its principal breadstuff. Several varieties of wheat are grown in Palestine. Tristram (*Nat. Hist. of Bible*, 492) mentions specially three of them: *Triticum compositum*, *T. spelta* (which is the most common of all), and *T. hybernum*.

Wheat is sown about November, shortly after the first rains have softened the soil and rendered it fit for ploughing. It is ripe in May or June, but the time of harvest varies for the different districts, being earliest in the low-lying Jordan Valley, and latest in the Lebanons. The processes of reaping, threshing, winnowing, and sifting have already been described (see Agriculture). The return yielded by wheat varies greatly. Thirty-fold is, according to Tristram, reckoned a good return (*op. cit.* 489). But that applies to Palestine as it is now. The sixty-fold or hundred-fold of the parable (Mat 13:8 | |) might well have been obtained in the days of its former prosperity. Wheat was an article of export from very early days (Eze 27:17, cf. Act 12:20), and

even to this day considerable quantities are exported by way of Haifa and Beirut. It is obtained mainly from the Haurân.

Hugh Duncan.

☠️ Wicked

WICKED.—Wickedness (πονηρία) is sin contemplated, not in the light of judicial guilt, or even of moral badness, but of the active mischief which it works.

Four Greek words in NT are translated ‘wicked’ in Authorized and Revised Versions .

(1) ἄθεσμος (only in 2Pe 2:7; 2Pe 3:17). This describes the man who will not walk according to the lines laid down (τίθεσθαι) for him by others; the man who gratifies his own desires and whims, in defiance of public opinion, or even of Divine regulation.

(2) ἄνομος (Act 2:23, and nine other times; ἀνομία, sixteen times). This word originally has to do by derivation with the sheep that will not stay in its own pasture (νομός), or the man who breaks through limits (νόμοι) assigned, and hence signifies a lawless man. The thought is similar to that in (1).

(3) κακος. Meaning originally ‘unpleasant’ (cf. Luk 16:5, Act 28:5, Rev 16:2), and then ‘failing to answer expectation or fulfil the apparent reason for existence,’ the word comes to mean ‘morally bad’ as opposed to ἀγαθός, morally good (Mat 21:41; Mat 24:48, Col 3:5 etc.).

(4) πονηρός. This is the usual NT word; and it occurs very frequently, being usually rendered ‘wicked’ or ‘evil.’ It is connected by derivation with *toil* (τόνος). J. J. Schmidt suggests that, like the word ‘villainy,’ it has drifted from meaning ‘labouring’ and hence ‘lower class’ to ‘degraded’ and thence ‘vicious.’ But it seems more probable that the root thought in πονηρός is ‘causing trouble,’ ‘mischievous,’ and thence ‘actively wicked’ in contrast to χρηστός ‘actively good.’ A vivid picture of the thought involved is found in Mat 13:24-30; Mat 13:36-43, where the tares are the

fruit of the ‘wicked one,’ ὁ πονηρός. The bad man (κακός) may be content to sin alone, the wicked man (τονηρός) seeks to draw away others also.

1. *The causes of wickedness.*—(a) The wicked one (Mat 13:19; Mat 13:38, Eph 6:16, 1Jn 2:13-14; 1Jn 3:12, perh. Mat 6:13, etc.). The first great source of evil is apparently the devil. He is the great mischief-maker who disarranges God’s orderly world (κόσμος, Mat 4:8; Mat 13:35, etc.), and is ever found in antagonism to Christ’s dominion (Mat 13:37; Mat 13:39, 1Jn 5:18-20 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885). (b) Wicked spirits. Scripture reveals to us not only a general, but also an army of wicked spirits who are ever ready to do his work (see Mat 12:45, Act 19:12-13, etc.). (c) Fallen human nature. Suggestions from without are reinforced by willingness from within. Depraved human nature (cf. Mat 7:11) is traitor to Christ (Mat 15:19, Mar 7:22, Luk 11:39, Rom 1:29). This is the permanent condition of the world apart from Christ (1Jn 5:19, Gal 1:4).

2. *Manifestations of wickedness.*—The tree of wickedness has many kinds of fruit, by which we detect its character (Mat 7:17-18): e.g. violence (Mat 5:39, Act 17:5, 2Th 3:2), hypocrisy (Mat 22:18), an unforgiving spirit (Mat 18:32), idleness (Mat 25:26), unbelief (Heb 3:12), self-sufficiency (Jam 4:16), spite (3Jn 1:10); everything, in fact, that is unlike Christ, flourishes in the devil’s Eden—the lost world.

3. *The consequences of wickedness.*—The ‘children of the wicked one,’ if unredeemed from his service, will share his doom (Mat 13:49-50; Mat 25:26; Mat 25:30, Rom 1:29; Rom 1:32; cf. Eph 2:2-3).

4. *The remedy for wickedness.*—God’s attitude towards the wicked man is not one of implacable anger, but of winning kindness (Luk 6:35). Reconciled through the cross of Christ (Col 1:20-21), the wicked man may find complete pardon for the past. Nay more, he may be so renewed in nature as to have no taste for his former way of life (Rom 12:9, Act 3:26, 1Co 5:8, 1Th 5:22). And further, he may not only be completely ransomed from the slavery in which he was formerly held (Mat 6:13, Joh 17:15, 2Th 3:3, 1Jn 5:18 Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885), but may become actually victorious, through the imparted power of Christ, over the evil one, who is now bitterly antagonistic to his former subject (1Jn 2:13-14, Eph 6:11-13).

Literature.—Trench, *Synonyms*; Grimm-Thayer and Cremer, *Lexx. s.vv. κακός, τονηρος*

Widow

WIDOW (χήρα).—Four widows are referred to in the Gospels.

1. Anna of the tribe of Asher (Luk 2:36-38), a devout woman described as a prophetess, who had been a widow eighty-four years, and who constantly frequented the Temple, passing her time in fastings and prayers, and who, coming up at the moment of the presentation of the infant Saviour, moved by the spirit of prophecy, spake of Him to those present who were expecting the redemption of Jerusalem. The Lewis MS of the Syriac Gospels says that Anna lived only seven days with her husband, an alteration not improbably made by some scribe with the object of reducing Anna's age to a less unusual limit. See also art. Anna.
2. The widow of Sarepta or Zarephath, referred to by our Lord in the synagogue at Nazareth (Luk 4:25-26) as an instance of a Gentile who had entertained Elijah, and had received a blessing by his means. It has been suggested by A. Meyer (*Jesu Muttersprache*, iv. 8) that the word 'widow' here may have been 'Gentile' in some Aramaic original, ܐܪܡܝܝܬܐ (*armaita*), the feminine of 'Gentile' or 'Syrian' 'having been confused with ܐܪܡܝܬܐ (*armalta*), 'a widow.' If this were so, then our Lord's reference to Naaman the *Syrian* would be balanced by a reference to 'a woman who was a Syrian' or 'Gentile.'
3. The widow of Nain (Luk 7:11-17), a little town situated a few miles to the south of Mount Tabor in Galilee, to whom our Lord uttered His compassionate 'Weep not' just before restoring her only son to life. The people who witnessed the miracle exclaimed that a great prophet had risen up among them, probably with reference to Elijah or Elisha, the former of whom, like Christ, had raised a widow's son.
4. The poor widow who cast her two mites into the treasury (Mar 12:41-44, Luk 21:1-4), whom Christ commended. It should not be forgotten in practical applications of this incident and of our Lord's praise of the widow, that she cast in 'all her living,' that is to say, her day's entire income, or 'all that she had to live upon until more should be earned' (Swete), and that consequently the phrase 'widow's mite' is incorrectly applied to small sums deducted, and more or less easily spared, from a daily income.

In addition to these four widows, who were actual persons, a widow is a character in one of our Lord's parables (Luk 18:1-8), who, having no power to enforce the justice she claims, obtains it at length by her importunity; and from this our Lord draws His a

fortiori conclusion that God will hear and answer those who cry day and night unto Him. Further, widows are referred to by Christ (Mat_23:14 [omitted by Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885], Mar_12:40, Luk_20:47) as being often cruelly oppressed and defrauded by the Pharisees of His day.

It may be regarded as certain that our Lord's mother was a widow during the time of His ministry, hence His recommendation of her, just before His death, to the beloved disciple (Joh_19:26 f.).

The honourable and important position which widows occupied in the early Church is entirely in harmony with the respectful and sympathetic tone in which they are referred to in the above places of the Gospels.

In the Lewis MS of the Syriac Gospels the Syrophœnician woman (Mar_7:26) is described as a widow. This may be another instance of the possible confusion of 'widow' and 'Gentile' alluded to above.

Albert Bonus.

Wife

WIFE (γυνή).—For the general subject see Family, Marriage, Woman.

Our Lord places the claims of a wife above those of a father or mother, and emphasizes in the most striking way the spiritual and bodily unity, indissoluble except for one cause, of the two who have been joined together in marriage (Mat_19:3 ff., Mar_10:2 ff.). And precisely because of His exalted conception of a wife's place in her husband's heart, He teaches the absoluteness of His own claims on the loyalty and obedience of His disciples, by setting them clearly in a man's eyes over against those of the wife of his bosom. It was on the same occasion on which He pronounced what might be called the *Magna Charta* of married womanhood that He uttered those solemn words about the need of forsaking a wife for His sake and the gospel's (Mat_19:29, Mar_10:29; cf. Luk_18:29). And in the parable of the Great [Note: reat Cranmer's 'Great' Bible 1539.] Supper, among the rejected excuses of those who do not accept the gracious invitation, is that of the man who said, 'I have married a wife, and therefore I cannot come' (Luk_14:19).

J. C. Lambert.

Wild Beasts

WILD BEASTS.—See Animals in vol. i. p. 64^bf.

Wilderness

WILDERNESS.—The word or words (more or less synonymous) which the Authorized and Revised Versions translation by ‘wilderness’ or ‘desert’ afford a striking example of the difficulties which translators, and after them the ordinary readers of Holy Scripture, have to contend with, because that word does not convey to our mind the idea of something we know: in our western European countries there is not, properly speaking, any desert or wilderness, in the Biblical sense of the word. Thus, unable to consult our own experience, we have to fall back upon books we have read, and upon notions obtained in that way. Immediately there rises in our memory the view of a desert of sand, stretching itself out of sight in a complete solitude, and giving to the caravans of travellers scarcely any other choice but death from thirst, or burial under the moving soil blown up by some terrible windstorm. Such is the classical representation of a desert or wilderness, and it is a constant source of errors for the understanding of numerous passages of the Bible where that word occurs. There is no ‘desert of sand’ either in Palestine or in the neighbouring countries. In fact, the Hebrew word which is usually translation ‘desert’ or ‘wilderness’ (*midbâr*) does not in the least convey the idea of solitude or desolation; on the contrary, it belongs to a root which means ‘to pasture,’ and therefore, etymologically, ‘feeding-ground’ or ‘pasture-land’ would seem to be the most exact translation. But if we should adopt it, another ambiguity would be created, and a false notion suggested. Indeed, for a European reader, a pasture is a meadow with abundant grass, which is not at all true of the-Palestinian *midbâr*.

For a correct understanding of the meaning of the word ‘wilderness’ in the Bible, one has to remember that there were—and are still—nomads in Bible lands. Those people are not addicted to agricultural life, but to the breeding of cattle; they live on the borders of cultivated lands, between these and other regions which are either uninhabitable or practically uninhabited. The territories held by those nomads—called Bedawîn in modern times—are not without water and grass; but these indispensable resources, required for the herds, are both scarce, and the tribes of shepherds, are compelled to remove their camps from one place to another for feeding and watering their cattle. The *midbâr* is therefore essentially the ground occupied by nomad tribes; it forms around agricultural districts a zone variable in extension or breadth; sometimes culture wins over uncultivated lands, sometimes these regain spaces

formerly tilled and sown. At the boundary itself of those two tracts of land live some populations which hold a sort of intermediate position in the progress of civilization: they are half-sedentary, half-shepherds (half-*Fellahîn*, half-*Bedawîn*), and, dwelling still under tents, they cultivate the ground, plough, sow, and reap (cf. Max von Oppenheim, *Vom Mittelmeer zum Persischen Golf*, 1900, ii. pp. 78-84). Even in the interior of cultivated districts, where villages and towns exist, there are frequently patches of land where the soil remains abandoned to itself, without culture, and they offer, therefore, the same character as the exterior zone inhabited by nomads. Those spaces are generally used as pasture-grounds for the cattle, and have also been called *midbâr*. They are found even near towns; thus the OT mentions the wildernesses of Gibeon, of Tekoa, of Damascus, of Riblah (Massoretic Text *Diblah*, Eze 6:14). Besides those local denominations, others occur which apply to peripheric regions: wildernesses of Shur, of Sin, of Sinai, of Paran, of Zin, of Kadesh, of Ethan (or Yam-Suph), of Maon, of Ziph, of Beersheba, of Engedi, of Jeruel, of Beth-aven, of Edom, of Moab, of Kedemoth. Several of these wildernesses, as their names show, cover vast spaces; others, on the contrary, represent quite limited places.

One of the most important deserts is the **Wilderness of Judah**, twenty hours in length and five in breadth, which constitutes, with the Mountain (*Har*), the South (*Negeb*), and the Low-Country (*Shephelah*), the four parts of the territory of that tribe. The Wilderness of Judah is the region situated east of the watershed, between this high line and the western shore of the Dead Sea. The wildernesses of Ziph and of Maon are portions of it in the south, as well as those of Engedi and Tekoa in the middle; and finally also, in the north, the rough, barren, and uninhabited district where the road runs from Jerusalem to Jericho (cf. Luk 10:30 ff.) That wilderness is an uneven, undulating table-land, where conical hills and rocky hillocks arise, where deep ravines are cut between steep walls of rocks; it falls down towards the east—here in gradual declivities, there in sudden and abrupt slopes—in the direction of the Dead Sea, situated 1500 or 2000 feet below. No river or rivulet, no trees, no villages; a soil without vegetation, either sandy or stony, here and there with scarce and meagre grass, which is avidly sought for by small flocks of sheep and goats, belonging to a few miserable camps of black or brown tents. That wilderness was the refuge of David when persecuted by Saul (1 Samuel 22-26); he knew it from the time of his youth, having, when a boy, followed there the herds of his father (1Sa 16:11; 1Sa 17:15; 1Sa 17:34). Later on the same region sheltered Judas Maccabaeus and his companions (1Ma 9:33).

The wildernesses mentioned in the Bible are not all as inclement and inhospitable as the Wilderness of Judah. They are sometimes inhabited; they contain wells and cisterns, towns (Jos 15:61 f., 1Ki 9:18, 2Ch 8:4) and houses (1Ki 2:34), herds of sheep (1Sa 17:28), and pastures (Psa 65:13 f.).

The Gospel of John alludes twice to the sojourn of Israel in the wilderness (Joh 3:14 Moses lifting the serpent, and Joh 6:31; Joh 6:40 the manna). The Synoptics do not mention it; but it is spoken of in the Book of Acts, specially in Stephen's discourse (Joh 7:36-44) and in Joh 13:18, and in 1Co 10:5 and Heb 3:8 (quoting Psa 95:8) and Joh 3:17.

The Wilderness of Judah is named several times in connexion with John the Baptist. His youth, according to Luk 1:80, was spent 'in the deserts'; that is, certainly, with the keepers of herds, away from towns or villages, in solitude and contemplation. In that respect, as well as in others, John is like Amos, the shepherd of Tekoa. According to the Gospels, 'the deserts' included also the country near Jordan—beyond, that is, east of, the river—where John began his ministry, preaching and baptizing (Mat 3:1, Mar 1:4, Luk 3:2; cf. Mat 11:7, Luk 7:24; see artt. Bethabara, John the Baptist, Jordan), and the four Gospels apply to that event the prophecy of Isa 40:3 (Mat 3:3, Mar 1:3, Luk 3:4, Joh 1:23).

Ecclesiastical tradition has not been content with the indications given in the Gospels which connect John the Baptist's life and work with the wilderness: it has connected also his birth with it. The place where Zacharias and Elisabeth dwelt being only vaguely named in Luk 1:39, it has been identified by the Christians of the Holy Land and the pilgrims, since the time of the Crusades, with a village situated about 4 miles west from Jerusalem; the Arabs call it 'Ain-Karim, hut it is known in the language of the Churches as 'St. John in the Desert' or 'St. John in the Mountain.' That place is not in the Wilderness of Judah; its neighbourhood is cultivated and fertile, at least in the sense in which one can use that word when speaking of Judaea. Even if we should suppose that such was the birthplace of John, it would be unjustified to consider it as being 'in the wilderness' (cf. *ZDPV [Note: DPV Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.]* xxii. pp. 81-93).

It is also in the wilderness that the Gospel narratives place the scene of the Temptation of our Lord (Mat 4:1, Mar 1:12, Luk 4:1). Since the time of the Crusades, ecclesiastical tradition has contrived to localize that event in a particular, well-defined spot, and has chosen for it the wild and desolate mountain which arises almost vertically above the Fountain of Elisha, west from the oasis of Jericho. A Greek convent, continuation of a very old laura, which was, if not founded, at least developed by Elpidins (*ZDPV [Note: DPV Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.]* iii. p. 13), is suspended on the side of that mountain, which has received the name of Mount of the **Quarantania** (*Jebel Karantul*), on account of Jesus fasting 40 days. It is, of course, equally impossible to prove or to disprove that this, place is the one mentioned in the narratives of the Temptation.

Galilee, and particularly the shores of the Lake of Gennesaret, was at the time of our Lord relatively well peopled: this is proved by the Gospels, and still more explicitly by the testimony of Josephus. There were, however, spaces of land without human habitations, and probably left to the shepherds and their cattle. According to the narratives of the Gospels, several scenes of the Galilaean ministry of Jesus, and some of His teachings, were connected with places of that sort, designated now as ‘a desert’ or ‘a wilderness’ (ἐρημος or ἐρημία), now as ‘a desert place’ (ἐρημος τόπος).

We have to mention here (a) the multiplication of loaves (Mat 14:13-21, Mar 6:30-44, Luk 9:10-17, Mat 15:32-38, Mar 8:1-10); (b) Jesus withdrawing for prayer (Mar 1:35, Luk 5:16), or to avoid the crowd (Mar 1:45, Luk 4:42, Joh 11:54); (c) the demoniac of Gadara (Luk 8:29); (d) the parable of the Lost Sheep (Luk 15:3-7), where the 99 sheep remain ‘in the wilderness,’ whereas the shepherd goes after that which is lost until he finds it.

Literature.—*PEFSt* [*Note: EFSt Quarterly Statement of the same.*] , 1871, pp. 3-80; E. H. Palmer, *The Desert of the Exodus* , 2 vols., 1871; Furrer, art. ‘Wüste’ in Schenkel, *Bib. Lex.* v. pp. 680-685; G. A. Smith, *HGHL* [*Note: GHL Historical Geog. of Holy Land.*] , pp. 312-317; Buhl, *GAP* [*Note: AP Geographic des alten Palästina.*] , pp. 96-99; Lagrange in *RB* [*Note: Revue Biblique.*] , 1896, pp. 618-643, 1897, pp. 107-130, 605-625, 1900, pp. 63-86; B. Baentsch, *Die Wüste, ihre Namen und ihre bildliche Anwendung in den Alttest. Schriften*, 1883; Pierre Loti, *Le Désert* 6, 1895 [descriptive], and other [more scientific] books of travels in the Sinai-Peninsula; Bönhoff, ‘Die Wanderung Israels in der Wüste’ in *SK* [*Note: K Studien und Kritiken.*] , 1907, pp. 159-217.

Lucien Gautier.

Will

WILL.—‘Every man,’ says Thomas Reid (*Works*, 1863 ed., p. 530), ‘is conscious of a power to determine, in things which he conceives to depend upon his determination. To this power we give the name of *Will*; and, as it is usual, in the operations of the mind, to give the same name to the power and to the act of that power, the term “Will” is often put to signify the act of determining, which more properly is called *volition*.’ On the question of the freedom of the will see Free Will and Liberty; and on the human will of Jesus see Soul, 668^b. Our Lord Jesus Christ has given us a perfect example of how our great possession of freedom should be used, has shown us by His own perfect subordination of His will to the will of His Father, that the goal at which we should aim is to have our wills in perfect accord with the will of God, whether it

be His will as to our enduring or His will as to our doing. 'O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt' Mt (Mat_26:39); 'I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me' (Joh_6:38). It is our part to seek to have the mind of Christ, and to obey where God would have us to obey, and endure where He would have us to endure.

'Our wills are ours to make them thine.'

Literature.—NT Commentaries; Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible ; the works of Thomas Reid; R. A. Thompson, *Christian Theism*; Hill, *Lectures in Divinity*; A. M. Fairbairn, *The Philosophy of the Christian Religion*; Ritschl, *Justification and Reconciliation*; and Philosophical and Theological works in general.

George C. Watt.

☪ Wind

WIND (ἄνεμος; πνεῦμα only in Joh_3:8).—'The four winds' (Mat_24:31, Mar_13:27) is an expression standing for 'north, south, east, and west,' the winds in Palestine coming mainly from these directions. These winds retain their character, varied only in degree, throughout the year. The north wind is cold; the west, from the sea, moist; the south, warm; and the east, from the desert, dry. This last is very pleasant in the winter months; but in spring and autumn, when it is prevalent, it is exceedingly oppressive, a few hours often causing every living thing to droop. The popular belief that the most violent winds are from the east is not confirmed by the writer's experience of over five years in Galilee. The most memorable storm in that period was from the west. See, further, Sea Of Galilee, p. 591.

W. Ewing.

☪ Wine

WINE (οἶνος; once, Act_2:13, γλεῦκος).—The climate and soil of Palestine are excellently adapted to the production of grapes, and from very early times wine has been a common beverage in the country. In the OT it is praised as a source of good cheer to the heavy of heart, as a stimulant for the faint, and as a token of a full,

happy, and prosperous life (Pro 31:6, Psa 104:15). The dangers of excessive indulgence are indeed clearly indicated. The priest while on duty, and the Nazirite during the currency of his vow, might not touch it (Lev 10:9, Num 6:3). The sin of drunkenness is presented in revolting colours (Pro 23:29 ff., Isa 28:7 f). The Rechabite abstinence from wine, however, arose probably from the nomadic view of the vine as the symbol of the settled life, not from any objection to the use of wine in itself (W. R. Smith, *Prophets*, 84, 389). In the Gospels wine appears with bread as representing ordinary fare (Luk 7:33); it is drunk on festive occasions (Joh 2:3), and at religious feasts (Mat 26:29 etc.). Mingled with oil, it is applied to wounds as a healing agent (Luk 10:34); mingled with myrrh, it is used as a narcotic (Mar 15:23).

The ancient methods of wine-making persist to the present day. Commonly the grapes are placed in a large shallow trough, cut in the surface of the rock. The juice is there trodden out, and conducted by a channel to a deeper trough at a lower level. The time of the vintage and wine-treading is one of great joyfulness among the people, their labours being enlivened by the singing of songs, and rhythmic clapping of the hands. Fermentation sets in quickly. The first, or what the Jews called the ‘tumultuous’ stage, might be passed in four days, during which the wine remained in the trough, or vat, if possible. It was then put into earthenware jars which had been lined with pitch, or, if it were to be sent to a distance, into ‘bottles,’ where the process was completed. In about three months the wine was fit for use.

Where the soil was deep, a **press** was ‘digged’ in the earth (Mat 21:33 etc.). This, built round with masonry, and carefully cemented, received the juice expressed in a wooden structure set on the surface.

The ‘bottles’ are partially tanned goat-skins. The apertures where legs and tail have been severed are sewn up, leaving only that at the neck, which is firmly tied when the skin is filled. The wine in the first stage of fermentation, if tied in the skins, would, by reason of the gas generated, burst them. When the ‘tumultuous stage is passed, the new ‘bottle’ yields sufficiently to permit completion of the process. ‘Bottles’ once stretched in this way had no further powers of distention, and if used again for the same purpose would, of course, burst (Mat 9:17 etc.).

Different qualities of wine were distinguished (Joh 2:10), probably indicated, as they are still, by the localities where they are produced. The ‘new wine’ of Act 2:13 (lit. ‘sweet wine’) was probably ‘the wine made from the drip of the grapes before the clusters are trodden in the wine-press—stronger than the thin sour wines used as daily beverages’ (Lindsay, *Acts, in loc*). The modern ‘sweet wine’ is made from the white or green grapes, the juice being slightly boiled.

There is nothing known in the East of anything called 'wine' which is unfermented. Pharaoh's butler pressed grapes into his master's cup (Gen 40:11). 'In a text found at Edfu, it is said that grapes squeezed into water formed a refreshing beverage which was drunk by the king' (Driver, *Genesis, in loc.*). This possibly corresponds to the Spanish drink made by squeezing grapes not quite ripe into water. But it is never called 'wine.' The γλεῦκος of Act 2:13 was certainly fermented. Apart from the fact that the vintage was eight months passed, which put the keeping of unfermented grape juice, out of the question, it was alleged as the cause of drunkenness by those who must have known its character. The wine used by the Jews in Palestine—people most conservative in their religious customs—at the Passover, is of the ordinary kind. And there is no trace of any tradition among them of a change having been introduced. Their attitude towards the drinker of unfermented grape juice may be gathered from the saying in *Pirke Aboth* (iv. 28), 'He who learns from the young, to what is he like? to one that eats unripe grapes, and drinks *wine from his vat.*'

While in the NT wine is plainly regarded as good, and its medicinal value is recognized (1Ti 5:23), there is no blindness to the danger attached to its abuse (see, e.g., Eph 5:18, 1Ti 3:8, Tit 2:3). The question of total abstinence, like that of slavery, had not yet been raised. No argument for total abstinence can be built on the significance of terms used for 'wine' in Scripture. But 'the Apostle Paul has stated the case for total abstinence in Romans 14 in a way that does not need the treacherous aid of doubtful exegesis for its support' (*DB [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.]*, s.v. 'Food'). See, further, Hastings *DB [Note: Dictionary of the Bible.]* ii. 31 ff.; Mackie, *Bible Manners and Customs*, 43 ff.; Benzinger, *Heb. Arch.* (Index); Fowler, *The Wine of the Bible*.

W. Ewing.

☞ Winter

WINTER (χειμών, Mat 24:20, Mar 13:18, Joh 10:22).—This is the time of cold and rain-storms. The modern Arab, name, *esh-shitta*, means literally 'the rain.' It is the season in which the rain supply of the year falls; it lasts roughly for seven months, from October till April inclusive, thus including the part of the year which we call spring (see Summer). While in the deeper parts of the Jordan Valley it is never very cold, the raw air breeds many discomforts in the rainy season. On the higher lands, however, the cold is often intense, snow lying at times—e.g. in Jerusalem—to a depth of some inches. The rain moistens the soil, hard baked by the summer sun. In a land

where the science of road-making is practically unknown, the paths go swiftly to mud, so that travel in winter is always toilsome, and not seldom perilous.

W. Ewing.

WISDOM

- i. Use of the conception in Biblical history and literature.
 - A. As applied to a school of thought.
 1. The 'wise men.'
 2. Their writings.
 - B. As applied to the Spirit of God.
 1. Jewish hypostatization.
 2. Christological development.
- A. ii. NT use of the word σοφία.
 1. In the Gospels.
 2. In the Pauline Epistles.
 3. In the Ep. of James and elsewhere.
- iii. Use of word and concept in the discourses of Jesus.
 1. In comparisons of His message with the Baptist's.
 2. To rebuke blasphemy against His work.
- iv. Matthaean connexions of the two groups of sayings.
 1. Wisdom sayings of Matthew 11.
 2. Wisdom sayings of Matthew 12.
- v. Lukan connexions of the two groups.

1. Luk_11:49-51 a Wisdom utterance.
 2. Relation to context of Luke 7 = Matthew 11.
 3. Connected discourse-elements of Lk.-Acts.
 - (a) Luk_12:13-34.
 - (b) Luke 16; Luk_18:9-14.
 - (c) Luk_11:1-13; Luk_18:1-8.
- vi. The Wisdom utterances represent a special type of Gospel tradition.
1. Independent of Matthaean *Logia*.
 2. Inseparable from narrative.
 3. Employed in common Greek form by Mt. and Luke.
 4. More fully and authentically present in Luke.
- vii. Relation of this to narrative-elements of Synoptic tradition.
1. Dependence of Mark.
 2. Relation to peculiar narrative-element of Luke.
- viii. Conclusions as to proto-Lukan source.
- B.** ix. Wisdom speculation in the development of Christology.
1. The Wisdom doctrine of St. Paul as related—
 - (a) to (Jewish) Stoicism.
 - (b) to Apocalypitics.
 - (c) to Mystery-religion.
 2. The Johannine and Patristic Christology.

- (a) Substitution of Greek terminology (Logos for Wisdom).
- (b) Standpoint of the Fourth Evangelist.
- (c) The Wisdom utterance Mat 11:25-30 the link between Synoptic and Johannine Christology.

Literature.

i. **The Biblical conception.**—In Biblical language the term ‘wisdom’ (OT חָכְמָה *hokhmâh*, LXX Septuagint and NT σοφία, rarely φρόνησις (Luk 1:17, Eph 1:8), or σύνεσις (Luk 2:47, Eph 3:4), is applied (A) to a human, (B) to a Divine attribute.

A. Under the former head is included.—1. The type of thought illustrated in the school of religio-philosophical thinkers contemporary with and later than the prophets, rivalled and ultimately displaced by the scribes. Thus the designation of Mat 23:34, ‘prophets and wise men and scribes,’ is seen to be Historically correct, as against the modified form of Luk 11:49 (‘prophets and apostles’; cf. 1Th 2:15, Eph 2:20 etc.), the representatives of these schools of Jewish thought being regarded as commissioned by and endowed with the Divine Spirit. 2. In a derived sense the writings of these inspired men (ἡ πανάρετος σοφία, applied by Hegesippus and Palestinian writers generally to the group Pr.-Wisd. of Sol.; see Eus. *Historia Ecclesiastica* iv. xxii. 8, ‘Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers’ [ed. Schaff-Wace], with note by McGiffert), regarded as utterances of the Spirit of God: ‘the Wisdom of God saith’ (Luk 11:49) = ‘the Holy Ghost saith’ (Heb 3:7) = ‘the Spirit (of apocalyptic prophecy) saith’ (1Ti 4:1, perhaps referring to *Jannes and Jambres*, 2Ti 3:8).

B. The designation ‘Wisdom of God,’ or simply ‘Wisdom,’ is sometimes applied to the Spirit of God as manifest in creation and redemption, in the illumination of the mind and regeneration of the soul.

1. In the *Hokhmâh*, or Wisdom literature, this is the habitual designation of the Divine Spirit, especially conceived as manifesting the redeeming love of God, which goes forth to seek and save the erring (Wis 1:6; Wis 7:22-28). Personification of Wisdom (Job 28, Proverbs 8), under the later speculative influence of Stoic metaphysics, passes imperceptibly into hypostatization and a Logos-doctrine, cosmological as well as soteriological (Wisdom=the Metathron, Wis 9:4; Wis 9:10; cf. Sirach 24, Wis 7:24 f). In Philo the terms ‘Wisdom’ and ‘Logos’ are practically equivalent, the Stoic term naturally tending among Greek readers to displace the Hebrew. Contemporaneously, under the mythologizing influence exerted through apocalyptic literature, the

redemptive mission of Wisdom (Wis 9:17 f.) develops into an unmistakable avatar doctrine, wherein Wisdom becomes incarnate, and dwells among men (Bar 3:37, cf. *Oxyrh. Frags.* Log. iii.), or even descends to the underworld to ‘visit all that sleep, and shine upon all that hope in the Lord’ (Sir 24:32 Lat.; cf. *pseudo-Isaiah*, ap. *Iren. Haer.* iii. xx. 4, and Eph 5:14). Rejected by men, she ascends again to her seat in heaven (Enoch xlii. 1),* [Note: The note of R. H. Charles on this passage of Enoch is too significant to be omitted: ‘The praise of wisdom was a favourite theme. Wisdom was regarded as having her dwelling-place in heaven (lxxxiv. 3, Job 28:12-14; Job 28:20-24, Bar 3:29, Sir 24:4), and as coming to earth and desiring to make her abode with men Pro 1:20 ff., Pro 1:8 ff., Pro 9:1-10, Sir 24:7; but as men refused to receive her (cf. xciv. 5), she returned to heaven. But in the Messianic times she will return, and will be poured out as water in abundance, xlix. 1, and the thirsty will drink to the full of wisdom, xlvii. 1; she will be bestowed on the elect, v. 8, xci. 10; cf. Apoc. Bar. xlv. 14, 4 Ezra 8:62; and the spirit of wisdom will abide in the Messiah, the Elect One, xlix. 3.’ What is here said of the outpouring of the spirit of wisdom is parallel to Act 2:16 ff. of the spirit of prophecy (cf. Num 11:29) and to the agraphon: ‘Et factum est cum ascendisset dominus de aqua, descendit fons omnis Spiritus Sancti, et requievit super eum,’ etc.] whence she returns to be poured out upon the elect in the Messianic age (xlix. 1). The mythologizing tendency was strongly reacted against by the scribes, especially in the period of Akiba, during the rivalry of Synagogue and Church in Palestine (a.d. 70-135). On the Jewish side, from this time forward, all personifications of the Divine Wisdom were rigidly restricted in their application to the Mosaic Torah (Sir 24:23-27, Bar 4:1, *Pirke Aboth*, iii. 14, vi. 10). We even find later readings in Jewish texts altering *hokhmâh* to *tôrâh* (σοφία to νόμος). In general, after the schism of the Nazarenes, speculative thought (doctrine of the Merkabah) is rigorously suppressed.

2. On the Christian side Wisdom speculation continued to develop in both the cosmological and the soteriological directions, with the Pauline Epistles as a basis. In the Johannine literature the Greek term ‘Logos’ is adopted, though the Wisdom doctrine itself continues Hebrew; but in the 2nd cent. Fathers, as in Philo, ‘Wisdom’ and ‘Logos’ are interchangeable and equivalent. Both designate the Spirit of God incarnate in Christ. The influence of mystery myths, already traceable in pre-Christian apocalypse, becomes more pronounced, Gnostic speculations becoming completely mythological. In these Wisdom (ἡ Σοφία, or *Achamoth* = *hokhmâh*) is the feminine or passive principle in the scheme of redemption, Σωτήρ the active. The present discussion will confine itself to the NT use of the two conceptions of wisdom: (A) as the inspired message of God through the ‘wise men’ (*hăkhâmîm*); (B) as the Divine Spirit itself, resident in Jesus, and manifested in His life as well as in His teaching. For the history of Wisdom as the Hebrew philosophy, and as a hypostasis

equivalent to the Stoic Logos, the reader is referred to the artt. 'Wisdom,' 'Wisdom Literature,' 'Wisdom, Book of,' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible and in the *Encyc. Biblica*.

ii. NT use.—1. A study of the use of the word σοφία, and its cognates in the Gospels, shows it to be, in some sense, distinctive of the Lukan writings, in which Jesus' teaching is presented primarily under this aspect of 'wisdom of God,' many examples having the characteristic forms of the *Hokhmâh* (Wisdom) literature (see Briggs, *Expos. Times*, viii., ix. [1897-98] four articles on 'The Wisdom of Jesus the Messiah'). The characteristic strophic form is apparent also in some discourse-material found only in Mt. (e.g. Mat 5:21 f., Mat 5:27 f., Mat 5:31 f., Mat 5:33 f., Mat 5:38 f., Mat 6:2-6; Mat 6:16-18), but is disarranged by additions in the canonical form of this Gospel. The word σοφία occurs but once in Mk. (Mar 6:2 = Mat 13:54), and is applied, as in Luk 2:40; Luk 2:52 and the series cited below, to Jesus' endowment with the Spirit. It occurs twice in Mt. (Mat 11:19; Mat 12:42), both occurrences being in passages verbally identical with Lk., and in a less original form. In Lk.-Acts it occurs 10 times; but the Lukan use is specially noteworthy, because endowment with the Spirit of God is here habitually spoken of, whether in the case of Jesus, of His forerunners, or of His successors, as the χάρισμα of 'wisdom.' So of Jesus (Luk 2:40; Luk 2:52; cf. Luk 2:47 σύνεσις and Luk 4:22 λόγοι χάριτος), of the endowment of the Twelve with the Spirit (Luk 21:15), of the Seven (Act 6:3), of Stephen (Act 6:10), of Joseph (Act 7:10), of Moses (Act 7:22). In the Fourth Gospel the conception of the endowment of Jesus with the spirit of wisdom is supplanted by that of an incarnation of the Logos. The word σοφία and its cognates are wholly wanting.

2. With this Gospel use should be compared that of the NT elsewhere. In the Pauline Epistles the word occurs 16 times in the passage 1Co 1:17 to 1Co 3:19, wherein St. Paul contrasts 'the wisdom of God,' which endows those who 'have the mind of Christ' with 'the wisdom of this world'; and 9 times in the twin Epistles (Eph.-Col.), written to oppose a 'philosophy and vain deceit' (Eph 4:14 'wiles of error') by means of the Divine gift of 'a spirit of wisdom and understanding in the mystery of the Divine will.' It is used by St. Paul in but three other instances, two of which (1Co 12:8, 2Co 1:12) are directly related to the group first mentioned, while the third occurs in the doxology Rom 11:33. The χάρισμα of wisdom claimed by St. Paul (1Co 1:17 to 1Co 2:16, Eph 3:3-11, cf. 1Co 12:8) is conceded to his letters in 2Pe 3:15.

3. The only other NT employments of the word, or of the connected-group of ideas, are in James and the Apocalypse. In Jam 1:5; Jam 3:13; Jam 3:15; Jam 3:17 'wisdom' is more exclusively practical and ethical, but is emphatically a Divine

endowment. The conception of 'the wisdom which cometh from above' (*i.e.* the Divine Spirit, given to all that ask, Jam 1:5), manifested in works of love, is contrasted with wisdom of the tongue in James 3. The former is the fundamental characteristic of the just or righteous man (ὁ δίκαιος), a use which agrees closely with that of Sirach and the OT Wisdom literature. Cf. Luk 1:17 φρόνησις δικαίων, and Luk 16:8 φρονίμως ... φρονιμώτιροι. In the Apocalypse 'wisdom' is an attribute of God in the doxologies Luk 5:12, Luk 7:12 (cf. Rom 11:33); otherwise it is referred to only as an endowment like that of Joseph (Gen 41:38 f.) and Daniel (Dan 5:14), requisite to solve riddles (Rev 13:18; Rev 17:9). The usage and conception of the Third Evangelist appear thus to stand midway between that of St. James and of St. Paul, with traces of the same use in certain parts of Mt. and Mark.

iii. Use in the discourses of Jesus.—The discourses of Jesus furnish a meagre but trustworthy starting-point for a history of the term in its Christological development. Among these discourses we cannot venture to reckon the saying Luk 21:15 (= Luk 12:11 = Mat 10:19 f. = Mar 13:11 = Joh 15:26 f.), since the parallels make it probable that στόμα καὶ σοφία (cf. Luk 2:47 *prudentiam el os*, cod. e.) is only the characteristic Lukan mode of expressing the promise of the Paraclete. All other occurrences of the word or connected idea in the discourses stand more or less closely related with one of two incidents: (1) Jesus' denunciation of the faithless generation which rejected for opposite reasons both the Baptist's mission and His own (Matthew 11), or (2) His denunciation of the scribes who blasphemed the Spirit of God whereby He wrought, demanding a sign from heaven (Mat 12:22-45). These discourses are variously distributed in our First and Third Gospels (Mat 11:2-30; Mat 12:22-45; Mat 21:28-32; Mat 23:34-38 and Luk 7:18-35; Luk 10:13-15; Luk 10:21 f., Luk 11:24-26; Luk 11:29-32; Luk 11:49-51), but have in common a close connexion in thought and a resemblance of language in exceptional degree as between the two canonical reporters. In these two groups of discourses, therefore, must be found, if anywhere, the basis in Jesus' own utterances for the subsequent application in Christology of the conception of the Divine Wisdom.

iv. Matthaean Connexions of the two Groups of Sayings.—1. The Matthaean context of group (1) starts from the question of John's disciples. This is made the occasion by Jesus of a comparison of unrepentant Israel to children who are pleased with neither the mournful nor the gay melodies of their playmates. His hearers had been displeased at the asceticism of John, and are equally so with the genial life of the 'Friend of publicans and sinners.' As against this rejection by the self-righteous of the message of repentance and forgiveness, 'Wisdom's children' (here those who had repented at the preaching of John, cf. Luk 21:31 f., Luk 7:29 f.) afford the justification of her methods (Mat 11:2-19). In Mt. the discourse continues with the

denunciation of ‘the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done,’ a paragraph which is perhaps accountable for the reading ἔργα. in some Manuscripts for τέκνα in Matthew 11; Matthew 19. These verses (Mat_11:20-24) are otherwise placed by Lk.; but those which follow (Mat_11:25-27 = Luk_10:21 f.) again relate to the wisdom of Jesus which is delivered to Him (παρεδόθη μοι) by His Father (in contrast with the παροῦσι of the scribes, Mar_7:13), and, though hid from the wise, is revealed to the ‘little ones.’ This in turn introduces in Mat_11:28-30 an invitation closely resembling those placed in the mouth of the Divine Wisdom in the literature of this class (cf. Sir_51:26 ff; Sir_6:28 and *Oxyrhynchus Log.* iii. [iv.]). This closes the chapter and the discourse.

2. In Mat_12:38-45 substantially the same subject is resumed, but it is now *à propos* of the blasphemy of the scribes against the Holy Spirit in ascribing Jesus’ exorcisms to Beelzebub (Mat_12:22-37), the intervening material (Mat_12:1-21) comprising the two Sabbath incidents of Mar_2:23 to Mar_3:6. In this further denunciation, not of the scribes but still of ‘this evil and adulterous generation,’ Jesus declares that it will fare worse than the Ninevites; for, while these repented at the warning of Jonah, this generation has rejected a greater warning (*i.e.* the Baptist’s; cf. Mar_11:11-14 and Bacon, *Sermon on the Mount*, App. C. iv. v. pp. 216-231). It is condemned also by the Queen of the South, because she came to hear ‘the wisdom of Solomon,’ whereas this generation has rejected a more gracious appeal (πλεῖον = ‘a greater matter,’ *i.e.* Jesus’ message of forgiveness conceived as the ‘wisdom’ of God). A concluding parable (Mat_12:43-45 = Luk_11:24-26) likens ‘this evil generation,’ with its Pharisaic *mania purifica*, to ‘a house swept and garnished’ which becomes the abode of demons, because inhospitable to the Spirit of God. It is highly noteworthy that in both groups the condemnation is uttered by Jesus for rejection of the Spirit of God, which in the case of the discourse anent the Baptist is assumed to be manifest in Jesus’ message of forgiveness, in the case of the blasphemy of the scribes in His healing power. The significance of the use of the term ‘wisdom’ in both cases (Mat_11:19; Mat_12:42) for the gracious and winning appeal of God’s redeeming, forgiving love, is made more apparent by the contrast in both instances with the Baptist’s harsher message of warning against ‘the wrath to come.’ This is manifest from the figures of wailing *versus* piping, mourning *versus* dancing, fasting *versus* feasting, preaching of Jonah *versus* wisdom of Solomon.

v. Lukan connexions of the two groups.—A further discourse, correctly connected in Luk_11:49-51 with group (2) (in Mat_23:34 ff. incorrectly attached to Mar_12:38-40 = Mat_23:1-12) carries to its logical conclusion the denunciation of the scribes who had blasphemed the Holy Spirit. Speaking now directly in the name of ‘the wisdom of God’ (Luk_11:49), Jesus predicts their impending fate, and in the Matthaean form (which

properly includes the pathetic appeal to Jerusalem, separated from it in Lk. [Mat 23:37-39 = Luk 13:34 f.]), the forsaking of ‘your house’ by God’s Spirit. Not only have we throughout this context the characteristic forms and modes of expression of the Wisdom literature, but the final warning is expressly introduced as an utterance of the wisdom of God’ (ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ), by which should be understood not the specific title of an individual writing of this literary category, but the entire canon of ‘Wisdom’ writings, inclusive of the lost work from which the extract is made. The following considerations will make this clear:—

1. The continuation of the previous line of thought is apparent from the allusion to the fate of God’s messengers (with Mat 23:34-37 = Luk 11:49-51; Luk 13:34 f. cf. Mat 12:39 ff. = Luk 11:29 ff.), to the vain plea of the Spirit [Wisdom] (with Mat 23:37-39 = Luk 13:34 f., cf. Mat 12:38-42 = Luk 11:29-32), and to the house left desolate (with Mat 23:38 f = Luk 13:35, cf. Mat 12:43-45 = Luk 11:24-36). Many considerations, on the other hand, make it probable that Mat 23:34-39 (= Luk 11:49-51; Luk 13:34 f.), if not more, is really drawn from some lost ‘Wisdom’ writing, (a) The sending of ‘prophets and wise men and scribes’ (*hăkhâmim* and *sophërim*) is something which cannot be ascribed to Jesus (Mt.) but only to the Divine Spirit (Wisdom). (b) The adoption of the figure of Psa 36:7; Psa 91:4, Isa 31:5, Deu 32:11 is appropriate only to the Divine Spirit, which broods over Jerusalem; it is actually so applied in 2Es 1:30. It will appear to many inappropriate if made an utterance of Jesus personally. The same may be said in less degree of the threat of the forsaking of the house (cf. Jer 12:7; Jer 22:5. Josephus preserves a kindred legend of voices in the Temple saying, ‘Let us remove hence,’ *BJ* vi. v. 3). (c) The whole context Mat 23:34-39 reappears in paraphrase in 2Es 1:28-37, which, though late and Christianized, preserves the material in the form of an utterance of ‘the Lord Almighty.’ (d) Mat 23:35 contains, as some think, an anachronistic reference to the murder of Zechariah the son of Baruch, shortly before the siege of Jerusalem (Josephus *BJ* iv. v. 4). This consideration, however, may be disregarded, as the reference may also be explained as a confusion of Zechariah the son of Jehoiada (2Ch 24:20-22) with the prophet Zechariah son of Berechiah (Zec 1:1).

2. Luk 7:1 to Luk 8:3 presents a context interconnected by the thought fundamental to the saying Mat 11:16-19—the Friend of publicans and sinners—the narrative-material with the exception of Mat 7:1-10 = Mat 8:5 to Mat 10:13 being peculiar to Luke. The discourse and narrative-material have the same bearing, and the former includes the nucleus of the ‘wisdom’ sayings of Matthew 11.

It thus appears that in the two groups of discourse-material principally represented in Matthew 11, 12 and Luke 7, 11 we have inextricably intermingled (1) sayings of Jesus wherein His own gracious mission was set over against the harsher warning of the

Baptist as the message of the Divine Wisdom; and (2) extracts in defence of His beneficent works, from the actual Wisdom literature, these extracts having been embodied along with His words of denunciation of the scribes, either by Himself or in the subsequent development of Evangelic tradition. To draw the line with precision between authentic utterances of Jesus, and material subsequently adapted from the Wisdom literature because pronounced by 'the wisdom of God' (Mat 11:28-30?) surpasses the powers of criticism; but the endeavour is the more needless because the really significant fact is that Jesus' actual teaching, at least in the form given it by the source here employed in common by Mt. and Lk., was so closely allied to the ideas of this Wisdom literature as to permit of intermingling at an extremely early date. A later example of the process of adaptation is furnished by the Oxyrhynchus papyrus which puts in the mouth of Jesus the characteristic Wisdom utterance: 'I stood in the midst of the world, and in the flesh was I seen of them (cf. Bar 3:8), and I found all men drunken, and none found I athirst among them, and my soul grieveth over the sons of men because they are blind in their heart' (*Oxyrh. Log.* III.).

3. Other elements of discourse-material from the Third Gospel and Acts may be clearly traced to a source of the same Wisdom type, if not the same composition, (a) In particular, the wisdom of Solomon, especially as exhibited in the hedonistic Epicureanism of Ecclesiastes, is pointedly contrasted with a higher wisdom in the great discourse on the true riches of Luk 12:13-34, part of which is taken up in Mat 6:19-34. The polemic against Ecclesiastes 2 in Mat 12:13-21 becomes tenfold more pointed as the discourse proceeds to compare the beauty of the lilies and the provision of the ravens 'which have neither store-chamber nor barn' (cf. Mat 12:18) with 'Solomon in all his glory' (cf. Ecc 1:12-18; Ecc 2:1-25). The subject of the discourse ('wherein life consists,' Mat 12:15; Mat 12:22 f.) is as distinctive of Hebrew Wisdom literature as the form and phraseology.

(b) To the same original context must be reckoned the greater part of Luke 16, the material of which is peculiar to Luke. The 'wisdom' of the unrighteous steward in the use of 'the mammon of unrighteousness' is a subject manifestly in close relation to the use of riches commended in Luk 12:13-34, the affinity extending even to the phraseology (with Luk 16:9 'riches that fail' cf. Luk 12:33 'treasure that faileth not'). The combination of the two, therefore, in Mat 6:19-34, *à propos* of the heavenly recompense (Mat 6:1; Mat 6:4; Mat 6:18), probably reflects a real connexion of Luk 12:13-34 with Luk 16:1-13 in the source.

Similar reasoning, based partly on the phraseology (cf. Luk 16:15 with Luk 18:14) partly on the subject-matter, connects the rest of Luke 16 (exc. v. Luk 16:17-18) with Luk 18:9-14 (Luk 19:11-27?). The two companion parables Luk 16:19-25 (Luk 16:26-31 seem to be a later addendum) and Luk 18:9-14 exemplify the principle laid down in Luk 16:15, while Luk 16:16 = Mat 11:12-14 links the whole with

Luk 7:29 f. The whole group of teachings and parables on worldly conditions is thus seen to have a common occasion and bearing, a common spirit, and a common point of view not elsewhere shown in the Gospels, but closely resembling the social teaching of James (cf. Luk 1:9-11, Luk 2:1-9, Luk 4:2 f., Luk 4:6; Luk 4:10; Luk 4:13 f., Luk 5:1-6).

(c) A kindred subject having a similar development in Lk., but otherwise only scantily represented in the Gospels, is that of dependence on the Divine bounty in answer to prayer (Luk 11:1-13), which can hardly be dissociated from the companion parables (Luk 11:5-8 and Luk 18:1-8). The bare and wholly disconnected fragment taken up in Mat 7:7-11 is as inadequate to represent this exquisite group as is Mat 6:19-34 if bereft of the parables on the Foolish Rich Man and the Shrewd Steward. Once more, it is the Ep. of James that supplies an echo of the same spirit (cf. Mat 1:5-8; Mat 1:17, Mat 4:2 f., Mat 5:13-18).

It is clear that the method here applied may be extended to much of the special discourse-material of Lk., including perhaps some elements of Acts (on Solomon in Act 7:44-50 see *Yale Bicentennial Contributions*, 1901, p. 271 f.). It is sufficient for the present to indicate that a large element of our Third Gospel is thus characterized.

vi. Wisdom utterances represent a special type of Gospel traditions.—The question of the relation of the Wisdom discourses to the recognized Gospel sources is one which inevitably suggests itself as soon as the fact is recognized that they are characterized by a peculiar and distinctive point of view. It becomes our duty, accordingly, to trace at least the outline of an answer.

1. The discourse-material of Matthew 11-12 falls outside the pentad characterized by the colophon *καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν κ.τ.λ.* already discussed in art. Logia.

2. Besides being separated by narrative-material from these groups, Matthew 11-12 differ from them in the fact of their relation to the narrative, from which they are inseparable, and in the degree of similarity in their language to the Lukan parallels. As against the groups of *logia* which have not, and from their character do not require, a narrative setting, the discourse of Matthew 11 not only relates the coming of the Baptist's disciples, but presupposes an account of Jesus' works of healing, and even requires us to suppose the reader somewhere informed of what had given rise to the taunt 'Behold a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners.' The same applies to the discourse in defence of Jesus' exorcism 'by the Spirit of God.' This indispensable narrative-element is always supplied more fully and in better connexion by Lk., in some cases by Lk. alone (Luk 11:1 ff; Luk 12:13-21).

3. The similarity of language to the Lukan parallels is here very exceptional, reaching the degree of verbal identity for whole sentences, and positively requiring the use of the same written *Greek* source.

4. This marked difference in the degree of resemblance serves to connect other non-Markan elements of Mt., such as Mat 3:1 to Mat 4:11; Mat 8:5-13; Mat 8:18-22, which are again found to fall outside the Matthaean pentad, to differ in content and point of view from the *Logian* source, and to be at once more complete and for the most part more authentic in detail in Luke than in Matthew. Linguistic peculiarities in several instances prove the dependence of Mt. in these portions. Thus Ἱεροσαλήμ is used by Lk. 68 times against 3 (5?) employments of Ἱεροσόλυμα. The latter form on the contrary is invariably employed in Mt., Mk., and Jn., *except* thrice in Mat 23:37 = Luk 13:34. βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ is systematically changed by Mt. to τῶν οὐρανῶν. There are but four exceptions: Mat 19:24 (= Mar 10:25) and Mat 12:28; Mat 21:31; Mat 21:43 (cf. Luk 7:29; Luk 11:20).

vii. Relation to narrative-elements of Synoptic tradition.—Although our First and to a less extent our Third Evangelist both derive the main framework of their narrative from our Second, this Second itself is not wanting in evidences of dependence on the source to which we have traced the Wisdom chapters of Mt. and Luke.

1. This relation appears in the description of the Baptist as Elias (Mar 1:2; Mar 1:5-6;^{*} [Note: Note especially the rare form ἔσθω found only in Luk 7:33-34; Luk 10:7; Luk 22:30. In all the other 55 occurrences of the verb in the NT, including 10 in Mark, 9 of Lk.'s own, the regular form ἐσθίω is used.] cf. Luk 7:24 f., Luk 7:33, Mat 11:14, 2Ki 1:8); of the Temptation (Mar 1:13, the ἄγγελοι and θηρία coming from Psa 91:11-13 quoted in Luk 4:10 f.); of Jesus as 'eating and drinking' while the disciples of the Baptist were fasting, and as 'a friend of publicans and sinners' (Mar 2:18-22; Mar 2:13-17; cf. Luk 7:33 f.); of the blasphemy of the scribes (Mar 3:22-35; cf. Luk 11:14-28), and perhaps of the Transfiguration (Mar 9:2-13; cf. Luk 9:28-36). In all these passages of Mk. and in other loosely connected material (Mar 9:36-48 = Luk 9:49 f., Luk 12:41-44 = Luk 24:1-4) the context of Lk. gives more or less conclusive evidence of priority. It is but reasonable to suppose that other Markan narratives such as Mar 6:1-6 may also have been derived hence, though the present Lukan form has been affected by Mk.

2. Of the connexion of the narrative-elements peculiar to Lk. with the source thus characterized it is hardly needful to speak. The common point of view of this material, presenting Jesus as the friend and champion of the lowly, from His

childhood in the manger, welcomed by shepherds, to His acceptance by the thief on the cross, is well known. Nor can such narratives as that of the repentant harlot (Luk 7:36-50) be separated without violence from the discourse context. It is only in Mt. and Mk. that Luk 7:1-10; Luk 21:1-4 find themselves on a foreign soil.

viii. Conclusions as to proto-Lukan source.—Admitting the precarious character of all attempts at extricating the Synoptic sources, and the probable development of the Antiochian (?) tradition between the period of its employment by Mk. and Mt. and its ultimate incorporation by Lk., enough remains to justify the following inference. A type of Gospel tradition grew up (at Antioch?) intermediate between those to which tradition attaches the names respectively of ‘Matthew’ and ‘John,’ and containing the ἡ λεχθέντα ἡ πραχθέντα. traditionally ascribed to the preaching of Peter. The Matthaean tradition is especially connected both by the unanimous testimony of antiquity and by internal evidence with Jerusalem. It takes as its method the agglutination of the *logia* of Jesus into a five-fold new *Torah*, as ‘commandments given by the Lord to the faith.’ This agrees with the legalistic tendencies of the Palestinian Church and the methods of the Synagogue as illustrated, e.g., in the *Pirke Aboth* (cf. the *Oxyrhynchus Logia*). Besides the *halachic* type of Gospel tradition the earliest testimony recognizes a *haggadic*, of which Peter is the authoritative source. It seems to have had two branches, the earlier (Mk.) connected by tradition and internal evidences with Rome, the later (Jn.) with Ephesus, both almost as wholly preoccupied with the doctrine of the Person of Christ as the Pauline Epistles, and appealing to the drama of the Ministry and Passion for proof of the Divine sonship of Jesus. In the earlier (Mk.), connexion with the Petrine tradition is still close. In the later (Jn.), Pauline Logos-doctrine wholly dominates. Midway between these two types of Gospel tradition, the Hebrew and the Graeco-Roman, is developed that which tradition credibly associates with the name of Luke at Antioch. Combining both sayings and doings (ἡρξάτο ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν, Act 1:1) in juster proportion than Mk., it finds in the *history*, as exhibited in both elements, a manifestation of the Spirit of God in terms of the Jewish Wisdom-doctrine. As our First canonical Evangelist presents as the opening scene of the ministry the new Lawgiver on the Mount of Beatitudes, so our Third presents the scene in the synagogue of Nazareth where the ‘words of grace’ uttered by the bearer of ‘the Spirit of the Lord God’ are rejected by His own people, the tragedy of the Divine Wisdom. The theme is constant, but is developed alike in message of grace and deed of mercy. The whole career of Jesus is a manifestation of ‘the power of God and the wisdom of God.’ Analysis of the sources of canonical Lk.-Acts reveals no difference in this fundamental point of view. From the beginning, as in the 5th cent., the Antioch school is historical, and its historical sources admittedly include, in Acts, if not in the Gospel, the oldest narrative of the NT. By the standard of internal evidence its tradition is more markedly Petrine than Mk.; its Christology roots itself, like the Pauline, but with less of the Hellenic

speculative development, in that broadest, most humanitarian, most tolerant school of Hebrew thought, the followers and exponents of 'all-virtuous Wisdom.'

ix. Wisdom speculation in the development of Christology.—The conception of Wisdom as affecting Synoptic tradition involves such literary analysis of the source as the foregoing. As affecting the doctrine of the Person of Christ it involves at least a passing glance at the Pauline Christology, the link between Synoptic and Johannine doctrine.

1. The Wisdom-doctrine of *St. Paul* stands in unmistakably close relation, as regards its antecedents, with the Wisdom literature; and, as respects its subsequent development, with the Johannine Logos-doctrine. *St. Paul's* indebtedness to Stoic philosophy and ethics is set forth by no less a master than Lightfoot ('*St. Paul and Seneca*' in *Com. on Phil. [Note: Philistine.]*). Recent demonstrations of his much more extensive and direct dependence on the Wisdom literature, especially the Book of Wisdom (*Internat. Crit. Com. on Romans*, by Sanday and Headlam, p. 51; cf. Grafe, 'Das Verhältniss der paulinischen Schriften zur Sapientia Salomonis' in *Th. Abh. C. v. Weizsäcker gewidmet*), should by now have made it plain that. Stoicism comes to *St. Paul* mainly through Jewish channels. Again, since it is certain that *St. Paul* both by temperament and by experience was more apocalyptist than scribe, it should not have been overlooked that he has advanced, however briefly, his own decision on the moot point, whether the complete manifestation of the Divine Wisdom is simply the Torah of Moses (so the scribes on the basis of Deu_4:6-8), or whether it is the living Spirit of God sent forth in human form. Rom_10:4-8 and Bar_3:9 to Bar_4:1 (especially Bar_3:29 f.) contain contemporary and rival interpretations of Deu_30:12; Deu_30:3. By *St. Paul's* interpretation 'the word' (of revelation) is nothing more or less than 'Christ' as pre-existent spirit, the same Wisdom which, 'because she was the artificer of all things,' passing into the soul of Solomon gave him 'an unerring knowledge of the things that are, to know the constitution of the world,' etc. (Wis_7:17-22), the same 'mind of Christ' by possession of which Christians have similar knowledge of the purposes of the Creator, just as a man's own consciousness gives him knowledge of his private designs (1Co_2:6-16; see *Mystery*). Definite identification is thus made by *St. Paul* in this and many other passages between the Divine Spirit of Wisdom, through which, according to 'Wisdom,' God created the world, and the pre-existent Christ. Even the avatar doctrine of the descent and ascent of Wisdom (see references above, i. 1) is unmistakably adopted by *St. Paul* partly in opposition to, partly in rivalry with, the widespread conceptions of mystery religion (see *Mystery*). But just as a study of the Pauline ethics will show that its Stoic elements have been subsumed under the Christian principle of altruistic service (Eph_5:1 f., Php_2:1-13), so it should be recognized that the Pauline Logos doctrine, while clearly incorporating in Eph_4:4-16 a quasi-mythological interpretation of Psa_68:18, rests upon an authentic teaching of Jesus. According to *St. Paul*, Psalms 68 sets forth the descent, conflict with the

hostile powers, triumph and ascent of the Divine Spirit (cf. Col 2:15, 1Pe 3:19) after releasing the captives of Death (cf. 1Co 15:26 f). But Eph 4:8-10, when compared with the earlier and later related passages concerning the avatar of Wisdom (Bacon, *Story of St. Paul*, p. 316 ff.), will be seen in some sense to rest upon the parable of Jesus concerning the ‘spoiling’ of the Strong Man armed, by the Stronger than he (*i.e.* the Spirit of God operative in Jesus, Mat 12:28). We find it, in fact, habitually applied in this sense by the Fathers (Apollinaris, frag. 2 in *Pasch. Chron.*; *Heads against Caius*, vii.; cf. Hnydekoper, *Works*, vol. ii., ‘Christ’s Mission to the Underworld’). Thus the Pauline Wisdom-or Logos-doctrine of a pre-existent, spiritual Christ is firmly rooted in the authentic teaching of Jesus Himself. To Jesus also ‘the power of God and the wisdom of God,’ were exhibited in His own mighty works and God-given teaching, and were a ‘sign ‘to His generation (Mat 11:2-24; Mat 12:38-42; cf. 1Co 1:17 to 1Co 2:16).

2. *Johannine and Patristic Christology.*—(a) It matters little that after St. Paul the Wisdom doctrine should have been rebaptized by the Greek title of Logos, perhaps under the influence of Philo, perhaps as a concession to a Greek-speaking Church. Even in the Fourth Gospel the basic conception remains Hebrew and Pauline. Sanday as a student of Johannine thought, Sabatier as a student of Pauline, concur in admitting the identity of doctrine under the diverse terminology.

(b) In the Fourth Gospel the standpoint of the Evangelist is purely and simply the theological. He depicts the self-manifestation of the Divine Wisdom or Logos as incarnate in Jesus by word and deed. Her ‘dwelling among men’ (Joh 1:10-14; cf. Enoch 42:2), rejection and apotheosis (Joh 20:17) is his theme. It is characteristic that here, as in the Wisdom literature in general, Wisdom is made to ‘praise herself’ (Sir 24:1). The incarnate Logos preaches Himself; His seven parables are seven ‘I am’s,’ His seven mighty works manifest His own glory (Joh 2:11). In Joh 7:38 Jesus even quotes again an unknown ‘scripture’ which by all analogy is drawn from the Wisdom literature (cf. Sir 24:30 f. [applied in Sir 24:23-29, by analogy with *five* rivers, to the five books of the Torah], Enoch 48:1, 49:1, and for Rabbinic interpretation in the scribal sense, *Emek Hammelcch*, 196^a, on Isa 12:3, ‘The waters are nothing else than the Torah, and the waters of salvation nothing else than the Torah of Messiah,’ Weber, *Lehrc d. Talm. [Note: Talmud.]* p. 360 f.; cf. also 1Co 10:4 and *Oxyrh. Log.* iii.).

(c) The Wisdom utterance Mat 11:25 ff. may be regarded as marking the transition-point between the Synoptic and Johannine representations of Jesus’ teaching. Not its doctrine alone, nor its mysticism, paralleling 1 Corinthians 2 (see *Mystery*), but the very form of its utterance is thus seen to be characteristic; for the Wisdom of God habitually speaks in the first person. Herein the discourses of the Fourth Gospel are as close to the spirit of the Wisdom literature as its Logos-doctrine

is close to the Wisdom-doctrine of St. Paul. In the development of Gospel literature the presentation of Jesus' career and teaching as the manifestation of the Divine Wisdom takes a place analogous to that of the Wisdom-doctrine of St. Paul in the development of Christology.

Literature.—On the Wisdom hypostasis see, in addition to the works cited above, Bousset, *Religion des Judenthums* 2, p. 394 ff.; Brandt, *Evangelische Geschichte.*, pp. 537, 561 f., 576; J. Drummond, *Philo Judæus*, ii. p. 201 ff.; Aall, *Gesch d. Logosidee*, i. p. 204 f. On Hebrew Wisdom literature: Cheyne, *Job and Solomon, or the Wisdom of the OT*, 1887. On the literary forms: Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa*; Wilke, *Dieneutest. Rhetorik*; Moffatt, *Historical New Test*, 2 pp. xx, 704. On the influence of the *Hokhmah* literature on the gospel: F. C. Porter, *Messages of the Apocalyptic Writers*, 1905, p. 19. On the discourses of the Third Gospel: Bacon, *The Sermon on the Mount*, 1900, Appendix C. On Mat 23:34-39, D. F. Strauss, 'Jesu Weheruf über Jerusalem und die σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ' in *Ztschr. wiss. Theol.* vi. (1863), pp. 84-93; Loman, *Th. Tijdschr.* i. pp. 550-560.

B. W. Bacon.

☩ Wisdom Of Christ

WISDOM OF CHRIST.—1. Christ, being God and man, possessed naturally two distinct kinds of wisdom—*Divine wisdom* and *human wisdom*. The former, as part of the totality of the Divine attributes (τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος), He necessarily possessed from eternity, and, according to Pauline teaching, He continued to possess it, in spite of His κένωσις, or self-emptying (Php 2:7), even after His Incarnation (Col 1:19; Col 2:9; cf. Col 2:3). The continued possession by the Incarnate Logos of the fulness of the Divine wisdom is no isolated doctrine, but is necessarily involved in the Logos-Christology of St. Paul and St. John, according to which the Father does not create and sustain the world directly, but mediately through the Logos, who is the Creator (Joh 1:3; Joh 1:10, Eph 3:9, Col 1:16, Heb 1:2), the Life (Joh 1:4), and the Light (Joh 1:9) of the world, the cause of its rational order, and the principle of its coherence and subsistence (Col 1:17). Cosmical functions of such a kind as this, assigned to the Logos in accordance with His essential nature and position in the Godhead, cannot be supposed to have been laid aside at the Incarnation, and therefore the limitations of Christ's knowledge, which the Synoptic Gospels recognize, either must be attributed to His manhood, or else it must be supposed that in the historical Christ were *two* centres of Divine consciousness—an unlimited one, in which He knew all things, and a limited one, in which He condescended to be ignorant of

certain things. The latter view, which is based on an ultra-literal interpretation of Mar 13:32, postulates three different kinds of wisdom in Christ—an *unlimited* Divine wisdom, a *limited* Divine wisdom, and a *human* wisdom. This scheme appears to us unnecessarily complicated. The ‘ignorance’ of Mar 13:32, although ascribed to *the Son*, can quite naturally, on the principle of *communicatio idiomatum*, be attributed to Christ’s human nature (οὐκ ἀγνοῶν ὁ Λόγος, ἢ Λόγος ἐστίν, ἔλεγεν, Οὐκ οἶδα, οἶδε γάρ, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον δεικνύς, ὅτι τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἰδιὸν ἐστὶ τὸ ἀγνοεῖν, Athan. c. [Note: circa, about.] *Arian*. iii. 45); and consequently there is no need to recognize in Christ more than *two* wisdoms, a human and a Divine (see, further, Kenosis).

(1) In virtue of His Divine wisdom, Christ is *omniscient*, i.e. He knows all actual and possible things, present, past and future, including the future contingent actions of beings possessed of free-will. The nature of this last kind of knowledge (sometimes called *scientia media*) is altogether inscrutable to us; but it is expressly ascribed to God in many passages of both Testaments (1Sa 23:1-13, Isa 41:22-23, Jer 38:15 ff., Heb 4:13 etc.), and is frequently claimed by Jesus (Mat 11:20-23; Mat 26:21, Joh 6:70 etc.), who is represented as able to read the heart of man (Joh 1:47-51; Joh 2:24-25 etc.).

(2) With regard to Christ’s *human wisdom*, believers in a real Incarnation (ἐνανθρώπησις), as distinguished from a mere assumption of a body (ἐνσάρκωσις, ἐνσωμάτωσις), are bound to recognize both its *finite character* and its *gradual development*. The gradual development of Christ’s wisdom is twice noticed by St. Luke (Luk 2:40 πληροῦμενον σοφία [σοφίας], Luk 2:52 προέκοπτε σοφία καὶ ἡλικία), and once by the author of Hebrews (Heb 5:8 καίπερ ὢν νιός, ἔμαθεν ἀφ’ ὧν ἔπαθε τὴν ὑπακοήν, καὶ τελειωθείς ἐγένετο, etc.) To understand the growth in wisdom here spoken of as merely *exhibitive*—Christ being; supposed, as He grew in age, to manifest more and more of the hidden wisdom which He possessed entire from the first (so John of Damascus and most of the later Fathers; also Aquinas and the Scholastics)—is not only bad exegesis, but is virtual Apollinarism. Apollinaris denied to Christ a real human soul; but Aquinas virtually does the same when he asserts that the soul of Christ was created *mature*, in the full enjoyment of free-will and of the Beatific Vision, and possessed of wisdom and knowledge practically coextensive with the Divine.* [Note: The Scholastic doctrine is that from the moment of conception Christ’s soul knew all actual events and things, past, present, and future. Only abstract possibilities, which were never to be realized, were hidden from Him.]

Far different is the representation of the Gospels. In them Christ undergoes not simply a bodily, but a normal psychical development. He is true infant, true boy, true youth, in mind as well as in body. As Irenaeus beautifully says: 'He came to save all by means of Himself—all, I say, who through Him are born again to God—infants, and children, and boys, and youths, and old men. He therefore passed through every age, becoming an infant for infants, thus sanctifying infants; a child for children, thus sanctifying those who are of this age, being at the same time made to them an example of piety, righteousness, and submission; a youth for youths, becoming an example to youths, and thus sanctifying them for the Lord' (*Against Heresies*, ii. 22-24). *The Incarnation of Christ thus restored the norm of human development*. In the growth of the child Jesus, God saw for the first time human nature expanding and perfecting itself according to its original ideal and plan, unhindered and undistorted by sin; and upon the gracious spectacle God and man looked with approval (Luk 2:40; Luk 2:52).

(3) By the human wisdom (*σοφία*) of Christ is meant His quick understanding in the things of God (cf. Jam 1:5); His knowledge of the Scriptures, and His power of interpreting them (cf. Act 6:3; Act 6:10); His deep moral insight, gained by actual experience of temptation and suffering (Heb 5:8); His capacity for learning His lessons at the synagogue school (cf. Act 7:22); His skill as a carpenter (cf. Exo 31:2 f.); the power of asking and answering hard questions (cf. Rev 13:18; Rev 17:9) which He displayed even as a boy (Luk 4:6), and which stood Him in good stead on so many occasions during His ministry. (Mat 22:15; Mat 22:23; Mat 22:34 etc.); His skill in constructing parables, allegories, and sententious sayings, like those of the wise men of old (cf. Mat 12:4); His persuasiveness as a teacher and eloquence as a preacher (see Mat 13:54, cf. 1Co 1:17; 1Co 2:1; 1Co 2:4); His common sense and practical ability (cf. Col 4:5); probably also His power of working miracles (Mar 6:2, cf. Act 7:10), and His prophetic gift (2Pe 3:15), which were in Him, partly at any rate, *human* endowments, as in other prophets (see Mar 13:32).

(4) It is implied in Scripture that Christ's human knowledge received *a great extension at His Resurrection and Ascension*. At the Resurrection He received all authority (*πᾶσα ἐξουσία*) in heaven and on earth (Mat 28:18), and this authority He exercises *as man*, and not simply as God (Php 2:10, Rev 5:6-14 etc.). His human knowledge, therefore, must now be coextensive with His human authority; that is, it must embrace all cosmical facts—past, present, and future. It is an error, however, to suppose that His human knowledge is even now infinite. Human nature is essentially *finite*, and therefore the human soul of Christ, though glorified, can never completely know the Infinite Essence of God. See, further, Consciousness.

2. On Christ as the Wisdom of God, see preceding article.

Literature.—Dorner, *Person of Christ*; Baldensperger, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*; Liddon, *BL [Note: L Bampton Lecture.]*; Gifford, *The Incarnation*; Gore, *Dissertations*; Bruce, *Humiliation of Christ*; Hall, *Kenotic Theory*; Mason, *Conditions of our Lord's Life on Earth*; Powell, *Principle of the Incarnation*; *Expositor*, iv. iv. [1891] p. 1 ff.

C. Harris.

Wise Men

WISE MEN.—See Magi.

Witness

WITNESS.—The idea of witness as related to Christ and His gospel plays an essential and highly important part in the NT writings and in the Christian faith and life universally. Not only in the primitive preaching, but also in all effectual preaching throughout the history of the Church, the gospel is conceived not as a speculative system, but as a *witness to Jesus the Christ* as being Himself *God's Witness* to the world.

Among the NT writers none appears to have so definitely and fondly reflected upon the idea of witness as St. John. It is one of his 'leading ideas.' In his Gospel (cf. Westcott, *Speaker's Com.* on 'St. John,' Introd.) he mentions a sevenfold witness to Christ: the witness (1) of the Father (Joh 5:34; Joh 5:37), (2) of the Son (Joh 8:14, Joh 18:37), (3) of His works (Joh 10:25, Joh 5:36), (4) of the Scriptures (Joh 5:39-46), (5) of the forerunner (Joh 1:7, Joh 5:35), (6) of the disciples (Joh 15:27, Joh 19:35), (7) of the Spirit (Joh 15:26, Joh 16:14). In view, however, of the unique significance of the Person of Christ, and in harmony with the method of the NT preaching, it will be most appropriate to consider our subject under these two heads:—I. The witness of Jesus Christ the Son, supported by the witness of the Father and of the Spirit. II. The witness of the disciples to Jesus Christ the Son of God, supported by the witness of the Holy Spirit.

I. *The witness of Jesus, supported by the witness of the Father and of the Spirit*

1. Jesus' personal witness.—His first disciples Jesus gathered about Himself through the power of the truth which He spoke and of His own Personality, so marvellously at

one with His word. He did not begin with declarations about Himself. He came to make the Father known. He came fulfilling, in word and deed, the Law and the Prophets. He preached repentance and inward righteousness. With a wealth of light He set forth the nature of the Kingdom of God. But in all this Jesus spoke as *witness*. He was conscious of an immediate, intimate, and unique fellowship with the Father, and out of this consciousness He spoke (Mat 11:27, Joh 3:11; Joh 10:15; Joh 14:10; Joh 17:21; Joh 17:25; see also art. Consciousness). The tone and manner of spiritual authority permeated all that He said and did from His earliest teaching to His sublime declaration before Pilate, and even to His words upon the cross (cf. esp. Matthew 5-7, Joh 18:37; Joh 19:30, Luk 11:43; Luk 11:46). But this consciousness of speaking as witness finds also distinct and emphatic expression in His word (cf. esp. Joh 8:12 ff.).

While Jesus' witness was primarily concerning the Father,—He even denied in a certain sense that He bore witness of Himself (Joh 5:31),—it is yet certain that He also bore witness of Himself (cf. esp. Joh 8:14; Joh 18:37; Joh 14:6). Jesus testifies of Himself as *the Way*. This testimony is unmistakable and unqualified. And yet the method of this witness was chiefly indirect or by way of necessary implication. He appealed to the Father's testimony concerning Him, or else silently waited till it should be brought to light. And when the revelation from the Father produced in the disciples a believing confession of His Son, Jesus clearly accepted and sanctioned that confession (e.g. Mat 16:16-20).

2. The witness of the Father to Jesus includes both the personal, inward testimony to Jesus Himself, which resulted in His full consciousness as Messiah and Son (see art. Consciousness), and all the works of God preparatory to and accompanying the life of Jesus Christ on earth designed to lead men to the certainty of faith in Him as Redeemer and Lord. Under this head we note: (1) *The witness of the Scriptures* (cf. esp. Joh 5:39, Luk 24:27, Act 10:43). This must be taken in the most real sense and yet not narrowly. The OT is full of the Messianic hope, and that hope was inspired by God. Jesus was steeped in the Scriptures, and He understood the things in them concerning Himself. We have no longer reason to insist upon a scheme of minute prediction and fulfilment, and yet we still affirm that Jesus is not to be understood otherwise than as the Fulfiller of the Law and the Prophets. (For a fuller discussion of this point see art. Fulfilment. Cf. also Valetton, *Christus und das AT [Note: T Altes Testament.]* ; and Kähler, *Jesus und das AT [Note: T Altes Testament.]*).

(2) *The witness of John* as a prophet of God (cf. esp. Joh 1:7-8; Joh 1:15; Joh 1:19 ff., Joh 5:36) is manifestly closely related to that of the Scriptures; but John is, of course, more specific than the earlier prophets could be. John's witness Jesus accepts as having a very real significance, for He regards it not as the witness of man merely, but as inspired of God.

(3) The *witness of the works* (cf. esp. Joh 5:30; Joh 5:36; Joh 10:37-38; Joh 14:10-11, Act 2:22-24). The works are a testimony from the Father; for Jesus declares: 'The Father abiding in me doeth his works.' It would, doubtless, be a grave mistake to regard Christ's word, 'The works which the Father hath given me to accomplish, the very works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me,' as meaning *only* His miracles. The testimony of the works issues from His whole life and ministry. His whole lifework was a manifestation of God, and as such was, in the larger sense, truly a miracle. See, further, artt. Miracles, Resurrection of Christ, and Sign.

3. The witness of the Spirit to Jesus the Son.—The witness of God concerning His Son calls for faith in the Son (1Jn 5:6 ff.). This witness is borne to us primarily in objective facts (1Jn 1:1 ff; 1Jn 5:8; 1Jn 5:10), but it is borne in upon our consciousness only by the Spirit of God. 'It is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is the truth' (1Jn 5:7; cf. also Mat 16:17). It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the Person and work of Jesus Christ are the object of this testimony. The Paraclete, the Spirit of truth (Christ says), '*shall bear witness of me*' (Joh 15:26). The witness of the Spirit, according to the NT, is a much larger thing than the assurance of personal sonship through Christ (Rom 8:16; cf. art. Assurance). Personal assurance is an essential and unspeakably important part—in a sense the climax—of the Spirit's witness. But it is un-Biblical to speak of this unqualifiedly as *the* witness of the Spirit. The Spirit's testimony is *coextensive with the objective testimony*. The manifestation of the truth of God in objective facts becomes to us an inward illumination only through the inward witness of the Spirit. Without the *testimonium Spiritus sancti internum* the objective witness is unable to produce full assurance. On the other hand, an inward persuasion that is not firmly grounded in objective reality is miserably insecure. The climax of the inward testimony is personal assurance; but the inward witness is inseparable from the outward. They are not two separate and independent testimonies. God would make us certain of His wonderful love and grace. To this end He reveals Christ *for us*, and He also reveals Him *in us*. The outward manifestation is the indispensable means to the inward revelation. The fact of the fellowship with God through the Spirit (e.g. Rom 8:14 ff.) is not a thing by itself, it is the demonstration of the truth of the promise by an initial and progressive realization of the same. The actual fellowship of the Spirit is the Spirit's own witness. See, further, art. Holy Spirit.

II. *The witness of the disciples, supported by the witness of the Holy Spirit.*—Nothing could be clearer than that the primitive Christian preaching was not only the most direct and specific witness to Jesus the crucified and risen Lord, but also a witness irrepressibly spontaneous and full of the unconquerable assurance of an over-powering certainty (Act 4:20, 1Co 9:16, 2Co 4:13).

What constitutes, according to the NT, the equipment and competence of a witness of Jesus Christ? Were His original disciples the only genuine witnesses? Are not those also 'who have not seen and yet have believed' (Joh 20:29) competent witnesses? In the first place, then, let us inquire how the original witnesses were prepared for their office. Early in His public ministry Jesus chose from out the larger number of His disciples 'twelve that they might be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach' (Mar 3:14). These He trained to be heralds of His gospel (see art. Apostles; and Bruce, *The Training of the Twelve*), and declared that, when the Paraclete should have come to them, they should *bear witness* of Him (Joh 15:26-27). After His Passion and Resurrection He expressly commissioned them to go forth as His witnesses (Luk 24:48, Act 1:8). They could, of course, have had no vital conception of Jesus and His mission without the illumination of the Holy Spirit. But was there something in their experience which constituted them the only real witnesses? Some have so held; but this is a view unwarranted by Scripture and out of harmony with the principles of evangelical Christianity. The original disciples, it is true, were the only eye- and ear-witnesses. Yet what they literally saw and heard was not the revelation itself, but only the means thereto. In Jesus the flesh was, so to speak, 'a transparency for the Word.' Nevertheless multitudes 'saw and heard' Jesus and understood not. None of the rulers of this world recognized in Him the Lord of glory (1Co 2:8). The original heralds of Christ did indeed lay a certain stress upon their being eye- and ear-witnesses. But they prized their experience of sensible intercourse with the Lord not for its own sake, but because it was to them the means of entering into an inward personal fellowship with Him. In the days of His flesh this personal fellowship with Him was necessarily mediated through the senses, though the fellowship itself was not sensuous but spiritual. Even for these original disciples the time must come when their fellowship with their Lord should be wholly independent of the senses. Through the Paraclete the Lord would renew and continue His fellowship with His disciples (cf. esp. John 14, 16 and Joh 17:26). But He would be no longer manifest through the senses (Joh 20:17; cf. the fine sermon of H. Hoffmann, *Eins ist not*, p. 153). It is clear from the NT that after Pentecost the original disciples were immovable in their persuasion that they possessed and had fellowship with their exalted Lord.

From all this it is clear that the visible manifestation of the Lord was designed to be superseded by a manifestation through the word of His witnesses. But can the word really take the place of the sensuous contact with the Lord's Person? For answer let it be remembered in the first place that Christ foretold that it should be sufficient (e.g. Joh 17:20 ff., Mat 28:20). What the original witnesses enjoyed, others should enjoy too—the same immediate fellowship, the same certainty. As the men of Sychar believed at last not for the woman's speaking, but because they had heard for themselves (Joh 4:42), so through the word of the Apostles others are brought into actual saving relation with the same Lord Christ. Alike for those who saw Him, and for those who saw Him not, the outward facts must be inwardly apprehended and

inwardly tested. And as was the design, so also is the actual experience under the gospel: where the word is truly preached the Spirit does energize and seal it, and those who believe receive the same certainty as the original disciples possessed. The whole NT preaching manifestly rests upon the full persuasion that this is and must be so (e.g. 1Pe 1:8, Heb 13:8, 2Pe 1:1, esp. Act 11:15; Act 11:18). Faith *does* come by hearing (Rom 10:17)—the *fact* of the vital union with Christ is proof of the adequacy of the word of testimony. Such is the argument of that wonderful passage, 1Jn 1:1-4. Those who through their association with Christ in the flesh had apprehended the life manifested, bear witness to others, *that these also may enter into the same fellowship with them*—the glorious fellowship with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ. In the days of His flesh, Jesus was (according to an expression of Beyschlag in his *Leben Jesu*) ‘His own prophet.’ After His resurrection this office is committed to faithful witnesses. And it is thus that they conceive their office. The ministry of reconciliation is committed to them. As ambassadors of Christ they stand in Christ’s stead (2Co 5:19-20). To bear witness to Christ is their one aim as heralds (1Jn 4:14). And their word is effectual. He who believes through their word is not then ‘a Christian of a secondary order’; his knowledge of Christ is indeed mediated and yet immediate (cf. the vigorous discussion of E. Haupt, *Die Bedeutung der heiligen Schrift für den evangelischen Christen*). The same holds good throughout all time. The word stands firm; it never passes away (Heb 2:1-2, Mar 13:31). Wherever the word of Christ is preached with the certainty of faith, it can bring the hearer into ‘the like precious faith’ (2Pe 1:1).

But the effectiveness of the word of testimony is absolutely conditioned upon the operation of the Holy Spirit. The essence of the word is the promise of fellowship, grace, eternal life through Jesus Christ. Unless the preacher has the inward consciousness of the reality of the life with Christ through the Spirit, his word is no witness. And unless the hearer is aided by the Spirit to apprehend and to prove the testimony, the word concerning peace, fellowship, freedom, and the power of an endless life would be but empty sound. When, however, the word is spoken in the Spirit, it is quick, powerful, convincing, saving (Heb 4:12, Joh 16:8, Jam 1:21).

Have, then, the original witnesses no peculiar privilege and authority? So far as personal certainty is concerned, they have no advantage over true believers of any age. Nevertheless, in the *economy* of the gospel dispensation, the word of the original witnesses is manifestly of cardinal importance. The mere fact that they were the *first* witness is of itself sufficient to give to their testimony a peculiar importance and to make it for evangelical Christians the last resort. Even those believing critics who go farthest in the sifting of Apostolic tradition, agree that the saving knowledge of God in Christ is mediated to us through the primitive Christian preaching. Either we must gain our knowledge of Christ by this means, or else we must give up the inquiry, for no other way is open to us (cf. art. Back to Christ). The primitive witnesses, however,

were more than merely the first, as though there by chance. They had been *chosen beforehand and specially trained* for the work of bearing witness. Either our Lord succeeded in giving to His chosen Apostles such an understanding of His mission and work as to enable them to bear competent witness, or else He failed. If He failed, there could be no certainty for them and no gospel to us through them. The soundness and sufficiency of their witness are established by the demonstration of the Spirit and of power, and this accompanies the same witness in every succeeding age.

For the sake of their testimony many of Christ's servants have been called upon to suffer death. Such were called in a special ethical sense μαρτυρες Ἰησοῦ (Act 22:20, Rev 2:13; Rev 17:6). 'This is not to be understood, as in ecclesiastical Greek, in the sense that death was the form of their testimony, but in reference to their testimony of Jesus as having occasioned their death' (Cremer, *Lex.*; cf. also Rev 20:4). An approach to the analogous use of μαρτυρέω is probably to be found in 1Ti 6:13 'Jesus Christ, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed the good confession.'

Literature.—Besides reff. in the art., see Dale, *Living Christ and Four Gospels*; Hare, *Mission of the Comforter*; Stearns, *Evid. of Chr. Exper.*; Smeaton, *Doct. of Holy Spirit*; Forrest, *Christ of Hist. and of Exper.*; Brace, *Gesta Christi*; R. J. Knowling, *The Witness of the Epistles*, and *The Witness of St. Paul to Christ*; Herrmann, *Warum bedarf unser Glaube geschichtl. Thatsachen?*; H. Scott Holland, *Creed and Character*, 1, 19; C. Wordsworth, *Primary Witness to the Truth of the Gospel*; Th. Zahn, *Bread and Salt from the Word of God*, 185; T. H. Green, *The Witness of God*; *Bapt. Rev. and Expos.* i [1904] 321; Kähler, *Zur Bibelfrage* (1907).

J. R. van Pelt.

☩ Woe

WOE.—The word οὐαί (in LXX Septuagint for the most part the translation of וָאֵי and וָהֵי) was spoken by our Lord in virtue of His prophetic office. He was 'the prophet that cometh into the world' (Joh 6:14), the decisive exponent of God's will (Deu 18:15 f., Act 3:22 f., Heb 1:1-2). As in the mouth of the OT prophets, so in His, 'the word of Yahwè must of necessity be a word of woe to a sinful people' [*Encyc. Bibl.* iii. 3875]. Like them, He was 'full of power by the spirit of the Lord, and of judgment, and of might, to declare unto Jacob his transgression, and to Israel his sin' (Mic 3:8). Two characters he specially abhorred—those of the seducer and the hypocrite. His language respecting the Jewish leaders is 'part of the judicial language

of the first Advent' (Mozley, *University Serm.* 29). Other Woes He utters with a sob of pity; but His indictment of the scribes and Pharisees is spoken with the wrath of love (cf. Rev 6:16). His 'prophetic plainness' is a trait that must not be left out of view in studying 'the mind of Christ,' and in contemplating His work as Priest and King. 'As well as meekness there was anger, and besides tenderness there was strength' (Hall Caine, *Illus. Lond. News*, 7th Mar. 1891; cf. Tennyson, *Memoir by his Son*, i. 326; *Ecce Homo*¹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 272, 276).—St. Mark reports only two instances of our Lord's using the word οὐαί. It does not occur in St. John. But St. John reports many stern utterances respecting those who sinned against light.

The Woe of Mar 13:17 (|| Mat 24:19, Luk 21:23) was spoken by Christ with deep commiseration; at the same time the passage in which it occurs is a prophetic one relating to the doom of Jerusalem which had rejected Him (cf. Luk 23:28-29). Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iii. 5) and Epiphanius (*de Mens.* 15) mention the flight of the Christians. Mat 11:21 (|| Luk 10:13)—where the mention of Chorazin shows how much of our Lord's work is left unrecorded (Plummer)—is part of a farewell lamentation over the three cities by the Lake which had seen His manifestations of Divine power but had not repented, and agrees with other fore-warnings that judgment will be most woeful for those who have thrown away the highest opportunities (Mat 12:41-42 || Luk 11:31-32; cf. Luk 12:47-48).—In Mat 18:7 (|| Luk 17:1, cf. Mar 9:42), the first Woe is spoken in pity, but the second in wrath. As is shown by the ἀνάγκη γάρ and the corresponding words in Lk., as well as by the context, οὐαί τῷ κόσμῳ is a lamentation over the ills brought on mankind by ambitions and selfish passions. The egotist and ambitionist (to use a word of Carlyle's) becomes the oppressor of the weak, and he also becomes their seducer,—a character for which Christ had such a loathing that He said 'it were better for him [who bears it] that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.' The second Woe, introduced by πλὴν (on which word see Plummer, *St. Luke*, 182), is directed against a man of this sort (τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ, the latter word putting him outside the pale of sympathy and respect), who, in our Lord's view, has committed the most heinous crime against the law of love (cf. Bruce, *Expos. Gr. Test.* 237; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, i. 344; Carr, *Expositor*, 1898 (ii.), 348; Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible* iii. 586^a).

Of the two passages in which our Lord pronounces woe against the contemporary leaders of Judaism, the one in Luke 11 is an early utterance, and was spoken in the house of a Pharisee who had asked Him to dine with him (v. 37), while the other in Matthew 23 is a late and public denunciation of them in Jerusalem on the eve of His

death. It was spoken when they were present, and for the purpose of warning the multitudes and His disciples to beware of them: hence, the real parallel to Matthew 23 in Mk. and Lk. is to be found in the brief sayings reported in Mar_12:38-40 and Luk_20:45-47.

In Luk_11:42-44; Luk_11:46-47; Luk_11:52 there are two indictments containing three Woes apiece, and addressed to Pharisees and lawyers (wh. see) respectively. Sentence is first pronounced upon the Pharisees for being so punctilious about matters of a subordinate nature, which should be kept in their proper place, while they neglected those moral obligations, which, were of far higher moment, 'judgment and the love of God' (Luk_11:42); for putting themselves forward into the first seats in the face of the congregation, and their fondness for having reverence done to them in public (Luk_11:43); and for being a secret source of defilement to others who were not aware of the evil tendency of their principles (Luk_11:44, cf. Luk_12:1). The second of these charges occurs, but without a Woe in Mat_23:6-7; while the other two are repeated in a more severe form in Mat_23:23; Mat_23:27.

The lawyers are then condemned for amplifying the written Law with their intolerably burdensome enactments, which they contrive to evade themselves, while so rigorous in exacting obedience to them from others (Luk_11:46); for their zeal in the erection and adornment of the tombs of the prophets, which, in bitter irony, is pronounced to be a sign of their continuing the work of the murderers of the prophets (Luk_11:47-48; Wendt, i. 281; *Ecce Homo*¹ [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , 267); and for taking away 'the key of knowledge' (see Keys) by their traditional interpretations, which rendered the people incapable of recognizing the living truth (Luk_11:52). The first of these charges is found in Mat_23:4 without a Woe; the others are repeated in Mat_23:13; Mat_23:29 ff.

This later denunciation (Mat_23:13, (14),* [Note: Mat_23:14 is probably an Interpolation from Mar_12:40. Its omission or transposition in the MSS may, however, be due to the fact that several sentences in succession begin with the same words (Scrivener, Introd.4 i. 9).] Mat_23:15-16; Mat_23:23; Mat_23:25; Mat_23:27; Mat_23:29; Cf. Isa_5:8; Isa_5:11; Isa_5:18; Isa_5:20-22; Hab_2:6; Hab_2:9; Hab_2:12; Hab_2:15; Hab_2:19) is still more impressive on account of its epic strain ('octies vae; Mat_5:3-11 octies beati,' Bengel). It shows how intense is the heat of our Lord's wrath when it is kindled (Psa_2:12), as no other continuous passage in the Gospels does. In it, our Lord pronounces woe against the scribes and Pharisees for their 'hypocrisy' or their dishonesty and love of stage-effect in religion, which was to Him the most hateful impiety; also for shutting the doors of the Kingdom of God which He had opened by His preaching, and so preventing people from entering (Mat_23:13, cf. Rev_3:6); for plundering (prob. wealthy and devout) widows (Plummer cites examples from the Talmud), and deceiving simple-minded people (Theophylact) by the long

prayers they make (Mat 23:14); for carrying on a most laborious propaganda for the purpose of gaining proselytes (cf. Josephus *Ant.* xx. ii. 4), and then making them more full of spiritual pride than themselves (Mat 23:15, cf. the Judaistic proselytizers who so relentlessly dogged St. Paul's footsteps, Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iv. 136^b); For pretending to guide others in the doing of God's will when they showed that they were so wanting in moral perception themselves (cf. Mat 15:14 || Luk 6:39); as, for example, when they subverted truth and justice by the sophistical distinctions they made in regard to the binding nature of different kinds of oaths (Mat 23:16-22, cf. Mar 7:6-13). He then condemned them for omitting 'the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and fidelity,' while they were so exact in tithing their smaller garden herbs, thus 'straining out a gnat and swallowing a camel' (Mat 23:23-24); and for so carefully observing, 'in preparing their food, the ceremonial rules for preserving their Levitical purity,' while they were not careful 'to avoid the moral defilement caused by the unlawful acquisition of that food, and by using it to minister to intemperance' (Mat 23:25-26, Wendt, i. 327). He compared the fair show of goodness they made with the artificial whiteness imparted to sepulchres by washing them with lime in spring (Mat 23:27-28, cf. Holtzmann, Meyer, *in loc.*; *Encyc. Bibl.* iv. 5138). The final Woe was pronounced with a stinging reference to the honours they were paying to the prophets whom their fathers killed (Mat 23:29-31); and, the cup of His indignation brimming over at the thought of His own impending death at their hands, He said, 'Fill ye up then the measure of (the sins of) your fathers' (Mat 23:32).

'Tremendous' (Mozley) as this language is, we are not to think that it was meant to apply to all the Pharisees indiscriminately. Nicodemus was a Pharisee (Joh 3:1), and there were, doubtless, many others (cf. Act 5:34) with respect to whom the charge of hypocrisy was inadmissible. Paul, as a Pharisee, was no hypocrite (Php 3:5-6); his Pharisaic upbringing was an important part of his providential training for his Christian Apostleship, and 'from Pharisaism in so far as it meant zeal for the highest objects of Jewish faith he never departed, and never could depart' (Act 26:5; Act 26:22; Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, 108 ff.). In this very chapter, our Lord admits their authority as that of those who 'sit in Moses' seat,' and even gives His sanction to some of their minor observances (Mat 23:2; Mat 23:23; cf. Hort, 31-32). A well-known passage in the Talmud, distinguishing the various classes of Pharisees from each other, says that the real and only Pharisee is 'he who does the will of his Father in heaven because he loves Him' (Levy, *NHWB [Note: HWB Neuhebräisches Wörterbuch.]* 4. 143).

In his famous article on the Talmud (*Qu. Review*, Oct. 1867), the late Emanuel Deutsch pronounced a warm panegyric on 'the chiefly Pharisaic masters of the Mishnic period' for their 'wisdom, piety, kindness, and high and noble courage' (*Literary Remains*, 29). C. G. Monteflore (*Hibbert Journal*, Jan. 1903) has called attention to the 'new and large material, so interesting, so counter to current conceptions and

verdicts,' produced by Schechter, 'the foremost Rabbinic scholar of his age,' in his articles in the *JQR* [Note: *QR Jewish Quarterly Review.*] (1894-1990). But 'Schechter confesses that the view he has to give of Rabbinical religion *presents a blank at the important period*'—the time of Christ. 'We are driven back, therefore, on the Gospels.* [Note: 7 of the Assumption of Moses (not later than a.d. 30), which has been supposed to refer to the Pharisees (Hastings' DB, Extra Vol. 53a), is more probably a description of the Sadducees (Charles, *Encyc. Bibl.* i. 236).] ... The evidence they afford appears irresistible ... and an appeal to the principles of the religion as set forth in the OT and in the Mishnah cannot prevail to discredit the facts there recorded' (Menzies, *Hibbert Journal*, July, 1903). There is thus no reasonable ground for doubt that during our Lord's life on earth the scribes and Pharisees were immersed in that externalism and religious affectation which He so vividly depicted; and it was their implacable hostility to His spiritual teaching, begun at a very early period in His ministry (Mar 3:6), that in the end brought about His crucifixion.

Mar 14:21 (|| Mat 26:24, Luk 22:22) οὐαὶ δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι' οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδεται; Lk. has πλὴν οὐαὶ, bringing out with emphasis the responsibility of Judas, who was free to act, notwithstanding the τὸ ὀρισμένον. This, which is perhaps the saddest sentence in the Gospels, was spoken without vindictiveness, although it undoubtedly reveals that our Lord was wounded to the quick by the treachery of Judas. The ἐκείνῳ seems to set him finally outside the circle of the disciples (cf. Westcott on Joh 13:27). But this Woe is not an imprecation like Psalms 109. It is not the devoting of Judas to destruction. Similarly the words which follow, καὶ ἀλὸν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος, are 'not to be pressed with logical rigour' (Meyer), but are to be understood as meaning, 'Better not to have lived at all than to have lived to betray the Son of Man.' The whole saying witnesses to the anguish that our Lord felt on account of the perfidy of this false friend (cf. Psa 41:9, Joh 13:18); and we can sympathize with Keim when he says (*Jesus of Nazara*, v. 286) that we should have to greet it as the removal of a hundred-pound weight from the heart of Christendom if the treachery of Judas could be proved to have had no existence. But this is as impossible as to remove the burden, 'Tiberio imperitante, supplicio adfectus erat,' from the heart of mankind.

There still remain the four Woes which in Luk 6:24-26 are set over against the four Beatitudes in Luk 6:20-23. Their authenticity, as well as that of the Beatitudes in their Lukan form, is called in question by many distinguished scholars (Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, Ext. Vol. 16; *Encyc. Bibl.* iv. 4383), but on grounds that are very far from convincing. The objection taken to the Woes from their being omitted in Mt. is not of much weight. The data for determining the precise relation between the

sermons in Mt. and Lk. are wanting. Each of the writers may have had before him a different report of the same Sermon; or there may have been two similar but different Sermons, reported in two distinct documents, of which the one was used by Mt. and the other by Luke. In either case, the omission of the Woes in Mt. would be sufficiently accounted for (cf. Sanday, *Expositor*, 1891 (i.), 311 ff.; Loisy, *Le Discours sur la Montagne*, quoted in *Expositor*, 1904 (ii.), 103). The external form in which the Woes (and also the Beatitudes) are set forth illustrates our Lord's method of teaching 'by aiming at the greatest clearness in the briefest compass' (Wendt, *Teaching*, i. 130, 134; cf. ii. 68); the characteristics stated were comprehensive and significant enough to enable His hearers to understand who were the persons intended. When He began by saying, 'Blessed are ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of God,' He gave His hearers the key to the meaning of the other utterances which followed. For 'the poor' (the 'āniyyîm) was a term that had long had an ethical and spiritual connotation (cf. Driver, art. 'Poor' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible iv. 19, 20; Harnack, *What is Christianity?* 92); and this would prevent our Lord's utterances from being interpreted in a materialistic sense. See artt. Ebionism, Poor, Poverty, Wealth.

In our opinion it is more probable that the Woes are authentic than that they are inferences from our Lord's teaching (Bruce, *Kingdom of God*, 10), or that they 'arose in consequence of the affliction of the persecuted Christians' (Meyer, *Com. on Lk.*, p. 55), or that they 'were constructed for the purpose of strengthening and interpreting the Beatitudes, after the model of Deu 27:15 ff., Is 5:8 ff. (Holtzmann, *Hand-Commentar*, 104). In view of the social conditions that exist at the present day, can it be said that their admonition is unneeded, or that they are not still living utterances? See also artt. Beatitude and Sermon on the Mount; and cf. Moulton, art. 'Synoptic Studies' in *Expositor* for August 1906.

James Donald.

☛ Wolf

WOLF.—See Animals in vol. i. p. 65^a.

☛ Woman

WOMAN.—The relation of Christ to woman is one of the most interesting and one of the most difficult topics in the Gospels. In order to estimate it aright it will be necessary to say something of the position of woman at the time when our Lord was

born. In the East generally, the penal code of Babylon well describes her abject humiliation: 'If a husband say unto his wife, Thou art not my wife, he shall pay half a mina and be free. But if a woman repudiate her husband, she shall be drowned in the river.' And her position was not much better in Judaea, where any, even the most frivolous, pretext could be given for divorce. 'The Jewish Law unquestionably allowed divorce on almost any ground' (Edersheim, *Life and Times*, ii. 333). The school of Hillel declared it a sufficient ground for divorce if a woman had spoiled her husband's dinner. In Greece the dignity of married life was very inadequately appreciated; even Socrates invites the courtesan Aspasia to talk with him 'as to how she might ply her occupation with most profit.' In Rome there were signs of better things. There was always a halo over the old Roman matron, and though time dissipated this, and divorce was so common that Seneca tells us that ladies reckoned their ages not by the consuls, but by the number of their husbands,* [Note: Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*. pp. 77-80.] yet women were gradually acquiring more and more influence and being more widely educated. In parts of the Roman Empire, especially in Macedonia, 'her social position was higher than in most parts of the civilized world. At Philippi, at Thessalonica and Berœa, the women—in some cases certainly, in all probably, ladies of birth and rank—take an active part with the Apostle (Paul)... The extant Macedonian inscriptions seem to assign to the sex a higher social influence than is common among the civilized nations of antiquity.'† [Note: Lightfoot, *Ep. to the Philippians*, pp. 55-56.] But however this position might vary in different parts of the Empire, it was clearly exceptional for the relation of woman to man to be other than a degrading one. The many exceptions only draw attention to the prevailing feeling.

This relation was necessarily profoundly modified by our Lord's birth of the virgin Mother. This fact, though it could have been known to only a very few during His lifetime, had nevertheless its own particular bearing. It brought Mary into a prominence which otherwise would have been unaccountable. It is true that Joseph may have died when our Lord was a child or before He began His ministry, but even this does not fully account for the position the mother occupies in the Gospels. It is not much we learn, for we know it was her habit to ponder over and keep to herself the secrets connected with His early life ([Luk 2:19](#); [Luk 2:51](#)), but that one scene at the village wedding (John 2) is sufficient to give us a clear conception of her importance. She alone knew how great He was, and how wonderful the destiny that was promised Him. And yet she was not so overwhelmed by its greatness as to lose her own personality. The ordinary Oriental mother would not have presumed to guide or direct the life of one so mysteriously born and whose future was so infinitely great. But she has so long been accustomed to suggest, if not to direct, that it is natural for her, when she sees an opportunity for the display of His power and the satisfaction of a need, to point it out. The reply, seemingly so harsh to us, only marks out her

position the more clearly. The words, 'Woman, what have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come,' could not have been said to one who had occupied but a subservient position in the home; on the contrary, they suggest that for many years she had been accustomed to speak freely as to her wishes for Him, and that this time was now over. From this it may be inferred that our Lord rejoiced in the true development of womanhood, was glad that the mother should not be a mere drudge or slave, but one occupying a definite position with definite duties and responsibilities. Further, it is clear from her question that He had not checked her interest in the wider events of the world and the Kingdom of God. A veil will always rest over the frequent communings between the Mother and the Son, but it is quite clear from the use of the expression 'mine hour,' that she had been led to think of and desire that time of manifestation when His Personality should be revealed. From the beginning, even before His birth, her mind had often been occupied with that revelation from the spiritual world in which the angel had spoken of a 'throne' and a 'kingdom' (Luk 1:32-33). Her mind, then, was not to be confined to the limited sphere of the household duties of the peasant's home. At the same time, it is clear that the natural desire, even in one so humble and lowly as she was, to have some share in the events which would lead to the bringing in of the Kingdom, was not to be gratified. Her part lay in the careful training, educating, and helping of that great Life which was entrusted to her.

It is singular, and some have thought that it was designed with a view to checking the Mariolatry which in the years to come was to dominate a large section of the Church, that Jesus refuses to allow the unique distinction which Mary certainly had in being the mother of the world's Redeemer to weigh against the worth of religious character. It was natural that one who recognized the beauty of His character and the power of His words should say, 'Blessed be the womb that bare thee, and the breasts that thou didst suck' (Luk 11:27); but the answer, whilst admitting the blessing, pointed to a higher one within the reach of all. 'Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it' (v. 28). This teaching is akin to that He gave when some one directed His attention to the fact that His mother and brethren were waiting to see Him. 'Who is my mother, and who are my brethren?'—He cried—and then stretching forth His hand towards His disciples, He said, 'Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, he is my brother, and sister, and mother' (Mat 12:47 ff.). From this it is clear that whilst He gave her, who was blessed indeed amongst women in being His mother, full opportunities for the development of her mind and spirit, never checking during those thirty years those natural desires to know all that He would tell her of the Kingdom of which the angel had spoken to her, yet He chiefly valued in her the growth of those spiritual graces which had led to her being selected for the high position she held. And nothing is more remarkable than the response she gave. During those three years she almost disappears from sight; and when at the very last she is seen beside the

cross, her attitude expresses that dignity, reserve, and self-control which she had learned of Him. When the great tragedy is being enacted, and the greatest possible excitement prevails, she, like her Divine Son, maintains an attitude of quiet self-restraint. The Oriental, even the Jewish, mother would have been prostrate, with dishevelled hair and garments; Mary is found 'standing' (Joh_19:25). There is no mention of words, not even of tears. Silently and quietly at the direction of her Son she leaves the cross, though we know that a sword was at the time piercing her through and through.

We have given much time to the study of the Virgin Mother because she was the only woman really educated by Christ, in the sense that St. John and St. Peter were, and we see in the little that is told of her what a true woman ought to be. The relation of Christ to the other women of the Gospels is just what we should expect from our knowledge of His relation to His mother. There is a freedom which surprises even His disciples (Joh_4:27), and a readiness to help which laid His character open to misconception (Luk_7:39). There is also the most delicate sensitiveness to the inner consciousness of shame in the sinner which at once wins confidence. His hatred of the sin never dominates over His love of the sinner. Simon was right in feeling that a prophet who knew the character of the woman who had intruded into his house would never have allowed her such close fellowship as the Saviour allowed. None but He, the sinless, could have done so. Again, none but He would have shown such patience as was seen in His treatment of the woman of Samaria (John 4). When He makes it plain that He knows her sin, and she changes the subject, He does not refuse to follow her, but makes the very controversy she introduces a means of spiritual help. It was this combination of strength and tenderness, of respect for the individuality of the soul and yet desire to disentangle it from its sins, that gave Him just that same pre-eminent place amongst the women as amongst the men of His day. They were glad to be of what assistance they could to His work, and ministered of their substance (Luk_8:3). It is characteristic that whilst they show a courage which surpasses that of the Twelve, they also show a wealth of devotion which is unintelligible to them. The presence of some near the cross, where they would be exposed to insults and rudeness, is as remarkable as St. Mary's gift of the alabaster cruse of ointment in the last week of His life. They respond more readily and easily to the power of His words and Personality. From Martha our Lord obtains a confession, even fuller and more far-reaching than that of St. Peter (Joh_11:24-27). And from the heathen Canaanitish woman He received one of the most remarkable illustrations of faith, the woman's insight penetrating beyond the words to the love which lay underneath them (Mat_15:22 ff., Mar_7:25 ff.).

The great respect in which Jesus held the position of woman, the high dignity He attached to it, is shown not only by His actions and words, but by the new sanctity which He gave to marriage. The words, 'The twain shall become one flesh' (Mat_19:5

= Mar_10:3), placed the wife at once on a level with the husband, and made the divorces that were so common impossible. Directly this teaching was received, it was impossible that woman should be deprived of her right as wife on the flimsiest excuse, or without any excuse at all. The revolution such a declaration made is realized only when we hear the comment of the spiritually minded disciples, 'If the case of the man is so with his wife, it is not expedient to marry' (Mat_19:10). That woman had a position in life of equal importance with that of man is made plain by the whole story of the Gospels: Anna, Elisabeth, the Virgin Mary, Martha, Mary, and Mary Magdalene rivalling in their own spheres St. Peter, St. John, St. James, St. Andrew. Without the part played by woman, that story would have been altogether incomplete.

One other suggestion as to the influence of woman which St. Matthew gives us is as interesting as it is unexpected. The dream of Pilate's wife is an evidence of the power that Christ's life and teaching exercised beyond the narrow circle of Jewish thought. Pilate, governor though he is, neither hears nor sees anything, and even when face to face with Christ is only puzzled not convinced. His wife, on the other hand, is deeply interested in all that she hears. Her mind is full of the doings of the Prophet of Nazareth. Her sleep is disturbed. She wakes frightened, and so convinced of the greatness of the issue her husband is trying, that she dares to interfere, though without success (Mat_27:19). Not too much can be made of this; but it is an indication, which the Gospel narrative emphasizes, that women are more susceptible to religious impressions than men, and are ready to make larger sacrifices. As women ministered at the Birth, the Presentation in the Temple, and during those early years when His mother was His chief teacher, so they ministered at the Entombment, when they anointed His body; at the Resurrection, when they carried the news to the frightened disciples; and at the Ascension, when they with the Apostles and the rest of His disciples received His blessing. Cf. next article.

Literature.—Edersheim, *LT* [*Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].*] ; Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*; *PRE* [*Note: RE Real-Encyklopädie fur protest. Theologic und Kirche.*] ³ [*Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred*] , art. 'Familie und Ehe'; Brace, *Gesta Christi*; Church, *Pascal, and other Serm.* 264; Moore, *God is Love*, 184; Lightfoot, *Serm. on Special Occasions*, 220; Gunsaulus, *Paths to the City of God*, 232.

G. H. S. Walpole.

WOMANLINESS.—Christianity is distinguished for the honour it assigns, the liberty it allows to woman. ‘Christianity raises woman from the slavish position which she held, both in Judaism and in heathendom, to her true moral dignity and importance, makes her an heir of the same salvation with man, and opens to her a field for the noblest and loveliest virtue’ (Schaff’s *Apostolic Christianity*, p. 441 f.). The duties of husbands are, according to St. Peter (1Pe 3:7), to be regulated by a recognition of the principle that their wives are ‘also joint heirs of the grace of life.’ In the Christian society ‘the conventional distinctions of religious caste or of social rank, even the natural distinction of sex, are banished,’ for ‘there can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus’ (Gal 3:28). Lightfoot *in loco* quotes a saying of Jesus from the Apocryphal Gospel of the Egyptians, which may be founded on this verse—‘Being asked by Salome when His kingdom should come, He is reported to have answered, “When the two shall be one, and the male with the female, neither male nor female.” ’ This mystical saying has its fulfilment in the character of Jesus. For the characteristic of Jesus Christ, and so the regulative principle of Christian morality, is completeness, symmetry, harmony, balance. Other men are known and loved for this or that excellence; but of Jesus Christ, with respect to His personal perfection, we can say what was said of Shakspeare with regard to his artistic pre-eminence, ‘His speciality is everything.’ Manhood in its wholeness and fulness is found in Him, alike wide in its range and lofty in its reach. Hence Jesus Christ is not a pattern merely for one sex, or one age, or one time, or one temperament, or one class. In this sense, too, there is in Him neither male nor female, bond nor free, Jew nor Greek, learned nor unlearned.

The sphere of woman is the home, not the world. Man lives in effort and conflict. ‘But woman is at home in the region of feeling and affection, and she finds her highest vocation in the cultivation of those loves and sympathies that make home the dearest spot on earth.’ Man, being thus active and even combative, develops ‘pertinacity and self-assertion; whereas the receptive nature of woman manifests itself rather in patient endurance and tender devotion to the service of loved ones. Her emotions dominate her intellect; her judgment to a certain extent is biassed by her feelings. On the other hand, where moral as well as intellectual considerations come into view, woman’s judgment is likely to be as just as that of man, whose decisions are frequently based on grounds of reason alone’ (Bruce, *The Formation of Christian Character*, p. 57 f.). May we find any such signs of womanliness in the character or teaching of Jesus?

Jesus assigned great importance to marriage and family, the sanctity and unity of the home. Although His vocation required His abandonment of home (Joh 2:4, Mar 3:33-34), and He required of His disciples also the same renunciation (Luk 14:26), yet He missed the shelter and peace of home (Mat 8:20), and recognized

the greatness of the sacrifice involved (Mat 19:29). His denunciation of the lax traditions of the elders regarding divorce (Mat 19:3-9) and the duty of children to their parents (Mar 7:9-13) was in defence of the home. It is supremely significant that love, the grace of the home, and not justice, the virtue of the State, is made the first and greatest commandment (Mar 12:29-31). The child is nearer, means more, to the mother than to the father; and Jesus understood and cared for children (Mat 11:16; Mat 18:2-3; Mat 19:13-15). Does not the modesty of the woman appear in His reference to the lustful glance (Mat 5:28), and His stooping to write upon the ground when the woman taken in her sin stood before Him (Joh 8:6)? Jesus understood the heart of a woman in penitence (Luk 7:47) and in gratitude (Joh 12:7-8). His defence of the offering of love shows not only His active but also His receptive affectionateness, His yearning for, as well as bestowal of, the generousities of the heart. He was not only intensely emotional, but quick in expressing His emotions (Joh 11:33; Joh 11:38, Mar 7:34; Mar 8:12, Joh 11:35, Luk 13:34; Luk 19:41, Mat 23:37). His tenderness, gentleness, patience, and forbearance are more distinctively feminine than masculine graces. In His resignation and obedience to His Father's will (Mat 11:26; Mat 11:29) is there not a womanly rather than a manly submissiveness? The prominence He gives in the Beatitudes to the passive graces of endurance rather than the active virtues of endeavour (Mat 5:3-10) vindicates the distinctive excellence of womanhood. His teaching about non-resistance (Mat 5:38-42), so much misunderstood and neglected, can be better appreciated by women than by men, for such patience under wrong has entered into their life more than into that of men. The mind of Jesus was intuitive rather than ratiocinative; His moral judgment was swift and sure; His spiritual discernment direct; and these are characteristic of women rather than of men.

Doubtless it was this *womanliness* in Jesus that attracted and attached so many women to Him during His earthly ministry: and they received from Him a loving welcome such as they did not find in any other religious teacher of the age. His disciples were astonished that He was speaking to the woman of Samaria (Joh 4:27), and doubtless the prejudices of many were offended by His action regarding women. His defence of the sinful woman and of Mary has been already noted. 'We have a lovely group of female disciples and friends around the Lord: Mary, the wife of Clopas; Salome, the mother of James and John; Mary of Bethany, who sat at Jesus' feet; her busy and hospitable sister Martha; Mary of Magdala, whom the Lord healed of a demoniacal possession; the sinner, who washed His feet with her tears of penitence and wiped them with her hair; and all the noble women who ministered to the Son of Man in His earthly poverty with the gifts of their love (Luk 8:3, Mat 27:55, Mar 15:41), lingered last around His Cross (Joh 19:25), and were first at His open sepulchre on the morning of the resurrection (Mat 28:1, Joh 20:1)' [Schaff, *op. cit.* p. 442]). The reverence that the mother of Jesus has properly inspired has given to womanhood a glory, and to woman a position and influence in the Christian Church,

never before and nowhere else recognized. To the instances given above of the relation of Jesus to women we may add His compassion for the widow of Nain (Luk_7:13), and His commendation of the widow's mites (Mar_12:43-44). His treatment of a woman on three occasions appears harsh, but a consideration of the circumstances in each case removes this impression. His rebuke to His mother at Cana (Joh_2:4) expresses His dread of any human interference with His fulfilment of His Divine vocation (cf. the rebuke of Peter, Mat_16:23); His repulse of the Syrophœnician mother (Mar_7:27) was His own indignant protest against Jewish exclusiveness; His requirement that the woman healed by touching His garment should confess her deed was no violence done to her sense of modesty, but was intended to replace the uncertainty of a cure snatched unawares by the assurance of healing willingly bestowed (Mar_5:34). What Christ has been to and done for women throughout the history of Christendom, and what women have suffered and accomplished for His Church and Kingdom on earth, afford abundant and conclusive evidence of the *womanliness* of Jesus in presenting in His character all womanly grace as well as manly virtue, and offering in His salvation what meets the deepest needs, and fulfils the loftiest hopes of womanhood in all lands and ages. See also Woman.

Alfred E. Garvie.

:-Wonders

WONDERS.—The two terms 'signs' and 'wonders' are frequently joined in the OT, and this usage is carried over into the NT. The word τέρας, 'wonder,' never occurs in the NT except in connexion with σημεῖον, 'sign' (wh. see). The Heb. correlatives were מופת and אות. Jesus used the conjoined terms twice in His recorded sayings—once when He foretold that false prophets would come and 'show great signs and wonders' (Mar_13:22, Mat_24:24), and once when He complained that the people demanded such things of Him before they would have faith in Him—'Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will in no wise believe' (Joh_4:48). The word τέρας occurs nowhere else in the Gospels. Elsewhere in the NT it is found once in a quotation from Joel to represent the marvels wrought by Jehovah in the heaven (Act_2:19), and twelve times in reference to miracles wrought by Moses (Act_7:36), by Jesus (Act_2:22), by the man of sin (2Th_2:9), and by the Apostles and early missionaries (Act_2:43; Act_4:30; Act_5:12; Act_6:8; Act_14:3; Act_15:12, Rom_15:19, 2Co_12:12, Heb_2:4). From the use of the word made by Jesus we might conclude that He did not esteem signs and wonders very highly, and that He freely granted that they were possible to false prophets as well as to Himself. In Origen (c. [*Note: circa, about.*] *Celsum*) we find

practically the same attitude of thought. Origen is disposed to concede that signs and wonders are wrought among the heathen.

‘Now, in order to grant that there did exist a healing spirit named aesculapius, who used to cure the bodies of men, I would say to those who are astonished at such an occurrence, that since the cure of bodies is a thing indifferent, *and a matter within the reach not merely of the good, but also of the bad*, you must show that they who practise healing are in no respect wicked’ (iii. 25 [Migne, vol. xi. col. 948]).

On the other hand, Celsus is willing to acknowledge that signs and wonders were wrought by Jesus, but he thinks the inference from these is unwarranted. They are to him no proof of Deity. He compares them to—

‘the feats performed by those who have been taught by Egyptians, who in the middle of the market-place, in return for a few obols, will impart the knowledge of their most venerated arts, and will expel demons from men, and dispel diseases, and invoke the souls of heroes, and exhibit expensive banquets and tables and dishes and dainties having no real existence, and who will put in motion, as if alive, what are not really living animals, but which have only the appearance of life. Then he asks: “Since, then, these persons can perform such feats, shall we of necessity conclude that they are sons of God, or must we admit that they are the proceedings of wicked men under the influence of an evil spirit?” ’ (i. 68).

It was easy for Origen to answer that Jesus never wrought His signs and wonders only for show, as magicians did, and that His constant aim was the reformation of character, as that of the magicians most evidently was not. Then he adds:

‘How should not He, who by the miracles which He did induced those who beheld the excellent results to undertake the reformation of their characters, manifest Himself not only to His genuine disciples, but also to others, as a pattern of most virtuous life, in order that His disciples might devote themselves to the work of instructing men in the will of God, and that the others, after being *more fully instructed by His word and character than by His miracles* as to how they were to direct their lives, might in all their conduct have a constant reference to the good pleasure of the universal God?’ (i. 68 [Migne, vol. xi. col. 788]).

Origen seems to have caught the very mind of the Master at this point. Jesus made use of signs and wonders to authenticate His mission, but His chief emphasis was always upon His ‘word and character’ rather than upon His miracles. Both Origen and Celsus, however, as these passages show, are willing to grant that signs and wonders were wrought by Jesus and by false prophets alike. Origen calls attention to the fact that Jesus, as indeed the entire NT, never calls miracles by the name τέρατα alone,

but always joins this to some other term suggesting higher things (*in Joan*, xviii. 60 [Migne, vol. xiv. col. 521]). The τέρατος was to the heathen merely a portent or prodigy, something unusual and extraordinary, something strange and abnormal, or, as Augustine put it, ‘quidquid arduum aut insolitum supra spem vel facultatem mirantis apparet,’ and more closely, ‘quaedam sunt quae solam faciunt admirationem’ (*de Utilitate credendi*, cap. xvi. [Migne, vol. xlii. col. 90]). Jesus could not be content to allow this name to stand alone for any of His miracles. It had to do merely with the outward effect or the temporary impression caused by the marvel, and some other term was added to show that the marvel was an exhibition of Divine power and a sign of a Divine presence among men. The wonder caught the attention and impressed the memory, and was subservient to the interests of the Kingdom in attracting men to listen and investigate, to hear and be saved. Jesus used it for an immediate individual benefit, but always with an eye to a further spiritual end. For the discussion of the nature and credibility of miracles in general, see art. Miracles.

D. A. Hayes.

Word

WORD.—(λόγος, ῥῆμα) is employed in the Gospels in a large variety of senses: (1) articulate utterance of any kind; (2) the inspired word of Scripture (cf. Mar 7:13—‘making the word of God of none effect through your traditions’); (3) a Divine message generally (Luk 3:2 ‘The word of God came to John in the wilderness,’ so Luk 4:4; Luk 8:11; Luk 11:28); (4) the ‘word of the kingdom,’ *i.e.* the gospel message (Mat 13:19 ff., Mar 16:20, Luk 5:1); (5) Christ’s word of authority (Luk 4:36 ‘What a word is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him’); (6) in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel, Christ Himself is the ‘Word made flesh’ (see Logos).

The peculiar significance attached to the spoken ‘word’ is to be explained in the light of Hebrew usage. In the OT, as in all primitive thought, a word is something more than an articulate sound with a given import. It is endowed with a certain power and reality. It carries with it some portion of the life and personality of the speaker. This is true more especially of a word spoken by God. Such a word is instinct with the Divine will, and effects by its own inherent power the thing which it indicates. ‘As the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven, so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please’ (Isa 55:10 f.). The ‘word’ delivered to the prophets is here conceived as an active power, which will bring about its own fulfilment. So in His creation and government of the world, God effects His purpose by His ‘word’ (Genesis 1, Psa 33:6;

Psa 33:9; Psa 107:20). It is regarded not simply as a commandment, but as a vital energy which is sent forth from God and realizes His will.

The references in the Gospels are coloured throughout by this Hebrew conception. Even where Divine utterance is not in question, a value is ascribed to 'words' which does not belong to them according to our modern modes of thought. 'For every idle word that a man speaks, he shall give account in the judgment;—for by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned' (Mat 12:36 f.). Jesus regards the most casual word as more than wasted breath. It is a spiritual force, and the man who sets it free is responsible for the good or evil which it produces. A similar estimate of the value of words underlies the many injunctions against profane, or foolish, or thoughtless, or unkind speech (Mat 5:22; Mat 5:34-37, Luk 12:10, Mat 12:34). Such 'words' have all the significance of wicked actions. Coming 'from within a man,' they express his mind and character even more truly than deeds, and will bear witness of him in the Judgment.

The influence of the OT conception appears more clearly, however, in the allusions to Christ's own 'word.' It is the vehicle of His wonder-working power. It has virtue in it to heal diseases and to quiet the winds and the sea. In several passages the 'word' is explained as one of kingly authority, which had might over the spiritual agencies at work in nature (cf. Luk 4:36, Mat 8:16). But the radical idea is undoubtedly that of a 'word with power' (Luk 4:32) analogous to the Divine word. To give effect to His will, Jesus had only to utter it; the word that went out from Him was itself 'quick and powerful,' and acted in His stead. In this sense also we must interpret the references to the message of Jesus as 'the word.' As thus described, the gospel is something more than the Christian teaching or the proclamation of the Messianic Kingdom. The idea is suggested that a new power had entered the world through Jesus, and communicated itself in His spoken message. Thus in the parable of the Sower, the word is compared to seed which contains in itself wonderful potentialities. All that is required of men is the right disposition of heart; the message, once received into the 'good ground,' will henceforth work of itself, with a living and ever-increasing power.

In the Fourth Gospel, more especially, the allusions to the words of Jesus have everywhere a pregnant meaning. 'The words that I speak unto you are spirit and life' (Joh 6:63); 'Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you' (Joh 15:3); 'He that heareth my word hath everlasting life' (Joh 5:24);—in such sayings and many others the idea of whole-hearted assimilation of the teaching of Jesus is certainly present, but it is by no means the only, or the central, idea. It is indeed characteristic of the Fourth Gospel that Jesus says little by way of positive teaching. He Himself, in His own Person, is the revelation, and the words ascribed to Him have reference mainly to His supreme worth as the Light of the world—the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Because they thus give expression to His Divine claim, they in

a manner represent Himself. To accept the words is to receive Jesus, in His life-giving power, into one's heart (cf. Joh_15:7 'If ye abide in me and my words abide in you').

It has often been suggested that the peculiar emphasis on the words of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel is intended to illustrate the thesis of the Prologue that He was Himself the Word made flesh. The absence of the Logos theory from the body of the Gospel would thus be counterbalanced by the many references to the 'words.' Against this view, however, it may be urged: (1) that no consistent rule is traceable in the use of *λόγος* and *ῥῆμα*, as might have been expected if the writer were working out some definite idea; (2) that *λόγος* in the Prologue bears a twofold significance ('word' and 'reason') which can nowhere be discerned in the later references. The more probable conclusion is that the value assigned to the words, of Jesus is connected, not so much with the specific Logos doctrine, as with the general conception that Jesus was one in nature with God. His words were therefore of the same quality as the Divine creative word. They were 'spirit and life' (Joh_6:63).

Literature.—Smend, *Alttest. Theol.* p. 87 f. (1893); Wendt *Die Lehre Jesu* (1901); H. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Theol.* ii. 396 f. (1897); Titius, *Die Johann. Anschauung der Seligkeit*, 70 f. (1900); J. Ker, *Serm.* i. 1; J. H. Newman, *Parochial and Plain. Serm.* v. 29; F. W. Robertson, *Serm.* iv. 145; R. W. Church, *Pascal, and other Serm.* 255.

E. F. Scott.

⚡ Work

WORK.—See Activity, Labour.

⚡ World

WORLD (*κόσμος*).—1. The underlying significance of the term *κόσμος* is that of *order*. Its probable derivation is from a root *κομιδ*, which appears in Lat. *comptus* and in our 'comb.' This order, regularity, neatness receives the widest illustration in classical usage. Thus *κόσμος* includes the idea of decency of behaviour (Aesch. *Ag.* 521, cf. Soph. *Aj.* 293), of constitutional government (Thuc. iv. 76), of elegance of attire (Hdt. iii. 123), and so, by just transference, of the world or universe (Plat. *Tim.* 27 A, cf. Arist. *Cœl.* i. 10), as exhibiting perfection of arrangement, and standing in eternal

contrast with chaos. In this, its widest application, it became employed by all writers on natural philosophy, though the meaning oscillates, with some uncertainty, between the earth and the universe generally (see Liddell and Scott, s.v., from which the quotations are taken). It is interesting to observe that *ordo* in Latin does not, as might have been expected, stand as an equivalent for κόσμος. Its equivalent in Latin is *mundus* (cf. Sanskr. *mund*), the root idea of which again is cleanliness, neatness, or order. Thus both the Latin and the Greek pass through, with a singular exactness of analogy, the same transferences of meaning, so that Cicero (*Univ.* 10) identifies κόσμος and *mundus* in that widest application of the term above referred to (see Lewis and Short's *Dict.* s.v. 'Mundus'). There is, however, a further transference of meaning in a use of *mundus* by classical writers not found in the corresponding use of κόσμος. It is employed (Hor. *Sat.* i. 3. 112, cf. Luc. *Pharsal.* v. 469), but somewhat rarely, in a social sense to signify mankind, whereas this application is not given to κόσμος except in so-called Alexandrine Greek. In a word, the conception of order covers every departmental application of the Greek κόσμος and its Latin equivalent.

2. If proof on such an issue were needed by students, the use of the word κόσμος would strikingly show the original way in which NT writers handle and apply such terms. Certainly, to the ancients, with the word κόσμος the vision of the figure of order would be manifest in thought. Generally speaking, in the NT the ancient conception falls so far into the background as sometimes to vanish. But what the word has lost in one way it has gained in other ways, as will be seen upon a brief examination of its employment generally in NT literature.

It is interesting, however, to note that, in the transferred applications of the word, this literature follows the lines of classical usage. Thus κόσμος is used of women's attire (1Pe 3:3), of the universe (Rom 1:20), of the earth (Mat 4:8 [cf. Luk 4:5 τῆς οἰκουμένης] Luk 16:26), and of human society (Joh 1:29) In such illustrations we do not part company with the radical idea of 'order,' but it is only faintly made apparent.

In the Synoptics the term is rarely employed, and the student of the Authorized Version must be put on his guard against supposing that, in all cases where the translation 'world' is used, it stands for κόσμος in the original. In some six cases it stands for αἰών, and in two for ἡ γῆ οἰκουμένη. But, as any confusion is sufficiently checked by (Revised Version margin), the point need not be pursued here. The use of the word, rare as it is in the Synoptics, is largely free from Johannine or Pauline

sentiment on the idea. It is difficult to find a passage in them in which the term is used absolutely *in malam partem*, as it is found not only in the writings of St. John and St. Paul, but also in those of St. Peter and St. James. In the parable of the Wheat and the Tares (Mat 13:24-43) the 'world' appears in no dark or ominous colouring. It is not its cares, but the cares of the age (αἰών, Mar 4:19), that choke the word so as to render it unfruitful. When our Lord in the Sermon on the Mount speaks of His disciples as the light of the world (Mar 5:14), we find the figure interpreted by the parallel expression which precedes it: 'Ye are the salt of the earth' (Mat 5:13). To declare that the world needs purification and illumination is not a wholesale condemnation of the world. There is in the Synoptics no violence of contrast between it and the Divine society. In its rare occurrences in the Synoptics the world is a sphere in which Christ's disciples live and move and have their being. For them it has its pitfalls (Mat 18:7), its characteristic dangers, but nowhere does it appear as wholly or inherently evil.

3. When one turns from the Synoptics to St. John's writings, for here it is impossible to separate his Gospel from his letters, the contrast appears startling. Instead of a rare appearance of the term, we find that it occurs some eighty times in the Gospel, and twenty-two times in the First Epistle (A. Plummer, Com. on the Gospel in *Cambridge Bible*). And with this frequently comes a change in meaning, a change, however, which in the Gospel appears gradual and climactic. For in the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel the term appears with the same lack of colour in which it is painted in the Synoptic Gospels.

The world is indeed seen to be beset by the grave fault of indifference to its own darkness. The light came, but it was not recognized. Yet in this lack of welcome His own were involved (Joh 1:11; cf. Joh 8:12). The testimony of the Baptist advances the issue a step farther. His recognition of Jesus as the Lamb of God (Joh 1:29; Joh 1:36) implies his recognition of the purpose of His mission as the world's Saviour from its sin. Later, our Lord's testimony to Nicodemus informs him of the gracious fact of His love towards the world. His deliberate intention in regard to the world was not its condemnation but its salvation. Life, not death, through Him was the Father's eternal purpose (Joh 3:16; Joh 3:13, cf. Joh 4:42, Joh 12:47). Through the type of the manna, our Lord brings Himself, if it may be so expressed, into still closer touch with the world. He is the Bread of heaven which gives life to the world (Joh 6:33). Later, with more awful explicitness, the bread is identified with His flesh, and its offering is on the world's behalf (Joh 6:51).

So gracious, indeed, are the Lord's utterances in regard to the world, that twice the group of the disciples appeared unable to distinguish themselves from it. They could not understand in the earlier stage of their discipleship why any manifestation of

Jesus should not be made on equal terms to the world as to themselves (Joh 7:4, cf. Joh 14:22). They omitted to see that a manifestation of Himself could be made only through the medium of love. A difference, therefore, not only in point of time but also in degree of training, explains any seeming inconsistency in our Lord's teaching in respect of the attitude of the world towards His own. At an earlier stage He declared that the world could not hate His followers,—there was nothing then to excite hostility either by way of their belief or their love (Joh 7:7). At a later stage the parting of the ways had come. His own had made their final choice. With the choice came the world's hatred. The persecution which He endured was to be theirs also (Joh 15:17-20). All turned upon the identity of themselves with Him. This once established, His own exhibited love and obedience. The world was seen as penetrated by hatred and disobedience. In this awful contrast and conflict, victory was assured for His own, and with victory would come its fruit. He was their surety. Peace and triumph were their lot through Him (Joh 16:33).

But Johannine teaching on the subject of the world cannot be regarded as complete if the First Epistle be ignored. The scope, however, of this Dictionary must limit the inquiry to general references. The doctrinal differences here are explicable, as Bp. Westcott has pointed out (*Gospel of St. John*. Introd. lxxviii). because the Gospel is related to the Epistle, as history to its comment or application; the former is throughout presupposed in the latter. 'The Lord's words in the Gospel have been moulded into aphorisms in the First Epistle'; and in the latter document the Apostle writes, conscious that the Church must be in dire conflict with the characteristic dangers and heresies of the age. It would seem reasonable to regard the teaching of the First Epistle on the world as a commentary, in particular, on our Lord's pregnant utterances on the 'convictions' of the world (Joh 16:8-11; see Westcott, *in loco*). In that passage, the world appears as separate from God, 'yet not past hope.' Our Lord declares there, not that He will convict the world simply as sinful, etc., but that He will show that it lacks the knowledge of what sin, righteousness, and judgment really are.

We conclude that the general teaching of St. John's Gospel on the subject of the world is that it is an order or sphere touching man's life, affecting man's life considered as apart from God; but that in the First Epistle the world is seen more darkly and ominously still: it is not merely regarded as apart from God, but as alien to Him, in direct opposition to His eternal and gracious purposes. St. John would teach us that if it is to be overcome, it must be by powers which lift us above it, and those are the twin powers of love and faith (Liddon, *Easter Sermons*, No. xxii.).

Literature.—In addition to the Lexx. and Comm., J. H. Newman, *Par. and Plain Serm.* vii. (1868) p. 27; F. W. Robertson, *Serm.*, 4th ser. (1874) p. 145; A. Maclaren, *A Year's Ministry*, 1st ser. (1884) p. 83; B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel of Life* (1892), p.

20; C. J. Vaughan, *Doncaster Serm.* (1891) p. 225; R. W. Church, *Village Serm.*, 2nd ser. (1894) p. 326; Stopford A. Brooke, *The Ship of the Soul* (1898), p. 31; R. Flint, *Serm. and Addresses* (1899), p. 145.

B. Whitefoord.

Worldliness

WORLDLINESS.—The teaching of Christianity concerning worldliness forms one of the most important parts of its practical message to mankind. And yet, more or less strongly marked at different periods, a tendency to serious misconception of this doctrine has probably existed in every generation since the days of Christ. The error into which it has led man is that of regarding the material world and whatever strictly pertains to it, as inherently evil and anti-spiritual. Such a misconception, it is true, did not originate in Christian times, but was taken over by Christianity from earlier systems of religious thought. The source from which it sprang, however, does not affect the gravity of its persistent survival; and inasmuch as the attitude of any faith to the present world must always deeply influence men's estimate of its claims, a clear apprehension of Christ's own teaching on the subject becomes of more than ordinary importance.

i. To reveal the basis of our Lord's doctrine of worldliness, we must review briefly one or two broad outlines of His message.

1. Christ's teaching concerning the existence of a spiritual realm.—Man has contact with two worlds, (a) Of his communion with the material universe and of the various relationships involved therein, he has by nature a vivid consciousness. This temporal world forms a realm of which, by his birth, he himself has become a part. It has for his possession a special form of life adapted to it. It reveals relationships of its own, as laying their obligation upon him—relationships to a properly constituted authority to be obeyed, and to relatives and friends to be loved. It provides also certain standards of judgment by which the various experiences of its inhabitants are deemed happy or sad, prosperous or unsuccessful, (b) But man has contact also with another world—the spiritual. Of his communion with this world he has, by nature, but dim and uncertain comprehension. It was to reveal the truth concerning it that Christ came to earth. Its existence and claims form one of the principal themes of His teaching. Of this realm also it is by a birth that a man becomes a part (Joh_3:3-6). This realm also has, adapted to it, a special form of life (Joh_6:33, Joh_17:3) which becomes his upon his entrance into it, and which receives its own spiritual sustenance (Joh_4:14; Joh_4:32; Joh_4:34, Joh_6:35; Joh_6:48-51, Joh_7:37) This realm also imposes certain

relationships upon him; for it, no less than the other, has its sanctions of authority (Mar 11:9, Joh 12:13; Joh 18:33-37) and ties of kinship, both of man with God (Joh 1:12, 1Jn 3:2) and of man with men (Mar 3:34-35 || Mat 10:29-30, Joh 19:26-27). Moreover, this realm also possesses standards of its own by means of which its citizens estimate the events and experiences of their lives (Mat 5:3 ff.: for the contrast offered to the standards of the temporal realm, see Mat 5:10-12, and consider the force of δοξασθῆναι in Joh 13:31). The sphere in which these spiritual relationships are acknowledged and their obligations become operative, was named by Christ the Kingdom of God (or, of Heaven), and it formed the theme even of His earliest teaching (e.g. Mar 1:15). This invisible world is as real as the visible. It is clearly marked and self-contained (Joh 3:6). Its citizens possess definite characteristics (Mar 10:15, Luk 18:16-17), and, as it is essentially spiritual in character (Luk 17:20-21, Joh 4:23), a certain fitness is necessary to those who would belong to it (Luk 9:62). Hence it has to be definitely entered (Mat 7:13-14, Mar 10:15; Mar 12:34, Joh 3:3; Joh 3:5).

2. His teaching concerning communion with this spiritual world.—Now, just as man has communion with the temporal world and its life, so he may have communion with this spiritual world and its life, (a) Christ Himself, as man, constantly enjoyed such fellowship. The Gospel narratives reveal Him as holding converse with the Father (Mar 1:35 et passim; see art. Communion), with angels (Mar 1:13, cf. Mat 26:53), and with departed spirits of holy men (Mar 9:2 ff.). Indeed, this realization of His communion with the unseen realm formed the basis of His sense of mission (Luk 2:49, Joh 7:16; Joh 8:16 b, Joh 8:29, Joh 16:32) and the source from which He derived His strength in suffering (Joh 18:11). (b) And the fellowship with the spiritual realm which Christ thus exemplified in His own life upon earth, He enjoined upon His followers also (Joh 15:4 ff; cf. Joh 6:53-55 et passim). While they must live before men their outward life in contact with the visible universe and its affairs, they possess also an inner life which must be lived ‘in secret’—in contact with the unseen (Mat 6:1-18; Mat 10:19-20).

3. The twofold communion.—Man, therefore, belongs to two worlds, and may have communion with both. But just as, possessing a twofold nature, carnal and spiritual, he knows that the spiritual is the higher, so, enjoying a twofold communion, he is to learn that the spiritual fellowship must take precedence, its realization being his supreme duty and the end of his creation. Yet, as in the freedom of his will he is able to cultivate the carnal in him at the expense of the spiritual, so too he is free, as the whole appeal of Christ’s teaching presupposes, to choose for himself with which realm, the temporal or the spiritual, his fellowship shall be the more real and intense.

II. *Christ’s teaching upon worldliness*

1. Christ encouraged no indifference to the claims of the temporal world.—There is an unworldliness which so emphasizes spiritual realities as to undervalue the material universe and its lawful concerns. This attitude, which, as we have hinted, has found frequent and varied expression among His followers, derives no support from the life or teaching of Christ Himself. The beauty and charm of the visible world appealed to Him (Mat 6:26; Mat 6:28). Its incidents furnished illustrations for His sermons (Mar 4:3, Mat 25:14). He participated in its festivals (Joh 2:1 ff.), and contrasted Himself with one whose asceticism disparaged its good cheer (Mat 11:18-19). Again, the claims of this world's lawful authorities always received His ready acknowledgment. Respect for them was scrupulously evinced alike in His advice (Mar 12:17) and in His example (Mat 17:27). Further, in His thought, the welfare of men is by no means a merely spiritual matter. On the contrary, the social obligations imposed by His religion form one of His most constant themes. Love towards others is the very test by which His true disciples can be identified (Mat 5:43-48, cf. 1Jn 2:9-11; 1Jn 4:20 etc.), and that love is to find expression not in vapid sentiment, but in whole-hearted service (Mar 10:42 ff., Mat 22:36-39, Luk 10:30 ff.). Indeed, Christ teaches that this love and service to man are the criterion of love and service to God (Mat 25:40; Mat 25:45), while in several suggestive passages He even hints that the earthly life forms in some sense an interpretation of the spiritual life (see Mar 2:5; Mar 2:10-11, Mat 18:10). Christ therefore calls His followers not to neglect the temporal world, much less to despise it, but to recognize that they have a function to fulfil in it by permeating every part of its life with beauty and truth (Mat 5:13-16; Mat 13:33, Joh 17:15). So far, indeed, is He from any underestimation of the present life, that we know of no teacher in any age whose principles, carried into effect, would so ameliorate the material condition of mankind in all its individual aspects and social relationships.

2. Christ uttered no condemnation of worldly possessions.—See art. Wealth.

3. A false antithesis.—It is clear, therefore, that in one study of the Christian doctrine of worldliness we must eliminate what is now seen to be a false antithesis. In view of the unfortunate ambiguity in meaning both of the Greek and of the English word, it is necessary to define closely the sense in which Christianity sets the 'world' in opposition to its own life and principles. The Christian teacher has to distinguish two forms of contrast. There is the contrast of *difference* or *distinction*, and there is the contrast of *opposition*. It is in the former sense alone, as our Lord's own life and words declare, that the material is set by Christianity over against the spiritual. The contrast of *opposition* established by Christianity is never between the spiritual and the material, but always between the spiritual and the anti-spiritual. The material, it is true, may be made the instrument of the anti-spiritual; but the two are essentially distinct, and confusion between them, signally absent from the Gospel teaching, must never be condoned in its exponents. It is of the utmost significance in this connexion

that our Lord deliberately refused to recognize a contrast of opposition between the powers of the heavenly and those of the earthly realm (Mar 12:13-17 || Joh 6:15, cf. Rom 13:7): the antithesis He accepted was that of the Heavenly King and ‘the prince of this world’ (Joh 12:31; Joh 14:30; Joh 16:11 in each case ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου or ὁ τοῦ κόσμου ἄρχων). The ‘world’ He condemned is not the material world, in which He Himself took delight, or its claims, which He loyally acknowledged, or (in themselves) its possessions, of which He spoke with guarded moderation, but a certain spirit of the world fundamentally antagonistic to man’s highest life, and the men in whom that spirit has established its abode (cf. the careful definition in 1Jn 2:16 and that implicit in Joh 12:31). It is between Christ’s Kingdom and the ‘world’ in *this* sense that there is opposition, and in this case the opposition is final and complete (Joh 15:18-19; Joh 16:33—note the terms of the contrast, ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ and ἐν ἐμοί—Joh 17:14, 1Jn 2:15; 1Jn 3:13; 1Jn 4:4-6).

4. The consequent meaning of worldliness.—The accurate recognition of Christ’s attitude to the temporal world at once yields the accurate conception of worldliness. Worldliness will clearly consist in devotion to ‘the world,’ not in *any* sense of that ambiguous term, but in the particular sense in which Christ revealed it to be evil. Inasmuch, therefore, as ‘the world,’ in the only signification in which He condemned it, is the spirit of antagonism (whether expressed as a principle or personified in individuals) to His spiritual kingdom, worldliness must be the possession of this spirit, and the practice of worldliness must be its manifestation. In view of persistent misconception of the teaching of Christianity on this subject, clearness at this point, even at the risk of repetition, is of the utmost importance. Worldliness does not consist in a love of the temporal world and its concerns, for between the Kingdom and ‘the world’ in this sense Christ acknowledges no necessary opposition, and a man may so use both realms as to fulfil the rightful claims of each without setting them in any inevitable antithesis. Nor does worldliness lie in the performance or nonperformance of any particular actions (Mar 2:18; Mar 2:24; Mar 3:4; Mar 7:5; Mar 7:8; Mar 7:15; Mar 7:21), Luk 11:39-41, Joh 5:10; Joh 7:23-24 et passim); for, since it is the possession of a certain spirit, the most scrupulous punctiliousness in outward conduct may coexist with the deepest unspirituality (Mat 27:6, Joh 12:5-6; Joh 18:28; Joh 19:31; cf. the significant pronouncement in Mat 21:28-31), and the truest unworldliness with apparent indifference to its formal expression (Mat 11:18-19). It is quite true that a love of the temporal world and indulgence in particular actions closely associated with it, may constitute manifestations of worldliness. A realm not evil in itself may easily become the medium of evil, and so, owing to an undue emphasis, man’s fellowship with the temporal world may, both by its positive and by its negative influence, prove injurious to his fellowship with the spiritual. Such a misuse of the two realms inevitably turns the contrast of distinction between them

into one of opposition. This result, however, is reached not because of any anti-spiritual quality intrinsic in the material realm itself, but through the employment of that realm as a vehicle of the anti-spiritual. The essence of worldliness lies deeper than any particular form in which it may be expressed, and, according to the Christian teaching, its essence is found in the mind—in *whatever* form embodied—which leads a man to identify himself with that ‘world’ which is anti-spiritual in its nature and influence.

5. The manifestation of worldliness.—Such a self-identification is revealed in practice by the point at which a man lays the chief emphasis of his life. As our review of Christ’s teaching has shown, man has communion with two worlds—the temporal and the spiritual. Right and lawful, however, as the first communion may be, there come frequent crises in which its interests are found to be in rivalry to those of the higher fellowship. To cling in such crises to the lower communion, in other words, to sacrifice the spiritual to the temporal, this is to be worldly, for this is to make the temporal world, innocent and good in itself, a vehicle of the anti-spiritual. It is unnecessary, and, in the strict sense, even impossible, to identify particular actions as in themselves involving the anti-spiritual; for, as we have seen, worldliness in practice is the possession of a certain spirit, and there is no action which must necessarily embody that spirit nor any which cannot be made a medium for it. The whole question of worldliness in action is ultimately one of arrangement and precedence. The things of the temporal world are right in their right place, but that is the second place in a man’s life. What Christ teaches is that they must never be allowed the first place, for that belongs to God (see Mat 6:33, where both elements are recognized and the true order is laid down; and for a striking illustration in OT, 1Ki 3:4-15). The practice of worldliness, therefore, consists in such an arrangement of these two elements in life as, from the standpoint of God, is false. It is the laying of a disproportionate emphasis upon the temporal, to the impoverishment of the spiritual, elements in life. In some cases this may be recognized by the entire exclusion of the spiritual (Luk 22:15-21); in others by its subjection to the temporal (Mat 8:21; Mat 10:37-38, Mar 5:17, Luk 14:15-24, Joh 3:19). The error, however, always lies not in the cultivation of communion with the temporal world, but in the untrue emphasis laid upon it; in the failure to see that, while many things appear desirable, only one thing is needful (Luk 10:41-42, cf. Mat 13:44-46); in the self-identification with that ‘world’ which is the direct antithesis of the Kingdom of heaven.

6. The Christian’s true relation to the temporal world.—Our Lord’s example and teaching, thus briefly reviewed, enable us to infer the Christian’s true relation to the temporal world, (a) Like his Master, he will be fully cognizant of its charms and fully responsive to its lawful claims. Christianity is a religion calculated to make true lovers of Nature, and to produce good fathers, good husbands, good rulers, good servants,

good men of business and men of public spirit. Those who have truly learnt the mind of Christ will never shrink from their obligations to the full-orbed life of the world in which lie has set them. On the contrary, it is their simple duty to see that every sphere of human life, public and private, individual and social, shall be permeated by His spirit (Mat_5:13-14; Mat_13:33). (b) Yet, while the claims of the temporal world will receive their due acknowledgment, the main stress of the Christian's life will lie elsewhere. He is in the world; but, like his Master (Joh_8:23), he is not of it (Joh_17:14-18). He will mix freely even in its darker scenes, but without sharing their spirit (Mar_2:16). For he is no longer a slave to that spirit: he has acquired the independence of real freedom (Joh_8:31-36). Indeed, his whole attitude to the temporal world has been changed. He no longer regards himself as a permanent holder, but as a temporary steward, ever awaiting the return of an unseen Lord (Mar_13:35-37). He thus maintains his fellowship with the two realms to which he belongs, but there is no division in his mind (μη μετεωριζεσθε in Luk_11:29 according to interpretation of Authorized Version and Revised Version NT 1881, OT 1885 : cf. the supreme submission of Mar_14:36) as to their comparative claims. His real world is the spiritual world. Whether he is giving alms, praying, fasting, or whatever he is doing, his true life is a life lived 'in secret' away from the gaze of men (Mat_6:1-18). (c) And it is the claim of this unseen life that dictates his policy in all his earthly concerns. If it require that he sacrifice his own temporal fame (cf. Joh_3:29-30) or temporal possessions (Mat_9:9), he does so with joy. If, on the contrary, it require that he retain these and employ them for the advancement of the Kingdom, he is equally, but no more, ready to obey While some men make a temporal use of eternal conditions (Mat_21:12 ff. and ||), he makes an eternal use of temporal conditions (Mat_25:40, Luk_16:9-11). While some interpret spiritual facts by the material (Mat_16:23, Joh_6:42; Joh_6:52), he seeks the key to material facts in the spiritual. Like his Lord, he never condemns as inherently evil the things which are temporal and material, but throughout his life he subjects them to what is spiritual and eternal (cf. 2Co_4:18). And herein he has found life's true interpretation (cf. Joh_6:63).

Literature.—Cremer, *Lex. s.v. κόσμος*; Weiss, *NT Theol.*, Index; Beyschlag, *NT Theol.* ii. 250, 435, 471; F. W. Robertson, *Serm.*, 2nd ser. xiii; Dale, *Laws of Christ*, 217; *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times.*] v. [1894] 201; J. Watson, *The Inspiration of our Faith*, 122; J. H. Jowett, *Apostolic Optimism*, 47; E. Grubb in *Present-Day Papers*, i. (1898) 7; J. Rickaby, *Oxf. and Camb. Conferences*, 2nd ser. (1900-1) p. 25.

H. Bisseker.

WORM.—See Animals in vol. i. p. 67^a.

☩ Wormwood

WORMWOOD.—See Gall.

☩ Worship

WORSHIP.—See Praise, Prayer, Synagogue, Temple.

☩ Wrath

WRATH.—See Anger.

☩ Writing

WRITING.—The allusions to writing in the Gospels may be classified under four headings, none of which requires any elaborate discussion.

1. In one series of passages ('Moses wrote,' or 'it is written') the reference is to the OT Scriptures, whose letter was held to be authoritative on matters of faith and morals. This view of Scripture was due mainly to the influence of the earlier Rabbis, and naturally it dominated more or less the thinking of the primitive Church, whose one sacred book was the OT. But the formula 'as it is written' had already acquired a juristic sense, as may be seen from numerous inscriptions and papyri (Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, pp. 112-114, 249, 250), so that the LXX Septuagint translators were not striking out a new line in rendering *Torah* often by νόμος. 'A religion of documents—considered even historically—is a religion of law.' It is in this legal or semitechnical sense that Pilate is said to have written the charge against Jesus (Joh 19:19 etc.), while another metaphorical application occurs in Luk 10:20 'rejoice that your names are written (or enrolled) in heaven.' The latter passage alludes to the well-known Rabbinic and apocalyptic conception of the heavenly books or registers, a figure employed to denote the indelible mercy of God and the certainty of the believer's relation to Himself, as a citizen of the heavenly state. To have one's

name written in the heavenly archives, or inscribed on the Divine roll of citizens, was equivalent to the enjoyment of a safe and sure lot with God. On the general use of γραφή in the Gospels and Epistles, see art. Scripture, and *ExpT* [Note: *xpT Expository Times.*] xiv. [1903] 475-478.

2. Twice the phrase is used of the composition of the Gospels (Luk_1:3, Joh_20:30-31; Joh_21:24-25), the object of the undertaking in both cases being carefully explained as practical, not literary. To confirm faith, if not to awaken it, is the aim of a written Gospel. Thus an implicit divergence from the above-mentioned sense of γραφή emerges here. No writer of the Gospel claims a juristic authority for his statements. There is nothing legal or formal about their contents (cf. Moffatt, *Historical New Testament*² [Note: designates the particular edition of the work referred] , pp. 42 f., 258, 259, 537, 538), nor, as the very persistence of oral tradition suggests, was there any notion of setting them up as infallible tests. Faith sprang from hearing rather than from reading in those days of primitive Christianity. The rise of written records was late, and even their growing prominence did not as yet shift the centre of gravity and influence from living intercourse to scholastic or doctrinal prepossessions. The living voice, the fellowship of the Christian Church, the witness of Apostles—these prevented anything like degeneration into a book religion. The *litera scripta* had its place and merits. But it was produced in and for the Church. And not until it became isolated from the Church did its abuse begin. ‘For the general principles of any study you may learn by books at home; but the detail, the colour, the tone, the air, the life which makes it live in us, you must catch all these from those in whom it lives already’ (Newman). Thus the rise of written records in Christianity introduced a real problem, which is soluble only upon a proper view of the mutual relations between living intercourse, such as the Church provides, and literary standards and sources (cf. Tolstoi’s *Essays*, 170 f.).

3. The ordinary use of writing is twice mentioned, in connexion with domestic (Luk_1:63) and business (Luk_16:6-7) affairs. The three R’s were taught in Jewish schools, so that writing would be a fairly common accomplishment, indispensable, of course, to the higher branches of trade and culture (cf. Edersheim’s *Sketches of Jewish Social Life*, p. 130 f.). See art. Education.

4. Jesus Himself is only once said to have written—and that upon the dust (Joh_8:6; Joh_8:8), stooping and scrawling with His finger on the ground to conceal His embarrassment and to avoid answering the brazen questions of the woman’s accusers (cf. *Ecce Homo*, ch. ix.). It is idle to suppose that He wrote any sentence, or to conjecture what that sentence was, whether the sins of His interrogators or some text like Mat_5:3 or Psa_50:16. It is the action and nothing else that is significant. Jesus

stooped to write, in short, by one of those natural gestures which a pure-minded man, seated on the ground, would employ to hide his confusion and put by a question which should never have been asked.

J. Moffatt.

☞Year

YEAR.—See Time.

☞Yoke

YOKE.—The yoke (ζυγός, Mat 11:29 f.) supplied Jesus with one of His agricultural metaphors (cf. Mat 13:38, Luk 12:17; Luk 15:14, Joh 15:1). It was ‘a bar which connects two of a kind usually—as the ox-yoke—fastened by bows on the necks of a pair of oxen and by thongs to the horns or the foreheads of the oxen. It consists generally of a piece of timber hollowed or made curving near each end, and fitted with bows for receiving the necks of the oxen, by which means two are connected for drawing. From a ring or hook in the bow a chain extends to the thing to be drawn’ (Lloyd’s *Ency. Dict.*). Another use of the word is found in Luk 14:19 (ζεῦγος, translation ‘pair’ in Luk 2:24), where it means a pair of draught-oxen. Now, while the facts of farm-life supplied the form for this metaphor of Jesus, it was not there alone that He found the idea of the metaphor. When from the fields His eye turned to the Scriptures to survey the story of His people, on many a page the yoke met His vision. There it is, in prose, poetry, and prophecy; about it have gathered the country’s glory and grief. To itself it has harnessed the people’s experiences. Ideas of opposing character—joy and woe, freedom and slavery, peace and war, plenty and poverty—are symbolized by it (Deu 28:48, Job 1:3; Job 42:12, Jer 2:20, Isa 58:6, 1Ki 12:4, Lam 3:27). Moreover, it is in His treatment of those bitter-sweet memories and realities of life that the teaching of Jesus, *under this figure of speech*, touches and keeps a lonely sublimity. Only once (Mat 11:29 f.) He uses the metaphor. Now it is in everyday use. For He ‘touched nothing that He did not adorn.’ And He so adorned the yoke as to draw after it the whole gospel.

When Jesus turned His gaze from the fields of industrial life, and from the book of remembrance of the past to the book of the life of His own generation, He discovered a nation under the yoke, a race under the harrow. He hit the mark when He spoke of

yokes. His audience was made up of those who were wearing yokes of all sorts and sizes, but no man with his own yoke harnessed on exactly as his neighbour's. On the other hand, that audience was suffering under an intolerable strain. Three yokes were galling and killing them—(1) the yoke of the Law, (2) of Rome, (3) of sin. Their leaders (Mat 23:4) bound grievous burdens on the people's shoulders; nor would they remove them. Of some it was the constant temptation to throw off the yoke of the foreigner. The Zealots (Luk 6:15) were most restive under Rome. They were the political Nationalists of the day. Again, who of them all was not 'sold under sin' (Rom 7:14)? These were the yokes of the people. The yoke of Jesus was the will of the Father. He wore it always, never worked without it; never against it, always *with* it (Joh 8:29). Once He asked thrice if He might take it off (Mat 26:39 ff.) for the road was steep. The yoke of Jesus was the welfare of man. He came to serve (Mar 10:45). To be Saviour was at once the lowliest, loftiest, and loneliest way of working out the welfare of man. And this yoke was tied on with cords of love (Joh 13:1) unto the end. The humanity of Jesus was His yoke. He was, not the angel (Heb 2:9; Heb 2:16), but the man Christ Jesus (1Ti 2:5); and He did the perfect will of the Father under this yoke, frail but firm—the body of His humiliation.

Literature.—Bishop Thorold's *The Yoke of Christ; Expositor*, i. vi. [1877] 142, vii. [1878] 348, xi. [1880] 101; *Exp. Times*, iii. [1892] 512, vi. [1895] 176; Henry Drummond, *Pax Vobiscum*, 41; W. A. Butler, *Sermons*, ii. 320; G. A. Chadwick, *Pilate's Gift*, 62; G. Macdonald, *Hope of the Gospel*, 152.

John R. Legge.

☞ Young Man

YOUNG MAN.—In the Gospels we have on four occasions incidents of importance described, in which 'a young man' (*νεανίσκος*, not *νεανίας*. [as in Act 7:51 of Saul, Act 20:9 of Eutychus, Act 23:17 of St. Paul's nephew]) is one of the figures.

1. St. Matthew (Mat 19:20; Mat 19:22; cf. Mar 10:17, Luk 18:18) describes by this name the 'ruler' who asked our Lord what he must do to inherit eternal life. It adds to the pathos of the scene to know that this man, who 'went away sorrowful' because he could not give up his great possessions in the quest for life, was still so youthful as to be called *νεανίσκος*. He had not reached the prime of life,* [Note: The word *νεανίσκος* stands for any age from boyhood up to 40 years. See Liddell and Scott, s.v., and cf. Swete's a note on Mar 10:17.] when the love of money had cankered his heart and soul.

2. The widow's only son at Nain, who was being carried out to burial when our Lord touched the bier and raised him to life, was comparatively young: our Lord called him νεανίσκος when He bade him arise (Luk_7:14). An additional touch is given to the beauty of the miracle if we may infer the mother's early widowhood and the youth's career of promise cut short, for which the Saviour's gift of life restored (ἔδωκεν αὐτόν , Luk_7:15) made ample and unexpected compensation.

3. St. Mark (Mar_14:51-52) records a brief and somewhat mysterious incident, which occurred on the way from Gethsemane to the high priest's palace on the night of the Betrayal. When 'all the disciples forsook him and fled' there 'followed with him' still 'a certain young man' who had 'a linen cloth cast about him, over his naked body.' Perhaps he had been roused from sleep that night, and so had nothing but his bed-robe on as he rushed from the house to see what was taking place at the garden. And when some of the 'multitude with swords and staves' who arrested Christ tried to lay hold on him also, he escaped, but left the linen cloth behind him in their grasp. Evidently the slight event had some special association for St. Mark with the memories of that night, and it has been conjectured that the νεανίσκος is, in fact, the Evangelist himself; and, further, that he was a member of the household where the Last Supper had just been eaten, perhaps the son of the οἰκοδεσπότης (Mar_14:14). Others, with less probability, have wished to identify him with St. John or with St. James the Lord's brother (see Swete's notes, *in loc.*). In art he is sometimes represented as the keeper of the garden (*l'ortolano*: see Mrs. Jameson's *Hist. of our Lord in Art*, vol. ii. p. 43). Bengel's inference (*locuples igitur erat*, Mat_11:8) tallies well with the idea that he was John Mark (see Act_12:12).

4. According to Mar_16:5, he who appeared to the women at the sepulchre on the morning of the Resurrection was 'a young man sitting on the right side, arrayed in a white robe.' In St. Matthew's account he is described as 'an angel of the Lord' (Mat_28:2), while St. Luke tells us of 'two men in shining garments' who spoke to them (Luk_24:4 : but in Luk_24:23 'a vision of angels'). In apt illustration of St. Mark's version Swete quotes 2Ma_3:26; 2Ma_3:33 δύο ἐφάνησαν αὐτῷ νεανία ... διαπρεπεῖς τὴν περιβολὴν ... οἱ αὐτοὶ νεανία πάλιν ἐφάνησαν τῷ Ἡλιοδώρῳ ἐν ταῖς αὐταῖς ἐσθήσεσι ἐστολισμένοι; and Josephus *Ant.* V. viii. 2, where the angel who appears to Manoah's wife is φάντασμα ... νεανία καλῶ παραπλήσιον μεγάλῳ. Cf. also *Evang. Petr.* §§; 9, 11, and 13.

Literature.—For homiletical treatment of these four incidents referring to νεανίσκοι, the following may be consulted:—1. Lynch, *Sermons for my Curates*, p. 175 ff.;

Martineau, *End. after the Christian Life*, p. 265 ff.; *Expositor*, i. vi. [1877] p. 229 ff. 2. Trench, *Notes on the Miracles*; W. M. Taylor, *Miracles of Our Lord*. 3. *Expositor*, i. i. [1875] p. 436 ff. See art. Mark 4. Maclaren, *Sermons preached in Manchester*, 2nd ser. p. 190 ff.

C. L. Feltoe.

☞ Zacchaeus

ZACCHAEUS (*Zακχαῖος*; Heb. זָכַי ‘pure’).—The graphic narrative of [Luk_19:1-10](#) tells us all that we know of Zacchaeus, and his name does not occur elsewhere in the NT. The importance of Jericho as a trade centre, the abundance and value of whose products called forth the enthusiastic approbation of Josephus (*BJ* iv. viii. 2, 3), required the employment of a considerable number of tax-collectors, and these were under the general direction of Zacchaeus (cf. ἀρχιτελώνης, [Luk_19:2](#)), who may, in point of fact, have been himself the fortunate leaseholder of the customs of that particular district. In other words, he may have purchased from the authorities the right to be as exacting as he pleased in his demands upon the people, provided he knew enough of the law to avoid the risk of exposure. There is no reason to believe that Zacchaeus was a notoriously bad representative of his class; but, on the other hand, having regard to that remorseful cry of his which seems to have been the product of an awakened conscience ([Luk_19:8](#)), it does not appear that his methods were always strictly equitable. He was, so far as one may gather, a *publicanus* (see art. Publican) of more than average respectability, yet not above some of the questionable ways associated with his profession. To paint his character in lurid colours, as distinguished by unusual heartlessness and selfishness, is not in accordance with the impression conveyed by the narrative.

One is never quite safe in venturing upon a pronouncement with regard to motives—they are generally so curiously mixed; and possibly a variety of motives contributed to the impulse which brought Zacchaeus into contact with Jesus that day. But while it might be too much to say that higher motives were entirely absent, it is quite obvious that the part played by a naturally lively curiosity was not inconsiderable. In this connexion, the contrast between Matthew *sitting* at the receipt of custom and Zacchaeus leaving all thoughts of business behind and *climbing a tree* with eager speed, is sufficiently great to indicate a vital difference in character between the two men.

More interesting than the attitude of Zacchaeus towards Jesus is the attitude of Jesus towards him. If we look for an explanation of the wonderful transformation, implicated in the resolve in which Zacchaeus gave expression to his feelings, we find it, undoubtedly, in the delightful frankness of Christ's first salutation, and in His courageous brushing aside of popular prejudice. In no other way could He have so completely gained, first, the attention, and then the heart of one whom society united in passing by. Nothing, surely, could be more remarkable than the delicate insight which led Jesus to choose Zacchaeus as His host. It was an irresistible touch, and, mingled with the other happy recollections of that day, it would abide in the mind of the publican as a peculiarly grateful memory.

Literature.—In addition to the various Comm., see A. B. Davidson, *Called of God*, 275; Matheson, *Representative Men of the NT*, 205; F. W. Robertson, *Serm.* i. v., ii. xvi.; Lynch, *Serm, for my Curates*, 71; A. Maclaren, *Paul's Prayers*, etc. 88; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*, xx.; C. S. Horne, *Rock of Ages*, 281; artt. 'Jericho' and 'Publican' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible .

A. G. Campbell.

☞Zachariah

ZACHARIAH.—See Barachiah.

☞Zacharias

ZACHARIAS (*Zαχαρίας*).—Father of John the Baptist (Luk 1:5-25; Luk 1:57-80); a Jewish priest, who was an old man at the close of the reign of Herod the Great [Note: reat Cranmer's 'Great' Bible 1539.] (b.c. 4). 'The strawberry grows underneath the nettle,' and, even in that evil time of wickedness in high places in Church and State, there lived in Palestine no inconsiderable number of just and devout persons both among priests and people. Of such was Zacharias. A Jewish priest, a member of the family of Abijah, Zacharias had been so careful to observe the law regarding the marriage of priests (Lev 21:7-14), that he chose for wife one of the sacerdotal house, a daughter of Aaron (Luk 1:5), named after Aaron's wife (Exo 6:23), Elisabeth, who was as pious as himself. They were righteous not only in the sight of men but of God, and blameless in their care to observe all His commandments and ordinances; but notwithstanding this, and the promise of God by Jeremiah (Jer 33:18), and their eager desire, and Zacharias' lifelong prayer (Luk 1:18), their union was not blessed

with offspring. It was due to Elisabeth's barrenness (Luk 1:7); and she keenly felt the reproach which it occasioned (Luk 1:25), for it was a common opinion among the Jews that childlessness was God's punishment for guilt. They had both reached old age when the miraculous event occurred which surpassed all they could have looked for.

Zacharias had left his home in the hill-country of Judah to fulfil in the Temple at Jerusalem his week of service; and it fell to his lot to perform the very special duty of burning incense in the Holy Place, separated only by the veil from the Holy of Holies. It was a very notable occasion in a priest's life, which did not come at all to many a priest (it is said there were 20,000 of them altogether about this period), and it was not likely the lot would ever fall on him again to offer it. The offering of incense was symbolical of prayer (Rev 5:8); the people worshipping in the courts outside were praying while the smoke was rising from his censer within (Luk 1:10); it was impossible that he should not be praying too, and if only by the force of long habit, the old petition rose once more to his lips. Suddenly there stood in front of him, on the right side of the altar of incense (Luk 1:11), where no mortal man should be, an angel of the Lord. In the presence of the supernatural, Zacharias feared and trembled; but the angel reassured him, told him that his prayer was heard, that his wife Elisabeth should bear him a son, whom he should live to see, and name John (= 'the grace of Jehovah'), which would be no barren title, but describe his character and mission: 'he shall be great in the sight of the Lord' (cf. Mat 11:11, Luk 7:28). This son must be brought up as a Nazirite in the highest form of Levitical devotion (Num 6:4, Jdg 13:4, Lam 4:7, Amo 2:12); he should, like another Elijah (1Ki 18:37), turn many of the children of Israel unto the Lord, and be the forerunner, as foretold by Malachi, to Messiah Himself (Luk 1:15-17).

Zacharias had not the faith of Abraham, who staggered not through unbelief (Rom 4:19) at a promise of God exactly similar, 'involving human generation, but prophetically announced and supernatural' (Alford). He asked for a sign (κατὰ τί;), and pointed out the difficulties in the way. Some (e.g. Bruce) have expressed surprise that 'so natural a hesitation' should be treated, and punished, as a sin'; but to whom much is given, of him much shall be required. Others have asked why Zacharias should be censured here, and not the virgin Mary (Luk 1:34-35), not observing that hers was not a question of doubt, 'Whereby shall I know?' but a request for direction (πῶς ἔσται ἡ τοῦτο;), 'How is it to be brought about?'—a question implying faith as to the event itself. She got a sign too, though she had not asked one; but hers was joyful, Zacharias' punitive, yet merciful. 'Thou shalt be dumb, not only as one stupefied with wonder, but also 'unable to speak'; yet for a season merely, till, at the proper time, the promise has its fulfilment. Thus, on the threshold of the Gospel, at the very

outset of its great series of miracles, is unbelief chastised. The soul that will not believe shall not be allowed to speak (cf. 2Co 4:13).

It was not, the Talmudists inform us, the custom of the priests, when officiating inside the Holy Place, to make their own devotions long, lest the people outside should be anxious; but Zacharias' interview with Gabriel, and perhaps the feelings it awakened, caused him to delay. The worshippers in the Temple courts marvelled why he tarried so long; the thought likely to occur to them was that God had slain the priest as unworthy (Bruce); and when at last he did make his appearance, he could neither explain the reason for his delay, nor give them the Aaronic benediction (Num 6:22-24), which was pronounced after every morning and evening sacrifice by the priest with uplifted hands, the people responding to it with a loud Amen (Keil, *Bibl. Archæol.*). Like the dying St. Columba before the altar at Iona, though for a different reason, Zacharias signed with his hand the blessing which he could not speak (Num 6:22). As soon as the days of his ministration were accomplished, he returned to his home; the tokens of his wife's pregnancy soon added a sign of joy to the sign of punishment which he bore about with him. The promised child was born, but the chastisement was not taken off till the hour arrived when he had his predicted function to fulfil, by calling the infant by his appointed name.

Godet remarks on the pleasant picture of family life presented by the scene of the Baptist's circumcision, It had been a custom since the birth of Isaac (who received his name at his circumcision) to give a child his name on the same day in which he was signed as one of God's people: for a similar reason, Christian children are named on the occasion of their entrance by baptism into the Church. A difficulty which some have felt, that Zacharias was dumb only and not deaf, yet is treated by the company as if unable to hear, is met by Olshausen with the remark that these two afflictions go so frequently together, that men easily accustom themselves to treat dumb persons as deaf.

The heart of Zacharias had been gathering thoughts to itself through all those months of silence, and no sooner was his mouth opened than he poured forth to God the hymn of priestly thanksgiving which we call, from its first word in the Latin version, *Benedictus* (wh. see). Here we need only note in it an evident allusion to his own name (signifying 'Remembered by Jehovah') and his wife's (*Elisabeth = Eli-sheba = 'the oath of God'*)—'to remember his holy covenant; the oath which he swore to our father Abraham' (Luk 1:72-73).

Nothing is said of Zacharias after this. The statement of several of the Fathers (Origen, Greg. Nyss., Cyr., and Pet. Alex. [Note: Alexandrian.]), though accepted by Baronius, that this Zacharias was slain by Herod between the Temple and the brazen altar, has no historical basis; it is a mere guess to explain the difficulty, that whereas

many of the prophets were martyred at a later date than Zechariah the son of Jehoiada (2Ch 24:20), yet our Lord, summing up the list of such murders, begins with Abel and ends with Zechariah (Mat 23:35). See Barachiah. Zacharias having been by this mistake made a martyr, his relics were forthcoming, and Cornelius a Lapide speaks of seeing and venerating his head in the Lateran basilica at Rome.

James Cooper.

Zarephath

ZAREPHATH (Authorized Version Sarepta).—A town of the narrow rocky Phœnician coast, 9 miles S.W. of Sidon, 17 miles N. of Tyre, and 60 miles directly N. of Nazareth, whence NT reference is made to it. Perched 500 feet high on a steep hillside a mile from the coast road, the modern shrunken hamlet looks down upon the traveller riding through a mile of the ruins of the ancient Zarephath, which once as a populous city extended to the sea, was provided with walls, and had a commodious harbour, now filled with sand and ruins.

While, in the theoretical division of the Holy Land among the twelve tribes by Joshua, Zarephath fell into the lot of Asher, going down, as that did, ‘even unto great Sidon,’ ‘and to the fortified city of Tyre’ (Jos 19:28 f.), it, together with the most of Asher’s territory, remained almost wholly Phœnician and Gentile. St. Luke’s report of Christ’s sermon at Nazareth distinctly connects Zarephath with Sidon, as do the LXX Septuagint and Massoretic Text in the account of Elijah’s sustenance by the widow there. This Evangelist—apparently the only Gentile-Christian NT writer—seizes as does no other upon the thought that the boundless grace of God has been extended in certain typical cases to remote Gentiles, even to the superseding and exclusion of those who were of the stock of Abraham and dwelt within the Holy Land. The choice, among all others, of the widow of pagan Phœnician Zarephath, and of Naaman the leper of heathen Syrian Damascus, to receive the favours of the prophets Elijah and Elisha, filled the crabbed synagogue hearers of Nazareth with wrath and murder (Luk 4:25 ff.).

Wilbur Fletcher Steele.

Zeal

ZEAL.—It is not easy to distinguish *zeal* (Gr. ζήλος from ζέω ‘to boil’) from *enthusiasm* (which see); but, as regards the derivation, the former indicates the *character*, the latter the *source* of the inward state; and, as regards the meaning, the former lays stress on the *volitional*, the latter on the *emotional* aspect of the complex condition of soul. As ‘ardour in embracing, pursuing, or defending’ an object, it is ascribed to Phinehas (Num 25:11; Num 25:13), Elijah (1Ma 2:58), the Jewish people (Act 21:20, Rom 10:2). St. Paul claims it for himself (Act 22:3, 2Co 11:2, Gal 1:14, Php 3:6), and commends it in the Corinthians (2Co 7:7; 2Co 7:11; 2Co 9:2) and Epaphras (Col 4:13, variant reading for *labour*). The same Greek word is used in the bad sense of *jealousy*, which is condemned in the Apostolic writings (1Co 3:3, 2Co 12:20, Gal 5:20, Jam 3:14; Jam 3:16). A quotation from the Psalms (Psa 69:9) is applied to Jesus to describe the impression made on the disciples by the first cleansing of the Temple (Joh 2:17). This may throw some light on the problem of the repetition of the act at the close of the ministry (Mat 21:12-17, Mar 11:15-18, Luk 19:45-46), as the first, may have been due to His fresh enthusiasm for His vocation, the second may have been a more deliberate assertion of His Messianic claim. As *zeal* in the fulfilment of His purpose is ascribed to God (2Ki 19:31, Isa 9:7; Isa 37:32; Isa 59:17; Isa 63:15, Eze 5:13), the mood itself as well as the occasion of it was worthy of Jesus as the Son of God.

From this term is derived the name of one of the Jewish parties, the *Zealots* (which see), to which, as his surname indicates, Simon the disciple (Luk 6:15, Act 1:13) had belonged. The zeal of Jesus for the Temple may have been what drew Simon to Him.

Alfred E. Garvie.

Zealot

ZEALOT (Gr. ζηλωτής) occurs in Luk 6:15 and Act 1:13 as the designation of Simon, one of the Twelve. In the lists given by Mt. and Mk. the equivalent ‘Cananaean’ (Κανα ναῖος) is used. The Zealots were the rigorous Nationalists, the party of violent opposition to Roman domination. Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. i. 6) calls them a ‘fourth sect of Jewish philosophy,’ and says that ‘Judas the Galilaeen was the founder.’ He adds: ‘These men agree in all things with the Pharisaic notions; but they have an inviolable attachment to liberty, and say that God is to be their only Ruler and Lord’; he speaks of their ‘immovable resolution’ and their indifference to suffering and death. These qualities were all abundantly illustrated in the final struggle at Jerusalem and at Masada. Edersheim (*LT [Note: T Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah [Edersheim].]* i.

237 ff.) dates the rise of the party from the accession of Herod the Great [Note: read Cranmer's 'Great' Bible 1539.] , and the activity of guerilla bands in Galilee under the leadership of one Ezechias. 'It was in fact a revival of the Maccabean movement, perhaps more fully in its national than in its religious aspect.' Plummer ('St. Luke' in *ICC* [Note: *CC International Critical Commentary.*]) attaches more importance to the religious aspect of the movement:—'The Zealots date from the time of the Maccabees as a class who attempted to force upon others their own rigorous interpretations of the Law.' In the later stages of the Jewish history the party grew more violent. Its ringleaders were known as the *Sicarii*, and their overthrow of all moderating leadership sealed the doom of Jerusalem. There is no special difficulty in believing that a member of this party might be attracted to Jesus and become one of His chosen disciples. Galilee was the home of the party, and it naturally included in it men of very different types, from the religious fanatic to the partisan of revolution. Simon's zealotry, purified by the knowledge of Jesus, might readily become true loyalty to the Kingdom of God. Edersheim gives us the additional explanation that, at the period when the ministry of Jesus began, 'A brief calm had fallen upon the land. There was nothing to provoke active resistance, and the party of the Zealots, although existing, and striking deeper root in the hearts of the people, was, for the time, rather what Josephus called it, "the philosophical party"—their minds busy with an ideal, which their hands were not yet preparing to make a reality' (*op. cit.* p. 243). We should, however, take note of the alternative possibility (see Plummer, *loc. cit.*) that Simon may have been called ζηλωτής 'because of his personal character either before or after his call,' as St. Paul (Gal 1:14) styles himself περισσοτέρως ζηλωτής ... τῶν ... παραδόσεων. See also Cananaean.

E. H. Titchmarsh.

Zebedee

ZEBEDEE (Ζεβεδαιός) is mentioned several times in the Gospels, but always as the father of James and John. Like his sons, he was a fisherman, and he and they were partners with Simon (Luk 5:10). He was with James and John in a boat when they were summoned by Jesus (Mat 4:21), and their call as disciples left him with the hired servants (Mar 1:20), and broke up the partnership with Simon. There is no record of any direct association of Zebedee with Jesus.

John Herkless.

ZEBULUN

1. Description.—Our knowledge of the limits of Zebulun are even more indefinite than in the case of Naphtali (wh. see), and for the same reasons. It was bounded on the east by that tribe, while on the south it seems to have touched the northern edge of the plain of Esdraelon, and to have included a portion of it towards the Kishon at the foot of Carmel. On the west the slopes towards the plain of Acre, and on the north the plain of Suchnîn, seem to have been the boundaries. Josephus, indeed, tells us (*Ant.* v. i. 22) that ‘the tribe of Zebulun’s lot included the land that lay as far as Gennesaret, and that which belonged to Carmel and the sea.’ The latter portion seems to have been implied in the promises of Gen 49:13 and Deu 33:18, but it is excluded in Joshua’s (Jos 19:10-16) division of the land. The seeming contradiction may perhaps be explained by supposing that Zebulun possessed a detached portion in Haifa (חיפה), for the emphasis in the repetition of אֶנְיַת יָהוּ and נַמִּים יָהוּ (Gen 49:13) clearly assigns that port to this tribe. This would agree also with the statement of the Rabbis: ‘Zebulun was going out to the seas,’ ‘Zebulun was diligent in business (פֶּרֶק מַטִּיא),’ ‘Zebulun was bringing in merchandise in ships’ (*Ber. Rab.* §§ 72, 99; *Waikra Rab.* § 25; *Yalkut Shimeoni*, § 161; *Mid. Tanh.*; *Pesikta Zutarta* and *Zohar* on Gen 49:13). Still the main body of Zebulun touched no sea. Apart from the southwest portion in the plain of Esdraelon, the tribal lands consist of undulating hills and narrow valleys, which, however, widen out at places into small but extremely fertile plains, the chief of which are the plain of Toran in the east, the plain of Suchnîn in the north, and *el-Battauf* or the plain of Asochis in the centre. Zebulun is not so wild in scenery as Naphtali, nor has it the same variety of climate, being wholly situated in Lower Galilee (*M. Shebiith*, ix. 2). It varies in elevation from 365 feet in the plain to 1780 feet at *Tell Jefât*. It possesses no perennial stream of any size, and has no lake of any kind except that from the beginning of the rainy season *el-Battauf* is flooded. It remains in this condition all winter, and often contains a large quantity of water till June or July. This must always have been, and still is, in itself a fruitful source of malaria, as also through the springs it feeds in the direction of Gennesaret. Elsewhere Zebulun is well supplied with springs. The rock of the district is the same soft white limestone we meet with in Naphtali. Of this there are great barren ridges especially to the north of the plain of Toran and west of *el-Battauf*; but, as we have observed in Naphtali, they might easily be transformed into orchard land. The other hills, which for the most part run east and west, are covered with low prickly oak. There is nothing of the nature of forests now except in the west and southwest—beside *Shefâ-Amr* and *el-Hâritîye*, still there is abundant evidence to show that in the 1st cent. other places, especially in the north, were well wooded (*BJ* iii. iii. 2 and vii. 8). The chief business of the population is now and must always have been *agriculture*. At the present time good crops are reaped in the plains and valleys and on the hill sides. Everywhere we meet with fruits of all kinds, olive trees in the valleys, and around all

the villages, orchards and vineyards, with an abundance of figs and pomegranates. On the hills, flocks of sheep and goats are pastured. But, fruitful as the land now is, it was formerly more so. We are told that in the early centuries ‘the land for sixteen miles around Sepphoris flowed with milk and honey’ (Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] *Biccur*. i. 8), and that means the whole tribe of Zebulun. Olive oil was plentiful around Jotapata—*Tell Jefât* (*BJ* iii. vii. 28); Araba in the north was a great grain market; while Suchnîn, close by, produced the best wine, and Shikmona in the south was famous for its pomegranates, just as Kefr Kenna is renowned to-day for the size and quality of those it produces. Antoninus Martyr (6th cent.) draws a most enchanting picture of the regions around Nazareth, and he compares the district to Paradise (*Itiner*. § 5). He was doubtless controlled to a great extent by sentiment, but it must be admitted that even at the present day many of the valleys, especially to the west of Nazareth, and above all that of *Seffurieh*, justify his description, with their profusion of flowers, fruits, and greenness so pleasing to the eye in contrast to the white rocks.

2. People and historical associations.—As in the rest of Galilee, the Jewish population here had come in during the later days of the Maccabees and the reign of Herod. During the century preceding our Lord’s Advent, Zebulun had passed through more stirring times than any other tribe of Israel. Its chief town, Sepphoris (Dio-Caesarea),—the traditional home of the parents of Mary,—had been repeatedly taken, and immediately after the death of Herod, when the young child Jesus was safe in Egypt, it had been twice besieged and captured, once by Judas the son of Hezekiah (*BJ* II. iv. 1; *Ant.* xvii. x. 5), and then by the troops of Varus assisted by a detachment of Arabs (*BJ* ii. v. 1; *Ant.* xvii. x. 9). On the latter occasion the city was burned, and many of the inhabitants were sold into slavery. Such an event would be long impressed on the minds of the people, especially those of Nazareth, who from *three miles distant* would view the scene from the hill tops around their city. They would lament many a friend and brother there, and during the years to come they would be making efforts to redeem their relatives from slavery. When the boy Jesus was ten years old, the land was again to pass through the horrors of war, when Judas and his Zealots held out till overcome by Gessius Florus (*Ant.* xviii. i. 6; cf. *BJ* ii. vii. 1). Thenceforward for many years there was peace, industry, and progress. The people of Zebulun are not to be thought of as poor. We learn that the inhabitants of Sepphoris had ample means. It was one of the cities rebuilt and fortified by Herod, who made it again the capital of Galilee (*Ant.* xviii. ii. 1); and amongst its inhabitants were senators and citizens (Jerus. [Note: Jerusalem.] *Horaioth* iii. 5). We read also of a city named Zebulun in this district. It is described as πόλις ἀνδρῶν, and was said to have houses like those of Tyre, Sidon, and Berytus, and to possess all sorts of good things (*BJ* ii. xviii. 9). But whatever may have been the extent of Zebulun’s trade on the sea, the people would be familiar with, and at least engage in the *carrying* trade

on land, for the great *Via Maris* of ancient and modern times passes along the plains of *Toraṅ* and *el-Battauf* westward to the sea, so that, whatever wealth the people may have become possessed of, they would at least be familiar with the sight of earth's treasures.

Not only would the memories of the events, through which the newly settled Zebulun had passed, influence its people, but their thoughts would also be moulded by the scenes around, which were rich in old historical associations. The tribe had given two judges to Israel, Ibzan of Bethlehem (Jdg 12:8) and Elon (Jdg 12:11), while 3 miles from Nazareth was Gath-hepher, the birthplace of Jonah, the first prophet to the Gentiles, and his tomb is still shown there. Then to the young Israelite of the 1st cent, no scene in the whole land could be more inspiring than the view from the hills of Zebulun. To the south the plain of Esdraelon, the battle-ground of Israel, lies stretched out—a glorious panorama. Every crisis in the nation's history had a memory there. Close at hand, by Tabor and Kishon, the men of Zebulun had 'jeopardied their lives to the death' (Jdg 5:18). Little Hermon—the Hill of Moreh—and Gideon's fountain (Jdg 7:1) would recall the 'day of Midian'; while Gilboa would bring thoughts of Israel's darker days, and Jezreel memories of sad declension in the time of Ahab. Shunem, Endor, and Bethshean could also be seen, and Megiddo too,—the scene of Josiah's heroic fight; while nearer still on the shoulder of Carmel was 'the place of burning,'—the site of Elijah's sacrifice, and of Baal's inglorious defeat before the God of Israel. More distant were Mt. Ebal, with its memories of blessing and cursing, and Pisgah's peak in the distant haze; while westward there would be a glimpse of the 'great sea.' All these and many more historical sites are to be seen, and thoughts of them rise and stir the heart of him who views the scene; and if so to the passing stranger, what must they have been to the young Zebulunite, whose daily food they were, and who, in virtue of His blood, was the heir of all their most glorious memories?

The relationship of this people to the Gentile world is also worthy of note. Josephus (*BJ* i. iv. 3) tells us of the innate enmity of the Syrian to the Jew; but here such feelings would be less intense. We are repeatedly told of bonds of union between Zebulun and Issachar, and that this latter tribe busied itself with the Torah and made many proselytes (*Ber. Rab.* § 98); and before such was possible mutual jealousies must have ceased. At the same time the people would become familiar with the ceremonials of admission to Judaism, including that of baptism (*Bab.* [Note: Babylonian.] *Jeb.* 46 a, b). It is further to be remarked that, though the text seems doubtful, the town of Nazareth in this tribe is named in the songs of Eliezer Ha-kalîr as one of the meeting-places of the priests, when they assembled to go up to serve in the Temple.

3. Christ in Zebulun.—Although our Lord's teaching was for the most part given in the tribe of Naphtali, the land of Zebulun takes precedence not only in the prophecy (Mat 4:15), but also in historical sequence, and it is equally important for a knowledge of the Gospels. If Naphtali experienced most of the brilliancy of the noonday of the Sun of Righteousness, it was in Zebulun that the dawn appeared and shone more and more unto the perfect day. In a city of this tribe the Lord Jesus was brought up (Luk 4:16). As He increased in wisdom and stature, its associations aided in the moulding of His human character. During a period of well nigh 30 Years His life was passed in one of its valleys, broken into only by visits to the Holy City. His earlier years were spent in the midst of its fierce politics, He knew the various party watchwords; He knew what was meant by 'wars and rumours of wars'; He had come into contact with soldiers from Tabor and Sepphoris, and early learned the terrors associated with the word 'legion'; He had met returned slaves—redeemed, freed, or fugitive; He had wrought in the villages of this tribe, and we can even think of Joseph taking the young Jesus to work with him at Sepphoris during the busy days of its rebuilding—for there was not the same objection to entering it as the polluted Tiberias. The flowers of Nazareth had fostered His love of Nature, the operations in its fields and the products of its gardens were to be used to teach lessons for eternity. Nathanael, and perhaps other disciples, were from Cana in Zebulun (Joh 21:2). It was in it too that Christ publicly declared His office in the gracious words He spoke (Luk 4:21), that He performed His first miracle, and 'manifested forth his glory' so that 'his disciples believed on him' (Joh 2:11). But when we have studied the power of all these influences, and considered to what they should lead, we only convince ourselves the more 'that what He was and what He became for the world cannot be explained or grasped by the help of contemporary history or social conditions' (Delitzsch, *Handwerkleben*, § 1).

As in the case of Naphtali, the Rabbis have something to say of Zebulun. They discuss the question as to what Jacob saw in vision, in that he blessed Zebulun immediately after Judah (Gen 49:10-14), and the usual answer they give is that he foresaw the glories of Rabbinism in the presence of the Sanhedrin at Sepphoris before it was removed to Tiberias (*Yalkut Shimeoni*, i. § 161). It is, however, also recognized that 'The Holy One, blessed be He, should cause His Shekinah to dwell in Zebulun' (*Shem. Rab.* § 1).

Literature.—See under Naphtali.

Wm. M. Christie.

ZERAH.—A link in our Lord's genealogy (Mat_1:3).

Zerubbabel

ZERUBBABEL.—Mentioned in both Mt.'s (Mat_1:12 f.) and Lk.'s (Luk_3:27) genealogy of Jesus.

Zion

ZION.—See Jerusalem, vol. i. p. 850^b f.